ORGANIZED LIBRARY

Volume 3 of 5
eBook Release Years: 2011–2022
30 Works • Chronological Order

Project Gutenberg Collection

Contents — Volume 3

1. On Liberty — John Stuart Mill [2011]

2. Untitled — Unknown [2011]

3. Untitled — Arnold Aletrino [2011]

4. Our Knowledge of the External World as a Field for Scientific Method in Philosophy — Bertrand Russell [2011]

5. Human, All Too Human: A Book for Free Spirits — Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche [2011]

6. History of Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt — Jacob Abbott [2012]

7. The Life of Ludwig van Beethoven, Volume I — Alexander Wheelock Thayer [2013]

8. Untitled — Unknown [2014]

9. Untitled — Unknown [2015]

10. Friedrich Nietzsche in seinen Werken — Lou Andreas-Salomé [2015]

11. The origin and development of the moral ideas — Edward Westermarck [2016]

12. The Joyful Wisdom ("La Gaya Scienza") — Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche [2016]

13. Enfranchisement of women — Harriet Hardy Taylor MillThe Project Gutenberg eBook of La Igualdad Social y Política y sus Relaciones con la Libertad [2016]

14. The Will to Power: An Attempted Transvaluation of All Values. Book III and IV — Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche [2016]

15. Shakspeare and His Times [Vol. 1 of 2] — Nathan Drake [2016]

16. The Intermediate Sex: A Study of Some Transitional Types of Men and Women — Edward Carpenter [2016]

17. A Complete History of Music — W. J. Baltzell [2017]

18. Cecilia of the Pink Roses — Katharine Haviland-Taylor [2019]

19. Fuente Ovejuna — Lope de Vega [2019]

20. Untitled — Unknown [2019]

21. Untitled — Unknown [2020]

22. Untitled — Unknown [2021]

23. A Short Treatise on Boots and Shoes, Ancient and Modern — Walter H. Goater [2021]

24. A Short Treatise on Head Wear, Ancient and Modern — Anne C. Goater [2021]

25. The Story of Milk — Johan Ditlev Frederiksen [2021]

26. Good Health and How We Won It, With an Account of the New Hygiene — Upton Sinclair [2021]

27. Foods and Their Adulteration — Harvey Washington Wiley [2021]

28. The Abergeldie Winter Book — Eléonore Riego de la Branchardière [2021]

29. The Origin, Tendencies and Principles of Government — Victoria C. Woodhull [2022]

30. Untitled — Unknown [2022]

On Liberty

John Stuart Mill

Project Gutenberg Release: January 10, 2011 · eBook #34901

Produced by Curtis Weyant, Martin Pettit and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at http://www.pgdp.net

On Liberty.

By John Stuart Mill.

With an Introduction by W. L. Courtney, LL.D.

The Walter Scott Publishing Co., Ltd. London and Felling-on-Tyne New York and Melbourne

To the beloved and deplored memory of her who was the inspirer, and in part the author, of all that is best in my writings--the friend and wife whose exalted sense of truth and right was my strongest incitement, and whose approbation was my chief reward--I dedicate this volume. Like all that I have written for many years, it belongs as much to her as to me; but the work as it stands has had, in a very insufficient degree, the inestimable advantage of her revision; some of the most important portions having been reserved for a more careful re-examination, which they are now never destined to receive. Were I but capable of interpreting to the world one-half the great thoughts and noble feelings which are buried in her grave, I should be the medium of a greater benefit to it than is ever likely to arise from anything that I can write, unprompted and unassisted by her all but unrivalled wisdom.

INTRODUCTION.

I.

John Stuart Mill was born on 20th May 1806. He was a delicate child, and the extraordinary education designed by his father was not calculated to develop and improve his physical powers. "I never was a boy," he says; "never played cricket." His exercise was taken in the form of walks with his father, during which the elder Mill lectured his son and examined him on his work. It is idle to speculate on the possible results of a different treatment. Mill remained delicate throughout his life, but was endowed with that intense mental energy which is so often combined with physical weakness. His youth was sacrificed to an idea; he was designed by his father to carry on his work; the individuality of the boy was unimportant. A visit to the south of France at the age of fourteen, in company with the family of General Sir Samuel Bentham, was not without its influence. It was a glimpse of another atmosphere, though the studious habits of his home life were maintained. Moreover, he derived from it his interest in foreign politics, which remained one of his characteristics to the end of his life. In 1823 he was appointed junior clerk in the Examiners' Office at the India House.

Mill's first essays were written in the _Traveller_ about a year before he entered the India House. From that time forward his literary work was uninterrupted save by attacks of illness. His industry was stupendous. He wrote articles on an infinite variety of subjects, political, metaphysical, philosophic, religious, poetical. He discovered Tennyson for his generation, he influenced the writing of Carlyle's _French Revolution_ as well as its success. And all the while he was engaged in studying and preparing for his more ambitious works, while he rose step by step at the India Office. His _Essays on Unsettled Questions in Political Economy_ were written in 1831, although they did not appear until thirteen years later. His _System of Logic_, the design of which was even then fashioning itself in his brain, took thirteen years to complete, and was actually published before the _Political Economy_. In 1844 appeared the article on Michelet, which its author anticipated would cause some discussion, but which did not create the sensation he expected. Next year there were the "Claims of Labour" and "Guizot," and in 1847 his articles on Irish affairs in the _Morning Chronicle_. These years were very much influenced by his friendship and correspondence with Comte, a curious comradeship between men of such different temperament. In 1848 Mill published his _Political Economy_, to which he had given his serious study since the completion of his _Logic_. His articles and reviews, though they involved a good deal of work--as, for instance, the re-perusal of the _Iliad_ and the _Odyssey_ in the original before reviewing Grote's _Greece_--were recreation to the student. The year 1856 saw him head of the Examiners' Office in the India House, and another two years brought the end of his official work, owing to the transfer of India to the Crown. In the same year his wife died. _Liberty_ was published shortly after, as well as the

Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform, and no year passed without Mill making important contributions on the political, philosophical, and ethical questions of the day.

Seven years after the death of his wife, Mill was invited to contest Westminster. His feeling on the conduct of elections made him refuse to take any personal action in the matter, and he gave the frankest expression to his political views, but nevertheless he was elected by a large majority. He was not a conventional success in the House; as a speaker he lacked magnetism. But his influence was widely felt. "For the sake of the House of Commons at large," said Mr. Gladstone, "I rejoiced in his advent and deplored his disappearance. He did us all good." After only three years in Parliament, he was defeated at the next General Election by Mr. W. H. Smith. He retired to Avignon, to the pleasant little house where the happiest years of his life had been spent in the companionship of his wife, and continued his disinterested labours. He completed his edition of his father's _Analysis of the Mind_, and also produced, in addition to less important work, _The Subjection of Women_, in which he had the active co-operation of his step-daughter. A book on Socialism was under consideration, but, like an earlier study of Sociology, it never was written. He died in 1873, his last years being spent peacefully in the pleasant society of his step-daughter, from whose tender care and earnest intellectual sympathy he caught maybe a far-off reflection of the light which had irradiated his spiritual life.

II.

The circumstances under which John Stuart Mill wrote his _Liberty_ are largely connected with the influence which Mrs. Taylor wielded over his career. The dedication is well known. It contains the most extraordinary panegyric on a woman that any philosopher has ever penned. "Were I but capable of interpreting to the world one-half the great thoughts and noble feelings which are buried in her grave, I should be the medium of a greater benefit to it than is ever likely to arise from anything that I can write, unprompted and unassisted by her all but unrivalled wisdom." It is easy for the ordinary worldly cynicism to curl a sceptical lip over sentences like these. There may be exaggeration of sentiment, the necessary and inevitable reaction of a man who was trained according to the "dry light" of so unimpressionable a man as James Mill, the father; but the passage quoted is not the only one in which John Stuart Mill proclaims his unhesitating belief in the intellectual influence of his wife. The treatise on _Liberty_ was written especially under her authority and encouragement, but there are many earlier references to the power which she exercised over his mind. Mill was introduced to her as early as 1831, at a dinner-party at Mr. Taylor's house, where were present, amongst others, Roebuck, W. J. Fox, and Miss Harriet Martineau. The acquaintance rapidly ripened into intimacy and the intimacy into friendship, and Mill was never weary of expatiating on all the advantages of so singular a relationship. In some of the presentation copies of his work on _Political Economy_, he wrote the following dedication:--"To Mrs. John Taylor, who, of all persons known to the author, is the most highly qualified either to originate or to appreciate speculation on social advancement, this work is with the highest respect and esteem dedicated." An article on the enfranchisement of women was made the occasion for another encomium. We shall hardly be wrong in attributing a much later book, _The Subjection of Women_, published in 1869, to the influence wielded by Mrs. Taylor. Finally, the pages of the _Autobiography_ ring with the dithyrambic praise of his "almost infallible counsellor."

The facts of this remarkable intimacy can easily be stated. The deductions are more difficult. There is no question that Mill's infatuation was the cause of considerable trouble to his acquaintances and friends. His father openly taxed him with being in love with another man's wife. Roebuck, Mrs. Grote, Mrs. Austin, Miss Harriet Martineau were amongst those who suffered because they made some allusion to a forbidden subject. Mrs. Taylor lived with her daughter in a lodging in the country; but in 1851 her husband died, and then Mill made her his wife. Opinions were widely divergent as to her merits; but every one agreed that up to the time of her death, in 1858, Mill was wholly lost to his friends. George Mill, one of Mill's younger brothers, gave it as his opinion that she was a clever and remarkable woman, but "nothing like what John took her to be." Carlyle, in his reminiscences, described her with ambiguous epithets. She was "vivid," "iridescent," "pale and passionate and sad-looking, a living-romance heroine of the royalist volition and questionable destiny." It is not possible to make much of a judgment like this, but we get on more certain ground when we discover that Mrs. Carlyle said on one occasion that "she is thought to be dangerous," and that Carlyle added that she was worse than dangerous, she was patronising. The occasion when Mill and his wife were brought into close contact with the Carlyles is well known. The manuscript of the first volume of the _French Revolution_ had been lent to Mill, and was accidentally burnt by Mrs. Mill's servant. Mill and his wife drove up to Carlyle's door, the wife speechless, the husband so full of conversation that he detained Carlyle with desperate attempts at loquacity for two hours. But Dr. Garnett tells us, in his _Life of Carlyle_, that Mill made a substantial reparation for the calamity for which he was responsible by inducing the aggrieved author to accept half of the L200 which he offered. Mrs. Mill, as I have said, died in 1858, after seven years of happy companionship with her husband, and was buried at Avignon. The inscription which Mill wrote for her grave is too characteristic to be omitted:--"Her great and loving heart, her noble soul, her clear, powerful, original, and comprehensive intellect, made her the guide and support, the instructor in wisdom and

the example in goodness, as she was the sole earthly delight of those who had the happiness to belong to her. As earnest for all public good as she was generous and devoted to all who surrounded her, her influence has been felt in many of the greatest improvements of the age, and will be in those still to come. Were there even a few hearts and intellects like hers, this earth would already become the hoped-for Heaven." These lines prove the intensity of Mill's feeling, which is not afraid of abundant verbiage; but they also prove that he could not imagine what the effect would be on others, and, as Grote said, only Mill's reputation could survive these and similar displays.

Every one will judge for himself of this romantic episode in Mill's career, according to such experience as he may possess of the philosophic mind and of the value of these curious but not infrequent relationships. It may have been a piece of infatuation, or, if we prefer to say so, it may have been the most gracious and the most human page in Mill's career. Mrs. Mill may have flattered her husband's vanity by echoing his opinions, or she may have indeed been an Egeria, full of inspiration and intellectual helpfulness. What usually happens in these cases,--although the philosopher himself, through his belief in the equality of the sexes, was debarred from thinking so,--is the extremely valuable action and reaction of two different classes and orders of mind. To any one whose thoughts have been occupied with the sphere of abstract speculation, the lively and vivid presentment of concrete fact comes as a delightful and agreeable shock. The instinct of the woman often enables her not only to apprehend but to illustrate a truth for which she would be totally unable to give the adequate philosophic reasoning. On the other hand, the man, with the more careful logical methods and the slow processes of formal reasoning, is apt to suppose that the happy intuition which leaps to the conclusion is really based on the intellectual processes of which he is conscious in his own case. Thus both parties to the happy contract are equally pleased. The abstract truth gets the concrete illustration; the concrete illustration finds its proper foundation in a series of abstract inquiries. Perhaps Carlyle's epithets of "iridescent" and "vivid" refer incidentally to Mrs. Mill's quick perceptiveness, and thus throw a useful light on the mutual advantages of the common work of husband and wife. But it savours almost of impertinence even to attempt to lift the veil on a mystery like this. It is enough to say, perhaps, that however much we may deplore the exaggeration of Mill's references to his wife, we recognise that, for whatever reason, the pair lived an ideally happy life.

It still, however, remains to estimate the extent to which Mrs. Taylor, both before and after her marriage with Mill, made actual contributions to his thoughts and his public work. Here I may be perhaps permitted to avail myself of what I have already written in a previous work.[1] Mill gives us abundant help in this matter in the _Autobiography_. When first he knew her, his thoughts were turning to the subject of Logic. But his published work on the subject owed nothing to her, he tells us, in its doctrines. It was Mill's custom to write the whole of a book so as to get his general scheme complete, and then laboriously to re-write it in order to perfect the phrases and the composition. Doubtless Mrs. Taylor was of considerable help to him as a critic of style. But to be a critic of doctrine she was hardly qualified. Mill has made some clear admissions on this point. "The only actual revolution which has ever taken place in my modes of thinking was already complete,"[2] he says, before her influence became paramount. There is a curiously humble estimate of his own powers (to which Dr. Bain has called attention), which reads at first sight as if it contradicted this. "During the greater part of my literary life I have performed the office in relation to her, which, from a rather early period, I had considered as the most useful part that I was qualified to take in the domain of thought, that of an interpreter of original thinkers, and mediator between them and the public." So far it would seem that Mill had sat at the feet of his oracle; but observe the highly remarkable exception which is made in the following sentence:--"For I had always a humble opinion of my own powers as an original thinker, _except in abstract science (logic, metaphysics, and the theoretic principles of political economy and politics.)_"[3] If Mill then was an original thinker in logic, metaphysics, and the science of economy and politics, it is clear that he had not learnt these from her lips. And to most men logic and metaphysics may be safely taken as forming a domain in which originality of thought, if it can be honestly professed, is a sufficient title of distinction.

Mrs. Taylor's assistance in the _Political Economy_ is confined to certain definite points. The purely scientific part was, we are assured, not learnt from her. "But it was chiefly her influence which gave to the book that general tone by which it is distinguished from all previous expositions of political economy that had any pretensions to be scientific, and which has made it so useful in conciliating minds which those previous expositions had repelled. This tone consisted chiefly in making the proper distinction between the laws of the production of wealth, which are real laws of Nature, dependent on the properties of objects, and the modes of its distribution, which, subject to certain conditions, depend on human will.... _I had indeed partially learnt this view of things from the thoughts awakened in me by the speculations of St. Simonians_; but it was made a living principle, pervading and animating the book, by my wife's promptings."[4] The part which is italicised is noticeable. Here, as elsewhere, Mill thinks out the matter by himself; the concrete form of the thoughts is suggested or prompted by the wife. Apart from this "general tone," Mill tells us that there was a specific contribution. "The chapter which has had a greater influence on opinion than all the rest, that on the Probable

Future of the Labouring Classes, is entirely due to her. In the first draft of the book that chapter did not exist. She pointed out the need of such a chapter, and the extreme imperfection of the book without it; she was the cause of my writing it." From this it would appear that she gave Mill that tendency to Socialism which, while it lends a progressive spirit to his speculations on politics, at the same time does not manifestly accord with his earlier advocacy of peasant proprietorships. Nor, again, is it, on the face of it, consistent with those doctrines of individual liberty which, aided by the intellectual companionship of his wife, he propounded in a later work. The ideal of individual freedom is not the ideal of Socialism, just as that invocation of governmental aid to which the Socialist resorts is not consistent with the theory of _laisser-faire_. Yet _Liberty_ was planned by Mill and his wife in concert. Perhaps a slight visionariness of speculation was no less the attribute of Mrs. Mill than an absence of rigid logical principles. Be this as it may, she undoubtedly checked the half-recognised leanings of her husband in the direction of Coleridge and Carlyle. Whether this was an instance of her steadying influence,[5] or whether it added one more unassimilated element to Mill's diverse intellectual sustenance, may be wisely left an open question. We cannot, however, be wrong in attributing to her the parentage of one book of Mill, _The Subjection of Women_. It is true that Mill had before learnt that men and women ought to be equal in legal, political, social, and domestic relations. This was a point on which he had already fallen foul of his father's essay on _Government_. But Mrs. Taylor had actually written on this very point, and the warmth and fervour of Mill's denunciations of women's servitude were unmistakably caught from his wife's view of the practical disabilities entailed by the feminine position.

III.

Liberty was published in 1859, when the nineteenth century was half over, but in its general spirit and in some of its special tendencies the little tract belongs rather to the standpoint of the eighteenth century than to that which saw its birth. In many of his speculations John Stuart Mill forms a sort of connecting link between the doctrines of the earlier English empirical school and those which we associate with the name of Mr. Herbert Spencer. In his _Logic_, for instance, he represents an advance on the theories of Hume, and yet does not see how profoundly the victories of Science modify the conclusions of the earlier thinker. Similarly, in his _Political Economy_, he desires to improve and to enlarge upon Ricardo, and yet does not advance so far as the modifications of political economy by Sociology, indicated by some later--and especially German--speculations on the subject. In the tract on _Liberty_, Mill is advocating the rights of the individual as against Society at the very opening of an era that was rapidly coming to the conclusion that the individual had no absolute rights against Society. The eighteenth century view is that individuals existed first, each with their own special claims and responsibilities; that they deliberately formed a Social State, either by a contract or otherwise; and that then finally they limited their own action out of regard for the interests of the social organism thus arbitrarily produced. This is hardly the view of the nineteenth century. It is possible that logically the individual is prior to the State; historically and in the order of Nature, the State is prior to the individual. In other words, such rights as every single personality possesses in a modern world do not belong to him by an original ordinance of Nature, but are slowly acquired in the growth and development of the social state. It is not the truth that individual liberties were forfeited by some deliberate act when men made themselves into a Commonwealth. It is more true to say, as Aristotle said long ago, that man is naturally a political animal, that he lived under strict social laws as a mere item, almost a nonentity, as compared with the Order, Society, or Community to which he belonged, and that such privileges as he subsequently acquired have been obtained in virtue of his growing importance as a member of a growing organisation. But if this is even approximately true, it seriously restricts that liberty of the individual for which Mill pleads. The individual has no chance, because he has no rights, against the social organism. Society can punish him for acts or even opinions which are anti-social in character. His virtue lies in recognising the intimate communion with his fellows. His sphere of activity is bounded by the common interest. Just as it is an absurd and exploded theory that all men are originally equal, so it is an ancient and false doctrine to protest that a man has an individual liberty to live and think as he chooses in any spirit of antagonism to that larger body of which he forms an insignificant part.

Nowadays this view of Society and of its development, which we largely owe to the _Philosophie Positive_ of M. Auguste Comte, is so familiar and possibly so damaging to the individual initiative, that it becomes necessary to advance and proclaim the truth which resides in an opposite theory. All progress, as we are aware, depends on the joint process of integration and differentiation; synthesis, analysis, and then a larger synthesis seem to form the law of development. If it ever comes to pass that Society is tyrannical in its restrictions of the individual, if, as for instance in some forms of Socialism, based on deceptive analogies of Nature's dealings, the type is everything and the individual nothing, it must be confidently urged in answer that the fuller life of the future depends on the manifold activities, even though they may be antagonistic, of the individual. In England, at all events, we know that government in all its different forms, whether as King, or as a caste of nobles, or as an oligarchical plutocracy, or even as trades unions, is so dwarfing in its action that, for the sake of the future, the individual must revolt. Just as our former point of view limited

the value of Mill's treatise on _Liberty_, so these considerations tend to show its eternal importance. The omnipotence of Society means a dead level of uniformity. The claim of the individual to be heard, to say what he likes, to do what he likes, to live as he likes, is absolutely necessary, not only for the variety of elements without which life is poor, but also for the hope of a future age. So long as individual initiative and effort are recognised as a vital element in English history, so long will Mill's _Liberty_, which he confesses was based on a suggestion derived from Von Humboldt, remain as an indispensable contribution to the speculations, and also to the health and sanity, of the world.

What his wife really was to Mill, we shall, perhaps, never know. But that she was an actual and vivid force, which roused the latent enthusiasm of his nature, we have abundant evidence. And when she died at Avignon, though his friends may have regained an almost estranged companionship, Mill was, personally, the poorer. Into the sorrow of that bereavement we cannot enter: we have no right or power to draw the veil. It is enough to quote the simple words, so eloquent of an unspoken grief--"I can say nothing which could describe, even in the faintest manner, what that loss was and is. But because I know that she would have wished it, I endeavour to make the best of what life I have left, and to work for her purposes with such diminished strength as can be derived from thoughts of her, and communion with her memory."

W. L. COURTNEY.

LONDON, _July 5th, 1901_.

FOOTNOTES:

[1] _Life of John Stuart Mill_, chapter vi. (Walter Scott.)

[2] _Autobiography_, p. 190.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 242.

[4] _Autobiography_, pp. 246, 247.

[5] Cf. an instructive page in the _Autobiography_, p. 252.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. PAGE INTRODUCTORY 1

CHAPTER II.

OF THE LIBERTY OF THOUGHT AND DISCUSSION 28

CHAPTER III.

OF INDIVIDUALITY, AS ONE OF THE ELEMENTS OF WELL-BEING 103

CHAPTER IV.

OF THE LIMITS TO THE AUTHORITY OF SOCIETY OVER THE INDIVIDUAL 140

CHAPTER V.

APPLICATIONS 177

The grand, leading principle, towards which every argument unfolded in these pages directly converges, is the absolute and essential importance of human development in its richest diversity.--WILHELM VON HUMBOLDT: _Sphere and Duties of Government_.

ON LIBERTY.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

The subject of this Essay is not the so-called Liberty of the Will, so unfortunately opposed to the misnamed doctrine of Philosophical Necessity; but Civil, or Social Liberty: the nature and limits of the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual. A question seldom stated, and hardly ever discussed, in general terms, but which profoundly influences the practical controversies of the age by its latent presence, and is likely soon to make itself recognised as the vital question of the future. It is so far from being new, that in a certain sense, it has divided mankind, almost from the remotest ages; but in the stage of progress into which the more civilised portions of the species have now entered, it presents itself under new conditions, and requires a different and more fundamental treatment.

The struggle between Liberty and Authority is the most conspicuous feature in the portions of history with which we are earliest familiar, particularly in that of Greece, Rome, and England. But in old times this contest was between subjects, or some classes of subjects, and the government. By liberty, was meant protection against the tyranny of the political rulers. The rulers were conceived (except in some of the popular governments of Greece) as in a necessarily antagonistic position to the people whom they ruled. They consisted of a governing One, or a governing tribe or caste, who derived their authority from inheritance or conquest, who, at all events, did not hold it at the pleasure of the governed, and whose supremacy men did not venture, perhaps did not desire, to contest, whatever precautions might be taken against its oppressive exercise. Their power was regarded as necessary, but also as highly dangerous; as a weapon which they would attempt to use against their subjects, no less than against external enemies. To prevent the weaker members of the community from being preyed upon by innumerable vultures, it was needful that there should be an animal of prey stronger than the rest, commissioned to keep them down. But as the king of the vultures would be no less bent upon preying on the flock than any of the minor harpies, it was indispensable to be in a perpetual attitude of defence against his beak and claws. The aim, therefore, of patriots, was to set limits to the power which the ruler should be suffered to exercise over the community; and this limitation was what they meant by liberty. It was attempted in two ways. First, by obtaining a recognition of certain immunities, called political liberties or rights, which it was to be regarded as a breach of duty in the ruler to infringe, and which if he did infringe, specific resistance, or general rebellion, was held to be justifiable. A second, and generally a later expedient, was the establishment of constitutional checks; by which the consent of the community, or of a body of some sort, supposed to represent its interests, was made a necessary condition to some of the more important acts of the governing power. To the first of these modes of limitation, the ruling power, in most European countries, was compelled, more or less, to submit. It was not so with the second; and to attain this, or when already in some degree possessed, to attain it more completely, became everywhere the principal object of the lovers of liberty. And so long as mankind were content to combat one enemy by another, and to be ruled by a master, on condition of being guaranteed more or less efficaciously against his tyranny, they did not carry their aspirations beyond this point.

A time, however, came, in the progress of human affairs, when men ceased to think it a necessity of nature that their governors should be an independent power, opposed in interest to themselves. It appeared to them much better that the various magistrates of the State should be their tenants or delegates, revocable at their pleasure. In that way alone, it seemed, could they have complete security that the powers of government would never be abused to their disadvantage. By degrees, this new demand for elective and temporary rulers became the prominent object of the exertions of the popular party, wherever any such party existed; and superseded, to a considerable extent, the previous efforts to limit the power of rulers. As the struggle proceeded for making the ruling power emanate from the periodical choice of the ruled, some persons began to think that too much importance had been attached to the limitation of the power itself. _That_ (it might seem) was a resource against rulers whose interests were habitually opposed to those of the people. What was now wanted was, that the rulers should be identified with the people; that their interest and will should be the interest and will of the nation. The nation did not need to be protected against its own will. There was no fear of its tyrannising over itself. Let the rulers be effectually responsible to it, promptly removable by it, and it could afford to trust them with power of which it could itself dictate the use to be made. Their power was but the nation's own power, concentrated, and in a form convenient for exercise. This mode of thought, or rather perhaps of feeling, was common among the last generation of European liberalism, in the Continental section of which it still apparently predominates. Those who admit any limit to what a government may do, except in the case of such governments as they think ought not to exist, stand out as brilliant exceptions among the political thinkers of the Continent. A similar tone of sentiment might by this time have been prevalent in our own country, if the circumstances which for a time encouraged it, had continued unaltered.

But, in political and philosophical theories, as well as in persons, success discloses faults and infirmities which failure might have concealed from observation. The notion, that the people have no need to limit their power over themselves, might seem axiomatic,

when popular government was a thing only dreamed about, or read of as having existed at some distant period of the past. Neither was that notion necessarily disturbed by such temporary aberrations as those of the French Revolution, the worst of which were the work of a usurping few, and which, in any case, belonged, not to the permanent working of popular institutions, but to a sudden and convulsive outbreak against monarchical and aristocratic despotism. In time, however, a democratic republic came to occupy a large portion of the earth's surface, and made itself felt as one of the most powerful members of the community of nations; and elective and responsible government became subject to the observations and criticisms which wait upon a great existing fact. It was now perceived that such phrases as "self-government," and "the power of the people over themselves," do not express the true state of the case. The "people" who exercise the power are not always the same people with those over whom it is exercised; and the "self-government" spoken of is not the government of each by himself, but of each by all the rest. The will of the people, moreover, practically means, the will of the most numerous or the most active _part_ of the people; the majority, or those who succeed in making themselves accepted as the majority: the people, consequently, _may_ desire to oppress a part of their number; and precautions are as much needed against this, as against any other abuse of power. The limitation, therefore, of the power of government over individuals, loses none of its importance when the holders of power are regularly accountable to the community, that is, to the strongest party therein. This view of things, recommending itself equally to the intelligence of thinkers and to the inclination of those important classes in European society to whose real or supposed interests democracy is adverse, has had no difficulty in establishing itself; and in political speculations "the tyranny of the majority" is now generally included among the evils against which society requires to be on its guard.

Like other tyrannies, the tyranny of the majority was at first, and is still vulgarly, held in dread, chiefly as operating through the acts of the public authorities. But reflecting persons perceived that when society is itself the tyrant--society collectively, over the separate individuals who compose it--its means of tyrannising are not restricted to the acts which it may do by the hands of its political functionaries. Society can and does execute its own mandates: and if it issues wrong mandates instead of right, or any mandates at all in things with which it ought not to meddle, it practises a social tyranny more formidable than many kinds of political oppression, since, though not usually upheld by such extreme penalties, it leaves fewer means of escape, penetrating much more deeply into the details of life, and enslaving the soul itself. Protection, therefore, against the tyranny of the magistrate is not enough: there needs protection also against the tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling; against the tendency of society to impose, by other means than civil penalties, its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct on those who dissent from them; to fetter the development, and, if possible, prevent the formation, of any individuality not in harmony with its ways, and compel all characters to fashion themselves upon the model of its own. There is a limit to the legitimate interference of collective opinion with individual independence: and to find that limit, and maintain it against encroachment, is as indispensable to a good condition of human affairs, as protection against political despotism.

But though this proposition is not likely to be contested in general terms, the practical question, where to place the limit--how to make the fitting adjustment between individual independence and social control--is a subject on which nearly everything remains to be done. All that makes existence valuable to any one, depends on the enforcement of restraints upon the actions of other people. Some rules of conduct, therefore, must be imposed, by law in the first place, and by opinion on many things which are not fit subjects for the operation of law. What these rules should be, is the principal question in human affairs; but if we except a few of the most obvious cases, it is one of those which least progress has been made in resolving. No two ages, and scarcely any two countries, have decided it alike; and the decision of one age or country is a wonder to another. Yet the people of any given age and country no more suspect any difficulty in it, than if it were a subject on which mankind had always been agreed. The rules which obtain among themselves appear to them self-evident and self-justifying. This all but universal illusion is one of the examples of the magical influence of custom, which is not only, as the proverb says, a second nature, but is continually mistaken for the first. The effect of custom, in preventing any misgiving respecting the rules of conduct which mankind impose on one another, is all the more complete because the subject is one on which it is not generally considered necessary that reasons should be given, either by one person to others, or by each to himself. People are accustomed to believe, and have been encouraged in the belief by some who aspire to the character of philosophers, that their feelings, on subjects of this nature, are better than reasons, and render reasons unnecessary. The practical principle which guides them to their opinions on the regulation of human conduct, is the feeling in each person's mind that everybody should be required to act as he, and those with whom he sympathises, would like them to act. No one, indeed, acknowledges to himself that his standard of judgment is his own liking; but an opinion on a point of conduct, not supported by reasons, can only count as one person's preference; and if the reasons, when given, are a mere appeal to a similar preference felt by other people, it is still only many people's liking instead of one. To an ordinary man, however, his own preference, thus supported, is not only a perfectly satisfactory reason, but the only one he generally has for any of his notions of morality, taste,

or propriety, which are not expressly written in his religious creed; and his chief guide in the interpretation even of that. Men's opinions, accordingly, on what is laudable or blamable, are affected by all the multifarious causes which influence their wishes in regard to the conduct of others, and which are as numerous as those which determine their wishes on any other subject. Sometimes their reason--at other times their prejudices or superstitions: often their social affections, not seldom their anti-social ones, their envy or jealousy, their arrogance or contemptuousness: but most commonly, their desires or fears for themselves--their legitimate or illegitimate self-interest. Wherever there is an ascendant class, a large portion of the morality of the country emanates from its class interests, and its feelings of class superiority. The morality between Spartans and Helots, between planters and negroes, between princes and subjects, between nobles and roturiers, between men and women, has been for the most part the creation of these class interests and feelings: and the sentiments thus generated, react in turn upon the moral feelings of the members of the ascendant class, in their relations among themselves. Where, on the other hand, a class, formerly ascendant, has lost its ascendancy, or where its ascendancy is unpopular, the prevailing moral sentiments frequently bear the impress of an impatient dislike of superiority. Another grand determining principle of the rules of conduct, both in act and forbearance, which have been enforced by law or opinion, has been the servility of mankind towards the supposed preferences or aversions of their temporal masters, or of their gods. This servility, though essentially selfish, is not hypocrisy; it gives rise to perfectly genuine sentiments of abhorrence; it made men burn magicians and heretics. Among so many baser influences, the general and obvious interests of society have of course had a share, and a large one, in the direction of the moral sentiments: less, however, as a matter of reason, and on their own account, than as a consequence of the sympathies and antipathies which grew out of them: and sympathies and antipathies which had little or nothing to do with the interests of society, have made themselves felt in the establishment of moralities with quite as great force.

The likings and dislikings of society, or of some powerful portion of it, are thus the main thing which has practically determined the rules laid down for general observance, under the penalties of law or opinion. And in general, those who have been in advance of society in thought and feeling have left this condition of things unassailed in principle, however they may have come into conflict with it in some of its details. They have occupied themselves rather in inquiring what things society ought to like or dislike, than in questioning whether its likings or dislikings should be a law to individuals. They preferred endeavouring to alter the feelings of mankind on the particular points on which they were themselves heretical, rather than make common cause in defence of freedom, with heretics generally. The only case in which the higher ground has been taken on principle and maintained with consistency, by any but an individual here and there, is that of religious belief: a case instructive in many ways, and not least so as forming a most striking instance of the fallibility of what is called the moral sense: for the _odium theologicum_, in a sincere bigot, is one of the most unequivocal cases of moral feeling. Those who first broke the yoke of what called itself the Universal Church, were in general as little willing to permit difference of religious opinion as that church itself. But when the heat of the conflict was over, without giving a complete victory to any party, and each church or sect was reduced to limit its hopes to retaining possession of the ground it already occupied; minorities, seeing that they had no chance of becoming majorities, were under the necessity of pleading to those whom they could not convert, for permission to differ. It is accordingly on this battle-field, almost solely, that the rights of the individual against society have been asserted on broad grounds of principle, and the claim of society to exercise authority over dissentients, openly controverted. The great writers to whom the world owes what religious liberty it possesses, have mostly asserted freedom of conscience as an indefeasible right, and denied absolutely that a human being is accountable to others for his religious belief. Yet so natural to mankind is intolerance in whatever they really care about, that religious freedom has hardly anywhere been practically realised, except where religious indifference, which dislikes to have its peace disturbed by theological quarrels, has added its weight to the scale. In the minds of almost all religious persons, even in the most tolerant countries, the duty of toleration is admitted with tacit reserves. One person will bear with dissent in matters of church government, but not of dogma; another can tolerate everybody, short of a Papist or a Unitarian; another, every one who believes in revealed religion; a few extend their charity a little further, but stop at the belief in a God and in a future state. Wherever the sentiment of the majority is still genuine and intense, it is found to have abated little of its claim to be obeyed.

In England, from the peculiar circumstances of our political history, though the yoke of opinion is perhaps heavier, that of law is lighter, than in most other countries of Europe; and there is considerable jealousy of direct interference, by the legislative or the executive power, with private conduct; not so much from any just regard for the independence of the individual, as from the still subsisting habit of looking on the government as representing an opposite interest to the public. The majority have not yet learnt to feel the power of the government their power, or its opinions their opinions. When they do so, individual liberty will probably be as much exposed to invasion from the government, as it already is from public opinion. But, as yet, there is a considerable amount of feeling ready to be called forth against any attempt of the law to control individuals in things in which they have not hitherto been

accustomed to be controlled by it; and this with very little discrimination as to whether the matter is, or is not, within the legitimate sphere of legal control; insomuch that the feeling, highly salutary on the whole, is perhaps quite as often misplaced as well grounded in the particular instances of its application. There is, in fact, no recognised principle by which the propriety or impropriety of government interference is customarily tested. People decide according to their personal preferences. Some, whenever they see any good to be done, or evil to be remedied, would willingly instigate the government to undertake the business; while others prefer to bear almost any amount of social evil, rather than add one to the departments of human interests amenable to governmental control. And men range themselves on one or the other side in any particular case, according to this general direction of their sentiments; or according to the degree of interest which they feel in the particular thing which it is proposed that the government should do, or according to the belief they entertain that the government would, or would not, do it in the manner they prefer; but very rarely on account of any opinion to which they consistently adhere, as to what things are fit to be done by a government. And it seems to me that in consequence of this absence of rule or principle, one side is at present as often wrong as the other; the interference of government is, with about equal frequency, improperly invoked and improperly condemned.

The object of this Essay is to assert one very simple principle, as entitled to govern absolutely the dealings of society with the individual in the way of compulsion and control, whether the means used be physical force in the form of legal penalties, or the moral coercion of public opinion. That principle is, that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant. He cannot rightfully be compelled to do or forbear because it will be better for him to do so, because it will make him happier, because, in the opinions of others, to do so would be wise, or even right. These are good reasons for remonstrating with him, or reasoning with him, or persuading him, or entreating him, but not for compelling him, or visiting him with any evil in case he do otherwise. To justify that, the conduct from which it is desired to deter him must be calculated to produce evil to some one else. The only part of the conduct of any one, for which he is amenable to society, is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute. Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign.

It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to say that this doctrine is meant to apply only to human beings in the maturity of their faculties. We are not speaking of children, or of young persons below the age which the law may fix as that of manhood or womanhood. Those who are still in a state to require being taken care of by others, must be protected against their own actions as well as against external injury. For the same reason, we may leave out of consideration those backward states of society in which the race itself may be considered as in its nonage. The early difficulties in the way of spontaneous progress are so great, that there is seldom any choice of means for overcoming them; and a ruler full of the spirit of improvement is warranted in the use of any expedients that will attain an end, perhaps otherwise unattainable. Despotism is a legitimate mode of government in dealing with barbarians, provided the end be their improvement, and the means justified by actually effecting that end. Liberty, as a principle, has no application to any state of things anterior to the time when mankind have become capable of being improved by free and equal discussion. Until then, there is nothing for them but implicit obedience to an Akbar or a Charlemagne, if they are so fortunate as to find one. But as soon as mankind have attained the capacity of being guided to their own improvement by conviction or persuasion (a period long since reached in all nations with whom we need here concern ourselves), compulsion, either in the direct form or in that of pains and penalties for non-compliance, is no longer admissible as a means to their own good, and justifiable only for the security of others.

It is proper to state that I forego any advantage which could be derived to my argument from the idea of abstract right, as a thing independent of utility. I regard utility as the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions; but it must be utility in the largest sense, grounded on the permanent interests of man as a progressive being. Those interests, I contend, authorise the subjection of individual spontaneity to external control, only in respect to those actions of each, which concern the interest of other people. If any one does an act hurtful to others, there is a _prima facie_ case for punishing him, by law, or, where legal penalties are not safely applicable, by general disapprobation. There are also many positive acts for the benefit of others, which he may rightfully be compelled to perform; such as, to give evidence in a court of justice; to bear his fair share in the common defence, or in any other joint work necessary to the interest of the society of which he enjoys the protection; and to perform certain acts of individual beneficence, such as saving a fellow-creature's life, or interposing to protect the defenceless against ill-usage, things which whenever it is obviously a man's duty to do, he may rightfully be made responsible to society for not doing. A person may cause evil to others not only by his actions but by his inaction, and in either case he is justly accountable to them for the injury. The latter case, it is true, requires a much more cautious exercise of compulsion than the former. To make any one answerable for doing evil to

others, is the rule; to make him answerable for not preventing evil, is, comparatively speaking, the exception. Yet there are many cases clear enough and grave enough to justify that exception. In all things which regard the external relations of the individual, he is _de jure_ amenable to those whose interests are concerned, and if need be, to society as their protector. There are often good reasons for not holding him to the responsibility; but these reasons must arise from the special expediencies of the case: either because it is a kind of case in which he is on the whole likely to act better, when left to his own discretion, than when controlled in any way in which society have it in their power to control him; or because the attempt to exercise control would produce other evils, greater than those which it would prevent. When such reasons as these preclude the enforcement of responsibility, the conscience of the agent himself should step into the vacant judgment seat, and protect those interests of others which have no external protection; judging himself all the more rigidly, because the case does not admit of his being made accountable to the judgment of his fellow-creatures.

But there is a sphere of action in which society, as distinguished from the individual, has, if any, only an indirect interest; comprehending all that portion of a person's life and conduct which affects only himself, or if it also affects others, only with their free, voluntary, and undeceived consent and participation. When I say only himself, I mean directly, and in the first instance: for whatever affects himself, may affect others _through_ himself; and the objection which may be grounded on this contingency, will receive consideration in the sequel. This, then, is the appropriate region of human liberty. It comprises, first, the inward domain of consciousness; demanding liberty of conscience, in the most comprehensive sense; liberty of thought and feeling; absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral, or theological. The liberty of expressing and publishing opinions may seem to fall under a different principle, since it belongs to that part of the conduct of an individual which concerns other people; but, being almost of as much importance as the liberty of thought itself, and resting in great part on the same reasons, is practically inseparable from it. Secondly, the principle requires liberty of tastes and pursuits; of framing the plan of our life to suit our own character; of doing as we like, subject to such consequences as may follow: without impediment from our fellow-creatures, so long as what we do does not harm them, even though they should think our conduct foolish, perverse, or wrong. Thirdly, from this liberty of each individual, follows the liberty, within the same limits, of combination among individuals; freedom to unite, for any purpose not involving harm to others: the persons combining being supposed to be of full age, and not forced or deceived.

No society in which these liberties are not, on the whole, respected, is free, whatever may be its form of government; and none is completely free in which they do not exist absolute and unqualified. The only freedom which deserves the name, is that of pursuing our own good in our own way, so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs, or impede their efforts to obtain it. Each is the proper guardian of his own health, whether bodily, or mental and spiritual. Mankind are greater gainers by suffering each other to live as seems good to themselves, than by compelling each to live as seems good to the rest.

Though this doctrine is anything but new, and, to some persons, may have the air of a truism, there is no doctrine which stands more directly opposed to the general tendency of existing opinion and practice. Society has expended fully as much effort in the attempt (according to its lights) to compel people to conform to its notions of personal, as of social excellence. The ancient commonwealths thought themselves entitled to practise, and the ancient philosophers countenanced, the regulation of every part of private conduct by public authority, on the ground that the State had a deep interest in the whole bodily and mental discipline of every one of its citizens; a mode of thinking which may have been admissible in small republics surrounded by powerful enemies, in constant peril of being subverted by foreign attack or internal commotion, and to which even a short interval of relaxed energy and self-command might so easily be fatal, that they could not afford to wait for the salutary permanent effects of freedom. In the modern world, the greater size of political communities, and above all, the separation between spiritual and temporal authority (which placed the direction of men's consciences in other hands than those which controlled their worldly affairs), prevented so great an interference by law in the details of private life; but the engines of moral repression have been wielded more strenuously against divergence from the reigning opinion in self-regarding, than even in social matters; religion, the most powerful of the elements which have entered into the formation of moral feeling, having almost always been governed either by the ambition of a hierarchy, seeking control over every department of human conduct, or by the spirit of Puritanism. And some of those modern reformers who have placed themselves in strongest opposition to the religions of the past, have been noway behind either churches or sects in their assertion of the right of spiritual domination: M. Comte, in particular, whose social system, as unfolded in his _Traite de Politique Positive_, aims at establishing (though by moral more than by legal appliances) a despotism of society over the individual, surpassing anything contemplated in the political ideal of the most rigid disciplinarian among the ancient philosophers.

Apart from the peculiar tenets of individual thinkers, there is also in the world at large an increasing inclination to stretch unduly the powers of society over the individual, both by the force of opinion and even by that of legislation: and as the tendency of all the changes taking place in the world is to strengthen society, and diminish the power of the individual, this encroachment is not one of the evils which tend spontaneously to disappear, but, on the contrary, to grow more and more formidable. The disposition of mankind, whether as rulers or as fellow-citizens to impose their own opinions and inclinations as a rule of conduct on others, is so energetically supported by some of the best and by some of the worst feelings incident to human nature, that it is hardly ever kept under restraint by anything but want of power; and as the power is not declining, but growing, unless a strong barrier of moral conviction can be raised against the mischief, we must expect, in the present circumstances of the world, to see it increase.

It will be convenient for the argument, if, instead of at once entering upon the general thesis, we confine ourselves in the first instance to a single branch of it, on which the principle here stated is, if not fully, yet to a certain point, recognised by the current opinions. This one branch is the Liberty of Thought: from which it is impossible to separate the cognate liberty of speaking and of writing. Although these liberties, to some considerable amount, form part of the political morality of all countries which profess religious toleration and free institutions, the grounds, both philosophical and practical, on which they rest, are perhaps not so familiar to the general mind, nor so thoroughly appreciated by many even of the leaders of opinion, as might have been expected. Those grounds, when rightly understood, are of much wider application than to only one division of the subject, and a thorough consideration of this part of the question will be found the best introduction to the remainder. Those to whom nothing which I am about to say will be new, may therefore, I hope, excuse me, if on a subject which for now three centuries has been so often discussed, I venture on one discussion more.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE LIBERTY OF THOUGHT AND DISCUSSION.

The time, it is to be hoped, is gone by, when any defence would be necessary of the "liberty of the press" as one of the securities against corrupt or tyrannical government. No argument, we may suppose, can now be needed, against permitting a legislature or an executive, not identified in interest with the people, to prescribe opinions to them, and determine what doctrines or what arguments they shall be allowed to hear. This aspect of the question, besides, has been so often and so triumphantly enforced by preceding writers, that it need not be specially insisted on in this place. Though the law of England, on the subject of the press, is as servile to this day as it was in the time of the Tudors, there is little danger of its being actually put in force against political discussion, except during some temporary panic, when fear of insurrection drives ministers and judges from their propriety;[6] and, speaking generally, it is not, in constitutional countries, to be apprehended that the government, whether completely responsible to the people or not, will often attempt to control the expression of opinion, except when in doing so it makes itself the organ of the general intolerance of the public. Let us suppose, therefore, that the government is entirely at one with the people, and never thinks of exerting any power of coercion unless in agreement with what it conceives to be their voice. But I deny the right of the people to exercise such coercion, either by themselves or by their government. The power itself is illegitimate. The best government has no more title to it than the worst. It is as noxious, or more noxious, when exerted in accordance with public opinion, than when in or opposition to it. If all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind. Were an opinion a personal possession of no value except to the owner; if to be obstructed in the enjoyment of it were simply a private injury, it would make some difference whether the injury was inflicted only on a few persons or on many. But the peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is, that it is robbing the human race; posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error.

It is necessary to consider separately these two hypotheses, each of which has a distinct branch of the argument corresponding to it. We can never be sure that the opinion we are endeavouring to stifle is a false opinion; and if we were sure, stifling it would be an evil still.

First: the opinion which it is attempted to suppress by authority may possibly be true. Those who desire to suppress it, of course deny its truth; but they are not infallible. They have no authority to decide the question for all mankind, and exclude every other person from the means of judging. To refuse a hearing to an opinion, because they are sure that it is false, is to assume that _their_

certainty is the same thing as _absolute_ certainty. All silencing of discussion is an assumption of infallibility. Its condemnation may be allowed to rest on this common argument, not the worse for being common.

Unfortunately for the good sense of mankind, the fact of their fallibility is far from carrying the weight in their practical judgment, which is always allowed to it in theory; for while every one well knows himself to be fallible, few think it necessary to take any precautions against their own fallibility, or admit the supposition that any opinion, of which they feel very certain, may be one of the examples of the error to which they acknowledge themselves to be liable. Absolute princes, or others who are accustomed to unlimited deference, usually feel this complete confidence in their own opinions on nearly all subjects. People more happily situated, who sometimes hear their opinions disputed, and are not wholly unused to be set right when they are wrong, place the same unbounded reliance only on such of their opinions as are shared by all who surround them, or to whom they habitually defer: for in proportion to a man's want of confidence in his own solitary judgment, does he usually repose, with implicit trust, on the infallibility of "the world" in general. And the world, to each individual, means the part of it with which he comes in contact; his party, his sect, his church, his class of society: the man may be called, by comparison, almost liberal and large-minded to whom it means anything so comprehensive as his own country or his own age. Nor is his faith in this collective authority at all shaken by his being aware that other ages, countries, sects, churches, classes, and parties have thought, and even now think, the exact reverse. He devolves upon his own world the responsibility of being in the right against the dissentient worlds of other people; and it never troubles him that mere accident has decided which of these numerous worlds is the object of his reliance, and that the same causes which make him a Churchman in London, would have made him a Buddhist or a Confucian in Pekin. Yet it is as evident in itself as any amount of argument can make it, that ages are no more infallible than individuals; every age having held many opinions which subsequent ages have deemed not only false but absurd; and it is as certain that many opinions, now general, will be rejected by future ages, as it is that many, once general, are rejected by the present.

The objection likely to be made to this argument, would probably take some such form as the following. There is no greater assumption of infallibility in forbidding the propagation of error, than in any other thing which is done by public authority on its own judgment and responsibility. Judgment is given to men that they may use it. Because it may be used erroneously, are men to be told that they ought not to use it at all? To prohibit what they think pernicious, is not claiming exemption from error, but fulfilling the duty incumbent on them, although fallible, of acting on their conscientious conviction. If we were never to act on our opinions, because those opinions may be wrong, we should leave all our interests uncared for, and all our duties unperformed. An objection which applies to all conduct, can be no valid objection to any conduct in particular. It is the duty of governments, and of individuals, to form the truest opinions they can; to form them carefully, and never impose them upon others unless they are quite sure of being right. But when they are sure (such reasoners may say), it is not conscientiousness but cowardice to shrink from acting on their opinions, and allow doctrines which they honestly think dangerous to the welfare of mankind, either in this life or in another, to be scattered abroad without restraint, because other people, in less enlightened times, have persecuted opinions now believed to be true. Let us take care, it may be said, not to make the same mistake: but governments and nations have made mistakes in other things, which are not denied to be fit subjects for the exercise of authority: they have laid on bad taxes, made unjust wars. Ought we therefore to lay on no taxes, and, under whatever provocation, make no wars? Men, and governments, must act to the best of their ability. There is no such thing as absolute certainty, but there is assurance sufficient for the purposes of human life. We may, and must, assume our opinion to be true for the guidance of our own conduct: and it is assuming no more when we forbid bad men to pervert society by the propagation of opinions which we regard as false and pernicious.

I answer that it is assuming very much more. There is the greatest difference between presuming an opinion to be true, because, with every opportunity for contesting it, it has not been refuted, and assuming its truth for the purpose of not permitting its refutation. Complete liberty of contradicting and disproving our opinion, is the very condition which justifies us in assuming its truth for purposes of action; and on no other terms can a being with human faculties have any rational assurance of being right.

When we consider either the history of opinion, or the ordinary conduct of human life, to what is it to be ascribed that the one and the other are no worse than they are? Not certainly to the inherent force of the human understanding; for, on any matter not self-evident, there are ninety-nine persons totally incapable of judging of it, for one who is capable; and the capacity of the hundredth person is only comparative; for the majority of the eminent men of every past generation held many opinions now known to be erroneous, and did or approved numerous things which no one will now justify. Why is it, then, that there is on the whole a preponderance among mankind of rational opinions and rational conduct? If there really is this preponderance--which there must be, unless human affairs are, and have always been, in an almost desperate state--it is owing to a quality of the human mind, the source of everything respectable in man either as an intellectual or as a moral being, namely, that his errors are corrigible. He is

capable of rectifying his mistakes, by discussion and experience. Not by experience alone. There must be discussion, to show how experience is to be interpreted. Wrong opinions and practices gradually yield to fact and argument: but facts and arguments, to produce any effect on the mind, must be brought before it. Very few facts are able to tell their own story, without comments to bring out their meaning. The whole strength and value, then, of human judgment, depending on the one property, that it can be set right when it is wrong, reliance can be placed on it only when the means of setting it right are kept constantly at hand. In the case of any person whose judgment is really deserving of confidence, how has it become so? Because he has kept his mind open to criticism of his opinions and conduct. Because it has been his practice to listen to all that could be said against him; to profit by as much of it as was just, and expound to himself, and upon occasion to others, the fallacy of what was fallacious. Because he has felt, that the only way in which a human being can make some approach to knowing the whole of a subject, is by hearing what can be said about it by persons of every variety of opinion, and studying all modes in which it can be looked at by every character of mind. No wise man ever acquired his wisdom in any mode but this; nor is it in the nature of human intellect to become wise in any other manner. The steady habit of correcting and completing his own opinion by collating it with those of others, so far from causing doubt and hesitation in carrying it into practice, is the only stable foundation for a just reliance on it: for, being cognisant of all that can, at least obviously, be said against him, and having taken up his position against all gainsayers--knowing that he has sought for objections and difficulties, instead of avoiding them, and has shut out no light which can be thrown upon the subject from any quarter--he has a right to think his judgment better than that of any person, or any multitude, who have not gone through a similar process.

It is not too much to require that what the wisest of mankind, those who are best entitled to trust their own judgment, find necessary to warrant their relying on it, should be submitted to by that miscellaneous collection of a few wise and many foolish individuals, called the public. The most intolerant of churches, the Roman Catholic Church, even at the canonisation of a saint, admits, and listens patiently to, a "devil's advocate." The holiest of men, it appears, cannot be admitted to posthumous honours, until all that the devil could say against him is known and weighed. If even the Newtonian philosophy were not permitted to be questioned, mankind could not feel as complete assurance of its truth as they now do. The beliefs which we have most warrant for, have no safeguard to rest on, but a standing invitation to the whole world to prove them unfounded. If the challenge is not accepted, or is accepted and the attempt fails, we are far enough from certainty still; but we have done the best that the existing state of human reason admits of; we have neglected nothing that could give the truth a chance of reaching us: if the lists are kept open, we may hope that if there be a better truth, it will be found when the human mind is capable of receiving it; and in the meantime we may rely on having attained such approach to truth, as is possible in our own day. This is the amount of certainty attainable by a fallible being, and this the sole way of attaining it.

Strange it is, that men should admit the validity of the arguments for free discussion, but object to their being "pushed to an extreme;" not seeing that unless the reasons are good for an extreme case, they are not good for any case. Strange that they should imagine that they are not assuming infallibility, when they acknowledge that there should be free discussion on all subjects which can possibly be _doubtful_, but think that some particular principle or doctrine should be forbidden to be questioned because it is _so certain_, that is, because _they are certain_ that it is certain. To call any proposition certain, while there is any one who would deny its certainty if permitted, but who is not permitted, is to assume that we ourselves, and those who agree with us, are the judges of certainty, and judges without hearing the other side.

In the present age--which has been described as "destitute of faith, but terrified at scepticism"--in which people feel sure, not so much that their opinions are true, as that they should not know what to do without them--the claims of an opinion to be protected from public attack are rested not so much on its truth, as on its importance to society. There are, it is alleged, certain beliefs, so useful, not to say indispensable to well-being, that it is as much the duty of governments to uphold those beliefs, as to protect any other of the interests of society. In a case of such necessity, and so directly in the line of their duty, something less than infallibility may, it is maintained, warrant, and even bind, governments, to act on their own opinion, confirmed by the general opinion of mankind. It is also often argued, and still oftener thought, that none but bad men would desire to weaken these salutary beliefs; and there can be nothing wrong, it is thought, in restraining bad men, and prohibiting what only such men would wish to practise. This mode of thinking makes the justification of restraints on discussion not a question of the truth of doctrines, but of their usefulness; and flatters itself by that means to escape the responsibility of claiming to be an infallible judge of opinions. But those who thus satisfy themselves, do not perceive that the assumption of infallibility is merely shifted from one point to another. The usefulness of an opinion is itself matter of opinion: as disputable, as open to discussion, and requiring discussion as much, as the opinion itself. There is the same need of an infallible judge of opinions to decide an opinion to be noxious, as to decide it to be false, unless the opinion condemned has full opportunity of defending itself. And it will not do to say that the heretic may be allowed to maintain the utility or harmlessness of his opinion, though forbidden to maintain its truth. The truth of an opinion is part of its utility. If we would

know whether or not it is desirable that a proposition should be believed, is it possible to exclude the consideration of whether or not it is true? In the opinion, not of bad men, but of the best men, no belief which is contrary to truth can be really useful: and can you prevent such men from urging that plea, when they are charged with culpability for denying some doctrine which they are told is useful, but which they believe to be false? Those who are on the side of received opinions, never fail to take all possible advantage of this plea; you do not find _them_ handling the question of utility as if it could be completely abstracted from that of truth: on the contrary, it is, above all, because their doctrine is "the truth," that the knowledge or the belief of it is held to be so indispensable. There can be no fair discussion of the question of usefulness, when an argument so vital may be employed on one side, but not on the other. And in point of fact, when law or public feeling do not permit the truth of an opinion to be disputed, they are just as little tolerant of a denial of its usefulness. The utmost they allow is an extenuation of its absolute necessity, or of the positive guilt of rejecting it.

In order more fully to illustrate the mischief of denying a hearing to opinions because we, in our own judgment, have condemned them, it will be desirable to fix down the discussion to a concrete case; and I choose, by preference, the cases which are least favourable to me--in which the argument against freedom of opinion, both on the score of truth and on that of utility, is considered the strongest. Let the opinions impugned be the belief in a God and in a future state, or any of the commonly received doctrines of morality. To fight the battle on such ground, gives a great advantage to an unfair antagonist; since he will be sure to say (and many who have no desire to be unfair will say it internally), Are these the doctrines which you do not deem sufficiently certain to be taken under the protection of law? Is the belief in a God one of the opinions, to feel sure of which, you hold to be assuming infallibility? But I must be permitted to observe, that it is not the feeling sure of a doctrine (be it what it may) which I call an assumption of infallibility. It is the undertaking to decide that question _for others_, without allowing them to hear what can be said on the contrary side. And I denounce and reprobate this pretension not the less, if put forth on the side of my most solemn convictions. However positive any one's persuasion may be, not only of the falsity, but of the pernicious consequences--not only of the pernicious consequences, but (to adopt expressions which I altogether condemn) the immorality and impiety of an opinion; yet if, in pursuance of that private judgment, though backed by the public judgment of his country or his contemporaries, he prevents the opinion from being heard in its defence, he assumes infallibility. And so far from the assumption being less objectionable or less dangerous because the opinion is called immoral or impious, this is the case of all others in which it is most fatal. These are exactly the occasions on which the men of one generation commit those dreadful mistakes, which excite the astonishment and horror of posterity. It is among such that we find the instances memorable in history, when the arm of the law has been employed to root out the best men and the noblest doctrines; with deplorable success as to the men, though some of the doctrines have survived to be (as if in mockery) invoked, in defence of similar conduct towards those who dissent from _them_, or from their received interpretation.

Mankind can hardly be too often reminded that there was once a man named Socrates, between whom and the legal authorities and public opinion of his time, there took place a memorable collision. Born in an age and country abounding in individual greatness, this man has been handed down to us by those who best knew both him and the age, as the most virtuous man in it; while _we_ know him as the head and prototype of all subsequent teachers of virtue, the source equally of the lofty inspiration of Plato and the judicious utilitarianism of Aristotle, "_i maestri di color che sanno_," the two headsprings of ethical as of all other philosophy. This acknowledged master of all the eminent thinkers who have since lived--whose fame, still growing after more than two thousand years, all but outweighs the whole remainder of the names which make his native city illustrious--was put to death by his countrymen, after a judicial conviction, for impiety and immorality. Impiety, in denying the gods recognised by the State; indeed his accuser asserted (see the "Apologia") that he believed in no gods at all. Immorality, in being, by his doctrines and instructions, a "corruptor of youth." Of these charges the tribunal, there is every ground for believing, honestly found him guilty, and condemned the man who probably of all then born had deserved best of mankind, to be put to death as a criminal.

To pass from this to the only other instance of judicial iniquity, the mention of which, after the condemnation of Socrates, would not be an anticlimax: the event which took place on Calvary rather more than eighteen hundred years ago. The man who left on the memory of those who witnessed his life and conversation, such an impression of his moral grandeur, that eighteen subsequent centuries have done homage to him as the Almighty in person, was ignominiously put to death, as what? As a blasphemer. Men did not merely mistake their benefactor; they mistook him for the exact contrary of what he was, and treated him as that prodigy of impiety, which they themselves are now held to be, for their treatment of him. The feelings with which mankind now regard these lamentable transactions, especially the later of the two, render them extremely unjust in their judgment of the unhappy actors. These were, to all appearance, not bad men--not worse than men commonly are, but rather the contrary; men who possessed in a full, or somewhat more than a full measure, the religious, moral, and patriotic feelings of their time and people: the very kind of men

who, in all times, our own included, have every chance of passing through life blameless and respected. The high-priest who rent his garments when the words were pronounced, which, according to all the ideas of his country, constituted the blackest guilt, was in all probability quite as sincere in his horror and indignation, as the generality of respectable and pious men now are in the religious and moral sentiments they profess; and most of those who now shudder at his conduct, if they had lived in his time, and been born Jews, would have acted precisely as he did. Orthodox Christians who are tempted to think that those who stoned to death the first martyrs must have been worse men than they themselves are, ought to remember that one of those persecutors was Saint Paul.

Let us add one more example, the most striking of all, if the impressiveness of an error is measured by the wisdom and virtue of him who falls into it. If ever any one, possessed of power, had grounds for thinking himself the best and most enlightened among his cotemporaries, it was the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. Absolute monarch of the whole civilised world, he preserved through life not only the most unblemished justice, but what was less to be expected from his Stoical breeding, the tenderest heart. The few failings which are attributed to him, were all on the side of indulgence: while his writings, the highest ethical product of the ancient mind, differ scarcely perceptibly, if they differ at all, from the most characteristic teachings of Christ. This man, a better Christian in all but the dogmatic sense of the word, than almost any of the ostensibly Christian sovereigns who have since reigned, persecuted Christianity. Placed at the summit of all the previous attainments of humanity, with an open, unfettered intellect, and a character which led him of himself to embody in his moral writings the Christian ideal, he yet failed to see that Christianity was to be a good and not an evil to the world, with his duties to which he was so deeply penetrated. Existing society he knew to be in a deplorable state. But such as it was, he saw, or thought he saw, that it was held together, and prevented from being worse, by belief and reverence of the received divinities. As a ruler of mankind, he deemed it his duty not to suffer society to fall in pieces; and saw not how, if its existing ties were removed, any others could be formed which could again knit it together. The new religion openly aimed at dissolving these ties: unless, therefore, it was his duty to adopt that religion, it seemed to be his duty to put it down. Inasmuch then as the theology of Christianity did not appear to him true or of divine origin; inasmuch as this strange history of a crucified God was not credible to him, and a system which purported to rest entirely upon a foundation to him so wholly unbelievable, could not be foreseen by him to be that renovating agency which, after all abatements, it has in fact proved to be; the gentlest and most amiable of philosophers and rulers, under a solemn sense of duty, authorised the persecution of Christianity. To my mind this is one of the most tragical facts in all history. It is a bitter thought, how different a thing the Christianity of the world might have been, if the Christian faith had been adopted as the religion of the empire under the auspices of Marcus Aurelius instead of those of Constantine. But it would be equally unjust to him and false to truth, to deny, that no one plea which can be urged for punishing anti-Christian teaching, was wanting to Marcus Aurelius for punishing, as he did, the propagation of Christianity. No Christian more firmly believes that Atheism is false, and tends to the dissolution of society, than Marcus Aurelius believed the same things of Christianity; he who, of all men then living, might have been thought the most capable of appreciating it. Unless any one who approves of punishment for the promulgation of opinions, flatters himself that he is a wiser and better man than Marcus Aurelius--more deeply versed in the wisdom of his time, more elevated in his intellect above it--more earnest in his search for truth, or more single-minded in his devotion to it when found;--let him abstain from that assumption of the joint infallibility of himself and the multitude, which the great Antoninus made with so unfortunate a result.

Aware of the impossibility of defending the use of punishment for restraining irreligious opinions, by any argument which will not justify Marcus Antoninus, the enemies of religious freedom, when hard pressed, occasionally accept this consequence, and say, with Dr. Johnson, that the persecutors of Christianity were in the right; that persecution is an ordeal through which truth ought to pass, and always passes successfully, legal penalties being, in the end, powerless against truth, though sometimes beneficially effective against mischievous errors. This is a form of the argument for religious intolerance, sufficiently remarkable not to be passed without notice.

A theory which maintains that truth may justifiably be persecuted because persecution cannot possibly do it any harm, cannot be charged with being intentionally hostile to the reception of new truths; but we cannot commend the generosity of its dealing with the persons to whom mankind are indebted for them. To discover to the world something which deeply concerns it, and of which it was previously ignorant; to prove to it that it had been mistaken on some vital point of temporal or spiritual interest, is as important a service as a human being can render to his fellow-creatures, and in certain cases, as in those of the early Christians and of the Reformers, those who think with Dr. Johnson believe it to have been the most precious gift which could be bestowed on mankind. That the authors of such splendid benefits should be requited by martyrdom; that their reward should be to be dealt with as the vilest of criminals, is not, upon this theory, a deplorable error and misfortune, for which humanity should mourn in sackcloth and ashes, but the normal and justifiable state of things. The propounder of a new truth, according to this doctrine, should stand, as

stood, in the legislation of the Locrians, the proposer of a new law, with a halter round his neck, to be instantly tightened if the public assembly did not, on hearing his reasons, then and there adopt his proposition. People who defend this mode of treating benefactors, cannot be supposed to set much value on the benefit; and I believe this view of the subject is mostly confined to the sort of persons who think that new truths may have been desirable once, but that we have had enough of them now.

But, indeed, the dictum that truth always triumphs over persecution, is one of those pleasant falsehoods which men repeat after one another till they pass into commonplaces, but which all experience refutes. History teems with instances of truth put down by persecution. If not suppressed for ever, it may be thrown back for centuries. To speak only of religious opinions: the Reformation broke out at least twenty times before Luther, and was put down. Arnold of Brescia was put down. Fra Dolcino was put down. Savonarola was put down. The Albigeois were put down. The Vaudois were put down. The Lollards were put down. The Hussites were put down. Even after the era of Luther, wherever persecution was persisted in, it was successful. In Spain, Italy, Flanders, the Austrian empire, Protestantism was rooted out; and, most likely, would have been so in England, had Queen Mary lived, or Queen Elizabeth died. Persecution has always succeeded, save where the heretics were too strong a party to be effectually persecuted. No reasonable person can doubt that Christianity might have been extirpated in the Roman Empire. It spread, and became predominant, because the persecutions were only occasional, lasting but a short time, and separated by long intervals of almost undisturbed propagandism. It is a piece of idle sentimentality that truth, merely as truth, has any inherent power denied to error, of prevailing against the dungeon and the stake. Men are not more zealous for truth than they often are for error, and a sufficient application of legal or even of social penalties will generally succeed in stopping the propagation of either. The real advantage which truth has, consists in this, that when an opinion is true, it may be extinguished once, twice, or many times, but in the course of ages there will generally be found persons to rediscover it, until some one of its reappearances falls on a time when from favourable circumstances it escapes persecution until it has made such head as to withstand all subsequent attempts to suppress it.

It will be said, that we do not now put to death the introducers of new opinions: we are not like our fathers who slew the prophets, we even build sepulchres to them. It is true we no longer put heretics to death; and the amount of penal infliction which modern feeling would probably tolerate, even against the most obnoxious opinions, is not sufficient to extirpate them. But let us not flatter ourselves that we are yet free from the stain even of legal persecution. Penalties for opinion, or at least for its expression, still exist by law; and their enforcement is not, even in these times, so unexampled as to make it at all incredible that they may some day be revived in full force. In the year 1857, at the summer assizes of the county of Cornwall, an unfortunate man,[7] said to be of unexceptionable conduct in all relations of life, was sentenced to twenty-one months' imprisonment, for uttering, and writing on a gate, some offensive words concerning Christianity. Within a month of the same time, at the Old Bailey, two persons, on two separate occasions,[8] were rejected as jurymen, and one of them grossly insulted by the judge and by one of the counsel, because they honestly declared that they had no theological belief; and a third, a foreigner,[9] for the same reason, was denied justice against a thief. This refusal of redress took place in virtue of the legal doctrine, that no person can be allowed to give evidence in a court of justice, who does not profess belief in a God (any god is sufficient) and in a future state; which is equivalent to declaring such persons to be outlaws, excluded from the protection of the tribunals; who may not only be robbed or assaulted with impunity, if no one but themselves, or persons of similar opinions, be present, but any one else may be robbed or assaulted with impunity, if the proof of the fact depends on their evidence. The assumption on which this is grounded, is that the oath is worthless, of a person who does not believe in a future state; a proposition which betokens much ignorance of history in those who assent to it (since it is historically true that a large proportion of infidels in all ages have been persons of distinguished integrity and honour); and would be maintained by no one who had the smallest conception how many of the persons in greatest repute with the world, both for virtues and for attainments, are well known, at least to their intimates, to be unbelievers. The rule, besides, is suicidal, and cuts away its own foundation. Under pretence that atheists must be liars, it admits the testimony of all atheists who are willing to lie, and rejects only those who brave the obloquy of publicly confessing a detested creed rather than affirm a falsehood. A rule thus self-convicted of absurdity so far as regards its professed purpose, can be kept in force only as a badge of hatred, a relic of persecution; a persecution, too, having the peculiarity, that the qualification for undergoing it, is the being clearly proved not to deserve it. The rule, and the theory it implies, are hardly less insulting to believers than to infidels. For if he who does not believe in a future state, necessarily lies, it follows that they who do believe are only prevented from lying, if prevented they are, by the fear of hell. We will not do the authors and abettors of the rule the injury of supposing, that the conception which they have formed of Christian virtue is drawn from their own consciousness.

These, indeed, are but rags and remnants of persecution, and may be thought to be not so much an indication of the wish to persecute, as an example of that very frequent infirmity of English minds, which makes them take a preposterous pleasure in the

assertion of a bad principle, when they are no longer bad enough to desire to carry it really into practice. But unhappily there is no security in the state of the public mind, that the suspension of worse forms of legal persecution, which has lasted for about the space of a generation, will continue. In this age the quiet surface of routine is as often ruffled by attempts to resuscitate past evils, as to introduce new benefits. What is boasted of at the present time as the revival of religion, is always, in narrow and uncultivated minds, at least as much the revival of bigotry; and where there is the strong permanent leaven of intolerance in the feelings of a people, which at all times abides in the middle classes of this country, it needs but little to provoke them into actively persecuting those whom they have never ceased to think proper objects of persecution.[10] For it is this--it is the opinions men entertain, and the feelings they cherish, respecting those who disown the beliefs they deem important, which makes this country not a place of mental freedom. For a long time past, the chief mischief of the legal penalties is that they strengthen the social stigma. It is that stigma which is really effective, and so effective is it that the profession of opinions which are under the ban of society is much less common in England, than is, in many other countries, the avowal of those which incur risk of judicial punishment. In respect to all persons but those whose pecuniary circumstances make them independent of the good will of other people, opinion, on this subject, is as efficacious as law; men might as well be imprisoned, as excluded from the means of earning their bread. Those whose bread is already secured, and who desire no favours from men in power, or from bodies of men, or from the public, have nothing to fear from the open avowal of any opinions, but to be ill-thought of and ill-spoken of, and this it ought not to require a very heroic mould to enable them to bear. There is no room for any appeal _ad misericordiam_ in behalf of such persons. But though we do not now inflict so much evil on those who think differently from us, as it was formerly our custom to do, it may be that we do ourselves as much evil as ever by our treatment of them. Socrates was put to death, but the Socratic philosophy rose like the sun in heaven, and spread its illumination over the whole intellectual firmament. Christians were cast to the lions, but the Christian church grew up a stately and spreading tree, overtopping the older and less vigorous growths, and stifling them by its shade. Our merely social intolerance kills no one, roots out no opinions, but induces men to disguise them, or to abstain from any active effort for their diffusion. With us, heretical opinions do not perceptibly gain, or even lose, ground in each decade or generation; they never blaze out far and wide, but continue to smoulder in the narrow circles of thinking and studious persons among whom they originate, without ever lighting up the general affairs of mankind with either a true or a deceptive light. And thus is kept up a state of things very satisfactory to some minds, because, without the unpleasant process of fining or imprisoning anybody, it maintains all prevailing opinions outwardly undisturbed, while it does not absolutely interdict the exercise of reason by dissentients afflicted with the malady of thought. A convenient plan for having peace in the intellectual world, and keeping all things going on therein very much as they do already. But the price paid for this sort of intellectual pacification, is the sacrifice of the entire moral courage of the human mind. A state of things in which a large portion of the most active and inquiring intellects find it advisable to keep the genuine principles and grounds of their convictions within their own breasts, and attempt, in what they address to the public, to fit as much as they can of their own conclusions to premises which they have internally renounced, cannot send forth the open, fearless characters, and logical, consistent intellects who once adorned the thinking world. The sort of men who can be looked for under it, are either mere conformers to commonplace, or time-servers for truth, whose arguments on all great subjects are meant for their hearers, and are not those which have convinced themselves. Those who avoid this alternative, do so by narrowing their thoughts and interest to things which can be spoken of without venturing within the region of principles, that is, to small practical matters, which would come right of themselves, if but the minds of mankind were strengthened and enlarged, and which will never be made effectually right until then: while that which would strengthen and enlarge men's minds, free and daring speculation on the highest subjects, is abandoned.

Those in whose eyes this reticence on the part of heretics is no evil, should consider in the first place, that in consequence of it there is never any fair and thorough discussion of heretical opinions; and that such of them as could not stand such a discussion, though they may be prevented from spreading, do not disappear. But it is not the minds of heretics that are deteriorated most, by the ban placed on all inquiry which does not end in the orthodox conclusions. The greatest harm done is to those who are not heretics, and whose whole mental development is cramped, and their reason cowed, by the fear of heresy. Who can compute what the world loses in the multitude of promising intellects combined with timid characters, who dare not follow out any bold, vigorous, independent train of thought, lest it should land them in something which would admit of being considered irreligious or immoral? Among them we may occasionally see some man of deep conscientiousness, and subtle and refined understanding, who spends a life in sophisticating with an intellect which he cannot silence, and exhausts the resources of ingenuity in attempting to reconcile the promptings of his conscience and reason with orthodoxy, which yet he does not, perhaps, to the end succeed in doing. No one can be a great thinker who does not recognise, that as a thinker it is his first duty to follow his intellect to whatever conclusions it may lead. Truth gains more even by the errors of one who, with due study and preparation, thinks for himself, than by the true opinions of those who only hold them because they do not suffer themselves to think. Not that it is solely, or chiefly, to form great thinkers,

that freedom of thinking is required. On the contrary, it is as much, and even more indispensable, to enable average human beings to attain the mental stature which they are capable of. There have been, and may again be, great individual thinkers, in a general atmosphere of mental slavery. But there never has been, nor ever will be, in that atmosphere, an intellectually active people. Where any people has made a temporary approach to such a character, it has been because the dread of heterodox speculation was for a time suspended. Where there is a tacit convention that principles are not to be disputed; where the discussion of the greatest questions which can occupy humanity is considered to be closed, we cannot hope to find that generally high scale of mental activity which has made some periods of history so remarkable. Never when controversy avoided the subjects which are large and important enough to kindle enthusiasm, was the mind of a people stirred up from its foundations, and the impulse given which raised even persons of the most ordinary intellect to something of the dignity of thinking beings. Of such we have had an example in the condition of Europe during the times immediately following the Reformation; another, though limited to the Continent and to a more cultivated class, in the speculative movement of the latter half of the eighteenth century; and a third, of still briefer duration, in the intellectual fermentation of Germany during the Goethian and Fichtean period. These periods differed widely in the particular opinions which they developed; but were alike in this, that during all three the yoke of authority was broken. In each, an old mental despotism had been thrown off, and no new one had yet taken its place. The impulse given at these three periods has made Europe what it now is. Every single improvement which has taken place either in the human mind or in institutions, may be traced distinctly to one or other of them. Appearances have for some time indicated that all three impulses are well-nigh spent; and we can expect no fresh start, until we again assert our mental freedom.

Let us now pass to the second division of the argument, and dismissing the supposition that any of the received opinions may be false, let us assume them to be true, and examine into the worth of the manner in which they are likely to be held, when their truth is not freely and openly canvassed. However unwillingly a person who has a strong opinion may admit the possibility that his opinion may be false, he ought to be moved by the consideration that however true it may be, if it is not fully, frequently, and fearlessly discussed, it will be held as a dead dogma, not a living truth.

There is a class of persons (happily not quite so numerous as formerly) who think it enough if a person assents undoubtingly to what they think true, though he has no knowledge whatever of the grounds of the opinion, and could not make a tenable defence of it against the most superficial objections. Such persons, if they can once get their creed taught from authority, naturally think that no good, and some harm, comes of its being allowed to be questioned. Where their influence prevails, they make it nearly impossible for the received opinion to be rejected wisely and considerately, though it may still be rejected rashly and ignorantly; for to shut out discussion entirely is seldom possible, and when it once gets in, beliefs not grounded on conviction are apt to give way before the slightest semblance of an argument. Waiving, however, this possibility--assuming that the true opinion abides in the mind, but abides as a prejudice, a belief independent of, and proof against, argument--this is not the way in which truth ought to be held by a rational being. This is not knowing the truth. Truth, thus held, is but one superstition the more, accidentally clinging to the words which enunciate a truth.

If the intellect and judgment of mankind ought to be cultivated, a thing which Protestants at least do not deny, on what can these faculties be more appropriately exercised by any one, than on the things which concern him so much that it is considered necessary for him to hold opinions on them? If the cultivation of the understanding consists in one thing more than in another, it is surely in learning the grounds of one's own opinions. Whatever people believe, on subjects on which it is of the first importance to believe rightly, they ought to be able to defend against at least the common objections. But, some one may say, "Let them be _taught_ the grounds of their opinions. It does not follow that opinions must be merely parroted because they are never heard controverted. Persons who learn geometry do not simply commit the theorems to memory, but understand and learn likewise the demonstrations; and it would be absurd to say that they remain ignorant of the grounds of geometrical truths, because they never hear any one deny, and attempt to disprove them." Undoubtedly: and such teaching suffices on a subject like mathematics, where there is nothing at all to be said on the wrong side of the question. The peculiarity of the evidence of mathematical truths is, that all the argument is on one side. There are no objections, and no answers to objections. But on every subject on which difference of opinion is possible, the truth depends on a balance to be struck between two sets of conflicting reasons. Even in natural philosophy, there is always some other explanation possible of the same facts; some geocentric theory instead of heliocentric, some phlogiston instead of oxygen; and it has to be shown why that other theory cannot be the true one: and until this is shown, and until we know how it is shown, we do not understand the grounds of our opinion. But when we turn to subjects infinitely more complicated, to morals, religion, politics, social relations, and the business of life, three-fourths of the arguments for every disputed opinion consist in dispelling the appearances which favour some opinion different from it. The greatest orator, save one, of antiquity, has left it on record that he always studied his adversary's case with as great, if not with still greater, intensity than even

his own. What Cicero practised as the means of forensic success, requires to be imitated by all who study any subject in order to arrive at the truth. He who knows only his own side of the case, knows little of that. His reasons may be good, and no one may have been able to refute them. But if he is equally unable to refute the reasons on the opposite side; if he does not so much as know what they are, he has no ground for preferring either opinion. The rational position for him would be suspension of judgment, and unless he contents himself with that, he is either led by authority, or adopts, like the generality of the world, the side to which he feels most inclination. Nor is it enough that he should hear the arguments of adversaries from his own teachers, presented as they state them, and accompanied by what they offer as refutations. That is not the way to do justice to the arguments, or bring them into real contact with his own mind. He must be able to hear them from persons who actually believe them; who defend them in earnest, and do their very utmost for them. He must know them in their most plausible and persuasive form; he must feel the whole force of the difficulty which the true view of the subject has to encounter and dispose of; else he will never really possess himself of the portion of truth which meets and removes that difficulty. Ninety-nine in a hundred of what are called educated men are in this condition; even of those who can argue fluently for their opinions. Their conclusion may be true, but it might be false for anything they know: they have never thrown themselves into the mental position of those who think differently from them, and considered what such persons may have to say; and consequently they do not, in any proper sense of the word, know the doctrine which they themselves profess. They do not know those parts of it which explain and justify the remainder; the considerations which show that a fact which seemingly conflicts with another is reconcilable with it, or that, of two apparently strong reasons, one and not the other ought to be preferred. All that part of the truth which turns the scale, and decides the judgment of a completely informed mind, they are strangers to; nor is it ever really known, but to those who have attended equally and impartially to both sides, and endeavoured to see the reasons of both in the strongest light. So essential is this discipline to a real understanding of moral and human subjects, that if opponents of all important truths do not exist, it is indispensable to imagine them, and supply them with the strongest arguments which the most skilful devil's advocate can conjure up.

To abate the force of these considerations, an enemy of free discussion may be supposed to say, that there is no necessity for mankind in general to know and understand all that can be said against or for their opinions by philosophers and theologians. That it is not needful for common men to be able to expose all the misstatements or fallacies of an ingenious opponent. That it is enough if there is always somebody capable of answering them, so that nothing likely to mislead uninstructed persons remains unrefuted. That simple minds, having been taught the obvious grounds of the truths inculcated on them, may trust to authority for the rest, and being aware that they have neither knowledge nor talent to resolve every difficulty which can be raised, may repose in the assurance that all those which have been raised have been or can be answered, by those who are specially trained to the task.

Conceding to this view of the subject the utmost that can be claimed for it by those most easily satisfied with the amount of understanding of truth which ought to accompany the belief of it; even so, the argument for free discussion is no way weakened. For even this doctrine acknowledges that mankind ought to have a rational assurance that all objections have been satisfactorily answered; and how are they to be answered if that which requires to be answered is not spoken? or how can the answer be known to be satisfactory, if the objectors have no opportunity of showing that it is unsatisfactory? If not the public, at least the philosophers and theologians who are to resolve the difficulties, must make themselves familiar with those difficulties in their most puzzling form; and this cannot be accomplished unless they are freely stated, and placed in the most advantageous light which they admit of. The Catholic Church has its own way of dealing with this embarrassing problem. It makes a broad separation between those who can be permitted to receive its doctrines on conviction, and those who must accept them on trust. Neither, indeed, are allowed any choice as to what they will accept; but the clergy, such at least as can be fully confided in, may admissibly and meritoriously make themselves acquainted with the arguments of opponents, in order to answer them, and may, therefore, read heretical books; the laity, not unless by special permission, hard to be obtained. This discipline recognises a knowledge of the enemy's case as beneficial to the teachers, but finds means, consistent with this, of denying it to the rest of the world: thus giving to the _elite_ more mental culture, though not more mental freedom, than it allows to the mass. By this device it succeeds in obtaining the kind of mental superiority which its purposes require; for though culture without freedom never made a large and liberal mind, it can make a clever _nisi prius_ advocate of a cause. But in countries professing Protestantism, this resource is denied; since Protestants hold, at least in theory, that the responsibility for the choice of a religion must be borne by each for himself, and cannot be thrown off upon teachers. Besides, in the present state of the world, it is practically impossible that writings which are read by the instructed can be kept from the uninstructed. If the teachers of mankind are to be cognisant of all that they ought to know, everything must be free to be written and published without restraint.

If, however, the mischievous operation of the absence of free discussion, when the received opinions are true, were confined to leaving men ignorant of the grounds of those opinions, it might be thought that this, if an intellectual, is no moral evil, and does not

affect the worth of the opinions, regarded in their influence on the character. The fact, however, is, that not only the grounds of the opinion are forgotten in the absence of discussion, but too often the meaning of the opinion itself. The words which convey it, cease to suggest ideas, or suggest only a small portion of those they were originally employed to communicate. Instead of a vivid conception and a living belief, there remain only a few phrases retained by rote; or, if any part, the shell and husk only of the meaning is retained, the finer essence being lost. The great chapter in human history which this fact occupies and fills, cannot be too earnestly studied and meditated on.

It is illustrated in the experience of almost all ethical doctrines and religious creeds. They are all full of meaning and vitality to those who originate them, and to the direct disciples of the originators. Their meaning continues to be felt in undiminished strength, and is perhaps brought out into even fuller consciousness, so long as the struggle lasts to give the doctrine or creed an ascendency over other creeds. At last it either prevails, and becomes the general opinion, or its progress stops; it keeps possession of the ground it has gained, but ceases to spread further. When either of these results has become apparent, controversy on the subject flags, and gradually dies away. The doctrine has taken its place, if not as a received opinion, as one of the admitted sects or divisions of opinion: those who hold it have generally inherited, not adopted it; and conversion from one of these doctrines to another, being now an exceptional fact, occupies little place in the thoughts of their professors. Instead of being, as at first, constantly on the alert either to defend themselves against the world, or to bring the world over to them, they have subsided into acquiescence, and neither listen, when they can help it, to arguments against their creed, nor trouble dissentients (if there be such) with arguments in its favour. From this time may usually be dated the decline in the living power of the doctrine. We often hear the teachers of all creeds lamenting the difficulty of keeping up in the minds of believers a lively apprehension of the truth which they nominally recognise, so that it may penetrate the feelings, and acquire a real mastery over the conduct. No such difficulty is complained of while the creed is still fighting for its existence: even the weaker combatants then know and feel what they are fighting for, and the difference between it and other doctrines; and in that period of every creed's existence, not a few persons may be found, who have realised its fundamental principles in all the forms of thought, have weighed and considered them in all their important bearings, and have experienced the full effect on the character, which belief in that creed ought to produce in a mind thoroughly imbued with it. But when it has come to be a hereditary creed, and to be received passively, not actively--when the mind is no longer compelled, in the same degree as at first, to exercise its vital powers on the questions which its belief presents to it, there is a progressive tendency to forget all of the belief except the formularies, or to give it a dull and torpid assent, as if accepting it on trust dispensed with the necessity of realising it in consciousness, or testing it by personal experience; until it almost ceases to connect itself at all with the inner life of the human being. Then are seen the cases, so frequent in this age of the world as almost to form the majority, in which the creed remains as it were outside the mind, encrusting and petrifying it against all other influences addressed to the higher parts of our nature; manifesting its power by not suffering any fresh and living conviction to get in, but itself doing nothing for the mind or heart, except standing sentinel over them to keep them vacant.

To what an extent doctrines intrinsically fitted to make the deepest impression upon the mind may remain in it as dead beliefs, without being ever realised in the imagination, the feelings, or the understanding, is exemplified by the manner in which the majority of believers hold the doctrines of Christianity. By Christianity I here mean what is accounted such by all churches and sects--the maxims and precepts contained in the New Testament. These are considered sacred, and accepted as laws, by all professing Christians. Yet it is scarcely too much to say that not one Christian in a thousand guides or tests his individual conduct by reference to those laws. The standard to which he does refer it, is the custom of his nation, his class, or his religious profession. He has thus, on the one hand, a collection of ethical maxims, which he believes to have been vouchsafed to him by infallible wisdom as rules for his government; and on the other, a set of every-day judgments and practices, which go a certain length with some of those maxims, not so great a length with others, stand in direct opposition to some, and are, on the whole, a compromise between the Christian creed and the interests and suggestions of worldly life. To the first of these standards he gives his homage; to the other his real allegiance. All Christians believe that the blessed are the poor and humble, and those who are ill-used by the world; that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven; that they should judge not, lest they be judged; that they should swear not at all; that they should love their neighbour as themselves; that if one take their cloak, they should give him their coat also; that they should take no thought for the morrow; that if they would be perfect, they should sell all that they have and give it to the poor. They are not insincere when they say that they believe these things. They do believe them, as people believe what they have always heard lauded and never discussed. But in the sense of that living belief which regulates conduct, they believe these doctrines just up to the point to which it is usual to act upon them. The doctrines in their integrity are serviceable to pelt adversaries with; and it is understood that they are to be put forward (when possible) as the reasons for whatever people do that they think laudable. But any one who reminded them that the maxims require an infinity of things which

they never even think of doing, would gain nothing but to be classed among those very unpopular characters who affect to be better than other people. The doctrines have no hold on ordinary believers--are not a power in their minds. They have a habitual respect for the sound of them, but no feeling which spreads from the words to the things signified, and forces the mind to take _them_ in, and make them conform to the formula. Whenever conduct is concerned, they look round for Mr. A and B to direct them how far to go in obeying Christ.

Now we may be well assured that the case was not thus, but far otherwise, with the early Christians. Had it been thus, Christianity never would have expanded from an obscure sect of the despised Hebrews into the religion of the Roman empire. When their enemies said, "See how these Christians love one another" (a remark not likely to be made by anybody now), they assuredly had a much livelier feeling of the meaning of their creed than they have ever had since. And to this cause, probably, it is chiefly owing that Christianity now makes so little progress in extending its domain, and after eighteen centuries, is still nearly confined to Europeans and the descendants of Europeans. Even with the strictly religious, who are much in earnest about their doctrines, and attach a greater amount of meaning to many of them than people in general, it commonly happens that the part which is thus comparatively active in their minds is that which was made by Calvin, or Knox, or some such person much nearer in character to themselves. The sayings of Christ coexist passively in their minds, producing hardly any effect beyond what is caused by mere listening to words so amiable and bland. There are many reasons, doubtless, why doctrines which are the badge of a sect retain more of their vitality than those common to all recognised sects, and why more pains are taken by teachers to keep their meaning alive; but one reason certainly is, that the peculiar doctrines are more questioned, and have to be oftener defended against open gainsayers. Both teachers and learners go to sleep at their post, as soon as there is no enemy in the field.

The same thing holds true, generally speaking, of all traditional doctrines--those of prudence and knowledge of life, as well as of morals or religion. All languages and literatures are full of general observations on life, both as to what it is, and how to conduct oneself in it; observations which everybody knows, which everybody repeats, or hears with acquiescence, which are received as truisms, yet of which most people first truly learn the meaning, when experience, generally of a painful kind, has made it a reality to them. How often, when smarting under some unforeseen misfortune or disappointment, does a person call to mind some proverb or common saying, familiar to him all his life, the meaning of which, if he had ever before felt it as he does now, would have saved him from the calamity. There are indeed reasons for this, other than the absence of discussion: there are many truths of which the full meaning _cannot_ be realised, until personal experience has brought it home. But much more of the meaning even of these would have been understood, and what was understood would have been far more deeply impressed on the mind, if the man had been accustomed to hear it argued _pro_ and _con_ by people who did understand it. The fatal tendency of mankind to leave off thinking about a thing when it is no longer doubtful, is the cause of half their errors. A contemporary author has well spoken of "the deep slumber of a decided opinion."

But what! (it may be asked) Is the absence of unanimity an indispensable condition of true knowledge? Is it necessary that some part of mankind should persist in error, to enable any to realise the truth? Does a belief cease to be real and vital as soon as it is generally received--and is a proposition never thoroughly understood and felt unless some doubt of it remains? As soon as mankind have unanimously accepted a truth, does the truth perish within them? The highest aim and best result of improved intelligence, it has hitherto been thought, is to unite mankind more and more in the acknowledgment of all important truths: and does the intelligence only last as long as it has not achieved its object? Do the fruits of conquest perish by the very completeness of the victory?

I affirm no such thing. As mankind improve, the number of doctrines which are no longer disputed or doubted will be constantly on the increase: and the well-being of mankind may almost be measured by the number and gravity of the truths which have reached the point of being uncontested. The cessation, on one question after another, of serious controversy, is one of the necessary incidents of the consolidation of opinion; a consolidation as salutary in the case of true opinions, as it is dangerous and noxious when the opinions are erroneous. But though this gradual narrowing of the bounds of diversity of opinion is necessary in both senses of the term, being at once inevitable and indispensable, we are not therefore obliged to conclude that all its consequences must be beneficial. The loss of so important an aid to the intelligent and living apprehension of a truth, as is afforded by the necessity of explaining it to, or defending it against, opponents, though not sufficient to outweigh, is no trifling drawback from, the benefit of its universal recognition. Where this advantage can no longer be had, I confess I should like to see the teachers of mankind endeavouring to provide a substitute for it; some contrivance for making the difficulties of the question as present to the learner's consciousness, as if they were pressed upon him by a dissentient champion, eager for his conversion.

But instead of seeking contrivances for this purpose, they have lost those they formerly had. The Socratic dialectics, so magnificently exemplified in the dialogues of Plato, were a contrivance of this description. They were essentially a negative discussion of the great questions of philosophy and life, directed with consummate skill to the purpose of convincing any one who had merely adopted the commonplaces of received opinion, that he did not understand the subject--that he as yet attached no definite meaning to the doctrines he professed; in order that, becoming aware of his ignorance, he might be put in the way to attain a stable belief, resting on a clear apprehension both of the meaning of doctrines and of their evidence. The school disputations of the middle ages had a somewhat similar object. They were intended to make sure that the pupil understood his own opinion, and (by necessary correlation) the opinion opposed to it, and could enforce the grounds of the one and confute those of the other. These last-mentioned contests had indeed the incurable defect, that the premises appealed to were taken from authority, not from reason; and, as a discipline to the mind, they were in every respect inferior to the powerful dialectics which formed the intellects of the "Socratici viri": but the modern mind owes far more to both than it is generally willing to admit, and the present modes of education contain nothing which in the smallest degree supplies the place either of the one or of the other. A person who derives all his instruction from teachers or books, even if he escape the besetting temptation of contenting himself with cram, is under no compulsion to hear both sides; accordingly it is far from a frequent accomplishment, even among thinkers, to know both sides; and the weakest part of what everybody says in defence of his opinion, is what he intends as a reply to antagonists. It is the fashion of the present time to disparage negative logic--that which points out weaknesses in theory or errors in practice, without establishing positive truths. Such negative criticism would indeed be poor enough as an ultimate result; but as a means to attaining any positive knowledge or conviction worthy the name, it cannot be valued too highly; and until people are again systematically trained to it, there will be few great thinkers, and a low general average of intellect, in any but the mathematical and physical departments of speculation. On any other subject no one's opinions deserve the name of knowledge, except so far as he has either had forced upon him by others, or gone through of himself, the same mental process which would have been required of him in carrying on an active controversy with opponents. That, therefore, which when absent, it is so indispensable, but so difficult, to create, how worse than absurd is it to forego, when spontaneously offering itself! If there are any persons who contest a received opinion, or who will do so if law or opinion will let them, let us thank them for it, open our minds to listen to them, and rejoice that there is some one to do for us what we otherwise ought, if we have any regard for either the certainty or the vitality of our convictions, to do with much greater labour for ourselves.

It still remains to speak of one of the principal causes which make diversity of opinion advantageous, and will continue to do so until mankind shall have entered a stage of intellectual advancement which at present seems at an incalculable distance. We have hitherto considered only two possibilities: that the received opinion may be false, and some other opinion, consequently, true; or that, the received opinion being true, a conflict with the opposite error is essential to a clear apprehension and deep feeling of its truth. But there is a commoner case than either of these; when the conflicting doctrines, instead of being one true and the other false, share the truth between them; and the nonconforming opinion is needed to supply the remainder of the truth, of which the received doctrine embodies only a part. Popular opinions, on subjects not palpable to sense, are often true, but seldom or never the whole truth. They are a part of the truth; sometimes a greater, sometimes a smaller part, but exaggerated, distorted, and disjoined from the truths by which they ought to be accompanied and limited. Heretical opinions, on the other hand, are generally some of these suppressed and neglected truths, bursting the bonds which kept them down, and either seeking reconciliation with the truth contained in the common opinion, or fronting it as enemies, and setting themselves up, with similar exclusiveness, as the whole truth. The latter case is hitherto the most frequent, as, in the human mind, one-sidedness has always been the rule, and many-sidedness the exception. Hence, even in revolutions of opinion, one part of the truth usually sets while another rises. Even progress, which ought to superadd, for the most part only substitutes one partial and incomplete truth for another; improvement consisting chiefly in this, that the new fragment of truth is more wanted, more adapted to the needs of the time, than that which it displaces. Such being the partial character of prevailing opinions, even when resting on a true foundation; every opinion which embodies somewhat of the portion of truth which the common opinion omits, ought to be considered precious, with whatever amount of error and confusion that truth may be blended. No sober judge of human affairs will feel bound to be indignant because those who force on our notice truths which we should otherwise have overlooked, overlook some of those which we see. Rather, he will think that so long as popular truth is one-sided, it is more desirable than otherwise that unpopular truth should have one-sided asserters too; such being usually the most energetic, and the most likely to compel reluctant attention to the fragment of wisdom which they proclaim as if it were the whole.

Thus, in the eighteenth century, when nearly all the instructed, and all those of the uninstructed who were led by them, were lost in admiration of what is called civilisation, and of the marvels of modern science, literature, and philosophy, and while greatly

overrating the amount of unlikeness between the men of modern and those of ancient times, indulged the belief that the whole of the difference was in their own favour; with what a salutary shock did the paradoxes of Rousseau explode like bombshells in the midst, dislocating the compact mass of one-sided opinion, and forcing its elements to recombine in a better form and with additional ingredients. Not that the current opinions were on the whole farther from the truth than Rousseau's were; on the contrary, they were nearer to it; they contained more of positive truth, and very much less of error. Nevertheless there lay in Rousseau's doctrine, and has floated down the stream of opinion along with it, a considerable amount of exactly those truths which the popular opinion wanted; and these are the deposit which was left behind when the flood subsided. The superior worth of simplicity of life, the enervating and demoralising effect of the trammels and hypocrisies of artificial society, are ideas which have never been entirely absent from cultivated minds since Rousseau wrote; and they will in time produce their due effect, though at present needing to be asserted as much as ever, and to be asserted by deeds, for words, on this subject, have nearly exhausted their power.

In politics, again, it is almost a commonplace, that a party of order or stability, and a party of progress or reform, are both necessary elements of a healthy state of political life; until the one or the other shall have so enlarged its mental grasp as to be a party equally of order and of progress, knowing and distinguishing what is fit to be preserved from what ought to be swept away. Each of these modes of thinking derives its utility from the deficiencies of the other; but it is in a great measure the opposition of the other that keeps each within the limits of reason and sanity. Unless opinions favourable to democracy and to aristocracy, to property and to equality, to co-operation and to competition, to luxury and to abstinence, to sociality and individuality, to liberty and discipline, and all the other standing antagonisms of practical life, are expressed with equal freedom, and enforced and defended with equal talent and energy, there is no chance of both elements obtaining their due; one scale is sure to go up and the other down. Truth, in the great practical concerns of life, is so much a question of the reconciling and combining of opposites, that very few have minds sufficiently capacious and impartial to make the adjustment with an approach to correctness, and it has to be made by the rough process of a struggle between combatants fighting under hostile banners. On any of the great open questions just enumerated, if either of the two opinions has a better claim than the other, not merely to be tolerated, but to be encouraged and countenanced, it is the one which happens at the particular time and place to be in a minority. That is the opinion which, for the time being, represents the neglected interests, the side of human well-being which is in danger of obtaining less than its share. I am aware that there is not, in this country, any intolerance of differences of opinion on most of these topics. They are adduced to show, by admitted and multiplied examples, the universality of the fact, that only through diversity of opinion is there, in the existing state of human intellect, a chance of fair-play to all sides of the truth. When there are persons to be found, who form an exception to the apparent unanimity of the world on any subject, even if the world is in the right, it is always probable that dissentients have something worth hearing to say for themselves, and that truth would lose something by their silence.

It may be objected, "But _some_ received principles, especially on the highest and most vital subjects, are more than half-truths. The Christian morality, for instance, is the whole truth on that subject, and if any one teaches a morality which varies from it, he is wholly in error." As this is of all cases the most important in practice, none can be fitter to test the general maxim. But before pronouncing what Christian morality is or is not, it would be desirable to decide what is meant by Christian morality. If it means the morality of the New Testament, I wonder that any one who derives his knowledge of this from the book itself, can suppose that it was announced, or intended, as a complete doctrine of morals. The Gospel always refers to a pre-existing morality, and confines its precepts to the particulars in which that morality was to be corrected, or superseded by a wider and higher; expressing itself, moreover, in terms most general, often impossible to be interpreted literally, and possessing rather the impressiveness of poetry or eloquence than the precision of legislation. To extract from it a body of ethical doctrine, has ever been possible without eking it out from the Old Testament, that is, from a system elaborate indeed, but in many respects barbarous, and intended only for a barbarous people. St. Paul, a declared enemy to this Judaical mode of interpreting the doctrine and filling up the scheme of his Master, equally assumes a pre-existing morality, namely, that of the Greeks and Romans; and his advice to Christians is in a great measure a system of accommodation to that; even to the extent of giving an apparent sanction to slavery. What is called Christian, but should rather be termed theological, morality, was not the work of Christ or the Apostles, but is of much later origin, having been gradually built up by the Catholic church of the first five centuries, and though not implicitly adopted by moderns and Protestants, has been much less modified by them than might have been expected. For the most part, indeed, they have contented themselves with cutting off the additions which had been made to it in the middle ages, each sect supplying the place by fresh additions, adapted to its own character and tendencies. That mankind owe a great debt to this morality, and to its early teachers, I should be the last person to deny; but I do not scruple to say of it, that it is, in many important points, incomplete and one-sided, and that unless ideas and feelings, not sanctioned by it, had contributed to the formation of European life and character, human affairs would have been in a worse condition than they now are. Christian morality (so called) has all the characters of a reaction; it is, in

great part, a protest against Paganism. Its ideal is negative rather than positive; passive rather than active; Innocence rather than Nobleness; Abstinence from Evil, rather than energetic Pursuit of Good: in its precepts (as has been well said) "thou shalt not" predominates unduly over "thou shalt." In its horror of sensuality, it made an idol of asceticism, which has been gradually compromised away into one of legality. It holds out the hope of heaven and the threat of hell, as the appointed and appropriate motives to a virtuous life: in this falling far below the best of the ancients, and doing what lies in it to give to human morality an essentially selfish character, by disconnecting each man's feelings of duty from the interests of his fellow-creatures, except so far as a self-interested inducement is offered to him for consulting them. It is essentially a doctrine of passive obedience; it inculcates submission to all authorities found established; who indeed are not to be actively obeyed when they command what religion forbids, but who are not to be resisted, far less rebelled against, for any amount of wrong to ourselves. And while, in the morality of the best Pagan nations, duty to the State holds even a disproportionate place, infringing on the just liberty of the individual; in purely Christian ethics, that grand department of duty is scarcely noticed or acknowledged. It is in the Koran, not the New Testament, that we read the maxim--"A ruler who appoints any man to an office, when there is in his dominions another man better qualified for it, sins against God and against the State." What little recognition the idea of obligation to the public obtains in modern morality, is derived from Greek and Roman sources, not from Christian; as, even in the morality of private life, whatever exists of magnanimity, high-mindedness, personal dignity, even the sense of honour, is derived from the purely human, not the religious part of our education, and never could have grown out of a standard of ethics in which the only worth, professedly recognised, is that of obedience.

I am as far as any one from pretending that these defects are necessarily inherent in the Christian ethics, in every manner in which it can be conceived, or that the many requisites of a complete moral doctrine which it does not contain, do not admit of being reconciled with it. Far less would I insinuate this of the doctrines and precepts of Christ himself. I believe that the sayings of Christ are all, that I can see any evidence of their having been intended to be; that they are irreconcilable with nothing which a comprehensive morality requires; that everything which is excellent in ethics may be brought within them, with no greater violence to their language than has been done to it by all who have attempted to deduce from them any practical system of conduct whatever. But it is quite consistent with this, to believe that they contain, and were meant to contain, only a part of the truth; that many essential elements of the highest morality are among the things which are not provided for, nor intended to be provided for, in the recorded deliverances of the Founder of Christianity, and which have been entirely thrown aside in the system of ethics erected on the basis of those deliverances by the Christian Church. And this being so, I think it a great error to persist in attempting to find in the Christian doctrine that complete rule for our guidance, which its author intended it to sanction and enforce, but only partially to provide. I believe, too, that this narrow theory is becoming a grave practical evil, detracting greatly from the value of the moral training and instruction, which so many well-meaning persons are now at length exerting themselves to promote. I much fear that by attempting to form the mind and feelings on an exclusively religious type, and discarding those secular standards (as for want of a better name they may be called) which heretofore co-existed with and supplemented the Christian ethics, receiving some of its spirit, and infusing into it some of theirs, there will result, and is even now resulting, a low, abject, servile type of character, which, submit itself as it may to what it deems the Supreme Will, is incapable of rising to or sympathising in the conception of Supreme Goodness. I believe that other ethics than any which can be evolved from exclusively Christian sources, must exist side by side with Christian ethics to produce the moral regeneration of mankind; and that the Christian system is no exception to the rule, that in an imperfect state of the human mind, the interests of truth require a diversity of opinions. It is not necessary that in ceasing to ignore the moral truths not contained in Christianity, men should ignore any of those which it does contain. Such prejudice, or oversight, when it occurs, is altogether an evil; but it is one from which we cannot hope to be always exempt, and must be regarded as the price paid for an inestimable good. The exclusive pretension made by a part of the truth to be the whole, must and ought to be protested against, and if a reactionary impulse should make the protestors unjust in their turn, this one-sidedness, like the other, may be lamented, but must be tolerated. If Christians would teach infidels to be just to Christianity, they should themselves be just to infidelity. It can do truth no service to blink the fact, known to all who have the most ordinary acquaintance with literary history, that a large portion of the noblest and most valuable moral teaching has been the work, not only of men who did not know, but of men who knew and rejected, the Christian faith.

I do not pretend that the most unlimited use of the freedom of enunciating all possible opinions would put an end to the evils of religious or philosophical sectarianism. Every truth which men of narrow capacity are in earnest about, is sure to be asserted, inculcated, and in many ways even acted on, as if no other truth existed in the world, or at all events none that could limit or qualify the first. I acknowledge that the tendency of all opinions to become sectarian is not cured by the freest discussion, but is often heightened and exacerbated thereby; the truth which ought to have been, but was not, seen, being rejected all the more violently

because proclaimed by persons regarded as opponents. But it is not on the impassioned partisan, it is on the calmer and more disinterested bystander, that this collision of opinions works its salutary effect. Not the violent conflict between parts of the truth, but the quiet suppression of half of it, is the formidable evil: there is always hope when people are forced to listen to both sides; it is when they attend only to one that errors harden into prejudices, and truth itself ceases to have the effect of truth, by being exaggerated into falsehood. And since there are few mental attributes more rare than that judicial faculty which can sit in intelligent judgment between two sides of a question, of which only one is represented by an advocate before it, truth has no chance but in proportion as every side of it, every opinion which embodies any fraction of the truth, not only finds advocates, but is so advocated as to be listened to.

We have now recognised the necessity to the mental well-being of mankind (on which all their other well-being depends) of freedom of opinion, and freedom of the expression of opinion, on four distinct grounds; which we will now briefly recapitulate.

First, if any opinion is compelled to silence, that opinion may, for aught we can certainly know, be true. To deny this is to assume our own infallibility.

Secondly, though the silenced opinion be an error, it may, and very commonly does, contain a portion of truth; and since the general or prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely or never the whole truth, it is only by the collision of adverse opinions, that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied.

Thirdly, even if the received opinion be not only true, but the whole truth; unless it is suffered to be, and actually is, vigorously and earnestly contested, it will, by most of those who receive it, be held in the manner of a prejudice, with little comprehension or feeling of its rational grounds. And not only this, but, fourthly, the meaning of the doctrine itself will be in danger of being lost, or enfeebled, and deprived of its vital effect on the character and conduct: the dogma becoming a mere formal profession, inefficacious for good, but cumbering the ground, and preventing the growth of any real and heartfelt conviction, from reason or personal experience.

Before quitting the subject of freedom of opinion, it is fit to take some notice of those who say, that the free expression of all opinions should be permitted, on condition that the manner be temperate, and do not pass the bounds of fair discussion. Much might be said on the impossibility of fixing where these supposed bounds are to be placed; for if the test be offence to those whose opinion is attacked, I think experience testifies that this offence is given whenever the attack is telling and powerful, and that every opponent who pushes them hard, and whom they find it difficult to answer, appears to them, if he shows any strong feeling on the subject, an intemperate opponent. But this, though an important consideration in a practical point of view, merges in a more fundamental objection. Undoubtedly the manner of asserting an opinion, even though it be a true one, may be very objectionable, and may justly incur severe censure. But the principal offences of the kind are such as it is mostly impossible, unless by accidental self-betrayal, to bring home to conviction. The gravest of them is, to argue sophistically, to suppress facts or arguments, to misstate the elements of the case, or misrepresent the opposite opinion. But all this, even to the most aggravated degree, is so continually done in perfect good faith, by persons who are not considered, and in many other respects may not deserve to be considered, ignorant or incompetent, that it is rarely possible on adequate grounds conscientiously to stamp the misrepresentation as morally culpable; and still less could law presume to interfere with this kind of controversial misconduct. With regard to what is commonly meant by intemperate discussion, namely invective, sarcasm, personality, and the like, the denunciation of these weapons would deserve more sympathy if it were ever proposed to interdict them equally to both sides; but it is only desired to restrain the employment of them against the prevailing opinion: against the unprevailing they may not only be used without general disapproval, but will be likely to obtain for him who uses them the praise of honest zeal and righteous indignation. Yet whatever mischief arises from their use, is greatest when they are employed against the comparatively defenceless; and whatever unfair advantage can be derived by any opinion from this mode of asserting it, accrues almost exclusively to received opinions. The worst offence of this kind which can be committed by a polemic, is to stigmatise those who hold the contrary opinion as bad and immoral men. To calumny of this sort, those who hold any unpopular opinion are peculiarly exposed, because they are in general few and uninfluential, and nobody but themselves feel much interest in seeing justice done them; but this weapon is, from the nature of the case, denied to those who attack a prevailing opinion: they can neither use it with safety to themselves, nor, if they could, would it do anything but recoil on their own cause. In general, opinions contrary to those commonly received can only obtain a hearing by studied moderation of language, and the most cautious avoidance of unnecessary offence, from which they hardly ever deviate even in a slight degree without losing ground: while unmeasured vituperation employed on the side of the prevailing opinion, really does deter people from professing contrary opinions, and from listening to those who profess them. For the interest, therefore, of truth and justice, it is far more important to restrain this employment of vituperative language than the other; and, for example, if it

were necessary to choose, there would be much more need to discourage offensive attacks on infidelity, than on religion. It is, however, obvious that law and authority have no business with restraining either, while opinion ought, in every instance, to determine its verdict by the circumstances of the individual case; condemning every one, on whichever side of the argument he places himself, in whose mode of advocacy either want of candour, or malignity, bigotry, or intolerance of feeling manifest themselves; but not inferring these vices from the side which a person takes, though it be the contrary side of the question to our own: and giving merited honour to every one, whatever opinion he may hold, who has calmness to see and honesty to state what his opponents and their opinions really are, exaggerating nothing to their discredit, keeping nothing back which tells, or can be supposed to tell, in their favour. This is the real morality of public discussion; and if often violated, I am happy to think that there are many controversialists who to a great extent observe it, and a still greater number who conscientiously strive towards it.

FOOTNOTES:

[6] These words had scarcely been written, when, as if to give them an emphatic contradiction, occurred the Government Press Prosecutions of 1858. That ill-judged interference with the liberty of public discussion has not, however, induced me to alter a single word in the text, nor has it at all weakened my conviction that, moments of panic excepted, the era of pains and penalties for political discussion has, in our own country, passed away. For, in the first place, the prosecutions were not persisted in; and, in the second, they were never, properly speaking, political prosecutions. The offence charged was not that of criticising institutions, or the acts or persons of rulers, but of circulating what was deemed an immoral doctrine, the lawfulness of Tyrannicide.

If the arguments of the present chapter are of any validity, there ought to exist the fullest liberty of professing and discussing, as a matter of ethical conviction, any doctrine, however immoral it may be considered. It would, therefore, be irrelevant and out of place to examine here, whether the doctrine of Tyrannicide deserves that title. I shall content myself with saying, that the subject has been at all times one of the open questions of morals; that the act of a private citizen in striking down a criminal, who, by raising himself above the law, has placed himself beyond the reach of legal punishment or control, has been accounted by whole nations, and by some of the best and wisest of men, not a crime, but an act of exalted virtue; and that, right or wrong, it is not of the nature of assassination, but of civil war. As such, I hold that the instigation to it, in a specific case, may be a proper subject of punishment, but only if an overt act has followed, and at least a probable connection can be established between the act and the instigation. Even then, it is not a foreign government, but the very government assailed, which alone, in the exercise of self-defence, can legitimately punish attacks directed against its own existence.

[7] Thomas Pooley, Bodmin Assizes, July 31, 1857. In December following, he received a free pardon from the Crown.

[8] George Jacob Holyoake, August 17, 1857; Edward Truelove, July, 1857.

[9] Baron de Gleichen, Marlborough-Street Police Court, August 4, 1857.

[10] Ample warning may be drawn from the large infusion of the passions of a persecutor, which mingled with the general display of the worst parts of our national character on the occasion of the Sepoy insurrection. The ravings of fanatics or charlatans from the pulpit may be unworthy of notice; but the heads of the Evangelical party have announced as their principle, for the government of Hindoos and Mahomedans, that no schools be supported by public money in which the Bible is not taught, and by necessary consequence that no public employment be given to any but real or pretended Christians. An Under-Secretary of State, in a speech delivered to his constituents on the 12th of November, 1857, is reported to have said: "Toleration of their faith" (the faith of a hundred millions of British subjects), "the superstition which they called religion, by the British Government, had had the effect of retarding the ascendency of the British name, and preventing the salutary growth of Christianity.... Toleration was the great corner-stone of the religious liberties of this country; but do not let them abuse that precious word toleration. As he understood it, it meant the complete liberty to all, freedom of worship, _among Christians, who worshipped upon the same foundation_. It meant toleration of all sects and denominations of _Christians who believed in the one mediation_." I desire to call attention to the fact, that a man who has been deemed fit to fill a high office in the government of this country, under a liberal Ministry, maintains the doctrine that all who do not believe in the divinity of Christ are beyond the pale of toleration. Who, after this imbecile display, can indulge the illusion that religious persecution has passed away, never to return?

CHAPTER III.

OF INDIVIDUALITY, AS ONE OF THE ELEMENTS OF WELL-BEING.

Such being the reasons which make it imperative that human beings should be free to form opinions, and to express their opinions without reserve; and such the baneful consequences to the intellectual, and through that to the moral nature of man, unless this liberty is either conceded, or asserted in spite of prohibition; let us next examine whether the same reasons do not require that men should be free to act upon their opinions--to carry these out in their lives, without hindrance, either physical or moral, from their fellow-men, so long as it is at their own risk and peril. This last proviso is of course indispensable. No one pretends that actions should be as free as opinions. On the contrary, even opinions lose their immunity, when the circumstances in which they are expressed are such as to constitute their expression a positive instigation to some mischievous act. An opinion that corn-dealers are starvers of the poor, or that private property is robbery, ought to be unmolested when simply circulated through the press, but may justly incur punishment when delivered orally to an excited mob assembled before the house of a corn-dealer, or when handed about among the same mob in the form of a placard. Acts, of whatever kind, which, without justifiable cause, do harm to others, may be, and in the more important cases absolutely require to be, controlled by the unfavourable sentiments, and, when needful, by the active interference of mankind. The liberty of the individual must be thus far limited; he must not make himself a nuisance to other people. But if he refrains from molesting others in what concerns them, and merely acts according to his own inclination and judgment in things which concern himself, the same reasons which show that opinion should be free, prove also that he should be allowed, without molestation, to carry his opinions into practice at his own cost. That mankind are not infallible; that their truths, for the most part, are only half-truths; that unity of opinion, unless resulting from the fullest and freest comparison of opposite opinions, is not desirable, and diversity not an evil, but a good, until mankind are much more capable than at present of recognising all sides of the truth, are principles applicable to men's modes of action, not less than to their opinions. As it is useful that while mankind are imperfect there should be different opinions, so is it that there should be different experiments of living; that free scope should be given to varieties of character, short of injury to others; and that the worth of different modes of life should be proved practically, when any one thinks fit to try them. It is desirable, in short, that in things which do not primarily concern others, individuality should assert itself. Where, not the person's own character, but the traditions or customs of other people are the rule of conduct, there is wanting one of the principal ingredients of human happiness, and quite the chief ingredient of individual and social progress.

In maintaining this principle, the greatest difficulty to be encountered does not lie in the appreciation of means towards an acknowledged end, but in the indifference of persons in general to the end itself. If it were felt that the free development of individuality is one of the leading essentials of well-being; that it is not only a co-ordinate element with all that is designated by the terms civilisation, instruction, education, culture, but is itself a necessary part and condition of all those things; there would be no danger that liberty should be under-valued, and the adjustment of the boundaries between it and social control would present no extraordinary difficulty. But the evil is, that individual spontaneity is hardly recognised by the common modes of thinking, as having any intrinsic worth, or deserving any regard on its own account. The majority, being satisfied with the ways of mankind as they now are (for it is they who make them what they are), cannot comprehend why those ways should not be good enough for everybody; and what is more, spontaneity forms no part of the ideal of the majority of moral and social reformers, but is rather looked on with jealousy, as a troublesome and perhaps rebellious obstruction to the general acceptance of what these reformers, in their own judgment, think would be best for mankind. Few persons, out of Germany, even comprehend the meaning of the doctrine which Wilhelm von Humboldt, so eminent both as a _savant_ and as a politician, made the text of a treatise--that "the end of man, or that which is prescribed by the eternal or immutable dictates of reason, and not suggested by vague and transient desires, is the highest and most harmonious development of his powers to a complete and consistent whole;" that, therefore, the object "towards which every human being must ceaselessly direct his efforts, and on which especially those who design to influence their fellow-men must ever keep their eyes, is the individuality of power and development;" that for this there are two requisites, "freedom, and a variety of situations;" and that from the union of these arise "individual vigour and manifold diversity," which combine themselves in "originality."[11]

Little, however, as people are accustomed to a doctrine like that of Von Humboldt, and surprising as it may be to them to find so high a value attached to individuality, the question, one must nevertheless think, can only be one of degree. No one's idea of excellence in conduct is that people should do absolutely nothing but copy one another. No one would assert that people ought not to put into their mode of life, and into the conduct of their concerns, any impress whatever of their own judgment, or of their own individual character. On the other hand, it would be absurd to pretend that people ought to live as if nothing whatever had been known in the world before they came into it; as if experience had as yet done nothing towards showing that one mode of existence, or of conduct, is preferable to another. Nobody denies that people should be so taught and trained in youth, as to know and benefit by the ascertained results of human experience. But it is the privilege and proper condition of a human being, arrived at the maturity of his faculties, to use and interpret experience in his own way. It is for him to find out what part of recorded experience is properly

applicable to his own circumstances and character. The traditions and customs of other people are, to a certain extent, evidence of what their experience has taught _them_; presumptive evidence, and as such, have a claim to his deference: but, in the first place, their experience may be too narrow; or they may not have interpreted it rightly. Secondly, their interpretation of experience may be correct, but unsuitable to him. Customs are made for customary circumstances, and customary characters: and his circumstances or his character may be uncustomary. Thirdly, though the customs be both good as customs, and suitable to him, yet to conform to custom, merely _as_ custom, does not educate or develop in him any of the qualities which are the distinctive endowment of a human being. The human faculties of perception, judgment, discriminative feeling, mental activity, and even moral preference, are exercised only in making a choice. He who does anything because it is the custom, makes no choice. He gains no practice either in discerning or in desiring what is best. The mental and moral, like the muscular powers, are improved only by being used. The faculties are called into no exercise by doing a thing merely because others do it, no more than by believing a thing only because others believe it. If the grounds of an opinion are not conclusive to the person's own reason, his reason cannot be strengthened, but is likely to be weakened by his adopting it: and if the inducements to an act are not such as are consentaneous to his own feelings and character (where affection, or the rights of others, are not concerned), it is so much done towards rendering his feelings and character inert and torpid, instead of active and energetic.

He who lets the world, or his own portion of it, choose his plan of life for him, has no need of any other faculty than the ape-like one of imitation. He who chooses his plan for himself, employs all his faculties. He must use observation to see, reasoning and judgment to foresee, activity to gather materials for decision, discrimination to decide, and when he has decided, firmness and self-control to hold to his deliberate decision. And these qualities he requires and exercises exactly in proportion as the part of his conduct which he determines according to his own judgment and feelings is a large one. It is possible that he might be guided in some good path, and kept out of harm's way, without any of these things. But what will be his comparative worth as a human being? It really is of importance, not only what men do, but also what manner of men they are that do it. Among the works of man, which human life is rightly employed in perfecting and beautifying, the first in importance surely is man himself. Supposing it were possible to get houses built, corn grown, battles fought, causes tried, and even churches erected and prayers said, by machinery--by automatons in human form--it would be a considerable loss to exchange for these automatons even the men and women who at present inhabit the more civilised parts of the world, and who assuredly are but starved specimens of what nature can and will produce. Human nature is not a machine to be built after a model, and set to do exactly the work prescribed for it, but a tree, which requires to grow and develop itself on all sides, according to the tendency of the inward forces which make it a living thing.

It will probably be conceded that it is desirable people should exercise their understandings, and that an intelligent following of custom, or even occasionally an intelligent deviation from custom, is better than a blind and simply mechanical adhesion to it. To a certain extent it is admitted, that our understanding should be our own: but there is not the same willingness to admit that our desires and impulses should be our own likewise; or that to possess impulses of our own, and of any strength, is anything but a peril and a snare. Yet desires and impulses are as much a part of a perfect human being, as beliefs and restraints: and strong impulses are only perilous when not properly balanced; when one set of aims and inclinations is developed into strength, while others, which ought to co-exist with them, remain weak and inactive. It is not because men's desires are strong that they act ill; it is because their consciences are weak. There is no natural connection between strong impulses and a weak conscience. The natural connection is the other way. To say that one person's desires and feelings are stronger and more various than those of another, is merely to say that he has more of the raw material of human nature, and is therefore capable, perhaps of more evil, but certainly of more good. Strong impulses are but another name for energy. Energy may be turned to bad uses; but more good may always be made of an energetic nature, than of an indolent and impassive one. Those who have most natural feeling, are always those whose cultivated feelings may be made the strongest. The same strong susceptibilities which make the personal impulses vivid and powerful, are also the source from whence are generated the most passionate love of virtue, and the sternest self-control. It is through the cultivation of these, that society both does its duty and protects its interests: not by rejecting the stuff of which heroes are made, because it knows not how to make them. A person whose desires and impulses are his own--are the expression of his own nature, as it has been developed and modified by his own culture--is said to have a character. One whose desires and impulses are not his own, has no character, no more than a steam-engine has a character. If, in addition to being his own, his impulses are strong, and are under the government of a strong will, he has an energetic character. Whoever thinks that individuality of desires and impulses should not be encouraged to unfold itself, must maintain that society has no need of strong natures--is not the better for containing many persons who have much character--and that a high general average of energy is not desirable.

In some early states of society, these forces might be, and were, too much ahead of the power which society then possessed of disciplining and controlling them. There has been a time when the element of spontaneity and individuality was in excess, and the social principle had a hard struggle with it. The difficulty then was, to induce men of strong bodies or minds to pay obedience to any rules which required them to control their impulses. To overcome this difficulty, law and discipline, like the Popes struggling against the Emperors, asserted a power over the whole man, claiming to control all his life in order to control his character--which society had not found any other sufficient means of binding. But society has now fairly got the better of individuality; and the danger which threatens human nature is not the excess, but the deficiency, of personal impulses and preferences. Things are vastly changed, since the passions of those who were strong by station or by personal endowment were in a state of habitual rebellion against laws and ordinances, and required to be rigorously chained up to enable the persons within their reach to enjoy any particle of security. In our times, from the highest class of society down to the lowest, every one lives as under the eye of a hostile and dreaded censorship. Not only in what concerns others, but in what concerns only themselves, the individual, or the family, do not ask themselves--what do I prefer? or, what would suit my character and disposition? or, what would allow the best and highest in me to have fair-play, and enable it to grow and thrive? They ask themselves, what is suitable to my position? what is usually done by persons of my station and pecuniary circumstances? or (worse still) what is usually done by persons of a station and circumstances superior to mine? I do not mean that they choose what is customary, in preference to what suits their own inclination. It does not occur to them to have any inclination, except for what is customary. Thus the mind itself is bowed to the yoke: even in what people do for pleasure, conformity is the first thing thought of; they live in crowds; they exercise choice only among things commonly done: peculiarity of taste, eccentricity of conduct, are shunned equally with crimes: until by dint of not following their own nature, they have no nature to follow: their human capacities are withered and starved: they become incapable of any strong wishes or native pleasures, and are generally without either opinions or feelings of home growth, or properly their own. Now is this, or is it not, the desirable condition of human nature?

It is so, on the Calvinistic theory. According to that, the one great offence of man is Self-will. All the good of which humanity is capable, is comprised in Obedience. You have no choice; thus you must do, and no otherwise: "whatever is not a duty, is a sin." Human nature being radically corrupt, there is no redemption for any one until human nature is killed within him. To one holding this theory of life, crushing out any of the human faculties, capacities, and susceptibilities, is no evil: man needs no capacity, but that of surrendering himself to the will of God: and if he uses any of his faculties for any other purpose but to do that supposed will more effectually, he is better without them. That is the theory of Calvinism; and it is held, in a mitigated form, by many who do not consider themselves Calvinists; the mitigation consisting in giving a less ascetic interpretation to the alleged will of God; asserting it to be his will that mankind should gratify some of their inclinations; of course not in the manner they themselves prefer, but in the way of obedience, that is, in a way prescribed to them by authority; and, therefore, by the necessary conditions of the case, the same for all.

In some such insidious form there is at present a strong tendency to this narrow theory of life, and to the pinched and hidebound type of human character which it patronises. Many persons, no doubt, sincerely think that human beings thus cramped and dwarfed, are as their Maker designed them to be; just as many have thought that trees are a much finer thing when clipped into pollards, or cut out into figures of animals, than as nature made them. But if it be any part of religion to believe that man was made by a good being, it is more consistent with that faith to believe, that this Being gave all human faculties that they might be cultivated and unfolded, not rooted out and consumed, and that he takes delight in every nearer approach made by his creatures to the ideal conception embodied in them, every increase in any of their capabilities of comprehension, of action, or of enjoyment. There is a different type of human excellence from the Calvinistic; a conception of humanity as having its nature bestowed on it for other purposes than merely to be abnegated. "Pagan self-assertion" is one of the elements of human worth, as well as "Christian self-denial."[12] There is a Greek ideal of self-development, which the Platonic and Christian ideal of self-government blends with, but does not supersede. It may be better to be a John Knox than an Alcibiades, but it is better to be a Pericles than either; nor would a Pericles, if we had one in these days, be without anything good which belonged to John Knox.

It is not by wearing down into uniformity all that is individual in themselves, but by cultivating it and calling it forth, within the limits imposed by the rights and interests of others, that human beings become a noble and beautiful object of contemplation; and as the works partake the character of those who do them, by the same process human life also becomes rich, diversified, and animating, furnishing more abundant aliment to high thoughts and elevating feelings, and strengthening the tie which binds every individual to the race, by making the race infinitely better worth belonging to. In proportion to the development of his individuality, each person becomes more valuable to himself, and is therefore capable of being more valuable to others. There is a greater fulness of life about his own existence, and when there is more life in the units there is more in the mass which is composed of them. As much

compression as is necessary to prevent the stronger specimens of human nature from encroaching on the rights of others, cannot be dispensed with; but for this there is ample compensation even in the point of view of human development. The means of development which the individual loses by being prevented from gratifying his inclinations to the injury of others, are chiefly obtained at the expense of the development of other people. And even to himself there is a full equivalent in the better development of the social part of his nature, rendered possible by the restraint put upon the selfish part. To be held to rigid rules of justice for the sake of others, develops the feelings and capacities which have the good of others for their object. But to be restrained in things not affecting their good, by their mere displeasure, develops nothing valuable, except such force of character as may unfold itself in resisting the restraint. If acquiesced in, it dulls and blunts the whole nature. To give any fair-play to the nature of each, it is essential that different persons should be allowed to lead different lives. In proportion as this latitude has been exercised in any age, has that age been noteworthy to posterity. Even despotism does not produce its worst effects, so long as Individuality exists under it; and whatever crushes individuality is despotism, by whatever name it may be called, and whether it professes to be enforcing the will of God or the injunctions of men.

Having said that Individuality is the same thing with development, and that it is only the cultivation of individuality which produces, or can produce, well-developed human beings, I might here close the argument: for what more or better can be said of any condition of human affairs, than that it brings human beings themselves nearer to the best thing they can be? or what worse can be said of any obstruction to good, than that it prevents this? Doubtless, however, these considerations will not suffice to convince those who most need convincing; and it is necessary further to show, that these developed human beings are of some use to the undeveloped--to point out to those who do not desire liberty, and would not avail themselves of it, that they may be in some intelligible manner rewarded for allowing other people to make use of it without hindrance.

In the first place, then, I would suggest that they might possibly learn something from them. It will not be denied by anybody, that originality is a valuable element in human affairs. There is always need of persons not only to discover new truths, and point out when what were once truths are true no longer, but also to commence new practices, and set the example of more enlightened conduct, and better taste and sense in human life. This cannot well be gainsaid by anybody who does not believe that the world has already attained perfection in all its ways and practices. It is true that this benefit is not capable of being rendered by everybody alike: there are but few persons, in comparison with the whole of mankind, whose experiments, if adopted by others, would be likely to be any improvement on established practice. But these few are the salt of the earth; without them, human life would become a stagnant pool. Not only is it they who introduce good things which did not before exist; it is they who keep the life in those which already existed. If there were nothing new to be done, would human intellect cease to be necessary? Would it be a reason why those who do the old things should forget why they are done, and do them like cattle, not like human beings? There is only too great a tendency in the best beliefs and practices to degenerate into the mechanical; and unless there were a succession of persons whose ever-recurring originality prevents the grounds of those beliefs and practices from becoming merely traditional, such dead matter would not resist the smallest shock from anything really alive, and there would be no reason why civilisation should not die out, as in the Byzantine Empire. Persons of genius, it is true, are, and are always likely to be, a small minority; but in order to have them, it is necessary to preserve the soil in which they grow. Genius can only breathe freely in an _atmosphere_ of freedom. Persons of genius are, _ex vi termini_, _more_ individual than any other people--less capable, consequently, of fitting themselves, without hurtful compression, into any of the small number of moulds which society provides in order to save its members the trouble of forming their own character. If from timidity they consent to be forced into one of these moulds, and to let all that part of themselves which cannot expand under the pressure remain unexpanded, society will be little the better for their genius. If they are of a strong character, and break their fetters, they become a mark for the society which has not succeeded in reducing them to commonplace, to point at with solemn warning as "wild," "erratic," and the like; much as if one should complain of the Niagara river for not flowing smoothly between its banks like a Dutch canal.

I insist thus emphatically on the importance of genius, and the necessity of allowing it to unfold itself freely both in thought and in practice, being well aware that no one will deny the position in theory, but knowing also that almost every one, in reality, is totally indifferent to it. People think genius a fine thing if it enables a man to write an exciting poem, or paint a picture. But in its true sense, that of originality in thought and action, though no one says that it is not a thing to be admired, nearly all, at heart, think that they can do very well without it. Unhappily this is too natural to be wondered at. Originality is the one thing which unoriginal minds cannot feel the use of. They cannot see what it is to do for them: how should they? If they could see what it would do for them, it would not be originality. The first service which originality has to render them, is that of opening their eyes: which being once fully done, they would have a chance of being themselves original. Meanwhile, recollecting that nothing was ever yet done which some one was not the first to do, and that all good things which exist are the fruits of originality, let them be modest enough to believe that

there is something still left for it to accomplish, and assure themselves that they are more in need of originality, the less they are conscious of the want.

In sober truth, whatever homage may be professed, or even paid, to real or supposed mental superiority, the general tendency of things throughout the world is to render mediocrity the ascendant power among mankind. In ancient history, in the middle ages, and in a diminishing degree through the long transition from feudality to the present time, the individual was a power in himself; and if he had either great talents or a high social position, he was a considerable power. At present individuals are lost in the crowd. In politics it is almost a triviality to say that public opinion now rules the world. The only power deserving the name is that of masses, and of governments while they make themselves the organ of the tendencies and instincts of masses. This is as true in the moral and social relations of private life as in public transactions. Those whose opinions go by the name of public opinion, are not always the same sort of public: in America they are the whole white population; in England, chiefly the middle class. But they are always a mass, that is to say, collective mediocrity. And what is a still greater novelty, the mass do not now take their opinions from dignitaries in Church or State, from ostensible leaders, or from books. Their thinking is done for them by men much like themselves, addressing them or speaking in their name, on the spur of the moment, through the newspapers. I am not complaining of all this. I do not assert that anything better is compatible, as a general rule, with the present low state of the human mind. But that does not hinder the government of mediocrity from being mediocre government. No government by a democracy or a numerous aristocracy, either in its political acts or in the opinions, qualities, and tone of mind which it fosters, ever did or could rise above mediocrity, except in so far as the sovereign Many have let themselves be guided (which in their best times they always have done) by the counsels and influence of a more highly gifted and instructed One or Few. The initiation of all wise or noble things, comes and must come from individuals; generally at first from some one individual. The honour and glory of the average man is that he is capable of following that initiative; that he can respond internally to wise and noble things, and be led to them with his eyes open. I am not countenancing the sort of "hero-worship" which applauds the strong man of genius for forcibly seizing on the government of the world and making it do his bidding in spite of itself. All he can claim is, freedom to point out the way. The power of compelling others into it, is not only inconsistent with the freedom and development of all the rest, but corrupting to the strong man himself. It does seem, however, that when the opinions of masses of merely average men are everywhere become or becoming the dominant power, the counterpoise and corrective to that tendency would be, the more and more pronounced individuality of those who stand on the higher eminences of thought. It is in these circumstances most especially, that exceptional individuals, instead of being deterred, should be encouraged in acting differently from the mass. In other times there was no advantage in their doing so, unless they acted not only differently, but better. In this age the mere example of nonconformity, the mere refusal to bend the knee to custom, is itself a service. Precisely because the tyranny of opinion is such as to make eccentricity a reproach, it is desirable, in order to break through that tyranny, that people should be eccentric. Eccentricity has always abounded when and where strength of character has abounded; and the amount of eccentricity in a society has generally been proportional to the amount of genius, mental vigour, and moral courage which it contained. That so few now dare to be eccentric, marks the chief danger of the time.

I have said that it is important to give the freest scope possible to uncustomary things, in order that it may in time appear which of these are fit to be converted into customs. But independence of action, and disregard of custom are not solely deserving of encouragement for the chance they afford that better modes of action, and customs more worthy of general adoption, may be struck out; nor is it only persons of decided mental superiority who have a just claim to carry on their lives in their own way. There is no reason that all human existences should be constructed on some one, or some small number of patterns. If a person possesses any tolerable amount of common-sense and experience, his own mode of laying out his existence is the best, not because it is the best in itself, but because it is his own mode. Human beings are not like sheep; and even sheep are not undistinguishably alike. A man cannot get a coat or a pair of boots to fit him, unless they are either made to his measure, or he has a whole warehouseful to choose from: and is it easier to fit him with a life than with a coat, or are human beings more like one another in their whole physical and spiritual conformation than in the shape of their feet? If it were only that people have diversities of taste, that is reason enough for not attempting to shape them all after one model. But different persons also require different conditions for their spiritual development; and can no more exist healthily in the same moral, than all the variety of plants can in the same physical, atmosphere and climate. The same things which are helps to one person towards the cultivation of his higher nature, are hindrances to another. The same mode of life is a healthy excitement to one, keeping all his faculties of action and enjoyment in their best order, while to another it is a distracting burthen, which suspends or crushes all internal life. Such are the differences among human beings in their sources of pleasure, their susceptibilities of pain, and the operation on them of different physical and moral agencies, that unless there is a corresponding diversity in their modes of life, they neither obtain their fair share of happiness, nor grow up to the mental, moral, and aesthetic stature of which their nature is capable. Why then should tolerance, as far as the public sentiment is

concerned, extend only to tastes and modes of life which extort acquiescence by the multitude of their adherents? Nowhere (except in some monastic institutions) is diversity of taste entirely unrecognised; a person may, without blame, either like or dislike rowing, or smoking, or music, or athletic exercises, or chess, or cards, or study, because both those who like each of these things, and those who dislike them, are too numerous to be put down. But the man, and still more the woman, who can be accused either of doing "what nobody does," or of not doing "what everybody does," is the subject of as much depreciatory remark as if he or she had committed some grave moral delinquency. Persons require to possess a title, or some other badge of rank, or of the consideration of people of rank, to be able to indulge somewhat in the luxury of doing as they like without detriment to their estimation. To indulge somewhat, I repeat: for whoever allow themselves much of that indulgence, incur the risk of something worse than disparaging speeches--they are in peril of a commission _de lunatico_, and of having their property taken from them and given to their relations.[13]

There is one characteristic of the present direction of public opinion, peculiarly calculated to make it intolerant of any marked demonstration of individuality. The general average of mankind are not only moderate in intellect, but also moderate in inclinations: they have no tastes or wishes strong enough to incline them to do anything unusual, and they consequently do not understand those who have, and class all such with the wild and intemperate whom they are accustomed to look down upon. Now, in addition to this fact which is general, we have only to suppose that a strong movement has set in towards the improvement of morals, and it is evident what we have to expect. In these days such a movement has set in; much has actually been effected in the way of increased regularity of conduct, and discouragement of excesses; and there is a philanthropic spirit abroad, for the exercise of which there is no more inviting field than the moral and prudential improvement of our fellow-creatures. These tendencies of the times cause the public to be more disposed than at most former periods to prescribe general rules of conduct, and endeavour to make every one conform to the approved standard. And that standard, express or tacit, is to desire nothing strongly. Its ideal of character is to be without any marked character; to maim by compression, like a Chinese lady's foot, every part of human nature which stands out prominently, and tends to make the person markedly dissimilar in outline to commonplace humanity.

As is usually the case with ideals which exclude one-half of what is desirable, the present standard of approbation produces only an inferior imitation of the other half. Instead of great energies guided by vigorous reason, and strong feelings strongly controlled by a conscientious will, its result is weak feelings and weak energies, which therefore can be kept in outward conformity to rule without any strength either of will or of reason. Already energetic characters on any large scale are becoming merely traditional. There is now scarcely any outlet for energy in this country except business. The energy expended in that may still be regarded as considerable. What little is left from that employment, is expended on some hobby; which may be a useful, even a philanthropic hobby, but is always some one thing, and generally a thing of small dimensions. The greatness of England is now all collective: individually small, we only appear capable of anything great by our habit of combining; and with this our moral and religious philanthropists are perfectly contented. But it was men of another stamp than this that made England what it has been; and men of another stamp will be needed to prevent its decline.

The despotism of custom is everywhere the standing hindrance to human advancement, being in unceasing antagonism to that disposition to aim at something better than customary, which is called, according to circumstances, the spirit of liberty, or that of progress or improvement. The spirit of improvement is not always a spirit of liberty, for it may aim at forcing improvements on an unwilling people; and the spirit of liberty, in so far as it resists such attempts, may ally itself locally and temporarily with the opponents of improvement; but the only unfailing and permanent source of improvement is liberty, since by it there are as many possible independent centres of improvement as there are individuals. The progressive principle, however, in either shape, whether as the love of liberty or of improvement, is antagonistic to the sway of Custom, involving at least emancipation from that yoke; and the contest between the two constitutes the chief interest of the history of mankind. The greater part of the world has, properly speaking, no history, because the despotism of Custom is complete. This is the case over the whole East. Custom is there, in all things, the final appeal; justice and right mean conformity to custom; the argument of custom no one, unless some tyrant intoxicated with power, thinks of resisting. And we see the result. Those nations must once have had originality; they did not start out of the ground populous, lettered, and versed in many of the arts of life; they made themselves all this, and were then the greatest and most powerful nations in the world. What are they now? The subjects or dependants of tribes whose forefathers wandered in the forests when theirs had magnificent palaces and gorgeous temples, but over whom custom exercised only a divided rule with liberty and progress. A people, it appears, may be progressive for a certain length of time, and then stop: when does it stop? When it ceases to possess individuality. If a similar change should befall the nations of Europe, it will not be in exactly the same shape: the despotism of custom with which these nations are threatened is not precisely stationariness. It proscribes singularity, but it does not preclude change, provided all change together. We have discarded the fixed costumes of our forefathers;

every one must still dress like other people, but the fashion may change once or twice a year. We thus take care that when there is change, it shall be for change's sake, and not from any idea of beauty or convenience; for the same idea of beauty or convenience would not strike all the world at the same moment, and be simultaneously thrown aside by all at another moment. But we are progressive as well as changeable: we continually make new inventions in mechanical things, and keep them until they are again superseded by better; we are eager for improvement in politics, in education, even in morals, though in this last our idea of improvement chiefly consists in persuading or forcing other people to be as good as ourselves. It is not progress that we object to; on the contrary, we flatter ourselves that we are the most progressive people who ever lived. It is individuality that we war against: we should think we had done wonders if we had made ourselves all alike; forgetting that the unlikeness of one person to another is generally the first thing which draws the attention of either to the imperfection of his own type, and the superiority of another, or the possibility, by combining the advantages of both, of producing something better than either. We have a warning example in China--a nation of much talent, and, in some respects, even wisdom, owing to the rare good fortune of having been provided at an early period with a particularly good set of customs, the work, in some measure, of men to whom even the most enlightened European must accord, under certain limitations, the title of sages and philosophers. They are remarkable, too, in the excellence of their apparatus for impressing, as far as possible, the best wisdom they possess upon every mind in the community, and securing that those who have appropriated most of it shall occupy the posts of honour and power. Surely the people who did this have discovered the secret of human progressiveness, and must have kept themselves steadily at the head of the movement of the world. On the contrary, they have become stationary--have remained so for thousands of years; and if they are ever to be farther improved, it must be by foreigners. They have succeeded beyond all hope in what English philanthropists are so industriously working at--in making a people all alike, all governing their thoughts and conduct by the same maxims and rules; and these are the fruits. The modern _regime_ of public opinion is, in an unorganised form, what the Chinese educational and political systems are in an organised; and unless individuality shall be able successfully to assert itself against this yoke, Europe, notwithstanding its noble antecedents and its professed Christianity, will tend to become another China.

What is it that has hitherto preserved Europe from this lot? What has made the European family of nations an improving, instead of a stationary portion of mankind? Not any superior excellence in them, which, when it exists, exists as the effect, not as the cause; but their remarkable diversity of character and culture. Individuals, classes, nations, have been extremely unlike one another: they have struck out a great variety of paths, each leading to something valuable; and although at every period those who travelled in different paths have been intolerant of one another, and each would have thought it an excellent thing if all the rest could have been compelled to travel his road, their attempts to thwart each other's development have rarely had any permanent success, and each has in time endured to receive the good which the others have offered. Europe is, in my judgment, wholly indebted to this plurality of paths for its progressive and many-sided development. But it already begins to possess this benefit in a considerably less degree. It is decidedly advancing towards the Chinese ideal of making all people alike. M. de Tocqueville, in his last important work, remarks how much more the Frenchmen of the present day resemble one another, than did those even of the last generation. The same remark might be made of Englishmen in a far greater degree. In a passage already quoted from Wilhelm von Humboldt, he points out two things as necessary conditions of human development, because necessary to render people unlike one another; namely, freedom, and variety of situations. The second of these two conditions is in this country every day diminishing. The circumstances which surround different classes and individuals, and shape their characters, are daily becoming more assimilated. Formerly, different ranks, different neighbourhoods, different trades and professions, lived in what might be called different worlds; at present, to a great degree in the same. Comparatively speaking, they now read the same things, listen to the same things, see the same things, go to the same places, have their hopes and fears directed to the same objects, have the same rights and liberties, and the same means of asserting them. Great as are the differences of position which remain, they are nothing to those which have ceased. And the assimilation is still proceeding. All the political changes of the age promote it, since they all tend to raise the low and to lower the high. Every extension of education promotes it, because education brings people under common influences, and gives them access to the general stock of facts and sentiments. Improvements in the means of communication promote it, by bringing the inhabitants of distant places into personal contact, and keeping up a rapid flow of changes of residence between one place and another. The increase of commerce and manufactures promotes it, by diffusing more widely the advantages of easy circumstances, and opening all objects of ambition, even the highest, to general competition, whereby the desire of rising becomes no longer the character of a particular class, but of all classes. A more powerful agency than even all these, in bringing about a general similarity among mankind, is the complete establishment, in this and other free countries, of the ascendency of public opinion in the State. As the various social eminences which enabled persons entrenched on them to disregard the opinion of the multitude, gradually become levelled; as the very idea of resisting the will of the public, when it is positively known that they have a will, disappears more and more from the minds of practical politicians; there ceases to be any

social support for non-conformity--any substantive power in society, which, itself opposed to the ascendency of numbers, is interested in taking under its protection opinions and tendencies at variance with those of the public.

The combination of all these causes forms so great a mass of influences hostile to Individuality, that it is not easy to see how it can stand its ground. It will do so with increasing difficulty, unless the intelligent part of the public can be made to feel its value--to see that it is good there should be differences, even though not for the better, even though, as it may appear to them, some should be for the worse. If the claims of Individuality are ever to be asserted, the time is now, while much is still wanting to complete the enforced assimilation. It is only in the earlier stages that any stand can be successfully made against the encroachment. The demand that all other people shall resemble ourselves, grows by what it feeds on. If resistance waits till life is reduced _nearly_ to one uniform type, all deviations from that type will come to be considered impious, immoral, even monstrous and contrary to nature. Mankind speedily become unable to conceive diversity, when they have been for some time unaccustomed to see it.

FOOTNOTES:

[11] _The Sphere and Duties of Government_, from the German of Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt, pp. 11-13.

[12] Sterling's _Essays_.

[13] There is something both contemptible and frightful in the sort of evidence on which, of late years, any person can be judicially declared unfit for the management of his affairs; and after his death, his disposal of his property can be set aside, if there is enough of it to pay the expenses of litigation--which are charged on the property itself. All the minute details of his daily life are pried into, and whatever is found which, seen through the medium of the perceiving and describing faculties of the lowest of the low, bears an appearance unlike absolute commonplace, is laid before the jury as evidence of insanity, and often with success; the jurors being little, if at all, less vulgar and ignorant than the witnesses; while the judges, with that extraordinary want of knowledge of human nature and life which continually astonishes us in English lawyers, often help to mislead them. These trials speak volumes as to the state of feeling and opinion among the vulgar with regard to human liberty. So far from setting any value on individuality--so far from respecting the rights of each individual to act, in things indifferent, as seems good to his own judgment and inclinations, judges and juries cannot even conceive that a person in a state of sanity can desire such freedom. In former days, when it was proposed to burn atheists, charitable people used to suggest putting them in a madhouse instead: it would be nothing surprising nowadays were we to see this done, and the doers applauding themselves, because, instead of persecuting for religion, they had adopted so humane and Christian a mode of treating these unfortunates, not without a silent satisfaction at their having thereby obtained their deserts.

CHAPTER IV.

OF THE LIMITS TO THE AUTHORITY OF SOCIETY OVER THE INDIVIDUAL.

What, then, is the rightful limit to the sovereignty of the individual over himself? Where does the authority of society begin? How much of human life should be assigned to individuality, and how much to society?

Each will receive its proper share, if each has that which more particularly concerns it. To individuality should belong the part of life in which it is chiefly the individual that is interested; to society, the part which chiefly interests society.

Though society is not founded on a contract, and though no good purpose is answered by inventing a contract in order to deduce social obligations from it, every one who receives the protection of society owes a return for the benefit, and the fact of living in society renders it indispensable that each should be bound to observe a certain line of conduct towards the rest. This conduct consists, first, in not injuring the interests of one another; or rather certain interests which, either by express legal provision or by tacit understanding, ought to be considered as rights; and secondly, in each person's bearing his share (to be fixed on some equitable principle) of the labours and sacrifices incurred for defending the society or its members from injury and molestation. These conditions society is justified in enforcing, at all costs to those who endeavour to withhold fulfilment. Nor is this all that society may do. The acts of an individual may be hurtful to others, or wanting in due consideration for their welfare, without going the length of violating any of their constituted rights. The offender may then be justly punished by opinion though not by law. As soon as any part of a person's conduct affects prejudicially the interests of others, society has jurisdiction over it, and the question whether the general welfare will or will not be promoted by interfering with it, becomes open to discussion. But there is no room for entertaining any such question when a person's conduct affects the interests of no persons besides himself, or needs not affect

them unless they like (all the persons concerned being of full age, and the ordinary amount of understanding). In all such cases there should be perfect freedom, legal and social, to do the action and stand the consequences.

It would be a great misunderstanding of this doctrine, to suppose that it is one of selfish indifference, which pretends that human beings have no business with each other's conduct in life, and that they should not concern themselves about the well-doing or well-being of one another, unless their own interest is involved. Instead of any diminution, there is need of a great increase of disinterested exertion to promote the good of others. But disinterested benevolence can find other instruments to persuade people to their good, than whips and scourges, either of the literal or the metaphorical sort. I am the last person to undervalue the self-regarding virtues; they are only second in importance, if even second, to the social. It is equally the business of education to cultivate both. But even education works by conviction and persuasion as well as by compulsion, and it is by the former only that, when the period of education is past, the self-regarding virtues should be inculcated. Human beings owe to each other help to distinguish the better from the worse, and encouragement to choose the former and avoid the latter. They should be for ever stimulating each other to increased exercise of their higher faculties, and increased direction of their feelings and aims towards wise instead of foolish, elevating instead of degrading, objects and contemplations. But neither one person, nor any number of persons, is warranted in saying to another human creature of ripe years, that he shall not do with his life for his own benefit what he chooses to do with it. He is the person most interested in his own well-being: the interest which any other person, except in cases of strong personal attachment, can have in it, is trifling, compared with that which he himself has; the interest which society has in him individually (except as to his conduct to others) is fractional, and altogether indirect: while, with respect to his own feelings and circumstances, the most ordinary man or woman has means of knowledge immeasurably surpassing those that can be possessed by any one else. The interference of society to overrule his judgment and purposes in what only regards himself, must be grounded on general presumptions; which may be altogether wrong, and even if right, are as likely as not to be misapplied to individual cases, by persons no better acquainted with the circumstances of such cases than those are who look at them merely from without. In this department, therefore, of human affairs, Individuality has its proper field of action. In the conduct of human beings towards one another, it is necessary that general rules should for the most part be observed, in order that people may know what they have to expect; but in each person's own concerns, his individual spontaneity is entitled to free exercise. Considerations to aid his judgment, exhortations to strengthen his will, may be offered to him, even obtruded on him, by others; but he himself is the final judge. All errors which he is likely to commit against advice and warning, are far outweighed by the evil of allowing others to constrain him to what they deem his good.

I do not mean that the feelings with which a person is regarded by others, ought not to be in any way affected by his self-regarding qualities or deficiencies. This is neither possible nor desirable. If he is eminent in any of the qualities which conduce to his own good, he is, so far, a proper object of admiration. He is so much the nearer to the ideal perfection of human nature. If he is grossly deficient in those qualities, a sentiment the opposite of admiration will follow. There is a degree of folly, and a degree of what may be called (though the phrase is not unobjectionable) lowness or depravation of taste, which, though it cannot justify doing harm to the person who manifests it, renders him necessarily and properly a subject of distaste, or, in extreme cases, even of contempt: a person could not have the opposite qualities in due strength without entertaining these feelings. Though doing no wrong to any one, a person may so act as to compel us to judge him, and feel to him, as a fool, or as a being of an inferior order: and since this judgment and feeling are a fact which he would prefer to avoid, it is doing him a service to warn him of it beforehand, as of any other disagreeable consequence to which he exposes himself. It would be well, indeed, if this good office were much more freely rendered than the common notions of politeness at present permit, and if one person could honestly point out to another that he thinks him in fault, without being considered unmannerly or presuming. We have a right, also, in various ways, to act upon our unfavourable opinion of any one, not to the oppression of his individuality, but in the exercise of ours. We are not bound, for example, to seek his society; we have a right to avoid it (though not to parade the avoidance), for we have a right to choose the society most acceptable to us. We have a right, and it may be our duty, to caution others against him, if we think his example or conversation likely to have a pernicious effect on those with whom he associates. We may give others a preference over him in optional good offices, except those which tend to his improvement. In these various modes a person may suffer very severe penalties at the hands of others, for faults which directly concern only himself; but he suffers these penalties only in so far as they are the natural, and, as it were, the spontaneous consequences of the faults themselves, not because they are purposely inflicted on him for the sake of punishment. A person who shows rashness, obstinacy, self-conceit--who cannot live within moderate means--who cannot restrain himself from hurtful indulgences--who pursues animal pleasures at the expense of those of feeling and intellect--must expect to be lowered in the opinion of others, and to have a less share of their favourable sentiments; but of this he has no right to complain, unless he has merited their favour by special excellence in his social relations, and has thus established a

title to their good offices, which is not affected by his demerits towards himself.

What I contend for is, that the inconveniences which are strictly inseparable from the unfavourable judgment of others, are the only ones to which a person should ever be subjected for that portion of his conduct and character which concerns his own good, but which does not affect the interests of others in their relations with him. Acts injurious to others require a totally different treatment. Encroachment on their rights; infliction on them of any loss or damage not justified by his own rights; falsehood or duplicity in dealing with them; unfair or ungenerous use of advantages over them; even selfish abstinence from defending them against injury--these are fit objects of moral reprobation, and, in grave cases, of moral retribution and punishment. And not only these acts, but the dispositions which lead to them, are properly immoral, and fit subjects of disapprobation which may rise to abhorrence. Cruelty of disposition; malice and ill-nature; that most anti-social and odious of all passions, envy; dissimulation and insincerity; irascibility on insufficient cause, and resentment disproportioned to the provocation; the love of domineering over others; the desire to engross more than one's share of advantages (the [Greek: pleonexia] of the Greeks); the pride which derives gratification from the abasement of others; the egotism which thinks self and its concerns more important than everything else, and decides all doubtful questions in its own favour;--these are moral vices, and constitute a bad and odious moral character: unlike the self-regarding faults previously mentioned, which are not properly immoralities, and to whatever pitch they may be carried, do not constitute wickedness. They may be proofs of any amount of folly, or want of personal dignity and self-respect; but they are only a subject of moral reprobation when they involve a breach of duty to others, for whose sake the individual is bound to have care for himself. What are called duties to ourselves are not socially obligatory, unless circumstances render them at the same time duties to others. The term duty to oneself, when it means anything more than prudence, means self-respect or self-development; and for none of these is any one accountable to his fellow-creatures, because for none of them is it for the good of mankind that he be held accountable to them.

The distinction between the loss of consideration which a person may rightly incur by defect of prudence or of personal dignity, and the reprobation which is due to him for an offence against the rights of others, is not a merely nominal distinction. It makes a vast difference both in our feelings and in our conduct towards him, whether he displeases us in things in which we think we have a right to control him, or in things in which we know that we have not. If he displeases us, we may express our distaste, and we may stand aloof from a person as well as from a thing that displeases us; but we shall not therefore feel called on to make his life uncomfortable. We shall reflect that he already bears, or will bear, the whole penalty of his error; if he spoils his life by mismanagement, we shall not, for that reason, desire to spoil it still further: instead of wishing to punish him, we shall rather endeavour to alleviate his punishment, by showing him how he may avoid or cure the evils his conduct tends to bring upon him. He may be to us an object of pity, perhaps of dislike, but not of anger or resentment; we shall not treat him like an enemy of society: the worst we shall think ourselves justified in doing is leaving him to himself, if we do not interfere benevolently by showing interest or concern for him. It is far otherwise if he has infringed the rules necessary for the protection of his fellow-creatures, individually or collectively. The evil consequences of his acts do not then fall on himself, but on others; and society, as the protector of all its members, must retaliate on him; must inflict pain on him for the express purpose of punishment, and must take care that it be sufficiently severe. In the one case, he is an offender at our bar, and we are called on not only to sit in judgment on him, but, in one shape or another, to execute our own sentence: in the other case, it is not our part to inflict any suffering on him, except what may incidentally follow from our using the same liberty in the regulation of our own affairs, which we allow to him in his.

The distinction here pointed out between the part of a person's life which concerns only himself, and that which concerns others, many persons will refuse to admit. How (it may be asked) can any part of the conduct of a member of society be a matter of indifference to the other members? No person is an entirely isolated being; it is impossible for a person to do anything seriously or permanently hurtful to himself, without mischief reaching at least to his near connections, and often far beyond them. If he injures his property, he does harm to those who directly or indirectly derived support from it, and usually diminishes, by a greater or less amount, the general resources of the community. If he deteriorates his bodily or mental faculties, he not only brings evil upon all who depended on him for any portion of their happiness, but disqualifies himself for rendering the services which he owes to his fellow-creatures generally; perhaps becomes a burthen on their affection or benevolence; and if such conduct were very frequent, hardly any offence that is committed would detract more from the general sum of good. Finally, if by his vices or follies a person does no direct harm to others, he is nevertheless (it may be said) injurious by his example; and ought to be compelled to control himself, for the sake of those whom the sight or knowledge of his conduct might corrupt or mislead.

And even (it will be added) if the consequences of misconduct could be confined to the vicious or thoughtless individual, ought society to abandon to their own guidance those who are manifestly unfit for it? If protection against themselves is confessedly due

to children and persons under age, is not society equally bound to afford it to persons of mature years who are equally incapable of self-government? If gambling, or drunkenness, or incontinence, or idleness, or uncleanliness, are as injurious to happiness, and as great a hindrance to improvement, as many or most of the acts prohibited by law, why (it may be asked) should not law, so far as is consistent with practicability and social convenience, endeavour to repress these also? And as a supplement to the unavoidable imperfections of law, ought not opinion at least to organise a powerful police against these vices, and visit rigidly with social penalties those who are known to practise them? There is no question here (it may be said) about restricting individuality, or impeding the trial of new and original experiments in living. The only things it is sought to prevent are things which have been tried and condemned from the beginning of the world until now; things which experience has shown not to be useful or suitable to any person's individuality. There must be some length of time and amount of experience, after which a moral or prudential truth may be regarded as established: and it is merely desired to prevent generation after generation from falling over the same precipice which has been fatal to their predecessors.

I fully admit that the mischief which a person does to himself, may seriously affect, both through their sympathies and their interests, those nearly connected with him, and in a minor degree, society at large. When, by conduct of this sort, a person is led to violate a distinct and assignable obligation to any other person or persons, the case is taken out of the self-regarding class, and becomes amenable to moral disapprobation in the proper sense of the term. If, for example, a man, through intemperance or extravagance, becomes unable to pay his debts, or, having undertaken the moral responsibility of a family, becomes from the same cause incapable of supporting or educating them, he is deservedly reprobated, and might be justly punished; but it is for the breach of duty to his family or creditors, not for the extravagance. If the resources which ought to have been devoted to them, had been diverted from them for the most prudent investment, the moral culpability would have been the same. George Barnwell murdered his uncle to get money for his mistress, but if he had done it to set himself up in business, he would equally have been hanged. Again, in the frequent case of a man who causes grief to his family by addiction to bad habits, he deserves reproach for his unkindness or ingratitude; but so he may for cultivating habits not in themselves vicious, if they are painful to those with whom he passes his life, or who from personal ties are dependent on him for their comfort. Whoever fails in the consideration generally due to the interests and feelings of others, not being compelled by some more imperative duty, or justified by allowable self-preference, is a subject of moral disapprobation for that failure, but not for the cause of it, nor for the errors, merely personal to himself, which may have remotely led to it. In like manner, when a person disables himself, by conduct purely self-regarding, from the performance of some definite duty incumbent on him to the public, he is guilty of a social offence. No person ought to be punished simply for being drunk; but a soldier or a policeman should be punished for being drunk on duty. Whenever, in short, there is a definite damage, or a definite risk of damage, either to an individual or to the public, the case is taken out of the province of liberty, and placed in that of morality or law.

But with regard to the merely contingent, or, as it may be called, constructive injury which a person causes to society, by conduct which neither violates any specific duty to the public, nor occasions perceptible hurt to any assignable individual except himself; the inconvenience is one which society can afford to bear, for the sake of the greater good of human freedom. If grown persons are to be punished for not taking proper care of themselves, I would rather it were for their own sake, than under pretence of preventing them from impairing their capacity of rendering to society benefits which society does not pretend it has a right to exact. But I cannot consent to argue the point as if society had no means of bringing its weaker members up to its ordinary standard of rational conduct, except waiting till they do something irrational, and then punishing them, legally or morally, for it. Society has had absolute power over them during all the early portion of their existence: it has had the whole period of childhood and nonage in which to try whether it could make them capable of rational conduct in life. The existing generation is master both of the training and the entire circumstances of the generation to come; it cannot indeed make them perfectly wise and good, because it is itself so lamentably deficient in goodness and wisdom; and its best efforts are not always, in individual cases, its most successful ones; but it is perfectly well able to make the rising generation, as a whole, as good as, and a little better than, itself. If society lets any considerable number of its members grow up mere children, incapable of being acted on by rational consideration of distant motives, society has itself to blame for the consequences. Armed not only with all the powers of education, but with the ascendency which the authority of a received opinion always exercises over the minds who are least fitted to judge for themselves; and aided by the _natural_ penalties which cannot be prevented from falling on those who incur the distaste or the contempt of those who know them; let not society pretend that it needs, besides all this, the power to issue commands and enforce obedience in the personal concerns of individuals, in which, on all principles of justice and policy, the decision ought to rest with those who are to abide the consequences. Nor is there anything which tends more to discredit and frustrate the better means of influencing conduct, than a resort to the worse. If there be among those whom it is attempted to coerce into prudence or temperance, any of the material of

which vigorous and independent characters are made, they will infallibly rebel against the yoke. No such person will ever feel that others have a right to control him in his concerns, such as they have to prevent him from injuring them in theirs; and it easily comes to be considered a mark of spirit and courage to fly in the face of such usurped authority, and do with ostentation the exact opposite of what it enjoins; as in the fashion of grossness which succeeded, in the time of Charles II., to the fanatical moral intolerance of the Puritans. With respect to what is said of the necessity of protecting society from the bad example set to others by the vicious or the self-indulgent; it is true that bad example may have a pernicious effect, especially the example of doing wrong to others with impunity to the wrong-doer. But we are now speaking of conduct which, while it does no wrong to others, is supposed to do great harm to the agent himself: and I do not see how those who believe this, can think otherwise than that the example, on the whole, must be more salutary than hurtful, since, if it displays the misconduct, it displays also the painful or degrading consequences which, if the conduct is justly censured, must be supposed to be in all or most cases attendant on it.

But the strongest of all the arguments against the interference of the public with purely personal conduct, is that when it does interfere, the odds are that it interferes wrongly, and in the wrong place. On questions of social morality, of duty to others, the opinion of the public, that is, of an overruling majority, though often wrong, is likely to be still oftener right; because on such questions they are only required to judge of their own interests; of the manner in which some mode of conduct, if allowed to be practised, would affect themselves. But the opinion of a similar majority, imposed as a law on the minority, on questions of self-regarding conduct, is quite as likely to be wrong as right; for in these cases public opinion means, at the best, some people's opinion of what is good or bad for other people; while very often it does not even mean that; the public, with the most perfect indifference, passing over the pleasure or convenience of those whose conduct they censure, and considering only their own preference. There are many who consider as an injury to themselves any conduct which they have a distaste for, and resent it as an outrage to their feelings; as a religious bigot, when charged with disregarding the religious feelings of others, has been known to retort that they disregard his feelings, by persisting in their abominable worship or creed. But there is no parity between the feeling of a person for his own opinion, and the feeling of another who is offended at his holding it; no more than between the desire of a thief to take a purse, and the desire of the right owner to keep it. And a person's taste is as much his own peculiar concern as his opinion or his purse. It is easy for any one to imagine an ideal public, which leaves the freedom and choice of individuals in all uncertain matters undisturbed, and only requires them to abstain from modes of conduct which universal experience has condemned. But where has there been seen a public which set any such limit to its censorship? or when does the public trouble itself about universal experience? In its interferences with personal conduct it is seldom thinking of anything but the enormity of acting or feeling differently from itself; and this standard of judgment, thinly disguised, is held up to mankind as the dictate of religion and philosophy, by nine-tenths of all moralists and speculative writers. These teach that things are right because they are right; because we feel them to be so. They tell us to search in our own minds and hearts for laws of conduct binding on ourselves and on all others. What can the poor public do but apply these instructions, and make their own personal feelings of good and evil, if they are tolerably unanimous in them, obligatory on all the world?

The evil here pointed out is not one which exists only in theory; and it may perhaps be expected that I should specify the instances in which the public of this age and country improperly invests its own preferences with the character of moral laws. I am not writing an essay on the aberrations of existing moral feeling. That is too weighty a subject to be discussed parenthetically, and by way of illustration. Yet examples are necessary, to show that the principle I maintain is of serious and practical moment, and that I am not endeavouring to erect a barrier against imaginary evils. And it is not difficult to show, by abundant instances, that to extend the bounds of what may be called moral police, until it encroaches on the most unquestionably legitimate liberty of the individual, is one of the most universal of all human propensities.

As a first instance, consider the antipathies which men cherish on no better grounds than that persons whose religious opinions are different from theirs, do not practise their religious observances, especially their religious abstinences. To cite a rather trivial example, nothing in the creed or practice of Christians does more to envenom the hatred of Mahomedans against them, than the fact of their eating pork. There are few acts which Christians and Europeans regard with more unaffected disgust, than Mussulmans regard this particular mode of satisfying hunger. It is, in the first place, an offence against their religion; but this circumstance by no means explains either the degree or the kind of their repugnance; for wine also is forbidden by their religion, and to partake of it is by all Mussulmans accounted wrong, but not disgusting. Their aversion to the flesh of the "unclean beast" is, on the contrary, of that peculiar character, resembling an instinctive antipathy, which the idea of uncleanness, when once it thoroughly sinks into the feelings, seems always to excite even in those whose personal habits are anything but scrupulously cleanly, and of which the sentiment of religious impurity, so intense in the Hindoos, is a remarkable example. Suppose now that in a people, of whom the majority were Mussulmans, that majority should insist upon not permitting pork to be eaten within the limits of

the country. This would be nothing new in Mahomedan countries.[14] Would it be a legitimate exercise of the moral authority of public opinion? and if not, why not? The practice is really revolting to such a public. They also sincerely think that it is forbidden and abhorred by the Deity. Neither could the prohibition be censured as religious persecution. It might be religious in its origin, but it would not be persecution for religion, since nobody's religion makes it a duty to eat pork. The only tenable ground of condemnation would be, that with the personal tastes and self-regarding concerns of individuals the public has no business to interfere.

To come somewhat nearer home: the majority of Spaniards consider it a gross impiety, offensive in the highest degree to the Supreme Being, to worship him in any other manner than the Roman Catholic; and no other public worship is lawful on Spanish soil. The people of all Southern Europe look upon a married clergy as not only irreligious, but unchaste, indecent, gross, disgusting. What do Protestants think of these perfectly sincere feelings, and of the attempt to enforce them against non-Catholics? Yet, if mankind are justified in interfering with each other's liberty in things which do not concern the interests of others, on what principle is it possible consistently to exclude these cases? or who can blame people for desiring to suppress what they regard as a scandal in the sight of God and man? No stronger case can be shown for prohibiting anything which is regarded as a personal immorality, than is made out for suppressing these practices in the eyes of those who regard them as impieties; and unless we are willing to adopt the logic of persecutors, and to say that we may persecute others because we are right, and that they must not persecute us because they are wrong, we must beware of admitting a principle of which we should resent as a gross injustice the application to ourselves.

The preceding instances may be objected to, although unreasonably, as drawn from contingencies impossible among us: opinion, in this country, not being likely to enforce abstinence from meats, or to interfere with people for worshipping, and for either marrying or not marrying, according to their creed or inclination. The next example, however, shall be taken from an interference with liberty which we have by no means passed all danger of. Wherever the Puritans have been sufficiently powerful, as in New England, and in Great Britain at the time of the Commonwealth, they have endeavoured, with considerable success, to put down all public, and nearly all private, amusements: especially music, dancing, public games, or other assemblages for purposes of diversion, and the theatre. There are still in this country large bodies of persons by whose notions of morality and religion these recreations are condemned; and those persons belonging chiefly to the middle class, who are the ascendant power in the present social and political condition of the kingdom, it is by no means impossible that persons of these sentiments may at some time or other command a majority in Parliament. How will the remaining portion of the community like to have the amusements that shall be permitted to them regulated by the religious and moral sentiments of the stricter Calvinists and Methodists? Would they not, with considerable peremptoriness, desire these intrusively pious members of society to mind their own business? This is precisely what should be said to every government and every public, who have the pretension that no person shall enjoy any pleasure which they think wrong. But if the principle of the pretension be admitted, no one can reasonably object to its being acted on in the sense of the majority, or other preponderating power in the country; and all persons must be ready to conform to the idea of a Christian commonwealth, as understood by the early settlers in New England, if a religious profession similar to theirs should ever succeed in regaining its lost ground, as religions supposed to be declining have so often been known to do.

To imagine another contingency, perhaps more likely to be realised than the one last mentioned. There is confessedly a strong tendency in the modern world towards a democratic constitution of society, accompanied or not by popular political institutions. It is affirmed that in the country where this tendency is most completely realised--where both society and the government are most democratic--the United States--the feeling of the majority, to whom any appearance of a more showy or costly style of living than they can hope to rival is disagreeable, operates as a tolerably effectual sumptuary law, and that in many parts of the Union it is really difficult for a person possessing a very large income, to find any mode of spending it, which will not incur popular disapprobation. Though such statements as these are doubtless much exaggerated as a representation of existing facts, the state of things they describe is not only a conceivable and possible, but a probable result of democratic feeling, combined with the notion that the public has a right to a veto on the manner in which individuals shall spend their incomes. We have only further to suppose a considerable diffusion of Socialist opinions, and it may become infamous in the eyes of the majority to possess more property than some very small amount, or any income not earned by manual labour. Opinions similar in principle to these, already prevail widely among the artisan class, and weigh oppressively on those who are amenable to the opinion chiefly of that class, namely, its own members. It is known that the bad workmen who form the majority of the operatives in many branches of industry, are decidedly of opinion that bad workmen ought to receive the same wages as good, and that no one ought to be allowed, through piecework or otherwise, to earn by superior skill or industry more than others can without it. And they employ a moral police, which occasionally becomes a physical one, to deter skilful workmen from receiving, and employers from giving, a larger remuneration for a more useful service. If the public have any jurisdiction over private concerns, I cannot see that these people are in fault, or that any

individual's particular public can be blamed for asserting the same authority over his individual conduct, which the general public asserts over people in general.

But, without dwelling upon supposititious cases, there are, in our own day, gross usurpations upon the liberty of private life actually practised, and still greater ones threatened with some expectation of success, and opinions proposed which assert an unlimited right in the public not only to prohibit by law everything which it thinks wrong, but in order to get at what it thinks wrong, to prohibit any number of things which it admits to be innocent.

Under the name of preventing intemperance, the people of one English colony, and of nearly half the United States, have been interdicted by law from making any use whatever of fermented drinks, except for medical purposes: for prohibition of their sale is in fact, as it is intended to be, prohibition of their use. And though the impracticability of executing the law has caused its repeal in several of the States which had adopted it, including the one from which it derives its name, an attempt has notwithstanding been commenced, and is prosecuted with considerable zeal by many of the professed philanthropists, to agitate for a similar law in this country. The association, or "Alliance" as it terms itself, which has been formed for this purpose, has acquired some notoriety through the publicity given to a correspondence between its Secretary and one of the very few English public men who hold that a politician's opinions ought to be founded on principles. Lord Stanley's share in this correspondence is calculated to strengthen the hopes already built on him, by those who know how rare such qualities as are manifested in some of his public appearances, unhappily are among those who figure in political life. The organ of the Alliance, who would "deeply deplore the recognition of any principle which could be wrested to justify bigotry and persecution," undertakes to point out the "broad and impassable barrier" which divides such principles from those of the association. "All matters relating to thought, opinion, conscience, appear to me," he says, "to be without the sphere of legislation; all pertaining to social act, habit, relation, subject only to a discretionary power vested in the State itself, and not in the individual, to be within it." No mention is made of a third class, different from either of these, viz. acts and habits which are not social, but individual; although it is to this class, surely, that the act of drinking fermented liquors belongs. Selling fermented liquors, however, is trading, and trading is a social act. But the infringement complained of is not on the liberty of the seller, but on that of the buyer and consumer; since the State might just as well forbid him to drink wine, as purposely make it impossible for him to obtain it. The Secretary, however, says, "I claim, as a citizen, a right to legislate whenever my social rights are invaded by the social act of another." And now for the definition of these "social rights." "If anything invades my social rights, certainly the traffic in strong drink does. It destroys my primary right of security, by constantly creating and stimulating social disorder. It invades my right of equality, by deriving a profit from the creation of a misery, I am taxed to support. It impedes my right to free moral and intellectual development, by surrounding my path with dangers, and by weakening and demoralising society, from which I have a right to claim mutual aid and intercourse." A theory of "social rights," the like of which probably never before found its way into distinct language--being nothing short of this--that it is the absolute social right of every individual, that every other individual shall act in every respect exactly as he ought; that whosoever fails thereof in the smallest particular, violates my social right, and entitles me to demand from the legislature the removal of the grievance. So monstrous a principle is far more dangerous than any single interference with liberty; there is no violation of liberty which it would not justify; it acknowledges no right to any freedom whatever, except perhaps to that of holding opinions in secret, without ever disclosing them: for the moment an opinion which I consider noxious, passes any one's lips, it invades all the "social rights" attributed to me by the Alliance. The doctrine ascribes to all mankind a vested interest in each other's moral, intellectual, and even physical perfection, to be defined by each claimant according to his own standard.

Another important example of illegitimate interference with the rightful liberty of the individual, not simply threatened, but long since carried into triumphant effect, is Sabbatarian legislation. Without doubt, abstinence on one day in the week, so far as the exigencies of life permit, from the usual daily occupation, though in no respect religiously binding on any except Jews, is a highly beneficial custom. And inasmuch as this custom cannot be observed without a general consent to that effect among the industrious classes, therefore, in so far as some persons by working may impose the same necessity on others, it may be allowable and right that the law should guarantee to each, the observance by others of the custom, by suspending the greater operations of industry on a particular day. But this justification, grounded on the direct interest which others have in each individual's observance of the practice, does not apply to the self-chosen occupations in which a person may think fit to employ his leisure; nor does it hold good, in the smallest degree, for legal restrictions on amusements. It is true that the amusement of some is the day's work of others; but the pleasure, not to say the useful recreation, of many, is worth the labour of a few, provided the occupation is freely chosen, and can be freely resigned. The operatives are perfectly right in thinking that if all worked on Sunday, seven days' work would have to be given for six days' wages: but so long as the great mass of employments are suspended, the small number who for the enjoyment of others must still work, obtain a proportional increase of earnings; and they are not obliged to follow those occupations,

if they prefer leisure to emolument. If a further remedy is sought, it might be found in the establishment by custom of a holiday on some other day of the week for those particular classes of persons. The only ground, therefore, on which restrictions on Sunday amusements can be defended, must be that they are religiously wrong; a motive of legislation which never can be too earnestly protested against. "Deorum injuriae Diis curae." It remains to be proved that society or any of its officers holds a commission from on high to avenge any supposed offence to Omnipotence, which is not also a wrong to our fellow-creatures. The notion that it is one man's duty that another should be religious, was the foundation of all the religious persecutions ever perpetrated, and if admitted, would fully justify them. Though the feeling which breaks out in the repeated attempts to stop railway travelling on Sunday, in the resistance to the opening of Museums, and the like, has not the cruelty of the old persecutors, the state of mind indicated by it is fundamentally the same. It is a determination not to tolerate others in doing what is permitted by their religion, because it is not permitted by the persecutor's religion. It is a belief that God not only abominates the act of the misbeliever, but will not hold us guiltless if we leave him unmolested.

I cannot refrain from adding to these examples of the little account commonly made of human liberty, the language of downright persecution which breaks out from the press of this country, whenever it feels called on to notice the remarkable phenomenon of Mormonism. Much might be said on the unexpected and instructive fact, that an alleged new revelation, and a religion founded on it, the product of palpable imposture, not even supported by the _prestige_ of extraordinary qualities in its founder, is believed by hundreds of thousands, and has been made the foundation of a society, in the age of newspapers, railways, and the electric telegraph. What here concerns us is, that this religion, like other and better religions, has its martyrs; that its prophet and founder was, for his teaching, put to death by a mob; that others of its adherents lost their lives by the same lawless violence; that they were forcibly expelled, in a body, from the country in which they first grew up; while, now that they have been chased into a solitary recess in the midst of a desert, many in this country openly declare that it would be right (only that it is not convenient) to send an expedition against them, and compel them by force to conform to the opinions of other people. The article of the Mormonite doctrine which is the chief provocative to the antipathy which thus breaks through the ordinary restraints of religious tolerance, is its sanction of polygamy; which, though permitted to Mahomedans, and Hindoos, and Chinese, seems to excite unquenchable animosity when practised by persons who speak English, and profess to be a kind of Christians. No one has a deeper disapprobation than I have of this Mormon institution; both for other reasons, and because, far from being in any way countenanced by the principle of liberty, it is a direct infraction of that principle, being a mere riveting of the chains of one half of the community, and an emancipation of the other from reciprocity of obligation towards them. Still, it must be remembered that this relation is as much voluntary on the part of the women concerned in it, and who may be deemed the sufferers by it, as is the case with any other form of the marriage institution; and however surprising this fact may appear, it has its explanation in the common ideas and customs of the world, which teaching women to think marriage the one thing needful, make it intelligible that many a woman should prefer being one of several wives, to not being a wife at all. Other countries are not asked to recognise such unions, or release any portion of their inhabitants from their own laws on the score of Mormonite opinions. But when the dissentients have conceded to the hostile sentiments of others, far more than could justly be demanded; when they have left the countries to which their doctrines were unacceptable, and established themselves in a remote corner of the earth, which they have been the first to render habitable to human beings; it is difficult to see on what principles but those of tyranny they can be prevented from living there under what laws they please, provided they commit no aggression on other nations, and allow perfect freedom of departure to those who are dissatisfied with their ways. A recent writer, in some respects of considerable merit, proposes (to use his own words), not a crusade, but a _civilizade_, against this polygamous community, to put an end to what seems to him a retrograde step in civilisation. It also appears so to me, but I am not aware that any community has a right to force another to be civilised. So long as the sufferers by the bad law do not invoke assistance from other communities, I cannot admit that persons entirely unconnected with them ought to step in and require that a condition of things with which all who are directly interested appear to be satisfied, should be put an end to because it is a scandal to persons some thousands of miles distant, who have no part or concern in it. Let them send missionaries, if they please, to preach against it; and let them, by any fair means (of which silencing the teachers is not one), oppose the progress of similar doctrines among their own people. If civilisation has got the better of barbarism when barbarism had the world to itself, it is too much to profess to be afraid lest barbarism, after having been fairly got under, should revive and conquer civilisation. A civilisation that can thus succumb to its vanquished enemy, must first have become so degenerate, that neither its appointed priests and teachers, nor anybody else, has the capacity, or will take the trouble, to stand up for it. If this be so, the sooner such a civilisation receives notice to quit, the better. It can only go on from bad to worse, until destroyed and regenerated (like the Western Empire) by energetic barbarians.

FOOTNOTE:

[14] The case of the Bombay Parsees is a curious instance in point. When this industrious and enterprising tribe, the descendants of the Persian fire-worshippers, flying from their native country before the Caliphs, arrived in Western India, they were admitted to toleration by the Hindoo sovereigns, on condition of not eating beef. When those regions afterwards fell under the dominion of Mahomedan conquerors, the Parsees obtained from them a continuance of indulgence, on condition of refraining from pork. What was at first obedience to authority became a second nature, and the Parsees to this day abstain both from beef and pork. Though not required by their religion, the double abstinence has had time to grow into a custom of their tribe; and custom, in the East, is a religion.

CHAPTER V.

APPLICATIONS.

The principles asserted in these pages must be more generally admitted as the basis for discussion of details, before a consistent application of them to all the various departments of government and morals can be attempted with any prospect of advantage. The few observations I propose to make on questions of detail, are designed to illustrate the principles, rather than to follow them out to their consequences. I offer, not so much applications, as specimens of application; which may serve to bring into greater clearness the meaning and limits of the two maxims which together form the entire doctrine of this Essay, and to assist the judgment in holding the balance between them, in the cases where it appears doubtful which of them is applicable to the case.

The maxims are, first, that the individual is not accountable to society for his actions, in so far as these concern the interests of no person but himself. Advice, instruction, persuasion, and avoidance by other people if thought necessary by them for their own good, are the only measures by which society can justifiably express its dislike or disapprobation of his conduct. Secondly, that for such actions as are prejudicial to the interests of others, the individual is accountable and may be subjected either to social or to legal punishments, if society is of opinion that the one or the other is requisite for its protection.

In the first place, it must by no means be supposed, because damage, or probability of damage, to the interests of others, can alone justify the interference of society, that therefore it always does justify such interference. In many cases, an individual, in pursuing a legitimate object, necessarily and therefore legitimately causes pain or loss to others, or intercepts a good which they had a reasonable hope of obtaining. Such oppositions of interest between individuals often arise from bad social institutions, but are unavoidable while those institutions last; and some would be unavoidable under any institutions. Whoever succeeds in an overcrowded profession, or in a competitive examination; whoever is preferred to another in any contest for an object which both desire, reaps benefit from the loss of others, from their wasted exertion and their disappointment. But it is, by common admission, better for the general interest of mankind, that persons should pursue their objects undeterred by this sort of consequences. In other words, society admits no rights, either legal or moral, in the disappointed competitors, to immunity from this kind of suffering; and feels called on to interfere, only when means of success have been employed which it is contrary to the general interest to permit--namely, fraud or treachery, and force.

Again, trade is a social act. Whoever undertakes to sell any description of goods to the public, does what affects the interest of other persons, and of society in general; and thus his conduct, in principle, comes within the jurisdiction of society: accordingly, it was once held to be the duty of governments, in all cases which were considered of importance, to fix prices, and regulate the processes of manufacture. But it is now recognised, though not till after a long struggle, that both the cheapness and the good quality of commodities are most effectually provided for by leaving the producers and sellers perfectly free, under the sole check of equal freedom to the buyers for supplying themselves elsewhere. This is the so-called doctrine of Free Trade, which rests on grounds different from, though equally solid with, the principle of individual liberty asserted in this Essay. Restrictions on trade, or on production for purposes of trade, are indeed restraints; and all restraint, _qua_ restraint, is an evil: but the restraints in question affect only that part of conduct which society is competent to restrain, and are wrong solely because they do not really produce the results which it is desired to produce by them. As the principle of individual liberty is not involved in the doctrine of Free Trade, so neither is it in most of the questions which arise respecting the limits of that doctrine: as for example, what amount of public control is admissible for the prevention of fraud by adulteration; how far sanitary precautions, or arrangements to protect work-people employed in dangerous occupations, should be enforced on employers. Such questions involve considerations of liberty, only in so far as leaving people to themselves is always better, _caeteris paribus_, than controlling them: but that they may be legitimately controlled for these ends, is in principle undeniable. On the other hand, there are questions relating to interference with trade, which are essentially questions of liberty; such as the Maine Law, already touched upon; the prohibition of the importation of opium into

China; the restriction of the sale of poisons; all cases, in short, where the object of the interference is to make it impossible or difficult to obtain a particular commodity. These interferences are objectionable, not as infringements on the liberty of the producer or seller, but on that of the buyer.

One of these examples, that of the sale of poisons, opens a new question; the proper limits of what may be called the functions of police; how far liberty may legitimately be invaded for the prevention of crime, or of accident. It is one of the undisputed functions of government to take precautions against crime before it has been committed, as well as to detect and punish it afterwards. The preventive function of government, however, is far more liable to be abused, to the prejudice of liberty, than the punitory function; for there is hardly any part of the legitimate freedom of action of a human being which would not admit of being represented, and fairly too, as increasing the facilities for some form or other of delinquency. Nevertheless, if a public authority, or even a private person, sees any one evidently preparing to commit a crime, they are not bound to look on inactive until the crime is committed, but may interfere to prevent it. If poisons were never bought or used for any purpose except the commission of murder, it would be right to prohibit their manufacture and sale. They may, however, be wanted not only for innocent but for useful purposes, and restrictions cannot be imposed in the one case without operating in the other. Again, it is a proper office of public authority to guard against accidents. If either a public officer or any one else saw a person attempting to cross a bridge which had been ascertained to be unsafe, and there were no time to warn him of his danger, they might seize him and turn him back, without any real infringement of his liberty; for liberty consists in doing what one desires, and he does not desire to fall into the river. Nevertheless, when there is not a certainty, but only a danger of mischief, no one but the person himself can judge of the sufficiency of the motive which may prompt him to incur the risk: in this case, therefore (unless he is a child, or delirious, or in some state of excitement or absorption incompatible with the full use of the reflecting faculty), he ought, I conceive, to be only warned of the danger; not forcibly prevented from exposing himself to it. Similar considerations, applied to such a question as the sale of poisons, may enable us to decide which among the possible modes of regulation are or are not contrary to principle. Such a precaution, for example, as that of labelling the drug with some word expressive of its dangerous character, may be enforced without violation of liberty: the buyer cannot wish not to know that the thing he possesses has poisonous qualities. But to require in all cases the certificate of a medical practitioner, would make it sometimes impossible, always expensive, to obtain the article for legitimate uses. The only mode apparent to me, in which difficulties may be thrown in the way of crime committed through this means, without any infringement, worth taking into account, upon the liberty of those who desire the poisonous substance for other purposes, consists in providing what, in the apt language of Bentham, is called "preappointed evidence." This provision is familiar to every one in the case of contracts. It is usual and right that the law, when a contract is entered into, should require as the condition of its enforcing performance, that certain formalities should be observed, such as signatures, attestation of witnesses, and the like, in order that in case of subsequent dispute, there may be evidence to prove that the contract was really entered into, and that there was nothing in the circumstances to render it legally invalid: the effect being, to throw great obstacles in the way of fictitious contracts, or contracts made in circumstances which, if known, would destroy their validity. Precautions of a similar nature might be enforced in the sale of articles adapted to be instruments of crime. The seller, for example, might be required to enter into a register the exact time of the transaction, the name and address of the buyer, the precise quality and quantity sold; to ask the purpose for which it was wanted, and record the answer he received. When there was no medical prescription, the presence of some third person might be required, to bring home the fact to the purchaser, in case there should afterwards be reason to believe that the article had been applied to criminal purposes. Such regulations would in general be no material impediment to obtaining the article, but a very considerable one to making an improper use of it without detection.

The right inherent in society, to ward off crimes against itself by antecedent precautions, suggests the obvious limitations to the maxim, that purely self-regarding misconduct cannot properly be meddled with in the way of prevention or punishment. Drunkenness, for example, in ordinary cases, is not a fit subject for legislative interference; but I should deem it perfectly legitimate that a person, who had once been convicted of any act of violence to others under the influence of drink, should be placed under a special legal restriction, personal to himself; that if he were afterwards found drunk, he should be liable to a penalty, and that if when in that state he committed another offence, the punishment to which he would be liable for that other offence should be increased in severity. The making himself drunk, in a person whom drunkenness excites to do harm to others, is a crime against others. So, again, idleness, except in a person receiving support from the public, or except when it constitutes a breach of contract, cannot without tyranny be made a subject of legal punishment; but if either from idleness or from any other avoidable cause, a man fails to perform his legal duties to others, as for instance to support his children, it is no tyranny to force him to fulfil that obligation, by compulsory labour, if no other means are available.

Again, there are many acts which, being directly injurious only to the agents themselves, ought not to be legally interdicted, but which, if done publicly, are a violation of good manners and coming thus within the category of offences against others may rightfully be prohibited. Of this kind are offences against decency; on which it is unnecessary to dwell, the rather as they are only connected indirectly with our subject, the objection to publicity being equally strong in the case of many actions not in themselves condemnable, nor supposed to be so.

There is another question to which an answer must be found, consistent with the principles which have been laid down. In cases of personal conduct supposed to be blamable, but which respect for liberty precludes society from preventing or punishing, because the evil directly resulting falls wholly on the agent; what the agent is free to do, ought other persons to be equally free to counsel or instigate? This question is not free from difficulty. The case of a person who solicits another to do an act, is not strictly a case of self-regarding conduct. To give advice or offer inducements to any one, is a social act, and may therefore, like actions in general which affect others, be supposed amenable to social control. But a little reflection corrects the first impression, by showing that if the case is not strictly within the definition of individual liberty, yet the reasons on which the principle of individual liberty is grounded, are applicable to it. If people must be allowed, in whatever concerns only themselves, to act as seems best to themselves at their own peril, they must equally be free to consult with one another about what is fit to be so done; to exchange opinions, and give and receive suggestions. Whatever it is permitted to do, it must be permitted to advise to do. The question is doubtful, only when the instigator derives a personal benefit from his advice; when he makes it his occupation, for subsistence or pecuniary gain, to promote what society and the state consider to be an evil. Then, indeed, a new element of complication is introduced; namely, the existence of classes of persons with an interest opposed to what is considered as the public weal, and whose mode of living is grounded on the counteraction of it. Ought this to be interfered with, or not? Fornication, for example, must be tolerated, and so must gambling; but should a person be free to be a pimp, or to keep a gambling-house? The case is one of those which lie on the exact boundary line between two principles, and it is not at once apparent to which of the two it properly belongs. There are arguments on both sides. On the side of toleration it may be said, that the fact of following anything as an occupation, and living or profiting by the practice of it, cannot make that criminal which would otherwise be admissible; that the act should either be consistently permitted or consistently prohibited; that if the principles which we have hitherto defended are true, society has no business, _as_ society, to decide anything to be wrong which concerns only the individual; that it cannot go beyond dissuasion, and that one person should be as free to persuade, as another to dissuade. In opposition to this it may be contended, that although the public, or the State, are not warranted in authoritatively deciding, for purposes of repression or punishment, that such or such conduct affecting only the interests of the individual is good or bad, they are fully justified in assuming, if they regard it as bad, that its being so or not is at least a disputable question: That, this being supposed, they cannot be acting wrongly in endeavouring to exclude the influence of solicitations which are not disinterested, of instigators who cannot possibly be impartial--who have a direct personal interest on one side, and that side the one which the State believes to be wrong, and who confessedly promote it for personal objects only. There can surely, it may be urged, be nothing lost, no sacrifice of good, by so ordering matters that persons shall make their election, either wisely or foolishly, on their own prompting, as free as possible from the arts of persons who stimulate their inclinations for interested purposes of their own. Thus (it may be said) though the statutes respecting unlawful games are utterly indefensible--though all persons should be free to gamble in their own or each other's houses, or in any place of meeting established by their own subscriptions, and open only to the members and their visitors--yet public gambling-houses should not be permitted. It is true that the prohibition is never effectual, and that whatever amount of tyrannical power is given to the police, gambling-houses can always be maintained under other pretences; but they may be compelled to conduct their operations with a certain degree of secrecy and mystery, so that nobody knows anything about them but those who seek them; and more than this, society ought not to aim at. There is considerable force in these arguments; I will not venture to decide whether they are sufficient to justify the moral anomaly of punishing the accessary, when the principal is (and must be) allowed to go free; or fining or imprisoning the procurer, but not the fornicator, the gambling-house keeper, but not the gambler. Still less ought the common operations of buying and selling to be interfered with on analogous grounds. Almost every article which is bought and sold may be used in excess, and the sellers have a pecuniary interest in encouraging that excess; but no argument can be founded on this, in favour, for instance, of the Maine Law; because the class of dealers in strong drinks, though interested in their abuse, are indispensably required for the sake of their legitimate use. The interest, however, of these dealers in promoting intemperance is a real evil, and justifies the State in imposing restrictions and requiring guarantees, which but for that justification would be infringements of legitimate liberty.

A further question is, whether the State, while it permits, should nevertheless indirectly discourage conduct which it deems contrary to the best interests of the agent; whether, for example, it should take measures to render the means of drunkenness more costly,

or add to the difficulty of procuring them, by limiting the number of the places of sale. On this as on most other practical questions, many distinctions require to be made. To tax stimulants for the sole purpose of making them more difficult to be obtained, is a measure differing only in degree from their entire prohibition; and would be justifiable only if that were justifiable. Every increase of cost is a prohibition, to those whose means do not come up to the augmented price; and to those who do, it is a penalty laid on them for gratifying a particular taste. Their choice of pleasures, and their mode of expending their income, after satisfying their legal and moral obligations to the State and to individuals, are their own concern, and must rest with their own judgment. These considerations may seem at first sight to condemn the selection of stimulants as special subjects of taxation for purposes of revenue. But it must be remembered that taxation for fiscal purposes is absolutely inevitable; that in most countries it is necessary that a considerable part of that taxation should be indirect; that the State, therefore, cannot help imposing penalties, which to some persons may be prohibitory, on the use of some articles of consumption. It is hence the duty of the State to consider, in the imposition of taxes, what commodities the consumers can best spare; and _a fortiori_, to select in preference those of which it deems the use, beyond a very moderate quantity, to be positively injurious. Taxation, therefore, of stimulants, up to the point which produces the largest amount of revenue (supposing that the State needs all the revenue which it yields) is not only admissible, but to be approved of.

The question of making the sale of these commodities a more or less exclusive privilege, must be answered differently, according to the purposes to which the restriction is intended to be subservient. All places of public resort require the restraint of a police, and places of this kind peculiarly, because offences against society are especially apt to originate there. It is, therefore, fit to confine the power of selling these commodities (at least for consumption on the spot) to persons of known or vouched-for respectability of conduct; to make such regulations respecting hours of opening and closing as may be requisite for public surveillance, and to withdraw the licence if breaches of the peace repeatedly take place through the connivance or incapacity of the keeper of the house, or if it becomes a rendezvous for concocting and preparing offences against the law. Any further restriction I do not conceive to be, in principle, justifiable. The limitation in number, for instance, of beer and spirit-houses, for the express purpose of rendering them more difficult of access, and diminishing the occasions of temptation, not only exposes all to an inconvenience because there are some by whom the facility would be abused, but is suited only to a state of society in which the labouring classes are avowedly treated as children or savages, and placed under an education of restraint, to fit them for future admission to the privileges of freedom. This is not the principle on which the labouring classes are professedly governed in any free country; and no person who sets due value on freedom will give his adhesion to their being so governed, unless after all efforts have been exhausted to educate them for freedom and govern them as freemen, and it has been definitively proved that they can only be governed as children. The bare statement of the alternative shows the absurdity of supposing that such efforts have been made in any case which needs be considered here. It is only because the institutions of this country are a mass of inconsistencies, that things find admittance into our practice which belong to the system of despotic, or what is called paternal, government, while the general freedom of our institutions precludes the exercise of the amount of control necessary to render the restraint of any real efficacy as a moral education.

It was pointed out in an early part of this Essay, that the liberty of the individual, in things wherein the individual is alone concerned, implies a corresponding liberty in any number of individuals to regulate by mutual agreement such things as regard them jointly, and regard no persons but themselves. This question presents no difficulty, so long as the will of all the persons implicated remains unaltered; but since that will may change, it is often necessary, even in things in which they alone are concerned, that they should enter into engagements with one another; and when they do, it is fit, as a general rule, that those engagements should be kept. Yet in the laws, probably, of every country, this general rule has some exceptions. Not only persons are not held to engagements which violate the rights of third parties, but it is sometimes considered a sufficient reason for releasing them from an engagement, that it is injurious to themselves. In this and most other civilised countries, for example, an engagement by which a person should sell himself, or allow himself to be sold, as a slave, would be null and void; neither enforced by law nor by opinion. The ground for thus limiting his power of voluntarily disposing of his own lot in life, is apparent, and is very clearly seen in this extreme case. The reason for not interfering, unless for the sake of others, with a person's voluntary acts, is consideration for his liberty. His voluntary choice is evidence that what he so chooses is desirable, or at the least endurable, to him, and his good is on the whole best provided for by allowing him to take his own means of pursuing it. But by selling himself for a slave, he abdicates his liberty; he foregoes any future use of it, beyond that single act. He therefore defeats, in his own case, the very purpose which is the justification of allowing him to dispose of himself. He is no longer free; but is thenceforth in a position which has no longer the presumption in its favour, that would be afforded by his voluntarily remaining in it. The principle of freedom cannot require that he should be free not to be free. It is not freedom, to be allowed to alienate his freedom. These reasons, the force of which is so conspicuous in this peculiar

case, are evidently of far wider application; yet a limit is everywhere set to them by the necessities of life, which continually require, not indeed that we should resign our freedom, but that we should consent to this and the other limitation of it. The principle, however, which demands uncontrolled freedom of action in all that concerns only the agents themselves, requires that those who have become bound to one another, in things which concern no third party, should be able to release one another from the engagement: and even without such voluntary release, there are perhaps no contracts or engagements, except those that relate to money or money's worth, of which one can venture to say that there ought to be no liberty whatever of retractation. Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt, in the excellent essay from which I have already quoted, states it as his conviction, that engagements which involve personal relations or services, should never be legally binding beyond a limited duration of time; and that the most important of these engagements, marriage, having the peculiarity that its objects are frustrated unless the feelings of both the parties are in harmony with it, should require nothing more than the declared will of either party to dissolve it. This subject is too important, and too complicated, to be discussed in a parenthesis, and I touch on it only so far as is necessary for purposes of illustration. If the conciseness and generality of Baron Humboldt's dissertation had not obliged him in this instance to content himself with enunciating his conclusion without discussing the premises, he would doubtless have recognised that the question cannot be decided on grounds so simple as those to which he confines himself. When a person, either by express promise or by conduct, has encouraged another to rely upon his continuing to act in a certain way--to build expectations and calculations, and stake any part of his plan of life upon that supposition, a new series of moral obligations arises on his part towards that person, which may possibly be overruled, but cannot be ignored. And again, if the relation between two contracting parties has been followed by consequences to others; if it has placed third parties in any peculiar position, or, as in the case of marriage, has even called third parties into existence, obligations arise on the part of both the contracting parties towards those third persons, the fulfilment of which, or at all events the mode of fulfilment, must be greatly affected by the continuance or disruption of the relation between the original parties to the contract. It does not follow, nor can I admit, that these obligations extend to requiring the fulfilment of the contract at all costs to the happiness of the reluctant party; but they are a necessary element in the question; and even if, as Von Humboldt maintains, they ought to make no difference in the _legal_ freedom of the parties to release themselves from the engagement (and I also hold that they ought not to make _much_ difference), they necessarily make a great difference in the _moral_ freedom. A person is bound to take all these circumstances into account, before resolving on a step which may affect such important interests of others; and if he does not allow proper weight to those interests, he is morally responsible for the wrong. I have made these obvious remarks for the better illustration of the general principle of liberty, and not because they are at all needed on the particular question, which, on the contrary, is usually discussed as if the interest of children was everything, and that of grown persons nothing.

I have already observed that, owing to the absence of any recognised general principles, liberty is often granted where it should be withheld, as well as withheld where it should be granted; and one of the cases in which, in the modern European world, the sentiment of liberty is the strongest, is a case where, in my view, it is altogether misplaced. A person should be free to do as he likes in his own concerns; but he ought not to be free to do as he likes in acting for another, under the pretext that the affairs of another are his own affairs. The State, while it respects the liberty of each in what specially regards himself, is bound to maintain a vigilant control over his exercise of any power which it allows him to possess over others. This obligation is almost entirely disregarded in the case of the family relations, a case, in its direct influence on human happiness, more important than all others taken together. The almost despotic power of husbands over wives need not be enlarged upon here because nothing more is needed for the complete removal of the evil, than that wives should have the same rights, and should receive the protection of law in the same manner, as all other persons; and because, on this subject, the defenders of established injustice do not avail themselves of the plea of liberty, but stand forth openly as the champions of power. It is in the case of children, that misapplied notions of liberty are a real obstacle to the fulfilment by the State of its duties. One would almost think that a man's children were supposed to be literally, and not metaphorically, a part of himself, so jealous is opinion of the smallest interference of law with his absolute and exclusive control over them; more jealous than of almost any interference with his own freedom of action: so much less do the generality of mankind value liberty than power. Consider, for example, the case of education. Is it not almost a self-evident axiom, that the State should require and compel the education, up to a certain standard, of every human being who is born its citizen? Yet who is there that is not afraid to recognise and assert this truth? Hardly any one indeed will deny that it is one of the most sacred duties of the parents (or, as law and usage now stand, the father), after summoning a human being into the world, to give to that being an education fitting him to perform his part well in life towards others and towards himself. But while this is unanimously declared to be the father's duty, scarcely anybody, in this country, will bear to hear of obliging him to perform it. Instead of his being required to make any exertion or sacrifice for securing education to the child, it is left to his choice to accept it or not when it is provided gratis! It still remains unrecognised, that to bring a child into existence without a fair prospect of being

able, not only to provide food for its body, but instruction and training for its mind, is a moral crime, both against the unfortunate offspring and against society; and that if the parent does not fulfil this obligation, the State ought to see it fulfilled, at the charge, as far as possible, of the parent.

Were the duty of enforcing universal education once admitted, there would be an end to the difficulties about what the State should teach, and how it should teach, which now convert the subject into a mere battle-field for sects and parties, causing the time and labour which should have been spent in educating, to be wasted in quarrelling about education. If the government would make up its mind to _require_ for every child a good education, it might save itself the trouble of _providing_ one. It might leave to parents to obtain the education where and how they pleased, and content itself with helping to pay the school fees of the poorer class of children, and defraying the entire school expenses of those who have no one else to pay for them. The objections which are urged with reason against State education, do not apply to the enforcement of education by the State, but to the State's taking upon itself to direct that education; which is a totally different thing. That the whole or any large part of the education of the people should be in State hands, I go as far as any one in deprecating. All that has been said of the importance of individuality of character, and diversity in opinions and modes of conduct, involves, as of the same unspeakable importance, diversity of education. A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another; and as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the government, whether this be a monarch, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation, in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body. An education established and controlled by the State, should only exist, if it exist at all, as one among many competing experiments, carried on for the purpose of example and stimulus, to keep the others up to a certain standard of excellence. Unless, indeed, when society in general is in so backward a state that it could not or would not provide for itself any proper institutions of education, unless the government undertook the task; then, indeed, the government may, as the less of two great evils, take upon itself the business of schools and universities, as it may that of joint stock companies, when private enterprise, in a shape fitted for undertaking great works of industry, does not exist in the country. But in general, if the country contains a sufficient number of persons qualified to provide education under government auspices, the same persons would be able and willing to give an equally good education on the voluntary principle, under the assurance of remuneration afforded by a law rendering education compulsory, combined with State aid to those unable to defray the expense.

The instrument for enforcing the law could be no other than public examinations, extending to all children, and beginning at an early age. An age might be fixed at which every child must be examined, to ascertain if he (or she) is able to read. If a child proves unable, the father, unless he has some sufficient ground of excuse, might be subjected to a moderate fine, to be worked out, if necessary, by his labour, and the child might be put to school at his expense. Once in every year the examination should be renewed, with a gradually extending range of subjects, so as to make the universal acquisition, and what is more, retention, of a certain minimum of general knowledge, virtually compulsory. Beyond that minimum, there should be voluntary examinations on all subjects, at which all who come up to a certain standard of proficiency might claim a certificate. To prevent the State from exercising, through these arrangements, an improper influence over opinion, the knowledge required for passing an examination (beyond the merely instrumental parts of knowledge, such as languages and their use) should, even in the higher class of examinations, be confined to facts and positive science exclusively. The examinations on religion, politics, or other disputed topics, should not turn on the truth or falsehood of opinions, but on the matter of fact that such and such an opinion is held, on such grounds, by such authors, or schools, or churches. Under this system, the rising generation would be no worse off in regard to all disputed truths, than they are at present; they would be brought up either churchmen or dissenters as they now are, the state merely taking care that they should be instructed churchmen, or instructed dissenters. There would be nothing to hinder them from being taught religion, if their parents chose, at the same schools where they were taught other things. All attempts by the state to bias the conclusions of its citizens on disputed subjects, are evil; but it may very properly offer to ascertain and certify that a person possesses the knowledge, requisite to make his conclusions, on any given subject, worth attending to. A student of philosophy would be the better for being able to stand an examination both in Locke and in Kant, whichever of the two he takes up with, or even if with neither: and there is no reasonable objection to examining an atheist in the evidences of Christianity, provided he is not required to profess a belief in them. The examinations, however, in the higher branches of knowledge should, I conceive, be entirely voluntary. It would be giving too dangerous a power to governments, were they allowed to exclude any one from professions, even from the profession of teacher, for alleged deficiency of qualifications: and I think, with Wilhelm von Humboldt, that degrees, or other public certificates of scientific or professional acquirements, should be given to all who present themselves for examination, and stand the test; but that such certificates should confer no advantage over competitors, other than the weight which may be attached to their testimony by public opinion.

It is not in the matter of education only, that misplaced notions of liberty prevent moral obligations on the part of parents from being recognised, and legal obligations from being imposed, where there are the strongest grounds for the former always, and in many cases for the latter also. The fact itself, of causing the existence of a human being, is one of the most responsible actions in the range of human life. To undertake this responsibility--to bestow a life which may be either a curse or a blessing--unless the being on whom it is to be bestowed will have at least the ordinary chances of a desirable existence, is a crime against that being. And in a country either over-peopled, or threatened with being so, to produce children, beyond a very small number, with the effect of reducing the reward of labour by their competition, is a serious offence against all who live by the remuneration of their labour. The laws which, in many countries on the Continent, forbid marriage unless the parties can show that they have the means of supporting a family, do not exceed the legitimate powers of the state: and whether such laws be expedient or not (a question mainly dependent on local circumstances and feelings), they are not objectionable as violations of liberty. Such laws are interferences of the state to prohibit a mischievous act--an act injurious to others, which ought to be a subject of reprobation, and social stigma, even when it is not deemed expedient to superadd legal punishment. Yet the current ideas of liberty, which bend so easily to real infringements of the freedom of the individual, in things which concern only himself, would repel the attempt to put any restraint upon his inclinations when the consequence of their indulgence is a life, or lives, of wretchedness and depravity to the offspring, with manifold evils to those sufficiently within reach to be in any way affected by their actions. When we compare the strange respect of mankind for liberty, with their strange want of respect for it, we might imagine that a man had an indispensable right to do harm to others, and no right at all to please himself without giving pain to any one.

I have reserved for the last place a large class of questions respecting the limits of government interference, which, though closely connected with the subject of this Essay, do not, in strictness, belong to it. These are cases in which the reasons against interference do not turn upon the principle of liberty: the question is not about restraining the actions of individuals, but about helping them: it is asked whether the government should do, or cause to be done, something for their benefit, instead of leaving it to be done by themselves, individually, or in voluntary combination.

The objections to government interference, when it is not such as to involve infringement of liberty, may be of three kinds.

The first is, when the thing to be done is likely to be better done by individuals than by the government. Speaking generally, there is no one so fit to conduct any business, or to determine how or by whom it shall be conducted, as those who are personally interested in it. This principle condemns the interferences, once so common, of the legislature, or the officers of government, with the ordinary processes of industry. But this part of the subject has been sufficiently enlarged upon by political economists, and is not particularly related to the principles of this Essay.

The second objection is more nearly allied to our subject. In many cases, though individuals may not do the particular thing so well, on the average, as the officers of government, it is nevertheless desirable that it should be done by them, rather than by the government, as a means to their own mental education--a mode of strengthening their active faculties, exercising their judgment, and giving them a familiar knowledge of the subjects with which they are thus left to deal. This is a principal, though not the sole, recommendation of jury trial (in cases not political); of free and popular local and municipal institutions; of the conduct of industrial and philanthropic enterprises by voluntary associations. These are not questions of liberty, and are connected with that subject only by remote tendencies; but they are questions of development. It belongs to a different occasion from the present to dwell on these things as parts of national education; as being, in truth, the peculiar training of a citizen, the practical part of the political education of a free people, taking them out of the narrow circle of personal and family selfishness, and accustoming them to the comprehension of joint interests, the management of joint concerns--habituating them to act from public or semi-public motives, and guide their conduct by aims which unite instead of isolating them from one another. Without these habits and powers, a free constitution can neither be worked nor preserved, as is exemplified by the too-often transitory nature of political freedom in countries where it does not rest upon a sufficient basis of local liberties. The management of purely local business by the localities, and of the great enterprises of industry by the union of those who voluntarily supply the pecuniary means, is further recommended by all the advantages which have been set forth in this Essay as belonging to individuality of development, and diversity of modes of action. Government operations tend to be everywhere alike. With individuals and voluntary associations, on the contrary, there are varied experiments, and endless diversity of experience. What the State can usefully do, is to make itself a central depository, and active circulator and diffuser, of the experience resulting from many trials. Its business is to enable each experimentalist to benefit by the experiments of others, instead of tolerating no experiments but its own.

The third, and most cogent reason for restricting the interference of government, is the great evil of adding unnecessarily to its power. Every function superadded to those already exercised by the government, causes its influence over hopes and fears to be

more widely diffused, and converts, more and more, the active and ambitious part of the public into hangers-on of the government, or of some party which aims at becoming the government. If the roads, the railways, the banks, the insurance offices, the great joint-stock companies, the universities, and the public charities, were all of them branches of the government; if, in addition, the municipal corporations and local boards, with all that now devolves on them, became departments of the central administration; if the employes of all these different enterprises were appointed and paid by the government, and looked to the government for every rise in life; not all the freedom of the press and popular constitution of the legislature would make this or any other country free otherwise than in name. And the evil would be greater, the more efficiently and scientifically the administrative machinery was constructed--the more skilful the arrangements for obtaining the best qualified hands and heads with which to work it. In England it has of late been proposed that all the members of the civil service of government should be selected by competitive examination, to obtain for those employments the most intelligent and instructed persons procurable; and much has been said and written for and against this proposal. One of the arguments most insisted on by its opponents, is that the occupation of a permanent official servant of the State does not hold out sufficient prospects of emolument and importance to attract the highest talents, which will always be able to find a more inviting career in the professions, or in the service of companies and other public bodies. One would not have been surprised if this argument had been used by the friends of the proposition, as an answer to its principal difficulty. Coming from the opponents it is strange enough. What is urged as an objection is the safety-valve of the proposed system. If indeed all the high talent of the country _could_ be drawn into the service of the government, a proposal tending to bring about that result might well inspire uneasiness. If every part of the business of society which required organised concert, or large and comprehensive views, were in the hands of the government, and if government offices were universally filled by the ablest men, all the enlarged culture and practised intelligence in the country, except the purely speculative, would be concentrated in a numerous bureaucracy, to whom alone the rest of the community would look for all things: the multitude for direction and dictation in all they had to do; the able and aspiring for personal advancement. To be admitted into the ranks of this bureaucracy, and when admitted, to rise therein, would be the sole objects of ambition. Under this regime, not only is the outside public ill-qualified, for want of practical experience, to criticise or check the mode of operation of the bureaucracy, but even if the accidents of despotic or the natural working of popular institutions occasionally raise to the summit a ruler or rulers of reforming inclinations, no reform can be effected which is contrary to the interest of the bureaucracy. Such is the melancholy condition of the Russian empire, as is shown in the accounts of those who have had sufficient opportunity of observation. The Czar himself is powerless against the bureaucratic body; he can send any one of them to Siberia, but he cannot govern without them, or against their will. On every decree of his they have a tacit veto, by merely refraining from carrying it into effect. In countries of more advanced civilisation and of a more insurrectionary spirit, the public, accustomed to expect everything to be done for them by the State, or at least to do nothing for themselves without asking from the State not only leave to do it, but even how it is to be done, naturally hold the State responsible for all evil which befalls them, and when the evil exceeds their amount of patience, they rise against the government and make what is called a revolution; whereupon somebody else, with or without legitimate authority from the nation, vaults into the seat, issues his orders to the bureaucracy, and everything goes on much as it did before; the bureaucracy being unchanged, and nobody else being capable of taking their place.

A very different spectacle is exhibited among a people accustomed to transact their own business. In France, a large part of the people having been engaged in military service, many of whom have held at least the rank of non-commissioned officers, there are in every popular insurrection several persons competent to take the lead, and improvise some tolerable plan of action. What the French are in military affairs, the Americans are in every kind of civil business; let them be left without a government, every body of Americans is able to improvise one, and to carry on that or any other public business with a sufficient amount of intelligence, order, and decision. This is what every free people ought to be: and a people capable of this is certain to be free; it will never let itself be enslaved by any man or body of men because these are able to seize and pull the reins of the central administration. No bureaucracy can hope to make such a people as this do or undergo anything that they do not like. But where everything is done through the bureaucracy, nothing to which the bureaucracy is really adverse can be done at all. The constitution of such countries is an organisation of the experience and practical ability of the nation, into a disciplined body for the purpose of governing the rest; and the more perfect that organisation is in itself, the more successful in drawing to itself and educating for itself the persons of greatest capacity from all ranks of the community, the more complete is the bondage of all, the members of the bureaucracy included. For the governors are as much the slaves of their organisation and discipline, as the governed are of the governors. A Chinese mandarin is as much the tool and creature of a despotism as the humblest cultivator. An individual Jesuit is to the utmost degree of abasement the slave of his order, though the order itself exists for the collective power and importance of its members.

It is not, also, to be forgotten, that the absorption of all the principal ability of the country into the governing body is fatal, sooner or later, to the mental activity and progressiveness of the body itself. Banded together as they are--working a system which, like all

systems, necessarily proceeds in a great measure by fixed rules--the official body are under the constant temptation of sinking into indolent routine, or, if they now and then desert that mill-horse round, of rushing into some half-examined crudity which has struck the fancy of some leading member of the corps: and the sole check to these closely allied, though seemingly opposite, tendencies, the only stimulus which can keep the ability of the body itself up to a high standard, is liability to the watchful criticism of equal ability outside the body. It is indispensable, therefore, that the means should exist, independently of the government, of forming such ability, and furnishing it with the opportunities and experience necessary for a correct judgment of great practical affairs. If we would possess permanently a skilful and efficient body of functionaries--above all, a body able to originate and willing to adopt improvements; if we would not have our bureaucracy degenerate into a pedantocracy, this body must not engross all the occupations which form and cultivate the faculties required for the government of mankind.

To determine the point at which evils, so formidable to human freedom and advancement, begin, or rather at which they begin to predominate over the benefits attending the collective application of the force of society, under its recognised chiefs, for the removal of the obstacles which stand in the way of its well-being; to secure as much of the advantages of centralised power and intelligence, as can be had without turning into governmental channels too great a proportion of the general activity, is one of the most difficult and complicated questions in the art of government. It is, in a great measure, a question of detail, in which many and various considerations must be kept in view, and no absolute rule can be laid down. But I believe that the practical principle in which safety resides, the ideal to be kept in view, the standard by which to test all arrangements intended for overcoming the difficulty, may be conveyed in these words: the greatest dissemination of power consistent with efficiency; but the greatest possible centralisation of information, and diffusion of it from the centre. Thus, in municipal administration, there would be, as in the New England States, a very minute division among separate officers, chosen by the localities, of all business which is not better left to the persons directly interested; but besides this, there would be, in each department of local affairs, a central superintendence, forming a branch of the general government. The organ of this superintendence would concentrate, as in a focus, the variety of information and experience derived from the conduct of that branch of public business in all the localities, from everything analogous which is done in foreign countries, and from the general principles of political science. This central organ should have a right to know all that is done, and its special duty should be that of making the knowledge acquired in one place available for others. Emancipated from the petty prejudices and narrow views of a locality by its elevated position and comprehensive sphere of observation, its advice would naturally carry much authority; but its actual power, as a permanent institution, should, I conceive, be limited to compelling the local officers to obey the laws laid down for their guidance. In all things not provided for by general rules, those officers should be left to their own judgment, under responsibility to their constituents. For the violation of rules, they should be responsible to law, and the rules themselves should be laid down by the legislature; the central administrative authority only watching over their execution, and if they were not properly carried into effect, appealing, according to the nature of the case, to the tribunal to enforce the law, or to the constituencies to dismiss the functionaries who had not executed it according to its spirit. Such, in its general conception, is the central superintendence which the Poor Law Board is intended to exercise over the administrators of the Poor Rate throughout the country. Whatever powers the Board exercises beyond this limit, were right and necessary in that peculiar case, for the cure of rooted habits of maladministration in matters deeply affecting not the localities merely, but the whole community; since no locality has a moral right to make itself by mismanagement a nest of pauperism, necessarily overflowing into other localities, and impairing the moral and physical condition of the whole labouring community. The powers of administrative coercion and subordinate legislation possessed by the Poor Law Board (but which, owing to the state of opinion on the subject, are very scantily exercised by them), though perfectly justifiable in a case of first-rate national interest, would be wholly out of place in the superintendence of interests purely local. But a central organ of information and instruction for all the localities, would be equally valuable in all departments of administration. A government cannot have too much of the kind of activity which does not impede, but aids and stimulates, individual exertion and development. The mischief begins when, instead of calling forth the activity and powers of individuals and bodies, it substitutes its own activity for theirs; when, instead of informing, advising, and, upon occasion, denouncing, it makes them work in fetters, or bids them stand aside and does their work instead of them. The worth of a State, in the long run, is the worth of the individuals composing it; and a State which postpones the interests of _their_ mental expansion and elevation, to a little more of administrative skill, or of that semblance of it which practice gives, in the details of business; a State which dwarfs its men, in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands even for beneficial purposes, will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished; and that the perfection of machinery to which it has sacrificed everything, will in the end avail it nothing, for want of the vital power which, in order that the machine might work more smoothly, it has preferred to banish.

==========

Untitled

Unknown

Project Gutenberg Release: March 20, 2011 · eBook #35636

Produced by Jana Srna and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at https://www.pgdp.net

[Anmerkungen zur Transkription:

Der Text stammt aus: Imago. Zeitschrift für Anwendung der Psychoanalyse auf die Geisteswissenschaften VII (1921). S. 361-386.

Schreibweise und Interpunktion des Originaltextes wurden übernommen; lediglich offensichtliche Druckfehler wurden korrigiert. Eine Liste der vorgenommenen Änderungen findet sich am Ende des Textes.

Im Original gesperrt gedruckter Text wurde mit _ markiert.]

Narzißmus als Doppelrichtung.

Von LOU ANDREAS-SALOMÉ.

I.

Was es auf sich hat mit dem _Freud_schen Narzißmusbegriff, das stellte sich erst allmählich immer bedeutsamer heraus, und erklärt damit vielleicht, warum, auch bei Gegnern und Dissidenten, der Name so wenig diskutiert wurde, als deckten bereits sonstige Benennungen den gleichen Begriff. Ursprünglich, solange Narzißmus tautologisch für Autoerotismus stand, war das ja in der Tat der Fall; als _Freud_ ihn dann übernahm, zur Kennzeichnung jener Libidophase, wo, nach autoerotischer Selbst- und Weltverwechslung des Säuglings, die erste Objektwahl auf das Subjekt selber fällt, da rührte er dadurch zugleich schon an ein weiterreichendes Problem: »Das Wort 'Narzißmus' will betonen, daß der Egoismus auch ein libidinöses Problem sei, oder, um es anders auszudrücken, der Narzißmus kann als die libidinöse Ergänzung des Egoismus betrachtet werden.« (_Freud_, Metaps. Erg. d. Trl.) Also kein Beschränktsein auf einzelnes Libidostadium, sondern als unser Stück Selbstliebe alle Stadien begleitend; nicht primitiver Ausgangspunkt der Entwicklung nur, sondern primär im Sinne basisbildender Dauer bis in alle spätern Objektbesetzungen der Libido hinein, die darin ja, nach _Freuds_ Bild dafür: nur, der Monere gleich, Pseudopodien ausstreckt, um sie nach Bedarf wieder in sich einzubeziehen. Allerdings stellte _Freuds_ Einführung des Narzißmusbegriffs in die theoretische Psychoanalyse von vornherein zu dessen Definition fest, daß die psychischen Energien: »im Zustande des Narzißmus beisammen und für unsre grobe Analyse ununterscheidbar sind, und daß es erst mit der Objektbesetzung möglich wird, eine Sexualenergie, die Libido, von einer Energie der Ichtriebe zu unterscheiden.« Mithin als Grenzbegriff gesetzt, über den Psychoanalyse nicht hinaus kann, bis zu dem hin sie jedoch therapeutisch zu dringen hat, als dem Punkt, wo krankhafte Störung erst ganz sich zu lösen, Gesundheit sich zu erneuen vermag, weil »krank« und »gesund« daran letztlich falsche oder rechte Aufeinanderbezogenheiten der zwei innern Tendenzen bedeuten, je nachdem diese sich hemmen oder fördern.

Indem beides sich am personellen Träger vollzieht, grenzt es, mit dessen steigender Bewußtheit seiner selbst, sich desto undeutlicher voneinander ab: macht den Umstand immer noch unmerklicher, daß im libidinös Gerichteten sich etwas durchsetzt, was der Einzelperson als solcher entgegengerichtet bleibt, was sie löst, zurücklöst in dasjenige, worin sie vor ihrer Bewußtheit noch für alles stand, wie alles gesamthaft für sie. Denn sollen Icherhaltungs-, Selbstbehauptungstriebe sich von libidinösen überhaupt begrifflich streng trennen, so kann Libido nichts anderes besagen als eben diesen Vorgang: diesen Bindestrich zwischen erlangter Einzelhaftigkeit und deren Rückbeziehung auf Konjugierendes, Verschmelzendes; im narzißtischen Doppelphänomen wäre sowohl die Bezugnahme der Libido auf uns selbst ausgedrückt als auch unsere eigene Verwurzelung mit dem Urzustand, dem wir, entsteigend, dennoch einverleibt blieben, wie die Pflanze dem Erdreich, trotz ihres entgegengesetzt gerichteten Wachstums ans Licht. Wie wir ja auch in den Körpervorgängen die geschlechtliche Weitergabe gebunden sehen an indifferenziert bleibende kleinste Totalitäten, und wie in unseres Körpers »erogenen Zonen« Überlebsel wirksam sind eines Infantilstadiums, aus dem die Organe sich längst in Dienstbarkeit der Icherhaltung aufteilten(1). Die Frage lautet auch gar nicht: ob's theoretisch vielleicht doch angängig sei, den narzißtischen Doppelsinn eindeutig zu fassen, sei es, den Ichtrieb der Libido zu überantworten (als entspräche z. B. auch das Ernährungsbedürfnis noch einer Art von Konjugation mit dem Außer-uns), oder

umgekehrt die Libido dem Bemächtigungsbestreben des einzelnen (als einer Ich-Habgier), zu unterstellen. Nein, nicht solches ist die Grundfrage, sondern es geht um die innere Verschiedenheit von Erlebnissen, die durch zweierlei Namengebung auseinandergehalten wird, anstatt durch gewaltsames Vereinheitlichen des Begriffs sie zu verwischen. Nachgehen, so weit wie möglich, so tief wie tunlich, den verborgenen lebendigen Tatbeständen: um das handelt sichs _Freud_scher Psychoanalyse, und dazu allein bedient sie sich des populären Gegensatzes von Ich- und Sexualtrieben. Darum erschiene es mir als Gefahr, wenn am Narzißmus seine Doppelseitigkeit nicht als sein Wesentliches betont bliebe, wenn durch Wortverwechslung mit bloßer Selbstliebe sein Problem sich sozusagen ungelöst erledigte. Ich möchte deshalb jene andere, fürs Ichbewußtsein zurücktretende, Seite daran -- die der festgehaltenen Gefühlsidentifizierung mit allem, der Wiederverschmelzung mit allem als positivem Grundziel der Libido(2), an einigen Punkten hervorkehren, und zwar an dreien: innerhalb unserer Objektbesetzungen, innerhalb unserer Wertsetzungen, und innerhalb narzißtischer Umsetzung ins künstlerische Schaffen.

(1) Absichtlich rede ich hier nicht von Ichtrieb und »Arttrieb«: namentlich seit der teleologischen Wendung des Wortes bei C. G. _Jung_ besinnt man sich besser darauf, wie unausrottbar viel Teleologie sich darin festgenistet hat, schon von _Schopenhauer_ und vom Evolutionismus her trotz dessen betonter Naturwissenschaftlichkeit der Auffassung. (Vgl. dazu die Klarstellung durch Carl _Abraham_ bereits in der Intern. Zeitschr. III, p. 72.) Insbesondere die infantile Sexualität, die grundlegende für alle spätere, läßt sich mit Arttrieb am wenigsten decken: da aber mit der Elternschaft, dem Kind-Ebenbilde, auch wiederum unser Narzißmus erst recht auflebt, so brächte auch sogar bei Fortpflanzung der Art uns das Wort noch um keine einzige Station weit vom Ich ab.

(2) In der Tat läßt sich nur durch Hinweis auf den positiven Charakter der _passiven_ Libidokomponente diese genügend unterscheiden von einer bloßen »Attitüde« unseres Ich-Machtstrebens: wie A. _Adler_ sie auffaßt, der dadurch zu intellektualistischer Verkürzung und Vereinfachung der psychischen Vorgänge kommt. Allerdings zu einer, die ihm manche Anhänger sichern mag, welche von _Freud_ abfielen, weil mit der bösen Sexualität nicht zu spaßen war als einem bloßen »Jargon« der Gefühlsäußerung. Aber den Mangel eines positiven Zweierlei -- das, für unsere menschliche Blickmethode, nun einmal überall wirksam wird, wo sich Leben regt -- muß auch A. _Adler_ sich irgendwie ersetzen: in der Schroffheit und Starrheit der libidinösen bloßen Fiktion, erscheint diese -- obwohl ein Minderwertigkeitsanzeichen -- schließlich als dermaßen allgemein und wesentlich, daß »Psychisches« geradezu damit in eins zu fassen wäre, d. h. der Gesunde, Nichtminderwertige, verlegen würde um hinreichende Beschaffung von Psyche.

Zunächst jedoch, schon vorweg des »trocknen Tones satt«, möchte ich von einem Bübchen erzählen, an dem mir besonders eindringlich zu beobachten vergönnt war, wie wir mit unserm Ichwerden nicht nur in die neuen Freuden bewußterer Selbstliebe drängen, sondern nicht minder das Ich sich uns vorerst aufdrängen kann als Einbuße an der Lust passiver Aufgenommenheit in das von uns noch nicht voll Unterschiedene. Um die Zeit dieses Doppelereignisses von Einbuße und Zuschuß begann das Bübchen sich aus einem zärtlich zutraulichen in ein weinerlich erbostes zu wandeln; es schlug, und nicht zum Scherz, die sehr geliebte Mutter, zeigte abwechselnd Zorn- und Angstzustände, und hätte sein Leid doch kaum klarer auszudrücken vermocht, als einst ein kleiner sprachkundigerer Leidensgenosse es dem geärgerten Vater gegenüber mit dem bittern Vorwurf tat: »Du bist so frech, und ich bin so traurig.« Die letzte Ursache zu alledem stellte sich damit heraus, daß das Leid sich löste, sobald das Bübchen aufgehört hatte, von sich in dritter Person zu reden, sobald, gleich schmerzlich durchbrechendem Zahn, das erste »Ich« sich ihm entrang. Einstweilen aber galt das neue Wort nur bei den, alltäglich gewordenen, Zusammenstößen mit der Umwelt; die Augenblicke alter Harmonie fanden immer noch statt des »Ich« das »Bubele« vor. So erklärte er jemandem, der ihn in den Winkel gestellt sah: »Ik bös!« hinterdrein jedoch, strahlend auf die Mutter zulaufend, verkündigte er: »Bubele wieder gut!« Erst nach Monaten trat endgültig das Bubele zurück, und ein völlig anderes als das verzweifelt böse Gesicht lugte durch den Türspalt herein, wenn er, eintretend, mit betonter Würde, die Anwesenden wissen ließ: »Ik komme!« Nun erst war die ständige Gekränktheit, die tiefe, erschrockene, geschwunden, unser aller Urkränkung: über das unbegreifliche Sichpreisgegebensehen an die eigene Vereinzelung, deren Unbegreiflichkeit sie eben als von außen bedingte erscheinen ließ. Mit jedem Schlag oder Schrei wider geliebte Personen, jedem rächenden Wehetun hatte zugleich letzte Wollust sich ausgeschwelgt, etwa in den Tränen der Mutter die verlorene Identität schmerzhaft wiedergenießend. Wie solcher kindliche Sadismus für die meiner Ansicht nach bisweilen doch nur sekundäre Natur des Sadistischen spricht, wenigstens als Umschlag aus unsern noch unbewußten Identifizierungen, so zeigt er vielleicht auch, wie unerhört nahe der Ödipuskomplex ihm gelegen ist: gerade seine überraschende Kraßheit gewinnend aus dieser Überstülpung der schweifenden Gefühlsweite in die Enge des Bewußtwerdens der eigenen Vereinzelung und damit in die Ichaggression. Übrigens war beim Bübchen mit der Ichgeburt der innere Widerstreit noch nicht vollends abgetan: das geschah erst durch eine Erscheinung, von der ich wohl weiß, daß ihr, durchaus nicht seltenes Vorkommen recht verschieden begründet sein kann, die in diesem Sonderfall sich aber gar deutlich als Notersatz für die eingebüßte Allesbedeutung betrug. Das Bübchen schmuggelte nämlich einen kleinen unsichtbaren Gefährten in die Welt seiner neuen Erfahrungen ein, dessen leiblichen Umriß er

einem Bilderbuch entnahm, worin blumenbekränzten Kindern ein lustiger Junge voraufsprang, mit den Worten darunter: der Mai ist gekommen. Junge Mai ergab fortan den ergänzenden Doppelgänger zu des Bübchens jeweiliger Schicksalslage: er hatte, je nach Bedarf, als froh oder betrübt, brav oder bös, beschenkt oder bestraft, ja als tot oder lebendig ihm das Komplement zu stellen; ergings dem Bübchen wenig nach Wunsch, so labte es sich an des Mai's um so ungemessenern Wunscherfüllungen; wo aber des Glückes Überfluß das Bübchen umzuwerfen drohte (wie zu Weihnachten angesichts des Baumes und der Gabenfülle), da entschied es kurzerhand: »heute dem Mai _nichts_!«, und beidemale war ersichtlich, daß nicht Neid oder Schadenfreude daran mitwirkten: am glücklicheren Mai tröstete, am leer ausgehenden Mai mäßigte das Bübchen _sich_, in jener einzig echten »Selbstlosigkeit« des noch nicht ganz zu Alleinbesitz mit sich gelangten Selbst. Im gleichen Grade, wie dieser Alleinbesitz sich festigte, erschien der Mai minder ständig, hatte er weiteren Weg zurückzulegen bis ans Haus, das er anfänglich mitbewohnte; später zog er gar in eine benachbarte Ortschaft und endlich mußte er sich zu Bahnbenutzung bequemen und Bahnzeiten innehalten. Als ich nach Bayern abreiste, bekam ich ihn zum Reisegeleit, und bei mir verstarb er des Todes, wodurch er sozusagen bayerisch lokalisiert blieb, nach meinem Aufenthalt befragt, versicherte das Bübchen drum: »die Lou, die ist nun im Himmel.« Hinzuzufügen bliebe noch, daß -- gewissermaßen entlang am Mai -- des Bübchens Selbstbewußtsein und -vertrauen ganz sonderlich erstarkten und nicht leicht etwas den Vergleich mit diesem Ik aushielt, ferner aber, daß es noch jetzt (mit drei Jahren) einen Anlaß gibt, wo der Mai wieder erscheint, wenn auch »nur nachts«: das ist, wenn dies ungemein musikalische Bübchen auf einen psalmodierenden Singsang verfällt, den es in einer letzten Bescheidenheit -- und dies ist interessant -- unter keinen Umständen dem vielvermögenden Ik allein zubilligt.

Gerade wie späterhin unsere Libido bereits bewußte Eigenschaft am Ich geworden, Angst erleidet bei Verdrängen, Hemmen unseres Bemächtigungsbestrebens, so kann sie es vorher erleiden auch infolge noch zögernden Zustimmens zur Herausbildung einer als eng und einzeln betonten Person; auch dies wirkt gleich Verdrängungsschüben, durch die sich in abgegrenztes Flußbett bequemen muß, was sich Meer gewähnt. Entsprechend der letztbemerkten Mission des Mai scheint das am längsten vorzuhalten bei Kindern mit starker Phantasietätigkeit, und ist aus wesentlich späteren Jahren als die des Bübchens mir zur Beobachtung gelangt. Von mir selbst entsinne ich mich eines hergehörigen Vorfalls aus meinem -- sehr ungefähr berechnet -- siebenten Jahr, den freilich ausnahmsweise Umstände begleiteten, die hier zu erörtern zu weit führen würde, sie fanden statt durch erstmaliges verfrühtes Hinausgeraten aus kindfrommer Gläubigkeit, also aus jener Gottgeborgenheit, die nicht unähnlich einer letzten geistigen Eihaut das Menschenkind umhüllen mag, mit ihrem Zerreißen die Ichgeburt in die Weltfremde(3) in gewissem Sinn erst vollendend. Es betraf einen Eindruck vor dem eigenen Spiegelbild: wie jähes, neuartiges Gewahrwerden dieses Abbildes als eines Ausgeschlossenseins von allem übrigen; nicht wegen etwas am Aussehn (z. B. als eines schöner phantasierten oder aber gewissenweckend infolge der Zweifelsünde jener Zeit), sondern die Tatsache selber, ein Sichabhebendes, Umgrenztes zu sein, überfiel mich wie Entheimatung, Obdachlosigkeit, als hätte sonst alles und jedes mich ohne weiteres mitenthalten, mir freundlich Raum in sich geboten(4). Natürlich erfahren Kinder und Kranke eher von dieser Unheimlichkeit, sich gerade an der Ichschranke zum bloßen Bildspuk, zu äffendem Schein zu werden, als ausgewachsene Normalmenschen, die nur der entgegengesetzte Umstand, diese Schrankensicherheit könne sich verflüchtigen, aus ihrer Fassung würfe. Wie beim Kinde das noch nicht gefestigte Ichbewußtsein, so legt beim psychotisch Erkrankten der Ichzerfall, jene andere Seite am Narzißtischen bloß, wo sich am Narzißmus erweist, daß er sich eben nicht mit »Selbstliebe« ganz deckt: weshalb der Psychot uns so viel darüber aussagt bei und durch Verlust seiner Ichgrenzen; indem er seine Fähigkeit zu Übertragung, zu Objektbesetzung, als nur vom Ich aus mögliche, einbüßt, regrediert er bis dorthin, wo man auf Einzelnes als solches, und so auch auf sich als den einzelnen, nicht mehr überträgt: nur daß ihm, wie dem Säugling, die beide allein diesen Zustand in so reiner Halbheit erfahren, das kennzeichnende Wort dafür fehlt, wir aber mit unsern Bezeichnungen schon stecken bleiben in der Mischung beider Hälften zu ununterscheidbarer Ganzheit, die uns nun bloß vom andern Rande her zu begutachten gegeben ist. Freilich gabs und gibts Leute, denen Namen auch für jenes Wortlose zu Gebote stehn, aber nur solche Namen, die das Unnennbare daran unterstrichen, um daraus das Recht abzuleiten, mit ihren Wörtern wie mit Entiteten umzugehn: das sind die Metaphysiker insbesondere älteren Datums: Doch wie wäre es, wenn wir eben die Nebulosität derartiger Ausdrücke uns zu nutze machten für andersartigen Zweck: für Unterscheidungen praktischer und faktischer Erlebnisseiten an unseren inwendigen Menschen? Nämlich so, wie zweifellos nur des Gläubigen klassische Religionssprache uns über fromme Zustände am deutlichsten belehrt, so auch des Metaphysikers Redewendungen über gewisse Existenzweisen an unserm Erleben, die für die Ichpsychologie, wie Sterne am Tage, unsichtbar werden; der große Fromme, der große Philosoph sind gleichermaßen Ausdrucksmächtige um deswillen, daß sie, wie der Psychoanalytiker ja nur zu gut weiß, ihre heißesten Antriebe aus der narzißtischen Urmacht bewahrten. Sie können den Erforscher menschlicher Seele ebenso beschenken, wie es sogar, hie und da, aus gleichem Grunde, der Psychot tut.

(3) Das Nähere ist verwendet in einer (bei _Diederichs_, Jena) erscheinenden Kindergeschichte: »Die Stunde ohne Gott.« Ein Thema übrigens, dem es sich lohnen würde, öfter forschend nachzugehen, insofern jeder Mensch unter irgend welchen Glaubensvorstellungen aufzuwachsen pflegt, und die entscheidende Stunde seines erstmaligen Zweifels -- nicht notwendig schon des theoretisch bedingten, häufig viel später und viel weniger tief wirksamen -- kennzeichnend bleibt für sein ganzes Wesen, auch wenn dies praktisch Erfahrene zunächst wieder mit theoretischer Bemühung verdrängt wird.

(4) In dem vortrefflichen Buch von G. _Róheim_ scheint mir bei Erklärung der Spiegelriten die narzißtische Doppelrichtung ebenfalls nicht genügend beachtet: wieviel auch in den Verboten und Geboten darauf beruht, daß vom Ich, seiner Selbstbespieglung, seinen Gewissensbissen, seiner sozialen Schädigung, seiner Gefährdung ausgegangen wird, die entgegengesetzte Seite kam sicherlich ergänzend hinzu in der Scheu des Ich vor sich selbst als dem in Begrenzung gebundenen.

Ein wenig hat es der Taufpate des Terminus, der Spiegelheld Narziß, auf dem Gewissen, wenn dabei zu einseitig die ichbeglückte Erotik allein herausblickt. Aber man bedenke, daß der Narkißos der Sage nicht vor künstlichem Spiegel steht, sondern vor dem der Natur: vielleicht nicht nur sich im Wasser erblickend, sondern auch sich _als alles_ noch, und vielleicht hätte er sonst nicht davor verweilt, sondern wäre geflohen? Liegt nicht in der Tat über seinem Antlitz von jeher neben der Verzücktheit auch die Schwermut? Wie dies beides sich bindet in eins: Glück und Trauer, das sich selber Entwendete, das auf sich selbst Zurückgeworfene, Hingegebenheit und eigene Behauptung: das würde ganz zum Bild nur dem Poeten(5).

(5)

»-- Dies also: dies geht von mir aus und löst sich in der Luft und im Gefühl der Haine, entweicht mir leicht, und wird nicht mehr die Meine und glänzt, weil es auf keine Feindschaft stößt.

Dies hebt sich unaufhörlich von mir fort, ich will nicht weg, ich warte, ich verweile; doch alle meine Grenzen haben Eile, stürzen hinaus und sind schon dort.

Und selbst im Schlaf: nichts bindet uns genug. Nachgiebige Mitte in mir, Kern voll Schwäche, Der nicht sein Fruchtfleisch anhält. Flucht, o Flug von allen Stellen meiner Oberfläche. --

Jetzt liegt es offen in dem teilnahmlosen zerstreuten Wasser, und ich darf es lang anstaunen unter meinem Kranz von Rosen.

Dort ist es nicht geliebt. Dort unten drin ist nichts als Gleichmut überstürzter Steine, und ich kann sehen, wie ich traurig bin.« --

(Aus: »Narziß« von Rainer Maria _Rilke_. Manuskript.)

II.

Daß auch Objektliebe auf Selbstliebe zurückgeht, daß davon tatsächlich jenes Akrobatenkunststück der Monere gilt, mit deren einziehbaren Scheingliedern _Freud_ sie drastisch verglich, das ist psychoanalytisch nach allen Seiten hin aufschlußgebend und belehrend geworden. Wie in des heiligen Augustins: »ich liebte die Liebe«, erscheinen jeweilige Objekte zutiefst als bloße Anlässe, einen Liebesüberschuß daran abzuladen, der auf uns selbst bezogen, und nur, sozusagen, nicht recht unterzubringen gewesen ist. Die Frage, wodurch wir überhaupt aus unserer Selbstliebe in Objektlibido hinausstoßen, wurde ja auch mehrfach von _Freud_ im Sinne eines solchen überschüssigen Zuviel erörtert. Nun meine ich, eben dies »Allzuviele« daran ergibt sich aus dem Umstand, daß es bereits vom Hause aus, als _Richtung des Verhaltens_, unsere Ichgrenzen als solche nicht berücksichtigt, sondern übersteigt, _nicht ihnen gilt_, ja ihnen entgegen steht, was nur wieder bedeutet: es ist narzißtisch bedingt, d. h. in aller Selbstbehauptung zugleich Wiederauflösungswerk am Selbst. Sicherlich gibt es auch die ganz eigentliche, bewußt auf uns gerichtete Selbstliebe, die dann vom Ichvorteil, nicht von der Wollust her, ihre Befriedigung bezieht. Aber auch die echte Wollust wird, indem sie am Selbst sich ausläßt, von diesem Selbst für den forschenden Blick leicht überdeckt, und noch ihr Zuviel umfließt es scheinbar als ihren Mittelpunkt. Erst an der Objektbesetzung zeichnet sich die Libido ja als etwas für sich ab, in den Umrissen des Objekts wird sie uns deshalb erst libidinös umrissen. Dahinter aber liegt, nach wie vor, weit ausgebreitet das Land, daraus sie stammt, und was sich im Vordergrund in der Einzelfigur des Objekts so groß davon abhebt, berückt uns nur, weil es diese Landestracht trägt. Ich denke mir: die _Freud_sche »Sexualüberschätzung«, das Bemühen, das Libidoobjekt zu erhöhen, mit allem Schönen und Wertvollen auszustaffieren, kommt von daher: sie sucht es ganz und gar zum würdigen, passenden Stellvertreter dessen zu machen, was, im Grunde immer noch allumfassend, sich schließlich daran ebenso schwer völlig anwenden, unterbringen läßt, wie innerhalb des Subjekt-Objekts selber. Letzten Endes steht jedes Objekt so stellvertretend, als -- im streng

psychoanalytischen Wortsinn verstanden -- »Symbol« für sonst eben unausdrückbare Fülle des unbewußt damit Verbundenen. Libidinös geredet besitzt keine Objektbesetzung andere Realität als solche symbolische; der Lustbezug daraus gleicht durchaus dem, was _Ferenczi_ einmal als »Wiederfindungslust« beschreibt: »die Tendenz, das Liebgewordene in allen Dingen der feindlichen Außenwelt wiederzufinden, ist wahrscheinlich auch die Quelle der Symbolbildung«(6). Fügen wir hinzu: damit auch die der Objektlibido als letztlich narzißtisch entspringender und gespeister. Die psychoanalytische Einsicht: daß auch spätere Liebesobjekte Übertragungen aus frühesten seien, gilt eben grundsätzlich: »Libidoobjekt« heißt Übertragensein aus noch ungeschiedener Subjekt-Objekteinheit in ein vereinzeltes Außenbild; und dieses ist damit genau so wenig in bloßer Vereinzelung gemeint, wie wir uns selber libidinös mit unsrer Einzelhaftigkeit bescheiden, wie wir vielmehr unsere Grenzen unwillkürlich darin zu übersehen, geringzuachten suchen.

(6) Zur Unterscheidung vom andern Lustbezug: demjenigen bloß ersparten Kraftaufwands, wie er _Freuds_ Witztechnik zugrunde liegt. (_Ferenczi_, Analyse von Gleichnissen, »Intern. Zeitschrift«, III, 5., p. 278.)

Bekanntlich redet _Freud_ von »Sexualüberschätzung« als von etwas, wobei unser Narzißmus ein wenig allzugründlich sein »Zuviel« an Libido ausgibt, woran er verarmt, leidet, um erst durch das Erfahren von Gegenliebe wieder frisch aufgefüllt zu werden. Dies kehrt sich jedenfalls am schärfsten hervor bei solcher Libido, die damit in zu schroffem Gegensatz gerät zum ichhaften Bemächtigungsbestreben, also bei männlich gearteter. Um ganz zu bemerken, wie gewißlich unser Narzißmus gerade an seinen Sexualüberschätzungen, seiner Ich-Zurückdrängung sich auch bereichert und steigert, muß man ihn vielleicht insbesondere dort betrachten, wo er sich nicht so weit in den Ichbezirk hinein »vermännlichte«, oder wo er, ehe das geschah, einen Rückschub erfuhr in das Infantilere, der ichbewußten Aggressivität ferner Bleibende. Man wolle nicht denken, daß damit die Libido des Weibtums mit ihrem von _Freud_ geschilderten Umkipp (von der Klitorissexualität in die passiv gewendete der Vagina) überwichtig genommen werden soll: aber kommt bei ihr die Egoseite des Narzißmus wiederum zu kurz, so gestattet sie doch dafür unverkürzt den Einblick in die andere, sonst uns allzu abgekehrt verbleibende Seite seines Wesens. Die Wollust, sich selber zu überrennen, sich nicht als Ich im Wege zu stehen beim beseeligenden Wiedererleben noch ichfremden Urzustandes, erhöht sich daran unter Umständen masochistisch, sowohl den körperlichen Schmerz als auch die Situation der Demütigung bejahend. Dem Ich gegenüber also _widerspruchsvoll_, da: »die Verkehrung der Aktivität in Passivität und Wendung gegen die eigene Person eigentlich niemals am ganzen Betrag der Triebregung vorgenommen wird«. (_Freud_, Trieb und Triebschicksale.) Eben dieses Paradoxon des Erlebens rückt jedoch erst voll ins Licht, inwiefern dem Narzißmus ein Doppelvollzug von Selbstbehauptung und von Schwelgen in noch Uneingegrenztem ur- und eigentümlich sei, wie _Freud_ ja überdies zugibt, wir hatten: »allen Grund anzunehmen, daß auch Schmerz, wie andere Unlustempfindungen, auf die Sexualerregung übergreifen und einen lustvollen Zustand erzeugen, um deswillen man sich auch die Unlust(7) des Schmerzes gefallen lassen kann« (wenn _Freud_ auch am sekundären Charakter des Masochismus festhalten will, als einer Reaktion auf vorangegangene, hinterdrein gleichsam nach Sühneschmerz verlangende Übergriffe). Innerhalb weiblich gerichteter Libido meine ich übrigens etwas vom sexuellen Urausdruck nicht nur verdeutlicht zu sehen in der Verschärfung zum masochistischen Zug, wo ja, ob auch negativ, das Ich als schmerzbedingendes, immerhin noch bedeutungsvoll mitwirkt; der Rückschub ins Passive gewährt überdies nämlich auch den erogenen Zonen dauernd ihren ursprünglichen Spielraum, als -- gegenüber dem Vorstoß ins Aktive -- dem Prinzip des Aufhaltenden, Verweilenden, also jener Zärtlichkeit, die hochgeeignet zur Beseelung, seelischen Verfeinerung der Leibesvorgänge, doch diese zugleich an ihre Kindergewohnheiten bindet; an infantile Erogenität des Gesamtleibes, an noch nicht punktuell einbezirkten Allkontakt sozusagen. Und endlich und nicht zum wenigsten, ist es der beharrende Überrest der Klitorissexualität selber, der, fürs Genitalziel überflüssig geworden, am Weibe sich an seinem infantilen Rückstand, sei es kindlicher oder kindischer, auslebt, bis -- -- ja vielleicht bis das Weib »das Kind« aus sich in die Welt hinausgeboren hat. Auf diesem Höhepunkt weiblicher Erfahrung aber, steht sie, die Erzeugerin, Ernährerin, Erzieherin des Kindes zugleich dem Wachstum ins Männliche nahe: _ihrem_ Stück Aktivität, darin fast doppelgeschlechtlich ergänzt, und eben drum wieder ins Urnarzißtische zurückgerundet, wie es auf der ganzen Welt sich nur ermöglicht im Bild der Mutter, die, sich selbst fortgebend, sich selbst an der Brust hält. Entsprechend dem Penis-Neid des Weibes findet man deshalb nicht selten beim Mann jenes Sichselbst-Wiedergebärenwollen (das sowohl zu unterscheiden wäre vom Zurückwollen in die geliebte Mutter = Gebärerin, als auch vom »inzestuosen Sich-eigner-Vaterseinwollen«); nach einigen Beobachtungen, die mir vorliegen, glaube ich darin eine weiblich umgemodelte Klitoris-Betonung zu sehen, indem ja, nach infantiler Annahme von der Analerotik her, die Klitoris auch etwas vom Leibe Ablösbares (den »Lumpf« aus _Freuds_ bekannter Kinderanalyse) bedeutet, wie es in mancher (natürlich nicht jeglicher) Schwangerschaftsphantasie männlicher Neurotiker sich ebenfalls Ausdruck schafft. Ich komme aber darauf, weil mir mehrfach auffiel, wie Mannbarwerden des Knaben zunächst als Bedrängtwerden von Fremdem empfunden wurde: als vergewaltigendes Außer-einem(8), das man in sich hineinzwingen, sich einverleiben möchte zu Besitz statt Besessenheit; bevor das »Zuviel« der Libido auf die Abfuhr ans Objekt verfällt, macht sie in

solchen Fällen sich bemerkbar _fast gleich einer Schädigung der narzißtischen Selbstliebe_, der Einheit von Libido und Ich: erst an der Objektbesetzung einen die beiden sich dann neu in der Gemeinsamkeit ihres Entzückens am Objekt.

(7) Vgl. hiezu die Schlußseiten von _Ferenczis_ »Von Krankheits- oder Pathoneurosen«, Intern. Zeitschr. IV, 5, wo von Masochismus und weiblicher Genitalität als sehr dunklen Problemen die Rede ist, und wo Körperverletzungen als Anlässe zu Regression auf ursprünglichen Hautmasochismus (die Haut infantilste erogene Zone!) erörtert werden.

Schon früh hat sich P. _Federn_ für den primären Charakter der »Passionslibido« ausgesprochen entgegen _Freuds_: »ein ursprünglicher Masochismus, der nicht -- -- -- aus dem Sadismus entstanden wäre, scheint nicht vorzukommen«. »Im Gegensatz dazu muß ich als sicher hinstellen, daß die Libido sowohl weiblich als männlich sein kann. (Intern. Zeitschr. II, 2, 119.)« »Das Kriterium des Masochismus ist -- -- die passive lustvolle Einstellung des Gesamt-Ichs. Menschen, die normale und masochistische Sexualität besitzen, geben an, daß die masochistische Sexualität 'durch das Gehirn gehe', sie nehmen die Überwältigung des ganzen Ichs selbst an«. Hiermit ist von P. _Federn_ für den primären Masochismus die Eignung zur vollen Liebesfähigkeit in Anspruch genommen, die sich nach _Freud_ kennzeichnet als »Relation des Gesamt-Ichs zu den Objekten«. (Samml. kl. Schr. z. N., IV, 274.)

(8) Verschiedene Träume aus der Knabenzeit gehören hieher; z. B. man ist mit sich selbst wie mit einer Vermummung umhüllt, Verkleidung oder Maske, da etwas darin steckt, das jeden Augenblick alles in Fetzen durchstoßen, zerreißen kann, und doch damit einen selber vernichten. Oder: man liegt neben offenem Grab, in das ein Grabstein hineinzustürzen droht, der dicht dabei hochragt und nur auf die erste unvorsichtige Bewegung wartet, denn _er_ gehört ja auf diese Öffnung, _einen selber_ aber begräbt sie.

So scheint _nicht so sehr die Objektbesetzung_, nicht die Sexualüberschätzung innerhalb ihrer, unserm Narzißmus gefährlich zu sein: wohl aber wird er seinerseits gefährlich dem Objekt der Libido; sein bleibendes Eingreifen verschuldet, daß es dabei diesem Objekt schließlich an den Kragen geht. Denn von vornherein nur zu einer Art von Stellvertreterschaft zugelassen, verflüchtigt es sich in seiner realen Beschaffenheit nur um so mehr und mehr, je gefeierter es auftritt. Die typischen Liebesenttäuschungen haben ihren letzten Grund, ihren unabwendbaren _hierin_: _nicht erst_ im Nachlassen der Liebe durch die Zeit oder durch enttäuschende Einsichten, denn, ganz abgesehen von diesem beiden hat das Objekt ja ganz eigentlich mit seinem Leibe dafür zu haften, daß es weit mehr als Leibhaftigkeit sei, und mit seinem, scheinbar doch erkorenen, auserwählten, Sonderwesen dafür, daß es im Grunde Allwesenheit sei. Je weiter Liebesekstase sich versteigt, ihr Objekt stets üppiger, ohne zu sparen, bereichernd, desto dünner, unterernährter bleibt das Objekt hinter seiner Symbolität zurück; je heißer unsere Schwärmerei, desto abkühlender diese Verwechslung, bis, auf richtiger Höhe, sich Brand und Frost fast identisch anfühlen (was das Schicksal der glücklichen Liebe fast unangenehmer als das der unglücklichen, der den Partner kühl lassenden aber selber schön warmbleibenden, machen kann). Auch hinter der reifgewordenen Genitallibido, die es mit den Realitäten am ernstesten nimmt, wächst dies symbolisierende Verfahren, das auch im Genitalen dennoch nur die narzißtischen Identifizierungen durchsetzen will: die keiner Objektbrücken im einzelnen bedürfen, über alles sich erstreckend aber auch nichts außer sich gelten lassend.

An der Objektlibido findet sich so manches, was ihr zugeschrieben wird, während mir scheint, daß es unter Umgehung ihrer, sich ziemlich direkt vom Narzißmus herleitet und nur in den eifrigen Symbolbildungen sich mit ihr zusammenfindet. Dazu gehört großenteils, was man Freundschaft zwischen verschiedenen Geschlechtern nennt. Bei der ungemein populären Diskussion dieses Themas beobachtete ich oft, wie sonderbar stark selbst unbefangen denkende Leute sich dagegen wehren, in Freundschaft nur eine Noch-nicht-, oder Schon-nicht-mehr-Liebe zu sehen, oder aber eine mit ihrer eigenen Verdrängung kämpfende. Meinem Eindruck nach liegt dies daran, daß im Freundschaftsbündnis allerdings Sexualanteile genug stecken, häufig jedoch solche, die ursprünglich nicht dem Partner zukommen, sondern sich dem Bunde mit ihm beigesellten von anderwärts: nämlich aus Aufarbeitungen vom Narzißtischen her, in Sublimierungen aus Infantilismen. Die Empfindung gewisser Nichtsexualität dem Freunde gegenüber bestünde damit zu Recht; nicht in gegenseitiger Erotik, sondern in etwas Drittem wurzelte sie: gleichviel, ob sie erwüchse aus noch immer infantilen Interessen oder erblühte zu hochvergeistigtesten, gleichviel ob die Freunde nun eins in Gott sein mögen, oder auch nur beim Sammeln oder Angeln. Das Wesentliche bleibt, daß, wie geliebt und anerkannt auch immer, der Freund letztlich gewertet, ja verklärt gewissermaßen, sei, er es doch erst von diesem Dritten aus wird, das im übrigen sogar fester zu binden imstande ist als Personalerotik, da, abgelenkt vom Sexualziel der Leibesbesitznahme, dafür unserer so aufgearbeiteten Libido gleichsam sich alles zu Besitz bietet, worauf sie nur irgend verfällt; in Sublimierung ihrer allerältesten autoerotischen Praxis kommt sie sozusagen zu einer geselligen Selbst- und Weltverwechslung à deux. Gut verarbeitetem und dadurch -- außerhalb der Genitallibido -- entwicklungsfröhlichem Narzißmus ist eben breiteste Umfassung freigegeben, zum Entgelt für die genitallibidinöse Enge sonstiger Partnerumarmung. Man könnte ja den schlechten Witz machen: unserm alten Autoerotismus, einstmals übers ganze Kinderkörperchen verteilt, gelänge es in den Sublimationsanstrengungen einfach, uns allmählich aus den Gliedern zu Kopfe

zu steigen, als recht eigentlicher »Verlegung von unten nach oben«. Von diesem Sprungbrett nun aber, gelingt ihm jener gewaltige Absprung erst, der die Bedeutung der Libido fürs kulturelle Leben überhaupt erneut, der Sprung vom _leibhaft Libidobetonten in die Welt sachlicher Betonungen_, von infantilster Selbstbezogenheit mitten hinein ins Außen-gegenüber. Dies Außen nicht symbolistisch verbrämend, sondern sachlich begutachtend, es real nutzend. Dadurch, daß es immer wieder noch unser Narzißmus selbst ist, woraus -- im Normalfall und in idealer Konsequenz -- auch noch die geistigsten, weitumspannendsten Aufarbeitungen sich ergeben, bekommt er, der Leibentsprungene, nun neuerdings, auf neue Weise, doch wieder Realboden unter die Füße: Sachlichkeit ist das gloriose menschliche Ziel, das dem Narzißmus endlich im Dienst von Forschung oder Fortschritt, Kunst oder Kultur, als verwandelter Eros zuwinkt wie aus Träumen der Kindheit. Wo er in kindischen Träumen stecken blieb, wo sein großer Sprung zu kurz ausfiel, da entgleist er auch an sich selbst ins Pathologische, Bodenlose.

III.

Was bedeutet nun im Grunde dieser Überschätzungsdrang, der das Objekt aus seiner Einzelheit und Wirklichkeit ins symbolisch Gewertete und Gültige rückt, und der, im Parallelvorgang dazu, den narzißtischen Urtrieb sich in Sublimationen hinaufarbeiten läßt? Beides beruht wohl darauf, daß der bewußtgewordene Mensch sich, je länger je mehr, genötigt sieht, mit seinen infantilen Identifikationsmethoden stets indirekter zu verfahren, d. h. also: sich ihre Undurchführbarkeit stets gleichnishafter zu verhehlen. Das ermöglicht er durch Wertübersteigerung des stellvertretenden Stücks: im _Wertüberschuß_ wird es gleichsam wieder zum Inbegriff selber, ersetzt diesen im Geist. Der narzißtische Libidobetrag, der damit darin stecken bleibt, besticht erfolgreich das der Realität immer angepaßtere Urteil, schließt mit diesem einen Vermittlungspakt, wonach recht eigentlich »Wert« symbolisch für Inbegriff, für »Ein und Alles« steht. Wertproblem überhaupt ist immer und jedesmal Libidoproblem: lediglich durch Anleihe beim libidinösen Zustand enthebt irgendwas sich der Begrenztheit, Aufeinanderbezogenheit des Übrigen. _Alles_ Werten strebt dem Überschätzen entgegen und hinweg aus der Relativität des Einzelngeltenden: es langt, verlangt unabwendbar nach Überzeugtsein durch Glauben (jenem Glauben, bei dem »kein Ding unmöglich« ist, sogar nicht die Wiederanknüpfung infantilsten Urtraums an sachlichste Welterfahrung; mag auch dabei unser sich sublimierender Narzißmus, dieser idealisierende Streber, uns dabei einigermaßen ähnlich werden lassen ewigen Toggenburgern, die ihren Liebesgegenstand um so reichlicher anhimmeln, als sich ihre reale Vermählung mit ihm unvollziehbarer erweist). Mit wie vielen Beweisen und Begründungen wir auch vorzugehen pflegen, nie gelingt darin Überzeugendes ohne heimlich-persönlichsten Anschluß an die narzißtische Forderung in uns; und wiederum: ist sie genehmigt, dann gelänge es keiner Gegenmacht, uns um-zuüberzeugen: versicherten wir noch so bescheiden, es ergäbe sich dadurch wohl nur eine subjektiv-gültige Bewertung, wir wissen sie trotzdem als end- und allgültig, so gewiß unser Narzißmus selbst nichts weiter ist, als das im Gefühlserlebnis noch dunkel festgehaltene Wissen _um unser Subjektivstes als unsere objektive Anschlußstelle_. Von aller Metaphysik, sofern sie das »Sein« mit »Gott« als absolutem Wertprinzip in Übereinstimmung zu bringen trachtet, gilt darum, daß sie nicht nur in ihrer Denkungsweise narzißtisch mitbedingt, sondern an sich das philosophisch aufgearbeitete Abbild des Bundes von Narzißmus und Sachlichkeit ist. Am unmittelbarsten vielleicht tritt dieser doppelte Sachverhalt hervor in der Frage nach dem _Lebenswert_, der nur durch ihn, erst durch ihn, zur Frage _wird_, indem es hier um den Narzißmuswert selber geht, ob auch das Urteil darüber sich ergehen mag wie über ein sachlich gegenüberstellbares Objekt. Im Lebensrausch als solchem -- wovon ja dem Gesunden hilfreich was in Blut und Hirn kreist -- also im narzißtisch hinter allem weiterbeharrenden Rausch, behält ewig der Optimist recht; bei Absehen von dieser innern »unsachlichen« Voraussetzung der Pessimist, d. h. der libidolos, »lieblos« Urteilende, nur eben unrecht hinsichtlich des Lebensträgers, des allein und eigentlich Lebendigen! Wo das Narzißtische im Menschen zu stark übergreift, da bringt seine Allzu-Zuversichtlichkeit trotz ihrer lebensweckenden Kräfte ihn in peinlichen Anprall an die Außenrealität; wo es dagegen zu geschwächt dem realgerichteten Urteil unterliegt, da bringen selbst dessen beste, glücklichste Erfolge keinen wirklichen Frohmut zustande. Darum gleicht sich dem sogenannten Normalen das Dasein ungefähr aus zwischen diesen beiden Richtungen, die gleichsam andeutungsweise, innerhalb der Normalität, etwas vom »Manischen« und etwas vom »Melancholischen« enthalten; auch normalerweise schon übertreibt sich der Tatbestand beidemale fälschend -- und sagt damit dennoch mehr aus, als die gemäßigtesten Zustände tun, wenn sie sich _sehr_ weit von »Haß wie Liebe« entfernen: dermaßen _ist_ »Leben« total nur in seinen Überschätzungen nach beiden Seiten, in seinen zu absoluten Wertabschätzungen, in etwas über alles Stückhafte hinaus, _wahrhaft_, als »Leben« vorhanden.

Aber das narzißtisch bedingte Werten wird erst Problem, wird auch erst Leistung, recht eigentlich da, wo »wertvoll« und »libidobesetzt«, nicht so unmittelbar in eins fallen wie in der Frage nach dem Lebenswert selber: wo, statt dessen, die Wertgebung voraussetzt, daß, um sie zu vollziehen, wenigstens das Infantilste der Stellungnahme dazu aufgegeben, umgestellt sei. Mit anderen Worten: wo der symbolisierende Idealisierungsakt am Objekt schon begleitet ist vom sublimierend aufarbeitenden Akt am Trieb selber (scharf zu unterscheidende Vorgänge, die zu verwechseln _Freud_ mit Recht gewarnt hat). Es ist außerordentlich

interessant, daß vom Narzißmus her nicht nur des Objekts, sondern auch des Subjekts Aufstieg ins immer »wertvoller« Aufgearbeitete möglich ist, was _Freuds_ Wort vom Narzißmus als »Keimpunkt des Idealbildens« schon früh (»Z. E. d. Narz.«) festlegte. Dieser Punkt wird wesentlich, sobald unser Selbstbildnis infolge von Realerfahrungen daran, uns zu enttäuschen beginnt: »Unserm Ideal-Ich gilt nun die Selbstliebe, welche in der Kindheit das wirkliche Ich genoß« (_Freud_, ebenda). Weil hiefür aber auf die Dauer unsere infantile Wunschpraktik nicht ausreicht, nachdem das Weltgegenüber immer sachlichere Maßstäbe an uns legt, so entsteht damit eine Nötigung zu gewissen Rangordnungen in uns, zu Stufungen, Gliederungen auch in unserer Triebwelt. Unser Ebenbild, hineingewünscht ins Ideale, wirkt mit dessen Dimensionen auf uns zurück, manche Züge unterstreichend, andere ausradierend; noch fühlen wir uns schön und groß, ja erst recht groß, aber doch nur, sofern wir uns auch, in den abweichenden Zügen, auch klein oder zu häßlich finden, uns mißschätzen _können_, angesichts des Idealbildes, das wir sind und doch nicht in all und jedem sind. Diese Rückwirkung auf uns, vom narzißtischen Geformten nun ideal, religiös, ethisch oder wie immer, soll man ja nicht gering anschlagen. Es bleibt wesentlich selbst nach Abzug dessen, was bei seiner Bildung von fremden und Außenfaktoren in Betracht kam: einmal den Geboten und Verboten unserer Erzieher, unserer Umwelt, dem feineren oder gröberen Drill; sodann jenes Quantums Objektlibido(9), die uns an die pflegenden und bevormundenden Personen bindet und sie selbst zu nachahmenswertesten Symbolen aller Idealwerte umschafft. Dennoch sind wir bei alledem auch von uns aufs Stärkste beteiligt: wie der Narzißmus innerhalb der Objektlibido das Personelle symbolisch hochzutreiben weiß, wie er sich in immer sachlich weiterfassenden, geisthaftern, abstraktern Zusammenhängen noch durchsetzt, so kommt er auch von sich aus zu letzter Wertautonomie. Sagt ihm am frühesten sein Gefühl, heiß wünschend: »Leben schon gleich Wert!« so vollendet sich das reifste in einem _fordernden_: »Nur Wert allein wahrhaft Leben«, und auch noch diese absolut sich gebärdende, über das Sein gesetzte Wert-Überwertung (die doch um des Seins halber überhaupt erst anhob), dieses Ethische in Reinkultur, auch das ist noch als Höchstleistung unseres Narzißmus zu buchen.

(9) Vortrefflich prägt den Unterschied zwischen Drill und Liebesgesinnung eine (mir gesprächsweise in dieser Form bekannt gewordene) Bemerkung I. _Marzinowskis_: Im einen Fall sucht man Heimlichkeit über eine Verfehlung zu wahren, den Strafakt zu umgehen, als sei sie damit wie unbegangen, im anderen Fall ersehnt man im Gegenteil Beichte, Bekenntnis, auf die Knie sich zu werfen, an die Brust dessen, für den man _liebenswert_ sein will. -- Weniger einverstanden bin ich, wenn _Marzinowski_ in: »Die erotischen Quellen des Minderwertigkeitsgefühls« (Zeitschr. f. Sexualw. IV) ohneweiters volle Reife darin sieht, über das Verlangen nach Gegenliebe, zur Liebesautonomie: »wenn ich dich liebe, was gehts dich an!« zu kommen. Zwar stimmt dies zu den sittlichen Anforderungen bestechend, klingt prächtig selbstlos, redet aber recht oft die Sprache unseres Narzißmus, der noch _gar nicht bis zur vollen Objektliebe gelangte_. Man denkt sich unter narzißtisch Veranlagten zu ausschließlich von Gegenliebe Abhängige (was weit mehr von den bewußter Ich-Eitlen oder aber Narzißmus-Schwachen gilt) anstatt Selbstgenügsame, _weil_ unbewußte Allteilhaber, die auch im Objektlibidinösen nur sehr lose an den Äußerungen vom Objekt her hängen. Bedrängt durch narzißtisches Zuviel, kann ihnen höchst egoistisch »Geben seliger denn Nehmen werden«, d. h. sie dankbarer stimmen für eines Menschen Gewalt, Liebe in ihnen zu wecken, als für seine Gegenliebe, die sie leicht beschämt und neu bedrängt.

Mir erscheint dieser Umstand um so bedeutsamer, als er klarlegt, von wie tief her psychoanalytische Einsicht in die ethischen Unter- und Beweggründe dringt: _Freuds_ Ausspruch vom »narzißtischen Keimpunkt des Idealbildens« rückt ebenso weit ab von metaphysischen Notbehelfen bei Betrachtung psychologischer Tatbestände, wie von jener rationalistischen Einstellung, die überall auf Außeneinflüsse zurückgeht (Nutzen oder Zwang unter nachfolgender Sanktion). Mit _Freud_ reicht die Frage so tief, als der Mensch Menschlichem zu folgen imstande ist: ins Ursprünglichste seiner selbst, dorthin, wo er seiner selbst bewußt wurde und diese Vereinzelung wiederzuergänzen sucht, noch entgegen der eigenen Triebgewalt in Gehorsam oder Liebe, um auf solchem Umweg das Urerlebnis der Allteilhaftigkeit wiedererneuen zu können. Würde das immer schärfer unterschiedenere Ich sich überrennen lassen vom Durcheinanderlaufen der Triebe, so bliebe es auf ein gewaltsames Infantilisieren beschränkt, dem die Außenwelt verloren geht, ohne daß der Urzustand des ihrer noch unbewußten Kindes wiederherstellbar wäre. Freilich ist ja die Ineins-Setzung unserer selbst mit Höchstwerten einerseits ebenfalls eine phantasierte Wirklichkeit, ob wir ihr noch so sehr nachstreben: anderseits aber verbürgt gerade dies Unbedingte daran, wie ganz aus unserm Wesen gebürtig sein muß, was wir mit so großer Gebärde gutheißen. Und in der Tat: wir sind es ja, die sich selbst enttäuschen oder mißfallen, der Gemaßregelte mit dem von seinem Idealwert ganz Benommenen bleiben untrennbar eins in uns, deshalb der narzißtische Liebesquell unentleert (weshalb auch neurotisch der an sich schier Verzweifelnde und der sich nahezu gottgleich Wähnende so verblüffend dicht beieinander stehen). Insofern bildet alle echte Ethik, alle ethische Autonomie, zweifellos ein Kompromiß zwischen Befehl und Begehr, während sie gerade das am prinzipiellsten zu vermeiden sucht: das Begehrte macht sie zwar unerreichlich, durch die Idealstrenge des geforderten Wertes, dafür aber bezieht sie das Befohlene tief ein in den Urtraum allesumfassenden, allesuntergründenden Seins. Dieser Kompromißcharakter verrät sich deutlich auch noch an den starrsten Wertsetzungen -- ja gerade an denen -- den

unterirdischen Zusammenhängen von Gesolltem und Gewünschtem, oder, anders benamst: von Ethik und Religion. Kann keine Religion ein irgendwie ethisch gültiges Moment entbehren (d. h.: daß das Kind zum Vater _aufblicke_), so ebenso gewißlich keine ethische Selbstbezwingung ein Moment der Mutterwärme, die sie darüber hinaus umfängt. Alles, was wir »sublimieren« nennen, beruht einfach auf dieser _Möglichkeit, auch noch Abstraktestem, Unpersönlichstem gegenüber etwas wahren zu können, von der letzten Intimität libidinösen Verhaltens_; nichts als dies ermöglicht den Vorgang, wobei: »die sexuelle Energie -- ganz oder zum großen Teil -- von der sexuellen Verwendung abgelenkt und anderen Zwecken zugeführt wird« (_Freud_, Drei Abh. z. Sexth.). Im religiösen Erlebnis, im »fromm« gerichteten Menschen, schießt früheste, elterngebundene Objektlibido in die narzißtische Strömung mit hinein, und schafft damit eine rechte Glanzleistung des Narzißmus: indem nun beide gemeinsam münden im Gotteswert, als dem zugleich Allesbeherrschenden und Allerintimsten. Was dem Objekt der Libido sonst so übel bekam: das Sichverflüchtigen des Personellen in immer stellvertretendere Symbolik, eben das bringt es am Gotteswert zum Meisterstück, nämlich dermaßen zum Symbol aller Liebessymbole, daß Gott sich daran verpersönlicht(10).

(10) So sehr freilich, daß die Objektidealisierung sogar die Triebsublimierung lähmen kann, und der Gott mehr Entzücken bewirkt als Moral. Übrigens ist es massiv und richtig Gläubigen auch meistens nur selbstverständlich, wenn etwa im Jenseits neben hochsublimierten Glückssorten auch die infantilsten Wünsche sich drastisch durchsetzen -- Askese gilt nur dem Hineingelangen. Erst dem außerhalb solcher Gläubigkeit Stehenden erscheint das nicht folgerichtig, beleidigt seine moralische Logik; und doch lediglich, weil _sein_ erhöhtes, »frommes« Verhalten den stofflichen (Kinder-) Himmel und zugehörigen Personengott, von sich aus, in sich selber, wertend ersetzen muß. Ihm geschieht es deshalb leicht, sich selbst gegenüber weniger ehrlich zu bleiben, und trotz seiner nüchternern sachlichern Einsicht, den narzißtischen Grund und Boden zu verleugnen (den der naive Glaubenshimmel ruhig mit überwölbt), weil er auf seiner obersten irdischen Kippe balancieren muß.

So muß denn das, was zuinnerst des Religiösen wirksam ist -- die Richtung auf ein vertrauensvoll idealisierendes Narzißtisches -- auch den von üblichen Glaubensvorstellungen Gelösten in seinen Sublimationsbestrebungen orientieren, sollen sie ihn nicht in eine Entfremdung zu sich selber geraten lassen. Soll er nicht, dem ihm Wertvollsten hingegeben, es nicht zugleich hoch über ihn hinwegfliegen sehen, ihn nur gerade so weit mit emporreißend, daß er beschämt und entrüstet auf sein flügellahmes Selbst heruntersieht, kurz, daß er statt des beabsichtigten Fluges in Gewissensängste, Schuldgefühle niedersinkt. In ernsthaftester Weise ist _Freuds_ Warnung zu beachten: sich über gegebenes Vermögen an Sublimationen zu »übernehmen«, heiße nicht Vollkommenheit, sondern Neurose vorbereiten. Aber wieder stoßen wir dabei darauf, wie tief und nüchtern _Freud_ sich psychoanalytisch die Ethikprobleme auch hinsichtlich des Schuldbewußtseins erschließt: wie -- wiederum sowohl abseits von metaphysisch als auch von äußerlich (utilitaristisch) vorgenommenen Lösungen -- die Frage sich ihm dahin beantwortet, daß unser narzißtischer Größenwahnrest auch noch dem ethischen Ehrgeiz, dem Aufwärts- und Vorwärtstreiben des real angepaßten Ich, zugrundeliegt, wobei dann am Wege verachtet zurückbleibt, was der anstrengenden Gangart nicht gleich folgen kann. Bis der Mensch »sich« nur noch von demjenigen aus ansieht, was er allein als Sein wertet, ohne es doch _sein_ zu können, und deshalb seine eigene Beschaffenheit zu verdrängen, zu verleugnen suchen muß, ohne von ihr doch frei zu werden. Verhältnismäßig harmlos erweist solcher Vorgang sich noch beim Strafe befürchtenden »Drill«, ja sogar noch beim Gehorsam aus objektbesetzender Liebe, die sich nicht genug tat: rührt er jedoch bis an den narzißtischen Urgrund der ethischen Phänomene, dann ist Schuldbewußtsein, Reue bereits nur noch Name für Erkrankung. Darum sind wohl alle Neurosen immer auch Schuldneurosen, und immer unter dem Kennzeichen, daß der Mensch aus der instinktsicheren Gesundheit seiner Selbstachtung sich hinausgedrängt fühlt, trotzdem er als Neurotiker gar nicht der Typus des »Begehrenden«, sondern der des empfindlich reagierenden Gewissens zu sein pflegt, und eben deshalb die rumorenden Wünsche überängstlich hinter Schloß und Riegel hält. Eine Vertiefung dieses Zwiespalts bis zum Bruch ist es, wenn im Gegensatz dazu der Psychot das Gewissen außer Spiel gesetzt sieht, triebhemmungslos wird, und wohl nur da und nur dann bloßer Phantasieverbrecher bleibt, sofern er schon zu negativistisch von der Realwelt abgekehrt steht um handelnd in sie einzugreifen. Weshalb ja auch das neurotische Pathos in ihm zu ironisierendem Tonfall umschlagen kann, worin sein Ich, gleichsam schon unbeteiligter, machtloser Zuschauer, noch seine Kritik zum besten gibt, nachdem es seinerseits dem Ausschluß, der Verdrängung verfiel, sich desorganisierte und dadurch an Stelle der ihm gegenübergesetzten Realwelt die Technik der primitivsten narzißtischen Wunschproduktion in Wahnbildern am Werk sehen muß. (Traumtechnik des Gesunden.)

Ich gerate auf diese scheinbare Abschweifung aber deshalb, weil mir vorkommen will, als gäbe es ein Analogon für »neurotisch« und »psychotisch« auf dem Gebiet der Ethik für den Normalzustand. Nämlich außer Schuldgefühlen, bezogen auf das Ich, seine Mängel und Taten, auch noch ein ähnliches Enttäuschungsgefühl an Leben und Welt, wobei wir uns aber mitschuldig fühlen, dem wir also nicht pharisäisch oder bettelnd als etwas anderes gegenüberstehen, sondern wobei wir _verletzt sind_ an einer _narzißtisch überlebenden Urverbundenheit_. Natürlich drückt dies das Infantilere aus im Vergleich zum ichgerichteten Gewissen,

das ums eigene Spezialseelenheil Sorge trägt, es kann aber daneben weiterbeharren. Ich entsinne mich aus meiner Kindheit und von noch später her eines grotesken Herzwehs über enttäuschende Mängel anderer, die mich weit mehr »ethisch« grämten als die eigenen Mängel: denn was konnte es nützen, vollkommener zu werden, wenn es nicht um das Ganze der Welt, und nur darum auch mich mit einbegriffen, derartig vollkommen bestellt war? Entzücken und Dankbarkeit riß mich hin, wo etwas solchen Glauben zu bewahrheiten schien, und enthob mich damit betrüblich rasch jeder persönlichen Gewissenssorge, welche Figur denn ich mitten drin machen würde. So viel Kindisches das auch ausdrückt, so liegt doch fraglos eine Spur Ironie in dem Umstand, daß der Andere, Gewissenhafte, der von seiner Selbstsucht am ethischesten loskommen Wollende, am eifrigsten und ständigsten mit sich beschäftigt bleiben muß, sich weder in Herzweh noch Herzenslust völlig vergessen darf. Deshalb sind auch noch bei der ethischen Einstellung zweierlei Verhaltungsweisen unterscheidbar: die eine vorwiegend von den Wertanforderungen des Ichbewußtseins aus und das Ich strebend im Mittelpunkt haltend, die andere von den alten Identifizierungskünsten des Narzißmus aus, aber gleichfalls aufgearbeitet in ethisch gerichtete Wunschträume. Dies jedoch dient aus einem bestimmten Grunde einer wichtigen Seite der Sache: denn offenbar entnimmt ja alle Ethik ihren Hauptcharakter, eben ihre Unbedingtheit, Absolutheit, Allgültigkeit dem narzißtischen Urzuschuß, der so sehr für alles Übermäßige zu haben ist, und »ethisiert« uns erst an diesem fragwürdigen Material. So kommt es zu Wechselwirkungen von beiden, deren Paradoxie, näher betrachtet, schwer überboten werden könnte. Gibt es doch keine Askese oder Gesetzesstrenge, kein endgültiges Verachten des Realen, das nicht nach dem narzißtischen Helfershelfer dabei riefe, erst er, der begehrliche, wunschdreiste, lehrt uns auch das: »geh an der Welt vorüber, es ist nichts.« Und anderseits: eben die absolut gerichtete Ethik bedarf der ganzen Fülle des Möglichen und Wirklichen, muß allen Sonderfällen des Geschehens gerecht werden, alle Aufeinanderbezogenheiten berücksichtigen, denn um der Menschen und ihres Heils- und Glückstraums willen ist sie da, vom kindlichselbstischen bis sublimen Egoismus des Himmelsstürmers und Gottsuchers. Dies Wesen der ethischen Praktik, die ihre Unbedingtheit narzißtisch bedingt, sowie wiederum diese strenge, hoheitsvolle Wertmiene des ethisch verwendeten Narzißmus, ergeben einen derartigen Knäuel von Widersprüchen von Fall zu Fall, daß man ruhig behaupten kann: nur rein schematisch verfuhr, wer jemals, über den Einzelfall hinaus, diese lebenstrotzende Wirrnis in glattem Faden aufwickelte.

Nun kann ich aber dies Thema nicht abbrechen, ohne eines hinzugesetzt zu haben: nämlich wie sehr eben dies meine ganze Hochachtung und Ehrfurcht vor dem Phänomen des »Ethischen« im Menschen geradezu ausmacht. Denn erst dadurch erhebt es sich zu den schöpferischen Betätigungen, ungeachtet es auf Gesetz und Regel und Soll ausgeht. Ja durch die Reibung innerhalb solchen Widerspruchs -- durch die Unbedingtheit, die dennoch sich lediglich durchzusetzen vermag »von Fall zu Fall«, d. h. im lebendigen Vollzuge allein -- wird es _die_ schöpferische Tätigkeit par excellence, vollziehend das, was »nie und nirgends sich begeben«. Ethik: sich erst voll ausweisend im vorschriftsmäßig am wenigsten zu Schlichtenden, im Durcheinandersichkreuzen der Gebote und Verbote, erst damit wahrhaft autonom das Gültige zum Erlebnis hebend. Begreiflicherweise bleibt Vorschrift, Gesetz, das prinzipiell betonteste da, wo heimliche Wunschzutaten abgewehrt werden sollen, trotzdem aber ist in irgend einem Sinne »Ethik« auch immer zugleich das Unvorgeschriebene, schlechthin Gedichtete, d. h. trägt in all ihrem Tateifer wie ihrem Werk zugleich das Stigma des Verträumten, woraus Dichtertat sich zum Werke formt. Nur, leistet der Dichter »träumend«, so handelt in die Praxis hinein der ethisch gerichtete Mensch: wagt seinen Traum an Realität, Drangsal, Erfahrung, an den Anprall aller Zufälle und Wirrnisse. Darin liegt die Würde des Bruchstückhaften, nie Vollendeten, was ihm allenfalls gelingt, verglichen mit künstlerischer Werkrundung, deren Abseits er nicht ertrüge, die er sprengt, um sie nochmals und nochmals aufs Spiel zu setzen. Ethik ist _Wagnis_, das äußerste Wagestück des Narzißmus, seine sublimste Keckheit, sein vorbildliches Abenteuer, der Ausbruch seines letzten Mutes und Übermutes ans Leben.

IV.

Bei dem, was Kunst genannt wird, künstlerisches Schaffen, oder sagen wir allgemeiner: poetisch anstatt praktisch gerichtete Betätigung, braucht man die narzißtische Kinderstube nicht erst an Restbeständen daraus aufzuspüren wie bei Objektbesetzungen oder Wertsetzungen: unmittelbar nimmt es immer wieder von dorther den Ausgang, auf eigenem Pfad, verfährt bis in alle letzten Ziele, narzißtisch »wertend« und »besetzend«. Die gleiche Methode stünde uns allen auch lebenslänglich, jeglichen Augenblick und bei jedem Eindruck zu Gebote, würden wir uns durch unsere logisch-praktische Anpassung an die Ich- und Realwelt nicht ihrer so grundsätzlich entledigen, daß wir meistens nur erinnernd dorthin zurückkönnen, wo Innen-Erlebnis und Außen-Vorfall noch ungetrennt für dasselbe Geschehen stehen. Für dies Erinnern gilt darum etwas anderes als fürs Gedächtnis, wovon _Freud_ vermerkt, es scheine: »ganz am Bewußtsein zu hängen, und ist scharf von den Erinnerungsspuren zu scheiden, in denen sich die Erlebnisse des Unbewußten fixieren« (Fußnote aus »Das Unbewußte«); denn diese sind im Bereich wirkender »Sachvorstellungen«, nicht davon abgezogener »Wortvorstellungen« (_Freud_) zu denken, dieser bloßen Verständigungskonventionen, deren wir uns gedächtnismäßig bemächtigen. Äußerste Exaktheit, Triumph besten Gedächtnisses,

kann so in umgekehrtes Verhältnis geraten zu Erinnerungsklarheit, die, in lebendigem Zusammenhang der Eindrücke wirksam, gleichsam nur an Leben entlang sich ins Bewußtsein hebt: Gedächtnis _haben_ wir, Erinnerung _sind_ wir. Das allein ist der Grund des unkünstlerischen bloßen »Abbildes«, und gilt darum weder für Kinder noch für Primitive, sofern sie Reales noch phantastisch, Phantasiertes als real nehmen können. Am schönsten kennzeichnet die vorgetäuschte Bewegung des Films den Gegensatz zu Erinnerungsbewegtem: man könnte sich sogar denken, daß derartige, dem Gedächtnis allzu tadellos nachhelfende Vergegenwärtigungen von Vergangenem, Erinnerung auf tödliche Weise beeinflussen würden, sie desorganisierend, zersetzend in ihrer grundliegenden Totalität. Gewissermaßen ist ja Erinnerung ein nie nur »praktischer«, immer auch schon »poetischer« Vollzug: sie ist damit sozusagen das einem jeden von uns aufbewahrte Stück Dichtertum, Ergebnis zugleich Distanz schaffender, bewußte Überschau ermöglichender Vergangenheit, und ewig-erneuter Aktualität und Affektivität, auch wo sich beides nicht so formend zusammentut wie im Werk des Poeten. Poesie ist Weiterführung dessen, was das Kind noch lebte und was es dem Heranwachsenden opfern mußte für seine Daseinspraxis: Poesie ist perfektgewordene Erinnerung.

Nun gibt es nichts, was tiefer in Kindheitseindrücke zurückbrächte, als aufgehobene Verdrängungen und nichts strebt von sich aus heftiger nach solcher erinnernder Befreiung als das kindliche, noch so ganz von Geboten und Verboten der Erwachsenen umstellte Leben. An die infantilen Verdrängungen schließen die spätern sich an -- bilden damit den »Schatz von Erinnerungsspuren, welche der bewußten Verfügung entzogen sind, und die nun mit assoziativer Bindung das an sich ziehen, worauf vom Bewußtsein her die abstoßenden Kräfte der Verdrängung wirken. Ohne infantile Amnesie, kann man sagen, gäbe es keine hysterische Amnesie« (_Freud_, Drei Abh. z. Sexth.). Schon früh, in seiner Studie über »die Dichter und das Phantasieren«, faßte _Freud_ daher Kunst auf als Spezifikum gegen Verdrängungsgifte, und welche Erweiterungen seine Arbeit über den Gegenstand auch seither durch ihn erfuhr: dieser Hauptpunkt bleibt derselbe, wenn er auch den Unwillen der Künstler erregt infolge meist zu flacher Auslegung. Man achtet nämlich zu häufig nur darauf, daß die Kunst Wunscherfüllungen gewährleistet, die sonst gar nicht oder nur strafbar oder endlich krankhaft sich durchsetzen, man übersieht aber darüber die ganze Tragweite der _Freud_schen Unterscheidung von »bewußtem« und »unbewußtem« Wunschziel. Niemand bedarf weniger der Erfüllung von Personalwünschen wie der Künstler. Niemand bleibt weniger in ihnen stecken, ja niemand kommt von vornherein, eben als Schaffender, von Erfüllungen _her_, statt ihnen nur nachzujagen. Durch zeitweiliges Zurückgenommensein in ursprünglicheren Zusammenschluß dessen, was sich uns sonst nur in Subjekt und Objekt spaltet, ist er seinem Einzelsinn und Privatsein im Schaffen enthobener als sonst irgendwo: ja eben dies allein gestattet und ermöglicht ihm die Aufhebung des Verdrängenden, eben dies erst gibt ja seinen Regungen eine Freiheit wieder, wie wenn sie »ich-gerecht« im Sinn der Bewußtseinszensur wären (vgl. _Freud_: »das Unbewußte wird für diese eine Konstellation ich-gerecht, ohne daß sonst an seiner Verdrängung etwas abgeändert würde. Der Erfolg des Unbewußten ist an dieser Kooperation unverkennbar; die verstärkten Strebungen benehmen sich doch anders als die normalen, sie befähigen zu besonders vollkommener Leistung«). Dafür ist maßgebend, daß nicht auf unser Individual-Ich, wie es sich bewußt auf sich selbst bezieht, dabei zurückgegangen sei, sondern auf jene noch Allen gemeinsame Grundlage, auf Aller Wesenskindheit, wie sich auch der künstlerische Mitgenuß hierauf nur gründen kann(11). Ohne es zu wollen, hat so der Künstler sein Publikum in sich, bei sich, und nur um so mehr, je vollständiger er davon abzusehen pflegt, aufgebraucht vom Schaffensvorgang selber. Wird es -- meines Erachtens -- beim ethischen Verhalten auffallend, wie sehr das Allgemeingültige letztlich sich »ethisch« doch nur durchführen läßt von »Fall zu Fall«, in solchem scheinbaren Selbstwiderspruch gerade seine eigentliche schöpferische Bedeutung erst offenbarend, so überrascht am allerpersönlichsten Erfaßtsein des Künstlers, wie sehr, wie ganz es immer schon das Allgemeine mit umfaßt, um erst daran wirklich, Werk, zu werden. Hier erschließt sich das anscheinend Subjektivste als Anschlußstelle des objektiv Gültigsten. Dazu stimmt die Erfahrung, daß schaffendes Verhalten, je leichter, sieghafter es sich durchsetzt, in desto rücksichtsloseren Gegensatz oft tritt zum, körperlich oder seelisch bestimmten, sonstigen Personalzustand: darin tatsächlich der Leibesfrucht ähnlich, deren Wachstum zu Verlagerungen, Bedrängnissen im übrigen Organismus führt oder Muttergift durch seine Adern kreisen läßt. Nicht selten erwacht der Künstler aus seiner Benommenheit wie aus einer zwangshaften, mit dem Gefühl von Befreiung, nun wieder an Beliebiges denken zu dürfen, sich in personell oder sachlich Wünschbarem ungehindert gehen zu lassen. Wobei er sich dann freilich oft mitverwandelt fühlt durch das Vorhergehende: als habe vieles sich erledigt, was vorher am stärksten beschäftigte, als seien Umwertungen eingetreten, die zuvor Unmerkliches neu betonen, Altes verjüngen, Junges vergreisen ließen.

(11) Innerhalb davon dürfte sich zweierlei Schaffensart unterscheiden lassen, je nachdem, wie weit Aufhebung von Verdrängungen vorwiegend in Frage kommt. Diese kann den Vorgang so kampf- und angstvoll einleiten, daß er zunächst Widerstreben statt Freude weckt; Hermann _Bang_ erzählte mir, wie oft er bei Arbeitsausbruch vom Stuhl springe und ans Fenster eile, hoffend, etwas Ablenkendes draußen möge ihn daraus erlösen. Glücksgefühl stellt sich hier erst als abgeworfener Verdrängungsdruck, als Kraftersparnis ein (analog den _Freud_schen Ausführungen über die Witztechnik). Positiver, bedingungsloser wirkt das Glück, wo es sich weniger um Verdrängungskampf handelt, als um unwillkürlich an uns sich vollziehende Erweiterungen, Ausweitungen

unseres Wesens: um Beschenktwerden mit etwas, was nicht Wunsch oder Versagung in unserm Dasein gewesen war, sondern was praktisch uns gar nicht »lag«, d. h. unserer persönlichen Struktur nicht entsprach, »verdrängt« also schon wurde mit der andrängenden Fülle unverwendbarer Ureindrücke. Im tiefen Zurückreichen bis ins Infantilste kann uns gerade daraus zufallen, was sich damit »werkhaft« erledigt: Ergänzung, Ahnung, die hoch um uns herum reicht, uns nun erst einschließend ins Menschentum Aller. Der identifizierende Narzißmus, von produktiver Phantasie aus seiner Infantilität emporgerissen, beteiligt sich berauscht daran, ohne daß unsere persönliche Ichhaltung praktisch verändert würde.

Interessant studiert es sich am Geschlechtlichen: wie durchaus es mit seinen Hauptkomplexen im Schaffensmittelpunkt stehen bleibt, an der Konzeption zutiefst damit beteiligt, und dennoch nur soweit, als es aufgearbeitet wurde ins -- gleichsam -- Privatwollustfreie, d. h. als der Zentralpunkt sich total aus dem personalen Umkreis verschob. Wo dies auch nur im geringsten mißlang, bedeutet die persönlich erstrebte Phantasiewunscherfüllung sofort das Versagen im Schöpferischen. Denn wohl bedarf der Künstler der Regression bis ins Infantilste und damit am leiblichsten Beeinflußte, aber auch nur er verhält sich auch hiezu »schaffend«. Der Anteil des Eros an Geistschöpferischem -- wie stark der Hinweis darauf auch _Freud_ verübelt wird -- gehört wohl zu den ältesten Erkenntnissen, und im Grunde sollte doch ebenfalls selbstverständlich sein, daß dafür nur _die_ Anteile daran in Betracht kommen, die wir nicht geradenwegs zum Normalziel abführen, sondern diesem Ziel entgegen, also infantil erhalten. Aber schöpferisch bedeutsam werden sie wiederum erst unter Beihilfe von Verdrängung: nur daß sie sich, anstatt aufs »Desinfantilisieren« und »Genitalisieren«, auf ein Entleiblichen des ursprünglich kindlich Polymorphen bezieht. Man möchte sagen: künstlerisches Schaffen _enthülst_ gewissermaßen aus dem Leibhaften den fruchtbaren Kern, der sich im Werk dann allseitig auswächst. Mit E. _Jones'_ Wort (aus der vorzüglichen Studie: »Die Empfängnis Mariae durch das Ohr«, Jahrbuch IV) gesagt, liegt im Künstlerischen: »die Reaktion gegen die Geschlechtlichkeit dem Streben, und ihre Sublimierung den Formen, die das Streben annimmt, zugrunde«(12). Daß Begehr und Reaktion, beide, hier gewaltig vertreten sein müssen(13), darauf gründet _Schopenhauer_ sein bekanntes Experiment: sexueller Reizung nachzugeben um dann, jählings, vom Punkt hoher Steigerung, abzubiegen in Geistesarbeit. Man wäre versucht zu glauben, ähnliche Experimente müßten sich bestätigen nicht nur bezüglich speziell-sexualer Mitwirkung, sondern aller Triebhaftigkeit, z. B. auch von als »böse« gebrandmarkten Regungen, denen wir ja nur infantil-sorglos noch ohneweiters nachgaben. Das noch amoralische Begehren, so dicht bei seiner Umstülpung vom narzißtisch Ununterschiedenen ins kraß selbstisch Verengte, mag bei diesem Übergang Möglichkeiten in sich enthalten, die dem Menschen nicht in der Praxis, nur in schaffender Phantasie, ganz aufgehen. Ist doch »Sexuales« wie »Böses« in diesem Sinn allein, aber darin tatsächlich, dem Schaffenden vermehrt zu eigen: wenn _Goethe_ versichert, er wisse »von keinem Verbrechen, das er nicht auch begangen haben könnte«, so kennzeichnet das nicht den individuellsten, sondern typischesten, den noch infantil-alles enthaltenden Menschen, den, auf formkünstlerischem Wege zielmächtigsten, aber auch den schlechthin riskiertesten. (Es handelt sich darum: »zu begreifen, daß die bevorzugten Objekte des Menschen, ihre Ideale, aus denselben Wahrnehmungen und Erlebnissen stammen, wie die von ihnen am meisten verabscheuten, und sich ursprünglich nur durch geringe Modifikationen voneinander unterscheiden«; _Freud_, »Das Unbewußte«.) Entgleist der Mensch aus seinem Schaffenszustand, so sieht er sich infolgedessen furchtbar aufgehängt zwischen Nichts und Nichts: weder geborgen am Werk, noch an der Realwelt, worin er dem Urteil der anderen fragwürdig wurde wie dem eigenen, d. h. wie seinem Privatpersonentum innerhalb praktischer Weltgeltungen. Lassen schon Stockungen, Störungen während der Arbeit Künstler leicht als Neurotiker erscheinen, so gleicht die gefährliche Grundvoraussetzung alles Schaffens sie nahezu psychotischer Verfassung an: indem es sie hinter den Rücken ihres Ich zurückzieht in ihrer eigentlichsten Tätigkeit. Gelegentlich mehrfacher Beobachtungen habe ich mich immer wieder überzeugt, mit welcher Selbstverständlichkeit, bei unvermutetem Absturz aus produktivem Verhalten, ein Zurückfallen in Infantilismen sexueller Art sich einstellen kann (_Freuds_ Bemerkung bewahrheitend: »Das Höchste und das Niederste hängen an der Sexualität überall am innigsten aneinander.« Drei Abh. z. Sexth.). Gerade daran pflegt die Befürchtung sich zu verstärken: daß es sich wohl nicht nur um vorübergehende Unterbrechung handle, sondern um Nachlassen der geistigen Potenz überhaupt. Dies ist aber um so bedauerlicher, als Schaffenszustände oft geradezu derartiger Absetzungen, Aussetzungen _bedürfen_ mögen, solcher Erholungspausen des Bewußtseins, dem heimlich weitergehende Arbeit sich entzieht, etwa wie dem Auge der Säfterückzug in winterlichen Stamm entzogen bleibt, während dessen die Bäume sich umschütten mit aller Melancholie entleerten, entfärbten Laubes. Wir beurteilen uns eben vom Bewußtseinsauge aus, das wir prüfend auf uns richteten seit Überschreiten unserer Infantilgrenze; und dieser beurteilende, verurteilende Blick ist dann am unerbittlichsten, schärfsten, wie auch die Triebe an dieser Grenze hier am stärksten sich stauen und verstärken(14). Es ist deshalb, als ob der Schaffende noch einmal Kindheitsparadies wie Kindheitshölle gleichermaßen zu durchkosten bekäme.

(12) Ich finde eben zwei Verse von Hugo von _Hofmannsthal_, die sowohl die Verdrängungshilfe beim Schaffen, als auch dessen widerspruchsvolle Verknüpfung mit der Leiblichkeit hübsch wiedergeben:

1. »Aus der verschütteten Gruft nur wollt' ich ins Freie mich wühlen, Aber da brach ich dem Licht Bahn und die Höhle erglüht.«

2. »Fürchterlich ist diese Kunst! Ich spinn' aus dem Leib mir den Faden, Und dieser Faden zugleich ist auch mein Weg durch die Luft.«

(13) In seinen »Drei Abh. z. Sexth.« vermerkt _Freud_ die Tatsache, daß man, obwohl dem Schönen das sexuell Reizende praktisch zugerechnet zu werden pflegt, doch niemals die Genitalien selber als schön bezeichnete. Sicherlich erklärt sich daraus, wie ganz die Hochwertigkeit ästhetischer Betrachtungsweise sich nur gegen die Gepflogenheiten der Praxis durchsetzte: auch noch die Enthüllung des Nackten als Poesie bleibt insofern eine Folge des Feigenblattes.

(14) Der verstorbene junge Markus hat gut in einer kleinen Studie (Zentralblatt IV, 11-12 »Die Objektwahl in der Liebe«, p. 598) darauf hingewiesen, wie die _Freud_sche »Latenzzeit« es sei, worin diejenigen Urteile sich in uns festsetzen, die später der Sexualität so autoritativ wie aus anderer Welt gegenübertreten.

Entfremdetsein von unserm Ich ist uns harmlos nur gegeben in unserer allnächtlichen kleinen Psychose, unserem allnächtlichen wundersamen Schaffenszustand, dem Traum, der schon so vielfach primitivem Kunstwerk verglichen wurde. Was den Traum dem Schaffen vor allem anähnelt, ist die ungeheuere Objektivität, womit er seinen Inhalt vor uns hinstellt, auch noch an das scheinbar krauseste Durcheinander verblüffende Kraft überzeugender Formung, Gestaltung, verschwendend. Aber nicht einmal diese selbst enthält, meines Erachtens, das künstlerischeste Moment daran: sondern erst die Traumfähigkeit _so vielem gerecht zu werden unbeeinflußt von unserer persönlichen Stellungnahme dazu_. Man kennt _Lichtenbergs_ ärgerliche Frage, warum, um alles in der Welt, sogar Dichter außerstande seien, fremde Charaktere derartig treffend, wissend, unbestechlich durch eigene Vorurteile zu verlebendigen, wie der Traum es mühelos erzielt. Mir ist das stets als tiefster Beweis dafür erschienen, daß im gesunden, unbeschädigten Narzißmus an sich selber dies übersubjektive Moment wirksam sei, d. h. seine Wunscherfüllungen gar nicht umhin können, aus tiefer Identifikation mit allem herauszuschaffen, weil nur dies seiner unwillkürlichen Tendenz entspricht. Sowohl am manifesten wie latenten Traumtext finden sich Teile dieser Art, die sich über das persönlich Wünschbare hinaussetzen, den Träumer anderen gegenüber zu kurz kommen lassen, und, wenn psychoanalytisch weit genug verfolgt, auf das noch Allumfassende des Narzißtischen führen. Nur daß im Traum der Homer schläft, der das Werken zunutze machen könnte. In Wachträumen dagegen, wo die geistige Überlegenheit nicht schlummert und wo sie auch Beobachtungen des Sachverhalts so erleichtern könnte, fehlt damit auch jene narzißtische Identifikation mit ihrer ungewollt großzügigen Objektivität: Wünsche des Ichs gewinnen Oberhand und zerstören mit ihrer passiven Selbstbespiegelung den aktiven Formdrang(15). Auch im Kunstwerk kann es Punkte geben, daraus Traum oder Wachtraum verräterisch reden: d. h. ungenügende Bewußtseinsarbeit oder aber ungenügende Ichverdrängung -- Punkte, bei denen besonders erfolgreich Analyse ansetzen kann, während das künstlerisch Vollgelungene sich aller Berechenbarkeit entzieht: sozusagen nicht ermöglicht, auf der Linksseite des bunten Mustergewebes dem Verlauf der Fäden und Verknotungen nachzuspüren(16).

(15) Mir hat es sich bisweilen aufgedrängt, daß in Wachträumen sich Übergang vorbereitet zu tätig-produktivem Zustand, wenn der Wunschtext, der meist höchst bewußt zugrundeliegt, mit seinem passiven Realisierungsspiel zur Seite weicht vor einer gewissermaßen formalen Bewältigung seiner Einfälle. _Dieser Übergang selbst_ schert sich dann daran illustrativ zu spiegeln, schafft sich selber gleichsam Sinnbilder, so daß es dabei fast zugeht, wie bei _Silberers_ »funktionalem Phänomen«: nur, anstatt zwischen Wachen und Einschlafen, hier zwischen Wachtraum und Produktion, also nach der anderen Richtung dessen, was uns unserem isolierten Ichbewußtsein enthebt.

(16) Hinsichtlich der Psychoanalyse an lebenden schaffenden Künstlern möchte ich glauben, daß man äußerst vorsichtig und streng zweierlei mögliche Wirkungen auseinanderhalten muß: die künstlerisch befreiende, wodurch Hemmungen, Stockungen in den formentbindenden Sublimationsvorgängen beseitigt werden, und eine unter Umständen gefährdende, insofern sie ans Dunkel rühren kann, worin die Frucht keimt. Ob man sich ganz ans Personale, Außerästhetische, halten kann bei tiefer dringender Psychoanalyse, ist kaum zu beantworten bei unserem geringen Wissen um das Zustandekommen schöpferischer Vorgänge.

So ist denn, ganz abgesehen von der »Begabungsfrage«, auf die beim Künstlertum zurückgegangen sein muß, die _Objektivierungsnötigung_ schon in der narzißtischen Identifikation als alles Schaffens Grundlage gegeben. Der Werkdrang, der Formwille ergibt sich in seiner ganzen Wucht aus dieser noch ungeschiedenen Einheitlichkeit von passiv und aktiv, wovon unsere mittleren, unsere bewußtseinsvermittelteren, abgeleiteteren Zustände so wenig mehr wissen, und was darum auch die Sprache in ein Zweierlei zerzupft (obschon wir noch biologisch »Reizsamkeit« und »Reaktion« als identisches Lebensmerkmal auffassen). Indem nun Schöpfungen der Kunst sich außerhalb des praktischen Daseinsablaufs in ihrer Wirklichkeit durchsetzen müssen,

binden sie ihre Erlebnisweise an die _Wiederholbarkeit_; Form geworden heißt da: in Vorhandenheit, Gegenwart, Sein, beharren durch unabänderliche Festlegung bis ins Letzte und Äußerste, so daß jedem inneren Nachschaffen, jedem Mitgenuß das Ganze sich lebendig darstellt. Kinder, in ihrer Phantasiefrische, wissen am besten um diesen Umstand, wenn sie eifervoll darauf bestehen, Erzähltes absolut gleichlautend wiederzuhören, und jede Änderung daran als »Lüge«, als Angriff auf ein positives Sein, rügen. Diese Formehrfurcht, für die Form noch Inhalt in tieferem Sinn ist und umgekehrt, läßt leicht Kinder künstlerisch begabter erscheinen, als sich später beglaubigt; sie haben eben noch -- wörtlich -- »Spiel«raum dafür innerhalb der praktisch-logischen Realität, die sie noch nicht von allen Seiten zwingend umlagert und »Urgezeugtes« noch nicht an Welt und Ich vorbei, in ganz andere Kategorie verweist. So spielend-selig würde der Künstler sein Werk erleben, handelte es sich nicht darum, nachdem es ihm geschenkt ward, es zu übersetzen wie Träume erst in »sekundärer Bearbeitung« vor dem Entsinken bewahrt werden können. Eben daß es nicht um ein stückweis Werdendes, erst zu Erarbeitendes geht, sondern um Vorhandenheit, davon nur Schleier zu reißen sind, die sich verdichten, plötzlich undurchdringlich werden können, macht die eigentlich aufreibende Anstrengung bei der Arbeit aus, ihre Hast und Angst. Ohne die drei Allzumenschlichkeiten, die mit allem Schöpferischen zusammenhängen: den Kampf gegen dabei zu behebende Verdrängungen, die Gefahr des Entgleisens in infantile Materialität, und endlich diese hastende Überspannung -- wäre es eine »Anweisung zu seligem Leben«, wie sie sonst nichts auf Erden kennt, ein Schwelgen aus dem Vollen, worin Rausch und Frieden sich zur gleichen unerhörten Erfahrung einen. Nicht umsonst pflegt solchen Zeiten, noch ehe das Bewußtsein ihr Nahen gewahr wird, gleich einem Herold, Freude voranzugehen (im Gegensatz zu anderer, von uns mehr oder weniger als begründet gewußter Freude, eine dem Manischen ähnliche, wie auch jähes Vertriebensein daraus eher an pathologische Melancholie gemahnt als an normale Verlust-Trauer)(17). Im Schöpferischen, wenn irgendwo, finden wir die Farben und Bilder, womit sich uns fast Gotthaftes ins Irdische malt. Und wenn der Mensch sich einen Gott als Weltenschöpfer vorstellt, so ist das nicht nur, um die Welt, sondern auch des Gottes -- narzißtische -- Wesenheit zu erklären: mag solcher Welt Böses und Übel in Menge anhaften, der fromme Glaube würde erst zunichte an einem Gott, der nicht wagt Werk, Welt, zu werden.

(17) In »Über Trauer und Melancholie« (S. d. kl. Schr. z. Nl. IV) wirft _Freud_ die Frage auf, warum, trotz gewisser Vergleichbarkeit von Melancholie mit normaler Trauer, von Manie mit Frohsinn, wohl der Melancholie Manie folge, nicht aber der Trauer Frohsinn, sondern nur resignierende Gewöhnung, und ob die _Allmählichkeit_ der Gewöhnung an den Verlust das verursache: »Diese Lösung geht so langsam und schrittweise vor sich, daß mit der Beendigung der Arbeit auch der für sie erforderliche Aufwand zerstreut ist.« Außer solchem ökonomischen Gesichtspunkt kommt vielleicht noch in Betracht, daß, während Normaltrauer auf ihren Einzelfall beschränkt bleibt und eben an dem, was noch übrig bleibt, sich zur Resignation ausgleicht, für Melancholie narzißtisch »alles« hin ist, inbegriffen das eigene, sich selbst vernichtende und entwertende Ich, und ebenso der Umschlag in Manie »alles« wiederherstellt, also nicht an Gräber sich gewöhnt, sondern Auferstehungen feiert. Dies würde aufs Stärkste an die narzißtisch-durchsetzten Zustände des poetisch Schaffenden erinnern.

[Im folgenden werden alle geänderten Textzeilen angeführt, wobei jeweils zuerst die Zeile wie im Original, danach die geänderte Zeile steht.

als auch vom »inzestuosen Sich-eigner-Vaterseinwollen); nach einigen als auch vom »inzestuosen Sich-eigner-Vaterseinwollen«); nach einigen

(Intern. Zeitschr. II, 2, 119.)« Das Kriterium des Masochismus ist -- (Intern. Zeitschr. II, 2, 119.)« »Das Kriterium des Masochismus ist --

(8) Verschiedene Träume aus Knabenzeit gehören hieher; z. B. man (8) Verschiedene Träume aus der Knabenzeit gehören hieher; z. B. man

-- Askese gilt nur dem Hineingelangen. Erst den außerhalb solcher -- Askese gilt nur dem Hineingelangen. Erst dem außerhalb solcher

]

End of Project Gutenberg's Narzißmus als Doppelrichtung, by Lou Andreas-Salomé

==========

Untitled

Arnold Aletrino

Project Gutenberg Release: April 20, 2011 · eBook #35924

Produced by André Engels and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at http://www.pgdp.net

HERMAPHRODISIE EN URANISME.

VOORDRACHT,

den 5en Juni 1908 te Amsterdam voor de candidaten van de Juridische Faculteit van het A. S. C. gehouden

--DOOR--

Dr. A. ALETRINO,

Priv.-doc. I/d Crim. anthrop. a/d Universiteit te Amsterdam.

F. VAN ROSSEN--AMSTERDAM 1908.

Zeer gewenschte toehoorderessen en toehoorders,

Ik stel er prijs op, vóór ik aan mijn eigenlijk onderwerp begin, U te verzoeken, wel te willen bedenken, dat ik op het standpunt sta, dat niemand, en dus ook ik niet, het recht heeft zich met de geslachtsdaden van anderen te bemoeien of die te veroordeelen, wanneer door deze niet een van de twee personen, tusschen wie de daad geschiedt, of een derde benadeeld wordt en dat ik--en ik weet bij ondervinding, door en na het congres voor crimineele anthropologie in 1901 te Amsterdam gehouden, waar ik een rapport "Sur la situation sociale de l'uraniste" inzond, hoezeer men geneigd is iemand die over dat onderwerp schrijft of spreekt, verkeerde bedoelingen toe te dichten en verkeerde woorden in den mond te leggen--geen propaganda maak voor normale of, zooals men het heeft willen noemen, abnormale geslachtsuitingen, maar dat ik de kwestie alleen uit een humanitair en wetenschappelijk oogpunt bestudeer.

Drie redenen zijn er, waarom ik juist dit onderdeel der natuurwetenschappen heb uitgekozen om hedenavond met U te bespreken, al kan die bespreking--om de groote uitgebreidheid van het onderwerp--niet dan zeer onvolledig zijn en ik mij--om den beperkten tijd, waarover ik kan beschikken--zal moeten bepalen tot het slechts in groote lijnen aangeven der omtrekken en zoovele en belangrijke détails zal moeten laten rusten.

De eerste reden is, dat men er noch op colleges voor juristen, noch op medische colleges, noch op de colleges voor gerechtelijke geneeskunde over spreekt. Is dit, omdat men het onderwerp van te weinig gewicht acht? Of is het uit overmatige kuischheid? Want zoodra er over dit onderwerp wordt gesproken, steekt een, ik zou haast zeggen pathologische, kuischheid haar hoofd op. Als bewijs daarvan diene, dat, toen ik eenige jaren geleden een opstel over het uranisme aan een medisch tijdschrift hier te lande had gezonden, ik het terugontving met een begeleidend schrijven, waarin te lezen stond, "dat de Redactie voor dìt onderwerp geen plaats wilde afstaan". Als een ander bewijs van die kuischheid diene, dat men iemand die over het onderwerp schrijft of spreekt, als iemand betitelt, "die het goed recht van het bestaan van "gruwelen" bepleit". Ik heb het moeten verduren, dat de minister-president Kuyper, eertijds zoowel in een zitting van de Eerste, als in een van de Tweede Kamer, coram populo mijn goeden naam aantastte, om wat ik op bovengenoemd congres had gezegd[1], en dat later een onbekend atoom, een zekere heer v. d. Biesen, die mij tot professor verhief, hem in een zitting van de Eerste Kamer die woorden nabazelde![2]

De tweede reden is, dat in den laatsten tijd het vraagstuk meer op den voorgrond is geschoven. Ik behoef U slechts te wijzen op het geval, door de onbescheidenheid van sommige dagbladen met naam en toenaam aan het licht gebracht, van een beeldhouwster, die hier in Amsterdam werkte en die plotseling van sexe is veranderd en nu als beeldhouwer in het buitenland vertoeft; ik behoef U slechts het proces-Moltke contra Harden te noemen, dat kort geleden in Berlijn is afgespeeld; ik wil U wijzen op de twee rechtzaken hier in de laatste jaren behandeld, waarbij de aangeklaagde beschuldigd werd onzedelijke homosexueele handelingen met minderjarigen te hebben gepleegd.

De derde reden is, dat ik het van ongemeen groot gewicht voor U vind, dat Gij van het onderwerp op de hoogte zijt. Als rechter kan het U worden opgedragen in zulk een geval te oordeelen. Gij kunt als verdediger worden aangewezen om een beklaagde in zulk een geval bij te staan, evengoed als de geneesheer kan worden geroepen om in zulk een geval hulp en raad te geven. Wanneer ik bedenk in welke moeilijkheid ik zelf heb verkeerd, toen--kort nadat ik als geneesheer gevestigd was--de zoon van een mijner patienten tot mij kwam om raad en hulp en ik geheel onvoorbereid wat het onderwerp betreft, gedwongen was hem te helpen--hij is dan ook de oorzaak geweest, dat ik met de studie er van ben begonnen en dat ik mij er in heb verdiept--dan voel ik het mijn plicht U, als het maar eenigszins kan, voor deze moeilijkheden te vrijwaren en U eenig inzicht in het onderwerp te geven, opdat Gij er misschien later gemakkelijker verder in kunt doordringen.

* * * * *

Men heeft altijd gemeend--en zelfs nu nog denken de meeste menschen er niet dieper over na--dat het even gemakkelijk is het onderscheid tusschen den homo sapiens masculinus en den homo sapiens femininus te beschrijven, als het door het verschil in kleeding tusschen de beide sexen aangegeven wordt. Dit nu is niet het geval en het is zeer moeilijk, zoo niet onmogelijk, een eigenschap, een eigenaardigheid aan te toonen, die zóó specifiek bij de eene sexe voorkomt, dat zij bij de andere sexe niet te vinden is. Alle eigenaardigheden en eigenschappen, die men tot nu toe als specifiek voor de eene sexe heeft aangezien, vindt men terug of heeft men bij de andere sexe teruggevonden. Hoe meer de onderzoekingen der anthropologen worden uitgebreid, des te meer komt men tot de ontdekking, dat men zich in die eigenschappen heeft vergist of dat men er een te fantastische beteekenis aan heeft gehecht.

De vorm van het bekken b.v. dien men zelfs tot nu toe als een specifiek verschilsteeken tusschen de beide sexen heeft beschouwd, is gebleken niet zoo betrouwbaar te zijn. Men meent, dat een steil, nauw bekken aan den man eigen is, een wijd plat bekken alleen bij de vrouw voorkomt. Verschillende onderzoekers nu hebben aangetoond, dat men bij Arabische vrouwen en bij de vrouwen van sommige wilde stammen, wanneer men haar van achter beschouwt, onmogelijk door den vorm van het bekken kan uitmaken of men een man of wel een vrouw voor zich heeft.[3] De hand heeft een tijdlang als het verschils-kenteeken voor man en vrouw gegolden. Pfitzner de anatoom heeft eenige honderdtallen van mannen- en vrouwenhanden onderzocht en heeft geen enkel teeken kunnen aangeven, dat niet zoowel aan de vrouwenhand als, in andere gevallen, aan de mannenband eigen kan zijn[4]. Zelfs het ademhalingstype--de costaal- of borstademhaling bij de vrouw, de buikademhaling bij den man--is gebleken, wat de costaal-ademhaling betreft, door de kleeding en de beschaving te zijn ontstaan en het is bewezen, dat vrouwen van wilde volksstammen een abdominaal-ademhaling vertoonen, even goed als de mannen.[5]

Wanneer wij dus de eigenschappen en eigenaardigheden van de beide sexen willen bestudeeren, zijn wij gedwongen ons te houden aan wat bij de overgroote meerderheid der beide sexen voorkomt. En dan kunnen wij de verschillende eigenschappen, behalve in de twee groote groepen van primaire en secundaire geslachtskenmerken, verdeelen in vijf afdeelingen:

1e. De plaats waar de bevruchtende cellen gevormd worden: bij de vrouw het ovarium, bij den man de testis.

2e. De gangen en wegen, waarlangs de bevruchtende cellen het lichaam verlaten en naar buiten worden gevoerd: bij de vrouw de tubae, de uterus en de vagina, bij den man de epididymis, het vas deferens en de penis.

3e. De secundaire geslachtskenmerken, die eerst in den puberteitstijd duidelijk zichtbaar worden: bij de vrouw het langer worden van het hoofdhaar, het groeien der borsten en de menstruatie, bij den man de verandering van de stem, het groeien van den baard en het grooter worden van het strottenhoofd.

4e. De verschillende geestelijke en gevoelseigenschappen. De vrouw is o. a. meer intuïtief, zachtmoediger, passief, de man daarentegen logisch, harder, ondernemend e. d.

5e. De vrouw voelt zich geslachtelijk tot den man, de man voelt zich geslachtelijk tot de vrouw aangetrokken.

Het is van het grootste belang, duidelijk voor oogen te hebben, dat elk dier verschilsgroepen haar oorsprong in eenzelfden oeraanleg vindt.

Beschouwen wij de eerste groep iets nader. Wanneer men het menschelijk embryo vóór den dertigsten dag van het intrauterine leven beziet, kan men nog niet uitmaken of het een mannelijk of wel een vrouwelijk individu zal worden. De teeltklieren ontstaan in de buikholte, uit het epithelium, door Waldeyer "kiemepitheel" genoemd, dat naast de oernieren, aan de achterzijde van de buikholte ontstaat. Eerst in de vijfde week kan men door verschillende kenmerken bepalen of de teeltklier een ovarium of wel een

testikel zal worden. De ovariën blijven gedurende het geheele leven binnen het lichaam, terwijl de testikels kort vóór of kort na de geboorte buiten de buikholte dalen. Zelfs de kiemcellen zijn identieke vormsels. De kern van de eicel kan men gelijk stellen met den kop, terwijl het plasma van de eicel met den staart van het spermatozoïd kan vergeleken worden.

De tweede groep, de gangen en uitvoerwegen. In de tweede zwangerschapsmaand ziet men twee paar gangen in de buikholte ontstaan, de Wolffsche of oerniergangen en de Müllersche gangen, die naar onder loopen en te samen in de opening van de cloake (waarover straks) eindigen. Wordt het embryo een mannelijk individu, dan ziet men, dat de Wolffsche gangen zich sterk gaan ontwikkelen, terwijl de Müllersche gangen in ontwikkeling achterblijven. De ondereinden der vier gangen vergroeien met elkaar, er komen daaraan twee kleine uitstulpsels te voorschijn: de aanleg voor de latere prostata en de vesiculae seminales is daar. Wordt het individu daarentegen een vrouw, dan blijven de Wolffsche gangen in ontwikkeling achter, de bovenste gedeelten der Müllersche gangen worden de tubae, uit de benedenste, die met de uiteinden der Wolffsche gangen vergroeien, wordt de uterus en de vagina.

Doch ook de uitwendige geslachtsorganen zijn oorspronkelijk hetzelfde gevormd. Vóór de zesde week ziet men aan het ondereinde van het lichaam alleen een spleet, den uitgang van de cloake, de gemeenschappelijke afvoerbuis voor urine en faecaalstoffen. Pas in de tiende week van het intrauterine leven groeit een wand van binnen naar buiten in de cloake en vervormt die tot twee gangen, de eene voor den afvoer van de faecaalstoffen, de andere voor de latere wording van het urogenitaalstelsel. In de zesde week van het embryonaal bestaan, begint zich boven de cloake een knobbeltje te verheffen. In de tweede maand zien wij, dat daarin een spleet ontstaat, die zich richt naar dat gedeelte der spleet van de cloake, waaruit het urogenitaalstelsel zal worden en die zich daarin voortzet. Rondom de spleet welven een paar huidplooien op, terwijl er rondom het geheel een paar welvingen ontwikkelen, de geslachtswrongen.

Wordt het aanstaande individu een vrouw, dan verandert er verder maar heel weinig. Het knobbeltje groeit iets uit en wordt de clitoris, waarom heen zich een huidplooi legt, het praeputium clitoridis, terwijl het vooreinde zich verdikt en tot glans clitoridis wordt. De geslachtsspleet verdiept en verwijdt zich en wordt tot vagina, terwijl de geslachtsplooien die zich verder ontwikkelen tot labia minora, de wrongen--door groote vetvorming uitgegroeid--tot labia majora worden. Bij den man is de verandering die intreedt, grooter. Het knobbeltje verlengt zich meer dan bij de vrouw en wordt de penis, de randen van de geslachtsspleet groeien over de spleet heen en vormen de urethra, de geslachtsplooien groeien aaneen, waardoor het scrotum ontstaat, dat de neergedaalde testikels zal opnemen. De verschillende deelen der geslachtsorganen kan men dus met elkaar vergelijken: de clitoris komt overeen met den penis, de ovariën met de testikels, de labia met het scrotum, de uterus met de prostata.

Geschiedt nu echter de groei dier deelen niet zoo regelmatig als wij hierboven hebben aangegeven, maar blijven sommige deelen te vroeg in hun groei staan en groeien andere deelen te ver, dan ontstaat het individu, dat men met den naam "hermaphrodiet" bestempelt.

Deze naam is afgeleid van de namen ~Hermês~ (Hermes), en ~Aphroditê~ (Aphrodité), en is, volgens het verhaal door Ovidius in zijn Metamorphosen meegedeeld, ontstaan, doordat de zoon van Hermes en van Aphrodite zich in de bron Salmeikis baadde, waardoor de bronnymph verliefd op hem werd. Wijl hij haar echter verstootte, smeekte zij de Goden haar met het lichaam van haar geliefde te vereenigen. De goden willigden het verzoek in en daaruit is het tweeslachtig wezen, de "hermaphrodiet", geworden. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire definieert het hermaphroditisme als "de werkelijke of schijnbare, geheele of gedeeltelijke aanwezigheid van twee sexen in hetzelfde individu".[6]

Reeds van de oudste tijden is het hermaphroditisme bekend en er is geen godsdienst bijna, waarin niet (bij de polytheïstische) de oppergod of (bij de monotheïstische) de godheid als een androgyne wordt gedacht en voorgesteld. De Persische Mithras-Mithradienst, de Egyptische Phtha en Isisdienst, hadden de voorstelling van een androgyne godheid. De Japansche god "de geest der aarde" wordt als twee-geslachtige godheid voorgesteld, en zelfs de Noorsche Frigadienst laat de voorstelling van androgynie herkennen. Dat de Grieken zich hun voornaamste Goden, Zeus, Aphrodite en Pan, als androgynen dachten, evenals de Romeinen hun Priapus, bewijzen de kunstvoortbrengselen, die ons van die tijden zijn overgebleven.[7]

Bij de Romeinen had men zeer vreemde opvattingen omtrent hermaphrodieten. Plinius verhaalt van een volk ergens in Afrika, dat geheel uit hermaphrodieten zou bestaan en deelt mee, dat hij zelf getuige er van is geweest, dat een hermaphrodiet willekeurig van geslacht kon veranderen. Bij de Wet der twaalf Tafelen was het den haruspices geoorloofd den hermaphrodiet te dooden, omdat de crimen laesae naturae niet ongestraft mocht blijven en de geboorte van een hermaphrodiet allerlei rampen voor het land voorspelde. Diodorus deelt mee, dat het verschijnen van een hermaphrodiet òf op de aanwezigheid van een God op aarde wijst,

die de zachtheid van de vrouw aan de kracht van den man paart, òf dat het een voorspelling inhoudt van groote rampen die over het land zullen komen.[8] Livius vermeldt eenige gevallen, waarin een hermaphrodiet ter dood is gebracht.[9]

Over het algemeen schijnen de Romeinen zich nog al veel met het hermaphroditisme te hebben bezig gehouden. In het Romeinsche recht toch wordt verschillende malen van den hermaphrodiet melding gemaakt. Ulpianus werpt de vragen op, of de hermaphrodiet mag getuigen, of hij het vaderlijk gezag mag uitoefenen, of hij mag erven en vindt een oplossing dààrin, dat hij zegt, dat het er van afhangt welke sexe er in den hermaphrodiet praevaleert.[10] Later zijn de gevoelens tegenover den hermaphrodiet gunstiger gestemd geworden, vooral ten tijde van Nero, wijl deze een zoodanige voorliefde voor hermaphrodieten schijnt te hebben gehad, dat hij zijn wagen bij voorkeur door vier hermaphroditische paarden liet trekken.[11]

Niettegenstaande sommige kerkvaders in de middeleeuwen Jehova als androgyn beschouwden, omdat hij Adam naar zijn evenbeeld had geschapen en deze androgyn moet zijn geweest--immers "creavit Deus eum ad imaginem suam, ad imaginem Dei creavit illum, masculum et feminam creavit eos"--bracht men de hermaphrodieten toch ter dood, omdat men meende, dat zij door God gezonden waren om zijn toorn te wreken en dat zij het naderen van rampen voorspelden. Men was van meening, dat de duivel er aan had deelgenomen, wanneer een hermaphrodiet werd geboren en de moeder werd dan ook gestraft, terwijl in sommige gevallen ook de vader niet vrijliep.[12] Bauhinius was nog op het einde van de 16e eeuw van oordeel, dat een hermaphrodiet moest gedood worden, terwijl Riolanus hetzelfde oordeelt in het begin van de 17e eeuw.[13] Later werd men gunstiger tegenover hen gestemd en bepaalde men er zich toe, om hen eenige rechten te ontzeggen. Wanneer een hermaphrodiet wilde huwen en de sexe was onduidelijk, dan werd het aan hem overgelaten een sexe te kiezen en mocht hij volgens die sexe huwen. Veranderen van sexe of geslachtsgemeenschap hebben anders dan naar de gekozene sexe, was niet geoorloofd en werd met den dood gestraft. Bauhinius verhaalt van een hermaphrodieten monnik, die zwanger werd en ter dood werd gebracht en voegt er aan toe: "Mas, Mulier, Monacus, Mundi Mirabile Monstrum."[14] De gevallen van Anne, later Jean, Grandjean en Marie, later Marin, Lemarcis, zijn beroemd geworden. Anne Grandjean was in 1732 in Grenoble geboren en als meisje opgevoed. Toen zij volwassen was geworden, bemerkte zij dat zij eigenlijk een man was, nam den naam van Jean Baptiste aan en trouwde met een vrouw. Toen dat bemerkt werd, veroordeelde de rechtbank hem als "profanateur du Sacrément du Mariage" tot verlies van eer, een lichamelijke straf en levenslange verbanning. Hij werd vrijgesproken maar werd gedwongen om in het vervolg altijd in vrouwenkleeren te gaan en om nooit meer met een vrouw geslachtsgemeenschap te hebben.[15]

Marie Lemarcis, die ook bemerkte, dat zij een man was, zich daarom Marin Lemarcis noemde, en met een vrouw wilde huwen, ontkwam ter nauwernood den dood door ophanging, doordat een voor dien tijd beroemd chirurg, Duval, tegen de expertise van vele anderen, verklaarde dat hij een man was. Hij werd veroordeeld om minstens tot zijn vijf en twintigste jaar vrouwenkleeren te dragen en het werd hem verboden om geslachtelijke gemeenschap met welke sexe dan ook, te hebben.[15]

Ambroise Paré verhaalt hoe hij het heeft bijgewoond, dat een meisje, door het springen over een sloot, plotseling van meisje jongen werd. Het omgekeerde, zegt Paré, dat een jongen een meisje wordt, komt nooit voor, "omdat de natuur altijd er naar streeft het volmaakte te bereiken".[16]

Door de onderzoekingen in de laatste eeuw nu, is het wezen van den hermaphrodiet beter bekend geworden en al weet men nog niet de oorzaak waardoor het hermaphroditisme ontstaat, men weet waardoor het tot stand komt. Wanneer bij een vrouwelijk individu de clitoris te groot wordt, de labia gedeeltelijk of geheel vergroeien en, zooals vele malen het geval is, er een hernia labialis (een breuk in een der labia majora, het afdalen van een darmlis in een der labia majora) bestaat; wanneer bij den man de penis niet de normale grootte bereikt, de beide helften van het scrotum zich niet vereenigen en de plaats der vergroeiing open blijft, de urethra zich eveneens niet sluit (hypospadie), maar zich in de splijting van het scrotum voortzet, wanneer daarbij de testikels niet in het scrotum dalen, maar in de buikholte of in het lieskanaal blijven (cryptorchie), dan heeft men de anatomische afwijking voor zich, die men met den naam van "uitwendig hermaphroditisme" bestempelt.

Al naar gelang van de twee soorten of van de enkele soort van teeltklieren, die in hetzelfde individu aanwezig zijn, terwijl de aard der geslachtsgangen of der uitwendige geslachtsorganen bij datzelfde individu, beiden of een van beiden, wel of niet met den aard dier twee soorten of der enkele soort van teeltklieren overeenkomt, verdeelt men de hermaphrodieten in "ware" en "onechte", onderscheidt men den "hermaphroditus verus" (androgynie, gevallen waarin zoowel testes als ovariën, onverschillig in welk stadium van ontwikkeling, in hetzelfde individu aanwezig zijn, met normale of misvormde uitwendige geslachtsorganen) en den "pseudohermaphroditus", den "hermaphroditus spurius" (wanneer bij ééngeslachtelijke ontwikkeling der teeltklieren, de inwendige en de uitwendige geslachtsorganen of een van beiden het type van het andere geslacht naderen).

Men heeft het hermaphroditismus verus verdeeld in h. v. bilateralis, unilateralis en lateralis, al naar gelang er in de buikholte aan beide zijden een ovarium en een testis te samen zouden voorkomen, of wel een ovarium èn een testis te samen aan de eene zijde en een ovarium òf een testis aan de andere zijde, of ook wel een ovarium aan de eene, een testis aan de andere zij. Theoretisch beredeneerd is een zoodanig voorkomen van herm. ver. natuurlijk mogelijk. In werkelijkheid echter is het bestaan er van nog nimmer vastgesteld en de eenige gevallen, vijf in aantal, van herm. verus zijn die, waarin het voorkomen van een zoogenaamden "ovotestis" is gevonden, het voorkomen namelijk van een teeltklier, waarin zoowel ovariaal als testikulair weefsel door het microscopisch onderzoek kon worden aangetoond. Onder de reeks gevallen van herm. ver. die Neugebauer in zijn werk "Hermaphroditismus beim Menschen" heeft opgeteld, zijn deze vijf de eenige waarbij echt herm. ver. is aangetoond. De overige gevallen zijn niet door een microscopisch onderzoek bewezen gevallen van herm. ver. te zijn geweest, ofschoon men ze er wel voor had gehouden.[17]

Van meer praktisch belang dan ook zijn voor ons de pseudohermaphrodieten. Men kan te doen hebben met een psh. externus, met een psh. internus of met een psh. completus of externus _et_ internus. Bij den psh. internus vindt men, behalve de inwendige geslachtsorganen die bij de sexe van het individu behooren, min of meer ontwikkelde inwendige geslachtsorganen van de andere sexe. Bij den psh. externus zijn de uitwendige geslachtsorganen van het individu zoodanig vervormd, dat men in twijfel kan verkeeren of men met vrouwelijke dan wel met mannelijke uitwendige geslachtsorganen te doen heeft. Bij den psh. completus ziet men de vereeniging van beide bovengenoemde afwijkingen. Men geeft den psh. de sexe, die door de teeltklier wordt aangetoond. Zoo vindt men bij den psh. intern. masc. behalve de testes en de inwendige mannelijke geslachtsorganen, b.v. een min of meer goed ontwikkelden uterus, bij den femininus, behalve de ovariën en de inwendige vrouwelijke geslachtsorganen, b.v. resten van het vas deferens.

Het meest van praktisch belang zijn voor ons de pseudoh. externi, omdat het interne psh. niet gemakkelijk bij het leven kan worden gediagnosticeerd en omdat het interne psh. meestal pas in aanmerking komt, wanneer het externe psh. tot een onderzoek heeft aanleiding gegeven.

Wat den hermaphrodiet of pseudohermaphrodiet betreft, wanneer men hem uit het oogpunt beschouwt van medeburger in de samenleving, zoowel de een als de ander kan zich als gewone, niet-misvormde menschen gedragen en dikwijls vindt men dan ook geen enkel verschil tusschen hun doen en laten en dat van den normaal-gevormden. Toch komen onder pseudohermaphrodieten zeer veel geestesstoornissen en verschillende afwijkingen op geestelijk en zedelijk gebied voor. Zonder nog zoo ver te gaan als Debierre, die--terwijl hij den hermaphrodiet en den pseudoh. onder de gedegenereerden rangschikt--hen in een toestand acht, waardoor zij een of anderen dag alle symptomen van lijders aan een degeneratie-psychose kunnen gaan vertoonen[18], zijn de meeste schrijvers het er over eens, dat het meerendeel der pseudoh.--ofschoon onder hen personen gevonden worden, die een uitstekend verstand en een zeer goeden aanleg hebben--over het algemeen, niet zóó ontwikkeld is, als normaal-gevormde menschen. De misvorming der teeltklieren en der geslachtsorganen laat wel degelijk haar schadelijken invloed bij hen gelden.[19]

De geslachtsdrift der meeste hermaphrodieten is gering, wat met het oog daarop, dat hun teeltklieren nooit zóó als bij normalen zijn ontwikkeld, niet te verwonderen is. Een enkele uitzondering daargelaten, waarin inderdaad een normale of misschien verhoogde potentie aanwezig is of was, moet men de verhalen der psh. op dat gebied als overdreven betitelen en vooral mededeelingen van psh. dat zij nu eens als man dan weer als vrouw geslachtsgemeenschap hebben gehad of kunnen hebben, meestal als een weinig fantastisch en met zekere restrictie aannemen.

De gevallen, waarin het voor den jurist en voor den medicus van belang is van het hermaphroditisme of van het pseudohermaphroditisme op de hoogte te zijn, zijn de volgende.

Ten eerste de gevallen van zoogenaamde "erreur de sexe", waarin namelijk het individu door een vergissing is ingeschreven bij den burgerlijken stand als behoorende tot de eene sexe en naderhand of op later leeftijd bemerkt, dat hij tot de andere sexe behoort en nu van sexe wil veranderen; 2e. gevallen van vergrijpen tegen de eerbaarheid, 3e. gevallen waarin een huwelijk blijkt te zijn gesloten met een hermaphrodiet en waarin op grond daarvan, dat de vrouw eigenlijk een man of de man eigenlijk een vrouw is, nietigverklaring van het huwelijk gevraagd wordt.

Wat de eerste gevallen betreft, verwijs ik U naar wat ik U heb meegedeeld van de beeldhouwster die nu als beeldhouwer in het buitenland vertoeft en naar de historische verhalen van Marin Lemarcis en Anne Grandjean, die wij zoo even hebben besproken. Omtrent de aanslagen tegen de eerbaarheid wil ik u doen opmerken, dat het b.v. zou kunnen geschieden, dat iemand beschuldigd wordt geslachtelijke gemeenschap te hebben gehad met een vrouw, tegen haar wil of terwijl zij in bewusteloozen toestand verkeert

en dat het blijkt, dat deze vrouw een pseudh. masculinus is, een geval van "erreur de sexe". Ook kan ik mij het geval voorstellen, en het is ook geschied, dat een man beschuldigd wordt geslachtsgemeenschap met een vrouw tegen haar wil te hebben gehad en dat het blijkt, dat de verkrachter eigenlijk een vrouwelijke psh. is. Het omgekeerde kan eveneens plaats hebben. Ik herinner mij niet welke schrijver het geval meedeelt, van een vroedvrouw, die beschuldigd werd onzedelijke handelingen te plegen met vrouwen, die zij in haar verlossing had bijgestaan en van wie het bij onderzoek bleek, dat deze vroedvrouw een mannelijke psh. was. En wat de derde categorie aangaat, wil ik u doen opmerken, dat Neugebauer verschillende gevallen, zoowel uit de literatuur als uit eigen praktijk, aanhaalt, waarin de vrouw die wilde huwen of reeds gehuwd was, bij onderzoek bleek een psh. masculinus te zijn, die door een "erreur de sexe" als vrouw was opgevoed. Het is nog niet zoo heel lang geleden, dat ik vernomen heb, dat een gynaecoloog hier in Amsterdam, een dame op zijn spreekuur ontving, die hem kwam consulteeren over de vraag of zij kinderen kon krijgen. Zij was al eenige jaren getrouwd en zij en haar man waren zeer gelukkig, alleen ontbrak aan hun geluk dat zij geen kinderen hadden. Bij onderzoek bleek het den gynaecoloog, dat hij met een mannelijke psh. te doen had, met een geval dus van "erreur de sexe". Hij is zoo verstandig geweest, die "dame" met vage troostwoorden naar huis te zenden en haar niet het geheim van haar sexe te openbaren, om niet twee menschen, die heel gelukkig waren, ongelukkig te maken. Of de openbaring hem iets zou hebben gebaat, staat te bezien. In bijna alle gevallen die Neugebauer meedeelt, zijn de mannelijke psh. tòch als vrouw gehuwd en hebben met hun man, die al of niet van hun toestand afwist, een zeer gelukkig leven geleid. Neugebauer deelt mede, dat het hem ettelijke malen is geschied, dat, wanneer hij den persoon op de erreur de sexe opmerkzaam maakte, groot verdriet en onwil om van sexe te veranderen het gevolg van zijn waarschuwing waren. Weinige maar stemden in een verandering toe. In hoeverre bij de erreur de sexe de opvoeding invloed heeft gehad, kan men niet goed bepalen. Moll ontkent dien grooten invloed van de opvoeding op het sexueele leven of liever op het zich man of vrouw voelen en zegt dat een of anderen dag de ware sexe wel te voorschijn komt, tegen de verkeerde opvoeding in.[20] Neugebauer is van tegenovergesteld oordeel en haalt eenige gevallen aan, waarmee hij zijn opvatting bewijst.[21] Zeker is het, dat sommige gevallen bekend en beschreven zijn, waarin, niettegenstaande de verkeerde opvoeding, de echte sexe toch de overhand nam, terwijl er andere voorbeelden zijn, waarin dat niet heeft plaats gehad. Het is waarschijnlijk de kwestie en het hangt er van af, in welke mate ontwikkeld de secundaire psychische geslachtskenmerken van de eene of van de andere sexe al of niet aanwezig zijn.

Evengoed nu als er verwisseling om zoo te zeggen der primaire geslachtskenmerken van de eene sexe naar de andere kan plaats vinden, kan hetzelfde ook geschieden met de secundaire geslachtskenmerken.

De borsten, die in het algemeen goed ontwikkeld alleen bij vrouwen voorkomen, terwijl de man slechts rudimenten--in ontwikkeling achtergebleven--borsten vertoont, kunnen bij den man groeien en het klierweefsel kan bij den man dermate ontwikkelen, dat de functie van het mamma-weefsel aan die van de vrouwelijke borst gelijk wordt. In de gevallen nu, waarin het borstklierweefsel bij den man even sterk als bij de vrouw ontwikkeld is, heeft men te doen met wat men betitelt met den naam van "gynaecomastie". Er zijn verschillende gevallen bekend, waarin de man de functie van de vrouw overnam en in plaats van deze, den zuigeling zoogde. In het bekende werk van Ploss-Bartels "Das Weib", komen eenige zoodanige gevallen vermeld voor, onder andere een door Alexander van Humboldt meegedeeld en een door Bernard van Ornstein.[22] Darwin verhaalt van een neger, die zijn kind de borst gaf en Geijll, de gynaecoloog, die vroeger te Dordrecht praktiseerde, haalt verschillende gevallen aan, waarin òf de afgescheiden vloeistof uit de mannenborst aan een microscopisch onderzoek is onderworpen en waardoor is vastgesteld, dat de vloeistof inderdaad melk was, òf--en deze gevallen door hem aangehaald, zijn door Volkmann, Israel, Stieda en Gruber te boek gesteld--het mammaweefsel den bouw vertoonde van dien der vrouwenborsten.[23]

Ook in den haar- en baardgroei vindt men die verwisseling. Ofschoon het algemeen is, dat baard en snor alleen bij mannen voorkomen, zijn er ettelijke gevallen bekend, waarin vrouwen een even sterk-ontwikkelden baard droegen als een man. Bérillon te Parijs, heeft in een boek "Les femmes à barbe" al de gevallen verzameld, die bekend zijn van vrouwen met baarden. Twee "précieuses" uit de 17e eeuw, Madame Pilou en Madame Cornual, waarover in de Mercure de France van het jaar 1907 een uitstekend opstel is verschenen[24], waren bekend om hun mannelijken haartooi.

Wij behoeven er niet op te wijzen, dat een verwisseling in stemklank, een diepe stem bij de vrouw en een hooge stem bij den man, dikwijls voorkomt. Bij den man heeft in de puberteit een verandering in zijn stemgeluid plaats; hij krijgt, zooals het genoemd wordt "den baard in de keel", zijn stemgeluid wordt dieper. Ettelijke gevallen zijn er bekend--en men behoeft maar rondom zich te luisteren om het zelf op te merken--waarin mannen een hooge vrouwenstem behouden, terwijl vrouwen een stemgeluid laten hooren, dat aan dat van een man doet denken.

Zelfs in de twee meest eigenaardige uitdrukkingen van de psyche, in het handschrift en in den gang, vindt men die verwisseling. Hoevele mannen hebben niet een handschrift, dat aan dat van de vrouw doet denken, terwijl vrouwen een handschrift vertoonen,

dat zóó sprekend op dat van een man gelijkt, dat men er zich zeer gemakkelijk in vergist.

Even goed echter als die verwisseling plaats heeft in de primaire en in de secundaire geslachtskenmerken, kan een verwisseling voorkomen in de laatste groep der geslachtskenmerken, in de groep waarin wij de geslachtsrichting hebben gerangschikt, namelijk dat de vrouw zich tot den man en de man zich tot de vrouw geslachtelijk voelt aangetrokken. Het kan geschieden, dat juist het omgekeerde plaats heeft en dat de man geslachtelijk voor den man, de vrouw geslachtelijk voor de vrouw voelt. Waar dit het geval is, hebben wij te maken met de groote groep van menschen, die--zooals Marc André Raffalovich zegt--"dès leur jeunesse, avant la puberté, sont portés spontanément, sentimentalement, sensuellement, sexuellement, amoureusement, intellectuellement vers d'autres individus du même sexe"[25], met de homosexueelen, de urningen, de uranisten.

De naam "homosexueel" is afgeleid van het Grieksche ~homoios~---de gelijke en het latijnsche "sexualis", in tegenoverstelling met hen, die zich tot personen van de andere sexe voelen aangetrokken en die "heterosexueelen" worden genoemd, dat is afgeleid van het grieksche "~heteros~"--de een van twee en het latijnsche "sexualis". Het woord "urning" door de Franschen vermooid tot "uranist", is het eerst door Numa Numantius gebruikt, het pseudoniem van Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, en is afgeleid uit een plaats in het Symposion van Plato. De Grieken onderscheidden twee Aphrodités, de oudste geboren uit Zeus en Dione was de Aphrodité pandémos, de jongste--Aphrodité urania--is geboren uit het zeeschuim, dat rondom het geslachtsorgaan van Zeus opspatte, toen het door den jongste der Titanen, Kronos, was afgesneden en in zee geworpen en is ontstaan zonder dat een vrouw aandeel in haar wording heeft gehad. De Eros pandémos is de liefde waarmede alle menschen beminnen, terwijl die van Urania, waaraan geen vrouw heeft deel gehad, de liefde van mannen tot mannen is. De liefde van mannen voor mannen heet "paederastie", die van vrouwen voor vrouwen "tribadie", welke namen dikwijls verkeerdelijk voor de geslachtsdaad worden gebruikt. De geslachtsdaad tusschen mannen heet "pedicatie", die tusschen vrouwen "amor lesbicus", terwijl de spiritueele liefde tusschen mannen den naam "amor platonicus", die tusschen vrouwen dien van "amor sapphicus" draagt.

Ik zal in de volgende bladzijden voornamelijk van den mannelijken homosexueel, van den uranist spreken, omdat van dezen het meeste bekend is en omdat de vrouwelijke homosexualiteit nog niet zoo grondig is bestudeerd, al komt deze waarschijnlijk in even groote mate als de mannelijke voor.

Even wil ik de opmerking maken, dat men wel moet onderscheiden tusschen den uranist en hem die homosexueele geslachtsdaden doet. De uranist doet wel homosexueele geslachtsdaden, maar blijft altijd uranist, dat is iemand die zich geslachtelijk uitsluitend tot personen van zijn eigen sexe voelt aangetrokken, terwijl hij die homosexueele daden doet zeer goed een heterosexueel kan zijn. Homosexueele daden plegen en uranist-zijn is niet hetzelfde en er ligt een hemelsbreed verschil tusschen den heterosexueel, die door gebrek aan vrouwen (in pensionaten, op schepen, in gevangenissen waar de gevangenen gemeenschappelijk zijn opgesloten enz. enz.), uit winstbejag (prostitutie) of uit vriendschap, homosexueele daden met een homosexueel of zelfs met een anderen heterosexueel pleegt en den echten uranist. De eerste toch zal, wanneer de gelegenheid weer daar is, tot het heterosexueel geslachtsverkeer teruggaan, zijn ware natuur weer laten gelden, terwijl de ander, die ook zijn ware natuur laat gelden, homosexueel zal blijven.

Homosexueel geslachtsverkeer, hetzij dan door echte uranisten of door heterosexueelen, is al van de verste oudheid bekend. De godsdienstplechtigheden voor Baäl gingen gepaard met homosexueele geslachtsuitingen, evenals de plechtigheden bij den dienst van Isis. Lydië, Syrië, Perzië waren bekend om het homosexueel geslachtsverkeer, dat daar inheemsch was en het is waarschijnlijk daarop, dat Paulus in zijn waarschuwing tegen den omgang met deze volken doelde. Jezus had waarschijnlijk den uranist op het oog, toen hij (Mattheüs 19:12) sprak: "En er zijn gesnedenen die alzoo uit huns moeders lichaam geboren worden.... begrijpe wie het kan". Bij de Joden was de homosexueele geslachtsuiting strafbaar. In Leviticus 18:22 staat geschreven: "Bij een man zult gij niet liggen met vrouwelijke bijligging, want het is een gruwel", terwijl in Leviticus 20:13 staat: "Wie bij een manspersoon zal hebben gelegen met vrouwelijke bijligging, zij hebben beide een gruwel gedaan en zullen gedood worden, hun bloed kome over hen". Herodotus en Hippocrates beschrijven de verschijnselen van een ziekte die bij de Scythen voorkomt, de Scythenziekte, ~thêleia nousos~, genaamd, waarbij de mannelijke personen al de eigenschappen van een vrouw kregen en niet meer in staat waren om voort te planten.[26] Dat het homosexueel geslachtsverkeer bij de Grieken inheemsch was, bewijzen de legenden van Zeus en Ganymedes, de overlevering van de verhouding tusschen Socrates en Alcibiades. Ja, zoodanig was het homosexueel geslachtsverkeer in de Grieksche maatschappij ingeweven, dat de geneesheeren, wanneer zij den eed zwoeren, beloofden, in welk huis zij ook kwamen, dit alleen te zullen doen voor het heil van de zieken "en zich te zullen onthouden van wellustige daden op de lichamen der vrouwen en der mannen, zoowel vrijen als slaven".[27] Wat het Romeinsche Rijk betreft, heeft Petronius ons beschrijvingen van het dagelijksch leven der Romeinen nagelaten, waaruit duidelijk blijkt hoezeer het homosexueel geslachtsverkeer daar gewoonte was. Caesar, dien wij als een geheel ander man zien, naar wat wij over hem hebben geleerd in

"de Bello Gallico", was bisexueel en werd "de man van alle vrouwen en de vrouw van alle mannen" bijgenaamd. Nero's homosexualiteit en zijn verhouding met den vrijgelatene Rufus zijn bekend, terwijl de uitspattingen van Heliogabalus, die als zonnepriester zich bij voorkeur in vrouwelijke kleêren vertoonde, door verschillende schrijvers vermeld zijn. De verhouding van Hadrianus met Antinous, den prachtig-gevormden jongeling, over wiens dood altijd een geheimzinnige sluier is gebleven, is te dikwijls genoemd, dan dat ik er nog melding van behoef te maken.

Ik wil hier en daar een greep uit de geschiedenis doen, en ga over tot de middeleeuwen. In het werk van Karl Julius Weber, "Das Pabstthum und die Päbste", lezen wij van de homosexueele daden die in de kloosters in de middeleeuwen werden gepleegd, niettegenstaande het telkens herhaald verbod en de straffen er op gesteld. Paul Zacchias en Ludovicus Claepius hebben hoofdstukken in hun werken gewijd aan den "Crimen sodomiae" en men vindt elders verhaald, hoe in den tijd der minnestreelen, niettegenstaande de schijnbaar groote vereering voor de vrouw, homosexueele handelingen naast die vereering voorkwamen. Vorstelijke personen zijn uranist geweest. Wij noemen Jakobus den eerste van Engeland en Eduard den derde. Aan het Fransche Hof waren homosexualiteit en homosexueele geslachtsdaden zoo gebruikelijk en zoo ingeweven, dat Elisabeth Charlotte, de schoonzuster van Louis Quatorze aan de keurvorstin Sophie schreef: "wie zijn kind lief heeft, moet het niet aan het Fransche hof sturen. De daden waarom Sodom en Gomorrha zijn verwoest, zijn niets, vergeleken bij de schandelijkheden die hier geschieden. Mannen leven met mannen, vrouwen leven met vrouwen en behalve de koning, de koningin en de Dauphin, is hier niemand te vertrouwen". De homosexueele daden en het uranisme, gepaard met verregaande effeminatie, van den broer van Louis Quatorze, van Philippe, Duc d'Orléans, waren algemeen bekend, evenals zijn verhouding met den Chevalier de Lorraine en den Marquis d'Effiat. Trouwens hij had een voorganger gehad in Hendrik den derde die, psychosexueel hermaphrodiet, na eerst een heterosexueele liefde te hebben gevoeld voor Marie de Clèves en andere vrouwen, zich later als homosexueel deed kennen.[28] Duitschland is niet vrij gebleven wat zijn vorsten betreft. Frederik de Groote en zijn broeder Heinrich waren uranisten, evenals Rudolph de tweede van Habsburg, een feit dat Heine in zijn Schlosslegende, die men alleen in de oude Hamburgsche uitgaven vindt en die men uit de latere uitgaven heeft verwijderd, heeft bezongen en die een van de redenen is geweest, of er zeker toe heeft bijgedragen, dat men hem uit Duitschland heeft verbannen. Van de latere Europeesche vorsten wil ik alleen Ludwig den 2e van Beijeren noemen, den krankzinnig-geworden uranist, aan wien wij het te danken hebben, dat de muziek van Wagner is bekend geworden[29], terwijl ik--uit vrees dat ik misschien wegens majesteitsschennis zou vervolgd worden--de namen van tegenwoordig levende vorstelijke personen liever wil verzwijgen.

Ook onder geleerden vindt men uranisten. Winkelmann, de vriend van Goethe, was uranist en werd te Triëst door Arcangeli, met wien hij in een homosexueele verhouding leefde, vermoord. Johannes v. Müller was uranist, even als de schrijver Grillparzer en de dichter August v. Platen.[30] Michel Angelo was uranist, al wil men ook beweren, dat hij wel degelijk een vrouwenliefde in zijn leven heeft gehad, de liefde van Vittoria Colonna. Behalve zijn sonnetten, die--al is het geen onomstootelijk bewijs--er voor pleiten, was zijn omgang en zijn verhouding tot Thomaso de Cavalieri van dien aard, dat de waarschijnlijkheid voor zijn homosexueel voelen een zeer groote is. Ook bij latere artiesten vindt men uitgesproken uranisme. Oscar Wilde was uranist, wat hem het proces heeft op den hals geschoven, dat zijn veroordeeling tengevolge heeft gehad, een proces dat als een der grootste schandalen in de historie der Engelsche rechtspleging zal blijven bestaan.[31] Van Walt Whitman[32] zegt men, dat hij uranist was, ofschoon er in den laatsten tijd stemmen opgaan, die het tegendeel volhouden.[33] Paul Verlaine, de poète maudit, was bisexueel en heeft, iets wat van algemeene bekendheid is, een homosexueele verhouding met Arthur Rimbaud gehad.[34] Onder de krijgslieden kan ik U le grand Condé noemen en generaal Mac Donald, die zich in den Boerenoorlog heeft onderscheiden en den naam van "fighting Mac" heeft gekregen.[35] Wanneer ooit een regeering zich huichelend en verachtelijk heeft gedragen, is het de Engelsche geweest, die zelfs geweigerd heeft, nadat Mac Donald om zijn uranisme in den dood was gejaagd, zijn begrafenis met militaire eer te laten plaats hebben. En ten laatste is het nog niet zoolang geleden, dat men zou vergeten hebben, dat Krupp,[36] de groote industrieel, zich van het leven heeft beroofd, omdat hij uranist zijnde, voor de vervolgingen waarmee paragraaf 175 hem bedreigde, bevreesd was.[37] Het zou mij gemakkelijk vallen deze lijst met nog vele namen te vergrooten.

Ofschoon er reeds in de geschriften van Restif de la Bretonne[38], in die van Casanova[39], in die van Montesquieu[40] en die van Voltaire[41] van de homosexualiteit en van het uranisme wordt melding gemaakt, duurde het tot het einde van de 18e eeuw, voordat de aandacht van de geleerden op het onderwerp werd gevestigd. Meiners[42] was de eerste, die een aantal feiten verzamelde en die te boek stelde, waaruit men over het uranisme en de homosexualiteit eenigszins op de hoogte kon komen. Niettegenstaande na hem Ehrenberg[43], Brière de Boismont[44], Hössli[45], Michéa[46] en anderen over het onderwerp schreven, ging het vraagstuk onopgemerkt aan de aandacht voorbij en was het Casper, de Duitsche gerechtelijk-geneeskundige, die in het jaar 1852 de kwestie weer ter sprake bracht.[47] Merkwaardig mag men het noemen, dat waar Casper reeds toen verkondigde, dat homosexualiteit en uranisme niet altijd de gevolgen zijn van zedebederf en van onzedelijkheid, de tegenovergestelde opvatting

door de jaren heen, niettegenstaande de tegenwerpingen van den kant der nieuwere onderzoekers ingebracht, tot nu toe heeft stand gehouden. Weer geraakte het vraagstuk op den achtergrond, totdat in het jaar 1870 of omstreeks dien tijd v. Krafft-Ebing zijn beroemd werk "Psychopathia sexualis" in het licht gaf. Kort vóór hem, had de Hannoversche assessor Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, onder het pseudoniem Numa Numantius, reeds in het jaar 1864, de eerste brochures van de reeks van twaalf, over het uranisme het licht doen zien, waarin hij het eerst den naam urning gebruikte.[48] Behalve dat Ulrichs op den juristendag te München, waar hij zijn opvattingen over het vraagstuk wilde verkondigen, bijna van het spreekgestoelte werd gesleurd en men het hem door kabaal en fluiten onmogelijk maakte om zijn redevoering ten einde te brengen, werd er niets gedaan om het vraagstuk dieper te doorgronden. Na v. Krafft-Ebing echter, en door zijn werk, was de aandacht voor goed op de kwestie gevestigd en weldra verschenen er in Duitschland, even als in Frankrijk mededeelingen over gevallen van homosexualiteit en uranisme. Toch bleef een geregeld doorgevoerde studie nog uit, niettegenstaande Albert Moll zijn boek over "Konträre Geschlechtsempfindung" had geschreven. Door het oprichten van het "Wissenschaftlich-humanitäre Comitée" in het jaar 1898 door Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld te Berlijn, dat ten doel heeft de geslachtelijke tusschentoestanden en vooral de homosexualiteit te bestudeeren, werd de aandacht voor goed op het vraagstuk gevestigd, vooral ook omdat een van de eerste daden van het Comitée was, een petitie tot de Regeering te richten, waarbij verzocht werd, paragraaf 175, de zoogenaamde "urningen-paragraaf", uit het strafwetboek te verwijderen. Deze paragraaf toch, hebben wij gezien, stelt de geslachtsuitingen tusschen mannen strafbaar en geeft tot niet anders dan tot chantage aanleiding, terwijl er tevens een groote onbillijkheid in ligt opgesloten, omdat wel de geslachtsdaden tusschen mannen, maar niet die tusschen vrouwen worden strafbaar gesteld.

Door het optreden van het Wissenschaftlich-humanitäre Comitée werd, om zoo te zeggen, de betoovering gebroken, waarin het onderwerp scheen te zijn bevangen en van alle kanten, zoowel in Duitschland als in andere landen, zagen de werken over uranisme en homosexualiteit het licht. In Duitschland waren het o. a. Näcke, Fuchs, Karsch, Iwan Bloch, v. Schrenck-Notzing, Benedikt Friedländer, om maar enkele te noemen, die hun onderzoekingen en hun opvattingen omtrent het vraagstuk het licht deden zien. In Engeland begon Havelock Ellis een studie-reeks over het normale en het afwijkende geslachtsleven, een boeken-rij die--om de merkwaardigheid dient het vermeld te worden--vertaald in het Duitsch en in Duitschland verschijnen moest, omdat de schrijver in het prude Engeland geen uitgever voor werken, over een dergelijk onderwerp handelend, kan vinden. In Frankrijk waren het Chevalier, Laupts (een pseudoniem, zooals hij mij meedeelde, omdat hij onder zijn eigen naam over dit onderwerp niet durft schrijven, uit angst zijn betrekking te zullen verliezen), Laurent, Lacassagne, Raffalovich (Marc André); in Italië Penta, die de Archivio di Psychopathie sessuali uitgaf, waarvan--jammer genoeg--maar één jaargang het licht heeft gezien, terwijl in ons land, behalve een opstel van mijn hand in de Psychiatrische en neurologische bladen van het jaar 1891[49] het werkje "Ongekend leed" en "Het Uranisch gezin" van Dr. v. Römer,[50] met het reeds genoemde rapport op het congres voor crimineele anthropologie in het jaar 1901[51] en een brochure die ik onder het pseudoniem "Karl Ihlfeld" heb geschreven,[52] het licht zagen. Een vertaling van het boekje van Wirz "Der Uraniër vor Kirche und H. Schrift"[53], alsmede een vertaling van het werk van Hirschfeld "Ursache und Wesen des Uranismus"[54] zijn daarna in Holland uitgegeven.

Gaan wij na welke opvattingen er over het uranisme en over de homosexualiteit heerschen, dan zien wij, dat vier opvattingen voornamelijk om den voorrang strijden.

De eerste opvatting is die, dat uranisme, dat homosexualiteit een gevolg is van een onzedelijk leven, van zedenbederf, van overprikkeling op geslachtelijk gebied, dat uranisme verkregen wordt door slecht voorbeeld, door verleiding en dat zij, die zich gedurende hun leven hebben te buiten gegaan aan heterosexueele geslachtsuitingen, eindelijk tot homosexueele daden hun toevlucht nemen, om aan hun behoefte naar nieuwe prikkels te voldoen. Deze opvatting van "verkregen uranisme" nu wordt door niemand meer gehuldigd, die zich ook maar eenigszins in de studie van het onderwerp heeft verdiept en alleen zij, die niets van het onderwerp weten en zich niet de moeite willen geven om het te bestudeeren, maar die zich tevreden stellen met steeds maar anderen na te praten, houden nog aan die opvatting vast.

Dat die opvatting in de wereld is gekomen en blijft bestaan, is niet te verwonderen. Men dacht en denkt aan de uitspattingen gedurende de décadence van het Romeinsche Rijk, waarin homosexueele geslachtsdaden gewoonte waren, maar vergeet er bij dat de heterosexueele uitspattingen toen ter tijd evenzeer een enormen omvang hadden aangenomen. Trouwens wij weten betrekkelijk zeer weinig van de Romeinsche maatschappij in dien tijd af, al kennen wij ook de verhalen van Petronius en anderen en zeker is het voor ons onmogelijk uit te maken, of de homosexueele geslachtsdaden ons uit dien tijd vermeld, de daden van echte uranisten waren of daden door mannelijke prostitués of andere heterosexueelen gepleegd. Een bewijs echter tegen de meening, dat het uranisme--en zelfs dat het plegen van homosexueele geslachtsdaden--altijd een gevolg van depravatie, van zedenbederf en van decadentie moeten zijn, is dat in den tijd van Pericles, in den bloeitijd van Athene, in de gouden eeuw, het

homosexueel geslachtsverkeer in Griekenland om zoo te zeggen algemeen was.

Dat de opvatting, dat uranisme en homosexualiteit een gevolg van uitspattingen op geslachtelijk gebied zijn, is ontstaan en bestaan blijft is te begrijpen. Men heeft de gevallen gezien van beginnende ouderdoms-kindschheid, van beginnende dementia paralytica e. d., waarbij zich dikwijls in het begin ethische en moreele defecten openbaren, waarbij zoo dikwijls een gebrek, een verkeerde handeling op zedelijk gebied de eerste aanduiding van de ziekte is, en heeft daaruit het besluit meenen te mogen trekken, dat deze handelingen het gevolg waren van vroeger-gepleegde uitspattingen en overprikkelde zinnelijkheid. Wij weten echter, dat het plegen van homosexueele geslachtsdaden volstrekt niet gelijk mag gesteld worden met uranisme en dat het plegen van homosexueele geslachtsdaden ook een gevolg van geestesstoornis kan zijn. Psychiaters kunnen getuigen, hoevele malen in de gestichten lijders aan dementie, of lijders aan andere psychosen, op het plegen van dergelijke daden betrapt worden.

En nog een oorzaak is er, waardoor men tot deze depravatie-opvatting is gekomen. Men heeft gevallen gezien van zoogenaamde "tardieve homosexualiteit", het opkomen van homosexueele geslachtsgevoelens op een zekeren leeftijd, vóór welken de persoon uitgesproken heterosexueel was. Dit verschijnsel dat nog niet goed bestudeerd en zeker nog niet verklaard is, komt meer voor dan men oppervlakkig zou meenen en de meeste gevallen, waarin men er van spreekt, dat iemand na een leven van heterosexueele uitspattingen homosexueel is geworden, berusten op het plotseling of langzamerhand te voorschijn komen van deze tardieve homosexualiteit. Trouwens in sommige gevallen kan de heterosexualiteit evenzoo tardief optreden. Mij is een geval bekend van een jongen man, die tot zijn vier en twintigste jaar uitgesproken en zeer duidelijk homosexueel was, die een of meer homosexueele verbintenissen heeft gehad en niet anders dan homosexueel aan zijn geslachtsdrift kon voldoen, en die langzamerhand zijn geslachtsrichting heeft voelen veranderen en nu reeds eenige jaren uitgesproken heterosexueel voelt. Zoowel de heterosexualiteit als de homosexualiteit echter zijn in die richting nog te weinig onderzocht en de heterosexualiteit wel het minst, zoodat men over deze kwestie nog geen zeker en nauwkeurig oordeel kan vellen. Een zekerheid echter is, dat die vorm van tardieve homosexualiteit bestaat en bestaan kan.

Wat nu echter tegen die onzedelijkheidsopvatting en tegen de meening, dat homosexualiteit door slecht voorbeeld en door omgang met homosexueele, onzedelijke individuen kan verkregen worden, spreekt, is dat het omgekeerde nooit nog is gezien. Wanneer het waar is, dat men na heterosexueele uitspattingen er gemakkelijk--door behoefte naar overprikkeling--toe komt, om homosexueele geslachtsdaden te doen, dan moet het ook kunnen dat een homosexueel--ten gevolge van oververzadiging door homosexueele geslachtsdaden--zijn toevlucht tot heterosexueele geslachtsdaden gaat nemen. Iets dergelijks nu is nog nooit opgemerkt en in de geheele literatuur over het uranisme en over de homosexualiteit is daarvan geen enkel voorbeeld te vinden, terwijl toch onder de homosexueelen even goed als onder de heterosexueelen losbollen en onzedelijke individuen worden gevonden! Te wenschen ware het wèl, dat het zou kunnen, dat men door overdadige heterosexueele uitspattingen homosexueel kon worden. Dan toch zou het omgekeerde ook het geval zijn en zou er een prachtig geneesmiddel gevonden zijn, om den homosexueel van zijn, door de maatschappij zoo verachte, neigingen te genezen. Tot nog toe echter heeft men nog niet kunnen ontdekken, of een zoodanige genezing of verandering bij een gedepraveerden homosexueel heeft plaats gehad.

En wat eveneens pleit tegen de opvatting, dat homosexualiteit kan verkregen worden, is dat waar de onanie zóó verbreid is, het percentage homosexueelen zoo betrekkelijk klein is en blijft. Volgens de meening van Rohleder[55] toch gaat 90% van het mannelijk geslacht zich in zijn jeugd aan onanie te buiten en een groot percentage daarvan pleegt, gedurende langer of korter tijd, mutueele onanie. Andere schrijvers achten het percentage niet zoo hoog, maar zijn het er toch over eens, dat het cijfer tamelijk groot is. Wanneer nu door homosexueelen omgang homosexualiteit verkregen zou kunnen worden, dan zouden zeker meer mannen dan nu homosexueel worden. Het percentage toch der homosexueelen is, zooals wij straks nog nader zullen bespreken, niet meer dan 2.3%. En wat wel het meeste er tegen pleit, dat homosexualiteit zou kunnen verkregen worden, is, dat het zoovele malen gebeurt en gebeurd is, dat bij heterosexueelen--die in hun jeugd gedurende zeer langen tijd met een homosexueelen vriend een homosexueele verbintenis hebben gehad, hetzij uit vriendschap of omdat zij het niet wilden weigeren, of omdat zij meenden dat dat de ware en eenige vriendschaps- en liefdesuiting is, onbekend met hun voelen en hun ziel--op een gegeven tijdstip hun ware gevoel wakker wordt en dat hun heterosexualiteit begint te spreken, zoodat zij de homosexueele verbintenis afbreken en een huwelijk met een vrouw sluiten uit liefde en uit heterosexueel gevoel. Wanneer homosexualiteit en uranisme zouden kunnen verkregen worden, dan zeker zou men onder die heterosexueelen toch menschen moeten aantreffen, die door hun homosexueelen omgang homosexueel of uranist zijn geworden. Zoo iemand, dan zijn zij wel in de gelegenheid geweest om van geslachtsrichting te veranderen.

Nogmaals, geen der onderzoekers, die zich ernstig met het vraagstuk heeft bezig gehouden of zich er nog in verdiept, huldigt de onzedelijkheidsmeening en alleen zij, die niets van het onderwerp weten of er niet of maar ten halve van op de hoogte zijn, houden

nog aan deze opvatting vast.

Een tweede opinie is, dat homosexualiteit, dat uranisme een uitvloeisel is van een stoornis in de geestvermogens van het individu, dat uranisme een psychopathie is.

Tot een zekere hoogte is v. Krafft-Ebing de schuld, dat deze opvatting ontstaan is en zich verbreid heeft. Hij toch is de eerste geweest, die van "psychopathia sexualis" heeft gesproken. En wel hadden Jolly en Moeli gelijk, toen zij in een zitting van de "Gesellschaft für Psychiatrie und Nervenheilkunde" te Berlijn, toen de benaming en het onderwerp, door v. Krafft-Ebing ingeleid, ter sprake kwam, de vrees uitten, dat men door dezen naam een verkeerden indruk zou krijgen en dat daardoor de opvatting der monomanieën, die met moeite was losgelaten, weer in de gedachten zou komen.[56] Het is geschied zooals Jolly en Moeli hebben gevreesd en niettegenstaande v. Krafft-Ebing later zijn eigen opvatting, als zou het uranisme een psychopathie zijn, heeft tegengesproken en in het derde deel van het Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen heeft bekend, dat hij zich heeft vergist en dat uranisme zich kan voordoen bij volkomen intactheid der geestvermogens, is de meening bij het publiek en bij het grootste deel der geleerden, dat geen kennis heeft genomen van den omkeer van v. Krafft-Ebing, blijven bestaan.[57]

Te verwonderen is het niet, dat v. Krafft-Ebing tot zijn opvatting kwam. Hij toch bestudeerde de afwijking bij de patienten in zijn krankzinnigengesticht, bij wie--zooals wij reeds hebben opgemerkt--homosexueele geslachtsdaden als uiting van hun geestesstoornis tamelijk dikwijls voorkomen. De psychiaters, die op zijn voetspoor het onderwerp eveneens bij de patienten in de gestichten bestudeerden, meenend--zooals tegenwoordig nog maar steeds het geval is--dat het onderwerp op het gebied van den psychiater en niet op dat van den gewonen geneesheer behoort (de gewone geneesheeren, niet-specialisten, zijn van eenzelfde opinie), moesten wel tot een zelfde conclusie komen. Zij, evenmin als v. Krafft-Ebing het had gedaan, dachten aan de onwillekeurige selectie die zij instelden, niet denkend aan het aantal uranisten dat niet in krankzinnigengestichten en--normaal van geestvermogens--wel in de maatschappij verkeert en nooit de gedachte krijgt om zich tot een psychiater te wenden. Waarom toch zouden zij dat doen? Geestelijk en wat hun ziel betreft, voelen zij zich geheel normaal en wanneer zij eenmaal op de hoogte van hun geslachts-verschil zijn, is er geen enkele reden voor hen zich tot een psychiater om raad en hulp te wenden. Dit groote aantal uranisten en homosexueelen nu, hebben v. Krafft-Ebing en de psychiaters over het hoofd gezien en dit zien de meeste psychiaters nog altijd over het hoofd en het is zeer waar wat Näcke zegt, namelijk, dat "wat psychiaters, neurologen en gerechtelijk-geneeskundigen van homosexueelen onder de oogen komt, meestal abnormaal is, maar dat men dit daarom niet in algemeenen zin mag toepassen. Deze artsen zijn daarom in zake homosexualiteit meer of minder incompetent, wijl zij juist de duizenden urningen, die gewoon in de maatschappij leven, niet kennen".[58]

Wanneer men nu, behalve de verbeterde uitspraak van v. Krafft-Ebing zelf, de uitspraken van de competente onderzoekers op dit gebied nagaat, de uitspraken van Hirschfeld, die minstens 5000 uranisten heeft onderzocht, van Fuchs, van Näcke, Bloch, v. Schrenck-Notzing, dan ziet men dat geen van hen het oordeel dat uranisme een psychopathie is, is toegedaan. Noch Lacassagne, noch Havelock Ellis, noch v. Römer, die alle ettelijke uranisten hebben onderzocht, hebben zich dan ook in die richting uitgesproken, integendeel hebben zij de opvatting "psychopathie" met alle kracht tegengesproken. Wat mijn eigen onderzoekingen betreft, al is het aantal uranisten dat ik heb onderzocht niet zóó groot, dat ik mij als de evenknie van de genoemde onderzoekers durf opwerpen, toch heb ik nog geen enkelen uranist ontmoet, bij wien ik een geestesstoornis of een ziekelijke stoornis in de geestvermogens heb kunnen vaststellen. Wel heb ik in eenige krankzinnigengestichten lijders gezien, die nu en dan pogingen deden om homosexueele geslachtsdaden te doen, maar bij dezen waren de daden een gevolg van hun psychisch defect en niet van hun homosexualiteit of van hun uranisme.

Ook de opvatting "psychopathie" wordt dan ook niet meer door de competente onderzoekers van dit onderwerp verdedigd.

Schijnbaar meer naar waarheid is de opvatting, dat uranisme en homosexualiteit een degeneratie, of een verschijnsel van degeneratie is.

Nu wil het mij echter voorkomen, of men in den laatsten tijd wat al te veel gebruik en zelfs misbruik van het woord "degeneratie" maakt. Alle menschelijke uitingen, die niet zoo dadelijk geweten, gevoeld of begrepen worden, is men maar al te veel geneigd met het woord degeneratie te bestempelen. Daarenboven zegt het woord "degeneratie" betrekkelijk weinig, en zeker is het niet een verklaring. Door het woord te gebruiken, stelt men vele malen een ander woord in de plaats voor het verschijnsel of het feit dat niet begrepen of geweten wordt.

Gaan wij echter nauwkeuriger na, welke verklaring men van "degeneratie" heeft gegeven, dan zien wij al heel spoedig, dat geen der definities past voor het uranisme. Magnan zegt, dat degeneratie "de ziekelijke toestand van het individu is, dat in vergelijking

met zijn ouders, constitutioneel verminderd is in zijn psycho-physisch weerstandsvermogen en slechts onvolkomen de biologische voorwaarden om den erfelijken strijd om het bestaan vol te houden, verwezenlijkt"[59]. Wertheim Salomonson zegt, "dat wij dan degeneratie kunnen constateeren, wanneer wij bij een individu een zoodanige afwijking van het type ontmoeten, dat wij, uit de ervaring van soortgelijke gevallen opgedaan, mogen besluiten, dat deze vermoedelijk op het kroost in meer ernstigen vorm zal worden overgedragen, terwijl zij bij de ouders reeds in meer gemitigeerden vorm aanwezig was."[60] Möbius voert aan, dat wij met "degeneratie zoodanige ongunstige afwijkingen van het type kunnen bestempelen, die een zekere grootte bereiken, blijvend zijn en door erfelijkheid op de nazaten kunnen overgaan",[61] terwijl Hoche degeneratie een "aus der Art schlagen" noemt en eveneens van "ongunstige afwijkingen van het type" spreekt.[62]

Vergelijken wij den uranist en het leven van den uranist met deze definities, dan zien wij, dat waar van een type wordt gesproken, nergens een type van een man of van een vrouw kan worden aangetoond. Wij hebben gezien, dat wij--omdat het type ontbrak--gedwongen waren om alleen met de eigenschappen, die bij de overgroote meerderheid der sexen voorkomen, rekening te houden. Wat dus "afwijking van het type" moet leeren, is niet duidelijk. Wat betreft het overgaan der afwijkingen op de kinderen, het is door verschillende onderzoekers bewezen, dat in de ascendentie van den uranist geen of bij uitzondering uranisten voorkomen en dat ook in de nakomelingschap van den uranist (soms toch krijgt de uranist, die om verschillende redenen kan getrouwd zijn, kinderen) geen of zeer weinig uranisten voorkomen. De meeste uranisten komen te midden van een familie van gewone broeders en zusters te voorschijn en in de meeste gevallen is er geen familielid aan te wijzen, bij wien men dezelfde of een dergelijke afwijking kan vinden. De meeste uranisten nu krijgen geen kinderen, omdat zij niet trouwen. En wat dien levensstrijd aangaat, ik geloof niet dat iemand zal durven beweren, dat mannen als Frederik de Groote, Condé, Mac Donald, Krupp en anderen de bewijzen hebben gegeven, dat zij de voorwaarden om den levensstrijd vol te houden, onvoldoende hebben verwezenlijkt!

Volkomen waar is het, dat de degeneratie zich niet bij de kinderen in denzelfden vorm als bij de ouders behoeft te openbaren, maar dat de kinderen andere verschijnselen van degeneratie dan de ouders kunnen vertoonen. Vraagt men nu echter, of er in de ascendentie van den uranist zooveel meer en zooveel ernstiger vormen van degeneratie voorkomen, dan in de familie of ascendentie van den heterosexueel, dan moeten wij ontkennend antwoorden. Immers mag men dan pas van de degeneratie van een persoon spreken, wanneer er verschillende ernstige afwijkingen van het normale (s. v. v.) bij hem te vinden zijn en wanneer over 't algemeen zijn geschiktheid om mee te bestaan en zijn plaats in de samenleving te vervullen in hooge mate is getroffen.[63] Door v. Römer is in zijn werk "Het uranisch huisgezin" voldoende en uitstekend aangetoond, dat degeneratie in de ascendentie van uranisten volstrekt niet erger en zwaarder is, dan in die van heterosexueelen. Trouwens ook andere onderzoekers, waaronder Hirschfeld in de eerste plaats, hebben aangetoond, dat bij den uranist van degeneratie in erger mate dan bij den heterosexueel, geen sprake is. Wat mijn eigen onderzoekingen betreft, ben ik tot dezelfde uitkomst als de andere onderzoekers gekomen en heb ik noch in de ascendentie der uranisten die ik heb onderzocht, noch bij de personen zelf, zoo veel of zoo groote degeneratie kunnen vinden, dat ik daaruit het besluit zou durven trekken, dat de uranist per se gedegenereerd is of het slachtoffer van degeneratie in zijn familie zou zijn. Onder al de uranisten die ik heb onderzocht, heb ik maar één gevonden, bij wien een zeer sterk uitgesproken degeneratie was aan te toonen en in wiens familie, zoowel in de directe ascendentie als in de zijliniën een zware belasting waarschijnlijk de schuld was, dat de uranist zelf een immoreel en lichamelijk gedegenereerd individu is geworden. In hoeverre nu zijn uranisme van die degeneratie afhankelijk was, weet ik niet te zeggen en is ook moeilijk aan te toonen.

Mocht dit alles nog niet genoeg bewijzen, dan wil ik daarenboven vermelden, dat--zooals uit verschillende bronnen blijkt--uranisme en homosexualiteit ook bij wilde en primitieve volken voorkomt. Zoowel in "Untrodden fields of anthropology"[64] als in het opstel van Karsch[65] en in het werk van Havelock Ellis[66] vindt men meer of minder uitgebreide mededeelingen daaromtrent. Burton heeft in zijn "Arabian Nights"[67] een gedeelte van de wereldbol afgebakend, welke hij de "sodatic Zone" noemt en die al de volken omvat, bij wie uranisme en homosexualiteit inheemsch is. Het is opmerkelijk, dat in die "sodatic zone", de primitieve en wilde volken de grootste plaats innemen. En men mag en kan toch niet aannemen, dat degeneratie, depravatie en zedebederf bij primitieve en wilde volken even ver zouden zijn voortgeschreden, als in het beschaafde Europa!

De vierde opvatting, dat het uranisme een variëteit is, blijft ons ter bespreking over. Deze opvatting is m. i. de ware en ik zou haast, met een variant op het bekende Fransche woord, willen zeggen: si elle n'existait pas, il faudrait l'inventer, zóó logisch staat de homosexualiteit op de lijn der geslachtsrichting, zóó onweerlegbaar moet zij te vinden en aan te wijzen zijn.

In zijn bekend werk "Oorsprong en bevruchting der bloemen" zegt Hugo de Vries: "het geheele probleem der erfelijkheid draait in hoofdzaak om de vraag naar het aandeel van den vader en de moeder aan de eigenschappen van het individu. De eene eigenschap heeft een mensch van zijn vader, de andere van zijn moeder. Ziedaar het feit. Slechts in schijn is elk mensch ten opzichte van het probleem der erfelijkheid een eenheid. In zijn binnenste is hij een dubbelwezen. Naast elkaar liggen in hem de

erfstukken van zijn vader en van zijn moeder. Nu eens werken zij samen, dan weer werken zij tegen elkaar, nu eens overheerscht het eene, dan weer het andere.... Elk levend wezen, dat door geslachtelijke voortplanting is ontstaan, vereenigt in zich de erfdeelen van zijn ouders. Deze liggen in hem als een mozaïek, wel innig vermengd, maar toch gescheiden.... Alle lichaamskernen zijn dus dubbelkernen, alle geslachtelijk ontstane wezens dubbelwezens, die levenslang hun dubbelen oorsprong verraden en die in bijzondere gevallen dit op een bijzondere en in het oog vallende wijze doen".[68]

Wij hebben gezien, dat de kenmerken van de eene sexe bij de andere sexe kunnen voorkomen. Wij hebben gezien, dat dit zoowel wat de primaire als wat de secundaire geslachtskenmerken betreft, het geval kan zijn en ook dat de psychische eigenaardigheden, die men voor specifiek voor de eene sexe houdt, even goed bij de andere sexe kunnen voorkomen. De psychische eigenschap, de geslachtsrichting, nu kan even goed een wisseling vertoonen en de eigenschap, die in de meeste gevallen specifiek voor den man is, kan bij de vrouw voorkomen even goed als het omgekeerde het geval kan zijn.

Dat de uranist, dat de homosexueel een variëteit is, kan men op de volgende wijze aantoonen. Nemen wij een denkbeeldige lijn en plaatsen wij aan de beide uiteinden daarvan, aan de eene zijde de man met 100% mannelijke eigenschappen--wanneer die bestaat; geen enkele man heeft die 100% mannelijke eigenschappen, omdat in iederen man ook vrouwelijke lichamelijke eigenschappen zijn aan te toonen (de prostata, de rudimenten van de borsten enz.)--aan de andere zijde de vrouw met 100% vrouwelijke eigenschappen--ook weer, wanneer die bestaat; op de vrouw is mutatis mutandis hetzelfde als op den man van toepassing--dan kunnen wij op die lijn de verschillende variëteiten vinden, die al naar gelang den kant van waar wij beginnen, overwegend mannelijke eigenschappen en heel weinig vrouwelijke hebben, of omgekeerd. Zoo voortgaande tot het midden van de lijn, zullen en moeten wij noodzakelijk op dit midden den volkomen hermaphrodiet vinden. Wanneer wij op dezelfde wijze met den heterosexueel en den homosexueel te werk gaan, dan zien wij, dat waar aan het eene einde van de lijn de absolute heterosexueel staat (wanneer deze absolute heterosexualiteit bestaat), aan het andere einde de absolute homosexueel (wanneer deze absolute homosexualiteit bestaat) moet komen. In het midden komt de bisexueel, de zoogenaamde psycho-sexueele hermaphrodiet. Dat er noch een absolute hetero- noch een absolute homosexualiteit bestaat, is te begrijpen. Een individu erft toch van zijn vader en van zijn moeder, van zijn grootvader en van zijn grootmoeder en van de geheele ascendeerende reeks mannen en vrouwen, die aan zijn vorming--door zijn grootouders en zijn ouders heen--hebben deelgenomen. In iederen heterosexueel zit een gedeelte homosexualiteit, al is dat ook nog zoo klein, even goed als er in iederen homosexueel een gedeelte heterosexualiteit is, al is dit ook nog zoo klein. Het zou wonder zijn, wanneer het individu wel in zijn lichamelijke eigenschappen, maar niet in zijn psychische, van de andere sexe in zijn ascendentie zou erven. Of nu in het midden van de lijn de bisexueel staat, die precies evenveel hetero- als homosexualiteit heeft, kan niet met zekerheid gezegd worden. Theoretisch gesproken, moet het zoo zijn. Maar of er een individu bestaat, dat een zoo precies-gedeelde geslachtsrichting bezit, is niet bekend.

Uit dit alles blijkt, dat de uranist een variëteit is, evenals alle individuen variëteiten zijn, dubbelwezens die zoowel de lichamelijke als de psychische eigenschappen van de beide sexen van hun ouders en voorouders in zich dragen. Met deze opvatting, die ik het eerst op het congres voor crimineele anthropologie te Amsterdam verkondigd heb, gaan dan ook de meeste onderzoekers--Hugo de Vries,[69] Näcke,[70] Hirschfeld,[71] Numa Prätorius[72] e. a.--mede. Uit het wezen der variëteit is het dan ook te verklaren, waarom men onder de uranisten die verschillende vormen vindt, die men bij heterosexueelen ook kan aantoonen, maar die meestal aan de aandacht ontsnappen, van ultra-virilen en virilen tot passieven en geëfemineerden toe. Dat deze variëteit is aangeboren zal wel niemand, naar wat wij zooeven hebben besproken, kunnen of willen tegenspreken.

Wat echter nog wel even sterk pleit voor het aangeboren-zijn van de homosexualiteit, zijn de droomen die de uranist heeft. Näcke is de eerste geweest, die gewezen heeft op "die psychologische Bedeutung der Träume", en zegt dan ook, dat de droom een caracteristicum is, waaruit men de psyche van het individu kan diagnosticeeren.[73] Het zou mij te ver voeren om hier ook over de zoogenaamde contrastdroomen te spreken en ik wil deze dan ook buiten bespreking laten. Zoo is het een zekerheid, dat een heterosexueel in zijn verliefde droomen nooit anders dan heterosexueele beelden ziet, een homosexueel nooit anders dan homosexueele; een bisexueel zal daarentegen nu eens heterosexueele, dan weer homosexueele, beelden voor zich zien. Gesteld iemand zou uranist kunnen worden, iemand zou zijn homosexualiteit kunnen verkrijgen, dan zou het uit zijn droomen blijken, dat hij niet de echte uranisten-natuur heeft en zouden zijn droomen niet voortdurend homosexueel, maar of afwisselend homo- en heterosexueel zijn, of alleen heterosexueel, al naar dat dan zijn ware natuur is. Welken uranist men nu naar zijn verliefde droomen vraagt, men zal altijd ten antwoord krijgen, dat zijn droomen--een enkele contrastdroom, als zeldzaamheid en in zeldzame gevallen er buiten gelaten--altijd homosexueel zijn.

Werpen wij een blik terug op de verschillende theorieën, die er over het uranisme bestaan. De opvatting onzedelijkheid, depravatie, ontucht die uranisme ten gevolge kunnen hebben is niet houdbaar en is ook door een ieder, die een ernstige studie van het

onderwerp heeft gemaakt of nog maakt, verlaten. Ook de opvatting, dat het uranisme een uiting is van een ziekelijke stoornis der geestvermogens, is bewezen onwaar te zijn en hij die het eerst den naam "psychopathia sexualis" heeft uitgesproken, is dan ook bereid geweest, zijn foutieve opvatting te bekennen. Door geen enkelen competenten onderzoeker wordt meer instemming met een dergelijke opvatting geuit. Integendeel, allen die een genoegzaam aantal gevallen van uranisme hebben onderzocht, zijn van het tegendeel van een psychopathie overtuigd.

Dit--zoowel als de kwestie der degeneratie--is van het hoogste belang voor de maatschappelijke zijde van het vraagstuk. Gesteld het uranisme zou een psychopathie zijn, gesteld het zou een degeneratie, een gevolg van degeneratie, een teeken van degeneratie zijn, dan zou hierin geen reden mogen gevonden worden om den uranist met verachting te behandelen of hem uit de samenleving te stooten. Is het uranisme een gevolg van stoornis der geestvermogens, dan is er zeker geen reden om hem met verachting, maar eer reden om hem met medelijden te behandelen. Immers dan staat hij gelijk met iederen ongelukkige, die een afwijking op geestelijk gebied vertoont. Zijn psychopathie toch is niet van zijn wil afhankelijk, zij is niet aan hem zelf, aan zijn wil toe te schrijven, hij heeft die integendeel zonder en tegen zijn wil gekregen.

Hetzelfde kan van de degeneratie worden gezegd. Ook die is niet van zijn wil afhankelijk, ook die heeft hij zonder en tegen zijn wil mee ter wereld gebracht. Doch op dat punt is nog iets anders op te merken, wat van het hoogste belang is. Gesteld het uranisme ware inderdaad een degeneratie--en mijnentwege noeme men het zoo, het is alleen een kwestie van woorden--dan nog zou dit, wat de maatschappelijke zijde van het vraagstuk betreft, niets zeggen. Niet alleen, dat "degeneratie" zonder meer, niets zegt, maar die "degeneratie" kan en mag nooit de maatstaf zijn, waarnaar men iemand beoordeelt. Het is alleen, en mag alleen de vraag zijn, hoe die degeneratie, hoe dit "aus der Art schlagen" zich uit! Men is zoo langzamerhand aan het woord "degeneratie" de beteekenis van individueele minderwaardigheid gaan hechten, die ten eenemale verkeerd is. Iemand die gedegenereerd is, "aus der Art schlägt", doordat hij volmaakter, beter is dan het meerendeel, een genie, een buitengewoon iemand, kan en mag men toch niet een minderwaardig individu noemen, omdat hij gedegenereerd is. Een zoogenaamd gedegenereerd iemand toch kan veel beter, veel meer waard zijn dan zijn niet-gedegenereerde evenmensch. Aan de "degeneratie" hebben wij den vooruitgang van de samenleving te danken, het is de schuld en het werk van "gedegenereerden", dat de wereld zoover gekomen is als geschied is. "Der normale Mensch ist langweilig" heeft Möbius gezegd en het zou er heel vreemd en vervelend in onze wereld uitzien, wanneer er geen dégénérés waren geweest en nog waren, geen genieën, geen geleerden, geen kunstenaars. Niettegenstaande of misschien, en waarschijnlijk zelfs, omdat zij gedegenereerd waren, hebben zoovele groote mannen de wereld vooruit gebracht. In het al- of niet-gedegenereerd zijn zonder meer, mag men geen reden tot waardeschatting van het individu vinden!

Zooals iedereen moet men ook den uranist naar zijn karakter, naar zijn eigenschappen beoordeelen en niet uitsluitend naar zijn geslachtsrichting. Amore, more, ore, re, nascuntur amicitiae! De neiging, waardoor hij van heterosexueelen verschilt, namelijk niet voort te planten (in sommige gevallen planten uranisten wèl voort. In alle geval kunnen zij even goed als heterosexueelen voortplanten.) en dit, om zoo te zeggen, willekeurig nalaten, heeft hij met zoovele heterosexueelen, b.v. vrijwillig celibatairen, gemeen. Dit niet-voortplanten nu is, wat den heterosexueel betreft, nooit een reden voor minachting van de zijde zijner medemenschen. De vraag moet en mag alleen zijn welke moreele, welke sociale eigenschappen een individu vertoont en of die eigenschappen, in den ruimsten zin genomen, beter, hooger, gelijk of minder dan de eigenschappen van het meerendeel zijn. Een ander motief is er niet.

Beschouwen wij den uranist zelf nader. Evenmin als men er begrip van heeft of vermoeden kan, dat het aantal uranisten--en het is uit de enquêtes van Hirschfeld bij de studenten aan de technische Hochschule te Berlijn en onder de Berlijnsche metaalarbeiders,[74] alsmede uit de enquête van v. Römer hier te lande[75] bewezen--plus minus 2.3% van het menschenaantal bedraagt, evenmin heeft men een goede voorstelling van den uranist, zooals hij zich in de maatschappij gedraagt, zooals hij in de maatschappij verkeert. Psychisch normaal, of liever volstrekt niet abnormaler dan de heterosexueelen in de samenleving, doet hij even goed als hij zijn werk, denkt hij even als hij, en voelt hij--op geslachtelijk gebied uitgezonderd--als de heterosexueel. Gaat men hun leven na, dan hoort men dat zij meestal te midden van geslachtelijk normale broeders en zusters zijn geboren en opgevoed, dat zij van hun jeugd reeds--sommige vroeger, andere later--neigingen hebben vertoond, verschillend van die van hun broeders, wanneer het jongens zijn, van hun zusters, wanneer het meisjes zijn. Als jongens voelden zij zich meer aangetrokken tot meisjes-bezigheden, tot meisjesvermaken; als meisjes waren zij de trouwe makkers van hun broeders in hun wilde spelen of in hun mannelijke liefhebberijen. Later, soms pas in de puberteit, is het hen meestal tot hun bewustzijn gekomen, dat zij inderdaad anders voelen dan het meerendeel van hun mannelijke vrienden. Merkwaardig is, dat de moeder dikwijls onbewust op de hoogte van zijn aanleg was, en het is niet zeldzaam te hooren, dat wanneer er grappenderwijs over vrijage of trouwen werd gesproken, de moeder de eenige en eerste was, om op te merken, dikwijls zonder dat zij precies wist waarom, dat haar zoon voor een huwelijk niet

geschikt is. Behalve in hun ontwakende geslachtsneiging, verschillen zij in niets van de kameraden van hun leeftijd en alleen is soms hun neiging, zonder dat zij het zelf weten, van invloed op de keuze van het vak waarin zij zich begeven. Vele uranisten toch voelen zich aangetrokken tot het vak van dames-modes, kapper enz., ofschoon volstrekt niet alle mannen, die zich in die takken van bedrijf begeven, uranisten zijn. Andere kiezen een beroep als van hun heterosexueele kameraden en niemand zou vermoeden, dat er in ieder beroep, in ieder ambt, in iedere bediening uranisten worden gevonden, uranisten, die in hun werk, hun denken en in wat zij ten uitvoer brengen, volstrekt niet bij hun heterosexueele ambtgenooten achterstaan. Men ontmoet ze dan ook in alle rangen en standen van de maatschappij en, wanneer ik alleen naga de uranisten die ik ken of die om hulp en raad bij mij zijn gekomen, dan zie ik daaronder geneesheeren, geestelijken, handelsmannen, studenten, arbeiders, rechters en advocaten, in één woord even zoovelen als er ambachten en beroepen, als er standen in de maatschappij zijn.

Wat een eigenaardigheid is, die men bij het meerendeel der uranisten terugvindt, is deze, dat zij bijna allen een tijdlang in hun leven met de gedachte aan suicide hebben rondgeloopen en dat zij langen tijd de diepste verachting en afkeer van zich zelf hebben gehad. Vóór den tijd namelijk, dat zij op de hoogte van hun toestand waren, in de periode toen hun geslachtsgevoel begon te ontwaken, bemerkten zij, dat zij niet waren als hun kameraden, dat zij zich niet tot meisjes en vrouwen voelden aangetrokken, maar bemerkten zij tot hun verbazing en hun schrik dat hun neigingen alleen op jongens en mannen gericht waren. De schok dien zij daardoor ontvingen, bracht hen meestal tot wanhoop en vertwijfeling en--afgaande op wat zij altijd omtrent deze neigingen en omtrent personen met deze neigingen hebben vernomen--hielden zij zich voor de meest abjecte wezens, die zij zich konden voorstellen. Zóó zelfs is hun wanhoop en de diepe verachting die zij voor hun eigen persoon koesterden--vooral wanneer zij bemerkten, dat hun neigingen niet veranderden, welke moeite zij zich ook gaven, hoevele malen zij ook beproefden met vrouwen geslachtelijk te verkeeren in de hoop, dat hun neigingen zouden veranderen, hoezeer zij zich ook, wanneer zij godsdienstig waren, in het gebed verdiepten--dat er voor hen nog één uitweg open leek, namelijk een eind aan hun leven te maken. Inderdaad zijn er van die geheimzinnige zelfmoorden op jeugdigen leeftijd, die aan het uranisme van den persoon moeten toegeschreven worden, evenals zoovele geheimzinnige zelfmoorden op later leeftijd, als indirect gevolg aan het uranisme van den persoon, aan zijn angst dat men zijn afwijking zal ontdekken, moeten worden geweten.

Heeft de jonge uranist het geluk in handen te vallen van een ouderen heterosexueel, die hem van zijn neigingen op de hoogte brengt, dan is hij gered. Hij legt zich neer bij de ellende van zijn toestand en zoekt zooveel mogelijk nog iets van zijn leven te maken. Een lange ellende echter blijft zijn leven toch voor hem. In een voortdurenden angst, dat men zal ontdekken wat en wie hij eigenlijk is, verstoken van het huiselijk geluk, gedoemd om alleen en altijd alleen, zonder liefde, zonder genegenheid rondom zich als die welke hij weet, dat door iedereen veroordeeld wordt, te leven, sleept hij meestal een bestaan door dat hem een last is en waarvan hij zoo spoedig mogelijk hoopt verlost te worden. Heeft hij het geluk gehad, in handen te vallen van een superieur man of van iemand, die zijn leven dragelijk weet te maken door hem andere en nieuwe idealen te scheppen, hem een ander doel voor oogen te houden dan een heterosexueel huisgezin, dan kan hij door zoo iemand gered worden, op het goede pad gehouden en kan door diens invloed, door diens omgang, zijn leven tot een dragelijk en goed leven worden gemaakt. Altijd echter is zijn leven onvolledig, altijd loopt hij rond met het gevoel, dat hij achter is gesteld bij zoovele anderen, altijd toch is de angst in al zijn doen, in heel zijn leven ingeweven, dat een of anderen dag zijn afwijking bekend kan worden en dat hij dan als een outcast voor zijn verder leven zal worden behandeld. Andere uranisten, verwoed en verbitterd door de onbillijke veroordeeling en beoordeeling van den kant van hun medemenschen, worden onverschillig, gooien zich in een leven van débauche en ontucht en verwoesten uit bitterheid en ontmoediging hun bestaan, dat misschien nuttig en goed had kunnen zijn. Andere weer leggen zich bij hun lot neer en leven door, geslagen, vervelend en verveeld, zonder illusie, zonder het uitzicht op iets moois, dat hen het bestaan beter en om te leven waard kan maken.

Dat zoovele uranisten nerveuse klachten hebben, is daarom niet te verwonderen. Steeds in angst dat men hun toestand zal leeren kennen en dat zij uit den omgang der menschen met wie zij verkeeren, zullen worden gestooten, altijd levend onder de bedreiging--wanneer zij wèl iemand, een heterosexueel of een anderen homosexueel hebben gevonden, met wien zij een verbintenis hebben aangeknoopt--dat zij door chantage tot armoede zullen worden uitgezogen of in het publiek zullen worden geschandvlekt, is het zeer goed te begrijpen, dat hun zenuwgestel op den duur geschaad wordt. En ook de moeilijk vol te houden abstinentie, voor hen die sensueel zijn aangelegd, helpt mee.

Gaat men, de geslachtsrichting daargelaten, na welke individuen uranisten zijn, dan komt men tot de overtuiging, dat zij niets meer--wat sommige uranisten graag willen doen gelooven--maar ook niets minder dan heterosexueelen zijn. Men vindt onder hen dezelfde variaties en dezelfde verschillen als onder heterosexueelen, en evenals onder de laatsten, vindt men onder hen goeden en slechten, braven en deugnieten, knappen en dommen, zedelijken en onzedelijken, in één woord alle eigenschappen en

eigenaardigheden, die men bij heterosexueelen vindt, treft men bij uranisten aan.

Wat hun geslachtsleven betreft, daarvan kan men hetzelfde zeggen. Evenals onder heterosexueelen, vindt men onder hen kuischen en onkuischen, koelen en sensueelen, ingetogenen en losbollen. En evenals onder heterosexueelen, vindt men ook onder hen personen met sexueele perversiteiten behebt: masochisten, sadisten, exhibitionisten en dergelijke meer. Eén eigenschap hebben zij im Allgemeinen voor boven heterosexueelen, namelijk dat men onder hen veel meer spiritueele liefdesverhoudingen vindt. Over het algemeen vindt men meer kuische, koele individuen onder uranisten dan onder heterosexueelen en treft men onder hen veel meer, dat hun liefdeverbintenis een meer spiritueele dan een corporeele is. Het is geen zeldzaamheid dat twee uranisten jarenlang met elkaar in een liefdesverhouding staan, zonder dat het tusschen hen tot een geslachtsuiting komt. En ook hebben zij boven heterosexueelen voor, dat over het algemeen hun omgang veel kiescher, veel gevoeliger, veel zachter is.

Toen ik weinige jaren geleden, voor mijn studie over het uranisme, eenigen tijd te Berlijn doorbracht, heb ik daar als lid van het Wissensch.-humanitär Comitée een openbare vergadering bijgewoond, waar Hirschfeld over het onderwerp sprak. Behalve door een groote menigte heterosexueelen, werd de vergadering natuurlijk door ettelijke honderdtallen homosexueelen bijgewoond. Dat er gedurende en op die vergadering geen enkel onvertogen woord viel, is niet te verwonderen. Maar toen ik daarna een van de beroemde homosexueele gecostumeerde bals bezocht, trof het mij, dat geen enkel onvertogen woord mijn ooren bereikte, trof het mij, dat ik geen enkel ongeoorloofd gebaar zag. En er waren daar zoowel uranisten, als mannelijke prostitués. Den volgenden dag woonde ik een vergadering van het Comitée bij, terwijl ik na afloop daarvan op een souper genoodigd was, dat meestal na die bijeenkomsten wordt gehouden. Ook daar, waar Hirschfeld en ik de eenige heterosexueelen waren, was de toon hoogst fatsoenlijk en de gesprekken van dien aard, dat niemand, zelfs de meest puriteinsche moralist, er aanstoot in zou hebben kunnen vinden. Ik ben in die dagen te Berlijn den geheelen dag in gezelschap van uranisten geweest, ik heb er gelegenheden bezocht waar de mannelijke basse prostitution zetelde. En toen ik in op den laatsten avond van mijn verblijf met den duitschen homosexueelen geneesheer, die ergens in Italië praktiseert, na ons laatste bezoek aan een kroegje van zeer laag allooi, liep te praten in de reeds stille straten van Berlijn en wij van gedachten wisselden over het uranisme en het heterosexueel geslachtsleven, toen moest ik volmondig bekennen, dat--zoolang ik in de afgeloopen dagen in Berlijn had gezworven, met hoeveel uranisten ik ook had omgegaan in dien betrekkelijk korten tijd, welke gesprekken ik ook had hooren voeren en had bijgewoond--hun toon den toon van heterosexueele mannen verre overtrof in kuischheid van taal en uitdrukking en dat er nergens en nooit op heterosexueele publieke gemaskerde bals, nooit in gelegenheden waar door zoogenaamde kellnerinnen werd bediend, een ingetogenheid van woorden en van doen--zooals mij door verschillende weters op dat heterosexueel gebied was meegedeeld--werd aangetroffen, als waarvan ik in die dagen onder uranisten getuige was geweest. Nergens en nergens, door niemand en niemand, heb ik één enkele uitdrukking hooren bezigen, die ongepast was en met volle overtuiging kan ik dan ook zeggen, dat de toon der gesprekken van al deze uranisten, dat de toon der gesprekken aan tafel en na het souper hemelsbreed verschilde van den toon dien men op heterosexueele heerendineetjes hoort en van de gesprekken, die heterosexueele heeren na het diner meestal gewoon zijn met elkaar te houden.

Dat deze meening niet op vooringenomenheid of op een onrechtvaardig oordeel berust, bleek mij korten tijd daarna, toen ik een opstel over de Berlijnsche homosexueelen van de hand van Näcke in het Archiv van Gross las.[76] Näcke heeft dezelfde personen ten naastenbij gesproken, met wie ik kennis had gemaakt, ik kon sommigen zeer goed uit zijn beschrijving herkennen; Näcke heeft ten naastenbij dezelfde gelegenheden bezocht als waar ik ben geweest en de conclusie van Näcke komt zoo goed met de mijne overeen, dat het den indruk zou kunnen maken, dat wij dien van elkaar hebben overgeschreven!

Vraagt men nu of er een middel is om den uranist te "genezen", om hem te veranderen en hem van homosexueel, heterosexueel te maken, dan moeten wij volmondig "neen" antwoorden. Men heeft voorgesteld hen te castreeren en sommige uranisten hebben er om gevraagd, om maar van hun onsociale neiging verlost te worden. Men heeft het gelukkigerwijs nooit gedaan, omdat het toch niet zou helpen. De geslachtsrichting zit niet in de teeltklieren, maar in de psyche. Men heeft voorgesteld--en v. Schrenck-Notzing is er een der voorstanders van--om ze te hypnotiseeren en hen suggestief te behandelen. Het heeft niet mogen baten en van de vijf gevallen, die door v. Schrenck-Notzing als genezen worden opgegeven, zijn er maar twee die op een wijze zijn genezen, dat men het geen genezing mag noemen. De eene patient zegt, dat hij nog dezelfde fantaisieën heeft als vroeger, maar dat hij--wanneer hij wakker is--macht genoeg over zich zelf heeft om er niet aan toe te geven. Daarbij denkt hij er met vrees aan, wat hij zou moeten beginnen, wanneer zijn vrouw eens zou komen te overlijden, omdat hij zeker is, dat hij dan weer in zijn oud kwaad zou vervallen. De tweede zoogenaamde genezen patient zegt, dat wanneer hij zich een tijdlang geabstineerd heeft, hij zijn oude aanvechtingen weer voelt opkomen.[77] Maar zelfs wanneer al de gevallen, die door met hypnose zijn behandeld, zoogenaamd genezen zouden

zijn, dan nog zou men niet het recht hebben van "genezing" te spreken, omdat--zooals v. Krafft-Ebing te recht opmerkt--"de resultaten der hypnose in deze gevallen niet op een werkelijke genezing, maar op een kunstig volvoerde dressuur berusten"[78]. Men zou op dezelfde wijze er van kunnen spreken, dat men iemand homosexueel heeft gemaakt, wanneer men hem door hypnose en suggestie er op gedresseerd had, zijn heterosexueele geslachtsuiting onmogelijk te kunnen volvoeren, maar hem daarentegen het doen van homosexueele geslachtsdaden had ingepraat. Iemand nu die homosexueele geslachtsdaden doet, hebben wij gezien, is daarom nog geen uranist en evenmin kan iemand die door hypnose en suggestie er toe gebracht is, om in plaats van homosexueele, heterosexueele geslachtsdaden te doen, als heterosexueel aangemerkt worden.

Men heeft uranisten den raad gegeven--en sommige geneesheeren, niet genoeg of in het geheel niet op de hoogte van het onderwerp, geven dien raad nog--om zich eerst bij prostitués te oefenen in het heterosexueel geslachtsverkeer en dan te trouwen, of dadelijk te trouwen, in de verwachting, dat de homosexualiteit dan wel zal overgaan. Het immoreele van een dergelijken raad daargelaten, is deze de meest verkeerde dien men een uranist kan geven. Niet alleen maakt men hem zelf ongelukkig, door de wroeging die hij later voelt, een vrouw aan zijn bestaan te hebben gebonden, waarin zijn ware natuur toch--niettegenstaande alle pogingen om heterosexueel te verkeeren--boven komt, maar men maakt zijn vrouw ook diep ongelukkig, doordat zij er onder gebukt moèt gaan, wanneer zij op de hoogte is gekomen van den toestand van haar echtgenoot--zelfs al vergeeft zij hem en houdt zij nog meer van hem omdat hij ongelukkig is (alleen een vrouw voelt zóó teer en zacht, dat er bij haar altijd vergeving en liefde is te vinden in zoo'n geval)--en zij haar verder leven voor zich ziet in één groote desillusie, wetend, dat zij zich geen huisgezin kan scheppen, voelend, dat haar dat eene groote en mooie in haar leven zal blijven ontbreken, de echte, ware liefde van haar man!

Genezing is er niet voor den uranist, omdat hij niet ziek is. Hem den last wegnemen, dien hij bij zijn geboorte heeft meegebracht en die met hem zal blijven tot aan zijn dood, kunnen wij niet. Het eenige wat wij kunnen, is hem trachten te begrijpen, hem trachten te helpen, trachten hem zijn moeilijk leven gemakkelijker te maken.

Er zijn er die vreezen, dat wanneer de theorie die ik heb meegedeeld--namelijk, dat de uranist een variëteit is--in ruimen kring bekend wordt, geen enkele uranist zich meer zal intoomen en dat ieder uranist zich maar aan zijn geslachtslust zal te buiten gaan, dat velen die op het oogenblik uit angst voor de verachting der menschen hun lusten intoomen, aan hun lusten den vrijen teugel zullen vieren. Maar bovenal vreest men, dat velen door de openbaarmaking van deze theorie uranist zullen worden.

Het laatste het eerst besprekend, weten wij, dat dit geen gewichtig argument is. Wij zijn nu genoegzaam overtuigd geworden en het is door de competente onderzoekers genoegzaam aangetoond, dat uranisme altijd is aangeboren en dat uranisme niet kan worden verkregen. Wat de andere opmerkingen betreft, vragen wij daartegenover of er zooveel menschen zich aan drinken zijn te buiten gegaan, sinds er verkondigd is, dat drankzucht een ziekte en niet altijd een bederf der zeden is, of er zooveel menschen zich aan de prostitutie zijn gaan overgeven, omdat men openlijk heeft verkondigd, dat de prostitutie een kwaad is, dat in de samenleving is ingeweven, en dat, onder welken verschillenden vorm dan ook, van den aanvang der samenleving af tot den huidigen dag bestaan heeft. En ook staat tegenover deze vrees het feit, dat niettegenstaande reeds eeuwen lang het uranisme met verachting is beschouwd, de uranist met minachting is behandeld, er toch altijd door uranisten geboren zijn en geleefd hebben, er steeds door homosexueele daden door uranisten zijn gepleegd en nog steeds gepleegd worden. Nooit nog heeft de afkeuring van de massa een uranist teruggehouden van zijn uranisme of belet, dat er uranisten werden geboren. Die minachting en verachting hebben alleen belet, dat de uranist openlijk voor zijn uranisme uitkwam. Zij heeft echter daarbij tevens chantage, wanhoop en zelfmoord in de hand gewerkt! Waarom, wanneer de opvatting, dat het uranisme een variëteit is, in ruimen kring bekend zal zijn, geen enkele uranist meer zijn lusten zal remmen, is mij onbegrijpelijk! Geven heterosexueelen dan maar allen toe aan hun lusten en breidelen zij hun sexueele lusten niet, omdat heterosexualiteit als een normale geslachtsrichting bekend staat en overal en steeds zoo genoemd wordt? Waarom, waar de heterosexueel zijn lusten intoomt, terwijl het hem bekend is dat zijn geslachtsrichting een normale is, de uranist de zijne niet zou intoomen, wanneer men erkent dat hij een variëteit is, is moeilijk te verdedigen.

Deze en dergelijke meeningen zijn alleen het gevolg van de verkeerde gedachte, dat uranisten en homosexueelen per se gedepraveerde en ultra-sensueele individuen zijn. Wij hebben genoegzaam aangetoond, dat dit niet zoo is, maar dat men integendeel veel meer spiritueele dan corporeele liefdegevoelens bij hen aantreft.

Nogmaals, genezen kunnen wij ze niet, wij kunnen alleen trachten ze te helpen. Niet hen verstooten, niet hen verachten moeten wij, niet hen behandelen als paria's om iets dat zij bij hun geboorte en zonder hun wil hebben meegekregen. Men weet niet hoeveel er gestreden, geschreid, hoeveel er gewanhoopt, hoeveel er geleden wordt! Uit de voorbeelden die ik heb genoemd, is duidelijk genoeg gebleken, dat de uranist even goed als de heterosexueel zijn plaats in de samenleving kan innemen; uit die voorbeelden is ook gebleken, dat hij die plaats met eere kan vervullen als artiest, als wetenschappelijk man, in één woord, als werker. Hem er op

te wijzen, dat de geslachtsdaad--en zelfs niet de heterosexueele geslachtsdaad--niet het eenige, het einddoel, het hoogste in het bestaan is; hem er op te wijzen, dat hij zich boven zijn geslachtsleven moet stellen, dat hij zijn lusten moet remmen, even goed als wij allen, dat hij door zijn voelen, door zijn denken, door zijn werken een ander doel zich kan scheppen tot nut en heil van zijn medemenschen, moet ons streven zijn.

Maar bij dit alles moeten wij nooit vergeten, dat waar wij allen--hetero- en homosexueelen--den last van het leven moeten dragen, wij heterosexueelen altijd dàt geluk vóór hebben, dat wij--wanneer wij moe en gekwetst zijn van het worstelen in de maatschappij en het botsen tegen de onverschilligheid en de hardheid van de menschen--altijd een vrouw kunnen vinden bij wie wij ons hoofd kunnen neerrusten in haar schoot, een vrouw die ons kan helpen, steunen en ons troosten; wij mogen en moeten nooit vergeten, dat waar wij dat hoogste en dat mooiste bezitten, dat eenige wat het leven dragelijk maakt, dat eenige wat het leven waard maakt om gedragen te worden, dat hen dat steeds ontbreken blijft, dat zij dat blijven missen tot hun dood.

Wij moeten en mogen nooit vergeten, dat zij zooveel ongelukkiger zijn.

Ik heb gezegd.

VOETNOTEN:

1: Zie Handelingen Eerste Kamer, 29 Jan. 1902 en Handelingen Tweede Kamer, 55ste Verg. 25 Febr. 1904, Vel 356, blz. 1870.

2: Handelingen Eerste Kamer, 1 Febr. 1905.

3: Havelock Ellis, Mann und Weib, vert. d. Kurella, Leipzig 1895, bldz. 56.

4: Geciteerd door Hirschfeld in Die objektieve Diagnose der Homosexualität, in Jahrb. f. sex. Zwischenstufen Dl. I. 1899. bldz. 8.

5: Havelock Ellis, l. c. bldz. 209-216.

6: Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, Histoire des Anomalies, Paris, 1836.

7: L. S. A. M. v. Römer, Ueber die androgynische Idee des Lebens, in Jahrb. f. sex. Zwischenst. Dl. V, Bd. 2, 1903.

8: Diodori Siculi, Bibliothecae etc. lib. IV, c. 6, 5, geciteerd door v. Römer, l. c. bladz. 905.

9: Laurent, Les bisexués, Paris, George Carré, 1894, bldz. 117.

10: Laurent, l. c. bldz. 118.

11: Neugebauer, Beobachtungen auf dem Gebiete des Scheinzwittertumes, in Jahrb. f. sex. Zwischenst. Dl. IV, 1902, bldz. 130.

12: Neugebauer, l. c. ibidem.

13: Laurent, l. c. bldz. 119 en 120.

14: Neugebauer, Hermaphroditismus beim Menschen, Leipzig, Dr. Werner Klinkhardt, 1908, bldz. 4.

15: Neugebauer, Hermaphroditismus enz., bldz. 83.

16: Laurent, l. c. bldz. 122.

17: Neugebauer, Hermaphroditismus enz., bldz. 666 en vlg.

18: Debierre, L'Hermaphrodisme, Paris, 1891, bldz. 434 en vlg.

19: Neugebauer, Hermaphroditismus enz. Op bldz. 690 en vlg. geeft deze 56 gevallen, waarin het pseudo- of zoogenaamd echt hermaphrodit. met psychische stoornis gepaard ging. Dit aantal kwam onder 1885 observaties van hermaphroditisme voor.

20: Moll, Libido sexualis, Fischer's Buchhandlung, Berlin 1878, bldz. 110.

21: Neugebauer, Interessante Beobachtungen, enz. bldz. 161.

22: Ploss, Das Weib in der Natur- und Völkerkunde, Leipzig 1899, Dl. II, bldz. 422.

23: Geijll, Over operatief ingrijpen bij pseudohermaphroditisme, Med. Weekblad, 9e Jaarg. 1902, No. 31, bldz. 418 en vlg.

24: Edmond Pilou, Deux précieuses au XVIIme Siècle, Mercure de France, Dl. 67, No. 237, 1º Mei 1907, bldz. 5.

25: Raffalovich (Marc André), Uranisme et Unisexualité, Lyon-Paris, 1896, bldz. 41.

26: Waar bij het historisch overzicht geen andere bron vermeld wordt, zijn de data overgenomen uit Moll, konträre Sexualempfindung, Fischer, Berlin W. 1899.

27: A. Aletrino, Eenige beschouwingen over den beroepseed der artsen, Proefschrift, Amsterdam 1889, bldz. 6.

28: L. S. A. M. v. Römer, Heinrich der Dritte, Jahrb. f. sex. Zwischenstufen, IVe Jahrg. 1902, bldz. 572 en vlg.

29: Hans Fuchs, Richard Wagner und die Homosexualität, Berlin 1903, en Vossische Zeitung van 24 en 28 Juni 1886.

30: Jahrb. f. sex. Zw.st. Dl. I, bldz. 150 en Dl. VI bldz. 357.

31: Jahrb. f. sex. Zw.st. Dl. II, bldz. 150.--Laupts, Perversion et perversité, Paris 1896, bldz. 105.--Raffalovich, Uranisme et unisexualité, Paris-Lyon 1896, bldz. 241.

32: Raffalovich, l. c. bldz. 138.

33: Johannes Schlaf, Walt Whitman Homosexueller? Brun's Verlag, Minden in W. 1906.

34: Raffalovich, l. c. bldz. 138.

35: Jahrb. f. sex. Zw.st. Dl. 5, bldz. 1322.

36: Jahrb. f. sex. Zw.st. Dl. 5, bldz. 1304.

37: § 175 v. h. Duitsche Strafwetboek luidt: "Die widernatürliche Unzucht, welche zwischen Personen männlichen Geschlechts oder von Menschen mit Thieren begangen wird, ist mit Gefängniss zu bestrafen; auch kann auf Verlust der bürgerlichen Ehrenrechte erkannt werden."

38: Collection des plus belles pages de Restif de la Bretonne, Paris, Société du Mercure de France, 1905.

39: J. Casanova de Seingalt, Mémoires, Paris, Garnier frères.

40: Montesquieu, De l'Esprit des Lois, Paris 1873, Hachette, Livre 12, Chap. 6, bldz. 286.

41: Voltaire, Dictionnaire philosophique.

42: Meiners, Betrachtungen über die Männerliebe der Griechen enz., Leipzig 1775.

43: Ehrenberg, Euphranor. Ueber die Liebe etc., Elberfeld u. Leipzig 1809.

44: Brière de Boismont, Remarques médico-légales sur la perversion de l'instinct génésique, Gaz. méd. de Paris, 21 Juli 1849.

45: Hössli, Eros. Die Männerliebe der Griechen, 1e Bd. Glarus 1836 en 2e Bd. St.-Gallen 1838.

46: Michéa, Les déviations maladives de l'appétit vénérien, Union méd. 17 Juli 1849.

47: Casper, Ueber Notzucht und Päderastie etc. Vierteljahrschrift f. gerichtliche u. öffentl. Medizin, Berlin 1852 Bd. I.

48: Numa Numantius (Karl Heinrich Ulrichs), 1. Vindex. 2. Inclusa. 3. Vindicta. 4. Formatrix. 5. Ara spei. 6. Gladius furens. 7. Memnon. 8. Incubus. 9. Argonauticus. 10. Uranus. 11. Araxes. 12. Kritische Pfeile. (Laatste uitgaaf verschenen te Leipzig, Max Spohr, 1898.)

49: Dr. A. Aletrino, Over Uranisme en het laatste boek van Raffalovich (Marc André), Psychiatrische en neurolog. bladen 1907.

50: Dr. L. S. A. M. Römer, Ongekend leed, Tierie, Amsterdam 1904. Het Uranisch gezin, Tierie, Amsterdam 1905.

51: Dr. A. Aletrino, La situation sociale de l'uraniste, Actes du 5me Congrès d'anthrop. crimin., de Bussy, Amsterdam 1901.

52: Karl Ihlfeld, Over Uranisme, Tierie, Amsterdam 1905.

53: Casper Wirz, De uraniër voor Kerk en H. Schrift, Tierie, Amsterdam 1904.

54: Magnus Hirschfeld, Oorzaken en Wezen van het Uranisme, vertaald door W. met een voorrede van Dr. A. Aletrino, Tierie, Amsterdam 1904.

Dit werk, voor 't eerst verschenen onder den titel Ursachen und Wesen des Uranismus in het Jahrb. f. sex. Zw.st. Dl. 5, 1901, is als op zich zelf staand werk uitgekomen onder den titel "Der Urnische Mensch".

55: Rohleder, Die Masturbation, Berlin 1902. Fischer's Med. Buchh. bldz. 45.

56: Moll, l. c. bldz. 89, 5e noot.

57: v. Krafft-Ebing, Neue Studien auf dem Gebiete der Homosexualität, Jahrb. f. sex. Zw.st. Bd. 3, bldz. 7.

58: Näcke, Ein Besuch bei den Homosexuellen in Berlin, Archiv. v. Gross. 15e Bd. 2e en 3e Hft.

59: Magnan et Legrain, Les dégénérés, Paris 1895, bldz. 79.

60: Wertheim Salomonson, Iets over ontaarding, Ned. Tijdsch. v. Geneeskunde, 39ste Jaarg. 1903, 2e Dl. bldz. 715.

61: Möbius, Beiträge zur Lehre der Geschlechts-Unterschiede, Halle a. S., Carl Marhold, 1907, bldz. 17.

62: Hoche, Handbuch d. ger. Psychiatrie, Berlin 1901, bldz. 413.

63: Sigm. Freud, Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie, Leipzig u. Wien, Franz Deuticke, 1905, bldz. 4.

64: Untrodden fields of anthropology, Paris 1898.

65: Karsch, Uranismus u. Päderastie enz. Jahrb. f. sex. Zw.st. 3e Bd. bldz. 72.

66: Havelock Ellis und Symonds, Das konträre Geschlechtsgefühl, Wiegand's Verlag, Leipzig 1896, bldz. 4.

67: Richard Burton, Arabian Nights, London 1885, Bd. 10, bldz. 205-254.

68: Hugo de Vries, Oorsprong en bevruchting der bloemen, Tierie, Amsterdam 1904, bldz. 29-33, 80.

69: Prof. Hugo de Vries schreef mij, naar aanleiding van mijn rapport op het Congres: "....met uw opvatting "variëteit" kan ik mij geheel vereenigen".

70: Näcke, Bericht über den Verlauf d. 5. intern. kriminal-anthr. Congr. in Amsterdam, Hans Gross' Archiv. Bd. 8, Hft. I, bldz. 97.

71: Hirschfeld, Jahrb. f. sex. Zw.st. Bd. 4, bldz. 962.

72: Numa Prätorius, ibidem bldz. 833.

73: Näcke, Die forensische Bedeutung der Träume, Hans Gross' Archiv. Bd. V, Hft. I, bldz. 121.

74: Hirschfeld, Das Ergebnis der statistischen Untersuchungen, Max Spohr, Leipzig 1904, bldz. 60.

75: v. Römer, Ongekend leed, Tierie, Amsterdam 1904, bldz. 13 en 14.

76: Ein Besuch bei den Homosexuellen, etc., Gross' Archiv. Bd. 15, 2e en 3e Hft., bldz. 248.

77: v. Schrenck-Notzing, Die Suggestionstherapie bei krankhaften Erscheinungen des Geschlechtstriebs, Stuttgart 1892, bldz. 244 en vlg.

78: v. Krafft-Ebing, Psychopathia sexualis, 10e uitgaaf, bldz. 285.

NOOT VAN DE BEWERKER:

In het bovenstaande is getracht zo goed mogelijk het origineel te volgen, met uitzondering van de voetnoten, die in het origineel onderin de pagina's stonden, en hier bij elkaar zijn geplaatst en hernummerd. Daarnaast zijn alle (vijf) Griekse woorden getranslitereerd en ingesloten tussen ~, en de volgende kennelijke drukfouten verbeterd:

* door Waldeyer "kiemepitheel" genoemd: in het origineel 'kiemepithel' * de voorstelling van androgynie: in het origineel 'andrygynie' * Mundi Mirabile Monstrum."[14]: in het origineel 'Monstrum.[14]' * zoogenaamde "erreur de sexe": in het origineel 'voogenaamde' * (Marc André): in het origineel '(Marc, André)' * het pseudoniem "Karl Ihlfeld": in het originaal 'pseudoneim' * Gesellschaft für Psychiatrie und Nervenheilkunde: in het origineel 'en' in plaats van 'und' * als een mozaïek: in het origineel 'mozaiëk' * aus der Art schlägt: in het origineel 'schlagt' * Mensch ist langweilig: in het origineel 'langeweilig' * nog één uitweg: in het origineel 'éen' * zonder het uitzicht op iets moois: in het origineel 'mooi's' * in een liefdesverhouding: in het origineel 'liefdeverhouding' * op een kunstig volvoerde dressuur berusten"[78].: in het origineel 'berusten[78],' * noot 18: in het origineel ontbrak de punt na 'vlg' * noot 22: Natur- und Völkerkunde: in het origineel 'Volkenkunde' * noot 25: Unisexualité: in het origineel 'Unisixualité' * noot 26: Fischer, Berlin: in het origineel 'Fisscher' * noot 31: Laupts: in het origineel 'Lauppts' * noot 61: Lehre der Geschlechts-Unterschiede: in het origineel 'Geschlechts-Unterschieden' * noot 63: Franz Deuticke: in het origineel 'Fransz' * noot 67: Arabian Nights, London: in het origineel 'Arabian Nights. Londen'

End of Project Gutenberg's Hermaphrodisie en Uranisme, by Arnold Aletrino

==========

Our Knowledge of the External World as a Field for Scientific Method in Philosophy

Bertrand Russell

Project Gutenberg Release: August 15, 2011 · eBook #37090

Produced by Jana Srna and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at https://www.pgdp.net

[Transcriber's Notes:

Every effort has been made to replicate this text as faithfully as possible, including inconsistencies in spelling and hyphenation. Some corrections of spelling and punctuation have been made. They are listed at the end of the text.

Italic text has been marked with _underscores_. Greek text has been transliterated and marked with ~tildes~.]

OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTERNAL WORLD

AS A FIELD FOR SCIENTIFIC METHOD IN PHILOSOPHY

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

INTRODUCTION TO MATHEMATICAL PHILOSOPHY Second Edition. Demy 8vo, 12s. 6d. net.

THE ANALYSIS OF MIND Demy 8vo, 16s. net.

PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION Seventh Impression. Cr. 8vo, 5s. net; Limp, 3s. 6d. net.

ROADS TO FREEDOM: SOCIALISM, ANARCHISM AND SYNDICALISM Fourth Impression. Cr. 8vo, 5s. net; Limp, 3s. 6d. net.

THE PRACTICE AND THEORY OF BOLSHEVISM Second Impression. Cr. 8vo, 6s. net.

OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTERNAL WORLD AS A FIELD FOR SCIENTIFIC METHOD IN PHILOSOPHY

BY BERTRAND RUSSELL, F.R.S

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD RUSKIN HOUSE, 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C. 1

First published in 1914 by The Open Court Publishing Company

Reissued by George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 1922

PREFACE

The following lectures[1] are an attempt to show, by means of examples, the nature, capacity, and limitations of the logical-analytic method in philosophy. This method, of which the first complete example is to be found in the writings of Frege, has gradually, in the course of actual research, increasingly forced itself upon me as something perfectly definite, capable of embodiment in maxims, and adequate, in all branches of philosophy, to yield whatever objective scientific knowledge it is possible to obtain. Most of the methods hitherto practised have professed to lead to more ambitious results than any that logical analysis can claim to reach, but unfortunately these results have always been such as many competent philosophers considered inadmissible. Regarded merely as hypotheses and as aids to imagination, the great systems of the past serve a very useful purpose, and are abundantly worthy of study. But something different is required if philosophy is to become a science, and to aim at results independent of the tastes and temperament of the philosopher who advocates them. In what follows, I have endeavoured to show, however imperfectly, the way by which I believe that this _desideratum_ is to be found.

[1] Delivered as Lowell Lectures in Boston, in March and April 1914.

The central problem by which I have sought to illustrate method is the problem of the relation between the crude data of sense and the space, time, and matter of mathematical physics. I have been made aware of the importance of this problem by my friend and collaborator Dr Whitehead, to whom are due almost all the differences between the views advocated here and those suggested in _The Problems of Philosophy_.[2] I owe to him the definition of points, the suggestion for the treatment of instants and "things," and the whole conception of the world of physics as a _construction_ rather than an _inference_. What is said on these topics here is, in fact, a rough preliminary account of the more precise results which he is giving in the fourth volume of our _Principia Mathematica_.[3] It will be seen that if his way of dealing with these topics is capable of being successfully carried through, a wholly new light is thrown on the time-honoured controversies of realists and idealists, and a method is obtained of solving all that is soluble in their problem.

[2] London and New York, 1912 ("Home University Library").

[3] The first volume was published at Cambridge in 1910, the second in 1912, and the third in 1913.

The speculations of the past as to the reality or unreality of the world of physics were baffled, at the outset, by the absence of any satisfactory theory of the mathematical infinite. This difficulty has been removed by the work of Georg Cantor. But the positive and detailed solution of the problem by means of mathematical constructions based upon sensible objects as data has only been rendered possible by the growth of mathematical logic, without which it is practically impossible to manipulate ideas of the requisite abstractness and complexity. This aspect, which is somewhat obscured in a merely popular outline such as is contained in the following lectures, will become plain as soon as Dr Whitehead's work is published. In pure logic, which, however, will be very briefly discussed in these lectures, I have had the benefit of vitally important discoveries, not yet published, by my friend Mr Ludwig Wittgenstein.

Since my purpose was to illustrate method, I have included much that is tentative and incomplete, for it is not by the study of finished structures alone that the manner of construction can be learnt. Except in regard to such matters as Cantor's theory of infinity, no finality is claimed for the theories suggested; but I believe that where they are found to require modification, this will be discovered by substantially the same method as that which at present makes them appear probable, and it is on this ground that I ask the reader to be tolerant of their incompleteness.

Cambridge, June 1914.

CONTENTS

LECTURE PAGE

I. Current Tendencies 3

II. Logic as the Essence of Philosophy 33

III. On our Knowledge of the External World 63

IV. The World of Physics and the World of Sense 101

V. The Theory of Continuity 129

VI. The Problem of Infinity considered Historically 155

VII. The Positive Theory of Infinity 185

VIII. On the Notion of Cause, with Applications to the Free-will Problem 211

Index 243

LECTURE I

CURRENT TENDENCIES

Philosophy, from the earliest times, has made greater claims, and achieved fewer results, than any other branch of learning. Ever since Thales said that all is water, philosophers have been ready with glib assertions about the sum-total of things; and equally glib

denials have come from other philosophers ever since Thales was contradicted by Anaximander. I believe that the time has now arrived when this unsatisfactory state of things can be brought to an end. In the following course of lectures I shall try, chiefly by taking certain special problems as examples, to indicate wherein the claims of philosophers have been excessive, and why their achievements have not been greater. The problems and the method of philosophy have, I believe, been misconceived by all schools, many of its traditional problems being insoluble with our means of knowledge, while other more neglected but not less important problems can, by a more patient and more adequate method, be solved with all the precision and certainty to which the most advanced sciences have attained.

Among present-day philosophies, we may distinguish three principal types, often combined in varying proportions by a single philosopher, but in essence and tendency distinct. The first of these, which I shall call the classical tradition, descends in the main from Kant and Hegel; it represents the attempt to adapt to present needs the methods and results of the great constructive philosophers from Plato downwards. The second type, which may be called evolutionism, derived its predominance from Darwin, and must be reckoned as having had Herbert Spencer for its first philosophical representative; but in recent times it has become, chiefly through William James and M. Bergson, far bolder and far more searching in its innovations than it was in the hands of Herbert Spencer. The third type, which may be called "logical atomism" for want of a better name, has gradually crept into philosophy through the critical scrutiny of mathematics. This type of philosophy, which is the one that I wish to advocate, has not as yet many whole-hearted adherents, but the "new realism" which owes its inception to Harvard is very largely impregnated with its spirit. It represents, I believe, the same kind of advance as was introduced into physics by Galileo: the substitution of piecemeal, detailed, and verifiable results for large untested generalities recommended only by a certain appeal to imagination. But before we can understand the changes advocated by this new philosophy, we must briefly examine and criticise the other two types with which it has to contend.

A. The Classical Tradition

Twenty years ago, the classical tradition, having vanquished the opposing tradition of the English empiricists, held almost unquestioned sway in all Anglo-Saxon universities. At the present day, though it is losing ground, many of the most prominent teachers still adhere to it. In academic France, in spite of M. Bergson, it is far stronger than all its opponents combined; and in Germany it has many vigorous advocates. Nevertheless, it represents on the whole a decaying force, and it has failed to adapt itself to the temper of the age. Its advocates are, in the main, those whose extra-philosophical knowledge is literary, rather than those who have felt the inspiration of science. There are, apart from reasoned arguments, certain general intellectual forces against it--the same general forces which are breaking down the other great syntheses of the past, and making our age one of bewildered groping where our ancestors walked in the clear daylight of unquestioning certainty.

The original impulse out of which the classical tradition developed was the naive faith of the Greek philosophers in the omnipotence of reasoning. The discovery of geometry had intoxicated them, and its _a priori_ deductive method appeared capable of universal application. They would prove, for instance, that all reality is one, that there is no such thing as change, that the world of sense is a world of mere illusion; and the strangeness of their results gave them no qualms because they believed in the correctness of their reasoning. Thus it came to be thought that by mere thinking the most surprising and important truths concerning the whole of reality could be established with a certainty which no contrary observations could shake. As the vital impulse of the early philosophers died away, its place was taken by authority and tradition, reinforced, in the Middle Ages and almost to our own day, by systematic theology. Modern philosophy, from Descartes onwards, though not bound by authority like that of the Middle Ages, still accepted more or less uncritically the Aristotelian logic. Moreover, it still believed, except in Great Britain, that _a priori_ reasoning could reveal otherwise undiscoverable secrets about the universe, and could prove reality to be quite different from what, to direct observation, it appears to be. It is this belief, rather than any particular tenets resulting from it, that I regard as the distinguishing characteristic of the classical tradition, and as hitherto the main obstacle to a scientific attitude in philosophy.

The nature of the philosophy embodied in the classical tradition may be made clearer by taking a particular exponent as an illustration. For this purpose, let us consider for a moment the doctrines of Mr Bradley, who is probably the most distinguished living representative of this school. Mr Bradley's _Appearance and Reality_ is a book consisting of two parts, the first called _Appearance_, the second _Reality_. The first part examines and condemns almost all that makes up our everyday world: things and qualities, relations, space and time, change, causation, activity, the self. All these, though in some sense facts which qualify reality, are not real as they appear. What is real is one single, indivisible, timeless whole, called the Absolute, which is in some sense spiritual, but does not consist of souls, or of thought and will as we know them. And all this is established by abstract logical

reasoning professing to find self-contradictions in the categories condemned as mere appearance, and to leave no tenable alternative to the kind of Absolute which is finally affirmed to be real.

One brief example may suffice to illustrate Mr Bradley's method. The world appears to be full of many things with various relations to each other--right and left, before and after, father and son, and so on. But relations, according to Mr Bradley, are found on examination to be self-contradictory and therefore impossible. He first argues that, if there are relations, there must be qualities between which they hold. This part of his argument need not detain us. He then proceeds:

"But how the relation can stand to the qualities is, on the other side, unintelligible. If it is nothing to the qualities, then they are not related at all; and, if so, as we saw, they have ceased to be qualities, and their relation is a nonentity. But if it is to be something to them, then clearly we shall require a _new_ connecting relation. For the relation hardly can be the mere adjective of one or both of its terms; or, at least, as such it seems indefensible. And, being something itself, if it does not itself bear a relation to the terms, in what intelligible way will it succeed in being anything to them? But here again we are hurried off into the eddy of a hopeless process, since we are forced to go on finding new relations without end. The links are united by a link, and this bond of union is a link which also has two ends; and these require each a fresh link to connect them with the old. The problem is to find how the relation can stand to its qualities, and this problem is insoluble."[4]

[4] _Appearance and Reality_, pp. 32-33.

I do not propose to examine this argument in detail, or to show the exact points where, in my opinion, it is fallacious. I have quoted it only as an example of method. Most people will admit, I think, that it is calculated to produce bewilderment rather than conviction, because there is more likelihood of error in a very subtle, abstract, and difficult argument than in so patent a fact as the interrelatedness of the things in the world. To the early Greeks, to whom geometry was practically the only known science, it was possible to follow reasoning with assent even when it led to the strangest conclusions. But to us, with our methods of experiment and observation, our knowledge of the long history of _a priori_ errors refuted by empirical science, it has become natural to suspect a fallacy in any deduction of which the conclusion appears to contradict patent facts. It is easy to carry such suspicion too far, and it is very desirable, if possible, actually to discover the exact nature of the error when it exists. But there is no doubt that what we may call the empirical outlook has become part of most educated people's habit of mind; and it is this, rather than any definite argument, that has diminished the hold of the classical tradition upon students of philosophy and the instructed public generally.

The function of logic in philosophy, as I shall try to show at a later stage, is all-important; but I do not think its function is that which it has in the classical tradition. In that tradition, logic becomes constructive through negation. Where a number of alternatives seem, at first sight, to be equally possible, logic is made to condemn all of them except one, and that one is then pronounced to be realised in the actual world. Thus the world is constructed by means of logic, with little or no appeal to concrete experience. The true function of logic is, in my opinion, exactly the opposite of this. As applied to matters of experience, it is analytic rather than constructive; taken _a priori_, it shows the possibility of hitherto unsuspected alternatives more often than the impossibility of alternatives which seemed _prima facie_ possible. Thus, while it liberates imagination as to what the world _may_ be, it refuses to legislate as to what the world _is_. This change, which has been brought about by an internal revolution in logic, has swept away the ambitious constructions of traditional metaphysics, even for those whose faith in logic is greatest; while to the many who regard logic as a chimera the paradoxical systems to which it has given rise do not seem worthy even of refutation. Thus on all sides these systems have ceased to attract, and even the philosophical world tends more and more to pass them by.

One or two of the favourite doctrines of the school we are considering may be mentioned to illustrate the nature of its claims. The universe, it tells us, is an "organic unity," like an animal or a perfect work of art. By this it means, roughly speaking, that all the different parts fit together and co-operate, and are what they are because of their place in the whole. This belief is sometimes advanced dogmatically, while at other times it is defended by certain logical arguments. If it is true, every part of the universe is a microcosm, a miniature reflection of the whole. If we knew ourselves thoroughly, according to this doctrine, we should know everything. Common sense would naturally object that there are people--say in China--with whom our relations are so indirect and trivial that we cannot infer anything important as to them from any fact about ourselves. If there are living beings in Mars or in more distant parts of the universe, the same argument becomes even stronger. But further, perhaps the whole contents of the space and time in which we live form only one of many universes, each seeming to itself complete. And thus the conception of the necessary unity of all that is resolves itself into the poverty of imagination, and a freer logic emancipates us from the strait-waistcoated benevolent institution which idealism palms off as the totality of being.

Another very important doctrine held by most, though not all, of the school we are examining is the doctrine that all reality is what is called "mental" or "spiritual," or that, at any rate, all reality is dependent for its existence upon what is mental. This view is often particularised into the form which states that the relation of knower and known is fundamental, and that nothing can exist unless it either knows or is known. Here again the same legislative function is ascribed to _a priori_ argumentation: it is thought that there are contradictions in an unknown reality. Again, if I am not mistaken, the argument is fallacious, and a better logic will show that no limits can be set to the extent and nature of the unknown. And when I speak of the unknown, I do not mean merely what we personally do not know, but what is not known to any mind. Here as elsewhere, while the older logic shut out possibilities and imprisoned imagination within the walls of the familiar, the newer logic shows rather what may happen, and refuses to decide as to what _must_ happen.

The classical tradition in philosophy is the last surviving child of two very diverse parents: the Greek belief in reason, and the mediaeval belief in the tidiness of the universe. To the schoolmen, who lived amid wars, massacres, and pestilences, nothing appeared so delightful as safety and order. In their idealising dreams, it was safety and order that they sought: the universe of Thomas Aquinas or Dante is as small and neat as a Dutch interior. To us, to whom safety has become monotony, to whom the primeval savageries of nature are so remote as to become a mere pleasing condiment to our ordered routine, the world of dreams is very different from what it was amid the wars of Guelf and Ghibelline. Hence William James's protest against what he calls the "block universe" of the classical tradition; hence Nietzsche's worship of force; hence the verbal bloodthirstiness of many quiet literary men. The barbaric substratum of human nature, unsatisfied in action, finds an outlet in imagination. In philosophy, as elsewhere, this tendency is visible; and it is this, rather than formal argument, that has thrust aside the classical tradition for a philosophy which fancies itself more virile and more vital.

B. Evolutionism

Evolutionism, in one form or another, is the prevailing creed of our time. It dominates our politics, our literature, and not least our philosophy. Nietzsche, pragmatism, Bergson, are phases in its philosophic development, and their popularity far beyond the circles of professional philosophers shows its consonance with the spirit of the age. It believes itself firmly based on science, a liberator of hopes, an inspirer of an invigorating faith in human power, a sure antidote to the ratiocinative authority of the Greeks and the dogmatic authority of mediaeval systems. Against so fashionable and so agreeable a creed it may seem useless to raise a protest; and with much of its spirit every modern man must be in sympathy. But I think that, in the intoxication of a quick success, much that is important and vital to a true understanding of the universe has been forgotten. Something of Hellenism must be combined with the new spirit before it can emerge from the ardour of youth into the wisdom of manhood. And it is time to remember that biology is neither the only science, nor yet the model to which all other sciences must adapt themselves. Evolutionism, as I shall try to show, is not a truly scientific philosophy, either in its method or in the problems which it considers. The true scientific philosophy is something more arduous and more aloof, appealing to less mundane hopes, and requiring a severer discipline for its successful practice.

Darwin's _Origin of Species_ persuaded the world that the difference between different species of animals and plants is not the fixed, immutable difference that it appears to be. The doctrine of natural kinds, which had rendered classification easy and definite, which was enshrined in the Aristotelian tradition, and protected by its supposed necessity for orthodox dogma, was suddenly swept away for ever out of the biological world. The difference between man and the lower animals, which to our human conceit appears enormous, was shown to be a gradual achievement, involving intermediate beings who could not with certainty be placed either within or without the human family. The sun and planets had already been shown by Laplace to be very probably derived from a primitive more or less undifferentiated nebula. Thus the old fixed landmarks became wavering and indistinct, and all sharp outlines were blurred. Things and species lost their boundaries, and none could say where they began or where they ended.

But if human conceit was staggered for a moment by its kinship with the ape, it soon found a way to reassert itself, and that way is the "philosophy" of evolution. A process which led from the amoeba to man appeared to the philosophers to be obviously a progress--though whether the amoeba would agree with this opinion is not known. Hence the cycle of changes which science had shown to be the probable history of the past was welcomed as revealing a law of development towards good in the universe--an evolution or unfolding of an ideal slowly embodying itself in the actual. But such a view, though it might satisfy Spencer and those whom we may call Hegelian evolutionists, could not be accepted as adequate by the more whole-hearted votaries of change. An ideal to which the world continuously approaches is, to these minds, too dead and static to be inspiring. Not only the aspirations, but the ideal too, must change and develop with the course of evolution; there must be no fixed goal, but a continual fashioning of

fresh needs by the impulse which is life and which alone gives unity to the process.

Ever since the seventeenth century, those whom William James described as the "tender-minded" have been engaged in a desperate struggle with the mechanical view of the course of nature which physical science seems to impose. A great part of the attractiveness of the classical tradition was due to the partial escape from mechanism which it provided. But now, with the influence of biology, the "tender-minded" believe that a more radical escape is possible, sweeping aside not merely the laws of physics, but the whole apparently immutable apparatus of logic, with its fixed concepts, its general principles, and its reasonings which seem able to compel even the most unwilling assent. The older kind of teleology, therefore, which regarded the End as a fixed goal, already partially visible, towards which we were gradually approaching, is rejected by M. Bergson as not allowing enough for the absolute dominion of change. After explaining why he does not accept mechanism, he proceeds:[5]

"But radical finalism is quite as unacceptable, and for the same reason. The doctrine of teleology, in its extreme form, as we find it in Leibniz for example, implies that things and beings merely realise a programme previously arranged. But if there is nothing unforeseen, no invention or creation in the universe, time is useless again. As in the mechanistic hypothesis, here again it is supposed that _all is given_. Finalism thus understood is only inverted mechanism. It springs from the same postulate, with this sole difference, that in the movement of our finite intellects along successive things, whose successiveness is reduced to a mere appearance, it holds in front of us the light with which it claims to guide us, instead of putting it behind. It substitutes the attraction of the future for the impulsion of the past. But succession remains none the less a mere appearance, as indeed does movement itself. In the doctrine of Leibniz, time is reduced to a confused perception, relative to the human standpoint, a perception which would vanish, like a rising mist, for a mind seated at the centre of things.

"Yet finalism is not, like mechanism, a doctrine with fixed rigid outlines. It admits of as many inflections as we like. The mechanistic philosophy is to be taken or left: it must be left if the least grain of dust, by straying from the path foreseen by mechanics, should show the slightest trace of spontaneity. The doctrine of final causes, on the contrary, will never be definitively refuted. If one form of it be put aside, it will take another. Its principle, which is essentially psychological, is very flexible. It is so extensible, and thereby so comprehensive, that one accepts something of it as soon as one rejects pure mechanism. The theory we shall put forward in this book will therefore necessarily partake of finalism to a certain extent."

[5] _Creative Evolution_, English translation, p. 41.

M. Bergson's form of finalism depends upon his conception of life. Life, in his philosophy, is a continuous stream, in which all divisions are artificial and unreal. Separate things, beginnings and endings, are mere convenient fictions: there is only smooth, unbroken transition. The beliefs of to-day may count as true to-day, if they carry us along the stream; but to-morrow they will be false, and must be replaced by new beliefs to meet the new situation. All our thinking consists of convenient fictions, imaginary congealings of the stream: reality flows on in spite of all our fictions, and though it can be lived, it cannot be conceived in thought. Somehow, without explicit statement, the assurance is slipped in that the future, though we cannot foresee it, will be better than the past or the present: the reader is like the child who expects a sweet because it has been told to open its mouth and shut its eyes. Logic, mathematics, physics disappear in this philosophy, because they are too "static"; what is real is an impulse and movement towards a goal which, like the rainbow, recedes as we advance, and makes every place different when we reach it from what it appeared to be at a distance.

Now I do not propose at present to enter upon a technical examination of this philosophy. At present I wish to make only two criticisms of it--first, that its truth does not follow from what science has rendered probable concerning the facts of evolution, and secondly, that the motives and interests which inspire it are so exclusively practical, and the problems with which it deals are so special, that it can hardly be regarded as really touching any of the questions that to my mind constitute genuine philosophy.

(1) What biology has rendered probable is that the diverse species arose by adaptation from a less differentiated ancestry. This fact is in itself exceedingly interesting, but it is not the kind of fact from which philosophical consequences follow. Philosophy is general, and takes an impartial interest in all that exists. The changes suffered by minute portions of matter on the earth's surface are very important to us as active sentient beings; but to us as philosophers they have no greater interest than other changes in portions of matter elsewhere. And if the changes on the earth's surface during the last few millions of years appear to our present ethical notions to be in the nature of a progress, that gives no ground for believing that progress is a general law of the universe. Except under the influence of desire, no one would admit for a moment so crude a generalisation from such a tiny selection of facts. What does result, not specially from biology, but from all the sciences which deal with what exists, is that we cannot understand the world

unless we can understand change and continuity. This is even more evident in physics than it is in biology. But the analysis of change and continuity is not a problem upon which either physics or biology throws any light: it is a problem of a new kind, belonging to a different kind of study. The question whether evolutionism offers a true or a false answer to this problem is not, therefore, a question to be solved by appeals to particular facts, such as biology and physics reveal. In assuming dogmatically a certain answer to this question, evolutionism ceases to be scientific, yet it is only in touching on this question that evolutionism reaches the subject-matter of philosophy. Evolutionism thus consists of two parts: one not philosophical, but only a hasty generalisation of the kind which the special sciences might hereafter confirm or confute; the other not scientific, but a mere unsupported dogma, belonging to philosophy by its subject-matter, but in no way deducible from the facts upon which evolution relies.

(2) The predominant interest of evolutionism is in the question of human destiny, or at least of the destiny of Life. It is more interested in morality and happiness than in knowledge for its own sake. It must be admitted that the same may be said of many other philosophies, and that a desire for the kind of knowledge which philosophy really can give is very rare. But if philosophy is to become scientific--and it is our object to discover how this can be achieved--it is necessary first and foremost that philosophers should acquire the disinterested intellectual curiosity which characterises the genuine man of science. Knowledge concerning the future--which is the kind of knowledge that must be sought if we are to know about human destiny--is possible within certain narrow limits. It is impossible to say how much the limits may be enlarged with the progress of science. But what is evident is that any proposition about the future belongs by its subject-matter to some particular science, and is to be ascertained, if at all, by the methods of that science. Philosophy is not a short cut to the same kind of results as those of the other sciences: if it is to be a genuine study, it must have a province of its own, and aim at results which the other sciences can neither prove nor disprove.

The consideration that philosophy, if there is such a study, must consist of propositions which could not occur in the other sciences, is one which has very far-reaching consequences. All the questions which have what is called a human interest--such, for example, as the question of a future life--belong, at least in theory, to special sciences, and are capable, at least in theory, of being decided by empirical evidence. Philosophers have too often, in the past, permitted themselves to pronounce on empirical questions, and found themselves, as a result, in disastrous conflict with well-attested facts. We must, therefore, renounce the hope that philosophy can promise satisfaction to our mundane desires. What it can do, when it is purified from all practical taint, is to help us to understand the general aspects of the world and the logical analysis of familiar but complex things. Through this achievement, by the suggestion of fruitful hypotheses, it may be indirectly useful in other sciences, notably mathematics, physics, and psychology. But a genuinely scientific philosophy cannot hope to appeal to any except those who have the wish to understand, to escape from intellectual bewilderment. It offers, in its own domain, the kind of satisfaction which the other sciences offer. But it does not offer, or attempt to offer, a solution of the problem of human destiny, or of the destiny of the universe.

Evolutionism, if what has been said is true, is to be regarded as a hasty generalisation from certain rather special facts, accompanied by a dogmatic rejection of all attempts at analysis, and inspired by interests which are practical rather than theoretical. In spite, therefore, of its appeal to detailed results in various sciences, it cannot be regarded as any more genuinely scientific than the classical tradition which it has replaced. How philosophy is to be rendered scientific, and what is the true subject-matter of philosophy, I shall try to show first by examples of certain achieved results, and then more generally. We will begin with the problem of the physical conceptions of space and time and matter, which, as we have seen, are challenged by the contentions of the evolutionists. That these conceptions stand in need of reconstruction will be admitted, and is indeed increasingly urged by physicists themselves. It will also be admitted that the reconstruction must take more account of change and the universal flux than is done in the older mechanics with its fundamental conception of an indestructible matter. But I do not think the reconstruction required is on Bergsonian lines, nor do I think that his rejection of logic can be anything but harmful. I shall not, however, adopt the method of explicit controversy, but rather the method of independent inquiry, starting from what, in a pre-philosophic stage, appear to be facts, and keeping always as close to these initial data as the requirements of consistency will permit.

Although explicit controversy is almost always fruitless in philosophy, owing to the fact that no two philosophers ever understand one another, yet it seems necessary to say something at the outset in justification of the scientific as against the mystical attitude. Metaphysics, from the first, has been developed by the union or the conflict of these two attitudes. Among the earliest Greek philosophers, the Ionians were more scientific and the Sicilians more mystical.[6] But among the latter, Pythagoras, for example, was in himself a curious mixture of the two tendencies: the scientific attitude led him to his proposition on right-angled triangles, while his mystic insight showed him that it is wicked to eat beans. Naturally enough, his followers divided into two sects, the lovers

of right-angled triangles and the abhorrers of beans; but the former sect died out, leaving, however, a haunting flavour of mysticism over much Greek mathematical speculation, and in particular over Plato's views on mathematics. Plato, of course, embodies both the scientific and the mystical attitudes in a higher form than his predecessors, but the mystical attitude is distinctly the stronger of the two, and secures ultimate victory whenever the conflict is sharp. Plato, moreover, adopted from the Eleatics the device of using logic to defeat common sense, and thus to leave the field clear for mysticism--a device still employed in our own day by the adherents of the classical tradition.

[6] _Cf._ Burnet, _Early Greek Philosophy_, pp. 85 ff.

The logic used in defence of mysticism seems to me faulty as logic, and in a later lecture I shall criticise it on this ground. But the more thorough-going mystics do not employ logic, which they despise: they appeal instead directly to the immediate deliverance of their insight. Now, although fully developed mysticism is rare in the West, some tincture of it colours the thoughts of many people, particularly as regards matters on which they have strong convictions not based on evidence. In all who seek passionately for the fugitive and difficult goods, the conviction is almost irresistible that there is in the world something deeper, more significant, than the multiplicity of little facts chronicled and classified by science. Behind the veil of these mundane things, they feel, something quite different obscurely shimmers, shining forth clearly in the great moments of illumination, which alone give anything worthy to be called real knowledge of truth. To seek such moments, therefore, is to them the way of wisdom, rather than, like the man of science, to observe coolly, to analyse without emotion, and to accept without question the equal reality of the trivial and the important.

Of the reality or unreality of the mystic's world I know nothing. I have no wish to deny it, nor even to declare that the insight which reveals it is not a genuine insight. What I do wish to maintain--and it is here that the scientific attitude becomes imperative--is that insight, untested and unsupported, is an insufficient guarantee of truth, in spite of the fact that much of the most important truth is first suggested by its means. It is common to speak of an opposition between instinct and reason; in the eighteenth century, the opposition was drawn in favour of reason, but under the influence of Rousseau and the romantic movement instinct was given the preference, first by those who rebelled against artificial forms of government and thought, and then, as the purely rationalistic defence of traditional theology became increasingly difficult, by all who felt in science a menace to creeds which they associated with a spiritual outlook on life and the world. Bergson, under the name of "intuition," has raised instinct to the position of sole arbiter of metaphysical truth. But in fact the opposition of instinct and reason is mainly illusory. Instinct, intuition, or insight is what first leads to the beliefs which subsequent reason confirms or confutes; but the confirmation, where it is possible, consists, in the last analysis, of agreement with other beliefs no less instinctive. Reason is a harmonising, controlling force rather than a creative one. Even in the most purely logical realms, it is insight that first arrives at what is new.

Where instinct and reason do sometimes conflict is in regard to single beliefs, held instinctively, and held with such determination that no degree of inconsistency with other beliefs leads to their abandonment. Instinct, like all human faculties, is liable to error. Those in whom reason is weak are often unwilling to admit this as regards themselves, though all admit it in regard to others. Where instinct is least liable to error is in practical matters as to which right judgment is a help to survival; friendship and hostility in others, for instance, are often felt with extraordinary discrimination through very careful disguises. But even in such matters a wrong impression may be given by reserve or flattery; and in matters less directly practical, such as philosophy deals with, very strong instinctive beliefs may be wholly mistaken, as we may come to know through their perceived inconsistency with other equally strong beliefs. It is such considerations that necessitate the harmonising mediation of reason, which tests our beliefs by their mutual compatibility, and examines, in doubtful cases, the possible sources of error on the one side and on the other. In this there is no opposition to instinct as a whole, but only to blind reliance upon some one interesting aspect of instinct to the exclusion of other more commonplace but not less trustworthy aspects. It is such onesidedness, not instinct itself, that reason aims at correcting.

These more or less trite maxims may be illustrated by application to Bergson's advocacy of "intuition" as against "intellect." There are, he says, "two profoundly different ways of knowing a thing. The first implies that we move round the object; the second that we enter into it. The first depends on the point of view at which we are placed and on the symbols by which we express ourselves. The second neither depends on a point of view nor relies on any symbol. The first kind of knowledge may be said to stop at the _relative_; the second, in those cases where it is possible, to attain the _absolute_."[7] The second of these, which is intuition, is, he says, "the kind of intellectual _sympathy_ by which one places oneself within an object in order to coincide with what is unique in it and therefore inexpressible" (p. 6). In illustration, he mentions self-knowledge: "there is one reality, at least, which we all seize from within, by intuition and not by simple analysis. It is our own personality in its flowing through time--our self which endures" (p. 8). The rest of Bergson's philosophy consists in reporting, through the imperfect medium of words, the knowledge gained by

intuition, and the consequent complete condemnation of all the pretended knowledge derived from science and common sense.

[7] _Introduction to Metaphysics_, p. 1.

This procedure, since it takes sides in a conflict of instinctive beliefs, stands in need of justification by proving the greater trustworthiness of the beliefs on one side than of those on the other. Bergson attempts this justification in two ways--first, by explaining that intellect is a purely practical faculty designed to secure biological success; secondly, by mentioning remarkable feats of instinct in animals, and by pointing out characteristics of the world which, though intuition can apprehend them, are baffling to intellect as he interprets it.

Of Bergson's theory that intellect is a purely practical faculty developed in the struggle for survival, and not a source of true beliefs, we may say, first, that it is only through intellect that we know of the struggle for survival and of the biological ancestry of man: if the intellect is misleading, the whole of this merely inferred history is presumably untrue. If, on the other hand, we agree with M. Bergson in thinking that evolution took place as Darwin believed, then it is not only intellect, but all our faculties, that have been developed under the stress of practical utility. Intuition is seen at its best where it is directly useful--for example, in regard to other people's characters and dispositions. Bergson apparently holds that capacity for this kind of knowledge is less explicable by the struggle for existence than, for example, capacity for pure mathematics. Yet the savage deceived by false friendship is likely to pay for his mistake with his life; whereas even in the most civilised societies men are not put to death for mathematical incompetence. All the most striking of his instances of intuition in animals have a very direct survival value. The fact is, of course, that both intuition and intellect have been developed because they are useful, and that, speaking broadly, they are useful when they give truth and become harmful when they give falsehood. Intellect, in civilised man, like artistic capacity, has occasionally been developed beyond the point where it is useful to the individual; intuition, on the other hand, seems on the whole to diminish as civilisation increases. Speaking broadly, it is greater in children than in adults, in the uneducated than in the educated. Probably in dogs it exceeds anything to be found in human beings. But those who find in these facts a recommendation of intuition ought to return to running wild in the woods, dyeing themselves with woad and living on hips and haws.

Let us next examine whether intuition possesses any such infallibility as Bergson claims for it. The best instance of it, according to him, is our acquaintance with ourselves; yet self-knowledge is proverbially rare and difficult. Most men, for example, have in their nature meannesses, vanities, and envies of which they are quite unconscious, though even their best friends can perceive them without any difficulty. It is true that intuition has a convincingness which is lacking to intellect: while it is present, it is almost impossible to doubt its truth. But if it should appear, on examination, to be at least as fallible as intellect, its greater subjective certainty becomes a demerit, making it only the more irresistibly deceptive. Apart from self-knowledge, one of the most notable examples of intuition is the knowledge people believe themselves to possess of those with whom they are in love: the wall between different personalities seems to become transparent, and people think they see into another soul as into their own. Yet deception in such cases is constantly practised with success; and even where there is no intentional deception, experience gradually proves, as a rule, that the supposed insight was illusory, and that the slower, more groping methods of the intellect are in the long run more reliable.

Bergson maintains that intellect can only deal with things in so far as they resemble what has been experienced in the past, while intuition has the power of apprehending the uniqueness and novelty that always belong to each fresh moment. That there is something unique and new at every moment, is certainly true; it is also true that this cannot be fully expressed by means of intellectual concepts. Only direct acquaintance can give knowledge of what is unique and new. But direct acquaintance of this kind is given fully in sensation, and does not require, so far as I can see, any special faculty of intuition for its apprehension. It is neither intellect nor intuition, but sensation, that supplies new data; but when the data are new in any remarkable manner, intellect is much more capable of dealing with them than intuition would be. The hen with a brood of ducklings no doubt has intuitions which seem to place her inside them, and not merely to know them analytically; but when the ducklings take to the water, the whole apparent intuition is seen to be illusory, and the hen is left helpless on the shore. Intuition, in fact, is an aspect and development of instinct, and, like all instinct, is admirable in those customary surroundings which have moulded the habits of the animal in question, but totally incompetent as soon as the surroundings are changed in a way which demands some non-habitual mode of action.

The theoretical understanding of the world, which is the aim of philosophy, is not a matter of great practical importance to animals, or to savages, or even to most civilised men. It is hardly to be supposed, therefore, that the rapid, rough and ready methods of instinct or intuition will find in this field a favourable ground for their application. It is the older kinds of activity, which bring out our kinship with remote generations of animal and semi-human ancestors, that show intuition at its best. In such matters as

self-preservation and love, intuition will act sometimes (though not always) with a swiftness and precision which are astonishing to the critical intellect. But philosophy is not one of the pursuits which illustrate our affinity with the past: it is a highly refined, highly civilised pursuit, demanding, for its success, a certain liberation from the life of instinct, and even, at times, a certain aloofness from all mundane hopes and fears. It is not in philosophy, therefore, that we can hope to see intuition at its best. On the contrary, since the true objects of philosophy, and the habits of thought demanded for their apprehension, are strange, unusual, and remote, it is here, more almost than anywhere else, that intellect proves superior to intuition, and that quick unanalysed convictions are least deserving of uncritical acceptance.

Before embarking upon the somewhat difficult and abstract discussions which lie before us, it will be well to take a survey of the hopes we may retain and the hopes we must abandon. The hope of satisfaction to our more human desires--the hope of demonstrating that the world has this or that desirable ethical characteristic--is not one which, so far as I can see, philosophy can do anything whatever to satisfy. The difference between a good world and a bad one is a difference in the particular characteristics of the particular things that exist in these worlds: it is not a sufficiently abstract difference to come within the province of philosophy. Love and hate, for example, are ethical opposites, but to philosophy they are closely analogous attitudes towards objects. The general form and structure of those attitudes towards objects which constitute mental phenomena is a problem for philosophy; but the difference between love and hate is not a difference of form or structure, and therefore belongs rather to the special science of psychology than to philosophy. Thus the ethical interests which have often inspired philosophers must remain in the background: some kind of ethical interest may inspire the whole study, but none must obtrude in the detail or be expected in the special results which are sought.

If this view seems at first sight disappointing, we may remind ourselves that a similar change has been found necessary in all the other sciences. The physicist or chemist is not now required to prove the ethical importance of his ions or atoms; the biologist is not expected to prove the utility of the plants or animals which he dissects. In pre-scientific ages this was not the case. Astronomy, for example, was studied because men believed in astrology: it was thought that the movements of the planets had the most direct and important bearing upon the lives of human beings. Presumably, when this belief decayed and the disinterested study of astronomy began, many who had found astrology absorbingly interesting decided that astronomy had too little human interest to be worthy of study. Physics, as it appears in Plato's _Timaeus_ for example, is full of ethical notions: it is an essential part of its purpose to show that the earth is worthy of admiration. The modern physicist, on the contrary, though he has no wish to deny that the earth is admirable, is not concerned, as physicist, with its ethical attributes: he is merely concerned to find out facts, not to consider whether they are good or bad. In psychology, the scientific attitude is even more recent and more difficult than in the physical sciences: it is natural to consider that human nature is either good or bad, and to suppose that the difference between good and bad, so all-important in practice, must be important in theory also. It is only during the last century that an ethically neutral science of psychology has grown up; and here too ethical neutrality has been essential to scientific success.

In philosophy, hitherto, ethical neutrality has been seldom sought and hardly ever achieved. Men have remembered their wishes, and have judged philosophies in relation to their wishes. Driven from the particular sciences, the belief that the notions of good and evil must afford a key to the understanding of the world has sought a refuge in philosophy. But even from this last refuge, if philosophy is not to remain a set of pleasing dreams, this belief must be driven forth. It is a commonplace that happiness is not best achieved by those who seek it directly; and it would seem that the same is true of the good. In thought, at any rate, those who forget good and evil and seek only to know the facts are more likely to achieve good than those who view the world through the distorting medium of their own desires.

The immense extension of our knowledge of facts in recent times has had, as it had in the Renaissance, two effects upon the general intellectual outlook. On the one hand, it has made men distrustful of the truth of wide, ambitious systems: theories come and go swiftly, each serving, for a moment, to classify known facts and promote the search for new ones, but each in turn proving inadequate to deal with the new facts when they have been found. Even those who invent the theories do not, in science, regard them as anything but a temporary makeshift. The ideal of an all-embracing synthesis, such as the Middle Ages believed themselves to have attained, recedes further and further beyond the limits of what seems feasible. In such a world, as in the world of Montaigne, nothing seems worth while except the discovery of more and more facts, each in turn the deathblow to some cherished theory; the ordering intellect grows weary, and becomes slovenly through despair.

On the other hand, the new facts have brought new powers; man's physical control over natural forces has been increasing with unexampled rapidity, and promises to increase in the future beyond all easily assignable limits. Thus alongside of despair as regards ultimate theory there is an immense optimism as regards practice: what man can _do_ seems almost boundless. The old

fixed limits of human power, such as death, or the dependence of the race on an equilibrium of cosmic forces, are forgotten, and no hard facts are allowed to break in upon the dream of omnipotence. No philosophy is tolerated which sets bounds to man's capacity of gratifying his wishes; and thus the very despair of theory is invoked to silence every whisper of doubt as regards the possibilities of practical achievement.

In the welcoming of new fact, and in the suspicion of dogmatism as regards the universe at large, the modern spirit should, I think, be accepted as wholly an advance. But both in its practical pretensions and in its theoretical despair it seems to me to go too far. Most of what is greatest in man is called forth in response to the thwarting of his hopes by immutable natural obstacles; by the pretence of omnipotence, he becomes trivial and a little absurd. And on the theoretical side, ultimate metaphysical truth, though less all-embracing and harder of attainment than it appeared to some philosophers in the past, can, I believe, be discovered by those who are willing to combine the hopefulness, patience, and open-mindedness of science with something of the Greek feeling for beauty in the abstract world of logic and for the ultimate intrinsic value in the contemplation of truth.

The philosophy, therefore, which is to be genuinely inspired by the scientific spirit, must deal with somewhat dry and abstract matters, and must not hope to find an answer to the practical problems of life. To those who wish to understand much of what has in the past been most difficult and obscure in the constitution of the universe, it has great rewards to offer--triumphs as noteworthy as those of Newton and Darwin, and as important in the long run, for the moulding of our mental habits. And it brings with it--as a new and powerful method of investigation always does--a sense of power and a hope of progress more reliable and better grounded than any that rests on hasty and fallacious generalisation as to the nature of the universe at large. Many hopes which inspired philosophers in the past it cannot claim to fulfil; but other hopes, more purely intellectual, it can satisfy more fully than former ages could have deemed possible for human minds.

LECTURE II

LOGIC AS THE ESSENCE OF PHILOSOPHY

The topics we discussed in our first lecture, and the topics we shall discuss later, all reduce themselves, in so far as they are genuinely philosophical, to problems of logic. This is not due to any accident, but to the fact that every philosophical problem, when it is subjected to the necessary analysis and purification, is found either to be not really philosophical at all, or else to be, in the sense in which we are using the word, logical. But as the word "logic" is never used in the same sense by two different philosophers, some explanation of what I mean by the word is indispensable at the outset.

Logic, in the Middle Ages, and down to the present day in teaching, meant no more than a scholastic collection of technical terms and rules of syllogistic inference. Aristotle had spoken, and it was the part of humbler men merely to repeat the lesson after him. The trivial nonsense embodied in this tradition is still set in examinations, and defended by eminent authorities as an excellent "propaedeutic," _i.e._ a training in those habits of solemn humbug which are so great a help in later life. But it is not this that I mean to praise in saying that all philosophy is logic. Ever since the beginning of the seventeenth century, all vigorous minds that have concerned themselves with inference have abandoned the mediaeval tradition, and in one way or other have widened the scope of logic.

The first extension was the introduction of the inductive method by Bacon and Galileo--by the former in a theoretical and largely mistaken form, by the latter in actual use in establishing the foundations of modern physics and astronomy. This is probably the only extension of the old logic which has become familiar to the general educated public. But induction, important as it is when regarded as a method of investigation, does not seem to remain when its work is done: in the final form of a perfected science, it would seem that everything ought to be deductive. If induction remains at all, which is a difficult question, it will remain merely as one of the principles according to which deductions are effected. Thus the ultimate result of the introduction of the inductive method seems not the creation of a new kind of non-deductive reasoning, but rather the widening of the scope of deduction by pointing out a way of deducing which is certainly not syllogistic, and does not fit into the mediaeval scheme.

The question of the scope and validity of induction is of great difficulty, and of great importance to our knowledge. Take such a question as, "Will the sun rise to-morrow?" Our first instinctive feeling is that we have abundant reason for saying that it will, because it has risen on so many previous mornings. Now, I do not myself know whether this does afford a ground or not, but I am willing to suppose that it does. The question which then arises is: What is the principle of inference by which we pass from past sunrises to future ones? The answer given by Mill is that the inference depends upon the law of causation. Let us suppose this to

be true; then what is the reason for believing in the law of causation? There are broadly three possible answers: (1) that it is itself known _a priori_; (2) that it is a postulate; (3) that it is an empirical generalisation from past instances in which it has been found to hold. The theory that causation is known _a priori_ cannot be definitely refuted, but it can be rendered very unplausible by the mere process of formulating the law exactly, and thereby showing that it is immensely more complicated and less obvious than is generally supposed. The theory that causation is a postulate, _i.e._ that it is something which we choose to assert although we know that it is very likely false, is also incapable of refutation; but it is plainly also incapable of justifying any use of the law in inference. We are thus brought to the theory that the law is an empirical generalisation, which is the view held by Mill.

But if so, how are empirical generalisations to be justified? The evidence in their favour cannot be empirical, since we wish to argue from what has been observed to what has not been observed, which can only be done by means of some known relation of the observed and the unobserved; but the unobserved, by definition, is not known empirically, and therefore its relation to the observed, if known at all, must be known independently of empirical evidence. Let us see what Mill says on this subject.

According to Mill, the law of causation is proved by an admittedly fallible process called "induction by simple enumeration." This process, he says, "consists in ascribing the nature of general truths to all propositions which are true in every instance that we happen to know of."[8] As regards its fallibility, he asserts that "the precariousness of the method of simple enumeration is in an inverse ratio to the largeness of the generalisation. The process is delusive and insufficient, exactly in proportion as the subject-matter of the observation is special and limited in extent. As the sphere widens, this unscientific method becomes less and less liable to mislead; and the most universal class of truths, the law of causation for instance, and the principles of number and of geometry, are duly and satisfactorily proved by that method alone, nor are they susceptible of any other proof."[9]

[8] _Logic_, book iii., chapter iii., Sec. 2.

[9] Book iii., chapter xxi., Sec. 3.

In the above statement, there are two obvious lacunae: (1) How is the method of simple enumeration itself justified? (2) What logical principle, if any, covers the same ground as this method, without being liable to its failures? Let us take the second question first.

A method of proof which, when used as directed, gives sometimes truth and sometimes falsehood--as the method of simple enumeration does--is obviously not a valid method, for validity demands invariable truth. Thus, if simple enumeration is to be rendered valid, it must not be stated as Mill states it. We shall have to say, at most, that the data render the result _probable_. Causation holds, we shall say, in every instance we have been able to test; therefore it _probably_ holds in untested instances. There are terrible difficulties in the notion of probability, but we may ignore them at present. We thus have what at least _may_ be a logical principle, since it is without exception. If a proposition is true in every instance that we happen to know of, and if the instances are very numerous, then, we shall say, it becomes very probable, on the data, that it will be true in any further instance. This is not refuted by the fact that what we declare to be probable does not always happen, for an event may be probable on the data and yet not occur. It is, however, obviously capable of further analysis, and of more exact statement. We shall have to say something like this: that every instance of a proposition[10] being true increases the probability of its being true in a fresh instance, and that a sufficient number of favourable instances will, in the absence of instances to the contrary, make the probability of the truth of a fresh instance approach indefinitely near to certainty. Some such principle as this is required if the method of simple enumeration is to be valid.

[10] Or rather a propositional function.

But this brings us to our other question, namely, how is our principle known to be true? Obviously, since it is required to justify induction, it cannot be proved by induction; since it goes beyond the empirical data, it cannot be proved by them alone; since it is required to justify all inferences from empirical data to what goes beyond them, it cannot itself be even rendered in any degree probable by such data. Hence, _if_ it is known, it is not known by experience, but independently of experience. I do not say that any such principle is known: I only say that it is required to justify the inferences from experience which empiricists allow, and that it cannot itself be justified empirically.[11]

[11] The subject of causality and induction will be discussed again in Lecture VIII.

A similar conclusion can be proved by similar arguments concerning any other logical principle. Thus logical knowledge is not derivable from experience alone, and the empiricist's philosophy can therefore not be accepted in its entirety, in spite of its

excellence in many matters which lie outside logic.

Hegel and his followers widened the scope of logic in quite a different way--a way which I believe to be fallacious, but which requires discussion if only to show how their conception of logic differs from the conception which I wish to advocate. In their writings, logic is practically identical with metaphysics. In broad outline, the way this came about is as follows. Hegel believed that, by means of _a priori_ reasoning, it could be shown that the world _must_ have various important and interesting characteristics, since any world without these characteristics would be impossible and self-contradictory. Thus what he calls "logic" is an investigation of the nature of the universe, in so far as this can be inferred merely from the principle that the universe must be logically self-consistent. I do not myself believe that from this principle alone anything of importance can be inferred as regards the existing universe. But, however that may be, I should not regard Hegel's reasoning, even if it were valid, as properly belonging to logic: it would rather be an application of logic to the actual world. Logic itself would be concerned rather with such questions as what self-consistency is, which Hegel, so far as I know, does not discuss. And though he criticises the traditional logic, and professes to replace it by an improved logic of his own, there is some sense in which the traditional logic, with all its faults, is uncritically and unconsciously assumed throughout his reasoning. It is not in the direction advocated by him, it seems to me, that the reform of logic is to be sought, but by a more fundamental, more patient, and less ambitious investigation into the presuppositions which his system shares with those of most other philosophers.

The way in which, as it seems to me, Hegel's system assumes the ordinary logic which it subsequently criticises, is exemplified by the general conception of "categories" with which he operates throughout. This conception is, I think, essentially a product of logical confusion, but it seems in some way to stand for the conception of "qualities of Reality as a whole." Mr Bradley has worked out a theory according to which, in all judgment, we are ascribing a predicate to Reality as a whole; and this theory is derived from Hegel. Now the traditional logic holds that every proposition ascribes a predicate to a subject, and from this it easily follows that there can be only one subject, the Absolute, for if there were two, the proposition that there were two would not ascribe a predicate to either. Thus Hegel's doctrine, that philosophical propositions must be of the form, "the Absolute is such-and-such," depends upon the traditional belief in the universality of the subject-predicate form. This belief, being traditional, scarcely self-conscious, and not supposed to be important, operates underground, and is assumed in arguments which, like the refutation of relations, appear at first sight such as to establish its truth. This is the most important respect in which Hegel uncritically assumes the traditional logic. Other less important respects--though important enough to be the source of such essentially Hegelian conceptions as the "concrete universal" and the "union of identity in difference"--will be found where he explicitly deals with formal logic.[12]

[12] See the translation by H. S. Macran, _Hegel's Doctrine of Formal Logic_, Oxford, 1912. Hegel's argument in this portion of his "Logic" depends throughout upon confusing the "is" of predication, as in "Socrates is mortal," with the "is" of identity, as in "Socrates is the philosopher who drank the hemlock." Owing to this confusion, he thinks that "Socrates" and "mortal" must be identical. Seeing that they are different, he does not infer, as others would, that there is a mistake somewhere, but that they exhibit "identity in difference." Again, Socrates is particular, "mortal" is universal. Therefore, he says, since Socrates is mortal, it follows that the particular is the universal--taking the "is" to be throughout expressive of identity. But to say "the particular is the universal" is self-contradictory. Again Hegel does not suspect a mistake but proceeds to synthesise particular and universal in the individual, or concrete universal. This is an example of how, for want of care at the start, vast and imposing systems of philosophy are built upon stupid and trivial confusions, which, but for the almost incredible fact that they are unintentional, one would be tempted to characterise as puns.

There is quite another direction in which a large technical development of logic has taken place: I mean the direction of what is called logistic or mathematical logic. This kind of logic is mathematical in two different senses: it is itself a branch of mathematics, and it is the logic which is specially applicable to other more traditional branches of mathematics. Historically, it began as _merely_ a branch of mathematics: its special applicability to other branches is a more recent development. In both respects, it is the fulfilment of a hope which Leibniz cherished throughout his life, and pursued with all the ardour of his amazing intellectual energy. Much of his work on this subject has been published recently, since his discoveries have been remade by others; but none was published by him, because his results persisted in contradicting certain points in the traditional doctrine of the syllogism. We now know that on these points the traditional doctrine is wrong, but respect for Aristotle prevented Leibniz from realising that this was possible.[13]

[13] _Cf._ Couturat, _La Logique de Leibniz_, pp. 361, 386.

The modern development of mathematical logic dates from Boole's _Laws of Thought_ (1854). But in him and his successors, before Peano and Frege, the only thing really achieved, apart from certain details, was the invention of a mathematical symbolism for deducing consequences from the premisses which the newer methods shared with those of Aristotle. This subject has considerable interest as an independent branch of mathematics, but it has very little to do with real logic. The first serious advance in real logic since the time of the Greeks was made independently by Peano and Frege--both mathematicians. They both arrived at their logical results by an analysis of mathematics. Traditional logic regarded the two propositions, "Socrates is mortal" and "All men are mortal," as being of the same form;[14] Peano and Frege showed that they are utterly different in form. The philosophical importance of logic may be illustrated by the fact that this confusion--which is still committed by most writers--obscured not only the whole study of the forms of judgment and inference, but also the relations of things to their qualities, of concrete existence to abstract concepts, and of the world of sense to the world of Platonic ideas. Peano and Frege, who pointed out the error, did so for technical reasons, and applied their logic mainly to technical developments; but the philosophical importance of the advance which they made is impossible to exaggerate.

[14] It was often recognised that there was _some_ difference between them, but it was not recognised that the difference is fundamental, and of very great importance.

Mathematical logic, even in its most modern form, is not _directly_ of philosophical importance except in its beginnings. After the beginnings, it belongs rather to mathematics than to philosophy. Of its beginnings, which are the only part of it that can properly be called _philosophical_ logic, I shall speak shortly. But even the later developments, though not directly philosophical, will be found of great indirect use in philosophising. They enable us to deal easily with more abstract conceptions than merely verbal reasoning can enumerate; they suggest fruitful hypotheses which otherwise could hardly be thought of; and they enable us to see quickly what is the smallest store of materials with which a given logical or scientific edifice can be constructed. Not only Frege's theory of number, which we shall deal with in Lecture VII., but the whole theory of physical concepts which will be outlined in our next two lectures, is inspired by mathematical logic, and could never have been imagined without it.

In both these cases, and in many others, we shall appeal to a certain principle called "the principle of abstraction." This principle, which might equally well be called "the principle which dispenses with abstraction," and is one which clears away incredible accumulations of metaphysical lumber, was directly suggested by mathematical logic, and could hardly have been proved or practically used without its help. The principle will be explained in our fourth lecture, but its use may be briefly indicated in advance. When a group of objects have that kind of similarity which we are inclined to attribute to possession of a common quality, the principle in question shows that membership of the group will serve all the purposes of the supposed common quality, and that therefore, unless some common quality is actually known, the group or class of similar objects may be used to replace the common quality, which need not be assumed to exist. In this and other ways, the indirect uses of even the later parts of mathematical logic are very great; but it is now time to turn our attention to its philosophical foundations.

In every proposition and in every inference there is, besides the particular subject-matter concerned, a certain _form_, a way in which the constituents of the proposition or inference are put together. If I say, "Socrates is mortal," "Jones is angry," "The sun is hot," there is something in common in these three cases, something indicated by the word "is." What is in common is the _form_ of the proposition, not an actual constituent. If I say a number of things about Socrates--that he was an Athenian, that he married Xantippe, that he drank the hemlock--there is a common constituent, namely Socrates, in all the propositions I enunciate, but they have diverse forms. If, on the other hand, I take any one of these propositions and replace its constituents, one at a time, by other constituents, the form remains constant, but no constituent remains. Take (say) the series of propositions, "Socrates drank the hemlock," "Coleridge drank the hemlock," "Coleridge drank opium," "Coleridge ate opium." The form remains unchanged throughout this series, but all the constituents are altered. Thus form is not another constituent, but is the way the constituents are put together. It is forms, in this sense, that are the proper object of philosophical logic.

It is obvious that the knowledge of logical forms is something quite different from knowledge of existing things. The form of "Socrates drank the hemlock" is not an existing thing like Socrates or the hemlock, nor does it even have that close relation to existing things that drinking has. It is something altogether more abstract and remote. We might understand all the separate words of a sentence without understanding the sentence: if a sentence is long and complicated, this is apt to happen. In such a case we have knowledge of the constituents, but not of the form. We may also have knowledge of the form without having knowledge of the constituents. If I say, "Rorarius drank the hemlock," those among you who have never heard of Rorarius (supposing there are any) will understand the form, without having knowledge of all the constituents. In order to understand a sentence, it is necessary to have knowledge both of the constituents and of the particular instance of the form. It is in this way that a sentence conveys

information, since it tells us that certain known objects are related according to a certain known form. Thus some kind of knowledge of logical forms, though with most people it is not explicit, is involved in all understanding of discourse. It is the business of philosophical logic to extract this knowledge from its concrete integuments, and to render it explicit and pure.

In all inference, form alone is essential: the particular subject-matter is irrelevant except as securing the truth of the premisses. This is one reason for the great importance of logical form. When I say, "Socrates was a man, all men are mortal, therefore Socrates was mortal," the connection of premisses and conclusion does not in any way depend upon its being Socrates and man and mortality that I am mentioning. The general form of the inference may be expressed in some such words as, "If a thing has a certain property, and whatever has this property has a certain other property, then the thing in question also has that other property." Here no particular things or properties are mentioned: the proposition is absolutely general. All inferences, when stated fully, are instances of propositions having this kind of generality. If they seem to depend upon the subject-matter otherwise than as regards the truth of the premisses, that is because the premisses have not been all explicitly stated. In logic, it is a waste of time to deal with inferences concerning particular cases: we deal throughout with completely general and purely formal implications, leaving it to other sciences to discover when the hypotheses are verified and when they are not.

But the forms of propositions giving rise to inferences are not the simplest forms: they are always hypothetical, stating that if one proposition is true, then so is another. Before considering inference, therefore, logic must consider those simpler forms which inference presupposes. Here the traditional logic failed completely: it believed that there was only one form of simple proposition (_i.e._ of proposition not stating a relation between two or more other propositions), namely, the form which ascribes a predicate to a subject. This is the appropriate form in assigning the qualities of a given thing--we may say "this thing is round, and red, and so on." Grammar favours this form, but philosophically it is so far from universal that it is not even very common. If we say "this thing is bigger than that," we are not assigning a mere quality of "this," but a relation of "this" and "that." We might express the same fact by saying "that thing is smaller than this," where grammatically the subject is changed. Thus propositions stating that two things have a certain relation have a different form from subject-predicate propositions, and the failure to perceive this difference or to allow for it has been the source of many errors in traditional metaphysics.

The belief or unconscious conviction that all propositions are of the subject-predicate form--in other words, that every fact consists in some thing having some quality--has rendered most philosophers incapable of giving any account of the world of science and daily life. If they had been honestly anxious to give such an account, they would probably have discovered their error very quickly; but most of them were less anxious to understand the world of science and daily life, than to convict it of unreality in the interests of a super-sensible "real" world. Belief in the unreality of the world of sense arises with irresistible force in certain moods--moods which, I imagine, have some simple physiological basis, but are none the less powerfully persuasive. The conviction born of these moods is the source of most mysticism and of most metaphysics. When the emotional intensity of such a mood subsides, a man who is in the habit of reasoning will search for logical reasons in favour of the belief which he finds in himself. But since the belief already exists, he will be very hospitable to any reason that suggests itself. The paradoxes apparently proved by his logic are really the paradoxes of mysticism, and are the goal which he feels his logic must reach if it is to be in accordance with insight. It is in this way that logic has been pursued by those of the great philosophers who were mystics--notably Plato, Spinoza, and Hegel. But since they usually took for granted the supposed insight of the mystic emotion, their logical doctrines were presented with a certain dryness, and were believed by their disciples to be quite independent of the sudden illumination from which they sprang. Nevertheless their origin clung to them, and they remained--to borrow a useful word from Mr Santayana--"malicious" in regard to the world of science and common sense. It is only so that we can account for the complacency with which philosophers have accepted the inconsistency of their doctrines with all the common and scientific facts which seem best established and most worthy of belief.

The logic of mysticism shows, as is natural, the defects which are inherent in anything malicious. While the mystic mood is dominant, the need of logic is not felt; as the mood fades, the impulse to logic reasserts itself, but with a desire to retain the vanishing insight, or at least to prove that it _was_ insight, and that what seems to contradict it is illusion. The logic which thus arises is not quite disinterested or candid, and is inspired by a certain hatred of the daily world to which it is to be applied. Such an attitude naturally does not tend to the best results. Everyone knows that to read an author simply in order to refute him is not the way to understand him; and to read the book of Nature with a conviction that it is all illusion is just as unlikely to lead to understanding. If our logic is to find the common world intelligible, it must not be hostile, but must be inspired by a genuine acceptance such as is not usually to be found among metaphysicians.

Traditional logic, since it holds that all propositions have the subject-predicate form, is unable to admit the reality of relations: all relations, it maintains, must be reduced to properties of the apparently related terms. There are many ways of refuting this opinion; one of the easiest is derived from the consideration of what are called "asymmetrical" relations. In order to explain this, I will first explain two independent ways of classifying relations.

Some relations, when they hold between A and B, also hold between B and A. Such, for example, is the relation "brother or sister." If A is a brother or sister of B, then B is a brother or sister of A. Such again is any kind of similarity, say similarity of colour. Any kind of dissimilarity is also of this kind: if the colour of A is unlike the colour of B, then the colour of B is unlike the colour of A. Relations of this sort are called _symmetrical_. Thus a relation is symmetrical if, whenever it holds between A and B, it also holds between B and A.

All relations that are not symmetrical are called _non-symmetrical_. Thus "brother" is non-symmetrical, because, if A is a brother of B, it may happen that B is a _sister_ of A.

A relation is called _asymmetrical_ when, if it holds between A and B, it _never_ holds between B and A. Thus husband, father, grandfather, etc., are asymmetrical relations. So are _before_, _after_, _greater_, _above_, _to the right of_, etc. All the relations that give rise to series are of this kind.

Classification into symmetrical, asymmetrical, and merely non-symmetrical relations is the first of the two classifications we had to consider. The second is into transitive, intransitive, and merely non-transitive relations, which are defined as follows.

A relation is said to be _transitive_, if, whenever it holds between A and B and also between B and C, it holds between A and C. Thus _before_, _after_, _greater_, _above_ are transitive. All relations giving rise to series are transitive, but so are many others. The transitive relations just mentioned were asymmetrical, but many transitive relations are symmetrical--for instance, equality in any respect, exact identity of colour, being equally numerous (as applied to collections), and so on.

A relation is said to be _non-transitive_ whenever it is not transitive. Thus "brother" is non-transitive, because a brother of one's brother may be oneself. All kinds of dissimilarity are non-transitive.

A relation is said to be _intransitive_ when, if A has the relation to B, and B to C, A never has it to C. Thus "father" is intransitive. So is such a relation as "one inch taller" or "one year later."

Let us now, in the light of this classification, return to the question whether all relations can be reduced to predications.

In the case of symmetrical relations--_i.e._ relations which, if they hold between A and B, also hold between B and A--some kind of plausibility can be given to this doctrine. A symmetrical relation which is transitive, such as equality, can be regarded as expressing possession of some common property, while one which is not transitive, such as inequality, can be regarded as expressing possession of different properties. But when we come to asymmetrical relations, such as before and after, greater and less, etc., the attempt to reduce them to properties becomes obviously impossible. When, for example, two things are merely known to be unequal, without our knowing which is greater, we may say that the inequality results from their having different magnitudes, because inequality is a symmetrical relation; but to say that when one thing is _greater_ than another, and not merely unequal to it, that means that they have different magnitudes, is formally incapable of explaining the facts. For if the other thing had been greater than the one, the magnitudes would also have been different, though the fact to be explained would not have been the same. Thus mere _difference_ of magnitude is not _all_ that is involved, since, if it were, there would be no difference between one thing being greater than another, and the other being greater than the one. We shall have to say that the one magnitude is _greater_ than the other, and thus we shall have failed to get rid of the relation "greater." In short, both possession of the same property and possession of different properties are _symmetrical_ relations, and therefore cannot account for the existence of _asymmetrical_ relations.

Asymmetrical relations are involved in all series--in space and time, greater and less, whole and part, and many others of the most important characteristics of the actual world. All these aspects, therefore, the logic which reduces everything to subjects and predicates is compelled to condemn as error and mere appearance. To those whose logic is not malicious, such a wholesale condemnation appears impossible. And in fact there is no reason except prejudice, so far as I can discover, for denying the reality of relations. When once their reality is admitted, all _logical_ grounds for supposing the world of sense to be illusory disappear. If this is to be supposed, it must be frankly and simply on the ground of mystic insight unsupported by argument. It is impossible to argue against what professes to be insight, so long as it does not argue in its own favour. As logicians, therefore, we may admit the

possibility of the mystic's world, while yet, so long as we do not have his insight, we must continue to study the everyday world with which we are familiar. But when he contends that our world is impossible, then our logic is ready to repel his attack. And the first step in creating the logic which is to perform this service is the recognition of the reality of relations.

Relations which have two terms are only one kind of relations. A relation may have three terms, or four, or any number. Relations of two terms, being the simplest, have received more attention than the others, and have generally been alone considered by philosophers, both those who accepted and those who denied the reality of relations. But other relations have their importance, and are indispensable in the solution of certain problems. Jealousy, for example, is a relation between three people. Professor Royce mentions the relation "giving": when A gives B to C, that is a relation of three terms.[15] When a man says to his wife: "My dear, I wish you could induce Angelina to accept Edwin," his wish constitutes a relation between four people, himself, his wife, Angelina, and Edwin. Thus such relations are by no means recondite or rare. But in order to explain exactly how they differ from relations of two terms, we must embark upon a classification of the logical forms of facts, which is the first business of logic, and the business in which the traditional logic has been most deficient.

[15] _Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences_, vol. i. p. 97.

The existing world consists of many things with many qualities and relations. A complete description of the existing world would require not only a catalogue of the things, but also a mention of all their qualities and relations. We should have to know not only this, that, and the other thing, but also which was red, which yellow, which was earlier than which, which was between which two others, and so on. When I speak of a "fact," I do not mean one of the simple things in the world; I mean that a certain thing has a certain quality, or that certain things have a certain relation. Thus, for example, I should not call Napoleon a fact, but I should call it a fact that he was ambitious, or that he married Josephine. Now a fact, in this sense, is never simple, but always has two or more constituents. When it simply assigns a quality to a thing, it has only two constituents, the thing and the quality. When it consists of a relation between two things, it has three constituents, the things and the relation. When it consists of a relation between three things, it has four constituents, and so on. The constituents of facts, in the sense in which we are using the word "fact," are not other facts, but are things and qualities or relations. When we say that there are relations of more than two terms, we mean that there are single facts consisting of a single relation and more than two things. I do not mean that one relation of two terms may hold between A and B, and also between A and C, as, for example, a man is the son of his father and also the son of his mother. This constitutes two distinct facts: if we choose to treat it as one fact, it is a fact which has facts for its constituents. But the facts I am speaking of have no facts among their constituents, but only things and relations. For example, when A is jealous of B on account of C, there is only one fact, involving three people; there are not two instances of jealousy, but only one. It is in such cases that I speak of a relation of three terms, where the simplest possible fact in which the relation occurs is one involving three things in addition to the relation. And the same applies to relations of four terms or five or any other number. All such relations must be admitted in our inventory of the logical forms of facts: two facts involving the same number of things have the same form, and two which involve different numbers of things have different forms.

Given any fact, there is an assertion which expresses the fact. The fact itself is objective, and independent of our thought or opinion about it; but the assertion is something which involves thought, and may be either true or false. An assertion may be positive or negative: we may assert that Charles I. was executed, or that he did _not_ die in his bed. A negative assertion may be said to be a _denial_. Given a form of words which must be either true or false, such as "Charles I. died in his bed," we may either assert or deny this form of words: in the one case we have a positive assertion, in the other a negative one. A form of words which must be either true or false I shall call a _proposition_. Thus a proposition is the same as what may be significantly asserted or denied. A proposition which expresses what we have called a fact, _i.e._ which, when asserted, asserts that a certain thing has a certain quality, or that certain things have a certain relation, will be called an atomic proposition, because, as we shall see immediately, there are other propositions into which atomic propositions enter in a way analogous to that in which atoms enter into molecules. Atomic propositions, although, like facts, they may have any one of an infinite number of forms, are only one kind of propositions. All other kinds are more complicated. In order to preserve the parallelism in language as regards facts and propositions, we shall give the name "atomic facts" to the facts we have hitherto been considering. Thus atomic facts are what determine whether atomic propositions are to be asserted or denied.

Whether an atomic proposition, such as "this is red," or "this is before that," is to be asserted or denied can only be known empirically. Perhaps one atomic fact may sometimes be capable of being inferred from another, though this seems very doubtful; but in any case it cannot be inferred from premisses no one of which is an atomic fact. It follows that, if atomic facts are to be known at all, some at least must be known without inference. The atomic facts which we come to know in this way are the facts of

sense-perception; at any rate, the facts of sense-perception are those which we most obviously and certainly come to know in this way. If we knew all atomic facts, and also knew that there were none except those we knew, we should, theoretically, be able to infer all truths of whatever form.[16] Thus logic would then supply us with the whole of the apparatus required. But in the first acquisition of knowledge concerning atomic facts, logic is useless. In pure logic, no atomic fact is ever mentioned: we confine ourselves wholly to forms, without asking ourselves what objects can fill the forms. Thus pure logic is independent of atomic facts; but conversely, they are, in a sense, independent of logic. Pure logic and atomic facts are the two poles, the wholly _a priori_ and the wholly empirical. But between the two lies a vast intermediate region, which we must now briefly explore.

[16] This perhaps requires modification in order to include such facts as beliefs and wishes, since such facts apparently contain propositions as components. Such facts, though not strictly atomic, must be supposed included if the statement in the text is to be true.

"Molecular" propositions are such as contain conjunctions--_if_, _or_, _and_, _unless_, etc.--and such words are the marks of a molecular proposition. Consider such an assertion as, "If it rains, I shall bring my umbrella." This assertion is just as capable of truth or falsehood as the assertion of an atomic proposition, but it is obvious that either the corresponding fact, or the nature of the correspondence with fact, must be quite different from what it is in the case of an atomic proposition. Whether it rains, and whether I bring my umbrella, are each severally matters of atomic fact, ascertainable by observation. But the connection of the two involved in saying that _if_ the one happens, _then_ the other will happen, is something radically different from either of the two separately. It does not require for its truth that it should actually rain, or that I should actually bring my umbrella; even if the weather is cloudless, it may still be true that I should have brought my umbrella if the weather had been different. Thus we have here a connection of two propositions, which does not depend upon whether they are to be asserted or denied, but only upon the second being inferable from the first. Such propositions, therefore, have a form which is different from that of any atomic proposition.

Such propositions are important to logic, because all inference depends upon them. If I have told you that if it rains I shall bring my umbrella, and if you see that there is a steady downpour, you can infer that I shall bring my umbrella. There can be no inference except where propositions are connected in some such way, so that from the truth or falsehood of the one something follows as to the truth or falsehood of the other. It seems to be the case that we can sometimes know molecular propositions, as in the above instance of the umbrella, when we do not know whether the component atomic propositions are true or false. The _practical_ utility of inference rests upon this fact.

The next kind of propositions we have to consider are _general_ propositions, such as "all men are mortal," "all equilateral triangles are equiangular." And with these belong propositions in which the word "some" occurs, such as "some men are philosophers" or "some philosophers are not wise." These are the denials of general propositions, namely (in the above instances), of "all men are non-philosophers" and "all philosophers are wise." We will call propositions containing the word "some" _negative_ general propositions, and those containing the word "all" _positive_ general propositions. These propositions, it will be seen, begin to have the appearance of the propositions in logical text-books. But their peculiarity and complexity are not known to the text-books, and the problems which they raise are only discussed in the most superficial manner.

When we were discussing atomic facts, we saw that we should be able, theoretically, to infer all other truths by logic if we knew all atomic facts and also knew that there were no other atomic facts besides those we knew. The knowledge that there are no other atomic facts is positive general knowledge; it is the knowledge that "all atomic facts are known to me," or at least "all atomic facts are in this collection"--however the collection may be given. It is easy to see that general propositions, such as "all men are mortal," cannot be known by inference from atomic facts alone. If we could know each individual man, and know that he was mortal, that would not enable us to know that all men are mortal, unless we _knew_ that those were all the men there are, which is a general proposition. If we knew every other existing thing throughout the universe, and knew that each separate thing was not an immortal man, that would not give us our result unless we _knew_ that we had explored the whole universe, _i.e._ unless we knew "all things belong to this collection of things I have examined." Thus general truths cannot be inferred from particular truths alone, but must, if they are to be known, be either self-evident, or inferred from premisses of which at least one is a general truth. But all _empirical_ evidence is of _particular_ truths. Hence, if there is any knowledge of general truths at all, there must be _some_ knowledge of general truths which is independent of empirical evidence, _i.e._ does not depend upon the data of sense.

The above conclusion, of which we had an instance in the case of the inductive principle, is important, since it affords a refutation of the older empiricists. They believed that all our knowledge is derived from the senses and dependent upon them. We see that, if this view is to be maintained, we must refuse to admit that we know any general propositions. It is perfectly possible logically that

this should be the case, but it does not appear to be so in fact, and indeed no one would dream of maintaining such a view except a theorist at the last extremity. We must therefore admit that there is general knowledge not derived from sense, and that some of this knowledge is not obtained by inference but is primitive.

Such general knowledge is to be found in logic. Whether there is any such knowledge not derived from logic, I do not know; but in logic, at any rate, we have such knowledge. It will be remembered that we excluded from pure logic such propositions as, "Socrates is a man, all men are mortal, therefore Socrates is mortal," because Socrates and _man_ and _mortal_ are empirical terms, only to be understood through particular experience. The corresponding proposition in pure logic is: "If anything has a certain property, and whatever has this property has a certain other property, then the thing in question has the other property." This proposition is absolutely general: it applies to all things and all properties. And it is quite self-evident. Thus in such propositions of pure logic we have the self-evident general propositions of which we were in search.

A proposition such as, "If Socrates is a man, and all men are mortal, then Socrates is mortal," is true in virtue of its _form_ alone. Its truth, in this hypothetical form, does not depend upon whether Socrates actually is a man, nor upon whether in fact all men are mortal; thus it is equally true when we substitute other terms for Socrates and _man_ and _mortal_. The general truth of which it is an instance is purely formal, and belongs to logic. Since it does not mention any particular thing, or even any particular quality or relation, it is wholly independent of the accidental facts of the existent world, and can be known, theoretically, without any experience of particular things or their qualities and relations.

Logic, we may say, consists of two parts. The first part investigates what propositions are and what forms they may have; this part enumerates the different kinds of atomic propositions, of molecular propositions, of general propositions, and so on. The second part consists of certain supremely general propositions, which assert the truth of all propositions of certain forms. This second part merges into pure mathematics, whose propositions all turn out, on analysis, to be such general formal truths. The first part, which merely enumerates forms, is the more difficult, and philosophically the more important; and it is the recent progress in this first part, more than anything else, that has rendered a truly scientific discussion of many philosophical problems possible.

The problem of the nature of judgment or belief may be taken as an example of a problem whose solution depends upon an adequate inventory of logical forms. We have already seen how the supposed universality of the subject-predicate form made it impossible to give a right analysis of serial order, and therefore made space and time unintelligible. But in this case it was only necessary to admit relations of two terms. The case of judgment demands the admission of more complicated forms. If all judgments were true, we might suppose that a judgment consisted in apprehension of a _fact_, and that the apprehension was a relation of a mind to the fact. From poverty in the logical inventory, this view has often been held. But it leads to absolutely insoluble difficulties in the case of error. Suppose I believe that Charles I. died in his bed. There is no objective fact "Charles I.'s death in his bed" to which I can have a relation of apprehension. Charles I. and death and his bed are objective, but they are not, except in my thought, put together as my false belief supposes. It is therefore necessary, in analysing a belief, to look for some other logical form than a two-term relation. Failure to realise this necessity has, in my opinion, vitiated almost everything that has hitherto been written on the theory of knowledge, making the problem of error insoluble and the difference between belief and perception inexplicable.

Modern logic, as I hope is now evident, has the effect of enlarging our abstract imagination, and providing an infinite number of possible hypotheses to be applied in the analysis of any complex fact. In this respect it is the exact opposite of the logic practised by the classical tradition. In that logic, hypotheses which seem _prima facie_ possible are professedly proved impossible, and it is decreed in advance that reality must have a certain special character. In modern logic, on the contrary, while the _prima facie_ hypotheses as a rule remain admissible, others, which only logic would have suggested, are added to our stock, and are very often found to be indispensable if a right analysis of the facts is to be obtained. The old logic put thought in fetters, while the new logic gives it wings. It has, in my opinion, introduced the same kind of advance into philosophy as Galileo introduced into physics, making it possible at last to see what kinds of problems may be capable of solution, and what kinds must be abandoned as beyond human powers. And where a solution appears possible, the new logic provides a method which enables us to obtain results that do not merely embody personal idiosyncrasies, but must command the assent of all who are competent to form an opinion.

LECTURE III

ON OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTERNAL WORLD

Philosophy may be approached by many roads, but one of the oldest and most travelled is the road which leads through doubt as to the reality of the world of sense. In Indian mysticism, in Greek and modern monistic philosophy from Parmenides onward, in Berkeley, in modern physics, we find sensible appearance criticised and condemned for a bewildering variety of motives. The mystic condemns it on the ground of immediate knowledge of a more real and significant world behind the veil; Parmenides and Plato condemn it because its continual flux is thought inconsistent with the unchanging nature of the abstract entities revealed by logical analysis; Berkeley brings several weapons, but his chief is the subjectivity of sense-data, their dependence upon the organisation and point of view of the spectator; while modern physics, on the basis of sensible evidence itself, maintains a mad dance of electrons which has, superficially at least, very little resemblance to the immediate objects of sight or touch.

Every one of these lines of attack raises vital and interesting problems.

The mystic, so long as he merely reports a positive revelation, cannot be refuted; but when he _denies_ reality to objects of sense, he may be questioned as to what he means by "reality," and may be asked how their unreality follows from the supposed reality of his super-sensible world. In answering these questions, he is led to a logic which merges into that of Parmenides and Plato and the idealist tradition.

The logic of the idealist tradition has gradually grown very complex and very abstruse, as may be seen from the Bradleian sample considered in our first lecture. If we attempted to deal fully with this logic, we should not have time to reach any other aspect of our subject; we will therefore, while acknowledging that it deserves a long discussion, pass by its central doctrines with only such occasional criticism as may serve to exemplify other topics, and concentrate our attention on such matters as its objections to the continuity of motion and the infinity of space and time--objections which have been fully answered by modern mathematicians in a manner constituting an abiding triumph for the method of logical analysis in philosophy. These objections and the modern answers to them will occupy our fifth, sixth, and seventh lectures.

Berkeley's attack, as reinforced by the physiology of the sense-organs and nerves and brain, is very powerful. I think it must be admitted as probable that the immediate objects of sense depend for their existence upon physiological conditions in ourselves, and that, for example, the coloured surfaces which we see cease to exist when we shut our eyes. But it would be a mistake to infer that they are dependent upon mind, not real while we see them, or not the sole basis for our knowledge of the external world. This line of argument will be developed in the present lecture.

The discrepancy between the world of physics and the world of sense, which we shall consider in our fourth lecture, will be found to be more apparent than real, and it will be shown that whatever there is reason to believe in physics can probably be interpreted in terms of sense.

The instrument of discovery throughout is modern logic, a very different science from the logic of the text-books and also from the logic of idealism. Our second lecture has given a short account of modern logic and of its points of divergence from the various traditional kinds of logic.

In our last lecture, after a discussion of causality and free will, we shall try to reach a general account of the logical-analytic method of scientific philosophy, and a tentative estimate of the hopes of philosophical progress which it allows us to entertain.

In this lecture, I wish to apply the logical-analytic method to one of the oldest problems of philosophy, namely, the problem of our knowledge of the external world. What I have to say on this problem does not amount to an answer of a definite and dogmatic kind; it amounts only to an analysis and statement of the questions involved, with an indication of the directions in which evidence may be sought. But although not yet a definite solution, what can be said at present seems to me to throw a completely new light on the problem, and to be indispensable, not only in seeking the answer, but also in the preliminary question as to what parts of our problem may possibly have an ascertainable answer.

In every philosophical problem, our investigation starts from what may be called "data," by which I mean matters of common knowledge, vague, complex, inexact, as common knowledge always is, but yet somehow commanding our assent as on the whole and in some interpretation pretty certainly true. In the case of our present problem, the common knowledge involved is of various kinds. There is first our acquaintance with particular objects of daily life--furniture, houses, towns, other people, and so on. Then there is the extension of such particular knowledge to particular things outside our personal experience, through history and geography, newspapers, etc. And lastly, there is the systematisation of all this knowledge of particulars by means of physical science, which derives immense persuasive force from its astonishing power of foretelling the future. We are quite willing to admit

that there may be errors of detail in this knowledge, but we believe them to be discoverable and corrigible by the methods which have given rise to our beliefs, and we do not, as practical men, entertain for a moment the hypothesis that the whole edifice may be built on insecure foundations. In the main, therefore, and without absolute dogmatism as to this or that special portion, we may accept this mass of common knowledge as affording data for our philosophical analysis.

It may be said--and this is an objection which must be met at the outset--that it is the duty of the philosopher to call in question the admittedly fallible beliefs of daily life, and to replace them by something more solid and irrefragable. In a sense this is true, and in a sense it is effected in the course of analysis. But in another sense, and a very important one, it is quite impossible. While admitting that doubt is possible with regard to all our common knowledge, we must nevertheless accept that knowledge in the main if philosophy is to be possible at all. There is not any superfine brand of knowledge, obtainable by the philosopher, which can give us a standpoint from which to criticise the whole of the knowledge of daily life. The most that can be done is to examine and purify our common knowledge by an internal scrutiny, assuming the canons by which it has been obtained, and applying them with more care and with more precision. Philosophy cannot boast of having achieved such a degree of certainty that it can have authority to condemn the facts of experience and the laws of science. The philosophic scrutiny, therefore, though sceptical in regard to every detail, is not sceptical as regards the whole. That is to say, its criticism of details will only be based upon their relation to other details, not upon some external criterion which can be applied to all the details equally. The reason for this abstention from a universal criticism is not any dogmatic confidence, but its exact opposite; it is not that common knowledge _must_ be true, but that we possess no radically different kind of knowledge derived from some other source. Universal scepticism, though logically irrefutable, is practically barren; it can only, therefore, give a certain flavour of hesitancy to our beliefs, and cannot be used to substitute other beliefs for them.

Although data can only be criticised by other data, not by an outside standard, yet we may distinguish different grades of certainty in the different kinds of common knowledge which we enumerated just now. What does not go beyond our own personal sensible acquaintance must be for us the most certain: the "evidence of the senses" is proverbially the least open to question. What depends on testimony, like the facts of history and geography which are learnt from books, has varying degrees of certainty according to the nature and extent of the testimony. Doubts as to the existence of Napoleon can only be maintained for a joke, whereas the historicity of Agamemnon is a legitimate subject of debate. In science, again, we find all grades of certainty short of the highest. The law of gravitation, at least as an approximate truth, has acquired by this time the same kind of certainty as the existence of Napoleon, whereas the latest speculations concerning the constitution of matter would be universally acknowledged to have as yet only a rather slight probability in their favour. These varying degrees of certainty attaching to different data may be regarded as themselves forming part of our data; they, along with the other data, lie within the vague, complex, inexact body of knowledge which it is the business of the philosopher to analyse.

The first thing that appears when we begin to analyse our common knowledge is that some of it is derivative, while some is primitive; that is to say, there is some that we only believe because of something else from which it has been inferred in some sense, though not necessarily in a strict logical sense, while other parts are believed on their own account, without the support of any outside evidence. It is obvious that the senses give knowledge of the latter kind: the immediate facts perceived by sight or touch or hearing do not need to be proved by argument, but are completely self-evident. Psychologists, however, have made us aware that what is actually given in sense is much less than most people would naturally suppose, and that much of what at first sight seems to be given is really inferred. This applies especially in regard to our space-perceptions. For instance, we instinctively infer the "real" size and shape of a visible object from its apparent size and shape, according to its distance and our point of view. When we hear a person speaking, our actual sensations usually miss a great deal of what he says, and we supply its place by unconscious inference; in a foreign language, where this process is more difficult, we find ourselves apparently grown deaf, requiring, for example, to be much nearer the stage at a theatre than would be necessary in our own country. Thus the first step in the analysis of data, namely, the discovery of what is really given in sense, is full of difficulty. We will, however, not linger on this point; so long as its existence is realised, the exact outcome does not make any very great difference in our main problem.

The next step in our analysis must be the consideration of how the derivative parts of our common knowledge arise. Here we become involved in a somewhat puzzling entanglement of logic and psychology. Psychologically, a belief may be called derivative whenever it is caused by one or more other beliefs, or by some fact of sense which is not simply what the belief asserts. Derivative beliefs in this sense constantly arise without any process of logical inference, merely by association of ideas or some equally extra-logical process. From the expression of a man's face we judge as to what he is feeling: we say we _see_ that he is angry, when in fact we only see a frown. We do not judge as to his state of mind by any logical process: the judgment grows up, often

without our being able to say what physical mark of emotion we actually saw. In such a case, the knowledge is derivative psychologically; but logically it is in a sense primitive, since it is not the result of any logical deduction. There may or may not be a possible deduction leading to the same result, but whether there is or not, we certainly do not employ it. If we call a belief "logically primitive" when it is not actually arrived at by a logical inference, then innumerable beliefs are logically primitive which psychologically are derivative. The separation of these two kinds of primitiveness is vitally important to our present discussion.

When we reflect upon the beliefs which are logically but not psychologically primitive, we find that, unless they can on reflection be deduced by a logical process from beliefs which are also psychologically primitive, our confidence in their truth tends to diminish the more we think about them. We naturally believe, for example, that tables and chairs, trees and mountains, are still there when we turn our backs upon them. I do not wish for a moment to maintain that this is certainly not the case, but I do maintain that the question whether it is the case is not to be settled off-hand on any supposed ground of obviousness. The belief that they persist is, in all men except a few philosophers, logically primitive, but it is not psychologically primitive; psychologically, it arises only through our having seen those tables and chairs, trees and mountains. As soon as the question is seriously raised whether, because we have seen them, we have a right to suppose that they are there still, we feel that some kind of argument must be produced, and that if none is forthcoming, our belief can be no more than a pious opinion. We do not feel this as regards the immediate objects of sense: there they are, and as far as their momentary existence is concerned, no further argument is required. There is accordingly more need of justifying our psychologically derivative beliefs than of justifying those that are primitive.

We are thus led to a somewhat vague distinction between what we may call "hard" data and "soft" data. This distinction is a matter of degree, and must not be pressed; but if not taken too seriously it may help to make the situation clear. I mean by "hard" data those which resist the solvent influence of critical reflection, and by "soft" data those which, under the operation of this process, become to our minds more or less doubtful. The hardest of hard data are of two sorts: the particular facts of sense, and the general truths of logic. The more we reflect upon these, the more we realise exactly what they are, and exactly what a doubt concerning them really means, the more luminously certain do they become. _Verbal_ doubt concerning even these is possible, but verbal doubt may occur when what is nominally being doubted is not really in our thoughts, and only words are actually present to our minds. Real doubt, in these two cases, would, I think, be pathological. At any rate, to me they seem quite certain, and I shall assume that you agree with me in this. Without this assumption, we are in danger of falling into that universal scepticism which, as we saw, is as barren as it is irrefutable. If we are to continue philosophising, we must make our bow to the sceptical hypothesis, and, while admitting the elegant terseness of its philosophy, proceed to the consideration of other hypotheses which, though perhaps not certain, have at least as good a right to our respect as the hypothesis of the sceptic.

Applying our distinction of "hard" and "soft" data to psychologically derivative but logically primitive beliefs, we shall find that most, if not all, are to be classed as soft data. They may be found, on reflection, to be capable of logical proof, and they then again become believed, but no longer as data. As data, though entitled to a certain limited respect, they cannot be placed on a level with the facts of sense or the laws of logic. The kind of respect which they deserve seems to me such as to warrant us in hoping, though not too confidently, that the hard data may prove them to be at least probable. Also, if the hard data are found to throw no light whatever upon their truth or falsehood, we are justified, I think, in giving rather more weight to the hypothesis of their truth than to the hypothesis of their falsehood. For the present, however, let us confine ourselves to the hard data, with a view to discovering what sort of world can be constructed by their means alone.

Our data now are primarily the facts of sense (_i.e._ of _our own_ sense-data) and the laws of logic. But even the severest scrutiny will allow some additions to this slender stock. Some facts of memory--especially of recent memory--seem to have the highest degree of certainty. Some introspective facts are as certain as any facts of sense. And facts of sense themselves must, for our present purposes, be interpreted with a certain latitude. Spatial and temporal relations must sometimes be included, for example in the case of a swift motion falling wholly within the specious present. And some facts of comparison, such as the likeness or unlikeness of two shades of colour, are certainly to be included among hard data. Also we must remember that the distinction of hard and soft data is psychological and subjective, so that, if there are other minds than our own--which at our present stage must be held doubtful--the catalogue of hard data may be different for them from what it is for us.

Certain common beliefs are undoubtedly excluded from hard data. Such is the belief which led us to introduce the distinction, namely, that sensible objects in general persist when we are not perceiving them. Such also is the belief in other people's minds: this belief is obviously derivative from our perception of their bodies, and is felt to demand logical justification as soon as we become aware of its derivativeness. Belief in what is reported by the testimony of others, including all that we learn from books, is of course involved in the doubt as to whether other people have minds at all. Thus the world from which our reconstruction is to

begin is very fragmentary. The best we can say for it is that it is slightly more extensive than the world at which Descartes arrived by a similar process, since that world contained nothing except himself and his thoughts.

We are now in a position to understand and state the problem of our knowledge of the external world, and to remove various misunderstandings which have obscured the meaning of the problem. The problem really is: Can the existence of anything other than our own hard data be inferred from the existence of those data? But before considering this problem, let us briefly consider what the problem is _not_.

When we speak of the "external" world in this discussion, we must not mean "spatially external," unless "space" is interpreted in a peculiar and recondite manner. The immediate objects of sight, the coloured surfaces which make up the visible world, are spatially external in the natural meaning of this phrase. We feel them to be "there" as opposed to "here"; without making any assumption of an existence other than hard data, we can more or less estimate the distance of a coloured surface. It seems probable that distances, provided they are not too great, are actually given more or less roughly in sight; but whether this is the case or not, ordinary distances can certainly be estimated approximately by means of the data of sense alone. The immediately given world is spatial, and is further not wholly contained within our own bodies. Thus our knowledge of what is external in this sense is not open to doubt.

Another form in which the question is often put is: "Can we know of the existence of any reality which is independent of ourselves?" This form of the question suffers from the ambiguity of the two words "independent" and "self." To take the Self first: the question as to what is to be reckoned part of the Self and what is not, is a very difficult one. Among many other things which we may mean by the Self, two may be selected as specially important, namely, (1) the bare subject which thinks and is aware of objects, (2) the whole assemblage of things that would necessarily cease to exist if our lives came to an end. The bare subject, if it exists at all, is an inference, and is not part of the data; therefore this meaning of Self may be ignored in our present inquiry. The second meaning is difficult to make precise, since we hardly know what things depend upon our lives for their existence. And in this form, the definition of Self introduces the word "depend," which raises the same questions as are raised by the word "independent." Let us therefore take up the word "independent," and return to the Self later.

When we say that one thing is "independent" of another, we may mean either that it is logically possible for the one to exist without the other, or that there is no causal relation between the two such that the one only occurs as the effect of the other. The only way, so far as I know, in which one thing can be _logically_ dependent upon another is when the other is _part_ of the one. The existence of a book, for example, is logically dependent upon that of its pages: without the pages there would be no book. Thus in this sense the question, "Can we know of the existence of any reality which is independent of ourselves?" reduces to the question, "Can we know of the existence of any reality of which our Self is not part?" In this form, the question brings us back to the problem of defining the Self; but I think, however the Self may be defined, even when it is taken as the bare subject, it cannot be supposed to be part of the immediate object of sense; thus in this form of the question we must admit that we can know of the existence of realities independent of ourselves.

The question of causal dependence is much more difficult. To know that one kind of thing is causally independent of another, we must know that it actually occurs without the other. Now it is fairly obvious that, whatever legitimate meaning we give to the Self, our thoughts and feelings are causally dependent upon ourselves, _i.e._ do not occur when there is no Self for them to belong to. But in the case of objects of sense this is not obvious; indeed, as we saw, the common-sense view is that such objects persist in the absence of any percipient. If this is the case, then they are causally independent of ourselves; if not, not. Thus in this form the question reduces to the question whether we can know that objects of sense, or any other objects not our own thoughts and feelings, exist at times when we are not perceiving them. This form, in which the difficult word "independent" no longer occurs, is the form in which we stated the problem a minute ago.

Our question in the above form raises two distinct problems, which it is important to keep separate. First, can we know that objects of sense, or very similar objects, exist at times when we are not perceiving them? Secondly, if this cannot be known, can we know that other objects, inferable from objects of sense but not necessarily resembling them, exist either when we are perceiving the objects of sense or at any other time? This latter problem arises in philosophy as the problem of the "thing in itself," and in science as the problem of matter as assumed in physics. We will consider this latter problem first.

Owing to the fact that we feel passive in sensation, we naturally suppose that our sensations have outside causes. Now it is necessary here first of all to distinguish between (1) our sensation, which is a mental event consisting in our being aware of a

sensible object, and (2) the sensible object of which we are aware in sensation. When I speak of the sensible object, it must be understood that I do not mean such a thing as a table, which is both visible and tangible, can be seen by many people at once, and is more or less permanent. What I mean is just that patch of colour which is momentarily seen when we look at the table, or just that particular hardness which is felt when we press it, or just that particular sound which is heard when we rap it. Each of these I call a sensible object, and our awareness of it I call a sensation. Now our sense of passivity, if it really afforded any argument, would only tend to show that the _sensation_ has an outside cause; this cause we should naturally seek in the sensible object. Thus there is no good reason, so far, for supposing that sensible objects must have outside causes. But both the thing-in-itself of philosophy and the matter of physics present themselves as outside causes of the sensible object as much as of the sensation. What are the grounds for this common opinion?

In each case, I think, the opinion has resulted from the combination of a belief that _something_ which can persist independently of our consciousness makes itself known in sensation, with the fact that our sensations often change in ways which seem to depend upon us rather than upon anything which would be supposed to persist independently of us. At first, we believe unreflectingly that everything is as it seems to be, and that, if we shut our eyes, the objects we had been seeing remain as they were though we no longer see them. But there are arguments against this view, which have generally been thought conclusive. It is extraordinarily difficult to see just what the arguments prove; but if we are to make any progress with the problem of the external world, we must try to make up our minds as to these arguments.

A table viewed from one place presents a different appearance from that which it presents from another place. This is the language of common sense, but this language already assumes that there is a real table of which we see the appearances. Let us try to state what is known in terms of sensible objects alone, without any element of hypothesis. We find that as we walk round the table, we perceive a series of gradually changing visible objects. But in speaking of "walking round the table," we have still retained the hypothesis that there is a single table connected with all the appearances. What we ought to say is that, while we have those muscular and other sensations which make us say we are walking, our visual sensations change in a continuous way, so that, for example, a striking patch of colour is not suddenly replaced by something wholly different, but is replaced by an insensible gradation of slightly different colours with slightly different shapes. This is what we really know by experience, when we have freed our minds from the assumption of permanent "things" with changing appearances. What is really known is a correlation of muscular and other bodily sensations with changes in visual sensations.

But walking round the table is not the only way of altering its appearance. We can shut one eye, or put on blue spectacles, or look through a microscope. All these operations, in various ways, alter the visual appearance which we call that of the table. More distant objects will also alter their appearance if (as we say) the state of the atmosphere changes--if there is fog or rain or sunshine. Physiological changes also alter the appearances of things. If we assume the world of common sense, all these changes, including those attributed to physiological causes, are changes in the intervening medium. It is not quite so easy as in the former case to reduce this set of facts to a form in which nothing is assumed beyond sensible objects. Anything intervening between ourselves and what we see must be invisible: our view in every direction is bounded by the nearest visible object. It might be objected that a dirty pane of glass, for example, is visible although we can see things through it. But in this case we really see a spotted patchwork: the dirtier specks in the glass are visible, while the cleaner parts are invisible and allow us to see what is beyond. Thus the discovery that the intervening medium affects the appearances of things cannot be made by means of the sense of sight alone.

Let us take the case of the blue spectacles, which is the simplest, but may serve as a type for the others. The frame of the spectacles is of course visible, but the blue glass, if it is clean, is not visible. The blueness, which we say is in the glass, appears as being in the objects seen through the glass. The glass itself is known by means of the sense of touch. In order to know that it is between us and the objects seen through it, we must know how to correlate the space of touch with the space of sight. This correlation itself, when stated in terms of the data of sense alone, is by no means a simple matter. But it presents no difficulties of principle, and may therefore be supposed accomplished. When it has been accomplished, it becomes possible to attach a meaning to the statement that the blue glass, which we can touch, is between us and the object seen, as we say, "through" it.

But we have still not reduced our statement completely to what is actually given in sense. We have fallen into the assumption that the object of which we are conscious when we touch the blue spectacles still exists after we have ceased to touch them. So long as we are touching them, nothing except our finger can be seen through the part touched, which is the only part where we immediately know that there is something. If we are to account for the blue appearance of objects other than the spectacles, when seen through them, it might seem as if we must assume that the spectacles still exist when we are not touching them; and if this assumption really is necessary, our main problem is answered: we have means of knowing of the present existence of objects not given in

sense, though of the same kind as objects formerly given in sense.

It may be questioned, however, whether this assumption is actually unavoidable, though it is unquestionably the most natural one to make. We may say that the object of which we become aware when we touch the spectacles continues to have effects afterwards, though perhaps it no longer exists. In this view, the supposed continued existence of sensible objects after they have ceased to be sensible will be a fallacious inference from the fact that they still have effects. It is often supposed that nothing which has ceased to exist can continue to have effects, but this is a mere prejudice, due to a wrong conception of causality. We cannot, therefore, dismiss our present hypothesis on the ground of _a priori_ impossibility, but must examine further whether it can really account for the facts.

It may be said that our hypothesis is useless in the case when the blue glass is never touched at all. How, in that case, are we to account for the blue appearance of objects? And more generally, what are we to make of the hypothetical sensations of touch which we associate with untouched visible objects, which we know would be verified if we chose, though in fact we do not verify them? Must not these be attributed to permanent possession, by the objects, of the properties which touch would reveal?

Let us consider the more general question first. Experience has taught us that where we see certain kinds of coloured surfaces we can, by touch, obtain certain expected sensations of hardness or softness, tactile shape, and so on. This leads us to believe that what is seen is usually tangible, and that it has, whether we touch it or not, the hardness or softness which we should expect to feel if we touched it. But the mere fact that we are able to infer what our tactile sensations would be shows that it is not logically necessary to assume tactile qualities before they are felt. All that is really known is that the visual appearance in question, together with touch, will lead to certain sensations, which can necessarily be determined in terms of the visual appearance, since otherwise they could not be inferred from it.

We can now give a statement of the experienced facts concerning the blue spectacles, which will supply an interpretation of common-sense beliefs without assuming anything beyond the existence of sensible objects at the times when they are sensible. By experience of the correlation of touch and sight sensations, we become able to associate a certain place in touch-space with a certain corresponding place in sight-space. Sometimes, namely in the case of transparent things, we find that there is a tangible object in a touch-place without there being any visible object in the corresponding sight-place. But in such a case as that of the blue spectacles, we find that whatever object is visible beyond the empty sight-place in the same line of sight has a different colour from what it has when there is no tangible object in the intervening touch-place; and as we move the tangible object in touch-space, the blue patch moves in sight-space. If now we find a blue patch moving in this way in sight-space, when we have no sensible experience of an intervening tangible object, we nevertheless infer that, if we put our hand at a certain place in touch-space, we should experience a certain touch-sensation. If we are to avoid non-sensible objects, this must be taken as the whole of our meaning when we say that the blue spectacles are in a certain place, though we have not touched them, and have only seen other things rendered blue by their interposition.

I think it may be laid down quite generally that, _in so far_ as physics or common sense is verifiable, it must be capable of interpretation in terms of actual sense-data alone. The reason for this is simple. Verification consists always in the occurrence of an expected sense-datum. Astronomers tell us there will be an eclipse of the moon: we look at the moon, and find the earth's shadow biting into it, that is to say, we see an appearance quite different from that of the usual full moon. Now if an expected sense-datum constitutes a verification, what was asserted must have been about sense-data; or, at any rate, if part of what was asserted was not about sense-data, then only the other part has been verified. There is in fact a certain regularity or conformity to law about the occurrence of sense-data, but the sense-data that occur at one time are often causally connected with those that occur at quite other times, and not, or at least not very closely, with those that occur at neighbouring times. If I look at the moon and immediately afterwards hear a train coming, there is no very close causal connection between my two sense-data; but if I look at the moon on two nights a week apart, there is a very close causal connection between the two sense-data. The simplest, or at least the easiest, statement of the connection is obtained by imagining a "real" moon which goes on whether I look at it or not, providing a series of _possible_ sense-data of which only those are actual which belong to moments when I choose to look at the moon.

But the degree of verification obtainable in this way is very small. It must be remembered that, at our present level of doubt, we are not at liberty to accept testimony. When we hear certain noises, which are those we should utter if we wished to express a certain thought, we assume that that thought, or one very like it, has been in another mind, and has given rise to the expression which we hear. If at the same time we see a body resembling our own, moving its lips as we move ours when we speak, we cannot resist the belief that it is alive, and that the feelings inside it continue when we are not looking at it. When we see our friend drop a weight

upon his toe, and hear him say--what we should say in similar circumstances, the phenomena _can_ no doubt be explained without assuming that he is anything but a series of shapes and noises seen and heard by us, but practically no man is so infected with philosophy as not to be quite certain that his friend has felt the same kind of pain as he himself would feel. We will consider the legitimacy of this belief presently; for the moment, I only wish to point out that it needs the same kind of justification as our belief that the moon exists when we do not see it, and that, without it, testimony heard or read is reduced to noises and shapes, and cannot be regarded as evidence of the facts which it reports. The verification of physics which is possible at our present level is, therefore, only that degree of verification which is possible by one man's unaided observations, which will not carry us very far towards the establishment of a whole science.

Before proceeding further, let us summarise the argument so far as it has gone. The problem is: "Can the existence of anything other than our own hard data be inferred from these data?" It is a mistake to state the problem in the form: "Can we know of the existence of anything other than ourselves and our states?" or: "Can we know of the existence of anything independent of ourselves?" because of the extreme difficulty of defining "self" and "independent" precisely. The felt passivity of sensation is irrelevant, since, even if it proved anything, it could only prove that sensations are caused by sensible objects. The natural _naive_ belief is that things seen persist, when unseen, exactly or approximately as they appeared when seen; but this belief tends to be dispelled by the fact that what common sense regards as the appearance of one object changes with what common sense regards as changes in the point of view and in the intervening medium, including in the latter our own sense-organs and nerves and brain. This fact, as just stated, assumes, however, the common-sense world of stable objects which it professes to call in question; hence, before we can discover its precise bearing on our problem, we must find a way of stating it which does not involve any of the assumptions which it is designed to render doubtful. What we then find, as the bare outcome of experience, is that gradual changes in certain sense-data are correlated with gradual changes in certain others, or (in the case of bodily motions) with the other sense-data themselves.

The assumption that sensible objects persist after they have ceased to be sensible--for example, that the hardness of a visible body, which has been discovered by touch, continues when the body is no longer touched--may be replaced by the statement that the _effects_ of sensible objects persist, _i.e._ that what happens now can only be accounted for, in many cases, by taking account of what happened at an earlier time. Everything that one man, by his own personal experience, can verify in the account of the world given by common sense and physics, will be explicable by some such means, since verification consists merely in the occurrence of an expected sense-datum. But what depends upon testimony, whether heard or read, cannot be explained in this way, since testimony depends upon the existence of minds other than our own, and thus requires a knowledge of something not given in sense. But before examining the question of our knowledge of other minds, let us return to the question of the thing-in-itself, namely, to the theory that what exists at times when we are not perceiving a given sensible object is something quite unlike that object, something which, together with us and our sense-organs, causes our sensations, but is never itself given in sensation.

The thing-in-itself, when we start from common-sense assumptions, is a fairly natural outcome of the difficulties due to the changing appearances of what is supposed to be one object. It is supposed that the table (for example) causes our sense-data of sight and touch, but must, since these are altered by the point of view and the intervening medium, be quite different from the sense-data to which it gives rise. There is, in this theory, a tendency to a confusion from which it derives some of its plausibility, namely, the confusion between a sensation as a psychical occurrence and its object. A patch of colour, even if it only exists when it is seen, is still something quite different from the seeing of it: the seeing of it is mental, but the patch of colour is not. This confusion, however, can be avoided without our necessarily abandoning the theory we are examining. The objection to it, I think, lies in its failure to realise the radical nature of the reconstruction demanded by the difficulties to which it points. We cannot speak legitimately of changes in the point of view and the intervening medium until we have already constructed some world more stable than that of momentary sensation. Our discussion of the blue spectacles and the walk round the table has, I hope, made this clear. But what remains far from clear is the nature of the reconstruction required.

Although we cannot rest content with the above theory, in the terms in which it is stated, we must nevertheless treat it with a certain respect, for it is in outline the theory upon which physical science and physiology are built, and it must, therefore, be susceptible of a true interpretation. Let us see how this is to be done.

The first thing to realise is that there are no such things as "illusions of sense." Objects of sense, even when they occur in dreams, are the most indubitably real objects known to us. What, then, makes us call them unreal in dreams? Merely the unusual nature of their connection with other objects of sense. I dream that I am in America, but I wake up and find myself in England without those

intervening days on the Atlantic which, alas! are inseparably connected with a "real" visit to America. Objects of sense are called "real" when they have the kind of connection with other objects of sense which experience has led us to regard as normal; when they fail in this, they are called "illusions." But what is illusory is only the inferences to which they give rise; in themselves, they are every bit as real as the objects of waking life. And conversely, the sensible objects of waking life must not be expected to have any more intrinsic reality than those of dreams. Dreams and waking life, in our first efforts at construction, must be treated with equal respect; it is only by some reality not _merely_ sensible that dreams can be condemned.

Accepting the indubitable momentary reality of objects of sense, the next thing to notice is the confusion underlying objections derived from their changeableness. As we walk round the table, its aspect changes; but it is thought impossible to maintain either that the table changes, or that its various aspects can all "really" exist in the same place. If we press one eyeball, we shall see two tables; but it is thought preposterous to maintain that there are "really" two tables. Such arguments, however, seem to involve the assumption that there can be something more real than objects of sense. If we see two tables, then there _are_ two visual tables. It is perfectly true that, at the same moment, we may discover by touch that there is only one tactile table. This makes us declare the two visual tables an illusion, because usually one visual object corresponds to one tactile object. But all that we are warranted in saying is that, in this case, the manner of correlation of touch and sight is unusual. Again, when the aspect of the table changes as we walk round it, and we are told there cannot be so many different aspects in the same place, the answer is simple: what does the critic of the table mean by "the same place"? The use of such a phrase presupposes that all our difficulties have been solved; as yet, we have no right to speak of a "place" except with reference to one given set of momentary sense-data. When all are changed by a bodily movement, no place remains the same as it was. Thus the difficulty, if it exists, has at least not been rightly stated.

We will now make a new start, adopting a different method. Instead of inquiring what is the minimum of assumption by which we can explain the world of sense, we will, in order to have a model hypothesis as a help for the imagination, construct one possible (not necessary) explanation of the facts. It may perhaps then be possible to pare away what is superfluous in our hypothesis, leaving a residue which may be regarded as the abstract answer to our problem.

Let us imagine that each mind looks out upon the world, as in Leibniz's monadology, from a point of view peculiar to itself; and for the sake of simplicity let us confine ourselves to the sense of sight, ignoring minds which are devoid of this sense. Each mind sees at each moment an immensely complex three-dimensional world; but there is absolutely nothing which is seen by two minds simultaneously. When we say that two people see the same thing, we always find that, owing to difference of point of view, there are differences, however slight, between their immediate sensible objects. (I am here assuming the validity of testimony, but as we are only constructing a _possible_ theory, that is a legitimate assumption.) The three-dimensional world seen by one mind therefore contains no place in common with that seen by another, for places can only be constituted by the things in or around them. Hence we may suppose, in spite of the differences between the different worlds, that each exists entire exactly as it is perceived, and might be exactly as it is even if it were not perceived. We may further suppose that there are an infinite number of such worlds which are in fact unperceived. If two men are sitting in a room, two somewhat similar worlds are perceived by them; if a third man enters and sits between them, a third world, intermediate between the two previous worlds, begins to be perceived. It is true that we cannot reasonably suppose just this world to have existed before, because it is conditioned by the sense-organs, nerves, and brain of the newly arrived man; but we can reasonably suppose that _some_ aspect of the universe existed from that point of view, though no one was perceiving it. The system consisting of all views of the universe perceived and unperceived, I shall call the system of "perspectives"; I shall confine the expression "private worlds" to such views of the universe as are actually perceived. Thus a "private world" is a perceived "perspective"; but there may be any number of unperceived perspectives.

Two men are sometimes found to perceive very similar perspectives, so similar that they can use the same words to describe them. They say they see the same table, because the differences between the two tables they see are slight and not practically important. Thus it is possible, sometimes, to establish a correlation by similarity between a great many of the things of one perspective, and a great many of the things of another. In case the similarity is very great, we say the points of view of the two perspectives are near together in space; but this space in which they are near together is totally different from the spaces inside the two perspectives. It is a relation between the perspectives, and is not in either of them; no one can perceive it, and if it is to be known it can be only by inference. Between two perceived perspectives which are similar, we can imagine a whole series of other perspectives, some at least unperceived, and such that between any two, however similar, there are others still more similar. In this way the space which consists of relations between perspectives can be rendered continuous, and (if we choose) three-dimensional.

We can now define the momentary common-sense "thing," as opposed to its momentary appearances. By the similarity of neighbouring perspectives, many objects in the one can be correlated with objects in the other, namely, with the similar objects.

Given an object in one perspective, form the system of all the objects correlated with it in all the perspectives; that system may be identified with the momentary common-sense "thing." Thus an aspect of a "thing" is a member of the system of aspects which _is_ the "thing" at that moment. (The correlation of the times of different perspectives raises certain complications, of the kind considered in the theory of relativity; but we may ignore these at present.) All the aspects of a thing are real, whereas the thing is a mere logical construction. It has, however, the merit of being neutral as between different points of view, and of being visible to more than one person, in the only sense in which it can ever be visible, namely, in the sense that each sees one of its aspects.

It will be observed that, while each perspective contains its own space, there is only one space in which the perspectives themselves are the elements. There are as many private spaces as there are perspectives; there are therefore at least as many as there are percipients, and there may be any number of others which have a merely material existence and are not seen by anyone. But there is only one perspective-space, whose elements are single perspectives, each with its own private space. We have now to explain how the private space of a single perspective is correlated with part of the one all-embracing perspective space.

Perspective space is the system of "points of view" of private spaces (perspectives), or, since "points of view" have not been defined, we may say it is the system of the private spaces themselves. These private spaces will each count as one point, or at any rate as one element, in perspective space. They are ordered by means of their similarities. Suppose, for example, that we start from one which contains the appearance of a circular disc, such as would be called a penny, and suppose this appearance, in the perspective in question, is circular, not elliptic. We can then form a whole series of perspectives containing a graduated series of circular aspects of varying sizes: for this purpose we only have to move (as we say) towards the penny or away from it. The perspectives in which the penny looks circular will be said to lie on a straight line in perspective space, and their order on this line will be that of the sizes of the circular aspects. Moreover--though this statement must be noticed and subsequently examined--the perspectives in which the penny looks big will be said to be nearer to the penny than those in which it looks small. It is to be remarked also that any other "thing" than our penny might have been chosen to define the relations of our perspectives in perspective space, and that experience shows that the same spatial order of perspectives would have resulted.

In order to explain the correlation of private spaces with perspective space, we have first to explain what is meant by "the place (in perspective space) where a thing is." For this purpose, let us again consider the penny which appears in many perspectives. We formed a straight line of perspectives in which the penny looked circular, and we agreed that those in which it looked larger were to be considered as nearer to the penny. We can form another straight line of perspectives in which the penny is seen end-on and looks like a straight line of a certain thickness. These two lines will meet in a certain place in perspective space, _i.e._ in a certain perspective, which may be defined as "the place (in perspective space) where the penny is." It is true that, in order to prolong our lines until they reach this place, we shall have to make use of other things besides the penny, because, so far as experience goes, the penny ceases to present any appearance after we have come so near to it that it touches the eye. But this raises no real difficulty, because the spatial order of perspectives is found empirically to be independent of the particular "things" chosen for defining the order. We can, for example, remove our penny and prolong each of our two straight lines up to their intersection by placing other pennies further off in such a way that the aspects of the one are circular where those of our original penny were circular, and the aspects of the other are straight where those of our original penny were straight. There will then be just one perspective in which one of the new pennies looks circular and the other straight. This will be, by definition, the place where the original penny was in perspective space.

The above is, of course, only a first rough sketch of the way in which our definition is to be reached. It neglects the size of the penny, and it assumes that we can remove the penny without being disturbed by any simultaneous changes in the positions of other things. But it is plain that such niceties cannot affect the principle, and can only introduce complications in its application.

Having now defined the perspective which is the place where a given thing is, we can understand what is meant by saying that the perspectives in which a thing looks large are nearer to the thing than those in which it looks small: they are, in fact, nearer to the perspective which is the place where the thing is.

We can now also explain the correlation between a private space and parts of perspective space. If there is an aspect of a given thing in a certain private space, then we correlate the place where this aspect is in the private space with the place where the thing is in perspective space.

We may define "here" as the place, in perspective space, which is occupied by our private world. Thus we can now understand what is meant by speaking of a thing as near to or far from "here." A thing is near to "here" if the place where it is is near to my

private world. We can also understand what is meant by saying that our private world is inside our head; for our private world is a place in perspective space, and may be part of the place where our head is.

It will be observed that _two_ places in perspective space are associated with every aspect of a thing: namely, the place where the thing is, and the place which is the perspective of which the aspect in question forms part. Every aspect of a thing is a member of two different classes of aspects, namely: (1) the various aspects of the thing, of which at most one appears in any given perspective; (2) the perspective of which the given aspect is a member, _i.e._ that in which the thing has the given aspect. The physicist naturally classifies aspects in the first way, the psychologist in the second. The two places associated with a single aspect correspond to the two ways of classifying it. We may distinguish the two places as that _at_ which, and that _from_ which, the aspect appears. The "place at which" is the place of the thing to which the aspect belongs; the "place from which" is the place of the perspective to which the aspect belongs.

Let us now endeavour to state the fact that the aspect which a thing presents at a given place is affected by the intervening medium. The aspects of a thing in different perspectives are to be conceived as spreading outwards from the place where the thing is, and undergoing various changes as they get further away from this place. The laws according to which they change cannot be stated if we only take account of the aspects that are near the thing, but require that we should also take account of the things that are at the places from which these aspects appear. This empirical fact can, therefore, be interpreted in terms of our construction.

We have now constructed a largely hypothetical picture of the world, which contains and places the experienced facts, including those derived from testimony. The world we have constructed can, with a certain amount of trouble, be used to interpret the crude facts of sense, the facts of physics, and the facts of physiology. It is therefore a world which _may_ be actual. It fits the facts, and there is no empirical evidence against it; it also is free from logical impossibilities. But have we any good reason to suppose that it is real? This brings us back to our original problem, as to the grounds for believing in the existence of anything outside my private world. What we have derived from our hypothetical construction is that there are no grounds _against_ the truth of this belief, but we have not derived any positive grounds in its favour. We will resume this inquiry by taking up again the question of testimony and the evidence for the existence of other minds.

It must be conceded to begin with that the argument in favour of the existence of other people's minds cannot be conclusive. A phantasm of our dreams will appear to have a mind--a mind to be annoying, as a rule. It will give unexpected answers, refuse to conform to our desires, and show all those other signs of intelligence to which we are accustomed in the acquaintances of our waking hours. And yet, when we are awake, we do not believe that the phantasm was, like the appearances of people in waking life, representative of a private world to which we have no direct access. If we are to believe this of the people we meet when we are awake, it must be on some ground short of demonstration, since it is obviously possible that what we call waking life may be only an unusually persistent and recurrent nightmare. It may be that our imagination brings forth all that other people seem to say to us, all that we read in books, all the daily, weekly, monthly, and quarterly journals that distract our thoughts, all the advertisements of soap and all the speeches of politicians. This _may_ be true, since it cannot be shown to be false, yet no one can really believe it. Is there any _logical_ ground for regarding this possibility as improbable? Or is there nothing beyond habit and prejudice?

The minds of other people are among our data, in the very wide sense in which we used the word at first. That is to say, when we first begin to reflect, we find ourselves already believing in them, not because of any argument, but because the belief is natural to us. It is, however, a psychologically derivative belief, since it results from observation of people's bodies; and along with other such beliefs, it does not belong to the hardest of hard data, but becomes, under the influence of philosophic reflection, just sufficiently questionable to make us desire some argument connecting it with the facts of sense.

The obvious argument is, of course, derived from analogy. Other people's bodies behave as ours do when we have certain thoughts and feelings; hence, by analogy, it is natural to suppose that such behaviour is connected with thoughts and feelings like our own. Someone says, "Look out!" and we find we are on the point of being killed by a motor-car; we therefore attribute the words we heard to the person in question having seen the motor-car first, in which case there are existing things of which we are not directly conscious. But this whole scene, with our inference, may occur in a dream, in which case the inference is generally considered to be mistaken. Is there anything to make the argument from analogy more cogent when we are (as we think) awake?

The analogy in waking life is only to be preferred to that in dreams on the ground of its greater extent and consistency. If a man were to dream every night about a set of people whom he never met by day, who had consistent characters and grew older with the lapse of years, he might, like the man in Calderon's play, find it difficult to decide which was the dream-world and which was the

so-called "real" world. It is only the failure of our dreams to form a consistent whole either with each other or with waking life that makes us condemn them. Certain uniformities are observed in waking life, while dreams seem quite erratic. The natural hypothesis would be that demons and the spirits of the dead visit us while we sleep; but the modern mind, as a rule, refuses to entertain this view, though it is hard to see what could be said against it. On the other hand, the mystic, in moments of illumination, seems to awaken from a sleep which has filled all his mundane life: the whole world of sense becomes phantasmal, and he sees, with the clarity and convincingness that belongs to our morning realisation after dreams, a world utterly different from that of our daily cares and troubles. Who shall condemn him? Who shall justify him? Or who shall justify the seeming solidity of the common objects among which we suppose ourselves to live?

The hypothesis that other people have minds must, I think, be allowed to be not susceptible of any very strong support from the analogical argument. At the same time, it is a hypothesis which systematises a vast body of facts and never leads to any consequences which there is reason to think false. There is therefore nothing to be said against its truth, and good reason to use it as a working hypothesis. When once it is admitted, it enables us to extend our knowledge of the sensible world by testimony, and thus leads to the system of private worlds which we assumed in our hypothetical construction. In actual fact, whatever we may try to think as philosophers, we cannot help believing in the minds of other people, so that the question whether our belief is justified has a merely speculative interest. And if it is justified, then there is no further difficulty of principle in that vast extension of our knowledge, beyond our own private data, which we find in science and common sense.

This somewhat meagre conclusion must not be regarded as the whole outcome of our long discussion. The problem of the connection of sense with objective reality has commonly been dealt with from a standpoint which did not carry initial doubt so far as we have carried it; most writers, consciously or unconsciously, have assumed that the testimony of others is to be admitted, and therefore (at least by implication) that others have minds. Their difficulties have arisen after this admission, from the differences in the appearance which one physical object presents to two people at the same time, or to one person at two times between which it cannot be supposed to have changed. Such difficulties have made people doubtful how far objective reality could be known by sense at all, and have made them suppose that there were positive arguments against the view that it can be so known. Our hypothetical construction meets these arguments, and shows that the account of the world given by common sense and physical science can be interpreted in a way which is logically unobjectionable, and finds a place for all the data, both hard and soft. It is this hypothetical construction, with its reconciliation of psychology and physics, which is the chief outcome of our discussion. Probably the construction is only in part necessary as an initial assumption, and can be obtained from more slender materials by the logical methods of which we shall have an example in the definitions of points, instants, and particles; but I do not yet know to what lengths this diminution in our initial assumptions can be carried.

LECTURE IV

THE WORLD OF PHYSICS AND THE WORLD OF SENSE

Among the objections to the reality of objects of sense, there is one which is derived from the apparent difference between matter as it appears in physics and things as they appear in sensation. Men of science, for the most part, are willing to condemn immediate data as "merely subjective," while yet maintaining the truth of the physics inferred from those data. But such an attitude, though it may be _capable_ of justification, obviously stands in need of it; and the only justification possible must be one which exhibits matter as a logical construction from sense-data--unless, indeed, there were some wholly _a priori_ principle by which unknown entities could be inferred from such as are known. It is therefore necessary to find some way of bridging the gulf between the world of physics and the world of sense, and it is this problem which will occupy us in the present lecture. Physicists appear to be unconscious of the gulf, while psychologists, who are conscious of it, have not the mathematical knowledge required for spanning it. The problem is difficult, and I do not know its solution in detail. All that I can hope to do is to make the problem felt, and to indicate the kind of methods by which a solution is to be sought.

Let us begin by a brief description of the two contrasted worlds. We will take first the world of physics, for, though the other world is given while the physical world is inferred, to us now the world of physics is the more familiar, the world of pure sense having become strange and difficult to rediscover. Physics started from the common-sense belief in fairly permanent and fairly rigid bodies--tables and chairs, stones, mountains, the earth and moon and sun. This common-sense belief, it should be noticed, is a piece of audacious metaphysical theorising; objects are not continually present to sensation, and it may be doubted whether they are there when they are not seen or felt. This problem, which has been acute since the time of Berkeley, is ignored by common

sense, and has therefore hitherto been ignored by physicists. We have thus here a first departure from the immediate data of sensation, though it is a departure merely by way of extension, and was probably made by our savage ancestors in some very remote prehistoric epoch.

But tables and chairs, stones and mountains, are not _quite_ permanent or _quite_ rigid. Tables and chairs lose their legs, stones are split by frost, and mountains are cleft by earthquakes and eruptions. Then there are other things, which seem material, and yet present almost no permanence or rigidity. Breath, smoke, clouds, are examples of such things--so, in a lesser degree, are ice and snow; and rivers and seas, though fairly permanent, are not in any degree rigid. Breath, smoke, clouds, and generally things that can be seen but not touched, were thought to be hardly real; to this day the usual mark of a ghost is that it can be seen but not touched. Such objects were peculiar in the fact that they seemed to disappear completely, not merely to be transformed into something else. Ice and snow, when they disappear, are replaced by water; and it required no great theoretical effort to invent the hypothesis that the water was the same thing as the ice and snow, but in a new form. Solid bodies, when they break, break into parts which are practically the same in shape and size as they were before. A stone can be hammered into a powder, but the powder consists of grains which retain the character they had before the pounding. Thus the ideal of absolutely rigid and absolutely permanent bodies, which early physicists pursued throughout the changing appearances, seemed attainable by supposing ordinary bodies to be composed of a vast number of tiny atoms. This billiard-ball view of matter dominated the imagination of physicists until quite modern times, until, in fact, it was replaced by the electromagnetic theory, which in its turn is developing into a new atomism. Apart from the special form of the atomic theory which was invented for the needs of chemistry, some kind of atomism dominated the whole of traditional dynamics, and was implied in every statement of its laws and axioms.

The pictorial accounts which physicists give of the material world as they conceive it undergo violent changes under the influence of modifications in theory which are much slighter than the layman might suppose from the alterations of the description. Certain features, however, have remained fairly stable. It is always assumed that there is _something_ indestructible which is capable of motion in space; what is indestructible is always very small, but does not always occupy a mere point in space. There is supposed to be one all-embracing space in which the motion takes place, and until lately we might have assumed one all-embracing time also. But the principle of relativity has given prominence to the conception of "local time," and has somewhat diminished men's confidence in the one even-flowing stream of time. Without dogmatising as to the ultimate outcome of the principle of relativity, however, we may safely say, I think, that it does not destroy the possibility of correlating different local times, and does not therefore have such far-reaching philosophical consequences as is sometimes supposed. In fact, in spite of difficulties as to measurement, the one all-embracing time still, I think, underlies all that physics has to say about motion. We thus have still in physics, as we had in Newton's time, a set of indestructible entities which may be called particles, moving relatively to each other in a single space and a single time.

The world of immediate data is quite different from this. Nothing is permanent; even the things that we think are fairly permanent, such as mountains, only become data when we see them, and are not immediately given as existing at other moments. So far from one all-embracing space being given, there are several spaces for each person, according to the different senses which give relations that may be called spatial. Experience teaches us to obtain one space from these by correlation, and experience, together with instinctive theorising, teaches us to correlate our spaces with those which we believe to exist in the sensible worlds of other people. The construction of a single time offers less difficulty so long as we confine ourselves to one person's private world, but the correlation of one private time with another is a matter of great difficulty. Thus, apart from any of the fluctuating hypotheses of physics, three main problems arise in connecting the world of physics with the world of sense, namely (1) the construction of permanent "things," (2) the construction of a single space, and (3) the construction of a single time. We will consider these three problems in succession.

(1) The belief in indestructible "things" very early took the form of atomism. The underlying motive in atomism was not, I think, any empirical success in interpreting phenomena, but rather an instinctive belief that beneath all the changes of the sensible world there must be something permanent and unchanging. This belief was, no doubt, fostered and nourished by its practical successes, culminating in the conservation of mass; but it was not produced by these successes. On the contrary, they were produced by it. Philosophical writers on physics sometimes speak as though the conservation of something or other were essential to the possibility of science, but this, I believe, is an entirely erroneous opinion. If the _a priori_ belief in permanence had not existed, the same laws which are now formulated in terms of this belief might just as well have been formulated without it. Why should we suppose that, when ice melts, the water which replaces it is the same thing in a new form? Merely because this supposition enables us to state the phenomena in a way which is consonant with our prejudices. What we really know is that, under certain

conditions of temperature, the appearance we call ice is replaced by the appearance we call water. We can give laws according to which the one appearance will be succeeded by the other, but there is no reason except prejudice for regarding both as appearances of the same substance.

One task, if what has just been said is correct, which confronts us in trying to connect the world of sense with the world of physics, is the task of reconstructing the conception of matter without the _a priori_ beliefs which historically gave rise to it. In spite of the revolutionary results of modern physics, the empirical successes of the conception of matter show that there must be some legitimate conception which fulfils roughly the same functions. The time has hardly come when we can state precisely what this legitimate conception is, but we can see in a general way what it must be like. For this purpose, it is only necessary to take our ordinary common-sense statements and reword them without the assumption of permanent substance. We say, for example, that things change gradually--sometimes very quickly, but not without passing through a continuous series of intermediate states. What this means is that, given any sensible appearance, there will usually be, _if we watch_, a continuous series of appearances connected with the given one, leading on by imperceptible gradations to the new appearances which common-sense regards as those of the same thing. Thus a thing may be defined as a certain series of appearances, connected with each other by continuity and by certain causal laws. In the case of slowly changing things, this is easily seen. Consider, say, a wall-paper which fades in the course of years. It is an effort not to conceive of it as one "thing" whose colour is slightly different at one time from what it is at another. But what do we really _know_ about it? We know that under suitable circumstances--_i.e._ when we are, as is said, "in the room"--we perceive certain colours in a certain pattern: not always precisely the same colours, but sufficiently similar to feel familiar. If we can state the laws according to which the colour varies, we can state all that is empirically verifiable; the assumption that there is a constant entity, the wall-paper, which "has" these various colours at various times, is a piece of gratuitous metaphysics. We may, if we like, _define_ the wall-paper as the series of its aspects. These are collected together by the same motives which led us to regard the wall-paper as one thing, namely a combination of sensible continuity and causal connection. More generally, a "thing" will be defined as a certain series of aspects, namely those which would commonly be said to be _of_ the thing. To say that a certain aspect is an aspect _of_ a certain thing will merely mean that it is one of those which, taken serially, _are_ the thing. Everything will then proceed as before: whatever was verifiable is unchanged, but our language is so interpreted as to avoid an unnecessary metaphysical assumption of permanence.

The above extrusion of permanent things affords an example of the maxim which inspires all scientific philosophising, namely "Occam's razor": _Entities are not to be multiplied without necessity._ In other words, in dealing with any subject-matter, find out what entities are undeniably involved, and state everything in terms of these entities. Very often the resulting statement is more complicated and difficult than one which, like common sense and most philosophy, assumes hypothetical entities whose existence there is no good reason to believe in. We find it easier to imagine a wall-paper with changing colours than to think merely of the series of colours; but it is a mistake to suppose that what is easy and natural in thought is what is most free from unwarrantable assumptions, as the case of "things" very aptly illustrates.

The above summary account of the genesis of "things," though it may be correct in outline, has omitted some serious difficulties which it is necessary briefly to consider. Starting from a world of helter-skelter sense-data, we wish to collect them into series, each of which can be regarded as consisting of the successive appearances of one "thing." There is, to begin with, some conflict between what common sense regards as one thing, and what physics regards an unchanging collection of particles. To common sense, a human body is one thing, but to science the matter composing it is continually changing. This conflict, however, is not very serious, and may, for our rough preliminary purpose, be largely ignored. The problem is: by what principles shall we select certain data from the chaos, and call them all appearances of the same thing?

A rough and approximate answer to this question is not very difficult. There are certain fairly stable collections of appearances, such as landscapes, the furniture of rooms, the faces of acquaintances. In these cases, we have little hesitation in regarding them on successive occasions as appearances of one thing or collection of things. But, as the _Comedy of Errors_ illustrates, we may be led astray if we judge by mere resemblance. This shows that something more is involved, for two different things may have any degree of likeness up to exact similarity.

Another insufficient criterion of one thing is _continuity_. As we have already seen, if we watch what we regard as one changing thing, we usually find its changes to be continuous so far as our senses can perceive. We are thus led to assume that, if we see two finitely different appearances at two different times, and if we have reason to regard them as belonging to the same thing, then there was a continuous series of intermediate states of that thing during the time when we were not observing it. And so it comes to be thought that continuity of change is necessary and sufficient to constitute one thing. But in fact it is neither. It is not _necessary_,

because the unobserved states, in the case where our attention has not been concentrated on the thing throughout, are purely hypothetical, and cannot possibly be our ground for supposing the earlier and later appearances to belong to the same thing; on the contrary, it is because we suppose this that we assume intermediate unobserved states. Continuity is also not sufficient, since we can, for example, pass by sensibly continuous gradations from any one drop of the sea to any other drop. The utmost we can say is that discontinuity during uninterrupted observation is as a rule a mark of difference between things, though even this cannot be said in such cases as sudden explosions.

The assumption of continuity is, however, successfully made in physics. This proves something, though not anything of very obvious utility to our present problem: it proves that nothing in the known world is inconsistent with the hypothesis that all changes are really continuous, though from too great rapidity or from our lack of observation they may not always appear continuous. In this hypothetical sense, continuity may be allowed to be a _necessary_ condition if two appearances are to be classed as appearances of the same thing. But it is not a _sufficient_ condition, as appears from the instance of the drops in the sea. Thus something more must be sought before we can give even the roughest definition of a "thing."

What is wanted further seems to be something in the nature of fulfilment of causal laws. This statement, as it stands, is very vague, but we will endeavour to give it precision. When I speak of "causal laws," I mean any laws which connect events at different times, or even, as a limiting case, events at the same time provided the connection is not logically demonstrable. In this very general sense, the laws of dynamics are causal laws, and so are the laws correlating the simultaneous appearances of one "thing" to different senses. The question is: How do such laws help in the definition of a "thing"?

To answer this question, we must consider what it is that is proved by the empirical success of physics. What is proved is that its hypotheses, though unverifiable where they go beyond sense-data, are at no point in contradiction with sense-data, but, on the contrary, are ideally such as to render all sense-data calculable from a sufficient collection of data all belonging to a given period of time. Now physics has found it empirically possible to collect sense-data into series, each series being regarded as belonging to one "thing," and behaving, with regard to the laws of physics, in a way in which series not belonging to one thing would in general not behave. If it is to be unambiguous whether two appearances belong to the same thing or not, there must be only one way of grouping appearances so that the resulting things obey the laws of physics. It would be very difficult to prove that this is the case, but for our present purposes we may let this point pass, and assume that there is only one way. We must include in our definition of a "thing" those of its aspects, if any, which are not observed. Thus we may lay down the following definition: _Things are those series of aspects which obey the laws of physics._ That such series exist is an empirical fact, which constitutes the verifiability of physics.

It may still be objected that the "matter" of physics is something other than series of sense-data. Sense-data, it may be said, belong to psychology and are, at any rate in some sense, subjective, whereas physics is quite independent of psychological considerations, and does not assume that its matter only exists when it is perceived.

To this objection there are two answers, both of some importance.

(a) We have been considering, in the above account, the question of the _verifiability_ of physics. Now verifiability is by no means the same thing as truth; it is, in fact, something far more subjective and psychological. For a proposition to be verifiable, it is not enough that it should be true, but it must also be such as we can _discover_ to be true. Thus verifiability depends upon our capacity for acquiring knowledge, and not only upon the objective truth. In physics, as ordinarily set forth, there is much that is unverifiable: there are hypotheses as to (A) how things would appear to a spectator in a place where, as it happens, there is no spectator; (B) how things would appear at times when, in fact, they are not appearing to anyone; (C) things which never appear at all. All these are introduced to simplify the statement of the causal laws, but none of them form an integral part of what is _known_ to be true in physics. This brings us to our second answer.

(b) If physics is to consist wholly of propositions known to be true, or at least capable of being proved or disproved, the three kinds of hypothetical entities we have just enumerated must all be capable of being exhibited as logical functions of sense-data. In order to show how this might possibly be done, let us recall the hypothetical Leibnizian universe of Lecture III. In that universe, we had a number of perspectives, two of which never had any entity in common, but often contained entities which could be sufficiently correlated to be regarded as belonging to the same thing. We will call one of these an "actual" private world when there is an actual spectator to which it appears, and "ideal" when it is merely constructed on principles of continuity. A physical thing consists, at each instant, of the whole set of its aspects at that instant, in all the different worlds; thus a momentary state of a thing is a whole set of

aspects. An "ideal" appearance will be an aspect merely calculated, but not actually perceived by any spectator. An "ideal" state of a thing will be a state at a moment when all its appearances are ideal. An ideal thing will be one whose states at all times are ideal. Ideal appearances, states, and things, since they are calculated, must be functions of actual appearances, states, and things; in fact, ultimately, they must be functions of actual appearances. Thus it is unnecessary, for the enunciation of the laws of physics, to assign any reality to ideal elements: it is enough to accept them as logical constructions, provided we have means of knowing how to determine when they become actual. This, in fact, we have with some degree of approximation; the starry heaven, for instance, becomes actual whenever we choose to look at it. It is open to us to believe that the ideal elements exist, and there can be no reason for _dis_believing this; but unless in virtue of some _a priori_ law we cannot _know_ it, for empirical knowledge is confined to what we actually observe.

(2) The three main conceptions of physics are space, time, and matter. Some of the problems raised by the conception of matter have been indicated in the above discussion of "things." But space and time also raise difficult problems of much the same kind, namely, difficulties in reducing the haphazard untidy world of immediate sensation to the smooth orderly world of geometry and kinematics. Let us begin with the consideration of space.

People who have never read any psychology seldom realise how much mental labour has gone into the construction of the one all-embracing space into which all sensible objects are supposed to fit. Kant, who was unusually ignorant of psychology, described space as "an infinite given whole," whereas a moment's psychological reflection shows that a space which is infinite is not given, while a space which can be called given is not infinite. What the nature of "given" space really is, is a difficult question, upon which psychologists are by no means agreed. But some general remarks may be made, which will suffice to show the problems, without taking sides on any psychological issue still in debate.

The first thing to notice is that different senses have different spaces. The space of sight is quite different from the space of touch: it is only by experience in infancy that we learn to correlate them. In later life, when we see an object within reach, we know how to touch it, and more or less what it will feel like; if we touch an object with our eyes shut, we know where we should have to look for it, and more or less what it would look like. But this knowledge is derived from early experience of the correlation of certain kinds of touch-sensations with certain kinds of sight-sensations. The one space into which both kinds of sensations fit is an intellectual construction, not a datum. And besides touch and sight, there are other kinds of sensation which give other, though less important spaces: these also have to be fitted into the one space by means of experienced correlations. And as in the case of things, so here: the one all-embracing space, though convenient as a way of speaking, need not be supposed really to exist. All that experience makes certain is the several spaces of the several senses, correlated by empirically discovered laws. The one space may turn out to be valid as a logical construction, compounded of the several spaces, but there is no good reason to assume its independent metaphysical reality.

Another respect in which the spaces of immediate experience differ from the space of geometry and physics is in regard to _points_. The space of geometry and physics consists of an infinite number of points, but no one has ever seen or touched a point. If there are points in a sensible space, they must be an inference. It is not easy to see any way in which, as independent entities, they could be validly inferred from the data; thus here again, we shall have, if possible, to find some logical construction, some complex assemblage of immediately given objects, which will have the geometrical properties required of points. It is customary to think of points as simple and infinitely small, but geometry in no way demands that we should think of them in this way. All that is necessary for geometry is that they should have mutual relations possessing certain enumerated abstract properties, and it may be that an assemblage of data of sensation will serve this purpose. Exactly how this is to be done, I do not yet know, but it seems fairly certain that it can be done.

The following illustrative method, simplified so as to be easily manipulated, has been invented by Dr Whitehead for the purpose of showing how points might be manufactured from sense-data. We have first of all to observe that there are no infinitesimal sense-data: any surface we can see, for example, must be of some finite extent. But what at first appears as one undivided whole is often found, under the influence of attention, to split up into parts contained within the whole. Thus one spatial object may be contained within another, and entirely enclosed by the other. This relation of enclosure, by the help of some very natural hypotheses, will enable us to define a "point" as a certain class of spatial objects, namely all those (as it will turn out in the end) which would naturally be said to contain the point. In order to obtain a definition of a "point" in this way, we proceed as follows:

Given any set of volumes or surfaces, they will not in general converge into one point. But if they get smaller and smaller, while of any two of the set there is always one that encloses the other, then we begin to have the kind of conditions which would enable us

to treat them as having a point for their limit. The hypotheses required for the relation of enclosure are that (1) it must be transitive; (2) of two _different_ spatial objects, it is impossible for each to enclose the other, but a single spatial object always encloses itself; (3) any set of spatial objects such that there is at least one spatial object enclosed by them all has a lower limit or minimum, _i.e._ an object enclosed by all of them and enclosing all objects which are enclosed by all of them; (4) to prevent trivial exceptions, we must add that there are to be instances of enclosure, _i.e._ there are really to be objects of which one encloses the other. When an enclosure-relation has these properties, we will call it a "point-producer." Given any relation of enclosure, we will call a set of objects an "enclosure-series" if, of any two of them, one is contained in the other. We require a condition which shall secure that an enclosure-series converges to a point, and this is obtained as follows: Let our enclosure-series be such that, given any other enclosure-series of which there are members enclosed in any arbitrarily chosen member of our first series, then there are members of our first series enclosed in any arbitrarily chosen member of our second series. In this case, our first enclosure-series may be called a "punctual enclosure-series." Then a "point" is all the objects which enclose members of a given punctual enclosure-series. In order to ensure infinite divisibility, we require one further property to be added to those defining point-producers, namely that any object which encloses itself also encloses an object other than itself. The "points" generated by point-producers with this property will be found to be such as geometry requires.

(3) The question of time, so long as we confine ourselves to one private world, is rather less complicated than that of space, and we can see pretty clearly how it might be dealt with by such methods as we have been considering. Events of which we are conscious do not last merely for a mathematical instant, but always for some finite time, however short. Even if there be a physical world such as the mathematical theory of motion supposes, impressions on our sense-organs produce sensations which are not merely and strictly instantaneous, and therefore the objects of sense of which we are immediately conscious are not strictly instantaneous. Instants, therefore, are not among the data of experience, and, if legitimate, must be either inferred or constructed. It is difficult to see how they can be validly inferred; thus we are left with the alternative that they must be constructed. How is this to be done?

Immediate experience provides us with two time-relations among events: they may be simultaneous, or one may be earlier and the other later. These two are both part of the crude data; it is not the case that only the events are given, and their time-order is added by our subjective activity. The time-order, within certain limits, is as much given as the events. In any story of adventure you will find such passages as the following: "With a cynical smile he pointed the revolver at the breast of the dauntless youth. 'At the word _three_ I shall fire,' he said. The words one and two had already been spoken with a cool and deliberate distinctness. The word _three_ was forming on his lips. At this moment a blinding flash of lightning rent the air." Here we have simultaneity--not due, as Kant would have us believe, to the subjective mental apparatus of the dauntless youth, but given as objectively as the revolver and the lightning. And it is equally given in immediate experience that the words _one_ and _two_ come earlier than the flash. These time-relations hold between events which are not strictly instantaneous. Thus one event may begin sooner than another, and therefore be before it, but may continue after the other has begun, and therefore be also simultaneous with it. If it persists after the other is over, it will also be later than the other. Earlier, simultaneous, and later, are not inconsistent with each other when we are concerned with events which last for a finite time, however short; they only become inconsistent when we are dealing with something instantaneous.

It is to be observed that we cannot give what may be called _absolute_ dates, but only dates determined by events. We cannot point to a time itself, but only to some event occurring at that time. There is therefore no reason in experience to suppose that there are times as opposed to events: the events, ordered by the relations of simultaneity and succession, are all that experience provides. Hence, unless we are to introduce superfluous metaphysical entities, we must, in defining what mathematical physics can regard as an instant, proceed by means of some construction which assumes nothing beyond events and their temporal relations.

If we wish to assign a date exactly by means of events, how shall we proceed? If we take any one event, we cannot assign our date exactly, because the event is not instantaneous, that is to say, it may be simultaneous with two events which are not simultaneous with each other. In order to assign a date exactly, we must be able, theoretically, to determine whether any given event is before, at, or after this date, and we must know that any other date is either before or after this date, but not simultaneous with it. Suppose, now, instead of taking one event A, we take two events A and B, and suppose A and B partly overlap, but B ends before A ends. Then an event which is simultaneous with both A and B must exist during the time when A and B overlap; thus we have come rather nearer to a precise date than when we considered A and B alone. Let C be an event which is simultaneous with both A and B, but which ends before either A or B has ended. Then an event which is simultaneous with A and B and C must exist during the time when all three overlap, which is a still shorter time. Proceeding in this way, by taking more and more events, a new event which is dated as simultaneous with all of them becomes gradually more and more accurately dated. This suggests a way by which

a completely accurate date can be defined.

A_____

B_____

C_____

Let us take a group of events of which any two overlap, so that there is some time, however short, when they all exist. If there is any other event which is simultaneous with all of these, let us add it to the group; let us go on until we have constructed a group such that no event outside the group is simultaneous with all of them, but all the events inside the group are simultaneous with each other. Let us define this whole group as an instant of time. It remains to show that it has the properties we expect of an instant.

What are the properties we expect of instants? First, they must form a series: of any two, one must be before the other, and the other must be not before the one; if one is before another, and the other before a third, the first must be before the third. Secondly, every event must be at a certain number of instants; two events are simultaneous if they are at the same instant, and one is before the other if there is an instant, at which the one is, which is earlier than some instant at which the other is. Thirdly, if we assume that there is always some change going on somewhere during the time when any given event persists, the series of instants ought to be compact, _i.e._ given any two instants, there ought to be other instants between them. Do instants, as we have defined them, have these properties?

We shall say that an event is "at" an instant when it is a member of the group by which the instant is constituted; and we shall say that one instant is before another if the group which is the one instant contains an event which is earlier than, but not simultaneous with, some event in the group which is the other instant. When one event is earlier than, but not simultaneous with another, we shall say that it "wholly precedes" the other. Now we know that of two events which are not simultaneous, there must be one which wholly precedes the other, and in that case the other cannot also wholly precede the one; we also know that, if one event wholly precedes another, and the other wholly precedes a third, then the first wholly precedes the third. From these facts it is easy to deduce that the instants as we have defined them form a series.

We have next to show that every event is "at" at least one instant, _i.e._ that, given any event, there is at least one class, such as we used in defining instants, of which it is a member. For this purpose, consider all the events which are simultaneous with a given event, and do not begin later, _i.e._ are not wholly after anything simultaneous with it. We will call these the "initial contemporaries" of the given event. It will be found that this class of events is the first instant at which the given event exists, provided every event wholly after some contemporary of the given event is wholly after some _initial_ contemporary of it.

Finally, the series of instants will be compact if, given any two events of which one wholly precedes the other, there are events wholly after the one and simultaneous with something wholly before the other. Whether this is the case or not, is an empirical question; but if it is not, there is no reason to expect the time-series to be compact.[17]

[17] The assumptions made concerning time-relations in the above are as follows:--

I. In order to secure that instants form a series, we assume:

(a) No event wholly precedes itself. (An "event" is defined as whatever is simultaneous with something or other.)

(b) If one event wholly precedes another, and the other wholly precedes a third, then the first wholly precedes the third.

(c) If one event wholly precedes another, it is not simultaneous with it.

(d) Of two events which are not simultaneous, one must wholly precede the other.

II. In order to secure that the initial contemporaries of a given event should form an instant, we assume:

(e) An event wholly after some contemporary of a given event is wholly after some _initial_ contemporary of the given event.

III. In order to secure that the series of instants shall be compact, we assume:

(f) If one event wholly precedes another, there is an event wholly after the one and simultaneous with something wholly before the other.

This assumption entails the consequence that if one event covers the whole of a stretch of time immediately preceding another event, then it must have at least one instant in common with the other event; _i.e._ it is impossible for one event to cease just before another begins. I do not know whether this should be regarded as inadmissible. For a mathematico-logical treatment of the above topics, _cf._ N. Wilner, "A Contribution to the Theory of Relative Position," _Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc._, xvii. 5, pp. 441-449.

Thus our definition of instants secures all that mathematics requires, without having to assume the existence of any disputable metaphysical entities.

Instants may also be defined by means of the enclosure-relation, exactly as was done in the case of points. One object will be temporally enclosed by another when it is simultaneous with the other, but not before or after it. Whatever encloses temporally or is enclosed temporally we shall call an "event." In order that the relation of temporal enclosure may be a "point-producer," we require (1) that it should be transitive, _i.e._ that if one event encloses another, and the other a third, then the first encloses the third; (2) that every event encloses itself, but if one event encloses another different event, then the other does not enclose the one; (3) that given any set of events such that there is at least one event enclosed by all of them, then there is an event enclosing all that they all enclose, and itself enclosed by all of them; (4) that there is at least one event. To ensure infinite divisibility, we require also that every event should enclose events other than itself. Assuming these characteristics, temporal enclosure is an infinitely divisible point-producer. We can now form an "enclosure-series" of events, by choosing a group of events such that of any two there is one which encloses the other; this will be a "punctual enclosure-series" if, given any other enclosure-series such that every member of our first series encloses some member of our second, then every member of our second series encloses some member of our first. Then an "instant" is the class of all events which enclose members of a given punctual enclosure-series.

The correlation of the times of different private worlds so as to produce the one all-embracing time of physics is a more difficult matter. We saw, in Lecture III., that different private worlds often contain correlated appearances, such as common sense would regard as appearances of the same "thing." When two appearances in different worlds are so correlated as to belong to one momentary "state" of a thing, it would be natural to regard them as simultaneous, and as thus affording a simple means of correlating different private times. But this can only be regarded as a first approximation. What we call one sound will be heard sooner by people near the source of the sound than by people further from it, and the same applies, though in a less degree, to light. Thus two correlated appearances in different worlds are not necessarily to be regarded as occurring at the same date in physical time, though they will be parts of one momentary state of a thing. The correlation of different private times is regulated by the desire to secure the simplest possible statement of the laws of physics, and thus raises rather complicated technical problems; but from the point of view of philosophical theory, there is no very serious difficulty of principle involved.

The above brief outline must not be regarded as more than tentative and suggestive. It is intended merely to show the kind of way in which, given a world with the kind of properties that psychologists find in the world of sense, it may be possible, by means of purely logical constructions, to make it amenable to mathematical treatment by defining series or classes of sense-data which can be called respectively particles, points, and instants. If such constructions are possible, then mathematical physics is applicable to the real world, in spite of the fact that its particles, points, and instants are not to be found among actually existing entities.

The problem which the above considerations are intended to elucidate is one whose importance and even existence has been concealed by the unfortunate separation of different studies which prevails throughout the civilised world. Physicists, ignorant and contemptuous of philosophy, have been content to assume their particles, points, and instants in practice, while conceding, with ironical politeness, that their concepts laid no claim to metaphysical validity. Metaphysicians, obsessed by the idealistic opinion that only mind is real, and the Parmenidean belief that the real is unchanging, repeated one after another the supposed contradictions in the notions of matter, space, and time, and therefore naturally made no endeavour to invent a tenable theory of particles, points, and instants. Psychologists, who have done invaluable work in bringing to light the chaotic nature of the crude materials supplied by unmanipulated sensation, have been ignorant of mathematics and modern logic, and have therefore been content to say that matter, space, and time are "intellectual constructions," without making any attempt to show in detail either how the intellect can construct them, or what secures the practical validity which physics shows them to possess. Philosophers, it is to be hoped, will come to recognise that they cannot achieve any solid success in such problems without some slight knowledge of logic, mathematics, and physics; meanwhile, for want of students with the necessary equipment, this vital problem remains unattempted and unknown.

There are, it is true, two authors, both physicists, who have done something, though not much, to bring about a recognition of the problem as one demanding study. These two authors are Poincare and Mach, Poincare especially in his _Science and

Hypothesis_, Mach especially in his _Analysis of Sensations_. Both of them, however, admirable as their work is, seem to me to suffer from a general philosophical bias. Poincare is Kantian, while Mach is ultra-empiricist; with Poincare almost all the mathematical part of physics is merely conventional, while with Mach the sensation as a mental event is identified with its object as a part of the physical world. Nevertheless, both these authors, and especially Mach, deserve mention as having made serious contributions to the consideration of our problem.

When a point or an instant is defined as a class of sensible qualities, the first impression produced is likely to be one of wild and wilful paradox. Certain considerations apply here, however, which will again be relevant when we come to the definition of numbers. There is a whole type of problems which can be solved by such definitions, and almost always there will be at first an effect of paradox. Given a set of objects any two of which have a relation of the sort called "symmetrical and transitive," it is almost certain that we shall come to regard them as all having some common quality, or as all having the same relation to some one object outside the set. This kind of case is important, and I shall therefore try to make it clear even at the cost of some repetition of previous definitions.

A relation is said to be "symmetrical" when, if one term has this relation to another, then the other also has it to the one. Thus "brother or sister" is a "symmetrical" relation: if one person is a brother or a sister of another, then the other is a brother or sister of the one. Simultaneity, again, is a symmetrical relation; so is equality in size. A relation is said to be "transitive" when, if one term has this relation to another, and the other to a third, then the one has it to the third. The symmetrical relations mentioned just now are also transitive--provided, in the case of "brother or sister," we allow a person to be counted as his or her own brother or sister, and provided, in the case of simultaneity, we mean complete simultaneity, _i.e._ beginning and ending together.

But many relations are transitive without being symmetrical--for instance, such relations as "greater," "earlier," "to the right of," "ancestor of," in fact all such relations as give rise to series. Other relations are symmetrical without being transitive--for example, difference in any respect. If A is of a different age from B, and B of a different age from C, it does not follow that A is of a different age from C. Simultaneity, again, in the case of events which last for a finite time, will not necessarily be transitive if it only means that the times of the two events overlap. If A ends just after B has begun, and B ends just after C has begun, A and B will be simultaneous in this sense, and so will B and C, but A and C may well not be simultaneous.

All the relations which can naturally be represented as equality in any respect, or as possession of a common property, are transitive and symmetrical--this applies, for example, to such relations as being of the same height or weight or colour. Owing to the fact that possession of a common property gives rise to a transitive symmetrical relation, we come to imagine that wherever such a relation occurs it must be due to a common property. "Being equally numerous" is a transitive symmetrical relation of two collections; hence we imagine that both have a common property, called their number. "Existing at a given instant" (in the sense in which we defined an instant) is a transitive symmetrical relation; hence we come to think that there really is an instant which confers a common property on all the things existing at that instant. "Being states of a given thing" is a transitive symmetrical relation; hence we come to imagine that there really is a thing, other than the series of states, which accounts for the transitive symmetrical relation. In all such cases, the class of terms that have the given transitive symmetrical relation to a given term will fulfil all the formal requisites of a common property of all the members of the class. Since there certainly is the class, while any other common property may be illusory, it is prudent, in order to avoid needless assumptions, to substitute the class for the common property which would be ordinarily assumed. This is the reason for the definitions we have adopted, and this is the source of the apparent paradoxes. No harm is done if there are such common properties as language assumes, since we do not deny them, but merely abstain from asserting them. But if there are not such common properties in any given case, then our method has secured us against error. In the absence of special knowledge, therefore, the method we have adopted is the only one which is safe, and which avoids the risk of introducing fictitious metaphysical entities.

LECTURE V

THE THEORY OF CONTINUITY

The theory of continuity, with which we shall be occupied in the present lecture, is, in most of its refinements and developments, a purely mathematical subject--very beautiful, very important, and very delightful, but not, strictly speaking, a part of philosophy. The logical basis of the theory alone belongs to philosophy, and alone will occupy us to-night. The way the problem of continuity enters into philosophy is, broadly speaking, the following: Space and time are treated by mathematicians as consisting of points and instants, but they also have a property, easier to feel than to define, which is called continuity, and is thought by many philosophers

to be destroyed when they are resolved into points and instants. Zeno, as we shall see, proved that analysis into points and instants was impossible if we adhered to the view that the number of points or instants in a finite space or time must be finite. Later philosophers, believing infinite number to be self-contradictory, have found here an antinomy: Spaces and times could not consist of a _finite_ number of points and instants, for such reasons as Zeno's; they could not consist of an _infinite_ number of points and instants, because infinite numbers were supposed to be self-contradictory. Therefore spaces and times, if real at all, must not be regarded as composed of points and instants.

But even when points and instants, as independent entities, are discarded, as they were by the theory advocated in our last lecture, the problems of continuity, as I shall try to show presently, remain, in a practically unchanged form. Let us therefore, to begin with, admit points and instants, and consider the problems in connection with this simpler or at least more familiar hypothesis.

The argument against continuity, in so far as it rests upon the supposed difficulties of infinite numbers, has been disposed of by the positive theory of the infinite, which will be considered in Lecture VII. But there remains a feeling--of the kind that led Zeno to the contention that the arrow in its flight is at rest--which suggests that points and instants, even if they are infinitely numerous, can only give a jerky motion, a succession of different immobilities, not the smooth transitions with which the senses have made us familiar. This feeling is due, I believe, to a failure to realise imaginatively, as well as abstractly, the nature of continuous series as they appear in mathematics. When a theory has been apprehended logically, there is often a long and serious labour still required in order to _feel_ it: it is necessary to dwell upon it, to thrust out from the mind, one by one, the misleading suggestions of false but more familiar theories, to acquire the kind of intimacy which, in the case of a foreign language, would enable us to think and dream in it, not merely to construct laborious sentences by the help of grammar and dictionary. It is, I believe, the absence of this kind of intimacy which makes many philosophers regard the mathematical doctrine of continuity as an inadequate explanation of the continuity which we experience in the world of sense.

In the present lecture, I shall first try to explain in outline what the mathematical theory of continuity is in its philosophically important essentials. The application to actual space and time will not be in question to begin with. I do not see any reason to suppose that the points and instants which mathematicians introduce in dealing with space and time are actual physically existing entities, but I do see reason to suppose that the continuity of actual space and time may be more or less analogous to mathematical continuity. The theory of mathematical continuity is an abstract logical theory, not dependent for its validity upon any properties of actual space and time. What is claimed for it is that, when it is understood, certain characteristics of space and time, previously very hard to analyse, are found not to present any logical difficulty. What we know empirically about space and time is insufficient to enable us to decide between various mathematically possible alternatives, but these alternatives are all fully intelligible and fully adequate to the observed facts. For the present, however, it will be well to forget space and time and the continuity of sensible change, in order to return to these topics equipped with the weapons provided by the abstract theory of continuity.

Continuity, in mathematics, is a property only possible to a _series_ of terms, _i.e._ to terms arranged in an order, so that we can say of any two that one comes _before_ the other. Numbers in order of magnitude, the points on a line from left to right, the moments of time from earlier to later, are instances of series. The notion of order, which is here introduced, is one which is not required in the theory of cardinal number. It is possible to know that two classes have the same number of terms without knowing any order in which they are to be taken. We have an instance of this in such a case as English husbands and English wives: we can see that there must be the same number of husbands as of wives, without having to arrange them in a series. But continuity, which we are now to consider, is essentially a property of an order: it does not belong to a set of terms in themselves, but only to a set in a certain order. A set of terms which can be arranged in one order can always also be arranged in other orders, and a set of terms which can be arranged in a continuous order can always also be arranged in orders which are not continuous. Thus the essence of continuity must not be sought in the nature of the set of terms, but in the nature of their arrangement in a series.

Mathematicians have distinguished different degrees of continuity, and have confined the word "continuous," for technical purposes, to series having a certain high degree of continuity. But for philosophical purposes, all that is important in continuity is introduced by the lowest degree of continuity, which is called "compactness." A series is called "compact" when no two terms are consecutive, but between any two there are others. One of the simplest examples of a compact series is the series of fractions in order of magnitude. Given any two fractions, however near together, there are other fractions greater than the one and smaller than the other, and therefore no two fractions are consecutive. There is no fraction, for example, which is next after 1/2: if we choose some fraction which is very little greater than 1/2, say 51/100 we can find others, such as 101/200, which are nearer to 1/2. Thus between any two fractions, however little they differ, there are an infinite number of other fractions. Mathematical space and time

also have this property of compactness, though whether actual space and time have it is a further question, dependent upon empirical evidence, and probably incapable of being answered with certainty.

In the case of abstract objects such as fractions, it is perhaps not very difficult to realise the logical possibility of their forming a compact series. The difficulties that might be felt are those of infinity, for in a compact series the number of terms between any two given terms must be infinite. But when these difficulties have been solved, the mere compactness in itself offers no great obstacle to the imagination. In more concrete cases, however, such as motion, compactness becomes much more repugnant to our habits of thought. It will therefore be desirable to consider explicitly the mathematical account of motion, with a view to making its logical possibility felt. The mathematical account of motion is perhaps artificially simplified when regarded as describing what actually occurs in the physical world; but what actually occurs must be capable, by a certain amount of logical manipulation, of being brought within the scope of the mathematical account, and must, in its analysis, raise just such problems as are raised in their simplest form by this account. Neglecting, therefore, for the present, the question of its physical adequacy, let us devote ourselves merely to considering its possibility as a formal statement of the nature of motion.

In order to simplify our problem as much as possible, let us imagine a tiny speck of light moving along a scale. What do we mean by saying that the motion is continuous? It is not necessary for our purposes to consider the whole of what the mathematician means by this statement: only part of what he means is philosophically important. One part of what he means is that, if we consider any two positions of the speck occupied at any two instants, there will be other intermediate positions occupied at intermediate instants. However near together we take the two positions, the speck will not jump suddenly from the one to the other, but will pass through an infinite number of other positions on the way. Every distance, however small, is traversed by passing through all the infinite series of positions between the two ends of the distance.

But at this point imagination suggests that we may describe the continuity of motion by saying that the speck always passes from one position at one instant to _the next_ position at _the next_ instant. As soon as we say this or imagine it, we fall into error, because there is no _next_ point or _next_ instant. If there were, we should find Zeno's paradoxes, in some form, unavoidable, as will appear in our next lecture. One simple paradox may serve as an illustration. If our speck is in motion along the scale throughout the whole of a certain time, it cannot be at the same point at two consecutive instants. But it cannot, from one instant to the next, travel further than from one point to the next, for if it did, there would be no instant at which it was in the positions intermediate between that at the first instant and that at the next, and we agreed that the continuity of motion excludes the possibility of such sudden jumps. It follows that our speck must, so long as it moves, pass from one point at one instant to the next point at the next instant. Thus there will be just one perfectly definite velocity with which all motions must take place: no motion can be faster than this, and no motion can be slower. Since this conclusion is false, we must reject the hypothesis upon which it is based, namely that there are consecutive points and instants.[18] Hence the continuity of motion must not be supposed to consist in a body's occupying consecutive positions at consecutive times.

[18] The above paradox is essentially the same as Zeno's argument of the stadium which will be considered in our next lecture.

The difficulty to imagination lies chiefly, I think, in keeping out the suggestion of _infinitesimal_ distances and times. Suppose we halve a given distance, and then halve the half, and so on, we can continue the process as long as we please, and the longer we continue it, the smaller the resulting distance becomes. This infinite divisibility seems, at first sight, to imply that there are infinitesimal distances, _i.e._ distances so small that any finite fraction of an inch would be greater. This, however, is an error. The continued bisection of our distance, though it gives us continually smaller distances, gives us always _finite_ distances. If our original distance was an inch, we reach successively half an inch, a quarter of an inch, an eighth, a sixteenth, and so on; but every one of this infinite series of diminishing distances is finite. "But," it may be said, "_in the end_ the distance will grow infinitesimal." No, because there is no end. The process of bisection is one which can, theoretically, be carried on for ever, without any last term being attained. Thus infinite divisibility of distances, which must be admitted, does not imply that there are distances so small that any finite distance would be larger.

It is easy, in this kind of question, to fall into an elementary logical blunder. Given any finite distance, we can find a smaller distance; this may be expressed in the ambiguous form "there is a distance smaller than any finite distance." But if this is then interpreted as meaning "there is a distance such that, whatever finite distance may be chosen, the distance in question is smaller," then the statement is false. Common language is ill adapted to expressing matters of this kind, and philosophers who have been dependent on it have frequently been misled by it.

In a continuous motion, then, we shall say that at any given instant the moving body occupies a certain position, and at other instants it occupies other positions; the interval between any two instants and between any two positions is always finite, but the continuity of the motion is shown in the fact that, however near together we take the two positions and the two instants, there are an infinite number of positions still nearer together, which are occupied at instants that are also still nearer together. The moving body never jumps from one position to another, but always passes by a gradual transition through an infinite number of intermediaries. At a given instant, it is where it is, like Zeno's arrow;[19] but we cannot say that it is at rest at the instant, since the instant does not last for a finite time, and there is not a beginning and end of the instant with an interval between them. Rest consists in being in the same position at all the instants throughout a certain finite period, however short; it does not consist simply in a body's being where it is at a given instant. This whole theory, as is obvious, depends upon the nature of compact series, and demands, for its full comprehension, that compact series should have become familiar and easy to the imagination as well as to deliberate thought.

[19] See next lecture.

What is required may be expressed in mathematical language by saying that the position of a moving body must be a continuous function of the time. To define accurately what this means, we proceed as follows. Consider a particle which, at the moment _t_, is at the point P. Choose now any small portion P1P2 of the path of the particle, this portion being one which contains P. We say then that, if the motion of the particle is continuous at the time _t_, it must be possible to find two instants _t_1, _t_2, one earlier than _t_ and one later, such that throughout the whole time from _t_1 to _t_2 (both included), the particle lies between P1 and P2. And we say that this must still hold however small we make the portion P1P2. When this is the case, we say that the motion is continuous at the time _t_; and when the motion is continuous at all times, we say that the motion as a whole is continuous. It is obvious that if the particle were to jump suddenly from P to some other point Q, our definition would fail for all intervals P1P2 which were too small to include Q. Thus our definition affords an analysis of the continuity of motion, while admitting points and instants and denying infinitesimal distances in space or periods in time.

P1 P P2 Q ------|----|----|----|------>

Philosophers, mostly in ignorance of the mathematician's analysis, have adopted other and more heroic methods of dealing with the _prima facie_ difficulties of continuous motion. A typical and recent example of philosophic theories of motion is afforded by Bergson, whose views on this subject I have examined elsewhere.[20]

[20] _Monist_, July 1912, pp. 337-341.

Apart from definite arguments, there are certain feelings, rather than reasons, which stand in the way of an acceptance of the mathematical account of motion. To begin with, if a body is moving at all fast, we _see_ its motion just as we see its colour. A _slow_ motion, like that of the hour-hand of a watch, is only known in the way which mathematics would lead us to expect, namely by observing a change of position after a lapse of time; but, when we observe the motion of the second-hand, we do not merely see first one position and then another--we see something as directly sensible as colour. What is this something that we see, and that we call visible motion? Whatever it is, it is _not_ the successive occupation of successive positions: something beyond the mathematical theory of motion is required to account for it. Opponents of the mathematical theory emphasise this fact. "Your theory," they say, "may be very logical, and might apply admirably to some other world; but in this actual world, actual motions are quite different from what your theory would declare them to be, and require, therefore, some different philosophy from yours for their adequate explanation."

The objection thus raised is one which I have no wish to underrate, but I believe it can be fully answered without departing from the methods and the outlook which have led to the mathematical theory of motion. Let us, however, first try to state the objection more fully.

If the mathematical theory is adequate, nothing happens when a body moves except that it is in different places at different times. But in this sense the hour-hand and the second-hand are equally in motion, yet in the second-hand there is something perceptible to our senses which is absent in the hour-hand. We can see, at each moment, that the second-hand _is moving_, which is different from seeing it first in one place and then in another. This seems to involve our seeing it simultaneously in a number of places, although it must also involve our seeing that it is in some of these places earlier than in others. If, for example, I move my hand quickly from left to right, you seem to see the whole movement at once, in spite of the fact that you know it begins at the left and ends at the right. It is this kind of consideration, I think, which leads Bergson and many others to regard a movement as really one indivisible whole, not the series of separate states imagined by the mathematician.

To this objection there are three supplementary answers, physiological, psychological, and logical. We will consider them successively.

(1) The physiological answer merely shows that, if the physical world is what the mathematician supposes, its sensible appearance may nevertheless be expected to be what it is. The aim of this answer is thus the modest one of showing that the mathematical account is not impossible as applied to the physical world; it does not even attempt to show that this account is necessary, or that an analogous account applies in psychology.

When any nerve is stimulated, so as to cause a sensation, the sensation does not cease instantaneously with the cessation of the stimulus, but dies away in a short finite time. A flash of lightning, brief as it is to our sight, is briefer still as a physical phenomenon: we continue to see it for a few moments after the light-waves have ceased to strike the eye. Thus in the case of a physical motion, if it is sufficiently swift, we shall actually at one instant see the moving body throughout a finite portion of its course, and not only at the exact spot where it is at that instant. Sensations, however, as they die away, grow gradually fainter; thus the sensation due to a stimulus which is recently past is not exactly like the sensation due to a present stimulus. It follows from this that, when we see a rapid motion, we shall not only see a number of positions of the moving body simultaneously, but we shall see them with different degrees of intensity--the present position most vividly, and the others with diminishing vividness, until sensation fades away into immediate memory. This state of things accounts fully for the perception of motion. A motion is _perceived_, not merely _inferred_, when it is sufficiently swift for many positions to be sensible at one time; and the earlier and later parts of one perceived motion are distinguished by the less and greater vividness of the sensations.

This answer shows that physiology can account for our perception of motion. But physiology, in speaking of stimulus and sense-organs and a physical motion distinct from the immediate object of sense, is assuming the truth of physics, and is thus only capable of showing the physical account to be possible, not of showing it to be _necessary_. This consideration brings us to the psychological answer.

(2) The psychological answer to our difficulty about motion is part of a vast theory, not yet worked out, and only capable, at present, of being vaguely outlined. We considered this theory in the third and fourth lectures; for the present, a mere sketch of its application to our present problem must suffice. The world of physics, which was assumed in the physiological answer, is obviously inferred from what is given in sensation; yet as soon as we seriously consider what is actually given in sensation, we find it apparently very different from the world of physics. The question is thus forced upon us: Is the inference from sense to physics a valid one? I believe the answer to be affirmative, for reasons which I suggested in the third and fourth lectures; but the answer cannot be either short or easy. It consists, broadly speaking, in showing that, although the particles, points, and instants with which physics operates are not themselves given in experience, and are very likely not actually existing things, yet, out of the materials provided in sensation, it is possible to make logical constructions having the mathematical properties which physics assigns to particles, points, and instants. If this can be done, then all the propositions of physics can be translated, by a sort of dictionary, into propositions about the kinds of objects which are given in sensation.

Applying these general considerations to the case of motion, we find that, even within the sphere of immediate sense-data, it is necessary, or at any rate more consonant with the facts than any other equally simple view, to distinguish instantaneous states of objects, and to regard such states as forming a compact series. Let us consider a body which is moving swiftly enough for its motion to be perceptible, and long enough for its motion to be not wholly comprised in one sensation. Then, in spite of the fact that we see a finite extent of the motion at one instant, the extent which we see at one instant is different from that which we see at another. Thus we are brought back, after all, to a series of momentary views of the moving body, and this series will be compact, like the former physical series of points. In fact, though the _terms_ of the series seem different, the mathematical character of the series is unchanged, and the whole mathematical theory of motion will apply to it _verbatim_.

When we are considering the actual data of sensation in this connection, it is important to realise that two sense-data may be, and _must_ sometimes be, really different when we cannot perceive any difference between them. An old but conclusive reason for believing this was emphasised by Poincare.[21] In all cases of sense-data capable of gradual change, we may find one sense-datum indistinguishable from another, and that other indistinguishable from a third, while yet the first and third are quite easily distinguishable. Suppose, for example, a person with his eyes shut is holding a weight in his hand, and someone noiselessly adds a small extra weight. If the extra weight is small enough, no difference will be perceived in the sensation. After a time, another small extra weight may be added, and still no change will be perceived; but if both extra weights had been added at once, it may be that the change would be quite easily perceptible. Or, again, take shades of colour. It would be easy to find three stuffs of such

closely similar shades that no difference could be perceived between the first and second, nor yet between the second and third, while yet the first and third would be distinguishable. In such a case, the second shade cannot be the same as the first, or it would be distinguishable from the third; nor the same as the third, or it would be distinguishable from the first. It must, therefore, though indistinguishable from both, be really intermediate between them.

[21] "Le continu mathematique," _Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale_, vol. i. p. 29.

Such considerations as the above show that, although we cannot distinguish sense-data unless they differ by more than a certain amount, it is perfectly reasonable to suppose that sense-data of a given kind, such as weights or colours, really form a compact series. The objections which may be brought from a psychological point of view against the mathematical theory of motion are not, therefore, objections to this theory properly understood, but only to a quite unnecessary assumption of simplicity in the momentary object of sense. Of the immediate object of sense, in the case of a visible motion, we may say that at each instant it is in all the positions which remain sensible at that instant; but this set of positions changes continuously from moment to moment, and is amenable to exactly the same mathematical treatment as if it were a mere point. When we assert that some mathematical account of phenomena is correct, all that we primarily assert is that _something_ definable in terms of the crude phenomena satisfies our formulae; and in this sense the mathematical theory of motion is applicable to the data of sensation as well as to the supposed particles of abstract physics.

There are a number of distinct questions which are apt to be confused when the mathematical continuum is said to be inadequate to the facts of sense. We may state these, in order of diminishing generality, as follows:--

(a) Are series possessing mathematical continuity logically possible?

(b) Assuming that they are possible logically, are they not impossible as applied to actual sense-data, because, among actual sense-data, there are no such fixed mutually external terms as are to be found, _e.g._, in the series of fractions?

(c) Does not the assumption of points and instants make the whole mathematical account fictitious?

(d) Finally, assuming that all these objections have been answered, is there, in actual empirical fact, any sufficient reason to believe the world of sense continuous?

Let us consider these questions in succession.

(a) The question of the logical possibility of the mathematical continuum turns partly on the elementary misunderstandings we considered at the beginning of the present lecture, partly on the possibility of the mathematical infinite, which will occupy our next two lectures, and partly on the logical form of the answer to the Bergsonian objection which we stated a few minutes ago. I shall say no more on this topic at present, since it is desirable first to complete the psychological answer.

(b) The question whether sense-data are composed of mutually external units is not one which can be decided by empirical evidence. It is often urged that, as a matter of immediate experience, the sensible flux is devoid of divisions, and is falsified by the dissections of the intellect. Now I have no wish to argue that this view is _contrary_ to immediate experience: I wish only to maintain that it is essentially incapable of being _proved_ by immediate experience. As we saw, there must be among sense-data differences so slight as to be imperceptible: the fact that sense-data are immediately given does not mean that their differences also _must_ be immediately given (though they _may_ be). Suppose, for example, a coloured surface on which the colour changes gradually--so gradually that the difference of colour in two very neighbouring portions is imperceptible, while the difference between more widely separated portions is quite noticeable. The effect produced, in such a case, will be precisely that of "interpenetration," of transition which is not a matter of discrete units. And since it tends to be supposed that the colours, being immediate data, must _appear_ different if they _are_ different, it seems easily to follow that "interpenetration" must be the ultimately right account. But this does not follow. It is unconsciously assumed, as a premiss for a _reductio ad absurdum_ of the analytic view, that, if A and B are immediate data, and A differs from B, then the fact that they differ must also be an immediate datum. It is difficult to say how this assumption arose, but I think it is to be connected with the confusion between "acquaintance" and "knowledge about." Acquaintance, which is what we derive from sense, does not, theoretically at least, imply even the smallest "knowledge about," _i.e._ it does not imply knowledge of any proposition concerning the object with which we are acquainted. It is a mistake to speak as if acquaintance had degrees: there is merely acquaintance and non-acquaintance. When we speak of becoming "better acquainted," as for instance with a person, what we must mean is, becoming acquainted with more parts of a certain whole; but the acquaintance with each part is either complete or nonexistent. Thus it is a mistake to say that if we were perfectly acquainted with

an object we should know all about it. "Knowledge about" is knowledge of propositions, which is not involved necessarily in acquaintance with the constituents of the propositions. To know that two shades of colour are different is knowledge about them; hence acquaintance with the two shades does not in any way necessitate the knowledge that they are different.

From what has just been said it follows that the nature of sense-data cannot be validly used to prove that they are not composed of mutually external units. It may be admitted, on the other hand, that nothing in their empirical character specially necessitates the view that they are composed of mutually external units. This view, if it is held, must be held on logical, not on empirical, grounds. I believe that the logical grounds are adequate to the conclusion. They rest, at bottom, upon the impossibility of explaining complexity without assuming constituents. It is undeniable that the visual field, for example, is complex; and so far as I can see, there is always self-contradiction in the theories which, while admitting this complexity, attempt to deny that it results from a combination of mutually external units. But to pursue this topic would lead us too far from our theme, and I shall therefore say no more about it at present.

(c) It is sometimes urged that the mathematical account of motion is rendered fictitious by its assumption of points and instants. Now there are here two different questions to be distinguished. There is the question of absolute or relative space and time, and there is the question whether what occupies space and time must be composed of elements which have no extension or duration. And each of these questions in turn may take two forms, namely: (A) is the hypothesis _consistent_ with the facts and with logic? (B) is it _necessitated_ by the facts or by logic? I wish to answer, in each case, yes to the first form of the question, and no to the second. But in any case the mathematical account of motion will not be fictitious, provided a right interpretation is given to the words "point" and "instant." A few words on each alternative will serve to make this clear.

Formally, mathematics adopts an absolute theory of space and time, _i.e._ it assumes that, besides the things which are in space and time, there are also entities, called "points" and "instants," which are occupied by things. This view, however, though advocated by Newton, has long been regarded by mathematicians as merely a convenient fiction. There is, so far as I can see, no conceivable evidence either for or against it. It is logically possible, and it is consistent with the facts. But the facts are also consistent with the denial of spatial and temporal entities over and above things with spatial and temporal relations. Hence, in accordance with Occam's razor, we shall do well to abstain from either assuming or denying points and instants. This means, so far as practical working out is concerned, that we adopt the relational theory; for in practice the refusal to assume points and instants has the same effect as the denial of them. But in strict theory the two are quite different, since the denial introduces an element of unverifiable dogma which is wholly absent when we merely refrain from the assertion. Thus, although we shall derive points and instants from things, we shall leave the bare possibility open that they may also have an independent existence as simple entities.

We come now to the question whether the things in space and time are to be conceived as composed of elements without extension or duration, _i.e._ of elements which only occupy a point and an instant. Physics, formally, assumes in its differential equations that things consist of elements which occupy only a point at each instant, but persist throughout time. For reasons explained in Lecture IV., the persistence of things through time is to be regarded as the formal result of a logical construction, not as necessarily implying any actual persistence. The same motives, in fact, which lead to the division of things into point-particles, ought presumably to lead to their division into instant-particles, so that the ultimate _formal_ constituent of the matter in physics will be a point-instant-particle. But such objects, as well as the particles of physics, are not data. The same economy of hypothesis, which dictates the practical adoption of a relative rather than an absolute space and time, also dictates the practical adoption of material elements which have a finite extension and duration. Since, as we saw in Lecture IV., points and instants can be constructed as logical functions of such elements, the mathematical account of motion, in which a particle passes continuously through a continuous series of points, can be interpreted in a form which assumes only elements which agree with our actual data in having a finite extension and duration. Thus, so far as the use of points and instants is concerned, the mathematical account of motion can be freed from the charge of employing fictions.

(d) But we must now face the question: Is there, in actual empirical fact, any sufficient reason to believe the world of sense continuous? The answer here must, I think, be in the negative. We may say that the hypothesis of continuity is perfectly consistent with the facts and with logic, and that it is technically simpler than any other tenable hypothesis. But since our powers of discrimination among very similar sensible objects are not infinitely precise, it is quite impossible to decide between different theories which only differ in regard to what is below the margin of discrimination. If, for example, a coloured surface which we see consists of a finite number of very small surfaces, and if a motion which we see consists, like a cinematograph, of a large finite number of successive positions, there will be nothing empirically discoverable to show that objects of sense are not continuous. In what is called _experienced_ continuity, such as is said to be given in sense, there is a large negative element: absence of

perception of difference occurs in cases which are _thought_ to give perception of absence of difference. When, for example, we cannot distinguish a colour A from a colour B, nor a colour B from a colour C, but can distinguish A from C, the indistinguishability is a purely negative fact, namely, that we do not _perceive_ a difference. Even in regard to immediate data, this is no reason for denying that there is a difference. Thus, if we see a coloured surface whose colour changes gradually, its sensible appearance if the change is continuous will be indistinguishable from what it would be if the change were by small finite jumps. If this is true, as it seems to be, it follows that there can never be any empirical evidence to demonstrate that the sensible world is continuous, and not a collection of a very large finite number of elements of which each differs from its neighbour in a finite though very small degree. The continuity of space and time, the infinite number of different shades in the spectrum, and so on, are all in the nature of unverifiable hypotheses--perfectly possible logically, perfectly consistent with the known facts, and simpler technically than any other tenable hypotheses, but not the sole hypotheses which are logically and empirically adequate.

If a relational theory of instants is constructed, in which an "instant" is defined as a group of events simultaneous with each other and not all simultaneous with any event outside the group, then if our resulting series of instants is to be compact, it must be possible, if _x_ wholly precedes _y_, to find an event _z_, simultaneous with part of _x_, which wholly precedes some event which wholly precedes _y_. Now this requires that the number of events concerned should be infinite in any finite period of time. If this is to be the case in the world of one man's sense-data, and if each sense-datum is to have not less than a certain finite temporal extension, it will be necessary to assume that we always have an infinite number of sense-data simultaneous with any given sense-datum. Applying similar considerations to space, and assuming that sense-data are to have not less than a certain spatial extension, it will be necessary to suppose that an infinite number of sense-data overlap spatially with any given sense-datum. This hypothesis is possible, if we suppose a single sense-datum, _e.g._ in sight, to be a finite surface, enclosing other surfaces which are also single sense-data. But there are difficulties in such a hypothesis, and I do not know whether these difficulties could be successfully met. If they cannot, we must do one of two things: either declare that the world of one man's sense-data is not continuous, or else refuse to admit that there is any lower limit to the duration and extension of a single sense-datum. I do not know what is the right course to adopt as regards these alternatives. The logical analysis we have been considering provides the apparatus for dealing with the various hypotheses, and the empirical decision between them is a problem for the psychologist.

(3) We have now to consider the _logical_ answer to the alleged difficulties of the mathematical theory of motion, or rather to the positive theory which is urged on the other side. The view urged explicitly by Bergson, and implied in the doctrines of many philosophers, is, that a motion is something indivisible, not validly analysable into a series of states. This is part of a much more general doctrine, which holds that analysis always falsifies, because the parts of a complex whole are different, as combined in that whole, from what they would otherwise be. It is very difficult to state this doctrine in any form which has a precise meaning. Often arguments are used which have no bearing whatever upon the question. It is urged, for example, that when a man becomes a father, his nature is altered by the new relation in which he finds himself, so that he is not strictly identical with the man who was previously not a father. This may be true, but it is a causal psychological fact, not a logical fact. The doctrine would require that a man who is a father cannot be strictly identical with a man who is a son, because he is modified in one way by the relation of fatherhood and in another by that of sonship. In fact, we may give a precise statement of the doctrine we are combating in the form: _There can never be two facts concerning the same thing._ A fact concerning a thing always is or involves a relation to one or more entities; thus two facts concerning the same thing would involve two relations of the same thing. But the doctrine in question holds that a thing is so modified by its relations that it cannot be the same in one relation as in another. Hence, if this doctrine is true, there can never be more than one fact concerning any one thing. I do not think the philosophers in question have realised that this is the precise statement of the view they advocate, because in this form the view is so contrary to plain truth that its falsehood is evident as soon as it is stated. The discussion of this question, however, involves so many logical subtleties, and is so beset with difficulties, that I shall not pursue it further at present.

When once the above general doctrine is rejected, it is obvious that, where there is change, there must be a succession of states. There cannot be change--and motion is only a particular case of change--unless there is something different at one time from what there is at some other time. Change, therefore, must involve relations and complexity, and must demand analysis. So long as our analysis has only gone as far as other smaller changes, it is not complete; if it is to be complete, it must end with terms that are not changes, but are related by a relation of earlier and later. In the case of changes which appear continuous, such as motions, it seems to be impossible to find anything other than change so long as we deal with finite periods of time, however short. We are thus driven back, by the logical necessities of the case, to the conception of instants without duration, or at any rate without any duration which even the most delicate instruments can reveal. This conception, though it can be made to seem difficult, is really easier than any other that the facts allow. It is a kind of logical framework into which any tenable theory must fit--not necessarily

itself the statement of the crude facts, but a form in which statements which are true of the crude facts can be made by a suitable interpretation. The direct consideration of the crude facts of the physical world has been undertaken in earlier lectures; in the present lecture, we have only been concerned to show that nothing in the crude facts is inconsistent with the mathematical doctrine of continuity, or demands a continuity of a radically different kind from that of mathematical motion.

LECTURE VI

THE PROBLEM OF INFINITY CONSIDERED HISTORICALLY

It will be remembered that, when we enumerated the grounds upon which the reality of the sensible world has been questioned, one of those mentioned was the supposed impossibility of infinity and continuity. In view of our earlier discussion of physics, it would seem that no _conclusive_ empirical evidence exists in favour of infinity or continuity in objects of sense or in matter. Nevertheless, the explanation which assumes infinity and continuity remains incomparably easier and more natural, from a scientific point of view, than any other, and since Georg Cantor has shown that the supposed contradictions are illusory, there is no longer any reason to struggle after a finitist explanation of the world.

The supposed difficulties of continuity all have their source in the fact that a continuous series must have an infinite number of terms, and are in fact difficulties concerning infinity. Hence, in freeing the infinite from contradiction, we are at the same time showing the logical possibility of continuity as assumed in science.

The kind of way in which infinity has been used to discredit the world of sense may be illustrated by Kant's first two antinomies. In the first, the thesis states: "The world has a beginning in time, and as regards space is enclosed within limits"; the antithesis states: "The world has no beginning and no limits in space, but is infinite in respect of both time and space." Kant professes to prove both these propositions, whereas, if what we have said on modern logic has any truth, it must be impossible to prove either. In order, however, to rescue the world of sense, it is enough to destroy the proof of _one_ of the two. For our present purpose, it is the proof that the world is _finite_ that interests us. Kant's argument as regards space here rests upon his argument as regards time. We need therefore only examine the argument as regards time. What he says is as follows:

"For let us assume that the world has no beginning as regards time, so that up to every given instant an eternity has elapsed, and therefore an infinite series of successive states of the things in the world has passed by. But the infinity of a series consists just in this, that it can never be completed by successive synthesis. Therefore an infinite past world-series is impossible, and accordingly a beginning of the world is a necessary condition of its existence; which was the first thing to be proved."

Many different criticisms might be passed on this argument, but we will content ourselves with a bare minimum. To begin with, it is a mistake to define the infinity of a series as "impossibility of completion by successive synthesis." The notion of infinity, as we shall see in the next lecture, is primarily a property of _classes_, and only derivatively applicable to series; classes which are infinite are given all at once by the defining property of their members, so that there is no question of "completion" or of "successive synthesis." And the word "synthesis," by suggesting the mental activity of synthesising, introduces, more or less surreptitiously, that reference to mind by which all Kant's philosophy was infected. In the second place, when Kant says that an infinite series can "never" be completed by successive synthesis, all that he has even conceivably a right to say is that it cannot be completed _in a finite time_. Thus what he really proves is, at most, that if the world had no beginning, it must have already existed for an infinite time. This, however, is a very poor conclusion, by no means suitable for his purposes. And with this result we might, if we chose, take leave of the first antinomy.

It is worth while, however, to consider how Kant came to make such an elementary blunder. What happened in his imagination was obviously something like this: Starting from the present and going backwards in time, we have, if the world had no beginning, an infinite series of events. As we see from the word "synthesis," he imagined a mind trying to grasp these successively, _in the reverse order_ to that in which they had occurred, _i.e._ going from the present backwards. _This_ series is obviously one which has no end. But the series of events up to the present has an end, since it ends with the present. Owing to the inveterate subjectivism of his mental habits, he failed to notice that he had reversed the sense of the series by substituting backward synthesis for forward happening, and thus he supposed that it was necessary to identify the mental series, which had no end, with the physical series, which had an end but no beginning. It was this mistake, I think, which, operating unconsciously, led him to attribute validity to a singularly flimsy piece of fallacious reasoning.

The second antinomy illustrates the dependence of the problem of continuity upon that of infinity. The thesis states: "Every complex substance in the world consists of simple parts, and there exists everywhere nothing but the simple or what is composed of it." The antithesis states: "No complex thing in the world consists of simple parts, and everywhere in it there exists nothing simple." Here, as before, the proofs of both thesis and antithesis are open to criticism, but for the purpose of vindicating physics and the world of sense it is enough to find a fallacy in _one_ of the proofs. We will choose for this purpose the proof of the antithesis, which begins as follows:

"Assume that a complex thing (as substance) consists of simple parts. Since all external relation, and therefore all composition out of substances, is only possible in space, the space occupied by a complex thing must consist of as many parts as the thing consists of. Now space does not consist of simple parts, but of spaces."

The rest of his argument need not concern us, for the nerve of the proof lies in the one statement: "Space does not consist of simple parts, but of spaces." This is like Bergson's objection to "the absurd proposition that motion is made up of immobilities." Kant does not tell us why he holds that a space must consist of spaces rather than of simple parts. Geometry regards space as made up of points, which are simple; and although, as we have seen, this view is not scientifically or logically _necessary_, it remains _prima facie_ possible, and its mere possibility is enough to vitiate Kant's argument. For, if his proof of the thesis of the antinomy were valid, and if the antithesis could only be avoided by assuming points, then the antinomy itself would afford a conclusive reason in favour of points. Why, then, did Kant think it impossible that space should be composed of points?

I think two considerations probably influenced him. In the first place, the essential thing about space is spatial order, and mere points, by themselves, will not account for spatial order. It is obvious that his argument assumes absolute space; but it is spatial _relations_ that are alone important, and they cannot be reduced to points. This ground for his view depends, therefore, upon his ignorance of the logical theory of order and his oscillations between absolute and relative space. But there is also another ground for his opinion, which is more relevant to our present topic. This is the ground derived from infinite divisibility. A space may be halved, and then halved again, and so on _ad infinitum_, and at every stage of the process the parts are still spaces, not points. In order to reach points by such a method, it would be necessary to come to the end of an unending process, which is impossible. But just as an infinite class can be given all at once by its defining concept, though it cannot be reached by successive enumeration, so an infinite set of points can be given all at once as making up a line or area or volume, though they can never be reached by the process of successive division. Thus the infinite divisibility of space gives no ground for denying that space is composed of points. Kant does not give his grounds for this denial, and we can therefore only conjecture what they were. But the above two grounds, which we have seen to be fallacious, seem sufficient to account for his opinion, and we may therefore conclude that the antithesis of the second antinomy is unproved.

The above illustration of Kant's antinomies has only been introduced in order to show the relevance of the problem of infinity to the problem of the reality of objects of sense. In the remainder of the present lecture, I wish to state and explain the problem of infinity, to show how it arose, and to show the irrelevance of all the solutions proposed by philosophers. In the following lecture, I shall try to explain the true solution, which has been discovered by the mathematicians, but nevertheless belongs essentially to philosophy. The solution is definitive, in the sense that it entirely satisfies and convinces all who study it carefully. For over two thousand years the human intellect was baffled by the problem; its many failures and its ultimate success make this problem peculiarly apt for the illustration of method.

The problem appears to have first arisen in some such way as the following.[22] Pythagoras and his followers, who were interested, like Descartes, in the application of number to geometry, adopted in that science more arithmetical methods than those with which Euclid has made us familiar. They, or their contemporaries the atomists, believed, apparently, that space is composed of indivisible points, while time is composed of indivisible instants.[23] This belief would not, by itself, have raised the difficulties which they encountered, but it was presumably accompanied by another belief, that the number of points in any finite area or of instants in any finite period must be finite. I do not suppose that this latter belief was a conscious one, because probably no other possibility had occurred to them. But the belief nevertheless operated, and very soon brought them into conflict with facts which they themselves discovered. Before explaining how this occurred, however, it is necessary to say one word in explanation of the phrase "finite number." The _exact_ explanation is a matter for our next lecture; for the present, it must suffice to say that I mean 0 and 1 and 2 and 3 and so on, for ever--in other words, any number that can be obtained by successively adding ones. This includes all the numbers that can be expressed by means of our ordinary numerals, and since such numbers can be made greater and greater, without ever reaching an unsurpassable maximum, it is easy to suppose that there are no other numbers. But this supposition, natural as it is, is mistaken.

[22] In what concerns the early Greek philosophers, my knowledge is largely derived from Burnet's valuable work, _Early Greek Philosophy_ (2nd ed., London, 1908). I have also been greatly assisted by Mr D. S. Robertson of Trinity College, who has supplied the deficiencies of my knowledge of Greek, and brought important references to my notice.

[23] _Cf._ Aristotle, _Metaphysics_, M. 6, 1080b, 18 _sqq._, and 1083b, 8 _sqq._

Whether the Pythagoreans themselves believed space and time to be composed of indivisible points and instants is a debatable question.[24] It would seem that the distinction between space and matter had not yet been clearly made, and that therefore, when an atomistic view is expressed, it is difficult to decide whether particles of matter or points of space are intended. There is an interesting passage[25] in Aristotle's _Physics_,[26] where he says:

"The Pythagoreans all maintained the existence of the void, and said that it enters into the heaven itself from the boundless breath, inasmuch as the heaven breathes in the void also; and the void differentiates natures, as if it were a sort of separation of consecutives, and as if it were their differentiation; and that this also is what is first in numbers, for it is the void which differentiates them."

[24] There is some reason to think that the Pythagoreans distinguished between discrete and continuous quantity. G. J. Allman, in his _Greek Geometry from Thales to Euclid_, says (p. 23): "The Pythagoreans made a fourfold division of mathematical science, attributing one of its parts to the how many, ~to poson~, and the other to the how much, ~to pelikon~; and they assigned to each of these parts a twofold division. For they said that discrete quantity, or the _how many_, either subsists by itself or must be considered with relation to some other; but that continued quantity, or the _how much_, is either stable or in motion. Hence they affirmed that arithmetic contemplates that discrete quantity which subsists by itself, but music that which is related to another; and that geometry considers continued quantity so far as it is immovable; but astronomy (~ten sphairiken~) contemplates continued quantity so far as it is of a self-motive nature. (Proclus, ed. Friedlein, p. 35. As to the distinction between ~to pelikon~, continuous, and ~to poson~, discrete quantity, see Iambl., _in Nicomachi Geraseni Arithmeticam introductionem_, ed. Tennulius, p. 148.)" _Cf._ p. 48.

[25] Referred to by Burnet, _op. cit._, p. 120.

[26] iv., 6. 213b, 22; H. Ritter and L. Preller, _Historia Philosophiae Graecae_, 8th ed., Gotha, 1898, p. 75 (this work will be referred to in future as "R. P.").

This seems to imply that they regarded matter as consisting of atoms with empty space in between. But if so, they must have thought space could be studied by only paying attention to the atoms, for otherwise it would be hard to account for their arithmetical methods in geometry, or for their statement that "things are numbers."

The difficulty which beset the Pythagoreans in their attempts to apply numbers arose through their discovery of incommensurables, and this, in turn, arose as follows. Pythagoras, as we all learnt in youth, discovered the proposition that the sum of the squares on the sides of a right-angled triangle is equal to the square on the hypotenuse. It is said that he sacrificed an ox when he discovered this theorem; if so, the ox was the first martyr to science. But the theorem, though it has remained his chief claim to immortality, was soon found to have a consequence fatal to his whole philosophy. Consider the case of a right-angled triangle whose two sides are equal, such a triangle as is formed by two sides of a square and a diagonal. Here, in virtue of the theorem, the square on the diagonal is double of the square on either of the sides. But Pythagoras or his early followers easily proved that the square of one whole number cannot be double of the square of another.[27] Thus the length of the side and the length of the diagonal are incommensurable; that is to say, however small a unit of length you take, if it is contained an exact number of times in the side, it is not contained any exact number of times in the diagonal, and _vice versa_.

[27] The Pythagorean proof is roughly as follows. If possible, let the ratio of the diagonal to the side of a square be _m_/_n_, where _m_ and _n_ are whole numbers having no common factor. Then we must have _m_2 = 2_n_2. Now the square of an odd number is odd, but _m_2, being equal to 2_n_2, is even. Hence _m_ must be even. But the square of an even number divides by 4, therefore _n_2, which is half of _m_2, must be even. Therefore _n_ must be even. But, since _m_ is even, and _m_ and _n_ have no common factor, _n_ must be odd. Thus _n_ must be both odd and even, which is impossible; and therefore the diagonal and the side cannot have a rational ratio.

Now this fact might have been assimilated by some philosophies without any great difficulty, but to the philosophy of Pythagoras it was absolutely fatal. Pythagoras held that number is the constitutive essence of all things, yet no two numbers could express the

ratio of the side of a square to the diagonal. It would seem probable that we may expand his difficulty, without departing from his thought, by assuming that he regarded the length of a line as determined by the number of atoms contained in it--a line two inches long would contain twice as many atoms as a line one inch long, and so on. But if this were the truth, then there must be a definite numerical ratio between any two finite lengths, because it was supposed that the number of atoms in each, however large, must be finite. Here there was an insoluble contradiction. The Pythagoreans, it is said, resolved to keep the existence of incommensurables a profound secret, revealed only to a few of the supreme heads of the sect; and one of their number, Hippasos of Metapontion, is even said to have been shipwrecked at sea for impiously disclosing the terrible discovery to their enemies. It must be remembered that Pythagoras was the founder of a new religion as well as the teacher of a new science: if the science came to be doubted, the disciples might fall into sin, and perhaps even eat beans, which according to Pythagoras is as bad as eating parents' bones.

The problem first raised by the discovery of incommensurables proved, as time went on, to be one of the most severe and at the same time most far-reaching problems that have confronted the human intellect in its endeavour to understand the world. It showed at once that numerical measurement of lengths, if it was to be made accurate, must require an arithmetic more advanced and more difficult than any that the ancients possessed. They therefore set to work to reconstruct geometry on a basis which did not assume the universal possibility of numerical measurement--a reconstruction which, as may be seen in Euclid, they effected with extraordinary skill and with great logical acumen. The moderns, under the influence of Cartesian geometry, have reasserted the universal possibility of numerical measurement, extending arithmetic, partly for that purpose, so as to include what are called "irrational" numbers, which give the ratios of incommensurable lengths. But although irrational numbers have long been used without a qualm, it is only in quite recent years that logically satisfactory definitions of them have been given. With these definitions, the first and most obvious form of the difficulty which confronted the Pythagoreans has been solved; but other forms of the difficulty remain to be considered, and it is these that introduce us to the problem of infinity in its pure form.

We saw that, accepting the view that a length is composed of points, the existence of incommensurables proves that every finite length must contain an infinite number of points. In other words, if we were to take away points one by one, we should never have taken away all the points, however long we continued the process. The number of points, therefore, cannot be _counted_, for counting is a process which enumerates things one by one. The property of being unable to be counted is characteristic of infinite collections, and is a source of many of their paradoxical qualities. So paradoxical are these qualities that until our own day they were thought to constitute logical contradictions. A long line of philosophers, from Zeno[28] to M. Bergson, have based much of their metaphysics upon the supposed impossibility of infinite collections. Broadly speaking, the difficulties were stated by Zeno, and nothing material was added until we reach Bolzano's _Paradoxien des Unendlichen_, a little work written in 1847-8, and published posthumously in 1851. Intervening attempts to deal with the problem are futile and negligible. The definitive solution of the difficulties is due, not to Bolzano, but to Georg Cantor, whose work on this subject first appeared in 1882.

[28] In regard to Zeno and the Pythagoreans, I have derived much valuable information and criticism from Mr P. E. B. Jourdain.

In order to understand Zeno, and to realise how little modern orthodox metaphysics has added to the achievements of the Greeks, we must consider for a moment his master Parmenides, in whose interest the paradoxes were invented.[29] Parmenides expounded his views in a poem divided into two parts, called "the way of truth" and "the way of opinion"--like Mr Bradley's "Appearance" and "Reality," except that Parmenides tells us first about reality and then about appearance. "The way of opinion," in his philosophy, is, broadly speaking, Pythagoreanism; it begins with a warning: "Here I shall close my trustworthy speech and thought about the truth. Henceforward learn the opinions of mortals, giving ear to the deceptive ordering of my words." What has gone before has been revealed by a goddess, who tells him what really _is_. Reality, she says, is uncreated, indestructible, unchanging, indivisible; it is "immovable in the bonds of mighty chains, without beginning and without end; since coming into being and passing away have been driven afar, and true belief has cast them away." The fundamental principle of his inquiry is stated in a sentence which would not be out of place in Hegel:[30] "Thou canst not know what is not--that is impossible--nor utter it; for it is the same thing that can be thought and that can be." And again: "It needs must be that what can be thought and spoken of is; for it is possible for it to be, and it is not possible for what is nothing to be." The impossibility of change follows from this principle; for what is past can be spoken of, and therefore, by the principle, still is.

[29] So Plato makes Zeno say in the _Parmenides_, apropos of his philosophy as a whole; and all internal and external evidence supports this view.

[30] "With Parmenides," Hegel says, "philosophising proper began." _Werke_ (edition of 1840), vol. xiii. p. 274.

The great conception of a reality behind the passing illusions of sense, a reality one, indivisible, and unchanging, was thus introduced into Western philosophy by Parmenides, not, it would seem, for mystical or religious reasons, but on the basis of a logical argument as to the impossibility of not-being. All the great metaphysical systems--notably those of Plato, Spinoza, and Hegel--are the outcome of this fundamental idea. It is difficult to disentangle the truth and the error in this view. The contention that time is unreal and that the world of sense is illusory must, I think, be regarded as based upon fallacious reasoning. Nevertheless, there is some sense--easier to feel than to state--in which time is an unimportant and superficial characteristic of reality. Past and future must be acknowledged to be as real as the present, and a certain emancipation from slavery to time is essential to philosophic thought. The importance of time is rather practical than theoretical, rather in relation to our desires than in relation to truth. A truer image of the world, I think, is obtained by picturing things as entering into the stream of time from an eternal world outside, than from a view which regards time as the devouring tyrant of all that is. Both in thought and in feeling, to realise the unimportance of time is the gate of wisdom. But unimportance is not unreality; and therefore what we shall have to say about Zeno's arguments in support of Parmenides must be mainly critical.

The relation of Zeno to Parmenides is explained by Plato[31] in the dialogue in which Socrates, as a young man, learns logical acumen and philosophic disinterestedness from their dialectic. I quote from Jowett's translation:

"I see, Parmenides, said Socrates, that Zeno is your second self in his writings too; he puts what you say in another way, and would fain deceive us into believing that he is telling us what is new. For you, in your poems, say All is one, and of this you adduce excellent proofs; and he on the other hand says There is no Many; and on behalf of this he offers overwhelming evidence. To deceive the world, as you have done, by saying the same thing in different ways, one of you affirming the one, and the other denying the many, is a strain of art beyond the reach of most of us.

"Yes, Socrates, said Zeno. But although you are as keen as a Spartan hound in pursuing the track, you do not quite apprehend the true motive of the composition, which is not really such an ambitious work as you imagine; for what you speak of was an accident; I had no serious intention of deceiving the world. The truth is, that these writings of mine were meant to protect the arguments of Parmenides against those who scoff at him and show the many ridiculous and contradictory results which they suppose to follow from the affirmation of the one. My answer is an address to the partisans of the many, whose attack I return with interest by retorting upon them that their hypothesis of the being of the many if carried out appears in a still more ridiculous light than the hypothesis of the being of the one."

[31] _Parmenides_, 128 A-D.

Zeno's four arguments against motion were intended to exhibit the contradictions that result from supposing that there is such a thing as change, and thus to support the Parmenidean doctrine that reality is unchanging.[32] Unfortunately, we only know his arguments through Aristotle,[33] who stated them in order to refute them. Those philosophers in the present day who have had their doctrines stated by opponents will realise that a just or adequate presentation of Zeno's position is hardly to be expected from Aristotle; but by some care in interpretation it seems possible to reconstruct the so-called "sophisms" which have been "refuted" by every tyro from that day to this.

[32] This interpretation is combated by Milhaud, _Les philosophes-geometres de la Grece_, p. 140 n., but his reasons do not seem to me convincing. All the interpretations in what follows are open to question, but all have the support of reputable authorities.

[33] _Physics_, vi. 9. 2396 (R.P. 136-139).

Zeno's arguments would seem to be "ad hominem"; that is to say, they seem to assume premisses granted by his opponents, and to show that, granting these premisses, it is possible to deduce consequences which his opponents must deny. In order to decide whether they are valid arguments or "sophisms," it is necessary to guess at the tacit premisses, and to decide who was the "homo" at whom they were aimed. Some maintain that they were aimed at the Pythagoreans,[34] while others have held that they were intended to refute the atomists.[35] M. Evellin, on the contrary, holds that they constitute a refutation of infinite divisibility,[36] while M. G. Noel, in the interests of Hegel, maintains that the first two arguments refute infinite divisibility, while the next two refute indivisibles.[37] Amid such a bewildering variety of interpretations, we can at least not complain of any restrictions on our liberty of choice.

[34] _Cf._ Gaston Milhaud, _Les philosophes-geometres de la Grece_, p. 140 n.; Paul Tannery, _Pour l'histoire de la science hellene_, p. 249; Burnet, _op. cit._, p. 362.

[35] _Cf._ R. K. Gaye, "On Aristotle, _Physics_, Z ix." _Journal of Philology_, vol. xxxi., esp. p. 111. Also Moritz Cantor, _Vorlesungen ueber Geschichte der Mathematik_, 1st ed., vol. i., 1880, p. 168, who, however, subsequently adopted Paul Tannery's opinion, _Vorlesungen_, 3rd ed. (vol. i. p. 200).

[36] "Le mouvement et les partisans des indivisibles," _Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale_, vol. i. pp. 382-395.

[37] "Le mouvement et les arguments de Zenon d'Elee," _Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale_, vol. i. pp. 107-125.

The historical questions raised by the above-mentioned discussions are no doubt largely insoluble, owing to the very scanty material from which our evidence is derived. The points which seem fairly clear are the following: (1) That, in spite of MM. Milhaud and Paul Tannery, Zeno is anxious to prove that motion is really impossible, and that he desires to prove this because he follows Parmenides in denying plurality;[38] (2) that the third and fourth arguments proceed on the hypothesis of indivisibles, a hypothesis which, whether adopted by the Pythagoreans or not, was certainly much advocated, as may be seen from the treatise _On Indivisible Lines_ attributed to Aristotle. As regards the first two arguments, they would seem to be valid on the hypothesis of indivisibles, and also, without this hypothesis, to be such as would be valid if the traditional contradictions in infinite numbers were insoluble, which they are not.

[38] _Cf._ M. Brochard, "Les pretendus sophismes de Zenon d'Elee," _Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale_, vol. i. pp. 209-215.

We may conclude, therefore, that Zeno's polemic is directed against the view that space and time consist of points and instants; and that as against the view that a finite stretch of space or time consists of a finite number of points and instants, his arguments are not sophisms, but perfectly valid.

The conclusion which Zeno wishes us to draw is that plurality is a delusion, and spaces and times are really indivisible. The other conclusion which is possible, namely, that the number of points and instants is infinite, was not tenable so long as the infinite was infected with contradictions. In a fragment which is not one of the four famous arguments against motion, Zeno says:

"If things are a many, they must be just as many as they are, and neither more nor less. Now, if they are as many as they are, they will be finite in number.

"If things are a many, they will be infinite in number; for there will always be other things between them, and others again between these. And so things are infinite in number."[39]

[39] Simplicius, _Phys._, 140, 28 D (R.P. 133); Burnet, _op. cit._, pp. 364-365.

This argument attempts to prove that, if there are many things, the number of them must be both finite and infinite, which is impossible; hence we are to conclude that there is only one thing. But the weak point in the argument is the phrase: "If they are just as many as they are, they will be finite in number." This phrase is not very clear, but it is plain that it assumes the impossibility of definite infinite numbers. Without this assumption, which is now known to be false, the arguments of Zeno, though they suffice (on certain very reasonable assumptions) to dispel the hypothesis of finite indivisibles, do not suffice to prove that motion and change and plurality are impossible. They are not, however, on any view, mere foolish quibbles: they are serious arguments, raising difficulties which it has taken two thousand years to answer, and which even now are fatal to the teachings of most philosophers.

The first of Zeno's arguments is the argument of the race-course, which is paraphrased by Burnet as follows:[40]

"You cannot get to the end of a race-course. You cannot traverse an infinite number of points in a finite time. You must traverse the half of any given distance before you traverse the whole, and the half of that again before you can traverse it. This goes on _ad infinitum_, so that there are an infinite number of points in any given space, and you cannot touch an infinite number one by one in a finite time."[41]

[40] _Op. cit._, p. 367.

[41] Aristotle's words are: "The first is the one on the non-existence of motion on the ground that what is moved must always attain the middle point sooner than the end-point, on which we gave our opinion in the earlier part of our discourse." _Phys._, vi. 9. 939B (R.P. 136). Aristotle seems to refer to _Phys._, vi. 2. 223AB [R.P. 136A]: "All space is continuous, for time and space are divided into the same and equal divisions.... Wherefore also Zeno's argument is fallacious, that it is impossible to go through an infinite collection or to touch an infinite collection one by one in a finite time. For there are two senses in which the term 'infinite' is applied both to length and to time, and in fact to all continuous things, either in regard to divisibility, or in regard to the ends. Now it is not

possible to touch things infinite in regard to number in a finite time, but it is possible to touch things infinite in regard to divisibility: for time itself also is infinite in this sense. So that in fact we go through an infinite, [space] in an infinite [time] and not in a finite [time], and we touch infinite things with infinite things, not with finite things." Philoponus, a sixth-century commentator (R.P. 136A, _Exc. Paris Philop. in Arist. Phys._, 803, 2. Vit.), gives the following illustration: "For if a thing were moved the space of a cubit in one hour, since in every space there are an infinite number of points, the thing moved must needs touch all the points of the space: it will then go through an infinite collection in a finite time, which is impossible."

Zeno appeals here, in the first place, to the fact that any distance, however small, can be halved. From this it follows, of course, that there must be an infinite number of points in a line. But, Aristotle represents him as arguing, you cannot touch an infinite number of points _one by one_ in a finite time. The words "one by one" are important. (1) If _all_ the points touched are concerned, then, though you pass through them continuously, you do not touch them "one by one." That is to say, after touching one, there is not another which you touch next: no two points are next each other, but between any two there are always an infinite number of others, which cannot be enumerated one by one. (2) If, on the other hand, only the successive middle points are concerned, obtained by always halving what remains of the course, then the points are reached one by one, and, though they are infinite in number, they are in fact all reached in a finite time. His argument to the contrary may be supposed to appeal to the view that a finite time must consist of a finite number of instants, in which case what he says would be perfectly true on the assumption that the possibility of continued dichotomy is undeniable. If, on the other hand, we suppose the argument directed against the partisans of infinite divisibility, we must suppose it to proceed as follows:[42] "The points given by successive halving of the distances still to be traversed are infinite in number, and are reached in succession, each being reached a finite time later than its predecessor; but the sum of an infinite number of finite times must be infinite, and therefore the process will never be completed." It is very possible that this is historically the right interpretation, but in this form the argument is invalid. If half the course takes half a minute, and the next quarter takes a quarter of a minute, and so on, the whole course will take a minute. The apparent force of the argument, on this interpretation, lies solely in the mistaken supposition that there cannot be anything beyond the whole of an infinite series, which can be seen to be false by observing that 1 is beyond the whole of the infinite series 1/2, 3/4, 7/8, 15/16, ...

[42] _Cf._ Mr C. D. Broad, "Note on Achilles and the Tortoise," _Mind_, N.S., vol. xxii. pp. 318-9.

The second of Zeno's arguments is the one concerning Achilles and the tortoise, which has achieved more notoriety than the others. It is paraphrased by Burnet as follows:[43]

"Achilles will never overtake the tortoise. He must first reach the place from which the tortoise started. By that time the tortoise will have got some way ahead. Achilles must then make up that, and again the tortoise will be ahead. He is always coming nearer, but he never makes up to it."[44]

[43] _Op. cit._

[44] Aristotle's words are: "The second is the so-called Achilles. It consists in this, that the slower will never be overtaken in its course by the quickest, for the pursuer must always come first to the point from which the pursued has just departed, so that the slower must necessarily be always still more or less in advance." _Phys._, vi. 9. 239B (R.P. 137).

This argument is essentially the same as the previous one. It shows that, if Achilles ever overtakes the tortoise, it must be after an infinite number of instants have elapsed since he started. This is in fact true; but the view that an infinite number of instants make up an infinitely long time is not true, and therefore the conclusion that Achilles will never overtake the tortoise does not follow.

The third argument,[45] that of the arrow, is very interesting. The text has been questioned. Burnet accepts the alterations of Zeller, and paraphrases thus:

"The arrow in flight is at rest. For, if everything is at rest when it occupies a space equal to itself, and what is in flight at any given moment always occupies a space equal to itself, it cannot move."

[45] _Phys._, vi. 9. 239B (R.P. 138).

But according to Prantl, the literal translation of the unemended text of Aristotle's statement of the argument is as follows: "If everything, when it is behaving in a uniform manner, is continually either moving or at rest, but what is moving is always in the _now_, then the moving arrow is motionless." This form of the argument brings out its force more clearly than Burnet's paraphrase.

Here, if not in the first two arguments, the view that a finite part of time consists of a finite series of successive instants seems to be assumed; at any rate the plausibility of the argument seems to depend upon supposing that there are consecutive instants. Throughout an instant, it is said, a moving body is where it is: it cannot move during the instant, for that would require that the instant should have parts. Thus, suppose we consider a period consisting of a thousand instants, and suppose the arrow is in flight throughout this period. At each of the thousand instants, the arrow is where it is, though at the next instant it is somewhere else. It is never moving, but in some miraculous way the change of position has to occur _between_ the instants, that is to say, not at any time whatever. This is what M. Bergson calls the cinematographic representation of reality. The more the difficulty is meditated, the more real it becomes. The solution lies in the theory of continuous series: we find it hard to avoid supposing that, when the arrow is in flight, there is a _next_ position occupied at the _next_ moment; but in fact there is no next position and no next moment, and when once this is imaginatively realised, the difficulty is seen to disappear.

The fourth and last of Zeno's arguments is[46] the argument of the stadium.

[46] _Phys._, vi. 9. 239B (R.P. 139).

The argument as stated by Burnet is as follows:

First Position. Second Position. A .... A .... B .... B .... C .... C ....

"Half the time may be equal to double the time. Let us suppose three rows of bodies, one of which (A) is at rest while the other two (B, C) are moving with equal velocity in opposite directions. By the time they are all in the same part of the course, B will have passed twice as many of the bodies in C as in A. Therefore the time which it takes to pass C is twice as long as the time it takes to pass A. But the time which B and C take to reach the position of A is the same. Therefore double the time is equal to the half."

Gaye[47] devoted an interesting article to the interpretation of this argument. His translation of Aristotle's statement is as follows:

"The fourth argument is that concerning the two rows of bodies, each row being composed of an equal number of bodies of equal size, passing each other on a race-course as they proceed with equal velocity in opposite directions, the one row originally occupying the space between the goal and the middle point of the course, and the other that between the middle point and the starting-post. This, he thinks, involves the conclusion that half a given time is equal to double the time. The fallacy of the reasoning lies in the assumption that a body occupies an equal time in passing with equal velocity a body that is in motion and a body of equal size that is at rest, an assumption which is false. For instance (so runs the argument), let A A ... be the stationary bodies of equal size, B B ... the bodies, equal in number and in size to A A ..., originally occupying the half of the course from the starting-post to the middle of the A's, and C C ... those originally occupying the other half from the goal to the middle of the A's, equal in number, size, and velocity, to B B ... Then three consequences follow. First, as the B's and C's pass one another, the first B reaches the last C at the same moment at which the first C reaches the last B. Secondly, at this moment the first C has passed all the A's, whereas the first B has passed only half the A's and has consequently occupied only half the time occupied by the first C, since each of the two occupies an equal time in passing each A. Thirdly, at the same moment all the B's have passed all the C's: for the first C and the first B will simultaneously reach the opposite ends of the course, since (so says Zeno) the time occupied by the first C in passing each of the B's is equal to that occupied by it in passing each of the A's, because an equal time is occupied by both the first B and the first C in passing all the A's. This is the argument: but it presupposes the aforesaid fallacious assumption."

[47] _Loc. cit._

First Position. Second Position. B B' B" B B' B" . . . . . .

A A' A" A A' A" . . . . . .

C C' C" C C' C" . . . . . .

This argument is not quite easy to follow, and it is only valid as against the assumption that a finite time consists of a finite number of instants. We may re-state it in different language. Let us suppose three drill-sergeants, A, A', and A", standing in a row, while the two files of soldiers march past them in opposite directions. At the first moment which we consider, the three men B, B', B" in one row, and the three men C, C', C" in the other row, are respectively opposite to A, A', and A". At the very next moment, each row has moved on, and now B and C" are opposite A'. Thus B and C" are opposite each other. When, then, did B pass C'? It must have been somewhere between the two moments which we supposed consecutive, and therefore the two moments cannot really have been consecutive. It follows that there must be other moments between any two given moments, and therefore that there must be

an infinite number of moments in any given interval of time.

The above difficulty, that B must have passed C' at some time between two consecutive moments, is a genuine one, but is not precisely the difficulty raised by Zeno. What Zeno professes to prove is that "half of a given time is equal to double that time." The most intelligible explanation of the argument known to me is that of Gaye.[48] Since, however, his explanation is not easy to set forth shortly, I will re-state what seems to me to be the logical essence of Zeno's contention. If we suppose that time consists of a series of consecutive instants, and that motion consists in passing through a series of consecutive points, then the fastest possible motion is one which, at each instant, is at a point consecutive to that at which it was at the previous instant. Any slower motion must be one which has intervals of rest interspersed, and any faster motion must wholly omit some points. All this is evident from the fact that we cannot have more than one event for each instant. But now, in the case of our A's and B's and C's, B is opposite a fresh A every instant, and therefore the number of A's passed gives the number of instants since the beginning of the motion. But during the motion B has passed twice as many C's, and yet cannot have passed more than one each instant. Hence the number of instants since the motion began is twice the number of A's passed, though we previously found it was equal to this number. From this result, Zeno's conclusion follows.

[48] _Loc. cit._, p. 105.

Zeno's arguments, in some form, have afforded grounds for almost all the theories of space and time and infinity which have been constructed from his day to our own. We have seen that all his arguments are valid (with certain reasonable hypotheses) on the assumption that finite spaces and times consist of a finite number of points and instants, and that the third and fourth almost certainly in fact proceeded on this assumption, while the first and second, which were perhaps intended to refute the opposite assumption, were in that case fallacious. We may therefore escape from his paradoxes either by maintaining that, though space and time do consist of points and instants, the number of them in any finite interval is infinite; or by denying that space and time consist of points and instants at all; or lastly, by denying the reality of space and time altogether. It would seem that Zeno himself, as a supporter of Parmenides, drew the last of these three possible deductions, at any rate in regard to time. In this a very large number of philosophers have followed him. Many others, like M. Bergson, have preferred to deny that space and time consist of points and instants. Either of these solutions will meet the difficulties in the form in which Zeno raised them. But, as we saw, the difficulties can also be met if infinite numbers are admissible. And on grounds which are independent of space and time, infinite numbers, and series in which no two terms are consecutive, must in any case be admitted. Consider, for example, all the fractions less than 1, arranged in order of magnitude. Between any two of them, there are others, for example, the arithmetical mean of the two. Thus no two fractions are consecutive, and the total number of them is infinite. It will be found that much of what Zeno says as regards the series of points on a line can be equally well applied to the series of fractions. And we cannot deny that there are fractions, so that two of the above ways of escape are closed to us. It follows that, if we are to solve the whole class of difficulties derivable from Zeno's by analogy, we must discover some tenable theory of infinite numbers. What, then, are the difficulties which, until the last thirty years, led philosophers to the belief that infinite numbers are impossible?

The difficulties of infinity are of two kinds, of which the first may be called sham, while the others involve, for their solution, a certain amount of new and not altogether easy thinking. The sham difficulties are those suggested by the etymology, and those suggested by confusion of the mathematical infinite with what philosophers impertinently call the "true" infinite. Etymologically, "infinite" should mean "having no end." But in fact some infinite series have ends, some have not; while some collections are infinite without being serial, and can therefore not properly be regarded as either endless or having ends. The series of instants from any earlier one to any later one (both included) is infinite, but has two ends; the series of instants from the beginning of time to the present moment has one end, but is infinite. Kant, in his first antinomy, seems to hold that it is harder for the past to be infinite than for the future to be so, on the ground that the past is now completed, and that nothing infinite can be completed. It is very difficult to see how he can have imagined that there was any sense in this remark; but it seems most probable that he was thinking of the infinite as the "unended." It is odd that he did not see that the future too has one end at the present, and is precisely on a level with the past. His regarding the two as different in this respect illustrates just that kind of slavery to time which, as we agreed in speaking of Parmenides, the true philosopher must learn to leave behind him.

The confusions introduced into the notions of philosophers by the so-called "true" infinite are curious. They see that this notion is not the same as the mathematical infinite, but they choose to believe that it is the notion which the mathematicians are vainly trying to reach. They therefore inform the mathematicians, kindly but firmly, that they are mistaken in adhering to the "false" infinite, since plainly the "true" infinite is something quite different. The reply to this is that what they call the "true" infinite is a notion totally irrelevant to the problem of the mathematical infinite, to which it has only a fanciful and verbal analogy. So remote is it that I do not

propose to confuse the issue by even mentioning what the "true" infinite is. It is the "false" infinite that concerns us, and we have to show that the epithet "false" is undeserved.

There are, however, certain genuine difficulties in understanding the infinite, certain habits of mind derived from the consideration of finite numbers, and easily extended to infinite numbers under the mistaken notion that they represent logical necessities. For example, every number that we are accustomed to, except 0, has another number immediately before it, from which it results by adding 1; but the first infinite number does not have this property. The numbers before it form an infinite series, containing all the ordinary finite numbers, having no maximum, no last finite number, after which one little step would plunge us into the infinite. If it is assumed that the first infinite number is reached by a succession of small steps, it is easy to show that it is self-contradictory. The first infinite number is, in fact, beyond the whole unending series of finite numbers. "But," it will be said, "there cannot be anything beyond the whole of an unending series." This, we may point out, is the very principle upon which Zeno relies in the arguments of the race-course and the Achilles. Take the race-course: there is the moment when the runner still has half his distance to run, then the moment when he still has a quarter, then when he still has an eighth, and so on in a strictly unending series. Beyond the whole of this series is the moment when he reaches the goal. Thus there certainly can be something beyond the whole of an unending series. But it remains to show that this fact is only what might have been expected.

The difficulty, like most of the vaguer difficulties besetting the mathematical infinite, is derived, I think, from the more or less unconscious operation of the idea of _counting_. If you set to work to count the terms in an infinite collection, you will never have completed your task. Thus, in the case of the runner, if half, three-quarters, seven-eighths, and so on of the course were marked, and the runner was not allowed to pass any of the marks until the umpire said "Now," then Zeno's conclusion would be true in practice, and he would never reach the goal.

But it is not essential to the existence of a collection, or even to knowledge and reasoning concerning it, that we should be able to pass its terms in review one by one. This may be seen in the case of finite collections; we can speak of "mankind" or "the human race," though many of the individuals in this collection are not personally known to us. We can do this because we know of various characteristics which every individual has if he belongs to the collection, and not if he does not. And exactly the same happens in the case of infinite collections: they may be known by their characteristics although their terms cannot be enumerated. In this sense, an unending series may nevertheless form a whole, and there may be new terms beyond the whole of it.

Some purely arithmetical peculiarities of infinite numbers have also caused perplexity. For instance, an infinite number is not increased by adding one to it, or by doubling it. Such peculiarities have seemed to many to contradict logic, but in fact they only contradict confirmed mental habits. The whole difficulty of the subject lies in the necessity of thinking in an unfamiliar way, and in realising that many properties which we have thought inherent in number are in fact peculiar to finite numbers. If this is remembered, the positive theory of infinity, which will occupy the next lecture, will not be found so difficult as it is to those who cling obstinately to the prejudices instilled by the arithmetic which is learnt in childhood.

LECTURE VII

THE POSITIVE THEORY OF INFINITY

The positive theory of infinity, and the general theory of number to which it has given rise, are among the triumphs of scientific method in philosophy, and are therefore specially suitable for illustrating the logical-analytic character of that method. The work in this subject has been done by mathematicians, and its results can be expressed in mathematical symbolism. Why, then, it may be said, should the subject be regarded as philosophy rather than as mathematics? This raises a difficult question, partly concerned with the use of words, but partly also of real importance in understanding the function of philosophy. Every subject-matter, it would seem, can give rise to philosophical investigations as well as to the appropriate science, the difference between the two treatments being in the direction of movement and in the kind of truths which it is sought to establish. In the special sciences, when they have become fully developed, the movement is forward and synthetic, from the simpler to the more complex. But in philosophy we follow the inverse direction: from the complex and relatively concrete we proceed towards the simple and abstract by means of analysis, seeking, in the process, to eliminate the particularity of the original subject-matter, and to confine our attention entirely to the logical _form_ of the facts concerned.

Between philosophy and pure mathematics there is a certain affinity, in the fact that both are general and _a priori_. Neither of them asserts propositions which, like those of history and geography, depend upon the actual concrete facts being just what they are.

We may illustrate this characteristic by means of Leibniz's conception of many _possible_ worlds, of which one only is _actual_. In all the many possible worlds, philosophy and mathematics will be the same; the differences will only be in respect of those particular facts which are chronicled by the descriptive sciences. Any quality, therefore, by which our actual world is distinguished from other abstractly possible worlds, must be ignored by mathematics and philosophy alike. Mathematics and philosophy differ, however, in their manner of treating the general properties in which all possible worlds agree; for while mathematics, starting from comparatively simple propositions, seeks to build up more and more complex results by deductive synthesis, philosophy, starting from data which are common knowledge, seeks to purify and generalise them into the simplest statements of abstract form that can be obtained from them by logical analysis.

The difference between philosophy and mathematics may be illustrated by our present problem, namely, the nature of number. Both start from certain facts about numbers which are evident to inspection. But mathematics uses these facts to deduce more and more complicated theorems, while philosophy seeks, by analysis, to go behind these facts to others, simpler, more fundamental, and inherently more fitted to form the premisses of the science of arithmetic. The question, "What is a number?" is the pre-eminent philosophic question in this subject, but it is one which the mathematician as such need not ask, provided he knows enough of the properties of numbers to enable him to deduce his theorems. We, since our object is philosophical, must grapple with the philosopher's question. The answer to the question, "What is a number?" which we shall reach in this lecture, will be found to give also, by implication, the answer to the difficulties of infinity which we considered in the previous lecture.

The question "What is a number?" is one which, until quite recent times, was never considered in the kind of way that is capable of yielding a precise answer. Philosophers were content with some vague dictum such as, "Number is unity in plurality." A typical definition of the kind that contented philosophers is the following from Sigwart's _Logic_ (Sec. 66, section 3): "Every number is not merely a _plurality_, but a plurality thought _as held together and closed, and to that extent as a unity_." Now there is in such definitions a very elementary blunder, of the same kind that would be committed if we said "yellow is a flower" because some flowers are yellow. Take, for example, the number 3. A single collection of three things might conceivably be described as "a plurality thought as held together and closed, and to that extent as a unity"; but a collection of three things is not the number 3. The number 3 is something which all collections of three things have in common, but is not itself a collection of three things. The definition, therefore, apart from any other defects, has failed to reach the necessary degree of abstraction: the number 3 is something more abstract than any collection of three things.

Such vague philosophic definitions, however, remained inoperative because of their very vagueness. What most men who thought about numbers really had in mind was that numbers are the result of _counting_. "On the consciousness of the law of counting," says Sigwart at the beginning of his discussion of number, "rests the possibility of spontaneously prolonging the series of numbers _ad infinitum_." It is this view of number as generated by counting which has been the chief psychological obstacle to the understanding of infinite numbers. Counting, because it is familiar, is erroneously supposed to be simple, whereas it is in fact a highly complex process, which has no meaning unless the numbers reached in counting have some significance independent of the process by which they are reached. And infinite numbers cannot be reached at all in this way. The mistake is of the same kind as if cows were defined as what can be bought from a cattle-merchant. To a person who knew several cattle-merchants, but had never seen a cow, this might seem an admirable definition. But if in his travels he came across a herd of wild cows, he would have to declare that they were not cows at all, because no cattle-merchant could sell them. So infinite numbers were declared not to be numbers at all, because they could not be reached by counting.

It will be worth while to consider for a moment what counting actually is. We count a set of objects when we let our attention pass from one to another, until we have attended once to each, saying the names of the numbers in order with each successive act of attention. The last number named in this process is the number of the objects, and therefore counting is a method of finding out what the number of the objects is. But this operation is really a very complicated one, and those who imagine that it is the logical source of number show themselves remarkably incapable of analysis. In the first place, when we say "one, two, three ..." as we count, we cannot be said to be discovering the number of the objects counted unless we attach some meaning to the words one, two, three, ... A child may learn to know these words in order, and to repeat them correctly like the letters of the alphabet, without attaching any meaning to them. Such a child may count correctly from the point of view of a grown-up listener, without having any idea of numbers at all. The operation of counting, in fact, can only be intelligently performed by a person who already has some idea what the numbers are; and from this it follows that counting does not give the logical basis of number.

Again, how do we know that the last number reached in the process of counting is the number of the objects counted? This is just one of those facts that are too familiar for their significance to be realised; but those who wish to be logicians must acquire the habit

of dwelling upon such facts. There are two propositions involved in this fact: first, that the number of numbers from 1 up to any given number is that given number--for instance, the number of numbers from 1 to 100 is a hundred; secondly, that if a set of numbers can be used as names of a set of objects, each number occurring only once, then the number of numbers used as names is the same as the number of objects. The first of these propositions is capable of an easy arithmetical proof so long as finite numbers are concerned; but with infinite numbers, after the first, it ceases to be true. The second proposition remains true, and is in fact, as we shall see, an immediate consequence of the definition of number. But owing to the falsehood of the first proposition where infinite numbers are concerned, counting, even if it were practically possible, would not be a valid method of discovering the number of terms in an infinite collection, and would in fact give different results according to the manner in which it was carried out.

There are two respects in which the infinite numbers that are known differ from finite numbers: first, infinite numbers have, while finite numbers have not, a property which I shall call _reflexiveness_; secondly, finite numbers have, while infinite numbers have not, a property which I shall call _inductiveness_. Let us consider these two properties successively.

(1) _Reflexiveness._--A number is said to be _reflexive_ when it is not increased by adding 1 to it. It follows at once that any finite number can be added to a reflexive number without increasing it. This property of infinite numbers was always thought, until recently, to be self-contradictory; but through the work of Georg Cantor it has come to be recognised that, though at first astonishing, it is no more self-contradictory than the fact that people at the antipodes do not tumble off. In virtue of this property, given any infinite collection of objects, any finite number of objects can be added or taken away without increasing or diminishing the number of the collection. Even an infinite number of objects may, under certain conditions, be added or taken away without altering the number. This may be made clearer by the help of some examples.

Imagine all the natural numbers 0, 1, 2, 3, ... to be written down in a row, and immediately beneath them write down the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, ..., so that 1 is under 0, 2 is under 1, and so on. Then every number in the top row has a number directly under it in the bottom row, and no number occurs twice in either row. It follows that the number of numbers in the two rows must be the same. But all the numbers that occur in the bottom row also occur in the top row, and one more, namely 0; thus the number of terms in the top row is obtained by adding one to the number of the bottom row. So long, therefore, as it was supposed that a number must be increased by adding 1 to it, this state of things constituted a contradiction, and led to the denial that there are infinite numbers.

0, 1, 2, 3, ... _n_ ... 1, 2, 3, 4, ... _n_ + 1 ...

The following example is even more surprising. Write the natural numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, ... in the top row, and the even numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, ... in the bottom row, so that under each number in the top row stands its double in the bottom row. Then, as before, the number of numbers in the two rows is the same, yet the second row results from taking away all the odd numbers--an infinite collection--from the top row. This example is given by Leibniz to prove that there can be no infinite numbers. He believed in infinite collections, but, since he thought that a number must always be increased when it is added to and diminished when it is subtracted from, he maintained that infinite collections do not have numbers. "The number of all numbers," he says, "implies a contradiction, which I show thus: To any number there is a corresponding number equal to its double. Therefore the number of all numbers is not greater than the number of even numbers, _i.e._ the whole is not greater than its part."[49] In dealing with this argument, we ought to substitute "the number of all finite numbers" for "the number of all numbers"; we then obtain exactly the illustration given by our two rows, one containing all the finite numbers, the other only the even finite numbers. It will be seen that Leibniz regards it as self-contradictory to maintain that the whole is not greater than its part. But the word "greater" is one which is capable of many meanings; for our purpose, we must substitute the less ambiguous phrase "containing a greater number of terms." In this sense, it is not self-contradictory for whole and part to be equal; it is the realisation of this fact which has made the modern theory of infinity possible.

[49] _Phil. Werke_, Gerhardt's edition, vol. i. p. 338.

There is an interesting discussion of the reflexiveness of infinite wholes in the first of Galileo's Dialogues on Motion. I quote from a translation published in 1730.[50] The personages in the dialogue are Salviati, Sagredo, and Simplicius, and they reason as follows:

"_Simp._ Here already arises a Doubt which I think is not to be resolv'd; and that is this: Since 'tis plain that one Line is given greater than another, and since both contain infinite Points, we must surely necessarily infer, that we have found in the same Species something greater than Infinite, since the Infinity of Points of the greater Line exceeds the Infinity of Points of the lesser. But now, to assign an Infinite greater than an Infinite, is what I can't possibly conceive.

"_Salv._ These are some of those Difficulties which arise from Discourses which our finite Understanding makes about Infinites, by ascribing to them Attributes which we give to Things finite and terminate, which I think most improper, because those Attributes of Majority, Minority, and Equality, agree not with Infinities, of which we can't say that one is greater than, less than, or equal to another. For Proof whereof I have something come into my Head, which (that I may be the better understood) I will propose by way of Interrogatories to _Simplicius_, who started this Difficulty. To begin then: I suppose you know which are square Numbers, and which not?

"_Simp._ I know very well that a square Number is that which arises from the Multiplication of any Number into itself; thus 4 and 9 are square Numbers, that arising from 2, and this from 3, multiplied by themselves.

"_Salv._ Very well; And you also know, that as the Products are call'd Squares, the Factors are call'd Roots: And that the other Numbers, which proceed not from Numbers multiplied into themselves, are not Squares. Whence taking in all Numbers, both Squares and Not Squares, if I should say, that the Not Squares are more than the Squares, should I not be in the right?

"_Simp._ Most certainly.

"_Salv._ If I go on with you then, and ask you, How many squar'd Numbers there are? you may truly answer, That there are as many as are their proper Roots, since every Square has its own Root, and every Root its own Square, and since no Square has more than one Root, nor any Root more than one Square.

"_Simp._ Very true.

"_Salv._ But now, if I should ask how many Roots there are, you can't deny but there are as many as there are Numbers, since there's no Number but what's the Root to some Square. And this being granted, we may likewise affirm, that there are as many square Numbers, as there are Numbers; for there are as many Squares as there are Roots, and as many Roots as Numbers. And yet in the Beginning of this, we said, there were many more Numbers than Squares, the greater Part of Numbers being not Squares: And tho' the Number of Squares decreases in a greater proportion, as we go on to bigger Numbers, for count to an Hundred you'll find 10 Squares, viz. 1, 4, 9, 16, 25, 36, 49, 64, 81, 100, which is the same as to say the 10th Part are Squares; in Ten thousand only the 100th Part are Squares; in a Million only the 1000th: And yet in an infinite Number, if we can but comprehend it, we may say the Squares are as many as all the Numbers taken together.

"_Sagr._ What must be determin'd then in this Case?

"_Salv._ I see no other way, but by saying that all Numbers are infinite; Squares are Infinite, their Roots Infinite, and that the Number of Squares is not less than the Number of Numbers, nor this less than that: and then by concluding that the Attributes or Terms of Equality, Majority, and Minority, have no Place in Infinites, but are confin'd to terminate Quantities."

[50] _Mathematical Discourses concerning two new sciences relating to mechanics and local motion, in four dialogues._ By Galileo Galilei, Chief Philosopher and Mathematician to the Grand Duke of Tuscany. Done into English from the Italian, by Tho. Weston, late Master, and now published by John Weston, present Master, of the Academy at Greenwich. See pp. 46 ff.

The way in which the problem is expounded in the above discussion is worthy of Galileo, but the solution suggested is not the right one. It is actually the case that the number of square (finite) numbers is the same as the number of (finite) numbers. The fact that, so long as we confine ourselves to numbers less than some given finite number, the proportion of squares tends towards zero as the given finite number increases, does not contradict the fact that the number of all finite squares is the same as the number of all finite numbers. This is only an instance of the fact, now familiar to mathematicians, that the _limit_ of a function as the variable _approaches_ a given point may not be the same as its _value_ when the variable actually _reaches_ the given point. But although the infinite numbers which Galileo discusses are equal, Cantor has shown that what Simplicius could not conceive is true, namely, that there are an infinite number of different infinite numbers, and that the conception of _greater_ and _less_ can be perfectly well applied to them. The whole of Simplicius's difficulty comes, as is evident, from his belief that, if _greater_ and _less_ can be applied, a part of an infinite collection must have fewer terms than the whole; and when this is denied, all contradictions disappear. As regards greater and less lengths of lines, which is the problem from which the above discussion starts, that involves a meaning of _greater_ and _less_ which is not arithmetical. The number of points is the same in a long line and in a short one, being in fact the same as the number of points in all space. The _greater_ and _less_ of metrical geometry involves the new metrical conception of _congruence_, which cannot be developed out of arithmetical considerations alone. But this question has not the fundamental importance which belongs to the arithmetical theory of infinity.

(2) _Non-inductiveness._--The second property by which infinite numbers are distinguished from finite numbers is the property of non-inductiveness. This will be best explained by defining the positive property of inductiveness which characterises the finite numbers, and which is named after the method of proof known as "mathematical induction."

Let us first consider what is meant by calling a property "hereditary" in a given series. Take such a property as being named Jones. If a man is named Jones, so is his son; we will therefore call the property of being called Jones hereditary with respect to the relation of father and son. If a man is called Jones, all his descendants in the direct male line are called Jones; this follows from the fact that the property is hereditary. Now, instead of the relation of father and son, consider the relation of a finite number to its immediate successor, that is, the relation which holds between 0 and 1, between 1 and 2, between 2 and 3, and so on. If a property of numbers is hereditary with respect to this relation, then if it belongs to (say) 100, it must belong also to all finite numbers greater than 100; for, being hereditary, it belongs to 101 because it belongs to 100, and it belongs to 102 because it belongs to 101, and so on--where the "and so on" will take us, sooner or later, to any finite number greater than 100. Thus, for example, the property of being greater than 99 is hereditary in the series of finite numbers; and generally, a property is hereditary in this series when, given any number that possesses the property, the next number must always also possess it.

It will be seen that a hereditary property, though it must belong to all the finite numbers greater than a given number possessing the property, need not belong to all the numbers less than this number. For example, the hereditary property of being greater than 99 belongs to 100 and all greater numbers, but not to any smaller number. Similarly, the hereditary property of being called Jones belongs to all the descendants (in the direct male line) of those who have this property, but not to all their ancestors, because we reach at last a first Jones, before whom the ancestors have no surname. It is obvious, however, that any hereditary property possessed by Adam must belong to all men; and similarly any hereditary property possessed by 0 must belong to all finite numbers. This is the principle of what is called "mathematical induction." It frequently happens, when we wish to prove that all finite numbers have some property, that we have first to prove that 0 has the property, and then that the property is hereditary, _i.e._ that, if it belongs to a given number, then it belongs to the next number. Owing to the fact that such proofs are called "inductive," I shall call the properties to which they are applicable "inductive" properties. Thus an inductive property of numbers is one which is hereditary and belongs to 0.

Taking any one of the natural numbers, say 29, it is easy to see that it must have all inductive properties. For since such properties belong to 0 and are hereditary, they belong to 1; therefore, since they are hereditary, they belong to 2, and so on; by twenty-nine repetitions of such arguments we show that they belong to 29. We may _define_ the "inductive" numbers as _all those that possess all inductive properties_; they will be the same as what are called the "natural" numbers, _i.e._ the ordinary finite whole numbers. To all such numbers, proofs by mathematical induction can be validly applied. They are those numbers, we may loosely say, which can be reached from 0 by successive additions of 1; in other words, they are all the numbers that can be reached by counting.

But beyond all these numbers, there are the infinite numbers, and infinite numbers do not have all inductive properties. Such numbers, therefore, may be called non-inductive. All those properties of numbers which are proved by an imaginary step-by-step process from one number to the next are liable to fail when we come to infinite numbers. The first of the infinite numbers has no immediate predecessor, because there is no greatest finite number; thus no succession of steps from one number to the next will ever reach from a finite number to an infinite one, and the step-by-step method of proof fails. This is another reason for the supposed self-contradictions of infinite numbers. Many of the most familiar properties of numbers, which custom had led people to regard as logically necessary, are in fact only demonstrable by the step-by-step method, and fail to be true of infinite numbers. But so soon as we realise the necessity of proving such properties by mathematical induction, and the strictly limited scope of this method of proof, the supposed contradictions are seen to contradict, not logic, but only our prejudices and mental habits.

The property of being increased by the addition of 1--_i.e._ the property of non-reflexiveness--may serve to illustrate the limitations of mathematical induction. It is easy to prove that 0 is increased by the addition of 1, and that, if a given number is increased by the addition of 1, so is the next number, _i.e._ the number obtained by the addition of 1. It follows that each of the natural numbers is increased by the addition of 1. This follows generally from the general argument, and follows for each particular case by a sufficient number of applications of the argument. We first prove that 0 is not equal to 1; then, since the property of being increased by 1 is hereditary, it follows that 1 is not equal to 2; hence it follows that 2 is not equal to 3; if we wish to prove that 30,000 is not equal to 30,001, we can do so by repeating this reasoning 30,000 times. But we cannot prove in this way that _all_ numbers are increased by the addition of 1; we can only prove that this holds of the numbers attainable by successive additions of 1 starting from 0. The reflexive numbers, which lie beyond all those attainable in this way, are as a matter of fact not increased by the addition of 1.

The two properties of reflexiveness and non-inductiveness, which we have considered as characteristics of infinite numbers, have not so far been proved to be always found together. It is known that all reflexive numbers are non-inductive, but it is not known that all non-inductive numbers are reflexive. Fallacious proofs of this proposition have been published by many writers, including myself, but up to the present no valid proof has been discovered. The infinite numbers actually known, however, are all reflexive as well as non-inductive; thus, in mathematical practice, if not in theory, the two properties are always associated. For our purposes, therefore, it will be convenient to ignore the bare possibility that there may be non-inductive non-reflexive numbers, since all known numbers are either inductive or reflexive.

When infinite numbers are first introduced to people, they are apt to refuse the name of numbers to them, because their behaviour is so different from that of finite numbers that it seems a wilful misuse of terms to call them numbers at all. In order to meet this feeling, we must now turn to the logical basis of arithmetic, and consider the logical definition of numbers.

The logical definition of numbers, though it seems an essential support to the theory of infinite numbers, was in fact discovered independently and by a different man. The theory of infinite numbers--that is to say, the arithmetical as opposed to the logical part of the theory--was discovered by Georg Cantor, and published by him in 1882-3.[51] The definition of number was discovered about the same time by a man whose great genius has not received the recognition it deserves--I mean Gottlob Frege of Jena. His first work, _Begriffsschrift_, published in 1879, contained the very important theory of hereditary properties in a series to which I alluded in connection with inductiveness. His definition of number is contained in his second work, published in 1884, and entitled _Die Grundlagen der Arithmetik, eine logisch-mathematische Untersuchung ueber den Begriff der Zahl_.[52] It is with this book that the logical theory of arithmetic begins, and it will repay us to consider Frege's analysis in some detail.

[51] In his _Grundlagen einer allgemeinen Mannichfaltigkeitslehre_ and in articles in _Acta Mathematica_, vol. ii.

[52] The definition of number contained in this book, and elaborated in the _Grundgesetze der Arithmetik_ (vol. i., 1893; vol. ii., 1903), was rediscovered by me in ignorance of Frege's work. I wish to state as emphatically as possible--what seems still often ignored--that his discovery antedated mine by eighteen years.

Frege begins by noting the increased desire for logical strictness in mathematical demonstrations which distinguishes modern mathematicians from their predecessors, and points out that this must lead to a critical investigation of the definition of number. He proceeds to show the inadequacy of previous philosophical theories, especially of the "synthetic _a priori_" theory of Kant and the empirical theory of Mill. This brings him to the question: What kind of object is it that number can properly be ascribed to? He points out that physical things may be regarded as one or many: for example, if a tree has a thousand leaves, they may be taken altogether as constituting its foliage, which would count as one, not as a thousand; and _one_ pair of boots is the same object as _two_ boots. It follows that physical things are not the subjects of which number is properly predicated; for when we have discovered the proper subjects, the number to be ascribed must be unambiguous. This leads to a discussion of the very prevalent view that number is really something psychological and subjective, a view which Frege emphatically rejects. "Number," he says, "is as little an object of psychology or an outcome of psychical processes as the North Sea.... The botanist wishes to state something which is just as much a fact when he gives the number of petals in a flower as when he gives its colour. The one depends as little as the other upon our caprice. There is therefore a certain similarity between number and colour; but this does not consist in the fact that both are sensibly perceptible in external things, but in the fact that both are objective" (p. 34).

"I distinguish the objective," he continues, "from the palpable, the spatial, the actual. The earth's axis, the centre of mass of the solar system, are objective, but I should not call them actual, like the earth itself" (p. 35). He concludes that number is neither spatial and physical, nor subjective, but non-sensible and objective. This conclusion is important, since it applies to all the subject-matter of mathematics and logic. Most philosophers have thought that the physical and the mental between them exhausted the world of being. Some have argued that the objects of mathematics were obviously not subjective, and therefore must be physical and empirical; others have argued that they were obviously not physical, and therefore must be subjective and mental. Both sides were right in what they denied, and wrong in what they asserted; Frege has the merit of accepting both denials, and finding a third assertion by recognising the world of logic, which is neither mental nor physical.

The fact is, as Frege points out, that no number, not even 1, is applicable to physical things, but only to general terms or descriptions, such as "man," "satellite of the earth," "satellite of Venus." The general term "man" is applicable to a certain number of objects: there are in the world so and so many men. The unity which philosophers rightly feel to be necessary for the assertion of a number is the unity of the general term, and it is the general term which is the proper subject of number. And this applies equally

when there is one object or none which falls under the general term. "Satellite of the earth" is a term only applicable to one object, namely, the moon. But "one" is not a property of the moon itself, which may equally well be regarded as many molecules: it is a property of the general term "earth's satellite." Similarly, 0 is a property of the general term "satellite of Venus," because Venus has no satellite. Here at last we have an intelligible theory of the number 0. This was impossible if numbers applied to physical objects, because obviously no physical object could have the number 0. Thus, in seeking our definition of number we have arrived so far at the result that numbers are properties of general terms or general descriptions, not of physical things or of mental occurrences.

Instead of speaking of a general term, such as "man," as the subject of which a number can be asserted, we may, without making any serious change, take the subject as the class or collection of objects--_i.e._ "mankind" in the above instance--to which the general term in question is applicable. Two general terms, such as "man" and "featherless biped," which are applicable to the same collection of objects, will obviously have the same number of instances; thus the number depends upon the class, not upon the selection of this or that general term to describe it, provided several general terms can be found to describe the same class. But some general term is always necessary in order to describe a class. Even when the terms are enumerated, as "this and that and the other," the collection is constituted by the general property of being either this, or that, or the other, and only so acquires the unity which enables us to speak of it as _one_ collection. And in the case of an infinite class, enumeration is impossible, so that description by a general characteristic common and peculiar to the members of the class is the only possible description. Here, as we see, the theory of number to which Frege was led by purely logical considerations becomes of use in showing how infinite classes can be amenable to number in spite of being incapable of enumeration.

Frege next asks the question: When do two collections have the same number of terms? In ordinary life, we decide this question by counting; but counting, as we saw, is impossible in the case of infinite collections, and is not logically fundamental with finite collections. We want, therefore, a different method of answering our question. An illustration may help to make the method clear. I do not know how many married men there are in England, but I do know that the number is the same as the number of married women. The reason I know this is that the relation of husband and wife relates one man to one woman and one woman to one man. A relation of this sort is called a one-one relation. The relation of father to son is called a one-many relation, because a man can have only one father but may have many sons; conversely, the relation of son to father is called a many-one relation. But the relation of husband to wife (in Christian countries) is called one-one, because a man cannot have more than one wife, or a woman more than one husband. Now, whenever there is a one-one relation between all the terms of one collection and all the terms of another severally, as in the case of English husbands and English wives, the number of terms in the one collection is the same as the number in the other; but when there is not such a relation, the number is different. This is the answer to the question: When do two collections have the same number of terms?

We can now at last answer the question: What is meant by the number of terms in a given collection? When there is a one-one relation between all the terms of one collection and all the terms of another severally, we shall say that the two collections are "similar." We have just seen that two similar collections have the same number of terms. This leads us to define the number of a given collection as the class of all collections that are similar to it; that is to say, we set up the following formal definition:

"The number of terms in a given class" is defined as meaning "the class of all classes that are similar to the given class."

This definition, as Frege (expressing it in slightly different terms) showed, yields the usual arithmetical properties of numbers. It is applicable equally to finite and infinite numbers, and it does not require the admission of some new and mysterious set of metaphysical entities. It shows that it is not physical objects, but classes or the general terms by which they are defined, of which numbers can be asserted; and it applies to 0 and 1 without any of the difficulties which other theories find in dealing with these two special cases.

The above definition is sure to produce, at first sight, a feeling of oddity, which is liable to cause a certain dissatisfaction. It defines the number 2, for instance, as the class of all couples, and the number 3 as the class of all triads. This does not _seem_ to be what we have hitherto been meaning when we spoke of 2 and 3, though it would be difficult to say _what_ we had been meaning. The answer to a feeling cannot be a logical argument, but nevertheless the answer in this case is not without importance. In the first place, it will be found that when an idea which has grown familiar as an unanalysed whole is first resolved accurately into its component parts--which is what we do when we define it--there is almost always a feeling of unfamiliarity produced by the analysis, which tends to cause a protest against the definition. In the second place, it may be admitted that the definition, like all definitions, is to a certain extent arbitrary. In the case of the small finite numbers, such as 2 and 3, it would be possible to frame definitions more nearly in accordance with our unanalysed feeling of what we mean; but the method of such definitions would lack uniformity, and

would be found to fail sooner or later--at latest when we reached infinite numbers.

In the third place, the real desideratum about such a definition as that of number is not that it should represent as nearly as possible the ideas of those who have not gone through the analysis required in order to reach a definition, but that it should give us objects having the requisite properties. Numbers, in fact, must satisfy the formulae of arithmetic; any indubitable set of objects fulfilling this requirement may be called numbers. So far, the simplest set known to fulfil this requirement is the set introduced by the above definition. In comparison with this merit, the question whether the objects to which the definition applies are like or unlike the vague ideas of numbers entertained by those who cannot give a definition, is one of very little importance. All the important requirements are fulfilled by the above definition, and the sense of oddity which is at first unavoidable will be found to wear off very quickly with the growth of familiarity.

There is, however, a certain logical doctrine which may be thought to form an objection to the above definition of numbers as classes of classes--I mean the doctrine that there are no such objects as classes at all. It might be thought that this doctrine would make havoc of a theory which reduces numbers to classes, and of the many other theories in which we have made use of classes. This, however, would be a mistake: none of these theories are any the worse for the doctrine that classes are fictions. What the doctrine is, and why it is not destructive, I will try briefly to explain.

On account of certain rather complicated difficulties, culminating in definite contradictions, I was led to the view that nothing that can be said significantly about things, _i.e._ particulars, can be said significantly (_i.e._ either truly or falsely) about classes of things. That is to say, if, in any sentence in which a thing is mentioned, you substitute a class for the thing, you no longer have a sentence that has any meaning: the sentence is no longer either true or false, but a meaningless collection of words. Appearances to the contrary can be dispelled by a moment's reflection. For example, in the sentence, "Adam is fond of apples," you may substitute _mankind_, and say, "Mankind is fond of apples." But obviously you do not mean that there is one individual, called "mankind," which munches apples: you mean that the separate individuals who compose mankind are each severally fond of apples.

Now, if nothing that can be said significantly about a thing can be said significantly about a class of things, it follows that classes of things cannot have the same kind of reality as things have; for if they had, a class could be substituted for a thing in a proposition predicating the kind of reality which would be common to both. This view is really consonant to common sense. In the third or fourth century B.C. there lived a Chinese philosopher named Hui Tzu, who maintained that "a bay horse and a dun cow are three; because taken separately they are two, and taken together they are one: two and one make three."[53] The author from whom I quote says that Hui Tzu "was particularly fond of the quibbles which so delighted the sophists or unsound reasoners of ancient Greece," and this no doubt represents the judgment of common sense upon such arguments. Yet if collections of things were things, his contention would be irrefragable. It is only because the bay horse and the dun cow taken together are not a new thing that we can escape the conclusion that there are three things wherever there are two.

[53] Giles, _The Civilisation of China_ (Home University Library), p. 147.

When it is admitted that classes are not things, the question arises: What do we mean by statements which are nominally about classes? Take such a statement as, "The class of people interested in mathematical logic is not very numerous." Obviously this reduces itself to, "Not very many people are interested in mathematical logic." For the sake of definiteness, let us substitute some particular number, say 3, for "very many." Then our statement is, "Not three people are interested in mathematical logic." This may be expressed in the form: "If _x_ is interested in mathematical logic, and also _y_ is interested, and also _z_ is interested, then _x_ is identical with _y_, or _x_ is identical with _z_, or _y_ is identical with _z_." Here there is no longer any reference at all to a "class." In some such way, all statements nominally about a class can be reduced to statements about what follows from the hypothesis of anything's having the defining property of the class. All that is wanted, therefore, in order to render the _verbal_ use of classes legitimate, is a uniform method of interpreting propositions in which such a use occurs, so as to obtain propositions in which there is no longer any such use. The definition of such a method is a technical matter, which Dr Whitehead and I have dealt with elsewhere, and which we need not enter into on this occasion.[54]

[54] Cf. _Principia Mathematica_, Sec. 20, and Introduction, chapter iii.

If the theory that classes are merely symbolic is accepted, it follows that numbers are not actual entities, but that propositions in which numbers verbally occur have not really any constituents corresponding to numbers, but only a certain logical form which is not a part of propositions having this form. This is in fact the case with all the apparent objects of logic and mathematics. Such

words as _or_, _not_, _if_, _there is_, _identity_, _greater_, _plus_, _nothing_, _everything_, _function_, and so on, are not names of definite objects, like "John" or "Jones," but are words which require a context in order to have meaning. All of them are _formal_, that is to say, their occurrence indicates a certain form of proposition, not a certain constituent. "Logical constants," in short, are not entities; the words expressing them are not names, and cannot significantly be made into logical subjects except when it is the words themselves, as opposed to their meanings, that are being discussed.[55] This fact has a very important bearing on all logic and philosophy, since it shows how they differ from the special sciences. But the questions raised are so large and so difficult that it is impossible to pursue them further on this occasion.

[55] In the above remarks I am making use of unpublished work by my friend Ludwig Wittgenstein.

LECTURE VIII

ON THE NOTION OF CAUSE, WITH APPLICATIONS TO THE FREE-WILL PROBLEM

The nature of philosophic analysis, as illustrated in our previous lectures, can now be stated in general terms. We start from a body of common knowledge, which constitutes our data. On examination, the data are found to be complex, rather vague, and largely interdependent logically. By analysis we reduce them to propositions which are as nearly as possible simple and precise, and we arrange them in deductive chains, in which a certain number of initial propositions form a logical guarantee for all the rest. These initial propositions are _premisses_ for the body of knowledge in question. Premisses are thus quite different from data--they are simpler, more precise, and less infected with logical redundancy. If the work of analysis has been performed completely, they will be wholly free from logical redundancy, wholly precise, and as simple as is logically compatible with their leading to the given body of knowledge. The discovery of these premisses belongs to philosophy; but the work of deducing the body of common knowledge from them belongs to mathematics, if "mathematics" is interpreted in a somewhat liberal sense.

But besides the logical analysis of the common knowledge which forms our data, there is the consideration of its degree of certainty. When we have arrived at its premisses, we may find that some of them seem open to doubt, and we may find further that this doubt extends to those of our original data which depend upon these doubtful premisses. In our third lecture, for example, we saw that the part of physics which depends upon testimony, and thus upon the existence of other minds than our own, does not seem so certain as the part which depends exclusively upon our own sense-data and the laws of logic. Similarly, it used to be felt that the parts of geometry which depend upon the axiom of parallels have less certainty than the parts which are independent of this premiss. We may say, generally, that what commonly passes as knowledge is not all equally certain, and that, when analysis into premisses has been effected, the degree of certainty of any consequence of the premisses will depend upon that of the most doubtful premiss employed in proving this consequence. Thus analysis into premisses serves not only a logical purpose, but also the purpose of facilitating an estimate as to the degree of certainty to be attached to this or that derivative belief. In view of the fallibility of all human beliefs, this service seems at least as important as the purely logical services rendered by philosophical analysis.

In the present lecture, I wish to apply the analytic method to the notion of "cause," and to illustrate the discussion by applying it to the problem of free will. For this purpose I shall inquire: I., what is meant by a causal law; II., what is the evidence that causal laws have held hitherto; III., what is the evidence that they will continue to hold in the future; IV., how the causality which is used in science differs from that of common sense and traditional philosophy; V., what new light is thrown on the question of free will by our analysis of the notion of "cause."

I. By a "causal law" I mean any general proposition in virtue of which it is possible to infer the existence of one thing or event from the existence of another or of a number of others. If you hear thunder without having seen lightning, you infer that there nevertheless was a flash, because of the general proposition, "All thunder is preceded by lightning." When Robinson Crusoe sees a footprint, he infers a human being, and he might justify his inference by the general proposition, "All marks in the ground shaped like a human foot are subsequent to a human being's standing where the marks are." When we see the sun set, we expect that it will rise again the next day. When we hear a man speaking, we infer that he has certain thoughts. All these inferences are due to causal laws.

A causal law, we said, allows us to infer the existence of one _thing_ (or _event_) from the existence of one or more others. The word "thing" here is to be understood as only applying to particulars, _i.e._ as excluding such logical objects as numbers or classes or abstract properties and relations, and including sense-data, with whatever is logically of the same type as sense-data.[56] In so

far as a causal law is directly verifiable, the thing inferred and the thing from which it is inferred must both be data, though they need not both be data at the same time. In fact, a causal law which is being used to extend our knowledge of existence must be applied to what, at the moment, is not a datum; it is in the possibility of such application that the practical utility of a causal law consists. The important point, for our present purpose, however, is that what is inferred is a "thing," a "particular," an object having the kind of reality that belongs to objects of sense, not an abstract object such as virtue or the square root of two.

[56] Thus we are not using "thing" here in the sense of a class of correlated "aspects," as we did in Lecture III. Each "aspect" will count separately in stating causal laws.

But we cannot become acquainted with a particular except by its being actually given. Hence the particular inferred by a causal law must be only _described_ with more or less exactness; it cannot be _named_ until the inference is verified. Moreover, since the causal law is _general_, and capable of applying to many cases, the given particular from which we infer must allow the inference in virtue of some general characteristic, not in virtue of its being just the particular that it is. This is obvious in all our previous instances: we infer the unperceived lightning from the thunder, not in virtue of any peculiarity of the thunder, but in virtue of its resemblance to other claps of thunder. Thus a causal law must state that the existence of a thing of a certain sort (or of a number of things of a number of assigned sorts) implies the existence of another thing having a relation to the first which remains invariable so long as the first is of the kind in question.

It is to be observed that what is constant in a causal law is not the object or objects given, nor yet the object inferred, both of which may vary within wide limits, but the _relation_ between what is given and what is inferred. The principle, "same cause, same effect," which is sometimes said to be the principle of causality, is much narrower in its scope than the principle which really occurs in science; indeed, if strictly interpreted, it has no scope at all, since the "same" cause never recurs exactly. We shall return to this point at a later stage of the discussion.

The particular which is inferred may be uniquely determined by the causal law, or may be only described in such general terms that many different particulars might satisfy the description. This depends upon whether the constant relation affirmed by the causal law is one which only one term can have to the data, or one which many terms may have. If many terms may have the relation in question, science will not be satisfied until it has found some more stringent law, which will enable us to determine the inferred things uniquely.

Since all known things are in time, a causal law must take account of temporal relations. It will be part of the causal law to state a relation of succession or coexistence between the thing given and the thing inferred. When we hear thunder and infer that there was lightning, the law states that the thing inferred is earlier than the thing given. Conversely, when we see lightning and wait expectantly for the thunder, the law states that the thing given is earlier than the thing inferred. When we infer a man's thoughts from his words, the law states that the two are (at least approximately) simultaneous.

If a causal law is to achieve the precision at which science aims, it must not be content with a vague _earlier_ or _later_, but must state how much earlier or how much later. That is to say, the time-relation between the thing given and the thing inferred ought to be capable of exact statement; and usually the inference to be drawn is different according to the length and direction of the interval. "A quarter of an hour ago this man was alive; an hour hence he will be cold." Such a statement involves two causal laws, one inferring from a datum something which existed a quarter of an hour ago, the other inferring from the same datum something which will exist an hour hence.

Often a causal law involves not one datum, but many, which need not be all simultaneous with each other, though their time-relations must be given. The general scheme of a causal law will be as follows:

"Whenever things occur in certain relations to each other (among which their time-relations must be included), then a thing having a fixed relation to these things will occur at a date fixed relatively to their dates."

The things given will not, in practice, be things that only exist for an instant, for such things, if there are any, can never be data. The things given will each occupy some finite time. They may be not static things, but processes, especially motions. We have considered in an earlier lecture the sense in which a motion may be a datum, and need not now recur to this topic.

It is not essential to a causal law that the object inferred should be later than some or all of the data. It may equally well be earlier or at the same time. The only thing essential is that the law should be such as to enable us to infer the existence of an object which we can more or less accurately describe in terms of the data.

II. I come now to our second question, namely: What is the nature of the evidence that causal laws have held hitherto, at least in the observed portions of the past? This question must not be confused with the further question: Does this evidence warrant us in assuming the truth of causal laws in the future and in unobserved portions of the past? For the present, I am only asking what are the grounds which lead to a belief in causal laws, not whether these grounds are adequate to support the belief in universal causation.

The first step is the discovery of approximate unanalysed uniformities of sequence or coexistence. After lightning comes thunder, after a blow received comes pain, after approaching a fire comes warmth; again, there are uniformities of coexistence, for example between touch and sight, between certain sensations in the throat and the sound of one's own voice, and so on. Every such uniformity of sequence or coexistence, after it has been experienced a certain number of times, is followed by an expectation that it will be repeated on future occasions, _i.e._ that where one of the correlated events is found, the other will be found also. The connection of experienced past uniformity with expectation as to the future is just one of those uniformities of sequence which we have observed to be true hitherto. This affords a psychological account of what may be called the animal belief in causation, because it is something which can be observed in horses and dogs, and is rather a habit of acting than a real belief. So far, we have merely repeated Hume, who carried the discussion of cause up to this point, but did not, apparently, perceive how much remained to be said.

Is there, in fact, any characteristic, such as might be called causality or uniformity, which is found to hold throughout the observed past? And if so, how is it to be stated?

The particular uniformities which we mentioned before, such as lightning being followed by thunder, are not found to be free from exceptions. We sometimes see lightning without hearing thunder; and although, in such a case, we suppose that thunder might have been heard if we had been nearer to the lightning, that is a supposition based on theory, and therefore incapable of being invoked to support the theory. What does seem, however, to be shown by scientific experience is this: that where an observed uniformity fails, some wider uniformity can be found, embracing more circumstances, and subsuming both the successes and the failures of the previous uniformity. Unsupported bodies in air fall, unless they are balloons or aeroplanes; but the principles of mechanics give uniformities which apply to balloons and aeroplanes just as accurately as to bodies that fall. There is much that is hypothetical and more or less artificial in the uniformities affirmed by mechanics, because, when they cannot otherwise be made applicable, unobserved bodies are inferred in order to account for observed peculiarities. Still, it is an empirical fact that it is possible to preserve the laws by assuming such bodies, and that they never have to be assumed in circumstances in which they ought to be observable. Thus the empirical verification of mechanical laws may be admitted, although we must also admit that it is less complete and triumphant than is sometimes supposed.

Assuming now, what must be admitted to be doubtful, that the whole of the past has proceeded according to invariable laws, what can we say as to the nature of these laws? They will not be of the simple type which asserts that the same cause always produces the same effect. We may take the law of gravitation as a sample of the kind of law that appears to be verified without exception. In order to state this law in a form which observation can confirm, we will confine it to the solar system. It then states that the motions of planets and their satellites have at every instant an acceleration compounded of accelerations towards all the other bodies in the solar system, proportional to the masses of those bodies and inversely proportional to the squares of their distances. In virtue of this law, given the state of the solar system throughout any finite time, however short, its state at all earlier and later times is determinate except in so far as other forces than gravitation or other bodies than those in the solar system have to be taken into consideration. But other forces, so far as science can discover, appear to be equally regular, and equally capable of being summed up in single causal laws. If the mechanical account of matter were complete, the whole physical history of the universe, past and future, could be inferred from a sufficient number of data concerning an assigned finite time, however short.

In the mental world, the evidence for the universality of causal laws is less complete than in the physical world. Psychology cannot boast of any triumph comparable to gravitational astronomy. Nevertheless, the evidence is not very greatly less than in the physical world. The crude and approximate causal laws from which science starts are just as easy to discover in the mental sphere as in the physical. In the world of sense, there are to begin with the correlations of sight and touch and so on, and the facts which lead us to connect various kinds of sensations with eyes, ears, nose, tongue, etc. Then there are such facts as that our body moves in answer to our volitions. Exceptions exist, but are capable of being explained as easily as the exceptions to the rule that unsupported bodies in air fall. There is, in fact, just such a degree of evidence for causal laws in psychology as will warrant the psychologist in assuming them as a matter of course, though not such a degree as will suffice to remove all doubt from the mind of a sceptical inquirer. It

should be observed that causal laws in which the given term is mental and the inferred term physical, or _vice versa_, are at least as easy to discover as causal laws in which both terms are mental.

It will be noticed that, although we have spoken of causal laws, we have not hitherto introduced the word "cause." At this stage, it will be well to say a few words on legitimate and illegitimate uses of this word. The word "cause," in the scientific account of the world, belongs only to the early stages, in which small preliminary, approximate generalisations are being ascertained with a view to subsequent larger and more invariable laws. We may say, "Arsenic causes death," so long as we are ignorant of the precise process by which the result is brought about. But in a sufficiently advanced science, the word "cause" will not occur in any statement of invariable laws. There is, however, a somewhat rough and loose use of the word "cause" which may be preserved. The approximate uniformities which lead to its pre-scientific employment may turn out to be true in all but very rare and exceptional circumstances, perhaps in all circumstances that actually occur. In such cases, it is convenient to be able to speak of the antecedent event as the "cause" and the subsequent event as the "effect." In this sense, provided it is realised that the sequence is not necessary and may have exceptions, it is still possible to employ the words "cause" and "effect." It is in this sense, and in this sense only, that we shall intend the words when we speak of one particular event "causing" another particular event, as we must sometimes do if we are to avoid intolerable circumlocution.

III. We come now to our third question, namely: What reason can be given for believing that causal laws will hold in future, or that they have held in unobserved portions of the past?

What we have said so far is that there have been hitherto certain observed causal laws, and that all the empirical evidence we possess is compatible with the view that everything, both mental and physical, so far as our observation has extended, has happened in accordance with causal laws. The law of universal causation, suggested by these facts, may be enunciated as follows:

"There are such invariable relations between different events at the same or different times that, given the state of the whole universe throughout any finite time, however short, every previous and subsequent event can theoretically be determined as a function of the given events during that time."

Have we any reason to believe this universal law? Or, to ask a more modest question, have we any reason to believe that a particular causal law, such as the law of gravitation, will continue to hold in the future?

Among observed causal laws is this, that observation of uniformities is followed by expectation of their recurrence. A horse who has been driven always along a certain road expects to be driven along that road again; a dog who is always fed at a certain hour expects food at that hour and not at any other. Such expectations, as Hume pointed out, explain only too well the common-sense belief in uniformities of sequence, but they afford absolutely no logical ground for beliefs as to the future, not even for the belief that we shall continue to expect the continuation of experienced uniformities, for that is precisely one of those causal laws for which a ground has to be sought. If Hume's account of causation is the last word, we have not only no reason to suppose that the sun will rise to-morrow, but no reason to suppose that five minutes hence we shall still expect it to rise to-morrow.

It may, of course, be said that all inferences as to the future are in fact invalid, and I do not see how such a view could be disproved. But, while admitting the legitimacy of such a view, we may nevertheless inquire: If inferences as to the future _are_ valid, what principle must be involved in making them?

The principle involved is the principle of induction, which, if it is true, must be an _a priori_ logical law, not capable of being proved or disproved by experience. It is a difficult question how this principle ought to be formulated; but if it is to warrant the inferences which we wish to make by its means, it must lead to the following proposition: "If, in a great number of instances, a thing of a certain kind is associated in a certain way with a thing of a certain other kind, it is probable that a thing of the one kind is always similarly associated with a thing of the other kind; and as the number of instances increases, the probability approaches indefinitely near to certainty." It may well be questioned whether this proposition is true; but if we admit it, we can infer that any characteristic of the whole of the observed past is likely to apply to the future and to the unobserved past. This proposition, therefore, if it is true, will warrant the inference that causal laws probably hold at all times, future as well as past; but without this principle, the observed cases of the truth of causal laws afford no presumption as to the unobserved cases, and therefore the existence of a thing not directly observed can never be validly inferred.

It is thus the principle of induction, rather than the law of causality, which is at the bottom of all inferences as to the existence of things not immediately given. With the principle of induction, all that is wanted for such inferences can be proved; without it, all such

inferences are invalid. This principle has not received the attention which its great importance deserves. Those who were interested in deductive logic naturally enough ignored it, while those who emphasised the scope of induction wished to maintain that all logic is empirical, and therefore could not be expected to realise that induction itself, their own darling, required a logical principle which obviously could not be proved inductively, and must therefore be _a priori_ if it could be known at all.

The view that the law of causality itself is _a priori_ cannot, I think, be maintained by anyone who realises what a complicated principle it is. In the form which states that "every event has a cause" it looks simple; but on examination, "cause" is merged in "causal law," and the definition of a "causal law" is found to be far from simple. There must necessarily be _some a priori_ principle involved in inference from the existence of one thing to that of another, if such inference is ever valid; but it would appear from the above analysis that the principle in question is induction, not causality. Whether inferences from past to future are valid depends wholly, if our discussion has been sound, upon the inductive principle: if it is true, such inferences are valid, and if it is false, they are invalid.

IV. I come now to the question how the conception of causal laws which we have arrived at is related to the traditional conception of cause as it occurs in philosophy and common sense.

Historically, the notion of cause has been bound up with that of human volition. The typical cause would be the fiat of a king. The cause is supposed to be "active," the effect "passive." From this it is easy to pass on to the suggestion that a "true" cause must contain some prevision of the effect; hence the effect becomes the "end" at which the cause aims, and teleology replaces causation in the explanation of nature. But all such ideas, as applied to physics, are mere anthropomorphic superstitions. It is as a reaction against these errors that Mach and others have urged a purely "descriptive" view of physics: physics, they say, does not aim at telling us "why" things happen, but only "how" they happen. And if the question "why?" means anything more than the search for a general law according to which a phenomenon occurs, then it is certainly the case that this question cannot be answered in physics and ought not to be asked. In this sense, the descriptive view is indubitably in the right. But in using causal laws to support inferences from the observed to the unobserved, physics ceases to be _purely_ descriptive, and it is these laws which give the scientifically useful part of the traditional notion of "cause." There is therefore _something_ to preserve in this notion, though it is a very tiny part of what is commonly assumed in orthodox metaphysics.

In order to understand the difference between the kind of cause which science uses and the kind which we naturally imagine, it is necessary to shut out, by an effort, everything that differentiates between past and future. This is an extraordinarily difficult thing to do, because our mental life is so intimately bound up with difference. Not only do memory and hope make a difference in our feelings as regards past and future, but almost our whole vocabulary is filled with the idea of activity, of things done now for the sake of their future effects. All transitive verbs involve the notion of cause as activity, and would have to be replaced by some cumbrous periphrasis before this notion could be eliminated.

Consider such a statement as, "Brutus killed Caesar." On another occasion, Brutus and Caesar might engage our attention, but for the present it is the killing that we have to study. We may say that to kill a person is to cause his death intentionally. This means that desire for a person's death causes a certain act, because it is believed that that act will cause the person's death; or more accurately, the desire and the belief jointly cause the act. Brutus desires that Caesar should be dead, and believes that he will be dead if he is stabbed; Brutus therefore stabs him, and the stab causes Caesar's death, as Brutus expected it would. Every act which realises a purpose involves two causal steps in this way: C is desired, and it is believed (truly if the purpose is achieved) that B will cause C; the desire and the belief together cause B, which in turn causes C. Thus we have first A, which is a desire for C and a belief that B (an act) will cause C; then we have B, the act caused by A, and believed to be a cause of C; then, if the belief was correct, we have C, caused by B, and if the belief was incorrect we have disappointment. Regarded purely scientifically, this series A, B, C may equally well be considered in the inverse order, as they would be at a coroner's inquest. But from the point of view of Brutus, the desire, which comes at the beginning, is what makes the whole series interesting. We feel that if his desires had been different, the effects which he in fact produced would not have occurred. This is true, and gives him a sense of power and freedom. It is equally true that if the effects had not occurred, his desires would have been different, since being what they were the effects did occur. Thus the desires are determined by their consequences just as much as the consequences by the desires; but as we cannot (in general) know in advance the consequences of our desires without knowing our desires, this form of inference is uninteresting as applied to our own acts, though quite vital as applied to those of others.

A cause, considered scientifically, has none of that analogy with volition which makes us imagine that the effect is _compelled_ by it. A cause is an event or group of events, of some known general character, and having a known relation to some other event,

called the effect; the relation being of such a kind that only one event, or at any rate only one well-defined sort of event, can have the relation to a given cause. It is customary only to give the name "effect" to an event which is later than the cause, but there is no kind of reason for this restriction. We shall do better to allow the effect to be before the cause or simultaneous with it, because nothing of any scientific importance depends upon its being after the cause.

If the inference from cause to effect is to be indubitable, it seems that the cause can hardly stop short of the whole universe. So long as anything is left out, something may be left out which alters the expected result. But for practical and scientific purposes, phenomena can be collected into groups which are causally self-contained, or nearly so. In the common notion of causation, the cause is a single event--we say the lightning causes the thunder, and so on. But it is difficult to know what we mean by a single event; and it generally appears that, in order to have anything approaching certainty concerning the effect, it is necessary to include many more circumstances in the cause than unscientific common sense would suppose. But often a probable causal connection, where the cause is fairly simple, is of more practical importance than a more indubitable connection in which the cause is so complex as to be hard to ascertain.

To sum up: the strict, certain, universal law of causation which philosophers advocate is an ideal, possibly true, but not _known_ to be true in virtue of any available evidence. What is actually known, as a matter of empirical science, is that certain constant relations are observed to hold between the members of a group of events at certain times, and that when such relations fail, as they sometimes do, it is usually possible to discover a new, more constant relation by enlarging the group. Any such constant relation between events of specified kinds with given intervals of time between them is a "causal law." But all causal laws are liable to exceptions, if the cause is less than the whole state of the universe; we believe, on the basis of a good deal of experience, that such exceptions can be dealt with by enlarging the group we call the cause, but this belief, wherever it is still unverified, ought not to be regarded as certain, but only as suggesting a direction for further inquiry.

A very common causal group consists of volitions and the consequent bodily acts, though exceptions arise (for example) through sudden paralysis. Another very frequent connection (though here the exceptions are much more numerous) is between a bodily act and the realisation of the purpose which led to the act. These connections are patent, whereas the causes of desires are more obscure. Thus it is natural to begin causal series with desires, to suppose that all causes are analogous to desires, and that desires themselves arise spontaneously. Such a view, however, is not one which any serious psychologist would maintain. But this brings us to the question of the application of our analysis of cause to the problem of free will.

V. The problem of free will is so intimately bound up with the analysis of causation that, old as it is, we need not despair of obtaining new light on it by the help of new views on the notion of cause. The free-will problem has, at one time or another, stirred men's passions profoundly, and the fear that the will might not be free has been to some men a source of great unhappiness. I believe that, under the influence of a cool analysis, the doubtful questions involved will be found to have no such emotional importance as is sometimes thought, since the disagreeable consequences supposed to flow from a denial of free will do not flow from this denial in any form in which there is reason to make it. It is not, however, on this account chiefly that I wish to discuss this problem, but rather because it affords a good example of the clarifying effect of analysis and of the interminable controversies which may result from its neglect.

Let us first try to discover what it is we really desire when we desire free will. Some of our reasons for desiring free will are profound, some trivial. To begin with the former: we do not wish to feel ourselves in the hands of fate, so that, however much we may desire to will one thing, we may nevertheless be compelled by an outside force to will another. We do not wish to think that, however much we may desire to act well, heredity and surroundings may force us into acting ill. We wish to feel that, in cases of doubt, our choice is momentous and lies within our power. Besides these desires, which are worthy of all respect, we have, however, others not so respectable, which equally make us desire free will. We do not like to think that other people, if they knew enough, could predict our actions, though we know that we can often predict those of other people, especially if they are elderly. Much as we esteem the old gentleman who is our neighbour in the country, we know that when grouse are mentioned he will tell the story of the grouse in the gun-room. But we ourselves are not so mechanical: we never tell an anecdote to the same person twice, or even once unless he is sure to enjoy it; although we once met (say) Bismarck, we are quite capable of hearing him mentioned without relating the occasion when we met him. In this sense, everybody thinks that he himself has free will, though he knows that no one else has. The desire for this kind of free will seems to be no better than a form of vanity. I do not believe that this desire can be gratified with any certainty; but the other, more respectable desires are, I believe, not inconsistent with any tenable form of determinism.

We have thus two questions to consider: (1) Are human actions theoretically predictable from a sufficient number of antecedents? (2) Are human actions subject to an external compulsion? The two questions, as I shall try to show, are entirely distinct, and we may answer the first in the affirmative without therefore being forced to give an affirmative answer to the second.

(1) _Are human actions theoretically predictable from a sufficient number of antecedents?_ Let us first endeavour to give precision to this question. We may state the question thus: Is there some constant relation between an act and a certain number of earlier events, such that, when the earlier events are given, only one act, or at most only acts with some well-marked character, can have this relation to the earlier events? If this is the case, then, as soon as the earlier events are known, it is theoretically possible to predict either the precise act, or at least the character necessary to its fulfilling the constant relation.

To this question, a negative answer has been given by Bergson, in a form which calls in question the general applicability of the law of causation. He maintains that every event, and more particularly every mental event, embodies so much of the past that it could not possibly have occurred at any earlier time, and is therefore necessarily quite different from all previous and subsequent events. If, for example, I read a certain poem many times, my experience on each occasion is modified by the previous readings, and my emotions are never repeated exactly. The principle of causation, according to him, asserts that the same cause, if repeated, will produce the same effect. But owing to memory, he contends, this principle does not apply to mental events. What is apparently the same cause, if repeated, is modified by the mere fact of repetition, and cannot produce the same effect. He infers that every mental event is a genuine novelty, not predictable from the past, because the past contains nothing exactly like it by which we could imagine it. And on this ground he regards the freedom of the will as unassailable.

Bergson's contention has undoubtedly a great deal of truth, and I have no wish to deny its importance. But I do not think its consequences are quite what he believes them to be. It is not necessary for the determinist to maintain that he can foresee the whole particularity of the act which will be performed. If he could foresee that A was going to murder B, his foresight would not be invalidated by the fact that he could not know all the infinite complexity of A's state of mind in committing the murder, nor whether the murder was to be performed with a knife or with a revolver. If the _kind_ of act which will be performed can be foreseen within narrow limits, it is of little practical interest that there are fine shades which cannot be foreseen. No doubt every time the story of the grouse in the gun-room is told, there will be slight differences due to increasing habitualness, but they do not invalidate the prediction that the story will be told. And there is nothing in Bergson's argument to show that we can never predict what _kind_ of act will be performed.

Again, his statement of the law of causation is inadequate. The law does not state merely that, if the _same_ cause is repeated, the _same_ effect will result. It states rather that there is a constant relation between causes of certain kinds and effects of certain kinds. For example, if a body falls freely, there is a constant relation between the height through which it falls and the time it takes in falling. It is not necessary to have a body fall through the _same_ height which has been previously observed, in order to be able to foretell the length of time occupied in falling. If this were necessary, no prediction would be possible, since it would be impossible to make the height exactly the same on two occasions. Similarly, the attraction which the sun will exert on the earth is not only known at distances for which it has been observed, but at all distances, because it is known to vary as the inverse square of the distance. In fact, what is found to be repeated is always the _relation_ of cause and effect, not the cause itself; all that is necessary as regards the cause is that it should be of the same _kind_ (in the relevant respect) as earlier causes whose effects have been observed.

Another respect in which Bergson's statement of causation is inadequate is in its assumption that the cause must be _one_ event, whereas it may be two or more events, or even some continuous process. The substantive question at issue is whether mental events are determined by the past. Now in such a case as the repeated reading of a poem, it is obvious that our feelings in reading the poem are most emphatically dependent upon the past, but not upon one single event in the past. All our previous readings of the poem must be included in the cause. But we easily perceive a certain law according to which the effect varies as the previous readings increase in number, and in fact Bergson himself tacitly assumes such a law. We decide at last not to read the poem again, because we know that this time the effect would be boredom. We may not know all the niceties and shades of the boredom we should feel, but we know enough to guide our decision, and the prophecy of boredom is none the less true for being more or less general. Thus the kinds of cases upon which Bergson relies are insufficient to show the impossibility of prediction in the only sense in which prediction has practical or emotional interest. We may therefore leave the consideration of his arguments and address ourselves to the problem directly.

The law of causation, according to which later events can theoretically be predicted by means of earlier events, has often been held to be _a priori_, a necessity of thought, a category without which science would be impossible. These claims seem to me excessive. In certain directions the law has been verified empirically, and in other directions there is no positive evidence against it. But science can use it where it has been found to be true, without being forced into any assumption as to its truth in other fields. We cannot, therefore, feel any _a priori_ certainty that causation must apply to human volitions.

The question how far human volitions are subject to causal laws is a purely empirical one. Empirically it seems plain that the great majority of our volitions have causes, but it cannot, on this account, be held necessarily certain that all have causes. There are, however, precisely the same kinds of reasons for regarding it as probable that they all have causes as there are in the case of physical events.

We may suppose--though this is doubtful--that there are laws of correlation of the mental and the physical, in virtue of which, given the state of all the matter in the world, and therefore of all the brains and living organisms, the state of all the minds in the world could be inferred, while conversely the state of all the matter in the world could be inferred if the state of all the minds were given. It is obvious that there is _some_ degree of correlation between brain and mind, and it is impossible to say how complete it may be. This, however, is not the point which I wish to elicit. What I wish to urge is that, even if we admit the most extreme claims of determinism and of correlation of mind and brain, still the consequences inimical to what is worth preserving in free will do not follow. The belief that they follow results, I think, entirely from the assimilation of causes to volitions, and from the notion that causes _compel_ their effects in some sense analogous to that in which a human authority can compel a man to do what he would rather not do. This assimilation, as soon as the true nature of scientific causal laws is realised, is seen to be a sheer mistake. But this brings us to the second of the two questions which we raised in regard to free will, namely, whether, assuming determinism, our actions can be in any proper sense regarded as compelled by outside forces.

(2) _Are human actions subject to an external compulsion?_ We have, in deliberation, a subjective sense of freedom, which is sometimes alleged against the view that volitions have causes. This sense of freedom, however, is only a sense that we can choose which we please of a number of alternatives: it does not show us that there is no causal connection between what we please to choose and our previous history. The supposed inconsistency of these two springs from the habit of conceiving causes as analogous to volitions--a habit which often survives unconsciously in those who intend to conceive causes in a more scientific manner. If a cause is analogous to a volition, outside causes will be analogous to an alien will, and acts predictable from outside causes will be subject to compulsion. But this view of cause is one to which science lends no countenance. Causes, we have seen, do not _compel_ their effects, any more than effects _compel_ their causes. There is a mutual relation, so that either can be inferred from the other. When the geologist infers the past state of the earth from its present state, we should not say that the present state _compels_ the past state to have been what it was; yet it renders it necessary as a consequence of the data, in the only sense in which effects are rendered necessary by their causes. The difference which we _feel_, in this respect, between causes and effects is a mere confusion due to the fact that we remember past events but do not happen to have memory of the future.

The apparent indeterminateness of the future, upon which some advocates of free will rely, is merely a result of our ignorance. It is plain that no desirable kind of free will can be dependent simply upon our ignorance; for if that were the case, animals would be more free than men, and savages than civilised people. Free will in any valuable sense must be compatible with the fullest knowledge. Now, quite apart from any assumption as to causality, it is obvious that complete knowledge would embrace the future as well as the past. Our knowledge of the past is not wholly based upon causal inferences, but is partly derived from memory. It is a mere accident that we have no memory of the future. We might--as in the pretended visions of seers--see future events immediately, in the way in which we see past events. They certainly will be what they will be, and are in this sense just as determined as the past. If we saw future events in the same immediate way in which we see past events, what kind of free will would still be possible? Such a kind would be wholly independent of determinism: it could not be contrary to even the most entirely universal reign of causality. And such a kind must contain whatever is worth having in free will, since it is impossible to believe that mere ignorance can be the essential condition of any good thing. Let us therefore imagine a set of beings who know the whole future with absolute certainty, and let us ask ourselves whether they could have anything that we should call free will.

Such beings as we are imagining would not have to wait for the event in order to know what decision they were going to adopt on some future occasion. They would know now what their volitions were going to be. But would they have any reason to regret this knowledge? Surely not, unless the foreseen volitions were in themselves regrettable. And it is less likely that the foreseen volitions would be regrettable if the steps which would lead to them were also foreseen. It is difficult not to suppose that what is foreseen is

fated, and must happen however much it may be dreaded. But human actions are the outcome of desire, and no foreseeing can be true unless it takes account of desire. A foreseen volition will have to be one which does not become odious through being foreseen. The beings we are imagining would easily come to know the causal connections of volitions, and therefore their volitions would be better calculated to satisfy their desires than ours are. Since volitions are the outcome of desires, a prevision of volitions contrary to desires could not be a true one. It must be remembered that the supposed prevision would not create the future any more than memory creates the past. We do not think we were necessarily not free in the past, merely because we can now remember our past volitions. Similarly, we might be free in the future, even if we could now see what our future volitions were going to be. Freedom, in short, in any valuable sense, demands only that our volitions shall be, as they are, the result of our own desires, not of an outside force compelling us to will what we would rather not will. Everything else is confusion of thought, due to the feeling that knowledge _compels_ the happening of what it knows when this is future, though it is at once obvious that knowledge has no such power in regard to the past. Free will, therefore, is true in the only form which is important; and the desire for other forms is a mere effect of insufficient analysis.

* * * * *

What has been said on philosophical method in the foregoing lectures has been rather by means of illustrations in particular cases than by means of general precepts. Nothing of any value can be said on method except through examples; but now, at the end of our course, we may collect certain general maxims which may possibly be a help in acquiring a philosophical habit of mind and a guide in looking for solutions of philosophic problems.

Philosophy does not become scientific by making use of other sciences, in the kind of way in which (_e.g._) Herbert Spencer does. Philosophy aims at what is _general_, and the special sciences, however they may _suggest_ large generalisations, cannot make them certain. And a hasty generalisation, such as Spencer's generalisation of evolution, is none the less hasty because what is generalised is the latest scientific theory. Philosophy is a study apart from the other sciences: its results cannot be established by the other sciences, and conversely must not be such as some other science might conceivably contradict. Prophecies as to the future of the universe, for example, are not the business of philosophy; whether the universe is progressive, retrograde, or stationary, it is not for the philosopher to say.

In order to become a scientific philosopher, a certain peculiar mental discipline is required. There must be present, first of all, the desire to know philosophical truth, and this desire must be sufficiently strong to survive through years when there seems no hope of its finding any satisfaction. The desire to know philosophical truth is very rare--in its purity, it is not often found even among philosophers. It is obscured sometimes--particularly after long periods of fruitless search--by the desire to _think_ we know. Some plausible opinion presents itself, and by turning our attention away from the objections to it, or merely by not making great efforts to find objections to it, we may obtain the comfort of believing it, although, if we had resisted the wish for comfort, we should have come to see that the opinion was false. Again the desire for unadulterated truth is often obscured, in professional philosophers, by love of system: the one little fact which will not come inside the philosopher's edifice has to be pushed and tortured until it seems to consent. Yet the one little fact is more likely to be important for the future than the system with which it is inconsistent. Pythagoras invented a system which fitted admirably with all the facts he knew, except the incommensurability of the diagonal of a square and the side; this one little fact stood out, and remained a fact even after Hippasos of Metapontion was drowned for revealing it. To us, the discovery of this fact is the chief claim of Pythagoras to immortality, while his system has become a matter of merely historical curiosity.[57] Love of system, therefore, and the system-maker's vanity which becomes associated with it, are among the snares that the student of philosophy must guard against.

[57] The above remarks, for purposes of illustration, adopt one of several possible opinions on each of several disputed points.

The desire to establish this or that result, or generally to discover evidence for agreeable results, of whatever kind, has of course been the chief obstacle to honest philosophising. So strangely perverted do men become by unrecognised passions, that a determination in advance to arrive at this or that conclusion is generally regarded as a mark of virtue, and those whose studies lead to an opposite conclusion are thought to be wicked. No doubt it is commoner to wish to arrive at an agreeable result than to wish to arrive at a true result. But only those in whom the desire to arrive at a _true_ result is paramount can hope to serve any good purpose by the study of philosophy.

But even when the desire to know exists in the requisite strength, the mental vision by which abstract truth is recognised is hard to distinguish from vivid imaginability and consonance with mental habits. It is necessary to practise methodological doubt, like

Descartes, in order to loosen the hold of mental habits; and it is necessary to cultivate logical imagination, in order to have a number of hypotheses at command, and not to be the slave of the one which common sense has rendered easy to imagine. These two processes, of doubting the familiar and imagining the unfamiliar, are correlative, and form the chief part of the mental training required for a philosopher.

The naive beliefs which we find in ourselves when we first begin the process of philosophic reflection may turn out, in the end, to be almost all capable of a true interpretation; but they ought all, before being admitted into philosophy, to undergo the ordeal of sceptical criticism. Until they have gone through this ordeal, they are mere blind habits, ways of behaving rather than intellectual convictions. And although it may be that a majority will pass the test, we may be pretty sure that some will not, and that a serious readjustment of our outlook ought to result. In order to break the dominion of habit, we must do our best to doubt the senses, reason, morals, everything in short. In some directions, doubt will be found possible; in others, it will be checked by that direct vision of abstract truth upon which the possibility of philosophical knowledge depends.

At the same time, and as an essential aid to the direct perception of the truth, it is necessary to acquire fertility in imagining abstract hypotheses. This is, I think, what has most of all been lacking hitherto in philosophy. So meagre was the logical apparatus that all the hypotheses philosophers could imagine were found to be inconsistent with the facts. Too often this state of things led to the adoption of heroic measures, such as a wholesale denial of the facts, when an imagination better stocked with logical tools would have found a key to unlock the mystery. It is in this way that the study of logic becomes the central study in philosophy: it gives the method of research in philosophy, just as mathematics gives the method in physics. And as physics, which, from Plato to the Renaissance, was as unprogressive, dim, and superstitious as philosophy, became a science through Galileo's fresh observation of facts and subsequent mathematical manipulation, so philosophy, in our own day, is becoming scientific through the simultaneous acquisition of new facts and logical methods.

In spite, however, of the new possibility of progress in philosophy, the first effect, as in the case of physics, is to diminish very greatly the extent of what is thought to be known. Before Galileo, people believed themselves possessed of immense knowledge on all the most interesting questions in physics. He established certain facts as to the way in which bodies fall, not very interesting on their own account, but of quite immeasurable interest as examples of real knowledge and of a new method whose future fruitfulness he himself divined. But his few facts sufficed to destroy the whole vast system of supposed knowledge handed down from Aristotle, as even the palest morning sun suffices to extinguish the stars. So in philosophy: though some have believed one system, and others another, almost all have been of opinion that a great deal was known; but all this supposed knowledge in the traditional systems must be swept away, and a new beginning must be made, which we shall esteem fortunate indeed if it can attain results comparable to Galileo's law of falling bodies.

By the practice of methodological doubt, if it is genuine and prolonged, a certain humility as to our knowledge is induced: we become glad to know _anything_ in philosophy, however seemingly trivial. Philosophy has suffered from the lack of this kind of modesty. It has made the mistake of attacking the interesting problems at once, instead of proceeding patiently and slowly, accumulating whatever solid knowledge was obtainable, and trusting the great problems to the future. Men of science are not ashamed of what is intrinsically trivial, if its consequences are likely to be important; the _immediate_ outcome of an experiment is hardly ever interesting on its own account. So in philosophy, it is often desirable to expend time and care on matters which, judged alone, might seem frivolous, for it is often only through the consideration of such matters that the greater problems can be approached.

When our problem has been selected, and the necessary mental discipline has been acquired, the method to be pursued is fairly uniform. The big problems which provoke philosophical inquiry are found, on examination, to be complex, and to depend upon a number of component problems, usually more abstract than those of which they are the components. It will generally be found that all our initial data, all the facts that we seem to know to begin with, suffer from vagueness, confusion, and complexity. Current philosophical ideas share these defects; it is therefore necessary to create an apparatus of precise conceptions as general and as free from complexity as possible, before the data can be analysed into the kind of premisses which philosophy aims at discovering. In this process of analysis, the source of difficulty is tracked further and further back, growing at each stage more abstract, more refined, more difficult to apprehend. Usually it will be found that a number of these extraordinarily abstract questions underlie any one of the big obvious problems. When everything has been done that can be done by method, a stage is reached where only direct philosophic vision can carry matters further. Here only genius will avail. What is wanted, as a rule, is some new effort of logical imagination, some glimpse of a possibility never conceived before, and then the direct perception that this possibility is realised in the case in question. Failure to think of the right possibility leaves insoluble difficulties, balanced arguments pro and con,

utter bewilderment and despair. But the right possibility, as a rule, when once conceived, justifies itself swiftly by its astonishing power of absorbing apparently conflicting facts. From this point onward, the work of the philosopher is synthetic and comparatively easy; it is in the very last stage of the analysis that the real difficulty consists.

Of the prospect of progress in philosophy, it would be rash to speak with confidence. Many of the traditional problems of philosophy, perhaps most of those which have interested a wider circle than that of technical students, do not appear to be soluble by scientific methods. Just as astronomy lost much of its human interest when it ceased to be astrology, so philosophy must lose in attractiveness as it grows less prodigal of promises. But to the large and still growing body of men engaged in the pursuit of science--men who hitherto, not without justification, have turned aside from philosophy with a certain contempt--the new method, successful already in such time-honoured problems as number, infinity, continuity, space and time, should make an appeal which the older methods have wholly failed to make. Physics, with its principle of relativity and its revolutionary investigations into the nature of matter, is feeling the need for that kind of novelty in fundamental hypotheses which scientific philosophy aims at facilitating. The one and only condition, I believe, which is necessary in order to secure for philosophy in the near future an achievement surpassing all that has hitherto been accomplished by philosophers, is the creation of a school of men with scientific training and philosophical interests, unhampered by the traditions of the past, and not misled by the literary methods of those who copy the ancients in all except their merits.

INDEX

Absolute, 6, 39.

Abstraction, principle of, 42, 124 ff.

Achilles, Zeno's argument of, 173.

Acquaintance, 25, 144.

Activity, 224 ff.

Allman, 161 n.

Analysis, 185, 204, 211, 241. legitimacy of, 150.

Anaximander, 3.

Antinomies, Kant's, 155 ff.

Aquinas, 10.

Aristotle, 40, 160 n., 161 ff., 240.

Arrow, Zeno's argument of, 173.

Assertion, 52.

Atomism, logical, 4.

Atomists, 160.

Belief, 58. primitive and derivative, 69 ff.

Bergson, 4, 11, 13, 20 ff., 137, 138, 150, 158, 165, 174, 178, 229 ff.

Berkeley, 63, 64, 102.

Bolzano, 165.

Boole, 40.

Bradley, 6, 39, 165.

Broad, 172 n.

Brochard, 169 n.

Burnet, 19 n., 160 n., 161 n., 170 n., 171 ff.

Calderon, 95.

Cantor, vi, vii, 155, 165, 190, 194, 199.

Categories, 38.

Causal laws, 109, 212 ff. evidence for, 216 ff. in psychology, 219.

Causation, 34 ff., 79, 212 ff. law of, 221. not _a priori_, 223, 232.

Cause, 220, 223.

Certainty, degrees of, 67, 68, 212.

Change, demands analysis, 151.

Cinematograph, 148, 174.

Classes, 202. non-existence of, 205 ff.

Classical tradition, 3 ff., 58.

Complexity, 145, 157 ff.

Compulsion, 229, 233 ff.

Congruence, 195.

Consecutiveness, 134.

Conservation, 105.

Constituents of facts, 51, 145.

Construction _v._ inference, iv.

Contemporaries, initial, 119, 120 n.

Continuity, 64, 129 ff., 141 ff., 155 ff. of change, 106, 108, 130 ff.

Correlation of mental and physical, 233.

Counting, 164, 181, 187 ff., 203.

Couturat, 40 n.

Dante, 10.

Darwin, 4, 11, 23, 30.

Data, 65 ff., 211. "hard" and "soft," 70 ff.

Dates, 117.

Definition, 204.

Descartes, 5, 73, 238.

Descriptions, 201, 214.

Desire, 227, 235.

Determinism, 233.

Doubt, 237.

Dreams, 85, 93.

Duration, 146, 149.

Earlier and later, 116.

Effect, 220.

Eleatics, 19.

Empiricism, 37, 222.

Enclosure, 114 ff., 120.

Enumeration, 202.

Euclid, 160, 164.

Evellin, 169.

Evolutionism, 4, 11 ff.

Extension, 146, 149.

External world, knowledge of, 63 ff.

Fact, 51. atomic, 52.

Finalism, 13.

Form, logical, 42 ff., 185, 208.

Fractions, 132, 179.

Free will, 213, 227 ff.

Frege, 5, 40, 199 ff.

Galileo, 4, 59, 192, 194, 239, 240.

Gaye, 169 n., 175, 177.

Geometry, 5.

Giles, 206 n.

Greater and less, 195.

Harvard, 4.

Hegel, 3, 37 ff., 46, 166.

"Here," 73, 92.

Hereditary properties, 195.

Hippasos, 163, 237.

Hui Tzu, 206.

Hume, 217, 221.

Hypotheses in philosophy, 239.

Illusions, 85.

Incommensurables, 162 ff., 237.

Independence, 73, 74. causal and logical, 74, 75.

Indiscernibility, 141, 148.

Indivisibles, 160.

Induction, 34, 222. mathematical, 195 ff.

Inductiveness, 190, 195 ff.

Inference, 44, 54.

Infinite, vi, 64, 133, 149. historically considered, 155 ff. "true," 179, 180. positive theory of, 185 ff.

Infinitesimals, 135.

Instants, 116 ff., 129, 151, 216. defined, 118.

Instinct _v._ Reason, 20 ff.

Intellect, 22 ff.

Intelligence, how displayed by friends, 93. inadequacy of display, 96.

Interpretation, 144.

James, 4, 10, 13.

Jourdain, 165 n.

Jowett, 167.

Judgment, 58.

Kant, 3, 112, 116, 155 ff., 200.

Knowledge about, 144.

Language, bad, 82, 135.

Laplace, 12.

Laws of nature, 218 ff.

Leibniz, 13, 40, 87, 186, 191.

Logic, 201. analytic not constructive, 8. Aristotelian, 5. and fact, 53. inductive, 34, 222. mathematical, vi, 40 ff. mystical, 46. and philosophy, 8, 33 ff., 239.

Logical constants, 208, 213.

Mach, 123, 224.

Macran, 39 n.

Mathematics, 40, 57.

Matter, 75, 101 ff. permanence of, 102 ff.

Measurement, 164.

Memory, 230, 234, 236.

Method, deductive, 5. logical-analytic, v, 65, 211, 236 ff.

Milhaud, 168 n., 169 n.

Mill, 34, 200.

Montaigne, 28.

Motion, 130, 216. continuous, 133, 136. mathematical theory of, 133. perception of, 137 ff. Zeno's arguments on, 168 ff.

Mysticism, 19, 46, 63, 95.

Newton, 30, 146.

Nietzsche, 10, 11.

Noel, 169.

Number, cardinal, 131, 186 ff. defined, 199 ff. finite, 160, 190 ff. inductive, 197. infinite, 178, 180, 188 ff., 197. reflexive, 190 ff.

Occam, 107, 146.

One and many, 167, 170.

Order, 131.

Parmenides, 63, 165 ff., 178.

Past and future, 224, 234 ff.

Peano, 40.

Perspectives, 88 ff., 111.

Philoponus, 171 n.

Philosophy and ethics, 26 ff. and mathematics, 185 ff. province of, 17, 26, 185, 236. scientific, 11, 16, 18, 29, 236 ff.

Physics, 101 ff., 147, 239, 242. descriptive, 224. verifiability of, 81, 110.

Place, 86, 90. _at_ and _from_, 92.

Plato, 4, 19, 27, 46, 63, 165 n., 166, 167.

Poincare, 123, 141.

Points, 113 ff., 129, 158. definition of, vi, 115.

Pragmatism, 11.

Prantl, 174.

Predictability, 229 ff.

Premisses, 211.

Probability, 36.

Propositions, 52. atomic, 52. general, 55. molecular, 54.

Pythagoras, 19, 160 ff., 237.

Race-course, Zeno's argument of, 171 ff.

Realism, new, 6.

Reflexiveness, 190 ff.

Relations, 45. asymmetrical, 47. Bradley's reasons against, 6. external, 150. intransitive, 48. multiple, 50. one-one, 203. reality of, 49. symmetrical, 47, 124. transitive, 48, 124.

Relativity, 103, 242.

Repetitions, 230 ff.

Rest, 136.

Ritter and Preller, 161 n.

Robertson, D. S., 160 n.

Rousseau, 20.

Royce, 50.

Santayana, 46.

Scepticism, 66, 67.

Seeing double, 86.

Self, 73.

Sensation, 25, 75, 123. and stimulus, 139.

Sense-data, 56, 63, 67, 75, 110, 141, 143, 213. and physics, v, 64, 81, 97, 101 ff., 140. infinitely numerous? 149, 159.

Sense-perception, 53.

Series, 49. compact, 132, 142, 178. continuous, 131, 132.

Sigwart, 187.

Simplicius, 170 n.

Simultaneity, 116.

Space, 73, 88, 103, 112 ff., 130. absolute and relative, 146, 159. antinomies of, 155 ff. perception of, 68. of perspectives, 88 ff. private, 89, 90. of touch and sight, 78, 113.

Spencer, 4, 12, 236.

Spinoza, 46, 166.

Stadium, Zeno's argument of, 134 n., 175 ff.

Subject-predicate, 45.

Synthesis, 157, 185.

Tannery, Paul, 169 n.

Teleology, 223.

Testimony, 67, 72, 82, 87, 96, 212.

Thales, 3.

Thing-in-itself, 75, 84.

Things, 89 ff., 104 ff., 213.

Time, 103, 116 ff., 130, 155 ff., 166, 215. absolute or relative, 146. local, 103. private, 121.

Uniformities, 217.

Unity, organic, 9.

Universal and particular, 39 n.

Volition, 223 ff.

Whitehead, vi, 207.

Wittgenstein, vii, 208 n.

Worlds, actual and ideal, 111. possible, 186. private, 88.

Zeller, 173.

Zeno, 129, 134, 136, 165 ff.

PRINTED BY NEILL AND CO., LTD., EDINBURGH.

[Transcriber's Note:

The following is a list of corrections made to the original. The first line is the original line, the second the corrected one.

Second Impression Second Impression.

more often than the impossibility of alternatives which seemed _prima more often than the impossibility of alternatives which seemed _prima

with it. We will call these the "initial contemporaries of the given with it. We will call these the "initial contemporaries" of the given

the next are liable to fail when we come to infinite number. The first the next are liable to fail when we come to infinite numbers. The first

of psychology or an outcome of pscyhical processes as the North Sea.... of psychology or an outcome of psychical processes as the North Sea....

according to the length and direction of the interval. "A quarter of a according to the length and direction of the interval. "A quarter of an

Intelligence, how displayed by friends, 93 Intelligence, how displayed by friends, 93.

Number, cardinal, 131 186 ff. Number, cardinal, 131, 186 ff.

]

==========

Human, All Too Human: A Book for Free Spirits

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche

Project Gutenberg Release: November 26, 2011 · eBook #38145

Produced by Gary Rees, Matthew Wheaton and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at https://www.pgdp.net (This book was produced from scanned images of public domain material from the Google Print project.)

HUMAN, ALL TOO HUMAN

A BOOK FOR FREE SPIRITS

BY FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE

TRANSLATED BY ALEXANDER HARVEY

CHICAGO CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY 1908

Copyright 1908 By Charles H. Kerr & Company

CONTENTS

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

OF THE FIRST AND LAST THINGS

HISTORY OF THE MORAL FEELINGS

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

PREFACE.

1

It is often enough, and always with great surprise, intimated to me that there is something both ordinary and unusual in all my writings, from the "Birth of Tragedy" to the recently published "Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future": they all contain, I have been told, snares and nets for short sighted birds, and something that is almost a constant, subtle, incitement to an overturning of habitual opinions and of approved customs. What!? Everything is merely--human--all too human? With this exclamation my writings are gone through, not without a certain dread and mistrust of ethic itself and not without a disposition to ask the exponent of evil things if those things be not simply misrepresented. My writings have been termed a school of distrust, still more of disdain: also, and more happily, of courage, audacity even. And in fact, I myself do not believe that anybody ever looked into the world with a distrust as deep as mine, seeming, as I do, not simply the timely advocate of the devil, but, to employ theological terms, an enemy and challenger of God; and whosoever has experienced any of the consequences of such deep distrust, anything of the chills and the agonies of isolation to which such an unqualified difference of standpoint condemns him endowed with it, will also understand how often I must have sought relief and self-forgetfulness from any source--through any object of veneration or enmity, of scientific seriousness or wanton lightness; also why I, when I could not find what I was in need of, had to fashion it for myself, counterfeiting it or imagining it (and what poet or writer has ever done anything else, and what other purpose can all the art in the world possibly have?) That which I always stood most in need of in order to effect my cure and self-recovery was faith, faith enough not to be thus isolated, not to look at life from so singular a point of view--a magic apprehension (in eye and mind) of relationship and equality, a calm confidence in friendship, a blindness, free from suspicion and questioning, to two sidedness; a pleasure in externals, superficialities, the near, the accessible, in all things possessed of color, skin and seeming. Perhaps I could be fairly reproached with much "art" in this regard, many fine counterfeitings; for example, that, wisely or wilfully, I had shut my eyes to Schopenhauer's blind will towards ethic, at a time when I was already clear sighted enough on the subject of ethic; likewise that I had deceived myself concerning Richard Wagner's incurable romanticism, as if it were a beginning and not an end; likewise concerning the

Greeks, likewise concerning the Germans and their future--and there may be, perhaps, a long list of such likewises. Granted, however, that all this were true, and with justice urged against me, what does it signify, what can it signify in regard to how much of the self-sustaining capacity, how much of reason and higher protection are embraced in such self-deception?--and how much more falsity is still necessary to me that I may therewith always reassure myself regarding the luxury of my truth. Enough, I still live; and life is not considered now apart from ethic; it _will_ [have] deception; it thrives (lebt) on deception ... but am I not beginning to do all over again what I have always done, I, the old immoralist, and bird snarer--talk unmorally, ultramorally, "beyond good and evil"?

2

Thus, then, have I evolved for myself the "free spirits" to whom this discouraging-encouraging work, under the general title "Human, All Too Human," is dedicated. Such "free spirits" do not really exist and never did exist. But I stood in need of them, as I have pointed out, in order that some good might be mixed with my evils (illness, loneliness, strangeness, _acedia_, incapacity): to serve as gay spirits and comrades, with whom one may talk and laugh when one is disposed to talk and laugh, and whom one may send to the devil when they grow wearisome. They are some compensation for the lack of friends. That such free spirits can possibly exist, that our Europe will yet number among her sons of to-morrow or of the day after to-morrow, such a brilliant and enthusiastic company, alive and palpable and not merely, as in my case, fantasms and imaginary shades, I, myself, can by no means doubt. I see them already coming, slowly, slowly. May it not be that I am doing a little something to expedite their coming when I describe in advance the influences under which I see them evolving and the ways along which they travel?

3

It may be conjectured that a soul in which the type of "free spirit" can attain maturity and completeness had its decisive and deciding event in the form of a great emancipation or unbinding, and that prior to that event it seemed only the more firmly and forever chained to its place and pillar. What binds strongest? What cords seem almost unbreakable? In the case of mortals of a choice and lofty nature they will be those of duty: that reverence, which in youth is most typical, that timidity and tenderness in the presence of the traditionally honored and the worthy, that gratitude to the soil from which we sprung, for the hand that guided us, for the relic before which we were taught to pray--their sublimest moments will themselves bind these souls most strongly. The great liberation comes suddenly to such prisoners, like an earthquake: the young soul is all at once shaken, torn apart, cast forth--it comprehends not itself what is taking place. An involuntary onward impulse rules them with the mastery of command; a will, a wish are developed to go forward, anywhere, at any price; a strong, dangerous curiosity regarding an undiscovered world flames and flashes in all their being. "Better to die than live _here_"--so sounds the tempting voice: and this "here," this "at home" constitutes all they have hitherto loved. A sudden dread and distrust of that which they loved, a flash of contempt for that which is called their "duty," a mutinous, wilful, volcanic-like longing for a far away journey, strange scenes and people, annihilation, petrifaction, a hatred surmounting love, perhaps a sacrilegious impulse and look backwards, to where they so long prayed and loved, perhaps a flush of shame for what they did and at the same time an exultation at having done it, an inner, intoxicating, delightful tremor in which is betrayed the sense of victory--a victory? over what? over whom? a riddle-like victory, fruitful in questioning and well worth questioning, but the _first_ victory, for all--such things of pain and ill belong to the history of the great liberation. And it is at the same time a malady that can destroy a man, this first outbreak of strength and will for self-destination, self-valuation, this will for free will: and how much illness is forced to the surface in the frantic strivings and singularities with which the freedman, the liberated seeks henceforth to attest his mastery over things! He roves fiercely around, with an unsatisfied longing and whatever objects he may encounter must suffer from the perilous expectancy of his pride; he tears to pieces whatever attracts him. With a sardonic laugh he overturns whatever he finds veiled or protected by any reverential awe: he would see what these things look like when they are overturned. It is wilfulness and delight in the wilfulness of it, if he now, perhaps, gives his approval to that which has heretofore been in ill repute--if, in curiosity and experiment, he penetrates stealthily to the most forbidden things. In the background during all his plunging and roaming--for he is as restless and aimless in his course as if lost in a wilderness--is the interrogation mark of a curiosity growing ever more dangerous. "Can we not upset every standard? and is good perhaps evil? and God only an invention and a subtlety of the devil? Is everything, in the last resort, false? And if we are dupes are we not on that very account dupers also? _must_ we not be dupers also?" Such reflections lead and mislead him, ever further on, ever further away. Solitude, that dread goddess and mater saeva cupidinum, encircles and besets him, ever more threatening, more violent, more heart breaking--but who to-day knows what solitude is?

4

From this morbid solitude, from the deserts of such trial years, the way is yet far to that great, overflowing certainty and healthiness which cannot dispense even with sickness as a means and a grappling hook of knowledge; to that matured freedom of the spirit which is, in an equal degree, self mastery and discipline of the heart, and gives access to the path of much and various reflection--to that inner comprehensiveness and self satisfaction of over-richness which precludes all danger that the spirit has gone astray even in its own path and is sitting intoxicated in some corner or other; to that overplus of plastic, healing, imitative and restorative power which is the very sign of vigorous health, that overplus which confers upon the free spirit the perilous prerogative of spending a life in experiment and of running adventurous risks: the past-master-privilege of the free spirit. In the interval there may be long years of convalescence, years filled with many hued painfully-bewitching transformations, dominated and led to the goal by a tenacious will for health that is often emboldened to assume the guise and the disguise of health. There is a middle ground to this, which a man of such destiny can not subsequently recall without emotion; he basks in a special fine sun of his own, with a feeling of birdlike freedom, birdlike visual power, birdlike irrepressibleness, a something extraneous (Drittes) in which curiosity and delicate disdain have united. A "free spirit"--this refreshing term is grateful in any mood, it almost sets one aglow. One lives--no longer in the bonds of love and hate, without a yes or no, here or there indifferently, best pleased to evade, to avoid, to beat about, neither advancing nor retreating. One is habituated to the bad, like a person who all at once sees a fearful hurly-burly _beneath_ him--and one was the counterpart of him who bothers himself with things that do not concern him. As a matter of fact the free spirit is bothered with mere things--and how many things--which no longer _concern_ him.

5

A step further in recovery: and the free spirit draws near to life again, slowly indeed, almost refractorily, almost distrustfully. There is again warmth and mellowness: feeling and fellow feeling acquire depth, lambent airs stir all about him. He almost feels: it seems as if now for the first time his eyes are open to things _near_. He is in amaze and sits hushed: for where had he been? These near and immediate things: how changed they seem to him! He looks gratefully back--grateful for his wandering, his self exile and severity, his lookings afar and his bird flights in the cold heights. How fortunate that he has not, like a sensitive, dull home body, remained always "in the house" and "at home!" He had been beside himself, beyond a doubt. Now for the first time he really sees himself--and what surprises in the process. What hitherto unfelt tremors! Yet what joy in the exhaustion, the old sickness, the relapses of the convalescent! How it delights him, suffering, to sit still, to exercise patience, to lie in the sun! Who so well as he appreciates the fact that there comes balmy weather even in winter, who delights more in the sunshine athwart the wall? They are the most appreciative creatures in the world, and also the most humble, these convalescents and lizards, crawling back towards life: there are some among them who can let no day slip past them without addressing some song of praise to its retreating light. And speaking seriously, it is a fundamental cure for all pessimism (the cankerous vice, as is well known, of all idealists and humbugs), to become ill in the manner of these free spirits, to remain ill quite a while and then bit by bit grow healthy--I mean healthier. It is wisdom, worldly wisdom, to administer even health to oneself for a long time in small doses.

6

About this time it becomes at last possible, amid the flash lights of a still unestablished, still precarious health, for the free, the ever freer spirit to begin to read the riddle of that great liberation, a riddle which has hitherto lingered, obscure, well worth questioning, almost impalpable, in his memory. If once he hardly dared to ask "why so apart? so alone? renouncing all I loved? renouncing respect itself? why this coldness, this suspicion, this hate for one's very virtues?"--now he dares, and asks it loudly, already hearing the answer, "you had to become master over yourself, master of your own good qualities. Formerly they were your masters: but they should be merely your tools along with other tools. You had to acquire power over your aye and no and learn to hold and withhold them in accordance with your higher aims. You had to grasp the perspective of every representation (Werthschaetzung)--the dislocation, distortion and the apparent end or teleology of the horizon, besides whatever else appertains to the perspective: also the element of demerit in its relation to opposing merit, and the whole intellectual cost of every affirmative, every negative. You had to find out the _inevitable_ error[1] in every Yes and in every No, error as inseparable from life, life itself as conditioned by the perspective and its inaccuracy.[1] Above all, you had to see with your own eyes where the error[1] is always greatest: there, namely, where life is littlest, narrowest, meanest, least developed and yet cannot help looking upon itself as the goal and standard of things, and smugly and ignobly and incessantly tearing to tatters all that is highest and greatest and richest, and putting the shreds into the form of questions from the standpoint of its own well being. You had to see with your own eyes the problem of classification, (Rangordnung, regulation concerning rank and station) and how strength and sweep and reach of perspective wax upward together: You had"--enough, the free spirit knows henceforward which "you had" it has obeyed and also what it now can do and what it now, for the first time, _dare_.

[1] Ungerechtigkeit, literally wrongfulness, injustice, unrighteousness.

7

Accordingly, the free spirit works out for itself an answer to that riddle of its liberation and concludes by generalizing upon its experience in the following fashion: "What I went through everyone must go through" in whom any problem is germinated and strives to body itself forth. The inner power and inevitability of this problem will assert themselves in due course, as in the case of any unsuspected pregnancy--long before the spirit has seen this problem in its true aspect and learned to call it by its right name. Our destiny exercises its influence over us even when, as yet, we have not learned its nature: it is our future that lays down the law to our to-day. Granted, that it is the problem of classification[2] of which we free spirits may say, this is _our_ problem, yet it is only now, in the midday of our life, that we fully appreciate what preparations, shifts, trials, ordeals, stages, were essential to that problem before it could emerge to our view, and why we had to go through the various and contradictory longings and satisfactions of body and soul, as circumnavigators and adventurers of that inner world called "man"; as surveyors of that "higher" and of that "progression"[3] that is also called "man"--crowding in everywhere, almost without fear, disdaining nothing, missing nothing, testing everything, sifting everything and eliminating the chance impurities--until at last we could say, we free spirits: "Here--a _new_ problem! Here, a long ladder on the rungs of which we ourselves have rested and risen, which we have actually been at times. Here is a something higher, a something deeper, a something below us, a vastly extensive order, (Ordnung) a comparative classification (Rangordnung), that we perceive: here--_our_ problem!"

[2] Rangordnung: the meaning is "the problem of grasping the relative importance of things."

[3] Uebereinander: one over another.

8

To what stage in the development just outlined the present book belongs (or is assigned) is something that will be hidden from no augur or psychologist for an instant. But where are there psychologists to-day? In France, certainly; in Russia, perhaps; certainly not in Germany. Grounds are not wanting, to be sure, upon which the Germans of to-day may adduce this fact to their credit: unhappily for one who in this matter is fashioned and mentored in an un-German school! This _German_ book, which has found its readers in a wide circle of lands and peoples--it has been some ten years on its rounds--and which must make its way by means of any musical art and tune that will captivate the foreign ear as well as the native--this book has been read most indifferently in Germany itself and little heeded there: to what is that due? "It requires too much," I have been told, "it addresses itself to men free from the press of petty obligations, it demands fine and trained perceptions, it requires a surplus, a surplus of time, of the lightness of heaven and of the heart, of otium in the most unrestricted sense: mere good things that we Germans of to-day have not got and therefore cannot give." After so graceful a retort, my philosophy bids me be silent and ask no more questions: at times, as the proverb says, one remains a philosopher only because one says--nothing!

Nice, Spring, 1886.

OF THE FIRST AND LAST THINGS.

1

=Chemistry of the Notions and the Feelings.=--Philosophical problems, in almost all their aspects, present themselves in the same interrogative formula now that they did two thousand years ago: how can a thing develop out of its antithesis? for example, the reasonable from the non-reasonable, the animate from the inanimate, the logical from the illogical, altruism from egoism, disinterestedness from greed, truth from error? The metaphysical philosophy formerly steered itself clear of this difficulty to such extent as to repudiate the evolution of one thing from another and to assign a miraculous origin to what it deemed highest and best, due to the very nature and being of the "thing-in-itself." The historical philosophy, on the other hand, which can no longer be viewed apart from physical science, the youngest of all philosophical methods, discovered experimentally (and its results will probably always be the same) that there is no antithesis whatever, except in the usual exaggerations of popular or metaphysical comprehension, and that an error of the reason is at the bottom of such contradiction. According to its explanation, there is, strictly speaking, neither unselfish conduct, nor a wholly disinterested point of view. Both are simply sublimations in which the basic element seems almost evaporated and betrays its presence only to the keenest observation. All that we need and that could

possibly be given us in the present state of development of the sciences, is a chemistry of the moral, religious, aesthetic conceptions and feeling, as well as of those emotions which we experience in the affairs, great and small, of society and civilization, and which we are sensible of even in solitude. But what if this chemistry established the fact that, even in _its_ domain, the most magnificent results were attained with the basest and most despised ingredients? Would many feel disposed to continue such investigations? Mankind loves to put by the questions of its origin and beginning: must one not be almost inhuman in order to follow the opposite course?

2

=The Traditional Error of Philosophers.=--All philosophers make the common mistake of taking contemporary man as their starting point and of trying, through an analysis of him, to reach a conclusion. "Man" involuntarily presents himself to them as an aeterna veritas as a passive element in every hurly-burly, as a fixed standard of things. Yet everything uttered by the philosopher on the subject of man is, in the last resort, nothing more than a piece of testimony concerning man during a very limited period of time. Lack of the historical sense is the traditional defect in all philosophers. Many innocently take man in his most childish state as fashioned through the influence of certain religious and even of certain political developments, as the permanent form under which man must be viewed. They will not learn that man has evolved,[4] that the intellectual faculty itself is an evolution, whereas some philosophers make the whole cosmos out of this intellectual faculty. But everything essential in human evolution took place aeons ago, long before the four thousand years or so of which we know anything: during these man may not have changed very much. However, the philosopher ascribes "instinct" to contemporary man and assumes that this is one of the unalterable facts regarding man himself, and hence affords a clue to the understanding of the universe in general. The whole teleology is so planned that man during the last four thousand years shall be spoken of as a being existing from all eternity, and with reference to whom everything in the cosmos from its very inception is naturally ordered. Yet everything evolved: there are no eternal facts as there are no absolute truths. Accordingly, historical philosophising is henceforth indispensable, and with it honesty of judgment.

[4] geworden.

3

=Appreciation of Simple Truths.=--It is the characteristic of an advanced civilization to set a higher value upon little, simple truths, ascertained by scientific method, than upon the pleasing and magnificent errors originating in metaphysical and aesthetical epochs and peoples. To begin with, the former are spoken of with contempt as if there could be no question of comparison respecting them, so rigid, homely, prosaic and even discouraging is the aspect of the first, while so beautiful, decorative, intoxicating and perhaps beatific appear the last named. Nevertheless, the hardwon, the certain, the lasting and, therefore, the fertile in new knowledge, is the higher; to hold fast to it is manly and evinces courage, directness, endurance. And not only individual men but all mankind will by degrees be uplifted to this manliness when they are finally habituated to the proper appreciation of tenable, enduring knowledge and have lost all faith in inspiration and in the miraculous revelation of truth. The reverers of forms, indeed, with their standards of beauty and taste, may have good reason to laugh when the appreciation of little truths and the scientific spirit begin to prevail, but that will be only because their eyes are not yet opened to the charm of the utmost simplicity of form or because men though reared in the rightly appreciative spirit, will still not be fully permeated by it, so that they continue unwittingly imitating ancient forms (and that ill enough, as anybody does who no longer feels any interest in a thing). Formerly the mind was not brought into play through the medium of exact thought. Its serious business lay in the working out of forms and symbols. That has now changed. Any seriousness in symbolism is at present the indication of a deficient education. As our very acts become more intellectual, our tendencies more rational, and our judgment, for example, as to what seems reasonable, is very different from what it was a hundred years ago: so the forms of our lives grow ever more intellectual and, to the old fashioned eye, perhaps, uglier, but only because it cannot see that the richness of inner, rational beauty always spreads and deepens, and that the inner, rational aspect of all things should now be of more consequence to us than the most beautiful externality and the most exquisite limning.

4

=Astrology and the Like.=--It is presumable that the objects of the religious, moral, aesthetic and logical notions pertain simply to the superficialities of things, although man flatters himself with the thought that here at least he is getting to the heart of the cosmos. He deceives himself because these things have power to make him so happy and so wretched, and so he evinces, in this respect, the same conceit that characterises astrology. Astrology presupposes that the heavenly bodies are regulated in their movements in harmony with the destiny of mortals: the moral man presupposes that that which concerns himself most nearly must also be the

heart and soul of things.

5

=Misconception of Dreams.=--In the dream, mankind, in epochs of crude primitive civilization, thought they were introduced to a second, substantial world: here we have the source of all metaphysic. Without the dream, men would never have been incited to an analysis of the world. Even the distinction between soul and body is wholly due to the primitive conception of the dream, as also the hypothesis of the embodied soul, whence the development of all superstition, and also, probably, the belief in god. "The dead still live: for they appear to the living in dreams." So reasoned mankind at one time, and through many thousands of years.

6

=The Scientific Spirit Prevails only Partially, not Wholly.=--The specialized, minutest departments of science are dealt with purely objectively. But the general universal sciences, considered as a great, basic unity, posit the question--truly a very living question--: to what purpose? what is the use? Because of this reference to utility they are, as a whole, less impersonal than when looked at in their specialized aspects. Now in the case of philosophy, as forming the apex of the scientific pyramid, this question of the utility of knowledge is necessarily brought very conspicuously forward, so that every philosophy has, unconsciously, the air of ascribing the highest utility to itself. It is for this reason that all philosophies contain such a great amount of high flying metaphysic, and such a shrinking from the seeming insignificance of the deliverances of physical science: for the significance of knowledge in relation to life must be made to appear as great as possible. This constitutes the antagonism between the specialties of science and philosophy. The latter aims, as art aims, at imparting to life and conduct the utmost depth and significance: in the former mere knowledge is sought and nothing else--whatever else be incidentally obtained. Heretofore there has never been a philosophical system in which philosophy itself was not made the apologist of knowledge [in the abstract]. On this point, at least, each is optimistic and insists that to knowledge the highest utility must be ascribed. They are all under the tyranny of logic, which is, from its very nature, optimism.

7

=The Discordant Element in Science.=--Philosophy severed itself from science when it put the question: what is that knowledge of the world and of life through which mankind may be made happiest? This happened when the Socratic school arose: with the standpoint of _happiness_ the arteries of investigating science were compressed too tightly to permit of any circulation of the blood--and are so compressed to-day.

8

=Pneumatic Explanation of Nature.=[5]--Metaphysic reads the message of nature as if it were written purely pneumatically, as the church and its learned ones formerly did where the bible was concerned. It requires a great deal of expertness to apply to nature the same strict science of interpretation that the philologists have devised for all literature, and to apply it for the purpose of a simple, direct interpretation of the message, and at the same time, not bring out a double meaning. But, as in the case of books and literature, errors of exposition are far from being completely eliminated, and vestiges of allegorical and mystical interpretations are still to be met with in the most cultivated circles, so where nature is concerned the case is--actually much worse.

[5] Pneumatic is here used in the sense of spiritual. Pneuma being the Greek word in the New Testament for the Holy Spirit.--Ed.

9

=Metaphysical World.=--It is true, there may be a metaphysical world; the absolute possibility of it can scarcely be disputed. We see all things through the medium of the human head and we cannot well cut off this head: although there remains the question what part of the world would be left after it had been cut off. But that is a purely abstract scientific problem and one not much calculated to give men uneasiness: yet everything that has heretofore made metaphysical assumptions valuable, fearful or delightful to men, all that gave rise to them is passion, error and self deception: the worst systems of knowledge, not the best, pin their tenets of belief thereto. When such methods are once brought to view as the basis of all existing religions and metaphysics, they are already discredited. There always remains, however, the possibility already conceded: but nothing at all can be made out of that, to say not a word about letting happiness, salvation and life hang upon the threads spun from such a possibility. Accordingly, nothing could be predicated of the metaphysical world beyond the fact that it is an elsewhere,[6] another sphere, inaccessible and incomprehensible to us: it would become a thing of negative properties. Even were the existence of such a world absolutely established, it would

nevertheless remain incontrovertible that of all kinds of knowledge, knowledge of such a world would be of least consequence--of even less consequence than knowledge of the chemical analysis of water would be to a storm tossed mariner.

[6] Anderssein.

10

=The Harmlessness of Metaphysic in the Future.=--As soon as religion, art and ethics are so understood that a full comprehension of them can be gained without taking refuge in the postulates of metaphysical claptrap at any point in the line of reasoning, there will be a complete cessation of interest in the purely theoretical problem of the "thing in itself" and the "phenomenon." For here, too, the same truth applies: in religion, art and ethics we are not concerned with the "essence of the cosmos".[7] We are in the sphere of pure conception. No presentiment [or intuition] can carry us any further. With perfect tranquility the question of how our conception of the world could differ so sharply from the actual world as it is manifest to us, will be relegated to the physiological sciences and to the history of the evolution of ideas and organisms.

[7] "Wesen der Welt an sich."

11

=Language as a Presumptive Science.=--The importance of language in the development of civilization consists in the fact that by means of it man placed one world, his own, alongside another, a place of leverage that he thought so firm as to admit of his turning the rest of the cosmos on a pivot that he might master it. In so far as man for ages looked upon mere ideas and names of things as upon aeternae veritates, he evinced the very pride with which he raised himself above the brute. He really supposed that in language he possessed a knowledge of the cosmos. The language builder was not so modest as to believe that he was only giving names to things. On the contrary he thought he embodied the highest wisdom concerning things in [mere] words; and, in truth, language is the first movement in all strivings for wisdom. Here, too, it is _faith in ascertained truth_[8] from which the mightiest fountains of strength have flowed. Very tardily--only now--it dawns upon men that they have propagated a monstrous error in their belief in language. Fortunately, it is too late now to arrest and turn back the evolutionary process of the reason, which had its inception in this belief. Logic itself rests upon assumptions to which nothing in the world of reality corresponds. For example, the correspondence of certain things to one another and the identity of those things at different periods of time are assumptions pure and simple, but the science of logic originated in the positive belief that they were not assumptions at all but established facts. It is the same with the science of mathematics which certainly would never have come into existence if mankind had known from the beginning that in all nature there is no perfectly straight line, no true circle, no standard of measurement.

[8] Glaube an die gefundene Wahrheit, as distinguished from faith in what is taken on trust as truth.

12

=Dream and Civilization.=--The function of the brain which is most encroached upon in slumber is the memory; not that it is wholly suspended, but it is reduced to a state of imperfection as, in primitive ages of mankind, was probably the case with everyone, whether waking or sleeping. Uncontrolled and entangled as it is, it perpetually confuses things as a result of the most trifling similarities, yet in the same mental confusion and lack of control the nations invented their mythologies, while nowadays travelers habitually observe how prone the savage is to forgetfulness, how his mind, after the least exertion of memory, begins to wander and lose itself until finally he utters falsehood and nonsense from sheer exhaustion. Yet, in dreams, we all resemble this savage. Inadequacy of distinction and error of comparison are the basis of the preposterous things we do and say in dreams, so that when we clearly recall a dream we are startled that so much idiocy lurks within us. The absolute distinctness of all dream-images, due to implicit faith in their substantial reality, recalls the conditions in which earlier mankind were placed, for whom hallucinations had extraordinary vividness, entire communities and even entire nations laboring simultaneously under them. Therefore: in sleep and in dream we make the pilgrimage of early mankind over again.

13

=Logic of the Dream.=--During sleep the nervous system, through various inner provocatives, is in constant agitation. Almost all the organs act independently and vigorously. The blood circulates rapidly. The posture of the sleeper compresses some portions of the body. The coverlets influence the sensations in different ways. The stomach carries on the digestive process and acts upon other

organs thereby. The intestines are in motion. The position of the head induces unaccustomed action. The feet, shoeless, no longer pressing the ground, are the occasion of other sensations of novelty, as is, indeed, the changed garb of the entire body. All these things, following the bustle and change of the day, result, through their novelty, in a movement throughout the entire system that extends even to the brain functions. Thus there are a hundred circumstances to induce perplexity in the mind, a questioning as to the cause of this excitation. Now, the dream is a _seeking and presenting of reasons_ for these excitations of feeling, of the supposed reasons, that is to say. Thus, for example, whoever has his feet bound with two threads will probably dream that a pair of serpents are coiled about his feet. This is at first a hypothesis, then a belief with an accompanying imaginative picture and the argument: "these snakes must be the _causa_ of those sensations which I, the sleeper, now have." So reasons the mind of the sleeper. The conditions precedent, as thus conjectured, become, owing to the excitation of the fancy, present realities. Everyone knows from experience how a dreamer will transform one piercing sound, for example, that of a bell, into another of quite a different nature, say, the report of cannon. In his dream he becomes aware first of the effects, which he explains by a subsequent hypothesis and becomes persuaded of the purely conjectural nature of the sound. But how comes it that the mind of the dreamer goes so far astray when the same mind, awake, is habitually cautious, careful, and so conservative in its dealings with hypotheses? why does the first plausible hypothesis of the cause of a sensation gain credit in the dreaming state? (For in a dream we look upon that dream as reality, that is, we accept our hypotheses as fully established). I have no doubt that as men argue in their dreams to-day, mankind argued, even in their waking moments, for thousands of years: the first _causa_, that occurred to the mind with reference to anything that stood in need of explanation, was accepted as the true explanation and served as such. (Savages show the same tendency in operation, as the reports of travelers agree). In the dream this atavistic relic of humanity manifests its existence within us, for it is the foundation upon which the higher rational faculty developed itself and still develops itself in every individual. Dreams carry us back to the earlier stages of human culture and afford us a means of understanding it more clearly. Dream thought comes so easily to us now because we are so thoroughly trained to it through the interminable stages of evolution during which this fanciful and facile form of theorising has prevailed. To a certain extent the dream is a restorative for the brain, which, during the day, is called upon to meet the many demands for trained thought made upon it by the conditions of a higher civilization.--We may, if we please, become sensible, even in our waking moments, of a condition that is as a door and vestibule to dreaming. If we close our eyes the brain immediately conjures up a medley of impressions of light and color, apparently a sort of imitation and echo of the impressions forced in upon the brain during its waking moments. And now the mind, in co-operation with the imagination, transforms this formless play of light and color into definite figures, moving groups, landscapes. What really takes place is a sort of reasoning from effect back to cause. As the brain inquires: whence these impressions of light and color? it posits as the inducing causes of such lights and colors, those shapes and figures. They serve the brain as the occasions of those lights and colors because the brain, when the eyes are open and the senses awake, is accustomed to perceiving the cause of every impression of light and color made upon it. Here again the imagination is continually interposing its images inasmuch as it participates in the production of the impressions made through the senses day by day: and the dream-fancy does exactly the same thing--that is, the presumed cause is determined from the effect and _after_ the effect: all this, too, with extraordinary rapidity, so that in this matter, as in a matter of jugglery or sleight-of-hand, a confusion of the mind is produced and an after effect is made to appear a simultaneous action, an inverted succession of events, even.--From these considerations we can see how _late_ strict, logical thought, the true notion of cause and effect must have been in developing, since our intellectual and rational faculties to this very day revert to these primitive processes of deduction, while practically half our lifetime is spent in the super-inducing conditions.--Even the poet, the artist, ascribes to his sentimental and emotional states causes which are not the true ones. To that extent he is a reminder of early mankind and can aid us in its comprehension.

14

=Association.=[9]--All strong feelings are associated with a variety of allied sentiments and emotions. They stir up the memory at the same time. When we are under their influence we are reminded of similar states and we feel a renewal of them within us. Thus are formed habitual successions of feelings and notions, which, at last, when they follow one another with lightning rapidity are no longer felt as complexities but as unities. In this sense we hear of moral feelings, of religious feelings, as if they were absolute unities. In reality they are streams with a hundred sources and tributaries. Here again, the unity of the word speaks nothing for the unity of the thing.

[9] Miterklingen: to sound simultaneously with.

15

=No Within and Without in the World.=[10]--As Democritus transferred the notions above and below to limitless space, where they are destitute of meaning, so the philosophers do generally with the idea "within and without," as regards the form and substance (Wesen und Erscheinung) of the world. What they claim is that through the medium of profound feelings one can penetrate deep into the soul of things (Innre), draw close to the heart of nature. But these feelings are deep only in so far as with them are simultaneously aroused, although almost imperceptibly, certain complicated groups of thoughts (Gedankengruppen) which we call deep: a feeling is deep because we deem the thoughts accompanying it deep. But deep thought can nevertheless be very widely sundered from truth, as for instance every metaphysical thought. Take from deep feeling the element of thought blended with it and all that remains is _strength_ of feeling which is no voucher for the validity of knowledge, as intense faith is evidence only of its own intensity and not of the truth of that in which the faith is felt.

[10] Kein Innen und Aussen in der Welt: the above translation may seem too literal but some dispute has arisen concerning the precise idea the author means to convey.

16

=Phenomenon and Thing-in-Itself.=--The philosophers are in the habit of placing themselves in front of life and experience--that which they call the world of phenomena--as if they were standing before a picture that is unrolled before them in its final completeness. This panorama, they think, must be studied in every detail in order to reach some conclusion regarding the object represented by the picture. From effect, accordingly is deduced cause and from cause is deduced the unconditioned. This process is generally looked upon as affording the all sufficient explanation of the world of phenomena. On the other hand one must, (while putting the conception of the metaphysical distinctly forward as that of the unconditioned, and consequently of the unconditioning) absolutely deny any connection between the unconditioned (of the metaphysical world) and the world known to us: so that throughout phenomena there is no manifestation of the thing-in-itself, and getting from one to the other is out of the question. Thus is left quite ignored the circumstance that the picture--that which we now call life and experience--is a gradual evolution, is, indeed, still in process of evolution and for that reason should not be regarded as an enduring whole from which any conclusion as to its author (the all-sufficient reason) could be arrived at, or even pronounced out of the question. It is because we have for thousands of years looked into the world with moral, aesthetic, religious predispositions, with blind prejudice, passion or fear, and surfeited ourselves with indulgence in the follies of illogical thought, that the world has gradually become so wondrously motley, frightful, significant, soulful: it has taken on tints, but we have been the colorists: the human intellect, upon the foundation of human needs, of human passions, has reared all these "phenomena" and injected its own erroneous fundamental conceptions into things. Late, very late, the human intellect checks itself: and now the world of experience and the thing-in-itself seem to it so severed and so antithetical that it denies the possibility of one's hinging upon the other--or else summons us to surrender our intellect, our personal will, to the secret and the awe-inspiring in order that thereby we may attain certainty of certainty hereafter. Again, there are those who have combined all the characteristic features of our world of phenomena--that is, the conception of the world which has been formed and inherited through a series of intellectual vagaries--and instead of holding the intellect responsible for it all, have pronounced the very nature of things accountable for the present very sinister aspect of the world, and preached annihilation of existence. Through all these views and opinions the toilsome, steady process of science (which now for the first time begins to celebrate its greatest triumph in the genesis of thought) will definitely work itself out, the result, being, perhaps, to the following effect: That which we now call the world is the result of a crowd of errors and fancies which gradually developed in the general evolution of organic nature, have grown together and been transmitted to us as the accumulated treasure of all the past--as the _treasure_, for whatever is worth anything in our humanity rests upon it. From this world of conception it is in the power of science to release us only to a slight extent--and this is all that could be wished--inasmuch as it cannot eradicate the influence of hereditary habits of feeling, but it can light up by degrees the stages of the development of that world of conception, and lift us, at least for a time, above the whole spectacle. Perhaps we may then perceive that the thing-in-itself is a meet subject for Homeric laughter: that it seemed so much, everything, indeed, and is really a void--void, that is to say, of meaning.

17

=Metaphysical Explanation.=--Man, when he is young, prizes metaphysical explanations, because they make him see matters of the highest import in things he found disagreeable or contemptible: and if he is not satisfied with himself, this feeling of dissatisfaction is soothed when he sees the most hidden world-problem or world-pain in that which he finds so displeasing in himself. To feel himself more unresponsible and at the same time to find things (Dinge) more interesting--that is to him the double benefit he owes to metaphysics. Later, indeed, he acquires distrust of the whole metaphysical method of explaining things: he then

perceives, perhaps, that those effects could have been attained just as well and more scientifically by another method: that physical and historical explanations would, at least, have given that feeling of freedom from personal responsibility just as well, while interest in life and its problems would be stimulated, perhaps, even more.

18

=The Fundamental Problems of Metaphysics.=--If a history of the development of thought is ever written, the following proposition, advanced by a distinguished logician, will be illuminated with a new light: "The universal, primordial law of the apprehending subject consists in the inner necessity of cognizing every object by itself, as in its essence a thing unto itself, therefore as self-existing and unchanging, in short, as a substance." Even this law, which is here called "primordial," is an evolution: it has yet to be shown how gradually this evolution takes place in lower organizations: how the dim, mole eyes of such organizations see, at first, nothing but a blank sameness: how later, when the various excitations of desire and aversion manifest themselves, various substances are gradually distinguished, but each with an attribute, that is, a special relationship to such an organization. The first step towards the logical is judgment, the essence of which, according to the best logicians, is belief. At the foundation of all beliefs lie sensations of pleasure or pain in relation to the apprehending subject. A third feeling, as the result of two prior, single, separate feelings, is judgment in its crudest form. We organic beings are primordially interested by nothing whatever in any thing (Ding) except its relation to ourselves with reference to pleasure and pain. Between the moments in which we are conscious of this relation, (the states of feeling) lie the moments of rest, of not-feeling: then the world and every thing (Ding) have no interest for us: we observe no change in them (as at present a person absorbed in something does not notice anyone passing by). To plants all things are, as a rule, at rest, eternal, every object like itself. From the period of lower organisms has been handed down to man the belief that there are like things (gleiche Dinge): only the trained experience attained through the most advanced science contradicts this postulate. The primordial belief of all organisms is, perhaps, that all the rest of the world is one thing and motionless.--Furthest away from this first step towards the logical is the notion of causation: even to-day we think that all our feelings and doings are, at bottom, acts of the free will; when the sentient individual contemplates himself he deems every feeling, every change, a something isolated, disconnected, that is to say, unqualified by any thing; it comes suddenly to the surface, independent of anything that went before or came after. We are hungry, but originally we do not know that the organism must be nourished: on the contrary that feeling seems to manifest itself without reason or purpose; it stands out by itself and seems quite independent. Therefore: the belief in the freedom of the will is a primordial error of everything organic as old as the very earliest inward prompting of the logical faculty; belief in unconditioned substances and in like things (gleiche Dinge) is also a primordial and equally ancient error of everything organic. Inasmuch as all metaphysic has concerned itself particularly with substance and with freedom of the will, it should be designated as the science that deals with the fundamental errors of mankind as if they were fundamental truths.

19

=Number.=--The invention of the laws of number has as its basis the primordial and prior-prevailing delusion that many like things exist (although in point of fact there is no such thing is a duplicate), or that, at least, there are things (but there is no "thing"). The assumption of plurality always presupposes that _something_ exists which manifests itself repeatedly, but just here is where the delusion prevails; in this very matter we feign realities, unities, that have no existence. Our feelings, notions, of space and time are false for they lead, when duly tested, to logical contradictions. In all scientific demonstrations we always unavoidably base our calculation upon some false standards [of duration or measurement] but as these standards are at least _constant_, as, for example, our notions of time and space, the results arrived at by science possess absolute accuracy and certainty in their relationship to one another: one can keep on building upon them--until is reached that final limit at which the erroneous fundamental conceptions, (the invariable breakdown) come into conflict with the results established--as, for example, in the case of the atomic theory. Here we always find ourselves obliged to give credence to a "thing" or material "substratum" that is set in motion, although, at the same time, the whole scientific programme has had as its aim the resolving of everything material into motions [themselves]: here again we distinguish with our feeling [that which does the] moving and [that which is] moved,[11] and we never get out of this circle, because the belief in things[12] has been from time immemorial rooted in our nature.--When Kant says "the intellect does not derive its laws from nature, but dictates them to her" he states the full truth as regards the _idea of nature_ which we form (nature = world, as notion, that is, as error) but which is merely the synthesis of a host of errors of the intellect. To a world not [the outcome of] our conception, the laws of number are wholly inapplicable: such laws are valid only in the world of mankind.

[11] Wir scheiden auch hier noch mit unserer Empfindung Bewegendes und Bewegtes.

[12] Glaube an Dinge.

20

=Some Backward Steps.=--One very forward step in education is taken when man emerges from his superstitious and religious ideas and fears and, for instance, no longer believes in the dear little angels or in original sin, and has stopped talking about the salvation of the soul: when he has taken this step to freedom he has, nevertheless, through the utmost exertion of his mental power, to overcome metaphysics. Then a backward movement is necessary: he must appreciate the historical justification, and to an equal extent the psychological considerations, in such a movement. He must understand that the greatest advances made by mankind have resulted from such a course and that without this very backward movement the highest achievements of man hitherto would have been impossible.--With regard to philosophical metaphysics I see ever more and more who have arrived at the negative goal (that all positive metaphysic is a delusion) but as yet very few who go a few steps backward: one should look out over the last rungs of the ladder, but not try to stand on them, that is to say. The most advanced as yet go only far enough to free themselves from metaphysic and look back at it with an air of superiority: whereas here, no less than in the hippodrome, it is necessary to turn around in order to reach the end of the course.

21

=Presumable [Nature of the] Victory of Doubt.=--Let us assume for a moment the validity of the skeptical standpoint: granted that there is no metaphysical world, and that all the metaphysical explanations of the only world we know are useless to us, how would we then contemplate men and things? [Menschen und Dinge]. This can be thought out and it is worth while doing so, even if the question whether anything metaphysical has ever been demonstrated by or through Kant and Schopenhauer, be put altogether aside. For it is, to all appearances, highly probable that men, on this point, will be, in the mass, skeptical. The question thus becomes: what sort of a notion will human society, under the influence of such a state of mind, form of itself? Perhaps the _scientific demonstration_ of any metaphysical world is now so difficult that mankind will never be free from a distrust of it. And when there is formed a feeling of distrust of metaphysics, the results are, in the mass, the same as if metaphysics were refuted altogether and _could_ no longer be believed. In both cases the historical question, with regard to an unmetaphysical disposition in mankind, remains the same.

22

=Disbelief in the "monumentum aere perennius".=[13]--A decided disadvantage, attending the termination of metaphysical modes of thought, is that the individual fixes his mind too attentively upon his own brief lifetime and feels no strong inducement to aid in the foundation of institutions capable of enduring for centuries: he wishes himself to gather the fruit from the tree that he plants and consequently he no longer plants those trees which require centuries of constant cultivation and are destined to afford shade to generation after generation in the future. For metaphysical views inspire the belief that in them is afforded the final sure foundation upon which henceforth the whole future of mankind may rest and be built up: the individual promotes his own salvation; when, for example, he builds a church or a monastery he is of opinion that he is doing something for the salvation of his immortal soul:--Can science, as well, inspire such faith in the efficacy of her results? In actual fact, science requires doubt and distrust as her surest auxiliaries; nevertheless, the sum of the irresistible (that is all the onslaughts of skepticism, all the disintegrating effects of surviving truths) can easily become so great (as, for instance, in the case of hygienic science) as to inspire the determination to build "eternal" works upon it. At present the contrast between our excitated ephemeral existence and the tranquil repose of metaphysical epochs is too great because both are as yet in too close juxtaposition. The individual man himself now goes through too many stages of inner and outer evolution for him to venture to make a plan even for his life time alone. A perfectly modern man, indeed, who wants to build himself a house feels as if he were walling himself up alive in a mausoleum.

[13] Monument more enduring than brass: Horace, Odes III:XXX.

23

=Age of Comparison.=--The less men are bound by tradition, the greater is the inner activity of motives, the greater, correspondingly, the outer restlessness, the promiscuous flow of humanity, the polyphony of strivings. Who now feels any great impulse to establish himself and his posterity in a particular place? For whom, moreover, does there exist, at present, any strong tie? As all the methods of the arts were copied from one another, so were all the methods and advancements of moral codes, of manners, of civilizations.--Such an age derives its significance from the fact that in it the various ideas, codes, manners and civilizations can be compared and experienced side by side; which was impossible at an earlier period in view of the localised

nature of the rule of every civilization, corresponding to the limitation of all artistic effects by time and place. To-day the growth of the aesthetic feeling is decided, owing to the great number of [artistic] forms which offer themselves for comparison. The majority--those that are condemned by the method of comparison--will be allowed to die out. In the same way there is to-day taking place a selection of the forms and customs of the higher morality which can result only in the extinction of the vulgar moralities. This is the age of comparison! That is its glory--but also its pain. Let us not, however shrink from this pain. Rather would we comprehend the nature of the task imposed upon us by our age as adequately as we can: posterity will bless us for doing so--a posterity that knows itself to be [developed] through and above the narrow, early race-civilizations as well as the culture-civilization of comparison, but yet looks gratefully back upon both as venerable monuments of antiquity.

24

=Possibility of Progress.=--When a master of the old civilization (den alten Cultur) vows to hold no more discussion with men who believe in progress, he is quite right. For the old civilization[14] has its greatness and its advantages behind it, and historic training forces one to acknowledge that it can never again acquire vigor: only intolerable stupidity or equally intolerable fanaticism could fail to perceive this fact. But men may consciously determine to evolve to a new civilization where formerly they evolved unconsciously and accidentally. They can now devise better conditions for the advancement of mankind, for their nourishment, training and education, they can administer the earth as an economic power, and, particularly, compare the capacities of men and select them accordingly. This new, conscious civilization is killing the other which, on the whole, has led but an unreflective animal and plant life: it is also destroying the doubt of progress itself--progress is possible. I mean: it is hasty and almost unreflective to assume that progress must _necessarily_ take place: but how can it be doubted that progress is possible? On the other hand, progress in the sense and along the lines of the old civilization is not even conceivable. If romantic fantasy employs the word progress in connection with certain aims and ends identical with those of the circumscribed primitive national civilizations, the picture presented of progress is always borrowed from the past. The idea and the image of progress thus formed are quite without originality.

[14] Cultur, culture, civilisation etc., but there is no exact English equivalent.

25

=Private Ethics and World Ethics.=--Since the extinction of the belief that a god guides the general destiny of the world and, notwithstanding all the contortions and windings of the path of mankind, leads it gloriously forward, men must shape oecumenical, world-embracing ends for themselves. The older ethics, namely Kant's, required of the individual such a course of conduct as he wishes all men to follow. This evinces much simplicity--as if any individual could determine off hand what course of conduct would conduce to the welfare of humanity, and what course of conduct is preeminently desirable! This is a theory like that of freedom of competition, which takes it for granted that the general harmony [of things] _must_ prevail of itself in accordance with some inherent law of betterment or amelioration. It may be that a later contemplation of the needs of mankind will reveal that it is by no means desirable that all men should regulate their conduct according to the same principle; it may be best, from the standpoint of certain ends yet to be attained, that men, during long periods should regulate their conduct with reference to special, and even, in certain circumstances, evil, objects. At any rate, if mankind is not to be led astray by such a universal rule of conduct, it behooves it to attain a _knowledge of the condition of culture_ that will serve as a scientific standard of comparison in connection with cosmical ends. Herein is comprised the tremendous mission of the great spirits of the next century.

26

=Reaction as Progress.=--Occasionally harsh, powerful, impetuous, yet nevertheless backward spirits, appear, who try to conjure back some past era in the history of mankind: they serve as evidence that the new tendencies which they oppose, are not yet potent enough, that there is something lacking in them: otherwise they [the tendencies] would better withstand the effects of this conjuring back process. Thus Luther's reformation shows that in his century all the impulses to freedom of the spirit were still uncertain, lacking in vigor, and immature. Science could not yet rear her head. Indeed the whole Renaissance appears but as an early spring smothered in snow. But even in the present century Schopenhauer's metaphysic shows that the scientific spirit is not yet powerful enough: for the whole mediaeval Christian world-standpoint (Weltbetrachtung) and conception of man (Mensch-Empfindung)[15] once again, notwithstanding the slowly wrought destruction of all Christian dogma, celebrated a resurrection in Schopenhauer's doctrine. There is much science in his teaching although the science does not dominate, but, instead of it, the old, trite "metaphysical necessity." It is one of the greatest and most priceless advantages of Schopenhauer's teaching that by it our feelings are temporarily forced back to those old human and cosmical standpoints to which no other path

could conduct us so easily. The gain for history and justice is very great. I believe that without Schopenhauer's aid it would be no easy matter for anyone now to do justice to Christianity and its Asiatic relatives--a thing impossible as regards the christianity that still survives. After according this great triumph to justice, after we have corrected in so essential a respect the historical point of view which the age of learning brought with it, we may begin to bear still farther onward the banner of enlightenment--a banner bearing the three names: Petrarch, Erasmus, Voltaire. We have taken a forward step out of reaction.

[15] Literally man-feeling or human outlook.

27

=A Substitute for Religion.=--It is supposed to be a recommendation for philosophy to say of it that it provides the people with a substitute for religion. And in fact, the training of the intellect does necessitate the convenient laying out of the track of thought, since the transition from religion by way of science entails a powerful, perilous leap,--something that should be advised against. With this qualification, the recommendation referred to is a just one. At the same time, it should be further explained that the needs which religion satisfies and which science must now satisfy, are not immutable. Even they can be diminished and uprooted. Think, for instance, of the christian soul-need, the sighs over one's inner corruption, the anxiety regarding salvation--all notions that arise simply out of errors of the reason and require no satisfaction at all, but annihilation. A philosophy can either so affect these needs as to appease them or else put them aside altogether, for they are acquired, circumscribed needs, based upon hypotheses which those of science explode. Here, for the purpose of affording the means of transition, for the sake of lightening the spirit overburdened with feeling, art can be employed to far better purpose, as these hypotheses receive far less support from art than from a metaphysical philosophy. Then from art it is easier to go over to a really emancipating philosophical science.

28

=Discredited Words.=--Away with the disgustingly over-used words optimism and pessimism! For the occasion for using them grows daily less; only drivelers now find them indispensably necessary. What earthly reason could anyone have for being an optimist unless he had a god to defend who _must_ have created the best of all possible worlds, since he is himself all goodness and perfection?--but what thinking man has now any need for the hypothesis that there is a god?--There is also no occasion whatever for a pessimistic confession of faith, unless one has a personal interest in denouncing the advocate of god, the theologian or the theological philosopher, and maintaining the counter proposition that evil reigns, that wretchedness is more potent than joy, that the world is a piece of botch work, that phenomenon (Erscheinung) is but the manifestation of some evil spirit. But who bothers his head about the theologians any more--except the theologians themselves? Apart from all theology and its antagonism, it is manifest that the world is neither good nor bad, (to say nothing about its being the best or the worst) and that these ideas of "good" and "bad" have significance only in relation to men, indeed, are without significance at all, in view of the sense in which they are usually employed. The contemptuous and the eulogistic point of view must, in every case, be repudiated.

29

=Intoxicated by the Perfume of Flowers.=--The ship of humanity, it is thought, acquires an ever deeper draught the more it is laden. It is believed that the more profoundly man thinks, the more exquisitely he feels, the higher the standard he sets for himself, the greater his distance from the other animals--the more he appears as a genius (Genie) among animals--the nearer he gets to the true nature of the world and to comprehension thereof: this, indeed, he really does through science, but he thinks he does it far more adequately through his religions and arts. These are, certainly, a blossoming of the world, but not, therefore, _nearer the roots of the world_ than is the stalk. One cannot learn best from it the nature of the world, although nearly everyone thinks so. _Error_ has made men so deep, sensitive and imaginative in order to bring forth such flowers as religions and arts. Pure apprehension would be unable to do that. Whoever should disclose to us the essence of the world would be undeceiving us most cruelly. Not the world as thing-in-itself but the world as idea[16] (as error) is rich in portent, deep, wonderful, carrying happiness and unhappiness in its womb. This result leads to a philosophy of world negation: which, at any rate, can be as well combined with a practical world affirmation as with its opposite.

[16] Vorstellung: this word sometimes corresponds to the English word "idea", at others to "conception" or "notion."

30

=Evil Habits in Reaching Conclusions.=--The most usual erroneous conclusions of men are these: a thing[17] exists, therefore it is right: Here from capacity to live is deduced fitness, from fitness, is deduced justification. So also: an opinion gives happiness, therefore it is the true one, its effect is good, therefore it is itself good and true. Here is predicated of the effect that it gives happiness, that it is good in the sense of utility, and there is likewise predicated of the cause that it is good, but good in the sense of logical validity. Conversely, the proposition would run: a thing[17] cannot attain success, cannot maintain itself, therefore it is evil: a belief troubles [the believer], occasions pain, therefore it is false. The free spirit, who is sensible of the defect in this method of reaching conclusions and has had to suffer its consequences, often succumbs to the temptation to come to the very opposite conclusions (which, in general, are, of course, equally erroneous): a thing cannot maintain itself: therefore it is good; a belief is troublesome, therefore it is true.

[17] Sache, thing but not in the sense of Ding. Sache is of very indefinite application (res).

31

=The Illogical is Necessary.=--Among the things which can bring a thinker to distraction is the knowledge that the illogical is necessary to mankind and that from the illogical springs much that is good. The illogical is so imbedded in the passions, in language, in art, in religion and, above all, in everything that imparts value to life that it cannot be taken away without irreparably injuring those beautiful things. Only men of the utmost simplicity can believe that the nature man knows can be changed into a purely logical nature. Yet were there steps affording approach to this goal, how utterly everything would be lost on the way! Even the most rational man needs nature again, from time to time, that is, his illogical fundamental relation (Grundstellung) to all things.

32

=Being Unjust is Essential.=--All judgments of the value of life are illogically developed and therefore unjust. The vice of the judgment consists, first, in the way in which the subject matter comes under observation, that is, very incompletely; secondly in the way in which the total is summed up; and, thirdly, in the fact that each single item in the totality of the subject matter is itself the result of defective perception, and this from absolute necessity. No practical knowledge of a man, for example, stood he never so near to us, can be complete--so that we could have a logical right to form a total estimate of him; all estimates are summary and must be so. Then the standard by which we measure, (our being) is not an immutable quantity; we have moods and variations, and yet we should know ourselves as an invariable standard before we undertake to establish the nature of the relation of any thing (Sache) to ourselves. Perhaps it will follow from all this that one should form no judgments whatever; if one could but merely _live_ without having to form estimates, without aversion and without partiality!--for everything most abhorred is closely connected with an estimate, as well as every strongest partiality. An inclination towards a thing, or from a thing, without an accompanying feeling that the beneficial is desired and the pernicious contemned, an inclination without a sort of experiential estimation of the desirability of an end, does not exist in man. We are primordially illogical and hence unjust beings _and can recognise this fact_: this is one of the greatest and most baffling discords of existence.

33

=Error Respecting Living for the Sake of Living Essential.=--Every belief in the value and worthiness of life rests upon defective thinking; it is for this reason alone possible that sympathy with the general life and suffering of mankind is so imperfectly developed in the individual. Even exceptional men, who can think beyond their own personalities, do not have this general life in view, but isolated portions of it. If one is capable of fixing his observation upon exceptional cases, I mean upon highly endowed individuals and pure souled beings, if their development is taken as the true end of world-evolution and if joy be felt in their existence, then it is possible to believe in the value of life, because in that case the rest of humanity is overlooked: hence we have here defective thinking. So, too, it is even if all mankind be taken into consideration, and one species only of impulses (the less egoistic) brought under review and those, in consideration of the other impulses, exalted: then something could still be hoped of mankind in the mass and to that extent there could exist belief in the value of life: here, again, as a result of defective thinking. Whatever attitude, thus, one may assume, one is, as a result of this attitude, an exception among mankind. Now, the great majority of mankind endure life without any great protest, and believe, to this extent, in the value of existence, but that is because each individual decides and determines alone, and never comes out of his own personality like these exceptions: everything outside of the personal has no existence for them or at the utmost is observed as but a faint shadow. Consequently the value of life for the generality of mankind consists simply in the fact that the individual attaches more importance to himself than he does to the world. The great lack of imagination from which he suffers is responsible for his inability to enter into the feelings of beings other than himself, and hence

his sympathy with their fate and suffering is of the slightest possible description. On the other hand, whosoever really _could_ sympathise, necessarily doubts the value of life; were it possible for him to sum up and to feel in himself the total consciousness of mankind, he would collapse with a malediction against existence,--for mankind is, in the mass, without a goal, and hence man cannot find, in the contemplation of his whole course, anything to serve him as a mainstay and a comfort, but rather a reason to despair. If he looks beyond the things that immediately engage him to the final aimlessness of humanity, his own conduct assumes in his eyes the character of a frittering away. To feel oneself, however, as humanity (not alone as an individual) frittered away exactly as we see the stray leaves frittered away by nature, is a feeling transcending all feeling. But who is capable of it? Only a poet, certainly: and poets always know how to console themselves.

34

=For Tranquility.=--But will not our philosophy become thus a tragedy? Will not truth prove the enemy of life, of betterment? A question seems to weigh upon our tongue and yet will not put itself into words: whether one _can_ knowingly remain in the domain of the untruthful? or, if one _must_, whether, then, death would not be preferable? For there is no longer any ought (Sollen), morality; so far as it is involved "ought," is, through our point of view, as utterly annihilated as religion. Our knowledge can permit only pleasure and pain, benefit and injury, to subsist as motives. But how can these motives be distinguished from the desire for truth? Even they rest upon error (in so far, as already stated, partiality and dislike and their very inaccurate estimates palpably modify our pleasure and our pain). The whole of human life is deeply involved in _untruth_. The individual cannot extricate it from this pit without thereby fundamentally clashing with his whole past, without finding his present motives of conduct, (as that of honor) illegitimate, and without opposing scorn and contempt to the ambitions which prompt one to have regard for the future and for one's happiness in the future. Is it true, does there, then, remain but one way of thinking, which, as a personal consequence brings in its train despair, and as a theoretical [consequence brings in its train] a philosophy of decay, disintegration, self annihilation? I believe the deciding influence, as regards the after-effect of knowledge, will be the _temperament_ of a man; I can, in addition to this after-effect just mentioned, suppose another, by means of which a much simpler life, and one freer from disturbances than the present, could be lived; so that at first the old motives of vehement passion might still have strength, owing to hereditary habit, but they would gradually grow weaker under the influence of purifying knowledge. A man would live, at last, both among men and unto himself, as in the natural state, without praise, reproach, competition, feasting one's eyes, as if it were a play, upon much that formerly inspired dread. One would be rid of the strenuous element, and would no longer feel the goad of the reflection that man is not even [as much as] nature, nor more than nature. To be sure, this requires, as already stated, a good temperament, a fortified, gentle and naturally cheerful soul, a disposition that has no need to be on its guard against its own eccentricities and sudden outbreaks and that in its utterances manifests neither sullenness nor a snarling tone--those familiar, disagreeable characteristics of old dogs and old men that have been a long time chained up. Rather must a man, from whom the ordinary bondages of life have fallen away to so great an extent, so do that he only lives on in order to grow continually in knowledge, and to learn to resign, without envy and without disappointment, much, yes nearly everything, that has value in the eyes of men. He must be content with such a free, fearless soaring above men, manners, laws and traditional estimates of things, as the most desirable of all situations. He will freely share the joy of being in such a situation, and he has, perhaps, nothing else to share--in which renunciation and self-denial really most consist. But if more is asked of him, he will, with a benevolent shake of the head, refer to his brother, the free man of fact, and will, perhaps, not dissemble a little contempt: for, as regards his "freedom," thereby hangs a tale.[18]

[18] den mit dessen "Freiheit" hat es eine eigene Bewandtniss.

HISTORY OF THE MORAL FEELINGS.

35

=Advantages of Psychological Observation.=--That reflection regarding the human, all-too-human--or as the learned jargon is: psychological observation--is among the means whereby the burden of life can be made lighter, that practice in this art affords presence of mind in difficult situations and entertainment amid a wearisome environment, aye, that maxims may be culled in the thorniest and least pleasing paths of life and invigoration thereby obtained: this much was believed, was known--in former centuries. Why was this forgotten in our own century, during which, at least in Germany, yes in Europe, poverty as regards psychological observation would have been manifest in many ways had there been anyone to whom this poverty could have manifested itself. Not only in the novel, in the romance, in philosophical standpoints--these are the works of exceptional men; still more in the state of opinion regarding public events and personages; above all in general society, which says much about men but

nothing whatever about man, there is totally lacking the art of psychological analysis and synthesis. But why is the richest and most harmless source of entertainment thus allowed to run to waste? Why is the greatest master of the psychological maxim no longer read?--for, with no exaggeration whatever be it said: the educated person in Europe who has read La Rochefoucauld and his intellectual and artistic affinities is very hard to find; still harder, the person who knows them and does not disparage them. Apparently, too, this unusual reader takes far less pleasure in them than the form adopted by these artists should afford him: for the subtlest mind cannot adequately appreciate the art of maxim-making unless it has had training in it, unless it has competed in it. Without such practical acquaintance, one is apt to look upon this making and forming as a much easier thing than it really is; one is not keenly enough alive to the felicity and the charm of success. Hence present day readers of maxims have but a moderate, tempered pleasure in them, scarcely, indeed, a true perception of their merit, so that their experiences are about the same as those of the average beholder of cameos: people who praise because they cannot appreciate, and are very ready to admire and still readier to turn away.

36

=Objection.=--Or is there a counter-proposition to the dictum that psychological observation is one of the means of consoling, lightening, charming existence? Have enough of the unpleasant effects of this art been experienced to justify the person striving for culture in turning his regard away from it? In all truth, a certain blind faith in the goodness of human nature, an implanted distaste for any disparagement of human concerns, a sort of shamefacedness at the nakedness of the soul, may be far more desirable things in the general happiness of a man, than this only occasionally advantageous quality of psychological sharpsightedness; and perhaps belief in the good, in virtuous men and actions, in a plenitude of disinterested benevolence has been more productive of good in the world of men in so far as it has made men less distrustful. If Plutarch's heroes are enthusiastically imitated and a reluctance is experienced to looking too critically into the motives of their actions, not the knowledge but the welfare of human society is promoted thereby: psychological error and above all obtuseness in regard to it, help human nature forward, whereas knowledge of the truth is more promoted by means of the stimulating strength of a hypothesis; as La Rochefoucauld in the first edition of his "Sentences and Moral Maxims" has expressed it: "What the world calls virtue is ordinarily but a phantom created by the passions, and to which we give a good name in order to do whatever we please with impunity." La Rochefoucauld and those other French masters of soul-searching (to the number of whom has lately been added a German, the author of "Psychological Observations") are like expert marksmen who again and again hit the black spot--but it is the black spot in human nature. Their art inspires amazement, but finally some spectator, inspired, not by the scientific spirit but by a humanitarian feeling, execrates an art that seems to implant in the soul a taste for belittling and impeaching mankind.

37

=Nevertheless.=--The matter therefore, as regards pro and con, stands thus: in the present state of philosophy an awakening of the moral observation is essential. The repulsive aspect of psychological dissection, with the knife and tweezers entailed by the process, can no longer be spared humanity. Such is the imperative duty of any science that investigates the origin and history of the so-called moral feelings and which, in its progress, is called upon to posit and to solve advanced social problems:--The older philosophy does not recognize the newer at all and, through paltry evasions, has always gone astray in the investigation of the origin and history of human estimates (Werthschaetzungen). With what results may now be very clearly perceived, since it has been shown by many examples, how the errors of the greatest philosophers have their origin in a false explanation of certain human actions and feelings; how upon the foundation of an erroneous analysis (for example, of the so called disinterested actions), a false ethic is reared, to support which religion and like mythological monstrosities are called in, until finally the shades of these troubled spirits collapse in physics and in the comprehensive world point of view. But if it be established that superficiality of psychological observation has heretofore set the most dangerous snares for human judgment and deduction, and will continue to do so, all the greater need is there of that steady continuance of labor that never wearies putting stone upon stone, little stone upon little stone; all the greater need is there of a courage that is not ashamed of such humble labor and that will oppose persistence, to all contempt. It is, finally, also true that countless single observations concerning the human, all-too-human, have been first made and uttered in circles accustomed, not to furnish matter for scientific knowledge, but for intellectual pleasure-seeking; and the original home atmosphere--a very seductive atmosphere--of the moral maxim has almost inextricably interpenetrated the entire species, so that the scientific man involuntarily manifests a sort of mistrust of this species and of its seriousness. But it is sufficient to point to the consequences: for already it is becoming evident that events of the most portentous nature are developing in the domain of psychological observation. What is the leading conclusion arrived at by one of the subtlest and calmest of thinkers, the author of the work "Concerning the Origin of the Moral Feelings", as a result of his thorough and incisive analysis of human

conduct? "The moral man," he says, "stands no nearer the knowable (metaphysical) world than the physical man."[19] This dictum, grown hard and cutting beneath the hammer-blow of historical knowledge, can some day, perhaps, in some future or other, serve as the axe that will be laid to the root of the "metaphysical necessities" of men--whether more to the blessing than to the banning of universal well being who can say?--but in any event a dictum fraught with the most momentous consequences, fruitful and fearful at once, and confronting the world in the two faced way characteristic of all great facts.

[19] "Der moralische Mensch, sagt er, steht der intelligiblen (metaphysischen) Welt nicht naeher, als der physische Mensch."

38

=To What Extent Useful.=--Therefore, whether psychological observation is more an advantage than a disadvantage to mankind may always remain undetermined: but there is no doubt that it is necessary, because science can no longer dispense with it. Science, however, recognizes no considerations of ultimate goals or ends any more than nature does; but as the latter duly matures things of the highest fitness for certain ends without any intention of doing it, so will true science, doing with ideas what nature does with matter,[20] promote the purposes and the welfare of humanity, (as occasion may afford, and in many ways) and attain fitness [to ends]--but likewise without having intended it.

[20] als die Nachahmung der Natur in Begriffen, literally: "as the counterfeit of nature in (regard to) ideas."

He to whom the atmospheric conditions of such a prospect are too wintry, has too little fire in him: let him look about him, and he will become sensible of maladies requiring an icy air, and of people who are so "kneaded together" out of ardor and intellect that they can scarcely find anywhere an atmosphere too cold and cutting for them. Moreover: as too serious individuals and nations stand in need of trivial relaxations; as others, too volatile and excitable require onerous, weighty ordeals to render them entirely healthy: should not we, the more intellectual men of this age, which is swept more and more by conflagrations, catch up every cooling and extinguishing appliance we can find that we may always remain as self contained, steady and calm as we are now, and thereby perhaps serve this age as its mirror and self reflector, when the occasion arises?

39

=The Fable of Discretionary Freedom.=--The history of the feelings, on the basis of which we make everyone responsible, hence, the so-called moral feelings, is traceable in the following leading phases. At first single actions are termed good or bad without any reference to their motive, but solely because of the utilitarian or prejudicial consequences they have for the community. In time, however, the origin of these designations is forgotten [but] it is imagined that action in itself, without reference to its consequences, contains the property "good" or "bad": with the same error according to which language designates the stone itself as hard[ness] the tree itself as green[ness]--for the reason, therefore, that what is a consequence is comprehended as a cause. Accordingly, the good[ness] or bad[ness] is incorporated into the motive and [any] deed by itself is regarded as morally ambiguous. A step further is taken, and the predication good or bad is no longer made of the particular motives but of the entire nature of a man, out of which motive grows as grow the plants out of the soil. Thus man is successively made responsible for his [particular] acts, then for his [course of] conduct, then for his motives and finally for his nature. Now, at last, is it discovered that this nature, even, cannot be responsible, inasmuch as it is only and wholly a necessary consequence and is synthesised out of the elements and influence of past and present things: therefore, that man is to be made responsible for nothing, neither for his nature, nor his motives, nor his [course of] conduct nor his [particular] acts. By this [process] is gained the knowledge that the history of moral estimates is the history of error, of the error of responsibility: as is whatever rests upon the error of the freedom of the will. Schopenhauer concluded just the other way, thus: since certain actions bring depression ("consciousness of guilt") in their train, there must, then, exist responsibility, for there would be no basis for this depression at hand if all man's affairs did not follow their course of necessity--as they do, indeed, according to the opinion of this philosopher, follow their course--but man himself, subject to the same necessity, would be just the man that he is--which Schopenhauer denies. From the fact of such depression Schopenhauer believes himself able to prove a freedom which man in some way must have had, not indeed in regard to his actions but in regard to his nature: freedom, therefore, to be thus and so, not to act thus and so. Out of the _esse_, the sphere of freedom and responsibility, follows, according to his opinion, the _operari_, the spheres of invariable causation, necessity and irresponsibility. This depression, indeed, is due apparently to the _operari_--in so far as it be delusive--but in truth to whatever _esse_ be the deed of a free will, the basic cause of the existence of an individual: [in order to] let man become whatever he wills to become, his [to] will (Wollen) must precede his existence.--Here, apart from the absurdity of the statement just made, there is drawn the wrong inference that the fact of the depression explains its character, the rational admissibility of it: from such a wrong inference does Schopenhauer first come

to his fantastic consequent of the so called discretionary freedom (intelligibeln Freiheit). (For the origin of this fabulous entity Plato and Kant are equally responsible). But depression after the act does not need to be rational: indeed, it is certainly not so at all, for it rests upon the erroneous assumption that the act need not necessarily have come to pass. Therefore: only because man deems himself free, but not because he is free, does he experience remorse and the stings of conscience.--Moreover, this depression is something that can be grown out of; in many men it is not present at all as a consequence of acts which inspire it in many other men. It is a very varying thing and one closely connected with the development of custom and civilization, and perhaps manifest only during a relatively brief period of the world's history.--No one is responsible for his acts, no one for his nature; to judge is tantamount to being unjust. This applies as well when the individual judges himself. The proposition is as clear as sunlight, and yet here everyone prefers to go back to darkness and untruth: for fear of the consequences.

40

=Above Animal.=--The beast in us must be wheedled: ethic is necessary, that we may not be torn to pieces. Without the errors involved in the assumptions of ethics, man would have remained an animal. Thus has he taken himself as something higher and imposed rigid laws upon himself. He feels hatred, consequently, for states approximating the animal: whence the former contempt for the slave as a not-yet-man, as a thing, is to be explained.

41

=Unalterable Character.=--That character is unalterable is not, in the strict sense, true; rather is this favorite proposition valid only to the extent that during the brief life period of a man the potent new motives can not, usually, press down hard enough to obliterate the lines imprinted by ages. Could we conceive of a man eighty thousand years old, we should have in him an absolutely alterable character; so that the maturities of successive, varying individuals would develop in him. The shortness of human life leads to many erroneous assertions concerning the qualities of man.

42

=Classification of Enjoyments and Ethic.=--The once accepted comparative classification of enjoyments, according to which an inferior, higher, highest egoism may crave one or another enjoyment, now decides as to ethical status or unethical status. A lower enjoyment (for example, sensual pleasure) preferred to a more highly esteemed one (for example, health) rates as unethical, as does welfare preferred to freedom. The comparative classification of enjoyments is not, however, alike or the same at all periods; when anyone demands satisfaction of the law, he is, from the point of view of an earlier civilization, moral, from that of the present, non-moral. "Unethical" indicates, therefore, that a man is not sufficiently sensible to the higher, finer impulses which the present civilization has brought with it, or is not sensible to them at all; it indicates backwardness, but only from the point of view of the contemporary degree of distinction.--The comparative classification of enjoyments itself is not determined according to absolute ethics; but after each new ethical adjustment, it is then decided whether conduct be ethical or the reverse.

43

=Inhuman Men as Survivals.=--Men who are now inhuman must serve us as surviving specimens of earlier civilizations. The mountain height of humanity here reveals its lower formations, which might otherwise remain hidden from view. There are surviving specimens of humanity whose brains through the vicissitudes of heredity, have escaped proper development. They show us what we all were and thus appal us; but they are as little responsible on this account as is a piece of granite for being granite. In our own brains there must be courses and windings corresponding to such characters, just as in the forms of some human organs there survive traces of fishhood. But these courses and windings are no longer the bed in which flows the stream of our feeling.

44

=Gratitude and Revenge.=--The reason the powerful man is grateful is this. His benefactor has, through his benefaction, invaded the domain of the powerful man and established himself on an equal footing: the powerful man in turn invades the domain of the benefactor and gets satisfaction through the act of gratitude. It is a mild form of revenge. By not obtaining the satisfaction of gratitude the powerful would have shown himself powerless and have ranked as such thenceforward. Hence every society of the good, that is to say, of the powerful originally, places gratitude among the first of duties.--Swift has added the dictum that man is grateful in the same degree that he is revengeful.

45

=Two-fold Historical Origin of Good and Evil.=--The notion of good and bad has a two-fold historical origin: namely, first, in the spirit of ruling races and castes. Whoever has power to requite good with good and evil with evil and actually brings requital, (that is, is grateful and revengeful) acquires the name of being good; whoever is powerless and cannot requite is called bad. A man belongs, as a good individual, to the "good" of a community, who have a feeling in common, because all the individuals are allied with one another through the requiting sentiment. A man belongs, as a bad individual, to the "bad," to a mass of subjugated, powerless men who have no feeling in common. The good are a caste, the bad are a quantity, like dust. Good and bad is, for a considerable period, tantamount to noble and servile, master and slave. On the other hand an enemy is not looked upon as bad: he can requite. The Trojan and the Greek are in Homer both good. Not he, who does no harm, but he who is despised, is deemed bad. In the community of the good individuals [the quality of] good[ness] is inherited; it is impossible for a bad individual to grow from such a rich soil. If, notwithstanding, one of the good individuals does something unworthy of his goodness, recourse is had to exorcism; thus the guilt is ascribed to a deity, the while it is declared that this deity bewitched the good man into madness and blindness.--Second, in the spirit of the subjugated, the powerless. Here every other man is, to the individual, hostile, inconsiderate, greedy, inhuman, avaricious, be he noble or servile; bad is the characteristic term for man, for every living being, indeed, that is recognized at all, even for a god: human, divine, these notions are tantamount to devilish, bad. Manifestations of goodness, sympathy, helpfulness, are regarded with anxiety as trickiness, preludes to an evil end, deception, subtlety, in short, as refined badness. With such a predisposition in individuals, a feeling in common can scarcely arise at all, at most only the rudest form of it: so that everywhere that this conception of good and evil prevails, the destruction of the individuals, their race and nation, is imminent.--Our existing morality has developed upon the foundation laid by ruling races and castes.

46

=Sympathy Greater than Suffering.=--There are circumstances in which sympathy is stronger than the suffering itself. We feel more pain, for instance, when one of our friends becomes guilty of a reprehensible action than if we had done the deed ourselves. We once, that is, had more faith in the purity of his character than he had himself. Hence our love for him, (apparently because of this very faith) is stronger than is his own love for himself. If, indeed, his egoism really suffers more, as a result, than our egoism, inasmuch as he must take the consequences of his fault to a greater extent than ourselves, nevertheless, the unegoistic--this word is not to be taken too strictly, but simply as a modified form of expression--in us is more affected by his guilt than the unegoistic in him.

47

=Hypochondria.=--There are people who, from sympathy and anxiety for others become hypochondriacal. The resulting form of compassion is nothing else than sickness. So, also, is there a Christian hypochondria, from which those singular, religiously agitated people suffer who place always before their eyes the suffering and death of Christ.

48

=Economy of Blessings.=--The advantageous and the pleasing, as the healthiest growths and powers in the intercourse of men, are such precious treasures that it is much to be wished the use made of these balsamic means were as economical as possible: but this is impossible. Economy in the use of blessings is the dream of the craziest of Utopians.

49

=Well-Wishing.=--Among the small, but infinitely plentiful and therefore very potent things to which science must pay more attention than to the great, uncommon things, well-wishing[21] must be reckoned; I mean those manifestations of friendly disposition in intercourse, that laughter of the eye, every hand pressure, every courtesy from which, in general, every human act gets its quality. Every teacher, every functionary adds this element as a gratuity to whatever he does as a duty; it is the perpetual well spring of humanity, like the waves of light in which everything grows; thus, in the narrowest circles, within the family, life blooms and flowers only through this kind feeling. The cheerfulness, friendliness and kindness of a heart are unfailing sources of unegoistic impulse and have made far more for civilization than those other more noised manifestations of it that are styled sympathy, benevolence and sacrifice. But it is customary to depreciate these little tokens of kindly feeling, and, indeed, there is not much of the unegoistic in them. The sum of these little doses is very great, nevertheless; their combined strength is of the greatest of strengths.--Thus, too,

much more happiness is to be found in the world than gloomy eyes discover: that is, if the calculation be just, and all these pleasing moments in which every day, even the meanest human life, is rich, be not forgotten.

[21] Wohl-wollen, kind feeling. It stands here for benevolence but not benevolence in the restricted sense of the word now prevailing.

50

=The Desire to Inspire Compassion.=--La Rochefoucauld, in the most notable part of his self portraiture (first printed 1658) reaches the vital spot of truth when he warns all those endowed with reason to be on their guard against compassion, when he advises that this sentiment be left to men of the masses who stand in need of the promptings of the emotions (since they are not guided by reason) to induce them to give aid to the suffering and to be of service in misfortune: whereas compassion, in his (and Plato's) view, deprives the heart of strength. To be sure, sympathy should be manifested but men should take care not to feel it; for the unfortunate are rendered so dull that the manifestation of sympathy affords them the greatest happiness in the world.--Perhaps a more effectual warning against this compassion can be given if this need of the unfortunate be considered not simply as stupidity and intellectual weakness, not as a sort of distraction of the spirit entailed by misfortune itself (and thus, indeed, does La Rochefoucauld seem to view it) but as something quite different and more momentous. Let note be taken of children who cry and scream in order to be compassionated and who, therefore, await the moment when their condition will be observed; come into contact with the sick and the oppressed in spirit and try to ascertain if the wailing and sighing, the posturing and posing of misfortune do not have as end and aim the causing of pain to the beholder: the sympathy which each beholder manifests is a consolation to the weak and suffering only in as much as they are made to perceive that at least they have the power, notwithstanding all their weakness, to inflict pain. The unfortunate experiences a species of joy in the sense of superiority which the manifestation of sympathy entails; his imagination is exalted; he is always strong enough, then, to cause the world pain. Thus is the thirst for sympathy a thirst for self enjoyment and at the expense of one's fellow creatures: it shows man in the whole ruthlessness of his own dear self: not in his mere "dullness" as La Rochefoucauld thinks.--In social conversation three fourths of all the questions are asked, and three fourths of all the replies are made in order to inflict some little pain; that is why so many people crave social intercourse: it gives them a sense of their power. In these countless but very small doses in which the quality of badness is administered it proves a potent stimulant of life: to the same extent that well wishing--(Wohl-wollen) distributed through the world in like manner, is one of the ever ready restoratives.--But will many honorable people be found to admit that there is any pleasure in administering pain? that entertainment--and rare entertainment--is not seldom found in causing others, at least in thought, some pain, and in raking them with the small shot of wickedness? The majority are too ignoble and a few are too good to know anything of this pudendum: the latter may, consequently, be prompt to deny that Prosper Merimee is right when he says: "Know, also, that nothing is more common than to do wrong for the pleasure of doing it."

51

=How Appearance Becomes Reality.=--The actor cannot, at last, refrain, even in moments of the deepest pain, from thinking of the effect produced by his deportment and by his surroundings--for example, even at the funeral of his own child: he will weep at his own sorrow and its manifestations as though he were his own audience. The hypocrite who always plays one and the same part, finally ceases to be a hypocrite; as in the case of priests who, when young men, are always, either consciously or unconsciously, hypocrites, and finally become naturally and then really, without affectation, mere priests: or if the father does not carry it to this extent, the son, who inherits his father's calling and gets the advantage of the paternal progress, does. When anyone, during a long period, and persistently, wishes to appear something, it will at last prove difficult for him to be anything else. The calling of almost every man, even of the artist, begins with hypocrisy, with an imitation of deportment, with a copying of the effective in manner. He who always wears the mask of a friendly man must at last gain a power over friendliness of disposition, without which the expression itself of friendliness is not to be gained--and finally friendliness of disposition gains the ascendancy over him--he _is_ benevolent.

52

=The Point of Honor in Deception.=--In all great deceivers one characteristic is prominent, to which they owe their power. In the very act of deception, amid all the accompaniments, the agitation in the voice, the expression, the bearing, in the crisis of the scene, there comes over them a belief in themselves; this it is that acts so effectively and irresistibly upon the beholders. Founders of religions differ from such great deceivers in that they never come out of this state of self deception, or else they have, very rarely,

a few moments of enlightenment in which they are overcome by doubt; generally, however, they soothe themselves by ascribing such moments of enlightenment to the evil adversary. Self deception must exist that both classes of deceivers may attain far reaching results. For men believe in the truth of all that is manifestly believed with due implicitness by others.

53

=Presumed Degrees of Truth.=--One of the most usual errors of deduction is: because someone truly and openly is against us, therefore he speaks the truth. Hence the child has faith in the judgments of its elders, the Christian in the assertions of the founder of the church. So, too, it will not be admitted that all for which men sacrificed life and happiness in former centuries was nothing but delusion: perhaps it is alleged these things were degrees of truth. But what is really meant is that, if a person sincerely believes a thing and has fought and died for his faith, it would be too _unjust_ if only delusion had inspired him. Such a state of affairs seems to contradict eternal justice. For that reason the heart of a sensitive man pronounces against his head the judgment: between moral conduct and intellectual insight there must always exist an inherent connection. It is, unfortunately, otherwise: for there is no eternal justice.

54

=Falsehood.=--Why do men, as a rule, speak the truth in the ordinary affairs of life? Certainly not for the reason that a god has forbidden lying. But because first: it is more convenient, as falsehood entails invention, make-believe and recollection (wherefore Swift says that whoever invents a lie seldom realises the heavy burden he takes up: he must, namely, for every lie that he tells, insert twenty more). Therefore, because in plain ordinary relations of life it is expedient to say without circumlocution: I want this, I have done this, and the like; therefore, because the way of freedom and certainty is surer than that of ruse.--But if it happens that a child is brought up in sinister domestic circumstances, it will then indulge in falsehood as matter of course, and involuntarily say anything its own interests may prompt: an inclination for truth, an aversion to falsehood, is quite foreign and uncongenial to it, and hence it lies in all innocence.

55

=Ethic Discredited for Faith's Sake.=--No power can sustain itself when it is represented by mere humbugs: the Catholic Church may possess ever so many "worldly" sources of strength, but its true might is comprised in those still numberless priestly natures who make their lives stern and strenuous and whose looks and emaciated bodies are eloquent of night vigils, fasts, ardent prayer, perhaps even of whip lashes: these things make men tremble and cause them anxiety: what, if it be really imperative to live thus? This is the dreadful question which their aspect occasions. As they spread this doubt, they lay anew the prop of their power: even the free thinkers dare not oppose such disinterestedness with severe truth and cry: "Thou deceived one, deceive not!"--Only the difference of standpoint separates them from him: no difference in goodness or badness. But things we cannot accomplish ourselves, we are apt to criticise unfairly. Thus we are told of the cunning and perverted acts of the Jesuits, but we overlook the self mastery that each Jesuit imposes upon himself and also the fact that the easy life which the Jesuit manuals advocate is for the benefit, not of the Jesuits but the laity. Indeed, it may be questioned whether we enlightened ones would become equally competent workers as the result of similar tactics and organization, and equally worthy of admiration as the result of self mastery, indefatigable industry and devotion.

56

=Victory of Knowledge over Radical Evil.=--It proves a material gain to him who would attain knowledge to have had during a considerable period the idea that mankind is a radically bad and perverted thing: it is a false idea, as is its opposite, but it long held sway and its roots have reached down even to ourselves and our present world. In order to understand _ourselves_ we must understand _it_; but in order to attain a loftier height we must step above it. We then perceive that there is no such thing as sin in the metaphysical sense: but also, in the same sense, no such thing as virtue; that this whole domain of ethical notions is one of constant variation; that there are higher and deeper conceptions of good and evil, moral and immoral. Whoever desires no more of things than knowledge of them attains speedily to peace of mind and will at most err through lack of knowledge, but scarcely through eagerness for knowledge (or through sin, as the world calls it). He will not ask that eagerness for knowledge be interdicted and rooted out; but his single, all powerful ambition to _know_ as thoroughly and as fully as possible, will soothe him and moderate all that is strenuous in his circumstances. Moreover, he is now rid of a number of disturbing notions; he is no longer beguiled by such words as hell-pain, sinfulness, unworthiness: he sees in them merely the flitting shadow pictures of false views of life and of

the world.

57

=Ethic as Man's Self-Analysis.=--A good author, whose heart is really in his work, wishes that someone would arise and wholly refute him if only thereby his subject be wholly clarified and made plain. The maid in love wishes that she could attest the fidelity of her own passion through the faithlessness of her beloved. The soldier wishes to sacrifice his life on the field of his fatherland's victory: for in the victory of his fatherland his highest end is attained. The mother gives her child what she deprives herself of--sleep, the best nourishment and, in certain circumstances, her health, her self.--But are all these acts unegoistic? Are these moral deeds miracles because they are, in Schopenhauer's phrase "impossible and yet accomplished"? Is it not evident that in all four cases man loves one part of himself, (a thought, a longing, an experience) more than he loves another part of himself? that he thus analyses his being and sacrifices one part of it to another part? Is this essentially different from the behavior of the obstinate man who says "I would rather be shot than go a step out of my way for this fellow"?--Preference for something (wish, impulse, longing) is present in all four instances: to yield to it, with all its consequences, is not "unegoistic."--In the domain of the ethical man conducts himself not as individuum but as dividuum.

58

=What Can be Promised.=--Actions can be promised, but not feelings, for these are involuntary. Whoever promises somebody to love him always, or to hate him always, or to be ever true to him, promises something that it is out of his power to bestow. But he really can promise such courses of conduct as are the ordinary accompaniments of love, of hate, of fidelity, but which may also have their source in motives quite different: for various ways and motives lead to the same conduct. The promise to love someone always, means, consequently: as long as I love you, I will manifest the deportment of love; but if I cease to love you my deportment, although from some other motive, will be just the same, so that to the people about us it will seem as if my love remained unchanged.--Hence it is the continuance of the deportment of love that is promised in every instance in which eternal love (provided no element of self deception be involved) is sworn.

59

=Intellect and Ethic.=--One must have a good memory to be able to keep the promises one makes. One must have a strong imagination in order to feel sympathy. So closely is ethics connected with intellectual capacity.

60

=Desire for Vengeance and Vengeance Itself.=--To meditate revenge and attain it is tantamount to an attack of fever, that passes away: but to meditate revenge without possessing the strength or courage to attain it is tantamount to suffering from a chronic malady, or poisoning of body and soul. Ethics, which takes only the motive into account, rates both cases alike: people generally estimate the first case as the worst (because of the consequences which the deed of vengeance may entail). Both views are short sighted.

61

=Ability to Wait.=--Ability to wait is so hard to acquire that great poets have not disdained to make inability to wait the central motive of their poems. So Shakespeare in Othello, Sophocles in Ajax, whose suicide would not have seemed to him so imperative had he only been able to cool his ardor for a day, as the oracle foreboded: apparently he would then have repulsed somewhat the fearful whispers of distracted thought and have said to himself: Who has not already, in my situation, mistaken a sheep for a hero? is it so extraordinary a thing? On the contrary it is something universally human: Ajax should thus have soothed himself. Passion will not wait: the tragic element in the lives of great men does not generally consist in their conflict with time and the inferiority of their fellowmen but in their inability to put off their work a year or two: they cannot wait.--In all duels, the friends who advise have but to ascertain if the principals can wait: if this be not possible, a duel is rational inasmuch as each of the combatants may say: "either I continue to live and the other dies instantly, or vice versa." To wait in such circumstances would be equivalent to the frightful martyrdom of enduring dishonor in the presence of him responsible for the dishonor: and this can easily cost more anguish than life is worth.

62

=Glutting Revenge.=--Coarse men, who feel a sense of injury, are in the habit of rating the extent of their injury as high as possible and of stating the occasion of it in greatly exaggerated language, in order to be able to feast themselves on the sentiments of hatred and revenge thus aroused.

63

=Value of Disparagement.=--Not a few, perhaps the majority of men, find it necessary, in order to retain their self esteem and a certain uprightness in conduct, to mentally disparage and belittle all the people they know. But as the inferior natures are in the majority and as a great deal depends upon whether they retain or lose this uprightness, so--

64

=The Man in a Rage.=--We should be on our guard against the man who is enraged against us, as against one who has attempted our life, for the fact that we still live consists solely in the inability to kill: were looks sufficient, it would have been all up with us long since. To reduce anyone to silence by physical manifestations of savagery or by a terrorizing process is a relic of under civilization. So, too, that cold look which great personages cast upon their servitors is a remnant of the caste distinction between man and man; a specimen of rude antiquity: women, the conservers of the old, have maintained this survival, too, more perfectly than men.

65

=Whither Honesty May Lead.=--Someone once had the bad habit of expressing himself upon occasion, and with perfect honesty, on the subject of the motives of his conduct, which were as good or as bad as the motives of all men. He aroused first disfavor, then suspicion, became gradually of ill repute and was pronounced a person of whom society should beware, until at last the law took note of such a perverted being for reasons which usually have no weight with it or to which it closes its eyes. Lack of taciturnity concerning what is universally held secret, and an irresponsible predisposition to see what no one wants to see--oneself--brought him to prison and to early death.

66

=Punishable, not Punished.=--Our crime against criminals consists in the fact that we treat them as rascals.

67

=Sancta simplicitas of Virtue.=--Every virtue has its privilege: for example, that of contributing its own little bundle of wood to the funeral pyre of one condemned.

68

=Morality and Consequence.=--Not alone the beholders of an act generally estimate the ethical or unethical element in it by the result: no, the one who performed the act does the same. For the motives and the intentions are seldom sufficiently apparent, and amid them the memory itself seems to become clouded by the results of the act, so that a man often ascribes the wrong motives to his acts or regards the remote motives as the direct ones. Success often imparts to an action all the brilliance and honor of good intention, while failure throws the shadow of conscience over the most estimable deeds. Hence arises the familiar maxim of the politician: "Give me only success: with it I can win all the noble souls over to my side--and make myself noble even in my own eyes."--In like manner will success prove an excellent substitute for a better argument. To this very day many well educated men think the triumph of Christianity over Greek philosophy is a proof of the superior truth of the former--although in this case it was simply the coarser and more powerful that triumphed over the more delicate and intellectual. As regards superiority of truth, it is evident that because of it the reviving sciences have connected themselves, point for point, with the philosophy of Epicurus, while Christianity has, point for point, recoiled from it.

69

=Love and Justice.=--Why is love so highly prized at the expense of justice and why are such beautiful things spoken of the former as if it were a far higher entity than the latter? Is the former not palpably a far more stupid thing than the latter?--Certainly, and on that very account so much the more agreeable to everybody: it is blind and has a rich horn of plenty out of which it distributes its gifts to everyone, even when they are unmerited, even when no thanks are returned. It is impartial like the rain, which according to

the bible and experience, wets not alone the unjust but, in certain circumstances, the just as well, and to their skins at that.

70

=Execution.=--How comes it that every execution causes us more pain than a murder? It is the coolness of the executioner, the painful preparation, the perception that here a man is being used as an instrument for the intimidation of others. For the guilt is not punished even if there be any: this is ascribable to the teachers, the parents, the environment, in ourselves, not in the murderer--I mean the predisposing circumstances.

71

=Hope.=--Pandora brought the box containing evils and opened it. It was the gift of the gods to men, a gift of most enticing appearance externally and called the "box of happiness." Thereupon all the evils, (living, moving things) flew out: from that time to the present they fly about and do ill to men by day and night. One evil only did not fly out of the box: Pandora shut the lid at the behest of Zeus and it remained inside. Now man has this box of happiness perpetually in the house and congratulates himself upon the treasure inside of it; it is at his service: he grasps it whenever he is so disposed, for he knows not that the box which Pandora brought was a box of evils. Hence he looks upon the one evil still remaining as the greatest source of happiness--it is hope.--Zeus intended that man, notwithstanding the evils oppressing him, should continue to live and not rid himself of life, but keep on making himself miserable. For this purpose he bestowed hope upon man: it is, in truth, the greatest of evils for it lengthens the ordeal of man.

72

=Degree of Moral Susceptibility Unknown.=--The fact that one has or has not had certain profoundly moving impressions and insights into things--for example, an unjustly executed, slain or martyred father, a faithless wife, a shattering, serious accident,--is the factor upon which the excitation of our passions to white heat principally depends, as well as the course of our whole lives. No one knows to what lengths circumstances (sympathy, emotion) may lead him. He does not know the full extent of his own susceptibility. Wretched environment makes him wretched. It is as a rule not the quality of our experience but its quantity upon which depends the development of our superiority or inferiority, from the point of view of good and evil.

73

=The Martyr Against His Will.=--In a certain movement there was a man who was too cowardly and vacillating ever to contradict his comrades. He was made use of in each emergency, every sacrifice was demanded of him because he feared the disfavor of his comrades more than he feared death: he was a petty, abject spirit. They perceived this and upon the foundation of the qualities just mentioned they elevated him to the altitude of a hero, and finally even of a martyr. Although the cowardly creature always inwardly said No, he always said Yes with his lips, even upon the scaffold, where he died for the tenets of his party: for beside him stood one of his old associates who so domineered him with look and word that he actually went to his death with the utmost fortitude and has ever since been celebrated as a martyr and exalted character.

74

=General Standard.=--One will rarely err if extreme actions be ascribed to vanity, ordinary actions to habit and mean actions to fear.

75

=Misunderstanding of Virtue.=--Whoever has obtained his experience of vice in connection with pleasure as in the case of one with a youth of wild oats behind him, comes to the conclusion that virtue must be connected with self denial. Whoever, on the other hand, has been very much plagued by his passions and vices, longs to find in virtue the rest and peace of the soul. That is why it is possible for two virtuous people to misunderstand one another wholly.

76

=The Ascetic.=--The ascetic makes out of virtue a slavery.

77

=Honor Transferred from Persons to Things.=--Actions prompted by love or by the spirit of self sacrifice for others are universally honored wherever they are manifest. Hence is magnified the value set upon whatever things may be loved or whatever things conduce to self sacrifice: although in themselves they may be worth nothing much. A valiant army is evidence of the value of the thing it fights for.

78

=Ambition a Substitute for Moral Feeling.=--Moral feeling should never become extinct in natures that are destitute of ambition. The ambitious can get along without moral feeling just as well as with it.--Hence the sons of retired, ambitionless families, generally become by a series of rapid gradations, when they lose moral feeling, the most absolute lunkheads.

79

=Vanity Enriches.=--How poor the human mind would be without vanity! As it is, it resembles a well stacked and ever renewed ware-emporium that attracts buyers of every class: they can find almost everything, have almost everything, provided they bring with them the right kind of money--admiration.

80

=Senility and Death.=--Apart from the demands made by religion, it may well be asked why it is more honorable in an aged man, who feels the decline of his powers, to await slow extinction than to fix a term to his existence himself? Suicide in such a case is a quite natural and due proceeding that ought to command respect as a triumph of reason: and did in fact command respect during the times of the masters of Greek philosophy and the bravest Roman patriots, who usually died by their own hand. Eagerness, on the other hand, to keep alive from day to day with the anxious counsel of physicians, without capacity to attain any nearer to one's ideal of life, is far less worthy of respect.--Religions are very rich in refuges from the mandate of suicide: hence they ingratiate themselves with those who cling to life.

81

=Delusions Regarding Victim and Regarding Evil Doer.=--When the rich man takes a possession away from the poor man (for example, a prince who deprives a plebeian of his beloved) there arises in the mind of the poor man a delusion: he thinks the rich man must be wholly perverted to take from him the little that he has. But the rich man appreciates the value of a single possession much less because he is accustomed to many possessions, so that he cannot put himself in the place of the poor man and does not act by any means as ill as the latter supposes. Both have a totally false idea of each other. The iniquities of the mighty which bulk most largely in history are not nearly so monstrous as they seem. The hereditary consciousness of being a superior being with superior environment renders one very callous and lulls the conscience to rest. We all feel, when the difference between ourselves and some other being is exceedingly great, that no element of injustice can be involved, and we kill a fly with no qualms of conscience whatever. So, too, it is no indication of wickedness in Xerxes (whom even the Greeks represent as exceptionally noble) that he deprived a father of his son and had him drawn and quartered because the latter had manifested a troublesome, ominous distrust of an entire expedition: the individual was in this case brushed aside as a pestiferous insect. He was too low and mean to justify continued sentiments of compunction in the ruler of the world. Indeed no cruel man is ever as cruel, in the main, as his victim thinks. The idea of pain is never the same as the sensation. The rule is precisely analogous in the case of the unjust judge, and of the journalist who by means of devious rhetorical methods, leads public opinion astray. Cause and effect are in all these instances entwined with totally different series of feeling and thoughts, whereas it is unconsciously assumed that principal and victim feel and think exactly alike, and because of this assumption the guilt of the one is based upon the pain of the other.

82

=The Soul's Skin.=--As the bones, flesh, entrails and blood vessels are enclosed by a skin that renders the aspect of men endurable, so the impulses and passions of the soul are enclosed by vanity: it is the skin of the soul.

83

=Sleep of Virtue.=--If virtue goes to sleep, it will be more vigorous when it awakes.

84

=Subtlety of Shame.=--Men are not ashamed of obscene thoughts, but they are ashamed when they suspect that obscene thoughts are attributed to them.

85

=Naughtiness Is Rare.=--Most people are too much absorbed in themselves to be bad.

86

=The Mite in the Balance.=--We are praised or blamed, as the one or the other may be expedient, for displaying to advantage our power of discernment.

87

=Luke 18:14 Improved.=--He that humbleth himself wisheth to be exalted.

88

=Prevention of Suicide.=--There is a justice according to which we may deprive a man of life, but none that permits us to deprive him of death: this is merely cruelty.

89

=Vanity.=--We set store by the good opinion of men, first because it is of use to us and next because we wish to give them pleasure (children their parents, pupils their teacher, and well disposed persons all others generally). Only when the good opinion of men is important to somebody, apart from personal advantage or the desire to give pleasure, do we speak of vanity. In this last case, a man wants to give himself pleasure, but at the expense of his fellow creatures, inasmuch as he inspires them with a false opinion of himself or else inspires "good opinion" in such a way that it is a source of pain to others (by arousing envy). The individual generally seeks, through the opinion of others, to attest and fortify the opinion he has of himself; but the potent influence of authority--an influence as old as man himself--leads many, also, to strengthen their own opinion of themselves by means of authority, that is, to borrow from others the expedient of relying more upon the judgment of their fellow men than upon their own.--Interest in oneself, the wish to please oneself attains, with the vain man, such proportions that he first misleads others into a false, unduly exalted estimate of himself and then relies upon the authority of others for his self estimate; he thus creates the delusion that he pins his faith to.--It must, however, be admitted that the vain man does not desire to please others so much as himself and he will often go so far, on this account, as to overlook his own interests: for he often inspires his fellow creatures with malicious envy and renders them ill disposed in order that he may thus increase his own delight in himself.

90

=Limits of the Love of Mankind.=--Every man who has declared that some other man is an ass or a scoundrel, gets angry when the other man conclusively shows that the assertion was erroneous.

91

=Weeping Morality.=--How much delight morality occasions! Think of the ocean of pleasing tears that has flowed from the narration of noble, great-hearted deeds!--This charm of life would disappear if the belief in complete irresponsibility gained the upper hand.

92

=Origin of Justice.=--Justice (reasonableness) has its origin among approximate equals in power, as Thucydides (in the dreadful conferences of the Athenian and Melian envoys) has rightly conceived. Thus, where there exists no demonstrable supremacy and a struggle leads but to mutual, useless damage, the reflection arises that an understanding would best be arrived at and some compromise entered into. The reciprocal nature is hence the first nature of justice. Each party makes the other content inasmuch as each receives what it prizes more highly than the other. Each surrenders to the other what the other wants and receives in return its own desire. Justice is therefore reprisal and exchange upon the basis of an approximate equality of power. Thus revenge pertains originally to the domain of justice as it is a sort of reciprocity. Equally so, gratitude.--Justice reverts naturally to the standpoint of self preservation, therefore to the egoism of this consideration: "why should I injure myself to no purpose and perhaps never attain my

end?"--So much for the origin of justice. Only because men, through mental habits, have forgotten the original motive of so called just and rational acts, and also because for thousands of years children have been brought to admire and imitate such acts, have they gradually assumed the appearance of being unegotistical. Upon this appearance is founded the high estimate of them, which, moreover, like all estimates, is continually developing, for whatever is highly esteemed is striven for, imitated, made the object of self sacrifice, while the merit of the pain and emulation thus expended is, by each individual, ascribed to the thing esteemed.--How slightly moral would the world appear without forgetfulness! A poet could say that God had posted forgetfulness as a sentinel at the portal of the temple of human merit!

93

=Concerning the Law of the Weaker.=--Whenever any party, for instance, a besieged city, yields to a stronger party, under stipulated conditions, the counter stipulation is that there be a reduction to insignificance, a burning and destruction of the city and thus a great damage inflicted upon the stronger party. Thus arises a sort of equalization principle upon the basis of which a law can be established. The enemy has an advantage to gain by its maintenance.--To this extent there is also a law between slaves and masters, limited only by the extent to which the slave may be useful to his master. The law goes originally only so far as the one party may appear to the other potent, invincible, stable, and the like. To such an extent, then, the weaker has rights, but very limited ones. Hence the famous dictum that each has as much law on his side as his power extends (or more accurately, as his power is believed to extend).

94

=The Three Phases of Morality Hitherto.=--It is the first evidence that the animal has become human when his conduct ceases to be based upon the immediately expedient, but upon the permanently useful; when he has, therefore, grown utilitarian, capable of purpose. Thus is manifested the first rule of reason. A still higher stage is attained when he regulates his conduct upon the basis of honor, by means of which he gains mastery of himself and surrenders his desires to principles; this lifts him far above the phase in which he was actuated only by considerations of personal advantage as he understood it. He respects and wishes to be respected. This means that he comprehends utility as a thing dependent upon what his opinion of others is and their opinion of him. Finally he regulates his conduct (the highest phase of morality hitherto attained) by his own standard of men and things. He himself decides, for himself and for others, what is honorable and what is useful. He has become a law giver to opinion, upon the basis of his ever higher developing conception of the utilitarian and the honorable. Knowledge makes him capable of placing the highest utility, (that is, the universal, enduring utility) before merely personal utility,--of placing ennobling recognition of the enduring and universal before the merely temporary: he lives and acts as a collective individuality.

95

=Ethic of the Developed Individual.=--Hitherto the altruistic has been looked upon as the distinctive characteristic of moral conduct, and it is manifest that it was the consideration of universal utility that prompted praise and recognition of altruistic conduct. Must not a radical departure from this point of view be imminent, now that it is being ever more clearly perceived that in the most personal considerations the most general welfare is attained: so that conduct inspired by the most personal considerations of advantage is just the sort which has its origin in the present conception of morality (as a universal utilitarianism)? To contemplate oneself as a complete personality and bear the welfare of that personality in mind in all that one does--this is productive of better results than any sympathetic susceptibility and conduct in behalf of others. Indeed we all suffer from such disparagement of our own personalities, which are at present made to deteriorate from neglect. Capacity is, in fact, divorced from our personality in most cases, and sacrificed to the state, to science, to the needy, as if it were the bad which deserved to be made a sacrifice. Now, we are willing to labor for our fellowmen but only to the extent that we find our own highest advantage in so doing, no more, no less. The whole matter depends upon what may be understood as one's advantage: the crude, undeveloped, rough individualities will be the very ones to estimate it most inadequately.

96

=Usage and Ethic.=--To be moral, virtuous, praiseworthy means to yield obedience to ancient law and hereditary usage. Whether this obedience be rendered readily or with difficulty is long immaterial. Enough that it be rendered. "Good" finally comes to mean him who acts in the traditional manner, as a result of heredity or natural disposition, that is to say does what is customary with scarcely an effort, whatever that may be (for example revenges injuries when revenge, as with the ancient Greeks, was part of

good morals). He is called good because he is good "to some purpose," and as benevolence, sympathy, considerateness, moderation and the like come, in the general course of conduct, to be finally recognized as "good to some purpose" (as utilitarian) the benevolent man, the helpful man, is duly styled "good". (At first other and more important kinds of utilitarian qualities stand in the foreground.) Bad is "not habitual" (unusual), to do things not in accordance with usage, to oppose the traditional, however rational or the reverse the traditional may be. To do injury to one's social group or community (and to one's neighbor as thus understood) is looked upon, through all the variations of moral laws, in different ages, as the peculiarly "immoral" act, so that to-day we associate the word "bad" with deliberate injury to one's neighbor or community. "Egoistic" and "non-egoistic" do not constitute the fundamental opposites that have brought mankind to make a distinction between moral and immoral, good and bad; but adherence to traditional custom, and emancipation from it. How the traditional had its origin is quite immaterial; in any event it had no reference to good and bad or any categorical imperative but to the all important end of maintaining and sustaining the community, the race, the confederation, the nation. Every superstitious custom that originated in a misinterpreted event or casualty entailed some tradition, to adhere to which is moral. To break loose from it is dangerous, more prejudicial to the community than to the individual (because divinity visits the consequences of impiety and sacrilege upon the community rather than upon the individual). Now every tradition grows ever more venerable--the more remote is its origin, the more confused that origin is. The reverence due to it increases from generation to generation. The tradition finally becomes holy and inspires awe. Thus it is that the precept of piety is a far loftier morality than that inculcated by altruistic conduct.

97

=Delight in the Moral.=--A potent species of joy (and thereby the source of morality) is custom. The customary is done more easily, better, therefore preferably. A pleasure is felt in it and experience thus shows that since this practice has held its own it must be good. A manner or moral that lives and lets live is thus demonstrated advantageous, necessary, in contradistinction to all new and not yet adopted practices. The custom is therefore the blending of the agreeable and the useful. Moreover it does not require deliberation. As soon as man can exercise compulsion, he exercises it to enforce and establish his customs, for they are to him attested lifewisdom. So, too, a community of individuals constrains each one of their number to adopt the same moral or custom. The error herein is this: Because a certain custom has been agreeable to the feelings or at least because it proves a means of maintenance, this custom must be imperative, for it is regarded as the only thing that can possibly be consistent with well being. The well being of life seems to spring from it alone. This conception of the customary as a condition of existence is carried into the slightest detail of morality. Inasmuch as insight into true causation is quite restricted in all inferior peoples, a superstitious anxiety is felt that everything be done in due routine. Even when a custom is exceedingly burdensome it is preserved because of its supposed vital utility. It is not known that the same degree of satisfaction can be experienced through some other custom and even higher degrees of satisfaction, too. But it is fully appreciated that all customs do become more agreeable with the lapse of time, no matter how difficult they may have been found in the beginning, and that even the severest way of life may be rendered a matter of habit and therefore a pleasure.

98

=Pleasure and Social Instinct.=--Through his relations with other men, man derives a new species of delight in those pleasurable emotions which his own personality affords him; whereby the domain of pleasurable emotions is made infinitely more comprehensive. No doubt he has inherited many of these feelings from the brutes, which palpably feel delight when they sport with one another, as mothers with their young. So, too, the sexual relations must be taken into account: they make every young woman interesting to every young man from the standpoint of pleasure, and conversely. The feeling of pleasure originating in human relationships makes men in general better. The delight in common, the pleasures enjoyed together heighten one another. The individual feels a sense of security. He becomes better natured. Distrust and malice dissolve. For the man feels the sense of benefit and observes the same feeling in others. Mutual manifestations of pleasure inspire mutual sympathy, the sentiment of homogeneity. The same effect is felt also at mutual sufferings, in a common danger, in stormy weather. Upon such a foundation are built the earliest alliances: the object of which is the mutual protection and safety from threatening misfortunes, and the welfare of each individual. And thus the social instinct develops from pleasure.

99

=The Guiltless Nature of So-Called Bad Acts.=--All "bad" acts are inspired by the impulse to self preservation or, more accurately, by the desire for pleasure and for the avoidance of pain in the individual. Thus are they occasioned, but they are not, therefore, bad.

"Pain self prepared" does not exist, except in the brains of the philosophers, any more than "pleasure self prepared" (sympathy in the Schopenhauer sense). In the condition anterior to the state we kill the creature, be it man or ape, that attempts to pluck the fruit of a tree before we pluck it ourselves should we happen to be hungry at the time and making for that tree: as we would do to-day, so far as the brute is concerned, if we were wandering in savage regions.--The bad acts which most disturb us at present do so because of the erroneous supposition that the one who is guilty of them towards us has a free will in the matter and that it was within his discretion not to have done these evil things. This belief in discretionary power inspires hate, thirst for revenge, malice, the entire perversion of the mental processes, whereas we would feel in no way incensed against the brute, as we hold it irresponsible. To inflict pain not from the instinct of self preservation but in requital--this is the consequence of false judgment and is equally a guiltless course of conduct. The individual can, in that condition which is anterior to the state, act with fierceness and violence for the intimidation of another creature, in order to render his own power more secure as a result of such acts of intimidation. Thus acts the powerful, the superior, the original state founder, who subjugates the weaker. He has the right to do so, as the state nowadays assumes the same right, or, to be more accurate, there is no right that can conflict with this. A foundation for all morality can first be laid only when a stronger individuality or a collective individuality, for example society, the state, subjects the single personalities, hence builds upon their unification and establishes a bond of union. Morality results from compulsion, it is indeed itself one long compulsion to which obedience is rendered in order that pain may be avoided. At first it is but custom, later free obedience and finally almost instinct. At last it is (like everything habitual and natural) associated with pleasure--and is then called virtue.

100

=Shame.=--Shame exists wherever a "mystery" exists: but this is a religious notion which in the earlier period of human civilization had great vogue. Everywhere there were circumscribed spots to which access was denied on account of some divine law, except in special circumstances. At first these spots were quite extensive, inasmuch as stipulated areas could not be trod by the uninitiated, who, when near them, felt tremors and anxieties. This sentiment was frequently transferred to other relationships, for example to sexual relations, which, as the privilege and gateway of mature age, must be withdrawn from the contemplation of youth for its own advantage: relations which many divinities were busy in preserving and sanctifying, images of which divinities were duly placed in marital chambers as guardians. (In Turkish such an apartment is termed a harem or holy thing, the same word also designating the vestibule of a mosque). So, too, Kingship is regarded as a centre from which power and brilliance stream forth, as a mystery to the subjects, impregnated with secrecy and shame, sentiments still quite operative among peoples who in other respects are without any shame at all. So, too, is the whole world of inward states, the so-called "soul," even now, for all non-philosophical persons, a "mystery," and during countless ages it was looked upon as a something of divine origin, in direct communion with deity. It is, therefore, an adytum and occasions shame.

101

=Judge Not.=--Care must be taken, in the contemplation of earlier ages, that there be no falling into unjust scornfulness. The injustice in slavery, the cruelty in the subjugation of persons and peoples must not be estimated by our standard. For in that period the instinct of justice was not so highly developed. Who dare reproach the Genoese Calvin for burning the physician Servetus at the stake? It was a proceeding growing out of his convictions. And the Inquisition, too, had its justification. The only thing is that the prevailing views were false and led to those proceedings which seem so cruel to us, simply because such views have become foreign to us. Besides, what is the burning alive of one individual compared with eternal hell pains for everybody else? And yet this idea then had hold of all the world without in the least vitiating, with its frightfulness, the other idea of a god. Even we nowadays are hard and merciless to political revolutionists, but that is because we are in the habit of believing the state a necessity, and hence the cruelty of the proceeding is not so much understood as in the other cases where the points of view are repudiated. The cruelty to animals shown by children and Italians is due to the same misunderstanding. The animal, owing to the exigencies of the church catechism, is placed too far below the level of mankind.--Much, too, that is frightful and inhuman in history, and which is almost incredible, is rendered less atrocious by the reflection that the one who commands and the one who executes are different persons. The former does not witness the performance and hence it makes no strong impression on him. The latter obeys a superior and hence feels no responsibility. Most princes and military chieftains appear, through lack of true perception, cruel and hard without really being so.--Egoism is not bad because the idea of the "neighbor"--the word is of Christian origin and does not correspond to truth--is very weak in us, and we feel ourselves, in regard to him, as free from responsibility as if plants and stones were involved. That another is in suffering must be learned and it can never be wholly learned.

102

"=Man Always Does Right.="--We do not blame nature when she sends a thunder storm and makes us wet: why then do we term the man who inflicts injury immoral? Because in the latter case we assume a voluntary, ruling, free will, and in the former necessity. But this distinction is a delusion. Moreover, even the intentional infliction of injury is not, in all circumstances termed immoral. Thus, we kill a fly intentionally without thinking very much about it, simply because its buzzing about is disagreeable; and we punish a criminal and inflict pain upon him in order to protect ourselves and society. In the first case it is the individual who, for the sake of preserving himself or in order to spare himself pain, does injury with design: in the second case, it is the state. All ethic deems intentional infliction of injury justified by necessity; that is when it is a matter of self preservation. But these two points of view are sufficient to explain all bad acts done by man to men. It is desired to obtain pleasure or avoid pain. In any sense, it is a question, always, of self preservation. Socrates and Plato are right: whatever man does he always does right: that is, does what seems to him good (advantageous) according to the degree of advancement his intellect has attained, which is always the measure of his rational capacity.

103

=The Inoffensive in Badness.=--Badness has not for its object the infliction of pain upon others but simply our own satisfaction as, for instance, in the case of thirst for vengeance or of nerve excitation. Every act of teasing shows what pleasure is caused by the display of our power over others and what feelings of delight are experienced in the sense of domination. Is there, then, anything immoral in feeling pleasure in the pain of others? Is malicious joy devilish, as Schopenhauer says? In the realm of nature we feel joy in breaking boughs, shattering rocks, fighting with wild beasts, simply to attest our strength thereby. Should not the knowledge that another suffers on our account here, in this case, make the same kind of act, (which, by the way, arouses no qualms of conscience in us) immoral also? But if we had not this knowledge there would be no pleasure in one's own superiority or power, for this pleasure is experienced only in the suffering of another, as in the case of teasing. All pleasure is, in itself, neither good nor bad. Whence comes the conviction that one should not cause pain in others in order to feel pleasure oneself? Simply from the standpoint of utility, that is, in consideration of the consequences, of ultimate pain, since the injured party or state will demand satisfaction and revenge. This consideration alone can have led to the determination to renounce such pleasure.--Sympathy has the satisfaction of others in view no more than, as already stated, badness has the pain of others in view. For there are at least two (perhaps many more) elementary ingredients in personal gratification which enter largely into our self satisfaction: one of them being the pleasure of the emotion, of which species is sympathy with tragedy, and another, when the impulse is to action, being the pleasure of exercising one's power. Should a sufferer be very dear to us, we divest ourselves of pain by the performance of acts of sympathy.--With the exception of some few philosophers, men have placed sympathy very low in the rank of moral feelings: and rightly.

104

=Self Defence.=--If self defence is in general held a valid justification, then nearly every manifestation of so called immoral egoism must be justified, too. Pain is inflicted, robbery or killing done in order to maintain life or to protect oneself and ward off harm. A man lies when cunning and delusion are valid means of self preservation. To injure intentionally when our safety and our existence are involved, or the continuance of our well being, is conceded to be moral. The state itself injures from this motive when it hangs criminals. In unintentional injury the immoral, of course, can not be present, as accident alone is involved. But is there any sort of intentional injury in which our existence and the maintenance of our well being be not involved? Is there such a thing as injuring from absolute badness, for example, in the case of cruelty? If a man does not know what pain an act occasions, that act is not one of wickedness. Thus the child is not bad to the animal, not evil. It disturbs and rends it as if it were one of its playthings. Does a man ever fully know how much pain an act may cause another? As far as our nervous system extends, we shield ourselves from pain. If it extended further, that is, to our fellow men, we would never cause anyone else any pain (except in such cases as we cause it to ourselves, when we cut ourselves, surgically, to heal our ills, or strive and trouble ourselves to gain health). We conclude from analogy that something pains somebody and can in consequence, through recollection and the power of imagination, feel pain also. But what a difference there always is between the tooth ache and the pain (sympathy) that the spectacle of tooth ache occasions! Therefore when injury is inflicted from so called badness the degree of pain thereby experienced is always unknown to us: in so far, however, as pleasure is felt in the act (a sense of one's own power, of one's own excitation) the act is committed to maintain the well being of the individual and hence comes under the purview of self defence and lying for self preservation. Without pleasure, there is no life; the struggle for pleasure is the struggle for life. Whether the individual shall carry on this struggle in such a

way that he be called good or in such a way that he be called bad is something that the standard and the capacity of his own intellect must determine for him.

105

=Justice that Rewards.=--Whoever has fully understood the doctrine of absolute irresponsibility can no longer include the so called rewarding and punishing justice in the idea of justice, if the latter be taken to mean that to each be given his due. For he who is punished does not deserve the punishment. He is used simply as a means to intimidate others from certain acts. Equally, he who is rewarded does not merit the reward. He could not act any differently than he did act. Hence the reward has only the significance of an encouragement to him and others as a motive for subsequent acts. The praise is called out only to him who is running in the race and not to him who has arrived at the goal. Something that comes to someone as his own is neither a punishment nor a reward. It is given to him from utiliarian considerations, without his having any claim to it in justice. Hence one must say "the wise man praises not because a good act has been done" precisely as was once said: "the wise man punishes not because a bad act has been done but in order that a bad act may not be done." If punishment and reward ceased, there would cease with them the most powerful incentives to certain acts and away from other acts. The purposes of men demand their continuance [of punishment and reward] and inasmuch as punishment and reward, blame and praise operate most potently upon vanity, these same purposes of men imperatively require the continuance of vanity.

106

=The Water Fall.=--At the sight of a water fall we may opine that in the countless curves, spirations and dashes of the waves we behold freedom of the will and of the impulses. But everything is compulsory, everything can be mathematically calculated. Thus it is, too, with human acts. We would be able to calculate in advance every single action if we were all knowing, as well as every advance in knowledge, every delusion, every bad deed. The acting individual himself is held fast in the illusion of volition. If, on a sudden, the entire movement of the world stopped short, and an all knowing and reasoning intelligence were there to take advantage of this pause, he could foretell the future of every being to the remotest ages and indicate the path that would be taken in the world's further course. The deception of the acting individual as regards himself, the assumption of the freedom of the will, is a part of this computable mechanism.

107

=Non-Responsibility and Non-Guilt.=--The absolute irresponsibility of man for his acts and his nature is the bitterest drop in the cup of him who has knowledge, if he be accustomed to behold in responsibility and duty the patent of nobility of his human nature. All his estimates, preferences, dislikes are thus made worthless and false. His deepest sentiment, with which he honored the sufferer, the hero, sprang from an error. He may no longer praise, no longer blame, for it is irrational to blame and praise nature and necessity. Just as he cherishes the beautiful work of art, but does not praise it (as it is incapable of doing anything for itself), just as he stands in the presence of plants, he must stand in the presence of human conduct, his own included. He may admire strength, beauty, capacity, therein, but he can discern no merit. The chemical process and the conflict of the elements, the ordeal of the invalid who strives for convalescence, are no more merits than the soul-struggles and extremities in which one is torn this way and that by contending motives until one finally decides in favor of the strongest--as the phrase has it, although, in fact, it is the strongest motive that decides for us. All these motives, however, whatever fine names we may give them, have grown from the same roots in which we believe the baneful poisons lurk. Between good and bad actions there is no difference in kind but, at most, in degree. Good acts are sublimated evil. Bad acts are degraded, imbruted good. The very longing of the individual for self gratification (together with the fear of being deprived of it) obtains satisfaction in all circumstances, let the individual act as he may, that is, as he must: be it in deeds of vanity, revenge, pleasure, utility, badness, cunning, be it in deeds of self sacrifice, sympathy or knowledge. The degrees of rational capacity determine the direction in which this longing impels: every society, every individual has constantly present a comparative classification of benefits in accordance with which conduct is determined and others are judged. But this standard perpetually changes. Many acts are called bad that are only stupid, because the degree of intelligence that decided for them was low. Indeed, in a certain sense, all acts now are stupid, for the highest degree of human intelligence that has yet been attained will in time most certainly be surpassed and then, in retrospection, all our present conduct and opinion will appear as narrow and petty as we now deem the conduct and opinion of savage peoples and ages.--To perceive all these things may occasion profound pain but there is, nevertheless, a consolation. Such pains are birth pains. The butterfly insists upon breaking through the cocoon, he presses through it, tears it to pieces, only to be blinded and confused by the strange light, by the

realm of liberty. By such men as are capable of this sadness--how few there are!--will the first attempt be made to see if humanity may convert itself from a thing of morality to a thing of wisdom. The sun of a new gospel sheds its first ray upon the loftiest height in the souls of those few: but the clouds are massed there, too, thicker than ever, and not far apart are the brightest sunlight and the deepest gloom. Everything is necessity--so says the new knowledge: and this knowledge is itself necessity. All is guiltlessness, and knowledge is the way to insight into this guiltlessness. If pleasure, egoism, vanity be necessary to attest the moral phenomena and their richest blooms, the instinct for truth and accuracy of knowledge; if delusion and confusion of the imagination were the only means whereby mankind could gradually lift itself up to this degree of self enlightenment and self emancipation--who would venture to disparage the means? Who would have the right to feel sad if made aware of the goal to which those paths lead? Everything in the domain of ethic is evolved, changeable, tottering; all things flow, it is true--but all things are also in the stream: to their goal. Though within us the hereditary habit of erroneous judgment, love, hate, may be ever dominant, yet under the influence of awaking knowledge it will ever become weaker: a new habit, that of understanding, not-loving, not-hating, looking from above, grows up within us gradually and in the same soil, and may, perhaps, in thousands of years be powerful enough to endow mankind with capacity to develop the wise, guiltless man (conscious of guiltlessness) as unfailingly as it now developes the unwise, irrational, guilt-conscious man--that is to say, the necessary higher step, not the opposite of it.

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE.

108

=The Double Contest Against Evil.=--If an evil afflicts us we can either so deal with it as to remove its cause or else so deal with it that its effect upon our feeling is changed: hence look upon the evil as a benefit of which the uses will perhaps first become evident in some subsequent period. Religion and art (and also the metaphysical philosophy) strive to effect an alteration of the feeling, partly by an alteration of our judgment respecting the experience (for example, with the aid of the dictum "whom God loves, he chastizes") partly by the awakening of a joy in pain, in emotion especially (whence the art of tragedy had its origin). The more one is disposed to interpret away and justify, the less likely he is to look directly at the causes of evil and eliminate them. An instant alleviation and narcotizing of pain, as is usual in the case of tooth ache, is sufficient for him even in the severest suffering. The more the domination of religions and of all narcotic arts declines, the more searchingly do men look to the elimination of evil itself, which is a rather bad thing for the tragic poets--for there is ever less and less material for tragedy, since the domain of unsparing, immutable destiny grows constantly more circumscribed--and a still worse thing for the priests, for these last have lived heretofore upon the narcoticizing of human ill.

109

=Sorrow is Knowledge.=--How willingly would not one exchange the false assertions of the homines religiosi that there is a god who commands us to be good, who is the sentinel and witness of every act, every moment, every thought, who loves us, who plans our welfare in every misfortune--how willingly would not one exchange these for truths as healing, beneficial and grateful as those delusions! But there are no such truths. Philosophy can at most set up in opposition to them other metaphysical plausibilities (fundamental untruths as well). The tragedy of it all is that, although one cannot believe these dogmas of religion and metaphysics if one adopts in heart and head the potent methods of truth, one has yet become, through human evolution, so tender, susceptible, sensitive, as to stand in need of the most effective means of rest and consolation. From this state of things arises the danger that, through the perception of truth or, more accurately, seeing through delusion, one may bleed to death. Byron has put this into deathless verse:

"Sorrow is knowledge: they who know the most Must mourn the deepest o'er the fatal truth, The tree of knowledge is not that of life."

Against such cares there is no better protective than the light fancy of Horace, (at any rate during the darkest hours and sun eclipses of the soul) expressed in the words

"quid aeternis minorem consiliis animum fatigas? cur non sub alta vel platano vel hac pinu jacentes."[22]

[22] Then wherefore should you, who are mortal, outwear Your soul with a profitless burden of care Say, why should we not, flung at ease neath this pine, Or a plane-tree's broad umbrage, quaff gaily our wine? (Translation of Sir Theodore Martin.)

At any rate, light fancy or heavy heartedness of any degree must be better than a romantic retrogression and desertion of one's flag, an approach to Christianity in any form: for with it, in the present state of knowledge, one can have nothing to do without hopelessly defiling one's intellectual integrity and surrendering it unconditionally. These woes may be painful enough, but without pain one cannot become a leader and guide of humanity: and woe to him who would be such and lacks this pure integrity of the intellect!

110

=The Truth in Religion.=--In the ages of enlightenment justice was not done to the importance of religion, of this there can be no doubt. It is also equally certain that in the ensuing reaction of enlightenment, the demands of justice were far exceeded inasmuch as religion was treated with love, even with infatuation and proclaimed as a profound, indeed the most profound knowledge of the world, which science had but to divest of its dogmatic garb in order to possess "truth" in its unmythical form. Religions must therefore--this was the contention of all foes of enlightenment--sensu allegorico, with regard for the comprehension of the masses, give expression to that ancient truth which is wisdom in itself, inasmuch as all science of modern times has led up to it instead of away from it. So that between the most ancient wisdom of man and all later wisdom there prevails harmony, even similarity of viewpoint; and the advancement of knowledge--if one be disposed to concede such a thing--has to do not with its nature but with its propagation. This whole conception of religion and science is through and through erroneous, and none would to-day be hardy enough to countenance it had not Schopenhauer's rhetoric taken it under protection, this high sounding rhetoric which now gains auditors after the lapse of a generation. Much as may be gained from Schopenhauer's religio-ethical human and cosmical oracle as regards the comprehension of Christianity and other religions, it is nevertheless certain that he erred regarding the value of religion to knowledge. He himself was in this but a servile pupil of the scientific teachers of his time who had all taken romanticism under their protection and renounced the spirit of enlightenment. Had he been born in our own time it would have been impossible for him to have spoken of the sensus allegoricus of religion. He would instead have done truth the justice to say: never has a religion, directly or indirectly, either as dogma or as allegory, contained a truth. For all religions grew out of dread or necessity, and came into existence through an error of the reason. They have, perhaps, in times of danger from science, incorporated some philosophical doctrine or other into their systems in order to make it possible to continue one's existence within them. But this is but a theological work of art dating from the time in which a religion began to doubt of itself. These theological feats of art, which are most common in Christianity as the religion of a learned age, impregnated with philosophy, have led to this superstition of the sensus allegoricus, as has, even more, the habit of the philosophers (namely those half-natures, the poetical philosophers and the philosophising artists) of dealing with their own feelings as if they constituted the fundamental nature of humanity and hence of giving their own religious feelings a predominant influence over the structure of their systems. As the philosophers mostly philosophised under the influence of hereditary religious habits, or at least under the traditional influence of this "metaphysical necessity," they naturally arrived at conclusions closely resembling the Judaic or Christian or Indian religious tenets--resembling, in the way that children are apt to look like their mothers: only in this case the fathers were not certain as to the maternity, as easily happens--but in the innocence of their admiration, they fabled regarding the family likeness of all religion and science. In reality, there exists between religion and true science neither relationship nor friendship, not even enmity: they dwell in different spheres. Every philosophy that lets the religious comet gleam through the darkness of its last outposts renders everything within it that purports to be science, suspicious. It is all probably religion, although it may assume the guise of science.--Moreover, though all the peoples agree concerning certain religious things, for example, the existence of a god (which, by the way, as regards this point, is not the case) this fact would constitute an argument against the thing agreed upon, for example the very existence of a god. The consensus gentium and especially hominum can probably amount only to an absurdity. Against it there is no consensus omnium sapientium whatever, on any point, with the exception of which Goethe's verse speaks:

"All greatest sages to all latest ages Will smile, wink and slily agree 'Tis folly to wait till a fool's empty pate Has learned to be knowing and free. So children of wisdom must look upon fools As creatures who're never the better for schools."

Stated without rhyme or metre and adapted to our case: the consensus sapientium is to the effect that the consensus gentium amounts to an absurdity.

111

=Origin of Religious Worship.=--Let us transport ourselves back to the times in which religious life flourished most vigorously and we will find a fundamental conviction prevalent which we no longer share and which has resulted in the closing of the door to religious life once for all so far as we are concerned: this conviction has to do with nature and intercourse with her. In those times

nothing is yet known of nature's laws. Neither for earth nor for heaven is there a must. A season, sunshine, rain can come or stay away as it pleases. There is wanting, in particular, all idea of natural causation. If a man rows, it is not the oar that moves the boat, but rowing is a magical ceremony whereby a demon is constrained to move the boat. All illness, death itself, is a consequence of magical influences. In sickness and death nothing natural is conceived. The whole idea of "natural course" is wanting. The idea dawns first upon the ancient Greeks, that is to say in a very late period of humanity, in the conception of a Moira [fate] ruling over the gods. If any person shoots off a bow, there is always an irrational strength and agency in the act. If the wells suddenly run dry, the first thought is of subterranean demons and their pranks. It must have been the dart of a god beneath whose invisible influence a human being suddenly collapses. In India, the carpenter (according to Lubbock) is in the habit of making devout offerings to his hammer and hatchet. A Brahmin treats the plume with which he writes, a soldier the weapon that he takes into the field, a mason his trowel, a laborer his plow, in the same way. All nature is, in the opinion of religious people, a sum total of the doings of conscious and willing beings, an immense mass of complex volitions. In regard to all that takes place outside of us no conclusion is permissible that anything will result thus and so, must result thus and so, that we are comparatively calculable and certain in our experiences, that man is the rule, nature the ruleless. This view forms the fundamental conviction that dominates crude, religion-producing, early civilizations. We contemporary men feel exactly the opposite: the richer man now feels himself inwardly, the more polyphone the music and the sounding of his soul, the more powerfully does the uniformity of nature impress him. We all, with Goethe, recognize in nature the great means of repose for the soul. We listen to the pendulum stroke of this great clock with longing for rest, for absolute calm and quiescence, as if we could drink in the uniformity of nature and thereby arrive first at an enjoyment of oneself. Formerly it was the reverse: if we carry ourselves back to the periods of crude civilization, or if we contemplate contemporary savages, we will find them most strongly influenced by rule, by tradition. The individual is almost automatically bound to rule and tradition and moves with the uniformity of a pendulum. To him nature--the uncomprehended, fearful, mysterious nature--must seem the domain of freedom, of volition, of higher power, indeed as an ultra-human degree of destiny, as god. Every individual in such periods and circumstances feels that his existence, his happiness, the existence and happiness of the family, the state, the success or failure of every undertaking, must depend upon these dispositions of nature. Certain natural events must occur at the proper time and certain others must not occur. How can influence be exercised over this fearful unknown, how can this domain of freedom be brought under subjection? thus he asks himself, thus he worries: Is there no means to render these powers of nature as subject to rule and tradition as you are yourself?--The cogitation of the superstitious and magic-deluded man is upon the theme of imposing a law upon nature: and to put it briefly, religious worship is the result of such cogitation. The problem which is present to every man is closely connected with this one: how can the weaker party dictate laws to the stronger, control its acts in reference to the weaker? At first the most harmless form of influence is recollected, that influence which is acquired when the partiality of anyone has been won. Through beseeching and prayer, through abject humiliation, through obligations to regular gifts and propitiations, through flattering homages, it is possible, therefore, to impose some guidance upon the forces of nature, to the extent that their partiality be won: love binds and is bound. Then agreements can be entered into by means of which certain courses of conduct are mutually concluded, vows are made and authorities prescribed. But far more potent is that species of power exercised by means of magic and incantation. As a man is able to injure a powerful enemy by means of the magician and render him helpless with fear, as the love potion operates at a distance, so can the mighty forces of nature, in the opinion of weaker mankind, be controlled by similar means. The principal means of effecting incantations is to acquire control of something belonging to the party to be influenced, hair, finger nails, food from his table, even his picture or his name. With such apparatus it is possible to act by means of magic, for the basic principle is that to everything spiritual corresponds something corporeal. With the aid of this corporeal element the spirit may be bound, injured or destroyed. The corporeal affords the handle by which the spiritual can be laid hold of. In the same way that man influences mankind does he influences some spirit of nature, for this latter has also its corporeal element that can be grasped. The tree, and on the same basis, the seed from which it grew: this puzzling sequence seems to demonstrate that in both forms the same spirit is embodied, now large, now small. A stone that suddenly rolls, is the body in which the spirit works. Does a huge boulder lie in a lonely moor? It is impossible to think of mortal power having placed it there. The stone must have moved itself there. That is to say some spirit must dominate it. Everything that has a body is subject to magic, including, therefore, the spirits of nature. If a god is directly connected with his portrait, a direct influence (by refraining from devout offerings, by whippings, chainings and the like) can be brought to bear upon him. The lower classes in China tie cords around the picture of their god in order to defy his departing favor, when he has left them in the lurch, and tear the picture to pieces, drag it through the streets into dung heaps and gutters, crying: "You dog of a spirit, we housed you in a beautiful temple, we gilded you prettily, we fed you well, we brought you offerings, and yet how ungrateful you are!" Similar displays of resentment have been made against pictures of the mother of god and pictures of saints in Catholic countries during the present century when such pictures would not do their duty during times of pestilence and drought.

Through all these magical relationships to nature countless ceremonies are occasioned, and finally, when their complexity and confusion grow too great, pains are taken to systematize them, to arrange them so that the favorable course of nature's progress, namely the great yearly circle of the seasons, may be brought about by a corresponding course of the ceremonial progress. The aim of religious worship is to influence nature to human advantage, and hence to instil a subjection to law into her that originally she has not, whereas at present man desires to find out the subjection to law of nature in order to guide himself thereby. In brief, the system of religious worship rests upon the idea of magic between man and man, and the magician is older than the priest. But it rests equally upon other and higher ideas. It brings into prominence the sympathetic relation of man to man, the existence of benevolence, gratitude, prayer, of truces between enemies, of loans upon security, of arrangements for the protection of property. Man, even in very inferior degrees of civilization, does not stand in the presence of nature as a helpless slave, he is not willy-nilly the absolute servant of nature. In the Greek development of religion, especially in the relationship to the Olympian gods, it becomes possible to entertain the idea of an existence side by side of two castes, a higher, more powerful, and a lower, less powerful: but both are bound together in some way, on account of their origin and are one species. They need not be ashamed of one another. This is the element of distinction in Greek religion.

112

=At the Contemplation of Certain Ancient Sacrificial Proceedings.=--How many sentiments are lost to us is manifest in the union of the farcical, even of the obscene, with the religious feeling. The feeling that this mixture is possible is becoming extinct. We realize the mixture only historically, in the mysteries of Demeter and Dionysos and in the Christian Easter festivals and religious mysteries. But we still perceive the sublime in connection with the ridiculous, and the like, the emotional with the absurd. Perhaps a later age will be unable to understand even these combinations.

113

=Christianity as Antiquity.=--When on a Sunday morning we hear the old bells ringing, we ask ourselves: Is it possible? All this for a Jew crucified two thousand years ago who said he was God's son? The proof of such an assertion is lacking.--Certainly, the Christian religion constitutes in our time a protruding bit of antiquity from very remote ages and that its assertions are still generally believed--although men have become so keen in the scrutiny of claims--constitutes the oldest relic of this inheritance. A god who begets children by a mortal woman; a sage who demands that no more work be done, that no more justice be administered but that the signs of the approaching end of the world be heeded; a system of justice that accepts an innocent as a vicarious sacrifice in the place of the guilty; a person who bids his disciples drink his blood; prayers for miracles; sins against a god expiated upon a god; fear of a hereafter to which death is the portal; the figure of the cross as a symbol in an age that no longer knows the purpose and the ignominy of the cross--how ghostly all these things flit before us out of the grave of their primitive antiquity! Is one to believe that such things can still be believed?

114

=The Un-Greek in Christianity.=--The Greeks did not look upon the Homeric gods above them as lords nor upon themselves beneath as servants, after the fashion of the Jews. They saw but the counterpart as in a mirror of the most perfect specimens of their own caste, hence an ideal, but no contradiction of their own nature. There was a feeling of mutual relationship, resulting in a mutual interest, a sort of alliance. Man thinks well of himself when he gives himself such gods and places himself in a relationship akin to that of the lower nobility with the higher; whereas the Italian races have a decidedly vulgar religion, involving perpetual anxiety because of bad and mischievous powers and soul disturbers. Wherever the Olympian gods receded into the background, there even Greek life became gloomier and more perturbed.--Christianity, on the other hand, oppressed and degraded humanity completely and sank it into deepest mire: into the feeling of utter abasement it suddenly flashed the gleam of divine compassion, so that the amazed and grace-dazzled stupefied one gave a cry of delight and for a moment believed that the whole of heaven was within him. Upon this unhealthy excess of feeling, upon the accompanying corruption of heart and head, Christianity attains all its psychological effects. It wants to annihilate, debase, stupefy, amaze, bedazzle. There is but one thing that it does not want: measure, standard (das Maas) and therefore is it in the worst sense barbarous, asiatic, vulgar, un-Greek.

115

=Being Religious to Some Purpose.=--There are certain insipid, traffic-virtuous people to whom religion is pinned like the hem of some garb of a higher humanity. These people do well to remain religious: it adorns them. All who are not versed in some

professional weapon--including tongue and pen as weapons--are servile: to all such the Christian religion is very useful, for then their servility assumes the aspect of Christian virtue and is amazingly adorned.--People whose daily lives are empty and colorless are readily religious. This is comprehensible and pardonable, but they have no right to demand that others, whose daily lives are not empty and colorless, should be religious also.

116

=The Everyday Christian.=--If Christianity, with its allegations of an avenging God, universal sinfulness, choice of grace, and the danger of eternal damnation, were true, it would be an indication of weakness of mind and character not to be a priest or an apostle or a hermit, and toil for one's own salvation. It would be irrational to lose sight of one's eternal well being in comparison with temporary advantage: Assuming these dogmas to be generally believed, the every day Christian is a pitiable figure, a man who really cannot count as far as three, and who, for the rest, just because of his intellectual incapacity, does not deserve to be as hard punished as Christianity promises he shall be.

117

=Concerning the Cleverness of Christianity.=--It is a master stroke of Christianity to so emphasize the unworthiness, sinfulness and degradation of men in general that contempt of one's fellow creatures becomes impossible. "He may sin as much as he pleases, he is not by nature different from me. It is I who in every way am unworthy and contemptible." So says the Christian to himself. But even this feeling has lost its keenest sting for the Christian does not believe in his individual degradation. He is bad in his general human capacity and he soothes himself a little with the assertion that we are all alike.

118

=Personal Change.=--As soon as a religion rules, it has for its opponents those who were its first disciples.

119

=Fate of Christianity.=--Christianity arose to lighten the heart, but now it must first make the heart heavy in order to be able to lighten it afterwards. Christianity will consequently go down.

120

=The Testimony of Pleasure.=--The agreeable opinion is accepted as true. This is the testimony of pleasure (or as the church says, the evidence of strength) of which all religions are so proud, although they should all be ashamed of it. If a belief did not make blessed it would not be believed. How little it would be worth, then!

121

=Dangerous Play.=--Whoever gives religious feeling room, must then also let it grow. He can do nothing else. Then his being gradually changes. The religious element brings with it affinities and kinships. The whole circle of his judgment and feeling is clouded and draped in religious shadows. Feeling cannot stand still. One should be on one's guard.

122

=The Blind Pupil.=--As long as one knows very well the strength and the weakness of one's dogma, one's art, one's religion, its strength is still low. The pupil and apostle who has no eye for the weaknesses of a dogma, a religion and so on, dazzled by the aspect of the master and by his own reverence for him, has, on that very account, generally more power than the master. Without blind pupils the influence of a man and his work has never become great. To give victory to knowledge, often amounts to no more than so allying it with stupidity that the brute force of the latter forces triumph for the former.

123

=The Breaking off of Churches.=--There is not sufficient religion in the world merely to put an end to the number of religions.

124

=Sinlessness of Men.=--If one have understood how "Sin came into the world," namely through errors of the reason, through which men in their intercourse with one another and even individual men looked upon themselves as much blacker and wickeder than was really the case, one's whole feeling is much lightened and man and the world appear together in such a halo of harmlessness that a sentiment of well being is instilled into one's whole nature. Man in the midst of nature is as a child left to its own devices. This child indeed dreams a heavy, anxious dream. But when it opens its eyes it finds itself always in paradise.

125

=Irreligiousness of Artists.=--Homer is so much at home among his gods and is as a poet so good natured to them that he must have been profoundly irreligious. That which was brought to him by the popular faith--a mean, crude and partially repulsive superstition--he dealt with as freely as the Sculptor with his clay, therefore with the same freedom that AEschylus and Aristophanes evinced and with which in later times the great artists of the renaissance, and also Shakespeare and Goethe, drew their pictures.

126

=Art and Strength of False Interpretation.=--All the visions, fears, exhaustions and delights of the saint are well known symptoms of sickness, which in him, owing to deep rooted religious and psychological delusions, are explained quite differently, that is not as symptoms of sickness.--So, too, perhaps, the demon of Socrates was nothing but a malady of the ear that he explained, in view of his predominant moral theory, in a manner different from what would be thought rational to-day. Nor is the case different with the frenzy and the frenzied speeches of the prophets and of the priests of the oracles. It is always the degree of wisdom, imagination, capacity and morality in the heart and mind of the interpreters that got so much out of them. It is among the greatest feats of the men who are called geniuses and saints that they made interpreters for themselves who, fortunately for mankind, did not understand them.

127

=Reverence for Madness.=--Because it was perceived that an excitement of some kind often made the head clearer and occasioned fortunate inspirations, it was concluded that the utmost excitement would occasion the most fortunate inspirations. Hence the frenzied being was revered as a sage and an oracle giver. A false conclusion lies at the bottom of all this.

128

=Promises of Wisdom.=--Modern science has as its object as little pain as possible, as long a life as possible--hence a sort of eternal blessedness, but of a very limited kind in comparison with the promises of religion.

129

=Forbidden Generosity.=--There is not enough of love and goodness in the world to throw any of it away on conceited people.

130

=Survival of Religious Training in the Disposition.=--The Catholic Church, and before it all ancient education, controlled the whole domain of means through which man was put into certain unordinary moods and withdrawn from the cold calculation of personal advantage and from calm, rational reflection. A church vibrating with deep tones; gloomy, regular, restraining exhortations from a priestly band, who involuntarily communicate their own tension to their congregation and lead them to listen almost with anxiety as if some miracle were in course of preparation; the awesome pile of architecture which, as the house of a god, rears itself vastly into the vague and in all its shadowy nooks inspires fear of its nerve-exciting power--who would care to reduce men to the level of these things if the ideas upon which they rest became extinct? But the results of all these things are nevertheless not thrown away: the inner world of exalted, emotional, prophetic, profoundly repentant, hope-blessed moods has become inborn in man largely through cultivation. What still exists in his soul was formerly, as he germinated, grew and bloomed, thoroughly disciplined.

131

=Religious After-Pains.=--Though one believe oneself absolutely weaned away from religion, the process has yet not been so thorough as to make impossible a feeling of joy at the presence of religious feelings and dispositions without intelligible content, as, for example, in music; and if a philosophy alleges to us the validity of metaphysical hopes, through the peace of soul therein

attainable, and also speaks of "the whole true gospel in the look of Raphael's Madonna," we greet such declarations and innuendoes with a welcome smile. The philosopher has here a matter easy of demonstration. He responds with that which he is glad to give, namely a heart that is glad to accept. Hence it is observable how the less reflective free spirits collide only with dogmas but yield readily to the magic of religious feelings; it is a source of pain to them to let the latter go simply on account of the former.--Scientific philosophy must be very much on its guard lest on account of this necessity--an evolved and hence, also, a transitory necessity--delusions are smuggled in. Even logicians speak of "presentiments" of truth in ethics and in art (for example of the presentiment that the essence of things is unity) a thing which, nevertheless, ought to be prohibited. Between carefully deduced truths and such "foreboded" things there lies the abysmal distinction that the former are products of the intellect and the latter of the necessity. Hunger is no evidence that there is food at hand to appease it. Hunger merely craves food. "Presentiment" does not denote that the existence of a thing is known in any way whatever. It denotes merely that it is deemed possible to the extent that it is desired or feared. The "presentiment" is not one step forward in the domain of certainty.--It is involuntarily believed that the religious tinted sections of a philosophy are better attested than the others, but the case is at bottom just the opposite: there is simply the inner wish that it may be so, that the thing which beautifies may also be true. This wish leads us to accept bad grounds as good.

132

=Of the Christian Need of Salvation.=--Careful consideration must render it possible to propound some explanation of that process in the soul of a Christian which is termed need of salvation, and to propound an explanation, too, free from mythology: hence one purely psychological. Heretofore psychological explanations of religious conditions and processes have really been in disrepute, inasmuch as a theology calling itself free gave vent to its unprofitable nature in this domain; for its principal aim, so far as may be judged from the spirit of its creator, Schleier-macher, was the preservation of the Christian religion and the maintenance of the Christian theology. It appeared that in the psychological analysis of religious "facts" a new anchorage and above all a new calling were to be gained. Undisturbed by such predecessors, we venture the following exposition of the phenomena alluded to. Man is conscious of certain acts which are very firmly implanted in the general course of conduct: indeed he discovers in himself a predisposition to such acts that seems to him to be as unalterable as his very being. How gladly he would essay some other kind of acts which in the general estimate of conduct are rated the best and highest, how gladly he would welcome the consciousness of well doing which ought to follow unselfish motive! Unfortunately, however, it goes no further than this longing: the discontent consequent upon being unable to satisfy it is added to all other kinds of discontent which result from his life destiny in particular or which may be due to so called bad acts; so that a deep depression ensues accompanied by a desire for some physician to remove it and all its causes.--This condition would not be found so bitter if the individual but compared himself freely with other men: for then he would have no reason to be discontented with himself in particular as he is merely bearing his share of the general burden of human discontent and incompleteness. But he compares himself with a being who alone must be capable of the conduct that is called unegoistic and of an enduring consciousness of unselfish motive, with God. It is because he gazes into this clear mirror, that his own self seems so extraordinarily distracted and so troubled. Thereupon the thought of that being, in so far as it flits before his fancy as retributive justice, occasions him anxiety. In every conceivable small and great experience he believes he sees the anger of the being, his threats, the very implements and manacles of his judge and prison. What succors him in this danger, which, in the prospect of an eternal duration of punishment, transcends in hideousness all the horrors that can be presented to the imagination?

133

Before we consider this condition in its further effects, we would admit to ourselves that man is betrayed into this condition not through his "fault" and "sin" but through a series of delusions of the reason; that it was the fault of the mirror if his own self appeared to him in the highest degree dark and hateful, and that that mirror was his own work, the very imperfect work of human imagination and judgment. In the first place a being capable of absolutely unegoistic conduct is as fabulous as the phoenix. Such a being is not even thinkable for the very reason that the whole notion of "unegoistic conduct," when closely examined, vanishes into air. Never yet has a man done anything solely for others and entirely without reference to a personal motive; indeed how could he possibly do anything that had no reference to himself, that is without inward compulsion (which must always have its basis in a personal need)? How could the ego act without ego?--A god, who, on the other hand, is all love, as he is usually represented, would not be capable of a solitary unegoistic act: whence one is reminded of a reflection of Lichtenberg's which is, in truth, taken from a lower sphere: "We cannot possibly feel for others, as the expression goes; we feel only for ourselves. The assertion sounds hard, but it is not, if rightly understood. A man loves neither his father nor his mother nor his wife nor his child, but simply the feelings which they inspire." Or, as La Rochefoucauld says: "If you think you love your mistress for the mere love of her, you are very much mistaken."

Why acts of love are more highly prized than others, namely not on account of their nature, but on account of their utility, has already been explained in the section on the origin of moral feelings. But if a man should wish to be all love like the god aforesaid, and want to do all things for others and nothing for himself, the procedure would be fundamentally impossible because he _must_ do a great deal for himself before there would be any possibility of doing anything for the love of others. It is also essential that others be sufficiently egoistic to accept always and at all times this self sacrifice and living for others, so that the men of love and self sacrifice have an interest in the survival of unloving and selfish egoists, while the highest morality, in order to maintain itself must formally enforce the existence of immorality (wherein it would be really destroying itself.)--Further: the idea of a god perturbs and discourages as long as it is accepted but as to how it originated can no longer, in the present state of comparative ethnological science, be a matter of doubt, and with the insight into the origin of this belief all faith collapses. What happens to the Christian who compares his nature with that of God is exactly what happened to Don Quixote, who depreciated his own prowess because his head was filled with the wondrous deeds of the heroes of chivalrous romance. The standard of measurement which both employ belongs to the domain of fable.--But if the idea of God collapses, so too, does the feeling of "sin" as a violation of divine rescript, as a stain upon a god-like creation. There still apparently remains that discouragement which is closely allied with fear of the punishment of worldly justice or of the contempt of one's fellow men. The keenest thorn in the sentiment of sin is dulled when it is perceived that one's acts have contravened human tradition, human rules and human laws without having thereby endangered the "eternal salvation of the soul" and its relations with deity. If finally men attain to the conviction of the absolute necessity of all acts and of their utter irresponsibility and then absorb it into their flesh and blood, every relic of conscience pangs will disappear.

134

If now, as stated, the Christian, through certain delusive feelings, is betrayed into self contempt, that is by a false and unscientific view of his acts and feelings, he must, nevertheless, perceive with the utmost amazement that this state of self contempt, of conscience pangs, of despair in particular, does not last, that there are hours during which all these things are wafted away from the soul and he feels himself once more free and courageous. The truth is that joy in his own being, the fulness of his own powers in connection with the inevitable decline of his profound excitation with the lapse of time, bore off the palm of victory. The man loves himself once more, he feels it--but this very new love, this new self esteem seems to him incredible. He can see in it only the wholly unmerited stream of the light of grace shed down upon him. If he formerly saw in every event merely warnings, threats, punishments and every kind of indication of divine anger, he now reads into his experiences the grace of god. The latter circumstance seems to him full of love, the former as a helpful pointing of the way, and his entirely joyful frame of mind now seems to him to be an absolute proof of the goodness of God. As formerly in his states of discouragement he interpreted his conduct falsely so now he does the same with his experiences. His state of consolation is now regarded as the effect produced by some external power. The love with which, at bottom, he loves himself, seems to be the divine love. That which he calls grace and the preliminary of salvation is in reality self-grace, self-salvation.

135

Therefore a certain false psychology, a certain kind of imaginativeness in the interpretation of motives and experiences is the essential preliminary to being a Christian and to experiencing the need of salvation. Upon gaining an insight into this wandering of the reason and the imagination, one ceases to be a Christian.

136

=Of Christian Asceticism and Sanctity.=--Much as some thinkers have exerted themselves to impart an air of the miraculous to those singular phenomena known as asceticism and sanctity, to question which or to account for which upon a rational basis would be wickedness and sacrilege, the temptation to this wickedness is none the less great. A powerful impulse of nature has in every age led to protest against such phenomena. At any rate science, inasmuch as it is the imitation of nature, permits the casting of doubts upon the inexplicable character and the supernal degree of such phenomena. It is true that heretofore science has not succeeded in its attempts at explanation. The phenomena remain unexplained still, to the great satisfaction of those who revere moral miracles. For, speaking generally, the unexplained must rank as the inexplicable, the inexplicable as the non-natural, supernatural, miraculous--so runs the demand in the souls of all the religious and all the metaphysicians (even the artists if they happen to be thinkers), whereas the scientific man sees in this demand the "evil principle."--The universal, first, apparent truth that is encountered in the contemplation of sanctity and asceticism is that their nature is complicated; for nearly always, within the physical world as well as in the moral, the apparently miraculous may be traced successfully to the complex, the obscure, the

multi-conditioned. Let us venture then to isolate a few impulses in the soul of the saint and the ascetic, to consider them separately and then view them as a synthetic development.

137

There is an obstinacy against oneself, certain sublimated forms of which are included in asceticism. Certain kinds of men are under such a strong necessity of exercising their power and dominating impulses that, if other objects are lacking or if they have not succeeded with other objects they will actually tyrannize over some portions of their own nature or over sections and stages of their own personality. Thus do many thinkers bring themselves to views which are far from likely to increase or improve their fame. Many deliberately bring down the contempt of others upon themselves although they could easily have retained consideration by silence. Others contradict earlier opinions and do not shrink from the ordeal of being deemed inconsistent. On the contrary they strive for this and act like eager riders who enjoy horseback exercise most when the horse is skittish. Thus will men in dangerous paths ascend to the highest steeps in order to laugh to scorn their own fear and their own trembling limbs. Thus will the philosopher embrace the dogmas of asceticism, humility, sanctity, in the light of which his own image appears in its most hideous aspect. This crushing of self, this mockery of one's own nature, this spernere se sperni out of which religions have made so much is in reality but a very high development of vanity. The whole ethic of the sermon on the mount belongs in this category: man has a true delight in mastering himself through exaggerated pretensions or excessive expedients and later deifying this tyrannically exacting something within him. In every scheme of ascetic ethics, man prays to one part of himself as if it were god and hence it is necessary for him to treat the rest of himself as devil.

138

=Man is Not at All Hours Equally Moral=; this is established. If one's morality be judged according to one's capacity for great, self sacrificing resolutions and abnegations (which when continual, and made a habit are known as sanctity) one is, in affection, or disposition, the most moral: while higher excitement supplies wholly new impulses which, were one calm and cool as ordinarily, one would not deem oneself even capable of. How comes this? Apparently from the propinquity of all great and lofty emotional states. If a man is brought to an extraordinary pitch of feeling he can resolve upon a fearful revenge or upon a fearful renunciation of his thirst for vengeance indifferently. He craves, under the influences of powerful emotion, the great, the powerful, the immense, and if he chances to perceive that the sacrifice of himself will afford him as much satisfaction as the sacrifice of another, or will afford him more, he will choose self sacrifice. What concerns him particularly is simply the unloading of his emotion. Hence he readily, to relieve his tension, grasps the darts of the enemy and buries them in his own breast. That in self abnegation and not in revenge the element of greatness consisted must have been brought home to mankind only after long habituation. A god who sacrifices himself would be the most powerful and most effective symbol of this sort of greatness. As the conquest of the most hardly conquered enemy, the sudden mastering of a passion--thus does such abnegation _appear_: hence it passes for the summit of morality. In reality all that is involved is the exchange of one idea for another whilst the temperament remained at a like altitude, a like tidal state. Men when coming out of the spell, or resting from such passionate excitation, no longer understand the morality of such instants, but the admiration of all who participated in the occasion sustains them. Pride is their support if the passion and the comprehension of their act weaken. Therefore, at bottom even such acts of self-abnegation are not moral inasmuch as they are not done with a strict regard for others. Rather do others afford the high strung temperament an opportunity to lighten itself through such abnegation.

139

=Even the Ascetic Seeks to Make Life Easier=, and generally by means of absolute subjection to another will or to an all inclusive rule and ritual, pretty much as the Brahmin leaves absolutely nothing to his own volition but is guided in every moment of his life by some holy injunction or other. This subjection is a potent means of acquiring dominion over oneself. One is occupied, hence time does not bang heavy and there is no incitement of the personal will and of the individual passion. The deed once done there is no feeling of responsibility nor the sting of regret. One has given up one's own will once for all and this is easier than to give it up occasionally, as it is also easier wholly to renounce a desire than to yield to it in measured degree. When we consider the present relation of man to the state we perceive unconditional obedience is easier than conditional. The holy person also makes his lot easier through the complete surrender of his life personality and it is all delusion to admire such a phenomenon as the loftiest heroism of morality. It is always more difficult to assert one's personality without shrinking and without hesitation than to give it up altogether in the manner indicated, and it requires moreover more intellect and thought.

140

After having discovered in many of the less comprehensible actions mere manifestations of pleasure in emotion for its own sake, I fancy I can detect in the self contempt which characterises holy persons, and also in their acts of self torture (through hunger and scourgings, distortions and chaining of the limbs, acts of madness) simply a means whereby such natures may resist the general exhaustion of their will to live (their nerves). They employ the most painful expedients to escape if only for a time from the heaviness and weariness in which they are steeped by their great mental indolence and their subjection to a will other than their own.

141

=The Most Usual Means= by which the ascetic and the sanctified individual seeks to make life more endurable comprises certain combats of an inner nature involving alternations of victory and prostration. For this purpose an enemy is necessary and he is found in the so called "inner enemy." That is, the holy individual makes use of his tendency to vanity, domineering and pride, and of his mental longings in order to contemplate his life as a sort of continuous battle and himself as a battlefield, in which good and evil spirits wage war with varying fortune. It is an established fact that the imagination is restrained through the regularity and adequacy of sexual intercourse while on the other hand abstention from or great irregularity in sexual intercourse will cause the imagination to run riot. The imaginations of many of the Christian saints were obscene to a degree; and because of the theory that sexual desires were in reality demons that raged within them, the saints did not feel wholly responsible for them. It is to this conviction that we are indebted for the highly instructive sincerity of their evidence against themselves. It was to their interest that this contest should always be kept up in some fashion because by means of this contest, as already stated, their empty lives gained distraction. In order that the contest might seem sufficiently great to inspire sympathy and admiration in the unsanctified, it was essential that sexual capacity be ever more and more damned and denounced. Indeed the danger of eternal damnation was so closely allied to this capacity that for whole generations Christians showed their children with actual conscience pangs. What evil may not have been done to humanity through this! And yet here the truth is just upside down: an exceedingly unseemly attitude for the truth. Christianity, it is true, had said that every man is conceived and born in sin, and in the intolerable and excessive Christianity of Calderon this thought is again perverted and entangled into the most distorted paradox extant in the well known lines

The greatest sin of man Is the sin of being born.

In all pessimistic religions the act of procreation is looked upon as evil in itself. This is far from being the general human opinion. It is not even the opinion of all pessimists. Empedocles, for example, knows nothing of anything shameful, devilish and sinful in it. He sees rather in the great field of bliss of unholiness simply a healthful and hopeful phenomenon, Aphrodite. She is to him an evidence that strife does not always rage but that some time a gentle demon is to wield the sceptre. The Christian pessimists of practice, had, as stated, a direct interest in the prevalence of an opposite belief. They needed in the loneliness and the spiritual wilderness of their lives an ever living enemy, and a universally known enemy through whose conquest they might appear to the unsanctified as utterly incomprehensible and half unnatural beings. When this enemy at last, as a result of their mode of life and their shattered health, took flight forever, they were able immediately to people their inner selves with new demons. The rise and fall of the balance of cheerfulness and despair maintained their addled brains in a totally new fluctuation of longing and peace of soul. And in that period psychology served not only to cast suspicion on everything human but to wound and scourge it, to crucify it. Man wanted to find himself as base and evil as possible. Man sought to become anxious about the state of his soul, he wished to be doubtful of his own capacity. Everything natural with which man connects the idea of badness and sinfulness (as, for instance, is still customary in regard to the erotic) injures and degrades the imagination, occasions a shamed aspect, leads man to war upon himself and makes him uncertain, distrustful of himself. Even his dreams acquire a tincture of the unclean conscience. And yet this suffering because of the natural element in certain things is wholly superfluous. It is simply the result of opinions regarding the things. It is easy to understand why men become worse than they are if they are brought to look upon the unavoidably natural as bad and later to feel it as of evil origin. It is the master stroke of religions and metaphysics that wish to make man out bad and sinful by nature, to render nature suspicious in his eyes and to so make himself evil, for he learns to feel himself evil when he cannot divest himself of nature. He gradually comes to look upon himself, after a long life lived naturally, so oppressed by a weight of sin that supernatural powers become necessary to relieve him of the burden; and with this notion comes the so called need of salvation, which is the result not of a real but of an imaginary sinfulness. Go through the separate moral expositions in the vouchers of christianity and it will always be found that the demands are excessive in order that it may be impossible for man to satisfy them. The object is not that he may become moral but that he may feel as sinful as possible. If this feeling had not been rendered

agreeable to man--why should he have improvised such an ideal and clung to it so long? As in the ancient world an incalculable strength of intellect and capacity for feeling was squandered in order to increase the joy of living through feastful systems of worship, so in the era of christianity an equally incalculable quantity of intellectual capacity has been sacrificed in another endeavor: that man should in every way feel himself sinful and thereby be moved, inspired, inspirited. To move, to inspire, to inspirit at any cost--is not this the freedom cry of an exhausted, over-ripe, over cultivated age? The circle of all the natural sensations had been gone through a hundred times: the soul had grown weary. Then the saints and the ascetics found a new order of ecstacies. They set themselves before the eyes of all not alone as models for imitation to many, but as fearful and yet delightful spectacles on the boundary line between this world and the next world, where in that period everyone thought he saw at one time rays of heavenly light, at another fearful, threatening tongues of flame. The eye of the saint, directed upon the fearful significance of the shortness of earthly life, upon the imminence of the last judgment, upon eternal life hereafter; this glowering eye in an emaciated body caused men, in the old time world, to tremble to the depths of their being. To look, to look away and shudder, to feel anew the fascination of the spectacle, to yield to it, sate oneself upon it until the soul trembled with ardor and fever--that was the last pleasure left to classical antiquity when its sensibilities had been blunted by the arena and the gladiatorial show.

142

=To Sum Up All That Has Been Said=: that condition of soul at which the saint or expectant saint is rejoiced is a combination of elements which we are all familiar with, except that under other influences than those of mere religious ideation they customarily arouse the censure of men in the same way that when combined with religion itself and regarded as the supreme attainment of sanctity, they are object of admiration and even of prayer--at least in more simple times. Very soon the saint turns upon himself that severity that is so closely allied to the instinct of domination at any price and which inspire even in the most solitary individual the sense of power. Soon his swollen sensitiveness of feeling breaks forth from the longing to restrain his passions within it and is transformed into a longing to master them as if they were wild steeds, the master impulse being ever that of a proud spirit; next he craves a complete cessation of all perturbing, fascinating feelings, a waking sleep, an enduring repose in the lap of a dull, animal, plant-like indolence. Next he seeks the battle and extinguishes it within himself because weariness and boredom confront him. He binds his self-deification with self-contempt. He delights in the wild tumult of his desires and the sharp pain of sin, in the very idea of being lost. He is able to play his very passions, for instance the desire to domineer, a trick so that he goes to the other extreme of abject humiliation and subjection, so that his overwrought soul is without any restraint through this antithesis. And, finally, when indulgence in visions, in talks with the dead or with divine beings overcomes him, this is really but a form of gratification that he craves, perhaps a form of gratification in which all other gratifications are blended. Novalis, one of the authorities in matters of sanctity, because of his experience and instinct, betrays the whole secret with the utmost simplicity when he says: "It is remarkable that the close connection of gratification, religion and cruelty has not long ago made men aware of their inner relationship and common tendency."

143

=Not What the Saint is but what he was in= the eyes of the non-sanctified gives him his historical importance. Because there existed a delusion respecting the saint, his soul states being falsely viewed and his personality being sundered as much as possible from humanity as a something incomparable and supernatural, because of these things he attained the extraordinary with which he swayed the imaginations of whole nations and whole ages. Even he knew himself not for even he regarded his dispositions, passions and actions in accordance with a system of interpretation as artificial and exaggerated as the pneumatic interpretation of the bible. The distorted and diseased in his own nature with its blending of spiritual poverty, defective knowledge, ruined health, overwrought nerves, remained as hidden from his view as from the view of his beholders. He was neither a particularly good man nor a particularly bad man but he stood for something that was far above the human standard in wisdom and goodness. Faith in him sustained faith in the divine and miraculous, in a religious significance of all existence, in an impending day of judgment. In the last rays of the setting sun of the ancient world, which fell upon the christian peoples, the shadowy form of the saint attained enormous proportions--to such enormous proportions, indeed, that down even to our own age, which no longer believes in god, there are thinkers who believe in the saints.

144

It stands to reason that this sketch of the saint, made upon the model of the whole species, can be confronted with many opposing sketches that would create a more agreeable impression. There are certain exceptions among the species who distinguish

themselves either by especial gentleness or especial humanity, and perhaps by the strength of their own personality. Others are in the highest degree fascinating because certain of their delusions shed a particular glow over their whole being, as is the case with the founder of christianity who took himself for the only begotten son of God and hence felt himself sinless; so that through his imagination--that should not be too harshly judged since the whole of antiquity swarmed with sons of god--he attained the same goal, the sense of complete sinlessness, complete irresponsibility, that can now be attained by every individual through science.--In the same manner I have viewed the saints of India who occupy an intermediate station between the christian saints and the Greek philosophers and hence are not to be regarded as a pure type. Knowledge and science--as far as they existed--and superiority to the rest of mankind by logical discipline and training of the intellectual powers were insisted upon by the Buddhists as essential to sanctity, just as they were denounced by the christian world as the indications of sinfulness.

End of Project Gutenberg's Human, All Too Human, by Friedrich Nietzsche

==========

History of Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt

Jacob Abbott

Project Gutenberg Release: July 11, 2012 · eBook #40205

Note: Project Gutenberg also has an HTML version of this file which includes the original illustrations. See 40205-h.htm or 40205-h.zip: (https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/40205/pg40205-images.html) or (https://www.gutenberg.org/files/40205/40205-h.zip)

Images of the original pages are available through Internet Archive. See http://archive.org/details/historyofcleopat00abbo

[Illustration: SCENE OF CLEOPATRA'S HISTORY]

HISTORY OF CLEOPATRA, QUEEN OF EGYPT.

by

JACOB ABBOTT.

With Engravings.

New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1854.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty-one, by Harper & Brothers, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern District of New York.

PREFACE.

In selecting the subjects for the successive volumes of this series, it has been the object of the author to look for the names of those great personages whose histories constitute useful, and not merely entertaining, knowledge. There are certain names which are familiar, as names, to all mankind; and every person who seeks for any degree of mental cultivation, feels desirous of informing himself of the leading outlines of their history, that he may know, in brief, what it was in their characters or their doings which has given them so widely-extended a fame. This knowledge, which it seems incumbent on every one to obtain in respect to such personages as Hannibal, Alexander, Cæsar, Cleopatra, Darius, Xerxes, Alfred, William the Conqueror, Queen Elizabeth, and Mary, queen of Scots, it is the design and object of these volumes to communicate, in a faithful, and, at the same time, if possible, in an attractive manner. Consequently, great historical names alone are selected; and it has been the writer's aim to present the prominent and leading traits in their characters, and all the important events in their lives, in a bold and free manner, and yet in the plain and simple language which is so obviously required in works which aim at permanent and practical usefulness.

CONTENTS.

Chapter Page

I. THE VALLEY OF THE NILE 13

II. THE PTOLEMIES 35

III. ALEXANDRIA 61

IV. CLEOPATRA'S FATHER 87

V. ACCESSION TO THE THRONE 112

VI. CLEOPATRA AND CÆSAR 132

VII. THE ALEXANDRINE WAR 157

VIII. CLEOPATRA A QUEEN 181

IX. THE BATTLE OF PHILIPPI 200

X. CLEOPATRA AND ANTONY 225

XI. THE BATTLE OF ACTIUM 256

XII. THE END OF CLEOPATRA 286

ENGRAVINGS.

Page

MAP, SCENE OF CLEOPATRA'S HISTORY _Frontispiece._

MAP, THE RAINLESS REGION 21

MAP, THE DELTA OF THE NILE 29

THE BIRTH-DAY PRESENT 50

ANTONY CROSSING THE DESERT 107

CLEOPATRA ENTERING THE PALACE OF CÆSAR 135

VIEW OF ALEXANDRIA 162

CLEOPATRA'S SISTER IN THE TRIUMPHAL PROCESSION 190

THE ENTERTAINMENTS AT TARSUS 242

THE RAISING OF ANTONY TO THE UPPER WINDOW OF THE TOMB 303

CLEOPATRA.

CHAPTER I.

THE VALLEY OF THE NILE.

The story of Cleopatra is a story of crime. It is a narrative of the course and the consequences of unlawful love. In her strange and romantic history we see this passion portrayed with the most complete and graphic fidelity in all its influences and effects; its uncontrollable impulses, its intoxicating joys, its reckless and mad career, and the dreadful remorse and ultimate despair and ruin in which it always and inevitably ends.

* * * * *

Cleopatra was by birth an Egyptian; by ancestry and descent she was a Greek. Thus, while Alexandria and the delta of the Nile formed the scene of the most important events and incidents of her history, it was the blood of Macedon which flowed in her veins. Her character and action are marked by the genius, the courage, the originality, and the impulsiveness pertaining to the stock from which she sprung. The events of her history, on the other hand, and the peculiar character of her adventures, her sufferings, and her sins, were determined by the circumstances with which she was surrounded, and the influences which were brought to bear upon her in the soft and voluptuous clime where the scenes of her early life were laid.

Egypt has always been considered as physically the most remarkable country on the globe. It is a long and narrow valley of verdure and fruitfulness, completely insulated from the rest of the habitable world. It is more completely insulated, in fact, than any literal island could be, inasmuch as deserts are more impassable than seas. The very existence of Egypt is a most extraordinary phenomenon. If we could but soar with the wings of an eagle into the air, and look down upon the scene, so as to observe the operation of that grand and yet simple process by which this long and wonderful valley, teeming so profusely with animal and vegetable life, has been formed, and is annually revivified and renewed, in the midst of surrounding wastes of silence, desolation,

and death, we should gaze upon it with never-ceasing admiration and pleasure. We have not the wings of the eagle, but the generalizations of science furnish us with a sort of substitute for them. The long series of patient, careful, and sagacious observations, which have been continued now for two thousand years, bring us results, by means of which, through our powers of mental conception, we may take a comprehensive survey of the whole scene, analogous, in some respects, to that which direct and actual vision would afford us, if we could look down upon it from the eagle's point of view. It is, however, somewhat humiliating to our pride of intellect to reflect that long-continued philosophical investigations and learned scientific research are, in such a case as this, after all, in some sense, only a sort of substitute for wings. A human mind connected with a pair of eagle's wings would have solved the mystery of Egypt in a week; whereas science, philosophy, and research, confined to the surface of the ground, have been occupied for twenty centuries in accomplishing the undertaking.

It is found at last that both the existence of Egypt itself, and its strange insulation in the midst of boundless tracts of dry and barren sand, depend upon certain remarkable results of the general laws of rain. The water which is taken up by the atmosphere from the surface of the sea and of the land by evaporation, falls again, under certain circumstances, in showers of rain, the frequency and copiousness of which vary very much in different portions of the earth. As a general principle, rains are much more frequent and abundant near the equator than in temperate climes, and they grow less and less so as we approach the poles. This might naturally have been expected; for, under the burning sun of the equator, the evaporation of water must necessarily go on with immensely greater rapidity than in the colder zones, and all the water which is taken up must, of course, again come down.

It is not, however, wholly by the latitude of the region in which the evaporation takes place that the quantity of rain which falls from the atmosphere is determined; for the condition on which the falling back, in rain, of the water which has been taken up by evaporation mainly depends, is the cooling of the atmospheric stratum which contains it; and this effect is produced in very various ways, and many different causes operate to modify it. Sometimes the stratum is cooled by being wafted over ranges of mountains; sometimes by encountering and becoming mingled with cooler currents of air; and sometimes, again, by being driven in winds toward a higher, and, consequently, cooler latitude. If, on the other hand, air moves from cold mountains toward warm and sunny plains, or from higher latitudes to lower, or if, among the various currents into which it falls, it becomes mixed with air warmer than itself, its capacity for containing vapor in solution is increased, and, consequently, instead of releasing its hold upon the waters which it has already in possession, it becomes thirsty for more. It moves over a country, under these circumstances, as a warm and drying wind. Under a reverse of circumstances it would have formed drifting mists, or, perhaps, even copious showers of rain.

It will be evident, from these considerations, that the frequency of the showers, and the quantity of the rain which will fall, in the various regions respectively which the surface of the earth presents, must depend on the combined influence of many causes, such as the warmth of the climate, the proximity and the direction of mountains and of seas, the character of the prevailing winds, and the reflecting qualities of the soil. These and other similar causes, it is found, do, in fact, produce a vast difference in the quantity of rain which falls in different regions. In the northern part of South America, where the land is bordered on every hand by vast tropical seas, which load the hot and thirsty air with vapor, and where the mighty Cordillera of the Andes rears its icy summits to chill and precipitate the vapors again, a quantity of rain amounting to more than ten feet in perpendicular height falls in a year. At St. Petersburg, on the other hand, the quantity thus falling in a year is but little more than one foot. The immense deluge which pours down from the clouds in South America would, if the water were to remain where it fell, wholly submerge and inundate the country. As it is, in flowing off through the valleys to the sea, the united torrents form the greatest river on the globe--the Amazon; and the vegetation, stimulated by the heat, and nourished by the abundant and incessant supplies of moisture, becomes so rank, and loads the earth with such an entangled and matted mass of trunks, and stems, and twining wreaths and vines, that man is almost excluded from the scene. The boundless forests become a vast and almost impenetrable jungle, abandoned to wild beasts, noxious reptiles, and huge and ferocious birds of prey.

Of course, the district of St. Petersburg, with its icy winter, its low and powerless sun, and its twelve inches of annual rain, must necessarily present, in all its phenomena of vegetable and animal life, a striking contrast to the exuberant prolificness of New Grenada. It is, however, after all, not absolutely the opposite extreme. There are certain regions on the surface of the earth that are actually rainless; and it is these which present us with the true and real contrast to the luxuriant vegetation and teeming life of the country of the Amazon. In these rainless regions all is necessarily silence, desolation, and death. No plant can grow; no animal can live. Man, too, is forever and hopelessly excluded. If the exuberant abundance of animal and vegetable life shut him out, in some measure, from regions which an excess of heat and moisture render too prolific, the total absence of them still more effectually forbids him a home in these. They become, therefore, vast wastes of dry and barren sands in which no root can find nourishment, and of dreary rocks to which not even a lichen can cling.

The most extensive and remarkable rainless region on the earth is a vast tract extending through the interior and northern part of Africa, and the southwestern part of Asia. The Red Sea penetrates into this tract from the south, and thus breaks the outline and continuity of its form, without, however, altering, or essentially modifying its character. It divides it, however, and to the different portions which this division forms, different names have been given. The Asiatic portion is called Arabia Deserta; the African tract has received the name of Sahara; while between these two, in the neighborhood of Egypt, the barren region is called simply _the desert_. The whole tract is marked, however, throughout, with one all-pervading character: the absence of vegetable, and, consequently, of animal life, on account of the absence of rain. The rising of a range of lofty mountains in the center of it, to produce a precipitation of moisture from the air, would probably transform the whole of the vast waste into as verdant, and fertile, and populous a region I as any on the globe.

[Illustration: VALLEY OF THE NILE]

As it is, there are no such mountains. The whole tract is nearly level, and so little elevated above the sea, that, at the distance of many hundred miles in the interior, the land rises only to the height of a few hundred feet above the surface of the Mediterranean; whereas in New Grenada, at less than one hundred miles from the sea, the chain of the Andes rises to elevations of from ten to fifteen thousand feet. Such an ascent as that of a few hundred feet in hundreds of miles would be wholly imperceptible to any ordinary mode of observation; and the great rainless region, accordingly, of Africa and Asia is, as it appears to the traveler, one vast plain, a thousand miles wide and five thousand miles long, with only one considerable interruption to the dead monotony which reigns, with that exception, every where over the immense expanse of silence and solitude. The single interval of fruitfulness and life is the valley of the Nile.

There are, however, in fact, three interruptions to the continuity of this plain, though only one of them constitutes any considerable interruption to its barrenness. They are all of them valleys, extending from north to south, and lying side by side. The most easterly of these valleys is so deep that the waters of the ocean flow into it from the south, forming a long and narrow inlet called the Red Sea. As this inlet communicates freely with the ocean, it is always nearly of the same level, and as the evaporation from it is not sufficient to produce rain, it does not even fertilize its own shores. Its presence varies the dreary scenery of the landscape, it is true, by giving us surging waters to look upon instead of driving sands; but this is all. With the exception of the spectacle of an English steamer passing, at weary intervals, over its dreary expanse, and some moldering remains of ancient cities on its eastern shore, it affords scarcely any indications of life. It does very little, therefore, to relieve the monotonous aspect of solitude and desolation which reigns over the region into which it has intruded.

The most westerly of the three valleys to which we have alluded is only a slight depression of the surface of the land marked by a line of _oases_. The depression is not sufficient to admit the waters of the Mediterranean, nor are there any rains over any portion of the valley which it forms sufficient to make it the bed of a stream. Springs issue, however, here and there, in several places, from the ground, and, percolating through the sands along the valley, give fertility to little dells, long and narrow, which, by the contrast that they form with the surrounding desolation, seem to the traveler to possess the verdure and beauty of Paradise. There is a line of these oases extending along this westerly depression, and some of them are of considerable extent. The oasis of Siweh, on which stood the far-famed temple of Jupiter Ammon, was many miles in extent, and was said to have contained in ancient times a population of eight thousand souls. Thus, while the most easterly of the three valleys which we have named was sunk so low as to admit the ocean to flow freely into it, the most westerly was so slightly depressed that it gained only a circumscribed and limited fertility through the springs, which, in the lowest portions of it, oozed from the ground. The third valley--the central one--remains now to be described.

The reader will observe, by referring once more to the map, that south of the great rainless region of which we are speaking, there lie groups and ranges of mountains in Abyssinia, called the Mountains of the Moon. These mountains are near the equator, and the relation which they sustain to the surrounding seas, and to currents of wind which blow in that quarter of the world, is such, that they bring down from the atmosphere, especially in certain seasons of the year, vast and continual torrents of rain. The water which thus falls drenches the mountain sides and deluges the valleys. There is a great portion of it which can not flow to the southward or eastward toward the sea, as the whole country consists, in those directions, of continuous tracts of elevated land. The rush of water thus turns to the northward, and, pressing on across the desert through the great central valley which we have referred to above, it finds an outlet, at last, in the Mediterranean, at a point two thousand miles distant from the place where the immense condenser drew it from the skies. The river thus created is the Nile. It is formed, in a word, by the surplus waters of a district inundated with rains, in their progress across a rainless desert, seeking the sea.

If the surplus of water upon the Abyssinian mountains had been constant and uniform, the stream, in its passage across the desert, would have communicated very little fertility to the barren sands which it traversed. The immediate banks of the river would have, perhaps, been fringed with verdure, but the influence of the irrigation would have extended no further than the water itself could have reached, by percolation through the sand. But the flow of the water is not thus uniform and steady. In a certain season of the year the rains are incessant, and they descend with such abundance and profusion as almost to inundate the districts where they fall. Immense torrents stream down the mountain sides; the valleys are deluged; plains turn into morasses, and morasses into lakes. In a word, the country becomes half submerged, and the accumulated mass of waters would rush with great force and violence down the central valley of the desert, which forms their only outlet, if the passage were narrow, and if it made any considerable descent in its course to the sea. It is, however, not narrow, and the descent is very small. The depression in the surface of the desert, through which the water flows, is from five to ten miles wide, and, though it is nearly two thousand miles from the rainy district across the desert to the sea, the country for the whole distance is almost level. There is only sufficient descent, especially for the last thousand miles, to determine a very gentle current to the northward in the waters of the stream.

Under these circumstances, the immense quantity of water which falls in the rainy district in these inundating tropical showers, expands over the whole valley, and forms for a time an immense lake, extending in length across the whole breadth of the desert. This lake is, of course, from five to ten miles wide, and a thousand miles long. The water in it is shallow and turbid, and it has a gentle current toward the north. The rains, at length, in a great measure cease; but it requires some months for the water to run off and leave the valley dry. As soon as it is gone, there springs up from the whole surface of the ground which has been thus submerged a most rank and luxuriant vegetation.

This vegetation, now wholly regulated and controlled by the hand of man, must have been, in its original and primeval state, of a very peculiar character. It must have consisted of such plants only as could exist under the condition of having the soil in which they grew laid, for a quarter of the year, wholly under water. This circumstance, probably, prevented the valley of the Nile from having been, like other fertile tracts of land, encumbered, in its native state, with forests. For the same reason, wild beasts could never have haunted it. There were no forests to shelter them, and no refuge or retreat for them but the dry and barren desert, during the period of the annual inundations. This most extraordinary valley seems thus to have been formed and preserved by Nature herself for the special possession of man. She herself seems to have held it in reserve for him from the very morning of creation, refusing admission into it to every plant and every animal that might hinder or disturb his occupancy and control. And if he were to abandon it now for a thousand years, and then return to it once more, he would find it just as he left it, ready for his immediate possession. There would be no wild beasts that he must first expel, and no tangled forests would have sprung up, that his ax must first remove. Nature is the husbandman who keeps this garden of the world in order, and the means and machinery by which she operates are the grand evaporating surfaces of the seas, the beams of the tropical sun, the lofty summits of the Abyssinian mountains, and, as the product and result of all this instrumentality, great periodical inundations of summer rain.

For these or some other reasons Egypt has been occupied by man from the most remote antiquity. The oldest records of the human race, made three thousand years ago, speak of Egypt as ancient then, when they were written. Not only is Tradition silent, but even Fable herself does not attempt to tell the story of the origin of her population. Here stand the oldest and most enduring monuments that human power has ever been able to raise. It is, however, somewhat humiliating to the pride of the race to reflect that the loftiest and proudest, as well as the most permanent and stable of all the works which man has ever accomplished, are but the incidents and adjuncts of a thin stratum of alluvial fertility, left upon the sands by the subsiding waters of summer showers.

The most important portion of the alluvion of the Nile is the northern portion, where the valley widens and opens toward the sea, forming a triangular plain of about one hundred miles in length on each of the sides, over which the waters of the river flow in a great number of separate creeks and channels. The whole area forms a vast meadow, intersected every where with slow-flowing streams of water, and presenting on its surface the most enchanting pictures of fertility, abundance, and beauty. This region is called the Delta of the Nile.

[Illustration: DELTA OF THE NILE]

The sea upon the coast is shallow, and the fertile country formed by the deposits of the river seems to have projected somewhat beyond the line of the coast; although, as the land has not advanced perceptibly for the last eighteen hundred years, it may be somewhat doubtful whether the whole of the apparent protrusion is not due to the natural conformation of the coast, rather than to any changes made by the action of the river.

The Delta of the Nile is so level itself, and so little raised above the level of the Mediterranean, that the land seems almost a continuation of the same surface with the sea, only, instead of blue waters topped with white-crested waves, we have broad tracts of waving grain, and gentle swells of land crowned with hamlets and villages. In approaching the coast, the navigator has no distant view of all this verdure and beauty. It lies so low that it continues beneath the horizon until the ship is close upon the shore. The first landmarks, in fact, which the seaman makes, are the tops of trees growing apparently out of the water, or the summit of an obelisk, or the capital of a pillar, marking the site of some ancient and dilapidated city.

The most easterly of the channels by which the waters of the river find their way through the Delta to the sea, is called, as it will be seen marked upon the map, the Pelusiac branch. It forms almost the boundary of the fertile region of the Delta on the eastern side. There was an ancient city named Pelusium near the mouth of it. This was, of course, the first Egyptian city reached by those who arrived by land from the eastward, traveling along the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. On account of its thus marking the eastern frontier of the country, it became a point of great importance, and is often mentioned in the histories of ancient times.

The westernmost mouth of the Nile, on the other hand, was called the Canopic mouth. The distance along the coast from the Canopic mouth to Pelusium was about a hundred miles. The outline of the coast was formerly, as it still continues to be, very irregular, and the water shallow. Extended banks of sand protruded into the sea, and the sea itself, as if in retaliation, formed innumerable creeks, and inlets, and lagoons in the land. Along this irregular and uncertain boundary the waters of the Nile and the surges of the Mediterranean kept up an eternal war, with energies so nearly equal, that now, after the lapse of eighteen hundred years since the state of the contest began to be recorded, neither side has been found to have gained any perceptible advantage over the other. The river brings the sands down, and the sea drives them incessantly back, keeping the whole line of the shore in such a condition as to make it extremely dangerous and difficult of access to man.

It will be obvious, from this description of the valley of the Nile, that it formed a country which was in ancient times isolated and secluded, in a very striking manner, from all the rest of the world. It was wholly shut in by deserts, on every side, by land; and the shoals, and sand-bars, and other dangers of navigation which marked the line of the coast, seemed to forbid approach by sea. Here it remained for many ages, under the rule of its own native ancient kings. Its population was peaceful and industrious. Its scholars were famed throughout the world for their learning, their science, and their philosophy. It was in these ages, before other nations had intruded upon its peaceful seclusion, that the Pyramids were built, and the enormous monoliths carved, and those vast temples reared whose ruined columns are now the wonder of mankind. During these remote ages, too, Egypt was, as now, the land of perpetual fertility and abundance. There would always be corn in Egypt, wherever else famine might rage. The neighboring nations and tribes in Arabia, Palestine, and Syria, found their way to it, accordingly, across the deserts on the eastern side, when driven by want, and thus opened a way of communication. At length the Persian monarchs, after extending their empire westward to the Mediterranean, found access by the same road to Pelusium, and thence overran and conquered the country. At last, about two hundred and fifty years before the time of Cleopatra, Alexander the Great, when he subverted the Persian empire, took possession of Egypt, and annexed it, among the other Persian provinces, to his own dominions. At the division of Alexander's empire, after his death, Egypt fell to one of his generals, named Ptolemy. Ptolemy made it his kingdom, and left it, at his death, to his heirs. A long line of sovereigns succeeded him, known in history as the dynasty of the Ptolemies--Greek princes, reigning over an Egyptian realm. Cleopatra was the daughter of the eleventh in the line.

The capital of the Ptolemies was Alexandria. Until the time of Alexander's conquest, Egypt had no sea-port. There were several landing-places along the coast, but no proper harbor. In fact, Egypt had then so little commercial intercourse with the rest of the world, that she scarcely needed any. Alexander's engineers, however, in exploring the shore, found a point not far from the Canopic mouth of the Nile where the water was deep, and where there was an anchorage ground protected by an island. Alexander founded a city there, which he called by his own name. He perfected the harbor by artificial excavations and embankments. A lofty light-house was reared, which formed a landmark by day, and exhibited a blazing star by night to guide the galleys of the Mediterranean in. A canal was made to connect the port with the Nile, and warehouses were erected to contain the stores of merchandise. In a word, Alexandria became at once a great commercial capital. It was the seat, for several centuries, of the magnificent government of the Ptolemies; and so well was its situation chosen for the purposes intended, that it still continues, after the lapse of twenty centuries of revolution and change, one of the principal emporiums of the commerce of the East.

CHAPTER II.

THE PTOLEMIES.

The founder of the dynasty of the Ptolemies--the ruler into whose hands the kingdom of Egypt fell, as has already been stated, at the death of Alexander the Great--was a Macedonian general in Alexander's army. The circumstances of his birth, and the events which led to his entering into the service of Alexander, were somewhat peculiar. His mother, whose name was Arsinoë, was a personal favorite and companion of Philip, king of Macedon, the father of Alexander. Philip at length gave Arsinoë in marriage to a certain man of his court named Lagus. A very short time after the marriage, Ptolemy was born. Philip treated the child with the same consideration and favor that he had evinced toward the mother. The boy was called the son of Lagus, but his position in the royal court of Macedon was as high and honorable, and the attentions which he received were as great, as he could have expected to enjoy if he had been in reality a son of the king. As he grew up, he attained to official stations of considerable responsibility and power.

In the course of time, a certain transaction occurred, by means of which Ptolemy involved himself in serious difficulty with Philip, though by the same means he made Alexander very strongly his friend. There was a province of the Persian empire called Caria, situated in the southwestern part of Asia Minor. The governor of this province had offered his daughter to Philip as the wife of one of his sons named Aridæus, the half brother of Alexander. Alexander's mother, who was not the mother of Aridæus, was jealous of this proposed marriage. She thought that it was part of a scheme for bringing Aridæus forward into public notice, and finally making him the heir to Philip's throne; whereas she was very earnest that this splendid inheritance should be reserved for her own son. Accordingly, she proposed to Alexander that they should send a secret embassage to the Persian governor, and represent to him that it would be much better, both for him and for his daughter, that she should have Alexander instead of Aridæus for a husband, and induce him, if possible, to demand of Philip that he should make the change.

Alexander entered readily into this scheme, and various courtiers, Ptolemy among the rest, undertook to aid him in the accomplishment of it. The embassy was sent. The governor of Caria was very much pleased with the change which they proposed to him. In fact, the whole plan seemed to be going on very successfully toward its accomplishment, when, by some means or other, Philip discovered the intrigue. He went immediately into Alexander's apartment, highly excited with resentment and anger. He had never intended to make Aridæus, whose birth on the mother's side was obscure and ignoble, the heir to his throne, and he reproached Alexander in the bitterest terms for being of so debased and degenerate a spirit as to desire to marry the daughter of a Persian governor; a man who was, in fact, the mere slave, as he said, of a barbarian king.

Alexander's scheme was thus totally defeated; and so displeased was his father with the officers who had undertaken to aid him in the execution of it, that he banished them all from the kingdom. Ptolemy, in consequence of this decree, wandered about an exile from his country for some years, until at length the death of Philip enabled Alexander to recall him. Alexander succeeded his father as King of Macedon, and immediately made Ptolemy one of his principal generals. Ptolemy rose, in fact, to a very high command in the Macedonian army, and distinguished himself very greatly in all the celebrated conqueror's subsequent campaigns. In the Persian invasion, Ptolemy commanded one of the three grand divisions of the army, and he rendered repeatedly the most signal services to the cause of his master. He was employed on the most distant and dangerous enterprises, and was often intrusted with the management of affairs of the utmost importance. He was very successful in all his undertakings. He conquered armies, reduced fortresses, negotiated treaties, and evinced, in a word, the highest degree of military energy and skill. He once saved Alexander's life by discovering and revealing a dangerous conspiracy which had been formed against the king. Alexander had the opportunity to requite this favor, through a divine interposition vouchsafed to him, it was said, for the express purpose of enabling him to evince his gratitude. Ptolemy had been wounded by a poisoned arrow, and when all the remedies and antidotes of the physicians had failed, and the patient was apparently about to die, an effectual means of cure was revealed to Alexander in a dream, and Ptolemy, in his turn, was saved.

At the great rejoicings at Susa, when Alexander's conquests were completed, Ptolemy was honored with a golden crown, and he was married, with great pomp and ceremony, to Artacama, the daughter of one of the most distinguished Persian generals.

At length Alexander died suddenly, after a night of drinking and carousal at Babylon. He had no son old enough to succeed him, and his immense empire was divided among his generals. Ptolemy obtained Egypt for his share. He repaired immediately to Alexandria, with a great army, and a great number of Greek attendants and followers, and there commenced a reign which continued, in great prosperity and splendor, for forty years. The native Egyptians were reduced, of course, to subjection and bondage. All the offices in the army, and all stations of trust and responsibility in civil life, were filled by Greeks. Alexandria was a Greek city, and it became at once one of the most important commercial centers in all those seas. Greek and Roman travelers found now a language spoken in Egypt which they could understand, and philosophers and scholars could gratify the curiosity which they had so long felt, in respect to the institutions, and monuments, and wonderful physical characteristics of the country,

with safety and pleasure. In a word, the organization of a Greek government over the ancient kingdom, and the establishment of the great commercial relations of the city of Alexandria, conspired to bring Egypt out from its concealment and seclusion, and to open it in some measure to the intercourse, as well as to bring it more fully under the observation, of the rest of mankind.

Ptolemy, in fact, made it a special object of his policy to accomplish these ends. He invited Greek scholars, philosophers, poets, and artists, in great numbers, to come to Alexandria, and to make his capital their abode. He collected an immense library, which subsequently, under the name of the Alexandrian library, became one of the most celebrated collections of books and manuscripts that was ever made. We shall have occasion to refer more particularly to this library in the next chapter.

Besides prosecuting these splendid schemes for the aggrandizement of Egypt, King Ptolemy was engaged, during almost the whole period of his reign, in waging incessant wars with the surrounding nations. He engaged in these wars, in part, for the purpose of extending the boundaries of his empire, and in part for self-defense against the aggressions and encroachments of other powers. He finally succeeded in establishing his kingdom on the most stable and permanent basis, and then, when he was drawing toward the close of his life, being in fact over eighty years of age, he abdicated his throne in favor of his youngest son, whose name was also Ptolemy. Ptolemy the father, the founder of the dynasty, is known commonly in history by the name of Ptolemy Soter. His son is called Ptolemy Philadelphus. This son, though the youngest, was preferred to his brothers as heir to the throne on account of his being the son of the most favored and beloved of the monarch's wives. The determination of Soter to abdicate the throne himself arose from his wish to put this favorite son in secure possession of it before his death, in order to prevent the older brothers from disputing the succession. The coronation of Philadelphus was made one of the most magnificent and imposing ceremonies that royal pomp and parade ever arranged. Two years afterward Ptolemy the father died, and was buried by his son with a magnificence almost equal to that of his own coronation. His body was deposited in a splendid mausoleum, which had been built for the remains of Alexander; and so high was the veneration which was felt by mankind for the greatness of his exploits and the splendor of his reign, that divine honors were paid to his memory. Such was the origin of the great dynasty of the Ptolemies.

Some of the early sovereigns of the line followed in some degree the honorable example set them by the distinguished founder of it; but this example was soon lost, and was succeeded by the most extreme degeneracy and debasement. The successive sovereigns began soon to live and to reign solely for the gratification of their own sensual propensities and passions. Sensuality begins sometimes with kindness, but it ends always in the most reckless and intolerable cruelty. The Ptolemies became, in the end, the most abominable and terrible tyrants that the principle of absolute and irresponsible power ever produced. There was one vice in particular, a vice which they seem to have adopted from the Asiatic nations of the Persian empire, that resulted in the most awful consequences. This vice was incest.

The law of God, proclaimed not only in the Scriptures, but in the native instincts of the human soul, forbids intermarriages among those connected by close ties of consanguinity. The necessity for such a law rests on considerations which can not here be fully explained. They are considerations, however, which arise from causes inherent in the very nature of man as a social being, and which are of universal, perpetual, and insurmountable force. To guard his creatures against the deplorable consequences, both physical and moral, which result from the practice of such marriages, the great Author of Nature has implanted in every mind an instinctive sense of their criminality, powerful enough to give effectual warning of the danger, and so universal as to cause a distinct condemnation of them to be recorded in almost every code of written law that has ever been promulgated among mankind. The Persian sovereigns were, however, above all law, and every species of incestuous marriage was practiced by them without shame. The Ptolemies followed their example.

One of the most striking exhibitions of the nature of incestuous domestic life which is afforded by the whole dismal panorama of pagan vice and crime, is presented in the history of the great-grandfather of the Cleopatra who is the principal subject of this narrative. He was Ptolemy Physcon, the seventh in the line. It is necessary to give some particulars of his history and that of his family, in order to explain the circumstances under which Cleopatra herself came upon the stage. The name Physcon, which afterward became his historical designation, was originally given him in contempt and derision. He was very small of stature in respect to height, but his gluttony and sensuality had made him immensely corpulent in body, so that he looked more like a monster than a man. The term Physcon was a Greek word, which denoted opprobriously the ridiculous figure that he made.

The circumstances of Ptolemy Physcon's accession to the throne afford not only a striking illustration of his character, but a very faithful though terrible picture of the manners and morals of the times. He had been engaged in a long and cruel war with his brother, who was king before him, in which war he had perpetrated all imaginable atrocities, when at length his brother died, leaving as his survivors his wife, who was also his sister, and a son who was yet a child. This son was properly the heir to the crown.

Physcon himself, being a brother, had no claim, as against a son. The name of the queen was Cleopatra. This was, in fact, a very common name among the princesses of the Ptolemaic line. Cleopatra, besides her son, had a daughter, who was at this time a young and beautiful girl. Her name was also Cleopatra. She was, of course, the niece, as her mother was the sister, of Physcon.

The plan of Cleopatra the mother, after her husband's death, was to make her son the king of Egypt, and to govern herself, as regent, until he should become of age. The friends and adherents of Physcon, however, formed a strong party in _his_ favor. They sent for him to come to Alexandria to assert his claims to the throne. He came, and a new civil war was on the point of breaking out between the brother and sister, when at length the dispute was settled by a treaty, in which it was stipulated that Physcon should marry Cleopatra, and be king; but that he should make the son of Cleopatra by her former husband his heir. This treaty was carried into effect so far as the celebration of the marriage with the mother was concerned, and the establishment of Physcon upon the throne. But the perfidious monster, instead of keeping his faith in respect to the boy, determined to murder him; and so open and brutal were his habits of violence and cruelty, that he undertook to perpetrate the deed himself, in open day. The boy fled shrieking to the mother's arms for protection, and Physcon stabbed and killed him there, exhibiting the spectacle of a newly-married husband murdering the son of his wife in her very arms!

It is easy to conceive what sort of affection would exist between a husband and a wife after such transactions as these. In fact, there had been no love between them from the beginning. The marriage had been solely a political arrangement. Physcon hated his wife, and had murdered her son, and then, as if to complete the exhibition of the brutal lawlessness and capriciousness of his passions, he ended with falling in love with her daughter. The beautiful girl looked upon this heartless monster, as ugly and deformed in body as he was in mind, with absolute horror. But she was wholly in his power. He compelled her, by violence, to submit to his will. He repudiated the mother, and forced the daughter to become his wife.

Physcon displayed the same qualities of brutal tyranny and cruelty in the treatment of his subjects that he manifested in his own domestic relations. The particulars we can not here give, but can only say that his atrocities became at length absolutely intolerable, and a revolt so formidable broke out, that he fled from the country. In fact, he barely escaped with his life, as the mob had surrounded the palace and were setting it on fire, intending to burn the tyrant himself and all the accomplices of his crimes together. Physcon, however, contrived to make his escape. He fled to the island of Cyprus, taking with him a certain beautiful boy, his son by the Cleopatra whom he had divorced; for they had been married long enough, before the divorce, to have a son. The name of this boy was Memphitis. His mother was very tenderly attached to him, and Physcon took him away on this very account, to keep him as a hostage for his mother's good behavior. He fancied that, when he was gone, she might possibly attempt to resume possession of the throne.

His expectations in this respect were realized. The people of Alexandria rallied around Cleopatra, and called upon her to take the crown. She did so, feeling, perhaps, some misgivings in respect to the danger which such a step might possibly bring upon her absent boy. She quieted herself, however, by the thought that he was in the hands of his own father, and that he could not possibly come to harm.

After some little time had elapsed, and Cleopatra was beginning to be well established in her possession of the supreme power at Alexandria, her birth-day approached, and arrangements were made for celebrating it in the most magnificent manner. When the day arrived, the whole city was given up to festivities and rejoicing. Grand entertainments were given in the palace, and games, spectacles, and plays in every variety, were exhibited and performed in all quarters of the city. Cleopatra herself was enjoying a magnificent entertainment, given to the lords and ladies of the court and the officers of her army, in one of the royal palaces.

[Illustration: THE BIRTH-DAY PRESENT.]

In the midst of this scene of festivity and pleasure, it was announced to the queen that a large box had arrived for her. The box was brought into the apartment. It had the appearance of containing some magnificent present, sent in at that time by some friend in honor of the occasion. The curiosity of the queen was excited to know what the mysterious coffer might contain. She ordered it to be opened; and the guests gathered around, each eager to obtain the first glimpse of the contents. The lid was removed, and a cloth beneath it was raised, when, to the unutterable horror of all who witnessed the spectacle, there was seen the head and hands of Cleopatra's beautiful boy, lying among masses of human flesh, which consisted of the rest of his body cut into pieces. The head had been left entire, that the wretched mother might recognize in the pale and lifeless features the countenance of her son. Physcon had sent the box to Alexandria, with orders that it should be retained until the evening of the birth-day, and then presented publicly to Cleopatra in the midst of the festivities of the scene. The shrieks and cries with which she filled the apartments of the

palace at the first sight of the dreadful spectacle, and the agony of long-continued and inconsolable grief which followed, showed how well the cruel contrivance of the tyrant was fitted to accomplish its end.

It gives us no pleasure to write, and we are sure it can give our readers no pleasure to peruse, such shocking stories of bloody cruelty as these. It is necessary, however, to a just appreciation of the character of the great subject of this history, that we should understand the nature of the domestic influences that reigned in the family from which she sprung. In fact, it is due, as a matter of simple justice to her, that we should know what these influences were, and what were the examples set before her in her early life; since the privileges and advantages which the young enjoy in their early years, and, on the other hand, the evil influences under which they suffer, are to be taken very seriously into the account when we are passing judgment upon the follies and sins into which they subsequently fall.

The monster Physcon lived, it is true, two or three generations before the great Cleopatra; but the character of the intermediate generations, until the time of her birth, continued much the same. In fact, the cruelty, corruption, and vice which reigned in every branch of the royal family increased rather than diminished. The beautiful niece of Physcon, who, at the time of her compulsory marriage with him, evinced such an aversion to the monster, had become, at the period of her husband's death, as great a monster of ambition, selfishness, and cruelty as he. She had two sons, Lathyrus and Alexander. Physcon, when he died, left the kingdom of Egypt to her by will, authorizing her to associate with her in the government whichever of these two sons she might choose. The oldest was best entitled to this privilege, by his priority of birth; but she preferred the youngest, as she thought that her own power would be more absolute in reigning in conjunction with him, since he would be more completely under her control. The leading powers, however, in Alexandria, resisted this plan, and insisted on Cleopatra's associating her oldest son, Lathyrus, with her in the government of the realm. They compelled her to recall Lathyrus from the banishment into which she had sent him, and to put him nominally upon the throne. Cleopatra yielded to this necessity, but she forced her son to repudiate his wife, and to take, instead, another woman, whom she fancied she could make more subservient to her will. The mother and the son went on together for a time, Lathyrus being nominally king, though her determination that she would rule, and his struggles to resist her intolerable tyranny, made their wretched household the scene of terrible and perpetual quarrels. At last Cleopatra seized a number of Lathyrus's servants, the eunuchs who were employed in various offices about the palace, and after wounding and mutilating them in a horrible manner, she exhibited them to the populace, saying that it was Lathyrus that had inflicted the cruel injuries upon the sufferers, and calling upon them to arise and punish him for his crimes. In this and in other similar ways she awakened among the people of the court and of the city such an animosity against Lathyrus, that they expelled him from the country. There followed a long series of cruel and bloody wars between the mother and the son, in the course of which each party perpetrated against the other almost every imaginable deed of atrocity and crime. Alexander, the youngest son, was so afraid of his terrible mother, that he did not dare to remain in Alexandria with her, but went into a sort of banishment of his own accord. He, however, finally returned to Egypt. His mother immediately supposed that he was intending to disturb her possession of power, and resolved to destroy him. He became acquainted with her designs, and, grown desperate by the long-continued pressure of her intolerable tyranny, he resolved to bring the anxiety and terror in which he lived to an end by killing her. This he did, and then fled the country. Lathyrus, his brother, then returned, and reigned for the rest of his days in a tolerable degree of quietness and peace. At length Lathyrus died, and left the kingdom to his son, Ptolemy Auletes, who was the great Cleopatra's father.

We can not soften the picture which is exhibited to our view in the history of this celebrated family, by regarding the mother of Auletes, in the masculine and merciless traits and principles which she displayed so energetically throughout her terrible career, as an exception to the general character of the princesses who appeared from time to time in the line. In ambition, selfishness, unnatural and reckless cruelty, and utter disregard of every virtuous principle and of every domestic tie, she was but the type and representative of all the rest.

She had two daughters, for example, who were the consistent and worthy followers of such a mother. A passage in the lives of these sisters illustrates very forcibly the kind of sisterly affection which prevailed in the family of the Ptolemies. The case was this:

There were two princes of Syria, a country lying northeast of the Mediterranean Sea, and so not very far from Egypt, who, though they were brothers, were in a state of most deadly hostility to each other. One had attempted to poison the other, and afterward a war had broken out between them, and all Syria was suffering from the ravages of their armies. One of the sisters, of whom we have been speaking, married one of these princes. Her name was Tryphena. After some time, but yet while the unnatural war was still raging between the two brothers, Cleopatra, the other sister--the same Cleopatra, in fact, that had been divorced from Lathyrus at the instance of his mother--espoused the other brother. Tryphena was exceedingly incensed against Cleopatra for marrying her husband's mortal foe, and the implacable hostility and hate of the sisters was thenceforth added to that which the brothers had

before exhibited, to complete the display of unnatural and parricidal passion which this shameful contest presented to the world.

In fact, Tryphena from this time seemed to feel a new and highly-excited interest in the contest, from her eager desire to revenge herself on her sister. She watched the progress of it, and took an active part in pressing forward the active prosecution of the war. The party of her husband, either from this or some other causes, seemed to be gaining the day. The husband of Cleopatra was driven from one part of the country to another, and at length, in order to provide for the security of his wife, he left her in Antioch, a large and strongly-fortified city, where he supposed that she would be safe, while he himself was engaged in prosecuting the war in other quarters where his presence seemed to be required.

On learning that her sister was at Antioch, Tryphena urged her husband to attack the place. He accordingly advanced with a strong detachment of the army, and besieged and took the city. Cleopatra would, of course, have fallen into his hands as a captive; but, to escape this fate, she fled to a temple for refuge. A temple was considered, in those days, an inviolable sanctuary. The soldiers accordingly left her there. Tryphena, however, made a request that her husband would deliver the unhappy fugitive into her hands. She was determined, she said, to kill her. Her husband remonstrated with her against this atrocious proposal. "It would be a wholly useless act of cruelty," said he, "to destroy her life. She can do us no possible harm in the future progress of the war, while to murder her under these circumstances will only exasperate her husband and her friends, and nerve them with new strength for the remainder of the contest. And then, besides, she has taken refuge in a temple; and if we violate that sanctuary, we shall incur, by such an act of sacrilege, the implacable displeasure of heaven. Consider, too, that she is your sister, and for you to kill her would be to commit an unnatural and wholly inexcusable crime."

So saying, he commanded Tryphena to say no more upon the subject, for he would on no account consent that Cleopatra should suffer any injury whatever.

This refusal on the part of her husband to comply with her request only inflamed Tryphena's insane resentment and anger the more. In fact, the earnestness with which he espoused her sister's cause, and the interest which he seemed to feel in her fate, aroused Tryphena's jealousy. She believed, or pretended to believe, that her husband was influenced by a sentiment of love in so warmly defending her. The object of her hate, from being simply an enemy, became now, in her view, a rival, and she resolved that, at all hazards, she should be destroyed. She accordingly ordered a body of desperate soldiers to break into the temple and seize her. Cleopatra fled in terror to the altar, and clung to it with such convulsive force that the soldiers cut her hands off before they could tear her away, and then, maddened by her resistance and the sight of blood, they stabbed her again and again upon the floor of the temple, where she fell. The appalling shrieks with which the wretched victim filled the air in the first moments of her flight and her terror, subsided, as her life ebbed away, into the most awful imprecations of the judgments of heaven upon the head of the unnatural sister whose implacable hate had destroyed her.

* * * * *

Notwithstanding the specimens that we have thus given of the character and action of this extraordinary family, the government of this dynasty, extending, as it did, through the reigns of thirteen sovereigns and over a period of nearly three hundred years, has always been considered one of the most liberal, enlightened, and prosperous of all the governments of ancient times. We shall have something to say in the next chapter in respect to the internal condition of the country while these violent men were upon the throne. In the meantime, we will here only add, that whoever is inclined, in observing the ambition, the selfishness, the party spirit, the unworthy intrigues, and the irregularities of moral conduct, which modern rulers and statesmen sometimes exhibit to mankind in their personal and political career, to believe in a retrogression and degeneracy of national character as the world advances in age, will be very effectually undeceived by reading attentively a full history of this celebrated dynasty, and reflecting, as he reads, that the narrative presents, on the whole, a fair and honest exhibition of the general character of the men by whom, in ancient times, the world was governed.

CHAPTER III.

ALEXANDRIA.

It must not be imagined by the reader that the scenes of vicious indulgence, and reckless cruelty and crime, which were exhibited with such dreadful frequency, and carried to such an enormous excess in the palaces of the Egyptian kings, prevailed to the same extent throughout the mass of the community during the period of their reign. The internal administration of government, and the institutions by which the industrial pursuits of the mass of the people were regulated, and peace and order preserved, and justice

enforced between man and man, were all this time in the hands of men well qualified, on the whole, for the trusts committed to their charge, and in a good degree faithful in the performance of their duties; and thus the ordinary affairs of government, and the general routine of domestic and social life, went on, notwithstanding the profligacy of the kings, in a course of very tolerable peace, prosperity, and happiness. During every one of the three hundred years over which the history of the Ptolemies extends, the whole length and breadth of the land of Egypt exhibited, with comparatively few interruptions, one wide-spread scene of busy industry. The inundations came at their appointed season, and then regularly retired. The boundless fields which the waters had fertilized were then every where tilled. The lands were plowed; the seed was sown; the canals and water-courses, which ramified from the river in every direction over the ground, were opened or closed, as the case required, to regulate the irrigation. The inhabitants were busy, and, consequently, they were virtuous. And as the sky of Egypt is seldom or never darkened by clouds and storms, the scene presented to the eye the same unchanging aspect of smiling verdure and beauty, day after day, and month after month, until the ripened grain was gathered into the store-houses, and the land was cleared for another inundation.

We say that the people were virtuous because they were busy; for there is no principle of political economy more fully established than that vice in the social state is the incident and symptom of idleness. It prevails always in those classes of every great population who are either released by the possession of fixed and unchangeable wealth from the necessity, or excluded by their poverty and degradation from the advantage, of useful employment. Wealth that is free, and subject to its possessor's control, so that he can, if he will, occupy himself in the management of it, while it sometimes may make individuals vicious, does not generally corrupt classes of men, for it does not make them idle. But wherever the institutions of a country are such as to create an aristocratic class, whose incomes depend on entailed estates, or on fixed and permanent annuities, so that the capital on which they live can not afford them any mental occupation, they are doomed necessarily to inaction and idleness. Vicious pleasures and indulgences are, with such a class as a whole, the inevitable result; for the innocent enjoyments of man are planned and designed by the Author of nature only for the intervals of rest and repose in a life of activity. They are always found wholly insufficient to satisfy one who makes pleasure the whole end and aim of his being.

In the same manner, if, either from the influence of the social institutions of a country, or from the operation of natural causes which human power is unable to control, there is a class of men too low, and degraded, and miserable to be reached by the ordinary inducements to daily toil, so certain are they to grow corrupt and depraved, that degradation has become in all languages a term almost synonymous with vice. There are many exceptions, it is true, to these general laws. Many active men are very wicked; and there have been frequent instances of the most exalted virtue among nobles and kings. Still, as a general law, it is unquestionably true that vice is the incident of idleness; and the sphere of vice, therefore, is at the top and at the bottom of society--those being the regions in which idleness reigns. The great remedy, too, for vice is employment. To make a community virtuous, it is essential that all ranks and gradations of it, from the highest to the lowest, should have something to do.

In accordance with these principles, we observe that, while the most extreme and abominable wickedness seemed to hold continual and absolute sway in the palaces of the Ptolemies, and among the nobles of their courts, the working ministers of state, and the men on whom the actual governmental functions devolved, discharged their duties with wisdom and fidelity, and throughout all the ordinary ranks and gradations of society there prevailed generally a very considerable degree of industry, prosperity, and happiness. This prosperity prevailed not only in the rural districts of the Delta and along the valley of the Nile, but also among the merchants, and navigators, and artisans of Alexandria.

Alexandria became, in fact, very soon after it was founded, a very great and busy city. Many things conspired to make it at once a great commercial emporium. In the first place, it was the depôt of export for all the surplus grain and other agricultural produce which was raised in such abundance along the Egyptian valley. This produce was brought down in boats to the upper point of the Delta, where the branches of the river divided, and thence down the Canopic branch to the city. The city was not, in fact, situated directly upon this branch, but upon a narrow tongue of land, at a little distance from it, near the sea. It was not easy to enter the channel directly, on account of the bars and sand-banks at its mouth, produced by the eternal conflict between the waters of the river and the surges of the sea. The water was deep, however, as Alexander's engineers had discovered, at the place where the city was built, and, by establishing the port there, and then cutting a canal across to the Nile, they were enabled to bring the river and the sea at once into easy communication.

The produce of the valley was thus brought down the river and through the canal to the city. Here immense warehouses and granaries were erected for its reception, that it might be safely preserved until the ships that came into the port were ready to take it away. These ships came from Syria, from all the coasts of Asia Minor, from Greece, and from Rome. They brought the agricultural productions of their own countries, as well as articles of manufacture of various kinds; these they sold to the merchants of

Alexandria, and purchased the productions of Egypt in return.

The port of Alexandria presented thus a constant picture of life and animation. Merchant ships were continually coming and going, or lying at anchor in the roadstead. Seamen were hoisting sails, or raising anchors, or rowing their capacious galleys through the water, singing, as they pulled, to the motion of the oars. Within the city there was the same ceaseless activity. Here groups of men were unloading the canal boats which had arrived from the river. There porters were transporting bales of merchandise or sacks of grain from a warehouse to a pier, or from one landing to another. The occasional parading of the king's guards, or the arrival and departure of ships of war to land or to take away bodies of armed men, were occurrences that sometimes intervened to interrupt, or as perhaps the people then would have said, to adorn this scene of useful industry; and now and then, for a brief period, these peaceful avocations would be wholly suspended and set aside by a revolt or by a civil war, waged by rival brothers against each other, or instigated by the conflicting claims of a mother and son. These interruptions, however, were comparatively few, and, in ordinary cases, not of long continuance. It was for the interest of all branches of the royal line to do as little injury as possible to the commercial and agricultural operations of the realm. In fact, it was on the prosperity of those operations that the revenues depended. The rulers were well aware of this, and so, however implacably two rival princes may have hated one another, and however desperately each party may have struggled to destroy all active combatants whom they should find in arms against them, they were both under every possible inducement to spare the private property and the lives of the peaceful population. This population, in fact, engaged thus in profitable industry, constituted, with the avails of their labors, the very estate for which the combatants were contending.

Seeing the subject in this light, the Egyptian sovereigns, especially Alexander and the earlier Ptolemies, made every effort in their power to promote the commercial greatness of Alexandria. They built palaces, it is true, but they also built warehouses. One of the most expensive and celebrated of all the edifices that they reared was the light-house which has been already alluded to. This light-house was a lofty tower, built of white marble. It was situated upon the island of Pharos, opposite to the city, and at some distance from it. There was a sort of isthmus of shoals and sand-bars connecting the island with the shore. Over these shallows a pier or causeway was built, which finally became a broad and inhabited neck. The principal part of the ancient city, however, was on the main land.[1]

The curvature of the earth requires that a light-house on a coast should have a considerable elevation, otherwise its summit would not appear above the horizon, unless the mariner were very near. To attain this elevation, the architects usually take advantage of some hill or cliff, or rocky eminence near the shore. There was, however, no opportunity to do this at Pharos; for the island was, like the main land, level and low. The requisite elevation could only be attained, therefore, by the masonry of an edifice, and the blocks of marble necessary for the work had to be brought from a great distance. The Alexandrian light-house was reared in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the second monarch in the line. No pains or expense were spared in its construction. The edifice, when completed, was considered one of the seven wonders of the world. It was indebted for its fame, however, in some degree, undoubtedly to the conspicuousness of its situation, rising, as it did, at the entrance of the greatest commercial emporium of its time, and standing there, like a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, to attract the welcome gaze of every wandering mariner whose ship came within its horizon, and to awaken his gratitude by tendering him its guidance and dispelling his fears.

The light at the top of the tower was produced by a fire, made of such combustibles as would emit the brightest flame. This fire burned slowly through the day, and then was kindled up anew when the sun went down, and was continually replenished through the night with fresh supplies of fuel. In modern times, a much more convenient and economical mode is adopted to produce the requisite illumination. A great blazing lamp burns brilliantly in the center of the lantern of the tower, and all that part of the radiation from the flame which would naturally have beamed upward, or downward, or laterally, or back toward the land, is so turned by a curious system of reflectors and polyzonal lenses, most ingeniously contrived and very exactly adjusted, as to be thrown forward in one broad and thin, but brilliant sheet of light, which shoots out where its radiance is needed, over the surface of the sea. Before these inventions were perfected, far the largest portion of the light emitted by the illumination of light-house towers streamed away wastefully in landward directions, or was lost among the stars.

Of course, the glory of erecting such an edifice as the Pharos of Alexandria, and of maintaining it in the performance of its functions, was very great; the question might, however, very naturally arise whether this glory was justly due to the architect through whose scientific skill the work was actually accomplished, or to the monarch by whose power and resources the architect was sustained. The name of the architect was Sostratus. He was a Greek. The monarch was, as has already been stated, the second Ptolemy, called commonly Ptolemy Philadelphus. Ptolemy ordered that, in completing the tower, a marble tablet should be built into the wall, at a suitable place near the summit, and that a proper inscription should be carved upon it, with his name as the

builder of the edifice conspicuous thereon. Sostratus preferred inserting his own name. He accordingly made the tablet and set it in its place. He cut the inscription upon the face of it, in Greek characters, with his own name as the author of the work. He did this secretly, and then covered the face of the tablet with an artificial composition, made with lime, to imitate the natural surface of the stone. On this outer surface he cut a new inscription, in which he inserted the name of the king. In process of time the lime moldered away, the king's inscription disappeared, and his own, which thenceforward continued as long as the building endured, came out to view.

The Pharos was said to have been four hundred feet high. It was famed throughout the world for many centuries; nothing, however, remains of it now but a heap of useless and unmeaning ruins.

Besides the light that beamed from the summit of this lofty tower, there was another center of radiance and illumination in ancient Alexandria, which was in some respects still more conspicuous and renowned, namely, an immense library and museum established and maintained by the Ptolemies. The Museum, which was first established, was not, as its name might now imply, a collection of curiosities, but an institution of learning, consisting of a body of learned men, who devoted their time to philosophical and scientific pursuits. The institution was richly endowed, and magnificent buildings were erected for its use. The king who established it began immediately to make a collection of books for the use of the members of the institution. This was attended with great expense, as every book that was added to the collection required to be transcribed with a pen on parchment or papyrus, with infinite labor and care. Great numbers of scribes were constantly employed upon this work at the Museum. The kings who were most interested in forming this library would seize the books that were possessed by individual scholars, or that were deposited in the various cities of their dominions, and then, causing beautiful copies of them to be made by the scribes of the Museum, they would retain the originals for the great Alexandrian Library, and give the copies to the men or the cities that had been thus despoiled. In the same manner they would borrow, as they called it, from all travelers who visited Egypt, any valuable books which they might have in their possession, and, retaining the originals, give them back copies instead.

In process of time the library increased to four hundred thousand volumes. There was then no longer any room in the buildings of the Museum for further additions. There was, however, in another part of the city, a great temple called the Serapion. This temple was a very magnificent edifice, or, rather, group of edifices, dedicated to the god Serapis. The origin and history of this temple were very remarkable. The legend was this:

It seems that one of the ancient and long-venerated gods of the Egyptians was a deity named Serapis. He had been, among other divinities, the object of Egyptian adoration ages before Alexandria was built or the Ptolemies reigned. There was also, by a curious coincidence, a statue of the same name at a great commercial town named Sinope, which was built upon the extremity of a promontory which projected from Asia Minor into the Euxine Sea.[2] Sinope was, in some sense, the Alexandria of the north, being the center and seat of a great portion of the commerce of that quarter of the world.

The Serapis of Sinope was considered as the protecting deity of seamen, and the navigators who came and went to and from the city made sacrifices to him, and offered him oblations and prayers, believing that they were, in a great measure, dependent upon some mysterious and inscrutable power which he exercised for their safety in storms. They carried the knowledge of his name, and tales of his imaginary interpositions, to all the places that they visited; and thus the fame of the god became extended, first, to all the coasts of the Euxine Sea, and subsequently to distant provinces and kingdoms. The Serapis of Sinope began to be considered every where as the tutelar god of seamen.

Accordingly, when the first of the Ptolemies was forming his various plans for adorning and aggrandizing Alexandria, he received, he said, one night, a divine intimation in a dream that he was to obtain the statue of Serapis from Sinope, and set it up in Alexandria, in a suitable temple which he was in the mean time to erect in honor of the god. It is obvious that very great advantages to the city would result from the accomplishment of this design. In the first place, a temple to the god Serapis would be a new distinction for it in the minds of the rural population, who would undoubtedly suppose that the deity honored by it was their own ancient god. Then the whole maritime and nautical interest of the world, which had been accustomed to adore the god of Sinope, would turn to Alexandria as the great center of religious attraction, if their venerated idol could be carried and placed in a new and magnificent temple built expressly for him there. Alexandria could never be the chief naval port and station of the world, unless it contained the sanctuary and shrine of the god of seamen.

Ptolemy sent accordingly to the King of Sinope and proposed to purchase the idol. The embassage was, however, unsuccessful. The king refused to give up the god. The negotiations were continued for two years, but all in vain. At length, on account of some

failure in the regular course of the seasons on that coast, there was a famine there, which became finally so severe that the people of the city were induced to consent to give up their deity to the Egyptians in exchange for a supply of corn. Ptolemy sent the corn and received the idol. He then built the temple, which, when finished, surpassed in grandeur and magnificence almost every sacred structure in the world.

It was in this temple that the successive additions to the Alexandrian library were deposited, when the apartments at the Museum became full. In the end there were four hundred thousand rolls or volumes in the Museum, and three hundred thousand in the Serapion. The former was called the parent library, and the latter, being, as it were, the offspring of the first, was called the daughter.

Ptolemy Philadelphus, who interested himself very greatly in collecting this library, wished to make it a complete collection of all the books in the world. He employed scholars to read and study, and travelers to make extensive tours, for the purpose of learning what books existed among all the surrounding nations; and, when he learned of their existence, he spared no pains or expense in attempting to procure either the originals themselves, or the most perfect and authentic copies of them. He sent to Athens and obtained the works of the most celebrated Greek historians, and then causing, as in other cases, most beautiful transcripts to be made, he sent the transcripts back to Athens, and a very large sum of money with them as an equivalent for the difference of value between originals and copies in such an exchange.

In the course of the inquiries which Ptolemy made into the literature of the surrounding nations, in his search for accessions to his library, he heard that the Jews had certain sacred writings in their temple at Jerusalem, comprising a minute and extremely interesting history of their nation from the earliest periods, and also many other books of sacred prophecy and poetry. These books, which were, in fact, the Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament, were then wholly unknown to all nations except the Jews, and among the Jews were known only to priests and scholars. They were kept sacred at Jerusalem. The Jews would have considered them as profaned in being exhibited to the view of pagan nations. In fact, the learned men of other countries would not have been able to read them; for the Jews secluded themselves so closely from the rest of mankind, that their language was, in that age, scarcely ever heard beyond the confines of Judea and Galilee.

Ptolemy very naturally thought that a copy of these sacred books would be a great acquisition to his library. They constituted, in fact, the whole literature of a nation which was, in some respects, the most extraordinary that ever existed on the globe. Ptolemy conceived the idea, also, of not only adding to his library a copy of these writings in the original Hebrew, but of causing a translation of them to be made into Greek, so that they might easily be read by the Greek and Roman scholars who were drawn in great numbers to his capital by the libraries and the learned institutions which he had established there. The first thing to be effected, however, in accomplishing either of these plans, was to obtain the consent of the Jewish authorities. They would probably object to giving up any copy of their sacred writings at all.

There was one circumstance which led Ptolemy to imagine that the Jews would, at that time particularly, be averse to granting any request of such a nature coming from an Egyptian king, and that was, that during certain wars which had taken place in previous reigns, a considerable number of prisoners had been taken by the Egyptians, and had been brought to Egypt as captives, where they had been sold to the inhabitants, and were now scattered over the land as slaves. They were employed as servile laborers in tilling the fields, or in turning enormous wheels to pump up water from the Nile. The masters of these hapless bondmen conceived, like other slave-holders, that they had a right of property in their slaves. This was in some respects true, since they had bought them of the government at the close of the war for a consideration; and though they obviously derived from this circumstance no valid proprietary right or claim as against the men personally, it certainly would seem that it gave them a just claim against the government of whom they bought, in case of subsequent manumission.

Ptolemy or his minister, for it can not now be known who was the real actor in these transactions, determined on liberating these slaves and sending them back to their native land, as a means of propitiating the Jews and inclining them to listen favorably to the request which he was about to prefer for a copy of their sacred writings. He, however, paid to those who held the captives a very liberal sum for ransom. The ancient historians, who never allow the interest of their narratives to suffer for want of a proper amplification on their part of the scale on which the deeds which they record were performed, say that the number of slaves liberated on this occasion was a hundred and twenty thousand, and the sum paid for them, as compensation to the owners, was six hundred talents, equal to six hundred thousand dollars.[3] And yet this was only a preliminary expense to pave the way for the acquisition of a single series of books, to add to the variety of the immense collection.

After the liberation and return of the captives, Ptolemy sent a splendid embassage to Jerusalem, with very respectful letters to the high priest, and with very magnificent presents. The embassadors were received with the highest honors. The request of Ptolemy that he should be allowed to take a copy of the sacred books for his library was very readily granted.

The priests caused copies to be made of all the sacred writings. These copies were executed in the most magnificent style, and were splendidly illuminated with letters of gold. The Jewish government also, at Ptolemy's request, designated a company of Hebrew scholars, six from each tribe--men learned in both the Greek and Hebrew languages--to proceed to Alexandria, and there, at the Museum, to make a careful translation of the Hebrew books into Greek. As there were twelve tribes, and six translators chosen from each, there were seventy-two translators in all. They made their translation, and it was called the _Septuagint_, from the Latin _septuaginta duo_, which means seventy-two.

Although out of Judea there was no feeling of reverence for these Hebrew Scriptures as books of divine authority, there was still a strong interest felt in them as very entertaining and curious works of history, by all the Greek and Roman scholars who frequented Alexandria to study at the Museum. Copies were accordingly made of the Septuagint translation, and were taken to other countries; and there, in process of time, copies of the copies were made, until, at length the work became extensively circulated throughout the whole learned world. When, finally, Christianity became extended over the Roman empire, the priests and monks looked with even a stronger interest than the ancient scholars had felt upon this early translation of so important a portion of the sacred Scriptures. They made new copies for abbeys, monasteries, and colleges; and when, at length, the art of printing was discovered, this work was one of the first on which the magic power of typography was tried. The original manuscript made by the scribes of the seventy-two, and all the early transcripts which were made from it, have long since been lost or destroyed; but, instead of them, we have now hundreds of thousands of copies in compact printed volumes, scattered among the public and private libraries of Christendom. In fact, now, after the lapse of two thousand years, a copy of Ptolemy's Septuagint may be obtained of any considerable bookseller in any country of the civilized world; and though it required a national embassage, and an expenditure, if the accounts are true, of more than a million of dollars, originally to obtain it, it may be procured without difficulty now by two days' wages of an ordinary laborer.

Besides the building of the Pharos, the Museum, and the Temple of Serapis, the early Ptolemies formed and executed a great many other plans tending to the same ends which the erection of these splendid edifices was designed to secure, namely, to concentrate in Alexandria all possible means of attraction, commercial, literary, and religious, so as to make the city the great center of interest, and the common resort for all mankind. They raised immense revenues for these and other purposes by taxing heavily the whole agricultural produce of the valley of the Nile. The inundations, by the boundless fertility which they annually produced, supplied the royal treasuries. Thus the Abyssinian rains at the sources of the Nile built the Pharos at its mouth, and endowed the Alexandrian library.

The taxes laid upon the people of Egypt to supply the Ptolemies with funds were, in fact, so heavy, that only the bare means of subsistence were left to the mass of the agricultural population. In admiring the greatness and glory of the city, therefore, we must remember that there was a gloomy counterpart to its splendor in the very extended destitution and poverty to which the mass of the people were every where doomed. They lived in hamlets of wretched huts along the banks of the river, in order that the capital might be splendidly adorned with temples and palaces. They passed their lives in darkness and ignorance, that seven hundred thousand volumes of expensive manuscripts might be enrolled at the Museum for the use of foreign philosophers and scholars. The policy of the Ptolemies was, perhaps, on the whole, the best, for the general advancement and ultimate welfare of mankind, which could have been pursued in the age in which they lived and acted; but, in applauding the results which they attained, we must not wholly forget the cost which they incurred in attaining them. At the same cost, we could, at the present day, far surpass them. If the people of the United States will surrender the comforts and conveniences which they individually enjoy--if the farmers scattered in their comfortable homes on the hill-sides and plains throughout the land will give up their houses, their furniture, their carpets, their books, and the privileges of their children, and then--withholding from the produce of their annual toil only a sufficient reservation to sustain them and their families through the year, in a life like that of a beast of burden, spent in some miserable and naked hovel--send the rest to some hereditary sovereign residing upon the Atlantic sea-board, that he may build with the proceeds a splendid capital, they may have an Alexandria now that will infinitely exceed the ancient city of the Ptolemies in splendor and renown. The nation, too, would, in such a case, pay for its metropolis the same price, precisely, that the ancient Egyptians paid for theirs.

The Ptolemies expended the revenues which they raised by this taxation mainly in a very liberal and enlightened manner, for the accomplishment of the purposes which they had in view. The building of the Pharos, the removal of the statue of Serapis, and the

endowment of the Museum and the library were great conceptions, and they were carried into effect in the most complete and perfect manner. All the other operations which they devised and executed for the extension and aggrandizement of the city were conceived and executed in the same spirit of scientific and enlightened liberality. Streets were opened; the most splendid palaces were built; docks, piers, and breakwaters were constructed, and fortresses and towers were armed and garrisoned. Then every means was employed to attract to the city a great concourse from all the most highly-civilized nations then existing. The highest inducements were offered to merchants, mechanics, and artisans to make the city their abode. Poets, painters, sculptors, and scholars of every nation and degree were made welcome, and every facility was afforded them for the prosecution of their various pursuits. These plans were all eminently successful. Alexandria rose rapidly to the highest consideration and importance; and, at the time when Cleopatra--born to preside over this scene of magnificence and splendor--came upon the stage, the city had but one rival in the world. That rival was Rome.

CHAPTER IV.

CLEOPATRA'S FATHER.

When the time was approaching in which Cleopatra appeared upon the stage, Rome was perhaps the only city that could be considered as the rival of Alexandria, in the estimation of mankind, in respect to interest and attractiveness as a capital. In one respect, Rome was vastly superior to the Egyptian metropolis, and that was in the magnitude and extent of the military power which it wielded among the nations of the earth. Alexandria ruled over Egypt, and over a few of the neighboring coasts and islands; but in the course of the three centuries during which she had been acquiring her greatness and fame, the Roman empire had extended itself over almost the whole civilized world. Egypt had been, thus far, too remote to be directly reached; but the affairs of Egypt itself became involved at length with the operations of the Roman power, about the time of Cleopatra's birth, in a very striking and peculiar manner; and as the consequences of the transaction were the means of turning the whole course of the queen's subsequent history, a narration of it is necessary to a proper understanding of the circumstances under which she commenced her career. In fact, it was the extension of the Roman empire to the limits of Egypt, and the connections which thence arose between the leading Roman generals and the Egyptian sovereign, which have made the story of this particular queen so much more conspicuous, as an object of interest and attention to mankind, than that of any other one of the ten Cleopatras who rose successively in the same royal line.

Ptolemy Auletes, Cleopatra's father, was perhaps, in personal character, the most dissipated, degraded, and corrupt of all the sovereigns in the dynasty. He spent his whole time in vice and debauchery. The only honest accomplishment that he seemed to possess was his skill in playing upon the flute; of this he was very vain. He instituted musical contests, in which the musical performers of Alexandria played for prizes and crowns; and he himself was accustomed to enter the lists with the rest as a competitor. The people of Alexandria, and the world in general, considered such pursuits as these wholly unworthy the attention of the representative of so illustrious a line of sovereigns; and the abhorrence which they felt for the monarch's vices and crimes was mingled with a feeling of contempt for the meanness of his ambition.

There was a doubt in respect to his title to the crown, for his birth, on the mother's side, was irregular and ignoble. Instead, however, of attempting to confirm and secure his possession of power by a vigorous and prosperous administration of the government, he wholly abandoned all concern in respect to the course of public affairs; and then, to guard against the danger of being deposed, he conceived the plan of getting himself recognized at Rome as one of the allies of the Roman people. If this were once done, he supposed that the Roman government would feel under an obligation to sustain him on his throne in the event of any threatened danger.

The Roman government was a sort of republic, and the two most powerful men in the state at this time were Pompey and Cæsar. Cæsar was in the ascendency at Rome at the time that Ptolemy made his application for an alliance. Pompey was absent in Asia Minor, being engaged in prosecuting a war with Mithradates, a very powerful monarch, who was at that time resisting the Roman power. Cæsar was very deeply involved in debt, and was, moreover, very much in need of money, not only for relief from existing embarrassments, but as a means of subsequent expenditure, to enable him to accomplish certain great political schemes which he was entertaining. After many negotiations and delays, it was agreed that Cæsar would exert his influence to secure an alliance between the Roman people and Ptolemy, on condition that Ptolemy paid him the sum of six thousand talents, equal to about six millions of dollars. A part of the money, Cæsar said, was for Pompey.

The title of ally was conferred, and Ptolemy undertook to raise the money which he had promised by increasing the taxes of his kingdom. The measures, however, which he thus adopted for the purpose of making himself the more secure in his possession of the throne, proved to be the means of overthrowing him. The discontent and disaffection of his people, which had been strong and universal before, though suppressed and concealed, broke out now into open violence. That there should be laid upon them, in addition to all their other burdens, these new oppressions, heavier than those which they had endured before, and exacted for such a purpose too, was not to be endured. To be compelled to see their country sold on any terms to the Roman people was sufficiently hard to bear; but to be forced to raise, themselves, and pay the price of the transfer, was absolutely intolerable. Alexandria commenced a revolt. Ptolemy was not a man to act decidedly against such a demonstration, or, in fact, to evince either calmness or courage in any emergency whatever. His first thought was to escape from Alexandria to save his life. His second, to make the best of his way to Rome, to call upon the Roman people to come to the succor of their ally!

Ptolemy left five children behind him in his flight. The eldest was the Princess Berenice, who had already reached maturity. The second was the great Cleopatra, the subject of this history. Cleopatra was, at this time, about eleven years old. There were also two sons, but they were very young. One of them was named Ptolemy.

The Alexandrians determined on raising Berenice to the throne in her father's place, as soon as his flight was known. They thought that the sons were too young to attempt to reign in such an emergency, as it was very probable that Auletes, the father, would attempt to recover his kingdom. Berenice very readily accepted the honor and power which were offered to her. She established herself in her father's palace, and began her reign in great magnificence and splendor. In process of time she thought that her position would be strengthened by a marriage with a royal prince from some neighboring realm. She first sent embassadors to make proposals to a prince of Syria named Antiochus. The embassadors came back, bringing word that Antiochus was dead, but that he had a brother named Seleucus, upon whom the succession fell. Berenice then sent them back to make the same offers to him. He accepted the proposals, came to Egypt, and he and Berenice were married. After trying him for a while, Berenice found that, for some reason or other, she did not like him as a husband, and, accordingly, she caused him to be strangled.

At length, after various other intrigues and much secret management, Berenice succeeded in a second negotiation, and married a prince, or a pretended prince, from some country of Asia Minor, whose name was Archelaus. She was better pleased with this second husband than she had been with the first, and she began, at last, to feel somewhat settled and established on her throne, and to be prepared, as she thought, to offer effectual resistance to her father in case he should ever attempt to return.

It was in the midst of the scenes, and surrounded by the influences which might be expected to prevail in the families of such a father and such a sister, that Cleopatra spent those years of life in which the character is formed. During all these revolutions, and exposed to all these exhibitions of licentious wickedness, and of unnatural cruelty and crime, she was growing up in the royal palaces a spirited and beautiful, but indulged and neglected child.

In the mean time, Auletes, the father, went on toward Rome. So far as his character and his story were known among the surrounding nations, he was the object of universal obloquy, both on account of his previous career of degrading vice, and now, still more, for this ignoble flight from the difficulties in which his vices and crimes had involved him.

He stopped, on the way, at the island of Rhodes. It happened that Cato, the great Roman philosopher and general, was at Rhodes at this time. Cato was a man of stern, unbending virtue, and of great influence at that period in public affairs. Ptolemy sent a messenger to inform Cato of his arrival, supposing, of course, that the Roman general would hasten, on hearing of the fact, to pay his respects to so great a personage as he, a king of Egypt--a Ptolemy--though suffering under a temporary reverse of fortune. Cato directed the messenger to reply that, so far as he was aware, he had no particular business with Ptolemy. "Say, however, to the king," he added, "that, if he has any business with me, he may call and see me, if he pleases."

Ptolemy was obliged to suppress his resentment and submit. He thought it very essential to the success of his plans that he should see Cato, and secure, if possible, his interest and co-operation; and he consequently made preparations for paying, instead of receiving, the visit, intending to go in the greatest royal state that he could command. He accordingly appeared at Cato's lodgings on the following day, magnificently dressed, and accompanied by many attendants. Cato, who was dressed in the plainest and most simple manner, and whose apartment was furnished in a style corresponding with the severity of his character, did not even rise when the king entered the room. He simply pointed with his hand, and bade the visitor take a seat.

Ptolemy began to make a statement of his case, with a view to obtaining Cato's influence with the Roman people to induce them to interpose in his behalf. Cato, however, far from evincing any disposition to espouse his visitor's cause, censured him, in the plainest

terms, for having abandoned his proper position in his own kingdom, to go and make himself a victim and a prey for the insatiable avarice of the Roman leaders. "You can do nothing at Rome," he said, "but by the influence of bribes; and all the resources of Egypt will not be enough to satisfy the Roman greediness for money." He concluded by recommending him to go back to Alexandria, and rely for his hopes of extrication from the difficulties which surrounded him on the exercise of his own energy and resolution there.

Ptolemy was greatly abashed at this rebuff, but, on consultation with his attendants and followers, it was decided to be too late now to return. The whole party accordingly re-embarked on board their galleys, and pursued their way to Rome.

Ptolemy found, on his arrival at the city, that Cæsar was absent in Gaul, while Pompey, on the other hand, who had returned victorious from his campaigns against Mithradates, was now the great leader of influence and power at the Capitol. This change of circumstances was not, however, particularly unfavorable; for Ptolemy was on friendly terms with Pompey, as he had been with Cæsar. He had assisted him in his wars with Mithradates by sending him a squadron of horse, in pursuance of his policy of cultivating friendly relations with the Roman people by every means in his power. Besides, Pompey had received a part of the money which Ptolemy had paid to Cæsar as the price of the Roman alliance, and was to receive his share of the rest in case Ptolemy should ever be restored. Pompey was accordingly interested in favoring the royal fugitive's cause. He received him in his palace, entertained him in magnificent style, and took immediate measures for bringing his cause before the Roman senate, urging upon that body the adoption of immediate and vigorous measures for effecting his restoration, as an ally whom they were bound to protect against his rebellious subjects.

There was at first some opposition in the Roman senate against espousing the cause of such a man, but it was soon put down, being overpowered in part by Pompey's authority, and in part silenced by Ptolemy's promises and bribes. The senate determined to restore the king to his throne, and began to make arrangements for carrying the measure into effect.

The Roman provinces nearest to Egypt were Cilicia and Syria, countries situated on the eastern and northeastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea, north of Judea. The forces stationed in these provinces would be, of course, the most convenient for furnishing the necessary troops for the expedition. The province of Cilicia was under the command of the consul Lentulus. Lentulus was at this time at Rome; he had repaired to the capital for some temporary purpose, leaving his province and the troops stationed there under the command, for the time, of a sort of lieutenant general named Gabinius. It was concluded that this Lentulus, with his Syrian forces, should undertake the task of reinstating Ptolemy on his throne.

While these plans and arrangements were yet immature, a circumstance occurred which threatened, for a time, wholly to defeat them. It seems that when Cleopatra's father first left Egypt, he had caused a report to be circulated there that he had been killed in the revolt. The object of this stratagem was to cover and conceal his flight. The government of Berenice soon discovered the truth, and learned that the fugitive had gone in the direction of Rome. They immediately inferred that he was going to appeal to the Roman people for aid, and they determined that, if that were the case, the Roman people, before deciding in his favor, should have the opportunity to hear their side of the story as well as his. They accordingly made preparations at once for sending a very imposing embassage to Rome. The deputation consisted of more than a hundred persons. The object of Berenice's government in sending so large a number was not only to evince their respect for the Roman people, and their sense of the magnitude of the question at issue, but also to guard against any efforts that Ptolemy might make to intercept the embassage on the way, or to buy off the members of it by bribes. The number, however, large as it was, proved insufficient to accomplish this purpose. The whole Roman world was at this time in such a condition of disorder and violence, in the hands of the desperate and reckless military leaders who then bore sway, that there were every where abundant facilities for the commission of any conceivable crime. Ptolemy contrived, with the assistance of the fierce partisans who had espoused his cause, and who were deeply interested in his success on account of the rewards which were promised them, to waylay and destroy a large proportion of this company before they reached Rome. Some were assassinated; some were poisoned; some were tampered with and bought off by bribes. A small remnant reached Rome; but they were so intimidated by the dangers which surrounded them, that they did not dare to take any public action in respect to the business which had been committed to their charge. Ptolemy began to congratulate himself on having completely circumvented his daughter in her efforts to protect herself against his designs.

Instead of that, however, it soon proved that the effect of this atrocious treachery was exactly the contrary of what its perpetrators had expected. The knowledge of the facts became gradually extended among the people of Rome, and it awakened a universal indignation. The party who had been originally opposed to Ptolemy's cause seized the opportunity to renew their opposition; and they gained so much strength from the general odium which Ptolemy's crimes had awakened, that Pompey found it almost

impossible to sustain his cause.

At length the party opposed to Ptolemy found, or pretended to find, in certain sacred books, called the Sibylline Oracles, which were kept in the custody of the priests, and were supposed to contain prophetic intimations of the will of Heaven in respect to the conduct of public affairs, the following passage:

"_If a king of Egypt should apply to you for aid, treat him in a friendly manner, but do not furnish him with troops; for if you do, you will incur great danger._"

This made new difficulty for Ptolemy's friends. They attempted, at first, to evade this inspired injunction by denying the reality of it. There was no such passage to be found, they said. It was all an invention of their enemies. This point seems to have been overruled, and then they attempted to give the passage some other than the obvious interpretation. Finally, they maintained that, although it prohibited their furnishing Ptolemy himself with troops, it did not forbid their sending an armed force into Egypt under leaders of their own. _That_ they could certainly do; and then, when the rebellion was suppressed, and Berenice's government overthrown, they could invite Ptolemy to return to his kingdom and resume his crown in a peaceful manner. This, they alleged, would not be "furnishing him with troops," and, of course, would not be disobeying the oracle.

These attempts to evade the direction of the oracle on the part of Ptolemy's friends, only made the debates and dissensions between them and his enemies more violent than ever. Pompey made every effort in his power to aid Ptolemy's cause; but Lentulus, after long hesitation and delay, decided that it would not be safe for him to embark in it. At length, however, Gabinius, the lieutenant who commanded in Syria, was induced to undertake the enterprise. On certain promises which he received from Ptolemy, to be performed in case he succeeded, and with a certain encouragement, not very legal or regular, which Pompey gave him, in respect to the employment of the Roman troops under his command, he resolved to march to Egypt. His route, of course, would lay along the shores of the Mediterranean Sea, and through the desert, to Pelusium, which has already been mentioned as the frontier town on this side of Egypt. From Pelusium he was to march through the heart of the Delta to Alexandria, and, if successful in his invasion, overthrow the government of Berenice and Archelaus, and then, inviting Ptolemy to return, reinstate him on the throne.

In the prosecution of this dangerous enterprise, Gabinius relied strongly on the assistance of a very remarkable man, then his second in command, who afterward acted a very important part in the subsequent history of Cleopatra. His name was Mark Antony. Antony was born in Rome, of a very distinguished family, but his father died when he was very young, and being left subsequently much to himself, he became a very wild and dissolute young man. He wasted the property which his father had left him in folly and vice; and then going on desperately in the same career, he soon incurred enormous debts, and involved himself, in consequence, in inextricable difficulties. His creditors continually harassed him with importunities for money, and with suits at law to compel payments which he had no means of making. He was likewise incessantly pursued by the hostility of the many enemies that he had made in the city by his violence and his crimes. At length he absconded, and went to Greece.

Here Gabinius, when on his way to Syria, met him, and invited him to join his army rather than to remain where he was in idleness and destitution. Antony, who was as proud and lofty in spirit as he was degraded in morals and condition, refused to do this unless Gabinius would give him a command. Gabinius saw in the daring and reckless energy which Antony manifested the indications of the class of qualities which in those days made a successful soldier, and acceded to his terms. He gave him the command of his cavalry. Antony distinguished himself in the Syrian campaigns that followed, and was now full of eagerness to engage in this Egyptian enterprise. In fact, it was mainly his zeal and enthusiasm to embark in the undertaking which was the means of deciding Gabinius to consent to Ptolemy's proposals.

The danger and difficulty which they considered as most to be apprehended in the whole expedition was the getting across the desert to Pelusium. In fact, the great protection of Egypt had always been her isolation. The trackless and desolate sands, being wholly destitute of water, and utterly void, could be traversed, even by a caravan of peaceful travelers, only with great difficulty and danger. For an army to attempt to cross them, exposed, as the troops would necessarily be, to the assaults of enemies who might advance to meet them on the way, and sure of encountering a terrible opposition from fresh and vigorous bands when they should arrive--wayworn and exhausted by the physical hardships of the way--at the borders of the inhabited country, was a desperate undertaking. Many instances occurred in ancient times in which vast bodies of troops, in attempting marches over the deserts by which Egypt was surrounded, were wholly destroyed by famine or thirst, or overwhelmed by storms of sand.[4]

These difficulties and dangers, however, did not at all intimidate Mark Antony. The anticipation, in fact, of the glory of surmounting them was one of the main inducements which led him to embark in the enterprise. The perils of the desert constituted one of the charms which made the expedition so attractive. He placed himself, therefore, at the head of his troop of cavalry, and set off across the sands in advance of Gabinius, to take Pelusium, in order thus to open a way for the main body of the army into Egypt. Ptolemy accompanied Antony. Gabinius was to follow.

With all his faults, to call them by no severer name, Mark Antony possessed certain great excellences of character. He was ardent, but then he was cool, collected, and sagacious; and there was a certain frank and manly generosity continually evincing itself in his conduct and character which made him a great favorite among his men. He was at this time about twenty-eight years old, of a tall and manly form, and of an expressive and intellectual cast of countenance. His forehead was high, his nose aquiline, and his eyes full of vivacity and life. He was accustomed to dress in a very plain and careless manner, and he assumed an air of the utmost familiarity and freedom in his intercourse with his soldiers. He would join them in their sports, joke with them, and good-naturedly receive their jokes in return; and take his meals, standing with them around their rude tables, in the open field. Such habits of intercourse with his men in a commander of ordinary character would have been fatal to his ascendency over them; but in Mark Antony's case, these frank and familiar manners seemed only to make the military genius and the intellectual power which he possessed the more conspicuous and the more universally admired.

Antony conducted his troop of horsemen across the desert in a very safe and speedy manner, and arrived before Pelusium. The city was not prepared to resist him. It surrendered at once, and the whole garrison fell into his hands as prisoners of war. Ptolemy demanded that they should all be immediately killed. They were rebels, he said, and, as such, ought to be put to death. Antony, however, as might have been expected from his character, absolutely refused to allow of any such barbarity. Ptolemy, since the power was not yet in his hands, was compelled to submit, and to postpone gratifying the spirit of vengeance which had so long been slumbering in his breast to a future day. He could the more patiently submit to this necessity, since it appeared that the day of his complete and final triumph over his daughter and all her adherents was now very nigh at hand.

[Illustration: ANTONY CROSSING THE DESERT.]

In fact, Berenice and her government, when they heard of the arrival of Antony and Ptolemy at Pelusium, of the fall of that city, and of the approach of Gabinius with an overwhelming force of Roman soldiers, were struck with dismay. Archelaus, the husband of Berenice, had been, in former years, a personal friend of Antony's. Antony considered, in fact, that they were friends still, though required by what the historian calls their duty to fight each other for the possession of the kingdom. The government of Berenice raised an army. Archelaus took command of it, and advanced to meet the enemy. In the mean time, Gabinius arrived with the main body of the Roman troops, and commenced his march, in conjunction with Antony, toward the capital. As they were obliged to make a circuit to the southward, in order to avoid the inlets and lagoons which, on the northern coast of Egypt, penetrate for some distance into the land, their course led them through the heart of the Delta. Many battles were fought, the Romans every where gaining the victory. The Egyptian soldiers were, in fact, discontented and mutinous, perhaps, in part, because they considered the government on the side of which they were compelled to engage as, after all, a usurpation. At length a great final battle was fought, which settled the controversy. Archelaus was slain upon the field, and Berenice was taken prisoner; their government was wholly overthrown, and the way was opened for the march of the Roman armies to Alexandria.

Mark Antony, when judged by our standards, was certainly, as well as Ptolemy, a depraved and vicious man; but his depravity was of a very different type from that of Cleopatra's father. The difference in the men, in one respect, was very clearly evinced by the objects toward which their interest and attention were respectively turned after this great battle. While the contest had been going on, the king and queen of Egypt, Archelaus and Berenice, were, of course, in the view both of Antony and Ptolemy, the two most conspicuous personages in the army of their enemies; and while Antony would naturally watch with the greatest interest the fate of his friend, the king, Ptolemy, would as naturally follow with the highest concern the destiny of his daughter. Accordingly, when the battle was over, while the mind of Ptolemy might, as we should naturally expect, be chiefly occupied by the fact that his _daughter_ was made a captive, Antony's, we might suppose, would be engrossed by the tidings that his _friend_ had been slain.

The one rejoiced and the other mourned. Antony sought for the body of his friend on the field of battle, and when it was found, he gave himself wholly to the work of providing for it a most magnificent burial. He seemed, at the funeral, to lament the death of his ancient comrade with real and unaffected grief. Ptolemy, on the other hand, was overwhelmed with joy at finding his daughter his captive. The long-wished-for hour for the gratification of his revenge had come at last, and the first use which he made of his power when he was put in possession of it at Alexandria was to order his daughter to be beheaded.

CHAPTER V.

ACCESSION TO THE THRONE.

At the time when the unnatural quarrel between Cleopatra's father and her sister was working its way toward its dreadful termination, as related in the last chapter, she herself was residing at the royal palace in Alexandria, a blooming and beautiful girl of about fifteen. Fortunately for her, she was too young to take any active part personally in the contention. Her two brothers were still younger than herself. They all three remained, therefore, in the royal palaces, quiet spectators of the revolution, without being either benefited or injured by it. It is singular that the name of both the boys was Ptolemy.

The excitement in the city of Alexandria was intense and universal when the Roman army entered it to reinstate Cleopatra's father upon his throne. A very large portion of the inhabitants were pleased with having the former king restored. In fact, it appears, by a retrospect of the history of kings, that when a legitimate hereditary sovereign or dynasty is deposed and expelled by a rebellious population, no matter how intolerable may have been the tyranny, or how atrocious the crimes by which the patience of the subject was exhausted, the lapse of a very few years is ordinarily sufficient to produce a very general readiness to acquiesce in a restoration; and in this particular instance there had been no such superiority in the government of Berenice, during the period while her power continued, over that of her father, which she had displaced, as to make this case an exception to the general rule. The mass of the people, therefore--all those, especially, who had taken no active part in Berenice's government--were ready to welcome Ptolemy back to his capital. Those who had taken such a part were all summarily executed by Ptolemy's orders.

There was, of course, a great excitement throughout the city on the arrival of the Roman army. All the foreign influence and power which had been exercised in Egypt thus far, and almost all the officers, whether civil or military, had been Greek. The coming of the Romans was the introduction of a new element of interest to add to the endless variety of excitements which animated the capital.

The restoration of Ptolemy was celebrated with games, spectacles, and festivities of every kind, and, of course, next to the king himself, the chief center of interest and attraction in all these public rejoicings would be the distinguished foreign generals by whose instrumentality the end had been gained.

Mark Antony was a special object of public regard and admiration at the time. His eccentric manners, his frank and honest air, his Roman simplicity of dress and demeanor, made him conspicuous; and his interposition to save the lives of the captured garrison of Pelusium, and the interest which he took in rendering such distinguished funeral honors to the enemy whom his army had slain in battle, impressed the people with the idea of a certain nobleness and magnanimity in his character, which, in spite of his faults, made him an object of general admiration and applause. The very faults of such a man assume often, in the eyes of the world, the guise and semblance of virtues. For example, it is related of Antony that, at one time in the course of his life, having a desire to make a present of some kind to a certain person, in requital for a favor which he had received from him, he ordered his treasurer to send a sum of money to his friend--and named for the sum to be sent an amount considerably greater than was really required under the circumstances of the case--acting thus, as he often did, under the influence of a blind and uncalculating generosity. The treasurer, more prudent than his master, wished to reduce the amount, but he did not dare directly to propose a reduction; so he counted out the money, and laid it in a pile in a place where Antony was to pass, thinking that when Antony saw the amount, he would perceive that it was too great. Antony, in passing by, asked what money that was. The treasurer said that it was the sum that he had ordered to be sent as a present to such a person, naming the individual intended. Antony was quick to perceive the object of the treasurer's maneuver. He immediately replied, "Ah! is that all? I thought the sum I named would make a better appearance than that; send him double the amount."

To determine, under such circumstances as these, to double an extravagance merely for the purpose of thwarting the honest attempt of a faithful servant to diminish it, made, too, in so cautious and delicate a way, is most certainly a fault. But it is one of those faults for which the world, in all ages, will persist in admiring and praising the perpetrator.

In a word, Antony became the object of general attention and favor during his continuance at Alexandria. Whether he particularly attracted Cleopatra's attention at this time or not does not appear. She, however, strongly attracted _his_. He admired her blooming beauty, her sprightliness and wit, and her various accomplishments. She was still, however, so young--being but fifteen years of age, while Antony was nearly thirty--that she probably made no very serious impression upon him. A short time after this, Antony went back to Rome, and did not see Cleopatra again for many years.

When the two Roman generals went away from Alexandria, they left a considerable portion of the army behind them, under Ptolemy's command, to aid him in keeping possession of his throne. Antony returned to Rome. He had acquired great renown by his march across the desert, and by the successful accomplishment of the invasion of Egypt and the restoration of Ptolemy. His funds, too, were replenished by the vast sums paid to him and to Gabinius by Ptolemy. The amount which Ptolemy is said to have agreed to pay as the price of his restoration was two thousand talents--equal to ten millions of dollars--a sum which shows on how great a scale the operations of this celebrated campaign were conducted. Ptolemy raised a large portion of the money required for his payments by confiscating the estates belonging to those friends of Berenice's government whom he ordered to be slain. It was said, in fact, that the numbers were very much increased of those that were condemned to die, by Ptolemy's standing in such urgent need of their property to meet his obligations.

Antony, through the results of this campaign, found himself suddenly raised from the position of a disgraced and homeless fugitive to that of one of the most wealthy and renowned, and, consequently, one of the most powerful personages in Rome. The great civil war broke out about this time between Cæsar and Pompey. Antony espoused the cause of Cæsar.

In the mean time, while the civil war between Cæsar and Pompey was raging, Ptolemy succeeded in maintaining his seat on the throne, by the aid of the Roman soldiers whom Antony and Gabinius had left him, for about three years. When he found himself drawing toward the close of life, the question arose to his mind to whom he should leave his kingdom. Cleopatra was the oldest child, and she was a princess of great promise, both in respect to mental endowments and personal charms. Her brothers were considerably younger than she. The claim of a son, though younger, seemed to be naturally stronger than that of a daughter; but the commanding talents and rising influence of Cleopatra appeared to make it doubtful whether it would be safe to pass her by. The father settled the question in the way in which such difficulties were usually surmounted in the Ptolemy family. He ordained that Cleopatra should marry the oldest of her brothers, and that they two should jointly occupy the throne. Adhering also, still, to the idea of the alliance of Egypt with Rome, which had been the leading principle of the whole policy of his reign, he solemnly committed the execution of his will and the guardianship of his children, by a provision of the instrument itself, to the Roman senate. The senate accepted the appointment, and appointed Pompey as the agent, on their part, to perform the duties of the trust. The attention of Pompey was, immediately after that time, too much engrossed by the civil war waged between himself and Cæsar, to take any active steps in respect to the duties of his appointment. It seemed, however, that none were necessary, for all parties in Alexandria appeared disposed, after the death of the king, to acquiesce in the arrangements which he had made, and to join in carrying them into effect. Cleopatra was married to her brother--yet, it is true, only a boy. He was about ten years old. She was herself about eighteen. They were both too young to govern; they could only reign. The affairs of the kingdom were, accordingly, conducted by two ministers whom their father had designated. These ministers were Pothinus, a eunuch, who was a sort of secretary of state, and Achillas, the commander-in-chief of the armies.

Thus, though Cleopatra, by these events, became nominally a queen, her real accession to the throne was not yet accomplished. There were still many difficulties and dangers to be passed through, before the period arrived when she became really a sovereign. She did not, herself, make any immediate attempt to hasten this period, but seems to have acquiesced, on the other hand, very quietly, for a time, in the arrangements which her father had made.

Pothinus was a eunuch. He had been, for a long time, an officer of government under Ptolemy, the father. He was a proud, ambitious, and domineering man, determined to rule, and very unscrupulous in respect to the means which he adopted to accomplish his ends. He had been accustomed to regard Cleopatra as a mere child. Now that she was queen, he was very unwilling that the real power should pass into her hands. The jealousy and ill will which he felt toward her increased rapidly as he found, in the course of the first two or three years after her father's death, that she was advancing rapidly in strength of character, and in the influence and ascendency which she was acquiring over all around her. Her beauty, her accomplishments, and a certain indescribable charm which pervaded all her demeanor, combined to give her great personal power. But, while these things awakened in other minds feelings of interest in Cleopatra and attachment to her, they only increased the jealousy and envy of Pothinus. Cleopatra was becoming his rival. He endeavored to thwart and circumvent her. He acted toward her in a haughty and overbearing manner, in order to keep her down to what he considered her proper place as his ward; for he was yet the guardian both of Cleopatra and her husband, and the regent of the realm.

Cleopatra had a great deal of what is sometimes called spirit, and her resentment was aroused by this treatment. Pothinus took pains to enlist her young husband, Ptolemy, on his side, as the quarrel advanced. Ptolemy was younger, and of a character much less marked and decided than Cleopatra. Pothinus saw that he could maintain control over him much more easily and for a much longer time than over Cleopatra. He contrived to awaken the young Ptolemy's jealousy of his wife's rising influence, and to induce

him to join in efforts to thwart and counteract it. These attempts to turn her husband against her only aroused Cleopatra's resentment the more. Hers was not a spirit to be coerced. The palace was filled with the dissensions of the rivals. Pothinus and Ptolemy began to take measures for securing the army on their side. An open rupture finally ensued, and Cleopatra was expelled from the kingdom.

She went to Syria. Syria was the nearest place of refuge, and then, besides, it was the country from which the aid had been furnished by which her father had been restored to the throne when he had been expelled, in a similar manner, many years before. Her father, it is true, had gone first to Rome; but the succors which he had negotiated for had been sent from Syria. Cleopatra hoped to obtain the same assistance by going directly there.

Nor was she disappointed. She obtained an army, and commenced her march toward Egypt, following the same track which Antony and Gabinius had pursued in coming to reinstate her father. Pothinus raised an army and went forth to meet her. He took Achillas as the commander of the troops, and the young Ptolemy as the nominal sovereign; while he, as the young king's guardian and prime minister, exercised the real power. The troops of Pothinus advanced to Pelusium. Here they met the forces of Cleopatra coming from the east. The armies encamped not very far from each other, and both sides began to prepare for battle.

The battle, however, was not fought. It was prevented by the occurrence of certain great and unforeseen events which at this crisis suddenly burst upon the scene of Egyptian history, and turned the whole current of affairs into new and unexpected channels. The breaking out of the civil war between the great Roman generals Cæsar and Pompey, and their respective partisans, has already been mentioned as having occurred soon after the death of Cleopatra's father, and as having prevented Pompey from undertaking the office of executor of the will. This war had been raging ever since that time with terrible fury. Its distant thundering had been heard even in Egypt, but it was too remote to awaken there any special alarm. The immense armies of these two mighty conquerors had moved slowly--like two ferocious birds of prey, flying through the air, and fighting as they fly--across Italy into Greece, and from Greece, through Macedon, into Thessaly, contending in dreadful struggles with each other as they advanced, and trampling down and destroying every thing in their way. At length a great final battle had been fought at Pharsalia. Pompey had been totally defeated. He had fled to the sea-shore, and there, with a few ships and a small number of followers, he had pushed out upon the Mediterranean, not knowing whither to fly, and overwhelmed with wretchedness and despair. Cæsar followed him in eager pursuit. He had a small fleet of galleys with him, on board of which he had embarked two or three thousand men. This was a force suitable, perhaps, for the pursuit of a fugitive, but wholly insufficient for any other design.

Pompey thought of Ptolemy. He remembered the efforts which he himself had made for the cause of Ptolemy Auletes, at Rome, and the success of those efforts in securing that monarch's restoration--an event through which alone the young Ptolemy had been enabled to attain the crown. He came, therefore, to Pelusium, and, anchoring his little fleet off the shore, sent to the land to ask Ptolemy to receive and protect him. Pothinus, who was really the commander in Ptolemy's army, made answer to this application that Pompey should be received and protected, and that he would send out a boat to bring him to the shore. Pompey felt some misgivings in respect to this proffered hospitality, but he finally concluded to go to the shore in the boat which Pothinus sent for him. As soon as he landed, the Egyptians, by Pothinus's orders, stabbed and beheaded him on the sand. Pothinus and his council had decided that this would be the safest course. If they were to receive Pompey, they reasoned, Cæsar would be made their enemy; if they refused to receive him, Pompey himself would be offended, and they did not know which of the two it would be safe to displease; for they did not know in what way, if both the generals were to be allowed to live, the war would ultimately end. "But by killing Pompey," they said, "we shall be sure to please Cæsar, and Pompey himself will _lie still_."

In the mean time, Cæsar, not knowing to what part of Egypt Pompey had fled, pressed on directly to Alexandria. He exposed himself to great danger in so doing, for the forces under his command were not sufficient to protect him in case of his becoming involved in difficulties with the authorities there. Nor could he, when once arrived on the Egyptian coast, easily go away again; for, at the season of the year in which these events occurred, there was a periodical wind which blew steadily toward that part of the coast, and, while it made it very easy for a fleet of ships to go to Alexandria, rendered it almost impossible for them to return.

Cæsar was very little accustomed to shrink from danger in any of his enterprises and plans, though still he was usually prudent and circumspect. In this instance, however, his ardent interest in the pursuit of Pompey overruled all considerations of personal safety. He arrived at Alexandria, but he found that Pompey was not there. He anchored his vessels in the port, landed his troops, and established himself in the city. These two events, the assassination of one of the great Roman generals on the eastern extremity of the coast, and the arrival of the other, at the same moment, at Alexandria, on the western, burst suddenly upon Egypt together, like simultaneous claps of thunder. The tidings struck the whole country with astonishment, and immediately engrossed universal

attention. At the camps both of Cleopatra and Ptolemy, at Pelusium, all was excitement and wonder. Instead of thinking of a battle, both parties were wholly occupied in speculating on the results which were likely to accrue, to one side or to the other, under the totally new and unexpected aspect which public affairs had assumed.

Of course the thoughts of all were turned toward Alexandria. Pothinus immediately proceeded to the city, taking with him the young king. Achillas, too, either accompanied them, or followed soon afterward. They carried with them the head of Pompey, which they had cut off on the shore where they had killed him, and also a seal which they took from his finger. When they arrived at Alexandria, they sent the head, wrapped up in a cloth, and also the seal, as presents to Cæsar. Accustomed as they were to the brutal deeds and heartless cruelties of the Ptolemies, they supposed that Cæsar would exult at the spectacle of the dissevered and ghastly head of his great rival and enemy. Instead of this, he was shocked and displeased, and ordered the head to be buried with the most solemn and imposing funeral ceremonies. He, however, accepted and kept the seal. The device engraved upon it was a lion holding a sword in his paw--a fit emblem of the characters of the men, who, though in many respects magnanimous and just, had filled the whole world with the terror of their quarrels.

The army of Ptolemy, while he himself and his immediate counselors went to Alexandria, was left at Pelusium, under the command of other officers, to watch Cleopatra. Cleopatra herself would have been pleased, also, to repair to Alexandria and appeal to Cæsar, if it had been in her power to do so; but she was beyond the confines of the country, with a powerful army of her enemies ready to intercept her on any attempt to enter or pass through it. She remained, therefore, at Pelusium, uncertain what to do.

In the mean time, Cæsar soon found himself in a somewhat embarrassing situation at Alexandria. He had been accustomed, for many years, to the possession and the exercise of the most absolute and despotic power, wherever he might be; and now that Pompey, his great rival, was dead, he considered himself the monarch and master of the world. He had not, however, at Alexandria, any means sufficient to maintain and enforce such pretensions, and yet he was not of a spirit to abate, on that account, in the slightest degree, the advancing of them. He established himself in the palaces of Alexandria as if he were himself the king. He moved, in state, through the streets of the city, at the head of his guards, and displaying the customary emblems of supreme authority used at Rome. He claimed the six thousand talents which Ptolemy Auletes had formerly promised him for procuring a treaty of alliance with Rome, and he called upon Pothinus to pay the balance due. He said, moreover, that by the will of Auletes the Roman people had been made the executor; and that it devolved upon him as the Roman consul, and, consequently, the representative of the Roman people, to assume that trust, and in the discharge of it to settle the dispute between Ptolemy and Cleopatra; and he called upon Ptolemy to prepare and lay before him a statement of his claims, and the grounds on which he maintained his right to the throne to the exclusion of Cleopatra.

On the other hand, Pothinus, who had been as little accustomed to acknowledge a superior as Cæsar, though his supremacy and domination had been exercised on a somewhat humbler scale, was obstinate and pertinacious in resisting all these demands, though the means and methods which he resorted to were of a character corresponding to his weak and ignoble mind. He fomented quarrels in the streets between the Alexandrian populace and Cæsar's soldiers. He thought that, as the number of troops under Cæsar's command in the city, and of vessels in the port, was small, he could tease and worry the Romans with impunity, though he had not the courage openly to attack them. He pretended to be a friend, or, at least, not an enemy, and yet he conducted toward them in an overbearing and insolent manner. He had agreed to make arrangements for supplying them with food, and he did this by procuring damaged provisions of a most wretched quality; and when the soldiers remonstrated, he said to them, that they who lived at other people's cost had no right to complain of their fare. He caused wooden and earthen vessels to be used in the palace, and said, in explanation, that he had been compelled to sell all the gold and silver plate of the royal household to meet the exactions of Cæsar. He busied himself, too, about the city, in endeavoring to excite odium against Cæsar's proposal to hear and decide the question at issue between Cleopatra and Ptolemy. Ptolemy was a sovereign, he said, and was not amenable to any foreign power whatever. Thus, without the courage or the energy to attempt any open, manly, and effectual system of hostility, he contented himself with making all the difficulty in his power, by urging an incessant pressure of petty, vexatious, and provoking, but useless annoyances. Cæsar's demands may have been unjust, but they were bold, manly, and undisguised. The eunuch may have been right in resisting them; but the mode was so mean and contemptible, that mankind have always taken part with Cæsar in the sentiments which they have formed as spectators of the contest.

With the very small force which Cæsar had at his command, and shut up as he was in the midst of a very great and powerful city, in which both the garrison and the population were growing more and more hostile to him every day, he soon found his situation was beginning to be attended with very serious danger. He could not retire from the scene. He probably would not have retired if he could have done so. He remained, therefore, in the city, conducting all the time with prudence and circumspection, but yet

maintaining, as at first, the same air of confident self-possession and superiority which always characterized his demeanor. He, however, dispatched a messenger forthwith into Syria, the nearest country under the Roman sway, with orders that several legions which were posted there should be embarked and forwarded to Alexandria with the utmost possible celerity.

CHAPTER VI.

CLEOPATRA AND CÆSAR.

In the mean time, while the events related in the last chapter were taking place at Alexandria, Cleopatra remained anxious and uneasy in her camp, quite uncertain, for a time, what it was best for her to do. She wished to be at Alexandria. She knew very well that Cæsar's power in controlling the course of affairs in Egypt would necessarily be supreme. She was, of course, very earnest in her desire to be able to present her cause before him. As it was, Ptolemy and Pothinus were in communication with the arbiter, and, for aught she knew, assiduously cultivating his favor, while she was far away, her cause unheard, her wrongs unknown, and perhaps even her existence forgotten. Of course, under such circumstances, she was very earnest to get to Alexandria.

But how to accomplish this purpose was a source of great perplexity. She could not march thither at the head of an army, for the army of the king was strongly intrenched at Pelusium, and effectually barred the way. She could not attempt to pass alone, or with few attendants, through the country, for every town and village was occupied with garrisons and officers under the orders of Pothinus, and she would be certainly intercepted. She had no fleet, and could not, therefore, make the passage by sea. Besides, even if she could by any means reach the gates of Alexandria, how was she to pass safely through the streets of the city to the palace where Cæsar resided, since the city, except in Cæsar's quarters, was wholly in the hands of Pothinus's government? The difficulties in the way of accomplishing her object seemed thus almost insurmountable.

She was, however, resolved to make the attempt. She sent a message to Cæsar, asking permission to appear before him and plead her own cause. Cæsar replied, urging her by all means to come. She took a single boat, and with the smallest number of attendants possible, made her way along the coast to Alexandria. The man on whom she principally relied in this hazardous expedition was a domestic named Apollodorus. She had, however, some other attendants besides. When the party reached Alexandria, they waited until night, and then advanced to the foot of the walls of the citadel. Here Apollodorus rolled the queen up in a piece of carpeting, and, covering the whole package with a cloth, he tied it with a thong, so as to give it the appearance of a bale of ordinary merchandise, and then throwing the load across his shoulder, he advanced into the city. Cleopatra was at this time about twenty-one years of age, but she was of a slender and graceful form, and the burden was, consequently, not very heavy. Apollodorus came to the gates of the palace where Cæsar was residing. The guards at the gates asked him what it was that he was carrying. He said that it was a present for Cæsar. So they allowed him to pass, and the pretended porter carried his package safely in.

When it was unrolled, and Cleopatra came out to view, Cæsar was perfectly charmed with the spectacle. In fact, the various conflicting emotions which she could not but feel under such circumstances as these, imparted a double interest to her beautiful and expressive face, and to her naturally bewitching manners. She was excited by the adventure through which she had passed, and yet pleased with her narrow escape from its dangers. The curiosity and interest which she felt on the one hand, in respect to the great personage into whose presence she had been thus strangely ushered, was very strong; but then, on the other, it was chastened and subdued by that feeling of timidity which, in new and unexpected situations like these, and under a consciousness of being the object of eager observation to the other sex, is inseparable from the nature of woman.

[Illustration: CLEOPATRA ENTERING THE PALACE OF CÆSAR.]

The conversation which Cæsar held with Cleopatra deepened the impression which her first appearance had made upon him. Her intelligence and animation, the originality of her ideas, and the point and pertinency of her mode of expressing them, made her, independently of her personal charms, an exceedingly entertaining and agreeable companion. She, in fact, completely won the great conqueror's heart; and, through the strong attachment to her which he immediately formed, he became wholly disqualified to act impartially between her and her brother in regard to their respective rights to the crown. We call Ptolemy Cleopatra's brother; for, though he was also, in fact, her husband, still, as he was only ten or twelve years of age at the time of Cleopatra's expulsion from Alexandria, the marriage had been probably regarded, thus far, only as a mere matter of form. Cæsar was now about fifty-two. He had a wife, named Calpurnia, to whom he had been married about ten years. She was living, at this time, in an unostentatious and quiet manner at Rome. She was a lady of an amiable and gentle character, devotedly attached to her husband, patient and

forbearing in respect to his faults, and often anxious and unhappy at the thought of the difficulties and dangers in which his ardent and unbounded ambition so often involved him.

Cæsar immediately began to take a very strong interest in Cleopatra's cause. He treated her personally with the fondest attention, and it was impossible for her not to reciprocate in some degree the kind feeling with which he regarded her. It was, in fact, something altogether new to her to have a warm and devoted friend, espousing her cause, tendering her protection, and seeking in every way to promote her happiness. Her father had all his life neglected her. Her brother, of years and understanding totally inferior to hers, whom she had been compelled to make her husband, had become her mortal enemy. It is true that, in depriving her of her inheritance and expelling her from her native land, he had been only the tool and instrument of more designing men. This, however, far from improving the point of view from which she regarded him, made him appear not only hateful, but contemptible too. All the officers of government, also, in the Alexandrian court had turned against her, because they had supposed that they could control her brother more easily if she were away. Thus she had always been surrounded by selfish, mercenary, and implacable foes. Now, for the first time, she seemed to have a friend. A protector had suddenly arisen to support and defend her--a man of very alluring person and manners, of a very noble and generous spirit, and of the very highest station. He loved her, and she could not refrain from loving him in return. She committed her cause entirely into his hands, confided to him all her interests, and gave herself up wholly into his power.

Nor was the unbounded confidence which she reposed in him undeserved, so far as related to his efforts to restore her to her throne. The legions which Cæsar had sent for into Syria had not yet arrived, and his situation in Alexandria was still very defenseless and very precarious. He did not, however, on this account, abate in the least degree the loftiness and self-confidence of the position which he had assumed, but he commenced immediately the work of securing Cleopatra's restoration. This quiet assumption of the right and power to arbitrate and decide such a question as that of the claim to the throne, in a country where he had accidentally landed and found rival claimants disputing for the succession, while he was still wholly destitute of the means of enforcing the superiority which he so coolly assumed, marks the immense ascendency which the Roman power had attained at this time in the estimation of mankind, and is, besides, specially characteristic of the genius and disposition of Cæsar.

Very soon after Cleopatra had come to him, Cæsar sent for the young Ptolemy, and urged upon him the duty and expediency of restoring Cleopatra. Ptolemy was beginning now to attain an age at which he might be supposed to have some opinion of his own on such a question. He declared himself utterly opposed to any such design. In the course of the conversation he learned that Cleopatra had arrived at Alexandria, and that she was then concealed in Cæsar's palace. This intelligence awakened in his mind the greatest excitement and indignation. He went away from Cæsar's presence in a rage. He tore the diadem which he was accustomed to wear from his head in the streets, threw it down, and trampled it under his feet. He declared to the people that he was betrayed, and displayed the most violent indications of vexation and chagrin. The chief subject of his complaint, in the attempts which he made to awaken the popular indignation against Cæsar and the Romans, was the disgraceful impropriety of the position which his sister had assumed in surrendering herself as she had done to Cæsar. It is most probable, however, unless his character was very different from that of every other Ptolemy in the line, that what really awakened his jealousy and anger was fear of the commanding influence and power to which Cleopatra was likely to attain through the agency of so distinguished a protector, rather than any other consequences of his friendship, or any real considerations of delicacy in respect to his sister's good name or his own marital honor.

However this may be, Ptolemy, together with Pothinus and Achillas, and all his other friends and adherents, who joined him in the terrible outcry that he made against the coalition which he had discovered between Cleopatra and Cæsar, succeeded in producing a very general and violent tumult throughout the city. The populace were aroused, and began to assemble in great crowds, and full of indignation and anger. Some knew the facts, and acted under something like an understanding of the cause of their anger. Others only knew that the aim of this sudden outbreak was to assault the Romans, and were ready, on any pretext, known or unknown, to join in any deeds of violence directed against these foreign intruders. There were others still, and these, probably, far the larger portion, who knew nothing and understood nothing but that there was to be tumult and a riot in and around the palaces, and were, accordingly, eager to be there.

Ptolemy and his officers had no large body of troops in Alexandria; for the events which had thus far occurred since Cæsar's arrival had succeeded each other so rapidly, that a very short time had yet elapsed, and the main army remained still at Pelusium. The main force, therefore, by which Cæsar was now attacked, consisted of the population of the city, headed, perhaps, by the few guards which the young king had at his command.

Cæsar, on his part, had but a small portion of his forces at the palace where he was attacked. The rest were scattered about the city. He, however, seems to have felt no alarm. He did not even confine himself to acting on the defensive. He sent out a detachment of his soldiers with orders to seize Ptolemy and bring him in a prisoner. Soldiers trained, disciplined, and armed as the Roman veterans were, and nerved by the ardor and enthusiasm which seemed always to animate troops which were under Cæsar's personal command, could accomplish almost any undertaking against a mere populace, however numerous or however furiously excited they might be. The soldiers sallied out, seized Ptolemy, and brought him in.

The populace were at first astounded at the daring presumption of this deed, and then exasperated at the indignity of it, considered as a violation of the person of their sovereign. The tumult would have greatly increased, had it not been that Cæsar--who had now attained all his ends in thus having brought Cleopatra and Ptolemy both within his power--thought it most expedient to allay it. He accordingly ascended to the window of a tower, or of some other elevated portion of his palace, so high that missiles from the mob below could not reach him, and began to make signals expressive of his wish to address them.

When silence was obtained, he made them a speech well calculated to quiet the excitement. He told them that he did not pretend to any right to judge between Cleopatra and Ptolemy as their superior, but only in the performance of the duty solemnly assigned by Ptolemy Auletes, the father, to the Roman people, whose representative he was. Other than this he claimed no jurisdiction in the case; and his only wish, in the discharge of the duty which devolved upon him to consider the cause, was to settle the question in a manner just and equitable to all the parties concerned, and thus arrest the progress of the civil war, which, if not arrested, threatened to involve the country in the most terrible calamities. He counseled them, therefore, to disperse, and no longer disturb the peace of the city. He would immediately take measures for trying the question between Cleopatra and Ptolemy, and he did not doubt but that they would all be satisfied with his decision.

This speech, made, as it was, in the eloquent and persuasive, and yet dignified and imposing manner for which Cæsar's harangues to turbulent assemblies like these were so famed, produced a great effect. Some were convinced, others were silenced; and those whose resentment and anger were not appeased, found themselves deprived of their power by the pacification of the rest. The mob was dispersed, and Ptolemy remained with Cleopatra in Cæsar's custody.

The next day, Cæsar, according to his promise, convened an assembly of the principal people of Alexandria and officers of state, and then brought out Ptolemy and Cleopatra, that he might decide their cause. The original will which Ptolemy Auletes had executed had been deposited in the public archives of Alexandria, and carefully preserved there. An authentic copy of it had been sent to Rome. Cæsar caused the original will to be brought out and read to the assembly. The provisions of it were perfectly explicit and clear. It required that Cleopatra and Ptolemy should be married, and then settled the sovereign power upon them jointly, as king and queen. It recognized the Roman commonwealth as the ally of Egypt, and constituted the Roman government the executor of the will, and the guardian of the king and queen. In fact, so clear and explicit was this document, that the simple reading of it seemed to be of itself a decision of the question. When, therefore, Cæsar announced that, in his judgment, Cleopatra was entitled to share the supreme power with Ptolemy, and that it was his duty, as the representative of the Roman power and the executor of the will, to protect both the king and the queen in their respective rights, there seemed to be nothing that could be said against his decision.

Besides Cleopatra and Ptolemy, there were two other children of Ptolemy Auletes in the royal family at this time. One was a girl, named Arsinoë. The other, a boy, was, singularly enough, named, like his brother, Ptolemy. These children were quite young, but Cæsar thought that it would perhaps gratify the Alexandrians, and lead them to acquiesce more readily in his decision, if he were to make some royal provision for them. He accordingly proposed to assign the island of Cyprus as a realm for them. This was literally a gift, for Cyprus was at this time a Roman possession.[5]

The whole assembly seemed satisfied with this decision except Pothinus. He had been so determined and inveterate an enemy to Cleopatra, that, as he was well aware, her restoration must end in his downfall and ruin. He went away from the assembly moodily determining that he would not submit to the decision, but would immediately adopt efficient measures to prevent its being carried into effect.

Cæsar made arrangements for a series of festivals and celebrations, to commemorate and confirm the re-establishment of a good understanding between the king and the queen, and the consequent termination of the war. Such celebrations, he judged, would have great influence in removing any remaining animosities from the minds of the people, and restore the dominion of a kind and friendly feeling throughout the city. The people fell in with these measures, and cordially co-operated to give them effect; but

Pothinus and Achillas, though they suppressed all outward expressions of discontent, made incessant efforts in secret to organize a party, and to form plans for overthrowing the influence of Cæsar, and making Ptolemy again the sole and exclusive sovereign.

Pothinus represented to all whom he could induce to listen to him that Cæsar's real design was to make Cleopatra queen alone, and to depose Ptolemy, and urged them to combine with him to resist a policy which would end in bringing Egypt under the dominion of a woman. He also formed a plan, in connection with Achillas, for ordering the army back from Pelusium. The army consisted of thirty thousand men. If that army could be brought to Alexandria and kept under Pothinus's orders, Cæsar and his three thousand Roman soldiers would be, they thought, wholly at their mercy.

There was, however, one danger to be guarded against in ordering the army to march toward the capital, and that was, that Ptolemy, while under Cæsar's influence, might open communications with the officers, and so obtain command of its movements, and thwart all the conspirators' designs. To prevent this, it was arranged between Pothinus and Achillas that the latter should make his escape from Alexandria, proceed immediately to the camp at Pelusium, resume the command of the troops there, and conduct them himself to the capital; and that in all these operations, and also subsequently on his arrival, he should obey no orders unless they came to him through Pothinus himself.

Although sentinels and guards were probably stationed at the gates and avenues leading from the city, Achillas contrived to effect his escape and to join the army. He placed himself at the head of the forces, and commenced his march toward the capital. Pothinus remained all the time within the city as a spy, pretending to acquiesce in Cæsar's decision, and to be on friendly terms with him, but really plotting for his overthrow, and obtaining all the information which his position enabled him to command, in order that he might co-operate with the army and Achillas when they should arrive.

All these things were done with the utmost secrecy, and so cunning and adroit were the conspirators in forming and executing their plots, that Cæsar seems to have had no knowledge of the measures which his enemies were taking, until he suddenly heard that the main body of Ptolemy's army was approaching the city, at least twenty thousand strong. In the mean time, however, the forces which he had sent for from Syria had not arrived, and no alternative was left but to defend the capital and himself as well as he could with the very small force which he had at his disposal.

He determined, however, first, to try the effect of orders sent out in Ptolemy's name to forbid the approach of the army to the city. Two officers were accordingly intrusted with these orders, and sent out to communicate them to Achillas. The names of these officers were Dioscorides and Serapion.

It shows in a very striking point of view to what an incredible exaltation the authority and consequence of a sovereign king rose in those ancient days, in the minds of men, that Achillas, at the moment when these men made their appearance in the camp, bearing evidently some command from Ptolemy in the city, considered it more prudent to kill them at once, without hearing their message, rather than to allow the orders to be delivered and then take the responsibility of disobeying them. If he could succeed in marching to Alexandria and in taking possession of the city, and then in expelling Cæsar and Cleopatra and restoring Ptolemy to the exclusive possession of the throne, he knew very well that the king would rejoice in the result, and would overlook all irregularities on his part in the means by which he had accomplished it, short of absolute disobedience of a known command. Whatever might be the commands that these messengers were bringing him, he supposed that they doubtless originated, not in Ptolemy's own free will, but that they were dictated by the authority of Cæsar. Still, they would be commands coming in Ptolemy's name; and the universal experience of officers serving under the military despots of those ancient days showed that, rather than to take the responsibility of directly disobeying a royal order once received, it was safer to avoid receiving it by murdering the messengers.

Achillas therefore directed the officers to be seized and slain. They were accordingly taken off and speared by the soldiers, and then the bodies were borne away. The soldiers, however, it was found, had not done their work effectually. There was no interest for them in such a cold-blooded assassination, and perhaps something like a sentiment of compassion restrained their hands. At any rate, though both the men were desperately wounded, one only died. The other lived and recovered.

Achillas continued to advance toward the city. Cæsar, finding that the crisis which was approaching was becoming very serious in its character, took, himself, the whole command within the capital, and began to make the best arrangements possible under the circumstances of the case to defend himself there. His numbers were altogether too small to defend the whole city against the overwhelming force which was advancing to assail it. He accordingly intrenched his troops in the palaces and in the citadel, and in such other parts of the city as it seemed practicable to defend. He barricaded all the streets and avenues leading to these points, and fortified the gates. Nor did he, while thus doing all in his power to employ the insufficient means of defense already in his hands

to the best advantage, neglect the proper exertions for obtaining succor from abroad. He sent off galleys to Syria, to Cyprus, to Rhodes, and to every other point accessible from Alexandria where Roman troops might be expected to be found, urging the authorities there to forward re-enforcements to him with the utmost possible dispatch.

During all this time Cleopatra and Ptolemy remained in the palace with Cæsar, both ostensibly co-operating with him in his councils and measures for defending the city from Achillas. Cleopatra, of course, was sincere and in earnest in this co-operation; but Ptolemy's adhesion to the common cause was very little to be relied upon. Although, situated as he was, he was compelled to seem to be on Cæsar's side, he must have secretly desired that Achillas should succeed and Cæsar's plans be overthrown. Pothinus was more active, though not less cautious in his hostility to them. He opened a secret communication with Achillas, sending him information, from time to time, of what took place within the walls, and of the arrangements made there for the defense of the city against him, and gave him also directions how to proceed. He was very wary and sagacious in all these movements, feigning all the time to be on Cæsar's side. He pretended to be very zealously employed in aiding Cæsar to secure more effectually the various points where attacks were to be expected, and in maturing and completing the arrangements for defense.

But, notwithstanding all his cunning, he was detected in his double dealing, and his career was suddenly brought to a close, before the great final conflict came on. There was a barber in Cæsar's household, who, for some cause or other, began to suspect Pothinus; and, having little else to do, he employed himself in watching the eunuch's movements and reporting them to Cæsar. Cæsar directed the barber to continue his observations. He did so; his suspicions were soon confirmed, and at length a letter, which Pothinus had written to Achillas, was intercepted and brought to Cæsar. This furnished the necessary proof of what they called his guilt, and Cæsar ordered him to be beheaded.

This circumstance produced, of course, a great excitement within the palace, for Pothinus had been for many years the great ruling minister of state--the king, in fact, in all but in name. His execution alarmed a great many others, who, though in Cæsar's power, were secretly wishing that Achillas might prevail. Among those most disturbed by these fears was a man named Ganymede. He was the officer who had charge of Arsinoë, Cleopatra's sister. The arrangement which Cæsar had proposed for establishing her in conjunction with her brother Ptolemy over the island of Cyprus had not gone into effect; for, immediately after the decision of Cæsar, the attention of all concerned had been wholly engrossed by the tidings of the advance of the army, and by the busy preparations which were required on all hands for the impending contest. Arsinoë, therefore, with her governor Ganymede, remained in the palace. Ganymede had joined Pothinus in his plots; and when Pothinus was beheaded, he concluded that it would be safest for him to fly.

He accordingly resolved to make his escape from the city, taking Arsinoë with him. It was a very hazardous attempt, but he succeeded in accomplishing it. Arsinoë was very willing to go, for she was now beginning to be old enough to feel the impulse of that insatiable and reckless ambition which seemed to form such an essential element in the character of every son and daughter in the whole Ptolemaic line. She was insignificant and powerless where she was, but at the head of the army she might become immediately a queen.

It resulted, in the first instance, as she had anticipated. Achillas and his army received her with acclamations. Under Ganymede's influence they decided that, as all the other members of the royal family were in durance, being held captive by a foreign general, who had by chance obtained possession of the capital, and were thus incapacitated for exercising the royal power, the crown devolved upon Arsinoë; and they accordingly proclaimed her queen.

Every thing was now prepared for a desperate and determined contest for the crown between Cleopatra, with Cæsar for her minister and general, on the one side, and Arsinoë, with Ganymede and Achillas for her chief officers, on the other. The young Ptolemy, in the mean time, remained Cæsar's prisoner, confused with the intricacies in which the quarrel had become involved, and scarcely knowing now what to wish in respect to the issue of the contest. It was very difficult to foresee whether it would be best for him that Cleopatra or that Arsinoë should succeed.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ALEXANDRINE WAR.

The war which ensued as the result of the intrigues and maneuvers described in the last chapter is known in the history of Rome and Julius Cæsar as the Alexandrine war. The events which occurred during the progress of it, and its termination at last in the triumph of Cæsar and Cleopatra, will form the subject of this chapter.

Achillas had greatly the advantage over Cæsar at the outset of the contest, in respect to the strength of the forces under his command. Cæsar, in fact, had with him only a detachment of three or four thousand men, a small body of troops which he had hastily put on board a little squadron of Rhodian galleys for pursuing Pompey across the Mediterranean. When he set sail from the European shores with this inconsiderable fleet, it is probable that he had no expectation even of landing in Egypt at all, and much less of being involved in great military undertakings there. Achillas, on the other hand, was at the head of a force of twenty thousand effective men. His troops were, it is true, of a somewhat miscellaneous character, but they were all veteran soldiers, inured to the climate of Egypt, and skilled in all the modes of warfare which were suited to the character of the country. Some of them were Roman soldiers, men who had come with the army of Mark Antony from Syria when Ptolemy Auletes, Cleopatra's father, was reinstated on the throne, and had been left in Egypt, in Ptolemy's service, when Antony returned to Rome. Some were native Egyptians. There was also in the army of Achillas a large number of fugitive slaves--refugees who had made their escape from various points along the shores of the Mediterranean, at different periods, and had been from time to time incorporated into the Egyptian army. These fugitives were all men of the most determined and desperate character.

Achillas had also in his command a force of two thousand horse. Such a body of cavalry made him, of course, perfect master of all the open country outside the city walls. At the head of these troops Achillas gradually advanced to the very gates of Alexandria, invested the city on every side, and shut Cæsar closely in.

The danger of the situation in which Cæsar was placed was extreme; but he had been so accustomed to succeed in extricating himself from the most imminent perils, that neither he himself nor his army seem to have experienced any concern in respect to the result. Cæsar personally felt a special pride and pleasure in encountering the difficulties and dangers which now beset him, because Cleopatra was with him to witness his demeanor, to admire his energy and courage, and to reward by her love the efforts and sacrifices which he was making in espousing her cause. She confided every thing to him, but she watched all the proceedings with the most eager interest, elated with hope in respect to the result, and proud of the champion who had thus volunteered to defend her. In a word, her heart was full of gratitude, admiration, and love.

The immediate effect, too, of the emotions which she felt so strongly was greatly to heighten her natural charms. The native force and energy of her character were softened and subdued. Her voice, which always possessed a certain inexpressible charm, was endued with new sweetness through the influence of affection. Her countenance beamed with fresh animation and beauty, and the sprightliness and vivacity of her character, which became at later periods of her life boldness and eccentricity, now being softened and restrained within proper limits by the respectful regard with which she looked upon Cæsar, made her an enchanting companion. Cæsar was, in fact, entirely intoxicated with the fascinations which she unconsciously displayed.

Under other circumstances than these, a personal attachment so strong, formed by a military commander while engaged in active service, might have been expected to interfere in some degree with the discharge of his duties; but in this case, since it was for Cleopatra's sake and in her behalf that the operations which Cæsar had undertaken were to be prosecuted, his love for her only stimulated the spirit and energy with which he engaged in them.

The first measure to be adopted was, as Cæsar plainly perceived, to concentrate and strengthen his position in the city, so that he might be able to defend himself there against Achillas until he should receive re-enforcements from abroad. For this purpose he selected a certain group of palaces and citadels which lay together near the head of the long pier or causeway which led to the Pharos, and, withdrawing his troops from all other parts of the city, established them there. The quarter which he thus occupied contained the great city arsenals and public granaries. Cæsar brought together all the arms and munitions of war which he could find in other parts of the city, and also all the corn and other provisions which were contained either in the public depôts or in private warehouses, and stored the whole within his lines. He then inclosed the whole quarter with strong defenses. The avenues leading to it were barricaded with walls of stone. Houses in the vicinity which might have afforded shelter to an enemy were demolished, and the materials used in constructing walls wherever they were needed, or in strengthening the barricades. Prodigious military engines, made to throw heavy stones, and beams of wood, and other ponderous missiles, were set up within his lines, and openings were made in the walls and other defenses of the citadel, wherever necessary, to facilitate the action of these machines.

[Illustration: VIEW OF ALEXANDRIA.]

There was a strong fortress situated at the head of the pier or mole leading to the island of Pharos, which was without Cæsar's lines, and still in the hands of the Egyptian authorities. The Egyptians thus commanded the entrance to the mole. The island itself, also, with the fortress at the other end of the pier, was still in the possession of the Egyptian authorities, who seemed disposed to

hold it for Achillas. The mole was very long, as the island was nearly a mile from the shore. There was quite a little town upon the island itself, besides the fortress or castle built there to defend the place. The garrison of this castle was strong, and the inhabitants of the town, too, constituted a somewhat formidable population, as they consisted of fishermen, sailors, wreckers, and such other desperate characters as usually congregate about such a spot. Cleopatra and Cæsar, from the windows of their palace within the city, looked out upon this island, with the tall light-house rising in the center of it and the castle at its base, and upon the long and narrow isthmus connecting it with the main land, and concluded that it was very essential that they should get possession of the post, commanding, as it did, the entrance to the harbor.

In the harbor, too, which, as will be seen from the engraving, was on the south side of the mole, and, consequently, on the side opposite to that from which Achillas was advancing toward the city, there were lying a large number of Egyptian vessels, some dismantled, and others manned and armed more or less effectively. These vessels had not yet come into Achillas's hands, but it would be certain that he would take possession of them as soon as he should gain admittance to those parts of the city which Cæsar had abandoned. This it was extremely important to prevent; for, if Achillas held this fleet, especially if he continued to command the island of Pharos, he would be perfect master of all the approaches to the city on the side of the sea. He could then not only receive re-enforcements and supplies himself from that quarter, but he could also effectually cut off the Roman army from all possibility of receiving any. It became, therefore, as Cæsar thought, imperiously necessary that he should protect himself from this danger. This he did by sending out an expedition to burn all the shipping in the harbor, and, at the same time, to take possession of a certain fort upon the island of Pharos which commanded the entrance to the port. This undertaking was abundantly successful. The troops burned the shipping, took the fort, expelled the Egyptian soldiers from it, and put a Roman garrison into it instead, and then returned in safety within Cæsar's lines. Cleopatra witnessed these exploits from her palace windows with feelings of the highest admiration for the energy and valor which her Roman protectors displayed.

The burning of the Egyptian ships in this action, however fortunate for Cleopatra and Cæsar, was attended with a catastrophe which has ever since been lamented by the whole civilized world. Some of the burning ships were driven by the wind to the shore, where they set fire to the buildings which were contiguous to the water. The flames spread and produced an extensive conflagration, in the course of which the largest part of the great library was destroyed. This library was the only general collection of the ancient writings that ever had been made, and the loss of it was never repaired.

The destruction of the Egyptian fleet resulted also in the downfall and ruin of Achillas. From the time of Arsinoë's arrival in the camp there had been a constant rivalry and jealousy between himself and Ganymede, the eunuch who had accompanied Arsinoë in her flight. Two parties had been formed in the army, some declaring for Achillas and some for Ganymede. Arsinoë advocated Ganymede's interests, and when, at length, the fleet was burned, she charged Achillas with having been, by his neglect or incapacity, the cause of the loss. Achillas was tried, condemned, and beheaded. From that time Ganymede assumed the administration of Arsinoë's government as her minister of state and the commander-in-chief of her armies.

About the time that these occurrences took place, the Egyptian army advanced into those parts of the city from which Cæsar had withdrawn, producing those terrible scenes of panic and confusion which always attend a sudden and violent change of military possession within the precincts of a city. Ganymede brought up his troops on every side to the walls of Cæsar's citadels and intrenchments, and hemmed him closely in. He cut off all avenues of approach to Cæsar's lines by land, and commenced vigorous preparations for an assault. He constructed engines for battering down the walls. He opened shops and established forges in every part of the city for the manufacture of darts, spears, pikes, and all kinds of military machinery. He built towers supported upon huge wheels, with the design of filling them with armed men when finally ready to make his assault upon Cæsar's lines, and moving them up to the walls of the citadels and palaces, so as to give to his soldiers the advantage of a lofty elevation in making their attacks. He levied contributions on the rich citizens for the necessary funds, and provided himself with men by pressing all the artisans, laborers, and men capable of bearing arms into his service. He sent messengers back into the interior of the country, in every direction, summoning the people to arms, and calling for contributions of money and military stores.

These messengers were instructed to urge upon the people that, unless Cæsar and his army were at once expelled from Alexandria, there was imminent danger that the national independence of Egypt would be forever destroyed. The Romans, they were to say, had extended their conquests over almost all the rest of the world. They had sent one army into Egypt before, under the command of Mark Antony, under the pretense of restoring Ptolemy Auletes to the throne. Now another commander, with another force, had come, offering some other pretexts for interfering in their affairs. These Roman encroachments, the messengers were to say, would end in the complete subjugation of Egypt to a foreign power, unless the people of the country aroused themselves to meet the danger manfully, and to expel the intruders.

As Cæsar had possession of the island of Pharos and of the harbor, Ganymede could not cut him off from receiving such re-enforcements of men and arms as he might make arrangements for obtaining beyond the sea; nor could he curtail his supply of food, as the granaries and magazines within Cæsar's quarter of the city contained almost inexhaustible stores of corn. There was one remaining point essential to the subsistence of an army besieged, and that was an abundant supply of water. The palaces and citadels which Cæsar occupied were supplied with water by means of numerous subterranean aqueducts, which conveyed the water from the Nile to vast cisterns built under ground, whence it was raised by buckets and hydraulic engines for use. In reflecting upon this circumstance, Ganymede conceived the design of secretly digging a canal, so as to turn the waters of the sea by means of it into these aqueducts. This plan he carried into effect. The consequence was, that the water in the cisterns was gradually changed. It became first brackish, then more and more salt and bitter, until, at length, it was wholly impossible to use it. For some time the army within could not understand these changes; and when, at length, they discovered the cause, the soldiers were panic-stricken at the thought that they were now apparently wholly at the mercy of their enemies, since, without supplies of water, they must all immediately perish. They considered it hopeless to attempt any longer to hold out, and urged Cæsar to evacuate the city, embark on board his galleys, and proceed to sea.

Instead of doing this, however, Cæsar, ordering all other operations to be suspended, employed the whole laboring force of his command, under the direction of the captains of the several companies, in digging wells in every part of his quarter of the city. Fresh water, he said, was almost invariably found, at a moderate depth, upon sea-coasts, even upon ground lying in very close proximity with the sea. The diggings were successful. Fresh water, in great abundance, was found. Thus this danger was passed, and the men's fears effectually relieved.

A short time after these transactions occurred, there came into the harbor one day, from along the shore west of the city, a small sloop, bringing the intelligence that a squadron of transports had arrived upon the coast to the westward of Alexandria, and had anchored there, being unable to come up to the city on account of an easterly wind which prevailed at that season of the year. This squadron was one which had been sent across the Mediterranean with arms, ammunition, and military stores for Cæsar, in answer to requisitions which he had made immediately after he had landed. The transports being thus wind-bound on the coast, and having nearly exhausted their supplies of water, were in distress; and they accordingly sent forward the sloop, which was probably propelled by oars, to make known their situation to Cæsar, and to ask for succor. Cæsar immediately went, himself, on board of one of his galleys, and ordering the remainder of his little fleet to follow him, he set sail out of the harbor, and then turned to the westward, with a view of proceeding along the coast to the place where the transports were lying.

All this was done secretly. The land is so low in the vicinity of Alexandria that boats or galleys are out of sight from it at a very short distance from the shore. In fact, travelers say that, in coming upon the coast, the illusion produced by the spherical form of the surface of the water and the low and level character of the coast is such that one seems actually to descend from the sea to the land. Cæsar might therefore have easily kept his expedition a secret, had it not been that, in order to be provided with a supply of water for the transports immediately on reaching them, he stopped at a solitary part of the coast, at some distance from Alexandria, and sent a party a little way into the interior in search for water. This party were discovered by the country people, and were intercepted by a troop of horse and made prisoners. From these prisoners the Egyptians learned that Cæsar himself was on the coast with a small squadron of galleys. The tidings spread in all directions. The people flocked together from every quarter. They hastily collected all the boats and vessels which could be obtained at the villages in that region and from the various branches of the Nile. In the mean time, Cæsar had gone on to the anchorage ground of the squadron, and had taken the transports in tow to bring them to the city; for the galleys, being propelled by oars, were in a measure independent of the wind. On his return, he found quite a formidable naval armament assembled to dispute the passage.

A severe conflict ensued, but Cæsar was victorious. The navy which the Egyptians had so suddenly got together was as suddenly destroyed. Some of the vessels were burned, others sunk, and others captured; and Cæsar returned in triumph to the port with his transports and stores. He was welcomed with the acclamations of his soldiers, and, still more warmly, by the joy and gratitude of Cleopatra, who had been waiting during his absence in great anxiety and suspense to know the result of the expedition, aware as she was that her hero was exposing himself in it to the most imminent personal danger.

The arrival of these re-enforcements greatly improved Cæsar's condition, and the circumstance of their coming forced upon the mind of Ganymede a sense of the absolute necessity that he should gain possession of the harbor if he intended to keep Cæsar in check. He accordingly determined to take immediate measures for forming a naval force. He sent along the coast, and ordered every ship and galley that could be found in all the ports to be sent immediately to Alexandria. He employed as many men as

possible in and around the city in building more. He unroofed some of the most magnificent edifices to procure timber as a material for making benches and oars. When all was ready, he made a grand attack upon Cæsar in the port, and a terrible contest ensued for the possession of the harbor, the mole, the island, and the citadels and fortresses commanding the entrances from the sea. Cæsar well knew that this contest would be a decisive one in respect to the final result of the war, and he accordingly went forth himself to take an active and personal part in the conflict. He felt doubtless, too, a strong emotion of pride and pleasure in exhibiting his prowess in the sight of Cleopatra, who could watch the progress of the battle from the palace windows, full of excitement at the dangers which he incurred, and of admiration at the feats of strength and valor which he performed. During this battle the life of the great conqueror was several times in the most imminent danger. He wore a habit or mantle of the imperial purple, which made him a conspicuous mark for his enemies; and, of course, wherever he went, in that place was the hottest of the fight. Once, in the midst of a scene of most dreadful confusion and din, he leaped from an overloaded boat into the water and swam for his life, holding his cloak between his teeth and drawing it through the water after him, that it might not fall into the hands of his enemies. He carried, at the same time, as he swam, certain valuable papers which he wished to save, holding them above his head with one hand, while he propelled himself through the water with the other.

The result of this contest was another decisive victory for Cæsar. Not only were the ships which the Egyptians had collected defeated and destroyed, but the mole, with the fortresses at each extremity of it, and the island, with the light-house and the town of Pharos, all fell into Cæsar's hands.

The Egyptians now began to be discouraged. The army and the people, judging, as mankind always do, of the virtue of their military commanders solely by the criterion of success, began to be tired of the rule of Ganymede and Arsinoë. They sent secret messengers to Cæsar avowing their discontent, and saying that, if he would liberate Ptolemy--who, it will be recollected, had been all this time held as a sort of prisoner of state in Cæsar's palaces--they thought that the people generally would receive him as their sovereign, and that then an arrangement might easily be made for an amicable adjustment of the whole controversy. Cæsar was strongly inclined to accede to this proposal.

He accordingly called Ptolemy into his presence, and, taking him kindly by the hand, informed him of the wishes of the people of Egypt, and gave him permission to go. Ptolemy, however, begged not to be sent away. He professed the strongest attachment to Cæsar, and the utmost confidence in him, and he very much preferred, he said, to remain under his protection. Cæsar replied that, if those were his sentiments, the separation would not be a lasting one. "If we part as friends," he said, "we shall soon meet again." By these and similar assurances he endeavored to encourage the young prince, and then sent him away. Ptolemy was received by the Egyptians with great joy, and was immediately placed at the head of the government. Instead, however, of endeavoring to promote a settlement of the quarrel with Cæsar, he seemed to enter into it now himself, personally, with the utmost ardor, and began at once to make the most extensive preparations both by sea and land for a vigorous prosecution of the war. What the result of these operations would have been can now not be known, for the general aspect of affairs was, soon after these transactions, totally changed by the occurrence of a new and very important event which suddenly intervened, and which turned the attention of all parties, both Egyptians and Romans, to the eastern quarter of the kingdom. The tidings arrived that a large army, under the command of a general named Mithradates, whom Cæsar had dispatched into Asia for this purpose, had suddenly appeared at Pelusium, had captured that city, and were now ready to march to Alexandria.

The Egyptian army immediately broke up its encampments in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and marched to the eastward to meet these new invaders. Cæsar followed them with all the forces that he could safely take away from the city. He left the city in the night and unobserved, and moved across the country with such celerity that he joined Mithradates before the forces of Ptolemy had arrived. After various marches and maneuvers, the armies met, and a great battle was fought. The Egyptians were defeated. Ptolemy's camp was taken. As the Roman army burst in upon one side of it, the guards and attendants of Ptolemy fled upon the other, clambering over the ramparts in the utmost terror and confusion. The foremost fell headlong into the ditch below, which was thus soon filled to the brim with the dead and the dying; while those who came behind pressed on over the bridge thus formed, trampling remorselessly, as they fled, on the bodies of their comrades, who lay writhing, struggling, and shrieking beneath their feet. Those who escaped reached the river. They crowded together into a boat which lay at the bank and pushed off from the shore. The boat was overloaded, and it sank as soon as it left the land. The Romans drew the bodies which floated to the shore up upon the bank again, and they found among them one, which, by the royal cuirass which was upon it, the customary badge and armor of the Egyptian kings, they knew to be the body of Ptolemy.

The victory which Cæsar obtained in this battle and the death of Ptolemy ended the war. Nothing now remained but for him to place himself at the head of the combined forces and march back to Alexandria. The Egyptian forces which had been left there made no

resistance, and he entered the city in triumph. He took Arsinoë prisoner. He decreed that Cleopatra should reign as queen, and that she should marry her youngest brother, the other Ptolemy--a boy at this time about eleven years of age. A marriage with one so young was, of course, a mere form. Cleopatra remained, as before, the companion of Cæsar.

Cæsar had, in the mean time, incurred great censure at Rome, and throughout the whole Roman world, for having thus turned aside from his own proper duties as the Roman consul, and the commander-in-chief of the armies of the empire, to embroil himself in the quarrels of a remote and secluded kingdom, with which the interests of the Roman commonwealth were so little connected. His friends and the authorities at Rome were continually urging him to return. They were especially indignant at his protracted neglect of his own proper duties, from knowing that he was held in Egypt by a guilty attachment to the queen--thus not only violating his obligations to the state, but likewise inflicting upon his wife Calpurnia, and his family at Rome, an intolerable wrong. But Cæsar was so fascinated by Cleopatra's charms, and by the mysterious and unaccountable influence which she exercised over him, that he paid no heed to any of these remonstrances. Even after the war was ended he remained some months in Egypt to enjoy his favorite's society. He would spend whole nights in her company, in feasting and revelry. He made a splendid royal progress with her through Egypt after the war was over, attended by a numerous train of Roman guards. He formed a plan for taking her to Rome, and marrying her there; and he took measures for having the laws of the city altered so as to enable him to do so, though he was already married.

All these things produced great discontent and disaffection among Cæsar's friends and throughout the Roman army. The Egyptians, too, strongly censured the conduct of Cleopatra. A son was born to her about this time, whom the Alexandrians named, from his father, Cæsarion. Cleopatra was regarded in the new relation of mother, which she now sustained, not with interest and sympathy, but with feelings of reproach and condemnation.

Cleopatra was all this time growing more and more accomplished and more and more beautiful; but her vivacity and spirit, which had been so charming while it was simple and childlike, now began to appear more forward and bold. It is the characteristic of pure and lawful love to soften and subdue the heart, and infuse a gentle and quiet spirit into all its action; while that which breaks over the barriers that God and nature have marked out for it, tends to make woman masculine and bold, to indurate all her sensibilities, and to destroy that gentleness and timidity of demeanor which have so great an influence in heightening her charms. Cleopatra was beginning to experience these effects. She was indifferent to the opinions of her subjects, and was only anxious to maintain as long as possible her guilty ascendency over Cæsar.

Cæsar, however, finally determined to set out on his return to the capital. Leaving Cleopatra, accordingly, a sufficient force to secure the continuance of her power, he embarked the remainder of his forces in his transports and galleys, and sailed away. He took the unhappy Arsinoë with him, intending to exhibit her as a trophy of his Egyptian victories on his arrival at Rome.

CHAPTER VIII.

CLEOPATRA A QUEEN.

The war by which Cæsar reinstated Cleopatra upon the throne was not one of very long duration. Cæsar arrived in Egypt in pursuit of Pompey about the 1st of August; the war was ended and Cleopatra established in secure possession by the end of January; so that the conflict, violent as it was while it continued, was very brief, the peaceful and commercial pursuits of the Alexandrians having been interrupted by it only for a few months.

Nor did either the war itself, or the derangements consequent upon it, extend very far into the interior of the country. The city of Alexandria itself and the neighboring coasts were the chief scenes of the contest until Mithradates arrived at Pelusium. He, it is true, marched across the Delta, and the final battle was fought in the interior of the country. It was, however, after all, but a very small portion of the Egyptian territory that was directly affected by the war. The great mass of the people, occupying the rich and fertile tracts which bordered the various branches of the Nile, and the long and verdant valley which extended so far into the heart of the continent, knew nothing of the conflict but by vague and distant rumors. The pursuits of the agricultural population went on, all the time, as steadily and prosperously as ever; so that when the conflict was ended, and Cleopatra entered upon the quiet and peaceful possession of her power, she found that the resources of her empire were very little impaired.

She availed herself, accordingly, of the revenues which poured in very abundantly upon her, to enter upon a career of the greatest luxury, magnificence, and splendor. The injuries which had been done to the palaces and other public edifices of Alexandria by the fire, and by the military operations of the siege, were repaired. The bridges which had been broken down were rebuilt. The canals

which had been obstructed were opened again. The sea-water was shut off from the palace cisterns; the rubbish of demolished houses was removed; the barricades were cleared from the streets; and the injuries which the palaces had suffered, either from the violence of military engines or the rough occupation of the Roman soldiery, were repaired. In a word, the city was speedily restored once more, so far as was possible, to its former order and beauty. The five hundred thousand manuscripts of the Alexandrian library, which had been burned, could not, indeed, be restored; but, in all other respects, the city soon resumed in appearance all its former splendor. Even in respect to the library, Cleopatra made an effort to retrieve the loss. She repaired the ruined buildings, and afterward, in the course of her life, she brought together, it was said, in a manner hereafter to be described, one or two hundred thousand rolls of manuscripts, as the commencement of a new collection. The new library, however, never acquired the fame and distinction that had pertained to the old.

The former sovereigns of Egypt, Cleopatra's ancestors, had generally, as has already been shown, devoted the immense revenues which they extorted from the agriculturalists of the valley of the Nile to purposes of ambition. Cleopatra seemed now disposed to expend them in luxury and pleasure. They, the Ptolemies, had employed their resources in erecting vast structures, or founding magnificent institutions at Alexandria, to add to the glory of the city, and to widen and extend their own fame. Cleopatra, on the other hand, as was, perhaps, naturally to be expected of a young, beautiful, and impulsive woman, suddenly raised to so conspicuous a position, and to the possession of such unbounded wealth and power, expended her royal revenues in plans of personal display, and in scenes of festivity, gayety, and enjoyment. She adorned her palaces, built magnificent barges for pleasure excursions on the Nile, and expended enormous sums for dress, for equipages, and for sumptuous entertainments. In fact, so lavish were her expenditures for these and similar purposes during the early years of her reign, that she is considered as having carried the extravagance of sensual luxury and personal display and splendor beyond the limits that had ever before or have ever since been attained.

Whatever of simplicity of character, and of gentleness and kindness of spirit she might have possessed in her earlier years, of course gradually disappeared under the influences of such a course of life as she now was leading. She was beautiful and fascinating still, but she began to grow selfish, heartless, and designing. Her little brother--he was but eleven years of age, it will be recollected, when Cæsar arranged the marriage between them--was an object of jealousy to her. He was now, of course, too young to take any actual share in the exercise of the royal power, or to interfere at all in his sister's plans or pleasures. But then he was growing older. In a few years he would be fifteen--which was the period of life fixed upon by Cæsar's arrangements, and, in fact, by the laws and usages of the Egyptian kingdom--when he was to come into possession of power as king, and as the husband of Cleopatra. Cleopatra was extremely unwilling that the change in her relations to him and to the government, which this period was to bring, should take place. Accordingly, just before the time arrived, she caused him to be poisoned. His death released her, as she had intended, from all restraints, and thereafter she continued to reign alone. During the remainder of her life, so far as the enjoyment of wealth and power, and of all other elements of external prosperity could go, Cleopatra's career was one of uninterrupted success. She had no conscientious scruples to interfere with the most full and unrestrained indulgence of every propensity of her heart, and the means of indulgence were before her in the most unlimited profusion. The only bar to her happiness was the impossibility of satisfying the impulses and passions of the human soul, when they once break over the bounds which the laws both of God and of nature ordain for restraining them.

In the mean time, while Cleopatra was spending the early years of her reign in all this luxury and splendor, Cæsar was pursuing his career, as the conqueror of the world, in the most successful manner. On the death of Pompey, he would naturally have succeeded at once to the enjoyment of the supreme power; but his delay in Egypt, and the extent to which it was known that he was entangled with Cleopatra, encouraged and strengthened his enemies in various parts of the world. In fact, a revolt which broke out in Asia Minor, and which it was absolutely necessary that he should proceed at once to quell, was the immediate cause of his leaving Egypt at last. Other plans for making head against Cæsar's power were formed in Spain, in Africa, and in Italy. His military skill and energy, however, were so great, and the ascendency which he exercised over the minds of men by his personal presence was so unbounded, and so astonishing, moreover, was the celerity with which he moved from continent to continent, and from kingdom to kingdom, that in a very short period from the time of his leaving Egypt, he had conducted most brilliant and successful campaigns in all the three quarters of the world then known, had put down effectually all opposition to his power, and then had returned to Rome the acknowledged master of the world. Cleopatra, who had, of course, watched his career during all this time with great pride and pleasure, concluded, at last, to go to Rome and make a visit to him there.

The people of Rome were, however, not prepared to receive her very cordially. It was an age in which vice of every kind was regarded with great indulgence, but the moral instincts of mankind were too strong to be wholly blinded to the true character of so

conspicuous an example of wickedness as this. Arsinoë was at Rome, too, during this period of Cæsar's life. He had brought her there, it will be recollected, on his return from Egypt, as a prisoner, and as a trophy of his victory. His design was, in fact, to reserve her as a captive to grace his _triumph_.

A triumph, according to the usages of the ancient Romans, was a grand celebration decreed by the senate to great military commanders of the highest rank, when they returned from distant campaigns in which they had made great conquests or gained extraordinary victories. Cæsar concentrated all his triumphs into one. They were celebrated on his return to Rome for the last time, after having completed the conquest of the world. The processions of this triumph occupied four days. In fact, there were four triumphs, one on each day for the four days. The wars and conquests which these ovations were intended to celebrate were those of Gaul, of Egypt, of Asia, and of Africa; and the processions on the several days consisted of endless trains of prisoners, trophies, arms, banners, pictures, images, convoys of wagons loaded with plunder, captive princes and princesses, animals, wild and tame, and every thing else which the conqueror had been able to bring home with him from his campaigns, to excite the curiosity or the admiration of the people of the city, and illustrate the magnitude of his exploits. Of course, the Roman generals, when engaged in distant foreign wars, were ambitious of bringing back as many distinguished captives and as much public plunder as they were able to obtain, in order to add to the variety and splendor of the triumphal procession by which their victories were to be honored on their return. It was with this view that Cæsar brought Arsinoë from Egypt; and he had retained her as his captive at Rome until his conquests were completed and the time for his triumph arrived. She, of course, formed a part of the triumphal train on the _Egyptian_ day. She walked immediately before the chariot in which Cæsar rode. She was in chains, like any other captive, though her chains, in honor of her lofty rank, were made of gold.

[Illustration: CLEOPATRA'S SISTER IN THE TRIUMPHAL PROCESSION.]

The effect, however, upon the Roman population of seeing the unhappy princess, overwhelmed as she was with sorrow and chagrin, as she moved slowly along in the train, among the other emblems and trophies of violence and plunder, proved to be by no means favorable to Cæsar. The populace were inclined to pity her, and to sympathize with her in her sufferings. The sight of her distress recalled, too, to their minds the dereliction from duty of which Cæsar had been guilty of in his yielding to the enticements of Cleopatra, and remaining so long in Egypt to the neglect of his proper duties as a Roman minister of state. In a word, the tide of admiration for Cæsar's military exploits which had been setting so strongly in his favor, seemed inclined to turn, and the city was filled with murmurs against him even in the midst of his triumphs.

In fact, the pride and vainglory which led Cæsar to make his triumphs more splendid and imposing than any former conqueror had ever enjoyed, caused him to overact his part so as to produce effects the reverse of his intentions. The case of Arsinoë was one example of this. Instead of impressing the people with a sense of the greatness of his exploits in Egypt, in deposing one queen and bringing her captive to Rome, in order that he might place another upon the throne in her stead, it only reproduced anew the censures and criminations which he had deserved by his actions there, but which, had it not been for the pitiable spectacle of Arsinoë in the train, might have been forgotten.

There were other examples of a similar character. There were the feasts, for instance. From the plunder which Cæsar had obtained in his various campaigns, he expended the most enormous sums in making feasts and spectacles for the populace at the time of his triumph. A large portion of the populace was pleased, it is true, with the boundless indulgences thus offered to them; but the better part of the Roman people were indignant at the waste and extravagance which were every where displayed. For many days the whole city of Rome presented to the view nothing but one wide-spread scene of riot and debauchery. The people, instead of being pleased with this abundance, said that Cæsar must have practiced the most extreme and lawless extortion to have obtained the vast amount of money necessary to enable him to supply such unbounded and reckless waste.

There was another way, too, by which Cæsar turned public opinion strongly against himself, by the very means which he adopted for creating a sentiment in his favor. The Romans, among the other barbarous amusements which were practiced in the city, were specially fond of combats. These combats were of various kinds. They were fought sometimes between ferocious beasts of the same or of different species, as dogs against each other, or against bulls, lions, or tigers. Any animals, in fact, were employed for this purpose, that could be teased or goaded into anger and ferocity in a fight. Sometimes men were employed in these combats--captive soldiers, that had been taken in war, and brought to Rome to fight in the amphitheaters there as gladiators. These men were compelled to contend sometimes with wild beasts, and sometimes with one another. Cæsar, knowing how highly the Roman assemblies enjoyed such scenes, determined to afford them the indulgence on a most magnificent scale, supposing, of course, that the greater and the more dreadful the fight, the higher would be the pleasure which the spectators would enjoy in

witnessing it. Accordingly, in making preparations for the festivities attending his triumph, he caused a large artificial lake to be formed at a convenient place in the vicinity of Rome, where it could be surrounded by the populace of the city, and there he made arrangements for a naval battle. A great number of galleys were introduced into the lake. They were of the usual size employed in war. These galleys were manned with numerous soldiers. Tyrian captives were put upon one side, and Egyptian upon the other; and when all was ready, the two squadrons were ordered to approach and fight a real naval battle for the amusement of the enormous throngs of spectators that were assembled around. As the nations from which the combatants in this conflict were respectively taken were hostile to each other, and as the men fought, of course, for their lives, the engagement was attended with the usual horrors of a desperate naval encounter. Hundreds were slain. The dead bodies of the combatants fell from the galleys into the lake, and the waters of it were dyed with their blood.

There were land combats, too, on the same grand scale. In one of them five hundred foot soldiers, twenty elephants, and a troop of thirty horse were engaged on each side. This combat, therefore, was an action greater, in respect to the number of the combatants, than the famous battle of Lexington, which marked the commencement of the American war; and in respect to the slaughter which took place, it was very probably ten times greater. The horror of these scenes proved to be too much even for the populace, fierce and merciless as it was, which they were intended to amuse. Cæsar, in his eagerness to outdo all former exhibitions and shows, went beyond the limits within which the seeing of men butchered in bloody combats and dying in agony and despair would serve for a pleasure and a pastime. The people were shocked; and condemnations of Cæsar's cruelty were added to the other suppressed reproaches and criminations which every where arose.

Cleopatra, during her visit to Rome, lived openly with Cæsar at his residence, and this excited very general displeasure. In fact, while the people pitied Arsinoë, Cleopatra, notwithstanding her beauty and her thousand personal accomplishments and charms, was an object of general displeasure, so far as public attention was turned toward her at all. The public mind was, however, much engrossed by the great political movements made by Cæsar and the ends toward which he seemed to be aiming. Men accused him of designing to be made a king. Parties were formed for and against him; and though men did not dare openly to utter their sentiments, their passions became the more violent in proportion to the external force by which they were suppressed. Mark Antony was at Rome at this time. He warmly espoused Cæsar's cause, and encouraged his design of making himself king. He once, in fact, offered to place a royal diadem upon Cæsar's head at some public celebration; but the marks of public disapprobation which the act elicited caused him to desist.

At length, however, the time arrived when Cæsar determined to cause himself to be proclaimed king. He took advantage of a certain remarkable conjuncture of public affairs, which can not here be particularly described, but which seemed to him specially to favor his designs, and arrangements were made for having him invested with the regal power by the senate. The murmurs and the discontent of the people at the indications that the time for the realization of their fears was drawing nigh, became more and more audible, and at length a conspiracy was formed to put an end to the danger by destroying the ambitious aspirant's life. Two stern and determined men, Brutus and Cassius, were the leaders of this conspiracy. They matured their plans, organized their band of associates, provided themselves secretly with arms, and when the senate convened, on the day in which the decisive vote was to have been passed, Cæsar himself presiding, they came up boldly around him in his presidential chair, and murdered him with their daggers.

Antony, from whom the plans of the conspirators had been kept profoundly secret, stood by, looking on stupefied and confounded while the deed was done, but utterly unable to render his friend any protection.

Cleopatra immediately fled from the city and returned to Egypt.

Arsinoë had gone away before. Cæsar, either taking pity on her misfortunes, or impelled, perhaps, by the force of public sentiment, which seemed inclined to take part with her against him, set her at liberty immediately after the ceremonies of his triumph were over. He would not, however, allow her to return into Egypt, for fear, probably, that she might in some way or other be the means of disturbing the government of Cleopatra. She proceeded, accordingly, into Syria, no longer as a captive, but still as an exile from her native land. We shall hereafter learn what became of her there.

Calpurnia mourned the death of her husband with sincere and unaffected grief. She bore the wrongs which she suffered as a wife with a very patient and unrepining spirit, and loved her husband with the most devoted attachment to the end. Nothing can be more affecting than the proofs of her tender and anxious regard on the night immediately preceding the assassination. There were certain slight and obscure indications of danger which her watchful devotion to her husband led her to observe, though they eluded

the notice of all Cæsar's other friends, and they filled her with apprehension and anxiety; and when at length the bloody body was brought home to her from the senate-house, she was overwhelmed with grief and despair.

She had no children. She accordingly looked upon Mark Antony as her nearest friend and protector, and in the confusion and terror which prevailed the next day in the city, she hastily packed together the money and other valuables contained in the house, and all her husband's books and papers, and sent them to Antony for safe keeping.

CHAPTER IX.

THE BATTLE OF PHILIPPI.

When the tidings of the assassination of Cæsar were first announced to the people of Rome, all ranks and classes of men were struck with amazement and consternation. No one knew what to say or do. A very large and influential portion of the community had been Cæsar's friends. It was equally certain that there was a very powerful interest opposed to him. No one could foresee which of these two parties would now carry the day, and, of course, for a time, all was uncertainty and indecision.

Mark Antony came forward at once, and assumed the position of Cæsar's representative and the leader of the party on that side. A will was found among Cæsar's effects, and when the will was opened it appeared that large sums of money were left to the Roman people, and other large amounts to a nephew of the deceased, named Octavius, who will be more particularly spoken of hereafter. Antony was named in the will as the executor of it. This and other circumstances seemed to authorize him to come forward as the head and the leader of the Cæsar party. Brutus and Cassius, who remained openly in the city after their desperate deed had been performed, were the acknowledged leaders of the other party; while the mass of the people were at first so astounded at the magnitude and suddenness of the revolution which the open and public assassination of a Roman emperor by a Roman senate denoted, that they knew not what to say or do. In fact, the killing of Julius Cæsar, considering the exalted position which he occupied, the rank and station of the men who perpetrated the deed, and the very extraordinary publicity of the scene in which the act was performed, was, doubtless, the most conspicuous and most appalling case of assassination that has ever occurred. The whole population of Rome seemed for some days to be amazed and stupefied by the tidings. At length, however, parties began to be more distinctly formed. The lines of demarkation between them were gradually drawn, and men began to arrange themselves more and more unequivocally on the opposite sides.

For a short time the supremacy of Antony over the Cæsar party was readily acquiesced in and allowed. At length, however, and before his arrangements were finally matured, he found that he had two formidable competitors upon his own side. These were Octavius and Lepidus.

Octavius, who was the nephew of Cæsar, already alluded to, was a very accomplished and elegant young man, now about nineteen years of age. He was the son of Julius Cæsar's niece.[6] He had always been a great favorite with his uncle. Every possible attention had been paid to his education, and he had been advanced by Cæsar, already, to positions of high importance in public life. Cæsar, in fact, adopted him as his son, and made him his heir. At the time of Cæsar's death he was at Apollonia, a city of Illyricum, north of Greece. The troops under his command there offered to march at once with him, if he wished it, to Rome, and avenge his uncle's death. Octavius, after some hesitation, concluded that it would be most prudent for him to proceed thither first himself, alone, as a private person, and demand his rights as his uncle's heir, according to the provisions of the will. He accordingly did so. He found, on his arrival, that the will, the property, the books and parchments, and the substantial power of the government, were all in Antony's hands. Antony, instead of putting Octavius into possession of his property and rights, found various pretexts for evasion and delay. Octavius was too young yet, he said, to assume such weighty responsibilities. He was himself also too much pressed with the urgency of public affairs to attend to the business of the will. With these and similar excuses as his justification, Antony seemed inclined to pay no regard whatever to Octavius's claims.

Octavius, young as he was, possessed a character that was marked with great intelligence, spirit, and resolution. He soon made many powerful friends in the city of Rome and among the Roman senate. It became a serious question whether he or Antony would gain the greatest ascendency in the party of Cæsar's friends. The contest for this ascendency was, in fact, protracted for two or three years, and led to a vast complication of intrigues, and maneuvers, and civil wars, which can not, however, be here particularly detailed.

The other competitor which Antony had to contend with was a distinguished Roman general named Lepidus. Lepidus was an officer of the army, in very high command at the time of Cæsar's death. He was present in the senate chamber on the day of the

assassination. He stole secretly away when he saw that the deed was done, and repaired to the camp of the army without the city and immediately assumed the command of the forces. This gave him great power, and in the course of the contests which subsequently ensued between Antony and Octavius, he took an active part, and held in some measure the balance between them. At length the contest was finally closed by a coalition of the three rivals. Finding that they could not either of them gain a decided victory over the others, they combined together, and formed the celebrated _triumvirate_, which continued afterward for some time to wield the supreme command in the Roman world. In forming this league of reconciliation, the three rivals held their conference on an island situated in one of the branches of the Po, in the north of Italy. They manifested extreme jealousy and suspicion of each other in coming to this interview. Two bridges were built leading to the island, one from each bank of the stream. The army of Antony was drawn up upon one side of the river, and that of Octavius upon the other. Lepidus went first to the island by one of the bridges. After examining the ground carefully, to make himself sure that it contained no ambuscade, he made a signal to the other generals, who then came over, each advancing by his own bridge, and accompanied by three hundred guards, who remained upon the bridge to secure a retreat for their master in case of treachery. The conference lasted three days, at the expiration of which time the articles were all agreed upon and signed.

This league being formed, the three confederates turned their united force against the party of the conspirators. Of this party Brutus and Cassius were still at the head.

The scene of the contests between Octavius, Antony, and Lepidus had been chiefly Italy and the other central countries of Europe. Brutus and Cassius, on the other hand, had gone across the Adriatic Sea into the East immediately after Cæsar's assassination. They were now in Asia Minor, and were employed in concentrating their forces, forming alliances with the various Eastern powers, raising troops, bringing over to their side the Roman legions which were stationed in that quarter of the world, seizing magazines, and exacting contributions from all who could be induced to favor their cause. Among other embassages which they sent, one went to Egypt to demand aid from Cleopatra. Cleopatra, however, was resolved to join the other side in the contest. It was natural that she should feel grateful to Cæsar for his efforts and sacrifices in her behalf, and that she should be inclined to favor the cause of his friends. Accordingly, instead of sending troops to aid Brutus and Cassius, as they had desired her to do, she immediately fitted out an expedition to proceed to the coast of Asia, with a view of rendering all the aid in her power to Antony's cause.

Cassius, on his part, finding that Cleopatra was determined on joining his enemies, immediately resolved on proceeding at once to Egypt and taking possession of the country. He also stationed a military force at Tænarus, the southern promontory of Greece, to watch for and intercept the fleet of Cleopatra as soon as it should appear on the European shores. All these plans, however--both those which Cleopatra formed against Cassius, and those which Cassius formed against her--failed of accomplishment. Cleopatra's fleet encountered a terrible storm, which dispersed and destroyed it. A small remnant was driven upon the coast of Africa, but nothing could be saved which could be made available for the purpose intended. As for Cassius's intended expedition to Egypt, it was not carried into effect. The dangers which began now to threaten him from the direction of Italy and Rome were so imminent, that, at Brutus's urgent request, he gave up the Egyptian plan, and the two generals concentrated their forces to meet the armies of the triumvirate which were now rapidly advancing to attack them. They passed for this purpose across the Hellespont from Sestos to Abydos, and entered Thrace.[7]

After various marches and countermarches, and a long succession of those maneuvers by which two powerful armies, approaching a contest, endeavor each to gain some position of advantage against the other, the various bodies of troops belonging, respectively, to the two powers, came into the vicinity of each other near Philippi. Brutus and Cassius arrived here first. There was a plain in the neighborhood of the city, with a rising ground in a certain portion of it. Brutus took possession of this elevation, and intrenched himself there. Cassius posted his forces about three miles distant, near the sea. There was a line of intrenchments between the two camps, which formed a chain of communication by which the positions of the two commanders were connected. The armies were thus very advantageously posted. They had the River Strymon and a marsh on the left of the ground that they occupied, while the plain was before them, and the sea behind. Here they awaited the arrival of their foes.

Antony, who was at this time at Amphipolis, a city not far distant from Philippi, learning that Brutus and Cassius had taken their positions in anticipation of an attack, advanced immediately and encamped upon the plain. Octavius was detained by sickness at the city of Dyrrachium, not very far distant. Antony waited for him. It was ten days before he came. At length he arrived, though in coming he had to be borne upon a litter, being still too sick to travel in any other way. Antony approached, and established his camp opposite to that of Cassius, near the sea, while Octavius took post opposite to Brutus. The four armies then paused, contemplating the probable results of the engagement that was about to ensue.

The forces on the two sides were nearly equal; but on the Republican side, that is, on the part of Brutus and Cassius, there was great inconvenience and suffering for want of a sufficient supply of provisions and stores. There was some difference of opinion between Brutus and Cassius in respect to what it was best for them to do. Brutus was inclined to give the enemy battle. Cassius was reluctant to do so, since, under the circumstances in which they were placed, he considered it unwise to hazard, as they necessarily must do, the whole success of their cause to the chances of a single battle. A council of war was convened, and the various officers were asked to give their opinions. In this conference, one of the officers having recommended to postpone the conflict to the next winter, Brutus asked him what advantage he hoped to attain by such delay. "If I gain nothing else," replied the officer, "I shall live so much the longer." This answer touched Cassius's pride and military sense of honor. Rather than concur in a counsel which was thus, on the part of one of its advocates at least, dictated by what he considered an inglorious love of life, he preferred to retract his opinion. It was agreed by the council that the army should maintain its ground and give the enemy battle. The officers then repaired to their respective camps.

Brutus was greatly pleased at this decision. To fight the battle had been his original desire, and as his counsels had prevailed, he was, of course, gratified with the prospect for the morrow. He arranged a sumptuous entertainment in his tent, and invited all the officers of his division of the army to sup with him. The party spent the night in convivial pleasures, and in mutual congratulations at the prospect of the victory which, as they believed, awaited them on the morrow. Brutus entertained his guests with brilliant conversation all the evening, and inspired them with his own confident anticipations of success in the conflict which was to ensue.

Cassius, on the other hand, in his camp by the sea, was silent and desponding. He supped privately with a few intimate friends. On rising from the table, he took one of his officers aside, and, pressing his hand, said to him that he felt great misgivings in respect to the result of the contest. "It is against my judgment," said he, "that we thus hazard the liberty of Rome on the event of one battle, fought under such circumstances as these. Whatever is the result, I wish you to bear me witness hereafter that I was forced into this measure by circumstances that I could not control. I suppose, however, that I ought to take courage, notwithstanding the reasons that I have for these gloomy forebodings. Let us, therefore, hope for the best; and come and sup with me again to-morrow night. To-morrow is my birth-day."

The next morning, the scarlet mantle--the customary signal displayed in Roman camps on the morning of a day of battle--was seen at the tops of the tents of the two commanding generals, waving there in the air like a banner. While the troops, in obedience to this signal, were preparing themselves for the conflict, the two generals went to meet each other at a point midway between their two encampments, for a final consultation and agreement in respect to the arrangements of the day. When this business was concluded, and they were about to separate, in order to proceed each to his own sphere of duty, Cassius asked Brutus what he intended to do in case the day should go against them. "We hope for the best," said he, "and pray that the gods may grant us the victory in this most momentous crisis. But we must remember that it is the greatest and the most momentous of human affairs that are always the most uncertain, and we can not foresee what is to-day to be the result of the battle. If it goes against us, what do you intend to do? Do you intend to escape, or to die?"

"When I was a young man," said Brutus, in reply, "and looked at this subject only as a question of theory, I thought it wrong for a man ever to take his own life. However great the evils that threatened him, and however desperate his condition, I considered it his duty to live, and to wait patiently for better times. But now, placed in the position in which I am, I see the subject in a different light. If we do not gain the battle this day, I shall consider all hope and possibility of saving our country forever gone, and I shall not leave the field of battle alive."

Cassius, in his despondency, had made the same resolution for himself before, and he was rejoiced to hear Brutus utter these sentiments. He grasped his colleague's hand with a countenance expressive of the greatest animation and pleasure, and bade him farewell, saying, "We will go out boldly to face the enemy. For we are certain either that we shall conquer them, or that we shall have nothing to fear from their victory over us."

Cassius's dejection, and the tendency of his mind to take a despairing view of the prospects of the cause in which he was engaged, were owing, in some measure, to certain unfavorable omens which he had observed. These omens, though really frivolous and wholly unworthy of attention, seem to have had great influence upon him, notwithstanding his general intelligence, and the remarkable strength and energy of his character. They were as follows:

In offering certain sacrifices, he was to wear, according to the usage prescribed on such occasions, a garland of flowers, and it happened that the officer who brought the garland, by mistake or accident, presented it wrong side before. Again, in some

procession which was formed, and in which a certain image of gold, made in honor of him, was borne, the bearer of it stumbled and fell, and the image was thrown upon the ground. This was a very dark presage of impending calamity. Then a great number of vultures and other birds of prey were seen, for a number of days before the battle, hovering over the Roman army; and several swarms of bees were found within the precincts of the camp. So alarming was this last indication, that the officers altered the line of the intrenchments so as to shut out the ill-omened spot from the camp. These and other such things had great influence upon the mind of Cassius, in convincing him that some great disaster was impending over him.

Nor was Brutus himself without warnings of this character, though they seem to have had less power to produce any serious impression upon his mind than in the case of Cassius. The most extraordinary warning which Brutus received, according to the story of his ancient historians, was by a supernatural apparition which he saw, some time before, while he was in Asia Minor. He was encamped near the city of Sardis at that time. He was always accustomed to sleep very little, and would often, it was said, when all his officers had retired, and the camp was still, sit alone in his tent, sometimes reading, and sometimes revolving the anxious cares which were always pressing upon his mind. One night he was thus alone in his tent, with a small lamp burning before him, sitting lost in thought, when he suddenly heard a movement as of some one entering the tent. He looked up, and saw a strange, unearthly, and monstrous shape, which appeared to have just entered the door and was coming toward him. The spirit gazed upon him as it advanced, but it did not speak.

Brutus, who was not much accustomed to fear, boldly demanded of the apparition who and what it was, and what had brought it there. "I am your evil spirit," said the apparition. "I shall meet you at Philippi." "Then, it seems," said Brutus, "that, at any rate, I shall see you again." The spirit made no reply to this, but immediately vanished.

Brutus arose, went to the door of his tent, summoned the sentinels, and awakened the soldiers that were sleeping near. The sentinels had seen nothing; and, after the most diligent search, no trace of the mysterious visitor could be found.

The next morning Brutus related to Cassius the occurrence which he had witnessed. Cassius, though very sensitive, it seems, to the influence of omens affecting himself, was quite philosophical in his views in respect to those of other men. He argued very rationally with Brutus to convince him that the vision which he had seen was only a phantom of sleep, taking its form and character from the ideas and images which the situation in which Brutus was then placed, and the fatigue and anxiety which he had endured, would naturally impress upon his mind.

But to return to the battle. Brutus fought against Octavius; while Cassius, two or three miles distant, encountered Antony, that having been, as will be recollected, the disposition of the respective armies and their encampments upon the plain. Brutus was triumphantly successful in his part of the field. His troops defeated the army of Octavius, and got possession of his camp. The men forced their way into Octavius's tent, and pierced the litter in which they supposed that the sick general was lying through and through with their spears. But the object of their desperate hostility was not there. He had been borne away by his guards a few minutes before, and no one knew what had become of him.

The result of the battle was, however, unfortunately for those whose adventures we are now more particularly following, very different in Cassius's part of the field. When Brutus, after completing the conquest of his own immediate foes, returned to his elevated camp, he looked toward the camp of Cassius, and was surprised to find that the tents had disappeared. Some of the officers around perceived weapons glancing and glittering in the sun in the place where Cassius's tents ought to appear. Brutus now suspected the truth, which was, that Cassius had been defeated, and his camp had fallen into the hands of the enemy. He immediately collected together as large a force as he could command, and marched to the relief of his colleague. He found him, at last, posted with a small body of guards and attendants upon the top of a small elevation to which he had fled for safety. Cassius saw the troop of horsemen which Brutus sent forward coming toward him, and supposed that it was a detachment from Antony's army advancing to capture him. He, however, sent a messenger forward to meet them, and ascertain whether they were friends or foes. The messenger, whose name was Titinius, rode down. The horsemen recognized Titinius, and, riding up eagerly around him, they dismounted from their horses to congratulate him on his safety, and to press him with inquiries in respect to the result of the battle and the fate of his master.

Cassius, seeing all this, but not seeing it very distinctly, supposed that the troop of horsemen were enemies, and that they had surrounded Titinius, and had cut him down or made him prisoner. He considered it certain, therefore, that all was now finally lost. Accordingly, in execution of a plan which he had previously formed, he called a servant, named Pindarus, whom he directed to follow him, and went into a tent which was near. When Brutus and his horsemen came up, they entered the tent. They found no

living person within; but the dead body of Cassius was there, the head being totally dissevered from it. Pindarus was never afterward to be found.

Brutus was overwhelmed with grief at the death of his colleague; he was also oppressed by it with a double burden of responsibility and care, since now the whole conduct of affairs devolved upon him alone. He found himself surrounded with difficulties which became more and more embarrassing every day. At length he was compelled to fight a second battle. The details of the contest itself we can not give, but the result of it was, that, notwithstanding the most unparalleled and desperate exertions made by Brutus to keep his men to the work, and to maintain his ground, his troops were borne down and overwhelmed by the irresistible onsets of his enemies, and his cause was irretrievably and hopelessly ruined.

When Brutus found that all was lost, he allowed himself to be conducted off the field by a small body of guards, who, in their retreat, broke through the ranks of the enemy on a side where they saw that they should meet with the least resistance. They were, however, pursued by a squadron of horse, the horsemen being eager to make Brutus a prisoner. In this emergency, one of Brutus's friends, named Lucilius, conceived the design of pretending to be Brutus, and, as such, surrendering himself a prisoner. This plan he carried into effect. When the troop came up, he called out for quarter, said that he was Brutus, and begged them to spare his life, and to take him to Antony. The men did so, rejoiced at having, as they imagined, secured so invaluable a prize.

In the mean time, the real Brutus pressed on to make his escape. He crossed a brook which came in his way, and entered into a little dell, which promised to afford a hiding-place, since it was encumbered with precipitous rocks and shaded with trees. A few friends and officers accompanied Brutus in his flight. Night soon came on, and he lay down in a little recess under a shelving rock, exhausted with fatigue and suffering. Then, raising his eyes to heaven, he imprecated, in lines quoted from a Greek poet, the just judgment of God upon the foes who were at that hour triumphing in what he considered the ruin of his country.

He then, in his anguish and despair, enumerated by name the several friends and companions whom he had seen fall that day in battle, mourning the loss of each with bitter grief. In the mean time, night was coming on, and the party, concealed thus in the wild dell, were destitute and unsheltered. Hungry and thirsty, and spent with fatigue as they were, there seemed to be no prospect for them of either rest or refreshment. Finally they sent one of their number to steal softly back to the rivulet which they had crossed in their retreat, to bring them some water. The soldier took his helmet to bring the water in, for want of any other vessel. While Brutus was drinking the water which they brought, a noise was heard in the opposite direction. Two of the officers were sent to ascertain the cause. They came back soon, reporting that there was a party of the enemy in that quarter. They asked where the water was which had been brought. Brutus told them that it had all been drank, but that he would send immediately for more. The messenger went accordingly to the brook again, but he came back very soon, wounded and bleeding, and reported that the enemy was close upon them on that side too, and that he had narrowly escaped with his life. The apprehensions of Brutus's party were greatly increased by these tidings: it was evident that all hope of being able to remain long concealed where they were must fast disappear.

One of the officers, named Statilius, then proposed to make the attempt to find his way out of the snare in which they had become involved. He would go, he said, as cautiously as possible, avoiding all parties of the enemy, and being favored by the darkness of the night, he hoped to find some way of retreat. If he succeeded, he would display a torch on a distant elevation which he designated, so that the party in the glen, on seeing the light, might be assured of his safety. He would then return and guide them all through the danger, by the way which he should have discovered.

This plan was approved, and Statilius accordingly departed. In due time the light was seen burning at the place which had been pointed out, and indicating that Statilius had accomplished his undertaking. Brutus and his party were greatly cheered by the new hope which this result awakened. They began to watch and listen for their messenger's return. They watched and waited long, but he did not come. On the way back he was intercepted and slain.

When at length all hope that he would return was finally abandoned, some of the party, in the course of the despairing consultations which the unhappy fugitives held with one another, said that they _must not_ remain any longer where they were, but must make their escape from that spot at all hazards. "Yes," said Brutus, "we must indeed make our escape from our present situation, but we must do it with our hands, and not with our feet." He meant by this that the only means now left to them to evade their enemies was self-destruction. When his friends understood that this was his meaning, and that he was resolved to put this design into execution in his own case, they were overwhelmed with sorrow. Brutus took them, one by one, by the hand and bade them farewell. He thanked them for their fidelity in adhering to his cause to the last, and said that it was a source of great comfort and satisfaction to

him that all his friends had proved so faithful and true. "I do not complain of my hard fate," he added, "so far as I myself am concerned. I mourn only for my unhappy country. As to myself, I think that my condition even now is better than that of my enemies; for, though I die, posterity will do me justice, and I shall enjoy forever the honor which virtue and integrity deserve; while they, though they live, live only to reap the bitter fruits of injustice and of tyranny.

"After I am gone," he continued, addressing his friends, as before, "think no longer of me, but take care of yourselves. Antony, I am sure, will be satisfied with Cassius's death and mine. He will not be disposed to pursue you vindictively any longer. Make peace with him on the best terms that you can."

Brutus then asked first one and then another of his friends to aid him in the last duty, as he seems to have considered it, of destroying his life; but one after another declared that they could not do any thing to assist him in carrying into effect so dreadful a determination. Finally, he took with him an old and long-tried friend named Strato, and went away a little, apart from the rest. Here he solicited once more the favor which had been refused him before--begging that Strato would hold out his sword. Strato still refused. Brutus then called one of his slaves. Upon this Strato declared that he would do any thing rather than that Brutus should die by the hand of a slave. He took the sword, and with his right hand held it extended in the air. With the left hand he covered his eyes, that he might not witness the horrible spectacle. Brutus rushed upon the point of the weapon with such fatal force that he fell and immediately expired.

Thus ended the great and famous battle of Philippi, celebrated in history as marking the termination of the great conflict between the friends and the enemies of Cæsar, which agitated the world so deeply after the conqueror's death. This battle established the ascendency of Antony, and made him for a time the most conspicuous man, as Cleopatra was the most conspicuous woman, in the world.

CHAPTER X.

CLEOPATRA AND ANTONY.

How far Cleopatra was influenced, in her determination to espouse the cause of Antony rather than that of Brutus and Cassius, in the civil war described in the last chapter, by gratitude to Cæsar, and how far, on the other hand, by personal interest in Antony, the reader must judge. Cleopatra had seen Antony, it will be recollected, some years before, during his visit to Egypt, when she was a young girl. She was doubtless well acquainted with his character. It was a character peculiarly fitted, in some respects, to captivate the imagination of a woman so ardent, and impulsive, and bold as Cleopatra was fast becoming.

Antony had, in fact, made himself an object of universal interest throughout the world, by his wild and eccentric manners and reckless conduct, and by the very extraordinary vicissitudes which had marked his career. In moral character he was as utterly abandoned and depraved as it was possible to be. In early life, as has already been stated, he plunged into such a course of dissipation and extravagance that he became utterly and hopelessly ruined; or, rather, he would have been so, had he not, by the influence of that magic power of fascination which such characters often possess, succeeded in gaining a great ascendency over a young man of immense fortune, named Curio, who for a time upheld him by becoming surety for his debts. This resource, however, soon failed, and Antony was compelled to abandon Rome, and to live for some years as a fugitive and exile, in dissolute wretchedness and want. During all the subsequent vicissitudes through which he passed in the course of his career, the same habits of lavish expenditure continued, whenever he had funds at his command. This trait in his character took the form sometimes of a noble generosity. In his campaigns, the plunder which he acquired he usually divided among his soldiers, reserving nothing for himself. This made his men enthusiastically devoted to him, and led them to consider his prodigality as a virtue, even when they did not themselves derive any direct advantage from it. A thousand stories were always in circulation in camp of acts on his part illustrating his reckless disregard of the value of money, some ludicrous, and all eccentric and strange.

In his personal habits, too, he was as different as possible from other men. He prided himself on being descended from Hercules, and he affected a style of dress and a general air and manner in accordance with the savage character of this his pretended ancestor. His features were sharp, his nose was arched and prominent, and he wore his hair and beard very long--as long, in fact, as he could make them grow. These peculiarities imparted to his countenance a very wild and ferocious expression. He adopted a style of dress, too, which, judged of with reference to the prevailing fashions of the time, gave to his whole appearance a rough, savage, and reckless air. His manner and demeanor corresponded with his dress and appearance. He lived in habits of the most unreserved familiarity with his soldiers. He associated freely with them, ate and drank with them in the open air, and joined in their

noisy mirth and rude and boisterous hilarity. His commanding powers of mind, and the desperate recklessness of his courage, enabled him to do all this without danger. These qualities inspired in the minds of the soldiers a feeling of profound respect for their commander; and this good opinion he was enabled to retain, notwithstanding such habits of familiarity with his inferiors as would have been fatal to the influence of an ordinary man.

In the most prosperous portion of Antony's career--for example, during the period immediately preceding the death of Cæsar--he addicted himself to vicious indulgences of the most open, public, and shameless character. He had around him a sort of court, formed of jesters, tumblers, mountebanks, play-actors, and other similar characters of the lowest and most disreputable class. Many of these companions were singing and dancing girls, very beautiful, and very highly accomplished in the arts of their respective professions, but all totally corrupt and depraved. Public sentiment, even in that age and nation, strongly condemned this conduct. The people were pagans, it is true, but it is a mistake to suppose that the formation of a moral sentiment in the community against such vices as these is a work which Christianity alone can perform. There is a law of nature, in the form of an instinct universal in the race, imperiously enjoining that the connection of the sexes shall consist of the union of one man with one woman, and that woman his wife, and very sternly prohibiting every other. So that there has probably never been a community in the world so corrupt, that a man could practice in it such vices as those of Antony, without not only violating his own sense of right and wrong, but also bringing upon himself the general condemnation of those around him.

Still, the world are prone to be very tolerant in respect to the vices of the great. Such exalted personages as Antony seem to be judged by a different standard from common men. Even in the countries where those who occupy high stations of trust or of power are actually selected, for the purpose of being placed there, by the voices of their fellow-men, all inquiry into the personal character of a candidate is often suppressed, such inquiry being condemned as wholly irrelevant and improper, and they who succeed in attaining to power enjoy immunities in their elevation which are denied to common men.

But, notwithstanding the influence of Antony's rank and power in shielding him from public censure, he carried his excesses to such an extreme that his conduct was very loudly and very generally condemned. He would spend all the night in carousals, and then, the next day, would appear in public, staggering in the streets. Sometimes he would enter the tribunals for the transaction of business when he was so intoxicated that it would be necessary for friends to come to his assistance to conduct him away. In some of his journeys in the neighborhood of Rome, he would take a troop of companions with him of the worst possible character, and travel with them openly and without shame. There was a certain actress, named Cytheride, whom he made his companion on one such occasion. She was borne upon a litter in his train, and he carried about with him a vast collection of gold and silver plate, and of splendid table furniture, together with an endless supply of luxurious articles of food and of wine, to provide for the entertainments and banquets which he was to celebrate with her on the journey. He would sometimes stop by the road side, pitch his tents, establish his kitchens, set his cooks at work to prepare a feast, spread his tables, and make a sumptuous banquet of the most costly, complete, and ceremonious character--all to make men wonder at the abundance and perfection of the means of luxury which he could carry with him wherever he might go. In fact, he always seemed to feel a special pleasure in doing strange and extraordinary things in order to excite surprise. Once on a journey he had lions harnessed to his carts to draw his baggage, in order to create a sensation.

Notwithstanding the heedlessness with which Antony abandoned himself to these luxurious pleasures when at Rome, no man could endure exposure and hardship better when in camp or on the field. In fact, he rushed with as much headlong precipitation into difficulty and danger when abroad, as into expense and dissipation when at home. During his contests with Octavius and Lepidus, after Cæsar's death, he once had occasion to pass the Alps, which, with his customary recklessness, he attempted to traverse without any proper supplies of stores or means of transportation. He was reduced, on the passage, together with the troops under his command, to the most extreme destitution and distress. They had to feed on roots and herbs, and finally on the bark of trees; and they barely preserved themselves, by these means, from actual starvation. Antony seemed, however, to care nothing for all this, but pressed on through the difficulty and danger, manifesting the same daring and determined unconcern to the end. In the same campaign he found himself at one time reduced to extreme destitution in respect to men. His troops had been gradually wasted away until his situation had become very desperate. He conceived, under these circumstances, the most extraordinary idea of going over alone to the camp of Lepidus and enticing away his rival's troops from under the very eyes of their commander. This bold design was successfully executed. Antony advanced alone, clothed in wretched garments, and with his matted hair and beard hanging about his breast and shoulders, up to Lepidus's lines. The men, who knew him well, received him with acclamations; and pitying the sad condition to which they saw that he was reduced, began to listen to what he had to say. Lepidus, who could not attack him, since he and Antony were not at that time in open hostility to each other, but were only rival

commanders in the same army, ordered the trumpeters to sound, in order to make a noise which should prevent the words of Antony from being heard. This interrupted the negotiation; but the men immediately disguised two of their number in female apparel, and sent them to Antony to make arrangements with him for putting themselves under his command, and offering, at the same time, to murder Lepidus, if he would but speak the word. Antony charged them to do Lepidus no injury. He, however, went over and took possession of the camp, and assumed the command of the army. He treated Lepidus himself, personally, with extreme politeness, and retained him as a subordinate under his command.

Not far from the time of Cæsar's death, Antony was married. The name of the lady was Fulvia. She was a widow at the time of her marriage with Antony, and was a woman of very marked and decided character. She had led a wild and irregular life previous to this time, but she conceived a very strong attachment to her new husband, and devoted herself to him from the time of her marriage with the most constant fidelity. She soon acquired a very great ascendency over him, and was the means of effecting a very considerable reform in his conduct and character. She was an ambitious and aspiring woman, and made many very efficient and successful efforts to promote the elevation and aggrandizement of her husband. She appeared, also, to take a great pride and pleasure in exercising over him, herself, a great personal control. She succeeded in these attempts in a manner that surprised every body. It seemed astonishing to all mankind that such a tiger as he had been could be subdued by any human power. Nor was it by gentleness and mildness that Fulvia gained such power over her husband. She was of a very stern and masculine character, and she seems to have mastered Antony by surpassing him in the use of his own weapons. In fact, instead of attempting to soothe and mollify him, she reduced him, it seems, to the necessity of resorting to various contrivances to soften and propitiate her. Once, for example, on his return from a campaign in which he had been exposed to great dangers, he disguised himself and came home at night in the garb of a courier bearing dispatches. He caused himself to be ushered, muffled and disguised as he was, into Fulvia's apartments, where he handed her some pretended letters, which, he said, were from her husband; and while Fulvia was opening them in great excitement and trepidation, he threw off his disguise, and revealed himself to her by clasping her in his arms and kissing her in the midst of her amazement.

Antony's marriage with Fulvia, besides being the means of reforming his morals in some degree, softened and civilized him in respect to his manners. His dress and appearance now assumed a different character. In fact, his political elevation after Cæsar's death soon became very exalted, and the various democratic arts by which he had sought to raise himself to it, being now no longer necessary, were, as usual in such cases, gradually discarded. He lived in great style and splendor when at Rome, and when absent from home, on his military campaigns, he began to exhibit the same pomp and parade in his equipage and in his arrangements as were usual in the camps of other Roman generals.

After the battle of Philippi, described in the last chapter, Antony--who, with all his faults, was sometimes a very generous foe--as soon as the tidings of Brutus's death were brought to him, repaired immediately to the spot, and appeared to be quite shocked and concerned at the sight of the body. He took off his own military cloak or mantle--which was a very magnificent and costly garment, being enriched with many expensive ornaments--and spread it over the corpse. He then gave directions to one of the officers of his household to make arrangements for funeral ceremonies of a very imposing character, as a testimony of his respect for the memory of the deceased. In these ceremonies it was the duty of the officer to have burned the military cloak which Antony had appropriated to the purpose of a pall, with the body. He did not, however, do so. The cloak being very valuable, he reserved it; and he withheld, also, a considerable part of the money which had been given him for the expenses of the funeral. He supposed that Antony would probably not inquire very closely into the details of the arrangements made for the funeral of his most inveterate enemy. Antony, however, did inquire into them, and when he learned what the officer had done, he ordered him to be killed.

The various political changes which occurred, and the movements which took place among the several armies after the battle of Philippi, can not be here detailed. It is sufficient to say that Antony proceeded to the eastward through Asia Minor, and in the course of the following year came into Cilicia. From this place he sent a messenger to Egypt to Cleopatra, summoning her to appear before him. There were charges, he said, against her, of having aided Cassius and Brutus in the late war instead of rendering assistance to him. Whether there really were any such charges, or whether they were only fabricated by Antony as pretexts for seeing Cleopatra, the fame of whose beauty was very widely extended, does not certainly appear. However this may be, he sent to summon the queen to come to him. The name of the messenger whom Antony dispatched on this errand was Dellius. Fulvia, Antony's wife, was not with him at this time. She had been left behind at Rome.

Dellius proceeded to Egypt and appeared at Cleopatra's court. The queen was at this time about twenty-eight years old, but more beautiful, as was said, than ever before. Dellius was very much struck with her beauty, and with a certain fascination in her voice and conversation, of which her ancient biographers often speak as one of the most irresistible of her charms. He told her that she

need have no fear of Antony. It was of no consequence, he said, what charges there might be against her. She would find that, in a very few days after she had entered into Antony's presence, she would be in great favor. She might rely, in fact, he said, on gaining, very speedily, an unbounded ascendency over the general. He advised her, therefore, to proceed to Cilicia without fear, and to present herself before Antony in as much pomp and magnificence as she could command. He would answer, he said, for the result.

Cleopatra determined to follow this advice. In fact, her ardent and impulsive imagination was fired with the idea of making, a second time, the conquest of the greatest general and highest potentate in the world. She began immediately to make provision for the voyage. She employed all the resources of her kingdom in procuring for herself the most magnificent means of display, such as expensive and splendid dresses, rich services of plate, ornaments of precious stones and of gold, and presents in great variety and of the most costly description for Antony. She appointed, also, a numerous retinue of attendants to accompany her, and, in a word, made all the arrangements complete for an expedition of the most imposing and magnificent character. While these preparations were going forward, she received new and frequent communications from Antony, urging her to hasten her departure; but she paid very little attention to them. It was evident that she felt quite independent, and was intending to take her own time.

At length, however, all was ready, and Cleopatra set sail. She crossed the Mediterranean Sea, and entered the mouth of the River Cydnus. Antony was at Tarsus, a city upon the Cydnus, a small distance above its mouth. When Cleopatra's fleet had entered the river, she embarked on board a most magnificent barge which she had constructed for the occasion, and had brought with her across the sea. This barge was the most magnificent and highly-ornamented vessel that had ever been built. It was adorned with carvings and decorations of the finest workmanship, and elaborately gilded. The sails were of purple, and the oars were inlaid and tipped with silver. Upon the deck of this barge Queen Cleopatra appeared, under a canopy of cloth of gold. She was dressed very magnificently in the costume in which Venus, the goddess of Beauty, was then generally represented. She was surrounded by a company of beautiful boys, who attended upon her in the form of Cupids, and fanned her with their wings, and by a group of young girls representing the Nymphs and the Graces. There was a band of musicians stationed upon the deck. This music guided the oarsmen, as they kept time to it in their rowing; and, soft as the melody was, the strains were heard far and wide over the water and along the shores, as the beautiful vessel advanced on its way. The performers were provided with flutes, lyres, viols, and all the other instruments customarily used in those times to produce music of a gentle and voluptuous kind.

In fact, the whole spectacle seemed like a vision of enchantment. Tidings of the approach of the barge spread rapidly around, and the people of the country came down in crowds to the shores of the river to gaze upon it in admiration as it glided slowly along. At the time of its arrival at Tarsus, Antony was engaged in giving a public audience at some tribunal in his palace, but every body ran to see Cleopatra and the barge, and the great triumvir was left consequently alone, or, at least, with only a few official attendants near him. Cleopatra, on arriving at the city, landed, and began to pitch her tents on the shores. Antony sent a messenger to bid her welcome, and to invite her to come and sup with him. She declined the invitation, saying that it was more proper that he should come and sup with her. She would accordingly expect him to come, she said, and her tents would be ready at the proper hour. Antony complied with her proposal, and came to her entertainment. He was received with a magnificence and splendor which amazed him. The tents and pavilions where the entertainment was made were illuminated with an immense number of lamps. These lamps were arranged in a very ingenious and beautiful manner, so as to produce an illumination of the most surprising brilliancy and beauty. The immense number and variety, too, of the meats and wines, and of the vessels of gold and silver, with which the tables were loaded, and the magnificence and splendor of the dresses worn by Cleopatra and her attendants, combined to render the whole scene one of bewildering enchantment.

[Illustration: THE ENTERTAINMENTS AT TARSUS.]

The next day, Antony invited Cleopatra to come and return his visit; but, though he made every possible effort to provide a banquet as sumptuous and as sumptuously served as hers, he failed entirely in this attempt, and acknowledged himself completely outdone. Antony was, moreover, at these interviews, perfectly fascinated with Cleopatra's charms. Her beauty, her wit, her thousand accomplishments, and, above all, the tact, and adroitness, and self-possession which she displayed in assuming at once so boldly, and carrying out so adroitly, the idea of her social superiority over him, that he yielded his heart almost immediately to her undisputed sway.

The first use which Cleopatra made of her power was to ask Antony, for her sake, to order her sister Arsinoë to be slain. Arsinoë had gone, it will be recollected, to Rome, to grace Cæsar's triumph there, and had afterward retired to Asia, where she was now living an exile. Cleopatra, either from a sentiment of past revenge, or else from some apprehensions of future danger, now desired

that her sister should die. Antony readily acceded to her request. He sent an officer in search of the unhappy princess. The officer slew her where he found her, within the precincts of a temple to which she had fled, supposing it a sanctuary which no degree of hostility, however extreme, would have dared to violate.

Cleopatra remained at Tarsus for some time, revolving in an incessant round of gayety and pleasure, and living in habits of unrestrained intimacy with Antony. She was accustomed to spend whole days and nights with him in feasting and revelry. The immense magnificence of these entertainments, especially on Cleopatra's part, were the wonder of the world. She seems to have taken special pleasure in exciting Antony's surprise by the display of her wealth and the boundless extravagance in which she indulged. At one of her banquets, Antony was expressing his astonishment at the vast number of gold cups, enriched with jewels, that were displayed on all sides. "Oh," said she, "they are nothing; if you like them, you shall have them all." So saying, she ordered her servants to carry them to Antony's house. The next day she invited Antony again, with a large number of the chief officers of his army and court. The table was spread with a new service of gold and silver vessels, more extensive and splendid than that of the preceding day; and at the close of the supper, when the company was about to depart, Cleopatra distributed all these treasures among the guests that had been present at the entertainment. At another of these feasts, she carried her ostentation and display to the astonishing extreme of taking off from one of her ear-rings a pearl of immense value and dissolving it in a cup of vinegar,[8] which she afterward made into a drink, such as was customarily used in those days, and then drank it. She was proceeding to do the same with the other pearl, when some of the company arrested the proceeding, and took the remaining pearl away.

In the mean time, while Antony was thus wasting his time in luxury and pleasure with Cleopatra, his public duties were neglected, and every thing was getting into confusion. Fulvia remained in Italy. Her position and her character gave her a commanding political influence, and she exerted herself in a very energetic manner to sustain, in that quarter of the world, the interests of her husband's cause. She was surrounded with difficulties and dangers, the details of which can not, however, be here particularly described. She wrote continually to Antony, urgently entreating him to come to Rome, and displaying in her letters all those marks of agitation and distress which a wife would naturally feel under the circumstances in which she was placed. The thought that her husband had been so completely drawn away from her by the guilty arts of such a woman, and led by her to abandon his wife and his family, and leave in neglect and confusion concerns of such momentous magnitude as those which demanded his attention at home, produced an excitement in her mind bordering upon phrensy. Antony was at length so far influenced by the urgency of the case that he determined to return. He broke up his quarters at Tarsus and moved south toward Tyre, which was a great naval port and station in those days. Cleopatra went with him. They were to separate at Tyre. She was to embark there for Egypt, and he for Rome.

At least that was Antony's plan, but it was not Cleopatra's. She had determined that Antony should go with her to Alexandria. As might have been expected, when the time came for the decision, the woman gained the day. Her flatteries, her arts, her caresses, her tears, prevailed. After a brief struggle between the sentiment of love on the one hand and those of ambition and of duty combined on the other, Antony gave up the contest. Abandoning every thing else, he surrendered himself wholly to Cleopatra's control, and went with her to Alexandria. He spent the winter there, giving himself up with her to every species of sensual indulgence that the most remorseless license could tolerate, and the most unbounded wealth procure.

There seemed, in fact, to be no bounds to the extravagance and infatuation which Antony displayed during the winter in Alexandria. Cleopatra devoted herself to him incessantly, day and night, filling up every moment of time with some new form of pleasure, in order that he might have no time to think of his absent wife, or to listen to the reproaches of his conscience. Antony, on his part, surrendered himself a willing victim to these wiles, and entered with all his heart into the thousand plans of gayety and merry-making which Cleopatra devised. They had each a separate establishment in the city, which was maintained at an enormous cost, and they made a regular arrangement by which each was the guest of the other on alternate days. These visits were spent in games, sports, spectacles, feasting, drinking, and in every species of riot, irregularity, and excess.

A curious instance is afforded of the accidental manner in which intelligence in respect to the scenes and incidents of private life in those ancient days is sometimes obtained, in a circumstance which occurred at this time at Antony's court. It seems that there was a young medical student at Alexandria that winter, named Philotas, who happened, in some way or other, to have formed an acquaintance with one of Antony's domestics, a cook. Under the guidance of this cook, Philotas went one day into the palace to see what was to be seen. The cook took his friend into the kitchens, where, to Philotas's great surprise, he saw, among an infinite number and variety of other preparations, eight wild boars roasting before the fires, some being more and some less advanced in the process. Philotas asked what great company was to dine there that day. The cook smiled at this question, and replied that there was to be no company at all, other than Antony's ordinary party. "But," said the cook, in explanation, "we are obliged always to prepare several suppers, and to have them ready in succession at different hours, for no one can tell at what time they will order the

entertainment to be served. Sometimes, when the supper has been actually carried in, Antony and Cleopatra will get engaged in some new turn of their diversions, and conclude not to sit down just then to the table, and so we have to take the supper away, and presently bring in another."

Antony had a son with him at Alexandria at this time, the child of his wife Fulvia. The name of the son, as well as that of the father, was Antony. He was old enough to feel some sense of shame at his father's dereliction from duty, and to manifest some respectful regard for the rights and the honor of his mother. Instead of this, however, he imitated his father's example, and, in his own way, was as reckless and as extravagant as he. The same Philotas who is above referred to was, after a time, appointed to some office or other in the young Antony's household, so that he was accustomed to sit at his table and share in his convivial enjoyments. He relates that once, while they were feasting together, there was a guest present, a physician, who was a very vain and conceited man, and so talkative that no one else had any opportunity to speak. All the pleasure of conversation was spoiled by his excessive garrulity. Philotas, however, at length puzzled him so completely with a question of logic--of a kind similar to those often discussed with great interest in ancient days--as to silence him for a time; and young Antony was so much delighted with this feat, that he gave Philotas all the gold and silver plate that there was upon the table, and sent all the articles home to him, after the entertainment was over, telling him to put his mark and stamp upon them, and lock them up.

The question with which Philotas puzzled the self-conceited physician was this. It must be premised, however, that in those days it was considered that cold water in an intermittent fever was extremely dangerous, except in some peculiar cases, and in those the effect was good. Philotas then argued as follows: "In cases of a certain kind it is best to give water to a patient in an ague. All cases of ague are cases of a certain kind. Therefore it is best in all cases to give the patient water." Philotas having propounded his argument in this way, challenged the physician to point out the fallacy of it; and while the physician sat perplexed and puzzled in his attempts to unravel the intricacy of it, the company enjoyed a temporary respite from his excessive loquacity.

Philotas adds, in his account of this affair, that he sent the gold and silver plate back to young Antony again, being afraid to keep them. Antony said that perhaps it was as well that this should be done, since many of the vessels were of great value on account of their rare and antique workmanship, and his father might possibly miss them and wish to know what had become of them.

As there were no limits, on the one hand, to the loftiness and grandeur of the pleasures to which Antony and Cleopatra addicted themselves, so there were none to the low and debasing tendencies which characterized them on the other. Sometimes, at midnight, after having been spending many hours in mirth and revelry in the palace, Antony would disguise himself in the dress of a slave, and sally forth into the streets, excited with wine, in search of adventures. In many cases, Cleopatra herself, similarly disguised, would go out with him. On these excursions Antony would take pleasure in involving himself in all sorts of difficulties and dangers--in street riots, drunken brawls, and desperate quarrels with the populace--all for Cleopatra's amusement and his own. Stories of these adventures would circulate afterward among the people, some of whom would admire the free and jovial character of their eccentric visitor, and others would despise him as a prince degrading himself to the level of a brute.

Some of the amusements and pleasures which Antony and Cleopatra pursued were innocent in themselves, though wholly unworthy to be made the serious business of life by personages on whom such exalted duties rightfully devolved. They made various excursions upon the Nile, and arranged parties of pleasure to go out on the water in the harbor, and to various rural retreats in the environs of the city. Once they went out on a fishing-party, in boats, in the port. Antony was unsuccessful; and feeling chagrined that Cleopatra should witness his ill luck, he made a secret arrangement with some of the fishermen to dive down, where they could do so unobserved, and fasten fishes to his hook under the water. By this plan he caught very large and fine fish very fast. Cleopatra, however, was too wary to be easily deceived by such a stratagem as this. She observed the maneuver, but pretended not to observe it; she expressed, on the other hand, the greatest surprise and delight at Antony's good luck, and the extraordinary skill which it indicated.

The next day she wished to go a fishing again, and a party was accordingly made as on the day before. She had, however, secretly instructed another fisherman to procure a dried and salted fish from the market, and, watching his opportunity, to get down into the water under the boats and attach it to the hook, before Antony's divers could get there. This plan succeeded, and Antony, in the midst of a large and gay party that were looking on, pulled out an excellent fish, cured and dried, such as was known to every one as an imported article, bought in the market. It was a fish of a kind that was brought originally from Asia Minor. The boats, and the water all around them, resounded with the shouts of merriment and laughter which this incident occasioned.

* * * * *

In the mean time, while Antony was thus spending his time in low and ignoble pursuits and in guilty pleasures at Alexandria, his wife Fulvia, after exhausting all other means of inducing her husband to return to her, became desperate, and took measures for fomenting an open war, which she thought would compel him to return. The extraordinary energy, influence, and talent which Fulvia possessed, enabled her to do this in an effectual manner. She organized an army, formed a camp, placed herself at the head of the troops, and sent such tidings to Antony of the dangers which threatened his cause as greatly alarmed him. At the same time news came of great disasters in Asia Minor, and of alarming insurrections among the provinces which had been committed to his charge there. Antony saw that he must arouse himself from the spell which had enchanted him and break away from Cleopatra, or that he would be wholly and irretrievably ruined. He made, accordingly, a desperate effort to get free. He bade the queen farewell, embarked hastily in a fleet of galleys, and sailed away to Tyre, leaving Cleopatra in her palace, vexed, disappointed, and chagrined.

CHAPTER XI.

THE BATTLE OF ACTIUM.

Cleopatra, in parting with Antony as described in the last chapter, lost him for two or three years. During this time Antony himself was involved in a great variety of difficulties and dangers, and passed through many eventful scenes, which, however, can not here be described in detail. His life, during this period, was full of vicissitude and excitement, and was spent probably in alternations of remorse for the past and anxiety for the future. On landing at Tyre, he was at first extremely perplexed whether to go to Asia Minor or to Rome. His presence was imperiously demanded in both places. The war which Fulvia had fomented was caused, in part, by the rivalry of Octavius, and the collision of his interests with those of her husband. Antony was very angry with her for having managed his affairs in such a way as to bring about a war. After a time Antony and Fulvia met at Athens. Fulvia had retreated to that city, and was very seriously sick there, either from bodily disease, or from the influence of long-continued anxiety, vexation, and distress. They had a stormy meeting. Neither party was disposed to exercise any mercy toward the other. Antony left his wife rudely and roughly, after loading her with reproaches. A short time afterward, she sank down in sorrow to the grave.

The death of Fulvia was an event which proved to be of advantage to Antony. It opened the way to a reconciliation between him and Octavius. Fulvia had been extremely active in opposing Octavius's designs, and in organizing plans for resisting him. He felt, therefore, a special hostility against her, and, through her, against Antony. Now, however, that she was dead, the way seemed to be in some sense opened for a reconciliation.

Octavius had a sister, Octavia, who had been the wife of a Roman general named Marcellus. She was a very beautiful and a very accomplished woman, and of a spirit very different from that of Fulvia. She was gentle, affectionate, and kind, a lover of peace and harmony, and not at all disposed, like Fulvia, to assert and maintain her influence over others by an overbearing and violent demeanor. Octavia's husband died about this time, and, in the course of the movements and negotiations between Antony and Octavius, the plan was proposed of a marriage between Antony and Octavia, which, it was thought, would ratify and confirm the reconciliation. This proposal was finally agreed upon. Antony was glad to find so easy a mode of settling his difficulties. The people of Rome, too, and the authorities there, knowing that the peace of the world depended upon the terms on which these two men stood with regard to each other, were extremely desirous that this arrangement should be carried into effect. There was a law of the commonwealth forbidding the marriage of a widow within a specified period after the death of her husband. That period had not, in Octavia's case, yet expired. There was, however, so strong a desire that no obstacle should be allowed to prevent this proposed union, or even to occasion delay, that the law was altered expressly for this case, and Antony and Octavia were married. The empire was divided between Octavius and Antony, Octavius receiving the western portion as his share, while the eastern was assigned to Antony.

It is not probable that Antony felt any very strong affection for his new wife, beautiful and gentle as she was. A man, in fact, who had led such a life as his had been, must have become by this time incapable of any strong and pure attachment. He, however, was pleased with the novelty of his acquisition, and seemed to forget for a time the loss of Cleopatra. He remained with Octavia a year. After that he went away on certain military enterprises which kept him some time from her. He returned again, and again he went away. All this time Octavia's influence over him and over her brother was of the most salutary and excellent character. She soothed their animosities, quieted their suspicions and jealousies, and at one time, when they were on the brink of open war, she effected a reconciliation between them by the most courageous and energetic, and at the same time, gentle and unassuming efforts. At the time of this danger she was with her husband in Greece; but she persuaded him to send her to her brother at Rome,

saying that she was confident that she could arrange a settlement of the difficulties impending. Antony allowed her to go. She proceeded to Rome, and procured an interview with her brother in the presence of his two principal officers of state. Here she pleaded her husband's cause with tears in her eyes; she defended his conduct, explained what seemed to be against him, and entreated her brother not to take such a course as should cast her down from being the happiest of women to being the most miserable. "Consider the circumstances of my case," said she. "The eyes of the world are upon me. Of the two most powerful men in the world, I am the wife of one and the sister of another. If you allow rash counsels to go on and war to ensue, I am hopelessly ruined; for, whichever is conquered, my husband or my brother, my own happiness will be for ever gone."

Octavius sincerely loved his sister, and he was so far softened by her entreaties that he consented to appoint an interview with Antony in order to see if their difficulties could be settled. This interview was accordingly held. The two generals came to a river, where, at the opposite banks, each embarked in a boat, and, being rowed out toward each other, they met in the middle of the stream. A conference ensued, at which all the questions at issue were, for a time at least, very happily arranged.

Antony, however, after a time, began to become tired of his wife, and to sigh for Cleopatra once more. He left Octavia at Rome and proceeded to the eastward, under pretense of attending to the affairs of that portion of the empire; but, instead of doing this, he went to Alexandria, and there renewed again his former intimacy with the Egyptian queen.

Octavius was very indignant at this. His former hostility to Antony, which had been in a measure appeased by the kind influence of Octavia, now broke forth anew, and was heightened by the feeling of resentment naturally awakened by his sister's wrongs. Public sentiment in Rome, too, was setting very strongly against Antony. Lampoons were written against him to ridicule him and Cleopatra, and the most decided censures were passed upon his conduct. Octavia was universally beloved, and the sympathy which was every where felt for her increased and heightened very much the popular indignation which was felt against the man who could wrong so deeply such sweetness, and gentleness, and affectionate fidelity as hers.

After remaining for some time in Alexandria, and renewing his connection and intimacy with Cleopatra, Antony went away again, crossing the sea into Asia, with the intention of prosecuting certain military undertakings there which imperiously demanded his attention. His plan was to return as soon as possible to Egypt after the object of his expedition should be accomplished. He found, however, that he could not bear even a temporary absence from Cleopatra. His mind dwelled so much upon her, and upon the pleasures which he had enjoyed with her in Egypt, and he longed so much to see her again, that he was wholly unfit for the discharge of his duties in the camp. He became timid, inefficient, and remiss, and almost every thing that he undertook ended disastrously. The army, who understood perfectly well the reason of their commander's remissness and consequent ill fortune, were extremely indignant at his conduct, and the camp was filled with suppressed murmurs and complaints. Antony, however, like other persons in his situation, was blind to all these indications of dissatisfaction; probably he would have disregarded them if he had observed them. At length, finding that he could bear his absence from his mistress no longer, he set out to march across the country, in the depth of the winter, to the sea-shore, to a point where he had sent for Cleopatra to come to join him. The army endured incredible hardships and exposures in this march. When Antony had once commenced the journey, he was so impatient to get forward that he compelled his troops to advance with a rapidity greater than their strength would bear. They were, besides, not provided with proper tents or with proper supplies of provision. They were often obliged, therefore, after a long and fatiguing march during the day, to bivouac at night in the open air among the mountains, with scanty means of appeasing their hunger, and very little shelter from the cold rain, or from the storms of driving snow. Eight thousand men died on this march, from cold, fatigue, and exposure; a greater sacrifice, perhaps, than had ever been made before to the mere ardor and impatience of a lover.

When Antony reached the shore, he advanced to a certain sea-port, near Sidon, where Cleopatra was to land. At the time of his arrival but a small part of his army was left, and the few men that survived were in a miserably destitute condition. Antony's eagerness to see Cleopatra became more and more excited as the time drew nigh. She did not come so soon as he had expected, and during the delay he seemed to pine away under the influence of love and sorrow. He was silent, absent-minded, and sad. He had no thoughts for any thing but the coming of Cleopatra, and felt no interest in any other plans. He watched for her incessantly, and would sometimes leave his place at the table, in the midst of the supper, and go down alone to the shore, where he would stand gazing out upon the sea, and saying mournfully to himself, "Why does not she come?" The animosity and the ridicule which these things awakened against him, on the part of the army, were extreme; but he was so utterly infatuated that he disregarded all the manifestations of public sentiment around him, and continued to allow his mind to be wholly engrossed with the single idea of Cleopatra's coming.

She arrived at last. She brought a great supply of clothes and other necessaries for the use of Antony's army, so that her coming not only gratified his love, but afforded him, also, a very essential relief, in respect to the military difficulties in which he was involved.

After some time spent in the enjoyment of the pleasure which being thus reunited to Cleopatra afforded him, Antony began again to think of the affairs of his government, which every month more and more imperiously demanded his attention. He began to receive urgent calls from various quarters, urging him to action. In the mean time, Octavia--who had been all this while waiting in distress and anxiety at Rome, hearing continually the most gloomy accounts of her husband's affairs, and the most humiliating tidings in respect to his infatuated devotion to Cleopatra--resolved to make one more effort to save him. She interceded with her brother to allow her to raise troops and to collect supplies, and then proceed to the eastward to re-enforce him. Octavius consented to this. He, in fact, assisted Octavia in making her preparations. It is said, however, that he was influenced in this plan by his confident belief that this noble attempt of his sister to reclaim her husband would fail, and that, by the failure of it, Antony would be put in the wrong, in the estimation of the Roman people, more absolutely and hopelessly than ever, and that the way would thus be prepared for his complete and final destruction.

Octavia was rejoiced to obtain her brother's aid to her undertaking, whatever the motive might be which induced him to afford it. She accordingly levied a considerable body of troops, raised a large sum of money, provided clothes, and tents, and military stores for the army; and when all was ready, she left Italy and put to sea, having previously dispatched a messenger to her husband to inform him that she was coming.

Cleopatra began now to be afraid that she was to lose Antony again, and she at once began to resort to the usual artifices employed in such cases, in order to retain her power over him. She said nothing, but assumed the appearance of one pining under the influence of some secret suffering or sorrow. She contrived to be often surprised in tears. In such cases she would hastily brush her tears away, and assume a countenance of smiles and good humor, as if making every effort to be happy, though really oppressed with a heavy burden of anxiety and grief. When Antony was near her she would seem overjoyed at his presence, and gaze upon him with an expression of the most devoted fondness. When absent from him, she spent her time alone, always silent and dejected, and often in tears; and she took care that the secret sorrows and sufferings that she endured should be duly made known to Antony, and that he should understand that they were all occasioned by her love for him, and by the danger which she apprehended that he was about to leave her.

The friends and secret agents of Cleopatra, who reported these things to Antony, made, moreover, direct representations to him, for the purpose of inclining his mind in her favor. They had, in fact, the astonishing audacity to argue that Cleopatra's claims upon Antony for a continuance of his love were paramount to those of Octavia. She, that is, Octavia, had been his wife, they said, only for a very short time. Cleopatra had been most devotedly attached to him for many years. Octavia was married to him, they alleged, not under the impulse of love, but from political considerations alone, to please her brother, and to ratify and confirm a political league made with him. Cleopatra, on the other hand, had given herself up to him in the most absolute and unconditional manner, under the influence solely of a personal affection which she could not control. She had surrendered and sacrificed every thing to him. For him she had lost her good name, alienated the affections of her subjects, made herself the object of reproach and censure to all mankind, and now she had left her native land to come and join him in his adverse fortunes. Considering how much she had done, and suffered, and sacrificed for his sake, it would be extreme and unjustifiable cruelty in him to forsake her now. She never would survive such an abandonment. Her whole soul was so wrapped up in him, that she would pine away and die if he were now to forsake her.

Antony was distressed and agitated beyond measure by the entanglements in which he found that he was involved. His duty, his inclination perhaps, certainly his ambition, and every dictate of prudence and policy, required that he should break away from these snares at once and go to meet Octavia. But the spell that bound him was too mighty to be dissolved. He yielded to Cleopatra's sorrows and tears. He dispatched a messenger to Octavia, who had by this time reached Athens, in Greece, directing her not to come any farther. Octavia, who seemed incapable of resentment or anger against her husband, sent back to ask what she should do with the troops, and money, and the military stores which she was bringing. Antony directed her to leave them in Greece. Octavia did so, and mournfully returned to her home.

As soon as she arrived at Rome, Octavius, her brother, whose indignation was now thoroughly aroused at the baseness of Antony, sent to his sister to say that she must leave Antony's house and come to him. A proper self-respect, he said, forbade her remaining any longer under the roof of such a man. Octavia replied that she would not leave her husband's house. That house was her post of

duty, whatever her husband might do, and there she would remain. She accordingly retired within the precincts of her old home, and devoted herself in patient and uncomplaining sorrow to the care of the family and the children. Among these children was one young son of Antony's, born during his marriage with her predecessor Fulvia. In the mean time, while Octavia was thus faithfully though mournfully fulfilling her duties as wife and mother, in her husband's house at Rome, Antony himself had gone with Cleopatra to Alexandria, and was abandoning himself once more to a life of guilty pleasure there. The greatness of mind which this beautiful and devoted wife thus displayed, attracted the admiration of all mankind. It produced, however, one other effect, which Octavia must have greatly deprecated. It aroused a strong and universal feeling of indignation against the unworthy object toward whom this extraordinary magnanimity was displayed.

In the mean time, Antony gave himself up wholly to Cleopatra's influence and control, and managed all the affairs of the Roman empire in the East in the way best fitted to promote her aggrandizement and honor. He made Alexandria his capital, celebrated triumphs there, arranged ostentatious expeditions into Asia and Syria with Cleopatra and her train, gave her whole provinces as presents, and exalted her two sons, Alexander and Ptolemy, children born during the period of his first acquaintance with her, to positions of the highest rank and station, as his own acknowledged sons. The consequences of these and similar measures at Rome were fatal to Antony's character and standing. Octavius reported every thing to the Roman senate and people, and made Antony's misgovernment and his various misdemeanors the ground of the heaviest accusations against him. Antony, hearing of these things, sent his agents to Rome and made accusations against Octavius; but these counter accusations were of no avail. Public sentiment was very strong and decided against him at the capital, and Octavius began to prepare for war.

Antony perceived that he must prepare to defend himself. Cleopatra entered into the plans which he formed for this purpose with great ardor. Antony began to levy troops, and collect and equip galleys and ships of war, and to make requisitions of money and military stores from all the eastern provinces and kingdoms. Cleopatra put all the resources of Egypt at his disposal. She furnished him with immense sums of money, and with an inexhaustible supply of corn, which she procured for this purpose from her dominions in the valley of the Nile. The various divisions of the immense armament which was thus provided for were ordered to rendezvous at Ephesus, where Antony and Cleopatra were awaiting to receive them, having proceeded there when their arrangements in Egypt were completed, and they were ready to commence the campaign.

When all was ready for the expedition to set sail from Ephesus, it was Antony's judgment that it would be best for Cleopatra to return to Egypt, and leave him to go forth with the fleet to meet Octavius alone. Cleopatra was, however, determined not to go away. She did not dare to leave Antony at all to himself, for fear that in some way or other a peace would be effected between himself and Octavius, which would result in his returning to Octavia and abandoning _her_. She accordingly contrived to persuade Antony to retain her with him, by bribing his chief counselor to advise him to do so. His counselor's name was Canidius. Canidius, having received Cleopatra's money, while yet he pretended to be wholly disinterested in his advice, represented to Antony that it would not be reasonable to send Cleopatra away, and deprive her of all participation in the glory of the war, when she was defraying so large a part of the expense of it. Besides, a large portion of the army consisted of Egyptian troops, who would feel discouraged and disheartened if Cleopatra were to leave them, and would probably act far less efficiently in the conflict than they would do if animated by the presence of their queen. Then, moreover, such a woman as Cleopatra was not to be considered, as many women would be, an embarrassment and a source of care to a military expedition which she might join, but a very efficient counselor and aid to it. She was, he said, a very sagacious, energetic, and powerful queen, accustomed to the command of armies and to the management of affairs of state, and her aid in the conduct of the expedition might be expected to conduce very materially to its success.

Antony was easily won by such persuasions as these, and it was at length decided that Cleopatra should accompany him.

Antony then ordered the fleet to move forward to the island of Samos.[9] Here it was brought to anchor and remained for some time, waiting for the coming in of new re-enforcements, and for the completion of the other arrangements. Antony, as if becoming more and more infatuated as he approached the brink of his ruin, spent his time while the expedition remained at Samos, not in maturing his plans and perfecting his arrangements for the tremendous conflict which was approaching, but in festivities, games, revelings, and every species of riot and dissolute excess. This, however, is not surprising. Men almost always, when in a situation analogous to his, fly to similar means of protecting themselves, in some small degree, from the pangs of remorse, and from the forebodings which stand ready to terrify and torment them at every instant in which these gloomy specters are not driven away by intoxication and revelry. At least Antony found it so. Accordingly, an immense company of players, tumblers, fools, jesters, and mountebanks were ordered to assemble at Samos, and to devote themselves with all zeal to the amusement of Antony's court. The island was one universal scene of riot and revelry. People were astonished at such celebrations and displays, wholly unsuitable, as

they considered them, to the occasion. If such are the rejoicings, said they, which Antony celebrates before going into the battle, what festivities will he contrive on his return, joyous enough to express his pleasure if he shall gain the victory?

After a time, Antony and Cleopatra, with a magnificent train of attendants, left Samos, and, passing across the Ægean Sea, landed in Greece, and advanced to Athens; while the fleet, proceeding westward from Samos, passed around Tænarus, the southern promontory of Greece, and then moved northward along the western coast of the peninsula. Cleopatra wished to go to Athens for a special reason. It was there that Octavia had stopped on her journey toward her husband with re-enforcements and aid; and while she was there, the people of Athens, pitying her sad condition, and admiring the noble spirit of mind which she displayed in her misfortunes, had paid her great attention, and during her stay among them had bestowed upon her many honors. Cleopatra now wished to go to the same place, and to triumph over her rival there, by making so great a display of her wealth and magnificence, and of her ascendency over the mind of Antony, as should entirely transcend and outshine the more unassuming pretensions of Octavia. She was not willing, it seems, to leave to the unhappy wife whom she had so cruelly wronged even the possession of a place in the hearts of the people of this foreign city, but must go and enviously strive to efface the impression which injured innocence had made, by an ostentatious exhibition of the triumphant prosperity of her own shameless wickedness. She succeeded well in her plans. The people of Athens were amazed and bewildered at the immense magnificence that Cleopatra exhibited before them. She distributed vast sums of money among the people. The city, in return, decreed to her the most exalted honors. They sent a solemn embassy to her to present her with these decrees. Antony himself, in the character of a citizen of Athens, was one of the embassadors. Cleopatra received the deputation at her palace. The reception was attended with the most splendid and imposing ceremonies.

One would have supposed that Cleopatra's cruel and unnatural hostility to Octavia might now have been satisfied; but it was not. Antony, while he was at Athens, and doubtless at Cleopatra's instigation, sent a messenger to Rome with a notice of divorcement to Octavia, and with an order that she should leave his house. Octavia obeyed. She went forth from her home, taking the children with her, and bitterly lamenting her cruel destiny.

In the mean time, while all these events had been transpiring in the East, Octavius had been making his preparations for the coming crisis, and was now advancing with a powerful fleet across the sea. He was armed with authority from the Roman senate and people, for he had obtained from them a decree deposing Antony from his power. The charges made against him all related to misdemeanors and offenses arising out of his connection with Cleopatra. Octavius contrived to get possession of a will which Antony had written before leaving Rome, and which he had placed there in what he supposed a very sacred place of deposit. The custodians who had it in charge replied to Octavius, when he demanded it, that they would not give it to him, but if he wished to take it they would not hinder him. Octavius then took the will, and read it to the Roman senate. It provided, among other things, that at his death, if his death should happen at Rome, his body should be sent to Alexandria to be given to Cleopatra; and it evinced in other ways a degree of subserviency and devotedness to the Egyptian queen which was considered wholly unworthy of a Roman chief magistrate. Antony was accused, too, of having plundered cities and provinces to make presents to Cleopatra; of having sent a library of two hundred thousand volumes to her from Pergamus, to replace the one which Julius Cæsar had accidentally burned; of having raised her sons, ignoble as their birth was, to high places of trust and power in the Roman government, and of having in many ways compromised the dignity of a Roman officer by his unworthy conduct in reference to her. He used, for example, when presiding at a judicial tribunal, to receive love-letters sent him from Cleopatra, and then at once turn off his attention from the proceedings going forward before him to read the letters.[10] Sometimes he did this when sitting in the chair of state, giving audience to embassadors and princes. Cleopatra probably sent these letters in at such times under the influence of a wanton disposition to show her power. At one time, as Octavius said in his arguments before the Roman senate, Antony was hearing a cause of the greatest importance, and during a time in the progress of the cause when one of the principal orators of the city was addressing him, Cleopatra came passing by, when Antony suddenly arose, and, leaving the court without any ceremony, ran out to follow her. These and a thousand similar tales exhibited Antony in so odious a light, that his friends forsook his cause, and his enemies gained a complete triumph. The decree was passed against him, and Octavius was authorized to carry it into effect; and accordingly, while Antony, with his fleet and army, was moving westward from Samos and the Ægean Sea, Octavius was coming eastward and southward down the Adriatic to meet him.

In process of time, after various maneuvers and delays, the two armaments came into the vicinity of each other at a place called Actium, which will be found upon the map on the western coast of Epirus, north of Greece. Both of the commanders had powerful fleets at sea, and both had great armies upon the land. Antony was strongest in land troops, but his fleet was inferior to that of Octavius, and he was himself inclined to remain on the land and fight the principal battle there. But Cleopatra would not consent to

this. She urged him to give Octavius battle at sea. The motive which induced her to do this has been supposed to be her wish to provide a more sure way of escape in case of an unfavorable issue to the conflict. She thought that in her galleys she could make sail at once across the sea to Alexandria in case of defeat, whereas she knew not what would become of her if beaten at the head of an army on the land. The ablest counselors and chief officers in the army urged Antony very strongly not to trust himself to the sea. To all their arguments and remonstrances, however, Antony turned a deaf ear. Cleopatra must be allowed to have her way.

On the morning of the battle, when the ships were drawn up in array, Cleopatra held the command of a division of fifty or sixty Egyptian vessels, which were all completely manned, and well equipped with masts and sails. She took good care to have every thing in perfect order for flight, in case flight should prove to be necessary. With these ships she took a station in reserve, and for a time remained there a quiet witness of the battle. The ships of Octavius advanced to the attack of those of Antony, and the men fought from deck to deck with spears, boarding-pikes, flaming darts, and every other destructive missile which the military art had then devised. Antony's ships had to contend against great disadvantages. They were not only outnumbered by those of Octavius, but were far surpassed by them in the efficiency with which they were manned and armed. Still, it was a very obstinate conflict. Cleopatra, however, did not wait to see how it was to be finally decided. As Antony's forces did not immediately gain the victory, she soon began to yield to her fears in respect to the result, and, finally, fell into a panic and resolved to fly. She ordered the oars to be manned and the sails to be hoisted, and then forcing her way through a portion of the fleet that was engaged in the contest, and throwing the vessels into confusion as she passed, she succeeded in getting to sea, and then pressed on, under full sail, down the coast to the southward. Antony, as soon as he perceived that she was going, abandoning every other thought, and impelled by his insane devotedness to her, hastily called up a galley of five banks of oars, and, leaping on board of it, ordered the oarsmen to pull with all their force after Cleopatra's flying squadron.

Cleopatra, looking back from the deck of her vessel, saw this swift galley pressing on toward her. She raised a signal at the stern of the vessel which she was in, that Antony might know for which of the fifty flying ships he was to steer. Guided by the signal, Antony came up to the vessel, and the sailors hoisted him up the side and helped him in. Cleopatra had, however, disappeared. Overcome with shame and confusion, she did not dare, it seems, to meet the look of the wretched victim of her arts whom she had now irretrievably ruined. Antony did not seek her. He did not speak a word. He went forward to the prow of the ship, and, throwing himself down there alone, pressed his head between his hands, and seemed stunned and stupefied, and utterly overwhelmed with horror and despair.

He was, however, soon aroused from his stupor by an alarm raised on board his galley that they were pursued. He rose from his seat, seized a spear, and, on ascending to the quarter-deck, saw that there were a number of small light boats, full of men and of arms, coming up behind them, and gaining rapidly upon his galley. Antony, now free for a moment from his enchantress's sway, and acting under the impulse of his own indomitable boldness and decision, instead of urging the oarsmen to press forward more rapidly in order to make good their escape, ordered the helm to be put about, and thus, turning the galley around, he faced his pursuers, and drove his ship into the midst of them. A violent conflict ensued, the din and confusion of which was increased by the shocks and collisions between the boats and the galley. In the end, the boats were beaten off, all excepting one: that one kept still hovering near, and the commander of it, who stood upon the deck, poising his spear with an aim at Antony, and seeking eagerly an opportunity to throw it, seemed by his attitude and the expression of his countenance to be animated by some peculiarly bitter feeling of hostility and hate. Antony asked him who he was, that dared so fiercely to threaten _him_. The man replied by giving his name, and saying that he came to avenge the death of his father. It proved that he was the son of a man whom Antony had at a previous time, on some account or other, caused to be beheaded.

There followed an obstinate contest between Antony and this fierce assailant, in the end of which the latter was beaten off. The boats then, having succeeded in making some prizes from Antony's fleet, though they had failed in capturing Antony himself, gave up the pursuit and returned. Antony then went back to his place, sat down in the prow, buried his face in his hands, and sank into the same condition of hopeless distress and anguish as before.

When husband and wife are overwhelmed with misfortune and suffering, each instinctively seeks a refuge in the sympathy and support of the other. It is, however, far otherwise with such connections as that of Antony and Cleopatra. Conscience, which remains calm and quiet in prosperity and sunshine, rises up with sudden and unexpected violence as soon as the hour of calamity comes; and thus, instead of mutual comfort and help, each finds in the thoughts of the other only the means of adding the horrors of remorse to the anguish of disappointment and despair. So extreme was Antony's distress, that for three days he and Cleopatra neither saw nor spoke to each other. She was overwhelmed with confusion and chagrin, and he was in such a condition of mental excitement that she did not dare to approach him. In a word, reason seemed to have wholly lost its sway--his mind, in the

alternations of his insanity, rising sometimes to fearful excitement, in paroxysms of uncontrollable rage, and then sinking again for a time into the stupor of despair.

In the mean time, the ships were passing down as rapidly as possible on the western coast of Greece. When they reached Tænarus, the southern promontory of the peninsula, it was necessary to pause and consider what was to be done. Cleopatra's women went to Antony and attempted to quiet and calm him. They brought him food. They persuaded him to see Cleopatra. A great number of merchant ships from the ports along the coast gathered around Antony's little fleet and offered their services. His cause, they said, was by no means desperate. The army on the land had not been beaten. It was not even certain that his fleet had been conquered. They endeavored thus to revive the ruined commander's sinking courage, and to urge him to make a new effort to retrieve his fortunes. But all was in vain. Antony was sunk in a hopeless despondency. Cleopatra was determined on going to Egypt, and he must go too. He distributed what treasure remained at his disposal among his immediate followers and friends, and gave them advice about the means of concealing themselves until they could make peace with Octavius. Then, giving up all as lost, he followed Cleopatra across the sea to Alexandria.

CHAPTER XII.

THE END OF CLEOPATRA.

The case of Mark Antony affords one of the most extraordinary examples of the power of unlawful love to lead its deluded and infatuated victim into the very jaws of open and recognized destruction that history records. Cases similar in character occur by thousands in common life; but Antony's, though perhaps not more striking in itself than a great multitude of others have been, is the most conspicuous instance that has ever been held up to the observation of mankind.

In early life, Antony was remarkable, as we have already seen, for a certain savage ruggedness of character, and for a stern and indomitable recklessness of will, so great that it seemed impossible that any thing human should be able to tame him. He was under the control, too, of an ambition so lofty and aspiring that it appeared to know no bounds; and yet we find him taken possession of, in the very midst of his career, and in the height of his prosperity and success, by a woman, and so subdued by her arts and fascinations as to yield himself wholly to her guidance, and allow himself to be led about by her entirely at her will. She displaces whatever there might have been that was noble and generous in his heart, and substitutes therefor her own principles of malice and cruelty. She extinguishes all the fires of his ambition, originally so magnificent in its aims that the world seemed hardly large enough to afford it scope, and instead of this lofty passion, fills his soul with a love of the lowest, vilest, and most ignoble pleasures. She leads him to betray every public trust, to alienate from himself all the affections of his countrymen, to repel most cruelly the kindness and devotedness of a beautiful and faithful wife, and, finally, to expel this wife and all of his own legitimate family from his house; and now, at last, she conducts him away in a most cowardly and ignoble flight from the field of his duty as a soldier--he knowing, all the time, that she is hurrying him to disgrace and destruction, and yet utterly without power to break from the control of his invisible chains.

* * * * *

The indignation which Antony's base abandonment of his fleet and army at the battle of Actium excited, over all that part of the empire which had been under his command, was extreme. There was not the slightest possible excuse for such a flight. His army, in which his greatest strength lay, remained unharmed, and even his fleet was not defeated. The ships continued the combat until night, notwithstanding the betrayal of their cause by their commander. They were at length, however, subdued. The army, also, being discouraged, and losing all motive for resistance, yielded too. In a very short time the whole country went over to Octavius's side.

In the mean time, Cleopatra and Antony, on their first return to Egypt, were completely beside themselves with terror. Cleopatra formed a plan for having all the treasures that she could save, and a certain number of galleys sufficient for the transportation of these treasures and a small company of friends, carried across the isthmus of Suez and launched upon the Red Sea, in order that she might escape in that direction, and find some remote hiding-place and safe retreat on the shores of Arabia or India, beyond the reach of Octavius's dreaded power. She actually commenced this undertaking, and sent one or two of her galleys across the isthmus; but the Arabs seized them as soon as they reached their place of destination, and killed or captured the men that had them in charge, so that this desperate scheme was soon abandoned. She and Antony then finally concluded to establish themselves at Alexandria, and made preparation, as well as they could, for defending themselves against Octavius there.

Antony, when the first effects of his panic subsided, began to grow mad with vexation and resentment against all mankind. He determined that he would have nothing to do with Cleopatra or with any of her friends, but went off in a fit of sullen rage, and built a hermitage in a lonely place on the island of Pharos, where he lived for a time, cursing his folly and his wretched fate, and uttering the bitterest invectives against all who had been concerned in it. Here tidings came continually in, informing him of the defection of one after another of his armies, of the fall of his provinces in Greece and Asia Minor, and of the irresistible progress which Octavius was now making toward universal dominion. The tidings of these disasters coming incessantly upon him kept him in a continual fever of resentment and rage.

At last he became tired of his misanthropic solitude, a sort of reconciliation ensued between himself and Cleopatra, and he went back again to the city. Here he joined himself once more to Cleopatra, and, collecting together what remained of their joint resources, they plunged again into a life of dissipation and vice, with the vain attempt to drown in mirth and wine the bitter regrets and the anxious forebodings which filled their souls. They joined with them a company of revelers as abandoned as themselves, and strove very hard to disguise and conceal their cares in their forced and unnatural gayety. They could not, however, accomplish this purpose. Octavius was gradually advancing in his progress, and they knew very well that the time of his dreadful reckoning with them must soon come; nor was there any place on earth in which they could look with any hope of finding a refuge in it from his vindictive hostility.

Cleopatra, warned by dreadful presentiments of what would probably at last be her fate, amused herself in studying the nature of poisons--not theoretically, but practically--making experiments with them on wretched prisoners and captives whom she compelled to take them, in order that she and Antony might see the effects which they produced. She made a collection of all the poisons which she could procure, and administered portions of them all, that she might see which were sudden and which were slow in their effects, and also learn which produced the greatest distress and suffering, and which, on the other hand, only benumbed and stupefied the faculties, and thus extinguished life with the least infliction of pain. These experiments were not confined to such vegetable and mineral poisons as could be mingled with the food or administered in a potion. Cleopatra took an equal interest in the effects of the bite of venomous serpents and reptiles. She procured specimens of all these animals, and tried them upon her prisoners, causing the men to be stung and bitten by them, and then watching the effects. These investigations were made, not directly with a view to any practical use which she was to make of the knowledge thus acquired, but rather as an agreeable occupation, to divert her mind, and to amuse Antony and her guests. The variety in the forms and expressions which the agony of her poisoned victims assumed--their writhings, their cries, their convulsions, and the distortions of their features when struggling with death, furnished exactly the kind and degree of excitement which she needed to occupy and amuse her mind.

Antony was not entirely at ease, however, during the progress of these terrible experiments. His foolish and childish fondness for Cleopatra was mingled with jealousy, suspicion, and distrust; and he was so afraid that Cleopatra might secretly poison him, that he would never take any food or wine without requiring that she should taste it before him. At length, one day, Cleopatra caused the petals of some flowers to be poisoned, and then had the flowers woven into the chaplet which Antony was to wear at supper. In the midst of the feast, she pulled off the leaves of the flowers from her own chaplet and put them playfully into her wine, and then proposed that Antony should do the same with his chaplet, and that they should then drink the wine, tinctured, as it would be, with the color and the perfume of the flowers. Antony entered very readily into this proposal, and when he was about to drink the wine, she arrested his hand, and told him that it was poisoned. "You see now," said she, "how vain it is for you to watch against me. If it were possible for me to live without you, how easy it would be for me to devise ways and means to kill you." Then, to prove that her words were true, she ordered one of the servants to drink Antony's wine. He did so, and died before their sight in dreadful agony.

The experiments which Cleopatra thus made on the nature and effects of poison were not, however, wholly without practical result. Cleopatra learned from them, it is said, that the bite of the asp was the easiest and least painful mode of death. The effect of the venom of that animal appeared to her to be the lulling of the sensorium into a lethargy or stupor, which soon ended in death, without the intervention of pain. This knowledge she seems to have laid up in her mind for future use.

The thoughts of Cleopatra appear, in fact, to have been much disposed, at this time, to flow in gloomy channels, for she occupied herself a great deal in building for herself a sepulchral monument in a certain sacred portion of the city. This monument had, in fact, been commenced many years ago, in accordance with a custom prevailing among Egyptian sovereigns, of expending a portion of their revenues during their life-time in building and decorating their own tombs. Cleopatra now turned her mind with new interest to her own mausoleum. She finished it, provided it with the strongest possible bolts and bars, and, in a word, seemed to be preparing it in all respects for occupation.

In the mean time, Octavius, having made himself master of all the countries which had formerly been under Antony's sway, now advanced, meeting none to oppose him, from Asia Minor into Syria, and from Syria toward Egypt. Antony and Cleopatra made one attempt, while he was thus advancing toward Alexandria, to avert the storm which was impending over them, by sending an embassage to ask for some terms of peace. Antony proposed, in this embassage, to give up every thing to his conqueror on condition that he might be permitted to retire unmolested with Cleopatra to Athens, and allowed to spend the remainder of their days there in peace; and that the kingdom of Egypt might descend to their children. Octavius replied that he could not make any terms with Antony, though he was willing to consent to any thing that was reasonable in behalf of Cleopatra. The messenger who came back from Octavius with this reply spent some time in private interviews with Cleopatra. This aroused Antony's jealousy and anger. He accordingly ordered the unfortunate messenger to be scourged and then sent back to Octavius, all lacerated with wounds, with orders to say to Octavius that if it displeased him to have one of his servants thus punished, he might revenge himself by scourging a servant of Antony's, who was then, as it happened, in Octavius's power.

The news at length suddenly arrived at Alexandria that Octavius had appeared before Pelusium, and that the city had fallen into his hands. The next thing Antony and Cleopatra well knew would be, that they should see him at the gates of Alexandria. Neither Antony nor Cleopatra had any means of resisting his progress, and there was no place to which they could fly. Nothing was to be done but to await, in consternation and terror, the sure and inevitable doom which was now so near.

Cleopatra gathered together all her treasures and sent them to her tomb. These treasures consisted of great and valuable stores of gold, silver, precious stones, garments of the highest cost, and weapons, and vessels of exquisite workmanship and great value, the hereditary possessions of the Egyptian kings. She also sent to the mausoleum an immense quantity of flax, tow, torches, and other combustibles. These she stored in the lower apartments of the monument, with the desperate determination of burning herself and her treasures together rather than to fall into the hands of the Romans.

In the mean time, the army of Octavius steadily continued its march across the desert from Pelusium to Alexandria. On the way, Octavius learned, through the agents in communication with him from within the city, what were the arrangements which Cleopatra had made for the destruction of her treasure whenever the danger should become imminent of its falling into his hands. He was extremely unwilling that this treasure should be lost. Besides its intrinsic value, it was an object of immense importance to him to get possession of it for the purpose of carrying it to Rome as a trophy of his triumph. He accordingly sent secret messengers to Cleopatra, endeavoring to separate her from Antony, and to amuse her mind with the profession that he felt only friendship for her, and did not mean to do her any injury, being in pursuit of Antony only. These negotiations were continued from day to day while Octavius was advancing. At last the Roman army reached Alexandria, and invested it on every side.

As soon as Octavius was established in his camp under the walls of the city, Antony planned a sally, and he executed it, in fact, with considerable energy and success. He issued suddenly from the gates, at the head of as strong a force as he could command, and attacked a body of Octavius's horsemen. He succeeded in driving these horsemen away from their position, but he was soon driven back in his turn, and compelled to retreat to the city, fighting as he fled, to beat back his pursuers. He was extremely elated at the success of this skirmish. He came to Cleopatra with a countenance full of animation and pleasure, took her in his arms and kissed her, all accoutered for battle as he was, and boasted greatly of the exploit which he had performed. He praised, too, in the highest terms, the valor of one of the officers who had gone out with him to the fight, and whom he had now brought to the palace to present to Cleopatra. Cleopatra rewarded the faithful captain's prowess with a magnificent suit of armor made of gold. Notwithstanding this reward, however, the man deserted Antony that very night, and went over to the enemy. Almost all of Antony's adherents were in the same state of mind. They would have gladly gone over to the camp of Octavius, if they could have found an opportunity to do so.

In fact, when the final battle was fought, the fate of it was decided by a grand defection in the fleet, which went over in a body to the side of Octavius. Antony was planning the operations of the day, and reconnoitering the movements of the enemy from an eminence which he occupied at the head of a body of foot soldiers--all the land forces that now remained to him--and looking off from the eminence on which he stood toward the harbor, he observed a movement among the galleys. They were going out to meet the ships of Octavius, which were lying at anchor not very far from them. Antony supposed that his vessels were going to attack those of the enemy, and he looked to see what exploits they would perform. They advanced toward Octavius's ships, and when they met them, Antony observed, to his utter amazement, that, instead of the furious combat that he had expected to see, the ships only exchanged friendly salutations, by the use of the customary naval signals; and then his ships, passing quietly round, took their positions in the lines of the other fleet. The two fleets had thus become merged and mingled into one.

Antony immediately decided that this was Cleopatra's treason. She had made peace with Octavius, he thought, and surrendered the fleet to him as one of the conditions of it. Antony ran through the city, crying out that he was betrayed, and in a phrensy of rage sought the palace. Cleopatra fled to her tomb. She took in with her one or two attendants, and bolted and barred the doors, securing the fastenings with the heavy catches and springs that she had previously made ready. She then directed her women to call out through the door that she had killed herself within the tomb.

The tidings of her death were borne to Antony. It changed his anger to grief and despair. His mind, in fact, was now wholly lost to all balance and control, and it passed from the dominion of one stormy passion to another with the most capricious facility. He cried out with the most bitter expressions of sorrow, mourning, he said, not so much Cleopatra's death, for he should soon follow and join her, as the fact that she had proved herself so superior to him in courage at last, in having thus anticipated him in the work of self-destruction.

He was at this time in one of the chambers of the palace, whither he had fled in his despair, and was standing by a fire, for the morning was cold. He had a favorite servant named Eros, whom he greatly trusted, and whom he had made to take an oath long before, that whenever it should become necessary for him to die, Eros should kill him. This Eros he now called to him, and telling him that the time was come, ordered him to take the sword and strike the blow.

Eros took the sword while Antony stood up before him. Eros turned his head aside as if wishing that his eyes should not see the deed which his hands were about to perform. Instead, however, of piercing his master with it, he plunged it into his own breast, fell down at Antony's feet, and died.

Antony gazed a moment at the shocking spectacle, and then said, "I thank thee for this, noble Eros. Thou hast set me an example. I must do for myself what thou couldst not do for me." So saying, he took the sword from his servant's hands, plunged it into his body, and staggering to a little bed that was near, fell over upon it in a swoon. He had received a mortal wound.

The pressure, however, which was produced by the position in which he lay upon the bed, stanched the wound a little and stopped the flow of blood. Antony came presently to himself again, and then began to beg and implore those around him to take the sword and put him out of his misery. But no one would do it. He lay for a time suffering great pain, and moaning incessantly, until, at length, an officer came into the apartment and told him that the story which he had heard of Cleopatra's death was not true; that she was still alive, shut up in her monument, and that she desired to see him there. This intelligence was the source of new excitement and agitation. Antony implored the by-standers to carry him to Cleopatra, that he might see her once more before he died. They shrank from the attempt; but, after some hesitation and delay, they concluded to undertake to remove him. So, taking him in their arms, they bore him along, faint and dying, and marking their track with his blood, toward the tomb.

Cleopatra would not open the gates to let the party in. The city was all in uproar and confusion through the terror of the assault which Octavius was making upon it, and she did not know what treachery might be intended. She therefore went up to a window above, and letting down ropes and chains, she directed those below to fasten the dying body to them, that she and the two women with her might draw it up. This was done. Those who witnessed it said that it was a most piteous sight to behold--Cleopatra and her women above exhausting their strength in drawing the wounded and bleeding sufferer up the wall, while he, when he approached the window, feebly raised his arms to them, that they might lift him in. The women had hardly strength sufficient to draw the body up. At one time it seemed that the attempt would have to be abandoned; but Cleopatra reached down from the window as far as she could to get hold of Antony's arms, and thus, by dint of great effort, they succeeded at last in taking him in. They bore him to a couch which was in the upper room from which the window opened, and laid him down, while Cleopatra wrung her hands, and tore her hair, and uttered the most piercing lamentations and cries. She leaned over the dying Antony, crying out incessantly with the most piteous exclamations of grief. She bathed his face, which was covered with blood, and vainly endeavored to stanch his wound.

Antony urged her to be calm, and not to mourn his fate. He asked for some wine. They brought it to him, and he drank it. He then entreated Cleopatra to save her life, if she possibly could do so, and to make some terms or other with Octavius, so as to continue to live. Very soon after this he expired.

[Illustration: THE RAISING OF ANTONY TO THE UPPER WINDOW OF THE TOMB]

In the mean time, Octavius had heard of the mortal wound which Antony had given himself; for one of the by-standers had seized the sword the moment that the deed was done, and had hastened to carry it to Octavius, and to announce to him the death of his

enemy. Octavius immediately desired to get Cleopatra into his power. He sent a messenger, therefore, to the tomb, who attempted to open a parley there with her. Cleopatra talked with the messenger through the keyholes or crevices, but could not be induced to open the door. The messenger reported these facts to Octavius. Octavius then sent another man with the messenger, and while one was engaging the attention of Cleopatra and her women at the door below, the other obtained ladders, and succeeded in gaining admission into the window above. Cleopatra was warned of the success of this stratagem by the shriek of her woman, who saw the officer coming down the stairs. She looked around, and observing at a glance that she was betrayed, and that the officer was coming to seize her, she drew a little dagger from her robe, and was about to plunge it into her breast, when the officer grasped her arm just in time to prevent the blow. He took the dagger from her, and then examined her clothes to see that there were no other secret weapons concealed there.

The capture of the queen being reported to Octavius, he appointed an officer to take her into close custody. This officer was charged to treat her with all possible courtesy, but to keep a close and constant watch over her, and particularly to guard against allowing her any possible means or opportunity for self-destruction.

In the mean time, Octavius took formal possession of the city, marching in at the head of his troops with the most imposing pomp and parade. A chair of state, magnificently decorated, was set up for him on a high elevation in a public square; and here he sat, with circles of guards around him, while the people of the city, assembled before him in the dress of suppliants, and kneeling upon the pavement, begged his forgiveness, and implored him to spare the city. These petitions the great conqueror graciously condescended to grant.

Many of the princes and generals who had served under Antony came next to beg the body of their commander, that they might give it an honorable burial. These requests, however, Octavius would not accede to, saying that he could not take the body away from Cleopatra. He, however, gave Cleopatra leave to make such arrangements for the obsequies as she thought fit, and allowed her to appropriate such sums of money from her treasures for this purpose as she desired. Cleopatra accordingly made the necessary arrangements, and superintended the execution of them; not, however, with any degree of calmness and composure, but in a state, on the contrary, of extreme agitation and distress. In fact, she had been living now so long under the unlimited and unrestrained dominion of caprice and passion, that reason was pretty effectually dethroned, and all self-control was gone. She was now nearly forty years of age, and, though traces of her inexpressible beauty remained, her bloom was faded, and her countenance was wan with the effects of weeping, anxiety, and despair. She was, in a word, both in body and mind, only the wreck and ruin of what she once had been.

When the burial ceremonies were performed, and she found that all was over--that Antony was forever gone, and she herself hopelessly and irremediably ruined--she gave herself up to a perfect phrensy of grief. She beat her breast, and scratched and tore her flesh so dreadfully, in the vain efforts which she made to kill herself, in the paroxysms of her despair, that she was soon covered with contusions and wounds, which, becoming inflamed and swelled, made her a shocking spectacle to see, and threw her into a fever. She then conceived the idea of pretending to be more sick than she was, and so refusing food and starving herself to death. She attempted to execute this design. She rejected every medical remedy that was offered her, and would not eat, and lived thus some days without food. Octavius, to whom every thing relating to his captive was minutely reported by her attendants, suspected her design. He was very unwilling that she should die, having set his heart on exhibiting her to the Roman people, on his return to the capital, in his triumphal procession. He accordingly sent her orders, requiring that she should submit to the treatment prescribed by the physician, and take her food, enforcing these his commands with a certain threat which he imagined might have some influence over her. And what threat does the reader imagine could possibly be devised to reach a mind so sunk, so desperate, so wretched as hers? Every thing seemed already lost but life, and life was only an insupportable burden. What interests, then, had she still remaining upon which a threat could take hold?

Octavius, in looking for some avenue by which he could reach her, reflected that she was a mother. Cæsarion, the son of Julius Cæsar, and Alexander, Cleopatra, and Ptolemy, Antony's children, were still alive. Octavius imagined that in the secret recesses of her wrecked and ruined soul there might be some lingering principle of maternal affection remaining which he could goad into life and action. He accordingly sent word to her that, if she did not yield to the physician and take her food, he would kill every one of her children.

The threat produced its effect. The crazed and frantic patient became calm. She received her food. She submitted to the physician. Under his treatment her wounds began to heal, the fever was allayed, and at length she appeared to be gradually recovering.

When Octavius learned that Cleopatra had become composed, and seemed to be in some sense convalescent, he resolved to pay her a visit. As he entered the room where she was confined, which seems to have been still the upper chamber of her tomb, he found her lying on a low and miserable bed, in a most wretched condition, and exhibiting such a spectacle of disease and wretchedness that he was shocked at beholding her. She appeared, in fact, almost wholly bereft of reason. When Octavius came in, she suddenly leaped out of the bed, half naked as she was, and covered with bruises and wounds, and crawled miserably along to her conqueror's feet in the attitude of a suppliant. Her hair was torn from her head, her limbs were swollen and disfigured, and great bandages appeared here and there, indicating that there were still worse injuries than these concealed. From the midst of all this squalidness and misery there still beamed from her sunken eyes a great portion of their former beauty, and her voice still possessed the same inexpressible charm that had characterized it so strongly in the days of her prime. Octavius made her go back to her bed again and lie down.

Cleopatra then began to talk and excuse herself for what she had done, attributing all the blame of her conduct to Antony. Octavius, however, interrupted her, and defended Antony from her criminations, saying to her that it was not his fault so much as hers. She then suddenly changed her tone, and acknowledging her sins, piteously implored mercy. She begged Octavius to pardon and spare her, as if now she were afraid of death and dreaded it, instead of desiring it as a boon. In a word, her mind, the victim and the prey alternately of the most dissimilar and inconsistent passions, was now overcome by fear. To propitiate Octavius, she brought out a list of all her private treasures, and delivered it to him as a complete inventory of all that she had. One of her treasurers, however, named Zeleucus, who was standing by, said to Octavius that that list was not complete. Cleopatra had, he alleged, reserved several things of great value, which she had not put down upon it.

This assertion, thus suddenly exposing her duplicity, threw Cleopatra into a violent rage. She sprang from her bed and assaulted her secretary in a most furious manner. Octavius and the others who were there interposed, and compelled Cleopatra to lie down again, which she did, uttering all the time the most grievous complaints at the wretched degradation to which she was reduced, to be insulted thus by her own servants at such a time. If she had reserved any thing, she said, of her private treasures, it was only for presents to some of her faithful friends, to induce them the more zealously to intercede with Octavius in her behalf. Octavius replied by urging her to feel no concern on the subject whatever. He freely gave her, he said, all that she had reserved, and he promised in other respects to treat her in the most honorable and courteous manner.

Octavius was much pleased at the result of this interview. It was obvious, as it appeared to him, that Cleopatra had ceased to desire to die; that she now, on the contrary, wished to live, and that he should accordingly succeed in his desire of taking her with him to grace his triumph at Rome. He accordingly made his arrangements for departure, and Cleopatra was notified that in three days she was to set out, together with her children, to go into Syria. Octavius said Syria, as he did not wish to alarm Cleopatra by speaking of Rome. She, however, understood well where the journey, if once commenced, would necessarily end, and she was fully determined in her own mind that she would never go there.

She asked to be allowed to pay one parting visit to Antony's tomb. This request was granted; and she went to the tomb with a few attendants, carrying with her chaplets and garlands of flowers. At the tomb her grief broke forth anew, and was as violent as ever. She bewailed her lover's death with loud cries and lamentations, uttered while she was placing the garlands upon the tomb, and offering the oblations and incense, which were customary in those days, as expressions of grief. "These," said she, as she made the offerings, "are the last tributes of affection that I can ever pay thee, my dearest, dearest lord. I can not join thee, for I am a captive and a prisoner, and they will not let me die. They watch me every hour, and are going to bear me far away, to exhibit me to thine enemies, as a badge and trophy of their triumph over thee. Oh intercede, dearest Antony, with the gods where thou art now, since those that reign here on earth have utterly forsaken me; implore them to save me from this fate, and let me die here in my native land, and be buried by thy side in this tomb."

When Cleopatra returned to her apartment again after this melancholy ceremony, she seemed to be more composed than she had been before. She went to the bath, and then she attired herself handsomely for supper. She had ordered supper that night to be very sumptuously served. She was at liberty to make these arrangements, for the restrictions upon her movements, which had been imposed at first, were now removed, her appearance and demeanor having been for some time such as to lead Octavius to suppose that there was no longer any danger that she would attempt self-destruction. Her entertainment was arranged, therefore, according to her directions, in a manner corresponding with the customs of her court when she had been a queen. She had many attendants, and among them were two of her own women. These women were long-tried and faithful servants and friends.

While she was at supper, a man came to the door with a basket, and wished to enter. The guards asked him what he had in his basket. He opened it to let them see; and, lifting up some green leaves which were laid over the top, he showed the soldiers that the basket was filled with figs. He said that they were for Cleopatra's supper. The soldiers admired the appearance of the figs, saying that they were very fine and beautiful. The man asked the soldiers to take some of them. This they declined, but allowed the man to pass in. When the supper was ended, Cleopatra sent all of her attendants away except the two women. They remained. After a little time, one of these women came out with a letter for Octavius, which Cleopatra had written, and which she wished to have immediately delivered. One of the soldiers from the guard stationed at the gates was accordingly dispatched to carry the letter. Octavius, when it was given to him, opened the envelope at once and read the letter, which was written, as was customary in those days, on a small tablet of metal. He found that it was a brief but urgent petition from Cleopatra, written evidently in agitation and excitement, praying that he would overlook her offense, and allow her to be buried with Antony. Octavius immediately inferred that she had destroyed herself. He sent off some messengers at once, with orders to go directly to her place of confinement and ascertain the truth, intending to follow them himself immediately.

The messengers, on their arrival at the gates, found the sentinels and soldiers quietly on guard before the door, as if all were well. On entering Cleopatra's room, however, they beheld a shocking spectacle. Cleopatra was lying dead upon a couch. One of her women was upon the floor, dead too. The other, whose name was Charmion, was sitting over the body of her mistress, fondly caressing her, arranging flowers in her hair, and adorning her diadem. The messengers of Octavius, on witnessing this spectacle, were overcome with amazement, and demanded of Charmion what it could mean. "It is all right," said Charmion. "Cleopatra has acted in a manner worthy of a princess descended from so noble a line of kings." As Charmion said this, she began to sink herself, fainting, upon the bed, and almost immediately expired.

The by-standers were not only shocked at the spectacle which was thus presented before them, but they were perplexed and confounded in their attempts to discover by what means Cleopatra and her women had succeeded in effecting their design. They examined the bodies, but no marks of violence were to be discovered. They looked all around the room, but no weapons, and no indication of any means of poison, were to be found. They discovered something that appeared like the slimy track of an animal on the wall, toward a window, which they thought might have been produced by an _asp_; but the animal itself was nowhere to be seen. They examined the body with great care, but no marks of any bite or sting were to be found, except that there were two very slight and scarcely-discernible punctures on the arm, which some persons fancied might have been so caused. The means and manner of her death seemed to be involved in impenetrable mystery.

There were various rumors on the subject subsequently in circulation both at Alexandria and at Rome, though the mystery was never fully solved. Some said that there was an asp concealed among the figs which the servant man brought in in the basket; that he brought it in that manner, by a preconcerted arrangement between him and Cleopatra, and that, when she received it, she placed the animal on her arm. Others say that she had a small steel instrument like a needle, with a poisoned point, which she had kept concealed in her hair, and that she killed herself with that, without producing any visible wound. Another story was, that she had an asp in a box somewhere in her apartment, which she had reserved for this occasion, and when the time finally came, that she pricked and teased it with a golden bodkin to make it angry, and then placed it upon her flesh and received its sting. Which of these stories, if either of them, were true, could never be known. It has, however, been generally believed among mankind that Cleopatra died in some way or other by the self-inflicted sting of the asp, and paintings and sculptures without number have been made to illustrate and commemorate the scene.

This supposition in respect to the mode of her death is, in fact, confirmed by the action of Octavius himself on his return to Rome, which furnishes a strong indication of his opinion of the manner in which his captive at last eluded him. Disappointed in not being able to exhibit the queen herself in his triumphal train, he caused a golden statue representing her to be made, with an image of an asp upon the arm of it, and this sculpture he caused to be borne conspicuously before him in his grand triumphal entry into the capital, as the token and trophy of the final downfall of the unhappy Egyptian queen.

THE END.

FOOTNOTES:

[1] See Map of the Delta of the Nile, page 29; also the View of Alexandria, page 162.

[2] See map; frontispiece.

[3] It will be sufficiently accurate for the general reader of history to consider the Greek talent, referred to in such transactions as these, as equal in English money to two hundred and fifty pounds, in American to a thousand dollars. It is curious to observe that, large as the total was that was paid for the liberation of these slaves, the amount paid for each individual was, after all, only a sum equal to about five dollars.

[4] For an account of one of these disasters, with an engraving illustrative of the scene, see the HISTORY OF CYRUS.

[5] For the position of this island in respect to Egypt and the neighboring countries, see map, frontispiece.

[6] This Octavius, on his subsequent elevation to imperial power, received the name of Augustus Cæsar, and it is by this name that he is generally known in history. He was, however, called Octavius at the commencement of his career, and, to avoid confusion, we shall continue to designate him by this name to the end of our narrative.

[7] See map, at the frontispiece.

[8] Pearls, being of the nature of _shell_ in their composition and structure, are soluble in certain acids.

[9] See map for the situation of Ephesus and of Samos.

[10] These letters, in accordance with the scale of expense and extravagance on which Cleopatra determined that every thing relating to herself and Antony should be done, were engraved on tablets made of onyx, or crystal, or other hard and precious stones.

==========

The Life of Ludwig van Beethoven, Volume I

Alexander Wheelock Thayer

Project Gutenberg Release: August 29, 2013 · eBook #43591

Transcriber's Note

Gesperrt text is indicated by ~tildes~, and superscript by caret symbols (e.g. M^{me}).

THE LIFE OF LUDWIG VAN BEETHOVEN VOLUME I

[Illustration]

[Illustration: LUDWIG VAN BEETHOVEN

After the Bust by Franz Klein

1812]

The Life of Ludwig van Beethoven

_By_ Alexander Wheelock Thayer

Edited, revised and amended from the original English manuscript and the German editions of Hermann Deiters and Hugo Riemann, concluded, and all the documents newly translated

By Henry Edward Krehbiel

Volume I

Published by The Beethoven Association New York

SECOND PRINTING

Copyright, 1921, By Henry Edward Krehbiel

From the press of G. Schirmer, Inc., New York Printed in the U. S. A.

IN PROFOUND REVERENCE THIS WORK IS DEDICATED BY THE EDITOR TO THE MEMORY OF

Alexander Wheelock Thayer and Dr. Hermann Deiters

ALSO IN GRATEFUL APPRECIATION TO THE BEETHOVEN ASSOCIATION

AND WITH A LARGE MEASURE OF GRATITUDE AND AFFECTION TO HIS FRIEND AND COLLEAGUE RICHARD ALDRICH

Introduction

If for no other reasons than because of the long time and monumental patience expended upon its preparation, the vicissitudes through which it has passed and the varied and arduous labors bestowed upon it by the author and his editors, the history of Alexander Wheelock Thayer's Life of Beethoven deserves to be set forth as an introduction to this work. His work it is, and his monument, though others have labored long and painstakingly upon it. There has been no considerable time since the middle of the last century when it has not occupied the minds of the author and those who have been associated with him in its creation. Between the conception of its plan and its execution there lies a period of more than two generations. Four men have labored zealously and affectionately upon its pages, and the fruits of more than four score men, stimulated to investigation by the first revelations made by the author, have been conserved in the ultimate form of the biography. It was seventeen years after Mr.

Thayer entered upon what proved to be his life-task before he gave the first volume to the world--and then in a foreign tongue; it was thirteen more before the third volume came from the press. This volume, moreover, left the work unfinished, and thirty-two years more had to elapse before it was completed. When this was done the patient and self-sacrificing investigator was dead; he did not live to finish it himself nor to see it finished by his faithful collaborator of many years, Dr. Deiters; neither did he live to look upon a single printed page in the language in which he had written that portion of the work published in his lifetime. It was left for another hand to prepare the English edition of an American writer's history of Germany's greatest tone-poet, and to write its concluding chapters, as he believes, in the spirit of the original author.

Under these circumstances there can be no vainglory in asserting that the appearance of this edition of Thayer's Life of Beethoven deserves to be set down as a significant occurrence in musical history. In it is told for the first time in the language of the great biographer the true story of the man Beethoven--his history stripped of the silly sentimental romance with which early writers and their later imitators and copyists invested it so thickly that the real humanity, the humanliness, of the composer has never been presented to the world. In this biography there appears the veritable Beethoven set down in his true environment of men and things--the man as he actually was, the man as he himself, like Cromwell, asked to be shown for the information of posterity. It is doubtful if any other great man's history has been so encrusted with fiction as Beethoven's. Except Thayer's, no biography of him has been written which presents him in his true light. The majority of the books which have been written of late years repeat many of the errors and falsehoods made current in the first books which were written about him. A great many of these errors and falsehoods are in the account of the composer's last sickness and death, and were either inventions or exaggerations designed by their utterers to add pathos to a narrative which in unadorned truth is a hundredfold more pathetic than any tale of fiction could possibly be. Other errors have concealed the truth in the story of Beethoven's guardianship of his nephew, his relations with his brothers, the origin and nature of his fatal illness, his dealings with his publishers and patrons, the generous attempt of the Philharmonic Society of London to extend help to him when upon his deathbed.

In many details the story of Beethoven's life as told here will be new to English and American readers; in a few cases the details will be new to the world, for the English edition of Thayer's biography is not a translation of the German work but a presentation of the original manuscript, so far as the discoveries made after the writing did not mar its integrity, supplemented by the knowledge acquired since the publication of the first German edition, and placed at the service of the present editor by the German revisers of the second edition. The editor of this English edition was not only in communication with Mr. Thayer during the last ten years of his life, but was also associated to some extent with his continuator and translator, Dr. Deiters. Not only the fruits of the labors of the German editors but the original manuscript of Thayer and the mass of material which he accumulated came into the hands of this writer, and they form the foundation on which the English "Thayer's Beethoven" rests. The work is a vastly different one from that which Thayer dreamed of when he first conceived the idea of bringing order and consistency into the fragmentary and highly colored accounts of the composer's life upon which he fed his mind and fancy as a student at college; but it is, even in that part of the story which he did not write, true to the conception of what Beethoven's biography should be. Knowledge of the composer's life has greatly increased since the time when Thayer set out upon his task. The first publication of some of the results of his investigations in his "Chronologisches Verzeichniss" in 1865, and the first volume of the biography which appeared a year later, stirred the critical historians into activity throughout Europe. For them he had opened up a hundred avenues of research, pointed out a hundred subjects for special study. At once collectors of autographs brought forth their treasures, old men opened up the books of their memories, librarians gave eager searchers access to their shelves, churches produced their archives, and hieroglyphic sketches which had been scattered all over Europe were deciphered by scholars and yielded up chronological information of inestimable value. To all these activities Thayer had pointed the way, and thus a great mass of facts was added to the already great mass which Thayer had accumulated. Nor did Thayer's labors in the field end with the first publication of his volumes. So long as he lived he gathered, ordered and sifted the new material which came under his observation and prepared it for incorporation into later editions and later volumes. After he was dead his editors continued the work.

Alexander Wheelock Thayer was born in South Natick, Massachusetts, on October 22nd, 1817, and received a liberal education at Harvard College, whence he was graduated in 1843. He probably felt that he was cut out for a literary career, for his first work after graduation was done in the library of his _Alma Mater_. There interest in the life of Beethoven took hold of him. With the plan in his mind of writing an account of that life on the basis of Schindler's biography as paraphrased by Moscheles, and bringing its statements and those contained in the "Biographische Notizen" of Wegeler and Ries and a few English accounts into harmony, he went to Europe in 1849 and spent two years in making researches in Bonn, Berlin, Prague and Vienna. He then returned to America and in 1852 became attached to the editorial staff of "The New York Tribune." It was in a double sense an attachment; illness compelled him to abandon journalism and sever his connection with the newspaper within two years, but he never gave up

his interest in it. He read it until the day of his death, and his acquaintance with the member of the Tribune's staff who was destined to have a part in the completion of his lifework began when, a little more than a generation after he had gone to Europe for the second time, he opened a correspondence with him on a topic suggested by one of this writer's criticisms. In 1854 he went to Europe again, still fired with the ambition to rid the life-history of Beethoven of the defects which marred it as told in the current books. Schindler had sold the _memorabilia_ which he had received from Beethoven and Beethoven's friend Stephan von Breuning to the Prussian Government, and the precious documents were safely housed in the Royal Library at Berlin. It was probably in studying them that Thayer realized fully that it was necessary to do more than rectify and harmonize current accounts of Beethoven's life if it were correctly to be told. He had already unearthed much precious ore at Bonn, but he lacked the money which alone would enable him to do the long and large work which now loomed before him. In 1856 he again came back to America and sought employment, finding it this time in South Orange, New Jersey, where Lowell Mason employed him to catalogue his musical library. Meanwhile Dr. Mason had become interested in his great project, and Mrs. Mehetabel Adams, of Cambridge, Massachusetts, also. Together they provided the funds which enabled him again to go to Europe, where he now took up a permanent residence. At first he spent his time in research-travels, visiting Berlin, Bonn, Cologne, Düsseldorf (where he found material of great value in the archives of the old Electoral Courts of Bonn and Cologne), Frankfort, Paris, Linz, Graz, Salzburg, London and Vienna. To support himself he took a small post in the Legation of the United States at Vienna, but exchanged this after a space for the U. S. Consulship at Trieste, to which office he was appointed by President Lincoln on the recommendation of Senator Sumner. In Trieste he remained till his death, although out of office after October 1st, 1882. To Sir George Grove he wrote under date June 1st, 1895: "I was compelled to resign my office because of utter inability longer to continue Beethoven work and official labor together." From Trieste, when his duties permitted, he went out on occasional exploring tours, and there he weighed his accumulations of evidence and wrote his volumes.

In his travels Thayer visited every person of importance then living who had been in any way associated with Beethoven or had personal recollection of him--Schindler, the composer's factotum and biographer; Anselm Hüttenbrenner, in whose arms he died; Caroline van Beethoven, widow of Nephew Karl; Charles Neate and Cipriani Potter, the English musicians who had been his pupils; Sir George Smart, who had visited him to learn the proper interpretation of the Ninth Symphony; Moscheles, who had been a professional associate in Vienna; Otto Jahn, who had undertaken a like task with his own, but abandoned it and turned over his gathered material to him; Mähler, an artist who had painted Beethoven's portrait; Gerhard von Breuning, son of Beethoven's most intimate friend, who as a lad of fourteen had been a cheery companion of the great man when he lay upon his fatal bed of sickness;--with all these and many others he talked, carefully recording their testimony in his note-books and piling up information with which to test the correctness of traditions and printed accounts and to amplify the veracious story of Beethoven's life. His industry, zeal, keen power of analysis, candor and fairmindedness won the confidence and help of all with whom he came in contact except the literary charlatans whose romances he was bent on destroying in the interest of the verities of history. The Royal Library at Berlin sent the books in which many of Beethoven's visitors had written down their part of the conversations which the composer could not hear, to him at Trieste so that he might transcribe and study them at his leisure.

In 1865, Thayer was ready with the manuscript for Volume I of the work, which contained a sketch of the Courts of the Electors of Cologne at Cologne and Bonn for over a century, told of the music cultivated at them and recorded the ancestry of Beethoven so far as it had been discovered. It also carried the history of the composer down to the year 1796. In Bonn, Thayer had made the acquaintance of Dr. Hermann Deiters, Court Councillor and enthusiastic musical littérateur, and to him he confided the task of editing and revising his manuscript and translating it into German. The reason which Thayer gave for not at once publishing his work in English was that he was unable to oversee the printing in his native land, where, moreover, it was not the custom to publish such works serially. He urged upon his collaborator that he practise literalness of translation in respect of his own utterances, but gave him full liberty to proceed according to his judgment in the presentation of documentary evidence. All of the material in the volume except the draughts from Wegeler, Ries and Schindler, with which he was frequently in conflict, was original discovery, the result of the labors begun in Bonn in 1849. His principles he set forth in these words: "I fight for no theories, and cherish no prejudices; my sole point of view is the truth.... I have resisted the temptation to discuss the character of his (Beethoven's) works and to make such a discussion the foundation of historical speculation, preferring to leave such matters to those who have a greater predilection for them. It appears to me that Beethoven the _composer_ is amply known through his works and in this assumption the long and wearisome labors of so many years were devoted to Beethoven the _man_." The plan to publish his work in German enabled Thayer to turn over all his documentary evidence to Deiters in its original shape, a circumstance which saved him great labor, but left it for his American editor and continuator. The first German volume appeared in 1866; its stimulative effect upon musical Europe has been indicated. Volume II came from the press in 1872, Volume III in 1879, both translated and

annotated by Deiters. They brought the story of Beethoven's life down to the end of the year 1816, leaving a little more than a decade still to be discussed.

The health of Thayer had never been robust, and the long and unintermittent application to the work of gathering and weighing evidence had greatly taxed his brain. He became subject to severe headaches and after the appearance of the third volume he found it impossible to apply himself for even a short time to work upon the biography. In July, 1890, he wrote a letter to Sir George Grove which the latter forwarded to this writer. In it he tells in words of pathetic gratitude of the unexpected honors showered upon him at Bonn when at the invitation of the Beethoven-Haus Verein he attended the exhibition and festival given in Beethoven's birthplace a short time before. Then he proceeds: "Of course the great question was on the lips of all: When will the fourth volume appear? I could only say: When the condition of my head allows it. No one could see or have from my general appearance the least suspicion that I was not in mental equal to my physical vigor. In fact, the extreme excitement of these three weeks took off for the time twenty years of my age and made me young again; but afterwards in Hamburg and in Berlin the reaction came. Spite of the delightful musical parties at Joachim's, Hausmann's, Mendelssohn's ... my head broke down more and more, and since my return hither, July 3rd, has as yet shown small signs of recuperation. The extreme importance of working out my fourth volume is more than ever impressed upon my mind and weighs upon me like an incubus. But as yet it is still utterly impossible for me to really work. Of course I only live for that great purpose and do not despair. My general health is such that I think the brain must in time recover something of its vigor and power of labor. What astonishes me and almost creates envy is to see this wonderful power of labor as exemplified by you and my neighbor, Burton. But from boyhood I have had head troubles, and what I went through with for thirty years in supporting myself and working on Beethoven is not to be described and excites my wonder that I did not succumb. Well, I will not yet despair." Thayer's mind, active enough in some things, refused to occupy itself with the Beethoven material; it needed distraction, and to give it that he turned to literary work of another character. He wrote a book against the Baconian authorship of Shakespeare's works; another on the Hebrews in Egypt and their Exodus (which Mr. E. S. Willcox, a friend of many years, published at his request in Peoria, Illinois). He also wrote essays and children's tales. Such writing he could do and also attend to his consular duties; but an hour or two of thought devoted to Beethoven, as he said in a letter to the present writer, brought on a racking headache and unfitted him for labor of any kind.

Meanwhile year after year passed by and the final volume of the biography was no nearer its completion than in 1880. In fact, beyond the selection and ordination of its material, it was scarcely begun. His friends and the lovers of Beethoven the world over grew seriously concerned at the prospect that it would never be completed. Sharing in this concern, the editor of the present edition developed a plan which he thought would enable Thayer to complete the work notwithstanding the disabilities under which he was laboring. He asked the coöperation of Novello, Ewer & Co., of London, and got them to promise to send a capable person to Trieste to act as a sort of literary secretary to Thayer. It was thought that, having all the material for the concluding volume on hand chronologically arranged, he might talk it over with the secretary, but without giving care to the manner of literary presentation. The secretary was then to give the material a proper setting and submit it to Thayer for leisurely revision. Very hopefully, and with feelings of deep gratitude to his friends, the English publishers, the American editor submitted his plan; but Thayer would have none of it. Though unable to work upon the biography for an hour continuously, he yet clung to the notion that some day he would not only finish it but also rewrite the whole for English and American readers. From one of the letters placed at my disposal by Sir George Grove, it appears that subsequently (in 1892) there was some correspondence between an English publisher and Mr. Thayer touching an English edition. The letter was written to Sir George on June 1st, 1895. In it he says: "I then hoped to be able to revise and prepare it (the Beethoven MS.) for publication myself, and was able to begin the labor and arrange with a typewriting woman to make the clean copy. How sadly I failed I wrote you. Since that time the subject has not been renewed between us. I am now compelled to relinquish all hope of ever being able to do the work. There are two great difficulties to be overcome: the one is that all letters and citations are in the original German as they were sent to Dr. Deiters; the other, there is much to be condensed, as I always intended should be for this reason: From the very first chapter to the end of Vol. III, I am continually in conflict with all previous writers and was compelled, therefore, to show in my text that I was right by so using my materials that the reader should be taken along step by step and compelled to see the truth for himself. Had all my arguments been given in notes nine readers out of ten would hardly have read them, and I should have been involved in numberless and endless controversies. Now the case is changed. A. W. T's novelties are now, with few if any exceptions, accepted as facts and can, in the English edition, be used as such. Besides this, there is much new matter to be inserted and some corrections to be made from the appendices of the three German volumes. The prospect now is that I may be able to do some of this work, or, at all events, go through my MS. page by page and do much to facilitate its preparation for publication in English. I have no expectation of ever receiving any pecuniary recompense for my 40 years of labor, for my many years of poverty arising from the costs of my extensive researches, for my--but

enough of this also." In explanation of the final sentence in this letter it may be added that Thayer told the present writer that he had never received a penny from his publisher for the three German volumes; nothing more, in fact, than a few books which he had ordered and for which the publisher made no charge.

Thus matters rested when Thayer died on July 15th, 1897. The thought that the fruits of his labor and great sacrifices should be lost to the world even in part was intolerable. Dr. Deiters, with undiminished zeal and enthusiasm, announced his willingness to revise the three published volumes for a second edition and write the concluding volume. Meanwhile all of Thayer's papers had been sent to Mrs. Jabez Fox of Cambridge, Massachusetts, the author's niece and one of his heirs. There was a large mass of material, and it became necessary to sift it in order that all that was needful for the work of revision and completion might be placed in the hands of Dr. Deiters. This work was done, at Mrs. Fox's request, by the present writer, who, also at Mrs. Fox's request, undertook the task of preparing this English edition. Dr. Deiters accomplished the work of revising Volume I, which was published by Weber, the original publisher of the German volumes, in 1891. He then decided that before taking up the revision of Volumes II and III he would bring the biography to a conclusion. He wrote, not the one volume which Thayer had hoped would suffice him, but two volumes, the mass of material bearing on the last decade of Beethoven's life having grown so large that it could not conveniently be comprehended in a single tome, especially since Dr. Deiters had determined to incorporate critical discussions of the composer's principal works in the new edition. The advance sheets of Volume IV were in Dr. Deiters's hands when, full of years and honors, he died on May 1st, 1907. Breitkopf and Härtel had meanwhile purchased the German copyright from Weber, and they chose Dr. Hugo Riemann to complete the work of revision. Under Dr. Riemann's supervision Volumes IV and V were brought out in 1908, and Volumes II and III in 1910-1911.

Not until this had been accomplished could the American collaborator go systematically to work on his difficult and voluminous task, for he had determined to use as much as possible of Thayer's original manuscript and adhere to Thayer's original purpose and that expressed in his letter to Sir George Grove. He also thought it wise to condense the work so as to bring it within three volumes and to seek to enhance its readableness in other ways. To this end he abolished the many appendices which swell the German volumes, and put their significant portions into the body of the narrative; he omitted many of the hundreds of foot-notes, especially the references to the works of the earlier biographers, believing that the special student would easily find the sources if he wished to do so, and the general reader would not care to verify the statements of one who has been accepted as the court of last resort in all matters of fact pertaining to Beethoven, the man; he also omitted many letters and presented the substance of others in his own words for the reason that they can all be consulted in the special volumes which contain the composer's correspondence; of the letters and other documents used in the pages which follow, he made translations for the sake of accuracy as well as to avoid conflict with the copyright privileges of the publishers of English versions. Being as free as the German editors in respect of the portion of the biography which did not come directly from the pen of Thayer, the editor of this English edition chose his own method of presentation touching the story of the last decade of Beethoven's life, keeping in view the greater clearness and rapidity of narrative which, he believed, would result from a grouping of material different from that followed by the German editors in their adherence to the strict chronological method established by Thayer.

A large number of variations from the text of the original German edition are explained in the body of this work or in foot-notes. In cases where the German editors were found to be in disagreement with the English manuscript in matters of opinion merely, the editor has chosen to let Mr. Thayer's arguments stand, though, as a rule, he has noted the adverse opinions of the German revisers also. A prominent instance of this kind is presented by the mysterious love-letter found secreted in Beethoven's desk after his death. Though a considerable literature has grown up around the "Immortal Beloved" since Thayer advanced the hypothesis that the lady was the Countess Therese Brunswick, the question touching her identity and the dates of the letters is still as much an open one as it was when Thayer, in his characteristic manner, subjected it to examination. This editor has, therefore, permitted Thayer not only to present his case in his own words, but helped him by bringing his scattered pleadings and briefs into sequence. He has also outlined in part the discussion which followed the promulgation of Thayer's theory, and advanced a few fugitive reflections of his own. The related incident of Beethoven's vain matrimonial project has been put into a different category by new evidence which came to light while Dr. Riemann was engaged in his revisory work. It became necessary, therefore, that the date of that incident be changed from 1807, where Thayer had put it, to 1810. By this important change Beethoven's relations to Therese Malfatti were made to take on a more serious attitude than Thayer was willing to accord them.

In this edition, finally, more importance is attached to the so-called Fischer Manuscript than Thayer was inclined to give it, although he, somewhat grudgingly we fear, consented that Dr. Deiters should print it with critical comments in the Appendix of his Vol. I. The manuscript, though known to Thayer, had come to the attention of Dr. Deiters too late for use in the narrative portion of the volume,

though it was thus used in the second edition. The story of the manuscript, which is now preserved in the museum of the Beethoven-Haus Verein in Bonn, is a curious one. Its author was Gottfried Fischer, whose ancestors for four generations had lived in the house in the Rheingasse which only a few years ago was still, though mendaciously, pointed out to strangers as the house in which Beethoven was born. Fischer, who lived till 1864, was born in the house which formerly stood on the site of the present building known as No. 934, ten years after Beethoven's eyes opened to the light in the Bonngasse. At the time of Fischer's birth the Beethoven family occupied a portion of the house and Fischer's father and the composer's father were friends and companions. There, too, had lived the composer's grandfather. Gottfried Fischer had a sister, Cäcilia Fischer, who was born eight years before Beethoven; she remained unmarried and lived to be 85 years old, dying on May 23rd, 1845. The festivities attending the unveiling of the Beethoven monument in 1838 brought many visitors to Bonn and a natural curiosity concerning the relics of the composer. Inquirers were referred to the house in the Rheingasse, then supposed to be the birthplace of the composer, where the Fischers, brother and sister, still lived. They told their story and were urged by eager listeners to put it into writing. This Gottfried did the same year, but, keeping the manuscript in hand, he added to it at intervals down to the year 1857 at least. He came to attach great value to his revelations and as time went on embellished his recital with a mass of notes, many of no value, many consisting of iterations and reiterations of incidents already recorded, and also with excerpts from books to which, in his simplicity, he thought that nobody but himself had access. He was an uneducated man, ignorant even of the correct use of the German language; it is, therefore, not surprising that much of his record is utterly worthless; but mixed with the dross there is much precious metal, especially in the spinster's recollection of the composer's father and grandfather, for while Gottfried grew senile his sister remained mentally vigorous to the end. Thayer examined the document and offered to buy it, but was dissuaded by the seemingly exorbitant price which the old man set upon it. It was finally purchased for the city's archives by the Oberbürgermeister and thus came to the notice of Dr. Deiters. His use of it has been followed by the present editor.

HENRY EDWARD KREHBIEL.

Blue Hill, Maine, U. S. A. July, 1914.

Postscript

The breaking out, in August, 1914, of the war between Austria and Servia which eventually involved nearly all the civilized nations of the world, led the publishers, who had originally undertaken to print this Work as brought to a conclusion by the American Editor, indefinitely to postpone its publication. In the spring of 1920 the Beethoven Association, composed of musicians of high rank, who had given a remarkably successful series of concerts of Beethoven's chamber-music in New York in the season 1919-20, at the suggestion of O. G. Sonneck and Harold Bauer resolved to devote the proceeds of the concerts to promoting the publication of Thayer's biography. To this act of artistic philanthropy the appearance of the work is due.

H. E. K. Blue Hill, Maine, U. S. A. September, 1920.

[Illustration: ALEXANDER WHEELOCK THAYER

January 1888]

Contents of Volume I

PAGE

INTRODUCTION vii

CHAPTER I. Fall of the Ecclesiastical-Civil States in Germany--Character of Their Rulers--The Electors of Cologne in the Eighteenth Century--Joseph Clemens--Clemens August--Max Friedrich--Incidents and Achievements in Their Reigns--The Electoral Courts and Their Music--Earliest Records of the Beethovens in the Rhineland--Musical Culture in Bonn at the Time of Ludwig van Beethoven's Birth--Operatic Repertories--Christian Gottlob Neefe--Appearance of the City 1

CHAPTER II. Beethoven's Ancestors in Belgium--Louis van Beethoven, His Grandfather--He Leaves His Paternal Home--Tenor Singer at Louvain--His Removal to Bonn--Marriage--Activities as Bass Singer and Chapelmaster in the Electoral Chapel--Birth and Education of Johann van Beethoven, Father of the Composer--Domestic Afflictions--His Marriage--Appearance and Character of the Composer's Mother 42

CHAPTER III. Birth of Ludwig van Beethoven, the Composer-- Conflict of Dates--The House in Which He Was Born--Poverty of the Family--An Inebriate Grandmother and a Dissipated Father--The Composer's Scant Schooling--His First Music Teachers--Lessons on the Pianoforte, Organ and Violin--Neefe Instructs Him in Composition--A Visit to Holland 53

CHAPTER IV. Beethoven a Pupil of Neefe--Early Employment of His Talent and Skill--First Efforts at Composition--Assists Neefe at the Organ in the Orchestra of the Electoral Court--Is Appointed Assistant Court Organist--Johann van Beethoven's Family--Domestic Tribulations--Youthful Publications 67

CHAPTER V. Elector Max Franz--Appearance and Character of Maria Theresias's Youngest Son--His Career in Church and State--Musical Culture in the Austrian Imperial Family--The Elector's Admiration for Mozart and Mozart's Characterization of Him--His Court Music at Bonn 77

CHAPTER VI. Beethoven Again--His Studies Interrupted--A Period of Artistic Inactivity in Bonn--The Young Organist Indulges in a Prank--A Visit to Vienna--Mozart Hears the Youthful Beethoven Play--Sympathetic Acquaintances--Death of Beethoven's Mother--Association with the von Breuning Family--Some Questions of Chronology Discussed 85

CHAPTER VII. The Family von Breuning--Beethoven Brought Under Refining Influences--Count Waldstein--Beethoven's First Mæcenas--Time of the Count's Arrival in Bonn--Beethoven Forced to Become Head of His Father's Family 98

CHAPTER VIII. The National Theatre of Elector Max Franz--Beethoven's Associates in the Court Orchestra--Anton Reicha--Andreas and Bernhard Romberg--His Practical Experience in the Electoral Band--The Operatic Repertory of Five Years in the Court Theatre 105

CHAPTER IX. The Last Three Years of Beethoven's Life in Bonn--Gleanings of Fact and Anecdote--A Visit from Haydn--Merry Journey up the Rhine--Beethoven's Meeting with Abbé Sterkel--He Extemporizes--His Playing Described by Carl Ludwig Junker--He Shows a Cantata to Haydn--The Extent of Max Franz's Patronage of the Composer--Social and Artistic Life in Bonn--Madame von Breuning a Guardian Angel--The Circle of Companions--Friendships with Young Women--Jeannette d'Honrath--Fräulein Westerhold--Eleonore von Breuning--Beethoven Leaves Bonn Forever--The Parting with His Friends--Incidents of His Journey to Vienna 110

CHAPTER X. Beethoven's Creative Activity in Bonn--An Inquiry into the Genesis of Many Compositions--The Cantatas on the Death of Joseph II and the Elevation of Leopold II--Vicissitudes of These Compositions--A Group of Songs--The "Ritterballet" and Other Instrumental Works--Several Chamber Compositions--The String Trio, Op. 3, Carried to England--Manuscripts Taken by Beethoven from Bonn to Vienna 129

CHAPTER XI. Beethoven in Vienna--Care for His Personal Appearance--Death of His Father--Records of Minor Receipts and Expenditures--His Studies with Haydn--Clandestine Lessons in Composition with Johann Schenk--A Rupture with Haydn--Becomes a Pupil of Albrechtsberger and Salieri--Characteristics as a Pupil 146

CHAPTER XII. Music in Vienna at the Time of Beethoven's Arrival There--Theatre, Church and Concert-Room--Salieri and the Royal Imperial Opera--Schikaneder's Theater auf der Wieden--Composers and Conductors in the Imperial Capital--Paucity of Public Concerts--A Music-loving Nobility: The Esterhazys; Kinsky; Lichnowsky; von Kees; van Swieten--Private Orchestras--Composers: Haydn, Koželuch, Förster, Eberl, Vanhall--Private Theatres 163

CHAPTER XIII. Beethoven in Society--Success as a Virtuoso--The Trios, Op. 1--Tender Memories of Friends in Bonn--A Letter to Leonore von Breuning--Wegeler Comes to Vienna--His Reminiscences--A Quarrel and Petition for Reconciliation--Irksome Social Conventions--Affairs of the Heart--Variations for Simrock--First Public Appearance as Pianist and Composer--The Pianoforte Concertos in C and B-flat--The Trios, Op. 1, Revised--Sonatas Dedicated to Haydn--Dances for the Ridotto Room--Plays at Haydn's Concert 174

CHAPTER XIV. The Years 1796 and 1797--Success Achieved in the Austrian Capital--A Visit to Prague--The Scena: "Ah, perfido!"--Sojourn in Berlin--King Frederick William II--Prince Louis Ferdinand--Violoncello Sonatas--Relations with Himmel--Plays for the Singakademie--Fasch and Zelter--War-Songs--The Rombergs--A Forgotten Riding-Horse--Compositions and Publications of the Period--Matthisson and His "Adelaide"--Quintet for Strings, Op. 4--Pieces for Wind-instruments--The "Jena" Symphony--Dances 190

CHAPTER XV. General Bernadotte--The Fiction about His Connection with the “Sinfonia eroica”--Rival Pianists--Joseph Wölffl--Tomaschek Describes Beethoven’s Playing--Dragonetti--J. B. Cramer--Beethoven’s Demeanor in Society--Compositions of 1798 and 1799--The Trios, Op. 9--Pianoforte Concertos in C and B-flat--An Unfinished Rondo for Pianoforte and Orchestra--Several Pianoforte Sonatas--“Sonate pathétique”--Trio for Pianoforte, Clarinet and Violoncello--Origin of the First Symphony--Protest Against an Arrangement of it as a Quintet 212

CHAPTER XVI. Beethoven’s Social Life in Vienna--Vogl-- Kiesewetter--Zmeskall--Amenda--Count Lichnowsky--Eppinger--Krumpholz--Schuppanzigh and His Quartet--Johann Nepomuk Hummel--Friendships with Women--Magdalene Willmann-- Christine Gerhardi--Dedications to Pupils--Countess Keglevics--Countess Henriette Lichnowsky--Countess Giulietta Guicciardi--Countess Thun--Princess Liechtenstein--Baroness Braun 229

CHAPTER XVII. Beethoven’s Character and Personality--His Disposition--Evil Effects of Early Associations and Inadequate Intellectual Training--Sentimental Ideals not Realized in Conduct--Self-sufficiency and Pride--The Homage of Young Disciples--Love of Nature--Relations with Women--Conceptions of Virtue--Literary Tastes--His Letters--The Sketchbooks--His Manner of Compositions--Origin of His Deafness 245

CHAPTER XVIII. Beethoven’s Brothers--His First Concert on His Own Account--Septet and First Symphony Performed--Punto and the Sonata for Horn--The Charlatan Steibelt Confounded--Beethoven’s Homes in Vienna--Madame Grillparzer, the Poet’s Mother--Doležalek-- Hoffmeister--E. A. Förster--The Quartets, Op. 18--Prince Lichnowsky’s Gift of a Quartet of Viols--Publications of 1800 265

CHAPTER XIX. The Year 1801--Compositions offered to Hoffmeister--Concerts for Wounded Soldiers--Vigano and the Ballet “Prometheus”--Interest in the Publication of Bach’s Works and His Indigent Daughter--Stephan von Breuning--Summer Home in Hetzendorf--Composition of “The Mount of Olives”--Compositions and Publications of the Year--The Funeral March in the Sonata, Op. 26--The So-called “Moonlight” Sonata--Inspired by a Poem of Seume’s--Illicit Publication of the String Quintet, Op. 29 281

CHAPTER XX. Important Letters of 1801--Communications to Amenda, Hoffmeister and Wegeler--The Composer’s Ill Health--The Beginning of His Deafness--Early Symptoms Described by Himself--Thoughts of Marriage--Indignation Aroused by the Criticisms of the Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung--The “Leipsic Oxen”--Gradual Recognition of Beethoven’s Genius--Anton Reicha--Von Breuning’s Relations with Beethoven--Lessons to Ferdinand Ries and Carl Czerny 297

CHAPTER XXI. Beethoven’s Love-Affairs--Countess Guicciardi--A Conversation with Schindler about Her Marriage--Schindler’s Contradictory Story--Countess Erdödy--Schindler’s Theory Disproved--The Letter to the “Immortal Beloved”--Critical Study of its Date--Countess Guicciardi Not the Woman Addressed--A Conjecture Concerning the Countess Therese von Brunswick--Other Candidates for the Honor of Being the Object of Beethoven’s Supreme Love--Magdalena Willmann--Amalia Sebald--The Arguments of Kalischer, Mariam Tenger and Marie Lipsins (La Mara) Set Forth by the Editor of this Biography--Statements of Relations and Descendants of the Countesses Guicciardi and von Brunswick--The Memoirs of the Countess Therese--Later French Investigations 317

CHAPTER XXII. The Year 1802--The Village of Heiligenstadt-- Beethoven’s Views on Transcriptions--His Despondency--The “Heiligenstadt Will”--Confession of His Deafness--The Second Symphony--Return to Vienna--Marches for the Pianoforte, Four Hands--A Defence of Brothers Johann and Karl Kaspar--Their Characters--Karl’s Management of Beethoven’s Business Affairs--The Bagatelles, Op. 33--The Songs, Op. 52--Compositions and Publications of 1802--Three Sonatas for Pianoforte and Violin--The Sonatas for Pianoforte, Op. 31--An Alteration by Nägeli--Finale of the Sonata in D minor--Beethoven on the Character of His Variations 348

Chapter I

Introductory--The Electors of Cologne in the Eighteenth Century--Joseph Clemens, Clemens August and Max Friedrich--The Electoral Courts and Their Music--Musical Culture in Bonn at the Time of Beethoven’s Birth--Appearance of the City in 1770.

One of the compensations for the horrors of the French Revolution was the sweeping away of many of the petty sovereignties into which Germany was divided, thereby rendering in our day a union of the German People and the rise of a German Nation possible. The first to fall were the numerous ecclesiastical-civil members of the old, loose confederation, some of which had played no ignoble nor unimportant part in the advance of civilization; but their day was past. The people of these states had in divers respects

enjoyed a better lot than those who were subjects of hereditary rulers, and the old German saying: “It is good to dwell under the crook,” had a basis of fact. At the least, they were not sold as mercenary troops; their blood was not shed on foreign fields to support their princes’ ostentatious splendor, to enable mistresses and ill-begotten children to live in luxury and riot. But the antiquated ideas to which the ecclesiastical rulers held with bigoted tenacity had become a barrier to progress, the exceptions being too few to render their farther existence desirable. These members of the empire, greatly differing in extent, population, wealth and political influence, were ruled with few or no exceptions by men who owed their positions to election by chapters or other church corporations, whose numbers were so limited as to give full play to every sort of intrigue; but they could not assume their functions until their titles were confirmed by the Pope as head of the church, and by the Emperor as head of the confederation. Thus the subject had no voice in the matter, and it hardly need be said that his welfare and prosperity were never included among the motives and considerations on which the elections turned.

The sees, by their charters and statutes, we think without exception, were bestowed upon men of noble birth. They were benefices and sinecures for younger sons of princely houses; estates set apart and consecrated to the use, emolument and enjoyment of German John Lacklands. In the long list of their incumbents, a name here and there appears, that calls up historic associations;--a man of letters who aided in the increase or diffusion of the cumbrous learning of his time; a warrior who exchanged his robes for a coat of mail; a politician who played a part more or less honorable or the reverse in the affairs and intrigues of the empire, and, very rarely, one whose daily walk and conversation reflected, in some measure, the life and principles of the founder of Christianity. In general, as they owed their places wholly to political and family influences, so they assumed the vows and garb of churchmen as necessary steps to the enjoyment of lives of affluence and pleasure. So late as far into the eighteenth century, travelling was slow, laborious and expensive. Hence, save for the few more wealthy and powerful, journeys, at long intervals, to a council, an imperial coronation or a diet of the empire, were the rare interruptions to the monotony of their daily existence. Not having the power to transmit their sees to their children, these ecclesiastics had the less inducement to rule with an eye to the welfare of their subjects: on the other hand, the temptation was very strong to augment their revenues for the benefit of relatives and dependents, and especially for the gratification of their own tastes and inclinations, among which the love of splendor and ostentatious display was a fruitful source of waste and extravagance.

Confined so largely to their own small capitals, with little intercourse except with their immediate neighbors, they were far more dependent upon their own resources for amusement than the hereditary princes: and what so obvious, so easily obtained and so satisfactory as music, the theatre and the dance! Thus every little court became a conservatory of these arts, and for generations most of the great names in them may be found recorded in the court calendars. One is therefore not surprised to learn how many of the more distinguished musical composers began life as singing boys in cathedral choirs of England and Germany. The secular princes, especially those of high rank, had, besides their civil administration, the stirring events of war, questions of public policy, schemes and intrigues for the advancement of family interests and the like, to engage their attention; but the ecclesiastic, leaving the civil administration, as a rule, in the hands of ministers, had little to occupy him officially but a tedious routine of religious forms and ceremonies; to him therefore the theatre, and music for the mass, the opera, the ball-room, and the salon, were matters of great moment--they filled a wide void and were cherished accordingly.

COLOGNE AND ITS ELECTORS

The three German ecclesiastical princes who possessed the greatest power and influence were the Archbishops of Mayence, Trèves and Cologne--Electors of the Empire and rulers of the fairest regions of the Rhine. Peace appears hardly to have been known between the city of Cologne and its earlier archbishops; and, in the thirteenth century, a long-continued and even bloody quarrel resulted in the victory of the city. It remained a free imperial town. The archbishops retained no civil or political power within its walls, not even the right to remain there more than three days at any one time. Thus it happened, that in the year 1257 Archbishop Engelbert selected Bonn for his residence, and formally made it the capital of the electorate, as it remained until elector and court were swept away in 1794.

Of the last four Electors of Cologne, the first was Joseph Clemens, a Bavarian prince, nephew of his predecessor Maximilian Heinrich. The choice of the chapter by a vote of thirteen to nine had been Cardinal Fürstenberg; but his known, or supposed, devotion to the interests of the French king had prevented the ratification of the election by either the Emperor or the Pope. A new one being ordered, resulted in favor of the Bavarian, then a youth of eighteen years. The Pope had ratified his election and appointed a bishop to perform his ecclesiastical functions _ad interim_, and the Emperor invested him with the electoral dignity December 1, 1689. Vehse says of him:

Like two of his predecessors he was the incumbent of five sees; he was Archbishop of Cologne, Bishop of Hildesheim, Liège, Ratisbon and Freisingen. His love for pomp and splendor was a passion which he gratified in the magnificence of his court. He delighted to draw thither beautiful and intellectual women. Madame de Raysbeck, and Countess Fugger, wife of his chief equerry, were his declared favorites. For seventeen years, that is, until the disastrous year 1706, when Fénelon consecrated him, he delayed assuming his vows. He held the opinion, universal in the courts of those days, that he might with a clear conscience enjoy life after the manner of secular princes. In pleasing the ladies, he was utterly regardless of expense, and for their amusement gave magnificent balls, splendid masquerades, musical and dramatic entertainments, and hunting parties.

St. Simon relates that several years of his exile were passed at Valenciennes, where, though a fugitive, he followed the same round of costly pleasures and amusements. He also records one of the Elector's jests which in effrontery surpasses anything related of his contemporary, Dean Swift. Some time after his consecration, he caused public notice to be given, that on the approaching first of April he would preach. At the appointed time he mounted the pulpit, bowed gravely, made the sign of the cross, shouted "Zum April!" (April fool!), and retired amid a flourish of trumpets and the rolling of drums.

Dr. Ennen labors energetically to prove that Joseph Clemens's fondness in later years for joining in all grand church ceremonies rested upon higher motives than the mere pleasure of displaying himself in his magnificent robes; and affirms that after assuming his priestly vows he led a life devoted to the church and worthy of his order; thenceforth never seeing Madame de Raysbeck, mother of his illegitimate children, except in the presence of a third person. It seems proper to say this much concerning a prince whose electorship is the point of departure for notices of music and musicians in Bonn during the eighteenth century; a prince whose fondness for the art led him at home and in exile to support both vocal and instrumental bands on a scale generous for that age; and who, moreover, made some pretensions to the title of composer himself, as we learn from a letter which under date of July 20, 1720, he wrote to a court councillor Rauch to accompany eleven of his motets. It is an amusingly frank letter, beginning with a confession that he was an _Ignorant_ who knew nothing about notes and had absolutely no knowledge of _musique_, wherefore he admits that his manner of composing is "very odd," being compelled to sing anything that came into his head to a composer whose duty it was to bring the ideas to paper. Nevertheless he is quite satisfied with himself, "At all events I must have a good ear and _gusto_, for the public that has heard has always approved. But the _methodum_ which I have adopted is that of the bees that draw and collect the honey from the sweetest flowers; so, also, I have taken all that I have composed from good masters whose _Musikalien_ pleased me. Thus I freely confess my pilfering, which others deny and try to appropriate what they have taken from others. Let no one, therefore, get angry if he hears old arias in it, for, as they are beautiful, the old is not deprived of its praise.... I ascribe everything to the grace of God who enlightened me, the unknowing, to do these things." Not all "composers," royal or mean, are as honest as the old Elector!

It is fortunate for the present purpose, that the portion of the electoral archives discovered after a lapse of nearly seventy years and now preserved at Düsseldorf, consists so largely of documents relating to the musical establishment of the court at Bonn during the last century of its existence. They rarely afford information upon the character of the music performed, but are sufficiently complete, when supplemented by the annual Court Calendars, to determine with reasonable correctness the number, character, position and condition of its members. The few petitions and decrees hereafter to be given in full because of their connection with the Beethovens, suffice for specimens of the long series of similar documents, uniform in character and generally of too little interest to be worth transcription.

In 1695 a decree issued at Liège by Joseph Clemens, then in that city as titular bishop, though not consecrated, adds three new names to the "Hoff-Musici," one of which, Van den Eeden, constantly reappears in the documents and calendars down to the year 1782. From a list of payments at Liège in the second quarter of 1696, we find that Henri Vandeneden (Heinrich Van den Eeden) was a bass singer, and that the aggregate of vocalists, instrumentists, with the organ-blower (_calcant_), was eighteen persons.

Returned to Bonn, Joseph Clemens resumed his plan of improving his music, and for those days of small orchestras and niggardly salaries he set it upon a rather generous foundation. A decree of April 1, 1698, put in force the next month, names 22 persons with salaries aggregating 8,890 florins.

POLITICAL VICISSITUDES OF THE ELECTORATE

After the death of Maximilian Heinrich the government passed into the hands of Cardinal Fürstenberg, his coadjutor, who owed the position to the intrigues of Louis XIV, and now used it by all possible means to promote French interests. The king's troops under French commanders, he admitted into the principal towns of the electorate, and, for his own protection, a French garrison of 10,000

men into Bonn. War was the consequence; an imperial army successfully invaded the province, and, advancing to the capital, subjected its unfortunate inhabitants to all the horrors of a relentless siege, that ended October 15, 1689, in the expulsion of the garrison, now reduced to some 3900 men, of whom 1500 were invalids. Yet in the war of the Spanish Succession which opened in 1701, notwithstanding the terrible lesson taught only eleven years before, the infatuated Joseph Clemens embraced the party of Louis. Emperor Leopold treated him with singular mildness, in vain. The Elector persisted. In 1702 he was therefore excluded from the civil government and fled from Bonn, the ecclesiastical authority in Cologne being empowered by the Emperor to rule in his stead. The next year, the great success of the French armies against the allies was celebrated by Joseph Clemens with all pomp in Namur, where he then was; but his triumph was short. John Churchill, then Earl of Marlborough, took the field as commander-in-chief of the armies of the allies. His foresight, energy and astonishing skill in action justified Addison's simile--whether sublime or only pompous--of the angel riding in the whirlwind and directing the storm. He was soon at Cologne, whence he despatched Cochorn to besiege Bonn. That great general executed his task with such skill and impetuosity, that on May 15 (1703) all was ready for storming the city, when d'Allègre, the French commander, offered to capitulate, and on the 19th was allowed to retire. "Now was Bonn for the third time wrested from the hands of the French and restored to the archbishopric, but alas, in a condition that aroused indignation, grief and compassion on all sides," says Müller.

Leopold was still kindly disposed toward Joseph Clemens, but he died May 5, 1705, and his successor, Joseph I, immediately declared him under the ban of the Empire. This deprived him of the means and opportunities, as Elector, for indulging his passion for pomp and display, while his neglect hitherto, under dispensations from the Pope, to take the vows necessary to the performance of ecclesiastical functions, was likewise fatal to that indulgence as archbishop. But this could be remedied; Fénelon, the famous Archbishop of Cambray, ordained him subdeacon August 15, 1706; the Bishop of Tournay made him deacon December 8, and priest on the 25th; on January 1, 1707, he read his first mass at Lille, and indulged his passion for parade to the full, as a pamphlet describing the incident, and silver and copper medals commemorating it, still evince. "Two years later, May 1, 1709, Joseph Clemens received from Fénelon in Ryssel (Lille) episcopal consecration and the pallium."--(Müller.) Upon the victory of Oudenarde by Marlborough, and the fall of Lille, he took refuge in Mons. The treaty of Rastadt, March, 1714, restored him to his electoral dignities and he returned to the Rhine; but Dutch troops continued to hold Bonn until December 11, 1715. On the morning of that day they evacuated the city and in the afternoon the Elector entered in a grand, solemn procession commemorated by an issue of silver medals.

During all these vicissitudes Joseph Clemens, from whatever source he derived the means, did not suffer his music to deteriorate and, returned to Bonn, no sooner was the public business regulated and restored to its former routine than he again turned his attention to its improvement.

Joseph Clemens died November 12, 1723, having previously secured the succession to his nephew Clemens August, last of the five Electors of Cologne of the Bavarian line. The new incumbent, third son of Maximilian Emanuel, Elector of Bavaria and his second wife, a daughter of the celebrated John Sobieski of Poland, was born August 17, 1700, at Brussels, where his father resided at the time as Governor General. From his fourth to his fifteenth year he had been held in captivity by the Austrians at Klagenfurt and Gratz; then, having been destined for the church, he spent several years at study in Rome. As a child in 1715 he had been appointed coadjutor to the Bishop of Regensburg; in 1719 he was elected to the two sees of Paderborn and Münster made vacant by the death of his brother Moritz, was chosen coadjutor to his uncle of Cologne in 1722, made his solemn entry into Bonn as elector May 15, 1724, was the same year also elected Bishop of Hildesheim, in 1725 Provost of the Cathedral at Liège, 1728 Bishop of Osnabrück, and, finally, in 1732 reached the dignity of Grand Master of the Teutonic Order.

THE RULE OF ELECTOR CLEMENS AUGUST

His rule is distinguished in the annals of the electorate for little else than the building, repairing, renewing and embellishing of palaces, hunting-seats, churches, convents, and other edifices. At Bonn he erected the huge pile the foundation of which had been laid by his uncle, now the seat of the university. The handsome City Hall was also his work; the villa at Poppelsdorf was enlarged by him into a small palace, Clemensruhe, now the University Museum of Natural History. In Brühl, the Augustusburg, now a Prussian royal palace, dates from his reign, and Münster, Mergentheim, Arnsberg and other places show similar monuments of his prodigality in the indulgence of his taste for splendor. "Monstrous were the sums," says Dr. Ennen, "squandered by him in the purchase of splendid ornaments, magnificent equipages, furniture costly for its variety, and of curious works of art; upon festivities, sleighing-parties, masquerades, operas, dramas and ballets; upon charlatans, swindlers, female vocalists, actors and dancers. His theatre and opera alone cost him 50,000 thalers annually and the magnificence of his masked balls, twice a week in winter, is proof sufficient that no small sums were lavished upon them."

The aggregate of the revenues derived from the several states of which Clemens August was the head nowhere appears; but the civil income of the electorate alone had, in his later years, risen from the million of florins of his predecessor to about the same number of thalers--an increase of some 40 per centum; added to this were large sums derived from the church, and subsidies from Austria, France and the sea-coast states amounting to at least 14,000,000 francs; indeed, during the Elector's last ten years the French subsidies alone made an aggregate of at least 7,300,000 francs; in 1728 Holland paid on account of the Clemens Canal 76,000 thalers. At the centennial opening of the strong-box of the Teutonic Order he obtained the fat accumulations of a hundred years; and 25 years later he opened it again. Yet, though during his rule peace was hardly interrupted in his part of Europe, he plunged ever deeper and more inextricably into debt, leaving one of large proportions as his legacy to his successor. He was a bad ruler, but a kindly, amiable and popular man. How should he know or feel the value of money or the necessity of prudence? His childhood had been spent in captivity, his student years in Rome, where, precisely at that period, poetry and music were cultivated, if not in very noble and manly forms, at least with a Medicean splendor. The society of the Arcadians was in full activity. True, both Clemens August and his brother were under the age which enabled them to be enrolled as "Shepherds," and consequently their names appear neither in Crescembini nor in Quadrio; but it is not to be supposed that two young princes, already bishops by election and certain of still higher dignities in the future, were excluded from the palaces of Ruspoli and Ottoboni, from those brilliant literary, artistic and luxurious circles in which, only half a dozen years before, their young countryman, the musician Handel, had found so cordial a welcome. Those were very expensive tastes, as the citation from Ennen shows, which the future elector brought with him from Rome. Italian palaces, Italian villas, churches, gardens, music, songstresses, mistresses, an Italian holy staircase on the Kreuzberg (leading to nothing); Italian pictures, mosaics and, what not? All these things cost money--but must he not have them?

This elector is perhaps the only archbishop on record to whose epitaph may truthfully be added: "He danced out of this world into some other";--which happened in this wise: Having, in the winter of 1760-61, by some unexpected stroke of good fortune, succeeded in obtaining from the usually prudent and careful bankers of Holland a loan of 80,000 thalers, he embraced the opportunity of making a long-desired visit to his family in Munich. Owing to a sudden attack of illness he was once on the point of turning back soon after leaving Bonn. He persevered, however, reached Coblenz and crossed over to the palace of the Elector of Trèves at Ehrenbreitstein, where he arrived at 4 P.M. February 5, 1761. At dinner an hour later he was unable to eat; but at the ball, which followed, he could not resist the fascination of the Baroness von Waldendorf--sister of His Transparency of Trèves--and danced with her "eight or nine turns." Of course he could not refuse a similar compliment to several other ladies. The physical exertion of dancing, joined to the excitement of the occasion and following a dreary winter-day's journey, was too much for the enfeebled constitution of a man of sixty years. He fainted in the ballroom, was carried to his chamber and died next day.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ELECTORAL CHAPEL

It seems to have been the etiquette, that when an elector breathed his last, the musical chapel expired with him. At all events, no other explanation appears of the fact that so many of the petitions for membership, which are still preserved, should be signed by men who had already been named in the Court Calendars. It is also to be remarked that some of the petitioners receive appointments "without salary." These seem to have been appointments of the kind, which in later years were distinguished in the records and in the calendars by the term "accessist," and which, according to the best lights afforded by the archives, may be considered as having been provisional, until the incumbent had proved his skill and capacity, or until a vacancy occurred through the death or resignation of some old member. There are indications that the "accessists," though without fixed salary, received some small remuneration for their services; but this is by no means certain. It would seem that both vocalists and instrumentists who received salaries out of the state revenues were limited to a fixed number; that the amount of funds devoted to this object was also strictly limited and the costs incurred by the engagement of superior artists with extra salaries, or by an increase of the number, were defrayed from the Elector's privy purse; that the position of "accessist" was sought by young musicians as a stepping-stone to some future vacancy which, when acquired, insured a gradually increasing income during the years of service and a small pension when superannuated; that the etiquette of the court demanded, even in cases when the Elector expressly called some distinguished artist to Bonn, that the appointment should be apparently only in gracious answer to an humble petition, and that, with few exceptions, both singers and members of the orchestra were employed in the church, the theatre and the concert-room.

Clemens August made his formal entry into Bonn, May 15, 1724. A number of petitions are passed over, but one granted "without salary" on February 18, 1727, from Van den Eeden must be given in its entirety:

Supplique tres humble a S. A. S. E. de Cologne pour Gille Vandeneet. BONN, d. 18 Feb., 1727.

Prince Serenissime, Monsigneur.

Vandeneet vient avec tout le respect qui luy est possible se mettre aux pieds de V. A. S. E. luy representer qu'ayant eu l'honneur d'avoir estre second organiste de feu S. A. S. E. d'heureuse memoire, elle daigne luy vouloir faire la même grace ne demendant aucun gage si long tems qu'il plaira a V. A. S. E. promettant la servire avec soin et diligence.

Quoi faisant etc. etc.

On the same date Van den Eeden received his appointment as second court organist. June 8, 1728, a decree is issued granting him a salary of 100 florins. To a third petition the next year, signed Van den Enden, the answer is an increase of his salary to 200 thalers, and thus a future instructor of Ludwig van Beethoven becomes established in Bonn. The records need not concern us now until we reach the following, which forms part of the history of the grandfather of the subject of this biography:

March, 1733,

DECRETUM For Ludovicum van Beethoven as Electoral Court Musician.

Cl. A. Whereas His Serene Highness Elector of Cologne, Duke Clemens August in Upper and Lower Bavaria, etc. Our Gracious Lord having, on the humble petition of Ludovico van Beethoven, graciously declared and received him as Court Musician, and assigned him an annual salary of 400 florins Rhenish, the present decree under the gracious hand of His Serene Electoral Highness and the seal of the Privy Chancellor, is granted to him, and the Electoral Councillor and Paymaster Risack is herewith commanded to pay the said Beethoven the 400 fl. _quartaliter_ from the beginning of this year and to make a proper accounting thereof. B... March, 1733.

Thirteen years later we find this:

Allowance of an additional 100 Thalers annually to the Chamber Musician van Beethoven.

Inasmuch as His Serene Highness Elector of Cologne, Duke Clement August of Upper and Lower Bavaria, our most Gracious Lord has increased the salary of his Chamber Musician van Beethoven by the addition of 100 thalers annually which became due through the death of Joseph Kayser, instrument maker, the Court Chamber Councillor and Paymaster Risach is hereby informed and graciously commanded to pay to him the said Beethoven the 100 fl. a year in quarterly installments against voucher from the proper time and to make the proper accounting. Witness, etc. Poppelsdorf, August 22, 1746.

On May 2, 1747, Johann Ries became Court Trumpeter with a salary of 192 thalers. This is the first representative we have met of a name which afterwards rose to great distinction, not only in the orchestra of the Elector but also in the world at large. On March 5, 1754, he was formally appointed Court Musician (violinist) having set forth in his petition that instead of confining himself to the trumpet he had made himself serviceable in the chapel by singing and playing other instruments. Later he took ill and was sent to Cologne. We shall presently meet his two daughters and his son Franz Ries, the last of whom will figure prominently in the life-history of Beethoven. Under date March 27, 1756, occur several papers which have a double interest. They relate to the Beethoven family and are so complete as to exhibit the entire process of appointment to membership in the electoral chapel. The original documents are not calculated to give the reader a very exalted idea of the orthographical knowledge of the petitioner or the Chamber Music Director Gottwaldt; but that fault gives us the clue to the correct pronunciation of the name Beethoven--the English "Beet-garden."

JOHANN VAN BEETHOVEN BECOMES "ACCESSIST"

To His Electoral Serenity of Cologne, etc. My most Gracious Lord the humble petition and prayer of Joan van Biethoffen.

Most Reverend, most Serene Elector, Most Gracious Lord, Lord, etc.

May it please your Electoral Serenity graciously to hear the humble representations how in the absence of voices in Your Highness's Court Chapel my insignificant self took part in the music for at least four years without the good fortune of having allotted by Your Serene Electoral Highness a small _salario_.

I therefore pray Your Serene Electoral Highness most humbly that it graciously please you (in consideration of my father's faithful service for 23 years) to rejoice me with a decree as court musician, which high grace will infuse me with zeal to serve Your Serene

Highness with the greatest fidelity and zealousness.

Your Serene Electoral Highness's Most humble-obedient-faithful servant, Joan van Biethoffen.

To the Music Director Gottwaldt for a report of his humble judgment. Attestation by the most gracious sign manual and seal of the privy chancellary.

Bonn, March 19, 1756. (Signed) Clemens August (L.S.)

Most reverend, most serene Elector, Most gracious Lord, Lord, etc.

Your Serene Electoral Highness has referred to my humble judgment the petition of Joan van Piethoffen, the supplicant prays Your Electoral Highness for a gracious decree as accessist in the court music, he has indeed served for two years with his voice on the Duc Sall (doxal), hopes in time to deserve the good will of Your Serene Highness by his industry, and his father who enjoys the grace of serving Your Highness as bass singer prays his appointment, I pray most humbly and obediently for instruction concerning your Highness's good will in the matter, submit myself humbly and obediently to Your Serene Highness's grace and remain in greatest humility.

Your Serene and Electoral Highness's Most Humble and obedient servant Gottwaldt, Director of the Chamber Music.

A further report was made to the Elector as follows:

BONN, March 27, 1756. _Coloniensis gratiosa._

Chamber Music Director Gottwaldt _ad supplicam_ of Joan van Betthoffen has served two years on the docsal and hopes through his industry to serve further to the satisfaction of Your Electoral Highness, to which end his father who through Your Highness's grace serves as bass singer will seek completely to qualify him which may it please Your Serene Highness to allow.

Idem Gottwaldt _ad supplicam_ Ernest Haveckas, accessist in the court music, reports that suppliant, though not fully capable as yet hopes by special diligence to make himself worthy of Your Highness's service and would be encouraged and rejoiced in his efforts if Your Serene Highness would graciously deign to grant him a _decreto_, humbly praying to be informed as to Your Highness's wishes in the matter.

DECRETUM

Court Musician's Decree for Johan van Biethofen.

Clm. A. Whereas His Serene Electoral Highness of Cologne, Duke Clement August in Upper and Lower Bavaria etc. Our Gracious Lord on the humble petition of Johan van Biethofen and in consideration of his skill in the art of singing, also the experience in the same already gained, having graciously declared and accepted him as court musician, appoint and accept him by this writing; therefore the said Biethofen receives this decree with the gracious sign manual and seal of the Privy Chancellary, and those who are concerned to recognize him hereafter as an Electoral court musician and to pay him such respect as the position deserves.

Bonn, March 25, 1756.

Johann van Beethoven was 16 years old at this time. Why he should appear in the Court Calendar as an _accessist_ four years after the publication of this decree appointing him Court Musician does not appear.

THE DUTIES OF COURT CHAPELMASTERS

But slender success has rewarded the search for means of determining the character and quality of that opera and music, upon which, according to Ennen, Clemens August lavished such large sums. The period embraced in that elector's rule (1724-1761) was precisely that in which the _old_ Italian opera, the oratorio and the sacred cantata reached their extreme limits of development through the genius of Handel and J. S. Bach. It closes at the moment when Gluck, C. P. E. Bach and Joseph Haydn were laying the immovable foundations of a new operatic, orchestral and pianoforte music, and before the perfected sonata-form, that found universal adoption in all compositions of the better class, not vocal. Little music comparatively was issued from the press in those days, and consequently new forms and new styles made their way slowly into vogue. Another consequence was that the offices of composer for the chamber, the church, the comedy, or however they were named, were by no means sinecures--neither at the

imperial court of Maria Theresia, nor at the court of any petty prince or noble whose servants formed his orchestra. Composers had to furnish music on demand and as often as was necessary, as the hunter delivered game or the fisherman fish. What a volume of music was produced in this manner can be seen in the case of Joseph Haydn at Esterhaz, whose fruitfulness did not, in all probability, exceed that of many another of his contemporaries. The older Telemann furnished compositions to the courts of Bayreuth and Eisenach as well as the Gray Friars at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and also performed his duties as musical director and composer at Hamburg. He wrote music with such ease that, as Handel said, he could write for eight voices as rapidly as an ordinary man could write a letter. Under such conditions did the men write who are mentioned as official composers in our narrative. It is probable that not a note of theirs remains in existence, and equally probable that the loss is not at all deplorable except as it leaves the curiosity of an antiquary unsatisfied. A few text-books to vocal pieces performed on various occasions during this reign have been preserved, their titles being “Componimento per Musica,” music by Giuseppe dall’Abaco, Director of the Chamber Music (1740); “La Morte d’Abel” (no date is given, but “il Signor Biethoven” sang the part of _Adamo_); “Esther” (“From the Italian of S. F. A. Aubert,” the text partly in German, partly in Italian); “Anagilda” (_Drama per Musica_).

After the unlucky ball at Ehrenbreitstein the crook and sceptre of Cologne passed from the Bavarian family which had so long held them into the hands of Maximilian Friedrich of the Suabian line Königsegg- (or Königseck-) Rothenfels. For a century or more this house had enjoyed fat livings in the church at Cologne, in which city the new elector was born on May 13, 1708. He was the fourth of his race who had held the important office of Dean of the Cathedral, from which post he was elevated to the electorship on April 6, 1761, and to the ecclesiastical principality of Münster the next year; with which two sees he was fain to be content. He was by nature an easy, good-tempered, indolent, friendly man, of no great force of character--qualities which in the incumbent of a rich sinecure just completing his fifty-third year, would be too fully confirmed and developed by habit to change with any change of circumstances; and which, says Stramberg, made him unusually popular throughout the land despite the familiar little verse:

Bei Clemens August trug man blau und weiss, Da lebte man wie im Paradeis; Bei Max Friedrich trug man sich schwarz und roth, Da litt man Hunger wie die schwere Noth.

The condition of the finances had become such through the extravagant expenditures of Clemens August that very energetic measures were necessary, and to the effects of these, during the first few years of Max Friedrich’s rule, in throwing many persons out of employment, these doggerel lines doubtless owe their origin.

MAX FRIEDRICH AND HIS MINISTER

It was fortunate for the Elector’s subjects that his indolence was made good by the activity and energy of a prime minister who found his beau ideal of a statesman in Frederick II of Prussia, whom, in his domestic policy, he imitated as far as the character of the two governments allowed. This was equally if not more true in the principality of Münster. To the respect which one must feel for the memory of Belderbusch, the all-powerful minister at Bonn, is added, in the case of Fürstenberg, the equally powerful minister at Münster, admiration and regard for the man. The former was respected, feared, but not loved in the electorate; the latter was respected and very popular in the principality. To Kasper Anton von Belderbusch the new Elector owed his elevation; to his care he entrusted the state; to his skill and strength of character he was indebted for release from the pecuniary difficulties which beset him and for the satisfaction, as the years rolled by, of seeing his states numbered among the most prosperous and flourishing in Germany. Belderbusch’s first care was to reduce the expenditure. “He put a stop to building,” says Ennen, “dismissed a number of the actors, restricted the number of concerts and court balls, dispensed with the costly hunts, reduced the salaries of court officials, officers and domestics, lessened the _état_ for the kitchen, cellar and table of the prince, turned the property left by Clemens August into money and comforted the latter’s creditors with the hope of better times.” But though economy was the rule, still, where the Elector considered it due to his position, he could be lavish. Whatever opinions may be entertained as to the wisdom and expediency of clothing ecclesiastics with civil power, it would be unjust not to give the bright as well as the dark side of the picture. This is well put by Kaspar Risbeck in relation to the Rhenish states whose princes were churchmen, and his remarks are in place here, since they relate in part to that in which the childhood and youth of Beethoven were spent.

The whole stretch of the country from here to Mayence is one of the richest and most populous in Germany. Within this territory of 18 German miles there are 20 cities lying hard by the shore of the Rhine and dating, for the greater part, from the period of the Romans. It is still plainly to be seen that this portion of Germany was the first to be built up. Neither morasses nor heaths interrupt the evidences of cultivation which stretch with equal industry far from the shores of the river over the contiguous country. While many cities and castles built under Charlemagne and his successors, especially Henry I, in other parts of Germany have fallen into decay, all in this section have not only been preserved but many have been added to them.... The natural wealth of the soil in

comparison with that of other lands, and the easy disposition of its products by means of the Rhine, have no doubt contributed most to these results. Nevertheless, great as is the prejudice in Germany against the ecclesiastical governments, they have beyond doubt aided in the blooming development of these regions. In the three ecclesiastical electorates which make up the greater part of this tract of land nothing is known of those tax burdens under which the subjects of so many secular princes of Germany groan. These princes have exceeded the old assessments but slightly. Little is known in their countries of serfdom. The appanage of many princes and princesses do not force them to extortion. They have no inordinate military institution, and do not sell the sons of their farmers; and they have never taken so active a part in the domestic and foreign wars of Germany as the secular princes. Though they are not adept in encouraging their subjects in art culture, varied agriculture has been developed to a high degree of perfection throughout the region. Nature does of its own accord what laws and regulations seek to compel, as soon as the rocks of offence are removed from the path.[1]

Henry Swinburne, whose letters to his brother were published long after his death under the title of “The Courts of Europe,” writes under date of November 29, 1780:

Bonn is a pretty town, neatly built, and its streets tolerably well paved, all in black lava. It is situated in a flat near the river. The Elector of Cologne’s palace faces the South entry. It has no beauty of architecture and is all plain white without any pretensions.

We went to court and were invited to dine with the Elector (Königsegge). He is 73 years old, a little, hale, black man, very merry and affable. His table is none of the best; no dessert wines handed about, nor any foreign wines at all. He is easy and agreeable, having lived all his life in ladies’ company, which he is said to have liked better than his breviary. The captains of his guard and a few other people of the court form the company, amongst whom were his two great-nieces, Madame de Hatzfeld and Madame de Taxis. The palace is of immense size, the ball-room particularly large and low.... The Elector goes about to all the assemblies and plays at Tric-trac. He asked me to be of his party but I was not acquainted with their way of playing. There is every evening an assembly or play at court. The Elector seems very strong and healthy, and will, I think, hold the Archduke a good tug yet.

This Archduke was Max Franz, youngest son of Maria Theresia, whose acquaintance Swinburne had made in Vienna, and who had just been chosen coadjutor to Max Friedrich. A curious proof of the liberality, not to say laxity, of the Elector’s sentiments in one direction is given by Stramberg in his “Rheinischer Antiquarius,” to wit, the possession of a mistress in common by him and his minister Belderbusch--the latter fathering the children--and this mistress was the Countess Caroline von Satzenhofen, Abbess of Vilich!

CHAPELMASTER LUDWIG VAN BEETHOVEN

The reduction which was made by Belderbusch upon the accession of Max Friedrich in the expenses of the theatre and other amusements does not appear, except in the case of the chapelmaster, to have extended to the court music proper, nor to have been long continued in respect to the “operetta and comedy.” The first in order of the documents and notices discovered relating to the musical establishment of this Elector are of no common interest, being the petition of a candidate for the vacant office of chapelmaster and the decree appointing him to that position. They are as follows:

Very Reverend Archbishop and Elector most gracious Lord Lord!

May it please Your Electoral Grace to permit a representation of my faithfully and dutifully performed services for a considerable space as vocalist as well as, since the death of the chapelmaster, for more than a year his duties _in Dupplo_, that is to say by singing and wielding the baton concerning which my demand still remains _ad referendum_ much less have I been assured of the position. Inasmuch as because of particular _recommendation_ Dousmoulin was preferred over me, and indeed unjustly, I have been forced hitherto to submit to fate.

But now, gracious Elector and Lord, that because of the reduction in salaries Chapelmaster Dousmoulin has already asked his demission or will soon do so, and I at the command of Baron Belderbusch am to begin _de novo_ to fill his office, and the same must surely be replaced,--Therefore

There reaches Your Electoral Grace my humble petition that you may graciously be pleased (: inasmuch as the “Toxal” must be sufficiently supplied with _musique_, and I must at all events take the lead in the occurring church ceremonies _in puncto_ the chorales:) to grant me the justice of which I was deprived on the death of Your Highness’s _antecessori_ of blessed memory, and appoint me chapelmaster with some augmentation of my lessened salary because of my services performed in _Duplo_. For which highest grace I shall pour out my prayers to God for the long continuing health and government of your Electoral Grace, while in

deepest submission I throw myself at your feet.

Your Electoral Grace's most humble servant Ludwig van Beethoven "Passist."

M. F. Whereas We, Maximilian Friedrich, Elector of Cologne, on the demission of our former chapelmaster Touche Moulin, and the humble petition of our bass singer Ludwig van Beethoven have appointed the latter to be chapelmaster with the retention of his position as bass singer, and have added 97 rthlr. _species_ 40 alb. to his former salary of 292 rthlr. _species_ 40 alb. per annum divided in _quartalien_, which appointment is hereby made and payment ordered by our grace, our exchequer and all whom it may concern are called on to observe the fact and do what is required under the circumstances.

Attest, etc.

Bonn, July 16, 1761.

Next in order, at an interval of rather more than a year, is the following short paper in reply to a petition, not preserved, of the new chapelmaster's son:

Supplicanten is hereby graciously assured that in the event of a _vacatur_ of a court musician's salary he shall have special consideration. Attest our gracious sign manual and the impress of the seal of the Privy Chancellary.

Bonn, November 27, 1762.

Max Fried. Elector. v. Belderbusch, (:L. S.:)

About December, 1763, a singer, Madame Lentner, after some four and a half years of service, threw up her appointment, giving occasion, through the vacancy thus caused, for the following petition, report and decrees:

Most Reverend Elector, Most Gracious Lord, Lord.

Will Your Electoral Grace deign to receive the representation that by the acceptance of service elsewhere of Court Musician Dauber there has fallen to the disposition of Your Reverend Electoral Grace a salary of 1,050 rth., wherefore I, Joannes van Beethoven, having graciously been permitted for a considerable time to serve as court musician and have been graciously assured by decree of appointment to the first vacancy, and have always faithfully and diligently performed my duties and graciously been permitted to be in good voice, therefore my prayer is made to Your Reverend and Electoral Grace for a grant of the aforesaid 1,050 rth. or a gracious portion thereof, which act of highest grace I shall try to merit by fidelity and zeal in the performance of my duties.

Your Reverend Electoral Grace's most obedient servant Joannes van Beethoven, vocalist.

This petition was seconded by the father in the following manner:

Most Reverend Archbishop and Elector, Most gracious Lord, Lord.

Your Electoral Grace having graciously been pleased to submit for my humble report the humble petition of Your Highness's court musician Joann Ries that his daughter be appointed to the place in the court music of Your Highness made vacant by the discharged soprano Lentner _sub Litt. A._

Humbly obeying Your gracious command I submit an impartial report that for about a year the daughter of the court musician Ries has frequented the "Duc sahl" (doxal) and sung the soprano part and that to my satisfaction.

But now that my son Joannes van Beethoven has already for 13 years sung soprano, contralto and tenor in every emergency that has arisen on the "Duc sahl," is also capable on the violin, wherefore Your Reverend Electoral Grace _27 Novembris 1762_ granted the accompanying decree graciously bearing your own high sign manual _sub Litt. B._

My humble and obedient but not anticipatory opinion is that the court singer Lentner's vacated salary _ad_ 300 fl. (: who went away without the gracious permission of Your Highness over a quarter of a year ago and reported to me _in specie_ she was going without permission and would not return:) be graciously divided so that my son be decreed to receive 200 florins and the daughter of Court Musician Ries 100 fl.

Zu Ewr. Churfürst. gnaden beständige hulden und gnaden mich unterthänigst erlassendt in tieffester submission ersterbe.

Your Reverend Electoral Grace's most humble and obedient Ludwig van Beethoven, Chapel Master.

JOHANN VAN BEETHOVEN'S SALARY

Increase of salary of 100 rthr. for Court Musician Beethoven.

M. F.

Whereas We, Maximilian Friedrich, Elector of Cologne, on the humble petition of our court musician Johann van Beethoven, have shown him the grace to allow him 100 rthr. out of the salary vacated by the departure of the singer Lentner to be paid annually in _quartalien_ we hereby confirm the allowance; for which this decree is graciously promulgated to be observed by our Electoral exchequer which is to govern itself accordingly.

Attest p. Bonn, April 24, 1764.

Under the same date a decree was issued appointing Anna Maria Ries, daughter of Johann Ries, Court Singer, with a salary of 100 th. also out of that of the Lentner. A few days later the following action was taken:

M. F. E.

To the Electoral Exchequer touching the appointment of Court Musician Beethoven and the Singer Ries.

You are hereby graciously informed that our court musician Bethoven junior and the singer Ries will soon lay before you two decrees of appointment. Now inasmuch as with this the salary of the former singer Lentner is disposed of but since she received an advance of 37-1/2 rth. from our Master of Revenues and 18 rth. _spec._ was paid to her creditors we graciously command you herewith so to arrange the payment of the two salaries that the advance from the Revenues and then the payment to the creditors be covered from the Lentner's salary; and that until this is done the salaries of the beforementioned Ries and Bethoven do not begin.

We etc. Bonn, April 27, 1764.

On April 3, 1778, Anna Maria Ries received an additional 100 fl. A few more documents lead us to the family of Johann Peter Salomon:

ad Supplicam Philip Salomon.

To inform our chapelmaster van Betthoven appointed on his humble petition that we are not minded to grant the letter prayed for to the Prince v. Sulkowsky, but in case his son is not returned by the beginning of the coming month 8bris, we are graciously determined to make disposition of his place and salary.

Attest. Münster, August 8, 1764. Sent, the 22 _dito_.

In spite of this order on July 1, 1765, the Elector gave a document to the son, Johann Peter Salomon, certifying that he had served him faithfully and diligently and had "so conducted himself as to deserve to be recommended to every one according to his station."[2] On petition of Philipp Salomon, the father, he and his daughter were appointed Court Musicians by decree dated August 11, 1764.

Several papers, dated April 26, 1768, although upon matters of very small importance, have a certain interest as being in part official communications from the pen of Chapelmaster van Beethoven, and illustrating in some measure his position and duties. They show, too, that his path was not always one bordered with roses. Being self-explanatory they require no comment:

I.

Most Reverend Archbishop and Elector, Most Gracious Lord, Lord.

Will Your Electoral Grace deign to listen to the complaint that when Court Singer Schwachhofer was commanded in obedience to an order of His Excellency Baron von Belderbusch to alternate with Jacobina Salomon in the singing of the solos in the church music as is the custom, the said Schwachhofer in the presence of the entire chapel impertinently and literally answered me as follows: I will not accept your _ordre_ and you have no right to command me.

Your Electoral Grace will doubtless recall various _disordre_ on the part of the court chapel indicating that all respect and _ordonance_ is withheld from me, each member behaving as he sees fit, which is very painful to my sensibilities.

Wherefore my humble prayer reaches Your Electoral Highness that the public affront of the Schwachhofer be punished to my deserved _satisfaction_ and that a decree issue from Your Highness to the entire chapel that at the cost of Your Gracious displeasure or punishment according to the offence my _ordre_ shall not be evaded.

Your Electoral Grace's Humble and Most Obedient Servant Ludovicus van Beethoven.

II.

To Chapelmaster van Beethoven Concerning the Court Musicians. M. F. E.

Receive the accompanying Command to the end that its contents be conveyed to all of our court musicians or be posted on the "toxal."

We remain, etc. Bonn, April 26, 1768.

III.

Command respecting the Court Musicians.

Having learned with displeasure that several of our court musicians have tried to evade the _ordre_ issued by our Chapel Master or refused to receive them from him, and conduct themselves improperly amongst themselves, all of our court musicians are hereby earnestly commanded without contradiction to obey all the commands given by our Chapel Master in our name, and bear peaceful relations with each other, since we are determined to proceed with rigor against the guilty to the extent of dismissal in certain cases.

Sig. Bonn, April 26, 1768.

JOHANN VAN BEETHOVEN NEEDS MORE MONEY

On November 17, 1769, Johann van Beethoven submits a petition in which he exhibits anew his genius for devising methods for varying the spelling of his own name. That he could no longer live on 100 th. salary is evident when it is remembered that he has now been married two years; but as there were several applicants for the salary which had fallen to the disposal of the Elector, it was divided among the four most needy. Beethoven's memorial contains a fact or two in regard to his duties as Court Musician which are new:

To His Electoral Grace of Cologne, etc., etc.

The Humble Supplication and Prayer of Johann Bethof, Court Musician.

Most Reverend Archbishop and Elector, Most Gracious Lord, Lord.

May Your Most Reverend Electoral Grace, graciously permit the presentation of this humble _supplicando_, how for many years I have served Your Highness faithfully and industriously on the "Duc saahl" and the theatre, and also have given instruction in various _supjecta_ concerning the aforesaid service to the entire satisfaction of Your Electoral Grace, and am engaged now in study to perfect myself to this end.

My father also joins in this _supplic_ in his humble capacity of the _theatri_ and will participate in the gladness should Your Electoral Grace graciously grant the favor; as it is impossible for me to live on the salary of 100 th. graciously allowed me, I pray Your Electoral Grace to bestow upon me the 100 th. left at Your gracious disposal by the death of Your court musician Philip Haveck; to merit this high grace by faithful and diligent service shall be my greatest striving.

Your Electoral Grace's most humble Joannes Bethof, Court Musician.

In answer to this there came the following decree:

Whereas we, Max. Frid. p. on the death of Court Musician Philipp Haveck and the submissive petition of our court musician Philipp Salomon bestowed upon him the grace of adding 50 fl. for his two daughters to the salary which he already enjoys out of the salary

of the above mentioned Haveck per year; we confirm the act hereby; wherefore we have graciously issued, this decree, which our Electoral Court Exchequer will humbly observe and make all necessary provisions.

Attest, p. Münster, 17th 9bris 1769.

(On the margin:) “Gracious addition of 50 fl. for the court musician Philipp Salomon” and, besides Brandt and Meuris, also “_in simili_ for Court Musician Joann Bethoff 25 fl.”

There need be no apology for filling a few more pages with extracts from documents found in the Düsseldorf archives; for now a period has been reached in which the child Ludwig van Beethoven is growing up into youth and early manhood, and thrown into constant contact with those whose names will appear. Some of these names will come up many years later in Vienna; others will have their parts to play in the narrative of that child’s life. Omitting, for the present, a petition of Johann van Beethoven, we begin them with that of Joseph Demmer, of date January 23, 1773, which first secured him his appointment after a year’s service and three months’ instruction from “the young Mr. van Beethoven.”

Most Reverend Archbishop and Elector, Most Gracious Lord, etc., etc.

I have been accepted as chorister in the cathedral of this city at a salary of 80 th. per year, and have so practised myself in music that I humbly flatter myself of my ability to perform my task with the highest satisfaction.

It being graciously known that the bass singer van Beethoven is incapacitated and can no longer serve as such, and the contra-bassist Noisten can not adapt his voice: therefore this my submissive to Your Reverend Electoral Grace that you graciously be pleased to accept me as your bass singer with such gracious salary as may seem fit; I offer should it be demanded to attend the operettas also and qualify myself in a short time. It depends upon a mere hint from Your Electoral Grace alone; that it shall not be burdensome to the cantor’s office of the cathedral to save the loss of the 80 th. yearly which it has bestowed upon me.

I am in most dutiful reverence Your Electoral Grace’s most obedient Joseph Demmer.

Pro Memoria.

Cantor Demmer earned at the utmost 106 rth. per year if he neglected none of the greater or little _Horis_.

Pays the Chamber Chancellor Kügelgen for board, annually, 66 rth. for _quartier_ (lodging) 12 rth.

moreover, he must find himself in clothes and washing since his father, the sub-sacristan in Cologne, is still overburdened with 6 children.

He has paid 6 rth. to young Mr. Beethoven for 3 months.

JOSEPH DEMMER SUCCEEDS BEETHOVEN

In response to another petition after the death of L. van Beethoven the following decree was issued:

Decree as Court vocal bass for Joseph Demmer.

Whereas His Electoral Grace of Cologne, M. F. our most gracious Lord, on the humble petition of Joseph Demmer has graciously appointed and accepted him as His Highness’s vocal bass on the Electoral Toxal, with a yearly salary of 200 fl. divided in _quartalien_ to begin with the current time, the appointment is confirmed hereby and a decree granted to the same Demmer, of which, for purposes of payment, the Electoral Chancellary will take notice and all whom it may concern will respect and obey the same and otherwise do what is necessary in the premises. Attest, p. Bonn, May 29, 1774.

Two years later leave of absence, but without salary, was granted to Joseph Demmer to visit Amsterdam to complete his education in music. Further notes from documentary sources:

1774. May 26. Andreas Lucchesi appointed Court Chapelmaster in place of Ludwig van Beethoven, deceased, with a salary of 1,000 fl.

May 29. Salary of Anna Maria Ries raised from 230 fl. to 300 fl. On May 13, 1775, together with Ferdinand Trewer (Drewer), violinist, she receives leave of absence for four months, to begin in June with two quarters’ pay in advance. In the Court Calendar for 1775, which was printed about seven months in advance, she is already described as Madame Drewers, née Ries. She was

considered the best singer in the chapel.

November 23. Franz Anton Ries has granted him 25 th. payable quarterly.

1775. March 23. Nicolas Simrock appointed on petition “Court Hornist on the Electoral Toxal, in the cabinet and at table,” and a salary of 300 fl. was granted April 1. This is the first appearance in these records of a name which afterwards rose into prominence.

1777. April 20. B. J. Mäurer, violoncellist, “who has served in the court chapel from the beginning of the year till now on a promise of 100 th.,” prays for an appointment as court ’cellist at a salary of 400 th. Appointed at a salary of 200 th.; we shall have occasion to recur to him presently in connection with notices touching Beethoven.

Under date May 22, 1778, J. van Beethoven informs the Elector that “the singer Averdonck, who is to be sent to Chapelmaster Sales at Coblenz, is to pay 15 fl. per month for board and lodging but that only a _douceur_ is to be asked for her instruction and that to take her thither will cost 20 th.” There followed upon this the following document:

To the humble announcement of Court Musician Beethoven touching the singer Averdonck.

Electoral Councillor Forlivesi is to pay to the proper authorities for a year beginning next month, 15 fl. a month and for the travelling expenses 20 rth. once and for all as soon as the journey is begun.

Attest. p. Bonn, May 22, 1778.

This pupil of Johann van Beethoven, Johanna Helena Averdonk, born in Bonn on December 11, 1760, and brought forward by her teacher at a concert in Cologne, received 120 th. “as a special grace” on July 2, and was appointed Court Singer on November 18, 1780, with a salary of 200 th. She died nine years later, August 13, 1789.

The petitions sent in to the Elector were rarely dated and were not always immediately attended to; therefore the date of a _decretum_ is not to be taken as conclusive in regard to the date of facts mentioned in a petition. An illustration is afforded by a petition of Franz Ries. He has returned from a tour to Vienna and prays for a salary of 500 fl. “not the half of what he can earn elsewhere.” The petition is dated March 2. Two months passing without bringing him an answer, he petitions again and obtains a decree on May 2 that in addition to his salary of 28 th. 2 alb. 6, he shall receive “annoch so viel,”--again as much,--i. e., 400 fl.

1780. August. Court Organist Van den Eede prays that in consideration of his service of 54 years he be graciously and charitably given the salary vacated by the death of Court Musician Salomon. Eighteen others make the same prayer. The decision of the privy council is in these words: “To be divided between Huttenus and Esch. A decree as musical vocalist must first be given to the latter.”

1781. February 15. The name of C. G. Neefe is now met with for the first time. He petitions for appointment to the position of organist in succession to Van den Eede, obviously aged and infirm. A decree was issued “_placet et expediatur_ on the death of Organist Van den Eede,” and a salary of 400 fl. granted.

1782. May 16. Johann van Beethoven petitions for “the three measures (_Malter_) of corn.”

The archives of Düsseldorf furnish little more during the time of Max Frederick save certain papers relating to the Beethoven family, which are reserved for another place.

OPERA AT THE ELECTOR’S COURT

The search for means to form some correct idea of the character of the musical performances at the Elector’s court during this reign has been more successful than for the preceding; but much is left to be desired down to the year 1778, when the theatre was placed upon a different basis and its history is sufficiently recorded. Such notices, however, in relation to the operatic entertainments as have been found scattered, mostly in the newspapers of Bonn, in those years, are numerous enough to give an idea of their character; while the remarks upon the festivities of the court, connected with them, afford a pretty lively picture of social amusement in the highest circle. We make room for some of the most significant occurrences, in chronological order:

1764. January 3. Galuppi’s opera “Il Filosofo di Campagna,” given in the Electoral Theatre with great applause.

January 8. A grand assembly at the palace in the afternoon, a magnificent supper in the grand gallery at which many spectators were present, and finally a masked ball.

March 23. Second performance of “La buona Figliuola,” music by Piccini.

May 13. Elector's birthday; "Le Nozze," music by Galuppi, and two ballets.

May 20. "II Filosofo" again, the notice of which is followed by the remark that the Elector is about removing to Brühl for the summer but will visit Bonn twice a week "on the days when operas are performed."

September 21. "La Pastorella al Soglio" (composer not named, probably Latilla), and two ballets.

December 16. "La Calamità di cuori," by Galuppi, and two ballets. This was "the first performance by the Mingotti company under the direction of Rizzi and Romanini."

1765. January 6. "Le Aventure di Rodolfo" (Piccini?), given by the same company together with a pantomime, "L'Arlequino fortunato per la Maggia." After the play there was a grand supper at which the Pope's nuncio was a guest, and finally a masked ball kept up till 6 o'clock in the morning.

1767. May 13. The Archbishop's birthday. Here is the programme condensed from the long description of the festivities in the "Bonnischer Anzeiger": 1, Early in the morning three rounds from the cannon on the city walls; 2, The court and public graciously permitted to kiss His Transparency's hand; 3, solemn high mass with salvos of artillery; 4, Grand dinner in public, the pope's nuncio, the foreign ministers and the nobility being the guests and the eating being accompanied by "exquisite table-music"; 5, After dinner "a numerously attended assembly"; 6, "A serenata composed especially for this most joyful day" and a comic opera in the palace theatre; 7, Supper of 130 covers; 8, _Bal masqué_ until 5 a. m. The two dramatic pieces were "Serenata festivale, tra Bacco, Diana ed il Reno," the authors unnamed, and "Schiava finta," _drama giocoso dal celebre don Francesco Garzia_, _Spagnuolo_, the music probably by Piccini; "Giovanni van Beethoven" sang the part of _Dorindo_.

1768. May 16. "On the stage of the Court Theatre was performed with much applause a musical poem in German, specially written for the birthday of His Highness, and afterward an Italian intermezzo entitled 'La Nobiltà delusa.'"

1769. The festivities in honor of the birthday of the Elector took place May 17th, when, according to the "Anzeiger," "an Italian musical drama written expressly for this occasion was performed"--but the title suggests the possibility of a mistake; "II Riso d'Apolline," with music by Betz, had been heard in 1701.

1771. A single discovery only for this year has rewarded search, that of a text-book, one of particular interest: "Silvain," comédie en une acte, mélée d'ariettes, représentée, etc. Text by Marmontel, music by Grétry. _Dolmon père_, Mons. Louis van Beethoven, _Maître de Chapelle_; _Dolmon, fils ainé_, Jean van Beethoven, etc.

1772. February 27. "Le Donne sempre Donne," music by Andreas Lucchesi.

In March, on occasion of the opening of the Estates, "La Contadine in Corte," music by Sacchini.

The pieces given on the birthday this year were "Il Natal di Giove," music by Lucchesi, and "La buona Figliuola," music by Piccini. On the 17th the latter was repeated on the arrival of the French ambassador.

1773. May 30. The Elector's birthday; "L'Inganno scoperto, overo il Conte Caramella," music by Lucchesi, in which Ludovico van Beethoven sang the part of _Brunoro, contadino e tamburino_.

VERSATILITY OF THE COURT MUSICIANS

There are three more operettas which evidently belong to the succeeding winter when the Bonn company had the aid of two singers from the electoral court of Trèves. Their titles are "L'Improvvisata, o sia la Galanteria disturbata," by Lucchesi, "Li tre Amanti ridicoli," by Galuppi, and "La Moda," by Baroni. Ludwig van Beethoven did not sing in them. The means are still wanting to fill up the many gaps in the annals of this period or to carry them on during the next three years. Perhaps, however, the loss is not of much importance, for the materials collected are sufficient to warrant certain conclusions in regard to the general character of the court music. The musicians, both vocal and instrumental, were employed in the church, concert-room and theatre; their number remained without material change from the days of Christopher Petz to the close of Chapelmaster van Beethoven's life; places in this service were held to be a sort of heritage, and of right due to the children of old incumbents, when possessed of sufficient musical talent and knowledge; few if any names of distinguished virtuosos are found in the lists of the members, and, in all probability, the performances never rose above the respectable mediocrity of a small band used to playing together in the light and pleasing music of the day.

The dramatic performances appear to have been confined to the operetta; and the vocalists, who sang the Latin of the mass, seem to have been required to be equally at home in German, Italian and French in the theatre. Two visits of the Angelo Mingotti troupe are noted; and one attempt, at least, to place the opera upon a higher basis by the engagement of Italian songstresses, was evidently made in the time of Clemens August.; it may be concluded that no great improvement was made--it is certain that no permanent one was; for in the other case the Bonn theatrical revolution of 1778 had not been needed. This must be noticed in detail.

Chronologically the following sketch belongs to the biography of Ludwig van Beethoven, as it embraces a period which happens in his case to be of special interest, young as he was;--the period from his 8th to his 14th year. But the details given, though of great importance for the light which they throw upon the musical life in which he moved and acted, would hardly be of so much interest to most readers as to justify breaking with them the course of the future narrative.

It was a period of great awakening in theatrical matters. Princes and courts were beginning everywhere in Germany to patronize the drama of their mother tongue and the labors of Lessing, Gotter and other well-known names, in the original production of German, or in the translation of the best English, Italian and French plays, were justifying and giving ever new impulse to the change in taste. From the many itinerant troupes of players performing in booths, or, in the larger cities, in the play-houses, the better class of actors were slowly finding their way into permanent companies engaged and supported by the governments. True, many of the newly established court theatres had but a short and not always a very merry life; true, also, that the more common plan was merely to afford aid and protection to some itinerant troupe; still the idea of a permanent national theatre on the footing of the already long-existing court musical establishments had made way, and had already been carried out in various places before it was taken up by the elector at Bonn. It can hardly be supposed that the example of the imperial court at Vienna, with the immense means at its disposal, could exert any direct influence upon the small court at Bonn at the other extremity of Germany; but what the Duke of Gotha and the elector at Mannheim had undertaken in this direction, Max Friedrich may well have ventured and determined to imitate. But there was an example nearer home--in fact in his own capital of Münster, where he, the prince primate, usually spent the summer. In 1775, Dobbler's troupe, which had been for some time playing in that city, was broken up.

The Westhus brothers in Münster built up their own out of the ruins; but it endured only a short time. Thereupon, under the care of the minister, H. von Fürstenberg (one of those rare men whom heaven elects and equips with all necessary gifts to cultivate what is good and beautiful in the arts), a meeting of the lovers of the stage was arranged in May and a few gentlemen of the nobility and a few from the parterre formed a council which assumed the direction. The Elector makes a considerable contribution. The money otherwise received is to be applied to the improvement of the wardrobe and the theatre. The actors receive their honoraria every month.[3]

OPERA AND DRAMA AT BONN IN 1779

At Easter, 1777, Seyler, a manager famous in German theatrical annals, and then at Dresden, finding himself unable to compete with his rival, Bondini, left that city with his company to try his fortunes in Frankfort-on-the-Main, Mayence, and other cities in that quarter. The company was very large--the Theatre Lexicon (Article "Mainz") makes it, including its orchestra, amount to 230 individuals!--much too large, it seems, in spite of the assertion of the Theatre Lexicon, to be profitable. Be that as it may, after an experience of a year or more, two of the leading members, Grossmann and Helmuth, accepted an engagement from Max Friedrich to form and manage a company at Bonn in order that "the German art of acting might be raised to a school of morals and manners for his people." Taking with them a pretty large portion of Seyler's company, including several of the best members, the managers reached Bonn and were ready upon the Elector's return from Münster to open a season. "The opening of the theatre took place," says the Bonn "Dramaturgische Nachrichten," "on the 26th of November, 1778, with a prologue spoken by Madame Grossmann, 'Wilhelmine Blondheim,' tragedy in three acts by Grossmann, and 'Die grosse Batterie,' comedy in one act by Ayrenhofer." The same authority gives a list of all the performances of the season, which extended to the 30th of May, 1779, together with débuts, the dismissals and other matters pertaining to the actors. The number of the evenings on which the theatre was open was 50. A five-act play, as a rule, occupied the whole performance, but of shorter pieces usually two were given; and thus an opening was found occasionally for an operetta. Of musical dramas only seven came upon the stage and these somewhat of the lightest order except the first--the melodrama "Ariadne auf Naxos," music by Benda. The others were:

1779. February 21. "Julie," translated from the French by Grossmann, music by Desaides.

February 28. "Die Jäger und das Waldmädchen," operetta in one act, music by Duni.

March 21. “Der Hofschmied,” in two acts, music by Philidor.

April 9. “Röschen und Colas,” in one act, music by Monsigny.

May 5. “Der Fassbinder,” in one act, music by Oudinot.

May 14. A prologue “Dedicated to the Birthday Festivities of His Electoral Grace of Cologne, May 13, 1779, by J. A. Freyherrn vom Hagen.”

The selection of dramas was, on the whole, very creditable to the taste of the managers. Five of Lessing’s works, among them “Minna von Barnhelm” and “Emilia Galotti,” are in the list and some of the best productions of Bock, Gotter, Engel and their contemporaries; of translations there were Colman’s “Clandestine Marriage” and “Jealous Wife,” Garrick’s “Miss in her Teens,” Cumberland’s “West Indian,” Hoadly’s “Suspicious Husband,” Voltaire’s “Zaire” and “Jeannette,” Beaumarchais’s “Eugénie,” two or three of the works of Molière, and Goldoni, etc.;--in short, the list presents much variety and excellence.

Max Friedrich was evidently pleased with the company, for the “Nachrichten” has the following in the catalogue of performances: “On the 8th (of April) His Electoral Grace was pleased to give a splendid breakfast to the entire company in the theatre.... The company will occupy itself until the return of His Electoral Grace from Münster, which will be in the middle of November, with learning the newest and best pieces, among which are ‘Hamlet,’ ‘King Lear’ and ‘Macbeth,’ which are to be given also with much splendor of costume according to the designs of famous artists.”

It may be remarked here that the “Bonn Comedy House” (for painting the interior of which Clemens August paid 468 thalers in 1751, a date which seems to fix the time at which that end of the palace was completed), occupied that portion of the present University Archæological Museum room next the Coblenz Gate, with large doors opening from the stage into the passageway so that this space could be used as an extension of the stage in pieces requiring it for the production of grand scenic effects. Above the theatre was the “Redouten-Saal” of Max Franz’s time. The Elector had, of course, an entrance from the passages of the palace into his box. The door for the public, in an angle of the wall now built up, opened out upon the grove of horse-chestnuts. The auditorium was necessarily low, but spacious enough for several hundred spectators. Though much criticized by travellers as being unworthy so elegant a court, not to say shabby, it seems to have been a nice and snug little theatre.

Meanwhile affairs with Seyler were drawing to a crisis. He had returned with his company from Mannheim and reopened at Frankfort, August 3, 1779. On the evening of the 17th, to escape imprisonment as a bankrupt, whether through his own fault or that of another--the Theatre Lexicon affirms the latter case--he took his wife and fled to Mayence. The company was allowed by the magistrates to play a few weeks with a view of earning at least the means of leaving the city; but on October 4, its members began to separate; Benda and his wife went to Berlin, but C. G. Neefe, the music director, and Opitz, descended the Rhine to Bonn and joined the company there--Neefe assuming temporarily the direction of the music in the theatre--of which more in another place.

No record has been found of the repertory of the Bonn theatre for the season 1779-1780, except that the opening piece on December 3, on the evening after the Elector’s return from Münster, was a prologue, “Wir haben Ihn wieder!” text by Baron vom Hagen, with airs, recitatives and choruses composed by Neefe; that the “Déserteur” was in the list, and finally Hiller’s “Jagd.” In June, 1781, the season being over, the company migrated to Pyrmont, from Pyrmont to Cassel, and thence, in October, back to Bonn.

ANOTHER BUSY SEASON AT BONN

The season of 1781-’82 was a busy one; of musical dramas alone 17 are reported as newly rehearsed from September, 1781, to the same time in 1782, viz:

“Die Liebe unter den Handwerkern” (“L’Amore Artigiano”) Music by Gassmann “Robert und Calliste” „ „ Guglielmi “Der Alchymist” „ „ Schuster. “Das tartarische Gesetz” „ „ d’Antoine (of Bonn) “Der eifersüchtige Liebhaber” (“L’Amant jaloux”) „ „ Grétry “Der Hausfreund” (“L’Ami de la Maison”) „ „ Grétry “Die Freundschaft auf der Probe” (“L’Amitié à l’Épreuve”) „ „ Grétry “Heinrich und Lyda” „ „ Neefe “Die Apotheke” „ „ Neefe “Eigensinn und Launen der Liebe” „ „ Deler (Teller, Deller?) “Romeo und Julie” „ „ Benda “Sophonisba” (Deklamation mit Musik) „ „ Neefe “Lucille” „ „ Grétry “Milton und Elmire” „ „ Mihl (or Mühle) “Die Samnitische Vermählungsfeier” (“Le Marriage des Samnites”) „ „ Grétry “Ernst und Lucinde” „ „ Grétry “Günther von Schwarzburg” „ „ Holzbauer

It does not follow, however, that all these operas, operettas and plays with music were produced during the season in Bonn. The company followed the Elector to Münster in June, 1782, and removed thence to Frankfort-on-the-Main for its regular series of

performances at Michaelmas. It came back to Bonn in the Autumn.

The season 1782-'83 was as active as the preceding. Some of the newly rehearsed spoken dramas were "Sir John Falstaff," from the English, translations of Sheridan's "School for Scandal," Shakespeare's "Lear," and "Richard III," Mrs. Cowley's "Who's the Dupe?" and, of original German plays, Schiller's "Fiesco" and "Die Räuber," Lessing's "Miss Sara Sampson," Schroeder's "Testament," etc., etc. The number of newly rehearsed musical dramas--in which class are included such ballad operas as General Burgoyne's "Maid of the Oaks"--reached twenty, viz:

"Das Rosenfest" Music by Wolf (of Weimar) "Azalia" „ „ Johann Küchler (Bassoonist in the Bonn chapel) "Die Sklavin" (_La Schiava_) „ „ Piccini "Zémire et Azor" „ „ Grétry "Das Mädchen im Eichthale" ("Maid of the Oaks") „ „ d'Antoine (Captain in the army of the Elector of Cologne) "Der Kaufmann von Smyrna" „ „ J. A. Juste (Court Musician in The Hague) "Die seidenen Schuhe" „ „ Alexander Frizer (or Fridzeri) "Die Reue vor der That" „ „ Desaides "Der Aerndtetanz" „ „ J. A. Hiller "Die Olympischen Spiele" (_Olympiade_) „ „ Sacchini "Die Lügnerin aus Liebe" „ „ Salieri "Die Italienerin zu London" „ „ Cimarosa "Das gute Mädchen" (_La buona figliuola_) „ „ Piccini "Der Antiquitäten-Sammler" „ „ André "Die Entführung aus dem Serail" „ „ Mozart "Die Eifersucht auf der Probe" (_Il Geloso in Cimento_) „ „ Anfossi "Rangstreit und Eifersucht auf dem Lande" (_Le Gelosie villane_) „ „ Sarti "Unverhofft kommt oft" (_Les Évènements imprévus_) „ „ Grétry "Felix, oder der Findling" (_Félix ou l'Enfant trouvé_) „ „ Monsigny "Die Pilgrimme von Mekka" „ „ Gluck

But a still farther provision has been made for the Elector's amusement during the season of 1783-'84, by the engagement of a ballet corps of eighteen persons. The titles of five newly rehearsed ballets are given in the report from which the above particulars are taken, and which may be found in the theatrical calendar for 1784.

With an enlarged company and a more extensive repertory, preparations were made for opening the theatre upon the Elector's return, at the end of October, from Münster to Bonn. But the relations of the company to the court have been changed. Let the "Theater-Kalender" describe the new position in which the stage at Bonn was placed:

Bonn. His Electoral Grace, by a special condescension, had graciously determined to make the theatrical performances gratuitous and to that end has closed a contract with His Highness's Theatrical Director Grossmann according to which besides the theatre free of rent, the illumination and the orchestra he is to receive an annual subvention for the maintenance of the company. On His Highness's command there will be two or three performances weekly. By particular grace the director is permitted to spend several summer months in other places.

AN INFLUENCE ON THE BOY BEETHOVEN

The advantages of this plan for securing a good repertory, a good company and a zealous striving for improvement are obvious; and its practical working during this, its only, season, so far as can now be gathered from scanty records, was a great success. It will hereafter be seen that the boy Ludwig van Beethoven was often employed at the pianoforte at the rehearsals--possibly also at the performances of the company of which Neefe was the musical director. That a company consisting almost exclusively of performers who had passed the ordeal of frequent appearance on the stage and had been selected with full knowledge of the capacity of each, and which, moreover, had gained so much success at the Bonn court as to be put upon a permanent footing, must have been one of more than the ordinary, average excellence, at least in light opera, needs no argument. Nor need comments be made upon the influence which daily intercourse with it, and sharing in its labors, especially in the direction of opera, must have exerted upon the mind of a boy of twelve or thirteen years possessed of real musical genius.

The theatrical season, and with it the company, came to an untimely end. Belderbusch died in January, 1784. Madame Grossmann died in childbed on March 28, and on April 15 the Elector followed them to another world. After the death of the Elector Maximilian Friedrich the Court Theatre was closed for the official mourning and the company dismissed with four weeks' salary.

It is consonant to the plan of this introductory chapter that some space be devoted to sketches of some of the principal men whose names have already occurred and to some notes upon the musical amateurs of Bonn who are known, or may be supposed, to have been friends of the boy Beethoven. These notices make no claim to the credit of being the result of original research; they are, except that of Neefe, little more than extracts from a letter, dated March 2, 1783, written by Neefe and printed in Cramer's "Magazin der Musik" (Vol. I, pp. 337 _et seq._). At that time the "Capelldirector," as Neefe calls him, was Cajetano Mattioli, born at Venice, August 7, 1750, whose appointments were concertmaster and musical director in Bonn, made on May 26, 1774 and April 24, 1777.

He studied in Parma, says Neefe, with the first violinist Angelo Moriggi, a pupil of Tartini, and in Parma, Mantua and Bologna conducted grand operas like “Orfeo,” “Alceste,” etc., by the Chevalier Gluck with success. He owed much to the example set by Gluck in the matter of conducting. It must be admitted that he is a man full of fire, of lively temperament and fine feeling. He penetrates quickly into the intentions of a composer and knows how to convey them promptly and clearly to the entire orchestra. He was the first to introduce accentuation, instrumental declamation, careful attention to forte and piano, or all the degrees of light and shade in the orchestra of this place. In none of the qualifications of a leader is he second to the famed Cannabich of Mannheim. He surpasses him in musical enthusiasm, and, like him, insists upon discipline and order. Through his efforts the musical repertory of this court has been provided with a very considerable collection of good and admirable compositions, symphonies, masses and other works, to which he makes daily additions; in the same manner he is continually striving for the betterment of the orchestra. Just now he is engaged in a project for building a new organ for the court chapel. The former organ, a magnificent instrument, became a prey of the flames at the great conflagration in the palace in 1777. His salary is 1,000 fl.

The chapelmaster (appointed May 26, 1774) was Mr. Andrea Lucchesi, born May 28, 1741, at Motta in Venetian territory. His teachers in composition were, in the theatre style, Mr. Cocchi of Naples; in the church style, Father Paolucci, a pupil of Padre Martini at Bologna, and afterwards Mr. Seratelli, Chapelmaster of the Duke of Venice. He is a good organist and occupied himself profitably with the instrument in Italy. He came here with Mr. Mattioli as conductor of an Italian opera company in 1771. Taken altogether he is a light, pleasing and gay composer whose part-writing is cleaner than that of most of his countrymen. In his church-works he does not confine himself to the strict style affected by many to please amateurs. Neefe enumerates Lucchesi’s compositions as follows: 9 works for the theatre, among them the opera “L’Isola della Fortuna” (1765), “Il Marito geloso” (1766), “Le Donne sempre Donne,” “Il Matrimonio per astuzia” (1771) for Venice, and the two composed at Bonn, “Il Natal di Giove” and “L’inganno scoperto,” various intermezzi and cantatas; various masses, vespers and other compositions for the church; six sonatas for the pianoforte and violin; a pianoforte trio, four pianoforte quartets and several pianoforte concertos. His salary was 1,000 fl.

CHRISTIAN GOTTLOB NEEFE’S CAREER

The organist of the Court Chapel was Christian Gottlob Neefe, son of a poor tailor of Chemnitz in Saxony, where he was born February 5, 1748. He is one of the many instances in musical history in which the career of the man is determined by the beauty of his voice in childhood. At a very early age he became a chorister in the principal church, which position gave him the best school and musical instruction that the small city afforded--advantages so wisely improved as to enable him in early youth to gain a living by teaching. At the age of 21, with 20 thalers in his pocket and a stipend of 30 thalers per annum from the magistrates of Chemnitz, he removed to Leipsic to attend the lectures of the university, and at that institution in the course of time he passed his examination in jurisprudence. Upon this occasion he argued the negative of the question: “Has a father the right to disinherit a son for devoting himself to the theatre?” In Chemnitz Neefe’s teachers in music had been men of small talents and very limited acquirements, and even in Leipsic he owed more to his persevering study of the theoretical works of Marpurg and C. P. E. Bach than to any regular instructor. But there he had the very great advantage of forming an intimate acquaintance with, and becoming an object of special interest to, Johann Adam Hiller, the celebrated director of the Gewandhaus Concerts, the then popular and famous composer, the introducer of Handel’s “Messiah” to the German public, the industrious writer upon music, and finally a successor of Johann Sebastian Bach as Cantor of the Thomas School. Hiller gave him every encouragement in his power in his musical career; opened the columns of his musical “Wöchentliche Nachrichten” to his compositions and writings; called him to his assistance in operatic composition; gave him the results of his long experience in friendly advice; criticized his compositions, and at length, in 1777, gave him his own position as music director of Seyler’s theatrical company, then playing at the Linkische Bad in Dresden. Upon the departure of that troupe for Frankfort-on-the-Main, Neefe was persuaded to remain with it in the same capacity. He thus became acquainted with Fräulein Zinck, previously court singer at Gotha but now engaged for Seyler’s opera. The acquaintance ripened into a mutual affection and ended in marriage not long afterward. It is no slight testimony to the high reputation which he enjoyed that at the moment of Seyler’s flight from Frankfort (1779) Bondini, whose success had driven that rival from Dresden, was in correspondence with Neefe and making him proposals to resign his position under Seyler for a similar but better one in his service. Pending the result of these negotiations Neefe, taking his wife with him, temporarily joined Grossmann and Helmuth at Bonn in the same capacity. Those managers, who knew the value of his services from their previous experience as members of the Seyler troupe, paid a very strong, though involuntary, tribute to his talents and personal character by adopting such unfair measures as to compel the musician to remain in Bonn until Bondini was forced to fill his vacancy by another candidate. Having once got him, Grossmann was determined to keep him--and succeeded.

As long as the Grossmann company remained undivided Neefe accompanied it in its annual visits to Münster and other places;--thus the sketch of his life printed sixteen years later in the first volume of the “Allgemeine Musikzeitung” of Leipsic bears date “Frankfort-on-the-Main, September 30, 1782”; but from that period save, perhaps, for a short time in 1783, he seems not to have left Bonn at all.

There were others besides Grossmann and Helmuth who thought Neefe too valuable an acquisition to the musical circles of Bonn not to be secured. Less than a year and a half after his arrival there the minister Belderbusch and the countess Hatzfeld, niece of the Elector, secured to him, though a Protestant, an appointment to the place of court organist. The salary of 400 florins, together with the 700 florins from Grossmann, made his income equal to that of the court chapelmaster. It is difficult now to conceive of the forgotten name of C. G. Neefe as having once stood high in the list of the first North German composers; yet such was the case. Of Neefe’s published compositions, besides the short vocal and clavier pieces in Hiller’s periodical, there had already appeared operettas in vocal score, “Die Apotheke” (1772), “Amor’s Guckkasten” (1772), “Die Einsprüche” (1773) and “Heinrich und Lyda” (1777); also airs composed for Hiller’s “Dorf-Barbier” and one from his own republished opera “Zemire und Azor”; twelve odes of Klopstock--sharply criticized by Forkel in his “Musikalisch-Kritische Bibliothek,” much to the benefit of the second edition of them; and a pretty long series of songs. Of instrumental music he had printed twenty-four sonatas for pianoforte solo or with violin; and from Breitkopf and Härtel’s catalogues, 1772 and 1774, may be added the following works included neither in his own list nor that of Gerber: a partita for string quartet, 2 horns, 2 oboes, 2 flutes and 2 bassoons; another for the same instruments minus the flutes and bassoons; a third for the string quartet and 2 oboes only, and two symphonies for string quartet, 2 horns, 2 oboes and 2 flutes. The “Sophonisbe” music was also finished and twenty years later, after Mozart had given a new standard of criticism, it was warmly eulogized in the “Allgemeine Musikzeitung” of Leipsic. At the date of his letter to Cramer (March 2, 1783) he had added to his published works “Sechs Sonaten am Clavier zu singen,” “Vademecum für Liebhaber des Gesangs und Clavier,” the clavier score of “Sophonisbe,” and a concerto for clavier and orchestra. His manuscripts, he adds (Cramer’s “Magazine,” I; p. 382), consist of (a) the scores of the operettas which had appeared in pianoforte arrangements; (b) the score of his opera “Zemire und Azor”; (c) the score of his opera “Adelheit von Veltheim”; (d) the score of a bardic song for the tragedy “The Romans in Germany”; (e) the scores of theatrical between-acts music; (f) the score of a Latin “Pater noster”; (g) various other smaller works. He had in hand the composition of the operetta “Der neue Gutsherr,” the pianoforte score of which, as also that of “Adelheit von Veltheim,” was about to be published by Dyck in Leipsic. A year before at a concert for amateurs at the house of Mr. von Mastiaux he had produced an ode by Klopstock, “Dem Unendlichen,” for four chorus voices and a large orchestra, which was afterwards performed in Holy Week in the _Fräuleinstiftskirche_. In short, Neefe brought to Bonn a high-sounding reputation, talent, skill and culture both musical and literary, which made him invaluable to the managers when new French and Italian operas were to be prepared for the German stage; great facility in throwing off a new air, song, _entr’acte_ or what not to meet the exigencies of the moment; very great industry, a _cacoethes scribendi_ of the very highest value to the student of Bonn’s musical history in his time and a new element into the musical life there. This element may have seemed somewhat formal and pedantic, but it was solid, for it was drawn from the school of Handel and Bach.

MUSIC IN PRIVATE HOUSES OF BONN

Let us return to Neefe’s letter to Cramer again for some notices of music outside the electoral palace:

Belderbusch, the minister, retained a quintet of wind-instruments, 2 clarinets, 2 horns and a bassoon.

The Countess von Belderbusch, wife of a nephew of the minister, whose name will come up again, “plays skilfully upon the clavier.”

The Countess von Hatzfeld, niece of the Elector, was “trained in singing and clavier playing by the best masters of Vienna to whom, indeed, she does very much honor. She declaims recitatives admirably and it is a pleasure to listen to her sing arias _di parlante_. She plays the fortepiano brilliantly and in playing yields herself up completely to her emotions, wherefore one never hears any restlessness or uneveness of time in her _tempo rubato_. She is enthusiastically devoted to music and musicians.”[4]

Chancellor and Captain von Schall “plays clavier and violin. Though not adept on either instrument he has very correct musical feeling. He knows how to appreciate the true beauties of a composition, and how to judge them, and has large historical and literary knowledge of music.”

Frau Court Councillor von Belzer “plays the clavier and sings. She has a strong, masculine contralto of wide range, particularly downwards.”

Johann Gottfried von Mastiaux, of the Finance Department and incumbent of divers high offices, is a self-taught musician. He plays several instruments himself and has given his four sons and a daughter the best musical instruction possible in Bonn. All are pianists and so many of them performers on other instruments that the production of quintets is a common family enjoyment. He is a devoted admirer of Haydn, with whom he corresponds, and in his large collection of music there are already 80 symphonies, 30 quartets and 40 trios by that master. His rare and valuable instruments are so numerous “that he could almost equip a complete orchestra. Every musician is his friend and welcome to him.”

Count Altstädter: “in his house one may at times hear a very good quartet.”

Captain Dantoine, “a passionate admirer and knower of music; plays the violin and the clavier a little. He learned composition from the books of Marpurg, Kirnberger and Riepel. Formed his taste in Italy. In both respects the reading of scores by classical masters has been of great service to him.” Among his compositions are several operettas, symphonies and quartets “in Haydn’s style.”

The three Messrs. Facius, “sons of the Russian agent here, are soundly musical; the two elder play the flute and the youngest plays the violoncello.” (According to Fischer the members of this family were visitors at the house of the Beethovens.)

There are many more music-lovers here, but the majority of them are too much given to privacy, so far as their musical practice goes, to be mentioned here. Enough has been said to show that a stranger fond of music need never leave Bonn without nourishment. Nevertheless, a large public concert institution under the patronage of His Electoral Grace is still desirable. It would be one more ornament of the capital and a promoter of the good cause of music.

What with the theatre, the court music, the musical productions in the church and such opportunities in private it is plain that young talent in those days in Bonn was in no danger of starvation for want of what Neefe calls “musikalische Nahrung.”

So much upon the _dramatis personæ_, other than the principal figure and his family. Let an attempt follow to describe the little city as it appeared in 1770--in other words, to picture the scene. By an enumeration made in 1789, the population of Bonn was 9,560 souls, a number which probably for a long series of years had rarely varied beyond a few score, more or less--one, therefore, that must very nearly represent the aggregate in 1770. For the town had neither manufactures nor commerce beyond what its own wants supported; it was simply the residence of the Elector--the seat of the court, and the people depended more or less directly upon that court for subsistence--as a wag expressed it, “all Bonn was fed from the Elector’s kitchen.” The old city walls--(the “gar gute Fortification, dass der Churfürst sicher genug darinnen Hof halten kann” of Johann Hübner’s description)--were already partially destroyed. Within them the whole population seems to have lived. Outside the city gates it does not appear that, save by a chapel or two, the eye was impeded in its sweep across gardens and open fields to the surrounding villages which, then as now hidden in clusters of walnut and fruit trees, appeared, when looked upon from the neighboring hills, like islands rising upon the level surface of the plain. The great increase of wealth and population during the last 150 years in all this part of the Rhine valley under the influence of the wise national economy of the Prussian government, has produced corresponding changes in and about the towns and villages; but the grand features of the landscape are unchanged; the ruins upon the Drachenfels and Godesberg looked down, as now, upon the distant roofs and spires of Bonn; the castle of Siegburg rose above the plains away to the East; the chapel crowned the Petersberg, the church with the marble stairs the nearer Kreuzberg.

A PROSPECT OF BONN IN BEETHOVEN’S DAY

The fine landing place with its growing trees and seats for idlers, the villas, hotels, coffee-houses and dwellings outside the old walls, are all recent; but the huge ferryboat, the “flying bridge,” even then was ever swinging like a pendulum from shore to shore. Steam as a locomotive power was unknown, and the commerce of the Rhine floated by the town, gliding down with the current on rafts or in clumsy but rather picturesque boats, or impelled against the stream by the winds, by horses and even by men and women. The amount of traffic was not, however, too great to be amply provided for in this manner; for population was kept down by war, by the hard and rude life of the peasant class, and by the influences of all the false national-economic principles of that age, which restrained commerce by every device that could be made to yield present profit to the rulers of the Rhine lands. Passengers had, for generations, no longer been plundered by mail-clad robbers dwelling upon a hundred picturesque heights; but each petty state had gained from the Emperor’s weakness “vested rights” in all sorts of custom-levies and taxes. Risbeck (1780) found nine toll-stations between Mayence and Coblenz; and thence to the boundary of Holland, he declares there were at least sixteen, and that in the average each must have collected 30,000 Rhenish florins per annum.

To the stranger, coming down from Mayence, with its narrow dark lanes, or up from Cologne, whose confined and pestiferously dirty streets, emitting unnamed stenches, were but typical of the bigotry, superstition and moral filth of the population--all now happily changed, thanks to a long period of French and Prussian rule--little Bonn seemed a very picture of neatness and comfort. Even its ecclesiastical life seemed of another order. The men of high rank in the church were of high rank also by birth; they were men of the world and gentlemen; their manners were polished and their minds enlarged by intercourse with the world and with gentlemen; they were tolerant in their opinions and liberal in their views. Ecclesiastics of high and low degree were met at every corner as in other cities of the Rhine region; but absence of military men was a remarkable feature. Johann Hübner gives the reason for this in few and quaint words:--"In times of war much depends upon who is master of Bonn, because traffic on the Rhine can be blockaded at this pass. Therefore the place has its excellent fortification which enables the Elector to hold his court in ample security within its walls. But he need not maintain a garrison there in time of peace, and in time of war troops are garrisoned who have taken the oath to the Emperor and the empire. This was settled by the peace of Ryswick as well as Rastatt."

While the improvement in the appearance of the streets of Bonn has necessarily been great, through the refitting or rebuilding of a large portion of the dwelling-houses, the plan of the town, except in those parts lying near the wall, has undergone no essential change, the principal one being the open spaces, where in 1770 churches stood. On the small triangular Römer-Platz was the principal parish church of Bonn, that of St. Remigius, standing in such a position that its tall tower looked directly down the Acherstrasse. In 1800 this tower was set on fire by lightning and destroyed; six years later the church itself was demolished by the French and its stones removed to become a part of the fortifications at Wesel. On the small, round grass plot as one goes from the Münster church toward the neighboring city gate (Neuthor) stood another parish church--a rotunda in form--that of St. Martin, which fell in 1812 and was removed; and at the opposite end of the minster, separated from it only by a narrow passage, was still a third, the small structure dedicated to St. Gangolph. This, too, was pulled down in 1806. Only the fourth parish church, that of St. Peter in Dietkirchen, is still in existence and was, at a later date, considerably enlarged. After the demolition of these buildings a new division of the town into parishes was made (1806).

The city front of the electoral palace, now the university, was more imposing than now, and was adorned by a tall, handsome tower containing a carillon, with bells numerous enough to play, for instance, the overture to Monsigny's "Deserter." This part of the palace, with the tower and chapel, was destroyed by fire in 1777.

The town hall, erected by Clemens August, and the other churches were as now, but the large edifice facing the university library and museum of casts, now occupied by private dwellings and shops, was then the cloister and church of the Franciscan monks. A convent of Capuchin nuns stood upon the Kesselgasse; its garden is now a bleaching ground.

HOLIDAY TIMES IN THE LITTLE CITY

Let the fancy picture, upon a fine Easter or Pentecost morning in those years, the little city in its holiday attire and bustle. The bells in palace and church tower ringing; the peasants in coarse but picturesque garments, the women abounding in bright colors, come in from the surrounding villages, fill the market-place and crowd the churches at the early masses. The nobles and gentry--in broad-flapped coats, wide waistcoats and knee-breeches, the entire dress often of brilliant colored silks, satins and velvets, huge, white, flowing neckcloths, ruffles over the hands, buckles of silver or even of gold at the knees and upon the shoes, huge wigs becurled and bepowdered on the heads, and surmounted by the cocked hat, when not held under the arm, a sword at the side, and commonly a gold-headed cane in the hand (and if the morning be cold, a scarlet cloak thrown over the shoulders)--are daintily picking their way to the palace to kiss His Transparency's hand or dashing up to the gates in heavy carriages with white wigged and cocked-hatted coachmen and footmen. Their ladies wear long and narrow bodices, but their robes flow with a mighty sweep; their apparent stature is increased by very high-heeled shoes and by piling up their hair on lofty cushions; their sleeves are short, but long silk gloves cover the arms. The ecclesiastics, various in name and costume, dress as now, save in the matter of the flowing wig. The Elector's company of guards is out and at intervals the thunder of the artillery on the walls is heard. On all sides, strong and brilliant contrasts of color meet the eye, velvet and silk, purple and fine linen, gold and silver--such were the fashions of the time--costly, inconvenient in form, but imposing, magnificent and marking the differences of rank and class. Let the imagination picture all this, and it will have a scene familiar to the boy Beethoven, and one in which as he grew up to manhood he had his own small part to play.

FOOTNOTES:

[1] "Briefe," II. 354, 355.

[2] This was the beginning of the career of Salomon. He became concertmaster to Prince Henry of Prussia, played in Paris, and in 1781 took up a residence in London where, as violinist and conductor, he became brilliantly active and successful. He made repeated visits to Bonn, once in 1790, when he was on his way to London accompanied by Haydn.

[3] Reichardt, “Theaterkalender, 1778,” p. 99.

[4] To her Beethoven dedicated his variations on “Venni Amore.”

Chapter II

The Ancestral van Beethoven Family in Belgium--Removal of the Grandfather to Bonn--His Activities as Singer and Chapelmaster--Birth and Education of Johann van Beethoven--The Parents of the Composer.

THE COMPOSER’S BELGIAN ANCESTRY

At the beginning of the seventeenth century a family named van Beethoven lived in a village of Belgium near Louvain. A member of it removed to and settled in Antwerp about 1650. A son of this Beethoven, named William, a wine dealer, married, September 11, 1680, Catherine Grandjean and had issue, eight children. One of them, baptized September 8, 1683, in the parish of Notre Dame, now received the name Henry Adelard, his sponsors being Henry van Beethoven, acting for Adelard de Redincq, Baron de Rocquigny, and Jacqueline Grandjean. This Henry Adelard Beethoven, having arrived at man’s estate, took to wife Maria Catherine de Herdt, who bore him twelve children--the third named Louis, the twelfth named Louis Joseph. The latter, baptized December 9, 1728, married, November 3, 1773, Maria Theresa Schuerweghs, and died November 11, 1808, at Oosterwyck. The second daughter, named like her mother Maria Theresa, married, September 6, 1808, Joseph Michael Jacobs and became the mother of Jacob Jacobs, in the middle of the nineteenth century a professor of painting in Antwerp, who supplied in part the materials for these notices of the Antwerp Beethovens, although the principal credit is due to M. Léon de Burbure of that city.[5]

The certificate of baptism of Louis van Beethoven, third son of Henry Adelard, is to this effect:

Antwerp, December 23, 1712--_Baptizatus_, Ludovicus.

Parents: Henricus van Beethoven and Maria Catherine de Hert.

Sponsors: Petrus Bellmaert and Dymphona van Beethoven.

It is a family tradition--Prof. Jacobs heard it from his mother--that this Louis van Beethoven, owing to some domestic difficulties (according to M. Burbure they were financial), secretly left his father’s house at an early age and never saw it again, although in later years an epistolary correspondence seems to have been established between the fugitive and his parents. Gifted with a good voice and well educated musically, he went to Louvain and applied for a vacant position as tenor to the chapter ad Sanctum Petrum, receiving it on November 2, 1731.[6] A few days later the young man of 18 years was appointed substitute for three months for the singing master (_Phonascus_), who had fallen ill, as is attested by the minutes of the Chapter, under date November 2, 1731.[7]

The young singer does not seem to have filled the place beyond the prescribed time. By a decree of Elector Clemens August, dated March, 1733 (the month of Joseph Haydn’s birth), he became Court Musician in Bonn with a salary of 400 florins, a large one for those days, particularly in the case of a young man who only three months before had completed his 20th year. Allowing the usual year of probation to which candidates for the court chapel were subjected, Beethoven must have come to Bonn in 1732. This corresponds to the time spent at Louvain as well as to a petition of 1774, to be given hereafter, in which Johann speaks of his father’s “42 years of service.” There is another paper of date 1784 which makes the elder Beethoven to have served about 46 years, but this is from another hand and of less authority than that written by the son.

OTHER BEETHOVEN FAMILIES IN BONN

What it was that persuaded Ludwig van Beethoven to go to Bonn is unknown. Gottfried Fischer, who owned the house in the Rheingasse in which two generations of Beethovens lived, professed to know that Elector Clemens August learned to know him as a good singer at Liège and for that reason called him to Bonn. That is not impossible, whether the Elector went to Louvain or Ludwig introduced himself to him at Liège. But it is significant that another branch of the Beethoven family was already represented at Bonn. Michael van Beethoven was born in Malines in February, 1684. He was a son of Cornelius van Beethoven and Catherine

Leempoel, and beyond doubt, as the later associations in Bonn prove, closely related to the Antwerp branch of the family. Michael van Beethoven married Maria Ludovica Stuykers (or Stuykens) on October 8, 1707. His eldest son also bore the name of Cornelius (born in September, 1708, in Malines) and there were four other sons born to him during his stay in Malines, among them two who were named Louis, up to 1715. At a date which is uncertain, this family removed to Bonn. There Cornelius, on February 20, 1734, married a widow named Helena de la Porte (née Calem), in the church of St. Gangolph, Ludwig van Beethoven, the young court singer, being one of the witnesses. In August of the same year Cornelius was proxy for his father (who, evidently, had not yet come to Bonn), as godfather for Ludwig's first child. Later, after his son had established a household, he removed to Bonn, for Michael van Beethoven died in June, 1749, in Bonn, and in December of the same year Maria Ludovica Stuykens (_sic_), "the Widow van Beethoven." Cornelius became a citizen of Bonn on January 17, 1736, on the ground that he had married the widow of a citizen, and in 1738 he stands alone as representative of the name in the list of Bonn's citizens. He seems to have been a merchant, and is probably the man who figures in the annual accounts of Clemens August as purveyor of candles. He lost his wife, and for a second married Anna Barbara Marx, _virgo_, on July 5, 1755, who bore him two daughters (1756 and 1759), both of whom died young and for both of whom Ludwig van Beethoven was sponsor. Cornelius died in 1764 and his wife in 1765, and with this the Malines branch of the family ended. Which one of the two cousins (for so we may in a general way consider them) came to Bonn, Ludwig or Cornelius, must be left to conjecture. There is evidence in favor of the former in the circumstance that Cornelius does not appear as witness at the marriage of Ludwig in 1733. If Ludwig was the earlier arrival, then the story of his call by the Elector may be true; he was not disappointed in his hope of being able to make his way by reason of his knowledge of music and singing.

The next recorded fact in his history may be seen in the ancient register of the parish of St. Remigius, now preserved in the town hall of Bonn. It is the marriage on September 7, 1733, of Ludwig van Beethoven and Maria Josepha Poll, the husband not yet 21 years of age, the wife 19. Then follows in the records of baptisms in the parish:

1734, August 8.

Parents:

Ludwig van Beethoven, Maria Josepha Poll.

Baptized:

Maria Bernardina Ludovica.

Sponsors:

Maria Bernardina Menz, Michael van Beethoven; in his place Cornelius van Beethoven.

The child Bernardina died in infancy, October 17, 1735. Her place was soon filled by a son, Marcus Josephus, baptized April 15, 1736, of whom the parents were doubtless early bereaved, for no other notice whatever has been found of him. After the lapse of some four years the childless pair again became parents, by the birth of a son, whose baptismal record has not been discovered. It is supposed that this child, Johann, was baptized in the Court Chapel, the records of which are not preserved in the archives of the town and seem to be lost; or that, possibly, he was born while the mother was absent from Bonn. An official report upon the condition and characters of the court musicians made in 1784, however, gives Johann van Beethoven _born in Bonn_ and aged forty-four--thus fixing the date of his birth towards the end of 1739 or the beginning of 1740.

The gradual improvement of the elder Beethoven's condition in respect of both emolument and social position, is creditable to him alike as a musician and as a man. Poorly as the musicians were paid, he was able in his last years to save a small portion of his earnings; his rise in social position is indicated in the public records;--thus, the first child is recorded as the son of L. v. Beethoven "musicus"; as sponsor to the eldest daughter of Cornelius van Beethoven, he appears as "Dominus" van Beethoven;--to the second as "Musicus Aulicus"; in 1761 he becomes "Herr Kapellmeister," and his name appears in the Court Calendar of the same year, third in a list of twenty-eight "Hommes de chambre honoraires." Of the elder Beethoven's appointment as head of the court music no other particulars have been obtained than those to be found in his petition and the accompanying decree printed in Chapter I. From these papers it appears that the bass singer has had the promise of the place from Clemens August as successor to Zudoli, but that the Elector, when the vacancy occurred, changed his mind and gave it to his favorite young violinist Touchemoulin, who held the position for so short a time, however, that his name never appears as chapelmaster in the Court Calendar, he having resigned on account of the reduction of his salary by Belderbusch, prime minister of the new Elector who just at that period succeeded Clemens August. The elevation of a singer to such a place was not a very uncommon event in those days, but that a

chapelmaster should still retain his place as singer probably was. Hasse and Graun began their careers as vocalists, but more to the point are the instances of Steffani, Handel's predecessor at the court of Hanover, and of Righini, successively chapelmaster at Mayence and Berlin. In all these cases the incumbents were distinguished and very successful composers. Beethoven was not. Wegeler's words, "the chapelmaster and bass singer had at an earlier date produced operas at the National Theatre established by the Elector," have been rather interpreted than quoted by Schindler and others thus: "it is thought that under the luxury-loving Elector Clemens August, he produced operas of his own composition"--a construction which is clearly forced and incorrect. Strange that so few writers can content themselves with exact citations! Not only is there no proof whatever, certainly none yet made public, that Chapelmaster van Beethoven was an author of operatic works, but the words in his own petition, "inasmuch as the Toxal must be sufficiently supplied with _musique_," can hardly be otherwise understood than as intended to meet a possible objection to his appointment on the ground of his not being a composer. Wegeler's words, then, would simply mean that he put upon the stage and conducted the operatic works produced, which were neither numerous nor of a very high order during his time. His labors were certainly onerous enough without adding musical composition. The records of the electoral court which have been described and in part reproduced in the preceding chapter, exhibit him conducting the music of chapel, theatre and "Toxal," examining candidates for admission into the electoral musical service, reporting upon questions referred to him by the privy council and the like, and all this in addition to his services as bass singer, a position which gave him the principal bass parts and solos to sing both in chapel and theatre. Wegeler records a tradition that in Gassmann's operetta "L'Amore Artigiano" and Monsigny's "Déserteur" he was "admirable and received the highest applause." If this be true it proves no small degree of enterprise on his part as chapelmaster and of well-conserved powers as a singer; for these two operas were first produced, the one in Vienna, the other in Paris, in 1769, when Beethoven had already entered his fifty-eighth year.

The words of Demmer in his petition of January 23, 1773, "the bass singer van Beethoven is incapacitated and can no longer serve as such," naturally suggest the thought that the old gentleman's appearance as _Brunoro_ in Lucchesi's "L'Inganno scoperto" in May, 1773, was a final compliment to his master, the Elector, upon his birthday. He did not live to celebrate another; the death of "Ludwig van Beethoven, Hoffkapellmeister," is recorded at Bonn under date of December 24, 1773--one day after the sixty-first anniversary of his baptism in Antwerp.

CHAPELMASTER VAN BEETHOVEN'S TRIALS

At home the good man had his cross to bear. His wife, Josepha, who with one exception had buried all her children, and possibly on that very account, became addicted to the indulgence of an appetite for strong drink, was at the date of her husband's death living as a boarder in a cloister at Cologne. How long she had been there does not appear, but doubtless for a considerable period. The son, too, was married, but though near was not in his father's house. The separation was brought about by his marriage, with which the father was not agreed. The house in which the chapelmaster died, and which he occupied certainly as early as 1765, was that next north of the so-called Gudenauer Hof, later the post-office in the neighboring Bonngasse, and bore the number 386. The chapelmaster appears, upon pretty good evidence, to have removed hither from the Fischer house in the Rheingasse, where he is said to have lived many years and even to have carried on a trade in wine, which change of dwelling may have taken place in 1767.

When one recalls the imposing style of dress at the era the short, muscular man, with dark complexion and very bright eyes, as Wegeler describes him[8] and as a painting by Courtpainter Radoux, still in possession of his descendants in Vienna, depicts him, presents quite an imposing picture to the imagination.

Of the early life of Johann van Beethoven there are no particulars preserved except such as are directly or indirectly conveyed in the official documents. Such of these papers as came from his own hand, if judged by the standard of our time, show a want of ordinary education; but it must not be forgotten that the orthography of the German language was not then fixed; nor that many a contemporary of his, who boasted a university education, or who belonged to the highest ranks of society, wrote in a style no better than his. This is certain: that after he had received an elementary education he was sent to the _Gymnasium_, for as a member of the lowest class (_infima_) of that institution he took part in September, 1750, as singer in the annual school play which it was the custom of the _Musæ Bonnenses_ to give. It would seem, therefore, that his good voice and musical gifts were appreciated at an early period. Herein, probably, is also to be found the reason why his stay at the gymnasium was not of long duration. The father had set him apart for service in the court music, and himself, as appears from the statements already printed, undertook his instruction; he taught him singing and clavier playing. Whether or not he also taught him violin playing, in which he was "capable," remains uncertain. In 1752, at the age of 12, as can be seen from his petition of March, 1756, and his father's of 1764, he entered the chapel as soprano. According to Gottwald's report of 1756 he had served "about 2 years"; the contradiction is probably explained by an interruption caused by the mutation of his voice. At the age of 16, he received his _decretum_ as "accessist" on the

score of his skill in singing and his experience already acquired, including his capability on the violin, which was the basis of the decree of April 24, 1764, granting him a salary of 100 rth. per annum.

So, at the age of 22, the young man received the promise of a salary, and at 24 obtained one of 100 thalers. In 1769, he received an increase of 25 fl., and 50 fl. more by the decree of April 3, 1772. He had, moreover, an opportunity to gain something by teaching. Not only did he give lessons in singing and clavier playing to the children of prominent families of the city, but he also frequently was called on to prepare young musicians for service in the chapel. Thus Demmer, says the memorandum heretofore given, “paid 6 rth. to young Mr. Beethoven for 3 months”; and a year later the following resolve of the privy council was passed:

Ad Suppl. Joan Beethoven

The demands of the suppliant having been found to be correct, the Electoral Treasury is commanded to satisfy the debt by the usual withdrawal of the sum from the salary of the defendant.

Bonn, May 24, 1775.

Attest. P.

which probably refers to a debt contracted by one of the women of the court chapel. A few years later, as we have seen, he seems to have been intrusted with the training of Johanna Helena Averdonck, whom he brought forward as his pupil in March, 1778, and the singer Gazzenello was his pupil before she went elsewhere. It was largely his own fault that the musically gifted man was unfortunate in both domestic and official relations. His intemperance in drink, probably inherited from his mother but attributed by old Fischer to the wine trade in which his father embarked, made itself apparent at an early date, and by yielding to it more and more as he grew older he undoubtedly impaired his voice and did much to bring about his later condition of poverty. How it finally led to a catastrophe we shall see later. According to the testimony of the widow Karth, he was a tall, handsome man, and wore powdered hair in his later years. Fischer does not wholly agree with her: “of medium height, longish face, broad forehead, round nose, broad shoulders, serious eyes, face somewhat scarred, thin pigtail.” Three and a half years after obtaining his salary of 100 th. he ventured to marry. Heinrich Kewerich, the father of his wife, was head cook in that palace at Ehrenbreitstein in which Clemens danced himself out of this world, but he died before that event took place.[9] His wife, as the church records testify, was Anna Clara Daubach. Her daughter Maria Magdalena, born December 19, 1746, married a certain Johann Laym, valet of the Elector of Trèves, on January 30, 1763. On November 28, 1765, the husband died, and Maria Magdalena was a widow before she had completed her 19th year. In a little less than two years the marriage register of St. Remigius, at Bonn, was enriched by this entry:

THE PARENTS OF THE COMPOSER

12ma 9bris. Praevia Dispensatione super 3bus denuntiationibus copulavi D. Joannem van Beethoven, Dni. Ludovici van Beethoven et Mariae Josephae Poll conjugum filium legitimum, et Mariam Magdalenam Keferich viduam Leym ex Ehrenbreitstein, Henrici Keferich et annae clarae Westorffs filiam legitimam. Coram testibus Josepho clemente Belseroski et philippo Salomon.

That is, Johann van Beethoven has married the young widow Laym.

How it came that the marriage took place in Bonn instead of the home of the bride we are told by Fischer. Chapelmaster van Beethoven was not at all agreed that his son should marry a woman of a lower station in life than his own. He did not continue his opposition against the fixed determination of his son; but it is to be surmised that he would not have attended a ceremony in Ehrenbreitstein, and hence the matter was disposed of quickly in Bonn. After the wedding the young pair paid a visit of a few days’ duration to Ehrenbreitstein.

CHARACTER OF MME. VAN BEETHOVEN

Fischer describes Madame van Beethoven as a “handsome, slender person” and tells of her “rather tall, longish face, a nose somewhat bent (_gehöffelt_, in the dialect of Bonn), spare, earnest eyes.” Cäcilia Fischer could not recall that she had ever seen Madame van Beethoven laugh; “she was always serious.” Her life’s vicissitudes may have contributed to this disposition:--the early loss of her father, and of her first husband, and the death of her mother scarcely more than a year after her second marriage. It is difficult to form a conception of her character because of the paucity of information about her. Wegeler lays stress upon her piety and gentleness; her amiability and kindliness towards her family appear from all the reports; nevertheless, Fischer betrays the fact that she could be vehement in controversies with the other occupants of the house. “Madame van Beethoven,” Fischer continues,

“was a clever woman; she could give converse and reply aptly, politely and modestly to high and low, and for this reason she was much liked and respected. She occupied herself with sewing and knitting. They led a righteous and peaceful married life, and paid their house-rent and baker’s bills promptly, quarterly, and on the day. She[10] was a good, a domestic woman, she knew how to give and also how to take in a manner that is becoming to all people of honest thoughts.” From this it is fair to assume that she strove to conduct her household judiciously and economically; whether or not this was always possible in view of the limited income, old Fischer does not seem to have been informed. She made the best she could of the weaknesses of her husband without having been able to influence him; her care for the children in externals was not wholly sufficient. Young Ludwig clung to her with a tender love, more than to the father, who was “only severe”; but there is nothing anywhere to indicate that she exerted an influence upon the emotional life and development of her son, and in respect of this no wrong will be done her if the lower order of her culture be taken into consideration. Nor must it be forgotten that in all probability she was naturally delicate and that her health was still further weakened by her domestic troubles and frequent accouchements. The “quiet, suffering woman,” as Madame Karth calls her, died in 1787 of consumption at the age of 40 years. Long years after in Vienna Beethoven was wont, when among his intimate friends, to speak of his “excellent” (_vortreffliche_) mother.[11]

At the time when Johann van Beethoven married, there was quite a colony of musicians, and other persons in the service of the court, in the Bonngasse, as that street is in part named which extends from the lower extremity of the market-place to the Cologne gate. Chapelmaster van Beethoven had left the house in the Rheingasse and lived at No. 386. In the adjoining house, north, No. 387, lived the musical family Ries. Farther down, the east house on that side of the way before the street assumes the name Kölnerstrasse was the dwelling of the hornist, afterward publisher, Simrock. Nearly opposite the chapelmaster’s the second story of the house No. 515 was occupied (but not till after 1771) by the Salomons; the parterre and first floor by the owner of the house, a lace-maker or dealer in laces, named Clasen. Of the two adjoining houses the one No. 576 was the dwelling of Johann Baum, a master locksmith, doubtless the Jean Courtin, “serrurier,” of the Court Calendar for 1773. In No. 617 was the family Hertel, twelve or fifteen years later living under the Beethovens in the Wenzelgasse, and not far off a family, Poll, perhaps relations of Madame Beethoven the elder. Conrad Poll’s name is found in the Court Calendars of the 1770’s as one of the eight Electoral “Heiducken” (footmen). In 1767 in the rear of the Clasen house, north[12] there was a lodging to let; and there the newly married Beethovens began their humble housekeeping. Their first child was a son, Ludwig Maria, baptized April 2, 1769, whose sponsors, as may be read in the register of St. Remigius parish, were the grandfather Beethoven and Anna Maria Lohe, wife of Jean Courtin, the next-door neighbor. This child lived but six days. In two years the loss of the parents was made up by the birth of him who is the subject of this biography.

FOOTNOTES:

[5] In Fétis’ “Biographie universelle” (new ed.) several of these names are misprinted. They are corrected here from Mr. Jacobs’ letter to A. W. T.

[6] Thayer’s account of this period in the life of Beethoven’s grandfather has here been extended from an article by the Chevalier L. de Burbure, published in the “Biographie nationale publiée par l’Académie Royale des sciences, des lettres et des beaux arts de Belgique.” Tome II. p. 105. (Brussels, 1868.) From this it further appears that two other members of the Antwerp branch of the family were devoted to the fine arts, viz.: Peter van Beethoven, painter, pupil of Abr. Genoel, jr., and Gerhard van Beethoven, sculptor, accepted in the guild of St. Luke about 1713, Director Vollmer, of Brussels, in a communication to Dr. Deiters gave information of a branch of the family in Mechlin and of still another in Brabant where, in the village of Wambeke, there was a curé van Beethoven who must either have died or been transferred between 1729 and 1732.

[7] The original entry is printed in full in the German edition of this biography.

[8] “The grandfather was a man short of stature, muscular, with extremely animated eyes, and was greatly respected as an artist.” Fischer’s description is different, but Wegeler is the more trustworthy witness of the two.

[9] The church records at Ehrenbreitstein say that he died August 2, 1759, in Molzberg, at the age of 58; his funeral took place in Ehrenbreitstein. A Frau Eva Katharina Kewerich, who died at Ehrenbreitstein on October 10, 1753, at the age of 89 years, was probably his mother.

[10] Some notes by Fischer contain the characteristic addition: “Madame van Beethoven once remarked that the most necessary things, such as house-rent, the baker, shoemaker and tailor must first be paid, but she would never pay drinking debts.”

[11] In the collection of Beethoven relics in the Beethoven House in Bonn there is a portrait which is set down as that of Beethoven's mother. The designation, however, rests only on uncertain tradition and lacks authoritative attestation. It is certainly difficult to see in it the representation of a consumptive woman only 40 years old. Moreover, it is strange that Beethoven should have sent from Vienna for the portrait of his grandfather and not for that of his dearly loved mother had one been in existence. It is only because of a resemblance between this picture and another that the belief exists that portraits of both of the parents of Beethoven are in existence. In 1890 two oil portraits were found in a shed in Cologne and restored by the painter Kempen, who recognized in them the handiwork of the painter Beckenkamp, who, like Beethoven's mother, was born in Ehrenbreitstein, was a visitor at the Beethoven home in Bonn and died in Cologne in 1828. The female portrait agrees with that in Bonn; they are life-size, finely executed pictures, but they are certainly not Beethoven's parents. Enough has been said about the portrait of the mother. In the case of that of the father the first objection is that it also lacks authentication. Fischer's description does not wholly fit the picture; the old man would not have forgotten the protruding lower lip. But the entire expression of the face, serious, it is true, but fleshy and vulgar, and the gray perruque, do not conform to what we know of the easy-going musician. It will be difficult, too, to trace any resemblance of expression between it and the familiar one of Beethoven from which a conclusion might be drawn. So long as proofs are wanting, scientific biography will have no right to accept the portraits as those of Beethoven's parents. Reproductions of them may be found in the "Musical Times" of London, December 15, 1892.

[12] The house is now owned by the Beethoven-Haus Verein, and maintained as a Beethoven museum.

Chapter III

The Childhood of Beethoven--An Inebriate Grandmother and a Dissipated Father--The Family Homes in Bonn--The Boy's Schooling--His Music Teachers--Visits Holland with his Mother.

THE DATE OF BEETHOVEN'S BIRTH

There is no authentic record of Beethoven's birthday. Wegeler, on the ground of custom in Bonn, dates it the day preceding the ceremony of baptism--an opinion which Beethoven himself seems to have entertained. It is the official record of this baptism only that has been preserved. In the registry of the parish of St. Remigius the entry appears as follows:

Parentes: _D: Joannes van Beethoven & Helena Keverichs, conjuges_

Proles: _17ma Xbris. Ludovicus_

Patrini: _D: Ludovicus van Beethoven & Gertrudis Müllers dicta Baums_

The sponsors, therefore, were Beethoven's grandfather the chapelmaster, and the wife of the next-door neighbor, Johann Baum, secretary at the electoral cellar. The custom obtaining at the time in the Catholic Rhine country not to postpone the baptism beyond 24 hours after the birth of a child, it is in the highest degree probable that Beethoven was born on December 16, 1770.[13]

Of several certificates of baptism the following is copied in full for the sake of a remark upon it written by the master's own hand:

Department de Rhin et Moselle Mairie de Bonn.

Extrait du Registre de Naissances de la Paroisse de St. Remy à Bonn.

Anno millesimo septingentesimo septuagesimo, de decima septima Decembris baptizatus est Ludovicus. Parentes D: Joannes van Beethoven et Helena[14] Keverichs, conjuges. Patrini, D: Ludovicus van Beethoven et Gertrudis Müllers dicta Baums.

Pour extrait conforme délivré à la Mairie de Bonn. _Bonn le 2 Juin, 1810._ [_Signatures and official seals._]

On the back of this paper Beethoven wrote:

"Es scheint der Taufschein nicht richtig, 1772 da noch ein Ludwig vor mir. Eine Baumgarten war glaube ich mein Pathe.

Ludwig van Beethoven."[15]

The composer, then, even in his fortieth year still believed the correct date to be 1772, which is the one given in all the old biographical notices, and which corresponds to the dates affixed to many of his first works, and indeed to nearly all allusions to his age in his early years. Only by keeping this fact in mind, can the long list of chronological contradictions, which continually meet the

student of his history during the first half of his life, be explained or comprehended. Whoever examines the original record of baptism in the registry at Bonn, sees instantly that the certificate, in spite of Beethoven, is correct; but all possible doubt is removed by the words of Wegeler:

Little Louis clung to this grandfather ... with the greatest affection, and, young as he was when he lost him, his early impressions always remained lively. He liked to speak of his grandfather with the friends of his youth, and his pious and gentle mother, whom he loved much more than he did his father, who was only severe, was obliged to tell him much of his grandfather.

Had 1772 been the correct date the child could never have retained personal recollections of a man who died on December 24, 1773. A survey of the whole ground renders the conclusion irresistible that at the time when the boy began to attract notice by his skill upon the pianoforte and by the promise of his first attempts in composition, his age was purposely falsified, a motive for which may perhaps be found in the excitement caused in the musical world by the then recent career of the Mozart children, and in the reflection that attainments which in a child of eight or ten years excite wonder and astonishment are considered hardly worthy of special remark in one a few years older. There is, unfortunately, nothing known of Johann van Beethoven's character which renders such a trick improbable. Noteworthy is it that, at first, the falsification rarely extends beyond one year; and, also, that in an official report in 1784 the correct age is given. Here an untruth could not be risked, nor be of advantage if it had been.

Dr. C. M. Kneisel, who championed the cause of the house in the Bonngasse in a controversy conducted in the "Kölnische Zeitung" in 1845, touching the birthplace of Beethoven, remarks that the mother "was, as is known, a native of the Ehrenbreitstein valley and separated from her relatives; he (Johann van Beethoven) was without relatives and in somewhat straitened circumstances financially. What, then, was more natural than that he should invite his neighbor, Frau Baum, a respected and well-to-do woman, _in whose house the baptismal feast was held_, to be sponsor for his little son?" This last fact indicates clearly the narrowness of the quarters in which the young couple dwelt. Does it not also hint that the grandfather was now a solitary man with no home in which to spread the little feast? Let Johann van Beethoven himself describe the pecuniary condition in which he found himself upon the death of his father:

Most Reverend Archbishop, Most Gracious Elector and Lord, Lord.

Will Your Electoral Grace graciously be pleased to hear that my father has passed away from this world, to whom it was granted to serve his Electoral Grace Clemens August and Your Electoral Grace and gloriously reigning Lord Lord 42 years, as chapelmaster with great honor, whose position I have been found capable of filling, but nevertheless I would not venture to offer my capacity to Your Electoral Grace, but since the death of my father has left me in needy circumstances my salary not sufficing and I compelled to draw on the savings of my father, my mother still living and in a cloister at a cost of 60 rth. for board and lodging each year and it is not advisable for me to take her to my home. Your Electoral Grace is therefore humbly implored to make an allowance from the 400 rth. vacated for an increase of my salary so that I may not need to draw upon the little savings and my mother may receive the pension graciously for the few years which she may yet live, to deserve which high grace it shall always be my striving.

Your Electoral Grace's Most humble and obedient Servant and musicus jean van Beethoven.

There is something bordering on the comic in the coolness of the hint here given that the petitioner would not object to an appointment as his father's successor, especially when it is remembered that Lucchesi and Mattioli were already in Bonn and the former had sufficiently proved his capacity by producing successful operas, both text and music, for the Elector's delectation. The hint was not taken; what provision was granted him, however, may be seen from a petition of January 8, 1774, praying for an addition to his salary from that made vacant by the death of his father, and a pension to his mother who is kept at board in a cloister. A memorandum appears on the margin to the effect that the Elector graciously consents that the widow, so long as she remains in the cloister, shall receive 60 rth. quarterly. Another petition of a year later has been lost, but its contents are indicated in the response, dated June 5, 1775, that Johann van Beethoven on the death of his mother shall have the enjoyment of the 60 rth. which had been granted her. The death of the mother followed a few months later and was thus announced in the "Intelligenzblatt" of Bonn on October 3, 1775: "Died, on September 30, Maria Josepha Pals (_sic_), widow van Beethoven, aged 61 years." In a list of salaries for 1776 (among the papers at Düsseldorf) for the "Musik Parthie" the salary of Johann van Beethoven is given at 36 rth. 45 alb. payable quarterly. The fact of the great poverty in which he and his family lived is manifest from the official documents (which confirm the many traditions to that effect) and from the more important recollections of aged people of Bonn brought to light in a controversy concerning the birthplace of the composer. For instance, Dr. Hennes, in his unsuccessful effort to establish the claims of the Fischer house in the Rheingasse, says: "The legacy left him (Johann van Beethoven) by his father did not last long.

That fine linen, which, as I was told, could be drawn through a ring, found its way, piece by piece, out of the house; even the beautiful large portrait showing the father wearing a tasseled cap and holding a roll of music, went to the second-hand shop." This is an error, though the painting may have gone for a time to the pawnbroker.

From the Bonngasse the Beethovens removed, when, is uncertain, to a house No. 7 or No. 8 on the left as one enters the Dreieckplatz in passing from the Sternstrasse to the Münsterplatz. They were living there in 1774, for the baptism of another son on the 8th of April of that year is recorded in the register of the parish of St. Gangolph, to which those houses belonged. This child's name was Caspar Anton Carl, the first two names from his sponsor the Minister Belderbusch, the third from Caroline von Satzenhofen, Abbess of Vilich. Was this condescension on the part of the minister and the abbess intended to soothe the father under the failure of his hopes of advancement? From the Dreieckplatz the Beethovens migrated to the Fischer house, No. 934 in the Rheingasse, so long held to be the composer's birthplace and long thereafter distinguished by a false inscription to that effect. Whether the removal took place in Ludwig's fifth or sixth year is not known; but at all events it was previous to the 2nd of October, 1776, for upon that day another son of Johann van Beethoven was baptized in the parish of St. Remigius by the name of Nicholas Johann. Dr. Hennes in his letter to the "Kölnische Zeitung" lays much stress upon the testimony of Cäcilia Fischer. He says: "the maiden lady of 76 years, Cäcilia Fischer, still remembers distinctly to have seen little Louis in his cradle and can tell many anecdotes about him, etc." The mistake is easily explained without supposing any intentional deception:--62 years afterwards she mistook the birth of Nicholas Johann for that of Ludwig. According to Fischer's report the family removed from this house in 1776 for a short time to one in the Neugasse, but returned again to the house in the Rheingasse after the palace fire in 1777. One thought which suggests itself in relation to these removals of Johann van Beethoven may, perhaps, be more than mere fancy: that in expectation of advancement in position upon the death of his father he had exchanged the narrow quarters of the lodging in the rear of the Clasen house for the much better dwelling in the Dreieckplatz; but upon the failure of his hopes had been fain to seek a cheaper place in the lower part of the town down near the river.

THE BOY BEETHOVEN'S EARLY STUDY

There is nothing decisive as to the time when the musical education of Ludwig van Beethoven began, nor any positive evidence that he, like Handel, Haydn or Mozart, showed remarkable genius for the art at a very early age. Schlosser has something on this point, but he gives no authorities, while the particulars which he relates could not possibly have come under his own observation. Müller[16] had heard from Franz Ries and Nicholas Simrock that Johann van Beethoven gave his son instruction upon the pianoforte and violin "in his earliest childhood.... To scarcely anything else did he hold him." In the dedication of the pianoforte sonatas (1783) to the Elector, the boy is made to say: "Music became my first youthful pursuit in my fourth year," which might be supposed decisive on the point if his age were not falsely given on the title-page. This much is certain: that after the removal to the Fischer house the child had his daily task of musical study and practice given him and in spite of his tears was forced to execute it. "Cäcilia Fischer," writes Hennes (1838), "still sees him, a tiny boy, standing on a little footstool in front of the clavier to which the implacable severity of his father had so early condemned him. The patriarch of Bonn, Head Burgomaster Windeck, will pardon me if I appeal to him to say that he, too, saw the little Louis van Beethoven in this house standing in front of the clavier and weeping." To this writes Dr. Wegeler:

I saw the same thing. How? The Fischer house was, perhaps still is, connected by a passage-way in the rear with a house in the Giergasse, which was then occupied by the owner, a high official of the Rhenish revenue service, Mr. Bachen, grandfather of Court Councillor Bachen of this city. The youngest son of the latter, Benedict, was my schoolmate, and on my visits to him the doings and sufferings of Louis were visible from the house.

It must be supposed that the father had seen indications of his son's genius, for it is difficult to imagine such an one remaining unperceived; but the necessities of the family with the failure of the petition for a better salary--sent in just at the time when the Elector was so largely increasing his expenditures for music by the engagement of Lucchesi and Mattioli and in other ways--are sufficient reasons for the inflexible severity with which the boy was kept at his studies. The desire to say something new and striking on the part of many who have written about Beethoven has led to such an admixture of fact and fancy that it is now very difficult to separate them. One (Schlosser) tells his readers that "the greatest joy of the lad was when his father took him upon his knees and permitted him to accompany a song on the clavier with his tiny fingers," while others tell the tale of his childhood in a manner to convey the idea that the father was a pitiless tyrant, the boy a victim and a slave--an error which a calm consideration of what is really known of the facts in the case at once dispels. There is but one road to excellence, even for the genius of a Handel or a Mozart--unremitted application. To this young Ludwig was compelled, sometimes, no doubt, through the fear or the actual infliction of punishment for neglect; sometimes, too, the father, whose habits were such as to favor a bad interpretation of his

conduct, was no doubt harsh and unjust. And such seems to be the truth. At any rate, the boy at an early date acquired so considerable a facility upon the clavier that his father could have him play at court and when he was seven years old produce him with one of his pupils at a concert in Bonn. Here is the announcement of the concert as it was reproduced in the “Kölnische Zeitung” of December 18, 1870, from the original:

AVERTISSEMENT

To-day, March 26, 1778, in the musical concert-room in the Sternengasse the Electoral Court Tenorist, Beethoven, will have the honor to produce two of his scholars, namely, Mlle. Averdonck, Court Contraltist, and his little son of six years. The former will have the honor to contribute various beautiful arias, the latter various clavier concertos and trios. He flatters himself that he will give complete enjoyment to all ladies and gentlemen, the more since both have had the honor of playing to the greatest delight of the entire Court.

Beginning at five o’clock in the evening.

Ladies and gentlemen who have not subscribed will be charged a florin. Tickets may be had at the aforesaid Akademiesaal, also of Mr. Claren auf der Bach in Mühlenstein.

Unfortunately we learn nothing concerning the pieces played by the boy nor of the success of his performance. That the violin as well as the pianoforte was practised by him is implicitly confirmed by the terms in which Schindler records his denial of the truth of the well-known spider story: “The great Ludwig refused to remember any such incident, much as the tale amused him. On the contrary, he said it was more to be expected that everything would have fled from his scraping, even flies and spiders.”

PAUCITY OF INTELLECTUAL TRAINING

The father’s main object being the earliest and greatest development of his son’s musical genius so as to make it a “marketable commodity,” he gave him no other school education than such as was afforded in one of the public schools. Fischer says he first attended a school in the Neugasse taught by a man named Huppert[17] and thence went to the Münsterschule. Among the lower grade schools in Bonn was the so-called Tirocinium, a Latin school, which prepared pupils for the gymnasium but was not directly connected with it, but had its own corps of teachers, like the whole educational system of the period, under the supervision of the Academic Council established by Max Friedrich in 1777. The pupils learned, outside of the elementary studies (arithmetic and writing are said to have been excluded), to read and write Latin up to an understanding of Cornelius Nepos. Johann Krengel, a much respected pedagogue, was teacher at the time and was appointed municipal schoolmaster in 1783 by the Academic Council. In 1786 he transferred the school to the Bonngasse. To this school young Beethoven was sent; when, is uncertain. His contemporary and schoolfellow Wurzer, Electoral Councillor and afterwards president of the Landgericht, relates the following in his memoirs:[18]

One of my schoolmates under Krengel was Luis van Beethoven, whose father held an appointment as court singer under the Elector. Apparently his mother was already dead at the time,[19] for Luis v. B. was distinguished by uncleanliness, negligence, etc. Not a sign was to be discovered in him of that spark of genius which glowed so brilliantly in him afterwards. I imagine that he was kept down to his musical studies from an early age by his father.

Wurzer entered the gymnasium in 1781; Beethoven did not. This, therefore, must have been the time at which all other studies were abandoned in favor of music. In what manner his education was otherwise pieced out is not to be learned. The lack of proper intellectual discipline is painfully obvious in Beethoven’s letters throughout his life. In his early manhood he wrote a fair hand, so very different from the shocking scrawl of his later years as to make one almost doubt the genuineness of autographs of that period; but in orthography, the use of capital letters, punctuation and arithmetic he was sadly deficient all his life long. He was still able to use the French tongue at a later period, and of Latin he had learned enough to understand the texts which he composed; but even as a schoolboy his studies appear to have been made second to his musical practice with which his hours out of school were apparently for the most part occupied. He was described by Dr. Müller as “a shy and taciturn boy, the necessary consequence of the life apart which he led, observing more and pondering more than he spoke, and disposed to abandon himself entirely to the feelings awakened by music and (later) by poetry and to the pictures created by fancy.” Of those who were his schoolfellows and who in after years recorded their reminiscences of him, not one speaks of him as a playfellow, none has anecdotes to relate of games with him, rambles on the hills or adventures upon the Rhine and its shores in which he bore a part. Music and ever music; hence the power of clothing his thoughts in words was not developed by early culture, and the occasional bursts of eloquence in his

letters and recorded conversations are held not to be genuine, because so seldom found. As if the strong mind, struggling for adequate expression, should not at times break through all barriers and overcome all obstacles![20] Urged forward thus by the father's severity, by his tender love for his mother and by the awakening of his own tastes, the development of his skill and talents was rapid; so much so that in his ninth year a teacher more competent than his father was needed.

BEETHOVEN AND VAN DEN EEDEN

The first to whom his father turned was the old court organist van den Eeden, who had been in the electoral service about fifty years and had come to Bonn before the arrival there of Ludwig van Beethoven, the grandfather. One can easily imagine his willingness to serve an old and deceased friend by fitting his grandson to become his successor; and this might account for Schlosser's story that at first he taught him gratis, and that he continued his instructions at the command and expense of the Elector. The story may or may not be true, but nothing has been discovered in the archives at Düsseldorf confirming the statement; in fact concerning the time, the subjects and the results of van den Eeden's instruction we are thrown largely upon conjecture. "In his eighth year," says Mäurer in his notices, "Court Organist van den Eeden took him as a pupil; nothing has been learned of his progress." This, if Mäurer was correct in stating his age, would have been about 1778. It is after this that Mäurer refers to his study under Pfeiffer. Independently of all this Fischer says: "His father not being able to teach him more in music, and suspecting that he had talent for composition, took him at first to an aged master named Santerrini who instructed him for a while; but the father thought little of this teacher, did not consider him the right man and desired a change." This desire resulted in securing Pfeiffer through the mediation of Grossmann. There was no musician Santerrini in the court chapel, but an actor, named Santorini, was a member of Grossmann's troupe; he cannot be considered in this connection. There is evidently a confusion of names, and the whole context, especially the reference to the "aged master," shows that no other than van den Eeden was meant by the teacher who gave instruction for a short time before Pfeiffer.

Schlosser does not say that this instruction was on the organ and it is unlikely that the boy, who was destined for a more systematic instruction in pianoforte playing, was put at the organ at so early an age. It was a deduction, probably, from the fact that van den Eeden was an organist and that later Beethoven displayed a great deal of dexterity upon that instrument. It is noteworthy that Wegeler (p. 11) says nothing definite as to whether or not Beethoven took lessons from van den Eeden; he merely thought it likely, because he knew no one else in Bonn from whom Beethoven could have learned the technical handling of the organ. But there were several such in Bonn irrespective of Neefe. Schindler makes certainty out of Wegeler's conjecture and relates that Beethoven often spoke of the old organist when discoursing upon the proper position and movement of the body and hands in organ and pianoforte playing, he having been taught to hold both calm and steady, to play in the connected style of Handel and Bach. This may have been correct so far as pianoforte playing is concerned; but Schindler had little knowledge of Beethoven's Bonn period, and the possibility of a confusion of names is not excluded even on the part of Beethoven himself, who received hints from several organists. Mäurer, after speaking of Pfeiffer, continues as follows: "Van den Eeden remained his only teacher in thorough-bass. As a man of seventy he sent the boy Louis, between eleven and twelve years old, to accompany the mass and other church music on the organ. His playing was so astonishing that one was forced to believe he had intentionally concealed his gifts. While preluding for the _Credo_ he took a theme from the movement and developed it to the amazement of the orchestra so that he was permitted to improvise longer than is customary. That was the opening of his brilliant career." Mäurer seems to know nothing of Neefe when he says that van den Eeden was Beethoven's only teacher in thorough-bass. What he says, too, about the lad's performance at the organ as substitute obviously rests upon a confounding of van den Eeden with another of Beethoven's organ teachers--most likely Neefe.

It is our conjecture that van den Eeden taught the boy chiefly and perhaps exclusively pianoforte playing, he being a master in that art; but his influence was small. It must be remembered that van den Eeden was a very old man, as whose successor Neefe had been chosen in 1781, and who died in June, 1782. Nowhere does he, like the other teachers of Beethoven, disclose individual traits; he is a totally colorless picture in the history of Beethoven's youth. Nor does it appear that there was any intimacy between him and the Beethoven family, since otherwise he would not have been missing in the notices of Fischer, who does not even know his name. The judgment of the father that his instruction was inefficient was probably correct.

OTHER TEACHERS OF THE BOY BEETHOVEN

A fitter master, it was thought, was obtained in Tobias Friedrich Pfeiffer, who came to Bonn in the summer of 1779, as tenor singer in Grossmann and Helmuth's theatrical company. Mäurer, the violoncellist, in some reminiscences of that period communicated to this work by Professor Jahn, says that Pfeiffer was a skillful pianist and gave the boy lessons, but not at any regular hours. Often

when he came with Beethoven, the father, from the wine-house late at night, the boy was roused from sleep and kept at the pianoforte until morning;--a course not particularly favorable to his progress at school, but one which may be readily credited in the light of what is known of Pfeiffer and Johann Beethoven, and one, moreover, which would cause the lessons to make an enduring impression upon the memory. There is some reason to think that the former was an inmate of the latter's family, which adds probability to the story. Although Pfeiffer was in Bonn but one year, Wegeler affirms that "Beethoven owed most of all to this teacher, and was so appreciative of the fact that he sent him financial help from Vienna through Simrock." To what extent Wegeler's opinion as to Beethoven's obligations is correct, it would be difficult to decide; but the utter improbability that a single year's lessons from this man would profit a boy eight and a half to nine and a half years old, more than those from any other of his teachers, much longer and systematically continued, is manifest. About this time the young court musician Franz Georg Rovantini lived in the same house with Beethoven. He was the son of a violinist Johann Conrad Rovantini who had been called to Bonn from Ehrenbreitstein and who died in 1766. He was related to the Beethoven family. The young musician was much respected and sought after as teacher. According to the Fischer document the boy Beethoven was among his pupils, taking lessons on the violin and viola. But these lessons, too, came to an early end; Rovantini died on September 9, 1781, aged 24.

A strong predilection for the organ was awakened early in the lad and he eagerly sought opportunities to study the instrument, apparently even before he became Neefe's pupil. In the cloister of the Franciscan monks at Bonn there lived a friar named Willibald Koch, highly respected for his playing and his expert knowledge of organ construction. We have no reason to doubt that young Ludwig sought him out, received instruction from him and made so much progress that Friar Willibald accepted him as assistant. In the same way he made friends with the organist in the cloister of the Minorites and "made an agreement" to play the organ there at 6 o'clock morning mass. It would seem that he felt the need of familiarity with a larger organ than that of the Franciscans. On the inside of the cover of a memorandum book which he carried to Vienna with him is found the note: "Measurements (_Fussmass_) of the Minorite pedals in Bonn." Plainly he had kept an interest in the organ. Still another tradition is preserved in a letter to the author from Miss Auguste Grimm, dated September, 1872, to the effect that Heinrich Theisen, born in 1759, organist at Rheinbreitbach near Honneck on the Rhine, studied the organ in company with Beethoven under Zenser, organist of the Münsterkirche at Bonn, and that the lad of ten years surpassed his fellow student of twenty. The tradition says that already at that time Ludwig composed pieces which were too difficult for his little hands. "Why, you can't play that, Ludwig," his teacher is said to have remarked, and the boy to have replied: "I will when I am bigger."

When Beethoven's studies with van den Eeden began and ended, whether they were confined to the organ or pianoforte, or partook of both--these are undecided points. It does not appear that any instruction in composition was given him until he became the pupil of Neefe. In the _facsimile_ which follows the part devoted to thorough-bass in the so-called "Studien," the composer says: "Dear Friends: I took the pains to learn this only that I might write the figures readily and later instruct others; for myself I never had to learn how to avoid errors, for from my childhood I had so keen a sensibility that I wrote correctly without knowing it had to be so, or could be otherwise." This lends plausibility, at least, to another anecdote related by Mäurer concerning an alleged precocious composition by Beethoven:

THE STORY OF A FIRST COMPOSITION

About this time the English Ambassador to the Elector's court, named Kressner, who had extended help to the Beethoven family, living scantily on a salary of 400 fl. [?], died. Louis composed a funeral cantata to his memory--his first composition. He handed his score to Lucchesi and asked him to correct the errors. Lucchesi gave it back with the remark that he could not understand it, and therefore could not comply with his request, but would have it performed. At the first rehearsal there was great astonishment at the originality of the composition, but approval was divided; after a few rehearsals the approbation grew and the piece was performed with general applause.

George Cressener came to Bonn in the autumn of 1755, and died there January 17, 1781, in the eighty-first year of his age. The "about this time" in Mäurer's story agrees, therefore, well enough with that date; it is, however, a suspicious circumstance that Mäurer had left the service and returned to Cologne in the Spring of 1780 and, therefore, was not eye-witness to the fact; and another that the circumstance was not remembered by other members of the court chapel, not even by Franz Ries, nor by Neefe, who, though not then a member, was already in Bonn. "In 1780," continues Mäurer, "Beethoven got acquainted with Zambona, who called his attention to his neglected education, gave him lessons daily in Latin, Louis continuing a year (in six weeks he read Cicero's letters!)--also logic, French and Italian--until Zambona left Bonn in order to become bookkeeper for Bartholdy in Mühlheim." In the "Geheime Staats-Conferenz Protocollen," May 20, 1787, one reads: "Stephan Zambona prays to be appointed, _Kammerportier_, etc.," to which is appended the remark: "the request not granted." Zambona is a name, too, which, half a dozen

years later, often appears in the Bonn “Intelligenzblatt,” as that of a shopkeeper in the Market Place of that town. If the story of the cantata be doubtful, that of these private studies on the part of a boy in Beethoven’s position, only in his tenth year and a schoolboy then if ever, like Hamlet’s possible dreams in the sleep of death, must “give us pause.”

Mother and son undertook a voyage to Holland in the beginning of the winter of 1781. The widow Karth, one of the Hertel family, born in 1780 and still living in Bonn in 1861, passed her childhood in the house No. 462 Wenzelgasse in the upper story of which the Beethovens then lived. One of her reminiscences is in place here. She distinctly remembered sitting, when a child, upon her own mother’s knee, and hearing Madame van Beethoven--“a quiet, suffering woman”--relate that when she went with her little boy Ludwig to Holland it was so cold on the boat that she had to hold his feet in her lap to prevent them from being frostbitten; and also that, while absent, Ludwig played a great deal in great houses, astonished people by his skill and received valuable presents. The circumstance of the cold feet warmed in the mother’s lap, is precisely one to fasten itself in the memory of a child and form a point around which other facts might cluster.[21]

Another incident related in connection with this journey to Holland--not as a fact, but as one which she had heard spoken of in her childhood--and one very difficult to comprehend, is, that some person, whether an envious boy or a heartless adult she could not tell, drew a knife across the fingers of Ludwig to disable him from playing!

FOOTNOTES:

[13] In one of Beethoven’s conversation books his nephew writes on December 15, 1823: “To-day is the 15th of December, the day of your birth, but I am not sure whether it is the 15th or 17th, inasmuch as we can not depend on the certificate of baptism and I read it only once when I was still with you in January.” The nephew, it will be observed, does not appeal to a family tradition but to the baptismal certificate and the uncertainty, therefore, is with reference to the date of baptism, not of birth. Hence the deduction which Kalischer makes (“Vossische Zeitung,” No. 17, 1891) that Beethoven was born on December 15. Hesse calls to witness a clerk employed in Simrock’s establishment with whom Beethoven had business transactions, and who had written on the back of the announcement of Beethoven’s death, “L. v. Beethoven was born on December 16, 1770.”

[14] The mistake in the mother’s name is sufficiently explained by the use of Lena as the contraction of both Helena and Magdalena.

[15] “The baptismal certificate seems to be incorrect, since there was a Ludwig born before me. A Baumgarten was my sponsor, I believe. Ludwig van Beethoven.”

[16] “Allg. Mus.-Ztg.,” May 23. 1827.

[17] There was no teacher of this name in Bonn at the time. There was a Rupert, however, who may have been the one meant by Fischer.

[18] These memoirs are in manuscript. They were formerly in the possession of Dr. Bodifée of Bonn, later in the Town Hall.

[19] Error; Beethoven’s mother did not die until 1787, long after he had left school.

[20] Thayer’s characterization of the joyless boyhood of Beethoven may submit to a slight modification, at least so far as his childhood is concerned, without violence to the verities of history. Fischer would have us believe that the lad took part with his brother Carl in boyish capers which were not always of a harmless character. In a letter to Simrock, Court Councillor Krupp relates: “My father, who died in 1847, was a youthful friend and schoolmate of Ludwig and Carl van Beethoven, and distantly related to the godmother of the former. Thursdays were holidays for the schoolboys, and the brothers Beethoven, L. and C., were then wont to come to the house of my grandparents, No. 28 Bonngasse (now belonging to my sister and me), and amuse themselves, among other things, with target shooting. There was a wall between the garden of our house and the gardens of the adjoining houses in the Wenzelgasse against which the target was placed at which the boys shot arrows; a hit in the centre brought forth a _Stüber_ (about 4 pfennigs) for the lucky marksman. Garden and wall are now (1890) in the same condition as then. In the evening the Beethoven brothers went home through the Gudenauergässchen. The family lived at the time in the Wenzelgasse back of our house.” Here is an inaccuracy, for Ludwig van Beethoven no longer went to school when the Beethoven family changed their house in the Rheingasse for that in the Wenzelgasse--which was probably about 1785. The letter continues: “Ludwig’s father treated him harshly, especially when he was intoxicated, and sometimes shut him up in the cellar.”

[21] There seems to have been no knowledge on the part of Beethoven's biographers of this visit to Holland until Thayer brought the incident to notice. It is, therefore, highly significant that the Fischer family also recalled the circumstance and, besides, knew what brought it about. The sister of young Rovantini, who died in September, 1781, was employed as governess in Rotterdam, and on receiving intelligence of the death of her brother came to Bonn, together with her mistress (whose name has not been preserved), to visit his grave. For a month she was an inmate of the Beethoven house; there was a good deal of music-making and some excursions to neighboring places of interest, including Coblenz. The visitors invited the Beethoven family to make a trip to Holland. Inasmuch as Johann van Beethoven could not get away, the mother went with the lad, and, a party of five, they embarked upon the voyage. This must have been in October or November, 1781, which agrees with the story of the extreme cold encountered on the voyage. They remained a considerable time, but whether or not Ludwig gave a concert as he had intended, is not known. Despite the attentions showered upon him by the wealthy lady from Rotterdam and the many honors, the pecuniary results were disappointing. To Fischer's question how he had fared Beethoven is reported to have answered: "The Dutch are skinflints (_Pfennigfuchser_); I'll never go to Holland again."

Chapter IV

Beethoven a Pupil of Neefe--His Talent and Skill Put to Use--First Efforts at Composition--Johann van Beethoven's Family--Domestic Tribulations.

Christian Gottlob Neefe succeeded the persons mentioned as Beethoven's master in music. When this tutorship began and ended, and whether or not it be true that the Elector engaged and paid him for his services in this capacity, as affirmed by divers writers--here again positive evidence is wanting. Neefe came to Bonn in October, 1779; received the decree of succession to the position of Court Organist on February 15, 1781, and was thus permanently engaged in the Elector's service. The unsatisfactory nature of the earlier instruction, as well as the high reputation of Neefe, placed in the strongest light before the Bonn public by those proceedings which had compelled him to remain there, would render it highly desirable to Johann van Beethoven to transfer his son to the latter's care. It would create no surprise should proof hereafter come to light that this change was made even before the issue of the decree of February 15, 1781;--that even then the pupil was profiting by the lessons of the zealous Bachist. Whether this was so or not, it was more than ever necessary that the boy's talents should be put to profitable use, for the father found his family still increasing. The baptism of a daughter named Anna Maria Franciska after her sponsors Anna Maria Klemmers, _dicta_ Kochs, and Franz Rovantini, court musician, is recorded in the St. Remigius register February 23, 1779, and her death on the 27th of the same month. The baptism of August Franciscus Georgius van Beethoven--Franz Rovantini, _Musicus Aulicus_ and Helene Averdonk, _patrini_, follows nearly two years later--January 17, 1781. There is no minister of State now to lend his name to a child of Johann van Beethoven, nor any lady abbess. Rovantini, one of the youngest members of the orchestra (relative and friend of the family), and a Frau Kochs, the young contralto, whose musical education the father had superintended, take their places--another indication that the head of the family is gradually sinking in social position.

It is Schlosser who states that "the Elector urged Neefe to make it his particular care to look after the training of the young Beethoven." How much weight is to be attached to this assertion of a man who hastily threw a few pages together soon after the death of the composer, and who begins by adopting the old error of 1772 as the date of his birth, and naming his father "Anton," may safely be left to the reader. That the story may possibly have some foundation in truth is not denied; but the probabilities are all against it. Just in these years Max Friedrich is busy with his tric-trac, his balls, his new operettas and comedies, and with his notion of making the theatre a school of morals. The truth seems to be (and it is the only hypothesis that suggests itself, corresponding to the established facts), that Johann van Beethoven had now determined to make an organist of his son as the surest method of making his talents productive. The appointment of Neefe necessarily destroyed Ludwig's hope of being van den Eeden's successor; but Neefe's other numerous employments would make an assistant indispensable, and to this place the boy might well aspire. It will be seen in the course of the narrative that Beethoven never had a warmer, kinder and more valuable friend than Neefe proved throughout the remainder of his Bonn life; that, in fact, his first appointment was obtained for him through Neefe, although this is the first hint yet published that the credit does not belong to a very different personage. What, then, so natural, so self-evident as that Neefe, foreseeing the approaching necessity of some one to take charge of the little organ in the chapel at times when his duties to the Grossmann company would prevent him from officiating in person, should gladly undertake the training of the remarkable talents of van den Eeden's pupil with no wish for any other remuneration than the occasional services which the youth could render him?

NEEFE'S INFLUENCE ON BEETHOVEN

Dr. Wegeler remarks: “Neefe had little influence upon the instruction of our Ludwig, who frequently complained of the too severe criticisms made on his first efforts in composition.” The first of these assertions is evidently an utter mistake. In 1793 Beethoven himself, at all events, thought differently: “I thank you for the counsel which you gave me so often in my progress in my divine art. If I ever become a great man yours shall be a share of the credit. This will give you the greater joy since you may rest assured,” etc. Thus he wrote to his old teacher. As to the complaint of harsh criticism it may be remarked that Neefe, reared in the strict Leipsic school, must have been greatly dissatisfied with the direction which the young genius was taking under the influences which surrounded him, and that he should labor to change its course. He was still a young man, and in his zeal for his pupil’s progress may well have criticized his childish compositions with a severity which, though no more than just and reasonable, may have so contrasted with injudicious praise from other quarters as to wound the boy’s self-esteem and leave a sting behind; especially if Neefe indulged in a tone at all contemptuous, a common fault of young men in like cases. Probably, in some conversation upon this point Beethoven may have remarked to Wegeler that Neefe had criticized him in his childhood rather too severely.

But to return from the broad field of hypothesis to the narrow path of facts. “On this day, June 20, 1782,” Neefe writes of himself and the Grossmann company, “we entered upon our journey to Münster, whither the Elector also went. The day before my predecessor, Court Organist van den Eeden, was buried; I received permission, however, to leave my duties in the hands of a vicar and go along to Westphalia and thence to the Michaelmas fair at Frankfort.” The Düsseldorf documents prove that this vicar was Ludwig van Beethoven, now just eleven and a half years of age. In the course of the succeeding winter, Neefe prepared that very valuable and interesting communication to “Cramer’s Magazine” which has been so largely quoted. In this occurs the first printed notice of Beethoven, one which is honorable to head and heart of its author. He writes, under date of March 2, 1783:

Louis van Beethoven, son of the tenor singer mentioned, a boy of eleven years and of most promising talent. He plays the clavier very skilfully and with power, reads at sight very well, and--to put it in a nutshell--he plays chiefly “The Well-Tempered Clavichord” of Sebastian Bach, which Herr Neefe put into his hands. Whoever knows this collection of preludes and fugues in all the keys--which might almost be called the _non plus ultra_ of our art--will know what this means. So far as his duties permitted, Herr Neefe has also given him instruction in thorough-bass. He is now training him in composition and for his encouragement has had nine variations for the pianoforte, written by him on a march--by Ernst Christoph Dressler--engraved at Mannheim. This youthful genius is deserving of help to enable him to travel. He would surely become a second Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart were he to continue as he has begun.

This allusion to Mozart, who had not then produced those immortal works upon which his fame now principally rests, speaks well for the insight of Neefe and renders his high appreciation of his pupil’s genius the more striking. Had this man then really so little influence upon its development as Wegeler supposed?

That C. P. E. Bach’s works were included in Neefe’s course of instruction is rendered nearly certain by the following facts: he was himself a devout student of them; the only reference to his father made by Beethoven in all the manuscripts examined for this work, an official document or two excepted, is upon an unfinished copy of one of Bach’s cantatas in these words: “Written by my dear father;”[22] and one of the works most used by him in compiling his “Materialien für Contrapunkt” in 1809 was Bach’s “Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu Spielen.” The unlucky remark of Wegeler, founded, too, possibly upon some expression of Beethoven’s in a moment of spleen, but certainly not in justice, has cast a shadow upon the relation between Neefe and his pupil. Writer after writer has copied without examining it. Does it bear examination? Possibly, if it be supposed to relate only to execution upon the pianoforte and organ; but in no other case. It is self-evident that serious study in the severe school of the Bachs was necessary to counteract the influence of the light and trivial music of the Bonn stage upon the young genius; and to Neefe the credit of seeing this and acting accordingly must be given. The reader’s attention is called particularly to the words “He is now training him in composition, and for his encouragement has had nine variations for the pianoforte written by him on a march by Dressler engraved at Mannheim,” in Neefe’s notice of Beethoven above cited, and the date of the article from which it is taken--March 2, 1783. Is it not perfectly clear that these variations have been recently composed, and very recently printed? Yet upon the title stands, “Par un jeune amateur, Louis van Beethoven, âgé de dix ans.” If this were a solitary case of apparent discrepancy between the boy’s age and the year given it would attract and deserve no notice; but it is one of many and adds its weight to the evidence of that falsification already spoken of.[23]

A second work belonging to this period is a two-part fugue in D for the organ.[24]

BEETHOVEN AS NEEFE’S ASSISTANT

To return to the young organist, who, since the publication of Wegeler's "Notizen," has always been supposed to have been placed at that instrument by the Elector Max Franz in the year 1785, as a method of giving him pecuniary aid without touching his feelings of pride and independence. The place of assistant to Neefe was no sinecure; although not involving much labor, it brought with it much confinement. The old organ had been destroyed by the fire of 1777, and a small chamber instrument still supplied its place. It was the constantly recurring necessity of being present at the religious services which made the position onerous.

On all Sundays and regular festivals (says the Court Calendar) high mass at 11 a.m. and vespers at 3 (sometimes 4) p.m. The vespers will be sung throughout in _Capellis solemnibus_ by the musicians of the electoral court, the middle vespers will be sung by the court clergy and musicians chorally as far as the _Magnificat_, which will be performed musically. On all Wednesdays in Lent the _Miserere_ will be sung by the chapel at 5 p.m. and on all Fridays the _Stabat mater_. Every Saturday at 3 p.m. the Litanies at the altar of Our Lady of Loretto. Every day throughout the year two masses will be read, the one at 9, the other at 11--on Sundays the latter at 10.

Such a programme gave the organist something at least to do, and when Neefe left Bonn for Münster, June 20, 1782, he left his pupil no easy task. Before the close of the theatrical season of the next winter (1782-'83) the master was obliged to call upon the boy for still farther assistance. "In the winter of 1784," writes the widow Neefe, "my husband of blessed memory was temporarily entrusted with the direction of the church music as well as other music at court while the Electoral Chapelmaster L. was absent on a journey of several months." The date is wrong, for Lucchesi's petition for leave of absence was granted April 26, 1783. Thus overwhelmed with business, Neefe could no longer conduct at the pianoforte the rehearsals for the stage, and Ludwig van Beethoven, now 12 years old, became also "cembalist in the orchestra." In those days every orchestra was provided with a harpsichord or pianoforte, seated at which the director guided the performance, playing from the score. Here, then, was in part the origin of that marvellous power, with which in later years Beethoven astonished his contemporaries, of reading and playing the most difficult and involved scores at first sight. The position of cembalist was one of equal honor and responsibility. Handel and Matthison's duel grew out of the fact that the former would not leave the harpsichord on a certain occasion before the close of the performance. Gassmann placed the young Salieri at the harpsichord of the Imperial Opera House as the best possible means of training him to become the great conductor that he was. This was the high place of honor given to Haydn when in London. In Ludwig van Beethoven's case it was the place in which he, as Mosel says of Salieri, "could make practical use of what he learned from books and scores at home." Moreover, it was a place in which he could, even in boyhood, hear to satiety the popular Italian, French and German operas of the day and learn to feel that something higher and nobler was necessary to touch the deeper feelings of the heart; a place which, had the Elector lived ten years longer, might have given the world another not merely great but prolific, nay inexhaustible, operatic composer. The cembalist's duties doubtless came to an end with the departure of the Elector for Münster in May or June, and he then had time for other pursuits, of which composition was one. A song, "Schilderung eines Mädchens," by him was printed this year in Bossler's "Blumenlese für Liebhaber," and a Rondo in C for pianoforte, anonymous, which immediately follows, was also of his composition. A more important work, which before the close of the year was published by Bossler with a magniloquent dedication to Max Friedrich, was the three sonatas for pianoforte, according to the title, if true, "composed by Ludwig van Beethoven, aged 11 years."[25] The reader can judge whether or not the 11 should be 12.

To turn for a moment to the Beethoven family matters. This summer (1783) had brought them some sorrow again. The child Franz Georg, now just two and a half years old, died August 16th. This was another stroke of bad fortune which not only wounded the heart but added to the pecuniary difficulties of the father, who was now losing his voice and whose character is described in an official report made the next summer by the words "of tolerable conduct." If the duties of Neefe during the last season had been laborious, in the coming one, 1783-'84, they were still more arduous. It was the first under the new contract by which the Elector assumed all the costs of the theatre, and a woman, Mme. Grossmann, had the direction. It was all-important to singers, actors and whoever was concerned that the result of the experiment should be satisfactory to their employer; and as the opera was more to his taste than the spoken drama, so much the more difficult was Neefe's task. Besides his acting as chapelmaster in the place of Lucchesi, still absent, there was "every forenoon rehearsal of opera," as Mme. Grossmann wrote to Councillor T., at which, of course, Neefe had to be present. There was ever new music to be examined, arranged, copied, composed--what not?--all which he must attend to; in short, he had everything to do which could be imposed upon a theatrical music director with a salary of 1,000 florins. It therefore became a busy time for his young assistant, who still had no recognition as member of the court chapel, not even as "accessist"--the last "accessist" organist was Meuris (1778)--and consequently no salary from the court. But he had now more than completed the usual year of probation to which candidates were subjected, and his talents and skill were well enough known to warrant his petition for an appointment. The petition has not been discovered; but the report made upon it to the privy council has been preserved, together with the following endorsement: "High Lord Steward Count von Salm, referring to the petition

of Ludwig van Beethoven for the position of Assistant Court Organist, is of the humble opinion that the grace ought to be bestowed upon him, together with a small compensation." This endorsement is dated "Bonn, February 29, 1784." The report upon the petition is as follows:

APPOINTED ASSISTANT COURT ORGANIST

Most Reverend Archbishop and Elector, Most Gracious Lord, Lord.

Your Electoral Grace has graciously been pleased to demand a dutiful report from me on the petition of Ludwig van Beethoven to Your Grace under date the 15th inst.

Obediently and without delay (I report) that suppliant's father was for 29 years, his grandfather for 46, in the service of Your Most Reverend Electoral Grace and Your Electoral Grace's predecessors; that the suppliant has been amply proved and found capable to play the court organ as he has done in the absence of Organist Neefe, also at rehearsals of the plays and elsewhere and will continue to do so in the future; that Your Grace has graciously provided for his care and subsistence (his father no longer being able to do so). It is therefore my humble judgment that for these reasons the suppliant well deserves to have graciously bestowed upon him the position of assistant at the court organ and an increase of remuneration. Commending myself to the good will of Your Most Reverend Electoral Grace I am Your Most Reverend Grace's

most humble and obedient servant

Sigismund Altergraff zu Salm und Reifferscheid.

Bonn, February 23, 1784.

The action taken is thus indicated:

Ad Sup.

Ludwig van Beethoven.

On the obedient report the suppliant's submissive prayer, granted. (_Beruhet._)

Bonn, February 29, 1784.

Again, on the cover:

Ad sup.

Lud. van Beethoven, Granted. (_Beruhet._)

Sig. Bonn, February 29, 1784.

The necessity of the case, the warm recommendation of Salm-Reifferscheid, very probably, too, the Elector's own knowledge of the fitness of the candidate, and perhaps the flattery in the dedication of the sonatas--for these were the days when dedications but half disguised petitions for favor--were sufficient inducements to His Transparency at length to confirm the young organist in the position which Neefe's kindness had now for nearly two years given him. Opinions differ as to the precise meaning of the word _Beruhet_ (translated "granted" in the above transcripts); but this much is certain: Beethoven was not appointed assistant organist in 1785 by Max Franz at the instance of Count Waldstein, but at the age of 13 in the spring of 1784 by Max Friedrich, and upon his own petition supported by the influence of Neefe and of Salm-Reifferscheid.

The appointment was made, but the salary had not been determined on when an event occurred which wrought an entire change in the position of theatrical affairs at Bonn:--the Elector died on April 15, and the theatrical company was dismissed with four weeks' wages. There was no longer a necessity for a second organist; and fortunate it was for the assistant that his name came before Max Friedrich's successor (in the reports soon to be copied) as being a regular member of the court chapel, although "without salary." Lucchesi returned to Bonn; Neefe had nothing to do but play his organ, cultivate his garden outside the town and give music lessons. It was long before such a conjunction of circumstances occurred as would have led the economical Max Franz to appoint an organist adjunct. Happy was it, therefore, that one of the deceased Elector's last acts secured young Beethoven the place.

EARLY EFFORTS AT COMPOSITION

The excellent Frau Karth, born in 1780, could not recall to memory any period of her childhood down to the death of Johann van Beethoven, when he and his family did not live in the lodging above that of her parents. This fact, together with the circumstance that no mention is made of the Beethovens in the account of the great inundation of the Rhine in February, 1782, when all the families dwelling in the Fischer house of the Rheingasse were rescued in boats from the windows of the first story, added to the strong probability that Beethoven's position was but the first formal step of the regular process of confirming an appointment already determined upon;--these points strongly suggest the idea that to Ludwig's advancement his father owed the ability to dwell once more in a better part of the town, i.e., in the pleasant house No. 462 Wenzelgasse. The house is very near the Minorite church, which contained a good organ, concerning the pedal measurements of which, as we have seen, Beethoven made a memorandum in a note-book which he carried with him to Vienna.[26] In the "Neuen Blumenlese für Klavierliebhaber" of this year, Part I, pp. 18 and 19, appeared a Rondo for Pianoforte, in A major, "dal Sig^{re} van Beethoven"[27]; and Part II, p. 44, the Arioso "An einen Säugling, von Hrn. Beethoven."[28] "Un Concert pour le Clavecin ou Fortepiano composé par Louis van Beethoven âgé de douze ans," 32 pp. manuscript written in a boy's hand, may also belong to this year[29]; and, judging by the handwriting, to the period may also be assigned a movement in three parts of four pages, formerly in the Artaria collection, without title, date or remark of any kind.[30]

The widow Karth perfectly remembered Johann van Beethoven as a tall, handsome man with powdered head. Ries and Simrock described Ludwig to Dr. Müller "as a boy powerfully, almost clumsily built."[31] How easily fancy pictures them--the tall man walking to chapel or rehearsal with the little boy trotting by his side, through the streets of Bonn, and the gratified expression of the father as the child takes the place and performs the duties of a man!

FOOTNOTES:

[22] "Morgengesang am Schöpfungstage."

[23] As given by Nottebohm in his catalogue (p. 154) the title of the original publication of the Variations by Goetz of Mannheim ran as follows: "_Variations pour le Clavecin sur une Marche de Mr. Dressler, composées et Dediées à son Excellence Madame la Comtesse de Wolfmetternich, née Baronne d'Assebourg, par un jeune amateur Louis van Beethoven, âgé de dix ans. 1780._" Inasmuch as Nottebohm's Notes on Thayer's "Chronologisches Verzeichniss" do not give the date 1780, it was probably appended by mistake. In the _delle Sinfonie, etc., che si trovanno in manoscritto nella officina de Breitkopf in Lipsia_, under the compositions of 1782, 1783 and 1784: _Variations da Louis van Beethoven, âgé de dix ans, Mannheim_, with the theme in notation. The Countess Wolff-Metternich, to whom the variations are dedicated, was the wife of Count Ignaz von Wolff-Metternich, "Konferenzmeister" and president of the High Court of Appeals, who died in Bonn, March 15, 1790. Ernst Christoph Dressler, composer of the theme varied by Beethoven, was an opera singer in Cassel.

[24] The Bagatelles for Pianoforte, Op. 33. included by Thayer in his MSS. and his "Chronologisches Verzeichniss" as also belonging to this period on the strength of their superscription on a manuscript copy, "Louis van Beethoven ... 1782," were, as Nottebohm has shown, not composed at this time. One of them was composed in 1802 and another sketched between 1799 and 1801. See Nottebohm ("Zweite Beethoveniana," p. 250). Nottebohm conjectures that the organ fugue was composed at his trial for the post of second court organist. In view of the fact that his age was falsified by his father at this time, it is likely that the work was composed in 1783.

[25] Title of the original publication: "Drei Sonaten für Klavier, dem Hochwürdigsten Erzbischofe und Kurfürsten zu Köln, Maximilian Friedrich meinem gnädigsten Herrn gewidmet und verfertigt von Ludwig van Beethoven, alt eilf Jahr." Beethoven wrote on a copy of the sonatas: "These Sonatas and the Variations of Dressler are my first works." He probably meant his first published works. See Thayer's "Chronologisches Verzeichniss," p. 2, 183.

[26] The editor has here thought it advisable to permit Thayer's original text to stand in the body of the book, although Dr. Deiters made a radical correction in his revision of the first volume of the biography. On the basis of the Fischer manuscript Dr. Deiters relates that the Beethoven family lived in the house in the Rheingasse at the time of the inundation; that Beethoven's mother sought to stay the alarm of the inmates with encouraging words, but at the last had to make her escape with the others into the Giergasse over boards and down ladders. Admitting that there are many inaccuracies in the recital, Dr. Deiters nevertheless accepts it in this particular and conjectures that Beethoven lived in the house in the Rheingasse until 1785.

[27] B. and H. Ges. Ausg. Serie 18, No. 196.

[28] B. and H. Ges. Ausg. Serie 23, No. 229.

[29] The manuscript contains the solo part complete with the orchestral preludes and interludes in transcription for pianoforte. There are indications that it was scored for small orchestra--strings, flutes and horns only. The composition was long unknown. Thayer included it in his “Chronologisches Verzeichniss” under No. 7, giving the themes. Guido Adler edited it at a much later date, and it has been published in the supplement to the collected works of Beethoven.

[30] Nottebohm conjectured that the movement referred to by Thayer was that for a musical clock, No. 29, in Thayer’s chronological catalogue, there described as a duo. Dr. Deiters thinks that it was a fragment of a composition for pianoforte and violin, No. 131 in the catalogue of the Artaria collection. It contains suggestions of Beethoven’s style, but the manuscript is a copy, not an autograph, and its authenticity is not proven.

[31] In the Fischer MS.: “Short of stature, broad shoulders, short neck, large head, round nose, dark brown complexion; he always bent forward slightly when he walked. In the house he was called der Spagnol (the Spaniard).”

Chapter V

Maria Theresia--Appearance and Character of Elector Max Franz--Musical Culture in the Austrian Imperial Family--A Royal Violinist--His Admiration for Mozart--His Court Music.

Maria Theresia was a tender mother, much concerned to see all her children well provided for in her lifetime and as independent as possible of her eldest son, the heir to the throne. This wish had already been fulfilled in the case of several of them.... The youngest son, Maximilian (born in Vienna, December 8, 1756), was already chosen coadjutor to his paternal uncle, Duke Karl of Lorraine, Grand Master of the Teutonic Order. But to provide a more bountiful and significant support, Prince Kaunitz formulated a plan which pleased the maternal heart of the monarch, and whose execution was calculated to extend the influence of the Court of Vienna in the German Empire. It was to bestow more ecclesiastical principalities upon the Archduke Maximilian. His eyes fell first upon the Archbishopric and Electorate of Cologne and the Archbishopric and Principality of Münster. These two countries had one and the same Regent, Maximilian Friedrich, descended from the Suabian family of Königseck-Rothenfels, Counts of the Empire. In view of the advanced age of this ruler his death did not seem far distant; but it was thought best not to wait for that contingency, but to secure the right of succession at once by having the Archduke elected Coadjutor in Cologne and Münster. Their possession was looked upon as a provision worthy of the son of an Empress-Queen. As Elector and Lord of the Rhenish shore, simultaneously co-director of the Westphalian Circuit (a dignity associated with the archbishopric of Münster), he could be useful to his house, and oppose the Prussian influence in the very part of Germany where it was largest.

Thus Dohm begins the seventh chapter of his “Denkwürdigkeiten” where, in a calm and passionless style, he relates the history of the intrigues and negotiations which ended in the election of Maria Theresia’s youngest son on August 7, 1780, as coadjutor to the Elector of Cologne and, on the 16th of the same month, to that of Münster, and secured him the peaceful and immediate succession when Max Friedrich’s functions should cease. The news of the election at Cologne reached Bonn on the same day about 1 o’clock p. m. The Elector proceeded at once to the Church of the Franciscans (used as the chapel since the conflagration of 1777), where a “musical ‘Te Deum’” was sung, while all the city bells were ringing. Von Kleist’s regiment fired a triple salvo, which the cannon on the city walls answered. At noon a public dinner was spread in the palace, one table setting 54, another 24 covers. In the evening at 8-1/2 o’clock, followed the finest illumination ever seen in Bonn, which the Elector enjoyed riding about in his carriage. After this came a grand supper of 82 covers, then a masked ball “to which every decently clad subject as well as any stranger was admitted, and which did not come to an end till nearly 7 o’clock.”

MAX FRANZ, THE NEW ELECTOR

Max Franz was in his twenty-eighth year when he came to Bonn. He was of middle stature, strongly built and already inclining to that corpulence which in his last years made him a prodigy of obesity. If all the absurdities of his eulogists be taken for truth, the last Elector of Cologne was endowed with every grace of mind and character that ever adorned human nature. In fact, however, he was a good-looking, kindly, indolent, somewhat choleric man; fond of a joke; affable; a hater of stiff ceremony; easy of access; an honest, amiable, conscientious ruler, who had the wisdom and will to supply his own deficiencies with enlightened and skilful ministers, and the good sense to rule, through their political foresight and sagacity, with an eye as much to the interests of his

subjects as his own.

In his boyhood he was rather stupid. Swinburne dismisses him in two lines: “Maximilian is a good-natured, neither here-nor-there kind of youth.” The brilliant, witty, shrewdly observant Mozart wrote to his father (Nov. 17, 1781): “To whom God gives an office he also gives an understanding. This is really the case with the Archduke. Before he became a priest he was much wittier and more intellectual and talked less, but more sensibly. You ought to see him now! Stupidity looks out of his eyes; he talks eternally, always in falsetto; he has a swollen neck--in a word, the man is completely transformed.” His mother had supplied him with the best instructors that Vienna afforded, and had sent him travelling pretty extensively for an archduke in those days. One of his journeys was to visit his sister Marie Antoinette in Paris, where his awkwardness and breaches of etiquette caused as much amusement to the anti-Austrian party as they did annoyance to the Queen, and afterwards to his brother Joseph, when they came to his ears.

In 1778 he was with Joseph in the campaign in Bavaria. An injury to his knee, caused by a fall of his horse, is the reason alleged for his abandonment of a military career; upon which he was prevailed upon, so the “Historisches Taschenbuch” (II, Vienna, 1806) expresses it, to become a candidate for the Coadjutorship of Cologne. If he had to be “prevailed upon” to enter the church, the more to his credit was the course he pursued when once his calling and election were sure.

The rigid economy which he introduced at court immediately after his accession in 1784 gave rise to the impression that he was penurious. It may be said in his defence that the condition of the finances required retrenchment and reform; that he was simple in his tastes and cared nothing for show and magnificence, except upon occasions when, in his opinion, the electoral dignity required them. Then, like his predecessors, he was lavish. His personal expenses were not great, and he waited until his revenues justified it before he indulged to any great extent his passion for the theatre, music and dancing (stout as he was, he was a passionate dancer), and his table. He was, through the nature of his physical constitution, an enormous eater, though his drink was only water.

The influence of a ruler upon the tone and character of society in a small capital is very great. A change for the better had begun during the time of Max Friedrich, but under his successor a new life entered Bonn. New objects of ambition were offered to the young men. The church and cloister ceased to be all in all. One can well understand how Wegeler in his old age, as he looked back half a century to the years when he was student and professor--and _such_ a half-century, with its revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, its political, religious and social changes!--should write (“Notizen,” p. 59): “In fact, it was a beautiful and in many ways active period in Bonn, so long as the genial Elector, Max Franz, Maria Theresia’s youngest son and favorite, reigned there.” How strongly the improved tone of society impressed itself upon the characters of the young is discernible in the many of them who, in after years, were known as men of large and liberal ideas and became distinguished as jurists, theologians and artists, or in science and letters. These were the years of Beethoven’s youth and early manhood; and though his great mental powers were in the main exercised upon his art, there is still to be observed through all his life a certain breadth and grandeur in his intellectual character, owing in part, no doubt, to the social influences under which it was developed.

It is highly honorable to the young Max Franz that he refused to avail himself of a privilege granted him in a Papal bull obtained for him by his mother--that of deferring the assumption of priestly vows for a period of ten years--but chose rather, as soon as he had leisure for the step, to enter the seminary in Cologne to fit himself for consecration. He entered November 29, rigidly submitted himself to all the discipline of the institution for the period of eight days, when, on December 8, the nuntius, Bellisoni, ordained him sub-deacon; after another eight days, on the 16th, deacon; and on the 21st, priest; thus showing that if there be no royal road to mathematics, there is a railway with express train for royal personages in pursuit of ecclesiastical science. Returning to Bonn, he read his first mass on Christmas eve in the Florian Chapel.

The cause of science and education the Elector had really at heart. In 1785 he had established a botanic garden; now he opened a public reading room in the palace library and sent a message to the theological school in Cologne, that if the improved course of instruction adopted in Austria was not introduced, he should found other seminaries. On the 26th of June he was present at the opening of a normal school; and on August 9th came the decree raising the Bonn Hochschule to the rank of a university by authority of an Imperial diploma.

Upon the suppression of the Jesuits in 1774, Max Friedrich devoted their possessions and revenues to the cause of education. New professorships were established in the gymnasium and in 1777 an “Academy” was formed. This was the first step; the second was to found an independent institution called the Lyceum; and at his death an application was before the Emperor for a university charter. Max Franz pushed the matter, obtained the charter from his brother, and Monday, the 20th of November, 1786, was the day appointed for the solemn inauguration of the new institution. The Court Calendar for the next year names six professors of

theology, six of jurisprudence, civil and ecclesiastical, four of medicine, and ten of philology and other branches of learning. In later editions new names are added; in that of 1790, Wegeler is professor of midwifery.

Though economical, Max Franz drew many a man of superior abilities--men of letters and artists--to Bonn; and but for the bursting of the storm which was even then gathering over the French border, his little capital might well have had a place in German literary history not inferior to that of Weimar. Nor are instances wanting in which he gave generous aid to young talent struggling with poverty; though that he did so much for Beethoven as is usually thought is, at least, doubtful.

This man, not a genius, not overwhelmingly great mentally, nor, on the other hand, so stupid as the stories told of his boyhood seem to indicate, but honest, well-meaning, ready to adopt and enforce wise measures devised by skilful ministers; easy, jocose and careless of appearances, very fond of music and a patron of letters and science,--this man, to whom in that period of vast intellectual fermentation the Index Expurgatorius was a dead letter, gave the tone to Bonn society.

A GIFTED IMPERIAL FAMILY

That solid musical education which she had received from her father, Maria Theresia bestowed upon her children, and their attainments in the art seem to have justified the time and labor spent. In 1749, at the age of seven and six, Christina and Maria Elizabeth took part in one of the festive musical pieces; Marie Antoinette was able to appreciate Gluck and lead the party in his favor in later years at Paris. Joseph is as much known in musical as in civil and political history. When Emperor he had his daily hour of music in his private apartments, playing either of several instruments or singing, according to the whim of the moment; and Maximilian, the youngest, acquired a good degree of skill both in singing and in the treatment of his favorite instrument, the viola. Beethoven once told Schindler that the Elector thought very highly of Mattheson. In his reminiscences of a visit to Vienna in 1783, J. F. Reichardt gives high praise to the musical interest, skill and zeal of Emperor Joseph and his brother Archduke Maximilian, and a writer in “Cramer’s Magazine,” probably Neefe, tells of a “remarkable concert” which took place at court in Bonn on April 5, 1786, at which the Elector played the viola, Duke Albrecht the violin, “and the fascinating Countess Belderbusch the clavier most charmingly.”

Maximilian had become personally acquainted with Mozart in Salzburg in 1775, where the young composer had set Metastasio’s “Il Re pastore” to music to be performed in his honor (April 23rd); from which time, to his credit be it said, he ever held the composer and his music in kindest remembrance. When in 1781 Mozart determined to leave his brutal Archbishop of Salzburg and remain in Vienna, the Archduke showed at all events a desire to aid him.

Yesterday (writes the composer November 17, 1781) the Archduke Maximilian summoned me to him at 3 o’clock in the afternoon. When I entered he was standing before a stove in the first room awaiting me. He came towards me and asked if I had anything to do to-day? “Nothing, Your Royal Highness, and if I had it would always be a grace to wait upon Your Royal Highness.” “No; I do not wish to constrain anyone.” Then he said that he was minded to give a concert in the evening for the Court of Wurtemberg. Would I play something and accompany the aria? I was to come to him again at 6 o’clock. So I played there yesterday.

Mozart was everything to him (continues Jahn); he signalized him at every opportunity and said, if he were Elector of Cologne, Mozart would surely be his chapelmaster. He had also suggested to the Princess (of Wurtemberg) that she appoint Mozart her music teacher, but received the reply that if it rested with her she would have chosen him; but the Emperor--“for him there is nobody but Salieri!” cries out Mozart peevishly--had recommended Salieri because of the singing, and she had to take him, for which she was sorry.

Jahn gives no reason why Mozart was not engaged for Bonn. Perhaps he would have been had Lucchesi resigned in consequence of the reduction of his salary; but he kept his office of chapelmaster and could not well be dismissed without cause. Mattioli’s resignation was followed by the call of Joseph Reicha to the place of concertmaster; but for Mozart no vacancy occurred at that time. Maximilian was in Vienna during most of the month of October, 1785, and may have desired to secure Mozart in some way, but just at that time the latter was, as his father wrote, “over head and ears busy with the opera ‘Le Nozze di Figaro.’” Old Chapelmaster Bono could not live much longer; which gave him hope, should the opera succeed, of obtaining a permanent appointment in Vienna; and, in short, his prospects seemed just then so good that his determination--if he should really receive an offer from the Elector--to remain in the great capital rather than to take his young wife so far away from home and friends as the Rhine then was, and, in a manner, bury himself in a small town where so few opportunities would probably be given him for the exercise of the vast powers which he was conscious of possessing, need not surprise us.

Was it the good or the ill fortune of the boy Beethoven that Mozart came not to Bonn? His marvellous original talents were thus left to be developed without the fostering care of one of the very greatest of musical geniuses, and one of the profoundest of musical scholars; but on the other hand it was not oppressed, perhaps crushed, by daily intercourse with that genius and scholarship.

Maximilian, immediately after reaching Bonn as Elector, ordered full and minute reports to be made out concerning all branches of the administration, of the public and court service and of the cost of their maintenance. Upon these reports were based his arrangements for the future. Those relating to the court music are too important and interesting to be overlooked, for they give us details which carry us instantly into the circle which young Beethoven has just entered and in which, through his father's connection with it, he must from earliest childhood have moved. They are three in number, the first being a list of all the individuals constituting the court chapel; the second a detailed description of the singers and players, together with estimates of their capabilities; the third consists of recommendations touching a reduction in salaries. A few paragraphs may be presented here as most intimately connected with significant personages in our history; they are combined and given in abstract from the first two documents. Among the tenors we find

FATHER AND SON IN THE COURT CHAPEL

J. van Beethoven, age 44, born in Bonn, married; his wife is 32 years old, has three sons living in the electorate, aged 13, 10 and 8 years, who are studying music, has served 28 years, salary 315 fl. "His voice has long been stale, has been long in the service, very poor, of fair deportment and married."

Among the organists:

Christian Gottlob Neefe, aged 36, born at Chemnitz; married, his wife is 32, has served 3 years, was formerly chapelmaster with Seiler; salary 400 fl. "Christian Neffe, the organist, in my humble opinion might well be dismissed, inasmuch as he is not particularly versed on the organ, moreover is a foreigner, having no _Meritten_ whatever and of the Calvinistic religion."

Ludwig van Beethoven, aged 13, born at Bonn, has served 2 years, no salary. "Ludwig Betthoven, a son of the Betthoven sub No. 8, has no salary, but during the absence of the chapelmaster Luchesy he played the organ; is of good capability, still young, of good and quiet deportment and poor."

One of the items of the third report, proposing reductions of salaries and removals, has a very special interest as proving that an effort was made to supplant Neefe and give the post of court organist to young Beethoven. It reads:

Item. If Neffe were to be dismissed another organist would have to be appointed, who, if he were to be used only in the chapel could be had for 150 florins, the same is small, young, and a son of a court _musici_, and in case of need has filled the place for nearly a year very well.

The attempt to have Neefe dismissed from the service failed, but a reduction of his salary to the pittance of 200 florins had already led him to look about him to find an engagement for himself and wife in some theatre, when Maximilian, having become acquainted with his merits (notwithstanding his Calvinism), restored his former allowance by a decree dated February 8, 1785. When Joseph Reicha came to Bonn in Mattioli's place is still undetermined with exactness; but a decree raising him from the position of concertmaster to that of concert director, and increasing his salary to 1,000 florins, bears date June 28, 1785. In the general payroll of this year Reicha's salary is stated to be 666 thalers 52 alb., "tenorist Beethoven's" 200 th., "Beethoven jun." 100 th.

Chapter VI

Beethoven Again--The Young Organist--A First Visit to Vienna--Death of Beethoven's Mother--Sympathetic Acquaintances--Dr. Wegeler's "Notizen"--Some Questions of Chronology.

Schindler records--and on such points his testimony is good--that he had heard Beethoven attribute the marvellous development of Mozart's genius in great measure to the "consistent instruction of his father," thus implying his sense of the disadvantages under which he himself labored from the want of regular and systematic musical training through the period of his childhood and youth.[32] It is, however, by no means certain that had Ludwig van Beethoven been the son of Leopold Mozart, he would ever have acquired that facility of expression which enabled Wolfgang Mozart to fill up the richest and most varied scores almost as rapidly as his pen could move, and so as hardly to need correction--as if the development of musical idea was to him a work of mere routine, or perhaps, better to say, of instinct. _Poeta nascitur, non fit_, not only in respect to his thoughts but to his power of clothing them in

language. Many a man of profoundest ideas can never by any amount of study and practice acquire the art of conveying them in a lucid and elegant manner. On the other hand there are those whose thoughts never rise above the ordinary level, but whose essays are very models of style. Handel said of the elder Telemann, that he could compose in eight parts as easily as he (Handel) could write a letter; and Handel's own facility in composition was something astonishing. Beethoven, on the contrary, as his original scores prove, earned his bread by the sweat of his brow. But no amount of native genius can compensate for the want of thorough training. If, therefore, it be true that nature had in some degree limited his powers of expressing his musical as well as his intellectual ideas, so much greater was the need that, at the age which he had now reached, he should have opportunity to prosecute uninterruptedly a more profound and systematic course of study. Hence, the death of Maximilian Friedrich, which must have seemed to the Beethovens at first a sad calamity, proved in the end a blessing in disguise; for while it did not deprive the boy of the pecuniary benefits of the position to which he had just been appointed, it gave him two or three years of comparative leisure, uninterrupted save by his share of the organist's duties, for his studies, which there is every reason to suppose he continued under the guidance of his firm friend Neefe.

These three years were a period of theatrical inactivity in Bonn. For the carnival season of 1785, the Elector engaged Böhm and his company, then playing alternately at Cologne, Aix-la-Chapelle and Düsseldorf. This troupe during its short season may have furnished the young organist with valuable matter for reflection, for in the list of newly studied pieces, from October 1783 to the same month 1785--thus including the engagement in Bonn--are Gluck's "Alceste" and "Orpheus," four operas of Salieri (the "Armida" among them), Sarti's "Fra due Litiganti" and "L'Incognito" in German translation, Holzbauer's "Günther von Schwarzburg" and five of Paisiello's operas. These were, says the report in the "Theater-Kalender" (1786), "in addition to the old and familiar French operettas, 'Zémire et Azor,' 'Sylvain,' 'Lucile,' 'Der Prächtige,' 'Der Hausfreund,' etc., etc." The three serious Vienna operas, "Alceste," "Orpheus" and "Armida," in such broad contrast to the general character of the stock pieces of the Rhenish companies, point directly to Maximilian and the Bonn season. The elector of Hesse-Cassel, being then in funds by the sale of his subjects to George III for the American Revolutionary War just closed, supported a large French theatrical company, complete in the three branches of spoken and musical drama and ballet. Max Franz, upon his return from Vienna in November, 1785, spent a few days in Cassel, and, upon the death of the Elector and the dismissal of the actors, a part of this company was engaged to play in Bonn during January and February, 1786. The performances were thrice a week, Monday, Wednesday and Saturday, and, with but two or three exceptions, consisted of a comedy, followed by a light opera or operetta. The list contains eight of Grétry's compositions, three by Desaides, two by Philidor, and one each by Sacchini, Champein, Pergolesi, Gossec, Frizieri, Monsigny and Schwarzendorf (called Martini)--all of light and pleasing character, and enjoying then a wide popularity not only in France but throughout the Continent.

Meantime Grossmann had left Frankfort and with Klos, previously a manager in Hamburg, had formed a new company for the Cologne, Bonn and Düsseldorf stages. This troupe gave the Carnival performances in 1787, confining them, so far as appears, to the old round of familiar pieces.

Each of these companies had its own music director. With Böhm was Mayer, composer of the "Irrlicht" and several ballets; with the French company Jean Baptiste Rochefort was "music-master"; and Grossmann had recently engaged Burgmüller, of the Bellomo company, composer of incidental music for "Macbeth." Hence, during these years, Neefe's public duties extended no farther than his service as organist, for Lucchesi and Reicha relieved him from all the responsibilities of the church and concert-room.

That the organ service was at this time in part performed by the assistant organist is a matter of course; there is also an anecdote, related by Wegeler on the authority of Franz Ries, which proves it. On Tuesday, Friday and Saturday of Holy Week, portions of the Lamentations of Jeremiah were included in the chapel service, recited by a single voice, accompanied on the pianoforte (the organ being interdicted) to the familiar Gregorian chant tune.

THE BOY ORGANIST CONFOUNDS A SINGER

On one occasion, in the week ending March 27, 1785, the vocalist was Ferdinand Heller, too good a musician to be easily disconcerted, the accompanist Ludwig van Beethoven, now in his fifteenth year. While the singer delivered the long passages of the Latin text to the reciting note the accompanist might indulge his fancy, restricted only by the solemnity fitted to the service. Wegeler relates that Beethoven

asked the singer, who sat with unusual firmness in the tonal saddle, if he would permit him to throw him out, and utilized the somewhat too readily granted permission to introduce so wide an excursion in the accompaniment while persistently striking the

reciting note with his little finger, that the singer got so bewildered that he could not find the closing cadence. Father Ries, the first violinist, then Music Director of the Electoral Chapel, still living, tells with details how Chapelmaster Lucchesi, who was present, was astonished by Beethoven's playing. In his first access of rage Heller entered a complaint against Beethoven with the Elector, who commanded a simpler accompaniment, although the spirited and occasionally waggish young prince was amused at the occurrence. Schindler adds that Beethoven in his last years remembered the circumstance, and said that the Elector had "reprimanded him very graciously and forbidden such clever tricks in the future."

The date is easily determined: In Holy Week, 1784, neither Maximilian nor Lucchesi was in Bonn; in 1786 Beethoven's skill would no longer have astonished the chapelmaster. Of the other characteristic anecdotes related of Beethoven's youth there is not one which belongs to this period (May, 1784-April, 1787), although some have been attributed to it by previous writers.

Nothing is to be added to the record already made except that, on the authority of Stephan von Breuning, the youth was once a pupil of Franz Ries on the violin, which must have been at this time; that, according to Wegeler, his composition of the song "Wenn Jemand eine Reise thut"[33] fell in this period, and that he wrote three pianoforte quartets, the original manuscript of which bore the following title: "Trois Quatuors pour Clavecin, violino, viola e basso. 1785. Composé par (de L.) Louis van Beethoven, âgé 13 ans."[34] The reader will remark and understand the discrepancy here between the date and the author's age. Were these quartets intended for publication and for dedication to Max Franz, as the sonatas had been for Max Friedrich? During their author's life they never saw the light, but their principal themes, even an entire movement, became parts of future works. They were published in 1832 by Artaria and appear as Nos. 75 and 77, Series 10, in the Complete Works.

One family event is recorded in the parish register of St. Remigius--the baptism of Maria Margaretha Josepha, daughter of Johann van Beethoven, on May 5, 1786.

There is a letter from Bonn, dated April 8, 1787, in "Cramer's Magazine" (II, 1385), which contains a passing allusion to Beethoven. It affords another glimpse of the musical life there:

Our residence city is becoming more and more attractive for music-lovers through the gracious patronage of our beloved Elector. He has a large collection of the most beautiful music and is expending much every day to augment it. It is to him, too, that we owe the privilege of hearing often virtuosi on various instruments. Good singers come seldom. The love of music is increasing greatly among the inhabitants. The pianoforte is especially liked; there are here several _Hammerclaviere_ by Stein of Augsburg, and other correspondingly good instruments.... The youthful Baron v. Gudenau plays the pianoforte right bravely, and besides young Beethoven, the children of the chapelmaster deserve to be mentioned because of their admirable and precociously developed talent. All of the sons of Herr v. Mastiaux play the clavier well, as you already know from earlier letters of mine.

"This young genius deserves support to enable him to travel," wrote Neefe in 1783. In the springtime of 1787 the young "genius" was at length enabled to travel. Whence or how he obtained the means to defray the expenses of his journey, whether aided by the Elector or some other Mæcenas, or dependent upon the small savings from his salary and--hardly possible--from the savings from his music lessons painfully and carefully hoarded for the purpose, does not appear. The series of papers at Düsseldorf is at this point broken; so that not even the petition for leave of absence has been discovered. The few indications bearing on this point are that he had no farther aid from the Elector than the continued payment of his salary. What is certain is that the youth, now sixteen, but passing for a year or two younger, visited Vienna, where he received a few lessons from Mozart (Ries, in "Notizen," page 86); that his stay was short, and that on his way home he was forced to borrow some money in Augsburg.

When he made the journey is equally doubtful. Schindler was told by some old acquaintances of Beethoven "that on the visit two persons only were deeply impressed upon the lifelong memory of the youth of sixteen years: the Emperor Joseph and Mozart." If the young artist really had an interview with the Emperor it must have occurred before the 11th of April, or after the 30th of June, for those were the days which began and ended Joseph's absence from Vienna upon his famous tour to the Crimea with the Russian Empress Catharine; if before that absence, then Beethoven was at least three months in the Austrian capital and had left Bonn before the date of Neefe's letter to "Cramer's Magazine"; in which case how could the writer in speaking of his young colleague have omitted all mention of the fact? How, too, could so important a circumstance have been unknown to or forgotten by Dr. Wegeler and have found no place in his "Notizen," which moreover, were prepared under the eyes of both Franz Ries and Madame von Breuning? It will soon be seen that Beethoven was again in Bonn before July 17--a date which admits the bare possibility of the reported meeting with Joseph after his return from Russia.

If an opinion, which, indeed, is little more than a conjecture, may be hazarded in relation with this visit, it is this: that if at any time the missing archives of Maximilian's court should come to light it will be found that not until after the busy week for organists and chapelmusicians ending with Easter was leave of absence granted to Beethoven; and that, too, with no farther pecuniary aid from the Elector than possibly a quarter or two of his salary in advance. In 1787, Easter Monday fell upon the 9th of April, the day after the date of Neefe's letter. Making due allowance of time for the necessary preparations for so important a journey, as in those days it was from Bonn to Vienna, it may be reasonably conjectured that some time in May the youth reached the latter city.

Let another conjecture find place here: it is that Johann van Beethoven had not yet abandoned the hope of deriving pecuniary profit from the precocity of his son's genius; that he still expected the boy, after replacing his hard organ-style of playing by one more suited to the character of the pianoforte, to make his dream of a wonder-child in some degree a reality. Hence--at what fearful cost to the father in his poverty we know not--Ludwig is sent to the most admirable pianist, the best teacher then living, Mozart.

BEETHOVEN'S INTRODUCTION TO MOZART

But enough of conjecture. The oft-repeated anecdote of Beethoven's introduction to Mozart is stripped by Prof. Jahn of Seyfried's superlatives and related in these terms:

Beethoven, who as a youth of great promise came to Vienna in 1786 (?)[35], but was obliged to return to Bonn after a brief sojourn, was taken to Mozart and at that musician's request played something for him which he, taking it for granted that it was a show-piece prepared for the occasion, praised in a rather cool manner. Beethoven observing this, begged Mozart to give him a theme for improvization. He always played admirably when excited and now he was inspired, too, by the presence of the master whom he reverenced greatly; he played in such a style that Mozart, whose attention and interest grew more and more, finally went silently to some friends who were sitting in an adjoining room, and said, vivaciously, "Keep your eyes on him; some day he will give the world something to talk about."

Ries ("Notizen," p. 86) merely says: "During his visit to Vienna he received some instruction from Mozart, but the latter, as Beethoven lamented, never played for him." Contrary to the conjecture above mentioned as to Johann van Beethoven's object in sending his son to Vienna, it seems, from the connection in which Ries introduces this remark, that the instruction given by Mozart to the youth was confined to composition. The lessons given were few--a fact which accounts for the circumstance that no member of Mozart's family in after years, when Beethoven had become world-renowned, has spoken of them.

If it be considered that poor Mozart lost his beloved father on May 28, 1787, and that his mind was then fully occupied with his new operatic subject, "Don Giovanni," it will not be thought strange that he did not exhibit his powers as a pianist to a youth just beginning with him a course of study in composition, especially as the pupil, in his eyes, was a little, undersized boy of 14--as there is every reason to believe. That pupil's power of handling a theme, since Mozart probably knew nothing of his five years' practice at the organ and in the theatre, may well have surprised him; but in execution as a pianist he probably stood far, far below the master when at the same age, below the little Hummel (at that very time an inmate of Mozart's family), and certainly below Cesarius Scheidl (forgotten name!) aged ten, who had played a pianoforte concerto between the parts of an oratorio no longer ago than the preceding 22nd of December in the grand concert of the "Society of Musicians." Had not Beethoven's visit been so abruptly, unexpectedly and sorrowfully brought to an end, he would, doubtless, have had nothing to regret on the score of his master's playing.

In some written talks to Beethoven in the years of his deafness, still preserved, are found two allusions at least made by his nephew to this personal acquaintance with Mozart. In the first case the words are these: "You knew Mozart; where did you see him?" In the other, two or three years later: "Was Mozart a good pianoforte player? It was then still in its infancy." Of course Beethoven's replies are wanting; and herewith is exhausted all that, during the researches for this work, has been found relating to his first visit in Vienna. The Vienna newspapers of the time contained notices of the "wonder-children" Hummel and Scheidl, but none whatever of Beethoven.

ACQUAINTANCES IN AUGSBURG

That the youth in passing through Augsburg must have become acquainted with the pianoforte-maker Stein and his family is self-evident. There is something in a conversation-book which seems to prove this, and also to add evidence to the falsification of his age. It is this: in the spring of 1824 Andreas Streicher and his wife--the same Stein's "Mädl"--whose appearance at the pianoforte when a child of eight and a half years is so piquantly described by Mozart, called upon Beethoven on their way from

Vienna into the country. A few sentences of the conversation, written in the hand of the composer's nephew, are preserved. The topic for a time is the packing of movables and Beethoven's removal into country lodgings for the summer; and at length they come upon the instruments manufactured by Streicher; after which Carl writes: "Frau von Streicher says that she is delighted that at 14 years of age you saw the instruments made by her father and now see those of her son." True, it may be said that this refers to Beethoven's knowledge of the Stein "Hammerclaviere" then in Bonn; but to any one thoroughly conversant with the subject these words are, like Iago's "trifles light as air," confirmation strong of the other view. His introduction to the family of the advocate Dr. Schaden in Augsburg, is certain. Reichardt was in that city in 1790 and wrote of Frau Nanette von Schaden as being of all the women he knew, those of Paris not excepted, far and away the greatest pianoforte player, not excelled perhaps, by any virtuoso in skill and certainty; also a singer with much expression and excellent declamation--"in every respect an amiable and interesting woman." The earliest discovered letter of Beethoven to Schaden, and dated Bonn, September 15, 1787, proves the friendship of the Schadens for him and fully explains the causes of his sudden departure from Vienna and the abrupt termination of his studies with Mozart.

I can easily imagine what you must think of me, and I can not deny that you have good grounds for an unfavorable opinion. I shall not, however, attempt to justify myself, until I have explained to you the reasons why I hope my apologies will be accepted. I must tell you that from the time I left Augsburg my cheerfulness as well as my health began to decline; the nearer I came to my native city the more frequent were the letters from my father urging me to travel with all possible speed, as my mother was not in a favorable state of health. I therefore hurried forward as fast as I could, although myself far from well. My longing once more to see my dying mother overcame every obstacle and assisted me in surmounting the greatest difficulties. I found my mother still alive but in the most deplorable state; her disease was consumption, and about seven weeks ago, after much pain and suffering, she died. She was such a kind, loving mother to me, and my best friend. Ah, who was happier than I when I could still utter the sweet name, mother, and it was heard? And to whom can I now speak it? Only to the silent image resembling her evoked by the power of the imagination. I have passed very few pleasant hours since my arrival here, having during the whole time been suffering from asthma, which may, I fear, eventually develop into consumption; to this is added melancholy--almost as great an evil as my malady itself. Imagine yourself in my place, and then I shall hope to receive your forgiveness for my long silence. You showed me extreme kindness and friendship by lending me three Carolins in Augsburg, but I must entreat your indulgence for a time. My journey cost me a great deal, and I have not the smallest hopes of earning anything here. Fate is not propitious to me in Bonn.

Pardon my detaining you so long with my chatter; it was necessary for my justification.

I do entreat you not to deprive me of your valuable friendship; nothing do I wish so much as in some degree to become worthy of your regard.

I am, with the highest respect Your most obedient servant and friend, L. v. Beethoven, Court Organist to the Elector of Cologne.[36]

DEATH OF BEETHOVEN'S MOTHER

The Bonn "Intelligenzblatt" supplies a pendant to this sad letter:--"1787, July 17. Died, Maria Magdalena Koverich (_sic_), named van Beethoven, aged 49 years."[37] When Ferdinand Ries, some thirteen years later, presented his father's letter of introduction to Beethoven in Vienna, the latter "read the letter through" and said: "I cannot answer your father just now; but do you write to him that I have not forgotten how my mother died. He will be satisfied with that." "Later," adds Ries, "I learned that, the family being greatly in need, my father had been helpful to him on this occasion in every way."

A petition of Johann van Beethoven, offered before the death of his wife, describing his pitiable condition and asking aid from the Elector, has not been discovered; but the substance of it is found in a volume of "Geheime Staats-Protocolle" for 1787 in form following:

July 24, 1787

Your Elec. Highness has taken possession of this petition.

Court Musician makes obedient representation that he has got into a very unfortunate state because of the long-continued sickness of his wife and has already been compelled to sell a portion of his effects and pawn others and that he no longer knows what to do for his sick wife and many children. He prays for the benefaction of an advance of 100 rthlr. on his salary.

No record is found in the Düsseldorf archives of any grant of aid to the distressed family; hence, so far as now appears, the only successful appeal for assistance was made to Franz Ries, then a young man of 32 years, who generously aided in “every way” his unfortunate colleague. Where then was the Breuning family? Where Graf Waldstein? To these questions the reply is that Beethoven was still unknown to them--a reply which involves the utter rejection of the chronology adopted by Dr. Wegeler, in his “Notizen,” of that part of the composer’s life. This mistake, if indeed it prove to be such, is one which has been adopted without hesitation by all who have written upon the subject. The reader here, for the first time, finds Wegeler’s account of Beethoven’s higher intellectual development and his introduction into a more refined social circle placed after, instead of before, the visit to Vienna; and his introduction to the Breunings and Waldstein dated at the time when the youth was developing into the man, and not at a point upon the confines of childhood and youth.

This demands some explanation.

DR. WEGELER’S CHRONOLOGY CORRECTED

The history of Beethoven’s Bonn life would be so sadly imperfect without the “Notizen” of Dr. Wegeler, which bear in every line such an impress of perfect candor and honesty, that they can be read only with feelings of gratefullest remembrance of their author and with fullest confidence in their authenticity. But no more in his case than in others can the reminiscences of an aged man be taken as conclusive evidence in regard to facts and occurrences of years long since past, when opposed to contemporary records, or involving confusion of dates. Some slight lapse of memory, misapprehension, or unlucky adoption of another’s mistake, may lead astray and be the abundant source of error. Still, it is only with great diffidence and extreme caution that one can undertake to correct an original authority so trustworthy as Dr. Wegeler. Such corrections must be made, however; for only by this can many a difficulty be removed. An error in the Doctor’s chronology might easily be occasioned by the long accepted false date of Beethoven’s birth, insensibly influencing his recollections; and certainly when Dr. Wegeler, Madame von Breuning and Franz Ries, all alike venerable in years as in character, sit together discussing in 1837-8 occurrences of 1785-8, with nothing to aid their memories or control their reminiscences but an old Court Calendar or two, they may well to some extent have confounded times and seasons in the vague and misty distance of so many years; the more easily because the error is one of but two or three years at most. Bearing upon the point in question is the fact that Frau Karth--who distinctly remembers the death of Madame van Beethoven--has no recollections of the young Breunings and Waldstein until after that event.

Some words of Dr. Wegeler in an unprinted letter to Beethoven (1825): “inasmuch as the house of my mother-in-law was more your domicile than your own, especially after you lost your noble mother,” seem to favor the usually accepted chronology: but if Beethoven was thus almost a member of the Breuning family as early as 1785 or 1786, how can the tone of the letter to Dr. Schaden be explained? Or how account for the fact, that, when he reached Bonn again and found his mother dying, and his father “in a very unfortunate state” and “compelled to sell a portion of his effects and pawn others and knew not what to do,” it was to Franz Ries he turned for aid? The good Doctor is certainly mistaken as to the time when Beethoven found Mæcenases in the Elector and Waldstein; why not equally so in relation to the Breuning family?

If, now, his own account of his intimacy with the young musician--given in the preface to the “Notizen”--be examined, it will be found to strengthen what has just been said: “Born in Bonn in 1765, I became acquainted in 1782 with the twelve years old lad, who, however, was already known as an author, and lived in most intimate association with him uninterruptedly until September, 1787” (and still he could forget that friend’s absence in Vienna only a few months before), “when, to finish my medical studies, I visited the Vienna schools and institutions. After my return in October, 1789, we continued to live together in an equally cordial association until Beethoven’s later departure for Vienna towards the close of 1792, whither I also emigrated in October, 1794.”

For more than two years, then, and just at this period, Dr. Wegeler was not in Bonn. Let still another circumstance be noted: Nothing has been discovered, either in the “Notizen” or elsewhere, which necessarily implies that Wegeler himself intimately knew the Breunings until after his return from Vienna in 1789; moreover, in those days, when the distinctions of rank were so strongly marked, it is, to say the least, exceedingly improbable, that the son of an immigrant Alsatian shoemaker should have obtained entrée upon the supposed terms of intimacy in a household in which the oldest child was some six years younger than himself, and which belonged to the highest social, if not titled rank, until he by the force of his talents, culture, and high character, had risen to its level. That, after so rising, the obscurity of his birth was forgotten and the only daughter became his wife, is alike honorable to both parties. It is unnecessary to pursue the point farther; the reader, having his attention drawn to it, will observe for himself the many less prominent, but strongly corroborating circumstances of the narrative, which confirm the chronology adopted in it. At all events it must stand until new and decisive facts against it be found.[38]

A YEAR OF SADNESS AND GLOOM

“My journey cost me a great deal, and I have not the smallest hope of earning anything here. Fate is not propitious to me in Bonn.” In poverty, ill, melancholy, despondent, motherless, ashamed of and depressed by his father’s ever increasing moral infirmity, the boy, prematurely old from the circumstances in which he had been placed since his eleventh year, had yet to bear another “sling and arrow of outrageous fortune.” The little sister, now a year and a half old--but here is the notice from the “Intelligenzblatt”:--“Died, November 25, Margareth, daughter of the Court Musician Johann van Beethoven, aged one year.” And so faded the last hope that the passionate tenderness of Beethoven’s nature might find scope in the purest of all relations between the sexes--that of brother and sister.

Thus, in sadness and gloom, Beethoven’s seventeenth year ended.

FOOTNOTES:

[32] Czerny also related that Beethoven had spoken to him of the harsh treatment and insufficient instruction received from his father. “But,” he added, “I had talent for music.” From a note by Otto Jahn. Also see Cock’s “Musical Miscellany.”

[33] “Urian’s Reise um die Welt.” Op. 52, No. 1, published in 1805.

[34] The manuscript formerly owned by Artaria is now (1907) in the possession of Dr. E. Prieger in Bonn. The figure indicating the composer’s age was first written “14” and then changed.

[35] In the first edition of Jahn’s “Mozart” the date is given as here. In later editions it was corrected in accordance with Thayer’s suggestion to 1787.

[36] Lady Wallace’s translation, amended. The letter is preserved in the Beethoven-Haus Museum in Bonn.

[37] The age of Beethoven’s mother at the time of her death is here incorrectly given. It should be 40.

[38] Thayer’s correction of Dr. Wegeler’s account of Beethoven’s first acquaintance with the family von Breuning was sharply criticized by a grandson of Wegeler in an article published in the _Coblenzer Zeitung_ of May 20, 1890. Thayer preserved Karl Wegeler’s article in the library copy of his biography, and had he lived to revise his work he would undoubtedly either have corrected his assertions or confirmed them. According to Dr. Wegeler (this is the younger Wegeler’s argument, in brief), Beethoven had been introduced to the von Breuning family at least as early as 1785, and in that circle had already met Count Waldstein, who had aided him in securing his first salary as Court Organist. The “Notizen” do not fix the dates, though they imply that the occurrences took place before 1785. As to the statement of the Widow Karth, Wegeler urges that the testimony of a child five years old could have no weight as against that of persons of mature age, and that an acquaintance might well exist without intercourse in the Beethoven dwelling. The letter to Dr. Schaden, the product of a melancholy mood, does not preclude the possibility that Beethoven had received help from another source, especially since great care had to be exercised in extending succor to him lest his sensibilities be hurt. Certain it is that Wegeler, who did not go to Vienna till 1787, had been a faithful friend and helper in the period of Beethoven’s destitution, as was proved by a thitherto unpublished letter of Beethoven to Wegeler, in which the former expressly stated that the latter had known him, Beethoven, almost since childhood. If the von Breuning family were really not on hand at the time of Beethoven’s trouble, the fact might be explained by their annual sojourn in the country, which was generally of considerable duration. Thayer’s assumption that Wegeler himself did not get intimately acquainted with the von Breunings until after his return from Vienna (in 1789) is at variance with the family recollections, which presented him as a young student (therefore before 1787) and with him Beethoven at the time when they became visitors at the house. Weakness of memory on the part of a man so intellectually fresh and vigorous as Dr. Wegeler was in 1838 (he died ten years later) was not to be assumed; least of all can Dr. Wegeler have erred concerning the beginning of his acquaintance with the family from which he got his wife. Finally, the intimate terms of friendship which existed between Beethoven and Eleonore von Breuning could be fully explained only on the theory of a childhood acquaintance.

In the first edition of Thayer’s biography (1866) Dr. Deiters printed the text bearing on this question as it is given above without note or comment. In the revised edition of Volume I (1901), he reproduced the original text in the body of the page but appended a footnote in which, while asserting that an authority like Thayer ought not to be opposed except “with great diffidence and extreme caution” (to use Thayer’s words referring to Dr. Wegeler), he nevertheless upheld the contention of Dr. Wegeler’s grandson. He says: “The definite assertion of Wegeler that he made the acquaintance of Beethoven as early as 1782, which is supported by

Beethoven's own words, 'you knew me almost since my childhood,' is not to be shaken. As little can it be questioned that Wegeler had been introduced in the Breuning house as a student before his departure for Vienna (according to Gerhard von Breuning before his acquaintance with Beethoven began); here Dr. Wegeler could not have made an error. Concerning his bringing Beethoven to the house he gives no date; the year 1785 is not mentioned in the "Notizen." On page 45, however, it is stated that Stephan von Breuning "lived in closest affiliation with him (Beethoven) from his tenth year till his death." Stephan was born August 17, 1774 (_Vide_ "Aus dem Schwarzspanierhause," page 6); this would indicate the year 1784. Wegeler's remark, "especially after you lost your noble mother," makes it clear as day that a close friendship existed before the death of Beethoven's mother."

Chapter VII

The von Breuning Family--Beethoven Brought Under Refining Influences--Count Waldstein, His Mæcenas--The Young Musician is Forced to Become Head of the Family.

In 1527, the year in which the administration of the office of _Hochmeister_ of the Teutonic Order was united with that of the _Deutschmeister_, whose residence had already been fixed at Mergentheim in 1525, this city became the principal seat of the order. From 1732 to 1761 Clemens Augustus was _Hoch- und Deutschmeister_ of the order; according to the French edition of the Court Calendar of 1761, Christoph von Breuning was _Conseiller d'État et Référendaire_, having succeeded his father-in-law von Mayerhofen in the office.

BEETHOVEN'S FRIENDS: THE VON BREUNINGS

Christoph von Breuning had five sons: Georg Joseph, Johann Lorenz, Johann Philipp, Emanuel Joseph and Christoph. Lorenz became chancellor of the Archdeanery of Bonn, and the _Freiadliges Stift_ at Neuss; after the death of his brother Emanuel he lived in Bonn so that, as head of the family, he might care for the education of the latter's children. He died there in 1796. Johann Philipp, born 1742 at Mergentheim, became canon and priest at Kerpen, a place on the old highway from Cologne to Aix-la-Chapelle, where he died June 12, 1831. Christoph was court councillor at Dillingen.

Emanuel Joseph continued in the electoral service at Bonn; at the early age of 20 years he was already court councillor (_Conseiller actuel_). He married Hélène von Kerich, born January 3, 1750, daughter of Stephan von Kerich, physician to the elector. Her brother, Abraham von Kerich, canon and scholaster of the archdeanery of Bonn, died in Coblenz in 1821. A high opinion of the intellect and character of Madame von Breuning is enforced upon us by what we learn of her influence upon the youthful Beethoven. Court Councillor von Breuning perished in a fire in the electoral palace on January 15, 1777. The young widow (she had barely attained her 28th year), continued to live in the house of her brother, Abraham von Kerich, with her three children, to whom was added a fourth in the summer of 1777. Immediately after the death of the father, his brother, the canon Lorenz von Breuning, changed his residence from Neuss to Bonn and remained in the same house as guardian and tutor of the orphaned children. These were:

1. Christoph, born May 13, 1771, a student of jurisprudence at Bonn, Göttingen and Jena, municipal councillor in Bonn, notary, president of the city council, professor at the law school in Coblenz, member of the Court of Review in Cologne, and, finally, _Geheimer Ober-Revisionsrath_ in Berlin. He died in 1841.

2. Eleonore Brigitte, born April 23, 1772. On March 28, 1802, she was married to Franz Gerhard Wegeler of Beul-an-der-Ahr, and died on June 13, 1841, at Coblenz.

3. Stephan, born August 17, 1774. He studied law at Bonn and Göttingen, and shortly before the end of the electorship of Max Franz was appointed to an office in the Teutonic Order at Mergentheim. In the spring of 1801 he went to Vienna, where he renewed his acquaintance with Beethoven. They had simultaneously been pupils of Ries in violin playing. The Teutonic Order offering no chance of advancement to a young man, he was given employment with the War Council and became Court Councillor in 1818. He died on June 4, 1827. His first wife was Julie von Vering, daughter of Ritter von Vering, a military physician; she died in the eleventh month of her wedded life. He then married Constanze Ruschowitz, who became the mother of Dr. Gerhard von Breuning, born August 28, 1813, author of "Aus dem Schwarzspanierhause."

4. Lorenz (called Lenz, the posthumous child), born in the summer of 1777, studied medicine and was in Vienna in 1794-97 simultaneously with Wegeler and Beethoven. He died on April 10, 1798 in Bonn.[39]

Madame von Breuning, who died on December 9, 1838, after a widowhood of 61 years, lived in Bonn until 1815, then in Kerpen, Beul-an-der-Ahr, Cologne and finally with her son-in-law, Wegeler, in Coblenz.

The acquaintance between Beethoven and Stephan von Breuning may have had some influence in the selection of the young musician as pianoforte teacher for Eleonore and Lorenz,[40] an event (in consideration of circumstances already detailed and of the ages, real and reputed, of pupils and master) which may be dated at the close of the year 1787, and which was, perhaps, the greatest good that fate, now become propitious, could have conferred upon him; for he was now so situated in his domestic relations, and at such an age, that introduction into so highly refined and cultivated a circle was of the highest value to him both morally and intellectually. The recent loss of his mother had left a void in his heart which so excellent a woman as Madame von Breuning could alone in some measure fill. He was at an age when the evil example of his father needed a counterbalance; when the extraordinary honors so recently paid to science and letters at the inauguration of the university would make the strongest impression; when the sense of his deficiencies in everything but his art would begin to be oppressive; when his mental powers, so strong and healthy, would demand some change, some recreation, from that constant strain in the one direction of music to which almost from infancy they had been subjected; when not only the reaction upon his mind of the fresh and new intellectual life now pervading Bonn society, but his daily contact with so many of his own age, friends and companions now enjoying advantages for improvement denied to him, must have cost him many a pang; when a lofty and noble ambition might be aroused to lead him ever onward and upward; when, the victim of a despondent melancholy, he might sink into the mere routine musician, with no lofty aims, no higher object than to draw from his talents means to supply his necessities and gratify his appetites.

There must have been something very engaging in the character of the small, pockmarked youth, or he could not have so won his way into the affections of the Widow von Breuning and her children. In his “Notizen” Wegeler writes:

In this house reigned an unconstrained tone of culture in spite of youthful wilfulness. Christoph von Breuning made early essays in poetry, as was the case (and not without success) with Stephan von Breuning much later. The friends of the family were distinguished by indulgence in social entertainments which combined the useful and the agreeable. When we add that the family possessed considerable wealth, especially before the war, it will be easy to understand that the first joyous emotions of Beethoven found vent here. Soon he was treated as one of the children of the family, spending in the house not only the greater part of his days, but also many nights. Here he felt that he was free, here he moved about without constraint, everything conspired to make him cheerful and develop his mind. Being five years older than Beethoven I was able to observe and form a judgment on these things.

It must not be forgotten that besides Madame von Breuning and her children the scholastic Abraham von Kerich and the canon Lorenz von Breuning were members of the household. The latter especially seems to have been a fine specimen of the enlightened clergy of Bonn who, according to Risbeck, formed so striking a contrast to the priests and monks of Cologne; and it is easy to trace Beethoven’s life-long love for the ancient classics--Homer and Plutarch at the head--to the time when the young Breunings would be occupied with them in the original under the guidance of their accomplished tutor and guardian. The uncle, Philipp von Breuning, may also have been influential in the intellectual progress of the young musician, for to him at Kerpen “the family von Breuning and their friends went annually for a vacation of five or six weeks. There, too, Beethoven several times spent a few weeks right merrily, and was frequently urged to play the organ,” as Wegeler tells us in the “Notizen.” There let him be left enjoying and profiting by his intimacy with that family, and returning their kindness in some measure by instructing Eleonore and Lenz in music, while a new friend and benefactor is introduced.

COUNT WALDSTEIN’S ARRIVAL IN BONN

Emanuel Philipp, Count Waldstein and Wartemberg von Dux, and his wife, a daughter of Emanuel Prince Lichtenstein, were parents of eleven children. The fourth son was Ferdinand Ernst Gabriel, born March 24, 1762. Uniting in his veins the blood of many of the houses of the Austrian Empire, there was no career, no line of preferment open to younger sons of titled families, which was not open to him, or to which he might not aspire. It was determined that he should seek activity in the Teutonic Order, of which Max Franz was Grand Master. According to the rules and regulations of the order, the young nobleman came to Bonn to pass his examinations and spend his year of novitiate. Could the time of his arrival there be determined with certainty, the date would have a most important bearing either to confirm or disprove the chronological argument of some of our earlier pages; but one may well despair of finding so unimportant an event as the journey of a young man of 25 from Vienna to the Rhine anywhere upon record. One thing bearing directly upon this point may be read in the “Wiener Zeitung” of July 2, 1788. A correspondent in Bonn says that on “the day before yesterday,” i.e., June 17, 1788, “our gracious sovereign, as Hoch- und Deutschmeister, gave the accolade with

the customary ceremonies to the Count von Waldstein, who had been accepted in the Teutonic Order." Allowing for the regular year of novitiate, the Count was certainly in Bonn before the 17th of June, 1787.

The misfortune of two unlucky Bohemian peasants, strange as it may seem, gives us, after the lapse of a century, a satisfactory solution of the difficulty. Some one reports in the "Wiener Zeitung" of May, 19, 1787, that on the 4th of that month two peasant houses were destroyed by fire in the village of Likwitz belonging to Osegg, and adds: "Count Ferdinand von Waldstein, moved by a noble spirit of humanity, hurried from Dux, took charge of affairs and was to be found wherever the danger was greatest." It was between May 4 and June 17, 1787, that Waldstein parted from his widowed mother and journeyed to the place of his novitiate. His name may easily have become known to Wegeler before the latter's departure from Bonn for Vienna.[41] Here follows what the good doctor says of the Count--to what degree correct or mistaken, the reader can determine for himself:

The first, and in every respect the most important, of the Mæcenases of Beethoven was Count Waldstein, Knight of the Teutonic Order, and (what is of greater moment here) the favorite and constant companion of the young Elector, afterwards Commander of the Order at Virnsberg and Chancellor of the Emperor of Austria. He was not only a connoisseur but also a practitioner of music. He it was who gave all manner of support to our Beethoven, whose gifts he was the first to recognize worthily. Through him the young genius developed the talent to improvise variations on a given theme. From him he received much pecuniary assistance bestowed in such a way as to spare his sensibilities, it being generally looked upon as a small gratuity from the Elector.

Beethoven's appointment as organist, his being sent to Vienna by the Elector, were the doings of the Count. When Beethoven at a later date dedicated the great and important Sonata in C major, Op. 53, to him, it was only a proof of the gratitude which lived on in the mature man. It is to Count Waldstein that Beethoven owed the circumstance that the first sproutings of his genius were not nipped; therefore we owe this Mæcenas Beethoven's later fame.

Frau Karth remembered distinctly the 17th of June upon which Waldstein entered the order, the fact being impressed upon her mind by a not very gentle reminder from the stock of a sentinel's musket that the palace chapel was no place for children on such an occasion. She remembered Waldstein's visits to Beethoven in the years following in his room in the Wenzelgasse and was confident that he made the young musician a present of a pianoforte.

To save his line from extinction the Count obtained a dispensation from his vows and married (May 9, 1812) Maria Isabella, daughter of Count Rzewski. A daughter, Ludmilla, was born to him; but no son. He died on August 29, 1823, and the family of Waldsteins of Dux disappears. While all that Wegeler says of this man's kindness in obtaining the place of organist for Beethoven and of his influence upon his musical education is one grand mistake,[42] there is no reason whatever to doubt that those qualities which made the youth a favorite with the Breunings, added to his manifest genius, made their way to the young count's heart and gained for Beethoven a zealous, influential and active friend. Still, in June, 1778, Waldstein possessed no such influence as to render a petition for increase of salary, offered by his protégé, successful. That document has disappeared, but a paper remains, dated June 5, concerning the petition, which is endorsed "Beruhet." Whatever this word may here mean it is certain that Ludwig's salary as organist remained at the old point of 100 thalers, which, with the 200 received by his father, the three measures of grain and the small sum that he might earn by teaching, was all that Johann van Beethoven and three sons, now respectively in their eighteenth, fifteenth and twelfth years, had to live upon; and therefore so much the more necessity for the exercise of Waldstein's generosity.

LUDWIG THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY

After the death of the mother, says Frau Karth, a housekeeper was employed and the father and sons remained together in the lodgings in the Wenzelgasse. Carl was intended for the musical profession; Johann was put apprentice to the court apothecary, Johann Peter Hittorf. Two years, however, had hardly elapsed when the father's infirmity compelled the eldest son, not yet nineteen years of age, to take the extraordinary step of placing himself at the head of the family. One of Stephan von Breuning's reminiscences shows how low Johann van Beethoven had sunk: viz., that of having seen Ludwig furiously interposing to rescue his intoxicated father from an officer of police.

Here again the petition has disappeared, but its contents are sufficiently made known by the terms of the decree dated November 20, 1789:

His Electoral Highness having graciously granted the prayer of the petitioner and dispensed henceforth wholly with the services of his father, who is to withdraw to a village in the electorate, it is graciously commanded that he be paid in accordance with his wish

only 100 rthr. of the annual salary which he has had heretofore, beginning with the approaching new year, and that the other 100 thlr. be paid to the suppliant's son besides the salary which he now draws and the three measures of grain for the support of his brothers.

It is probable that there was no intention to enforce this decree in respect of the withdrawal of the father from Bonn, and that this clause was inserted _in terrorem_ in case he misbehaved himself; for he continued, according to Frau Karth, to dwell with his children, and his first receipt, still preserved, for the reduced salary is dated at Bonn--a circumstance, however, which alone would prove little or nothing.

FOOTNOTES:

[39] Dr. Deiters, differing with Thayer on the subject of the date of the beginning of the intimacy between Beethoven and the von Breuning family, omitted in the revised version of the Beethoven biography the author's comments on the brief biographical data concerning the sons, which were as follows: "These dates, communicated by Dr. Gerhard, son of Stephan von Breuning, prove a singular inaccuracy in Wegeler's remark ('Nachtrag zur Notizen,' page 26): 'Lenz, as the youngest of the three brothers, was nearest to Beethoven in age.'" Of Stephan he says: "Inasmuch as he had lived in intimate association with Beethoven from his tenth year up to his death." Many a proof of this general fact will hereafter appear; but whether this "intimate association" began quite so early is a question. The two were at the same time pupils of Franz Ries on the violin, and they may well have become acquainted in 1785 or 1786; but it was not favorable to extreme intimacy that four years' difference existed in their ages; and that the one was but a schoolboy while the other was already an organist, an author and accustomed to move among men.

[40] Gerhard von Breuning would have it appear from a statement on page 6 of his book "Aus dem Schwarzspanierhause," that Beethoven was recommended to the von Breunings by Wegeler.

[41] Dr. Wegeler's grandson, in his criticism of Thayer's assertions concerning the date of the beginning of the acquaintance between Beethoven and the von Breunings, falls foul of even this ingenious demonstration, saying that the incident of the conflagration might have taken place when Count Waldstein was at home visiting his mother. He could not believe that the Count had spent all of the first 24 years of his life at Dux in "idyllic solitude," and argued that he might have visited Bonn _for the first time_ at an earlier date than 1787. Dr. Deiters held that the point was well taken; as if there was no alternative for the young count between "idyllic solitude" at Dux and a sojourn at Bonn!

[42] Thus in Mr. Thayer's original manuscript. Dr. Deiters omitted the remark in his revision, but it is here permitted to stand along with other controverted matters.

Chapter VIII

The National Theatre of Max Franz--Beethoven's Artistic Associates--Practical Experience in the Orchestra--The "Ritterballet"--The Operatic Repertory of Five Years.

OPERA UNDER ELECTOR MAX FRANZ

Early in the year 1788, the mind of the Elector, Max Franz, was occupied with the project for forming a company of _Hofschauspieler;_ in short, with the founding of a National Theatre upon the plan adopted by his predecessor in Bonn and by his brother Joseph in Vienna. His finances were now in order, the administration of public affairs in able hands and working smoothly, and there was nothing to hinder him from placing both music and theatre upon a better and permanent footing; which he now proceeded to do. The Klos troupe, which had left Cologne in March, played for a space in Bonn, and on its dispersal in the summer several of its better actors were engaged and added to others who had already settled in Bonn. The only names which it is necessary to mention here are those of significance in the history of Beethoven. Joseph Reicha was director; Neefe, pianist and stage-manager for opera; in the orchestra were Franz Ries and Andreas Romberg (violin), Ludwig van Beethoven (viola), Bernard Romberg (violoncello), Nicolaus Simrock (horn) and Anton Reicha (flute). A comparison of the lists of the theatrical establishment with that of the court chapel as printed in the Court Calendars for 1778 and the following years, shows that the two institutions were kept distinct, though the names for the greater part appear in both. Some of the singers in the chapel played in the theatrical orchestra, while certain of the players in the chapel sang upon the stage. Other names appear in but one of the lists.

As organist the name of Beethoven appears still in the Court Calendar, but as viola player he had a place in both the orchestras. Thus, for a period of full four years, he had the opportunity of studying practically orchestral compositions in the best of all

schools--the orchestra itself. This body of thirty-one members, under the energetic leadership of Reicha, many of them young and ambitious, some already known as virtuosos and still keeping their places in musical history as such, was a school for instrumental music such as Handel, Bach, Mozart and Haydn had not enjoyed in their youth; that its advantages were improved both by Beethoven and others of the younger men, all the world knows.

One fact worthy of note in relation to this company is the youth of most of the new members engaged. Maximilian seems to have sought out young talent, and when it proved to be of true metal, gave it a permanent place in his service, adopted wise measures for its cultivation, and thus laid a foundation upon which, but for the outbreak of the French Revolution, and the consequent dispersion of his court, would in time have risen a musical establishment, one of the very first in Germany.

This is equally true of the new members of his orchestra. Reicha himself was still rather a young man, born in 1757. He was a virtuoso on the violoncello and a composer of some note; but his usefulness was sadly impaired by his sufferings from gout. The cousins Andreas and Bernhard Romberg, Maximilian had found at Münster and brought to Bonn. They had in their boyhood, as virtuosos upon their instruments--Andreas violin, Bernhard 'cello--made a tour as far as Paris, and their concerts were crowned with success. Andreas was born near Münster in 1767, and Ledebur ("Tonkünstler Berlins") adopts the same year as the date also of Bernhard's birth. They were, therefore, three years older than Beethoven and now just past 21. Both were already industrious and well-known composers and must have been a valuable addition to the circle of young men in which Beethoven moved. The decree appointing them respectively Court Violinist and Court Violoncellist is dated November 19, 1790.

Anton Reicha, a fatherless nephew of the concertmaster, born at Prague, February 27, 1770, was brought by his uncle to Bonn. He had been already for some years in that uncle's care and under his instruction had become a good player of the flute, violin and pianoforte. In Bonn, Reicha became acquainted with Beethoven, who was then organist at court. "We spent fourteen years together," says Reicha, "united in a bond like that of Orestes and Pylades, and were continually side by side in our youth. After a separation of eight years we saw each other again in Vienna, and exchanged confidences concerning our experiences." At the age of 17 composing orchestral and vocal music for the Electoral Chapel, a year later flautist in the theatre, at nineteen both flautist and violinist in the chapel and so intimate a friend of Beethoven, who was less than a year his junior--were Reicha's laurels no spur to the ambition of the other?

The names of several of the performers upon wind-instruments were new names in Bonn, and the thought suggests itself that the Elector brought with him from Vienna some members of the _Harmoniemusik_ which had won high praise from Reichardt, and it will hereafter appear that such a band formed part of the musical establishment in Bonn--a fact of importance in its bearing upon the questions of the origin and date of various known works both of Beethoven and of Reicha, and of no less weight in deciding where and how these men obtained their marvellous knowledge of the powers and effects of this class of instruments.

The arrangements were all made in 1788, but not early enough to admit of the opening of the theatre until after the Christmas holidays, namely, on the evening of January 3, 1789. The theatre had been altered and improved. An incendiary fire threatened its destruction the day before, but did not postpone the opening. The opening piece was "Der Baum der Diana" by Vincenzo Martin. It may be thought not very complimentary to the taste of Maximilian that the first season of his National Theatre was opened thus, instead of with one of Gluck's or Mozart's masterpieces. It suffices to say that he, in his capacity of Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, had spent a good part of the autumn at Mergentheim and only reached Bonn on his return on the last day of January. Hence he was not responsible for that selection.

The season which opened on January 3, 1789, closed on May 23. Within this period the following operas were performed, Beethoven taking part in the performances as a member of the orchestra: "Der Baum der Diana" (_L'Arbore di Diana_), Martin; "Romeo und Julie," Georg Benda; "Ariadne" (duo-drama by Georg Benda); "Das Mädchen von Frascati" (_La Frascatana_), Paisiello; "Julie," Desaides; "Die drei Pächter" (_Les trois Fermiers_), Desaides; "Die Entführung aus dem Serail," Mozart; "Nina," Dalayrac; "Trofonio's Zauberhöhle" (_La grotta di Trofonio_), Salieri; "Der eifersüchtige Liebhaber" (_L'Amant jaloux_), Grétry; "Der Schmaus" (_Il Convivo_), Cimarosa; "Der Alchymist," Schuster; "Das Blendwerk" (_La fausse Magie_), Grétry.

The second season began October 13, 1789, and continued until February 23, 1790. On the 24th of February news reached Bonn of the death of Maximilian's brother, the Emperor Joseph II, and the theatre was closed. The repertory for the season comprised "Don Giovanni," Mozart (which was given three times); "Die Colonie" (_L'Isola d'Amore_), Sacchini; "Der Barbier von Sevilla" (_Il Barbiere di Siviglia_), Paisiello; "Romeo und Julie," Georg Benda; "Die Hochzeit des Figaro" (_Le Nozze di Figaro_), Mozart (given four times); "Nina," Dalayrac; "Die schöne Schusterin," Umlauf; "Ariadne," Georg Benda; "Die Pilgrimme von Mecca," Gluck; "Der

König von Venedig" (_Il Re Teodoro_), Paisiello; "Der Alchymist," Schuster; "Das listige Bauernmädchen" (_La finta Giardiniera_), Paisiello; "Der Doktor und Apotheker," Dittersdorf. A letter to the "Berliner Annalen des Theaters" mentions three operas which are not in the list of the theatrical calendar and indicates that the theatre was opened soon after receipt of the intelligence of the death of Joseph, and several pieces performed, among them _Il Marchese Tulipano_ by Paisiello. The writer also mentions performances of Anfossi's (or Sarti's) _Avaro inamorato_, Pergolese's _Serva padrona_ and _La Villanella di spirito_, composer unmentioned, by an Italian company headed by Madame Bianchi.

The third season began October 23, 1790, and closed on March 8, 1791. Between the opening and November 27, performances of the following musical-dramatic works are recorded: "König Theodor in Venedig" (_Il Re Teodoro_), Paisiello; "Die Wilden" (_Azemia_), Dalayrac; "Der Alchymist," Schuster; "Kein Dienst bleibt unbelohnt," (?); "Der Barbier von Sevilla," Paisiello; "Die schöne Schusterin," Umlauf; "Lilla," Martini; "Die Geitzigen in der Falle," Schuster; "Nina," Dalayrac; "Dr. Murner," Schuster. On March 8, the season closed with a ballet by Horschelt, "Pyramus und Thisbe." The reporter in the "Theaterkalender" says:

On Quinquagesima Sunday (March 6) the local nobility performed in the Ridotto Room a characteristic ballet in old German costume. The author, His Excellency Count Waldstein, to whom the composition and music do honor, had shown in it consideration for the chief proclivities of our ancestors for war, the chase, love and drinking. On March 8, all the nobility attended the theatre in their old German dress and the parade made a great, splendid and respectable picture. It was also noticeable that the ladies would lose none of their charms, were they to return to the costumes of antiquity.

Before proceeding with this history a correction must be made in this report: the music to the "Ritterballet," which was the characteristic ballet referred to, was not composed by Count Waldstein but by Ludwig van Beethoven. We shall recur to it presently. Owing to a long-continued absence of the Elector, the principal singers and the greater part of the orchestra, the fourth season did not begin till the 28th of December, 1791. Between that date and February 20, 1792, the following musical works were performed: "Doktor und Apotheker," Dittersdorf; "Robert und Caliste," Guglielmi; "Félix," Monsigny; "Die Dorfdeputirten," Schubauer; "Im Trüben ist gut Fischen" (_Fra due Litiganti, il Terzo gode_), Sarti; "Das rothe Käppchen," Dittersdorf; "Lilla," Martini; "Der Barbier von Sevilla," Paisiello; "Ende gut, Alles gut," music by the Electoral Captain d'Antoin; "Die Entführung aus dem Serail," Mozart; "Die beiden Savoyarden" (_Les deux petits Savoyards_), Dalayrac.

OPERAS AT BONN IN 1792

The fifth season began in October, 1792. Of the nine operas given before the departure of Maximilian and the company to Münster in December, "Die Müllerin" by De la Borde, "König Axur in Ormus" by Salieri, and "Hieronymus Knicker" by Dittersdorf, were the only ones new to Bonn; and in only the first two of these could Beethoven have taken part, unless at rehearsals; for at the beginning of November he left Bonn--and, as it proved, forever. Probably Salieri's masterpiece was his last opera within the familiar walls of the Court Theatre of the Elector of Cologne.

Beethoven's eighteenth birthday came around during the rehearsals for the first season, of this theatre; his twenty-second just after the beginning of the fifth. During four years (1788-1792) he was adding to his musical knowledge and experience in a direction wherein he has usually been represented as deficient--as active member of an operatic orchestra; and the catalogue of works performed shows that the best schools of the day, save that of Berlin, must have been thoroughly mastered by him in all their strength and weakness. Beethoven's titanic power and grandeur would have marked his compositions under any circumstances; but it is very doubtful if, without the training of those years in the Electoral "Toxal, Kammer und Theater" as member of the orchestra, his works would have so abounded in melodies of such profound depths of expression, of such heavenly serenity and repose and of such divine beauty as they do, and which give him rank with the two greatest of melodists, Handel and Mozart.

Chapter IX

Gleanings of Musical Fact and Anecdote--Haydn in Bonn--A Rhine Journey--Abbé Sterkel--Beethoven Extemporises--Social and Artistic Life in Bonn--Eleonore von Breuning--The Circle of Friends--Beethoven Leaves Bonn Forever--The Journey to Vienna.

As a pendant to the preceding sketches of Bonn's musical history a variety of notices belonging to the last three years of Beethoven's life in his native place are here brought together in chronological order. Most of them relate to him personally, and some of them, through errors of date, have been looked upon hitherto as adding proofs of the precocity of his genius.

Prof. Dr. Wurzer communicated to the "Kölnische Zeitung" of August 30, 1838, the following pleasant anecdote:

In the summer of the year 1790 or 1791 I was one day on business in Godesberger Brunnen. After dinner Beethoven and another young man came up. I related to him that the church at Marienforst (a cloister in the woods behind Godesberg) had been repaired and renovated, and that this was also true of the organ, which was either wholly new or at least greatly improved. The company begged him to give them the pleasure of letting them hear him play on the instrument. His great good nature led him to grant our wish. The church was locked, but the prior was very obliging and had it unlocked for us. B. now began to play variations on themes given him by the party in a manner that moved us profoundly; but what was much more significant, poor laboring folk who were cleaning out the débris left by the work of repair, were so greatly affected by the music that they put down their implements and listened with obvious pleasure. _Sit ei terra levis!_

JOSEPH HAYDN'S VISIT TO BONN

The greatest musical event of the year (1790) in Bonn occurred just at its close--the visit of Joseph Haydn, on his way to London with Johann Peter Salomon, whose name so often occurs in the preliminary chapters of this work. Of this visit, Dies has recorded Haydn's own account:

In the capital, Bonn, he was surprised in more ways than one. He reached the city on Saturday [Christmas, December 25] and set apart the next day for rest. On Sunday, Salomon accompanied Haydn to the court chapel to listen to mass. Scarcely had the two entered the church and found suitable seats when high mass began. The first chords announced a product of Haydn's muse. Our Haydn looked upon it as an accidental occurrence which had happened only to flatter him; nevertheless it was decidedly agreeable to him to listen to his own composition. Toward the close of the mass a person approached and asked him to repair to the oratory, where he was expected. Haydn obeyed and was not a little surprised when he found that the Elector, Maximilian, had had him summoned, took him at once by the hand and presented him to the virtuosi with the words: "Here I make you acquainted with the Haydn whom you all revere so highly." The Elector gave both parties time to become acquainted with each other, and, to give Haydn a convincing proof of his respect, invited him to dinner. This unexpected invitation put Haydn into an embarrassing position, for he and Salomon had ordered a modest little dinner in their lodgings, and it was too late to make a change. Haydn was therefore fain to take refuge in excuses which the Elector accepted as genuine and sufficient. Haydn took his leave and returned to his lodgings, where he was made aware in a special manner of the good will of the Elector, at whose secret command the little dinner had been metamorphosed into a banquet for twelve persons to which the most capable musicians had been invited.

Was the young musician one of these "most capable musicians"? Sunday evening, March 6th, came the performance of Beethoven's music to the "Ritterballet" before noticed; but without his name being known. Bossler's "Musikalische Correspondenz" of July 13, 1791, contains a list of the "Cabinet, Chapel and Court Musicians of the Elector of Cologne." Names designated by an asterisk were "solo players who may justly be ranked with virtuosi"; two asterisks indicated composers. Four names only--those of Joseph Reicha, Perner and the two Rombergs--have the two stars; Beethoven has none. "Hr. Ludwig van Beethoven plays pianoforte concertos; Hr. Neefe plays accompaniments at court and in the theatre and at concerts.... Concertante violas are played by virtuoso violinists"--that is all, except that we learn that the Elector is losing interest in the instrument on which Beethoven played in the orchestra: "His Electoral Highness of Cologne seldom plays the viola nowadays, but finds amusement at the pianoforte with operas, etc., etc."

At Mergentheim, the capital of the Teutonic Order, a grand meeting of commanders and knights took place in the autumn of 1791, the Grand Master Maximilian Francis presiding, and the sessions continuing from September 18 to October 20, as appears from the records at Vienna. The Elector's stay there seems to have been protracted to a period of at least three months. During his visit there of equal length two years before, time probably dragged heavily, so this time ample provision was made for theatrical and musical amusement. Among the visiting theatrical troupes was one called the "Häusslersche Gesellschaft," which played in summer at Nuremberg, in winter in Münster and Eichstädt. The entrepreneur was Baron von Bailaux, the chapelmaster Weber, the elder; and among the personnel were Herr Weber, the younger, and Madame Weber. From Max Weber's biography of his father it appears that these Webers were the brother and sister-in-law of Carl Maria von Weber, then a child of some five years. "The troupe," says the reporter of the "Theater-Kalender," "performs the choicest pieces and the grandest operas." So the father, Franz Anton von Weber, must have found himself at length in his own proper element, and still more so a year later, when he himself became the manager.

This company for a time migrated to Mergentheim and resumed the title of "Kurfürstliches Hoftheater." Beethoven soon came thither also. Did he, when in after years he met Carl Maria von Weber, remember him as a feeble child at Mergentheim? Had his intercourse there with Fridolin von Weber, pupil of Joseph Haydn, any influence upon his determination soon after to become also

that great master's pupil?

AN EXPEDITION UP THE RHINE

Simonetti, Maximilian's favorite and very fine tenor concert-singer, and some twenty-five members of the electoral orchestra, with Franz Ries as conductor--Reicha was too ill--including Beethoven, the two Rombergs and the fine octet of wind-instruments, formed an equally ample provision for the strictly musical entertainments. Actors, singers, musicians--Simonetti and the women-singers excepted--most of them still young, all in their best years and at the age for its full enjoyment, made the journey in two large boats up the Rhine and Main. Before leaving Bonn the company assembled and elected Lux king of the expedition, who in distributing the high offices of his court conferred upon Bernhard Romberg and Ludwig van Beethoven the dignity of, and placed them in his service as, kitchen-boys--scullions. It was the pleasantest season of the year for such a journey, the summer heats being tempered by the coolness of the Rhine and the currents of air passing up and down the deep gorge of the river. Vegetation was at its best and brightest, and the romantic beauty of its old towns and villages had not yet suffered either by the desolations of the wars soon to break upon them or by the resistless and romance-destroying march of "modern improvement." Coblenz and Mayence were still capitals of states, and the huge fortress Rheinfels was not yet a ruin. When Risbeck passed down the Rhine ten years before, his boat "had a mast and sail, a flat deck with a railing, comfortable cabins with windows and some furniture, and in a general way in style was built like a Dutch yacht." In boats like this, no doubt, the jolly company made the slow and, under the circumstances, perhaps, tedious journey against the current of the "arrowy Rhine." But a glorious time and a merry they had of it. Want of speed was no misfortune to them, and in Beethoven's memory the little voyage lived bright and beautiful and was to him "a fruitful source of loveliest visions."

The Bingerloch was then held to be a dangerous, as it certainly was a difficult pass for boats ascending; for here the river, suddenly contracted to half its previous width, plunged amid long lines of rugged rocks into the gorge. So, leaving the boats to their conductors, the party ascended to the Niederwald; and there King Lux raised Beethoven to a higher dignity in his court--Wegeler does not state what it was--and confirmed his appointment by a diploma, or letters patent, dated on the heights above Rüdesheim. To this important document was attached by thread ravelled from a sail, a huge seal of pitch, pressed into the cover of a small box, which gave to the instrument a right imposing look--like the Golden Bull at Frankfort. This diploma from the hand of his comic majesty was among the articles taken by the possessor to Vienna where Wegeler saw it, still carefully preserved, in 1796.

At Aschaffenburg on the Main was the large summer palace of the Electors of Mainz; and here dwelt Abbé Sterkel, now a man of 40 years; a musician from his infancy, one of the first pianists of all Germany and without a rival in this part of it, except perhaps Vogler of Mannheim. His style both as composer and pianist had been refined and cultivated to the utmost, both in Germany and Italy, and his playing was in the highest degree light, graceful, pleasing--as Ries described it to Wegeler, "somewhat ladylike." Ries and Simrock took the young Romberg and Beethoven to pay their respects to the master, "who, complying with the general request, sat himself down to play. Beethoven, who up to this time," says Wegeler, "had not heard a great or celebrated pianoforte player, knew nothing of the finer nuances in the handling of the instrument; his playing was rude and hard. Now he stood with attention all on a strain by the side of Sterkel"; for this grace and delicacy, if not power of execution, which he now heard were a new revelation to him. After Sterkel had finished, the young Bonn concertplayer was invited to take his place at the instrument; but he naturally hesitated to exhibit himself after such a display. The shrewd Abbé, however, brought him to it by a pretence of doubting his ability.

BEETHOVEN'S MEETING WITH STERKEL

A year or two before, Chapelmaster Vincenzo Righini, a colleague of Sterkel in the service of the Elector of Mayence, had published "Dodeci Ariette," one of which, "Vieni (Venni) Amore," was a melody with five vocal variations, to the same accompaniment. Beethoven, taking this melody as his theme, had composed, dedicated to the Countess of Hatzfeld and published twenty-four variations for the pianoforte upon it. Some of these were very difficult, and Sterkel now expressed his doubts if their author could himself play them. His honor thus touched, "Beethoven played not only these variations so far as he could remember them (Sterkel could not find them), but went on with a number of others no less difficult, all to the great surprise of the listeners, perfectly, and in the ingratiating manner that had struck him in Sterkel's playing."[43]

Once in Mergentheim the merry monarch and his jolly subjects had other things to think of and seem to have made a noise in the world in more senses than one. At all events Carl Ludwig Junker, Chaplain at Kirchberg, the residence of Prince Hohenlohe, heard of them and then went over to hear them. Junker was a dilettante composer and the author of some half-dozen small works upon

music--musical almanacs published anonymously, and the like, all now forgotten save by collectors, as are his pianoforte concertos--but at that time he was a man of no small mark in the musical world of Western Germany. He came over to Mergentheim, was treated with great attention by the Elector's musicians, and showed his gratitude in a long letter to Bossler's "Correspondenz" (November 23, 1791), in which superlatives somewhat abound, but which is an exquisite piece of gossip and gives the liveliest picture that exists of the "Kapelle." We have room for only a portion of it:

Here I was also an eye-witness to the esteem and respect in which this chapel stands with the Elector. Just as the rehearsal was to begin Ries was sent for by the Prince, and upon his return brought a bag of gold. "Gentlemen," said he, "this being the Elector's name-day he sends you a present of a thousand thalers." And again, I was eye-witness of this orchestra's surpassing excellence. Herr Winneberger, Kapellmeister at Wallenstein, laid before it a symphony of his own composition, which was by no means easy of execution, especially for the wind-instruments, which had several solos _concertante_. It went finely, however, at the first trial, to the great surprise of the composer. An hour after the dinner-music the concert began. It was opened with a symphony of Mozart; then followed a recitative and air sung by Simonetti; next, a violoncello concerto played by Herr Romberger [Bernhard Romberg]; fourthly, a symphony by Pleyel; fifthly, an air by Righini, sung by Simonetti; sixthly, a double concerto for violin and violoncello played by the two Rombergs; and the closing piece was the symphony of Winneberger, which had very many brilliant passages. The opinion already expressed as to the performance of this orchestra was confirmed. It was not possible to attain a higher degree of exactness. Such perfection in the _pianos_, _fortes_, _rinforzandos_--such a swelling and gradual increase of tone and then such an almost imperceptible dying away, from the most powerful to the lightest accents--all this was formerly to be heard only in Mannheim. It would be difficult to find another orchestra in which the violins and basses are throughout in such excellent hands.... The members of the chapel, almost without exception, are in their best years, glowing with health, men of culture and fine personal appearance. They form truly a fine sight, when one adds the splendid uniform in which the Elector has clothed them--red, and richly trimmed with gold.

I heard also one of the greatest of pianists--the dear, good Bethofen, some compositions by whom appeared in the Spires "Blumenlese" in 1783, written in his eleventh year. True, he did not perform in public, probably the instrument here was not to his mind. It is one of Spath's make, and at Bonn he plays upon one by Steiner. But, what was infinitely preferable to me, I heard him extemporize in private; yes, I was even invited to propose a theme for him to vary. The greatness of this amiable, light-hearted man, as a virtuoso, may in my opinion be safely estimated from his almost inexhaustible wealth of ideas, the altogether characteristic style of expression in his playing, and the great execution which he displays. I know, therefore, no one thing which he lacks, that conduces to the greatness of an artist. I have heard Vogler upon the pianoforte--of his organ playing I say nothing, not having heard him upon that instrument--have often heard him, heard him by the hour together, and never failed to wonder at his astonishing execution; but Bethofen, in addition to the execution, has greater clearness and weight of idea, and more expression--in short, he is more for the heart--equally great, therefore, as an _adagio_ or _allegro_ player. Even the members of this remarkable orchestra are, without exception, his admirers, and all ears when he plays. Yet he is exceedingly modest and free from all pretension. He, however, acknowledged to me, that, upon the journeys which the Elector had enabled him to make, he had seldom found in the playing of the most distinguished virtuosos that excellence which he supposed he had a right to expect. His style of treating his instrument is so different from that usually adopted, that it impresses one with the idea, that by a path of his own discovery he has attained that height of excellence whereon he now stands.

Had I acceded to the pressing entreaties of my friend Bethofen, to which Herr Winterberger added his own, and remained another day in Mergentheim, I have no doubt he would have played to me hours; and the day, thus spent in the society of these two great artists, would have been transformed into a day of the highest bliss.

There is one passage in this exceedingly valuable and interesting letter which, in the present state of knowledge of Beethoven's youth, is utterly inexplicable. It is this: "Yet he is exceedingly modest and free from all pretension. He, however, acknowledged to me that upon the journeys which the Elector had enabled him to make, he had seldom found in the playing of the most distinguished virtuosos that excellence which he supposed he had a right to expect." What were the journeys? Who can tell?

There is but one more to add to these musical reminiscences of that period--another visit of Joseph Haydn, who, having changed the plan of his route, returned in July _via_ Bonn from London to Vienna. The electoral orchestra gave him a breakfast at Godesberg and there Beethoven laid before him a cantata "which received the particular attention of Haydn, who encouraged its author to continue study." It is not improbable that the arrangements were in part now made under which the young composer became a few months later the pupil of the veteran.

Many a eulogy has been written upon Max Franz for his supposed protection of, and favors granted to, the young Beethoven. It has, however, already been made clear that except the gracious reprimand at the time when the singer Heller was made the subject of the boy's joke, all the facts and anecdotes upon which those eulogies are based belong to a much later than the supposed period. The appointment of Beethoven as Chamber Musician (1789) was no distinguishing mark of favor. Half a dozen other youths of his age shared it with him. His being made Court Pianist was a matter of course; for whom had he as a rival? Had he been in any great degree a favorite of the Elector, what need had there been of his receiving from Waldstein, as Wegeler states, "much pecuniary assistance bestowed in such a way as to spare his sensibilities, it being generally looked upon as a small gratuity from the Elector?" One general remark may be made here which has a bearing upon this point, namely: that Beethoven's dedications of important works throughout his life were, as a rule, made to persons from whom he had received, or from whom he had hopes of receiving, pecuniary benefits. Indeed, in one notable case where such a dedication produced him nothing, he never forgot nor forgave the omission. Had he felt that Maximilian was in any single instance really generous toward him, why did he never dedicate any work to him? Why in all the correspondence, private memoranda and recorded conversations, which have been examined for this work, has Beethoven never mentioned him either in terms of gratitude, or in any manner whatever? All idea that his relations to the Elector were different from those of Bernhard Romberg, Franz Ries or Anton Reicha, must be given up. He was organist, pianist, member of the orchestra; and for these services received his pay like others. There is no proof of more, no indication of less.

But with Waldstein, the case was otherwise. The young count, eight years older than Beethoven, coming direct from Vienna, where his family connections gave him access to the salons of the very highest rank of the nobility, was thoroughly acquainted with the noblest and best that the imperial capital could show in the art of music. Himself more than an ordinary dilettante, he could judge of the youth's powers and became his friend. We have seen that he used occasionally to go to the modest room in the Wenzelgasse, that he even employed Beethoven to compose his "Ritterballet" music, and we shall see, that he foretold the future eminence of the composer and that the name, Beethoven, would stand next those of Mozart and Haydn on the roll of fame. Waldstein's name, too, is in Beethoven's roll of fame; it stands in the list of those to whom important works are dedicated. The dedication of the twenty-four variations on "Venni Amore" to the Countess Hatzfeld indicates, if it does not prove, that Beethoven's deserts were neither unknown nor unacknowledged at her house.

At that time the favorite places of resort for the professors of the new university and for young men whose education and position at court or in society were such as to make them welcome guests, was the house on the Market-place now known as the Zehrgarten; and there, says Frau Karth, Beethoven was in the habit of going. A large portion of this house was let in lodgings, and it is said that Eugène Beauharnais, with his wife and children, at one time occupied the first floor. Its mistress was the Widow Koch who spread also a table for a select company of boarders. Her name, too, often appears in the "Intelligenzblatt" of Bonn in advertisements of books and music. Of her three children, a son and two daughters, the beautiful Barbara--the Babette Koch mentioned in a letter of Beethoven's--was the belle of Bonn. Wegeler's eulogy of her ("Notizen," p. 58) contains the names of several members of that circle whom, doubtless, the young composer so often met at the house.

BARBARA KOCH; ELEONORE VON BREUNING

She was a confidential friend of Eleonore von Breuning, a lady who of all the representatives of the female sex that I met in a rather active and long life came nearest the ideal of a perfect woman--an opinion which is confirmed by all who had the good fortune to know her well. She was surrounded not only by young artists like Beethoven, the two Rombergs, Reicha, the twin brothers Kügelchen and others, but also by the intellectual men of all classes and ages, such as D. Crevelt, Prof. Velten, who died early, Fischenich, who afterward became Municipal Councillor, Prof. Thaddäus Dereser, afterward capitular of the cathedral, Wrede, who became a bishop, Heckel and Floret, secretaries of the Elector, Malchus, private secretary of the Austrian minister von Keverberg, later Government Councillor of Holland, Court Councillor von Bourscheidt, Christian von Breuning and many others.

About the time Beethoven left Bonn for Vienna, the wife of Count Anton von Belderbusch, nephew of the deceased minister of that name, had deserted her husband for the embraces of a certain Baron von Lichtenstein, and Babette Koch was engaged as governess and instructress of the motherless children. In process of time Belderbusch obtained a divorce (under the French law) from his adulterous wife and married the governess, August 9, 1802.

BEETHOVEN IN THE BREUNING HOUSE

But it was in the Breuning house that Beethoven enjoyed and profited most. The mother's kindness towards him gave her both the right and the power to urge and compel him to the performance of his duties; and this power over him in his obstinate and passionate moods she possessed in a higher degree than any other person. Wegeler gives an anecdote in point: Baron Westphal von Fürstenberg, until now in the service of the Elector, was appointed minister to the Dutch and Westphalian Circuit and to the courts of Cologne and Trèves, his headquarters being at Bonn. He resided in the large house which is now occupied by the post-office, directly behind the statue of him who was engaged as music teacher in the count's family. The Breuning house was but a few steps distant diagonally across a corner of the square. Here Madame von Breuning was sometimes compelled to use her authority and force the young man to go to his lessons. Knowing that she was watching him he would go, _ut iniquæ mentis asellus_, but sometimes at the very door would turn back and excuse himself on the plea that to-day it was impossible to give a lesson--to-morrow he would give two; to which, as upon other occasions when reasoning with him was of no avail, the good lady would shrug her shoulders with the remark: "He has his _raptus_ again," an expression which the rapt Beethoven never forgot. Most happy was it for him that in Madame von Breuning he had a friend who understood his character thoroughly, who cherished affection for him, who could and did so effectually act as peace-maker when the harmony between him and her children was disturbed. Schindler is a witness that just for this phase of her motherly care Beethoven, down to the close of life, was duly grateful.

In his later days he still called the members of this family his guardian angels of that time and remembered with pleasure the many reprimands which he had received from the lady of the house. "She understood," said he, "how to keep insects off the flowers." By insects he meant certain friendships which had already begun to threaten danger to the natural development of his talent and a proper measure of artistic consciousness by awakening vanity in him by their flatteries. He was already near to considering himself a famous artist, and therefore more inclined to give heed to those who encouraged him in his illusions than such as set before him the fact that he had still to learn everything that makes a master out of a disciple.

This is well said, is very probable in itself, and belongs in the category of facts as to which Schindler is a trustworthy witness.

Stephan von Breuning became so good a violinist as to play occasionally in the electoral orchestra. As he grew older, and the comparative difference in age between him and Beethoven lessened, the acquaintance between them became one of great intimacy. Frau Karth says he was a frequent visitor in the Wenzelgasse, and she had a lively recollection of "the noise they used to make with their music" in the room overhead. Lenz, the youngest of the Breunings, was but fifteen when his teacher left Bonn, but a few years after he became a pupil of Beethoven again in Vienna and became a good pianist. For him the composer seems to have cherished a warm affection, one to which the seven years' difference in their ages gave a peculiar tenderness. It has been supposed that Beethoven at one time indulged a warmer feeling than mere friendship for Eleonore von Breuning; but this idea is utterly unsupported by anything which has been discovered during the inquiries made for this work.

Beethoven's remarkable powers of improvising were often exhibited at the Breuning house. Wegeler has an anecdote here:

Once when Beethoven was improvising at the house of the Breunings (on which occasions he used frequently to be asked to characterize in the music some well-known person) Father Ries was urged to accompany him upon the violin. After some hesitation he consented, and this may have been the first time that two artists improvised a duo.

Beethoven had in common with all men of original and creative genius a strong repugnance to the drudgery of forcing the elements of his art into dull brains and awkward fingers; but that this repugnance was "extraordinary," as Wegeler says, does not appear. A Frau von Bevervörde, one of his Bonn pupils, assured Schindler that she never had any complaint to make of her teacher in respect to either the regularity of his lessons or his general course of instruction. Nor is there anything now to be gathered from the traditions at Vienna which justifies the epithet. Ries's experience is not here in point, for his relations to Beethoven were like those of little Hummel to Mozart. He received such instruction gratis as the master in leisure moments felt disposed to give. There was no pretence of systematic teaching at stated hours. The occasional neglect of a lesson at Baron Westphal's, as detailed in the anecdote above given, may be explained on other ground than that of extraordinary repugnance to teaching. Beethoven was, in 1791-'92, just at the age when the desire for distinction was fresh and strong; he was conscious of powers still not fully developed; his path was diverse from that of the other young men with whom he associated and who, from all that can be gathered now on the subject, had little faith in that which he had chosen. He must have felt the necessity of other instruction, or, at all events, of better opportunities to compare his powers with those of others, to measure himself by a higher standard, to try the effect of his compositions in another sphere, to satisfy himself that his instincts as a composer were true and that his deviations from the beaten track were not wild and capricious. Waldstein, we know from Wegeler (and this is confirmed by his own words), had faith in him and his works, and it will be seen that another, Fischenich, had also. But what would be said of him and his compositions in the city of

Mozart, Haydn, Gluck? To this add the restlessness of an ambitious youth to whom the routine of duties, which must long since in great measure have lost the charm of novelty, had become tedious, and the natural longing of young men for the great world, for a wider field of action, had grown almost insupportable.

BEETHOVEN'S SWEETHEARTS IN BONN

Or Beethoven's _raptus_ may just then have had a very different origin; Jeannette d'Honrath, or Fräulein Westerhold, was perhaps the innocent cause--two young ladies whose names are preserved by Wegeler of the many for whom he says his friend at various times indulged transient, but not the less ardent, passions. The former was from Cologne, whence she occasionally came to Bonn to pass a few weeks with Eleonore von Breuning.

"She was a beautiful, vivacious blond, of good education," says Wegeler, "and amiable disposition, who enjoyed music greatly and possessed an agreeable voice; wherefore she several times teased our friend by singing a song, familiar at the time, beginning:

'Mich heute noch von dir zu trennen Und dieses nicht verhindern können, Ist zu empfindlich für mein Herz!'

for the favored rival was the Austrian recruiting officer in Cologne, Carl Greth, who married the young lady and died on October 15, 1827, as Field Marshal General, Commander of the 23rd Regiment of Infantry and Commandant at Temesvar."[44]

The passion for Miss d'Honrath was eclipsed by a subsequent fancy for a Fräulein von Westerhold. The Court Calendars of these years name "Hochfürstlich Münsterischer Obrist-Stallmeister, Sr. Excellenz der Hochwohlgeborne Herr Friedrich Rudolph Anton, Freyherr von Westerhold-Giesenberg, kurkölnischer und Hochstift-Münsterischer Geheimrath." This much betitled man, according to Neefe (Spazier's "Berlin. Mus. Zeitung"),

played the bassoon himself and maintained a fair band among his servants, particularly players of wind-instruments. He had two sons, one of whom was a master of the flute, and two daughters. The elder daughter--the younger was still a child--Maria Anna Wilhelmine, was born on July 24, 1774, married Baron Friedrich Clemens von Elverfeldt, called von Beverföde-Werries, on April 24, 1792, and died on November 3, 1852. She was an excellent pianist. In Münster, Neefe heard "the fiery Mad. von Elverfeldt play a difficult sonata by Sardi (not Sarti) with a rapidity and accuracy that were marvellous."

It is not surprising that Beethoven's talent should have met with recognition and appreciation in this musical family. He became the young woman's teacher, and as the chief equerry Count Westerhold had to accompany the Elector on his visits to Münster, where, moreover, he owned a house, there is a tradition in the family that young Beethoven went with them before the young lady's marriage in 1790. She it was with whom Beethoven was now in love. He had the disease violently, nor did he "let concealment, like a worm i' th' bud," feed upon his cheek. Forty years afterward Bernhard Romberg had anecdotes to relate of this "Werther love."

The strong doubt that any such feeling for Eleonore von Breuning was ever cherished by Beethoven has already been expressed. The letters to her from Vienna printed by Wegeler, and other correspondence still in manuscript, confirm this doubt by their general tone; but that a really warm friendship existed between them and continued down to the close of his life, with a single interruption just before he left Bonn, of the cause of which nothing is known, so much is certain. Among the few souvenirs of youthful friendship which he preserved was the following compliment to him on his twentieth birthday, surrounded by a wreath of flowers:

ZU B'S GEBURTSTAG VON SEINER SCHÜLERIN.

Glück und langes Leben Wünsch ich heute dir; Aber auch daneben Wünsch ich etwas mir!

Mir in Rücksicht deiner Wünsch ich deine Huld, Dir in Rücksicht meiner Nachsicht und Geduld.

1790

Von Ihrer Freundin u. Schülerin Lorchen von Breuning.[45]

Another was a silhouette of Fräulein von Breuning. Referring to Beethoven's allusion to this in a letter to Wegeler (1825) the latter says: "In two evenings the silhouettes of all the members of the von Breuning family and more intimate friends of the house, were made by the painter Neesen of Bonn. In this way I came into the possession of that of Beethoven which is here printed. Beethoven was probably in his sixteenth year at the time";--far more probably in his nineteenth, the reader will say.

To the point of Beethoven's susceptibility to the tender passion let Wegeler again be cited:

The truth as I learned to know it, and also my brother-in-law Stephan von Breuning, Ferdinand Ries, and Bernhard Romberg, is that there was never a time when Beethoven was not in love, and that in the highest degree. These passions, for the Misses d'Honrath and Westerhold, fell in his transition period from youth to manhood, and left impressions as little deep as were those made upon the beauties who had caused them. In Vienna, at all events so long as I lived there, Beethoven was always in love and occasionally made a conquest which would have been very difficult if not impossible for many an Adonis.

A review of some of the last pages shows that for the most part after 1789 the life of Beethoven was a busy one, but that the frequent absences of the Elector, as recorded in the newspapers of the day, left many a period of considerable duration during which, except for the meetings of the orchestra for rehearsal and study, he had full command of his time. Thus he had plenty of leisure hours and weeks to devote to composition, to instruction in music, for social intercourse, for visits to Kerpen and other neighboring places, for the indulgence of his strong propensity to ramble in the fields and among the mountains, for the cultivation in that beautiful Rhine region of his warm passion for nature.

The new relations to his father and brothers, as virtual head of the family, were such as to relieve his mind from anxiety on their account. His position in society, too, had become one of which he might justly be proud, owing, as it was, to no adventitious circumstances, but simply to his genius and high personal character. Of illness in those years we hear nothing, except Wegeler's remark ("Notizen," 11): "When the famous organist Abbé Vogler played in Bonn (1790 or 1791) I sat beside Beethoven's sickbed"; a mere passing attack, or Wegeler would have vouchsafed it a more extended notice in his subsequent remarks upon his friend's health. Thus these were evidently happy years, in spite of certain characteristic and gloomy expressions of Beethoven in letters hereafter to be given, and years of active intellectual, artistic and moral development.

THE SUGGESTION OF HAYDN AS TEACHER

The probability that in July, 1792, it had been proposed to Haydn to take Beethoven as a pupil has been mentioned; but it is pretty certain that the suggestion did not come from the Elector, who, there is little doubt, was in Frankfort at the coronation of his nephew Emperor Franz (July 14) at the time of Haydn's visit. The indefatigable Karajan[46] is unable to determine precisely when the composer left London or reached Vienna; but it is known he was in the former city after July 1st and in the latter before August 4th. Whatever arrangements may have been made between the pupil and master, they were subject to the will of the Elector, and here Waldstein may well have exerted himself to his protégé's advantage. At all events, the result was favorable and the journey determined upon. Perhaps, had Haydn found Maximilian in Bonn, he might have taken the young man with him; as it was, some months elapsed before his pupil could follow.

Some little space must be devoted to the question, whence the pecuniary resources for so expensive a journey to and sojourn in Vienna were derived. The good-hearted Neefe did not forget to record the event in very flattering terms when he wrote next year in Spazier's "Berliner Musik-Zeitung":

In November of last year Ludwig van Beethoven, assistant court organist and unquestionably now one of the foremost pianoforte players, went to Vienna _at the expense of our Elector_ to Haydn in order to perfect himself under his direction more fully in the art of composition.

In a note he adds:

Inasmuch as this L. v. B. according to several reports is said to be making great progress in art and owes a part of his education to Herr Neefe in Bonn, to whom he has expressed his gratitude in writing, it may be well (Herr N's modesty interposing no objection) to append a few words here, since, moreover, they redound to the credit of Herr B.: "I thank you for your counsel very often given me in the course of my progress in my divine art. If ever I become a great man, yours will be some of the credit. This will give you the greater pleasure, since you can remain convinced, etc."

THE LIMIT OF MAXIMILIAN'S FAVOR

"At the expense of our Elector"--so says Neefe; so, too, Fischenich says of Beethoven "whom the Elector has sent to Haydn in Vienna." Maximilian, then, had determined to show favor to the young musician. This idea is confirmed by Beethoven's noting, in the small memorandum book previously referred to, the reception soon after reaching Vienna of 25 ducats and his disappointment that the sum had not been a hundred. (A receipt for his salary, 25 th. for the last quarter of this year, still in the Düsseldorf archives, is dated October 22, and seems at first sight to prove an advance per favor; but many others in the same collection show that payments were usually made about the beginning of the second month of each quarter.) There is also a paper in the Düsseldorf

collection, undated, but clearly only a year or two after Beethoven's departure, by which important changes are made in the salaries of the Elector's musicians. In this list Beethoven does not appear among those paid from the _Landrentmeisterei_ (i.e., the revenues of the state), but is to receive from the _Chatouille_ (privy purse) 600 florins--a sum equivalent to the hundred ducats which he had expected in vain. It is true these changes were never carried out, but the paper shows the Elector's intentions.

With such facts before us, how is Beethoven to be relieved of the odium of ingratitude to his benefactor? By the circumstance that, for anything that appears, the good intentions of the Elector--excepting in an increase of salary hereafter to be noted, and the transmission of the 25 ducats--were never carried out; and the young musician, after receiving his quarterly payment two or three times, was left entirely dependent upon his own resources. Maximilian's justification lies in the sea of troubles by which he was so soon to be overwhelmed.

That the 100 ducats were not advanced to Beethoven before leaving Bonn is easily accounted for. In October, 1792, the French revolutionary armies were approaching the Rhine. On the 22nd they entered Mayence; on the 24th and 25th the archives and funds of the court at Bonn were packed up and conveyed down the Rhine. On the 31st the Elector, accompanied by the Prince of Neuwied, reached Cleve on his first flight from his capital. It was a time of terror. All the principal towns of the Rhine region, Trèves, Coblenz, etc., even Cologne, were deserted by the higher classes of the inhabitants. Perhaps it was owing to this that Beethoven obtained permission to leave Bonn for Vienna just then instead of waiting until the approaching theatrical and musical season had passed. But with the treasury removed to Düsseldorf, he had to content himself with just sufficient funds to pay his way to Vienna and the promise of more to be forwarded thither.

Beethoven's departure from Bonn called forth lively interest on the part of his friends. The plan did not contemplate a long sojourn in the Austrian capital; it was his purpose, after completing his studies there, to return to Bonn and thence to go forth on artistic tours.[47] This is proved by an autograph album dating from his last days in Bonn, which some of his intimate friends, obviously those with whom he was wont to associate at the Zehrgarten, sent with him on his way, now preserved in the Imperial Library at Vienna. The majority of the names are familiar to us, but many which one might have expected to find, notably those of the musicians of Bonn, are missing. Eleonore von Breuning's contribution was a quotation from Herder:

Freundschaft, mit dem Guten, Wächset wie der Abendschatten, Bis des Lebens Sonne sinkt.[48]

Bonn, den 1. November Ihre wahre Freundin Eleonore 1792 Breuning.

Most interesting of all the inscriptions in the album, however, is that of Count Waldstein, which was first published by Schindler (Vol. I, p. 18) from a copy procured for him by Aloys Fuchs. It proves how great were the writer's hopes, how strong his faith in Beethoven:

Dear Beethoven! You are going to Vienna in fulfillment of your long-frustrated wishes. The Genius of Mozart is mourning and weeping over the death of her pupil. She found a refuge but no occupation with the inexhaustible Haydn; through him she wishes to form a union with another. With the help of assiduous labor you shall receive _Mozart's spirit from Haydn's hands_.

Your true friend Waldstein.

Bonn, October 29, 1792.

The dates in the album prove that Beethoven was still in Bonn on November 1, 1792, and indicate that it was the last day of his sojourn there. In Duten's "Journal of Travels," as translated and augmented by John Highmore, Gent. (London, 1782)--a Baedeker's or Murray's handbook of that time--the post-road from Bonn to Frankfort-on-the-Main is laid down as passing along the Rhine _via_ Andernach to Coblenz, and thence, crossing the river at Ehrenbreitstein, _via_ Montabaur, Limburg, Würges and Königstein;--corresponding to the route advertised in the "Intelligenzblatt" a few years later--time 25 hours, 43 minutes.

THE JOURNEY TO VIENNA

This was the route taken by Beethoven and some unknown companion. Starting from Bonn at 6 a.m. they would, according to Dutens and Highmore, dine at Coblenz about 3 p.m. and be in Frankfort about 7 next morning.

The first three pages of the memorandum book above cited contain a record of the expenses of this journey as far as Würges. One of the items is this: "Trinkgeld (_pourboire_) at Coblenz because the fellow drove like the devil right through the Hessian army at the risk of a cudgelling, one small thaler." This army marched from Coblenz on November 5; but on the same day a French corps,

having advanced from Mayence beyond Limburg, took possession of Weilburg. The travellers could not, therefore, have journeyed through Limburg later than the night of the 3rd. We conclude, then, that it was between November 1st and 3rd that Beethoven bade farewell to Bonn, and at Ehrenbreitstein saw Father Rhine for the last time.

The temptation is too strong to be resisted to add here the contents of the three pages of the memorandum book devoted to this journey, and the reasonings--fancies, if the reader prefers the term--drawn from them, upon which is founded the assertion that Beethoven had a travelling companion. This is probable in itself, and is confirmed by, first, two handwritings; second, the price paid for post-horses (thus, the first entry is for a station and a quarter at 50 _Stüber_, the regular price being one florin, or 40 _Stüber_ per horse for a single passenger; there were, therefore, two horses and 10 _Stüber_ extra per post for the second passenger); third, the word “us” in the record of the _Trinkgeld_ at Coblenz; fourth, the accounts cease at Würges, but they would naturally have been continued to Vienna had they been noted down by Beethoven from motives of economy; fifth, the payment of 2 fl. for dinner and supper is certainly more than a young man, not overburdened with money, would in those days have spent at the post-house.

We may suppose, then, that the companions have reached the end of their journey in common, and sit down to compute and divide the expenses. Beethoven hands his blank-book to his friend, who writes thus:

(Page 1) From Bonn to Remagen, 1-1/4 Stat, at 50 Stbr. 3 fl. From Remag. to Andernach, 1-1/2 St. 3.45 Tip 45 Tolls 45 From Andernach to Coblenz, 1 St. 3. Tips to Andernach 50 „ to Coblenz Tolls to Andernach 42 Tolls to Coblenz

These last three items are not carried out, and Beethoven now takes the book and adds the items of the “Tolls to Andernach” thus:

Sinzig 7 St(über) Reinicke 5 St. Preissig 10 St. Norich 4-1/2 St.

These 26 Stüber, changed into Kreutzers, make up the 42 in the column above. On the next page he continues:

(Page 2) Coblenz, tolls 30 x Rothehahnen (Red Cocks) 24 x Coblenz to Montebaur 2 rthlr. and 1/2 d Tolls for Coblenz 48 x Tip because the fellow drove like the devil right through the Hessian army at the risk of a cudgelling one small thaler Ate dinner 2 fl. Post from Montebaur to Limburg 3 fl. 57 x 10 x road money 15 x „ „

(Page 3) Supper 2 fl. in Limburg 12 Batzen Tips 14 x Grease money 14 x Tip for postillion 1 fl.

The other hand now writes:

The same money for meals and tips, besides 12 x road money to Wirges.

The entries of the second and third pages are now changed into florin currency and brought together, making 22 fl. and 14 x; add the expenses on the first page to this sum and we have a total of about 35 fl. from Bonn to Würges for two young men travelling day and night, and no doubt as economically as was possible.

The next entries are by Beethoven’s hand in Vienna, and we are left to imagine his arrival in Frankfort and his departure thence _via_ Nuremberg, Regensburg, Passau and Linz in the public post-coach for Vienna. Proof will be found hereafter that he was in that city on or before November 10th, and that Schindler (Vol. I, p. 19) therefore confounds this journey with that of 1787, and is all wrong when he says “they travelled very slowly and the money which they had taken along was exhausted before they had traversed half the journey.”

FOOTNOTES:

[43] Wegeler’s story of the meeting between Beethoven and Sterkel is confirmed in every detail by a letter from N. Simrock to Schindler, a copy of which was found among the posthumous papers of Thayer.

[44] In one of the Beethoven conversation books, _anno_ 1823, may be read in Schindler’s handwriting: “Captain v. Greth’s address, Commandant in Temesvar.”

[45] From the Fischoff Manuscript. The verbal play can scarcely be given in English rhymed couplets. The sentiment is: “Happiness and long life I wish you to-day, but something do I crave for myself from you--your regard, your forbearance and your patience.”

[46] “J. Haydn in London,” page 53.

[47] Neefe relates that on his second visit to England, Haydn had contemplated taking Beethoven with him.

[48] “Friendship, with that which is good, grows like the evening shadow till the setting of the sun of life.”

Chapter X

Beethoven’s Creative Activity in Bonn--An Inquiry into the Genesis of Many Compositions--The Cantatas on the Death of Joseph II and the Elevation of Leopold II--Songs, the “Ritterballet,” the Octet and Other Chamber Pieces.

But for the outbreak of the French Revolution, Bonn seems to have been destined to become a brilliant centre of learning and art. Owing to the Elector’s taste and love for music, that art became--what under the influence of Goethe poetry and drama were in Weimar--the artistic expression and embodiment of the intellectual character of the time. In this art, among musicians and composers, Beethoven, endowed with a genius whose originality has rarely if ever been surpassed, “lived, moved and had his being.” His official superiors, Lucchesi, Reicha, Neefe, were indefatigable in their labors for the church, the stage and the concert-room; his companions, Andreas Perner, Anton Reicha, the Rombergs, were prolific in all the forms of composition from the set of variations to even the opera and oratorios; and in the performance of their productions, as organist, pianist and viola player, he, of course, assisted. The trophies of Miltiades allowed no rest to Themistocles. Did the applause bestowed upon the scenes, duos, trios, quartets, symphonies, operas of his friends awaken no spirit of emulation in him? Was he contented to be the mere performer, leaving composition to others? And yet what a “beggarly account” is the list of compositions known to belong to this period of his life![49] Calling to mind the activity of others, particularly Mozart, developed in their boyhood, and reflecting on the incentives which were offered to Beethoven in Bonn, one may well marvel at the small number and the small significance of the compositions which preceded the Trios Op. 1, with which, at the age of 24 years, he first presented himself to the world as a finished artist. But a change has come over the picture in the progress of time. Not only are the beginnings of many works which he presented to the world at a late day as the ripe products of his genius to be traced back to the Bonn period; fate has also made known to us compositions of his youth which, for a long time, were lost in whole or in part, and which, in connection with the three great pianoforte quartets of 1785, not only disclose a steady progress, but also discover the self-developed individual artist at a much earlier date than has heretofore been accepted. Now that we are again in possession of the cantatas and other fruits of the Bonn period, or have learned to know them better as such, we are able to free ourselves from the old notion which presented Beethoven as a slowly and tardily developed master.

CANTATA ON THE DEATH OF JOSEPH II

The most interesting of Beethoven’s compositions in the Bonn period are unquestionably the cantatas on the death of Joseph II and the elevation of Leopold II. Beethoven did not bring them either to performance or publication; they were dead to the world. Nottebohm called attention to the fact that manuscript copies of their scores were announced in the auction catalogue of the library of Baron de Beine in April, 1813. It seems probable that Hummel purchased them at that time; at any rate, after his death they found their way from his estate into the second-hand bookshop of List and Francke in Leipsic, where they were bought in 1884 by Armin Fridmann of Vienna. Dr. Eduard Hanslick acquainted the world with the rediscovered treasures in a feuilleton published in the “Neue Freie Presse” newspaper of Vienna on May 13, 1884, and the funeral cantata was performed for the first time at Vienna in November, 1884, and at Bonn on June 29, 1885.[50] Both cantatas were then included in the Complete Works of Beethoven published by Breitkopf and Härtel. The “Cantata on the Death of Joseph the Second, composed by L. van Beethoven,” was written between March and June, 1790. The Emperor died on February 20th, and the news of his death reached Bonn on February 24th. The Lesegesellschaft at once planned a memorial celebration, which took place on March 19th. At a meeting held to make preparations for the function on February 28, Prof. Eulogius Schneider (who delivered the memorial address) expressed the wish that a musical feature be incorporated in the programme and said that a young poet had that day placed a poem in his hands which only needed a setting from one of the excellent musicians who were members of the society or a composer from elsewhere. Beethoven’s most influential friends, at the head of them Count Waldstein, were members of the society. Here, therefore, we have beyond doubt the story of how Beethoven’s composition originated. The minutes of the last meeting for preparation, held on March 17, state that “for various reasons the proposed cantata cannot be performed.” Among the various reasons may have been the excessive difficulty of the parts for the wind-instruments which, according to Wegeler, frustrated a projected performance at Mergentheim; though it is also possible that Beethoven, who was notoriously a slow worker, was unable to complete the music in the short time which was at his disposal. The text of the cantata was written by Severin Anton Averdonk, son of an employee of the electoral Bureau of Accounts, and brother of the court singer Johanna Helene Averdonk, who, in her youth, was for a space a pupil of Johann van Beethoven. Beethoven set the young poet’s ode for solo voice, chorus and orchestra without trumpets and drums. Brahms, on playing through the score, remarked: “It is Beethoven through and through. Even if there were no name on the

title-page none other than that of Beethoven could be conjectured." The same thing may be said of the "Cantata on the Elevation of Leopold II to the Imperial Dignity, composed by L. V. Beethoven." Leopold's election as Roman Emperor took place on September 30, 1790, his coronation on October 9, when Elector Max Franz was present at Frankfort. This gives us a hint as to the date of the composition. Whether or not the Elector commissioned it cannot be said. Averdonk was again the poet. The two cantatas mark the culmination of Beethoven's creative labors in Bonn; they show his artistic individuality ripened and a sovereign command of all the elements which Bonn was able to teach him from a technical point of view.

OTHER WORKS OF THE BONN PERIOD

Two airs for bass voice with orchestral accompaniment are, to judge by the handwriting, also to be ascribed to about 1790. The first is entitled "'Prüfung des Küssens' ('The Test of Kissing'), V. L. V. Beethowen." The use of the "w" instead of the "v" in the spelling of the name points to an early period for the composition. The text of the second bears the title, "Mit Mädeln sich vertragen," and was taken by Beethoven from the original version of Goethe's "Claudine von Villa Bella." Paper, handwriting and the spelling of the name of the composer indicate the same period as the first air. The two compositions remained unknown a long time, but are now to be had in the Supplement to the Complete Works published by Breitkopf and Härtel.

To these airs must be added a considerable number of songs as fruits of Beethoven's creative labors in Bonn. The first of these, "Ich, der mit flatterndem Sinn," was made known by publication in the Complete Works. A sketch found among sketches for the variations on "Se vuol ballare," led Nottebohm to set down 1792 as the year of its origin. Of the songs grouped and published as Op. 52 the second, "Feuerfarbe," belongs to the period of transition from Bonn to Vienna. On January 26, 1793, Fischenich wrote to Charlotte von Schiller: "I am enclosing with this a setting of the 'Feuerfarbe' on which I should like to have your opinion. It is by a young man of this place whose musical talents are universally praised and whom the Elector has sent to Haydn in Vienna. He proposes also to compose Schiller's 'Freude,' and indeed strophe by strophe. Ordinarily he does not trouble himself with such trifles as the enclosed, which he wrote at the request of a lady." From this it is fair to conclude that the song was finished before Beethoven's departure from Bonn. Later he wrote a new postlude, which is found among _motivi_ for the Octet and the Trio in C minor. Of the other songs in Op. 52 the origin of several may be set down as falling in the Bonn period. That of the first, "Urian's Reise um die Welt," we have already seen. Whether or not these songs, which met with severe criticism in comparison with other greater works of Beethoven, were published without Beethoven's knowledge, is doubtful.[51] Probability places the following songs in the period of transition, or just before it: "An Minna," sketched on a page with "Feuerfarbe," and other works written out in the early days of the Vienna period; a drinking-song, "to be sung at parting," "Erhebt das Glas mit froher Hand," to judge by the handwriting, an early work, presumably _circa_ 1787; "Elegie auf den Tod eines Pudels"; "Die Klage," to be placed in 1790, inasmuch as the original manuscript form appears simultaneously with sketches of the funeral cantata; "Wer ist ein freier Mann?", whose original autograph in the British Museum bears the inscription "ipse fecit L. v. Beethoven," and must be placed not later than 1790, while a revised form is probably a product of 1795, and to a third Wegeler appended a different text, "Was ist des Maurer's Ziel?" published in 1806; the "Punschlied" may be a trifle older; the autograph of "Man strebt die Flamme zu verhehlen," in the possession of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, which has been placed in the year 1792, bears in Beethoven's handwriting the words "pour Madame Weissenthurn par Louis van Beethoven." Madame Weissenthurn was a writer and actress, and from 1789 a member of the company of the Burgtheater in Vienna, and it is more than likely that Beethoven did not get acquainted with her till he went to Vienna, although she was born on the Rhine.

Turn we now to the instrumental works which date back to the Bonn period. The beginning is made with the work which, in a manner, first brought Beethoven into close relationship with the stage--the "Ritterballet," produced by the nobility on Carnival Sunday, March 6, 1791, and which, consequently, cannot have been composed long before, say in 1790 or 1791. The ballet was designed by Count Waldstein in connection with Habich, a dancing-master from Aix-la-Chapelle. Of the contents of the piece we know nothing more than is contained in the report from Bonn printed three chapters back, namely, that it illustrated the predilection of the ancient Germans for war, the chase, love and drinking; the music, being without words, can give us no further help. It consists of eight short numbers, designed to accompany the pantomime: 1, March; 2, German Song;[52] 3, Hunting Song; 4, Romance; 5, War Song; 6, Drinking Song; 7, German Dance; 8, Coda. It was intended that the music should be accepted as Waldstein's and, therefore, Beethoven never published it.

It seems as if the last year of Beethoven's sojourn in Bonn was especially influential in the development of his artistic character and ability. Of the works of 1792, besides trifles, there were two of larger dimensions which, if we were not better advised, would unhesitatingly be placed in the riper Vienna period. The autograph of the Octet for wind-instruments, published after the composer's death and designated at a later date as Op. 103, bears the inscription "Parthia in Es" (above this, "dans un Concert"),

“Due Oboe, Due Clarinetti, Due Corni, Due Fagotti di L. v. Beethoven.” From a sketch which precedes suggestions for the song “Feuerfarbe,” Nottebohm concludes that the Octet was composed in 1792, or, at the latest in 1793. In the latter case it would be a Viennese product. It is improbable, however, that Beethoven found either incentive or occasion soon after reaching Vienna to write a piece of this character, and it is significant that in his later years he never returned to a combination of eight instruments. But there was an incentive in Bonn in the form of the excellent dinner-music of the Elector described by Chaplain Junker, which was performed by two oboes, two clarinets, two horns and two bassoons. It may be set down as a fruit of 1792, his last year in Bonn. For the same combination of instruments, Beethoven also composed a Rondino in E-flat, published in 1829 by Diabelli, probably from the posthumous manuscript. From the autograph Nottebohm argued that it was written in Bonn, and what has been said of the origin of the Octet applies also to the Rondino. The autograph of a little duet in G for two flutes bears the inscription: “For Friend Degenharth by L. v. Beethoven. August 23rd, 1792, midnight.”

We are lifted to a higher plane again by a work which in invention and construction surpasses the compositions already mentioned and still to be mentioned in the present category, and discloses the fully developed Beethoven as we know him--the Trio in E-flat, for violin, viola and violoncello, Op. 3. Its publication was announced by Artaria in February, 1797. According to Wegeler, Beethoven was commissioned by Count Appony in 1795 to write a quartet. He made two efforts, but produced first a Trio (Op. 3), and then a Quintet (Op. 4). We know better the origin of the latter work now; but Wegeler is also mistaken about the origin of the Trio; it was a Bonn product. Here the proof:

At the general flight from Bonn, whether the one at the end of October or that of December 15, 1793, the Elector ordered his chaplain, Abbé Clemens Dobbeler, to accompany an English lady, the Honourable Mrs. Bowater, to Hamburg. “While there,” says William Gardiner in his “Music and Friends,” III, 142, “he was declared an emigrant and his property was seized. Luckily he placed some money in our (English) government funds, and his only alternative was to proceed to England.” Dobbeler accompanied Mrs. Bowater to Leicester. She,

having lived much in Germany, had acquired a fine taste in music; and as the Abbé was a very fine performer on the violin, music was essential to fill up this irksome period (while Mrs. Bowater lived in lodgings before moving into old Dolby Hall). My company was sought with that of two of my friends to make up occasionally an instrumental quartett.... Our music consisted of the Quartetts of Haydn, Boccherini, and Wranizky. The Abbé, who never travelled without his violin, had luckily put into his fiddle-case a Trio composed by Beethoven, just before he set off, which thus, in the year 1793, found its way to Leicester. This composition, so different from anything I had ever heard, awakened in me a new sense, a new delight in the science of sounds.... When I went to town (London) I enquired for the works of this author, but could learn nothing more than that he was considered a madman and that his music was like himself. However, I had a friend in Hamburg through whom, although the war was raging at the time, I occasionally obtained some of these inestimable treasures.

THE TRIO FOR STRINGS, OP. 3

What trio was this so praised by the enthusiastic Englishman? On the last page but one of Gardiner’s “Italy, her Music, Arts and People” he writes, speaking of his return down the Rhine:

Recently we arrived at Bonn, the birthplace of Beethoven. About the year 1786, my friend the Abbé Dobler, chaplain to the Elector of Cologne, first noticed this curly, blackheaded boy, the son of a tenor singer in the cathedral. Through the Abbé I became acquainted with the first production of this wonderful composer. How great was my surprise in playing the viola part to his Trio in E-flat, so unlike anything I had ever heard. It was a new sense to me, an intellectual pleasure which I had never received from sounds.

Again, in a letter to Beethoven, Gardiner says, “Your Trio in E-flat (for violin, viola and bass).” To all but the blind this narrative pours a flood of light upon the whole question.[53]

There come up now for consideration the compositions in which Beethoven’s principal instrument, the pianoforte, is employed. They carry us back a space, and to the earliest examples we add a related composition for violin.

It was a part of Beethoven’s official duty to play pianoforte before the Elector, and it may therefore easily be imagined that after his first boyish attempt in 1784, he would continue to compose concertos and parts of concertos for the pianoforte and orchestra, and not wait until 1795, when he publicly performed the “entirely new” concerto in B-flat. Quite recently the world has learned of a first movement for a pianoforte concerto in D, concerning which the first report was made by Guido Adler in 1888, and which was

performed in Vienna on April 7, 1889, and then incorporated, as edited by Adler, in the supplement to the Complete Works. It was discovered in copy, solo and orchestra parts, in the possession of Joseph Bezeczny, the head of an educational institution for the blind in Prague, and the handwriting is his. Immediately after its first performance its authenticity was questioned by Dr. Paumgartner, who called attention to its Mozartian characteristics, but failed to advance any reason for doubting the testimony of so thorough a musical scholar as Adler. The latter had emphasized the resemblances to Mozart's works, which, indeed, are too obvious to escape attention; but for a long time after 1785, especially after Beethoven met Mozart personally in Vienna, the former was completely in the latter's thrall, and that his music should occasionally be reminiscent of his model is not at all singular. Such reminiscences are to be found in the quartets of 1785 and the trio for pianoforte and wind-instruments. It is safe to assume that the movement was written, as Adler suggests, in the period 1788-1793, perhaps before rather than after 1790, and that Beethoven attached little value to it and laid it permanently aside.

A companion-piece to this movement is the fragment of a Concerto for Violin in C major, of which the autograph is in the archives of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna, the handwriting of which indicates that it belongs to the early Vienna if not the Bonn period. That it is a first transcription is indicated by the fact that there are many erasures and corrections. The fragment contains 259 measures, embracing the orchestral introduction, the first solo passage, the second _tutti_ and the beginning of the free fantasia for the solo instrument; it ends with the introduction of a new transition _motif_ which leads to the conjecture that the movement was finished and that the missing portion has been lost.[54]

A Trio in E-flat for Pianoforte, Violin and Violoncello, found among Beethoven's posthumous papers, was published in 1836 by Dunst in Frankfort-on-the-Main. On the original publication its authenticity was certified to by Diabelli, Czerny and Ferdinand Ries, and it was stated that the original manuscript was in the possession of Schindler; Wegeler verified the handwriting as that of Beethoven. Schindler cites Beethoven's utterance that he had written the work at the age of 15 years and described it as one of his "highest strivings in the free style of composition," which was either a misunderstanding of Schindler's or a bit of irony on the part of Beethoven. Nearer the truth, at any rate, is a remark in Gräffer's written catalogue of Beethoven's works: "Composed _anno_ 1791, and originally intended for the three trios, Op. 1, but omitted as too weak by Beethoven." Whether or not this observation rests on an authentic source is not stated.[55]

Whether or not the Pianoforte Trios, Op. 1, were composed in Bonn may be left without discussion here, since we shall be obliged to recur to the subject later. The facts about them that have been determined beyond controversy are, that they were published in 1795; were not ready in their final shape in 1794; and were already played in the presence of Haydn in 1793.

OTHER WORKS COMPOSED IN BONN

The Variations in E-flat for Pianoforte, Violin and Violoncello, which were published in 1804 by Hofmeister in Leipsic as Op. 44, apparently belong to the last year of Beethoven's life in Bonn. Nottebohm found a sketch of the work alongside one of the song "Feuerfarbe," which fact points to the year 1792; Beethoven in a letter to the publisher appears not to have laid particular store by it, a circumstance easily understood in view of the great works which had followed the youthful effort.

Besides these compositions, a Trio for Pianoforte, Flute and Bassoon,[56] concerning which all the information which we have came from the catalogue of Beethoven's effects sold at auction, has recently been published. It is No. 179 in the catalogue, where it is described as a composition of the Bonn period. On the autograph, preserved in Berlin, the title, placed at the end, is "Trio concertante a clavicembalo, flauto, fagotto, composto da Ludovico van Beethoven organista di S. S. (illegible word), cologne." The designation of the composer as organist, etc., fixes the place of its origin, and the handwriting indicates an early date.

Among the papers found in Beethoven's apartments after his death, was the manuscript of a Sonata in B-flat for Pianoforte and Flute, which passed into the hands of Artaria. It is not in Beethoven's handwriting, and the little evidence of its authenticity is not convincing.[57]

It is more than likely that the Variations for Pianoforte and Violin on Mozart's "Se vuol ballare" ought to be assigned to the latter part of the Bonn period. They were published in July, 1793, with a dedication to Eleonore von Breuning, to whom Beethoven sent the composition with a letter dated November 2, 1793.[58] The dedication leads to the presumption that the work was carried to Vienna in a finished state and there subjected to only the final polish. The postscript to the letter to Fräulein von Breuning betrays the reason for the hurried publication: Beethoven wanted to checkmate certain Viennese pianists whom he had detected copying peculiarities of his playing in improvisation which he suspected they would publish as their own devices.

Besides the pieces already mentioned, Beethoven wrote the following works for pianoforte in Bonn:

1. A Prelude in F minor.[59] According to a remark on a printed copy shown to be authentic, Beethoven wrote it when he was 15 year old, that is, in 1786 or, the question of his age not being determined at the time, 1787. The prelude is, as a matter of fact, a fruit of his studies in the art of imitation; and the initiative, probably, came from Bach's Preludes.

2. Two Preludes through the Twelve Major Keys for Pianoforte or Organ; published by Hoffmeister in 1803 as Op. 39. Obviously exercises written for Neefe while he was Beethoven's teacher in composition.

3. Variations on the arietta "Venni Amore," by Righini, in D major--"Venni Amore," not "Vieni"; the arietta begins: "Venni Amore nel tuo regno, ma compagno del Timor." Righini gave his melody a number of vocal variations. Beethoven republished his in Vienna in 1801 through Traeg (Complete Works, Series 17, No. 178); composed about 1790 and published in Mannheim in 1791. They were inscribed to Countess Hatzfeld (_née_ Countess de Girodin), who has been praised in this book as an eminent pianist. The story of the encounter between Beethoven and Sterkel in which these variations figure has also been told. Beethoven had a good opinion of them; Czerny told Otto Jahn that he had brought them with him to Vienna and used them to "introduce" himself.

PIANOFORTE VARIATIONS AND A SONATA

Two books of variations are to be adjudged to the Bonn period because of their place of publication and other biographical considerations. They are the Variations in A major on a theme from Dittersdorf's opera "Das rothe Käppchen" ("Es war einmal ein alter Mann") and the Variations for four hands on a theme by Count Waldstein. Both sets were published by Simrock in Bonn, the first of Beethoven's compositions published in his native town. They were not published until 1794, but according to a letter to Simrock, dated August 2, 1794, the latter had received the first set a considerable time before, and Beethoven had held back the corrections while the other was already printed. Beethoven's intimate association with Waldstein in Bonn is a familiar story, but we hear nothing of it in the early Viennese days. The variations on a theme of his own seem likely to have been the product of a wish expressed by the Count. That Beethoven seldom wrote for four hands, and certainly not without a special reason, is an accepted fact.[60]

Another presumably Bonnian product which has come down to us only as a fragment is the Sonata in C major for Pianoforte, published in 1830 by Dunst in Frankfort, with a dedication to Eleonore von Breuning. It is probably the sonata which Beethoven, according to the letter to be given presently, had promised to his friend and which was fully sketched at the time. There would be no doubt of the fact that the sonata was written in Bonn if the presumption that the letter was written in Bonn were true; but even as it is, the fact that the letter says that it had been promised "long ago" indicates a pre-Viennese origin. All that is certain is that Eleonore von Breuning received it from Beethoven in 1796. In the copy sent to the publisher eleven measures at the end of the _Adagio_ were lacking. These were supplied by Ferdinand Ries in the manner of Beethoven. There can scarcely be a doubt that Beethoven finished the _Adagio_, and it can be assumed that he also composed a last movement, which has been lost.

Concerning the Rondo in C major published in Bossler's "Blumenlese" of 1783, we have already spoken.[61]

It is a striking fact to any one who has had occasion to examine carefully the chronology of publication of Beethoven's works, that up to nearly the close of 1802 whatever appeared under his name was worthy of that name; but that then, in the period of the second, third and fourth symphonies, of the sonatas. Op. 47, 53, 57 and of "Leonore," to the wonder of the critics of that time serial advertisements of the "Kunst- und Industrie-Comptoir" in Vienna announce the Trios, Op. 30 and the seven Bagatelles, Op. 33; in another the "Grand Sinfonie," Op. 36, and the Variations on "God save the King"; on May 15, 1805, the Waldstein Sonata and the Romance, Op. 50; and on June 16 the songs. Op. 52, which the "Allgemeine Mus. Zeitung" describes as "commonplace, poor, weak, in part ridiculous stuff." Ries solves the enigma when he writes ("Notizen," 124) that all trifles, many things which he never intended to publish because he deemed them unworthy of his name, were given to the world through the agency of his brother. In this manner the world was made acquainted with songs which he had written long before he went to Vienna from Bonn. Even little compositions which he had written in albums were filched and published.

But even if the widest latitude be given to the judgment in selecting from the publications of these years' works belonging to the Bonn period, still what an exceedingly meagre list is the aggregate of Beethoven's compositions from his twelfth to the end of his twenty-second year! Mozart's, according to Köchel, reach at that age 293; Handel completed his twentieth year, February 23, 1705; on the twenty-fifth his second opera "Nero" was performed. And what had he not previously written!

This apparent lack of productiveness on the part of Beethoven has been noticed by other writers. One has disputed the fact and is of opinion that the composer in later years destroyed the manuscripts of his youth to prevent the possibility of injury to his fame by their posthumous publication. But this explanation is nonsense, as every one knows who has had an opportunity to examine the autograph collections in Vienna and there to remark with what scrupulous care even his most valueless productions were preserved by their author in all his migrations from house to house and from city to country throughout his Vienna life.

Beethoven attached absolutely no value to his autographs; after they had once been engraved they generally were piled on the floor in his living room or an anteroom among other pieces of music. I often brought order into his music, but when Beethoven hunted for anything, everything was sent flying in disorder. At that time I might have carried away the autograph manuscripts of all the pieces which had been printed, or had I asked him for them he would unquestionably have given them to me without a thought.

These words of Ries are confirmed by the small number of autographs of printed works in the auction catalogue of Beethoven's posthumous papers--most of them having remained in the hands of the publishers or having been lost, destroyed or stolen.

WORKS TAKEN TO VIENNA FROM BONN

Another author has endeavored to supply the vacuum by deducing the chronology of Beethoven's works from their form, matter or general character as viewed by his eyes, referring all which seem to him below the standard of the composer at any particular period to an earlier one; and a very comical chronology he makes of it. His success certainly has not been such as to induce any attempt of the kind here; and yet that he is right in the general fact is the hypothesis which the following remarks are conceived to establish as truth. Schindler--who is often very positive on the ground that what he does not know cannot be true--in introducing his chronological table of Beethoven's works, published from 1796 to 1800, remarks: "It may be asserted with positiveness that none of the works catalogued below were composed before 1794"; upon which point the assertion is ventured that Schindler is thoroughly mistaken and that many of the works published by Beethoven during the first dozen years of his Vienna life were taken thither from Bonn. They doubtless were more or less altered, amended, improved, corrected, but nevertheless belong as compositions to those years when "Beethoven played pianoforte concertos, and Herr Neefe accompanied at Court in the theatre and in concerts." While the other young men were trying their strength upon works for the orchestra and stage, the performance of which would necessarily give them notoriety, the Court Pianist would naturally confine himself mostly to his own instrument and to chamber music--to works whose production before a small circle in the salons of the Elector, Countess Hatzfeld and others would excite little if any public notice. But here he struck out so new, and at that time so strange a path that no small degree of praise is due to the sagacity of Count Waldstein, who comprehended his aims, felt his greatness and encouraged him to trust to and be guided by his own instincts and genius.

That Beethoven also tried his powers in a wider field we know from the two cantatas, the airs in "Die schöne Schusterin" and the "Ritterballet." Carl Haslinger in Vienna also possessed an orchestral introduction to the second act of an unnamed opera which may as well be referred to the Bonn period as to any other; and it is not by any means a wild suggestion that he had tried his strength in other concertos for pianoforte and full orchestra than that of 1784. As to the compositions for two, six or eight wind-instruments there was little if any danger of mistake in supposing them to have been written for the Elector's "Harmonie-Musik." But this is wandering from the point; to establish which the following remarks are in all humility submitted:

CREATIVE INDUSTRY IN BONN

I. If a list be drawn up of Beethoven's compositions published between 1795 and December, 1802, with the addition of other works known to have been composed in those years, the result will be nearly as follows (omitting single songs and other minor pieces): symphonies, 2; ballet ("Prometheus"), 1; sonatas (solo and duo), 32; romances (violin and orchestra), 2; serenade, 1; duos (clarinet and bassoon), 3; sets of variations, 15; sets of dances, 5; "Ah! perfido" and "Adelaide," 2; pianoforte concertos, 3; trios (pianoforte and other instruments), 9; quartets, 6; quintets, 3; septet, 1; pianoforte rondos, 3; marches (for four hands), 3; oratorio ("Christus"), 1; an aggregate of 92 compositions in eight years or ninety-six months. And most of them such compositions! That Beethoven was a remarkable man all the world knows; but that he could produce at this rate, study operatic composition with Salieri, sustain, nay, increase his reputation as a pianoforte virtuoso, journey to Prague, Berlin and other places, correct proof-sheets for his publishers, give lessons and yet find time to write long letters to friends, to sleep, to eat, drink and be merry with companions of his own age--this is, to say the least, "a morsel difficult of digestion." The more so from the fact that at the very time when he began to devote himself more exclusively to composition such marvellous fertility suddenly ceased. The inference is obvious.

II. When Neefe, in 1798, calls Beethoven “beyond controversy one of the foremost pianoforte players,” it excites no surprise. Ten years before he had played the most of Bach’s “Well-Tempered Clavichord” and had now long held the offices of Second Court Organist and Concerto Player; but what sufficient reason could Waldstein have had for his faith that this pianist, by study and perseverance, would yet be able to seize and hold the sceptre of Mozart? And upon what grounds, too, could Fischenich, on January 26, 1793, write as he did to Charlotte von Schiller from Bonn (see _ante_) and add, “I expect something perfect from him, for so far as I know him he is wholly devoted to the great and sublime.... Haydn has written here that he would soon put him at grand operas and soon be obliged to quit composing.”

Note the date of this--January 26, 1793. Haydn must have written some time before this, when Beethoven could not have been with him more than six or eight weeks. Did the master found his remark upon what he had seen in his pupil or upon the compositions which his pupil had placed before him? Wegeler has printed an undated and incomplete letter of Beethoven to Eleonore von Breuning, certainly, however, not later than the spring of 1794, which was accompanied by a set of variations and a rondo for pianoforte and violin. Do the following passages in this letter indicate anything?

I have a great deal to do or I would before this have transcribed the sonata _which I promised you long ago_. It is a mere sketch in my manuscript and it would be a difficult task even for the clever and practised Paraquin to copy it. You can have the rondo copied and return the score to me. It is the only one of my things which is, in a manner, suitable to you.

May these words not be paraphrased thus: “As to the sonata which I played at your house and of which I promised you a copy--it is in my manuscript hardly more than a sketch, so that I could not trust it to a copyist, not even to Paraquin, and I have not had leisure to transcribe it myself.” And, finally, the closing lines of a short article in the “Jahrbuch der Tonkunst für Wien und Prag,” 1776--which notice was not written later than the spring of 1795, nine or ten months before the publication of the Sonatas Op. 2--are pregnantly suggestive: “We have a number of beautiful sonatas by him, amongst which the last ones particularly distinguish themselves.” These works were, therefore, well-known in manuscript even at the time when he was busy with his studies under Haydn and Albrechtsberger.

III. If in spite of the above it still be objected that the _opera_ 1 to 15, or 20, as you please, are of a character beyond the powers of Beethoven during his Bonn life, who _knows_ this to be a fact? Has such an objection any other basis than a mere prejudice?

EVIDENCES OF EARLY ACTIVITY

A fanciful theory has exhibited Beethoven to us as a rude, undeveloped genius, who, being transferred to Vienna and schooled two years by Haydn and Albrechtsberger, then began with the Trios Op. 1, wrought his way upward in eight years through the twenty-three compositions of _opera_ 2 to 14 in a geometrical progression to the first pianoforte concertos, the ballet “Prometheus” and the Symphony in C! It is, however, known that in March, 1795, Beethoven played his Pianoforte Concerto in B-flat in Vienna, shortly afterward published the Trios, Op. 1, and in 1796 composed the two sonatas for pianoforte and violoncello in Berlin. A young man who at the age of 24 or 25 could give the public two such concertos could hardly have been such a rough diamond only three or four years before.

IV. However convincing the preceding propositions may seem to the ordinary reader, the critical student of musical history justly demands something more. It is not enough for him to know that Op. 19 was composed before the publication of Op. 1; that Op. 2 is in part made up from the Pianoforte Quartets of 1785; that the Quintet Op. 4 is an arrangement of the “Parthia” in E-flat for wind-instruments afterwards published as Op. 103, and is now proved to belong to the Bonn period, and that a whole movement of the funeral cantata found its way into “Fidelio”--the argument is to him like an arch without its keystone until one or more of the important works be named specifically as Bonn compositions and proved to be such.[62]

FOOTNOTES:

[49] The discoveries made after Thayer completed and printed his first volume in German (1866), largely inspired by his labors, have made a thorough revision of this chapter imperative. In all that follows the editor has accepted the statement of facts made by Dr. Deiters in his revised version of the first volume published in 1901, but, in pursuance of his plan as set forth in the introduction, has omitted that which seemed to him more or less inconsequential, as well as that which belongs in the field of analysis and criticism.

[50] There have been a few performances of this cantata in Austria and Germany since its publication. It was given at a concert of the Beethoven Association in New York on March 16, 1920, under the direction of Mr. Sam Franko, with an English paraphrase of

the text by the Editor of this biography, designed to rid it of its local application and some of its bombast and make its sentiment applicable to any heroic emancipator.

[51] See Vol. II, p. 210, of the first German edition of this work. Ries says, on page 124 of the “Notizen,” apropos of the posthumous manuscripts: “All such trifles and things which he never meant to publish, as not considering them worthy of his name, were secretly brought into the world by his brothers. Such were the songs published when he had attained the highest degree of fame, composed years before at Bonn, previous to his departure for Vienna; and in like manner other trifles, written for albums, etc., were secretly taken from him and published.”

[52] The subject of the German Song was used by Beethoven later in a sonata.

[53] The Trio in E-flat was not published until 1797. It is therefore obvious that the music which Abbé Dobbeler carried with him to England must have been a manuscript copy. Dr. Deiters, accepting without attempt at contradiction Thayer’s proof of its origin at a period not later than 1792, nevertheless puts forth the conjecture that the work may have been revised and reconstructed at a later date in Vienna, as was the case with other compositions. It is not to be supposed, he urges, that Beethoven, enjoying the celebrity that he did in 1797, would have published then with an opus number a production of his youth without first subjecting it to a thorough revision. Moreover, his earlier chamber compositions were in three movements, the minuet having been added for the first time in the Octet. It was scarcely conceivable that he should have simultaneously conceived a work in six movements unless he had had a Mozart model in his mind. But why not? We have seen from the story of the music admired at the court of Vienna from which the Elector came that the serenade form was in favor there. The Sonata for Pianoforte and Violoncello which Artaria announced in May, 1807, is an arrangement of this Trio, but it was not made by Beethoven.

[54] Josef Hellmesberger, of Vienna, completed the movement, utilizing the existing _motivi_, and the piece was published by Friedrich Schreiber.

[55] Dr. Deiters points out as characteristics of this Trio which indicate that it was not written by Beethoven at the age of 15, but long after the pianoforte quartets, the freedom in invention and development, the large dimensions of the free fantasia portion, its almost imperceptible return to the principal theme, and the introduction of a coda in the first movement. _Motivi_ from this movement recur in later works, for instance, the Sonata in F minor, Op. 2, and the Pianoforte Concerto in C major. Beethoven seems to have used the designation “Scherzo” in it for the first time.

[56] The combination of instruments in this piece led Dr. Deiters to conjecture that it may have been composed for the family von Westerhold. Count von Westerhold played the bassoon, his son the flute, and his daughter the pianoforte.

[57] Dr. Deiters points out that Thayer, in transcribing the themes of this Trio, overlooked a _Largo_, which made the movements number four instead of three as given in the Chronological Catalogue. The existence of four movements added to the doubtful authenticity in the eyes of the German editor.

[58] This letter will appear later. The Variations are published in Series 12, No. 103, of the Complete Edition. In a catalogue of Breitkopf and Härtel of 1793, they are designated Op. 1; also in a catalogue in 1794 of Geyl and Hedler’s. It is plain from a passage in the letter to Eleonore von Breuning (“I never would have written it in this way,” etc.) that the Coda did not receive its definitive form until just before publication. Thayer was of the opinion when he wrote Vol. I of this work, that it had been appended in Vienna.

[59] It was published in 1805 by the Kunst- und Industriecomptoir of Vienna. Complete Works, Series 18, No. 195; _cf._ Nottebohm’s “Beethoven’s Studien,” p. 6.

[60] In the Fall of 1919, announcement was made by the newspapers that French investigators had discovered in the British Museum four thitherto unknown Beethoven autographs amongst manuscripts purchased by Julian Marshall. The editor of the second edition of Köchel’s “Thematic Catalogue of Mozart’s Works” had seen the manuscripts and included two of them as authentic Mozart compositions and two as probably such in the supplement to that work. They were a Trio in D, for pianoforte, violin and violoncello (two pages of the first _Allegro_ missing, listed as K, No. 52a); three pieces for pianoforte, four hands, a _Gavotte_ in F, an _Allegro_ in B-flat, and a _Marcia lugubre_ in C minor (six measures), No. 71a; a _Rondo_ in B-flat, to which the editor assigned the year 1786, No. 511a; and a _Menuet_ in C, for orchestra, the first of a set composed by Beethoven in 1795, which M. Chantavoine published in 1903 under the title “Douze Menuets inédits pour Orchestre. L. van Beethoven. Œuvres posthumes. Au Ménestrel.” Theodore Wyzewa and Georges de St. Foix made a study of the manuscripts and discussed them in “Le Guide Musical” of December, 1919, January and February, 1920. They were then set down as “pseudo-Mozarts.” M. Charles Malherbe

declared that none of the compositions was in Mozart's hand, and M. de St. Foix, after further consideration of the internal evidence, declared them all to be indubitably by Beethoven and gave his reasons in an essay published in "The Musical Quarterly" (New York and Boston, G. Schirmer) of April, 1920. He told the history of the manuscripts as follows: "They had been presented by the Emperor of Austria to the Sultan Abdul Aziz. The latter, who probably cared very little for these relics of the 18th century, presented them in turn to his musical director, Guatelli Pasha. An English collector, Julian Marshall, purchased them from the Pasha's son, W. Guatelli Bey, and when, later on, the British Museum acquired the Marshall Collection these manuscripts went over into its possession."

The _Gavotte_ was played at a concert of the Beethoven Association in New York in January, 1920, by Madame Samaroff and Harold Bauer, being inserted as a movement in the Sonata in A major for four hands, Op. 6. Mr. Bauer also made an arrangement for two hands which has been published by G. Schirmer.

[61] The discoveries which have been made since Thayer wrote his first volume have very effectually disproved the old belief touching the sterility of the Bonn period. The inquiry which might still be pursued now is whether or not other compositions which have been attributed to a later period may not also have been composed, or at least projected and sketched, in Bonn. The point of view has changed, but what Thayer wrote over half a century ago is still so largely pertinent that it is here given in the body of the text with only such modifications as were necessary to bring it into harmony with the rest of the chapter.

[62] Thayer proceeds from this point to give the reasons for his belief that the Trios Op. 1 and 3 were written in Bonn. The origin of Op. 1 will be discussed hereafter; that of the latter has just been made clear by the story of Mrs. Bowater and Abbé Dobbeler.

Chapter XI

Beethoven in Vienna--Personal Details--Death of His Father--Minor Expenditures and Receipts--Studies with Albrechtsberger and Salieri.

BEETHOVEN SETTLES DOWN IN VIENNA

It would be pleasant to announce the arrival of Ludwig van Beethoven in Vienna with, so to speak, a grand flourish of trumpets, and to indulge the fancy in a highly-colored and poetic account of his advent there; but, unluckily, there is none of that lack of data which is favorable to that kind of composition; none of that obscurity which exalts one to write history as he would have it and not as it really was. The facts are too patent. Like the multitude of studious youths and young men who came thither annually to find schools and teachers, this small, thin, dark-complexioned, pockmarked, dark-eyed, bewigged young musician of 22 years had quietly journeyed to the capital to pursue the study of his art with a small, thin, dark-complexioned, pockmarked, black-eyed and bewigged veteran composer. In the well-known anecdote related by Carpani of Haydn's introduction to him, Anton Esterhazy, the prince, is made to call the composer "a Moor." Beethoven had even more of the Moor in his looks than his master. His front teeth, owing to the singular flatness of the roof of his mouth, protruded, and, of course, thrust out his lips; the nose, too, was rather broad and decidedly flattened, while the forehead was remarkably full and round--in the words of the late Court Secretary, Mähler, who twice painted his portrait, a "bullet."

"Beethoven," wrote Junker, "confessed that in his journeys he had seldom found in the playing of the most distinguished virtuosos that excellence which he supposed he had a right to expect." He now had an opportunity to make his observations upon the pianists and composers at the very headquarters, then, of German music, to improve himself by study under the best of them and, by and by, to measure his strength with theirs. He found very soon that the words of the poet were here also applicable:

"'Tis distance lends enchantment to the view," and did not find--now Mozart was gone--"what he supposed he had a right to expect." For the present, however, we have to do but with the young stranger in a large city, seeking lodgings, and making such arrangements for the future as shall not be out of due proportion to the limited pecuniary means at his command. If the minute details which here follow should seem to be too insignificant in themselves, the bearing they have upon some other future questions must justify their introduction.

Turning again to the memorandum book, the first entries which follow the notes of the journey from Bonn to Würges are merely of necessities to be supplied--"wood, wig-maker, coffee, overcoat, boots, shoes, pianoforte-desk, seal, writing-desk, pianoforte-money" and something illegible followed by the remark: "All beginning with next month." The next page gives a hint as to the day of his arrival. It contains the substance of two advertisements in the "Wiener Zeitung" of pianofortes for sale, one near the

Hohen Markt and two “im Kramerschen Breihaus No. 257 im Schlossergassel, am Graben.” The latter appears _for the last time_ on the 10th of November; Beethoven was, therefore, then in Vienna.

But he intends to cultivate the Graces as well as the Muses. The next page begins with this: “Andreas Lindner, dancing-master, lives in the Stoss am Himmel, No. 415,” to which succeeds a note, evidently of money received from the Elector, possibly in Bonn but more likely in Vienna: “25 ducats received of which, expended on November (?) half a sovereign for the pianoforte, or 6 florins, 40 kreutzer--2 florins were of my own money.” The same page also shows him in the matter of his toilet preparing even then for entrance into society: “Black silk stockings, 1 ducat; 1 pair of winter silk stockings, 1 florin, 40 kreutzers; boots, 6 florins; shoes, 1 florin, 30 kreutzers.” But these expenses in addition to his daily necessities are making a large inroad upon his “25 ducats received”; and on page 7 we read: “On Wednesday the 12th of December, I had 15 ducats.” (The 12th of December fell upon Wednesday in the year 1792.) Omitting for the present what else stands upon page 7, here are the interesting contents of page 8--and how suggestive and pregnant they are: “In Bonn I counted on receiving 100 ducats here; but in vain. I have got to equip myself completely anew.”

Several pages which follow contain what, upon inspection, proves evidently to be his monthly payments from the time when “all was to begin next month,” of which the first may be given as a specimen: “House-rent, 14 florins; pianoforte, 6 florins, 49 kreutzers; eating, each time 12 kreutzers; meals with wine 6 and one-half florins; 3 kreutzers for B. and H.; it is not necessary to give the housekeeper more than 7 florins, the rooms are so close to the ground.”[63]

DEATH OF JOHANN VAN BEETHOVEN

Beethoven was hardly well settled in his lodgings, the novelty of his position had scarcely begun to wear off under the effect of habit, when startling tidings reached him from Bonn of an event to cloud his Christmas holidays, to weaken his ties to his native place, to increase his cares for his brothers and make an important change in his pecuniary condition. His father had suddenly died--“1792, Dec. 18, _obiit_ Johannes Beethoff,” says the death-roll of St. Remigius parish. The Elector-Archbishop, still in Münster, heard this news also and consecrated a joke to the dead man’s memory. On the 1st of January, 1793, he wrote a letter to Court Marshal von Schall in which these words occur:

The revenues from the liquor excise have suffered a loss in the deaths of Beethoven and Eichhoff. For the widow of the latter, provision will be made if circumstances allow in view of his 40 years of service--in the electoral kitchen.

Franz Ries was again to befriend Beethoven and act for him in his absence, and the receipt for his first quarter’s salary (25 th.) is signed “F. Ries, in the name of Ludwig Beethoven,” at the usual time, namely the beginning of the second month of the quarter, February 4. But the lapse of Johann van Beethoven’s pension of 200 thalers, was a serious misfortune to his son, particularly since the 100 ducats were not forthcoming. The correspondence between Beethoven and Ries not being preserved it can only be conjectured that the latter took the proper steps to obtain that portion of the pension set apart by the electoral decree for the support of the two younger sons; but in vain, owing to the disappearance of the original document; and that, receiving information of this fact, Beethoven immediately sent from Vienna the petition which follows, but which, as is mostly the case with that class of papers in the Bonn archives, is without date:

Several years ago Your Serene Electoral Highness was graciously pleased to retire my father, the tenor singer van Beethoven, from service, and to set aside 100 thalers of his salary to me that I might clothe, nourish and educate my two younger brothers and also pay the debts of my father.

I was about to present this decree to Your Highness’s Revenue Exchequer when my father urgently begged me not to do so inasmuch as it would have the appearance in the eyes of the public as if he were incapable of caring for his family, adding that he would himself pay me the 25 thalers quarterly, which he always did.

When, however, on the death of my father (in December of last year) I wished to make use of Your Highness’s grace by presenting the above-mentioned gracious decree I learned to my terror, that my father had misapplied (_unterschlagen_ = to embezzle) the same.

In most obedient veneration I therefore pray Your Electoral Highness for the gracious renewal of this decree and that Your Highness’s Revenue Exchequer be directed to pay over to me the sum graciously allowed to me due for the last quarter at the beginning of last February.

Your Electoral and Serene Highness's Most obedient and faithful Lud. v. Beethoven; Court Organist.

The petition was duly considered by the Privy Council and with the result indicated by the endorsement:

ad sup. of the Court Organist L. van Beethoven

... "The 100 reichsthaler which he is now receiving annually is increased by a further 100 reichsthaler in quarterly payments beginning with January 1st, from the 200 rth. salary vacated by the death of his father; he is further to receive the three measures of grain graciously bestowed upon him for the education of his brothers." The Electoral Court Chancellory will make the necessary provisions. Attest p.

The order to the exchequer followed on May 24th, and on June 15th, Franz Ries had the satisfaction of signing receipts--one for 25 thalers for January, February and March, and one for 50 thalers for the second quarter of the year; but from this time onward no hint has yet been discovered that Beethoven ever received anything from the Elector or had any resources but his own earnings and the generosity of newly-found friends in Vienna. These resources were soon needed. The remark that two florins of the payment towards the pianoforte were out of his own money proves that he possessed a small sum saved up by degrees from lesson-giving, from presents received and the like; but it could not have been a large amount, while the 25 ducats and the above recorded receipts of salary were all too small to have carried him through the summer of 1793. Here is the second of his monthly records of necessary and regular expenses in farther proof of this: "14 florins house-rent; 6 fl. 40 x, pianoforte; meals with wine, 15 fl. and a half;--(?), 3 florins; maid, 1," the sum total being as added by himself "11 ducats and one-half florin." And yet at the end of the year there are entries that show that he was not distressed for money. For instance: "the 24th October, i.e., reckoning from November 1st, 112 florins and 30 kreutzer"; "2 ducats for a seal; 1 florin, 25 kreutzers, copyist"; "Tuesday and Saturday from 7 to 8. Sunday from 11 to 12, 3 florins"; and the final entry not later in date than 1794 is: "3 carolins in gold, 4 carolins in crown thalers and 4 ducats make 7 carolins and 4 ducats and a lot of small change."

In what manner Beethoven was already in 1794 able to remain "in Vienna without salary until recalled," to quote the Elector's words, will hereafter appear with some degree of certainty; but just now he claims attention as pupil of Haydn and Albrechtsberger. The citations made in a previous chapter from the letters of Neefe and Fischenich prove how strong an impression Beethoven's powers, both as virtuoso and composer, had made upon Joseph Haydn immediately after his reaching Vienna; and no man then living was better able to judge on such points. But whether the famous chapelmaster, just returned from his English triumphs, himself a daring and successful innovator and now very busy with compositions in preparation for his second visit to London, was the man to guide the studies of a headstrong, self-willed and still more daring musical revolutionist was, _a priori_, a very doubtful question. The result proved that he was not.

BEETHOVEN'S STUDIES WITH HAYDN

The memorandum book has a few entries which relate to Haydn. On page 7, that which contains the 15 ducats on the 12th of October, 1792, there is a column of numerals, the first of which reads, "Haidn 8 groschen"; the other twelve, except a single "1," all "2"; and on the two pages which happen to have the dates of October 24 and 29, 1793, are these two entries: "22 x, chocolate for Haidn and me"; "Coffee, 6 x for Haidn and me." These notes simply confirm what was known from other sources, namely, that Beethoven began to study with Haydn very soon after reaching Vienna and continued to be his pupil until the end of the year 1793.[64] They indicate, also, that the scholar, whatever feelings he may have indulged towards the master in secret, kept on good terms with him, and that their private intercourse was not confined to the hours devoted to lessons in Haydn's room in the Hamberger house, No. 992 on the (no longer existing) Wasserkunstbastei.

Concerning the course of study during that year, nothing can be added to the words of Nottebohm ("Allg. Mus. Zeitung," 1863-1864), founded upon a most thorough examination of all the known manuscripts and authorities which bear upon this question. Of the manuscripts Nottebohm says: "They are exercises in simple counterpoint on six plain chants in the old modes.... He must have written more." But what? On this point there are no indications to be found. It may be accepted with considerable certainty that the contrapuntal exercises were preceded by an introductory, though probably brief, study of the nature of consonances and dissonances. For this the last chapter of the first book of Fux's "Gradus ad Parnassum" might have served.

But this (adds Nottebohm) would not have sufficed to fill the entire period. In view of Haydn's predilection for Fux's system it is not conceivable that there were preliminary exercises, say in the free style or in the modern keys; there remains, therefore, no alternative but to go back further and opine that the study with Haydn began with the theory of harmony and exercises in which the

system of Philipp Emanuel Bach might have been used.

“It is certain,” says Schindler, “that Beethoven’s knowledge of the science of harmony at the time when he began his study with Haydn did not go beyond thoroughbass.” The correctness of this opinion of Schindler may be safely left to the judgment of the reader. The fact seems to be that Beethoven, conscious of the disadvantages attending the want of thorough systematic instruction, distrustful of himself and desirous of bringing to the test many of his novel and cherished ideas, had determined to accomplish a complete course of contrapuntal study, and thus renew, revise and reduce to order and system the great mass of his previous scientific acquirements. He would, at all events, thoroughly know and understand the _regular_ that he might with confidence judge for himself how far to indulge in the _irregular_. To this view, long since adopted, the results of Nottebohm’s researches add credibility. It explains, also, how a young man, too confident in the soundness of his views to be willing to alter his productions because they contained passages and effects censured by those about him for being other than those of Mozart and Haydn, was yet willing, with the modesty of true genius, to shut them up in his writing-desk until, through study and observation, he could feel himself standing upon the firm basis of sound knowledge and then retain or exclude, according to the dictates of an enlightened judgment.

Beethoven, however, very soon discovered that also in Haydn, as a teacher, he had “not found that excellence which he supposed he had a right to expect.” Ries remembered a remark made by him on this point: “Haydn had wished that Beethoven might put the word, ‘Pupil of Haydn,’ on the title of his first works. Beethoven was unwilling to do so because, as he said, though he had had some instruction from Haydn he had never learned anything from him.” Still more in point is the oft-repeated story of Johann Schenk’s kindness to Beethoven, related by Seyfried in Gräfer’s and Schilling’s lexica and confirmed by Schindler, which, when divested of its errors in dates, may be related thus: Among Beethoven’s earliest acquaintances in Vienna was the Abbé Joseph Gelinek, one of the first virtuosos then in that city and an amazingly fruitful and popular composer of variations. It was upon him that Carl Maria von Weber, some years afterwards, wrote the epigram:

Kein Thema auf der Welt verschonte dein Genie, Das simpelste allein--Dich selbst--variirst du nie!

“No theme on earth escaped your genius airy,-- The simplest one of all--yourself--you never vary.”

Czerny told Otto Jahn that his father once met Gelinek tricked out in all his finery. “Whither?” he inquired. “I am asked to measure myself with a young pianist who is just arrived; I’ll use him up.” A few days later he met him again. “Well, how was it?” “Ah, he is no man; he’s a devil. He will play me and all of us to death. And how he improvises!” According to Czerny, Gelinek remained a sworn enemy to Beethoven.

It was in Gelinek’s lodgings that Schenk heard Beethoven improvise for the first time,

a treat which recalled lively recollections of Mozart. With many manifestations of displeasure, Beethoven, always eager to learn, complained to Gelinek that he was never able to make any progress in his contrapuntal studies under Haydn, since the master, too variously occupied, was unable to pay the amount of attention which he wanted to the exercises he had given him to work out. Gelinek spoke on the subject with Schenk and asked him if he did not feel disposed to give Beethoven a course in composition. Schenk declared himself willing, with ready courtesy, but only under two conditions: that it should be without compensation of any kind and under the strict seal of secrecy. The mutual agreement was made and kept with conscientious fidelity.

Thus far Seyfried; we shall now permit Schenk to tell his own story:[65]

In 1792, His Royal Highness Archduke Maximilian, Elector of Cologne, was pleased to send his charge Louis van Beethoven to Vienna to study musical composition with Haydn. Towards the end of July, Abbé Gelinek informed me that he had made the acquaintance of a young man who displayed extraordinary virtuosity on the pianoforte, such, indeed, as he had not observed since Mozart. In passing he said that Beethoven had been studying counterpoint with Haydn for more than six months and was still at work on the first exercise; also that His Excellency Baron van Swieten had earnestly recommended the study of counterpoint and frequently inquired of him how far he had advanced in his studies. As a result of these frequent incitations and the fact that he was still in the first stages of his instruction, Beethoven, eager to learn, became discontented and often gave expression to his dissatisfaction to his friend. Gelinek took the matter much to heart and came to me with the question whether I felt disposed to assist his friend in the study of counterpoint. I now desired to become better acquainted with Beethoven as soon as possible, and a day was fixed for me to meet him in Gelinek’s lodgings and hear him play on the pianoforte.

BEETHOVEN’S IMPROVISATIONS

Thus I saw the composer, now so famous, for the first time and heard him play. After the customary courtesies he offered to improvise on the pianoforte. He asked me to sit beside him. Having struck a few chords and tossed off a few figures as if they were of no significance, the creative genius gradually unveiled his profound psychological pictures. My ear was continually charmed by the beauty of the many and varied motives which he wove with wonderful clarity and loveliness into each other, and I surrendered my heart to the impressions made upon it while he gave himself wholly up to his creative imagination, and anon, leaving the field of mere tonal charm, boldly stormed the most distant keys in order to give expression to violent passions....

The first thing that I did the next day was to visit the still unknown artist who had so brilliantly disclosed his mastership. On his writing desk I found a few passages from his first lesson in counterpoint. A cursory glance disclosed the fact that, brief as it was, there were mistakes in every key. Gelinek's utterances were thus verified. Feeling sure that my pupil was unfamiliar with the preliminary rules of counterpoint, I gave him the familiar textbook of Joseph Fux, "Gradus ad Parnassum," and asked him to look at the exercises that followed. Joseph Haydn, who had returned to Vienna towards the end of the preceding year,[66] was intent on utilizing his muse in the composition of large masterworks, and thus laudably occupied could not well devote himself to the rules of grammar. I was now eagerly desirous to become the helper of the zealous student. But before beginning the instruction I made him understand that our coöperation would have to be kept secret. In view of this I recommended that he copy every exercise which I corrected in order that Haydn should not recognize the handwriting of a stranger when the exercise was submitted to him. After a year, Beethoven and Gelinek had a falling out for a reason that has escaped me; both, it seemed to me, were at fault. As a result Gelinek got angry and betrayed my secret. Beethoven and his brothers made no secret of it longer.

I began my honorable office with my good Louis in the beginning of August, 1792,[67] and filled it uninterruptedly until May, 1793,[67] by which time he finished double counterpoint in the octave and went to Eisenstadt. If His Royal Highness had sent his charge at once to Albrechtsberger his studies would never have been interrupted and he would have completed them.

Here follows a passage, afterward stricken out by Schenk, in which he resents the statement that Beethoven had finished his studies with Albrechtsberger. This would have been advisable, but if it were true, Gelinek as well as Beethoven would have told him of the fact. "On the contrary, he admitted to me that he had gone to Herr Salieri, Royal Imperial Chapelmaster, for lessons in the free style of composition." Then Schenk continues:

About the middle of May he told me that he would soon go with Haydn to Eisenstadt and stay there till the beginning of winter; he did not yet know the date of his departure. I went to him at the usual hour in the beginning of June but my good Louis was no longer to be seen. He left for me the following little billet which I copy word for word:

"Dear Schenk!

It was not my desire to set off to-day for Eisenstadt. I should like to have spoken with you again. Meanwhile rest assured of my gratitude for the favors shown me. I shall endeavor with all my might to requite them. I hope soon to see you again, and once more to enjoy the pleasure of your society. Farewell and

do not entirely forget your Beethoven."

It was my intention only briefly to touch upon my relations with Beethoven; but the circumstances under which, and the manner in which I became his guide in musical composition constrained me to be somewhat more explicit. For my efforts (if they can be called efforts) I was rewarded by my good Louis with a precious gift, viz.: a firm bond of friendship which lasted without fading till the day of his death.

Written in the summer of 1830.

A chronological difficulty is presented by Schenk's story of the cessation of the instruction. There can be no doubt that it began towards the beginning of August, 1793, as confirmed by the distinct utterance of Schenk (who errs in the year, however), particularly by the statement that the study with Haydn had already endured six months. Schenk's instruction is said to have lasted till the end of May, 1794, and the definitive mention of the month makes an error improbable. But at this time Haydn was already long in England, while Schenk's narrative represents Beethoven as saying that he intended going to Eisenstadt with Haydn; moreover, Beethoven was already Albrechtsberger's pupil and as such was no longer in need of secret help. Nevertheless, the continuance of the relations with Schenk is easily possible and they were not likely to be interrupted so long as Beethoven remained in Vienna; this is indicated by the reference to double counterpoint, which Beethoven did not study under Haydn but with Albrechtsberger; also Schenk's intimation that if the Elector had sent his charge "at once" to Albrechtsberger shows that instruction

with the latter had already begun. The letter to Schenk, though cast in friendly terms, can nevertheless be interpreted as a declination of further services, a breaking off of the relationship between teacher and pupil, for which the journey to Eisenstadt was a welcome excuse. But we learn only from Schenk that Beethoven was to make the journey with Haydn, and he may have been mistaken in this as he was in the year. It is very conceivable that Beethoven had received an invitation to visit him from Prince Esterhazy, who must surely have got acquainted with him in Vienna. He who is unwilling to accept this, must place the letter and the journey in the last months of 1793, which is in every respect improbable.

BEETHOVEN'S RELATIONS WITH HAYDN

The relations between Haydn and his pupil did not long continue truly cordial; yet Beethoven concealed his dissatisfaction and no break occurred. Thoughtless and reckless of consequences, as he often in later years unfortunately exhibited himself when indulging his wilfulness, he was at this time responsible to the Elector for his conduct, and Haydn, moreover, was too valuable and influential a friend to be wantonly alienated. So, whatever feelings he cherished in secret, he kept them to himself, went regularly to his lessons and, as noted above, occasionally treated his master to chocolate or coffee. It was, of course, Haydn who took the young man to Eisenstadt, and, as Neefe tells us, he wished to take him to England. Why was that plan not carried out? Did Maximilian forbid it? Would Beethoven's pride not allow him to go thither as Haydn's pupil? Did zeal for his contrapuntal studies prevent it? Or had his relations to the Austrian nobility already become such as offered him higher hopes of success in Vienna than Haydn could propose in London? Or, finally, was it his ambition rather to make himself known as Beethoven the composer than as Beethoven the pianoforte virtuoso? Pecuniary reasons are insufficient to account for the failure of the plan; for Haydn, who now knew the London public, could easily have removed all difficulty on that score. Neefe's letter was written near the end of September, 1793, when already "a number of reports" had reached Bonn "that Beethoven had made great progress in his art." These "reports," we know from Fischenich, came in part from Haydn himself. Add to that the wish to take his pupil with him to England--which was certainly the highest compliment he could possibly have paid him--and the utter groundlessness of Beethoven's suspicions that Haydn "was not well-minded towards him," as Ries says in his "Notizen" (page 85), is apparent. Yet these suspicions, added to the reasons above suggested, sufficiently explain the departure of the master for London without the company of his pupil, who now (January, 1794) was transferred to Albrechtsberger.

In the pretty extensive notes copied from the memorandum book already so much cited, there are but two which can with any degree of certainty be referred to a date later than 1793. One of them is this:

Schuppanzigh, 3 times a W. (Week?) Albrechtsberger, 3 times a W. (Week?)

The necessary inference from this is that Beethoven began the year 1794 with three lessons a week in violin-playing from Schuppanzigh (unless the youth of the latter should forbid such an inference) and three in counterpoint from the most famous teacher of that science. Seyfried affirms that the studies with the latter continued "two complete years with tireless persistency." The coming narrative will show that other things took up much of Beethoven's attention in 1795, and that before the close of that year, if not already at its beginning, his course with Albrechtsberger ended.[68]

STUDIES WITH ALBRECHTSBERGER

The instruction which Beethoven received from Albrechtsberger (and which was based chiefly on the master's "Anweisung zur Komposition") began again with simple counterpoint, in which Beethoven now received more detailed directions than had been given by Haydn. Albrechtsberger wrote down rules for him, Beethoven did the same and worked out a large number of exercises on two plain-song melodies which Albrechtsberger then corrected according to the rules of strict writing. There followed contrapuntal exercises in free writing, in imitation, in two-, three- and four-part fugue, choral fugue, double counterpoint in the different intervals, double fugue, triple counterpoint and canon. The last was short, as here the instruction ceased. Beethoven worked frequently in the immediate presence and with the direct coöperation of Albrechtsberger. The latter labored with obvious conscientiousness and care, and was ever ready to aid his pupil. If he appears at times to have been given over to minute detail and conventional method, it must be borne in mind that rigid schooling in fixed rules is essential to the development of an independent artist, even if he makes no use of them, and that it is only in this manner that freedom in workmanship can be achieved. Of this the youthful Beethoven was aware and every line of his exercises bears witness that he entered into his studies with complete interest and undivided zeal.[69] This was particularly the case in his exercises in counterpoint and imitation, where he strove to avoid errors, and their beneficial results are plainly noticeable in his compositions. Several of the compositions written after the lessons, disclose how "he was led from a predominantly figurative to a more contrapuntal manner of writing." There is less of this observable in the case of fugue, in

which the instruction itself was not free from deficiencies; and the pupil worked more carelessly. The restrictive rules occasionally put him out of conceit with his work; “he was at the age in which, as a rule, suggestion and incitation are preferred to instruction,” and his stubborn nature played an important rôle in the premises. However, it ought to be added that he was also at an age when his genial aptness in invention and construction had already found exercise in other directions. Even though he did not receive thorough education in fugue from Albrechtsberger, he nevertheless learned the constituent elements of the form and how to apply them. Moreover, in his later years he made all these things the subjects of earnest and devoted study independent of others; and in the compositions of his later years he returned with special and manifest predilection to the fugued style. Nothing could be more incorrect than to emphasize Beethoven’s lack of theoretical education. If, while studying with Albrechtsberger, but more particularly in his independent compositions, Beethoven ignored many of the strict rules, it was not because he was not able to apply them, but because he purposely set them aside. Places can be found in his exercises in which the rules are violated; but the testimony of the ear acquits the pupil. Rules are not the objects of themselves, they do not exist for their own sake, and in despite of all artistic systems; it is the reserved privilege of the evolution of art-means and prescient, forward genius to point out what in them is of permanent value, and what must be looked upon as antiquated. Nature designed that Beethoven should employ music in the depiction of soul-states, to emancipate melody and express his impulses in the free forms developed by Ph. Em. Bach, Mozart, Haydn and their contemporaries. In this direction he had already disclosed himself as a doughty warrior before the instruction in Vienna had its beginning, and it is very explicable that to be hemmed in by rigid rules was frequently disagreeable to him. He gradually wearied of “creating musical skeletons.” But all the more worthy of recognition, yea, of admiration, is the fact that the young composer who had already mounted so high, should by abnegation of his creative powers surrender himself to the tyranny of the rules and find satisfaction in conscientious practice of them.

Nottebohm summed up his conclusions from the investigations which he made of Beethoven’s posthumous papers thus: prefacing that, after 1785, Beethoven more and more made the manner of Mozart his own, he continues:

WHAT BEETHOVEN LEARNED

The instruction which he received from Haydn and Albrechtsberger enriched him with new forms and media of expression and these effected a change in his mode of writing. The voices acquired greater melodic flow and independence. A certain opacity took the place of the former transparency in the musical fabric. Out of a homophonic polyphony of two or more voices, there grew a polyphony that was real. The earlier obbligato accompaniment gave way to an obbligato style of writing which rested to a greater extent on counterpoint. Beethoven has accepted the principle of polyphony; his part-writing has become purer and it is noteworthy that the compositions written immediately after the lessons are among the purest that Beethoven ever composed. True, the Mozart model still shines through the fabric, but we seek it less in the art of figuration than in the form and other things which are only indirectly associated with the obbligato style. Similarly, we can speak of other influences--that of Joseph Haydn, for instance. This influence is not contrapuntal. Beethoven built upon his acquired and inherited possessions. He assimilated the traditional forms and means of expression, gradually eliminated foreign influences and, following the pressure of his subjective nature with its inclination towards the ideal, he created his own individual style.

As is known, Seyfried in his book entitled “Ludwig van Beethoven’s Studien im Generalbasse,” which appeared in 1832, gathered together all that was to be found in the way of exercises, excerpts from textbooks, etc., in Beethoven’s posthumous papers and presented them in so confused and arbitrary a manner that only the keenness and patience of a Nottebohm could point the way through the maze; Seyfried would have us believe that the entire contents of his book belonged to the studies under Albrechtsberger.

It will require no waste of words, says Nottebohm (p. 198), to prove the incompatibility of such a claim with the results of our investigations. As a matter of fact, only the smallest portion of the “Studies” can be traced back to the instruction which Beethoven received from Albrechtsberger. The greater part had nothing to do with this instruction and, aside from the changes made, belongs to the other labors. In the smaller portion Seyfried made things as easy for himself as possible. Of Beethoven’s exercises he took only such as he found cleanly copied or legibly written, and omitted those which were difficult to decipher because of many corrections. This is the explanation of the fact that Seyfried did not include a single exercise in strict simple counterpoint. If all the passages bearing on the course followed under Albrechtsberger were brought together and all the errors made in the presentation overlooked, we should still have but a fragmentary and faulty reflection of that study. Neither need we enter upon a discussion of the marginal notes attributed to Beethoven which so plentifully besprinkle Seyfried’s book. The fact is that in all the manuscripts which belong to the studies under Albrechtsberger not one of the “sarcastically thrown out” marginal notes is to be found. The glosses which do appear as Beethoven’s ... are of a wholly different character from those printed by Seyfried. They show that

Beethoven was deeply immersed and interested in the matter. It would, indeed, be inexplicable what could have persuaded Beethoven to continue study with a teacher with whom, as Seyfried would have us believe, he was in conflict already at the beginning of simple counterpoint. He had it in his power to discontinue his studies at any moment.

A doubt has been hinted above whether Beethoven's studies under Albrechtsberger were continued beyond the beginning of the year 1795. If all these exercises in counterpoint, fugue and canon, and all those excerpts from Fux, C. P. E. Bach, Türk, Albrechtsberger, and Kirnberger, which Seyfried made the basis of his "Studien"--and mingled in a confusion inextricable by any one possessing less learning, patience, sagacity and perseverance than Nottebohm--had already belonged to the period of his pupilage, their quantity alone, taken in connection with the writer's other occupations, would indeed preclude such a doubt; but knowing that perhaps the greater portion of those manuscripts belongs to a period many years later, and considering the great facility in writing which Beethoven had already acquired before coming to Vienna, there seems to be no indication of any course of study which might not easily be completed during the one year with Haydn (and Schenk) and one year with Albrechtsberger. Schönfeld, in the "Jahrbuch der Tonkunst für Wien und Prag," supposes that Beethoven was still the pupil of the latter at the time when he wrote, which was in the spring of 1795. His words are: "An eloquent proof of his [Beethoven's] real love of art is the circumstance that he has placed himself in the hands of our immortal Haydn, in order to be initiated into the sacred mysteries of composition. This great master has, in his absence, turned him over to our great Albrechtsberger." There is nothing decisive in this; and yet it is all that appears to confirm the "two years" of Seyfried; while on the other hand Wegeler, who, during all the year 1795, was much with Beethoven, has nowhere in his "Notizen" any allusion whatever to his friend as being still a student under a master.

Referring to the number of pages (160) of exercises and the three lessons a week, Nottebohm calculates the period of instruction to have been about fifteen months. Inasmuch as among the exercises in double counterpoint in the tenth there is found a sketch belonging to the second movement of the Trio, Op. 1, No. 2, which Trio was advertised as finished on May 9th, 1795, it follows that the study was at or near its end at that date. The conclusion of his instruction from Albrechtsberger may therefore be set down at between March and May, 1795.

INSTRUCTION FROM SALIERI

The third of Beethoven's teachers in Vienna was the Imperial Chapelmaster Anton Salieri; but this instruction was neither systematic nor confined to regular hours. Beethoven took advantage of Salieri's willingness "to give gratuitous instruction to musicians of small means." He wanted advice in vocal composition, and submitted to Salieri some settings of Italian songs which the latter corrected in respect of verbal accent and expression, rhythm, metrical articulation, subdivision of thought, mood, singableness, and the conduct of the melody which comprehended all these things. Having himself taken the initiative in this, Beethoven devoted himself earnestly and industriously to these exercises, and they were notably profitable in his creative work. "Thereafter [also in his German songs] he treated the text with much greater care than before in respect of its prosodic structure, as also of its contents and the prescribed situation," and acquired a good method of declamation. That Salieri's influence extended beyond the period in which Beethoven's style developed itself independently cannot be asserted, since many other and varied influences made themselves felt later.

This instruction began soon after Beethoven's arrival in Vienna and lasted in an unconstrained manner at least until 1802; at even a later date he asked counsel of Salieri in the composition of songs, particularly Italian songs. According to an anecdote related by Czerny, at one of these meetings for instruction Salieri found fault with a melody as not being appropriate to the air. The next day he said to Beethoven: "I can't get your melody out of my head." "Then, Herr von Salieri," replied Beethoven, "it cannot have been so utterly bad." The story may be placed in the early period; but it appears from a statement by Moscheles that Beethoven still maintained an association with Salieri in 1809. Moscheles, who was in Vienna at this time, found a note on Salieri's table which read: "The pupil Beethoven was here!"

Ries, speaking of the relations between Haydn, Albrechtsberger and Salieri as teachers and Beethoven as pupil, says: "I knew them all well; all three valued Beethoven highly, but were also of one mind touching his habits of study. All of them said Beethoven was so headstrong and self-sufficient (_selbstwollend_) that he had to learn much through harsh experience which he had refused to accept when it was presented to him as a subject of study." Particularly Albrechtsberger and Salieri were of this opinion; "the dry rules of the former and the comparatively unimportant ones of the latter concerning dramatic composition (according to the Italian school of the period) could not appeal to Beethoven." It is now known that the "dry rules" of Albrechtsberger could make a strong appeal to Beethoven as appertaining to theoretical study, and that the old method of composition to which he remained true all his life always had a singular charm for him as a subject of study and investigation.

Here, as in many other cases, the simple statement of the difficulties suggests their explanation. Beethoven the pupil may have honestly and conscientiously followed the precepts of his instructors in whatever he wrote in that character; but Beethoven the composer stood upon his own territory, followed his own tastes and impulses, wrote and wrought subject to no other control. He paid Albrechtsberger to teach him counterpoint--not to be the censor and critic of his compositions. And Ries's memory may well have deceived him as to the actual scope of the strictures made by the old master, and have transferred to the pupil what, fully thirty years before, had been spoken of the composer.

As has been mentioned, Beethoven's relations with Salieri at a later date were still pleasant; the composer dedicated to the chapelmaster the three violin sonatas, Op. 12, which appeared in 1799. Nothing is known of a dedication to Albrechtsberger. According to an anecdote related by Albrechtsberger's grandson Hirsch, Beethoven called him a "musical pedant"; yet we may see a remnant of gratitude toward his old teacher in Beethoven's readiness to take an interest in his young grandson.

We have now to turn our attention to Beethoven's relations to Viennese society outside of his study.

FOOTNOTES:

[63] Beethoven's first lodgings were in an attic-room which he soon exchanged for a room on the ground floor of a house No. 45 Alsterstrasse occupied by one Strauss, a printer. The house now on the site is No. 30. Another occupant of the house was Prince Lichnowsky, who soon after took him into his lodgings. He remained in this house until May, 1795.

[64] Or the beginning of 1794, since Haydn left Vienna on January 19, of that year.

[65] The excerpt from Schenk's autobiography which follows was communicated to Thayer by Otto Jahn and included in the appendix to Vol. II of the original edition of this biography. The present editor has followed Dr. Deiters in his presentation of the case in Vol. I of the revised edition.

[66] Haydn, according to Wurzbach, returned to Vienna on July 24, 1792.

[67] Schenk is in error as to both dates. He means, of course, 1793 and 1794.

[68] The investigations of Nottebohm, in "Beethoven's Studien" and "Beethoveniana," have been relied on in the compilation of the story of the study under Albrechtsberger, which takes the place of the original narrative by Thayer.

[69] Once Beethoven writes an unprepared seventh-chord with a suspension on the margin of an exercise and adds the query: "Is it allowed?"

Chapter XII

Music in Vienna in 1793--Theatre, Church and Concert-Room--A Music-Loving Nobility--The Esterhazys, Kinsky, Lichnowsky, von Kees and van Swieten--Composers: Haydn, Kozeluch, Förster and Eberl.

OPERA AND CONCERTS IN VIENNA

The musical drama naturally took the first place in the musical life of Vienna at this period. The enthusiasm of Joseph II for a national German opera, to which the world owed Mozart's exquisite "Entführung," proved to be but short-lived, and the Italian _opera buffa_ resumed its old place in his affections. The new company engaged was, however, equal to the performance of "Don Giovanni" and "Figaro" and Salieri's magnificent "Axur." Leopold II reached Vienna on the evening of March 13, 1790, to assume the crown of his deceased brother, but no change was, for the present, made in the court theatre. Indeed, as late as July 5 he had not entered a theatre, and his first appearance at the opera was at the performance of "Axur," September 21, in the company of his visitor King Ferdinand of Naples; but once firmly settled on the imperial throne, Joseph's numerous reforms successfully annulled, the Turkish war brought to a close and his diverse coronations happily ended, the Emperor gave his thoughts to the theatre. Salieri, though now but forty-one years of age, and rich with the observation and experience of more than twenty years in the direction of the opera, was, according to Mosel, graciously allowed, but according to other and better authorities, compelled, to withdraw from the operatic orchestra and confine himself to his duties as director of the sacred music in the court chapel and to the composition of one operatic work annually, if required. The "Wiener Zeitung" of January 28, 1792, records the appointment of Joseph Weigl, Salieri's pupil and assistant, now twenty-five years old, "as Chapelmaster and Composer to the Royal Imperial National Court Theatre with a salary of 1,000 florins." The title Composer was rather an empty one. Though already favorably known to the public,

he was forbidden to compose new operas for the court stage. To this end famous masters were to be invited to Vienna. A first fruit of this new order of things was the production of Cimarosa's "Il Matrimonio segreto," February 7, 1792, which with good reason so delighted Leopold that he gave the performers a supper and ordered them back into the theatre and heard the opera again _da capo_. It was among the last of the Emperor's theatrical pleasures; he died March 1st, and his wife on the 15th of May following. Thus for the greater part of the time from March 1 to May 24, the court theatres were shut; and yet during the thirteen months ending December 15, 1792, Italian opera had been given 180 times--134 times in the Burg and 46 times in the Kärnthnerthor-Theater--and ballet 163 times; so that, as no change for the present was made, there was abundance in these branches of the art for a young composer, like Beethoven, to hear and see. All accounts agree that the company then performing was one of uncommon excellence and its performances, with those of the superb orchestra, proved the value of the long experience, exquisite taste, unflagging zeal and profound knowledge of their recent head, Salieri. Such as Beethoven found the opera in the first week of November, 1792, such it continued for the next two years--exclusively Italian, but of the first order.

A single stroke of extraordinary good fortune--a happy accident is perhaps a better term--had just now given such prosperity to a minor theatrical enterprise that in ten years it was to erect and occupy the best playhouse in Vienna and, for a time, to surpass the Court Theatre in the excellence and splendor of its operatic performances. We mean Schikaneder's Theater auf der Wieden; but in 1793 its company was mean, its house small, its performances bad enough.

Schikaneder's chapelmaster and composer was John Baptist Henneberg; the chapelmaster of Marinelli, head of another German company in the Leopoldstadt, was Wenzel Müller, who had already begun his long list of 227 light and popular compositions to texts magical or farcical. Some two weeks after Beethoven's arrival in Vienna, on November 23rd, Schikaneder announced, falsely, the one-hundredth performance of "Die Zauberflöte," an opera the success of which placed his theatre a few years later upon a totally different footing, and brought Beethoven into other relations to it than those of an ordinary visitor indulging his comical taste, _teste_ Seyfried, for listening to and heartily enjoying very bad music.

The leading dramatic composers of Vienna, not yet named, must receive a passing notice. Besides Cimarosa, who left Vienna a few months later, Beethoven found Peter Dutillieu, a Frenchman by birth but an Italian musician by education and profession, engaged as composer for the Court Theatre. His "Il Trionfo d'Amore" had been produced there November 14, 1791, and his "Nanerina e Padolfino" had lately come upon the stage. Ignaz Umlauf, composer of "Die schöne Schusterin" and other not unpopular works, had the title of Chapelmaster and Composer to the German Court Opera, and was Salieri's substitute as chapelmaster in the sacred music of the Court Chapel. Franz Xavier Süssmayr, so well known from his connection with Mozart, was just now writing for Schikaneder's stage; Schenk for Marinelli's and for the private stages of the nobility; and Paul Wranitzky, first violinist and so-called Musikdirektor in the Court Theatre, author of the then popular "Oberon" composed for the Wieden stage, was employing his very respectable talents for both Marinelli and Schikaneder.

The church music of Vienna seems to have been at a very low point in 1792 and 1793. Two composers, however, whose names are still of importance in musical history, were then in that city devoting themselves almost exclusively to this branch of the art; Albrechtsberger, Court Organist, but in a few months (through the death of Leopold Hoffmann, March 17, 1793) to become musical director at St. Stephen's; and Joseph Eybler (some five years older than Beethoven), who had just become _Regens chori_ in the Carmelite church, whence he was called to a similar and better position in the Schottische Kirche two years later.

Public concerts, as the term is now understood, may be said not to have existed, and regular subscription concerts were few. Mozart gave a few series of them, but after his death there appears to have been no one of sufficient note in the musical world to make such a speculation remunerative. Single subscription concerts given by virtuosos, and annual ones by some of the leading resident musicians, of course, took place then as before and since. The only real and regular concerts were the four annual performances in the Burgtheater, two at Christmas and two at Easter, for the benefit of the musicians' widows and orphans. These concerts, established mainly by Gassmann and Salieri, were never exclusive in their programmes--oratorio, symphony, cantata, concerto, whatever would add to their attraction, found place. The stage was covered with the best musicians and vocalists of the capital and the superb orchestra was equally ready to accompany the playing of a Mozart or of an ephemeral _Wunderkind_. Risbeck was told ten years before that the number taking part in orchestra and chorus had even then on some occasions reached 400--a statement, however, which looks much like exaggeration.

Very uncommon semi-private concerts were still kept up in 1793. The reader of Mozart's biography will remember that in 1782 this great composer joined a certain Martin in giving a series of concerts during the morning hours in the Augarten Hall, most of the performers being dilettanti and the music being furnished from the library of von Kees. These concerts found such favor that they

were renewed for several years and generally were twelve in number.

Ladies of even the highest nobility permitted themselves to be heard. The auditorium was extremely brilliant and everything was conducted in so orderly and decent a fashion that everybody was glad to support the institute to the best of his energies. The receipts from the chief subscription were expended entirely on the cost of the concerts. Later Herr Rudolph assumed the direction. (“Allg. Mus. Zeitung,” III, 45.)

This man, still young, and a fine violin-player, was the director when Beethoven came to Vienna, and the extraordinary spectacle was still to be seen of princes and nobles following his lead in the performance of orchestral music to an audience of their own class at the strange hours of from 6 to 8 in the morning!

From the above it appears that Vienna presented to the young musician no preëminent advantages either in opera, church-music or its public concerts. Other cities equalled the Austrian capital in the first two, and London was then far in advance of all in the number, variety and magnificence of the last. It was in another field that Vienna surpassed every competitor. As Gluck twenty years before had begun the great revolution in operatic music completed by Mozart, so Haydn, building on the foundation of the Bachs and aided by Mozart, was effecting a new development of purely instrumental music which was yet to reach its highest stage through the genius and daring of the youth now his pupil. The example set by the Austrian family through so many generations had produced its natural effect, and a knowledge of and taste for music were universal among the princes and nobles of the empire. Some of the more wealthy princes, like Esterhazy, maintained musical establishments complete even to the Italian opera; others were contented with hearing the mass sung in their house-chapel to an orchestral accompaniment; where this was impossible, a small orchestra only was kept up, often composed of the officials and servants, who were selected with regard to their musical abilities; and so down to the band of wind-instruments, the string quartet, and even to a single organ-player, pianist or violinist. What has been said in a former chapter of music as a quasi-necessity at the courts of the ecclesiastical princes, applies in great measure to the secular nobility. At their castles and country-seats in the summer, amusement was to be provided for many an otherwise tedious hour; and in their city residences during the winter they and their guests could not always feast, dance or play at cards; and here, too, music became a common and favored recreation. At all events, it was the fashion. Outside the ranks of the noble-born, such as by talents, high culture or wealth occupied high social positions, followed the example and opened their salons to musicians and lovers of music, moved thereto for the most part by a real, rarely by a pretended, taste for the art--in either case aiding and encouraging its progress. Hence, an enormous demand for chamber music, both vocal and instrumental, especially the latter. The demand created the supply by encouraging genius and talent to labor in that direction; and thus the Austrian school of instrumental music soon led the world, as in the previous generation the demand for oratorios in England gave that country the supremacy in that branch of art.

During certain months of the year, Vienna was filled with the greatest nobles, not only of the Austrian states, but of other portions of the German Empire. Those who spent their time mostly in their own small courts came up to the capital but for a short season; others reversed this, making the city their usual residence and visiting their estates only in summer. By the former class many a once (if not still) famous composer in their service was thus occasionally for short periods brought to the metropolis--as Mozart by the brutal Archbishop of Salzburg, and Haydn by Prince Esterhazy. By the latter class many of the distinguished composers and virtuosos resident in the city were taken into the country during the summer to be treated as equals, to live like gentlemen among gentlemen. Another mode of encouraging the art was the ordering or purchasing of compositions; and this not only from composers of established reputation, as Haydn, Mozart, C. P. E. Bach, but also from young and as yet unknown men; thus affording a twofold benefit--pecuniary aid and an opportunity of exhibiting their powers.

The instrumental virtuosos, when not permanently engaged in the service of some prince or theatre, looked in the main for the reward of their studies and labors to the private concerts of the nobility. If at the same time they were composers, it was in such concerts that they brought their productions to a hearing. The reader of Jahn’s biography of Mozart will remember how much even he depended upon this resource to gain the means of support for himself and family. Out of London, even so late as 1793, there can hardly be said to have existed a “musical public,” as the term is now understood, and in Vienna at least, with its 200,000 inhabitants, a virtuoso rarely ventured to announce a concert to which he had not already a subscription, sufficient to ensure him against loss, from those at whose residences he had successfully exhibited his skill. Beethoven, remaining “in Vienna without salary until recalled” by Max, found in these resources and his pupils an ample income.

But this topic requires something more than the above general remarks. Some twelve years previous to Beethoven’s coming to Vienna, Risbeck, speaking of the art in that capital, had written:

ORCHESTRAS OF THE GREAT NOBLES

Musicians are the only ones (artists) concerning whom the nobility exhibit taste. Many houses maintain private bands for their own delectation, and all the public concerts prove that this field of art stands in high respect. It is possible to enlist four or five large orchestras here, all of them incomparable. The number of real virtuosos is small, but as regards the orchestral musicians scarcely anything more beautiful is to be heard in the world.

TITLED MUSIC-LOVERS IN VIENNA

How many such orchestras were still kept up in 1792-'93 it is, probably, now impossible to determine. Those of Princes Lobkowitz, Schwarzenberg and Auersperg may safely be named. Count Heinrich von Haugwitz and doubtless Count Batthyany brought their musicians with them when they came to the capital for "the season." The Esterhazy band, dismissed after the death of Haydn's old master, seems not yet to have been renewed. Prince Grassalkowitz (or Kracsalkowitz) had reduced his to a band of eight wind-instruments--oboes, clarinets, bassoons, horns--a kind of organization then much in vogue. Baron Braun had one to play at dinner as at the supper in "Don Giovanni"--an accessory to the scene which Mozart introduced out of his own frequent experience. Prince Karl Lichnowsky and others retained their own players of string quartets.

The grandees of the Bohemian and Moravian capitals--Kinsky, Clamm, Nostiz, Thun, Buquoi, Hartig, Salm-Pachta, Sporck, Fünfkirchen, etc.--emulated the Austrian and Hungarian nobles. As many of them had palaces also in Vienna, and most, if not all, spent part of the year there, bringing with them a few of the more skilful members of their orchestras to execute chamber music and for the nucleus of a band when symphonies, concertos and grand vocal works were to be executed, they also added their contingent to the musical as well as to the political and fashionable life of the metropolis. The astonishingly fruitful last eight years of Mozart's life falling within the period now under contemplation, contributed to musical literature compositions wonderfully manifold in character and setting an example that forced other composers to leave the beaten track. Haydn had just returned from his first stay in London, enriched with the pregnant experience acquired during that visit. Van Swieten had gained during his residence in Berlin appreciation of and love for the works of Handel, Bach and their schools, and since his return to Vienna, about 1778, had exerted, and was still exerting, a very powerful and marked influence upon Vienna's musical taste.

Thus all the conditions precedent for the elevation of the art were just at this time fulfilled at Vienna, and in one department--that of instrumental music--they existed in a degree unknown in any other city. The extraordinary results as to the quantity produced in those years may be judged from the sale-catalogue (1779) of a single music-dealer, Johann Traeg, which gives of symphonies, symphonies-concertantes and overtures (the last being in a small minority) the extraordinary number of 512. The music produced at private concerts given by the nobility ranged from the grand oratorios, operas, symphonies, down to variations for the pianoforte and to simple songs. Leading musicians and composers, whose circumstances admitted of it, also gave private concerts at which they made themselves and their works known, and to which their colleagues were invited. Prince Lobkowitz, at the time Beethoven reached Vienna, was a young man of twenty years. He was born on December 7, 1772, and had just married, on August 2, a daughter of Prince Schwarzenberg. He was a violinist of considerable powers and so devoted a lover of music and the drama, so profuse a squanderer of his income upon them, as in twenty years to reduce himself to bankruptcy. Precisely Beethoven's supposed age, the aristocrat of wealth and power and the aristocrat of talent and genius became exceedingly intimate, occasionally quarrelling and making up their differences as if belonging by birth to the same sphere.

The reigning Prince Esterhazy was that Paul Anton who, after the death of his father on February 25, 1790, broke up the musical establishment at Esterhaz and gave Haydn relief from his thirty years of service. He died on January 22, 1794, and was succeeded by his son Nicholas, a young man just five years older than Beethoven. Prince Nicholas inherited his grandfather's taste for music, reëngaged an orchestra, and soon became known as one of the most zealous promoters of Roman Catholic church-music. The best composers of Vienna, including Beethoven, wrote masses for the chapel at Esterhaz, where they were performed with great splendor.

Count Johann Nepomuk Esterhazy, "of the middle line zu Frakno," was a man of forty-five years, a good performer upon the oboe, and (which is much to his credit) had been a firm friend and patron of Mozart.

Of Count Franz Esterhazy, a man of thirty-five years, Schönfeld, in his "Jahrbuch der Tonkunst," thus speaks: "This great friend of music at certain times of the year gives large and splendid concerts at which, for the greater part, large and elevated compositions are performed--particularly the choruses of Handel, the 'Sanctus' of Emanuel Bach, the 'Stabat Mater' of Pergolese, and the like. At these concerts there are always a number of the best virtuosos."

It was not the present Prince Joseph Kinsky (who died in 1798 in his forty-eighth year) who at a later period became a distinguished patron of Beethoven, but his son Ferdinand Johann Nepomuk, then a bright boy of eleven years, born on December 4, 1781, upon whose youthful taste the strength, beauty and novelty of that composer's works made a deep impression. Prince Carl Lichnowsky, the pupil and friend of Mozart, had a quartet concert at his dwelling every Friday morning. The regularly engaged musicians were Ignaz Schuppanzigh, son of a professor in the Real-Schule, and a youth at this time of sixteen years (if the musical lexica are to be trusted), first violin; Louis Sina, pupil of Förster, also a very young man, second violin; Franz Weiss, who completed his fifteenth year on January 18, 1793, viola; and Anton Kraft, or his son Nicholas, a boy of fourteen years (born December 18, 1778), violoncello. It was, in fact, a quartet of boy virtuosos, of whom Beethoven, several years older, could make what he would.

The Prince's wife was Marie Christine, twenty years of age, one of those "Three Graces," as Georg Förster called them, daughters of that Countess Thun in whose house Mozart had found such warm friendship and appreciation, and whose noble qualities are so celebrated by Burney, Reichardt and Förster. The Princess, as well as her husband, belonged to the better class of amateur performers upon the pianoforte.

Court Councillor von Kees, Vice-President of the Court of Appeals of Lower Austria, was still living. He was, says Gyrowetz, speaking of a period a few years earlier, "recognized as the foremost music-lover and dilettante in Vienna; and twice a week he gave in his house society concerts at which were gathered together the foremost virtuosos of Vienna, and the first composers, such as Joseph Haydn, Mozart, Dittersdorf, Hoffmeister, Albrechtsberger, Giarnovichi and so on. Haydn's symphonies were played there." In Haydn's letters to Madame Genzinger the name of von Kees often occurs--the last time in a note of August 4, 1792, which mentions that the writer is that day to dine with the Court Councillor. This distinguished man left on his death (January 5, 1795) a very extensive collection of music.

Gottfried, Freiherr van Swieten, son of Maria Theresia's famous Dutch physician, says Schönfeld, is,

VAN SWIETEN AND HIS INFLUENCE

as it were, looked upon as a patriarch of music. He has taste only for the great and exalted. He himself many years ago composed twelve beautiful symphonies ("stiff as himself," said Haydn). When he attends a concert our semi-connoisseurs never take their eyes off him, seeking to read in his features, not always intelligible to every one, what ought to be their opinion of the music. Every year he gives a few large and brilliant concerts at which only music by the old masters is performed. His preference is for the Handelian manner, and he generally has some of Handel's great choruses performed. As late as last Christmas (1794) he gave such a concert at Prince von Paar's, at which an oratorio by this master was performed.

Neukomm told Prof. Jahn that in concerts, "if it chanced that a whispered conversation began, His Excellency, who was in the habit of sitting in the first row of seats, would rise solemnly, draw himself up to his full height, turn to the culprits, fix a long and solemn gaze upon them, and slowly resume his chair. It was effective, always." He had some peculiar notions of composition; he was, for instance, fond of imitations of natural sounds in music and forced upon Haydn the imitation of frogs in "The Seasons." Haydn himself says:

This entire passage in imitation of a frog did not flow from my pen. I was constrained to write down the French croak. At an orchestral performance this wretched conceit soon disappears, but it cannot be justified in a pianoforte score. Let the critics be not too severe on me. I am an old man and cannot revise all this again.

But to van Swieten, surely, is due the credit of having founded in Vienna a taste for Handel's oratorios and Bach's organ and pianoforte music, thus adding a new element to the music there. The costs of the oratorio performances were not, however, defrayed by him, as Schönfeld seems to intimate. They were met by the association called by him into being, and of which he was perpetual secretary, whose members were the Princes Liechtenstein, Esterhazy, Schwarzenberg, Auersperg, Kinsky, Trautmannsdorf, Sinsendorf, and the Counts Czernin, Harrach, Erdödy and Fries; at whose palaces as well as in van Swieten's house and sometimes in the great hall of the Imperial Royal Library the performances were given at midday to an audience of invited guests. Fräulein Martinez, who holds so distinguished a place in Burney's account of his visit to Vienna--that pupil of Porpora at whose music-lessons the young Joseph Haydn forty years before had been employed as accompanist--still flourished in the Michael's House and gave a musical party every Saturday evening during the season.

Court Councillor and Chamber Paymaster von Meyer (says Schönfeld) is so excellent a lover of music that his entire personnel in the chancellary is musical, among them being such artists as a Raphael and a Hauschka. It will readily be understood, therefore,

that here in the city as well as at his country-seat there are many concerts. His Majesty the Emperor himself has attended some of these concerts.

These details are sufficient to illustrate and confirm the remarks made above upon Vienna as the central point of instrumental music. Of the great number of composers in that branch of the art whom Beethoven found there, a few of the more eminent must be named.

FAMOUS COMPOSERS IN VIENNA

Of course, Haydn stood at the head. The next in rank--_longo intervallo_--was Mozart's successor in the office of Imperial Chamber Composer, Leopold Kozeluch, a Bohemian, now just forty years of age. Though now forgotten and, according to Beethoven, "miserabilis," he was renowned throughout Europe for his quartets and other chamber music. A man of less popular repute but of a solid genius and acquirements far beyond those of Kozeluch, whom Beethoven greatly respected and twenty-five years later called his "old master," was Emanuel Aloys Förster, a Silesian, now forty-five years of age. His quintets, quartets and the like ranked very high, but at that time were known for the most part only in manuscript. Anton Eberl, five years the senior of Beethoven, a Viennese by birth, had composed two operettas in the sixteenth year of his age which were produced at the Kärnthnerthor-Theater, one of which gained the young author the favor of Gluck. He seems to have been a favorite of Mozart and caught so much of the spirit and style of that master as to produce compositions which were printed by dishonest publishers under Mozart's name, and as his were sold throughout Europe. In 1776 he accompanied the Widow Mozart and her sister, Madame Lange, the vocalist, in the tour through Germany, gaining that reputation in other cities which he enjoyed at home, both as pianist and composer. His force was in instrumental composition, and we shall hereafter see him for a moment as a symphonist bearing away the palm from Beethoven!

Johann Vanhall, whose name was so well known in Paris and London that Burney, twenty years before, sought him out in his garret in a suburb of Vienna, was as indefatigable as ever in production. Gerber says in his first Lexicon (1792) that Breitkopf and Härtel had then fifty of his symphonies in manuscript. His fecundity was equal to that of Haydn; his genius such that all his works are now forgotten. It is needless to continue this list.

One other fact illustrating the musical tastes and accomplishments of the higher classes of the capital may be added. There were, during the winter 1792-93, ten private theatres with amateur companies in activity, of which the more important were in the residences of the nobles Stockhammer, Kinsky, Sinsendorf and Strassaldo, and of the bookseller Schrambl. Most of these companies produced operas and operettas.

Chapter XIII

Beethoven in Society--Concerts--Wegeler's Recollections--Compositions--The First Trios--Sonatas Dedicated to Haydn--Variations--Dances for the Ridotto Rooms--Plays at Haydn's Concert.

However quiet and "without observation" Beethoven's advent in Vienna may have been at that time when men's minds were occupied by movements of armies and ideas of revolution, he could hardly have gone thither under better auspices. He was Court Organist and Pianist to the Emperor's uncle; his talents in that field were well known to the many Austrians of rank who had heard him in Bonn when visiting there or when paying their respects to the Elector in passing to and from the Austrian Netherlands; he was a pupil of Joseph Haydn--a circumstance in itself sufficient to secure him a hearing; and he was protected by Count Waldstein, whose family connections were such that he could introduce his favorite into the highest circles, the imperial house only excepted. Waldstein's mother was a Liechtenstein; his grandmother a Trautmannsdorf; three of his sisters had married respectively into the families Dietrichstein, Crugenburg and Wallis; and by the marriages of uncles and aunts he was connected with the great houses Oettingen-Spielberg, Khevenhüller-Melisch, Kinsky, Palfy von Erdöd and Ulfeld--not to mention others less known. If the circle be extended by a degree or two it embraces the names Kaunitz, Lobkowitz, Kohary, Fünfkirchen, Keglevics and Colloredo-Mansfeld.

Dr. Burney, in closing his "Present State of Music in Germany," notes the distinction in the styles of composition and performance in some of the principal cities of that country, "Vienna being most remarkable for fire and animation; Mannheim for neat and brilliant execution; Berlin for counterpoint and Brunswick for taste." Since Burney's tour (1772) Vienna had the highest example of all these qualities united in Mozart. But he had passed away, and no great pianist of the first rank remained; there were extraordinary dilettanti and professional pianists "of very neat and brilliant execution," but none who possessed great "fire, animation and invention," qualities still most valued in Vienna and in which the young Beethoven, with all the hardness and heaviness of manipulation caused by his devotion to the organ, was wholly unrivalled. With all the salons in the metropolis open to him, his

success as a virtuoso was, therefore, certain. All the contemporary authorities, and all the traditions of those years, agree in the fact of that success, and that his playing of Bach's preludes and fugues especially, his reading of the most difficult scores at sight and his extemporaneous performances excited ever new wonder and delight. Schindler records that van Swieten, after musical performances at his house, "detained Beethoven and persuaded him to add a few fugues by Sebastian Bach as an evening blessing," and he preserves a note without date, though evidently belonging to Beethoven's first years in Vienna, which proves how high a place the young man had then won in the old gentleman's favor:

To Mr. Beethoven in Alstergasse, No. 45, with the Prince Lichnowsky: If there is nothing to hinder next Wednesday I should be glad to see you at my home at half past 8 with your nightcap in your bag. Give me an immediate answer.

Swieten.

There is also an entry in the oft-cited memorandum book belonging in date to October or November, 1793, which may be given in this connection: "Supped in the evening at Swieten's, 17 pourboire. To the janitor 4 x for opening the door."

THE THREE TRIOS, OP. 1

But the instant and striking success of Beethoven as virtuoso by no means filled up the measure of his ambition. He aspired to the higher position of composer, and to obtain this more was needed than the performance of variations, however excellent. To this end he selected the three Trios afterwards published as Op. 1, and brought them to performance at the house of Prince Lichnowsky. Happily for us, Beethoven related some particulars concerning this first performance of these compositions in Vienna to his pupil Ries, who gives the substance of the story thus:

It was planned to introduce the first three Trios of Beethoven, which were about to be published as Op. 1, to the artistic world at a soirée at prince Lichnowsky's. Most of the artists and music-lovers were invited, especially Haydn, for whose opinion all were eager. The Trios were played and at once commanded extraordinary attention. Haydn also said many pretty things about them, but advised Beethoven not to publish the third, in C minor. This astonished Beethoven, inasmuch as he considered the third the best of the Trios, as it is still the one which gives the greatest pleasure and makes the greatest effect. Consequently, Haydn's remark left a bad impression on Beethoven and led him to think that Haydn was envious, jealous and ill-disposed toward him. I confess that when Beethoven told me of this I gave it little credence. I therefore took occasion to ask Haydn himself about it. His answer, however, confirmed Beethoven's statement; he said he had not believed that this Trio would so quickly and easily be understood and so favorably received by the public.

The Fischoff manuscript says:

The three Trios for pianoforte, violin and violoncello, Op. 1 (the pearls of all sonatas), which are in fact his sixth work, justly excited admiration, though they were performed in only a few circles. Wherever this was done, however, connoisseurs and music-lovers bestowed upon them undivided applause, which grew with the succeeding works as the hearers not only accustomed themselves to the striking and original qualities of the master but grasped his spirit and strove for the high privilege of understanding him.

More than two years passed by, however, before the composer thought fit to send these Trios to the press; perhaps restrained by a feeling of modesty, since he was still a student, perhaps by a doubt as to the success of compositions so new in style, or by prudence, choosing to delay their publication until they had been so often performed from the manuscript as to secure their comprehension and appreciation, and thus an adequate number of subscribers. In the meantime he prepared the way for them by publishing a few sets of variations. "Beethoven had composed variations on themes from Mozart's 'Zauberflöte,' which he had already sketched in Bonn, and Zmeskall took it upon himself to submit them to a publisher; but they had only a small sale." (The Fischoff MS.) This refers doubtless to the Variations "Se vuol ballare" from "Le Nozze di Figaro," which, having been revised and improved by a new coda, came out in July, 1793, with a dedication to Eleonore von Breuning. It was not until the next year that the thirteen variations upon the theme "Es war einmal ein alter Mann," from Dittersdorf's "Rothkäppchen," appeared, and these were followed by those for four hands on the Waldstein theme, first advertised in January, 1795.

In fact, Beethoven evidently was in no haste to publish his compositions. It will presently be seen that he sent the "Se vuol ballare" variations to press partly at the request of others and partly to entrap the rival pianists of Vienna. A few years later we shall find him dashing off and immediately publishing variations on popular theatrical melodies; but works of greater scope, and especially his pianoforte concertos, were for the most part long retained in his exclusive possession. Thus the Pianoforte Concerto in B-flat major, Op. 18, though supposed by Tomaschek to have been composed at Prague in 1798, certainly (if Beethoven's own words in a letter

to Breitkopf and Härtel are to be believed) preceded in composition that in C major, Op. 15, and must, therefore, have been finished at the latest in March, 1795, and was doubtless often played by him at private concerts during the period now before us. It was not published until 1801.

Let the reader now recall to mind some of the points previously dwelt upon: the Fischenich letter of January and Neefe's letter of October, 1793, which record the favorable reports sent to Bonn of Beethoven's musical progress; his studies with Haydn and Schenk; the cares and perplexities caused him temporarily by the death of his father, and the unpleasant circumstances attending that event; his steady success as a virtuoso; his visit in the summer to Prince Esterhazy; and it is obvious with what industry and energy he engaged in his new career, with what zeal and unfaltering activity he labored to make the most of his opportunities. In one year after leaving Bonn he felt his success secure, and no longer feared Hamlet's "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune." This is indicated in a passage ("O, how we shall then rejoice together," etc.) of the earliest of his Vienna letters which has been preserved--that letter in which, as Wegeler remarks, "he asked pardon for much more error than he had committed," and which, though often reprinted from the "Notizen," is too important and characteristic to be here omitted.

BEETHOVEN SUES FOR PARDON

Vienna, November 2, 93.

Most estimable Leonore! My most precious friend!

Not until I have lived almost a year in the capital do you receive a letter from me, and yet you were most assuredly perpetually in my liveliest memory. Often in thought I have conversed with you and your dear family, though not with that peace of mind which I could have desired. It was then that the wretched misunderstanding hovered before me and my conduct presented itself as most despicable. But it was too late. O, what would I not give could I obliterate from my life those actions so degrading to myself and so contrary to my character. True, there were many circumstances which tended to estrange us, and I suspect that tales whispered in our ears of remarks made one about the other were chiefly that which prevented us from coming to an understanding. We both believed that we were speaking from conviction; whereas it was only in anger, and we were both deceived. Your good and noble character, my dear friend, is sufficient assurance to me that you forgave me long ago. But we are told that the sincerest contrition consists in acknowledgment of our faults; and to do this has been my desire. And now let us drop the curtain on the affair, only drawing from it this lesson--that when friends quarrel it is much better to have it out face to face than to turn to a go-between.

With this you will receive a dedication from me to you concerning which I only wish that the work were a larger one and more worthy of you. I was plagued here to publish the little work, and I took advantage of the opportunity, my estimable E., to show my respect and friendship for you and my enduring memory of your family. Take this trifle and remember that it comes from a friend who respects you greatly. Oh, if it but gives you pleasure, my wishes will be completely fulfilled. Let it be a reminder of the time when I spent so many and such blessed hours at your home. Perhaps it will keep me in your recollection until I eventually return to you, which, it is true, is not likely to be soon. But how we shall rejoice then, my dear friend--you will then find in your friend a happier man, from whose visage time and a kindlier fate shall have smoothed out all the furrows of a hateful past.

If you should chance to see B. Koch, please say to her that it is not nice of her never once to have written to me. I wrote to her twice and three times to Malchus, but no answer. Say to her that if she doesn't want to write she might at least urge Malchus to do so. In conclusion I venture a request; it is this: I should like once again to be so happy as to own a waistcoat knit of hare's wool by your hands, my dear friend. Pardon the immodest request, my dear friend, but it proceeds from a great predilection for everything that comes from your hands. Privately I may also acknowledge that a little vanity is also involved in the request; I want to be able to say that I have something that was given me by the best and most estimable girl in Bonn. I still have the waistcoat which you were good enough to give me in Bonn, but it has grown so out of fashion that I can only treasure it in my wardrobe as something very precious because it came from you. You would give me much pleasure if you were soon to rejoice me with a dear letter from yourself. If my letters should in any way please you I promise in this to be at your command so far as lies in my power, as everything is welcome to me which enables me to show how truly I am

Your admiring, true friend L. v. Beethoven.

P.S. The V. [variations] you will find a little difficult to play, especially the trills in the _coda_; but don't let that alarm you. It is so contrived that you need play only the trill, leaving out the other notes because they are also in the violin part. I never would have composed a thing of the kind had I not often observed that here and there in Vienna there was somebody who, after I had

improvised of an evening, noted down many of my peculiarities, and made parade of them next day as his own. Foreseeing that some of these things would soon appear in print, I resolved to anticipate them. Another reason that I had was to embarrass the local pianoforte masters. Many of them are my deadly enemies and I wanted to revenge myself on them, knowing that once in a while somebody would ask them to play the variations and they would make a sorry show with them.

Except Beethoven's memorandum, "Schuppanzigh 3 times each W.; Albrechtsberger 3 times each W.", which indicates his change of instructors, there is nothing to be recorded until, probably in May or June (1794), we come to the fragment of another letter to Eleonore von Breuning also contained in Wegeler's "Notizen" (p. 60), which has particular interest both as showing how bitterly his conscience reproached him for acts inconsistent with the forbearance and command of temper due to friendship, but in which he ever remained too apt to indulge, and as adding some implied confirmation of the argument previously made in relation to the compositions of the Bonn period. In this letter he acknowledges receipt of a cravat embroidered by Eleonore and protests that thoughts of her generosity and his unworthiness had brought him to tears. He continues: "Do pray believe me that little as I have deserved it, _my friend_ (let me always call you such), I have suffered much and still suffer from the loss of your friendship.... As a slight return for your kind recollection of me I take the liberty of sending these Variations and the Rondo with violin (accompaniment). I have a great deal to do or I should have transcribed the Sonata I promised you long ago. It is a mere sketch in manuscript, and to copy it would be a difficult, etc." The letter is signed: "The friend who still reveres you, Beethowen" (_sic_).[70]

In January, 1794, Elector Max had paid a short visit to Vienna, where, perhaps, it was determined that Beethoven should remain "without salary until recalled." After the declaration of war by the Empire against France, the electorate, as a German state, could no longer remain neutral; and thus it came to pass that in October the victorious French army marched into Bonn. The Elector fled to Frankfort-on-the-Main, November 6th, thence to Münster, while his court and all such as were obnoxious to the republican authorities dispersed in all directions for safety.

One of these fugitives, a young man of twenty-nine years but already the Rector of the University, to "save his head" hastened away to Vienna--Dr. Wegeler. He reached that capital in October and found Beethoven not in the "room on the ground floor" where "it was not necessary to pay the housekeeper more than 7 florins," but living as a guest in the family of Prince Karl Lichnowsky; and this explains sufficiently the cessation of those records of monthly payments before noticed.

DR. WEGELER'S REMINISCENCES

The reminiscences of Wegeler for the period of his stay in Vienna, excepting those which may be better introduced chronologically in other connections, may well find place here. They are interesting and characteristic in themselves and indicate, also, the great change for the better in Beethoven's pecuniary condition; for a man who keeps a servant and a horse cannot, if honest, be a sufferer from poverty:

Carl, Prince of Lichnowsky, Count Werdenberg, Dynast Granson, was a very great patron, yes, a friend of Beethoven's, who took him into his house as a guest, where he remained at least a few years. I found him there toward the end of the year 1794, and left him there in the middle of 1796. Meanwhile, however, Beethoven had almost always a home in the country.

The Prince was a great lover and connoisseur of music. He played the pianoforte, and by studying Beethoven's pieces and playing them more or less well, sought to convince him that there was no need of changing anything in his style of composition, though the composer's attention was often called to the difficulties of his works. There were performances at his house every Friday morning, participated in by four hired musicians--Schuppanzigh, Weiss, Kraft and another (Link?), besides our friend; generally also an amateur, Zmeskall. Beethoven always listened with pleasure to the observations of these gentlemen. Thus, to cite a single instance, the famous violoncellist Kraft in my presence called his attention to a passage in the finale of the Trio, Op. 1, No. 3, to the fact that it ought to be marked "sulla corda G," and the indication 4-4 time which Beethoven had marked in the finale of the second Trio, changed to 2-4. Here the new compositions of Beethoven, so far as was feasible, were first performed. Here there were generally present several great musicians and music-lovers. I, too, as long as I lived in Vienna, was present, if not every time, at least most of the time.

Here a Hungarian count once placed a difficult composition by Bach in manuscript before him which he played _a vista_ exactly as Bach would have played it, according to the testimony of the owner. Here the Viennese author Förster once brought him a quartet of which he had made a clean copy only that morning. In the second portion of the first movement the violoncello got out. Beethoven stood up, and still playing his own part sang the bass accompaniment. When I spoke about it to him as a proof of extraordinary acquirements, he replied with a smile: "The bass part _had_ to be so, else the author would have known nothing

about composition." To the remark that he had played a _presto_ which he had never seen before so rapidly that it must have been impossible to see the individual notes, he answered: "Nor is that necessary; if you read rapidly there may be a multitude of typographical errors, but you neither see nor give heed to them, so long as the language is a familiar one."

After the concert the musicians generally stayed to dine. Here there gathered, in addition, artists and savants without regard to social position. The Princess Christiane was the highly cultivated daughter of Count Franz Joseph von Thun, who, a very philanthropic and respectable gentleman, was disposed to extravagant enthusiasm by his intercourse with Lavater, and believed himself capable of healing diseases through the power of his right hand.

The following undated letter also belongs to the years of Beethoven's intimate association with Wegeler in Vienna (1794-96). It is significant of Beethoven's character. Though easily offended and prone to anger, no sooner was the first ebullition of temper past than he was so reconciliatory and open to explanation that usually his contrition was out of all proportion to his fault. For this reason, and because it presents the friend in a light which provoked a protest from his modesty, Wegeler was unwilling to make public the entire letter.[71]

CONFESSION, CONTRITION, PETITION

Dearest! Best! In what an odious light you have exhibited me to myself! I acknowledge it, I do not deserve your friendship. You are so noble, so considerate, and the first time that I ranged myself alongside of you I fell so far below you! Ah, for weeks I have displeased my best and noblest friend! You think that I have lost some of my goodness of heart, but, thank Heaven! it was no intentional or deliberate malice which induced me to act as I did towards you; it was my inexcusable thoughtlessness which did not permit me to see the matter in its true light. O, how ashamed I am, not only for your sake but also my own. I can scarcely trust myself to ask for your friendship again. Oh, Wegeler, my only comfort lies in this, that you have known me almost from my childhood, and yet, O let me say for myself, I was always good, and always strove to be upright and true in my actions--otherwise how could you have loved me? Could I have changed so fearfully for the worse in such a short time? Impossible; these feelings of goodness and love of righteousness cannot have died forever in me in a moment. No, Wegeler, dearest, best, O, venture again to throw yourself entirely into the arms of your B.; trust in the good qualities you used to find in him; I will guarantee that the pure temple of sacred friendship which you erect shall remain firm forever; no accident, no storm shall ever shake its foundations--firm--forever--our friendship--pardon--oblivion--a new upflaming of the dying, sinking friendship--O, Wegeler, do not reject this hand of reconciliation. Place yours in mine--O, God!--but no more; I am coming to throw myself in your arms, to entreat you to restore to me my lost friend. And you will give yourself to me, your penitent, loving, never-forgetting

Beethoven again.

It was only now that I received your letter, because I have just returned home.

In this connection Wegeler comes to speak of the outward conditions of Beethoven: "Beethoven," he says on page 33,

brought up under extremely restricted circumstances, and as it were, under guardianship, though that of his friends, did not know the value of money and was anything but economical. Thus, to cite a single instance, the Prince's dinner hour was fixed at 4 o'clock. "Now," said Beethoven, "it is desired that every day I shall be at home at half-past 3, put on better clothes, care for my beard, etc.--I can't stand that!" So it happened that he frequently went to the taverns, since, as has been said, in this as in all other matters of economy, he knew nothing about the value of things or of money. The Prince, Wegeler continues, who had a loud, metallic voice, once directed his serving-man that if ever he and Beethoven should ring at the same time the latter was to be first served. Beethoven heard this, and the same day engaged a servant for himself. In the same manner, once when he took a whim to learn to ride, which speedily left him, the stable of the Prince being offered him, he bought a horse.

Concerning his friend's affairs of the heart, Wegeler had opportunity to make observations in Vienna. He relates on page 43 that while he was in the capital Beethoven "was always in love and made many conquests which would have been difficult if not impossible for many an Adonis." Beethoven's antipathy to teaching before he left Bonn has already been noticed. In Vienna he developed a still stronger repugnance to playing in society when requested to do so. He often complained to Wegeler how grievously this put him out of sorts, whereupon the latter sought to entertain him and quiet him by conversation. "When this purpose was reached," he continues,

I dropped the conversation, seated myself at the writing table, and Beethoven, if he wanted to continue the discourse, had to sit down on the chair before the pianoforte. Soon, still turned away from the instrument, he aimlessly struck a few chords out of which

gradually grew the most beautiful melodies. Oh, why did I not understand more of music! Several times I put ruled paper upon the desk as if without intention, in order to get a manuscript of his; he wrote upon it but then folded it up and put it in his pocket! Concerning his playing I was permitted to say but little, and that only in passing. He would then go away entirely changed in mood and always come back again gladly. The antipathy remained, however, and was frequently the cause of differences between Beethoven and his friends and well-wishers.

OLD BONN FRIENDS REMEMBERED

There is still one other reminiscence of Wegeler in the appendix to the “Notizen” (page 9) worthy of citation. “At one time private lectures were given in Vienna on Kant, which had been arranged by Adam Schmidt, Wilhelm Schmidt, Hunczovsky, Göpfert and others. In spite of my urgings Beethoven refused to attend a single one of them.” There is no reference in Wegeler’s “Notizen” to instruction received by Beethoven from Albrechtsberger. With his old colleague in the Court Orchestra in Bonn, Nicolaus Simrock, though he was a much older man, Beethoven remained in touch after his removal to Vienna. Simrock, who was highly esteemed both as man and musician, had embarked in business as a music publisher in Bonn. The Variations on a theme from Dittersdorf’s “Rothkäppchen,” were published by him (at the latest in the early part of 1794), as well as those for pianoforte four hands on a theme by Count Waldstein (some time in the same year). It is to the latter composition that the following letter refers:

Vienna, August 2, 1794.

Dear Simrock:

I deserve a little scolding from you for holding back your Variations so long, but, indeed, I do not lie when I say that I was hindered from correcting them sooner by an overwhelming amount of business. You will note the shortcomings for yourself, but I must wish you joy on the appearance of your engraving, which is beautiful, clear and legible. Verily, if you keep on thus you will become chief among cutters, that is, note cutters[72]. In my former letter I promised to send you something of mine and you interpreted the remark as being in the language of the cavaliers. How have I deserved such a title? Faugh! who would indulge in such language in these democratic days of ours? To free myself from the imputation as soon as I have finished the grand revision of my compositions, which will be soon, you shall have something which you will surely engrave. I have also been looking about me for a commissioner and have found a right capable young fellow for the place. His name is Traeg. You have naught to do but to write to him or me about the conditions which you want to make. He asks of you one-third _rabate_. The devil take all such bargaining! It is very hot here. The Viennese fear that they will soon be unable to eat ice-cream, there having been little cold last winter and ice being scarce. Many persons of importance have come here and it was said that a revolution was imminent; but it is my belief that so long as the Austrian has his dark beer and sausage he will not revolt. It is said that the suburban gates are to be closed at ten o’clock at night. The soldiers’ guns are loaded with bullets. No one dares speak aloud for fear of arrest by the police. Are your daughters grown? Bring one up to be my wife, for if I am to remain single in Bonn I shall not stay long, of a surety. You also must be living in fear. How is good Ries? I shall write to him soon for he can have only an unfavorable opinion of me--but this damned writing! I cannot get over my antipathy towards it. Have you performed my piece yet? Write to me occasionally.

Please send also a few copies of the first Variations.

Your Beethoven.

These “first Variations” obviously are those on the theme from “Rothkäppchen”; those referred to in the early part of the letter the ones on Count Waldstein’s theme. The “piece” whose performance he inquires about is the Octet, and the allusion to it justifies the belief that it was composed for the wind-instrument players of Bonn who found no opportunity to play it while Beethoven was still in his native city. The letter, like that written to Eleonore von Breuning, shows that Beethoven was still thinking of the possibility or probability of a return to Bonn. Its cheerful tone discloses a comfortable, satisfied frame of mind--the mood from which the first Trios proceeded.

FIRST CONCERT APPEARANCES IN VIENNA

We return to the chronological record of events. The first of these in the year 1795, was Beethoven’s first appearance in public as virtuoso and composer. The annual concerts in the Burgtheater established by Gassmann for the benefit of the widows of the Tonkünstlergesellschaft were announced for the evenings of March 29 and 30. The vocal work selected for performance was an oratorio in two parts, “Gioas, Re di Giuda,” by Antonio Cartellieri; the instrumental, a Concerto for Pianoforte and Orchestra, composed and played by Ludwig van Beethoven. Cartellieri was a young man of twenty-three years (born in Danzig, September

27, 1772) who, a year or two since, had come from Berlin to study operatic composition with the then greatest living composer in that field, Salieri. As the direction of these Widow and Orphan concerts was almost exclusively in the hands of Salieri, one is almost tempted to think that he may on this occasion have indulged a pardonable vanity in bringing forward two of his pupils, if we did not know how strong an attraction the name of Beethoven must have been for the public which, as yet, had had no opportunity to learn his great powers except by report. The day of the performance drew near but the Concerto was not yet written out. “Not until the afternoon of the second day before the concert did he write the rondo, and then while suffering from a pretty severe colic which frequently afflicted him. I [Wegeler] relieved him with simple remedies so far as I could. In the anteroom sat four copyists to whom he handed sheet after sheet as soon as it was finished.... At the first rehearsal, which took place the next day in Beethoven’s room, the pianoforte was found to be half a tone lower than the wind-instruments. Without a moment’s delay Beethoven had the wind-instruments and the others tune to B-flat instead of A and played his part in C-sharp.” Thus Wegeler in his “Notizen” (pg. 36). But he has confounded two compositions. The concerto which Beethoven played on March 29, 1795, was not that in C (Op. 15) which was not yet finished, but, in all probability, that in B-flat (Op. 19). For the fact that the Concerto in B-flat was composed before that in C we have the testimony of Beethoven himself, who wrote to Breitkopf and Härtel on April 22, 1801: “I simply want to call your attention to the fact that one of my first Concertos will be published by Hoffmeister, which is not among my best works, and one also by Mollo which, though composed later, etc.” The Concerto in B-flat was published in 1801 by Hoffmeister and that in C in the same year by Mollo and Co. in Vienna, the latter a little in advance of the former, wherefore there need be no surprise at the earlier _opus_ number.

Beethoven also took part in the second concert on March 30, the minutes of the Tonkünstlerschaft recording that he “improvised on the pianoforte”; and though busily engaged he also embraced an opportunity to testify to his devotion to the manes of Mozart. On March 31, 1795, Mozart’s widow arranged a performance of “La Clemenza di Tito” in the Burgtheater. “After the first part,” says the advertisement, “Mr. Ludwig van Beethoven will play a Concerto of Mozart’s composition on the Pianoforte.” We opine that this concerto was Mozart’s in D minor, which Beethoven loved especially and for which he wrote cadenzas.

The Trios, Op. 1, had now become so well known and appreciated in musical circles as to justify their publication, and accordingly, an advertisement inviting subscriptions for Ludwig van Beethoven’s “three Grand Trios” appeared in the “Wiener Zeitung” on May 16, 1795. Three days later a contract was signed by the author and Artaria and Company. The printed list of subscribers gives 123 names, mostly belonging to the higher circles, with subscriptions amounting to 241 copies. As Beethoven paid the publisher but one florin per copy, and the subscription price was one ducat, he made a handsome profit out of the transaction.[73]

FIRST PIANOFORTE TRIOS AND SONATAS

We must tarry a moment longer with these Trios. That the author is disposed to place their origin in the Bonn period has already appeared. Argument in favor of this view can be found in the fact of their early performance in Vienna, for there can be no reasonable question of the correctness of Ries’s story, for which Beethoven himself was authority, that they were played at the house of Prince Lichnowsky, in the presence of Haydn. This performance must have taken place before January 19, 1794, because on that day Haydn started again for England. Now, Beethoven’s sketches show that he was still working on at least the second and third of the Trios after 1794, and that they were not ready for the printer before the end of that year. Further explanation is offered by the following little circumstances: since Haydn was present, the performance at Prince Lichnowsky’s must have been from manuscript. In the morning meeting which probably took place only a short time before the soirée, Beethoven’s attention was called to the desirability of changing in the last movement of the second Trio, the time-signature from 4-4 to 2-4. Beethoven made the change. From these facts it may be concluded that after a first there was a final revision of these Trios and that the former version disappeared or was destroyed after the latter was made. It has repeatedly been intimated that the author believes that the rewriting of compositions completed in Beethoven’s early period is farther-reaching than is generally assumed. The case therefore seems to present itself as follows: Haydn heard the Trios at Lichnowsky’s in their first state; Beethoven then took them up for revision and in the course of 1794 and the beginning of 1795 brought them to the state in which we know them. It is not possible to say positively whether or not the first form, particularly of the first Trio, dates back to the Bonn period.

An interesting anecdote connected with these Trios may well find place here; it is contributed by Madame Mary de Fouche, daughter of Tomkison, who, in the seventh decade of the nineteenth century, was one of the more famous pianoforte manufacturers of London: In the early days of the century, a little society of musicians--J. B. Cramer, the pianist; F. Cramer, violinist, half-brother of the preceding; J. P. Salomon, whose name has so often come up in previous chapters of this work; Bridgetower, a mulatto and celebrated violinist, whose name we shall meet again; Watts, tenor; Morant, also tenor, who married the great Dussek’s widow; Dahmen, Lindley and Crossdale, violoncellists--was in the habit of meeting regularly at Mr. Tomkison’s to try

over and criticise such new music of the German school as came to the London dealers. At one of these meetings the new Trios of Beethoven, Op. 1, were played through, J. B. Cramer at the pianoforte. “This is the man,” he cried, “who is to console us for the loss of Mozart!” According to the recollection of Cipriani Potter, this was after Cramer had made the personal acquaintance of Beethoven in Vienna, and had heard him play there.

Some other incidents recorded by Wegeler belong to this year. Haydn reached Vienna upon his return from his second visit to England on August 20. Beethoven had now ready the three Sonatas, Op. 2, and at one of the Friday morning concerts at Prince Lichnowsky’s he played them to Haydn, to whom they were dedicated.

Here (says Wegeler on page 29 of the ‘Notizen’), Count Appony asked Beethoven to compose a quartet for him for a given compensation, Beethoven not yet having written a piece in this genre. The Count declared that contrary to custom he did not want to have exclusive possession of the quartet for half a year before publication, nor did he ask that it be dedicated to him, etc. In response to repeated urgings by me, Beethoven twice set about the task, but the first effort resulted in a grand violin Trio (Op. 3), the second in a violin Quintet (Op. 4).

How much mistaken Wegeler was in these concluding statements has already been indicated.

The three Pianoforte Sonatas dedicated to Haydn were, therefore, the second group of compositions which Beethoven considered illustrative of his artistic ideals and worthy of publication. Nothing can be said with positiveness touching the time of their origin. Schönfeld’s words in his “Jahrbuch der Tonkunst von Wien und Prag”: “We already have several of his Sonatas, among which his last are particularly noteworthy,” which were written at least eight months before the Sonatas appeared in print, lead to the conclusion that the Sonatas were known in Vienna in manuscript in the spring of 1795. Their appearance in print was announced in the “Wiener Zeitung” of March 9, 1796.

Still another anecdote recorded by Wegeler refers to another composition of this period: “Beethoven was seated in a box at the opera with a lady of whom he thought much at a performance of ‘La Molinara.’ When the familiar _Nel cor più non mi sento_ was reached the lady remarked that she had possessed some variations on the theme but had lost them. In the same night Beethoven wrote the six variations on the melody and the next morning sent them to the lady with the inscription: _Variazioni, etc., Perdute par la--ritrovate par Luigi van Beethoven_. They are so easy that it is likely Beethoven wished that she should be able to play them at sight.” Paisiello’s “La Molinara,” composed in 1788 for Naples, was performed on March 8, 1794 in the Court Opera, and again on June 24 and 27, 1795, in the Kärnthnerthor-Theater in Vienna. Considering the time of the publication of these unpretentious but genial little variations, their composition may be set down after the latter performances. At the same period Beethoven wrote variations on another theme (_Quant’ è più bello_) from the same opera, which were published before the former and dedicated to Prince Carl Lichnowsky. It is likely that a few more sets of variations, a form of composition for which Beethoven had a strong predilection at the time, had their origin in these early years of Beethoven’s life in Vienna. The Variations in C on the “Menuet à la Vigano” from the ballet “Le Nozze disturbate,” may confidently be assigned to the year 1795. The ballet was performed for the first time on May 18, 1795, at Schikaneder’s theatre; the Variations are advertised as published on February 27, 1796.

The Gesellschaft der bildenden Künstler had, in the year 1792, established an annual ball in the Redoutensaal in the month of November; and Haydn, just then returned covered with glory from England, composed a set of twelve minuets and twelve German dances for the occasion. In 1793, the Royal Imperial Composer Kozeluch followed Haydn’s example. In 1794, Dittersdorf wrote the same number of like dances for the large hall, and Eybler for the small. In view of this array of great names, and considering that as yet the Trios, Op. 1, were the only works of a higher order than the Variations which Beethoven had sent to press, the advertisements for the annual ball to be given upon the 22nd of November, 1795, give a vivid proof of the high reputation which the young man had gained as a composer now at the end of his third year in Vienna. These advertisements conclude thus: “The music for the Minuets and German dances for this ball is an entirely new arrangement. For the larger room they were written by the Royal Imperial Chapelmaster Süssmayr; for the smaller room by the master hand of Mr. Ludwig van Beethoven out of love for the artistic fraternity.” These dances, arranged for pianoforte by Beethoven himself, came from the press of Artaria a few weeks later, as did also Süssmayr’s; Beethoven’s name in the advertisement being in large and conspicuous type.

As the year began with the first, so it closed with Beethoven’s second appearance in public as composer and virtuoso; and here is the advertisement of the performance from the “Wiener Zeitung” of December 16:

BEETHOVEN PAYS TRIBUTE TO HAYDN

Next Friday, the 18th instant, Mr. the Chapelmaster Haydn will give a grand musical concert in the small Redoutensaal, at which Mad. Tomeoni and Mr. Mombelli will sing. Mr. van Beethoven will play a Concerto of his composing on the Pianoforte, and three grand symphonies, not yet heard here, which the Chapelmaster composed during his last sojourn in London, will be performed.

One would gladly know what concerto was played.[74] But there was little public criticism then outside of London and very rarely any in Vienna. The mere fact of the appearance of Beethoven at his old master's concert is, however, another proof that too much stress has been laid upon a hasty word spoken by him to Ries. Haydn wanted that Beethoven should put "Pupil of Haydn" on the title-page of his first works. Beethoven was unwilling to do so because, as he said, "though he had taken some lessons from Haydn he had never learned anything from him." Nothing could be more natural than for Haydn, knowing nothing of the studies of his pupil with Schenk, to express such a wish in relation to the Sonatas dedicated to him, and equally natural that the author should refuse; but to add to the attractions of the concert was a very different matter--a graceful and delicate compliment which he could with pleasure make.

This chapter may appropriately close with the one important family event of this year. The father, the mother, two infant brothers and two infant sisters slept in the churchyard at Bonn; but Ludwig, Caspar and Johann were never more to look upon their graves. The three brothers were now reunited. Vienna had become their new home and not one of them beheld the rushing Rhine again.

FOOTNOTES:

[70] Though Thayer fixed the date of this letter in May or June, 1794, Dr. Deiters believed that it was of a much earlier date; and may, indeed, have been written before Beethoven went to Vienna. For his theory Dr. Deiters found a plausible argument in the spelling of the name with a "w" instead of a "v," and the reiterated references to a misunderstanding which had long been made right. The letter has no date or superscription and Wegeler assumed that it was the continuation of one whose first page had been lost. If the letter was written in Bonn it would prove that the Rondo (probably that in G for Pianoforte and Violin, B. and H. Series XII, No. 102) was composed before the beginning of the Viennese period; which might well be. The Sonata is probably the unfinished one in C, dedicated to Eleonore von Breuning.

[71] This was done by Wegeler's grandson, Carl Wegeler, in an essay published in the "Coblenz Zeitung" on May 20, 1890.

[72] An early example of Beethoven's fondness for punning. _Stechen_ means many things in German--among them to sting, stab, tilt in a tournament, take a trick at cards--as well as to engrave, or cut in metal.

[73] The son of Artaria told Nohl that his father had told him that he got the money to pay Beethoven without the composer's knowledge from Prince Lichnowsky.

[74] It was probably that in B-flat. See Nottebohm's "Zweite Beethoveniana," page 72.

Chapter XIV

The Years 1796 and 1797--Beethoven in Prague and Berlin--King Frederick William II and Prince Louis Ferdinand--Himmel, Fasch and Zelter--Compositions and Publications.

The narrative resumes its course with the year 1796, the twenty-sixth of Beethoven's life and his fourth in Vienna. If not yet officially, he was _de facto_ discharged from his obligations to the Elector Maximilian and all his relations with Bonn and its people were broken off. Vienna had become his home, and there is no reason to suppose that he ever afterwards cherished any real and settled purpose to exchange it for another--not even in 1809 when, for the moment, he had some thought of accepting Jerome Bonaparte's invitation to Cassel.

He had now entered his course of contrapuntal study with Albrechtsberger; he was first of the pianoforte players of the capital and his name added attraction even to the concert which Haydn, returning again from his London triumphs, had given to introduce some of his new works to the Viennese; his "master-hand" was already publicly recognized in the field of musical composition; he counted many nobles of the higher ranks in his list of personal friends and had been, perhaps even now was, a member of Prince Carl Lichnowsky's family. The change in his pecuniary condition might have thrown a more equitable temperament than his off its balance. Three years ago he anxiously noted down the few kreutzers occasionally spent for coffee or chocolate "für Haidn und mich"; now he keeps his own servant and a horse. His brothers, if at all a burden, were no longer a heavy one. Carl Caspar, according to the best information now obtainable, soon gained moderate success in the musical profession and, with probably

some occasional aid from Ludwig both pecuniary and in obtaining pupils, earned sufficient for his comfortable support; while Johann had secured a situation in that apothecary shop “Zum Heiligen Geist” which, in 1860, was still to be seen in the Kärnthnerstrasse near the former site of the gate of that name.[75] His wages were, of course, small and we shall soon see that Ludwig offers him assistance if needed, though not to Karl; but Johann’s position gradually improved and he was able in a few years to save enough to enable him, unaided by his brother, to purchase and establish himself in a business of his own.[76]

“Fate had become propitious to Beethoven”; and a final citation from the memorandum book will show in what spirit he was determined to merit the continuance of Fortune’s favor. If we make allowance for the old error as to his real age, this citation may belong to a period a year or two later; but may it not be one of those extracts from books and periodical publications which all his life long he was so fond of making? This seems to be the more probable supposition. The words are these: “Courage! In spite of all bodily weaknesses my spirit shall rule. You have lived 25 years. This year must determine the complete man. Nothing must remain undone.”

And now let the chronological narrative of events be resumed. As the year 1795 had ended with a public appearance of Beethoven as pianoforte player and composer, so also began the year 1796; and, as on a former occasion in a concert by Haydn, so this time he played at a concert given by a singer, Signora Bolla, who afterward became famous, in the Redoutensaal. Again he played a pianoforte concerto.

MEETING OF FRIENDS IN NUREMBERG

“In 1796,” says Wegeler (“Nachträge,” p. 18), “the two older Breuning brothers, Christoph and Stephan, find him (Beethoven) at Nuremberg on a return journey to Vienna. Which journey is not specified. None of the three having a passport from Vienna they were all detained at Linz, but soon liberated through my intervention at Vienna.” And from a letter written by Stephan von Breuning to his mother, dated January, 1796, Wegeler quotes: “From Nuremberg, Beethoven travelled all the way in company with us. The three Bonnians thus attracted the attention of the police, who thought they had made a wonderful discovery. I do not believe that there could be a less dangerous man than Beethoven.” Wegeler’s suggestion that Beethoven was returning “perhaps from Berlin” is of course out of the question. But between the date of Haydn’s concert (December 18th) and Stephan von Breuning’s letter, if written towards the end of January, there was ample time, even in those days of post-coaches, for a journey to Prague and thence across the country to Mergentheim or Ellingen, at that time the temporary residences of Elector Maximilian. The necessity of Beethoven’s knowing precisely in what relation he was to stand with the Elector in the future, accounts sufficiently for his being in Nuremberg at that time, especially if he had had occasion to visit Prague during the Christmas holidays, which is not improbable. Dlabacz, in his “Künstler-Lexikon,” has a paragraph of which this is a part: “v. Beethoven, a Concertmaster on the pianoforte. In the year 1795, he gave an academy in Prague at which he played with universal approval.” It is true that Dlabacz may here record a concert given during Beethoven’s stay in the Bohemian capital some weeks later; but, on the one hand, no other notice of such a concert has been discovered; and, on the other, the “universal approval” on this occasion may have been an inducement for him to return thither so soon.

At all events, his delay in Vienna after coming from Nuremberg was short and was doubtless occupied with the last corrections of the Sonatas, Op. 2, dedicated to Haydn, the six Menuets (second part), the Variations on the theme from “Le Nozze disturbate” and those on “Nel cor più non mi sento,” all of which works are advertised in the “Wiener Zeitung” in the course of the next two months, while their author was again in Prague or cities farther North. For the following letter we are indebted to Madame van Beethoven, widow of the composer’s nephew, Carl:

To my brother Nicholaus Beethoven

to be delivered at the apothecary shop at the Kärnthner Thor Mr. von Z.[77] will please hand this letter to the wig-maker who will care for its delivery.

Prague, February 19th (1796).

Dear Brother!

So that you may at least know where I am and what I am doing I must needs write you. In the first place I am getting on well--very well. My art wins for me friends and respect; what more do I want? This time, too, I shall earn considerable money. I shall remain here a few weeks more and then go to Dresden, Leipsic and Berlin. It will probably be six weeks before I shall return. I hope that you will be more and more pleased with your sojourn in Vienna; but beware of the whole guild of wicked women. Have you yet

called on Cousin Elss? You might write to me at this place if you have inclination and time.

F. Linowsky will probably soon return to Vienna; he has already gone from here. If you need money you may go to him boldly, for he still owes me some.

For the rest I hope that your life will grow continually in happiness and to that end I hope to contribute something. Farewell, dear brother, and think occasionally of

Your true, faithful brother L. Beethoven.

Greetings to Brother Caspar. My address is The Golden Unicorn on the Kleinseite.

A debt of gratitude is certainly due Johann van Beethoven for having carefully preserved this letter for full half a century and leaving it to his heirs, notwithstanding all the troubles which afterwards arose between the brothers, since it is hardly more valuable and interesting for the facts which it states directly than for what it indicates and suggests more or less clearly.

A SOJOURN IN PRAGUE AND ITS FRUITS

It, with other considerations, render it well nigh certain that Beethoven had now come to Prague with Prince Lichnowsky as Mozart had done, seven years before, and that upon leaving Vienna he had had no intention of pursuing his journey farther; but encouraged by the success thus reported to his brother, he suddenly determined to seek instruction and experience, pleasure, profit and fame in an extended tour. Had he projected this journey already in Vienna, how could all recollection of it have been lost by Wegeler? How could von Breuning in the letter cited above have omitted all mention of it? Nor is it possible to think that Beethoven, still so young and still so unknown outside the Austrian and Bohemian capitals, having so many powerful and influential friends there, and there only, could at this time have gone forth to seek elsewhere some permanent position with a fixed salary. The remarks which have been preserved, made by him in writing or conversation, expressing a desire for such an appointment, all belong to a later period, and cannot by any torture of language be made to refer to this, when he was looking into the future with well-grounded hopes and serene confidence of advancement in his new home. Vienna seemed to offer him all his ambition could crave; why should he seek his fortune beyond her walls?

It is pleasant to note his care for the welfare of his brother Johann, which care, doubtless, the other brother did not need. But how could Prince Lichnowsky have been indebted to Ludwig?

The musical public of Prague was the same that had so recently honored itself by its instant and noble appreciation of Mozart, and had given so glorious a welcome to “Figaro,” “Don Giovanni” and “Titus.” There being no royal or imperial court there, and the public amusements being less numerous than in Vienna, the nobility were thrown more on their own resources for recreation; and hence, besides the traditional taste of the Bohemians for instrumental music, their capital was, perhaps, a better field for the virtuoso than Vienna. No notice of any public concert given by Beethoven on this visit has been discovered, either in the newspapers of the time or in the reminiscences of Thomaschek and others; and “the considerable money” earned “this time” must have been the presents of the nobility for his performances in their salons, and, perhaps, for compositions.

The conception of the aria “Ah, perfido! spergiuro” is generally associated with Beethoven’s sojourn in Prague. The belief rests upon the fact that upon the cover of a copy which he revised Beethoven wrote the words “Une grande Scène mise en musique par L. v. Beethoven à Prague, 1796.” On the first page is written: _Recitativo e Aria composta e dedicata alla Signora Contessa di Clari da L. v. Beethoven_. The opus number, 46, in this title is in the handwriting of Al. Fuchs, who owned a copy. Now, on November 21st, 1796, Madame Duschek, the well known friend of Mozart, at a concert in Leipsic sang “An Italian Scena composed for Madame Duschek by Beethoven,” and it was easy to conclude that the aria was really written by Beethoven for Madame Duschek. On a page of sketches preserved in Berlin among others there are sketches belonging to “Ah, perfido!” which do not agree with the printed page. On the lower margin of the first page is the remark: _pour Mademoiselle la Comtesse de Clari_. Nottebohm is led by these things to surmise that the aria was written in Vienna in 1795, before the visit to Prague. In any case, we are permitted to associate the date 1796 only with the completion of the work in Prague; and the purpose may well have been to have it sung by Madame Duschek, who is thus proved to have belonged to the circle of Beethoven’s friends in Prague. Nevertheless, the aria was originally intended for the Countess Josephine Clari, a well known amateur singer who married Count Christian Clam-Gallas in 1797. The scena first appeared in print in the fall of 1805, when it was published in a collection made by Hoffmeister and Kühnel. Beethoven placed it upon the programme of his concert in 1808.

Another family in which Beethoven was received on the footing of a friend was that of Appellate Councillor Kanka. Both father and son were dilettante composers and instrumental players--the father on the violoncello, the son on the pianoforte. Gerber gives them a place in his Lexicon. “Miss Jeanette” (the daughter), says the eulogistic Schönfeld, “played the pianoforte with great expression and skill.” The son adopted his father’s profession, became a distinguished writer on Bohemian law, and in later years did Beethoven good service as legal adviser.

There is in the Artaria collection, a thick fascicle of sketches and musical fragments from Beethoven’s hand in which papers from the Bonn period down to the close of the century are stitched together in such disorder as to show that they were thus joined merely for preservation. One sheet of mere sketches bears, if correctly deciphered, this inscription: “Written and dedicated to Gr. C. G. as a souvenir of his stay in P.” On the fourth page of the sheet stands “these 4 Bagtalles by B.” with something more illegible. May not some yet unknown composition of Beethoven be still in the possession of the family Clam-Gallas? Count Christian and his two daughters are numbered by Schönfeld among the fine pianoforte players of Prague, and these few notices exhaust the information obtained upon this visit of Beethoven there. His next appearance is in Berlin. No record has been found of the proposed visit to either Dresden or Leipsic, although his journey, it would seem, must have taken him through the Saxon capital.

INCIDENTS OF A VISIT TO BERLIN

In after years he was fond of talking about his sojourn in Berlin, and some particulars have thus been preserved. “He played,” says Ries,

several times at court (that of King Frederick William II), where he played the two grand sonatas with _obbligato_ violoncello, Op. 5, written for Duport, first violoncellist of the King, and himself. On his departure he received a gold snuff-box filled with Louis d’ors. Beethoven declared with pride that it was not an ordinary snuff-box, but such an one as it might have been customary to give to an ambassador.

This king shared his uncle Frederick II’s love for music, while his taste was better and more cultivated. His instrument was the violoncello, and he often took part in quartets and sometimes in the rehearsals of Italian operas. He exerted a powerful and enduring influence for good upon the musical taste of Berlin. It was he who caused the operas of Gluck and Mozart to be performed there and introduced oratorios of Handel into the court concerts. His appreciation of Mozart’s genius, and his wish to attach that great master to his court, are well known; and these facts render credible a statement with which Carl Czerny closes a description of Beethoven’s extemporaneous playing contributed to Cock’s “London Musical Miscellany” (August 2nd, 1852):

His improvisation was most brilliant and striking. In whatever company he might chance to be, he knew how to produce such an effect upon every hearer that frequently not an eye remained dry, while many would break out into loud sobs; for there was something wonderful in his expression in addition to the beauty and originality of his ideas and his spirited style of rendering them. After ending an improvisation of this kind he would burst into loud laughter and banter his hearers on the emotion he had caused in them. “You are fools!” he would say. Sometimes he would feel himself insulted by these indications of sympathy. “Who can live among such spoiled children?” he would cry, and only on that account (as he told me) he declined to accept an invitation which the King of Prussia gave him after one of the extemporary performances above described.

Chapelmaster Reichardt had withdrawn himself from Berlin two years before, having fallen into disfavor because of his sympathy with the French Revolution. Neither Himmel nor Righini, his successors, ever showed a genius for chamber music of a high order, and, indeed, there was no composer of reputation in this sphere then living in that quarter. The young Beethoven by his two sonatas had proved his powers and the King saw in him precisely the right man to fill the vacancy--no small proof of superior taste and judgment. What the German expression was which the translator of Czerny’s letter has rendered “accept an invitation which the King gave him” there is no means of knowing; but as it stands it can only mean an invitation to enter permanently into his service. The death of the King the next year, of course, prevented its being ever renewed.

Friedrich Heinrich Himmel, five years older than Beethoven, whom the King had withdrawn from the study of theology and caused to be thoroughly educated as a musician, first under Naumann in Dresden and afterwards in Italy, had returned the year before and had assumed his duties as Royal Pianist and Composer. As a virtuoso on his instrument his only rival in Berlin was Prince Louis Ferdinand, son of Prince August and nephew of Frederick II, two years younger than Beethoven and endowed by nature with talents and genius which would have made him conspicuous had fortune not given him royal descent. He and Beethoven became well known to each other and each felt and did full justice to the other’s musical genius and attainments. Now let Ries speak again:

MEETINGS WITH HIMMEL, FASCH AND ZELTER

In Berlin he (Beethoven) associated much with Himmel, of whom he said that he had a pretty talent, but no more; his pianoforte playing, he said, was elegant and pleasing, but he was not to be compared with Prince Louis Ferdinand. In his opinion he paid the latter a high compliment when once he said to him that his playing was not that of a king or prince but more like that of a thoroughly good pianoforte player. He fell out with Himmel in the following manner: One day when they were together Himmel begged Beethoven to improvise; which Beethoven did. Afterwards Beethoven insisted that Himmel do the same. The latter was weak enough to agree; but after he had played for quite a time Beethoven remarked: “Well, when are you going fairly to begin?” Himmel had flattered himself that he had already performed wonders; he jumped up and the men behaved ill towards each other. Beethoven said to me: “I thought that Himmel had been only preluding a bit.” Afterwards they were reconciled, indeed, but Himmel could never forgive or forget[78]. They also exchanged letters until Himmel played Beethoven a shabby trick. The latter always wanted to know the news from Berlin. This bored Himmel, who at last wrote that the greatest news from Berlin was that a lamp for the blind had been invented. Beethoven ran about with the news and all the world wanted to know how this was possible. Thereupon he wrote to Himmel that he had blundered in not giving more explicit information. The answer which he received, but which does not permit of communication, not only put an end to the correspondence but brought ridicule upon Beethoven, who was so inconsiderate as to show it then and there.

With Carl Friedrich Christian Fasch and Carl Friedrich Zelter he also made a friendly acquaintance, and twice at least attended meetings of the Singakademie, which then numbered about 90 voices. The first time, June 21st, says the “Geschichte der Singakademie”:

A chorale, the first three numbers of the mass and the first six of the 119th Psalm were sung for him. Hereupon he seated himself at the pianoforte and played an improvisation on the theme of the final fugue: “Meine Zunge rühmt im Wettgesang dein Lob.” The last numbers of “Davidiana” (a collection of versets by Fasch) formed the conclusion. No biographer has mentioned this visit or even his sojourn in Berlin. Nor does Fasch pay special attention to it; but the performance must have pleased, for it was repeated at the meeting on the 28th.

The performance of the Society must also have pleased Beethoven, and with good reason; for Fasch’s mass was in sixteen parts and the psalm and “Davidiana,” in part, in eight; and no such music was then to be heard elsewhere north of the Alps.

In 1810, Beethoven, speaking of his playing on that occasion, told Mme. von Arnim (then Elizabeth Brentano) that at the close his hearers did not applaud but came crowding around him weeping; and added, ironically, “that is not what we artists wish--we want applause!” Fasch’s simple record of Beethoven’s visit is this:

June 21, 1796. Mr. van Beethoven extemporized on the “Davidiana,” taking the fugue theme from Ps. 119, No. 16.... Mr. Beethoven, pianist from Vienna, was so accommodating as to permit us to hear an improvisation. . . . June 28, Mr. van Beethoven was again so obliging as to play an improvisation for us.

Early in July, the King left Berlin for the baths of Pyrmont, the nobility dispersed to their estates or to watering-places, and the city “was empty and silent.” Beethoven, therefore, could have had no inducement to prolong his stay; but the precise time of his departure is unknown. Schindler names Leipsic as one of the cities in which, during this tour, Beethoven “awakened interest and created a sensation by his pianoforte playing, and, particularly, by his brilliant improvisation”; but no allusion in any public journal of that or any subsequent period, not even the faintest tradition, has been discovered to confirm the evidently erroneous statements. Moreover, Rochlitz in his account of a visit to the composer in 1822 remarks, “I had not yet seen Beethoven”; and again, “It was only as a youth that he ... passed through (Leipsic).” So, until some new discovery be made, this must also find its place in the long list of Schindler’s mistakes.

Notwithstanding Wegeler’s statement (“Notizen,” 28) that he left Beethoven a member of the family of Prince Lichnowsky “in the middle of 1796,” it is as certain as circumstantial evidence can well make it that the Doctor and Christoph von Breuning had returned to Bonn before Beethoven reached Vienna again; but Stephan and Lenz were still there. The former obtained at this time an appointment in the Teutonic Order, which so many of his ancestors had served, and his name appears in the published “Calendars of the Order” from 1797 to 1803, both inclusive, as “Hofrathsassessor.” He then soon departed from Vienna to Mergentheim, whence he wrote (November 23rd) with other matters the following upon Beethoven to Wegeler and Christoph:

I do not know whether or not Lenz has written you anything about Beethoven; but take notice that I saw him in Vienna and that according to my mind, which Lenz has confirmed, he has become somewhat staider, or, perhaps I should say, has acquired more knowledge of humanity through travels (or was it because of the new ebullition of friendship on his arrival?) and a greater conviction of the scarceness and value of good friends. A hundred times, dear Wegeler, he wishes you here again, and regrets nothing so much as that he did not follow much of your advice. ("Notizen," page 19.)

Except this notice of his bearing and demeanor, there is a complete hiatus in Beethoven's history from his appearance in the Singakademie until the following November. The so-called Fischoff Manuscript has, it is true, a story of a "dangerous illness" which was caused by his own imprudence this summer; but as it is in date utterly irreconcilable with other known facts, it will receive its due consideration hereafter. The most plausible suggestion is that coming back, flushed with victory, with the success of his tour and delighted with the novelty of travelling at his ease, he made that excursion to Pressburg and Pesth of which afterwards Ries was informed and made record ("Notizen," page 109), but of which no other account is known.

ATTEMPTS AT PATRIOTIC MUSIC

And thus we come to November. This was the year of that astounding series of victories ending at Arcole, gained by the young French general Napoleon Bonaparte. The Austrian government and people alike saw and feared the danger of invasion, a general uprising took place and volunteer corps were formed in all quarters. For the Vienna corps, Friedelberg wrote his "Abschiedsgesang an Wiens Bürger beim Auszug der Fahnen-Division der Wiener Freiwilliger," and Beethoven set it to music. The original printed edition bears date "November 15, 1795." It does not appear to have gained any great popularity, and a drinking-song ("Lasst das Herz uns froh erheben") was afterwards substituted for Friedelberg's text, and published by Schott in Mayence.

The rapid progress of the French army had caused the Germans in Italy to become distrustful of the future and to hasten homeward. Among them were Beethoven's old companions in the Bonn orchestra, the cousins Andreas and Bernhard Romberg, who in the spring of this year (May 26th), had kissed the hand of the Queen of Naples, daughter of the Empress Maria Theresia, and then departed to Rome to join another friend of the Bonn period, Karl Kügelgen. The three coming north arrived at Vienna in the autumn; the Rombergs remained there for a space with Beethoven, while Kügelgen proceeded to Berlin. Baron von Braun--not to be mistaken for Beethoven's "first Mæcenas" the Russian Count Browne--had heard the cousins the year before in Munich and invited them "to give Vienna an opportunity to hear them." There is no notice of their concert in the Vienna newspapers of the period, and the date is unknown. From Lenz von Breuning is gleaned an additional fact which alone gives interest to the concert for us. He writes to Wegeler in January, 1797--not 1796, as erroneously printed in the appendix to the "Notizen," page 20--and after the meeting with the von Breunings at Nuremberg:

Beethoven is here again;[79] he played in the Romberg concert. He is the same as of old and I am glad that he and the Rombergs still get along with each other. Once he was near a break with them; I interceded and achieved my end to a fair extent. Moreover, he thinks a great deal of me just now.

It it clear that the Rombergs, under the circumstances, must have largely owed their limited success to Beethoven's name and influence. In February, 1797, they were again in their old positions in Schroeder's orchestra in Hamburg.

Beethoven during this winter must be imagined busily engaged with pupils and private concerts, perhaps also with his operatic studies with Salieri, certainly with composition and with preparation for and the oversight of various works then passing through the press; for in February and April, Artaria advertises the two Violoncello Sonatas, Op. 5, the Pianoforte Sonata for four hands, Op. 6, the Trio, Op. 3, the Quintet, Op. 4, and the Twelve Variations on a Danse Russe; these last are the variations which he dedicated to the Countess Browne and which gave occasion for the anecdote related by Ries illustrating Beethoven's forgetfulness; for this dedication he had

received a handsome riding-horse from Count Browne as a gift. He rode the animal a few times, soon after forgot all about it and, worse than that, its food also. His servant, who soon noticed this, began to hire out the horse for his own benefit and, in order not to attract the attention of Beethoven to the fact, for a long time withheld from him all bills for fodder. At length, however, to Beethoven's great amazement he handed in a very large one, which recalled to him at once his horse and his neglectfulness. ("Notizen," page 120.)

On Thursday, April 6, 1797, Schuppanzigh gave a concert, on the programme of which Beethoven's name figured twice. Number 2 was an "Aria by Mr. van Beethoven, sung by Madame Tribolet (-Willmann);" No. 3 was "a Quintet for Pianoforte and 4

wind-instruments, played and composed by Mr. L. v. Beethoven." This was the beautiful Quintet, Op. 16, the time of whose origin is thus more definitely indicated than in the "Chronologisches Verzeichniss," a fact for which we are indebted to Nottebohm.

But the war was renewed and the thoughts of the Viennese were occupied with matters more serious than the indulgence of their musical taste. On the 16th of March, Bonaparte forced the passage of the Tagliamento and Isonzo. During the two weeks following he had conquered the greater part of Carniola, Carinthia and the Tyrol, and was now rapidly approaching Vienna. On the 11th of February, Lorenz Leopold Hauschka's "Gott erhalte unsern Kaiser" with Haydn's music had been sung for the first time in the theatre and now, when, on April 7th, the Landsturm was called out, Friedelberg produced his war-song "Ein grosses, deutsches Volk sind wir," to which Beethoven also gave music. The printed copy bears date April 14th, suggesting the probability that it was sung on the occasion of the grand consecration of the banners which took place on the Glacis on the 17th. Beethoven's music was, however, far from being so fortunate as Haydn's, and seems to have gained as little popularity as his previous attempt; but as the preliminaries to a treaty of peace were signed at Leoben on the 18th, and the armies, so hastily improvised, were dismissed three weeks afterwards, the taste for war-songs vanished.

A QUIET AND UNEVENTFUL PERIOD

The little that is known of Beethoven's position as a teacher at this period is very vague and unsatisfactory; enough, however, to render it sufficiently certain that he had plenty of pupils, many of them young ladies of high rank who paid him generously. In the triple capacity of teacher, composer and pianist his gains were large and he was able to write in May to Wegeler that he was doing well and steadily better.

It is very possible that the illness mentioned by the Fischoff Manuscript may have occurred during this summer. There can be little doubt that the original authority for the statement is Zmeskall, and therefore the fact of such an attack may be accepted as certain, but the date--being, as there given, clearly wrong, as well as the inference that in it lay the original cause of the composer's subsequent loss of hearing--must be left mainly to conjecture. From May to November, 1797, Beethoven's history is still a blank and nothing but the utter silence of Lenz von Breuning in his correspondence with his family at Bonn on a topic so likely to engage his sympathies as the dangerous illness of his friend, appears to prevent the filling of this blank in part by throwing him upon a bed of sickness. True, Lenz may have written and the letter have been lost or destroyed; or he may have neglected to write because of his approaching departure from Vienna, which took place in the autumn. His album, still preserved, has among its contributors Ludwig and Johann van Beethoven and Zmeskall. Ludwig wrote as follows:

Truth exists for the wise, Beauty for a feeling heart: They belong to each other.

Dear, good Breuning;

Never shall I forget the time which I spent with you in Bonn as well as here. Hold fast your friendship for me; you will always find me the same.

Vienna 1797 the 1st of October. Your true friend L. v. Beethoven.

They never met again. Lenz died on April 10th of the following year. In November, Beethoven enjoyed a singular compliment paid him by the association of the Bildende Künstler--a repetition of his minuets and trios composed two years before for the artists' ball; and on the 23rd of December, he again contributed to the attractions of the Widows' and Orphans' Concert by producing the Variations for two Oboes and English Horn on "Là ci darem la mano," played by Czerwenka, Reuter and Teimer. His publications in 1797, besides those mentioned at the beginning of the year, were the Twelve Variations for Pianoforte and Violoncello on the theme from Handel's "Judas Maccabæus," precise date unknown; the Pianoforte Sonata, Op. 7; and the Serenade, Op. 8, both advertised by Artaria and Co., October 7th. Finally, the Rondo in C, Op. 51, No. 1, published by Artaria with the catalogue number 711.

* * * * *

We come to a consideration of the facts touching the compositions of the years 1796 and 1797.

THE COMPOSITION OF "ADELAIDE"

Among the most widely known of these is "Adelaide." The composition of this song must have been begun in the first half of 1795, if not earlier, for sketches of it are found among the exercises in double counterpoint written for Albrechtsberger. Other sheets

containing sketches for “Adelaide” and the setting of Bürger’s “Seufzer eines Ungeliebten” are preserved in the library of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna and the British Museum in London. The song was published by Artaria in 1797, under the title “Adelaide von Matthisson. Eine Kantate für eine Singstimme mit Begleitung des Klaviers. In Musik gesetzt und dem Verfasser gewidmet von Ludwig van Beethoven.” The opus number 46 was given to it later. In 1800 Beethoven sent a copy of the song to the poet and accompanied it with the following letter:

Most honored Sir!

You are herewith receiving from me a composition which has been in print for several years, but concerning which you probably, to my shame, know nothing. Perhaps I can excuse myself and explain how it came about that I dedicated something to you which came so warmly from my heart yet did not inform you of the fact, by saying that at first I was unaware of your place of residence, and partly also I was diffident, not knowing but that I had been over-hasty in dedicating a work to you without knowing whether or not it met with your approval.

Even now I send you “Adelaide” with some timidity. You know what changes are wrought by a few years in an artist who is continually going forward; the greater the progress one makes in art the less one is satisfied with one’s older works. My most ardent wish will be fulfilled if my musical setting of your heavenly “Adelaide” does not wholly displease you, and if it should move you soon to write another poem of its kind, and you, not finding my request too immodest, should send it to me at once, I will put forth all my powers to do your beautiful poetry justice. Look upon the dedication as partly a token of the delight which the composition of your A. gave me, partly as an evidence of my gratitude and respect for the blessed pleasure which your poetry has always given, _and always will_ give me.

Vienna, August 4th, 1800.

When playing “Adelaide” sometimes recall your sincere admirer

Beethoven.

Whether or not Matthisson answered this letter is not known; but when he republished “Adelaide” in the first volume of his collected poems in 1815, he appended to it a note to this effect: “Several composers have vitalized this little lyric fantasy with music; but according to my strong conviction none of them so threw the text into the shade with his melody as the highly gifted Ludwig van Beethoven in Vienna.” The “Opferlied,” the words of which were also written by Matthisson, is one of the poems to which Beethoven repeatedly recurred. “It seems always to have presented itself to him as a prayer,” says Nottebohm. Its last words, “The beautiful to the good,” were written in autograph albums even in his later years. The origin of the composition is to be ascribed to 1795, as Nottebohm enters it in his catalogue. It was thus possible for Wegeler to know it in 1797, when he put a Masonic text under the music. It had not yet been published at that time, however, which fact accounts for the discovery of sketches for it in a sketchbook of 1798-1799 described by Nottebohm.

It was not published until later, probably in 1808, when it came with two other songs from the press of Simrock. Beethoven composed the poem a second time, utilizing the beginning of his first melody, for solo, chorus and orchestra (Op. 121b). To this setting we shall recur hereafter. There is still another song which must be brought into the story of this period. It is the “Seufzer eines Ungeliebten,” with its two parts based on two independent but related poems by Bürger. Particular interest attaches to the second part, “Gegenliebe,” from the fact that its melody was used afterward by Beethoven for the variations in the “Choral Fantasia,” Op. 80. Sketches for this melody are found associated with sketches for “Adelaide” on a sheet in the archives of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde. Nottebohm fixes the year of the song’s origin as 1795. It was first published as late as 1837 by Diabelli along with the song, “Turteltaube, du klagest,” which was composed much later. The Italian song, “O care selve, o cara felice libertà” (from Metastasio’s “Olimpiade”), entered under number 1264 in Thayer’s “Chronologisches Verzeichniss,” appears as a chorus for three voices at the end of the Albrechtsberger exercises, and hence may be placed in the year 1795, as is done by Nottebohm, who adds that it originated simultaneously with the setting of “Wer ist ein freier Mann?” Here mention must also be made of two arias which Beethoven wrote for introduction in Umlauf’s comic opera “Die schöne Schusterin.” These songs were assigned to the Bonn period in the first edition of this biography because the opera was performed in Bonn in the years 1789 and 1790. The two songs composed by Beethoven are an arietta, or rather strophic song, “O welch’ ein Leben,” for tenor, and an aria, “Soll ein Schuh nicht drücken?” for soprano. The words of the latter are in the original libretto. The words of the tenor song, though not part of the original text, were obviously written for the opera. The melody was afterward used by Beethoven as a setting for Goethe’s “Mailied,” published in 1805, as Op. 52. Both songs, as written for the opera, were published for the first time in the

Complete Edition of Beethoven's works from the copies preserved in the Berlin Library.

NUMEROUS PIECES OF CHAMBER MUSIC

Most important of the instrumental compositions of this period is the Quintet for Strings, Op. 4, which is frequently set down as an arrangement (or revised transcription) of the Octet, Op. 103. The Quintet, however, though it employs the same motivi as the Octet, is an entirely new work, made so by the radical changes of structure--changes of register to adapt the themes to the stringed instruments and changes in the themes themselves. The origin of the Quintet can be placed anywhere in the period from 1792 (when the Octet was probably begun) to the beginning of 1797, when the Quintet was advertised as "wholly new." There is a clue in the Wegeler anecdote already related in connection with the String Trio, Op. 3, in the chapter of this work devoted to the works composed in Bonn. In 1795, Count Appony commissioned Beethoven to compose a quartet, the honorarium being fixed. Wegeler's recollection was that Beethoven twice undertook the task; but the first effort resulted in the String Trio and the second in "a quintet (Op. 4)." There is not sufficient internal evidence to reject the story so far as it affects the Quintet (the Trio has already been subjected to study), and from its structure it might well be argued that the composition was undertaken as a quartet and expanded into a quintet in the hands of the composer. If Count Appony's commission was given in 1795, the date of the completion of the Quintet may be set down as 1796. Artaria, who published the work, advertised it in the "Wiener Zeitung" of February 8th, 1797.

The two Sonatas for Pianoforte and Violoncello, Op. 5, belong to the year 1796, and are the fruits of the visit to Berlin. There is no reason to question Ries's story that Beethoven composed them for Pierre Duport and played them with him. The dedication to Friedrich Wilhelm II and the character of the works lend credibility to Ries's account of their origin. Beethoven played them with Bernhard Romberg in Vienna at the close of 1796 or beginning of 1797, and they were published soon afterward, being advertised by Artaria in the "Wiener Zeitung" of February 8th, 1797. The Twelve Variations on a theme from Handel's "Judas Maccabæus," were published by Artaria in 1797, dedicated to the Princess Lichnowsky, _née_ Countess Thun. There were no performances of Handel's oratorios in Vienna at this time, but it is not improbable that the suggestion for the Variations came from Baron van Swieten.

Here seems to be the place to refer to the Allegro movement in sonata-form for viola and violoncello which Beethoven gave the title, "Duett mit zwei Augengläsern obbligato von L. v. Beethoven" (Duet with two Eyeglasses obbligato, by L. v. Beethoven), to be found in the volume of sketches from this period (1784-1800) which the British Museum bought from J. N. Kafka in 1875.[80] There ought to be a hint as to the identity of the two players "with two eyeglasses obbligato." Here is also the place for the three Duos for Clarinet and Bassoon first published by André in Offenbach. The Sextet for Wind-Instruments published by Breitkopf and Härtel in 1810 (it received the opus number 71 later), belongs to this period. Sketches for the last movement, which differ from the ultimate form, however, are found amongst the sketches for the Pianoforte Sonata, Op. 10, No. 3. The inception of the Sonata must fall sometime between the middle of 1796 and the middle of 1798, since the subscription for it was opened in the beginning of July, 1798, and other works of a similar character were already completed in 1797. It is, therefore, possible to place the origin of the earlier movements of the Sextet in an earlier period, say 1796-97, a proceeding which is confirmed by the circumstance that the beginning is found before sketches for "Ah, perfido!" (which was composed in 1796 at the latest), on a sheet of sketches in the Artaria collection. The Kafka volume of sketches in the British Museum contains sketches for the minuet and trio of the Sextet, "Ah, perfido!" and the Pianoforte Sonata, Op. 49, No. 2. This fact also indicates the year 1796. Beethoven let the work lie a long time. It had its first hearing at a chamber concert for the benefit of Schuppanzigh in April, 1805; but it was not until 1809 that he gave it out for publication. On August 3rd of that year he wrote to Breitkopf and Härtel: "By the next mail-coach you will receive a song, _or perhaps two_, and a sextet for wind-instruments," and on August 8th: "The sextet is one of my earlier things and, moreover, was written in a single night--nothing can really be said of it beyond that it was written by an author who at least has produced a few better works; yet for many people such works are the best." The statement that the work was written in a single night must be taken in a Pickwickian sense, for sketches of it have been found.

PREDILECTION FOR WIND-INSTRUMENTS

It is plain that at this time Beethoven had a particular predilection for wind-instruments. Erich Prieger owned a fragment of a Quintet in E-flat for Oboe, three Horns and Bassoon, formerly in the possession of Artaria. The beginning of the first movement is lacking, but can be supplied from the repetition in the second part. The Adagio is intact, but there are only a few measures of the Minuet. Influenced, no doubt, by the performances of such compositions, Beethoven composed at this time two works for two oboes and English horn. Nottebohm surmises that they were instigated by a terzetto for two oboes and English horn composed by a musician named Wendt and performed at a concert of the Tonkünstler-Gesellschaft by three brothers, Johann, Franz and Philipp Teimer, on

December 23rd, 1793. One of the two works, the Trio which was published as Op. 87, is pretty well known, since it was made accessible to wider circles by arrangements published in Beethoven's day and with his approval. Artaria published it in April, 1806, without opus number. He also published it for two violins and viola as Op. 29, and finally as a Sonata for Pianoforte and Violin. The last transcription was published first, as stated in Thayer's Catalogue. Nothing of a historical nature is known of the Variations on "Là ci darem" for the same instruments beyond the fact that they were performed on December 23rd, 1797, at the concert for the benefit of the Widows and Orphans in the National Court Theatre. On a free page of the autograph (after the sixth variation) there are some miscellaneous sketches, among them a motive for the Adagio of Op. 3, another which was used in the Serenade, Op. 25, and, more remarkable still, a few measures of "Adelaide," on which he was at work in 1793, and which appeared in print in 1797. Obviously, the Variations were finished, and we may set down at the latest the year 1795 for their beginning.

The Sextet for four stringed instruments and two horns, Op. 81b, also belongs to this early period and in all likelihood was conceived before the Sextet for wind-instruments. Sketches for the first two movements are upon a sheet in the Berlin library by the side of sketches for the song, "Seufzer eines Ungeliebten." Sketches for this song keep company with some for "Adelaide." The Sextet is therefore to be credited to the year 1795, or perhaps 1794. It was published in 1819 by Simrock in Bonn. In a letter which Beethoven sent to Simrock with the MS. (but which has been lost) he had written to the publisher, who was an admirable horn player, that "the pupil had given his master many a hard nut to crack." As to whether or not, and if so when and where, the Sextet had been played before being sent to Simrock there is, as yet, no conclusive evidence.

The beautiful Quintet in E flat, Op. 16, for Pianoforte and Wind-instruments, was played at a concert given by Schuppanzigh on April 6th, 1797, being number 5 on the programme which described it as "A Quintet for the Fortepiano accompanied by four Wind-Instruments, played and composed by Mr. Ludwig van Beethoven." It had probably been completed not long before. Sketches are found in connection with a remark concerning the Sonata in C minor, Op. 10, No. 1.

It was in all probability composed between 1794 and the beginning of 1797. In the minutes of a meeting of the Tonkünstler-Gesellschaft under date May 10th, 1797, occurs this entry: "On the second day Mr. van Beethoven produced a Quintet and distinguished himself in the Quintet and incidentally by an improvisation." The word "dabey" (incidentally) seems to indicate that he introduced an improvisation in the Quintet as he did on a later occasion to the embarrassment of the other players, but to the delight of the listeners. Ries tells the story in his "Notizen," p. 79. It was at a concert at which the famous oboist Friedrich Ramm, of Munich, took part.

In the final Allegro there occur several holds before a resumption of the theme. At one of these Beethoven suddenly began to improvise, took the Rondo as a theme and entertained himself and the others for a considerable space; but not his associates. They were displeased, and Ramm even enraged (_aufgebracht_). It really was comical to see these gentlemen waiting expectantly every moment to go on, continually lifting their instruments to their lips, then quietly putting them down again. At last Beethoven was satisfied and dropped again into the Rondo. The entire audience was delighted.

Wasielewski doubts the correctness of the story, since there is but one hold in the Finale. Dr. Deiters thought that Ries confounded the last with the first movement, in which the clarinet enters after a _fermata_. The Quintet was published by Mollo in Vienna in 1801, and was dedicated to Prince Schwarzenberg. It appeared simultaneously in one arrangement made by Beethoven himself as a Quartet for Pianoforte and Strings, as Ries expressly declares. Beethoven had nothing to do with the arrangement as a String Quartet published by Artaria as Op. 75.

Touching the history of the Serenade for Violin, Viola and Violoncello, Op. 8, little else is known beyond the fact that its publication was announced in the "Wiener Zeitung" on October 7th, 1797, by Artaria. Mr. Shedlock called attention in the "Musical Times" of 1892 (p. 525) to sketches which appeared along with others of the Pianoforte Concerto in B-flat, and the Trio, Op. 1, No. 2. That Beethoven valued the work highly is a fair deduction from the fact that he published it soon after its composition and authorized the publication of an arrangement for Pianoforte and Viola which he had revised. This arrangement received the opus number 42, though probably not from Beethoven. Hoffmeister in Leipzig, who published it in 1804, under the title "Notturno pour Fortepiano et Alto arrangé d'un Notturno pour Violon, Alto et Violoncello et revu par l'auteur--Œuvre 42," advertised it in the "Intelligenzblatt der Zeitschrift für die elegante Welt" on December 17, 1803. It is this arrangement, no doubt, to which Beethoven referred in a letter to Hoffmeister, dated September 22nd, 1803, in which he said: "These transcriptions are not mine, though they were much improved by me in places. Therefore, I am not willing to have you state that I made them, for that would be a lie and I could find neither time nor patience for such work." According to the view of Dr. Deiters, which was shared also by Nottebohm, the Serenade, Op. 25, also belongs here. It was probably composed before Op. 8. Beethoven entrusted its publication in the beginning of 1802 to Cappi, who

had just begun business. Then, like Op. 8, it was published by Hoffmeister as Op. 41, in an arrangement for Pianoforte and Flute (or Violin), which, no doubt, was included in Beethoven's protest against being set down as the transcriber.

A GROUP OF PIANOFORTE SONATAS

Prominent among the compositions of this time is the Sonata in E-flat for Pianoforte, Op. 7. The only evidence of the date of its composition is the announcement of its publication by Artaria in the "Wiener Zeitung" of October 7th, 1797. There are sketches for the third movement in the Kafka volume, but they afford no help in fixing a date. The Sonata is inscribed to the Countess Babette Keglevich, one of Beethoven's pupils, who afterwards married Prince Innocenz Odescalchi in Pressburg. Nottebohm quotes the following from a letter written by a nephew of the Countess: "The Sonata was composed for her when she was still a maiden. It was one of the hobbies, of which he (Beethoven) had many, that, living as he did _vis-à-vis_, he came in morning gown, slippers and tasseled cap (_Zipfelmütze_) to give her lessons." Inasmuch as the sketches mentioned belong only to the third movement and the sheet contains the remark: "diverse 4 bagatelles de inglese Ländler, etc.," Nottebohm supposes that the movement was originally intended for one of the Bagatelles and was later incorporated in the Sonata. It is very probable that the two little Sonatas, Op. 49, belong to this period. Everybody knows that the second movement of the second Sonata (the minuet) is based on the same motive as the third movement of the Septet. That the motive is older in the Sonata than in the Septet is proved by the fact that sketches for it are found along with some to "Ah, perfido!" (1795-96) and the Sextet for Wind-instruments, Op. 71. This circumstance establishes its early origin, say in 1795 or, at latest, 1796. Nottebohm considers it likely that the first Sonata was finished at the latest in 1798, certainly before the Sonata "Pathétique" and the Trio for strings, Op. 9, No. 3. The Sonatas were ready for publication as early as 1802, in which year brother Carl offered them to André in Offenbach. They were not published until 1805, when they appeared with the imprint of the Bureau d'Arts et d'Industrie, as appears from an advertisement in the "Wiener Zeitung" of January l9th, 1805. Here, too, belongs the little Sonata in D for four hands, Op. 6, published by Artaria in October, 1797, as Nottebohm surmises. It was probably composed for purposes of instruction. Except a few trifles (marches, and two sets of variations) Beethoven wrote nothing more for four hands, though Diabelli offered him 40 ducats for a four-hand sonata in 1824.

In the pianoforte compositions of these two years are to be included the Variations in A on a Russian dance from the ballet "Das Waldmädchen," published in April, 1797, and dedicated to the Countess Browne, _née_ Bietinghoff. "Das Waldmädchen," by Traffieri, music by Paul Wranitzky, was first performed at the Kärnthnerthor-Theater on September 28, 1796, and was repeated sixteen times the same year. This fixes the time of the composition of the Variations approximately. They were probably written before the end of 1796.

There are a few other compositions brought to light by Nottebohm and Mandyczewski, which call for notice. No. 299, Series XXV (Supplement), B. and H. Complete Works, is an Allegretto in C minor, 3/4 time; No. 295 a Bagatelle, also in C minor 3/4, Presto, sketches for which are associated with those for the C minor Sonata, Op. 10, No. 1. From the remark: "Very short minuets to the new sonatas. The Presto remains for that in C minor," written about this time Nottebohm concludes that this Bagatelle was conceived as an intermezzo in the C minor Sonata, and that, possibly, the Allegretto had a similar origin.[81]

A unique place among Beethoven's early works is occupied by the two pieces for mandolin with pianoforte accompaniment first published in the Complete Edition. Thayer, who knew of the sketches at Artaria's, but seems not to have seen the composition recovered by Nottebohm, which is called Sonatine, associated Beethoven's purpose with Krumpholz, who was a virtuoso on the mandolin; but Mylich, Amenda's student companion, may have been in the composer's mind.

The fact that no compositions for orchestra save the dances for the Redoutensaal, to be referred to presently, have been preserved, is not to be taken as conclusive evidence that Beethoven did not venture into the field of orchestral music in the Bonn and early Vienna days. Such an assertion is less likely to be made now than before the discovery of the two Imperial cantatas of 1790. Moreover, Mr. Shedlock's extracts from the Kafka sketchbook in the British Museum show that Beethoven tried his youthful hand at a symphony. Among the earliest of the sketches there is one in C minor marked "Sinfonia," which begins as follows:

[Illustration]

THE "JENA" SYMPHONY AND SOME DANCES

Nottebohm notes the theme also in his "Zweite Beethoveniana" (p. 577). Shedlock's contention that out of this theme grew the second movement of the first Pianoforte Quartet (composed in 1785) is incontestable. The symphonic sketch is therefore of earlier date than 1785. In 1909, Prof. Fritz Stein, Musical Director of the University of Jena, announced that in the collection of music of the

Academic Concerts, founded in 1780, he had discovered the complete parts of a symphony in four movements in C “par Louis van Beethoven.” These words are in the handwriting of the copyist on the second violin part; on the ’cello part is written: “Symphonie von Beethoven.” Dr. Hugo Riemann,[82] after a glance through the score prepared by Prof. Stein and put at his disposal, gave it as his opinion that the symphony might well be a composition by Beethoven. Thematically, he says it suggests partly the Mannheim school, partly Haydn; the instrumentation is nearer Mozart than Stamitz or Cannabich.

Mention of Beethoven’s orchestral dances has already been made. Schindler’s remark that the musicians of Vienna “refused citizenship” to Beethoven’s efforts to write Austrian dance music is discredited, at least so far as Viennese society is concerned, by the success of his dances composed for the Redoutensaal and the very considerable number of his waltzes, ländlers, minuets, écossaises, allemandes and contra-dances which have been preserved. Only the smaller portion of these dances have been included in the Complete Edition of Breitkopf and Härtel. Thus in Series II there are 12 minuets and 12 German dances; in Series XXV (Supplement), 6 “Ländrische Tänze” for two violins and bass, 6 German dances for pianoforte and violin, and, for pianoforte alone, 6 German dances, 6 écossaises and a few miscellaneous dances; in Series XVIII (Small Pieces for Pianoforte) there are 6 minuets and 13 “Ländrische” (1-6 identical with those numbered 7-13 in Series II, but transcribed). There are many dances as yet unpublished. For instance, among the Artaria MSS, purchased by Erich Prieger, there are 12 écossaises, of which 6 are as yet unknown, also 12 “Deutsche” for pianoforte and 6 minuets for two violins and bass, which have never been printed. The three orchestral dances noted by Thayer in the Thematic Catalogue as No. 290, of the Artaria collection, are Nos. 3, 9 and 11 of the 12 minuets which A. von Perger discovered in the archives of the Künstler-Pensions-Institut in 1872, and which were published by Hengel in Paris in pianoforte transcription in 1903 and in score and parts in 1906, edited by Chantavoine. They were composed for the Künstlersocietät and are now in the Court Library at Vienna. (MS. 16,925.)

FOOTNOTES:

[75] It is now No. 16 of the extended Operngasse.

[76] Czerny described Beethoven’s brothers to Otto Jahn as follows: “Carl: small of stature, red-haired, ugly; Johann: large, dark, a handsome man and complete dandy.”

[77] “Mr. von Z.” is doubtless Zmeskall, who is thus shown to have been a trusted friend of Beethoven’s in 1796. “This time” indicates plainly that Beethoven had been in Prague before. Through the words: “Greetings to Brother Caspar” the pen has been heavily drawn, and, if the color of the ink can be trusted after so many years, it was done at the time of writing. “F. Linowsky” is Fürst (Prince) Lichnowsky.

[78] Beethoven told the story to Mme. von Arnim with the additional particular that they were walking in Unter den Linden and went thence into a private room of the principal coffee-house where there was a pianoforte, for the exhibition of their skill.

[79] After the journey to Pesth?

[80] See the articles by J. S. Shedlock in “The Musical Times,” June to December, 1892. Mr. Shedlock made a copy of the duet for Dr. Deiters.

[81] “Beethoveniana,” p. 31. Later Beethoven wanted to give the Sonata an Intermezzo in C major (Ibid., p. 479), but did not carry out the intention.

[82] See Vol. II, p. 60, of the revised edition of “Ludwig van Beethoven’s Leben” by Thayer, 1910.

Chapter XV

General Bernadotte--His Connection with the “Heroic” Symphony--Rival Pianists--J. Wölffl--Dragonetti and Cramer--Compositions of the Years 1798 and 1799.

Early in the year 1798, a political event occurred which demands notice here from its connection with one of Beethoven’s noblest and most original works--the “Sinfonia Eroica.” The singular tissue of error which, owing to carelessness in observing dates, has been woven in relation to its origin may be best destroyed by a simple statement of fact.

The extraordinary demands made by the French Directory upon the Austrian government as preliminary to the renewal of diplomatic intercourse, after the peace of Campo Formio--such as a national palace and French theatre for the minister and the

right of jurisdiction over all Frenchmen in the Austrian dominions--all of which were rejected by the Imperial government, had aroused to a high pitch the public curiosity both as to the man who might be selected for the appointment and as to the course he might adopt. This curiosity was by no means diminished by the intelligence that the new minister was Jean Baptiste Bernadotte, the young general who had borne so important a part in the recent invasion of Istria. He arrived in Vienna on February 5th, 1798. The state of the Empress's health, who was delivered of the Archduchess Maria Clementine on the 1st of March, delayed the private audience of Bernadotte for the presentation of his credentials to the Emperor until the second of that month, and his public audience until the 8th of April. During the festivities of the court, which then took place, Bernadotte was always present, and a reporter of that day says both the Emperor and Empress held more conversation with him than with any other of the "cercle." This familiar intercourse, however, came speedily to an end; for on the 13th Bernadotte had the rashness to display the hated tricolor from his balcony and to threaten to defend it by force. A riot occurred, and it was thought that in the extreme excitement of popular feeling nothing but the strong detachments of cavalry and infantry detailed for his protection saved his life--saved it to ascend the throne of Sweden on the twentieth anniversary of his arrival in Vienna!

Since etiquette allowed a foreign minister neither to make nor receive visits in his public capacity until after his formal reception at court, the General, during the two months of his stay, except the last five days, "lived very quietly." Those who saw him praised him as "well behaved, sedate and modest." In his train was Rudolph Kreutzer, the great violinist.

BERNADOTTE AND THE HEROIC SYMPHONY

Bernadotte had now just entered his 34th year; Kreutzer was in his 32nd; both of them, therefore, in age, as in tastes and acquirements, fitted to appreciate the splendor of Beethoven's genius and to enjoy his society. Moreover, as the Ambassador was the son of a provincial advocate, there was no difference of rank by birth, which could prevent them from meeting upon equal terms. Under such circumstances, and remembering that just at that epoch the young General Bonaparte was the topic of universal wonder and admiration, one is fully prepared for the statement of Schindler upon the origin of the "Heroic" Symphony:

The first idea for the symphony is said to have gone out from General Bernadotte, then French Ambassador in Vienna, who esteemed Beethoven very highly. This I heard from several of Beethoven's friends. I was also told so by Count Moritz Lichnowsky (brother of Prince Lichnowsky), who was often in the society of Bernadotte with Beethoven....

Again in 1823:

Beethoven had a lively recollection that Bernadotte had really first inspired him with the idea of the "Eroica" Symphony.

This is from Schindler's work in its first form. His unfortunate propensity sometimes to accept the illusions of his fancy for matters of fact is exhibited in the corresponding passage in his third edition:

In Bernadotte's salon, which was open to notabilities of all ranks of life, Beethoven also appeared. He had already made it known that he was a great admirer of the First Consul of the Republic. From the General emanated the suggestion that Beethoven celebrate the greatest hero of his age in a musical composition. It was not long (!) before the thought had become a deed. (Vol. I, page 101.)

In proceeding with the history of the Symphony, Schindler extracts largely from Beethoven's own copy of Schleiermacher's translation of Plato. That the idea of Bonaparte as First Consul may have influenced the form and matter of the Symphony, when he came to the labor of its composition, and that Beethoven may have based for himself a sort of system of political ethics upon Schleiermacher's Plato--all this is very possible; but Bernadotte was far away from Vienna before the consular form of government was adopted at Paris, and the "Sinfonia Eroica" had been publicly performed at Vienna before the Plato came from the Berlin press!

It is certainly to be regretted that so much fine writing by Schindler and his copyists on this point should be exploded by a date--like a ship by a single shell; but how could anyone believe that the much-employed Beethoven, at the age of 27, he who had refused two years before, even despite Wegeler's urging, to listen to a single private lecture on Kant, had become in so short a time a Platonic philosopher?

Let us return to a field where Beethoven was even now more at home than he ever became in Plato's political philosophy. Salieri had again engaged him for the "Widows and Orphans" concerts of April 1st and 2nd at which Haydn's "Seven Last Words" was sung and Beethoven's Pianoforte Quintet played. Kaiser Franz and the imperial family were present.

RIVALRY OF BEETHOVEN AND WÖLFFL

It was now no longer the case that Beethoven was without a rival as pianoforte virtuoso. He had a competitor fully worthy of his powers; one who divided about equally with him the suffrages of the leaders in the Vienna musical circles. In fact the excellencies peculiar to the two were such and so different, that it depended upon the taste of the auditor to which he accorded the praise of superiority. Joseph Wölffl of Salzburg, two years younger than Beethoven, a “wonder-child,” who had played a violin concerto in public at the age of seven years, was a pupil of Leopold Mozart and Michael Haydn. Being in Vienna, when but eighteen years old, he was engaged, on the recommendation of Mozart, by the Polish count Oginsky, who took him to Warsaw. His success there, as pianoforte virtuoso, teacher and composer, was almost unexampled. But it is only in his character as pianist that we have to do with him; and a reference may be made to the general principle, that a worthy competition is the best spur to genius. When we read in one of his letters Beethoven’s words “I have also greatly perfected my pianoforte playing,” they will cause no surprise; for only by severe industry and consequent improvement could he retain his high position, in the presence of such rivals as Wölffl and, a year or two later, J. B. Cramer. A lively picture of Wölffl by Tomaschek, who heard him in 1799, in his autobiography sufficiently proves that his party in Vienna was composed of those to whom extraordinary execution was the main thing; while Beethoven’s admirers were of those who had hearts to be touched. A parallel between Beethoven and Wölffl in a letter to the “Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung” (Vol. I, pp. 24, 25) dated April 22, 1799, just at the time when the performances of both were topics of general conversation in musical circles, and still fresh in the memory of all who had heard them, is in the highest degree apposite to the subject of this chapter. The writer says:

Opinion is divided here touching the merits of the two; yet it would seem as if the majority were on the side of the latter (Wölffl). I shall try to set forth the peculiarities of each without taking part in the controversy. Beethoven’s playing is extremely brilliant but has less delicacy and occasionally he is guilty of indistinctness. He shows himself to the greatest advantage in improvisation, and here, indeed, it is most extraordinary with what lightness and yet firmness in the succession of ideas Beethoven not only varies a theme given him on the spur of the moment by figuration (with which many a virtuoso makes his fortune and--wind) but really develops it. Since the death of Mozart, who in this respect is for me still the _non plus ultra_, I have never enjoyed this kind of pleasure in the degree in which it is provided by Beethoven. In this Wölffl fails to reach him. But W. has advantages in this that, sound in musical learning and dignified in his compositions, he plays passages which seem impossible with an ease, precision and clearness which cause amazement (of course he is helped here by the large structure of his hands) and that his interpretation is always, especially in Adagios, so pleasing and insinuating that one can not only admire it but also enjoy.... That Wölffl likewise enjoys an advantage because of his amiable bearing, contrasted with the somewhat haughty pose of Beethoven, is very natural.

No biography of Beethoven which makes any pretence to completeness, can omit the somewhat inflated and bombastic account which Seyfried gives of the emulation between Beethoven and Wölffl. Ignatz von Seyfried at the period in question was one of Schikaneder’s conductors, to which position he had been called when not quite twenty-one years of age, and had assumed its duties March 1, 1797. He was among the most promising of the young composers of the capital, belonged to a highly respectable family, had been educated at the University, and his personal character was unblemished. He would, therefore, naturally have access to the musical salons and his reminiscences of music and musicians in those years may be accepted as the records of observation. The unfavorable light which the researches of Nottebohm have thrown upon him as editor of the so-called “Beethoven Studien” does not extend to such statements of fact as might easily have come under his own cognizance; and the passage now cited from the appendix of the “Studien,” though written thirty years after the events it describes, bears all the marks of being a faithful transcript of the writer’s own memories:

Beethoven had already attracted attention to himself by several compositions and was rated a first-class pianist in Vienna when he was confronted by a rival in the closing years of the last century. Thereupon there was, in a way, a revival of the old Parisian feud of the Gluckists and Piccinists, and the many friends of art in the Imperial City arrayed themselves in two parties. At the head of Beethoven’s admirers stood the amiable Prince Lichnowsky; among the most zealous patrons of Wölffl was the broadly cultured Baron Raymond von Wetzlar, whose delightful villa (on the Grünberg near the Emperor’s recreation-castle) offered to all artists, native and foreign, an asylum in the summer months, as pleasing as it was desirable, with true British loyalty. There the interesting combats of the two athletes not infrequently offered an indescribable artistic treat to the numerous and thoroughly select gathering. Each brought forward the latest product of his mind. Now one and anon the other gave free rein to his glowing fancy; sometimes they would seat themselves at two pianofortes and improvise alternately on themes which they gave each other, and thus created many a four-hand Capriccio which if it could have been put upon paper at the moment would surely have bidden defiance to time. It would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, to award the palm of victory to either one of the gladiators in respect of technical skill. Nature had been a particularly kind mother to Wölffl in bestowing upon him a gigantic hand which could span a tenth as easily

as other hands compass an octave, and permitted him to play passages of double notes in these intervals with the rapidity of lightning. In his improvisations even then Beethoven did not deny his tendency toward the mysterious and gloomy. When once he began to revel in the infinite world of tones, he was transported also above all earthly things;--his spirit had burst all restricting bonds, shaken off the yoke of servitude, and soared triumphantly and jubilantly into the luminous spaces of the higher æther. Now his playing tore along like a wildly foaming cataract, and the conjurer constrained his instrument to an utterance so forceful that the stoutest structure was scarcely able to withstand it; and anon he sank down, exhausted, exhaling gentle plaints, dissolving in melancholy. Again the spirit would soar aloft, triumphing over transitory terrestrial sufferings, turn its glance upward in reverent sounds and find rest and comfort on the innocent bosom of holy nature. But who shall sound the depths of the sea? It was the mystical Sanscrit language whose hieroglyphs can be read only by the initiated. Wölffl, on the contrary, trained in the school of Mozart, was always equable; never superficial but always clear and thus more accessible to the multitude. He used art only as a means to an end, never to exhibit his acquirements. He always enlisted the interest of his hearers and inevitably compelled them to follow the progression of his well-ordered ideas. Whoever has heard Hummel will know what is meant by this....

But for this (the attitude of their patrons) the _protégés_ cared very little. They respected each other because they knew best how to appreciate each other, and as straightforward honest Germans followed the principle that the roadway of art is broad enough for many, and that it is not necessary to lose one's self in envy in pushing forward for the goal of fame!

Wölffl proved his respect for his rival by dedicating to "M. L. van Beethoven" the pianoforte sonatas, Op. 7, which were highly commended in the "Allg. Mus. Zeit." of Leipsic of January, 1799. Another interesting and valuable discussion of Beethoven's powers and characteristics as a pianoforte virtuoso at this period is contained in the autobiography of Tomaschek, who heard him both in public and in private during a visit which Beethoven made again this year to Prague. Tomaschek was then both in age (he was born on April 17, 1774) and in musical culture competent to form an independent judgment on such a subject.

TOMASCHEK ON BEETHOVEN'S PLAYING

In the year 1798, says Tomaschek (unfortunately without giving any clue to the time of the year), in which I continued my juridical studies, Beethoven, the giant among pianoforte players, came to Prague. He gave a largely attended concert in the Konviktssaal, at which he played his Concerto in C major, Op. 15, and the Adagio and graceful Rondo in A major from Op. 2, and concluded with an improvisation on a theme given him by Countess Sch... (Schick?), "Ah tu fosti il primo oggetto," from Mozart's "Titus" (duet No. 7). Beethoven's magnificent playing and particularly the daring flights in his improvisation stirred me strangely to the depths of my soul; indeed I found myself so profoundly bowed down that I did not touch my pianoforte for several days.... I heard Beethoven at his second concert, which neither in performance nor in composition renewed again the first powerful impression. This time he played the Concerto in B-flat which he had just composed in Prague.[83] Then I heard him a third time at the home of Count C., where he played, besides the graceful Rondo from the A major Sonata, an improvisation on the theme: "Ah! vous dirai-je, Maman." This time I listened to Beethoven's artistic work with more composure. I admired his powerful and brilliant playing, but his frequent daring deviations from one motive to another, whereby the organic connection, the gradual development of idea was put aside, did not escape me. Evils of this nature frequently weaken his greatest compositions, those which sprang from a too exuberant conception. It is not seldom that the unbiassed listener is rudely awakened from his transport. The singular and original seemed to be his chief aim in composition, as is confirmed by the answer which he made to a lady who asked him if he often attended Mozart's operas. "I do not know them," he replied, "and do not care to hear the music of others lest I forfeit some of my originality."

The veteran Tomaschek when he wrote thus had heard all the greatest virtuosos of the pianoforte, who, from the days of Mozart to 1840, had made themselves famous; and yet Beethoven remained for him still "the lord of pianoforte players" and "the giant among pianoforte players." Still, great as he was now when Tomaschek heard him, Beethoven could write three years later that he had greatly perfected his playing.

It is only to be added to the history of the year 1798, that it is the time in which Beethoven fixes the beginning of his deafness. Like it, the year 1799 offers, upon the whole, but scanty materials to the biographers of Beethoven--standing in broad contrast to the next and, indeed all succeeding years, in which their quantity and variety become a source of embarrassment.

Two new and valuable, though but passing acquaintances, were made by Beethoven this year, however--with Domenico Dragonetti, the greatest contrabassist known to history, and John Baptist Cramer, one of the greatest pianists. Dragonetti was not more remarkable for his astounding execution than for the deep, genuine musical feeling which elevated and ennobled it. He was now--the spring of 1799, so far as the means are at hand of determining the time--returning to London from a visit to his native

province, and his route taking him to Vienna he remained there for several weeks. Beethoven and he soon met and they were mutually pleased with each other. Many years afterwards Dragonetti related the following anecdote to Samuel Appleby, Esq., of Brighton, England: “Beethoven had been told that his new friend could execute violoncello music upon his huge instrument, and one morning, when Dragonetti called at his room, he expressed his desire to hear a sonata. The contrabass was sent for, and the Sonata, No. 2, of Op. 5, was selected. Beethoven played his part, with his eyes immovably fixed upon his companion, and, in the finale, where the arpeggios occur, was so delighted and excited that at the close he sprang up and threw his arms around both player and instrument.” The unlucky contrabassists of orchestras had frequent occasion during the next few years to know that this new revelation of the powers and possibilities of their instrument to Beethoven, was not forgotten.

Cramer, born at Mannheim, 1771, but from early infancy reared and educated in England, was successively the pupil of the noted Bensor, Schroeter and Clementi; but, like Beethoven, was in no small degree self-taught. He was so rarely and at such long intervals on the Continent that his extraordinary merits have never been fully understood and appreciated there. Yet for a period of many years in the first part of the nineteenth century he was undoubtedly, upon the whole, the first pianist of Europe, The object of his tour in 1799 was not to display his own talents and acquirements, but to add to his general musical culture and to profit by his observations upon the styles and peculiar characteristics of the great pianists of the Continent. In Vienna he renewed his intercourse with Haydn, whose prime favorite he had been in England, and at once became extremely intimate with Beethoven.

Cramer surpassed Beethoven in the perfect neatness, correctness and finish of his execution; Beethoven assured him that he preferred his touch to that of any other player; his brilliancy was astonishing; but yet taste, feeling, expression, were the qualities which more eminently distinguished him. Beethoven stood far above Cramer in power and energy, especially when extemporizing. Each was supreme in his own sphere; each found much to learn in the perfections of the other; each, in later years, did full justice to the other’s powers. Thus Ries says: “Amongst the pianoforte players he [Beethoven] had praise for but one as being distinguished--John Cramer. All others were but little to him.” On the other hand, Mr. Appleby, who knew Cramer well, was long afterwards told by him, “No man in these days has heard extempore playing, unless he has heard Beethoven.”

CRAMER’S RECOLLECTIONS OF BEETHOVEN

Making a visit one morning to him, Cramer, as he entered the anteroom, heard Beethoven extemporizing by himself, and remained there more than half an hour “completely entranced,” never in his life having heard such exquisite effects, such beautiful combinations. Knowing Beethoven’s extreme dislike to being listened to on such occasions, Cramer retired and never let him know that he had so heard him.

Cramer’s widow communicates a pleasant anecdote. At an Augarten Concert the two pianists were walking together and hearing a performance of Mozart’s pianoforte Concerto in C minor (Köchel, No. 491); Beethoven suddenly stood still and, directing his companion’s attention to the exceedingly simple, but equally beautiful motive which is first introduced towards the end of the piece, exclaimed: “Cramer, Cramer! we shall never be able to do anything like that!” As the theme was repeated and wrought up to the climax, Beethoven, swaying his body to and fro, marked the time and in every possible manner manifested a delight rising to enthusiasm.

Schindler’s record of his conversations upon Beethoven with Cramer and Cherubini in 1841 is interesting and valuable. He has, however, left one important consideration unnoticed, namely, that the visits of those masters to Vienna were five years apart--five years of great change in Beethoven--a period during which his deafness, too slight to attract Cramer’s attention, had increased to a degree beyond concealment, and which, joined to his increased devotion to composition and compulsory abandonment of all ambition as a virtuoso, with consequent neglect of practice, had affected his execution unfavorably. Hence the difference in the opinions of such competent judges as Cramer, describing him as he was in 1799-1800, Cherubini in 1805-6, and two years later Clementi, afford a doubtless just and fair indication of the decline of Beethoven’s powers as a mere pianist--not extending, however, at least for some years yet, to his extemporaneous performances. We shall find from Ries and others ample confirmation of the fact.

And now let Schindler speak:

To the warm feeling of Cramer for Beethoven I owe the more important matters.... Cherubini, disposed to be curt, characterized Beethoven’s pianoforte playing in a single word: “rough.” The gentleman Cramer, however, desired that less offence be taken at the rudeness of his performance than at the unreliable reading of one and the same composition--one day intellectually brilliant and full of characteristic expression, the next freakish to the verge of unclearness; often confused. (Which is confirmed by Ries, Czerny and

others.) Because of this a few friends expressed a wish to hear Cramer play several works publicly from the manuscript. This touched a sensitive spot in Beethoven; his jealousy was aroused and, according to Cramer, their relations became strained.

This strain, however, left no such sting behind it as to diminish Cramer's good opinion of Beethoven both as man and artist, or hinder his free expression of it. To this fact the concurrent testimony of his widow and son, and those enthusiasts for Beethoven Charles Neate, Cipriani Potter and others who knew Cramer well, bear witness. It was the conversation of Cramer about Beethoven which induced Potter, after the fall of Napoleon, to journey to Vienna, to make the acquaintance of the great master and, if possible, become his pupil.

Cramer's musical gods were Handel and Mozart, notwithstanding his life-long love for Bach's clavier compositions; hence the abrupt transitions, the strange modulations, and the, until then, unheard passages, which Beethoven introduced ever more freely into his works--many of which have not yet found universal acceptance--were to him, as to Tomaschek and so many other of his contemporaries, imperfections and distortions of compositions, which but for them were models of beauty and harmonious proportion. He once gave this feeling utterance with comic exaggeration, when Potter, then a youth, was extolling some abstruse combinations, by saying: "If Beethoven emptied his inkstand upon a piece of music paper you would admire it!"

Upon Beethoven's demeanor in society, Schindler proceeds thus:

BEETHOVEN'S DEMEANOR IN SOCIETY

The communications of both (Cramer and Madame Cherubini) agreed in saying that in mixed society his conduct was reserved, stiff and marked by artist's pride; whereas among his intimates he was droll, lively, indeed, voluble at times, and fond of giving play to all the arts of wit and sarcasm, not always wisely especially in respect of political and social prejudices. To this the two were able to add much concerning his awkwardness in taking hold of such objects as glasses, coffee cups, etc., to which Master Cherubini added the comment: "Toujours brusque." These statements confirmed what I had heard from his older friends touching the social demeanor of Beethoven in general.

Cramer reached Vienna early in September, and remained there, according to Schindler, through the following winter; but he does not appear to have given any public concerts, although, during the first month of his stay, we learn from a newspaper, he "earned general and deserved applause by his playing." It is needless to dwell upon the advantages to Beethoven of constant intercourse for several months with a master like Cramer, whose noblest characteristics as pianist were the same as Mozart's, and precisely those in which Beethoven was deficient.

* * * * *

Let us pass in review the compositions which had their origin in the years 1798 and 1799. First of all come the three Trios for stringed instruments, Op. 9. The exact date of their conception has not yet been determined, all that is positive being that Beethoven sold them to Traeg on March 16, 1798, and that the publisher's announcement of them appeared on July 21st of the same year. The only sketches for the Trios quoted by Nottebohm show them in connection with a sketch for the last movement of the "Sonate pathétique," which was published in 1799; but this proves nothing. It may be easily imagined that Beethoven desired to make more extended use of the experience gained in writing the Trios, Op. 3, and that he therefore began sketching Op. 9 in 1796 or 1797. Beethoven dedicated the works to Count Browne in words such as could hardly have been called forth by the present of a horse. Perhaps some future investigator will be able to show upon what grounds Beethoven in the dedication called Count Browne his "first Mæcenas," a title better deserved by Prince Lichnowsky.

THE FIRST TWO PIANOFORTE CONCERTOS

The first two concertos for pianoforte call for consideration here, for it was not until 1798 that they acquired the form in which they are now known. That the Concerto in B-flat was the earlier of the two has been proved in a preceding chapter of this volume. It was this Concerto and not the one in C major (as Wegeler incorrectly reported) that was played in March, 1795. Wegeler's error was due to the circumstance that the Concerto in C was published first. Sketches for the Concerto in B-flat major are found among the exercises written for Albrechtsberger, sketches for the Sonata in E major (Op. 14, No. 1), and others for a little quartet movement which was owned by M. Malherbe of Paris; on this sheet occurs a short exercise with the remark "Contrapunto all'ottava" which points to the beginning of 1795 or even 1794. The sketch is an obviously early form of a passage in the free fantasia. This agrees with the statement that on March 29, 1795, Beethoven played a new concerto, the key of which is not indicated. It is most likely that it was this in B-flat, since the one in C did not exist at the time. Beethoven, it appears, played it a few times afterward in Vienna and

then rewrote it. According to Tomaschek's account he played the B-flat Concerto (expressly distinguished from that in C) in 1798, again in Prague. Tomaschek added, "which he had composed in Prague." This is confounding the original version with the revision, concerning which Nottebohm gives information in his "Zweite Beethoveniana" on the basis of sketches which point to 1798. The fact of the revision is proved by Beethoven's memoranda, such as "To remain as it was," "From here on everything to remain as it was." The revision of the first movement was radical, and the entire work was apparently undertaken in view of an imminent performance, most likely that of Prague in 1798. It was published by Hoffmeister und Kühnel and dedicated to Carl Nikl Edlen von Nikelsberg.

That the Concerto in C was composed later than that in B-flat has been proved by Beethoven's testimony as well as other external evidences and is confirmed by the few remaining sketches analyzed by Nottebohm. They appear in connection with a sketch for the cadenza for the B-flat Concerto which, therefore, must have been finished when its companion was begun. A sketch for a cadenza for the C major Concerto comes after sketches for the Sonata in D, Op. 10, No. 3, which was published in 1798. This new concerto must, therefore, have been finished. According to the testimony of Tomaschek he played it in 1798 in the Konviktsaal in Prague. Schindler says he played it for the first time "in the spring of 1800 in the Kärnthnerthor-Theater," but this concert is likely to have been that of April 2nd, 1800, described by Hanslick in his "Geschichte des Concertwesens in Wien" (p. 127). Schindler evidently knew nothing of the performance in Prague and a confusion must be at the bottom of Czerny's statement that the Concerto was played in the Kärnthnerthor-Theater in 1801. The Concerto in C, dedicated to the Countess Odescalchi, _née_ Keglevich, was published by Mollo in Vienna in 1801. There are three cadenzas for the first movement of the Concerto, the last two of which call for an extended compass of the pianoforte and are thus shown to be of later date than the first.

To these concertos must be added the Rondo in B-flat for Pianoforte and Orchestra found unfinished among Beethoven's compositions and published by Diabelli and Co. in 1829. Sonnleithner, on the authority of Diabelli, says it was completed by Czerny, who also filled out the accompaniment. There is no authentic record of the time of its composition. O. Jahn surmised that it may have been designed for the Concerto in B-flat. Its contents indicate an earlier period. A sketch printed by Nottebohm associated with a Romanza for Pianoforte, Flute and Bassoon, judged by the handwriting, is not of later date than 1795. E. Mandyczewski compared the original manuscript, now in the library of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, with the printed form and decided that the work was completed in plan and _motiri_ by Beethoven, who, however, did not carry out the cadenzas and only indicated the passages. The share which Czerny had in it is thus indicated; he added the cadenzas and extended the pianoforte passages which Beethoven had only indicated, making them more effective and brilliant. The use of the high registers of the pianoforte which Czerny employs somewhat too freely in view of the simple character of the piece, was not contemplated by Beethoven, who once remarked of Czerny: "He uses the piccolo too much for me." In Mandyczewski's opinion the handwriting points to a time before 1800, and the contents indicate the early Vienna if not the Bonn period. Mandyczewski also thinks that the romanza-like Andante is palpably a very early composition and that the correspondence in key and measure with the B-flat Concerto might indicate that it was originally designed as a part of that work, a supposition which is strengthened by the fact that the original manuscript is neither dated nor signed. This internal evidence has much in its favor, the more since it is not at all obvious what might have prompted Beethoven to write an independent rondo for concert use. There is no external evidence; if there were, the conception of the B-flat Concerto would have to be set at a much earlier date than has yet been done. The first Vienna sketches for the Concerto, as Nottebohm shows, prove that the present three movements belonged together from the beginning. They were, therefore, surely played at the first performance in 1795. Nottebohm, who repeated Jahn's surmise in his "Thematisches Verzeichniss," changed his mind after a study of the sketches and rejected the notion that the rondo had been designed for the Concerto. Only by assuming an earlier date for the rondo can the theory be upheld. Attention may here be called to Wegeler's statement ("Notizen," p. 56) that the rondo of the first Concerto (he says, of course, the Concerto in C) was not composed until the second afternoon before the performance. There may possibly have been another. This is not necessarily disproved by the fact that sketches for the present one were in existence. The question is not settled by the evidence now before us, but the probabilities are with Mandyczewski.

Now begins the glorious series of sonatas. The first were the three (Op. 10) which, though begun in part at an earlier date, were definitively finished and published in 1798. Eder, the publisher, opened a subscription for them by an advertisement in the "Wiener Zeitung," July 5th, 1798; therefore they were finished at that time. The sketching for them had begun in 1796, as appears from Nottebohm's statement,[84] and Beethoven worked on the three simultaneously. Sketches for the first movement of the first Sonata are mixed with sketches for the soprano air for Umlauf's "Schusterin" which have been attributed to 1796, and the Variations for three Wind-Instruments which were played in 1797. Sketches for the third sonata are found among notes for the Sextet for Wind-Instruments (composed about 1796) and also for the Concerto in C minor, which, therefore, was begun thus early, and for

one of the seven country dances which appeared in 1799, or perhaps earlier. The sketches for the last movement of No. 3 are associated alone with sketches for a cadenza for the C major Concerto which Beethoven played in Prague in 1798, and may therefore be placed in this year. It follows that the three sonatas were developed gradually in 1796-98, and completed in 1798. From the sketches and the accompanying memoranda[85] we learn, furthermore, that for the first Sonata, which now has three movements, a fourth, an Intermezzo, was planned on which Beethoven several times made a beginning but permitted to fall. Two of these movements became known afterwards as “Bagatelles.” We learn also that the last movement of the first Sonata, and the second movement of the second, were originally laid out on a larger scale.

COMPOSITION OF THE “SONATE PATHÉTIQUE”

The “Sonate pathétique,” Op. 13, was published by Eder, in Vienna, in 1799, and afterwards by Hoffmeister, who announced them on December 18 of the same year. Sketches for the rondo are found among those for the Trio, Op. 9, and after the beginning of a fair copy of the Sonata, Op. 49, No. 1. From this there is no larger deduction than that the Sonata probably had its origin about 1798. One of the sketches, however, indicates that the last movement was originally conceived for more than one instrument, probably for a sonata for pianoforte and violin. Beethoven published the two Sonatas, Op. 14, which he dedicated to the Baroness Braun, immediately after the “Sonate pathétique.” They came from the press of Mollo and were announced on December 21, 1799. The exact time of their composition cannot be determined definitely. Up to the present time no sketches for the second are known to exist; copious ones for the first, however, are published by Nottebohm in his “Zweite Beethoveniana” (p. 45 _et seq._), some of which appear before sketches for the Sonata, Op. 12, No. 3, then approaching completion, and some after sketches for the Concerto in B-flat. Because of this juxtaposition, Nottebohm places the conception of the Sonata in 1795.

Touching the history of the Trio, Op. 11, for Pianoforte, Clarinet and Violoncello, little is known. It was advertised as wholly new by Mollo and Co. on October 3, 1798, and is inscribed to the Countess Thun. Sketches associated with works that are unknown or were never completed are in the British Museum and set forth by Nottebohm in his “Zweite Beethoveniana” (p. 515). The sketch for the Adagio resembles the beginning of the minuet in the Sonata, Op. 49, No. 2, and is changed later; this points approximately to 1798. The last movement consists of a series of variations on the theme of a trio from Weigl’s opera “L’Amor marinaro,” beginning “Pria ch’io l’impegno.” Weigl’s opera was performed for the first time on October 15, 1797. Czerny told Otto Jahn that Beethoven took the theme at the request of a clarinet player (Beer?) for whom he wrote the Trio. The elder Artaria told Cipriani Potter in 1797, that he had given the theme to Beethoven and requested him to introduce variations on it into a trio, and added that Beethoven did not know that the melody was Weigl’s until after the Trio was finished, whereupon he grew very angry on finding it out. Czerny says in the supplement to his “Pianoforte School”:

It was at the wish of the clarinet player for whom Beethoven wrote this Trio that he employed the above theme by Weigl (which was then very popular) as the finale. At a later period he frequently contemplated writing another concluding movement for this Trio, and letting the variations stand as a separate work.

If Czerny is correct in his statement, obvious deductions from it are these, which are scarcely consistent with Artaria’s story: if the theme was “very popular” at the time the opera must have had several performances, and it is not likely that the melody was unfamiliar to Beethoven, who also, it may be assumed, wrote the title of Weigl’s trio, which is printed at the beginning of the last movement of Beethoven’s composition. Beethoven produced the Trio for the first time at the house of Count Fries on the occasion of his first meeting with Steibelt. The three Sonatas for Pianoforte and Violin, Op. 12, were advertised in the “Wiener Zeitung” of January 12, 1799, as published by Artaria, which would seem to place their origin in 1798. The program of a concert given by Madame Duschek on March 29, 1798, preserved in the archives of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, announces a sonata with accompaniment to be played by Beethoven. The accompanying (_obbligato_) instrument is not mentioned, but the work may well have been one of these Sonatas. Nottebohm discusses the juxtaposition of sketches for the second Sonata with sketches for the Pianoforte Concerto in B-flat and the sonata in E, Op. 14, No. 1, and is inclined to fix 1795 as the year of the sonata’s origin. But we are in the dark as to whether the sketches for the Pianoforte Concerto were for its original or its revised form.

Among the instrumental compositions of this year belong the Variations for Pianoforte and Violoncello on “Ein Mädchen oder Weibchen” from Mozart’s “Zauberflöte,” of which nothing more is known than that Traeg announced their publication on September 12, 1798. They were afterward taken over by Artaria. The Variation for Pianoforte on a theme from Grétry’s “Richard, Cœur de Lion” (“Une fièvre brûlante”) were announced as newly published on November 7, 1798, by Traeg; Cappi and Diabelli acquired them later. Sketches for them are found by the side of sketches for the first movement of the Sonata in C minor, Op. 10, No. 1, which circumstance indicates that 1796 was the year of their origin. According to Sonnleithner, “Richard, Cœur de Lion” was first

performed at the Hoftheater, Vienna, on January 7, 1788; then again on June 13, 1799 in the Theater auf den Wieden; but a ballet, “Richard Löwenherz,” by Vigano, music by Weigl, in which Grétry’s romance, “Une fièvre brûlante,” was interpolated, was brought forward on July 2, 1795, in the Hof- und Nationaltheater and repeated often in that year, and it was thence, no doubt, that the suggestion for the variations came to Beethoven. The six little Variations on a Swiss air were published, according to Nottebohm, by Simrock in Bonn in 1798. The ten Variations on “La stessa, la stessissima” from Salieri’s “Falstaff, ossia le tre Burle,” were announced as just published in the “Wiener Zeitung” of March 2, 1799. Salieri’s opera was performed on January 3 (Wlassak says January 6), 1799, in the Hoftheater; Beethoven’s, therefore, was an occasional composition conceived and produced in a very short time. Sketches are found among some for the first Quartet, Op. 18, and others. The Variations are dedicated to the Countess Babette Keglevich. Twice more in the same year operatic productions induced similar works. The publication of the Variations on “Kind, willst du ruhig schlafen?” from Winter’s “Unterbrochenes Opferfest,” was announced in the “Wiener Zeitung” of December 21, 1799, by Mollo and Co.; the opera had its first performance in Vienna on June 15, 1796, and was repeated frequently within the years immediately following--six times in 1799. In this case also it may be assumed that publication followed hard on the heels of composition. Sketches are found in companionship with others belonging to the Quartet, Op. 18, No. 5, and the Septet. The Variations on “Tändeln und Scherzen,” from Süssmayr’s opera “Soliman II, oder die drei Sultaninnen,” belong to the same time. The opera was performed on October 1, 1799, in the Hoftheater; the publication of the variations by Hoffmeister was announced in the “Wiener Zeitung” on December 18, 1799. They may have been printed previously by Eder. They were dedicated to Countess Browne, _née_ von Bietinghoff. It is interesting to learn from Czerny that these Variations were the first of Beethoven’s compositions which the master gave him to study when he became his pupil. Before them he had pieces by C. P. E. Bach and after them the “Sonate pathéthique.”

THE PERIOD OF THE FIRST SYMPHONY

As evidence pointing to the period in which the first Symphony was written we have, first of all, the report of the first performance on April 2, 1800; but inasmuch as the copying of the parts and the rehearsals must have consumed a considerable time, the period would be much too short (especially in view of Beethoven’s method of working) if we were also to assume that the Symphony originated in 1800. It is very likely that, with the Quartets, it was sketched at an earlier period and worked out in the main by 1799 at the latest. It was published toward the end of 1801 by Hoffmeister and Kühnel as Op. 21, dedicated to Baron van Swieten and advertised in the “Wiener Zeitung” of January 16, 1802. Beethoven had already planned a symphony while studying with Albrechtsberger. Nottebohm reports on his purposes after a study of some sketches and from him we learn that the theme of the present last movement was originally intended for a first movement. Beethoven must have worked on this composition in 1794-’95, perhaps at the suggestion of van Swieten--a conclusion suggested by the fact that the dedication of the first symphony went to him. Beethoven abandoned this early plan and turned to other ideas for the new symphony, but there is no clue as to the precise time when this was done. In 1802, Mollo published an arrangement of the symphony as a quintet at the same time that Hoffmeister and Kühnel published a like arrangement of the Septet. Beethoven published the following protest in the “Wiener Zeitung” of October 20, 1802:

I believe that I owe it to the public and myself publicly to announce that the two Quintets in C major and E-flat major, of which the first (taken from a symphony of mine) has been published by Mr. Mollo in Vienna, and the second (taken from my familiar Septet, Op. 20) by Mr. Hoffmeister in Leipzig, are not original quintets but transcriptions prepared by the publishers. The making of transcriptions at the best is a matter against which (in this prolific day of such things) an author must protest in vain; but it is possible at least to demand of the publishers that they indicate the fact on the title-page, so that the honor of the author may not be lessened and the public be not deceived. This much to hinder such things in the future. At the same time I announce that a new Quintet of mine in C major, Op. 29, will shortly be published by Breitkopf and Härtel in Leipzig.

Mention may here be made in conclusion of the two French songs, “Que le temps (jour) me dure” (Rousseau) and “Plaisir d’aimer,” recovered from sketches and described by Jean Chantavoine in “Die Musik” (Vol. I, No. 12, 1902). The origin of the latter is fixed in 1799, by its association with a sketch for the Quartets, Op. 18.

FOOTNOTES:

[83] It will be seen in a letter of Beethoven’s that this concerto was in fact composed before that in C major; but it is not improbable that the last movement was written in Prague.

[84] “Zweite Beethoveniana,” p. 29 _et seq._

[85] Among sketches for the second movement of the Quintet, Op. 16, Beethoven wrote: “For the new sonatas very short minuets. The Scherzo remains for that in C minor.” And in another sketch he writes: “Intermezzo for the sonata in C minor.”--Nottebohm, “Zweite Beethoveniana,” 32, 479.

Chapter XVI

Beethoven’s Social Life in Vienna--His Friends: Vogl, Kiesewetter, Zmeskall, Amenda, Count Lichnowsky, Eppinger, Krumpholz--Schuppanzigh and His Quartet--Hummel--Friendships with Women--His Dedications.

The chronological progress of the narrative must again be interrupted for a chapter or two, since no picture of a man’s life can be complete without the lights or shades arising from his social relations--without some degree of knowledge respecting those with whom he is on terms of equality and intimacy and whose company he most affects. The attempt to draw such a picture in the case of Beethoven, that is, during his first years in Vienna, leaves much to be desired, for, although the search for materials has not been very unsuccessful, many of the data are but vague and scattered notices. In a Conversation Book, bearing Beethoven’s own date “on the 20th of March, 1820,” some person unknown writes:

Do you want to know where I first had the honor and good fortune to see you? More than 25 years ago I lived with Frank of Prague in the Drachengassel in the old Fish Market. Several noblemen, for instance His Excellency van B. Cristen (?), Heinerle, Vogl (now a singer), Kösswetter, basso, now Court Councillor, Greyenstein (?), has long been living in France, etc. There we often

musicicised, etc. supperized, etc. punchized, etc.

and at the conclusion Your Excellency often rejoiced us at _my_ P. F. I was then Court Councillor in the War Office (?). I have practised since then at least 15 thousand métiers--Did we meet in Prague? In what year?--1796--3 days--I was in Prague also in 1790-1-2.

There is nothing in the portions of this Conversation Book, copied for this work, to show who this man of “15 thousand métiers” was, now sitting with Beethoven in an eating-house, and recalling to his memory the frolics of his first year and a quarter in Vienna; nor are Heinerle, Cristen, Greyenstein and Frank of Prague sufficiently known to fame as to be now identified; but Johann Michael Vogl, less than two years older than Beethoven, was afterward a very celebrated tenor of the opera. In 1793-4 he was still pursuing the study of jurisprudence, which he abandoned in 1795 for the stage. May not this early friendship for Beethoven have been among the causes of the resuscitation of “Fidelio” in 1814, for the benefit performance of Vogl, Saal and Weinmüller?

There is a story, first put in circulation by a certain August Barth, to the effect that the singer of that name once finding Beethoven employed in burning a mass of musical and other papers, sang one vocal piece thus destined to destruction, was pleased with it, and saved the immortal “Adelaide!” The story is sufficiently refuted by the fact that when Barth first came to Vienna, in 1807, the “Adelaide” had been in print some ten years. If the name Vogl be substituted in the tale, there may, perhaps, be so much truth in it as this: that he was consulted upon the merits of the composition by Beethoven, approved it, and first sang it and made it known--as he was the first, years afterwards, to sing in public the “Erlkönig” and other fine productions of Franz Schubert. The “Kösswetter, basso,” was Raphael George Kiesewetter, who lived to be renowned as a writer upon topics of musical history, and to play a part in the revival of ancient music in Vienna, not less noteworthy than that of Thibaut in Heidelberg. At the period of the “music-making, supping and punch drinking” by the “noblemen” in the apartments of Frank of Prague, Kiesewetter was a young man of twenty, engaged, like Vogl, in the study of the law. In the spring of 1794--and thus the date of these meetings is determined--he received an appointment in the military chancellary, and went at once to the headquarters at Schwetzingen on the Rhine. More important and valuable during these years, as subsequently, was the warm, sincere friendship of Nicolaus Zmeskall von Domanovecz, an official in the Royal Hungarian Court Chancellary. “You belong to my earliest friends in Vienna,” writes Beethoven in 1816. Zmeskall, to quote the words of Sonnleithner,

was an expert violoncellist, a sound and tasteful composer. Too modest to publish his compositions, he willed them to the archives of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde. After personal examination I can only give assurance that his three string quartets would entitle him to an honorable place among masters of the second rank, and are more deserving to be heard than many new things which, for all manner of reasons, we are compelled to hear.

BEETHOVEN’S REGARD FOR ZMESKALL

That Zmeskall was a very constant attendant at the musical parties of Prince Carl Lichnowsky and frequently took part in them, may be seen from Wegeler's record. He was ten years older than Beethoven, had been long enough in Vienna to know the best society there, into which he was admitted not more because of his musical attainments than because of the respectability of his position and character; and was, therefore, what the young student-pianist needed most, a friend, who at the same time could be to a certain degree an authoritative adviser, and at all times was a judicious one. On the part of Zmeskall there was an instant and hearty appreciation of the extraordinary powers of the young stranger from the Rhine and a clear anticipation of his splendid artistic future. A singular proof of this is the care with which he preserved the most insignificant scraps of paper, if Beethoven had written a few words upon them; for, certainly, no other motive could have induced him to save many notes of this kind and of no importance ten, fifteen, twenty years, as may be seen in the published letters of the composer. On the part of Beethoven, there was sincere respect for the dignity and gravity of Zmeskall's character, which usually restrained him within proper limits in their personal intercourse; but he delighted, especially in the earlier period, to give, in his notes and letters, full play to his queer fancies and sometimes extravagant humour.

Here are a few examples in point:

To His Well Well Highest and Bestborn, the Herr von Zmeskall, Imperial and Royal as also Royal and Imperial Court Secretary:

Will His High and Wellborn, His Herrn von Zmeskall's Zmeskallity have the kindness to say where we can speak to him to-morrow?

We are your most damnably devoted

Beethoven.

My dearest Baron Muckcartdriver.

Je vous suis bien obligé pour votre faiblesse de vos yeux. Moreover I forbid you henceforth to rob me of the good humor into which I occasionally fall, for yesterday your Zmeskall-damanovitzian chatter made me melancholy. The devil take you; I want none of your moral (precepts) for Power is the morality of men who loom above the others, and it is also mine; and if you begin again to-day I'll torment you till you agree that everything that I do is good and praiseworthy (for I am going to the Swan--the Ox would be preferable, yet this rests with your Zmeskallian Domanovezian decision (_résponse_).

Adieu Baron Ba...ron, ~ron / nor / orn / rno / onr /~ (_voilà quelque chose_ from the old pawnshop.)

Mechanical skill was never so developed in Beethoven that he could make good pens from goose quills--and the days of other pens were not yet. When, therefore, he had no one with him to aid him in this, he usually sent to Zmeskall for a supply. Of the large number of such applications preserved by his friend and now scattered in all civilized lands as autographs, here are two specimens.

Best of Music Counts! I beg of you to send me one or a few pens of which I am really in great need. As soon as I learn where real good, and admirable pens are to be found I will buy some of them. I hope to see you at the Swan today.

Adieu, most precious Music Count yours etc.

His Highness von Z. is commanded to hasten a bit with the plucking out of a few of his quills (among them, no doubt, some not his own). It is hoped that they may not be too tightly grown. As soon as you have done all that we shall ask we shall be, with excellent esteem your

F---- Beethoven.

Had Zmeskall not carefully treasured these notes, they would never have met any eye but his own; it is evident, therefore, that he entered fully into their humor, and that it was the same to him, whether he found himself addressed as "Baron," "Count," "Cheapest Baron," "Music Count," "Baron Muckcartdriver," "His Zmeskallian Zmeskallity," or simply "Dear Z."--which last is the more usual. He knew his man, and loved him; and these "quips and quiddities" were received in the spirit which begat them. The whole tenor of the correspondence between the two shows that Zmeskall had more influence for good upon Beethoven than any other of his friends; he could reprove him for faults, and check him when in the wrong, without producing a quarrel more serious than the one indicated in the protest, above given, against interrupting his "good humor."

As a musician, as well as man and friend, Zmeskall stood high in Beethoven's esteem. His apartments, No. 1166, in that huge conglomeration of buildings known as the Bürgerspital, were for a long series of years the scene of a private morning concert, to

which only the first performers of chamber music and a very few guests were admitted. Here, after the rupture with Prince Lichnowsky, Beethoven's productions of this class were usually first tried over. Not until Beethoven's death did their correspondence cease.

ESTEEM AND AFFECTION FOR AMENDA

Another young man who gained an extraordinary place in Beethoven's esteem and affection, and who departed from Vienna before anything occurred to cause a breach between them, was a certain Karl Amenda, from the shore of the Baltic, who died some forty years later as Provost in Courland. He was a good violinist, belonged to the circle of dilettanti which Beethoven so much affected, and, on parting, received from the composer one of his first attempts at quartet composition. His name most naturally suggests itself to fill the blank in a letter to Ries, July, 1804, wherein some living person, not named, is mentioned as one with whom he (Beethoven) "never had a misunderstanding," but he adds "although we have known nothing of each other for nearly six years," which was not true of Amenda, since letters passed between them in 1801. The small portion of their written correspondence which has been made public shows that their friendship was of the romantic character once so much the fashion; and a letter of Amenda is filled with incense which in our day would bear the name of almost too gross flattery. But times change and tastes with them. His name appears once in the Zmeskall correspondence, namely, in a mutilated note now in the Royal Imperial Court Library, beginning "My cheapest Baron! Tell the guitarist to come to me to-day. Amenda is to make an _Amende_ (part torn away) which he deserves for his bad pauses (torn) provide the guitarist."

Karl Amenda was born on October 4, 1771, at Lippaiken in Courland. He studied music with his father and Chapelmaster Beichtmer, was so good a violinist that he was able to give a concert at 14 years of age, and continued his musical studies after he was matriculated as a student of theology at the University of Jena. After a three years' course there he set out on a tour, and reached Vienna in the spring of 1798. There he first became precentor for Prince Lobkowitz and afterward music-teacher in the family of Mozart's widow. How, thereupon, he became acquainted with Beethoven we are able to report from a document still in the possession of the family, which bears the superscription "Brief Account of the Friendly Relations between L. v. Beethoven and Karl Friedrich Amenda, afterward Provost at Talsen in Courland, written down from oral tradition":

After the completion of his theological studies K. F. Amenda goes to Vienna, where he several times meets Beethoven at the table d'hôte, attempts to enter into conversation with him, but without success, since Beeth. remains very _réservé_. After some time Amenda, who meanwhile had become music-teacher at the home of Mozart's widow, receives an invitation from a friendly family and there plays first violin in a quartet. While he was playing somebody turned the pages for him, and when he turned about at the finish he was frightened to see Beethoven, who had taken the trouble to do this and now withdrew with a bow. The next day the extremely amiable host at the evening party appeared and cried out: "What have you done? You have captured Beethoven's heart! B. requests that you rejoice him with your company." A., much pleased, hurries to B., who at once asks him to play with him. This is done and when, after several hours, A. takes his leave, B. accompanies him to his quarters, where there was music again. As B. finally prepared to go he said to A.: "I suppose you can accompany me." This is done, and B. kept A. till evening and went with him to his home late at night. From that time the mutual visits became more and more numerous and the two took walks together, so that the people in the streets when they saw only one of them in the street at once called out: "Where is the other one?" A. also introduced Mylich, with whom he had come to Vienna, to B., and Mylich often played trios with B. and A. His instrument was the second violin or viola. Once when B. heard that Mylich had a sister in Courland who played the pianoforte prettily, he handed him a sonata in manuscript with the inscription: "To the sister of my good friend Mylich." The manuscript was rolled up and tied with a little silk ribbon. B. complained that he could not get along on the violin. Asked by A. to try it, nevertheless, he played so fearfully that A. had to call out: "Have mercy--quit!" B. quit playing and the two laughed till they had to hold their sides. One evening B. improvised marvellously on the pianoforte and at the close A. said: "It is a great pity that such glorious music is born and lost in a moment." Whereupon B.: "There you are mistaken; I can repeat every extemporization"; whereupon he sat himself down and played it again without a change. B. was frequently embarrassed for money. Once he complained to A.; he had to pay rent and had no idea how he could do it. "That's easily remedied," said A. and gave him a theme ("Freudvoll und Leidvoll") and locked him in his room with the remark that he must make a beginning on the variations within three hours. When A. returns he finds B. on the spot but ill-tempered. To the question whether or not he had begun B. handed over a paper with the remark: "There's your stuff!" (_Da ist der Wisch!_) A. takes the notes joyfully to B.'s landlord and tells him to take it to a publisher, who would pay him handsomely for it. The landlord hesitated at first but finally decided to do the errand and, returning joyfully, asks if other bits of paper like that were to be had. But in order definitely to relieve such financial needs A. advised B. to make a trip to Italy. B. says he is willing but only on condition that A. go with him. A. agrees gladly and the trip is practically planned. Unfortunately news of a death calls A. back to his

home. His brother has been killed in an accident and the duty of caring for the family devolves on him. With doubly oppressed heart A. takes leave of B. to return to his home in Courland. There he receives a letter from B. saying: “Since you cannot go along, I shall not go to Italy.” Later the friends frequently exchanged thoughts by correspondence.[86]

Though, as we have learned, it was music which brought Beethoven into contact with Amenda, it was the latter’s amiability and nobility of character that endeared him to the composer, who cherished him as one of his dearest friends and confided things to him which he concealed from his other intimates--his deafness, for instance. A striking proof of Beethoven’s affection is offered by the fact that he gave Amenda a copy of his Quartet in F (Op. 18, No. 1), writing on the first violin part:

Dear Amenda: Take this quartet as a small memorial of our friendship, and whenever you play it recall the days which we passed together and the sincere affection felt for you then and which will always be felt by

Your true and warm friend Ludwig van Beethoven.

Vienna, 1799, June 25.

In a letter written nearly a year later Beethoven asks his friend not to lend the quartet, as he had revised it. A letter written, evidently, about the time of Amenda’s departure from Vienna indicated that Beethoven was oppressed at this period with another grief than that caused by the loss of his friend’s companionship. Beethoven speaks of his “already lacerated heart,” says that “the worst of the storm is over” and mentions an invitation to Poland--which he had accepted. Nothing came of this Polish enterprise. Dr. A. C. Kalischer suspected that the lacerated heart was due to the composer’s unrequited love for Magdalena Willmann, a singer then in Vienna to whom he made a proposal of marriage which was never answered.

FRIENDSHIP WITH COUNT LICHNOWSKY

Count Moritz Lichnowsky, brother of Prince Carl, of whom we shall not lose sight entirely until the closing scene, was another of the friends of those years. He had been a pupil of Mozart, played the pianoforte with much skill and was an influential member of the party which defended the novelty and felt the grandeur of his friend’s compositions. Schindler saw much of him during Beethoven’s last years, and eulogizes the “noble Count” in very strong terms.

Another of that circle of young dilettanti, and one of the first players of Beethoven’s compositions, was a young Jewish violinist, Heinrich Eppinger. He played at a charity concert in Vienna, making his first appearance there in 1789. “He became, in after years,” says a correspondent of the time, “a dilettante of the most excellent reputation, lived modestly on a small fortune and devoted himself entirely to music.” At the period before us Eppinger was one of Beethoven’s first violins at the private concerts of the nobility. Häring, who became a distinguished merchant and banker, belonged now to this circle of young amateur musicians, and in 1795 had the reputation of being at the head of the amateur violinists. The youthful friendship between him and the composer was not interrupted as they advanced into life, and twenty years later was of great advantage to Beethoven.

But a more interesting person for us is the instructor under whom Beethoven in Vienna resumed his study of the violin (a fact happily preserved by Ries)--Wenzel Krumpholz. He was a brother of the very celebrated Bohemian harp player who drowned himself in the Seine in 1790. In his youth Krumpholz had been for a period of three years a pupil of Haydn at Esterhaz and had played first violin in the orchestra there. He left Esterhaz to enter the service of Prince Kinsky, but came to Vienna in 1795 to join the operatic orchestra, and at once became noted as a performer in Haydn’s quartets. He was (says Eugene Eiserle in Glöggl’s “Neue Wiener Musik-Zeitung” of August 13, 1857),

a highly sensitive art-enthusiast, and one of the first of those who foresaw and recognized Beethoven’s greatness. He attached himself to Beethoven with such pertinacity and self-sacrifice that the latter, though he always called him “his fool,” accepted him as “a most intimate friend,” made him acquainted with all his plans for compositions and generally reposed the utmost confidence in him. Krumpholz formed also an exceedingly close friendship with his countryman Wenzel Czerny, a music-teacher living in the Leopoldstadt, and from 1797 onward spent most of his leisure evenings with the Czerny family, and thus the little son Karl, in his eighth and ninth years, learned almost daily what works Beethoven had in hand, and, like Krumpholz, became filled with enthusiasm for the tone-hero.

Krumpholz was a virtuoso on the mandolin, and hence, probably, that page of sketches by Beethoven in the Artaria Collection headed “Sonatine für Mandolin u. P. F.” Among the Zmeskall papers in the Royal Imperial Library in Vienna there is a half-sheet of coarse foolscap paper upon which is written with lead-pencil in huge letters by the hand of Beethoven,

The Music Count is dismissed with infamy to-day.--

The First Violin will be exiled to the misery of Siberia.

The _Baron_ is forbidden for a whole month to ask questions and never again to be overhasty, and he must concern himself with nothing but his _ipse miserum_.

B.

“Music Count” and “Baron” are, of course, Zmeskall; but these notices of Beethoven’s various first violins show the folly of attempting to decide whether one of them or Schuppanzigh was to be sent to Siberia, so long as there is no hint whatever as to the time and occasion of the note.

The very common mistake of forgetting that there is a time in the lives of distinguished men when they are but aspirants to fame, when they have their reputations still to make, often, in fact, attracting less notice and raising feebler hopes of future distinction in those who know them, than many a more precocious contemporary--this mistake has thrown the figures of Schuppanzigh and his associates in the quartet concerts at Prince Carl Lichnowsky’s into a very false prominence in the picture of these first seven years of Beethoven’s Vienna life. The composer himself was not the Beethoven whom we know. Had he died in 1800, his place in musical history would have been that of a great pianoforte player and of a very promising young composer, whose decease thus in his prime had disappointed well-founded hopes of great future eminence.

SCHUPPANZIGH AND HIS QUARTET

This is doubly true of the members of the quartet. Had they passed away in early manhood, not one of them, except perhaps young Kraft, the only one who ever distinguished himself as a virtuoso upon his instrument, would have been remembered in the annals of music. They were during these years but laying the foundation for future excellence and celebrity as performers of Mozart’s, Haydn’s, Förster’s and Beethoven’s quartets. Schuppanzigh, first violin, and Weiss, viola, alone appear to have been constantly associated in their quartet-playing. Kraft, violoncellist, was often absent, when his father, or Zmeskall, or some other, supplied his place; and as the second violin was often taken by the master of the house, when they were engaged for private concerts, Sina was, naturally, absent. Still, from 1794 to 1799, the four appear to have practised much and very regularly together. They enjoyed an advantage known to no other quartet--that of playing the compositions of Haydn and Förster under the eyes of the composers, and being taught by them every effect that the music was intended to produce. Each of the performers, therefore, knowing precisely the intentions of the composer, acquired the difficult art of being independent and at the same time of being subordinate to the general effect. When Beethoven began to compose quartets he had, therefore, a set of performers schooled to perfection by his great predecessors, and who already had experience in his own music through his trios and quartets.

Ignatz Schuppanzigh, the leader, born 1776, died March 2, 1830 in Vienna, originally studied music as a dilettante and became a capital player of the viola; but, about the time when Beethoven came to Vienna, he exchanged that instrument for the violin and made music his profession. He was fond of directing orchestral performances and seems to have gained a considerable degree of local reputation and to have been somewhat of a favorite in that capacity before reaching his 21st year. In 1798-99, he took charge of those concerts in the Augarten established by Mozart and Martin, and afterwards led by Rudolph. Seyfried, writing after his death, calls Schuppanzigh a “natural born and really energetic leader of the orchestra.” The difference in age, character and social position between him and Beethoven was such as not to admit between them that higher and nobler friendship which united the latter and Zmeskall; but they could be, and were, of great use to each other, and there was a strong personal liking, if not affection, which was mutual. Schuppanzigh’s person early assumed very much of the form and proportions of Sterne’s Dr. Slop, and after his return from Russia he is one of the “Milord Falstaffs” of Beethoven’s correspondence and Conversation Books. His obesity was, however, already the subject of the composer’s jests, and he must have been an exceedingly good-tempered young man, to bear with and forgive the coarse and even abusive text of the short vocal piece (1801) headed “Lob auf den Dicken” (“Praise of the Fat One”). But it is evidently a mere jest, and was taken as such. It is worthy of note that Beethoven and Schuppanzigh in addressing each other used neither the familiar “du” nor the respectful “Sie,” but “er”--a fact which has been supposed to prove Beethoven’s great contempt for the violinist; but as it would prove equal contempt on the other side, it proves too much. Of Sina and Weiss, both Silesians by birth, there is little that need be added here. Weiss became the first viola player of Vienna, and a not unsuccessful composer of ballet and other music.

Anton Kraft (the father) came from Bohemia to pursue his legal studies in Vienna, but abandoned them to enter the Imperial Court Orchestra as violoncellist. In 1778, he accepted an invitation from Haydn to join the orchestra in Esterhaz; where, on the 18th of December of the same year, his son Nicholas Anton was born. The child, endowed by nature with great musical talents, enjoyed the advantages of his father's instructions and example and of growing up under the eye of Haydn and in the constant study of that great musician's works. Upon the death of Esterhazy and the dispersion of his orchestra, Kraft came with his son, now in his fourteenth year, to Vienna. On April 15th, 1792, Nicholas played a concerto composed by his father at the "Widows and Orphans" concert, and on the 21st again appeared in a concert given by the father. Notwithstanding a very remarkable success, the son was destined for another profession than music; and from this time until his eighteenth year, he played his instrument only as an amateur, and as such Beethoven first knew the youth. But when the young Prince Lobkowitz formed his orchestra in 1796, both the Krafts were engaged, and Nicholas Anton thenceforth made music his profession. In the maturity of his years and powers, his only rival among all the German violoncellists was Bernhard Romberg.

Schindler, with his characteristic inattention to dates, observes, speaking of Schuppanzigh, Weiss and the elder Kraft:

KNOWLEDGE OF ORCHESTRAL INSTRUMENTS

These three artists are intimately connected with the development of Beethoven and, indeed, with a large portion of his creations; wherefore they will frequently be remembered here. Meanwhile it may suffice to say that it was to this company of practically-trained musicians that the rising young composer owed his knowledge of the efficient use of stringed instruments. In addition are to be mentioned Joseph Friedlowsky, who taught our master the mechanism of the clarinet, and the famous hornist, Johann Wenzel Stich, who called himself Giovanni Punto in Italian, to whom Beethoven owed what he knew of the proper writing for horn, of which he already gave striking illustration in his Sonata for Horn, Op. 17. In the mechanism of the flute and its construction, which underwent so many changes in the first decades of the century, Carl Scholl steadily remained Beethoven's instructor.

There is doubtless some degree of truth in this in so far as it relates to a later period. Punto, of course, gave Beethoven a new revelation of the powers and possibilities of the horn, as Dragonetti did of the contrabass; but he first came to Vienna near the end of 1799, and died at Prague only three years after (February 16, 1803). All the others here named by Schindler--with one exception, the elder Kraft--were youths of 16-18 years, when Beethoven composed his first and second concertos--works which prove that he was not altogether ignorant of the use of orchestral instruments! Had Schindler known something of the history of Max Franz's orchestra in Bonn, he would have avoided many a mistake.[87]

Johann Nepomuk Hummel, the pupil of Mozart, was another of the youths whom Beethoven drew into his circle. In 1795, the elder Hummel brought back his son to Vienna (from that very successful concert tour which had occupied the last six years and had made the boy known even to the cities of distant Scotland) and put him to the studies of counterpoint and composition with Albrechtsberger and Salieri. He seems to have been quietly at his studies, playing only in private, until April 28th, 1799, when he again appeared in public both as pianist and composer, in a concert in the Augartensaal, directed by Schuppanzigh. "He performed a symphony besides a melodrama composed for the occasion and between them played prettily _composed_ improvisations on the pianoforte." That the talented and promising boy of seventeen years should, upon arriving home again, seek the acquaintance and favor of one who during his absence had made so profound an impression upon the Vienna public as Beethoven, and that the latter should have rejoiced to show kindness to Mozart's favorite pupil, hardly needs to be mentioned. A chapter of description would not illustrate the nature of their intercourse so vividly, as two short but exceedingly characteristic notes of Beethoven's which Hummel preserved and which found their way into print after his death:

I

He is not to come to me again. He is a treacherous dog and may the flayer get all such treacherous dogs!

II

Herzens Natzerl:

You are an honest fellow and I now see you were right. Come, then, to me this afternoon. You'll find Schuppanzigh here also and we two will bump, thump and pump you to your heart's delight. A kiss from

Your

Beethoven also called Mehlschöberl.[88]

ENVIOUS VIENNESE MUSICIANS

In a letter to Eleonore von Breuning, Beethoven described many of the Vienna pianists as his “deadly enemies.” Schindler’s observations upon the composer’s relations with the Viennese musicians, though written in his peculiar style, seem to be very judicious and correct.

Nobody is likely to expect, he says (Vol. I, 23-24), that an artist who made his way upwards as our Beethoven, although almost confining his activities exclusively to aristocratic circles that upheld him in extraordinary fashion, would remain free from the attacks of his colleagues; on the contrary, the reader will be prepared to see a host of enemies advance against him because of the shining qualities and evidences of genius of our hero, in contrast with the heavy burden of social idiosyncrasies and uncouthness. More than anything else, what seemed least tolerable to his opponents was the notion that his appearance, the excitability which he controlled too little in his intercourse with his colleagues and his lack of consideration in passing judgment were natural accompaniments of genius. His too small toleration of many bizarreries and weaknesses of high society, and on the other hand his severe demand on his colleagues for higher culture, even his Bonn dialect, afforded his enemies more than enough material to revenge themselves on him by evil gossip and slander.... The musicians in Vienna at that time, with a very few exceptions, were lacking, not only in artistic, but also in the most necessary degree of general, education and were as full of the envy of handicraftsmen as the members of the guilds themselves. There was a particular antipathy to all foreigners as soon as they manifested a purpose to make their homes in the imperial city.

Schindler might have added that the change had been in no small degree produced through the instructions and example of Beethoven as they acted upon the Czernys, Moscheles and other young admirers of his genius. In short, Beethoven’s instant achievement of a position as artist only paralleled by Mozart and of a social rank which Gluck, Salieri, Haydn had gained only after making their names famous throughout Europe, together with the general impression that the mantle of Mozart had fallen upon him--all this begat bitter envy in those whom his talents and genius overshadowed; they revenged themselves by deriding him for his personal peculiarities and by condemning and ridiculing the novelties in his compositions; while he met their envy with disdain, their criticisms with contempt; and, when he did not treat their compositions with indifference, but too often only noticed them with sarcasm.

This picture, certainly, is not an agreeable one, but all the evidence proves it, unfortunately, faithful. Such men as Salieri, Gyrowetz, Weigl, are not to be understood as included in the term “pianist” as used by Beethoven in his letter to Eleonore von Breuning. For these men “stood high in Beethoven’s respect,” says Schindler, and his words are confirmed to the fullest extent by the Conversation Books and other authorities; which also show that Eybler’s name might have been added to the list. They were all more or less older than Beethoven, and for their contrapuntal learning, particularly in the case of Weigl and Eybler, he esteemed them very highly. No indications, however, have been found, that he was upon terms of close private friendship and intimacy with either.

FRIENDSHIPS WITH WOMEN

Beethoven was no exception to the general rule, that men of genius delight in warm and lasting friendships with women of superior minds and culture--not meaning those “conquests” which, according to Wegeler, even during his first three years in Vienna, “he occasionally made, which if not impossible for many an Adonis would still have been difficult.” Let such matters, even if details concerning them were now attainable, be forgotten. His celibacy was by no means owing to a deliberate choice of a single life. What is necessary and proper of the little that is known on _this_ point will, in due time, be imparted simply and free from gloss or superfluous comment. As to his friendships with the other sex, it would be throwing the view of them into very false perspective to employ those of later years in giving piquancy to a chapter here. Let them also come in due order and thus, while they lose nothing of interest, they may, perchance afford relief and give brightness to canvas which otherwise might sometimes become too sombre. Happily during these prosperous years now before us, the picture has been for the most part bright and sunny and the paucity of the information upon the topic in question is of less consequence.

In the present connection one of our old Bonn friends again comes upon the scene. The beautiful, talented and accomplished Magdalene Willmann was invited to sing at Venice during the carnival of 1794. She left Bonn the preceding summer with her brother Max and his wife (Fräulein Tribolet) to fulfill the engagement. After leaving Venice, they gave a concert in Gratz, and journeyed on to Vienna. Here Max and his wife remained, having accepted engagements from Schikaneder, while Magdalene went

on to Berlin. Not suiting the operatic public there she returned to Vienna, and was soon engaged to sing both German and Italian parts in the Court Opera. Beethoven renewed his intercourse with them and soon became so captivated with the charms of the beautiful Magdalene as to offer her his hand. This fact was communicated to the author by a daughter of Max Willmann, still living in 1860, who had often heard her father speak of it. To the question, why her aunt did not accept the offer of Beethoven, Madame S. hesitated a moment, and then, laughing, replied: “Because he was so ugly, and half crazy!” In 1799, Magdalene married a certain Galvani, but her happiness was short; she died toward the end of 1801.

Two letters of Beethoven to be found in the printed collection have been preserved from the period before us, addressed to Christine Gerhardi, a young woman of high distinction in society at the time for the splendor of her talents and her high culture. Dr. Sonnleithner wrote of her:

She was the daughter of an official at the court of the Emperor Leopold II ... an excellent singer, but remained a dilettante and sang chiefly in concerts for charitable purposes (which she herself arranged), or for the benefit of eminent artists. Old Professor Peter Frank was director of the general hospital of Vienna in the neighborhood of which (No. 20 Alserstrasse) she lived. He was a great lover of music, but his son, Dr. Joseph Frank, was a greater; he made essays in composition and arranged musical soirées at the home of his father at which Beethoven and Fräulein Gerhardi took part, playing and singing. The son frequently composed cantatas, which Beethoven corrected, for the name-days and birthdays of his father, and in which Fräulein Gerhardi sang the soprano solos.... She was at the time the most famous amateur singer in Vienna, and inasmuch as Haydn knew her well there is no doubt but that he had her in mind when he composed “The Creation”; indeed, she sang the soprano part with great applause not only at Schwarzenberg but also at the first performance in the Burgtheater. All reports agree that she met Beethoven often at Frank’s and that he frequently accompanied her singing on the pianoforte. He did not give her lessons.

Dr. Joseph von Frank and Christine Gerhardi were married on August 20, 1798; they moved away from Vienna in 1804.

A few notes upon certain young women to whom Beethoven dedicated compositions at this period of his life may form no inappropriate close to this chapter. It was much the custom then for teachers of music to dedicate their works to pupils, especially to those who belonged to the higher social ranks--such dedications being at the same time compliments to the pupils and advertisements for the instructors, with the farther advantage often of being sources of pecuniary profit. When, therefore, we read the name of Baroness Albini on the title-page of certain sonatas by Sterkel, of Julia Countess Guicciardi on one by Kleinheinz, of Anna Countess Mailath on songs by Teyber, we assume at once the probability in these and like instances that the relation of master and pupil existed. Beethoven also followed the custom; and the young ladies, subjects of the following notices, are all known or supposed to have taken lessons of him.

Anna Louisa Barbara (“La Comtesse Babette”) was the daughter of Karl Count Keglevics de Busin, of Hungarian Croatian lineage, and Barbara Countess Zichy. She married Prince Innocenz d’Erba Odescalchi on the 10th of February, 1801 (another authority gives 1800). Beethoven’s dedications to her are the Sonata, Op. 7 (published in 1797), the Variations “La stessa la stessissima” (1799), and the Pianoforte Concerto, Op. 15, 1801--the last to her as Princess Odescalchi. A note by the composer to Zmeskall--which, judging both from its contents and the handwriting, could not have been written later than 1801-2--shows that the Odescalchi palace was one of those at which he took part in musical soirées.

“Countess Henriette Lichnowsky,” writes Count Amade, “was the sister of the ruling Prince Carl, and was doubtless married to the Marquis of Carneville after the dedication to her of the Rondo (G major, Op. 51, No. 2, published in September, 1802); she lived in Paris after her marriage and died about 1830.” The Rondo was first dedicated to Countess Giulietta Guicciardi, but Beethoven asked it back in exchange for the C-sharp minor Sonata; to which fact we shall recur presently. Countess Thun, to whom Beethoven dedicated the Clarinet Trio, Op. 11, in 1797, was the mother of Prince Carl Lichnowsky and Countess Henriette Lichnowsky. She died May 18, 1800. The Sonata in E-flat, Op. 27, No. 1, was dedicated to Josepha Sophia, wife of Prince Johann Joseph von Liechtenstein, daughter of Joachim Egon, Landgrave of Fürstenberg-Weitra. She was born on June 20, 1776, married on April 22, 1792 and died February 23, 1848. Whether her father was related at all, and if so, how, to the Fürstenberg in whose house Beethoven gave lessons in Bonn, is not known. Her husband, however, was first cousin to Count Ferdinand von Waldstein. The Baroness Braun to whom Beethoven dedicated the two Pianoforte Sonatas Op. 14 and the Sonata for Horn in 1801, was the wife of Baron Peter von Braun, lessee of the Nationaltheater and afterwards of the Theater an der Wien. The dedications disclose an early association which eventually led to Beethoven’s being asked to compose an opera. It is not known that Beethoven was a social visitor in the house of Baron Braun, but he was a highly respected guest in the house of Count Browne, to whose wife Beethoven dedicated the “Waldmädchen” Variations and the three Pianoforte Sonatas, Op. 10.

FOOTNOTES:

[86] Amenda returned to his home in Courland in the fall of 1799. The friends corresponded with each other for a time, but the majority of Beethoven's letters are lost. While a student at the University in Leipzig, Amenda's grandson placed some of them in the hands of a publisher at his request and did not get them back. Amenda was first a private teacher, became a preacher in Talsen in 1802, provost of the diocese of Kadau in 1820, consistorial councillor in 1830 and died on March 8, 1836. A portrait painted in 1808, is preserved in the Beethoven Museum in Bonn.

[87] Beethoven did not always follow the suggestions of these men. According to an anecdote told by Doležalek to Otto Jahn, Kraft once complained that a passage was not playable. "It's got to be," answered Beethoven. In a like vein K. Holz relates that "Beethoven asked an excellent artist whether or not certain things were possible"; the question of how difficult they were did not enter. Thus Friedlowsky for clarinet, Czerwensky for oboe, Hradezky and Herbst for horn. If others complained of impossibilities the answer was "They can do it and you must." (From Thayer's papers.)

[88] The humor to which Beethoven resorts in this note in order to show his contrition necessarily evaporates in any attempt to translate its Viennese colloquialisms. "Herzens Natzerl" is to be understood as "Dear little Ignacius of my heart," Nazerl being an affectionate diminutive of Ignaz or Ignacius. Why it should have been applied to Hummel, whose Christian names were Johann Nepomuk, does not appear. "Mehlschöberl" is a term which has survived in the Austrian cuisine of to-day, the article itself being a sort of soup dumpling.

Chapter XVII

Beethoven's Character and Personality--His Disposition--Love of Nature--Relations with the Opposite Sex--Literary Tastes--His Letters--Manner of Composing--The Sketchbooks--Origin of His Deafness.

The year 1800 is an important era in Beethoven's history. It is the year in which, cutting loose from the pianoforte, he asserted his claims to a position with Mozart and the still living and productive Haydn in the higher forms of chamber and orchestral composition--the quartet and the symphony. It is the year, too, in which the bitter consciousness of an increasing derangement of his organs of hearing was forced upon him and the terrible anticipation of its incurable nature and of its final result in almost total deafness began to harass and distress him. The course of his life was afterwards so modified, on the one hand, by the prosperous issue of these new appeals to the taste and judgment of the public, and, on the other, by the unhappy progress of his malady, each acting and reacting upon a nature singularly exceptional, that for this and other reasons some points in his personal character and habits, and a few general remarks upon and illustrations of another topic or two must be made before resuming the narrative of events.

A true and exhaustive picture of Beethoven as a man would present an almost ludicrous contrast to that which is generally entertained as correct. As sculptors and painters have each in turn idealized the work of his predecessor, until the composer stands before us like a Homeric god until those who knew him personally, could they return to earth, would never suspect that the grand form and noble features of the more pretentious portraits are intended to represent the short muscular figure and pock-pitted face of their old friend--so in literature evoked by the composer a similar process has gone on, with a corresponding suppression of whatever is deemed common and trivial, until he is made a being living in his own peculiar realm of gigantic ideas, above and apart from the rest of mankind--a sort of intellectual Thor, dwelling in "darkness and clouds of awful state," and making in his music mysterious revelations of things unutterable! But it is really some generations too soon for a conscientious investigator of his history to view him as a semi-mythological personage, or to discover that his notes to friends asking for pens, making appointments to dinner at taverns, or complaining of servants, are "cyclopean blocks of granite," which, like the "chops and tomato sauce" of Mr. Pickwick, contain depths unfathomable of profound meaning. The present age must be content to find in Beethoven, with all his greatness, a very human nature, one which, if it showed extraordinary strength, exhibited also extraordinary weaknesses.

INCONSISTENT TRAITS OF CHARACTER

It was the great misfortune of Beethoven's youth--his impulses good and bad being by nature exceedingly quick and violent--that he did not grow up under the influence of a wise and strict parental control, which would have given him those habits of self-restraint that, once fixed, are a second and better nature, and through which the passions, curbed and moderated, remain only as sources of noble energy and power. His very early admission into the orchestra of the theatre as cembalist, was more to the advantage of

his musical than of his moral development. It was another misfortune that, in those years, when the strict regulations of a school would have compensated in some measure for the unwise, unsteady, often harsh discipline of his father, he was thus thrown into close connection with actors and actresses, who, in those days, were not very distinguished for the propriety of their manners and morals. Before his seventeenth or eighteenth year, when he became known to the Breuning family and Count Waldstein, he could hardly have learned the importance of cultivating those high principles of life and conduct on which in later years he laid so much stress. And, at that period of life, the character even under ordinary circumstances is so far developed, the habits have become so far formed and fixed, and the natural tendencies have acquired so much strength, that it is, as a rule, too late to conquer the power of a perfect self-command. At all events, the consequences of a deficient early moral education followed Beethoven through life and are visible in the frequent contests between his worse and his better nature and in his constant tendency to extremes. To-day, upon some perhaps trivial matter, he bursts into ungovernable wrath; to-morrow, his penitence exceeds the measure of his fault. To-day he is proud, unbending, offensively careless of those claims which society grants to people of high rank; to-morrow his humility is more than adequate to the occasion. The poverty in which he grew up was not without its effect upon his character. He never learned to estimate money at its real value; though often profuse and generous to a fault, even wasteful, yet at times he would fall into the other extreme. With all his sense of nobility of independence, he early formed the habit of leaning upon others; and this the more, as his malady increased, which certainly was a partial justification; but he thus became prone to follow unwise counsels, or, when his pride was touched, to assert an equally unwise independence. At other times, in the multitude of counsellors he became the victim of utter irresolution, when decision and firmness were indispensable and essential to his welfare. Thus, both by following the impulse of the moment, and by hesitation when a prompt determination was demanded, he took many a false step, which could no longer be retrieved when reflection brought with it bitter regret.

It would be doing great injustice both to Beethoven and to the present writer to understand the preceding remarks as being intended to represent the composer's lapses in these regards, as being more than unpleasant and unfortunate episodes in the general tenor of his life; but as they did occur to his great disadvantage, the fact cannot be silently passed over.

A romantically sentimental admiration of the heroes of ancient classic literature, having its origin in Paris, had become widely the fashion in Beethoven's youth. The democratic theories of the French sentimentalists had received a new impulse from the dignified simplicity of the foreign representatives of the young American Republic, Franklin, Adams, Jay--from the retirement to private life on their plantations and farms of the great military leaders in the contest, Washington, Greene, Schuyler, Knox and others, after the war with England was over; from the pride taken by the French officers, who had served in America, in their insignia of the order of the Cincinnati; and even from the letters and journals of German officers, who, in captivity, had formed friendships with many of the better class of the republican leaders, and seen with their own eyes in what simplicity they lived while guiding the destinies of the new-born nation. Thus through the greater part of Central Europe the idea became current of a pure and sublime humanity, above and beyond the influence of the passions, of which Cincinnatus, Scipio, Cato, Washington, Franklin, were the supposed representatives. Zschokke makes his Heuwen say: "Virtue and the heroes of antiquity had inspired me with enthusiasm for virtue and heroism"; and so, also, Beethoven. He exalted his imagination and fancy by the perusal of the German poets and translations of the ancient and English classics, especially Homer, Plutarch and Shakespeare; dwelt fondly upon the great characters as models for the conduct of life; but between the sentiment which one feels and the active principle on which he acts, there is often a wide cleft. That Beethoven proved to be no Stoic, that he never succeeded in governing his passions with absolute sway, was not because the spirit was unwilling; the flesh was weak. Adequate firmness of character had not been acquired in early years. But those who have most thoroughly studied his life, know best how pure and lofty were his aspirations, how wide and deep his sympathies with all that is good, how great his heart, how, on the whole, heroic his endurance of his great calamity. They can best feel the man's true greatness, admire the nobility of his nature, and drop the tear of sorrow and regret upon his vagaries and faults. He who is morbidly sensitive, and compelled to keep constant ward and watch over his passions, can best appreciate and sympathize with the man, Beethoven.

Truth and candor compel the confession, that in those days of prosperity he bore his honors with less of meekness than we could wish; that he had lost something of that modesty and ingenuousness eulogized by Junker ten years before, in his Mergentheim letter. His "somewhat lofty bearing" had even been reported by the correspondent of the "Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung." Traces of self-sufficiency and even arrogance--faults almost universal among young and successful geniuses, often in a far higher degree than was true of Beethoven, and with not a tithe of his reason--are unquestionably visible. No one can read without regret his remarks upon certain persons not named, with whom at this very time he was upon terms of apparently intimate friendship. "I value them," he writes, "only by what they do for me.... I look upon them only as instruments upon which I play when I feel so disposed." His "somewhat lofty bearing" was matter for jest to the venerable Haydn, who, according to a trustworthy tradition, when

Beethoven's visits to him had become few and far between would inquire of other visitors: "How goes it with our Great Mogul?" Nor would the young nobles, whose society he frequented, take offence; but it certainly made him enemies among those whom he "valued according to their service and looked upon as mere instruments"--and no wonder!

Pierson, in his edition of the so-called "Beethoven's Studien," has added to Seyfried's personal sketches a few reminiscences of that Griesinger, who was so long Saxon Minister in Vienna, and to whom we owe the valuable "Biographische Notizen über Joseph Haydn." One of his anecdotes is to the purpose here and may be taken as substantially historical.

BEETHOVEN'S SELF-ESTEEM INJURED

When he was still only an attaché, and Beethoven was little known except as a celebrated pianoforte player, both being still young, they happened to meet at the house of Prince Lobkowitz. In conversation with a gentleman present, Beethoven said in substance, that he wished to be relieved from all bargain and sale of his works, and would gladly find some one willing to pay him a certain income for life, for which he should possess the exclusive right of publishing all he wrote; adding, "and I would not be idle in composition. I believe Goethe does this with Cotta, and, if I mistake not, Handel's London publisher held similar terms with him."

"My dear young man," returned the other, "You must not complain; for you are neither a Goethe nor a Handel, and it is not to be expected that you ever will be; for such masters will not be born again." Beethoven bit his lips, gave a most contemptuous glance at the speaker, and said no more. Lobkowitz endeavored to appease him, and in a subsequent conversation said:

"My dear Beethoven, the gentleman did not intend to wound you. It is an established maxim, to which most men adhere, that the present generation cannot possibly produce such mighty spirits as the dead, who have already earned their fame."

"So much the worse, Your Highness," retorted Beethoven: "but with men who will not believe and trust in me because I am as yet unknown to universal fame, I cannot hold intercourse!"

It is easy for this generation, which has the productions of the composer's whole life as the basis of its judgment of his powers, to speak disparagingly of his contemporaries for not being able to discover in his first twelve or fifteen works good reason for classing him with Goethe and Handel; but he who stand upon a mountain cannot justly ridicule him on the plain for the narrow extent of his view. It was as difficult then to conceive the possibility of instrumental music being elevated to heights greater than those reached by Haydn and Mozart, as it is for us to conceive of Beethoven being hereafter surpassed.

In the short personal sketches of Beethoven's friends which have been introduced, the dates of their births have been noted so far as known, that the reader may observe how very large a proportion of them were of the same age as the composer, or still younger--some indeed but boys--when he came to Vienna. And so it continued. As the years pass by in our narrative and names familiar to us disappear, the new ones which take their places, with rare exceptions, are still of men much younger than himself. The older generation of musical amateurs at Vienna, van Swieten and his class, had accepted the young Bonn organist and patronized him, as a pianist. But when Beethoven began to press his claims as a composer, and, somewhat later, as his deafness increased, to neglect his playing, some of the elder friends had passed away, others had withdrawn from society, and the number was few of those who, like Lichnowsky, could comprehend that departures from the forms and styles of Mozart and Haydn were not necessarily faults. With the greater number, as perfection necessarily admits of no improvement and both quartet and symphony in _form_ had been carried to that point by Haydn and Mozart, it was a perfectly logical conclusion that farther progress was impossible. They could not perceive that there was still room for the invention or discovery of new elements of interest, beauty, power; for such perceptions are the offspring of genius. With Beethoven they were instinctive.

One more remark: Towards the decline of life, the masterpieces of literature and art, on which the taste was formed, are apt to become invested in the mind with a sort of nimbus of sanctity; hence, the productions of a young and daring innovator, even when the genius and talent displayed in them are felt and receive just acknowledgement, have the aspect, not only of an extravagant and erring waste of misapplied powers, but of a kind of profane audacity. For these and similar reasons Beethoven's novelties found little favor with the veterans of the concert-room.

THE HOMAGE OF YOUNG DISCIPLES

The criticism of the day was naturally ruled and stimulated by the same spirit. Beethoven's own confession how it at first wounded him, will come in its order; but after he felt that his victory over it was sure--was in fact gained with a younger generation--he only laughed at the critics; to answer them, except by new works, was beneath him. Seyfried says of him (during the years of the

“Eroica,” “Fidelio,” etc.): “When he came across criticisms in which he was accused of grammatical errors he rubbed his hands in glee and cried out with a loud laugh: ‘Yes, yes! they marvel and put their heads together because they do not find it in any school of thoroughbass!’” But for the young of both sexes, Beethoven’s music had an extraordinary charm. And this not upon technical grounds, nor solely for its novelties, always an attractive feature to the young, but because it appealed to the sensibilities, excited emotions and touched the heart as no other purely instrumental compositions had ever done. And so it was that Beethoven also in his quality of composer soon gathered about him a circle of young disciples, enthusiastic admirers. Their homage may well have been grateful to him--as such is to every artist and scholar of genius, who, striking out and steadfastly pursuing a new path, subjects himself to the sharp animadversions of critics who, in all honesty, really can see little or nothing of good in that which is not to be measured and judged by old standards. The voice of praise under such circumstances is doubly pleasing. It is known that, when Beethoven’s works began to find a just appreciation from a new generation of critics, who had indeed been schooled by them, he collected and preserved a considerable number of laudatory articles, whose fate cannot now be traced. When, however, the natural and just satisfaction which is afforded by the homage of honest admirers and deservedly eulogistic criticism, degenerates into a love of indiscriminate praise and flattery, it becomes a weakness, a fault. Of this error in Beethoven there are traces easily discernible, and especially in his later years; there are pages of fulsome eulogy addressed to him in the Conversation Books, which would make the reader blush for him, did not the mere fact that such books existed remind him of the bitterness of the composer’s lot. The failing was also sometimes his misfortune; for those who were most profuse in their flatteries, and thus gained his ear, were by no means the best of his counsellors. But aside from the attractive force of his genius, Beethoven possessed a personal magnetism, which attached his young worshippers to him and, all things considered, to his solid and lasting benefit in his private affairs. Just at this time, and for some years to come, his brothers usually rendered him the aid he needed; but thenceforth to the close of his life, the names of a constant succession of young men will appear in and vanish from our narrative, who were ever necessary to him and ever ready at his call with their voluntary services.

Beethoven’s love of nature was already a marked trait of his character. This was indulged and strengthened by long rambles upon the lofty hills and in the exquisitely beautiful valleys which render the environs of Vienna to the north and west so charming. Hence, when he left the city to spend the hot summer months in the country, with but an exception or two in a long series of years, his residence was selected with a view to the indulgence of this noble passion. Hence, too, his great delight in the once celebrated work of Christian Sturm: “Beobachtungen über die Werke Gottes,” which, however absurd much of its natural philosophy (in the old editions) appears now in the light of advanced knowledge, was then by far the best manual of popular scientific truth, and was unsurpassed in fitness to awaken and foster a taste for, and the understanding of, the beauties of nature. Schindler has recorded the master’s life-long study and admiration of this book. It was one which cherished his veneration for the Creator and Preserver of the universe, and yet left his contempt for procrustean religious systems and ecclesiastical dogmas its free course. “To him, who, in the love of Nature, holds communion with her visible forms, she speaks a various language,” says Bryant. Her language was thoroughly well understood by Beethoven; and when, in sorrow and affliction, his art, his Plutarch, his “Odyssey,” proved to be resources too feeble for his comfort, he went to Nature for solace, and rarely failed to find it.

BEETHOVEN’S MORAL PRINCIPLES

Art has been so often disgraced by the bad morals and shameless lives of its votaries, that it is doubly gratifying to be able to affirm of Beethoven that, like Handel, Bach and Mozart, he did honor to his profession by his personal character and habits. Although irregular, still he was as simple and temperate in eating and drinking as was possible in the state of society in which he lived. That he was no inordinate lover of wine or strong drinks is certain. No allusion is remembered in any of his letters, notes, memoranda, nor in the Conversation Books, which indicates a liking for any game of chance or skill. He does not appear to have known one playing-card from another. Music, books, conversation with men and women of taste and intelligence, dancing, according to Ries (who adds that he could never learn to dance in time--but Beethoven’s dancing days were soon over--), and, above all, his long walks, were his amusements and recreations. His whim for riding was of short duration--at all events, the last allusion to any horse owned by him is in the anecdote on a previous page.

One rather delicate point demands a word: and surely, what Franklin in his autobiography could confess of himself, and Lockhart mention without scruple of Walter Scott, his father-in-law, need not be here suppressed. Nor can it well be, since a false assumption on the point has been made the basis already of a considerable quantity of fine writing, and employed to explain certain facts relative to Beethoven’s compositions. Spending his whole life in a state of society in which the vow of celibacy was by no means a vow of chastity; in which the parentage of a cardinal’s or archbishop’s children was neither a secret nor a disgrace; in which the illegitimate offspring of princes and magnates were proud of their descent and formed upon it well-grounded hopes of

advancement and success in life; in which the moderate gratification of the sexual was no more discountenanced than the satisfying of any other natural appetite--it is nonsense to suppose, that, under such circumstances, Beethoven could have puritanic scruples on that point. Those who have had occasion and opportunity to ascertain the facts, know that he had not, and are also aware that he did not always escape the common penalties of transgressing the laws of strict purity. But he had too much dignity of character ever to take part in scenes of low debauchery, or even when still young to descend to the familiar jesting once so common between tavern girls and the guests. Thus, as the elder Simrock related, upon the journey to Mergentheim recorded in the earlier pages of this work, it happened at some place where the company dined, that some of the young men prompted the waiting-girl to play off her charms upon Beethoven. He received her advances and familiarities with repellent coldness; and as she, encouraged by the others, still persevered, he lost his patience, and put an end to her importunities by a smart box on the ear.

The practice, not uncommon in his time, of living with an unmarried woman as a wife, was always abhorrent to him--how much so, a sad story will hereafter illustrate; to a still greater degree an intrigue with the wife of another man. In his later years he so broke off his once familiar intercourse with a distinguished composer and conductor of Vienna, as hardly to return his greetings with common politeness. Schindler affirmed that the only reason for this was that the man in question had taken to his bed and board the wife of another.

The names of two married women might be here given, to whom at a later period Beethoven was warmly attached; names which happily have hitherto escaped the eyes of literary scavengers, and are therefore here suppressed. Certain of his friends used to joke him about these ladies, and it is certain that he rather enjoyed their jests even when the insinuations, that his affection was beyond the limit of the Platonic, were somewhat broad; but careful enquiry has failed to elicit any evidence that even in these cases he proved unfaithful to his principles. A story related by Jahn is also to the point, viz.: that Beethoven only by the urgent solicitations of the Czerny family was after much refusal persuaded to extemporize in the presence of a certain Madame Hofdemel. She was the widow of a man who had attempted her life and then committed suicide; and the refusal of Beethoven to play before her arose from his having the general belief at the time, that a too great intimacy had existed between her and Mozart. Jahn, it may be observed, has recently had the great satisfaction of being able to prove the innocence of Mozart in this matter and of rescuing his memory from the only dark shadow which rested upon it. This much on this topic it has been deemed necessary to say here, not only for the reason above given, but to put an end to long-prevailing misconceptions and misconstructions of passages in Beethoven's letters and private memoranda and to save farther comment when they shall be introduced hereafter.

Beethoven's fine sense for the lyric element in poetry was already conspicuous in the fine tact with which the texts of his songs, belonging in date to his last years in Bonn, were selected from the annual publications in which most of them appeared. Another fine proof of this is afforded by a glance through the older editions of Matthisson's poems. In the fourth (1797), there are but two which are really well adapted to composition in the song-form--the "Adelaide" and "Das Opferlied." A third Beethoven left unfinished. He had doubtless been led to attempt its composition through the force of its appeal to his personal feelings and sympathies, but soon discovering its non-lyrical character abandoned it. It is the "Wunsch."

Rochlitz in his letters from Vienna (1822) reports Beethoven's humorous account of his enthusiasm for Klopstock in his early life:

Since that summer in Carlsbad I read Goethe every day, that is, when I read at all. He (Goethe) has killed Klopstock for me. You are surprised? And now you laugh? Ah ha! It is because I have read Klopstock. I carried him about with me for years while walking and also at other times. Well, I did not always understand him, of course. He leaps about so much and he begins at too lofty an elevation. Always _Maestoso_, D-flat major! Isn't it so? But he is great and uplifts the soul nevertheless. When I could not understand him I could sort of guess. If only he did not always want to die! That will come quickly enough. Well, it always sounds well, at any rate, etc.

Thus, whatever scattered hints bearing upon the point come under our notice combine to impart a noble idea of Beethoven's poetic taste and culture, and to show that the allusions to the ancient classic authors in his letters and conversation were not made for display, but were the natural consequence of a love for and a hearty appreciation of them derived from their frequent perusal in translations.

BEETHOVEN AS A LETTER-WRITER

Beethoven's correspondence forms so important a portion of his biography that something must be said here upon his character as a letter-writer. A few of his autograph letters bear marks of previous study and careful elaboration; but, in general, whatever he wrote in the way of private correspondence was dashed off on the spur of the moment, and with no thought that it would ever come

under any eye but that for which it was intended. It is therefore easy to imagine how energetically he would have protested could he have known that his most insignificant notes were preserved in such numbers, and that the time would come when they would all be made public; or, still worse, that some which were but the offspring of momentary pique against those with whom he lived in closest relations would be used after his death to their injury; and that outbursts of sudden passion--when the wrong was perhaps as often on his side as on the other--after all the parties concerned had passed away, would have an almost judicial authority accorded to them.

In studying a collection of some eight hundred of his letters and notes,[89] originals and copies in print or manuscript, the most striking fact is the insignificance of by far the greater number--that so few bear marks of any care in their preparation, or contain matter of any intrinsic value. In fact, perhaps the greater part of the short notes to Zmeskall and others owe their origin to Beethoven's dislike of entrusting oral messages to his servants. For the most part it is in vain to seek in his correspondence anything bearing upon the theory or art of music; very seldom is any opinion expressed upon the productions of any contemporary composer; no vivid sketches of men and manners flow from his pen, like those which render the letters of Mozart and Mendelssohn so charming. The proportion of their correspondence which possesses more than a merely biographical value was large; of Beethoven's very small.

His letters, of course, exhibit the usual imperfections of a hasty and confidential correspondence; sometimes, indeed, of an aggravated character. Some of them contain loose statements of fact, such as all men are liable to make through haste or imperfect knowledge; others contain passages of which the only conceivable explanation is Schindler's statement that Beethoven sometimes amused himself with the harmless mystification of others; but, taken together, the more important letters--while they usually evince his difficulty in finding the best expressions of his thoughts and his constant struggle with the rules of his mother tongue--place his truth and candor in a very favorable light and sometimes rise into a rude eloquence. The reader feels that when the writer is unjust he is under the influence of a mistake or passion--and, as a rule, it is not too late to detect such injustice; that his errors of fact are simply mistakes, honestly made and easily corrected; that if, in the mass, a few paragraphs occur which can be neither fully justified nor excused, it is not to be forgotten that they were not intended for our eyes and that they were written under the constant pressure of a great calamity, which made him doubly sensitive and irritable; and so it will be easy, like Sterne's Recording Angel, to blot such passages with a tear.

Another striking fact of Beethoven's correspondence, when viewed as a whole, is the proof it affords that, except in his hours of profound depression, he was far from being the melancholy and gloomy character of popular belief. He shows himself here--as he was by nature--of a gay and lively temperament, fond of a jest, an inveterate though not always a very happy punster, a great lover of wit and humor. It is a cause for profound gratitude that it was so; since he thus preserved an elasticity of spirits that enabled him to escape the consequences of brooding in solitude over his great misfortune; to rise superior to his fate and concentrate his great powers upon his self-imposed tasks; and to meet with hope and courage the cruel fortune which put an end to so many well-founded expectations and ambitious projects, and confined him to a single road to fame and honor--that of composition. It happens that several of the more valuable and interesting of his letters belong to the period immediately following that now before us, and in them we are able to trace, with reasonable accuracy, the effect which his incipient and increasing deafness produced upon him--first, the anxiety caused by earliest symptoms; then the profound grief bordering upon despair when the final result had become certain; and at last his submission to and acceptance of his fate. There is in truth something nobly heroic in the manner in which Beethoven at length rose superior to his great affliction. The magnificent series of works produced in the ten years from 1798 to 1808 are no greater monuments to his genius than to the godlike resolution with which he wrought out the inspirations of that genius under circumstances most fitted to weaken its efforts and restrain its energies.

BEETHOVEN AND HIS SKETCHBOOKS

Beethoven was seldom without a folded sheet or two of music paper in his pocket upon which he wrote with pencil in two or three measures of music hints of any musical thought which might occur to him wherever he chanced to be. Towards the end of his life his Conversation Books often answered the same purpose; and there are traditions of bills-of-fare at dining-rooms having been honored with ideas afterwards made immortal. This habit gave Abbé Gelinek a foundation for the following amusing nonsense as related by Tomaschek: "He (Gelinek) declared," says Tomaschek,

as if it were an aphorism, that all of Beethoven's compositions were lacking in internal coherency and that not infrequently they were overloaded. These things he looked upon as grave faults of composition and sought to explain them from the manner in which Beethoven went about his work, saying that he had always been in the habit of noting every musical idea that occurred to him upon

a bit of paper which he threw into a corner of his room, and that after a while there was a considerable pile of the memoranda which the maid was not permitted to touch when cleaning the room. Now when Beethoven got into a mood for work he would hunt a few musical _motivi_ out of his treasure-heap which he thought might serve as principal and secondary themes for the composition in contemplation, and often his selection was not a lucky one. I (Tomaschek) did not interrupt the flow of his passionate, yet awkward speech, but briefly answered that I was unfamiliar with Beethoven's method of composing but was inclined to think that the aberrations occasionally to be found in his compositions were to be ascribed to his individuality, and that only an unprejudiced and keen psychologist, who had had an opportunity to observe Beethoven from the beginning of his artistic development to its maturity in order gradually to familiarize himself with his views on art, could fit himself to give the musical world an explanation of the intellectual cross-relationships in Beethoven's glorious works, a thing just as impossible to his blind enthusiasts as to his virulent opponents. Gelinek may have applied these last words to himself, and not incorrectly.

This conversation took place in 1814, the day after a rehearsal of Beethoven's Symphony in A--the Seventh! Gelinek's pile of little bits of paper in the corner of the room, when touched by the wand of truth, resolves itself into blank music books, to which his new ideas were transferred from the original slight pencil sketches, and frequently with two or three words to indicate the kind of composition to which they were suited. Divers anecdotes are current which pretend to give the origin of some of the themes thus recorded and afterwards wrought out, but few judicious readers will attach much weight to most of them. For although conceptions can sometimes be traced directly to their exciting causes, the musical composer can seldom say more than that they occurred to him at such a time and place--and often not even that. It is certainly not improbable that Beethoven's admirers may have questioned him upon this point, as Schindler did upon the "Pastoral" Symphony, and that he was able to satisfy them; but Handel's "Harmonious Blacksmith" may be taken as the type of most of the current stories, which only need truth to make them interesting.

To return to the sketchbooks--which performed a twofold office; being not alone the registers of new conceptions, but containing the preliminary studies of the instrumental works into which they were wrought out. The introduction to the excellent pamphlet, "Ein Skizzenbuch von Beethoven, beschrieben und in Auszügen dargestellt von Gustav Nottebohm," though properly confined by him to the single book which he was describing, is equally true of so many that have been examined with care as to warrant its general application. The following extracts may be taken as true of the greater part of the sketchbooks:

HOW THE SKETCHING WAS DONE

Before us (he says) lies a volume in oblong folio (_Teatro_) of 192 pages and bearing 16 staves on each page, and, save a few empty places, containing throughout notes and sketches in Beethoven's handwriting for compositions of various sorts. The volume is bound in craftsman's style, trimmed, and has a stout pasteboard cover. It was bound thus before it was used or received the notes. [Excepting the number of pages this description applies to most of the true sketchbooks.] The sketches are for the greater part one-part; that is, they occupy but a single staff, only exceptionally are they on two or more staves. [In some of the later books the proportion of sketches in two or more parts is much greater than in this.] It is permissible to assume in advance that they were written originally and in the order in which they follow each other in the sketchbook. When a cursory glance over the whole does not seem to contradict this assumption, a careful study nevertheless compels a modification at times. It is to be observed that generally Beethoven began a new page with a new composition; and, moreover, that he worked alternately or simultaneously at different movements. As a result, different groups of sketches are crowded so closely together that in order to find room he was obliged to make use of spaces which had been left open, and thus eventually sketches for the most different compositions had to be mixed together and brought into companionship. [In some of the books "vi-" not infrequently meets the eye. It was the one of Beethoven's modes of keeping the clue in the labyrinth of sketches, being part of the word _vide_. The second syllable, "-de," can always be found on the same or a neighboring page.] "N.B.," "No. 100," "No. 500," "No. 1000," etc., and in later sketches "meilleur," are common, all which signs are explained by Schindler as being a whimsical mode of estimating the comparative value of different musical ideas, or of forms of the same. Again Nottebohm continues: In spite of this confused working it is plain that Beethoven, as a rule, was conscious from the beginning of the goal for which he was striving, that he was true to his first concept and carried out the projected form to the end. The contrary is also true at times, and the sketchbook (like others) disclosed a few instances in which Beethoven in the course was led from the form originally conceived into another, so that eventually something different appeared from what was planned in the first instance. (Once more.) In general it may be observed that Beethoven in all his work begun in the sketchbook proceeded in the most varied manner, and at times reached his goal in a direction opposite to that upon which he first set out. [At times] the thematic style dominates; the first sketch breaks off abruptly with the principal subject and the work that follows is confined to transforming and reshaping the thematic kernel at first thrown on the paper until it appears to be fitted for development; then the same process is undertaken with intermediary sections; everywhere we find beginnings, never a whole; a

whole comes before us only outside of the sketchbook, in the printed composition where sections which were scattered in the sketchbook are brought together. [In other cases] the thematic manner is excluded; every sketch is aimed at a unity and is complete in itself; the very first one gives the complete outline for a section of a movement; those that follow are then complete reshapings of the first, as other readings directed towards a change in the summary character, or a reformation of the whole, an extension of the middle sections, etc. Naturally, the majority of the sketches do not belong exclusively to either of the two tendencies, but hover between them, now leaning toward one, now toward the other.

One readily sees that, when the general plan of a work is clear and distinct before the mind, it is quite indifferent in what order the various parts are studied; and that Beethoven simply adopted the method of many a dramatic and other author, who sketches his scenes or chapters not in course but as mood, fancy or opportunity dictates. It is equally evident that the composer could have half a dozen works upon his hands at the same time, not merely without disadvantage to any one of them, but to the gain of all, since he could turn to one or another as the spirit of composition impelled; like the author of a profound literary work, who relieves and recreates his mind by varying his labors, and executes his grand task all the more satisfactorily, because he, from time to time, refreshes himself by turning his attention to other and lighter topics. When Beethoven writes to Wegeler: “As I am writing now I often compose three or four pieces at once,” he could have referred only to the preliminary studies of the sketchbooks. Sometimes, it is true, works were laid aside incomplete after he had begun the task of writing them out in full, and finished when occasion demanded; but as a rule his practice was quite different, viz.: All the parts of a work having been thus studied until he had determined upon the form, character and style of every important division and subdivision, and recorded the results in his sketchbook by a few of the first measures, followed by “etc.” or “and so on,” the labor of composition may be said to have been finished, and there remained only the task of writing out the clean copy of what now existed full and complete in his mind, and of making such minor corrections and improvements as might occur to him on revision. The manuscripts show that these were sometimes very numerous, though they rarely extend to any change in the form or to any alteration in the grand effect except to heighten it, or render it more unexpected or exciting. When upon reflection he was dissatisfied with a movement as a whole he seems rarely to have attempted its improvement by mere correction, choosing rather to discard it at once and compose a new one based either upon the same themes or upon entirely new motives. The several overtures to “Fidelio” are illustrations of both procedures.

The sketches of the greater part of Beethoven’s songs, after the Bonn period, are preserved, and prove with what extreme care he wrought out his melodies. The sketchbook analysed by Nottebohm affords a curious illustration in Matthison’s “Opferlied,” the melody being written out in full not less than six times, the theme in substance remaining unchanged. Absolute correctness of accent, emphasis, rhythm--of prosody, in short--was with him a leading object; and various papers, as well as the Conversation Books, attest his familiarity with metrical signs and his scrupulous obedience to metrical laws. Since the shameful mutilation and dispersion of Beethoven’s manuscripts at the time of their sale, probably no one person has been able to trace and examine half of the sketchbooks; still, enough have come under observation during the researches for this work to establish with reasonable certainty these points:

I. That each sketchbook was filled in pretty regular course from beginning to end before a new one was taken.

II. That had the collection been kept entire it would have afforded the means of determining with a good degree of certainty the chronology of most of his instrumental works, after coming to Vienna, as to their first conception and studies--excluding, of course, those which, in one form or another, he brought with him from Bonn.

III. That the more important vocal compositions were studied separately.

IV. That only from the sketchbooks can an adequate idea of the vast fertility of Beethoven’s genius be formed. They are in music, like Hawthorne’s “Notebooks” in literature, the record of a never ceasing flow of new thoughts and ideas, until death sealed the fountain forever. There are themes and hints, never used, for all kinds of instrumental compositions, from the trifles, which he called “Bagatelles,” to symphonies, evidently intended to be as different from those we know as they are from each other; and these hints are in such numbers, that those which can be traced in the published works are perhaps much the smaller proportion of the whole. Whoever has the will and opportunity to devote an hour or two to an examination of a few of these monuments of Beethoven’s inventive genius, will easily comprehend the remark which he made near the close of his life: “It seems to me that I have just begun to compose!”[90]

SYMPTOMS OF APPROACHING DEAFNESS

One topic more demands brief notice before closing this chapter. In the “Merrymaking of the Countryfolk” of Beethoven’s “Pastoral” Symphony, at the point where the fun grows most fast and furious and the excitement rises to its height, an ominous sound, as of distant thunder, gives the first faint warning of the coming storm. So in the life of the composer at the moment of that highest success and prosperity, which we have labored to place vividly before the mind of the reader, just when he could first look forward with well-grounded confidence to the noblest gratification of a musician’s honorable ambition, a new and discordant element thrust itself into the harmony of his life. This was the symptoms of approaching deafness. His own account fixes their appearance in the year 1799; then they were still so feeble and intermittent, as to have caused him at first no serious anxiety; but in another year they had assumed so much the appearance of a chronic and increasing evil, as to compel him to abandon plans for travel which he had formed, and for which he was preparing himself, with great industry and perseverance, to appear in the twofold capacity of virtuoso and composer. Instead, therefore, in 1801, of having “long since journeyed through half the world,” he, for two years, had been confined to Vienna or its immediate vicinity, vainly seeking relief from surgeons and physicians.

It is not difficult to imagine calamities greater than that which now threatened Beethoven--as, the loss of sight to a Raphael or Rubens in the height of their fame and powers; a partial paralysis or other incurable disease of the brain cutting short the career of a Shakespeare or Goethe, a Bacon or Kant, a Newton or Humboldt. Better the untimely fate of a Buckle, than to live long years of unavailing regret over the blasted hopes and promise of early manhood. In such cases there remains no resource; hope itself is dead. But to Beethoven, even if his worst fears should prove prophetic and his infirmity at length close all prospects of a career as virtuoso and conductor, the field of composition still remained open. This he knew, and it saved him from utter despair. Who can say that the world has not been a gainer by a misfortune which stirred the profoundest depths of his being and compelled the concentration of all his powers into one direction?

As the disease made progress and the prospect of relief became less, notwithstanding a grief and anxiety which caused him such mental agony as even to induce the thought of suicide, he so well succeeded in keeping it concealed from all but a few intimate and faithful friends, that no notice whatever is to be found of it until 1802 except in papers from his own hand. They form a very touching contrast to his letters to other correspondents. Neither the head nor the heart is to be envied of the man who can read them without emotion. The two most important are letters to Wegeler giving full details of his case; doubly valuable because they are not merely letters to a friend, but an elaborate account of the symptoms and medical treatment of his disease, made to a physician of high standing who thoroughly understood the constitution of the patient. They are therefore alike significant for what they contain and for what they omit. No hypothesis as to the cause of the evil can be entertained, which is discordant with them. Reserving them, however, for their proper places in the order of time, a story or two inconsistent with them may here be disposed of.

The so-called Fischoff Manuscript says:

THEORIES AS TO THE LOSS OF HEARING

In the year 1796, Beethoven, on a hot summer day, came greatly overheated to his home, threw open doors and windows, disrobed down to his trousers and cooled himself in a draft at the open window. The consequence was a dangerous sickness which, on his convalescence, settled in his organs of hearing, and from this time his deafness steadily increased.

In this passage both the date and the averment are irreconcilable with the letters to Wegeler.

Dr. Weissenbach, in his “Reise zum Congress” (1814), gives what appears to be the same story but in fewer words. “He (Beethoven) once endured a fearful attack of typhus. From this time dates the decay of his nervous system, and probably also the, to him, great misfortune of the loss of hearing.” Neither a typhus nor a typhoid fever is a matter of a few days or weeks if severe; and the chronology of our narrative is, to say the least, so far fixed and certain as to exclude the possibility of his having passed through any very serious illness of that nature since he came to Vienna. But it is not at all improbable that, in 1784 or 1785, he may have been a victim to this frightful disorder, and that it may have been the cause of his melancholy condition of health at the time of his mother’s death, and of the chronic diarrhœa with which he was so long troubled. True, there is no record of such an illness; but that proves nothing. There is no record that he passed through an attack of small-pox, except that which the disease left upon his face.

But the most extraordinary and inexplicable account of the origin of his deafness is that given by Beethoven himself to the English pianist, Charles Neate, in 1815. Mr. Neate was once urging Beethoven to visit England and mentioned as a farther inducement the great skill of certain English physicians in treating diseases of the ear, assuring him that he might cherish hopes of relief. Beethoven replied in substance as follows: “No; I have already had all sorts of medical advice. I shall never be cured--I will tell you

how it happened. I was once busy writing an opera--

Neate: “Fidelio?”

Beethoven: “No. It was not ‘Fidelio.’ I had a very ill-tempered, troublesome _primo tenore_ to deal with. I had already written two grand airs to the same text, with which he was dissatisfied, and now a third which, upon trial, he seemed to approve and took away with him. I thanked the stars that I was at length rid of him and sat down immediately to a work which I had laid aside for those airs and which I was anxious to finish. I had not been half an hour at work, when I heard a knock at my door, which I at once recognized as that of my _primo tenore_. I sprang up from my table under such an excitement of rage, that, as the man entered the room, I threw myself upon the floor as they do upon the stage (here B. spread out his arms and made a gesture of illustration), coming down upon my hands. When I arose I found myself deaf and have been so ever since. The physicians say, the nerve is injured.”

That Beethoven really related this strange story cannot be questioned; the word of the venerable Charles Neate to the author is sufficient on that point. What is to be thought of it, is a very different matter. Here at least it may stand without comment.

FOOTNOTES:

[89] The number of known letters and documents has grown greatly since Thayer wrote these words. Kalischer’s Collection numbers over 1200 and Emerich Kastner gives the first lines of 1380 in Frimmel’s second “Beethoven Jahrbuch” published in 1909.

[90] Opportunities for studying Beethoven’s sketchbooks have greatly increased since Mr. Thayer wrote these words. Nottebohm who rendered an incalculable service to all students of the great composer after the book from which our author quotes, published a volume entitled “Beethoveniana” in 1872, and a second entitled “Zweite Beethoveniana” in 1887. To these the revisors of this biography have repeatedly referred in tracing the history of Beethoven’s compositions. A collection of sketches formerly owned by J. N. Kafka and now in the British Museum was described by Mr. J. S. Shedlock in “The Musical Times” (July to December, 1892). A volume containing sketches for the last quartets is at the present writing in the possession of Mr. Cecilio de Roda of Madrid and was described by the “Rivista Italiana” (Nos. XI-XIV, 1907) and also published in pamphlet form under the title “Un Quadrena di autografi di Beethoven del 1825.”

Chapter XVIII

Beethoven’s Brothers--His First Concert on His Own Account--Punto and the Sonata for Horn--Steibelt Confounded--E. A. Förster and the First Quartets--The Septet and First Symphony--Beethoven’s Homes--Hoffmeister--Compositions and Publications of 1800.

It is not easy to conceive upon what ground the opinion became current, as it did, that Beethoven in the year 1800 and for several years to come was still burdened with the support of his brothers--young men now respectively in their 26th and 24th years. This mistake as to Johann has already been exposed. Leaving Ludwig for the first quarter of this year doubly busy--having, in addition to his usual occupations, his preparations to make for a grand concert in April--we turn, for a page, to his brother Carl.

In the “Hof- und Staats-Schematismus” for the year 1800, at the end of the list of persons employed in the “K. K. Universal-Staatschuldenkasse” are the names of two “Praktikanten”; the first is “Mr. Carl v. Beethoven lives in the Sterngasse, 484.” In the same publication appears a new department or bureau of the above-named office called the “K. K. n. öst. Klassen-Steuer-Kasse” and the second of the three bureau officers is “Mr. Carl v. Beethoven lives unterm Tuchladen, 605.”

It is not improbable that, while simply “Praktikant,” he may have needed occasional pecuniary aid, but his preferment to the place of “Kassa-Officier” rendered him independent. This appointment is dated March 24th, 1800, and gave him a salary of 250 florins. Small as the sum now appears, it was amply sufficient, with what he could earn by teaching music (and the brother of the great Beethoven could have no lack of pupils), to enable him to live comfortably. In fact, he was better off than many a colleague in the public service, who still with care and economy managed to live respectably. It may therefore be confidently asserted that Beethoven was henceforth relieved of all care on account of Carl, as of Johann, until the bankruptcy of the government and Carl’s broken health many years later, made fraternal assistance indispensable.

At the beginning of this year Carl had tried his fortune as a composer--but probably with slender profit, since no second venture has been discovered. Six minuets, six “Deutsche” and six contradances by him are advertised in the “Wiener Zeitung” of January 11, in double editions, one for clavier and one for two violins and violoncello. The concert for which Beethoven had been preparing during the winter took place on the 2d of April. It was his first public appearance for his own benefit in Vienna, and, so far as is known,

anywhere except in Prague. All that is now to be ascertained in relation to it is contained in the advertisement, in the programme, and in a single notice, sent to the “Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung.” The programme, which was in the possession of Madame van Beethoven (widow of the composer’s nephew) is as follows:

To-day, Wednesday, April 2nd, 1800, Herr _Ludwig van Beethoven_ will have the honor to give a grand concert for his benefit in the Royal Imperial Court Theatre beside the Burg. The pieces which will be performed are the following:

1. A grand symphony by the late Chapelmaster Mozart.

2. An aria from “The Creation” by the Princely Chapelmaster Herr Haydn, sung by Mlle. Saal.

3. A grand Concerto for the Pianoforte, played and composed by Herr _Ludwig van Beethoven_.

4. A Septet, most humbly and obediently dedicated to Her Majesty the Empress, and composed by Herr _Ludwig van Beethoven_ for four stringed and three wind-instruments, played by Messrs. Schuppanzigh, Schreiber, Schindlecker, Bär, Nickel, Matauschek and Dietzel.

5. A Duet from Haydn’s “Creation,” sung by Mr. and Mlle. Saal.

6. Herr _Ludwig van Beethoven_ will improvise on the pianoforte.

7. A new grand symphony with complete orchestra, composed by Herr _Ludwig van Beethoven_.

Tickets for boxes and stalls are to be had of Herr van Beethoven at his lodgings in the Tiefen Graben, No. 241, third storey, and of the box-keeper.

Prices of admission are as usual.

The beginning is at half-past 6 o’clock.

The correspondent of the “Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung” described the concert as the most interesting affair of its kind given for a long time, said the new concerto had “many beauties, especially in the first two movements,” praised the “taste and feeling” exhibited in the Septet, and in the Symphony found “much art, novelty and wealth of ideas”; but, he continues: “unfortunately there was too much use of the wind-instruments, so that the music sounded more as if written for a military band than an orchestra.” The rest of the notice is devoted to scolding the band for inattention to the conductor. Which of the pianoforte Concertos Beethoven played on this occasion is nowhere intimated. The Symphony in C soon became known throughout Germany; while the Septet achieved a sudden popularity so widely extended and enduring as at length to become an annoyance to the composer.[91]

A PUBLIC CONCERT WITH PUNTO

Before the month was out Beethoven again played in public in a concert given by Johann Stich, known as Punto. This Bohemian virtuoso, after several years of wandering, had lately come to Vienna from Paris, _via_ Munich. As a performer upon the horn he was unrivalled by any predecessor or contemporary; but as a composer he was beneath criticism. Beethoven’s delight in any one whose skill afforded him new experience of the powers and possible effects of any orchestral instrument is known to the reader. Nothing more natural, therefore, than his readiness to compose a sonata for himself and Punto to be played at the latter’s concert on April 18th. Ries informs us that “though the concert was announced with the Sonata the latter was not yet begun. Beethoven began the work the day before the performance and it was ready for the concert.” His habit of merely sketching his own part and of trusting to his memory and the inspiration of the moment, even when producing his grand Concertos in public, probably rendered him good service on this occasion. The “Allgemeine Musikzeitung” (III, 704) preserves also the interesting fact that owing to the enthusiastic applause the Sonata was immediately repeated.

April 27th was the anniversary of the day on which Maximilian Franz entered Bonn to assume the duties of Elector and Archbishop. Sixteen years had passed and on this day he, with a small retinue, again entered Vienna. He took refuge “in an Esterhazy villa in a suburb,” while the small château near which now stands the railway station at Hetzendorf, behind Schönbrunn Garden, was preparing for his residence; whither he soon removed, and where for the present we leave him.

At the end of February or early in March, the charlatan Daniel Steibelt gave a concert in Prague which brought him in 1800 florins, and in April or May, “having finished his speculation, he went to Vienna, his purse filled with ducats, where he was knocked in the head by the pianist Beethoven,” says Tomaschek. Ries relates how:

When Steibelt came to Vienna with his great name, some of Beethoven's friends grew alarmed lest he do injury to the latter's reputation. Steibelt did not visit him; they met first time one evening at the house of Count Fries, where Beethoven produced his new Trio in B-flat major for Pianoforte, Clarinet and Violoncello (Op. 11), for the first time.[92] There is no opportunity for particular display on the part of the pianist in this Trio. Steibelt listened to it with a sort of condescension, uttered a few compliments to Beethoven and felt sure of his victory. He played a Quintet of his own composition, improvised, and made a good deal of effect with his tremolos, which were then something entirely new. Beethoven could not be induced to play again. A week later there was again a concert at Count Fries's; Steibelt again played a quintet which had a good deal of success. He also played an improvisation (which had, obviously, been carefully prepared) and chose the same theme on which Beethoven had written variations in his Trio.[93] This incensed the admirers of Beethoven and him; he had to go to the pianoforte and improvise. He went in his usual (I might say, ill-bred) manner to the instrument as if half-pushed, picked up the violoncello part of Steibelt's quintet in passing, placed it (intentionally?) upon the stand upside down and with one finger drummed a theme out of the first few measures. Insulted and angered he improvised in such a manner that Steibelt left the room before he finished, would never again meet him and, indeed, made it a condition that Beethoven should not be invited before accepting an offer.

It was, and still is, the custom at Vienna for all whose vocations and pecuniary circumstances render it possible, to spend all or some portion of the summer months in the country. The aristocracies of birth and wealth retire to their country-seats, live in villas for the season or join the throngs at the great watering-places; other classes find refuge in the villages and hamlets which abound in the lovely environs of the city, where many a neat cottage is built for their use and where the peasants generally have a spare room or two, cleanly kept and neatly furnished. Beethoven's habit of escaping from town during the hot months was, therefore, nothing peculiar to him. We have reached the point whence, with little if any interruption, Beethoven can be followed from house to house, in city and country, through the rest of his life; a matter of great value in fixing the true dates of important letters and determining the chronology of his life and works--but for the first seven years the record is very incomplete.

VARIOUS DWELLING PLACES IN VIENNA

Carl Holz told Jahn: "He (Beethoven) lived at first in a little attic-room in the house of the book-binder Strauss in the Alservorstadt, where he had a miserable time." This is one of the facts which an inquisitive young man like Holz would naturally learn of the master during the short period when he was his factotum. This attic-room must have been soon changed for the room "on the ground-floor" mentioned in a previous chapter. An undated note of van Swieten is directed to Beethoven at "No. 45 Alsergasse, at Prince Lichnowsky's"; but in the Vienna directory for 1804 no street is so named, and the only number 45 in the "Alsergrund" is in the Lämmelgasse, property of Georg Musial; but Prince Josef Lichnowsky is named as owner of No. 125 in the Hauptstrasse of that suburb. This was the same house; it had merely changed numbers. The site is now occupied by the house No. 30 Alserstrasse. Thence Beethoven went as a guest to the house occupied by Prince Lichnowsky. In May, 1795, Beethoven, in advertising the Trios, Op. 1, gives the "residence of the author" as the "Ogylisches Haus in the Kreuzgasse behind the Minorite church, No. 35 in the first storey"; but that is no reason to think that Prince Lichnowsky then lived there. Where Beethoven was during the next few years has not been ascertained, but, as has been seen by the concert bill on a preceding page, he was during the winter of 1799-1800 in the Tiefen Graben "in a very high and narrow house," as Czerny wrote to F. Luib.[94] For the summer of 1800, he took quarters for himself and servant in one of those houses in Unter-Döbling, an hour's walk, perhaps, from town, to which the readiest access is by the bridge over the brook on the North side of the Döbling hospital for the insane. The wife of a distinguished Vienna advocate occupied with her children another part of the same house. One of these children was Grillparzer, afterward famous as a poet. The zeal with which Beethoven at this period labored to perfect his pianoforte playing, and his dislike to being listened to, have been already noted. Madame Grillparzer was a lady of fine taste and culture, fond of music and therefore able to appreciate the skill of her fellow-lodger, but ignorant of his aversion to listeners. Her son, in 1861, still remembered Beethoven's incessant practice and his mother's habit of standing outside her own door to enjoy his playing. This continued for some time; but one day Beethoven sprang from the instrument to the door, opened it, looked out to see if any one was listening, and unfortunately discovered the lady. From that moment he played no more. Madame Grillparzer, thus made aware of his sensitiveness on this point, informed him through his servant that thenceforth her door into the common passageway should be kept locked, and she and her family would solely use another. It was of no avail; Beethoven played no more.

Another authentic and characteristic anecdote can belong only to this summer. There lived in a house hard by a peasant of no very good reputation, who had a daughter remarkably beautiful, but also not of the best fame. Beethoven was greatly captivated by her and was in the habit of stopping to gaze at her when he passed by where she was at work in farmyard or field. She, however, made no return of his evident liking and only laughed at his admiration. On one occasion the father was arrested for engaging in a brawl

and imprisoned. Beethoven took the man's part and went to the magistrates to obtain his release. Not succeeding, he became angry and abusive, and in the end would have been arrested for his impertinence but for the strong representations made by some, who knew him, of his position in society and of the high rank, influence and power of his friends.

Throughout this period of Beethoven's life, each summer is distinguished by some noble composition, completed, or nearly so, so that on his return to the city it was ready for revision and his copyist. Free from the demands of society, his time was his own; his fancy was quickened, his inspiration strengthened, in field and forest labor was a delight. The most important work of the master bears in his own hand the date, 1800, and may reasonably be supposed to have been the labor of this summer. It is the Concerto in C minor for Pianoforte and Orchestra, Op. 37.

DOLEŽALEK AND HOFFMEISTER

At the approach of autumn Beethoven returned to his old quarters in the Tiefen Graben. In this year Krumpholz introduced to him Johann Emanuel (possibly Johann Nepomuk Emanuel) Doležalek, a young man of 20 years, born in Chotieborz in Bohemia, who had come to Vienna to take lessons from Albrechtsberger. He played the pianoforte and violoncello, was a capable musician, in his youth a rather popular composer of Bohemian songs and then, for half a century, one of the best teachers in the capital. Toward the close of his life he was frequently occupied with the arrangement of private concerts, chiefly quartet parties, for Prince Czartoryski and other prominent persons. As long as he lived he was an enthusiastic admirer of Beethoven, and enjoyed the friendship of the composer till his death. Among his observations are the statements concerning the hatred of Beethoven felt by the Vienna musicians already noted. Koželuch, he relates, threw the C minor Trio at his (Doležalek's) feet when the latter played it to him. Speaking of Beethoven, Koželuch said to Haydn: "We would have done that differently, wouldn't we, Papa?" and Haydn answered, smilingly, "Yes, we would have done that differently." Haydn, says Doležalek, could not quite reconcile himself with Beethoven's music. It was Doležalek who witnessed the oft-told scene in the Swan tavern when Beethoven insisted on paying without having eaten.

One of the most prolific and popular composers whom Beethoven found in Vienna was Franz Anton Hoffmeister, "Chapelmaster and R. I. licensed Music, Art and Book Seller." He was an immigrant from the Neckar valley and (born 1754) much older than Beethoven, to whom he had extended a warm sympathy and friendship, doubly valuable from his somewhat similar experience as a young student in Vienna. This is evident from the whole tone of their correspondence. In 1800, Hoffmeister left Vienna and in Leipzig formed a copartnership with Ambrosius Kühnel, organist of the Electoral Saxon Court Chapel, and established a publishing house there, still retaining his business in Vienna. As late as December 5, 1800, his signature is as above given; but on the 1st of January, 1801, the advertisements in the public press announce the firm of "Hoffmeister and Kühnel, _Bureau de Musique_ in Leipzig." Since 1814 the firm name has been C. F. Peters. Knowing Beethoven personally and so intimately, it is alike creditable to the talents of the one and the taste and appreciation of the other that Hoffmeister, immediately upon organizing his new publishing house, should have asked him for manuscripts. To his letter he received an answer dated Dec. 15, 1800, in which Beethoven says:

... Per _primo_ you must know that I am very sorry that you, my dear brother in music, did not earlier let me know something (of your doings) so that I might have marketed my quartets with you, as well as many other pieces which I have sold, but if Mr. Brother is as conscientious as many other honest engravers who grave us poor composers to death, you will know how to derive profit from them when they appear. I will now set forth in brief what Mr. Brother can have from me. I^{mo} a Septet _per il Violino_, _Viola_, _Violoncello_, _Contrabasso_, _Clarinetto_, _Corno_, _Fagotto_--_tutti obligati_. (I cannot write anything not obligato for I came into this world with an obligato accompaniment.) This Septet has pleased greatly. For more frequent use the three wind-instruments, namely _Fagotto_, _Clarinetto_ and _Corno_ might be transcribed for another violin, viola and violoncello. II^o A grand Symphony for full orchestra. III^o A Concerto for pianoforte which I do not claim to be one of my best, as well as another one which will be published here by Mollo (this for the information of the Leipzig critics) because I am for the present keeping the better ones for myself until I make a tour; but it will not disgrace you to publish it. IV^o A grand Solo Sonata.[95] That is all that I can give you at this moment. A little later you may have a Quintet for stringed instruments as well as, probably, Quartets and other things which I have not now with me. In your reply you might set the prices and as you are neither a Jew nor an Italian, nor I either one or the other, we shall no doubt come to an understanding.

THE FIRST STRING QUARTETS

The reference to the Quartets, Op. 18, in this letter, taken in connection with the apologies for long delay in writing, indicates conclusively enough that at least the first set, the first three, had been placed in the hands of Mollo and Co. early in the autumn,

and it is barely possible, not probable, that they had already been issued from the press.[96] The importance of these Quartets in the history both of Beethoven and of chamber music renders very desirable more definite information upon their origin and dates of composition than the incomplete, unsatisfactory and not always harmonious data already known, afford. The original manuscripts appear to have been lost.

Von Lenz quotes in his “Critical Catalogue of Beethoven’s Works” an anecdote from a pamphlet printed at Dorpat in which is related:

After Beethoven had composed his well-known String Quartet in F major he played for his friend (Amenda) (on the pianoforte?) the glorious _Adagio_ (D minor, 9-8 time) and asked him what thought had been awakened by it. “It pictured for me the parting of two lovers,” was the answer. “Good!” remarked Beethoven, “I thought of the scene in the burial vault in ‘Romeo and Juliet’.”

This Quartet existed, then, before Amenda left Vienna. Czerny says in his notes for Jahn: “Of the first six Violin Quartets that in D major, No. 3 in print, was the very first composed by Beethoven. On the advice of Schuppanzigh he called that in F major No. 1, although it was composed later.” Ries confirms this: “Of his Violin Quartets, Op. 18, he composed that in D major first of all. That in F major, which now precedes it, was originally the third.”[97] _Nota bene_ that neither Czerny nor Ries spoke from personal observation at the time of composition; they must both have learned the fact from Beethoven himself, or, more probably, from dates on the original manuscripts. A criticism of three quartets which appeared in the “Allg. Mus. Zeitung” in 1799, which failed to give the name of the composer, has been applied by some writers (by Langhans in his History of Music, for instance) to Beethoven’s Op. 18; but erroneously. They were the works of Emanuel Aloys Förster (born January 26, 1748, in Neurath, Upper Silesia, died November 12, 1823, in Vienna), a musician who was so highly esteemed by Beethoven that, on one occasion at least, he called him his “old master.” The phrase can easily be interpreted to mean that Beethoven found instruction in Förster’s chamber music which he heard at the soirées of Prince Lichnowsky and other art-patrons. Förster’s compositions, not many of which have been preserved in print, are decidedly Beethovenish in character. His eldest son, who in 1870 was still living in Trieste, remembered Beethoven perfectly well from 1803 to 1813, and communicated to the author of this biography some reminiscences well worth preserving. It is known from other sources that Beethoven, after the retirement of Albrechtsberger, considered Förster to be the first of all the Vienna teachers of counterpoint and composition, and this is confirmed by the son’s statement that it was on Beethoven’s advice that he sent to press the compendious “Anleitung zum Generalbass” which Breitkopf and Härtel published in 1805. A year or two later, Count Rasoumowsky applied to Beethoven for instruction in musical theory and especially in quartet composition. Beethoven absolutely refused, but so strongly recommended his friend Förster, that the latter was engaged. Förster’s dwelling in all those years was a favorite resort of the principal composers and dilettanti. Thither came Beethoven; Zmeskall, a very precise gentleman with abundant white hair; Schuppanzigh, a short fat man with a huge belly; Weiss, tall and thin; Linke, the lame violoncellist, Henry Eppinger, the Jewish violin dilettante, the youthful Mayseder, J. N. Hummel, and others. The regular periods of these quartet meetings were Sunday at noon, and the evening of Thursday; but Beethoven in those years often spent other evenings with Förster, “when the conversation usually turned upon musical theory and composition.” Notwithstanding the wide difference in their ages (22 years), their friendship was cordial and sincere. The elder not only appreciated and admired the genius of the younger, but honored him as a man; and spoke of him as being not only a great musical composer, but, however at times rough in manner and harsh, even rude, in speech, of a most honorable and noble nature. Add to all this the fact, that Beethoven in later years recommended Förster to pupils as his own “old master,” and it is no forced and unnatural inference, that he (Beethoven) had studied quartet composition with him, as he had counterpoint with Albrechtsberger, and operatic writing with Salieri. Nor is this inference weakened--it is rather strengthened--by some points in what now follows:

The earliest mention of a string quartet in connection with Beethoven is that proposal by Count Appony cited from Wegeler which led to no instant result. Then comes a passage from a letter to Amenda: “Do not give your Quartet to anybody, because I have greatly changed it, having learned how to write quartets properly.” Had he learned from study under Förster?

SKETCHES FOR THE FIRST QUARTETS

The original manuscripts being lost, further chronological notices concerning them must be sought for in the sketchbooks. Here Nottebohm comes to our assistance. In the Petter collection at Vienna there are sketches for the last movement of the G major Quartet, the last movement of the B-flat Quartet (among them one which was discarded), both deviating from the printed form more or less, and one for the last movement of the F major Quartet, this approaching pretty closely the ultimate form; thus this quartet was farther advanced than the others. Associated with this sketch are sketches for the Sonata in B-flat, Op. 22, and for the easy Variations in G major which were begun while work was in progress on the last movement of the Quartet in G. Beethoven worked

simultaneously on the first movement of Op. 22 and the scherzo of the first Quartet; while working on the last movement of the Quartet in B-flat the rondo of the Sonata was begun. The sketches date from 1799 and 1800. Inasmuch as they occur before those for the Horn Sonata, which was composed very hurriedly and performed on April 18, 1800, the sketches were doubtless written earlier. One of the variations of the Quartet in A major was sketched much earlier--in 1794 or 1795. A little sketch for the first movement of the F major Quartet found beside sketches for the Violin Sonata, Op. 24, no doubt belongs to the revised form of the Quartet. In a sketchbook formerly in the possession of Grassnick in Berlin, there are sketches for the Quartet in D major which are near the ultimate form, except that there is a different theme for the last movement. Then comes a beginning in G major inscribed "Quartet 2," the germ of the theme of the second Quartet. There was, therefore, at the time no second Quartet, and that in D is the first. There follows "Der Kuss," sketches for the "Opferlied," the Rondo in G major, Op. 51, No. 2, to a passage from Schiller's "Ode to Joy," to Gellert's "Meine Lebenszeit verstreicht," in G minor, to an intermezzo for pianoforte, to the revised form of the B-flat Concerto (which he played in Prague in 1798), and to various songs. The indications are, therefore, that the sketches were written in 1798. Then come sketches for the variations on "La stessa, la stessissima," which originated and were published in the beginning of 1799, and after them extended sketches for the first movement of the F major Quartet, of which those belonging to the first movement are in an advanced stage, those for the second movement less so. A few sketches for a "third" quartet (thus specified) which were not used show that there was no third at the time; therefore, the Quartet in F is the second and was planned in 1799. Another sketchbook contains the continuation of the sketches for the F major Quartet, and, indeed, for all the movements; then an unused sketch for a "third" quartet (still not yet in existence), then to two songs by Goethe (one "Ich denke dein"), then to the movements of the G major Quartet, which is thus indicated to have been the third (the intermezzo in the second movement was conceived later), further sketches for the A major Quartet, which, it follows, was the fourth. Among these sketches are others for the Septet and the Variations on "Kind, willst du ruhig schlafen?" which appeared in December in 1799, and was therefore not composed earlier. All these sketches date from 1798 and 1799; but the Quartets were not finished. In an unused sketch for the Adagio of the quartet in F occur the words: "Les derniers soupirs," which confirm the story told by Amenda. The continuation of the G major Quartet dates to 1800. Up to now no sketches for the Quartet in C minor have been found.

The results of this chronological investigation may be summed up as follows: The composition of the Quartets was begun in 1798, that in D, the third, being first undertaken. This was followed by that in F and soon after, or simultaneously, work was begun on that in G, which was originally designed as the second; but, as that in F was completed earlier, this was designated as the second by Beethoven, and that in G became in point of time the third. The Quartet in F was finished in its original shape by June 25, 1799, on which day he gave it to Amenda; he revised it later. Whether or not this was also done with the others cannot be said; there is no evidence. The remark made in 1801, that he had just learned to write quartets, need not be read as meaning that he had formal instruction from Förster, but is amply explained by his practice on the six Quartets; yet Förster may have influenced him strongly. He then wrote the one in A (now No. 5), intending it to be the fourth; in this he seems to have made use of a _motif_ invented at an earlier period. The Quartets in B-flat and C minor followed, the latter being, perhaps, the last. The definitive elaboration of the Quartets lasted certainly until 1800, possibly until 1801. The Quartets then appeared in two sets from the press of Mollo. It is likely that the first three, at least, were in the hands of the publisher before the end of 1800, as is proved by the letter to Hoffmeister. The first three appeared in the summer of 1801 and were advertised as on sale by Nägeli in Zurich already in July; they were mentioned in the "Allg. Musik. Zeitung" on August 26, and in Spazier's "Zeitung für die Elegante Welt." In October of the same year the last three appeared and Mollo advertised them in the "Wiener Zeitung" of October 28. The Quartets are dedicated to Prince Lobkowitz.

Notice of a valuable present to Beethoven from his lenient and generous patron, Prince Carl Lichnowsky, naturally connects itself with the story of the Quartets--a gift thus described by Alois Fuchs, formerly violinist in the Imperial Court Orchestra, under date of December 2, 1846:

BEETHOVEN'S QUARTET OF INSTRUMENTS

Ludwig van Beethoven owned a complete quartet of excellent Italian instruments given to him by his princely patron and friend Lichnowsky at the suggestion of the famous quartet-player Schuppanzigh. I am in a position to describe each of the instruments in detail.

1. A violin made by Joseph Guarnerius in Cremona in the year 1718 is now in the possession of Mr. Karl Holz, director of the _Concerts spirituels_ in Vienna.

2. The second violin (which was offered for sale) was made by Nicholas Amati in the year 1667, and was in the possession of Dr. Ohmeyer, who died recently in Hütteldorf; it has been purchased by Mr. Huber.

3. The viola, made by Vincenzo Ruger in 1690, is also the property of Mr. Karl Holz.

4. The violoncello, an Andreas Guarnerius of the year 1712, is in the possession of Mr. P. Wertheimber of Vienna.

The seal of Beethoven has been impressed under the neck of each instrument and on the back of each Beethoven scratched a big B, probably for the purpose of protecting himself against an exchange. The instruments are all well preserved and in good condition. The most valuable one, without question, is the violin by Joseph Guarnerius, which is distinguished by extraordinary power of tone, for which, indeed, Mr. Holz has refused an offer of 1000 florins.

The four instruments were bought by Peter Th. Jokits in 1861, who gave them to the Royal Library at Berlin. Beethoven received them from Lichnowsky certainly before 1802, but in what year is unknown.[98] Another proof of the Prince's regard and generosity, however, belongs to this, namely, an annuity of 600 florins to be continued until the composer should find some suitable permanent employment.

* * * * *

The only known publication of the year 1800 is the Rondo in G major, Op. 51, No. 2, which came from the press of Simrock. As for the compositions of the year it is safe to assume that Beethoven put the finishing touches to the first Symphony, the Septet, Op. 20, and the Quartets, Op. 18. Furthermore, there can be little doubt but that the Sonata for Horn, Op. 17, the Pianoforte Sonata, Op. 22, the Concerto in C minor, and the Variations for Four Hands on the melody of the song "Ich denke dein," belong to this year. The "Variations très faciles" on an original theme in G were sketched and probably completed. The only chronological clues to the Horn Sonata are the date of its first performance, April 18, 1800, and the anecdote by Ries concerning the rapid completion of the work. No sketches have been found and nothing is known of the autograph; but according to Nottebohm the beginning of a clean copy of the Adagio is to be found among the sketches for the Sonatas Op. 22 and 23. Punto was still in Munich in 1800, and since the work seems assuredly to have been designed for him, there is equal certainty that it was composed in that year. It was published by Mollo in March, 1801. The Septet, for four strings and three wind-instruments, dedicated to the Empress Maria Theresia, was played at the concert at which the Symphony in C major was brought forward, April 2, 1800; but it had been heard previously in the house of Prince Schwarzenberg. Inasmuch as sketches for it are found among those for the Quartets, specially the one in A major, which belong to the year 1799, its inception may be placed in that year, though it was probably finished in 1800 shortly before its performance. There is no date on the autograph. It was offered to Hoffmeister in the letter of December 15, 1800, and was published by him in 1802. The Septet speedily won great popularity and was frequently transcribed. Hoffmeister had an arrangement for string quintet which he advertised on August 18, 1802. Ries thought that Beethoven had made it, but he was in error; nevertheless, Beethoven gave Hoffmeister permission to publish an arrangement in which strings were substituted for the wind-instruments, and himself transcribed it as a pianoforte trio with violin or clarinet _ad lib_. This arrangement was made as a tribute of gratitude from the composer to his new physician, Dr. Johann Schmidt. The doctor played the violin and his daughter the pianoforte, both fairly well, and Beethoven arranged his popular piece for family use and, as was customary at the time, gave Dr. Schmidt the exclusive possession of the music for a year.[99]

The theme of the minuet in the Septet was borrowed from the Pianoforte Sonata, Op. 49, No. 2, but its treatment is original. There has been considerable controversy without absolutely definitive result touching the melody which is varied in the Andante. Kretschmer, in his "Deutsche Volkslieder" (Berlin, 1838; Vol. I, No. 102, p. 181), prints the melody in connection with a Rhenish folksong ("Ach Schiffer, lieber Schiffer"), and there is a tradition that Czerny said that it was taken by Beethoven from that source. Nottebohm offers evidence deserving of consideration that the melody is a folktune; but Ries and Wegeler, who lived on the Rhine, had nothing to say on the subject. Erk and Böhme ("Deutscher Liederhort," Vol. I, p. 273) publish folksongs dealing with the legend which is at the base of "Ach Schiffer, lieber Schiffer," but the melody of the Andante is not to be found among them, and Böhme gives it as his opinion that the song printed by Kretschmer was written to Beethoven's melody by Kretschmer's collaborator Zuccalmaglio. It is not likely that the melody, had it lived in the mouths of the people, would have escaped so industrious a collector as Erk, who, moreover, was a native of the Rhine country. The evidence would seem to indicate that the melody was original with Beethoven.

COMPOSITIONS SKETCHED IN 1800

The Pianoforte Sonata in B-flat, Op. 22, also belongs to this year, as appears from the fact that it was offered to Hoffmeister in the letter of December 15. It was still in an unfinished state on the completion of the Sonata for Horn, as is shown by the circumstance that sketches of it are mingled with a fair transcript of a passage from the latter work. There are also sketches for Op. 22, among

those for the Quartet in B-flat, Op. 18, No. 6, and the later movements of the Quartet in F--no doubt the revision. The sketches therefore belong to the year 1800, but may date back to 1799, from which it would appear that Beethoven worked an unusually long time on the Sonata. The principal labor was performed most likely in the summer of 1800, which Beethoven spent at Unterdöbling. It was published in 1802 by Hoffmeister and Kühnel. Sketches from the “Six Easy Variations” are found amongst some for the last movement of the Quartet in G, which seem to be nearly finished. Again we can fix the year as 1799 or 1800. Of special importance is the fact that the theme of the Variations is the same as the first episode of the rondo of the Sonata in B-flat, and the circumstance that the sketches are of almost the same date indicates that the identity was not accidental. The Variations were advertised as new by Traeg on December 16, 1800.

The Variations in D for four hands on the melody of Goethe’s poem, “Ich denke dein,” were conceived at practically the same time as those just described. Beethoven at first intended to give each stanza a separate setting, and to this end made two sketches, which are associated with the Quartet sketches and belong to the year 1799. He then took the melody of the first stanza as a theme for variations for four hands in the same year and wrote them into the autograph album of two sisters, the countesses Therese Brunswick and Josephine Deym. On September 22, 1803, he offered them to Hoffmeister in the place of the Trio Variations, Op. 44, with the remark that he considered them better than the latter. Hoffmeister, however, published the Trio Variations (in 1804). The Variations in D were not published until the beginning of 1805, and were described as having been written in 1800 for the two countesses mentioned, and dedicated to them.

An autograph preserved in the Royal Library in Berlin contains four of the variations on “Ich denke dein,” an Adagio in F major noted on four staves (three with treble, one with the bass clef), a Scherzo in G major, 3/4 time, and an Allegro in G major, 2/4. Albert Kopfermann, who published the Adagio for the first time in No. 12, Vol. I, of “Die Musik,” considers, no doubt correctly, that the three compositions were written for an automatic musical instrument. Though the number of new compositions produced in 1800 was small, attention must be directed to the fact that the revision and completion of works for publication, together with the planning of new works, gave a deal of occupation to Beethoven. Amongst the compositions made ready for the printer were the Quartets, which were not ready till near the end of the year. To them must be added the Sonata in E-flat, Op. 27, No. 1, and the Concerto in C minor, the autograph of which distinctly bears the date 1800. It is certain, moreover, that Beethoven began working on “Prometheus” in this year, and the summer must have been a busy one for him.

FOOTNOTES:

[91] “He could not endure his Septet and grew angry because of the universal applause with which it was received.” (Czerny to Jahn.) “The theme of the variations is said to be a Rhenish folksong.” (_Ibid._)

[92] This is, of course, an error, as the Trio had been before the public since October 3rd, 1798.

[93] From Weigl’s “Corsair aus Liebe.”

[94] According to Frimmel, “Beethoven’s Wohnungen,” Vienna “Neue Freie Presse,” August 11, 1899, this house was that of Court Councillor Greiner, then No. 241, afterwards 235, now No. 10 in the Tiefen Graben which, slightly altered, still remains. On the strength of Czerny’s statement that one had to look up to the fifth or sixth storey to see Beethoven, and the old report that Beethoven lived “in the Kleine Weintraube,” Frimmel was led to think that possibly he lived in one of the houses on the higher ground behind the Greiner house to which there was access from the open place “Am Hof” as well as from the houses in the Tiefen Graben and the Greiner house. The houses which bore the sign “Zur Weintraube” were situated “am Hofe.”

[95] In B-flat, Op. 22.

[96] The Pianoforte Concerto offered to Hoffmeister was that in B-flat. It was published by Hoffmeister and Kühnel toward the end of 1801 and advertised on January 16, 1802. The Concerto published by Mollo was that in C major. A letter written to Breitkopf and Härtel on the same day contains the equivalent of the remark: “I am for the present keeping the better ones for myself until I make a tour,” which is significant, since it makes it sure that other concertos were at least planned and that the one in C minor was looked upon as finished by Beethoven.

[97] In reality it was the second, as the Amenda parts show.

[98] Holz sold the Guarnerius violin in 1852 (see the “Allgemeine Deutsche Musikzeitung” of 1888). When the Beethoven Museum in Bonn was dedicated, the instruments were borrowed from the authorities of the Royal Library, and exhibited in a glass case,

where they remain by sufferance of the Prussian authorities.

[99] See the dedication in Kalischer's collection of Beethoven's letters translated by J. S. Shedlock, Vol. I, p. 94.

Chapter XIX

The Year 1801--Concerts for Wounded Soldiers--Vigano and the Ballet "Prometheus"--Stephan von Breuning--Hetzendorf--"Christus am Ölberg"--Compositions and Publications of the Year--The Funeral March in the Sonata, Op. 26--The "Moonlight" Sonata--The Quintet, Op. 29.

The tone of Beethoven's correspondence and the many proofs of his untiring industry during the winter 1800-1 and early part of the succeeding spring, suggest a mind at ease, rejoicing in the exercise of its powers, and a body glowing with vigorous health. But for his own words to Wegeler: "I have been really miserable this winter," the passing allusions to ill health in his replies to Hoffmeister's letters would merely impress the reader as being half-groundless apologies for lack of punctuality in writing. This chapter will exhibit the young master both as he appeared to the public and as he showed himself in confidential intercourse to the few in whose presence he put aside the mask and laid open his heart; and will, therefore, it is believed, be found fully to justify what has been said of his heroic energy, courage and endurance under a trouble of no ordinary nature.

In the beginning of the year he wrote to Hoffmeister[100] as follows under date "January 15 (or thereabouts), 1801":

... Your enterprises delight me also and I wish that if works of art ever bring profit that it might go to real artists instead of mere shopkeepers.

The fact that you purpose to publish the works of _Sebastian Bach_ does good to my heart which beats only for the lofty and magnificent art of this patriarch of harmony, and I hope soon to see them in vigorous sale. I hope, as soon as golden peace has been declared, to be helpful in many ways, especially if you offer the works for subscription.

As regards our real business, since you ask it I meet your wishes by offering you the following items: Septet (concerning which I have already written you), 20 ducats; Symphony, 20 ducats; Grand Solo Sonata--Allegro, Adagio, Minuetto, Rondo--20 ducats. This Sonata is a tidy piece of work (_hat sich gewaschen_), my dearest Mr. Brother.

Now for an explanation: You will wonder, perhaps, that I have made no distinction here between Sonata, Septet and Symphony. I have done this because I have learned that a septet or symphony has a smaller sale than a sonata, though a symphony ought unquestionably to be worth more. (N. B. The Septet consists of a short introductory _Adagio_, then _Allegro_, _Adagio_, _Minuetto_, _Andante_ with variations, _Minuetto_ again, a short _Adagio_ introduction and then _Presto_.) I put the price of the Concerto at only 10 ducats because, as I have already written, I do not give it out as one of my best. I do not think the amount excessive on the whole; I have tried, at least, to make the price as moderate as possible for you. As regards the bill of exchange you may, since you leave the matter to me, issue it to Geimüller or Schüller. The whole sum amounts to 70 ducats for the four works. I do not understand any money except Viennese ducats; how many thalers in gold that amounts to does not concern me, I being a really bad negotiator and mathematician.

This disposes of the disagreeable (_saure_) business; I call it so because I wish things were different in the world. There ought to be only one art warehouse in the world to which an artist would only need to carry his art-works to take away with him whatever he needed; as it is one must be half tradesman; and how we adjust ourselves--good God!--that is what I again call disagreeable. As regards the L... O...,[101] let them talk; they will certainly never make anybody immortal by their twaddle, and as little will they rob anybody of immortality to whom Apollo has decreed it.

BENEFIT CONCERTS FOR WOUNDED SOLDIERS

The next letter requires a word of introduction. That military campaign which included the disastrous field of Hohenlinden (December 3, 1800), had filled the hospitals at Vienna, and among the various means of raising funds for the benefit of the wounded, was a series of public concerts. The two in which they reached their climax took place in the large Ridotto room (_Redouten-Saal_) of the imperial palace. The one arranged by Baron von Braun as Director of the Court Opera, was a performance of Haydn's "Creation" conducted by the composer, on January 16th; the other was arranged by Mme. Frank (Christine Gerhardi) for January 30th. That lady, Mme. Galvani (Magdalena Willmann) and Herr Simoni were the singers, Beethoven and Punto the instrumental solo performers; Haydn directed two of his own symphonies, Paër and Conti directed the orchestra in the

accompaniments to the vocal music. In the first public announcement printed in the “Wiener Zeitung” the only artist mentioned was “the famous amateur singer Frau von Frank, _née_ Gerhardi,” as the giver of the concert. This called out from Beethoven the following letter:

Pour Madame de Frank.

I think it my duty, best of women, to ask you not to permit your husband again in the second announcement of our concert to forget that those who contribute their talents to the same also be made known to the public. This is the custom, and I do not see if it is not done what is to increase the attendance at the concert, which is its chief aim. Punto is not a little wrought up about the matter, and he is right, and it was my intention even before I saw him to remind you of what must have been the result of great haste or great forgetfulness. Look after this, best of women, since if it is not done dissatisfaction will surely result.

Having been convinced, not only by myself but by others as well, that I am not a useless factor in this concert, I know that not only I but Punto, Simoni, Galvani will ask that the public be informed also of our zeal for the philanthropic purposes of this concert; otherwise we must all conclude that we are useless.

Wholly yours

L. v. Bthvn.

Whether this sharp remonstrance produced the desired effect cannot now be ascertained, but the original advertisement was repeated in the newspaper on the 24th and 28th _verbatim_.

In the state of affairs then existing it was no time to give public concerts for private emolument; moreover, a quarrel with the orchestra a year before might have prevented Beethoven from obtaining the Burgtheater again, and the new Theater-an-der-Wien was not yet ready for occupation; but there is still another adequate reason for his giving no _Akademie_ (concert) this spring. He had been engaged to compose an important work for the court stage.

VIGANO AND THE PROMETHEUS BALLET

Salvatore Vigano, dancer and composer of ballets, both action and music, the son of a Milanese of the same profession, was born at Naples, March 29, 1769. He began his career at Rome, taking female parts because women were not allowed there to appear upon the stage. He then had engagements successively at Madrid--where he married Maria Medina, a celebrated Spanish danseuse--Bordeaux, London and Venice, in which last city, in 1791, he composed his “Raoul, Sire de Croqui.” Thence he came to Vienna, where he and his wife first appeared in May, 1793. His “Raoul” was produced on June 25th at the Kärnthnerthor-Theater. After two years of service here he accepted engagements in five continental cities and returned to Vienna again in 1799. The second wife of Emperor Franz, Maria Theresia, was a woman of much and true musical taste and culture, and Vigano determined to compliment her in a ballet composed expressly for that purpose. Haydn’s gloriously successful “Creation” may, perhaps, have had an influence in the choice of a subject, “The Men of Prometheus,” and the dedication of Beethoven’s Septet to the Empress may have had its effect in the choice of a composer. At all events, the work was entrusted to Beethoven.

If the manner in which this work has been neglected by Beethoven’s biographers and critics may be taken as a criterion, an opinion prevails that it was not worthy of him in subject, execution or success. It seems to be forgotten that as an orchestral composer he was then known only by two or three pianoforte concertos and his first Symphony--a work which by no means rivals the greater production of Mozart and Haydn--and that for the stage he was not known to have written anything. There is a misconception, too, as to the position which the ballet just then held in the Court Theatre. As a matter of fact it stood higher than ever before and, perhaps, than it has ever stood since. Vigano was a man of real genius and had wrought a reform which is clearly, vigorously and compendiously described in a memoir of Heinrich von Collin, from which we quote:

In the reign of Leopold II the ballet, which had become a well-attended entertainment in Vienna through the efforts of Noverre, was restored to the stage. Popular interest turned at once to them again, and this was intensified in a great degree when, beside the ballet-master Muzarelli, a second ballet-master, Mr. Salvatore Vigano, whose wife disclosed to the eyes of the spectators a thitherto unsuspected art, also gave entertainments. The most important affairs of state are scarcely able to create a greater war of feeling than was brought about at the time by the rivalry of the two ballet-masters. Theatre-lovers without exception divided themselves into two parties who looked upon each other with hatred and contempt because of a difference of conviction.... The new ballet-master owed his extraordinary triumph over his older rival to his restoration of his art back from the exaggerated,

inexpressive artificialities of the old Italian ballet to the simple forms of nature. Of course, there was something startling in seeing a form of drama with which thitherto there had been associated only leaps, contortions, constrained positions, and complicated dances which left behind them no feeling of unity, suddenly succeeded by dramatic action, depth of feeling, and plastic beauty of representation as they were so magnificently developed in the earlier ballets of Mr. Salvatore Vigano, opening, as they did, a new realm of beauty. And though it may be true that it was especially the natural, joyous, unconstrained dancing of Madame Vigano and her play of features, as expressive as it was fascinating, which provoked the applause of the many, it is nevertheless true that the very subject-matter of the ballets, which differentiate themselves very favorably from his later conceits, and his then wholly classical, skilful and manly dancing, were well calculated to inspire admiration and respect for the master and his creations.

Two or three pages might be compiled of spicy matter upon the beautiful Mme. Vigano's lavish display of the Venus-like graces and charms of her exquisite form; but her name, long before the "Prometheus" ballet, had disappeared from the roll of the theatre and Fräulein Cassentini reigned in her stead. There was nothing derogatory to Beethoven in his acceptance of the commission to compose the music to a ballet by Vigano; but by whom commissioned, upon what terms, and when--concerning these and similar particulars, we know nothing. We only know, that at the close of the season before Easter, on the 28th of March, "Die Geschöpfe des Prometheus" was performed for the first time for the benefit of the prima ballerina of the ballet corps, Fräulein Cassentini, and that the whole number of its performances this year was sixteen, and in 1802 thirteen. The pecuniary result to Beethoven must therefore have been satisfactory. True, the full score did not appear in print in Beethoven's lifetime or for a long time thereafter; it was not published, indeed, until the appearance of the critical Complete Edition, in which it figures as No. 11 of Series II; nothing is known of the original manuscript. A copy revised except as to two numbers, is in the Royal Imperial Court Library at Vienna. A pianoforte arrangement of the score was published in June, 1801, by Artaria with the opus number 24 and a dedication to Prince Lichnowsky. Hoffmeister printed the orchestral parts and a pianoforte score in 1804 as Op. 43 (the number 24 having meanwhile been assigned to the Violin Sonata in F). Mention ought, perhaps, also to be made of a pianoforte arrangement of No. 8 for four hands "composé pour la famille Kobler par Louis van Beethoven. Cette pièce se trouve aussi à gr. Orchestre dans le même Magazin." The Kobler family was frequently in Vienna, among other times in 1814; it had nothing to do with the "Prometheus" music.

Alois Fuchs has preserved a characteristic anecdote which came to him "from the worthy hand of a contemporary":

When Beethoven had composed the music to the ballet "Die Geschöpfe des Prometheus" in 1801, he was one day met by his former teacher, the great Joseph Haydn, who stopped him at once and said: "Well, I heard your ballet yesterday and it pleased me very much!" Beethoven replied: "O, dear Papa, you are very kind; but it is far from being a 'Creation!'" Haydn, surprised at the answer and almost offended, said after a short pause: "That is true; it is not yet a 'Creation' and I can scarcely believe that it will ever become one." Whereupon the men said their adieus, both somewhat embarrassed.

From the period immediately following we have another letter from Beethoven to Hoffmeister, dated April 22, 1801, in which he says:

Perhaps, too, it is the only sign of genius about me that my things are not always in the best of order, and nobody can mend the matter except myself. Thus, for instance, the pianoforte part, as is usual with me, was not written out in score and I only now have made a fair copy of it so that because of your haste you might not receive my too illegible manuscript. So that the works may appear in the proper sequence as far as possible I inform you that the following opus numbers ought to be placed on the compositions:

On the Solo Sonata Opus 22 On the Symphony „ 21 On the Septet „ 20 On the Concerto „ 19

The titles I will send you soon.

Set me down as a subscriber for the works of Johann Sebastian Bach, also Prince Lichnowsky. The transcription of the Mozart sonata (or sonatas) as quartets and quintets will do you honor and certainly prove remunerative. In this also I should like to be of greater service, but I am a disorderly individual and with the best of intentions I am continually forgetting everything; yet I have spoken about the matter here and there, and everywhere have found inclination towards it. It would be a handsome thing if Mr. Brother besides doing this were to publish an arrangement of the Septet for flute, as quintet, for example; by this means the amateur flautists, who have already approached me on the subject, would be helped and they would swarm around it like hungry insects. To say something about myself, I have just written a ballet in which the ballet-master did not do as well as he might have done. Baron von Liechtenstein has endowed us with a product not commensurate with the ideas which the newspapers have

spread touching his genius; another bit of evidence against the newspapers. The Baron seems to have formed his ideal on Herr Müller in the marionette show, without, however, having attained it.

T

[... TRUNCATED at 800,000 chars for file-size management — full text in original source ...]

==========

Untitled

Unknown

Project Gutenberg Release: April 12, 2014 · eBook #45368

THE OUTLINE OF HISTORY

Mr. WELLS has also written the following novels:

LOVE AND MR. LEWISHAM KIPPS MR. POLLY THE WHEELS OF CHANCE THE NEW MACHIAVELLI ANN VERONICA TONO BUNGAY MARRIAGE BEALBY THE PASSIONATE FRIENDS THE WIFE OF SIR ISAAC HARMAN THE RESEARCH MAGNIFICENT MR. BRITLING SEES IT THROUGH THE SOUL OF A BISHOP JOAN AND PETER THE UNDYING FIRE

¶ The following fantastic and imaginative romances:

THE WAR OF THE WORLDS THE TIME MACHINE THE WONDERFUL VISIT THE ISLAND OF DR. MOREAU THE SEA LADY THE SLEEPER AWAKES THE FOOD OF THE GODS THE WAR IN THE AIR THE FIRST MEN IN THE MOON IN THE DAYS OF THE COMET THE WORLD SET FREE

And numerous Short Stories now collected in One Volume under the title of

THE COUNTRY OF THE BLIND

¶ A Series of books on Social, Religious, and Political questions:

ANTICIPATIONS (1900) MANKIND IN THE MAKING FIRST AND LAST THINGS NEW WORLDS FOR OLD A MODERN UTOPIA THE FUTURE IN AMERICA AN ENGLISHMAN LOOKS AT THE WORLD WHAT IS COMING? WAR AND THE FUTURE IN THE FOURTH YEAR GOD THE INVISIBLE KING

¶ And two little books about children’s play, called

FLOOR GAMES and LITTLE WARS

THE OUTLINE OF HISTORY

Being a Plain History of Life and Mankind

BY

H. G. WELLS

WRITTEN WITH THE ADVICE AND EDITORIAL HELP OF

MR. ERNEST BARKER, SIR H. H. JOHNSTON, SIR E. RAY LANKESTER AND PROFESSOR GILBERT MURRAY

AND ILLUSTRATED BY

J. F. HORRABIN

VOLUME I

New York THE MACMILLAN COMPANY 1920

All rights reserved

COPYRIGHT, 1920,

BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

COPYRIGHT, 1920,

BY H. G. WELLS.

Set up and electrotyped. Published November, 1920.

NORWOOD PRESS

J. S. Cushing Co.--Berwick & Smith Co.

Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

INTRODUCTION

"_A philosophy of the history of the human race, worthy of its name, must begin with the heavens and descend to the earth, must be charged with the conviction that all existence is one--a single conception sustained from beginning to end upon one identical law._"--FRIEDRICH RATZEL.

This _Outline of History_ is an attempt to tell, truly and clearly, in one continuous narrative, the whole story of life and mankind so far as it is known to-day. It is written plainly for the general reader, but its aim goes beyond its use as merely interesting reading matter. There is a feeling abroad that the teaching of history considered as a part of general education is in an unsatisfactory condition, and particularly that the ordinary treatment of this "subject" by the class and teacher and examiner is too partial and narrow. But the desire to extend the general range of historical ideas is confronted by the argument that the available time for instruction is already consumed by that partial and narrow treatment, and that therefore, however desirable this extension of range may be, it is in practice impossible. If an Englishman, for example, has found the history of England quite enough for his powers of assimilation, then it seems hopeless to expect his sons and daughters to master universal history, if that is to consist of the history of England, plus the history of France, plus the history of Germany, plus the history of Russia, and so on. To which the only possible answer is that universal history is at once something more and something less than the aggregate of the national histories to which we are accustomed, that it must be approached in a different spirit and dealt with in a different manner. This book seeks to justify that answer. It has been written primarily to show that _history as one whole_ is amenable to a more broad and comprehensive handling than is the history of special nations and periods, a broader handling that will bring it within the normal limitations of time and energy set to the reading and education of an ordinary citizen. This outline deals with ages and races and nations, where the ordinary history deals with reigns and pedigrees and campaigns; but it will not be found to be more crowded with names and dates, nor more difficult to follow and understand. History is no exception amongst the sciences; as the gaps fill in, the outline simplifies; as the outlook broadens, the clustering multitude of details dissolves into general laws. And many topics of quite primary interest to mankind, the first appearance and the growth of scientific knowledge for example, and its effects upon human life, the elaboration of the ideas of money and credit, or the story of the origins and spread and influence of Christianity, which must be treated fragmentarily or by elaborate digressions in any partial history, arise and flow completely and naturally in one general record of the world in which we live.

The need for a common knowledge of the general facts of human history throughout the world has become very evident during the tragic happenings of the last few years. Swifter means of communication have brought all men closer to one another for good or for evil. War becomes a universal disaster, blind and monstrously destructive; it bombs the baby in its cradle and sinks the food-ships that cater for the non-combatant and the neutral. There can be no peace now, we realize, but a common peace in all the world; no prosperity but a general prosperity. But _there can be no common peace and prosperity without common historical ideas_. Without such ideas to hold them together in harmonious co-operation, with nothing but narrow, selfish, and conflicting nationalist traditions, races and peoples are bound to drift towards conflict and destruction. This truth, which was apparent to that great philosopher Kant a century or more ago--it is the gist of his tract upon universal peace--is now plain to the man in the street. Our internal policies and our economic and social ideas are profoundly vitiated at present by wrong and fantastic ideas of the origin and historical relationship of social classes. A sense of history as the common adventure of all mankind is as necessary for peace within as it is for peace between the nations.

Such are the views of history that this _Outline_ seeks to realize. It is an attempt to tell how our present state of affairs, this distressed and multifarious human life about us, arose in the course of vast ages and out of the inanimate clash of matter, and to estimate the quality and amount and range of the hopes with which it now faces its destiny. It is one experimental contribution to a

great and urgently necessary educational reformation, which must ultimately restore universal history, revised, corrected, and brought up to date, to its proper place and use as the backbone of a general education. We say “restore,” because all the great cultures of the world hitherto, Judaism and Christianity in the Bible, Islam in the Koran, have used some sort of cosmogony and world history as a basis. It may indeed be argued that without such a basis any really binding culture of men is inconceivable. Without it we are a chaos.

Remarkably few sketches of universal history by one single author have been written. One book that has influenced the writer very strongly is Winwood Reade’s _Martyrdom of Man_. This _dates_, as people say, nowadays, and it has a fine gloom of its own, but it is still an extraordinarily inspiring presentation of human history as one consistent process. Mr. F. S. Marvin’s _Living Past_ is also an admirable summary of human progress. There is a good _General History of the World_ in one volume by Mr. Oscar Browning. America has recently produced two well-illustrated and up-to-date class books, Breasted’s _Ancient Times_ and Robinson’s _Medieval and Modern Times_, which together give a very good idea of the story of mankind since the beginning of human societies. There are, moreover, quite a number of nominally Universal Histories in existence, but they are really not histories at all, they are encyclopædias of history; they lack the unity of presentation attainable only when the whole subject has been passed through one single mind. These universal histories are compilations, assemblies of separate national or regional histories by different hands, the parts being necessarily unequal in merit and authority and disproportionate one to another. Several such universal histories in thirty or forty volumes or so, adorned with allegorical title pages and illustrated by folding maps and plans of Noah’s Ark, Solomon’s Temple, and the Tower of Babel, were produced for the libraries of gentlemen in the eighteenth century. Helmolt’s _World History_, in eight massive volumes, is a modern compilation of the same sort, very useful for reference and richly illustrated, but far better in its parts than as a whole. Another such collection is the _Historians’ History of the World_ in 25 volumes. _The Encyclopædia Britannica_ contains, of course, a complete encyclopædia of history within itself, and is the most modern of all such collections.[1] F. Ratzel’s _History of Mankind_, in spite of the promise of its title, is mainly a natural history of man, though it is rich with suggestions upon the nature and development of civilization. That publication and Miss Ellen Churchill Semple’s _Influence of Geographical Environment_, based on Ratzel’s work, are quoted in this _Outline_, and have had considerable influence upon its plan. F. Ratzel would indeed have been the ideal author for such a book as our present one. Unfortunately neither he nor any other ideal author was available.[2]

The writer will offer no apology for making this experiment. His disqualifications are manifest. But such work needs to be done by as many people as possible, he was free to make his contribution, and he was greatly attracted by the task. He has read sedulously and made the utmost use of all the help he could obtain. There is not a chapter that has not been examined by some more competent person than himself and very carefully revised. He has particularly to thank his friends Sir E. Ray Lankester, Sir H. H. Johnston, Professor Gilbert Murray, and Mr. Ernest Barker for much counsel and direction and editorial help. Mr. Philip Guedalla has toiled most efficiently and kindly through all the proofs. Mr. A. Allison, Professor T. W. Arnold, Mr. Arnold Bennett, the Rev. A. H. Trevor Benson, Mr. Aodh de Blacam, Mr. Laurence Binyon, the Rev. G. W. Broomfield, Sir William Bull, Mr. L. Cranmer Byng, Mr. A. J. D. Campbell, Mr. A. Y. Campbell, Mr. L. Y. Chen, Mr. A. R. Cowan, Mr. O. G. S. Crawford, Dr. W. S. Culbertson, Mr. R. Langton Cole, Mr. B. G. Collins, Mr. J. J. L. Duyvendak, Mr. O. W. Ellis, Mr. G. S. Ferrier, Mr. David Freeman, Mr. S. N. Fu, Mr. G. B. Gloyne, Sir Richard Gregory, Mr. F. H. Hayward, Mr. Sydney Herbert, Dr. Fr. Krupicka, Mr. H. Lang Jones, Mr. C. H. B. Laughton, Mr. B. I. Macalpin, Mr. G. H. Mair, Mr. F. S. Marvin, Mr. J. S. Mayhew, Mr. B. Stafford Morse, Professor J. L. Myres, the Hon. W. Ormsby-Gore, Sir Sydney Olivier, Mr. R. I. Pocock, Mr. J. Pringle, Mr. W. H. R. Rivers, Sir Denison Ross, Dr. E. J. Russell, Dr. Charles Singer, Mr. A. St. George Sanford, Dr. C. O. Stallybrass, Mr. G. H. Walsh, Mr. G. P. Wells, Miss Rebecca West, and Mr. George Whale have all to be thanked for help, either by reading parts of the MS. or by pointing out errors in the published parts, making suggestions, answering questions, or giving advice. The amount of friendly and sympathetic assistance the writer has received, often from very busy people, has been a quite extraordinary experience. He has met with scarcely a single instance of irritation or impatience on the part of specialists whose domains he has invaded and traversed in what must have seemed to many of them an exasperatingly impudent and superficial way. Numerous other helpful correspondents have pointed out printer’s errors and minor slips in the serial publication which preceded this book edition, and they have added many useful items of information, and to those writers also the warmest thanks are due. But of course none of these generous helpers are to be held responsible for the judgments, tone, arrangement, or writing of this _Outline_. In the relative importance of the parts, in the moral and political implications of the story, the final decision has necessarily fallen to the writer. The problem of illustrations was a very difficult one for him, for he had had no previous experience in the production of an illustrated book. In Mr. J. F. Horrabin he has had the good fortune to find not only an illustrator but a collaborator. Mr. Horrabin has spared no pains to make this work informative and exact. His maps and drawings are a part of the text, the most vital and decorative part. Some of them, the hypothetical maps, for example,

of the western world at the end of the last glacial age, during the “pluvial age” and 12,000 years ago, and the migration map of the Barbarian invaders of the Roman Empire, represent the reading and inquiry of many laborious days.

The index to this edition is the work of Mr. Strickland Gibson of Oxford. Several correspondents have asked for a pronouncing index and accordingly this has been provided.

The writer owes a word of thanks to that living index of printed books, Mr. J. F. Cox of the London Library. He would also like to acknowledge here the help he has received from Mrs. Wells. Without her labour in typing and re-typing the drafts of the various chapters as they have been revised and amended, in checking references, finding suitable quotations, hunting up illustrations, and keeping in order the whole mass of material for this history, and without her constant help and watchful criticism, its completion would have been impossible.

[Illustration: H. G. Wells]

SCHEME OF CONTENTS

BOOK I

THE MAKING OF OUR WORLD

PAGE CHAPTER I. THE EARTH IN SPACE AND TIME 3

CHAPTER II. THE RECORD OF THE ROCKS

§ 1. The first living things 7

§ 2. How old is the world? 13

CHAPTER III. NATURAL SELECTION AND THE CHANGES OF SPECIES 16

CHAPTER IV. THE INVASION OF THE DRY LAND BY LIFE

§ 1. Life and water 23

§ 2. The earliest animals 25

CHAPTER V. CHANGES IN THE WORLD’S CLIMATE

§ 1. Why life must change continually 29

§ 2. The sun a steadfast star 34

§ 3. Changes from within the earth 35

§ 4. Life may control change 36

CHAPTER VI. THE AGE OF REPTILES

§ 1. The age of lowland life 38

§ 2. Flying dragons 43

§ 3. The first birds 43

§ 4. An age of hardship and death 44

§ 5. The first appearance of fur and feathers 47

CHAPTER VII. THE AGE OF MAMMALS

§ 1. A new age of life 51

§ 2. Tradition comes into the world 52

§ 3. An age of brain growth 56

§ 4. The world grows hard again 57

§ 5. Chronology of the Ice Age 59

BOOK II

THE MAKING OF MEN

CHAPTER VIII. THE ANCESTRY OF MAN

§ 1. Man descended from a walking ape 62

§ 2. First traces of man-like creatures 68

§ 3. The Heidelberg sub-man 69

§ 4. The Piltdown sub-man 70

§ 5. The riddle of the Piltdown remains 72

CHAPTER IX. THE NEANDERTHAL MEN, AN EXTINCT RACE. (THE EARLY PALÆOLITHIC AGE)

§ 1. The world 50,000 years ago 75

§ 2. The daily life of the first men 79

§ 3. The last Palæolithic men 84

CHAPTER X. THE LATER POSTGLACIAL PALÆOLITHIC MEN, THE FIRST TRUE MEN. (LATER PALÆOLITHIC AGE)

§ 1. The coming of men like ourselves 86

§ 2. Subdivision of the Later Palæolithic 95

§ 3. The earliest true men were clever savages 98

§ 4. Hunters give place to herdsmen 101

§ 5. No sub-men in America 102

CHAPTER XI. NEOLITHIC MAN IN EUROPE

§ 1. The age of cultivation begins 104

§ 2. Where did the Neolithic culture arise? 108

§ 3. Everyday Neolithic life 109

§ 4. How did sowing begin? 116

§ 5. Primitive trade 118

§ 6. The flooding of the Mediterranean Valley 118

CHAPTER XII. EARLY THOUGHT

§ 1. Primitive philosophy 122

§ 2. The Old Man in religion 125

§ 3. Fear and hope in religion 126

§ 4. Stars and seasons 127

§ 5. Story-telling and myth-making 129

§ 6. Complex origins of religion 130

CHAPTER XIII. THE RACES OF MANKIND

§ 1. Is mankind still differentiating? 136

§ 2. The main races of mankind 140

§ 3. Was there an Alpine race? 142

§ 4. The Heliolithic culture of the Brunet peoples 146

§ 5. How existing races may be related to each other 148

CHAPTER XIV. THE LANGUAGES OF MANKIND

§ 1. No one primitive language 150

§ 2. The Aryan languages 151

§ 3. The Semitic languages 153

§ 4. The Hamitic languages 154

§ 5. The Ural-Altaic languages 156

§ 6. The Chinese languages 157

§ 7. Other language groups 157

§ 8. Submerged and lost languages 161

§ 9. How languages may be related 163

BOOK III

THE DAWN OF HISTORY

CHAPTER XV. THE ARYAN-SPEAKING PEOPLES IN PREHISTORIC TIMES

§ 1. The spreading of the Aryan-speakers 167

§ 2. Primitive Aryan life 169

§ 3. Early Aryan daily life 176

CHAPTER XVI. THE FIRST CIVILIZATIONS

§ 1. Early cities and early nomads 183

§ 2A. The riddle of the Sumerians 188

§ 2B. The empire of Sargon the First 191

§ 2C. The empire of Hammurabi 191

§ 2D. The Assyrians and their empire 192

§ 2E. The Chaldean empire 194

§ 3. The early history of Egypt 195

§ 4. The early civilization of India 201

§ 5. The early history of China 201

§ 6. While the civilizations were growing 206

CHAPTER XVII. SEA PEOPLES AND TRADING PEOPLES

§ 1. The earliest ships and sailors 209

§ 2. The Ægean cities before history 213

§ 3. The first voyages of exploration 217

§ 4. Early traders 218

§ 5. Early travellers 220

CHAPTER XVIII. WRITING

§ 1. Picture writing 223

§ 2. Syllable writing 227

§ 3. Alphabet writing 228

§ 4. The place of writing in human life 229

CHAPTER XIX. GODS AND STARS, PRIESTS AND KINGS

§ 1. Nomadic and settled religion 232

§ 2. The priest comes into history 234

§ 3. Priests and the stars 238

§ 4. Priests and the dawn of learning 240

§ 5. King against priests 241

§ 6. How Bel-Marduk struggled against the kings 245

§ 7. The god-kings of Egypt 248

§ 8. Shi Hwang-ti destroys the books 252

CHAPTER XX. SERFS, SLAVES, SOCIAL CLASSES, AND FREE INDIVIDUALS

§ 1. The common man in ancient times 254

§ 2. The earliest slaves 256

§ 3. The first “independent” persons 259

§ 4. Social classes three thousand years ago 262

§ 5. Classes hardening into castes 266

§ 6. Caste in India 268

§ 7. The system of the Mandarins 270

§ 8. A summary of five thousand years 272

BOOK IV

JUDEA, GREECE, AND INDIA

CHAPTER XXI. THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES AND THE PROPHETS

§ 1. The place of the Israelites in history 277

§ 2. Saul, David, and Solomon 286

§ 3. The Jews a people of mixed origin 292

§ 4. The importance of the Hebrew prophets 294

CHAPTER XXII. THE GREEKS AND THE PERSIANS

§ 1. The Hellenic peoples 298

§ 2. Distinctive features of the Hellenic civilization 304

§ 3. Monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy in Greece 307

§ 4. The kingdom of Lydia 315

§ 5. The rise of the Persians in the East 316

§ 6. The story of Crœsus 320

§ 7. Darius invades Russia 326

§ 8. The battle of Marathon 332

§ 9. Thermopylæ and Salamis 334

§ 10. Platæa and Mycale 340

CHAPTER XXIII. GREEK THOUGHT AND LITERATURE

§ 1. The Athens of Pericles 343

§ 2. Socrates 350

§ 3. What was the quality of the common Athenians? 352

§ 4. Greek tragedy and comedy 354

§ 5. Plato and the Academy 355

§ 6. Aristotle and the Lyceum 357

§ 7. Philosophy becomes unworldly 359

§ 8. The quality and limitations of Greek thought 360

CHAPTER XXIV. THE CAREER OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT

§ 1. Philip of Macedonia 367

§ 2. The murder of King Philip 373

§ 3. Alexander’s first conquests 377

§ 4. The wanderings of Alexander 385

§ 5. Was Alexander indeed great? 389

§ 6. The successors of Alexander 395

§ 7. Pergamum a refuge of culture 396

§ 8. Alexander as a portent of world unity 397

CHAPTER XXV. SCIENCE AND RELIGION AT ALEXANDRIA

§ 1. The science of Alexandria 401

§ 2. Philosophy of Alexandria 410

§ 3. Alexandria as a factory of religions 410

CHAPTER XXVI. THE RISE AND SPREAD OF BUDDHISM

§ 1. The story of Gautama 415

§ 2. Teaching and legend in conflict 421

§ 3. The gospel of Gautama Buddha 422

§ 4. Buddhism and Asoka 426

§ 5. Two great Chinese teachers 433

§ 6. The corruptions of Buddhism 438

§ 7. The present range of Buddhism 440

BOOK V

THE RISE AND COLLAPSE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

CHAPTER XXVII. THE TWO WESTERN REPUBLICS

§ 1. The beginnings of the Latins 445

§ 2. A new sort of state 454

§ 3. The Carthaginian republic of rich men 466

§ 4. The First Punic War 467

§ 5. Cato the Elder and the spirit of Cato 471

§ 6. The Second Punic War 475

§ 7. The Third Punic War 480

§ 8. How the Punic War undermined Roman liberty 485

§ 9. Comparison of the Roman republic with a modern state 486

CHAPTER XXVIII. FROM TIBERIUS GRACCHUS TO THE GOD EMPEROR IN ROME

§ 1. The science of thwarting the common man 493

§ 2. Finance in the Roman state 496

§ 3. The last years of republican politics 499

§ 4. The era of the adventurer generals 505

§ 5. Caius Julius Cæsar and his death 509

§ 6. The end of the republic 513

§ 7. Why the Roman republic failed 516

CHAPTER XXIX. THE CÆSARS BETWEEN THE SEA AND THE GREAT PLAINS OF THE OLD WORLD

§ 1. A short catalogue of emperors 52

§ 2. Roman civilization at its zenith 529

§ 3. Limitations of the Roman mind 539

§ 4. The stir of the great plains 541

§ 5. The Western (true Roman) Empire crumples up 552

§ 6. The Eastern (revived Hellenic) Empire 560

BOOK VI

CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM

CHAPTER XXX. THE BEGINNINGS, THE RISE, AND THE DIVISIONS OF CHRISTIANITY

§ 1. Judea at the Christian era 569

§ 2. The teachings of Jesus of Nazareth 573

§ 3. The universal religions 582

§ 4. The crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth 584

§ 5. Doctrines added to the teachings of Jesus 586

§ 6. The struggles and persecutions of Christianity 594

§ 7. Constantine the Great 598

§ 8. The establishment of official Christianity 601

§ 9. The map of Europe, A.D. 500 605

§ 10. The salvation of learning by Christianity 609

CHAPTER XXXI. SEVEN CENTURIES IN ASIA (CIRCA 50 B.C. TO A.D. 650)

§ 1. Justinian the Great 614

§ 2. The Sassanid Empire in Persia 616

§ 3. The decay of Syria under the Sassanids 619

§ 4. The first message from Islam 623

§ 5. Zoroaster and Mani 624

§ 6. Hunnish peoples in Central Asia and India 627

§ 7. The great age of China 630

§ 8. Intellectual fetters of China 635

§ 9. The travels of Yuan Chwang 642

LIST OF MAPS AND ILLUSTRATIONS

PAGE

Life in the Early Palæozoic 11

Time-chart from Earliest Life to 40,000,000 Years Ago 14

Life in the Later Palæozoic Age 19

Australian Lung Fish 26

Some Reptiles of the Late Palæozoic Age 27

Astronomical Variations Affecting Climate 33

Some Mesozoic Reptiles 40

Later Mesozoic Reptiles 42

Pterodactyls and Archæopteryx 45

Hesperornis 48

Some Oligocene Mammals 53

Miocene Mammals 58

Time-diagram of the Glacial Ages 60

Early Pleistocene Animals, Contemporary with Earliest Man 64

The Sub-Man Pithecanthropus 65

The Riddle of the Piltdown Sub-Man 71

Map of Europe 50,000 Years Ago 77

Neanderthal Man 78

Early Stone Implements 81

Australia and the Western Pacific in the Glacial Age 82

Cro-magnon Man 87

Europe and Western Asia in the Later Palæolithic Age 89

Reindeer Age Articles 90

A Reindeer Age Masterpiece 93

Reindeer Age Engravings and Carvings 94

Diagram of the Estimated Duration of the True Human Periods 97

Neolithic Implements 107

Restoration of a Lake Dwelling 111

Pottery from Lake Dwellings 112

Hut Urns 115

A Menhir of the Neolithic Period 128

Bronze Age Implements 132

Diagram Showing the Duration of the Neolithic Period 133

Heads of Australoid Types 139

Bushwoman 141

Negro Types 142

Mongolian Types 143

Caucasian Types 144

Map of Europe, Asia, Africa 15,000 Years Ago 145

The Swastika 147

Relationship of Human Races (Diagrammatic Summary) 149

Possible Development of Languages 155

Racial Types (after Champollion) 163

Combat between Menelaus and Hector 176

Archaic Horses and Chariots 178

The Cradle of Western Civilization 185

Sumerian Warriors in Phalanx 189

Assyrian Warrior (_temp._ Sargon II) 193

Time-chart 6000 B.C. to A.D. 196

The Cradle of Chinese Civilization (Map) 202

Boats on Nile about 2500 B.C. 211

Egyptian Ship on Red Sea, 1250 B.C. 212

Ægean Civilization (Map) 214

A Votary of the Snake Goddess 215

American Indian Picture-Writing 225

Egyptian Gods--Set, Anubis, Typhon, Bes 236

Egyptian Gods--Thoth-lunus, Hathor, Chnemu 239

An Assyrian King and His Chief Minister 243

Pharaoh Chephren 248

Pharaoh Rameses III as Osiris (Sarcophagus relief) 249

Pharaoh Akhnaton 251

Egyptian Peasants (Pyramid Age) 257

Brawl among Egyptian Boatmen (Pyramid Age) 260

Egyptian Social Types (From Tombs) 261

The Land of the Hebrews 280

Aryan-speaking Peoples 1000-500 B.C. (Map) 301

Hellenic Races 1000-800 B.C. (Map) 302

Greek Sea Fight, 550 B.C. 303

Rowers in an Athenian Warship, 400 B.C. 306

Scythian Types 319

Median and Second Babylonian Empires (in Nebuchadnezzar's Reign) 321

The Empire of Darius 329

Wars of the Greeks and Persians (Map) 333

Athenian Foot-soldier 334

Persian Body-guard (from Frieze at Susa) 338

The World According to Herodotus 341

Athene of the Parthenon 348

Philip of Macedon 368

Growth of Macedonia under Philip 371

Macedonian Warrior (bas-relief from Pella) 373

Campaigns of Alexander the Great 381

Alexander the Great 389

Break-up of Alexander's Empire 393

Seleucus I 395

Later State of Alexander's Empire 398

The World According to Eratosthenes, 200 B.C. 405

The Known World, about 250 B.C. 406

Isis and Horus 413

Serapis 414

The Rise of Buddhism 419

Hariti 428

Chinese Image of Kuan-yin 429

The Spread of Buddhism 432

Indian Gods--Vishnu, Brahma, Siva 437

Indian Gods--Krishna, Kali, Ganesa 439

The Western Mediterranean, 800-600 B.C. 446

Early Latium 447

Burning the Dead: Etruscan Ceremony 449

Statuette of a Gaul 450

Roman Power after the Samnite Wars 451

Samnite Warriors 452

Italy after 275 B.C. 453

Roman Coin Celebrating the Victory over Pyrrhus 455

Mercury 457

Carthaginian Coins 468

Roman _As_ 471

Rome and its Alliances, 150 B.C. 481

Gladiators 489

Roman Power, 50 B.C. 506

Julius Cæsar 512

Roman Empire at Death of Augustus 518

Roman Empire in Time of Trajan 524

Asia and Europe: Life of the Period (Map) 544

Central Asia, 200-100 B.C. 547

Tracks of Migrating and Raiding Peoples, 1-700 A.D. 555

Eastern Roman Empire 561

Constantinople (Maps to show value of its position) 563

Galilee 571

Map of Europe, 500 A.D. 608

The Eastern Empire and the Sassanids 620

Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia 622

Ephthalite Coin 629

Chinese Empire, Tang Dynasty 633

Yuan Chwang's Route from China to India 643

BOOK I

THE MAKING OF OUR WORLD

THE OUTLINE OF HISTORY

I

THE EARTH IN SPACE AND TIME

The earth on which we live is a spinning globe. Vast though it seems to us, it is a mere speck of matter in the greater vastness of space.

Space is, for the most part, emptiness. At great intervals there are in this emptiness flaring centres of heat and light, the "fixed stars." They are all moving about in space, notwithstanding that they are called fixed stars, but for a long time men did not realize

their motion. They are so vast and at such tremendous distances that their motion is not perceived. Only in the course of many thousands of years is it appreciable. These fixed stars are so far off that, for all their immensity, they seem to be, even when we look at them through the most powerful telescopes, mere points of light, brighter or less bright. A few, however, when we turn a telescope upon them, are seen to be whirls and clouds of shining vapour which we call nebulæ. They are so far off that a movement of millions of miles would be imperceptible.

One star, however, is so near to us that it is like a great ball of flame. This one is the sun. The sun is itself in its nature like a fixed star, but it differs from the other fixed stars in appearance because it is beyond comparison nearer than they are; and because it is nearer men have been able to learn something of its nature. Its mean distance from the earth is ninety-three million miles. It is a mass of flaming matter, having a diameter of 866,000 miles. Its bulk is a million and a quarter times the bulk of our earth.

These are difficult figures for the imagination. If a bullet fired from a Maxim gun at the sun kept its muzzle velocity unimpaired, it would take seven years to reach the sun. And yet we say the sun is near, measured by the scale of the stars. If the earth were a small ball, one inch in diameter, the sun would be a globe of nine feet diameter; it would fill a small bedroom. It is spinning round on its axis, but since it is an incandescent fluid, its polar regions do not travel with the same velocity as its equator, the surface of which rotates in about twenty-five days. The surface visible to us consists of clouds of incandescent metallic vapour. At what lies below we can only guess. So hot is the sun's atmosphere that iron, nickel, copper, and tin are present in it in a gaseous state. About it at great distances circle not only our earth, but certain kindred bodies called the planets. These shine in the sky because they reflect the light of the sun; they are near enough for us to note their movements quite easily. Night by night their positions change with regard to the fixed stars.

It is well to understand how empty space is. If, as we have said, the sun were a ball nine feet across, our earth would, in proportion, be the size of a one-inch ball, and at a distance of 323 yards from the sun. The moon would be a speck the size of a small pea, thirty inches from the earth. Nearer to the sun than the earth would be two other very similar specks, the planets Mercury and Venus, at a distance of 125 and 250 yards respectively. Beyond the earth would come the planets Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune, at distances of 500, 1806, 3000, 6000, and 9500 yards respectively. There would also be a certain number of very much smaller specks, flying about amongst these planets, more particularly a number called the asteroids circling between Mars and Jupiter, and occasionally a little puff of more or less luminous vapour and dust would drift into the system from the almost limitless emptiness beyond. Such a puff is what we call a comet. _All the rest of the space about us and around us and for unfathomable distances beyond is cold, lifeless, and void._ The nearest fixed star to us, _on this minute scale_, be it remembered,--the earth as a one-inch ball, and the moon a little pea--would be over 40,000 miles away.

The science that tells of these things and how men have come to know about them is Astronomy, and to books of astronomy the reader must go to learn more about the sun and stars. The science and description of the world on which we live are called respectively Geology and Geography.

The diameter of our world is a little under 8000 miles. Its surface is rough; the more projecting parts of the roughness are mountains, and in the hollows of its surface there is a film of water, the oceans and seas. This film of water is about five miles thick at its deepest part--that is to say, the deepest oceans have a depth of five miles. This is very little in comparison with the bulk of the world.

About this sphere is a thin covering of air, the atmosphere. As we ascend in a balloon or go up a mountain from the level of the sea-shore the air is continually less dense, until at last it becomes so thin that it cannot support life. At a height of twenty miles there is scarcely any air at all--not one hundredth part of the density of air at the surface of the sea. The highest point to which a bird can fly is about four miles up--the condor, it is said, can struggle up to that; but most small birds and insects which are carried up by aeroplanes or balloons drop off insensible at a much lower level, and the greatest height to which any mountaineer has ever climbed is under five miles. Men have flown in aeroplanes to a height of over four miles, and balloons with men in them have reached very nearly seven miles, but at the cost of considerable physical suffering. Small experimental balloons, containing not men, but recording instruments, have gone as high as twenty-two miles.

It is in the upper few hundred feet of the crust of the earth, in the sea, and in the lower levels of the air below four miles that life is found. We do not know of any life at all except in these films of air and water upon our planet. So far as we know, all the rest of space is as yet without life. Scientific men have discussed the possibility of life, or of some process of a similar kind, occurring upon such kindred bodies as the planets Venus and Mars. But they point merely to questionable possibilities.

Astronomers and geologists and those who study physics have been able to tell us something of the origin and history of the earth. They consider that, vast ages ago, the sun was a spinning, flaring mass of matter, not yet concentrated into a compact centre of heat and light, considerably larger than it is now, and spinning very much faster, and that as it whirled, a series of fragments detached themselves from it, which became the planets. Our earth is one of these planets. The flaring mass that was the material of the earth broke as it spun into two masses, a larger, the earth itself, and a smaller, which is now the dead, still moon. Astronomers give us convincing reasons for supposing that sun and earth and moon and all that system were then whirling about at a speed much greater than the speed at which they are moving to-day, and that at first our earth was a flaming thing upon which no life could live. The way in which they have reached these conclusions is by a very beautiful and interesting series of observations and reasoning, too long and elaborate for us to deal with here. But they oblige us to believe that the sun, incandescent though it is, is now much cooler than it was, and that it spins more slowly now than it did, and that it continues to cool and slow down. And they also show that the rate at which the earth spins is diminishing and continues to diminish--that is to say, that our day is growing longer and longer, and that the heat at the centre of the earth wastes slowly. There was a time when the day was not a half and not a third of what it is to-day; when a blazing hot sun, much greater than it is now, must have moved visibly--had there been an eye to mark it--from its rise to its setting across the skies. There will be a time when the day will be as long as a year is now, and the cooling sun, shorn of its beams, will hang motionless in the heavens.

It must have been in days of a much hotter sun, a far swifter day and night, high tides, great heat, tremendous storms and earthquakes, that life, of which we are a part, began upon the world. The moon also was nearer and brighter in those days and had a changing face.[3]

II

THE RECORD OF THE ROCKS

§ 1. _The First Living Things._ § 2. _How Old Is the World?_

§ 1

We do not know how life began upon the earth.[4]

Biologists, that is to say, students of life, have made guesses about these beginnings, but we will not discuss them here. Let us only note that they all agree that life began where the tides of those swift days spread and receded over the steaming beaches of mud and sand.

The atmosphere was much denser then, usually great cloud masses obscured the sun, frequent storms darkened the heavens. The land of those days, upheaved by violent volcanic forces, was a barren land, without vegetation, without soil. The almost incessant rain-storms swept down upon it, and rivers and torrents carried great loads of sediment out to sea, to become muds that hardened later into slates and shales, and sands that became sandstones. The geologists have studied the whole accumulation of these sediments as it remains to-day, from those of the earliest ages to the most recent. Of course the oldest deposits are the most distorted and changed and worn, and in them there is now no certain trace to be found of life at all. Probably the earliest forms of life were small and soft, leaving no evidence of their existence behind them. It was only when some of these living things developed skeletons and shells of lime and such-like hard material that they left fossil vestiges after they died, and so put themselves on record for examination.

The literature of geology is very largely an account of the fossils that are found in the rocks, and of the order in which layers after layers of rocks lie one on another. The very oldest rocks must have been formed before there was any sea at all, when the earth was too hot for a sea to exist, and when the water that is now sea was an atmosphere of steam mixed with the air. Its higher levels were dense with clouds, from which a hot rain fell towards the rocks below, to be converted again into steam long before it reached their incandescence. Below this steam atmosphere the molten world-stuff solidified as the first rocks. These first rocks must have solidified as a cake over glowing liquid material beneath, much as cooling lava does. They must have appeared first as crusts and clinkers. They must have been constantly remelted and recrystallized before any thickness of them became permanently solid. The name of Fundamental Gneiss is given to a great underlying system of crystalline rocks which probably formed age by age as this hot youth of the world drew to its close. The scenery of the world in the days when the Fundamental Gneiss was formed must have been more like the interior of a furnace than anything else to be found upon earth at the present time.

After long ages the steam in the atmosphere began also to condense and fall right down to earth, pouring at last over these warm primordial rocks in rivulets of hot water and gathering in depressions as pools and lakes and the first seas. Into those seas the streams that poured over the rocks brought with them dust and particles to form a sediment, and this sediment accumulated in layers, or as geologists call them, _strata_, and formed the first Sedimentary Rocks. Those earliest sedimentary rocks sank into depressions and were covered by others; they were bent, tilted up, and torn by great volcanic disturbances and by tidal strains that swept through the rocky crust of the earth. We find these first sedimentary rocks still coming to the surface of the land here and there, either not covered by later strata or exposed after vast ages of concealment by the wearing off of the rock that covered them later--there are great surfaces of them in Canada especially; they are cleft and bent, partially remelted, recrystallized, hardened and compressed, but recognizable for what they are. And they contain no single certain trace of life at all. They are frequently called _Azoic_ (lifeless) Rocks. But since in some of these earliest sedimentary rocks a substance called graphite (black lead) occurs, and also red and black oxide of iron, and since it is asserted that these substances need the activity of living things for their production, which may or may not be the case, some geologists prefer to call these earliest sedimentary rocks _Archæozoic_ (primordial life). They suppose that the first life was soft living matter that had no shells or skeletons or any such structure that could remain as a recognizable fossil after its death, and that its chemical influence caused the deposition of graphite and iron oxide. This is pure guessing, of course, and there is at least an equal probability that in the time of formation of the Azoic Rocks, life had not yet begun.

Long ago there were found in certain of these ancient first-formed rocks in Canada, curious striped masses, and thin layers of white and green mineral substance which Sir William Dawson considered were fossil vestiges, the walls or coverings of some very simple sort of living thing which has now vanished from the earth. He called these markings _Eozoon Canadense_ (the Canadian dawn-animal). There has been much discussion and controversy over this Eozoon, but to-day it is agreed that Eozoon is nothing more than a crystalline marking. Mixed minerals will often intercrystallize in blobs or branching shapes that are very suggestive of simple plant or animal forms. Any one who has made a lead tree in his schooldays, or lit those queer indoor fireworks known as serpents' eggs, which unfold like a long snake, or who has seen the curious markings often found in quartz crystals, or noted the tree-like pattern on old stone-ware beer mugs, will realize how closely non-living matter can sometimes mock the shapes of living things.

Overlying or overlapping these Azoic or Archæozoic rocks come others, manifestly also very ancient and worn, which do contain traces of life. These first remains are of the simplest description; they are the vestiges of simple plants, called algæ, or marks like the tracks made by worms in the sea mud. There are also the skeletons of the microscopic creatures called Radiolaria. This second series of rocks is called the Proterozoic (beginning of life) series, and marks a long age in the world's history. Lying over and above the Proterozoic rocks is a third series, which is found to contain a considerable number and variety of traces of living things. First comes the evidence of a diversity of shellfish, crabs, and such-like crawling things, worms, seaweeds, and the like; then of a multitude of fishes and of the beginnings of land plants and land creatures. These rocks are called the Palæozoic (ancient life) rocks. They mark a vast era, during which life was slowly spreading, increasing, and developing in the seas of our world. Through long ages, through the earliest Palæozoic time, it was no more than a proliferation of such swimming and creeping things in the water. There were creatures called trilobites; they were crawling things like big sea woodlice that were probably related to the American king-crab of to-day. There were also sea-scorpions, the prefects of that early world. The individuals of certain species of these were nine feet long. These were the very highest sorts of life. There were abundant different sorts of an order of shellfish called brachiopods. There were plant animals, rooted and joined together like plants, and loose weeds that waved in the waters.

It was not a display of life to excite our imaginations. There was nothing that ran or flew or even swam swiftly or skilfully. Except for the size of some of the creatures, it was not very different from, and rather less various than, the kind of life a student would gather from any summer-time ditch nowadays for microscopic examination. Such was the life of the shallow seas through a hundred million years or more in the early Palæozoic period. The land during that time was apparently absolutely barren. We find no trace nor hint of land life. Everything that lived in those days lived under water for most or all of its life.

[Illustration: Life in the Early Palæozoic

Note its general resemblance, except for size, to the microscopic summer ditch-water life of to-day.]

Between the formation of these Lower Palæozoic rocks in which the sea scorpion and trilobite ruled, and our own time, there have intervened almost immeasurable ages, represented by layers and masses of sedimentary rocks. There are first the Upper Palæozoic Rocks, and above these the geologists distinguish two great divisions. Next above the Palæozoic come the Mesozoic

(middle life) rocks, a second vast system of fossil-bearing rocks, representing perhaps a hundred millions of swift years, and containing a wonderful array of fossil remains, bones of giant reptiles and the like, which we will presently describe; and above these again are the Cainozoic (recent life) rocks, a third great volume in the history of life, an unfinished volume of which the sand and mud that was carried out to sea yesterday by the rivers of the world, to bury the bones and scales and bodies and tracks that will become at last fossils of the things of to-day, constitute the last written leaf.

(It is, we may note, the practice of many geologists to make a break between the rest of the Cainozoic system of rocks and those which contain traces of humanity, which latter are cut off as a separate system under the name of Quaternary. But that, as we shall see, is rather like taking the last page of a book, which is really the conclusion of the last chapter, and making a separate chapter of it and calling it the last chapter.)

These markings and fossils in the rocks and the rocks themselves are our first historical documents. The history of life that men have puzzled out and are still puzzling out from them is called the Record of the Rocks. By studying this record men are slowly piecing together a story of life's beginnings, and of the beginnings of our kind, of which our ancestors a century or so ago had no suspicion. But when we call these rocks and the fossils a record and a history, it must not be supposed that there is any sign of an orderly keeping of a record. It is merely that whatever happens leaves some trace, if only we are intelligent enough to detect the meaning of that trace. Nor are the rocks of the world in orderly layers one above the other, convenient for men to read. They are not like the books and pages of a library. They are torn, disrupted, interrupted, flung about, defaced, like a carelessly arranged office after it has experienced in succession a bombardment, a hostile military occupation, looting, an earthquake, riots, and a fire. And so it is that for countless generations this Record of the Rocks lay unsuspected beneath the feet of men. Fossils were known to the Ionian Greeks in the sixth century B.C.,[5] they were discussed at Alexandria by Eratosthenes and others in the third century B.C., a discussion which is summarized in Strabo's _Geography_ (?20-10 B.C.). They were known to the Latin poet Ovid, but he did not understand their nature. He thought they were the first rude efforts of creative power. They were noted by Arabic writers in the tenth century. Leonardo da Vinci, who lived so recently as the opening of the sixteenth century (1452-1519), was one of the first Europeans to grasp the real significance of fossils,[6] and it has been only within the last century and a half that man has begun the serious and sustained deciphering of these long-neglected early pages of his world's history.

§ 2

[Illustration: graph of eras]

Speculations about geological time vary enormously.[7] Estimates of the age of the oldest rocks by geologists and astronomers starting from different standpoints have varied between 1,600,000,000, and 25,000,000. The lowest estimate was made by Lord Kelvin in 1867. Professor Huxley guessed at 400,000,000 years. There is a summary of views and the grounds upon which the estimates have been made in Osborn's _Origin and Evolution of Life_; he inclines to the moderate total of 100,000,000. It must be clearly understood by the reader how sketchy and provisional all these time estimates are. They rest nearly always upon theoretical assumptions of the slenderest kind. That the period of time has been vast, that it is to be counted by scores and possibly by hundreds of millions of years, is the utmost that can be said with certainty in the matter. It is quite open to the reader to divide every number in the appended time diagram by ten or multiply it by two; no one can gainsay him. Of the relative amount of time as between one age and another we have, however, stronger evidence; if the reader cuts down the 800,000,000 we have given here to 400,000,000, then he must reduce the 40,000,000 of the Cainozoic to 20,000,000. And be it noted that whatever the total sum may be, most geologists are in agreement that _half or more than half of the whole of geological time had passed before life had developed to the Later Palæozoic level_. The reader reading quickly through these opening chapters may be apt to think of them as a mere swift prelude of preparation to the apparently much longer history that follows, but in reality that subsequent history is longer only because it is more detailed and more interesting to us. It looms larger in perspective. For ages that stagger the imagination this earth spun hot and lifeless, and again for ages of equal vastness it held no life above the level of the animalculæ in a drop of ditch-water.

Not only is Space from the point of view of life and humanity empty, but Time is empty also. Life is like a little glow, scarcely kindled yet, in these void immensities.

III

NATURAL SELECTION AND THE CHANGES OF SPECIES

Now here it will be well to put plainly certain general facts about this new thing, _life_, that was creeping in the shallow waters and intertidal muds of the early Palæozoic period, and which is perhaps confined to our planet alone in all the immensity of space.

Life differs from all things whatever that are without life in certain general aspects. There are the most wonderful differences among living things to-day, but all living things past and present agree in possessing _a certain power of growth_, all living things _take nourishment_, all living things _move about_ as they feed and grow, though the movement may be no more than the spread of roots through the soil, or of branches in the air. Moreover, living things reproduce; they give rise to other living things, either by growing and then dividing or by means of seeds or spores or eggs or other ways of producing young. _Reproduction_ is a characteristic of life.

No living thing goes on living forever. There seems to be a _limit of growth_ for every kind of living thing. Among very small and simple living things, such as that microscopic blob of living matter the _Amæba_, an individual may grow and then divide completely into two new individuals, which again may divide in their turn. Many other microscopic creatures live actively for a time, grow, and then become quiet and inactive, enclose themselves in an outer covering and break up wholly into a number of still smaller things, spores, which are released and scattered and again grow into the likeness of their parent. Among more complex creatures the reproduction is not usually such simple division, though division does occur even in the case of many creatures big enough to be visible to the unassisted eye. But the rule with almost all larger beings is that the individual grows up to a certain limit of size. Then, before it becomes unwieldy, its growth declines and stops. As it reaches its full size it _matures_, it begins to produce young, which are either born alive or hatched from eggs. But all of its body does not produce young. Only a special part does that. After the individual has lived and produced offspring for some time, it ages and dies. It does so by a sort of necessity. There is a practical limit to its life as well as to its growth. These things are as true of plants as they are of animals. And they are not true of things that do not live. Non-living things, such as crystals, grow, but they have no set limits of growth or size, they _do not move of their own accord_ and there is _no stir within them_. Crystals once formed may last unchanged for millions of years. There is _no reproduction_ for any non-living thing.

This growth and dying and reproduction of living things leads to some very wonderful consequences. The young which a living thing produces are either directly, or after some intermediate stages and changes (such as the changes of a caterpillar and butterfly), like the parent living thing. But they are never exactly like it or like each other. There is always a slight difference, which we speak of as _individuality_. A thousand butterflies this year may produce two or three thousand next year; these latter will look to us almost exactly like their predecessors, but each one will have just that slight difference. It is hard for us to see individuality in butterflies because we do not observe them very closely, but it is easy for us to see it in men. All the men and women in the world now are descended from the men and women of A.D. 1800, but not one of us now is exactly the same as one of that vanished generation. And what is true of men and butterflies is true of every sort of living thing, of plants as of animals. Every species changes all its individualities in each generation. That is as true of all the minute creatures that swarmed and reproduced and died in the Archæozoic and Proterozoic seas, as it is of men to-day.

Every species of living things is continually dying and being born again, as a multitude of fresh individuals.

Consider, then, what must happen to a new-born generation of living things of any species. Some of the individuals will be stronger or sturdier or better suited to succeed in life in some way than the rest, many individuals will be weaker or less suited. In particular single cases any sort of luck or accident may occur, but _on the whole_ the better equipped individuals will live and grow up and reproduce themselves and the weaker will _as a rule_ go under. The latter will be less able to get food, to fight their enemies and pull through. So that in each generation there is as it were a picking over of a species, a picking out of most of the weak or unsuitable and a preference for the strong and suitable. This process is called _Natural Selection_ or the _Survival of the Fittest_.[8]

It follows, therefore, from the fact that living things grow and breed and die, that every species, so long as the conditions under which it lives remain the same, becomes more and more perfectly fitted to those conditions in every generation.

But now suppose those conditions change, then the sort of individual that used to succeed may now fail to succeed and a sort of individual that could not get on at all under the old conditions may now find its opportunity. These species will change, therefore, generation by generation; the old sort of individual that used to prosper and dominate will fail and die out and the new sort of individual will become the rule,--until the general character of the species changes.

Suppose, for example, there is some little furry whitey-brown animal living in a bitterly cold land which is usually under snow. Such individuals as have the thickest, whitest fur will be least hurt by the cold, less seen by their enemies, and less conspicuous as they seek their prey. The fur of this species will thicken and its whiteness increase with every generation, until there is no advantage in carrying any more fur.

[Illustration: DIAGRAM OF LIFE IN THE LATER PALÆOZOIC AGE.

Life is creeping out of the water. An insect like a dragon fly is shown. There were amphibia like gigantic newts and salamanders, and even primitive reptiles in these swamps.]

Imagine now a change of climate that brings warmth into the land, sweeps away the snows, makes white creatures glaringly visible during the greater part of the year and thick fur an encumbrance. Then every individual with a touch of brown in its colouring and a thinner fur will find itself at an advantage, and very white and heavy fur will be a handicap. There will be a weeding out of the white in favour of the brown in each generation. If this change of climate come about too quickly, it may of course exterminate the species altogether; but if it come about gradually, the species, although it may have a hard time, may yet be able to change itself and adapt itself generation by generation. This change and adaptation is called the _Modification of Species_.

Perhaps this change of climate does not occur all over the lands inhabited by the species; maybe it occurs only on one side of some great arm of the sea or some great mountain range or such-like divide, and not on the other. A warm ocean current like the Gulf Stream may be deflected, and flow so as to warm one side of the barrier, leaving the other still cold. Then on the cold side this species will still be going on to its utmost possible furriness and whiteness and on the other side it will be modifying towards brownness and a thinner coat. At the same time there will probably be other changes going on; a difference in the paws perhaps, because one half of the species will be frequently scratching through snow for its food, while the other will be scampering over brown earth. Probably also the difference of climate will mean differences in the sort of food available, and that may produce differences in the teeth and the digestive organs. And there may be changes in the sweat and oil glands of the skin due to the changes in the fur, and these will affect the excretory organs and all the internal chemistry of the body. And so through all the structure of the creature. A time will come when the two separated varieties of this formerly single species will become so unlike each other as to be recognizably different species. Such a splitting up of a species in the course of generations into two or more species is called the _Differentiation of Species_.

And it should be clear to the reader that given these elemental facts of life, given growth and death and reproduction with individual variation in a world that changes, life _must_ change in this way, modification and differentiation _must_ occur, old species _must_ disappear, and new ones appear. We have chosen for our instance here a familiar sort of animal, but what is true of furry beasts in snow and ice is true of all life, and equally true of the soft jellies and simple beginnings that flowed and crawled for hundreds of millions of years between the tidal levels and in the shallow, warm waters of the Proterozoic seas.

The early life of the early world, when the blazing sun rose and set in only a quarter of the time it now takes, when the warm seas poured in great tides over the sandy and muddy shores of the rocky lands and the air was full of clouds and steam, must have been modified and varied and species must have developed at a great pace. Life was probably as swift and short as the days and years; the generations, which natural selection picked over, followed one another in rapid succession.

Natural selection is a slower process with man than with any other creature. It takes twenty years or more before an ordinary human being in western Europe grows up and reproduces. In the case of most animals the new generation is on trial in a year or less. With such simple and lowly beings, however, as first appeared in the primordial seas, growth and reproduction was probably a matter of a few brief hours or even of a few brief minutes. Modification and differentiation of species must accordingly have been extremely rapid, and life had already developed a very great variety of widely contrasted forms before it began to leave traces in the rocks. The Record of the Rocks does not begin, therefore, with any group of closely related forms from which all subsequent and existing creatures are descended. It begins in the midst of the game, with nearly every main division of the animal kingdom already represented.[9] Plants are already plants, and animals animals. The curtain rises on a drama in the sea that has already begun, and has been going on for some time. The brachiopods are discovered already in their shells, accepting and consuming much the same sort of food that oysters and mussels do now; the great water scorpions crawl among the seaweeds, the trilobites roll up into balls and unroll and scuttle away. In that ancient mud and among those early weeds there was probably as rich and abundant and active a life of infusoria and the like as one finds in a drop of ditch-water to-day. In the ocean waters, too, down to the utmost downward limit to which light could filter, then as now, there was an abundance of minute and translucent, and in many cases

phosphorescent, beings.

But though the ocean and intertidal waters already swarmed with life, the land above the high-tide line was still, so far as we can guess, a stony wilderness without a trace of life.

IV

THE INVASION OF THE DRY LAND BY LIFE

§ 1. _Life and Water._ § 2. _The Earliest Animals._

§ 1

Wherever the shore line ran there was life, and that life went on in and by and with water as its home, its medium, and its fundamental necessity.

The first jelly-like beginnings of life must have perished whenever they got out of the water, as jelly-fish dry up and perish on our beaches to-day. Drying up was the fatal thing for life in those days, against which at first it had no protection. But in a world of rain-pools and shallow seas and tides, any variation that enabled a living thing to hold out and keep its moisture during hours of low tide of drought met with every encouragement in the circumstances of the time. There must have been a constant risk of stranding. And, on the other hand, life had to keep rather near the shore and beaches in the shallows because it had need of air (dissolved of course in the water) and light.

No creature can breathe, no creature can digest its food, without water. We talk of breathing air, but what all living things really do is to breathe oxygen dissolved in water. The air we ourselves breathe must first be dissolved in the moisture in our lungs; and all our food must be liquefied before it can be assimilated. Water-living creatures which are always under water, wave the freely exposed gills by which they breathe in that water, and extract the air dissolved in it. But a creature that is to be exposed for any time out of the water, must have its body and its breathing apparatus protected from drying up. Before the seaweeds could creep up out of the Early Palæozoic seas into the intertidal line of the beach, they had to develop a tougher outer skin to hold their moisture. Before the ancestor of the sea scorpion could survive being left by the tide it had to develop its casing and armour. The trilobites probably developed their tough covering and rolled up into balls, far less as a protection against each other and any other enemies they may have possessed, than as a precaution against drying. And when presently, as we ascend the Palæozoic rocks, the fish appear, first of all the backboned or vertebrated animals, it is evident that a number of them are already adapted by the protection of their gills with gill covers and by a sort of primitive lung swimming-bladder, to face the same risk of temporary stranding.

Now the weeds and plants that were adapting themselves to intertidal conditions were also bringing themselves into a region of brighter light, and light is very necessary and precious to all plants. Any development of structure that would stiffen them and hold them up to the light, so that instead of crumpling and flopping when the waters receded, they would stand up outspread, was a great advantage. And so we find them developing fibre and support, and the beginning of _woody fibre_ in them. The early plants reproduced by soft spores, or half-animal “gametes,” that were released in water, were distributed by water and could only germinate under water. The early plants were tied, and most lowly plants to-day are tied, by the conditions of their life cycle, to water. But here again there was a great advantage to be got by the development of some protection of the spores from drought that would enable reproduction to occur without submergence. So soon as a species could do that, it could live and reproduce and spread above the high-water mark, bathed in light and out of reach of the beating and distress of the waves. The main classificatory divisions of the larger plants mark stages in the release of plant life from the necessity of submergence by the development of woody support and of a method of reproduction that is more and more defiant of drying up. The lower plants are still the prisoner attendants of water. The lower mosses must live in damp, and even the development of the spore of the ferns demands at certain stages extreme wetness. The highest plants have carried freedom from water so far that they can live and reproduce if only there is some moisture in the soil below them. They have solved their problem of living out of water altogether.

The essentials of that problem were worked out through the vast æons of the Proterozoic Age and the early Palæozoic Age by nature’s method of experiment and trial. Then slowly, but in great abundance, a variety of new plants began to swarm away from the sea and over the lower lands, still keeping to swamp and lagoon and watercourse as they spread.

§ 2

And after the plants came the animal life.

There is no sort of land animal in the world, as there is no sort of land plant, whose structure is not primarily that of a water-inhabiting being which has been adapted through the modification and differentiation of species to life out of the water. This adaptation is attained in various ways. In the case of the land scorpion the gill-plates of the primitive sea scorpion are sunken into the body so as to make the lung-books secure from rapid evaporation. The gills of crustaceans, such as the crabs which run about in the air, are protected by the gill-cover extensions of the back shell or carapace. The ancestors of the insects developed a system of air pouches and air tubes, the tracheal tubes, which carry the air all over the body before it is dissolved. In the case of the vertebrated land animals, the gills of the ancestral fish were first supplemented and then replaced by a bag-like growth from the throat, the primitive lung swimming-bladder. To this day there survive certain mudfish which enable us to understand very clearly the method by which the vertebrated land animals worked their way out of the water. These creatures (_e.g._ the African lung fish) are found in tropical regions in which there is a rainy full season and a dry season, during which the rivers become mere ditches of baked mud. During the rainy season these fish swim about and breathe by gills like any other fish. As the waters of the river evaporate, these fish bury themselves in the mud, their gills go out of action, and the creature keeps itself alive until the waters return by swallowing air, which passes into its swimming-bladder. The Australian lung fish, when it is caught by the drying up of the river in stagnant pools, and the water has become deaerated and foul, rises to the surface and gulps air. A newt in a pond does exactly the same thing. These creatures still remain at the transition stage, the stage at which the ancestors of the higher vertebrated animals were released from their restriction to an under-water life.

The amphibia (frogs, newts, tritons, etc.) still show in their life history all the stages in the process of this liberation. They are still dependent on water for their reproduction; their eggs must be laid in sunlit water, and there they must develop. The young tadpole has branching external gills that wave in the water; then a gill cover grows back over them and forms a gill chamber. Then, as the creature's legs appear and its tail is absorbed, it begins to use its lungs, and its gills dwindle and vanish. The adult frog can live all the rest of its days in the air, but it can be drowned if it is kept steadfastly below water. When we come to the reptile, however, we find an egg which is protected from evaporation by a tough egg case, and this egg produces young which breathe by lungs from the very moment of hatching. The reptile is on all fours with the seeding plant in its freedom from the necessity to pass any stage of its life cycle in water.

[Illustration: _Australian Lung fish breathing air_]

The later Palæozoic Rocks of the northern hemisphere give us the materials for a series of pictures of this slow spreading of life over the land. Geographically, all round the northern half of the world it was an age of lagoons and shallow seas very favourable to this invasion. The new plants, now that they had acquired the power to live this new aerial life, developed with an extraordinary richness and variety.

[Illustration: Some Reptiles of the Late Palæozoic Age]

There were as yet no true flowering plants,[10] no grasses nor trees that shed their leaves in winter;[11] the first "flora" consisted of great tree ferns, gigantic equisetums, cycad ferns, and kindred vegetation. Many of these plants took the form of huge-stemmed trees, of which great multitudes of trunks survive fossilized to this day. Some of these trees were over a hundred feet high, of orders and classes now vanished from the world. They stood with their stems in the water, in which no doubt there was a thick tangle of soft mosses and green slime and fungoid growths that left few plain vestiges behind them. The abundant remains of these first swamp forests constitute the main coal-measures of the world to-day.

Amidst this luxuriant primitive vegetation crawled and glided and flew the first insects. They were rigid-winged, four-winged creatures, often very big, some of them having wings measuring a foot in length. There were numerous dragon flies--one found in the Belgian coal-measures had a wing span of twenty-nine inches! There were also a great variety of flying cockroaches. Scorpions abounded, and a number of early spiders, which, however, had no spinnerets for web making.[12] Land snails appeared. So too did the first-known step of our own ancestry upon land, the amphibia. As we ascend the higher levels of the Later Palæozoic record, we find the process of air adaptation has gone as far as the appearance of true reptiles amidst the abundant and various amphibia.

The land life of the Upper Palæozoic Age was the life of a green swamp forest without flowers or birds or the noises of modern insects. There were no big land beasts at all; wallowing amphibia and primitive reptiles were the very highest creatures that life had so far produced. Whatever land lay away from the water or high above the water was still altogether barren and lifeless. But steadfastly, generation by generation, life was creeping away from the shallow sea-water of its beginning.

V

CHANGES IN THE WORLD'S CLIMATE

§ 1. _Why Life Must Change Continually._ § 2. _The Sun a Steadfast Star._ § 3. _Changes from Within the Earth._ § 4. _Life May Control Change._

§ 1

The Record of the Rocks is like a great book that has been carelessly misused. All its pages are torn, worn, and defaced, and many are altogether missing. The outline of the story that we sketch here has been pieced together slowly and painfully in an investigation that is still incomplete and still in progress. The Carboniferous Rocks, the "coal-measures," give us a vision of the first great expansion of life over the wet lowlands. Then come the torn pages known as the Permian Rocks (which count as the last of the Palæozoic), that preserve very little for us of the land vestiges of their age. Only after a long interval of time does the history spread out generously again.

It must be borne in mind that great changes of climate have always been in progress, that have sometimes stimulated and sometimes checked life. Every species of living thing is always adapting itself more and more closely to its conditions. And conditions are always changing. There is no finality in adaptation. There is a continuing urgency towards fresh change.

About these changes of climate some explanations are necessary here. They are not regular changes; they are slow fluctuations between heat and cold. The reader must not think that because the sun and earth were once incandescent, the climatic history of the world is a simple story of cooling down. The centre of the earth is certainly very hot to this day, but we feel nothing of that internal heat at the surface; the internal heat, except for volcanoes and hot springs, has not been perceptible at the surface since first the rocks grew solid. Even in the Azoic or Archæozoic Age there are traces in ice-worn rocks and the like of periods of intense cold. Such cold waves have always been going on everywhere, alternately with warmer conditions. And there have been periods of great wetness and periods of great dryness throughout the earth.

A complete account of the causes of these great climatic fluctuations has still to be worked out, but we may perhaps point out some of the chief of them.[13] Prominent among them is the fact that the earth does not spin in a perfect circle round the sun. Its path or orbit is like a hoop that is distorted; it is, roughly speaking, elliptical (ovo-elliptical), and the sun is nearer to one end of the ellipse than the other. It is at a point which is a focus of the ellipse. And the shape of this orbit never remains the same. It is slowly distorted by the attractions of the other planets, for ages it may be nearly circular, for ages it is more or less elliptical. As the ellipse becomes most nearly circular, then the focus becomes most nearly the centre. When the orbit becomes most elliptical, then the position of the sun becomes most remote from the middle or, to use the astronomer's phrase, most eccentric. When the orbit is most nearly circular, then it must be manifest that all the year round the earth must be getting much the same amount of heat from the sun; when the orbit is most distorted, then there will be a season in each year when the earth is nearest the sun (this phase is called _Perihelion_) and getting a great deal of heat comparatively, and a season when it will be at its farthest from the sun (_Aphelion_) and getting very little warmth. A planet at _aphelion_ is travelling its slowest, and its fastest at _perihelion_; so that the hot part of its year will last for a much less time than the cold part of its year. (Sir Robert Ball calculated that the greatest difference possible between the seasons was thirty-three days.) During ages when the orbit is most nearly circular there will therefore be least extremes of climate, and when the orbit is at its greatest eccentricity, there will be an age of cold with great extremes of seasonal temperature. These _changes in the orbit of the earth_ are due to the varying pull of all the planets, and Sir Robert Ball declared himself unable to calculate any regular cycle of orbital change, but Professor G. H. Darwin maintained that it is possible to make out a kind of cycle between greatest and least eccentricity of about 200,000 years.

But this change in the shape of the orbit is only one cause of the change of the world's climate. There are many others that have to be considered with it. As most people know, the change in the seasons is due to the fact that the equator of the earth is inclined at an angle to the plane of its orbit. If the earth stood up straight in its orbit, so that its equator was in the plane of its orbit, there would be no change in the seasons at all. The sun would always be overhead at the equator, and the day and night would each be exactly twelve hours long throughout the year everywhere. It is this inclination which causes the difference in the seasons and the unequal length of the day in summer and winter. There is, according to Laplace, a possible variation of nearly three degrees (from 22° 6' to 24° 50') in this inclination of the equator to the orbit, and when this is at a maximum, the difference between summer and winter is at its greatest. Great importance has been attached to this variation in the inclination of the equator to the orbit by Dr. Croll in his

book _Climate and Time_. At present the angle is 23° 27’. Manifestly when the angle is at its least, the world’s climate, other things being equal, will be most equable.

And as a third important factor there is what is called the _precession of the equinoxes_. This is a slow wabble of the pole of the spinning earth that takes 25,000 odd years. Any one who watches a spinning top as it “sleeps,” will see its axis making a slow circular movement, exactly after the fashion of this circling movement of the earth’s axis. The north pole, therefore, does not always point to the same north point among the stars; its pointing traces out a circle in the heavens every 25,000 years.

Now, there will be times when the earth is at its extreme of aphelion or of perihelion, when one hemisphere will be most turned to the sun in its midsummer position and the other most turned away at its midwinter position. And as the precession of the equinoxes goes on, a time will come when the summer-winter position will come not at aphelion and perihelion, but at the half-way points between them. When the summer of one hemisphere happens at perihelion and the winter at aphelion, it will be clear that the summer of the other hemisphere will happen at aphelion and its winter at perihelion. One hemisphere will have a short hot summer and a very cold winter, and the other a long cold summer and a briefer warmish winter. But when the summer-winter positions come at the half-way point of the orbit, and it is the spring of one hemisphere and the autumn of the other that is at aphelion or perihelion, there will not be the same wide difference between the climate of the two hemispheres.

Here are three wavering systems of change all going on independently of each other; the precession of the equinoxes, the change in the obliquity of the equator to the orbit, and the changes in the eccentricity of the orbit. Each system tends by itself to produce periods of equability and periods of greater climatic contrast. And all these systems of change interplay with each other. When it happens that at the same time the orbit is most nearly circular, the equator is at its least inclination from the plane of the earth’s orbit, and the spring and autumn are at perihelion and aphelion, then all these causes will be conspiring to make climate warm and uniform; there will be least difference of summer and winter. When, on the other hand, the orbit is in its most eccentric stage of deformation, when also the equator is most tilted up and when further the summer and winter are at aphelion and perihelion, then climates will be at their extremest and winter at its bitterest. There will be great accumulations of ice and snow in winter; the heat of the brief hot summer will be partly reflected back into space by the white snow, and it will be unequal to the task of melting all the winter’s ice before the earth spins away once more towards its chilly aphelion. The earth will accumulate cold so long as this conspiracy of extreme conditions continues.

[Illustration: DIAGRAM TO ILLUSTRATE ONE SET OF CAUSES, THE ASTRONOMICAL VARIATIONS, WHICH MAKE THE CLIMATE OF THE WORLD CHANGE SLOWLY BUT CONTINUOUSLY.

It does not change in regular periods. It fluctuates through vast ages. As the world’s climate changes, life must change too or perish.]

So our earth’s climate changes and wavers perpetually as these three systems of influence come together with a common tendency towards warmth or severity, or as they contradict and cancel each other.

We can trace in the Record of the Rocks an irregular series of changes due to the interplay of these influences; there have been great ages when the separate rhythms of these three systems kept them out of agreement and the atmosphere was temperate, ages of world-wide warmth, and other ages when they seemed to concentrate bitterly to their utmost extremity, to freeze out and inflict the utmost stresses and hardship upon life.

And in accordance we find from the record in the rocks that there have been long periods of expansion and multiplication when life flowed and abounded and varied, and harsh ages when there was a great weeding out and disappearance of species, genera, and classes, and the learning of stern lessons by all that survived. Such a propitious conjunction it must have been that gave the age of luxuriant low-grade growth of the coal-measures; such an adverse series of circumstances that chilled the closing æons of the Palæozoic time.

It is probable that the warm spells have been long relatively to the cold ages. Our world to-day seems to be emerging with fluctuations from a prolonged phase of adversity and extreme conditions. Half a million years ahead it may be a winterless world with trees and vegetation even in the polar circles. At present we have no certainty in such a forecast, but later on, as knowledge increases, it may be possible to reckon with more precision, so that our race will make its plans thousands of years ahead to meet the coming changes.

§ 2

Another entirely different cause of changes in the general climate of the earth may be due to variations in the heat of the sun. We do not yet understand what causes the heat of the sun or what sustains that undying fire. It is possible that in the past there have been periods of greater and lesser intensity. About that we know nothing; human experience has been too short; and so far we have been able to find no evidence on this matter in the geological record. On the whole, scientific men are inclined to believe that the sun has blazed with a general steadfastness throughout geological time. It may have been cooling slowly, but, speaking upon the scale of things astronomical, it has certainly not cooled very much.

§ 3

A third great group of causes influencing climate are to be found in the forces within the world itself. Throughout the long history of the earth there has been a continuous wearing down of the hills and mountains by frost and rain and a carrying out of their material to become sedimentary rocks under the seas. There has been a continuous process of wearing down the land and filling up the seas, by which the seas, as they became shallower, must have spread more and more over the land. The reverse process, a process of crumpling and upheaval, has also been in progress, but less regularly. The forces of upheaval have been spasmodic; the forces of wearing down continuous. For long ages there has been comparatively little volcanic upheaval, and then have come periods in which vast mountain chains have been thrust up and the whole outline of land and sea changed. Such a time was the opening stage of the Cainozoic period, in which the Alps, the Himalayas, and the Andes were all thrust up from the sea-level to far beyond their present elevations, and the main outlines of the existing geography of the world were drawn.

Now, a time of high mountains and deep seas would mean a larger dry land surface for the world, and a more restricted sea surface, and a time of low lands would mean a time of wider and shallower seas. High mountains precipitate moisture from the atmosphere and hold it out of circulation as snow and glaciers, while smaller oceans mean a lesser area for surface evaporation. Other things being equal, lowland stages of the world's history would be ages of more general atmospheric moisture than periods of relatively greater height of the mountains and greater depth of the seas. But even small increases in the amount of moisture in the air have a powerful influence upon the transmission of radiant heat through that air. The sun's heat will pass much more freely through dry air than through moist air, and so a greater amount of heat would reach the land surfaces of the globe under the conditions of extremes of elevation and depth, than during the periods of relative lowness and shallowness. Dry phases in the history of the earth mean, therefore, hot days. But they also mean cold nights, because for the same reason that the heat comes abundantly to the earth, it will be abundantly radiated away. Moist phases mean, on the other hand, cooler days and warmer nights. The same principle applies to the seasons, and so a phase of great elevations and depressions of the surface would also be another contributory factor on the side of extreme climatic conditions.

And a stage of greater elevation and depression would intensify its extreme conditions by the gradual accumulation of ice caps upon the polar regions and upon the more elevated mountain masses. This accumulation would be at the expense of the sea, whose surface would thus be further shrunken in comparison with the land.

Here, then, is another set of varying influences that will play in with and help or check the influence of the astronomical variations stated in § 1 and § 2. There are other more localized forces at work into which we cannot go in any detail here, but which will be familiar to the student of the elements of physical geography; the influence of great ocean currents in carrying warmth from equatorial to more temperate latitudes; the interference of mountain chains with the moisture borne by prevalent winds and the like. As in the slow processes of nature these currents are deflected or the mountain chains worn down or displaced by fresh upheavals, the climate over great areas will be changed and all the conditions of life changed with it. Under the incessant slow variations of these astronomical, telluric, and geographical influences life has no rest. As its conditions change it must change or perish.

§ 4

And while we are enumerating the forces that change climate and the conditions of terrestrial life, we may perhaps look ahead a little and add a fourth set of influences, at first unimportant in the history of the world so far as the land surface is concerned, but becoming more important after the age of Reptiles, to which we shall proceed in our next chapter. These are the effects produced upon climate by life itself. Particularly great is the influence of vegetation, and especially that of forests. Every tree is continually transpiring water vapour into the air; the amount of water evaporated in summer by a lake surface is far less than the amount evaporated by the same area of beech forest. As in the later Mesozoic and the Cainozoic Age, great forests spread over the world, their action in keeping the air moist and mitigating and stabilizing climate by keeping the summer cool and the winter mild must have become more and more important. Moreover, forests accumulate and protect soil and so prepare the possibility of agricultural

life.

Water-weeds again may accumulate to choke and deflect rivers, flood and convert great areas into marshes, and so lead to the destruction of forests or the replacement of grass-lands by boggy wildernesses.

Finally, with the appearance of human communities, came what is perhaps the most powerful of all living influences upon climate. By fire and plough and axe man alters his world. By destroying forests and by irrigation man has already affected the climate of great regions of the world's surface. The destruction of forests makes the seasons more extreme; this has happened, for instance, in the northeastern states of the United States of America. Moreover, the soil is no longer protected from the scour of rain, and is washed away, leaving only barren rock beneath. This has happened in Spain and Dalmatia and, some thousands of years earlier, in South Arabia. By irrigation, on the other hand, man restores the desert to life and mitigates climate. This process is going on in Northwest India and Australia. In the future, by making such operations worldwide and systematic, man may be able to control climate to an extent at which as yet we can only guess.

VI

THE AGE OF REPTILES

§ 1. _The Age of Lowland Life._ § 2. _Flying Dragons._ § 3. _The First Birds._ § 4. _An Age of Hardship and Death._ § 5. _The First Appearance of Fur and Feathers._

§ 1

We know that for hundreds of thousands of years the wetness and warmth, the shallow lagoon conditions that made possible the vast accumulations of vegetable matter which, compressed and mummified,[14] are now coal, prevailed over most of the world. There were some cold intervals, it is true; but they did not last long enough to destroy the growths. Then that long age of luxuriant low-grade vegetation drew to its end, and for a time life on the earth seems to have undergone a period of world-wide bleakness.

When the story resumes again, we find life entering upon a fresh phase of richness and expansion. Vegetation has made great advances in the art of living out of water. While the Palæozoic plants of the coal-measures probably grew with swamp water flowing over their roots, the Mesozoic flora from its very outset included palm-like cycads and low-ground conifers that were distinctly land plants growing on soil above the water level. The lower levels of the Mesozoic land were no doubt covered by great fern brakes and shrubby bush and a kind of jungle growth of trees. But there existed as yet no grass, no small flowering plants, no turf nor greensward. Probably the Mesozoic was not an age of very brightly coloured vegetation. It must have had a flora green in the wet season and brown and purple in the dry. There were no gay flowers, no bright autumn tints before the fall of the leaf, because there was as yet no fall of the leaf. And beyond the lower levels the world was still barren, still unclothed, still exposed without any mitigation to the wear and tear of the wind and rain.

When one speaks of conifers in the Mesozoic the reader must not think of the pines and firs that clothe the high mountain slopes of our time. He must think of low-growing evergreens. The mountains were still as bare and lifeless as ever. The only colour effects among the mountains were the colour effects of naked rock, such colours as make the landscape of Colorado so marvellous to-day.

Amidst this spreading vegetation of the lower plains the reptiles were increasing mightily in multitude and variety. They were now in many cases absolutely land animals. There are numerous anatomical points of distinction between a reptile and an amphibian; they held good between such reptiles and amphibians as prevailed in the carboniferous time of the Upper Palæozoic; but the fundamental difference between reptiles and amphibia which matters in this history is that the amphibian must go back to the water to lay its eggs, and that in the early stages of its life it must live in and under water. The reptile, on the other hand, has cut out all the tadpole stages from its life cycle, or, to be more exact, its tadpole stages are got through before the young leave the egg case. The reptile has come out of the water altogether. Some had gone back to it again, just as the hippopotamus and the otter among mammals have gone back, but that is a further extension of the story to which we cannot give much attention in this _Outline_.

[Illustration: Some Mesozoic Reptiles]

In the Palæozoic period, as we have said, life had not spread beyond the swampy river valleys and the borders of sea lagoons and the like; but in the Mesozoic, life was growing ever more accustomed to the thinner medium of the air, was sweeping boldly up over

the plains and towards the hillsides. It is well for the student of human history and the human future to note that. If a disembodied intelligence with no knowledge of the future had come to earth and studied life during the early Palæozoic age, he might very reasonably have concluded that life was absolutely confined to the water, and that it could never spread over the land. It found a way. In the Later Palæozoic Period that visitant might have been equally sure that life could not go beyond the edge of a swamp. The Mesozoic Period would still have found him setting bounds to life far more limited than the bounds that are set to-day. And so to-day, though we mark how life and man are still limited to five miles of air and a depth of perhaps a mile or so of sea, we must not conclude from that present limitation that life, through man, may not presently spread out and up and down to a range of living as yet inconceivable.

[Illustration: Some

Late Mesozoic

Reptiles]

The earliest known reptiles were beasts with great bellies and not very powerful legs, very like their kindred amphibia, wallowing as the crocodile wallows to this day; but in the Mesozoic they soon began to stand up and go stoutly on all fours, and several great sections of them began to balance themselves on tail and hind legs, rather as the kangaroos do now, in order to release the fore limbs for grasping food. The bones of one notable division of reptiles which retained a quadrupedal habit, a division of which many remains have been found in South African and Russian Early Mesozoic deposits, display a number of characters which approach those of the mammalian skeleton, and because of this resemblance to the mammals (beasts) this division is called the _Theriomorpha_ (beastlike). Another division was the crocodile branch, and another developed towards the tortoises and turtles. The _Plesiosaurs_ and _Ichthyosaurs_ were two groups which have left no living representatives; they were huge reptiles returning to a whale-like life in the sea. _Pliosaurus_, one of the largest plesiosaurs, measured thirty feet from snout to tail tip--of which half was neck. The _Mosasaurs_ were a third group of great porpoise-like marine lizards. But the largest and most diversified group of these Mesozoic reptiles was the group we have spoken of as kangaroo-like, the _Dinosaurs_, many of which attained enormous proportions. In bigness these greater _Dinosaurs_ have never been exceeded, although the sea can still show in the whales creatures as great. Some of these, and the largest among them, were herbivorous animals; they browsed on the rushy vegetation and among the ferns and bushes, or they stood up and grasped trees with their fore legs while they devoured the foliage. Among the browsers, for example, were the _Diplodocus carnegii_, which measured eighty=four feet in length, and the _Atlantosaurus_. The _Gigantosaurus_, disinterred by a German expedition in 1912 from rocks in East Africa, was still more colossal. It measured well over a hundred feet! These greater monsters had legs, and they are usually figured as standing up on them; but it is very doubtful if they could have supported their weight in this way, out of water. Buoyed up by water or mud, they may have got along. Another noteworthy type we have figured is the _Triceratops_. There were also a number of great flesh-eaters who preyed upon these herbivores. Of these, _Tyrannosaurus_ seems almost the last word in “frightfulness” among living things. Some species of this genus measured forty feet from snout to tail. Apparently it carried this vast body kangaroo fashion on its tail and hind legs. Probably it reared itself up. Some authorities even suppose that it leapt through the air. If so, it possessed muscles of a quite miraculous quality. A leaping elephant would be a far less astounding idea. Much more probably it waded half submerged in pursuit of the herbivorous river saurians.

§ 2

One special development of the dinosaurian type of reptile was a light, hopping, climbing group of creatures which developed a bat-like web between the fifth finger and the side of the body, which was used in gliding from tree to tree after the fashion of the flying squirrels. These bat-lizards were the _Pterodactyls_. They are often described as _flying_ reptiles, and pictures are drawn of Mesozoic scenery in which they are seen soaring and swooping about. But their breastbone has no keel such as the breastbone of a bird has for the attachment of muscles strong enough for long-sustained flying. They must have flitted about like bats. They must have had a grotesque resemblance to heraldic dragons, and they played the part of bat-like birds in the Mesozoic jungles. But bird-like though they were, they were not birds nor the ancestors of birds. The structure of their wings was altogether different from that of birds. The structure of their wings was that of a hand with one long finger and a web; the wing of a bird is like an arm with feathers projecting from its hind edge. And these Pterodactyls had no feathers.

§ 3

Far less prevalent at this time were certain other truly birdlike creatures, of which the earlier sorts also hopped and clambered and the later sorts skimmed and flew. These were at first--by all the standards of classification--Reptiles. They developed into true birds as they developed wings and as their reptilian scales became long and complicated, fronds rather than scales, and so at last, by much spreading and splitting, feathers. Feathers are the distinctive covering of birds, and they give a power of resisting heat and cold far greater than that of any other integumentary covering except perhaps the thickest fur. At a very early stage this novel covering of feathers, this new heatproof contrivance that life had chanced upon, enabled many species of birds to invade a province for which the pterodactyl was ill equipped. They took to sea fishing--if indeed they did not begin with it--and spread to the north and south polewards beyond the temperature limits set to the true reptiles. The earliest birds seem to have been carnivorous divers and water birds. To this day some of the most primitive bird forms are found among the sea birds of the Arctic and Antarctic seas, and it is among these sea birds that zoologists still find lingering traces of teeth, which have otherwise vanished completely from the beak of the bird.

The earliest known bird (the _Archæopteryx_) had no beak; it had a row of teeth in a jaw like a reptile's. It had three claws at the forward corner of its wing. Its tail too was peculiar. All modern birds have their tail feathers set in a short compact bony rump; the _Archæopteryx_ had a long bony tail with a row of feathers along each side.

§ 4

[Illustration: Archæopteryx

(the earliest known bird)]

This great period of Mesozoic life, this second volume of the book of life, is indeed an amazing story of reptilian life proliferating and developing. But the most striking thing of all the story remains to be told. Right up to the latest Mesozoic Rocks we find all these reptilian orders we have enumerated still flourishing unchallenged. There is no hint of an enemy or competitor to them in the relics we find of their world. Then the record is broken. We do not know how long a time the break represents; many pages may be missing here, pages that may represent some great cataclysmal climatic change. When next we find abundant traces of the land plants and the land animals of the earth, this great multitude of reptile species had gone. For the most part they have left no descendants. They have been "wiped out." The pterodactyls have gone absolutely; of the plesiosaurs and ichthyosaurs none is alive; the mosasaurs have gone; of the lizards a few remain, the monitor of the Dutch East Indies is the largest; all the multitude and diversity of the dinosaurs have vanished. Only the crocodiles and the turtles and tortoises carry on in any quantity into Cainozoic times. The place of all these types in the picture that the Cainozoic fossils presently unfold to us is taken by other animals not closely related to the Mesozoic reptiles and certainly not descended from any of their ruling types. A new kind of life is in possession of the world.

This apparently abrupt ending up of the reptiles is, beyond all question, the most striking revolution in the whole history of the earth before the coming of mankind. It is probably connected with the close of a vast period of equable warm conditions and the onset of a new austerer age, in which the winters were bitterer and the summers brief but hot. The Mesozoic life, animal and vegetable alike, was adapted to warm conditions and capable of little resistance to cold. The new life, on the other hand, was before all things capable of resisting great changes of temperature.

Whatever it was that led to the extinction of the Mesozoic reptiles, it was probably some very far-reaching change indeed, for the life of the seas did at the same time undergo a similar catastrophic alteration. The crescendo and ending of the Reptiles on land was paralleled by the crescendo and ending of the Ammonites, a division of creatures like squids with coiled shells which swarmed in those ancient seas. All through the rocky record of this Mesozoic period there is a vast multitude and variety of these coiled shells; there are hundreds of species, and towards the end of the Mesozoic period they increased in diversity and produced exaggerated types. When the record resumes, these too have gone. So far as the reptiles are concerned, people may perhaps be inclined to argue that they were exterminated because the Mammals that replaced them competed with them, and were more fitted to survive; but nothing of the sort can be true of the Ammonites, because to this day their place has not been taken. Simply they are gone. Unknown conditions made it possible for them to live in the Mesozoic seas, and then some unknown change made life impossible for them. No genus of Ammonite survives to-day of all that vast variety, but there still exists one isolated genus very closely related to the Ammonites, the Pearly Nautilus. It is found, it is to be noted, in the warm waters of the Indian and Pacific oceans.[15]

And as for the Mammals competing with and ousting the less fit reptiles, a struggle of which people talk at times, there is not a scrap of evidence of any such direct competition. To judge by the Record of the Rocks as we know it to-day, there is much more reason for believing that first the reptiles in some inexplicable way perished, and then that later on, after a very hard time for all life upon the earth, the mammals, as conditions became more genial again, developed and spread to fill the vacant world.

§ 5

Were there mammals in the Mesozoic period?

This is a question not yet to be answered precisely. Patiently and steadily the geologists gather fresh evidence and reason out completer conclusions. At any time some new deposit may reveal fossils that will illuminate this question. Certainly either mammals, or the ancestors of the mammals, must have lived throughout the Mesozoic period. In the very opening chapter of the Mesozoic volume of the Record there were those Theriomorphous Reptiles to which we have already alluded, and in the later Mesozoic a number of small jaw-bones are found, entirely mammalian in character. But there is not a scrap, not a bone, to suggest that there lived any Mesozoic Mammal which could look a dinosaur in the face. The Mesozoic mammals or mammal-like reptiles--for we do not know clearly which they were--seem to have been all obscure little beasts of the size of mice and rats, more like a down-trodden order of reptiles than a distinct class; probably they still laid eggs and were developing only slowly their distinctive covering of hair. They lived away from big waters, and perhaps in the desolate uplands, as marmots do now; probably they lived there beyond the pursuit of the carnivorous dinosaurs. Some perhaps went on all fours, some chiefly went on their hind legs and clambered with their fore limbs. They became fossils only so occasionally that chance has not yet revealed a single complete skeleton in the whole vast record of the Mesozoic rocks by which to check these guesses.

[Illustration: _Hesperornis_

(_Reptilian wingless water-bird_)]

These little Theriomorphs, these ancestral mammals, developed hair. Hairs, like feathers, are long and elaborately specialized scales. Hair is perhaps the clue to the salvation of the early mammals. Leading lives upon the margin of existence, away from the marshes and the warmth, they developed an outer covering only second in its warmth-holding (or heat-resisting) powers to the down and feathers of the Arctic sea-birds. And so they held out through the age of hardship between the Mesozoic and Cainozoic ages, to which most of the true reptiles succumbed.

All the main characteristics of this flora and sea and land fauna that came to an end with the end of the Mesozoic age were such as were adapted to an equable climate and to shallow and swampy regions. But in the case of their Cainozoic successors, both hair and feathers gave _a power of resistance to variable temperatures_ such as no reptile possessed, and with it they gave a range far greater than any animal had hitherto attained.

The range of life of the Lower Palæozoic Period was confined to warm water.

The range of life of the Upper Palæozoic Period was confined to warm water or to warm swamps and wet ground.

The range of life of the Mesozoic Period as we know it was confined to water and fairly low-lying valley regions under equable conditions.

Meanwhile in each of these periods there were types involuntarily extending the range of life beyond the limits prevailing in that period; and when ages of extreme conditions prevailed, it was these marginal types which survived to inherit the depopulated world.

That perhaps is the most general statement we can make about the story of the geological record; it is a story of widening range. Classes, genera, and species of animals appear and disappear, but the range widens. It widens always. Life has never had so great a range as it has to-day. Life to-day, in the form of man, goes higher in the air than it has ever done before; man’s geographical range is from pole to pole, he goes under the water in submarines, he sounds the cold, lifeless darkness of the deepest seas, he burrows into virgin levels of the rocks, and in thought and knowledge he pierces to the centre of the earth and reaches out to the uttermost star. Yet in all the relics of the Mesozoic time we find no certain memorials of his ancestry. His ancestors, like the ancestors of all the kindred mammals, must have been creatures so rare, so obscure, and so remote that they have left scarcely a trace amidst the abundant vestiges of the monsters that wallowed rejoicing in the steamy air and lush vegetation of the Mesozoic lagoons, or crawled or hopped or fluttered over the great river plains of that time.[16]

VII

THE AGE OF MAMMALS

§ 1. _A New Age of Light._ § 2. _Tradition Comes into the World._ § 3. _An Age of Brain Growth._ § 4. _The World Grows Hard Again._ § 5. _Chronology of the Ice Age._

§ 1

The third great division of the geological record, the Cainozoic, opens with a world already physically very like the world we live in to-day. Probably the day was at first still perceptibly shorter, but the scenery had become very modern in its character. Climate was, of course, undergoing, age by age, its incessant and irregular variations; lands that are temperate to-day have passed, since the Cainozoic age began, through phases of great warmth, intense cold, and extreme dryness; but the landscape, if it altered, altered to nothing that cannot still be paralleled to-day in some part of the world or other. In the place of the cycads, sequoias, and strange conifers of the Mesozoic, the plant names that now appear in the lists of fossils include birch, beech, holly, tulip trees, ivy, sweet gum, bread-fruit trees. Flowers had developed concurrently with bees and butterflies. Palms were now very important. Such plants had already been in evidence in the later levels of the (American Cretaceous) Mesozoic, but now they dominated the scene altogether. Grass was becoming a great fact in the world. Certain grasses, too, had appeared in the later Mesozoic, but only with the Cainozoic period came grass plains and turf spreading wide over a world that was once barren stone.

The period opened with a long phase of considerable warmth; then the world cooled. And in the opening of this third part of the record, this Cainozoic period, a gigantic crumpling of the earth's crust and an upheaval of mountain ranges was in progress. The Alps, the Andes, the Himalayas, are all Cainozoic mountain ranges; the background of an early Cainozoic scene, to be typical, should display an active volcano or so. It must have been an age of great earthquakes.

Geologists make certain main divisions of the Cainozoic period, and it will be convenient to name them here and to indicate their climate. First comes the _Eocene_ (dawn of recent life), an age of exceptional warmth in the world's history, subdivided into an older and newer Eocene; then the _Oligocene_ (but little of recent life), in which the climate was still equable. The _Miocene_ (with living species still in a minority) was the great age of mountain building, and the general temperature was falling. In the _Pliocene_ (more living than extinct species), climate was very much at its present phase; but with the _Pleistocene_ (a great majority of living species) there set in a long period of extreme conditions--it was the Great Ice Age. Glaciers spread from the poles towards the equator, until England to the Thames was covered in ice. Thereafter to our own time came a period of partial recovery.

§ 2

In the forests and following the grass over the Eocene plains there appeared for the first time a variety and abundance of mammals. Before we proceed to any description of these mammals, it may be well to note in general terms what a mammal is.

[Illustration: Some Oligocene Mammals]

From the appearance of the vertebrated animals in the Lower Palæozoic Age, when the fish first swarmed out into the sea, there has been a steady progressive development of vertebrated creatures. A fish is a vertebrated animal that breathes by gills and can live only in water. An amphibian may be described as a fish that has added to its gill-breathing the power of breathing air with its swimming-bladder in adult life, and that has also developed limbs with five toes to them in place of the fins of a fish. A tadpole is for a time a fish; it becomes a land creature as it develops. A reptile is a further stage in this detachment from water; it is an amphibian that is no longer amphibious; it passes through its tadpole stage--its fish stage, that is--in an egg. From the beginning it must breathe in air; it can never breathe under water as a tadpole can do. Now, a modern mammal is really a sort of reptile that has developed a peculiarly effective protective covering, hair; and that also retains its eggs in the body until they hatch so that it brings forth living young (viviparous), and even after birth it cares for them and feeds them by its mammæ for a longer or shorter period. Some reptiles, some vipers for example, are viviparous, but none stand by their young as the real mammals do. Both the birds and the mammals, which escaped whatever destructive forces made an end to the Mesozoic reptiles, and which survived to dominate the Cainozoic world, have these two things in common: first, a far more effective protection against changes of temperature than any other variation of the reptile type ever produced; and, secondly, a peculiar care for their eggs, the bird by incubation and the mammal by retention, and a disposition to look after the young for a certain period after hatching or birth. There is by comparison the greatest carelessness about offspring in the reptile.

Hair was evidently the earliest distinction of the mammals from the rest of the reptiles. It is doubtful if the particular Theriodont reptiles who were developing hair in the early Mesozoic were viviparous. Two mammals survive to this day which not only do not suckle their young,[17] but which lay eggs, the _Ornithorhynchus_ and the _Echidna_, and in the Eocene there were a number of allied forms. They are the survivors of what was probably a much larger number and variety of small egg-laying hairy creatures, hairy reptiles, hoppers, climbers, and runners, which included the Mesozoic ancestors of all existing mammals up to and including man.

Now we may put the essential facts about mammalian reproduction in another way. _The mammal is a family animal._ And the family habit involved the possibility of a new sort of continuity of experience in the world. Compare the completely closed-in life of an individual lizard with the life of even a quite lowly mammal of almost any kind. The former has no mental continuity with anything beyond itself; it is a little self-contained globe of experience that serves its purpose and ends; but the latter “picks up” from its mother, and “hands on” to its offspring. All the mammals, except for the two genera we have named, had already before the lower Eocene age arrived at this stage of pre-adult dependence and imitation. They were all more or less imitative in youth and capable of a certain modicum of education; they all, as a part of their development, received a certain amount of care and example and even direction from their mother. This is as true of the hyæna and rhinoceros as it is of the dog or man; the difference of educability is enormous, but the fact of protection and educability in the young stage is undeniable. So far as the vertebrated animals go, these new mammals, with their viviparous, young-protecting disposition, and these new birds, with their incubating, young-protecting disposition, introduce at the opening of the Cainozoic period a fresh thing into the expanding story of life, namely, social association, the addition to hard and inflexible instinct of _tradition_, and the nervous organization necessary to receive tradition.

All the innovations that come into the history of life begin very humbly. The supply of blood-vessels in the swimming-bladder of the mudfish in the lower Palæozoic torrent-river, that enabled it to pull through a season of drought, would have seemed at that time to that bodiless visitant to our planet we have already imagined, a very unimportant side fact in that ancient world of great sharks and plated fishes, sea-scorpions, and coral reefs and seaweed; but it opened the narrow way by which the land vertebrates arose to predominance. The mudfish would have seemed then a poor refugee from the too crowded and aggressive life of the sea. But once lungs were launched into the world, every line of descent that had lungs went on improving them. So, too, in the upper Palæozoic, the fact that some of the Amphibia were losing their “amphibiousness” by a retardation of hatching of their eggs, would have appeared a mere response to the distressful dangers that threatened the young tadpole. Yet that prepared the conquest of the dry land for the triumphant multitude of the Mesozoic reptiles. It opened a new direction towards a free and vigorous land-life along which all the reptilian animals moved. And this viviparous, young-tending training that the ancestral mammalia underwent during that age of inferiority and hardship for them, set going in the world a new continuity of perception, of which even man to-day only begins to appreciate the significance.

§ 3

A number of types of mammal already appear in the Eocene. Some are differentiating in one direction, and some in another, some are perfecting themselves as herbivorous quadrupeds, some leap and climb among the trees, some turn back to the water to swim, but all types are unconsciously exploiting and developing the brain which is the instrument of this new power of acquisition and educability. In the Eocene rocks are found small early predecessors of the horse (Eohippus), tiny camels, pigs, early tapirs, early hedgehogs, monkeys and lemurs, opossums and carnivores. Now, all these were more or less ancestral to living forms, and all have brains relatively much smaller than their living representatives. There is, for instance, an early rhinoceros, _Titanotherium_, with a brain not one tenth the size of that of the existing rhinoceros. The latter is by no means a perfect type of the attentive and submissive student, but even so it is ten times more observant and teachable than its predecessor. This sort of thing is true of all the orders and families that survive until to-day. All the Cainozoic mammals were doing this one thing in common under the urgency of a common necessity; they were all growing brain. It was a parallel advance. In the same order or family to-day, the brain is usually from six to ten times what it was in the Eocene ancestor.

Grass was now spreading over the world, and with this extension arose some huge graminivorous brutes of which no representative survives to-day. Such were the Uintatheres and the Titanotheres. And in pursuit of such beasts came great swarms of primitive dogs, some as big as bears, and the first cats, one in particular (_Smilodon_), a small fierce-looking creature with big knife-like canines, the first sabre-toothed tiger, which was to develop into greater things. American deposits in the Miocene display a great variety of camels, giraffe camels with long necks, gazelle camels, llamas, and true camels. North America, throughout most of the Cainozoic period, appears to have been in open and easy continuation with Asia, and when at last the glaciers of the Great

Ice Age, and then the Bering Strait, came to separate the two great continental regions, the last camels were left in the old world and the llamas in the new.

In the Eocene the first ancestors of the elephants appear in northern Africa as snouted creatures; the elephant's trunk dawned on the world in the Miocene.

One group of creatures is of peculiar interest in a history that is mainly to be the story of mankind. We find fossils in the Eocene of monkeys and lemurs, but of one particular creature we have as yet not a single bone. It was half ape, half monkey; it clambered about the trees and ran, and probably ran well, on its hind legs upon the ground. It was small-brained by our present standards, but it had clever hands with which it handled fruits and beat nuts upon the rocks and perhaps caught up sticks and stones to smite its fellows. It was our ancestor.

§ 4

Through millions of simian generations the spinning world circled about the sun; slowly its orbit, which may have been nearly circular during the equable days of the early Eocene, was drawn by the attraction of the circling outer planets into a more elliptical form. Its axis of rotation, which had always heeled over to the plane of its orbit, as the mast of a yacht under sail heels over to the level of the water, heeled over by imperceptible degrees a little more and a little more. And each year its summer point shifted a little further from perihelion round its path. These were small changes to happen to a one-inch ball, circling at a distance of 330 yards from a flaming sun nine feet across, in the course of a few million years. They were changes an immortal astronomer in Neptune, watching the earth from age to age, would have found almost imperceptible. But from the point of view of the surviving mammalian life of the Miocene, they mattered profoundly. Age by age the winters grew on the whole colder and harder and a few hours longer relatively to the summers in a thousand years; age by age the summers grew briefer. On an average the winter snow lay a little later in the spring in each century, and the glaciers in the northern mountains gained an inch this year, receded half an inch next, came on again a few inches....

[Illustration: Miocene Mammals]

The Record of the Rocks tells of the increasing chill. The Pliocene was a temperate time, and many of the warmth-loving plants and animals had gone. Then, rather less deliberately, some feet or some inches every year, the ice came on.

An arctic fauna, musk ox, woolly mammoth, woolly rhinoceros, lemming, ushers in the Pleistocene. Over North America, and Europe and Asia alike, the ice advanced. For thousands of years it advanced, and then for thousands of years it receded, to advance again. Europe down to the Baltic shores, Britain down to the Thames, North America down to New England, and more centrally as far south as Ohio, lay for ages under the glaciers. Enormous volumes of water were withdrawn from the ocean and locked up in those stupendous ice caps so as to cause a world-wide change in the relative levels of land and sea. Vast areas were exposed that are now again sea bottom.

The world to-day is still coming slowly out of the last of four great waves of cold. It is not growing warmer steadily. There have been fluctuations. Remains of bog oaks, for example, which grew two or three thousand years ago, are found in Scotland at latitudes in which not even a stunted oak will grow at the present time. And it is amidst this crescendo and diminuendo of frost and snow that we first recognize forms that are like the forms of men. The Age of Mammals culminated in ice and hardship and man.

§ 5

Guesses about the duration of the great age of cold are still vague, but in the Time diagram on page 60 we follow H. F. Osborn in accepting as our guides the estimates of Albrecht Penck[18] and C. A. Reeds.[19]

[Illustration: TIME DIAGRAM OF THE GLACIAL AGES.

The reader should compare this diagram carefully with our first time diagram, Chapter II, § 2, p. 14. That diagram, if it were on the same scale as this one, would be between 41 and 410 feet long. The position of the Eoanthropus is very uncertain: it may be as early as the Pliocene]

BOOK II

THE MAKING OF MEN

VIII

THE ANCESTRY OF MAN[20]

§ 1. _Man Descended from a Walking Ape._ § 2. _First Traces of Man-like Creatures._ § 3. _The Heidelberg Sub-man._ § 4. _The Piltdown Sub-man._ § 5. _The Riddle of the Piltdown Remains._

§ 1

The origin of man is still very obscure. It is commonly asserted that he is “descended” from some man-like ape such as the chimpanzee, the orang-utang, or the gorilla, but that of course is as reasonable as saying that I am “descended” from some Hottentot or Esquimaux as young or younger than myself. Others, alive to this objection, say that man is descended from the common ancestor of the chimpanzee, the orang-utang, and the gorilla. Some “anthropologists” have even indulged in a speculation whether mankind may not have a double or treble origin; the negro being descended from a gorilla-like ancestor, the Chinese from a chimpanzee-like ancestor, and so on. These are very fanciful ideas, to be mentioned only to be dismissed. It was formerly assumed that the human ancestor was “probably arboreal,” but the current idea among those who are qualified to form an opinion seems to be that he was a “ground ape,” and that the existing apes have developed in the arboreal direction.

[Illustration: Early Pleistocene Animals]

Of course, if one puts the skeleton of a man and the skeleton of a gorilla side by side, their general resemblance is so great that it is easy to jump to the conclusion that the former is derived from such a type as the latter by a process of brain growth and general refinement. But if one examines closely into one or two differences, the gap widens. Particular stress has recently been laid upon the tread of the foot. Man walks on his toe and his heel; his great toe is his chief lever in walking, as the reader may see for himself if he examines his own footprints on the bathroom floor and notes where the pressure falls as the footprints become fainter. His great toe is the king of his toes.

Among all the apes and monkeys, the only group that have their great toes developed on anything like the same fashion as man are some of the lemurs. The baboon walks on a flat foot and all his toes, using his middle toe as his chief throw off, much as the bear does. And the three great apes all walk on the outer side of the foot in a very different manner from the walking of man.

[Illustration: POSSIBLE APPEARANCE OF THE SUB-MAN _PITHECANTHROPUS_.

The face, jaws, and teeth are mere guess work (_see_ text). The creature may have been much less human looking than this.]

The great apes are forest dwellers; their walking even now is incidental; they are at their happiest among trees. They have very distinctive methods of climbing; they swing by the arms much more than the monkeys do, and do not, like the latter, take off with a spring from the feet. They have a specially developed climbing style of their own. But man walks so well and runs so swiftly as to suggest a very long ancestry upon the ground. Also, he does not climb well now; he climbs with caution and hesitation. His ancestors may have been running creatures for long ages. Moreover, it is to be noted that he does not swim naturally; he has to learn to swim, and that seems to point to a long-standing separation from rivers and lakes and the sea. Almost certainly that ancestor was a smaller and slighter creature than its human descendants. Conceivably the human ancestor at the opening of the Cainozoic period was a running ape, living chiefly on the ground, hiding among rocks rather than trees. It could still climb trees well and hold things between its great toe and its second toe (as the Japanese can to this day), but it was already coming down to the ground again from a still remoter, a Mesozoic arboreal ancestry. It is quite understandable that such a creature would very rarely die in water in such circumstances as to leave bones to become fossilized.

It must always be borne in mind that among its many other imperfections the Geological Record necessarily contains abundant traces only of water or marsh creatures or of creatures easily and frequently drowned. The same reasons that make any traces of the ancestors of the mammals rare and relatively unprocurable in the Mesozoic rocks, probably make the traces of possible human ancestors rare and relatively unprocurable in the Cainozoic rocks. Such knowledge as we have of the earliest men, for example, is almost entirely got from a few caves, into which they went and in which they left their traces. Until the hard Pleistocene times they lived and died in the open, and their bodies were consumed or decayed altogether.

But it is well to bear in mind also that the Record of the Rocks has still to be thoroughly examined. It has been studied only for a few generations, and by only a few men in each generation. Most men have been too busy making war, making profits out of their neighbours, toiling at work that machinery could do for them in a tenth of the time, or simply playing about, to give any attention to these more interesting things. There may be, there probably are, thousands of deposits still untouched containing countless fragments and vestiges of man and his progenitors. In Asia particularly, in India or the East Indies, there may be hidden the most illuminating clues. What we know to-day of early men is the merest scrap of what will presently be known.

The apes and monkeys already appear to have been differentiated at the beginning of the Cainozoic Age, and there are a number of Oligocene and Miocene apes whose relations to one another and to the human line have still to be made out. Among these we may mention _Dryopithecus_ of the Miocene Age, with a very human-looking jaw. In the Siwalik Hills of northern India remains of some very interesting apes have been found, of which _Sivapithecus_ and _Palæopithecus_ were possibly related closely to the human ancestor. Possibly these animals already used implements. Charles Darwin represents baboons as opening nuts by breaking them with stones, using stakes to prize up rocks in the hunt for insects, and striking blows with sticks and stones.[21] The chimpanzee makes itself a sort of tree hut by intertwining branches. Stones apparently chipped for use have been found in strata of Oligocene Age at Boncelles in Belgium. Possibly the implement-using disposition was already present in the Mesozoic ancestry from which we are descended.[22]

§ 2

Among the earliest evidences of some creature, either human or at least more man-like than any living ape upon earth, are a number of flints and stones very roughly chipped and shaped so as to be held in the hand. These were probably used as hand-axes. These early implements (“Eoliths”) are often so crude and simple that there was for a long time a controversy whether they were to be regarded as natural or artificial productions.[23] The date of the earliest of them is put by geologists as Pliocene--that is to say, _before the First Glacial Age_. They occur also throughout the First Interglacial period. We know of no bones or other remains in Europe or America of the quasi-human beings of half a million years ago, who made and used these implements. They used them to hammer with, perhaps they used them to fight with, and perhaps they used bits of wood for similar purposes.[24]

But at Trinil, in Java, in strata which are said to correspond either to the later Pliocene or to the American and European First Ice Age, there have been found some scattered bones of a creature, such as the makers of these early implements may have been. The top of a skull, some teeth, and a thigh-bone have been found. The skull shows a brain-case about half-way in size between that of the chimpanzee and man, but the thigh-bone is that of a creature as well adapted to standing and running as a man, and as free, therefore, to use its hands. The creature was not a man, nor was it an arboreal ape like the chimpanzee. It was a walking ape. It has been named by naturalists _Pithecanthropus erectus_ (the walking ape-man). We cannot say that it is a direct human ancestor, but we may guess that the creatures who scattered these first stone tools over the world must have been closely similar and kindred, and that our ancestor was a beast of like kind. This little trayful of bony fragments from Trinil is, at present, apart from stone implements, the oldest relic of early humanity, or of the close blood relations of early humanity, that is known.

While these early men or “sub-men” were running about Europe four or five hundred thousand years ago, there were mammoths, rhinoceroses, a huge hippopotamus, a giant beaver, and a bison and wild cattle in their world. There were also wild horses, and the sabre-toothed tiger still abounded. There are no traces of lions or true tigers at that time in Europe, but there were bears, otters, wolves, and a wild boar. It may be that the early sub-man sometimes played jackal to the sabre-toothed tiger, and finished up the bodies on which the latter had gorged itself.[25]

§ 3

After this first glimpse of something at least sub-human in the record of geology, there is not another fragment of human or man-like bone yet known from that record for an interval of hundreds of thousands of years. It is not until we reach deposits which are stated to be of the Second Interglacial period, 200,000 years later, 200,000 or 250,000 years ago, that another little scrap of bone comes to hand. Then we find a jaw-bone.

This jaw-bone was found in a sandpit near Heidelberg, at a depth of eighty feet from the surface,[26] and it is not the jaw-bone of a man as we understand man, but it is man-like in every respect, except that it has absolutely no trace of a chin; it is more massive than a man’s, and its narrowness behind could not, it is thought, have given the tongue sufficient play for articulate speech. It is not

an ape's jaw-bone; the teeth are human. The owner of this jaw-bone has been variously named _Homo Heidelbergensis_ and _Palæoanthropus Heidelbergensis_, according to the estimate formed of its humanity or sub-humanity by various authorities. He lived in a world not remotely unlike the world of the still earlier sub-man of the first implements; the deposits in which it is found show that there were elephants, horses, rhinoceroses, bison, a moose, and so forth with it in the world, but the sabre-toothed tiger was declining and the lion was spreading over Europe. The implements of this period (known as the Chellean period) are a very considerable advance upon those of the Pliocene Age. They are well made but _very much bigger_ than any truly human implements. The Heidelberg man may have had a very big body and large forelimbs. He may have been a woolly strange-looking creature.

§ 4

We must turn over the Record for, it may be, another 100,000 years for the next remains of anything human or sub-human. Then in a deposit ascribed to the Third Interglacial period, which may have begun 100,000 years ago and lasted 50,000 years,[27] the smashed pieces of a whole skull turn up. The deposit is a gravel which may have been derived from the washing out of still earlier gravel strata and this skull fragment may be in reality as old as the First Glacial period. The bony remains discovered at Piltdown in Sussex display a creature still ascending only very gradually from the sub-human.

The first scraps of this skull were found in an excavation for road gravel in Sussex. Bit by bit other fragments of this skull were hunted out from the quarry heaps until most of it could be pieced together. It is a thick skull, thicker than that of any living race of men, and it has a brain capacity intermediate between that of Pithecanthropus and man. This creature has been named _Eoanthropus_, the dawn man. In the same gravel-pits were found teeth of rhinoceros, hippopotamus, and the leg-bone of a deer with marks upon it that may be cuts. A curious bat-shaped instrument of elephant bone has also been found.[28]

There was, moreover, a jaw-bone among these scattered remains, which was at first assumed naturally enough to belong to _Eoanthropus_, but which it was afterwards suggested was probably that of a chimpanzee. It is extraordinarily like that of a chimpanzee, but Dr. Keith, one of the greatest authorities in these questions, assigns it, after an exhaustive analysis in his _Antiquity of Man_ (1915), to the skull with which it is found. It is, as a jaw-bone, far less human in character than the jaw of the much more ancient _Homo Heidelbergensis_, but the teeth are in some respects more like those of living men.

[Illustration: DIAGRAM TO ILLUSTRATE THE RIDDLE OF THE PILTDOWN SUB-MAN.]

Dr. Keith, swayed by the jaw-bone, does not think that _Eoanthropus_, in spite of its name, is a creature in the direct ancestry of man. Much less is it an intermediate form between the Heidelberg man and the Neanderthal man we shall presently describe. It was only related to the true ancestor of man as the orang is related to the chimpanzee. It was one of a number of sub-human running apes of more than ape-like intelligence, and if it was not on the line royal, it was at any rate a very close collateral.

After this glimpse of a skull, the Record for very many centuries gives nothing but flint implements, which improve steadily in quality. A very characteristic form is shaped like a sole, with one flat side stricken off at one blow and the other side worked. The archæologists, as the Record continues, are presently able to distinguish scrapers, borers, knives, darts, throwing stones, and the like. Progress is now more rapid; in a few centuries the shape of the hand-axe shows distinct and recognizable improvements. And then comes quite a number of remains. The Fourth Glacial Age is rising towards its maximum. Man is taking to caves and leaving vestiges there; at Krapina in Croatia, at Neanderthal near Düsseldorf, at Spy, human remains have been found, skulls and bones of a creature that is certainly a man. Somewhere about 50,000 years ago, if not earlier, appeared _Homo Neanderthalensis_ (also called _Homo antiquus_ and _Homo primigenius_), a quite passable human being. His thumb was not quite equal in flexibility and usefulness to a human thumb, he stooped forward, and could not hold his head erect, as all living men do, he was chinless and perhaps incapable of speech, there were curious differences about the enamel and the roots of his teeth from those of all living men, he was very thick-set, he was, indeed, not quite of the human species; but there is no dispute about his attribution to the genus _Homo_. He was certainly not descended from Eoanthropus, but his jaw-bone is so like the Heidelberg jaw-bone as to make it possible that the clumsier and heavier _Homo Heidelbergensis_, a thousand centuries before him, was of his blood and race.

§ 5

Upon this question of the Piltdown jaw-bone, it may be of interest to quote here a letter to the writer from Sir Ray Lankester, discussing the question in a familiar and luminous manner. It will enable the reader to gauge the extent and quality of the evidence that we possess at present upon the nature of these early human and sub-human animals. Upon these fragile Piltdown fragments

alone more than a hundred books, pamphlets, and papers have been written. These scraps of bone are guarded more carefully from theft and wilful damage than the most precious jewels, and in the museum cases one sees only carefully executed _fac-similes_.

“As to the Piltdown jaw-bone, the best study of it is that by Smith Woodward, who first described it and the canine found later. The jaw is imperfect in front, but has the broad, flat symphysis of the Apes. G. S. Miller, an American anthropologist, has made a very good comparison of it with a chimpanzee’s jaw, and concludes that it is a chimpanzee’s. (His monograph is in the _Am. Jour. of Phys. Anthrop._, vol. i, no. 1.) The one point in the Piltdown jaw itself against chimpanzee identification is the smooth, flat, worn surface of the molars. This is a human character, and is due to lateral movement of the jaw, and hence rubbing down of the tubercles of the molars. This is not worth much. But the serious question is, are we to associate this jaw with the cranium found close by it? If so, it is certainly not chimpanzee nor close to the Apes, but decidedly hominid. Two other small fragments of crania and a few more teeth have been found in the gravel two miles from Piltdown, which agree with the Piltdown cranium in having superciliary ridges fairly strong for a human skull, but not anything like the great superciliary ridges of Apes. The fact one has to face is this; here you have an imperfect cranium, very thick-walled and of small cubical contents (1100 or so), but much larger in that respect than any ape’s. A few yards distant from it in the same layer of gravel is found a jaw-bone having rather large pointed canines, a flat, broad symphysis, and other points about the inner face of the ramus and ridges which resemble those of the chimpanzee. Which is the more likely: (_a_) that these two novel fragments tending apewards from man were parts of the same individual; or (_b_), that the sweeping of the Wealden valley has brought there together a half-jaw and a broken cranium _both_ more ape-like in character than any known human corresponding bits, and yet derived from two separate anthropoid beasts, one (the jaw) more simian, and the other (the cranium) much less so? As to the probabilities, we must remember that this patch of gravel at Piltdown, clearly and definitely, is a wash-up of remains of various later tertiary and post-tertiary deposits. It contains fragments of Miocene mastodon and rhinoceros teeth. These latter differ entirely in mineral character from the Eoanthropus jaw and the cranium. But (and this needs re-examination and _chemical_ analysis) the Piltdown jaw and the Piltdown cranium do not seem to me to be quite alike in their mineral condition. The jaw is more deeply iron-stained, and I should say (but not confidently), harder than the cranium. Now, it is easy to attribute too much importance to that difference, since in a patch of iron-stained gravel, such as that at Piltdown, the soaking of water and iron salts into bones embedded may be much greater in one spot than in another only a yard off, or a few inches deeper!

“So I think we are stumped and baffled! The most prudent way is to keep the jaw and the cranium apart in all argument about them. On the other hand, on the principle that hypotheses are not to be multiplied beyond necessity, there is a case for regarding the two--jaw and cranium--as having been parts of one beast--or man.”

To which Sir H. H. Johnston adds: “Against the chimpanzee hypothesis it must be borne in mind that so far no living chimpanzee or fossil chimpanzee-like remains have been found nearer England than north equatorial Africa or North-west India, and no remains of great apes at all nearer than Southern France and the upper Rhine--and those widely different from the _Eoanthropus_ jaw.”

IX

THE NEANDERTHAL MEN, AN EXTINCT RACE

(The Early Palæolithic Age[29])

§ 1. _The World 50,000 Years Ago._ § 2. _The Daily Life of the First Men._ § 3. _The Last Palæolithic Men._

§ 1

In the time of the Third Interglacial period the outline of Europe and western Asia was very different from what it is to-day. Vast areas to the west and northwest which are now under the Atlantic waters were then dry land; the Irish Sea and the North Sea were river valleys. Over these northern areas there spread and receded and spread again a great ice cap such as covers central Greenland to-day (see Map, on page 77). This vast ice cap, which covered both polar regions of the earth, withdrew huge masses of water from the ocean, and the sea-level consequently fell, exposing great areas of land that are now submerged again. The Mediterranean area was probably a great valley below the general sea-level, containing two inland seas cut off from the general ocean. The climate of this Mediterranean basin was perhaps cold temperate, and the region of the Sahara to the south was not then a desert of baked rock and blown sand, but a well-watered and fertile country. Between the ice sheets to the north and the Alps and Mediterranean valley to the south stretched a bleak wilderness whose climate changed from harshness to a mild

kindliness and then hardened again for the Fourth Glacial Age.

Across this wilderness, which is now the great plain of Europe, wandered a various fauna. At first there were hippopotami, rhinoceroses, mammoths, and elephants. The sabre-toothed tiger was diminishing towards extinction. Then, as the air chilled, the hippopotamus, and then other warmth-loving creatures, ceased to come so far north, and the sabre-toothed tiger disappeared altogether. The woolly mammoth, the woolly rhinoceros, the musk ox, the bison, the aurochs, and the reindeer became prevalent, and the temperate vegetation gave place to plants of a more arctic type. The glaciers spread southward to the maximum of the Fourth Glacial Age (about 50,000 years ago), and then receded again. In the earlier phase, the Third Interglacial period, a certain number of small family groups of men (_Homo Neanderthalensis_) and probably of sub-men (_Eoanthropus_) wandered over the land, leaving nothing but their flint implements to witness to their presence. They probably used a multitude and variety of wooden implements also; they had probably learnt much about the shapes of objects and the use of different shapes from wood, knowledge which they afterwards applied to stone; but none of this wooden material has survived; we can only speculate about its forms and uses. As the weather hardened to its maximum of severity, the Neanderthal men, already it would seem acquainted with the use of fire, began to seek shelter under rock ledges and in caves--and so leave remains behind them. Hitherto they had been accustomed to squat in the open about the fire, and near their water supply. But they were sufficiently intelligent to adapt themselves to the new and harder conditions. (As for the sub-men, they seem to have succumbed to the stresses of this Fourth Glacial Age altogether. At any rate, the rudest type of Palæolithic implements presently disappears.)

[Illustration: THIS MAP REPRESENTS THE PRESENT STATE OF OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE GEOGRAPHY OF EUROPE AND WESTERN ASIA AT A PERIOD WHICH WE GUESS TO BE ABOUT 50,000 YEARS AGO, THE NEANDERTHALER AGE.

Much of this map is of course speculative, but its broad outlines must be fairly like those of the world in which men first became men.]

Not merely man was taking to the caves. This period also had a cave lion, a cave bear, and a cave hyæna. These creatures had to be driven out of the caves and kept out of the caves in which these early men wanted to squat and hide; and no doubt fire was an effective method of eviction and protection. Probably early men did not go deeply into the caves, because they had no means of lighting their recesses. They got in far enough to be out of the weather, and stored wood and food in odd corners. Perhaps they barricaded the cave mouths. Their only available light for going deeply into the caverns would be torches.

[Illustration: Neanderthal Man]

What did these Neanderthal men hunt? Their only possible weapons for killing such giant creatures as the mammoth or the cave bear, or even the reindeer, were spears of wood, wooden clubs, and those big pieces of flint they left behind them, the “Chellean” and “Mousterian” implements;[30] and probably their usual quarry was smaller game. But they did certainly eat the flesh of the big beasts when they had a chance, and perhaps they followed them when sick or when wounded by combats, or took advantage of them when they were bogged or in trouble with ice or water. (The Labrador Indians still kill the caribou with spears at awkward river crossings.) At Dewlish in Dorset, an artificial trench has been found which is supposed to have been a Palæolithic trap for elephants.[31] We know that the Neanderthalers partly ate their kill where it fell; but they brought back the big marrow bones to the cave to crack and eat at leisure, because few ribs and vertebræ are found in the caves, but great quantities of cracked and split long bones. They used skins to wrap about them, and the women probably dressed the skins.

We know also that they were right-handed like modern men, because the left side of the brain (which serves the right side of the body) is bigger than the right. But while the back parts of the brain which deal with sight and touch and the energy of the body are well developed, the front parts, which are connected with thought and speech, are comparatively small. It was as big a brain as ours, but different. This species of _Homo_ had certainly a very different mentality from ours; its individuals were not merely simpler and lower than we are, they were on another line. It may be they did not speak at all, or very sparingly. They had nothing that we should call a language.

§ 2

In Worthington Smith’s _Man the Primeval Savage_ there is a very vividly written description of early Palæolithic life, from which much of the following account is borrowed. In the original, Mr. Worthington Smith assumes a more extensive social life, a larger community, and a more definite division of labour among its members than is altogether justifiable in the face of such subsequent writings as J. J. Atkinson’s memorable essay on Primal Law.[32] For the little tribe Mr. Worthington Smith described there has been

substituted, therefore, a family group under the leadership of one Old Man, and the suggestions of Mr. Atkinson as to the behaviour of the Old Man have been worked into the sketch.

Mr. Worthington Smith describes a squatting-place near a stream, because primitive man, having no pots or other vessels, must needs have kept close to a water supply, and with some chalk cliffs adjacent from which flints could be got to work. The air was bleak, and the fire was of great importance, because fires once out were not easily relit in those days. When not required to blaze it was probably banked down with ashes. The most probable way in which fires were started was by hacking a bit of iron pyrites with a flint amidst dry dead leaves; concretions of iron pyrites and flints are found together in England where the gault and chalk approach each other.[33] The little group of people would be squatting about amidst a litter of fern, moss, and such-like dry material. Some of the women and children would need to be continually gathering fuel to keep up the fires. It would be a tradition that had grown up. The young would imitate their elders in this task. Perhaps there would be rude wind shelters of boughs on one side of the encampment.

The Old Man, the father and master of the group, would perhaps be engaged in hammering flints beside the fire. The children would imitate him and learn to use the sharpened fragments. Probably some of the women would hunt good flints; they would fish them out of the chalk with sticks and bring them to the squatting-place.

There would be skins about. It seems probable that at a very early time primitive men took to using skins. Probably they were wrapped about the children, and used to lie upon when the ground was damp and cold. A woman would perhaps be preparing a skin. The inside of the skin would be well scraped free of superfluous flesh with trimmed flints, and then strained and pulled and pegged out flat on the grass, and dried in the rays of the sun.

[Illustration: EARLY STONE IMPLEMENTS.

The Mousterian Age implements, and all above it, are those of Neanderthal men or, possibly in the case of the rostro-carinates, of sub-men. The lower row (Reindeer Age) are the work of true men. The student should compare this diagram with the time diagram attached to Chapter VII, § 6, and he should note the relatively _large size_ of the pre-human implements.]

Away from the fire other members of the family group prowl in search of food, but at night they all gather closely round the fire and build it up, for it is their protection against the wandering bear and such-like beasts of prey. The Old Man is the only fully adult male in the little group. There are women, boys and girls, but so soon as the boys are big enough to rouse the Old Man’s jealousy, he will fall foul of them and either drive them off or kill them. Some girls may perhaps go off with these exiles, or two or three of these youths may keep together for a time, wandering until they come upon some other group, from which they may try to steal a mate. Then they would probably fall out among themselves. Some day, when he is forty years old perhaps or even older, and his teeth are worn down and his energy abating, some younger male will stand up to the Old Man and kill him and reign in his stead. There is probably short shrift for the old at the squatting-place. So soon as they grow weak and bad-tempered, trouble and death come upon them.

What did they eat at the squatting-place?

“Primeval man is commonly described as a hunter of the great hairy mammoth, of the bear, and the lion, but it is in the highest degree improbable that the human savage ever hunted animals much larger than the hare, the rabbit, and the rat. Man was probably the hunted rather than the hunter.

[Illustration: AUSTRALIA & the Western Pacific in the Glacial Age]

“The primeval savage was both herbivorous and carnivorous. He had for food hazel-nuts, beech-nuts, sweet chestnuts, earth-nuts, and acorns. He had crab-apples, wild pears, wild cherries, wild gooseberries, bullaces, sorbs, sloes, blackberries, yewberries, hips and haws, water-cress, fungi, the larger and softer leaf-buds, Nostoc (the vegetable substance called ‘fallen stars’ by country-folk), the fleshy, juicy, asparagus-like rhizomes or subterranean stems of the _Labiatæ_ and like plants, as well as other delicacies of the vegetable kingdom. He had birds’ eggs, young birds, and the honey and honeycomb of wild bees. He had newts, snails, and frogs--the two latter delicacies are still highly esteemed in Normandy and Brittany. He had fish, dead and alive, and fresh-water mussels; he could easily catch fish with his hands and paddle and dive for and trap them. By the seaside he would have fish, mollusca, and seaweed. He would have many of the larger birds and smaller mammals, which he could easily secure by throwing stones and sticks, or by setting simple snares. He would have the snake, the slow-worm, and the crayfish. He would have various grubs and insects, the large larvæ of beetles and various caterpillars. The taste for caterpillars still survives in China, where they

are sold in dried bundles in the markets. A chief and highly nourishing object of food would doubtlessly be bones smashed up into a stiff and gritty paste.

“A fact of great importance is this--primeval man would not be particular about having his flesh food over-fresh. He would constantly find it in a dead state, and, if semi-putrid, he would relish it none the less--the taste for high or half-putrid game still survives. If driven by hunger and hard pressed, he would perhaps sometimes eat his weaker companions or unhealthy children who happened to be feeble or unsightly or burthensome. The larger animals in a weak and dying state would no doubt be much sought for; when these were not forthcoming, dead and half-rotten examples would be made to suffice. An unpleasant odour would not be objected to; it is not objected to now in many continental hotels.

“The savages sat huddled close together round their fire, with fruits, bones, and half-putrid flesh. We can imagine the old man and his women twitching the skin of their shoulders, brows, and muzzles as they were annoyed or bitten by flies or other insects. We can imagine the large human nostrils, indicative of keen scent, giving rapidly repeated sniffs at the foul meat before it was consumed; the bad odour of the meat, and the various other disgusting odours belonging to a haunt of savages, being not in the least disapproved.

“Man at that time was not a _degraded_ animal, for he had never been higher; he was therefore an exalted animal, and, low as we esteem him now, he yet represented the highest stage of development of the animal kingdom of his time.”

That is at least an acceptable sketch of a Neanderthal squatting-place. But before extinction overtook them, even the Neanderthalers learnt much and went far.

Whatever the older Palæolithic men did with their dead, there is reason to suppose that the later _Homo Neanderthalensis_ buried some individuals at least with respect and ceremony. One of the best-known Neanderthal skeletons is that of a youth who apparently had been deliberately interred. He had been placed in a sleeping posture, head on the right fore-arm. The head lay on a number of flint fragments carefully piled together “pillow fashion.” A big hand-axe lay near his head, and around him were numerous charred and split ox bones, as though there had been a feast or an offering.

To this appearance of burial during the later Neanderthal age we shall return when we are considering the ideas that were inside the heads of primitive men.

This sort of men may have wandered, squatted about their fires, and died in Europe for a period extending over 100,000 years, if we assume, that is, that the Heidelberg jaw-bone belongs to a member of the species, a period so vast that all the subsequent history of our race becomes a thing of yesterday. Along its own line this species of men was accumulating a dim tradition, and working out its limited possibilities. Its thick skull imprisoned its brain, and to the end it was low-browed and brutish.

§ 3

When the Dutch discovered Tasmania, they found a detached human race not very greatly advanced beyond this Lower Palæolithic stage. But over most of the world the Lower Palæolithic culture had developed into a more complicated and higher life twenty or thirty thousand years ago. The Tasmanians were not racially Neanderthalers;[34] their brain-cases, their neck-bones, their jaws and teeth, show that; they had no Neanderthal affinities; they were of the same species as ourselves. There can be little doubt that throughout the hundreds of centuries during which the scattered little groups of Neanderthal men were all that represented men in Europe, real men, of our own species, in some other part of the world, were working their way along parallel lines from much the same stage as the Neanderthalers ended at, and which the Tasmanians preserved, to a higher level of power and achievement. The Tasmanians, living under unstimulating conditions, remote from any other human competition or example, lagged behind the rest of the human brotherhood.[35]

About 200 centuries ago or earlier, real men of our own species, if not of our own race, came drifting into the European area.

X

THE LATER POSTGLACIAL PALÆOLITHIC MEN, THE FIRST TRUE MEN

(Later Palæolithic Age)

§ 1. _The Coming of Men Like Ourselves._ § 2. _Subdivision of the Later Palæolithic._ § 3. _The Earliest True Men Were Splendid Savages._ § 4. _Hunters Give Place to Herdsmen._ § 5. _No Sub-men in America._

§ 1

The Neanderthal type of man prevailed in Europe at least for tens of thousands of years. For ages that make all history seem a thing of yesterday, these nearly human creatures prevailed. If the Heidelberg jaw was that of a Neanderthaler, and if there is no error in the estimate of the age of that jaw, then the Neanderthal Race lasted out for more than 200,000 years! Finally, between 40,000 and 25,000 years ago, as the Fourth Glacial Age softened towards more temperate conditions (see Map on p. 89), a different human type came upon the scene, and, it would seem, exterminated _Homo Neanderthalensis_.[36] This new type was probably developed in South Asia or North Africa, or in lands now submerged in the Mediterranean basin, and, as more remains are collected and evidence accumulates, men will learn more of their early stages. At present we can only guess where and how, through the slow ages, parallel with the Neanderthal cousin, these first _true men_ arose out of some more ape-like progenitor. For hundreds of centuries they were acquiring skill of hand and limb, and power and bulk of brain, in that still unknown environment. They were already far above the Neanderthal level of achievement and intelligence, when first they come into our ken, and they had already split into two or more very distinctive races.

[Illustration: Cromagnon

Man]

These new-comers did not migrate into Europe in the strict sense of the word, but rather, as century by century the climate ameliorated, they followed the food and plants to which they were accustomed, as those spread into the new realms that opened to them. The ice was receding, vegetation was increasing, big game of all sorts was becoming more abundant. Steppe-like conditions, conditions of pasture and shrub, were bringing with them vast herds of wild horse. Ethnologists (students of race) class these new human races in one same species as ourselves, and with all human races subsequent to them, under one common specific name of _Homo sapiens_. They had quite human brain-cases and hands. Their teeth and their necks were anatomically as ours are.

Now here again, with every desire to be plain and explicit with the reader, we have still to trouble him with qualified statements and notes of interrogation. There is now an enormous literature about these earliest true men, the men of the Later Palæolithic Age, and it is still for the general reader a very confusing literature indeed. It is confusing because it is still confused at the source. We know of two distinct sorts of skeletal remains in this period, the first of these known as the Cro-Magnon race, and the second the Grimaldi race; but the great bulk of the human traces and appliances we find are either without human bones or with insufficient bones for us to define their associated physical type. There may have been many more distinct races than these two. There may have been intermediate types. In the grotto of Cro-Magnon it was that complete skeletons of one main type of these Newer Palæolithic men, these true men, were first found, and so it is that they are spoken of as Cro-Magnards.

[Illustration: MAP SHOWING EUROPE AND WESTERN ASIA ABOUT THE TIME THE TRUE MEN WERE REPLACING THE NEANDERTHALERS IN WESTERN EUROPE]

[Illustration: Reindeer Age Articles

(_drawn to differing scales_)

Bone points

(_Azillian--pierced for thong_)

Pebble cup mortar

Harpoons of reindeer horn

Bone needles

Arrow straighteners

(_reindeer horn_)

Australian natives' method of using throwing-stick or spear-thrower

Throwing-stick (_reindeer horn_)]

These Cro-Magnards were a tall people with very broad faces, prominent noses, and, all things considered, astonishingly big brains. The brain capacity of the woman in the Cro-Magnon cave exceeded that of the average male to-day. Her head had been smashed by a heavy blow. There were also in the same cave with her the complete skeleton of an older man, nearly six feet high, the fragments of a child's skeleton, and the skeletons of two young men. There were also flint implements and perforated sea-shells, used no doubt as ornaments. Such is one sample of the earliest true men. But at the Grimaldi cave, near Mentone, were discovered two skeletons also of the Later Palæolithic period, but of a widely contrasted type, with negroid characteristics that point rather to the negroid type. There can be no doubt that we have to deal in this period with at least two, and probably more, highly divergent races of true men. They may have overlapped in time, or Cro-Magnards may have followed the Grimaldi race, and either or both may have been contemporary with the late Neanderthal men. Various authorities have very strong opinions upon these points, but they are, at most, opinions. The whole story is further fogged at present by our inability to distinguish, in the absence of skeletons, which race has been at work in any particular case. In what follows the reader will ask of this or that particular statement, "Yes, but is this the Cro-Magnard or the Grimaldi man or some other that you are writing about?" To which in most cases the honest answer is, "As yet we do not know." Confessedly our account of the newer Palæolithic is a jumbled account. There are probably two or three concurrent and only roughly similar histories of these newer Palæolithic men as yet, inextricably mixed up together. Some authorities appear to favour the Cro-Magnards unduly and to dismiss the Grimaldi people with as little as possible of the record.

The appearance of these truly human postglacial Palæolithic peoples was certainly an enormous leap forward in the history of mankind. Both of these main races had a human fore-brain, a human hand, an intelligence very like our own. They dispossessed _Homo Neanderthalensis_ from his caverns and his stone quarries. And they agreed with modern ethnologists, it would seem, in regarding him as a different species. Unlike most savage conquerors, who take the women of the defeated side for their own and interbreed with them, it would seem that the true men would have nothing to do with the Neanderthal race, women or men. There is no trace of any intermixture between the races, in spite of the fact that the newcomers, being also flint users, were establishing themselves in the very same spots that their predecessors had occupied. We know nothing of the appearance of the Neanderthal man, but this absence of intermixture seems to suggest an extreme hairiness, an ugliness, or a repulsive strangeness in his appearance over and above his low forehead, his beetle brows, his ape neck, and his inferior stature. Or he--and she--may have been too fierce to tame. Says Sir Harry Johnston, in a survey of the rise of modern man in his _Views and Reviews_: "The dim racial remembrance of such gorilla-like monsters, with cunning brains, shambling gait, hairy bodies, strong teeth, and possibly cannibalistic tendencies, may be the germ of the ogre in folklore...."

These true men of the Palæolithic Age, who replaced the Neanderthalers, were coming into a milder climate, and although they used the caves and shelters of their predecessors, they lived largely in the open. They were hunting peoples, and some or all of them appear to have hunted the mammoth and the wild horse as well as the reindeer, bison, and aurochs. They ate much horse. At a great open-air camp at Solutré, where they seem to have had animal gatherings for many centuries, it is estimated that there are the bones of 100,000 horses, besides reindeer, mammoth, and bison bones. They probably followed herds of horses, the little bearded ponies of that age, as these moved after pasture. They hung about on the flanks of the herd, and became very wise about its habits and dispositions. A large part of these men's lives must have been spent in watching animals.

Whether they tamed and domesticated the horse is still an open question. Perhaps they learnt to do so by degrees as the centuries passed. At any rate, we find late Palæolithic drawings of horses with marks about the heads that are strongly suggestive of bridles, and there exists a carving of a horse's head showing what is perhaps a rope of twisted skin or tendon. But even if they tamed the horse, it is still more doubtful whether they rode it or had much use for it when it was tamed. The horse they knew was a wild pony with a beard under its chin, not up to carrying a man for any distance. It is improbable that these men had yet learnt the rather unnatural use of animal's milk as food. If they tamed the horse at last, it was the only animal they seem to have tamed. They had no dogs, and they had little to do with any sort of domesticated sheep or cattle.

It greatly aids us to realize their common humanity that these earliest true men could draw. Both races, it would seem, drew astonishingly well. They were by all standards savages, but they were artistic savages. They drew better than any of their successors down to the beginnings of history. They drew and painted on the cliffs and cave walls that they had wrested from the Neanderthal men. And the surviving drawings come to the ethnologist, puzzling over bones and scraps, with the effect of a plain message shining through guesswork and darkness. They drew on bones and antlers; they carved little figures.

These late Palæolithic people not only drew remarkably well for our information, and with an increasing skill as the centuries passed, but they have also left us other information about their lives in their graves. They buried. They buried their dead, often with ornaments, weapons, and food; they used a lot of colour in the burial, and evidently painted the body. From that one may infer that they painted their bodies during life. Paint was a big fact in their lives. They were inveterate painters; they used black, brown, red, yellow, and white pigments, and the pigments they used endure to this day in the caves of France and Spain. Of all modern races, none have shown so pictorial a disposition; the nearest approach to it has been among the American Indians.

[Illustration: A Reindeer Age Masterpiece]

[Illustration:

Reindeer Age (_Aurignacian_)

Engravings & Carvings]

These drawings and paintings of the later Palæolithic people went on through a long period of time, and present wide fluctuations in artistic merit. We give here some early sketches, from which we learn of the interest taken by these early men in the bison, horse, ibex, cave bear, and reindeer. In its early stages the drawing is often primitive like the drawing of clever children; quadrupeds are usually drawn with one hindleg and one foreleg, as children draw them to this day. The legs on the other side were too much for the artist's technique. Possibly the first drawings began as children's drawings begin, out of idle scratchings. The savage scratched with a flint on a smooth rock surface, and was reminded of some line or gesture. But their solid carvings are at least as old as their first pictures. The earlier drawings betray a complete incapacity to group animals. As the centuries progressed, more skilful artists appeared. The representation of beasts became at last astonishingly vivid and like. But even at the crest of their artistic time they still drew in profile as children do; perspective and the fore-shortening needed for back and front views were too much for them.[37] They rarely drew themselves. The vast majority of their drawings represent animals. The mammoth and the horse are among the commonest themes. Some of the people, whether Grimaldi people or Cro-Magnon people, also made little ivory and soapstone statuettes, and among these are some very fat female figures. These latter suggest the physique of Grimaldi rather than of Cro-Magnon artists. They are like Bushmen women. The human sculpture of the earlier times inclined to caricature, and generally such human figures as they represent are far below the animal studies in vigour and veracity.

Later on there was more grace and less coarseness in the human representations. One little ivory head discovered is that of a girl with an elaborate coiffure. These people at a later stage also scratched and engraved designs on ivory and bone. Some of the most interesting groups of figures are carved very curiously round bone, and especially round rods of deer bone, so that it is impossible to see the entire design all together. Figures have also been found modelled in clay, although no Palæolithic people made any use of pottery.

Many of the paintings are found in the depths of unlit caves. They are often difficult of access. The artists must have employed lamps to do their work, and shallow soapstone lamps in which fat could have been burnt have been found. Whether the seeing of these cavern paintings was in some way ceremonial or under what circumstances they were seen, we are now altogether at a loss to imagine.

§ 2

Archæologists distinguish at present three chief stages in the history of these newer Palæolithic men in Europe, and we must name these stages here. But it may be as well to note at the same time that it is a matter of the utmost difficulty to distinguish which of two deposits in different places is the older or newer. We may very well be dealing with the work of more or less contemporary and different races when we think we are dealing with successive ones. We are dealing, the reader must bear in mind, with little disconnected patches of material, a few score all together. The earliest stage usually distinguished by the experts is the _Aurignacian_ (from the grotto of Aurignac); it is characterized by very well-made flint implements, and by a rapid development of art and more particularly of statuettes and wall paintings. The most esteemed of the painted caves is ascribed to the latter part of this the first of the three subdivisions of the newer Palæolithic. The second subdivision of this period is called the _Solutrian_ (from Solutré), and is distinguished particularly by the quality and beauty of its stone implements; some of its razor-like blades are only equalled and not surpassed by the very best of the Neolithic work. They are of course unpolished, but the best specimens are as thin as steel blades and almost as sharp. Finally, it would seem, came the _Magdalenian_ (from La Madeleine) stage, in which the horse and reindeer were dwindling in numbers and the red deer coming into Europe.[38] The stone implements are smaller, and

there is a great quantity of bone harpoons, spearheads, needles, and the like. The hunters of the third and last stage of the later Palæolithic Age appear to have supplemented a diminishing food supply by fishing. The characteristic art of the period consists of deep reliefs done upon bone and line engraving upon bone. It is to this period that the designs drawn round bones belong, and it has been suggested that these designs upon round bones were used to print coloured designs upon leather. Some of the workmanship on bone was extraordinarily fine. Parkyn quotes from de Mortillet, about the Reindeer Age (Magdalenian) bone needles, that they “are much superior to those of later, even historical, times, down to the Renaissance. The Romans, for example, never had needles comparable to those of the Magdalenian epoch.”

[Illustration: TIME DIAGRAM SHOWING THE ESTIMATED DURATION OF THE TRUE HUMAN PERIODS.

This time diagram again is on a larger scale than its predecessors. The time diagram on page 60, if it were on this scale, would be nearly 4 feet long, and the diagram of the whole geological time on page 14, between 500 and 5000 feet long (or perhaps even as much as 10,000 feet long).]

It is quite impossible at present to guess at the relative lengths of these ages. We are not even positive about their relative relationship. Each lasted perhaps for four or five more thousand years, more than double the time from the Christian Era to our own day.

At last it would seem that circumstances began to turn altogether against these hunting Newer Palæolithic people who had flourished for so long in Europe. They disappeared. New kinds of men appeared in Europe, replacing them. These latter seem to have brought in bow and arrows; they had domesticated animals and cultivated the soil. A new way of living, the Neolithic way of living, spread over the European area; and the life of the Reindeer Age and of the races of Reindeer Men, the Later Palæolithic men, after a reign vastly greater than the time between ourselves and the very earliest beginnings of recorded history, passed off the European stage.

§ 3

There is a disposition on the part of many writers to exaggerate the intellectual and physical qualities of these later Palæolithic men and make a wonder of them.[39] Collectively considered, these people had remarkable gifts, but a little reflection will show they had almost as remarkable deficiencies. The tremendous advance they display upon their Neanderthalian predecessors and their special artistic gift must not blind us to their very obvious limitations. For all the quantity of their brains, the quality was narrow and special. They had vivid perceptions, an acute sense of animal form, they had the real artist’s impulse to render; so far they were fully grown human beings. But that disposition to paint and draw is shown to-day by the Bushmen, by Californian Indians, and by Australian black fellows; it is not a mark of all-round high intellectual quality. The cumulative effect of their drawings and paintings is very great, but we must not make the mistake of crowding all these achievements together in our minds as though they had suddenly flashed out upon the world in a brief interval of time, or as though they were all the achievements of one people. These races of Reindeer Men were in undisturbed possession of western Europe for a period at least ten times as long as the interval between ourselves and the beginning of the Christian Era, and through all that immense time they were free to develop and vary their life to its utmost possibilities. Their art constitutes their one claim to be accounted more than common savages.

They were in close contact with animals, but they never seemed to have got to terms with any animal unless it was the horse. They had no dogs. They had no properly domesticated animals at all. They watched and drew and killed and ate. They do not seem to have cooked their food. Perhaps they scorched and grilled it, but they could not have done much more, because they had no cooking implements. Although they had clay available, and although there are several Palæolithic clay figures on record, they had _no pottery_. Although they had a great variety of flint and bone implements, they never rose to the possibilities of using timber for permanent shelters or such-like structures. They never made hafted axes or the like that would enable them to deal with timber. There is a suggestion in some of the drawings of a fence of stakes in which a mammoth seems to be entangled. But here we may be dealing with superimposed scratchings. They had _no buildings_. It is not even certain that they had tents or huts. They may have had simple skin tents. Some of the drawings seem to suggest as much. It is doubtful if they knew of the bow. They left no good arrowheads behind them. Certain of their implements are said to be “arrow-straighteners” by distinguished authorities, but that is about as much evidence as we have of arrows. They may have used sharpened sticks as arrows. They had _no cultivation_ of grain or vegetables of any sort. Their women were probably squaws, smaller than the men; the earlier statuettes represent them as grossly fat, almost as the Bushmen women are often fat to-day. (But this may not be true of the Cro-Magnards.)

They clothed themselves, it would seem, in skins, if they clothed themselves at all. These skins they prepared with skill and elaboration, and towards the end of the age they used bone needles, no doubt to sew these pelts. One may guess pretty safely that they painted these skins, and it has even been supposed, printed off designs upon them from bone cylinders. But their garments were mere wraps; there are no clasps or catches to be found. They do not seem to have used grass or such-like fibre for textiles. Their statuettes are naked. They were, in fact, except for a fur wrap in cold weather, naked painted savages.

These hunters lived on open steppes for two hundred centuries or so, ten times the length of the Christian era. They were, perhaps, overtaken by the growth of the European forests, as the climate became milder and damper. When the wild horse and the reindeer diminished in Europe, and a newer type of human culture, with a greater power over food supply, a greater tenacity of settlement, and probably a larger social organization, arose, the Reindeer Men had to learn fresh ways of living or disappear. How far they learnt and mingled their strain with the new European populations, and how far they went under we cannot yet guess. Opinions differ widely. Wright lays much stress on the “great hiatus” between the Palæolithic and Neolithic remains, while Osborn traces the likeness of the former in several living populations. In the region of the Doubs and of the Dordogne in France, many individuals are to be met with to this day with skulls of the “Cro-Magnon” type. Apparently the Grimaldi type of men has disappeared altogether from Europe. Whether the Cro-Magnon type of men mingled completely with the Neolithic peoples, or whether they remained distinct and held their own in favourable localities to the north and west, following the reindeer over Siberia and towards America, which at that time was continuous with Siberia, or whether they disappeared altogether from the world, is a matter that can be only speculated about at present. There is not enough evidence for a judgment. Possibly they mingled to a certain extent. There is little to prevent our believing that they survived without much intermixture for a long time in north Asia, that “pockets” of them remained here and there in Europe, that there is a streak of their blood in most European peoples to-day, and that there is a much stronger streak, if not a predominant strain, in the Mongolian and American races.[40]

§ 4

It was about 12,000 or fewer years ago that, with the spread of forests and a great change of the fauna, the long prevalence of the hunting life in Europe drew to its end. Reindeer vanished. Changing conditions frequently bring with them new diseases. There may have been prehistoric pestilences. For many centuries there may have been no men in Britain or Central Europe (Wright). For a time there were in Southern Europe drifting communities of some little known people who are called the Azilians.[41] They may have been transition generations; they may have been a different race. We do not know. Some authorities incline to the view that the Azilians were the first wave of a race which, as we shall see later, has played a great part in populating Europe, the dark-white or Mediterranean or Iberian race. These Azilian people have left behind them a multitude of pebbles, roughly daubed with markings of an unknown purport (see illus., p. 94). The use or significance of these Azilian pebbles is still a profound mystery. Was this some sort of token writing? Were they counters in some game? Did the Azilians play with these pebbles or tell a story with them, as imaginative children will do with bits of wood and stone nowadays? At present we are unable to cope with any of these questions.

We will not deal here with the other various peoples who left their scanty traces in the world during the close of the New Palæolithic period, the spread of the forests where formerly there had been steppes, and the wane of the hunters, some 10,000 or 12,000 years ago. We will go on to describe the new sort of human community that was now spreading over the northern hemisphere, whose appearance marks what is called the _Neolithic Age_. The map of the world was assuming something like its present outlines, the landscape and the flora and fauna were taking on their existing characteristics. The prevailing animals in the spreading woods of Europe were the royal stag, the great ox, and the bison; the mammoth and the musk ox had gone. The great ox, or aurochs, is now extinct, but it survived in the German forests up to the time of the Roman Empire. It was never domesticated.[42] It stood eleven feet high at the shoulder, as high as an elephant. There were still lions in the Balkan peninsula, and they remained there until about 1000 or 1200 B.C. The lions of Württemberg and South Germany in those days were twice the size of the modern lion. South Russia and Central Asia were thickly wooded then, and there were elephants in Mesopotamia and Syria, and a fauna in Algeria that was tropical African in character.

Hitherto men in Europe had never gone farther north than the Baltic Sea or the English midlands, but now Ireland, the Scandinavian peninsula, and perhaps Great Russia were becoming possible regions for human occupation. There are no Palæolithic remains in Sweden or Norway, nor in Ireland or Scotland. Man, when he entered these countries, was apparently already at the Neolithic stage of social development.

§ 5

Nor is there any convincing evidence of man in America before the end of the Pleistocene.[43] The same relaxation of the climate that permitted the retreat of the reindeer hunters into Russia and Siberia, as the Neolithic tribes advanced, may have allowed them to wander across the land that is now cut by Bering Strait, and so reach the American continent. They spread thence southward, age by age. When they reached South America, they found the giant sloth (the _Megatherium_), the glyptodon, and many other extinct creatures, still flourishing. The glyptodon was a monstrous South American armadillo, and a human skeleton has been found by Roth buried beneath its huge tortoise-like shell.[44]

All the human remains in America, even the earliest, it is to be noted, are of an Amer-Indian character. In America there does not seem to have been any preceding races of sub-men. Man was fully man when he entered America. The old world was the nursery of the sub-races of mankind.

XI

NEOLITHIC MAN IN EUROPE[45]

§ 1. _The Age of Cultivation Begins._ § 2. _Where Did the Neolithic Culture Arise?_ § 3. _Everyday Neolithic Life._ § 4. _How Did Sowing Begin?_ § 5. _Primitive Trade._ § 6. _The Flooding of the Mediterranean Valley._

§ 1

THE Neolithic phase of human affairs began in Europe about 10,000 or 12,000 years ago. But probably men had reached the Neolithic stage elsewhere some thousands of years earlier.[46] Neolithic men came slowly into Europe from the south or south-east as the reindeer and the open steppes gave way to forest and modern European conditions.

The Neolithic stage in culture is characterized by: (1) the presence of polished stone implements, and in particular the stone _axe_, which was perforated so as to be the more effectually fastened to a wooden handle, and which was probably used rather for working wood than in conflict. There are also abundant arrow heads. The fact that some implements are polished does not preclude the presence of great quantities of implements of unpolished stone. But there are differences in the make between even the unpolished tools of the Neolithic and of the Palæolithic Period. (2) The beginning of a sort of agriculture, and the use of plants and seeds. But at first there are abundant evidences that hunting was still of great importance in the Neolithic Age. Neolithic man did not at first sit down to his agriculture. He took snatch crops. He settled later. (3) Pottery and proper cooking. The horse is no longer eaten. (4) Domesticated animals. The dog appears very early. The Neolithic man had domesticated cattle, sheep, goats, and pigs. He was a huntsman turned herdsman of the herds he once hunted.[47] (5) Plaiting and weaving.

These Neolithic people probably “migrated” into Europe, in the same way that the Reindeer Men had migrated before them; that is to say, generation by generation and century by century, as the climate changed, they spread after their accustomed food. They were not “nomads.” Nomadism, like civilization, had still to be developed. At present we are quite unable to estimate how far the Neolithic peoples were new-comers and how far their arts were developed or acquired by the descendants of some of the hunters and fishers of the Later Palæolithic Age.

Whatever our conclusions in that matter, this much we may say with certainty; there is no great break, no further sweeping away of one kind of man and replacement by another kind between the appearance of the Neolithic way of living and our own time. There are invasions, conquests, extensive emigrations and intermixtures, but the races as a whole carry on and continue to adapt themselves to the areas into which they began to settle in the opening of the Neolithic Age. The Neolithic men of Europe were white men ancestral to the modern Europeans. They may have been of a darker complexion than many of their descendants; of that we cannot speak with certainty. But there is no real break in culture from their time onward until we reach the age of coal, steam, and power-driven machinery that began in the eighteenth century.

After a long time gold, the first known of the metals, appears among the bone ornaments with jet and amber. Irish Neolithic remains are particularly rich in gold. Then, perhaps 6000 or 7000 years ago in Europe, Neolithic people began to use copper in certain centres, making out of it implements of much the same pattern as their stone ones. They cast the copper in moulds made to the shape of the stone implements. Possibly they first found native copper and hammered it into shape.[48] Later--we will not venture upon figures--men had found out how to get copper from its ore. Perhaps, as Lord Avebury suggested, they discovered the secret of smelting by the chance putting of lumps of copper ore among the ordinary stones with which they built the fire pits they used for cooking. In China, Hungary, Cornwall, and elsewhere copper ore and tinstone occur in the same veins; it is a very common

association, and so, rather through dirtiness than skill, the ancient smelters, it may be, hit upon the harder and better bronze, which is an alloy of copper and tin.[49] Bronze is not only harder than copper, but the mixture of tin and copper is more fusible and easier to reduce. The so-called “pure-copper” implements usually contain a small proportion of tin, and there are no tin implements known, nor very much evidence to show that early men knew of tin as a separate metal.[50][51] The plant of a prehistoric copper smelter has been found in Spain, and the material of bronze foundries in various localities. The method of smelting revealed by these finds carries out Lord Avebury’s suggestion. In India, where zinc and copper ore occur together, brass (which is an alloy of the two metals) was similarly hit upon.

So slight was the change in fashions and methods produced by the appearance of bronze, that for a long time such bronze axes and so forth as were made were cast in moulds to the shape of the stone implements they were superseding.

[Illustration: Neolithic Implements]

Finally, perhaps as early as 3000 years ago in Europe, and even earlier in Asia Minor, men began to smelt iron. Once smelting was known to men, there is no great marvel in the finding of iron. They smelted iron by blowing up a charcoal fire, and wrought it by heating and hammering. They produced it at first in comparatively small pieces;[52] its appearance worked a gradual revolution in weapons and implements; but it did not suffice to change the general character of men’s surroundings. Much the same daily life that was being led by the more settled Neolithic men 10,000 years ago was being led by peasants in out-of-the-way places all over Europe at the beginning of the eighteenth century.[53]

People talk of the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, and the Iron Age in Europe, but it is misleading to put these ages as if they were of equal importance in history. Much truer is it to say that there was:

(1) An _Early Palæolithic Age_, of vast duration; (2) a _Later Palæolithic Age_, that lasted not a tithe of the time; and (3) the Age of Cultivation, the age of the white men in Europe, which began 10,000 or at most 12,000 years ago, of which the Neolithic Period was the beginning, and which is still going on.

§ 2

We do not know yet the region in which the ancestors of the white and whitish Neolithic peoples worked their way up from the Palæolithic stage of human development. Probably it was somewhere about south-western Asia, or in some region now submerged beneath the Mediterranean Sea or the Indian Ocean, that, while the Neanderthal men still lived their hard lives in the bleak climate of a glaciated Europe, the ancestors of the white men developed the rude arts of _their_ Later Palæolithic period. But they do not seem to have developed the artistic skill of their more northerly kindred, the European Later Palæolithic races. And through the hundred centuries or so while Reindeer Men were living under comparatively unprogressive conditions upon the steppes of France, Germany, and Spain, these more-favoured and progressive people to the south were mastering agriculture, learning to develop their appliances, taming the dog, domesticating cattle, and, as the climate to the north mitigated and the equatorial climate grew more tropical, spreading northward. All these early chapters of our story have yet to be disinterred. They will probably be found in Asia Minor, Persia, Arabia, India, or north Africa, or they lie beneath the Mediterranean waters. Twelve thousand years ago, or thereabouts--we are still too early for anything but the roughest chronology--Neolithic peoples were scattered all over Europe, north Africa, and Asia. They were peoples at about the level of many of the Polynesian islanders of the last century, and they were the most advanced peoples in the world.

§ 3

It will be of interest here to give a brief account of the life of the European Neolithic people before the appearance of metals. We get our light upon that life from various sources. They scattered their refuse about, and in some places (_e.g._ on the Danish coast) it accumulated in great heaps, known as the kitchen middens. They buried some of their people, but not the common herd, with great care and distinction, and made huge heaps of earth over their sepulchres; these heaps are the barrows or dolmens which contribute a feature to the European, Indian, and American scenery in many districts to this day. In connection with these mounds, or independently of them, they set up great stones (megaliths), either singly or in groups, of which Stonehenge in Wiltshire and Carnac in Brittany are among the best-known examples. In various places their villages are still traceable.

One fruitful source of knowledge about Neolithic life comes from Switzerland, and was first revealed by the very dry winter of 1854, when the water level of one of the lakes, sinking to an unheard-of lowness, revealed the foundations of prehistoric pile dwellings of

the Neolithic and early Bronze Ages, built out over the water after the fashion of similar homes that exist to-day in Celebes and elsewhere. Not only were the timbers of those ancient platforms preserved, but a great multitude of wooden, bone, stone, and earthenware utensils and ornaments, remains of food and the like, were found in the peaty accumulations below them. Even pieces of net and garments have been recovered. Similar lake dwellings existed in Scotland, Ireland, and elsewhere--there are well-known remains at Glastonbury in Somersetshire; in Ireland lake dwellings were inhabited from prehistoric times up to the days when O'Neil of Tyrone was fighting against the English before the plantation of Scotch colonists to replace the Irish in Ulster in the reign of James I of England. These lake villages had considerable defensive value, and there was a sanitary advantage in living over flowing water.

Probably these Neolithic Swiss pile dwellings did not shelter the largest communities that existed in those days. They were the homes of small patriarchal groups. Elsewhere upon fertile plains and in more open country there were probably already much larger assemblies of homes than in those mountain valleys. There are traces of such a large community of families in Wiltshire in England, for example; the remains of the stone circle of Avebury near Silbury mound were once the "finest megalithic ruin in Europe."[54] It consisted of two circles of stones surrounded by a larger circle and a ditch, and covering all together twenty-eight and a half acres. From it two avenues of stones, each a mile and a half long, ran west and south on either side of Silbury Hill. Silbury Hill is the largest prehistoric artificial mound in England. The dimensions of this centre of a faith and a social life now forgotten altogether by men indicate the concerted efforts and interests of a very large number of people, widely scattered though they may have been over the west and south and centre of England. Possibly they assembled at some particular season of the year in a primitive sort of fair. The whole community "lent a hand" in building the mounds and hauling the stones. The Swiss pile-dwellers, on the contrary, seem to have lived in practically self-contained villages.

[Illustration: Pottery from Lake Dwellings

J.F.H.

(after a drawing in Déchelette's "Manuel d'Archéologie")]

[Illustration: Restoration of a Lake dwelling]

These lake-village people were considerably more advanced in methods and knowledge, and probably much later in time than the early Neolithic people who accumulated the shell mounds, known as kitchen middens, on the Danish and Scotch coasts. These kitchen midden folk may have been as early as 10,000 B.C. or earlier; the lake dwellings were probably occupied continuously from 5000 or 4000 B.C. down almost to historic times. Those early kitchen-midden people were among the most barbaric of Neolithic peoples, their stone axes were rough, and they had no domesticated animal except the dog. The lake-dwellers, on the other hand, had, in addition to the dog, which was of a medium-sized breed, oxen, goats, and sheep. Later on, as they were approaching the Bronze Age, they got swine. The remains of cattle and goats prevail in their débris, and, having regard to the climate and country about them, it seems probable that these beasts were sheltered in the buildings upon the piles in winter, and that fodder was stored for them. Probably the beasts lived in the same houses with the people, as the men and beasts do now in Swiss chalets. The people in the houses possibly milked the cows and goats, and milk perhaps played as important a part in their economy as it does in that of the mountain Swiss of to-day. But of that we are not sure at present. Milk is not a natural food for adults; it must have seemed queer stuff to take at first; and it may have been only after much breeding that a continuous supply of milk was secured from cows and goats. Some people think that the use of milk, cheese, butter, and other milk products came later into human life when men became nomadic. The writer is, however, disposed to give the Neolithic men credit for having discovered milking. The milk, if they did use it (and, no doubt, in that case sour curdled milk also, but not well-made cheese and butter), they must have kept in earthenware pots, for they had pottery, though it was roughly hand-made pottery and not the shapely product of the potter's wheel. They eked out this food supply by hunting. They killed and ate red deer and roe deer, bison and wild boar. And they ate the fox, a rather high-flavoured meat, and not what any one would eat in a world of plenty. Oddly enough, they do not seem to have eaten the hare, although it was available as food. They are supposed to have avoided eating it, as some savages are said to avoid eating it to this day, because they feared that the flesh of so timid a creature might make them, by a sort of infection, cowardly.[55]

Of their agricultural methods we know very little. No ploughs and no hoes have been found. They were of wood and have perished. Neolithic men cultivated and ate wheat, barley, and millet, but they knew nothing of oats or rye. Their grain they roasted, ground between stones and stored in pots, to be eaten when needed. And they made exceedingly solid and heavy bread, because round flat slabs of it have been got out of these deposits. Apparently they had no yeast. If they had no yeast, then they had no fermented

drink. One sort of barley that they had is the sort that was cultivated by the ancient Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians, and they also had an Egyptian variety of wheat, showing that their ancestors had brought or derived this cultivation from the south-east. The centre of diffusion of wheat was somewhere in the eastern Mediterranean region. A wild form is still found in the neighbourhood of Mt. Hermon (see footnote to Ch. XVI, § 1). When the lake dwellers sowed their little patches of wheat in Switzerland, they were already following the immemorial practice of mankind. The seed must have been brought age by age from that distant centre of diffusion. In the ancestral lands of the south-east men had already been sowing wheat perhaps for thousands of years.[56] Those lake dwellers also ate peas, and crab-apples--the only apples that then existed in the world. Cultivation and selection had not yet produced the apple of to-day.

They dressed chiefly in skins, but they also made a rough cloth of flax. Fragments of that flaxen cloth have been discovered. Their nets were made of flax; they had as yet no knowledge of hemp and hempen rope. With the coming of bronze, their pins and ornaments increased in number. There is reason to believe they set great store upon their hair, wearing it in large shocks with pins of bone and afterwards of metal. To judge from the absence of realistic carvings or engravings or paintings, they either did not decorate their garments or decorated them with plaids, spots, interlacing designs, or similar conventional ornament. Before the coming of bronze there is no evidence of stools or tables; the Neolithic people probably squatted on their clay floors. There were no cats in these lake dwellings; no mice or rats had yet adapted themselves to human dwellings; the cluck of the hen was not as yet added to the sounds of human life, nor the domestic egg to its diet.[57]

The chief tool and weapon of Neolithic man was his axe; his next the bow and arrow. His arrow heads were of flint, beautifully made, and he lashed them tightly to their shafts. Probably he prepared the ground for his sowing with a pole, or a pole upon which he had stuck a stag’s horn. Fish he hooked or harpooned. These implements no doubt stood about in the interior of the house, from the walls of which hung his fowling-nets. On the floor, which was of clay or trodden cow-dung (after the fashion of hut floors in India to-day), stood pots and jars and woven baskets containing grain, milk, and such-like food. Some of the pots and pans hung by rope loops to the walls. At one end of the room, and helping to keep it warm in winter by their animal heat, stabled the beasts. The children took the cows and goats out to graze, and brought them in at night before the wolves and bears came prowling.

[Illustration: _Hut urns, the first probably representing a lake-dwelling.... After Lubbock._]

Since Neolithic man had the bow, he probably also had stringed instruments, for the rhythmic twanging of a bow-string seems almost inevitably to lead to that. He also had earthenware drums across which skins were stretched; perhaps also he made drums by stretching skins over hollow tree stems.[58] We do not know when man began to sing, but evidently he was making music, and since he had words, songs were no doubt being made. To begin with, perhaps, he just let his voice loose as one may hear Italian peasants now behind their ploughs singing songs without words. After dark in the winter he sat in his house and talked and sang and made implements by touch rather than sight. His lighting must have been poor, and chiefly firelight, but there was probably always some fire in the village, summer or winter. Fire was too troublesome to make for men to be willing to let it out readily. Sometimes a great disaster happened to those pile villages, the fire got free, and they were burnt out. The Swiss deposits contain clear evidence of such catastrophes.

All this we gather from the remains of the Swiss pile dwellings, and such was the character of the human life that spread over Europe, coming from the south and from the east with the forests as, 10,000 or 12,000 years ago, the reindeer and the Reindeer Men passed away. It is evident that we have here a way of life already separated by a great gap of thousands of years of invention from its original Palæolithic stage. The steps by which it rose from that condition we can only guess at. From being a hunter hovering upon the outskirts of flocks and herds of wild cattle and sheep, and from being a co-hunter with the dog, man by insensible degrees may have developed a sense of proprietorship in the beasts and struck up a friendship with his canine competitor. He learnt to turn the cattle when they wandered too far; he brought his better brain to bear to guide them to fresh pasture. He hemmed the beasts into valleys and enclosures where he could be sure to find them again. He fed them when they starved, and so slowly he tamed them. Perhaps his agriculture began with the storage of fodder. He reaped, no doubt, before he sowed. The Palæolithic ancestor away in that unknown land of origin to the south-east first supplemented the precarious meat supply of the hunter by eating roots and fruits and wild grains. Man storing graminiferous grasses for his cattle might easily come to beat out the grain for himself.

§ 4

How did man learn to sow in order that he might reap?

We may hesitate here to guess at the answer to that question. But a very great deal has been made of the fact that wherever sowing occurs among primitive people in any part of the world, it is accompanied by a human sacrifice or by some ceremony which may be interpreted as the mitigation and vestige of an ancient sacrificial custom. This is the theme of Sir J. G. Frazer's _Golden Bough_. From this it has been supposed that the first sowings were in connection with the burial of a human being, either through wild grain being put with the dead body as food or through the scattering of grain over the body. It may be argued that there is only one reason why man should have disturbed the surface of the earth before he took to agriculture, and that was to bury his dead; and in order to bury a dead body and make a mound over it, it was probably necessary for him to disturb the surface over a considerable area. Neolithic man's chief apparatus for mound-making consisted of picks of deer's horn and shovels of their shoulder-blades, and with this he would have found great difficulty in making a deep excavation. Nor do we find such excavations beside the barrows. Instead of going down into tough sub-soil, the mound-makers probably scraped up some of the surface soil and carried it to the mound. All this seems probable, and it gives just that wide area of bared and turned-over earth upon which an eared grass, such as barley, millet, or primitive wheat, might have seeded and grown. Moreover, the mound-makers, being busy with the mound, would not have time to hunt meat, and if they were accustomed to store and eat wild grain, they would be likely to scatter grain, and the grain would be blown by the wind out of their rude vessels over the area they were disturbing. And if they were bringing up seed in any quantity in baskets and pots to bury with the corpse, some of it might easily blow and be scattered over the fresh earth. Returning later to the region of the mound, they would discover an exceptionally vigorous growth of food grain, and it would be a natural thing to associate it with the buried person, and regard it as a consequence of his death and burial. He had given them back the grain they gave him increased a hundredfold.

At any rate, there is apparently all over the world a traceable association in ancient ceremonial and in the minds of barbaric people between the death and burial of a person and the ploughing and sowing of grain. From this it is assumed that there was once a world-wide persuasion that it was necessary that some one should be buried before a crop could be sown, and that out of this persuasion arose a practice and tradition of human sacrifice at seedtime, which has produced profound effects in the religious development of the race. There may have been some idea of refreshing the earth by a blood draught or revivifying it with the life of the sacrificed person. We state these considerations here merely as suggestions that have been made of the way in which the association of seedtime and sacrifice arose. They are, at the best, speculations; they have a considerable vogue at the present time, and we have to note them, but we have neither the space nor the time here to examine them at length. The valuable accumulations of suggestions due to the industry and ingenuity of Sir J. G. Frazer still await a thorough critical examination, and to his works the reader must go for the indefatigable expansion of this idea.

§ 5

All these early beginnings must have taken place far back in time, and in regions of the world that have still to be effectively explored by the archæologists. They were probably going on in Asia or Africa, in what is now the bed of the Mediterranean, or in the region of the Indian Ocean, while the Reindeer man was developing his art in Europe. The Neolithic men who drifted over Europe and western Asia 12,000 or 10,000 years ago were long past these beginnings; they were already close, a few thousand years, to the dawn of written tradition and the remembered history of mankind. Without any very great shock or break, bronze came at last into human life, giving a great advantage in warfare to those tribes who first obtained it. Written history had already begun before weapons of iron came into Europe to supersede bronze.

Already in those days a sort of primitive trade had sprung up. Bronze and bronze weapons, and such rare and hard stones as jade, gold because of its plastic and ornamental possibilities, and skins and flax-net and cloth, were being swapped and stolen and passed from hand to hand over great stretches of country. Salt also was probably being traded. On a meat dietary men can live without salt, but grain-consuming people need it just as herbivorous animals need it. Hopf says that bitter tribal wars have been carried on by the desert tribes of the Soudan in recent years for the possession of the salt deposits between Fezzan and Murzuk. To begin with, barter, blackmail, tribute, and robbery by violence passed into each other by insensible degrees. Men got what they wanted by such means as they could.[59]

§ 6

So far we have been telling of a history without events, a history of ages and periods and stages in development. But before we conclude this portion of the human story, we must record what was probably an event of primary importance and at first perhaps of tragic importance to developing mankind, and that was the breaking in of the Atlantic waters to the great Mediterranean valley.

The reader must keep in mind that we are endeavouring to give him plain statements that he can take hold of comfortably. But both in the matter of our time charts and the three maps we have given of prehistoric geography there is necessarily much speculative matter. We have dated the last Glacial Age and the appearance of the true men as about 40,000 or 35,000 years ago. Please bear that “about” in mind. The truth may be 60,000 or 20,000. But it is no good saying “a very long time” or “ages” ago, because then the reader will not know whether we mean centuries or millions of years. And similarly in these maps we give, they represent not the truth, but something like the truth. The outline of the land was “some such outline.” There were such seas and such land masses. But both Mr. Horrabin, who has drawn these maps, and I, who have incited him to do so, have preferred to err on the timid side.[60] We are not geologists enough to launch out into original research in these matters, and so we have stuck to the 40-fathom line and the recent deposits as our guides for our post-glacial map and for the map of 12,000 to 10,000 B.C. But in one matter we have gone beyond these guides. It is practically certain that at the end of the last Glacial Age the Mediterranean was a couple of land-locked sea basins, not connected--or only connected by a torrential overflow river. The eastern basin was the fresher; it was fed by the Nile, the “Adriatic” river, the “Red-Sea” river, and perhaps by a river that poured down amidst the mountains that are now the Greek Archipelago from the very much bigger Sea of Central Asia that then existed. Almost certainly human beings, and possibly even Neolithic men, wandered over that now lost Mediterranean valley.

The reasons for believing this are very good and plain. To this day the Mediterranean is a sea of evaporation. The rivers that flow into it do not make up for the evaporation from its surface. There is a constant current of water pouring into the Mediterranean from the Atlantic, and another current streaming in from the Bosphorus and Black Sea. For the Black Sea gets more water than it needs from the big rivers that flow into it; it is an overflowing sea, while the Mediterranean is a thirsty sea. From which it must be plain that when the Mediterranean was cut off both from the Atlantic Ocean and the Black Sea it must have been a shrinking sea with its waters sinking to a much lower level than those of the ocean outside. This is the case of the Caspian Sea to-day. Still more so is it the case with the Dead Sea.

But if this reasoning is sound, then where to-day roll the blue waters of the Mediterranean there must once have been great areas of land, and land with a very agreeable climate. This was probably the case during the last Glacial Age, and we do not know how near it was to our time when the change occurred that brought back the ocean waters into the Mediterranean basin. Certainly there must have been Grimaldi people, and perhaps even Azilian and Neolithic people going about in the valleys and forests of these regions that are now submerged. The Neolithic Dark Whites, the people of the Mediterranean race, may have gone far towards the beginnings of settlement and civilization in that great lost Mediterranean Valley.

Mr. W. B. Wright[61] gives us some very stimulating suggestions here. He suggests that in the Mediterranean basin there were two lakes, “one a fresh-water lake, in the eastern depression, which drained into the other in the western depression. It is interesting to think what must have happened when the ocean level rose once more as a result of the dissipation of the ice-sheets, and its waters began to pour over into the Mediterranean area. The inflow, small at first, must have ultimately increased to enormous dimensions, as the channel was slowly lowered by erosion and the ocean level slowly rose. If there were any unconsolidated materials on the sill of the Strait, the result must have been a genuine debacle, and if we consider the length of time which even an enormous torrent would take to fill such a basin as that of the Mediterranean, we must conclude that this result was likely to have been attained in any case. Now, this may seem all the wildest speculation, but it is not entirely so, for if we examine a submarine contour map of the Straits of Gibraltar, we find there is an enormous valley running up from the Mediterranean deep, right through the Straits, and trenching some distance out on to the Atlantic shelf. This valley or gorge is probably the work of the inflowing waters of the ocean at the termination of the period of interior drainage.”

This refilling of the Mediterranean, which by the rough chronology we are employing in this book may have happened somewhen between 30,000 and 10,000 B.C., must have been one of the greatest single events in the pre-history of our race. If the later date is the truer, then, as the reader will see plainly enough after reading the next two chapters, the crude beginnings of civilization, the first lake dwellings and the first cultivation, were probably round that eastern Levantine Lake into which there flowed not only the Nile, but the two great rivers that are now the Adriatic and the Red Sea. Suddenly the ocean waters began to break through over the westward hills and to pour in upon these primitive peoples--the lake that had been their home and friend became their enemy; its waters rose and never abated; their settlements were submerged; the waters pursued them in their flight. Day by day and year by year the waters spread up the valleys and drove mankind before them. Many must have been surrounded and caught by the continually rising salt flood. It knew no check; it came faster and faster; it rose over the treetops, over the hills, until it had filled the whole basin of the present Mediterranean and until it lapped the mountain cliffs of Arabia and Africa. Far away, long before the dawn of history, this catastrophe occurred.

XII

EARLY THOUGHT[62]

§ 1. _Primitive Philosophy._ § 2. _The Old Man in Religion._ § 3. _Fear and Hope in Religion._ § 4. _Stars and Seasons._ § 5. _Story-telling and Myth-making._ § 6. _Complex Origins of Religion._

§ 1

Before we go on to tell how 6000 or 7000 years ago men began to gather into the first towns and to develop something more than the loose-knit tribes that had hitherto been their highest political association, something must be said about the things that were going on inside these brains of which we have traced the growth and development through a period of 500,000 years from the Pithecanthropus stage.

What was man thinking about himself and about the world in those remote days?

At first he thought very little about anything but immediate things. At first he was busy thinking such things as: “Here is a bear; what shall I do?” Or “There is a squirrel; how can I get it?” Until language had developed to some extent there could have been little thinking beyond the range of actual experience, for language is the instrument of thought as book-keeping is the instrument of business. It records and fixes and enables thought to get on to more and more complex ideas. It is the hand of the mind to hold and keep. Primordial man, before he could talk, probably saw very vividly, mimicked very cleverly, gestured, laughed, danced, and lived, without much speculation about whence he came or why he lived. He feared the dark, no doubt, and thunderstorms and big animals and queer things and whatever he dreamt about, and no doubt he did things to propitiate what he feared or to change his luck and please the imaginary powers in rock and beast and river. He made no clear distinction between animate and inanimate things; if a stick hurt him, he kicked it; if the river foamed and flooded, he thought it was hostile. His thought was probably very much at the level of a bright little contemporary boy of four or five. He had the same subtle unreasonableness of transition and the same limitations. But since he had little or no speech he would do little to pass on the fancies that came to him, and develop any tradition or concerted acts about them.

The drawings even of Late Palæolithic man do not suggest that he paid any attention to sun or moon or stars or trees. He was preoccupied only with animals and men. Probably he took day and night, sun and stars, trees and mountains, as being in the nature of things--as a child takes its meal times and its nursery staircase for granted. So far as we can judge, he drew no fantasies, no ghosts or anything of that sort. The Reindeer Men’s drawings are fearless familiar things, with no hint about them of any religious or occult feelings. There is scarcely anything that we can suppose to be a religious or mystical symbol at all in his productions. No doubt he had a certain amount of what is called _fetishism_ in his life; he did things we should now think unreasonable to produce desired ends, for that is all fetishism amounts to; it is only incorrect science based on guess-work or false analogy, and entirely different in its nature from religion. No doubt he was excited by his dreams, and his dreams mixed up at times in his mind with his waking impressions and puzzled him. Since he buried his dead, and since even the later Neanderthal men seem to have buried their dead, and apparently with food and weapons, it has been argued that he had a belief in a future life. But it is just as reasonable to suppose that early men buried their dead with food and weapons because they doubted if they were dead, which is not the same thing as believing them to have immortal spirits, and that their belief in their continuing vitality was reinforced by dreams of the departed. They may have ascribed a sort of were-wolf existence to the dead, and wished to propitiate them.

The Reindeer man, we feel, was too intelligent and too like ourselves not to have had some speech, but quite probably it was not very serviceable for anything beyond direct statement or matter of fact narrative. He lived in a larger community than the Neanderthaler, but how large we do not know. Except when game is swarming, hunting communities must not keep together in large bodies or they will starve. The Indians who depend upon the caribou in Labrador must be living under circumstances rather like those of the Reindeer men. They scatter in small family groups, as the caribou scatter in search of food; but when the deer collect for the seasonal migration, the Indians also collect. That is the time for trade and feasts and marriages. The simplest American Indian is 10,000 years more sophisticated than the Reindeer man, but probably that sort of gathering and dispersal was also the way of Reindeer men. At Solutré in France there are traces of a great camping and feasting-place. There was no doubt an exchange of news there, but one may doubt if there was anything like an exchange of ideas. One sees no scope in such a life for theology or philosophy or superstition or speculation. Fears, yes; but unsystematic fears; fancies and freaks of the imagination, but personal and transitory freaks and fancies.

Perhaps there was a certain power of suggestion in these encounters. A fear really felt needs few words for its transmission; a value set upon something may be very simply conveyed.

In these questions of primitive thought and religion, we must remember that the lowly and savage peoples of to-day probably throw very little light on the mental state of men before the days of fully developed language. Primordial man could have had little or no tradition before the development of speech. All savage and primitive peoples of to-day, on the contrary, are soaked in tradition--the tradition of thousands of generations. They may have weapons like their remote ancestors and methods like them, but what were slight and shallow impressions on the minds of their predecessors are now deep and intricate grooves worn throughout the intervening centuries generation by generation.

§ 2

Certain very fundamental things there may have been in men's minds long before the coming of speech. Chief among these must have been fear of the Old Man of the tribe. The young of the primitive squatting-place grew up under that fear. Objects associated with him were probably forbidden. Every one was forbidden to touch his spear or to sit in his place, just as to-day little boys must not touch father's pipe or sit in his chair. He was probably the master of all the women. The youths of the little community had to remember that. The idea of _something forbidden_, the idea of things being, as it is called, _tabu_, not to be touched, not to be looked at, may thus have got well into the human mind at a very early stage indeed. J. J. Atkinson, in an ingenious analysis of these primitive tabus which are found among savage peoples all over the world, the tabus that separate brother and sister, the tabus that make a man run and hide from his stepmother, traces them to such a fundamental cause as this.[63] Only by respecting this primal law could the young male hope to escape the Old Man's wrath. And the Old Man must have been an actor in many a primordial nightmare. A disposition to propitiate him even after he was dead is quite understandable. One was not sure that he _was_ dead. He might only be asleep or shamming. Long after an Old Man was dead, when there was nothing to represent him but a mound and a megalith, the women would convey to their children how awful and wonderful he was. And being still a terror to his own little tribe, it was easy to go on to hoping that he would be a terror to other and hostile people. In his life he had fought for his tribe, even if he had bullied it. Why not when he was dead? One sees that the Old Man idea was an idea very natural to the primitive mind and capable of great development.[64]

§ 3

Another idea probably arose early out of the mysterious visitation of infectious diseases, and that was the idea of uncleanness and of being accurst. From that, too, there may have come an idea of avoiding particular places and persons, and persons in particular phases of health. Here was the root of another set of tabus. Then man, from the very dawn of his mental life, may have had a feeling of the sinister about places and things. Animals, who dread traps, have that feeling. A tiger will abandon its usual jungle route at the sight of a few threads of cotton.[65] Like most young animals, young human beings are easily made fearful of this or that by their nurses and seniors. Here is another set of ideas, ideas of repulsion and avoidance, that sprang up almost inevitably in men.

As soon as speech began to develop, it must have got to work upon such fundamental feelings and begun to systematize them, and keep them in mind. By talking together men would reinforce each other's fears, and establish a common tradition of tabus of things forbidden and of things unclean. With the idea of uncleanness would come ideas of cleansing and of removing a curse. The cleansing would be conducted through the advice and with the aid of wise old men or wise old women, and in such cleansing would lie the germ of the earliest priestcraft and witchcraft.

Speech from the first would be a powerful supplement to the merely imitative education and to the education of cuffs and blows conducted by a speechless parent. Mothers would tell their young and scold their young. As speech developed, men would find they had experiences and persuasions that gave them or seemed to give them power. They would make secrets of these things. There is a double streak in the human mind, a streak of cunning secretiveness and a streak perhaps of later origin that makes us all anxious to tell and astonish and impress each other. Many people make secrets in order to have secrets to tell. These secrets of early men they would convey to younger, more impressionable people, more or less honestly and impressively in some process of initiation. Moreover, the pedagogic spirit overflows in the human mind; most people like "telling other people not to." Extensive arbitrary prohibitions for the boys, for the girls, for the women, also probably came very early into human history.

Then the idea of the sinister has for its correlative the idea of the propitious, and from that to the idea of making things propitious by ceremonies is an easy step.[66]

§ 4

Out of such ideas and a jumble of kindred ones grew the first quasi-religious elements in human life. With every development of speech it became possible to intensify and develop the tradition of tabus and restraints and ceremonies. There is not a savage or barbaric race to-day that is not held in a net of such tradition. And with the coming of the primitive herdsman there would be a considerable broadening out of all this sort of practice. Things hitherto unheeded would be found of importance in human affairs. Neolithic man was nomadic in a different spirit from the mere daylight drift after food of the primordial hunter. He was a herdsman, upon whose mind a sense of direction and the lie of the land had been forced. He watched his flock by night as well as by day. The sun by day and presently the stars by night helped to guide his migrations; he began to find after many ages that the stars are steadier guides than the sun. He would begin to note particular stars and star groups, and to distinguish any individual thing was, for primitive man, to believe it individualized and personal. He would begin to think of the chief stars as persons, very shining and dignified and trustworthy persons looking at him like bright eyes in the night. His primitive tillage strengthened his sense of the seasons. Particular stars ruled his heavens when seedtime was due. The beginnings of agriculture were in the sub-tropical zone, or even nearer the equator, where stars of the first magnitude shine with a splendour unknown in more temperate latitudes.

And Neolithic man was counting, and falling under the spell of numbers. There are savage languages that have no word for any number above five. Some peoples cannot go above two. But Neolithic man in the lands of his origin in Asia and Africa even more than in Europe was already counting his accumulating possessions. He was beginning to use tallies, and wondering at the triangularity of three and the squareness of four, and why some quantities like twelve were easy to divide in all sorts of ways, and others, like thirteen, impossible. Twelve became a noble, generous, and familiar number to him, and thirteen rather an outcast and disreputable one.

[Illustration: A CARVED STATUE (“MENHIR”) OF THE NEOLITHIC PERIOD--A CONTRAST TO THE FREEDOM AND VIGOUR OF PALÆOLITHIC ART.]

Probably man began reckoning time by the clock of the full and new moons. Moonlight is an important thing to herdsmen who no longer merely hunt their herds, but watch and guard them. Moonlight, too, was perhaps his time for love-making, as indeed it may have been for primordial man and the ground ape ancestor before him. But from the phases of the moon, as his tillage increased, man’s attitude would go on to the greater cycle of the seasons. Primordial man probably only drifted before the winter as the days grew cold. Neolithic man knew surely that the winter would come, and stored his fodder and presently his grain. He had to fix a seedtime, a propitious seedtime, or his sowing was a failure. The earliest recorded reckoning is by moons and by generations of men. The former seems to be the case in the Book of Genesis, where, if one reads the great ages of the patriarchs who lived before the flood as lunar months instead of years, Methusaleh and the others are reduced to a credible length of life. But with agriculture began the difficult task of squaring the lunar month with the solar year; a task which has left its scars on our calendar to-day. Easter shifts uneasily from year to year, to the great discomfort of holiday-makers; it is now inconveniently early and now late in the season because of this ancient reference of time to the moon.

And when men began to move with set intention from place to place with their animal and other possessions, then they would begin to develop the idea of other places in which they were not, and to think of what might be in those other places. And in any valley where they lingered for a time, they would, remembering how they got there, ask, “How did this or that other thing get here?” They would begin to wonder what was beyond the mountains, and where the sun went when it set, and what was above the clouds.

§ 5

The capacity for telling things increased with their vocabulary. The simple individual fancies, the unsystematic fetish tricks and fundamental tabus of Palæolithic man began to be handed on and made into a more consistent system. Men began to tell stories about themselves, about the tribe, about its tabus and why they had to be, about the world and the why for the world. A tribal mind came into existence, a tradition. Palæolithic man was certainly more of a free individualist, more of an artist, as well as more of a savage, than Neolithic man. Neolithic man was coming under prescription; he could be trained from his youth and told to do things and not to do things; he was not so free to form independent ideas of his own about things. He had thoughts given to him; he was under a new power of suggestion. And to have more words and to attend more to words is not simply to increase mental power;

words themselves are powerful things and dangerous things. Palæolithic man's words, perhaps, were chiefly just names. He used them for what they were. But Neolithic man was thinking about these words, he was thinking about a number of things with a great deal of verbal confusion, and getting to some odd conclusions. In speech he had woven a net to bind his race together, but also it was a net about his feet. Man was binding himself into new and larger and more efficient combinations indeed, but at a price. One of the most notable things about the Neolithic Age is the total absence of that free direct artistic impulse which was the supreme quality of later Palæolithic man. We find much industry, much skill, polished implements, pottery with conventional designs, co-operation upon all sorts of things, but no evidence of personal creativeness.[67] Self-suppression is beginning for men. Man has entered upon the long and tortuous and difficult path towards a life for the common good, with all its sacrifice of personal impulse, which he is still treading to-day.

Certain things appear in the mythology of mankind again and again. Neolithic man was enormously impressed by serpents--and he no longer took the sun for granted. Nearly everywhere that Neolithic culture went, there went a disposition to associate the sun and the serpent in decoration and worship. This primitive serpent worship spread ultimately far beyond the regions where the snake is of serious practical importance in human life.

§ 6

With the beginnings of agriculture a fresh set of ideas arose in men's minds. We have already indicated how easily and naturally men may have come to associate the idea of sowing with a burial. Sir J. G. Frazer has pursued the development of this association in the human mind, linking up with it the conception of special sacrificial persons who are killed at seedtime, the conception of a specially purified class of people to kill these sacrifices, the first priests, and the conception of a _sacrament_, a ceremonial feast in which the tribe eats portions of the body of the victim in order to share in the sacrificial benefits.

Out of all these factors, out of the Old Man tradition, out of the desire to escape infection and uncleanness, out of the desire for power and success through magic, out of the sacrificial tradition of seedtime, and out of a number of like beliefs and mental experiments and misconceptions, a complex something was growing up in the lives of men which was beginning to bind them together mentally and emotionally in a common life and action. This something we may call _religion_ (Lat. _religare_, to bind[68]). It was not a simple or logical something, it was a tangle of ideas about commanding beings and spirits, about gods, about all sorts of "musts" and "must-nots." Like all other human matters, religion has grown. It must be clear from what has gone before that primitive man--much less his ancestral apes and his ancestral Mesozoic mammals--could have had no idea of God or Religion; only very slowly did his brain and his powers of comprehension become capable of such general conceptions. Religion is something that has grown up with and through human association, and God has been and is still being discovered by man.

[Illustration: Bronze Age Implements

(drawn to differing scales)]

This book is not a theological book, and it is not for us to embark upon theological discussion; but it is a part, a necessary and central part, of the history of man to describe the dawn and development of his religious ideas and their influence upon his activities. All these factors we have noted must have contributed to this development, and various writers have laid most stress upon one or other of them. Sir J. G. Frazer we have already noted as the leading student of the derivation of sacraments from magic sacrifices. Grant Allen, in his _Evolution of the Idea of God_, laid stress chiefly on the posthumous worship of the "Old Man." Sir E. B. Tylor (_Primitive Culture_) gave his attention mainly to the disposition of primitive man to ascribe a soul to every object animate and inanimate. Mr. A. E. Crawley, in _The Tree of Life_, has called attention to other centres of impulse and emotion, and particularly to sex as a source of deep excitement. The thing we have to bear in mind is that Neolithic man was still mentally undeveloped, he could be confused and illogical to a degree quite impossible to an educated modern person. Conflicting and contradictory ideas could lie in his mind without challenging one another; now one thing ruled his thoughts intensely and vividly and now another; his fears, his acts, were still disconnected as children's are.

[Illustration: TIME DIAGRAM SHOWING THE GENERAL DURATION OF THE NEOLITHIC PERIOD IN WHICH EARLY THOUGHT DEVELOPED.]

Confusedly under the stimulus of the need and possibility of co-operation and a combined life, Neolithic mankind was feeling out for guidance and knowledge. Men were becoming aware that personally they needed protection and direction, cleansing from impurity, power beyond their own strength. Confusedly in response to that demand, bold men, wise men, shrewd and cunning men were

arising to become magicians, priests, chiefs, and kings. They are not to be thought of as cheats or usurpers of power, nor the rest of mankind as their dupes. All men are mixed in their motives; a hundred things move men to seek ascendancy over other men, but not all such motives are base or bad. The magicians usually believed more or less in their own magic, the priests in their ceremonies, the chiefs in their right. The history of mankind henceforth is a history of more or less blind endeavours to conceive a common purpose in relation to which all men may live happily, and to create and develop a common consciousness and a common stock of knowledge which may serve and illuminate that purpose. In a vast variety of forms this appearance of kings and priests and magic men was happening all over the world under Neolithic conditions. Everywhere mankind was seeking where knowledge and mastery and magic power might reside; everywhere individual men were willing, honestly or dishonestly, to rule, to direct, or to be the magic beings who would reconcile the confusions of the community.

In many ways the simplicity, directness, and detachment of a later Palæolithic rock-painter appeal more to modern sympathies than does the state of mind of these Neolithic men, full of the fear of some ancient Old Man who had developed into a tribal God, obsessed by ideas of sacrificial propitiation and magic murder. No doubt the reindeer hunter was a ruthless hunter and a combative and passionate creature, but he killed for reasons we can still understand; Neolithic man, under the sway of talk and a confused thought process, killed on theory, he killed for monstrous and now incredible ideas, he killed those he loved through fear and under direction. Those Neolithic men not only made human sacrifices at seedtime; there is every reason to suppose they sacrificed wives and slaves at the burial of their chieftains; they killed men, women, and children whenever they were under adversity and thought the gods were athirst. They practised infanticide.[69] All these things passed on into the Bronze Age.

Hitherto a social consciousness had been asleep and not even dreaming in human history. Before it awakened it produced nightmares.

Away beyond the dawn of history, 3000 or 4000 years ago, one thinks of the Wiltshire uplands in the twilight of a midsummer day's morning. The torches pale in the growing light. One has a dim apprehension of a procession through the avenue of stone, of priests, perhaps fantastically dressed with skins and horns and horrible painted masks--not the robed and bearded dignitaries our artists represent the Druids to have been--of chiefs in skins adorned with necklaces of teeth and bearing spears and axes, their great heads of hair held up with pins of bone, of women in skins or flaxen robes, of a great peering crowd of shock-headed men and naked children. They have assembled from many distant places; the ground between the avenues and Silbury Hill is dotted with their encampments. A certain festive cheerfulness prevails. And amidst the throng march the appointed human victims, submissive, helpless, staring towards the distant smoking altar at which they are to die--that the harvests may be good and the tribe increase.... To that had life progressed 3000 or 4000 years ago from its starting-place in the slime of the tidal beaches.

XIII

THE RACES OF MANKIND

§1. Is Mankind Still Differentiating? §2. The Main Races of Mankind. §3. Was There an Alpine Race? §4. The Brunet Peoples. §5. How Existing Races may be Related to Each Other.

§ 1

It is necessary now to discuss plainly what is meant by a phrase, used often very carelessly, "The Races of Mankind."

It must be evident from what has already been explained in Chapter III that man, so widely spread and subjected therefore to great differences of climate, consuming very different food in different regions, attacked by different enemies, must always have been undergoing considerable local modification and differentiation. Man, like every other species of living thing, has constantly been tending to differentiate into several species; wherever a body of men has been cut off, in islands or oceans or by deserts or mountains, from the rest of humanity, it must have begun very soon to develop special characteristics, specially adapted to the local conditions. But, on the other hand, man is usually a wandering and enterprising animal, for whom there exist few insurmountable barriers. Men imitate men, fight and conquer them, interbreed, one people with another. Concurrently for thousands of years there have been two sets of forces at work, one tending to separate men into a multitude of local varieties, and another to remix and blend these varieties together before a separate species has been established.

These two sets of forces may have fluctuated in this relative effect in the past. Palæolithic man, for instance, may have been more of a wanderer, he may have drifted about over a much greater area, than later Neolithic man; he was less fixed to any sort of home

or lair, he was tied by fewer possessions. Being a hunter, he was obliged to follow the migrations of his ordinary quarry. A few bad seasons may have shifted him hundreds of miles. He may therefore have mixed very widely and developed few varieties over the greater part of the world.

The appearance of agriculture tended to tie those communities of mankind that took it up to the region in which it was most conveniently carried on, and so to favour differentiation. Mixing or differentiation is not dependent upon a higher or lower stage of civilization; many savage tribes wander now for hundreds of miles; many English villagers in the eighteenth century, on the other hand, had never been more than eight or ten miles from their villages, neither they nor their fathers nor grandfathers before them. Hunting peoples often have enormous range. The Labrador country, for instance, is inhabited by a few thousand Indians,[70] who follow the one great herd of caribou as it wanders yearly north and then south again in pursuit of food. This mere handful of people covers a territory as large as France. Nomad peoples also range very widely. Some Kalmuck tribes are said to travel nearly a thousand miles between summer and winter pasture.

It carries out this suggestion, that Palæolithic man ranged widely and was distributed, thinly indeed but uniformly, throughout the world, that the Palæolithic remains we find are everywhere astonishingly uniform. To quote Sir John Evans,[71] “The implements in distant lands are so identical in form and character with the British specimens that they might have been manufactured by the same hands.... On the banks of the Nile, many hundreds of feet above its present level, implements of the European types have been discovered; while in Somaliland, in an ancient river-valley at a great elevation above the sea, Sir H. W. Seton-Karr has collected a large number of implements formed of flint and quartzite, which, judging from their form and character, might have been dug out of the drift-deposits of the Somme and the Seine, the Thames or the ancient Solent.”

Phases of spreading and intermixture have probably alternated with phases of settlement and specialization in the history of mankind. But up to a few hundred years ago it is probable that since the days of the Palæolithic Age at least mankind has on the whole been differentiating. The species has differentiated in that period into a very great number of varieties, many of which have reblended with others, which have spread and undergone further differentiation or become extinct. Wherever there has been a strongly marked local difference of conditions and a check upon intermixture, there one is almost obliged to assume a variety of mankind must have appeared. Of such local varieties there must have been a great multitude.

In one remote corner of the world, Tasmania, a little cut-off population of people remained in the early Palæolithic stage until the discovery of that island by the Dutch in 1642. They are now, unhappily, extinct. The last Tasmanian died in 1877. They may have been cut off from the rest of mankind for 15,000 or 20,000 or 25,000 years.

But among the numerous obstacles and interruptions to intermixture there have been certain main barriers, such as the Atlantic Ocean, the highlands, once higher, and the now vanished seas of central Asia and the like, which have cut off great groups of varieties from other great groups of varieties over long periods of time. These separated groups of varieties developed very early certain broad resemblances and differences. Most of the varieties of men in eastern Asia and America, but not all, have now this in common, that they have yellowish buff skins, straight black hair, and often high cheek-bones. Most of the native peoples of Africa south of the Sahara, but not all, have black or blackish skins, flat noses, thick lips, and frizzy hair. In north and western Europe a great number of peoples have fair hair, blue eyes, and ruddy complexions; and about the Mediterranean there is a prevalence of white-skinned peoples with dark eyes and black hair. The black hair of many of these dark whites is straight, but never so strong and waveless as the hair of the yellow peoples. It is straighter in the east than in the west. In southern India we find brownish and darker peoples with straight black hair, and these as we pass eastward give place to more distinctly yellow peoples. In scattered islands and in Papua and New Guinea we find another series of black and brownish peoples of a more lowly type with frizzy hair.

[Illustration: Australoid types]

But it must be borne in mind that these are very loose-fitting generalizations. Some of the areas and isolated pockets of mankind in the Asiatic area may have been under conditions more like those in the European area; some of the African areas are of a more Asiatic and less distinctively African type. We find a wavy-haired, fairish, hairy-skinned race, the Ainu, in Japan. They are more like the Europeans in their facial type than the surrounding yellow Japanese. They may be a drifted patch of the whites or they may be a quite distinct people. We find primitive black people in the Andaman Islands far away from Australia and far away from Africa. There is a streak of very negroid blood traceable in south Persia and some parts of India. These are the “Asiatic” negroids. There is little or no proof that all black people, the Australians, the Asiatic negroids and the negroes, derive from one origin, but only that they have lived for vast periods under similar conditions. We must not assume that human beings in the eastern Asiatic area were

all differentiating in one direction and all the human beings in Africa in another. There were great currents of tendency, it is true, but there were also backwaters, eddies, admixtures, readmixtures, and leakages from one main area to the other. A coloured map of the world to show the races would not present just four great areas of colour; it would have to be dabbed over with a multitude of tints and intermediate shades, simple here, mixed and overlapping there.

In the early Neolithic Period in Europe--it may be 10,000 or 12,000 years ago or so--man was differentiating all over the world, and he had already differentiated into a number of varieties, but he has never differentiated into different _species_. A “species,” we must remember, in biological language is distinguished from a “variety” by the fact that varieties can interbreed, while species either do not do so or produce offspring which, like mules, are sterile. All mankind can interbreed freely, can learn to understand the same speech, can adapt itself to co-operation. And in the present age, man is probably no longer undergoing differentiation at all. Readmixture is now a far stronger force than differentiation. Men mingle more and more. Mankind from the view of a biologist is an animal species in a state of arrested differentiation and possible readmixture.

§ 2

It is only in the last fifty or sixty years that the varieties of men came to be regarded in this light, as a tangle of differentiations recently arrested or still in progress. Before that time students of mankind, influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by the story of Noah and the Ark and his three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japhet, were inclined to classify men into three or four great races, and they were disposed to regard these races as having always been separate things, descended from originally separate ancestors. They ignored the great possibilities of blended races and of special local isolations and variations. The classification has varied considerably, but there has been rather too much readiness to assume that mankind _must_ be completely divisible into three or four main groups. Ethnologists (students of race) have fallen into grievous disputes about a multitude of minor peoples, as to whether they were of this or that primary race or “mixed,” or strayed early forms, or what not. But all races are more or less mixed. There are, no doubt, four main groups, but each is a miscellany, and there are little groups that will not go into any of the four main divisions.

[Illustration: Bushwoman]

Subject to these reservations, when it is clearly understood that when we speak of these main divisions we mean not simple and pure races, but groups of races, then they have a certain convenience in discussion. Over the European and Mediterranean area and western Asia there are, and have been for many thousand years, white peoples, usually called the CAUCASIANS,[72] subdivided into two or three subdivisions, the northern blonds, an alleged intermediate race about which many authorities are doubtful, and the southern dark whites; over eastern Asia and America a second group of races prevails, the MONGOLIANS, generally with yellow skins, straight black hair, and sturdy bodies; over Africa the NEGROES, and in the region of Australia and New Guinea the black, primitive AUSTRALOIDS. These are convenient terms, provided the student bears in mind that they are not exactly defined terms. They represent only the common characteristics of certain main groups of races; they leave out a number of little peoples who belong properly to none of these divisions, and they disregard the perpetual mixing where the main groups overlap.

§ 3

[Illustration: Negro types]

[Illustration: Mongolian Types]

Whether the “Caucasian” race is to be divided into two or three main subdivisions depends upon the classificatory value to be attached to certain differences in the skeleton and particularly to the shape of the skull. The student in his further reading will meet with constant references to round-skulled (Brachycephalic) and long-skulled peoples (Dolichocephalic). No skull looked at from above is completely round, but some skulls (the dolichocephalic) are much more oblong than others; when the width of a skull is four-fifths or more of its length from back to front, that skull is called brachycephalic; when the width is less than four-fifths of the length, the skull is dolichocephalic. While some ethnologists regard the difference between brachycephaly and dolichocephaly as a difference of quite primary importance, another school--which the writer must confess has entirely captured his convictions--dismisses this as a mere secondary distinction. It seems probable that the skull shapes of a people may under special circumstances vary in comparatively few generations.[73]

We do not know what influences alter the shape of the skull, just as we do not know why people of British descent in the Darling region of Australia (“Cornstalks”) grow exceptionally tall, or why in New England their jaw-bones seem to become slighter and their teeth in consequence rather crowded. Even in Neolithic times dolichocephalic and brachycephalic skulls are found in the same group of remains and often buried together, and that is true of most peoples to-day. Some peoples, such as the mountain people of central Europe, have more brachycephalic individuals per cent. than others; some, as the Scandinavians, are more prevalently dolichocephalic. In Neolithic Britain and in Scandinavia the earliest barrows (= tomb mounds) are long grave-shaped barrows and the late ones round, and the skulls found in the former are usually dolichocephalic and in the latter most frequently brachycephalic. This points perhaps to a succession of races in western Europe in the Neolithic Period (see Chapter XLV), but it may also point to changes of diet, habit, or climate.

[Illustration: Caucasian Types]

But it is this study of skull shapes which has led many ethnologists to divide the Caucasian race, not, as it was divided by Huxley, into two, the northern _blonds_ and the Mediterranean and North African _dark whites_ or brunets, but into three. They split his blonds into two classes. They distinguish a northern European type, blond and dolichocephalic, the Nordic; a Mediterranean or Iberian race, Huxley’s dark whites, which is dark-haired and dolichocephalic, and between these two they descry this third race, their brachycephalic race, the Alpine race. The opposite school would treat the alleged Alpine race simply as a number of local brachycephalic varieties of Nordic or Iberian peoples. The Iberian peoples were the Neolithic people of the long barrows, and seem at first to have pervaded most of Europe and western Asia.

[Illustration: Map of EUROPE, Western ASIA & Northern AFRICA in the Forest (Pluvial) Period (about 15,000 or 12,000 years ago)

Showing probable range of the main races before the dawn of history. Mountain barriers are indicated thus [symbol] Sea barriers [symbol]]

§ 4

This Mediterranean or Iberian race certainly had a wider range in early times, and was a less specialized and distinctive race than the Nordic. It is very hard to define its southward boundaries from the Negro, or to mark off its early traces in central Asia from those of early Dravidians or Mongolians. Wilfred Scawen Blunt[74] says that Huxley “had long suspected a common origin of the Egyptians and the Dravidians of India, perhaps a long belt of brown-skinned men from India to Spain in very early days.” Across France and Great Britain these dark-white Iberian or Mediterranean people were ousted by a round-barrow-making “Alpine” or Alpine-Nordic race, and the dawn of history in Europe sees them being pressed westward and southward everywhere by the expansion of the fairer northern peoples.

It is possible that this “belt” of Huxley’s of dark-white and brown-skinned men, this race of brunet-brown folk, ultimately spread even farther than India; that they reached to the shores of the Pacific, and that they were everywhere the original possessors of the Neolithic culture and the beginners of what we call civilization. The Nordic and the Mongolian peoples may have been but north-western and north-eastern branches from this more fundamental stem. Or the Nordic race may have been a branch, while the Mongolian, like the Negro, may have been another equal and distinct stem with which the brunet-browns met and mingled in South China. Or the Nordic peoples also may have developed separately from a palæolithic stage.

[Illustration: The Swastika]

At some period in human history (see Elliot Smith’s _Migrations of Early Culture_) there seems to have been a special type of Neolithic culture widely distributed in the world which had a group of features so curious and so unlikely to have been independently developed in different regions of the earth, as to compel us to believe that it was in effect one culture. It reached through all the regions inhabited by the brunet Mediterranean race, and beyond through India, Further India, up the Pacific coast of China, and it spread at last across the Pacific and to Mexico and Peru. It was a coastal culture not reaching deeply inland. (Here again we cover the ground of Huxley’s “belt of brown-skinned men,” and extend it far to the east across the stepping-stones of Polynesia. There are, we may note, some very striking resemblances between early Japanese pottery and so forth and similar Peruvian productions.) This peculiar development of the Neolithic culture, which, Elliot Smith called the _heliolithic_[75] culture, included many or all of the following odd practices: (1) circumcision, (2) the very queer custom of sending the _father_ to bed when a child is born, known as the _couvade_, (3) the practice of massage, (4) the making of mummies, (5) megalithic monuments[76] (_e.g._ Stonehenge), (6) artificial deformation of the heads of the young by bandages, (7) tattooing, (8) religious association of the

sun and the serpent, and (9) the use of the symbol known as the swastika (see figure) for good luck. This odd little symbol spins gaily round the world; it seems incredible that men would have invented and made a pet of it twice over. Elliot Smith traces these practices in a sort of constellation all over this great Mediterranean-Indian Ocean-Pacific area. Where one occurs, most of the others occur. They link Brittany with Borneo and Peru. But this constellation of practices does not crop up in the primitive homes of Nordic or Mongolian peoples, nor does it extend southward much beyond equatorial Africa. For thousands of years, from 15,000 to 1000 B.C., such a heliolithic Neolithic culture and its brownish possessors may have been oozing round the world through the warmer regions of the world, drifting by canoes often across wide stretches of sea. And its region of origin may have been, as Elliot Smith suggests, the Mediterranean and North-African region. It must have been spreading up the Pacific Coast and across the island stepping-stones to America, long after it had passed on into other developments in its areas of origin. Many of the peoples of the East Indies, Melanesia and Polynesia were still in this heliolithic stage of development when they were discovered by European navigators in the eighteenth century. The first civilizations in Egypt and the Euphrates-Tigris valley probably developed directly out of this widespread culture.[77] We will discuss later whether the Chinese civilization had a different origin. The Semitic nomads of the Arabian desert seem also to have had a heliolithic stage.

§ 5

It may clear up the necessarily rather confused discussion of this chapter to give a summary of the views expressed here in a diagram. This, on page 149, should be compared later with the language diagram on page 155.

We have put the Australoids as a Negroid branch, but many authorities would set back the Australoid stem closer to the Tasmanian, and there may even be sound reasons for transferring both Australoids and Tasmanians as separate branches to the left of the “Later Palæolithic Races.” To avoid crowding we have omitted the Hairy Ainu. They may be the last vestiges of an ancient primitive Pre-Nordic Pre-Mongolian strain from which the Nordic races are descended.

[Illustration: A Diagrammatic Summary of Current Ideas of the RELATIONSHIP of HUMAN RACES

(It must be borne in mind that human races interbreed freely.)]

XIV

THE LANGUAGES OF MANKIND

§ 1. _No one Primitive Language._ § 2. _The Aryan Languages._ § 3. _The Semitic Languages._ § 4. _The Hamitic Languages._ § 5. _The Ural Altaic Languages._ § 6. _The Chinese Languages._ § 7. _Other Language Groups._ § 8. _Submerged and Lost Languages._ § 9. _How Languages may be Related._

§ 1

It is improbable that there was ever such a thing as a common human language. We know nothing of the language of Palæolithic man; we do not even know whether Palæolithic man talked freely.

We know that Palæolithic man had a keen sense of form and attitude, because of his drawings; and it has been suggested that he communicated his ideas very largely by gesture. Probably such words as the earlier men used were mainly cries of alarm or passion or names for concrete things, and in many cases they were probably imitative sounds made by or associated with the things named.[78]

The first languages were probably small collections of such words; they consisted of interjections and nouns. Probably the nouns were said in different intonations to convey different meanings. If Palæolithic man had a word for “horse” or “bear,” he probably showed by tone or gesture whether he meant “bear is coming,” “bear is going,” “bear is to be hunted,” “dead bear,” “bear has been here,” “bear did this,” and so on. Only very slowly did the human mind develop methods of indicating action and relationship in a formal manner. Modern languages contain many thousands of words, but the earlier languages could have consisted only of a few hundred. It is said that even modern European peasants can get along with something less than a thousand words, and it is quite conceivable that so late as the Early Neolithic Period that was the limit of the available vocabulary. Probably men did not indulge in those days in conversation or description. For narrative purposes they danced and acted rather than told. They had no method of counting beyond a method of indicating two by a dual number, and some way of expressing many. The growth of speech was at first a very slow process indeed, and grammatical forms and the expression of abstract ideas may have come very late in human

history, perhaps only 400 or 500 generations ago.

§ 2

The students of languages (philologists) tell us that they are unable to trace with certainty any common features in all the languages of mankind. They cannot even find any elements common to all the Caucasian languages. They find over great areas groups of languages which have similar root words and similar ways of expressing the same idea, but then they find in other areas languages which appear to be dissimilar down to their fundamental structure, which express action and relation by entirely dissimilar devices, and have an altogether different grammatical scheme.[79] One great group of languages, for example, now covers nearly all Europe and stretches out to India; it includes English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Greek, Russian, Armenian, Persian, and various Indian tongues. It is called the Indo-European or ARYAN family. The same fundamental roots, the same grammatical ideas, are traceable through all this family. Compare, for example, English _father, mother_, Gothic _fadar, moutar_, German _vater, mutter_, Latin _pater, mater_, Greek _pater, meter_, French _père, mère_, Armenian _hair, mair_, Sanscrit _pitar, matar_, etc., etc. In a similar manner the Aryan languages ring the changes on a great number of fundamental words, _f_ in the Germanic languages becoming _p_ in Latin, and so on. They follow a law of variation called Grimm's Law. These languages are not different things, they are variations of one thing. The people who use these languages think in the same way.

At one time in the remote past, in the Neolithic Age, that is to say 6000[80] years or more ago, there may have been one simple original speech from which all these Aryan languages have differentiated. Somewhere between central Europe and western Asia there must have wandered a number of tribes sufficiently intermingled to develop and use one tongue. It is convenient here to call them the Aryan peoples. Sir H. H. Johnston has called them "Aryan Russians." They belonged mostly to the Caucasian group of races and to the blond and northern subdivision of the group, to the Nordic race that is.

Here one must sound a note of warning. There was a time when the philologists were disposed to confuse languages and races, and to suppose that people who once all spoke the same tongue must be all of the same blood. That, however, is not the case, as the reader will understand if he will think of the negroes of the United States who now all speak English, or of the Irish, who--except for purposes of political demonstration--no longer speak the old Erse language but English, or of the Cornish people, who have lost their ancient Keltic speech. But what a common language does do, is to show that a common intercourse has existed, and the possibility of intermixture; and if it does not point to a common origin, it points at least to a common future.

But even this original Aryan language, which was a spoken speech perhaps 4000 or 3000 B.C., was by no means a _primordial_ language or the language of a savage race. Its speakers were in or past the Neolithic stage of civilization. It had grammatical forms and verbal devices of some complexity. The vanished methods of expression of the later Palæolithic peoples, of the Azilians, or of the early Neolithic kitchen-midden people for instance, were probably much cruder than the most elementary form of Aryan.

Probably the Aryan group of languages became distinct in a wide region of which the Danube, Dnieper, Don, and Volga were the main rivers, a region that extended eastward beyond the Ural mountains north of the Caspian Sea. The area over which the Aryan speakers roamed probably did not for a long time reach to the Atlantic or to the south of the Black Sea beyond Asia Minor. There was no effectual separation of Europe from Asia then at the Bosphorus.[81] The Danube flowed eastward to a great sea that extended across the Volga region of south-eastern Russia right into Turkestan, and included the Black, Caspian, and Aral Seas of to-day. Perhaps it sent out arms to the Arctic Ocean. It must have been a pretty effective barrier between the Aryan speakers and the people in north-eastern Asia. South of this sea stretched a continuous shore from the Balkans to Afghanistan.[82] North-west of it a region of swamps and lagoons reached to the Baltic.

§ 3

Next to Aryan, philologists distinguish another group of languages which seem to have been made quite separately from the Aryan languages, the Semitic. Hebrew and Arabic are kindred, but they seem to have even a different set of root words from the Aryan tongues; they express their ideas of relationship in a different way; the fundamental ideas of their grammars are generally different. They were in all probability made by human communities quite out of touch with the Aryans, separately and independently. Hebrew, Arabic, Abyssinian, ancient Assyrian, ancient Phœnician, and a number of associated tongues are put together, therefore, as being derived from a second primary language, which is called the SEMITIC. In the very beginnings of recorded history we find Aryan-speaking peoples and Semitic-speaking peoples carrying on the liveliest intercourse of war and trade round and about the eastern end of the Mediterranean, but the fundamental differences of the primary Aryan and primary Semitic languages oblige us to

believe that in early Neolithic times, before the historical period, there must for thousands of years have been an almost complete separation of the Aryan-speaking and the Semitic-speaking peoples. The latter seem to have lived either in south Arabia or in north-east Africa. In the opening centuries of the Neolithic Age the original Aryan speakers and the original Semitic speakers were probably living, so to speak, in different worlds, with a minimum of intercourse. Racially, it would seem, they had a remote common origin; both Aryan speakers and Semites are classed as Caucasians; but while the original Aryan speakers seem to have been of Nordic race, the original Semites were rather of the Mediterranean type.

§ 4

Philologists speak with less unanimity of a third group of languages, the HAMITIC, which some declare to be distinct from, and others allied to, the Semitic. The weight of opinion inclines now towards the idea of some primordial connection of these two groups. The Hamitic group is certainly a much wider and more various language group than the Semitic or the Aryan, and the Semitic tongues are more of a family, have more of a common likeness, than the Aryan. The Semitic languages may have arisen as some specialized proto-Hamitic group, just as the birds arose from a special group of reptiles (Chap. IV). It is a tempting speculation, but one for which there is really no basis of justifying fact, to suppose that the rude primordial ancestor group of the Aryan tongues branched off from the proto-Hamitic speech forms at some still earlier date than the separation and specialization of Semitic. The Hamitic speakers to-day, like the Semitic speakers, are mainly of the Mediterranean Caucasian race. Among the Hamitic languages are the ancient Egyptian and Coptic, the Berber languages (of the mountain people of north Africa, the Masked Tuaregs, and other such peoples), and what are called the Ethiopic group of African languages in eastern Africa, including the speech of the Gallas and the Somalis. The general grouping of these various tongues suggests that they originated over some great area to the west, as the primitive Semitic may have arisen to the east of the Red Sea divide. That divide was probably much more effective in Pleistocene times; the sea extended across to the west of the Isthmus of Suez, and a great part of lower Egypt was under water. Long before the dawn of history, however, Asia and Africa had joined at Suez, and these two language systems were in contact in that region. And if Asia and Africa were separated then at Suez, they may, on the other hand, have been joined by way of Arabia and Abyssinia.

[Illustration: Possible Development of LANGUAGES

disregarding admixtures, e.g. Turkish elements in Russian, Latin in English, Hamitic in Keltic, & so forth; & omitting various Indian, Melanesian & other groups.]

These Hamitic languages may have radiated from a centre on the African coast of the Mediterranean, and they may have extended over the then existing land connections very widely into western Europe.

All these three great groups of languages, it may be noted, the Aryan, Semitic, and Hamitic, have one feature in common which they do not share with any other language, and that is grammatical gender; but whether that has much weight as evidence of a remote common origin of Aryan, Semitic, and Hamitic, is a question for the philologist rather than for the general student. It does not affect the clear evidence of a very long and very ancient prehistoric separation of the speakers of these three diverse groups of tongues.

The bulk of the Semitic and Hamitic-speaking peoples are put by ethnologists with the Aryans among the Caucasian group of races. They are “white.” The Semitic and Nordic “races” have a much more distinctive physiognomy; they seem, like their characteristic languages, to be more marked and specialized than the Hamitic-speaking peoples.

§ 5

Across to the north-east of the Aryan and Semitic areas there must once have spread a further distinct language system which is now represented by a group of languages known as the TURANIAN, or URAL-ALTAIC group. This included the Lappish of Lapland and the Samoyed speech of Siberia, the Finnish language, Magyar, Turkish or Tartar, Manchu and Mongol; it has not as a group been so exhaustively studied by European philologists, and there is insufficient evidence yet whether it does or does not include the Korean and Japanese languages. (A Japanese writer, Mr. K. Hirai, has attempted to show that Japanese and Aryan may have had a common parent tongue.[83])

§ 6

A fifth region of language formation was south-eastern Asia, where there still prevails a group of languages consisting of monosyllables without any inflections, in which the tone used in uttering a word determines its meaning. This may be called the Chinese or MONOSYLLABIC group, and it includes Chinese, Burmese, Siamese, and Tibetan. The difference between any of these Chinese tongues and the more western languages is profound. In the Pekinese form of Chinese there are only about 420 primary monosyllables, and consequently each of these has to do duty for a great number of things, and the different meanings are indicated either by the context or by saying the word in a distinctive tone. The relations of these words to each other are expressed by quite different methods from the Aryan methods; Chinese grammar is a thing different in nature from English grammar; it is a separate and different invention. Many writers declare there is no Chinese grammar at all, and that is true if we mean by grammar anything in the European sense of inflections and concords. Consequently any such thing as a literal translation from Chinese into English is an impossibility. The very method of the thought is different.[84] Their philosophy remains still largely a sealed book to the European on this account, and vice versa, because of the different nature of the expressions.

§ 7

In addition the following other great language families are distinguished by the philologist. All the American-Indian languages, which vary widely among themselves, are separable from any Old World group. Here we may lump them together not so much as a family as a miscellany.[85] There is one great group of languages in Africa, from a little way north of the equator to its southern extremity, the BANTU, and in addition a complex of other languages across the centre of the continent about which we will not trouble here.[86] There are also two probably separate groups, the DRAVIDIAN in South India, and the MALAY-POLYNESIAN stretched over Polynesia, and also now including Indian tongues.

Now it seems reasonable to conclude from these fundamental differences that about the time when men were passing from the Palæolithic to Neolithic conditions, and beginning to form rather larger communities than the family herd, when they were beginning to tell each other long stories and argue and exchange ideas, human beings were distributed about the world in a number of areas which communicated very little with each other. They were separated by oceans, seas, thick forests, deserts or mountains from one another. There may have been in that remote time, it may be 10,000 years ago or more, Aryan, Semitic, Hamitic, Turanian, American, and Chinese-speaking tribes and families, wandering over their several areas of hunting and pasture, all at very much the same stage of culture, and each developing its linguistic instrument in its own way. Probably each of these original tribes was not more numerous altogether than the Indians in Hudson Bay Territory to-day. Agriculture was barely beginning, and until agriculture made a denser population possible men may have been almost as rare as the great apes have always been.

In addition to these early Neolithic tribes, there must have been various varieties of still more primitive forest folk in Africa and in India. Central Africa, from the Upper Nile, was then a vast forest, impenetrable to ordinary human life, a forest of which the Congo forests of to-day are the last shrunken remains.

Possibly the spread of men of a race higher than primitive Australoids into the East Indies,[87] and the development of the languages of the Malay-Polynesian type came later in time than the origination of these other language groups.

The language divisions of the philologist do tally, it is manifest, in a broad sort of way with the main race classes of the ethnologist, and they carry out the same idea of age-long separations between great divisions of mankind. In the Glacial Age, ice, or at least a climate too severe for the free spreading of peoples, extended from the north pole into central Europe and across Russia and Siberia to the great tablelands of central Asia. After the last Glacial Age, this cold north mitigated its severities very slowly, and was for long without any other population than the wandering hunters who spread eastward and across Bering Strait. North and central Europe and Asia did not become sufficiently temperate for agriculture until quite recent times, times that is within the limit of 12,000 or possibly even 10,000 years, and a dense forest period intervened between the age of the hunter and the agricultural clearings.

This forest period was also a very wet period. It has been called the Pluvial or Lacustrine Age, the rain or pond period. It has to be remembered that the outlines of the land of the world have changed greatly even in the last hundred centuries. Across European Russia, from the Baltic to the Caspian Sea, as the ice receded there certainly spread much water and many impassable swamps; the Caspian Sea and the Sea of Aral and parts of the Desert of Turkestan, are the vestiges of a great extent of sea that reached far up to the Volga valley and sent an arm westward to join the Black Sea. Mountain barriers much higher than they are now, and the arm of the sea that is now the region of the Indus, completed the separation of the early Caucasian races from the Mongolians and the Dravidians, and made the broad racial differentiation of those groups possible.

Again the blown-sand Desert of Sahara--it is not a dried-up sea, but a wind desert, and was once fertile and rich in life--becoming more and more dry and sandy, cut the Caucasians off from the sparse primitive Negro population in the central forest region of Africa.

The Persian Gulf extended very far to the north of its present head, and combined with the Syrian desert to cut off the Semitic peoples from the eastern areas, while on the other hand the south of Arabia, much more fertile than it is to-day, may have reached across what is now the Gulf of Aden towards Abyssinia and Somaliland. The Mediterranean and Red Sea were probably still joined at Suez. The Himalayas and the higher and vaster massif of central Asia and the northward extension of the Bay of Bengal up to the present Ganges valley divided off the Dravidians from the Mongolians, the canoe was the chief link between Dravidian and Southern Mongol, and the Gobi system of seas and lakes which presently became the Gobi desert, and the great system of mountain chains which follow one another across Asia from the center to the north-east, split the Mongolian races into the Chinese and the Ural-Altaic language groups.

Bering Strait, when this came into existence, before or after the Pluvial Period, isolated the Amer-Indians.

These ancient separations must have remained effectual well into Neolithic times. The barriers between Africa, Asia, and Europe were lowered or bridged by that time, but mixing had not gone far. The practical separation of the west from Dravidian India and China continued indeed down almost into historical times; but the Semite, the Hamite, and the Aryan were already in close contact and vigorous reaction again in the very dawn of history.

We are not suggesting here, be it noted, that these ancient separations were absolute separations, but that they were effectual enough at least to prevent any great intermixture of blood or any great intermixture of speech in those days of man’s social beginnings. There was, nevertheless, some amount of meeting and exchange even then, some drift of knowledge that spread the crude patterns and use of various implements, and the seeds of a primitive agriculture about the world.

§ 8

The fundamental tongues of these nine main language groups we have noted were not by any means all the human speech beginnings of the Neolithic Age. There may have been other, and possibly many other, ineffective centres of speech which were afterwards overrun by the speakers of still surviving tongues, and of elementary languages which faded out. We find strange little patches of speech still in the world which do not seem to be connected with any other language about them. Sometimes, however, an exhaustive inquiry seems to affiliate these disconnected patches, seems to open out to us tantalizing glimpses of some simpler, wider, and more fundamental and universal form of human speech. One language group that has been keenly discussed is the Basque group of dialects. The Basques live now on the north and south slopes of the Pyrenees; they number perhaps 600,000 altogether in Europe, and to this day they are a very sturdy and independent-spirited people. Their language, as it exists to-day, is a fully developed one. But it is developed upon lines absolutely different from those of the Aryan languages about it. Basque newspapers have been published in the Argentine and in the United States to supply groups of prosperous emigrants. The earliest “French” settlers in Canada were Basque, and Basque names are frequent among the French Canadians to this day. Ancient remains point to a much wider distribution of the Basque speech and people over Spain. For a long time this Basque language was a profound perplexity to scholars, and its structural character led to the suggestion that it might be related to some Amer-Indian tongue. A. H. Keane, in _Man Past and Present_, assembles reasons for linking it--though remotely--with the Berber language of North Africa, and through the Berber with the general body of Hamitic languages, but this relationship is questioned by other philologists. They find Basque more akin to certain similarly stranded vestiges of speech found in the Caucasian Mountains, and they are disposed to regard it as a last surviving member, much changed and specialized, of a once very widely extended group of pre-Hamitic languages, otherwise extinct, spoken chiefly by peoples of that brunet Mediterranean race (round-barrow men) which once occupied most of western and southern Europe and western Asia, and which may have been very closely related to the Dravidians of India and the peoples with a heliolithic culture who spread eastward thence through the East Indies to Polynesia and beyond.

It is quite possible that over western and southern Europe language groups extended 10,000 years ago that have completely vanished before Aryan tongues. Later on we shall note, in passing, the possibility of three lost language groups represented by (1) Ancient Cretan, Lydian, and the like (though these may have belonged, says Sir H. H. Johnston, to the “Basque-Caucasian-Dravidian (!) group”), (2) Sumerian, and (3) Elamite. The suggestion has been made--it is a mere guess--that ancient Sumerian may have been a linking language between the early Basque-Caucasian and early Mongolian groups. If this is

true, then we have in this “Basque-Caucasian-Dravidian-Sumerian-proto-Mongolian” group a still more ancient and more ancestral system of speech than the fundamental Hamitic.

The Hottentot language is said to have affinities with the Hamitic tongues, from which it is separated by the whole breadth of Bantu-speaking central Africa. A Hottentot-like language with Bushman affinities is still spoken in equatorial east Africa, and this strengthens the idea that the whole of east Africa was once Hamitic-speaking. The Bantu languages and peoples spread, in comparatively recent times, from some center of origin in west central Africa and cut off the Hottentots from the other Hamitic peoples. But it is at least equally probable that the Hottentot is a separate language group.

Among other remote and isolated little patches of language are the Papuan speech of New Guinea and the native Australian. The now extinct Tasmanian language is little known. What we know of it is in support of what we have guessed about the comparative speechlessness of Palæolithic man.

We may quote a passage from Hutchinson’s _Living Races of Mankind_ upon this matter:--

“The language of the natives is irretrievably lost, only imperfect indication of its structure and a small proportion of its words having been preserved. In the absence of sibilants and some other features, their dialects resembled the Australian, but were of ruder, of less developed structure, and so imperfect that, according to Joseph Milligan, our best authority on the subject, they observed no settled order or arrangement of words in the construction of their sentences, but conveyed in a supplementary fashion by tone, manner, and gesture those modifications of meaning which we express by mood, tense, number, etc. Abstract terms were rare; for every variety of gum-tree or wattle-tree there was a name, but no word for ‘tree’ in general, nor for qualities such as hard, soft, warm, cold, long, short, round, etc. Anything hard was ‘like a stone,’ anything round ‘like the moon,’ and so on, usually suiting the action to the word and confirming by some sign the meaning to be understood.”

[Illustration: Racial Types ... From Egyptian tomb-paintings. (After Champollion.)]

§ 9

In reading this chapter it is well to remember how laborious and difficult are the tasks of comparative philology, and how necessary it is to understand the qualifications and limitations that are to be put upon its conclusions. The Aryan group of languages is much better understood than any other, for the simple reason that it has been more familiar and accessible to European science. The other groups have been less thoroughly investigated, because so far they have not been studied exhaustively by men accustomed to use them, and whose minds are set in the key of their structure. Even the Semitic languages have been approached at a disadvantage because few Jews think in Hebrew. But a time is fast approaching when Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, and Indian philologists will come to the rescue in these matters, and good reason may be found for revising much that has been said above about the native American, Ural-Altaic, primitive Chinese, and Polynesian groups of tongues.

BOOK III

THE DAWN OF HISTORY

XV

THE ARYAN-SPEAKING PEOPLES IN PREHISTORIC TIMES

§ 1. _The Spreading of the Aryan-Speakers._ § 2. _Primitive Aryan Life._ § 3. _Early Aryan Daily Life._

§ 1

We have spoken of the Aryan language as probably arising in the region of the Danube and South Russia and spreading from that region of origin. We say “probably,” because it is by no means certainly proved that that was the centre; there have been vast discussions upon this point and wide divergences of opinion. We give the prevalent view. As it spread widely, Aryan began to differentiate into a number of subordinate languages. To the west and south it encountered the Basque language, which was then widely spread in Spain, and also possibly various Hamitic Mediterranean languages.

The Neolithic Mediterranean race, the Iberian race, was distributed over Great Britain, Ireland, France, Spain, north Africa, south Italy, and, in a more civilized state, Greece and Asia Minor. It was probably closely related to the Egyptian. To judge by its

European vestiges it was a rather small human type, generally with an oval face and a long head. It buried its chiefs and important people in megalithic chambers--_i.e._ made of big stones--covered over by great mounds of earth; and these mounds of earth, being much longer than they are broad, are spoken of as the long barrows. These people sheltered at times in caves, and also buried some of their dead therein; and from the traces of charred, broken, and cut human bones, including the bones of children, it is inferred that they were cannibals. These short dark Iberian tribes (and the Basques also if they were a different race) were thrust back westward, and conquered and enslaved by slowly advancing waves of a taller and fairer Aryan-speaking people, coming southward and westward through central Europe, who are spoken of as the Kelts. Only the Basque resisted the conquering Aryan speech. Gradually these Keltic-speakers made their way to the Atlantic, and all that now remains of the Iberians is mixed into the Keltic population. How far the Keltic invasion affected the Irish population is a matter of debate at the present time; the Kelts may have been a mere caste of conquerors who imposed their language on a larger subject population. It is even doubtful if the north of England is more Aryan than pre-Keltic in blood. There is a sort of short dark Welshman, and certain types of Irishmen, who are Iberians by race. The modern Portuguese are also largely of Iberian blood.

The Kelts spoke a language, Keltic,[88] which was also in its turn to differentiate into the language of Gaul, Welsh, Breton, Scotch and Irish Gaelic, and other tongues. They buried the ashes of their chiefs and important people in round barrows. While these Nordic Kelts were spreading westward, other Nordic Aryan peoples were pressing down upon the dark white Mediterranean race in the Italian and Greek peninsulas, and developing the Latin and Greek groups of tongues. Certain other Aryan tribes were drifting towards the Baltic and across into Scandinavia, speaking varieties of the Aryan which became ancient Norse--the parent of Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, and Icelandic--Gothic, and Low and High German.

While the primitive Aryan speech was thus spreading and breaking up into daughter languages to the west, it was also spreading and breaking up to the east. North of the Carpathians and the Black Sea, Aryan-speaking tribes were increasing and spreading and using a distinctive dialect called Slavonian, from which came Russian, Serbian, Polish, Bulgarian, and other tongues; other variations of Aryan distributed over Asia Minor and Persia were also being individualized as Armenian and Indo-Iranian, the parent of Sanscrit and Persian. In this book we have used the word Aryan for all this family of languages, but the term Indo-European is sometimes used for the entire family, and “Aryan” itself restricted in a narrower sense to the Indo-Iranian speech.[89] This Indo-Iranian speech was destined to split later into a number of languages, including Persian and Sanscrit, the latter being the language of certain tribes of fair-complexioned Aryan speakers who pushed eastward into India somewhen between 3000 and 1000 B.C. and conquered dark Dravidian peoples who were then in possession of that land.

§ 2

What sort of life did these prehistoric Aryans lead, these Nordic Aryans who were the chief ancestors of most Europeans and most white Americans and European colonists of to-day, as well as of the Armenians,[90] Persians, and high-caste Hindus?

In answering that question we are able to resort to a new source of knowledge in addition to the dug-up remains and vestiges upon which we have had to rely in the case of Palæolithic man. We have language. By careful study of the Aryan languages it has been found possible to deduce a number of conclusions about the life of these Aryan peoples 5000 or 4000 years ago. All these languages have a common resemblance, as each, as we have already explained, rings the changes upon a number of common roots. When we find the same root word running through all or most of these tongues, it seems reasonable to conclude that the thing that root word signifies must have been known to the common ancestors. Of course, if they have _exactly the same word_ in their languages, this may not be the case; it may be the new name of a new thing or of a new idea that has spread over the world quite recently. “Gas,” for instance is a word that was made by Van Helmont, a Dutch chemist, about 1625, and has spread into most civilized tongues, and “tobacco” again is an American-Indian word which followed the introduction of smoking almost everywhere. But if the same word turns up in a number of languages, and _if it follows the characteristic modifications of each language_, we may feel sure that it has been in that language, and a part of that language, since the beginning, suffering the same changes with the rest of it. We know, for example, that the words for waggon and wheel run in this fashion through the Aryan tongues, and so we are able to conclude that the primitive Aryans, the more purely Nordic Aryans, had waggons, though it would seem from the absence of any common roots for spokes, rim, or axle that their wheels were not wheelwright’s wheels with spokes, but made of the trunks of trees shaped out with an axe between the ends.

These primitive waggons were drawn by oxen. The early Aryans did not ride or drive horses; they had very little to do with horses. The Reindeer men were a horse-people, but the Neolithic Aryans were a cow-people. They ate beef, not horse; and after many ages they began this use of draught cattle. They reckoned wealth by cows. They wandered, following pasture, and “trekking” their

goods, as the South African Boers do, in ox-waggons, though of course their waggons were much clumsier than any to be found in the world to-day. They probably ranged over very wide areas. They were migratory, but not in the strict sense of the word “nomadic”; they moved in a slower, clumsier fashion than did the later, more specialized nomadic peoples. They were forest and parkland people without horses. They were developing a migratory life out of the more settled “forest clearing” life of the earlier Neolithic period. Changes of climate which were replacing forest by pasture, and the accidental burning of forests by fire may have assisted this development.

When these early “Aryans” came to big rivers or open water, they built boats, at first hollow tree trunks and then skin-covered frameworks of lighter wood. Before history began there was already some Aryan canoe-traffic across the English Channel and in the Baltic, and also among the Greek islands. But the Aryans, as we shall see later, were probably not the first peoples to take to the sea.

We have already described the sort of home the primitive Aryan occupied and his household life, so far as the remains of the Swiss pile-dwellings enable us to describe these things. Mostly his houses were of too flimsy a sort, probably of wattle and mud, to have survived, and possibly he left them and trekked on for very slight reasons. The Aryan peoples burnt their dead, a custom they still preserve in India, but their predecessors, the long-barrow people, the Iberians, buried their dead in a sitting position. In some ancient Aryan burial mounds (round barrows) the urns containing the ashes of the departed are shaped like houses, and these represent rounded huts with thatched roofs. See Fig. p. 57.

The grazing of the primitive Aryan was far more important to him than his agriculture. At first he cultivated with a rough wooden hoe; then, after he had found out the use of cattle for draught purposes, he began real ploughing with oxen, using at first a suitably bent tree bough as his plough. His first cultivation before that came about must have been rather in the form of garden patches near the house buildings than of fields. Most of the land his tribe occupied was common land on which the cattle grazed together.

He never used stone for building house walls until upon the very verge of history. He used stone for hearths (_e.g._ at Glastonbury) and sometimes stone sub-structures. He did, however, make a sort of stone house in the centre of the great mounds in which he buried his illustrious dead. He may have learnt this custom from his Iberian neighbours and predecessors. It was these dark whites of the heliolithic culture, and not the primitive Aryans, who were responsible for such primitive temples as Stonehenge or Carnac in Brittany.

His social life was growing. Man was now living in clans and tribal communities. These clans and communities clashed; they took each other’s grazing land, they sought to rob each other; there began a new thing in human life, _war_. For war is not a primeval thing; it has not been in this world for more than 20,000 years. To this day very primitive peoples, such as the Australian black-fellows, do not understand war. The Palæolithic Age was an age of fights and murder, no doubt, but not of the organized collective fighting of numbers of men.[91] But now men could talk together and group themselves under leaders, and they found a need of centres where they could come together with their cattle in time of raids and danger. They began to make camps with walls of earth and palisades, many of which are still to be traced in the history-worn contours of the European scenery. The leaders under whom men fought in war were often the same men as the sacrificial purifiers who were their early priests.

The knowledge of bronze spread late in Europe. Neolithic man had been making his slow advances age by age for 7000 or 8000 years before the metals came. By that time his social life had developed so that there were men of various occupations and men and women of different ranks in the community. There were men who worked wood and leather, potters and carvers. The women span and wove and embroidered. There were chiefs and families that were distinguished as leaderly and noble; and man varied the monotony of his herding and wandering, he consecrated undertakings and celebrated triumphs, held funeral assemblies, and distinguished the traditional seasons of the year, by _feasts_. His meats we have already glanced at; but somewhen between 10,000 B.C. and the broadening separation of the Aryan peoples towards 2000 or 1000 B.C., mankind discovered fermentation, and began to brew intoxicating drinks. He made these of honey, of barley, and, as the Aryan tribes spread southward, of the grape. And he got merry and drunken. Whether he first used yeast to make his bread light or to ferment his drink we do not know.

At his feasts there were individuals with a gift for “playing the fool,” who did so no doubt to win the laughter of their friends,[92] but there was also another sort of men, of great importance in their time, and still more important to the historian, certain singers of songs and stories, the bards or rhapsodists. These _bards_ existed among all the Aryan-speaking peoples; they were a consequence of and a further factor in that development of spoken language which was the chief of all the human advances made in Neolithic times. They chanted or recited stories of the past, or stories of the living chief and his people; they told other stories that

they invented; they memorized jokes and catches. They found and seized upon and improved the rhythms, rhymes, alliterations, and such-like possibilities latent in language; they probably did much to elaborate and fix grammatical forms. They were the first great artists of the ear, as the later Aurignacian rock painters were the first great artists of the eye and hand. No doubt they used much gesture; probably they learnt appropriate gestures when they learnt their songs; but the order and sweetness and power of language was their primary concern.

And they mark a new step forward in the power and range of the human mind. They sustained and developed in men's minds a sense of a greater something than themselves, the tribe, and of a life that extended back into the past. They not only recalled old hatreds and battles, they recalled old alliances and a common inheritance. The feats of dead heroes lived again. A new thought came into men's minds, the desire to be remembered. Men began to live in thought before they were born and after they were dead.

Like most human things, this bardic tradition grew first slowly and then more rapidly. By the time bronze was coming into Europe there was not an Aryan people that had not a profession and training of bards. In their hands language became as beautiful as it is ever likely to be. These bards were living books, man-histories, guardians and makers of a new and more powerful tradition in human life. Every Aryan people had its long poetical records thus handed down, its sagas (Teutonic), its epics (Greek), its vedas (Old Sanscrit). The earliest Aryan people were essentially a people of the voice. The recitation seems to have predominated even in those ceremonial and dramatic dances and that "dressing-up" which among most human races have also served for the transmission of tradition.[93]

At that time there was no writing, and when first the art of writing crept into Europe, as we shall tell later, it must have seemed far too slow, clumsy, and lifeless a method of record for men to trouble very much about writing down these glowing and beautiful treasures of the memory. Writing was at first kept for accounts and matters of fact. The bards and rhapsodists flourished for long after the introduction of writing. They survived, indeed, in Europe as the minstrels into the Middle Ages.

Unhappily their tradition had not the fixity of a written record. They amended and reconstructed, they had their fashions and their phases of negligence. Accordingly we have now only the very much altered and revised vestiges of that spoken literature of prehistoric times. One of the most interesting and informing of these prehistoric compositions of the Aryans survives in the Greek _Iliad_. An early form of _Iliad_ was probably recited by 1000 B.C., but it was not written down until perhaps 700 or 600 B.C. Many men must have had to do with it as authors and improvers, but later Greek tradition attributed it to a blind bard named Homer, to whom also is ascribed the _Odyssey_, a composition of a very different spirit and outlook. To be a bard was naturally a blind man's occupation.[94] The Slavs called all bards _sliepac_, which was also their word for a blind man. The original recited version of the _Iliad_ was older than that of the _Odyssey_. "The _Iliad_ as a complete poem is older than the _Odyssey_, though the material of the _Odyssey_, being largely undatable folk-lore, is older than any of the historical material in the _Iliad_."[95] Both epics were probably written over and rewritten by some poet of a later date, in much the same manner that Lord Tennyson, the poet laureate of Queen Victoria, in his _Idylls of the King_, wrote over the _Morte d'Arthur_ (which was itself a writing over by Sir Thomas Malory, _circ._ 1450, of pre-existing legends), making the speeches and sentiments and the characters more in accordance with those of his own time. But the events of the _Iliad_ and the _Odyssey_, the way of living they describe, the spirit of the acts recorded, belong to the closing centuries of the prehistoric age. These sagas, epics, and vedas do supply, in addition to archæology and philology, a third source of information about those vanished times.

Here, for example, is the concluding passage of the _Iliad_, describing very exactly the making of a prehistoric barrow. (We have taken here Chapman's rhymed translation, correcting certain words with the help of the prose version of Lang, Leaf, and Myers.)

" ... Thus oxen, mules, in waggons straight they put, Went forth, and an unmeasur'd pile of sylvan matter cut; Nine days employ'd in carriage, but when the tenth morn shin'd On wretched mortals, then they brought the bravest of his kind Forth to be burned. Troy swam in tears. Upon the pile's most height They laid the body, and gave fire. All day it burn'd, all night. But when th' eleventh morn let on earth her rosy fingers shine, The people flock'd about the pile, and first with gleaming wine Quench'd all the flames. His brothers then, and friends, the snowy bones, Gather'd into an urn of gold, still pouring out their moans. Then wrapt they in soft purple veils the rich urn, digg'd a pit, Grav'd it, built up the grave with stones, and quickly piled on it A barrow.... ... The barrow heap'd once, all the town In Jove-nurs'd Priam's Court partook a sumptuous fun'ral feast, And so horse-taming Hector's rites gave up his soul to rest."

There remains also an old English saga, _Beowulf_, made long before the English had crossed from Germany into England, which winds up with a similar burial. The preparation of a pyre is first described. It is hung round with shields and coats of mail. The body is brought and the pyre fired, and then for ten days the warriors built a mighty mound to be seen afar by the traveller on sea or land. _Beowulf_, which is at least a thousand years later than the _Iliad_, is also interesting because one of the main adventures in it is the looting of the treasures of a barrow already ancient in those days.

§ 3

The Greek epics reveal the early Greeks with no knowledge of iron, without writing, and before any Greek-founded cities existed in the land into which they had evidently come quite recently as conquerors. They were spreading southward from the Aryan region of origin. They seem to have been a fair people, newcomers in Greece, newcomers to a land that had been held hitherto by a darker people, people who are now supposed to have belonged to a dark white “aboriginal” race, a “Mediterranean” people allied to those Iberians whom the Kelts pressed westward, and to the Hamitic white people of North Africa.

[Illustration: Combat between Menelaus & Hector (in the Iliad)

From a platter ascribed to the end of the seventh century in the British Museum. This is probably the earliest known vase bearing a Greek inscription. Greek writing was just beginning. Note the Swastika.]

Let us, at the risk of a slight repetition, be perfectly clear upon one point. The _Iliad_ does not give us the primitive neolithic life of that Aryan region of origin; it gives us that life already well on the move towards a new state of affairs. The primitive neolithic way of living, with its tame and domesticated animals, its pottery and cooking, and its patches of rude cultivation, we have sketched in Chapter XI. We have already discussed in § 4 of Chapter XIII the probability of a widespread _heliolithic_ culture, a sort of sub-civilization, very like the Polynesian and Indonesian life of a hundred years ago, an elaboration of the earlier Neolithic stage. Between 15,000 and 6000 B.C. the neolithic way of living had spread with the forests and abundant vegetation of the Pluvial Period, over the greater part of the old world, from the Niger to the Hwang-ho and from Ireland to the south of India. Now, as the climate of great portions of the earth was swinging towards drier and more open conditions again, the primitive neolithic life was developing along two divergent directions. One was leading to a more wandering life, towards at last a constantly migratory life between summer and winter pasture, which is called NOMADISM; the other, in certain sunlit river valleys, was towards a water-treasuring life of irrigation, in which men gathered into the first towns and made the first CIVILIZATION. The nature and development of civilization we shall consider more fully in the next chapter, but here we have to note that the Greeks, as the _Iliad_ presents them, are neither simple neolithic nomads, innocent of civilization, nor are they civilized men. They are primitive nomads in an excited state, because they have just come upon civilization, and regard it as an opportunity for war and loot.[96] So far they are exceptional and not representative. But our interest in them in this chapter is not in their distinctively Greek and predatory aspect, but in what they reveal of the ordinary northward life from which they are coming.

These early Greeks of the _Iliad_ are sturdy fighters, but without discipline--their battles are a confusion of single combats. They have horses, but no cavalry; they use the horse, which is a comparatively recent addition to Aryan resources, to drag a rude fighting chariot into battle. The horse is still novel enough to be something of a terror in itself. For ordinary draught purposes, as in the quotation from the _Iliad_ we have just made, oxen were employed.

The only priests of these Aryans are the keepers of shrines and sacred places. There are chiefs, who are heads of families and who also perform sacrifices, but there does not seem to be much mystery or sacramental feeling in their religion. When the Greeks go to war, these heads and elders meet in council and appoint a king, whose powers are very loosely defined. There are no laws, but only customs; and no exact standards of conduct.

[Illustration: Horses & chariots--(from an archaic Greek vase)]

The social life of the early Greeks centred about the households of these leading men. There were no doubt huts for herds and the like, and outlying farm buildings; but the hall of the chief was a comprehensive centre, to which everyone went to feast, to hear the bards, to take part in games and exercises. The primitive craftsmen were gathered there. About it were cowsheds and stabling and such-like offices. Unimportant people slept about anywhere as retainers did in the mediæval castles and as people still do in Indian households. Except for quite personal possessions, there was still an air of patriarchal communism about the tribe. The tribe, or the chief as the head of the tribe, owned the grazing lands; forest and rivers were the wild.

The Aryan civilization seems, and indeed all early communities seem, to have been without the little separate households that make up the mass of the population in western Europe or America to-day. The tribe was a big family; the nation a group of tribal families; a household often contained hundreds of people. Human society began, just as herds and droves begin among animals, by the family delaying its breaking up. Nowadays the lions in East Africa are apparently becoming social animals in this way, by the young keeping with the mother after they are fully grown, and hunting in a group. Hitherto the lion has been much more of a solitary beast. If men and women do not cling to their families nowadays as much as they did, it is because the state and the community now supply safety and help and facilities that were once only possible in the family group.

In the Hindu community of to-day these great households of the earlier stages of human society are still to be found. Mr. Bhupendranath Basu has recently described a typical Hindu household.[97] It is an Aryan household refined and made gentle by thousands of years of civilization, but its social structure is the same as that of the households of which the Aryan epics tell.

“The joint family system,” he said, “has descended to us from time immemorial, the Aryan patriarchal system of old still holding sway in India. The structure, though ancient, remains full of life. The joint family is a co-operative corporation, in which men and women have a well-defined place. At the head of the corporation is the senior member of the family, generally the eldest male member, but in his absence the senior female member often assumes control.” (Cp. Penelope in the _Odyssey_.)

“All able-bodied members must contribute their labour and earnings, whether of personal skill or agriculture and trade, to the common stock; weaker members, widows, orphans, and destitute relations, all must be maintained and supported; sons, nephews, brothers, cousins, all must be treated equally, for any undue preference is apt to break up the family. We have no word for cousins--they are either brothers or sisters, and we do not know what are cousins two degrees removed. The children of a first cousin are your nephews and nieces, just the same as the children of your brothers and sisters. A man can no more marry a cousin, however removed, than he can marry his own sister, except in certain parts of Madras, where a man may marry his maternal uncle’s daughter. The family affections, the family ties, are always very strong, and therefore the maintenance of an equal standard among so many members is not so difficult as it may appear at first sight. Moreover, life is very simple. Until recently shoes were not in general use at home, but sandals without any leather fastenings. I have known of a well-to-do middle-class family of several brothers and cousins who had two or three pairs of leather shoes between them, these shoes being only used when they had occasion to go out, and the same practice is still followed in the case of the more expensive garments, like shawls, which last for generations, and with their age are treated with loving care, as having been used by ancestors of revered memory.

“The joint family remains together sometimes for several generations, until it becomes too unwieldy, when it breaks up into smaller families, and you thus see whole villages peopled by members of the same clan. I have said that the family is a co-operative society, and it may be likened to a small state, and is kept in its place by strong discipline based on love and obedience. You see nearly every day the younger members coming to the head of the family and taking the dust of his feet as a token of benediction; whenever they go on an enterprise, they take his leave and carry his blessing.... There are many bonds which bind the family together--the bonds of sympathy, of common pleasures, of common sorrows; when a death occurs, all the members go into mourning; when there is a birth or a wedding, the whole family rejoices. Then above all is the family deity, some image of Vishnu, the preserver; his place is in a separate room, generally known as the room of God, or in well-to-do families in a temple attached to the house, where the family performs its daily worship. There is a sense of personal attachment between this image of the deity and the family, for the image generally comes down from past generations, often miraculously acquired by a pious ancestor at some remote time.... With the household gods is intimately associated the family priest.... The Hindu priest is a part of the family life of his flock, between whom and himself the tie has existed for many generations. The priest is not generally a man of much learning; he knows, however, the traditions of his faith.... He is not a very heavy burden, for he is satisfied with little--a few handfuls of rice, a few home-grown bananas or vegetables, a little unrefined sugar made in the village, and sometimes a few pieces of copper are all that is needed.... A picture of our family life would be incomplete without the household servants. A female servant is known as the ‘jhi,’ or daughter, in Bengal--she is like the daughter of the house; she calls the master and the mistress father and mother, and the young men and women of the family brothers and sisters. She participates in the life of the family; she goes to the holy places along with her mistress, for she could not go alone, and generally she spends her life with the family of her adoption; her children are looked after by the family. The treatment of men servants is very similar. These servants, men and women, are generally people of the humbler castes, but a sense of personal attachment grows up between them and the members of the family, and as they get on in years they are affectionately called by the younger members elder brothers, uncles, aunts, etc.... In a well-to-do house there is always a resident teacher, who instructs the children of the family as well as other boys of the village; there is no expensive school building, but room is found in some veranda or shed in the courtyard for the children and their teacher,

and into this school low-caste boys are freely admitted. These indigenous schools were not of a very high order, but they supplied an agency of instruction for the masses which was probably not available in many other countries....

“With Hindu life is bound up its traditional duty of hospitality. It is the duty of a householder to offer a meal to any stranger who may come before midday and ask for one; the mistress of the house does not sit down to her meal until every member is fed, and, as sometimes her food is all that is left, she does not take her meal until well after midday lest a hungry stranger should come and claim one.” ...

We have been tempted to quote Mr. Basu at some length, because here we do get to something like a living understanding of the type of household which has prevailed in human communities since Neolithic days, which still prevails to-day in India, China, and the Far East, but which in the west is rapidly giving ground before a state and municipal organization of education and a large-scale industrialism within which an amount of individual detachment and freedom is possible, such as these great households never knew....

But let us return now to the history preserved for us in the Aryan epics.

The Sanscrit epics tell a very similar story to that underlying the _Iliad_, the story of a fair, beef-eating people--only later did they become vegetarians--coming down from Persia into the plain of North India and conquering their way slowly towards the Indus. From the Indus they spread over India, but as they spread they acquired much from the dark Dravidians they conquered, and they seem to have lost their bardic tradition. The vedas, says Mr. Basu, were transmitted chiefly in the households by the women....

The oral literature of the Keltic peoples who pressed westward has not been preserved so completely as that of the Greeks or Indians; it was written down many centuries later, and so, like the barbaric, primitive English _Beowulf_, has lost any clear evidence of a period of migration into the lands of an antecedent people. If the pre-Aryans figure in it at all, it is as the fairy folk of the Irish stories. Ireland, most cut off of all the Keltic-speaking communities, retained to the latest date its primitive life; and the _Táin_, the Irish _Iliad_, describes a cattle-keeping life in which war chariots are still used, and war dogs also, and the heads of the slain are carried off slung round the horses’ necks. The _Táin_ is the story of a cattle raid. Here too the same social order appears as in the _Iliad_; the chiefs sit and feast in great halls, they build halls for themselves, there is singing and story-telling by the bards and drinking and intoxication.[98] Priests are not very much in evidence, but there is a sort of medicine man who deals in spells and prophecy.

XVI

THE FIRST CIVILIZATIONS

§ 1. _Early Cities and Early Nomads._ § 2A. _The Riddle of the Sumerians._ § 2B. _The Empire of Sargon the First._ § 2C. _The Empire of Hammurabi._ § 2D. _The Assyrians and their Empire._ § 2E. _The Chaldean Empire._ § 3. _The Early History of Egypt._ § 4. _The Early Civilization of India._ § 5. _The Early History of China._ § 6. _While the Civilizations were Growing._

§ 1

When the Aryan way of speech and life was beginning to spread to the east and west of the region in which it began, and breaking up as it spread into a number of languages and nations, considerable communities of much more civilized men were already in existence in Egypt and in Mesopotamia, and probably also in China and in (still purely Dravidian) India. Our story has overshot itself in its account of the Aryans and of their slow progress from early Neolithic conditions to the heroic barbarism of the Bronze Age. We must now go back. Such a pre-Keltic gathering as we sketched at Avebury would have happened about 2000 B.C., and the building of the barrow for Hector as the _Iliad_ describes it, 1300 B.C. or even later. It is perhaps natural for a European writer writing primarily for English-reading students to overrun his subject in this way. No great harm is done if the student does clearly grasp that there has been an overlap.

Here then we take up the main thread of human history again. We must hark back to 6000 B.C. or even earlier. But although we shall go back so far, the people we shall describe are people already in some respects beyond the Neolithic Aryans of three thousand years later, more particularly in their social organization and their material welfare. While in Central Europe and Central Asia the primitive Neolithic way of life was becoming more migratory and developing into nomadism, in the great river valleys it is becoming more settled and localized. It is still doubtful whether we are to consider Mesopotamia or Egypt the earlier scene of the two parallel beginnings of settled communities living in towns. By 4000 B.C., in both these regions of the earth, such communities

existed, and had been going on for a very considerable time. The excavations of the American expedition[99] at Nippur have unearthed evidence of a city community existing there at least as early as 5000 B.C., and probably as early as 6000 B.C., an earlier date than anything we know of in Egypt. De Candolle asserts that it is only in the Euphrates-Tigris district that wheat has ever been found growing wild.[100] It may be that from Mesopotamia as a centre the cultivation of wheat spread over the entire eastern hemisphere. Or it may be that wheat grew wild in some regions now submerged. There may have been a wild wheat region in what is now the sea bottom of the eastern Mediterranean. But cultivation is not civilization; the growing of wheat had spread from the Atlantic to the Pacific with the distribution of the Neolithic culture by perhaps 10,000 or 9000 B.C., before the beginnings of civilization. Civilization is something more than the occasional seasonal growing of wheat. It is the settlement of men upon an area continuously cultivated and possessed, who live in buildings continuously inhabited with a common rule and a common city or citadel. For a long time civilization may quite possibly have developed in Mesopotamia without any relations with the parallel beginnings in Egypt. The two settlements may have been quite independent, arising separately out of the widely diffused Heliolithic Neolithic culture. Or they may have had a common origin in the region of the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and southern Arabia.

[Illustration: Map of The CRADLE of WESTERN CIVILIZATION

6,000 to 4,000 B.C.

J.F.H.]

The first condition necessary to a real settling down of Neolithic men, as distinguished from a mere temporary settlement among abundant food, was of course a trustworthy all-the-year-round supply of water, fodder for the animals, food for themselves, and building material for their homes. There had to be everything they could need at any season, and no want that would tempt them to wander further. This was a possible state of affairs, no doubt, in many European and Asiatic valleys; and in many such valleys, as in the case of the Swiss lake-dwellings, men settled from a very early date indeed; but nowhere, of any countries now known to us, were these favourable conditions found upon such a scale, and nowhere did they hold good so surely year in and year out as in Egypt and in the country between the upper waters of the Euphrates and Tigris and the Persian Gulf.[101] Here was a constant water supply under enduring sunlight; trustworthy harvests year by year; in Mesopotamia wheat yielded, says Herodotus, two hundredfold to the sower; Pliny says that it was cut twice and afterwards yielded good fodder for sheep; there were abundant palms and many sorts of fruits; and as for building material, in Egypt there was clay and easily worked stone, and in Mesopotamia a clay that becomes a brick in the sunshine. In such countries men would cease to wander and settle down almost unawares; they would multiply and discover themselves numerous and by their numbers safe from any casual assailant. They multiplied, producing a denser human population than the earth had ever known before; their houses became more substantial, wild beasts were exterminated over great areas, the security of life increased so that ordinary men went about in the towns and fields without encumbering themselves with weapons, and, among themselves at least, they became peaceful peoples. Men took root as man had never taken root before.

But in the less fertile and more seasonal lands outside these favoured areas, there developed on the other hand a thinner, more active population of peoples, the primitive nomadic peoples. In contrast with the settled folk, the agriculturists, these nomads lived freely and dangerously. They were in comparison lean and hungry men. Their herding was still blended with hunting; they fought constantly for their pastures against hostile families. The discoveries in the elaboration of implements and the use of metals made by the settled peoples spread to them and improved their weapons. They followed the settled folk from Neolithic phase to Bronze phase. It is possible that, in the case of iron, the first users were nomadic. They became more warlike with better arms, and more capable of rapid movements with the improvement of their transport. One must not think of a nomadic stage as a predecessor of a settled stage in human affairs. To begin with, man was a slow drifter, following food. Then one sort of men began to settle down, and another sort became more distinctly nomadic. The settled sort began to rely more and more upon grain for food; the nomad began to make a greater use of milk for food. He bred his cows for milk. The two ways of life specialized in opposite directions. It was inevitable that nomad folk and the settled folk should clash, that the nomads should seem hard barbarians to the settled peoples, and the settled peoples soft and effeminate and very good plunder to the nomad peoples. Along the fringes of the developing civilizations there must have been a constant raiding and bickering between hardy nomad tribes and mountain tribes and the more numerous and less warlike peoples in the towns and villages.

For the most part this was a mere raiding of the borders. The settled folk had the weight of numbers on their side; the herdsmen might raid and loot, but they could not stay. That sort of mutual friction might go on for many generations. But ever and again we find some leader or some tribe amidst the disorder of free and independent nomads, powerful enough to force a sort of unity upon

its kindred tribes, and then woe betide the nearest civilization. Down pour the united nomads on the unwarlike, unarmed plains, and there ensues a war of conquest. Instead of carrying off the booty, the conquerors settle down on the conquered land, which becomes all booty for them; the villagers and townsmen are reduced to servitude and tribute-paying, they become hewers of wood and drawers of water, and the leaders of the nomads become kings and princes, masters and aristocrats. They too settle down, they learn many of the arts and refinements of the conquered, they cease to be lean and hungry, but for many generations they retain traces of their old nomadic habits, they hunt and indulge in open-air sports, they drive and race chariots, they regard work, especially agricultural work, as the lot of an inferior race and class.

This in a thousand variations has been one of the main stories in history for the last seventy centuries or more. In the first history that we can clearly decipher we find already in all the civilized regions a distinction between a non-working ruler class and the working mass of the population. And we find too that after some generations, the aristocrat, having settled down, begins to respect the arts and refinements and law-abidingness of settlement, and to lose something of his original hardihood. He intermarries, he patches up a sort of toleration between conqueror and conquered; he exchanges religious ideas and learns the lessons upon which soil and climate insist. He becomes a part of the civilization he has captured. And as he does so, events gather towards a fresh invasion by the free adventurers of the outer world.[102]

§ 2A

[Illustration: A very early Sumerian stone carving showing Sumerian warriors in phalanx]

This alternation of settlement, conquest, refinement, fresh conquest, refinement, is particularly to be noted in the region of the Euphrates and Tigris, which lay open in every direction to great areas which are not arid enough to be complete deserts, but which were not fertile enough to support civilized populations. Perhaps the earliest people to form real cities in this part of the world, or indeed in any part of the world, were a people of mysterious origin called the Sumerians. They were neither Semites nor Aryans, and whence they came we do not know. Whether they were dark whites of Iberian or Dravidian affinities is less certainly to be denied.[103] They used a kind of writing which they scratched upon clay, and their language has been deciphered.[104] It was a language more like the unclassified Caucasic language groups than any others that now exist. These languages may be connected with Basque, and may represent what was once a widespread group extending from Spain and western Europe to eastern India, and reaching southwards to Central Africa. These people shaved their heads and wore simple tunic-like garments of wool. They settled first on the lower courses of the great river and not very far from the Persian Gulf, which in those days ran up for a hundred and thirty miles[105] and more beyond its present head. They fertilized their fields by letting water run through irrigation trenches, and they gradually became very skilful hydraulic engineers; they had cattle, asses, sheep, and goats, but no horses; their collections of mud huts grew into towns, and their religion raised up towerlike temple buildings.

Clay, dried in the sun, was a very great fact in the lives of these people. This lower country of the Euphrates-Tigris valleys had little or no stone. They built of brick, they made pottery and earthenware images, and they drew and presently wrote upon thin tile-like cakes of clay. They do not seem to have had paper or to have used parchment. Their books and memoranda, even their letters, were potsherds.

At Nippur they built a great tower of brick to their chief god, El-lil (Enlil), the memory of which is supposed to be preserved in the story of the Tower of Babel. They seem to have been divided up into city states, which warred among themselves and maintained for many centuries their military capacity. Their soldiers carried long spears and shields, and fought in close formation. Sumerians conquered Sumerians. Sumeria remained unconquered by any stranger race for a very long period of time indeed. They developed their civilization, their writing, and their shipping, through a period that may be twice as long as the whole period from the Christian era to the present time.

The first of all known empires was that founded by the high priest of the god of the Sumerian city of Erech. It reached, says an inscription at Nippur, from the Lower (Persian Gulf) to the Upper (Mediterranean or Red?) Sea. Among the mud heaps of the Euphrates-Tigris valley the record of that vast period of history, that first half of the Age of Cultivation, is buried. There flourished the first temples and the first priest-rulers that we know of among mankind.

§ 2B

Upon the western edge of this country appeared nomadic tribes of Semitic-speaking peoples who traded, raided, and fought with the Sumerians for many generations. Then arose at last a great leader among these Semites, Sargon (2750 B.C.),[106] who united

them, and not only conquered the Sumerians, but extended his rule from beyond the Persian Gulf on the east to the Mediterranean on the west. His own people were called the Akkadians and his empire is called the Sumerian Akkadian Empire. It endured for over two hundred years.

But though the Semites conquered and gave a king to the Sumerian cities, it was the Sumerian civilization which prevailed over the simpler Semitic culture. The newcomers learnt the Sumerian writing (the “cuneiform” writing) and the Sumerian language; they set up no Semitic writing of their own. The Sumerian language became for these barbarians the language of knowledge and power, as Latin was the language of knowledge and power among the barbaric peoples of the middle ages in Europe. This Sumerian learning had a very great vitality. It was destined to survive through a long series of conquests and changes that now began in the valley of the two rivers.

§ 2C

As the people of the Sumerian Akkadian Empire lost their political and military vigour, fresh inundations of a warlike people began from the east, the Elamites,[107] while from the west came the Semitic Amorites, pinching the Sumerian Akkadian Empire between them. The Amorites settled in what was at first a small up-river town, named Babylon; and after a hundred years of warfare became masters of all Mesopotamia under a great king, Hammurabi (2100 B.C.), who founded the first Babylonian Empire.

Again came peace and security and a decline in aggressive prowess, and in another hundred years fresh nomads from the east were invading Babylonia, bringing with them the horse and the war chariot, and setting up their own king in Babylon....

§2D

Higher up the Tigris, above the clay lands and with easy supplies of workable stone, a Semitic people, the Assyrians, while the Sumerians were still unconquered by the Semites, were settling about a number of cities of which Assur and Nineveh were the chief. Their peculiar physiognomy, the long nose and thick lips, was very like that of the commoner type of Polish Jew to-day. They wore great beards and ringletted long hair, tall caps and long robes. They were constantly engaged in mutual raiding with the Hittites to the west; they were conquered by Sargon I and became free again; a certain Tushratta, King of Mitanni, to the north-west, captured and held their capital, Nineveh, for a time; they intrigued with Egypt against Babylon and were in the pay of Egypt; they developed the military art to a very high pitch, and became mighty raiders and exacters of tribute; and at last, adopting the horse and the war chariot, they settled accounts for a time with the Hittites, and then, under Tiglath Pileser I, conquered Babylon for themselves (about 1100 B.C.[108]). But their hold on the lower, older, and more civilized land was not secure, and Nineveh, the stone city, as distinguished from Babylon, the brick city, remained their capital. For many centuries power swayed between Nineveh and Babylon, and sometimes it was an Assyrian and sometimes a Babylonian who claimed to be “king of the world.”

For four centuries Assyria was restrained from expansion towards Egypt by a fresh northward thrust and settlement of another group of Semitic peoples, the Arameans, whose chief city was Damascus, and whose descendants are the Syrians of to-day. (There is, we may note, no connection whatever between the words Assyrian and Syrian. It is an accidental similarity.) Across these Syrians the Assyrian kings fought for power and expansion south-westward. In 745 B.C. arose another Tiglath Pileser, Tiglath Pileser III, the Tiglath Pileser of the Bible.[109] He not only directed the transfer of the Israelites to Media (the “Lost Ten Tribes” whose ultimate fate has exercised so many curious minds), but he conquered and ruled Babylon, so founding what historians know as the New Assyrian Empire. His son, Shalmaneser IV,[110] died during the siege of Samaria, and was succeeded by a usurper, who, no doubt to flatter Babylonian susceptibilities, took the ancient Akkadian Sumerian name of Sargon, Sargon II. He seems to have armed the Assyrian forces for the first time with iron weapons. It was probably Sargon II who actually carried out the deportation of the Ten Tribes.

Such shiftings about of population became a very distinctive part of the political methods of the Assyrian new empire. Whole nations who were difficult to control in their native country would be shifted en _masse_ to unaccustomed regions and amidst strange neighbours, where their only hope of survival would lie in obedience to the supreme power.

[Illustration: Assyrian warrior

(Bas-relief from the palace of Sargon II)]

Sargon's son, Sennacherib, led the Assyrian hosts to the borders of Egypt. There Sennacherib's army was smitten by a pestilence, a disaster described in the nineteenth chapter of the Second Book of Kings.

"And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand; and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses. So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh."[111]

Sennacherib's grandson, Assurbanipal (called by the Greeks Sardanapalus), did succeed in conquering and for a time holding lower Egypt.

§2E

The Assyrian Empire lasted only a hundred and fifty years after Sargon II. Fresh nomadic Semites coming from the south-east, the Chaldeans, assisted by two Aryan peoples from the north, the Medes and Persians, combined against it, and took Nineveh in 606 B.C.

The Chaldean Empire, with its capital at Babylon (Second Babylonian Empire), lasted under Nebuchadnezzar the Great (Nebuchadnezzar II) and his successors until 539 B.C., when it collapsed before the attack of Cyrus, the founder of the Persian power....

So the story goes on. In 330 B.C., as we shall tell later in some detail, a Greek conqueror, Alexander the Great, is looking on the murdered body of the last of the Persian rulers.

The story of the Tigris and Euphrates civilizations, of which we have given as yet only the bare outline, is a story of conquest following after conquest, and each conquest replaces old rulers and ruling classes by new; races like the Sumerian and the Elamite are swallowed up, their languages vanish, they interbreed and are lost, the Assyrian melts away into Chaldean and Syrian, the Hittites become Aryanized and lose distinction, the Semites who swallowed up the Sumerians give place to Aryan rulers, Medes and Persians appear in the place of the Elamites, the Aryan Persian language dominates the empire until the Aryan Greek ousts it from official life. Meanwhile the plough does its work year by year, the harvests are gathered, the builders build as they are told, the tradesmen work and acquire fresh devices; the knowledge of writing spreads, novel things, the horse and wheeled vehicles and iron, are introduced and become part of the permanent inheritance of mankind; the volume of trade upon sea and desert increases, men's ideas widen, and knowledge grows. There are set-backs, massacres, pestilence; but the story is, on the whole, one of enlargement. For four thousand years this new thing, civilization, which had set its root into the soil of the two rivers, grew as a tree grows; now losing a limb, now stripped by a storm, but always growing and resuming its growth. After four thousand years the warriors and conquerors were still going to and fro over this growing thing they did not understand, but men had now (330 B.C.) got iron, horses, writing and computation, money, a greater variety of foods and textiles, a wider knowledge of their world.

The time that elapsed between the empire of Sargon I and the conquest of Babylon by Alexander the Great was as long, be it noted, at the least estimate, as the time from Alexander the Great to the present day. And before the time of Sargon, men had been settled in the Sumerian land, living in towns, worshipping in temples, following an orderly Neolithic agricultural life in an organized community for at least as long again. "Eridu, Lagash, Ur, Uruk, Larsa, have already an immemorial past when first they appear in history."[112]

One of the most difficult things for both the writer and student of history is to sustain the sense of these time intervals and prevent these ages becoming shortened by perspective in his imagination. Half the duration of human civilization and the keys to all its chief institutions are to be found _before_ Sargon I. Moreover, the reader cannot too often compare the scale of the dates in these latter fuller pages of man's history with the succession of countless generations to which the time diagrams given on pages 14, 60, and 89 bear witness.

§ 3

The story of the Nile valley from the dawn of its traceable history until the time of Alexander the Great is not very dissimilar from that of Babylonia; but while Babylonia lay open on every side to invasion, Egypt was protected by desert to the west and by desert and sea to the east, while to the south she had only negro peoples. Consequently her history is less broken by the invasions of strange races than is the history of Assyria and Babylon, and until towards the eighth century B.C., when she fell under an Ethiopian

dynasty, whenever a conqueror did come into her story, he came in from Asia by way of the Isthmus of Suez.

[Illustration: Iron Weapons]

The Stone Age remains in Egypt are of very uncertain date; there are Palæolithic and then Neolithic remains. It is not certain whether the Neolithic pastoral people who left those remains were the direct ancestors of the later Egyptians. In many respects they differed entirely from their successors. They buried their dead, but before they buried them they cut up the bodies and apparently ate portions of the flesh. They seem to have done this out of a feeling of reverence for the departed; the dead were "eaten with honour" according to the phrase of Mr. Flinders Petrie. It may have been that the survivors hoped to retain thereby some vestige of the strength and virtue that had died. Traces of similar savage customs have been found in the long barrows that were scattered over western Europe before the spreading of the Aryan peoples, and they have pervaded negro Africa, where they are only dying out at the present time.

[Illustration: Early figure of the Egyptian hippopotamus goddess.]

About 5000 B.C., or earlier, the traces of these primitive peoples cease, and the true Egyptians appear on the scene. The former people were hut builders and at a comparatively low stage of Neolithic culture, the latter were already a civilized Neolithic people; they used brick and wood buildings instead of their predecessors' hovels, and they were working stone. Very soon they passed into the Bronze Age. They possessed a system of picture writing almost as developed as the contemporary writing of the Sumerians, but quite different in character. Possibly there was an irruption from southern Arabia by way of Aden, of a fresh people, who came into upper Egypt and descended slowly towards the delta of the Nile. Dr. Wallis Budge writes of them as "conquerors from the East." But their gods and their ways, like their picture writing, were very different indeed from the Sumerian. One of the earliest known figures of a deity is that of a hippopotamus goddess, and so very distinctively African.[113]

The clay of the Nile is not so fine and plastic as the Sumerian clay, and the Egyptians made no use of it for writing. But they early resorted to strips of the papyrus reed fastened together, from whose name comes our word "paper."

The broad outline of the history of Egypt is simpler than the history of Mesopotamia. It has long been the custom to divide the rulers of Egypt into a succession of Dynasties, and in speaking of the periods of Egyptian history it is usual to speak of the first, fourth, fourteenth, and so on, Dynasty. The Egyptians were ultimately conquered by the Persians after their establishment in Babylon, and when finally Egypt fell to Alexander the Great in 332 B.C., it was Dynasty XXXI that came to an end. In that long history of over 4000 years, a much longer period than that between the career of Alexander the Great and the present day, certain broad phases of development may be noted here. There was a phase known as the "old kingdom," which culminated in the IVth Dynasty; this Dynasty marks a period of wealth and splendour, and its monarchs were obsessed by such a passion for making monuments for themselves as no men have ever before or since had a chance to display and gratify. It was Cheops[114] and Chephren and Mycerinus of this IVth Dynasty who raised the vast piles of the great and the second and the third pyramids at Gizeh. These unmeaning[115] sepulchral piles, of an almost incredible vastness,[116] erected in an age when engineering science had scarcely begun, exhausted the resources of Egypt through three long reigns, and left her wasted as if by a war.

The story of Egypt from the IVth to the XVth Dynasty is a story of conflicts between alternative capitals and competing religions, of separations into several kingdoms and reunions. It is, so to speak, an internal history. Here we can name only one of that long series of Pharaohs, Pepi II, who reigned ninety years, the longest reign in history, and left a great abundance of inscriptions and buildings. At last there happened to Egypt what happened so frequently to the civilizations of Mesopotamia. Egypt was conquered by nomadic Semites, who founded a "shepherd" dynasty, the Hyksos (XVIth), which was finally expelled by native Egyptians. This invasion probably happened while that first Babylonian Empire which Hammurabi founded was flourishing, but the exact correspondences of dates between early Egypt and Babylonia are still very doubtful. Only after a long period of servitude did a popular uprising expel these foreigners again.

After the war of liberation (circa 1600 B.C.) there followed a period of great prosperity in Egypt, _the New Empire_. Egypt became a great and united military state, and pushed her expeditions at last as far as the Euphrates, and so the age-long struggle between the Egyptian and Babylonian-Assyrian power began.

For a time Egypt was the ascendant power. Thothmes III[117] and his son Amenophis III (XVIIIth Dynasty) ruled from Ethiopia to the Euphrates in the fifteenth century B.C. For various reasons these names stand out with unusual distinctness in the Egyptian record. They were great builders, and left many monuments and inscriptions. Amenophis III founded Luxor, and added greatly to

Karnak. At Tel-el-Amarna a mass of letters has been found, the royal correspondence with Babylonian and Hittite and other monarchs, including that Tushratta who took Nineveh, throwing a flood of light upon the political and social affairs of this particular age. Of Amenophis IV we shall have more to tell later, but of one, the most extraordinary and able of Egyptian monarchs, Queen Hatasu, the aunt and stepmother of Thotmes III, we have no space to tell. She is represented upon her monuments in masculine garb, and with a long beard as a symbol of wisdom.

Thereafter there was a brief Syrian conquest of Egypt, a series, of changing dynasties, among which we may note the XIXth, which included Rameses II, a great builder of temples, who reigned seventy-seven years (about 1317 to 1250 B.C.), and who is supposed by some to have been the Pharaoh of Moses, and the XXIInd, which included Shishak, who plundered Solomon's temple (circa 930 B.C.). An Ethiopian conqueror from the Upper Nile founded the XXVth Dynasty, a foreign dynasty, which went down (670 B.C.) before the new Assyrian Empire created by Tiglath Pileser III, Sargon II, and Sennacherib, of which we have already made mention.

The days of any Egyptian predominance over foreign nations were drawing to an end. For a time under Psammetichus I of the XXVIth Dynasty (664-610 B.C.) native rule was restored, and Necho II recovered for a time the old Egyptian possessions in Syria up to the Euphrates while the Medes and Chaldeans were attacking Nineveh. From those gains Necho II was routed out again after the fall of Nineveh and the Assyrians by Nebuchadnezzar II, the great Chaldean king, the Nebuchadnezzar of the Bible. The Jews, who had been the allies of Necho II, were taken into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon.

When, in the sixth century B.C., Chaldea fell to the Persians, Egypt followed suit, a rebellion later made Egypt independent once more for sixty years, and in 332 B.C. she welcomed Alexander the Great as her conqueror, to be ruled thereafter by foreigners, first by Greeks, then by Romans, then in succession by Arabs, Turks, and British, until the present day.

Such briefly is the history of Egypt from its beginnings; a history first of isolation and then of increasing entanglement with the affairs of other nations, as increasing facilities of communication drew the peoples of the world into closer and closer interaction.

§ 4

The history we need to tell here of India is simpler even than this brief record of Egypt. Somewhere about the time of Hammurabi or later, a branch of the Aryan-speaking people who then occupied North Persia and Afghanistan, pushed down the northwest passes into India. They conquered their way until they prevailed over all the darker populations of North India, and spread their rule or influence over the whole peninsula. They never achieved any unity in India; their history is a history of warring kings and republics. The Persian empire, in the days of its expansion after the capture of Babylon, pushed its boundaries beyond the Indus, and later Alexander the Great marched as far as the border of the desert that separates the Punjab from the Ganges valley. But with this bare statement we will for a time leave the history of India.

§ 5

[Illustration: The Cradle of CHINESE CIVILIZATION]

Meanwhile, as this triple system of White Man civilization developed in India and in the lands about the meeting-places of Asia, Africa, and Europe, another and quite distinct civilization was developing and spreading out from the then fertile but now dry and desolate valley of the Tarim and from the slopes of the Kuen-lun mountains in two directions, down the course of the Hwang-ho, and into the valley of the Yang-tse-kiang. We know practically nothing as yet of the archæology of China, we do not know anything of the Stone Age in that part of the world, and at present our ideas of this early civilization are derived from the still very imperfectly explored Chinese literature. It has evidently been from the first and throughout a Mongolian civilization. Until after the time of Alexander the Great there are few traces of any Aryan or Semitic, much less of Hamitic influence. All such influences were still in another world, separated by mountains, deserts, and wild nomadic tribes until that time. The Chinese seem to have made their civilization spontaneously and unassisted. Some recent writers suppose indeed a connection with ancient Sumeria. Of course both China and Sumeria arose on the basis of the almost world-wide early Neolithic culture, but the Tarim valley and the lower Euphrates are separated by such vast obstacles of mountain and desert as to forbid the idea of any migration or interchange of peoples who had once settled down.

But though the civilization of China is wholly Mongolian (as we have defined Mongolian), it does not follow that the northern roots are the only ones from which it grew. If it grew first in the Tarim valley, then unlike all other civilizations (including the Mexican and

Peruvian) it did not grow out of the heliolithic culture. We Europeans know very little as yet of the ethnology and pre-history of southern China. There the Chinese mingle with such kindred peoples as the Siamese and Burmese, and seem to bridge over towards the darker Dravidian peoples and towards the Malays. It is quite clear from the Chinese records that there were southern as well as northern beginnings of a civilization, and that the Chinese civilization that comes into history 2000 years B.C. is the result of a long process of conflicts, minglings, and interchanges between a southern and a northern culture of which the southern may have been the earlier. The southern Chinese perhaps played the rôle towards the northern Chinese that the Hamites or Sumerians played to the Aryan and Semitic peoples in the west, or that the settled Dravidians played towards the Aryans in India. They may have been the first agriculturists and the first temple builders. But so little is known as yet of this attractive chapter in pre-history, that we cannot dwell upon it further here.

The chief foreigners mentioned in the early annals of China were a Ural-Altaic people on the north-east frontier, the Huns, against whom certain of the earlier emperors made war.

Chinese history is still very imperfectly known to European students, and our accounts of the early records are particularly unsatisfactory. About 2700 to 2400 B.C. reigned five emperors, who seem to have been almost incredibly exemplary beings.

There follows upon these first five emperors a series of dynasties, of which the accounts become more and more exact and convincing as they become more recent. China has to tell a long history of border warfare and of graver struggles between the settled and nomad peoples. To begin with, China, like Sumer and like Egypt, was a land of city states. The government was at first a government of numerous kings; they became loosely feudal under an emperor, as the Egyptians did; and then later, as with the Egyptians, came a centralizing empire. Shang (1750 to 1125 B.C.) and Chow (1125 to 250 B.C.) are named as being the two great dynasties of the feudal period. Bronze vessels of these earlier dynasties, beautiful, splendid, and with a distinctive style of their own, still exist, and there can be no doubt of the existence of a high state of culture even before the days of Shang.

It is perhaps a sense of symmetry that made the later historians of Egypt and China talk of the earlier phases of their national history as being under dynasties comparable to the dynasties of the later empires, and of such early “Emperors” as Menes (in Egypt) or the First Five Emperors (in China). The early dynasties exercised far less centralized powers than the later ones. Such unity as China possessed under the Shang dynasty was a religious rather than an effective political union. The “Son of Heaven” offered sacrifices for all the Chinese. There was a common script, a common civilization, and a common enemy in the Huns of the north-western borders.

The last of the Shang Dynasty was a cruel and foolish monarch who burnt himself alive (1125 B.C.) in his palace after a decisive defeat by Wu Wang, the founder of the Chow Dynasty. Wu Wang seems to have been helped by allies from among the south-western tribes as well as by a popular revolt.

For a time China remained loosely united under the Chow emperors, as loosely united as was Christendom under the popes in the Middle Ages; the Chow emperors had become the traditional high priests of the land in the place of the Shang Dynasty and claimed a sort of overlordship in Chinese affairs, but gradually the loose ties of usage and sentiment that held the empire together lost their hold upon men’s minds. Hunnish peoples to the north and west took on the Chinese civilization without acquiring a sense of its unity. Feudal princes began to regard themselves as independent. Mr. Liang-Chi-Chao,[118] one of the Chinese representatives at the Paris Conference of 1919, states that between the eighth and fourth centuries B.C. “there were in the Hwang-ho and Yang-tse valleys no less than five or six thousand small states with about a dozen powerful states dominating over them.” The land was subjected to perpetual warfare (“Age of Confusion”). In the sixth century B.C. the great powers in conflict were Ts’i and Ts’in, which were northern Hwang-ho states, and Ch’u, which was a vigorous, aggressive power in the Yang-tse valley. A confederation against Ch’u laid the foundation for a league that kept the peace for a hundred years; the league subdued and incorporated Ch’u and made a general treaty of disarmament. It became the foundation of a new pacific empire.

The knowledge of iron entered China at some unknown date, but iron weapons began to be commonly used only about 500 B.C., that is to say two or three hundred years or more after this had become customary in Assyria, Egypt, and Europe. Iron was probably introduced from the north into China by the Huns.

The last rulers of the Chow Dynasty were ousted by the kings of Ts’in, the latter seized upon the sacred sacrificial bronze tripods, and so were able to take over the imperial duty of offering sacrifices to Heaven. In this manner was the Ts’in Dynasty established. It ruled with far more vigour and effect than any previous family. The reign of Shi-Hwang-ti (meaning “first universal emperor”) of this dynasty is usually taken to mark the end of feudal and divided China. He seems to have played the unifying rôle in the east that

Alexander the Great might have played in the west, but he lived longer, and the unity he made (or restored) was comparatively permanent, while the empire of Alexander the Great fell to pieces, as we shall tell, at his death. Shi-Hwang-ti, among other feats in the direction of common effort, organized the building of the Great Wall of China against the Huns. A civil war followed close upon his reign, and ended in the establishment of the Han Dynasty. Under this Han Dynasty the empire grew greatly beyond its original two river valleys, the Huns were effectively restrained, and the Chinese penetrated westward until they began to learn at last of civilized races and civilizations other than their own.

By 100 B.C. the Chinese had heard of India, their power had spread across Tibet and into Western Turkestan, and they were trading by camel caravans with Persia and the western world. So much for the present must suffice for our account of China. We shall return to the distinctive characters of its civilization later.

§ 6

And in these thousands of years during which man was making his way step by step from the barbarism of the heliolithic culture to civilization at these old-world centres, what was happening in the rest of the world? To the north of these centres, from the Rhine to the Pacific, the Nordic and Mongolian peoples, as we have told, were also learning the use of metals; but while the civilizations were settling down these men of the great plains were becoming migratory and developing from a slow wandering life towards a complete seasonal nomadism. To the south of the civilized zone, in central and southern Africa, the negro was making a slower progress, and that, it would seem, under the stimulus of invasion by whiter tribes from the Mediterranean regions, bringing with them in succession cultivation and the use of metals. These white men came to the black by two routes: across the Sahara to the west as Berbers and Tuaregs and the like, to mix with the negro and create such quasi-white races as the Fulas; and also by way of the Nile, where the Baganda (= Gandafolk) of Uganda, for example, may possibly be of remote white origin. The African forests were denser then, and spread eastward and northward from the Upper Nile.

The islands of the East Indies, three thousand years ago, were probably still only inhabited here and there by stranded patches of Palæolithic Australoids, who had wandered thither in those immemorial ages when there was a nearly complete land bridge by way of the East Indies to Australia. The islands of Oceania were uninhabited. The spreading of the heliolithic peoples by sea-going canoes into the islands of the Pacific came much later in the history of man, at earliest a thousand years B.C. Still later did they reach Madagascar. The beauty of New Zealand also was as yet wasted upon mankind; its highest living creatures were a great ostrich-like bird, the moa, now extinct, and the little kiwi which has feathers like coarse hair and the merest rudiment of wings.

In North America a group of Mongoloid tribes were now cut off altogether from the old world. They were spreading slowly southward, hunting the innumerable bison of the plains. They had still to learn for themselves the secrets of a separate agriculture based on maize, and in South America to tame the lama to their service and so build up in Mexico and Peru two civilizations roughly parallel in their nature to that of Sumer, but different in many respects, and later by six or seven thousand years....

When men reached the southern extremity of America, the _Megatherium_, the giant sloth, and the _Glyptodon_, the giant armadillo, were still living....

There is a considerable imaginative appeal in the obscure story of the early American civilizations. It was largely a separate development.[119] Somewhen at last the southward drift of the Amerindians must have met and mingled with the eastward, canoe-borne drift of the heliolithic culture. But it was the heliolithic culture still at a very lowly stage and probably before the use of metals. It has to be noted as evidence of this canoe-borne origin of American culture, that elephant-headed figures are found in Central American drawings. American metallurgy may have arisen independently of the old-world use of metal, or it may have been brought by these elephant carvers. These American peoples got to the use of bronze and copper, but not to the use of iron; they had gold and silver; and their stonework, their pottery, weaving, and dyeing were carried to a very high level. In all these things the American product resembles the old-world product generally, but always it has characteristics that are distinctive. The American civilizations had picture-writing of a primitive sort, but it never developed even to the pitch of the earliest Egyptian hieroglyphics. In Yucatan only was there a kind of script, the Maya writing, but it was used simply for keeping a calendar. In Peru the beginnings of writing were superseded by a curious and complicated method of keeping records by means of knots tied upon strings of various colours and shapes. It is said that even laws and orders could be conveyed by this code. These string bundles were called _quipus_, but though quipus are still to be found in collections, the art of reading them is altogether lost. The Chinese histories, Mr. L. Y. Chen informs us, state that a similar method of record by knots was used in China before the invention of writing there. The Peruvians also got to making maps and the use of counting-frames. “But with all this there was no means of handing on knowledge

and experience from one generation to another, nor was anything done to fix and summarize these intellectual possessions, which are the basis of literature and science."[120]

When the Spaniards came to America, the Mexicans knew nothing of the Peruvians nor the Peruvians of the Mexicans. Intercourse there was none. Whatever links had ever existed were lost and forgotten. The Mexicans had never heard of the potato, which was a principal article of Peruvian diet. In 5000 B.C. the Sumerians and Egyptians probably knew as little of one another. America was 6000 years behind the Old World.

XVII

SEA PEOPLES AND TRADING PEOPLES

§ 1. _The Earliest Ships and Sailors._ § 2. _The Ægean Cities before History._ § 3. _The First Voyages of Exploration._ § 4. _Early Traders._ § 5. _Early Travellers._

§ 1

The first boats were made very early indeed in the Neolithic stage of culture by riverside and lakeside peoples. They were no more than trees and floating wood, used to assist the imperfect natural swimming powers of men. Then came the hollowing out of the trees, and then, with the development of tools and a primitive carpentry, the building of boats. Men in Egypt and Mesopotamia also developed a primitive type of basket-work boat, caulked with bitumen. Such was the "ark of bulrushes" in which Moses was hidden by his mother. A kindred sort of vessel grew up by the use of skins and hides expanded upon a wicker framework. To this day cow-hide wicker boats (coracles) are used upon the west coast of Ireland, where there is plenty of cattle and a poverty of big trees. They are also still used on the Euphrates, and on the Towy in South Wales. Inflated skins may have preceded the coracle, and are still used on the Euphrates and upper Ganges. In the valleys of the great rivers, boats must early have become an important means of communication; and it seems natural to suppose that it was from the mouths of the great rivers that man, already in a reasonably seaworthy vessel, first ventured out upon what must have seemed to him then the trackless and homeless sea.

No doubt he ventured at first as a fisherman, having learnt the elements of seacraft in creeks and lagoons. Men may have navigated boats upon the Levantine lake before the refilling of the Mediterranean by the Atlantic waters. The canoe was an integral part of the heliolithic culture, it drifted with that culture upon the warm waters of the earth from the Mediterranean to (at last) America. There were not only canoes, but Sumerian boats and ships upon the Euphrates and Tigris, when these rivers in 7000 B.C. fell by separate mouths into the Persian Gulf. The Sumerian city of Eridu, which stood at the head of the Persian Gulf (from which it is now separated by a hundred and thirty miles of alluvium[121]), had ships upon the sea then. We also find evidence of a fully developed sea life six thousand years ago at the eastern end of the Mediterranean, and possibly at that time there were already canoes on the seas among the islands of the nearer East Indies. There are pre-dynastic Neolithic Egyptian representations of Nile ships of a fair size, capable of carrying elephants.[122]

Very soon the seafaring men must have realized the peculiar freedom and opportunities the ship gave them. They could get away to islands; no chief nor king could pursue a boat or ship with any certainty; every captain was a king. The seamen would find it easy to make nests upon islands and in strong positions on the mainland. There they could harbour, there they could carry on a certain agriculture and fishery; but their speciality and their main business was, of course, the expedition across the sea. That was not usually a trading expedition; it was much more frequently a piratical raid. From what we know of mankind, we are bound to conclude that the first sailors plundered when they could, and traded when they had to.

[Illustration: Boats on the Nile, about 2500 B.C. [From Torr's "Ancient Ships".]]

Because it developed in the comparatively warm and tranquil waters of the eastern Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, and the western horn of the Indian Ocean, the shipping of the ancient world retained throughout certain characteristics that make it differ very widely from the ocean-going sailing shipping, with its vast spread of canvas, of the last four hundred years. "The Mediterranean," says Mr. Torr,[123] "is a sea where a vessel with sails may lie becalmed for days together, while a vessel with oars would easily be traversing the smooth waters, with coasts and islands everywhere at hand to give her shelter in case of storm. In that sea, therefore, oars became the characteristic instruments of navigation, and the arrangement of oars the chief problem in shipbuilding. And so long as the Mediterranean nations dominated Western Europe, vessels of the southern type were built upon the northern coasts, though there generally was wind enough here for sails and too much wave for oars.... The art of rowing can

first be discerned upon the Nile. Boats with oars are represented in the earliest pictorial monuments of Egypt, dating from about 2500 B.C.; and although some crews are paddling with their faces towards the bow, others are rowing with their faces towards the stern. The paddling is certainly the older practice, for the hieroglyph chen depicts two arms grasping an oar in the attitude of paddling, and the hieroglyphs were invented in the earliest ages. And that practice may really have ceased before 2500 B.C., despite the testimony of monuments of that date; for in monuments dating from about 1250 B.C. crews are represented unmistakably rowing with their faces towards the stern and yet grasping their oars in the attitude of paddling, so that even then Egyptian artists mechanically followed the turn of the hieroglyph to which their hands were accustomed. In these reliefs there are twenty rowers on the boats on the Nile, and thirty on the ships on the Red Sea; but in the earliest reliefs the number varies considerably, and seems dependent on the amount of space at the sculptor's disposal."

[Illustration: Egyptian ship on the Red Sea, about 1250 B.C. (From Torr's "Ancient Ships.")

Mr. Langton Cole calls attention to the rope truss in this illustration, stiffening the beam of the ship. No other such use of the truss is known until the days of modern engineering.]

The Aryan peoples came late to the sea. The earliest ships on the sea were either Sumerian or Hamitic; the Semitic peoples followed close upon these pioneers. Along the eastern end of the Mediterranean, the Phœnicians, a Semitic people, set up a string of independent harbour towns of which Acre, Tyre, and Sidon were the chief; and later they pushed their voyages westward and founded Carthage and Utica in North Africa. Possibly Phœnician keels were already in the Mediterranean by 2000 B.C. Both Tyre and Sidon wee originally on islands, an so easily defensible against a land raid. But before we go on to the marine exploits of this great sea-going race, we must note a very remarkable and curious nest of early sea people whose remains have been discovered in Crete.[124]

§ 2

These early Cretans were of unknown race, but probably of a race akin to the Iberians of Spain and Western Europe and the dark whites of Asia Minor and North Africa, and their language is unknown. This race lived not only in Crete, but in Cyprus, Greece, Asia Minor, Sicily, and South Italy. It was a civilized people for long ages before the fair Aryan Greeks spread southward through Macedonia. At Cnossos, in Crete, there have been found the most astonishing ruins and remains, and Cnossos, therefore, is apt to overshadow the rest of these settlements in people's imaginations, but it is well to bear in mind that, though Cnossos was no doubt a chief city of this Ægean civilization, these "Ægeans" had in the fullness of their time many cities and a wide range. Possibly, all that we know of them now are but the vestiges of a far more extensive heliolithic Neolithic civilization which is now submerged under the waters of the Mediterranean.

At Cnossos there are Neolithic remains as old or older than any of the pre-dynastic remains of Egypt. The Bronze Age began in Crete as soon as it did in Egypt, and there have been vases found by Flinders Petrie in Egypt and referred by him to the Ist Dynasty, which he declared to be importations from Crete. Stone vessels have been found in Crete of forms characteristic of the IVth (pyramid-building) Dynasty, and there can be no doubt that there was a vigorous trade between Crete and Egypt in the time of the XIIth Dynasty. This continued until about 1000 B.C. It is clear that this island civilization arising upon the soil of Crete is at least as old as the Egyptian, and that it was already launched upon the sea as early as 4000 B.C.

The great days of Crete were not so early as this. It was only about 2500 B.C. that the island appears to have been unified under one ruler. Then began an age of peace and prosperity unexampled in the history of the ancient world. Secure from invasion, living in a delightful climate, trading with every civilized community in the world, the Cretans were free to develop all the arts and amenities of life. This Cnossos was not so much a town as the vast palace of the king and his people. It was not even fortified. The kings, it would seem, were called Minos always, as the kings of Egypt were all called Pharaoh; the king of Cnossos figures in the early legends of the Greeks as King Minos, who lived in the Labyrinth and kept there a horrible monster, half man, half bull, the Minotaur, to feed which he levied a tribute of youths and maidens from the Athenians. Those stories are a part of Greek literature, and have always been known, but it is only in the last few decades that the excavations at Cnossos have revealed how close these legends were to the reality. The Cretan labyrinth was a building as stately, complex, and luxurious as any in the ancient world. Among other details we find waterpipes, bathrooms, and the like conveniences, such as have hitherto been regarded as the latest refinements of modern life. The pottery, the textile manufactures, the sculpture and painting of these people, their gem and ivory work, their metal and inlaid work, is as admirable as any that mankind has produced. They were much given to festivals and shows, and, in particular, they were addicted to bull-fights and gymnastic entertainments. Their female costume became astonishingly

“modern” in style; their women wore corsets and flounced dresses. They had a system of writing which has not yet been deciphered.

[Illustration: ÆGEAN CIVILIZATION]

It is the custom nowadays to make a sort of wonder of these achievements of the Cretans, as though they were a people of incredible artistic ability living in the dawn of civilization. But their great time was long past that dawn; as late as 2000 B.C. It took them many centuries to reach their best in art and skill, and their art and luxury are by no means so great a wonder if we reflect that for 3000 years they were immune from invasion, that for a thousand years they were at peace. Century after century their artizans could perfect their skill, and their men and women refine upon refinement. Wherever men of almost any race have been comparatively safe in this fashion for such a length of time, they have developed much artistic beauty. Given the opportunity, all races are artistic. Green legend has it that it was in Crete that Dædalus attempted to make the first flying machine. Dædalus (= cunning artificer) was a sort of personified summary of mechanical skill. It is curious to speculate what germ of fact lies behind him and those waxen wings that, according to the legend, melted and plunged his son Icarus in the sea.

[Illustration: J.F.H. from photos by British School at Athens

Faience figure from Cnossos ... A votary of the Snake Goddess....]

There came at last a change in the condition of the lives of these Cretans, for other peoples, the Greeks and the Phœnicians, were also coming out with powerful fleets upon the seas. We do not know what led to the disaster nor who inflicted it; but somewhen about 1400 B.C. Cnossos was sacked and burnt, and though the Cretan life struggled on there rather lamely for another four centuries, there came at last a final blow about 1000 B.C. (that is to say, in the days of the Assyrian ascendancy in the East). The palace at Cnossos was destroyed, and never rebuilt nor reinhabited. Possibly this was done by the ships of those newcomers into the Mediterranean, the barbaric Greeks, a group of Aryan tribes, who may have wiped out Cnossos as they wiped out the city of Troy. The legend of Theseus tells of such a raid. He entered the Labyrinth (which may have been the Cnossos Palace) by the aid of Ariadne, the daughter of Minos, and slew the Minotaur.

The _Iliad_ makes it clear that destruction came upon Troy because the Trojans stole Greek women. Modern writers, with modern ideas in their heads, have tried to make out that the Greeks assailed Troy in order to secure a trade route or some such fine-spun commercial advantage. If so, the authors of the _Iliad_ hid the motives of their characters very skilfully. It would be about as reasonable to say that the Homeric Greeks went to war with the Trojans in order to be well ahead with a station on the Berlin to Bagdad railway. The Homeric Greeks were a healthy barbaric Aryan people, with very poor ideas about trade and “trade routes”; they went to war with the Trojans because they were thoroughly annoyed about this stealing of women. It is fairly clear from the Minos legend and from the evidence of the Cnossos remains, that the Cretans kidnapped or stole youths and maidens to be slaves, bull-fighters, athletes, and perhaps sacrifices. They traded fairly with the Egyptians, but it may be they did not realize the gathering strength of the Greek barbarians; they “traded” violently with them, and so brought sword and flame upon themselves.[125]

Another great sea people were the Phœnicians. They were great seamen because they were great traders. Their colony of Carthage (founded before 800 B.C. by Tyre) became at last greater than any of the older Phœnician cities, but already before 1500 B.C. both Sidon and Tyre had settlements upon the African coast. Carthage was comparatively inaccessible to the Assyrian and Babylonian hosts, and, profiting greatly by the long siege of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar II, became the greatest maritime power the world had hitherto seen. She claimed the Western Mediterranean as her own, and seized every ship she could catch west of Sardinia. Roman writers accuse her of great cruelties. She fought the Greeks for Sicily, and later (in the second century B.C.) she fought the Romans. Alexander the Great formed plans for her conquest; but he died, as we shall tell later, before he could carry them out.

§ 3

At her zenith Carthage probably had the hitherto unheard-of population of a million. This population was largely industrial, and her woven goods were universally famous. As well as a coasting trade, she had a considerable land trade with Central Africa,[126] and she sold negro slaves, ivory, metals, precious stones and the like, to all the Mediterranean people; she worked Spanish copper mines, and her ships went out into the Atlantic and coasted along Portugal and France northward as far as the Cassiterides (the Scilly Isles, or Cornwall, in England) to get tin. About 520 B.C. a certain Hanno made a voyage that is still one of the most notable in the world. This Hanno, if we may trust the _Periplus of Hanno_, the Greek translation of his account which still survives, followed

the African coast southward from the Straits of Gibraltar as far as the confines of Liberia. He had sixty big ships, and his main task was to found or reinforce certain Carthaginian stations upon the Morocco coast. Then he pushed southward. He founded a settlement in the Rio de Oro (on Kerne or Herne Island), and sailed on past the Senegal river. The voyagers passed on for seven days beyond the Gambia, and landed at last upon some island. This they left in a panic, because, although the day was silent with the silence of the tropical forest, at night they heard the sound of flutes, drums, and gongs, and the sky was red with the blaze of the bush fires. The coast country for the rest of the voyage was one blaze of fire, from the burning of the bush. Streams of fire ran down the hills into the sea, and at length a blaze arose so loftily that it touched the skies. Three days further brought them to an island containing a lake (? Sherbro Island). In this lake was another island (? Macaulay Island), and on this were wild, hairy men and women, “whom the interpreters called gorilla.” The Carthaginians, having caught some of the females of these “gorillas”--they were probably chimpanzees--turned back and eventually deposited the skins of their captives--who had proved impossibly violent guests to entertain on board ship--in the Temple of Juno.

A still more wonderful Phœnician sea voyage, long doubted, but now supported by some archæological evidence, is related by Herodotus, who declares that the Pharaoh Necho of the XXVIth Dynasty commissioned some Phœnicians to attempt the circumnavigation of Africa, and that starting from the Gulf of Suez southward, they did finally come back through the Mediterranean to the Nile delta. They took nearly three years to complete their voyage. Each year they landed, and sowed and harvested a crop of wheat before going on.

§ 4

The great trading cities of the Phœnicians are the most striking of the early manifestations of the peculiar and characteristic gift of the Semitic peoples to mankind, trade and exchange.[127] While the Semitic Phœnician peoples were spreading themselves upon the seas, another kindred Semitic people, the Arameans, whose occupation of Damascus we have already noted, were developing the caravan routes of the Arabian and Persian deserts, and becoming the chief trading people of Western Asia. The Semitic peoples, earlier civilized than the Aryan, have always shown, and still show to-day, a far greater sense of quality and quantity in marketable goods than the latter; it is to their need of account-keeping that the development of alphabetical writing is to be ascribed, and it is to them that most of the great advances in computation are due. Our modern numerals are Arabic; our arithmetic and algebra are essentially Semitic sciences.

The Semitic peoples, we may point out here, are to this day _counting peoples_ strong in their sense of equivalents and reparation. The moral teaching of the Hebrews was saturated by such ideas. “With what measure ye mete, the same shall be meted unto you.” Other races and peoples have imagined diverse and fitful and marvellous gods, but it was the trading Semites who first began to think of God as a Righteous Dealer, whose promises were kept, who failed not the humblest creditor, and called to account every spurious act.

The trade that was going on in the ancient world before the sixth or seventh century B.C. was almost entirely a barter trade. There was little or no credit or coined money. The ordinary standard of value with the early Aryans was cattle, as it still is with the Zulus and Kaffirs to-day. In the _Iliad_, the respective values of two shields are stated in head of cattle, and the Roman word for moneys, _pecunia_, is derived from _pecus_, cattle. Cattle as money had this advantage; it did not need to be carried from one owner to another, and if it needed attention and food, at any rate it bred. But it was inconvenient for ship or caravan transit. Many other substances have at various times been found convenient as a standard; tobacco was once legal tender in the colonial days in North America, and in West Africa fines are paid and bargains made in bottles of trade gin. The early Asiatic trade included metals; and weighed lumps of metal, since they were in general demand and were convenient for hoarding and storage, costing nothing for fodder and needing small house-room, soon asserted their superiority over cattle and sheep. Iron, which seems to have been first reduced from its ores by the Hittites, was, to begin with, a rare and much-desired substance.[128] It is stated by Aristotle to have supplied the first currency. In the collection of letters found at Tel-el-Amarna, addressed to and from Amenophis III (already mentioned) and his successor Amenophis IV, one from a Hittite king promises iron as an extremely valuable gift. Gold, then as now, was the most precious and therefore most portable, security. In early Egypt silver was almost as rare as gold until after the XVIIIth Dynasty. Later the general standard of value in the Eastern world became silver, measured by weight.

To begin with, metals were handed about in ingots and weighed at each transaction. Then they were stamped to indicate their fineness and guarantee their purity. The first recorded coins were minted about 600 B.C. in Lydia, a gold-producing country in the west of Asia Minor. The first-known gold coins were minted in Lydia by Crœsus, whose name has become a proverb for wealth; he was conquered, as we shall tell later, by that same Cyrus the Persian who took Babylon in 539 B.C. But very probably coined

money had been used in Babylonia before that time. The “sealed shekel,” a stamped piece of silver, came very near to being a coin. The promise to pay so much silver or gold on “leather” (= parchment) with the seal of some established firm is probably as old or older than coinage. The Carthaginians used such “leather money.” We know very little of the way in which small traffic was conducted. Common people, who in those ancient times were in dependent positions, seem to have had no money at all; they did their business by barter. Early Egyptian paintings show this going on.[129]

§ 5

When one realizes the absence of small money or of any conveniently portable means of exchange in the pre-Alexandrian world, one perceives how impossible was private travel in those days.[130] The first “inns”--no doubt a sort of caravanserai--are commonly said to have come into existence in Lydia in the third or fourth century B.C. That, however, is too late a date. They are certainly older than that. There is good evidence of them at least as early as the sixth century. Æschylus twice mentions inns. His word is “all-receiver,” or “all-receiving house.”[131] Private travellers must have been fairly common in the Greek world, including its colonies, by this time. But such private travel was a comparatively new thing then. The early historians Hecatæus and Herodotus travelled widely. “I suspect,” says Professor Gilbert Murray, “that this sort of travel ‘for Historie’ or ‘for discovery’ was rather a Greek invention. Solon is supposed to have practiced it; and even Lycurgus.”... The earlier travellers were traders travelling in a caravan or in a shipload, and carrying their goods and their minas and shekels of metal or gems or bales of fine stuff with them, or government officials travelling with letters of introduction and a proper retinue. Possibly there were a few mendicants, and, in some restricted regions, religious pilgrims.

That earlier world before 600 B.C. was one in which a lonely “stranger” was a rare and suspected and endangered being. He might suffer horrible cruelties, for there was little law to protect such as he. Few individuals strayed therefore. One lived and died attached and tied to some patriarchal tribe if one was a nomad, or to some great household if one was civilized, or to one of the big temple establishments which we will presently discuss. Or one was a herded slave. One knew nothing, except for a few monstrous legends, of the rest of the world in which one lived. We know more to-day, indeed, of the world of 600 B.C. than any single living being knew at that time. We map it out, see it as a whole in relation to past and future. We begin to learn precisely what was going on at the same time in Egypt and Spain and Media and India and China. We can share in imagination, not only the wonder of Hanno’s sailors, but of the men who lit the warning beacons on the shore. We know that those “mountains flaming to the sky” were only the customary burning of the dry grass at that season of the year. Year by year, more and more rapidly, our common knowledge increases. In the years to come men will understand still more of those lives in the past until perhaps they will understand them altogether.

XVIII

WRITING

§ 1. _Picture Writing._ § 2. _Syllable Writing._ § 3. _Alphabet Writing._ § 4. _The Place of Writing in Human Life._

§ 1

In the five preceding chapters (XIII to XVII) we have sketched in broad outline the development of the chief human communities from the primitive beginnings of the heliolithic culture to the great historical kingdoms and empires in the sixth century B.C. We must now study a little more closely the general process of social change, the growth of human ideas, and the elaboration of human relationships that were going on during these ages between 10,000 B.C. and 500 B.C. What we have done so far is to draw the map and name the chief kings and empires, to define the relations in time and space of Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt, Phœnicia, Cnossos, and the like; we come now to the real business of history, which is to get down below these outer forms to the thoughts and lives of individual men.

By far the most important thing that was going on during those fifty or sixty centuries of social development was the invention of writing and its gradual progress to importance in human affairs. It was a new instrument for the human mind, an enormous enlargement of its range of action, a new means of continuity. We have seen how in later Palæolithic and early Neolithic times the elaboration of articulate speech gave men a mental handhold for consecutive thought and a vast enlargement of their powers of co-operation. For a time this new acquirement seems to have overshadowed their earlier achievement of drawing, and possibly it checked the use of gesture. But drawing presently reappeared again, for record, for signs, for the joy of drawing. Before real writing

came picture-writing, such as is still practised by the Amerindians, the Bushmen, and savage and barbaric people in all parts of the world. It is essentially a drawing of things and acts, helped out by heraldic indications of proper names, and by strokes and dots to represent days and distances and such-like quantitative ideas.

Quite kindred to such picture-writing is the pictograph that one finds still in use to-day in international railway time-tables upon the continent of Europe, where a little black sign of a cup indicates a stand-up buffet for light refreshments; a crossed knife and fork, a restaurant; a little steamboat, a transfer to a steamboat; and a postilion's horn, a diligence. Similar signs are used in the well-known Michelin guides for automobilists in Europe, to show a post-office (envelope) or a telephone (telephone receiver). The quality of hotels is shown by an inn with one, two, three, or four gables, and so forth. Similarly, the roads of Europe are marked with wayside signs representing a gate, to indicate a level crossing ahead, a sinuous bend for a dangerous curve, and the like. From such pictographic signs to the first elements of Chinese writing is not a very long stretch.

In Chinese writing there are still traceable a number of pictographs. Most are now difficult to recognize. A mouth was originally written as a mouth-shaped hole and is now, for convenience of brushwork, squared; a child, originally a recognizable little mannikin, is now a hasty wriggle and a cross; the sun, originally a large circle with a dot in the centre, has been converted, for the sake of convenience of combination, into a crossed oblong, which is easier to make with a brush. By combining these pictographs, a second order of ideas is expressed. For example, the pictograph for mouth combined with pictograph for vapour expressed "words."[132]

[Illustration: _Specimens of American Indian picture-writing_

(_after Schoolcraft ..._)]

No. 1, painted on a rock on the shore of Lake Superior, records an expedition across the lake, in which five canoes took part. The upright strokes in each indicate the number of the crew, and the bird represents a chief, "The Kingfisher." The three circles (suns) under the arch (of heaven) indicate that the voyage lasted three days, and the tortoise, a symbol of land, denotes a safe arrival. No. 2 is a petition sent to the United States Congress by a group of Indian tribes, asking for fishing rights in certain small lakes. The tribes are represented by their totems, martens, bear, manfish, and catfish, led by the crane. Lines running from the heart and eye of each animal to the heart and eye of the crane denote that they are all of one mind; and a line runs from the eye of the crane to the lakes, shown in the crude little "map" in the lower left-hand corner.]

From such combinations one passes to what are called _ideograms_: the sign for "words" and the sign for "tongue" combine to make "speech"; the sign for "roof" and the sign for "pig" make "home"--for in the early domestic economy of China the pig was as important as it used to be in Ireland. But, as we have already noted earlier, the Chinese language consists of a comparatively few elementary monosyllabic sounds, which are all used in a great variety of meanings, and the Chinese soon discovered that a number of these _pictographs_ and _ideographs_ could be used also to express other ideas, not so conveniently pictured, but having the same sound. Characters so used are called _phonograms_. For example, the sound fang meant not only "boat," but "a place," "spinning," "fragrant," "inquire," and several other meanings according to the context. But while a boat is easy to draw most of the other meanings are undrawable. How can one draw "fragrant" or "inquire"? The Chinese, therefore, took the same sign for all these meanings of _fang_, but added to each of them another distinctive sign, the determinative, to show what sort of _fang_ was intended. A "place" was indicated by the same sign as for "boat" (_fang_) and the determinative sign for "earth"; "spinning" by the sign for _fang_ and the sign for "silk"; "inquire" by the sign for _fang_ and the sign for "words," and so on.

One may perhaps make this development of pictographs, ideographs, and phonograms a little clearer by taking an analogous case in English. Suppose we were making up a sort of picture-writing in English, then it would be very natural to use a square with a slanting line to suggest a lid, for the word and thing _box_. That would be a pictograph. But now suppose we had a round sign for money, and suppose we put this sign inside the box sign, that would do for "cash-box" or "treasury." That would be an ideogram. But the word "box" is used for other things than boxes. There is the box shrub which gives us boxwood. It would be hard to draw a recognizable box-tree distinct from other trees, but it is quite easy to put our sign "box," and add our sign for shrub as a determinative to determine that it is that sort of box and not a common box that we want to express. And then there is "box," the verb, meaning to fight with fists. Here, again, we need a determinative; we might add the two crossed swords, a sign which is used very often upon maps to denote a battle. A box at a theatre needs yet another determinative, and so we go on, through a long series of phonograms.

Now it is manifest that here in the Chinese writing is a very peculiar and complex system of sign-writing. A very great number of characters have to be learnt and the mind habituated to their use. The power it possesses to carry ideas and discussion is still ungauged by western standards, but we may doubt whether with this instrument it will ever be possible to establish such a wide, common mentality as the simpler and swifter alphabets of the western civilizations permit. In China it created a special reading-class, the mandarins, who were also the ruling and official class. Their necessary concentration upon words and classical forms, rather than upon ideas and realities, seems, in spite of her comparative peacefulness and the very high individual intellectual quality of her people, to have greatly hampered the social and economic development of China. Probably it is the complexity of her speech and writing, more than any other imaginable cause, that has made China to-day politically, socially, and individually a vast pool of backward people rather than the foremost power in the whole world.[133]

§ 2

But while the Chinese mind thus made for itself an instrument which is probably too elaborate in structure, too laborious in use, and too inflexible in its form to meet the modern need for simple, swift, exact, and lucid communications, the growing civilizations of the west were working out the problem of a written record upon rather different and, on the whole, more advantageous lines. They did not seek to improve their script to make it swift and easy, but circumstances conspired to make it so. The Sumerian picture-writing, which had to be done upon clay and with little styles, which made curved marks with difficulty and inaccurately, rapidly degenerated by a conventionalized dabbing down of wedged-shaped marks (cuneiform = wedge-shaped) into almost unrecognizable hints of the shapes intended. It helped the Sumerians greatly to learn to write, that they had to draw so badly. They got very soon to the Chinese pictographs, ideographs, and phonograms, and beyond them.

Most people know a sort of puzzle called a rebus. It is a way of representing words by pictures, not of the things the words represent, but by the pictures of other things having a similar sound. For example, two gates and a head is a rebus for Gates-head; a little streamlet (beck), a crowned monarch, and a ham, Beckingham. The Sumerian language was a language well adapted to this sort of representation. It was apparently a language of often quite vast polysyllables, made up of very distinct inalterable syllables; and many of the syllables taken separately were the names of concrete things. So that this cuneiform writing developed very readily into a syllabic way of writing, in which each sign conveys a syllable just as each act in a charade conveys a syllable. When presently the Semites conquered Sumeria, they adapted the syllabic system to their own speech, and so this writing became entirely a sign-for-a-sound writing. It was so used by the Assyrians and by the Chaldeans. But it was not a letter-writing, it was a syllable-writing. This cuneiform script prevailed for long ages over Assyria, Babylonia, and the Near East generally; there are vestiges of it in some of the letters of our alphabet to-day.

§ 3

But, meanwhile, in Egypt and upon the Mediterranean coast another system of writing grew up. Its beginnings are probably to be found in the priestly picture-writing (hieroglyphics) of the Egyptians, which also in the usual way became partly a sound-sign system. As we see it on the Egyptian monuments, the hieroglyphic writing consists of decorative but stiff and elaborate forms, but for such purpose as letter-writing and the keeping of recipes and the like, the Egyptian priests used a much simplified and flowing form of these characters, the _hieratic script_. Side by side with this hieratic script rose another, probably also derivative from the hieroglyphs, a script now lost to us, which was taken over by various non-Egyptian peoples in the Mediterranean, the Phœnicians, Libyans, Lydians, Cretans, and Celt-Iberians, and used for business purposes. Possibly a few letters were borrowed from the later cuneiform. In the hands of these foreigners this writing was, so to speak, cut off from its roots; it lost all but a few traces of its early pictorial character. It ceased to be pictographic or ideographic; it became simply a pure sound-sign system, an _alphabet_.

There were a number of such alphabets in the Mediterranean differing widely from each other.[134] It may be noted that the Phœnician alphabet (and perhaps others) omitted vowels. Possibly they pronounced their consonants very hard and had rather indeterminate vowels, as is said to be still the case with tribes of South Arabia. Quite probably, too, the Phœnicians used their alphabet at first not so much for writing as for single initial letters in their business accounts and tallies. One of these Mediterranean alphabets reached the Greeks, long after the time of the Iliad, who presently set to work to make it express the clear and beautiful sounds of their own highly developed Aryan speech. It consisted at first of consonants, and the Greeks added the vowels. They began to write for record, to help and fix their bardic tradition....

§ 4

So it was by a series of very natural steps that writing grew out of the life of man. At first and for long ages it was the interest and the secret of only a few people in a special class, a mere accessory to the record of pictures. But there were certain very manifest advantages, quite apart from the increased expressiveness of mood and qualification, to be gained by making writing a little less plain than straightforward pictures, and in conventionalizing and codifying it. One of these was that so messages might be sent understandable by the sender and receiver, but not plain to the uninitiated. Another was that so one might put down various matters and help one's memory and the memory of one's friends, without giving away too much to the common herd. Among some of the earliest Egyptian writings, for example, are medical recipes and magic formulæ. Accounts, letters, recipes, name lists, itineraries; these were the earliest of written documents. Then, as the art of writing and reading spread, came that odd desire, that pathetic desire so common among human beings, to astonish some strange and remote person by writing down something striking, some secret one knew, some strange thought, or even one's name, so that long after one had gone one's way, it might strike upon the sight and mind of another reader. Even in Sumeria men scratched on walls, and all that remains to us of the ancient world, its rocks, its buildings, is plastered thickly with the names and the boasting of those foremost among human advertisers, its kings. Perhaps half the early inscriptions in that ancient world are of this nature, if, that is, we group with the name-writing and boasting the epitaphs, which were probably in many cases prearranged by the deceased.

For long the desire for crude self-assertion of the name-scrawling sort and the love of secret understandings kept writing within a narrow scope; but that other, more truly social desire in men, the desire to _tell_, was also at work. The profounder possibilities of writing, the possibilities of a vast extension and definition and settlement of knowledge and tradition, only grew apparent after long ages. But it will be interesting at this point and in this connection to recapitulate certain elemental facts about life, upon which we laid stress in our earlier chapters, because they illuminate not only the huge value of writing in the whole field of man's history, but also the rôle it is likely to play in his future.

1. Life had at first, it must be remembered, only a discontinuous repetition of consciousness, as the old died and the young were born.

Such a creature as a reptile has in its brain a capacity for experience, but when the individual dies, its experience dies with it. Most of its motives are purely instinctive, and all the mental life that it has is the result of heredity (birth inheritance).

2. But ordinary mammals have added to pure instinct _tradition_, a tradition of experience imparted by the imitated example of the mother, and in the case of such mentally developed animals as dogs, cats, or apes, by a sort of mute precept also. For example, the mother cat chastises her young for misbehaviour. So do mother apes and baboons.

3. Primitive man added to his powers of transmitting experience, representative art and speech. Pictorial and sculptured record and _verbal tradition_ began.

Verbal tradition was developed to its highest possibility by the bards. They did much to make language what it is to the world to-day.

4. With the invention of writing, which developed out of pictorial record, human tradition was able to become fuller and much more exact. Verbal tradition, which had hitherto changed from age to age, began to be fixed. Men separated by hundreds of miles could now communicate their thoughts. An increasing number of human beings began to share a common written knowledge and a common sense of a past and a future. Human thinking became a larger operation in which hundreds of minds in different places and in different ages could react upon one another; it became a process constantly more continuous and sustained....

5. For hundreds of generations the full power of writing was not revealed to the world, because for a long time the idea of multiplying writings by taking prints of a first copy did not become effective. The only way of multiplying writings was by copying one copy at a time, and this made books costly and rare. Moreover, the tendency to keep things secret, to make a cult and mystery of them, and so to gain an advantage over the generality of men, has always been very strong in men's minds. It is only nowadays that the great masses of mankind are learning to read, and reaching out towards the treasures of knowledge and thought already stored in books.

Nevertheless, from the first writings onward a new sort of tradition, an enduring and immortal tradition, began in the minds of men. Life, through mankind, grew thereafter more and more distinctly conscious of itself and its world. It is a thin streak of intellectual growth we trace in history, at first in a world of tumultuous ignorance and forgetfulness; it is like a mere line of light coming through the chink of an opening door into a darkened room; but slowly it widens, it grows. At last came a time in the history of Europe when

the door, at the push of the printer, began to open more rapidly. Knowledge flared up, and as it flared it ceased to be the privilege of a favoured minority. For us now that door swings wider, and the light behind grows brighter. Misty it is still, glowing through clouds of dust and reek.

The door is not half open; the light is but a light new lit. Our world to-day is only in the beginning of knowledge.

XIX

GODS AND STARS, PRIESTS AND KINGS

§ 1. _Nomadic and Settled Religion._ § 2. _The Priest Comes into History._ § 3. _Priests and the Stars._ § 4. _Priests and the Dawn of Learning._ § 5. _King against Priest._ § 6. _How Bel-Marduk Struggled against the Kings._ § 7. _The God-Kings of Egypt._ § 8. _Shi Hwang-ti Destroys the Books._

§ 1

We have already told what there is to tell of the social life of the Aryan tribes when they were settling down to the beginnings of civilized life; we have seen how they were associated in great households, grouped together under tribal leaders, who made a sort of informal aristocracy rather like that of the sixth form and prefects in an English boys' school; we have considered the rôle of the bards in the creation of an oral tradition, and we have glanced at their not very complex religious ideas. We may note one or two points of difference from the equivalent life of the nomadic Semites.

Like the early Aryan life, it was a life in a sort of family-tribe household. But it had differences due originally perhaps to the warmer, drier climate. Though both groups of races had cattle and sheep, the Aryans were rather herdsmen, the Semites, shepherds. The Semites had no long winter evenings and no bardic singing. They never sat in hall. They have consequently no epics. They had stories, camp-fire stories, but not verbally beautified story-recitations. The Semite also was more polygamous than the Aryan, his women less self-assertive,[135] and the tendency of his government more patriarchal. The head of the household or the tribe was less of a leader and more of a master, more like the Palæolithic Old Man. And the Semitic nomads were closer to the earlier civilizations, a thing that fitted in with their greater aptitude for trade and counting. But the religion of the nomadic Semite was as little organized as the religion of the Aryan. In either case the leading man performed most of the functions of the priest. The Aryan gods were little more than a kind of magical super-prince; they were supposed to sit in hall together, and to talk and make scenes with one another under Jupiter or Thor. The early Semitic gods, on the other hand, were thought of as tribal patriarchs. As peoples develop towards nomadism, they seem to lose even such primitive religion and magic as their Neolithic ancestors professed. Nomadism cuts men off from fixed temples and intense local associations; they take a broader and simpler view of the world. They tend towards religious simplification.

We write here of the nomadic peoples, the Aryan herdsmen and Semitic shepherds, and we write in the most general terms. They had their undercurrent of fables and superstitions, their phases of fear and abjection and sacrificial fury. These people were people like ourselves, with brains as busy and moody and inconsistent, and with even less training and discipline. It is absurd to suppose--as so many writers about early religion do seem to suppose--that their religious notions can be reduced to the consistent logical development of some one simple idea. We have already glanced, in Chapter XII, at the elements of religion that must have arisen necessarily in the minds of those early peoples. But for most of the twenty-four hours these nomads were busy upon other things, and there is no sign that their houses, their daily routines, their ordinary acts, were dominated or their social order shaped, by any ideas that we should now call religious. As yet life and its ideas were too elementary for that.

But directly we turn our attention to these new accumulations of human beings that are beginning in Egypt and Mesopotamia, we find that one of the most conspicuous objects in every city is a temple or a group of temples. In some cases there arises beside it in these regions a royal palace, but as often the temple towers over the palace. This presence of the temple is equally true of the Phœnician cities and of the Greek and Roman as they arise. The palace of Cnossos, with its signs of comfort and pleasure-seeking, and the kindred cities of the Ægean peoples, include religious shrines, but in Crete there are also temples standing apart from the palatial city-households. All over the ancient civilized world we find them; wherever primitive civilization set its foot in Africa, Europe, or western Asia, a temple arose, and where the civilization is most ancient, in Egypt and in Sumer, there the temple is most in evidence. When Hanno reached what he thought was the most westerly point of Africa, he set up a temple to Hercules. We have, in fact, come now to a new stage in the history of mankind, the temple stage.

§ 2

In all these temples there was a shrine; dominating the shrine there was commonly a great figure, usually of some monstrous half-animal form, before which stood an altar for sacrifices. This figure was either regarded as the god or as the image or symbol of the god, for whose worship the temple existed. And connected with the temple there were a number, and often a considerable number, of priests or priestesses, and temple servants, generally wearing a distinctive costume and forming an important part of the city population. They belonged to no household, as did the simple priest of the primitive Aryan; they made up a new kind of household of their own. They were a caste and a class apart, attracting intelligent recruits from the general population.

The primary duty of this priesthood was concerned with the worship of and the sacrifices to the god of the temple. And these things were done, not at any time, but at particular times and seasons. There had come into the life of man with his herding and agriculture a sense of a difference between the parts of the year and of a difference between day and day. Men were beginning to work--and to need days of rest. The temple, by its festivals, kept count. The temple in the ancient city was like the clock and calendar upon a writing-desk.

But it was a centre of other functions. It was in the early temples that the records and tallies of events were kept and that writing began. And there was knowledge there. The people went to the temple not only _en masse_ for festivals, but individually for help. The early priests were also doctors and magicians. In the earliest temples we already find those little offerings for some private and particular end, which are still made in the chapels of Catholic churches to-day, _ex votos_, little models of hearts relieved and limbs restored, acknowledgment of prayers answered and accepted vows.

It is clear that here we have that comparatively unimportant element in the life of the early nomad, the medicine-man, the shrine-keeper, and the memorist, developed, with the development of the community and as a part of the development of the community from barbarism to civilized settlement, into something of very much greater importance. And it is equally evident that those primitive fears of (and hopes of help from) strange beings, the desire to propitiate unknown forces, the primitive desire for cleansing and the primitive craving for power and knowledge have all contributed to crystallize out this new social fact of the temple.

The temple was accumulated by complex necessities, it grew from many roots and needs, and the god that dominated the temple was the creation of many imaginations and made up of all sorts of impulses, ideas, and half ideas. Here there was a god in which one sort of ideas predominated, and there another. It is necessary to lay some stress upon this confusion and variety of origin in gods, because there is a very abundant literature now in existence upon religious origins, in which a number of writers insist, some on this leading idea and some on that--we have noted several in our Chapter XII on “Early Thought”--as though it were the only idea. Professor Max Müller in his time, for example, harped perpetually on the idea of sun stories and sun worship. He would have had us think that early man never had lusts or fears, cravings for power, nightmares or fantasies, but that he meditated perpetually on the beneficent source of light and life in the sky. Now dawn and sunset are very moving facts in the daily life, but they are only two among many.

[Illustration:

Set Egyptian god of darkness.

Anubis darkness god.

Typhon wife of Anubis, also known as the Terrible One

The cheerful Bes

J.F.H.]

Early men, three or four hundred generations ago, had brains very like our own. The fancies of our childhood and youth are perhaps the best clue we have to the ground-stuff of early religion, and anyone who can recall those early mental experiences will understand very easily the vagueness, the monstrosity, and the incoherent variety of the first gods. There were sun gods, no doubt, early in the history of temples, but there were also hippopotamus gods and hawk gods; there were cow deities, there were monstrous male and female gods, there were gods of terror and gods of an adorable quaintness, there were gods who were nothing but lumps of meteoric stone that had fallen amazingly out of the sky, and gods who were mere natural stones that had

chanced to have a queer and impressive shape. Some gods, like Marduk of Babylon and the Baal (= the Lord) of the Phœnicians, Canaanites, and the like, were quite probably at bottom just legendary wonder beings, such as little boys will invent for themselves to-day. The early Semites, it is said, as soon as they thought of a god, invented a wife for him; most of the Egyptian and Babylonian gods were married. But the gods of the nomadic Semites had not this marrying disposition. Children were less eagerly sought by the inhabitants of the food-grudging steppes.

Even more natural than to provide a wife for a god is to give him a house to live in to which offerings can be brought. Of this house the knowing man, the magician, would naturally become the custodian. A certain seclusion, a certain aloofness, would add greatly to the prestige of the god. The steps by which the early temple and the early priesthood developed so soon as an agricultural population settled and increased are all quite natural and understandable, up to the stage of the long temple with the image, shrine and altar at one end and the long nave in which the worshippers stood. And this temple, because it had records and secrets, because it was a centre of power, advice, and instruction, because it sought and attracted imaginative and clever people for its service, naturally became a kind of brain in the growing community. The attitude of the common people who tilled the fields and herded the beasts towards the temple would remain simple and credulous. There, rarely seen and so imaginatively enhanced, lived the god whose approval gave prosperity, whose anger meant misfortune; he could be propitiated by little presents and the help of his servants could be obtained. He was wonderful, and of such power and knowledge that it did not do to be disrespectful to him even in one's thoughts. Within the priesthood, however, a certain amount of thinking went on at a rather higher level than that.

§ 3[136]

And now we have to note a very interesting fact about the chief temples of Egypt and, so far as we know--because the ruins are not so distinct--of Babylonia, and that is that they were "oriented"--that is to say, that the same sort of temple was built so that the shrine and entrance always faced in the same direction.[137] In Babylonian temples this was most often due east, facing the sunrise on March 21st and September 21st, the equinoxes; and it is to be noted that it was at the spring equinox that the Euphrates and Tigris came down in flood. The Pyramids of Gizeh are also oriented east and west, and the Sphinx faces due east, but very many of the Egyptian temples to the south of the delta of the Nile do not point due east, but to the point where the sun rises at the longest day--and in Egypt the inundation comes close to that date. Others, however, pointed nearly northward, and others again pointed to the rising of the star Sirius or to the rising-point of other conspicuous stars. The fact of orientation links up with the fact that there early arose a close association between various gods and the sun and various fixed stars. Whatever the mass of people outside were thinking, the priests of the temples were beginning to link the movements of those heavenly bodies with the power in the shrine. They were thinking about the gods they served and thinking new meanings into them. They were brooding upon the mystery of the stars. It was very natural for them to suppose that these shining bodies, so irregularly distributed and circling so solemnly and silently, must be charged with portents to mankind.

[Illustration:

Thoth-lunus god of letters and all learning

Hathor (Isis) the Egyptian cow goddess ...

Chnemu creator-god, married to Hekt, a frog goddess.]

Among other things, this orientation of the temples served to fix and help the great annual festival of the New Year. On one morning in the year, and one morning alone, in a temple oriented to the rising-place of the sun at Midsummer Day, the sun's first rays would smite down through the gloom of the temple and the long alley of the temple pillars, and light up the god above the altar and irradiate him with glory. The narrow, darkened structure of the ancient temples seems to be deliberately planned for such an effect. No doubt the people were gathered in the darkness before the dawn; in the darkness there was chanting and perhaps the offering of sacrifices; the god alone stood mute and invisible. Prayers and invocations would be made. Then upon the eyes of the worshippers, sensitized by the darkness, as the sun rose behind them, the god would suddenly shine.

So, at least, one explanation of orientation is found by such students of orientation as Sir Norman Lockyer.[138] Not only is orientation apparent in most of the temples of Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, and the east, it is found in the Greek temples; Stonehenge is oriented to the midsummer sunrise, and so are most of the megalithic circles of Europe; the Temple of Heaven in Peking is oriented to midwinter. In the days of the Chinese Empire, up to a few years ago, one of the most important of all the duties of the Emperor of China was to sacrifice and pray in this temple upon midwinter's day for a propitious year.

The Egyptian priests had mapped out the stars into the constellations, and divided up the zodiac into twelve signs, by 3000 B.C. ...

§ 4

This clear evidence of astronomical inquiry and of a development of astronomical ideas is the most obvious, but only the most obvious, evidence of the very considerable intellectual activities that went on within the temple precincts in ancient times. There is a curious disposition among many modern writers to deprecate priesthoods and to speak of priests as though they had always been impostors and tricksters, preying upon the simplicity of mankind. But, indeed, they were for long the only writing class, the only reading public, the only learned and the only thinkers; they were all the professional classes of the time. You could have no intellectual life at all, you could not get access to literature or any knowledge except through the priesthood. The temples were not only observatories and libraries and clinics, they were museums and treasure-houses. The original _Periplus_ of Hanno hung in one temple in Carthage, skins of his “gorillas” were hung and treasured in another. Whatever there was of abiding worth in the life of the community sheltered there. Herodotus, the early Greek historian (485-425 B.C.), collected most of his material from the priests of the countries in which he travelled, and it is evident they met him generously and put their very considerable resources completely at his disposal. Outside the temples the world was still a world of blankly illiterate and unspeculative human beings, living from day to day entirely for themselves. Moreover, there is little evidence that the commonalty felt cheated by the priests, or had anything but trust and affection for the early priesthoods. Even the great conquerors of later times were anxious to keep themselves upon the right side of the priests of the nations and cities whose obedience they desired, because of the immense popular influence of these priests.

No doubt there were great differences between temple and temple and cult and cult in the spirit and quality of the priesthood. Some probably were cruel, some vicious and greedy, many dull and doctrinaire, stupid with tradition, but it has to be kept in mind that there were distinct limits to the degeneracy or inefficiency of a priesthood. It had to keep its grip upon the general mind. It could not go beyond what people would stand--either towards the darkness or towards the light. Its authority rested, in the end, on the persuasion that its activities were propitious.

§ 5[139]

It is clear that the earliest civilized governments were essentially priestly governments. It was not kings and captains who first set men to the plough and a settled life. It was the ideas of the gods and plenty, working with the acquiescence of common men. The early rulers of Sumer we know were all priests, kings only because they were chief priests. And priestly government had its own weaknesses as well as its peculiar deep-rooted strength. The power of a priesthood is a power over their own people alone. It is a subjugation through mysterious fears and hopes. The priesthood can gather its people together for war, but its traditionalism and all its methods unfit it for military control. Against the enemy without, a priest-led people is feeble.

Moreover, a priest is a man vowed, trained, and consecrated, a man belonging to a special corps, and necessarily with an intense _esprit de corps_. He has given up his life to his temple and his god. This is a very excellent thing for the internal vigour of his own priesthood, his own temple. He lives or dies for the honour of his particular god. But in the next town or village is another temple with another god. It is his constant preoccupation to keep his people from that god. Religious cults and priesthoods are sectarian by nature; they will convert, they will overcome, but they will never coalesce. Our first perceptions of events in Sumer, in the dim uncertain light before history began, is of priests and gods in conflict; until the Sumerians were conquered by the Semites they were never united; and the same incurable conflict of priesthoods scars all the temple ruins of Egypt. It was impossible that it could have been otherwise, having regard to the elements out of which religion arose.

[Illustration: An Assyrian King & his Chief Minister]

It was out of those two main weaknesses of all priesthoods, namely, the incapacity for efficient military leadership and their inevitable jealousy of all other religious cults, that the power of secular kingship arose. The foreign enemy either prevailed and set up a king over the people, or the priesthoods who would not give way to each other set up a common fighting captain, who retained more or less power in peace time. This secular king developed a group of officials about him and began, in relation to military organization, to take a share in the priestly administration of the people’s affairs. So, growing out of priestcraft and beside the priest, the king, the protagonist of the priest, appears upon the stage of human history, and a very large amount of the subsequent experiences of mankind is only to be understood as an elaboration, complication, and distortion of the struggle, unconscious or deliberate, between these two systems of human control, the temple and the palace. And it was in the original centres of civilization

that this antagonism was most completely developed. The Aryan peoples never passed through a phase of temple rule on their way to civilization; they came to civilization late; they found that drama already half-played. They took over the ideas of both temple and kingship, when those ideas were already elaborately developed, from the more civilized Hamitic or Semitic people they conquered.

The greater importance of the gods and the priests in the earlier history of the Mesopotamian civilization is very apparent, but gradually the palace won its way until it was at last in a position to struggle definitely for the supreme power. At first, in the story, the palace is ignorant and friendless in the face of the temple; the priests alone read, the priests alone know, the people are afraid of him. But in the dissensions of the various cults comes the opportunity of the palace. From other cities, from among captives, from defeated or suppressed religious cults, the palace gets men who also can read and who can do magic things.[140] The court also becomes a centre of writing and record; the king thinks for himself and becomes politic. Traders and foreigners drift to the court, and if the king has not the full records and the finished scholarship of the priests, he has a wider and fresher first-hand knowledge of many things. The priest comes into the temple when he is very young; he passes many years as a neophyte; the path of learning the clumsy letters of primitive times is slow and toilsome; he becomes erudite and prejudiced rather than a man of the world. Some of the more active-minded young priests may even cast envious eyes at the king's service. There are many complications and variations in this ages-long drama of the struggle going on beneath the outward conflicts of priest and king, between the made man and the born man, between learning and originality, between established knowledge and settled usage on the one hand, and creative will and imagination on the other. It is not always, as we shall find later, the priest who is the conservative and unimaginative antagonist. Sometimes a king struggles against narrow and obstructive priesthoods; sometimes priesthoods uphold the standards of civilization against savage, egotistical, or reactionary kings.

One or two outstanding facts and incidents of the early stages of this fundamental struggle in political affairs are all that we can note here between 4000 B.C. and the days of Alexander.

§ 6

In the early days of Sumeria and Akkadia the city-kings were priests and medicine-men rather than kings, and it was only when foreign conquerors sought to establish their hold in relation to existing institutions that the distinction of priest and king became definite. But the god of the priests remained as the real overlord of the land and of priest and king alike. He was the universal landlord; the wealth and authority of his temples and establishments outshone those of the king. Especially was this the case within the city walls. Hammurabi, the founder of the first Babylonian Empire, is one of the earlier monarchs whom we find taking a firm grip upon the affairs of the community. He does it with the utmost politeness to the gods. In an inscription recording his irrigation work in Sumeria and Akkadia, he begins: "When Anu and Bel entrusted me with the rule of Sumer and Akkad----." We possess a code of laws made by this same Hammurabi--it is the earliest known code of law--and at the head of this code we see the figure of Hammurabi receiving the law from its nominal promulgator, the god Shamash.

An act of great political importance in the conquest of any city was the carrying off of its god to become a subordinate in the temple of its conqueror. This was far more important than the subjugation of king by king. Merodach, the Babylonian Jupiter, was carried off by the Elamites, and Babylon did not feel independent until its return. But sometimes a conqueror was afraid of the god he had conquered. In the collection of letters addressed to Amenophis III and IV at Tel-Amarna in Egypt, to which allusion has already been made, is one from a certain king, Tushratta, King of Mitani, who has conquered Assyria and taken the statue of the goddess Ishtar. Apparently he has sent this statue into Egypt, partly to acknowledge the overlordship of Amenophis, but partly because he fears her anger. (Winckler.) In the Bible is related (Sam. i. v. 1) how the Ark of the Covenant of the God of the Hebrews was carried off by the Philistines, as a token of conquest, into the temple of the fish god, Dagon, at Ashdod, and how Dagon fell down and was broken, and how the people of Ashdod were smitten with disease. In the latter story particularly the gods and priests fill the scene; there is no king in evidence at all.

Right through the history of the Babylonian and Assyrian empires no monarch seems to have felt his tenure of power secure in Babylon until he had "taken the hand of Bel"--that is to say, that he had been adopted by the priesthood of "Bel" as the god's son and representative. As our knowledge of Assyrian and Babylonian history grows clearer, it becomes plainer that the politics of that world, the revolutions, usurpations, changes of dynasty, intrigues with foreign powers, turned largely upon issues between the great wealthy priesthoods and the growing but still inadequate power of the monarchy. The king relied on his army, and this was usually a mercenary army of foreigners, speedily mutinous if there was no pay or plunder, and easily bribed. We have already noted the name of Sennacherib, the son of Sargon II, among the monarchs of the Assyrian Empire. Sennacherib was involved in a violent quarrel with the priesthood of Babylon; he never "took the hand of Bel"; and finally struck at that power by destroying altogether the

holy part of the city of Babylon (691 B.C.) and removing the statue of Bel-Marduk to Assyria. He was assassinated by one of his sons, and his successor, Esarhaddon (his son, but not the son who was his assassin), found it expedient to restore Bel-Marduk and rebuild his temple, and make his peace with the god.[141]

Assurbanipal (Greek, Sardanapalus), the son of this Esarhaddon, is a particularly interesting figure from this point of view of the relationship of priesthood and king. His father's reconciliation with the priests of Bel-Marduk went so far that Sardanapalus was given a Babylonian instead of a military Assyrian education. He became a great collector of the clay documents of the past, and his library, which has been unearthed, is now the most precious source of historical material in the world. But for all his learning he kept his grip on the Assyrian army; he made a temporary conquest of Egypt, suppressed a rebellion in Babylon, and carried out a number of successful expeditions. As we have already told in Chapter XVI, he was almost the last of the Assyrian monarchs. The Aryan tribes, who knew more of war than of priestcraft, and particularly the Scythians, the Medes and Persians, had long been pressing upon Assyria from the north and north-east. The Medes and Persians formed an alliance with the nomadic Semitic Chaldeans of the south for the joint undoing of Assyria. Nineveh, the Assyrian capital, fell to these Aryans in 606 B.C.

Sixty-seven years after the taking of Nineveh by the Aryans, which left Babylonia to the Semitic Chaldeans, the last monarch of the Chaldean Empire (the Second Babylonian Empire), Nabonidus, the father of Belshazzar, was overthrown by Cyrus, the Persian. This Nabonidus, again, was a highly educated monarch, who brought far too much intelligence and imagination and not enough of the short range wisdom of this world to affairs of state. He conducted antiquarian researches, and to his researches it is that we owe the date of 3750 B.C., assigned to Sargon I and still accepted by many authorities. He was proud of this determination, and left inscriptions to record it. It is clear he was a religious innovator; he built and rearranged temples and attempted to centralize religion in Babylon by bringing a number of local gods to the temple of Bel-Marduk. No doubt he realized the weakness and disunion of his empire due to these conflicting cults, and had some conception of unification in his mind.

Events were marching too rapidly for any such development. His innovation had manifestly raised the suspicion and hostility of the priesthood of Bel. They sided with the Persians. "The soldiers of Cyrus entered Babylon without fighting." Nabonidus was taken prisoner, and Persian sentinels were set at the gates of the temple of Bel, "where the services continued without intermission."

Cyrus did, in fact, set up the Persian Empire in Babylon with the blessing of Bel-Marduk. He gratified the conservative instincts of the priests by packing off the local gods back to their ancestral temples. He also restored the Jews to Jerusalem.[142] These were merely matters of immediate policy to him. But in bringing in the irreligious Aryans, the ancient priesthood was paying too highly for the continuation of its temple services. It would have been wiser to have dealt with the innovations of Nabonidus, that earnest heretic, to have listened to his ideas, and to have met the needs of a changing world. Cyrus entered Babylon 539 B.C.; by 521 B.C. Babylon was in insurrection again, and in 520 B.C. another Persian monarch, Darius, was pulling down her walls. Within two hundred years the life had altogether gone out of those venerable rituals of Bel-Marduk, and the temple of Bel-Marduk was being used by builders as a quarry.

[Illustration: CHEPHREN]

§ 7[143]

The story of priest and king in Egypt is similar to, but by no means parallel with, that of Babylonia. The kings of Sumeria and Assyria were priests who had become kings; they were secularized priests. The Pharaoh of Egypt does not appear to have followed precisely that line. Already in the very oldest records the Pharaoh has a power and importance exceeding that of any priest. He is, in fact, a god, and more than either priest or king. We do not know how he got to that position. No monarch of Sumeria or Babylonia or Assyria could have induced his people to do for him what the great pyramid-building Pharaohs of the IVth Dynasty made their people do in those vast erections. The earlier Pharaohs were not improbably regarded as incarnations of the dominant god. The falcon god Horus sits behind the head of the great statue of Chephren. So late a monarch as Rameses III (XIXth Dynasty) is represented upon his sarcophagus (now at Cambridge) bearing the distinctive symbols of the three great gods of the Egyptian system.[144] He carries the two sceptres of Osiris, the god of Day and Resurrection; upon his head are the horns of the cow goddess Hathor, and also the sun ball and feathers of Ammon Ra. He is not merely wearing the symbols of these gods as a devout Babylonian might wear the symbols of Bel-Marduk; he is these three gods in one.

[Illustration: Ramses III as Osiris--between the goddesses Nephthys and Isis....

Relief on the cover of the sarcophagus (at Cambridge). After Sharpe.

Inscription (round the edges of cover), as far as decipherable.

“Osiris, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, lord of the two countries ... son of the Sun, beloved of the gods, lord of diadems, Rameses, prince of Heliopolis, triumphant! Thou art in the condition of a god, thou shalt arise as Usr, there is no enemy to thee, I give to thee triumph among them....” BUDGE, _Catalogue, Egyptian Collection, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge_.]

The student will find much more in Sir J. G. Frazer’s _Golden Bough_ about the ancient use of human beings as well as statues to represent gods. Here we have merely to point to an apparent difference of idea between the Asiatic and African monarchies in this respect.

We find also a number of sculptures and paintings to enforce the idea that the Pharaohs were the actual sons of gods. The divine fathering and birth of Amenophis III, for instance (of the XVIIIth Dynasty), is displayed in extraordinary detail in a series of sculptures at Luxor. Moreover, it was held that the Pharaohs, being of so divine a strain, could not marry common clay, and consequently they were accustomed to marry blood relations within the degrees of consanguinity now prohibited, even marrying their sisters.

The struggle between palace and temple came into Egyptian history, therefore, at a different angle from that at which it came into Babylonia. Nevertheless, it came in. Professor Maspero (in his _New Light on Ancient Egypt_) gives a very interesting account of the struggle of Amenophis IV with the priesthoods, and particularly with priests of the great god, Ammon Ra, Lord of Karnak. The mother of Amenophis IV was not of the race of Pharaoh; it would seem that his father, Amenophis III, made a love match with a subject, a beautiful Syrian named Tii, and Professor Maspero finds in the possible opposition to and annoyance of this queen by the priests of Ammon Ra the beginnings of the quarrel. She may, he thinks, have inspired her son with a fanatical hatred of Ammon Ra. But Amenophis IV may have had a wider view. Like the Babylonian Nabonidus, who lived a thousand years later, he may have had in mind the problem of moral unity in his empire. We have already noted that Amenophis III ruled from Ethiopia to the Euphrates, and that the store of letters to himself and his son found at Tel Amarna show a very wide range of interest and influence. At any rate, Amenophis IV set himself to close all the Egyptian and Syrian temples, to put an end to all sectarian worship throughout his dominions, and to establish everywhere the worship of one god, Aton, the solar disk. He left his capital, Thebes, which was even more the city of Ammon Ra than later Babylon was the city of Bel-Marduk, and set up his capital at Tel Amarna; he altered his name from “Amenophis,” which consecrated him to Ammon (Amen) to “Akhnaton,” the Sun’s Glory; and he held his own against all the priesthoods of his empire for eighteen years and died a Pharaoh.

[Illustration: Akhnaton(Amenophis IV)

[based on the cast at Cairo, & the reliefs in the Berlin Museum.]]

Opinions upon Amenophis IV, or Akhnaton, differ very widely. There are those who regard him as the creature of his mother’s hatred of Ammon and the uxorious spouse of a beautiful wife. Certainly he loved his wife very passionately; he showed her great honour--Egypt honoured women, and was ruled at different times by several queens--and he was sculptured in one instance with his wife seated upon his knees, and in another in the act of kissing her in a chariot; but men who live under the sway of their womenkind do not sustain great empires in the face of the bitter hostility of the most influential organized bodies in their realm.[145] Others write of him as a “gloomy fanatic.” Matrimonial bliss is rare in the cases of gloomy fanatics. It is much more reasonable to regard him as the Pharaoh who refused to be a god. It is not simply his religious policy and his frank display of natural affection that seem to mark a strong and very original personality. His æsthetic ideas were his own. He refused to have his portrait conventionalized into the customary smooth beauty of the Pharaoh god, and his face looks out at us across an interval of thirty-four centuries, a man amidst ranks of divine insipidities.

A reign of eighteen years was not long enough for the revolution he contemplated, and his son-in-law who succeeded him went back to Thebes and made his peace with Ammon Ra.

To the very end of the story the divinity of kings haunted the Egyptian mind, and infected the thoughts of intellectually healthier races. When Alexander the Great reached Babylon, the prestige of Bel-Marduk was already far gone in decay, but in Egypt, Ammon Ra was still god enough to make a snob of the conquering Grecian. The priests of Ammon Ra, about the time of the XVIIIth or XIXth Dynasty (_circa_ 1400 B.C.), had set up in an oasis of the desert a temple and oracle. Here was an image of the god which could speak, move its head, and accept or reject scrolls of inquiry. This oracle was still flourishing in 332 B.C. The young master of the world, it is related, made a special journey to visit it; he came into the sanctuary, and the image advanced out of the

darkness at the back to meet him. There was an impressive exchange of salutations. Some such formula as this must have been used (says Professor Maspero): “Come, son of my loins, who loves me so that I give thee the royalty of Ra and the royalty of Horus! I give thee valiance, I give thee to hold all countries and all religions under thy feet; I give thee to strike all the peoples united together with thy arm!”

So it was that the priests of Egypt conquered their conqueror, and an Aryan monarch first became a god....[146]

§ 8

The struggle of priest and king in China cannot be discussed here at any length. It was different again, as in Egypt it was different from Babylonia, but we find the same effort on the part of the ruler to break up tradition because it divides up the people. The Chinese Emperor, the “Son of Heaven,” was himself a high-priest, and his chief duty was sacrificial; in the more disorderly phases of Chinese history he ceases to rule and continues only to sacrifice. The literary class was detached from the priestly class at an early date. It became a bureaucratic body serving the local kings and rulers. That is a fundamental difference between the history of China and any Western history. While Alexander was overrunning Western Asia, China, under the last priest-emperors of the Chow Dynasty, was sinking into a state of great disorder. Each province clung to its separate nationality and traditions, and the Huns spread from province to province. The King of Ts’in (who lived about eighty years after Alexander the Great), impressed by the mischief tradition was doing in the land, resolved to destroy the entire Chinese literature, and his son, Shi Hwang-ti, the “first universal Emperor,” made a strenuous attempt to seek out and destroy all the existing classics.[147] They vanished while he ruled, and he ruled without tradition, and welded China into a unity that endured for some centuries; but when he had passed, the hidden books crept out again. China remained united, though not under his descendants, but after a civil war under a fresh dynasty, the Han Dynasty (206 B.C.). The first Han monarch did not sustain this campaign of Shi Hwang-ti against the _literati_, and his successor made his peace with them and restored the texts of the classics.

XX

SERFS, SLAVES, SOCIAL CLASSES, AND FREE INDIVIDUALS

§ 1. _The Common Man in Ancient Times._ § 2. _The Earliest Slaves._ § 3. _The first “Independent” Persons._ § 4. _Social Classes Three Thousand Years Ago._ § 5. _Classes Hardening into Castes._ § 6. _Caste in India._ § 7. _The System of the Mandarins._ § 8. _A Summary of Five Thousand Years._

§ 1

We have been sketching in the last four chapters the growth of civilized states out of the primitive Neolithic agriculture that began in Mesopotamia perhaps 15,000, perhaps 20,000, years ago. It was at first horticulture rather than agriculture; it was done with the hoe before the plough, and at first it was quite supplementary to the sheep, goat, and cattle tending that made the “living” of the family tribe. We have traced the broad outlines of the development in regions of exceptional fruitfulness of the first settled village communities into more populous towns and cities, and the growth of the village shrine and the village medicine-man into the city temple and the city priesthood. We have noted the beginnings of organized war, first as a bickering between villages, and then as a more disciplined struggle between the priest-king and god of one city and those of another. Our story has passed on rapidly from the first indications of conquest and empire in Sumer, perhaps 6000 or 7000 B.C., to the spectacle of great empires growing up, with roads and armies, with inscriptions and written documents, with educated priesthoods and kings and rulers sustained by a tradition already ancient. We have traced in broad outline the appearance and conflicts and replacements of these empires of the great rivers. We have directed attention, in particular, to the evidence of a development of still wider political ideas as we find it betrayed by the actions and utterances of such men as Nabonidus and Amenophis IV. It has been an outline of the accumulations of human experience for ten or fifteen thousand years, a vast space of time in comparison with all subsequent history, but a brief period when we measure it against the succession of endless generations that intervenes between us and the first rude flint-using human creatures of the Pleistocene dawn. But for these last four chapters we have been writing almost entirely not about mankind generally, but only about the men who thought, the men who could draw and read and write, the men who were altering their world. Beneath their activities what was the life of the mute multitude?

The life of the common man was, of course, affected and changed by these things, just as the lives of the domestic animals and the face of the cultivated country were changed; but for the most part it was a change suffered and not a change in which the common

man upon the land had any voice or will. Reading and writing were not yet for the likes of him. He went on cultivating his patch, loving his wife and children, beating his dog and tending his beasts, grumbling at hard times, fearing the magic of the priests and the power of the gods, desiring little more except to be left alone by the powers above him. So he was in 10,000 B.C.; so he was, unchanged in nature and outlook, in the time of Alexander the Great; so over the greater part of the world he remains to-day. He got rather better tools, better seeds, better methods, a slightly sounder house, he sold his produce in a more organized market as civilization progressed. A certain freedom and a certain equality passed out of human life when men ceased to wander. Men paid in liberty for safety, shelter, and regular meals. By imperceptible degrees the common man found the patch he cultivated was not his own; it belonged to the god; and he had to pay a fraction of his produce to the god. Or the god had given it to the king, who exacted his rent and tax. Or the king had given it to an official, who was the lord of the common man. And sometimes the god or the king or the noble had work to be done, and then the common man had to leave his patch and work for his master.

How far the patch he cultivated was his own was never very clear to him. In ancient Assyria the land seems to have been held as a sort of freehold and the occupier paid taxes; in Babylonia the land was the god's, and he permitted the cultivator to work thereon. In Egypt the temples or Pharaoh-the-god or the nobles under Pharaoh were the owners and rent receivers. But the cultivator was not a slave; he was a peasant, and only bound to the land in so far that there was nothing else for him to do but cultivate, and nowhere else for him to go. He lived in a village or town, and went out to his work. The village, to begin with, was often merely a big household of related people under a patriarch headman, the early town a group of householders under its elders. There was no process of enslavement as civilization grew, but the headmen and leaderly men grew in power and authority, and the common men did not keep pace with them, and fell into a tradition of dependence and subordination.

On the whole, the common men were probably well content to live under lord or king or god and obey their bidding. It was safer. It was easier. All animals--and man is no exception--begin life as dependents. Most men never shake themselves loose from the desire for leading and protection.[148]

§ 2

[Illustration: Egyptian peasants seized for non-payment of taxes ... (Pyramid Age)]

The earlier wars did not involve remote or prolonged campaigns, and they were waged by levies of the common people. But war brought in a new source of possessions, plunder, and a new social factor, the captive. In the earlier, simpler days of war, the captive man was kept only to be tortured or sacrificed to the victorious god; the captive women and children were assimilated into the tribe. But later many captives were spared to be slaves because they had exceptional gifts or peculiar arts. It would be the kings and captains who would take these slaves at first, and it would speedily become apparent to them that these men were much more their own than were the peasant cultivators and common men of their own race.[149] The slave could be commanded to do all sorts of things for his master that the quasi-free common man would not do so willingly because of his attachment to his own patch of cultivation. From a very early period the artificer was often a household slave, and the manufacture of trade goods, pottery, textiles, metal ware, and so forth, such as went on vigorously in the household city of the Minos of Cnossos, was probably a slave industry from the beginning. Sayce, in his _Babylonians and Assyrians_,[150] quotes Babylonian agreements for the teaching of trades to slaves, and dealing with the exploitation of slave products. Slaves produced slave children, enslavement in discharge of debts added to the slave population; it is probable that as the cities grew larger, a larger part of the new population consisted of these slave artificers and slave servants in the large households. They were by no means abject slaves; in later Babylon their lives and property were protected by elaborate laws. Nor were they all outlanders. Parents might sell their children into slavery, and brothers their orphan sisters. Free men who had no means of livelihood would even sell themselves into slavery. And slavery was the fate of the insolvent debtor. Craft apprenticeship, again, was a sort of fixed-term slavery. Out of the slave population, by a converse process, arose the freed-man and freed-woman, who worked for wages and had still more definite individual rights. Since in Babylon slaves could themselves own property, many slaves saved up and bought themselves. Probably the town slave was often better off and practically as free as the cultivator of the soil, and as the rural population increased, its sons and daughters came to mix with and swell the growing ranks of artificers, some bound, some free.

As the extent and complexity of government increased, the number of households multiplied. Under the king's household grew up the households of his great ministers and officials, under the temple grew up the personal households of temple functionaries; it is not difficult to realize how houses and patches of land would become more and more distinctly the property of the occupiers, and more and more definitely alienated from the original owner-god. The earlier empires in Egypt and China both passed into a feudal stage, in which families, originally official, became for a time independent noble families. In the later stages of Babylonian

civilization we find an increasing propertied class of people appearing in the social structure, neither slaves nor peasants nor priests nor officials, but widows and descendants of such people, or successful traders and the like, and all _masterless_ folk. Traders came in from the outside. Babylon was full of Aramean traders, who had great establishments, with slaves, freed-men, employees of all sorts. (Their book-keeping was a serious undertaking. It involved storing a great multitude of earthenware tablets in huge earthenware jars.) Upon this gathering mixture of more or less free and detached people would live other people, traders, merchants, small dealers, catering for their needs. Sayce (_op. cit._) gives the particulars of an agreement for the setting up and stocking of a tavern and beerhouse, for example. The passer-by, the man who happened to be about, had come into existence.

But another and far less kindly sort of slavery also arose in the old civilization, and that was gang slavery. If it did not figure very largely in the cities, it was very much in evidence elsewhere. The king was, to begin with, the chief _entrepreneur_. He made the canals and organized the irrigation (_e.g._ Hammurabi's enterprises noted in the previous chapter). He exploited mines. He seems (at Cnossos, _e.g._) to have organized manufactures for export. The Pharaohs of the 1st Dynasty were already working the copper and turquoise mines in the peninsula of Sinai. For many such purposes gangs of captives were cheaper and far more controllable than levies of the king's own people. From an early period, too, captives may have tugged the oars of the galleys, though Torr (_Ancient Ships_) notes that up to the age of Pericles (450 B.C.) the free Athenians were not above this task. And the monarch also found slaves convenient for his military expeditions. They were uprooted men; they did not fret to go home, because they had no homes to go to. The Pharaohs hunted slaves in Nubia, in order to have black troops for their Syrian expeditions. Closely allied to such slave troops were the mercenary barbaric troops the monarchs caught into their service, not by positive compulsion, but by the bribes of food and plunder and under the pressure of need. As the old civilization developed, these mercenary armies replaced the national levies of the old order more and more, and servile gang labour became a more and more important and significant factor in the economic system. From mines and canal and wall building, the servile gang spread into cultivation. Nobles and temples adopted the gang slave system for their works. Plantation gangs began to oust the patch cultivation of the labourer-serf in the case of some staple products....

§ 3

So, in a few paragraphs, we trace the development of the simple social structure of the early Sumerian cities to the complex city crowds, the multitude of individuals varying in race, tradition, education, and function, varying in wealth, freedom, authority, and usefulness, in the great cities of the last thousand years B.C. The most notable thing of all is the gradual increase amidst this heterogeneous multitude of what we may call _free individuals_, detached persons who are neither priests, nor kings, nor officials, nor serfs, nor slaves, who are under no great pressure to work, who have time to read and inquire. They appear side by side with the development of social security and private property. Coined money and monetary reckoning developed. The operations of the Arameans and such-like Semitic trading people led to the organization of credit and monetary security. In the earlier days almost the only property, except a few movables, consisted of rights in land and in houses; later, one could deposit and lend securities, could go away and return to find one's property faithfully held and secure. Towards the middle of the period of the Persian Empire there lived one free individual, Herodotus, who has a great interest for us because he was among the first writers of critical and intelligent history, as distinguished from a mere priestly or court chronicle. It is worth while to glance here very briefly at the circumstances of his life. Later on we shall quote from his history.

[Illustration: Brawl among boatmen ... (From tomb of Ptah-hetep----Pyramid Age)]

We have already noted the conquest of Babylonia by the Aryan Persians under Cyrus in 539 B.C. We have noted, further, that the Persian Empire spread into Egypt, where its hold was precarious; and it extended also over Asia Minor. Herodotus was born about 484 B.C. in a Greek city of Asia Minor, Halicarnassus, which was under the overlordship of the Persians, and directly under the rule of a political boss or tyrant. There is no sign that he was obliged either to work for a living or spend very much time in the administration of his property. We do not know the particulars of his affairs, but it is clear that in this minor Greek city, under foreign rule, he was able to obtain and read and study manuscripts of nearly everything that had been written in the Greek language before his time. He travelled, so far as one can gather, with freedom and comfort about the Greek archipelagoes; he stayed wherever he wanted to stay, and he seems to have found comfortable accommodation; he went to Babylon and to Susa, the new capital the Persians had set up in Babylonia to the east of the Tigris; he toured along the coast of the Black Sea, and accumulated a considerable amount of knowledge about the Scythians, the Aryan people who were then distributed over South Russia; he went to the south of Italy, explored the antiquities of Tyre, coasted Palestine, landed at Gaza, and made a long stay in Egypt. He went about Egypt looking at temples and monuments and gathering information. We know, not only from him, but from other evidence,

that in those days the older temples and the pyramids (which were already nearly three thousand years old) were visited by strings of tourists, a special sort of priests acting as guides. The inscriptions the sightseers scribbled upon the walls remain to this day, and many of them have been deciphered and published.

[Illustration: STATUETTES FROM MIDDLE-CLASS EGYPTIAN TOMBS SHOWING LOW CLASS SOCIAL TYPES IN THE ANCIENT COMMUNITIES.]

As his knowledge accumulated, he conceived the idea of writing a great history of the attempts of Persia to subdue Greece. But in order to introduce that history he composed an account of the past of Greece, Persia, Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Scythia, and of the geography and peoples of those countries. He then set himself, it is said, to make his history known among his friends in Halicarnassus by reciting it to them, but they failed to appreciate it; and he then betook himself to Athens, the most flourishing of all Greek cities at that time. There his work was received with applause. We find him in the centre of a brilliant circle of intelligent and active-minded people, and the city authorities voted him a reward of ten talents (a sum of money equivalent to £2,400) in recognition of his literary achievement....

But we will not complete the biography of this most interesting man, nor will we enter into any criticism of his garrulous, marvel-telling, and most entertaining history. It is a book to which all intelligent readers come sooner or later, abounding as it does in illuminating errors and Boswellian charm. We give these particulars here simply to show that in the fifth century B.C. a new factor was becoming evident in human affairs. Reading and writing had already long escaped from the temple precincts and the ranks of the court scribes. Record was no longer confined to court and temple. A new sort of people, these people of leisure and independent means, were asking questions, exchanging knowledge and views, and developing ideas. So beneath the march of armies and the policies of monarchs, and above the common lives of illiterate and incurious men, we note the beginnings of what is becoming at last nowadays a dominant power in human affairs, the _free intelligence of mankind_.

Of that free intelligence we shall have more to say when in a subsequent chapter we tell of the Greeks.

§ 4

We may summarize the discussion of the last two chapters here by making a list of the chief elements in this complicated accumulation of human beings which made up the later Babylonian and Egyptian civilizations of from two thousand five hundred to three thousand years ago. These elements grew up and became distinct one from another in the great river valleys of the world in the course of five or six thousand years. They developed mental dispositions and traditions and attitudes of thought one to another. The civilization in which we live to-day is simply carrying on and still further developing and working out and rearranging these relationships. This is the world from which we inherit. It is only by the attentive study of their origins that we can detach ourselves from the prejudices and immediate ideas of the particular class to which we may belong, and begin to understand the social and political questions of our own time.

(1) First, then, came the priesthood, _the temple system_, which was the nucleus and the guiding intelligence about which the primitive civilizations grew. It was still in these later days a great power in the world, the chief repository of knowledge and tradition, an influence over the lives of every one, and a binding force to hold the community together. But it was no longer all-powerful, because its nature made it conservative and inadaptable. It no longer monopolized knowledge nor initiated fresh ideas. Learning had already leaked out to other less pledged and controlled people, who thought for themselves. About the temple system were grouped its priests and priestesses, its scribes, its physicians, its magicians, its lay brethren, treasurers, managers, directors, and the like. It owned great properties and often hoarded huge treasures.

(2) Over against the priesthood, and originally arising out of it, was the _court system_, headed by a king or a “king of kings,” who was in later Assyria and Babylonia a sort of captain and lay controller of affairs, and in Egypt a god-man, who had released himself from the control of his priests. About the monarch were accumulated his scribes, counsellors, record keepers, agents, captains, and guards. Many of his officials, particularly his provincial officials, had great subordinate establishments, and were constantly tending to become independent. The nobility of the old river valley civilizations arose out of the court system. It was, therefore, a different thing in its origins from the nobility of the early Aryans, which was a republican nobility of elders and leading men.

(3) At the base of the social pyramid was the large and most necessary class in the community, _the tillers of the soil_. Their status varied from age to age and in different lands; they were free peasants paying taxes, or serfs of the god, or serfs or tenants of king or noble, or of a private owner, paying him a rent; in most cases tax or rent was paid in produce. In the states of the river valleys

they were high cultivators, cultivating comparatively small holdings; they lived together for safety in villages, and had a common interest in maintaining their irrigation channels and a sense of community in their village life. The cultivation of the soil is an exacting occupation; the seasons and the harvest sunsets will not wait for men; children can be utilized at an early age, and so the cultivator class is generally a poorly educated, close-toiling class, superstitious by reason of ignorance and the uncertainty of the seasons, ill-informed and easily put upon. It is capable at times of great passive resistance, but it has no purpose in its round but crops and crops, to keep out of debt and hoard against bad times. So it has remained to our own days over the greater part of Europe and Asia.

(4) Differing widely in origin and quality from the tillers of the soil was _the artisan class_. At first, this was probably in part a town-slave class, in part it consisted of peasants who had specialized upon a craft. But in developing an art and mystery of its own, a technique that had to be learnt before it could be practised, each sort of craft probably developed a certain independence and a certain sense of community of its own. The artisans were able to get together and discuss their affairs more readily than the toilers on the land, and they were able to form guilds to restrict output, maintain rates of pay, and protect their common interest.

(5) As the power of the Babylonian rulers spread out beyond the original areas of good husbandry into grazing regions and less fertile districts, a class of _herdsmen_ came into existence. In the case of Babylonia these were nomadic Semites, the Bedouin, like the Bedouin of to-day. They probably grazed their flocks over great areas much as the sheep ranchers of California do.[151] They were paid and esteemed much more highly than the husbandmen.

(6) The first _merchants_ in the world were shipowners, like the people of Tyre and Cnossos, or nomads who carried and traded goods as they wandered between one area of primitive civilization and another. In the Babylonian and Assyrian world the traders were predominantly the Semitic Arameans, the ancestors of the modern Syrians. They became a distinct factor in the life of the community; they formed great households of their own. Usury developed largely in the last thousand years B.C. Traders needed accommodation; cultivators wished to anticipate their crops. Sayce (_op. cit._) gives an account of the Babylonian banking-house of Egibi, which lasted through several generations and outlived the Chaldean Empire.

(7) A class of _small retailers_, one must suppose, came into existence with the complication of society during the later days of the first empires, but it was not probably of any great importance. It is difficult to understand how there could be much active retailing without small change, and there is little evidence of small change to be found either in Egypt or Mesopotamia.[152] Shekels and half-shekels of silver, weighing something between a quarter and half an ounce, are the lightest weights of stamped metal of which we find mention.

(8) A growing class of _independent property owners_.

(9) As the amenities of life increased, there grew up in the court, temples, and prosperous private houses a class of _domestic servants_, slaves or freed slaves, or young peasants taken into the household.

(10) _Gang workers._--These were prisoners of war or debt slaves, or impressed or deported men.

(11) _Mercenary soldiers._--These also were often captives or impressed men. Sometimes they were enlisted from friendly foreign populations in which the military spirit still prevailed.

(12) _Seamen._

In modern political and economic discussions we are apt to talk rather glibly of “labour.” Much has been made of the _solidarity of labour_ and its sense of community. It is well to note that in these first civilizations, what we speak of as “labour” is represented by five distinct classes dissimilar in origin, traditions, and outlook--namely, classes 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, and the oar-tugging part of 12. The “solidarity of labour” is, we shall find when we come to study the mechanical revolution of the nineteenth century A.D., a new idea and a new possibility in human affairs.

§ 5

Let us, before we leave this discussion of the social classes that were developing in these first civilizations, devote a little attention to their fixity. How far did they stand aloof from each other, and how far did they intermingle? So far as the classes we have counted as 9, 10, 11, and 12 go, the servants, the gang labourers and slaves, the gang soldiers, and, to a lesser extent, the sailors, or at any rate the galley rowers among the sailors, they were largely recruited classes, they did not readily and easily form homes, they were not distinctively breeding classes; they were probably replenished generation after generation by captives, by the failures

of other classes, and especially from the failures of the class of small retailers, and by persuasion and impressment from among the cultivators. But so far as the sailors go, we have to distinguish between the mere rower and the navigating and shipowning seamen of such ports as Tyre and Sidon. The shipowners pass, no doubt, by insensible gradations into the mercantile class, but the navigators must have made a peculiar community in the great seaports, having homes there and handing on the secrets of seacraft to their sons. The eighth class we have distinguished was certainly a precarious class, continually increased by the accession of the heirs and dependents, the widows and retired members of the wealthy and powerful, and continually diminished by the deaths or speculative losses of these people and the dispersal of their properties. The priests and priestesses too, so far as all this world west of India went, were not a very reproductive class; many priesthoods were celibate, and that class, too, may also be counted as a recruited class. Nor are servants, as a rule, reproductive. They live in the households of other people; they do not have households and rear large families of their own. This leaves us as the really vital classes of the ancient civilized community:

(_a_) The royal and aristocratic class, officials, military officers, and the like;

(_b_) The mercantile class;

(_c_) The town artisans;

(_d_) The cultivators of the soil; and

(_e_) The herdsmen.

Each of these classes reared its own children in its own fashion, and so naturally kept itself more or less continuously distinct from the others. General education was not organized in those ancient states, education was mainly a household matter (as it is still in many parts of India to-day), and so it was natural and necessary for the sons to follow in the footsteps of their father and to marry women accustomed to their own sort of household. Except during times of great political disturbance therefore, there would be a natural and continuous separation of classes; which would not, however, prevent exceptional individuals from intermarrying or passing from one class to another. Poor aristocrats would marry rich members of the mercantile class; ambitious herdsmen, artisans, or sailors would become rich merchants. So far as one can gather, that was the general state of affairs in both Egypt and Babylonia. The idea was formerly entertained that in Egypt there was a fixity of classes, but this appears to be a misconception due to a misreading of Herodotus. The only exclusive class in Egypt which did not intermarry was, as in England to-day, the semi-divine royal family.

At various points in the social system there were probably developments of exclusiveness, an actual barring out of interlopers. Artisans of particular crafts possessing secrets, for example, have among all races and in all ages tended to develop guild organizations restricting the practice of their craft and the marriage of members outside their guild. Conquering people have also, and especially when there were marked physical differences of race, been disposed to keep themselves aloof from the conquered peoples, and have developed an aristocratic exclusiveness. Such organizations of restriction upon free intercourse have come and gone in great variety in the history of all long-standing civilizations. The natural boundaries of function were always there, but sometimes they have been drawn sharply and laid stress upon, and sometimes they have been made little of. There has been a general tendency among the Aryan peoples to distinguish noble (patrician) from common (plebeian) families; the traces of it are evident throughout the literature and life of Europe to-day, and it has received a picturesque enforcement in the “science” of heraldry. This tradition is still active even in democratic America. Germany, the most methodical of European countries, had in the Middle Ages a very clear conception of the fixity of such distinctions. Below the princes (who themselves constituted an exclusive class which did not marry beneath itself) there were the:

(_a_) Knights, the military and official caste, with heraldic coats-of-arms;

(_b_ and _c_) The Bürgerstand, the merchants, shipping people, and artisans; and

(_d_) The Bauernstand, the cultivating serfs or peasants.

Mediæval Germany went as far as any of the Western heirs of the first great civilizations towards a fixation of classes. The idea is far less congenial both to the English-speaking people and to the French and Italians, who, by a sort of instinct, favour a free movement from class to class. Such exclusive ideas began at first among, and were promoted chiefly by, the upper classes, but it is a natural response and a natural Nemesis to such ideas that the mass of the excluded should presently range themselves in antagonism to their superiors. It was in Germany, as we shall see in the concluding chapters of this story, that the conception of a

natural and necessary conflict, “the class war,” between the miscellaneous multitudes of the disinherited (“the class-conscious proletariat” of the Marxist) and the rulers and merchants first arose. It was an idea more acceptable to the German mind than to the British or French.... But before we come to that conflict, we must traverse a long history of many centuries.

§ 6

If now we turn eastward from this main development of civilization in the world between Central Asia and the Atlantic, to the social development of India in the 2000 years next before the Christian era, we find certain broad and very interesting differences. The first of these is that we find such a fixity of classes in process of establishment as no other part of the world can present. This fixity of classes is known to Europeans as the institution of _caste_;[153] its origins are still in complete obscurity, but it was certainly well rooted in the Ganges valley before the days of Alexander the Great. It is a complicated horizontal division of the social structure into classes or castes, the members of which may neither eat nor intermarry with persons of a lower caste under penalty of becoming outcasts, and who may also “lose caste” for various ceremonial negligences and defilements. By losing caste a man does not sink to a lower caste; he becomes outcast. The various subdivisions of caste are very complex; many are practically trade organizations. Each caste has its local organization which maintains discipline, distributes various charities, looks after its own poor, protects the common interests of its members, and examines the credentials of newcomers from other districts. (There is little to check the pretensions of a travelling Hindu to be of a higher caste than is legitimately his.) Originally, the four main castes seem to have been:

The Brahmins--the priests and teachers;

The Kshatriyas--the warriors;

The Vaisyas--herdsmen, merchants, money-lenders, and land-owners;

The Sudras;

And, outside the castes, the Pariahs.

But these primary divisions have long been superseded by the disappearance of the second and third primary castes, and the subdivision of the Brahmins and Sudras into a multitude of minor castes, all exclusive, each holding its members to one definite way of living and one group of associates.

Next to this extraordinary fission and complication of the social body we have to note that the Brahmins, the priests and teachers of the Indian world, unlike so many Western priesthoods, are a reproductive and exclusive class, taking no recruits from any other social stratum.

Whatever may have been the original incentive to this extensive fixation of class in India, there can be little doubt of the rôle played by the Brahmins as the custodians of tradition and the only teachers of the people in sustaining it. By some it is supposed that the first three of the four original castes, known also as the “twice born,” were the descendants of the Vedic Aryan conquerors of India, who established these hard-and-fast separations to prevent racial mixing with the conquered Sudras and Pariahs. The Sudras are represented as a previous wave of northern conquerors, and the Pariahs are the original Dravidian inhabitants of India. But those speculations are not universally accepted, and it is, perhaps, rather the case that the uniform conditions of life in the Ganges valley throughout long centuries served to stereotype a difference of classes that have never had the same steadfastness of definition under the more various and variable conditions of the greater world to the west.

However caste arose, there can be no doubt of its extraordinary hold upon the Indian mind. In the sixth century B.C. arose Gautama, the great teacher of Buddhism, proclaiming, “As the four streams that flow into the Ganges lose their names as soon as they mingle their waters in the holy river, so all who believe in Buddha cease to be Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas, and Sudras.” His teaching prevailed in India for some centuries; it spread over China, Tibet, Japan, Burmah, Ceylon, Turkestan, Manchuria; it is to-day the religion of one-third of the human race, but it was finally defeated and driven out of Indian life by the vitality and persistence of the Brahmins and of their caste ideas....

§ 7

In China we find a social system travelling along yet another and only a very roughly parallel line to that followed by the Indian and Western civilizations. The Chinese civilization even more than the Hindu is organized for peace, and the warrior plays a small part

in its social scheme. As in the Indian civilization, the leading class is an intellectual one; less priestly than the Brahmin and more official. But unlike the Brahmins, the mandarins, who are the literate men of China, are not a caste; one is not a mandarin by birth, but by education; they are drawn by education and examination from all classes of the community, and the son of a mandarin has no prescriptive right to succeed his father.[154] As a consequence of these differences, while the Brahmins of India are, as a class, ignorant even of their own sacred books, mentally slack, and full of a pretentious assurance, the Chinese mandarin has the energy that comes from hard mental work. But since his education so far has been almost entirely a scholarly study of the classical Chinese literature, his influence has been entirely conservative. Before the days of Alexander the Great, China had already formed itself and set its feet in the way in which it was still walking in the year 1900 A.D. Invaders and dynasties had come and gone, but the routine of life of the yellow civilization remained unchanged.

The traditional Chinese social system recognized four main classes below the priest-emperor.

(_a_) The literary class, which was equivalent partly to the officials of the Western world and partly to its teachers and clerics. In the time of Confucius its education included archery and horsemanship. Rites and music, history and mathematics completed the “Six Accomplishments.”

(_b_) The cultivators of the land.

(_c_) The artisans.

(_d_) The mercantile class.

But since from the earliest times it has been the Chinese way to divide the landed possessions of a man among all his sons, there has never been in Chinese history any class of great land-owners, renting their land to tenants, such as most other countries have displayed. The Chinese land has always been cut up into small holdings, which are chiefly freeholds, and cultivated intensively. There are landlords in China who own one or a few farms and rent them to tenants, but there are no great, permanent estates. When a patch of land, by repeated division, is too small to sustain a man, it is sold to some prospering neighbour, and the former owner drifts to one of the great towns of China to join the mass of wage-earning workers there. In China, for many centuries, there have been these masses of town population with scarcely any property at all, men neither serfs nor slaves, but held to their daily work by their utter impecuniousness. From such masses it is that the soldiers needed by the Chinese government are recruited, and also such gang labour as has been needed for the making of canals, the building of walls, and the like has been drawn.[155] The war captive and the slave class play a smaller part in Chinese history than in any more westerly record of these ages before the Christian era.

One fact, we may note, is common to all these three stories of developing social structure, and that is the immense power exercised by the educated class in the early stages before the crown or the commonalty began to read and, consequently, to think for itself. In India, by reason of their exclusiveness, the Brahmins, the educated class, retain their influence to this day; over the masses of China, along entirely different lines and because of the complexities of the written language, the mandarinate has prevailed. The diversity of race and tradition in the more various and eventful world of the West has delayed, and perhaps arrested for ever, any parallel organization of the specially intellectual elements of society into a class ascendancy. In the Western world, as we have already noted, education early “slopped over,” and soaked away out of the control of any special class; it escaped from the limitation of castes and priesthoods and traditions into the general life of the community. Writing and reading had been simplified down to a point when it was no longer possible to make a cult and mystery of them. It may be due to the peculiar elaboration and difficulty of the Chinese characters, rather than to any racial difference, that the same thing did not happen to the same extent in China.

§ 8

In these last six chapters we have traced in outline the whole process by which, in the course of 5000 or 6000 years--that is to say, in something between 150 and 200 generations--mankind passed from the stage of early Neolithic husbandry, in which the primitive skin-clad family tribe reaped and stored in their rude mud huts the wild-growing fodder and grain-bearing grasses with sickles of stone, to the days of the fourth century B.C., when all round the shores of the Mediterranean and up the Nile, and across Asia to India, and again over the great alluvial areas of China, spread the fields of human cultivation and busy cities, great temples, and the coming and going of human commerce. Galleys and lateen-sailed ships entered and left crowded harbours, and made their careful way from headland to headland and from headland to island, keeping always close to the land. Phœnician shipping under

Egyptian owners was making its way into the East Indies and perhaps even further into the Pacific. Across the deserts of Africa and Arabia and through Turkestan toiled the caravans with their remote trade; silk was already coming from China, ivory from Central Africa, and tin from Britain to the centres of this new life in the world. Men had learnt to weave fine linen[156] and delicate fabrics of coloured wool; they could bleach and dye; they had iron as well as copper, bronze, silver, and gold; they had made the most beautiful pottery and porcelain; there was hardly a variety of precious stone in the world that they had not found and cut and polished; they could read and write; divert the course of rivers, pile pyramids, and make walls a thousand miles long. The fifty or sixty centuries in which all this had to be achieved may seem a long time in comparison with the threescore and ten years of a single human life, but it is utterly inconsiderable in comparison with the stretches of geological time. Measuring backward from these Alexandrian cities to the days of the first stone implements, the _rostro-carinate_ implements of the Pliocene Age, gives us an extent of time fully a hundred times as long.

We have tried in this account, and with the help of maps and figures and time charts, to give a just idea of the order and shape of these fifty or sixty centuries. Our business is with that outline. We have named but a few names of individuals; though henceforth the personal names must increase in number. But the content of this outline that we have drawn here in a few diagrams and charts cannot but touch the imagination. If only we could look closelier, we should see through all these sixty centuries a procession of lives more and more akin in their fashion to our own. We have shown how the naked Palæolithic savage gave place to the Neolithic cultivator, a type of man still to be found in the backward places of the world. We have given an illustration of Sumerian soldiers copied from a carved stone that was set up long before the days when the Semitic Sargon I conquered the land. Day by day some busy brownish man carved those figures, and, no doubt, whistled as he carved. In those days the plain of the Egyptian delta was crowded with gangs of swarthy workmen unloading the stone that had come down the Nile to add a fresh course to the current pyramid. One might paint a thousand scenes from those ages: of some hawker merchant in Egypt spreading his stock of Babylonish garments before the eyes of some pretty, rich lady; of a miscellaneous crowd swarming between the pylons to some temple festival at Thebes; of an excited, dark-eyed audience of Cretans like the Spaniards of to-day, watching a bull-fight, with the bull-fighters in trousers and tightly girded, exactly like any contemporary bull-fighter; of children learning their cuneiform signs--at Nippur the clay exercise tiles of a school have been found; of a woman with a sick husband at home slipping into some great temple in Carthage to make a vow for his recovery. Or perhaps it is a wild Greek, skin-clad and armed with a bronze axe, standing motionless on some Illyrian mountain crest, struck with amazement at his first vision of a many-oared Cretan galley crawling like a great insect across the amethystine mirror of the Adriatic Sea. He went home to tell his folk a strange story of a monster, Briareus with his hundred arms. Of millions of such stitches in each of these 200 generations is the fabric of this history woven. But unless they mark the presence of a primary seam or join, we cannot pause now to examine any of these stitches.

BOOK IV

JUDEA, GREECE, AND INDIA

XXI

THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES AND THE PROPHETS[157]

§ 1. _The Place of the Israelites in History._ § 2. _Saul, David, and Solomon._ § 3. _The Jews a People of Mixed Origin._ § 4. _The Importance of the Hebrew Prophets._

§ 1

We are now in a position to place in their proper relationship to this general outline of human history the Israelites, and the most remarkable collection of ancient documents in the world, that collection which is known to all Christian peoples as the Old Testament. We find in these documents the most interesting and valuable lights upon the development of civilization, and the clearest indications of a new spirit that was coming into human affairs during the struggles of Egypt and Assyria for predominance in the world of men.

All the books that constitute the Old Testament were certainly in existence, and in very much their present form, at latest by the year 100 B.C. They were probably already recognized as sacred writings in the time of Alexander the Great (330 B.C.), and known and read with the utmost respect a hundred years before his time.[158] At that time some of them were of comparatively recent composition; others were already of very considerable antiquity. They were the sacred literature of a people, the Jews, who, except

for a small remnant of common people, had recently been deported to Babylonia from their own country in 587 B.C. by Nebuchadnezzar II, the Chaldean. They had returned to their city, Jerusalem, and had rebuilt their temple there under the auspices of Cyrus, that Persian conqueror who, we have already noted, in 539 B.C. overthrew Nabonidus, the last of the Chaldean rulers in Babylon. The Babylonian Captivity had lasted about fifty years, and many authorities are of opinion that there was a considerable admixture during that period both of race and ideas with the Babylonians.

The position of the land of Judea and of Jerusalem, its capital, is a peculiar one. The country is a band-shaped strip between the Mediterranean to the west and the desert beyond the Jordan to the east; through it lies the natural high road between the Hittites, Syria, Assyria, and Babylonia to the north and Egypt to the south. It was a country predestined, therefore, to a stormy history. Across it Egypt, and whatever power was ascendant in the north, fought for empire; against its people they fought for a trade route. It had itself neither the area, the agricultural possibilities, nor the mineral wealth to be important. The story of its people that these scriptures have preserved runs like a commentary to the greater history of the two systems of civilization to the north and south and of the sea peoples to the west.

These scriptures consist of a number of different elements. The first five books, the _Pentateuch_, were early regarded with peculiar respect. They begin in the form of a universal history with a double account of the Creation of the world and mankind, of the early life of the race, and of a great Flood by which, except for certain favoured individuals, mankind was destroyed. Excavations have revealed Babylonian versions of both the Creation story and the Flood story of prior date to the restoration of the Jews, and it is therefore argued by Biblical critics that these opening chapters were acquired by the Jews during their captivity. They constitute the first ten chapters of Genesis. There follows a history of the fathers and founders of the Hebrew nation, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. They are presented as patriarchal Bedouin chiefs, living the life of nomadic shepherds in the country between Babylonia and Egypt. The existing Biblical account is said by the critics to be made up out of several pre-existing versions; but whatever its origins, the story, as we have it to-day, is full of colour and vitality. What is called Palestine to-day was at that time the land of Canaan, inhabited by a Semitic people called the Canaanites, closely related to the Phœnicians who founded Tyre and Sidon, and to the Amorites who took Babylon and, under Hammurabi, founded the first Babylonian Empire. The Canaanites were a settled folk in the days--which were perhaps contemporary with the days of Hammurabi--when Abraham's flocks and herds passed through the land. The God of Abraham, says the Bible narrative, promised this smiling land of prosperous cities to him and to his children. To the book of Genesis the reader must go to read how Abraham, being childless, doubted this promise, and of the births of Ishmael and Isaac. And in Genesis too, he will find the lives of Isaac and Jacob, whose name was changed to Israel, and of the twelve sons of Israel; and how in the days of a great famine they went down into Egypt. With that, Genesis, the first book of the Pentateuch, ends. The next book, Exodus, is concerned with the story of Moses.

The story of the settlement and slavery of the children of Israel in Egypt is a difficult one. There is an Egyptian record of a settlement of certain Semitic peoples in the land of Goshen by the Pharaoh Rameses II, and it is stated that they were drawn into Egypt by want of food. But of the life and career of Moses there is no Egyptian record at all; there is no account of any plagues of Egypt or of any Pharaoh who was drowned in the Red Sea. There is much about the story of Moses that has a mythical flavour, and one of the most remarkable incidents in it, his concealment by his mother in an ark of bulrushes, has also been found in an ancient Sumerian inscription made at least a thousand years before his time by that Sargon I who founded the ancient Akkadian Sumerian Empire. It runs:

"Sargon, the powerful king, the king of Akkadia am I, my mother was poor, my father I knew not; the brother of my father lived in the mountains.... My mother, who was poor, secretly gave birth to me; she placed me in a _basket of reeds_, she shut up the mouth of it with bitumen, she abandoned me to the river, which did not overwhelm me. The river bore me away and brought me to Akki the irrigator. Akki the irrigator received me in the goodness of his heart. Akki the irrigator reared me to boyhood. Akki the irrigator made me a gardener. My service as a gardener was pleasing unto Istar and I became king."

[Illustration: The LAND of the HEBREWS]

This is perplexing. Still more perplexing is the discovery of a clay tablet written by the Egyptian governors of a city in Canaan to the Pharaoh Amenophis IV, who came in the XVIIIth Dynasty before Rameses II, apparently mentioning the Hebrews by name and declaring that they are overrunning Canaan. Manifestly, if the Hebrews were conquering Canaan in the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty, they could not have been made captive and oppressed, before they conquered Canaan, by Rameses II of the XIXth Dynasty. But it is quite understandable that the Exodus story, written long after the events it narrates, may have concentrated and simplified, and perhaps personified and symbolized, what was really a long and complicated history of tribal invasions. One Hebrew tribe may

have drifted down into Egypt and become enslaved, while the others were already attacking the outlying Canaanite cities. It is even possible that the land of the captivity was not Egypt (Hebrew, Misraim), but Misrim in the north of Arabia, on the other side of the Red Sea. These questions are discussed fully and acutely in the _Encyclopædia Biblica_ (articles _Moses_ and _Exodus_), to which the curious reader must be referred.[159]

Two other books of the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy and Leviticus, are concerned with the Law and the priestly rules. The book of Numbers takes up the wanderings of the Israelites in the desert and their invasion of Canaan.

Whatever the true particulars of the Hebrew invasion of Canaan may be, there can be no doubt that the country they invaded had changed very greatly since the days of the legendary promise, made centuries before, to Abraham. Then it seems to have been largely a Semitic land, with many prosperous trading cities. But great waves of strange peoples had washed along this coast. We have already told how the dark Iberian or Mediterranean peoples of Italy and Greece, the peoples of that Ægean civilization which culminated at Cnossos, were being assailed by the southward movement of Aryan-speaking races, such as the Italians and Greeks, and how Cnossos was sacked about 1400 B.C., and destroyed altogether about 1000 B.C. It is now evident that the people of these Ægean seaports were crossing the sea in search of securer land nests. They invaded the Egyptian delta and the African coast to the west, they formed alliances with the Hittites and other Aryan or Aryanized races. This happened after the time of Rameses II, in the time of Rameses III. Egyptian monuments record great sea fights, and also a march of these people along the coast of Palestine towards Egypt. Their transport was in the ox-carts characteristic of the Aryan tribes, and it is clear that these Cretans were acting in alliance with some early Aryan invaders. No connected narrative of these conflicts that went on between 1300 B.C. and 1000 B.C. has yet been made out, but it is evident from the Bible narrative, that when the Hebrews under Joshua pursued their slow subjugation of the promised land, they came against a new people, the Philistines, unknown to Abraham,[160] who were settling along the coast in a series of cities of which Gaza, Gath, Ashdod, Ascalon, and Joppa became the chief, who were really, like the Hebrews, newcomers, and probably chiefly these Cretans from the sea and from the north. The invasion, therefore, that began as an attack upon the Canaanites, speedily became a long and not very successful struggle for the coveted and promised land with these much more formidable newcomers, the Philistines.

It cannot be said that the promised land was ever completely in the grasp of the Hebrews. Following after the Pentateuch in the Bible come the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth (a digression), Samuel I and II, and Kings I and II, with Chronicles repeating with variation much of the matter of Samuel II and Kings; there is a growing flavour of reality in most of this latter history, and in these books we find the Philistines steadfastly in possession of the fertile lowlands of the south, and the Canaanites and Phœnicians holding out against the Israelites in the north. The first triumphs of Joshua are not repeated. The book of Judges is a melancholy catalogue of failures. The people lose heart. They desert the worship of their own god Jehovah,[161] and worship Baal and Ashtaroth (= Bel and Ishtar). They mixed their race with the Philistines, with the Hittites, and so forth, and became, as they have always subsequently been, a racially mixed people. Under a series of wise men and heroes they wage a generally unsuccessful and never very united warfare against their enemies. In succession they are conquered by the Moabites, the Canaanites, the Midianites, and the Philistines. The story of these conflicts, of Gideon and of Samson and the other heroes who now and then cast a gleam of hope upon the distresses of Israel, is told in the book of Judges. In the first book of Samuel is told the story of their great disaster at Ebenezer in the days when Eli was judge.

This was a real pitched battle in which the Israelites lost 30,000 (!) men. They had previously suffered a reverse and lost 4000 men, and then they brought out their most sacred symbol, the Ark of the Covenant of God.

“And when the ark of the covenant of the Lord came into the camp, all Israel shouted with a great shout, so that the earth rang again. And when the Philistines heard the noise of the shout, they said, ‘What meaneth the noise of this great shout in the camp of the Hebrews?’ And they understood, that the ark of the Lord was come into the camp. And the Philistines were afraid, for they said, ‘God is come into the camp,’ And they said, ‘Woe unto us! for there hath not been such a thing heretofore. Woe unto us! who shall deliver us out of the hand of these mighty Gods? these are the Gods that smote the Egyptians with all the plagues in the wilderness. Be strong, and quit yourselves like men, O ye Philistines, that ye be not servants unto the Hebrews, as they have been to you: quit yourselves like men, and fight.’

“And the Philistines fought, and Israel was smitten, and they fled every man into his tent: and there was a very great slaughter for there fell of Israel thirty thousand[162] footmen. And the ark of God was taken; and the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, were slain.

“And there ran a man of Benjamin out of the army, and came to Shiloh the same day with his clothes rent, and with earth upon his head. And when he came, lo, Eli sat upon a seat by the wayside watching: for his heart trembled for the ark of God. And when the man came into the city and told it, all the city cried out. And when Eli heard the noise of the crying, he said, ‘What meaneth the noise of this tumult?’ And the man came in hastily, and told Eli. Now Eli was ninety and eight years old; and his eyes were dim, that he could not see. And the man said unto Eli, ‘I am he that came out of the army, and I fled to-day out of the army.’ And he said, ‘What is there done, my son?’ And the messenger answered and said, ‘Israel is fled before the Philistines, and there hath been also a great slaughter among the people, and thy two sons also, Hophni and Phinehas, are dead, and the ark of God is taken.’ And it came to pass when he made mention of the ark of God, that Eli fell from off his seat backward by the side of the gate, and his neck brake, and he died: for he was an old man, and heavy. And he had judged Israel forty years.

“And his daughter in law, Phinehas’ wife, was with child, near to be delivered: and when she heard the tidings that the ark of God was taken, and that her father in law and her husband were dead, she bowed herself and travailed; for her pains came upon her. And about the time of her death the women that stood by her said unto her, ‘Fear not; for thou hast born a son! But she answered not, neither did she regard it. And she named the child I-chabod,[163] saying, ‘The glory is departed from Israel:’ because the ark of God was taken, and because of her father in law and her husband.” (1 Sam., chap. iv.)

The successor of Eli and the last of the Judges was Samuel, and at the end of his rule came an event in the history of Israel which paralleled and was suggested by the experience of the greater nations around. A king arose. We are told in vivid language the plain issue between the more ancient rule of priestcraft and the newer fashion in human affairs. It is impossible to avoid a second quotation.

“Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah, and said unto him: ‘Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations.’

“But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, ‘Give us a king to judge us.’ And Samuel prayed unto the Lord. And the Lord said unto Samuel, ‘Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them. According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt even unto this day, wherewith they have forsaken me, and served other gods, so do they also unto thee. Now therefore hearken unto their voice: howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them, and shew them the manner of the king that shall reign over them.’

“And Samuel told all the words of the Lord unto the people that asked of him a king. And he said, ‘This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties; and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters to be confectioners, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the Lord will not hear you in that day.’

“Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, ‘Nay; but we will have a king over us; that we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles.’” (I Sam., chap. viii.)

§ 2

But the nature and position of their land was against the Hebrews, and their first king Saul was no more successful than their judges. The long intrigues of the adventurer David against Saul are told in the rest of the first book of Samuel, and the end of Saul was utter defeat upon Mount Gilboa. His army was overwhelmed by the Philistine archers.

“And it came to pass on the morrow, when the Philistines came to strip the slain, that they found Saul and his three sons fallen in Mount Gilboa. And they cut off his head, and stripped off his armour, and sent into the land of the Philistines round about, to publish it in the house of their idols, and among the people. And they put his armour in the house of Ashtaroth; and they fastened his body to the wall of Beth-shan.” (I Sam., chap, xxxi.)

David (990 B.C. roughly) was more politic and successful than his predecessor, and he seems to have placed himself under the protection of Hiram, King of Tyre. This Phœnician alliance sustained him, and was the essential element in the greatness of his son Solomon. His story, with its constant assassinations and executions, reads rather like the history of some savage chief than of a civilized monarch. It is told with great vividness in the second book of Samuel.

The first book of Kings begins with the reign of King Solomon (960 B.C. roughly). The most interesting thing in that story, from the point of view of the general historian, is the relationship of Solomon to the national religion and the priesthood, and his dealings with the tabernacle, the priest Zadok, and the prophet Nathan.

The opening of Solomon's reign is as bloody as his father's. The last recorded speech of David arranges for the murder of Shimei; his last recorded word is "blood." "But his hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood," he says, pointing out that though old Shimei is protected by a vow David had made to the Lord so long as David lives, there is nothing to bind Solomon in that matter. Solomon proceeds to murder his brother, who has sought the throne but quailed and made submission. He then deals freely with his brother's party. The weak hold of religion upon the racially and mentally confused Hebrews at that time is shown by the ease with which he replaces the hostile chief priest by his own adherent Zadok, and still more strikingly by the murder of Joab by Benaiah, Solomon's chief ruffian, in the Tabernacle, while the victim is claiming sanctuary and holding to the very horns of Jehovah's altar. Then Solomon sets to work, in what was for that time a thoroughly modern spirit, to recast the religion of his people. He continues the alliance with Hiram, King of Sidon, who uses Solomon's kingdom as a high road by which to reach and build shipping upon the Red Sea, and a hitherto unheard-of wealth accumulates in Jerusalem as a result of this partnership. Gang labour appears in Israel; Solomon sends relays of men to cut cedarwood in Lebanon under Hiram, and organizes a service of porters through the land. (There is much in all this to remind the reader of the relations of some Central African chief to a European trading concern.) Solomon then builds a palace for himself, and a temple not nearly as big for Jehovah. Hitherto, the Ark of the Covenant, the divine symbol of these ancient Hebrews, had abode in a large tent, which had been shifted from one high place to another, and sacrifices had been offered to the God of Israel upon a number of different high places. Now the ark is brought into the golden splendours of the inner chamber of a temple of cedar-sheathed stone, and put between two great winged figures of gilded olivewood, and sacrifices are henceforth to be made only upon the altar before it.

This centralizing innovation will remind the reader of both Akhnaton and Nabonidus. Such things as this are done successfully only when the prestige and tradition and learning of the priestly order has sunken to a very low level.[164]

"And he appointed, according to the order of David his father, the courses of the priests to their service, and the Levites to their charges, to praise and minister before the priests, as the duty of every day required; the porters also by their courses at every gate; for so had David the man of God commanded. And they departed not from the commandment of the king unto the priests and Levites concerning any matter, or concerning the treasures."

Neither Solomon's establishment of the worship of Jehovah in Jerusalem upon this new footing, nor his vision of and conversation with his God at the opening of his reign, stood in the way of his developing a sort of theological flirtatiousness in his declining years. He married widely, if only for reasons of state and splendour, and he entertained his numerous wives by sacrificing to their national deities, to the Sidonian goddess Ashtaroth (Ishtar), to Chemosh (a Moabitish god), to Moloch, and so forth. The Bible account of Solomon does, in fact, show us a king and a confused people, both superstitious and mentally unstable, in no way more religious than any other people of the surrounding world.

A point of considerable interest in the story of Solomon, because it marks a phase in Egyptian affairs, is his marriage to a daughter of Pharaoh: This must have been one of the Pharaohs of the XXIst Dynasty: In the great days of Amenophis III, as the Tel Amarna letters witness, Pharaoh could condescend to receive a Babylonian princess into his harem, but he refused absolutely to grant so divine a creature as an Egyptian princess in marriage to the Babylonian monarch. It points to the steady decline of Egyptian prestige that now, three centuries later, such a petty monarch as Solomon could wed on equal terms with an Egyptian princess. There was, however, a revival with the next Egyptian dynasty (XXII); and the Pharaoh Shishak, the founder, taking advantage of the cleavage between Israel and Judah, which had been developing through the reigns of both David and Solomon, took Jerusalem and looted the all-too-brief splendours both of the new temple and of the king's house.

Shishak seems also to have subjugated Philistia. From this time onward it is to be noted that the Philistines fade in importance. They had already lost their Cretan language and adopted that of the Semites they had conquered, and although their cities remain more or less independent, they merge gradually into the general Semitic life of Palestine.

There is evidence that the original rude but convincing narrative of Solomon's rule, of his various murders, of his association with Hiram, of his palace and temple building, and the extravagances that weakened and finally tore his kingdom in twain, has been subjected to extensive interpolations and expansions by a later writer, anxious to exaggerate his prosperity and glorify his wisdom. It is not the place here to deal with the criticism of Bible origins, but it is a matter of ordinary common sense rather than of scholarship to note the manifest reality and veracity of the main substance of the account of David and Solomon, an account explaining sometimes and justifying sometimes, but nevertheless relating facts, even the harshest facts, as only a contemporary or almost contemporary writer, convinced that they cannot be concealed, would relate them, and then to remark the sudden lapse into adulation when the inserted passages occur. It is a striking tribute to the power of the written assertion over realities in men's minds that this Bible narrative has imposed, not only upon the Christian, but upon the Moslim world, the belief that King Solomon was not only one of the most magnificent, but one of the wisest of men. Yet the first book of Kings tells in detail his utmost splendours, and beside the beauty and wonder of the buildings and organizations of such great monarchs as Thotmes III or Rameses II or half a dozen other Pharaohs, or of Sargon II or Sardanapalus or Nebuchadnezzar the Great, they are trivial. His temple, measured internally, was twenty cubits broad, about 35 feet[165]--that is, the breadth of a small villa residence--and sixty cubits, say, 100 feet, long. And as for his wisdom and statescraft, one need go no further than the Bible to see that Solomon was a mere helper in the wide-reaching schemes of the trader-king Hiram, and his kingdom a pawn between Phœnicia and Egypt. His importance was due largely to the temporary enfeeblement of Egypt, which encouraged the ambition of the Phœnician and made it necessary to propitiate the holder of the key to an alternate trade route to the East. To his own people Solomon was a wasteful and oppressive monarch, and already before his death his kingdom was splitting, visibly to all men.

With the reign of King Solomon the brief glory of the Hebrews ends; the northern and richer section of his kingdom, long oppressed by taxation to sustain his splendours, breaks off from Jerusalem to become the separate kingdom of Israel, and this split ruptures that linking connection between Sidon and the Red Sea by which Solomon's gleam of wealth was possible. There is no more wealth in Hebrew history. Jerusalem remains the capital of one tribe, the tribe of Judah, the capital of a land of barren hills, cut off by Philistia from the sea and surrounded by enemies.

The tales of wars, of religious conflicts, of usurpations, assassinations, and of fratricidal murders to secure the throne goes on for three centuries. It is a tale frankly barbaric. Israel wars with Judah and the neighbouring states; forms alliances first with one and then with the other. The power of Aramean Syria burns like a baleful star over the affairs of the Hebrews, and then there rises behind it the great and growing power of the last Assyrian Empire. For three centuries the life of the Hebrews was like the life of a man who insists upon living in the middle of a busy thoroughfare, and is consequently being run over constantly by omnibuses and motor-lorries.

"Pul" (apparently the same person as Tiglath Pileser III) is, according to the Bible narrative, the first Assyrian monarch to appear upon the Hebrew horizon, and Menahem buys him off with a thousand talents of silver (738 B.C.). But the power of Assyria is heading straight for the now aged and decadent land of Egypt, and the line of attack lies through Judea; Tiglath Pileser III returns and Shalmaneser follows in his steps, the King of Israel intrigues for help with Egypt, that "broken reed," and in 721 B.C., as we have already noted, his kingdom is swept off into captivity and utterly lost to history. The same fate hung over Judah, but for a little while it was averted. The fate of Sennacherib's army in the reign of King Hezekiah (701 B.C.), and how he was murdered by his sons (II Kings xix. 37), we have already mentioned. The subsequent subjugation of Egypt by Assyria finds no mention in Holy Writ, but it is clear that before the reign of Sennacherib, King Hezekiah had carried on a diplomatic correspondence with Babylon (700 B.C.), which was in revolt against Sargon II of Assyria. There followed the conquest of Egypt by Esarhaddon, and then for a time Assyria was occupied with her own troubles; the Scythians and Medes and Persians were pressing her on the north, and Babylon was in insurrection. As we have already noted, Egypt, relieved for a time from Assyrian pressure, entered upon a phase of revival, first under Psammetichus and then under Necho II.

Again the little country in between made mistakes in its alliances. But on neither side was there safety. Josiah opposed Necho, and was slain at the battle of Megiddo (608 B.C.). The king of Judah became an Egyptian tributary. Then when Necho, after pushing as far as the Euphrates, fell before Nebuchadnezzar II, Judah fell with him (604 B.C.). Nebuchadnezzar, after a trial of three puppet kings, carried off the greater part of the people into captivity in Babylon (586 B.C.), and the rest, after a rising and a massacre of Babylonian officials, took refuge from the vengeance of Chaldea in Egypt.

"And all the vessels of the house of God, great and small, and the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king, and of his princes; all these he brought to Babylon. And they burnt the house of God and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof. And them that had escaped from the sword

carried he away to Babylon; where they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia." (II Chron. xxxvi. 18, 19, 20.)

So the four This eBook is for the use of anyone anywhere in the United States and most other parts of the world at no cost and with almost no restrictions whatsoever. You may copy it, give it away or re-use it under the terms of the Project Gutenberg License included with this eBook or online at www.gutenberg.org. If you are not located in the United States, you will have to check the laws of the country where you are located before using this eBook.

Title: The Enchanted April

Author: Elizabeth Von Arnim

Release date: July 29, 2005 [eBook #16389] Most recently updated: September 24, 2025

Language: English

Other information and formats: www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/16389

Credits: Manette Rothermel

*** START OF THE PROJECT GUTENBERG EBOOK THE ENCHANTED APRIL ***

[Illustration]

The Enchanted April

by Elizabeth Von Arnim

Contents

Chapter 1 Chapter 2 Chapter 3 Chapter 4 Chapter 5 Chapter 6 Chapter 7 Chapter 8 Chapter 9 Chapter 10 Chapter 11 Chapter 12 Chapter 13 Chapter 14 Chapter 15 Chapter 16 Chapter 17 Chapter 18 Chapter 19 Chapter 20 Chapter 21 Chapter 22

Chapter 1

It began in a Woman's Club in London on a February afternoon—an uncomfortable club, and a miserable afternoon—when Mrs. Wilkins, who had come down from Hampstead to shop and had lunched at her club, took up _The Times_ from the table in the smoking-room, and running her listless eye down the Agony Column saw this:

To Those who Appreciate Wistaria and Sunshine. Small mediaeval Italian Castle on the shores of the Mediterranean to be Let Furnished for the month of April. Necessary servants remain. Z, Box 1000, _The Times_.

That was its conception; yet, as in the case of many another, the conceiver was unaware of it at the moment.

So entirely unaware was Mrs. Wilkins that her April for that year had then and there been settled for her that she dropped the newspaper with a gesture that was both irritated and resigned, and went over to the window and stared drearily out at the dripping street.

Not for her were mediaeval castles, even those that are specially described as small. Not for her the shores in April of the Mediterranean, and the wistaria and sunshine. Such delights were only for the rich. Yet the advertisement had been addressed to persons who appreciate these things, so that it had been, anyhow, addressed too to her, for she certainly appreciated them; more than anybody knew; more than she had ever told. But she was poor. In the whole world she possessed of her very own only ninety pounds, saved from year to year, put by carefully pound by pound, out of her dress allowance. She had scraped this sum together at the suggestion of her husband as a shield and refuge against a rainy day. Her dress allowance, given her by her father, was £100 a year, so that Mrs. Wilkins's clothes were what her husband, urging her to save, called modest and becoming, and her acquaintance to each other, when they spoke of her at all, which was seldom for she was very negligible, called a perfect sight.

Mr. Wilkins, a solicitor, encouraged thrift, except that branch of it which got into his food. He did not call that thrift, he called it bad housekeeping. But for the thrift which, like moth, penetrated into Mrs. Wilkins's clothes and spoilt them, he had much praise. "You never know," he said, "when there will be a rainy day, and you may be very glad to find you have a nest-egg. Indeed we both may."

Looking out of the club window into Shaftesbury Avenue—hers was an economical club, but convenient for Hampstead, where she lived, and for Shoolbred's, where she shopped—Mrs. Wilkins, having stood there some time very drearily, her mind's eye on the Mediterranean in April, and the wistaria, and the enviable opportunities of the rich, while her bodily eye watched the really extremely horrible sooty rain falling steadily on the hurrying umbrellas and splashing omnibuses, suddenly wondered whether perhaps this was not the rainy day Mellersh—Mellersh was Mr. Wilkins—had so often encouraged her to prepare for, and whether to get out of such a climate and into the small mediaeval castle wasn't perhaps what Providence had all along intended her to do with her savings. Part of her savings, of course; perhaps quite a small part. The castle, being mediaeval, might also be dilapidated, and dilapidations were surely cheap. She wouldn't in the least mind a few of them, because you didn't pay for dilapidations which were already there; on the contrary—by reducing the price you had to pay they really paid you. But what nonsense to think of it . . .

She turned away from the window with the same gesture of mingled irritation and resignation with which she had laid down _The Times_, and crossed the room towards the door with the intention of getting her mackintosh and umbrella and fighting her way into one of the overcrowded omnibuses and going to Shoolbred's on her way home and buying some soles for Mellersh's dinner—Mellersh was difficult with fish and liked only soles, except salmon—when she beheld Mrs. Arbuthnot, a woman she knew by sight as also living in Hampstead and belonging to the club, sitting at the table in the middle of the room on which the newspapers and magazines were kept, absorbed, in her turn, in the first page of _The Times_.

Mrs. Wilkins had never yet spoken to Mrs. Arbuthnot, who belonged to one of the various church sets, and who analysed, classified, divided and registered the poor; whereas she and Mellersh, when they did go out, went to the parties of impressionist painters, of whom in Hampstead there were many. Mellersh had a sister who had married one of them and lived up on the Heath, and because of this alliance Mrs. Wilkins was drawn into a circle which was highly unnatural to her, and she had learned to dread pictures. She had to say things about them, and she didn't know what to say. She used to murmur, "Marvellous," and feel that it was not enough. But nobody minded. Nobody listened. Nobody took any notice of Mrs. Wilkins. She was the kind of person who is not noticed at parties. Her clothes, infested by thrift, made her practically invisible; her face was non-arresting; her conversation was reluctant; she was shy. And if one's clothes and face and conversation are all negligible, thought Mrs. Wilkins, who recognised her disabilities, what, at parties, is there left of one?

Also she was always with Wilkins, that clean-shaven, fine-looking man, who gave a party, merely by coming to it, a great air. Wilkins was very respectable. He was known to be highly thought of by his senior partners. His sister's circle admired him. He pronounced adequately intelligent judgments on art and artists. He was pithy; he was prudent; he never said a word too much, nor, on the other hand, did he ever say a word too little. He produced the impression of keeping copies of everything he said; and he was so obviously reliable that it often happened that people who met him at these parties became discontented with their own solicitors, and after a period of restlessness extricated themselves and went to Wilkins.

Naturally Mrs. Wilkins was blotted out. "She," said his sister, with something herself of the judicial, the digested, and the final in her manner, "should stay at home." But Wilkins could not leave his wife at home. He was a family solicitor, and all such have wives and show them. With his in the week he went to parties, and with his on Sundays he went to church. Being still fairly young—he was thirty-nine—and ambitious of old ladies, of whom he had not yet acquired in his practice a sufficient number, he could not afford to miss church, and it was there that Mrs. Wilkins became familiar, though never through words, with Mrs. Arbuthnot.

She saw her marshalling the children of the poor into pews. She would come in at the head of the procession from the Sunday School exactly five minutes before the choir, and get her boys and girls neatly fitted into their allotted seats, and down on their little knees in their preliminary prayer, and up again on their feet just as, to the swelling organ, the vestry door opened, and the choir and clergy, big with the litanies and commandments they were presently to roll out, emerged. She had a sad face, yet she was evidently efficient. The combination used to make Mrs. Wilkins wonder, for she had been told by Mellersh, on days when she had only been able to get plaice, that if one were efficient one wouldn't be depressed, and that if one does one's job well one becomes automatically bright and brisk.

About Mrs. Arbuthnot there was nothing bright and brisk, though much in her way with the Sunday School children that was automatic; but when Mrs. Wilkins, turning from the window, caught sight of her in the club she was not being automatic at all, but

was looking fixedly at one portion of the first page of _The Times_, holding the paper quite still, her eyes not moving. She was just staring; and her face, as usual, was the face of a patient and disappointed Madonna.

Obeying an impulse she wondered at even while obeying it, Mrs. Wilkins, the shy and the reluctant, instead of proceeding as she had intended to the cloakroom and from thence to Schoolbred's in search of Mellersh's fish, stopped at the table and sat down exactly opposite Mrs. Arbuthnot, to whom she had never yet spoken in her life.

It was one of those long, narrow refectory tables, so that they were quite close to each other.

Mrs. Arbuthnot, however, did not look up. She continued to gaze, with eyes that seemed to be dreaming, at one spot only of The Times.

Mrs. Wilkins watched her a minute, trying to screw up courage to speak to her. She wanted to ask her if she had seen the advertisement. She did not know why she wanted to ask her this, but she wanted to. How stupid not to be able to speak to her. She looked so kind. She looked so unhappy. Why couldn't two unhappy people refresh each other on their way through this dusty business of life by a little talk—real, natural talk, about what they felt, what they would have liked, what they still tried to hope? And she could not help thinking that Mrs. Arbuthnot, too, was reading that very same advertisement. Her eyes were on the very part of the paper. Was she, too, picturing what it would be like—the colour, the fragrance, the light, the soft lapping of the sea among little hot rocks? Colour, fragrance, light, sea; instead of Shaftesbury Avenue, and the wet omnibuses, and the fish department at Shoolbred's, and the Tube to Hampstead, and dinner, and to-morrow the same and the day after the same and always the same . . .

Suddenly Mrs. Wilkins found herself leaning across the table. "Are you reading about the mediaeval castle and the wistaria?" she heard herself asking.

Naturally Mrs. Arbuthnot was surprised; but she was not half so much surprised as Mrs. Wilkins was at herself for asking.

Mrs. Arbuthnot had not yet to her knowledge set eyes on the shabby, lank, loosely-put-together figure sitting opposite her, with its small freckled face and big grey eyes almost disappearing under a smashed-down wet-weather hat, and she gazed at her a moment without answering. She _was_ reading about the mediaeval castle and the wistaria, or rather had read about it ten minutes before, and since then had been lost in dreams—of light, of colour, of fragrance, of the soft lapping of the sea among little hot rocks . . .

"Why do you ask me that?" she said in her grave voice, for her training of and by the poor had made her grave and patient.

Mrs. Wilkins flushed and looked excessively shy and frightened. "Oh, only because I saw it too, and I thought perhaps—I thought somehow—" she stammered.

Whereupon Mrs. Arbuthnot, her mind being used to getting people into lists and divisions, from habit considered, as she gazed thoughtfully at Mrs. Wilkins, under what heading, supposing she had to classify her, she could most properly be put.

"And I know you by sight," went on Mrs. Wilkins, who, like all the shy, once she was started plunged on, frightening herself to more and more speech by the sheer sound of what she had said last in her ears. "Every Sunday—I see you every Sunday in church—"

"In church?" echoed Mrs. Arbuthnot.

"And this seems such a wonderful thing—this advertisement about the wistaria—and—"

Mrs. Wilkins, who must have been at least thirty, broke off and wriggled in her chair with the movement of an awkward and embarrassed schoolgirl.

"It seems _so_ wonderful," she went on in a kind of burst, "and—it is such a miserable day . . ."

And then she sat looking at Mrs. Arbuthnot with the eyes of an imprisoned dog.

"This poor thing," thought Mrs. Arbuthnot, whose life was spent in helping and alleviating, "needs advice."

She accordingly prepared herself patiently to give it.

"If you see me in church," she said, kindly and attentively, "I suppose you live in Hampstead too?"

“Oh yes,” said Mrs. Wilkins. And she repeated, her head on its long thin neck drooping a little as if the recollection of Hampstead bowed her, “Oh yes.”

“Where?” asked Mrs. Arbuthnot, who, when advice was needed, naturally first proceeded to collect the facts.

But Mrs. Wilkins, laying her hand softly and caressingly on the part of _The Times_ where the advertisement was, as though the mere printed words of it were precious, only said, “Perhaps that’s why _this_ seems so wonderful.”

“No—I think _that’s_ wonderful anyhow,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, forgetting facts and faintly sighing.

“Then you _were_ reading it?”

“Yes,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, her eyes going dreamy again.

“Wouldn’t it be wonderful?” murmured Mrs. Wilkins.

“Wonderful,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot. Her face, which had lit up, faded into patience again. “Very wonderful,” she said. “But it’s no use wasting one’s time thinking of such things.”

“Oh, but it _is_,” was Mrs. Wilkins’s quick, surprising reply; surprising because it was so much unlike the rest of her—the characterless coat and skirt, the crumpled hat, the undecided wisp of hair straggling out. “And just the considering of them is worth while in itself—such a change from Hampstead—and sometimes I believe—I really do believe—if one considers hard enough one gets things.”

Mrs. Arbuthnot observed her patiently. In what category would she, supposing she had to, put her?

“Perhaps,” she said, leaning forward a little, “you will tell me your name. If we are to be friends”—she smiled her grave smile—“as I hope we are, we had better begin at the beginning.”

“Oh yes—how kind of you. I’m Mrs. Wilkins,” said Mrs. Wilkins. “I don’t expect,” she added, flushing, as Mrs. Arbuthnot said nothing, “that it conveys anything to you. Sometimes it—it doesn’t seem to convey anything to me either. But”—she looked round with a movement of seeking help—“I _am_ Mrs. Wilkins.”

She did not like her name. It was a mean, small name, with a kind of facetious twist, she thought, about its end like the upward curve of a pugdog’s tail. There it was, however. There was no doing anything with it. Wilkins she was and Wilkins she would remain; and though her husband encouraged her to give it on all occasions as Mrs. Mellersh-Wilkins she only did that when he was within earshot, for she thought Mellersh made Wilkins worse, emphasising it in the way Chatsworth on the gate-posts of a villa emphasises the villa.

When first he suggested she should add Mellersh she had objected for the above reason, and after a pause—Mellersh was much too prudent to speak except after a pause, during which presumably he was taking a careful mental copy of his coming observation—he said, much displeased, “But I am not a villa,” and looked at her as he looks who hopes, for perhaps the hundredth time, that he may not have married a fool.

Of course he was not a villa, Mrs. Wilkins assured him; she had never supposed he was; she had not dreamed of meaning . . . she was only just thinking . . .

The more she explained the more earnest became Mellersh’s hope, familiar to him by this time, for he had then been a husband for two years, that he might not by any chance have married a fool; and they had a prolonged quarrel, if that can be called a quarrel which is conducted with dignified silence on one side and earnest apology on the other, as to whether or no Mrs. Wilkins had intended to suggest that Mr. Wilkins was a villa.

“I believe,” she had thought when it was at last over—it took a long while—“that _anybody_ would quarrel about _anything_ when they’ve not left off being together for a single day for two whole years. What we both need is a holiday.”

“My husband,” went on Mrs. Wilkins to Mrs. Arbuthnot, trying to throw some light on herself, “is a solicitor. He—” She cast about for something she could say elucidatory of Mellersh, and found: “He’s very handsome.”

“Well,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot kindly, “that must be a great pleasure to you.”

“Why?” asked Mrs. Wilkins.

“Because,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, a little taken aback, for constant intercourse with the poor had accustomed her to have her pronouncements accepted without question, “because beauty—handsomeness—is a gift like any other, and if it is properly used—”

She trailed off into silence. Mrs. Wilkins’s great grey eyes were fixed on her, and it seemed suddenly to Mrs. Arbuthnot that perhaps she was becoming crystallised into a habit of exposition, and of exposition after the manner of nursemaids, through having an audience that couldn’t but agree, that would be afraid, if it wished, to interrupt, that didn’t know, that was, in fact, at her mercy.

But Mrs. Wilkins was not listening; for just then, absurd as it seemed, a picture had flashed across her brain, and there were two figures in it sitting together under a great trailing wistaria that stretched across the branches of a tree she didn’t know, and it was herself and Mrs. Arbuthnot—she saw them—she saw them. And behind them, bright in sunshine, were old grey walls—the mediaeval castle—she saw it—they were there . . .

She therefore stared at Mrs. Arbuthnot and did not hear a word she said. And Mrs. Arbuthnot stared too at Mrs. Wilkins, arrested by the expression on her face, which was swept by the excitement of what she saw, and was as luminous and tremulous under it as water in sunlight when it is ruffled by a gust of wind. At this moment, if she had been at a party, Mrs. Wilkins would have been looked at with interest.

They stared at each other; Mrs. Arbuthnot surprised, inquiringly, Mrs. Wilkins with the eyes of some one who has had a revelation. Of course. That was how it could be done. She herself, she by herself, couldn’t afford it, and wouldn’t be able, even if she could afford it, to go there all alone; but she and Mrs. Arbuthnot together . . .

She leaned across the table. “Why don’t we try and get it?” she whispered.

Mrs. Arbuthnot became even more wide-eyed. “Get it?” she repeated.

“Yes,” said Mrs. Wilkins, still as though she were afraid of being overheard. “Not just sit here and say How wonderful, and then go home to Hampstead without having put out a finger—go home just as usual and see about the dinner and the fish just as we’ve been doing for years and years and will go on doing for years and years. In fact,” said Mrs. Wilkins, flushing to the roots of her hair, for the sound of what she was saying, of what was coming pouring out, frightened her, and yet she couldn’t stop, “I see no end to it. There is no end to it. So that there ought to be a break, there ought to be intervals—in everybody’s interests. Why, it would really be being unselfish to go away and be happy for a little, because we would come back so much nicer. You see, after a bit everybody needs a holiday.”

“But—how do you mean, get it?” asked Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“Take it,” said Mrs. Wilkins.

“Take it?”

“Rent it. Hire it. Have it.”

“But—do you mean you and I?”

“Yes. Between us. Share. Then it would only cost half, and you look so—you look exactly as if you wanted it just as much as I do—as if you ought to have a rest—have something happy happen to you.”

“Why, but we don’t know each other.”

“But just think how well we would if we went away together for a month! And I’ve saved for a rainy day, and I expect so have you, and this _is_ the rainy day—look at it—”

“She is unbalanced,” thought Mrs. Arbuthnot; yet she felt strangely stirred.

“Think of getting away for a whole month—from everything—to heaven—”

“She shouldn’t say things like that,” thought Mrs. Arbuthnot. “The vicar—” Yet she felt strangely stirred. It would indeed be wonderful to have a rest, a cessation.

Habit, however, steadied her again; and years of intercourse with the poor made her say, with the slight though sympathetic superiority of the explainer, “But then, you see, heaven isn’t somewhere else. It is here and now. We are told so.”

She became very earnest, just as she did when trying patiently to help and enlighten the poor. “Heaven is within us,” she said in her gentle low voice. “We are told that on the very highest authority. And you know the lines about the kindred points, don’t you—”

“Oh yes, I know _them_,” interrupted Mrs. Wilkins impatiently.

“The kindred points of heaven and home,” continued Mrs. Arbuthnot, who was used to finishing her sentences. “Heaven is in our home.”

“It isn’t,” said Mrs. Wilkins, again surprisingly.

Mrs. Arbuthnot was taken aback. Then she said gently, “Oh, but it is. It is there if we choose, if we make it.”

“I do choose, and I do make it, and it isn’t,” said Mrs. Wilkins.

Then Mrs. Arbuthnot was silent, for she too sometimes had doubts about homes. She sat and looked uneasily at Mrs. Wilkins, feeling more and more the urgent need to getting her classified. If she could only classify Mrs. Wilkins, get her safely under her proper heading, she felt that she herself would regain her balance, which did seem very strangely to be slipping all to one side. For neither had she had a holiday for years, and the advertisement when she saw it had set her dreaming, and Mrs. Wilkins’s excitement about it was infectious, and she had the sensation, as she listened to her impetuous, odd talk and watched her lit-up face, that she was being stirred out of sleep.

Clearly Mrs. Wilkins was unbalanced, but Mrs. Arbuthnot had met the unbalanced before—indeed she was always meeting them—and they had no effect on her own stability at all; whereas this one was making her feel quite wobbly, quite as though to be off and away, away from her compass points of God, Husband, Home and Duty—she didn’t feel as if Mrs. Wilkins intended Mr. Wilkins to come too—and just for once be happy, would be both good and desirable. Which of course it wasn’t; which certainly of course it wasn’t. She, also, had a nest-egg, invested gradually in the Post Office Savings Bank, but to suppose that she would ever forget her duty to the extent of drawing it out and spending it on herself was surely absurd. Surely she couldn’t, she wouldn’t ever do such a thing? Surely she wouldn’t, she couldn’t ever forget her poor, forget misery and sickness as completely as that? No doubt a trip to Italy would be extraordinarily delightful, but there were many delightful things one would like to do, and what was strength given to one for except to help one not to do them?

Steadfast as the points of the compass to Mrs. Arbuthnot were the great four facts of life: God, Husband, Home, Duty. She had gone to sleep on these facts years ago, after a period of much misery, her head resting on them as on a pillow; and she had a great dread of being awakened out of so simple and untroublesome a condition. Therefore it was that she searched with earnestness for a heading under which to put Mrs. Wilkins, and in this way illumine and steady her own mind; and sitting there looking at her uneasily after her last remark, and feeling herself becoming more and more unbalanced and infected, she decided _pro tem_, as the vicar said at meetings, to put her under the heading Nerves. It was just possible that she ought to go straight into the category Hysteria, which was often only the antechamber to Lunacy, but Mrs. Arbuthnot had learned not to hurry people into their final categories, having on more than one occasion discovered with dismay that she had made a mistake; and how difficult it had been to get them out again, and how crushed she had been with the most terrible remorse.

Yes. Nerves. Probably she had no regular work for others, thought Mrs. Arbuthnot; no work that would take her outside herself. Evidently she was rudderless—blown about by gusts, by impulses. Nerves was almost certainly her category, or would be quite soon if no one helped her. Poor little thing, thought Mrs. Arbuthnot, her own balance returning hand in hand with her compassion, and unable, because of the table, to see the length of Mrs. Wilkins’s legs. All she saw was her small, eager, shy face, and her thin shoulders, and the look of childish longing in her eyes for something that she was sure was going to make her happy. No; such things didn’t make people happy, such fleeting things. Mrs. Arbuthnot had learned in her long life with Frederick—he was her husband, and she had married him at twenty and was now thirty-three—where alone true joys are to be found. They are to be found, she now knew, only in daily, in hourly, living for others; they are to be found only—hadn’t she over and over again taken her disappointments and discouragements there, and come away comforted?—at the feet of God.

Frederick had been the kind of husband whose wife betakes herself early to the feet of God. From him to them had been a short though painful step. It seemed short to her in retrospect, but it had really taken the whole of the first year of their marriage, and

every inch of the way had been a struggle, and every inch of it was stained, she felt at the time, with her heart's blood. All that was over now. She had long since found peace. And Frederick, from her passionately loved bridegroom, from her worshipped young husband, had become second only to God on her list of duties and forbearances. There he hung, the second in importance, a bloodless thing bled white by her prayers. For years she had been able to be happy only by forgetting happiness. She wanted to stay like that. She wanted to shut out everything that would remind her of beautiful things, that might set her off again longing, desiring....

"I'd like so much to be friends," she said earnestly. "Won't you come and see me, or let me come to you sometimes? Whenever you feel as if you wanted to talk. I'll give you my address"—she searched in her handbag—"and then you won't forget." And she found a card and held it out.

Mrs. Wilkins ignored the card.

"It's so funny," said Mrs. Wilkins, just as if she had not heard her, "but I _see_ us both—you and me—this April in the mediaeval castle."

Mrs. Arbuthnot relapsed into uneasiness. "Do you?" she said, making an effort to stay balanced under the visionary gaze of the shining grey eyes. "Do you?"

"Don't you ever see things in a kind of flash before they happen?" asked Mrs. Wilkins.

"Never," said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

She tried to smile; she tried to smile the sympathetic yet wise and tolerant smile with which she was accustomed to listen to the necessarily biassed and incomplete views of the poor. She didn't succeed. The smile trembled out.

"Of course," she said in a low voice, almost as if she were afraid the vicar and the Savings Bank were listening, "it would be most beautiful—most beautiful—"

"Even if it were wrong," said Mrs. Wilkins, "it would only be for a month."

"That—" began Mrs. Arbuthnot, quite clear as to the reprehensibleness of such a point of view; but Mrs. Wilkins stopped her before she could finish.

"Anyhow," said Mrs. Wilkins, stopping her, "I'm sure it's wrong to go on being good for too long, till one gets miserable. And I can see you've been good for years and years, because you look so unhappy"—Mrs. Arbuthnot opened her mouth to protest—"and I—I've done nothing but duties, things for other people, ever since I was a girl, and I don't believe anybody loves me a bit—a bit—the b-better—and I long—oh, I long—for something else—something else—"

Was she going to cry? Mrs. Arbuthnot became acutely uncomfortable and sympathetic. She hoped she wasn't going to cry. Not there. Not in that unfriendly room, with strangers coming and going.

But Mrs. Wilkins, after tugging agitatedly at a handkerchief that wouldn't come out of her pocket, did succeed at last in merely apparently blowing her nose with it, and then, blinking her eyes very quickly once or twice, looked at Mrs. Arbuthnot with a quivering air of half humble, half frightened apology, and smiled.

"Will you believe," she whispered, trying to steady her mouth, evidently dreadfully ashamed of herself, "that I've never spoken to any one before in my life like this? I can't think, I simply don't know, what has come over me."

"It's the advertisement," said Mrs. Arbuthnot, nodding gravely.

"Yes," said Mrs. Wilkins, dabbing furtively at her eyes, "and us both being so—"—she blew her nose again a little—"miserable."

Chapter 2

Of course Mrs. Arbuthnot was not miserable—how could she be, she asked herself, when God was taking care of her?—but she let that pass for the moment unrepudiated, because of her conviction that here was another fellow-creature in urgent need of her help; and not just boots and blankets and better sanitary arrangements this time, but the more delicate help of comprehension, of finding the exact right words.

The exact right words, she presently discovered, after trying various ones about living for others, and prayer, and the peace to be found in placing oneself unreservedly in God's hands—to meet all these words Mrs. Wilkins had other words, incoherent and yet, for the moment at least, till one had had more time, difficult to answer—the exact right words were a suggestion that it would do no harm to answer the advertisement. Non-committal. Mere inquiry. And what disturbed Mrs. Arbuthnot about this suggestion was that she did not make it solely to comfort Mrs. Wilkins; she made it because of her own strange longing for the mediaeval castle.

This was very disturbing. There she was, accustomed to direct, to lead, to advise, to support—except Frederick; she long since had learned to leave Frederick to God—being led herself, being influenced and thrown off her feet, by just an advertisement, by just an incoherent stranger. It was indeed disturbing. She failed to understand her sudden longing for what was, after all, self-indulgence, when for years no such desire had entered her heart.

"There's no harm in simply _asking_," she said in a low voice, as if the vicar and the Savings Bank and all her waiting and dependent poor were listening and condemning.

"It isn't as if it _committed_ us to anything," said Mrs. Wilkins, also in a low voice, but her voice shook.

They got up simultaneously—Mrs. Arbuthnot had a sensation of surprise that Mrs. Wilkins should be so tall—and went to a writing-table, and Mrs. Arbuthnot wrote to Z, Box 1000, _The Times_, for particulars. She asked for all particulars, but the only one they really wanted was the one about the rent. They both felt that it was Mrs. Arbuthnot who ought to write the letter and do the business part. Not only was she used to organising and being practical, but she also was older, and certainly calmer; and she herself had no doubt too that she was wiser. Neither had Mrs. Wilkins any doubt of this; the very way Mrs. Arbuthnot parted her hair suggested a great calm that could only proceed from wisdom.

But if she was wiser, older and calmer, Mrs. Arbuthnot's new friend nevertheless seemed to her to be the one who impelled. Incoherent, she yet impelled. She appeared to have, apart from her need of help, an upsetting kind of character. She had a curious infectiousness. She led one on. And the way her unsteady mind leaped at conclusions—wrong ones, of course; witness the one that she, Mrs. Arbuthnot, was miserable—the way she leaped at conclusions was disconcerting.

Whatever she was, however, and whatever her unsteadiness, Mrs. Arbuthnot found herself sharing her excitement and her longing; and when the letter had been posted in the letter-box in the hall and actually was beyond getting back again, both she and Mrs. Wilkins felt the same sense of guilt.

"It only shows," said Mrs. Wilkins in a whisper, as they turned away from the letter-box, "how immaculately good we've been all our lives. The very first time we do anything our husbands don't know about we feel guilty."

"I'm afraid I can't say I've been immaculately good," gently protested Mrs. Arbuthnot, a little uncomfortable at this fresh example of successful leaping at conclusions, for she had not said a word about her feeling of guilt.

"Oh, but I'm sure you have—I _see_ you being good—and that's why you're not happy."

"She shouldn't say things like that," thought Mrs. Arbuthnot. "I must try and help her not to."

Aloud she said gravely, "I don't know why you insist that I'm not happy. When you know me better I think you'll find that I am. And I'm sure you don't mean really that goodness, if one could attain it, makes one unhappy."

"Yes, I do," said Mrs. Wilkins. "Our sort of goodness does. We have attained it, and we are unhappy. There are miserable sorts of goodness and happy sorts—the sort we'll have at the mediaeval castle, for instance, is the happy sort."

"That is, supposing we go there," said Mrs. Arbuthnot restrainingly. She felt that Mrs. Wilkins needed holding on to. "After all, we've only written just to ask. Anybody may do that. I think it quite likely we shall find the conditions impossible, and even if they were not, probably by to-morrow we shall not want to go."

"I _see_ us there," was Mrs. Wilkins's answer to that.

All this was very unbalancing. Mrs. Arbuthnot, as she presently splashed through the dripping streets on her way to a meeting she was to speak at, was in an unusually disturbed condition of mind. She had, she hoped, shown herself very calm to Mrs. Wilkins, very practical and sober, concealing her own excitement. But she was really extraordinarily moved, and she felt happy, and she felt guilty, and she felt afraid, and she had all the feelings, though this she did not know, of a woman who has come away from a secret

meeting with her lover. That, indeed, was what she looked like when she arrived late on her platform; she, the open-browed, looked almost furtive as her eyes fell on the staring wooden faces waiting to hear her try and persuade them to contribute to the alleviation of the urgent needs of the Hampstead poor, each one convinced that they needed contributions themselves. She looked as though she were hiding something discreditable but delightful. Certainly her customary clear expression of candour was not there, and its place was taken by a kind of suppressed and frightened pleasedness, which would have led a more worldly-minded audience to the instant conviction of recent and probably impassioned lovemaking.

Beauty, beauty, beauty . . . the words kept ringing in her ears as she stood on the platform talking of sad things to the sparsely attended meeting. She had never been to Italy. Was that really what her nest-egg was to be spent on after all? Though she couldn't approve of the way Mrs. Wilkins was introducing the idea of predestination into her immediate future, just as if she had no choice, just as if to struggle, or even to reflect, were useless, it yet influenced her. Mrs. Wilkins's eyes had been the eyes of a seer. Some people were like that, Mrs. Arbuthnot knew; and if Mrs. Wilkins had actually seen her at the mediaeval castle it did seem probable that struggling would be a waste of time. Still, to spend her nest-egg on self-indulgence— The origin of this egg had been corrupt, but she had at least supposed its end was to be creditable. Was she to deflect it from its intended destination, which alone had appeared to justify her keeping it, and spend it on giving herself pleasure?

Mrs. Arbuthnot spoke on and on, so much practised in the kind of speech that she could have said it all in her sleep, and at the end of the meeting, her eyes dazzled by her secret visions, she hardly noticed that nobody was moved in any way whatever, least of all in the way of contributions.

But the vicar noticed. The vicar was disappointed. Usually his good friend and supporter Mrs. Arbuthnot succeeded better than this. And, what was even more unusual, she appeared, he observed, not even to mind.

"I can't imagine," he said to her as they parted, speaking irritably, for he was irritated both by the audience and by her, "what these people are coming to. _Nothing_ seems to move them."

"Perhaps they need a holiday," suggested Mrs. Arbuthnot; an unsatisfactory, a queer reply, the vicar thought.

"In February?" he called after her sarcastically.

"Oh no—not till April," said Mrs. Arbuthnot over her shoulder.

"Very odd," thought the vicar. "Very odd indeed." And he went home and was not perhaps quite christian to his wife.

That night in her prayers Mrs. Arbuthnot asked for guidance. She felt she ought really to ask, straight out and roundly, that the mediaeval castle should already have been taken by some one else and the whole thing thus be settled, but her courage failed her. Suppose her prayer were to be answered? No; she couldn't ask it; she couldn't risk it. And after all—she almost pointed this out to God—if she spent her present nest-egg on a holiday she could quite soon accumulate another. Frederick pressed money on her; and it would only mean, while she rolled up a second egg, that for a time her contributions to the parish charities would be less. And then it could be the next nest-egg whose original corruption would be purged away by the use to which it was finally put.

For Mrs. Arbuthnot, who had no money of her own, was obliged to live on the proceeds of Frederick's activities, and her very nest-egg was the fruit, posthumously ripened, of ancient sin. The way Frederick made his living was one of the standing distresses of her life. He wrote immensely popular memoirs, regularly, every year, of the mistresses of kings. There were in history numerous kings who had had mistresses, and there were still more numerous mistresses who had had kings; so that he had been able to publish a book of memoirs during each year of his married life, and even so there were great further piles of these ladies waiting to be dealt with. Mrs. Arbuthnot was helpless. Whether she liked it or not, she was obliged to live on the proceeds. He gave her a dreadful sofa once, after the success of his Du Barri memoir, with swollen cushions and soft, receptive lap, and it seemed to her a miserable thing that there, in her very home, should flaunt this re-incarnation of a dead old French sinner.

Simply good, convinced that morality is the basis of happiness, the fact that she and Frederick should draw their sustenance from guilt, however much purged by the passage of centuries, was one of the secret reasons of her sadness. The more the memoired lady had forgotten herself, the more his book about her was read and the more free-handed he was to his wife; and all that he gave her was spent, after adding slightly to her nest-egg—for she did hope and believe that some day people would cease to want to read of wickedness, and then Frederick would need supporting—on helping the poor. The parish flourished because, to take a handful at random, of the ill-behaviour of the ladies Du Barri, Montespan, Pompadour, Ninon de l'Enclos, and even of learned

Maintenon. The poor were the filter through which the money was passed, to come out, Mrs. Arbuthnot hoped, purified. She could do no more. She had tried in days gone by to think the situation out, to discover the exact right course for her to take, but had found it, as she had found Frederick, too difficult, and had left it, as she had left Frederick, to God. Nothing of this money was spent on her house or dress; those remained, except for the great soft sofa, austere. It was the poor who profited. Their very boots were stout with sins. But how difficult it had been. Mrs. Arbuthnot, groping for guidance, prayed about it to exhaustion. Ought she perhaps to refuse to touch the money, to avoid it as she would have avoided the sins which were its source? But then what about the parish's boots? She asked the vicar what he thought, and, through much delicate language, evasive and cautious, it did finally appear that he was for the boots.

At least she had persuaded Frederick, when first he began his terrible successful career—he only began it after their marriage; when she married him he had been a blameless official attached to the library of the British Museum—to publish the memoirs under another name, so that she was not publicly branded. Hampstead read the books with glee, and had no idea that their writer lived in its midst. Frederick was almost unknown, even by sight, in Hampstead. He never went to any of its gatherings. Whatever it was he did in the way of recreation was done in London, but he never spoke of what he did or whom he saw; he might have been perfectly friendless for any mention he ever made of friends to his wife. Only the vicar knew where the money for the parish came from, and he regarded it, he told Mrs. Arbuthnot, as a matter of honour not to mention it.

And at least her little house was not haunted by the loose-lived ladies, for Frederick did his work away from home. He had two rooms near the British Museum, which was the scene of his exhumations, and there he went every morning, and he came back long after his wife was asleep. Sometimes he did not come back at all. Sometimes she did not see him for several days together. Then he would suddenly appear at breakfast, having let himself in with his latchkey the night before, very jovial and good-natured and free-handed and glad if she would allow him to give her something—a well-fed man, contented with the world; a jolly, full-blooded, satisfied man. And she was always gentle, and anxious that his coffee should be as he liked it.

He seemed very happy. Life, she often thought, however much one tabulated was yet a mystery. There were always some people it was impossible to place. Frederick was one of them. He didn't seem to bear the remotest resemblance to the original Frederick. He didn't seem to have the least need of any of the things he used to say were so important and beautiful—love, home, complete communion of thoughts, complete immersion in each other's interests. After those early painful attempts to hold him up to the point from which they had hand in hand so splendidly started, attempts in which she herself had got terribly hurt and the Frederick she supposed she had married was mangled out of recognition, she hung him up finally by her bedside as the chief subject of her prayers, and left him, except for those, entirely to God. She had loved Frederick too deeply to be able now to do anything but pray for him. He had no idea that he never went out of the house without her blessing going with him too, hovering, like a little echo of finished love, round that once dear head. She didn't dare think of him as he used to be, as he had seemed to her to be in those marvellous first days of their love-making, of their marriage. Her child had died; she had nothing, nobody of her own to lavish herself on. The poor became her children, and God the object of her love. What could be happier than such a life, she sometimes asked herself; but her face, and particularly her eyes, continued sad.

"Perhaps when we're old . . . perhaps when we are both quite old . . ." she would think wistfully.

Chapter 3

The owner of the mediaeval castle was an Englishman, a Mr. Briggs, who was in London at the moment and wrote that it had beds enough for eight people, exclusive of servants, three sitting-rooms, battlements, dungeons, and electric light. The rent was £60 for the month, the servants' wages were extra, and he wanted references—he wanted assurances that the second half of his rent would be paid, the first half being paid in advance, and he wanted assurances of respectability from a solicitor, or a doctor, or a clergyman. He was very polite in his letter, explaining that his desire for references was what was usual and should be regarded as a mere formality.

Mrs. Arbuthnot and Mrs. Wilkins had not thought of references, and they had not dreamed a rent could be so high. In their minds had floated sums like three guineas a week; or less, seeing that the place was small and old.

Sixty pounds for a single month.

It staggered them.

Before Mrs. Arbuthnot's eyes rose up boots: endless vistas, all the stout boots that sixty pounds would buy; and besides the rent there would be the servants' wages, and the food, and the railway journeys out and home. While as for references, these did indeed seem a stumbling-block; it did seem impossible to give any without making their plan more public than they had intended.

They had both—even Mrs. Arbuthnot, lured for once away from perfect candour by the realisation of the great saving of trouble and criticism an imperfect explanation would produce—they had both thought it would be a good plan to give out, each to her own circle, their circles being luckily distinct, that each was going to stay with a friend who had a house in Italy. It would be true as far as it went—Mrs. Wilkins asserted that it would be quite true, but Mrs. Arbuthnot thought it wouldn't be quite—and it was the only way, Mrs. Wilkins said, to keep Mellersh even approximately quiet. To spend any of her money just on the mere getting to Italy would cause him indignation; what he would say if he knew she was renting part of a mediaeval castle on her own account Mrs. Wilkins preferred not to think. It would take him days to say it all; and this although it was her very own money, and not a penny of it had ever been his.

"But I expect," she said, "your husband is just the same. I expect all husbands are alike in the long run."

Mrs. Arbuthnot said nothing, because her reason for not wanting Frederick to know was the exactly opposite one—Frederick would be only too pleased for her to go, he would not mind it in the very least; indeed, he would hail such a manifestation of self-indulgence and worldliness with an amusement that would hurt, and urge her to have a good time and not to hurry home with a crushing detachment. Far better, she thought, to be missed by Mellersh than to be sped by Frederick. To be missed, to be needed, from whatever motive, was, she thought, better than the complete loneliness of not being missed or needed at all.

She therefore said nothing, and allowed Mrs. Wilkins to leap at her conclusions unchecked. But they did, both of them, for a whole day feel that the only thing to be done was to renounce the mediaeval castle; and it was in arriving at this bitter decision that they really realised how acute had been their longing for it.

Then Mrs. Arbuthnot, whose mind was trained in the finding of ways out of difficulties, found a way out of the reference difficulty; and simultaneously Mrs. Wilkins had a vision revealing to her how to reduce the rent.

Mrs. Arbuthnot's plan was simple, and completely successful. She took the whole of the rent in person to the owner, drawing it out of her Savings Bank—again she looked furtive and apologetic, as if the clerk must know the money was wanted for purposes of self-indulgence—and, going up with the six ten pound notes in her hand-bag to the address near the Brompton Oratory where the owner lived, presented them to him, waiving her right to pay only half. And when he saw her, and her parted hair and soft dark eyes and sober apparel, and heard her grave voice, he told her not to bother about writing round for those references.

"It'll be all right," he said, scribbling a receipt for the rent. "Do sit down, won't you? Nasty day, isn't it? You'll find the old castle has lots of sunshine, whatever else it hasn't got. Husband going?"

Mrs. Arbuthnot, unused to anything but candour, looked troubled at this question and began to murmur inarticulately, and the owner at once concluded that she was a widow—a war one, of course, for other widows were old—and that he had been a fool not to guess it.

"Oh, I'm sorry," he said, turning red right up to his fair hair. "I didn't mean—h'm, h'm, h'm—"

He ran his eye over the receipt he had written. "Yes, I think that's all right," he said, getting up and giving it to her. "Now," he added, taking the six notes she held out and smiling, for Mrs. Arbuthnot was agreeable to look at, "I'm richer, and you're happier. I've got money, and you've got San Salvatore. I wonder which is best."

"I think you know," said Mrs. Arbuthnot with her sweet smile.

He laughed and opened the door for her. It was a pity the interview was over. He would have liked to ask her to lunch with him. She made him think of his mother, of his nurse, of all things kind and comforting, besides having the attraction of not being his mother or his nurse.

"I hope you'll like the old place," he said, holding her hand a minute at the door. The very feel of her hand, even through its glove, was reassuring; it was the sort of hand, he thought, that children would like to hold in the dark. "In April, you know, it's simply a mass of flowers. And then there's the sea. You must wear white. You'll fit in very well. There are several portraits of you there."

"Portraits?"

“Madonnas, you know. There’s one on the stairs really exactly like you.”

Mrs. Arbuthnot smiled and said good-bye and thanked him. Without the least trouble and at once she had got him placed in his proper category: he was an artist and of an effervescent temperament.

She shook hands and left, and he wished she hadn’t. After she was gone he supposed that he ought to have asked for those references, if only because she would think him so unbusiness-like not to, but he could as soon have insisted on references from a saint in a nimbus as from that grave, sweet lady.

Rose Arbuthnot.

Her letter, making the appointment, lay on the table.

Pretty name.

That difficulty, then, was overcome. But there still remained the other one, the really annihilating effect of the expense on the nest-eggs, and especially on Mrs. Wilkins’s, which was in size, compared with Mrs. Arbuthnot’s, as the egg of the plover to that of the duck; and this in its turn was overcome by the vision vouchsafed to Mrs. Wilkins, revealing to her the steps to be taken for its overcoming. Having got San Salvatore—the beautiful, the religious name, fascinated them—they in their turn would advertise in the Agony Column of _The Times_, and would inquire after two more ladies, of similar desires to their own, to join them and share the expenses.

At once the strain of the nest-eggs would be reduced from half to a quarter. Mrs. Wilkins was prepared to fling her entire egg into the adventure, but she realised that if it were to cost even sixpence over her ninety pounds her position would be terrible. Imagine going to Mellersh and saying, “I owe.” It would be awful enough if some day circumstances forced her to say, “I have no nest-egg,” but at least she would be supported in such a case by the knowledge that the egg had been her own. She therefore, though prepared to fling her last penny into the adventure, was not prepared to fling into it a single farthing that was not demonstrably her own; and she felt that if her share of the rent was reduced to fifteen pounds only, she would have a safe margin for the other expenses. Also they might economise very much on food—gather olives off their own trees and eat them, for instance, and perhaps catch fish.

Of course, as they pointed out to each other, they could reduce the rent to an almost negligible sum by increasing the number of sharers; they could have six more ladies instead of two if they wanted to, seeing that there were eight beds. But supposing the eight beds were distributed in couples in four rooms, it would not be altogether what they wanted, to find themselves shut up at night with a stranger. Besides, they thought that perhaps having so many would not be quite so peaceful. After all, they were going to San Salvatore for peace and rest and joy, and six more ladies, especially if they got into one’s bedroom, might a little interfere with that. speech first However, there seemed to be only two ladies in England at that moment who had any wish to join them, for they had only two answers to their advertisement.

“Well, we only want two,” said Mrs. Wilkins, quickly recovering, for she had imagined a great rush.

“I think a choice would have been a good thing,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“You mean because then we needn’t have had Lady Caroline Dester.”

“I didn’t say that,” gently protested Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“We needn’t have her,” said Mrs. Wilkins. “Just one more person would help us a great deal with the rent. We’re not obliged to have two.”

“But why should we not have her? She seems really quite what we want.”

“Yes—she does from her letter,” said Mrs. Wilkins doubtfully.

She felt she would be terribly shy of Lady Caroline. Incredible as it may seem, seeing how they get into everything, Mrs. Wilkins had never come across any members of the aristocracy.

They interviewed Lady Caroline, and they interviewed the other applicant, a Mrs. Fisher.

Lady Caroline came to the club in Shaftesbury Avenue, and appeared to be wholly taken up by one great longing, a longing to get away from everybody she had ever known. When she saw the club, and Mrs. Arbuthnot, and Mrs. Wilkins, she was sure that here was exactly what she wanted. She would be in Italy—a place she adored; she would not be in hotels—places she loathed; she would not be staying with friends—persons she disliked; and she would be in the company of strangers who would never mention a single person she knew, for the simple reason that they had not, could not have, and would not come across them. She asked a few questions about the fourth woman, and was satisfied with the answers. Mrs. Fisher, of Prince of Wales Terrace. A widow. She too would be unacquainted with any of her friends. Lady Caroline did not even know where Prince of Wales Terrace was.

“It’s in London,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“Is it?” said Lady Caroline.

It all seemed most restful.

Mrs. Fisher was unable to come to the club because, she explained by letter, she could not walk without a stick; therefore Mrs. Arbuthnot and Mrs. Wilkins went to her.

“But if she can’t come to the club how can she go to Italy?” wondered Mrs. Wilkins, aloud.

“We shall hear that from her own lips,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

From Mrs. Fisher’s lips they merely heard, in reply to delicate questioning, that sitting in trains was not walking about; and they knew that already. Except for the stick, however, she appeared to be a most desirable fourth—quiet, educated, elderly. She was much older than they or Lady Caroline—Lady Caroline had informed them she was twenty-eight—but not so old as to have ceased to be active-minded. She was very respectable indeed, and still wore a complete suit of black though her husband had died, she told them, eleven years before. Her house was full of signed photographs of illustrious Victorian dead, all of whom she said she had known when she was little. Her father had been an eminent critic, and in his house she had seen practically everybody who was anybody in letters and art. Carlyle had scowled at her; Matthew Arnold had held her on his knee; Tennyson had sonorously rallied her on the length of her pig-tail. She animatedly showed them the photographs, hung everywhere on her walls, pointing out the signatures with her stick, and she neither gave any information about her own husband nor asked for any about the husbands of her visitors; which was the greatest comfort. Indeed, she seemed to think that they also were widows, for on inquiring who the fourth lady was to be, and being told it was a Lady Caroline Dester, she said, “Is she a widow too?” And on their explaining that she was not, because she had not yet been married, observed with abstracted amiability, “All in good time.”

But Mrs. Fisher’s very abstractedness—and she seemed to be absorbed chiefly in the interesting people she used to know and in their memorial photographs, and quite a good part of the interview was taken up by reminiscent anecdote of Carlyle, Meredith, Matthew Arnold, Tennyson, and a host of others—her very abstractedness was a recommendation. She only asked, she said, to be allowed to sit quiet in the sun and remember. That was all Mrs. Arbuthnot and Mrs. Wilkins asked of their sharers. It was their idea of a perfect sharer that she should sit quiet in the sun and remember, rousing herself on Saturday evenings sufficiently to pay her share. Mrs. Fisher was very fond, too, she said, of flowers, and once when she was spending a week-end with her father at Box Hill—

“Who lived at Box Hill?” interrupted Mrs. Wilkins, who hung on Mrs. Fisher’s reminiscences, intensely excited by meeting somebody who had actually been familiar with all the really and truly and undoubtedly great—actually seen them, heard them talking, touched them.

Mrs. Fisher looked at her over the top of her glasses in some surprise. Mrs. Wilkins, in her eagerness to tear the heart out quickly of Mrs. Fisher’s reminiscences, afraid that at any moment Mrs. Arbuthnot would take her away and she wouldn’t have heard half, had already interrupted several times with questions which appeared ignorant to Mrs. Fisher.

“Meredith of course,” said Mrs. Fisher rather shortly. “I remember a particular week-end”—she continued. “My father often took me, but I always remember this week-end particularly—”

“Did you know Keats?” eagerly interrupted Mrs. Wilkins.

Mrs. Fisher, after a pause, said with sub-acid reserve that she had been unacquainted with both Keats and Shakespeare.

“Oh of course—how ridiculous of me!” cried Mrs. Wilkins, flushing scarlet. “It’s because”—she floundered—“it’s because the immortals somehow still seem alive, don’t they—as if they were here, going to walk into the room in another minute—and one forgets they are dead. In fact one knows perfectly well that they’re not dead—not nearly so dead as you and I even now,” she assured Mrs. Fisher, who observed her over the top of her glasses.

“I thought I _saw_ Keats the other day,” Mrs. Wilkins incoherently proceeded, driven on by Mrs. Fisher’s look over the top of her glasses. “In Hampstead—crossing the road in front of that house—you know—the house where he lived—”

Mrs. Arbuthnot said they must be going.

Mrs. Fisher did nothing to prevent them.

“I _really_ thought I saw him,” protested Mrs. Wilkins, appealing for belief first to one and then to the other while waves of colour passed over her face, and totally unable to stop because of Mrs. Fisher’s glasses and the steady eyes looking at her over their tops. “I believe I _did_ see him—he was dressed in a—”

Even Mrs. Arbuthnot looked at her now, and in her gentlest voice said they would be late for lunch.

It was at this point that Mrs. Fisher asked for references. She had no wish to find herself shut up for four weeks with somebody who saw things. It is true that there were three sitting-rooms, besides the garden and the battlements at San Salvatore, so that there would be opportunities of withdrawal from Mrs. Wilkins; but it would be disagreeable to Mrs. Fisher, for instance, if Mrs. Wilkins were suddenly to assert that she saw Mr. Fisher. Mr. Fisher was dead; let him remain so. She had no wish to be told he was walking about the garden. The only reference she really wanted, for she was much too old and firmly seated in her place in the world for questionable associates to matter to her, was one with regard to Mrs. Wilkins’s health. Was her health quite normal? Was she an ordinary, everyday, sensible woman? Mrs. Fisher felt that if she were given even one address she would be able to find out what she needed. So she asked for references, and her visitors appeared to be so much taken aback—Mrs. Wilkins, indeed, was instantly sobered—that she added, “It is usual.”

Mrs. Wilkins found her speech first. “But,” she said, “aren’t we the ones who ought to ask for some from you?”

And this seemed to Mrs. Arbuthnot too the right attitude. Surely it was they who were taking Mrs. Fisher into their party, and not Mrs. Fisher who was taking them into it?

For answer Mrs. Fisher, leaning on her stick, went to the writing-table and in a firm hand wrote down three names and offered them to Mrs. Wilkins, and the names were so respectable, more, they were so momentous, they were so nearly august, that just to read them was enough. The President of the Royal Academy, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Governor of the Bank of England—who would dare disturb such personages in their meditations with inquiries as to whether a female friend of theirs was all she should be?

“They have known me since I was little,” said Mrs. Fisher—everybody seemed to have known Mrs. Fisher since or when she was little.

“I don’t think references are nice things at all between—between ordinary decent women,” burst out Mrs. Wilkins, made courageous by being, as she felt, at bay; for she very well knew that the only reference she could give without getting into trouble was Shoolbred, and she had little confidence in that, as it would be entirely based on Mellersh’s fish. “We’re not business people. We needn’t distrust each other—”

And Mrs. Arbuthnot said, with a dignity that yet was sweet, “I’m afraid references do bring an atmosphere into our holiday plan that isn’t quite what we want, and I don’t think we’ll take yours up or give you any ourselves. So that I suppose you won’t wish to join us.”

And she held out her hand in good-bye.

Then Mrs. Fisher, her gaze diverted to Mrs. Arbuthnot, who inspired trust and liking even in Tube officials, felt that she would be idiotic to lose the opportunity of being in Italy in the particular conditions offered, and that she and this calm-browed woman between them would certainly be able to curb the other one when she had her attacks. So she said, taking Mrs. Arbuthnot’s offered hand, “Very well. I waive references.”

She waived references.

The two as they walked to the station in Kensington High Street could not help thinking that this way of putting it was lofty. Even Mrs. Arbuthnot, spendthrift of excuses for lapses, thought Mrs. Fisher might have used other words; and Mrs. Wilkins, by the time she got to the station, and the walk and the struggle on the crowded pavement with other people's umbrellas had warmed her blood, actually suggested waiving Mrs. Fisher.

"If there is any waiving to be done, do let us be the ones who waive," she said eagerly.

But Mrs. Arbuthnot, as usual, held on to Mrs. Wilkins; and presently, having cooled down in the train, Mrs. Wilkins announced that at San Salvatore Mrs. Fisher would find her level. "I see her finding her level there," she said, her eyes very bright.

Whereupon Mrs. Arbuthnot, sitting with her quiet hands folded, turned over in her mind how best she could help Mrs. Wilkins not to see quite so much; or at least, if she must see, to see in silence.

Chapter 4

It had been arranged that Mrs. Arbuthnot and Mrs. Wilkins, travelling together, should arrive at San Salvatore on the evening of March 31st—the owner, who told them how to get there, appreciated their disinclination to begin their time in it on April 1st—and Lady Caroline and Mrs. Fisher, as yet unacquainted and therefore under no obligations to bore each other on the journey, for only towards the end would they find out by a process of sifting who they were, were to arrive on the morning of April 2nd. In this way everything would be got nicely ready for the two who seemed, in spite of the equality of the sharing, yet to have something about them of guests.

There were disagreeable incidents towards the end of March, when Mrs. Wilkins, her heart in her mouth and her face a mixture of guilt, terror and determination, told her husband that she had been invited to Italy, and he declined to believe it. Of course he declined to believe it. Nobody had ever invited his wife to Italy before. There was no precedent. He required proofs. The only proof was Mrs. Arbuthnot, and Mrs. Wilkins had produced her; but after what entreaties, what passionate persuading! Mrs. Arbuthnot had not imagined she would have to face Mr. Wilkins and say things to him that were short of the truth, and it brought home to her what she had for some time suspected, that she was slipping more and more away from God.

Indeed, the whole of March was filled with unpleasant, anxious moments. It was an uneasy month. Mrs. Arbuthnot's conscience, made super-sensitive by years of pampering, could not reconcile what she was doing with its own high standard of what was right. It gave her little peace. It nudged her at her prayers. It punctuated her entreaties for divine guidance with disconcerting questions, such as, "Are you not a hypocrite? Do you really mean that? Would you not, frankly, be disappointed if that prayer were granted?"

The prolonged wet, raw weather was on the side too of her conscience, producing far more sickness than usual among the poor. They had bronchitis; they had fevers; there was no end to the distress. And here she was going off, spending precious money on going off, simply and solely to be happy. One woman. One woman being happy, and these piteous multitudes . . .

She was unable to look the vicar in the face. He did not know, nobody knew, what she was going to do, and from the very beginning she was unable to look anybody in the face. She excused herself from making speeches appealing for money. How could she stand up and ask people for money when she herself was spending so much on her own selfish pleasure? Nor did it help her or quiet her that, having actually told Frederick, in her desire to make up for what she was squandering, that she would be grateful if he would let her have some money, he instantly gave her a cheque for £100. He asked no questions. She was scarlet. He looked at her a moment and then looked away. It was a relief to Frederick that she should take some money. She gave it all immediately to the organisation she worked with, and found herself more tangled in doubts than ever.

Mrs. Wilkins, on the contrary, had no doubts. She was quite certain that it was a most proper thing to have a holiday, and altogether right and beautiful to spend one's own hard-collected savings on being happy.

"Think how much nicer we shall be when we come back," she said to Mrs. Arbuthnot, encouraging that pale lady.

No, Mrs. Wilkins had no doubts, but she had fears; and March was for her too an anxious month, with the unconscious Mr. Wilkins coming back daily to his dinner and eating his fish in the silence of imagined security.

Also things happen so awkwardly. It really is astonishing, how awkwardly they happen. Mrs. Wilkins, who was very careful all this month to give Mellersh only the food he liked, buying it and hovering over its cooking with a zeal more than common, succeeded so well that Mellersh was pleased; definitely pleased; so much pleased that he began to think that he might, after all, have married the right wife instead of, as he had frequently suspected, the wrong one. The result was that on the third Sunday in the month—Mrs. Wilkins had made up her trembling mind that on the fourth Sunday, there being five in that March and it being on the fifth of them that she and Mrs. Arbuthnot were to start, she would tell Mellersh of her invitation—on the third Sunday, then, after a very well-cooked lunch in which the Yorkshire pudding had melted in his mouth and the apricot tart had been so perfect that he ate it all, Mellersh, smoking his cigar by the brightly burning fire the while hail gusts banged on the window, said: “I am thinking of taking you to Italy for Easter.” And paused for her astounded and grateful ecstasy.

None came. The silence in the room, except for the hail hitting the windows and the gay roar of the fire, was complete. Mrs. Wilkins could not speak. She was dumbfounded. The next Sunday was the day she had meant to break her news to him, and she had not yet even prepared the form of words in which she would break it.

Mr. Wilkins, who had not been abroad since before the war, and was noticing with increasing disgust, as week followed week of wind and rain, the peculiar persistent vileness of the weather, had slowly conceived a desire to get away from England for Easter. He was doing very well in his business. He could afford a trip. Switzerland was useless in April. There was a familiar sound about Easter in Italy. To Italy he would go; and as it would cause comment if he did not take his wife, take her he must—besides, she would be useful; a second person was always useful in a country whose language one did not speak for holding things, for waiting with the luggage.

He had expected an explosion of gratitude and excitement. The absence of it was incredible. She could not, he concluded, have heard. Probably she was absorbed in some foolish day-dream. It was regrettable how childish she remained.

He turned his head—their chairs were in front of the fire—and looked at her. She was staring straight into the fire, and it was no doubt the fire that made her face so red.

“I am thinking,” he repeated, raising his clear, cultivated voice and speaking with acerbity, for inattention at such a moment was deplorable, “of taking you to Italy for Easter. Did you not hear me?”

Yes, she had heard him, and she had been wondering at the extraordinary coincidence—really most extraordinary—she was just going to tell him how—how she had been invited—a friend had invited her—Easter, too—Easter was in April, wasn’t it?—her friend had a—had a house there.

In fact Mrs. Wilkins, driven by terror, guilt and surprise, had been more incoherent if possible than usual.

It was a dreadful afternoon. Mellersh, profoundly indignant, besides having his intended treat coming back on him like a blessing to roost, cross-examined her with the utmost severity. He demanded that she refuse the invitation. He demanded that, since she had so outrageously accepted it without consulting him, she should write and cancel her acceptance. Finding himself up against an unsuspected, shocking rock of obstinacy in her, he then declined to believe she had been invited to Italy at all. He declined to believe in this Mrs. Arbuthnot, of whom till that moment he had never heard; and it was only when the gentle creature was brought round—with such difficulty, with such a desire on her part to throw the whole thing up rather than tell Mr. Wilkins less than the truth—and herself endorsed his wife’s statements that he was able to give them credence. He could not but believe Mrs. Arbuthnot. She produced the precise effect on him that she did on Tube officials. She hardly needed to say anything. But that made no difference to her conscience, which knew and would not let her forget that she had given him an incomplete impression. “Do you,” asked her conscience, “see any real difference between an incomplete impression and a completely stated lie? God sees none.”

The remainder of March was a confused bad dream. Both Mrs. Arbuthnot and Mrs. Wilkins were shattered; try as they would not to, both felt extraordinarily guilty; and when on the morning of the 30th they did finally get off there was no exhilaration about the departure, no holiday feeling at all.

“We’ve been too good—_much_ too good,” Mrs. Wilkins kept on murmuring as they walked up and down the platform at Victoria, having arrived there an hour before they need have, “and that’s why we feel as though we’re doing wrong. We’re brow-beaten—we’re not any longer real human beings. Real human beings aren’t ever as good as we’ve been. Oh”—she clenched her thin hands—“to _think_ that we ought to be so happy now, here on the very station, actually starting, and we’re not, and it’s being spoilt for us just simply because we’ve spoilt _them!_ What have we done—what have we done, I should like to know,” she

inquired of Mrs. Arbuthnot indignantly, “except for once want to go away by ourselves and have a little rest from _them?_”

Mrs. Arbuthnot, patiently pacing, did not ask who she meant by _them_, because she knew. Mrs. Wilkins meant their husbands, persisting in her assumption that Frederick was as indignant as Mellersh over the departure of his wife, whereas Frederick did not even know his wife had gone.

Mrs. Arbuthnot, always silent about him, had said nothing of this to Mrs. Wilkins. Frederick went too deep into her heart for her to talk about him. He was having an extra bout of work finishing another of those dreadful books, and had been away practically continually the last few weeks, and was away when she left. Why should she tell him beforehand? Sure as she so miserably was that he would have no objection to anything she did, she merely wrote him a note and put it on the hall-table ready for him if and when he should come home. She said she was going for a month’s holiday as she needed a rest and she had not had one for so long, and that Gladys, the efficient parlourmaid, had orders to see to his comforts. She did not say where she was going; there was no reason why she should; he would not be interested, he would not care.

The day was wretched, blustering and wet; the crossing was atrocious, and they were very sick. But after having been very sick, just to arrive at Calais and not be sick was happiness, and it was there that the real splendour of what they were doing first began to warm their benumbed spirits. It got hold of Mrs. Wilkins first, and spread from her like a rose-coloured flame over her pale companion. Mellersh at Calais, where they restored themselves with soles because of Mrs. Wilkins’s desire to eat a sole Mellersh wasn’t having—Mellersh at Calais had already begun to dwindle and seem less important. None of the French porters knew him; not a single official at Calais cared a fig for Mellersh. In Paris there was no time to think of him because their train was late and they only just caught the Turin train at the Gare de Lyons; and by the afternoon of the next day when they got into Italy, England, Frederick, Mellersh, the vicar, the poor, Hampstead, the club, Shoolbred, everybody and everything, the whole inflamed sore dreariness, had faded to the dimness of a dream.

Chapter 5

It was cloudy in Italy, which surprised them. They had expected brilliant sunshine. But never mind: it was Italy, and the very clouds looked fat. Neither of them had ever been there before. Both gazed out of the windows with rapt faces. The hours flew as long as it was daylight, and after that there was the excitement of getting nearer, getting quite near, getting there. At Genoa it had begun to rain—Genoa! Imagine actually being at Genoa, seeing its name written up in the station just like any other name—at Nervi it was pouring, and when at last towards midnight, for again the train was late, they got to Mezzago, the rain was coming down in what seemed solid sheets. But it was Italy. Nothing it did could be bad. The very rain was different—straight rain, falling properly on to one’s umbrella; not that violently blowing English stuff that got in everywhere. And it did leave off; and when it did, behold the earth would be strewn with roses.

Mr. Briggs, San Salvatore’s owner, had said, “You get out at Mezzago, and then you drive.” But he had forgotten what he amply knew, that trains in Italy are sometimes late, and he had imagined his tenants arriving at Mezzago at eight o’clock and finding a string of flys to choose from.

The train was four hours late, and when Mrs. Arbuthnot and Mrs. Wilkins scrambled down the ladder-like high steps of their carriage into the black downpour, their skirts sweeping off great pools of sooty wet because their hands were full of suit-cases, if it had not been for the vigilance of Domenico, the gardener at San Salvatore, they would have found nothing for them to drive in. All ordinary flys had long since gone home. Domenico, foreseeing this, had sent his aunt’s fly, driven by her son his cousin; and his aunt and her fly lived in Castagneto, the village crouching at the feet of San Salvatore, and therefore, however late the train was, the fly would not dare come home without containing that which it had been sent to fetch.

Domenico’s cousin’s name was Beppo, and he presently emerged out of the dark where Mrs. Arbuthnot and Mrs. Wilkins stood, uncertain what to do next after the train had gone on, for they could see no porter and they thought from the feel of it that they were standing not so much on a platform as in the middle of the permanent way.

Beppo, who had been searching for them, emerged from the dark with a kind of pounce and talked Italian to them vociferously. Beppo was a most respectable young man, but he did not look as if he were, especially not in the dark, and he had a dripping hat slouched over one eye. They did not like the way he seized their suit-cases. He could not be, they thought, a porter. However, they presently from out of his streaming talk discerned the words San Salvatore, and after that they kept on saying them to him, for it was the only Italian they knew, as they hurried after him, unwilling to lose sight of their suit-cases, stumbling across rails and

through puddles out to where in the road a small, high fly stood.

Its hood was up, and its horse was in an attitude of thought. They climbed in, and the minute they were in—Mrs. Wilkins, indeed, could hardly be called in—the horse awoke with a start from its reverie and immediately began going home rapidly; without Beppo; without the suit-cases.

Beppo darted after him, making the night ring with his shouts, and caught the hanging reins just in time. He explained proudly, and as it seemed to him with perfect clearness, that the horse always did that, being a fine animal full of corn and blood, and cared for by him, Beppo, as if he were his own son, and the ladies must not be alarmed—he had noticed they were clutching each other; but clear, and loud, and profuse of words though he was, they only looked at him blankly.

He went on talking, however, while he piled the suit-cases up round them, sure that sooner or later they must understand him, especially as he was careful to talk very loud and illustrate everything he said with the simplest elucidatory gestures, but they both continued only to look at him. They both, he noticed sympathetically, had white faces, fatigued faces, and they both had big eyes, fatigued eyes. They were beautiful ladies, he thought, and their eyes, looking at him over the tops of the suit-cases watching his every movement—there were no trunks, only numbers of suit-cases—were like the eyes of the Mother of God. The only thing the ladies said, and they repeated it at regular intervals, even after they had started, gently prodding him as he sat on his box to call his attention to it, was, “San Salvatore?”

And each time he answered vociferously, encouragingly, “_Sì, sì_—San Salvatore.”

“We don’t _know_ of course if he’s taking us there,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot at last in a low voice, after they had been driving as it seemed to them a long while, and had got off the paving-stones of the sleep-shrouded town and were out on a winding road with what they could just see was a low wall on their left beyond which was a great black emptiness and the sound of the sea. On their right was something close and steep and high and black—rocks, they whispered to each other; huge rocks.

“No—we don’t _know_,” agreed Mrs. Wilkins, a slight coldness passing down her spine.

They felt very uncomfortable. It was so late. It was so dark. The road was so lonely. Suppose a wheel came off. Suppose they met Fascisti, or the opposite of Fascisti. How sorry they were now that they had not slept at Genoa and come on the next morning in daylight.

“But that would have been the first of April,” said Mrs. Wilkins, in a low voice.

“It is that now,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot beneath her breath.

“So it is,” murmured Mrs. Wilkins.

They were silent.

Beppo turned round on his box—a disquieting habit already noticed, for surely his horse ought to be carefully watched—and again addressed them with what he was convinced was lucidity—no _patois_, and the clearest explanatory movements.

How much they wished their mothers had made them learn Italian when they were little. If only now they could have said, “Please sit round the right way and look after the horse.” They did not even know what horse was in Italian. It was contemptible to be so ignorant.

In their anxiety, for the road twisted round great jutting rocks, and on their left was only the low wall to keep them out of the sea should anything happen, they too began to gesticulate, waving their hands at Beppo, pointing ahead. They wanted him to turn round again and face his horse, that was all. He thought they wanted him to drive faster; and there followed a terrifying ten minutes during which, as he supposed, he was gratifying them. He was proud of his horse, and it could go very fast. He rose in his seat, the whip cracked, the horse rushed forward, the rocks leaped towards them, the little fly swayed, the suit-cases heaved, Mrs. Arbuthnot and Mrs. Wilkins clung. In this way they continued, swaying, heaving, clattering, clinging, till at a point near Castagneto there was a rise in the road, and on reaching the foot of the rise the horse, who knew every inch of the way, stopped suddenly, throwing everything in the fly into a heap, and then proceeded up at the slowest of walks.

Beppo twisted himself round to receive their admiration, laughing with pride in his horse.

There was no answering laugh from the beautiful ladies. Their eyes, fixed on him, seemed bigger than ever, and their faces against the black of the night showed milky.

But here at least, once they were up the slope, were houses. The rocks left off, and there were houses; the low wall left off, and there were houses; the sea shrunk away, and the sound of it ceased, and the loneliness of the road was finished. No lights anywhere, of course, nobody to see them pass; and yet Beppo, when the houses began, after looking over his shoulder and shouting “Castagneto” at the ladies, once more stood up and cracked his whip and once more made his horse dash forward.

“We shall be there in a minute,” Mrs. Arbuthnot said to herself, holding on.

“We shall soon stop now,” Mrs. Wilkins said to herself, holding on. They said nothing aloud, because nothing would have been heard above the whip-cracking and the wheel-clattering and the boisterous inciting noises Beppo was making at his horse.

Anxiously they strained their eyes for any sight of the beginning of San Salvatore.

They had supposed and hoped that after a reasonable amount of village a mediaeval archway would loom upon them, and through it they would drive into a garden and draw up at an open, welcoming door, with light streaming from it and those servants standing in it who, according to the advertisement, remained.

Instead the fly suddenly stopped.

Peering out they could see they were still in the village street, with small dark houses each side; and Beppo, throwing the reins over the horse’s back as if completely confident this time that he would not go any farther, got down off his box. At the same moment, springing as it seemed out of nothing, a man and several half-grown boys appeared on each side of the fly and began dragging out the suit-cases.

“No, no—San Salvatore, San Salvatore”—exclaimed Mrs. Wilkins, trying to hold on to what suit-cases she could.

“_Sì, sì_—San Salvatore,” they all shouted, pulling.

“This _can’t_ be San Salvatore,” said Mrs. Wilkins, turning to Mrs. Arbuthnot, who sat quite still watching her suit-cases being taken from her with the same patience she applied to lesser evils. She knew she could do nothing if these men were wicked men determined to have her suit-cases.

“I don’t think it can be,” she admitted, and could not refrain from a moment’s wonder at the ways of God. Had she really been brought here, she and poor Mrs. Wilkins, after so much trouble in arranging it, so much difficulty and worry, along such devious paths of prevarication and deceit, only to be—

She checked her thoughts, and gently said to Mrs. Wilkins, while the ragged youths disappeared with the suit-cases into the night and the man with the lantern helped Beppo pull the rug off her, that they were both in God’s hands; and for the first time on hearing this, Mrs. Wilkins was afraid.

There was nothing for it but to get out. Useless to try to go on sitting in the fly repeating San Salvatore. Every time they said it, and their voices each time were fainter, Beppo and the other man merely echoed it in a series of loud shouts. If only they had learned Italian when they were little. If only they could have said, “We wish to be driven to the door.” But they did not even know what door was in Italian. Such ignorance was not only contemptible, it was, they now saw, definitely dangerous. Useless, however, to lament it now. Useless to put off whatever it was that was going to happen to them by trying to go on sitting in the fly. They therefore got out.

The two men opened their umbrellas for them and handed them to them. From this they received a faint encouragement, because they could not believe that if these men were wicked they would pause to open umbrellas. The man with the lantern then made signs to them to follow him, talking loud and quickly, and Beppo, they noticed, remained behind. Ought they to pay him? Not, they thought, if they were going to be robbed and perhaps murdered. Surely on such an occasion one did not pay. Besides, he had not after all brought them to San Salvatore. Where they had got to was evidently somewhere else. Also, he did not show the least wish to be paid; he let them go away into the night with no clamour at all. This, they could not help thinking, was a bad sign. He asked for nothing because presently he was to get so much.

They came to some steps. The road ended abruptly in a church and some descending steps. The man held the lantern low for them to see the steps.

“San Salvatore?” said Mrs. Wilkins once again, very faintly, before committing herself to the steps. It was useless to mention it now, of course, but she could not go down steps in complete silence. No mediaeval castle, she was sure, was ever built at the bottom of steps.

Again, however, came the echoing shout—“_Sì, sì_—San Salvatore.”

They descended gingerly, holding up their skirts just as if they would be wanting them another time and had not in all probability finished with skirts for ever.

The steps ended in a steeply sloping path with flat stone slabs down the middle. They slipped a good deal on these wet slabs, and the man with the lantern, talking loud and quickly, held them up. His way of holding them up was polite.

“Perhaps,” said Mrs. Wilkins in a low voice to Mrs. Arbuthnot, “It is all right after all.”

“We’re in God’s hands,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot again; and again Mrs. Wilkins was afraid.

They reached the bottom of the sloping path, and the light of the lantern flickered over an open space with houses round three sides. The sea was the fourth side, lazily washing backwards and forwards on pebbles.

“San Salvatore,” said the man pointing with his lantern to a black mass curved round the water like an arm flung about it.

They strained their eyes. They saw the black mass, and on the top of it a light.

“San Salvatore?” they both repeated incredulously, for where were the suit-cases, and why had they been forced to get out of the fly?

“_Sì, sì_—San Salvatore.”

They went along what seemed to be a quay, right on the edge of the water. There was not even a low wall here—nothing to prevent the man with the lantern tipping them in if he wanted to. He did not, however, tip them in. Perhaps it was all right after all, Mrs. Wilkins again suggested to Mrs. Arbuthnot on noticing this, who this time was herself beginning to think that it might be, and said no more about God’s hands.

The flicker of the lantern danced along, reflected in the wet pavement of the quay. Out to the left, in the darkness and evidently at the end of a jetty, was a red light. They came to an archway with a heavy iron gate. The man with the lantern pushed the gate open. This time they went up steps instead of down, and at the top of them was a little path that wound upwards among flowers. They could not see the flowers, but the whole place was evidently full of them.

It here dawned on Mrs. Wilkins that perhaps the reason why the fly had not driven them up to the door was that there was no road, only a footpath. That also would explain the disappearance of the suit-cases. She began to feel confident that they would find their suit-cases waiting for them when they got up to the top. San Salvatore was, it seemed, on the top of a hill, as a mediaeval castle should be. At a turn of the path they saw above them, much nearer now and shining more brightly, the light they had seen from the quay. She told Mrs. Arbuthnot of her dawning belief, and Mrs. Arbuthnot agreed that it was very likely a true one.

Once more, but this time in a tone of real hopefulness, Mrs. Wilkins said, pointing upwards at the black outline against the only slightly less black sky, “San Salvatore?” And once more, but this time comfortingly, encouragingly, came back the assurance, “_Sì, sì_—San Salvatore.”

They crossed a little bridge, over what was apparently a ravine, and then came a flat bit with long grass at the sides and more flowers. They felt the grass flicking wet against their stockings, and the invisible flowers were everywhere. Then up again through trees, along a zigzag path with the smell all the way of the flowers they could not see. The warm rain was bringing out all the sweetness. Higher and higher they went in this sweet darkness, and the red light on the jetty dropped farther and farther below them.

The path wound round to the other side of what appeared to be a little peninsula; the jetty and the red light disappeared; across the emptiness on their left were distant lights.

“Mezzago,” said the man, waving his lantern at the lights.

“_Sì, sì_,” they answered, for they had by now learned “_sì, sì_”. Upon which the man congratulated them in a great flow of polite words, not one of which they understood, on their magnificent Italian; for this was Domenico, the vigilant and accomplished gardener of San Salvatore, the prop and stay of the establishment, the resourceful, the gifted, the eloquent, the courteous, the intelligent Domenico. Only they did not know that yet; and he did in the dark, and even sometimes in the light, look, with his knife-sharp swarthy features and swift, panther movements, very like somebody wicked.

They passed along another flat bit of path, with a black shape like a high wall towering above them on their right, and then the path went up again under trellises, and trailing sprays of scented things caught at them and shook raindrops on them, and the light of the lantern flickered over lilies, and then came a flight of ancient steps worn with centuries, and then another iron gate, and then they were inside, though still climbing a twisting flight of stone steps with old walls on either side like the walls of dungeons, and with a vaulted roof.

At the top was a wrought-iron door, and through it shone a flood of electric light.

“_Ecco_,” said Domenico, lithely running up the last few steps ahead and pushing the door open.

And there they were, arrived; and it was San Salvatore; and their suit-cases were waiting for them; and they had not been murdered.

They looked at each other’s white faces and blinking eyes very solemnly.

It was a great, a wonderful moment. Here they were, in their mediaeval castle at last. Their feet touched its stones.

Mrs. Wilkins put her arm round Mrs. Arbuthnot’s neck and kissed her.

“The first thing to happen in this house,” she said softly, solemnly, “shall be a kiss.”

“Dear Lotty,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“Dear Rose,” said Mrs. Wilkins, her eyes brimming with gladness.

Domenico was delighted. He liked to see beautiful ladies kiss. He made them a most appreciative speech of welcome, and they stood arm in arm, holding each other up, for they were very tired, blinking smilingly at him, and not understanding a word.

Chapter 6

When Mrs. Wilkins woke next morning she lay in bed a few minutes before getting up and opening the shutters. What would she see out of her window? A shining world, or a world of rain? But it would be beautiful; whatever it was would be beautiful.

She was in a little bedroom with bare white walls and a stone floor and sparse old furniture. The beds—there were two—were made of iron, enamelled black and painted with bunches of gay flowers. She lay putting off the great moment of going to the window as one puts off opening a precious letter, gloating over it. She had no idea what time it was; she had forgotten to wind up her watch ever since, centuries ago, she last went to bed in Hampstead. No sounds were to be heard in the house, so she supposed it was very early, yet she felt as if she had slept a long while—so completely rested, so perfectly content. She lay with her arms clasped round her head thinking how happy she was, her lips curved upwards in a delighted smile. In bed by herself: adorable condition. She had not been in a bed without Mellersh once now for five whole years; and the cool roominess of it, the freedom of one’s movements, the sense of recklessness, of audacity, in giving the blankets a pull if one wanted to, or twitching the pillows more comfortably! It was like the discovery of an entirely new joy.

Mrs. Wilkins longed to get up and open the shutters, but where she was was really so very delicious. She gave a sigh of contentment, and went on lying there looking round her, taking in everything in her room, her own little room, her very own to arrange just as she pleased for this one blessed month, her room bought with her own savings, the fruit of her careful denials, whose door she could bolt if she wanted to, and nobody had the right to come in. It was such a strange little room, so different from any she had known, and so sweet. It was like a cell. Except for the two beds, it suggested a happy austerity. “And the name of the chamber,” she thought, quoting and smiling round at it, “was Peace.”

Well, this was delicious, to lie there thinking how happy she was, but outside those shutters it was more delicious still. She jumped up, pulled on her slippers, for there was nothing on the stone floor but one small rug, ran to the window and threw open the shutters.

"_Oh!_" cried Mrs. Wilkins.

All the radiance of April in Italy lay gathered together at her feet. The sun poured in on her. The sea lay asleep in it, hardly stirring. Across the bay the lovely mountains, exquisitely different in colour, were asleep too in the light; and underneath her window, at the bottom of the flower-starred grass slope from which the wall of the castle rose up, was a great cypress, cutting through the delicate blues and violets and rose-colours of the mountains and the sea like a great black sword.

She stared. Such beauty; and she there to see it. Such beauty; and she alive to feel it. Her face was bathed in light. Lovely scents came up to the window and caressed her. A tiny breeze gently lifted her hair. Far out in the bay a cluster of almost motionless fishing boats hovered like a flock of white birds on the tranquil sea. How beautiful, how beautiful. Not to have died before this . . . to have been allowed to see, breathe, feel this. . . . She stared, her lips parted. Happy? Poor, ordinary, everyday word. But what could one say, how could one describe it? It was as though she could hardly stay inside herself, it was as though she were too small to hold so much of joy, it was as though she were washed through with light. And how astonishing to feel this sheer bliss, for here she was, not doing and not going to do a single unselfish thing, not going to do a thing she didn't want to do. According to everybody she had ever come across she ought at least to have twinges. She had not one twinge. Something was wrong somewhere. Wonderful that at home she should have been so good, so terribly good, and merely felt tormented. Twinges of every sort had there been her portion; aches, hurts, discouragements, and she the whole time being steadily unselfish. Now she had taken off all her goodness and left it behind her like a heap of rain-sodden clothes, and she only felt joy. She was naked of goodness, and was rejoicing in being naked. She was stripped, and exulting. And there, away in the dim mugginess of Hampstead, was Mellersh being angry.

She tried to visualise Mellersh, she tried to see him having breakfast and thinking bitter things about her; and lo, Mellersh himself began to shimmer, became rose-colour, became delicate violet, became an enchanting blue, became formless, became iridescent. Actually Mellersh, after quivering a minute, was lost in light.

"_Well_," thought Mrs. Wilkins, staring, as it were, after him. How extraordinary not to be able to visualise Mellersh; and she who used to know every feature, every expression of his by heart. She simply could not see him as he was. She could only see him resolved into beauty, melted into harmony with everything else. The familiar words of the General Thanksgiving came quite naturally into her mind, and she found herself blessing God for her creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life, but above all for His inestimable Love; out loud; in a burst of acknowledgment. While Mellersh, at that moment angrily pulling on his boots before going out into the dripping streets, was indeed thinking bitter things about her.

She began to dress, choosing clean white clothes in honour of the summer's day, unpacking her suit-cases, tidying her adorable little room. She moved about with quick, purposeful steps, her long thin body held up straight, her small face, so much puckered at home with effort and fear, smoothed out. All she had been and done before this morning, all she had felt and worried about, was gone. Each of her worries behaved as the image of Mellersh had behaved, and dissolved into colour and light. And she noticed things she had not noticed for years—when she was doing her hair in front of the glass she noticed it, and thought, "Why, what pretty stuff." For years she had forgotten she had such a thing as hair, plaiting it in the evening and unplaiting it in the morning with the same hurry and indifference with which she laced and unlaced her shoes. Now she suddenly saw it, and she twisted it round her fingers before the glass, and was glad it was so pretty. Mellersh couldn't have seen it either, for he had never said a word about it. Well, when she got home she would draw his attention to it. "Mellersh," she would say, "look at my hair. Aren't you pleased you've got a wife with hair like curly honey?"

She laughed. She had never said anything like that to Mellersh yet, and the idea of it amused her. But why had she not? Oh yes—she used to be afraid of him. Funny to be afraid of anybody; and especially of one's husband, whom one saw in his more simplified moments, such as asleep, and not breathing properly through his nose.

When she was ready she opened her door to go across to see if Rose, who had been put the night before by a sleepy maidservant into a cell opposite, were awake. She would say good-morning to her, and then she would run down and stay with that cypress tree till breakfast was ready, and after breakfast she wouldn't so much as look out of a window till she had helped Rose get everything ready for Lady Caroline and Mrs. Fisher. There was much to be done that day, settling in, arranging the rooms; she mustn't leave

Rose to do it alone. They would make it all so lovely for the two to come, have such an entrancing vision ready for them of little cells bright with flowers. She remembered she had wanted Lady Caroline not to come; fancy wanting to shut some one out of heaven because she thought she would be shy of her! And as though it mattered if she were, and as though she would be anything so self-conscious as shy. Besides, what a reason. She could not accuse herself of goodness over that. And she remembered she had wanted not to have Mrs. Fisher either, because she had seemed lofty. How funny of her. So funny to worry about such little things, making them important.

The bedrooms and two of the sitting-rooms at San Salvatore were on the top floor, and opened into a roomy hall with a wide glass window at the north end. San Salvatore was rich in small gardens in different parts and on different levels. The garden this window looked down on was made on the highest part of the walls, and could only be reached through the corresponding spacious hall on the floor below. When Mrs. Wilkins came out of her room this window stood wide open, and beyond it in the sun was a Judas tree in full flower. There was no sign of anybody, no sound of voices or feet. Tubs of arum lilies stood about on the stone floor, and on a table flamed a huge bunch of fierce nasturtiums. Spacious, flowery, silent, with the wide window at the end opening into the garden, and the Judas tree absurdly beautiful in the sunshine, it seemed to Mrs. Wilkins, arrested on her way across to Mrs. Arbuthnot, too good to be true. Was she really going to live in this for a whole month? Up to now she had had to take what beauty she could as she went along, snatching at little bits of it when she came across it—a patch of daisies on a fine day in a Hampstead field, a flash of sunset between two chimney pots. She had never been in definitely, completely beautiful places. She had never been even in a venerable house; and such a thing as a profusion of flowers in her rooms was unattainable to her. Sometimes in the spring she had bought six tulips at Shoolbred's, unable to resist them, conscious that Mellersh if he knew what they had cost would think it inexcusable; but they had soon died, and then there were no more. As for the Judas tree, she hadn't an idea what it was, and gazed at it out there against the sky with the rapt expression of one who sees a heavenly vision.

Mrs. Arbuthnot, coming out of her room, found her there like that, standing in the middle of the hall staring.

"Now what does she think she sees now?" thought Mrs. Arbuthnot.

"We _are_ in God's hands," said Mrs. Wilkins, turning to her, speaking with extreme conviction.

"Oh!" said Mrs. Arbuthnot quickly, her face, which had been covered with smiles when she came out of her room, falling. "Why, what has happened?"

For Mrs. Arbuthnot had woken up with such a delightful feeling of security, of relief, and she did not want to find she had not after all escaped from the need of refuge. She had not even dreamed of Frederick. For the first time for years she had been spared the nightly dream that he was with her, that they were heart to heart, and its miserable awakening. She had slept like a baby, and had woken up confident; she had found there was nothing she wished to say in her morning prayer except Thank you. It was disconcerting to be told she was after all in God's hands.

"I hope nothing has happened?" she asked anxiously.

Mrs. Wilkins looked at her a moment, and laughed. "How funny," she said, kissing her.

"What is funny?" asked Mrs. Arbuthnot, her face clearing because Mrs. Wilkins laughed.

"We are. This is. Everything. It's all so wonderful. It's so funny and so adorable that we should be in it. I daresay when we finally reach heaven—the one they talk about so much—we shan't find it a bit more beautiful."

Mrs. Arbuthnot relaxed to smiling security again. "Isn't it divine?" she said.

"Were you ever, ever in your life so happy?" asked Mrs. Wilkins, catching her by the arm.

"No," said Mrs. Arbuthnot. Nor had she been; not ever; not even in her first love-days with Frederick. Because always pain had been close at hand in that other happiness, ready to torture with doubts, to torture even with the very excess of her love; while this was the simple happiness of complete harmony with her surroundings, the happiness that asks for nothing, that just accepts, just breathes, just is.

"Let's go and look at that tree close," said Mrs. Wilkins. "I don't believe it can only be a tree."

And arm in arm they went along the hall, and their husbands would not have known them their faces were so young with eagerness, and together they stood at the open window, and when their eyes, having feasted on the marvellous pink thing, wandered farther among the beauties of the garden, they saw sitting on the low wall at the east edge of it, gazing out over the bay, her feet in lilies, Lady Caroline.

They were astonished. They said nothing in their astonishment, but stood quite still, arm in arm, staring down at her.

She too had on a white frock, and her head was bare. They had had no idea that day in London, when her hat was down to her nose and her furs were up to her ears, that she was so pretty. They had merely thought her different from the other women in the club, and so had the other women themselves, and so had all the waitresses, eyeing her sideways and eyeing her again as they passed the corner where she sat talking; but they had had no idea she was so pretty. She was exceedingly pretty. Everything about her was very much that which it was. Her fair hair was very fair, her lovely grey eyes were very lovely and grey, her dark eyelashes were very dark, her white skin was very white, her red mouth was very red. She was extravagantly slender—the merest thread of a girl, though not without little curves beneath her thin frock where little curves should be. She was looking out across the bay, and was sharply defined against the background of empty blue. She was full in the sun. Her feet dangled among the leaves and flowers of the lilies just as if it did not matter that they should be bent or bruised.

“She ought to have a headache,” whispered Mrs. Arbuthnot at last, “sitting there in the sun like that.”

“She ought to have a hat,” whispered Mrs. Wilkins.

“She’s treading on lilies.”

“But they’re hers as much as ours.”

“Only one-fourth of them.”

Lady Caroline turned her head. She looked up at them a moment, surprised to see them so much younger than they had seemed that day at the club, and so much less unattractive. Indeed, they were really almost quite attractive, if any one could ever be really quite attractive in the wrong clothes. Her eyes, swiftly glancing over them, took in every inch of each of them in the half second before she smiled and waved her hand and called out Good-morning. There was nothing, she saw at once, to be hoped for in the way of interest from their clothes. She did not consciously think this, for she was having a violent reaction against beautiful clothes and the slavery they impose on one, her experience being that the instant one had got them they took one in hand and gave one no peace till they had been everywhere and been seen by everybody. You didn’t take your clothes to parties; they took you. It was quite a mistake to think that a woman, a really well-dressed woman, wore out her clothes; it was the clothes that wore out the woman—dragging her about at all hours of the day and night. No wonder men stayed young longer. Just new trousers couldn’t excite them. She couldn’t suppose that even the newest trousers ever behaved like that, taking the bit between their teeth. Her images were disorderly, but she thought as she chose, she used what images she liked. As she got off the wall and came towards the window, it seemed a restful thing to know she was going to spend an entire month with people in dresses made as she dimly remembered dresses used to be made five summers ago.

“I got here yesterday morning,” she said, looking up at them and smiling. She really was bewitching. She had everything, even a dimple.

“It’s a great pity,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, smiling back, “because we were going to choose the nicest room for you.”

“Oh, but I’ve done that,” said Lady Caroline. “At least, I think it’s the nicest. It looks two ways—I adore a room that looks two ways, don’t you? Over the sea to the west, and over this Judas tree to the north.”

“And we had meant to make it pretty for you with flowers,” said Mrs. Wilkins.

“Oh, Domenico did that. I told him to directly I got here. He’s the gardener. He’s wonderful.”

“It’s a good thing, of course,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot a little hesitatingly, “to be independent, and to know exactly what one wants.”

“Yes, it saves trouble,” agreed Lady Caroline.

“But one shouldn’t be so independent,” said Mrs. Wilkins, “as to leave no opportunity for other people to exercise their benevolences on one.”

Lady Caroline, who had been looking at Mrs. Arbuthnot, now looked at Mrs. Wilkins. That day at that queer club she had had merely a blurred impression of Mrs. Wilkins, for it was the other one who did all the talking, and her impression had been of somebody so shy, so awkward that it was best to take no notice of her. She had not even been able to say good-bye properly, doing it in an agony, turning red, turning damp. Therefore she now looked at her in some surprise; and she was still more surprised when Mrs. Wilkins added, gazing at her with the most obvious sincere admiration, speaking indeed with a conviction that refused to remain unuttered, “I didn’t realise you were _so_ pretty.”

She stared at Mrs. Wilkins. She was not usually told this quite so immediately and roundly. Abundantly as she was used to it—impossible not to be after twenty-eight solid years—it surprised her to be told it with such bluntness, and by a woman.

“It’s very kind of you to think so,” she said.

“Why, you’re lovely,” said Mrs. Wilkins. “Quite, quite lovely.”

“I hope,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot pleasantly, “you make the most of it.”

Lady Caroline then stared at Mrs. Arbuthnot. “Oh yes,” she said. “I make the most of it. I’ve been doing that ever since I can remember.”

“Because,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, smiling and raising a warning forefinger, “it won’t last.”

Then Lady Caroline began to be afraid these two were originals. If so, she would be bored. Nothing bored her so much as people who insisted on being original, who came and buttonholed her and kept her waiting while they were being original. And the one who admired her—it would be tiresome if she dogged her about in order to look at her. What she wanted of this holiday was complete escape from all she had had before, she wanted the rest of complete contrast. Being admired, being dogged, wasn’t contrast, it was repetition; and as for originals, to find herself shut up with two on the top of a precipitous hill in a mediaeval castle built for the express purpose of preventing easy goings out and in, would not, she was afraid, be especially restful. Perhaps she had better be a little less encouraging. They had seemed such timid creatures, even the dark one—she couldn’t remember their names—that day at the club, that she had felt it quite safe to be very friendly. Here they had come out of their shells; already; indeed, at once. There was no sign of timidity about either of them here. If they had got out of their shells so immediately, at the very first contact, unless she checked them they would soon begin to press upon her, and then good-bye to her dream of thirty restful, silent days, lying unmolested in the sun, getting her feathers smooth again, not being spoken to, not waited on, not grabbed at and monopolised, but just recovering from the fatigue, the deep and melancholy fatigue, of the too much.

Besides, there was Mrs. Fisher. She too must be checked. Lady Caroline had started two days earlier than had been arranged for two reasons: first, because she wished to arrive before the others in order to pick out the room or rooms she preferred, and second, because she judged it likely that otherwise she would have to travel with Mrs. Fisher. She did not want to travel with Mrs. Fisher. She did not want to arrive with Mrs. Fisher. She saw no reason whatever why for a single moment she should have to have anything at all to do with Mrs. Fisher.

But unfortunately Mrs. Fisher also was filled with a desire to get to San Salvatore first and pick out the room or rooms she preferred, and she and Lady Caroline had after all travelled together. As early as Calais they began to suspect it; in Paris they feared it; at Modane they knew it; at Mezzago they concealed it, driving out to Castagneto in two separate flys, the nose of the one almost touching the back of the other the whole way. But when the road suddenly left off at the church and the steps, further evasion was impossible; and faced by this abrupt and difficult finish to their journey there was nothing for it but to amalgamate.

Because of Mrs. Fisher’s stick Lady Caroline had to see about everything. Mrs. Fisher’s intentions, she explained from her fly when the situation had become plain to her, were active, but her stick prevented their being carried out. The two drivers told Lady Caroline boys would have to carry the luggage up to the castle, and she went in search of some, while Mrs. Fisher waited in the fly because of her stick. Mrs. Fisher could speak Italian, but only, she explained, the Italian of Dante, which Matthew Arnold used to read with her when she was a girl, and she thought this might be above the heads of boys. Therefore Lady Caroline, who spoke ordinary Italian very well, was obviously the one to go and do things.

“I am in your hands,” said Mrs. Fisher, sitting firmly in her fly. “You must please regard me as merely an old woman with a stick.”

And presently, down the steps and cobbles to the piazza, and along the quay, and up the zigzag path, Lady Caroline found herself as much obliged to walk slowly with Mrs. Fisher as if she were her own grandmother.

“It’s my stick,” Mrs. Fisher complacently remarked at intervals.

And when they rested at those bends of the zigzag path where seats were, and Lady Caroline, who would have liked to run on and get to the top quickly, was forced in common humanity to remain with Mrs. Fisher because of her stick, Mrs. Fisher told her how she had been on a zigzag path once with Tennyson.

“Isn’t his cricket wonderful?” said Lady Caroline absently.

“_The_ Tennyson,” said Mrs. Fisher, turning her head and observing her a moment over her spectacles.

“Isn’t he?” said Lady Caroline.

“I am speaking,” said Mrs. Fisher, “of Alfred.”

“Oh,” said Lady Caroline.

“And it was a path, too,” Mrs. Fisher went on severely, “curiously like this. No eucalyptus tree, of course, but otherwise curiously like this. And at one of the bends he turned and said to me—I see him now turning and saying to me—”

Yes, Mrs. Fisher would have to be checked. And so would these two up at the window. She had better begin at once. She was sorry she had got off the wall. All she need have done was to have waved her hand, and waited till they came down and out into the garden to her.

So she ignored Mrs. Arbuthnot’s remark and raised forefinger, and said with marked coldness—at least, she tried to make it sound marked—that she supposed they would be going to breakfast, and that she had had hers; but it was her fate that however coldly she sent forth her words they came out sounding quite warm and agreeable. That was because she had a sympathetic and delightful voice, due entirely to some special formation of her throat and the roof of her mouth, and having nothing whatever to do with what she was feeling. Nobody in consequence ever believed they were being snubbed. It was most tiresome. And if she stared icily it did not look icy at all, because her eyes, lovely to begin with, had the added loveliness of very long, soft, dark eyelashes. No icy stare could come out of eyes like that; it got caught and lost in the soft eyelashes, and the persons stared at merely thought they were being regarded with a flattering and exquisite attentiveness. And if ever she was out of humour or definitely cross—and who would not be sometimes in such a world?—she only looked so pathetic that people all rushed to comfort her, if possible by means of kissing. It was more than tiresome, it was maddening. Nature was determined that she should look and sound angelic. She could never be disagreeable or rude without being completely misunderstood.

“I had my breakfast in my room,” she said, trying her utmost to sound curt. “Perhaps I’ll see you later.”

And she nodded, and went back to where she had been sitting on the wall, with the lilies being nice and cool round her feet.

Chapter 7

Their eyes followed her admiringly. They had no idea they had been snubbed. It was a disappointment, of course, to find she had forestalled them and that they were not to have the happiness of preparing for her, of watching her face when she arrived and first saw everything, but there was still Mrs. Fisher. They would concentrate on Mrs. Fisher, and would watch her face instead; only, like everybody else, they would have preferred to watch Lady Caroline’s.

Perhaps, then, as Lady Caroline had talked of breakfast, they had better begin by going and having it, for there was too much to be done that day to spend any more time gazing at the scenery—servants to be interviewed, the house to be gone through and examined, and finally Mrs. Fisher’s room to be got ready and adorned.

They waved their hands gaily at Lady Caroline, who seemed absorbed in what she saw and took no notice, and turning away found the maidservant of the night before had come up silently behind them in cloth slippers with string soles.

She was Francesca, the elderly parlour-maid, who had been with the owner, he had said, for years, and whose presence made inventories unnecessary; and after wishing them good-morning and hoping they had slept well, she told them breakfast was ready in the dining-room on the floor below, and if they would follow her she would lead.

They did not understand a single word of the very many in which Francesca succeeded in clothing this simple information, but they followed her, for it at least was clear that they were to follow, and going down the stairs, and along the broad hall like the one above except for glass doors at the end instead of a window opening into the garden, they were shown into the dining-room; where, sitting at the head of the table having her breakfast, was Mrs. Fisher.

This time they exclaimed. Even Mrs. Arbuthnot exclaimed, though her exclamation was only “Oh.”

Mrs. Wilkins exclaimed at greater length. “Why, but it’s like having the bread taken out of one’s mouth!” exclaimed Mrs. Wilkins.

“How do you do,” said Mrs. Fisher. “I can’t get up because of my stick.” And she stretched out her hand across the table.

They advanced and shook it.

“We had no idea you were here,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“Yes,” said Mrs. Fisher, resuming her breakfast. “Yes. I am here.” And with composure she removed the top of her egg.

“It’s a great disappointment,” said Mrs. Wilkins. “We had meant to give you _such_ a welcome.”

This was the one, Mrs. Fisher remembered, briefly glancing at her, who when she came to Prince of Wales Terrace said she had seen Keats. She must be careful with this one—curb her from the beginning.

She therefore ignored Mrs. Wilkins and said gravely, with a downward face of impenetrable calm bent on her egg, “Yes. I arrived yesterday with Lady Caroline.”

“It’s really dreadful,” said Mrs. Wilkins, exactly as if she had not been ignored. “There’s nobody left to get anything ready for now. I feel thwarted. I feel as if the bread had been taken out of my mouth just when I was going to be happy swallowing it.”

“Where will you sit?” asked Mrs. Fisher of Mrs. Arbuthnot—markedly of Mrs. Arbuthnot; the comparison with the bread seemed to her most unpleasant.

“Oh, thank you—” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, sitting down rather suddenly next to her.

There were only two places she could sit down in, the places laid on either side of Mrs. Fisher. She therefore sat down in one, and Mrs. Wilkins sat down opposite her in the other.

Mrs. Fisher was at the head of the table. Round her was grouped the coffee and the tea. Of course they were all sharing San Salvatore equally, but it was she herself and Lotty, Mrs. Arbuthnot mildly reflected, who had found it, who had had the work of getting it, who had chosen to admit Mrs. Fisher into it. Without them, she could not help thinking, Mrs. Fisher would not have been there. Morally Mrs. Fisher was a guest. There was no hostess in this party, but supposing there had been a hostess it would not have been Mrs. Fisher, nor Lady Caroline, it would have been either herself or Lotty. Mrs. Arbuthnot could not help feeling this as she sat down, and Mrs. Fisher, the hand which Ruskin had wrung suspended over the pots before her, inquired, “Tea or coffee?” She could not help feeling it even more definitely when Mrs. Fisher touched a small gong on the table beside her as though she had been used to that gong and that table ever since she was little, and, on Francesca’s appearing, bade her in the language of Dante bring more milk. There was a curious air about Mrs. Fisher, thought Mrs. Arbuthnot, of being in possession; and if she herself had not been so happy she would have perhaps minded.

Mrs. Wilkins noticed it too, but it only made her discursive brain think of cuckoos. She would no doubt immediately have begun to talk of cuckoos, incoherently, unrestrainably and deplorably, if she had been in the condition of nerves and shyness she was in last time she saw Mrs. Fisher. But happiness had done away with shyness—she was very serene; she could control her conversation; she did not have, horrified, to listen to herself saying things she had no idea of saying when she began; she was quite at her ease, and completely natural. The disappointment of not going to be able to prepare a welcome for Mrs. Fisher had evaporated at once, for it was impossible to go on being disappointed in heaven. Nor did she mind her behaving as hostess. What did it matter? You did not mind things in heaven. She and Mrs. Arbuthnot, therefore, sat down more willingly than they otherwise would have done, one on either side of Mrs. Fisher, and the sun, pouring through the two windows facing east across the bay, flooded the room, and there was an open door leading into the garden, and the garden was full of many lovely things, especially freesias.

The delicate and delicious fragrance of the freesias came in through the door and floated round Mrs. Wilkins’s enraptured nostrils. Freesias in London were quite beyond her. Occasionally she went into a shop and asked what they cost, so as just to have an

excuse for lifting up a bunch and smelling them, well knowing that it was something awful like a shilling for about three flowers. Here they were everywhere—bursting out of every corner and carpeting the rose beds. Imagine it—having freesias to pick in armsful if you wanted to, and with glorious sunshine flooding the room, and in your summer frock, and its being only the first of April!

“I suppose you realise, don’t you, that we’ve got to heaven?” she said, beaming at Mrs. Fisher with all the familiarity of a fellow-angel.

“They are considerably younger than I had supposed,” thought Mrs. Fisher, “and not nearly so plain.” And she mused a moment, while she took no notice of Mrs. Wilkins’s exuberance, on their instant and agitated refusal that day at Prince of Wales Terrace to have anything to do with the giving or the taking of references.

Nothing could affect her, of course; nothing that anybody did. She was far too solidly seated in respectability. At her back stood massively in a tremendous row those three great names she had offered, and they were not the only ones she could turn to for support and countenance. Even if these young women—she had no grounds for believing the one out in the garden to be really Lady Caroline Dester, she had merely been told she was—even if these young women should all turn out to be what Browning used to call—how well she remembered his amusing and delightful way of putting things—Fly-by-Nights, what could it possibly, or in any way matter to her? Let them fly by night if they wished. One was not sixty-five for nothing. In any case there would only be four weeks of it, at the end of which she would see no more of them. And in the meanwhile there were plenty of places where she could sit quietly away from them and remember. Also there was her own sitting-room, a charming room, all honey-coloured furniture and pictures, with windows to the sea towards Genoa, and a door opening on to the battlements. The house possessed two sitting-rooms, and she had explained to that pretty creature Lady Caroline—certainly a pretty creature, whatever else she was; Tennyson would have enjoyed taking her for blows on the downs—who had seemed inclined to appropriate the honey-coloured one, that she needed some little refuge entirely to herself because of her stick.

“Nobody wants to see an old woman hobbling about everywhere,” she had said. “I shall be quite content to spend much of my time by myself in here or sitting out on these convenient battlements.”

And she had a very nice bedroom, too; it looked two ways, across the bay to the morning sun—she liked the morning sun—and onto the garden. There were only two of these bedrooms with cross-views in the house, she and Lady Caroline had discovered, and they were by far the airiest. They each had two beds in them, and she and Lady Caroline had had the extra beds taken out at once and put into two of the other rooms. In this way there was much more space and comfort. Lady Caroline, indeed, had turned hers into a bed-sitting-room, with the sofa out of the bigger drawing-room and the writing-table and the most comfortable chair, but she herself had not had to do that because she had her own sitting-room, equipped with what was necessary. Lady Caroline had thought at first of taking the bigger sitting-room entirely for her own, because the dining-room on the floor below could quite well be used between meals to sit in by the two others, and was a very pleasant room with nice chairs, but she had not liked the bigger sitting-room’s shape—it was a round room in the tower, with deep slit windows pierced through the massive walls, and a domed and ribbed ceiling arranged to look like an open umbrella, and it seemed a little dark. Undoubtedly Lady Caroline had cast covetous glances at the honey-coloured room, and if she, Mrs. Fisher, had been less firm would have installed herself in it. Which would have been absurd.

“I hope,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, smilingly making an attempt to convey to Mrs. Fisher that though she, Mrs. Fisher, might not be exactly a guest she certainly was not in the very least a hostess, “your room is comfortable.”

“Quite,” said Mrs. Fisher. “Will you have some more coffee?”

“No, thank you. Will you?”

“No, thank you. There were two beds in my bedroom, filling it up unnecessarily, and I had one taken out. It has made it much more convenient.”

“Oh _that’s_ why I’ve got two beds in my room!” exclaimed Mrs. Wilkins, illuminated; the second bed in her little cell had seemed an unnatural and inappropriate object from the moment she saw it.

“I gave no directions,” said Mrs. Fisher, addressing Mrs. Arbuthnot, “I merely asked Francesca to remove it.”

“I have two in my room as well,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“Your second one must be Lady Caroline’s. She had hers removed too,” said Mrs. Fisher. “It seems foolish to have more beds in a room than there are occupiers.”

“But _we_ haven’t got any husbands here either,” said Mrs. Wilkins, “and I don’t see any use in extra beds in one’s room if one hasn’t got husbands to put in them. Can’t we have them taken away too?”

“Beds,” said Mrs. Fisher coldly, “cannot be removed from one room after another. They must remain somewhere.”

Mrs. Wilkins’s remarks seemed to Mrs. Fisher persistently unfortunate. Each time she opened her mouth she said something best left unsaid. Loose talk about husbands had never in Mrs. Fisher’s circle been encouraged. In the ’eighties, when she chiefly flourished, husbands were taken seriously, as the only real obstacles to sin. Beds too, if they had to be mentioned, were approached with caution; and a decent reserve prevented them and husbands ever being spoken of in the same breath.

She turned more markedly than ever to Mrs. Arbuthnot. “Do let me give you a little more coffee,” she said.

“No, thank you. But won’t you have some more?”

“No indeed. I never have more than two cups at breakfast. Would you like an orange?”

“No, thank you. Would you?”

“No, I don’t eat fruit at breakfast. It is an American fashion which I am too old now to adopt. Have you had all you want?”

“Quite. Have you?”

Mrs. Fisher paused before replying. Was this a habit, this trick of answering a simple question with the same question? If so it must be curbed, for no one could live for four weeks in any real comfort with somebody who had a habit.

She glanced at Mrs. Arbuthnot, and her parted hair and gentle brow reassured her. No; it was accident, not habit, that had produced those echoes. She could as soon imagine a dove having tiresome habits as Mrs. Arbuthnot. Considering her, she thought what a splendid wife she would have been for poor Carlyle. So much better than that horrid clever Jane. She would have soothed him.

“Then shall we go?” she suggested.

“Let me help you up,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, all consideration.

“Oh, thank you—I can manage perfectly. It’s only sometimes that my stick prevents me—”

Mrs. Fisher got up quite easily; Mrs. Arbuthnot had hovered over her for nothing.

“_I’m_ going to have one of these gorgeous oranges,” said Mrs. Wilkins, staying where she was and reaching across to a black bowl piled with them. “Rose, how can you resist them. Look—have this one. Do have this beauty—” And she held out a big one.

“No, I’m going to see to my duties,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, moving towards the door. “You’ll forgive me for leaving you, won’t you,” she added politely to Mrs. Fisher.

Mrs. Fisher moved towards the door too; quite easily; almost quickly; her stick did not hinder her at all. She had no intention of being left with Mrs. Wilkins.

“What time would you like to have lunch?” Mrs. Arbuthnot asked her, trying to keep her head as at least a non-guest, if not precisely a hostess, above water.

“Lunch,” said Mrs. Fisher, “is at half-past twelve.”

“You shall have it at half-past twelve then,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot. “I’ll tell the cook. It will be a great struggle,” she continued, smiling, “but I’ve brought a little dictionary—”

“The cook,” said Mrs. Fisher, “knows.”

“Oh?” said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“Lady Caroline has already told her,” said Mrs. Fisher.

“Oh?” said Mrs. Arbuthnot again.

“Yes. Lady Caroline speaks the kind of Italian cooks understand. I am prevented going into the kitchen because of my stick. And even if I were able to go, I fear I shouldn’t be understood.”

“But—” began Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“But it’s _too_ wonderful,” Mrs. Wilkins finished for her from the table, delighted with these unexpected simplifications in her and Rose’s lives. “Why, we’ve got positively nothing to do here, either of us, except just be happy. You wouldn’t believe,” she said, turning her head and speaking straight to Mrs. Fisher, portions of orange in either hand, “how terribly good Rose and I have been for years without stopping, and how much now we need a perfect rest.”

And Mrs. Fisher, going without answering her out of the room, said to herself, “She must, she shall be curbed.”

Chapter 8

Presently, when Mrs. Wilkins and Mrs. Arbuthnot, unhampered by any duties, wandered out and down the worn stone steps and under the pergola into the lower garden, Mrs. Wilkins said to Mrs. Arbuthnot, who seemed pensive, “Don’t you see that if somebody else does the ordering it frees us?”

Mrs. Arbuthnot said she did see, but nevertheless she thought it rather silly to have everything taken out of their hands.

“I love things to be taken out of my hands,” said Mrs. Wilkins.

“But we found San Salvatore,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, “and it is rather silly that Mrs. Fisher should behave as if it belonged only to her.”

“What is rather silly,” said Mrs. Wilkins with much serenity, “is to mind. I can’t see the least point in being in authority at the price of one’s liberty.”

Mrs. Arbuthnot said nothing to that for two reasons—first, because she was struck by the remarkable and growing calm of the hitherto incoherent and excited Lotty, and secondly because what she was looking at was so very beautiful.

All down the stone steps on either side were periwinkles in full flower, and she could now see what it was that had caught at her the night before and brushed, wet and scented, across her face. It was wistaria. _Wistaria and sunshine_ . . . she remembered the advertisement. Here indeed were both in profusion. The wistaria was tumbling over itself in its excess of life, its prodigality of flowering; and where the pergola ended the sun blazed on scarlet geraniums, bushes of them, and nasturtiums in great heaps, and marigolds so brilliant that they seemed to be burning, and red and pink snapdragons, all outdoing each other in bright, fierce colour. The ground behind these flaming things dropped away in terraces to the sea, each terrace a little orchard, where among the olives grew vines on trellises, and fig-trees, and peach-trees, and cherry-trees. The cherry-trees and peach-trees were in blossom—lovely showers of white and deep rose-colour among the trembling delicacy of the olives; the fig-leaves were just big enough to smell of figs, the vine-buds were only beginning to show. And beneath these trees were groups of blue and purple irises, and bushes of lavender, and grey, sharp cactuses, and the grass was thick with dandelions and daisies, and right down at the bottom was the sea. Colour seemed flung down anyhow, anywhere; every sort of colour, piled up in heaps, pouring along in rivers—the periwinkles looked exactly as if they were being poured down each side of the steps—and flowers that grow only in borders in England, proud flowers keeping themselves to themselves over there, such as the great blue irises and the lavender, were being jostled by small, shining common things like dandelions and daisies and the white bells of the wild onion, and only seemed the better and the more exuberant for it.

They stood looking at this crowd of loveliness, this happy jumble, in silence. No, it didn’t matter what Mrs. Fisher did; not here; not in such beauty. Mrs. Arbuthnot’s discomposure melted out of her. In the warmth and light of what she was looking at, of what to her was a manifestation, an entirely new side of God, how could one be discomposed? If only Frederick were with her, seeing it too, seeing as he would have seen it when first they were lovers, in the days when he saw what she saw and loved what she loved. . .

She sighed.

“You mustn’t sigh in heaven,” said Mrs. Wilkins. “One doesn’t.”

“I was thinking how one longs to share this with those one loves,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“You mustn’t long in heaven,” said Mrs. Wilkins. “You’re supposed to be quite complete there. And it is heaven, isn’t it, Rose? See how everything has been let in together—the dandelions and the irises, the vulgar and the superior, me and Mrs. Fisher—all welcome, all mixed up anyhow, and all so visibly happy and enjoying ourselves.”

“Mrs. Fisher doesn’t seem happy—not visibly, anyhow,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, smiling.

“She’ll begin soon, you’ll see.”

Mrs. Arbuthnot said she didn’t believe that after a certain age people began anything.

Mrs. Wilkins said she was sure no one, however old and tough, could resist the effects of perfect beauty. Before many days, perhaps only hours, they would see Mrs. Fisher bursting out into every kind of exuberance. “I’m quite sure,” said Mrs. Wilkins, “that we’ve got to heaven, and once Mrs. Fisher realises that that’s where she is, she’s bound to be different. You’ll see. She’ll leave off being ossified, and go all soft and able to stretch, and we shall get quite—why, I shouldn’t be surprised if we get quite fond of her.”

The idea of Mrs. Fisher bursting out into anything, she who seemed so particularly firmly fixed inside her buttons, made Mrs. Arbuthnot laugh. She condoned Lotty’s loose way of talking of heaven, because in such a place, on such a morning, condonation was in the very air. Besides, what an excuse there was.

And Lady Caroline, sitting where they had left her before breakfast on the wall, peeped over when she heard laughter, and saw them standing on the path below, and thought what a mercy it was they were laughing down there and had not come up and done it round her. She disliked jokes at all times, but in the morning she hated them; especially close up; especially crowding in her ears. She hoped the originals were on their way out for a walk, and not on their way back from one. They were laughing more and more. What could they possibly find to laugh at?

She looked down on the tops of their heads with a very serious face, for the thought of spending a month with laughers was a grave one, and they, as though they felt her eyes, turned suddenly and looked up.

The dreadful geniality of those women. . .

She shrank away from their smiles and wavings, but she could not shrink out of sight without falling into the lilies. She neither smiled nor waved back, and turning her eyes to the more distant mountains surveyed them carefully till the two, tired of waving, moved away along the path and turned the corner and disappeared.

This time they both did notice that they had been met with, at least, unresponsiveness.

“If we weren’t in heaven,” said Mrs. Wilkins serenely, “I should say we had been snubbed, but as nobody snubs anybody there of course we can’t have been.”

“Perhaps she is unhappy,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“Whatever it is she is she’ll get over it here,” said Mrs. Wilkins with conviction.

“We must try and help her,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“Oh, but nobody helps anybody in heaven. That’s finished with. You don’t try to be, or do. You simply _are_.”

Well, Mrs. Arbuthnot wouldn’t go into that—not here, not to-day. The vicar, she knew, would have called Lotty’s talk levity, if not profanity. How old he seemed from here; an old, old vicar.

They left the path, and clambered down the olive terraces, down and down, to where at the bottom the warm, sleepy sea heaved gently among the rocks. There a pine-tree grew close to the water, and they sat under it, and a few yards away was a fishing-boat lying motionless and green-bellied on the water. The ripples of the sea made little gurgling noises at their feet. They screwed up their eyes to be able to look into the blaze of light beyond the shade of their tree. The hot smell from the pine-needles and from the cushions of wild thyme that padded the spaces between the rocks, and sometimes a smell of pure honey from a clump of warm irises up behind them in the sun, puffed across their faces. Very soon Mrs. Wilkins took her shoes and stockings off, and let her feet

hang in the water. After watching her a minute Mrs. Arbuthnot did the same. Their happiness was then complete. Their husbands would not have known them. They left off talking. They ceased to mention heaven. They were just cups of acceptance.

Meanwhile Lady Caroline, on her wall, was considering her position. The garden on the top of the wall was a delicious garden, but its situation made it insecure and exposed to interruptions. At any moment the others might come and want to use it, because both the hall and the dining-room had doors opening straight into it. Perhaps, thought Lady Caroline, she could arrange that it should be solely hers. Mrs. Fisher had the battlements, delightful with flowers, and a watch-tower all to herself, besides having snatched the one really nice room in the house. There were plenty of places the originals could go to—she had herself seen at least two other little gardens, while the hill the castle stood on was itself a garden, with walks and seats. Why should not this one spot be kept exclusively for her? She liked it; she liked it best of all. It had the Judas tree and an umbrella pine, it had the freesias and the lilies, it had a tamarisk beginning to flush pink, it had the convenient low wall to sit on, it had from each of its three sides the most amazing views—to the east the bay and mountains, to the north the village across the tranquil clear green water of the little harbour and the hills dotted with white houses and orange groves, and to the west was the thin thread of land by which San Salvatore was tied to the mainland, and then the open sea and the coast line beyond Genoa reaching away into the blue dimness of France. Yes, she would say she wanted to have this entirely to herself. How obviously sensible if each of them had their own special place to sit in apart. It was essential to her comfort that she should be able to be apart, left alone, not talked to. The others ought to like it best too. Why herd? One had enough of that in England, with one's relations and friends—oh, the numbers of them!—pressing on one continually. Having successfully escaped them for four weeks why continue, and with persons having no earthly claim on one, to herd?

She lit a cigarette. She began to feel secure. Those two had gone for a walk. There was no sign of Mrs. Fisher. How very pleasant this was.

Somebody came out through the glass doors, just as she was drawing a deep breath of security. Surely it couldn't be Mrs. Fisher, wanting to sit with her? Mrs. Fisher had her battlements. She ought to stay on them, having snatched them. It would be too tiresome if she wouldn't, and wanted not only to have them and her sitting-room but to establish herself in this garden as well.

No; it wasn't Mrs. Fisher, it was the cook.

She frowned. Was she going to have to go on ordering the food? Surely one or other of those two waving women would do that now.

The cook, who had been waiting in increasing agitation in the kitchen, watching the clock getting nearer to lunch-time while she still was without knowledge of what lunch was to consist of, had gone at last to Mrs. Fisher, who had immediately waved her away. She then wandered about the house seeking a mistress, any mistress, who would tell her what to cook, and finding none; and at last, directed by Francesca, who always knew where everybody was, came out to Lady Caroline.

Domenico had provided this cook. She was Costanza, the sister of that one of his cousins who kept a restaurant down on the piazza. She helped her brother in his cooking when she had no other job, and knew every sort of fat, mysterious Italian dish such as the workmen of Castagneto, who crowded the restaurant at midday, and the inhabitants of Mezzago when they came over on Sundays, loved to eat. She was a fleshless spinster of fifty, grey-haired, nimble, rich of speech, and thought Lady Caroline more beautiful than anyone she had ever seen; and so did Domenico; and so did the boy Giuseppe who helped Domenico and was, besides, his nephew; and so did the girl Angela who helped Francesca and was, besides, Domenico's niece; and so did Francesca herself. Domenico and Francesca, the only two who had seen them, thought the two ladies who arrived last very beautiful, but compared to the fair young lady who arrived first they were as candles to the electric light that had lately been installed, and as the tin tubs in the bedrooms to the wonderful new bathroom their master had had arranged on his last visit.

Lady Caroline scowled at the cook. The scowl, as usual, was transformed on the way into what appeared to be an intent and beautiful gravity, and Costanza threw up her hands and took the saints aloud to witness that here was the very picture of the Mother of God.

Lady Caroline asked her crossly what she wanted, and Costanza's head went on one side with delight at the sheer music of her voice. She said, after waiting a moment in case the music was going to continue, for she didn't wish to miss any of it, that she wanted orders; she had been to the Signorina's mother, but in vain.

"She is not my mother," repudiated Lady Caroline angrily; and her anger sounded like the regretful wail of a melodious orphan.

Costanza poured forth pity. She too, she explained, had no mother—

Lady Caroline interrupted with the curt information that her mother was alive and in London.

Costanza praised God and the saints that the young lady did not yet know what it was like to be without a mother. Quickly enough did misfortunes overtake one; no doubt the young lady already had a husband.

“No,” said Lady Caroline icily. Worse than jokes in the morning did she hate the idea of husbands. And everybody was always trying to press them on her—all her relations, all her friends, all the evening papers. After all, she could only marry one, anyhow; but you would think from the way everybody talked, and especially those persons who wanted to be husbands, that she could marry at least a dozen.

Her soft, pathetic “No” made Costanza, who was standing close to her, well with sympathy.

“Poor little one,” said Costanza, moved actually to pat her encouragingly on the shoulder, “take hope. There is still time.”

“For lunch,” said Lady Caroline freezingly, marvelling as she spoke that she should be patted, she who had taken so much trouble to come to a place, remote and hidden, where she could be sure that among other things of a like oppressive nature pattings also were not, “we will have—”

Costanza became business-like. She interrupted with suggestions, and her suggestions were all admirable and all expensive.

Lady Caroline did not know they were expensive, and fell in with them at once. They sounded very nice. Every sort of young vegetables and fruits came into them, and much butter and a great deal of cream and incredible numbers of eggs. Costanza said enthusiastically at the end, as a tribute to this acquiescence, that of the many ladies and gentlemen she had worked for on temporary jobs such as this she preferred the English ladies and gentlemen. She more than preferred them—they roused devotion in her. For they knew what to order; they did not skimp; they refrained from grinding down the faces of the poor.

From this Lady Caroline concluded that she had been extravagant, and promptly countermanded the cream.

Costanza’s face fell, for she had a cousin who had a cow, and the cream was to have come from them both.

“And perhaps we had better not have chickens,” said Lady Caroline.

Costanza’s face fell more, for her brother at the restaurant kept chickens in his back-yard, and many of them were ready for killing.

“Also do not order strawberries till I have consulted with the other ladies,” said Lady Caroline, remembering that it was only the first of April, and that perhaps people who lived in Hampstead might be poor; indeed, must be poor, or why live in Hampstead? “It is not I who am mistress here.”

“Is it the old one?” asked Costanza, her face very long.

“No,” said Lady Caroline.

“Which of the other two ladies is it?”

“Neither,” said Lady Caroline.

Then Costanza’s smiles returned, for the young lady was having fun with her and making jokes. She told her so, in her friendly Italian way, and was genuinely delighted.

“I never make jokes,” said Lady Caroline briefly. “You had better go, or lunch will certainly not be ready by half-past twelve.”

And these curt words came out sounding so sweet that Costanza felt as if kind compliments were being paid her, and forgot her disappointment about the cream and the chickens, and went away all gratitude and smiles.

“This,” thought Lady Caroline, “will never do. I haven’t come here to housekeep, and I won’t.”

She called Costanza back. Costanza came running. The sound of her name in that voice enchanted her.

“I have ordered the lunch for to-day,” said Lady Caroline, with the serious angel face that was hers when she was annoyed, “and I have also ordered the dinner, but from now on you will go to one of the other ladies for orders. I give no more.”

The idea that she would go on giving orders was too absurd. She never gave orders at home. Nobody there dreamed of asking her to do anything. That such a very tiresome activity should be thrust upon her here, simply because she happened to be able to talk Italian, was ridiculous. Let the originals give orders if Mrs. Fisher refused to. Mrs. Fisher, of course, was the one Nature intended for such a purpose. She had the very air of a competent housekeeper. Her clothes were the clothes of a housekeeper, and so was the way she did her hair.

Having delivered herself of her ultimatum with an acerbity that turned sweet on the way, and accompanied it by a peremptory gesture of dismissal that had the grace and loving-kindness of a benediction, it was annoying that Costanza should only stand still with her head on one side gazing at her in obvious delight.

“Oh, _go_ away!” exclaimed Lady Caroline in English, suddenly exasperated.

There had been a fly in her bedroom that morning which had stuck just as Costanza was sticking; only one, but it might have been a myriad it was so tiresome from daylight on. It was determined to settle on her face, and she was determined it should not. Its persistence was uncanny. It woke her, and would not let her go to sleep again. She hit at it, and it eluded her without fuss or effort and with an almost visible blandness, and she had only hit herself. It came back again instantly, and with a loud buzz alighted on her cheek. She hit at it again and hurt herself, while it skimmed gracefully away. She lost her temper, and sat up in bed and waited, watching to hit at it and kill it. She kept on hitting at it at last with fury and with all her strength, as if it were a real enemy deliberately trying to madden her; and it elegantly skimmed in and out of her blows, not even angry, to be back again the next instant. It succeeded every time in getting on to her face, and was quite indifferent how often it was driven away. That was why she had dressed and come out so early. Francesca had already been told to put a net over her bed, for she was not going to allow herself to be annoyed twice like that. People were exactly like flies. She wished there were nets for keeping them off too. She hit at them with words and frowns, and like the fly they slipped between her blows and were untouched. Worse than the fly, they seemed unaware that she had even tried to hit them. The fly at least did for a moment go away. With human beings the only way to get rid of them was to go away herself. That was what, so tired, she had done this April; and having got here, having got close up to the details of life at San Salvatore, it appeared that here, too, she was not to be let alone.

Viewed from London there had seemed to be no details. San Salvatore from there seemed to be an empty, a delicious blank. Yet, after only twenty-four hours of it, she was discovering that it was not a blank at all, and that she was having to ward off as actively as ever. Already she had been much stuck to. Mrs. Fisher had stuck nearly the whole of the day before, and this morning there had been no peace, not ten minutes uninterruptedly alone.

Costanza of course had finally to go because she had to cook, but hardly had she gone before Domenico came. He came to water and tie up. That was natural, since he was the gardener, but he watered and tied up all the things that were nearest to her; he hovered closer and closer; he watered to excess; he tied plants that were as straight and steady as arrows. Well, at least he was a man, and therefore not quite so annoying, and his smiling good-morning was received with an answering smile; upon which Domenico forgot his family, his wife, his mother, his grown-up children and all his duties, and only wanted to kiss the young lady’s feet.

He could not do that, unfortunately, but he could talk while he worked, and talk he did; voluminously; pouring out every kind of information, illustrating what he said with gestures so lively that he had to put down the watering-pot, and thus delay the end of the watering.

Lady Caroline bore it for a time but presently was unable to bear it, and as he would not go, and she could not tell him to, seeing that he was engaged in his proper work, once again it was she who had to.

She got off the wall and moved to the other side of the garden, where in a wooden shed were some comfortable low cane chairs. All she wanted was to turn one of these round with its back to Domenico and its front to the sea towards Genoa. Such a little thing to want. One would have thought she might have been allowed to do that unmolested. But he, who watched her every movement, when he saw her approaching the chairs darted after her and seized one and asked to be told where to put it.

Would she never get away from being waited on, being made comfortable, being asked where she wanted things put, having to say thank you? She was short with Domenico, who instantly concluded the sun had given her a headache, and ran in and fetched her a sunshade and a cushion and a footstool, and was skilful, and was wonderful, and was one of Nature’s gentlemen.

She shut her eyes in a heavy resignation. She could not be unkind to Domenico. She could not get up and walk indoors as she would have done if it had been one of the others. Domenico was intelligent and very competent. She had at once discovered that it was he who really ran the house, who really did everything. And his manners were definitely delightful, and he undoubtedly was a charming person. It was only that she did so much long to be let alone. If only, only she could be left quite quiet for this one month, she felt that she might perhaps make something of herself after all.

She kept her eyes shut, because then he would think she wanted to sleep and would go away.

Domenico's romantic Italian soul melted within him at the sight, for having her eyes shut was extraordinarily becoming to her. He stood entranced, quite still, and she thought he had stolen away, so she opened them again.

No; there he was, staring at her. Even he. There was no getting away from being stared at.

"I have a headache," she said, shutting them again.

"It is the sun," said Domenico, "and sitting on the wall without a hat."

"I wish to sleep."

"_Sì signorina_," he said sympathetically; and went softly away.

She opened her eyes with a sigh of relief. The gentle closing of the glass doors showed her that he had not only gone quite away but had shut her out in the garden so that she should be undisturbed. Now perhaps she would be alone till lunch-time.

It was very curious, and no one in the world could have been more surprised than she herself, but she wanted to think. She had never wanted to do that before. Everything else that it is possible to do without too much inconvenience she had either wanted to do or had done at one period or another of her life, but not before had she wanted to think. She had come to San Salvatore with the single intention of lying comatose for four weeks in the sun, somewhere where her parents and friends were not, lapped in forgetfulness, stirring herself only to be fed, and she had not been there more than a few hours when this strange new desire took hold of her.

There had been wonderful stars the evening before, and she had gone out into the top garden after dinner, leaving Mrs. Fisher alone over her nuts and wine, and, sitting on the wall at the place where the lilies crowded their ghost heads, she had looked out into the gulf of the night, and it had suddenly seemed as if her life had been a noise all about nothing.

She had been intensely surprised. She knew stars and darkness did produce unusual emotions because, in others, she had seen them being produced, but they had not before done it in herself. A noise all about nothing. Could she be quite well? She had wondered. For a long while past she had been aware that her life was a noise, but it had seemed to be very much about something; a noise, indeed, about so much that she felt she must get out of earshot for a little or she would be completely, and perhaps permanently, deafened. But suppose it was only a noise about nothing?

She had not had a question like that in her mind before. It had made her feel lonely. She wanted to be alone, but not lonely. That was very different; that was something that ached and hurt dreadfully right inside one. It was what one dreaded most. It was what made one go to so many parties; and lately even the parties had seemed once or twice not to be a perfectly certain protection. Was it possible that loneliness had nothing to do with circumstances, but only with the way one met them? Perhaps, she had thought, she had better go to bed. She couldn't be very well.

She went to bed; and in the morning, after she had escaped the fly and had her breakfast and got out again into the garden, there was this same feeling again, and in broad daylight. Once more she had that really rather disgusting suspicion that her life till now had not only been loud but empty. Well, if that were so, and if her first twenty-eight years—the best ones—had gone just in meaningless noise, she had better stop a moment and look round her; pause, as they said in tiresome novels, and consider. She hadn't got many sets of twenty-eight years. One more would see her growing very like Mrs. Fisher. Two more— She averted her eyes.

Her mother would have been concerned if she had known. Her mother doted. Her father would have been concerned too, for he also doted. Everybody doted. And when, melodiously obstinate, she had insisted on going off to entomb herself in Italy for a whole month with queer people she had got out of an advertisement, refusing even to take her maid, the only explanation her friends could imagine was that poor Scrap—such was her name among them—had overdone it and was feeling a little nervy.

Her mother had been distressed at her departure. It was such an odd thing to do, such a sign of disappointment. She encouraged the general idea of the verge of a nervous breakdown. If she could have seen her adored Scrap, more delightful to look upon than any other mother's daughter had ever yet been, the object of her utmost pride, the source of all her fondest hopes, sitting staring at the empty noonday Mediterranean considering her three possible sets of twenty-eight years, she would have been miserable. To go away alone was bad; to think was worse. No good could come out of the thinking of a beautiful young woman. Complications could come out of it in profusion, but no good. The thinking of the beautiful was bound to result in hesitations, in reluctances, in unhappiness all round. And here, if she could have seen her, sat her Scrap thinking quite hard. And such things. Such old things. Things nobody ever began to think till they were at least forty.

Chapter 9

That one of the two sitting-rooms which Mrs. Fisher had taken for her own was a room of charm and character. She surveyed it with satisfaction on going into it after breakfast, and was glad it was hers. It had a tiled floor, and walls the colour of pale honey, and inlaid furniture the colour of amber, and mellow books, many in ivory or lemon-coloured covers. There was a big window overlooking the sea towards Genoa, and a glass door through which she could proceed out on to the battlements and walk along past the quaint and attractive watch-tower, in itself a room with chairs and a writing table, to where on the other side of the tower the battlements ended in a marble seat, and one could see the western bay and the point round which began the Gulf of Spezia. Her south view, between these two stretches of sea, was another hill, higher than San Salvatore, the last of the little peninsula, with the bland turrets of a smaller and uninhabited castle on the top, on which the setting sun still shone when everything else was sunk in shadow. Yes, she was very comfortably established here; and receptacles—Mrs. Fisher did not examine their nature closely, but they seemed to be small stone troughs, or perhaps little sarcophagi—ringed round the battlements with flowers.

These battlements, she thought, considering them, would have been a perfect place for her to pace up and down gently in moments when she least felt the need of her stick, or to sit in on the marble seat, having first put a cushion on it, if there had not unfortunately been a second glass door opening on to them, destroying their complete privacy, spoiling her feeling that the place was only for her. The second door belonged to the round drawing-room, which both she and Lady Caroline had rejected as too dark. That room would probably be sat in by the women from Hampstead, and she was afraid they would not confine themselves to sitting in it, but would come out through the glass door and invade her battlements. This would ruin the battlements. It would ruin them as far as she was concerned if they were to be overrun; or even if, not actually overrun, they were liable to be raked by the eyes of persons inside the room. No one could be perfectly at ease if they were being watched and knew it. What she wanted, what she surely had a right to, was privacy. She had no wish to intrude on the others; why then should they intrude on her? And she could always relax her privacy if, when she became better acquainted with her companions, she should think it worth while, but she doubted whether any of the three would so develop as to make her think it worth while.

Hardly anything was really worth while, reflected Mrs. Fisher, except the past. It was astonishing, it was simply amazing, the superiority of the past to the present. Those friends of hers in London, solid persons of her own age, knew the same past that she knew, could talk about it with her, could compare it as she did with the tinkling present, and in remembering great men forget for a moment the trivial and barren young people who still, in spite of the war, seemed to litter the world in such numbers. She had not come away from these friends, these conversable ripe friends, in order to spend her time in Italy chatting with three persons of another generation and defective experience; she had come away merely to avoid the treacheries of a London April. It was true what she had told the two who came to Prince of Wales Terrace, that all she wished to do at San Salvatore was to sit by herself in the sun and remember. They knew this, for she had told them. It had been plainly expressed and clearly understood. Therefore she had a right to expect them to stay inside the round drawing-room and not to emerge interruptingly on to her battlements.

But would they? The doubt spoilt her morning. It was only towards lunch-time that she saw a way to be quite safe, and ringing for Francesca, bade her, in slow and majestic Italian, shut the shutters of the glass door of the round drawing-room, and then, going with her into the room, which had become darker than ever in consequence, but also, Mrs. Fisher observed to Francesca, who was being voluble, would because of this very darkness remain agreeably cool, and after all there were the numerous slit-windows in the walls to let in light and it was nothing to do with her if they did not let it in, she directed the placing of a cabinet of curios across the door on its inside.

This would discourage egress.

Then she rang for Domenico, and caused him to move one of the flower-filled sarcophagi across the door on its outside.

This would discourage ingress.

“No one,” said Domenico, hesitating, “will be able to use the door.”

“No one,” said Mrs. Fisher firmly, “will wish to.”

She then retired to her sitting-room, and from a chair placed where she could look straight on to them, gazed at her battlements, secured to her now completely, with calm pleasure.

Being here, she reflected placidly, was much cheaper than being in an hotel and, if she could keep off the others, immeasurably more agreeable. She was paying for her rooms—extremely pleasant rooms, now that she was arranged in them—£3 a week, which came to about eight shillings a day, battlements, watch-tower and all. Where else abroad could she live as well for so little, and have as many baths as she liked, for eight shillings a day? Of course she did not yet know what her food would cost, but she would insist on carefulness over that, though she would also insist on its being carefulness combined with excellence. The two were perfectly compatible if the caterer took pains. The servants’ wages, she had ascertained, were negligible, owing to the advantageous exchange, so that there was only the food to cause her anxiety. If she saw signs of extravagance she would propose that they each hand over a reasonable sum every week to Lady Caroline which should cover the bills, any of it that was not used to be returned, and if it were exceeded the loss to be borne by the caterer.

Mrs. Fisher was well off and had the desire for comforts proper to her age, but she disliked expenses. So well off was she that, had she so chosen, she could have lived in an opulent part of London and driven from it and to it in a Rolls-Royce. She had no such wish. It needed more vitality than went with true comfort to deal with a house in an opulent spot and a Rolls-Royce. Worries attended such possessions, worries of every kind, crowned by bills. In the sober gloom of Prince of Wales Terrace she could obscurely enjoy inexpensive yet real comfort, without being snatched at by predatory men-servants or collectors for charities, and a taxi stand was at the end of the road. Her annual outlay was small. The house was inherited. Death had furnished it for her. She trod in the dining-room on the Turkey carpet of her fathers; she regulated her day by the excellent black marble clock on the mantelpiece which she remembered from childhood; her walls were entirely covered by the photographs her illustrious deceased friends had given either herself or her father, with their own handwriting across the lower parts of their bodies, and the windows, shrouded by the maroon curtains of all her life, were decorated besides with the selfsame aquariums to which she owed her first lessons in sealore, and in which still swam slowly the goldfishes of her youth.

Were they the same goldfish? She did not know. Perhaps, like carp, they outlived everybody. Perhaps, on the other hand, behind the deep-sea vegetation provided for them at the bottom, they had from time to time as the years went by withdrawn and replaced themselves. Were they or were they not, she sometimes wondered, contemplating them between the courses of her solitary meals, the same goldfish that had that day been there when Carlyle—how well she remembered it—angrily strode up to them in the middle of some argument with her father that had grown heated, and striking the glass smartly with his fist had put them to flight, shouting as they fled, “Och, ye deaf deevils! Och, ye lucky deaf deevils! Ye can’t hear anything of the blasted, blethering, doddering, glaikit fool-stuff yer maister talks, can ye?” Or words to that effect.

Dear, great-souled Carlyle. Such natural gushings forth; such true freshness; such real grandeur. Rugged, if you will—yes, undoubtedly sometimes rugged, and startling in a drawing-room, but magnificent. Who was there now to put beside him? Who was there to mention in the same breath? Her father, than whom no one had had more _flair_, said: “Thomas is immortal.” And here was this generation, this generation of puniness, raising its little voice in doubts, or, still worse, not giving itself the trouble to raise it at all, not—it was incredible, but it had been thus reported to her—even reading him. Mrs. Fisher did not read him either, but that was different. She had read him; she had certainly read him. Of course she had read him. There was Teufelsdröck—she quite well remembered a tailor called Teufelsdröck. So like Carlyle to call him that. Yes, she must have read him, though naturally details escaped her.

The gong sounded. Lost in reminiscence Mrs. Fisher had forgotten time, and hastened to her bedroom to wash her hands and smoothe her hair. She did not wish to be late and set a bad example, and perhaps find her seat at the head of the table taken. One could put no trust in the manners of the younger generation; especially not in those of that Mrs. Wilkins.

She was, however, the first to arrive in the dining-room. Francesca in a white apron stood ready with an enormous dish of smoking hot, glistening maccaroni, but nobody was there to eat it.

Mrs. Fisher sat down, looking stern. Lax, lax.

“Serve me,” she said to Francesca, who showed a disposition to wait for the others.

Francesca served her. Of the party she liked Mrs. Fisher least, in fact she did not like her at all. She was the only one of the four ladies who had not yet smiled. True she was old, true she was unbeautiful, true she therefore had no reason to smile, but kind ladies smiled, reason or no. They smiled, not because they were happy but because they wished to make happy. This one of the four ladies could not then, Francesca decided, be kind; so she handed her the maccaroni, being unable to hide any of her feelings, morosely.

It was very well cooked, but Mrs. Fisher had never cared for maccaroni, especially not this long, worm-shaped variety. She found it difficult to eat—slippery, wriggling off her fork, making her look, she felt, undignified when, having got it as she supposed into her mouth, ends of it yet hung out. Always, too, when she ate it she was reminded of Mr. Fisher. He had during their married life behaved very much like maccaroni. He had slipped, he had wriggled, he had made her feel undignified, and when at last she had got him safe, as she thought, there had invariably been little bits of him that still, as it were, hung out.

Francesca from the sideboard watched Mrs. Fisher’s way with maccaroni gloomily, and her gloom deepened when she saw her at last take her knife to it and chop it small.

Mrs. Fisher really did not know how else to get hold of the stuff. She was aware that knives in this connection were improper, but one did finally lose patience. Maccaroni was never allowed to appear on her table in London. Apart from its tiresomeness she did not even like it, and she would tell Lady Caroline not to order it again. Years of practice, reflected Mrs. Fisher, chopping it up, years of actual living in Italy, would be necessary to learn the exact trick. Browning managed maccaroni wonderfully. She remembered watching him one day when he came to lunch with her father, and a dish of it had been ordered as a compliment to his connection with Italy. Fascinating, the way it went in. No chasing round the plate, no slidings off the fork, no subsequent protrusions of loose ends—just one dig, one whisk, one thrust, one gulp, and lo, yet another poet had been nourished.

“Shall I go and seek the young lady?” asked Francesca, unable any longer to look on a good maccaroni being cut with a knife.

Mrs. Fisher came out of her reminiscent reflections with difficulty. “She knows lunch is at half-past twelve,” she said. “They all know.”

“She may be asleep,” said Francesca. “The other ladies are further away, but this one is not far away.”

“Beat the gong again then,” said Mrs. Fisher.

What manners, she thought; what, what manners. It was not an hotel, and considerations were due. She must say she was surprised at Mrs. Arbuthnot, who had not looked like somebody unpunctual. Lady Caroline, too—she had seemed amiable and courteous, whatever else she might be. From the other one, of course, she expected nothing.

Francesca fetched the gong, and took it out into the garden and advanced, beating it as she advanced, close up to Lady Caroline, who, still stretched in her low chair, waited till she had done, and then turned her head and in the sweetest tones poured forth what appeared to be music but was really invective.

Francesca did not recognise the liquid flow as invective; how was she to, when it came out sounding like that? And with her face all smiles, for she could not but smile when she looked at this young lady, she told her the maccaroni was getting cold.

“When I do not come to meals it is because I do not wish to come to meals,” said the irritated Scrap, “and you will not in future disturb me.”

“Is she ill?” asked Francesca, sympathetic but unable to stop smiling. Never, never had she seen hair so beautiful. Like pure flax; like the hair of northern babes. On such a little head only blessing could rest, on such a little head the nimbus of the holiest saints could fitly be placed.

Scrap shut her eyes and refused to answer. In this she was injudicious, for its effect was to convince Francesca, who hurried away full of concern to tell Mrs. Fisher, that she was indisposed. And Mrs. Fisher, being prevented, she explained, from going out to Lady Caroline herself because of her stick, sent the two others instead, who had come in at that moment heated and breathless and full of excuses, while she herself proceeded to the next course, which was a very well-made omelette, bursting most agreeably at both its ends with young green peas.

“Serve me,” she directed Francesca, who again showed a disposition to wait for the others.

“_Oh_, why won’t they leave me alone?—oh, why _won’t_ they leave me alone?” Scrap asked herself when she heard more scrunchings on the little pebbles which took the place of grass, and therefore knew some one else was approaching.

She kept her eyes tight shut this time. Why should she go in to lunch if she didn’t want to? This wasn’t a private house; she was in no way tangled up in duties towards a tiresome hostess. For all practical purposes San Salvatore was an hotel, and she ought to be let alone to eat or not to eat exactly as if she really had been in an hotel.

But the unfortunate Scrap could not just sit still and close her eyes without rousing that desire to stroke and pet in her beholders with which she was only too familiar. Even the cook had patted her. And now a gentle hand—how well she knew and how much she dreaded gentle hands—was placed on her forehead.

“I’m afraid you’re not well,” said a voice that was not Mrs. Fisher’s, and therefore must belong to one of the originals.

“I have a headache,” murmured Scrap. Perhaps it was best to say that; perhaps it was the shortest cut to peace.

“I’m so sorry,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot softly, for it was her hand being gentle.

“And I,” said Scrap to herself, “who thought if I came here I would escape mothers.”

“Don’t you think some tea would do you good?” asked Mrs. Arbuthnot tenderly.

Tea? The idea was abhorrent to Scrap. In this heat to be drinking tea in the middle of the day. . .

“No,” she murmured.

“I expect what would really be best for her,” said another voice, “is to be left quiet.”

How sensible, thought Scrap; and raised the eye-lashes of one eye just enough to peep through and see who was speaking.

It was the freckled original. The dark one, then, was the one with the hand. The freckled one rose in her esteem.

“But I can’t bear to think of you with a headache and nothing being done for it,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot. “Would a cup of strong black coffee—?”

Scrap said no more. She waited, motionless and dumb, till Mrs. Arbuthnot should remove her hand. After all, she couldn’t stand there all day, and when she went away she would have to take her hand with her.

“I do think,” said the freckled one, “that she wants nothing except quiet.”

And perhaps the freckled one pulled the one with the hand by the sleeve, for the hold on Scrap’s forehead relaxed, and after a minute’s silence, during which no doubt she was being contemplated—she was always being contemplated—the footsteps began to scrunch the pebbles again, and grew fainter, and were gone.

“Lady Caroline has a headache,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot, re-entering the dining-room and sitting down in her place next to Mrs. Fisher. “I can’t persuade her to have even a little tea, or some black coffee. Do you know what aspirin is in Italian?”

“The proper remedy for headaches,” said Mrs. Fisher firmly, “is castor oil.”

“But she hasn’t got a headache,” said Mrs. Wilkins.

“Carlyle,” said Mrs. Fisher, who had finished her omelette and had leisure, while she waited for the next course, to talk, “suffered at one period terribly from headaches, and he constantly took castor oil as a remedy. He took it, I should say, almost to excess, and called it, I remember, in his interesting way the oil of sorrow. My father said it coloured for a time his whole attitude to life, his whole philosophy. But that was because he took too much. What Lady Caroline wants is one dose, and one only. It is a mistake to keep on taking castor oil.”

“Do you know the Italian for it?” asked Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“Ah, that I’m afraid I don’t. However, she would know. You can ask her.”

“But she hasn’t got a headache,” repeated Mrs. Wilkins, who was struggling with the maccaroni. “She only wants to be let alone.”

They both looked at her. The word shovel crossed Mrs. Fisher’s mind in connection with Mrs. Wilkins’s actions at that moment.

“Then why should she say she has?” asked Mrs. Arbuthnot.

“Because she is still trying to be polite. Soon she won’t try, when the place has got more into her—she’ll really be it. Without trying. Naturally.”

“Lotty, you see,” explained Mrs. Arbuthnot, smiling to Mrs. Fisher, who sat waiting with a stony patience for her next course, delayed because Mrs. Wilkins would go on trying to eat the maccaroni, which must be less worth eating than ever now that it was cold; “Lotty, you see, has a theory about this place—”

But Mrs. Fisher had no wish to hear any theory of Mrs. Wilkins’s.

“I am sure I don’t know,” she interrupted, looking severely at Mrs. Wilkins, “why you should assume Lady Caroline is not telling the truth.”

“I don’t assume—I know,” said Mrs. Wilkins.

“And pray how do you know?” asked Mrs. Fisher icily, for Mrs. Wilkins was actually helping herself to more maccaroni, offered her officiously and unnecessarily a second time by Francesca.

“When I was out there just now I saw inside her.”

Well, Mrs. Fisher wasn’t going to say anything to that; she wasn’t going to trouble to reply to downright idiocy. Instead she sharply rapped the little table-gong by her side, though there was Francesca standing at the sideboard, and said, for she would wait no longer for her next course, “Serve me.”

And Francesca—it must have been wilful—offered her the maccaroni again.

Chapter 10

There was no way of getting into or out of the top garden at San Salvatore except through the two glass doors, unfortunately side by side, of the dining-room and the hall. A person in the garden who wished to escape unseen could not, for the person to be escaped from would be met on the way. It was a small, oblong garden, and concealment was impossible. What trees there were—the Judas tree, the tamarisk, the umbrella-pine—grew close to the low parapets. Rose bushes gave no real cover; one step to right or left of them, and the person wishing to be private was discovered. Only the north-west corner was a little place jutting out from the great wall, a kind of excrescence or loop, no doubt used in the old distrustful days for observation, where it was possible to sit really unseen, because between it and the house was a thick clump of daphne.

Scrap, after glancing round to see that no one was looking, got up and carried her chair into this place, stealing away as carefully on tiptoe as those steal whose purpose is sin. There was another excrescence on the walls just like it at the north-east corner, but this, though the view from it was almost more beautiful, for from it you could see the bay and the lovely mountains behind Mezzago, was exposed. No bushes grew near it, nor had it any shade. The north-west loop then was where she would sit, and she settled into it, and nestling her head in her cushion and putting her feet comfortably on the parapet, from whence they appeared to the villagers on the piazza below as two white doves, thought that now indeed she would be safe.

Mrs. Fisher found her there, guided by the smell of her cigarette. The incautious Scrap had not thought of that. Mrs. Fisher did not smoke herself, and all the more distinctly could she smell the smoke of others. The virile smell met her directly she went out into the garden from the dining-room after lunch in order to have her coffee. She had bidden Francesca set the coffee in the shade of the house just outside the glass door, and when Mrs. Wilkins, seeing a table being carried there, reminded her, very officiously and tactlessly Mrs. Fisher considered, that Lady Caroline wanted to be alone, she retorted—and with what propriety—that the garden was for everybody.

Into it accordingly she went, and was immediately aware that Lady Caroline was smoking. She said to herself, “These modern young women,” and proceeded to find her; her stick, now that lunch was over, being no longer the hindrance to action that it was before her meal had been securely, as Browning once said—surely it was Browning? Yes, she remembered how much diverted

she had been—roped in.

Nobody diverted her now, reflected Mrs. Fisher, making straight for the clump of daphne; the world had grown very dull, and had entirely lost its sense of humour. Probably they still had their jokes, these people—in fact she knew they did, for _Punch_ still went on; but how differently it went on, and what jokes. Thackeray, in his inimitable way, would have made mincemeat of this generation. Of how much it needed the tonic properties of that astringent pen it was of course unaware. It no longer even held him—at least, so she had been informed—in any particular esteem. Well, she could not give it eyes to see and ears to hear and a heart to understand, but she could and would give it, represented and united in the form of Lady Caroline, a good dose of honest medicine.

“I hear you are not well,” she said, standing in the narrow entrance of the loop and looking down with the inflexible face of one who is determined to do good at the motionless and apparently sleeping Scrap.

Mrs. Fisher had a deep voice, very like a man’s, for she had been overtaken by that strange masculinity that sometimes pursues a woman during the last laps of her life.

Scrap tried to pretend that she was asleep, but if she had been her cigarette would not have been held in her fingers but would have been lying on the ground.

She forgot this. Mrs. Fisher did not, and coming inside the loop, sat down on a narrow stone seat built out of the wall. For a little she could sit on it; for a little, till the chill began to penetrate.

She contemplated the figure before her. Undoubtedly a pretty creature, and one that would have had a success at Farringford. Strange how easily even the greatest men were moved by exteriors. She had seen with her own eyes Tennyson turn away from everybody—turn, positively, his back on a crowd of eminent people assembled to do him honour, and withdraw to the window with a young person nobody had ever heard of, who had been brought there by accident and whose one and only merit—if it be a merit, that which is conferred by chance—was beauty. Beauty! All over before you can turn round. An affair, one might almost say, of minutes. Well, while it lasted it did seem able to do what it liked with men. Even husbands were not immune. There had been passages in the life of Mr. Fisher . . .

“I expect the journey has upset you,” she said in her deep voice. “What you want is a good dose of some simple medicine. I shall ask Domenico if there is such a thing in the village as castor oil.”

Scrap opened her eyes and looked straight at Mrs. Fisher.

“Ah,” said Mrs. Fisher, “I knew you were not asleep. If you had been you would have let your cigarette fall to the ground.”

Scrap threw the cigarette over the parapet.

“Waste,” said Mrs. Fisher. “I don’t like smoking for women, but I still less like waste.”

“What _does_ one do with people like this?” Scrap asked herself, her eyes fixed on Mrs. Fisher in what felt to her an indignant stare but appeared to Mrs. Fisher as really charming docility.

“Now you’ll take my advice,” said Mrs. Fisher, touched, “and not neglect what may very well turn into an illness. We are in Italy, you know, and one has to be careful. You ought, to begin with, to go to bed.”

“I never go to bed,” snapped Scrap; and it sounded as moving, as forlorn, as that line spoken years and years ago by an actress playing the part of Poor Jo in dramatised version of Bleak House—“I’m always moving on,” said Poor Jo in this play, urged to do so by a policeman; and Mrs. Fisher, then a girl, had laid her head on the red velvet parapet of the front row of the dress circle and wept aloud.

It was wonderful, Scrap’s voice. It had given her, in the ten years since she came out, all the triumphs that intelligence and wit can have, because it made whatever she said seem memorable. She ought, with a throat formation like that, to have been a singer, but in every kind of music Scrap was dumb except this one music of the speaking voice; and what a fascination, what a spell lay in that. Such was the loveliness of her face and the beauty of her colouring that there was not a man into whose eyes at the sight of her there did not leap a flame of intensest interest; but, when he heard her voice, the flame in that man’s eyes was caught and fixed. It was the same with every man, educated and uneducated, old, young, desirable themselves or undesirable, men of her own world and bus-conductors, generals and Tommies—during the war she had had a perplexing time—bishops equally with vergers—round

about her confirmation startling occurrences had taken place—wholesome and unwholesome, rich and penniless, brilliant or idiotic; and it made no difference at all what they were, or how long and securely married: into the eyes of every one of them, when they saw her, leapt this flame, and when they heard her it stayed there.

Scrap had had enough of this look. It only led to difficulties. At first it had delighted her. She had been excited, triumphant. To be apparently incapable of doing or saying the wrong thing, to be applauded, listened to, petted, adored wherever she went, and when she came home to find nothing there either but the most indulgent proud fondness—why, how extremely pleasant. And so easy, too. No preparation necessary for this achievement, no hard work, nothing to learn. She need take no trouble. She had only to appear, and presently say something.

But gradually experiences gathered round her. After all, she had to take trouble, she had to make efforts, because, she discovered with astonishment and rage, she had to defend herself. That look, that leaping look, meant that she was going to be grabbed at. Some of those who had it were more humble than others, especially if they were young, but they all, according to their several ability, grabbed; and she who had entered the world so jauntily, with her head in the air and the completest confidence in anybody whose hair was grey, began to distrust, and then to dislike, and soon to shrink away from, and presently to be indignant. Sometimes it was just as if she didn't belong to herself, wasn't her own at all, but was regarded as a universal thing, a sort of beauty-of-all-work. Really men . . . And she found herself involved in queer, vague quarrels, being curiously hated. Really women . . . And when the war came, and she flung herself into it along with everybody else, it finished her. Really generals . . .

The war finished Scrap. It killed the one man she felt safe with, whom she would have married, and it finally disgusted her with love. Since then she had been embittered. She was struggling as angrily in the sweet stuff of life as a wasp got caught in honey. Just as desperately did she try to unstick her wings. It gave her no pleasure to outdo other women; she didn't want their tiresome men. What could one do with men when one had got them? None of them would talk to her of anything but the things of love, and how foolish and fatiguing that became after a bit. It was as though a healthy person with a normal hunger was given nothing whatever to eat but sugar. Love, love . . . the very word made her want to slap somebody. "_Why_ should I love you? _Why_ should I?" she would ask amazed sometimes when somebody was trying—somebody was always trying—to propose to her. But she never got a real answer, only further incoherence.

A deep cynicism took hold of the unhappy Scrap. Her inside grew hoary with disillusionment, while her gracious and charming outside continued to make the world more beautiful. What had the future in it for her? She would not be able, after such a preparation, to take hold of it. She was fit for nothing; she had wasted all this time being beautiful. Presently she wouldn't be beautiful, and what then? Scrap didn't know what then, it appalled her to wonder even. Tired as she was of being conspicuous she was at least used to that, she had never known anything else; and to become inconspicuous, to fade, to grow shabby and dim, would probably be most painful. And once she began, what years and years of it there would be! Imagine, thought Scrap, having most of one's life at the wrong end. Imagine being old for two or three times as long as being young. Stupid, stupid. Everything was stupid. There wasn't a thing she wanted to do. There were thousands of things she didn't want to do. Avoidance, silence, invisibility, if possible unconsciousness—these negations were all she asked for at the moment; and here, even here, she was not allowed a minute's peace, and this absurd woman must come pretending, merely because she wanted to exercise power and make her go to bed and make her—hideous—drink castor oil, that she thought she was ill.

"I'm sure," said Mrs. Fisher, who felt the cold of the stone beginning to come through and knew she could not sit much longer, "you'll do what is reasonable. Your mother would wish—have you a mother?"

A faint wonder came into Scrap's eyes. Have you a mother? If ever anybody had a mother it was Scrap. It had not occurred to her that there could be people who had never heard of her mother. She was one of the major marchionesses—there being, as no one knew better than Scrap, marchionesses and marchionesses—and had held high positions at Court. Her father, too, in his day had been most prominent. His day was a little over, poor dear, because in the war he had made some important mistakes, and besides he was now grown old; still, there he was, an excessively well-known person. How restful, how extraordinarily restful to have found some one who had never heard of any of her lot, or at least had not yet connected her with them.

She began to like Mrs. Fisher. Perhaps the originals didn't know anything about her either. When she first wrote to them and signed her name, that great name of Dester which twisted in and out of English history like a bloody thread, for its bearers constantly killed, she had taken it for granted that they would know who she was; and at the interview in Shaftesbury Avenue she was sure they did know, because they hadn't asked, as they otherwise would have, for references.

Scrap began to cheer up. If nobody at San Salvatore had ever heard of her, if for a whole month she could shed herself, get right away from everything connected with herself, be allowed really to forget the clinging and the clogging and all the noise, why, perhaps she might make something of herself after all. She might really think; really clear up her mind; really come to some conclusion.

“What I want to do here,” she said, leaning forward in her chair and clasping her hands round her knees and looking up at Mrs. Fisher, whose seat was higher than hers, almost with animation, so much pleased was she that Mrs. Fisher knew nothing about her, “is to come to a conclusion. That’s all. It isn’t much to want, is it? Just that.”

She gazed at Mrs. Fisher, and thought that almost any conclusion would do; the great thing was to get hold of something, catch something tight, cease to drift.

Mrs. Fisher’s little eyes surveyed her. “I should say,” she said, “that what a young woman like you wants is a husband and children.”

“Well, that’s one of the things I’m going to consider,” said Scrap amiably. “But I don’t think it would be a conclusion.”

“And meanwhile,” said Mrs. Fisher, getting up, for the cold of the stone was now through, “I shouldn’t trouble my head if I were you with considerings and conclusions. Women’s heads weren’t made for thinking, I assure you. I should go to bed and get well.”

“I am well,” said Scrap.

“Then why did you send a message that you were ill?”

“I didn’t.”

“Then I’ve had all the trouble of coming out here for nothing.”

“But wouldn’t you prefer coming out and finding me well than coming out and finding me ill?” asked Scrap, smiling.

Even Mrs. Fisher was caught by the smile.

“Well, you’re a pretty creature,” she said forgivingly. “It’s a pity you weren’t born fifty years ago. My friends would have liked looking at you.”

“I’m very glad I wasn’t,” said Scrap. “I dislike being looked at.”

“Absurd,” said Mrs. Fisher, growing stern again. “That’s what you are made for, young women like you. For what else, pray? And I assure you that if my friends had looked at you, you would have been looked at by some very great people.”

“I dislike very great people,” said Scrap, frowning. There had been an incident quite recently—really potentates. . .

“What _I_ dislike,” said Mrs. Fisher, now as cold as the stone she had got up from, “is the pose of the modern young woman. It seems to me pitiful, positively pitiful, in its silliness.”

And, her stick crunching the pebbles, she walked away.

“That’s all right,” Scrap said to herself, dropping back into her comfortable position with her head in the cushion and her feet on the parapet; if only people would go away she didn’t in the least mind why they went.

“Don’t you think darling Scrap is growing a little, just a little, peculiar?” her mother had asked her father a short time before that latest peculiarity of the flight to San Salvatore, uncomfortably struck by the very odd things Scrap said and the way she had taken to slinking out of reach whenever she could and avoiding everybody except—such a sign of age—quite young men, almost boys.

“Eh? What? Peculiar? Well, let her be peculiar if she likes. A woman with her looks can be any damned thing she pleases,” was the infatuated answer.

“I do let her,” said her mother meekly; and indeed if she did not, what difference would it make?

Mrs. Fisher was sorry she had bothered about Lady Caroline. She went along the hall towards her private sitting-room, and her stick as she went struck the stone floor with a vigour in harmony with her feelings. Sheer silliness, these poses. She had no patience with them. Unable to be or do anything of themselves, the young of the present generation tried to achieve a reputation for

cleverness by decrying all that was obviously great and obviously good and by praising everything, however obviously bad, that was different. Apes, thought Mrs. Fisher, roused. Apes. Apes. And in her sitting-room she found more apes, or what seemed to her in her present mood more, for there was Mrs. Arbuthnot placidly drinking coffee, while at the writing-table, the writing-table she already looked upon as sacred, using her pen, her own pen brought for her hand alone from Prince of Wales Terrace, sat Mrs. Wilkins writing; at the table; in her room; with her pen.

“Isn’t this a delightful place?” said Mrs. Arbuthnot cordially. “We have just discovered it.”

“I’m writing to Mellersh,” said Mrs. Wilkins, turning her head and also cordially—as though, Mrs. Fisher thought, she cared a straw who she was writing to and anyhow knew who the person she called Mellersh was. “He’ll want to know,” said Mrs. Wilkins, optimism induced by her surroundings, “that I’ve got here safely.”

Chapter 11

The sweet smells that were everywhere in San Salvatore were alone enough to produce concord. They came into the sitting-room from the flowers on the battlements, and met the ones from the flowers inside the room, and almost, thought Mrs. Wilkins, could be seen greeting each other with a holy kiss. Who could be angry in the middle of such gentlenesses? Who could be acquisitive, selfish, in the old rasped London way, in the presence of this bounteous beauty?

Yet Mrs. Fisher seemed to be all three of these things.

There was so much beauty, so much more than enough for every one, that it did appear to be a vain activity to try and make a corner in it.

Yet Mrs. Fisher was trying to make a corner in it, and had railed off a portion for her exclusive use.

Well, she would get over that presently; she would get over it inevitably, Mrs. Wilkins was sure, after a day or two in the extraordinary atmosphere of peace in that place.

Meanwhile she obviously hadn’t even begun to get over it. She stood looking at her and Rose with an expression that appeared to be one of anger. Anger. Fancy. Silly old nerve-racked London feelings, thought Mrs. Wilkins, whose eyes saw the room full of kisses, and everybody in it being kissed, Mrs. Fisher as copiously as she herself and Rose.

“You don’t like us being in here,” said Mrs. Wilkins, getting up and at once, after her manner, fixing on the truth. “Why?”

“I should have thought,” said Mrs. Fisher leaning on her stick, “you could have seen that it is my room.”

“You mean because of the photographs,” said Mrs. Wilkins.

Mrs. Arbuthnot, who was a little red and surprised, got up too.

“And the notepaper,” said Mrs. Fisher. “Notepaper with my London address on it. That pen—”

She pointed. It was still in Mrs. Wilkins’s hand.

“Is yours. I’m very sorry,” said Mrs. Wilkins, laying it on the table. And she added smiling, that it had just been writing some very amiable things.

“But why,” asked Mrs. Arbuthnot, who found herself unable to acquiesce in Mrs. Fisher’s arrangements without at least a gentle struggle, “ought we not to be here? It’s a sitting-room.”

“There is another one,” said Mrs. Fisher. “You and your friend cannot sit in two rooms at once, and if I have no wish to disturb you in yours I am unable to see why you should wish to disturb me in mine.”

“But why—” began Mrs. Arbuthnot again.

“It’s quite natural,” Mrs. Wilkins interrupted, for Rose was looking stubborn; and turning to Mrs. Fisher she said that although sharing things with friends was pleasant she could understand that Mrs. Fisher, still steeped in the Prince of Wales Terrace attitude to life, did not yet want to, but that she would get rid of that after a bit and feel quite different. “Soon you’ll want us to share,” said Mrs. Wilkins reassuringly. “Why, you may even get so far as _asking_ me to use your pen if you knew I hadn’t got one.”

Mrs. Fisher was moved almost beyond control by this speech. To have a ramshackle young woman from Hampstead patting her on the back as it were, in breezy certitude that quite soon she would improve, stirred her more deeply than anything had stirred her since her first discovery that Mr. Fisher was not what he seemed. Mrs. Wilkins must certainly be curbed. But how? There was a curious imperviousness about her. At that moment, for instance, she was smiling as pleasantly and with as unclouded a face as if she were saying nothing in the least impertinent. Would she know she was being curbed? If she didn't know, if she were too tough to feel it, then what? Nothing, except avoidance; except, precisely, one's own private sitting-room.

"I'm an old woman," said Mrs. Fisher, "and I need a room to myself. I cannot get about, because of my stick. As I cannot get about I have to sit. Why should I not sit quietly and undisturbed, as I told you in London I intended to? If people are to come in and out all day long, chattering and leaving doors open, you will have broken the agreement, which was that I was to be quiet."

"But we haven't the least wish—" began Mrs. Arbuthnot, who was again cut short by Mrs. Wilkins.

"We're only too glad," said Mrs. Wilkins, "for you to have this room if it makes you happy. We didn't know about it, that's all. We wouldn't have come in if we had—not till you invited us, anyhow. I expect," she finished looking down cheerfully at Mrs. Fisher, "you soon will." And picking up her letter she took Mrs. Arbuthnot's hand and drew her towards the door.

Mrs. Arbuthnot did not want to go. She, the mildest of women, was filled with a curious and surely unchristian desire to stay and fight. Not, of course, really, nor even with any definitely aggressive words. No; she only wanted to reason with Mrs. Fisher, and to reason patiently. But she did feel that something ought to be said, and that she ought not to allow herself to be rated and turned out as if she were a schoolgirl caught in ill behaviour by Authority.

Mrs. Wilkins, however, drew her firmly to and through the door, and once again Rose wondered at Lotty, at her balance, her sweet and equable temper—she who in England had been such a thing of gusts. From the moment they got into Italy it was Lotty who seemed the elder. She certainly was very happy; blissful, in fact. Did happiness so completely protect one? Did it make one so untouchable, so wise? Rose was happy herself, but not anything like _so_ happy. Evidently not, for not only did she want to fight Mrs. Fisher but she wanted something else, something more than this lovely place, something to complete it; she wanted Frederick. For the first time in her life she was surrounded by perfect beauty, and her one thought was to show it to him, to share it with him. She wanted Frederick. She yearned for Frederick. Ah, if only, only Frederick . . .

"Poor old thing," said Mrs. Wilkins, shutting the door gently on Mrs. Fisher and her triumph. "Fancy on a day like this."

"She's a very rude old thing," said Mrs. Arbuthnot.

"She'll get over that. I'm sorry we chose just her room to go and sit in."

"It's much the nicest," said Mrs. Arbuthnot. "And it isn't hers."

"Oh but there are lots of other places, and she's such a poor old thing. Let her have the room. Whatever does it matter?"

And Mrs. Wilkins said she was going down to the village to find out where the post-office was and post her letter to Mellersh, and would Rose go too.

"I've been thinking about Mellersh," said Mrs. Wilkins as they walked, one behind the other, down the narrow zigzag path up which they had climbed in the rain the night before.

She went first. Mrs. Arbuthnot, quite naturally now, followed. In England it had been the other way about—Lotty, timid, hesitating, except when she burst out so awkwardly, getting behind the calm and reasonable Rose whenever she could.

"I've been thinking about Mellersh," repeated Mrs. Wilkins over her shoulder, as Rose seemed not to have heard.

"Have you?" said Rose, a faint distaste in her voice, for her experiences with Mellersh had not been of a kind to make her enjoy remembering him. She had deceived Mellersh; therefore she didn't like him. She was unconscious that this was the reason of her dislike, and thought it was that there didn't seem to be much, if any, of the grace of God about him. And yet how wrong to feel that, she rebuked herself, and how presumptuous. No doubt Lotty's husband was far, far nearer to God than she herself was ever likely to be. Still, she didn't like him.

"I've been a mean dog," said Mrs. Wilkins.

“A what?” asked Mrs. Arbuthnot, incredulous of her hearing.

“All this coming away and leaving him in that dreary place while I rollick in heaven. He had planned to take me to Italy for Easter himself. Did I tell you?”

“No,” said Mrs. Arbuthnot; and indeed she had discouraged talk about husbands. Whenever Lotty had begun to blurt out things she had swiftly changed the conversation. One husband led to another, in conversation as well as in life, she felt, and she could not, she would not, talk of Frederick. Beyond the bare fact that he was there, he had not been mentioned. Mellersh had had to be mentioned, because of his obstructiveness, but she had carefully kept him from overflowing outside the limits of necessity.

“Well, he did,” said Mrs. Wilkins. “He had never done such a thing in his life before, and I was horrified. Fancy—just as I had planned to come to it myself.”

She paused on the path and looked up at Rose.

“Yes,” said Rose, trying to think of something else to talk about.

“Now you see why I say I’ve been a mean dog. _He_ had planned a holiday in Italy with me, and _I_ had planned a holiday in Italy leaving him at home. I think,” she went on, her eyes fixed on Rose’s face, “Mellersh has every reason to be both angry and hurt.”

Mrs. Arbuthnot was astonished. The extraordinary quickness with which, hour by hour, under her very eyes, Lotty became more selfless, disconcerted her. She was turning into something surprisingly like a saint. Here she was now being affectionate about Mellersh—Mellersh, who only that morning, while they hung their feet into the sea, had seemed a mere iridescence, Lotty had told her, a thing of gauze. That was only that morning; and by the time they had had lunch Lotty had developed so far as to have got him solid enough again to write to, and to write to at length. And now, a few minutes later, she was announcing that he had every reason to be angry with her and hurt, and that she herself had been—the language was unusual, but it did express real penitence—a mean dog.

Rose stared at her astonished. If she went on like this, soon a nimbus might be expected round her head, was there already, if one didn’t know it was the sun through the tree-trunks catching her sandy hair.

A great desire to love and be friends, to love everybody, to be friends with everybody, seemed to be invading Lotty—a desire for sheer goodness. Rose’s own experience was that goodness, the state of being good, was only reached with difficulty and pain. It took a long time to get to it; in fact one never did get to it, or, if for a flashing instant one did, it was only for a flashing instant. Desperate perseverance was needed to struggle along its path, and all the way was dotted with doubts. Lotty simply flew along. She had certainly, thought Rose, not got rid of her impetuousness. It had merely taken another direction. She was now impetuously becoming a saint. Could one really attain goodness so violently? Wouldn’t there be an equally violent reaction?

“I shouldn’t,” said Rose with caution, looking down into Lotty’s bright eyes—the path was steep, so that Lotty was well below her—“I shouldn’t be sure of that too quickly.”

“But I am sure of it, and I’ve written and told him so.”

Rose stared. “Why, but only this morning—” she began.

“It’s all in this,” interrupted Lotty, tapping the envelope and looking pleased.

“What—everything?”

“You mean about the advertisement and my savings being spent? Oh no—not yet. But I’ll tell him all that when he comes.”

“When he comes?” repeated Rose.

“I’ve invited him to come and stay with us.”

Rose could only go on staring.

“It’s the least I could do. Besides—look at this.” Lotty waved her hand. “Disgusting not to share it. I was a mean dog to go off and leave him, but no dog I’ve ever heard of was ever as mean as I’d be if I didn’t try and persuade Mellersh to come out and enjoy this too. It’s barest decency that he should have some of the fun out of my nest-egg. After all, he has housed me and fed me for years.

One shouldn't be churlish."

"But—do you think he'll come?"

"Oh, I _hope_ so," said Lotty with the utmost earnestness; and added, "Poor lamb."

At that Rose felt she would like to sit down. Mellersh a poor lamb? That same Mellersh who a few hours before was mere shimmer? There was a seat at the bend of the path, and Rose went to it and sat down. She wished to get her breath, gain time. If she had time she might perhaps be able to catch up the leaping Lotty, and perhaps be able to stop her before she committed herself to what she probably presently would be sorry for. Mellersh at San Salvatore? Mellersh, from whom Lotty had taken such pains so recently to escape?

"I _see_ him here," said Lotty, as if in answer to her thoughts.

Rose looked at her with real concern: for every time Lotty said in that convinced voice, "I _see_," what she saw came true. Then it was to be supposed that Mr. Wilkins too would presently come true.

"I wish," said Rose anxiously, "I understood you."

"Don't try," said Lotty, smiling.

"But I must, because I love you."

"Dear Rose," said Lotty, swiftly bending down and kissing her.

"You're so quick," said Rose. "I can't follow your developments. I can't keep touch. It was what happened with Freder—"

She broke off and looked frightened.

"The whole idea of our coming here," she went on again, as Lotty didn't seem to have noticed, "was to get away, wasn't it? Well, we've got away. And now, after only a single day of it, you want to write to the very people—"

She stopped.

"The very people we were getting away from," finished Lotty. "It's quite true. It seems idiotically illogical. But I'm so happy, I'm so well, I feel so fearfully wholesome. This place—why, it makes me feel _flooded_ with love."

And she stared down at Rose in a kind of radiant surprise.

Rose was silent a moment. Then she said, "And do you think it will have the same effect on Mr. Wilkins?"

Lotty laughed. "I don't know," she said. "But even if it doesn't, there's enough love about to flood fifty Mr. Wilkinses, as you call him. The great thing is to have lots of love _about_. I don't see," she went on, "at least I don't see here, though I did at home, that it matters who loves as long as somebody does. I was a stingy beast at home, and used to measure and count. I had a queer obsession about justice. As though justice mattered. As though justice can really be distinguished from vengeance. It's only love that's any good. At home I wouldn't love Mellersh unless he loved me back, exactly as much, absolute fairness. Did you ever. And as he didn't, neither did I, and the _aridity_ of that house! The _aridity_ . . ."

Rose said nothing. She was bewildered by Lotty. One odd effect of San Salvatore on her rapidly developing friend was her sudden free use of robust words. She had not used them in Hampstead. Beast and dog were more robust than Hampstead cared about. In words, too, Lotty had come unchained.

But how she wished, oh how Rose wished, that she too could write to her husband and say "Come." The Wilkins _ménage_, however pompous Mellersh might be, and he had seemed to Rose pompous, was on a healthier, more natural footing than hers. Lotty could write to Mellersh and would get an answer. She couldn't write to Frederick, for only too well did she know he wouldn't answer. At least, he might answer—a hurried scribble, showing how much bored he was at doing it, with perfunctory thanks for her letter. But that would be worse than no answer at all; for his handwriting, her name on an envelope addressed by him, stabbed her heart. Too acutely did it bring back the letters of their beginnings together, the letters from him so desolate with separation, so aching with love and longing. To see apparently one of these very same letters arrive, and open it and find:

Dear Rose—Thanks for letter. Glad you're having a good time. Don't hurry back. Say if you want any money. Everything going splendidly here.—Yours, Frederick.

—no, it couldn't be borne.

"I don't think I'll come down to the village with you to-day," she said, looking up at Lotty with eyes suddenly gone dim. "I think I want to think."

"All right," said Lotty, at once starting off briskly down the path. "But don't think too long," she called back over her shoulder. "Write and invite him at once."

"Invite whom?" asked Rose, startled.

"Your husband."

Chapter 12

At the evening meal, which was the first time the whole four sat round the dining-room table together, Scrap appeared.

She appeared quite punctually, and in one of those wrappers or tea-gowns which are sometimes described as ravishing. This one really was ravishing. It certainly ravished Mrs. Wilkins, who could not take her eyes off the enchanting figure opposite. It was a shell-pink garment, and clung to the adorable Scrap as though it, too, loved her.

"What a beautiful dress!" exclaimed Mrs. Wilkins eagerly.

"What—this old rag?" said Scrap, glancing down at it as if to see which one she had got on. "I've had it a hundred years." And she concentrated on her soup.

"You must be very cold in it," said Mrs. Fisher, thin-lipped; for it showed a great deal of Scrap—the whole of her arms, for instance, and even where it covered her up it was so thin that you still saw her.

"Who—me?" said Scrap, looking up a moment. "Oh, no."

And she continued her soup.

"You mustn't catch a chill, you know," said Mrs. Arbuthnot, feeling that such loveliness must at all costs be preserved unharmed. "There's a great difference here when the sun goes down."

"I'm quite warm," said Scrap, industriously eating her soup.

"You look as if you had nothing at all on underneath," said Mrs. Fisher.

"I haven't. At least, hardly anything," said Scrap, finishing her soup.

"How very imprudent," said Mrs. Fisher, "and how highly improper."

Whereupon Scrap stared at her.

Mrs. Fisher had arrived at dinner feeling friendly towards Lady Caroline. She at least had not intruded into her room and sat at her table and written with her pen. She did, Mrs. Fisher had supposed, know how to behave. Now it appeared that she did not know, for was this behaving, to come dressed—no, undressed—like that to a meal? Such behaviour was not only exceedingly improper but also most inconsiderate, for the indelicate creature would certainly catch a chill, and then infect the entire party. Mrs. Fisher had a great objection to other people's chills. They were always the fruit of folly; and then they were handed on to her, who had done nothing at all to deserve them.

"Bird-brained," thought Mrs. Fisher, sternly contemplating Lady Caroline. "Not an idea in her head except vanity."

"But there are no men here," said Mrs. Wilkins, "so how can it be improper? Have you noticed," she inquired of Mrs. Fisher, who endeavoured to pretend she did not hear, "how difficult it is to be improper without men?"

Mrs. Fisher neither answered her nor looked at her; but Scrap looked at her, and did that with her mouth which in any other mouth would have been a faint grin. Seen from without, across the bowl of nasturtiums, it was the most beautiful of brief and dimpled smiles.

She had a very alive sort of face, that one, thought Scrap, observing Mrs. Wilkins with a dawn of interest. It was rather like a field of corn swept by lights and shadows. Both she and the dark one, Scrap noticed, had changed their clothes, but only in order to put on silk jumpers. The same amount of trouble would have been enough to dress them properly, reflected Scrap. Naturally they looked like nothing on earth in the jumpers. It didn't matter what Mrs. Fisher wore; indeed, the only thing for her, short of plumes and ermine, was what she did wear. But these others were quite young still, and quite attractive. They really definitely had faces. How different life would be for them if they made the most of themselves instead of the least. And yet—Scrap was suddenly bored, and turned away her thoughts and absently ate toast. What did it matter? If you did make the best of yourself, you only collected people round you who ended by wanting to grab.

"I've had the most wonderful day," began Mrs. Wilkins, her eyes shining.

Scrap lowered hers. "Oh," she thought, "she's going to gush."

"As though anybody were interested in her day," thought Mrs. Fisher, lowering hers also.

In fact, whenever Mrs. Wilkins spoke Mrs. Fisher deliberately cast down her eyes. Thus would she mark her disapproval. Besides, it seemed the only safe thing to do with her eyes, for no one could tell what the uncurbed creature would say next. That which she had just said, for instance, about men—addressed too, to her—what could she mean? Better not conjecture, thought Mrs. Fisher; and her eyes, though cast down, yet saw Lady Caroline stretch out her hand to the Chianti flask and fill her glass again.

Again. She had done it once already, and the fish was only just going out of the room. Mrs. Fisher could see that the other respectable member of the party, Mrs. Arbuthnot, was noticing it too. Mrs. Arbuthnot was, she hoped and believed, respectable and well-meaning. It is true she also had invaded her sitting-room, but no doubt she had been dragged there by the other one, and Mrs. Fisher had little if anything against Mrs. Arbuthnot, and observed with approval that she only drank water. That was as it should be. So, indeed, to give her her dues, did the freckled one; and very right at their age. She herself drank wine, but with what moderation: one meal, one glass. And she was sixty-five, and might properly, and even beneficially, have had at least two.

"That," she said to Lady Caroline, cutting right across what Mrs. Wilkins was telling them about her wonderful day and indicating the wine-glass, "is very bad for you."

Lady Caroline, however, could not have heard, for she continued to sip, her elbow on the table, and listen to what Mrs. Wilkins was saying.

And what was it she was saying? She had invited somebody to come and stay? A man?

Mrs. Fisher could not credit her ears. Yet it evidently was a man, for she spoke of the person as he.

Suddenly and for the first time—but then this was most important—Mrs. Fisher addressed Mrs. Wilkins directly. She was sixty-five, and cared very little what sorts of women she happened to be with for a month, but if the women were to be mixed with men it was a different proposition altogether. She was not going to be made a cat's-paw of. She had not come out there to sanction by her presence what used in her day to be called fast behaviour. Nothing had been said at the interview in London about men; if there had been she would have declined, of course, to come.

"What is his name?" asked Mrs. Fisher, abruptly interposing.

Mrs. Wilkins turned to her with a slight surprise. "Wilkins," she said.

"Wilkins?"

"Yes."

"Your name?"

"And his."

"A relation?"

“Not blood.”

“A connection?”

“A husband.”

Mrs. Fisher once more cast down her eyes. She could not talk to Mrs. Wilkins. There was something about the things she said. . . “A husband.” Suggesting one of many. Always that unseemly twist to everything. Why could she not say “My husband”? Besides, Mrs. Fisher had, she herself knew not for what reason, taken both the Hampstead young women for widows. War ones. There had been an absence of mention of husbands at the interview which would not, she considered, be natural if such persons did after all exist. And if a husband was not a relation, who was? “Not blood.” What a way to talk. Why, a husband was the first of all relations. How well she remembered Ruskin—no, it was not Ruskin, it was the Bible that said a man should leave his father and mother and cleave only to his wife; showing that she became by marriage an even more than blood relation. And if the husband’s father and mother were to be nothing to him compared to his wife, how much less than nothing ought the wife’s father and mother be to her compared to her husband. She herself had been unable to leave her father and mother in order to cleave to Mr. Fisher because they were no longer, when she married, alive, but she certainly would have left them if they had been there to leave. Not blood, indeed. Silly talk.

The dinner was very good. Succulence succeeded succulence. Costanza had determined to do as she chose in the matter of cream and eggs the first week, and see what happened at the end of it when the bills had to be paid. Her experience of the English was that they were quiet about bills. They were shy of words. They believed readily. Besides, who was the mistress here? In the absence of a definite one, it occurred to Costanza that she might as well be the mistress herself. So she did as she chose about the dinner, and it was very good.

The four, however, were so much preoccupied by their own conversation that they ate it without noticing how good it was. Even Mrs. Fisher, she who in such matters was manly, did not notice. The entire excellent cooking was to her as though it were not; which shows how much she must have been stirred.

She was stirred. It was that Mrs. Wilkins. She was enough to stir anybody. And she was undoubtedly encouraged by Lady Caroline, who, in her turn, was no doubt influenced by the Chianti.

Mrs. Fisher was very glad there were no men present, for they certainly would have been foolish about Lady Caroline. She was precisely the sort of young woman to unbalance them; especially, Mrs. Fisher recognised, at that moment. Perhaps it was the Chianti momentarily intensifying her personality, but she was undeniably most attractive; and there were few things Mrs. Fisher disliked more than having to look on while sensible, intelligent men, who the moment before were talking seriously and interestingly about real matters, became merely foolish and simpering—she had seen them actually simpering—just because in walked a bit of bird-brained beauty. Even Mr. Gladstone, that great wise statesman, whose hand had once rested for an unforgettable moment solemnly on her head, would have, she felt, on perceiving Lady Caroline left off talking sense and horribly embarked on badinage.

“You see,” Mrs. Wilkins said—a silly trick that, with which she mostly began her sentences; Mrs. Fisher each time wished to say, “Pardon me—I do not see, I hear”—but why trouble?—“You see,” said Mrs. Wilkins, leaning across towards Lady Caroline, “we arranged, didn’t we, in London that if any of us wanted to we could each invite one guest. So now I’m doing it.”

“I don’t remember that,” said Mrs. Fisher, her eyes on her plate.

“Oh yes, we did—didn’t we, Rose?”

“Yes—I remember,” said Lady Caroline. “Only it seemed so incredible that one could ever want to. One’s whole idea was to get away from one’s friends.”

“And one’s husbands.”

Again that unseemly plural. But how altogether unseemly, thought Mrs. Fisher. Such implications. Mrs. Arbuthnot clearly thought so too, for she had turned red.

“And family affection,” said Lady Caroline—or was it the Chianti speaking? Surely it was the Chianti.

“And the want of family affection,” said Mrs. Wilkins—what a light she was throwing on her home life and real character.

“That wouldn’t be so bad,” said Lady Caroline. “I’d stay with that. It would give one room.”

“Oh no, no—it’s dreadful,” cried Mrs. Wilkins. “It’s as if one had no clothes on.”

“But I like that,” said Lady Caroline.

“Really—” said Mrs. Fisher.

“It’s a divine feeling, getting rid of things,” said Lady Caroline, who was talking altogether to Mrs. Wilkins and paid no attention to the other two.

“Oh, but in a bitter wind to have nothing on and know there never will be anything on and you going to get colder and colder till at last you die of it—that’s what it was like, living with somebody who didn’t love one.”

These confidences, thought Mrs. Fisher . . . and no excuse whatever for Mrs. Wilkins, who was making them entirely on plain water. Mrs. Arbuthnot, judging from her face, quite shared Mrs. Fisher’s disapproval; she was fidgeting.

“But didn’t he?” asked Lady Caroline—every bit as shamelessly unreticent as Mrs. Wilkins.

“Mellersh? He showed no signs of it.”

“Delicious,” murmured Lady Caroline.

“Really—” said Mrs. Fisher.

“I didn’t think it was at all delicious. I was miserable. And now, since I’ve been here, I simply stare at myself being miserable. As miserable as that. And about Mellersh.”

“You mean he wasn’t worth it.”

“Really—” said Mrs. Fisher.

“No, I don’t. I mean I’ve suddenly got well.”

Lady Caroline, slowly twisting the stem of her glass in her fingers, scrutinised the lit-up face opposite.

“And now I’m well I find I can’t sit here and gloat all to myself. I can’t be happy, shutting him out. I must share. I understand exactly what the Blessed Damozel felt like.”

“What was the Blessed Damozel?” asked Scrap.

“Really—” said Mrs. Fisher; and with such emphasis this time that Lady Caroline turned to her.

“Ought I to know?” she asked. “I don’t know any natural history. It sounds like a bird.”

“It is a poem,” said Mrs. Fisher with extraordinary frost.

“Oh,” said Scrap.

“I’ll lend it to you,” said Mrs. Wilkins, over whose face laughter rippled.

“No,” said Scrap.

“And its author,” said Mrs. Fisher icily, “though not perhaps quite what one would have wished him to be, was frequently at my father’s table.”

“What a bore for you,” said Scrap. “That’s what mother’s always doing—inviting authors. I hate authors. I wouldn’t mind them so much if they didn’t write books. Go on about Mellersh,” she said, turning to Mrs. Wilkins.

“Really—” said Mrs. Fisher.

“All those empty beds,” said Mrs. Wilkins.

“What empty beds?” asked Scrap.

“The ones in this house. Why, of course they each ought to have somebody happy inside them. Eight beds, and only four people. It’s dreadful, dreadful to be so greedy and keep everything just for oneself. I want Rose to ask her husband out too. You and Mrs. Fisher haven’t got husbands, but why not give some friend a glorious time?”

Rose bit her lip. She turned red, she turned pale. If only Lotty would keep quiet, she thought. It was all very well to have suddenly become a saint and want to love everybody, but need she be so tactless? Rose felt that all her poor sore places were being danced on. If only Lotty would keep quiet . . .

And Mrs. Fisher, with even greater frostiness than that with which she had received Lady Caroline’s ignorance of the Blessed Damozel, said, “There is only one unoccupied bedroom in this house.”

“Only one?” echoed Mrs. Wilkins, astonished. “Then who are in all the others?”

“We are,” said Mrs. Fisher.

“But we’re not in all the bedrooms. There must be at least six. That leaves two over, and the owner told us there were eight beds—didn’t he Rose?”

“There are six bedrooms,” said Mrs. Fisher; for both she and Lady Caroline had thoroughly searched the house on arriving, in order to see which part of it they would be most comfortable in, and they both knew that there were six bedrooms, two of which were very small, and in one of these small ones Francesca slept in the company of a chair and a chest of drawers, and the other, similarly furnished, was empty.

Mrs. Wilkins and Mrs. Arbuthnot had hardly looked at the house, having spent most of their time out-of-doors gaping at the scenery, and had, in the agitated inattentiveness of their minds when first they began negotiating for San Salvatore, got into their heads that the eight beds of which the owner spoke were the same as eight bedrooms; which they were not. There were indeed eight beds, but four of them were in Mrs. Wilkins’s and Mrs. Arbuthnot’s rooms.

“There are six bedrooms,” repeated Mrs. Fisher. “We have four, Francesca has the fifth, and the sixth is empty.”

“So that,” said Scrap, “however kind we feel we would be if we could, we can’t. Isn’t it fortunate?”

“But then there’s only room for one?” said Mrs. Wilkins, looking round at the three faces.

“Yes—and you’ve got him,” said Scrap.

Mrs. Wilkins was taken aback. This question of the beds was unexpected. In inviting Mellersh she had intended to put him in one of the four spare-rooms that she imagined were there. When there were plenty of rooms and enough servants there was no reason why they should, as they did in their small, two-servanted house at home, share the same one. Love, even universal love, the kind of love with which she felt herself flooded, should not be tried. Much patience and self-effacement were needed for successful married sleep. Placidity; a steady faith; these too were needed. She was sure she would be much fonder of Mellersh, and he not mind her nearly so much, if they were not shut up together at night, if in the morning they could meet with the cheery affection of friends between whom lies no shadow of differences about the window or the washing arrangements, or of absurd little choked-down resentments at something that had seemed to one of them unfair. Her happiness, she felt, and her ability to be friends with everybody, was the result of her sudden new freedom and its peace. Would there be that sense of freedom, that peace, after a night shut up with Mellersh? Would she be able in the morning to be full towards him, as she was at that moment full, of nothing at all but loving-kindness? After all, she hadn’t been very long in heaven. Suppose she hadn’t been in it long enough for her to have become fixed in blandness? And only that morning what an extraordinary joy it had been to find herself alone when she woke, and able to pull the bed-clothes any way she liked!

Francesca had to nudge her. She was so much absorbed that she did not notice the pudding.

“If,” thought Mrs. Wilkins, distractedly helping herself, “I share my room with Mellersh I risk losing all I now feel about him. If on the other hand I put him in the one spare-room, I prevent Mrs. Fisher and Lady Caroline from giving somebody a treat. True they don’t seem to want to at present, but at any moment in this place one or the other of them may be seized with a desire to make somebody happy, and then they wouldn’t be able to because of Mellersh.”

“What a problem,” she said aloud, her eyebrows puckered.

“What is?” asked Scrap.

“Where to put Mellersh.”

Scrap stared. “Why, isn’t one room enough for him?” she asked.

“Oh yes, quite. But then there won’t be any room left at all—any room for somebody you may want to invite.”

“I shan’t want to,” said Scrap.

“Or _you_,” said Mrs. Wilkins to Mrs. Fisher. “Rose, of course, doesn’t count. I’m sure she would like sharing her room with her husband. It’s written all over her.”

“Really—” said Mrs. Fisher.

“Really what?” asked Mrs. Wilkins, turning hopefully to her, for she thought the word this time was the preliminary to a helpful suggestion.

It was not. It stood by itself. It was, as before, mere frost.

Challenged, however, Mrs. Fisher did fasten it on to a sentence. “Really am I to understand,” she asked, “that you propose to reserve the one spare-room for the exclusive use of your own family?”

“He isn’t my own family,” said Mrs. Wilkins. “He’s my husband. You see—”

“I see nothing,” Mrs. Fisher could not this time refrain from interrupting—for what an intolerable trick. “At the most I hear, and that reluctantly.”

But Mrs. Wilkins, as impervious to rebuke as Mrs. Fisher had feared, immediately repeated the tiresome formula and launched out into a long and excessively indelicate speech about the best place for the person she called Mellersh to sleep in.

Mellersh—Mrs. Fisher, remembering the Thomases and Johns and Alfreds and Roberts of her day, plain names that yet had all become glorious, thought it sheer affectation to be christened Mellersh—was, it seemed, Mrs. Wilkins’s husband, and therefore his place was clearly indicated. Why this talk? She herself, as if foreseeing his arrival, had had a second bed put in Mrs. Wilkins’s room. There were certain things in life which were never talked about but only done. Most things connected with husbands were not talked about; and to have a whole dinner-table taken up with a discussion as to where one of them should sleep was an affront to the decencies. How and where husbands slept should be known only to their wives. Sometimes it was not known to them, and then the marriage had less happy moments; but these moments were not talked about either; the decencies continued to be preserved. At least, it was so in her day. To have to hear whether Mr. Wilkins should or should not sleep with Mrs. Wilkins, and the reasons why he should and the reasons why he shouldn’t, was both uninteresting and indelicate.

She might have succeeded in imposing propriety and changing the conversation if it had not been for Lady Caroline. Lady Caroline encouraged Mrs. Wilkins, and threw herself into the discussion with every bit as much unreserve as Mrs. Wilkins herself. No doubt she was impelled on this occasion by Chianti, but whatever the reason there it was. And, characteristically, Lady Caroline was all for Mr. Wilkins being given the solitary spare-room. She took that for granted. Any other arrangement would be impossible, she said; her expression was, “Barbarous.” Had she never read her Bible, Mrs. Fisher was tempted to inquire—_And they two shall be one flesh?_ Clearly also, then, one room. But Mrs. Fisher did not inquire. She did not care even to allude to such texts to some one unmarried.

However, there was one way she could force Mr. Wilkins into his proper place and save the situation: she could say she herself intended to invite a friend. It was her right. They had all said so. Apart from propriety, it was monstrous that Mrs. Wilkins should want to monopolise the one spare-room, when in her own room was everything necessary for her husband. Perhaps she really would invite somebody—not invite, but suggest coming. There was Kate Lumley, for instance. Kate could perfectly afford to come and pay her share; and she was of her own period and knew, and had known, most of the people she herself knew and had known. Kate, of course, had only been on the fringe; she used to be asked only to the big parties, not to the small ones, and she still was only on the fringe. There were some people who never got off the fringe, and Kate was one. Often, however, such people were more permanently agreeable to be with than the others, in that they remained grateful.

Yes; she might really consider Kate. The poor soul had never married, but then everybody could not expect to marry, and she was quite comfortably off—not too comfortably, but just comfortably enough to pay her own expenses if she came and yet be grateful. Yes; Kate was the solution. If she came, at one stroke, Mrs. Fisher saw, would the Wilkinses be regularised and Mrs. Wilkins be prevented from having more than her share of the rooms. Also, Mrs. Fisher would save herself from isolation; spiritual isolation. She desired physical isolation between meals, but she disliked that isolation which is of the spirit. Such isolation would, she feared, certainly be hers with these three alien-minded young women. Even Mrs. Arbuthnot was, owing to her friendship with Mrs. Wilkins, necessarily alien-minded. In Kate she would have a support. Kate, without intruding on her sitting-room, for Kate was tractable, would be there at meals to support her.

Mrs. Fisher said nothing at the moment; but presently in the drawing-room, when they were gathered round the wood fire—she had discovered there was no fireplace in her own sitting-room, and therefore she would after all be forced, so long as the evenings remained cool, to spend them in the other room—presently, while Francesca was handing coffee round and Lady Caroline was poisoning the air with smoke, Mrs. Wilkins, looking relieved and pleased, said: “Well, if nobody really wants that room, and wouldn’t use it anyhow, I shall be very glad if Mellersh may have it.”

“Of course he must have it,” said Lady Caroline.

Then Mrs. Fisher spoke.

“I have a friend,” she said in her deep voice; and sudden silence fell upon the others.

“Kate Lumley,” said Mrs. Fisher.

Nobody spoke.

“Perhaps,” continued Mrs. Fisher, addressing Lady Caroline, “you know her?”

No, Lady Caroline did not know Kate Lumley; and Mrs. Fisher, without asking the others if they did, for she was sure they knew no one, proceeded. “I wish to invite her to join me,” said Mrs. Fisher.

Complete silence.

Then Scrap said, turning to Mrs. Wilkins, “That settles Mellersh, then.”

“It settles the question of Mr. Wilkins,” said Mrs. Fisher, “although I am unable to understand that there should ever have been a question, in the only way that is right.”

“I’m afraid you’re in for it, then,” said Lady Caroline, again to Mrs. Wilkins. “Unless,” she added, “he can’t come.”

But Mrs. Wilkins, her brow perturbed—for suppose after all she were not yet quite stable in heaven?—could only say, a little uneasily, “I _see_ him here.”

Chapter 13

The uneventful days—only outwardly uneventful—slipped by in floods of sunshine, and the servants, watching the four ladies, came to the conclusion there was very little life in them.

To the servants San Salvatore seemed asleep. No one came to tea, nor did the ladies go anywhere to tea. Other tenants in other springs had been far more active. There had been stir and enterprise; the boat had been used; excursions had been made; Beppo’s fly was ordered; people from Mezzago came over and spent the day; the house rang with voices; even sometimes champagne had been drunk. Life was varied, life was interesting. But this? What was this? The servants were not even scolded. They were left completely to themselves. They yawned.

Perplexing, too, was the entire absence of gentlemen. How could gentlemen keep away from so much beauty? For, added up, and even after the subtraction of the old one, the three younger ladies produced a formidable total of that which gentlemen usually sought.

Also the evident desire of each lady to spend long hours separated from the other ladies puzzled the servants. The result was a deathly stillness in the house, except at meal-times. It might have been as empty as it had been all the winter, for any sounds of life

there were. The old lady sat in her room, alone; the dark-eyed lady wandered off alone, loitering, so Domenico told them, who sometimes came across her in the course of his duties, incomprehensibly among the rocks; the very beautiful fair lady lay in her low chair in the top garden, alone; the less, but still beautiful fair lady went up the hills and stayed up them for hours, alone; and every day the sun blazed slowly round the house, and disappeared at evening into the sea, and nothing at all had happened.

The servants yawned.

Yet the four visitors, while their bodies sat—that was Mrs. Fisher's—or lay—that was Lady Caroline's—or loitered—that was Mrs. Arbuthnot's—or went in solitude up into the hills—that was Mrs. Wilkins's—were anything but torpid really. Their minds were unusually busy. Even at night their minds were busy, and the dreams they had were clear, thin, quick things, entirely different from the heavy dreams of home. There was that in the atmosphere of San Salvatore which produced active-mindedness in all except the natives. They, as before, whatever the beauty around them, whatever the prodigal seasons did, remained immune from thoughts other than those they were accustomed to. All their lives they had seen, year by year, the amazing recurrent spectacle of April in the gardens, and custom had made it invisible to them. They were as blind to it, as unconscious of it, as Domenico's dog asleep in the sun.

The visitors could not be blind to it—it was too arresting after London in a particularly wet and gloomy March. Suddenly to be transported to that place where the air was so still that it held its breath, where the light was so golden that the most ordinary things were transfigured—to be transported into that delicate warmth, that caressing fragrance, and to have the old grey castle as the setting, and, in the distance, the serene clear hills of Perugini's backgrounds, was an astonishing contrast. Even Lady Caroline, used all her life to beauty, who had been everywhere and seen everything, felt the surprise of it. It was, that year, a particularly wonderful spring, and of all the months at San Salvatore April, if the weather was fine, was best. May scorched and withered; March was restless, and could be hard and cold in its brightness; but April came along softly like a blessing, and if it were a fine April it was so beautiful that it was impossible not to feel different, not to feel stirred and touched.

Mrs. Wilkins, we have seen, responded to it instantly. She, so to speak, at once flung off all her garments and dived straight into glory, unhesitatingly, with a cry of rapture.

Mrs. Arbuthnot was stirred and touched, but differently. She had odd sensations—presently to be described.

Mrs. Fisher, being old, was of a closer, more impermeable texture, and offered more resistance; but she too had odd sensations, also in their place to be described.

Lady Caroline, already amply acquainted with beautiful houses and climates, to whom they could not come quite with the same surprise, yet was very nearly as quick to react as Mrs. Wilkins. The place had an almost instantaneous influence on her as well, and of one part of this influence she was aware: it had made her, beginning on the very first evening, want to think, and acted on her curiously like a conscience. What this conscience seemed to press upon her notice with an insistence that startled her—Lady Caroline hesitated to accept the word, but it would keep on coming into her head—was that she was tawdry.

Tawdry. She. Fancy.

She must think that out.

The morning after the first dinner together, she woke up in a condition of regret that she should have been so talkative to Mrs. Wilkins the night before. What had made her be, she wondered. Now, of course, Mrs. Wilkins would want to grab, she would want to be inseparable; and the thought of a grabbing and an inseparableness that should last four weeks made Scrap's spirit swoon within her. No doubt the encouraged Mrs. Wilkins would be lurking in the top garden waiting to waylay her when she went out, and would hail her with morning cheerfulness. How much she hated being hailed with morning cheerfulness—or indeed, hailed at all. She oughtn't to have encouraged Mrs. Wilkins the night before. Fatal to encourage. It was bad enough not to encourage, for just sitting there and saying nothing seemed usually to involve her, but actively to encourage was suicidal. What on earth had made her? Now she would have to waste all the precious time, the precious, lovely time for thinking in, for getting square with herself, in shaking Mrs. Wilkins off.

With great caution and on the tips of her toes, balancing herself carefully lest the pebbles should scrunch, she stole out when she was dressed to her corner; but the garden was empty. No shaking off was necessary. Neither Mrs. Wilkins nor anybody else was to be seen. She had it entirely to herself. Except for Domenico, who presently came and hovered, watering his plants, again especially

all the plants that were nearest her, no one came out at all; and when, after a long while of following up thoughts which seemed to escape her just as she had got them, and dropping off exhausted to sleep in the intervals of this chase, she felt hungry and looked at her watch and saw that it was past three, she realised that nobody had even bothered to call her in to lunch. So that, Scrap could not but remark, if any one was shaken off it was she herself.

Well, but how delightful, and how very new. Now she would really be able to think, uninterruptedly. Delicious to be forgotten.

Still, she was hungry; and Mrs. Wilkins, after that excessive friendliness the night before, might at least have told her lunch was ready. And she had really been excessively friendly—so nice about Mellersh's sleeping arrangements, wanting him to have the spare-room and all. She wasn't usually interested in arrangements, in fact she wasn't ever interested in them; so that Scrap considered she might be said almost to have gone out of her way to be agreeable to Mrs. Wilkins. And, in return, Mrs. Wilkins didn't even bother whether or not she had any lunch.

Fortunately, though she was hungry, she didn't mind missing a meal. Life was full of meals. They took up an enormous proportion of one's time; and Mrs. Fisher was, she was afraid, one of those persons who at meals linger. Twice now had she dined with Mrs. Fisher, and each time she had been difficult at the end to dislodge, lingering on slowly cracking innumerable nuts and slowly drinking a glass of wine that seemed as if it would never be finished. Probably it would be a good thing to make a habit of missing lunch, and as it was quite easy to have tea brought out to her, and as she breakfasted in her room, only once a day would she have to sit at the dining-room table and endure the nuts.

Scrap burrowed her head comfortably in the cushions, and with her feet crossed on the low parapet gave herself up to more thought. She said to herself, as she had said at intervals throughout the morning: Now I'm going to think. But, never having thought out anything in her life, it was difficult. Extraordinary how one's attention wouldn't stay fixed; extraordinary how one's mind slipped sideways. Settling herself down to a review of her past as a preliminary to the consideration of her future, and hunting in it to begin with for any justification of that distressing word tawdry, the next thing she knew was that she wasn't thinking about this at all, but had somehow switched on to Mr. Wilkins.

Well, Mr. Wilkins was quite easy to think about, though not pleasant. She viewed his approach with misgivings. For not only was it a profound and unexpected bore to have a man added to the party, and a man, too, of the kind she was sure Mr. Wilkins must be, but she was afraid—and her fear was the result of a drearily unvarying experience—that he might wish to hang about her.

This possibility had evidently not yet occurred to Mrs. Wilkins, and it was not one to which she could very well draw her attention; not, that is, without being too fatuous to live. She tried to hope that Mr. Wilkins would be a wonderful exception to the dreadful rule. If only he were, she would be so much obliged to him that she believed she might really quite like him.

But—she had misgivings. Suppose he hung about her so that she was driven from her lovely top garden; suppose the light in Mrs. Wilkins's funny, flickering face was blown out. Scrap felt she would particularly dislike this to happen to Mrs. Wilkins's face, yet she had never in her life met any wives, not any at all, who had been able to understand that she didn't in the least want their husbands. Often she had met wives who didn't want their husbands either, but that made them none the less indignant if they thought somebody else did, and none the less sure, when they saw them hanging round Scrap, that she was trying to get them. Trying to get them! The bare thought, the bare recollection of these situations, filled her with a boredom so extreme that it instantly sent her to sleep again.

When she woke up she went on with Mr. Wilkins.

Now if, thought Scrap, Mr. Wilkins were not an exception and behaved in the usual way, would Mrs. Wilkins understand, or would it just simply spoil her holiday? She seemed quick, but would she be quick about just this? She seemed to understand and see inside one, but would she understand and see inside one when it came to Mr. Wilkins?

The experienced Scrap was full of doubts. She shifted her feet on the parapet; she jerked a cushion straight. Perhaps she had better try and explain to Mrs. Wilkins, during the days still remaining before the arrival—explain in a general way, rather vague and talking at large—her attitude towards such things. She might also expound to her her peculiar dislike of people's husbands, and her profound craving to be, at least for this one month, let alone.

But Scrap had her doubts about this too. Such talk meant a certain familiarity, meant embarking on a friendship with Mrs. Wilkins; and if, after having embarked on it and faced the peril it contained of too much Mrs. Wilkins, Mr. Wilkins should turn out to be

artful—and people did get very artful when they were set on anything—and manage after all to slip through into the top garden, Mrs. Wilkins might easily believe she had been taken in, and that she, Scrap, was deceitful. Deceitful! And about Mr. Wilkins. Wives were really pathetic.

At half-past four she heard sounds of saucers on the other side of the daphne bushes. Was tea being sent out to her?

No; the sounds came no closer, they stopped near the house. Tea was to be in the garden, in her garden. Scrap considered she might at least have been asked if she minded being disturbed. They all knew she sat there.

Perhaps some one would bring hers to her in her corner.

No; nobody brought anything.

Well, she was too hungry not to go and have it with the others to-day, but she would give Francesca strict orders for the future.

She got up, and walked with that slow grace which was another of her outrageous number of attractions towards the sounds of tea. She was conscious not only of being very hungry but of wanting to talk to Mrs. Wilkins again. Mrs. Wilkins had not grabbed, she had left her quite free all day in spite of the _rapprochement_ the night before. Of course she was an original, and put on a silk jumper for dinner, but she hadn't grabbed. This was a great thing. Scrap went towards the tea-table quite looking forward to Mrs. Wilkins; and when she came in sight of it she saw only Mrs. Fisher and Mrs. Arbuthnot.

Mrs. Fisher was pouring out the tea, and Mrs. Arbuthnot was offering Mrs. Fisher macaroons. Every time Mrs. Fisher offered Mrs. Arbuthnot anything—her cup, or milk, or sugar—Mrs. Arbuthnot offered her macaroons—pressed them on her with an odd assiduousness, almost with obstinacy. Was it a game? Scrap wondered, sitting down and seizing a macaroon.

"Where is Mrs. Wilkins?" asked Scrap.

They did not know. At least, Mrs. Arbuthnot, on Scrap's inquiry, did not know; Mrs. Fisher's face, at the name, became elaborately uninterested.

It appeared that Mrs. Wilkins had not been seen since breakfast. Mrs. Arbuthnot thought she had probably gone for a picnic. Scrap missed her. She ate the enormous macaroons, the best and biggest she had ever come across, in silence. Tea without Mrs. Wilkins was dull; and Mrs. Arbuthnot had that fatal flavour of motherliness about her, of wanting to pet one, to make one very comfortable, coaxing one to eat—coaxing her, who was already so frankly, so even excessively, eating—that seemed to have dogged Scrap's steps through life. Couldn't people leave one alone? She was perfectly able to eat what she wanted unincited. She tried to quench Mrs. Arbuthnot's zeal by being short with her. Useless. The shortness was not apparent. It remained, as all Scrap's evil feelings remained, covered up by the impenetrable veil of her loveliness.

Mrs. Fisher sat monumentally, and took no notice of either of them. She had had a curious day, and was a little worried. She had been quite alone, for none of the three had come to lunch, and none of them had taken the trouble to let her know they were not coming; and Mrs. Arbuthnot, drifting casually into tea, had behaved oddly till Lady Caroline joined them and distracted her attention.

Mrs. Fisher was prepared not to dislike Mrs. Arbuthnot, whose parted hair and mild expression seemed very decent and womanly, but she certainly had habits that were difficult to like. Her habit of instantly echoing any offer made her of food or drink, of throwing the offer back on one, as it were, was not somehow what one expected of her. "Will you have some more tea?" was surely a question to which the answer was simply yes or no; but Mrs. Arbuthnot persisted in the trick she had exhibited the day before at breakfast, of adding to her yes or no the words, "Will _you?_" She had done it again that morning at breakfast and here she was doing it at tea—the two meals at which Mrs. Fisher presided and poured out. Why did she do it? Mrs. Fisher failed to understand.

But this was not what was worrying her; this was merely by the way. What was worrying her was that she had been quite unable that day to settle to anything, and had done nothing but wander restlessly from her sitting-room to her battlements and back again. It had been a wasted day, and how much she disliked waste. She had tried to read, and she had tried to write to Kate Lumley; but no—a few words read, a few lines written, and up she got again and went out on to the battlements and stared at the sea.

It did not matter that the letter to Kate Lumley should not be written. There was time enough for that. Let the others suppose her coming was definitely fixed. All the better. So would Mr. Wilkins be kept out of the spare-room and put where he belonged. Kate would keep. She could be held in reserve. Kate in reserve was just as potent as Kate in actuality, and there were points about Kate in reserve which might be missing from Kate in actuality. For instance, if Mrs. Fisher were going to be restless, she would rather

Kate were not there to see. There was a want of dignity about restlessness, about trotting backwards and forwards. But it did matter that she could not read a sentence of any of her great dead friends' writings; no, not even of Browning's, who had been so much in Italy, nor of Ruskin's, whose _Stones of Venice_ she had brought with her to re-read so nearly on the very spot; nor even a sentence of a really interesting book like the one she had found in her sitting-room about the home life of the German Emperor, poor man—written in the nineties, when he had not yet begun to be more sinned against than sinning, which was, she was firmly convinced, what was the matter with him now, and full of exciting things about his birth and his right arm and _accoucheurs_—without having to put it down and go and stare at the sea.

Reading was very important; the proper exercise and development of one's mind was a paramount duty. How could one read if one were constantly trotting in and out? Curious, this restlessness. Was she going to be ill? No, she felt well; indeed, unusually well, and she went in and out quite quickly—trotted, in fact—and without her stick. Very odd that she shouldn't be able to sit still, she thought, frowning across the tops of some purple hyacinths at the Gulf of Spezia glittering beyond a headland; very odd that she, who walked so slowly, with such dependence on her stick, should suddenly trot.

It would be interesting to talk to some one about it, she felt. Not to Kate—to a stranger. Kate would only look at her and suggest a cup of tea. Kate always suggested cups of tea. Besides, Kate had a flat face. That Mrs. Wilkins, now—annoying as she was, loose-tongued as she was, impertinent, objectionable, would probably understand, and perhaps know what was making her be like this. But she could say nothing to Mrs. Wilkins. She was the last person to whom one would admit sensations. Dignity alone forbade it. Confide in Mrs. Wilkins? Never.

And Mrs. Arbuthnot, while she wistfully mothered the obstructive Scrap at tea, felt too that she had had a curious day. Like Mrs. Fisher's, it had been active, but, unlike Mrs. Fisher's, only active in mind. Her body had been quite still; her mind had not been still at all, it had been excessively active. For years she had taken care to have no time to think. Her scheduled life in the parish had prevented memories and desires from intruding on her. That day they had crowded. She went back to tea feeling dejected, and that she should feel dejected in such a place with everything about her to make her rejoice, only dejected her the more. But how could she rejoice alone? How could anybody rejoice and enjoy and appreciate, really appreciate, alone? Except Lotty. Lotty seemed able to. She had gone off down the hill directly after breakfast, alone yet obviously rejoicing, for she had not suggested that Rose should go too, and she was singing as she went.

Rose had spent the day by herself, sitting with her hands clasping her knees, staring straight in front of her. What she was staring at were the grey swords of the agaves, and, on their tall stalks, the pale irises that grew in the remote place she had found, while beyond them, between the grey leaves and the blue flowers, she saw the sea. The place she had found was a hidden corner where the sun-baked stones were padded with thyme, and nobody was likely to come. It was out of sight and sound of the house; it was off any path; it was near the end of the promontory. She sat so quiet that presently lizards darted over her feet, and some tiny birds like finches, frightened away at first, came back again and flitted among the bushes round her just as if she hadn't been there. How beautiful it was. And what was the good of it with no one there, no one who loved being with one, who belonged to one, to whom one could say, "Look." And wouldn't one say, "Look—_dearest?_" Yes, one would say _dearest_ and the sweet word, just to say it to somebody who loved one, would make one happy.

She sat quite still, staring straight in front of her. Strange that in this place she did not want to pray. She who had prayed so constantly at home didn't seem able to do it here at all. The first morning she had merely thrown up a brief thank you to heaven on getting out of bed, and had gone straight to the window to see what everything looked like—thrown up the thank you as carelessly as a ball, and thought no more about it. That morning, remembering this and ashamed, she had knelt down with determination; but perhaps determination was bad for prayers, for she had been unable to think of a thing to say. And as for her bedtime prayers, on neither of the nights had she said a single one. She had forgotten them. She had been so much absorbed in other thoughts that she had forgotten them; and, once in bed, she was asleep and whirling along among bright, thin swift dreams before she had so much time as to stretch herself out.

What had come over her? Why had she let go the anchor of prayer? And she had difficulty, too, in remembering her poor, in remembering even that there were such things as poor. Holidays, of course, were good, and were recognised by everybody as good, but ought they so completely to blot out, to make such havoc of, the realities? Perhaps it was healthy to forget her poor; with all the greater gusto would she go back to them. But it couldn't be healthy to forget her prayers, and still less could it be healthy not to mind.

Rose did not mind. She knew she did not mind. And, even worse, she knew she did not mind not minding. In this place she was indifferent to both the things that had filled her life and made it seem as if it were happy for years. Well, if only she could rejoice in her wonderful new surroundings, have that much at least to set against the indifference, the letting go—but she could not. She had no work; she did not pray; she was left empty.

Lotty had spoilt her day that day, as she had spoilt her day the day before—Lotty, with her invitation to her husband, with her suggestion that she too should invite hers. Having flung Frederick into her mind again the day before, Lotty had left her; for the whole afternoon she had left her alone with her thoughts. Since then they had been all of Frederick. Where at Hampstead he came to her only in her dreams, here he left her dreams free and was with her during the day instead. And again that morning, as she was struggling not to think of him, Lotty had asked her, just before disappearing singing down the path, if she had written yet and invited him, and again he was flung into her mind and she wasn't able to get him out.

How could she invite him? It had gone on so long, their estrangement, such years; she would hardly know what words to use; and besides, he would not come. Why should he come? He didn't care about being with her. What could they talk about? Between them was the barrier of his work and her religion. She could not—how could she, believing as she did in purity, in responsibility for the effect of one's actions on others—bear his work, bear living by it; and he, she knew, had at first resented and then been merely bored by her religion. He had let her slip away; he had given her up; he no longer minded; he accepted her religion indifferently, as a settled fact. Both it and she—Rose's mind, becoming more luminous in the clear light of April at San Salvatore, suddenly saw the truth—bored him.

Naturally when she saw this, when that morning it flashed upon her for the first time, she did not like it; she liked it so little that for a space the whole beauty of Italy was blotted out. What was to be done about it? She could not give up believing in good and not liking evil, and it must be evil to live entirely on the proceeds of adulteries, however dead and distinguished they were. Besides, if she did, if she sacrificed her whole past, her bringing up, her work for the last ten years, would she bore him less? Rose felt right down at her very roots that if you have once thoroughly bored somebody it is next to impossible to unbore him. Once a bore always a bore—certainly, she thought, to the person originally bored.

Then, thought she, looking out to sea through eyes grown misty, better cling to her religion. It was better—she hardly noticed the reprehensibleness of her thought—than nothing. But oh, she wanted to cling to something tangible, to love something living, something that one could hold against one's heart, that one could see and touch and do things for. If her poor baby hadn't died . . . babies didn't get bored with one, it took them a long while to grow up and find one out. And perhaps one's baby never did find one out; perhaps one would always be to it, however old and bearded it grew, somebody special, somebody different from every one else, and if for no other reason, precious in that one could never be repeated.

Sitting with dim eyes looking out to sea she felt an extraordinary yearning to hold something of her very own tight to her bosom. Rose was slender, and as reserved in figure as in character, yet she felt a queer sensation of—how could she describe it?—bosom. There was something about San Salvatore that made her feel all bosom. She wanted to gather to her bosom, to comfort and protect, soothing the dear head that should lie on it with softest strokings and murmurs of love. Frederick, Frederick's child—come to her, pillowed on her, because they were unhappy, because they had been hurt. . . They would need her then, if they had been hurt; they would let themselves be loved then, if they were unhappy.

Well, the child was gone, would never come now; but perhaps Frederick—some day—when he was old and tired . . .

Such were Mrs. Arbuthnot's reflections and emotions that first day at San Salvatore by herself. She went back to tea dejected as she had not been for years. San Salvatore had taken her carefully built-up semblance of happiness away from her, and given her nothing in exchange. Yes—it had given her yearnings in exchange, this ache and longing, this queer feeling of bosom; but that was worse than nothing. And she who had learned balance, who never at home was irritated but always able to be kind, could not, even in her dejection, that afternoon endure Mrs. Fisher's assumption of the position as hostess at tea.

One would have supposed that such a little thing would not have touched her, but it did. Was her nature changing? Was she to be not only thrown back on long-stifled yearnings after Frederick, but also turned into somebody who wanted to fight over little things? After tea, when both Mrs. Fisher and Lady Caroline had disappeared again—it was quite evident that nobody wanted her—she was more dejected than ever, overwhelmed by the discrepancy between the splendour outside her, the warm, teeming beauty and self-sufficiency of nature, and the blank emptiness of her heart.

Then came Lotty, back to dinner, incredibly more freckled, exuding the sunshine she had been collecting all day, talking, laughing, being tactless, being unwise, being without reticence; and Lady Caroline, so quiet at tea, woke up to animation, and Mrs. Fisher was not so noticeable, and Rose was beginning to revive a little, for Lotty's spirits were contagious as she described the delights of her day, a day which might easily to any one else have had nothing in it but a very long and very hot walk and sandwiches, when she suddenly said catching Rose's eye, "Letter gone?"

Rose flushed. This tactlessness . . .

"What letter?" asked Scrap, interested. Both her elbows were on the table and her chin was supported in her hands, for the nut-stage had been reached, and there was nothing for it but to wait in as comfortable as position as possible till Mrs. Fisher had finished cracking.

"Asking her husband here," said Lotty.

Mrs. Fisher looked up. Another husband? Was there to be no end to them? Nor was this one, then, a widow either; but her husband was no doubt a decent, respectable man, following a decent, respectable calling. She had little hope of Mr. Wilkins; so little, that she had refrained from inquiring what he did.

"Has it?" persisted Lotty, as Rose said nothing.

"No," said Rose.

"Oh, well—to-morrow then," said Lotty.

Rose wanted to say No again to this. Lotty would have in her place, and would, besides, have expounded all her reasons. But she could not turn herself inside out like that and invite any and everybody to come and look. How was it that Lotty, who saw so many things, didn't see stuck on her heart, and seeing keep quiet about it, the sore place that was Frederick?

"Who is your husband?" asked Mrs. Fisher, carefully adjusting another nut between the crackers.

"Who should he be," said Rose quickly, roused at once by Mrs. Fisher to irritation, "except _Mr._ Arbuthnot?"

"I mean, of course, what is Mr. Arbuthnot?"

And Rose, gone painfully red at this, said after a tiny pause, "My husband."

Naturally, Mrs. Fisher was incensed. She couldn't have believed it of this one, with her decent hair and gentle voice, that she too should be impertinent.

Chapter 14

That first week the wistaria began to fade, and the flowers of the Judas-tree and peach-trees fell off and carpeted the ground with rose-colour. Then all the freesias disappeared, and the irises grew scarce. And then, while these were clearing themselves away, the double banksia roses came out, and the big summer roses suddenly flaunted gorgeously on the walls and trellises. Fortune's Yellow was one of them; a very beautiful rose. Presently the tamarisk and the daphnes were at their best, and the lilies at their tallest. By the end of the week the fig-trees were giving shade, the plum-blossom was out among the olives, the modest weigelias appeared in their fresh pink clothes, and on the rocks sprawled masses of thick-leaved, star-shaped flowers, some vivid purple and some a clear, pale lemon.

By the end of the week, too, Mr. Wilkins arrived; even as his wife had foreseen he would, so he did. And there were signs almost of eagerness about his acceptance of her suggestion, for he had not waited to write a letter in answer to hers, but had telegraphed.

That, surely, was eager. It showed, Scrap thought, a definite wish for reunion; and watching his wife's happy face, and aware of her desire that Mellersh should enjoy his holiday, she told herself that he would be a very unusual fool should he waste his time bothering about anybody else. "If he isn't nice to her," Scrap thought, "he shall be taken to the battlements and tipped over." For, by the end of the week, she and Mrs. Wilkins had become Caroline and Lotty to each other, and were friends.

Mrs. Wilkins had always been friends, but Scrap had struggled not to be. She had tried hard to be cautious, but how difficult was caution with Mrs. Wilkins! Free herself from every vestige of it, she was so entirely unreserved, so completely expansive, that soon

Scrap, almost before she knew what she was doing, was being unreserved too. And nobody could be more unreserved than Scrap, once she let herself go.

The only difficulty about Lotty was that she was nearly always somewhere else. You couldn't catch her; you couldn't pin her down to come and talk. Scrap's fears that she would grab seemed grotesque in retrospect. Why, there was no grab in her. At dinner and after dinner were the only times one really saw her. All day long she was invisible, and would come back in the late afternoon looking a perfect sight, her hair full of bits of moss, and her freckles worse than ever. Perhaps she was making the most of her time before Mellersh arrived to do all the things she wanted to do, and meant to devote herself afterwards to going about with him, tidy and in her best clothes.

Scrap watched her, interested in spite of herself, because it seemed so extraordinary to be as happy as all that on so little. San Salvatore was beautiful, and the weather was divine; but scenery and weather had never been enough for Scrap, and how could they be enough for somebody who would have to leave them quite soon and go back to life in Hampstead? Also, there was the imminence of Mellersh, of that Mellersh from whom Lotty had so lately run. It was all very well to feel one ought to

[... TRUNCATED at 800,000 chars for file-size management — full text in original source ...]

==========

Untitled

Unknown

Project Gutenberg Release: September 30, 2015 · eBook #50095

THE WORKS

OF

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

[Illustration]

THE WORKS OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

EDITED BY

WILLIAM GEORGE CLARK, M.A. FELLOW AND TUTOR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, AND PUBLIC ORATOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE;

AND WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A. LIBRARIAN OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

VOLUME IV

~Cambridge and London:~ MACMILLAN AND CO. 1864.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

THE Preface vii

KING JOHN 3

Notes to King John 97

KING RICHARD II. 109

Notes to King Richard II. 223

THE FIRST PART OF KING HENRY IV. 233

Notes to The First Part of King Henry IV. 351

THE SECOND PART OF KING HENRY IV. 361

Notes to The Second Part of King Henry IV. 481

KING HENRY V. 491

Notes to King Henry V. 607

The Chronicle Historie of Henry the Fift &c. 615

PREFACE.

I. SHAKESPEARE'S KING JOHN was printed for the first time in the Folio of 1623. The poet adopted most of the characters, the general plot, and occasional lines, or fragments of lines, from an earlier play, in two parts, published in 1591, with the following

title-page:

The | Troublesome Raigne | of _Iohn_ King of _England_, with the dis-|_couerie of King_ Richard Cordelions | Base sonne (vulgarly named, The Ba-|stard Fawconbridge): _also the_ | death of King _Iohn_ at _Swinstead_ | _Abbey._ | _As it was (sundry times) publikely acted by the_ | _Queenes Maiesties Players, in the ho-_|_nourable Citie of London._ | Imprinted at London for _Sampson Clarke_, | _and are to be solde at his shop, on the backe-_|side of the _Royall Exchange_. | 1591. |

This play was reprinted for a different bookseller in 1611, with the words 'W. Sh.' added to the title; and a third edition in 1622, again issued by a different bookseller, has 'W. Shakespeare.'

There can be little doubt that the booksellers attributed the play to Shakespeare in the hope that so popular a name might help the sale, for although the earlier play is by no means devoid of merit, the evidence of its style conclusively proves that Shakespeare had no part in the authorship. We have therefore not reprinted it, but contented ourselves with indicating the passages borrowed verbally from it.

2. Of RICHARD II. four editions in Quarto were published before the appearance of the first Folio:

Q■. The | Tragedie of King Ri-|chard the se-|cond. | _As it hath beene publikely acted_ | _by the right Honourable the_ | _Lorde Chamberlaine his Ser'uants._ | LONDON | Printed by Valentine Simmes for Andrew Wise, and | are to be sold at his shop in Paules church yard at | the signe of the Angel. | 1597. |

Q■. The | Tragedie of King Ri-|chard the second. | As it hath beene publikely acted by the Right Ho-|nourable the Lord Chamberlaine his | seruants. | _By William Shake-speare._ | LONDON | Printed by Valentine Simmes for Andrew Wise, and | are to be sold at his shop in Paules churchyard at | the signe of the Angel. | 1598. |

Q■. The | Tragedie of King | Richard the second. | As it hath been publikely acted by the Right | Honourable the Lord Chamberlaine | his seruantes. | By _William Shake-speare_. | LONDON, | Printed by W. W. for _Mathew Law_, and are to be | sold at his shop in Paules Church-yard, at | the signe of the Foxe. | 1608. |

The same edition was also issued in the same year with the following title-page:

The | Tragedie of King | Richard the Second: | With new additions of the Parlia-|ment Sceane, and the deposing | of King Richard, | As it hath been lately acted by the Kinges | Maiesties seruantes, at the Globe. | By _William Shake-speare_. | At London, | Printed by W. W. for _Mathew Law_, and are to | be sold at his shop in Paules Church-yard, | at the signe of the Foxe. | 1608. |

Q■. The | Tragedie of King | Richard the Se-|cond: | _With new additions of the Parliament Sceane_, | _and the deposing of King_ | _Richard._ | As it hath been lately acted by the Kinges | Maiesties seruants, at the Globe. | _By_ WILLIAM SHAKE-SPEARE. | At LONDON, | Printed for _Mathew Law_, and are to be sold | at his shop in Paules Church-yard, at the | signe of the Foxe. | 1615. |

Each of these Quartos was printed from its immediate predecessor. The third however contains an important addition, found in all the extant copies of Q■, amounting to 165 lines, viz. IV. 1. 154-318. This is what is meant by 'the new additions of the Parliament scene' mentioned in the title-pages of some copies of Q■ and in that of Q■. These 'new additions' are found also in the first and following Folios and in Q■. The play, as given in the first Folio, was no doubt printed from a copy of Q■, corrected with some care and prepared for stage representation. Several passages have been left out with a view of shortening the performance. In the 'new additions of the Parliament Scene' it would appear that the defective text of the Quarto had been corrected from the author's MS. For this part therefore the first Folio is our highest authority: for all the rest of the play the first Quarto affords the best text.

The fifth Quarto (Q■) was printed from the second Folio (F■), but its readings sometimes agree with one or other of the earlier Quartos, and in a few cases are entirely independent of previous editions. Its title-page is as follows:

The | Life and | Death of King | Richard the | Second. | With new Additions of the | _Parliament Scene_, and the | Deposing of King _Richard_. | As it hath beene acted by the Kings Majesties | Servants, at the _Globe_. | By _William Shakespeare_. | London, Printed by Iohn Norton. | 1634. |

* * * * *

3. THE FIRST PART OF KING HENRY THE FOURTH appeared in six successive Quarto editions before the publication of the first Folio. The title-pages of the first five of these editions are given in full below. The version in the first Folio seems to have been

printed from a partially corrected copy of the fifth Quarto. In many places the readings coincide with those of the earlier Quartos, which were probably consulted by the corrector. The title of the play in the Folio is, 'The First Part of Henry the Fourth, with the Life and Death of Henry Sirnamed Hotspurre.' As there is no copy of the fourth Quarto in the Capell collection, our collation has been made from the copy in the Bodleian, and verified by that in the Devonshire Library. The deficiencies of Capell's copy of the third Quarto have been supplied by a collation of the Bodleian copy of that edition.

Q■. The | History of | Henrie the | Fovrth; | With the battell at Shrewsburie, | _betweene the King and Lord_ | Henry Percy, surnamed | Henrie Hotspur of | the North. | _With the humorous conceits of Sir_ | Iohn Falstalffe. | AT LONDON, | Printed by _P. S._ for _Andrew Wise_, dwelling | in Paules Churchyard, at the signe of | the Angell. 1598. |

Q■. The | History of | Henrie the | Fovrth; | With the battell at Shrewsburie, | _betweene the King and Lord_ Henry | Percy, _surnamed_ Henry Hot-|spur of the North. | _With the humorous conceits of Sir_ | Iohn Falstalffe. | Newly corrected by _W. Shakespeare_. | AT LONDON, | Printed by _S. S._ for _Andrew Wise_, dwelling | in Paules Churchyard, at the signe of | the Angell. 1599. |

Q■. The | History of | Henrie the fourth, | With the battell at Shrewsburie, | _betweene the King, and Lord_ | Henry Percy, surnamed Henry Hot-|_spur of the North._ | _With the humorous conceits of Sir_ | Iohn Falstaffe. | Newly corrected by _W. Shakespeare_. | London | Printed by Valentine Simmes, for _Mathew Law_, and | are to be solde at his shop in Paules Churchyard, | at the signe of the Fox. | 1604. |

Q■. The | History of | Henry the fourth, | With the battell at Shrewseburie, | _betweene the King, and Lord_ | Henry Percy, surnamed Henry | _Hotspur of the North._ | _With the humorous conceites of Sir_ | Iohn Falstalffe. | _Newly corrected by W. Shake-speare._ | London, | Printed for _Mathew Law_, and are to be sold at | his shop in Paules Church-yard, neere vnto S. | Augustines gate, at the signe of | the Foxe. 1608. |

Q■. The | History of | Henrie the fourth, | With the Battell at Shrewseburie, betweene | the King, and Lord Henrie Percy, sur-| named _Henrie Hotspur_ of the North. | With the humorous conceites of Sir | _Iohn Falstaffe_. | Newly corrected by _W. Shakespeare._ | LONDON, | Printed by W. W. for _Mathew Law_, and are to be sold | at his shop in Paules Church-yard, neere vnto S. | _Augustines_ Gate, at the signe of the Foxe. | 1613. |

Subsequent editions in Quarto were printed in 1622 (Q■) by T. P. for Mathew Law, in 1632 (Q■) by John Norton for William Sheares, and in 1639 (Q■) by John Norton for Hugh Perry. In all these the title-page is substantially the same. Each Quarto appears to have been printed from its predecessor.

The 'Dering MS.' quoted in our foot-notes was discovered in the muniment room at Surrenden by the Rev. Lambert B. Larking in 1844, and published in the following year for the Shakespeare Society under the editorship of Mr Halliwell. It contains a large portion of the First Part of Henry IV. and some scenes of the Second Part. Mr Halliwell believes it to have been written in the early part of the 17th century, certainly earlier than 1640, for the purpose of private theatrical performance. Some additions and corrections were made by the hand of 'Sir Edward Deryng, the first baronet, who died in 1644.' (_Introduction_, p. xii. ed. 1845.)

We are of opinion that this MS. was copied from the fifth Quarto of the First Part, and from a complete Quarto of the Second Part. The writer seems to have been both illiterate and careless. His punctuation is singularly bad, and his spelling peculiar to himself. We have noticed such various readings as seemed in any way remarkable.

* * * * *

4. THE SECOND PART OF KING HENRY THE FOURTH was first published in Quarto in 1600 with the following title-page:

THE | Second part of Henrie | the fourth, continuing to his death, | _and coronation of Henrie_ | the fift. | With the humours of sir Iohn Fal-| _staffe, and swaggering_ | Pistoll. | _As it hath been sundrie times publikely_ | acted by the right honourable, the Lord | Chamberlaine his seruants. | _Written by William Shakespeare._ | LONDON | Printed by V. S. for Andrew Wise, and | William Aspley. | 1600. |

In some copies of the Quarto the first scene of Act III. is left out altogether. The omission seems to have been discovered after part of the edition had been struck off and rectified by the insertion of two new leaves. In order to make this insertion, the type was taken to pieces in part of the preceding and subsequent leaves, so that there are two different impressions for the latter part of Act II. and the beginning of Act III. Sc. 2. Where this difference occurs we have used the symbols Q■, and Q■; where the two are identical we

use only Q.

The version in the first Folio was probably printed from a transcript of the original MS. It contains passages of considerable length which are not found in the Quarto. Some of these are among the finest in the play, and are too closely connected with the context to allow of the supposition that they were later additions inserted by the author after the publication of the Quarto. In the MS. from which that edition was printed, these passages had been most likely omitted, or erased, in order to shorten the play for the stage. The Folio in other places affords occasional readings which seem preferable to those of the Quarto, but for the most part the Quarto is to be regarded as having the higher critical value.

* * * * *

5. KING HENRY THE FIFTH appears in its present form for the first time in the Folio of 1623. An imperfect edition in quarto was printed surreptitiously in 1600, with the following title:

(Q■). The | Cronicle | History of Henry the fift, | With his battell fought at _Agin Court_ in | France. Togither with _Auntient_ | _Pistoll._ | _As it hath bene sundry times playd by the Right honorable_ | _the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants._ | LONDON Printed by _Thomas Creede_, for Tho. Milling-|ton, and Iohn Busby. And are to be | sold at his house in Carter Lane, next | the Powle head. 1600. |

The text of this edition is given literatim at the end of the present volume, with the readings of two reprints which appeared in 1602 and 1608 respectively. The title-pages of these are as follows:

(Q■). The | Chronicle | History of Henry the fift, | With his battell fought at _Agin Court_ | in _France_. Together with _Auntient_ | _Pistoll._ | _As it hath bene sundry times playd by the Right honorable_ | _the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants._ | LONDON | Printed by Thomas Creede, for Thomas | Pauier, and are to be sold at his shop in Cornhill, | at the signe of the Cat and Parrets neare | the Exchange. 1602. |

Q■. The | Chronicle History | of Henry the fift, with his | battell fought at _Agin Court_ in | France. Together with _an-_|_cient Pistoll._ | _As it hath bene sundry times playd by the Right Honou-_|_rable the Lord Chamberlaine his_ | _Seruants._ | Printed for T. P. 1608. |

The text of these Quarto editions is so imperfect and varies so much from the more authentic text of the Folio, that it was impossible to give the variations in our foot-notes. We are inclined to agree with Mr Collier and others in the supposition that the Quarto text was 'hastily made up from notes taken at the theatre during the performance, subsequently patched together.' The references to these Quartos are inclosed in brackets in accordance with the rule mentioned in the Preface to Vol. I. p. xxi.

It is scarcely necessary to add that 'The famous Victories of Henry the Fift,' published in 1617, has nothing to do with Shakespeare's play.

* * * * *

We have the pleasure of adding several new names to the list of our benefactors. Miss Thackeray, of Windsor, has been so kind as to lend us a copy of Nares's Glossary which belonged to her late father, the Provost of King's College, Cambridge, and is copiously annotated in his hand.

Mr Henry Wilbraham has obtained for us the loan of some valuable MS. notes on Shakespeare, compiled by the late Mr Roger Wilbraham, F.R.S., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, and now in the possession of Mr George Fortescue Wilbraham of Delamere House, Cheshire.

Dr C. M. Ingleby and Mr G. R. French have sent us valuable communications, the former with reference to difficulties in the text, the latter with reference to points of history and genealogy.

We are also indebted for various acts of kindness and courtesy to the Marquis Camden, the Rev. T. S. Woollaston, the Rev. Lambert B. Larking, the Rev. Archibald Clerke of Kilmallie, Mr Stirling of Keir, Mr Pryme, Mr W. B. Donne, Mr P. S. Worsley, Professor Goldwin Smith, the Rev. H. O. Coxe, Librarian of the Bodleian, Mr C. Wright, and the late Mr George Daniell.

W. G. C. W. A. W.

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

King John.

III. 1. 69. Add note, _his owner_] _dishonour_ Bullock conj.

III. 1. 209. Note, for _new betrimmed_ read _new untamed_ or _new betrimmed_.

IV. 2. 63. Add note, _you_] _you'd_ Keightley conj.

IV. 3. 54. Add to note, _sin of time's_ Keightley conj.

V. 2. 30. Note, for Dyce conj. read S. Walker conj.

V. 7. 108. Add to note, _give thanks to you_ Keightley conj.

King Richard II.

I. 2. 12. Note, for _Q■ Q■_ read _Q■ Q■ Ff_.

I. 3. 153. Note, for Anon. read Seymour.

II. 3. 95. Add note, _ostentation of despised_] _ostentation's undisguised_ Bullock conj.

First Part of Henry IV.

I. 2. 175, 176. Add note, _two ... third_] _three ... fourth_ Farmer conj. MS.

II. 2. 41. Add note, _garters_] _garter_ Farmer conj. MS.

Second Part of Henry IV.

I. 1. 141. Add note, _buckle_] _knuckle_ Bailey conj.

I. 3. 51. Add note, _and_] _draw_ or _and draw_ Keightley conj.

I. 3. 60. Add note, _cost_] _house_ Keightley conj.

I. 3. 101, 102. Add note, _They ... Are_] _Thou Art_ Keightley conj.

II. 4. 331, 346. Notes, for Q read Qq.

Henry V.

I. 2. 270. Add to note, _thence_ Keightley conj.

I. 2. 274. Add note, _my sail_] _my full_ or _me full_ Keightley conj.

II. Chorus, 41. Add to note, _But, ere ... come_ Keightley conj.

II. 1. 42. Add note, _off_] _off now_ Keightley conj.

THE LIFE AND DEATH

OF

KING JOHN.

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ[A].

KING JOHN. PRINCE HENRY, son to the king. ARTHUR, Duke of Bretagne, nephew to the king. The Earl of PEMBROKE. The Earl of ESSEX. The Earl of SALISBURY. The Lord BIGOT. HUBERT DE BURGH. ROBERT FAULCONBRIDGE, son to Sir Robert Faulconbridge. PHILIP the BASTARD, his half-brother. JAMES GURNEY, servant to Lady Faulconbridge. PETER of Pomfret, a

prophet.

PHILIP, King of France. LEWIS, the Dauphin. Lymoges, Duke of AUSTRIA. CARDINAL PANDULPH, the Pope's legate. MELUN, a French lord. CHATILLON, ambassador from France to King John.

QUEEN ELINOR, mother to King John. CONSTANCE, mother to Arthur. BLANCH of Spain, niece to King John. LADY FAULCONBRIDGE.

Lords, Citizens of Angiers, Sheriff, Heralds, Officers, Soldiers, Messengers, and other Attendants.

SCENE: _Partly in England, and partly in France_[B].

[A] First given by Rowe. See note (I).

[B] SCENE ...] See note (II).

THE LIFE AND DEATH

OF

KING JOHN.

ACT I.

SCENE I. KING JOHN'S _palace_.

Enter KING JOHN, QUEEN ELINOR, PEMBROKE, ESSEX, SALISBURY, _and others, with_ CHATILLON.[1]

K. John. Now, say, Chatillon, what would France with us?

Chat. Thus, after greeting, speaks the King of France In my behaviour to the majesty, The borrowed majesty, of England here.[2]

Eli. A strange beginning: 'borrowed majesty!'[2] 5

K. John. Silence, good mother; hear the embassy.

Chat. Philip of France, in right and true behalf Of thy deceased brother Geffrey's son,[3] Arthur Plantagenet, lays most lawful claim[4] To this fair island and the territories, 10 To Ireland, Poictiers, Anjou, Touraine, Maine,[5] Desiring thee to lay aside the sword Which sways usurpingly these several titles, And put the same into young Arthur's hand, Thy nephew and right royal sovereign. 15

K. John. What follows if we disallow of this?

Chat. The proud control of fierce and bloody war, To enforce these rights so forcibly withheld.

K. John. Here have we war for war and blood for blood, Controlment for controlment: so answer France.[6] 20

Chat. Then take my king's defiance from my mouth, The farthest limit of my embassy.

K. John. Bear mine to him, and so depart in peace: Be thou as lightning in the eyes of France; For ere thou canst report I will be there,[7] 25 The thunder of my cannon shall be heard: So hence! Be thou the trumpet of our wrath And sullen presage of your own decay.[8] An honourable conduct let him have: Pembroke, look to't. Farewell, Chatillon.[9] 30

[_Exeunt Chatillon and Pembroke._

Eli. What now, my son! have I not ever said How that ambitious Constance would not cease Till she had kindled France and all the world, Upon the right and party of her son? This might have been prevented and made whole 35 With very easy arguments of love, Which now the manage of two kingdoms must[10] With fearful bloody issue arbitrate.

K. John. Our strong possession and our right for us.

Eli. Your strong possession much more than your right, 40 Or else it must go wrong with you and me: So much my conscience whispers in your ear, Which none but heaven and you and I shall hear.

Enter a Sheriff.[11]

Essex. My liege, here is the strangest controversy Come from the country to be judged by you, 45 That e'er I heard: shall I produce the men?

K. John. Let them approach. Our abbeys and our priories shall pay This expedition's charge.

Enter ROBERT FAULCONBRIDGE, _and_ PHILIP _his bastard brother_.[12]

What men are you?

Bast. Your faithful subject I, a gentleman[13] 50 Born in Northamptonshire and eldest son, As I suppose, to Robert Faulconbridge,[14] A soldier, by the honour-giving hand Of Cœur-de-lion knighted in the field.[15]

K. John. What art thou?[16] 55

Rob. The son and heir to that same Faulconbridge.

K. John. Is that the elder, and art thou the heir? You came not of one mother then, it seems.

Bast. Most certain of one mother, mighty king; That is well known; and, as I think, one father: 60 But for the certain knowledge of that truth I put you o'er to heaven and to my mother: Of that I doubt, as all men's children may.

Eli. Out on thee, rude man! thou dost shame thy mother And wound her honour with this diffidence. 65

Bast. I, madam? no, I have no reason for it; That is my brother's plea and none of mine; The which if he can prove, a' pops me out[17] At least from fair five hundred pound a year: Heaven guard my mother's honour and my land! 70

K. John. A good blunt fellow. Why, being younger born, Doth he lay claim to thine inheritance?

Bast. I know not why, except to get the land. But once he slander'd me with bastardy: But whether I be as true begot or no,[18] 75 That still I lay upon my mother's head; But that I am as well begot, my liege,-- Fair fall the bones that took the pains for me!-- Compare our faces and be judge yourself.[19] If old Sir Robert did beget us both 80 And were our father and this son like him,[20] O old Sir Robert, father, on my knee I give heaven thanks I was not like to thee!

K. John. Why, what a madcap hath heaven lent us here![21]

Eli. He hath a trick of Cœur-de-lion's face;[22] 85 The accent of his tongue affecteth him. Do you not read some tokens of my son In the large composition of this man?

K. John. Mine eye hath well examined his parts And finds them perfect Richard. Sirrah, speak, 90 What doth move you to claim your brother's land?

Bast. Because he hath a half-face, like my father.[23] With half that face would he have all my land:[23][24] A half-faced groat five hundred pound a year![23]

Rob. My gracious liege, when that my father lived, 95 Your brother did employ my father much,--

Bast. Well, sir, by this you cannot get my land: Your tale must be how he employ'd my mother.

Rob. And once dispatch'd him in an embassy To Germany, there with the emperor 100 To treat of high affairs touching that time. The advantage of his absence took the king And in the mean time sojourn'd at my father's; Where how he did prevail I shame to speak, But truth is truth: large lengths of seas and shores[25] 105 Between my father and my mother lay, As I have heard my father speak himself, When this same lusty gentleman was got. Upon his death-bed he by will bequeath'd His lands to me, and took it on his death[26] 110 That this my mother's son was none of his; And if he were, he came into the world[27] Full fourteen weeks before the course of time. Then, good my liege, let me have what is mine, My father's land, as was my father's will. 115

K. John. Sirrah, your brother is legitimate; Your father's wife did after wedlock bear him, And if she did play false, the fault was hers; Which fault lies on the hazards of all husbands[28] That marry wives. Tell me, how if my brother, 120 Who, as you say, took pains to get this son, Had of your father claim'd this son for his? In sooth, good friend, your father might have kept This calf bred from his cow from all the world; In sooth he might; then, if he were my brother's, 125 My brother might not claim him; nor your

father, Being none of his, refuse him: this concludes; My mother's son did get your father's heir; Your father's heir must have your father's land.

Rob. Shall then my father's will be of no force 130 To dispossess that child which is not his?

Bast. Of no more force to dispossess me, sir, Than was his will to get me, as I think.

Eli. Whether hadst thou rather be a Faulconbridge[29] And like thy brother, to enjoy thy land, 135 Or the reputed son of Cœur-de-lion, Lord of thy presence and no land beside?[30]

Bast. Madam, an if my brother had my shape,[31] And I had his, sir Robert's his, like him;[32] And if my legs were two such riding-rods,[33] 140 My arms such eel-skins stuff'd, my face so thin That in mine ear I durst not stick a rose Lest men should say 'Look, where three-farthings goes!' And, to his shape, were heir to all this land,[34] Would I might never stir from off this place, 145 I would give it every foot to have this face;[35] I would not be sir Nob in any case.[36]

Eli. I like thee well: wilt thou forsake thy fortune, Bequeath thy land to him and follow me? I am a soldier and now bound to France. 150

Bast. Brother, take you my land, I'll take my chance. Your face hath got five hundred pound a year, Yet sell your face for five pence and 'tis dear. Madam, I'll follow you unto the death.

Eli. Nay, I would have you go before me thither. 155

Bast. Our country manners give our betters way.

K. John. What is thy name?

Bast. Philip, my liege, so is my name begun; Philip, good old sir Robert's wife's eldest son.

K. John. From henceforth bear his name whose form thou bear'st:[37] 160 Kneel thou down Philip, but rise more great,[38] Arise sir Richard and Plantagenet.

Bast. Brother by the mother's side, give me your hand: My father gave me honour, yours gave land. Now blessed be the hour, by night or day, 165 When I was got, sir Robert was away!

Eli. The very spirit of Plantagenet! I am thy grandam, Richard; call me so.[39]

Bast. Madam, by chance but not by truth; what though?[40] Something about, a little from the right, 170 In at the window, or else o'er the hatch: Who dares not stir by day must walk by night, And have is have, however men do catch: Near or far off, well won is still well shot, And I am I, howe'er I was begot. 175

K. John. Go, Faulconbridge: now hast thou thy desire; A landless knight makes thee a landed squire. Come, madam, and come, Richard, we must speed For France, for France, for it is more than need.

Bast. Brother, adieu: good fortune come to thee! 180 For thou wast got i' the way of honesty.[41]

[_Exeunt all but Bastard._[42]

A foot of honour better than I was; But many a many foot of land the worse.[43] Well, now can I make any Joan a lady. 'Good den, sir Richard!'--'God-a-mercy, fellow!'-- 185 And if his name be George, I'll call him Peter; For new-made honour doth forget men's names: 'Tis too respective and too sociable[44] For your conversion. Now your traveller,[45] He and his toothpick at my worship's mess, 190 And when my knightly stomach is sufficed, Why then I suck my teeth and catechize My picked man of countries: 'My dear sir,'[46] Thus, leaning on mine elbow, I begin, 'I shall beseech you'--that is question now;[47] 195 And then comes answer like an Absey book:[48] 'O sir,' says answer, 'at your best command; At your employment; at your service, sir:' 'No, sir,' says question, 'I, sweet sir, at yours:' And so, ere answer knows what question would, 200 Saving in dialogue of compliment,[49] And talking of the Alps and Apennines, The Pyrenean and the river Po,[50] It draws toward supper in conclusion so.[51] But this is worshipful society 205 And fits the mounting spirit like myself,[52] For he is but a bastard to the time That doth not smack of observation;[53] And so am I, whether I smack or no;[53][54] And not alone in habit and device, 210 Exterior form, outward accoutrement, But from the inward motion to deliver Sweet, sweet, sweet poison for the age's tooth: Which, though I will not practise to deceive,[55] Yet, to avoid deceit, I mean to learn; 215 For it shall strew the footsteps of my rising. But who comes in such haste in riding-robes? What

woman-post is this? hath she no husband That will take pains to blow a horn before her?

Enter LADY FAULCONBRIDGE _and_ JAMES GURNEY.

O me! it is my mother. How now, good lady![56] 220 What brings you here to court so hastily?

Lady F. Where is that slave, thy brother? where is he,[57] That holds in chase mine honour up and down?

Bast. My brother Robert? old sir Robert's son? Colbrand the giant, that same mighty man? 225 Is it sir Robert's son that you seek so?

Lady F. Sir Robert's son! Ay, thou unreverend boy, Sir Robert's son: why scorn'st thou at sir Robert?[58] He is sir Robert's son, and so art thou.

Bast. James Gurney, wilt thou give us leave awhile?[59] 230

Gur. Good leave, good Philip.

Bast. Philip! sparrow: James,[60] There's toys abroad: anon I'll tell thee more. [_Exit Gurney._[61] Madam, I was not old sir Robert's son: Sir Robert might have eat his part in me Upon Good-Friday and ne'er broke his fast: 235 Sir Robert could do well: marry, to confess,[62] Could he get me? Sir Robert could not do it:[63] We know his handiwork: therefore, good mother, To whom am I beholding for these limbs?[64] Sir Robert never holp to make this leg.[65] 240

Lady F. Hast thou conspired with thy brother too,[66] That for thine own gain shouldst defend mine honour? What means this scorn, thou most untoward knave?

Bast. Knight, knight, good mother, Basilisco-like.[67] What! I am dubb'd! I have it on my shoulder.[68] 245 But, mother, I am not sir Robert's son; I have disclaim'd sir Robert and my land; Legitimation, name and all is gone: Then, good my mother, let me know my father; Some proper man, I hope: who was it, mother? 250

Lady F. Hast thou denied thyself a Faulconbridge?

Bast. As faithfully as I deny the devil.

Lady F. King Richard Cœur-de-lion was thy father: By long and vehement suit I was seduced To make room for him in my husband's bed: 255 Heaven lay not my transgression to my charge![69] Thou art the issue of my dear offence,[70] Which was so strongly urged past my defence.

Bast. Now, by this light, were I to get again, Madam, I would not wish a better father. 260 Some sins do bear their privilege on earth, And so doth yours; your fault was not your folly:[71] Needs must you lay your heart at his dispose. Subjected tribute to commanding love, Against whose fury and unmatched force 265 The aweless lion could not wage the fight, Nor keep his princely heart from Richard's hand.[72] He that perforce robs lions of their hearts May easily win a woman's. Ay, my mother,[73] With all my heart I thank thee for my father! 270 Who lives and dares but say thou didst not well When I was got, I'll send his soul to hell. Come, lady, I will show thee to my kin;[74] And they shall say, when Richard me begot, If thou hadst said him nay, it had been sin: 275 Who says it was, he lies; I say 'twas not. [_Exeunt._

FOOTNOTES:

[1] SCENE I King John's palace] The court of England. Pope. Northampton ... palace. Capell.

Salisbury, and others] Capell and Salisbury. Ff.

Chatillon] Johnson. Chattilon Rowe. the Chattylion of France. Ff.

[2] _borrowed_] Ff. _borrow'd_ Rowe.

[3] _brother_] F■. _brother_, F■ F■ F■.

[4] _most_] om. Pope.

[5] _Anjou_] Rowe. _Anjowe_ Ff.

Touraine] Rowe (ed. 2). _Torayne_ F■. _Lorayne_ F■. _Loraine_ F■ F■. _Touaine_ Rowe (ed. 1).

[6] _Controlment ... controlment_] F■. _Controlement ... controlement_ F■ F■ F■. See note (III).

[7] _For ere_] _Or, ere_ Seymour conj.

report I ... there,] Capell. _report, I ... there:_ Ff. (_there;_ F■ F■).

[8] _sullen_] _sudden_ Becket conj.

[9] Exeunt ...] Exit Chat. and Pem. Ff.

[10] _manage_] _mannage_ Ff.

[11] Enter a Sheriff.] Enter the Sheriff of Northamptonshire and whispers Essex. Capell. See note (IV).

[12] expedition's] expeditious F■.]

Enter ...] Enter R. F. and Philip. Ff. Exit Sheriff; and Re-enters with R. F. and P., his bastard brother. Capell (after line 47).

[13] SCENE II. Pope.

Bast.] Philip. Ff. (and to line 132; afterwards Bast.).

[14] _Robert_] om. F■ F■ F■.

[15] _Cœur-de-lion_] _Cordelion_ Ff. (and passim).

[16] _What_] _And what_ Capell.

[17] _a'_] _a_ Ff. _he_ Pope.

[18] _whether_] F■. _where_ F■ F■ F■. See note (V).

as true] _true_ Pope.

[19] _yourself._] Rowe. _your selfe_ F■ F■. _your self_ F■ F■.

[20] _him,_] _him_: Ff.

[21] _lent_] _sent_ Heath conj.

[22] _trick_] See note (VI).

[23] _father. With ... land: ... year!_] _father? With ... land, ... year?_ F■ F■. _father, With ... land, ... year?_ F■ F■.

[24] _half that face_] _that half-face_ Theobald. _half the face_ Anon. conj.

[25] _lengths_] _length_ Capell conj.

[26] _death_] _oath_ Anon. conj.

[27] _And if_] _An if_ Hanmer.

[28] _hazards_] _hazard_ Pope.

[29] _Whether_] _Say_ Pope.

[30] _thy_] _the_ Warburton.

[31] _an if_] Hanmer. _and if_ Ff.

[32] _Robert's_] _Robert_ Theobald. _Robert's_, Hanmer.

[33] _And if_] _An if_ S. Walker conj.

[34] _to his_] _with his_ Hanmer.

his ... this] _this ... his_ Mason conj.

[35] _I would_] _I'd_ Pope.

[36] _I_] F■ F■ F■. _It_ F■. See note (VII).

sir Nob] Capell. _sir nobbe_ F■ F■ F■. _Sir Nobbe_ F■. _sir Rob_ Lloyd conj.

[37] _From ... bear'st_] Pope. _From ... bearest_ As two lines, the first ending _name_, in Ff.

[38] _rise_] Ff. _rise up_ Pope. _arise_ Steevens. _to rise_ Keightley conj.

[39] _grandam, Richard:_] _grandame Richard,_ F■ F■ F■. _grandam, Richard,_ F■. _grandam; Richard,_ Pope.

[40] _what though?_] _what tho'?_ Theobald. _what tho_; Ff.

[41] _wast_] _as_ Pope.

Exeunt ... Bastard.] Ff. Exeunt. Capell.

[42] SCENE III. Pope. SCENE II. The same. Anti-room of the same. Enter Bastard. Capell.

[43] _many a many_] _many, many a_ Hanmer. _many, ah, many a_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[44] _too ... too_] _two ... too_ F■.

too sociable] _unsociable_ Pope.

[45] _your conversion._] Capell. _your conversion,_ Ff. _your conversing._ Pope. _conversation._ Lloyd conj.

[46] _picked_] _piked_ Pope. _picqued_ Theobald.

man of] _man, of_ Steevens conj.

countries] _courtesies_ Jackson conj.

[47] _I ... now_] Misplaced in Singer (ed. 2).

[48] _Absey book_] _ABC-book_ Pope.

[49] _Saving_] _Serving_ Theobald (Warburton conj.).

[50] _Pyrenean_] _Perennean_ F■. _Pyrennean_ F■ F■ F■. _Pyreneans_ Collier (ed. 2, Collier MS.).

[51] _toward_] F■ F■. _towards_ F■ F■.

[52] _the mounting_] _a mounting_ Collier MS.

spirit] _spirits_ Delius.

[53] _smack ... smack_] Theobald. _smoake ... smacke_ F■ F■. _smoak ... smack_ F■ F■. _smack ... smoak_ Pope.

[54] _And ... no_] Put in brackets, as spurious, by Warburton.

[55] _Which_] _This_ Johnson conj.

[56] Enter ...] Capell. Ff. after line 221.

_it is_] Pope. _'tis_ Ff.

How now] _now_ Pope.

[57] SCENE IV. Pope.

[58] _scorn'st_] _scornest_ F■.

[59] _Gurney_] F■. _Gournie_ F■. _Gourney_ F■ F■.

[60] _Philip! sparrow:_] Capell. _Philip, sparrow,_ Ff. _Philip,--spare me,_ Theobald (Warburton). _Philip--spare oh!_ Grey conj.

[61] Exit Gurney] Exit James. Ff.

[62] _to confess_] _confess_ Pope. _to confess the truth_ Keightley conj.

[63] _Could he get me?_] Pope. _Could get me_ Ff. _Could not get me_; Dyce (Collier MS.).

[64] _beholding_] _beholden_ Pope.

[65] _holp_] _help'd_ Pope.

[66] _conspired_] _conspir'd_ Rowe.

[67] _Knight, knight, good mother, Basilisco-like._] F■ F■. _Knight, knight good mother, Basilisco-like:_ F■ F■. Omitted by Rowe (ed. 2). _Knight--Knight, good mother, Basilisco like_ Pope. _Knight, knight, good mother--Basilisco like._ Theobald. _Knight, knight,--good mother, Basilisco like._ Id. conj. _Knight--knight--good mother--Basilisco;--'slight!_ Id. conj. (withdrawn).

[68] _What!_] Theobald. _What,_ Ff. _Why_ Pope. _Why,_ Hanmer.

[69] _my charge!_] _my charge,_ Ff. _thy charge,_ Long MS.

[70] _Thou_] F■. _That_ F■ F■ F■.

[71] _your folly_] _you folly_ F■.

[72] _hand_] _hands_ F■.

[73] _Ay_] _aye_ Ff.

[74] _thee_] _the_ F■.

ACT II.

SCENE I. _France. Before Angiers._

Enter AUSTRIA _and forces, drums, etc. on one side: on the other_ KING PHILIP _of France and his Power_; LEWIS, ARTHUR, CONSTANCE _and attendants._[75]

Lew. Before Angiers well met, brave Austria.[76] Arthur, that great forerunner of thy blood, Richard, that robb'd the lion of his heart And fought the holy wars in Palestine, By this brave duke came early to his grave: 5 And for amends to his posterity, At our importance hither is he come, To spread his colours, boy, in thy behalf, And to rebuke the usurpation Of thy unnatural uncle, English John: 10 Embrace him, love him, give him welcome hither.

Arth. God shall forgive you Cœur-de-lion's death The rather that you give his offspring life, Shadowing their right under your wings of war:[77] I give you welcome with a powerless hand, 15 But with a heart full of unstained love:[78] Welcome before the gates of Angiers, duke.

Lew. A noble boy! Who would not do thee right?

Aust. Upon thy cheek lay I this zealous kiss, As seal to this indenture of my love, 20 That to my home I will no more return, Till Angiers and the right thou hast in France, Together with that pale, that white-faced shore, Whose foot spurns back the ocean's roaring tides And coops from other lands her islanders, 25 Even till that England, hedged in with the main, That water-walled bulwark, still secure And confident from foreign purposes, Even till that utmost corner of the west[79] Salute thee for her king: till then, fair boy, 30 Will I not think of home, but follow arms.

Const. O, take his mother's thanks, a widow's thanks, Till your strong hand shall help to give him strength To make a more requital to your love!

Aust. The peace of heaven is theirs that lift their swords[80] 35 In such a just and charitable war.

K. Phi. Well then, to work: our cannon shall be bent[81] Against the brows of this resisting town. Call for our chiefest men of discipline, To cull the plots of best advantages: 40 We'll lay before this town our royal bones, Wade to the market-place in Frenchmen's blood, But we will make it subject to this boy.

Const. Stay for an answer to your embassy, Lest unadvised you stain your swords with blood: 45 My Lord Chatillon may from England bring That right in peace which here we urge in war, And then we shall repent each drop of blood That hot rash haste so indirectly shed.[82]

Enter CHATILLON.

K. Phi. A wonder, lady! lo, upon thy wish, 50 Our messenger Chatillon is arrived! What England says, say briefly, gentle lord; We coldly pause for thee; Chatillon, speak.

Chat. Then turn your forces from this paltry siege And stir them up against a mightier task. 55 England, impatient of your just demands, Hath put himself in arms: the adverse winds, Whose leisure I have stay'd, have given him time To land his legions all as soon as I; His marches are expedient to this town, 60 His forces strong, his soldiers confident. With him along is come the mother-queen, An Ate, stirring him to blood and strife;[83] With her her niece, the Lady Blanch of Spain; With them a bastard of the king's deceased;[84] 65 And all the unsettled humours of the land, Rash, inconsiderate, fiery voluntaries, With ladies' faces and fierce dragons' spleens, Have sold their fortunes at their native homes, Bearing their birthrights proudly on their backs,[85] 70 To make a hazard of new fortunes here: In brief, a braver choice of dauntless spirits Than now the English bottoms have waft o'er Did never float upon the swelling tide, To do offence and scath in Christendom. [_Drum beats._[86] 75 The interruption of their churlish drums Cuts off more circumstance: they are at hand,[87] To parley or to fight; therefore prepare.[87]

K. Phi. How much unlook'd for is this expedition!

Aust. By how much unexpected, by so much 80 We must awake endeavour for defence; For courage mounteth with occasion: Let them be welcome then; we are prepared.

Enter KING JOHN, ELINOR, BLANCH, _the_ Bastard, Lords, _and Forces_.[88]

K. John. Peace be to France, if France in peace permit[89] Our just and lineal entrance to our own; 85 If not, bleed France, and peace ascend to heaven, Whiles we, God's wrathful agent, do correct[90] Their proud contempt that beats His peace to heaven.[91]

K. Phi. Peace be to England, if that war return From France to England, there to live in peace. 90 England we love; and for that England's sake With burden of our armour here we sweat. This toil of ours should be a work of thine; But thou from loving England art so far, That thou hast under-wrought his lawful king,[92] 95 Cut off the sequence of posterity, Out-faced infant state and done a rape Upon the maiden virtue of the crown. Look here upon thy brother Geffrey's face; These eyes, these brows, were moulded out of his: 100 This little abstract doth contain that large Which died in Geffrey, and the hand of time Shall draw this brief into as huge a volume.[93] That Geffrey was thy elder brother born, And this his son; England was Geffrey's right 105 And this is Geffrey's: in the name of God[94] How comes it then that thou art call'd a king, When living blood doth in these temples beat, Which owe the crown that thou o'ermasterest?

K. John. From whom hast thou this great commission, France, 110 To draw my answer from thy articles?[95]

K. Phi. From that supernal judge, that stirs good thoughts In any breast of strong authority,[96] To look into the blots and stains of right:[97] That judge hath made me guardian to this boy: 115 Under whose warrant I impeach thy wrong And by whose help I mean to chastise it.

K. John. Alack, thou dost usurp authority.[98]

K. Phi. Excuse; it is to beat usurping down.[98][99]

Eli. Who is it thou dost call usurper, France?[98][100] 120

Const. Let me make answer; thy usurping son.[98]

Eli. Out, insolent! thy bastard shall be king,[98] That thou mayst be a queen, and check the world![98]

Const. My bed was ever to thy son as true[98] As thine was to thy husband; and this boy[98] 125 Liker in feature to his father Geffrey[98] Than thou and John in manners; being as like[98][101] As rain to water, or devil to his dam.[98] My boy a bastard! By my soul, I think[98] His father never was so true begot:[98] 130 It cannot be, an if thou wert his mother.[98][102]

Eli. There's a good mother, boy, that blots thy father.[98]

Const. There's a good grandam, boy, that would blot thee.[98][103]

Aust. Peace![98]

Bast. Hear the crier.[98]

Aust. What the devil art thou?[98]

Bast. One that will play the devil, sir, with you,[98] 135 An a' may catch your hide and you alone:[98][104] You are the hare of whom the proverb goes,[98] Whose valour plucks dead lions by the beard:[98] I'll smoke your skin-coat, an I catch you right;[98][105] Sirrah, look to't; i' faith, I will, i' faith.[98] 140

Blanch. O, well did he become that lion's robe[98] That did disrobe the lion of that robe![98]

Bast. It lies as sightly on the back of him[98] As great Alcides' shows upon an ass:[98][106] But, ass, I'll take that burthen from your back,[98] 145 Or lay on that shall make your shoulders crack.[98]

Aust. What cracker is this same that deafs our ears[98] With this abundance of superfluous breath?[98]

K. Phi. Lewis, determine what we shall do straight.[98][107]

Lew. Women and fools, break off your conference.[98][108] 150 King John, this is the very sum of all; England and Ireland, Anjou, Touraine, Maine,[109] In right of Arthur do I claim of thee:[110] Wilt thou resign them and lay down thy arms?

K. John. My life as soon: I do defy thee, France. 155 Arthur of Bretagne, yield thee to my hand;[111] And out of my dear love I'll give thee more Than e'er the coward hand of France can win: Submit thee, boy.[112]

Eli. Come to thy grandam, child.[112]

Const. Do, child, go to it grandam, child;[112][113][114] 160 Give grandam kingdom, and it grandam will[112][114] Give it a plum, a cherry, and a fig:[112] There's a good grandam.[112]

Arth. Good my mother, peace![112] I would that I were low laid in my grave:[112] I am not worth this coil that's made for me.[112] 165

Eli. His mother shames him so, poor boy, he weeps.[112]

Const. Now shame upon you, whether she does or no![112][115] His grandam's wrongs, and not his mother's shames,[112][116] Draws those heaven-moving pearls from his poor eyes,[112][117] Which heaven shall take in nature of a fee;[112] 170 Ay, with these crystal beads heaven shall be bribed[112][118] To do him justice and revenge on you.[112]

Eli. Thou monstrous slanderer of heaven and earth![112]

Const. Thou monstrous injurer of heaven and earth![112] Call not me slanderer; thou and thine usurp[112][119] 175 The dominations, royalties and rights[112][120] Of this oppressed boy: this is thy eld'st son's son,[112][121] Infortunate in nothing but in thee:[112] Thy sins are visited in this poor child;[112][122] The canon of the law is laid on him,[112] 180 Being but the second generation[112] Removed from thy sin-conceiving womb.[112]

K. John. Bedlam, have done.[112][123]

Const. I have but this to say,[112] That he is not only plagued for her sin,[112] But God hath made her sin and her the plague[112] 185 On this removed issue, plagued for her[112] And with her plague; her sin his injury,[112][124] Her injury the beadle to her sin,[112][125] All punish'd in the person of this child,[112] And all for her; a plague upon her![112][126] 190

Eli. Thou unadvised scold, I can produce[112] A will that bars the title of thy son.[112]

Const. Ay, who doubts that? a will! a wicked will;[112] A woman's will; a canker'd grandam's will![112]

K. Phi. Peace, lady! pause, or be more temperate:[112] 195 It ill beseems this presence to cry aim[112][127] To these ill-tuned repetitions.[112] Some trumpet summon hither to the walls These men of Angiers: let us hear them speak Whose title they admit, Arthur's or John's. 200

Trumpet sounds. Enter certain Citizens _upon the walls_.[128]

First Cit. Who is it that hath warn'd us to the walls?

K. Phi. 'Tis France, for England.

K. John. England, for itself. You men of Angiers, and my loving subjects,--

K. Phi. You loving men of Angiers, Arthur's subjects, Our trumpet call'd you to this gentle parle,-- 205

K. John. For our advantage; therefore hear us first.[129] These flags of France, that are advanced here Before the eye and prospect of your town, Have hither march'd to your endamagement: The cannons have their bowels full of wrath, 210 And ready mounted are they to spit forth Their iron indignation 'gainst your walls: All preparation for a bloody siege[130] And merciless proceeding by these French[131] Confronts your city's eyes, your winking gates;[132] 215 And but for our approach those sleeping stones, That as a waist doth girdle you about,[133] By the compulsion of their ordinance[134] By this time from their fixed beds of lime Had been dishabited, and wide havoc made 220 For bloody power to rush upon your peace. But on the sight of us your lawful king, Who painfully with much expedient march Have brought a countercheck before your gates, To save unscratch'd your city's threatened cheeks,[135] 225 Behold, the French amazed vouchsafe a parle; And now, instead of bullets wrapp'd in fire,[136] To make a shaking fever in your walls, They shoot but calm words folded up in smoke, To make a faithless error in your ears: 230 Which trust accordingly kind citizens, And let us in, your king, whose labour'd spirits,[137] Forwearied in this action of swift speed,[138] Crave harbourage within your city walls.[139]

K. Phi. When I have said, make answer to us both. 235 Lo, in this right hand, whose protection Is most divinely vow'd upon the right Of him it holds, stands young Plantagenet, Son to the elder brother of this man, And king o'er him and all that he enjoys: 240 For this down-trodden equity, we tread In warlike march these greens before your town, Being no further enemy to you Than the constraint of hospitable zeal In the relief of this oppressed child 245 Religiously provokes. Be pleased then To pay that duty which you truly owe To him that owes it, namely this young prince:[140] And then our arms, like to a muzzled bear, Save in aspect, hath all offence seal'd up;[141] 250 Our cannons' malice vainly shall be spent Against the invulnerable clouds of heaven;[142] And with a blessed and unvex'd retire, With unhack'd swords and helmets all unbruised. We will bear home that lusty blood again 255 Which here we came to spout against your town, And leave your children, wives and you in peace. But if you fondly pass our proffer'd offer,[143] 'Tis not the roundure of your old-faced walls[144] Can hide you from our messengers of war, 260 Though all these English and their discipline Were harbour'd in their rude circumference.[145] Then tell us, shall your city call us lord, In that behalf which we have challenged it?[146] Or shall we give the signal to our rage 265 And stalk in blood to our possession?

First Cit. In brief, we are the king of England's subjects: For him, and in his right, we hold this town.[147]

K. John. Acknowledge then the king, and let me in.

First Cit. That can we not; but he that proves the king, 270 To him will we prove loyal: till that time Have we ramm'd up our gates against the world.

K. John. Doth not the crown of England prove the king? And if not that, I bring you witnesses, Twice fifteen thousand hearts of England's breed,-- 275

Bast. Bastards, and else.[148]

K. John. To verify our title with their lives.

K. Phi. As many and as well-born bloods as those,--

Bast. Some bastards too.[148]

K. Phi. Stand in his face to contradict his claim.

First Cit. Till you compound whose right is worthiest, We for the worthiest hold the right from both.

K. John. Then God forgive the sin of all those souls[149] That to their everlasting residence, Before the dew of evening fall, shall fleet, In dreadful trial of our kingdom's king!

K. Phi. Amen, amen! Mount, chevaliers! to arms!

Bast. Saint George, that swinged the dragon, and e'er since[150] Sits on his horse back at mine hostess' door,[150][151] Teach us some fence! [_To Aust._] Sirrah, were I at home,[152] At your den, sirrah, with your lioness, I would set an ox-head to your lion's hide,[153] And make a monster of you.

Aust. Peace! no more.

Bast. O, tremble, for you hear the lion roar.

K. John. Up higher to the plain; where we'll set forth In best appointment all our regiments.

Bast. Speed then, to take advantage of the field.[154]

K. Phi. It shall be so; and at the other hill[155] Command the rest to stand. God and our right! [_Exeunt._

Here after excursions, enter the Herald of France, _with trumpets, to the gates_.[156]

F. Her. You men of Angiers, open wide your gates,[157] And let young Arthur, Duke of Bretagne, in,[158] Who by the hand of France this day hath made Much work for tears in many an English mother, Whose sons lie scattered on the bleeding ground:[159] Many a widow's husband grovelling lies,[160] Coldly embracing the discoloured earth;[161] And victory, with little loss, doth play[162] Upon the dancing banners of the French, Who are at hand, triumphantly display'd,[163] To enter conquerors and to proclaim Arthur of Bretagne England's king and yours.[158]

Enter English Herald, _with trumpet_.[164]

E. Her. Rejoice, you men of Angiers, ring your bells; King John, your king and England's, doth approach, Commander of this hot malicious day: Their armours, that march'd hence so silver-bright, Hither return all gilt with Frenchmen's blood;[165] There stuck no plume in any English crest That is removed by a staff of France;[166] Our colours do return in those same hands That did display them when we first march'd forth; And, like a jolly troop of huntsmen, come Our lusty English, all with purpled hands, Dyed in the dying slaughter of their foes:[167] Open your gates and give the victors way.

First Cit. Heralds, from off our towers we might behold,[168] From first to last, the onset and retire Of both your armies; whose equality By our best eyes cannot be censured: Blood hath bought blood and blows have answer'd blows; Strength match'd with strength, and power confronted power: Both are alike; and both alike we like. One must prove greatest: while they weigh so even, We hold our town for neither, yet for both.

Re-enter the two KINGS, _with their powers, severally_.[169]

K. John. France, hast thou yet more blood to cast away?[170] Say, shall the current of our right run on?[171] Whose passage, vex'd with thy impediment, Shall leave his native channel, and o'erswell With course disturb'd even thy confining shores, Unless thou let his silver water keep[172] A peaceful progress to the ocean.

K. Phi. England, thou hast not saved one drop of blood, In this hot trial, more than we of France; Rather, lost more. And by this hand I swear, That sways the earth this climate overlooks, Before we will lay down our just-borne arms,[173] We'll put thee down, 'gainst whom these arms we bear, Or add a royal number to the dead, Gracing the scroll that tells of this war's loss With slaughter coupled to the name of kings.

Bast. Ha, majesty! how high thy glory towers, When the rich blood of kings is set on fire! O, now doth Death line his dead chaps with steel; The swords of soldiers are his teeth, his fangs; And now he feasts, mousing the flesh of men,[174] In undetermined differences of kings. Why stand these royal fronts amazed thus? Cry, 'havoc!' kings; back to the stained field, You equal potents, fiery kindled spirits![175] Then let confusion of one part confirm The other's peace; till then, blows, blood, and death!

K. John. Whose party do the townsmen yet admit?

K. Phi. Speak, citizens, for England; who's your king?[176]

First Cit. The king of England, when we know the king.

K. Phi. Know him in us, that here hold up his right.

K. John. In us, that are our own great deputy, 365 And bear possession of our person here,[177] Lord of our presence, Angiers, and of you.[178]

First Cit. A greater power than we denies all this;[179] And till it be undoubted, we do lock Our former scruple in our strong-barr'd gates; 370 King'd of our fears, until our fears, resolved,[180][181] Be by some certain king purged and deposed.[181]

Bast. By heaven, these scroyles of Angiers flout you, kings,[182] And stand securely on their battlements, As in a theatre, whence they gape and point 375 At your industrious scenes and acts of death.[183] Your royal presences be ruled by me:[184] Do like the mutines of Jerusalem,[185] Be friends awhile and both conjointly bend[186] Your sharpest deeds of malice on this town: 380 By east and west let France and England mount Their battering cannon charged to the mouths, Till their soul-fearing clamours have brawl'd down The flinty ribs of this contemptuous city: I'ld play incessantly upon these jades, 385 Even till unfenced desolation Leave them as naked as the vulgar air. That done, dissever your united strengths, And part your mingled colours once again; Turn face to face and bloody point to point; 390 Then, in a moment, Fortune shall cull forth Out of one side her happy minion, To whom in favour she shall give the day, And kiss him with a glorious victory. How like you this wild counsel, mighty states? 395 Smacks it not something of the policy?[187]

K. John. Now, by the sky that hangs above our heads, I like it well. France, shall we knit our powers And lay this Angiers even with the ground; Then after fight who shall be king of it? 400

Bast. An if them hast the mettle of a king,[188] Being wrong'd as we are by this peevish town, Turn thou the mouth of thy artillery, As we will ours, against these saucy walls; And when that we have dash'd them to the ground, 405 Why then defy each other, and pell-mell Make work upon ourselves, for heaven or hell.

K. Phi. Let it be so. Say, where will you assault?

K. John. We from the west will send destruction Into this city's bosom. 410

Aust. I from the north.

K. Phi. Our thunder from the south[189] Shall rain their drift of bullets on this town.

Bast. O prudent discipline! From north to south:[190] Austria and France shoot in each other's mouth:[190] I'll stir them to it. Come, away, away![190] 415

First Cit. Hear us, great kings: vouchsafe awhile to stay, And I shall show you peace and fair-faced league; Win you this city without stroke or wound; Rescue those breathing lives to die in beds, That here come sacrifices for the field: 420 Persever not, but hear me, mighty kings.

K. John. Speak on with favour; we are bent to hear.[191]

First Cit. That daughter there of Spain, the Lady Blanch, Is niece to England: look upon the years[192] Of Lewis the Dauphin and that lovely maid:[193] 425 If lusty love should go in quest of beauty, Where should he find it fairer than in Blanch? If zealous love should go in search of virtue,[194] Where should he find it purer than in Blanch? If love ambitious sought a match of birth, 430 Whose veins bound richer blood than Lady Blanch? Such as she is, in beauty, virtue, birth, Is the young Dauphin every way complete:[193] If not complete of, say he is not she;[195] And she again wants nothing, to name want, 435 If want it be not that she is not he:[196] He is the half part of a blessed man, Left to be finished by such as she;[197] And she a fair divided excellence,[198] Whose fulness of perfection lies in him. 440 O, two such silver currents, when they join, Do glorify the banks that bound them in; And two such shores to two such streams made one, Two such controlling bounds shall you be, kings, To these two princes, if you marry them. 445 This union shall do more than battery can To our fast-closed gates; for at this match, With swifter spleen than powder can enforce,[199] The mouth of passage shall we fling wide ope. And give you entrance: but without this match, 450 The

sea enraged is not half so deaf, Lions more confident, mountains and rocks[200] More free from motion, no, not Death himself[200] In mortal fury half so peremptory, As we to keep this city.

Bast. Here's a stay[201] 455 That shakes the rotten carcass of old Death Out of his rags! Here's a large mouth, indeed, That spits forth death and mountains, rocks and seas, Talks as familiarly of roaring lions As maids of thirteen do of puppy-dogs! 460 What cannoneer begot this lusty blood?[202] He speaks plain cannon fire, and smoke and bounce;[203] He gives the bastinado with his tongue: Our ears are cudgell'd; not a word of his But buffets better than a fist of France: 465 Zounds! I was never so bethump'd with words Since I first call'd my brother's father dad.[204]

Eli. Son, list to this conjunction, make this match;[205][206] Give with our niece a dowry large enough:[206] For by this knot thou shalt so surely tie[206] 470 Thy now unsured assurance to the crown,[206][207] That yon green boy shall have no sun to ripe[206] The bloom that promiseth a mighty fruit.[206] I see a yielding in the looks of France;[206] Mark, how they whisper: urge them while their souls[206] 475 Are capable of this ambition,[206] Lest zeal, now melted by the windy breath[206][208] Of soft petitions, pity and remorse,[206] Cool and congeal again to what it was.[206]

First Cit. Why answer not the double majesties 480 This friendly treaty of our threaten'd town?

K. Phi. Speak England first, that hath been forward first[209] To speak unto this city: what say you?

K. John. If that the Dauphin there, thy princely son,[193] Can in this book of beauty read 'I love,' 485 Her dowry shall weigh equal with a queen:[210] For Anjou, and fair Touraine, Maine, Poictiers,[211] And all that we upon this side the sea, Except this city now by us besieged, Find liable to our crown and dignity, 490 Shall gild her bridal bed and make her rich In titles, honours and promotions, As she in beauty, education, blood,[212] Holds hand with any princess of the world.[213]

K. Phi. What say'st thou, boy? look in the lady's face. 495

Lew. I do, my lord; and in her eye I find[214] A wonder, or a wondrous miracle, The shadow of myself form'd in her eye;[215] Which, being but the shadow of your son,[215] Becomes a sun and makes your son a shadow:[215][216] 500 I do protest I never loved myself Till now infixed I beheld myself[217] Drawn in the flattering table of her eye.[218]

[_Whispers with Blanch._

Bast. Drawn in the flattering table of her eye![219] Hang'd in the frowning-wrinkle of her brow! 505 And quarter'd in her heart! he doth espy Himself love's traitor: this is pity now, That, hang'd and drawn and quarter'd, there should be In such a love so vile a lout as he.

Blanch. My uncle's will in this respect is mine:[220] 510 If he see aught in you that makes him like, That any thing he sees, which moves his liking, I can with ease translate it to my will;[221] Or if you will, to speak more properly, I will enforce it easily to my love.[222] 515 Further I will not flatter you, my lord, That all I see in you is worthy love, Than this; that nothing do I see in you, Though churlish thoughts themselves should be your judge, That I can find should merit any hate. 520

K. John. What say these young ones? What say you, my niece?

Blanch. That she is bound in honour still to do What you in wisdom still vouchsafe to say.[223]

K. John. Speak then, prince Dauphin; can you love this lady?

Lew. Nay, ask me if I can refrain from love; 525 For I do love her most unfeignedly.

K. John. Then do I give Volquessen, Touraine, Maine, Poictiers, and Anjou, these five provinces,[224] With her to thee; and this addition more, Full thirty thousand marks of English coin. 530 Philip of France, if thou be pleased withal, Command thy son and daughter to join hands.

K. Phi. It likes us well; young princes, close your hands.[225]

Aust. And your lips too; for I am well assured[226] That I did so when I was first assured.[226] 535

K. Phi. Now, citizens of Angiers, ope your gates,[227] Let in that amity which you have made; For at Saint Mary's chapel presently The rites of marriage shall be solemnized. Is not the Lady Constance in this troop? 540 I know she is not, for this match made up[228] Her presence would have interrupted much: Where is she and her son? tell me, who knows.[229]

Lew. She is sad and passionate at your highness' tent.[230]

K. Phil. And, by my faith, this league that we have made 545 Will give her sadness very little cure. Brother of England, how may we content This widow lady? In her right we came;[231] Which we, God knows, have turn'd another way, To our own vantage.

K. John. We will heal up all; 550 For we'll create young Arthur Duke of Bretagne[232] And Earl of Richmond; and this rich fair town We make him lord of. Call the Lady Constance;[233] Some speedy messenger bid her repair To our solemnity: I trust we shall, 555 If not fill up the measure of her will, Yet in some measure satisfy her so That we shall stop her exclamation. Go we, as well as haste will suffer us, To this unlook'd for, unprepared pomp. 560

[_Exeunt all but the Bastard._[234]

Bast. Mad world! mad kings! mad composition![235] John, to stop Arthur's title in the whole, Hath willingly departed with a part, And France, whose armour conscience buckled on, Whom zeal and charity brought to the field 565 As God's own soldier, rounded in the ear With that same purpose-changer, that sly devil, That broker, that still breaks the pate of faith, That daily break-vow, he that wins of all, Of kings, of beggars, old men, young men, maids, 570 Who, having no external thing to lose[236] But the word 'maid,' cheats the poor maid of that,[237] That smooth-faced gentleman, tickling Commodity, Commodity, the bias of the world, The world, who of itself is peised well,[238] 575 Made to run even upon even ground, Till this advantage, this vile-drawing bias,[239] This sway of motion, this Commodity, Makes it take head from all indifferency, From all direction, purpose, course, intent: 580 And this same bias, this Commodity, This bawd, this broker, this all-changing word,[240] Clapp'd on the outward eye of fickle France, Hath drawn him from his own determined aid,[241] From a resolved and honourable war, 585 To a most base and vile-concluded peace.[242] And why rail I on this Commodity?[243] But for because he hath not woo'd me yet: Not that I have the power to clutch my hand,[244] When his fair angels would salute my palm; 590 But for my hand, as unattempted yet,[245] Like a poor beggar, raileth on the rich. Well, whiles I am a beggar, I will rail[246] And say there is no sin but to be rich; And being rich, my virtue then shall be 595 To say there is no vice but beggary. Since kings break faith upon commodity, Gain, be my lord, for I will worship thee.[247] [_Exit._

FOOTNOTES:

[75] ACT II. SCENE I. Rowe (ed. 2). Scæna Secunda. Ff.

France ...] Capell. Enter before Angiers, Philip King of France, Lewis, Daulphin, Austria, Constance, Arthur Ff.

[76] Lew.] King Philip. Theobald conj.

[77] _their_] _his_ Collier MS.

[78] _unstained_] _unstrained_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[79] _utmost_] _outmost_ F■.

[80] _that_] _who_ F■.

[81] _work: our_] _work, our_ F■. _worke our_ F■ F■. _work our_ F■.

cannon] _engines_ Pope.

[82] _indirectly_] _indiscreetly_ Singer (Collier MS.).

[83] _An Ate_] Rowe. _An Ace_ Ff. _As Ate_ Collier MS.

[84] _king's_] _kings_ F■. _king_ F■ F■ F■. See note (XI).

[85] _birthrights_] _birth-rights_ F■ F■. _birth-right_ F■ F■.

[86] _Drum beats_] F■ (after line 77). _Drummes beates._ F■. _Drums beats._ F■. _Drums beat._ F■.

[87] _hand, To ... fight;_] _hand, To ... fight,_ Ff. _hand. To ... fight,_ Pope.

[88] Enter ...] Enter K. of England, Bastard, Queene, Blanch, Pembroke, and others. Ff.

[89] SCENE II. Pope.

[90] _Whiles_] _Whilst_ Rowe.

[91] _beats_] _beat_ Hanmer.

[92] _his_] _its_ Rowe. _her_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[93] _huge_] _large_ Rowe. See note (VIII).

[94] _this_] _his_ Grant White (Mason conj.).

this is Geffrey's] _Geffry is his_ or _Geffry's right is his_ Seymour conj.

Geffrey's: in the name of God] _Geffrey's; ... God_ Rowe. _Geffreyes in ... God:_ F■ F■ F■. (_Geffreys_ F■). _Geffreys, ... God,_ F■. _Geffrey's son ... God_ Jervis conj.

[95] _from_] _to_ Hanmer.

[96] _breast_] _beast_ F■.

[97] _blots_] _bolts_ Warburton.

[98] _Alack ... conference_] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

[99] _Excuse; it is_] Malone. _Excuse it is_ Ff. _Excuse it, 'tis_ Rowe (ed. 2).

[100] _is it_] Ff. _is it that_ Rowe (ed. 1). _is't that Rowe_ (ed. 2).

[101] _John in manners; being_] Capell (Roderick conj.). _John, in manners being_ Ff.

[102] _an if_] Theobald. _and if_ Ff.

[103] _There's ... thee_] As two lines in Ff, ending _boy ... thee_.

would] _wouldst_ Theobald.

[104] _An a'_] Theobald. _And a_ Ff.

[105] _an_] Theobald. _and_ Ff.

[106] _Alcides' shows_] _Alcides' shews_ Theobald. _Alcides shooes_ Ff. (_shoos_ F■). _Alcides' should_ Keightley conj.

[107] K. Phi. _Lewis_] Capell. _King Lewis_ Ff. _King Philip_ Theobald. _King,--Lewis_ Knight (Malone conj., withdrawn). See note (IX).

[108] Lew.] K. Philip. Theobald.

[109] _Anjou_] Theobald. _Angiers_ Ff.

[110] _do I_] _I do_ Theobald.

[111] _Bretagne_] Hanmer. _Britaine_ F■ F■. _Britain_ F■. _Brittain_ F■.

[112] _Submit thee ... repetitions_] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

[113] _Do, child, go_] _Do, go, child, go; go_ Capell.

[114] _it ... it_] F■ F■ F■. _yt ... it_ F■. _it' ... it'_ Johnson. _it's ... it's_ Capell.

[115] _whether_] _where_ F■ F■ F■. _whe're_ F■.

she] _he_ Ritson conj.

[116] _wrongs_] _wrong_ F■.

[117] _Draws_] Ff. _Draw_ Capell.

[118] _heaven shall_] _shall heaven_ Collier MS.

[119] _not me_] _me not_ F■.

[120] _dominations_] F■. _domination_ F■ F■ F■.

[121] _this is thy eld'st_] Capell. _this is thy eldest_ Ff. _thy eld'st_ Ritson conj.

eld'st son's son] _eldest's son_ Anon. conj.

[122] _in_] _on_ Anon. conj.

[123] _Bedlam_] Ff. _Beldam_ Rann (Ritson conj.).

[124] _with her plague; her sin_] Edd. (Roby conj.). _with her plague her sinne:_ Ff. _with her--Plague her son!_ Johnson. _with her sin, her plague_ Capell. _with her plagued; her sin,_ Rann (Roderick conj.). _with her sin, her plague,_ Steevens conj. See note (X).

her sin his] _her sin, her_ Lloyd conj.

[125] _sin_] _sins_ Malone conj.

[126] _And all for her;_] _And all for her, and by her;_ Lettsom conj.

[127] _aim_] _ayme_ F■. _ay me_ F■ F■ F■. _amen_ Rowe (ed. 2). _j'aime_ Johnson conj. _shame_ Jackson conj.

[128] SCENE III. Pope.

certain Citizens] Capell. a Citizen Ff.

First Cit.] 1 Cit. Capell (and throughout the scene). Cit. F■. Citti. F■. Citt. F■ F■.

[129] _our_] _your_ Tyrwhitt conj.

[130] _preparation_] _preparations_ Pope.

[131] _And merciless proceeding by these French_] _And ... proceeding, ... French._ Ff. _And ... proceeding, ... French,_ Rowe. _And, ... proceeding, ... French,_ Theobald.

[132] _Confronts your_] Capell _Confront your_ Rowe. _Comfort yours_ F■ F■. _Comfort your_ F■ F■. _Come 'fore_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[133] _waist_] _waiste_ F■. _waste_ F■ F■ F■.

doth] _do_ Rowe.

[134] _ordinance_] _ordnance_ Malone.

[135] _threatened_] F■. _threatned_ F■ F■ F■.

[136] _instead_] F■. _insteed_ F■ F■. _in stead_ F■.

[137] _us in, your_] Capell. _us in. Your_ Ff. _in us, your_ Pope.

[138] _Forwearied_] Steevens. _Forewearied_ Ff.

[139] _Crave_] Pope. _Craves_ Ff.

[140] _owes_] _owns_ Pope.

[141] _hath_] _have_ Hanmer.

[142] _invulnerable_] F■ F■ F■. _involuerable_ F■.

[143] _our_] _your_ Theobald.

proffer'd] _proper_ Jervis conj.

offer] _love_ S. Walker conj.

[144] _roundure_] Capell. _rounder_ Ff. _rondure_ Singer.

old-faced] _bold-faced_ Williams conj.

[145] _rude_] _wide_ Williams conj.

[146] _which_] _in which_ Keightley conj.

[147] See note (XI).

[148] Marked as 'Aside' by Pope.

[149] _sin_] _sins_ Collier MS.

[150] Arranged as in Pope. The first line ends at _dragon_, in Ff.

[151] _on his_] Pope. _on's_ Ff. See note (XII).

[152] [To Aust.] Pope.

[153] _I would_] _I'd_ Pope.

[154] _advantage_] _th' advantage_ Pope.

[Exeunt English. Capell.

[155] _and_] [to Lew.] _and_ Capell.

[156] [Exeunt] Exeunt French. Capell.

Here....] Ff. A long Charge sounded: then ... Warburton. Alarums, as of a Battel join'd; Excursions; afterwards, Retreat. Enter a French Herald.... Capell.

[157] SCENE IV. Pope. SCENE II. Capell. om. Ff. See note (XIII).

[158] _Bretagne_] Rowe (ed. 2). _Britaine_ F■ F■. _Britain_ F■ F■.

[159] _scattered_] _scatter'd_ Rowe.

[160] _Many_] _And many_ Pope.

[161] _discoloured_] _discolour'd_ Rowe.

[162] _And_] _While_ Pope.

[163] _Who ... display'd_] _Triumphantly display'd; who are at hand_ Keightley conj.

display'd] Rowe. _displayed_ Ff.

[164] trumpet.] trumpets. Hanmer.

[165] _with_] _in_ Rowe.

[166] _removed by a_] _remov'd by any_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[167] _Dyed_] _Stain'd_ Pope.

[168] First Cit.] 1 Cit. Capell. Citi. Rowe. Hub. Ff (and throughout the scene). See note (XIV).

[169] Re-enter ... severally.] Enter ... at severall doores. Ff. Flourish. Enter King John, and his Power, on one Side, Bastard, Elinor, Blanch, &c: on the other, King Philip, and French, Austria, and Lewis. Capell.

[170] SCENE V. Pope.

[171] _run_] F■ F■. _runne_ F■. _rome_ F■. _roam_ Malone. _foam_ Nicholson conj.

[172] _water_] _waters_ Grant White (Collier MS.).

[173] _lay down_] _lay by_ Pope.

[174] _mousing_] _mouthing_ Pope.

[175] _equal potents_] _equal potent_ Collier (Collier MS.).

fiery kindled] F■ F■ F■. _fierie kindled_ F■. _fiery-kindled_ Pope. _firey-kindled_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[176] _who's_] F■ F■ F■. _whose_ F■.

[177] _possession_] _procession_ Collier MS.

[178] _of you_] F■ F■. _if you_ F■ F■.

[179] First Cit.] 1 C. Capell. Citi. Rowe. Fra. F■. Fran. F■ F■ F■.

_we_] _ye_ Theobald (Warburton).

[180] _King'd of our fears,_] Rann (Tyrwhitt conj.). _Kings of our feare,_ F■ F■. _Kings of our fear_, F■ F■. _Kings of our fears,--_ Theobald. _Kings are our fears,--_ Warburton. _Kind of our fears_ Jackson conj. _Kings, of our fear;_ Knight (Becket conj.). _King'd of our fear,_ Collier. _Kings of ourselves,_ Delius conj. _Kings of our fear!_ Keightley conj.

[181] _King'd ... deposed._] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

[182] _these_] _the_ Warburton.

[183] _industrious_] _illustrious_ Capell conj.

[184] _Your_] _You_ Rowe.

[185] _mutines_] _mutiners_ Spedding conj.

[186] _awhile_] _a-while_ F■ F■. _a' while_ F■ F■.

[187] _Smacks ... policy?_] Omitted by Pope.

[188] [To Phi. Capell.

_An if_] Capell. _And if_ Ff.

[189] _thunder_] _thunders_ Grant White (Capell conj.).

[190] _O prudent ... away!_] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

O prudent ... it] Marked as 'Aside' by Capell.

[191] _Speak on with favour; we_] _Speak on with favour, we_ Ff. _Speak on; with favour we_ Rowe.

[192] _niece_] Singer (Collier MS.). _neere_ F■ F■. _near_ F■ F■.

[193] _Dauphin_] Rowe. _Dolphin_ Ff (and passim).

[194] _should_] F■ F■ om. F■ F■.

[195] _complete of, say_] _compleat of,--say,_ Theobald. _compleat, oh! say_ Hanmer. _completed, say_ Lloyd conj.

[196] _be not, that_] _be, but that_ Jervis conj.

[197] _as she_] Ff. _a she_ Theobald (Thirlby conj.).

[198] _fair divided_] _fair-divided_ S. Walker conj.

[199] _With ... enforce_] _Swifter than powder can in spleen enforce_ Becket conj.

spleen] _speed_ Pope.

[200] _more ... More_] _so ... So_ Pope.

[201] _stay_] _flaw_ Johnson conj. _say_ Singer (Becket conj.). _story or storm_ Spedding conj.

[202] _lusty blood_] _lusty-blood_ Anon. conj.

[203] _cannon fire,_] Ff. _cannon,--fire_ Capell.

[204] _I first_] _first I_ Anon. conj.

[205] _Eli._] Rowe. _Old Qu._ Ff.

[206] _Son ... it was._] Marked as 'Aside to John' by Capell.

[207] _unsured_] _unsure_ Anon. conj.

[208] _Lest_] F■. _Least_ F■ F■ F■. _Let_ Jackson conj.

now melted by] _now melted_, by Hanmer.

windy] _whining_ Jackson conj.

[209] _hath_] _have_ Anon. conj.

[210] _queen_] _queen's_ Keightley conj.

[211] _Anjou_] Pope, ed. 2, (Theobald). _Angiers_ Ff.

[212] _As_] Ff. _And_ Rowe.

[213] _hand_] F■. _hands_ F■ F■ F■.

[214] Lew.] Dol. Ff.

[215] _The shadow ... a shadow_] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

[216] _sun_] Rowe (ed. 2). _sonne_ F■ F■. son F■ F■.

[217] _beheld_] _behold_ Hanmer.

[218] Whispers ...] Ff. Courts in dumb Shew. Capell.

[219] [Aside. Dyce.

[220] [To Lew. Capell.

[221] _it to_] _into_ Anon. conj.

[222] _easily_] F■ F■. _easlie_ F■ F■.

[223] _still_] _will_ Pope. _shall_ Steevens (Capell conj.).

[224] _Anjou_] F■. _Aniow_ F■. _Anjow_ F■ F■. See note (XI).

[225] _well; young princes, close_] Rowe. _well young princes; close_ Ff.

[226] _And your ... assured_] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

assured ... assured] _assured ... affied_ S. Walker conj.

[227] _Angiers_] _Angires_ F■.

[228] _not, for_] F■ F■. _not for_ F■ F■.

[229] _son?... knows_] Steevens (1793) _son, ... knows?_ Ff.

[230] _She is_] _She's_ Pope.

[231] _widow_] _widow'd_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[232] _Bretagne_] Hanmer. _Britaine_ F■ F■. _Britain_ F■ F■.

[233] _We_] _We'll_ Anon. conj.

[234] Exeunt all....] Rowe. Exeunt. Ff.

[235] SCENE VI. Pope.

[236] _having_] _as they have_ Hanmer.

[237] _'maid' ... maid_] _maids ... maids_ Hanmer.

cheats ... that] _are cheated e'en of that_ Seymour conj.

[238] _who_] _which_ Pope.

peised] _peysed_ F■ F■ F■. _poysed_ F■.

[239] _vile-drawing_] _vile drawing_ Ff.

[240] _this all-changing word_] _this all-changing-word_ F■. _that all-changing-world_ F■ F■ F■.

[241] _aid_] _aim_ Collier, ed. 2 (Mason conj.). _deed_ Bubier conj.

[242] _vile-concluded_] F■. _vile concluded_ F■ F■ F■.

[243] _on this_] _thus on_ Anon. conj.

[244] _Not that I have the_] _Nor that I have the_ Hanmer. _Not but I have the_ or _Not that I have not_ Collier conj. _Not that I have no_ Collier MS.

[245] _But for_] _But that_ Pope.

[246] _whiles_] _while_ Pope.

[247] _Gain, be_] Theobald. _Gaine be_ Ff (_Gain_ F■ F■).

ACT III.

SCENE I. _The French_ KING'S _Pavilion_.[248]

Enter CONSTANCE, ARTHUR, _and_ SALISBURY.

Const. Gone to be married! gone to swear a peace! False blood to false blood join'd! gone to be friends! Shall Lewis have Blanch, and Blanch those provinces? It is not so; thou hast misspoke, misheard; Be well advised, tell o'er thy tale again: 5 It cannot be; thou dost but say 'tis so: I trust I may not trust thee; for thy word[249] Is but the vain breath of a common man: Believe me, I do not believe thee, man;[250] I have a king's oath to the contrary. 10 Thou shalt be punish'd for thus frighting me, For I am sick and capable of fears, Oppress'd with wrongs and therefore full of fears. A widow, husbandless, subject to fears, A woman, naturally born to fears; 15 And though thou now confess thou didst but jest,[251] With my vex'd spirits I cannot take a truce,[251][252] But they will quake and tremble all this day. What dost thou mean by shaking of thy head? Why dost thou look so sadly on my son? 20 What means that hand upon that breast of thine? Why holds thine eye that lamentable rheum, Like a proud river peering o'er his

bounds? Be these sad signs confirmers of thy words?[253] Then speak again; not all thy former tale, 25 But this one word, whether thy tale be true.

Sal. As true as I believe you think them false[254] That give you cause to prove my saying true.

Const. O, if thou teach me to believe this sorrow, Teach thou this sorrow how to make me die, 30 And let belief and life encounter so As doth the fury of two desperate men Which in the very meeting fall and die. Lewis marry Blanch! O boy, then where art thou?[255] France friend with England, what becomes of me?[256] 35 Fellow, be gone: I cannot brook thy sight: This news hath made thee a most ugly man.[257]

Sal. What other harm have I, good lady, done,[257] But spoke the harm that is by others done?[257]

Const. Which harm within itself so heinous is[257] 40 As it makes harmful all that speak of it.[257]

Arth. I do beseech you, madam, be content.[258]

Const. If thou, that bid'st me be content, wert grim, Ugly and slanderous to thy mother's womb, Full of unpleasing blots and sightless stains,[259] 45 Lame, foolish, crooked, swart, prodigious, Patch'd with foul moles and eye-offending marks, I would not care, I then would be content, For then I should not love thee, no, nor thou Become thy great birth nor deserve a crown. 50 But thou art fair, and at thy birth, dear boy, Nature and Fortune join'd to make thee great: Of Nature's gifts thou mayst with lilies boast And with the half-blown rose. But Fortune, O, She is corrupted, changed and won from thee; 55 She adulterates hourly with thine uncle John,[260] And with her golden hand hath pluck'd on France To tread down fair respect of sovereignty. And made his majesty the bawd to theirs. France is a bawd to Fortune and King John,[261] 60 That strumpet Fortune, that usurping John! Tell me, thou fellow, is not France forsworn? Envenom him with words, or get thee gone And leave those woes alone which I alone[262] Am bound to under-bear.

Sal. Pardon me, madam, 65 I may not go without you to the kings.

Const. Thou mayst, thou shalt; I will not go with thee: I will instruct my sorrows to be proud;[263] For grief is proud and makes his owner stoop.[264] To me and to the state of my great grief 70 Let kings assemble; for my grief's so great That no supporter but the huge firm earth[265] Can hold it up: here I and sorrows sit;[266] Here is my throne, bid kings come bow to it.

[_Seats herself on the ground._[267]

Enter KING JOHN, KING PHILIP, LEWIS, BLANCH, ELINOR, _the_ BASTARD, AUSTRIA, _and_ Attendants.

K. Phi. 'Tis true, fair daughter; and this blessed day Ever in France shall be kept festival:[268] 75 To solemnize this day the glorious sun Stays in his course and plays the alchemist, Turning with splendour of his precious eye The meagre cloddy earth to glittering gold: 80 The yearly course that brings this day about Shall never see it but a holiday.[269]

Const. A wicked day, and not a holy day! [_Rising._[270] What hath this day deserved? what hath it done, That it in golden letters should be set 85 Among the high tides in the calendar? Nay, rather turn this day out of the week, This day of shame, oppression, perjury. Or, if it must stand still, let wives with child Pray that their burthens may not fall this day, 90 Lest that their hopes prodigiously be cross'd: But on this day let seamen fear no wreck;[271] No bargains break that are not this day made: This day, all things begun come to ill end, Yea, faith itself to hollow falsehood change![272] 95

K. Phi. By heaven, lady, you shall have no cause To curse the fair proceedings of this day: Have I not pawn'd to you my majesty?

Const. You have beguiled me with a counterfeit Resembling majesty, which, being touch'd and tried,[273] 100 Proves valueless: you are forsworn, forsworn; You came in arms to spill mine enemies' blood,[274] But now in arms you strengthen it with yours: The grappling vigour and rough frown of war Is cold in amity and painted peace,[275] 105 And our oppression hath made up this league.[276] Arm, arm, you heavens, against these perjured kings![277] A widow cries; be husband to me, heavens![278] Let not the hours of this ungodly day Wear out the day in peace; but, ere sunset,[279] 110 Set armed discord 'twixt these perjured kings! Hear me, O, hear me!

Aust. Lady Constance, peace!

Const. War! war! no peace! peace is to me a war. O Lymoges! O Austria! thou dost shame That bloody spoil: thou slave, thou wretch, thou coward! 115 Thou little valiant, great in villany! Thou ever strong upon the stronger side! Thou Fortune's champion that

dost never fight But when her humorous ladyship is by To teach thee safety! thou art perjured too, 120 And soothest up greatness. What a fool art thou. A ramping fool, to brag and stamp and swear[280] Upon my party! Thou cold-blooded slave, Hast thou not spoke like thunder on my side, Been sworn my soldier, bidding me depend 125 Upon thy stars, thy fortune and thy strength, And dost thou now fall over to my foes? Thou wear a lion's hide! doff it for shame, And hang a calf's-skin on those recreant limbs.[281]

Aust. O, that a man should speak those words to me![282] 130

Bast. And hang a calf's-skin on those recreant limbs.[283]

Aust. Thou darest not say so, villain, for thy life.

Bast. And hang a calf's-skin on those recreant limbs.[283][284]

K. John. We like not this; thou dost forget thyself.

Enter PANDULPH.[285]

K. Phi. Here comes the holy legate of the pope. 135

Pand. Hail, you anointed deputies of heaven! To thee, King John, my holy errand is. I Pandulph, of fair Milan cardinal, And from Pope Innocent the legate here, Do in his name religiously demand 140 Why thou against the church, our holy mother, So wilfully dost spurn; and force perforce Keep Stephen Langton, chosen archbishop[286] Of Canterbury, from that holy see?[287] This, in our foresaid holy father's name, 145 Pope Innocent, I do demand of thee.

K. John. What earthy name to interrogatories[288] Can task the free breath of a sacred king?[289] Thou canst not, cardinal, devise a name So slight, unworthy and ridiculous, 150 To charge me to an answer, as the pope.[290] Tell him this tale; and from the mouth of England Add thus much more, that no Italian priest Shall tithe or toll in our dominions; But as we, under heaven, are supreme head,[291] 155 So under Him that great supremacy,[292] Where we do reign, we will alone uphold, Without the assistance of a mortal hand: So tell the pope, all reverence set apart To him and his usurp'd authority. 160

K. Phi. Brother of England, you blaspheme in this.

K. John. Though you and all the kings of Christendom Are led so grossly by this meddling priest, Dreading the curse that money may buy out; And by the merit of vile gold, dross, dust, 165 Purchase corrupted pardon of a man, Who in that sale sells pardon from himself, Though you and all the rest so grossly led This juggling witchcraft with revenue cherish, Yet I alone, alone do me oppose 170 Against the pope and count his friends my foes.

Pand. Then, by the lawful power that I have, Thou shalt stand cursed and excommunicate: And blessed shall he be that doth revolt From his allegiance to an heretic; 175 And meritorious shall that hand be call'd, Canonized and worshipp'd as a saint,[293] That takes away by any secret course Thy hateful life.

Const. O, lawful let it be That I have room with Rome to curse awhile![294] 180 Good father cardinal, cry thou amen To my keen curses; for without my wrong There is no tongue hath power to curse him right.

Pand. There's law and warrant, lady, for my curse.

Const. And for mine too: when law can do no right,[295] 185 Let it be lawful that law bar no wrong: Law cannot give my child his kingdom here, For he that holds his kingdom holds the law; Therefore, since law itself is perfect wrong, How can the law forbid my tongue to curse? 190

Pand. Philip of France, on peril of a curse, Let go the hand of that arch-heretic; And raise the power of France upon his head, Unless he do submit himself to Rome.

Eli. Look'st thou pale, France? do not let go thy hand. 195

Const. Look to that, devil; lest that France repent,[296] And by disjoining hands, hell lose a soul.

Aust. King Philip, listen to the cardinal.

Bast. And hang a calf's-skin on his recreant limbs.[297]

Aust. Well, ruffian, I must pocket up these wrongs, 200 Because--

Bast. Your breeches best may carry them.

K. John. Philip, what say'st thou to the cardinal?

Const. What should he say, but as the cardinal?

Lew. Bethink you, father; for the difference Is purchase of a heavy curse from Rome, 205 Or the light loss of England for a friend: Forego the easier.

Blanch. That's the curse of Rome.[298]

Const. O Lewis, stand fast! the devil tempts thee here[299] In likeness of a new untrimmed bride.[300]

Blanch. The Lady Constance speaks not from her faith,[301] 210 But from her need.[301]

Const. O, if thou grant my need,[301] Which only lives but by the death of faith,[301] That need must needs infer this principle,[301] That faith would live again by death of need.[301] O then, tread down my need, and faith mounts up;[301] 215 Keep my need up, and faith is trodden down![301]

K. John. The king is moved, and answers not to this.[301][302]

Const. O, be removed from him, and answer well![301]

Aust. Do so, King Philip; hang no more in doubt.[301]

Bast. Hang nothing but a calf's-skin, most sweet lout.[301] 220

K. Phi. I am perplex'd, and know not what to say.

Pand. What canst thou say but will perplex thee more, If thou stand excommunicate and cursed?

K. Phi. Good reverend father, make my person yours, And tell me how you would bestow yourself. 225 This royal hand and mine are newly knit, And the conjunction of our inward souls Married in league, coupled and link'd together With all religious strength of sacred vows; The latest breath that save the sound of words 230 Was deep-sworn faith, peace, amity, true love Between our kingdoms and our royal selves, And even before this truce, but new before,[303] No longer than we well could wash our hands To clap this royal bargain up of peace, 235 Heaven knows, they were besmear'd and overstain'd With slaughter's pencil, where revenge did paint The fearful difference of incensed kings: And shall these hands, so lately purged of blood, So newly join'd in love, so strong in both, 240 Unyoke this seizure and this kind regreet? Play fast and loose with faith? so jest with heaven, Make such unconstant children of ourselves, As now again to snatch our palm from palm, Unswear faith sworn, and on the marriage-bed 245 Of smiling peace to march a bloody host, And make a riot on the gentle brow Of true sincerity? O, holy sir, My reverend father, let it not be so! Out of your grace, devise, ordain, impose 250 Some gentle order; and then we shall be blest[304] To do your pleasure and continue friends.

Pand. All form is formless, order orderless. Save what is opposite to England's love. Therefore to arms! be champion of our church, 255 Or let the church, our mother, breathe her curse, A mother's curse, on her revolting son. France, thou mayst hold a serpent by the tongue, A chafed lion by the mortal paw,[305] A fasting tiger safer by the tooth, 260 Than keep in peace that hand which thou dost hold.

K. Phi. I may disjoin my hand, but not my faith.

Pand. So makest thou faith an enemy to faith; And like a civil war set'st oath to oath, Thy tongue against thy tongue. O, let thy vow 265 First made to heaven, first be to heaven perform'd, That is, to be the champion of our church. What since thou sworest is sworn against thyself And may not be performed by thyself, For that which thou hast sworn to do amiss 270 Is not amiss when it is truly done,[306] And being not done, where doing tends to ill, The truth is then most done not doing it: The better act of purposes mistook Is to mistake again; though indirect,[307] 275 Yet indirection thereby grows direct, And falsehood falsehood cures, as fire cools fire Within the scorched veins of one new-burn'd. It is religion that doth make vows kept; But thou hast sworn against religion, 280 By what thou swear'st against the thing thou swear'st,[308] And makest an oath the surety for thy truth[309] Against an oath: the truth thou art unsure[309][310][311] To swear, swears only not to be forsworn;[311][312] Else what a mockery should it be to

swear! 285 But thou dost swear only to be forsworn; And most forsworn, to keep what thou dost swear. Therefore thy later vows against thy first[313] Is in thyself rebellion to thyself; And better conquest never canst thou make 290 Than arm thy constant and thy nobler parts Against these giddy loose suggestions:[314] Upon which better part our prayers come in, If thou vouchsafe them. But if not, then know The peril of our curses light on thee[315] 295 So heavy as thou shalt not shake them off, But in despair die under their black weight.

Aust. Rebellion, flat rebellion!

Bast. Will't not be? Will not a calf's-skin stop that mouth of thine?

Lew. Father, to arms![316]

Blanch. Upon thy wedding-day? 300 Against the blood that thou hast married? What, shall our feast be kept with slaughtered men?[317] Shall braying trumpets and loud churlish drums, Clamours of hell, be measures to our pomp? O husband, hear me! ay, alack, how new[318] 305 Is husband in my mouth! even for that name, Which till this time my tongue did ne'er pronounce, Upon my knee I beg, go not to arms Against mine uncle.

Const. O, upon my knee,[319] Made hard with kneeling, I do pray to thee,[319] 310 Thou virtuous Dauphin, alter not the doom[319] Forethought by heaven![319]

Blanch. Now shall I see thy love: what motive may Be stronger with thee than the name of wife?

Const. That which upholdeth him that thee upholds, 315 His honour: O, thine honour, Lewis, thine honour!

Lew. I muse your majesty doth seem so cold, When such profound respects do pull you on.

Pand. I will denounce a curse upon his head.

K. Phi. Thou shalt not need. England, I will fall from thee.[320] 320

Const. O fair return of banish'd majesty!

Eli. O foul revolt of French inconstancy!

K. John. France, thou shalt rue this hour within this hour.

Bast. Old Time the clock-setter, that bald sexton Time, Is it as he will? well then, France shall rue. 325

Blanch. The sun's o'ercast with blood: fair day, adieu! Which is the side that I must go withal? I am with both: each army hath a hand; And in their rage, I having hold of both, They whirl asunder and dismember me. 330 Husband, I cannot pray that thou mayst win; Uncle, I needs must pray that thou mayst lose; Father, I may not wish the fortune thine; Grandam, I will not wish thy wishes thrive: Whoever wins, on that side shall I lose; 335 Assured loss before the match be play'd.

Lew. Lady, with me, with me thy fortune lies.[321]

Blanch. There where my fortune lives, there my life dies.

K. John. Cousin, go draw our puissance together.

[_Exit Bastard._[322]

France, I am burn'd up with inflaming wrath; 340 A rage whose heat hath this condition, That nothing can allay, nothing but blood,[323] The blood, and dearest-valued blood, of France.[324]

K. Phi. Thy rage shall burn thee up, and thou shalt turn To ashes, ere our blood shall quench that fire: 345 Look to thyself, thou art in jeopardy.

K. John. No more than he that threats. To arms let's hie! [_Exeunt._

SCENE II. _The same. Plains near Angiers._[325]

Alarums, excursions. Enter the BASTARD, _with_ AUSTRIA'S _head_.

Bast. Now, by my life, this day grows wondrous hot; Some airy devil hovers in the sky,[326] And pours down mischief. Austria's head lie there, While Philip breathes.

Enter KING JOHN, ARTHUR, _and_ HUBERT.[327]

K. John. Hubert, keep this boy. Philip, make up:[328] 5 My mother is assailed in our tent, And ta'en, I fear.

Bast. My lord, I rescued her; Her highness is in safety, fear you not: But on, my liege; for very little pains Will bring this labour to an happy end. [_Exeunt._[329] 10

SCENE III. _The same._[330]

Alarums, excursions, retreat. Enter KING JOHN, ELINOR, ARTHUR, _the_ BASTARD, HUBERT, _and_ Lords.

K. John. [_To Elinor_] So shall it be; your grace shall stay behind[331] So strongly guarded. [_To Arthur_] Cousin, look not sad:[332] Thy grandam loves thee; and thy uncle will As dear be to thee as thy father was.

Arth. O, this will make my mother die with grief! 5

K. John. [_To the Bastard_] Cousin, away for England! haste before:[333] And, ere our coming, see thou shake the bags Of hoarding abbots; imprisoned angels[334] Set at liberty: the fat ribs of peace[334][335] Must by the hungry now be fed upon:[336] 10 Use our commission in his utmost force.[337]

Bast. Bell, book, and candle shall not drive me back, When gold and silver becks me to come on.[338] I leave your highness. Grandam, I will pray, If ever I remember to be holy, 15 For your fair safety; so, I kiss your hand.

Eli. Farewell, gentle cousin.

K. John. Coz, farewell. [_Exit Bastard._[339]

Eli. Come hither, little kinsman; hark, a word.[340]

K. John. Come hither, Hubert. O my gentle Hubert,[341] We owe thee much! within this wall of flesh 20 There is a soul counts thee her creditor, And with advantage means to pay thy love: And, my good friend, thy voluntary oath Lives in this bosom, dearly cherished. Give me thy hand. I had a thing to say, 25 But I will fit it with some better time.[342] By heaven, Hubert, I am almost ashamed[343] To say what good respect I have of thee.

Hub. I am much bounden to your majesty.

K. John. Good friend, thou hast no cause to say so yet,[344] 30 But thou shalt have; and creep time ne'er so slow, Yet it shall come for me to do thee good. I had a thing to say, but let it go: The sun is in the heaven, and the proud day, Attended with the pleasures of the world, 35 Is all too wanton and too full of gawds[345] To give me audience: if the midnight bell Did, with his iron tongue and brazen mouth,[346] Sound on into the drowsy race of night;[346][347] If this same were a churchyard where we stand, 40 And thou possessed with a thousand wrongs, Or if that surly spirit, melancholy, Had baked thy blood and made it heavy-thick,[348] Which else runs tickling up and down the veins,[349] Making that idiot, laughter, keep men's eyes[350] 45 And strain their cheeks to idle merriment, A passion hateful to my purposes, Or if that thou couldst see me without eyes, Hear me without thine ears, and make reply Without a tongue, using conceit alone, 50 Without eyes, ears and harmful sound of words; Then, in despite of brooded watchful day,[351] I would into thy bosom pour my thoughts: But, ah, I will not! yet I love thee well; And, by my troth, I think thou lovest me well. 55

Hub. So well, that what you bid me undertake, Though that my death were adjunct to my act, By heaven, I would do it.[352]

K. John. Do not I know thou wouldst? Good Hubert, Hubert, Hubert, throw thine eye On yon young boy: I'll tell thee what, my friend, 60 He is a very serpent in my way; And wheresoe'er this foot of mine doth tread, He lies before me: dost thou understand me? Thou art his keeper.

Hub. And I'll keep him so, That he shall not offend your majesty.[353]

K. John. Death.[65] 65

Hub. My lord?[354]

K. John. A grave.

Hub. He shall not live.

K. John. Enough. I could be merry now. Hubert, I love thee; Well, I'll not say what I intend for thee: Remember. Madam, fare you well:[355] I'll send those powers o'er to your majesty.

Eli. My blessing go with thee!

K. John. For England, cousin, go:[356] Hubert shall be your man, attend on you[357] With all true duty. On toward Calais, ho! [_Exeunt._

SCENE IV. _The same. The_ FRENCH KING'S _tent_.

Enter KING PHILIP, LEWIS, PANDULPH, _and_ Attendants.[358]

K. Phi. So, by a roaring tempest on the flood, A whole armado of convicted sail[359] Is scattered and disjoin'd from fellowship.[360]

Pand. Courage and comfort! all shall yet go well.

K. Phi. What can go well, when we have run so ill? 5 Are we not beaten? Is not Angiers lost? Arthur ta'en prisoner? divers dear friends slain? And bloody England into England gone, O'erbearing interruption, spite of France?

Lew. What he hath won, that hath he fortified: 10 So hot a speed with such advice disposed, Such temperate order in so fierce a cause,[361] Doth want example: who hath read or heard Of any kindred action like to this?

K. Phi. Well could I bear that England had this praise, 15 So we could find some pattern of our shame.

Enter CONSTANCE.

Look, who comes here! a grave unto a soul;[362] Holding the eternal spirit, against her will,[363] In the vile prison of afflicted breath.[364] I prithee, lady, go away with me. 20

Const. Lo, now! now see the issue of your peace.

K. Phi. Patience, good lady! comfort, gentle Constance!

Const. No, I defy all counsel, all redress, But that which ends all counsel, true redress,[365] Death, death; O amiable lovely death![365] 25 Thou odoriferous stench! sound rottenness![366] Arise forth from the couch of lasting night,[367] Thou hate and terror to prosperity, And I will kiss thy detestable bones[368] And put my eyeballs in thy vaulty brows 30 And ring these fingers with thy household worms And stop this gap of breath with fulsome dust And be a carrion monster like thyself: Come, grin on me, and I will think thou smilest, And buss thee as thy wife. Misery's love,[369] 35 O, come to me!

K. Phil. O fair affliction, peace!

Const. No, no, I will not, having breath to cry: O, that my tongue were in the thunder's mouth! Then with a passion would I shake the world;[370] And rouse from sleep that fell anatomy 40 Which cannot hear a lady's feeble voice,[371] Which scorns a modern invocation.[371][372]

Pand. Lady, you utter madness, and not sorrow.

Const. Thou art not holy to belie me so;[373] I am not mad: this hair I tear is mine; 45 My name is Constance; I was Geffrey's wife; Young Arthur is my son, and he is lost: I am not mad: I would to heaven I were! For then, 'tis like I should forget myself: O, if I could, what grief should I forget! 50 Preach some philosophy to make me mad,[374] And thou shalt be canonized, cardinal;[374][375] For being not mad but sensible of grief,[374] My reasonable part produces reason[374] How I may be deliver'd of these woes,[374] 55 And teaches me to kill or hang myself:[374] If I were mad, I should forget my son,[374] Or madly think a babe of clouts were he:[374] I am not mad; too well, too well I feel The different plague of each calamity. 60

K. Phi. Bind up those tresses. O, what love I note[376] In the fair multitude of those her hairs![376] Where but by chance a silver drop hath fallen,[376] Even to that drop ten thousand wiry friends[376][377] Do glue themselves in sociable grief,[376] 65 Like true, inseparable, faithful loves,[376][378] Sticking together in calamity.[376]

Const. To England, if you will.[376]

K. Phi. Bind up your hairs.[376]

Const. Yes, that I will; and wherefore will I do it?[376] I tore them from their bonds and cried aloud[376] 70 'O that these hands could so redeem my son,[376] As they have given these hairs their liberty!'[376] But now I envy at their liberty,[376] And will again commit them to their bonds,[376] Because my poor child is a prisoner.[376] 75 And, father cardinal, I have heard you say[379] That we shall see and know our friends in heaven: If that be true, I shall see my boy again;[380] For since the birth of Cain, the first male child, To him that did but yesterday suspire, 80 There was not such a gracious creature born. But now will canker-sorrow eat my bud And chase the native beauty from his cheek And he will look as hollow as a ghost, As dim and meagre as an ague's fit, 85 And so he'll die; and, rising so again, When I shall meet him in the court of heaven I shall not know him: therefore never, never Must I behold my pretty Arthur more.

Pand. You hold too heinous a respect of grief. 90

Const. He talks to me that never had a son.

K. Phi. You are as fond of grief as of your child.

Const. Grief fills the room up of my absent child, Lies in his bed, walks up and down with me, Puts on his pretty looks, repeats his words, 95 Remembers me of all his gracious parts, Stuffs out his vacant garments with his form; Then, have I reason to be fond of grief?[381] Fare you well: had you such a loss as I,[382] I could give better comfort than you do. 100 I will not keep this form upon my head,[383] When there is such disorder in my wit. O Lord! my boy, my Arthur, my fair son! My life, my joy, my food, my all the world! My widow-comfort, and my sorrows' cure! [_Exit._[384] 105

K. Phi. I fear some outrage, and I'll follow her. [_Exit._

Lew. There's nothing in this world can make me joy:[385] Life is as tedious as a twice-told tale Vexing the dull ear of a drowsy man; And bitter shame hath spoil'd the sweet world's taste.[386] 110 That it yields nought but shame and bitterness.[387]

Pand. Before the curing of a strong disease, Even in the instant of repair and health, The fit is strongest; evils that take leave,[388] On their departure most of all show evil:[388] 115 What have you lost by losing of this day?

Lew. All days of glory, joy and happiness.

Pand. If you had won it, certainly you had. No, no; when Fortune means to men most good, She looks upon them with a threatening eye. 120 'Tis strange to think how much King John hath lost In this which he accounts so clearly won: Are not you grieved that Arthur is his prisoner?

Lew. As heartily as he is glad he hath him.

Pand. Your mind is all as youthful as your blood. 125 Now hear me speak with a prophetic spirit; For even the breath of what I mean to speak Shall blow each dust, each straw, each little rub, Out of the path which shall directly lead Thy foot to England's throne; and therefore mark. 130 John hath seized Arthur; and it cannot be That, whiles warm life plays in that infant's veins,[389] The misplaced John should entertain an hour,[390] One minute, nay, one quiet breath of rest.[391] A sceptre snatch'd with an unruly hand 135 Must be as boisterously maintain'd as gain'd; And he that stands upon a slippery place Makes nice of no vile hold to stay him up: That John may stand, then Arthur needs must fall;[392] So be it, for it cannot be but so. 140

Lew. But what shall I gain by young Arthur's fall?

Pand. You, in the right of Lady Blanch your wife, May then make all the claim that Arthur did.

Lew. And lose it, life and all, as Arthur did.

Pand. How green you are and fresh in this old world! 145 John lays you plots; the times conspire with you;[393] For he that steeps his safety in true blood Shall find but bloody safety and untrue. This act so evilly born shall cool the hearts[394] Of all his

people and freeze up their zeal, 150 That none so small advantage shall step forth[395] To check his reign, but they will cherish it;[396] No natural exhalation in the sky, No scope of nature, no distemper'd day,[397] No common wind, no customed event, 155 But they will pluck away his natural cause[398] And call them meteors, prodigies and signs, Abortives, presages and tongues of heaven,[399] Plainly denouncing vengeance upon John.

Lew. May be he will not touch young Arthur's life, 160 But hold himself safe in his prisonment.

Pand. O, sir, when he shall hear of your approach, If that young Arthur be not gone already, Even at that news he dies; and then the hearts[400] Of all his people shall revolt from him 165 And kiss the lips of unacquainted change And pick strong matter of revolt and wrath Out of the bloody fingers' ends of John. Methinks I see this hurly all on foot: And, O, what better matter breeds for you[401] 170 Than I have named! The bastard Faulconbridge Is now in England, ransacking the church, Offending charity: if but a dozen French[402] Were there in arms, they would be as a call To train ten thousand English to their side, 175 Or as a little snow, tumbled about,[403] Anon becomes a mountain. O noble Dauphin,[404] Go with me to the king: 'tis wonderful What may be wrought out of their discontent,[405] Now that their souls are topful of offence.[405] 180 For England go: I will whet on the king.

Lew. Strong reasons make strong actions: let us go:[406] If you say ay, the king will not say no. [_Exeunt._

FOOTNOTES:

[248] ACT III. SCENE I.] Pope (ed. 2). Actus Secundus. Ff. ACT II. SCENE I. Rowe. SCENE VII. Pope (ed. 1).

The French....] Theobald.

[249] _I trust_] _I think_ Pope.

[250] _Believe ... man_] Omitted in Pope.

[251] _jest, ... spirits_] Rowe. _jest ... spirits,_ Ff.

[252] _cannot_] _can't_ Pope.

[253] _signs_] _sighs_ Warburton.

[254] _you think_] _you'll think_ Keightley conj.

[255] _marry_] _wed_ Pope.

Blanch!] _Blanch?_ Ff.

[256] _England,_] Ff. _England!_ Rowe (ed. 2).

[257] _This ... it_] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

[258] _madam_] _mother_ Pope.

[259] _and sightless_] _unsightly_ Collier MS.

[260] _She adulterates_] Capell. _Sh' adulterates_ Ff. _Adulterates_ Pope.

[261] _King John_] to _John_ Pope.

[262] _those_] _these_ F■.

[263] _sorrows_] _sorrow_ Rowe (ed. 2).

[264] _and_] _an 't_ Anon. conj.

his] _its_ Boswell. See note (XV).

owner stoop] _donor stoop_ Jackson conj. _owners too_ Mitford conj.

stoop] F■ F■. _stoope_ F■ F■. _stout_ Hammer.

his owner] _dishonour_ Bullock conj.

[265] _earth_] _earth_ [throwing herself upon it. Capell.

[266] _and sorrows_] F■ F■. _and sorrowes_ F■ F■. _and sorrow_ Pope. _in sorrow_ Jackson conj.

[267] Seats....] Sits down on the floor. Theobald, om. Ff.

[268] ACTUS TERTIUS, SCÆNA PRIMA Ff. Theobald continues the scene. ACT III. SC. 2. Hanmer. See note (II).

Enter ... Attendants] Malone. Enter King John, France, Dolphin, Blanch, Elianor, Philip, Austria, Constance. Ff.

[269] _holiday_] _holy day_ F■ F■ F■. _Holy-day_ F■.

[270] _A ... day!_] Omitted by Pope.]

an holy-day Theobald. _a holy day_] F■ F■ F■. _a Holy day_ F■.

[Rising] Theobald.

[271] _But on this day_] Rowe (ed. 2). _But (on this day)_ Ff. _Except this day_ Pope.

wreck] _wrack_ Ff.

[272] _change_] _chang'd_ Pope.

[273] _being_] om. Pope.]

and tried] om. Ritson conj.

[274] _mine_] _my_ F■.

[275] _cold_] _cool'd_ Hanmer. _clad_ Capell. _coil'd_ Staunton conj.

painted] _faint in_ Collier MS. _pacted_ Bubier conj.

[276] _hath_] _had_ F■.

[277] _you_] _ye_ Pope.

[278] _cries;_] Capell. _cries,_ Ff.

heavens] _heav'n_ Pope.

[279] _day_] Theobald. _daies_ F■. _dayes_ F■. _days_ F■ F■.

[280] _and stamp_] _to stamp_ F■.

[281] _calf's-skin_] Capell. _Calves skin_ F■ F■ F■. _Calves-skin_ F■.

[282] _should_] _would_ Pope.

[283] _calf's-skin_] Capell. _Calves-skin_ F■ F■ F■. _Calves skin_ F■.

[284] Twelve lines from (Q) inserted by Pope. See note (XVI).

[285] SCENE II. Pope. SCENE III. Hanmer.

[286] _archbishop_] F■ F■. _arshbishop_ F■ F■.

[287] _see_] F■. _sea_ F■ F■ F■.

[288] _earthy_] _earthly_ Pope.

[289] _task_] Theobald. _tast_ F■ F■. _taste_ F■ F■. _tax_ Rowe (ed. 2).

[290] _pope_] _pope's_ Keightley conj.

[291] _heaven_] _God_ Collier conj.

[292] _Him_] _it_ Rowe (ed. 2). _heaven_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[293] _Canonized and worshipp'd_] _Worshipp'd and canonized_ Seymour conj.

[294] _room_] F■ F■. _roome_ F■ F■. _leave_ Pope.

[295] _too: when ... right,_] _too: when ... right,_ Rowe (ed. 2). _too, when ... right._ Ff.

[296] _that, devil_] Pope. _that devil_ Ff.

[297] _calf's-skin_] Capell. _Calves-skin_ Ff.

[298] _That's_] _That s_ F■. _That is_ F■ F■ F■.

[299] _O Lewis_] _Lewis_ Pope.

[300] _new untrimmed_] Ff. _new and trimmed_ Theobald, _new untamed_ or _new betrimmed_. Id. conj. _new-uptrimmed_ Dyce. _new entrimmed_ Richardson conj.

[301] _The lady ... lout._] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

[302] _king_] F■ F■. _kind_] F■ F■.

[303] _but new before,_] _but new--before--_ Seymour conj.

[304] _and then_] _and_ Pope.

[305] _chased_] Theobald. _cased_ Ff. _chased_ Pope. _uncas'd_ Becket conj. _caged_ Collier (Mitford conj.). _raged_ Keightley conj. See note (XVII).

[306] _Is not_] Ff. _Is most_ Hanmer. _Is yet_ Warburton. _Is't not_ Johnson. _Is but_ Collier (Collier MS.). _Is done_ Spedding conj.

[307] _again;_] Theobald. _again_ Ff.

[308] _By what_] _By that_ Hanmer. _By which_ Capell (Johnson conj.).

[309] _truth Against an oath: the truth_] _truth, Against an oath. The truth_ Johnson (Heath conj.). _truth, Against an oath the truth,_ F■ F■. _truth: Against an oath the truth,_ F■ F■. _truth, Against an oath the truth;_ Rowe (ed. 2). _truth, Against an oath the truth_ Pope. _truth Against an oath that truth_ Hanmer.

[310] _the truth_] _the proof_ Staunton. See note (XVIII).

[311] _unsure To swear,_] _untrue To swear:_ Hanmer. _unsure--Toswear,_ Warburton. _unsure. Who swears,_ Capell.

[312] _swears_] _sweares_ F■ F■. _swears,_ F■ F■. _swear_ Rowe (ed. 2).

[313] _later_] F■ F■. _latter_ F■ F■.

[314] _giddy loose_] _giddy-loose_ S. Walker conj.

[315] _thee_] _thee;_ Capell.

[316] Lew.] Daul. Ff.

[317] _slaughtered_] Ff. _slaughter'd_ Rowe.

[318] _ay, alack_] _ah! alack_ Warburton.

[319] _O, upon ... heaven_] Arranged as in Pope. As three lines in Ff, ending _kneeling ... Daulphin ... heaven_.

[320] _I will_] _I'll_ Pope.

[321] _with me,_] _with me;_ Capell. _lies_] _lives_ Capell.

[322] [Exit Bastard.] Pope.

[323] _allay_] _allay't_ Capell conj.

[324] _The blood_] _The best_ S. Walker conj.

[325] SCENE II.] SCENE III. Pope. SCENE IV. Hanmer.

The same. Plains....] Malone. A field of battle. Pope.

[326] _airy_] _fiery_ Theobald (Warburton).

[327] _While Philip breathes_] Omitted by Pope. See note (XIX).

[Alarums. Capell.

[328] _Hubert_] _There, Hubert_ Pope.

keep] _keep thou_ Rann (Tyrwhitt conj.).

Philip] _Richard_ Theobald. _cousin_ Hanmer.

[329] _an happy_] _a happy_ Capell.

[Exeunt.] Exit. Ff.

[330] SCENE III.] Capell. SCENE IV. Pope. SCENE V. Hanmer. Scene continued in Ff.

[331] [To Elinor,] Hanmer.

[332] [To Arthur] Pope.

[333] [To the Bastard] Pope.

[334] _imprisoned angels Set_] Ff. _their imprison 'd angels Set_ Pope. _their imprisoned angels Set thou_ Theobald. _angels imprisoned Set thou_ Reed (1813). _set at liberty Imprison'd angels_ Grant White (S. Walker conj.).

[335] _Set_] _Set all_ Anon. conj.

[336] _hungry ... upon_] _hungry soldiers now be fed on_ Malone conj. (withdrawn).

now] _war_ Theobald (Warburton). _maw_ Hanmer.

[337] _his_] _its_ Rowe.

[338] _becks_] _beck_ Theobald.

[339] _gentle_] _my gentle_ Pope.

[Exit....] Pope.

[340] [Taking him to one side of the stage. Pope.

[341] [To Hubert on the other side. Pope.

[342] _time_] Pope. _tune_ Ff.

[343] _I am_] _I'm_ Pope.

[344] _so yet,_] Ff. _so--yet--_ Pope.

[345] _all too_] _allto_ Seymour conj.

gawds] _gawdes_ F■. _gawdes._ F■ F■. _gawds,_ F■.

[346] _Did ... Sound on into_] _Had ... sounden unto_ Rann conj.

[347] _Sound on_] Ff. _Sound one_ Theobald. _Sound: On!_ Delius conj.

into] Ff. _unto_ Theobald.

race] Ff. _reign_ Seymour conj. _ear_ Dyce and Staunton (S. Walker conj.). _car_ Staunton conj. (withdrawn).

[348] _heavy-thick_] Pope. _heavy, thick_ Ff.

[349] _tickling_] _trickling_ Grey conj. _tingling_ Collier MS.

[350] _keep_] _steep_ Long MS. _peep_ Mason conj.

[351] _brooded_] Ff. _broad-ey'd_ Pope. _broad and_ Mitford conj. _the broad_ Collier MS. _broody_ Anon. MS. conj. (ap. Halliwell).

brooded watchful] _brooded-watchful_ Delius (Mason conj.).

[352] _I would do it_] _I'd do_ Pope. _I'd do't_ Theobald.

[353] _That he ... Death_] As one line, S. Walker conj.

[354] _My lord?_] _My lord._ Ff.

[355] [Returning to the Queen. Pope.

[356] _go_] om. Steevens.

[357] _attend_] F■ F■. _to attend_ F■ F■. _t'attend_ Pope.

[358] SCENE IV.] Capell. Scæna Tertia. Ff. SCENE V. Pope. SCENE VI. Hanmer.

The same. The French King's tent.] Malone. The French Court. Theobald. The French Camp. Capell.

Pandulph,] Pandulpho, F■. Pandupho, F■ F■ F■.

[359] _convicted_] _collected_ Pope. _convented_ Singer (Mason conj.). _connected_ Delius (Malone conj.). _convected_ Dyce conj. _consorted_ Keightley conj. _combined_ Spedding conj.

[360]. _scattered_] Ff. _scatter'd_ Rowe.

[361] _cause_] _course_ Hanmer (Theobald conj.).

[362] _here!_] Capell. _heere?_ F■. _here?_ F■ F■ F■.

[363] _against_] _'gainst_ Pope.

[364] _breath_] _earth_ Farmer conj.

[365] _redress, Death, death:_] Theobald. _redress: Death, death,_ Ff. _redress, Death; death,_ Pope.

[366] _Thou ... rottenness_] Omitted by Pope.

[367] _forth from_] _from forth_ Collier MS.

the couch] _thy couch_ Pope.

[368] _detestable bones_] _bones detestable_ Hanmer.

[369] _buss_] _kiss_ Pope.

Misery's love] _thou love of misery_ Pope.

[370] _a passion_] _what passion_ Collier MS.

would I] F■. _I would_ F■ F■ F■.

[371] See note (XX).

[372] _Which scorns_] _And scorns_ Pope.

modern] _modest_ Rowe (ed. 2). _mother's_ Knight (Heath conj.). _widow's_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[373] _not holy_] F■. _holy_ F■ F■ F■. _unholy_ Delius and Staunton (Steevens conj.).

[374] _Preach ... were he_] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

[375] _thou ... cardinal_] _cardinal, thou shalt be canonized_ Seymour conj.

[376] _Bind ... prisoner_] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

[377] _friends_] Rowe (ed. 2). _fiends_ Ff.

[378] _loves_] _lovers_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[379] _And_] _Oh_ Pope. _Ah!_ Anon. conj.

[380] _true_] om. Pope.

I shall] _I'll_ Seymour conj.

[381] _Then, ... grief?_] F■ F■ F■. Then ... grief? F■. _Then ... grief._ Rowe.

[382] _had you_] _had you had_ Anon. conj.

[383] [Tearing off her head-cloaths. Pope. Looses her hair again. Dent MS. Tearing her hair. Collier MS.]

[384] [Exit.] Exit wildly. Capell.

[385] SCENE VI. Pope. SCENE VII. Hammer.

[386] _And_] _A_ Rowe (ed. 2). _world's taste_] Pope. _words taste_ Ff. _word, state_] Jackson conj. _the ... world's_] _that ... word's_ Delias conj.

[387] _shame_] _gall_ S. Walker conj.

[388] _leave, On ... departure_] Capell. _leave On ... departure,_ F■ F■ F■. _leave. On ... departure._ F■.

[389] _whiles_] _whilst_ Rowe.

[390] _an hour_] _one hour_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[391] _One minute_] _A minute_ Rowe.

[392] _stand, then_] _stand then,_ Hanmer.

[393] _you plots_] _your plots_ Malone conj.

[394] _born_] F■ F■. _borne_ F■ F■.

[395] _none_] _no_ Pope.

[396] _reign_] F■. _reigne_ F■ F■ F■. _rein_ Capell conj.

[397] _scope_] _scape_ Pope. _shape_ Hanmer. See note (XXI).

[398] _his_] _its_ Pope.

[399] _presages and_] _and presages_ Pope.

[400] _that_] _this_ F■.

[401] _O,_] _lo!_ Mason conj.

[402] _a dozen_] _twelve_ Pope.

[403] _Or_] _Ev'n_ Hanmer.

[404] _O_] om. Pope.

[405] _discontent, Now ... offence._] _discontent, Now ... offence,_ Ff. _discontent. Now ... offence,_ Rowe. _discontent: Now ... offence._ Knight.

[406] _reasons make_] Capell. _reasons makes_ Ff. _reason makes_ Rowe.

strong actions] F■ F■ F■. _strange actions_ F■.

ACT IV.

SCENE I. _A room in a castle._

Enter HUBERT _and_ Executioners.[407]

Hub. Heat me these irons hot; and look thou stand[408] Within the arras: when I strike my foot Upon the bosom of the ground, rush forth, And bind the boy which you shall find with me Fast to the chair: be heedful: hence, and watch. 5

First Exec. I hope your warrant will bear out the deed.[409]

Hub. Uncleanly scruples! fear not you: look to't.[410]

[_Exeunt Executioners._

Young lad, come forth; I have to say with you.

Enter ARTHUR.

Arth. Good morrow, Hubert.

Hub. Good morrow, little prince.[411]

Arth. As little prince, having so great a title 10 To be more prince, as may be. You are sad.

Hub. Indeed, I have been merrier.

Arth. Mercy on me! Methinks no body should be sad but I: Yet, I remember, when I was in France,[412] Young gentlemen would be as sad as night, 15 Only for wantonness. By my Christendom. So I were out of prison and kept sheep, I should be as merry as the day is long;[413] And so I would be here, but that I doubt My uncle practises more harm to me: 20 He is afraid of me and I of him: Is it my fault that I was Geffrey's son? No, indeed, is't not; and I would to heaven[414] I were your son, so you would love me, Hubert.

Hub. [_Aside_] If I talk to him, with his innocent prate[415] 25 He will awake my mercy which lies dead: Therefore I will be sudden and dispatch.

Arth. Are you sick, Hubert? you look pale to-day: In sooth, I would you were a little sick, That I might sit all night and watch with you: 30 I warrant I love you more than you do me.[416]

Hub. [_Aside_] His words do take possession of my bosom.[417] Read here, young Arthur. [_Showing a paper._ [_Aside_] How now, foolish rheum![418][419] Turning dispiteous torture out of door![419][420] I must be brief, lest resolution drop 35 Out at mine eyes in tender womanish tears. Can you not read it? is it not fair writ?[421]

Arth. Too fairly, Hubert, for so foul effect:[422] Must you with hot irons burn out both mine eyes?[423]

Hub. Young boy, I must.

Arth. And will you?

Hub. And I will.

Arth. Have you the heart? When your head did but ache, I knit my handkercher about your brows,[424] The best I had, a princess wrought it me, And I did never ask it you again; And with my hand at midnight held your head, And like the watchful minutes to the hour, Still and anon cheer'd up the heavy time, Saying, 'What lack you?' and 'Where lies your grief?' Or 'What good love may I perform for you?' Many a poor man's son would have lien still[425] And ne'er have spoke a loving word to you; But you at your sick service had a prince.[426] Nay, you may think my love was crafty love And call it cunning: do, an if you will:[427] If heaven be pleased that you must use me ill, Why then you must. Will you put out mine eyes? These eyes that never did nor never shall[428] So much as frown on you.[429]

Hub. I have sworn to do it; And with hot irons must I burn them out.

Arth. Ah, none but in this iron age would do it![430] The iron of itself, though heat red-hot,[430] Approaching near these eyes, would drink my tears[430] And quench his fiery indignation[430][431] Even in the matter of mine innocence;[430][432] Nay, after that, consume away in rust,[430] But for containing fire to harm mine eye.[430] Are you more stubborn-hard than hammer'd iron?[430][433] An if an angel should have come to me[434] And told me Hubert should put out mine eyes, I would not have believed him,--no tongue but Hubert's.[435]

Hub. Come forth. [_Stamps._

Re-enter Executioners, _with a cord, irons, &c._[436]

Do as I bid you do.

Arth. O, save me, Hubert, save me! my eyes are out Even with the fierce looks of these bloody men.

Hub. Give me the iron, I say, and bind him here.[437]

Arth. Alas, what need you be so boisterous-rough?[438] I will not struggle, I will stand stone-still.[439] For heaven sake, Hubert, let me not be bound![440] Nay, hear me, Hubert, drive these men away, And I will sit as quiet as a lamb; I will not stir, nor wince, nor speak a word,[441] Nor look upon the iron angerly:[442] Thrust but these men away, and I'll forgive you, Whatever torment you do put me to.

Hub. Go, stand within; let me alone with him.

First Exec. I am best pleased to be from such a deed.[409]

[_Exeunt Executioners._[443]

Arth. Alas, I then have chid away my friend! He hath a stern look, but a gentle heart: Let him come back, that his compassion may Give life to yours.

Hub. Come, boy, prepare yourself.

Arth. Is there no remedy?

Hub. None, but to lose your eyes.

Arth. O heaven, that there were but a mote in yours,[444] A grain, a dust, a gnat, a wandering hair, Any annoyance in that precious sense! Then feeling what small things are boisterous there, Your vile intent must needs seem horrible.

Hub. Is this your promise? go to, hold your tongue.

Arth. Hubert, the utterance of a brace of tongues[445] Must needs want pleading for a pair of eyes:[445] Let me not hold my tongue, let me not, Hubert; Or, Hubert, if you will, cut out my tongue, So I may keep mine eyes: O, spare mine eyes, Though to no use but still to look on you! Lo, by my troth, the instrument is cold And would not harm me.

Hub. I can heat it, boy.

Arth. No, in good sooth; the fire is dead with grief, Being create for comfort, to be used In undeserved extremes: see else yourself; There is no malice in this burning coal;[446] The breath of heaven hath blown his spirit out[447] 110 And strew'd repentant ashes on his head.[447]

Hub. But with my breath I can revive it, boy.

Arth. An if you do, you will but make it blush[448][449] And glow with shame of your proceedings, Hubert:[448] Nay, it perchance will sparkle in your eyes;[448] 115 And like a dog that is compell'd to fight,[448] Snatch at his master that doth tarre him on.[448][450] All things that you should use to do me wrong Deny their office: only you do lack That mercy which fierce fire and iron extends,[451] 120 Creatures of note for mercy-lacking uses.[452]

Hub. Well, see to live; I will not touch thine eye[453] For all the treasure that thine uncle owes:[454] Yet am I sworn and I did purpose, boy, With this same very iron to burn them out. 125

Arth. O, now you look like Hubert! all this while You were disguised.[455]

Hub. Peace; no more. Adieu. Your uncle must not know but you are dead; I'll fill these dogged spies with false reports: And, pretty child, sleep doubtless and secure, 130 That Hubert, for the wealth of all the world, Will not offend thee.

Arth. O heaven! I thank you, Hubert.

Hub. Silence; no more: go closely in with me: Much danger do I undergo for thee. [_Exeunt._

SCENE II. KING JOHN'S _palace_.

Enter KING JOHN, PEMBROKE, SALISBURY, _and other_ Lords.[456]

K. John. Here once again we sit, once again crown'd,[457] And looked upon, I hope, with cheerful eyes.

Pem. This 'once again,' but that your highness pleased, Was once superfluous: you were crown'd before, And that high royalty was ne'er pluck'd off, 5 The faiths of men ne'er stained with revolt; Fresh expectation troubled not the land With any long'd-for change or better state.

Sal. Therefore, to be possess'd with double pomp, To guard a title that was rich before, 10 To gild refined gold, to paint the lily, To throw a perfume on the violet, To smooth the ice, or add another hue Unto the rainbow, or with taper-light To seek the beauteous eye of heaven to garnish, 15 Is wasteful and ridiculous excess.

Pem. But that your royal pleasure must be done, This act is as an ancient tale new told, And in the last repeating troublesome, Being urged at a time unseasonable. 20

Sal. In this the antique and well noted face Of plain old form is much disfigured; And, like a shifted wind unto a sail, It makes the course of thoughts to fetch about, Startles and frights consideration, 25 Makes sound opinion sick and truth suspected,[458] For putting on so new a fashion'd robe.

Pem. When workmen strive to do better than well,[459] They do confound their skill in covetousness;[460] And oftentimes excusing of a fault 30 Doth make the fault the worse by the excuse, As patches set upon a little breach Discredit more in hiding of the fault[461] Than did the fault before it was so patch'd.[461]

Sal. To this effect, before you were new crown'd, 35 We breathed our counsel: but it pleased your highness To overbear it, and we are all well pleased,[462] Since all and every part of what we would Doth make a stand at what your highness will.[463]

K. John. Some reasons of this double coronation 40 I have possess'd you with and think them strong; And more, more strong, then lesser is my fear,[464] I shall indue you with: meantime but ask What you would have reform'd that is not well, And well shall you perceive how willingly 45 I will both hear and grant you your requests.

Pem. Then I, as one that am the tongue of these To sound the purposes of all their hearts, Both for myself and them, but, chief of all, Your safety, for the which myself and them[465] 50 Bend their best studies, heartily request The enfranchisement of Arthur; whose restraint Doth move the murmuring lips of discontent To break into this dangerous argument,--[466] If what in rest you have in right you hold,[467] 55 Why then your fears, which, as they say, attend[468] The steps of wrong, should move you to mew

up[468] Your tender kinsman and to choke his days With barbarous ignorance and deny his youth The rich advantage of good exercise? 60 That the time's enemies may not have this To grace occasions, let it be our suit That you have bid us ask his liberty;[469] Which for our goods we do no further ask[470] Than whereupon our weal, on you depending,[471] 65 Counts it your weal he have his liberty.[472]

Enter HUBERT.

K. John. Let it be so: I do commit his youth To your direction. Hubert, what news with you?

[_Taking him apart._[473]

Pem. This is the man should do the bloody deed; He show'd his warrant to a friend of mine: 70 The image of a wicked heinous fault Lives in his eye; that close aspect of his Does show the mood of a much troubled breast;[474] And I do fearfully believe 'tis done, What we so fear'd he had a charge to do. 75

Sal. The colour of the king doth come and go Between his purpose and his conscience, Like heralds 'twixt two dreadful battles set:[475] His passion is so ripe, it needs must break.

Pem. And when it breaks, I fear will issue thence 80 The foul corruption of a sweet child's death.

K. John. We cannot hold mortality's strong hand:[476] Good lords, although my will to give is living, The suit which you demand is gone and dead: He tells us Arthur is deceased to-night. 85

Sal. Indeed we fear'd his sickness was past cure.

Pem. Indeed we heard how near his death he was Before the child himself felt he was sick: This must be answer'd either here or hence.

K. John. Why do you bend such solemn brows on me? 90 Think you I bear the shears of destiny? Have I commandment on the pulse of life?

Sal. It is apparent foul play; and 'tis shame[477] That greatness should so grossly offer it: So thrive it in your game! and so, farewell. 95

Pem. Stay yet, Lord Salisbury; I'll go with thee, And find the inheritance of this poor child, His little kingdom of a forced grave. That blood which owed the breadth of all this isle,[478] Three foot of it doth hold: bad world the while! 100 This must not be thus borne: this will break out To all our sorrows, and ere long I doubt. [_Exeunt Lords._[479]

K. John. They burn in indignation. I repent:[480][481] There is no sure foundation set on blood,[481] No certain life achieved by others' death.[481] 105

Enter a Messenger.[482]

A fearful eye thou hast: where is that blood That I have seen inhabit in those cheeks? So foul a sky clears not without a storm: Pour down thy weather: how goes all in France?

Mess. From France to England. Never such a power[483] 110 For any foreign preparation Was levied in the body of a land. The copy of your speed is learn'd by them; For when you should be told they do prepare, The tidings comes that they are all arrived.[484] 115

K. John. O, where hath our intelligence been drunk? Where hath it slept? Where is my mother's care,[485] That such an army could be drawn in France, And she not hear of it?

Mess. My liege, her ear Is stopp'd with dust; the first of April died 120 Your noble mother: and, as I hear, my lord, The Lady Constance in a frenzy died Three days before: but this from rumour's tongue I idly heard; if true or false I know not.

K. John. Withhold thy speed, dreadful occasion! 125 O, make a league with me, till I have pleased My discontented peers! What! mother dead![486] How wildly then walks my estate in France! Under whose conduct came those powers of France[487] That thou for truth givest out are landed here? 130

Mess. Under the Dauphin.[488]

K. John. Thou hast made me giddy With these ill tidings.

Enter the BASTARD _and_ PETER _of Pomfret_.[489]

Now, what says the world To your proceedings? do not seek to stuff My head with more ill news, for it is full.

Bast. But if you be afeard to hear the worst,[490] 135 Then let the worst unheard fall on your head.

K. John. Bear with me, cousin; for I was amazed Under the tide: but now I breathe again Aloft the flood, and can give audience To any tongue, speak it of what it will. 140

Bast. How I have sped among the clergy-men,[491] The sums I have collected shall express. But as I travell'd hither through the land, I find the people strangely fantasied; Possess'd with rumours, full of idle dreams, 145 Not knowing what they fear, but full of fear: And here's a prophet, that I brought with me From forth the streets of Pomfret, whom I found With many hundreds treading on his heels; To whom he sung, in rude harsh-sounding rhymes, 150 That, ere the next Ascension-day at noon, Your highness should deliver up your crown.

K. John. Thou idle dreamer, wherefore didst thou so?

Peter. Foreknowing that the truth will fall out so.

K. John. Hubert, away with him; imprison him; 155 And on that day at noon, whereon he says I shall yield up my crown, let him be hang'd. Deliver him to safety; and return, For I must use thee. [_Exit Hubert with Peter._[492]

O my gentle cousin, Hear'st thou the news abroad, who are arrived? 160

Bast. The French, my lord; men's mouths are full of it: Besides, I met Lord Bigot and Lord Salisbury, With eyes as red as new-enkindled fire, And others more, going to seek the grave Of Arthur, whom they say is kill'd to-night[493][494] 165 On your suggestion.[494]

K. John. Gentle kinsman, go, And thrust thyself into their companies:[495] I have a way to win their loves again; Bring them before me.

Bast. I will seek them out.

K. John. Nay, but make haste; the better foot before. 170 O, let me have no subject enemies,[496] When adverse foreigners affright my towns With dreadful pomp of stout invasion! Be Mercury, set feathers to thy heels, And fly like thought from them to me again. 175

Bast. The spirit of the time shall teach me speed. [_Exit._

K. John. Spoke like a sprightful noble gentleman. Go after him; for he perhaps shall need Some messenger betwixt me and the peers; And be thou he.

Mess. With all my heart, my liege. [_Exit._[497] 180

K. John. My mother dead!

Re-enter HUBERT.[498]

Hub. My lord, they say five moons were seen to-night;[499] Four fixed, and the fifth did whirl about The other four in wondrous motion.

K. John. Five moons!

Hub. Old men and beldams in the streets 185 Do prophesy upon it dangerously: Young Arthur's death is common in their mouths: And when they talk of him, they shake their heads And whisper one another in the ear; And he that speaks doth gripe the hearer's wrist, 190 Whilst he that hears makes fearful action, With wrinkled brows, with nods, with rolling eyes. I saw a smith stand with his hammer, thus, The whilst his iron did on the anvil cool, With open mouth swallowing a tailor's news; 195 Who, with his

shears and measure in his hand, Standing on slippers, which his nimble haste Had falsely thrust upon contrary feet, Told of a many thousand warlike French[500] That were embattailed and rank'd in Kent: 200 Another lean unwash'd artificer Cuts off his tale and talks of Arthur's death.

K. John. Why seek'st thou to possess me with these fears? Why urgest thou so oft young Arthur's death? Thy hand hath murder'd him: I had a mighty cause[501] 205 To wish him dead, but thou hadst none to kill him.

Hub. No had, my lord! why, did you not provoke me?[502]

K. John. It is the curse of kings to be attended By slaves that take their humours for a warrant To break within the bloody house of life,[503] 210 And on the winking of authority To understand a law, to know the meaning Of dangerous majesty, when perchance it frowns More upon humour than advised respect.

Hub. Here is your hand and seal for what I did. 215

K. John. O, when the last account 'twixt heaven and earth Is to be made, then shall this hand and seal Witness against us to damnation! How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds Make deeds ill done! Hadst not thou been by,[504] 220 A fellow by the hand of nature mark'd, Quoted and sign'd to do a deed of shame, This murder had not come into my mind: But taking note of thy abhorr'd aspect, Finding thee fit for bloody villany, 225 Apt, liable to be employ'd in danger, I faintly broke with thee of Arthur's death; And thou, to be endeared to a king, Made it no conscience to destroy a prince.[505]

Hub. My lord,-- 230

K. John. Hadst thou but shook thy head or made a pause When I spake darkly what I purposed, Or turn'd an eye of doubt upon my face, As bid me tell my tale in express words,[506] Deep shame had struck me dumb, made me break off, 235 And those thy fears might have wrought fears in me: But thou didst understand me by my signs And didst in signs again parley with sin;[507] Yea, without stop, didst let thy heart consent, And consequently thy rude hand to act 240 The deed, which both our tongues held vile to name. Out of my sight, and never see me more! My nobles leave me; and my state is braved, Even at my gates, with ranks of foreign powers: Nay, in the body of this fleshly land,[508] 245 This kingdom, this confine of blood and breath, Hostility and civil tumult reigns[509] Between my conscience and my cousin's death.

Hub. Arm you against your other enemies, I'll make a peace between your soul and you. 250 Young Arthur is alive: this hand of mine Is yet a maiden and an innocent hand, Not painted with the crimson spots of blood. Within this bosom never enter'd yet The dreadful motion of a murderous thought;[510] 255 And you have slander'd nature in my form, Which, howsoever rude exteriorly, Is yet the cover of a fairer mind Than to be butcher of an innocent child.[511]

K. John. Doth Arthur live? O, haste thee to the peers, 260 Throw this report on their incensed rage, And make them tame to their obedience! Forgive the comment that my passion made Upon thy feature; for my rage was blind, And foul imaginary eyes of blood[512] 265 Presented thee more hideous than thou art. O, answer not, but to my closet bring The angry lords with all expedient haste. I conjure thee but slowly; run more fast. [_Exeunt._

SCENE III. _Before the castle._

Enter ARTHUR, _on the walls_.[513]

Arth. The wall is high, and yet will I leap down: Good ground, be pitiful and hurt me not! There's few or none do know me: if they did, This ship-boy's semblance hath disguised me quite. I am afraid; and yet I'll venture it. 5 If I get down, and do not break my limbs, I'll find a thousand shifts to get away: As good to die and go, as die and stay. [_Leaps down._[514] O me! my uncle's spirit is in these stones: Heaven take my soul, and England keep my bones! [_Dies._ 10

Enter PEMBROKE, SALISBURY, _and_ BIGOT.

Sal. Lords, I will meet him at Saint Edmundsbury:[515] It is our safety, and we must embrace This gentle offer of the perilous time.

Pem. Who brought that letter from the cardinal?

Sal. The Count Melun, a noble lord of France;[516] 15 Whose private with me of the Dauphin's love[517] Is much more general than these lines import.

Big. To-morrow morning let us meet him then.

Sal. Or rather then set forward; for 'twill be Two long days' journey, lords, or ere we meet.[518] 20

Enter the BASTARD.

Bast. Once more to-day well met, distemper'd lords! The king by me requests your presence straight.

Sal. The king hath dispossess'd himself of us: We will not line his thin bestained cloak[519] With our pure honours, nor attend the foot 25 That leaves the print of blood where'er it walks. Return and tell him so: we know the worst.

Bast. Whate'er you think, good words, I think, were best.

Sal. Our griefs, and not our manners, reason now.

Bast. But there is little reason in your grief; 30 Therefore 'twere reason you had manners now.

Pem. Sir, sir, impatience hath his privilege.[520]

Bast. 'Tis true, to hurt his master, no man else.[520][521]

Sal. This is the prison. What is he lies here?

[_Seeing Arthur._[522]

Pem. O death, made proud with pure and princely beauty! 35 The earth had not a hole to hide this deed.

Sal. Murder, as hating what himself hath done, Doth lay it open to urge on revenge.

Big. Or, when he doom'd this beauty to a grave,[523] Found it too precious-princely for a grave.[524] 40

Sal. Sir Richard, what think you? have you beheld,[525] Or have you read or heard? or could you think? Or do you almost think, although you see, That you do see? could thought, without this object,[526] Form such another? This is the very top,[527] 45 The height, the crest, or crest unto the crest, Of murder's arms: this is the bloodiest shame, The wildest savagery, the vilest stroke, That ever wall-eyed wrath or staring rage Presented to the tears of soft remorse. 50

Pem. All murders past do stand excused in this: And this, so sole and so unmatchable, Shall give a holiness, a purity, To the yet unbegotten sin of times;[528] And prove a deadly bloodshed but a jest, 55 Exampled by this heinous spectacle.

Bast. It is a damned and a bloody work; The graceless action of a heavy hand, If that it be the work of any-hand.

Sal. If that it be the work of any hand![529] 60 We had a kind of light what would ensue: It is the shameful work of Hubert's hand; The practice and the purpose of the king: From whose obedience I forbid my soul, Kneeling before this ruin of sweet life, 65 And breathing to his breathless excellence[530] The incense of a vow, a holy vow, Never to taste the pleasures of the world, Never to be infected with delight, Nor conversant with ease and idleness, 70 Till I have set a glory to this hand,[531] By giving it the worship of revenge.

Pem. } Our souls religiously confirm thy words. _Big._ }

Enter HUBERT.

Hub. Lords, I am hot with haste in seeking you:[532] Arthur doth live; the king hath sent for you. 75

Sal. O, he is bold and blushes not at death. Avaunt, thou hateful villain, get thee gone!

Hub. I am no villain.

Sal. Must I rob the law? [_Drawing his sword._[533]

Bast. Your sword is bright, sir; put it up again.

Sal. Not till I sheathe it in a murderer's skin.

Hub. Stand back, Lord Salisbury, stand back, I say; By heaven, I think my sword's as sharp as yours: I would not have you, lord, forget yourself, Nor tempt the danger of my true defence; Lest I, by marking of your rage, forget[534] Your worth, your greatness and nobility.

Big. Out, dunghill! darest thou brave a nobleman?

Hub. Not for my life: but yet I dare defend My innocent life against an emperor.

Sal. Thou art a murderer.

Hub. Do not prove me so;[535] Yet I am none: whose tongue soe'er speaks false, Not truly speaks; who speaks not truly, lies.

Pem. Cut him to pieces.

Bast. Keep the peace, I say.

Sal. Stand by, or I shall gall you, Faulconbridge.

Bast. Thou wert better gall the devil, Salisbury: If thou but frown on me, or stir thy foot, Or teach thy hasty spleen to do me shame, I'll strike thee dead. Put up thy sword betime;[536] Or I'll so maul you and your toasting-iron, That you shall think the devil is come from hell.

Big. What wilt thou do, renowned Faulconbridge?[537] Second a villain and a murderer?

Hub. Lord Bigot, I am none.

Big. Who kill'd this prince?

Hub. 'Tis not an hour since I left him well: I honour'd him, I loved him, and will weep My date of life out for his sweet life's loss.

Sal. Trust not those cunning waters of his eyes, For villany is not without such rheum;[538] And he, long traded in it, makes it seem Like rivers of remorse and innocency.[539] Away with me, all you whose souls abhor The uncleanly savours of a slaughter-house;[540] For I am stifled with this smell of sin.[541]

Big. Away toward Bury, to the Dauphin there!

Pem. There tell the king he may inquire us out.

[_Exeunt Lords._

Bast. Here's a good world! Knew you of this fair work?[542] Beyond the infinite and boundless reach[543] Of mercy, if thou didst this deed of death,[543] Art thou damn'd, Hubert.[543]

Hub. Do but hear me, sir.

Bast. Ha! I'll tell thee what; Thou'rt damn'd as black--nay, nothing is so black;[544] Thou art more deep damn'd than Prince Lucifer: There is not yet so ugly a fiend of hell As thou shalt be, if thou didst kill this child.

Hub. Upon my soul--[545]

Bast. If thou didst but consent To this most cruel act, do but despair; And if thou want'st a cord, the smallest thread That ever spider twisted from her womb Will serve to strangle thee; a rush will be a beam[546] To hang thee on; or wouldst thou drown thyself,[547] Put but a little water in a spoon, And it shall be as all the ocean, Enough to stifle such a villain up. I do suspect thee very grievously.

Hub. If I in act, consent, or sin of thought, Be guilty of the stealing that sweet breath Which was embounded in this beauteous clay, Let hell want pains enough to torture me. I left him well.

Bast. Go, bear him in thine arms.[548] I am amazed, methinks, and lose my way 140 Among the thorns and dangers of this world. How easy dost thou take all England up![549] From forth this morsel of dead royalty,[549] The life, the right and truth of all this realm Is fled to heaven; and England now is left 145 To tug and scamble and to part by the teeth[550] The unowed interest of proud-swelling state.[551] Now for the bare-pick'd bone of majesty Doth dogged war bristle his angry crest And snarleth in the gentle eyes of peace: 150 Now powers from home and discontents at home Meet in one line; and vast confusion waits, As doth a raven on a sick-fallen beast,[552] The imminent decay of wrested pomp.[553] Now happy he whose cloak and cincture can[554] 155 Hold out this tempest. Bear away that child And follow me with speed: I'll to the king: A thousand businesses are brief in hand,[555] And heaven itself doth frown upon the land. [_Exeunt._[556]

FOOTNOTES:

[407] ACT IV. SC. 1.] Actus Quartus, Scæna prima. F■. Actus Quintus ... F■ F■ F■.

A room in a castle.] Staunton. Northampton. A room in the castle. Capell. Changes to England. A Prison. Pope. Canterbury. A room in the castle. Grant White. Dover. A room in the castle. Halliwell.

Executioners.] Ff. Executioner. Rowe. certain Officers of the Castle. Capell. two attendants. Malone.

[408] _thou_] _you_ Rowe.

[409] First Exec.] Exec. Ff. 1. O. Capell.

[410] _Uncleanly_] _Unmanly_ Grey conj.

scruples! fear] Rowe (ed. 2). _scruples feare_ F■ F■ (_fear_ F■). _scruples, fear_ F■. _scruple! fear_ Rann.

Exeunt ...] Exeunt Officers. Capell. om. Ff.

[411] _Good morrow, little_] _Morrow, little_ Pope.

[412] _France_] _Fance_ F■.

[413] _should_] _would_ Boswell (1821).

_be as_] _be as as_ F■. _be_ Pope.

[414] _No, indeed_] _Indeed_ Pope.

_is't_] F■ F■. _it's_ F■ F■. _it is_ Pope.

[415] [Aside] Rowe.

[416] _I warrant_] _Alas,_ Pope.

[417] [Aside] Capell.

[418] [Showing a paper.] Rowe (ed. 2).

[Aside] Rowe (ed. 2).

How now] _How how_ Capell (corrected in MS.).

[419] _rheum!... door!_] Steevens. _rheume?... doore?_ Ff. (_door?_ F■). _rheume, ... door!_ Rowe (ed. 2). _rheum! ... door?_ Capell.

[420] _dispiteous_] _dispitious_ Ff. _this piteous_ Long MS.

torture] _nature_ Hanmer.

[421] _is it not fair_] _is't not fairly_ Keightley conj.

[422] _effect_] _a fact_ Malone conj.

[423] _hot_] om. Pope.

[424] _handkercher_] Ff. _handkerchief_ Rowe.

[425] _lien_] _lyen_ F■ F■ F■. _lain_ F■.

[426] _sick service_] _sick-service_ Delius.

[427] _an if_] Theobald. _and if_ Ff.

[428] _nor_] _and_ Pope.

[429] _I have_] _I've_ Pope.

[430] _Ah, ... iron?_] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

[431] _his_] Capell. _this_ Ff. _their_ Rowe (ed. 1). _its_ Rowe (ed. 2).

[432] _matter_] _water_ Long MS.

[433] _stubborn-hard_] Warburton. _stubborne hard_ F■ F■. _stubborn hard_ F■ F■.

[434] _An if_] Capell. _And if_ F■. _Oh if_ Pope.

[435] _him,--no tongue but Hubert's_] _him: no tongue but Hubert's._ Ff. _a tongue but Hubert's._ Pope. _a tongue 'bate Hubert._ Warburton conj. _no tongue, but Hubert's._ Steevens (1793). _him. No tongue but Hubert's--_ Knight (Steevens conj.). See note (xxii).

[436] [Stamps ...] om. Ff. Stamps, and the men enter. Pope. Re-enter Officers with a cord, the irons, &c. Capell.

[437] _iron_] _irons_ Anon. conj.

[438] _boisterous-rough_] Theobald. _boistrous rough_ F■ F■. _boisterous rough_ F■ F■.

[439] _stone-still_] Rowe. _stone still_ Ff.

[440] _heaven sake_] _heav'n's sake_ Warburton.

[441] _wince_] F■ F■ F■. _winch_ F■.

[442] _angerly_] _angrily_ Pope.

[443] Exeunt ...] Exeunt officers. Capell. Exit. Pope. om. Ff.

[444] _mote_] Steevens (Long MS. and Malone conj.). _moth_ Ff.

[445] _Hubert ... eyes:_] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

[446] _in this burning_] _burning in this_ Grey conj.

[447] his] its Pope.

[448] _An ... on_] Put in the margin, as spurious, by Pope.

[449] _An if_] Edd. (S. Walker conj.) _And if_ Ff.

[450] _tarre_] Ff. _set_ Rowe.

[451] _extends_] _extend_ Pope.

[452] _mercy-lacking_] Pope. _mercy, lacking_ Ff.

[453] _to live_] _and live_ Roderick conj.

eye] Ff. _eyes_ Steevens (Capell conj.).

[454] _owes_] _owns_ Pope.

[455] _disguised_] Pope. _disguis'd_ Ff.

[456] King John's Palace.] The Court of England. Pope. The same. A Room of State in the Palace. Capell.

Enter ...] Flourish. Enter King John, crowned; ... King takes his State. Capell.

[457] _once again crown'd_] F■ F■. _once against crown'd_ F■ F■. _crown'd once again_ Pope.

[458] _suspected_] _suspect_ Anon. conj.

[459] _to do better_] _to better do_ Staunton conj.

[460] _covetousness_] _covetise_ Capell conj.

[461] _fault ... fault_] _flaw ... flaw_ Warburton.

[462] _it_] _'t_ Anon. conj.

and we are] _yet we're_ Pope. _and we're_ Theobald.

[463] _Doth_] _Do_ Rowe (ed. 2). _Must_ Pope.

will] _wills_ Keightley conj.

[464] _then lesser is my fear,_] _then lesser is my feare_ F■. _then lesse is my feare_ F■. _then lesse is my fear_ F■ F■ (_less_ F■). _the less that is my fear,_ Rowe (ed. 2). _(the lesser is my fear)_ Pope. _(when lesser is my fear)_ Steevens (Tyrwhitt conj.). _than lesser is my fear_ Collier (ed. 1). _thus lessening my fear_ Collier MS. _than lesser, in my fear_ Keightley conj.

[465] _them_] _they_ Pope. See note (XXIII).

[466] _argument,--_] Capell. _argument._ Ff.

[467] _in rest_] _in wrest_ Steevens conj. _int'rest_ Jackson conj. _in rent_ Anon. conj.

in right] _not right_ Staunton conj.

hold] _hold not_ Malone conj.

[468] _then ... should_] _shou'd ... then_ Pope. _then ... should not_ Keightley conj.

[469] _you_] _you'd_ Keightley conj.

[470] _goods_] _good_ Pope.

[471] _Than_] _Then_ F■. _you_] _yours_ Collier MS.

[472] _he have his_] _that he have_ Pope.

[473] [Taking him apart.] Capell. The King goes aside with Hubert. Hanmer.

[474] _Does_] F■. _Doe_ F■. _Do_ F■ F■. _Doth_ Dyce and Staunton.

[475] _set_] _sent_ Theobald.

[476] [Turning to the Lords. Capell.

[477] _foul play_] _foule-play_ F■ F■. _foul play_ F■ F■.

[478] _owed_] _ow'd_ Ff. _own'd_ Pope. _breadth_] _breath_ Rowe.

[479] [Exeunt Lords.] Exeunt. Ff.

[480] SCENE III. Pope.

[481] [Aside. Rowe (ed. 2).

[482] Enter ...] Enter Mes. Ff. (after line 102).

[483] _England. Never_] Johnson (Roderick Conj.) _England, never_ Ff. _England never_ Rowe. _England--Never_ Capell.

[484] _comes_] F■ F■ F■. _come_ F■.

[485] _care_] _care_ or _care_ F■. _care_ F■ F■ F■. See note (XXIV).

[486] _What!_] _What?_ Ff. _My_ Pope.

[487] _came_] _come_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[488] _Dauphin_] _Dolphin_ Ff. _Dauphin's_ Hanmer.

[489] Enter ...] Ff (after _Dolphin,_ line 131).

[490] _afeard_] _afraid_ F■.

[491] _clergy-men_] F■. _clergy men_ F■ F■ F■. _clergymen_ Warburton.

[492] Exit ...] Theobald.

[493] _whom_] Ff. _who_ Pope.

[494] _Of ... suggestion_] As one line in Ff.

[495] _companies_] _company_ Pope.

[496] _subject_] F■. _subjects_ F■ F■ F■.

[497] [Exit.] Rowe.

[498] Re-enter H.] Capell. Enter H. Ff.

[499] SCENE IV. Pope.

[500] _Told_] _He told_ Long MS.

[501] _a mighty cause_] _a cause_ Pope. _mighty cause_ Steevens.

[502] _No had_] Ff. _Had none_ Rowe (ed. 2). _None had_ Knight.

[503] _within_] F■. om. F■ F■ F■ _into_ Pope.

[504] _Make_] _Makes_ Theobald.

deeds ill] Ff. _ill deeds_ Knight (Capell conj.).

Hadst] _for hadst_ Pope. _Hadest_ Capell.

[505] _Made_] _Mad'st_ Pope.

[506] _As_] _Or_ Pope. _And_ Malone.

[507] _sin_] _sign_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[508] [Laying his hand upon his breast. Long MS.

[509] _reigns_] _reign_ Hanmer.

[510] _murderous_] Ff. _murd'rous_ Pope. _murd'rer's_ Hanmer (Warburton).

[511] _an innocent_] _a guiltless_ Pope.

[512] _foul imaginary_] _foul-imaginary_ S. Walker conj.

[513] SCENE III.] SCENE V. Pope.

Before the castle.] The same. Before ... Capell. A prison. Rowe. A street before a prison. Pope.

Enter ...] Ff. Enter ... disguis'd. Theobald.

[514] [Leaps down.] Rowe.

[515] _Saint_] F■. _S._ F■. _St._ F■ F■.

[516] _Melun_] Rowe. _Meloone_ F■. _Melloone_ F■ F■ F■.

[517] _with me_] Ff. _missive_ Collier (Collier MS.). _witness_ Spedding conj.

[518] _or ere_] F■ F■ F■. _or e're_ F■.

Enter ...] Enter Bastard. Ff.

[519] _thin bestained_] Rowe. _thin-bestained_ Ff. _sin-bestained_ Singer (Collier MS.).

cloak] _cloake_ F■ F■. _clake_ F■ F■.

[520] _his_] _its_ Pope.

[521] _man_] _mans_ F■. See note (XXV).

[522] [Seeing Arthur] Pope.

[523] _a grave_] _the glaive_ Hanmer.

[524] _precious-princley_] Capell. _precious princely_ Ff.

[525] _have you beheld_] F■ F■. _you have beheld_ F■ F■.

[526] _That_] _What_ Pope.

[527] _This is_] _'tis_ Pope. _This'_ S. Walker conj.

[528] _sin of times_] F■. _sinne of times_ F■ F■ F■. _sins of time_ Pope. _sin of time_ Steevens. _sin of time's_ Keightley conj.

[529] _hand!_] _hand?_ Ff. _hand,--_ Capell.

[530] _his_] _this_ Rowe.

[531] _hand_] _head_ Singer (Farmer conj.).

[Taking Arthur's hand. Mason conj.

[532] SCENE VI. Pope.

[533] _law?_] F■ F■. _law._ F■ F■.

[Drawing his sword.] Pope.

[534] _of_] _but_ Collier (Collier MS.).

[535] _Do not_] _Do but_ or _Do you_ Keightley conj.

[536] _thee_] _the_ Warburton (a misprint).

[537] _wilt thou_] _will you_ Rowe (ed. 2).

[538] _such rheum_] _such a rheum_ Warburton.

[539] _innocency_] _innocence_ Pope.

[540] _savours_] F■. _savour_ F■ F■ F■.

[541] _this_] _the_ F■.

[542] SCENE VII. Pope.

[543] _Beyond ... Hubert._] Arranged as by Pope. As two lines, the first ending _mercy,_ in Ff.

[544] _as black--_] Rowe (ed. 2). _as blacke,_ F■ F■. _as black,_ F■ F■. _so black--_ Pope.

[545] _soul--_] Pope. _soule._ F■ F■. _soul._ F■ F■.

[546] _serve to_] Omitted by Pope.

[547] _thyself_] om. Steevens conj. (ending line 129 at _will be_).

[548] [Hubert takes up Arthur. Collier (Collier MS.).

[549] _up!... royalty,_] Theobald. _up, ... royalty?_ Ff.

[550] _scamble_] _scramble_ Rowe.

[551] _proud swelling_] Pope. _proud-swelling_ Ff.

[552] _sick-fallen_] _sick, fall'n_ Pope.

[553] _wrested_] _wasted_ Anon. conj.

[554] _cincture_] Pope. _center_ Ff. _bever_ Anon. MS. conj. (ap. Halliwell).

[555] _in_] _at_ Rowe.

[556] Exeunt.] Exit. Ff. Exeunt; Hubert bearing out Arthur. Collier (Collier MS.).

ACT V.

SCENE I. KING JOHN'S _palace_.

Enter KING JOHN, PANDULPH, _and_ Attendants.[557]

K. John. Thus have I yielded up into your hand The circle of my glory. [_Giving the crown._[558]

Pand. Take again From this my hand, as holding of the pope[559] Your sovereign greatness and authority.

K. John. Now keep your holy word: go meet the French, 5 And from his holiness use all your power To stop their marches 'fore we are inflamed.[560] Our discontented counties do revolt; Our people quarrel with obedience, Swearing allegiance and the love of soul[561] 10 To stranger blood, to foreign royalty. This inundation of mistemper'd humour[562] Rests by you only to be qualified: Then pause not; for the present time's so sick, That present medicine must be minister'd, 15 Or overthrow incurable ensues.[563]

Pand. It was my breath that blew this tempest up. Upon your stubborn usage of the pope; But since you are a gentle convertite, My tongue shall hush again this storm of war 20 And make fair weather in your blustering land. On this Ascension-day, remember well, Upon your oath of service to the pope, Go I to make the French lay down their arms. [_Exit._

K. John. Is this Ascension-day? Did not the prophet 25 Say that before Ascension-day at noon My crown I should give off? Even so I have: I did suppose it should be on constraint; But, heaven be thank'd, it is but voluntary.

Enter the BASTARD.

Bast. All Kent hath yielded; nothing there holds out 30 But Dover Castle: London hath received, Like a kind host, the Dauphin and his powers: Your nobles will not hear you, but are gone To offer service to your enemy, And wild amazement hurries up and down[564] 35 The little number of your doubtful friends.[565]

K. John. Would not my lords return to me again, After they heard young Arthur was alive?

Bast. They found him dead and cast into the streets. An empty casket, where the jewel of life[566] 40 By some damn'd hand was robb'd and ta'en away.

K. John. That villain Hubert told me he did live.

Bast. So, on my soul, he did, for aught he knew. But wherefore do you droop? why look you sad? Be great in act, as you have been in thought; 45 Let not the world see fear and sad distrust[567] Govern the motion of a kingly eye: Be stirring as the time; be fire with fire;[568] Threaten the threatener and outface the brow Of bragging horror: so shall inferior eyes, 50 That borrow their behaviours from the great, Grow great by your example and put on The dauntless spirit of resolution. Away, and glister like the god of war, When he intendeth to become the field: 55 Show boldness and aspiring confidence. What, shall they seek the lion in his den, And fright him there? and make him tremble there? O, let it not be said: forage, and run[569] To meet displeasure farther from the doors, 60 And grapple with him ere he comes so nigh.

K. John. The legate of the pope hath been with me, And I have made a happy peace with him; And he hath promised to dismiss the powers Led by the Dauphin.

Bast. O inglorious league! 65 Shall we, upon the footing of our land, Send fair-play orders and make compromise,[570] Insinuation, parley and base truce To arms invasive? shall a beardless boy, A cocker'd silken wanton, brave our fields, 70 And flesh his spirit in a warlike soil, Mocking the air with colours idly spread,[571] And find no check? Let us, my liege, to arms: Perchance the cardinal cannot make your peace;[572] Or if he do, let it at least be said 75 They saw we had a purpose of defence.

K. John. Have thou the ordering of this present time.

Bast. Away, then, with good courage! yet, I know, Our party may well meet a prouder foe. [_Exeunt._

SCENE II. _The_ DAUPHIN'S _Camp at St Edmundsbury_.

Enter, in arms, LEWIS, SALISBURY, MELUN, PEMBROKE, BIGOT, _and_ Soldiers.[573]

Lew. My Lord Melun, let this be copied out, And keep it safe for our remembrance: Return the precedent to these lords again; That, having our fair order written down, Both they and we, perusing o'er these notes, 5 May know wherefore we took the sacrament And keep our faiths firm and inviolable.

Sal. Upon our sides it never shall be broken. And, noble Dauphin, albeit we swear A voluntary zeal and an unurged faith[574] 10 To your proceedings; yet believe me, prince, I am not glad that such a sore of time Should seek a plaster by contemn'd revolt,[575] And heal the inveterate canker of one wound By making many. O, it grieves my soul, 15 That I must draw this metal from my side To be a widow-maker! O, and there Where honourable rescue and defence Cries out upon the name of Salisbury![576] But such is the infection of the time, 20 That, for the health and physic of our right, We cannot deal but with the very hand Of stern injustice and confused wrong. And is't not pity, O my grieved friends, That we, the sons and children of this isle, 25 Were born to see so sad an hour as this;[577] Wherein we step after a stranger march[578] Upon her gentle bosom, and fill up Her enemies' ranks,--I must withdraw and weep Upon the spot of this enforced cause,--[579] 30 To grace the gentry of a land remote, And follow unacquainted colours here? What, here? O nation, that thou couldst remove! That Neptune's arms, who clippeth thee about, Would bear thee from the knowledge of thyself,[580] 35 And grapple thee unto a pagan shore;[581] Where these two Christian armies might combine The blood of malice in a vein of league,[582] And not to spend it so unneighbourly![583]

Lew. A noble temper dost thou show in this; 40 And great affections wrestling in thy bosom[584] Doth make an earthquake of nobility.[585] O, what a noble combat hast thou fought[586] Between compulsion and a brave respect![587] Let me wipe off this honourable dew, 45 That silverly doth progress on thy cheeks: My heart hath melted at a lady's tears, Being an ordinary inundation; But this effusion of such manly drops, This shower, blown up by tempest of the soul, 50 Startles mine eyes, and makes me more amazed Than had I seen the vaulty top of heaven Figured quite o'er with burning meteors. Lift up thy brow, renowned Salisbury, And with a great heart heave away this storm: 55 Commend these waters to those baby eyes[588] That never saw the giant world enraged; Nor met with fortune other than at feasts, Full of warm blood, of mirth, of gossiping.[589] Come, come; for thou shalt thrust thy hand as deep 60 Into the purse of rich prosperity As Lewis himself: so, nobles, shall you all, That knit your sinews to the strength of mine. And even there, methinks, an angel spake:

Enter PANDULPH.[590]

Look, where the holy legate comes apace, 65 To give us warrant from the hand of heaven, And on our actions set the name of right With holy breath.

Pand. Hail, noble prince of France![591] The next is this, King John hath reconciled Himself to Rome; his spirit is come in, 70 That so stood out against the holy church, The great metropolis and see of Rome: Therefore thy threatening colours now wind up; And tame the savage spirit of wild war, That, like a lion foster'd up at hand, 75 It may lie gently at the foot of peace, And be no further harmful than in show.

Lew. Your grace shall pardon me, I will not back: I am too high-born to be propertied, To be a secondary at control, 80 Or useful serving-man and instrument, To any sovereign state throughout the world. Your breath first kindled the dead coal of wars[592] Between this chastised kingdom and myself, And brought in matter that should feed this fire; 85 And now 'tis far too huge to be blown out With that same weak wind which enkindled it. You taught me how to know the face of right, Acquainted me with interest to this land,[593] Yea, thrust this enterprise into my heart; 90 And come ye now to tell me John hath made His peace with Rome? What is that peace to me? I, by the honour of my marriage-bed, After young Arthur, claim this land for mine; And, now it is half-conquer'd, must I back 95 Because that John hath made his peace with Rome? Am I Rome's slave? What penny hath Rome borne, What men provided, what munition sent, To underprop this action? Is't not I That undergo this charge? who else but I, 100 And such as to my claim are liable, Sweat in this business and maintain this war? Have I not heard these islanders shout out 'Vive le roi!' as I have bank'd their towns? Have I not here the best cards for the game, 105 To win this easy match play'd for a crown? And shall I now give o'er the yielded set? No, no, on my soul, it never shall be said.[594]

Pand. You look but on the outside of this work.

Lew. Outside or inside, I will not return 110 Till my attempt so much be glorified As to my ample hope was promised Before I drew this gallant head of war, And cull'd these fiery spirits from the world, To outlook conquest and to win renown 115 Even in the jaws of danger and of death. [_Trumpet sounds._[595] What lusty trumpet thus doth summon us?

Enter the BASTARD, _attended_.[596]

Bast. According to the fair play of the world,[597] Let me have audience; I am sent to speak:[598] My holy lord of Milan, from the king[598] 120 I come, to learn how you have dealt for him;[598] And, as you answer, I do know the scope And warrant limited unto my tongue.

Pand. The Dauphin is too wilful-opposite,[599] And will not temporize with my entreaties;[600] 125 He flatly says he'll not lay down his arms.

Bast. By all the blood that ever fury breathed, The youth says well. Now hear our English king; For thus his royalty doth speak in me. He is prepared, and reason too he should:[601] 130 This apish and unmannerly approach, This harness'd masque and unadvised revel, This unhair'd sauciness and boyish troops,[602] The king doth smile at; and is well prepared To whip this dwarfish war, these pigmy arms,[603] 135 From out the circle of his territories. That hand which had the strength, even at your door, To cudgel you and make you take the hatch, To dive like buckets in concealed wells, To crouch in litter of your stable planks, 140 To lie like pawns lock'd up in chests and trunks, To hug with swine, to seek sweet safety out[604] In vaults and prisons, and to thrill and shake Even at the crying of your nation's crow,[605] Thinking his voice an armed Englishman;[606] 145 Shall that victorious hand be feebled here, That in your chambers gave you chastisement? No: know the gallant monarch is in arms And like an eagle o'er his aery towers,[607] To souse annoyance that comes near his nest. 150 And you degenerate, you ingrate revolts,[608] You bloody Neroes, ripping up the womb Of your dear mother England, blush for shame; For your own ladies and pale-visaged maids Like Amazons come tripping after drums, 155 Their thimbles into armed gauntlets change,[609] Their needles to lances, and their gentle hearts[610] To fierce and bloody inclination.

Lew. There end thy brave, and turn thy face in peace; We grant thou canst outscold us: fare thee well;[611] 160 We hold our time too precious to be spent With such a brabbler.[612]

Pand. Give me leave to speak.

Bast. No, I will speak.

Lew. We will attend to neither. Strike up the drums; and let the tongue of war Plead for our interest and our being here. 165

Bast. Indeed, your drums, being beaten, will cry out; And so shall you, being beaten: do but start An echo with the clamour of thy drum, And even at hand a drum is ready braced That shall reverberate all as loud as thine;[613] 170 Sound but another, and another shall As loud as thine rattle the welkin's ear And mock the deep-mouth'd thunder: for at hand, Not trusting to this halting legate here, Whom he hath used rather for sport than need, 175 Is warlike John; and in his forehead sits A bare-ribb'd death, whose office is this day[614] To feast upon whole thousands of the French.

Lew. Strike up our drums, to find this danger out.

Bast. And thou shalt find it, Dauphin, do not doubt. 180

[_Exeunt._

SCENE III. _The field of battle._

Alarums. Enter KING JOHN _and_ HUBERT.[615]

K. John. How goes the day with us? O, tell me, Hubert.

Hub. Badly, I fear. How fares your majesty?

K. John. This fever, that hath troubled me so long, Lies heavy on me; O, my heart is sick!

Enter a Messenger.

Mess. My lord, your valiant kinsman, Faulconbridge, 5 Desires your majesty to leave the field And send him word by me which way you go.

K. John. Tell him, toward Swinstead, to the abbey there.[616]

Mess. Be of good comfort; for the great supply That was expected by the Dauphin here, 10 Are wreck'd three nights ago on Goodwin Sands.[617] This news was brought to Richard but even now: The French fight coldly, and retire themselves.

K. John. Ay me! this tyrant fever burns me up,[618] And will not let me welcome this good news. 15 Set on toward Swinstead: to my litter straight;[616] Weakness possesseth me, and I am faint. [_Exeunt._

SCENE IV. _Another part of the field._[619]

Enter SALISBURY, PEMBROKE, _and_ BIGOT.

Sal. I did not think the king so stored with friends.

Pem. Up once again; put spirit in the French:[620] If they miscarry, we miscarry too.[620]

Sal. That misbegotten devil, Faulconbridge, In spite of spite, alone upholds the day. 5

Pem. They say King John sore sick hath left the field.

Enter MELUN, _wounded_.

Mel. Lead me to the revolts of England here.

Sal. When we were happy we had other names.

Pem. It is the Count Melun.

Sal. Wounded to death.

Mel. Fly, noble English, you are bought and sold; 10 Unthread the rude eye of rebellion[621] And welcome home again discarded faith. Seek out King John and fall before his feet; For if the French be lords of this loud day,[622] He means to recompense the pains you take 15 By cutting off your heads: thus hath he sworn And I with him, and many moe with me,[623] Upon the altar at Saint Edmundsbury;[624] Even on that altar where we swore to you Dear amity and everlasting love. 20

Sal. May this be possible? may this be true?

Mel. Have I not hideous death within my view, Retaining but a quantity of life, Which bleeds away, even as a form of wax Resolveth from his figure 'gainst the fire?[625] 25 What in the world should make me now deceive, Since I must lose the use of all deceit?[626] Why should I then be false, since it is true That I must die here and live hence by truth? I say again, if Lewis do win the day,[627] 30 He is forsworn, if e'er those eyes of yours Behold another day break in the east: But even this night, whose black contagious breath Already smokes about the burning crest[628] Of the old, feeble and day-wearied sun, 35 Even this ill night, your breathing shall expire, Paying the fine of rated treachery[629] Even with a treacherous fine of all your lives, If Lewis by your assistance win the day. Commend me to one Hubert with your king: 40 The love of him, and this respect besides, For that my grandsire was an Englishman,[630] Awakes my conscience to confess all this. In lieu whereof, I pray you, bear me hence From forth the noise and rumour of the field, 45 Where I may think the remnant of my thoughts In peace, and part this body and my soul With contemplation and devout desires.

Sal. We do believe thee: and beshrew my soul But I do love the favour and the form 50 Of this most fair occasion, by the which We will untread the steps of damned flight, And like a bated and retired flood,[631] Leaving our rankness and irregular course,[632] Stoop low within those bounds we have o'erlook'd[633] 55 And calmly run on in obedience Even to our ocean, to our great King John. My arm shall give thee help to bear thee hence; For I do see the cruel pangs of death[634] Right in thine eye. Away, my friends! New flight;[635] 60 And happy newness, that intends old right.[636]

[_Exeunt, leading off Melun._

SCENE V. _The French camp._[637]

Enter LEWIS _and his train_.

Lew. The sun of heaven methought was loath to set, But stay'd, and made the western welkin blush, When English measure backward their own ground[638] In faint retire. O, bravely came we off, When with a volley of our needless shot, 5 After such bloody toil, we bid good night; And wound our tattering colours clearly up,[639] Last in the field, and almost lords of it!

Enter a Messenger.

Mess. Where is my prince, the Dauphin?[640]

Lew. Here: what news?

Mess. The Count Melun is slain; the English lords 10 By his persuasion are again fall'n off,[641] And your supply, which you have wish'd so long,[642] Are cast away and sunk on Goodwin Sands.

Lew. Ah, foul shrewd news! beshrew thy very heart! I did not think to be so sad to-night[643] 15 As this hath made me. Who was he that said King John did fly an hour or two before The stumbling night did part our weary powers?

Mess. Whoever spoke it, it is true, my lord.

Lew. Well; keep good quarter and good care to-night: 20 The day shall not be up so soon as I, To try the fair adventure of to-morrow. [_Exeunt._

SCENE VI. _An open place in the neighbourhood of Swinstead Abbey._[644]

Enter the BASTARD _and_ HUBERT, _severally_.

Hub. Who's there? speak, ho! speak quickly, or I shoot.

Bast. A friend. What art thou?

Hub. Of the part of England.

Bast. Whither dost thou go?[645][646]

Hub. What's that to thee? why may not I demand[646][647] Of thine affairs, as well as thou of mine?[646][647] 5

Bast. Hubert, I think?[646][647]

Hub. Thou hast a perfect thought: I will upon all hazards well believe Thou art my friend, that know'st my tongue so well. Who art thou?

Bast. Who thou wilt: and if thou please,[648] Thou mayst befriend me so much as to think 10 I come one way of the Plantagenets.

Hub. Unkind remembrance! thou and eyeless night[649] Have done me shame: brave soldier, pardon me, That any accent breaking from thy tongue Should 'scape the true acquaintance of mine ear. 15

Bast. Come, come; sans compliment, what news abroad?

Hub. Why, here walk I in the black brow of night, To find you out.

Bast. Brief, then; and what's the news?

Hub. O, my sweet sir, news fitting to the night, Black, fearful, comfortless and horrible. 20

Bast. Show me the very wound of this ill news: I am no woman, I'll not swoon at it.[650]

Hub. The king, I fear, is poison'd by a monk: I left him almost speechless; and broke out To acquaint you with this evil, that you might 25 The better arm you to the sudden time, Than if you had at leisure known of this.[651]

Bast. How did he take it? who did taste to him?

Hub. A monk, I tell you; a resolved villain, Whose bowels suddenly burst out: the king 30 Yet speaks and peradventure may recover.

Bast. Who didst thou leave to tend his majesty?[652]

Hub. Why, know you not? the lords are all come back,[653] And brought Prince Henry in their company; At whose request the king hath pardon'd them, 35 And they are all about his majesty.

Bast. Withhold thine indignation, mighty heaven, And tempt us not to bear above our power! I'll tell thee, Hubert, half my power this night,[654] Passing these flats, are taken by the tide; 40 These Lincoln Washes have devoured them; Myself, well mounted, hardly have escaped.[655] Away before: conduct me to the king; I doubt he will be dead or ere I come.[656] [_Exeunt._

SCENE VII. _The orchard in Swinstead Abbey._[657]

Enter Prince HENRY, SALISBURY, _and_ BIGOT.

P. Hen. It is too late: the life of all his blood Is touch'd corruptibly, and his pure brain,[658] Which some suppose the soul's frail dwelling-house, Doth by the idle comments that it makes Foretell the ending of mortality. 5

Enter PEMBROKE.

Pem. His highness yet doth speak, and holds belief That, being brought into the open air, It would allay the burning quality Of that fell poison which assaileth him.

P. Hen. Let him be brought into the orchard here.[659] 10 Doth he still rage? [_Exit Bigot._

Pem. He is more patient Than when you left him; even now he sung.

P. Hen. O vanity of sickness! fierce extremes In their continuance will not feel themselves.[660] Death, having prey'd upon the outward parts,[661] 15 Leaves them invisible, and his siege is now[662] Against the mind, the which he pricks and wounds[663] With many legions of strange fantasies, Which, in their throng and press to that last hold, Confound themselves. 'Tis strange that death should sing. 20 I am the cygnet to this pale faint swan,[664] Who chants a doleful hymn to his own death, And from the organ-pipe of frailty sings His soul and body to their lasting rest.[665]

Sal. Be of good comfort, prince; for you are born 25 To set a form upon that indigest Which he hath left so shapeless and so rude.

Enter Attendants, _and_ BIGOT, _carrying_ KING JOHN _in a chair_.[666]

K. John. Ay, marry, now my soul hath elbow-room; It would not ou Translator: François Guizot

Release date: April 10, 2006 [eBook #18143]

Language: French

Other information and formats: www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/18143

Credits: Produced by Paul Murray, Rénald Lévesque and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at http://www.pgdp.net (This file was produced from images generously made available by the Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF/Gallica))

*** START OF THE PROJECT GUTENBERG EBOOK ROMÉO ET JULIETTE ***

Produced by Paul Murray, Rénald Lévesque and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at http://www.pgdp.net (This file was produced from images generously made available by the Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF/Gallica))

Note du transcripteur. ========== Ce document est tiré de:

OEUVRES COMPLÈTES DE SHAKSPEARE

TRADUCTION DE M. GUIZOT

NOUVELLE ÉDITION ENTIÈREMENT REVUE AVEC UNE ÉTUDE SUR SHAKSPEARE DES NOTICES SUR CHAQUE PIÈCE ET DES NOTES

Volume 3 Timon d'Athènes Le Jour des Rois.--Les deux gentilshommes de Vérone. Roméo et Juliette.--Le Songe d'une nuit d'été. Tout est bien qui finit bien.

PARIS A LA LIBRAIRIE ACADÉMIQUE DIDIER ET Cie, LIBRAIRES-ÉDITEURS 35, QUAI DES AUGUSTINS 1864
==========

ROMÉO ET JULIETTE

TRAGÉDIE

NOTICE SUR ROMÉO ET JULIETTE

Deux grandes familles de Vérone, les Montecchi et les Capelletti (les _Montaigu_ et les _Capulet_), vivaient depuis longtemps dans une inimitié qui avait souvent donné lieu, dans les rues, à des combats sanglants. Alberto della Scala, second capitaine perpétuel de Vérone, avait inutilement travaillé à les réconcilier; mais du moins était-il parvenu à les contenir de telle sorte que lorsqu'ils se rencontraient, dit l'historien de Vérone, Girolamo della Corte, «les plus jeunes cédaient le pas aux plus âgés, ils se saluaient et se rendaient le salut.»

En 1303, sous Bartolommeo della Scala, élu capitaine perpétuel après la mort de son père Alberto, Antonio Cappelletto, chef de sa faction, donna, dans le carnaval, une grande fête, à laquelle il invita une partie de la noblesse de Vérone. Roméo Montecchio, âgé de vingt à vingt et un ans, et l'un des plus beaux et des plus aimables jeunes gens de la ville; s'y rendit masqué avec quelques-uns de ses amis. Au bout de quelque temps, ayant ôté son masque, il s'assit dans un coin d'où il pouvait voir et être vu. On s'étonna beaucoup de la hardiesse avec laquelle il venait ainsi au milieu de ses ennemis. Cependant, comme il était jeune et de manières agréables, ceux-ci, dit l'historien, «n'y firent pas autant d'attention qu'ils en auraient fait peut-être s'il eût été plus âgé.» Ses yeux et ceux de Juliette Cappelletto se rencontrèrent bientôt, et, frappés également d'admiration, ils ne cessèrent plus de se regarder. La fête s'étant terminée par une danse appelée chez nous, dit Girolamo, «la danse du chapeau» (_dal cappello_), une dame vint prendre Roméo, qui, se trouvant ainsi introduit dans la danse, après avoir fait quelques tours avec sa danseuse, la quitta pour aller prendre Juliette, qui dansait avec un autre. Aussitôt qu'elle l'eût senti lui toucher la main, elle lui dit: «Bénie soit votre venue!» Et lui, lui serrant la main, répondit: «Quelles bénédictions en recevez-vous, madame?» Et elle reprit en souriant: «Ne vous étonnez pas, seigneur, si je bénis votre venue; M. Mercutio était là depuis longtemps à me glacer, et par votre politesse vous êtes venu me réchauffer.» (Ce jeune homme, qui s'appelait Mercutio, dit le louche, et que l'agrément de son esprit faisait aimer de tout le monde,

avait toujours eu les mains plus froides que la glace.) A ces mots, Roméo répondit: «Je suis grandement heureux de vous rendre service en quoi que ce soit.» Comme la danse finissait, Juliette ne put dire que ces mots: «Hélas! je suis plus à vous qu'à moi-même.»

Roméo s'étant rendu plusieurs fois dans une petite rue, sur laquelle donnaient les fenêtres de Juliette, un soir elle le reconnut à «son éternuement ou à quelque autre signe,» et elle ouvrit la fenêtre. Ils se saluèrent «très-poliment (_cortesissimamente_),» et, après s'être longtemps entretenus de leurs amours, ils convinrent qu'il fallait qu'ils se mariassent, quoi qu'il en pût arriver; et que cela devait se faire par l'entremise du frère Lonardo, franciscain, «théologien, grand philosophe, distillateur admirable, savant dans l'art de la magie,» et confesseur de presque toute la ville. Roméo l'alla trouver, et le frère, songeant au crédit qu'il acquerrait, non-seulement auprès du capitaine perpétuel, mais dans toute la ville, s'il parvenait à réconcilier les deux familles, se prêta aux désirs des deux jeunes gens. A l'époque de la Quadragésime, où la confession était d'obligation, Juliette se rendit avec sa mère dans l'église de Saint-François, dans la citadelle, et étant entrée la première dans le confessionnal, de l'autre côté duquel se trouvait Roméo, également venu à l'église avec son père, ils reçurent la bénédiction nuptiale par la fenêtre du confessionnal, que le frère avait eu soin d'ouvrir; puis, par les soins d'une très adroite vieille de la maison de Juliette, ils passèrent la nuit ensemble dans son jardin.

Cependant, après les fêtes de Pâques, une troupe nombreuse de Capelletti rencontra, à peu de distance des portes de Vérone, quelques Montecchi, et les attaqua, animée par Tébaldo, cousin germain de Juliette, qui, voyant que Roméo faisait tous ses efforts pour arrêter le combat, s'attacha à lui, et, le forçant à se défendre, en reçut un coup d'épée dans la gorge, dont il tomba mort sur-le-champ. Roméo fut banni, et, peu de temps après, Juliette, près de se voir contrainte d'en épouser un autre, eut recours au frère Lonardo, qui lui donna à avaler une poudre au moyen de laquelle elle devait passer pour morte, et être portée dans la sépulture de sa famille, qui se trouvait placée dans l'église du couvent de Lonardo. Celui-ci devait venir l'en retirer et la faire passer ensuite, déguisée, à Mantoue, où était Roméo, qu'il se chargeait d'instruire de tout.

Les choses se passèrent comme l'avait annoncé Lonardo; mais Roméo ayant appris indirectement la mort de Juliette avant d'avoir reçu la lettre du religieux, partit sur-le-champ pour Vérone avec un seul domestique, et, muni d'un poison violent, se rendit au tombeau, qu'il ouvrit, baigna de larmes le corps de Juliette, avala le poison et mourut. Juliette, réveillée l'instant d'après, voyant Roméo mort et ayant appris du religieux, qui venait d'arriver, ce qui s'était passé, fut saisie d'une douleur si forte que, «sans pouvoir dire une parole, elle demeura morte sur le sein de son Roméo[1].»

[Note 1: Voyez _Istorie di Verona del sig. Girolamo della Corte_, etc., t. Ier, p. 589 et suiv. Édit. de 1594.]

Cette histoire est racontée comme véritable par Girolamo della Corte; il assure avoir vu plusieurs fois le tombeau de Juliette et de Roméo, qui, s'élevant un peu au-dessus de terre et placé près d'un puits, servait alors de lavoir à la maison des orphelins de Saint-François, que l'on bâtissait en cet endroit. Il rapporte en même temps que le cavalier Gerardo Boldiero, son oncle, qui l'avait mené à ce tombeau, lui avait montré dans un coin du mur, près du couvent des Capucins, l'endroit d'où il avait entendu dire qu'un grand nombre d'années auparavant on avait retiré les restes de Juliette et de Roméo, ainsi que de plusieurs autres. Le capitaine Bréval, dans ses voyages, dit également avoir vu à Vérone, en 1762, un vieux bâtiment qui était alors une maison d'orphelins, et qui, selon son guide, avait renfermé le tombeau de Roméo et de Juliette; mais il n'existait plus.

Ce n'est probablement pas sur le récit de Girolamo della Corte que Shakspeare a composé sa tragédie; elle fut d'abord représentée, à ce qu'il paraît, en 1595, chez lord Hundsdon, lord chambellan de la reine Élisabeth, et imprimée pour la première fois en 1597. Or, l'ouvrage de Girolamo della Corte, qui devait avoir vingt-deux livres, se trouve interrompu au milieu du vingtième livre et à l'année 1560 par la maladie de l'auteur. On voit de plus, dans la préface de l'éditeur, que cette maladie fut longue et amena la mort de l'historien, que la nécessité de revoir le travail auquel Girolamo n'avait pu mettre lui-même la dernière main prit un temps considérable, et enfin que les procès, tant «civils que criminels,» dont fut tourmenté l'éditeur, ne lui permirent pas de mener à fin son entreprise aussi promptement qu'il l'aurait désiré; en sorte que l'ouvrage de Girolamo ne put être publié que longtemps après sa mort: l'édition de 1594 est donc, selon toute apparence, la première, et ne pouvait guère, en 1595, être déjà venue à la connaissance de Shakspeare.

Mais l'histoire de Roméo et de Juliette, sans doute très-populaire à Vérone, avait déjà fait le sujet d'une nouvelle, composée par Luigi da Porto, et publiée à Venise en 1535, six ans après la mort de l'auteur, sous le titre de la _Giulietta_. Cette nouvelle, réimprimée, traduite, imitée dans plusieurs langues, fournit à Arthur Brooke le sujet d'un poëme anglais, publié en 1562[2], et où Shakspeare a certainement puisé le sujet de sa tragédie. L'imitation est complète. Juliette, dans le poëme de Brooke ainsi que

dans la nouvelle de Luigi da Porto, se tue avec le poignard de Roméo, au lieu de mourir de douleur comme dans l'histoire de Girolamo della Corte; mais ce qu'il y a de singulier, c'est que le poëme d'Arthur Brooke, et Shakspeare qui l'a suivi, fassent mourir Roméo comme dans l'histoire, avant le réveil de Juliette, tandis que, dans la nouvelle de Luigi da Porto, il ne meurt qu'après l'avoir vue se réveiller et avoir eu avec elle une scène de douleur et d'adieux. On a reproché à Shakspeare de ne s'être pas conformé à cette circonstance qui lui fournissait une situation très-pathétique, et on en a conclu qu'il ne connaissait pas la nouvelle italienne, bien que traduite en anglais. Cependant quelques circonstances donnent lieu de croire que Shakspeare connaissait cette traduction. Quant à ses motifs pour préférer le récit du poëte à celui du romancier, il peut en avoir eu plusieurs: d'abord, pour s'être écarté en un point si important de la nouvelle de Luigi da Porto, qu'il a suivie scrupuleusement sur presque tous les autres, peut-être Arthur Brooke, l'auteur même du poëme, avait-il eu quelques renseignements sur l'histoire véritable, telle que l'avait racontée Girolamo della Corte, contemporain de Shakspeare; il aura pu les lui communiquer, et l'exactitude de Shakspeare à se rapprocher, autant qu'il le pouvait, de l'histoire ou des récits reçus comme tels, ne lui aura pas permis d'hésiter dans le choix. D'ailleurs, et c'est probablement ici la vraie raison du poëte, Shakspeare ne fait presque jamais précéder une résolution forte par de longs discours: «Les discours, dit Macbeth, jettent un souffle trop froid sur l'action.» Quelques angoisses que la réflexion ajoute à la douleur, elle porte l'esprit sur un trop grand nombre d'objets pour ne pas le distraire de l'idée unique qui conduit aux actions désespérées. Après avoir reçu les adieux de Roméo, après avoir pleuré sa mort avec lui, il eût pu arriver que Juliette la pleurât toute sa vie au lieu de se tuer à l'instant. Garrick a refait cette scène du tombeau d'après la supposition adoptée par la nouvelle de Luigi da Porto; la scène est touchante, mais, comme cela était peut-être inévitable dans une situation pareille, impossible à rendre par des paroles; les sentiments en sont trop et trop peu agités, le désespoir trop et trop peu violent. Il y a dans le laconisme de la Juliette et du Roméo de Shakspeare, à ces derniers moments, bien plus de passion et de vérité.

[Note 2: Sous le titre de: _l'Histoire tragique de Roméo et Juliette, contenant un exemple rare de vraie fidélité, avec les subtiles inventions et pratiques d'un vieux moine, et leur fâcheuse issue._ Ce poëme a été réimprimé à la suite de _Roméo et Juliette_, dans les grandes éditions de Shakspeare, entre autres dans celle de Malone.]

Ce laconisme est d'autant plus remarquable que, dans tout le cours de la pièce, Shakspeare s'est livré sans contrainte à cette abondance de réflexions et de paroles qui est l'un des caractères de son génie. Nulle part le contraste n'est plus frappant entre le fond des sentiments que peint le poëte et la forme sous laquelle il les exprime. Shakspeare excelle à voir les sentiments humains tels qu'ils se présentent, tels qu'ils sont réellement dans la nature, sans préméditation, sans travail de l'homme sur lui-même, naïfs et impétueux, mêlés de bien et de mal, d'instincts vulgaires et d'élans sublimes, comme l'est l'âme humaine dans son état primitif et spontané. Quoi de plus vrai que l'amour de Roméo et de Juliette, cet amour si jeune, si vif, si irréfléchi, plein à la fois de passion physique et de tendresse morale, abandonné sans mesure et pourtant sans grossièreté, parce que les délicatesses du coeur s'unissent partout à l'emportement des sens! Il n'y a rien là de subtil, ni de factice, ni de spirituellement arrangé par le poëte; ce n'est ni l'amour pur des imaginations pieusement exaltées, ni l'amour licencieux des vies blasées et perverties; c'est l'amour lui-même, l'amour tout entier, involontaire, souverain, sans contrainte et sans corruption, tel qu'il éclate à l'entrée de la jeunesse, dans le coeur de l'homme, à la fois simple et divers, comme Dieu l'a fait. _Roméo et Juliette_ est vraiment la tragédie de l'amour, comme _Othello_ celle de la jalousie, et _Macbeth_ celle de l'ambition. Chacun des grands drames de Shakspeare est dédié à l'un des grands sentiments de l'humanité; et le sentiment qui remplit le drame est bien réellement celui qui remplit et possède l'âme humaine quand elle s'y livre; Shakspeare n'y retranche, n'y ajoute et n'y change rien; il le représente simplement, hardiment, dans son énergique et complète vérité.

Passez maintenant du fond à la forme et du sentiment même au langage que lui prête le poëte; quel contraste! Autant le sentiment est vrai et profondément connu et compris, autant l'expression en est souvent factice, chargée de développements et d'ornements où se complaît l'esprit du poëte, mais qui ne se placent point naturellement dans la bouche du personnage. _Roméo et Juliette_ est peut-être même, entre les grandes pièces de Shakspeare, celle où ce défaut abonde le plus. On dirait que Shakspeare a voulu imiter ce luxe de paroles, cette facilité verbeuse qui, dans la littérature comme dans la vie, caractérisent en général les peuples du midi; il avait certainement lu, du moins dans les traductions, quelques poëtes italiens; et les innombrables subtilités dont le langage de tous les personnages de _Roméo et Juliette_ est, pour ainsi dire, tissu, les continuelles comparaisons avec le soleil, les fleurs et les étoiles, quoique souvent brillantes et gracieuses, sont évidemment une imitation du style des sonnets et une dette payée à la couleur locale. C'est peut-être parce que les sonnets italiens sont presque toujours sur le ton plaintif que la recherche et l'exagération de langage se font particulièrement sentir dans les plaintes des deux amants; l'expression de leur court bonheur est, surtout dans la bouche de Juliette, d'une simplicité ravissante; et quand ils arrivent au terme extrême de leur destinée, quand le poëte entre dans la dernière scène de cette douloureuse tragédie, alors il renonce à toutes ses velléités d'imitation, à toutes ses réflexions spirituellement savantes; ses personnages, à qui, dit Johnson, «il a toujours laissé un _concetti_ dans leur misère,» n'en

retrouvent plus dès que la misère a frappé ses grands coups; l'imagination cesse de se jouer; la passion elle-même ne se montre plus qu'en s'unissant à des sentiments solides, graves, presque sévères; et cette amante si avide des joies de l'amour, Juliette, menacée dans sa fidélité conjugale, ne songe plus qu'à remplir ses devoirs et à conserver sans tache l'épouse de son cher Roméo. Admirable trait de sens moral et de bon sens dans le génie adonné à peindre la passion!

Du reste, Shakspeare se trompait lorsqu'en prodiguant les réflexions, les images et les paroles, il croyait imiter l'Italie et ses poëtes. Il n'imitait pas du moins les maîtres de la poésie italienne, ses pareils, les seuls qui méritassent ses regards. Entre eux et lui, la différence est immense et singulière: c'est par l'intelligence des sentiments naturels que Shakspeare excelle; il les peint aussi vrais et aussi simples, au fond, qu'il leur prête d'affectation et quelquefois de bizarrerie dans le langage; c'est au contraire dans les sentiments mêmes que les grands poëtes italiens du XIVe siècle, Pétrarque surtout, introduisent souvent autant de recherche et de subtilité que d'élévation et de grâce; ils altèrent et transforment, selon leurs croyances, religieuses et morales, ou même selon leurs goûts littéraires, ces instincts et ces passions du coeur humain auxquels Shakspeare laisse leur physionomie et leur liberté natives. Quoi de moins semblable que l'amour de Pétrarque pour Laure et celui de Juliette pour Roméo? En revanche, l'expression, dans Pétrarque, est presque toujours aussi naturelle que le sentiment est raffiné; et tandis que Shakspeare présente, sous une forme étrange et affectée, des émotions parfaitement simples et vraies, Pétrarque prête à des émotions mystiques, ou du moins singulières et très-contenues, tout le charme d'une forme simple et pure.

Je veux citer un seul exemple de cette différence entre les deux poëtes, mais un exemple bien frappant, car c'est sur la même situation, le même sentiment, presque sur la même image que, dans cette occasion, ils se sont exercés l'un et l'autre.

Laure est morte. Pétrarque veut peindre, à son entrée dans le sommeil de la mort, celle qu'il a peinte, si souvent et avec tant de passion charmante, dans l'éclat de la vie et de la jeunesse:

Non come fiamma che per forza è spenta, Ma che per se medesma si consume, Sen' andò in pace l'anima contenta, A guisa d'un soave e chiaro lume, Cui nutrimento a poco a poco manca, Tenendo al fin il suo usato costume. Pallida nò, ma più che neve bianca Che senza vento in un bel colle fiocchi, Parea posar come persona stanca. Quasi un dolce dormir ne' suoi begli occhi, Sendo lo spirto già da lei diviso, Era quel che morir chiaman gli schiocchi. Morte bella parea nel suo bel viso[3].

[Note 3: _Rime di Petrarca, Trionfo della morte_, c. I.]

«Comme un flambeau qui n'est pas éteint violemment, mais qui se consume de lui-même, son âme sereine s'en alla en paix, semblable à une lumière claire et douce à qui l'aliment manque peu à peu, et qui garde jusqu'à la fin son apparence accoutumée. Elle n'était point pâle, mais, plus blanche que la neige qui tombe à flocons, sans un souffle de vent, sur une gracieuse colline, elle semblait se reposer, comme une personne fatiguée. L'esprit s'étant déjà séparé d'elle, ses beaux yeux semblaient dormir doucement de ce sommeil que les insensés appellent la mort, et la mort paraissait belle sur son beau visage.»

Juliette aussi est morte. Roméo la contemple dans son tombeau, et lui aussi il la trouve toujours belle:

... O, my love, my wife! Death, that has suck'd the honey of thy breath, Has had no power yet upon thy beauty; Thou art not conquer'd; beauty's ensign yet Is crimson in thy lips and in thy cheeks; And death's pale flag is not advanced there!

«O mon amour, ma femme! la mort, qui a sucé le miel de ton haleine, n'a point eu encore de pouvoir sur ta beauté; tu n'es pas sa conquête; la couleur de la beauté, l'incarnat brille encore sur tes lèvres et sur tes joues, et la mort n'a pas planté ici son pâle drapeau!»

Je n'ai garde d'insister sur la comparaison. Qui ne sent combien la forme est plus simple et plus belle dans Pétrarque? C'est la poésie suave et brillante du Midi à côté de l'imagination forte, rude et heurtée du Nord.

L'amour de Roméo pour Rosalinde est une invention de Luigi da Porto, conservée dans le poëme d'Arthur Brooke. Cette invention jette si peu d'intérêt sur les premiers actes de la pièce, que Shakspeare ne l'a probablement adoptée que pour faire mieux ressortir ce caractère de soudaineté propre aux passions du climat. Le personnage de Mercutio lui a été indiqué par ces vers du poëme anglais:

A courtier that eche where was highly had in price, For he was courteous of his speech, and pleasant of devise. Even as a lyon would among the lambs be bold, Such was among the bashful maydes Mercutio to behold.

«Un courtisan que, quelque part qu'il se trouvât, chacun tenait en très-haute estime, car il était courtois dans ses discours et devisait plaisamment; autant un lion serait hardi au milieu des agneaux, autant Mercutio le paraissait au milieu des jeunes filles timides.»

Tel était sans doute le bel air du temps de Shakspeare, et c'est comme le type de l'homme aimable et amusant qu'il a peint Mercutio. Cependant, si la hardiesse lui a manqué pour attaquer, comme Molière, les ridicules de la cour, il laisse assez souvent entrevoir que le ton lui en était à charge. Le rôle de Mercutio paraît avoir coûté à son goût et à la justesse de son esprit. Dryden rapporte, comme une tradition de son temps, que Shakspeare disait «qu'il avait été obligé de tuer Mercutio au troisième acte, de peur que Mercutio ne le tuât.» Cependant Mercutio a conservé en Angleterre de zélés partisans; Johnson entre autres, à cette occasion, traite assez durement Dryden pour quelques paroles irrévérentes sur cet aimable Mercutio, dont les «saillies, dit-il, ne sont peut-être pas toujours à sa portée.» L'éloignement de Shakspeare pour le genre d'esprit qu'il a prodigué dans _Roméo_ est, du reste, suffisamment prouvé par l'injonction du frère Laurence à Roméo, lorsque celui-ci commence à lui expliquer ses affaires en style de sonnet: «Mon fils, lui dit-il, parle simplement.» Le frère Laurence est l'homme sage de la pièce, et ses discours sont en général aussi simples que de son temps il était permis à un philosophe de l'être.

Le rôle de la nourrice de Juliette offre également peu de ces subtilités que Shakspeare paraît, dans cet ouvrage, avoir réservées aux gens de la haute classe, et quelquefois aux valets qui les imitent. Ce caractère de la nourrice est indiqué dans le poëme d'Arthur Brooke, où il est loin cependant d'avoir la même vérité grossière que dans la pièce de Shakspeare.

Partout où ils échappent aux concetti, les vers de _Roméo et Juliette_ sont peut-être les plus gracieux et les plus brillants qui soient sortis de la plume de Shakspeare; ils sont en grande partie rimés, autre hommage rendu aux habitudes italiennes.

Roméo et Juliette fut jouée pour la première fois, en 1596, par _les serviteurs de lord Hundsdon_, les grands seigneurs ayant joui jusqu'au règne de Jacques Ier d'une liberté illimitée quant à la protection qu'ils accordaient aux acteurs. Un acte du Parlement y apporta alors quelque restriction.

ROMÉO ET JULIETTE

PERSONNAGES

ESCALUS, prince de Vérone. PARIS, jeune seigneur, parent du prince. MONTAIGU, CAPULET, chefs des deux maisons ennemies. UN VIEILLARD, oncle de Capulet. ROMÉO, fils de Montaigu. MERCUTIO, parent du prince et ami de Roméo. BENVOLIO, neveu de Montaigu et ami de Roméo. TYBALT, neveu de la signora Capulet. FRERE LAURENCE, franciscain. FRERE JEAN, religieux du même ordre. BALTHASAR, domestique de Roméo. SAMSON, GREGOIRE, domestique de Capulet. ABRAHAM, domestique de Montaigu. UN APOTHICAIRE. TROIS MUSICIENS. UN VALET. UN PAGE de Pâris. PIERRE. UN OFFICIER. CHOEUR. LA SIGNORA MONTAIGU, femme de Montaigu. LA SIGNORA CAPULET, femme de Capulet. JULIETTE, fille de Capulet. LA NOURRICE de Juliette.

CITOYENS DE VÉRONE, PLUSIEURS HOMMES ET FEMMES DES DEUX FAMILLES, MASQUES, GARDES, GENS DU GUET ET SERVITEURS.

La scène est pendant presque toute la pièce à Vérone.

Au cinquième acte elle est une fois à Mantoue.

PROLOGUE

Dans la belle Vérone, où nous plaçons notre scène, l'antique haine de deux maisons égales en dignité vient d'éclater par de nouveaux troubles, où le sang des citoyens a souillé les mains des citoyens. De la race funeste de ces deux ennemis a pris naissance, sous des étoiles funestes, un couple d'amants infortunés dont les malheurs et la ruine déplorable enseveliront avec eux les luttes de leurs parents. L'épisode terrible de cet amour marqué de mort, l'obstination de leurs parents dans des fureurs dont la mort de leurs enfants peut seule terminer le cours, vont pendant ces deux heures occuper notre scène. Si vous nous prêtez la faveur d'une oreille attentive, nous travaillerons par nos efforts à perfectionner ce qui pourrait manquer ici.

ACTE PREMIER

SCÈNE I

Une place publique.

Entrent SAMSON et GRÉGOIRE, _armés d'épées et de boucliers._

SAMSON.--Tiens, Grégoire, sur ma parole, on ne nous fera plus avaler de pilules[4].

[Note 4: SAMSON. _Gregory, o'my word, we'll not carry coals._ GREGORY. _No, for then we should be colliers._ SAMSON. _I mean, an we be in choler we'll draw._ GREGORY. _Ay, while you live, draw your neck out, o'the collar._

Carry coals (porter du charbon) était, du temps de Shakspeare, une expression proverbiale en anglais pour dire _supporter des injures_. Samson, jouant sur les deux sens de cette expression, répond: _Non, car nous serions des charbonniers._ Il a fallu changer cette réplique de Samson pour qu'elle se rapportât à l'expression _avaler des pilules_, la seule qui, en français puisse rendre _carry coals_. On a été de même obligé à quelques légères altérations dans les deux répliques suivantes, dont la plaisanterie porte sur la consonance des mots _choler_ (colère) et _collar_ (collier, collier de fer). La même liberté, et de plus grandes encore seront souvent indispensables dans le cours de cette pièce, pour donner un sens quelconque à cette suite de jeux de mots, de calembours, de quolibets, dont se compose, durant les deux premiers actes, la conversation de presque tous les personnages, et aussi pour éviter ou adoucir quelques plaisanteries trop grossières. C'est un travail ingrat autant que rebutant de chercher dans la partie burlesque de notre langue de quoi travestir convenablement des bouffonneries où l'esprit ne peut découvrir d'autre mérite que celui qu'elles empruntent de ce grotesque attirail, et où l'on est à chaque instant tenté de demander pardon au lecteur de la peine qu'on prend pour lui transmettre ces puérilités: mais c'est Shakspeare qu'il s'agit de faire connaître, ou du moins le goût de ce temps d'où est sorti Shakspeare.]

GRÉGOIRE.--Non, car elles pourraient bien nous donner la colique.

SAMSON.--Je veux dire que, si on nous fâche, il faudra être francs du collier.

GRÉGOIRE.--Franc pour toute ta vie du collier du bourreau, n'est-ce pas?

SAMSON.--Je suis prompt à taper quand je me mets en train.

GRÉGOIRE.--Mais tu n'es pas prompt à te mettre en train de taper.

SAMSON.--La vue d'un de ces chiens de Montaigu me remue tout le corps.

GRÉGOIRE.--On se remue pour courir; quand on est brave, on tient ferme: c'est pour cela que, lorsqu'on te remue, tu te sauves.

SAMSON.--Un chien de cette maison me remuera de telle sorte que je tiendrai ferme: je prendrai le côté du mur avec tout homme ou femme des Montaigu.

GRÉGOIRE.--C'est ce qui prouve que tu n'es qu'un faible esclave, car ce sont les plus faibles qu'on met au pied du mur[5].

[Note 5: _The weakest goes to the wall_ (le plus faible va contre le mur). Il a fallu changer un peu le sens de la phrase pour qu'elle se prêtât à la suite de la plaisanterie. Samson répond que les femmes étant _the weaker vessels_ (les vases les moins solides), expression empruntée à l'Écriture, sont toujours (_thrust to the wall_) jetées contre le mur, au coin du mur.]

SAMSON.--Oui, c'est vrai; et voilà pourquoi les femmes étant des vaisseaux plus fragiles, on les met toujours au pied du mur. Je prendrai le côté du mur sur les serviteurs de la maison de Montaigu; et pour les filles, je les mettrai au pied du mur.

GRÉGOIRE.--La querelle est entre nos maîtres et nous, leurs hommes.

SAMSON.--Cela m'est égal, je veux me montrer tyran. Quand je me serai battu avec les hommes, je serai cruel envers les filles: je leur couperai la tête.

GRÉGOIRE.--La tête des filles?

SAMSON.--Oui, la tête des filles, ou bien....[6]: arrange cela comme tu voudras.

[Note 6: _Or their maidenheads; take it in what sense thou wilt._--GREG. _They must take it in sense that feel it._--SAMS. _Me they shall feel, while I am able to stand._ Le jeu de mots roule sur les têtes des filles (_the heads of the maids_) ou leur virginité (_maidenhead_); il est impossible à rendre en français.]

GRÉGOIRE.--C'est à celles qui le sentiront à s'en arranger.

SAMSON.--Elles me sentiront tant que le courage me tiendra; et on sait que je suis un gaillard bien en chair.

GRÉGOIRE.--Oui, tu n'es pas poisson: si tu l'étais, tu serais un hareng de deux liards. Allons, tire ta flamberge; en voilà deux de la maison des Montaigu.

(Entrent Abraham et Balthasar.)

SAMSON.--Voilà mon épée hors du fourreau. Cherche-leur querelle, je t'épaulerai.

GRÉGOIRE.--Comment, en tournant les épaules et en te sauvant?

SAMSON.--Ne crains rien de mon courage.

GRÉGOIRE.--Moi, craindre ton courage! non, vraiment.

SAMSON.--Mettons la loi de notre côté; laissons-les commencer.

GRÉGOIRE.--Je vais froncer le sourcil en passant devant eux; qu'ils le prennent comme ils voudront.

SAMSON.--C'est-à-dire comme ils l'oseront. Moi, je vais leur mordre mon pouce[7]; s'ils le supportent, ils sont déshonorés.

[Note 7: Mordre son pouce était, du temps de Shakspeare, une des insultes les plus en usage pour commencer une querelle.]

ABRAHAM.--Est-ce à notre intention, monsieur, que vous mordez votre pouce?

SAMSON.--Je mords mon pouce, monsieur.

ABRAHAM.--Est-ce à notre intention, monsieur, que vous mordez votre pouce?

SAMSON.--Aurons-nous la loi de notre côté si je réponds oui?

GRÉGOIRE.--Non pas.

SAMSON.--Non, monsieur, ce n'est pas à votre intention que je mords mon pouce; mais je mords mon pouce, monsieur.

GRÉGOIRE.--Cherchez-vous querelle, monsieur?

ABRAHAM.--Querelle, monsieur? Non monsieur.

SAMSON.--Si vous cherchez querelle, monsieur, je suis bon pour vous; je sers un aussi bon maître que vous.

ABRAHAM.--Pas un meilleur.

SAMSON.--Soit, monsieur.

GRÉGOIRE.--Dis meilleur. (_A part, à Samson_.) J'aperçois un des parents de mon maître[8].

[Note 8: Il faut que cette phrase de Grégoire se rapporte à Tybalt, qu'il aperçoit apparemment de loin, car Benvolio est parent des Montaigu.]

(On voit de loin entrer Benvolio.)

SAMSON.--Oui, meilleur, monsieur.

ABRAHAM.--Vous mentez.

SAMSON.--Tirez, si vous êtes des hommes.--Grégoire, n'oublie pas ce coup qui fait tant de bruit.

(Ils se battent.)

BENVOLIO, _accourant l'épée nue pour les séparer_.--Séparez-vous, imbéciles. Remettez vos épées; vous ne savez ce que vous faites. (_Il abaisse leurs épées_)

(Entre Tybalt.)

TYBALT.--Quoi! tu tires l'épée contre cette lâche canaille! Tourne-toi, Benvolio; regarde ta mort en face.

BENVOLIO.--Je ne veux que rétablir la paix ici. Remets ton épée, ou sers-t'en pour m'aider à séparer ces hommes.

TYBALT.--Quoi! l'épée est tirée et tu parles de paix! Je hais ce mot comme je hais l'enfer, tous les Montaigu et toi. Défends-toi, lâche.

(Ils se battent.)

(Entrent des partisans des deux maisons qui se joignent à la mêlée. Entrent ensuite des citoyens avec de gros bâtons.)

PREMIER CITOYEN.--Prenez vos bâtons, vos piques, vos pertuisanes. Frappons, faisons-les tomber à terre: à bas les Capulet! à bas les Montaigu!

Entrent le vieux Capulet, en robe de chambre, et la signora Capulet.

CAPULET.--Quel est ce bruit? Holà! Donnez-moi mon épée de combat.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Votre béquille, votre béquille! Que voulez-vous faire d'une épée?

CAPULET.--Mon épée! vous dis-je, j'aperçois le vieux Montaigu: il fait briller sa lame en l'air pour me braver.

(Entrent Montaigu et la signora Montaigu.)

MONTAIGU.--C'est toi, traître de Capulet!--Ne me retenez pas, laissez-moi aller.

LA SIGNORA MONTAIGU.--Je ne vous laisserai pas faire un pas pour chercher un ennemi.

(Entrent le prince et sa suite.)

LE PRINCE.--Sujets rebelles, ennemis de la paix, profanateurs de ce fer souillé du sang de vos voisins...--Ne m'écouteront-ils donc pas?--Holà! comment! Hommes ou bêtes que vous êtes, qui ne savez éteindre les flammes de votre rage pernicieuse que dans des flots de sang tirés de vos propres veines; sous peine de la torture, jetez à terre de vos mains sanglantes ces armes forgées par la colère[9], et écoutez la sentence de votre prince irrité.--Déjà par votre fait, vieux Capulet, et vous Montaigu, trois querelles intestines ont, sur une parole en l'air, troublé trois fois la tranquillité de nos rues, et fait quitter aux anciens de Vérone les graves ornements qui leur conviennent, pour manier de vieilles pertuisanes dans de vieilles mains rongées par la paix, afin de réprimer les violences de la haine qui vous ronge. Si jamais vous troublez encore nos rues, vous payerez de votre vie la violation de la paix. Pour cette fois, que tous se retirent, excepté vous, Capulet, qui me suivrez; et vous, Montaigu, rendez-vous cette après-midi à l'antique manoir de Villafranca[10], où nous tenons notre cour publique de justice, pour y apprendre nos intentions ultérieures sur ce qui vient de se passer. Encore une fois, sous peine de mort, que tous se retirent.

[Note 9: _Mis-tempered weapons_, ce qui signifie à la fois armes d'une mauvaise trempe et armes forgées dans une mauvaise intention, forgées à mal.]

[Note 10: _Villafranca_, que Shakspeare appelle _Free town_, était, selon la nouvelle originale, une propriété des Capulet.]

(Sortent le prince, sa suite, Capulet, la signora Capulet, Tybalt, les citoyens et les domestiques.)

LA SIGNORA MONTAIGU.--Qui donc a de nouveau ranimé cette ancienne querelle? Répondez, mon neveu; y étiez-vous lorsqu'elle a commencé?

BENVOLIO.--Les domestiques de votre ennemi et les vôtres étaient déjà ici à se battre chaudement quand je suis arrivé: j'ai tiré l'épée pour les séparer. En ce moment est survenu, l'épée à la main, le bouillant Tybalt, qui, tout en me jetant des défis aux oreilles, s'est mis à faire le moulinet au-dessus de sa tête, et à pourfendre les vents, qui, n'en recevant pas le moindre mal, ont sifflé de mépris. Pendant que nous faisions échange d'estocades et de coups, venaient à tout moment de nouveaux combattants pour l'un et l'autre parti, jusqu'à ce qu'enfin est arrivé le prince, qui les a séparés.

LA SIGNORA MONTAIGU.--Oh! où est Roméo? l'avez-vous vu aujourd'hui? Je suis bien heureuse qu'il ne se soit pas trouvé à cette bagarre.

BENVOLIO.--Ce matin, madame, une heure avant que le divin soleil lançât son premier regard à travers la fenêtre d'or de l'orient, le trouble de mon âme m'a poussé à sortir hors de chez moi; et là, sous le bosquet de sycomores qui s'élève à l'ouest de la ville, aussi matinal que moi dans sa promenade, j'ai vu votre fils. J'ai marché vers lui; mais il m'a aperçu, et s'est glissé dans l'épaisseur du bois. Jugeant de ses sentiments par les miens, qui ne sont jamais plus actifs que dans la solitude, j'ai suivi mon humeur en ne poursuivant pas la sienne, et j'ai évité avec plaisir celui qui me fuyait avec plaisir.

MONTAIGU.--Plus d'une fois avant le jour on l'a vu dans ce lieu augmenter de ses pleurs la fraîche rosée du matin, accroître les nuages des nuages qu'élevaient ses profonds soupirs; mais aussitôt qu'à la dernière extrémité de l'orient le soleil, qui égaye toutes choses, commence à tirer les obscurs rideaux du lit de l'Aurore, mon fils accablé rentre pour se dérober à sa lumière, se retire seul dans sa chambre, ferme les fenêtres, et, interdisant tout accès au doux éclat du jour, se forme ainsi une nuit artificielle. Cette disposition le conduira nécessairement à une mélancolie noire et funeste, si de bons conseils n'en écartent la cause.

BENVOLIO.--Mon noble oncle, en savez-vous la cause?

MONTAIGU.--Je ne la sais point, et ne puis l'apprendre de lui.

BENVOLIO.--L'avez-vous pressé par quelques moyens?

MONTAIGU.--Il l'a été par moi-même et par beaucoup d'autres amis; mais, n'écoutant que lui-même sur ses propres sentiments, il se garde, je ne saurais dire quelle fidélité, mais du moins un secret complet et absolu; aussi rebelle à toute tentative pour sonder ce mystère, que le bouton piqué par un ver envieux avant d'avoir pu déployer à l'air ses pétales odorants et livrer ses beautés au soleil. Si nous pouvions seulement savoir d'où provient son chagrin, nous serions aussi empressés de le guérir que de le connaître.

(Roméo paraît dans l'éloignement.)

BENVOLIO.--Tenez, le voilà qui vient. Veuillez vous éloigner; il faudra qu'il me refuse bien obstinément si je ne parviens pas à savoir ce qui l'afflige.

MONTAIGU.--Je désire bien que tu sois assez heureux pour obtenir par ton insistance une sincère confession.--Venez, madame, retirons-nous.

(Sortent Montaigu et la signora Montaigu.)

BENVOLIO.--Bonjour, mon cousin.

ROMÉO.--Le jour est-il donc si jeune encore?

BENVOLIO.--Neuf heures viennent de sonner.

ROMÉO.--Hélas! les heures tristes paraissent longues. Était-ce mon père que j'ai vu s'éloigner si vite?

BENVOLIO.--C'était lui.--Quel est donc le chagrin qui allonge les heures de Roméo?

ROMÉO.--La privation de ce qui les rendrait courtes si je le possédais.

BENVOLIO.--Amoureux?

ROMÉO.--Accablé[11].

[Note 11: BENV. _In love?_

ROM. Out.

BENV. _Of love?_

ROM. _Out of her_... etc.

Out of love signifie ici par amour. Benvolio, selon l'usage des jeunes gens de cette pièce de ne parler presque jamais sérieusement, veut tourner en plaisanterie la réponse de Roméo, en lui faisant dire qu'il est _amoureux par amour_. Cela ne

pouvait se rendre.]

BENVOLIO.--D'amour?

ROMÉO.--De la rigueur de celle que j'aime.

BENVOLIO.--Hélas! faut-il que l'Amour, aux regards si doux, soit à l'épreuve si dur et si tyrannique?

ROMÉO.--Hélas! faut-il que l'Amour, avec ses yeux toujours couverts d'un bandeau, trouve sans voir des chemins pour faire sa volonté! Où dînerons-nous?--O dieux!--Quel était donc ce tumulte?--Mais, non, ne me le dis pas; j'ai tout entendu.--Il y a bien à faire avec la haine, mais plus encore avec l'amour.--O amour querelleur, ô haine amoureuse, toi qui es tout et nais d'abord de rien, chose légère qui nous accable, vanité sérieuse, chaos difforme des plus séduisantes apparences, plume de plomb, fumée brillante, feu glacé, santé malade, sommeil toujours éveillé qui n'est point le sommeil! voilà l'amour que je sens, sans y sentir l'amour. Cela ne te fait-il pas rire?

BENVOLIO.--Non, cousin; bien plutôt pleurer.

ROMÉO.--Tendre coeur, et de quoi?

BENVOLIO.--De voir ton tendre coeur si oppressé.

ROMÉO.--Eh bien! telle est l'erreur de l'affection. Mes chagrins demeuraient appesantis dans mon sein; tu les forces à se répandre en les pressant sous le poids du tien, et l'affection que tu me montres ajoute une peine de plus à cet excès de peine que je ressens déjà. L'amour est une fumée qu'élève la vapeur des soupirs: libre de s'échapper, c'est un feu qui éclate dans les yeux des amants; réprimé, une mer que les amants nourrissent de leurs larmes. Qu'est-ce encore autre chose? une folie raisonnable, une bile amère qui suffoque, un doux parfum qui conserve.--Adieu, mon cousin.

(Il veut sortir.)

BENVOLIO.--Doucement, je veux vous accompagner, et c'est me manquer que de me quitter ainsi.

ROMÉO.--Eh! je ne me retrouve plus moi-même: je ne suis point ici; ce n'est point Roméo que tu vois, il est quelque part ailleurs.

BENVOLIO.--Dites-le-moi dans votre tristesse; quelle est celle que vous aimez?

ROMÉO.--Quoi! faut-il te le dire en gémissant?

BENVOLIO.--En gémissant? Non, pas tout à fait; mais dites-le-moi tristement: qui est-ce?

ROMÉO.--Demandez à un malade de faire avec tristesse son testament! Oh! qu'il est mal d'importuner d'un tel mot celui qui est si mal!--Tristement, cousin, j'aime une femme.

BENVOLIO.--J'étais arrivé juste en supposant que vous aimiez.

ROMÉO.--Un bien bon tireur! Et elle est belle celle que j'aime.

BENVOLIO.--Un beau but, beau cousin, est plus facile à frapper.

ROMÉO.--Eh bien! à ce coup-ci, vous manquez, on ne pourrait l'atteindre avec l'arc de Cupidon, car elle est animée de l'esprit de Diane, et solidement armée d'une chasteté à l'épreuve; elle vit invulnérable aux faibles coups de l'arc enfantin de l'Amour; elle ne se laissera point assiéger par d'amoureuses négociations, ne supportera pas la rencontre des yeux qui l'assaillent, n'ouvrira point le pan de sa robe à l'or qui séduit même les saints. Oh! elle est riche en beauté, pauvre seulement en ceci, qu'en mourant son trésor de beauté mourra avec elle.

BENVOLIO.--A-t-elle donc juré de vivre dans la chasteté?

ROMÉO.--Elle l'a juré; et cette parcimonie produira un immense dégât, car la beauté réduite par sa sévérité à mourir de faim prive de beauté toute postérité. Elle est trop belle, trop sagement belle, pour mériter le bonheur en me mettant au désespoir. Elle a fait un voeu contre l'amour; et sous ce voeu ma vie est une mort à moi qui vis pour te le dire.

BENVOLIO.--Suivez mon conseil, oubliez de penser à elle.

ROMÉO.--Oh! apprends-moi donc comment je pourrai oublier de penser.

BENVOLIO.--En donnant à tes yeux quelque liberté: considère d'autres beautés.

ROMÉO.--Ce serait le moyen de me faire penser plus souvent à son exquise beauté. Ces masques fortunés, qui caressent le front de nos belles dames, ne font par leur noirceur que nous rappeler la beauté qu'ils cachent. Celui qui est frappé d'aveuglement ne peut oublier le précieux trésor de la vue qu'il a perdu. Montre-moi une maîtresse belle par-dessus toutes les autres, que me sera sa beauté, sinon un livre de souvenirs où je lirai le nom de celle qui surpasse cette beauté incomparable? Adieu, tu ne peux m'apprendre à oublier.

BENVOLIO.--Tu recevras de moi cette doctrine, ou j'en mourrai ton débiteur.

(Ils sortent.)

SCÈNE II

Une rue.

Entrent CAPULET, PARIS, UN DOMESTIQUE.

CAPULET.--Montaigu est lié par la même défense que moi, et sous des peines semblables; et il ne sera pas difficile, je pense, à deux vieillards comme nous de vivre en paix.

PARIS.--Vous jouissez tous d'une existence honorable, et c'est pitié que vous ayez été si longtemps ennemis. Mais parlez, seigneur, que répondez-vous à ma demande?

CAPULET.--En répétant ce que je vous ai déjà dit. Mon enfant est encore étrangère dans le monde; elle n'a pas vu s'accomplir la révolution de quatorze années: laissons encore pâlir l'orgueil de deux étés avant de la croire mûre pour être une épouse.

PARIS.--De plus jeunes qu'elles sont devenues d'heureuses mères.

CAPULET.--Mais elles se flétrissent trop tôt, ces mères prématurées.--La terre a englouti toutes mes autres espérances; elle est en espérance la maîtresse de mes terres. Mais faites-lui votre cour, aimable Pâris; gagnez son coeur; ma volonté n'est qu'une dépendance de son consentement: si elle vous agrée, c'est dans les limites de son choix que réside mon aveu, et que ma voix vous sera loyalement accordée.--Ce soir je donne une fête dont j'ai depuis longtemps l'usage; j'y ai invité beaucoup de convives, tous mes amis; et parmi eux, je vous verrai avec très-grande joie, comme un de plus, en augmenter le nombre. Attendez-vous à voir ce soir dans ma pauvre maison des étoiles qui foulent aux pieds la terre, éclipsent la lumière des cieux; cette joie bienfaisante que ressent le jeune homme plein d'ardeur lorsqu'avril, dans toute sa parure, marche sur les talons de l'hiver chancelant, vous l'éprouverez ce soir parmi ces jeunes fleurs de beauté prêtes à s'épanouir; écoutez-les toutes, voyez-les toutes, et préférez celle dont le mérite sera le plus grand. Au milieu du spectacle d'une telle réunion, ma fille, réduite à elle-même, pourra faire nombre, mais non pas attirer l'attention.--Allons, venez avec moi.--(_A un domestique_.) Toi, maraud, trotte dans la belle Vérone; trouve toutes les personnes dont les noms sont écrits ici (_il lui donne un papier_), et dis-leur que la maison et le maître attendent leur bon plaisir.

(Sortent Capulet et Pâris.)

LE DOMESTIQUE.--Trouver ceux dont les noms sont écrits, ici! Il est écrit que le cordonnier se servira de sa toises et le tailleur de pierres de sa forme; le pêcheur de son pinceau, et le peintre de ses filets. Mais on m'envoie chercher les personnes dont les noms sont inscrits là-dessus, et je ne pourrai jamais trouver les noms que l'écrivain a écrits là-dessus. Il faut que je m'adresse aux savants... dans un moment...

(Entrent Benvolio et Roméo.)

BENVOLIO.--Allons, mon cher, la flamme est un remède à la brûlure qu'a faite une autre flamme; une douleur est diminuée par l'angoisse d'une autre; tournez jusqu'à vous étourdir et vous vous remettez en tournant dans l'autre sens; un chagrin désespéré se guérit par la langueur d'un nouveau chagrin. Laisse entrer dans tes yeux un nouveau poison, et l'ancien venin perdra toute son âcreté.

ROMÉO.--Votre feuille de plantain est excellente pour cela.

BENVOLIO.--Pour quel mal, je t'en prie?

ROMÉO.--Pour vos os brisés?

BENVOLIO.--Allons, Roméo, es-tu fou?

ROMÉO.--Non, pas fou, mais lié plus que ne le serait un fou, tenu en prison, privé d'aliments, fustigé, tourmenté, et..... Bonsoir, mon bon garçon.

LE DOMESTIQUE.--Dieu vous donne le bonsoir.--Je vous en prie, monsieur, savez-vous lire?

ROMÉO.--Oui, c'est un bonheur que j'ai dans ma misère.

LE DOMESTIQUE.--Peut-être l'avez-vous appris sans livres: mais, je vous prie, pouvez-vous lire tout ce que vous voyez?

ROMÉO.--Oui, si je connais les caractères et la langue.

LE DOMESTIQUE.--C'est répondre sincèrement; tenez vous en joie.

ROMÉO.--Arrêtez, mon ami, je sais lire. (_Il lit_.) «Le seigneur Martino, sa femme et sa fille; le comte Anselme et ses charmantes soeurs; la dame veuve de Vitruvio; le seigneur Placentio et ses aimables nièces; Mercutio et son frère Valentin; mon oncle Capulet, sa femme et ses filles; ma jolie nièce Rosaline; Livia; le seigneur Valentio et son cousin Tybalt, Lucio et l'agréable Hélène.» C'est une belle assemblée. (_Il lui rend le papier_.) Où doit-elle se réunir?

LE DOMESTIQUE.--Là-haut.

ROMÉO.--Où, là-haut?

LE DOMESTIQUE.--A souper, à la maison.

ROMÉO.--A la maison de qui?

LE DOMESTIQUE.--De mon maître.

ROMÉO.--Au fait, c'est ce que j'aurais dû vous demander d'abord.

LE DOMESTIQUE.--Maintenant je vous dirai, sans que vous me le demandiez, que mon maître est le puissant et riche Capulet; et si vous n'êtes pas de la maison de Montaigu, je vous invite à venir avaler un verre de vin. Tenez-vous en joie.

(Il sort.)

BENVOLIO.--A cette ancienne fête des Capulet soupera Rosaline, celle que tu aimes tant: avec toutes les beautés qu'on admire à Vérone. Viens-y, et d'un oeil sans prévention compare sa figure avec quelques autres que je te montrerai, et ton cygne ne te paraîtra plus qu'une corneille.

ROMÉO.--Quand la religieuse dévotion de mes yeux pourra me soutenir un pareil mensonge, que mes larmes se changent en flammes, et que ces hérétiques diaphanes, si souvent noyés sans pouvoir mourir, soient brûlés comme imposteurs. Une femme plus belle que mon amante! Le soleil qui voit tout n'a jamais vu son égale depuis le commencement du monde.

BENVOLIO.--Bon, vous l'avez vue belle parce qu'il n'y avait personne autre à côté; elle se balançait elle-même dans vos deux yeux: mais pesez dans ces balances de cristal la dame de vos pensées avec telle autre jeune fille que je vous montrerai brillant à cette fête, et à peine trouverez-vous bien celle qui vous paraît maintenant la plus belle de toutes.

ROMÉO.--J'irai, non pour y voir un semblable objet, mais pour m'y pénétrer de plaisir dans la splendeur de celui qui m'est cher.

(Ils sortent.)

SCÈNE III

Un appartement de la maison de Capulet.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET, LA NOURRICE de Juliette.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Nourrice, où est ma fille? Appelle-la, qu'elle vienne.

LA NOURRICE.--Dans l'instant, sur mon honneur[12]..... à l'âge de douze ans--Je lui ai dit de venir.....--Quoi, mon agneau, mon oiseau du bon Dieu..... Dieu nous préserve..... Où est donc cette petite fille? Juliette!

[Note 12: _By my maidenhead_.]

(Entre Juliette.)

JULIETTE.--Allons, qui m'appelle?

LA NOURRICE.--Votre mère.

JULIETTE.--Me voici, madame; que voulez-vous?

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Voici de quoi il s'agit.--Nourrice, laisse-nous un moment, nous avons à parler en secret.--Non, reviens, nourrice, je me suis ravisée; tu entendras notre entretien.--Tu sais que ma fille est d'un âge raisonnable.

LA NOURRICE.--Ma foi, je puis vous dire son âge à une heure près.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Elle n'a pas quatorze ans.

LA NOURRICE.--J'y mettrais quatorze de mes dents qu'elle n'a pas encore quatorze ans..... (et cependant à mon grand chagrin, je vous dis, je vous douze[13] qu'il ne m'en reste plus que quatre).... Combien avons-nous d'ici à la Saint-Pierre?

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Une quinzaine et quelques jours par-dessus[14].

[Note 13: _And yet to my teen be it spoken I have four. Teen_ est un vieux mot qui signifie _chagrin_, il se prononce à peu près comme _ten_, dix. Il a fallu, pour conserver le jeu de mots, employer le quolibet de madame Jourdain.]

[Note 14: _A fortnight and odd days._ Une quinzaine et quelques jours hors de compte. Odd signifie tout ce qui ne rentre pas dans une unité, une mesure, une règle commune. Il signifie aussi impair. La nourrice le prend dans ce sens et répond: _Even or odd_ (pair ou impair).]

LA NOURRICE.--Par-dessus ou par-dessous, c'est précisément ce jour-là. Vienne la veille de la Saint-Pierre au soir, elle aura quatorze ans.--Suzanne et elle (Dieu fasse paix à toutes les âmes chrétiennes!) étaient du même âge....--C'est bien; Suzanne est avec Dieu; elle était trop bonne pour moi.--Mais, comme je disais, la veille au soir de la Saint-Pierre, elle aura quatorze ans; elle les aura, sûr; je me le rappelle à merveille. Il y a à présent onze ans du tremblement de terre, et elle fut sevrée, jamais je ne l'oublierai, précisément ce jour-là parmi tous les jours de l'année; car j'avais frotté d'absinthe le bout de mon sein, j'étais assise au soleil contre le mur du colombier; mon maître et vous étiez alors à Mantoue...--Oh! j'ai de la mémoire; et comme je vous disais, dès qu'elle eut goûté de l'absinthe sur le bout de mon sein, et qu'elle l'eut trouvée amère, il fallait la voir, pauvre petite, se fâcher et se mettre en colère contre le sein. Comme je disais, voilà le colombier qui tremble. Oh! il ne fut pas besoin, je vous jure, de me dire de trotter, et depuis ce temps-là, il y a onze ans, car elle se tenait déjà seule; quoi! avec le bout de la baguette elle courait et roulait tout partout: car, tenez, c'était la veille qu'elle s'était cassé la tête; et alors mon mari, Dieu veuille avoir son âme, c'était un drôle de corps! il releva l'enfant: «Comment, dit-il, tu te laisses tomber sur le nez! quand tu auras plus d'esprit, tu tomberas en arrière; n'est-ce pas, Jules?» et, par Notre-Dame, la petite coquine cessa de pleurer, et dit: «Oui.» Voyez pourtant ce que c'est qu'une plaisanterie. J'en réponds, je vivrais mille ans que je ne l'oublierais jamais: «N'est-ce pas, Jules?» dit mon mari: et la petite morveuse finit tout de suite et dit: «Oui...»

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--En voilà assez; je t'en prie, tais-toi.

LA NOURRICE.--Oui, madame; et pourtant je ne peux pas m'empêcher de rire quand je pense comme elle cessa de crier et dit: «Oui...» Et pourtant, je vous jure, elle avait sur le front une bosse aussi grosse que la coquille d'un poulet. C'était un coup terrible, et elle pleurait amèrement. «Comment, dit mon mari, tu te laisses tomber sur le nez! Tu tomberas en arrière quand tu seras plus grande; n'est-ce pas, Jules?» Elle finit tout de suite et dit: «Oui.»

JULIETTE.--Finis, nourrice, finis, je t'en prie, quand je te le dis.

LA NOURRICE.--Allons, j'ai fini. Que Dieu te marque de sa grâce! Tu étais la plus jolie petite enfant que j'aie jamais nourrie: si je peux vivre assez pour te voir mariée, je n'en demande pas davantage.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Et le mariage est justement le sujet dont je suis venu causer avec elle.--Dites-moi, ma fille Juliette, avez-vous envie de vous marier?

JULIETTE.--C'est un honneur auquel je n'ai jamais pensé.

LA NOURRICE.--Un honneur! Si je n'avais pas été ta seule nourrice, je dirais que tu as sucé la sagesse avec le lait.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Eh bien! pensez maintenant au mariage. Il y a dans Vérone des femmes plus jeunes que vous, considérées et déjà mères; et moi, je m'en souviens bien, j'étais déjà votre mère longtemps avant l'âge où vous voilà fille encore; enfin, en un mot, le brave Pâris vous adresse ses voeux.

LA NOURRICE.--C'est un homme, jeune dame... madame, c'est un homme comme tout le monde... Vraiment, il semble moulé en cire.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--L'été de Vérone n'a pas une fleur qui puisse lui être comparée.

LA NOURRICE.--Oh! vraiment, c'est une fleur; ma foi, oui, une vraie fleur.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Qu'en dites-vous? Vous sentez-vous du goût pour ce gentilhomme? Ce soir, vous le verrez à notre fête. Parcourez tout le livre[15] de la figure du jeune Pâris, et vous y apercevrez le plaisir écrit avec la plume de la beauté. Examinez ces traits si bien d'accord, et vous verrez comme ils s'expliquent l'un l'autre; et ce que peut encore offrir d'obscur ce charmant volume, vous le trouverez écrit dans la marge de ses yeux. Ce précieux livre d'amour, cet amant encore sans liens ne demande, pour compléter sa beauté, que l'ornement dont il va se couvrir. C'est la mer qui fait vivre le poisson; et la beauté doit être orgueilleuse de donner asile à la beauté. Le livre qui sous ses fermoirs d'or enserre la légende dorée en partage la gloire aux yeux de tous: ainsi, en le possédant, vous partagerez tout ce qui lui appartient sans rien diminuer du vôtre.

[Note 15: De toutes ces métaphores sur Pâris, comparé à un livre, une seule a paru impossible à rendre, c'est celle où la signora Capulet l'appelant _unbound lover_, en fait à la fois _un amant sans liens et un amant sans reliure_.]

LA NOURRICE.--Diminuer! non, en vérité; elle grossira plutôt: les femmes grossissent par le moyen des hommes.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Répondez-moi en un mot: l'amour de Pâris pourrait-il vous plaire?

JULIETTE.--Je verrai à le trouver agréable si le voir peut faire qu'il m'agrée. Mais mon regard ne pénétrera pas plus avant que le point où votre consentement lui donnera la force de se lancer.

(Entre un domestique.)

LE DOMESTIQUE.--Madame, les convives sont arrivés, le souper est servi, on vous attend; on demande ma jeune maîtresse; on jure, dans l'office, après la nourrice; toutes choses sont à point. Il faut que j'aille servir, je vous en prie, venez sur-le-champ.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Nous te suivons. Allons, Juliette, le comte nous attend.

LA NOURRICE.--Allez, ma fille, chercher ce qui donnera d'heureuses nuits à vos heureux jours.

(Elles sortent.)

SCÈNE IV

Une rue.

Entrent ROMÉO, MERCUTIO, BENVOLIO, _avec cinq ou six autres masques et des porteurs de flambeaux._

ROMÉO.--Eh bien! est-ce là ce que nous dirons pour notre excuse, ou entrerons nous sans apologie?

BENVOLIO.--Tous ces bavardages-là sont du temps passé[16].

[Note 16: Il paraît qu'autrefois il arrivait souvent qu'on vînt à une fête sans y être invité; alors on paraissait en masque et précédé d'une espèce de hérault, également déguisé et qui prononçait par forme d'excuse un compliment préparé. Apparemment que, du temps de Shakspeare, la mode de ces compliments commençait à passer.]

Nous n'aurons point de Cupidon avec son bandeau et son écharpe, portant un arc à la tartare fait de latte peinte, pour effrayer les dames au hasard, comme un homme qui chasse les corneilles; nous n'aurons pas non plus de ces prologues sans livres répétés en traînant après le souffleur au moment de notre entrée. Qu'ils nous mesurent des yeux comme il leur plaira, nous leur mesurerons une mesure de danse, et nous voilà partis.

ROMÉO.--Donnez-moi une torche; ces gambades ne me vont pas. Sombre[17] comme je le suis, c'est à moi à porter le flambeau.

[Note 17: Chaque troupe de masques était précédée d'un homme portant une torche qui entrait dans l'assemblée, mais ne se mêlait point à la fête.]

MERCUTIO.--Vraiment, mon cher Roméo, il faudra bien que vous dansiez.

ROMÉO.--Non pas moi, croyez-moi. Vous autres, vous avez des souliers à danser et le pied léger; moi, j'ai une âme de plomb qui me cloue tellement à terre que je ne saurais remuer.

MERCUTIO.--Vous êtes amoureux, empruntez les ailes de l'Amour pour vous élancer au delà des hauteurs ordinaires.

ROMÉO.--Il m'a lancé un dard qui me perce trop cruellement pour que je puisse me lancer sur ses ailes légères; et enchaîné[18] comme je le suis, je ne puis m'élever au-dessus de ma sombre tristesse: je succombe sous le pesant fardeau de l'Amour.

[Note 18: Il y a ici abondance et complication de jeux de mots entre _sore_ (cruel) et _soar_ (prendre l'essor), _bound_ (enchaîné) et _bound_ (bond). On en a indiqué ce qui a été possible.]

MERCUTIO.--Et en succombant vous écraserez l'Amour: vous êtes un poids trop fort pour quelque chose de si délicat.

ROMÉO.--L'Amour délicat! il est dur, rude, ingouvernable, piquant comme l'épine.

MERCUTIO.--Si l'Amour vous mène rudement, menez rudement l'Amour; s'il vous pique, donnez de l'éperon et vous le mettrez à bas. Allons, une boîte pour mon visage; c'est un masque pour un masque. (_Il met son masque_.) Que m'importe à présent quel oeil curieux remarque mes difformités? Voici un front refrogné qui rougira pour moi.

BENVOLIO.--Allons, frappe, et entrons; et aussitôt entrés, que chacun ait recours à ses jambes.

ROMÉO.--Donnez-moi une torche. Que des étourdis légers de coeur effleurent de leurs pieds les joncs insensibles[19]. Pour moi, je tiendrai, comme on dit, la chandelle, et je regarderai. Ce qui me convient, c'est le proverbe des grand'mères: «La fête n'a jamais été si belle, et je m'en vas[20].»

[Note 19: Avant de connaître l'usage des tapis, on couvrait de joncs le sol des appartements; de là _joncher_.]

[Note 20: MERCUT.

The game was never so fair and I am done. Tut, dun's the mouse, the constable's word, If thou art dun, we'll draw thee from the mire, etc.

Il y a ici entre _done_ et _dun_ un jeu de mots intraduisible. _Dun's the mouse_ (la souris est grise) serait, selon les commentateurs, un proverbe équivalent à notre proverbe: _A la nuit, tous chats sont gris._ Mais ils se trouvent hors d'état d'expliquer suffisamment l'allusion contenue dans ces mots _the constable's word_. En adoptant dans la traduction leur version sur le _dun's the mouse_, je serais plutôt tenté d'y voir un jeu de mots employé par quelque constable dans une occasion où, ayant à se saisir d'un malfaiteur, il aura employé, pour avertir ses gens sans alarmer celui qu'il cherchait, ces mots insignifiants, _dun's the mouse_ (la souris est grise), pour ceux-ci, _done's the mouse_ (la souris est prise, c'en est fait de la souris). Quoi qu'il en soit, cette explication n'est pas plus mauvaise qu'aucune de celles qu'ont données les commentateurs. _Dun out from the mire_ était une ancienne chanson: on a substitué à cette allusion impossible à rendre un jeu de mots sur ces deux sens du mot _gris_, qui n'est point dans Shakspeare, à charge de revanche.]

MERCUTIO.--Bon, bon, à la nuit tous chats sont gris; c'est le mot du constable: et si tu es gris, nous te tirerons, sauf respect, de la mare où cet amour t'a enfoncé jusqu'aux oreilles. Venez, nous brûlons le jour[21]. Holà!

[Note 21: _We burn day light_, expression proverbiale commune à l'anglais et au français.]

ROMÉO.--Cela n'est pas ainsi.

MERCUTIO.--Je veux dire, mon cher, qu'en nous arrêtant ainsi nous dépensons notre lumière sans profit, comme des lampes qui brûleraient le jour. Il faut voir dans ce que nous disons ce que nous avons intention de dire, car c'est là que la raison se trouvera cinq fois plutôt qu'une seule dans nos cinq sens.

ROMÉO.--Oui, nous avons bonne intention en allant à cette mascarade; mais il n'est pas raisonnable d'y aller.

MERCUTIO.--Peut-on te demander pourquoi?

ROMÉO.--J'ai fait un songe cette nuit.

MERCUTIO.--Et moi aussi.

ROMÉO.--Eh bien! qu'avez-vous rêvé?

MERCUTIO.--Que ceux qui rêvent mentent souvent[22].

[Note 22: Jeu de mots intraduisible entre (lie) mentir, _et (lie)_ être couché.]

ROMÉO.--Oui, lorsqu'endormis dans leur lit ils rêvent des choses vraies.

MERCUTIO.--Oh! je vois que la reine Mab vous a visité cette nuit: c'est la fée sage-femme[23]. Elle vient, petite et légère comme l'agate placée à l'index d'un alderman, traînée par un attelage de minces atomes, et parcourt le nez des hommes pendant leur sommeil. Les rayons de ses roues sont faits de longues pattes de faucheur; l'impériale de sa voiture d'ailes de sauterelles; ses traits de la plus fine toile d'araignée; ses harnais des rayons humides d'un clair de lune. Le manche de son fouet est un os de grillon, et la mèche une mince pellicule. Son postillon est un petit moucheron vêtu de gris, pas à moitié si gros que le petit ver rond retiré avec la pointe d'une aiguille du doigt d'une jeune fille. Son chariot est une coquille de noisette vide travaillée par l'écureuil, ouvrier en bois, ou par le vieux ver, de temps immémorial associé des fées. C'est dans cet équipage qu'elle galope toutes les nuits au travers du cerveau des amants, et ils rêvent d'amour; sur les genoux des hommes de cour, et ils rêvent aussitôt de révérences; sur les doigts des gens de loi, et sur-le-champ ils rêvent d'épices; sur les lèvres des dames, et à l'instant elles rêvent de baisers: mais souvent Mab irritée les punit par des boutons d'avoir empesté leur haleine en mangeant des confitures[24]. Quelquefois elle galope sur le nez d'un courtisan, et il rêve qu'il flaire une place à solliciter. Quelquefois elle vient, avec la queue d'un pourceau de dîme, chatouiller le nez d'un prébendaire endormi, et il rêve d'un second bénéfice. Tantôt elle dirige son char sur le cou d'un soldat, et il rêve d'ennemis qu'il pourfend, de brèches, d'embuscades, de coutelas d'Espagne, de rasades profondes de cinq brasses: alors elle bat le tambour à son oreille; il s'éveille en sursaut, et dans sa frayeur il jure une ou deux invocations, puis se rendort. C'est cette même Mab qui pendant la nuit mêle la crinière des chevaux et la frise en sales tampons de crins ensorcelés, qui, une fois débrouillés, présagent de grands malheurs. C'est la sorcière qui pèse sur le sein des jeunes filles étendues dans leur lit, pour leur apprendre à supporter et en faire des femmes fortes[25]. C'est elle qui...

[Note 23: _She is the fairies midwife_, ce qui ne signifie point _la sage-femme des fées_, mais _la sage-femme entre les fées_. On ne voit nulle part que l'emploi de la reine Mab, la fée des songes, fût d'accoucher les fées; mais c'était elle qui enlevait à leur mère, au moment de leur naissance, les enfants nés pendant la nuit pour y substituer un enfant étranger.]

[Note 24: _Sweet meats_, espèce de confitures parfumées, connues alors sous le nom de _kissing comfits_, et dont les femmes faisaient un grand usage]

[Note 25:

This is the hag, when maids lie on their backs, That presses them, and learn them first to bear, Making them women of good carriage.

La phrase était impossible à rendre exactement.]

ROMÉO.--Paix, paix, Mercutio, paix; ce sont des riens que tu nous dis là.

MERCUTIO.--Tu as raison, car je parle de songes, enfants d'un cerveau oisif, produit de quelques vaines chimères, d'une substance aussi légère que l'air, et plus inconstante que le vent, qui, caressant le sein glacé du nord, s'irrite soudain, et, par une bouffée contraire, tourne sa face vers le midi qui verse la rosée.

BENVOLIO.--Ce vent dont vous nous parlez nous rejette loin de nous-mêmes. Le souper est fini et nous arriverons trop tard.

ROMÉO.--Trop tôt, au contraire, j'en ai peur. Un pressentiment funeste semble me dire qu'au milieu des réjouissances de cette nuit quelque événement encore suspendu dans les astres va commencer son cours terrible, et amener, par le traître coup d'une mort prématurée, le terme de cette vie méprisée que je renferme en mon sein. Mais, que celui qui gouverne ma course dirige ma voile! Allons, joyeux seigneurs.

BENVOLIO.--Battez, tambours.

(Ils sortent.)

SCÈNE V

Une salle de la maison de Capulet, garnie de musiciens.

Entrent des DOMESTIQUES.

PREMIER DOMESTIQUE.--Où est Potpan, qu'il ne m'aide pas à desservir? Lui, manier le tranchoir! jouer du tranchoir!

SECOND DOMESTIQUE.--Quand le bon air d'une maison est remis dans les mains d'un ou deux hommes, et des mains sales encore, cela fait mal au coeur[26].

[Note 26: _Tis a foul thing. A foul thing_ signifie une chose _malpropre_ et une chose _fâcheuse, coupable_, etc.]

PREMIER DOMESTIQUE.--Emporte les pliants, dérange le buffet, aie l'oeil à la vaisselle. Mon cher, mets de côté pour moi un morceau de massepain[27]; et si tu veux me faire plaisir, tu diras au portier de laisser entrer Suzanne Grindstone et Nell.--Antoine! Potpan!

[Note 27: Les massepains étaient alors d'énormes gâteaux, dont nos _macarons_, dit l'un des commentateurs de Shakspeare ne sont qu'un _diminutif dégénéré_.]

SECOND DOMESTIQUE.--Oui, mon garçon, nous voilà.

PREMIER DOMESTIQUE.--On a besoin de vous, on vous appelle, on vous demande, on vous cherche dans la grande salle.

SECOND DOMESTIQUE.--Nous ne pouvons pas être ici et là en même temps. Allons, gai, mes amis; soyons vifs un moment, et que celui qui vivra le dernier emporte tout.

(Ils se retirent.)

(Entrent Capulet, les convives et les masques.)

CAPULET.--Cavaliers, soyez les bienvenus. Voilà des dames à qui les cors ne font pas mal au pied, et qui vous donneront bien un tour de danse.--Ah, ah! mesdames, laquelle de vous refusera de danser maintenant? Celle qui fera la dégoûtée, je protesterai qu'elle a des cors aux pieds. Est-ce là vous serrer de près?--Cavaliers, soyez les bienvenus. J'ai vu le temps où je portais un masque aussi, et où je pouvais conter mes histoires tout bas à l'oreille d'une belle dame, et de manière à ne pas lui déplaire. Ce temps est passé; il est passé, passé.--Vous êtes les bienvenus, cavaliers.--Allons, musiciens, commencez. En cercle, en cercle, faites place; et vous, jeunes filles, sautez. (_Les instruments jouent et l'on danse_.) Holà! valets, encore des lumières, relevez les tables contre le mur; éteignez le feu, la salle devient trop chaude.--Allons, mon cher, voilà un divertissement imprévu qui ne prend pas mal. Asseyez-vous, asseyez-vous, bon cousin Capulet; car vous et moi nous avons passé nos jours de danse. Combien y a-t-il de temps que vous et moi nous avons porté un masque pour la dernière fois?

SECOND CAPULET.--Par Notre-Dame, il y a trente ans.

CAPULET.--Comment donc, mon cher? il n'y a pas tant, il n'y a pas tant. C'était à la noce de Lucentio: il y aura, vienne la Pentecôte quand elle voudra, quelque vingt-cinq ans; nous y allâmes en masque.

SECOND CAPULET.--Il y a davantage, davantage: son fils est plus âgé que cela; son fils a trente ans.

CAPULET.--Vous me direz cela, à moi? Il y a deux ans que son fils était encore mineur.

ROMÉO.--Quelle est cette dame dont s'est enrichie la main de ce cavalier?

UN DOMESTIQUE.--Je ne la connais pas, monsieur.

ROMÉO.--Oh! c'est d'elle que la flamme de ces flambeaux doit apprendre à briller. Sa beauté près de ce visage semblable à la nuit ressemble à un joyau attaché à l'oreille d'un Éthiopien: beauté trop brillante pour les usages de la vie, trop précieuse pour la terre! Telle une blanche colombe parmi les corbeaux, telle paraît cette dame auprès de ses compagnes. Quand la danse aura cessé, j'observerai où elle se tient; et je rendrai heureuse ma main téméraire en touchant la sienne. Mon coeur a-t-il aimé jusqu'à ce moment? Protestez du contraire, mes yeux, car jusqu'à cette nuit je n'avais jamais vu la véritable beauté.

TYBALT.--A sa voix, cet homme doit être un Montaigu. Garçon, donne-moi ma rapière. Comment, ce misérable osera venir ici, caché sous un masque grotesque, pour dénigrer et ridiculiser notre fête! Par la tige et l'honneur de ma race, je ne crois pas pécher en lui donnant le coup de la mort.

CAPULET.--Qu'est-ce que c'est, mon neveu? Pourquoi tempêtez-vous ainsi?

TYBALT.--Mon oncle, cet homme est un Montaigu, notre ennemi; un traître qui est venu ici ce soir, en haine de nous, pour se moquer de notre fête.

CAPULET.--Est-ce le jeune Roméo?

TYBALT.--C'est lui-même, ce traître de Roméo.

CAPULET.--Modère-toi, mon cher neveu; laisse-le en paix, il a l'air d'un noble cavalier; et, pour dire la vérité, tout Vérone le vante comme un jeune homme vertueux et d'une conduite honorable. Je ne voudrais pas, pour tous les trésors de cette ville, lui faire ici, dans ma maison, la moindre insulte. Sois donc patient, ne fais pas attention à lui: c'est ma volonté; et si tu la respectes, tu prendras un visage gracieux et quitteras cet air de mauvaise humeur qui sied mal dans une fête.

TYBALT.--Il sied très-bien quand un pareil traître devient votre convive: je ne le souffrirai pas.

CAPULET.--Vous le souffrirez vraiment, mon petit ami! Je vous dis que vous le souffrirez. Allons donc; est-ce moi qui suis le maître ici, ou bien vous? Allons donc, vous ne le souffrirez pas? Dieu me pardonne! vous allez mettre le trouble parmi mes hôtes, vous prendrez les airs d'un coq sur son panier[28]! vous ferez le maître!....

[Note 28: _You will set cock-a-hoop_: un coq sur un cerceau.]

TYBALT.--Mais, mon oncle, c'est une honte....

CAPULET.--Allez, allez, vous êtes un jeune insolent.... Nous verrons vraiment.... Cette farce pourrait bien vous tourner mal. Je sais ce que je dis. Il faudra que vous veniez ici me contrarier! En vérité, vous prenez bien votre temps.--A merveille, mes enfants.--Vous n'êtes qu'un fat, allez; tenez-vous tranquille, ou....--Encore des lumières; encore des lumières. N'avez-vous pas de honte?--Je vous forcerai bien à être tranquille. Comment!--Allons, gai, mes enfants.

TYBALT.--Cette patience forcée, et la colère à laquelle je voudrais m'abandonner, font, en se heurtant, trembler tout mon corps des assauts qu'elles se livrent. Je m'en irai; mais cette intrusion qui semble douce maintenant, se changera en fiel amer.

(Il sort.)

ROMÉO, _à Juliette_.--Si d'une main trop indigne j'ai profané la sainteté de l'autel, voici la douce expiation de ma faute: mes lèvres, pèlerins rougissants, sont prêtes à adoucir par un tendre baiser la rude impression de ma main.

JULIETTE.--Bon pèlerin, vous faites injure à votre main, qui n'a montré en ceci qu'une dévotion pleine de convenance; car les saints ont des mains que peuvent toucher celles des pèlerins; et joindre les mains est le baiser du pieux voyageur en terre sainte.

ROMÉO.--Les saints n'ont-ils pas des lèvres? et les pieux voyageurs aussi?

JULIETTE.--Oui, pèlerin, des lèvres qu'ils doivent employer à prier.

ROMÉO.--Oh! s'il en est ainsi, chère sainte, permets aux lèvres de faire l'office des mains: elles te prient, exauce leur prière, de peur que ma foi ne se change en désespoir.

JULIETTE.--Les saints ne bougent pas, bien qu'ils exaucent la prière qui leur est faite.

ROMÉO.--Alors ne bougez pas, tandis que je vais recueillir le fruit de ma prière: ainsi vos lèvres auront purifié les miennes de leur péché.

(Il lui donne un baiser.)

JULIETTE.--Alors mes lèvres doivent avoir pris le péché dont elles ont déchargé les vôtres.

ROMÉO.--Pris le péché de mes lèvres! ô faute doucement punie! Rendez-moi mon péché.

JULIETTE.--Vous donnez des baisers avec méthode[29].

[Note 29: _By the book_.]

LA NOURRICE.--Madame, votre mère veut vous dire un mot.

ROMÉO.--Quelle est sa mère?

LA NOURRICE.--Vraiment, jeune homme; sa mère est la maîtresse de la maison, et c'est une bonne dame, sage et vertueuse. J'ai nourri sa fille avec qui vous causiez; et je dis que celui qui mettra la main dessus aura du comptant.

ROMÉO.--C'est une Capulet!--Oh! qu'il va m'en coûter cher! ma vie est engagée à mon ennemie.

BENVOLIO.--Allons, Roméo, partons, la fête est à son plus beau moment.

ROMÉO.--Oui, j'en ai peur, et mon tourment n'en est que plus grand.

CAPULET.--Arrêtez, cavaliers, ne songez pas encore à nous quitter: nous avons là une ridicule petite collation sans cérémonie.--Vous le voulez donc absolument? Allons, je vous remercie tous; je vous remercie, honnêtes cavaliers; bonne nuit.--Encore des torches par là!--Allons, allons donc chercher nos lits. Ah! par ma foi, mon cher (_au second Capulet_), il se fait tard. Je vais aller me reposer.

(Ils sortent.)

JULIETTE.--Approche, nourrice; dis-moi, quel est ce cavalier?

LA NOURRICE.--C'est le fils et l'héritier du vieux Tibério.

JULIETTE.--Quel est celui qui sort actuellement?

LA NOURRICE.--Je crois, ma foi, que c'est le jeune Pétruccio.

JULIETTE.--Et celui qui le suit, qui ne voulait pas danser?

LA NOURRICE.--Je ne le connais pas.

JULIETTE.--Va, demande son nom.--S'il est marié, il est probable que mon tombeau sera mon lit nuptial.

LA NOURRICE.--Son nom est Roméo: c'est un Montaigu, le fils unique de votre grand ennemi.

JULIETTE.--Mon unique amour lié de l'unique objet de ma haine!.... Je l'ai vu trop tôt sans le connaître! et je l'ai connu trop tard! O prodige de l'amour qui vient de naître en moi, que je sois forcée d'aimer un ennemi détesté!

LA NOURRICE.--Qu'est-ce que c'est? qu'est-ce que c'est?

JULIETTE.--Un vers que je viens d'apprendre de quelqu'un avec qui j'ai dansé.

(Une voix dans l'intérieur appelle Juliette.)

LA NOURRICE.--Tout à l'heure, tout à l'heure. (_A Juliette_.) Venez, allons-nous-en; tous les étrangers sont partis.

(Elles sortent.)

(Entre le choeur.)

LE CHOEUR.--Une ancienne passion languit maintenant sur son lit de mort, et de jeunes désirs soupirent après son héritage. Cette beauté pour qui l'amour gémissait et demandait à mourir, comparée à la tendre Juliette, a maintenant cessé d'être belle. Maintenant Roméo est aimé, et il aime à son tour; la magie des regards a jeté sur eux le même charme. Cependant il faut qu'il se plaigne à celle qu'il croit son ennemie, et qu'elle dérobe sur de cruels hameçons le doux appât de l'Amour. Étant tenu pour un ennemi, il ne pourra avoir accès près d'elle pour exprimer ces voeux que les amants ont accoutumé de jurer; tandis qu'elle, aussi pressée d'amour, aura bien moins de moyens encore de chercher à rencontrer celui qu'elle aime depuis un moment, mais la passion leur prête sa puissance, l'occasion leur fournira les moyens de se rapprocher, et tempérera leur détresse par une douceur extrême.

(Il sort.)

FIN DU PREMIER ACTE.

ACTE DEUXIÈME

SCÈNE I

Un lieu ouvert touchant le jardin de Capulet.

Entre ROMÉO.

ROMÉO.--Puis-je aller plus loin lorsque mon coeur est ici? Marche, terre insensible, et retourne vers ton centre.

(Il escalade le mur et saute dans le jardin.)

(Entrent Benvolio et Mercutio.)

BENVOLIO.--Roméo! cousin Roméo!

MERCUTIO.--Il a fait sagement, et, sur ma vie, il s'est échappé pour aller trouver son lit.

BENVOLIO.--Il a couru de ce côté, et a sauté par-dessus le mur de ce verger. Appelle-le, bon Mercutio.

MERCUTIO.--Oui, et je vais même le conjurer.--Roméo! caprice! insensé! passion! amant! apparais-nous sous la forme d'un soupir; dis-nous seulement un vers, et je serai satisfait.--Crie-nous seulement un _hélas!_ Fais seulement rimer _tendresse_ et _maîtresse_; dis quelques mots de douceur à ma commère Vénus, un petit sobriquet à son fils et héritier le jeune aveugle Adam Cupidon[30], qui tira si proprement quand le roi Cophetua devint amoureux de la fille du mendiant[31].--Il ne m'entend point, il ne bouge point, il ne remue point; il faut que ce magot-là soit mort, et je vais l'évoquer.--Je te conjure par les yeux brillants de Rosaline, par son front élevé, par l'incarnat de ses lèvres, par son joli pied, par sa jambe bien faite, et tout ce qui s'ensuit[32], de nous apparaître sous ta propre ressemblance.

[Note 30: _Adam Cupid_. Adam Bell était le nom d'un archer fameux auquel on a dû supposer que Shakspeare voulait faire allusion. C'est ce qui a engagé les critiques à adopter cette leçon à la place d'_Abraham Cupid_, que portent les premières éditions.]

[Note 31: Allusion à un vers d'une ancienne ballade:

The blinded boy that shoots so trim,

(L'enfant aveugle qui tire si proprement). La ballade a pour titre: _King Cophetua and the beggar maid_, et se trouve dans le recueil intitulé _Relics of ancient english poetry_, rassemblé par le docteur Percy.]

[Note 32:

By her fine foot, straight leg, and quivering thigh _And the demesnes that there adjacent lie_.]

BENVOLIO.--S'il t'entend, tu le fâcheras.

MERCUTIO.--Ce que je dis ne peut l'offenser; ce qui pourrait l'offenser serait d'évoquer quelque esprit étrange dans le cercle de sa maîtresse, et de l'y laisser jusqu'à ce qu'elle l'eût conjuré et fait rentrer dans l'abîme; cela pourrait l'irriter; mon invocation est

honnête et obligeante, et je ne conjure au nom de sa maîtresse que pour le faire apparaître.

BENVOLIO.--Viens, il se sera enfoncé sous ces arbres pour l'amour de la nuit; ils sont faits l'un pour l'autre[33]: son amour est aveugle; les ténèbres seules lui conviennent.

[Note 33: _To be consorted with the humorous night, humorous_ veut dire ici _d'une humeur assortie à la sienne._]

MERCUTIO.--Quand l'amour est aveugle, il ne peut toucher le but[34].--Roméo, je te souhaite une bonne nuit; moi, je vais gagner mon alcôve. Ce lit de camp est trop froid pour que j'y puisse dormir.--Eh bien! partons-nous?

[Note 34: Il a fallu passer ces cinq vers:

Now will he sit under a medlar tree And wish his mistress were that kind of fruit As maid call medlars, when they laugh alone. O Roméo, that she were, ah that she were An open et cætera, _thou a propin pear._

Ces deux derniers vers, dont les commentateurs ne sont pas trop parvenus à saisir le sens, leur ont cependant paru d'une telle indécence qu'ils n'ont osé les insérer dans le texte, et les ont rejetés dans une note où ils nous apprennent que _l'et cætera_ est l'indication d'une obscénité encore plus grossière, l'usage, du temps de Shakspeare étant, lorsque quelque expression prononcée sur la scène paraissait trop indécente pour l'impression, de la suppléer par un _et cætera_.]

BENVOLIO.--Allons, car il serait fort inutile de le chercher ici, puisqu'il ne veut pas qu'on le trouve.

(Ils sortent.)

SCÈNE II

Le jardin de Capulet.

Entre ROMÉO.

ROMÉO.--Il se rit des cicatrices, celui qui n'a jamais reçu une blessure. (_Juliette paraît à une fenêtre._)--Mais doucement! Quelle lumière brille soudain à travers cette fenêtre? C'est l'Orient; Juliette est le soleil.--Lève-toi, soleil de beauté; tue la lune jalouse, déjà malade et pâle de douleur de ce que toi, sa servante, es bien plus belle qu'elle. Ne sois pas sa servante, puisqu'elle est jalouse. La couleur dont se revêtent ses vestales est une couleur malade et livide; on ne la voit qu'aux imbéciles, rejette-la loin de toi. Oui, c'est ma dame; oui, ce sont mes amours: oh! si elle pouvait savoir ce qu'elle est pour moi!--Elle parle, et cependant elle ne fait entendre aucun son. Qu'importe! ses yeux ont un langage; je veux leur répondre.--Je suis trop téméraire; ce n'est pas à moi qu'elle parle. Deux des plus brillantes étoiles du ciel, appelées ailleurs par quelque soin, conjurent ses yeux de briller dans leur sphère jusqu'à leur retour. Mais quoi? si ses yeux étaient au ciel, et que les étoiles fussent dans sa tête, l'éclat de ses joues leur ferait honte comme le jour à une lampe; et ses yeux, de la voûte du ciel, verseraient à travers les régions éthérées des flots si brillants de lumière, que les oiseaux chanteraient pensant qu'il n'est pas nuit!--Voyez comme elle appuie sa joue sur sa main. Oh! que ne suis-je un gant placé sur cette main, pour toucher cette joue!

JULIETTE.--Hélas!

ROMÉO.--Elle parle.--Oh! parle encore, ange radieux! car tu parais aussi resplendissant au sein de cette nuit étendue sur ma tête qu'un messager ailé du ciel, lorsqu'aux regard étonnés des mortels, qui, les yeux élevés de tout leur effort, se renversent en arrière pour le contempler, il fend le cours paresseux des nuages et vogue au sein des airs.

JULIETTE.--O Roméo! Roméo!--Pourquoi es-tu Roméo?--Renie ton père et rejette ton nom; ou, si tu ne le veux pas, jure seulement de m'aimer, et je cesse d'être une Capulet.

ROMÉO, _à part_.--Dois-je l'écouter plus longtemps, ou répondrai-je à ceci?

JULIETTE.--Il n'y a que ton nom qui soit mon ennemi. Tu es toujours toi-même, non un Montaigu. Qu'est-ce ce que c'est que Montaigu? Ce n'est ni la main, ni le pied, ni le bras, ni le visage, ni aucune des autres parties qui appartiennent à un homme. Oh! sois quelque autre chose. Qu'y a-t-il dans un nom? Ce que nous appelons une rose, sous tout autre nom sentirait aussi bon. Ainsi Roméo, ne se nommât-il plus Roméo, garderait en perdant ce nom ses perfections chéries. Roméo, dépouille-toi de ton nom; et pour ce nom, qui ne fait pas partie de toi-même, prends-moi tout entière.

ROMÉO.--Je te prends au mot. Appelle-moi ton amant, et je reçois un nouveau baptême, je cesse à jamais d'être Roméo.

JULIETTE.--Qui es-tu, toi qui, couvert par la nuit, viens ainsi t'emparer de mes secrets?

ROMÉO.--Je ne sais de quel nom me servir pour t'apprendre qui je suis. Mon nom, ô ma sainte chérie[35], m'est odieux, puisqu'il est pour toi celui d'un ennemi. S'il était écrit, je le mettrais en pièces.

[Note 35: _Ma sainte_ était à cette époque le nom que les amants donnaient le plus habituellement à leur maîtresse.]

JULIETTE.--Mon oreille n'a pas encore aspiré cent paroles prononcées par cette voix, et cependant j'en reconnais les sons.--N'es-tu pas Roméo, un Montaigu?

ROMÉO.--Ni l'un ni l'autre, ma charmante sainte, si l'un ou l'autre te sont odieux.

JULIETTE.--Comment es-tu arrivé jusqu'ici, dis-le moi, et qu'y viens-tu faire? Les murs du verger sont élevés et difficiles à escalader. Songe qui tu es; ces lieux sont pour toi la mort si quelqu'un de mes parents vient à t'y rencontrer.

ROMÉO.--Des ailes légères de l'amour j'ai volé sur le haut de ces murailles; car des barrières de pierre ne peuvent exclure l'amour; et tout ce que l'amour peut faire, l'amour ose le tenter: tes parents ne sont donc point pour moi un obstacle.

JULIETTE.--S'ils te voient, ils te tueront.

ROMÉO.--Hélas! tes yeux sont pour moi bien plus dangereux que vingt de leurs épées. Donne-moi seulement un doux regard, et je suis à l'épreuve de leur inimitié.

JULIETTE.--Je ne voudrais pas pour le monde entier qu'ils te vissent ici.

ROMÉO.--Le manteau de la nuit me dérobe à leurs regards. A moins que tu ne m'aimes, laisse-les me surprendre: il me vaut mieux perdre la vie par leur haine que mourir lentement sans ton amour.

JULIETTE.--Qui t'a appris à trouver ce lieu?

ROMÉO.--L'amour, qui m'a d'abord excité à le chercher: il m'a prêté son intelligence, et je lui ai prêté mes yeux.--Je ne suis point un pilote; mais fusses-tu aussi loin de moi que ce vaste rivage baigné des mers les plus éloignées, pour un tel chargement j'aventurerais tout.

JULIETTE.--Tu le sais, la nuit étend son masque sur mon visage, sans quoi ce que tu viens de m'entendre dire colorerait devant toi mes joues de la rougeur qui convient à une jeune fille. Je voudrais bien pouvoir conserver encore les apparences; je voudrais, je voudrais pouvoir nier ce que j'ai dit. Mais, adieu tous ces compliments.--M'aimes-tu? Je sais que tu vas me répondre _oui_, et j'en recevrai ta parole.... Cependant, si tu le jures, tu peux devenir perfide: On dit que Jupiter se rit des parjures des amants. O cher Roméo, si tu m'aimes, dis-le-moi sincèrement; ou bien, si tu me trouves trop prompte à me rendre, je prendrai un visage sévère, je me montrerai irritée, et je te dirai _non_; et alors tu me feras la cour: mais autrement je n'en voudrais rien faire pour le monde entier.--En vérité, beau Montaigu, je t'aime trop, et tu peux trouver ma conduite légère. Mais crois-moi, cavalier, tu me trouveras plus fidèle que celles qui ont plus que moi l'art de déguiser. J'aurais été plus réservée, il faut que je l'avoue, si tu n'avais entendu, avant que je pusse m'en apercevoir, les expressions passionnées de mon sincère amour. Pardonne-moi donc, et n'impute point à la légèreté de mon amour cette faiblesse que t'a découverte l'obscurité de la nuit.

ROMÉO.--Madame, par cette heureuse lune qui touche d'une lueur argentée les cimes de ces arbres fruitiers, je jure.....

JULIETTE.--Ah! ne jure point par la lune, l'inconstante lune, qui chaque mois change la forme de son disque; de peur que ton amour ne soit variable.

ROMÉO.--Par quoi jurerai-je?

JULIETTE.--Ne jure point du tout; ou si tu le veux, jure par ta personne gracieuse, toi, le dieu de mon culte idolâtre, et je te croirai.

ROMÉO.--Si le cher amour de mon coeur.....

JULIETTE.--C'est bien; ne jure point. Bien que ma joie soit en toi, je ne ressens point de joie cette nuit de notre engagement: il est trop précipité, trop inconsidéré, trop soudain, trop semblable à l'éclair, qui a cessé d'être avant qu'on ait pu dire: Il éclaire! Mon

doux ami, bonne nuit. Développé par l'haleine de l'été, ce bouton d'amour peut, quand nous nous reverrons, être devenu belle fleur. Bonne nuit! bonne nuit! Qu'un repos, un calme aussi doux que celui qui remplit mon sein arrive à ton coeur!

ROMÉO.--Oh! me laisseras-tu si peu satisfait?

JULIETTE.--Et quelle satisfaction peux-tu obtenir cette nuit?

ROMÉO.--L'échange de tes fidèles serments d'amour contre les miens.

JULIETTE.--Je t'ai donné mon amour avant que tu l'eusses demandé, et je voudrais être encore à te le donner.

ROMÉO.--Voudrais-tu me le retirer? et pourquoi, mon amour?

JULIETTE.--Seulement pour avoir le plaisir d'être franche avec toi, et de te le donner de nouveau. Mais ce que je désire, je le possède déjà: ma libéralité envers toi est sans bornes comme la mer; mon amour est aussi profond: plus je te donne, et plus il me reste; car tous les deux sont infinis.--J'entends du bruit là-dedans. Cher amour, adieu. (_La nourrice appelle de l'intérieur._)--Tout à l'heure, bonne nourrice.--Doux Montaigu, sois fidèle. Demeure un moment encore, je vais revenir.

(Elle sort.)

ROMÉO.--O bienheureuse, bienheureuse nuit! Je crains, comme c'est la nuit, que tout ceci ne soit un songe, trop doucement flatteur pour être réel.

(Juliette reparaît à la fenêtre.)

JULIETTE.--Trois mots, cher Roméo, et puis bonne nuit pour tout de bon. Si les vues de ton amour sont honorables, si le mariage est ton but, fais-moi savoir demain matin, par quelqu'un que je trouverai le moyen de t'envoyer, en quel lieu, en quel temps tu veux accomplir la cérémonie, et j'irai mettre à tes pieds toute la fortune de ma vie, et je te suivrai comme mon seigneur jusqu'au bout de l'univers.

LA NOURRICE, _dans la maison_.--Madame!

JULIETTE.--Je viens, tout à l'heure.--Mais si tes intentions ne sont pas bonnes, je te conjure...

LA NOURRICE, _dans la maison_.--Madame!

JULIETTE.--Dans l'instant, je viens.--De cesser tes poursuites, et de me laisser à ma douleur. Demain j'enverrai.

ROMÉO.--Que mon âme prospère.....

JULIETTE.--Mille fois bonne nuit.

(Elle sort.)

ROMÉO.--Mille fois mauvaise nuit, du moment où lui manque ta lumière! l'Amour court vers l'amour, comme l'écolier loin de ses livres; mais l'amour s'éloigne de l'Amour comme l'enfant retourne à l'école, les yeux chargés de tristesse.

(Il se retire à pas lents.)

(Juliette revient encore à la fenêtre.)

JULIETTE.--St! Roméo! St!--Oh! que n'ai-je la voix du fauconnier pour ramener cet aimable faucon! L'esclavage a la voix éteinte, il ne peut parler haut; autrement je percerais les cavernes où se retire l'écho, et je fatiguerais sa voix aérienne à répéter le nom de mon Roméo jusqu'à ce que les sons en fussent plus affaiblis que les miens.

ROMÉO.--C'est mon âme qui m'appelle par mon nom! Oh! que les sons argentins de la voix des amants portent, durant la nuit, une délicieuse musique à l'oreille qui les attend!

JULIETTE.--Roméo!

ROMÉO.--Ma douce amie!

JULIETTE.--A quelle heure demain matin enverrai-je vers toi?

ROMÉO.--A neuf heures.

JULIETTE.--Je n'y manquerai pas: d'ici à ce moment il y a vingt années..... J'ai oublié pourquoi je t'ai rappelé.

ROMÉO.--Laisse-moi demeurer ici jusqu'à ce que tu t'en souviennes.

JULIETTE.--Je l'oublierais pour te faire rester ici, et ne songerais qu'au plaisir que me fait ta présence.

ROMÉO.--Et moi je veux rester avec toi pour te faire tout oublier, et oublier moi-même toute autre demeure que celle-ci.

JULIETTE.--Le jour est prêt à poindre. Je voudrais que tu fusses parti; mais pas plus loin de moi que l'oiseau d'un enfant capricieux, qui le laisse sautiller à quelque distance de sa main, comme un pauvre prisonnier retenu dans sa chaîne entortillée, puis d'un coup de son fil de soie le retire vers lui, tant son amour lui plaint un moment de liberté.

ROMÉO.--Je voudrais être ton oiseau!

JULIETTE.--Je le voudrais aussi, mon doux ami; cependant je te ferais mourir à force de caresses.--Bonne nuit, bonne nuit! Se quitter est un si doux chagrin, que je dirais bonne nuit jusqu'à ce qu'il fît jour.

(Elle sort.)

ROMÉO.--Que le sommeil descende sur tes yeux, et la paix dans ton coeur! Que ne suis-je le sommeil et la paix, pour obtenir un si doux lieu de repos!--Je vais chercher dans sa cellule mon père spirituel pour implorer son assistance et lui apprendre mon heureuse chance.

(Il sort.)

SCÈNE III

La cellule de frère Laurence.

Entre FRÈRE LAURENCE avec un panier.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Le matin, de ses yeux grisâtres, sourit sur le front ténébreux de la nuit, rayant de traits de lumière les nuages de l'orient. La Nuit au teint vergeté s'éloigne, en chancelant comme un ivrogne, de la route du jour et des roues enflammées du char de Titan[36]. Maintenant, avant que le Soleil ait avancé sur l'horizon son oeil brûlant pour égayer le jour et sécher l'humide rosée de la nuit, il faut que je remplisse l'osier de cette corbeille d'herbes malfaisantes et de fleurs d'un suc précieux.--La terre, cette mère de la nature, est aussi son tombeau; et le sépulcre de la mort renferme aussi le germe de la vie. Nous trouvons des enfants de diverses sortes nés de ses flancs et nourris sur son sein maternel, nombre d'entre eux excellent en nombreuses vertus, aucun qui n'en possède quelques-unes, et cependant tous différents. Quelle abondance de puissants bienfaits sont déposés dans les plantes, les pierres, et dans leur véritable destination! car il n'existe sur la terre rien de si méprisable que la terre n'en reçoive quelque bienfait spécial, et rien de si bon qui, s'il est détourné de ce légitime usage, infidèle à sa vraie source, ne se précipite dans l'abus. Mal appliquée, la vertu même se change en vice; et le vice est quelquefois purifié par l'action. Dans l'enveloppe naissante de cette petite fleur, le poison a établi son séjour, et la médecine sa puissance; offerte à l'odorat, elle le réveille et tous les sens à la fois; si on la goûte, elle paralyse en même temps les sens et le coeur. Ainsi, de même que dans les plantes, demeurent toujours en présence dans le sein de l'homme deux ennemis en lutte, la grâce et la volonté grossière; et là où domine le principe pervers, l'ulcère de la mort a bientôt dévoré le germe vital.

[Note 36: _From forth day's path way, and Titan's fiery wheels_. On a suivi la version des anciennes éditions adoptées par M. Malone, M. Steevens a préféré celle des éditions modernes: _From forth day's path way made by Titan's wheels_, parce que _from forth_ signifiant _hors_, on peut s'écarter _hors du chemin_, et non pas _hors des roues_; mais de pareilles irrégularités ne sont pas rares dans Shakspeare, et la version la plus vraisemblable est toujours celle qui présente l'image la plus complète et la plus suivie dans ses détails et ses conséquences: ainsi la Nuit, représentée comme un ivrogne, doit, selon toute apparence, chercher à s'écarter des roues du char qui la poursuit.]

(Entre Roméo.)

ROMÉO.--Bonjour, père.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--_Benedicite_.--Quelle voix matinale me salue avec tant de douceur?--Jeune fils, cela indique une tête malade de dire sitôt bonjour à ton lit. Les soucis font sentinelle dans les yeux du vieillard; et, au lieu qu'habitent les soucis, le sommeil ne reposera plus. Mais le sommeil doré règne sur la couche où vient s'étendre la jeunesse, la tête libre et les membres exempts de douleur. Ainsi donc, c'est, je m'assure, quelque maladie qui t'a fait lever si matin; ou bien, devinai-je juste, et notre Roméo ne serait-il pas entré cette nuit dans son lit?

ROMÉO.--Cette dernière conjecture est la vraie, et mon repos n'en a été que plus doux.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Dieu pardonne au péché! Étais-tu avec Rosaline?

ROMÉO.--Avec Rosaline? Non, mon père spirituel: j'ai oublié ce nom, et les douleurs attachées à ce nom.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Tu es mon bon fils. Mais où donc as-tu été?

ROMÉO.--Je te le dirai sans me le faire redemander. J'ai été à une fête chez mon ennemi, et là j'ai tout à coup reçu une blessure de quelqu'un que j'ai blessé. Notre guérison à tous deux dépend de tes secours et de ta sainte médecine; je ne ressens point de haine, saint homme, car tu le vois, je te prie également en faveur de mon ennemi.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Parle simplement, mon bon fils, et va au but sans détour: une confession vague ne reçoit qu'une absolution vague.

ROMÉO.--Sache donc clairement que la charmante fille du riche Capulet est l'objet de mes plus chères amours; et de même que je lui ai donné mon coeur, elle m'a donné le sien, et tout est conclu, sauf ce que tu dois conclure par un saint mariage. Quand, où, comment nous nous sommes vus, nous nous sommes parlés d'amour, nous avons échangé nos serments, c'est ce que je te dirai avec le temps; mais ce que je te demande, c'est de consentir à nous marier aujourd'hui.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Bienheureux saint François, quel changement est ceci? Rosaline, que vous aimiez si chèrement, est-elle donc si promptement abandonnée? L'amour des jeunes gens n'est pas véritablement dans le coeur, il n'est que dans les yeux. _Jésus Maria!_ quelle abondance de larmes a lavé tes joues pâles pour Rosaline! que d'eau salée prodiguée en vain pour assaisonner un amour que tu ne goûteras pas! Le soleil n'a pas encore éclairci le ciel chargé de tes soupirs; tes gémissements passés résonnent encore à mon oreille vieillie; tiens, voilà encore sur ta joue la trace d'une ancienne larme que tu n'as pas effacée. Si jamais tu fus toi-même, si ces douleurs ont existé pour toi, toi et tes douleurs, tout était pour Rosaline, et tu es changé! Prononce donc cet arrêt: il est permis aux femmes de faillir, puisque les hommes manquent de force.

ROMÉO.--Tu m'as souvent grondé d'aimer Rosaline.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--D'idolâtrer, mon fils, non pas d'aimer.

ROMÉO.--Tu m'ordonnais d'ensevelir mon amour.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Non pas de mettre l'un en terre pour en faire sortir un autre.

ROMÉO.--Je t'en prie, ne me gronde pas; celle que j'aime maintenant me rend bonheur pour bonheur, m'accorde amour pour amour; l'autre n'en usait pas ainsi.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Oh! qu'elle savait bien que ton amour lisait par coeur, et ne savait pas épeler!--Viens, jeune inconstant, viens avec moi: un motif m'engage à te secourir. Peut-être cette alliance sera-t-elle assez heureuse pour changer en affection véritable la haine de vos deux familles.

ROMÉO.--Oh! partons: je tiens à ce que nous nous hâtions au plus vite.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Sagement et lentement: qui court trébuche.

(Ils sortent.)

SCÈNE IV

Une rue de Vérone.

BENVOLIO, MERCUTIO.

MERCUTIO.--Où diable ce Roméo peut-il être? N'est-il pas rentré chez lui cette nuit?

BENVOLIO.--Il n'est pas rentré chez son père; j'ai parlé à son domestique.

MERCUTIO.--C'est toujours cette pâle cruelle, cette Rosaline, qui le tourmente tant que pour sûr il deviendra fou.

BENVOLIO.--Tybalt, le neveu du vieux Capulet, a envoyé une lettre à la maison de son père.

MERCUTIO.--C'est un cartel, sur ma vie.

BENVOLIO.--Roméo y répondra.

MERCUTIO.--Tout homme qui sait écrire peut répondre à une lettre.

BENVOLIO.--Mais il répondra à l'auteur de la lettre défi pour défi.

MERCUTIO.--Hélas! le pauvre Roméo! il est déjà mort; assassiné par les yeux noirs d'une fille blanche, l'oreille traversée d'un chant d'amour, le coeur percé au beau milieu par le trait du petit archer aveugle, est-ce là un homme en état de faire tête à Tybalt?

BENVOLIO.--Quel homme est-ce donc que ce Tybalt?

MERCUTIO.--Autre chose que le roi des chats[37], je vous en réponds; le plus fier champion de la courtoisie: il se bat comme vous chantez un air sur la note; il garde les temps, la mesure, les distances; il prend le repos d'une note noire, une, deux, et la troisième dans le corps; il vous perce à mort un bouton de soie. Un duelliste, un duelliste; un gentilhomme de la première main, ferme sur la première et la seconde cause[38]: _Ah! la botte immortelle, le revers, le ha!_

[Note 37: On trouve dans de vieux contes un Tybalt, roi des chats.]

[Note 38: _A gentleman of the very first cause, of the first and second cause._ Il y avait des livres où étaient traitées les règles du point d'honneur, et les diverses causes de querelles, qu'on appelait la première, la seconde, la troisième cause.]

BENVOLIO.--Que veux-tu dire?

MERCUTIO.--La peste soit de ces fats ridicules et prétentieux, avec leur grasseyement et leur manière de changer la prononciation. Par Jésus! _une excellente lame! un homme de fort belle taille! une très-bonne créature[39]!_ N'est-ce pas, mon cher grand-père, une chose déplorable, que nous soyons affligés de ces insectes étrangers, ces colporteurs de nouvelles modes, ces _pardonnez-moi_, si attachés aux formes actuelles qu'ils ne sauraient plus se trouver à l'aise sur nos vieux bancs? Ah! leurs _os_, leurs os[40]!

[Note 39: _A very good whore._]

[Note 40: O _their_ bons! _their_ bons! et dans l'ancienne édition _their bones! their bones_. Il est clair que Mercutio veut jouer sur le mot _bones_ (os) et sur le mot français _bon_ employé par ceux qui prétendaient aux belles manières.]

(Entre Roméo.)

BENVOLIO.--Voici Roméo! voici Roméo!

MERCUTIO.--Tout évidé comme un hareng sec. Oh! chair, chair, comme tu ressembles à du poisson! Le voilà pour toute nourriture aux vers qui coulaient de la veine de Pétrarque; mais auprès de sa dame, Laure n'était qu'une servante de cuisine, quoiqu'elle eût un amoureux plus habile à rimer pour elle; Didon n'était qu'une dondon; Cléopâtre qu'une Égyptienne; Hélène et Héro, des créatures, des courtisanes; Thisbé un oeil gris ou quelque chose comme cela. Mais ce n'est pas de cela qu'il s'agit.--Seigneur Roméo, _bonjour_: voilà un salut à la française en l'honneur de vos hauts-de-chausses français. Vous nous avez joliment donné le change hier au soir.

ROMÉO.--Bonjour, vous deux. Comment vous ai-je donné le change[41]?

[Note 41: _The slip, sir, slip._ Jeu de mots qui roule sur _the slip_, qui veut dire s'échapper, et est aussi le nom d'une pièce de monnaie souvent fausse _(counterfeit.)_]

MERCUTIO.--Une escapade, une escapade, mon cher. Vous ne comprenez pas.

ROMÉO.--Pardon, cher Mercutio, j'étais fort occupé; et, dans ma position, il est permis de faillir à quelques révérences[42].

[Note 42: ROMÉO._--Pardon, good Mercutio, my business was great; and in such case as mine, a man may strain courtesy._

MERCUTIO.--_That's as much as to say--such a case as yours constrains a man to bow in the hams._

ROMÉO.--_Meaning to courtesy._

MERCUTIO.--_Thou hast most kindly hit it._

ROMÉO.--_A most courteous exposition._

MERCUTIO.--_Nay, I am the very pink of courtesy._

ROMÉO.--_Pink for flower._

MERCUTIO.--_Right._

ROMÉO--_Why, then is my pump well flowered._

MERCUTIO.--_Well said: follow me this jest now, till thou hast worn thy pump; that, when the single sole of it is worn, the jest may remain, after the wearing, solely singular._

ROMÉO.--_O single-soled jest, solely singular for the singleness!_

MERCUTIO.--_Come between us, good Benvolio; my wits fail._

ROMÉO.--_Switch and spurs, switch and spurs, or I'll cry a match._

MERCUTIO.--_Nay, if thy wits run the wild goose chace, I have done, for thou hast more of the wild goose in one of thy wits, than, I am sure, I have in my whole five: Was I with you there for the goose?_

ROMÉO.--_Thou wast never with me for anything, when thou wast not there for the goose._

MERCUTIO.--_I will bite thee by thee ear for that jest._

ROMÉO.--_Nay, good goose, bite not._

MERCUTIO.--_Thy wit is a very bitter sweeting; it is a most sharp sauce._

ROMÉO.--_And is it not well served in to a sweet goose?_

MERCUTIO.--O, _here's a wit of cheverel, that stretches from an inch narrow to an ell broad!_

ROMÉO.--_I stretch it out for that word--broad: which added to the goose, proves thee far and wide a broad goose._

Il a fallu, en traduisant, se contenter de l'à peu près, la liberté de quelques-unes des plaisanteries, et la puérile recherche de jeux de mots qui fait le sel de presque toutes, les rendant impossibles à traduire exactement.

La première de ces plaisanteries porte sur le mot _courtesy_, qui signifie _révérence_ et _politesse_.

Pour entendre la seconde, il faut savoir que les danseurs portaient des souliers brodés en fleurs ou attachés avec des rubans en forme de fleurs.

La chasse _de l'oie sauvage_ fait allusion à une espèce de course de chevaux qu'on nommait ainsi, et qui consistait à attacher deux chevaux ensemble avec une longe: celui qui gagnait les devants obligeait l'autre à le suivre partout où il lui plaisait; et, lorsque l'un des deux coureurs avait mis son compagnon dans l'impossibilité de le suivre, il était regardé comme vainqueur.]

MERCUTIO.--C'est comme si vous disiez qu'un homme dans votre position est obligé de fléchir du jarret.

ROMÉO.--Vous voulez dire faire la révérence.

MERCUTIO.--Tu as très-obligeamment deviné.

ROMÉO.--C'est là une explication fort polie.

MERCUTIO.--Oh! je me pique de politesse.

ROMÉO.--Tu en es la fleur.

MERCUTIO.--Assurément.

ROMÉO.--La fleur de chardon qui se pique à mes souliers.

MERCUTIO.--Bien répondu. Maintenant c'est une pointe qu'il te faut suivre jusqu'à ce que tes souliers soient usés, parce qu'au moins, quand les souliers seront partis de la semelle, il t'en restera la pointe qui sera seule de son espèce.

ROMÉO.--Tu conviendras qu'elle est boiteuse, celle-là: tout son mérite, c'est de n'avoir pas sa pareille.

MERCUTIO.--Benvolio, viens nous séparer; mon esprit est rendu.

ROMÉO.--Donne du fouet et de l'éperon, du fouet et de l'éperon, ou je demande un autre coureur.

MERCUTIO.--Oh! ma foi, si tu cours la chasse de l'oie sauvage, j'ai fini, car tu tiens plus de l'oie sauvage dans un seul de tes sens, que moi, j'en suis sûr, dans tous les cinq.--Est-ce donc la course de l'oie que je faisais avec vous?

ROMÉO.--Je ne t'ai jamais vu avec moi nulle part que ce ne fût pour faire l'oie.

MERCUTIO.--Je vais te mordre l'oreille pour cette mauvaise plaisanterie.

ROMÉO.--Non, bonne oie, ne mords pas.

MERCUTIO.--C'est ton esprit qui a du mordant; il fait la sauce un peu âpre.

ROMÉO.--Il n'en vaut que mieux pour une oie douce.

MERCUTIO.--Oh! pour celui-là, il prête comme une peau de chevreuil, de la largeur d'un pouce à la longueur d'une demi-toise.

ROMÉO.--Ce qui veut dire qu'en long et en large tu n'es autre chose qu'une grosse oie.

MERCUTIO.--Eh bien, ceci ne vaut-il pas mieux que de gémir d'amour? Te voilà sociable maintenant, te voilà Roméo; te voilà tel que tu es par éducation et par nature; car cet imbécile d'Amour ressemble à un grand nigaud qui court niaisement çà et là pour trouver où cacher sa marotte dans un trou[43].

[Note 43: _That runs lolling up and down to hide his bauble in a hole._]

BENVOLIO.--Allons, allons, ne va pas plus loin.

MERCUTIO.--Ne voilà-t-il pas que tu me coupes la parole au beau milieu de l'histoire?

ROMÉO.--Tu allais l'étendre à n'en pas finir.

MERCUTIO.--Oh! tu te trompes, j'aurais été fort court; j'avais traité la matière à fond, et ne prétendais pas occuper le tapis plus longtemps.

(Entrent la nourrice et Pierre.)

ROMÉO.--Voilà une bonne figure.

MERCUTIO.--Une voile! une voile! une voile!

BENVOLIO.--Il y en a bien deux, une jupe et un caleçon[44].

[Note 44: _A shirt and a smock_, une chemise de femme et une chemise d'homme.]

LA NOURRICE.--Pierre!

PIERRE.--Me voilà!

LA NOURRICE.--Pierre, mon éventail.

MERCUTIO.--Je t'en prie, donne-le-lui, Pierre, pour cacher son visage: son éventail est le plus beau des deux.

LA NOURRICE.--Dieu vous donne le bonjour, cavaliers.

MERCUTIO.--Dieu vous donne le bonsoir[45], belle dame.

[Note 45: _God ye good den, fair gentlewoman._

NURS.--_Is it good den?_

MERC.--_It is no less, I tell you, for the hand of the dial is now upon the first of noon; good den_ s'employait quelquefois pour _goodeven_ (bonsoir).]

LA NOURRICE.--Sommes-nous déjà au soir?

MERCUTIO.--Assurément; la main impudente du cadran est sur le point de midi.

LA NOURRICE.--Ôtez-vous de mon chemin. Quel homme êtes-vous donc?

ROMÉO.--Un homme, ma bonne, ma bonne dame, que Dieu a créé pour se faire tort à lui-même.

LA NOURRICE.--Bien dit, par ma foi.--Pour se faire tort à lui-même, dit-il?--Cavaliers, quelqu'un de vous saura-t-il me dire où je pourrais trouver le jeune Roméo?

ROMÉO.--Je puis vous le dire; mais je vous préviens que le jeune Roméo sera plus vieux quand vous l'aurez trouvé qu'il ne l'était quand vous vous êtes mise à le chercher. Je suis le plus jeune du nom, faute de pis.

LA NOURRICE.--Vous dites fort bien.

MERCUTIO.--Quoi, le pis est bien? C'est le bien prendre, ma foi, sagement, sagement.

LA NOURRICE.--Si vous êtes Roméo, seigneur, je voudrais vous entretenir un instant en particulier.

BENVOLIO.--Elle veut l'inviter _à_ quelque souper.

MERCUTIO.--Une entremetteuse! une entremetteuse! une entremetteuse[46]! holà, hé!

[Note 46: _So ho!_ Cri des chasseurs quand ils ont fait lever le lièvre.]

ROMÉO.--Qu'as-tu donc trouvé?

MERCUTIO.--Ce n'est pas un lièvre, mon cher, à moins que ce ne soit un lièvre dans un pâté de carême, quelque peu passé et moisi avant qu'on puisse le finir.

Un vieux lièvre moisi Et un vieux lièvre moisi Est un très-beau plat pour le carême; Mais dans un lièvre moisi Il y a trop à manger pour vingt personnes S'il est moisi avant d'être fini.

Roméo, rentrez-vous chez votre père? Nous y dînerons.

ROMÉO.--Je vais vous suivre.

MERCUTIO.--Adieu, vieille madame; adieu, madame, madame, madame[47].

[Note 47: _Ladies, ladies, ladies_, refrain d'une vieille chanson.]

(Mercutio et Benvolio sortent.)

LA NOURRICE.--Adieu, de tout mon coeur.--Qu'est-ce donc, s'il vous plaît, seigneur, que ce marchand d'insolences qui était si plein de ses sottises?

ROMÉO.--C'est un homme, nourrice, qui aime à s'entendre parler, et qui en dit plus en une minute qu'il n'en fait en un mois.

LA NOURRICE.--S'il s'avise de rien dire contre moi, je le ferai bien taire, voyez-vous, fût-il plus fort qu'il ne l'est, lui et vingt gamins de son espèce; et, si je ne pouvais pas, je trouverais bien qui m'aiderait. Vilain polisson! Je ne suis pas de ses coureuses, moi, je

ne suis pas de ses camarades de couteau.--Et toi aussi, il faut que tu te tiennes là et que tu laisses le premier polisson user de moi à son plaisir!

PIERRE.--Je n'ai vu personne user de vous à son plaisir; si je l'avais vu, mon épée aurait été bientôt dehors, je vous en réponds; je dégaine aussi vite qu'un autre quand je vois l'occasion d'une bonne querelle et que j'ai la loi de mon côté.

LA NOURRICE.--En vérité, je le dis devant Dieu, je suis si en colère que je tremble de tous mes membres. Vilain polisson!--Seigneur, un mot, je vous prie. Comme je vous l'ai dit, ma jeune maîtresse m'a envoyée vous chercher: ce qu'elle m'a chargée de vous dire je le garderai pour moi. Mais laissez-moi vous dire d'abord que si vous aviez l'intention de la mener dans le paradis des fous, comme on dit, ce serait un bien vilain procédé, comme on dit; car la demoiselle est jeune, et par conséquent si vous étiez double avec elle, ce serait une chose qui n'est pas à faire vis-à-vis d'une jeune demoiselle, et une conduite fort méprisable.

ROMÉO.--Nourrice, recommande-moi à ta dame et maîtresse. Je te proteste...

LA NOURRICE.--Bon coeur! oui, ma foi, je lui dirai tout cela. Seigneur, seigneur! qu'elle va être une femme contente!

ROMÉO.--Que lui diras-tu, nourrice? Tu ne m'écoutes pas.

LA NOURRICE.--Je lui dirai, seigneur, que vous _protestez_; et c'est là, je le vois bien, parler en gentilhomme[48].

[Note 48: _Je vous proteste_ était, à ce qu'il paraît, une des locutions françaises les plus indispensables à un homme du bel air.]

ROMÉO.--Dis-lui de trouver quelque prétexte pour aller à confesse cette après-midi; elle viendra à la cellule de frère Laurence, qui la confessera et la mariera. Voilà pour ta peine.

LA NOURRICE.--Non, en vérité, seigneur, pas une obole.

ROMÉO.--Allez, allez, je vous dis que vous l'accepterez.

LA NOURRICE.--Cette après-midi, seigneur? Bien, elle s'y trouvera.

ROMÉO.--Et toi, bonne nourrice, va attendre derrière le mur de l'abbaye; avant une heure mon domestique t'y rejoindra et te portera des cordes tressées en échelle, qui, dans le mystérieux silence de la nuit, m'élèveront au dernier degré du plus glorieux bonheur. Adieu, sois fidèle, et je reconnaîtrai tes soins. Adieu! recommande-moi à ta maîtresse.

LA NOURRICE.--Que le Dieu du ciel vous bénisse!--Un mot, seigneur.

ROMÉO.--Que me veux-tu, chère nourrice?

LA NOURRICE.--Votre domestique est-il discret? Vous avez peut-être ouï dire que deux personnes peuvent garder un secret quand on en a mis une à la porte?

ROMÉO.--Je te garantis mon domestique fidèle comme l'acier.

LA NOURRICE.--Bien, seigneur. Ma maîtresse est la plus douce créature..... Oh! seigneur, seigneur, lorsqu'elle était encore une petite babillarde...--Il y a dans la ville un noble cavalier, un certain Pâris qui voudrait bien en tâter; mais elle, la bonne âme, aimerait autant voir un crapaud, oui, un crapaud, que de le voir. Pour la mettre en colère, je lui dis quelquefois que Pâris est le plus joli garçon des deux; mais je vous réponds que, quand je lui dis cela, elle devient aussi blanche que quelque linge qui soit au monde.--_Romarin_ et _Roméo_ ne commencent-ils pas tous deux par la même lettre[49]?

[Note 49: Le romarin était un emblème de fidélité, mais l'R s'appelait la lettre de chien, parce qu'ils paraissent la prononcer dès qu'ils commencent à montrer les dents, et la nourrice, qui ne sait pas lire, croit que Roméo veut se moquer d'elle en lui disant que son nom commence par un R.]

ROMÉO.--Oui, nourrice; pourquoi? Tous deux commencent par un R.

LA NOURRICE.--Ah! moqueur que vous êtes! c'est le nom du chien. R est pour le chien. Non, cela commence par une autre lettre, je le sais bien, et elle a fait de ça la plus jolie petite versification de vous et de _Romarin_, ça vous ferait plaisir à entendre.

ROMÉO.--Parle de moi à ta maîtresse.

LA NOURRICE.--Oui, mille et mille fois. Pierre!

(Roméo sort.)

PIERRE.--Me voilà.

LA NOURRICE.--Prends mon éventail et marche devant.

(Ils sortent.)

SCÈNE V

Le jardin de Capulet.

JULIETTE.

JULIETTE.--Neuf heures sonnaient quand j'ai envoyé la nourrice: elle m'avait promis qu'elle serait de retour au bout d'une demi-heure; peut-être n'aura-t-elle pu le trouver. Non, ce n'est pas cela.--Oh! elle est boiteuse! La messagère de l'Amour devrait être la pensée, dix fois plus rapide que les rayons du soleil lorsqu'ils chassent les ombres des sombres collines. Aussi l'Amour est-il traîné par des colombes aux ailes agiles; aussi, prompt comme le vent, Cupidon porte-t-il des ailes.--Déjà le soleil arrive au point le plus élevé de sa course journalière, et depuis neuf heures jusqu'à midi il s'est écoulé trois longues heures, et cependant elle ne revient pas. Si elle avait les affections et le sang brûlant de la jeunesse, son mouvement serait aussi prompt que celui d'une balle; d'un mot je la ferais bondir vers mon tendre amant, et un mot de lui me la renverrait. Mais ces vieilles gens, il semble qu'ils soient morts; on ne saurait les remuer; ils sont d'une lenteur! lourds et pâles comme le plomb! (_Entrent la nourrice et Pierre._)--O Dieu! la voilà qui revient. O ma douce nourrice! quelle nouvelle? l'as-tu vu? L'as-tu trouvé? Renvoie ton valet.

LA NOURRICE.--Pierre, restez à la porte.

JULIETTE.--Eh bien, bonne, chère nourrice?--O Dieu! pourquoi cet air triste? Eusses-tu de mauvaises nouvelles, annonce-les moi gaiement; si elles sont bonnes, c'est faire honte à la musique des douces nouvelles que de me les dire sur un air si discordant.

LA NOURRICE.--Je suis fatiguée; laissez-moi me reposer un moment. Fi donc! comme les os me font mal! Ai-je assez couru!

JULIETTE.--Je voudrais que tu eusses mes os et moi tes nouvelles..... Je t'en prie, allons, parle; bonne, bonne nourrice, parle.

LA NOURRICE.--Jésus! que vous êtes pressée! ne pouvez-vous pas attendre un instant? Ne voyez-vous pas que je suis hors d'haleine?

JULIETTE.--Comment peux-tu être hors d'haleine, puisque tu en as assez pour me dire que tu es hors d'haleine? Les raisons que tu me donnes pour me faire attendre sont plus longues que le récit que tu me refuses. Tes nouvelles sont-elles bonnes ou mauvaises? Réponds à cela _oui_ ou _non_, et après j'attendrai patiemment les détails. Contente-moi; sont-elles bonnes ou mauvaises?

LA NOURRICE.--Eh bien! vous avez fait le choix d'une sotte; vous n'entendez rien à choisir un homme. Roméo! Non, ce n'est pas ça.--Quoiqu'il soit plus beau de visage que personne, malgré cela, il a la jambe mieux faite que tous les autres. Pour la main, le pied, la taille, il n'en faut pas parler; cependant ça n'a pas son pareil. Il n'est pas la fleur de la politesse!... non! mais, j'en réponds, il a la douceur d'un agneau. Va ton chemin, jeune fille, et sers Dieu.--Comment! est-ce qu'on a dîné ici?

JULIETTE.--Non, non, mais je savais déjà tout cela. Que dit-il de notre mariage? qu'en dit-il?

LA NOURRICE.--Ah Dieu! que la tête me fait mal! Quelle tête j'ai! elle me bat comme si elle allait se fendre en mille pièces; et mon dos, de l'autre côté! oh! le dos! le dos! Vous devriez vous maudire d'avoir eu le coeur de m'envoyer comme cela me tuer à courir de tous côtés.

JULIETTE.--En vérité, je suis bien fâchée de te voir souffrir. Chère, chère, chère nourrice, réponds; que dit mon amant?

LA NOURRICE.--Votre amant parle comme un honnête gentilhomme, poli, obligeant, gracieux, et, j'en réponds, plein de vertu.--Où est votre mère?

JULIETTE.--Où est ma mère? Eh bien! elle est là dedans. Où veux-tu qu'elle soit? Que tu me réponds singulièrement! _Votre amant parle comme un honnête gentilhomme... Où est votre mère?_

LA NOURRICE.--Oh! bonne sainte Vierge! est-ce que le feu y est? Ma foi! comme vous voudrez; si c'est là l'emplâtre que vous mettez sur mes os malades, vous pourrez dorénavant faire vos commissions vous-même.

JULIETTE.--Est-ce donc la peine de se fâcher ainsi? Allons! que dit Roméo?

LA NOURRICE.--Avez-vous obtenu la permission d'aller à confesse aujourd'hui?

JULIETTE.--Oui.

LA NOURRICE.--Eh bien! dépêchez-vous de vous rendre à la cellule du père Laurence; il y a là un mari qui va vous rendre femme. A présent, voilà le sang léger qui vous monte aux joues: elles deviennent écarlates à la moindre nouvelle. Dépêchez-vous d'aller _à_ l'église; moi, il faut que j'aille d'un autre côté chercher une échelle au moyen de laquelle votre amant grimpera aussitôt qu'il fera nuit, pour vous dénicher un oiseau. J'ai toute la peine, et je travaille pour votre plaisir; mais bientôt, ce soir, vous aurez votre part du fardeau. Allez, je vais dîner; dépêchez-vous de vous rendre à la cellule.

JULIETTE.--De voler au plus beau sort.--Excellente nourrice, adieu.

(Elles sortent.)

SCÈNE VI

La cellule du frère Laurence.

Entrent FRÈRE LAURENCE et ROMÉO.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Veuille le ciel, souriant à notre cérémonie sainte, ne pas envoyer le chagrin nous la reprocher dans les heures à venir!

ROMÉO.--_Amen, amen._ Mais viennent les chagrins qui pourront, ils ne suffiront pas à payer le bonheur que me donne un seul et court instant de sa vue. Unissez seulement nos mains au son des paroles sacrées, et qu'ensuite la mort, qui dévore l'amour, fasse tout ce qu'elle peut oser; c'en est assez pour moi d'avoir pu la nommer mienne.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Ces violents transports ont une fin violente au milieu de leur triomphe, comme la poudre et le feu, que le même instant voit s'unir et s'épuiser. Le miel le plus doux rassasie par sa délicieuse saveur, et dans les plaisirs du goût s'éteint l'appétit. Aimez donc avec modération; ainsi font les longues amours: qui va trop vite arrive aussi tard que qui va trop lentement. _(Entre Juliette.)_--Voici la dame. Oh! un pied si léger n'usera jamais ces pierres inaltérables. Un amant monterait à cheval sur ces fils qui l'été flottent dans le vague de l'air, qu'il ne tomberait point à terre, tant sont légères les vanités de ce monde.

JULIETTE.--Je souhaite le bonjour à mon vénérable confesseur.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Roméo, ma fille, te remerciera pour nous deux.

JULIETTE.--Je lui en souhaite autant à lui-même, sans quoi ses remerciements seraient un prix trop élevé.

ROMÉO.--Ah! Juliette, si la mesure de ta joie est comblée comme la mienne, et que tu aies plus de talent pour la peindre, parfume de ton haleine l'air qui nous environne, et que la brillante harmonie de ta voix déploie les images du bonheur que nous recevons l'un de l'autre en une si chère entrevue.

JULIETTE.--Il est des pensées qui sont plus riches de fond que de paroles, et qui se sentent de leur trésor et non de leur parure. Ils sont dans la misère ceux qui peuvent calculer ce qu'ils possèdent. Mais tel est l'excès de fortune où s'est élevé mon sincère amour, que je ne saurais compter seulement jusqu'à moitié la valeur de mes richesses.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Allons, allons, venez avec moi, et nous aurons bientôt fait; car, avec votre permission, vous ne resterez pas seuls jusqu'à ce que la sainte Église ait fait de vous deux une seule chair.

(Ils sortent.)

FIN DU DEUXIÈME ACTE.

ACTE TROISIÈME

SCÈNE I

Un lieu public.

Entrent BENVOLIO, MERCUTIO, UN PAGE _et des_ VALETS.

BENVOLIO.--Je t'en prie, cher Mercutio, retirons-nous. Le jour est brûlant, les Capulet sont dehors, si nous venons à les rencontrer, jamais nous n'éviterons une querelle, car dans ces chaleurs où nous sommes le sang bouillonne avec furie[50].

[Note 50: _In the warm time the people for the most part be more unruly._

P. Smith, _Commonwealth of England_.]

MERCUTIO.--Tu ressembles à ces hommes qui, en entrant dans une taverne, vous campent leur épée sur la table en disant: «Dieu me fasse la grâce de n'avoir pas besoin de toi,» et qui n'ont pas plutôt senti l'effet du second verre de vin qu'ils la tirent contre le cabaretier, lorsqu'il n'y en a réellement aucun besoin.

BENVOLIO.--Moi! je ressemble à ces gens-là?

MERCUTIO.--Allons, allons, tu es dans ton espèce un gaillard aussi bouillant que personne en Italie, aussi prompt à t'emporter et aussi emporté dans ta promptitude.

BENVOLIO.--Et à quoi revient ceci?

MERCUTIO.--C'est que, s'il y en avait deux comme toi, bientôt nous ne les aurions plus, car ils se tueraient l'un l'autre. Toi, tu te prendrais de querelle avec un homme pour un poil de plus ou de moins à la barbe; tu te prendrais de querelle avec un homme parce qu'il casserait des noisettes, sans autre raison, si ce n'est que tu as les yeux couleur de noisette. Quel autre oeil qu'un oeil ainsi fait pourrait découvrir un pareil sujet de querelle? Ta tête est pleine de querelles, comme l'oeuf est plein de nourriture; cependant elle a été rendue, à force de querelles et de coups, aussi vide qu'un oeuf éclos. N'as-tu pas cherché dispute à un homme sur ce qu'il toussait dans la rue, parce que cela éveillait ton chien qui dormait au soleil; à un tailleur, parce qu'il portait son habit neuf avant les fêtes de Pâques; à un autre encore, parce qu'un vieux ruban nouait ses souliers neufs? Et tu veux me faire la leçon pour m'empêcher de quereller?

BENVOLIO.--Si j'étais aussi querelleur que toi, le premier que je rencontrerais pourrait acheter le revenu de toute ma vie pour le prix d'une heure et quart.

MERCUTIO.--De toute ta vie, imbécile[51]!

[Note 51: _The fee simple of my life_! BENV.

The fee simple; oh! simple, MERCUT.

Ce jeu de mots de Mercutio a été impossible à rendre.]

(Entrent Tybalt et plusieurs autres.)

BENVOLIO.--Par mon chef, voici venir les Capulet.

MERCUTIO.--Par mon talon, je m'en moque.

TYBALT.--Tenez-vous près de moi, je veux leur parler.--Cavaliers, bonsoir; un mot avec un de vous.

MERCUTIO.--Rien qu'un seul mot avec un de nous? Accouplez quelque chose avec, que cela fasse un mot et un coup.

TYBALT.--Vous m'y trouverez assez disposé, mon gentilhomme, pour peu que vous m'en donniez l'occasion.

MERCUTIO.--Ne pouvez-vous prendre l'occasion sans qu'on vous la donne?

TYBALT.--Mercutio, tu es de concert avec Roméo.

MERCUTIO.--De concert? Comment! nous prend-il pour des ménétriers, c'est que si nous étions des ménétriers, faites attention que vous ne nous trouveriez pas d'accord avec vous. Voilà mon archet, voilà qui vous fera danser. Corbleu, de concert!

BENVOLIO.--Nous parlons ici dans un lieu fréquenté de tout le monde: ou retirons-nous en quelque lieu écarté, ou raisonnez tranquillement sur vos griefs, ou bien allons-nous-en; tous les yeux se fixent sur nous.

MERCUTIO.--Les hommes ont des yeux pour regarder. Qu'ils nous regardent, si cela leur plaît; pour moi, je ne bouge pas d'ici pour faire plaisir à qui que ce soit.

(Entre Roméo.)

TYBALT.--Eh bien! la paix soit avec vous, cavalier. J'aperçois mon homme.

MERCUTIO.--Que je sois pendu pourtant, mon gentilhomme, s'il porte votre livrée. Par ma foi, vous pouvez marcher devant sur le pré, il vous y suivra; et dans ce sens votre seigneurie peut dire qu'elle a trouvé son homme.

TYBALT.--Roméo, la haine que je te porte ne me permet pas un mot plus doux: tu es un traître.

ROMÉO.--Tybalt, les raisons que j'ai de t'aimer me font pardonner à la fureur qu'annonce un pareil salut. Je ne suis point un traître: ainsi donc, adieu, je vois que tu ne me connais pas.

TYBALT.--Jeune homme, cela ne répare point les outrages que tu m'as faits: ainsi reviens et mets l'épée à la main.

ROMÉO.--Je proteste que je ne t'ai jamais offensé, et que je t'aime plus que tu ne saurais le penser jusqu'à ce que tu connaisses les motifs de mon affection. Ainsi, brave Capulet, dont le nom m'est aussi cher que le mien, accepte cette satisfaction.

MERCUTIO.--Oh! lâche sang-froid! déshonorante soumission!--_A la stoccata_, pour effacer cela. Tybalt, le preneur de rats, voulez-vous faire un tour avec moi?

TYBALT.--Que veux-tu de moi?

MERCUTIO.--Bon roi des chats, rien du tout qu'une de vos neuf vies, afin d'en faire ce qu'il me plaira; et ensuite, selon que vous en userez à mon égard, je pourrai bien battre à plat les huit autres. Veuillez donc prendre votre épée par les oreilles pour la faire sortir de son étui, et dépêchez-vous; ou bien, avant qu'elle soit dehors, la mienne sera sur vos oreilles.

TYBALT, _tirant l'épée._--Je suis à vous.

ROMÉO.--Cher Mercutio, remets ton épée.

MERCUTIO.--Allons, mon gentilhomme, votre passade.

(Il se battent.)

ROMÉO.--Tire ton épée, Benvolio, désarmons-les.--Gentilshommes, c'est une honte: ne tombez pas dans une pareille désobéissance.--Tybalt, Mercutio, le prince a expressément défendu toute querelle dans les rues de Vérone.--Tybalt, arrêtez.--Cher Mercutio.....

(Sortent Tybalt et ses partisans.)

MERCUTIO.--Je suis blessé! Malédiction sur les deux maisons! me voilà expédié!--Est-ce qu'il est parti, et sans rien avoir?

BENVOLIO.--Quoi, tu es blessé?

MERCUTIO.--Oui, oui, une égratignure: par ma foi, c'est assez. Où est mon page?--Drôle, va chercher un chirurgien.

(Le page sort.)

ROMÉO.--Prends ton courage, ami, ta blessure ne peut être grave.

MERCUTIO.--Non, elle n'est pas aussi profonde qu'un puits, ni aussi large que la porte d'une église; mais c'en est assez, elle suffira. Venez me voir demain matin, et vous me trouverez tombé[52] dans le sérieux. Je suis poivré, j'en réponds, du moins pour

ce monde-ci. Malédiction sur vos deux maisons! Corbleu! un chien, un rat, une souris, un chat, égratigner un homme à mort! un bravache, un faquin, un traître, qui ne combat que par règles d'arithmétique! pourquoi diable êtes-vous venu vous jeter entre nous deux? J'ai reçu le coup par-dessous votre bras.

[Note 52: _A grave man_, un homme grave et un homme bon pour le tombeau.]

ROMÉO.--Je faisais pour le mieux.

MERCUTIO.--Aidez-moi, Benvolio, à entrer dans quelque maison voisine, ou bien je vais m'évanouir. Malédiction sur vos deux maisons! elles ont fait de moi une pâture à vers. Oh! j'ai la botte et bien à fond. Ah! vos deux maisons!

(Mercutio et Benvolio sortent.)

ROMÉO.--C'est pour moi que ce gentilhomme, le proche parent du prince, mon intime ami, a reçu cette blessure mortelle: ma réputation est entachée par l'affront que m'a fait Tybalt; Tybalt, mon parent depuis une heure! O chère Juliette! ta beauté a fait de moi un homme efféminé, elle a amolli la trempe vigoureuse de mon courage.

(Entre Benvolio.)

BENVOLIO.--O Roméo, Roméo! le brave Mercutio est mort: cette âme généreuse, dédaignant trop tôt la terre, s'est élevée vers les nuages.

ROMÉO.--Les noires destinées de ce jour vont s'étendre sur des jours nombreux: celui-ci commence seulement les malheurs, d'autres les finiront.

(Rentre Tybalt.)

BENVOLIO.--Voici le furieux Tybalt qui revient.

ROMÉO.--Vivant, triomphant, et Mercutio est tué! Retourne dans les cieux, prudente douceur, et toi, fureur à l'oeil enflammé, sois maintenant mon guide.--A présent, Tybalt, reprends pour toi ce nom de traître que tu me donnais tout à l'heure: l'âme de Mercutio, arrêtée à peu de distance au-dessus de nos têtes, attend que la tienne vienne lui tenir compagnie. Il faut que toi ou moi, ou tous les deux, nous allions le rejoindre.

TYBALT.--C'est toi, qui étais ici-bas de son parti, misérable enfant, qui dois l'aller trouver.

ROMÉO.--Voici qui en décidera.

(Ils se battent. Tybalt tombe.)

BENVOLIO.--Fuis, Roméo; va-t'en: les citoyens sont en alarme, et Tybalt est tué. Ne reste point ainsi dans la stupeur. Le prince va te condamner à mort si tu es pris. Fuis, sauve-toi, va-t'en.

ROMÉO.--Oh! je suis le jouet de la fortune[53].

[Note 53: _I am fortune's fool._]

BENVOLIO.--Pourquoi es-tu encore ici?

(Roméo sort.)

(Entrent des citoyens, etc.)

UN CITOYEN.--Par quelle rue s'est-il enfui, celui qui a tué Mercutio? Tybalt, cet assassin, par où s'est-il sauvé?

BENVOLIO.--Le voilà étendu là, ce Tybalt.

LE CITOYEN.--Levez-vous, seigneur, suivez-moi, je vous somme au nom du prince; obéissez.

(Entrent le prince et sa suite, Montaigu, Capulet, leurs femmes et autres personnages.)

LE PRINCE.--Où sont les vils auteurs de ce tumulte?

BENVOLIO.--Noble prince, je puis raconter toutes les malheureuses circonstances de cette fatale querelle. Voilà celui que le jeune Roméo a tué, et qui avait tué ton parent le brave Mercutio.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Tybalt! mon neveu! ô fils de mon frère! Cruelle vue! hélas! le sang de mon cher neveu tout répandu!--Prince, si tu es juste, pour notre sang, le sang des Montaigu doit être versé.--Mon neveu, mon neveu!

LE PRINCE.--Benvolio, qui a commencé cette rixe sanglante?

BENVOLIO.--Tybalt, que vous voyez ici tué de la main de Roméo. Roméo lui a parlé raisonnablement; il l'a prié de considérer combien la querelle était légère; il lui a représenté en outre quel serait votre courroux. Tout cela dit d'un ton plein de douceur, d'un regard tranquille, et même dans l'humble attitude d'un suppliant, n'a pu faire trêve à la violence désordonnée de Tybalt, qui, sourd aux paroles de paix, tourne la pointe de son épée contre le sein du brave Mercutio: celui-ci, tout aussi bouillant que lui, engage le fer homicide contre le fer, et, avec un dédain martial, d'une main écarte la froide mort, et de l'autre la renvoie à Tybalt, qui par son adresse la repousse vers lui. Roméo crie de toutes ses forces: «Arrêtez, amis; séparez-vous;» et d'un bras plus prompt que sa parole, il abaisse leurs pointes meurtrières et se précipite entre eux deux: mais un coup cruel de Tybalt se fait jour par-dessous le bras de Roméo, et atteint aux sources de la vie l'intrépide Mercutio. Alors Tybalt se sauve; mais quelques moments après il revient vers Roméo, chez qui venait de naître le désir de la vengeance: tous deux y courent comme la foudre; car avant que j'eusse eu le temps de tirer mon épée pour les séparer, le courageux Tybalt était tué. Roméo l'ayant vu tomber a pris la fuite. Voilà la vérité, ou Benvolio consent à mourir.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Il est parent des Montaigu; l'affection le rend imposteur: il ne dit pas la vérité. Près de vingt d'entre eux ont combattu dans cette odieuse rencontre, et les vingt ensemble n'ont pu tuer qu'un seul homme. Je demande justice; et toi, prince, tu nous la dois: Roméo a tué Tybalt; Roméo ne doit plus vivre.

LE PRINCE.--Roméo a tué Tybalt, mais Tybalt a tué Mercutio: qui de vous payera le prix d'un sang si cher?

LA SIGNORA MONTAIGU.--Ce n'est pas Roméo, prince; il était l'ami de Mercutio: sa faute a seulement terminé la vie de Tybalt, comme l'aurait fait la loi.

LE PRINCE.--Et pour cette offense, nous l'exilons sur l'heure. Je suis intéressé dans l'effet de vos haines: mon sang coule ici pour vos querelles féroces; mais je saurai vous imposer une si forte amende que je vous ferai tous repentir de mes pertes. Je serai sourd à toute défense et à toute excuse; ni larmes ni prières ne pourront racheter de pareils délits: ne songez donc point à en faire usage. Que Roméo quitte ces lieux en toute hâte, ou l'heure qui l'y verra surprendre sera la dernière de sa vie. (_A sa suite._)--Emportez ce corps, et attendez mes ordres: la clémence devient meurtrière quand elle pardonne à l'homicide.

(Ils sortent.)

SCÈNE II

Un appartement dans la maison de Capulet.

Entre JULIETTE.

JULIETTE.--Qu'un galop rapide, coursiers aux pieds brûlants, vous emporte vers le palais du Soleil: de son fouet, un conducteur tel que Phaéton vous aurait précipités vers le couchant et aurait ramené la sombre Nuit. Étends ton épais rideau. Nuit qui couronne l'amour; ferme les yeux errants, et que Roméo puisse voler dans mes bras sans qu'on le dise et sans qu'on le voie. La lumière de leurs mutuelles beautés suffit aux amants pour accomplir leurs amoureux mystères; ou si l'Amour est aveugle, il ne s'en accorde que mieux avec la Nuit. Viens, Nuit obligeante, matrone aux vêtements modestes, tout en noir, apprends-moi à perdre au jeu de qui perd gagne, où l'enjeu est deux virginités sans tache; couvre de ton obscur manteau mes joues où se révolte mon sang effarouché, jusqu'à ce que mon craintif amour, devenu plus hardi dans l'épreuve d'un amour fidèle, n'y voie plus qu'un chaste devoir.--Viens, ô Nuit; viens, Roméo; viens, toi qui es le jour au milieu de la nuit; car sur les ailes de la nuit tu arriveras plus éclatant que n'est sur les plumes du corbeau la neige nouvellement tombée. Viens, douce nuit; viens, nuit amoureuse, le front couvert de ténèbres: donne-moi mon Roméo; et quand il aura cessé de vivre, reprends-le, et, partage-le en petites étoiles, il rendra la face des cieux si belle, que le monde deviendra amoureux de la nuit et renoncera au culte du soleil indiscret. Oh! j'ai acheté une demeure d'amour, mais je n'en suis pas encore en possession, et celui qui m'a acquise n'est pas encore en jouissance. Ce jour est aussi ennuyeux que la veille d'une fête pour l'enfant qui a une robe neuve et qui ne peut encore la mettre.--Oh! voilà ma nourrice. (_Entre

la nourrice avec une échelle de cordes._) Elle m'apporte des nouvelles, et la bouche qui prononce seulement le nom de Roméo devient l'organe d'une éloquence céleste.--Eh bien! nourrice, quelles nouvelles? Qu'as-tu là? l'échelle que Roméo t'a dit d'apporter?

LA NOURRICE.--Oui, oui, l'échelle.

(Elle la jette à terre.)

JULIETTE.--Ah ciel! quelles nouvelles? Pourquoi tordre ainsi tes mains?

LA NOURRICE.--O jour de malheur! il est mort, il est mort, il est mort! Nous sommes perdues, madame, nous sommes perdues. O malheureux jour! il n'est plus, il est tué, il est mort!

JULIETTE.--Le ciel a-t-il pu être si cruel?

LA NOURRICE.--Ce n'est pas le ciel, non; c'est Roméo. O Roméo! ô Roméo! qui l'aurait jamais pensé? Roméo!....

JULIETTE.--Quel démon es-tu, pour me tourmenter ainsi? L'horrible enfer devrait seul retentir des hurlements d'un pareil supplice. Roméo s'est-il tué lui-même? Dis seulement _oui_, et ce simple monosyllabe _oui_ renfermera plus de poison que l'oeil empoisonné du basilic. L'existence de ce _oui_[54] terminera la mienne; ou ferme ces yeux qui me répondent _oui_, ou s'il est mort dis _oui_, et s'il ne l'est pas dis _non_: qu'un mot bien court décide de mon bonheur ou de mon malheur.

[Note 54: Juliette joue sur le mot _I_, qui signifiait alors également _moi_ et _oui_, _I_ pour _yes_.]

LA NOURRICE.--J'ai vu la blessure, je l'ai vue de mes yeux, Dieu me pardonne! là, sur sa mâle poitrine. Un pauvre cadavre, un pauvre cadavre tout sanglant, pâle, pâle comme les cendres, tout souillé de sang, d'un sang tout noir. A cette vue je me suis évanouie.

JULIETTE.--Oh! manque, mon coeur! Pauvre banqueroutier, manque pour toujours[55]; emprisonnez-vous, mes yeux; ne jetez plus un seul regard sur la liberté. Terre vile, rends-toi à la terre; que tout mouvement s'arrête, et qu'une même bière presse de son poids et Roméo et toi.

[Note 55: _O break my heart, poor bankrupt, break at once; break_ signifie se briser et faire banqueroute.]

LA NOURRICE.--O Tybalt, Tybalt! le meilleur ami que j'eusse! O aimable Tybalt, honnête cavalier, faut-il que j'aie vécu pour te voir mort!

JULIETTE.--Quelle est donc cette tempête qui souffle ainsi dans les deux sens contraires? Roméo est-il tué, et Tybalt est-il mort? Mon cousin chéri et mon époux plus cher encore? Que la terrible trompette sonne donc le jugement universel. Qui donc est encore en vie, si ces deux-là sont morts?

LA NOURRICE.--Tybalt est mort, et Roméo est banni: Roméo, qui l'a tué, est banni.

JULIETTE.--O Dieu! la main de Roméo a-t-elle versé le sang de Tybalt?

LA NOURRICE.--Il l'a fait, il l'a fait! O jour de malheur! il l'a fait!

JULIETTE.--O coeur de serpent caché sous un visage semblable à une fleur! jamais dragon a-t-il choisi un si charmant repaire? Beau tyran, angélique démon, corbeau couvert des plumes d'une colombe, agneau transporté de la rage du loup, méprisable substance de la plus divine apparence, toi, justement le contraire de ce que tu paraissais à juste titre, damnable saint, traître plein d'honneur! O nature, qu'allais-tu donc chercher en enfer, lorsque de ce corps charmant, paradis sur la terre, tu fis le berceau de l'âme d'un démon? Jamais livre contenant une aussi infâme histoire porta-t-il une si belle couverture? et se peut-il que la trahison habite un si brillant palais?

LA NOURRICE.--Il n'y a plus ni sincérité, ni foi, ni honneur dans les hommes; tous sont parjures, corrompus, hypocrites. Ah! où est mon valet? Donnez-moi un peu d'_aqua vitæ_..... Tous ces chagrins, tous ces maux, toutes ces peines me vieillissent. Honte soit à Roméo!

JULIETTE.--Maudite soit ta langue pour un pareil souhait! Il n'est pas né pour la honte: la honte rougirait de s'asseoir sur son front; c'est un trône où on peut couronner l'honneur, unique souverain de la terre entière. Oh! quelle brutalité me l'a fait maltraiter ainsi?

LA NOURRICE.--Quoi! vous direz du bien de celui qui a tué votre cousin?

JULIETTE.--Eh! dirai-je du mal de celui qui est mon mari? Ah! mon pauvre époux, quelle langue soignera ton nom, lorsque moi, ta femme depuis trois heures, je l'ai ainsi déchiré? Mais pourquoi, traître, as-tu tué mon cousin? Ah! ce traître de cousin a voulu tuer mon époux.--Rentrez, larmes insensées, rentrez dans votre source; c'est au malheur qu'appartient ce tribut que par méprise vous offrez à la joie. Mon époux vit, lui que Tybalt aurait voulu tuer; et Tybalt est mort, lui qui aurait voulu tuer mon époux. Tout ceci est consolant, pourquoi donc pleuré-je? Ah! c'est qu'il y a là un mot, plus fatal que la mort de Tybalt, qui m'a assassinée.--Je voudrais bien l'oublier; mais, ô ciel! il pèse sur ma mémoire comme une offense digne de la damnation sur l'âme du pécheur. _Tybalt est mort, et Roméo est..... banni!_ Ce _banni,_ ce seul mot _banni_, a tué pour moi dix mille Tybalt. La mort de Tybalt était un assez grand malheur, tout eût-il fini là; ou si les cruelles douleurs se plaisent à marcher ensemble, et qu'il faille nécessairement que d'autres peines les accompagnent, pourquoi, après m'avoir dit: «Tybalt est mort,» n'a-t-elle pas continué: «ton père aussi, ou ta mère, ou tous les deux?» cela eût excité en moi les douleurs ordinaires[56]. Mais par cette arrière-garde qui a suivi la mort de Tybalt, _Roméo est banni_; par ce seul mot, père, mère, Tybalt, Roméo, Juliette, tous sont assassinés, tous morts. Roméo banni! Il n'y a ni fin, ni terme, ni borne, ni mesure dans la mort qu'apporte avec lui ce mot, aucune parole ne peut sonder ce malheur.--Mon père, ma mère, où sont-ils, nourrice?

[Note 56: _Modern lamentation_ (douleurs d'usage).]

LA NOURRICE.--Pleurants et gémissants sur le corps de Tybalt. Voulez-vous aller les trouver? Je vais vous y conduire.

JULIETTE.--Ils lavent donc ses blessures de leurs larmes! Quand elles se sécheront, les miennes seront finies par le bannissement de Roméo.--Remporte ces cordes.--Pauvre échelle, te voilà trompée comme moi, car Roméo est exilé. Il t'avait faite pour lui servir de route vers mon lit; et moi, fille encore, je meurs fille et veuve.--Viens, échelle; viens, nourrice; je vais à mon lit nuptial: c'est à la mort, et non à Roméo qu'appartient ma virginité.

LA NOURRICE.--Hâtez-vous de vous rendre à votre chambre: je trouverai Roméo pour vous consoler; je sais bien où il est. Écoutez-moi, votre Roméo sera ici _ce _soir; je vais le trouver; il est caché dans la cellule du frère Laurence.

JULIETTE.--Oh! trouve-le. Donne cet anneau à mon fidèle chevalier, et dis-lui de venir recevoir mon dernier adieu.

(Elles sortent.)

SCÈNE III

La cellule du frère Laurence.

Entrent FRÈRE LAURENCE et ROMÉO.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Roméo, sors de ta retraite: viens ici, homme craintif; l'affliction s'est éprise de tes mérites, et la calamité t'a épousé.

ROMÉO.--Mon père, quelles nouvelles? quel est l'arrêt du prince? quelle infortune encore inconnue demande à s'attacher à moi?

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Mon cher fils n'est que trop accoutumé à cette cruelle société. Je t'apporte la nouvelle de l'arrêt du prince.

ROMÉO.--Eh bien! le jugement du prince est-il plus doux que le jour du jugement?

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Un arrêt moins rigoureux s'est échappé de sa bouche: ce n'est pas la mort de ton corps, mais son bannissement.

ROMÉO.--Ah! le bannissement! aie pitié de moi; dis la mort. L'aspect de l'exil porte avec lui plus de terreur, beaucoup plus que la mort. Ah! ne me dis pas que c'est le bannissement.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Tu es banni de Vérone. Prends patience; le monde est grand et vaste.

ROMÉO.--Le monde n'existe pas hors des murs de Vérone; ce n'est plus qu'un purgatoire, une torture, un véritable enfer. Banni de ce lieu, je le suis du monde, c'est la mort. Oui, le bannissement, c'est la mort sous un faux nom; et ainsi, en nommant la mort un bannissement, tu me tranches la tête avec une hache d'or, et souris au coup qui m'assassine.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--O mortel péché! ô farouche ingratitude! Pour ta faute, notre loi demandait la mort; mais le prince indulgent, prenant ta défense, a repoussé de côté la loi, et a changé ce mot funeste de _mort_ en celui de _bannissement_: c'est une rare clémence, et tu ne veux pas la reconnaître.

ROMÉO.--C'est un supplice et non une grâce. Le ciel est ici, où vit Juliette: les chats, les chiens, la moindre petite souris, tout ce qu'il y a de plus misérable vivra ici dans le ciel, pourra la voir; et Roméo ne le peut plus! La mouche qui vit de charogne jouira d'une condition plus digne d'envie, plus honorable, plus relevée que Roméo; elle pourra s'ébattre sur les blanches merveilles de la chère main de Juliette, et dérober le bonheur des immortels sur ces lèvres où la pure et virginale modestie entretient une perpétuelle rougeur, comme si les baisers qu'elles se donnent étaient pour elles un péché; mais Roméo ne le peut pas, il est banni! Ce que l'insecte peut librement voler, il faut que je vole pour le fuir; il est libre et je suis banni[57]; et tu me diras encore que l'exil n'est pas la mort!... N'as-tu pas quelque poison tout préparé, quelque poignard affilé, quelque moyen de mort soudaine, fût-ce la plus ignoble? Mais banni! me tuer ainsi! banni! O moine, quand ce mot se prononce en enfer, les hurlements l'accompagnent.--Comment as-tu le coeur, toi un prêtre, un saint confesseur, toi qui absous les fautes, toi mon ami déclaré, de me mettre en pièces par ce mot _bannissement_?

[Note 57:_They may do this, when I am from this must fly They are free men, but I am banished._

Le jeu de mots du premier de ces deux vers est entre _fly_ (mouche) et _fly_ (fuir); celui du second entre _free-men_ (hommes libres) et _freaming_ (bourdonnant), qui se prononcent à peu près de même, a été impossible à rendre.]

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Amant insensé, écoute seulement une parole.

ROMÉO.--Oh! tu vas me parler encore de bannissement.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Je veux te donner une arme pour te défendre de ce mot: c'est la philosophie, ce doux baume de l'adversité; elle te consolera, quoique tu sois exilé.

ROMÉO.--Encore l'exil! Que la philosophie aille se faire pendre: à moins que la philosophie n'ait le pouvoir de créer une Juliette, de déplacer une ville, ou de changer l'arrêt d'un prince, elle n'est bonne à rien, elle n'a nulle vertu; ne m'en parle plus.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Oh! je vois maintenant que les insensés n'ont point d'oreilles.

ROMÉO.--Comment en auraient-ils, lorsque les hommes sages n'ont pas d'yeux?

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Laisse-moi discuter avec toi ta situation.

ROMÉO.--Tu ne peux parler de ce que tu ne sens pas. Si tu étais aussi jeune que moi, amant de Juliette, marié seulement depuis une heure, meurtrier de Tybalt, éperdu d'amour comme moi, et comme moi banni, alors tu pourrais parler; alors tu pourrais t'arracher les cheveux et te jeter sur la terre comme je fais, pour prendre la mesure d'un tombeau qui n'est pas encore ouvert.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Lève-toi, on frappe; bon Roméo, cache-toi.

(On frappe derrière le théâtre.)

ROMÉO.--Me cacher? Non, à moins que la vapeur des gémissements de mon coeur malade, m'enveloppant comme un brouillard, ne me dérobe aux yeux qui me cherchent. (On frappe.)

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Écoute comme ils frappent.--Qui est là?--Roméo, lève-toi; tu seras pris.--Attendez un instant.--Lève-toi, fuis dans mon cabinet.--_(On frappe.)_ Dans un moment.--Volonté de Dieu! quelle obstination est la tienne?--J'y vais, j'y vais.--_(On frappe.)_ Qui frappe si fort? D'où venez-vous? que demandez-vous?

LA NOURRICE, _en dehors_.--Laissez-moi entrer, et vous apprendrez mon message. Je viens de la part de la signora Juliette.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--En ce cas, soyez la bienvenue.

(Entre la nourrice.)

LA NOURRICE.--O saint frère, oh! dites-moi, saint frère, où est l'époux de ma maîtresse? où est Roméo?

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Le voilà étendu sur la terre, ivre de ses propres larmes.

LA NOURRICE.--Oh! il est dans le même état que ma maîtresse, juste dans le même état.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--O funeste sympathie, déplorable situation!

LA NOURRICE.--Voilà comme elle est étendue, pleurant et sanglotant, sanglotant et pleurant.--Levez-vous, levez-vous, levez-vous, si vous êtes un homme. Pour l'amour de Juliette, pour l'amour d'elle, levez-vous et soutenez-vous. Comment pouvez-vous être tombé si bas?

ROMÉO.--O nourrice!

LA NOURRICE.--Ah! seigneur, seigneur!--Eh bien! la mort est la fin de tous.

ROMÉO.--Parles-tu de Juliette? En quel état est-elle? Ne me regarde-t-elle pas comme un assassin de profession, depuis que j'ai souillé l'enfance de notre bonheur d'un sang qui tient de si près au sien? Où est-elle? comment est-elle? que dit ma secrète épouse du lien qui a scellé nos amours[58]?

[Note 58: _What say My conceal'd lady to our cancell'd love_?]

LA NOURRICE.--Ah! elle ne dit rien, seigneur; mais elle pleure, et puis elle pleure: tantôt elle tombe sur son lit, tantôt elle se relève en sursaut et elle appelle Tybalt, et puis elle appelle en criant Roméo; et puis elle retombe.

ROMÉO.--Comme si ce nom, parti d'une arme meurtrière, la tuait, comme la main maudite de celui qui le porte a tué son parent.--Dis-moi, frère, dis-moi en quelle vile partie de mon corps habite ce nom; dis-le moi, pour que j'en ravage l'odieuse demeure.

(Il tire son épée.)

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Arrête ta main désespérée. Es-tu un homme? Ta figure crie que tu en es un; mais tes pleurs sont d'une femme, et tes actions désordonnées indiquent la fureur d'une bête privée de raison. Femme dépourvue de grâces, homme seulement en apparence, n'es-tu donc sous la ressemblance de tous les deux qu'un animal difforme? Tu m'as confondu. Par mon saint ordre, j'avais cru ton âme mieux trempée. Après avoir tué Tybalt, veux-tu te tuer toi-même, et, par le coup d'une damnable haine contre toi-même, tuer aussi ton épouse qui ne vit qu'en toi? Pourquoi t'emporter ainsi contre ta naissance, le ciel et la terre? Ta naissance, le ciel et la terre se sont réunis pour avoir part à ton existence, et tu veux tout perdre à la fois! Fi donc! fi donc! tu déshonores ta personne, ton amour, ton intelligence; toi qui, riche de ces dons précieux, comme l'avare, n'en emploies aucun à son véritable usage, seul capable de donner du lustre à ta personne, à ton intelligence, à ton amour. Ta noble figure devient un simulacre de cire dépouillé de ce qui fait la valeur d'un homme: tes serments du plus tendre amour ne sont qu'un noir parjure, lorsque tu détruis cet amour que tu avais fait voeu de chérir: ton intelligence, cet ornement de ta personne et de ton amour, trompée elle-même dans la règle qu'elle doit leur prescrire à tous deux, de même que la poudre dans le carnier d'un soldat maladroit, prend feu par ton impéritie et te met en pièces par les moyens destinés à ta défense.--Allons, homme, relève-toi, ta Juliette est vivante, ta Juliette pour l'amour de qui tu étais mort, il n'y a qu'un moment. Tu es heureux par là, Tybalt voulait te tuer, et c'est toi qui as tué Tybalt; là encore tu es heureux. La loi, qui te menaçait de la mort, devenue ton amie, n'a prononcé que l'exil; en cela tu es heureux; un amas de bénédictions est descendu sur ta tête; le bonheur s'empresse autour de toi dans ses plus doux atours; et toi, comme une jeune fille obstinée et perverse, tu boudes avec humeur ta fortune et ton amour. Prends-y garde, prends-y garde; c'est ainsi qu'on meurt misérable. Allons, va rejoindre ton amante, comme il a été convenu; monte dans sa chambre; pars et va la consoler. Mais souviens-toi de la quitter avant que la garde soit placée; car alors tu ne pourrais plus arriver à Mantoue, où tu dois rester jusqu'à ce que nous puissions trouver l'occasion d'annoncer votre mariage, de réconcilier vos parents, d'obtenir ta grâce du prince, et de te rappeler, cinq cent mille fois plus transporté de bonheur que tu n'as répandu de lamentations en partant.--Va devant, nourrice; parle de moi à ta maîtresse; dis-lui de hâter dans toute la maison le moment de se mettre au lit: le chagrin dont ils sont accablés doit les y disposer. Roméo va venir.

LA NOURRICE.--O Seigneur mon Dieu, je resterais ici toute la nuit pour entendre ces bons avis. Oh! ce que c'est que la science!--Mon cher maître, je vais annoncer à ma maîtresse que vous allez venir.

ROMÉO.--Va, et dis à ma douce amie de se préparer à me gronder.

LA NOURRICE.--Voici, seigneur, un anneau qu'elle m'a chargé de vous donner. Hâtez-vous, ne perdez pas de temps, car il se fait déjà bien tard.

(Elle sort.)

ROMÉO.--Comme ce don a ranimé mon courage!

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Partez, bonne nuit. Toute votre destinée dépend de ceci: ou sortez de la ville avant que la garde soit postée, ou au point du jour sortez déguisé. Restez à Mantoue; je trouverai votre domestique; de temps en temps, il vous instruira de tout ce qu'il arrivera de favorable pour vous ici. Donne-moi ta main; il est tard; adieu, bonne nuit.

ROMÉO.--Si je n'étais appelé par une joie au-dessus de toutes les joies, ce serait un chagrin de me séparer de toi si brusquement. Adieu!

(Ils sortent.)

SCÈNE IV

La maison de Capulet.

CAPULET, LA SIGNORA CAPULET, PARIS.

CAPULET.--Il est arrivé, seigneur, des choses si malheureuses, que nous n'avons pas eu le temps de disposer notre fille. Voyez-vous, elle aimait chèrement son cousin Tybalt, et moi je l'aimais bien aussi. Enfin, nous sommes nés pour mourir.--Il est très-tard, elle ne descendra pas ce soir; et je vous réponds que, sans votre compagnie, il y a une heure que je serais au lit.

PARIS.--Ces moments amers ne sont pas des moments d'amour[59].--Bonne nuit, madame; présentez mes hommages à votre fille.

[Note 59: _Those times of woe afford no time to woo._]

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Je n'y manquerai pas, et demain, dès le matin, je saurai sa pensée: pour ce soir, son accablement l'a forcée à se retirer.

CAPULET.--Moi, Pâris, je veux témérairement vous répondre de l'amour de ma fille. Je pense bien qu'à tous égards elle se laissera gouverner par moi; je dis plus, je n'en doute pas.--Ma femme, allez la trouver avant de vous mettre au lit, instruisez-la de l'amour de mon fils Pâris, et donnez-lui ordre, faites-y bien attention, pour mercredi prochain. Mais doucement: quel jour est-ce aujourd'hui?

PARIS.--Lundi, seigneur.

CAPULET.--Lundi? Ah ah! mercredi est trop tôt: ce sera donc pour jeudi. Dites-lui que jeudi elle sera mariée à ce noble comte.--Serez-vous prêt? Cette précipitation est-elle de votre goût? Nous ne ferons pas grand embarras. Un ami ou deux; car, écoutez donc, le meurtre de Tybalt étant si récent, on pourrait trouver que pour un parent, nous en faisions bien peu de cas, si nous donnions de grands divertissements. Ainsi nous inviterons quelque demi-douzaine d'amis, et voilà tout.... Mais que dites-vous de jeudi?

PARIS.--Seigneur, je voudrais que jeudi vînt demain.

CAPULET.--Fort bien; allons, retirez-vous.--Ainsi, jeudi.--Vous, ma femme, voyez Juliette avant de vous mettre au lit; préparez-la au jour de ses noces.--Adieu, seigneur.... Holà! de la lumière dans ma chambre; marchez devant moi.... Il est si tard que bientôt l'on pourra dire qu'il est de bonne heure.--Bonne nuit.

(Ils sortent.)

SCÈNE V

La chambre de Juliette.

Entrent ROMÉO et JULIETTE.

JULIETTE.--Veux-tu donc déjà me quitter? le jour n'est pas encore prêt de paraître: c'est le rossignol, et non l'alouette, dont la voix a pénétré ton oreille inquiète; toute la nuit il chante là-bas sur ce grenadier. Crois-moi, cher amour, c'était le rossignol.

ROMÉO.--C'est l'alouette qui proclame le matin, et non pas le rossignol. Vois, ma bien-aimée, ces traits d'une lumière jalouse qui traversent les nuages entr'ouverts à l'orient: tous les flambeaux de la nuit sont consumés; et au sommet des montagnes couvertes de brouillards s'élève sur la pointe du pied le joyeux matin. Il me faut partir et vivre, ou rester et mourir.

JULIETTE.--Cette lumière n'est point la lumière du jour, je le sais bien, moi: c'est quelque météore qu'exhale le soleil pour te servir de flambeau cette nuit, et t'éclairer dans ta route vers Mantoue. Reste donc, il n'est pas encore nécessaire que tu t'en ailles.

ROMÉO.--Qu'on me surprenne ici, qu'on me mette à mort, je suis content si tu le veux ainsi. Je dirai que cette teinte grisâtre n'est pas l'oeil du matin, mais le pâle reflet du front de Cynthie, et que ce n'est pas l'alouette dont les accents vont frapper la voûte des cieux, si haut au-dessus de nos têtes. J'ai bien plus de penchant à rester que de volonté de partir.--Viens, Mort, et sois la bienvenue; Juliette le veut ainsi.--Que dis-tu, mon amour? causons, ce n'est pas le jour.

JULIETTE.--C'est le jour, c'est le jour: hâte-toi de partir, va-t'en. C'est l'alouette qui chante si faux, qui roule des sons si péniblement discordants, et d'une aigreur si désagréable. On prétend que l'alouette sait observer dans son chant de gracieuses séparations; cela n'est pas vrai, puisqu'elle nous sépare[60]. Quelques-uns disent que l'alouette a changé d'yeux avec le crapaud dégoûtant: oh! que je voudrais qu'ils eussent aussi changé de voix, puisque cette voix nous arrache des bras l'un de l'autre, et te chassent d'ici par ces sons qui appellent le jour. Oh! maintenant, va-t'en; le ciel s'éclaircit de plus en plus.

[Note 60:_Some say the lark makes sweet division, It is not so for she divideth us._]

ROMÉO.--Le ciel s'éclaircit de plus en plus, et de plus en plus notre sort s'obscurcit.

(Entre la nourrice.)

LA NOURRICE.--Madame!

JULIETTE.--Qu'y a-t-il, nourrice?

LA NOURRICE.--Madame votre mère vient à votre chambre: le jour paraît; prenez garde; ayez l'oeil au guet.

(Elle sort.)

JULIETTE.--Eh bien! fenêtre, laisse entrer le jour et sortir ma vie.

ROMÉO.--Adieu, adieu! Un baiser, et je vais descendre.

(Roméo descend.)

JULIETTE.--Te voilà donc parti, mon amant, mon maître, mon ami! Il me faut de tes nouvelles à chaque jour de chacune de mes heures, car dans chaque minute il y aura pour moi plus d'un jour. Oh! qu'à ce compte je serai chargée d'années avant de revoir mon Roméo!

ROMÉO.--Adieu! je ne laisserai échapper aucune occasion de te faire passer, ô ma bien-aimée! l'expression de mes voeux.

JULIETTE.--Ah! crois-tu que nous nous revoyions jamais?

ROMÉO.--Je n'en doute point, et toutes tes peines serviront de sujet aux entretiens de nos jours à venir.

JULIETTE.--O Dieu! j'ai dans l'âme un funeste présage: il me semble que je te vois, maintenant que tu es descendu, comme un mort couché au fond d'un tombeau; ou ma vue se trouble, ou tu me parais pâle.

ROMÉO.--Je vous assure, mon cher amour, que vous paraissez de même à mes yeux.--Le chagrin dévorant dessèche notre sang. Adieu, adieu!

(Roméo sort.)

JULIETTE.--O Fortune, Fortune! les hommes te nomment inconstante. Si tu es inconstante, qu'as-tu à faire avec lui, qui est connu pour garder sa foi? Sois inconstante, ô Fortune! car alors j'espère que tu ne me le garderas pas longtemps, mais que tu le renverras bientôt.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET, _derrière le théâtre_.--Hé! ma fille! êtes-vous levée!

JULIETTE.--Qui m'appelle? Est-ce madame ma mère? Quoi! si tard n'est-elle pas couchée, ou bien est-elle levée si matin? Quelle cause extraordinaire l'amène ici?

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Eh bien! Juliette, comment cela va-t-il maintenant?

JULIETTE.--Madame, je ne suis pas bien.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Toujours pleurant la mort de ton cousin? Eh quoi! tes larmes le laveront-elles de la poussière du tombeau? et quand tu y parviendrais, tu ne pourrais le faire revivre. Finis-en donc: une certaine douleur montre beaucoup d'affection; mais beaucoup de douleur montre toujours un défaut de jugement.

JULIETTE.--Laissez-moi pleurer encore une perte aussi sensible.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--De cette manière, vous sentirez la perte, mais ne jouirez pas de l'ami que vous pleurez.

JULIETTE.--Sentant aussi vivement sa perte, je ne puis m'empêcher de le pleurer toujours.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Je le vois bien, mon enfant, ce qui te fait pleurer, ce n'est pas tant sa mort que de savoir vivant le misérable qui l'a tué.

JULIETTE.--Quel misérable, madame?

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Le misérable Roméo.

JULIETTE.--Un misérable et lui sont à bien des lieues de distance. Que Dieu lui pardonne; moi, je lui pardonne de tout mon coeur; et cependant nul homme n'afflige mon coeur comme lui.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Oui, vous souffrez de voir que ce perfide meurtrier respire.

JULIETTE.--Oui, madame, de ce qu'il respire hors de la portée de mes mains. Je voudrais être seule chargée de venger la mort de mon cousin.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Nous en aurons vengeance, sois tranquille: ne pleure donc plus. J'enverrai à Mantoue, où est maintenant cet apostat de banni: il y a là quelqu'un qui lui donnera un breuvage si efficace, qu'il ira bientôt tenir compagnie à Tybalt; et alors j'espère que tu seras satisfaite.

JULIETTE.--En vérité, je ne serai jamais satisfaite de Roméo, que je ne le voie..... mort.--Mon pauvre coeur est si cruellement affligé pour mon cousin!--Madame, si vous pouviez seulement trouver un homme pour porter le poison, je le préparerais, et de manière à ce que Roméo, après l'avoir reçu, dormît bientôt en paix.--Oh! comme mon coeur abhorre de l'entendre nommer..... et de ne pouvoir aller le joindre..... et venger l'amitié que je portais à mon cousin Tybalt sur la personne de celui qui l'a tué!

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Trouve les moyens, et moi je trouverai l'homme.--Mais je vais, mon enfant, _t'_apprendre de joyeuses nouvelles.

JULIETTE.--La joie vient à propos dans un temps où nous en avons si grand besoin. De grâce, madame, quelles sont ces nouvelles?

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Oui, oui, tu as un père soigneux, mon enfant, un père qui, pour te tirer de ton accablement, t'a préparé tout de suite un heureux jour auquel tu ne t'attends pas, et dont je n'avais pas eu la pensée.

JULIETTE.--Madame, à la bonne heure: quel est ce jour?

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Vraiment, ma fille, jeudi prochain, de bon matin, un brillant, jeune et noble cavalier, le comte Pâris, dans l'église de Saint-Pierre, aura le bonheur de faire de toi une joyeuse épouse.

JULIETTE.--Ma foi! par l'église de Saint-Pierre, et par saint Pierre lui-même, il ne fera point de moi une joyeuse épouse. Je suis étonnée de cette précipitation, et qu'il me faille épouser avant que l'homme qui doit être mon mari vienne me faire sa cour. Je vous prie, madame, dites à mon seigneur et père que je ne veux pas me marier encore, et que quand je me marierai, je jure que j'épouserai Roméo, que vous savez que je hais, plutôt que Pâris.--Ce sont là des nouvelles, en vérité!

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Voilà votre père qui vient: faites-lui cette réponse vous-même, et voyez comment il la recevra de votre part.

(Entrent Capulet et la nourrice.)

CAPULET.--Lorsque le soleil est couché, l'humidité de l'air se répand en gouttes de rosée; mais pour le couchant du fils de mon frère, il pleut tout à fait.--Comment, une gouttière, jeune fille! Quoi, toujours en larmes! toujours des torrents! Tu fais à la fois de ta petite personne une barque, une mer, un ouragan; car je vois dans tes yeux, que je peux appeler la mer, un flux et reflux perpétuel de larmes; ton corps est la barque qui flotte dans ces ondes salées; les vents sont tes soupirs, qui font avec tes larmes un mutuel assaut de violence; en sorte que, s'il ne survient un calme soudain, ils feront chavirer ton corps battu de la tempête.--Où en sommes-nous, ma femme? Lui avez-vous annoncé ma résolution?

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Oui, seigneur, mais elle ne veut pas; elle vous remercie. Je voudrais que l'insensée fût mariée à son tombeau.

CAPULET.--Attendez, ma femme, j'en suis, j'en suis. Comment, elle ne veut pas! Elle ne nous remercie pas, elle n'est pas fière, elle ne se trouve pas bien heureuse de ce que, tout indigne qu'elle est, nous lui avons ménagé pour époux un si digne gentilhomme!

JULIETTE.--Non, je n'en suis pas fière, mais j'en suis reconnaissante. Je ne peux jamais être fière de ce que je déteste; mais je puis être reconnaissante même de ce que je déteste, lorsque c'est l'affection qui l'a fait faire.

CAPULET.--Comment, raisonneuse, qu'est-ce que cela veut dire?--Fière,... et je vous remercie,... et je ne vous remercie pas,... et pourtant je ne suis pas fière--Eh bien! madame la mignonne, je ne me soucie point d'être remercié par vos remerciements, ni que vous me fassiez fièrement de la fierté: mais préparez vos petites jambes à aller jeudi prochain avec Pâris à l'église de Saint-Pierre; ou je t'y traînerai, moi, sur une claie. Va-t'en, charogne moisie; va-t'en, malheureuse, face de suif!

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Fi! fi! êtes-vous fou?

JULIETTE.--Mon bon père, je vous en conjure à genoux; écoutez-moi avec patience, seulement un mot.

CAPULET.--Va te faire pendre, petite drôlesse, désobéissante coquine. Je te le répète: ou rends-toi à l'église jeudi, ou ne me regarde jamais en face. Pas un mot, pas une réponse, pas une réplique. Les doigts me démangent....--Eh bien! ma femme, nous nous tenions à peine pour heureux parce que Dieu ne nous avait donné que cette unique enfant: maintenant je vois que c'est encore trop d'un, et que nous avons reçu en elle une malédiction.--Qu'elle s'en aille, la malheureuse!

LA NOURRICE.--Que le Dieu du ciel la bénisse! vous avez tort, seigneur, de la maltraiter ainsi.

CAPULET.--Et pourquoi, madame la Sagesse? Tenez votre langue, mère Prudence, allez bavarder avec vos commères.

LA NOURRICE.--Je ne fais pas un crime en parlant.

CAPULET.--Oh! que Dieu nous soit en aide!

LA NOURRICE.--Est-ce qu'on ne peut pas parler?

CAPULET.--Taisez-vous, sotte bougonneuse; allez débiter vos maximes sur la tasse de votre commère; nous n'en avons que faire ici.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Vous êtes trop vif.

CAPULET.--Paix de Dieu! j'en deviendrai fou: le jour, la nuit, le matin, le soir, chez moi ou dehors, seul ou en compagnie, dormant ou veillant, j'ai toujours pensé à la marier! et aujourd'hui, après l'avoir pourvue d'un gentilhomme de famille princière, ayant de beaux domaines, qui est jeune, de belles manières, regorgeant, comme on dit, des qualités les plus avantageuses, fait en tout à plaisir, il faut qu'une malheureuse petite sotte de pleurnicheuse, une poupée gémissante, vienne, à cette bonne fortune qui lui arrive, vous répondre: Je ne ne veux pas me marier;... je ne peux aimer;... je suis trop jeune;... je suis trop jeune, pardonnez-moi....--Mais si vous ne voulez pas vous marier, je vous pardonnerai: allez paître où vous voudrez; vous n'habiterez toujours pas avec moi. Faites attention à ce que je vous dis; songez-y bien; je n'ai pas l'habitude de plaisanter; jeudi est près, mettez la main sur votre coeur; avisez-y. Si vous êtes ma fille, je vous donnerai à mon ami. Si tu ne l'es pas, va te faire pendre,

mendier, périr de faim, mourir dans les rues; car, sur mon âme, jamais je ne te reconnaîtrai, jamais rien de ce qui m'appartient ne te fera du bien. Comptez là-dessus; faites vos réflexions, car je vous tiendrai parole.

(Il sort.)

JULIETTE.--N'y a-t-il donc plus pour moi un regard de pitié, qui, du haut des nuages, pénètre les profondeurs de mon chagrin? O ma tendre mère, ne me rejetez pas loin de vous; différez ce mariage d'un mois, d'une semaine; ou si vous ne le voulez pas, faites donc dresser mon lit nuptial dans le sombre monument où l'on a déposé Tybalt.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Ne me parle pas, car je ne te répondrai pas un mot. Fais ce que tu voudras, je ne me mêle plus de ce qui te regarde.

(Elle sort.)

JULIETTE.--O Dieu!.... O ma nourrice, comment prévenir ceci? Mon époux est sur la terre, ma foi est dans le ciel; comment cette foi reviendra-t-elle sur la terre, à moins que mon époux ne quitte la terre et ne me la renvoie des cieux? Console-moi, conseille-moi.--Hélas! hélas! comment le ciel peut-il entourer d'embûches une créature aussi faible que moi!--Que dis-tu? N'as-tu pas un seul mot de joie, quelque consolation, nourrice?

LA NOURRICE.--Ma foi, je n'en connais qu'une: Roméo est banni, et je gagerais le monde contre rien qu'il n'osera jamais revenir vous réclamer; ou, s'il le fait, il faudra que ce soit en cachette. Alors, les choses étant comme elles sont, je pense que ce que vous avez de mieux à faire c'est d'épouser le comte. Oh! c'est un aimable cavalier! Roméo n'est qu'un torchon auprès de lui. Un aigle, ma dame, n'a pas un oeil aussi clair, aussi perçant, aussi beau que celui de Pâris. Que mal m'advienne si je ne pense pas que vous êtes heureuse de trouver ce second parti! car il est bien au-dessus du premier: et d'ailleurs, quand cela ne serait pas, votre premier mari est mort, ou il vaudrait autant qu'il le fût que de l'avoir vivant sans en profiter.

JULIETTE.--Parles-tu du fond du coeur?

LA NOURRICE.--Du fond de l'âme aussi, ou que je sois maudite dans tous les deux!

JULIETTE.--_Amen_.

LA NOURRICE.--Et à quoi?

JULIETTE.--Eh bien! tu m'as merveilleusement consolée. Rentre, et dis à ma mère qu'ayant fâché mon père, je suis allée à la cellule de frère Laurence m'en confesser et demander l'absolution.

LA NOURRICE.--Vraiment, je vais le lui aller dire, et vous prenez un parti très-sage.

(Elle sort.)

JULIETTE.--Vieille réprouvée! démon maudit! je ne sais quel est ton plus grand péché, ou de souhaiter que je me parjure ainsi, ou de déprécier mon époux avec cette même langue qui l'avait tant de milliers de fois exalté au-dessus de toute comparaison. Va, conseillère: mon coeur et toi sommes désormais séparés. Je vais trouver le frère, savoir quel expédient il aura à m'offrir; et si tout le reste me manque, moi, j'ai le pouvoir de mourir.

(Elle sort.)

FIN DU TROISIÈME ACTE.

ACTE QUATRIÈME

SCÈNE I

La cellule du frère Laurence.

Entrent FRÈRE LAURENCE ET PARIS.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Quoi! jeudi, seigneur? le terme est bien court.

PARIS.--Mon père Capulet le veut ainsi, et je n'irai pas refroidir son empressement par des retards.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Vous dites que vous ne connaissez pas les dispositions de la dame: cette conduite n'est pas régulière; je ne l'approuve point.

PARIS.--Elle pleure sans mesure la mort de Tybalt, et voilà pourquoi je l'ai si peu entretenue de mon amour: Vénus n'ose sourire dans une maison de larmes. Son père voit du danger à laisser le chagrin prendre sur elle tant d'empire; et, dans sa sagesse, il hâte notre mariage, pour arrêter ce déluge de pleurs. La société d'un époux pourra éloigner d'elle un souvenir devenu trop puissant dans la solitude. Vous concevez maintenant le motif de cette précipitation.

FRÈRE LAURENCE, _à part_--Je voudrais ignorer le motif qui devrait la ralentir.--Tenez, seigneur, voici la dame qui vient à ma cellule.

(Entre Juliette.)

PARIS.--Quelle heureuse rencontre, ma souveraine, ma femme!

JULIETTE.--Tout cela sera peut-être, seigneur, quand je pourrai être votre femme.

PARIS.--Cela peut être et doit être, mon amour, jeudi prochain.

JULIETTE.--Ce qui doit être sera.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Ceci est une sentence certaine.

PARIS.--Venez-vous vous confesser à ce père?

JULIETTE.--Si je vous répondais, ce serait me confesser à vous.

PARIS.--N'allez pas lui nier que vous m'aimerez.

JULIETTE.--Je vous confesserai à vous que je l'aime.

PARIS.--Et vous lui confesserez aussi, j'en suis sûr, que vous m'aimez.

JULIETTE.--Si je le fais, cela aura plus de prix quand vous aurez le dos tourné qu'en votre présence.

PARIS.--Chère âme, ton visage est bien terni de larmes.

JULIETTE.--Elles n'ont pas remporté là une grande victoire; il n'était déjà pas trop beau avant qu'elles l'eussent gâté.

PARIS.--Tu lui fais, par cette réponse, plus de tort que par tes pleurs.

JULIETTE.--Je ne le calomnie point, seigneur: c'est une vérité; et ce que je dis là, je me le suis dit en face.

PARIS.--Ton visage est à moi, et tu l'as calomnié.

JULIETTE.--Cela peut être, car il ne m'appartient pas.--Saint père, êtes-vous de loisir à présent, ou reviendrai-je vous trouver à la messe du soir?

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--J'ai tout loisir, ma triste fille.--Seigneur, je dois vous prier de nous laisser seuls.

PARIS.--Dieu me préserve de troubler la dévotion! Juliette, je vous réveillerai jeudi de grand matin: jusqu'à ce jour, adieu, et recevez ce saint baiser.

(Il sort.)

JULIETTE.--Oh! ferme la porte, et ensuite viens pleurer avec moi: je suis sans espoir, sans ressource, sans secours.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Ah! Juliette, je connais déjà tes chagrins: et ma tête n'est pas assez forte pour les supporter. J'apprends que tu dois, sans que rien puisse le retarder, être mariée à ce comte jeudi prochain.

JULIETTE.--Frère, ne me dis point que tu le sais sans me dire en même temps comment je puis l'empêcher. Si dans ta sagesse tu n'as pas les moyens de me secourir, dis-moi seulement que tu approuves ma résolution, et de ce poignard je vais moi-même me

secourir sur-le-champ. Dieu a uni mon coeur à celui de Roméo; tu as joint nos mains; et avant que cette main, qui a scellé par toi mon union avec Roméo, devienne le sceau d'un autre titre, avant que mon coeur fidèle, par une déloyale trahison, se déclare pour un autre, ceci les fera périr tous deux. Ainsi, cherche dans l'expérience de ta longue vie un conseil à me donner pour le moment, ou bien, vois, ce poignard sanglant deviendra médiateur entre moi et l'extrémité où je suis; il décidera en arbitre de ce que tes lumières et tes années réunies n'auront pu conduire à une issue digne du véritable honneur. Ne sois pas si lent à me répondre: il me tarde de mourir si ta réponse ne me parle pas de moyens de salut.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Arrête, ma fille, j'entrevois une sorte d'espérance, qui demande une exécution aussi désespérée qu'est désespéré le cas que nous voulons prévenir.--Si, plutôt que d'épouser le comte Pâris, tu as la force de vouloir te tuer toi-même, il est vraisemblable que toi, qui recherches la mort pour éviter cette ignominie, tu entreprendras bien pour y échapper une chose qui ressemble à la mort. Si tu as ce courage, je te donnerai un moyen.

JULIETTE.--Oh! plutôt que d'épouser Pâris, commande-moi de me précipiter du haut des remparts de cette tour, ou d'aller par les chemins fréquentés par les voleurs; ordonne-moi de me glisser au milieu des serpents; enchaîne-moi avec des ours rugissants; ou enferme-moi la nuit dans un cimetière, entièrement couvert d'os de morts s'entre-choquant, de jambes encore infectes, de crânes jaunis et informes; ou commande-moi d'entrer dans un tombeau nouvellement creusé, et de me cacher avec un mort dans son linceul, choses qui me faisaient trembler, seulement à en entendre parler; j'obéirai sans crainte ou hésitation, pour demeurer l'épouse sans tache de mon cher bien-aimé.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Eh bien! retourne chez toi, montre un air joyeux, consens à épouser Pâris. C'est demain mercredi: demain au soir fais en sorte de coucher seule; que ta nourrice ne couche point dans ta chambre. Prends cette fiole, et quand tu seras dans ton lit, avale cette liqueur distillée: soudain coulera dans toutes tes veines une froide et assoupissante humeur; les artères, interrompant leur mouvement naturel, cesseront de battre; nulle chaleur, nul souffle n'attestera que tu vis encore; les roses de tes lèvres et de tes joues se faneront et deviendront pâles comme la cendre; les rideaux de tes yeux s'abaisseront comme à l'instant où la mort les ferme à la lumière de la vie; chaque partie de ton corps, privée de la souplesse qui te permet d'en disposer, paraîtra roide, inflexible et froide, comme dans la mort. Tu demeureras quarante-deux heures sous cette apparence empruntée d'une mort glacée, après quoi tu te réveilleras comme d'un sommeil agréable. Le lendemain, ton nouvel époux viendra dès le matin pour te faire sortir de ton lit; tu seras morte. Alors, suivant l'usage de notre pays, parée dans ton cercueil de tes plus beaux atours, et le visage découvert, tu seras portée dans cet antique tombeau où reposent tous les descendants des Capulet. Cependant, avant que tu sois réveillée, Roméo, instruit par mes lettres de notre entreprise, viendra ici; lui et moi nous épierons le moment de ton réveil, et cette nuit-là même Roméo t'emmènera d'ici à Mantoue. Voilà l'expédient qui te préservera de l'ignominie dont tu es menacée, si aucun caprice d'inconstance, aucune crainte de femme ne vient dans l'exécution abattre ton courage.

JULIETTE.--Donne, oh! donne-moi! Ne me parle pas de crainte.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Tiens, et va-t'en: sois forte et prospère dans cette résolution! J'enverrai en hâte à Mantoue un moine porter mes lettres à ton époux.

JULIETTE.--Amour, donne-moi la force, et la force me sauvera. Adieu, mon bon père.

(Ils se quittent.)

SCÈNE II

Un appartement de la maison de Capulet.

Entrent CAPULET, LA SIGNORA CAPULET, LA NOURRICE _et des_ DOMESTIQUES.

CAPULET.--Invite toutes les personnes dont le nom est écrit là-dessus. (_Le domestique sort_.)--Toi, drôle, va m'arrêter vingt habiles cuisiniers.

SECOND DOMESTIQUE.--Vous n'en aurez pas un mauvais, seigneur, car je verrai s'ils se lèchent les doigts.

CAPULET.--Et qu'est-ce que tu verras par-là?

SECOND DOMESTIQUE.--Vraiment, seigneur, c'est un mauvais cuisinier que celui qui ne se lèche pas les doigts. Ainsi, celui qui ne se lèche pas les doigts ne viendra pas avec moi.

CAPULET.--Va vite. (_Le domestiqua sort_.) Nous serons bien mal préparés pour cette noce.--Est-ce que ma fille est allé trouver le frère Laurence?

LA NOURRICE.--Oui, vraiment.

CAPULET.--Bon, il lui fera peut-être un peu de bien. C'est une insolente petite coquine bien entêtée.

(Entre Juliette.)

LA NOURRICE.--Tenez, voyez comme elle revient de confesse avec un visage riant.

CAPULET.--Eh bien! obstinée, où avez-vous été courir?

JULIETTE.--Où j'ai appris à me repentir du péché d'une désobéissante résistance à vous et à vos ordres. Le saint frère Laurence m'a enjoint de tomber ici à vos genoux, et de vous demander pardon. Pardon, je vous en conjure; désormais je me laisserai toujours gouverner par vous.

CAPULET.--Envoyez chercher le comte: allez et qu'on l'instruise de ceci. Je veux que ce noeud soit formé dès demain matin.

JULIETTE.--J'ai rencontré le jeune comte à la cellule du frère Laurence, et je lui ai accordé ce qui se peut accorder des droits de l'amour sans passer les bornes de la pudeur.

CAPULET.--Allons, j'en suis bien aise, tout va bien, relevez-vous; les choses vont comme elles doivent aller.--Il faut que je voie le comte; oui vraiment, allez, je vous dis, et amenez-le ici. En vérité, devant Dieu, toute notre ville a de grandes obligations à ce respectable religieux.

JULIETTE.--Nourrice, voulez-vous venir avec moi dans mon cabinet? Vous m'aiderez à assortir la parure que vous croirez convenable pour m'habiller demain.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Non, pas avant jeudi. Nous avons le temps.

CAPULET.--Allez, nourrice, allez avec elle; nous irons à l'église demain.

(Juliette et la nourrice sortent.)

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Nous serons bien à court pour nos préparatifs: il est déjà presque nuit.

CAPULET.--Bon, bon; je me donnerai du mouvement et tout ira bien, je te le garantis, ma femme. Va rejoindre Juliette, aide-la à se parer; je ne me coucherai point cette nuit. Laisse-moi tranquille: pour cette fois, c'est moi qui ferai la ménagère.--Holà! mon chapeau.--Ils sont tous sortis. Allons, je vais aller moi-même chez le comte Pâris, et le disposer à la cérémonie de demain.--Mon coeur est merveilleusement léger depuis que cette fille entêtée est rentrée dans son devoir.

(Ils sortent.)

SCÈNE III

La chambre de Juliette.

Entrent JULIETTE ET LA NOURRICE.

JULIETTE.--Oui, cet ajustement est celui qui conviendra le mieux; mais, bonne nourrice, je t'en prie, laisse-moi seule cette nuit: j'ai besoin de bien des oraisons pour obtenir du ciel un regard propice dans l'état où je suis, qui est plein, comme tu sais, d'irrégularités et de péché.

(Entre la signora Capulet.)

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Eh bien! êtes-vous bien occupée? Avez-vous besoin que je vous aide?

JULIETTE.--Non, madame; nous avons fait un choix de tout ce qui est nécessaire pour paraître convenablement à la cérémonie de demain. Si c'est votre bon plaisir, permettez qu'on me laisse seule maintenant, et que ma nourrice veille cette nuit avec vous; car, j'en suis sûre, vous devez avoir des affaires par-dessus les yeux pour une chose qui se fait si précipitamment.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Bonne nuit, va te mettre au lit et te reposer, tu en as besoin.

(La signora Capulet et la nourrice sortent.)

JULIETTE.--Adieu.--Dieu sait quand nous nous reverrons. (_Elle ferme la porte._) Je sens courir dans mes veines un frisson de peur, qui glace presque en moi la chaleur de la vie. Il faut que je les rappelle pour me rassurer.--Nourrice! Ah! que ferait-elle ici? il faut que je joue seule ma scène funèbre.--Viens, fiole.--Mais si ce breuvage n'opérait aucun effet, serais-je donc mariée de force au comte? Non, non, ceci me préservera. Repose ici. (_Elle place un poignard à côté d'elle._)--Mais si c'était un poison que le frère m'eût adroitement fourni pour me faire mourir, dans la crainte de se voir déshonoré par ce mariage, lui qui m'a mariée avec Roméo... Je crains qu'il n'en soit ainsi, et cependant quand j'y songe, cela ne doit pas être, car il a toujours été reconnu pour un saint homme. Je ne veux pas entretenir une si mauvaise pensée.--Mais quoi! si, après que je serai déposée dans le tombeau, j'allais me réveiller avant le moment où Roméo doit venir me délivrer... C'est là une chose bien effrayante. Ne serais-je pas alors suffoquée sous cette voûte dont la sombre entrée ne reçoit aucun air salutaire, et étouffée avant que mon Roméo arrivât? ou, si je suis vivante, n'est-il pas vraisemblable que l'horrible idée de la mort et de la nuit jointe à la terreur du lieu, sous cette voûte, antique réceptacle où depuis tant de siècles sont entassés les ossements de mes ancêtres qu'on y a tous ensevelis; où Tybalt, tout sanglant et encore tout frais enterré, est là à se corrompre dans son linceul; où l'on dit que les spectres nocturnes viennent s'assembler à certaines heures de la nuit?... Hélas! hélas! n'est-il pas probable que, trop tôt éveillée, au milieu de ces odeurs infectes, de ces cris semblables à ceux de la mandragore[61] qu'on arrache de la terre, et qui font, dit-on, perdre la raison à ceux qui les entendent... Oh! si je m'éveille, ne pourra-t-il pas arriver que ma tête s'égare, assiégée de ces hideuses terreurs? Ne puis-je pas dans ma folie aller me jouer avec les restes de mes aïeux, et arracher de son linceul Tybalt tout défiguré; ou, dans cette frénésie, me servir, comme d'un bâton, de quelque os d'un de mes grands-pères pour briser ma cervelle désespérée?--Oh! regardez! Il me semble voir l'ombre de mon cousin chercher Roméo, qui a enfoncé dans son corps la pointe d'une épée.... Arrête, Tybalt, arrête!--Roméo, je viens. Je bois ceci à ta santé.

(Elle se jette sur le lit.)

[Note 61: On attribuait à la mandragore, entre autres propriétés singulières, celle de pousser, lorsqu'on l'arrachait, des cris qui faisaient perdre la raison à ceux qui les entendaient. On prétendait qu'elle croissait sur la fosse des hommes mis à mort pour quelque crime, et qu'elle était le produit de la corruption de leur corps; aussi la regardait-on comme douée de vie.]

SCÈNE IV

Une salle dans la maison de Capulet.

Entrent LA SIGNORA CAPULET et LA NOURRICE.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Nourrice, prenez ces clefs et allez chercher encore des épices.

LA NOURRICE.--Ils demandent des dattes et des coings à l'office.

(Entre Capulet.)

CAPULET.--Allons, levez-vous, levez-vous, levez-vous; le coq a chanté pour la seconde fois; la cloche du couvre-feu a sonné; il est trois heures.--Ayez l'oeil au four, bonne Angélique; qu'on n'épargne rien.

LA NOURRICE.--Et vous, allez, tracassier, allez, allez vous mettre au lit; en vérité, vous serez malade demain pour avoir passé la nuit.

CAPULET.--Non, pas du tout. Bon, j'ai bien veillé d'autres nuits pour moins que cela, et je n'en ai jamais été incommodé.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Oui, vous avez été, de votre temps, un coureur d'aventures[62]; mais je veillerai à ce que vous ne fassiez plus de ces sortes de veillées.

[Note 62: _A mouse hunt_ (un chasseur de souris).]

CAPULET.--Jalouse! jalouse! (_Entrent des domestiques avec des broches, du bois, des corbeilles._) Qu'est-ce que c'est que tout cela, mon ami?

PREMIER DOMESTIQUE.--Ce sont des affaires pour le cuisinier, seigneur, mais je ne sais pas ce que c'est.

CAPULET.--Dépêche-toi, dépêche-toi. (_Le domestique sort._) Toi, apporte des fagots plus secs; appelle Pierre, et il te dira où ils sont.

LE DOMESTIQUE.--Ah! j'ai dans ma tête, seigneur, des fagots tout trouvés, sans déranger Pierre pour cela.

(Il sort.)

CAPULET.--Par la messe, c'est bien dit; tu es un joyeux compère[63]! Ah! je te fagoterai.--Par ma foi! voilà le jour. Le comte ne tardera pas à venir ici avec la musique; il me l'a dit. (_On entend des instruments._) Mais je l'entends qui s'approche.--Nourrice! ma femme! allons. Eh bien, nourrice! Allons, dis-je. (_Entre la nourrice._) Allez éveiller Juliette; allez, habillez-la: je vais, moi, causer avec Pâris.... Allons, dépêchez-vous, dépêchez-vous; voilà le marié déjà arrivé: dépêchez-vous, vous-dis-je.

(Ils sortent.)

[Note 63:

SERVANT. _I have a head, sir, that will find out logs And never trouble Peter for the matter_.

CAPULET. _'Mass, and well said; a merry whoreson! ha! Thou shalt be logger-head._

Logs et _Logger-head_ (bûches, têtes de bois). Il a fallu trouver un équivalent.]

SCÈNE V

La chambre de Juliette.--Juliette est sur son lit.

Entre LA NOURRICE.

LA NOURRICE.--Ma maîtresse! allons, ma maîtresse! Juliette!... Ma foi, pour elle, elle dort profondément.--Eh bien! mon agneau; eh bien, madame! Fi! paresseuse! Allons, mon amour, levez-vous, dis-je. Madame! mon cher coeur, allons, madame la mariée...--Quoi, pas le mot! Vous vous en donnez pour quatre sous maintenant[64], vous dormez pour huit jours; car la nuit prochaine, j'en réponds, le comte Pâris a gagé son repos que vous ne sommeilleriez guère.... Dieu me pardonne (ma foi, _amen_)! Comme elle dort profondément! Il faut absolument que je l'éveille.--Madame, madame, madame! Voulez-vous que le comte vous surprenne au lit[65]? Vous vous lèveriez bien vite, de frayeur, j'en suis sûre, n'est-ce pas?... Comment! tout habillée! vous n'avez pas quitté votre robe, et vous voilà encore couchée! il faut absolument que je vous réveille.--Madame, madame, madame!... Hélas! au secours! au secours! ma maîtresse est morte. Oh! malheureux jour, faut-il que je sois jamais née! De l'eau-de-vie! oh! seigneur! oh! madame!

[Note 64: _You take your penny-worths now._]

[Note 65: Il paraîtrait que l'usage était alors que le marié allât chercher sa fiancée dans son lit, si elle n'avait pas le soin de le prévenir par sa diligence.]

(Entre la signora Capulet.)

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Quel bruit fait-on ici!

LA NOURRICE.--O journée lamentable!

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Qu'est-ce que c'est?

LA NOURRICE.--Voyez, voyez. O funeste jour!

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--O malheureuse, malheureuse que je suis! Mon enfant, mon unique vie! Reviens à la vie, rouvre tes yeux ou je mourrai avec toi. Au secours! au secours! que tout le monde vienne au secours!

(Entre Capulet.)

CAPULET.--Fi donc! amenez Juliette, son époux est arrivé.

LA NOURRICE.--Elle est morte, décédée; elle est morte, O jour maudit!

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Hélas! hélas! elle est morte, elle est morte, elle est morte.

CAPULET.--Ah! laissez-moi la voir...--Hélas! elle est déjà froide; son sang est arrêté et ses muscles roides: il y a déjà longtemps que la vie a abandonné ses lèvres. La mort pèse sur elle comme une gelée intempestive sur la plus douce des fleurs de toute la prairie.

LA NOURRICE.--O déplorable jour!

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--O temps de désastres!

CAPULET.--La mort, qui l'a enlevée pour me faire gémir, enchaîne ma langue et m'ôte la parole.

(Entrent frère Laurence et Pâris, avec les musiciens.)

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Eh bien! la mariée est-elle prête à aller à l'église?

CAPULET.--Elle est prête à y aller, mais pour n'en revenir jamais.--O mon fils, dans la nuit qui précède tes noces, la mort a envahi la couche de ton épouse. Vois, elle est là étendue, cette jeune fleur qu'elle a défleurée;[66] c'est le trépas qui est mon gendre. Le trépas est mon héritier; il a épousé ma fille; je mourrai et lui laisserai tout: quand on meurt, tout appartient à la mort.

[Note 66: _Flower as she was, deflowered by him._]

PARIS.--N'ai-je donc si longtemps désiré de voir le visage de ce jour que pour qu'il m'offrît un pareil spectacle!

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--O jour malheureux et maudit! jour de misère, jour odieux! O heure la plus déplorable que le temps ait jamais rencontré dans les travaux éternels de son pèlerinage! N'avoir qu'une seule, une pauvre et seule enfant qui m'aimait, mon unique joie, ma seule consolation; et la cruelle mort la ravit à ma vue!

LA NOURRICE.--O malheur! O malheureux, malheureux, malheureux jour! jour lamentable! le plus malheureux que j'aie jamais encore vu! O jour! O jour! jour, jour odieux! Jamais on n'a vu un jour si cruel que celui-ci. O malheureux jour! ô malheureux jour!

PARIS.--Trompé, divorcé, outragé, déchiré, assassiné par toi, ô détestable mort! par toi, toi, cruelle, perdu sans ressource. O amours, ô vie! non plus la vie, mais l'amour dans la mort.

CAPULET.--Avili, désespéré, haï, martyrisé, tué! O heure de désolation, pourquoi es-tu venue frapper de mort, de mort, notre fête solennelle? O mon enfant, mon enfant! mon âme et non plus mon enfant..... te voilà morte, morte! Hélas! mon enfant est morte, et avec mon enfant sont ensevelies toutes mes joies.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Paix, silence! n'avez-vous pas de honte? Le remède au désespoir n'est pas dans le désespoir.--Le ciel et vous aviez une part dans cette belle enfant: maintenant le ciel la possède tout entière, et ce n'en est que mieux pour elle. Vous ne pouviez sauver de la mort cette part qui en elle vous appartenait, mais le ciel garde sa part dans la vie éternelle. Le comble de vos voeux était son bonheur; c'était votre paradis de la voir s'élever; et maintenant pleurerez-vous en la voyant élevée au-dessus des nuages, à la hauteur du ciel même! Oh! dans votre amour vous savez si mal aimer votre enfant, que vous voilà hors de sens de la voir heureuse. Ce n'est pas la mieux mariée celle qui vit longtemps mariée; la mieux mariée est celle qui meurt mariée jeune. Séchez vos larmes; attachez vos branches de romarin sur ce beau cadavre, et, suivant l'usage, portez-la à l'église parée de ses plus brillants atours. Bien que les tendres faiblesses de la nature nous contraignent tous à nous plaindre, les larmes de la nature excitent le sourire de la raison.

CAPULET.--Tout ce que nous avions préparé pour une fête change d'objet et va servir à de sombres funérailles, nos instruments seront des cloches lugubres; le festin des noces va devenir un triste banquet funéraire; à nos hymnes solennels seront substitués des chants funèbres; et ces bouquets de noces vont servir à un cadavre enseveli; toute chose s'est convertie en la chose contraire.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Rentrez, seigneur... et vous, madame, avec lui. Seigneur Pâris, allez. Que chacun se prépare à accompagner ce beau cadavre à son tombeau. Le ciel, pour quelque offense, s'est assombri pour vous: ne l'irritez pas davantage en résistant à sa volonté suprême.

(Sortent Capulet, la signora Capulet, Pâris et le frère Laurence.)

PREMIER MUSICIEN.--Ma foi, nous pouvons serrer nos flûtes et nous en aller.

LA NOURRICE.--Ah! serrez-les, serrez-les, mes bons et honnêtes amis; car vous voyez que c'est une aventure bien triste.

(Elle sort.)

PREMIER MUSICIEN.--Oui, par ma foi! il y aurait mieux à faire.

(Entre Pierre)

PIERRE.--O musiciens, musiciens! _O contentement du coeur, contentement du coeur!_[67] Si vous voulez me rendre la vie, jouez _Contentement du coeur_.

[Note 67: _Heart's ease_, air d'une ballade.]

PREMIER MUSICIEN.--Et pourquoi _Contentement du coeur_?

PIERRE.--O musiciens, parce que mon coeur joue de lui-même _Mon coeur est plein de tristesse_[68]. Jouez-moi quelque complainte un peu gaie pour me réconforter.

[Note 68: _My heart is full of woe_, refrain d'une autre ballade.]

SECOND MUSICIEN.--Nous ne vous jouerons pas de complainte; ce n'est pas le moment de jouer.

PIERRE.--Vous ne voulez donc pas?

SECOND MUSICIEN.--Non.

PIERRE.--Eh bien, je vous en donnerai, moi, et qui sonnera.

PREMIER MUSICIEN.--Qu'est-ce que vous nous donnerez?

PIERRE.--Pas d'argent, sur ma foi[69], mais une danse. Vous aurez de ma musique.

[Note 69: PETER. _No money on my faith; but the gleek: I will give you the minstrel._

1 MUS. _Then I will give you the serving creature_.

PETER. _Then will I lay the serving creature's dagger on your pate. I will carry no crotchets: I'll_ re _you, I'll_ fa _you; do you note me._

1 MUS. _An you_ re _us, and_ fa _us, you note us._

2 MUS. _Pray you, put up your dagger, and put out your wit._

PETER. _Then have at you with my wit: I will dry-beat you with an iron wit, and put up my iron dagger_.

Presque toutes les plaisanteries de ce dialogue portent sur des locutions et des manières de parler tellement hors d'usage, que les commentateurs sont fort embarrassés à en rendre raison. Il a fallu chercher des équivalents.]

PREMIER MUSICIEN.--Oh bien! je vous ferai aller en mesure, moi.

PIERRE.--Prenez garde que mon poignard ne batte la mesure sur votre tête, et je ne m'arrêterai pas aux paroles, voyez-vous; et si je veux que vous me fassiez une fugue, j'aurais bientôt dit _ut_: mettez cela en note.

PREMIER MUSICIEN.--C'est vous qui donnez la note avec votre _ut_.

SECOND MUSICIEN.--Je vous en prie, mettez votre poignard dans le fourreau et votre esprit en dehors.

PIERRE.--Eh bien! garde à vous contre mon esprit. Mon esprit a le fil, il va vous percer à jour; ainsi, je puis vous faire grâce du fil de mon poignard. Répondez-moi en hommes de tête:

Quand le chagrin poignant a blessé le coeur Et que l'esprit est accablé d'une douloureuse tristesse, La musique aux sons argentins...

Pourquoi _sons argentins_? pourquoi _la musique aux sons argentins_? Qu'en dites-vous, Simon Corde-à-boyau?

PREMIER MUSICIEN.--Vraiment, c'est que l'argent a un son très-agréable.

PIERRE.--Joli! Et vous, qu'en dites-vous, Hugues Rebec[70]?

[Note 70: _Rebec, rebecquin_, nom d'un ancien violon à trois cordes.]

SECOND MUSICIEN.--Je dis moi, que _sons argentins_, cela veut dire des sons qui nous valent de l'argent.

PIERRE.--Joli aussi!--Et qu'en dites-vous, Jacques Du Son?

TROISIÈME MUSICIEN.--Ma foi, je ne sais que dire.

PIERRE.--Ah! pardon; j'oubliais que vous êtes le chanteur.--Eh bien! je répondrai pour vous. On dit _la musique aux sons argentins_, parce que ce n'est pas ordinairement avec de l'or qu'on paye des gaillards comme vous de leur musique.

La musique aux sons argentins Apporte promptement un remède à leurs maux.

(Il sort en chantant.)

PREMIER MUSICIEN.--Quel malin diable est-ce là?

SECOND MUSICIEN.--Qu'il s'aille faire pendre. Venez entrons là dedans; nous y attendrons le retour du convoi et nous resterons à dîner.

(Ils sortent.)

FIN DU QUATRIÈME ACTE.

ACTE CINQUIÈME

SCÈNE I

Une rue de Mantoue.

Entre ROMÉO.

ROMÉO.--Si l'oeil du sommeil ne m'a pas trompé par de flatteuses illusions, mes songes m'annoncent prochainement d'heureuses nouvelles. Le maître de ma poitrine siége légèrement sur son trône, et une humeur inaccoutumée m'a, durant toute cette journée, élevé au-dessus de la terre dans des pensées joyeuses. J'ai rêvé que mon épouse arrivait et me trouvait mort (étrange songe, qui laisse à un mort la faculté de penser!) et que ses baisers communiquaient à mes lèvres un tel souffle de vie, que je me suis ranimé et me suis vu empereur. O ciel! quelle est donc la douceur des jouissances réelles de l'amour, puisque l'ombre de l'amour seulement est si riche de bonheur? (_Entre Balthasar._)--Des nouvelles de Vérone!--Eh bien! Balthasar, ne m'apportes-tu pas des lettres du frère Laurence? Comment se porte ma Juliette? Mon père jouit-il d'une bonne santé? Comment se porte ma Juliette? C'est cela que je te redemande, car rien ne peut être mal si ma Juliette est bien.

BALTHASAR.--Elle est bien; ainsi rien ne peut être mal... Son corps sommeille dans le tombeau des Capulet, et l'immortelle partie de son être vit avec les anges. Je l'ai vu déposer dans le tombeau de sa famille, et j'ai pris sur-le-champ la poste pour venir vous l'apprendre. Oh! pardonnez si je vous apporte ces funestes nouvelles, puisque c'est la mission que vous m'aviez laissée, seigneur.

ROMÉO.--En est-il ainsi?--A présent, astres contraires, je vous défie.--Tu connais ma demeure. Va, procure-moi de l'encre et du papier; arrête des chevaux de poste, je veux partir cette nuit.

BALTHASAR.--Pardonnez-moi, seigneur, mais je ne puis vous laisser seul; vous êtes pâle, et votre air égaré annonce quelque malheur.

ROMÉO.--Allons donc, tu te trompes. Laisse-moi, et fais ce que je t'ordonne.--N'as-tu point de lettres pour moi du frère Laurence?

BALTHASAR.--Non, mon cher maître.

ROMÉO.--N'importe. Va-t'en, et arrête-moi ces chevaux; je te rejoins à l'instant. (_Balthasar sort._)--C'est bien, Juliette; je reposerai avec toi cette nuit; occupons-nous d'en trouver les moyens.--O mal, tu es prompt à entrer dans les pensées de l'homme

au désespoir! Je me souviens d'un apothicaire que j'ai remarqué dernièrement ici aux environs, couvert de vêtements déchirés, le regard sombre, et épluchant des simples; son aspect était celui de la maigreur; la misère dévorante l'avait rongé jusqu'aux os. Du plafond de son indigente boutique pendaient une tortue, un crocodile empaillé et d'autres peaux de poissons difformes; et le long de ses rayons des tiroirs vides annonçaient par leurs étiquettes ce qui leur manquait; des pois de terre verte, des vessies et des graines moisies, des restes de ficelle et de vieux pains de roses, étaient clair-semés çà et là pour servir de montre. En voyant sa misère, je me dis à moi-même: Si un homme avait besoin de quelque poison dont la vente fût punie d'une mort certaine à Mantoue, voilà un malheureux coquin qui lui en vendrait. Oh! cette pensée n'a fait que prévenir mes besoins: il faut que ce misérable m'en vende.--Autant que je m'en souviens, ce doit être ici sa demeure.--Comme c'est aujourd'hui fête, la boutique du pauvre hère est fermée.--Holà, holà, apothicaire!

(Entre l'apothicaire.)

L'APOTHICAIRE.--Qui appelle donc si fort?

ROMÉO.--Viens ici, mon ami. Je vois que tu es pauvre, tiens, voilà quarante ducats; donne-moi une drachme de poison qui expédie si promptement qu'aussitôt qu'elle se sera répandue dans les veines, celui qui, las de la vie, en aura fait usage tombe mort sur-le-champ, et que son corps perde la respiration avec la même rapidité qu'en met la poudre enflammée à s'échapper des fatales entrailles du canon.

L'APOTHICAIRE.--J'ai de ces poisons mortels, mais la loi de Mantoue punit de mort quiconque en débite.

ROMÉO.--Quoi! si dénué de tout, si plein de misère, et tu as peur de mourir! La famine est sur tes joues; le besoin et la souffrance ont peint la mort dans tes yeux; sur ton dos traîne la misère en haillons. Le monde ne t'est point ami, ni la loi du monde; le monde n'a point de loi qui puisse t'enrichir; cesse donc d'être pauvre; enfreins seulement la loi, et prends cet or.

L'APOTHICAIRE.--C'est ma pauvreté et non pas ma volonté qui consent.

ROMÉO.--C'est ta pauvreté que je paye, et non ta volonté.

L'APOTHICAIRE.--Mettez ceci dans un liquide quelconque, celui que vous voudrez; avalez-le, et eussiez-vous la force de vingt hommes ensemble, il vous aura expédié sur-le-champ.

ROMÉO.--Tiens, voilà ton or, poison plus funeste pour la vie des hommes, et qui commet bien plus de meurtres dans ce monde odieux que ces pauvres compositions que tu n'as pas la permission de vendre. C'est moi qui te vends du poison; toi tu ne m'en as pas vendu.--Adieu, achète de quoi manger et te remettre en chair.--Viens, cordial et non pas poison, viens avec moi au tombeau de Juliette: c'est là que tu dois me servir!

(Il sort.)

SCÈNE II

La cellule du frère Laurence.

Entre FRÈRE JEAN.

FRÈRE JEAN.--Saint franciscain, mon frère, holà!

(Entre frère Laurence.)

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Je crois entendre la voix du frère Jean.--Soyez le bienvenu de Mantoue. Que dit Roméo? ou bien, s'il a écrit ce qu'il pensait, donnez-moi sa lettre?

FRÈRE JEAN.--Cherchant pour m'accompagner un frère déchaussé, membre de notre ordre, qui visitait les malades de cette ville, au moment où je le trouvai, les inspecteurs de la cité, soupçonnant que nous étions tous deux entrés dans une maison infectée de la contagion, ont fermé les portes et n'ont jamais voulu nous laisser sortir. Ma course vers Mantoue a été arrêtée là.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Qui donc a porté ma lettre à Roméo?

FRÈRE JEAN.--Je n'ai pu l'envoyer, la voilà. Je n'ai pas même pu trouver de messager qui te la rapportât, tant ils redoutaient la contagion!

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Funeste circonstance! Par notre communauté, cette lettre n'était pas indifférente; elle portait un message de la plus grande importance, et ce retard peut être d'un grand danger.--Frère Jean, va me chercher un levier de fer, et me l'apporte promptement dans ma cellule.

FRÈRE JEAN.--Frère, je vais te l'apporter.

(Il sort.)

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Maintenant il faut que je me rende seul au monument. Dans trois heures la belle Juliette s'éveillera. Elle va me maudire en apprenant que Roméo n'a pas été instruit de ce qui vient d'arriver. Mais j'écrirai de nouveau à Mantoue, et je garderai Juliette dans ma cellule jusqu'à l'arrivée de Roméo.--Pauvre cadavre vivant enfermé dans la tombe d'un mort!

(Il sort.)

SCÈNE III

Un cimetière dans lequel se voit un monument appartenant à la famille des Capulet.

Entre PARIS _et son_ PAGE _qui porte une torche et des fleurs._

PARIS.--Page, donne-moi ton flambeau. Éloigne-toi et te tiens à l'écart.--Non, éteins-le; je ne veux pas être vu. Va te coucher sous ces cyprès, et applique ton oreille contre le sol creusé: les nombreux tombeaux qu'on y a ouverts ont tellement ébranlé sa solidité que personne ne pourra marcher dans le cimetière que tu ne l'entendes: alors, siffle pour m'avertir que tu entends approcher quelqu'un.--Donne-moi ces fleurs; fais ce que je t'ordonne: va.

LE PAGE.--Je suis presque effrayé de rester seul ici dans ce cimetière, cependant je vais m'y aventurer.

(Il s'éloigne.)

PARIS.--Douce fleur, je sème de fleurs ton lit nuptial. Tombeau chéri, qui renferme dans ton enceinte la plus parfaite image des êtres éternels; belle Juliette, qui habites avec les anges, accepte cette dernière marque d'amour. Vivante, je t'honorai; morte, mes hommages funéraires viennent orner ta tombe. (_Le page siffle._)--Mon page a fait le signal; quelqu'un approche: quel pied sacrilége erre dans ces lieux pendant la nuit, pour troubler mes tristes fonctions et le culte d'un fidèle amour? Quoi! avec un flambeau!--Nuit, couvre-moi un moment de ton voile.

(Il se retire.)

(Entrent Roméo et Balthasar qui le précède avec une torche, une pioche, etc.)

ROMÉO.--Donne-moi cette pioche et ce croc de fer. Prends cette lettre, et demain de bonne heure aie soin de la remettre à mon seigneur et père. Donne-moi la lumière. Sur ta vie, je t'enjoins, quoi que tu puisses entendre ou voir, de rester au loin à l'écart, et de ne pas m'interrompre en ce que je veux faire. Si je descends dans ce lit de la mort, c'est en partie pour contempler encore les traits de ma bien-aimée; mais surtout pour ôter de son doigt insensible un anneau précieux, un anneau dont j'ai besoin pour un usage qui est cher à mon coeur. Ainsi, éloigne-toi; va-t'en.--Si, poussé par quelque inquiétude, tu reviens épier ce que je veux faire ensuite, par le ciel, je te déchirerai morceau par morceau, et je joncherai de tes membres ce cimetière affamé. La circonstance, mes projets sont sauvages et farouches, plus terribles, plus inexorables que les tigres à jeun ou la mer en furie.

BALTHASAR.--Je m'en vais, seigneur, et ne vous troublerai point.

ROMÉO.--C'est ainsi que tu me prouveras ton attachement. Prends cela. Vis et sois heureux, honnête serviteur.

BALTHASAR.--Précisément cause de tout cela, je veux me cacher ici à l'entour. Ses regards me font peur, et j'ai mes doutes sur ses intentions.

(Il sort.)

ROMÉO.--Toi, gouffre de mort, ventre détestable assouvi du plus précieux repas que pût offrir la terre, c'est ainsi que je saurai forcer tes mâchoires pourries à s'ouvrir, et que dans ma haine je veux te gorger d'une nouvelle proie.

(Il enfonce la porte du monument.)

PARIS.--C'est cet orgueilleux Montaigu, ce banni, qui a tué le cousin de ma bien-aimée, dont le chagrin, à ce qu'on croit, a causé la mort de la belle Juliette. Il vient ici faire aux cadavres quelque infâme outrage. Je vais l'arrêter. (_Il s'avance._)--Suspends tes efforts sacriléges, vil Montaigu: peut-on poursuivre la vengeance au delà de la mort? Scélérat condamné, je t'arrête: obéis et suis-moi, car il faut que tu meures.

ROMÉO.--Oui, il le faut, et c'est pour cela que je suis ici. Bon et noble jeune homme, ne tente point un homme désespéré; fuis loin d'ici, et laisse-moi. Pense à ceux qui sont là morts, et qui t'effrayent. Je t'en conjure, jeune homme, ne charge point ma tête d'un nouveau péché en me poussant à la fureur. Oh! va-t'en. Par le ciel, je t'aime plus que moi-même, car c'est contre moi-même que je viens armé dans ce lieu. Ne t'arrête pas ici plus longtemps; va-t'en; vis, et tu diras que la pitié d'un furieux t'a commandé de fuir.

PARIS.--Je défie tes conjurations, et je t'arrête comme tombé en félonie par ton retour.

ROMÉO.--Tu veux donc me provoquer? Eh bien! songe à te défendre, jeune homme.

(Ils se battent.)

LE PAGE.--O ciel! ils se battent. Je vais chercher la garde.

(Il sort.)

PARIS.--Oh! je suis mort! (_Il tombe._) Si tu es capable de pitié, ouvre la tombe; et couche-moi près de Juliette.

ROMÉO.--Sur ma foi, je le ferai.--Il faut que je contemple ces traits.--Le parent de Mercutio, le noble comte Pâris.--Que m'a dit Balthasar tandis que nous cheminions ensemble? Mon âme en tumulte ne lui prêtait aucune attention. Il m'a dit, je crois, que Pâris avait dû épouser Juliette. Ne me l'a-t-il pas dit? ou l'aurais-je rêvé? ou bien est-ce dans un moment de folie, tandis qu'il me parlait de Juliette, que je l'aurai imaginé ainsi?--Oh! donne-moi ta main, toi dont le nom est écrit avec le mien dans le funeste livre du malheur. Je vais t'ensevelir dans un tombeau glorieux. Un tombeau! Oh! non, c'est un dôme brillant, jeune homme assassiné, car Juliette y repose, et sa beauté fait de cette voûte un séjour de fête plein de clarté. Mort, sois déposé ici par les mains d'un homme mort. (_Il couche Pâris dans le monument._)--Combien de fois des hommes, à l'article de la mort, ont eu un rayon de joie! C'est ce que ceux qui les soignent appellent un éclair avant la mort. Mais comment puis-je appeler ceci un éclair?--O mon amante, ma femme! la mort, qui a sucé le miel de ton haleine, n'a pas encore eu de pouvoir sur ta beauté: tu n'es pas vaincue; les couleurs de la beauté brillent encore de tout leur vermillon sur tes lèvres et tes joues, et le pâle étendard de la mort n'en a pas encore pris la place.--Tybalt, es-tu là couché dans ton drap sanglant? Quelle faveur plus grande puis-je te faire que d'abattre, de la même main qui a moissonné ta jeunesse, la jeunesse de celui qui fut ton ennemi?--Pardonne-moi, cousin.--O chère Juliette, pourquoi es-tu si belle encore? Dois-je croire que ce fantôme appelé la Mort est amoureux, et que cet odieux monstre décharné te garde ici dans l'obscurité pour faire de toi sa maîtresse? De peur qu'il n'en soit ainsi, je resterai toujours avec toi, et ne sortirai plus jamais de ce palais de la sombre nuit. Je demeurerai avec les vers qui sont tes femmes de chambre. Ici je veux établir mon éternel repos, et débarrasser du joug des étoiles funestes cette chair fatiguée du monde. Mes yeux, regardez pour la dernière fois; mes bras, pressez-la pour la dernière fois; et vous, mes lèvres, portes de la respiration, scellez d'un baiser légitime un marché sans terme avec la mort qui possède sans partage.--(_Au poison._) Viens, amer conducteur, guide rebutant, pilote désespéré; lance maintenant tout d'un coup, sur les rochers qui vont la briser en éclats, ta barque fatiguée du travail de la mer. Voici que je bois à mes amours! (_Il boit le poison._)--O fidèle apothicaire, tes remèdes sont actifs.--Avec ce baiser, je meurs.

(Il meurt.)

(Entre dans le cimetière frère Laurence avec une lanterne, un levier et une bêche.)

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--O saint François, sois mon guide. Combien de fois cette nuit mes pieds vieillis ont-ils chancelé, en se heurtant contre des tombeaux!--Qui est là?

BALTHASAR.--Celui qui est ici est un ami, et un homme qui vous connaît bien.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Que la bénédiction repose sur vous.--Dites-moi, mon bon ami, quel est ce flambeau là-bas, qui prête en vain sa lumière à des vers et à des crânes sans yeux? Il brûle, à ce qu'il me semble, dans le monument des Capulet.

BALTHASAR.--Oui, père vénérable, c'est là qu'il brûle; et dans ce monument est mon maître, un homme que vous aimez.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Qui est votre maître?

BALTHASAR.--Roméo.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Y a-t-il longtemps qu'il est là?

BALTHASAR.--Une grande demi-heure.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Entrez avec moi sous la voûte.

BALTHASAR.--Je n'ose, mon père. Mon maître ignore que je n'ai pas quitté ce lieu; et avec un accent terrible il m'a menacé de la mort si je demeurais pour épier ses desseins.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Eh bien! reste donc ici; j'irai seul. La crainte s'empare de moi. Oh! je crains bien qu'il ne soit arrivé quelque accident funeste.

BALTHASAR.--Comme je dormais sous ce cyprès que vous voyez, j'ai rêvé que mon maître se battait avec un autre homme, et que mon maître l'avait tué.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Roméo! (_Il s'avance._)--Hélas! hélas! quel est ce sang qui souille les pierres de l'entrée du caveau? Que signifient ces épées sanglantes et sans maîtres, que je vois à terre teintes de sang dans ce séjour de paix? (_Il entre dans le monument._)--Roméo! Oh! qu'il est pâle!--Et qui encore? Quoi! Pâris aussi, baigné dans son sang! Ah! quelle heure cruelle est coupable de ce lamentable événement!--Juliette se remue!

(Juliette se réveille et se soulève.)

JULIETTE.--O frère secourable, où est mon seigneur? Je me rappelle bien où je devais me trouver, et m'y voilà. Où est mon Roméo?

(Bruit derrière le théâtre.)

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--J'entends du bruit.--Madame, sortez de cet antre de la mort, de la contagion, et d'un sommeil contre nature. Une puissance supérieure à toutes nos résistances a traversé nos desseins. Venez, sortez d'ici; votre époux est là, mort à vos côtés, et Pâris aussi.--Suivez-moi, je vous placerai dans une communauté de saintes religieuses. Ne vous arrêtez pas à me faire des questions: la garde approche; venez, venez, chère Juliette, je n'ose rester plus longtemps ici. (_Il s'éloigne._)

JULIETTE.--Va, sors d'ici, car je ne veux pas m'en aller.--Qu'est-ce que cela! Une coupe que serre la main de mon bien-aimé! C'est le poison, je le vois, qui a terminé sa vie avant le temps.--Quoi! égoïste! avoir tout bu, sans m'en laisser une seule goutte amie pour me secourir après toi! Je veux baiser tes lèvres; peut-être y recueillerai-je quelques restes du poison, suffisants pour me faire mourir au moyen d'un cordial. (_Elle l'embrasse._)--Tes lèvres sont chaudes encore!

PREMIER SOLDAT, _derrière le théâtre_.--Conduis-nous, jeune homme. Par quel chemin?

JULIETTE.--Oui vraiment, du bruit? Alors j'aurai bientôt fait. Oh! bienheureux poignard (_elle saisit le poignard de Roméo_), voici ton fourreau (_elle se frappe_), tu peux t'y rouiller; laisse-moi mourir.

(Elle tombe sur le corps de Roméo et meurt.)

(Entre la garde avec le page de Pâris.)

LE PAGE.--Voilà l'endroit; là, où brûle ce flambeau.

PREMIER SOLDAT.--La terre est ensanglantée. Cherchez autour du cimetière: allez quelques-uns de vous, et qui que vous rencontriez, saisissez-le. (_Sortent quelques soldats._) Oh! spectacle pitoyable! Ici le comte tué, et Juliette sanglante, chaude encore et morte il n'y a qu'un moment, elle qui est enterrée depuis deux jours. Allez instruire le prince; courez chez les Capulet; avertissez les Montaigu. Allez chercher encore quelques autres personnes. (_Sortent les autres soldats._) Nous voyons bien le lieu où se sont accumulés tant de malheurs; mais pour expliquer ce qui a donné lieu[71] à ces malheurs si déplorables, il nous en faut connaître les circonstances.

[Note 71: _We see the ground whereon these woes do lie; but the true ground of all these piteous woes, we cannot_, etc. _Ground_ (lieu, endroit), et _ground_ (fondement).]

(Rentrent quelques soldats avec Balthasar.)

SECOND SOLDAT.--Voici le domestique de Roméo, nous l'avons trouvé dans le cimetière.

PREMIER SOLDAT.--Gardez-le en sûreté jusqu'à l'arrivée du prince.

(Un autre soldat arrive avec le frère Laurence.)

TROISIÈME SOLDAT.--Voici un religieux qui tremble, soupire et pleure. Nous lui avons pris cette bêche et ce levier comme il venait de cette partie du cimetière.

PREMIER SOLDAT.--Cela est très-suspect. Retenez aussi ce religieux.

(Entre le prince avec sa suite.)

LE PRINCE.--Quel malheur s'est donc éveillé si matin, qu'il nous oblige avant le jour d'interrompre notre sommeil?

(Entrent Capulet, sa femme et plusieurs autres personnes.)

CAPULET.--Qui est-ce qui se passe donc qu'on crie ainsi dehors?

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--Le peuple crie dans les rues, Roméo! d'autres, Juliette! d'autres, Pâris! et tous courent en poussant des clameurs, vers notre monument.

LE PRINCE.--Quelle est donc cette alarme dont le bruit a frappé nos oreilles?

PREMIER SOLDAT.--Mon souverain, ici est le comte Pâris tué, et Roméo mort, et Juliette, morte depuis deux jours, qui n'est pas froide encore, et vient d'être tuée.

LE PRINCE.--Regardez, cherchez, et tâchez de découvrir d'où viennent ces meurtres horribles.

PREMIER SOLDAT.--Voici un religieux et le domestique de Roméo qui est là assassiné; ils avaient sur eux des instruments propres à ouvrir la tombe qui renferme ces morts.

CAPULET.--O ciel! ô ma femme! voyez comme notre fille est sanglante! Ce poignard s'est mépris: hélas! en voilà le fourreau sur le corps de Montaigu; et le fer s'est égaré dans le sein de ma fille.

LA SIGNORA CAPULET.--O malheureuse! ce spectacle de mort est comme la cloche qui appelle ma vieillesse au tombeau.

(Entre Montaigu.)

LE PRINCE.--Approche, Montaigu. Tu t'es levé de bonne heure pour voir ton fils et ton héritier couché là de meilleure heure encore.

MONTAIGU.--Hélas! prince, ma femme est morte cette nuit, la douleur de l'exil de mon fils l'a suffoquée. Quels malheurs nouveaux conspirent encore contre ma vieillesse?

LE PRINCE.--Regarde, et tu verras.

MONTAIGU.--O fils mal-appris, où est le respect de te presser ainsi d'arriver avant ton père au tombeau?

LE PRINCE.--Ferme pour un moment ta bouche à l'outrage, jusqu'à ce que nous ayons pu éclaircir ces mystères et en découvrir la source, la cause et la marche véritable. Alors je me mets à la tête de vos communes douleurs, et vous conduirai, s'il le faut, à la tombe. En attendant, contenez-vous, et que le malheur subisse le joug de la patience. (_Aux gardes._)--Qu'on amène devant moi tous ceux que l'on soupçonne.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Je suis le plus considérable, le moins capable d'action, et cependant, comme le temps et le lieu déposent contre moi, le plus soupçonné de cet horrible meurtre; et je comparais ici pour m'accuser et me justifier, me condamner et m'absoudre.

LE PRINCE.--Alors, dites tout de suite ce que vous savez de ceci.

FRÈRE LAURENCE.--Je serai court, car je n'ai plus l'haleine aussi longue que le serait un ennuyeux récit.--Roméo, que vous voyez mort, était l'époux de Juliette; et cette Juliette, que vous voyez morte, l'épouse fidèle de Roméo. Je les avais mariés, et le jour de leur mariage secret fut le jour fatal de Tybalt, dont la mort prématurée a banni de cette ville le nouvel époux de Juliette. C'était à cause de cela, et non à cause de la mort de Tybalt, que dépérissait Juliette.--Vous, Capulet, pour éloigner le chagrin qui la tenait assiégée, vous l'avez fiancée et vous vouliez la marier de force au comte Pâris. Alors elle vint me trouver, et, les yeux égarés, elle me pressa de trouver les moyens de la garantir de ce second mariage, sans quoi elle allait se tuer dans ma cellule. Alors, usant des secrets de mon art, je lui donnai un breuvage assoupissant qui eût pour effet, comme je me l'étais proposé, de produire en elle les apparences de la mort. Cependant j'écrivis à Roméo de revenir ici dans cette fatale nuit, pour m'aider à la retirer de sa tombe empruntée: c'était le terme où la force du breuvage devait expirer. Mais celui qui portait ma lettre, le frère Jean, a été retenu par un accident, et me l'a rendue hier au soir: alors tout seul, à l'heure marquée pour son réveil, je suis venu dans l'intention de la tirer du tombeau de sa famille, et de la tenir cachée dans ma cellule jusqu'à ce que j'eusse une occasion favorable d'envoyer vers Roméo. Mais à mon arrivée ici, qui a précédé de quelques moments celui où elle s'est réveillée, j'y ai trouvé le noble Pâris couché avant le temps, et le fidèle Roméo mort. Elle s'éveille, et je la pressais de sortir, et de supporter avec patience cette oeuvre du ciel; mais en cet instant un bruit est venu m'effrayer et m'écarter du tombeau: elle, livrée au désespoir, n'a pas voulu me suivre, et, selon toute apparence, elle a elle-même attenté à ses jours. C'est là tout ce que je sais: sa nourrice est instruite de son mariage. Si dans tout ceci il est arrivé quelque malheur par ma faute, que ma vieille existence soit, quelques heures avant le temps, sacrifiée à la rigueur des lois les plus sévères.

LE PRINCE.--Nous t'avons toujours connu pour un saint homme. Où est le domestique de Roméo? Qu'a-t-il à nous apprendre là-dessus?

BALTHASAR.--Je portai à mon maître la nouvelle de la mort de Juliette. Aussitôt il partit de Mantoue en poste pour venir à ce lieu même, à ce monument. Là, il m'ordonna de remettre de bonne heure cette lettre à son père, et, entrant sous cette voûte, me menaça de la mort si je ne m'en allais pas et ne le laissais seul.

LE PRINCE.--Donne-moi la lettre, je veux la lire. Où est le page du comte, qui est allé chercher la garde? (_Au page._)--Maraud, que faisait ton maître en ce lieu?

LE PAGE.--Il y est venu avec des fleurs pour les jeter sur le tombeau de la signora, et il m'a ordonné de me tenir à l'écart: je lui ai obéi. Dans ce moment, un homme avec une torche est venu pour ouvrir le monument; et bientôt après mon maître s'est élancé sur lui l'épée à la main: alors j'ai couru avertir la garde.

LE PRINCE.--Cette lettre confirme le récit du religieux: elle contient le récit de leurs amours, les nouvelles qu'il a reçues de la mort de Juliette: il dit qu'il a acheté du poison d'un pauvre apothicaire, et qu'il est venu à ce monument pour y mourir et reposer auprès de Juliette.--Où sont ces deux ennemis, Capulet, Montaigu?--Voyez quelle verge s'est étendue sur vos haines. Le ciel a trouvé le moyen de détruire votre bonheur par l'amour; et moi, pour avoir fermé les yeux sur vos querelles, j'ai perdu deux parents. Nous sommes tous punis.

CAPULET.--O mon frère Montaigu, donne-moi ta main; ce sera le douaire de ma fille: je ne peux rien te demander de plus.

MONTAIGU.--Et moi je puis te donner davantage, car je ferai élever sa statue en or pur, et tant que Vérone sera connue sous ce nom, nulle statue n'approchera du prix de celle de la tendre et fidèle Juliette.

CAPULET.--Roméo, aussi riche que son épouse, reposera près d'elle: chétives expiations de nos inimitiés!

LE PRINCE.--L'aurore de ce jour apporte avec elle une sombre paix, et de douleur le soleil a caché son visage. Sortez de ce lieu, et allez vous entretenir de ces tristes aventures. Quelques-uns auront leur pardon, quelques-uns aussi seront punis, car il n'y eut jamais une histoire plus douloureuse que celle de Juliette et de son Roméo.

(Ils sortent.)

FIN DU CINQUIÈME ET DERNIER ACTE.

End of Project Gutenberg's Roméo et Juliette, by William Shakespeare

==========

Friedrich Nietzsche in seinen Werken

Lou Andreas-Salomé

Project Gutenberg Release: November 22, 2015 · eBook #50525

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE

IN SEINEN

WERKEN

VON

LOU ANDREAS-SALOMÉ.

MIT 2 BILDERN UND 3 FACSIMILIRTEN BRIEFEN NIETZSCHES.

ZWEITE AUFLAGE.

MOTTO:

NIETZSCHES WAHLSPRUCH:

»Increscunt animi, virescit volnere virtus.--« Furius Antias bei Gellius.

VERLAGSBUCHHANDLUNG CARL KONEGEN

(ERNST STÜLPNAGEL). WIEN 1911.

Nicht Willens mich auseinanderzusetzen, weder mit dem inzwischen veröffentlichten Nachlaß Nietzsches, noch mit Andern über Nietzsche, lasse ich diese Schrift in unverändertem (anastatischem) Druck neu auflegen.

Lou Andreas-Salomé.

IN TREUEM GEDENKEN GEWIDMET

EINEM UNGENANNTEN

INHALTS-VERZEICHNISS.

Sein Wesen

Seine Wandlungen

Das »System Nietzsche«

[Illustration]

Ein Brief Friedrich Nietzsches zum Vorwort.

I. ABSCHNITT

SEIN WESEN.

MOTTO:

»Der Mensch mag sich noch so weit mit seiner Erkenntniss ausrecken, sich selber noch so objectiv Vorkommen: zuletzt trägt er doch Nichts davon, als seine eigene Biographie.«

(Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I. 513.)

»Mihi ipsi scripsi!« ruft Friedrich Nietzsche in seinen Briefen wiederholt nach Vollendung eines Werkes aus. Und gewiss hat es etwas zu bedeuten, wenn der erste lebende Stilist dies von sich selber sagt, er, dem es, wie keinem Zweiten, gelungen ist, für jeden seiner Gedanken, und noch für die feinste Schattirung darin, den erschöpfenden Ausdruck zu finden. Dem, der Nietzsches Schriften zu lesen weiss, ist es denn auch ein verrätherisches Wort: es deutet die Verborgenheit an, in welcher alle seine Gedanken stehen, die lebendige Hülle, die sie vielgestaltig umkleidet, es deutet an, dass er im Grunde nur für sich dachte, für sich schrieb, weil er nur sich selbst beschrieb, sein eignes Selbst in Gedanken umsetzte.

* * * * *

Die »Bitte« in der »Fröhlichen Wissenschaft«, auf welche in dem vorstehend facsimilirten Briefe Bezug genommen ist, lautet:

»Ich kenne mancher Menschen Sinn Und weiss nicht, "Wer ich selber bin! Mein Auge ist mir viel zu nah-- Ich bin nicht, was ich seh und sah. Ich wollte mir schon besser nützen, Könnt' ich mir selber ferner sitzen. Zwar nicht so ferne wie mein Feind! Zu fern sitzt schon der nächste Freund-- Doch zwischen dem und mir die Mitte! Errathet ihr, um was ich bitte?«

(Scherz, List und Rache 25.)

Wenn es überhaupt die Aufgabe des Biographen ist, den Denker durch den Menschen zu erläutern, so gilt dies in ungewöhnlich hohem Masse für Nietzsche, denn bei keinem Andern fallen äusseres Geisteswerk und inneres Lebensbild so völlig in Eins zusammen. Auf ihn trifft es ganz besonders zu, was er in dem vorangestellten Briefe von den Philosophen überhaupt ausspricht: dass man ihre Systeme auf die Personalacten ihrer Urheber hin prüfen solle. Später hat er der gleichen Auffassung in den Worten Ausdruck gegeben: »Allmählig hat sich mir herausgestellt, was jede grosse Philosophie bisher war: nämlich das Selbstbekenntniss ihres Urhebers und eine Art ungewollter und unvermerkter mémoires.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 6.)

Dies war denn auch der leitende Gedanke in meinem in dem vorstehenden Briefe erwähnten Entwurf zu einer Charakteristik Nietzsches, den ich ihm im October 1882 vorlas und mit ihm durchsprach. Die Arbeit enthielt im Umriss den ersten Theil des vorliegenden Buches und einzelne Abschnitte des zweiten Theiles,--der Inhalt des dritten, das eigentliche »System Nietzsche« war damals noch nicht geboren. Im Laufe der Jahre erweiterte sich, im Anschlüsse an die rasch aufeinander folgenden Werke, jene Charakteristik immer mehr, und Einzelnes daraus ist bereits in besonderen Aufsätzen veröffentlicht worden.[1] Es handelte sich für mich ausschliesslich darum, die Hauptzüge von Nietzsches geistiger Eigenart zu schildern, aus denen allein seine Philosophie und ihre Entwicklung begriffen werden können. Zu diesem Zwecke beschränkte ich mich freiwillig sowohl nach der Seite der rein theoretischen Betrachtungsweise, als auch hinsichtlich der rein persönlichen Lebensbeschreibung. Beides durfte nicht zu weit geführt werden, wenn die Grundlinien seines Wesens deutlich hervortreten sollten. Wer Nietzsche auf seine Bedeutung als Theoretiker hin prüfen wollte, auf das, was etwa die zünftige Philosophie aus ihm zu lernen vermöchte, der würde sich enttäuscht abwenden, ohne zum Kern seiner Bedeutung vorzudringen. Denn der Werth seiner Gedanken liegt nicht in ihrer theoretischen Originalität, nicht in dem, was dialektisch begründet oder widerlegt werden kann, sondern durchaus in der intimen Gewalt, mit welcher hier eine Persönlichkeit zur Persönlichkeit redet,--in dem, was nach seinem eigenen Ausdruck wohl zu widerlegen, aber doch nicht »todtzumachen« ist. Wer andererseits von Nietzsches äusserem Erleben ausgehen wollte, um sein Inneres zu erfassen, der würde ebenfalls nur eine leere Schale in der Hand behalten, aus welcher der Geist entwichen ist. Denn man kann von Nietzsche sagen, dass er nach aussen hin eigentlich nichts erlebte:[2] all sein Erleben war ein so tief innerliches, dass es sich nur im Gespräch, von Mund zu Mund, und in den Gedanken seiner Werke kundthat. Die Summe von Monologen, aus denen im Wesentlichen seine vielbändigen Aphorismensammlungen bestehen, bilden ein einziges grosses Memoirenwerk, dem sein Geistesbild zu Grunde liegt. Dieses Bild ist es, das ich hier zu zeichnen versuche: das _Gedanken-Erlebniss_ in seiner Bedeutung für Nietzsches Geisteswesen--das _Selbstbekenntniss_ in seiner Philosophie.

Obgleich Nietzsche seit einigen Jahren häufiger genannt wird als irgend ein anderer Denker, obgleich viele Federn damit beschäftigt sind, theils Jünger für ihn zu werben, theils gegen ihn zu polemisiren, so ist er doch in den Grundzügen seiner geistigen Individualität nahezu unbekannt geblieben. Denn seitdem die kleine, zerstreute Schaar seiner Leser, die er stets besass, und die ihn wahrhaft zu lesen verstand, zu einer grossen Schaar von Anhängern angewachsen ist, seitdem weite Kreise sich seiner bemächtigt haben, ist ihm das Schicksal widerfahren, welches jedem Aphoristiker droht; einzelne seiner Ideen, aus dem Zusammenhang gelöst und dadurch beliebig deutbar, sind zu Stich- und Schlagworten ganzer Richtungen gemacht worden, erklingen im Kampf von Meinungen, im Streit von Parteien, denen er selbst völlig fern stand. Wohl verdankt er diesem Umstand

seinen raschen Ruhm, den plötzlichen Lärm um seinen stillen Namen,--aber im Besten, durchaus Einzigartigen und Unvergleichlichen, das er zu geben hat, ist er dadurch vielleicht übersehen worden und unbeachtet geblieben,--ja in eine vielleicht noch tiefere Verborgenheit zurückgetreten als vorher. Viele feiern ihn zwar noch laut, mit der ganzen Naivetät gläubiger Kritiklosigkeit, doch gerade sie gemahnen unwillkürlich an sein bitteres Wort: Der Enttäuschte spricht: »Ich horchte auf Widerhall, und ich. hörte nur Lob--« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 99). Kaum Einer von ihnen ist ihm wahrhaft nachgegangen,--fernab von den Andern und ihrem Tagesstreit und allein in der Ergriffenheit seines eigenen Innern; kaum Einer hat diesen einsamen, schwer ergründlichen, heimlichen und auch unheimlichen Geist begleitet, der Ungeheures zu tragen wähnte und an einem ungeheuren Wahn zusammenbrach.

Daher ist es, als stände er da inmitten derer, die ihn am meisten preisen, wie ein Fremdling und Einsiedler, dessen Fuss sich in ihren Kreis nur verirrte, und von dessen verhüllter Gestalt Keiner den Mantel gehoben,--ja, als stände er da mit der Klage seines »Zarathustra« auf den Lippen:

»Sie reden Alle von mir, wenn sie Abends ums Feuer sitzen, aber Niemand--denkt an mich! Dies ist die neue Stille, die ich lernte: ihr Lärm um mich breitet einen Mantel um meine Gedanken.«

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche ist am 15. October 1844 als der einzige Sohn eines Predigers in Röcken bei Lützen geboren, von wo sein Vater später nach Naumburg versetzt wurde. Seine Schulbildung empfing er in der nahegelegenen Schulpforta und ging dann als Student der classischen Philologie an die Universität Bonn, wo damals der berühmte Philologe Ritschl lehrte. Er studirte fast ausschliesslich unter Ritschl, verkehrte auch persönlich viel mit ihm und folgte ihm im Herbst 1865 nach Leipzig. In seine Leipziger Studienzeit fällt Nietzsches erste persönliche Beziehung zu Richard Wagner, den er 1868 im Hause von dessen Schwester, der Frau Prof. Brockhaus, kennen lernte, nachdem er sich schon früher mit seinen Werken vertraut gemacht. Noch vor seiner Promotion berief 1869 die Universität Basel den 24jährigen Nietzsche auf den Lehrstuhl des Philologen Kiessling, der von dort an das Johanneum in Hamburg ging. Nietzsche erhielt erst eine ausserordentliche, kurz darauf eine ordentliche Professur für classische Philologie, und die Universität Leipzig verlieh ihm den Doctorgrad ohne vorhergehende Promotion. Neben seinen Universitätscollegien übernahm er den Unterricht des Griechischen in der dritten (höchsten) Classe des Baseler Pädagogiums,--einer Mittelanstalt zwischen Gymnasium und Universität,--an welcher noch andere Universitätsprofessoren, wie der Culturhistoriker Jacob Burckhardt und der Philologe Mähly, lehrten. Hier gewann er grossen Einfluss auf seine Schüler; sein seltnes Talent, junge Geister an sich zu fesseln und entwickelnd, anregend auf sie zu wirken, kam zu voller Geltung. Burckhardt sagte damals von ihm: einen solchen Lehrer habe Basel noch niemals besessen. Burckhardt gehörte zum engsten Freundeskreise Nietzsches, zu dem noch der Kirchenhistoriker Franz Overbeck und der Kantphilosoph Heinrich Romundt zählten. Mit den beiden Letztem wohnte Nietzsche zusammen in einem Hause, welches nach Veröffentlichung der »Unzeitgemässen Betrachtungen« in der Baseler Gesellschaft den Beinamen: »Die Gifthütte« erhielt. Gegen Schluss seines Baseler Aufenthalts lebte Nietzsche eine Zeit lang mit seiner einzigen, fast gleichaltrigen Schwester Elisabeth zusammen, die später seinen Jugendfreund Bernhard Förster heiratete und mit diesem nach Paraguay ging. 1870 machte Nietzsche den deutschfranzösischen Krieg als freiwilliger Krankenpfleger mit; nicht lange darauf traten die ersten drohenden Anzeichen eines Kopfleidens hervor, das sich in periodisch wiederkehrenden heftigen Schmerzen und Uebelkeiten äusserte. Will man Nietzsches eigenen, mündlichen Aeusserungen Glauben schenken, so war dieses Leiden erblicher Natur, und ist sein Vater demselben erlegen. Neujahr 1876 fühlte er sich bereits so köpf- und augenkrank, dass er sich im Pädagogium vertreten lassen musste, und von da ab verschlimmerte sich sein Zustand derartig, dass er mehrere Male dem Tode nahe war.

»Ein paar Mal den Pforten des Todes entwischt, aber fürchterlich gequält,--so lebe ich von Tag zu Tage; jeder Tag hat seine Krankengeschichte.« Mit diesen Worten schildert Nietzsche in einem Briefe an einen Freund die Leiden, unter welchen er ungefähr 15 Jahre zugebracht hat.

Umsonst verlebte er den Winter 1876-1877 in dem milden Klima von Sorrent, wo er sich in Gesellschaft einiger Freunde befand: von Rom war seine langjährige Freundin Malwida von Meysenbug (Verfasserin der bekannten »Memoiren einer Idealistin« und Anhängerin R. Wagners) zu ihm gekommen; von Westpreussen Dr. Paul Rée, mit dem ihn schon damals Freundschaft und Gleichheit der Bestrebungen-verband. Dem kleinen gemeinschaftlichen Hauswesen hatte sich auch noch ein junger brustkranker Baseler, Namens Brenner, zugesellt, der jedoch bald darauf starb. Als auch der Aufenthalt im Süden ohne günstige Wirkung auf seine Schmerzen blieb, gab Nietzsche 1878 seine Lehrthätigkeit am Pädagogium und 1879 seine Professur an der Universität endgiltig auf. Seitdem führte er nur noch ein Einsiedlerleben, theils in Italien--meistens in Genua--theils im Schweizer Gebirge, namentlich in dem kleinen Engadiner Dorfe Sils-Maria, unweit des Maloja-Passes.

Sein äusserer Lebenslauf erscheint damit abgeschlossen und gleichsam beendet, während sein Denkerleben erst jetzt recht eigentlich beginnt: so dass uns der Denker Nietzsche, mit dem wir uns zu beschäftigen haben, erst am Ausgang dieser Lebensereignisse vollkommen deutlich entgegentritt. Trotzdem werden wir auf alle Schicksalswendungen und Erlebnisse, die hier nur kurz skizzirt worden sind, bei Gelegenheit der verschiedenen Perioden seiner Geistesentwicklung noch ausführlicher zurückkommen müssen. Sein Leben und Schaffen zerfällt in der Hauptsache in drei ineinander übergreifende Perioden, die je ein Jahrzehnt umfassen:

Zehn Jahre, 1869--1879, dauerte Nietzsches Lehrthätigkeit in Basel; diese philologische Wirksamkeit fällt der Zeit nach fast völlig zusammen mit dem Jahrzehnt seiner Jüngerschaft Wagner gegenüber und mit der Veröffentlichung derjenigen Werke, welche von der Metaphysik Schopenhauers beeinflusst sind: sie währte von 1868 bis 1878, in welchem Jahre er zum Zeichen seiner philosophischen Sinnesänderung Wagner sein positivistisches Erstlingswerk: »Menschliches, Allzumenschliches« übersandte.

Seit dem Anfang der Siebzigerjahre bestand seine Verbindung mit Paul Rée, die im Herbst 1882 ihren Abschluss fand,--gleichzeitig mit der Vollendung der »Fröhlichen Wissenschaft«, des letzten derjenigen Werke Nietzsches, die noch auf positivistischer Grundlage ruhen.

Im Herbst 1882 fasste Nietzsche den Entschluss, sich zehn Jahre lang aller schriftstellerischen Thätigkeit zu enthalten. In dieser Zeit tiefsten Schweigens wollte er seine neue, dem Mystischen sich zuwendende Philosophie auf ihre Richtigkeit prüfen und dann 1892 als ihr Verkündiger auftreten. Diesen Vorsatz hat er nicht ausgeführt, sondern gerade in den Achtzigerjahren eine fast ununterbrochene Productivität entfaltet und ist dann noch vor Ablauf des von ihm angesetzten Jahrzehntes verstummt: 1889 setzte ein gewaltsamer Ausbruch seines Kopfleidens plötzlich aller weiteren Geistesarbeit ein Ziel.

Der Zeitraum aber zwischen der Niederlegung seiner Baseler Professur und dem Aufhören aller geistigen Thätigkeit überhaupt umfasst wiederum ein Jahrzehnt, die Zeit von 1879--1889. Seitdem lebt Nietzsche als Kranker, nach einem vorübergehenden Aufenthalt in der Anstalt von Professor Binswanger in Jena, bei seiner Mutter in Naumburg.

Die beiden diesem Buche beigegebenen Bilder zeigen Nietzsche inmitten dieser letzten zehn Leidensjahre. Und gewiss ist dies die Zeit gewesen, in welcher seine Physiognomie, sein ganzes Aeussere, am charakteristischesten ausgeprägt erschien: die Zeit, in welcher der Gesammtausdruck seines Wesens bereits völlig vom tief bewegten Innenleben durchdrungen war, und selbst noch in dem bezeichnend blieb, was er zurückhielt und verbarg. Ich möchte sagen: dieses Verborgene, die Ahnung einer verschwiegenen Einsamkeit,--das war der erste, starke Eindruck, durch den Nietzsches Erscheinung fesselte. Dem flüchtigen Beschauer bot sie nichts Auffallendes; der mittelgrosse Mann in seiner überaus einfachen, aber auch überaus sorgfältigen Kleidung, mit den ruhigen Zügen und dem schlicht zurückgestrichenen braunen Haar konnte leicht übersehen werden. Die feinen, höchst ausdrucksvollen Mundlinien wurden durch einen vornübergekämmten grossen Schnurrbart fast völlig verdeckt; er hatte ein leises Lachen, eine geräuschlose Art zu sprechen und einen vorsichtigen, nachdenklichen Gang, wobei er sich ein wenig in den Schultern beugte; man konnte sich schwer diese Gestalt inmitten einer Menschenmenge vorstellen,--sie trug das Gepräge des Abseitsstehens, des Alleinstehens. Unvergleichlich schön und edel geformt, so dass sie den Blick unwillkürlich auf sich zogen, waren an Nietzsche die Hände, von denen er selbst glaubte, dass sie seinen Geist verriethen,--eine darauf zielende Bemerkung findet sich in »Jenseits von Gut und Böse« (288): »Es giebt Menschen, welche auf eine unvermeidliche Weise Geist haben, sie mögen sich drehen und wenden, wie sie wollen, und die Hände vor die verrätherischen Augen halten --als ob die Hand kein Verräther wäre!--.«[3]

Wahrhaft verrätherisch sprachen auch die Augen. Halbblind, besassen sie dennoch nichts vom Spähenden, Blinzelnden, ungewollt Zudringlichen vieler Kurzsichtigen; vielmehr sahen sie aus wie Hüter und Bewahrer eigener Schätze, stummer Geheimnisse, die kein unberufener Blick streifen sollte. Das mangelhafte Sehen gab seinen Zügen eine ganz besondere Art von Zauber dadurch, dass sie, anstatt wechselnde, äussere Eindrücke wiederzuspiegeln, nur das Wiedergaben, was durch sein Inneres zog. In das Innere blickten diese Augen und zugleich,--weit über die nächsten Gegenstände hinweg,--in die Ferne, oder besser: in das Innere wie in eine Ferne. Denn im Grunde war seine ganze Denkerforschung nichts als ein Durchforschen der Menschenseele nach unentdeckten Welten, nach »ihren noch unausgetrunkenen Möglichkeiten« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 45), die er sich rastlos schuf und umschuf. Wenn er sich einmal gab, wie er war, im Bann eines ihn erregenden Gesprächs zu Zweien, dann konnte in seine Augen ein ergreifendes Leuchten kommen und schwinden;--wenn er aber in finsterer Stimmung war, dann sprach die Einsamkeit düster, beinahe drohend aus ihnen, wie aus unheimlichen Tiefen,--aus jenen Tiefen, in denen er immer allein blieb, die er mit Niemandem theilen konnte, vor denen ihn selbst bisweilen Grauen erfasste,--und in die sein Geist zuletzt versank.

Einen ähnlichen Eindruck des Verborgenen und Verschwiegenen machte auch Nietzsches Benehmen. Im gewöhnlichen Leben war er von grosser Höflichkeit und einer fast weiblichen Milde, von einem stetigen, wohlwollenden Gleichmuth,--er hatte Freude an den vornehmen Formen im Umgang und hielt viel auf sie. Immer aber lag darin eine Freude an der _Verkleidung_,--Mantel und Maske für ein fast nie entblösstes Innenleben. Ich erinnere mich, dass, als ich Nietzsche zum ersten Male sprach,--es war an einem Frühlingstage in der Peterskirche zu Rom,--während der ersten Minuten das gesucht Formvolle an ihm mich frappirte und täuschte. Aber nicht lange täuschte es an diesem Einsamen, der seine Maske doch nur so ungewandt trug, wie Jemand, der aus Wüste und Gebirge kommt, den Rock der Allerweltsleute trägt; sehr bald tauchte die Frage auf, die er selbst in die Worte zusammengefasst hat: »Bei Allem, was ein Mensch _sichtbar werden_ lässt, kann man fragen: was soll es _verbergen_? Wovon soll es den Blick ablenken? Welches Vorurtheil soll es erregen? Und dann noch: bis wie weit geht die Feinheit dieser Verstellung? Und worin vergreift er sich dabei?«

Dieser Zug stellt nur die Kehrseite der Einsamkeit dar, aus welcher Nietzsches Innenleben ganz herausbegriffen werden muss,--einer sich stetig steigernden Selbstvereinsamung und Selbstbeziehung auf sich.

In dem Maasse, als sie zunimmt, wird alles nach Aussen gewandte Sein zum Schein,--zum blossen täuschenden Schleier, den die Einsamkeitstiefe nur um sich webt, um zeitweilig für Menschenaugen erkennbare Oberfläche zu werden. »Tiefdenkende Menschen kommen sich im Verkehr mit Andern als Komödianten vor, weil sie sich da, um verstanden zu werden, immer erst eine Oberfläche anheucheln müssen.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches II 232). Ja, man kann selbst Nietzsches Gedanken, sofern sie sich theoretisch aussprechen, noch mit zu dieser Oberfläche rechnen, hinter der, abgründig tief und stumm, das innere Erleben ruht, dem sie entstiegen sind. Sie gleichen einer »Haut, welche Etwas verräth, aber noch mehr verbirgt« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 32); »denn«, sagt er »entweder verstecke man seine Meinungen, oder man verstecke sich hinter seine Meinungen« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches II 338). Er findet eine schöne Bezeichnung für sich selbst, wenn er in diesem Sinne von den »Verborgenen unter den Mänteln des Lichts« redet (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 44),--von denen, die sich in ihre Gedankenklarheit verhüllen.

In jeder Periode seiner Geistesentwicklung finden wir daher Nietzsche in irgend einer Art und Form der Maskirung, und immer ist sie es, welche die jeweilige Entwicklungsstufe recht eigentlich charakterisirt. »Alles, was tief ist, liebt die Maske.... Jeder tiefe Geist braucht eine Maske: mehr noch, um jeden tiefen Geist wächst fortwährend eine Maske« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 40).

»Wanderer, wer bist Du?-- -- --Ruhe Dich hier aus.-- -- --erhole Dich!-- -- --Was dient Dir zur Erholung?-- -- --« »Zur Erholung? Zur Erholung? Oh du Neugieriger, was sprichst du da! Aber gieb mir, ich bitte-- --« »Was? Was? sprich es aus!--»Eine Maske mehr! Eine zweite Maske!...« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 278).

Und zwar wird es sich uns aufdrängen, dass in dem Grade, als seine Selbstvereinsamung und grüblerische Selbstbeziehung auf sich ausschliesslicher wird, auch die Bedeutung der jedesmaligen Verkleidung eine tiefere wird, und das wirkliche Wesen hinter seiner Aeusserungsform, das wirkliche Sein hinter dem vorgehaltenen Schein immer weniger sichtbar zurückweicht. Schon in »Der Wanderer und sein Schatten« (175) weist er auf die »Mediocrität als Maske« hin. »Die Mediocrität ist die glücklichste Maske, die der überlegene Geist tragen kann, weil sie die grosse Menge, das heisst die Mediocren, nicht an Maskirung denken lässt--: und doch nimmt er sie gerade ihretwegen vor,--um sie nicht zu reizen, ja nicht selten aus Mitleid und Güte.« Von dieser Maske des Harmlosen an wechselt er sie bis zu der des Grauenhaften, die noch Grauenhafteres hinter sich verbirgt: »--bisweilen ist die Narrheit selbst die Maske für ein unseliges allzu gewisses Wissen.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 270),--und endlich bis zu einem täuschenden Lichtbild des göttlich Lachenden, das den Schmerz in Schönheit zu verklären strebt. So ist Nietzsche innerhalb seiner letzten philosophischen Mystik allmälig in jene letzte Einsamkeit versunken, in deren Stille wir ihm nicht mehr folgen können, die uns nur noch, wie Symbole und Wahrzeichen, seine lachenden Gedankenmasken und deren Deutung übrig lässt, während er für uns bereits zu dem geworden ist, als den er sich einmal in einem Briefe unterschreibt: »Der auf ewig Abhandengekommene.« (Brief vom 8. Juli 1881 aus Sils-Maria.)

Dieses innere Alleinsein, diese Einsamkeit ist in allen Wandlungen Nietzsches der unveränderliche Rahmen, aus welchem sein Bild uns anschaut. Mag er sich verkleidet haben, wie er will,--immer trägt er »die Einöde und den heiligen unbetretbaren Grenzbezirk mit sich, wohin er auch gehe«. (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 387.) Und es drückt daher auch nur das Bedürfniss aus, dass das äussere Dasein seiner einsamen Innerlichkeit entsprechen möge, wenn er einem Freunde schreibt: (Am 31 October 1880 aus Italien.)

»Als Recept, sowie als natürliche Passion erscheint mir immer deutlicher die Einsamkeit und zwar die vollkommene,--und den Zustand, in dem wir unser Bestes schaffen können, muss man hersteilen und viele Opfer dafür bringen können.«

Den zwingenden Anlass aber, sein inneres Alleinsein so vollkommen wie möglich zu einem äusseren zu machen, bot ihm erst sein _körperliches Leiden_, welches ihn von den Menschen forttrieb und selbst den Verkehr mit einzelnen seiner Freunde,--immer einen seltenen Verkehr zu Zweien,--nur mit grossen Unterbrechungen möglich machte.

Leiden und Einsamkeit,--das sind also die beiden grossen Schicksalszüge in Nietzsches Entwicklungsgeschichte, immer stärker ausgeprägt, je näher man dem Ende kommt. Und sie tragen bis an das Ende jenes wundersame Doppelgesicht, welches sie als ein äusserlich _gegebenes Lebenslos_, und zugleich als eine rein psychisch bedingte, eine _gewollte innere_ Nothwendigkeit erscheinen lassen. Auch sein physisches Leiden, nicht minder als seine Verborgenheit und Einsamkeit, reflectirte und symbolisirte etwas Tiefinnerliches--und dies so unmittelbar, dass er es auch in seine äussere Schickung aufnahm wie einen ihm zugedachten ernsten Freund und Wegegenossen. So schreibt er einmal bei Gelegenheit einer Beileidsäusserung (Ende August 1881 aus Sils-Maria): »Es jammert mich immer zu hören, dass Sie leiden, dass Ihnen irgend etwas fehlt, dass Sie Jemanden verloren haben: während bei mir Leiden und Entbehrung _zur Sache_ gehören und nicht, wie bei Ihnen, zum Unnöthigen und zur Unvernunft des Daseins.«

Hierauf beziehen sich die einzelnen, in seinen Werken zerstreuten Aphorismen über den _Werth des Leidens für die Erkenntniss_.

Er schildert den Einfluss der Stimmungen des Kranken und des Genesenden auf das Denken, er begleitet die feinsten Uebergänge solcher Stimmungen bis ins Geistigste hinauf. Eine periodisch wiederkehrende Erkrankung, wie die seinige es war, scheidet beständig eine Lebensperiode, und damit auch eine Gedankenperiode von der vorhergehenden. Sie gibt durch dieses Doppeldasein die Erfahrungen und das Bewusstsein zweier Wesenheiten. Sie lässt alle Dinge immer wieder auch dem Geiste neu werden,--»_neu schmecken_« nennt er es einmal höchst treffend,--und setzt ganz neue Augen auch noch für das Gewohnteste, Alltäglichste ein. Ein Jegliches erhält etwas von der Frische und dem lichten Thau der Morgenschönheit, weil _eine Nacht_ es vom vorhergehenden Tage getrennt hat. So wird jede Genesung ihm zu einer Palingenesis seiner selbst und darin zugleich des Lebens um ihn,--und immer wieder ist der Schmerz »verschlungen in den Sieg«.

Deutet Nietzsche es schon selbst an, dass die Natur seines physischen Leidens sich gewissermassen in seinen Gedanken und Werken widerspiegle, so springt der enge Zusammenhang von Denken und Leiden noch auffälliger hervor, wenn man sein Schaffen und dessen Entwicklung als Ganzes betrachtet. Man steht nicht jenen allmäligen Veränderungen des Geisteslebens gegenüber, wie sie ein Jeder durchmacht, der seiner natürlichen Grösse entgegenwächst,-- nicht den Wandlungen des _Wachsthums_: sondern einem jähen Wandel und Wechsel, einem fast rhythmischen Auf und Nieder von Geisteszuständen, die letzten Grundes nichts Anderem zu entspringen scheinen, als einem _Erkranken an Gedanken und einem Genesen an Gedanken_.

Nur aus der innersten Bedürftigkeit seiner ganzen Natur, nur aus dem quälendsten Heilungsverlangen heraus erschliessen sich ihm neue Erkenntnisse. Kaum aber ist er völlig in ihnen aufgegangen, kaum hat er an ihnen ausgeruht und sie seiner eignen Kraft assimilirt,--da ergreift es ihn auch schon wieder wie ein neues Fieber, etwas wie ein unruhig drängender Ueberschuss an innerer Energie, der zuletzt seinen Stachel gegen ihn selbst kehrt und ihn an sich selber erkranken lässt. »Das Zuviel von Kraft erst ist der Beweis der Kraft», sagt Nietzsche im Vorwort zur Götzen-Dämmerung (s. I);--in diesem Zuviel thut seine Kraft sich Schmerzen an, tobt sie sich aus in leidvollen Kämpfen, reizt sich auf zu den Qualen und Erschütterungen, an denen sein Geist fruchtbar werden will.[4] Mit der stolzen Behauptung: »Was mich nicht umbringt, macht mich stärker!« (Götzen-Dämmerung, Sprüche und Pfeile 8) geisselt er sich,--nicht bis zum Umbringen, nicht bis zum Tode, aber eben bis zu jenen Fiebern und Verwundungen, deren er bedarf. Dieses Schmerzheischende zieht sich durch die ganze Entwicklungsgeschichte Nietzsches als die eigentliche Geistesquelle in ihr; er spricht es am treffendsten in den Worten aus: »Geist ist das Leben, das selber ins Leben schneidet: an der eignen Qual mehrt es sich das eigne Wissen,--wusstet ihr das schon? Und des Geistes Glück ist dies: gesalbt zu sein und durch Thränen geweiht zum Opferthier,-- wusstet ihr das schon?------Ihr kennt nur des Geistes Funken: aber ihr seht den Amboss nicht, der er' ist, und nicht die Grausamkeit seines Hammers!« (Also sprach Zarathustra II 33.) »Jene Spannung der Seele im Unglück,---- --ihre Schauer im Anblick des grossen Zügrundegehens, ihre Erfindsamkeit und Tapferkeit im Tragen, Ausharren, Ausdeuten, Ausnützen des Unglücks, und was ihr nur je von Tiefe, Geheimniss, Maske, Geist, List, Grösse geschenkt worden ist:--ist es nicht ihr unter Leiden, unter der Zucht des grossen Leidens geschenkt worden?« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 225.)

Und immer wieder tritt Zweierlei an diesem Vorgang besonders auffällig hervor: Einmal der enge Zusammenhang von Gedankenleben und Seelenleben in seinem Wesen, die Abhängigkeit seines Geistes von den Bedürfnissen und Erregungen seines Innern. Dann aber die Eigenthümlichkeit, dass aus dieser so engen Zusammengehörigkeit sich immer von Neuem Leiden ergeben müssen; jedesmal bedarf es einer höhen Gluth der Seele, wo es zu höchster Klarheit, zu hellem Licht der Erkenntniss kommen soll,--aber nie darf diese Gluth in wohlthuender Wärme ausströmen, sondern muss verwunden mit sengenden Feuern und brennenden Flammen: auch hier gehört,--wie er es in dem oben angeführten Briefe ausdrückt,--»das Leiden zur Sache«.

Wie Nietzsches körperliches Leiden der Anlass zu seiner äusseren Vereinsamung wurde, so muss auch in seinem psychischen Leidenszustand einer der tiefsten Gründe gesucht werden für seinen scharf zugespitzten Individualismus, für die strenge Betonung des »Einzelnen« als des »Einsamen« in Nietzsches besonderem Sinn. Die Geschichte des »Einzelnen« ist durchaus eine _Leidensgeschichte_ und nicht irgend welchem allgemeinen Individualismus zu vergleichen,--ihr Inhalt lautet viel weniger: »Selbstgenügsamkeit« als: »_Selbsterduldung«_.Betrachtet man das leidensvolle Auf und Nieder seiner Geisteswandlungen, dann liest man die Geschichte eben so vieler Selbstverwundungen, und es verbirgt einen langen, schmerzlichen Heldenkampf mit sich selbst, wenn Nietzsche über seine Philosophie die kühnen Worte setzt: »Dieser Denker braucht Niemanden, der ihn widerlegt: er genügt sich dazu selber!« (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 249.)

Seine ausserordentliche Fähigkeit, sich immer wieder in die härteste Selbstüberwindung einzuleben, in jeder neuen Erkenntniss immer wieder heimisch zu werden, scheint nur da zu sein, um die Trennung vom Neuerrungenen jedesmal um so erschütternder zu gestalten. »Ich komme! brich Deine Hütte ab und wandre mir entgegen!« gebietet ihm der Geist, und mit trotziger Hand macht er sich selbst obdachlos und sucht von Neuem das Dunkel, das Abenteuer und die Wüste auf mit der Klage auf den Lippen: »Ich muss den Fuss weiter heben, diesen müden, verwundeten Fuss: und weil ich muss, so habe ich oft für das Schönste, das mich nicht halten konnte, einen grimmigen Rückblick,--weil es mich nicht halten konnte!« (Fröhliche Wissenschaft 309.) Sobald ihm in einer Anschauungsweise wahrhaft wohl geworden ist, erfüllt sich an ihm selbst sein Wort: »Wer sein Ideal erreicht, kommt eben damit über dasselbe hinaus.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 73.)[5]

Der _Meinungswechsel_, der _Wandlungsdrang_ stecken daher der Philosophie Nietzsches tief im Herzen, sie sind durchaus bestimmend für die Art seines Erkennens. Nicht umsonst nennt er sich im Schlusslied von »Jenseits von Gut und Böse« einen: »Ringer, der zu oft sich selbst bezwungen,--Zu oft sich gegen eigne Kraft gestemmt,-- --Durch eignen Sieg verwundet und gehemmt.«

Im Heroismus der Bereitwilligkeit, die eigne Ueberzeugung preiszugeben, nimmt dieser Drang in seinem Innern geradezu die Stelle der _Ueberzeugungstreue_[6] ein. »Wir würden uns für unsere Meinungen nicht verbrennen lassen:« heisst es in Der Wanderer und sein Schatten (333), »wir sind ihrer nicht so sicher. Aber vielleicht dafür, dass wir unsere Meinungen haben dürfen und ändern dürfen.« Und in der Morgenröthe (370) spricht sich diese Gesinnung in den schönen Worten aus: »Nie etwas zurückhalten oder Dir verschweigen, was _gegen Deinen Gedanken_ gedacht werden kann. Gelobe es Dir! Es gehört zur ersten Redlichkeit des Denkens. Du musst jeden Tag auch Deinen Feldzug gegen Dich selber führen. Ein Sieg und eine eroberte Schanze sind nicht mehr Deine Angelegenheit, sondern die der Wahrheit,--aber auch Deine Niederlage ist nicht mehr Deine Angelegenheit!« Darüber steht als Titel: »Inwiefern der Denker seinen Feind liebt.« Aber diese Feindesliebe entspringt der dunklen Ahnung, dass im Feind ein künftiger Genosse verborgen sein könne, und dass nur des Unterliegenden neue Siege harren: sie entspringt der Ahnung, dass für ihn der stets gleiche, schmerzliche Seelenprocess der Selbstverwandlung unumgängliche Bedingung aller Schaffenskraft sei. »Der Geist ist es, der uns rettet, dass wir nicht ganz verglühen und verkohlen.-- --Vom Feuer erlöst, schreiten wir dann, durch den Geist getrieben, von Meinung zu Meinung,-- --als _edle Verräther_ aller Dinge.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches, I 637.) »--wir _müssen_ Verräther werden, Untreue üben, unsere Ideale immer wieder preisgeben. (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches, I 629.) Dieser Einsame musste gleichsam sich selber vervielfältigen, in eine Mehrheit von Denkern zerfallen, in dem Masse, als er sich in sich selber abschloss;--nur so vermochte er geistig zu leben. Der Selbstverwundungstrieb war nur eine Art seines Selbsterhaltungstriebes: nur indem er sich immer wieder in Leiden stürzte, entlief er seinen Leiden. »Unverwundbar bin ich allein an meiner Ferse!-- -- -- -- --Und nur wo Gräber sind, gibt es Auferstehungen!-- -- --Also sang Zarathustra;« (II 46)--Er, zu dem das Leben einst »dies Geheimniss redete«: »Siehe, sprach es, ich bin das, was sich immer selber überwinden muss« (II 49).[7]

Ueber nichts hat wohl Nietzsche so oft und so tief nachgedacht, wie über dieses sein eignes Wesensräthsel, und über nichts können wir uns daher aus seinen Werken so gut unterrichten wie gerade hierüber: im Grunde waren ihm alle seine Erkenntnissräthsel nichts anderes. Je tiefer er sich selbst erkannte, desto rückhaltsloser wurde seine ganze Philosophie zu einer ungeheuren Widerspiegelung seines Selbstbildes,--und desto naiver legte er es dem Allbilde als solchem unter. Wie unter den Philosophen abstracte Systematiker ihre eignen Begriffe zu einer Weltgesetzlichkeit verallgemeinert haben, so verallgemeinert

Nietzsche seine Seele zur Weltseele. Aber um sein Bild zu zeichnen, bedarf es nicht erst der Zurückführung seiner sämmtlichen Theorien auf ihn selbst, wie es in den folgenden Theilen geschieht. Ein gewisses Verständniss dafür ist auch schon hier möglich, wo Nietzsche lediglich in Bezug auf seine geistige Veranlagung betrachtet wird, Der Reichthum derselben ist zu mannigfaltig, als dass er in einer bestimmten Ordnung erhalten werden könnte; die Lebendigkeit und der Machtwillen jedes einzelnen Talentes und Geistestriebes führen nothwendig zu einer nie beschwichtigten Nebenbuhlerschaft aller Talente. In Nietzsche lebten in stetem Unfrieden, nebeneinander und sich gegenseitig tyrannisirend, ein Musiker von hoher Begabung, ein Denker von freigeisterischer Richtung, ein religiöses Genie und ein geborener Dichter. Nietzsche selbst versuchte, daraus die Besonderheit seiner geistigen Individualität zu erklären, und erging sich häufig in eingehenden Gesprächen darüber.

Er unterschied zwei grosse Hauptgruppen von Charakteren: solche, deren verschiedene Regungen und Triebe in Harmonie zueinander stehen, eine gesunde Einheit bilden, und solche, deren Triebe und Regungen sich gegenseitig hemmen und befehden. Die erste Gruppe verglich er,--innerhalb des einzelnen Individuums,--mit dem Zustande der Menschheit zur Zeit des Heerdenwesens, vor aller staatlichen Gliederung: wie dort der Einzelne seine Individualität und sein Machtgefühl nur besitzt im geschlossenen Ganzen der Heerde, so hier die einzelnen Triebe im Ganzen der geschlossenen Persönlichkeit, deren Inbegriff sie bilden. Die Naturen der zweiten Gruppe dagegen leben in ihrem Innern, wie die Menschen bei einem Kriege Aller gegen Alle leben würden;--die Persönlichkeit selbst löst sich gewissermassen in eine Unsumme von eigenmächtigen Triebpersönlichkeiten auf, in eine Subject-Vielheit. Dieser Zustand wird nur überwunden, wenn von aussen her eine höhere Macht, eine stärkere Autorität geschaffen werden kann, die über Alle zu herrschen weiss: gleich einem Gesetz staatlicher Gliederung, für das es nur unterworfene Gewalten gibt. Denn was in den zuerst geschilderten Naturen ganz instinctmässig vor sich geht--die Einordnung des Einzelnen ins Ganze,--das muss hier erst erobert und den tyrannischen Einzelgelüsten abgezwungen werden als eine unerbittlich feste Rangordnung der Triebe untereinander.[8] Man sieht, hier ist der Punkt, an welchem Nietzsche die Möglichkeit einer Selbstbehauptung als_ Ganzes durch das Leiden alles Einzelnen_ aufgegangen ist. Hier liegt wie in einer Knospe eingeschlossen die ursprüngliche Bedeutung seiner späteren Decadenz-Lehre mit dem Grundgedanken: es giebt die Möglichkeit eines höchsten Vermögens und Schaffens durch ein beständiges Erdulden und Verwunden. Mit einem Wort: hier ging ihm die Bedeutung des _Heroismus als Ideal_ auf. Die eigene qualvolle Unvollkommenheit riss ihn dem Ideal und dessen Tyrannei entgegen: »Unsere Mängel sind die Augen, mit denen wir das Ideal sehen.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches, II 86).

»Was macht heroisch? zugleich seinem höchsten Leide und seiner höchsten Hoffnung entgegengehen« sagt er (Fröhliche Wissenschaft 268). Und ich füge dem noch drei Aphorismen bei, die er mir einmal niederschrieb, und die mir seine Auffassung mit besonderer Schärfe zu verdeutlichen scheinen:

»Der Gegensatz des heroischen Ideals ist das Ideal der harmonischen Allentwicklung,--ein schöner Gegensatz und ein sehr wünschenswerther! Aber nur ein Ideal für grundgute Menschen. (Zum Beispiel: Goethe).[9]

Weiter: »Heroismus--das ist die Gesinnung eines Menschen, der ein Ziel erstrebt, gegen welches gerechnet er gar nicht mehr in Betracht kommt. Heroismus ist der gute Wille zum absoluten Selbst-Untergang.«

Und als drittes: »Menschen, die nach Grösse streben, sind gewöhnlich böse Menschen; es ist ihre _einzige Art, sich zu ertragen_.« Das Wort »böse« will hier ebenso wie oben das Wort »gut« weder im Sinn des landläufigen Urtheils noch überhaupt im Sinne eines Urtheils genommen werden, sondern blos als Bezeichnung eines Thatbestandes: und als eine solche bezeichnet es für Nietzsche stets den »innern Krieg« in einer Menschenseele,--dasselbe, was er später »Anarchie in den Instincten« nennt. In seiner letzten Schaffensperiode hat sich ihm, auf dem Wege einer bestimmten Gedankenentwicklung, das Bild dieses Seelenzustandes bis zum Culturbilde der Menschheit ausgedehnt; die Losungsworte heissen da: Innenkrieg = Décadence, und Sieg = Selbstuntergang der Menschheit zur Erschaffung einer Uebermenschheit. Ursprünglich aber handelt es sich für ihn um sein eigenes Seelenbild.

Er unterscheidet nämlich die harmonische oder einheitliche und die heroische oder vielspältige Naturanlage als die beiden Typen des _handelnden_ und des _erkennenden_ Menschen, mit anderen Worten: den Typus seines Wesens-Gegensatzes und seinen eigenen.

Zum handelnden Menschen wird ihm der Ungetheilte und Unzersetzte, der Instinct-Mensch, die Herrennatur. Wenn dieser seiner natürlichen Entwicklung folgt, muss sein Wesen sich immer selbstsicherer und fester zuspitzen und seine gedrängte Kraft in gesunden Thaten sich entladen. Die Hemmnisse, welche die Aussenwelt ihm möglicherweise entgegenstellt, enthalten zugleich eine Anregung und Förderung dafür: denn nichts ist ihm naturgemässer, als der tapfere Kampf nach aussen hin, in nichts erweist sich seine ungebrochene Gesundheit so sehr als in seiner Kriegstüchtigkeit. Mag sein Intellect klein oder gross sein: in jedem Fall

steht er im Dienst dieser frischen Wesenskraft und dessen, was ihr wohl thut und noth thut,-- er hat sich ihr in seinen Zielen nicht entgegengesetzt, er hat sie nicht zersetzt, er folgt nicht eignen Wegen.

Ganz anders der erkennende Mensch. Anstatt nach einem festen Zusammenschluss seiner Triebe zu suchen, der sie schützt und erhält, lässt er sie so weit als irgend möglich auseinanderlaufen; je breiter das Gebiet, das sie zu umfassen lernen, desto besser, je mehr der Dinge, bis zu denen sie ihre Fühlhörner ausstrecken, und die sie betasten, sehen, hören, riechen, desto tüchtiger sind sie ihm für seine Zwecke,--für die Zwecke des Erkennens. Denn ihm ist nunmehr »das Leben ein Mittel der Erkenntniss« (Fröhliche Wissenschaft 324) und erruft seinen Genossen zu (Fröhliche Wissenschaft 319): »Wir selber wollen unsere Experimente und Versuchstiere sein!« So gibt er sich selbst freiwillig als Einheit auf,--je polyphoner sein Subject, desto lieber ist es ihm:

»Scharf und milde, grob und fein, Vertraut und seltsam, schmutzig und rein, Der Narren und Weisen Stelldichein: Dies Alles bin ich, will ich sein, Taube zugleich, Schlange und Schwein!«

(Fröhliche Wissenschaft, Scherz, List und Rache 11.)

Denn wir Erkennenden, sagt er, müssen dankbar sein »gegen Gott, Teufel, Schaf und Wurm in uns,-- -- -- --mit Vorder- und Hinterseelen, denen Keiner leicht in die letzten Absichten sieht, mit Vorder- und Hintergründen, welche kein Fuss zu Ende laufen dürfte, wir die geborenen, geschworenen, eifersüchtigen Freunde der _Einsamkeit_-- --«. (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 44.) Der Erkennende hat die Seele, welche »die längste Leiter hat und am tiefsten hinunter kann,-- -- --die _umfänglichste_ Seele, welche am weitesten in sich laufen und irren und schweifen kann;-- -- --die sich selber fliehende, die sich selber im weitesten Kreise einholt; die weiseste Seele, welcher die Narrheit am süssesten zuredet: -- -- --die sich selber bebendste, in der alle Dinge ihr Strömen und Wiederströmen und Ebbe und Fluth haben-- -- --.« (Also sprach Zarathustra III 82.)

Mit solcher Seele wird man zum »Tausendfuss und Tausend-Fühlhorn« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 205), immer im Begriff, sich selbst zu entlaufen, um sich bis in fremdes Wesen hinein zu erstrecken: »Wenn man erst sich selber gefunden hat, muss man verstehen, sich von Zeit zu Zeit zu _verlieren_--und dann wieder zu finden: vorausgesetzt, dass man ein Denker ist. Diesem ist es nämlich nachtheilig, immer an Eine Person gebunden zu sein.« (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 306.) Das Gleiche besagen die Verse (Fröhliche Wissenschaft, Scherz, List und Rache 33):

»Verhasst ist mir's schon, selber mich zu führen! Ich liebe es, gleich Wald- und Meeresthieren, Mich für ein gutes Weilchen zu verlieren, In holder Irrniss grüblerisch zu hocken. Von ferne her mich endlich heimzulocken, Mich selber zu mir selber--zu verführen.«

Das Versehen ist überschrieben »Der Einsame«, d. h. der von den Anforderungen und Kämpfen der Aussenwelt möglichst Abgeschiedene; denn kriegstüchtig nach aussen hin wird ein solches Innenleben in dem Masse immer weniger, je vollkommener es benommen und bewegt ist von den Kriegen, Siegen, Niederlagen und Eroberungen innerhalb seiner eignen Triebe. In der Einsamkeit seiner geistigen Selbstversenkung und Selbsterweiterung sucht es vielmehr eine Hülle, die es schonend behüte vor den lauten und verwundenden Lebensereignissen draussen,--steht es doch schon ohnedies in Kampf und Wunden; gilt doch von diesem Erkennenden die Schilderung:--das ist ein Mensch, der beständig ausserordentliche Dinge erlebt, sieht, hört, argwöhnt, hofft, träumt; der von _seinen eigenen Gedanken wie von Aussen her_,-- --als von _seiner Art Ereignissen und Blitzschlägen_ getroffen wird.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 292.)

Denn die kriegerische Stellung der Triebe zu einander in seinem Innern ist damit nicht aufgehoben, sondern eher gesteigert: »Wer aber die Grundtriebe des Menschen darauf hin ansieht, wie weit sie gerade hier als inspirirende Genien (oder Dämonen und Kobolde--) ihr Spiel getrieben haben mögen, wird finden,-- -- -- -- --dass jeder Einzelne von ihnen gerade sich gar zu gerne als letzten Zweck des Daseins und als berechtigten _Herrn_ aller übrigen Triebe darstellen möchte. Denn jeder Trieb ist herrschsüchtig und _als solcher_ versucht er zu philosophiren« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 6).

Daher grade legt die Erkenntniss des Erkennenden ein »entscheidendes Zeugniss dafür ab, _wer er ist_,--das heisst, in welcher Rangordnung die innersten Triebe seiner Natur zu einander gestellt sind« (ebendaselbst).

Trotzdem aber wird durch das Erkennen in diesem Innen-Krieg eine Verwandlung vollzogen, die demselben eine neue Bedeutung gibt,--eine rettende und erlösende Bedeutung: in der Erkenntniss ist ein allen Trieben gemeinsames Ziel gegeben, eine Richtung, der ein jeder von ihnen insofern zustrebt, als sie alle das Nämliche erobern wollen. Die Zersplitterung des Beliebens, die Tyrannei der Willkür ist damit gebrochen. Die Triebe halten an ihrer »Subjects-Vielheit« fest, aber sie unterstellen dieselbe einer höheren

Macht, die ihnen als Dienern und Werkzeugen befiehlt; sie bleiben wild und kriegerisch, aber sie werden in ihrem Kriegs-Ziel unvermerkt zu Helden, die zu kämpfen und zu bluten berufen sind;--das heroische Ideal ist inmitten ihrer Selbstsucht aufgerichtet und zeigt den für sie einzig möglichen Weg zur Grösse. So ist die Gefahr der Anarchie beseitigt zu Gunsten eines sichern »Gesellschaftsbaues der Triebe und Affecte«.

Ich erinnere mich eines mündlichen Ausspruches von Nietzsche, der sehr bezeichnend diese Freude des Erkennenden an der umfassenden Breite und Tiefe seiner Natur ausdrückt,--die Lust, die daraus entspringt, dass er sein Leben nunmehr als ein »Experiment des Erkennenden« (Fröhliche Wissenschaft 324) auffassen darf: »Einer alten, wetterfesten Burg gleiche ich, die viele versteckte Keller und Unterkeller hat; in meine eignen verborgensten Dunkelgänge bin ich noch nicht ganz hinabgekrochen, in meine unterirdischen Kammern bin ich noch nicht gekommen. Sollte mit ihnen nicht alles unterbaut sein? sollte ich nicht aus meiner Tiefe zu allen Oberflächen der Erde hinaufklettern können? sollten wir nicht auf jedem Dunkelgang zu uns selber wiederkehren?«

Dasselbe Gefühl gibt auch in der »Fröhlichen Wissenschaft« (249) der Aphorismus wieder, der die Ueberschrift trägt: »Der Seufzer des Erkennenden«: »Oh über meine Habsucht! In dieser Seele wohnt keine Selbstlosigkeit,-- vielmehr ein Alles begehrendes Selbst, welches durch viele Individuen wie durch _seine_ Augen sehen und wie mit _seinen_ Händen greifen möchte,--ein auch die ganze Vergangenheit noch zurückholendes Selbst, welches nichts verlieren will, was ihm überhaupt gehören könnte! Oh über diese Flamme-meiner Habsucht! Oh dass ich in hundert Wesen wiedergeboren würde!«

Auf diese Weise wird das Umfassende und Verschlungene der unharmonischen, der »stillosen« Natur zu einem gewaltigen Vorzug: »Wollten und wagten wir eine Architektur nach _unserer_ Seelen-Art,-- -- -- -- so müsste das Labyrinth unser Vorbild sein!« (Morgenröthe 169.)--aber kein Labyrinth, in welchem die Seele sich selbst verliert, sondern aus dessen Wirrnis sie zur Erkenntniss hindurchdringt. »Man muss noch Chaos in sich haben, um einen tanzenden Stern gebären zu können«,-- dieses Wort Zarathustras (I 15) gilt von ihr, die zum Sternendasein, zum Licht geboren ist als zu ihrem eigensten Wesensgenius, ihrer eigensten Verklärung. Nietzsche hat dies unter dem Namen: »Eine lichte Art von Schatten« geschildert (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 258): »Dicht neben den ganz nächtigen Menschen befindet sich fast regelmässig, wie an sie angebunden, eine Lichtseele. Sie ist gleichsam der negative Schatten, den jene werfen.«

Diese Lichtseele ist um so strahlender, je mächtiger und nächtiger, also je tyrannischer und gefährlicher die Natur ist, welche sich gleichsam in ihr verbrennen lässt,--alle ihre Neigungen als Brennstoff in diese heilige Gluth wirft. Die Art, in welcher dies geschieht, wechselt mit dem Erkenntnissstandpunkt des Erkennenden: Nietzsches Auffassung dessen, was »Erkenntnisse ist, ist in seinen verschiedenen Geistesperioden eine verschiedene, und dementsprechend verschiebt sich auch jedesmal das, was er die »innere Rangordnung der Triebe« nennt, innerhalb des wogenden Kampfes in dieser reichen Genie-Natur. Man kann sagen, dass aus den wechselnden Bildern solcher Verschiebungen sich die Geschichte seiner Entwicklung im Wesentlichen zusammensetzt, bis in seiner letzten Schaffensperiode sein ganzes Innenleben sich in philosophischen Theorien widerspiegelt: bis ihm Dunkelseele und Lichtseele zu Repräsentanten des Menschlichen und Uebermenschlichen werden.

Der geschilderte Seelenprocess selbst aber bleibt durch alle Wandlungen hindurch in seinen Grundzügen der nämliche. »Hat man Charakter, so hat man auch sein typisches Erlebniss, das immer wiederkommt,« sagt Nietzsche (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 70). Nun, dieses ist sein typisches Erlebniss, das immer wiederkommt, an dem er sich immer wieder aufrichtete, über sich selbst erhob,--an dem er auch endlich sich in sich selbst überschlug und zu Grunde ging.

Und daran _musste_ er wohl zu Grunde gehen. Denn in dem gleichen Process, der ihm stets von neuem Heilung und Erhebung sicherte, lag auch schon das pathologische Moment dieser Art von Geistesentwicklung verborgen. Auf den ersten Blick fällt es nicht auf. Man sollte vielmehr meinen, in einer Kraft, die sich selber so zu heilen weiss, müsse mindestens ebensoviel Gesundheit stecken wie in dem ruhigen Frieden einer harmonischen Kräfteentfaltung. Ja, sogar eine weit grössere Gesundheit: denn sie ist im Stande, selbst an dem, was Wunden schlägt und Fieber erzeugt, sich noch zu befestigen und zu beweisen; sie ist im Stande, Krankheit und Kampf zu einem _Stimulans_ für Leben und Erkennen umzuwandeln, zu einem Sporn und Hellsehen für ihre Zwecke,--sie _umfasst_ also schadlos Kampf und Krankheit. Auf solche Weise wollte Nietzsche, namentlich zuletzt, namentlich als er am krankhaftesten war, seine Leidensgeschichte aufgefasst wissen: alseine _Genesungs_geschichte. Allerdings vermochte diese gewaltige Natur es, sich mitten aus Schmerzen und Widerstreit heraus in ihrem Erkenntnissideal selbst zu heilen und zusammenzufassen. Aber, nach erlangter Genesung, _bedurfte_ sie wiederum ebenso nothwendig der Leiden und Kämpfe, der Fieber und Wunden. Sie, die sich selbst Heilung geschafft, ruft jene wieder, hervor; sie wendet sich gegen sich selbst, schäumt gleichsam über, um sich in neue Krankheitszustände zu ergiessen. Ueber jedem erreichten Erkenntnissziel, jedem erlangten

Genesungsglück stehen immer wieder die Worte: »Wer sein Ideal erreicht, kommt eben damit über dasselbe hinaus«, denn: »sein Ueberglück ward ihm zum Ungemach« (Fröhliche Wissenschaft, Scherz, List und Rache 47), und er fühlt sich: »verwundet von seinem Glücke«[10] (Also sprach Zarathustra II 2). »_Sich Schmerzen machen_. Rücksichtslosigkeit des Denkens ist oft das Zeichen einer unfriedlichen inneren Gesinnung, welche Betäubung begehrt.« Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 581.

Die Gesundheit ist hier also nicht das Ueberlegene und Ueberragende, welches das Pathologische, als ein Nebensächliches, zu einem Werkzeug für sich umschafft, sondern beide bedingen sich, ja _enthalten_ sich gegenseitig,--beide zusammen stellen thatsächlich eine eigenthümliche _Selbstspaltung_ innerhalb ein und desselben Geisteslebens dar.

Eine solche innere Spaltung liegt nämlich dem ganzen geschilderten Seelenprocess zu Grunde. Anscheinend zwar sollte in ihm die Vielspältigkeit, die Subjects-Vielheit der unharmonisch veranlagten Natur, in einer hohem Einheit, in einem richtunggebenden Ziel aufgehoben werden. Nun vollzieht sich aber dieser Vorgang _innerhalb_ der vielspältigen Seele in der Weise, dass ein einziger Trieb sich alle übrigen unterordnet; mit anderen Worten: die Vielspältigkeit wird auf eine um so tiefer gehende _Zweispaltung_ reducirt. So wenig wie die Gesundheit hier überragend das Krankhafte mit _umfasst_, so wenig umfasst und überragt der herrschende Trieb wahrhaft das gesammte Innere, indem er es in den Dienst der Erkenntniss stellt: der Erkennende blickt wohl mit seinen Geistesaugen auf sich selbst wie auf eine zweite Wesenheit, aber er bleibt doch in der eigenen Wesenheit gefangen; er ist nur im Stande sie zu spalten, nicht über sie hinauszugreifen. Die Macht der Erkenntniss also, weit davon entfernt, eine einigende zu sein, ist vielmehr eine trennende,--aber die Tiefe der Trennung erweckt den _Schein_, als läge das Ziel aller Regungen _ausser ihnen_. In Folge dieser Selbsttäuschung drängen alle Kräfte begeistert der Erkenntniss zu, als vermöchten sie damit sich selbst und ihrem Zwiespalt zu entlaufen.

Man sollte allerdings glauben, es werde wenigstens eine Art von Zusammenschluss des Gesammtlebens dadurch erreicht, dass auf der einen Seite das Triebleben, unter dem darauf gerichteten Erkenntnissblick, zu ungeheurer Bewusstheit gesteigert wird,--dass auf der anderen das Denken durch die Welt der Stimmungen und Triebe eine ungemeine Belebung erhält. Aber das Resultat ist ein gerade entgegengesetztes, indem der Gedanke die Unmittelbarkeit aller inneren Regungen _zersetzt_, die Erregungen des Inneren hinwiederum die beherrschte Strenge des Gedankens beständig _lockern_. So durchdringt thatsächlich die Spaltung des Ganzen alles Einzelne nur immer weiter und tiefer.

Was ist es nun, das trotzdem eine so hohe, geradezu erlösend wirkende Befriedigung aus einer so durchsichtigen Selbsttäuschung quellen lässt? Was ist es, das einen Schein dazu befähigt, das ganze Sein, wenn auch unter steten Erkrankungen und Verwundungen, zu beseligen und zu verklären? Mit dieser Frage stehen wir vor dem eigentlichen Nietzsche-Problem; sie erst weist uns auf den geheimen Zusammenhang des Gesunden und Pathologischen in ihm.

Indem nämlich die Vielheit unverbundener Einzeltriebe sich in zwei einander gleichsam gegenüber stehende Wesenheiten zerspaltet, von denen die Eine herrscht, die Andere dient,--wird es dem Menschen ermöglicht, zu sich selber nicht nur wie zu einem _anderen_, sondern auch wie zu einem _höhern_ Wesen zu empfinden. Indem er einen Theil seiner selbst sich selber zum Opfer bringt, ist er einer _religiösen Exaltation_ nahe gekommen. In den Erschütterungen seines Geistes, in denen er das heroische Ideal eigener Preisgebung und Hingebung zu verwirklichen wähnt, bringt er _an sich selbst einen religiösen Affect_ zum Ausbruch.

Von allen grossen Geistesanlagen Nietzsches gibt es keine, die tiefer und unerbittlicher mit seinem geistigen Gesammtorganismus verbunden gewesen wäre, als sein religiöses Genie. Zu einer anderen Zeit, in einer andern Culturperiode würde dasselbe diesem Predigerssohn sicherlich nicht gestattet haben, zum Denker zu werden. Unter den Einflüssen unserer Zeit erhielt jedoch sein religiöser Geist die Richtung aufs Erkennen und vermochte dasjenige, wonach es ihn instinctiv am drängendsten verlangte, wie nach dem natürlichen Ausdruck seiner Gesundheit, nur in krankhafter Weise zu befriedigen,--das heisst, er vermochte es nur vermittelst einer Rückbeziehung auf sich selbst anstatt auf eine ihn mit umfassende, ausser ihm liegende Lebensmacht. So erreichte er das gerade Gegentheil des Angestrebten: nicht eine höhere Einheit seines Wesens, sondern dessen innerste Zweitheilung, nicht den Zusammenschluss aller Regungen und Triebe zu einem einheitlichen Individuum, sondern ihre Spaltung zum »_Dividuum_«. Es war immerhin eine Gesundheit erreicht,--doch mit den Mitteln der Krankheit; eine wirkliche Anbetung, doch mit den Mitteln der Täuschung; eine wirkliche Selbstbehauptung und Selbsterhebung, doch mit den Mitteln der Selbstverwundung. Deshalb liegen in dem gewaltigen religiösen Affect, aus dem ganz allein bei Nietzsche alle Erkenntniss hervorgeht, unlöslich in einen Knoten verschlungen: eigne _Aufopferung_ und _eigne Apotheose_, Grausamkeit der eignen _Vernichtung_ und Wollust der eignen _Vergötterung_, leidvolles Siechen und siegende Genesung, glühender Rausch und kühle Bewusstheit. Man fühlt hier die enge Verknüpfung der Gegensätze, die einander unaufhörlich bedingen: man fühlt das Ueberschäumen und freiwillige

Hinabstürzen der aufs Höchste erregten und gespannten Kräfte ins Chaotische, Dunkle, Schauerliche, und dann wieder aus diesem heraus ein Drängen ins Lichte, Zarteste,--das Drängen eines Willens, der sich«-- --von der Noth der Fülle und Ueberfülle, vom Leiden der in ihm gedrängten Gegensätze löst«,[11]--ein Chaos, das den Gott gebären möchte,--gebären _muss_.

»Im Menschen ist _Geschöpf_ und _Schöpfer_ vereint: im Menschen ist Stoff, Bruchstück, Ueberfluss, Lehm, Koth, Unsinn, Chaos; aber im Menschen ist auch Schöpfer, Bildner, Hammer-Härte, Zuschauer-Göttlichkeit und siebenter Tag...«. (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 225.) Und hier zeigt sich, dass unablässiges Leiden und unablässige Selbstvergöttlichung sich gegenseitig bedingen, indem ein jedes seinen eignen Gegensatz immer wieder neu erzeugt,-- wie es Nietzsche in der Geschichte des Königs Viçvamitra ausgedrückt findet, »der aus tausendjährigen Selbstmarterungen ein solches Machtgefühl und Zutrauen zu sich gewann, dass er es unternahm, einen _neuen Himmel_ zu bauen:-- -- --Jeder, der irgendwann einmal einen »neuen Himmel« gebaut hat, fand die Macht dazu erst in der eignen Hölle...« (Genealogie der Moral III 10.) Eine andere Stelle, wo er dieser Sage gedenkt, steht in der Morgenröthe (113) und folgt unmittelbar auf die Schilderung jener machtdurstigen Leidenden, die als das würdigste Object ihrer Vergewaltigungslust sich selbst auserlesen haben: »Der Triumph des Asketen über sich selber, sein dabei nach Innen gewendetes Auge, welches den Menschen zu einem Leidenden und zu einem Zuschauenden zerspaltet sieht und fürderhin in die Aussenwelt nur hineinblickt, um aus ihr gleichsam Holz zum eigenen Scheiterhaufen zu sammeln, diese letzte Tragödie des Triebes nach Auszeichnung, bei der es nur noch Eine Person gibt, welche in sich selber _verkohlt_-- --« Dieser Abschnitt, der die Beschreibung aller bisherigen Askese und ihrer Motive enthält, schliesst mit der Bemerkung: -- --ja, ist denn wirklich der Kreislauf im Streben nach Auszeichnung mit dem Asketen am letzten Ende angelangt und in sich abgerollt? Könnte dieser Kreis nicht noch einmal von Anfang an durchlaufen werden, mit der festgehaltenen Grundstimmung des Asketen und zugleich des mitleidenden Gottes?«

In »Menschliches, Allzumenschliches« (I 137) sagt er darüber: Es gibt einen _Trotz gegen sich selbst_, zu dessen sublimirtesten Aeusserungen manche Formen der Askese gehören. Gewisse Menschen haben nämlich ein so hohes Bedürfniss, ihre Gewalt und Herrschsucht auszuüben, dass sie-- -- --endlich darauf verfallen, _gewisse Theile ihres eigenen Wesens_-- -- --zu tyrannisiren.-- -- --Dieses Zerbrechen seiner selbst, dieser Spott über die eigene Natur, dieses spernere se sperni, aus dem die Religionen so viel gemacht haben, ist eigentlich _ein sehr hoher Grad der Eitelkeit_.-- -- --Der Mensch hat eine wahre Wollust darin, sich durch übertriebene Ansprüche zu vergewaltigen und _dieses tyrannisch fordernde Etwas in seiner Seele nachher zu vergöttern_.«--und 138: »-- --Eigentlich liegt ihm also nur an der Entladung seiner Emotion; da fasst er wohl, um seine Spannung zu erleichtern, die Speere der Feinde zusammen und begräbt sie in seine Brust,«--und 142: »-- --er geisselt seine Selbstvergötterung mit Selbstverachtung und Grausamkeit, er freut sich an dem wilden Aufruhre seiner Begierden,-- -- --er versteht es, seinem Affect, zum Beispiel dem der äussersten Herrschsucht, einen Fallstrick zu legen, so dass er in den der äussersten Erniedrigung übergeht und seine aufgehetzte Seele durch diesen Contrast aus allen Fugen gerissen wird;-- -- --es ist im Grunde eine seltene Art von Wollust, welche er begehrt, aber vielleicht jene Wollust, in der alle anderen in einen Knoten zusammengeschlungen sind. Novalis, eine der Autoritäten in Fragen der Heiligkeit durch Erfahrung und Instinct, spricht das ganze Geheimniss einmal mit naiver Freude aus: »Es ist wunderbar genug, dass nicht längst die Association von Wollust, Religion und Grausamkeit die Menschen aufmerksam auf ihre innige Verwandtschaft und gemeinschaftliche Tendenz gemacht hat.«

In der That ist eine rechte Nietzsche-Studie in ihrer Hauptsache eine _religionspsychologische_ Studie, und nur insoweit als das Gebiet der Religionspsychologie bereits aufgehellt ist, fallen auch helle Streiflichter auf die Bedeutung seines Wesens, seines Leidens und seiner Selbst-Beseligung. Seine ganze Entwicklung ging gewissermassen davon aus, dass er den Glauben verlor, also von der »Emotion über den Tod Gottes«,--dieser ungeheuren Emotion, die bis in das letzte Werk hineinklingt, das Nietzsche, schon auf der Schwelle des Wahnsinns verfasste,-- bis in den vierten Theil seines: »Also sprach Zarathustra«. _Die Möglichkeit, einen Ersatz[12] »für den verlorenen Gott« in den verschiedensten Formen der Selbstvergottung_ zu finden, das ist die Geschichte seines Geistes, seiner Werke, seiner Erkrankung. Es ist die Geschichte des »_religiösen Nachtriebes im Denker_«, der noch mächtig bleibt, auch nachdem der Gott zerbrach, auf den er sich bezog, und auf den Nietzsches Worte Anwendung finden können: (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 223): »Die Sonne ist schon hinunter gegangen, aber der Himmel unseres Lebens glüht und leuchtet noch von ihr her, ob wir sie schon nicht mehr sehen.« Man lese darüber den ergreifenden Gefühlsausbruch des »tollen Menschen« in der »Fröhlichen Wissenschaft« (125). »Wohin ist Gott?« rief er, »ich will es Euch sagen! _Wir haben ihn getödtet_!--ihr und ich! Wir Alle sind seine Mörder!-- -- -- -- -- --Hören wir noch nichts vom Lärm der Todtengräber, welche Gott begraben? Riechen wir noch nichts von der göttlichen Verwesung?--auch Götter verwesen! Gott ist todt! Gott bleibt todt! Und wir haben ihn getödtet! Wie trösten wir uns, die Mörder aller Mörder? Das Heiligste und Mächtigste, was die Welt bisher besass, ist unter unseren Messern verblutet,--wer wischt dies Blut von uns ab? Mit welchem Wasser könnten wir uns reinigen?-- -- -- --_Ist nicht die Grösse dieser That zu gross für uns? Müssen wir nicht selber zu Göttern werden, um nur ihrer würdig zu erscheinen_? Es

gab nie eine grössere That,--und wer nur immer nach uns geboren wird, gehört um dieser That willen in eine höhere Geschichte, als alle Geschichte bisher war!«-- --

Die Antwort auf diesen Ausbruch von Qual und Sehnsucht gab sich Nietzsche in seiner letzten Schaffensperiode mit den Worten Zarathustras (I Schluss): »Todt sind alle Götter: nun wollen wir, dass der Uebermensch lebe!«--und sprach damit den innersten Seelengrund seiner Philosophie aus.

Die Gottsehnsucht wird in ihrer Qual zu einem Drang der Gott-Schöpfung, und dieser musste sich nothwendig in Selbstvergottung äussern. Mit richtigem Blick erkannte Nietzsche im religiösen Phänomen die ungeheure Auslebung des individuellsten Verlangens, den Willen zur höchsten Selbstbeseligung. Dieser Individualismus, der als Kern in allem Religiösen steckt, dieser »sublime Egoismus«, der in allem Religiösen frei und naiv ausströmt, indem er sich auf eine von aussen gegebene Lebens-oder Gottesmacht zu beziehen glaubt, wurde in ihm, dem »Erkennenden«, auf sich selbst zurückgeworfen. Und so gelangt er dazu, sich die ihm vom Verstände aufgedrungene Gottlosigkeit mit dem vermessenen Schlüsse innerlich anzueignen: »_Wenn_ es Götter gäbe, wie hielte ich's aus, kein Gott zu sein! Also gibt es keine Götter.« Diese Worte stehen im zweiten Theil des »Also sprach Zarathustra« (6); an sie lassen sich jene anderen anschliessen (55): »_Und Anbetung wird noch in Deiner Eitelkeit sein_!« In ihnen ist die ganze Gefahr ausgesprochen, die über dem »Einsamen« und »Einzelnen« schwebt, der sich spalten und verdoppeln muss. »Einer ist immer zu viel um mich.-- -- --Immer Einmal Eins--das gibt auf die Dauer Zwei!« (Also sprach Zarathustra I 76.)

Die Art, wie er sich zu dieser Zweiheit stellte, wie er sich gegen sie zur Wehre setzte oder ihr nachgab, und worin er sie jedesmal suchte,--das alles bedingt den Wandel seiner Erkenntniss, sowie die Eigenart seiner verschiedenen Geistesperioden--bis endlich seine Zweiheit ihm zu einer Hallucination und Vision, zu einer leibhaften Wesenheit wurde, die seinen Geist verdüsterte, seinen Verstand erstickte. Er vermochte nicht sich länger gegen sich selbst zu wehren: Dieses war das dionysiche Drama vom »Schicksal der Seele« (Zur Genealogie der Moral, Vorrede XIII) in Nietzsche selbst. Die Einsamkeit des Innenlebens, in welcher der Geist über sich selbst hinausgelangen will, ist nirgends tiefer und schmerzvoller als zum Schluss. Man könnte sagen, die stärkste Mauer in dieser verhängnissvollen Selbstvermaurung sei ein zarter, glänzender, göttlicher Schein, der sie umgaukelt, eine Luftspiegelung, die ihm die eigenen Grenzen verwischt und verbirgt. Jeder Gang nach aussen führt immer wieder in die Tiefe dieses Selbst zurück, das sich schliesslich zu Gott und Welt, zu Himmel und Hölle werden muss--jeder Gang führt es einen Schritt weiter in seine letzte Tiefe und in seinen Untergang.

Diese Grundzüge von Nietzsches Eigenart enthalten die Ursachen des zugleich _Raffinirten_ und _Exaltirten_, das auch dem Grossen und Bedeutenden in seiner Philosophie beigemischt ist gleich einer brennenden Würze. Am schärfsten wird es wohl von der unverdorbenen Zunge junger und gesunder Geister herausgeschmeckt werden,--oder auch von denen, die, im ruhigen Frieden glaubensvoller Anschauungen geborgen, niemals den ganzen furchtbaren Kampf und Brand eines religiös veranlagten Freigeistes am eignen Leibe erfahren haben. Aber es ist auch dasjenige, was Nietzsche in so hohem Masse zum Philosophen unserer Zeit hat werden lassen. Denn in ihm hat typische Gestalt gewonnen, was sie in ihrer Tiefe bewegt: jene »Anarchie in den Instincten« schöpferischer und religiöser Kräfte, die zu gewaltig nach Sättigung begehren, um sich mit den Brosamen begnügen zu können, welche vom Tisch der modernen Erkenntniss für sie abfallen. Dass sie sich nicht mit ihnen begnügen können. aber ebensowenig ihre Stellung zur Erkenntniss preisgeben,-- gleich unersättlich im leidenschaftlichen Verlangen wie unermüdlich im Darben und Entbehren,--das ist der grosse und erschütternde Zug im Bilde der Philosophie Nietzsches. Das ist es auch, was sie in immer neuen Wendungen zum Ausdruck bringt:--eine Reihe von gewaltigen Versuchen, dieses Problem moderner Tragik, das Räthsel der modernen Sphinx zu lösen und sie in den Abgrund zu stürzen.

Aber deshalb ist es eben der _Mensch_ und nicht der _Theoretiker_, auf den wir unsern Blick richten müssen, um uns in den Werken Nietzsches zurechtzufinden,--und deshalb wird auch der Gewinn, das Resultat unserer Betrachtung nicht darin bestehen, dass uns ein neues theoretisches Weltbild in seiner Wahrheit aufgeht, sondern das Bild einer Menschenseele in ihrer Zusammensetzung von Grösse und Krankhaftigkeit. Zunächst scheint die philosophische Bedeutung in Nietzsches Wandlungen dadurch abgeschwächt zu werden, dass sich jedesmal genau derselbe innere Process abspielt. Aber sie wird vertieft und verschärft, weil der Wechsel der Ansichten immer wieder auf das Wesen übergreift. Nicht nur die äusseren Umrisslinien einer Theorie sind jedesmal verändert, sondern die ganze Stimmung, Luft, Beleuchtung wandelt sich mit ihnen. Während wir Gedanken einander widerlegen hören, sehen wir Welten versinken, neue Welten emporsteigen. Gerade hierauf beruht die wahre Originalität des Nietzscheschen Geistes: durch das Medium seiner Natur, die Alles auf sich und ihre intimsten Bedürfnisse bezieht, aber sich auch an Alles hingebend verliert, erschliessen sich ihm jene inneren Erlebnisse und Ergebnisse von Gedankenwelten, die wir sonst nur mit dem Verstände streifen, ohne sie jemals in ihren Tiefen auszuschöpfen und ohne daher an ihnen schöpferisch zu werden. Theoretisch betrachtet, lehnt er sich häufig an fremde Muster und Meister an, aber das, worin diese ihre Reife, ihren

Productionspunkt haben, wird ihm nur zum Anlass, daran zu eigner Productivität zu gelangen.[13] Die geringste Berührung, die sein Geist empfand, genügte, um in ihm eine Fülle innern Lebens,--Gedanken-Erlebens, auszulösen. Er hat einmal gesagt: »Es gibt zwei Arten des Genie's: eins, welches vor allem zeugt und zeugen will, und ein andres, welches sich gern befruchten lässt und gebiert.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 248.) Zweifellos gehörte er der letzteren Art an. In Nietzsches geistiger Natur lag--ins Grosse gesteigert--etwas Weibliches;[14] aber er ist darin in einem solchen Masse Genie, dass es fast gleichgiltig erscheint, woher er die erste Anregung empfängt. Wenn wir alles zusammenlesen, was sein Erdreich befruchtet hat, dann haben wir einige unscheinbare Samenkörner vor uns: wenn wir in seine Philosophie eintreten, umrauscht uns ein Wald schattenspendender Bäume, umfängt uns die verschwenderische Vegetation einer wildgrossen Natur. Seine Ueberlegenheit bestand darin, dass er jedem Samenkorn, welches in sein Inneres fiel, entgegenbrachte, was er selbst als das Kennzeichen des echten Genies anführt: »den neuen, treibenden Fruchtboden mit einer urwaldfrischen unausgenutzten Kraft.« (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 118.)

[1] Eine zusammenfassende Charakteristik Nietzsches, in der zum ersten Male die drei Perioden seiner geistigen Entwicklung unterschieden und bestimmt charakterisirt sind, erschien in der Sonntags-Beilage der Vossischen Zeitung 1891, Nr. 2, 3 und 4. Ausserdem brachte die »Freie Bühne« eingehendere Ausführungen einzelner Punkte unter dem Titel »Zum Bilde Friedrich Nietzsches, Jahrg. II (1891), Heft 3, 4 und 5, Jahrg. III (1892), Heft 3 und 5; das Magazin für Literatur 1892, October, »Ein Apokalyptiker«; Der Zeitgeist 1893, Nr. 20, »Ideal und Askese«.

[2] Was das Leben--, die sogenannten »Erlebnisse« angeht,-- wer von uns hat dafür auch nur Ernst genug? Oder Zeit genug? Bei solchen Sachen waren wir, fürchte ich, nie recht »bei der Sache«, wir haben eben unser Herz nicht dort--und nicht einmal unser Ohr!« (Zur Genealogie der Moral, Vorrede III.)

[3] Eine ähnliche Bedeutung legte er seinen selten kleinen und feinmodellirten Ohren bei, von denen er sagte, sie seien die wahren »Ohren für Unerhörtes«. (Zarathustra I 25.)

[4] »Giebt es--eine Vorneigung für das Harte, Schauerliche, Böse, Problematische des Daseins aus Wohlsein, aus überströmender Gesundheit, aus der Ueberfülle selbst?------Giebt es vielleicht--eine Frage für Irrenärzte--_Neurosen der Gesundheit_?« (Versuch einer Selbstkritik zur neuen Ausgabe der »Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik« IV u. IX.)

[5] Vgl. auch »Die fröhliche Wissenschaft« 253, »Eines Tages erreichen wir unser Ziel--und weisen nunmehr mit Stolz darauf hin, was für lange Reisen wir dazu gemacht haben. Wir kamen aber dadurch so weit, dass wir an jeder Stelle wähnten, zu Hause zu sein.«

[6] Daher nennt er die Ueberzeugungen _Feinde der Wahrheit_: »Ueberzeugungen sind gefährlichere Feinde der Wahrheit als Lügen.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches, I 483).

[7] Durch diesen Trieb entwickelte er sich mehr, als er es selbst wahr haben wollte, zu jenem »Don Juan der Erkenntniss«, den er (Morgenröthe 327) folgendermassen schildert: »Er hat Geist, Kitzel und Genuss an Jagd und Intriguen der Erkenntniss--bis an die höchsten und fernsten Sterne der Erkenntniss hinauf!--bis ihm zuletzt Nichts mehr zu erjagen übrig bleibt, als das absolut _Wehethuende_ der Erkenntniss, glefich dem Trinker, der am Ende Absinth und Scheidewasser trinkt. So gelüstet es ihn am Ende nach der Hölle,--es ist die letzte Erkenntniss, die ihn _verführt_. Vielleicht, dass auch sie ihn enttäuscht, wie alles Erkannte! Und dann müsste er in alle Ewigkeit stehen bleiben, an die Enttäuschung festgenagelt und selber zum steinernen Gast geworden, mit einem Verlangen nach einer Abendmahlzeit der Erkenntniss, die ihm nie mehr zu Theil wird!--denn die ganze Welt der Dinge hat diesem Hungrigen keinen Bissen mehr zu reichen.«

[8] »Die Instincte bekämpfen _müssen_--das ist die Formel für décadence: so lange das Leben _aufsteigt_, ist Glück gleich Instinct«, sagt er (Götzen-Dämmerung, Das Problem des Sokrates 11), und unterscheidet so den Dekadenten von der geborenen Herrennatur.

[9] Nietzsche fasst hier, nebenbei bemerkt, Goethe durchaus anders auf als einige Jahre später (in der Götzen-Dämmerung). Hier sieht er noch in ihm den Antipoden seiner eigenen, unharmonischen Natur--später hingegen einen ihm tief verwandten Geist, der nicht harmonisch war, sondern sich durch Ausgestaltung und Hingabe seiner selbst zum Harmonischen _umschuf_.

[10] Vgl. auch Jenseits von Gut und Böse 224: »wir-- -- --sind erst dort in unsrer Seligkeit, wo wir auch am meisten--in Gefahr sind.«

[11] »Versuch einer Selbstkritik«, in der neuen Ausgabe der »Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik« XI.

[12] Siehe in der Fröhlichen Wissenschaft (Scherz, List und Rache 38) über die menschliche Bestimmung als erfüllt in der Gottschöpfung des Menschen:

»Der Fromme spricht: »Gott liebt uns, weil er uns erschuf!« »Der Mensch schuf Gott!« sagt drauf ihr Feinen. Und soll nicht lieben, was er schuf? Soll's gar, weil er es schuf, verneinen? Das hinkt, das trägt des Teufels Huf.

[13] Auch wenn man von denjenigen Denkern absieht, welche die verschiedenen Phasen von Nietzsches Entwicklung direct bestimmt haben, lassen sich viele seiner Gedanken schon bei früheren Philosophen nachweisen. Auf diese für die wahre Bedeutung Nietzsches durchaus unwesentliche Thatsache ist neuerdings mit dem grössten Lärm von Leuten hingewiesen worden, denen lediglich der Zufall das eine oder andere philosophische Buch in die Hände gespielt hat. In der vorliegenden Schrift ist absichtlich auf die Stellung Nietzsches in der Geschichte der Philosophie kein Bezug genommen, da dies eine eingehende systematische Prüfung seiner einzelnen Theorien auf ihren objectiven Werth zur Voraussetzung haben würde, was einer besonderen Arbeit Vorbehalten bleiben muss.

[14] Manchmal, wenn er dies besonders empfand, war er geneigt, das weibliche Genie als das eigentliche Genie zu nehmen. »Die Thiere denken anders über die Weiber, als die Menschen; ihnen gilt das Weibchen als das productive Wesen.-- -- -- -- --Die Schwangerschaft hat die Weiber milder, abwartender, furchtsamer, unterwerfungslustiger gemacht; und ebenso erzeugt die geistige Schwangerschaft den Charakter des Contemplativen, welcher dem weiblichen Charakter verwandt ist:--es sind die männlichen Mütter.--« (Die fröhliche Wissenschaft 72.)

II. ABSCHNITT

SEINE WANDLUNGEN.

MOTTO:

»Die Schlange, welche sich nicht häuten kann, geht zu Grunde. Ebenso die Geister, welche man verhindert, ihre Meinungen zu wechseln; sie hören auf, Geist zu sein.«

(Morgenröthe 573)

Die erste Wandlung, die Nietzsche in seinem Geistesleben durchkämpfte, liegt weit zurück in der Dämmerung seiner Kindheit oder doch wenigstens seiner Knabenjahre.

Es ist der Bruch mit dem christlichen Kirchenglauben. In seinen Werken findet diese Trennung selten Erwähnung. Trotzdem kann sie als der Ausgangspunkt seiner Wandlungen angesehen werden, weil schon von ihr aus ein charakteristisches Licht auf die Eigenart seiner Entwicklung fällt. Seine Aeusserungen über diesen Gegenstand, den ich besonders eingehend mit ihm besprochen habe, betrafen hauptsächlich die Gründe, welche den Glaubensbruch hervorrufen. Weitaus die meisten religiös veranlagten Menschen werden erst durch intellectuelle Gründe dahin gedrängt, sich in schmerzlichen Kämpfen von ihren Glaubensvorstellungen loszusagen. Wo aber, in selteneren Fällen, die erste Entfremdung vom Gemüthsleben selbst ausgeht, da ist der Process ein kampfloser und schmerzloser; der Verstand zersetzt nur, was schon vorher abgestorben,--eine Leiche war. In Nietzsches Fall fand eine eigenthümliche Kreuzung dieser beiden Möglichkeiten statt: weder waren es nur intellectuelle Gründe, die ihn ursprünglich von den anerzogenen Vorstellungen frei machten, noch auch hatte der alte Glaube aufgehört, den Bedürfnissen seines Gemüths zu entsprechen. Vielmehr betonte Nietzsche immer wieder, dass das Christenthum des elterlichen Pfarrhauses seinem inneren Wesen »glatt und weich« angelegen habe--»gleich einer gesunden Haut«, und dass ihm die Erfüllung all seiner Gebote so leicht geworden sei wie das Befolgen einer eignen Neigung. Dieses gleichsam angeborene, unveräusserliche »Talent« zu aller Religion hielt er für eine der Ursachen der Sympathie, die ihm ernste Christen selbst dann noch entgegenbrachten, als er bereits durch eine tiefe Geisteskluft von ihnen getrennt war.

Der dunkle Instinct, der ihn hier zum ersten Mal aus lieb und theuer gewordnen Gedankenkreisen forttrieb, erwachte grade in diesem Heimathsgefühl, in diesem warmen »Zu Hause«, von dem sich Nietzsches Wesen darin umfangen fühlte. Um in machtvoller Entwicklung zu sich selbst zu gelangen, bedurfte sein Geist der seelischen Kämpfe, Schmerzen und Erschütterungen,--er bedurfte dessen, dass sein Gemüth sich die Trennung von diesem ruhigen Friedenszustand _anthat_, weil seine Schaffenskraft von der Emotion und Exaltation seines Innern abhängig war: hier tritt uns die Erscheinung des

Schmerzheischenden in der »Decadenten-Natur« zum ersten Mal in Nietzsches Leben entgegen.

»Unter friedlichen Umständen fällt der kriegerische Mensch über sich selbst her,« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 76) und verbannt sich selbst in eine Gedankenfremde, in der er von nun an zu einem ewigen Wandern ohne Rast und Ruhe bestimmt ist. Aber in dieser Rastlosigkeit lebt von nun an eine unersättliche Sehnsucht in Nietzsche, die nach dem verlorenen Paradies zurückstrebt, während seine Geistesentwicklung ihn zwingt, sich in grader Linie immer weiter davon zu entfernen.

Im Gespräch über die Wandlungen, die schon hinter ihm lagen, äusserte Nietzsche einmal halb im Scherz: »Ja, so beginnt nun der Lauf und wird fortgesetzt,--bis wohin? wenn Alles durchlaufen ist,--wohin läuft man alsdann? Wenn alle Combinationsmöglichkeiten erschöpft wären,--was folgte dann noch? wie? müsste man nicht wieder beim Glauben anlangen? Vielleicht bei einem _katholischen_ Glauben?« Und der Hintergedanke, der sich in dieser Aeusserung verbarg, trat in den ernst hinzugefügten Worten aus seinem Versteck:

»_In jedem Fall könnte der Kreis wahrscheinlicher sein als der Stillstand._«

Eine in sich selbst zurücklaufende, niemals stillstehende Bewegung,--das ist in Wahrheit das Kennzeichen der ganzen Geistesart Nietzsches. Die Combinationsmöglichkeiten sind keineswegs unendlich, sind im Gegentheil sehr begrenzt, da der vorwärts treibende, selbstverwundende Drang, der die Gedanken nicht zur Ruhe kommen lässt, ganz und gar der innern Eigenart der Persönlichkeit entspringt: so weit auch die Gedanken zu schweifen scheinen, so bleiben sie doch stets an die gleichen Seelenvorgänge gebunden, die sie immer wieder zurück unter die herrschenden Bedürfnisse zwingen. Wir werden sehen, inwiefern Nietzsches Philosophie in der That einen Kreis beschreibt, und wie zum Schlüsse der Mann in einigen seiner intimsten und verschwiegensten Gedankenerlebnisse sich wieder dem _Knaben_ nähert, so dass von dem Gang seiner Philosophie die Worte gelten: siehe einen Fluss, der in vielen Windungen zurück zur Quelle fliesst!« (Also sprach Zarathustra III 23.) Es ist kein Zufall, dass Nietzsche in seiner letzten Schaffensperiode zu seiner mystischen Lehre von einer ewigen Wiederkunft gelangte: das Bild des _Kreises,--eines ewigen Wechsels in einer ewigen Wiederholung,_--steht wie ein wundersames Symbol und Geheimzeichen über der Eingangspforte zu seinen Werken.

Als sein erstes »literarisches Kinderspiel« (Zur Genealogie der Moral, Vorrede VI) nennt Nietzsche einen Aufsatz aus seiner Knabenzeit, »über den Ursprung des Bösen«, worin er, »wie es billig ist«, Gott »zum _Vater_ des Bösen« machte. Auch gesprächsweise erwähnte er diesen Aufsatz als Beweis dafür, dass er sich schon zu einer Zeit philosophischen Grübeleien hingegeben habe, wo er sich noch in dem philologischen Schulzwang der Schulpforte befand.

Wenn wir Nietzsche aus seiner Kindheit in seine Lehrjahre und dann in die lange Zeit seiner philologischen Thätigkeit folgen, dann erkennen wir auch hier deutlich, wie seine Entwicklung von Anfang an auch rein äusserlich unter dem Einfluss eines gewissen Selbstzwanges verläuft. Schon die strenge philologische Schulung musste einen solchen Zwang für den jungen Feuergeist enthalten, dessen reiche schöpferische Kräfte dabei leer ausgingen. Ganz besonders aber galt dies von der Richtung seines Lehrers Ritschl. Grade bei diesem wurde das Hauptaugenmerk, sowohl nach Seite der Methode wie nach Seite der Probleme, auf formale Beziehungen und äussere Zusammenhänge gerichtet, während die innere Bedeutung der Schriftwerke zurückstand. Für Nietzsches ganze Eigenart aber war es bezeichnend, dass er später seine Probleme ausschliesslich der Welt des Innern entnahm und geneigt war, das Logische dem Psychologischen unterzuordnen.

Und doch war es eben hier, in dieser strengen Zucht und auf diesem steinigen Boden, dass sein Geist so früh reife Frucht trug und Ausgezeichnetes leistete. Eine Reihe vortrefflicher philologischer Untersuchungen[1] bezeichnet den Weg von seinen Studienjahren an bis zu der Baseler Professur. Es ist nicht unwahrscheinlich, dass eine zu frühe Entfesselung des ganzen Geistesreichthums Nietzsches durch das Studium der Philosophie oder der Künste ihn von vornherein zu jener Zügellosigkeit verführt hätte, der sich einige seiner letzten Werke nähern. So aber gab für seine »vielspältigen Triebe« die kühle Strenge philologischer Wissenschaft eine Zeit lang das einigende und zusammenhaltende Band ab, indem es für Manches, das in ihm schlummerte, zur Fessel wurde.

In welchem Grade jedoch Nietzsches unberücksichtigte starke Talente ihn quälten und störten, während er seinen Fachstudien nachging, das empfand er darum nicht minder als ein tiefes Leiden. Namentlich war es der Drang nach Musik, den er nicht abzuweisen vermochte, und oft musste er Tönen lauschen, während er Gedanken lauschen wollte. Wie eine tönende Klage begleiten jene ihn durch die Jahre hindurch, bis ihm sein Kopfleiden jede Ausübung der Musik unmöglich machte.

Aber wie gross auch der Gegensatz war, den Nietzsches Philologenthum zu seinem spätem Philosophenthum bildete, so fehlt es doch nicht an zahlreichen vermittelnden Zügen, die von der einen Periode zu der andern überleiten.

Grade die Richtung Ritschls, welche diesen Gegensatz zu verschärfen scheint, kam in einer bestimmten Besonderheit Nietzsches Geistesart sogar entgegen, indem sie seinen Hang zum Produciren noch verstärkte und ausbildete. Es lag in ihr das Streben nach einer gewissen formell künstlerischen Abrundung und virtuosen Behandlung wissenschaftlicher Fragen, möglich gemacht durch strenge Begrenzung derselben und Concentrirung auf einen gegebenen Punkt. Bei Nietzsche stand nun das Bedürfniss, durch freiwillige und concentrirte Beschränkung einer Aufgabe, dieselbe in rein künstlerischer Weise zum Abschluss zu bringen, in engem Zusammenhang mit dem Grundtrieb seiner Natur, über das Selbstgeschaltene immer wieder hinauszugehen, es als ein endgültig Erledigtes, Vergangenes, von sich abzustossen. Für den Philologen ist ein solcher Wechsel der Aufgaben und Probleme von selbst gegeben,--den für Nietzsche charakteristischen Ausspruch: »Eine Sache, die sich aufgeklärt hat, hört auf, uns etwas anzugehen,« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 80)--könnte ein Philologe gethan haben, denn für diesen wird thatsächlich ein aufgeklärtes Dunkel zu einer völlig erledigten Sache, die ihn nicht länger zu beschäftigen braucht. Aber es sind hiervon tief verschiedene Gründe, die Nietzsches häufigen Gedankenwechsel bedingen, und daher ist es in hohem Grade interessant zu sehen, wie sich hier die Gegensätze des Philologenthums und Philosophenthums dennoch zu berühren scheinen, und wie Nietzsche auch in dieser ihm fremdesten Verkleidung,--der nüchtern philologischen,-- in dieser äussersten geistigen Selbstunterordnung, sein Selbst durchsetzte.

Der Philologe tritt einem Problem mit seiner Gesinnung, seinem innern Menschen, überhaupt nicht nahe, assimilirt es sich in keiner Weise und wird von ihm daher auch nur so lange festgehalten, als er zur Lösung der Aufgabe bedarf. Für Nietzsche dagegen bedeutete Beschäftigung mit einem Problem, bedeutete _erkennen_, vor allem andren: sich erschüttern lassen; und von einer Wahrheit sich überzeugen bedeutete ihm: von einem Erlebniss überwältigt werden,--»über den Haufen geworfen werden«, wie er es nannte. Er nahm einen Gedanken auf, wie man ein Schicksal auf sich nimmt, das den ganzen Menschen ergreift und in Bann schlägt: er _lebte_ den Gedanken noch viel mehr, als er ihn dachte, aber er that es mit einer so leidenschaftlichen Inbrunst, einer so maasslosen Hingebung, dass er sich an ihm erschöpfte,-- und, gleich einem Schicksal, das ausgelebt ist, fiel der Gedanke wieder von ihm ab. Erst in der Ernüchterung, wie sie naturgemäss einer jeden derartigen Erregung folgen musste, Hess er seine überwundene Erkenntniss rein intellectuell auf sich wirken; erst dann ging er ihr mit still und klar nachprüfendem Verstände nach. Sein merkwürdiger Wandlungsdrang auf dem Gebiete philosophischer Erkenntniss war durch den ungeheuren Drang nach immer neuen Emotionen geistigster Art bedingt, und daher war für ihn vollkommene Klarheit stets nur die Begleiterscheinung von Ueberdruss und Erschöpfung.

Aber selbst in dieser Erschöpfung verlassen ihn seine _Probleme_ nicht, der Ueberdruss gilt nur ihren _Lösungen_, durch welche die Quelle der Erschütterung momentan verschüttet worden ist. Die gefundene Lösung war deshalb für Nietzsche jedesmal ein Signal zu einem _Gesinnungswechsel_, denn nur so liess sich das Problem festhalten, die Lösung von neuem versuchen. Mit wahrem _Hass_ verfolgte er hinterher Alles, was ihn zu ihr getrieben, Alles, was ihm geholfen hatte, sie zu finden. Da »eine Sache, die sich aufgeklärt hat, aufhört, uns etwas anzugehen«, so wollte Nietzsche im Grunde nichts von der endgiltigen Aufklärung eines Problems wissen, und jenes Wort, das scheinbar die volle Befriedigung erfolgreichen Denkens zum Ausdruck bringt, bezeichnete für ihn die Tragik seines Lebens: er wollte nicht, dass; die Probleme seiner Forschung jemals aufhören sollten, ihn etwas anzugehen, er wollte, dass sie fortfahren sollten, ihn im Tiefsten seiner Seele aufzuwühlen, und daher war er gewissermaassen der Auflösung gram, die ihm sein Problem raubte, daher warf er sich jedesmal auf sie mit der ganzen Feinheit und Ueberfeinheit seiner Skepsis und zwang sie schadenfroh,--seines eigenen Leids und des Schadens, den er sich damit zufügte, froh!--ihm seine Probleme wieder herauszugeben. Deshalb kann man von vorn herein mit einem gewissen Recht von Nietzsche sagen: was innerhalb einer Denkrichtung, einer Betrachtungsweise diesen leidenschaftlichen Geist dauernd festhalten, was einen neuen Wandel und Wechsel unmöglich machen soll, das muss im letzten Grunde _unaufklärbar_ für ihn bleiben, es muss der Energie aller Lösungsversuche widerstehen, seinen Verstand an tödtlichen Räthseln aufreiben,--an Räthseln gleichsam kreuzigen. Als endlich in der That auf diesem; Wege die Erschütterung seines Innern stärker geworden war, als die durch sie gewaltsam gespornte Verstandeskraft, da erst gab es für ihn kein Entrinnen und kein Entweichen mehr. Doch da verlor sich auch nothwendig das Ende in Dunkel, Schmerz und Geheimniss: in eine Besessenheit der Gedanken durch die Gefühlserregungen, die einem stürmischen Meere gleich über ihnen zusammenschlugen.

Wer Nietzsches Zickzack-Pfaden bis zuletzt folgt, der tritt dicht an diesen Punkt heran, wo er sich, im Grauen vor einer letzten Aufklärung und Problemlösung, endgiltig in die ewigen Räthsel der Mystik hinabstürzt.--

Die Geistesbegabung Nietzsches zeichnete sich aber noch durch zwei Eigenschaften aus, die in gleicher Weise dem Philologen wie später dem Philosophen zu statten kamen. Die erste war sein Talent für Subtilitäten, seine Genialität in der Behandlung feinster Dinge, die von einer zarten und sichern Hand angefasst sein wollen, um nicht verwischt und entstellt zu werden. Es ist dasselbe, was ihn später nach meinem Dafürhalten als Psychologen noch mehr _fein_ als _gross_ erscheinen lässt,--oder lieber: am grössten im Erfassen und Gestalten von Feinheiten. Höchst bezeichnend ist dafür der Ausdruck, den er einmal (Der Fall Wagner 3) von den Dingen gebraucht, wie sie sich dem Blick des Erkennenden darstellen: »Das _Filigran_ der Dinge«.

In Verbindung mit diesem Zuge steht die Neigung, Verborgenem und Heimlichem nachzuspüren, Verstecktes ans Licht zu ziehen--; der Blick für das Dunkel, und die instinctiv ergänzende Anempfindung und Nachempfindung, wo dem Wissen Lücken bleiben. Ein grosser Theil von Nietzsches Genialität beruht hierauf. Es hängt dies aufs engste mit seiner hohen künstlerischen Kraft zusammen, in der sich der Blick für das Feine und Einzelne in wundervoller Weise zu einem grossen, freien Schauen des Zusammenhanges, des Gesammtbildes erweitert. Im Dienste strengphilologischer Kritik hat er dieses Talent geübt, um aus den Texten das Verblasste und Vergessene gewissenhaft herauszulesen,[2]--aber in diesem Bemühen ist er zugleich schon über seine rein gelehrten Studien hinausgeführt worden. Der Weg, auf dem dieses geschah, führt uns zu seiner bedeutendsten philologischen Arbeit, zu der Arbeit über die Quellen des Diogenes Laertius.

Denn die Beschäftigung mit dieser Schrift wurde für ihn der Anlass, dem Leben der alten griechischen Philosophen und seiner Beziehung zum Gesammtleben der Griechen nachzugehen. In seinen späteren Werken kommt er einmal darauf zu sprechen (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 261). Man sieht es, wie er über den Trümmern der Ueberlieferung gesessen und gegrübelt haben mag, in die Lücken, in die entstellten Theile die verlornen Gestalten hineindichtend, sie nachschaffend und entzückt wandelnd »unter Gebilden von mächtigstem und reinstem Typus«. Er schaut hinein in die Dämmerung jener Zeiten »wie in eine Bildner-Werkstätte solcher Typen«. Und es ergreift ihn wunderbar, sich vorzustellen, dass dort die Ansätze gelegen haben mögen zu einem noch höhern Philosophentypus, wie ihn vielleicht Plato »von der sokratischen Verzauberung frei geblieben« gefunden hätte. Dies Alles ist aber mehr als ein blosser Uebergang vom Philologen zum Philosophen. Was sich da in seinen sehnsüchtig schaffenden Gedanken verrieth, während er gezwungen war, trockene Kritik zu üben, legt schon den letzten und höchsten Punkt seines Ehrgeizes bloss; nicht umsonst ist es gewesen, dass Nietzsche in die Philosophie nicht auf dem Wege abstracter philosophischer Fachstudien eintrat, sondern auf dem einer tiefen Auffassung des philosophischen Lebens in seiner innersten Bedeutung. Und wenn wir das Ziel bezeichnen wollten, welchem durch alle Wandlungen hindurch die Kämpfe dieses unersättlichen Geistes galten, so vermöchten wir dafür kein bezeichnenderes Wort zu finden als das von der ersehnten Entdeckung »einer neuen, bis dahin unentdeckt gebliebenen Möglichkeit des philosophischen Lebens«. (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches i 261.)

So steht jene rein philologische Schrift dicht vor der ganzen Reihe der späteren Werke,--einer kleinen, in der Mauer halb verborgenen Pforte vergleichbar, die in ein umfangreiches Gebäude einführt. Wenn wir sie öffnen, streift unser Blick schon die lange Flucht der Innenräume, bis zum letzten, zum dunkelsten. Und wer hier auf der Schwelle stehen bleibt und hindurchblickt, der vermag der gewaltigen Kraft nicht ohne Staunen zu gedenken, die Stein um Stein zu einem Ganzen fügte: einer Kraft, die jeden Einzeltheil mit verschwenderischem Reichthum ausschmückte, ihn spielend zu so zahllosen Seitengängen und verborgenen Verstecken ausbaute, als beabsichtige sie ein Labyrinth,--und die dennoch mit eiserner Consequenz stets in gerader Grundlinie an ihrem Werke weiter schuf.

An seinen griechischen Studien ging aber Nietzsche nicht nur die Ahnung seines innerlichsten Strebens und die erste Fernsicht auf das Ziel seiner geheimen Sehnsucht auf, sondern sie wiesen ihm auch den Weg, auf dem er sich diesem Ziel nähern konnte. Denn sie waren es, die ihm das ganze Culturbild des alten Hellenenthums zeigten, die ihm jene Bilder einer versunkenen Kunst und Religion entrollten, in deren Anschauen er in durstigen Zügen »frisches volles Leben« trank. So stellt er seine philologische Gelehrsamkeit in den Dienst culturhistorischer, ästhetischer, geschichtsphilosophischer Forschung und überwindet ihren Formalismus.

Es verwandelt und vertieft sich für ihn damit die Bedeutung der Philologie, »die zwar weder eine Muse noch eine Grazie, aber eine Götterbotin ist; und wie die Musen zu den trüben, geplagten, böotischen Bauern niederstiegen, so kommt sie in eine Welt voll düsterer Farben und Bilder, voll von allertiefsten und unheilbarsten Schmerzen, und erzählt tröstend von den lichten Göttergestalten eines fernen, blauen, glücklichen Zauberlandes«.

Diese Worte sind der Antrittsvorlesung Nietzsches an der Baseler Universität »Homer und die Klassische Philologie« (24) entnommen, die (Basel 1869) nur für Freunde gedruckt worden ist. Zwei Jahre später erschien (Basel 1871) eine andere kleine

Schrift derselben Geistesrichtung: »Sokrates und die griechische Tragödie«, welche indessen fast vollständig, mit nur äusserlichen Umstellungen des Gedankenzusammenhangs, in das 1872 veröffentlichte erste grössere philosophische Werk Nietzsches: »Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik« (Leipzig, E. W. Fritsch, jetzt C. G. Naumann)[3] aufgenommen worden ist. In diesen beiden Arbeiten baute Nietzsche seine culturphilosophischen Ausführungen noch auf streng philologischer Grundlage auf; und sie alle haben dazu beigetragen, seinen Namen unter den philologischen Fachgenossen zu verbreiten. Dennoch bezeichnen sie schon den Weg, den er, von seinem ursprünglichen Fachstudium aus, durch Kunst und Geschichte hindurch, zurückgelegt hatte, um schliesslich in die geschlossene Weltanschauung einer bestimmten Philosophie einzutreten. Es war die Weltanschauung Richard Wagners, die Verknüpfung seines Kunststrebens mit Schopenhauers Metaphysik. Wenn wir das Werk aufschlagen, so befinden wir uns mitten im Bannkreis des Meisters von Bayreuth.

Durch ihn erst vollzog sich für Nietzsche die volle Verschmelzung von Philologenthum und Philosophenthum, wurde erst jenes Wort wahr, womit er seinen »Homer und die klassische Philologie« schliesst, indem er einen Ausspruch des Seneca umkehrt: »philosophia facta est quae philologia fuit,« »damit soll ausgesprochen sein, dass alle und jede philologische Thätigkeit umschlossen und eingehegt sein soll von einer philosophischen Weltanschauung, in der alles Einzelne und Vereinzelte als etwas Verwerfliches verdampft und nur das Ganze und Einheitliche bestehen bleibt.«

Der Zauber, der Nietzsche auf Jahre hinaus zum Jünger Wagners machte, erklärt sich namentlich daraus, dass Wagner innerhalb des germanischen Lebens dasselbe Ideal einer Kunstcultur verwirklichen wollte, welches Nietzsche innerhalb des griechischen Lebens als Ideal aufgegangen war. Mit der Metaphysik Schopenhauers trat im Grunde nichts anderes hinzu, als eine Steigerung dieses Ideals ins Mystische, ins unergründlich Bedeutungsvolle,--gleichsam ein Accent, den es durch die _metaphysische Interpretation_ alles Kunsterlebens und Kunsterkennens noch erhielt. Diesen Accent empfindet man am deutlichsten, wenn man den »Sokrates und die griechische Tragödie« vergleicht mit der Ergänzung und Erweiterung, die derselbe in dem Hauptwerk: »Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik« erhalten hat. In diesem Buche sucht Nietzsche alle Kunstentwicklung auf die Bethätigung zweier entgegengesetzter »Kunsttriebe der Natur« zurückzuführen, die er nach den beiden Kunstgottheiten der Griechen als das Dionysische und das Apollinische bezeichnet. Unter ersterem versteht er das orgiastische Element, wie es sich in den wonnevollen Verzückungen, in der Mischung von Schmerz und Lust, von Freude und Entsetzen, in der selbstvergessenen Trunkenheit Dionysischer Feste auslebte. In ihnen sind die gewöhnlichen Schranken und Grenzen des Daseins vernichtet, scheint das Individuum wieder mit dem Naturganzen zu verschmelzen; zerbrochen ist das Principium individuationis; »der Weg zu den Müttern des Seins, zu dem innersten Kern der Dinge liegt offen« (86). Näher gebracht wird uns das Wesen dieses Triebes durch die physiologische Erscheinung des Rausches. Die ihm entsprechende Kunst ist die Musik. Den Gegensatz bildet der formenbildende Trieb, der in Apollo, dem Gott aller bildnerischen Kräfte, verkörpert ist. In ihm vereinigt sich maassvolle Begrenzung, Freiheit von allen wilderen Regungen und weisheitsvolle Ruhe. Er muss als der erhabene Ausdruck, als »die Vergöttlichung des »Principii individuationis« (16) betrachtet weiden, »dessen Gesetz das Individuum, d. h. die Einhaltung der Grenzen desselben, das Maass im hellenischen Sinne ist« (17). Die Macht des durch ihn symbolisirten Triebes offenbart sich physiologisch in dem schönen Schein der Welt des Traumes. Seine Kunst ist die plastische des Bildners.

In der Versöhnung und Verbindung dieser beiden sich anfänglich bekämpfenden Triebe erkennt Nietzsche Ursprung und Wesen der attischen Tragödie, die als die Frucht der Versöhnung der beiden widerstrebenden Kunstgottheiten ebenso sehr dionysisches als apollinisches Kunstwerk ist. Entstanden aus dem dithyrambischen Chor, der die Leiden des Gottes feierte, ist sie ursprünglich nur Chor, dessen Sänger durch die dionysische Erregung so verwandelt und verzaubert wurden, dass sie sich selbst als Diener des Gottes, als Satyrn, empfanden und als solche ihren Herrn und Meister Dionysos schauten. Mit dieser Vision, die der Chor aus sich erzeugt, gelangt sein Zustand zu apollinischer Vollendung. Das Drama als »die apollinische Versinnlichung dionysischer Erkenntnisse und Wirkungen« ist vollständig. »Jene Chorpartien, mit denen die Tragödie durchflochten ist, sind also gewissermassen der Mutterschoss des eigentlichen Dramas« (41); sie sind das dionysische Element desselben, während der Dialog den apollinischen Bestandteil bildet. In ihm sprechen von der Scene aus die Helden des Dramas als die apollinischen Erscheinungen, in denen sich der ursprüngliche tragische Held Dionysos objectivirt, als blosse Masken, hinter denen allen die Gottheit steckt.

Wir werden am Schlüsse unseres Buches sehen, in welch eigenthümlicher Weise Nietzsche ganz zuletzt noch einmal auf diesen Gedanken zurückgriff, indem er seine verschiedenen Entwicklungsperioden und Gesinnungswandlungen so darzustellen versuchte, als seien sie nicht unmittelbare Aeusserungen seines Geistes gewesen, sondern gewissermaassen nur willkürlich vorgehaltene Masken, »apollinische Scheinbilder«, hinter denen sein dionysisches Selbst, göttlich überlegen, das ewig gleiche geblieben sei. Die Ursachen dieser Selbsttäuschung werden wir am Schlüsse erkennen.

Die Bedeutung, die Nietzsche dem Dionysischen beimisst, ist charakteristisch für seine ganze Geistesart: als Philolog hat er mit seiner Deutung der Dionysoscultur einen neuen Zugang zur Welt der Alten gesucht; als Philosoph hat er diese Deutung zur Grundlage seiner ersten einheitlichen Weltanschauung gemacht; und über alle seine spätem Wandlungen hinweg taucht sie noch in seiner letzten Schaffensperiode wieder auf; verwandelt zwar, insofern ihr Zusammenhang mit der Metaphysik Schopenhauers und Wagners zerrissen ist: aber sich doch gleich geblieben in dem, worin schon damals seine eignen verborgenen Seelenregungen nach einem Ausdruck suchten; verwandelt erscheint sie zu Bildern und Symbolen seines letzten, einsamsten und innerlichsten Erlebens. Und der Grund dafür ist, dass Nietzsche im Rausch des Dionysischen etwas seiner eignen Natur Homogenes herausfühlte: jene geheimnissvolle Wesenseinheit von Weh und Wonne, von Selbstverwundung und Selbstvergötterung,--jenes Uebermass gesteigerten Gefühlslebens, in welchem alle Gegensätze sich bedingen und verschlingen, und auf das wir immer wieder zurückkommen werden.

Den schärfsten Contrast zum Dionysischen und der aus ihm geborenen Kunstcultur bildet die Geistesrichtung des theoretischen, aller Intuition entfremdeten Menschen, die auf den Namen des Sokrates getauft wird. In der »Geburt der Tragödie« sucht Nietzsche die Entwicklung dieser Geistesrichtung von Sokrates an durch die Philosophie und Wissenschaft aller Jahrhunderte bis auf unsere Zeit in grossen Zügen zu schildern. Mit Sokrates, dessen Vernunftlehre sich gegen die ursprünglichen hellenischen Instincte kehrte, um sie zu zügeln,--»schlägt der griechische Geschmack zu Gunsten der Dialektik um«, und es beginnt jener Triumphzug des Theoretischen, das durch Vernunft-Einsicht die letzten Gründe des Seins zu erforschen und dasselbe corrigiren zu können vermeint. Diesem Optimismus hat erst Kants Kritik ein Ende bereitet, indem sie auf die Grenzen des theoretischen Erkennens hinwies und, wie Nietzsche später witzig bemerkt, die Philosophie zu einer »Enthaltsamkeitslehre« reducirt, »die gar nicht über die Schwelle hinwegkommt und sich peinlich, das Recht zum Eintritt _verweigert_« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 204). Dadurch schaffte sie, nach Nietzsche, Raum für die Regeneration der Philosophie durch Schopenhauer, der endlich einen Zugang zum unerforschten Sein und zu dessen Umgestaltung auf dem Wege der intuitiven Erkenntniss erschlossen habe.

In den Jahren 1873--1876 veröffentlichte Nietzsche im Geist und Sinn seines vorhergehenden Werkes, unter dem Gesammttitel: »_Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen_«, vier kleinere Schriften,--bestimmt: »gegen die Zeit, und dadurch auf die Zeit und hoffentlich zu Gunsten einer kommenden Zeit«, zu wirken. Die erste derselben, die den Titel führte: »_David Strauss, der Bekenner und der Schriftsteller_«, bestand in einer vernichtenden Kritik des damals überaus gefeierten Buches »Der alte und der neue Glaube«, und einer energischen Befehdung des einseitigen Intellectualismus unserer modernen Bildung. Von dauernderem Interesse ist die zweite höchst werthvolle Schrift: »_Vom Nutzen und Nachtheil der Historie für das Leben_«, deren Grundgedanke in Nietzsches letzten Werken, wenn auch modificirt, aber darum nicht weniger deutlich wiederkehrt als seine Auffassung des Dionysischen. Das Wort Historie bezeichnet hier den Begriff des Gedankenlebens, ganz allgemein gefasst, im Gegensatz zum Instinctleben;--Erkennen des Vergangenen, Wissen vom Gewesenen, im Gegensatz zur vollen Lebenskraft des Gegenwärtigen und Werdenden. Die Schrift behandelt die Frage: »Wie ist das Wissen dem Leben unterthan zu machen?« und präcisirt den Standpunkt des Verfassers in dem Satze: »Nur soweit die Historie dem Leben dient, wollen wir ihr dienen.« Sie dient ihm aber nur so lange, als gegenüber den zersetzenden, belastenden und überall eindringenden Einflüssen des Gedanklichen die wichtigste Seelenfunction im Menschen noch völlig intact geblieben ist. »-- --die _plastische Kraft_ eines Menschen, eines Volkes, einer Cultur,-- --ich meine jene Kraft, aus sich heraus eigenartig zu wachsen, Vergangenes und Fremdes umzubilden und einzuverleiben, Wunden auszuheilen, Verlorenes zu ersetzen, zerbrochene Formen aus sich nachzuformen« (10). Sonst entsteht in uns ein Chaos fremder, uns nur zugeströmter Reichthümer, die wir nicht zu bewältigen, nicht zu assimiliren im Stande sind, und deren Mannigfaltigkeit daher das Einheitliche und Organische unserer Persönlichkeit schwer gefährdet. Wir werden dann zum passiven Schauplatz durcheinanderwogender Kämpfe, in denen sich die verschiedensten Gedanken, Stimmungen, Werthurtheile unaufhörlich befehden; wir leiden unter den Siegen der Einen wie unter den Niederlagen der Andern, ohne im Stande zu sein, unser Selbst zu ihrer Aller Herrn zu machen.

Hier findet sich zum ersten Mal eine Hindeutung auf Nietzsches so viel besprochenen _Decadenzbegriff_, der in seinen späteren Werken eine so grosse Rolle spielt. Nicht umsonst gemahnt uns diese erste Beschreibung der Decadenzgefahr an die von uns gegebene Schilderung seines eignen Seelenzustandes;--wir können hier schon den seelischen Ursprung derselben deutlich erkennen: es ist die geheime Qual, die es diesem leidenschaftlichen Geist verursachte, den steten Andrang überwältigender Erkenntnisse und Gedankenströmungen auszuhalten,-- Gewalt, mit der all sein Denken und Wissen auf sein Innenleben einwirkte, so dass die Fülle innerer einander widerstreitender Erlebnisse die geschlossenen Grenzen der Persönlichkeit zu sprengen drohte. Er sagt selbst im Vorwort (V) zu jener Schrift: »--Auch soll-- -- --nicht verschwiegen werden, dass ich die Erfahrungen, die mir jene quälenden Empfindungen erregten, meistens aus mir selbst und nur zur Vergleichung aus Anderen entnommen habe.«[4] Was er in sich selbst vorfand, das wurde ihm zur allgemeinen Gefahr des ganzen Zeitalters,--und steigerte sich später sogar zu einer

Todesgefahr für das ganze Menschenthum, die ihn zum Erlöser und Erretter aufrief. Die Folge aber dieses Umstandes ist ein eigenthümlicher Doppelsinn, der durch die ganze Schrift hindurch geht und einem kundigen Nietzsche-Leser sofort auffällt: da nämlich dasjenige, was am herrschenden Zeitgeist seine Bedenken hervorrief, doch etwas wesentlich Anderes war als sein eigenes Seelenproblem, so wendet er sich ohne Unterschied gegen zwei voneinander völlig verschiedene Dinge: Einmal gegen die Verkümmerung eines vollen, reichen Seelenlebens durch den erkältenden und lähmenden Einfluss einseitiger Verstandesbildung: »Der moderne Mensch schleppt zuletzt eine ungeheure Menge von unverdaulichen Wissenssteinen mit sich herum, die dann bei Gelegenheit ordentlich im Leibe rumpeln, wie es im Märchen heisst« (36). »Im Inneren ruht dann wohl die Empfindung jener Schlange gleich, die ganze Kaninchen verschluckt hat und sich dann still gefasst in die Sonne legt und alle Bewegungen ausser den nothwendigsten vermeidet.-- --Jeder, der vorübergeht, hat nur den einen Wunsch, dass eine solche »Bildung« nicht an Unverdaulichkeit zu Grunde gehe« (37).--Das andere Mal aber gerade gegen die allzu heftige, aufreizende und aufrührerische Einwirkung des Gedanklichen auf das psychische Leben, gegen den dadurch hervorgerufenen Kampf zusammenhangloser wilder Triebkräfte.

Es ist ein Unterschied wie zwischen Seelenstumpfsinn und Seelenwahnsinn. In Nietzsche selbst pflegten die abstractesten Gedanken sich in Gemüthsmächte umzusetzen, die ihn mit unmittelbarer und unberechenbarer Gewalt fortrissen. In dem von ihm gezeichneten Bilde unseres Zeitalters mussten sich ihm daher die beiden entgegengesetzten Wirkungen des Intellectuellen vermischen, und in Bezug auf die eine von ihnen,--auf die chaotische Entfesselung des Seelenlebens,--verschmolzen ihm in ähnlicher Weise zwei verschiedene Ursachen mit einander. Es handelt sich nämlich nicht nur um die rein intellectuellen Einflüsse, nicht nur um die Gefahr des Verstandesmässigen für das Instinctmässige, sondern auch um die uns vererbten und einverleibten Einflüsse längst verflossener Zeiten, die, einst einer intellectuellen Quelle entsprungen, jetzt nur in der Form von Trieben und Gefühlsschätzungen in uns leben.

Der geschlossenen Persönlichkeit droht also nicht nur die Gefahr, die von aussen kommt, sondern auch diejenige, die sie in sich trägt, die mit ihr geboren ist,--jene »Instinct-Widersprüchlichkeit«, die das Erbe aller Spätlinge ist, denn--Spätlinge sind Mischlinge.

Die Ueberwindung des Nachtheils, den die »Historie« in diesem Sinn,--erlernt oder erlebt,--bringen kann, liegt in der Hinwendung auf das Unhistorische. Unter dem Unhistorischen versteht Nietzsche die Rückkehr zum Unbewussten, zum Willen des Nichtwissens, zum Horizont-Abschliessenden, ohne das es kein Leben gibt. »Jedes Lebendige kann nur innerhalb eines Horizontes gesund, stark und fruchtbar werden« (11),-- --»Das Unhistorische ist einer umhüllenden Atmosphäre ähnlich, in der sich Leben allein erzeugt«.-- --Es ist wahr: erst dadurch, dass der Mensch denkend, überdenkend, vergleichend, trennend, zusammenschliessend jenes unhistorische Element einschränkt, erst dadurch dass innerhalb jener umschliessenden Dunstwolke ein heller, blitzender Lichtschein entsteht, also erst durch die Kraft, das Vergangene zum Leben zu gebrauchen und aus dem Geschehenen wieder Geschichte zu machen, wird der Mensch zum Menschen: aber in einem, Uebermaasse von Historie hört der Mensch wieder auf« (12 f.). Seine Kraft misst sich an dem Maass des Historischen, das er verträgt und besiegt,--an der Kraft des Unhistorischen in ihm: »Je stärkere Wurzeln die innere Natur eines Menschen hat, um so mehr wird er auch von der Vergangenheit sich aneignen oder anzwingen; und dächte man sich die mächtigste und ungeheuerste Natur, so wäre sie daran zu erkennen, dass es für sie gar keine Grenze des historischen Sinnes geben würde, an der sie überwuchernd und schädlich zu wirken vermöchte; alles Vergangene, eigenes und fremdestes, würde sie an sich heran, in sich hineinziehen und gleichsam zu Blut umschaffen. Das was eine solche Natur nicht bezwingt, weiss sie zu vergessen; es ist nicht mehr da, der Horizont ist geschlossen und ganz, und nichts vermag daran zu erinnern, dass es noch jenseits desselben Menschen, Leidenschaften, Lehren, Zwecke gibt.« (11) Ein solcher Geist treibt Historie auf alle drei Weisen, auf die sie überhaupt getrieben werden kann, ohne ihr nach irgend einer der drei Richtungen hin zu verfallen: er schaut sie an als _Monumentalgeschichte_, indem er seinen Blick auf den grossen Gestalten der Vorzeit ruhen lässt und sie auf sein Werk und sein Wollen bezieht, ohne sich jedoch an sie zu verlieren: als begeisternde Vorgänger und Genossen. Er vertieft sich in _antiquarische Geschichte_, indem er alles Vergangene durchwandert! wie die Stätte seines eignen Vorlebens,--wie Jemand, der die Stätte seiner eignen Kindheit betritt, an welcher ihm auch das Geringste werthvoll und bedeutsam erscheint:-- --»--er versteht die Mauer, das gethürmte Thor, die Rathsverordnung, das Volksfest wie ein ausgemaltes Tagebuch seiner Jugend und findet sich selbst in diesem Allen, seine Kraft, seinen Fleiss, seine Lust, sein Urtheil, seine Thorheit und Unart wieder. Hier Hess es sich leben, sagt er sich, denn es lässt sich leben, hier wird es sich leben lassen, denn wir sind zäh und nicht über Nacht umzubrechen. So blickt er, mit diesem »Wir«, über das vergängliche wunderliche Einzelleben hinweg und fühlt sich selbst als den Haus-, Geschlechts- und Stadtgeist« (28). Er wird endlich drittens auch _kritisch_ auf die Geschichte blicken, um zum Aufbau einer Zukunft eine Vergangenheit umzubrechen, und hierzu bedarf er der grössten Lebenskraft, denn grösser als die Gefahr, ein Schwärmer oder ein Sammler zu werden, ist die, ein Verneinender zu bleiben. »Es ist immer ein gefährlicher, nämlich für das Leben selbst gefährlicher Process:-- -- --Denn da wir nun einmal die Resultate früherer

Geschlechter sind,-- -- --ist (es) nicht möglich sich ganz von dieser Kette zu lösen.-- --Wir bringen es im besten Falle zu einem Widerstreite der ererbten, angestammten Natur und unserer Erkenntniss,-- -- --wir pflanzen eine neue Gewöhnung, einen neuen Instinct, eine zweite Natur an, so dass die erste Natur abdorrt. Es ist ein Versuch, sich gleichsam a posteriori eine Vergangenheit zu geben, aus der man stammen möchte, im Gegensatz zu der, aus der man stammt-- -- --. Aber hier und da gelingt der Sieg doch, und es gibt-- -- -- -- --einen merkwürdigen Trost: nämlich zu wissen, dass auch jene erste Natur irgend wann einmal eine zweite Natur war und dass jede siegende zweite Natur zu einer ersten wird« (33 f.).--Man kann diese drei Betrachtungsweisen der Historie in gewissem Sinne auf drei Perioden von Nietzsches eigener Entwicklung anwenden, indem man mit der antiquarischen, die dem Philologen zukommt, den Anfang macht, darauf die monumentale Auffassung folgen lässt, die ihn veranlasst, als Jünger zu Füssen grosser Meister zu sitzen, und endlich seine spätere positivistische Periode als die kritische bezeichnet. Nachdem aber Nietzsche auch diese letztere überwunden hatte, verschmolzen ihm alle drei Standpunkte zu einem einzigen, auf dem, wie sich zeigen wird, die in dieser Schrift enthaltenen Gedanken in geheimnissvoller und ergreifender Weise wiederkehren sollten, in der extremen und paradoxen Zuspitzung des Satzes: das Historische sei unterthan dem individuellen Leben, dessen ständige Bedingung das Unhistorische ist.--Die starke Natur, die er als zugleich historisch und unhistorisch beschreibt, ist somit ein Erbe aller Vergangenheit und dadurch ungeheuer in der Fülle des Erlebens, aber ein Erbe, der seinen Reichthum wahrhaft fruchtbar zu machen weiss, weil er ihn wahrhaft besitzt, über ihn gebietet,--nicht von ihm besessen und beherrscht wird. Ein solcher Erbe und Spätling ist dann immer zugleich der _Erstling_ einer neuen Cultur und, als Träger der Vergangenheit, ein Gestalter der Zukunft: der Reichthum, den er ausstreut, trägt noch den künftigen Zeiten Früchte. Er ist einer von den grossen »Unzeitgemässen«, welche in die fernste Vergangenheit niedertauchen, in die fernste Zukunft hinausweisen, in ihrer Zeit aber immer als Fremdlinge dastehen, obgleich in ihnen die Gegenwart ihre höchste Kraft sammelt und ausgibt.

Hier liegt der erste Ansatz zu den Gedanken der letzten Schaffensperiode Nietzsches: ein Einzelner der Genius der gesammten Menschheit, allein, fähig, von der Gegenwart aus die Vergangenheit als Ganzes zu deuten und damit auch die Zukunft, als fernstes Ganzes, bis in alle Ewigkeit in ihrem Ziel und Sinn zu bestimmen.

Rein äusserlich betrachtet, reichen die Wurzeln dieser Anschauung hinab bis zu Nietzsches Philologenthum, welches ihn dazu führte, sich alter Culturen erkennend zu bemächtigen. Wissen und Sein waren seiner geistigen Eigenart stets Eins: und so hiess für Nietzsche classischer Philologe sein so viel als Grieche sein. Gewiss musste dies die ihn quälende Instinctwidersprüchlichkeit, welche sich für ihn zum Gegensatz von Antik und Modern zuspitzte, noch verstärken, gleichzeitig aber auch die Mittel zu ihrer Bekämpfung enthalten, nämlich: durch die Vergangenheit, der Gegenwart überlegen, die Zukunft bauen; aus einem Mann der Zeit zu einem Spätling älterer Culturen und einem Erstling neuer Cultur werden.[5]

Zweien solcher »Unzeitgemässen«,--das ist Vorzeitgemässen und Zukunftgemässen, sind die beiden letzten von Nietzsches »Unzeitgemässen Betrachtungen« geweiht: »_Schopenhauer als Erzieher_«, und »_Richard Wagner in Bayreuth_«. In diesen beiden, mit überströmender Begeisterung aufgerichteten, Standbildern des Genius wird es besonders klar, 'bis zu welchem Grade die angestrebte Cultur des Unzeitgemässen in einem Cultus des Genies gipfelte. Im Genie besitzt die Menschheit nicht nur ihren Erzieher, ihren Führer, ihren Verkünder, sondern auch ihren eigentlichen und ausschliesslichen Endzweck. Die Vorstellung von den »erhabenen Einzelnen«, um derentwillen allein die übrige »Fabrikwaare der Natur« vorhanden sei, ist einer von jenen Schopenhauerischen Grundgedanken, die Nietzsche nie wieder losgelassen haben. Etwas in seinem innersten Geist dürstete ebenso unersättlich nach der ungeheuren Steigerung des Egoistischen in das Idealselbstische, das darin liegt, als auch nach der dunklen Kehrseite dieses höchsten Menschenlooses, nach dem »Einsamen« und »Heroischen«. In seiner mittleren Schaffensperiode ging er scheinbar von dieser ursprünglichen Genievorstellung ab, weil sie ihren metaphysischen Hintergrund eingebüsst hatte, von dem allein der grosse »Einzelne« sich in übermenschlicher Bedeutsamkeit abheben konnte,--wie eine Gestalt aus der höheren und wahren Welt. Aber der Gedanke des Geniecultus barg einen Ansatz zu dem, was Nietzsche, am Ende seiner Entwicklung, mit einem Griff genialen Wahnsinns, dann wieder aus ihm gestaltet hat. Denn zum Ersatz einer metaphysischen Deutung steigerte sich ihm der _positive Lebenswerth_ des Genies noch so hoch über Schopenhauers Auffassung desselben hinaus, dass diese letztere nur ein schwaches Gegenbild zu der seinen bietet.

Solange nämlich der Geniecultus ein Cultus des Metaphysischen in der menschlichen Physis blieb, erstreckte er sich auf eine fortlaufende Reihe, eine Kette solcher »Einzelner«, die einander in Sinn und Wesen ebenbürtig und gleichwerthig waren. Sie werden nicht als Bestandtheile einer Entwicklungslinie des Menschlichen betrachtet, sie: »--setzen nicht etwa einen Prozess fort, sondern leben zeitlos-gleichzeitig«,--sie bilden »eine Art von Brücke über den wüsten Strom des Werdens«. »-- -- --ein Riese ruft dem anderen durch die öden Zwischenräume der Zeiten zu, und ungestört durch muthwilliges, lärmendes Gezwerge, welches unter ihnen wegkriecht, setzt sich das hohe Geistergespräch fort.« (Nutzen u. Nachtheil d. Histor. 91). Weil es dieses »Gezwerge«

ist, das die ganze Entwicklungsgeschichte sowohl in ihren Geschehnissen, wie in ihren Gesetzen bestimmt, so ist Eins sicher: »Das Ziel der Menschheit kann nicht am Ende liegen,sondern nur in ihren höchsten Exemplaren.« (A. a. O.)

Aber da auch die höchsten Exemplare nur das zum Ausdruck bringen, was in der Tiefe des Menschlichen überhaupt, als sein metaphysisches Grundwesen, ruht, so unterscheiden sie sich von der Masse der Menschen weniger durch eine Wesens_verschiedenheit_, als vielmehr durch eine _Wesensenthüllung_, durch eine göttliche Nacktheit,--während der Mensch der Masse tausend über sein wahres Wesen gebreitete Schichten trägt, die alle der Welt und Lebensoberfläche angehören und sich hier und da bis zur Undurchdringlichkeit verhärten. »Wenn der grosse Denker die Menschen verachtet, so verachtet er ihre Faulheit: denn ihrethalben erscheinen sie als Fabrikware.-- --Der Mensch, welcher nicht zur Masse gehören will, braucht nur aufzuhören, gegen sich bequem zu sein« (Schopenhauer als Erzieher 4). Daher ist liebevolle Erziehung und Bemühung um Alle die Folge dieser Anschauungsweise, die im tiefsten Sinn Alle gleichstellt, weil sie den metaphysischen Kern in jeder Schale ehrt; sie entfernt sich darum von nichts so weit als von Nietzsches späteren Forderungen der Sklaverei und Tyrannei.

Ist aber wie in Nietzsches späterer Philosophie dieser metaphysische Hintergrund zerstört, löst sich das übersinnliche Sein in das unendliche Werden des Wirklichen auf, so vermag sich der Einzelne über die Masse nur durch einen Wesensunterschied zu erheben, der einem höchsten Gradesunterschied gleichkommt: indem er die Quintessenz dieses Werdeprocesses repräsentirt, umfasst er denselben möglichst in seiner Totalität, während der Mensch der Masse ihn nur blind und bruchstückweise zu erleben und in sich darzustellen weiss. Dieser Einzelne wäre gewissermassen als der Einziges imstande, der langen Entwicklung, die sich Geschichte nennt, einen Sinn zu geben; er selbst wäre nicht wie der Schopenhauerische Mensch geschaffen aus übersinnlichem Stoff, aber dafür wäre er durch und durch Schöpfer und als solcher imstande, der Welt jene Bedeutsamkeit der Dinge zu ersetzen, an die der Metaphysiker glaubt. Anstatt vieler einander ebenbürtiger Einzelner, die sich wie ein gleichmässig hoher zusammenhängender Bergrücken über dem Menschengetriebe erheben, gibt es daher in Nietzsches letzter Philosophie nur den grossen Einsamen, der sich als Gipfel des Ganzen darstellt; nach oben hin ist er noch viel einsamer als sie, denn er ist als Abschluss der Entwicklung das höchste Exemplar der Gattung, nach unten aber ist er viel härter und herrischer als sie, denn die Masse und das Leben bedeuten an sich, oder metaphysisch, nichts; er muss ihnen erst bis an seinen Gipfel hinan eine bestimmte Rangordnung verleihen. Es ist leicht begreiflich, warum erst mit ihm der Geniecultus ins Ungeheure wächst, denn in Ermangelung der metaphysischen Deutung, durch die der Schopenhauerische Mensch von vornherein in eine höhere Ordnung der Dinge erhoben wird, kann Er nur durch das Mittel des Ungeheuren überzeugen.

Folgendes sind die vier Gedanken der ersten philosophischen Periode Nietzsches, womit er sich, wenn auch in stets veränderter Auffassung bis zuletzt beschäftigt hat: es sind das Dionysische, die Decadenz, das Unzeitgemässe, der Geniecultus. Wie wir ihn selbst, so werden wir auch sie immer wiederfinden, und in demselben Maasse, als er sich selbst immer persönlicher in seiner Philosophie zum Ausdruck bringt, gestaltet er auch sie immer charakteristischer. Betrachtet man seine Gedanken in ihrem Wechsel und ihrer Mannigfaltigkeit, dann erscheinen sie fast unübersehbar und allzu complicirt; versucht man hingegen aus ihnen herauszuschälen, was sich im Wechsel stets gleich bleibt, dann erstaunt man über die Einfachheit und Beständigkeit seiner Probleme. »Immer ein Anderer und immer Derselbe!« konnte Nietzsche von sich sagen.

Dass die Wagner-Schopenhauerische Weltanschauung eine so tiefe Bedeutung für Nietzsche gewann, dass er später noch nach allen Kämpfen und von ganz entgegengesetzten Richtungen seines Geisteslebens aus sich wieder ihren Grundgedanken annäherte, zeigt, wie sehr dieselbe seiner ganzen Natur entgegenkam, wie sehr sich in ihr aussprach, was in ihm schlummerte. Aus seinem Philologenthum in dieses Philosophenthum erhoben, fühlte er sich ohne Zweifel einem Gefangenen gleich, von dem die Ketten fallen. Waren doch vorher seine besten Kräfte gebunden gewesen; jetzt durfte er aufathmen, jetzt wurde Alles in ihm befreit. Seine künstlerischen Instincte schwelgten in den Offenbarungen der Wagner'schen Musik; seine starke Veranlagung zu religiösen und moralischen Exaltationen genoss in der metaphysischen Ausdeutung dieser Kunst eine beständige Möglichkeit der Erhebung. Sein umfassendes gründliches Wissen diente der neuen Weltanschauung, die sich in seiner Auffassung des Griechenthums wiederspiegelte. Da in Wagners Person das Kunstgenie Thatsache geworden, in ihm gleichsam der »erlösende Heiland« gegeben war, so fiel Nietzsche die Stellung des Erkennenden, des wissenschaftlichen Vermittlers, zu: damit blieb er in der Aufgabe des Philosophen. Aber die gewonnene Erkenntniss selbst bildete nur den Anlass zur vollen Entfaltung seiner künstlerischen und religiösen Eigenart, und eben dies bezeichnet ihren Werth für seinen Geist. Wonach er sich schon während seiner philologischen Studien gesehnt hatte, als er dem Leben der alten Philosophen nachforschte, das war hier zur Wahrheit geworden: das Denken ein Erleben, die Erkenntniss ein Mitarbeiten und Mitschaffen an der neuen Cultur; im Gedanken durften alle Seelenkräfte Zusammenwirken: er forderte den ganzen Menschen. Nietzsche gibt nur dem befreienden Entzücken Ausdruck, das er hier genoss, wenn er am Schluss seines »Sokrates und die klassische Philologie« in die Worte ausbricht: »Ach! Es ist der

Zauber dieser Kämpfe, dass, wer sie schaut, sie auch kämpfen muss!«

Und wie seine einzelnen Geistesanlagen sich jetzt freier ausleben und entwickeln durften, so bot diese Periode in Nietzsches Leben auch jenem tiefsten, fast weiblichen Bedürfnisse seines Inneren nach persönlicher Anbetung, nach Aufblick, volle Befriedigung, das sich später so schmerzlich an sich selbst befriedigen musste. Mochte die Wagner-Schopenhauerische Philosophie, ihrer ganzen Anschauungsweise nach, ihm ein noch so tiefes Glück gewähren, so war doch das Werthvollste für ihn hier das persönliche Verhältniss zu Wagner, der unbedingte Aufblick zu ihm. Seine Begeisterung entzündete sich darin an einer ausser ihm stehenden Persönlichkeit, in der er gleichsam das Ideal seines eigenen Wesens verkörpert zu sehen glaubte. Das Glück eines solchen Glaubens breitet über die Gedanken der ersten philosophischen Schriften Nietzsches etwas Gesundes, beinahe Naives, das von der Eigenart seiner späteren Werke scharf absticht. Es ist, als sähe man ihn erst an dem Bilde seines Meisters Wagner und dessen Philosophen Schopenhauer sich selbst begreifen und errathen. Denn mit instinctiver Scheu weist er noch jene Kunst zurück, sein eigenes Selbst in bewusster Weise zum »Object und Experiment des Erkennenden« zu machen, die Kunst, an der er später so gross und so krank werden sollte. »Wie kann sich der Mensch kennen? Er ist eine dunkle und verhüllte Sache; und wenn der Hase sieben Häute hat, so kann der Mensch sich siebenmal siebzig abziehen und wird doch nicht sagen können »das bist du nun wirklich, das ist nicht mehr Schaale«. Zudem ist es ein quälerisches gefährliches Beginnen, sich selbst derartig anzugraben und in den Schacht seines Wesens auf dem nächsten Wege gewaltsam hinabzusteigen. Wie leicht beschädigt er sich dabei so, dass kein Arzt ihn heilen kann« (Schopenhauer als Erzieher 7). Und deshalb ruft er der Jugend, die nach Einsicht in ihr eigenes Selbst begehrt, die Worte zu: »was hat deine Seele hinangezogen, was hat sie beherrscht und zugleich beglückt? Stelle dir die Reihe dieser verehrten Gegenstände vor dir auf, und vielleicht ergeben sie dir-- -- --ein Gesetz, das Grundgesetz deines eigentlichen Selbst. Vergleiche diese Gegenstände, sieh,-- -- --wie sie eine Stufenleiter bilden, auf welcher du bis jetzt zu dir selbst hingeklettert bist; denn dein wahres Wesen liegt nicht tief verborgen in dir, sondern unermesslich hoch über dir -- -- --.« (A. a. O.)

Mit einer Offenheit, die ihm später während der Zeit peinlichster Selbstanalyse ganz abhanden kam, legt er die Motive bloss, aus denen es ihn von Anfang an inbrünstig nach einer solchen Jüngerschaft verlangt habe--nach einem überlegenen »Wegweiser zugleich und Zuchtmeister« (Schopenhauer als Erzieher 14): »-- --darf ich ein wenig bei einer Vorstellung verweilen, welche in meiner Jugend so häufig und so dringend war, wie kaum eine andre. Wenn ich früher recht nach Herzenslust in Wünschen ausschweifte, dachte ich mir, dass mir die schreckliche Bemühung und Verpflichtung, mich selbst zu erziehen, durch das Schicksal abgenommen würde: dadurch dass ich zur rechten Zeit einen Philosophen zum Erzieher fände, einen wahren Philosophen, dem man ohne weiteres Besinnen gehorchen könnte, weil man ihm mehr vertrauen würde als sich selbst.« (Schopenhauer als Erzieher 8 f.) Es ist interessant, zu beobachten, wie er zu diesem Zwecke hinter dem Denker Schopenhauer einen Idealmenschen Schopenhauer zu entdecken sucht,[6] und wie er Wagner gegenüber von einer tiefen Verwandtschaft ihrer beiderseitigen Naturen ausgeht. In der That überrascht die Uebereinstimmung der von ihm geschilderten natürlichen und geistigen Anlagen Wagners mit der »Vielstimmigkeit« seiner eigenen Anlagen, wie sie im ersten Theil dieses Buches dargelegt ist. So sagt er in »Richard Wagner in Bayreuth« (13): »Jeder seiner Triebe strebte ins Ungemessene, alle daseinsfreudigen Begabungen wollten sich einzeln losreissen und für sich befriedigen; je grösser ihre Fülle, um so grösser war der Tumult, um so feindseliger ihre Kreuzung«.

Dann, beim Eintritt der »geistigen und sittlichen« Mannbarkeit Wagners, gelangt diese »Vielheit« zum Zusammenschluss und zugleich zu einer eigentümlichen »Spaltung in sich«. »Seine Natur erscheint in furchtbarer Weise vereinfacht, in zwei Triebe oder Sphären auseinandergerissen. Zu unterst wühlt ein heftiger Wille in jäher Strömung, der gleichsam auf allen Wegen, Höhlen und Schluchten ans Licht will und nach Macht verlangt. (10.)-- -- -- -- -- --Der gesammte Strom stürzte sich bald in dieses, bald in jenes Thal und bohrte in die dunkelsten Schluchten:--in der Nacht dieses halb unterirdischen Wühlens erschien ein Stern hoch über ihm-- --« (12.) »Wir thun einen Blick in die _andere_ Sphäre Wagners. Es ist die eigenste Urerfahrung, welche Wagner in sich selbst erlebt und wie ein religiöses Geheimniss verehrt:-- -- --jene wundervolle Erfahrung und Erkenntniss, dass die eine Sphäre seines Wesens der andern treu blieb,-- -- --die schöpferische, schuldlose lichtere Sphäre der dunkelen, unbändigen, tyrannischen.« (13.)

»Im Verhalten der beiden tiefsten Kräfte zu einander, in der Hingebung der einen an die andere, lag die grosse Nothwendigkeit, durch welche er allein ganz und er selbst bleiben konnte.« (13.)

Gegen den Schluss der Schrift sucht Nietzsche auch die Musik Wagners aus dieser ihm selbst so verwandten Eigenart heraus zu begreifen, indem er das musikalische Genie Wagners als eine Art Wiederspieglung von dessen seelischen Zuständen auffasste:

»-- --wie seine Musik sich mit einer gewissen Grausamkeit des Entschlusses dem Gange des Dramas, der wie das Schicksal unerbittlich ist, unterwirft, während die feurige Seele dieser Kunst darnach lechzt, einmal ohne alle Zügel in der Freiheit und

Wildniss umherzuschweifen.« (82.)

»Ueber allen den tönenden Individuen und dem Kampfe ihrer Leidenschaften, über dem ganzen Strudel von Gegensätzen, schwebt,-- --ein übermächtiger symphonischer Verstand, welcher aus dem Kriege fortwährend die Eintracht gebiert.« (79.)

»Nie ist Wagner mehr Wagner, als wenn die Schwierigkeiten sich verzehnfachen und er in ganz grossen Verhältnissen mit der Lust des Gesetzgebers walten kann. Ungestüme, widerstrebende Massen zu einfachen Rhythmen bändigen, durch eine verwirrende Mannigfaltigkeit von Ansprüchen und Begehrungen Einen Willen durchführen«--. (80.)

Aber gerade diese Verwandtschaft ihrer beiderseitigen Naturen musste Nietzsche schliesslich zu einer Weiterentwicklung seines Geistes auf einsamen Bahnen führen, sie musste ihn irgend wann einmal von Wagner losreissen. Sobald Nietzsche in dieser Periode den Höhepunkt erreicht hat, ist auch schon der erste Schritt vorgezeichnet, der ihn unvermeidlich abwärts führen musste. Es erscheint als eine völlige Verkehrung des Sachverhalts, wenn er später in seinem ungerechten Büchlein »Der Fall Wagner« behauptet: »Mein grösstes. Erlebniss war eine _Genesung_. Wagner gehört bloss zu meinen Krankheiten.« (Vorwort.) Denn in das Krankhafte geht seine Entwicklung erst lange nach seinem Bruch mit Wagner, ja man kann von seiner Wagnerperiode in gewissem Sinne sagen, dass sie zu seinen überwundenen Gesundheiten gehört habe. Trotzdem aber darf man das Wahre in seiner Behauptung nicht überhören: dass er nämlich damals seinen eigenen Höhepunkt noch nicht erreicht habe, wie gesund und glücklich er auch zu jener Zeit gewesen sei.

Diese Gesundheit hätte er sich nur erhalten können um den Preis der Grösse. Um aus dem Jünger ein Meister zu werden, musste er erst in sein Selbst einkehren; da aber seine Natur mit zwingender Nothwendigkeit nach einer Jüngerschaft im religiösen Sinne verlangte, so blieb nur die eine Möglichkeit, Jünger und Meister in sich selbst zu vereinigen,-- sei es auch, um daran zu leiden, sei es auch, um an einer krankhaften Verschmelzung Beider zu Grunde zu gehen. Von seinem Weg zur Grösse gilt Zarathustras Wort: »Gipfel und Abgrund--das ist jetzt in Eins beschlossen!«

Man hat dem Abfall Nietzsches von Wagner die verschiedenartigsten Deutungen gegeben, man hat ihn aus rein idealen Beweggründen--unwiderstehlichem Wahrheitsdrang--und auch aus menschlichen-allzumenschlichen Motiven zu erklären gesucht. In Wirklichkeit kreuzte sich aber wohl beides darin in ganz ähnlicher Weise, wie dies schon in der allerersten Wandlung Nietzsches, in seiner Abwendung vom Glauben, der Fall gewesen war; gerade der Umstand, dass er volles Genügen, Seelenfrieden und eine Geistesheimat gefunden hatte, dass ihm Wagners Weltanschauung so weich und glatt anlag wie eine »gesunde Haut«, kitzelte ihn, sie sich abzustreifen, Hess ihm sein »Ueberglück als Ungemach« erscheinen, Hess ihn »verwundet werden von seinem Glück«. Auf diese Art der Entstehungseiner freigeisterischen Richtung findet seine »Vermuthung über den Ursprung der Freigeisterei« überhaupt (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 232) Anwendung, die durch allzu starke Empfindungsseligkeit in der gegebenen Weltanschauung erzeugt werde: »Ebenso wie die Gletscher zunehmen, wenn in den Aequatorialgegenden die Sonne mit grösserer Gluth als früher auf die Meere niederbrennt, so mag auch wohl eine sehr starke, um sich greifende Freigeisterei Zeugniss dafür sein, dass irgendwo die Gluth der Empfindung ausserordentlich gewachsen ist.«

Erst in der selbstgewollten, selbstgesuchten Peinigung wuchs seinem Geist die streitbare, harte Rüstung, mit der gewappnet er dann gegen seine alten Ideale zu Felde zog. Gewiss empfand er es als eine Befreiung, sich mit dem Verzicht auf Erhebendes und Schönes zugleich aus einer letzten Abhängigkeit loszulösen; aber dennoch stellte diese Selbstbefreiung einen Act der Entsagung dar; er litt unter ihr, wie man unter Wunden leidet, auch wenn man sie sich selbst geschlagen hat.

Der Bruch vollzog sich endgiltig und für Wagner völlig unerwartet, als dieser mit seiner Parsifal-Dichtung bei katholisirenden Tendenzen angelangt--war, während Nietzsches Geistesentwicklung in einer jähen Wandlung sich der positivistischen Philosophie der Engländer und Franzosen zugewandt hatte. Der Abfall Nietzsches von Wagner bedeutete aber nicht nur eine Trennung der Geister, sondern zerriss zugleich ein Verhältniss, in welchem sich beide so nahe gestanden hatten, wie nur der Sohn dem Vater, der Bruder dem Bruder nahe steht. Ganz vergessen, ganz verschmerzen konnte es wohl keiner von ihnen. Noch im Herbst 1882, ein halbes Jahr vor dem Tode Wagners, wurde während der Bayreuther Festspiele,--der Erstaufführung des Parsifal--, der Versuch gemacht, Nietzsche vor dem Meister zu erwähnen. Nietzsche weilte damals in der Nähe, in dem thüringischen Dörfchen Tautenburg bei Dornburg, und seine alte Freundin Fräulein von Meysenbug meinte, obschon mit Unrecht, dass im Fall des Gelingens Nietzsche zu bewegen gewesen wäre, nach Bayreuth zu kommen und Sich mit Wagner zu versöhnen. Indessen der Versuch misslang; Wagner verliess in grosser Erregung das Zimmer und verbot, den Namen jemals wieder vor ihm auszusprechen. Aus ungefähr derselben Zeit stammt folgender in Facsimile wiedergegebene Brief Nietzsches, der seine eigene Stellung in dem Bruch mit Wagner beredt genug schildert:

[Illustration]

[Illustration]

[Illustration]

[Illustration]

Wenn ich diese kurze Schilderung lese, dann sehe ich ihn selbst vor mir, wie er, während einer gemeinsamen Reise von Italien her durch die Schweiz, mit mir das Gut Triebschen bei Luzern besuchte, den Ort, an welchem er mit Wagner unvergessliche Zeiten verlebt hatte. Lange, lange sass er dort schweigend am Seeufer, in schwere Erinnerungen versunken; dann, mit dem Stock im feuchten Sande zeichnend, sprach er mit leiser Stimme von jenen vergangenen Zeiten. Und als er aufblickte, da weinte er.

Mit seiner innern und äussern Loslösung von dem Wagnerthum und der Philosophie Schopenhauers fällt Nietzsches schwerstes körperliches Leiden zusammen. So lebte er damals, körperlich wie geistig, unter Stürmen und Schmerzen, die ihn in die Nähe »leiblichen wie seelischen Todes« brachten. Seine Krankheit war zum Ausbruch gekommen in den Jahren gesteigertster Productivität, allzu vielseitiger und aufreibender Beschäftigung mit wissenschaftlichen Untersuchungen, philosophischen Problemen, mit der geistigen Bewegung der Gegenwart, der Kunst Wagners und mit der Musik selbst. Es ist gewiss nicht zufällig, dass auch der letzte, verhängnissvolle Ausbruch seines Kopfleidens am Ende der Achtziger Jahre ebenfalls auf eine Periode ungeheurer geistiger Schaffenskraft und Regsamkeit folgte. Wenn er sich am gesundesten und rüstigsten, in der Vollkraft seiner Leistungsfähigkeit fühlte, dann kam er stets der Krankheit am nächsten; und die Zeiten unfreiwilliger Müsse und Ruhe waren es, die ihm immer wieder Erholung brachten und die Katastrophe noch aufhielten.

Dieser Vorgang spiegelt rein körperlich etwas von jenem eigenthümlich pathologischen Zuge der »Uebergesundheit« seines Geisteslebens wieder, welche in Krankheitszustände überzuströmen pflegte, nachdem sie ihren Höhepunkt erreicht hatte. Aus ihnen rang er sich aber mit der zähen Kraft seiner ungeheuren Natur stets wieder zur Gesundheit durch.

Solange er noch die Schmerzen bezwang und die volle Arbeitskraft in sich fühlte, konnte selbst das Leiden seiner lebensvollen Unverwüstlichkeit und Selbstbehauptung noch nichts anhaben. Noch am 12. Mai 1878 schreibt er im Ton getrosten Muthwillens in einem Briefe aus Basel: »Die Gesundheit schwankend und gefährlich, aber--fast hätte ich gesagt: was geht mich meine Gesundheit an?«

Aber dann folgt, am 14. December 1878, die Hindeutung auf den voraussichtlich nothwendigen Rücktritt von der Professur: »Mein Zustand ist eine Thierquälerei und Vorhölle, ich kanns nicht leugnen. _Wahrscheinlich_ hört es mit meiner akademischen Thätigkeit auf, _vielleicht_ mit der Thätigkeit überhaupt, _möglicherweise_ mit-- --u. s. w.« Und dann die bittere Klage: »Es scheint mir nichts mehr zu helfen, die Schmerzen waren gar zu toll.-- -- --Immer heisst es: Ertrage! Entsage! Ach, man bekommt die Geduld auch satt. Wir haben die Geduld zur Geduld nöthig!«

Endlich, im Tone stiller Ergebung, ein Brief aus Genf, vom 15. Mai 1879:

»Mir geht es nicht gut, aber ich bin ein alter routinirter Leidtragender und werde meine Bürde weiterschleppen,--aber _nicht_ mehr lange, so hoffe ich!«

Bald darauf legte er seine Professur nieder, und auf immer umfing ihn die Einsamkeit, Der Verzicht auf seine Lehrthätigkeit fiel ihm schwer,--war es doch im Grunde der Verzicht auf jede fernere strengwissenschaftliche Arbeit. Kopf und Augen,--er nennt sich selbst einen »Kranken, der jetzt leider auch ein Sieben-Achtel-Blinder ist, und nicht mehr lesen kann, ausser mit Schmerzen und auf ein Viertelstündchen« (Brief an Rée)--, hinderten ihn nunmehr dauernd an einem stofflichen Ausbau seiner Gedanken durch ausgebreitete Studien. Wie umfangreich und vielseitig er seine Forschungen angelegt hatte, zeigt die grosse Mannigfaltigkeit seiner an der Universität und am Pädagogium zu Basel gehaltenen Vorlesungen.

Allerdings beschränkte er sich damals noch auf die Erforschung des Hellenenthums und blieb philosophisch in den Fesseln eines bestimmten metaphysischen Systems gebunden. Aber seine spätere Selbstbefreiung vom Zwang dieses Systems hätte unter andern Gesundheitsverhältnissen um so günstiger wirken müssen. Das Culturbild des griechischen Lebens, aus dem er damals mit den Augen des Metaphysikers die tiefsten Grundzüge des Weltbildes und Menschenlebens herauszulesen meinte, würde sich ihm, auf dem Wege wissenschaftlicher Weiterarbeit, allmählig zu einem Totalbilde der Weltentwicklung erweitert haben. In der Genialität seiner feinen Anempfindung und künstlerischen Nachgestaltungskraft war er geradezu prädestinirt zu geschichtsphilosophischen Leistungen im Grossen. Sein Drang zum Produciren wäre dadurch gehindert worden, sich allzusehr ins Subjective zu verlieren;

empfand er es doch oftmals selbst, dass, je beflügelter, drängender und leidenschaftlicher geartet die Gedanken sind, desto umfassender und strenger der Stoff sein müsse, an dem sie gebunden, von dem sie beherrscht werden. Daher begegnen wir in seinen Werken bis zuletzt immer wieder erneuten fruchtlosen Anstrengungen, sich nach aussen hin auszubreiten und sein Denken wissenschaftlich zu begründen,--es ist etwas vom vergeblichen Flügelschlagen eines gefangenen Adlers darin. Er war durch seine Gesundheit _genöthigt_, sich selbst zum Stoff seiner Gedanken zu nehmen, sein eignes Ich seinem philosophischen Weltbilde unterzulegen und dieses aus dem eignen Innern herauszuspinnen. Vielleicht hätte er im andern Falle etwas so ganz Eigenartiges,--und daher so ganz Einzigartiges, nicht geleistet. Aber trotzdem vermag man nicht ohne das tiefste Bedauern auf diesen Wendepunkt in Nietzsches Schicksal zurückzublicken,--auf diesen unheimlichen _Zwang_ zur Selbstvereinsamung und Selbstabschliessung,--man vermag sich dem Gefühl nicht zu entziehen, dass er hier an einer Grösse, die ihm Vorbehalten war, _vorübergeht_.

An dieser Stelle wird es um Nietzsche Nacht. Seine bisherigen Ideale, seine Gesundheit, seine Arbeitskraft, sein Wirkungskreis,--Alles, was seinem Leben Licht und Glanz und Wärme gegeben hatte, entschwand ihm eins nach dem andern. Es war ein ungeheurer Zusammenbruch, unter dessen Trümmern er wie begraben wurde. Es begannen seine »_Dunkel-Zeiten_.« (S. Der Wanderer u. sein Schatten 191.)

Die jetzt folgenden Schriften sind nicht, wie die bisherigen, aus einer Fülle herausgeschöpft, die in ihm angesammelt und bereit lag, von einem Ziel aus verfasst, das er erreicht zu haben glaubte,--sie erzählen vielmehr davon, wie er sich in seiner Nacht orientirt und langsam vorwärts tastet, sie sind die qualvollen, kampfvollen, endlich sieghaften Schritte nach einem dunklen Ziele hin.

»Als ich allein weiter ging,« bekennt er viele Jahre später (Einführende Vorrede zum zweiten Bande von »Menschliches, Allzumenschliches«) von dieser Zeit, »zitterte ich: nicht lange darauf, und ich war krank, mehr als krank, nämlich müde, aus der unaufhaltsamen Enttäuschung über Alles, was uns modernen Menschen zur Begeisterung übrig blieb-- --«. Aber nicht als einen Klagenden sehen wir ihn sich durch die Trümmer hindurchkämpfen,--und mit Recht bezeichnet er dies als den Reiz jener Schriften: »dass hier ein Leidender und Entbehrender redet, wie als ob er _nicht_ ein Leidender und Entbehrender sei.« (Ebendaselbst.)

Immer wieder wird er zu einem Neu-Schaffenden und Neu-Entdeckenden. Tief unter die Trümmerwelt steigt er hinab, er untergräbt und unterwühlt noch ihre letzten Fundamente und späht mit nachtgewöhntem Auge nach den verborgenen Schätzen und Heimlichkeiten des Erdinnern aus. Ein zweiter Trophonius, listig aus-und einschlüpfend, weiss er auch aus der Tiefe noch Aufschluss zu geben über die Welt da droben und ihr Räthsel zu deuten. So sehen wir ihn: »einen Unterirdischen, an der Arbeit, einen Bohrenden, Grabenden, Untergrabenden,-- --wie er langsam, besonnen, mit sanfter Unerbittlichkeit vorwärts kommt, ohne dass die Noth sich allzusehr, verriethe, welche jede lange Entbehrung von Licht und Luft mit sich bringt.« Und darüber kommt uns jene zuversichtliche Frage, mit der er selbst auf diese Jahre zurückblickte, und die die Betrachtung seiner ferneren Entwicklungsgeschichte uns beantworten soll: »--Scheint es nicht, dass-- -- --er vielleicht seine eigne lange Finsterniss haben will, sein Unverständliches, Verborgenes, Rätselhaftes, weil er weiss, was er auch haben wird: seinen eignen Morgen, seine-eigne Erlösung, seine eigne Morgenröte?...« (Einführende Vorrede zur neuen Ausgabe der »Morgenröte«.)

[Illustration]

[Illustration]

[Illustration]

[Illustration]

Mit solchen Gefühlen von Selbstmitleid und Selbstbewunderung blickte Nietzsche auf die Geistesperiode zurück, vor welcher wir nunmehr stehen. Wir sehen: das Charakterische sind von vornherein die Kämpfe und Wunden, die es ihn kostete, sich die neue Weltanschauung anzueignen; es ist das tiefe Erkranken an ihr, aus dem er sich alsdann seine neue Gesundheit schuf. Seine Originalität musste sich daher zunächst viel weniger in den Einsichten und Theorien selbst aussprechen, die sich ihm damals erschlossen, als vielmehr in der Kraft, mit der er sich vom alten Ideal losriss, um sie erfassen zu können. Er gelangte eben nicht wie die Meisten zum Bewusstsein erhöhter Selbständigkeit und eigenster Geistesthätigkeit auf Grund einer intellectuellen Entwicklung, die uns gleichgiltig und kalt stimmt gegenüber den verlassenen unreiferen Gedanken. Er gelangte dazu nur durch eine gewaltsame Empörung gegen das Ehemalige, wobei die intellectuellen Gründe den Gesinnungswechsel weniger bedingten als begleiteten. Daher sehen wir anfänglich immer, dass Nietzsche die neuen Gedanken in einer gewissen Unselbständigkeit so hinnimmt, wie er sie gerade vorfindet,--dass er sie zunächst wieder kritiklos empfängt; denn seine ganze Kraft ist inzwischen

vollständig in Anspruch genommen von den allerinnerlichsten Erlebnissen, und die neuen Theorien als solche bilden,--um einen Lieblingsausdruck von Nietzsche zu gebrauchen,--nur eine vorläufige »Vordergrundsphilosophie«, während im verborgenen Hintergründe, den Kämpfen des Seelenlebens, sich der eigentlich entscheidende Process abspielt.

Je fester er mit dem Alten verwachsen ist, je gewaltsamer der Sprung ins Neue eine vollständige Entwurzelung aus dem heimischen Geistesboden verlangt, desto tiefer ist die innere Bedeutung der Wandlung. So kann man in gewissem Sinne sagen, dass gerade die scheinbare innere Unselbständigkeit, mit welcher Nietzsche sich einer fremden Denkweise vorläufig hingiebt, eine Kraft heroischester Selbständigkeit verbürgt. Während die theuersten Gedanken ihn heimlocken, überlässt er sich wehrlos Gedankenkreisen, denen gegenüber er sich noch als Fremdling, ja insgeheim noch als Gegner fühlt,--aber mit jenem schönen Wort im Herzen: »Ein Sieg und eine eroberte Schanze sind nicht mehr deine Angelegenheit, sondern die der Wahrheit,--aber auch deine Niederlage ist nicht mehr deine Angelegenheit.« (Morgenröthe 370 »Inwiefern der Denker seinen Feind liebt.«)

Man muss dies im Auge behalten, wenn man Nietzsches unvermitteltem Gesinnungswechsel gerecht werden und die Entstehung seines positivistischen Erstlingswerkes begreifen will,--dieses Werkes, welches so überraschend und unerwartet seinem Geiste entsprang. Erst im Jahre 1876 war die letzte der »Unzeitgemässen Betrachtungen«, das in überströmender Begeisterung geschriebene Büchlein »Richard Wagner in Bayreuth«, erschienen, und schon in dem Winter 1876/1877 entstand die erste seiner Aphorismensammlungen: _Menschliches, Allzumenschliches_. Ein Buch für freie Geister. (Dem Andenken Voltaire's geweiht zur Gedächtniss-Feier seines Todestages, des 30. Mai 1778) nebst einem Anhang: Vermischte Meinungen und Sprüche. (Verlag von Ernst Schmeitzner, Chemnitz, 1878.) Von keinem Buche gilt mit grösserm Recht das Wort, das er über die Werke dieser Periode schrieb: »Meine Schriften reden _nur_ von meinen _Ueberwindungen_: ich bin darin, mit Allem, was mir feind war.-- -- --Einsam nunmehr,-- --nahm ich-- --Partei _gegen_ mich und _für_ Alles, was gerade mir wehe that und hart fiel«. (Einführende Vorrede zur Neuen Ausgabe von Menschliches, Allzumenschliches II, VIII.) Jenes Werk spiegelt den damaligen Zustand seines Geistes so deutlich wieder, dass es zwei völlig von einander verschiedene Bestandtheile zu enthalten scheint: einerseits den noch unselbständigen Positivisten Nietzsche, der uns in den neu übernommenen Theorien fast nichts Eigenes giebt, sondern uns nur darüber orientirt, wo er sich jetzt befindet,--in welche neue »Haut« er sich fast passiv hat kleiden lassen; andererseits den Kämpfer und Dulder Nietzsche, der sich entschlossen von den ehemaligen Idealen losringt und uns in diesem Kampfe eine ergreifende Fülle des originalsten Gedankenlebens durch die Inbrunst offenbart, mit welcher er sich gegen sein eigenes altes Selbst wehrt und sich selbst verwundet. Hieraus erklärt sich auch die Leidenschaftlichkeit und Rücksichtslosigkeit der Angriffe, die er gegen Wagner und dessen Ansichten richtet. Niemand ist weniger fähig zu ruhig abwägender Gerechtigkeit als der, welcher seinen Ueberzeugungswechsel gerade vollzieht,--und dies nicht aus rein intellectuellen Gründen, sondern selber aus der Tiefe des »Menschlichen, Allzumenschlichen« seiner eigenen Natur heraus. Keinen Gedanken schleudern wir so weit, so heftig von uns fort, als denjenigen, von dem wir uns soeben erst in schmerzlichem Widerstreit getrennt haben, und vor dem wir noch verletzt und erschüttert, voll geheimer Wunden, die unser Stolz verbirgt, dastehen: es ist Hass darin als ein Nachklang unvergesslicher Liebe.

Durchaus bezeichnend für das Jähe und Innerliche der Wandlung Nietzsches ist es, dass sie auch diesmal ihren Ausgang von einem _persönlichen Verhältniss_ nahm. Wie der bitterste Stachel im Kampf gegen das alte Erkenntnissideal ein Freundschaftsbruch war, so verkörperte sich für Nietzsche auch der neue Erkenntnisstypus wiederum in einer Persönlichkeit. Je leidensvoller die Einsamkeit, in welche der Freundschaftsbruch ihn zurückwarf, desto mehr Innigkeit gewann Nietzsches Beziehung zu Paul Rée, denn »für einen solchen Einsamen ist der Freund ein köstlicherer Gedanke als für die Vielsamen,« wie er Rée einmal schreibt. (31. October 1880, aus Italien.)

War sein Verhältniss zu Richard Wagner durch die Ausschliesslichkeit gekennzeichnet, mit der Nietzsche in ihm aufging und zu ihm aufsah: durch seine _Jüngerschaft_,--so bildet sein Freundschaftsbund mit Rée mehr eine geistige _Genossenschaft_, die selbst dadurch nicht behindert wurde, dass die Freunde fern von einander lebten, und Rée nur zeitweise seinen Wohnsitz in Westpreussen verlassen konnte, um mit Nietzsche an verschiedenen Orten zusammenzutreffen. Schon am 19. November 1877 klagt Nietzsche von Basel aus, wo er noch im Kreise von Gesinnungsgenossen lebte, über diese Entfernung, welche ihn, infolge einer Erkrankung Rées, für längere Zeit vom Freunde getrennt hielt:

»Möge ich bald von Ihnen, mein Freund, hören, dass die bösen Krankheitsgeister ganz von Ihnen gewichen sind; dann bliebe mir für Ihr neues Lebensjahr nichts zu wünschen übrig, als dass Sie bleiben, der Sie sind und dass Sie mir bleiben, der Sie im letzten Jahre waren,-- -- -- -- -- -- -- --ich muss Ihnen doch sagen, dass ich in meinem Leben noch nicht so viel Annehmlichkeiten von der Freundschaft gehabt habe, wie durch Sie in diesem Jahre, gar nicht von dem zu reden, was ich von Ihnen gelernt habe. Wenn ich von Ihren Studien höre, so wässert mir immer der Mund nach Ihrem Umgänge; wir sind geschaffen dafür, uns gut zu verständigen, ich glaube, wir finden uns immer auf dem halben Wege schon, wie gute Nachbarn, die immer zur gleichen Zeit den Einfall haben,

sich zu besuchen, und sich auf der Grenze ihrer Besitzungen einander entgegenzukommen. Vielleicht steht es ein wenig mehr in Ihrer Gewalt, als in meiner, die grosse räumliche Entfernung zu überwinden; darf ich in dieser Beziehung für das neue Jahr hoffen? Ich selber bin gar zu elend und gebrechlich daran, als dass ich nicht um die beste Freude, die es giebt, bitten dürfte, selbst wenn die Bitte unbescheiden ist--ein gutes Gespräch unter uns über menschliche Dinge, ein persönliches Gespräch, nicht ein briefliches, zu dem ich immer untauglicher werde.«-- -- -- -- --

Je mehr Nietzsches körperliches Leiden ihn in die Einsamkeit zwang, je einsiedlerischer, fern von allen Menschen, er leben musste, um dieses Leiden ertragen zu können, desto sehnsüchtiger verlangt er nach dem Freunde, der seine Einsamkeit zur »Zweisamkeit« machen solle: »Zehnmal täglich wünsche ich bei Ihnen, mit Ihnen zu sein.« (Brief aus Basel, December 1878.) »Immer knüpfe ich im Geist meine Zukunft mit der Ihrigen zusammen.« (Aus Genf, Mai 1879.) »Viele Wünsche habe ich aufgeben müssen, aber noch niemals _den_, mit Ihnen zusammenzuleben,--mein »Garten Epikurs.«« (Aus Naumburg, den letzten October 1879.)

Die heftigen Schmerzen und Anfälle, unter denen Nietzsche litt, weckten damals Todesgedanken in ihm, und diese geben einem jeden Wiedersehen eine besonders tief empfundene Bedeutung. »Wie viel Freude haben Sie min gemacht, mein lieber, ausserordentlich lieber Freund!« ruft er nach einem solchen aus. »Also ich habe Sie noch einmal gesehen und so gefunden, wie mein Herz mir die; Erinnerung bewahrt hatte; wie ein beständiger, angenehmer Rausch wars, diese Tage hindurch. Ich gestehe Ihnen, ich hoffe nicht mehr auf ein Wiedersehn, die Erschütterung meiner Gesundheit ist zu tief, die Qual zu anhaltend, was nützt mir alle Selbstüberwindung und Geduld! Ja, in Sorrentiner Zeiten gab es noch zu hoffen, aber das ist vorbei. So preise ich denn, Sie gehabt zu haben, mein herzlich geliebter Freund.«-- -- --

Die beiden Freunde gelangten in diesen Jahren zu um so übereinstimmenderen Ansichten, als ihre Studien vielfach gemeinsame waren. Rée vermittelte Nietzsche meistens die Bücher, deren er bedurfte, las dem Augenleidenden vor und lebte mit ihm in einem ständigen, theils brieflichen, theils persönlichen Verkehr und Gedankenaustausch.

»Mein geliebter Freund!« schreibt Nietzsche nach einer etwas länger währenden Trennung, »Für unser Zusammensein,-- falls ich dieses Glück doch noch erleben sollte, ist viel in mir präparirt. Auch ein Kistchen Bücher steht für jenen Augenblick bereit, Réealia betitelt, es sind gute Sachen darunter, über die Sie sich freuen werden. Können Sie mir ein lehrreiches Buch, womöglich englischer Abkunft,[7] aber ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit mit gutem, grossem Druck zusenden?--Ich lebe ganz ohne Bücher, als Sieben-Achtel-Blinder, aber ich nehme gern die verbotene Frucht aus Ihrer Hand.--Es lebe das Gewissen, weil es nun eine Historie haben wird und mein Freund an ihm zum Historiker geworden ist! Glück und Heil auf Ihren Wegen. Von Herzen Ihnen nahe

Ihr

Friedrich Nietzsche.

So schreibt er dem Freunde immer wieder, in verschiedenen Wendungen: »Bei allem Guten, das Sie thun oder Vorhaben, wird auch für mich der Tisch gedeckt und mein Appetit ist sehr lebendig nach _Réealismus_, das wissen Sie!«

So wurde denn der Réealismus die ursprüngliche Form, in der Nietzsche den philosophischen Realismus in sich aufnahm und den alten Idealismus begrub. Schon das anonym erschienene kleine Erstlingswerk Rées (Berlin, Carl Duncker, 1875), dessen »_Psychologische Beobachtungen_«-- Sentenzen im Geist und Stil La Rochefoucaulds-- schätzte Nietzsche nicht nur, sondern er überschätzte es sogar, wie ein noch jetzt erhaltener Brief an den Verfasser bekundet. Rées Lieblingsautoren wurden nun auch die seinigen: die französischen Aphoristiker, die La Rochefoucauld, La Bruyère, Vauvenargues, Chamfort, beeinflussten um diese Zeit ausserordentlich Nietzsches Stil und Denken. Von den philosophischen Schriftstellern Frankreichs bevorzugte er mit Rée, Pascal und Voltaire, von den Novellisten Stendhal und Mérimée. Von ungleich tieferer Bedeutung war jedoch für ihn Rées zweites Werk »_Der Ursprung der moralischen Empfindungen_« (Chemnitz, Ernst Schmeitzner, 1877)[8], das für die nächste Zeit gewissermassen Nietzsches positivistisches Glaubensbekenntnis bildete. Dadurch wurde er zu den englischen Positivisten gefühlt, an die Rée sich angeschlossen hatte, und die auch Nietzsche bald allen ähnlichen deutschen Werken vorzog. Die Hauptanziehungskraft, die der Positivismus auf ihn ausübte, lag vornehmlich in der Beantwortung jener einen Frage, die Rée in seinem Buch behandelte, der Frage nach der Entstehung des moralischen Phänomens. Für Rée fiel sie zusammen mit der Frage _nach den Gründen der Sanction_ altruistischer Empfindungen; seine Untersuchungen richteten sich hauptsächlich gegen die ethischen Systeme der bisherigen Metaphysik. Da nun die Ethik Wagners und Schopenhauers auf dem Altruismus und dessen metaphysischem Gefühlswerth fusst, so musste Nietzsche gerade in Rées Buch die geeignetesten Waffen zu seinem Kampf

gegen die verlassene Weltanschauung finden. »Der Ursprung der moralischen Empfindungen« wurde der eigentliche Gegenstand seiner Forschung, und man kann sein Erstlingswerk kurz als den Versuch bezeichnen, zur vollen Einsicht in die Nichtigkeit seiner ehemaligen Ideale zu gelangen durch die Einsicht in ihre _Entstehungsgeschichte_. Auf diesem Wege wird sein gesammtes Philosophiren zu einer Analyse und Geschichte menschlicher Vorurtheile und Irrthümer; der Metaphysiker wird zum Psychologen und Historiker und stellt sich auf den Boden eines nüchternen und consequenten Positivismus. Er schloss sich aufs Engste der englischen positivistischen Schule an in ihrer bekannten Zurückführung der moralischen Werthurtheile und Phänomene auf den _Nutzen_, die _Gewohnheit_ und das _Vergessen_ der ursprünglichen Nützlichkeitsgründe; es bedarf daher keiner besonderen Erläuterung seiner Theorien; es genügt auf die Richtung hinzuweisen, welcher er sie entnahm. Man vergleiche Stellen wie die folgende in »Menschliches, Allzumenschliches«: »Die Geschichte der-- -- --moralischen Empfindungen verläuft in folgenden Hauptphasen. Zuerst nennt man einzelne Handlungen gut oder böse ohne alle Rücksicht auf deren Motive, sondern allein der nützlichen oder schädlichen Folgen wegen. Bald aber vergisst man die Herkunft dieser Bezeichnungen und wähnt, dass den Handlungen an sich, ohne Rücksicht auf deren Folgen, die Eigenschaft »gut« oder »böse« innewohne.« (I 39). »Wie wenig moralisch sähe die Welt ohne die Vergesslichkeit aus! Ein Dichter könnte sagen, dass Gott die Vergesslichkeit als Thürhüterin an die Tempelschwelle der Menschenwürde hingelagert habe.« (I 92). Den Weg, auf dem die sogenannte Moralität der Handlungen entstanden ist, kann man mit den Worten bezeichnen:«--_jetzt_ aus Gewohnheit, Vererbung und Anerziehung, _ursprünglich_, weil (es)--_nützlicher_ und _ehrebringender_ ist.« (II 26). Ferner, Der Wanderer und sein Schatten (40): »Die Bedeutung des Vergessens in der moralischen Empfindung: Die selben Handlungen, welche innerhalb der ursprünglichen Gesellschaft zuerst die Absicht auf gemeinsamen Nutzen eingab, sind später von anderen Generationen auf andere Motive hin gethan worden: aus Furcht oder Ehrfurcht vor Denen, die sie forderten und anempfablen, oder aus Gewohnheit, weil man sie von Kindheit an um sich hatte thun sehen, oder aus Wohlwollen, weil ihre Ausübung überall Freude und zustimmende Gesichter schuf, oder aus Eitelkeit, weil sie gelobt wurden. Solche Handlungen, an denen das Grundmotiv, das der Nützlichkeit, _vergessen_ worden ist, heissen dann _moralische_.« »Der Inhalt unseres Gewissens ist Alles, was in den Jahren der Kindheit von uns ohne Grund regelmässig _gefordert_ wurde« (52), indem dem einzelnen Menschen das, was in der Geschichte der Menschheit in der bezeichneten Weise entstanden ist, überliefert wird als eine Summe religiös sanctionirter und festgeprägter Pflichtbegriffe. »Die Sitte respräsentirt die Erfahrungen früherer Menschen über das vermeintlich Nützliche und Schädliche,--aber _das Gefühl für die Sitte_ (Sittlichkeit) bezieht sich nicht auf jene Erfahrungen als solche, sondern auf das Alter, die Heiligkeit, die Indiscutabilität der Sitte.« (Morgenröthe 19).

So zieht sich durch das ganze Werk hindurch, was schon der Titel charakteristisch andeutet: die Gedankenarbeit der Zerstörung, die rücksichtslose Blosslegung der »Allzumenschlichkeit« dessen, was bisher heilig, ewig, übermenschlich hiess. Um zu sehen, mit welcher schroffen Einseitigkeit und Uebertreibung sich Nietzsche hier gegen sich selbst wandte, lohnt es die Mühe, seinen nunmehrigen Anschauungen in Bezug auf diejenigen vier Punkte nachzugehen, die in seiner vorhergehenden philosophischen Periode eine entgegengesetzte Deutung erfahren hatten: in Bezug auf die Bedeutung des »Dionysischen«, des »Dekadenz-Begriffs«, des »Unzeitgemässen«, und des »Geniecultus«. An Stelle des Dionysos steht hier der früher so viel geschmähte Sokrates als Schirmherr und Tempelhüter des neuen Wahrheitstempels da. »Wenn Alles gut geht, wird die Zeit kommen, da man, um sich sittlich-vernünftig zu fördern, lieber die Memorabilien des Sokrates in die Hand nimmt, als die Bibel, und wo Montaigne und Horaz als Vorläufer und Wegweiser zum Verständniss des einfachsten und unvergänglichsten Mittler-Weisen, des Sokrates, benuzt werden. Zu ihm führen die Strassen der verschiedendsten philosophischen Lebensweisen zurück, welche im Grunde die Lebensweisen der verschiedenen Temperamente sind, festgestellt durch Vernunft und Gewohnheit und allesammt mit ihrer Spitze hin nach der Freude am Leben und am eignen Selbst gerichtet.-- -- --« (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 86). Dieser Sieg des Sokratischen, der Vernunft und weisen Leidenschaftslosigkeit, über das Dionysische, über die Affectsteigerung und den selbstvergessenen Lebensrausch, gipfelt in dem Satz, dass »der wissenschaftliche Mensch die Weiterentwickelung des künstlerischen« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 222), und alles dessen sei, was auf dem Rausch anstatt auf der Einsicht beruht, denn: »an sich ist-- --der Künstler schon ein zurückbleibendes Wesen.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 159). Daher bedeutete für Griechenland das Aufkommen des sokratischen Geistes einen _ungeheuren Fortschritt_. »Die Formen aus der Fremde entlehnen, nicht schaffen, aber zum schönsten Schein umbilden--das ist griechisch: nachahmen, nicht zum Gebrauch, sondern zur künstlerischen Täuschung,-- -- --ordnen, verschönern, verflachen--so geht es fort von Homer bis zu den Sophisten des dritten und vierten Jahrhunderts der neuen Zeitrechnung, welche ganz Aussenseite, pomphaftes Wort, begeisterte Gebärde sind und sich an lauter ausgehöhlte, schein-, klang- und effect-lüsterne Seelen wenden.--Und nun würdige man die Grösse jener Ausnahme Griechen, welche die _Wissenschaft_ schufen. Wer von ihnen erzählt, erzählt die heldenhafteste Geschichte des menschlichen Geistes!« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches II 221; Vergleiche auch Morgenröthe 544 über das damalige »Jauchzen über die neue Erfindung des _vernünftigen_ Denkens.») Die _Abkunft alles Gefühlsmässigen_ von _Urtheilen_ und

ursprünglichen Gedankenschlüssen wird deshalb Denen entgegengestellt, die dem Affectleben als dem höchsten Leben das Wort reden. »--Gefühle sind nichts Letztes, Ursprüngliches, hinter den Gefühlen stehen Urtheile und Werthschätzungen, welche in der Form von Gefühlen uns vererbt sind. _Die Inspiration, die aus dem Gefühle stammt, ist das Enkelkind eines Urtheils--und oft eines falschen!--und jedenfalls nicht deines eigenen! Seinem Gefühle vertrauen--das heisst seinem Grossvater und seiner Grossmutter und deren Grosseltern mehr gehöre hen als den Göttern, die in uns sind: unserer Vernunft und unserer Erfahrung._« (Morgenröthe 35). Die »edlen Schwärmer«, welche die Unterordnung des Fühlens unter das vernünftige Denken zu verhindern suchen, verführen dadurch zu einer »_Lasterhaftigkeit des Intellectes._« (Morgenröthe 543). »_Diesen schwärmerischen Trunkenbolden_ verdankt die Menschheit viel Übles:-- -- --Zu alledem pflanzen jene Schwärmer mit allen ihren Kräften den Glauben _an den Rausch als an das Leben im Leben_: einen furchtbaren Glauben! _Wie die Wilden jetzt schnell durch das »Feuerwasser« verdorben werden und zu Grunde gehen, so ist die Menschheit_-- -- --_langsam und gründlich durch die geistigen Feuerwässer trunken machender Gefühle_-- -- --_verdorben worden:_« (Morgenröthe 50).-- -- --daran denken sie nicht, dass die _Erkenntniss_ auch der hässlichsten Wirklichkeit schön ist,-- -- --Das Glück der Erkennenden mehrt die Schönheit der Welt-- -- --;----zwei so grundverschiedene Menschen, wie Plato und Aristoteles, kamen in dem überein, was _das höchste Glück_ ausmache,----: sie fanden es im _Erkennen_, in der Thätigkeit eines wohlgeübten findenden und erfindenden _Verstandes_ (_nicht_ etwa in der »Intuition,« _nicht_ in der Vision, und ebenfalls _nicht_ im Schaffen,--)--« (Morgenröthe 550). Damit fällt der bisherige Genie-Cultus:[9] »Ach, um den wohlfeilen Ruhm des »Genie's«! Wie schnell ist sein Thron errichtet, seine Anbetung zum Brauch geworden! Immer noch liegt man vor der Kraft auf den Knieen--nach alter _Sclaven-Gewohnheit_ --und doch ist, wenn der Grad von _Verehrungswürdigkeit_ festgestellt werden soll, nur _der Grad der Vernunft in der Kraft_ entscheidend. (Morgenröthe 548).--Es ist die Zeit angebrochen für die strengen und schlichten Geister, die übermässige Verherrlichung der künstlerischen Genialität steht der »fortschreitenden Vermännlichung der Menschheit« entgegen. (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 147). Scheinbar kämpft das Genie wohl für »die höhere Würde und Bedeutung des Menschen«, es »will sich die glänzenden, tiefsinnigen Deutungen des Lebens durchaus nicht nehmen lassen und wehrt sich gegen nüchterne, schlichte Methoden und Resultate«, anstatt zurückzutreten gegenüber der höherstehenden »wissenschaftlichen Hingebung an das Wahre in jeder Gestalt, erscheine diese auch noch so schlicht«. (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 146). Wenn man die sogenannte »Inspiration« untersucht, so zeigt sich, dass nicht so sehr das Wunder einer zeugenden Phantasie, sondern ebenfalls nur die »Urtheilskraft« sichtend, ordnend, wählend, das Kunstwerk erzeugt,--»wie man jetzt aus den Notizbüchern Beethoven's ersieht, dass er die herrlichsten Melodien allmählich zusammengetragen und aus vielfachen Ansätzen gewissermaassen ausgelesen hat.-- -- -- -- --die künstlerische Improvisation steht tief im Verhältniss zum ernst und mühevoll erlesenen Kunstgedanken«. (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 155) Daher ist Genie in viel höherem Grade _erlernbar_, als meist angenommen wird: »Redet nur nicht von Begabung, angeborenen Talenten! Es sind grosse Männer aller Art zu nennen, welche wenig begabt waren. Aber sie _bekamen_ Grösse, wurden »Genie's«,-- -- --: sie hatten Alle jenen tüchtigen Handwerker-Ernst, welcher erst lernt, die Theile vollkommen zu bilden, bis er es wagt, ein grosses Ganzes zu machen; sie gaben sich Zeit dazu, weil sie mehr Lust am Gutmachen des Kleinen, Nebensächlichen hatten, als an dem Effecte eines blendenden Ganzen.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 163). Der Drang, das Wunder der Genialität zu erklären und herabzusetzen, ist hier, wo es in Nietzsches Gedanken dem Wagner-Wunder gilt, ebenso stark, wie später, in seiner letzten Geistesperiode, der Drang, dem Genie--diesmal dem _eigenen_ Genie--das Wort zu sprechen und es auf das höchste zu glorificiren. Hier erscheint ihm sogar jede wahrhafte Grösse als ein Verhängniss, weil sie »_viele schwächere Kräfte_ und _Keime zu erdrücken_« sucht, während es nur gerecht und wünschenswerth sei, dass nicht nur einzelne Grosse leben, sondern dass ebenfalls den »_schwächeren und zarteren Naturen auch Luft und Licht gegönnt_« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 158) werde. »Das Vorurtheil zu Gunsten der Grösse: Die Menschen überschätzen ersichtlich alles Grosse und Hervorstechende.-- -- --Die extremen Naturen erregen viel zu sehr die Aufmerksamkeit; aber es ist auch eine viel geringere Cultur nöthig, um von ihnen sich fesseln zu lassen.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 260).

Er findet nicht Worte genug, um den Hochmuth derer zu geissein, die sich von der Allgemeinheit ausgenommen wissen wollen: »es ist Phantasterei, von sich zu glauben, dass man eine Meile Wegs voraus sei und dass die gesammte Menschheit _unsere_ Strasse ziehe. Man soll der hochmüthigen Vereinsamung nicht so leicht das Wort reden« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 375). Denn diese Phantasterei beruht meistens auf einer eitlen Selbsttäuschung über die Motive unseres Thuns und Lassens; der wahre Denker weiss, dass eine so starke Betonung der Rangunterschiede unter den Menschen unberechtigt ist, und dass das Menschliche, selbst in seinen edelsten und höchsten Regungen, noch ein »Allzumenschliches« bleibt. Kraft dieser Einsicht ist er imstande, sich mit allen Uebrigen auf Eine Stufe zu stellen und sich gerade dadurch denkend über sein eignes unzulängliches Wesen zu erheben. »Vielleicht, dass es eine Zukunft giebt, wo dieser Muth des Denkens so angewachsen sein wird, dass er als der äusserste Hochmuth sich _über_ den Menschen und Dingen fühlt,--wo der Weise als der am meisten Muthige _sich selber_ und das Dasein am meisten _unter sich_ sieht?« (Morgenröthe 551). Deshalb besitzt der Weise die Neigung, die menschlichen

Handlungen auf ihre Allzumenschlichkeit zu prüfen: »Man wird selten irren, wenn man extreme Handlungen auf Eitelkeit, mittelmässige auf Gewöhnung und kleinliche auf Furcht zurückführt.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches 174). Die Bedeutung der Eitelkeit als eines Hauptmotivs der menschlichen Handlungen wird immer neu betont und erwogen,--wie ihr auch in _Rées_ Buch ein besonderes Capitel gewidmet war. »Wer die Eitelkeit bei sich leugnet, besitzt sie gewöhnlich in so brutaler Form, dass er instinctiv vor ihr das Auge schliesst, um sich nicht verachten zu müssen.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches II 38). »Wie arm wäre der menschliche Geist ohne die Eitelkeit!« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 79). Die Eitelkeit, das »menschliche Ding an sich.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches II 46). »Die ärgste Pest könnte der Menschheit nicht so schaden, als wenn eines Tages die Eitelkeit aus ihr entschwände.« (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 285). Denn auch das, was wir uns gewöhnt haben, für Kraftgefühl und Machtbewusstsein inneren höchsten Werthes anzusehen, ist meistens nur ein Ausfluss der Eitelkeit, sich hervorzuthun. Der Mensch will für mehr gelten, als er eigentlich seiner Kraft nach zu gelten berechtigt ist. »Er merkt zeitig, dass nicht Das, was er _ist_, sondern Das, was er gilt, ihn trägt oder niederwirft: hier ist der Ursprung der _Eitelkeit_.« (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 181. »Die Eitelkeit als die grosse Nützlichkeit.«),--wo Nietzsche den _Mächtigen_ gleichsetzt mit dem Eitlen, Listigen, Klugen, der die eigne Furchtsamkeit und Wehrlosigkeit dadurch verbirgt, dass er sich Ansehen verschafft. Die einschlägigen Aussprüche stehen im schärfsten Gegensatz zu seiner spätem Anschauung der Sklaven- und Herrennaturen, sowie der ursprünglichen Gemeinwesen. (Vergl. auch den Aphorismus »Eitelkeit als Nachtrieb des ungesellschaftlichen Zustandes« in Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 31.) Die Eitelkeit schwindet in dem Maasse, als sich der höher stehende Mensch der Gleichheit oder doch der Aehnlichkeit menschlicher Motive bewusst wird und sich selbst in der ihn allen Andern gleichstellenden »Allzumenschlichkeit« seiner Triebe erkennt.

Der einzige wahrhaft werthbestimmende Unterschied zwischen den Menschen liegt ausschliesslich in der Art und dem Grade ihres intellectuellen Vermögens; die Menschen _veredeln_ heisst demnach nichts anderes, als _Einsicht_ unter sie tragen. Selbst das, was vom moralischen Standpunkt aus als _böse_ bezeichnet wird, erweist sich meistens als bedingt durch geistige Verkümmerung und Verrohung. »Viele Handlungen werden böse genannt und sind nur dumm, weil der Grad der Intelligenz, welcher sich für sie entschied, sehr niedrig war.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 107). Die Unfähigkeit, den Schaden oder das Weh, welches man Andern zufügt, richtig zu taxiren, lässt den sogenannten Verbrecher, den in seiner Geistesentwickelung Zurückgebliebenen, als besonders grausam und herzlos erscheinen. »Ob der Einzelne den Kampf um das Leben so kämpft, dass die Menschen ihn _gut_, oder so, dass sie ihn _böse_ nennen, darüber entscheidet das Maass und die Beschaffenheit seines Intellects.« (Menschliches. Allzumenschliches I 104). »Die Menschen, welche jetzt grausam sind, müssen uns als Stufen _früherer Culturen_ gelten,------. Es sind _zurückgebliebene_ Menschen, deren Gehirn, durch alle möglichen Zufälle im Verlaufe der Vererbung, nicht so zart und vielseitig fortgebildet worden ist.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 43). Es sind die Menschen des Niedergangs. Je vorgeschrittener aber ein Mensch, desto mehr verfeinert, mildert, ja verdünnt sich gewissermassen die rohe Instinctkraft der ursprünglichen Leidenschaften, aus der noch die Handlungen des Zurückgebliebenen quellen.--»Gute Handlungen sind sublimirte böse; böse Handlungen sind vergröberte, verdummte, gute. -- -- --Die Grade der Urtheilsfähigkeit entscheiden, wohin Jemand sich-- -- --hinziehen lässt.-- -- -- --Ja, in einem bestimmten Sinne sind auch jetzt noch _alle_ Handlungen dumm, denn der höchste Grad von menschlicher Intelligenz-- -- --wird sicherlich noch überboten werden: und dann-- -- --wird der erste Versuch gemacht, ob die Menschheit aus einer moralischen sich in eine _weise Menschheit umwandeln könne_«. (Menschliches, All-zurnenschliches I 107). Ihr Merkzeichen aber wird sein, dass in den Menschen »der gewaltthätige Instinct schwächer«, »die Gerechtigkeit in Allen grösser« wird, »Gewalt und Sclaverei« aufhört. (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 452). Beneidenswerth sind Diejenigen, in denen sich durch generationenlange Gewöhnung ein milder, mitleidsvoller und liebevoller Sinn vererbt hat: »_Die Herkunft von guten Ahnen macht den ächten Geburtsadel aus; eine einzige Unterbrechung in jener Kette, Ein böser Vorfallr also hebt den Geburtsadel auf. Man soll Jeden, welcher von seinem Adel redet, fragen: hast du keinen gewaltthätigen, habsüchtigen, ausschweifenden, boshaften, grausamen Menschen unter deinen Vorfahren_? Kann er darauf in gutem Wissen und Gewissen mit Nein antworten, so bewerbe man sich um seine Freundschaft. (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 456). »Das beste Mittel, jeden Tag gut zu beginnen, ist: beim Erwachen daran zu denken, ob man nicht wenigstens einem Menschen an diesem Tage eine Freude machen könne. Wenn dies als ein Ersatz für die religiöse Gewöhnung gelten dürfte, so hätten die Menschen einen Vortheil bei dieser Aenderung.« Und diese Verherrlichung der zarten und mitleidigen Regungen auf Kosten nicht nur der brutalen Roheit, sondern auch der begeisterten Leidenschaft des religiösen oder künstlerischen Rausches klingt aus in der schönen Begründung der Religionslosigkeit: »Es ist nicht genug Liebe und Güte in der Welt, um noch davon an eingebildete Wesen wegschenken zu dürfen.« (Menschliches, Allzumenschlichen 1129).[10]

Wir werden später sehen, wie stark sich Nietzsches letzte Philosophie gegen diese Auffassung der Mitleids Moral und der Abschwächung des Instinctlebens richtet, Und wie ihm nur derjenige der höchststehende Mensch heissen wird, der die ganze Fülle

der leidenschaftlichen Triebe und Instincte in sich birgt,--also der »böse« Mensch. Noch ist ihm aber ausserhalb der Güte und Selbstlosigkeit kein Menschenwerth denkbar, weil nur diese die Ueberwindung der thierischen Vergangenheit darstellen.

Deshalb sollte man den Weisen allein zugleich gut nennen, nicht weil er anders geartet ist als der Unweise, sondern weil die ursprüngliche menschliche Beschaffenheit in ihm vergeistigt und dadurch »die Wildheit in seinen Anlagen besänftigt« worden ist (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 56). »Die volle Entschiedenheit des Denkens und Forschens, also die Freigeisterei, zur Eigenschaft des Charakters geworden, macht im Handeln massig: denn sie schwächt die Begehrlichkeit« (Ebendaselbst 464). »Dabei verschwindet immer mehr-- -- --die übermässige Erregbarkeit des Gemüthes. Er (der Weise) geht zuletzt wie ein Naturforscher unter Pflanzen, so unter Menschen herum und nimmt sich selber als ein Phänomen wahr, welches nur seinen erkennenden Trieb stark anregt« (Ebendaselbst 254). Alle menschliche Grösse beruht auf einer Verfeinerung des Instinctmässigen; der höchste Mensch entsteht durch das Abstreifen des Thierischen, als ein »Nicht-mehr-Thier«, rein negativ gedacht; er ist als das »dialektische und vernünftige Wesen« das »Ueber-Thier« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 40), in dem sich »eine neue Gewohnheit, die des Begreifens, Nicht-Liebens, Nicht-Hassens, Ueberschauens« allmählich anpflanzen kann (Ebendaselbst 107).

Ein »Ueber-Mensch« hingegen, als ein Wesen von _positiven_ neuen und höheren Eigenschaften, galt Nietzsche damals als vollendete Phantasterei und seine Erfindung als der stärkste Beweis menschlicher Eitelkeit. »Es müsste geistigere Geschöpfe geben, als die Menschen sind, blos um den Humor ganz auszukosten, der darin liegt, dass der Mensch sich für den Zweck des ganzen Weltendaseins ansieht, und die Menschheit sich ernstlich nur mit Aussicht auf eine Welt-Mission zufrieden giebt« (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 14). »Ehemals suchte man zum Gefühl der Herrlichkeit des Menschen zu kommen, indem man auf seine göttliche _Abkunft_ hinzeigte: diess ist jetzt ein verbotener Weg geworden, denn an seiner Thür steht der Affe, nebst anderem greulichen Gethier, und fletscht verständnissvoll die Zähne, wie um zu sagen: nicht weiter in dieser Richtung! So versucht man es jetzt in der entgegengesetzten Richtung: der Weg, _wohin_ die Menschheit geht, soll zum Beweise ihrer Herrlichkeit-- ---dienen. Ach, auch damit ist es Nichts!-- -- -- -- --Wie hoch die Menschheit sich entwickelt haben möge--und vielleicht wird sie am Ende gar tiefer, als am Anfang stehen!--es giebt für sie keinen Übergang in eine höhere Ordnung, so wenig die Ameise und der Ohrwurm am Ende ihrer »Erdenbahn« zur Gottverwandtschaft und Ewigkeit emporsteigen. Das Werden schleppt das Gewesensein hinter sich her: warum sollte es von diesem ewigen Schauspiele eine Ausnahme geben! Fort mit solchen Sentimentalitäten!« (Morgenröthe 49). Vermöchte ein Mensch das Leben ganz zu erkennen, so müsste er »am Werthe des Lebens verzweifeln; gelänge es ihm, das Gesammtbewusstsein der Menschheit in sich zu fassen und zu empfinden, er würde mit einem Fluche gegen das Dasein zusammenbrechen,--denn die Menschheit hat im Ganzen _keine_ Ziele, folglich kann der Mensch-- ---nicht darin seinen Trost und Halt finden, sondern seine Verzweiflung« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 33). Daher lautet »der erste Grundsatz des neuen Lebens«: »man soll das Leben auf das Sicherste, Beweisbarste hin einrichten: nicht wie bisher auf das Entfernteste, Unbestimmteste, Horizont-Wolkenhafteste hin« (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 310). Man soll wieder »zum guten Nachbar der nächsten Dinge« (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 16) werden und, anstatt im »Unzeitgemässen« der fernsten Vergangenheit und Zukunft zu schwelgen, die höchsten Erkenntnissgedanken der eigenen Zeit in sich verkörpern. Denn es ist der Menschheit nunmehr, anstelle all jener phantastischen Ziele, »die Erkenntnis der Wahrheit als das einzige ungeheure Ziel«' (Morgenröthe 45) vor Augen zu stellen. »Dem Lichte zu--deine letzte Bewegung; ein Jauchzen der Erkenntniss--dein letzter Laut« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 292). Es ist möglich, dass ein solcher überhandnehmender Intellectualismus ihr Glück und ihre Lebensfähigkeit beeinträchtigt, dass er also in einem gewissen Sinne ein »Decadenz-Symptom« ist,--aber hier deckt sich der Begriff der Decadenz mit dem der edelsten Grösse: »Vielleicht selbst, dass die Menschheit an dieser Leidenschaft der Erkenntniss zu Grunde geht!-- -- --Sind die Liebe und der Tod nicht Geschwister?-- --wir wollen Alle lieber den Untergang der Menschheit, als den Rückgang der Erkenntniss!« (Morgenröthe 429). Ein solcher »Tragödien-Ausgang der Erkenntniss« (Morgenröthe 45) wäre gerechtfertigt, denn für sie ist kein Opfer zu gross: »Fiat veritas, pereatvita!« Dieses Wort fasste damals Nietzsches Erkenntnissideal zusammen,-- dasselbe Wort, gegen das er sich noch kurz zuvor mit der grössten Erbitterung gewendet hatte, und das er nur wenige Jahre später wieder ebenso heftig bekämpfen sollte, so dass die _Umkehrung_ desselben als die Quintessenz sowohl seiner ursprünglichen als auch seiner späteren Lehre gelten kann. Das _Lebenwollen_ um jeden Preis, auch um den Preis der Lebenserkenntniss, --das ist die »neue Lehre«, die Nietzsche später jener Lebensmüdigkeit entgegenstellte, deren Einsicht in der Werthlosigkeit alles Geschaffenen gipfelt: »In der Reife--des Lebens und des Verstandes überkommt den Menschen das Gefühl, dass sein Vater Unrecht hatte, ihn zu zeugen« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 386); denn »Jeder Glaube an Werth und Würdigkeit des Lebens beruht auf unreinem Denken« (Ebendaselbst 33).

Verfolgt man Nietzsches Gedanken in dieser Gruppe von Werken, so kann man deutlich herausempfinden, unter welchem inneren Zwange er sie zu immer schroffem Consequenzen zuspitzte, und mit welchem Grade von Selbstüberwindung dies jedesmal

geschah. Aber gerade infolge des _Gegensatzes_, in dem diese Erkenntnissrichtung zu seinem innersten Bedürfen und Verlangen stand, wurde die Erkenntniss der Wahrheit für ihn zu einem _Ideal_,--gewann sie für ihn die Bedeutung einer höheren, von ihm selbst unterschiedenen, ihm schlechthin überlegenen Macht. Der Zwang, dem er sich damit unterwarf, befähigte ihn ihr gegenüber zu einem enthusiastischen,--fast _religiösen_ Verhalten und ermöglichte ihm jene 'religiös motivirte _Selbstspaltung_, deren Nietzsche bedurfte,--jene Selbstspaltung, durch die der Erkennende auf sein eigenes Wesen und dessen Regungen und Triebe herabblicken kann wie auf ein _zweites_ Wesen. Indem er sich so gleichsam der Wahrheit als einer Idealmacht _opferte_, gelangte er zu einer Affect-Entladung religiöser Art, die eine viel intensivere Gluth in ihm erzeugen musste, als sie sich jemals an einer warmen, kampflosen Befriedigung seiner innern Wünsche und Neigungen hätte entzünden können. So erscheint in dieser Periode, paradox genug, sein ganzer Kampf _wider den Rausch_, seine ganze Verherrlichung der Affectlosigkeit lediglich als ein Versuch, sich durch diese Selbstvergewaltigung zu berauschen.

Daher vollzog er seine Wandlung in einem äussersten Extrem; ja man könnte sagen: die Energie, mit welcher er sich zu einem lauten, rückhaltlosen »Ja!« der neuen Denkweise gegenüber aufrafft, stelle nur den Gewaltact eines »Nein!« dar, mit dem er seine eigne Natur und ihre tiefsten Bedürfnisse zu unterjochen strebt. Jene »vorurteilslose Kälte und Ruhe des Erkennenden«, sein Ideal in dieser Geistesperiode, begriff für ihn eine Art sublimer Selbstfolterung in sich, und er ertrug sie nur, indem er dabei die Leiden seines Seelenlebens entschlossen als eine Krankheit auffasste, als eine von den »Krankheiten, in denen Eisumschläge noth thun« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 38),--und auch wohl thun,--denn »die scharfe Kälte ist so gut ein Reizmittel als ein hoher Wärmegrad«.

Deshalb tritt seine Uebereinstimmung mit R^es Gedankenrichtung nirgends so vollständig zu Tage als gerade in dem Erstlingswerk »Menschliches, Allzumenschliches«, zu einer Zeit also, wo er am schwersten unter seiner Trennung von Wagner und dessen Metaphysik litt. Daher Hess er sich in seinem übertriebenen Intellectualismus vielfach von der persönlichen Eigenart Rées leiten. Er formte sich auf Grund derselben ein ganz bestimmtes Idealbild, das ihm zur Richtschnur diente: die Ueberlegenheit des Denkers über den Menschen, die Nichtachtung aller Schätzungen, welche dem Affectleben entspringen, die unbedingte und rückhaltlose Hingabe an die wissenschaftliche Forschung erstand vor ihm als ein _neuer und höherer Typus des erkennenden Menschen_ und verlieh seiner Philosophie ihr eigenthümliches Gepräge.

Im Bedürfniss, die rein wissenschaftlichen Gedanken, die er dem Positivismus entnahm, in einer menschlichen Form verkörpert zu denken, verfing er sich im Bild einer einzelnen, ganz bestimmten Persönlichkeit, die ihm selbst durchaus entgegengesetzt war, und marterte sich damit, die Züge dieses Bildes noch zu verschärfen. Dass er immer wieder zu seiner Entwickelung der Selbstverneinung, zu seiner Geistessteigerung der freiwilligen Schmerzen bedurfte, erklärt auch hier den scheinbaren Widerspruch, dass er, um seine Selbständigkeit aus dem Bannkreise Wagners und der Metaphysik zu retten, sich wieder unter fremden Bann stellte, sein Selbst aufzugeben suchte. Denn weder im Charakter der philosophischen Richtung noch in dem des persönlichen Verhältnisses lag eine Veranlassung dazu; die Gründe blieben vielmehr rein innerlicher Natur. Sie allein trieben ihn zum engen Anschluss an einen Andern und dessen Gedanken; sietrieben ihn, gleichsam aus einem »Collectivgeist« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 180) heraus zu denken und zu schaffen. In diesem Sinne konnte er bei Uebersendung seines »Menschlichen, Allzumenschlichen« dem Freunde schreiben: »Ihnen gehört's,--den Andern wird's geschenkt!« und gleich darauf hinzufügen: »Alle meine Freunde sind jetzt einmüthig, dass mein Buch von Ihnen geschrieben sei und herstamme: weshalb ich zu dieser neuen Vaterschaft gratulire! Es lebe der Réealismus!«

Es stellte sich eben zwischen den beiden Freunden eine eigenthümliche Art der Ergänzung heraus, die derjenigen ganz entgegengesetzt war, welche einst zwischen Nietzsche und Wagner bestanden hatte. Für Wagner, als das Kunstgenie, musste Nietzsche der Denker und Erkennende sein, der wissenschaftliche Vermittler der neuen Kunstcultur. Jetzt hingegen war in Rée der Theoetiker gegeben, und Nietzsche ergänzte ihn dadurch, dass er die praktischen Consequenzen der Theorien zog und ihre innere Bedeutung für Cultur und Leben festzustellen suchte. An diesem Punkt, bei der Frage nach dem Werth, schied sich die geistige Eigenart der Freunde. So hörte der Eine da auf, wo der Andere anfing. Rée, als Denker von schroffer Einseitigkeit, liess sich durch solche Fragen nicht beeinflussen; ihm ging der künstlerische, philosophische, religiöse Geistesreichthum Nietzsches ganz ab, dagegen war er von Beiden der schärfere Kopf. Mit Staunen und Interesse sah er, wie seiae fest und sauber gesponaenen Gedankenfäden sich unter Nietzsches Zauberhänden in lebendige frischblühende Ranken verwandelten. Für Nietzsches Werke ist es charakteristisch, dass selbst ihre Irrthümer und Fehler noch eine Fülle von Anregung enthalten, die ihre allgemeine Bedeutung erhöht, selbst wo jene ihren wissenschaftlichen Werth verringern. Im Gegensatz dazu ist es für Rées Schriften bezeichnend, dass sie mehr Mängel als Fehler besitzen; dies drückt wohl am klarsten aus der Schlusssatz des kurzen Vorwortes zum »Ursprung der moralischen Empfindungen«: »In dieser Schrift sind Lücken, aber Lücken sind besser, als Lückenbüsser«! Nietzsches geniale

Vielseitigkeit hingegen erschliesst neue Einblicke gerade in Gebiete, zu denen der Logik der Schlüssel fehlt, in denen diese sich gezwungen sieht, dem Wissen seine Lücken zu lassen.

Während für Nietzsche die leidenschaftliche Verschmelzung des Gedankenlebens mit dem gesammten Innenleben charakteristisch war, bildete einen Grundzug von Rées geistigem Wesen die schroffe und bis zum Aeussersten gehende Scheidung von Denken und Empfinden. Nietzsches Genialität entsprang dem lebensvollen Feuer hinter seinen Gedanken, welches sie in einem so herrlichen Lichte ausstrablen liess, wie sie es auf dem Wege der logischen Einsicht allein nicht hätten gewinnen können; Rées Geistesstärke beruhte auf der kalten Unbeeinflussbarkeit des Logischen durch das Psychische, auf der Schärfe und klaren Strenge seines wissenschaftlichen Denkens. Seine Gefahr lag in der Einseitigkeit und Abgeschlossenheit dieses Denkens, in einem Mangel an jener weitgehenden und feinen Witterung, die mehr Verständniss als Verstand verlangt; Nietzsches Gefahr lag gerade in seiner unbegrenzten Anempfindungsfähigkeit und der Abhängigkeit seiner Verständeseinsichten von allen Regungen und Erregungen seines Gemüths. Selbst da, wo seine jeweilige Denkweise momentan mit geheimen Wünschen und Herzenstrieben in Widerspruch zu gerathen schien, schöpfte er doch seine höchste Erkenntnisskraft aus dem wilden Kampf und Widerstreit mit solchen Wünschen und Trieben. Rées Geistesart hingegen schien selbst dann noch jede Betheiligung des Gemüthslebens an Erkenntnissfragen auszuschliessen, wenn einmal das Erkenntnissresultat seinem individuellen Empfinden entsprach. Denn der Denker in ihm blickte überlegen und fremd auf den Menschen in ihm herab und saugte demselben dadurch gewissermaassen einen Theil seiner Energie aus, und mit der Energie den Egoismus. An dessen Stelle gab es in diesem Charakter nichts als eine tiefe, lautere, unbegrenzte Güte des Wesens, deren Aeusserungen in einem interessanten und ergreifenden Gegensatz standen zu der kalten Nüchternheit und Härte seines Denkens. Nietzsche aber besass umgekehrt jene hochfliegende Selbstliebe, die sich selbst so lange in ihre Erkenntnissideale hinein verlegt, bis sie sich fast mit ihnen verwechselt und der Welt mit der Begeisterung des Apostels und Bekehrers gegenübertritt.

So lag hinter aller theoretischen Uebereinstimmung der Freunde eine um so tiefere Verschiedenheit des Empfindens unter der Gedankenhülle verborgen. Was durchaus der natürliche Ausdruck der geistigen Eigenart des Einen war, war für den Andern der volle Gegensatz der seinigen; aber eben darum Beiden dasselbe Ideal. Nietzsche schätzte und überschätzte an Rée, was ihm selbst am schwersten fiel, weil eben für ihn in einem solchen Selbstzwang wieder die innere Bedeutung seiner Wandlung lag: »Mein lieber Freund und Vollender!« nennt er ihn deshalb in einem Briefe, »wie sollte ich es auch aushalten, ohne von Zeit zu Zeit meine eigene Natur gleichsam in einem gereinigten Metall und in einer erhöhtem Form zu sehen,--ich, der ich selber Bruchstück---- --bin und durch selten, selten gute Minuten in das bessere Land hinausschaue, wo die ganzen und vollständigen Naturen wandeln!«

Aber diese von sich selbst absehende Hingebung ist nur der Weg, auf dem er sich innerhalb einer neuen Weltanschauung zu einem eigenen neuen Selbst durchringt; es ist nur der leidende Zustand, in dem er den aufgenommenen fremden Geistessamen zu seinem eignen lebensvollen Originalgeist umschafft und ausgestaltet. Es sind wie immer die Geburtswehen, die seine neue Schöpfung begleiten und es ihm verbürgen, dass er sich mit; seinem ganzen Wesen und allen seinen Kräften in ihr; ausleben und erneuern wird.

Die Geschichte also, wie Nietzsche sich in dieser Wandlung entwickelt und sie wieder verlässt, ist wesentlich eine Geschichte seines innern Erlebens, seiner Seelenkämpfe. In den hierhergehörigen Werken,--von seinem Erstgeborenen und Schmerzenskinde »Menschliches, Allzumenschliches« an, bis hinein in die tiefbewegte freudige Stimmung der »Fröhlichen Wissenschaft«, die gewissermassen schon der folgenden Geistesperiode angehört, liegt diese Entwicklung vor uns ausgebreitet. In ihnen allen hat er in einer Reihe von Aphorismensammlungen das »Bild und Ideal des Freigeistes« aufrichten wollen, des freien Geistes in seinen Gedanken über alle Gebiete des Wissens und des Lebens und noch mehr in der Fülle seiner Gedankenerlebnisse selbst. Die Grundstimmung, aus der ein jedes dieser Bücher hervorgegangen ist, prägt sich jedesmal als das eigentlich Charakteristische an demselben schon im Titel aus. Niemals sind Nietzsches Titel zufällig, indifferent oder abstractem Stoff entnommen, sie sind ganz und gar Bilder innerer Vorgänge, ganz und gar Symbole. So fasste er auch den Grundinhalt seiner einsamen Denkerexistenz am Schluss der Siebzigerjahre in wenigen Worten zusammen, als er auf das Titelblatt des zweiten Werkes schrieb: »Der Wanderer und sein Schatten« (Chemnitz 1880, Ernst Schmeitzner). Aus der Hitze der ersten, leidenschaftlichen Kämpfe ist er hier in die Einsamkeit seiner selbst eingekehrt; aus dem Krieger wurde ein Wanderer, der statt feindseliger Angriffe auf die verlassene Geistesheimath nunmehr das Land seiner freiwilligen Verbannung danach durchforscht, ob der steinige Boden sich nicht anbauen lasse, ob nicht auch er irgendwo seine fette Erdkrume besitze. Der laute Zwiespalt mit dem Gegner hat sich in die Stille eines Zwiegesprächs mit sich selbst aufgelöst: der Einsame hört seinen eigenen Gedanken zu wie einer mehrstimmigen Unterhaltung, er lebt in ihrer Gesellschaft wie unter ihrem ihn überall hin begleitenden Schatten. Noch

erscheinen sie ihm düster, einförmig und gespenstisch, ja, so hoch und drohend emporgewachsen, wie es Schattengebilde nur sind, wenn die Sonne im Untergang steht. Aber nicht lange mehr, denn seine Nähe streift ihnen allmählich alles Schattenhafte ab: was Gedanke war und farblose Theorie, das erhält Klang und Blick, Gestalt und Leben. Ist dies doch der innere Process seiner Aneignung und Umschaffung des Neuen und Ungewohnten: dass er ihm Leben einhaucht, dass er ihm zu voller Lebensfülle verhilft. Man möchte sagen: Nietzsche wählt sich die düstersten Gedankenschatten aus, um sie mit seinem eigenen Blut zu nähren, um sie, sei es auch unter Wunden und Verlusten, zuletzt dennoch zu seinem eigenen lebendigen Selbst verwandelt zu sehen, zu seinem Doppel-Selbst.

In dem Maasse als die Gedanken, mit denen er sich umgiebt, von dem ganzen Reichthum seines Wesens in sich aufnehmen, in dem Maasse als sie sich langsam mit der ganzen wunderbaren Kraft und Gluth desselben sättigen, wird die Stimmung immer gehobener und getroster. Man fühlt: hier geht Nietzsche Schritt um Schritt den Weg zu sich selbst, beginnt heimisch zu werden in seiner neuen »Haut«, beginnt sich in seiner Eigenart auszuleben, ihm ist wie einem Wanderer, der nach harter Mühsal endlich nach Hause kommt. Er will nicht mehr dasselbe Ziel des Denkens erreichen, wie sein Genosse Paul Rée, er will _das Seine_: dies hört man sogar schon aus Briefen heraus, in denen er immer noch den Theoretiker bewundert: »Immer mehr bewundere ich übrigens, wie gut gewappnet Ihre Darstellung nach der logischen Seite ist. Ja, so etwas kann ich nicht machen; höchstens ein bischen seufzen oder singen,--aber beweisen, dass es Einem wohl im Kopfe wird, das können Sie, und daran ist hundertmal mehr gelegen.«

In solchem »Singen und Seufzen« hatte sich gerade die eigene Genialität seinem Bewusstsein aufgedrängt, als die Gabe zu den herrlichsten Klagegesängen und Siegeshymnen, die jemals eine Gedankenschlacht begleiteten, als die Schöpfergabe, auch noch den nüchternsten, den hässlichsten Gedanken in innere Musik umzusetzen. Lebte doch der Musiker in ihm sich nicht mehr auf eigene Kosten aus, er ging mit auf, ein Einzelton, in der neuen grossen Melodie des Ganzen.

Und dies giebt in der That seinen Werken und Gedanken zu dieser Zeit noch eine ganz besondere Bedeutung: die neue Einheitlichkeit, die sein Wesen dadurch gewonnen hat, dass alle seine Triebe und Talente allmählich dem einen grossen Ziele des Erkennens dienstbar gemacht worden sind. Der Künstler, der Dichter, der Musiker Nietzsche, anfangs gewaltsam zurückgedrängt und unterdrückt, beginnt wieder sich Gehör zu verschaffen, aber unterthan dem Denker in ihm und dessen Zielen;-- --dies hat ihn dazu befähigt, von seinen neuen Wahrheiten in einer Weise zu »singen und zu seufzen« die ihn zum ersten Stilisten der Gegenwart erhoben haben.[11] Seinen Stil auf Ursachen und Bedingungen hin prüfen ist daher mehr, als die blosse Ausdrucksform seiner Gedanken untersuchen: es bedeutet, Nietzsche in seinem innersten Grundwesen belauschen. Denn der Stil dieser Werke ist entstanden durch die opferwillige und begeisterte Verschwendung grosser künstlerischer Talente zu Gunsten des strengen Erkennens,--durch das Bestreben, _nur_ dieses strenge Erkennen und nichts als dieses auszusprechen, aber nicht in abstracter Allgemeinheit, sondern in individualisirtester Nüancirung,--so wie es sich in allen Regungen einer ergriffenen und erschütterten Seele wiederspiegelt. Die lebendigste Innerlichkeit und Fülle hatte Nietzsche schon in den Werken seiner ersten Geistesperiode in vollendete Form zu giessen verstanden,--aber erst jetzt lernte er, sie mit der Schärfe und Kälte nüchternen Denkens zu verbinden: wie ein goldener Ring umschliesst dieses die Lebensfülle in einem jeden seiner Aphorismen und verleiht ihnen gerade hierdurch ihren eigenthümlichen Zauber. So schuf Nietzsche gewissermaassen einen _neuen Stil_ in der Philosophie, die bis dahin nur den Ton des Wissenschafters oder die dichterische Rede des Enthusiasten vernommen hatte: er schuf den Stil des _Charakteristischen_, der den Gedanken nicht nur als solchen, sondern mit dem ganzen Stimmungsreichthum seiner seelischen Resonanz ausspricht, mit all den feinen und geheimen Gefühlsbeziehungen, die ein Wort, ein Gedanke weckt. Durch diese Eigenart meistert Nietzsche nicht nur die Sprache, sondern hebt zugleich über die Grenze sprachlicher Unzulänglichkeit hinaus, indem er durch die Stimmung miterklingen lässt, was sonst im Worte stumm bleibt.

In keines Andern Geist aber konnte das bloss Gedachte so völlig zu etwas wirklich Erlebtem werden, wie in Nietzsches Geist, denn keines Andern Leben ging je so völlig darin auf, mit dem ganzen innern Menschen am Denken schöpferisch zu werden. Seine Gedanken hoben sich nicht, wie es gewöhnlich der Fall ist, vom wirklichen Leben und dessen Ereignissen _ab_: sie _machten_ vielmehr das eigentliche und einzige Lebensereigniss dieses Einsamen _aus_. Und dem gegenüber erschien ihm auch der lebensvollste Ausdruck, den er für sie fand, noch blass und leblos: »Ach, was seid ihr doch, ihr meine geschriebenen und gemalten Gedanken!« so klagt er in dem schönen Schluss-Aphorismus von »Jenseits von Gut und Böse« (296). »Es ist nicht lange her, da wart ihr noch so bunt, jung und boshaft, voller Stacheln und geheimer Würzen, dass ihr mich niesen und lachen machtet--und jetzt?-- -- --Welche Sachen schreiben und malen wir denn ab, wir Mandarinen mit chinesischem Pinsel, wir Verewiger der Dinge, welche sich schreiben _lassen_, was vermögen wir denn allein abzumalen? Ach, immer nur Das, was eben welk werden will und anfängt, sich zu verriechen! Ach, immer nur abziehende und erschöpfte Gewitter und gelbe späte Gefühle! Ach, immer nur Vogel,

die sich müde flogen und verflogen und sich nun mit der Hand haschen lassen,--mit _unserer_ Hand!--Und nur euer _Nachmittag_ ist es, ihr meine geschriebenen und gemalten Gedanken, für den allein ich Farben habe, viel Farben vielleicht, viel bunte Zärtlichkeiten und fünfzig Gelbs und Brauns und Grüns und Roths:--aber Niemand erräth mir daraus, wie ihr in eurem Morgen aussahet, ihr plötzlichen Funken und Wunder meiner Einsamkeit, ihr meine alten, geliebten-- -- --_schlimmen_ Gedanken!«

Es gehört ganz wesentlich dazu, dass man sich Nietzsche bei seinen stillen und einsamen Wanderungen vorstelle, ein paar Aphorismen mit sich herumtragend als das Resultat langer stummer Selbstunterhaltung,--nicht über den Schreibtisch gebückt, nicht mit der Feder in der Hand:

»Ich schreib nicht mit der Hand allein: Der Fuss will stets mit Schreiber sein.«

singt er in der Fröhlichen Wissenschaft (Scherz, List und Rache 52). Gebirge und Meer umgeben ihn bei seinen Gedanken-Wandelungen als der wirkungsvolle Hintergrund für die Gestalt dieses Einsamen. Am Hafen von Genua träumte er seine Träume, sah eine neue Welt am verhüllten Horizont empordämmern in der Morgenröthe und fand das Wort seines Zarathustra (II 5): »-- --aus dem Überflüsse heraus ist es schön hinaus zu blicken auf ferne Meere.« Im Engadiner Gebirge aber erkannte er sich selbst wie in einer Wiederspiegelung von Kälte und Gluth, aus deren Mischung alle seine Kämpfe und Wandlungen hervorgegangen waren. »In mancher Natur-Gegend entdecken wir uns selber wieder, mit angenehmem Grausen; es ist die schönste Doppelgängerei,« sagt er davon (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 338), »-- -- --in dem gesammten-- -- --Charakter dieser Hochebene, welche sich ohne Furcht neben die Schrecknisse des ewigen Schnees hingelagert hat, hier, wo Italien und Finnland zum Bunde zusammengekommen sind und die Heimath aller silbernen Farbentöne der Natur zu sein scheint: Von diesem Ort mit seinen »kleinen, abgelegenen Seen,« aus denen ihn »die Einsamkeit selber mit ihren Augen anzusehen schien,« sagt er auch in einem Briefe: »Seine Natur ist der meinigen verwandt, wir wundem uns nicht über einander, sondern sind vertraulich zusammen.«

Aeusserlich betrachtet, hatte ihn allerdings sein Kopf- und Augenleiden gezwungen, rein aphoristisch zu arbeiten, aber auch seiner geistigen Eigenart entsprach es immer mehr, seine Gedanken nicht in der fortlaufenden Kette vor sich zu sehen, wie man sie, systematisch arbeitend, auf dem Papier fixirt, sondern ihnen zuzuhören wie in einem Gespräch zu Zweien, einem immer wieder abgebrochenen und immer wieder aufgenommenen, von Einzelheiten ausgehenden Dialog,--der seinen »Ohren für Unerhörtes« (Also sprach Zarathustra I 25), vernehmbar wurde gleich gesprochenem Wort.

»Schreiben kann ich nicht, obschon ich es herzlich gern thun möchte,« schreibt er auf einer Postkarte (Januar 1881 aus Italien). »Ach, die _Augen_! Ich weiss mir damit gar nicht mehr zu helfen, sie halten mich förmlich _mit Gewalt ferne_ von der Wissenschaft--und was habe ich ausserdem! Nun, die Ohren! könnte man sagen.« Aber mit diesem Lauschen und Horchen nahm er es sehr genau, und es giebt keinen Satz in seinen Büchern, auf den nicht Anwendung findet, was er einmal in einem seiner Briefe schreibt: »Ich bin immer von sehr feinen Sprachdingen occupirt; die letzte Entscheidung über den Text zwingt zum scrupulösesten »Hören« von Wort und Satz. Die Bildhauer nennen diese letzte Arbeit: ad unguem.«

Als Nietzsche im Jahre 1881 sein drittes Werk auf positivistischer Grundlage, die »_Morgenröthe_« (Chemnitz 1881, Ernst Schmeitzner), vollendete, da war in ihm der Process einer Verlebendigung und Individualisirung der aufgenommenen Theorien schon vollkommen zum Abschluss gelangt Dieses Werk und in ebenso hohem Grade das nächstfolgende erscheinen mir daher als die bedeutendsten und gehaltvollsten seiner mittleren Geistesperiode. Denn in ihnen ist es ihm gelungen, praktisch den übertriebenen Intellektualismus zu überwinden, dem er sich in »Menschliches, Allzumenschliches« noch ohne Weiteres in freiwilliger Selbstmarterung unterworfen hatte,-- es ist ihm gelungen, denselben innerlich und individuell zu ergänzen und menschlich zu vertiefen, ohne die wissenschaftliche Grundlage, auf die er sich gestellt hatte, unter den Füssen zu verlieren,--ohne die Strenge der Erkenntnissmethode zu lockern, mit der er seinen Problemen nachging. Nietzsches eigene Natur hatte ihm geholfen, die Einseitigkeiten und Härten seiner praktischen Philosophie zu widerlegen, und einen lebensvolleren Typus des Erkennenden aus den Gedankenkämpfen der letzten Jahre herauszugestalten. Denn die Unterordnung des Affektlebens unter das Denken hatte sich, wie wir sahen, in Nietzsche vermöge einer so gewaltigen inneren Hingebung an das Wahrheitsideal vollzogen, dass gerade dadurch ihm die _Bedeutung des Affectlebens für das Denken aufgehen musste_. Unmerklich verschob sich ihm damit der Hauptaccent von dem rein intellectuellen Vorgang auf die Macht des Gefühls, die sich in den Dienst auch noch der nüchternsten und hässlichsten Wahrheiten zu stellen vermag, bloss weil sie _Wahrheiten_ sind. So beginnt denn schon wieder an Stelle der Verstandeskraft die Seelenkraft zu dem zu werden, was den Rang des Denkers als Menschen bestimmt. Und es ist leicht zu sehen, wie auf diesem Wege allmählich der Werth einer ganz neuen Denkweise Nietzsche aufgehen musste,--einer allem Verstandesmässigen überhaupt abholden Philosophie.

In keinem seiner Bücher lassen sich so sehr wie in der »Morgenröthe« die feinen Uebergänge und Gedankenverbindungen nachweisen, die von seiner positivistischen Geistesperiode in die darauf folgende einer mystischen Willensphilosophie hinüberleiten. Der _Uebergang_ von einem Alten zu einem Neuen macht, ähnlich wie im »Menschlichen, Allzumenschlichen«, den hohen Reiz und Werth des Buches aus. Aber in ganz entgegengesetzter Weise wie dort, wo wir _theoretisch_ der vollendeten Thatsache eines Gesinnungswechsels gegenüberstehen, in den sich das leidende Gefühl erst allmählich hineinzufinden sucht. Hier dagegen wird jede Möglichkeit einer _Theorien-Aenderung_ noch mit Heftigkeit zurückgewiesen als »Versuchungen des wissenschaftlichen Menschen«, während die Seele schon begehrlich und tastend ihre Fühlhörner immer wieder nach dem Verbotenen ausstreckt, wie sehr der Verstand es ihr auch verwehrt. So sind es Aeusserungen leisen Schwankens, einzelne Ausbrüche tief erregten Seelenlebens, denen wir ahnungsvoll das Zukünftige entnehmen, weil sie in diesem Gemüthszustand eine ungewollte Naivetät und Unmittelbarkeit besitzen, die Nietzsche sonst vollständig abgeht. Hier _verräth_ er sich fortwährend, ohne es zu ahnen, indem er den Anlass zu jeder »Versuchung« prüft und tadelt,--er entblösst das Geheime und Verborgene seines Innenlebens, sodass wir zu sehen glauben, wie sein vergangenes und sein zukünftiges Selbst mit einander hinter dem Rücken der scheinbar unangetasteten Verstandesphilosophie das Bekenntniss heimlichen Höffens und Verlangens austauschen. In der Auflehnung gegen dieses heimliche Hoffen und Verlangen ruft er sich in dem Aphorismus »Nicht die Leidenschaft zum Argument der Wahrheit machen!« (Morgenröthe 543) die Worte zu: »Oh, ihr-- -- --edlen Schwärmer, ich kenne euch!-- -- -- -- --Bis zum Hass gegen die Kritik, die Wissenschaft, die Vernunft treibt ihr es!-- -- --Farbige Bilder, wo Vernunftgründe noth thäten! Gluth und Macht der Ausdrücke!-- -- --Ihr versteht euch darauf, zu beleuchten und zu verdunkeln, und mit Licht zu verdunkeln!-- -- -- -- --Wie dürstet ihr darnach, Menschen in diesem Zustande --es ist der der Lasterhaftigkeit des Intellectes --zu finden und an ihrem Brande eure Flammen zu entzünden!-- -- --« Erst in Nietzsches letzter Philosophie begreift man ganz, wie sehr er selbst es ist, an den er die Mahnung richtet: »Nichts wäre verkehrter, als abwarten wollen, was die Wissenschaft über die ersten und letzten Dinge einmal endgültig feststellen wird,-- -- --Der Trieb, auf diesem Gebiete durchaus _nur Sicherheiten_ haben zu wollen, ist ein _religiöser Nachtrieb_, nichts Besseres,--« (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 16).

Aber inmitten zahlreicher derartiger Auflehnungen gegen sich selbst, bricht dann auch vereinzelt der Ueberdruss durch an der strengen Selbstbescheidung des Verstandes-Erkennens und an--»der Tyrannei des Wahren«:--»ich wüsste nicht, warum die Alleinherrschaft und Allmacht der Wahrheit zu wünschen wäre;-- -- -- --man muss sich von ihr im Unwahren ab und zu _erholen_ können,--sonst wird sie uns langweilig,--« (Morgenröthe 507). Und sehnsüchtig ruft er sogar den von ihm geschmähten Künstlern zu: »Oh, wollten doch die Dichter wieder werden, was sie einstmals gewesen sein sollen:--_Seher_, die uns Etwas von dem _Möglichen_ erzählen! Wollten sie uns von den _zukünftigen Tugenden_ Etwas vorausempfinden lassen! Oder von Tugenden, die nie auf Erden sein werden, obschon sie irgendwo in der Welt sein könnten,--von purpurnglühenden Sternbildern und ganzen Milchstrassen des Schönen! Wo seid ihr, ihr Astronomen des Ideals?« (Morgenröthe 551).

So sehen wir in der »Morgenröthe« nicht nur, wie er gegen die heimlich in ihm aufsteigenden Gelüste ankämpft, sondern wie er ihnen auch schon nachgiebt, in der hingegebenen Sehnsucht nach etwas Neuem, in der Ahnung eines vor ihm aufsteigenden Erkerintnisszieles. Beides ist in charakteristischer Weise mit einander vermischt, insofern ja die höchste Gluth der Seele, die Nietzsche für ein Erkenntnissideal aufwendet, bei ihm stets den bereits beginnenden Niedergang desselben Ideals anzeigt, dem er sich zur Zeit der Unbeirrtesten Ueberzeugung von dessen Wahrheit und Nothwendigkeit nur mit Widerstreben gefügt hatte. Dies ist die »Sonnenbahn der Idee«, wie er sie selbst auf Grund eigener Erfahrung geschildert hat: »Wenn eine Idee am Horizonte eben aufgeht, ist gewöhnlich die Temperatur der Seele dabei sehr kalt. Erst allmählich entwickelt die Idee ihre Wärme, und am heissesten ist diese-- --, wenn der Glaube an die Idee schon wieder im Sinken ist.« (Der Wanderer und sein Schatten 207.) Sich selbst aber charakterisirt er in derselben Schrift (331) mit den Worten: »Jene Personen, welche langsam beginnen und schwer in einer Sache heimisch werden, haben nachher mitunter die Eigenschaft der stätigen Beschleunigung,--sodass zuletzt Niemand weiss, wohin der Strom sie noch reissen kann.«

Die Macht der langsam und schwer, aber um so verhängnissvoller und unwiderstehlicher entzündeten Innerlichkeit,-- diese überschäumende Fülle, musste ihn schliesslich dem Positivismus entfremden und zu neuen Gedankenfernen führen. Schon sieht er im vollsten Gegensatz zur früher verherrlichten »Affectlosigkeit« sein Ideal darin, dass der Erkennende »der Mensch Eines hohen Gefühls, die Verkörperung einer einzigen grossen Stimmung« sei; es soll ihm »eben Das der gewöhnliche Zustand« sein, »was bisher als die mit Schauder empfundene Ausnahme hier und da einmal in unseren Seelen eintrat: eine fortwährende Bewegung zwischen hoch und tief und das Gefühl von hoch und tief, ein beständiges Wie-auf-Treppen-steigen und zugleich Wie-auf-Wolken-ruhen«. (Fröhliche Wissenschaft 288.) Vor einem solchen »Erkennenden« steht jetzt als Lockung" was ihm ehemals als Gefahr galt: »Einmal den Boden verlieren! Schweben! Irren! Toll sein!« (Fröhliche Wissenschaft 46.) Und in der

»Morgenröthe« (271) heisst es unter der Ueberschrift »Feststimmung«: »Gerade für jene Menschen, welche am hitzigsten nach Macht streben, ist es unbeschreiblich angenehm, sich _überwältigt_ zu fühlen! Plötzlich und tief in ein Gefühl, wie in einen Strudel hinabzusinken! Sich die Zügel aus der Hand reissen zu lassen, und einer Bewegung wer weiss wohin? zuzusehen!«

In einer solchen Feststimmung des Ueberflusses und Ueberschusses, langsam aus den nüchternsten Erkenntnissen herausgeschöpft und angesammelt,--in einem solchen Zauber der Ausspannung und Erholung nach langem Arbeitstag, gleitet Nietzsche in eine Welt der Mystik hinein. In einer solchen Selbstüberwältigung besiegt der eigene Sieg den Sieger. Es ist das »_Glück des Gegensatzes_«, das er darin sucht, des Gegensatzes zum Kühlen, Strengen, Verstandesmässigen der positivistischen Denkweise: die Erkenntniss neu gegründet auf die begeisterten Eingebungen des Gefühls, des Affectlebens, und unterthan gemacht dem Schaffensdrang des Willens.

Diese »Morgenröthe« ist kein blasses, kaltes, rückwärts leuchtendes Aufklärungslicht mehr,--hinter ihr erhebt sich schon eine wärmende, lebenzeugende Sonne, und während er selbst noch im grauen Zwielicht der Dämmerung dasteht, sind seine Augen schon sehnsüchtig auf diesen hellen verheissenden Schein am Horizont gerichtet. »Es gibt so viele Morgenröthen, die noch nicht geleuchtet haben!« schrieb er mit den Worten des Rig-veda als Motto auf das Titelblatt, ohne dass er noch zu glauben wagte, er selbst sei berufen, ein solches Leuchten am Himmel der Erkenntniss zu entzünden, Das Buch enthält »Gedanken über die moralischen Vorurtheile«, wie dem Titel ergänzend beigefügt ist, und damit will es scheinbar noch dem zersetzenden, negirenden Geiste der vorhergehenden Werke angehören; aber darüber schwebt schon ein träumender, hoffender Geist, der zwar nur hier und da vollen Ausdruck findet, aber schweigend sinnt, wie es zu ermöglichen wäre, aus allen _Vorurtheilen_ heraus zu neuen _Werthurtheilen_ zu gelangen, wie es möglich wäre, zum Schöpfer neuer Werthe zu werden. »Wenn endlich auch alle Bräuche und Sitten vernichtet sind, auf welche die Macht der Götter, der Priester und Erlöser sich stützt, wenn also die Moral im alten Sinne gestorben sein wird: dann kommt--ja was kommt dann?« (Morgenröthe 96.)

Der Sturz, der Abbruch des Alten ist eben kein Ende mehr, vielmehr ein Ausblick, ein Anfang und ein Appell an alle besten Geisteskräfte. »Es kommt eben noch etwas,--die Hauptsache kommt noch!« verspricht die Morgenröthe und wird immer heller und röther.

Ein Jahr nach Veröffentlichung der »Morgenröthe« schrieb Nietzsche denn auch zum ersten Mal wieder über neue philosophische Hoffnungen und Fempläne:

-- »Nun, liebste Freundin, Sie haben immer für mich ein gutes Wort in Bereitschaft, es macht mir grosse Freude, Ihnen zu gefallen. Die fürchterliche Existenz der Entsagung, welche ich führen muss und welche so hart ist, wie je eine asketische Lebenseinschnürung, hat einige Trostmittel, die mir das Leben immer noch schätzenswerter machen als das Nichtsein. Einige grosse Perspectiven des geistig sittlichen Horizonts sind meine mächtigste Lebensquelle. Ich bin so froh darüber, dass gerade auf diesem Boden unsere Freundschaft ihre Wurzeln und Hoffnungen treibt. Niemand kann so von Herzen sich über Alles freuen, was von Ihnen gethan und geplant wird!

Treulich Ihr Freund

F. N.«

Und kurz darauf ruft er am Schlüsse eines anderen Briefes aus:

»Auch ich habe jetzt Morgenröthen um mich, und keine gedruckten! Was ich nie mehr glaubte,-- -- -- --das erscheint mir jetzt als möglich,--als die goldene Morgenröthe am Horizonte all' meines zukünftigen Lebens-- -- --.«

Diese Stimmung, die mit der Gewalt der Sehnsucht eine neue Geisteswelt fern am Horizont heraufbeschwor, damit sie Ersatz böte für alles, was Zweifel und Kritik zerstört hatten, klingt am deutlichsten durch in den Schlussworten der »Morgenröthe«, in denen Nietzsche seine kritische und negirende Denkrichtung selber als einen _Wegweiser_ zu neuen Idealen aufzufassen sucht:

»Warum doch gerade in dieser Richtung, dorthin, wo bisher alle Sonnen der Menschheit _untergegangen_ sind? Wird man vielleicht uns einstmals nachsagen, dass auch wir, _nach Westen steuernd, ein Indien zu erreichen hofften_,--dass aber unser Loos war, an der Unendlichkeit zu scheitern? Oder, meine Brüder? Oder--? (Morgenröthe, Schluss.)

Als Nietzsche im Jahre 1882 seine »Fröhliche Wissenschaft« vollendete, da war ihm sein Indien bereits zur Gewissheit geworden: er glaubte gelandet zu sein an den Küsten einer fremden, noch namenlosen, ungeheuren Welt, von der nichts anderes bekannt sei,

als dass sie jenseits alles dessen liegen müsse, was von Gedanken angefochten, von Gedanken zerstört werden kann. Ein weites, scheinbar uferloses Meer zwischen ihm und jeder Möglichkeit einer erneuten begrifflichen Kritik,--jenseits aller Kritik meinte er festen Boden gefasst zu haben.

Der übermüthige Jubel dieser Gewissheit klingt in den Versen wieder, die er in das Widmungs-Exemplar seiner »Fröhlichen Wissenschaft« schrieb:

»Freundin, sprach Columbus, traue Keinem Genuesen mehr! Immer starrt er in das Blaue Fernstes zieht ihn allzusehr! Wen er liebt, den lockt er gerne Weit hinaus in Raum und Zeit,-- Üeber uns glänzt Stern bei Sterne Um uns braust die Ewigkeit.«

Aber er irrte sich in Bezug auf die völlige Neuheit und Jenseitigkeit des Landes,--es war der umgekehrte Irrthum des Columbus, der, das Alte suchend, das Neue fand. Denn Nietzsche war in der That, ohne es zu bemerken, nach einer Weltumseglung von der entgegengesetzten Seite an die Küste eben desjenigen Landes zurückgelangt, von welchem er ursprünglich ausgegangen, und welches er für immer im Rücken gelassen zu haben glaubte, als er sich von der Metaphysik abwandte. Wir werden es an allen Werken seiner letzten Geistesperiode erkennen, in wiefern sie wieder aus jenem alten Boden hervorgewachsen sind, wenn auch in ihrem Wachsthum und ihrer Eigenart beeinflusst durch die Erfahrungen der letzten Jahre. Unstreitig hatte ein Hauptwerth der positivistischen Denkrichtung für Nietzsche darin gelegen, dass sie ihm wenigstens innerhalb gewisser Grenzen wirklich Spielraum für alle diese Stimmungs-Uebergänge und Gefühlsschwankungen zu bieten vermochte und ihn dadurch eine Zeit lang festhielt. Sie schlug ihn nicht in Fesseln, wie es die Metaphysik nothwendig gethan hatte, sondern wies ihm nur eine Wegerichtung; sie bürdete ihm nicht ein Erkenntnisssystem auf, sondern gab ihm im wesentlichen nur eine neue Erkenntnissmethode an die Hand. Darum war auch seine Emancipation von ihr keine so gewaltsame und plötzliche wie seine Wagnerwandlung, sie war, anstatt eines Fesselsprengens, ein allmähliches Sich-Verfliegen und Sich-Verlaufen,--»all mein Wandern und Bergsteigen: eine Noth war's nur und ein Behelf des Unbeholfenen:--_fliegen_ allein will mein ganzer Wille!« (Also sprach Zarathustra III 19.) »Ich habe gehen gelernt: seitdem lasse ich mich laufen!« (I 54.) Aber wohl vollzog sie sich ebenso unaufhaltsam und unwiderruflich, wie die vorhergehende Wandlung. Denn über die rein empiristische Betrachtungsweise seiner Probleme, über die principielle Beschränkung auf das Erfahrungsgebiet, musste Nietzsche irgend wann einmal wieder hinaus; einer Philosophie der »letzten und höchsten Dinge« in irgend einer Form konnte er, der ganzen Art seines Geistes nach, nicht dauernd entsagen. Es konnte sich im Grunde nur darum handeln, auf welchem stillen. Seitenweg er sich wieder dorthin zurückschleichen würde,--wo die Götter und die Uebermenschen hausen.

Nietzsche schreibt einmal an Rée:

»Ach, liebster, guter Freund, mit dem schmerzlichsten Bedauern lese ich-- -- --die Nachricht Ihres Krankseins. Was soll aus uns werden, wenn wir in unseren besten Jahren so elend dahinwelken?-- -- --_Will uns das Schicksal ein schönes Greisenalter aufsparen, weil unsere Denkweise diesem am natürlichsten, wie eine gesunde Haut, anliegt?_ Aber müssten wir da nicht zu lange warten? Die Gefahr wäre, dass wir die Geduld verlören--.«

Er verlor sie völlig. »Schon krümmt und bricht sich mir die Haut!« sang er gleich darauf in einem schlechten Versehen der »Fröhlichen Wissenschaft«, und unter der »Greisenhaut« des »affectlosen Erkennenden« regte sich machtvoll jener Verjüngungsdrang, aus welchem heraus Nietzsche noch in seinem Untergange eine Apotheose des Lebens, des ewigen Lebens, schrieb.

Das Schicksal brauchte ihm kein Greisenalter auf-zusparen--.

Aber als die Basis der neuen Lehre, die er verkünden wollte, als das einzige zuverlässige Fundament, auf dem sie errichtet werden könnte, dachte sich Nietzsche damals doch noch eine wissenschaftliche Begründung. Gerade in dieser Zeit des Ueberganges sehen wir ihn daher von dem lebhaftesten Verlangen ergriffen, sich grossen zusammenhängenden Forschungen widmen zu dürfen, denen er seit langen Jahren hatte entsagen müssen. Mit nimmermüdem Interesse und Antheil verfolgte er die Studien, welche Rée seit 1878 unternommen hatte, um durch sie die Grundgedanken seines ersten moralphilosophischen Buches zu erweitern und zu erhärten. Als dieser 1881 Nietzsche mittheilte, dass er sein neues Werk noch vor Ablauf des Jahres zu vollenden hoffe, empfing er die beglückte Antwort: »Dieses selbe Jahr soll nun auch das Werk ans Licht bringen, an dem ich im Bilde des Zusammenhanges und der goldenen Kette meine arme, stückweise Philosophie vergessen darf! Welches herrliche Jahr 1881!«

Die in Frage stehende Schrift: »Die Entstehung des Gewissens« (Berlin 1885) wurde jedoch erst vier Jahre später völlig beendigt, nachdem Nietzsche inzwischen längst den letzten Rest seiner »Freigeisterei« von sich abgestreift und die abgelegte Haut auch

schon mit der gewöhnlichen Energie verbrannt hatte. Aber durch den regen Antheil, den er so lange an Rées Studien zu jenem Buche genommen, hat es eine bestimmte Bedeutung für sein Gedankenleben gewonnen. Doch stützt er sich jetzt nicht in demselben Sinne auf »Die Entstehung des Gewissens«, wie er sich einst in »Menschliches, Allzumenschliches« auf den »Ursprung der moralischen Empfindungen« gestützt hatte. Darauf beruht überhaupt ein Unterschied zwischen der letzten Geistesperiode Nietzsches und der vorhergehenden positivistischen, dass er sich nicht mehr darauf beschränkt, einzelne gegebene Theorien in ihrer inneren Bedeutsamkeit zum Ausdruck zu bringen, sondern dass er sich der kühnsten Entwickelung eines eigenen Systems hingiebt, dass er aus dem Aphoristischen, Vereinzelten hinausstrebt. Hatte die »freigeisterische« Richtung ihn dazu angetrieben, ihre Erkenntnisse in tiefstem Erleben und Empfinden zu verinnerlichen, so drängte nun die leidenschaftliche Gewalt dieses inneren Erlebens ihrerseits nach Entlastung in bestimmten Gedanken und Theorien; sie drängte danach, sich in neue geschlossene Weltbilder umzusetzen.

Im Sommer 1882 wurde Nietzsche dadurch zu dem Entschlüsse geführt, sich während einer Reihe von Jahren demjenigen Studium zu widmen, das ihm für den systematischen Ausbau seiner »Zukunftsphilosophie« unentbehrlich zu sein schien, dem Studium der Naturwissenschaften. Er wollte zu diesem Zwecke sein Leben im Süden aufgeben, um in Paris, Wien oder München Vorlesungen zu hören. Zehn Jahre lang sollte jede schriftstellerische Thätigkeit eingestellt werden, bis das Neue in ihm nicht nur völlig ausgereift, sondern auch auf wissenschaftlichem Wege als richtig erwiesen wäre.

Etwas später als Nietzsche fühlte auch Rée das Bedürfniss, sich mit den Naturwissenschaften auseinanderzusetzen, die ihnen Beiden bisher fremd geblieben waren. Er jedoch wünschte sie nicht als Material zum Ausbau eigener philosophischer Hypothesen heranzuziehen, sondern hatte, nach Vollendung seines Buches, das Verlangen, neue Gedanken frei auf sich wirken zu lassen und völlig aus seinem engeren Specialgebiete herauszutreten. So wandte er sich denn der Medicin zu, studirte noch einmal, und machte sein Staatsexamen als praktischer Arzt, mit der Absicht, sich längere Zeit der Psychiatrie zu widmen und auf diesem Umwege zu den Geisteswissenschaften zurückzukehren, Niemals standen sich die Freunde geistig ferner als damals, wo sie scheinbar noch einmal Dasselbe zu erstreben schienen: sie waren an den einander entgegengesetzten Polen ihres Wesens und Geistes angelangt.[12] Das spricht sich bezeichnend auch darin aus, dass die geplanten zehn Jahre des Schweigens für Nietzsche gerade diejenigen seiner grössten Productivität wurden, während Rée bis jetzt den Punkt noch nicht erreicht hat, auf dem sein altes Schaffen und sein neues Wissen in Eins verschmelzen und ihn zu neuer erhöhter Selbstthätigkeit anregen müssen.

Nietzsche war durch sein Kopfleiden an der Ausführung seiner Entschlüsse gehindert worden; schon der anbrechende Winter 1882 fand ihn wieder in seiner Einsiedlerklause zu Genua. Doch auch bei besserer Gesundheit wäre das Vorhaben nicht ausführbar gewesen. Denn Nietzsche befand sich nicht mehr in jenem abwartenden Zustande, in welchem der Geist noch Fremdes aufnehmen, sich störenden Einsichten willig unterordnen kann; er war schon viel zu stark productiv erregt, um noch von irgend etwas berührt zu werden, das ihn in seinem Drange zu schaffen hätte aufhalten können. Während er zur Entfesselung seiner Schaffenskraft einer ersten Befruchtung von aussen her bedurfte, sei es selbst unter Schmerzen und Selbstüberwindung, während er sich einer solchen fremden Erkenntniss gegenüber hingebend verhielt, in der Inbrunst der Verschmelzung mit ihr sein Selbst preisgab, erscheint er--einmal befruchtet--um so unzugänglicher und unbeeinflussbarer. Er ist ganz benommen vom eigenen Zustand und von Dem, was Leben in ihm gewinnen will. Richtet sich aber seine Aufmerksamkeit nach aussen, so geschieht es nur noch, um für das Leben, das aus ihm geboren werden soll, um jeden Preis Raum zu schaffen, keineswegs aber, um seine Existenzbedingungen noch einmal zu prüfen und in Frage zu stellen.

Der ihm durch seinen körperlichen Zustand zum zweiten Mal aufgezwungene Verzicht auf umfassende wissenschaftliche Studien führte dieses Mal zu dem entgegengesetzten Resultat wie zur Zeit seines Wagnerbruches und seiner positivistischen Periode. Damals war er die Veranlassung, dass Nietzsche, anstatt neue Theorien zu begründen, die von Anderen aufgenommenen innerlich auszuschöpfen und in ihren Seelenwirkungen festzustellen suchte. Jetzt hingegen wird er dadurch verleitet, die ihm fehlende theoretische Grundlage gewissermassen hinzuzudichten. Hierin liegt geradezu ein Grundzug der letzten Philosophie Nietzsches: das Bedürfniss, sich systematisch auszubreiten, als gelte es, den verschiedensten Wissensgebieten die Beweise für die Richtigkeit seines schöpferischen Gedankens zu entnehmen, in Wahrheit jedoch nur ein gewaltsames Raumschaffen für denselben: ein so souveränes Ausleben seiner Innerlichkeit, dass sich ihm unwillkürlich das ganze Weltbild zu einer Wiege seiner Schöpfung umgestaltet.

Dementsprechend gewinnen von jetzt an alle seine Lehren, so paradox dies klingen mag, einen um so persönlicheren Charakter, je allgemeiner gefasst sie erscheinen, je allgemeingiltigere Bedeutung sie beanspruchen. Zuletzt verbirgt sich ihr Hauptkern unter so vielen Schalen, ihr letzter Geheimsinn unter so vielen Masken, dass die Theorien, in denen er zum Ausdruck kommt, fast nur noch Bilder und Symbole inneren Erlebens sind. Endlich fehlt jeder Wille zur Uebereinstimmung und zur Verständigung mit

Anderen,--»Mein Urtheil ist mein Urtheil: dazu hat nicht leicht auch ein Anderer das Recht« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 43)--und doch wird gleichzeitig dieses Urtheil zum Weltgesetz decretirt, zu einem Befehl an die ganze Menschheit. Denn so vollständig verschmilzt für Nietzsche zum Schlüsse innere Eingebung und Aussen-Offenbarung, dass er in seinem Innenleben das Weltganze zu umfassen wähnt, und sein Geist in mystischer Weise den Inbegriff des Seienden in sich zu enthalten, aus sich zu gebären glaubt.« Für mich--wie gäbe es ein Ausser-mir? Es gibt kein Aussen!« (Also sprach Zarathustra III 95.)

Entsprechend dem Umstande, dass Nietzsches letzte Schaffensperiode ganz und gar in der philosophischen Ausdeutung seines eigenen Seelenlebens besteht, nennt er »Die fröhliche Wissenschaft«, das Werk, welches sie einleitet, in einem seiner Briefe »das Persönlichste unter meinen Büchern«, und klagt noch kurz vor dem Druck der »Fröhlichen Wissenschaft« in einem anderen Briefe: »Das Manuscript erweist sich seltsamer Weise als unedirbar. Das kommt vom Princip des mihi ipsi scribo!«

In der That hat er wohl niemals so völlig für sich selbst geschrieben, als zu jener Zeit, wo er im Begriffe stand, seiner ganzen Weltbetrachtung sein eigenes Selbst unterzulegen, Alles aus seinem eigenen Selbst heraus zu erklären. So ist die Mystik der neuen Grundlehren Nietzsches wohl schon hier enthalten, aber noch verborgen im rein persönlichen Element, aus dem sie hervorging. In Folge dessen bilden diese Aphorismen Monologe, monologischer gemeint als sonst irgend etwas in Nietzsches Werken, gleichsam halblaute >Zwischenreden«, ja oft nur gedacht als ein stummes geistiges Mienenspiel, das weit mehr verstecken als verrathen soll. Die Gedanken der »Zukunftsphilosophie« reden schon daraus zu uns, aber sie umgeben uns noch gleich verschleierten Gestalten, deren Blick dunkel und räthselhaft auf uns ruht, und dies nicht, weil sie, wie in der »Morgenröthe«, nur Ahnungen zum Ausdrücke bringen und noch der festen Züge und sicheren Umrisse entbehren, sondern weil ihnen mit Absicht ein Schleier übergeworfen und Schweigsamkeit anbefohlen wurde. Mit dem Finger an der Lippe scheint Nietzsche hier vor uns zu stehen, und gerade daraus entnehmen wir, dass er uns Viel, dass er uns Alles zu bekennen wünscht.

Aber es wird ihm schwer, ohne Rückhalt davon zu sprechen, weil auch in diesem Falle sein Selbstbekenntniss zugleich wieder ein Schmerzensbekenntniss ist. Und in einem viel tieferen, viel schmerzvolleren Sinn als bisher führt uns diesmal die Philosophie Nietzsches hinein in die verborgenen Leiden und Qualen seines Erlebens, sodass, im Vergleiche hierzu, selbst die harten Kämpfe und Entsagungen seiner positivistischen Periode uns harmlos und gefahrlos Vorkommen werden. Auf den ersten Blick erscheint dies als ein Widerspruch, da Nietzsches letzte Philosophie gerade aus dem Drange he'rvorgegangen ist, an Stelle der ihm widerstrebenden positivistischen Theorien eine Weltanschauung aufzubauen, die seinem innersten Verlangen völlig entspräche. Insofern beginnt er in der That seine letzte Wandlung unter Jauchzen und Frohlocken. Aber man darf nicht vergessen, dass diese äusserste Selbsteinkehr, dieser Versuch, das Weltbild aus seinem Eigenbild zu construiren, Nietzsches_ Leiden an sich selbst zu Tage_ treten lässt, aus dem sein tiefster Wesensgrund besteht. Bisher hat er in seinen Erkenntnisswandlungen diesem Leiden an sich selbst dadurch zu entrinnen gesucht, dass er den einen Theil seines Selbst durch den anderen quälte und tyrannisirte, aber bei allen Wandlungen des theoretischen Menschen blieb unverwandelt und sich ewig gleich der praktische Mensch mit seinen inneren Nöthen. Jetzt erst, wo Nietzsche sich nicht mehr zwingt und kasteit, jetzt erst, wo er seiner Sehnsucht freie Worte giebt, begreift man ganz, in welcher Qual er lebte, hört man endlich den Schrei nach _Erlösung von sich selbst_,--nach seinem _Wesens-Gegensatz_, nach vollständiger und endgiltiger Verwandlung, Umwandlung,-- nicht einzelner Erkenntnisse nur, sondern des ganzen, des innersten Menschen. Man sieht förmlich, wie er hier, in Verzweiflung, aus sich selbst heraus und nach aussen greift, nach einem erlösenden Ideal, welches er aus einem solchen Wesens-Gegensatz zu formen sucht. Daher liess sich voraussehen: sobald Nietzsche seinen Seeleninhalt frei zum Weltinhalt umschuf, sobald er seinem intimsten Erleben die Weltgesetze entnahm, musste seine Philosophie ein tragisches Weltbild zeichnen: die Menschheit musste von ihm aufgefasst werden als eine an sich selbst leidende, an ihrer eigenen Entwicklung hoffnungslos krankende Zwittergattung, deren Daseinsberechtigung gar nicht in ihr selbst, sondern in einer schlechthin anderen, höheren, Uebermenschen-Gattung liege, zu der sie nur eine Brücke bilden solle. Das Endziel der Menschheit sei Untergang und Selbstaufopferung zu Gunsten dieses ihr entgegengesetzten Ideals.

Erst am Eingang zu Nietzsches letzter Philosophie wird daher völlig klar, bis zu welchem Grade es der religiöse Grundtrieb ist, der sein Wesen und Erkennen stets beherrschte. Seine verschiedenen Philosophien sind ihm ebensoviele Gott-Surrogate, die ihm helfen sollen, ein mystisches Gott-Ideal ausser seiner selbst entbehren zu können. Seine letzten Lehren enthalten nun das Eingeständniss, dass er dies nicht vermag. Und gerade deshalb stossen wir in seinen letzten Werken wieder auf eine so leidenschaftliche Bekämpfung der Religion, des Gottesglaubens und des Erlösungsbedürfnisses, weil er sich ihnen so gefährlich nähert. Hier spricht aus ihm ein Hass der Angst und der Liebe, mit dem er sich seine eigene Gottesstärke einreden, seine menschliche Hilflosigkeit ausreden möchte. Denn wir werden sehen, kraft welcher Selbsttäuschung und geheimen List Nietzsche endlich den tragischen Conflict seines Lebens löst,--den Conflict, des Gottes zu bedürfen und dennoch den Gott leugnen zu

müssen. Zuerst gestaltet er mit sehnsuchtstrunkener Phantasie, in Träumen und Verzückungen, visionengleich, das mystische Uebermenschen-Ideal, und dann, um sich vor sich selbst zu retten, sucht er, mit einem ungeheuren Sprung, sich mit demselben zu identificiren. So wird er zuletzt zu einer Doppelgestalt, halb kranker, leidender Mensch, halb erlöster, lachender Uebermensch. Das Eine ist er als Geschöpf, das Andere als Schöpfer, das Eine als Wirklichkeit, das Andere als mystisch gedachte Ueberwirklichkeit. Oft aber, während man seinen Reden darüber zuhört, empfindet man mit Grauen, dass er als Gegenstand der Anbetung hinstellt, was in Wahrheit auch für ihn nicht vorhanden ist, und man gedenkt seines Wortes, »-- -- --wer weiss, ob sich nicht bisher in allen grossen Fällen eben das Gleiche begab: dass die Menge einen Gott anbetete,--und dass der »Gott« nur ein armes Opferthier war!« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 269.)

»Das Opferthier als Gott« ist wahrlich ein Titel, der über der letzten Philosophie Nietzsches stehen könnte und am deutlichsten den inneren Widerspruch enthüllt, der in ihr liegt,--jene Exaltation von Schmerz und Wonne, in der beide ununterscheidbar in einander fliessen. Wir haben vorher gesehen, inwiefern es eine Feststimmung war, in der Nietzsche in seine letzte Geisteswandlung hinüberglitt,-- eine Feierstimmung träumenden Rausches und Ueberflusses: wir sehen jetzt den Punkt, an welchem die Gewalt der inneren Erregung in den Schmerz überschlägt. Er war in jener ganzen Zeit, selbst in seinem Alltagsleben, erfüllt von einer Stimmung äusserster seelischer Ueberwältigung, in der man sogar der Ausgelassenheit fähig ist, aber nur weil alle Nerven beben, in der man leicht bis zum Scherzen und Lachen gelangt, aber nur mit zitternden Lippen. Bedurfte es doch jedesmal für Nietzsche einer solchen Verschlingung von Wonne und Weh, von Begeisterung und Leiden, um ihn einer geistigen Wiedergeburt entgegenzuführen. Sein Glück musste erst zum »Ueberglück«, und in diesem Uebermass zum eigenen Gegner und Gegensatz geworden sein; Frieden und Heimatgefühl, wo er sie einmal innerhalb eines gewonnenen Erkenntnissgebietes mühsam errungen hatte, mussten ihn erst zu Selbstverwundung und Selbstvertreibung gereizt haben, damit sein Geist in sich selber schwelgen und sich in neuen Schöpfungen entlasten konnte.

Es ist dafür bezeichnend, dass er sein Werk, im Jauchzen seines Herzens, die frohe Botschaft, »Die fröhliche Wissenschaft« nannte, zugleich aber über den Schluss-Aphorismus desselben die düsteren Räthselworte setzte: »Incipit tragoedia!«

Dieser Verbindung von tiefer Erschütterung und spielendem Uebermuth, von Tragik und Heiterkeit, welche für die ganze Gruppe der letzten Werke charakteristisch ist, entspricht es auch, dass die »Fröhliche Wissenschaft«, im schärfsten Gegensatz zu dem dunkeln Geheimniss der Schlussworte, ein »Vorspiel« in Versen besitzt: »Scherz, List und Rache.« Hier begegnen uns zum ersten Mal Verse in Nietzsches Schriften,--sie mehren sich aber in dem Maasse, als er seinem persönlichen Untergang zuzuschreiten glaubt. In Gesängen klingt sein Geist aus. Die Verse sind überraschend verschieden an Werth, zum Theil vollendet: Gedanken, die an ihrer eigenen Schönheit und Fülle sich zu Gedichten wandelten;--zum Theil von einer so wunderlichen Unvollkommenheit, wie sie nur die Laune des Muthwillens vom Zaune bricht. Ueber ihnen allen aber ruht etwas seltsam Ergreifendes: Sind es doch Blumen, die sich ein Einsamer auf den Leidensweg streut, der seiner harrt, um den Schein zu erwecken, dass es ein Freudenweg sei. Frisch gebrochenen Rosen gleichen sie, auf die sein Fuss treten will, während er schon beschäftigt ist, in seinen leidvollsten Erkenntnissen seinem Haupte die Dornenkrone zu flechten.

Sie klingen wie ein Präludium zu dem erschütternden Schauspiel seiner höchsten Erhebung und seines Unterganges. Von diesem Schauspiel hebt auch die Philosophie Nietzsches den Vorhang nicht ganz. Was sie uns zeigt, ist nur, gleich einem Bilde auf diesem Vorhang, ein buntes Blumengewinde, aus dem, halb versteckt, die Worte gross und traurig hervorleuchten:

»Incipit tragoedia!«

[1] Die philologischen Arbeiten Nietzsches sind: _Zur Geschichte der Theognideischen Spruchsammlung_, im Rheinischen Museum, Bd. 22; _Beiträge zur Kritik der griechischen Lyriker, I. Der Danae Klage von Simonides_, im Rhein. Mus., Bd. 23; _De Laertii Diogenis Fontibus_, im Rhein. Mus., Bd. 23 und 24; _Analecta Laertiana_, im Rhein. Mus., Bd. 25; _Beiträge zur Quellenkunde und Kritik des Laertius Diogenes_, Gratulationsschrift des Pädagogiums zu Basel. Basel 1870.--_Certamen quod dicitur Homeri et Hesiodi e codice Florentino post H. Stephanum denuo_ ed. F. N., in den Acta societatis philologae Lipsiensis ed. Fr. Ritschl, Vol. I; dazu der florentinische Tractat über _Homer und Hesiod_, ihr Geschlecht und ihren Wettkampf, im Rhein. Mus, Bd. 25 und 28. Auch rührt das »Registerheft« zu den ersten 24 Bänden des Rheinischen Museums (1842-1869) von ihm her, das er nach Ritschls Disposition zusammenstellte.

[2] Er hat so gelesen, wie er es einmal »gut lesen« nennt: »--das heisst langsam, tief, vor- und rücksichtig, mit Hintergedanken, mit offen gelassenen Thüren, mit zarten Fingern und Augen lesen--« (Einführende Vorrede zur neuen Ausgabe der Morgenröthe 11.)

[3] Dieses Buch erregte bei seinem Erscheinen das lebhafteste Missfallen der philologischen Zunft; hatte der Verfasser es doch gewagt, seinen Ausführungen nicht nur die Lehren des verpönten Philosophen Arthur Schopenhauer, sondern auch die künstlerischen Anschauungen des damals noch ebenso geschmähten »Zukunftsmusikers« Richard Wagner zu Grunde zu legen. Ein junger philologischer Heisssporn, Ulrich v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, der jetzt zu den hervorragenden Vertretern der classischen Philologie in Deutschland gehört, machte sich in nicht besonders glücklicher und geschmackvoller Weise zum Sprachrohr zünftiger Einseitigkeit. Ohne der Eigenart des Nietzscheschen Buches irgendwie gerecht zu werden, griff er es in der Broschüre »Zukunftsphilologie! eine erwidrung auf F. N.'s »gebürt der tragödie«, Berlin 1872, von einem beschränkt philologischen Standpunkte auf das heftigste an. Für den Angegriffenen traten in die Schranken derjenige, an den vor Allen das Buch gerichtet war, Richard Wagner, der Künstler, in einem in der »Norddeutschen Allgemeinen Zeitung« vom 23. Juni 1872 abgedruckten offenen Briefe an Friedrich Nietzsche, und Erwin Rohde, der bereits damals von seiner tiefen Kenntnis des griechischen Alterthums die vollgiltigsten Proben abgelegt hatte. In der ausgezeichnet geschriebenen Streitschrift: »Afterphilologie. Sendschreiben eines Philologen an Richard Wagner«, Leipzig 1872, stellte er sich auf den von dem Gegner gewählten Boden und wies die von diesem gemachten Einwände und Beschuldigungen zurück, worauf v. Wilamowitz dann noch mit einer Duplik, »Zukunftsphilologie! Zweites Stück, eine erwidrung auf die rettungsversuche für F. N.'s »gebürt der tragödie«, Berlin 1873, antwortete.

[4] Vergleiche die einführende Vorrede zur Neuen Ausgabe des zweiten Bandes von Menschliches, Allzumenschliches, wo es IV heisst: »--was ich gegen die »historische Krankheit« gesagt habe, das sagte ich als Einer, der von ihr langsam, mühsam genesen lernte-- -- --.

[5] Vorwort V: »Auch soll-- --nicht verschwiegen werden,-- -- -- --dass ich nur, sofern ich Zögling älterer Zeiten, zumal der griechischen bin, über mich als ein Kind dieser jetzigen Zeit zu so unzeitgemässen Erfahrungen komme.«

[6] Vgl. Schopenhauer als Erzieher 19: »ich ahnte, in ihm jenen Erzieher und Philosophen gefunden zu haben, den ich so lange suchte. Zwar nur als Buch: und das war ein grosser Mangel. Um so mehr strengte ich mich an, durch das Buch hindurch zu sehen und mir den lebendigen Menschen vorzustellen, dessen grosses Testament ich zu lesen hatte, und der nur solche zu seinen Erben zu machen verhiess, welche mehr sein wollten und konnten als nur seine Leser: nämlich seine Söhne und Zöglinge.

[7] Nietzsche lebte damals in einer Bewunderung der englischen Gelehrten und Philosophen, die später in ihr Gegentheil umschlug; in Menschliches, Allzumenschliches II 184 nennt er sie noch die »ganzen, vollen und füllenden Naturen«, und in einem Briefe an Rée nennt er die englischen Philosophen der Gegenwart, »den einzig gut philosophischen Umgang, den es jetzt giebt«. Dementsprechend ist das Einzige, was er in dieser Periode an seinem ehemaligen Meister Schopenhauer noch hochschätzt: »sein harter Thatsachen-Sinn, sein guter Wille zu Helligkeit und Vernunft, der ihn oft so englisch--erscheinen lässt.« (Fröhliche Wissenschaft 99.)

[8] Erwähnt wird es von Nietzsche in »Menschliches, Allzumenschliches« I 37.

[9] Vergleiche Menschliches, Allzumenschliches die Aphorismen über »Cultus des Genius' aus Eitelkeit« (162) und »Gefahr und Gewinn im Cultus des Genius'.« (164).

[10] Dieser Besitz von »Liebe und Güte« als der heilsamsten Kräuter und Kräfte im Verkehre der Menschen (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 48) ist noch mehr werth als die gepriesene grosse einzelne Aufopferung; noch »mächtiger an der Cultur gebaut«, hat jenes immerwährende freundliche Wohlwollen, das des Lebens »_Behagen_« schafft. (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 49)

[11] Vergleiche die folgenden Aphorismen, die Nietzsche mir einmal aufschrieb:

Zur Lehre vom Stil.

1.

Das Erste, was noth thut, ist Leben: der Stil soll _leben_.

2.

Der Stil soll _dir_ angemessen sein in Hinsicht auf eine ganz bestimmte Person, der du dich mittheilen willst. (Gesetz der _doppelten Relation_.)

3.

Man muss erst genau wissen: »so und so würde ich das sprechen und _vortragen_«--bevor man schreiben darf. Schreiben muss eine Nachahmung sein.

4.

Weil dem Schreibenden viele _Mittel_ des Vortragenden _fehlen_, so muss er im Allgemeinen eine _sehr ausdrucksvolle_ Art von Vortrag zum Vorbild haben: das Abbild davon, das Geschriebene, wird schon nothwendig viel blässer ausfallen.

5.

Der Reichthum an Leben verräth sich durch _Reichthum an Gebärden_. Man muss alles, Länge und Kürze der Sätze, die Interpunctionen, die Wahl der Worte, die Pausen, die Reihenfolge der Argumente--als Gebärden empfinden _lernen_.

6.

Vorsicht vor der Periode! Zur Periode haben nur die Menschen ein Recht, die einen langen Athem auch im Sprechen haben. Bei den meisten ist die Periode eine Affectation.

7.

Der Stil soll beweisen, dass man an seine Gedanken _glaubt_, und sie nicht nur denkt, sondern _empfindet_.

8.

Je abstracter die Wahrheit ist, die man lehren will, um so mehr muss man erst die _Sinne_ zu ihr verführen.

9.

Der Tact des guten Prosaikers in der Wahl seiner Mittel besteht darin, dicht an die Poesie heranzutreten, aber _niemals_ zu ihr überzutreten.

10.

Es ist nicht artig und klug, seinem Leser die leichteren Einwände vorwegzunehmen. Es ist sehr artig und _sehr klug_, seinem Leser zu überlassen, die letzte Quintessenz unserer Weisheit _selber auszusprechen_.

[12] Siehe in der »Fröhlichen Wissenschaft« (279) unter der Ueberschrift »Sternen-Freundschaft« die schönen Worte, mit denen Nietzsche damals von dieser geistigen Genossenschaft Abschied nahm.

III. ABSCHNITT.

DAS "SYSTEM NIETZSCHE"

MOTTO:

»Schaffen wollt ihr noch die Welt, vor der ihr knien könnt.«

(Also sprach Zarathustra II. 47).

Geist? Was ist mir Geist! Was ist mir Erkenntniss! Ich schätze nichts als _Antriebe_,--und ich möchte schwören, dass wir darin unser Gemeinsames haben. Sehen Sie doch durch diese Phase _hindurch_, in der ich seit einigen Jahren gelebt habe,--sehen Sie _dahinter_! Lassen _Sie_ sich nicht über mich täuschen--glauben doch nicht, dass »der Freigeist« mein Ideal ist!! _Ich bin_-- ----Verzeihung! Liebste Lou!

F. N.

In dieser geheimnissvollen Weise bricht der vorstehende Brief Nietzsches ab, den er in der Zeit zwischen der Veröffentlichung der »Fröhlichen Wissenschaft« und derjenigen seiner mystischen Dichtung »Also sprach Zarathustra« geschrieben hat. In den wenigen Zeilen sind bereits die wesentlichsten Züge der letzten Philosophie Nietzsches angedeutet: auf dem Gebiet der Logik die principielle Abkehr von dem bisherigen reinlogischen Erkenntnissideal, von der theoretischen Strenge der verstandesmassigen

»Freigeisterei«; auf dem Gebiet der Ethik, anstatt der bisherigen negirenden Kritik, die Verlegung der Wahrheitsbegründung in die Welt der seelischen Antriebe, als der Quelle einer neuen Werthung und Abschätzung aller Dinge; ferner eine Art von _Rückkehr_ zu Nietzsches erster philosophischer Entwicklungsphase, die vor seinem positivistischen Freigeisterthum liegt,--nämlich zur Metaphysik der Wagner-Schopenhauerischen _Aesthetik_ und ihrer Lehre vom übermenschlichen Genie. Und hierauf endlich gründet sich, als auf den Kempunkt der neuen Zukunftsphilosophie, _das Mysterium einer ungeheuren Selbst-Apotheose_, das er in dem zögernden Wort »Ich bin«--sich noch scheut auszusprechen.

Nietzsches letzte Geistesperiode umfasst fünf Werke: Die vierbändige Dichtung »_Also sprach Zarathustra_« (I und II 1883; III 1884, Chemnitz, Ernst Schmeitzner; IV 1891, Leipzig, C. G. Naumann); _Jenseits von Gut und Böse_, Vorspiel einer Philosophie der Zukunft (1886, Leipzig, C. G. Naumann; 2. Auflage 1891); _Zur Genealogie der Moral_, eine Streitschrift (1887, Leipzig, C. G. Naumann); _Der Fall Wagner_, ein Musikanten-Problem (1888, Leipzig, C. G. Naumann); endlich die kleine Aphorismen-Sammlung _Götzen-Dämmerung_ oder _Wie man mit dem Hammer philosophirt_ (1889, Leipzig, C. G. Naumann). Wir können hier aber nicht dem Gange seines philosophischen Denkens Schritt für Schritt an der Hand jener Werke folgen, da sie nicht, wie die der vorhergehenden Periode, ebensoviele Entwicklungsstufen seines Gedankens darstellen, sondern zum ersten Mal alle dazu bestimmt sind, der Darlegung eines _Systems_ zu dienen, wenn auch nur eines Systems, das mehr auf ihrer Gesammtstimmung als auf der klaren Einheitlichkeit begrifflicher Deduction beruht. Der aphoristische Charakter, den seine Bücher auch hier bewahren, erscheint daher in diesem Fall als ein unleugbarer Mangel der Form seiner Darstellung, nicht, wie bisher, als ein eigenthümlicher Vorzug derselben. Was Nietzsche durch seine vollendete Meisterschaft in der aphoristischen Form gelang: einen jeden Gedanken in seiner seelischen Bedeutsamkeit voll auszuschöpfen und mit allen seinen feinen inneren Nebenbeziehungen wiederzugeben, das reicht nicht aus für die systematische Begründung eigener Theorien, sondern löst sie hier und da in ein geistreiches Spiel mit blendenden Hypothesen auf. Nietzsche wurde sowohl durch sein Augenleiden als auch durch seine Gewöhnung an sprunghaftes Denken dazu gezwungen, im Allgemeinen an seiner alten Schreibweise festzuhalten, aber immer wieder macht er,--sowohl in Jenseits von Gut und Böse, als auch in der Genealogie der Moral,--den Versuch, über das Rein--Aphoristische hinauszukommen, seine Gedanken systematisch zu ordnen und vorzutragen, weil das, was ihm vorschwebt, ein einheitliches Ganzes geworden ist.

Daher finden wir auch hier zum ersten Mal bei ihm eine Art von _Erkenntnisstheorie_, einen Ansatz dazu, sich mit den erkenntnisstheoretischen Problemen auseinanderzusetzen, nachdem er ihnen bisher immer aus dem Wege gegangen war, wie er überhaupt gern jedes Problem mied, dem sich nur auf rein begrifflichem Wege beikommen lässt. Jetzt erst bleibt er nicht mehr ohne Weiteres bei der praktischen Philosophie stehen, sondern hält es für nothwendig, auf die Mittel hinzuweisen, mit denen er sich das erkenntnisstheoretische Pförtchen aufgebrochen habe, durch das er zu seinen Hypothesen gelangt. Ziemlich ausführliche Bemerkungen darüber finden sich an den verschiedensten Stellen seiner Werke zerstreut. Es erscheint aber höchst charakteristisch, dass sie sich erst jetzt finden, wo er der Welt des Abstrakt-Logischen principielle Feindschaft erklärt und fest entschlossen ist, alle schwierigen Begriffsknoten, auf die er stossen könnte, mit einem Schwerthieb zu zerhauen: er befasst sich mit der Erkenntnisstheorie eben nur, um sie über den Haufen zu werfen.

Zur Zeit seines Wagnerthums war Nietzsche als Jünger Schopenhauers diesem seinem Meister in der bekannten Interpretirung und Modificirung Kants gefolgt, laut welcher die Fragen nach den höchsten und letzten Dingen ihre Beantwortung finden, zwar nicht durch den Verstand, sondern durch die höchsten Eingebungen und Erleuchtungen des Willenslebens. Später stimmte Nietzsche, unter heftigem Protest gegen diese Annahme der Schopenhauerischen Metaphysik, der strengen Selbstbescheidung der Erfahrungswissenschaft zu, welche sich mit dem Verstandeserkennen auf den ihm zugänglichen Gebieten begnügt. Aber Nietzsche hielt diese Zustimmung nur so lange aufrecht, als er mit Hilfe eines fanatischen Intellektualismus sich aus dem bescheidenen Verstandeserkennen ein ihn begeisterndes Wahrheitsideal zu schaffen vermochte, dem sich sein Wille und Seelenleben blind unterwarf. Sobald sein Fanatismus sich erschöpft hatte, sobald seine Begeisterung die intellektuellen Ziele und Werthe nicht mehr in so über-schwänglich-idealer Beleuchtung sah, wurde er derselben überhaupt überdrüssig und verlangte nach neuen Idealen. In diesem Verlangen ging ihm nun innerhalb des Positivismus eine Einsicht auf, die er bisher nicht beachtet hatte: nämlich die Einsicht in die Relativität alles Denkens, die Zurückführung alles Verstandeserkennens auf die rein praktische Grundlage des menschlichen Trieblebens, dem es entstammt und von dem es dauernd abhängig ist.

Diesem Wege, der ihm von seinen eigenen philosophischen Genossen vorgezeichnet war, brauchte er nur mit gewohnter Exaltation zu folgen, um schliesslich zu seiner ursprünglichen Schätzung der Affekte zürückzugelangen. Denn was für die Andern nur eine natürliche Consequenz war, welche die moderne Erkenntnisstheorie zieht, und welche die Methode und die Resultate der Erfahrungswissenschaft als solche gar nicht berührt, daraus entnahm Nietzsche den Anstoss zu einem völligen

Gesinnungswechsel. Mit derselben äussersten Uebertreibung und demselben Fanatismus, mit denen er das streng begriffliche Denken als höchstes Wahrheitsideal angebetet hatte, verhöhnt er es jetzt als etwas Geringes und Niedriges gegenüber den Trieben, die es in Wahrheit regieren.

Was sich inzwischen verändert hat, ist zwar nur seine _Stimmung_, nur seine _Gefühlsauffassung_ der Sachlage, aber eben dies besagt für Nietzsche Alles: es veisst ihn allmählich fort zu immer weitergehenden Folgerungen und wird so schliesslich zum Ausgangspunkt für eine neue Weltanschauung.

Dieser Verlauf ist typisch für die Entstehung aller Grundgedanken in Nietzsches »Zukunftsphifosophie-«; ihm werden wir in seiner Erkenntnisstheorie wie in seiner Morallehre, in seiner Äesthetik wie in seiner letzten Mystik wieder begegnen und stets dieselben drei Entwicklungsstufen daran wahrnehmen: zuerst das Anknüpfen an einzelne letzte Consequenzen der modernen Erfahrungswissenschaft, dann ein Umschlagen seiner Gemüthsstimmung in der Auffassung solcher Ergebnisse, ihre Zuspitzung und Uebertreibung bis aufs Aeusserste, und endlich, daraus fliessend, seine eigenen, neuen Theorien.

Hinsichtlich dieser sind aber zwei Seiten zu unterscheiden, einestheils ihr thatsächlicher philosophischer Gehalt, anderntheils Nietzsches rein seelische Wieder-Spiegelung in ihnen, indem er sich in seinen Gedanken den Ausdruck für sein tiefstes Wesen schafft. Diese Selbstwiederspiegelung führt uns zu dem Bilde Nietzsches zurück, wie es im ersten Theile dieser Arbeit entworfen ist. Der Gedankengehalt aber der neuen Lehre erweist sich als eine kunstvolle Verbindung der beiden philosophischen Phasen in Nietzsches Geistesentwicklung,--als ein Muster von zwei verschiedenen mit genialer Hand ineinandergeflochtenen Geweben: der Schopenhauerischen Willenslehre und der Entwicklungslehre der Positivistem

Für Nietzsches Erkenntnisstheorie, mit ihrer Bekämpfung der Bedeutung des Logischen und ihrer Zurückführung desselben auf das schlechthin Unlogische, kommt am meisten in Betracht sein Buch »Jenseits von Gut und Böse«, das in einzelnen Abschnitten ebensogut heissen könnte: »Jenseits von Wahr und Falsch«. Denn hier erörtert er am ausführlichsten die _Unberechtigung der Werthgegensätze_ »wahr und unwahr«, die mit der Einsicht in ihren Ursprung nicht minder hinfällig werden, wie die Werthgegensätze »gut und böse«. »Das Problem vom Werthe der Wahrheit trat vor uns hin,-- -- --Was in uns will eigentlich »»zur Wahrheit««?-- -- --Gesetzt, wir wollen Wahrheit: _warum nicht lieber Unwahrheit?_-- --« (1.) »Ja, was zwingt uns überhaupt zur Annahme, dass es einen wesenhaften Gegensatz von »wahr« und »falsch« giebt? Genügt es nicht, Stufen der Scheinbark eit anzunehmen-- --?« (34.) »In welcher seltsamen Vereinfachung und Fälschung lebt der Mensch!-- -- -- erst auf diesem nunmehr festen und granitnen Grunde von Unwissenheit durfte sich--die Wissenschaft erheben, der Wille zum Wissen auf dem Grunde eines viel gewaltigeren Willens, des Willens zum Nicht-wissen, zum Ungewissen, zum Unwahren! Nicht als sein Gegensatz, sondern--als seine Verfeinerung«! (24.) Das »Bewusstsein« ist nicht »in irgend einem entscheidenden Sinne dem Instinktiven _entgegengesetzt_,--das meiste bewusste Denken eines Philosophen ist durch seine Instinkte heimlich geführt und in bestimmte Bahnen gezwungen.« (3.) Alle Logik ist letzten Endes nichts anderes als eine blosse »Zeichen-Convention« (Götzen-Dämmerung III 3), alles Denken eine Art von »Zeichensprache der Affekte«, da »wir zu keiner anderen »Realität« hinab oder hinauf können als gerade zur Realität unserer Triebe--denn Denken ist nur ein Verhalten dieser Triebe zu einander.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 36). Und daraus folgt denn schon: »-- --_je mehr_ Affekte wir über eine Sache zu Worte kommen lassen, _je mehr_ Augen, verschiedne Augen wir uns für dieselbe Sache einzusetzen wissen, um so vollständiger wird unser »Begriff« dieser Sache, unsre »Objektivität« sein. Den Willen aber überhaupt eliminiren, die Affekte sammt und sonders aushängen, gesetzt, dass wir dies vermöchten: wie? hiesse das nicht den Intellekt _castriren_?... (Zur Genealogie der Moral III 12).

Hier ist der Punkt, an welchem Nietzsches Auffassung plötzlich von seiner ehemaligen abweicht und ihn zu der entgegengesetzten führt. Hat er früher davor gewarnt, irgend einem Affekt zu trauen, weil derselbe doch nur das »Enkelkind« alter vergessener und wahrscheinlich irrthümlicher Urtheilsschlüsse sei, so beruft er sich jetzt auf die uralte Gefühlsgrundlage, der alle Urtheilsschlüsse entstammen, und degradirt diese so zu unselbständigen, abhängigen »Enkelkindern« des Gefühls. Für beide Auffassungen findet er die gesuchte Begründung noch in der positivistischen Weltanschauung, aber was dort friedlich neben einander besteht,--die Relativität des Denkens und diejenige des Affektlebens,-- --das trennt sich für ihn in zwei unversöhnliche Gegensätze: auf der einen Seite steht der bis auf die Spitze getriebene Intellektualismus, dem er sich bis dahin hingegeben, und durch den er alles Leben dem Denken, alles Gemüth dem Verstände unterthan machen wollte,--auf der anderen Seite eine ebenfalls auf das Höchste gesteigerte Gefühlsexaltation, die sich für ihre lange Unterdrückung rächt und in ihrem Lebensüberschwang sich nur genug thun kann in einem fanatischen: »fiat vita, pereat veritas!«

Darum heisst es weiter: »Die Falschheit eines Urtheils ist uns noch kein Einwand gegen ein Urtheil;-- --Die Frage ist, wie weit es lebenfördernd, lebenerhaltend -- --ist;-- -- --Verzichtleisten auf falsche Urtheile (wäre) ein Verzichtleisten auf Leben, eine

Verneinung des Lebens.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 4.) »Bei allem Werthe, der dem Wahren, dem Wahrhaftigen,-- --zukommen mag: es wäre möglich, dass dem Scheine, dem Willen zur Täuschung, und der Begierde ein für alles Leben höherer und grundsätzlicherer Werth zugeschrieben werden müsste. Es wäre sogar noch möglich, dass, _was_ den Werth jener guten und verehrten Dinge ausmacht, gerade darin bestünde, mit jenen schlimmen, scheinbar entgegengesetzten Dingen auf verfängliche Weise verwandt, verknüpft, verhäkelt, vielleicht gar wesensgleich zu sein.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 2.) »-- -- --wir sind von Grund aus, von Alters her--_ans Lügen gewöhnt_. Oder, um es tugendhafter und heuchlerischer, kurz angenehmer auszudrücken: man ist viel mehr Künstler als man weiss.« (Ebendaselbst 192.) Und das Lebenerhaltendere der Lüge ist es, das den Künstler hoch über den wissenschaftlichen Menschen und dessen Wahrheitsforschung stellt. »--die Kunst, in der gerade die Lüge sich heiligt, der Wille zur Täuschung das gute Gewissen zur Seite hat,« (Zur Genealogie der Moral III 25), ist es auch, um derentwillen jetzt plötzlich wieder die ehemals so geschmähten Metaphysiker weit vornehmer und schätzenswerther erscheinen, als die »Wirklichkeits-Philosophaster«, mit ihrer Genügsamkeit und »Lappenhaftigkeit«. (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 10.)

An dieser erneuten Verherrlichung des Künstlerthums und selbst der Metaphysik erkennt man, wie weit Nietzsche schon zu einem neuen, entgegengesetzten Typus des Erkennenden durchgedrungen ist, und wie weit er sich bereits von den positivistischen »Wirklichkeits-Philosophastern« entfernt hat. Denn was diese als eine unvermeidliche _Zugabe_ zum erkennenden Denken betrachten und im Erkenntnissakt nach Möglichkeit zu _reduciren_ suchen: die Abhängig-keitdes Denkens vom menschlichen Triebleben,--das gerade bedarf, nach Nietzsche der höchstmöglichen Steigerung. Die Einsicht in die Relativität alles Denkens, in die engen Grenzen, die der Wahrheitserkenntniss gezogen sind, dien! ihm ausschliesslich zur Proklamirung einer neuen Grenzenlosigkeit des Erkennens, die demselben den absoluten Charakter wiedergeben soll. Weil Nietzsche der absoluten Ideale bedurfte, um sie anbeten und an ihnen seine Hingebung ausleben zu können, suchte er, sobald sein logisches Wahrheitsideal allzu bescheiden zusammenschrumpfte, Abhilfe in dessen Gegensatz, im Maasslosen des gesteigerten Affektlebens. Ist er vorher davon ausgegangen, das Wahrheitsstreben von einer letzten Illusion zu befreien, indem er es als relativ auffasste, so öffnet er sich nun einen neuen Zugang zu neuen Illusionen: durch Verlegung des Erkenntnissgebietes in das der Gefühlserregungen und Willenseingebungen. Damit sind alle zurückhaltenden, einschränkenden Dämme niedergerissen und rückhaltlos darf das Affektleben darüber hinfluthen. Nirgends Gewissheit oder überall Gewissheit, das kommt hier beinahe auf dasselbe hinaus; wo der Gedanke alle selbständigen Erkenntnissrechte eingebüsst hat, da schweift er, als Spielzeug und Werkzeug der ihn regierenden verborgenen Triebe bis in die fernsten Fernen, bis in die tiefsten Tiefen. Ist Nietzsche ursprünglich aus dem geheimnissvoll schimmernden Zaubergarten der Metaphysik in die nüchterne Verstandeswelt empirischer Forschung eingetreten, so verliert er sich jetzt in den Irrgarten einer Wildniss, die, ungelichtet und undurchdringlich, diese Verstandeswelt umgiebt. Gerade der Umstand, dass in ihr noch keine Wege gebahnt sind, dem Denken noch keine Richtung gewiesen ist,--dass Alles in ihr noch herrenlos und gesetzlos ist, und der Willensmachtspruch Raum hat für jegliches Schaffen,--gerade dies Abenteuerlich-Gefährliche ist ihm Bürgschaft für den richtigen Weg, denn es erscheint als die Richtung mitten ins Innere des Lebens, mitten in seine Urkräfte hinein. »Räthsel-Trunkene, Zwielicht-Frohe« nennt daher Zarathustra seine Jünger, »deren Seele mit Flöten zu jedem Irr-Schlunde gelockt wird:--denn nicht wollt ihr mit _feiger Hand einem Faden nachtasten_; und, wo ihr _errathen_ könnt, da hasst ihr es, zu _erschliessen_.« (Also sprach Zarathustra III 6 f.) »Auch im Erkennen fühle ich nur meines Willens Zunge und Werde-Lust (Ebendaselbst II 8); »Werk- und Spielzeuge sind Sinn und Geist!« (Ebendaselbst I 43), denn das Leben spricht: »Auch du, Erkennender, bist nur ein Pfad und Fusstapfen meines Willens: wahrlich, mein Wille zur Macht wandelt auch auf den Füssen deines Willens zur Wahrheit!« (Ebendaselbst II 50)

Nietzsche, der so lange Zeit hindurch, zur Beschwichtigung und Zügelung seyier tieferregten Innerlichkeit und ihres Affektlebens, eine kalte und nüchterne Denkweise benutzt hatte, erfuhr nun an sich selber, was er früher einmal vorahnend und warnend, in »Menschliches, Allzumenschliches (II 275), geschildert: »Hat man seinen Geist verwendet, um über die Maasslosigkeit der Affekte Herr zu werden, so geschieht es vielleicht mit dem leidigen Erfolge, dass man die Maasslosigkeit auf den Geist überträgt und fürderhin im Denken und Erkennenwollen ausschweift.[1] In einem solchen Verlangen wild auszuschweifen, schafft er sich einen neuen Wahlspruch:»Nichts ist wahr, Alles ist erlaubt!« (Zur Genealogie der Moral III. 24.) und preist den Werth der Täuschung, der willkürlichen Fiktion, des Unlogischen und »Unwahren«, als der im Grunde lebenfördernden, willensteigernden Mächte. In der Vorstellung, dass ja in dem gesammten Weltbilde, so wie wir es um uns aufgebaut haben, wir selbst als die Schöpfer mit unserer psychischen Eigenart drinstecken, und dass unser Erkennen letzten Endes doch nichts ist als eine »Anmenschlichung der Dinge«, schwelgt er so lange, bis das Weltganze sich ihm zu einem Traumbilde verflüchtigt, das sich der Einzelne willkürlich ersonnen hat. »Warum dürfte die Welt, _die uns etwas angeht_--, nicht eine Fiktion sein?« fragt er sich (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 34), mit dem Hintergedanken: _und also durch einen Gewaltakt umzuschaffen sein_?

Hierauf bezieht sich ein kurzes interessantes Kapitel in der »Götzen-Dämmerung« (IV), dessen Absicht aber nur im Zusammenhang mit den übrigen zerstreuten Bemerkungen Nietzsches über diesen Gegenstand ganz verständlich wird. Es ist überschrieben: »Wie die »wahre Welt« endlich zur Fabel wurde. Geschichte eines Irrthums.« und enthält eine Skizzirung des philosophischen Entwicklungsganges von den Alten bis zu uns. Die alte Philosophie fasste schon, wenn auch erst in naiver Weise, den Erkennenden und sein Weltbild, die Person und die Wahrheit, als identisch; sie gipfelte in der Umschreibung des Satzes: »ich, Plato, _bin_ die Wahrheit.« »Die wahre Welt«, im Gegensatz zur unwahren, scheinbaren, in der die Unweisen leben, ist, »erreichbar für den Weisen,--lebt in ihr, _er ist sie_.« Im Christenthum trennt sich die Idee der »wahren Welt« fortschreitend von der Persönlichkeit, indem sie sich entmenschlicht und sublimirt, als Zukunftsverheissung, als Versprechen über den Menschen auffliegt. Endlich, durch eine Reihe von metaphysischen Systemen hindurch, verblasst sie bei Kant zu einem blossen Schatten, »unerreichbar, unbeweisbar, unversprechbar,«--bis sie sich, mit der endgiltigen Abkehr von aller Metaphysik, völlig zu Nichts verflüchtigt: »Grauer Morgen. Erstes Gähnen der Vernunft. Hahnenschrei des Positivismus.« Damit steigt die bisher, als scheinbar und unwahr gescholtene Welt im Preise, weil sie die einzig übrigbleibende ist: »Heller Tag; Frühstück; Rückkehr des bon sens und der Heiterkeit; Schamröthe Plato's; Teufelslärm aller freien Geister.« Aber mit der Einsicht in die Entstehung der Fabel von der »wahren Welt« haben wir zugleich die Entstehungsweise des Weltbildes unserer Erkenntniss überhaupt eingesehen. Jetzt, wo der Glaube an eine mystische »wahre« Welt hinter der scheinbaren, durch Täuschung und Irrthum entstandenen, uns nicht mehr tröstet, was bleibt uns noch übrig? »Mit der wahren Welt haben wir auch die scheinbare abgeschafft,« die ja nur als deren Gegensatz möglich war. Wieder ist der Mensch auf sich selbst zurückgeworfen als auf den _Selbstschöpfer aller Dinge_. Wieder ist die alte Fassung: »Ich, Plato, bin die Welt,« möglich geworden und steht als letzte Weisheit am Anfang aller Philosophie, nun aber nicht mehr in der naiven, noch ungebrochenen Identificirung von Person und Wahrheit, von Subjekt und Objekt, sondern als klar bewusste und gewollte Schöpferthat Dessen, der sich selbst als den Weltenträger erkannt hat. »Ich, Nietzsche-Zarathustra, bin die Welt, sie ist, weil ich bin, sie ist, wie ich will.« Dieses Ergebniss wird nur angedeutet in den geheimnissvollen Schlussworten: »_Mittag; Augenblick des kürzesten Schattens; Ende des längsten Irrthums. Höhepunkt der Menschheit; Incipit Zarathustra_.«

Hier lässt es sich schon deutlich verfolgen, wie sich neue und ins Mystische überschlagende Gedanken Nietzsches mit Elementen mischen und verknüpfen, die er noch der modernen Erkenntnisstheorie entnimmt. Und damit ist bereits der Punkt erreicht, von dem aus sich seine neue Lehre aufbaut, und bei dem es sich nicht mehr um eine blosse Gefühlsübertreibung gewisser allgemeingiltiger Einsichten handelt. Denn aus der Thatsache der Begrenztheit und Relativität alles menschlichen Erkennens, und aus der der Priorität des menschlichen Trieblebens gegenüber demselben formt sich ihm unvermerkt der neue Typus des Philosophen: das überlebensgrosse Bild eines Einzelnen, dessen Gewaltwille über wahr und unahr entscheidet, und in dessen Hand das Verstandeserkennen der Menschen ein blosses Spielzeug ist. Man könnte sagen: dasjenige, was den Geist zu strenger Selbstbescheidung zwingt, was ihn von allen Seiten bedingt und beeinflusst, das personificirt sich Nietzsche unter dem Bilde einer zügellosen Allmacht, die er auf einen übermenschlichen Einzelnen überträgt. Ja, in ihm sollen alle Triebe und Kräfte alles Menschenthums dermaassen entfesselt und gesteigert gedacht werden, dass die Quintessenz des Lebens, der Kraft-Extract des Ganzen, in ihm gleichsam Person geworden ist, sodass er auch die Erkenntnissnormen umzuprägen und zu verrücken im Stande wäre. Doch geschieht dies nicht in einem Act der Contemplation, sondern in einer schöpferischen That, als Handlung und Befehl, der an die Welt ergeht. »--_Die eigentlichen Philosophen aber sind Befehlende und Gesetzgeber_: sie sagen »_so soll_ es sein!« sie bestimmen erst das Wohin? und Wozu? des Menschen-- --,--sie greifen mit schöpferischer Hand nach der Zukunft-- --. Ihr »Erkennen« ist _Schaffen_, ihr Schaffen ist eine Gesetzgebung, ihr Wille zur Wahrheit ist--_Wille zur Macht_.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 211.) Ihre Philosophie »schafft immer die Welt nach ihrem Bilde, sie kann nicht anders; Philosophie ist dieser tyrannische Trieb selbst, der geistigste Wille zur Macht, zur »Schaffung der Welt«, zur causa prima« (Ebendaselbst 9). Die »cäsarischen Züchter und Gewaltmenschen der Cultur« (Ebendaselbst 207) sind es, mit deren Erläuterung und Beschreibung sich Nietzsches ganze Zukunftsphilosophie beschäftigt, ja, in deren Bilde ihr gesammter Inhalt besteht. In seiner Erkenntnisstheorie wird ihnen nur der Boden bereitet, in seiner Ethik und Aesthetik wachsen sie aus diesem Boden immer höher hinauf in eine religiöse Mystik, in der Gott, Welt und Mensch zu einem einzigen ungeheuren Ueberwesen verschmelzen.

Es ist leicht zu sehen, inwiefern sich Nietzsche mit dem Bilde dieses Schöpfer-Philosophen seinen ehemaligen metaphysischen Anschauungen nähert, wie er aber dieselben zugleich durch seine späteren wissenschaftlichen Theorien zu modificiren sucht. Die »idealen« Wahrheiten der Metaphysik mit ihren erhebenden und tröstenden Deutungen des Welträthsels nimmt er nicht wieder auf, aber indem er überhaupt mit der Möglichkeit einer »Wahrheit« aufräumt, indem er die Skepsis in das Gebiet des Erkennens hineinträgt und sich auf den Standpunkt »Alles ist unwahr« stellt, schafft er sich Raum, um einen _Ersatz_ für jene verlorenen idealen Wahrheiten und Trostgründe herzustellen. Durch einen Machtspruch, durch einen Willensakt wird in die Dinge die Bedeutung hineingelegt, die sie an sich selbst nicht haben; aus dem Wahrheits-_Entdecker_, als welcher der Philosoph bisher galt,

ist er gewissermassen zum Wahrheits-_Erfinder_ geworden, zu einem »Überreichen des Willens« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 212), der zwar Unwahrheiten und Täuschungen ausspricht, aber dessen schöpferischer Wille sie wahr, d. h. zu überzeugenden Wirklichkeiten, zu machen weiss. »Wer seinen Willen nicht in die Dinge zu legen weiss, der legt wenigstens einen _Sinn_ noch hinein« (Götzen-Dämmerung, Sprüche und Pfeile 18). Damit kehrt er sich gegen die Metaphysiker, aber wie sie nimmt er sich das Recht zu einer Umdeutung und Umschaffung der Dinge auf Grund der über die blosse Verstandeskraft hinausgehenden Eingebungen des Gemüths.

In dieser persönlich gedachten Ueberlegenheit des Affektlebens über das Verstandesleben, in welcher schliesslich der Wahrheitsgehalt einer Erkenntniss als unwesentlich erachtet wird gegenüber ihrem Willens- und Gefühlsgehalt, spiegelt sich rückhaltlos Nietzsches Geistesart, sein innerstes Wesen und Sehnen wieder. Nach dem langen Zwang im Dienste des strengen Wahrheitserkennens war dies eine Reaktion, deren Seligkeit ihn in einen Taumel der Mystik hineinriss. Seine eigene Seele gibt er jenem übermenschengrossen Schöpfer-Philosophen, in dem des Lebens Fülle und Ueberfülle sich drängt und schöpferisch nach Entlastung durch den Gedanken verlangt,--es ist der »tropische« Mensch, auf den die Worte passen, die wir bereits im ersten Theile dieses Buches auf Nietzsches tieferregtes Innenleben angewendet haben: »die umfänglichste Seele, welche am weitesten in sich laufen und irren und schweifen kann;-- -- --die sich selber fliehende, die sich selber im weitesten Kreise einholt; die weiseste Seele, welcher die Narrheit am süssesten zuredet: die sich selber bebendste, in der alle Dinge ihr Strömen und Wiederströmen und Ebbe und Fluth haben« (Also sprach Zarathustra III 82).

Aber noch weiter geht diese unwillkürliche und gewaltsame Reaktion gegen die vorhergehende Geistesperiode, und geht die unbewusste Selbstwiderspiegelung in den Theorien, bis hinein in das persönlichste Empfinden Nietzsches. Denn in ihnen treffen wir auch auf jenen unheimlichen Zug in Nietzsches Seelenleben, wonach er sich nur in der Selbstopferung und Selbstvergewaltigung befriedigte und seiner Exaltation genug that. Wie er sich zuvor zur Unterwerfung unter die Forderungen eines strengen Intellektualismus gezwungen hatte, so zwingt er jetzt umgekehrt den Verstand, den Trieb zu rein intellektuellem Erkennen, unter den Machtwillen der Affekte. Hatte er zuvor seinen seelischen Menschen vergewaltigt, so vergewaltigt er jetzt den erkennenden Menschen in sich. Er ruht nicht eher, als bis der Triumph des entfesselten Lebenswillens zu einer Selbstverhöhnung des Verstandes wird: in unheimlicher Weise resultirt schliesslich die höchste Erkenntniss aus einer Selbstpreisgebung alles logischen Erkennens,--der Denker wird »heimlich durch seine Grausamkeit gelockt und vorwärts gedrängt, durch jene gefährlichen Schauder der _gegen sich selbst_ gewendeten Grausamkeit«.--er muss als »Künstler und Verklärer der Grausamkeit« walten (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 229). Der menschliche Geist taucht zuletzt freiwillig hinab in seine Vernichtung, denn nur so empfängt er die höchste Offenbarung,--er taucht hinab ins Grenzenlose, Maasslose, das über ihm zusammenschlägt, denn nur so erfüllt er sein Ziel. Wir werden in der ganzen letzten Philosophie Nietzsches, in der Ethik wie in der Aesthetik, den durchgehenden Grundgedanken wiederfinden: _dass der Untergang durch das Uebermass_ die Bedingung einer höchsten Neuschöpfung sei, und daher mündet auch Nietzsches Erkenntnisstheorie in eine Art schauerlich--persönlicher Mystik aus, in der die Begriffe Wahn und Wahrheit unlöslich verkettet sind, und das »Uebermenschliche« daher kommt als ein Blitz, der den Geist treffen und tödten, als ein Wahnsinn, mit dem sein Wahrheitssinn geimpft werden soll: »Wollte ich doch, sie hätten einen Wahnsinn, an dem sie zu Grunde gingen!-- -- --Wahrlich ich wollte, ihr Wahnsinn hiesse Wahrheit!-- --Und des Geistes Glück ist diess: gesalbt zu sein und durch Thränen geweiht zum Opferthier,--wusstet ihr das schon? Und die Blindheit des Blinden und sein Suchen und Tappen soll noch von der Macht der Sonne zeugen, in die er schaute,--wusstet ihr das schon?« (Also sprach Zarathustra II 33).

Aber dieses letzte Mysterium kann uns, wie das ganze Bild des Schöpfer-Philosophen überhaupt, nur fortschreitend, in der Ethik und Aesthetik Nietzsches, völlig deutlich werden, indem es, von den abstrakten Grundlinien aus, stets körperhaftere Züge gewinnt, bis es endlich, als eine mystische Wesensverklärung Nietzsches selber, in seiner persönlichen Einzelgestalt vor unseren Augen steht.

Dass erst die Ethik der Erkenntnisstheorie ihre rechte Erläuterung und Begründung giebt, erhellt schon aus dem Charakter des Erkennenden als des wahren Trägers des Lebenswillens,--des Erkennenden als des Handelnden und Schaffenden. Es gilt daher im höchsten Grade von Nietzsches Philosophie, was er von den Systemen der Philosophen überhaupt aussagt: »dass die moralischen-- --Absichten-- --den eigentlichen Lebenskeim ausmachten, aus dem jedesmal die ganze Pflanze gewachsen ist« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 6). Dieser enge Zusammenhang des Philosophen mit dem Leben als solchem und mit dessen menschlichsten und persönlichsten Zwecken soll ihn am entschiedensten von allen Denen trennen, die das Leben anfeinden oder pessimistisch ansehen. Er soll der geborene Lebens-Apologet sein und seine Philosophie eo ipso eine Lebens-Apotheose, denn zu sich selbst kann das Leben nur immer wieder »Ja« sagen. In Wirklichkeit jedoch ist fast immer das Gegentheil der Fall gewesen (Götzen-Dämmerung II I). »Über das Leben haben zu allen Zeiten die Weisesten gleich geurtheilt: _es taugt nichts_.... Immer und

überall hat man aus ihrem Munde denselben Klang gehört,--einen Klang voll Zweifel, voll Schwermuth, voll Müdigkeit am Leben, voll Widerstand gegen das Leben.« War doch dieser geschwächte Lebenswille eine Folge der Verfeinerung und Sublimirung ihres menschlich-thierischen Wesens, der intellektuellen und beschaulichen Eigenart ihrer Natur,--war es doch, nach Nietzsches ehemaliger Auffassung, gewissermaassen zugleich ihr _Adelszeichen_, das sie von den geistig rohen Menschen, vom _Pöbel_, unterschied und zu ihrer Führerrolle berechtigte. Hier hat sich nun die Auffassung dahin verändert, dass nicht mehr auf die Lebensdurchgeistigung, sondern auf die Lebensschwächung der Nachdruck gelegt wird. Die Menschen des Geistes erscheinen nunmehr als die Kranken und Entnervten, als die _Niedergangstypen_ eines jeden Zeitalters. Der von Nietzsche so geliebte und verherrlichte Philosoph, der bei den Griechen die Lehre von der Herrschaft der Vernunft über die Naturinstinkte vertrat, Sokrates, wandelt sich ihm damit wieder zu der gefährlichen und geschmähten Versucher-Gestalt, die er für Nietzsche zur Zeit der Schopenhauerischen Periode war. Sokrates, der Hässliche, Missgestaltete unter den vornehmen, wohlgebildeten Griechen, trat unter ihnen auf als der erste grosse Decadent, er corrumpirte und verschnitt den ursprünglichen hellenischen Lebensinstinkt, indem er ihn der Vernunftlehre unterwarf (Vergleiche Götzen-Dämmerung II »Das Problem des Sokrates«). Darin ist er das Urbild aller Denker, die das Leben durch das Denken meistern wollen, aber wie sie Alle beweist er damit Nichts gegen das Leben, sondern nur Etwas gegen das Denken. Denn wenn auch bisher alle Philosophen zur Missachtung des Daseins, zur Erschlaffung der lebenerhaltenden Instinkte beigetragen haben, so spricht sich darin nicht eine Wahrheit hinsichtlich des also geringgeschätzten Lebens aus, sondern nur der Widerspruch, in den sie mit sich selber gerathen sind, als das charakteristische Symptom eines Krankheitszustandes. Es lehrt nur, dass die Menschen des überwiegenden Intellekts sich von der Lebensquelle, die auch ihrem Intellekt erst Nahrung zuführt, abgekehrt haben, dass sie Abgelebte, Müde, Spätlinge niedergehender Culturen sind, dass sie in sich nicht mehr die sieghafte, heilende, umformende Kraft besitzen, welche über die Schäden und Lücken des Daseins triumphirt und dasselbe zu höherer Entwicklung weiterführt. Ihnen allen gilt daher die argwöhnische Frage: »Waren sie vielleicht allesammt auf den Beinen nicht mehr fest? spät? wackelig? ddcadents? Erschiene die Weisheit vielleicht auf Erden als Rabe, den ein kleiner Geruch von Aas begeistert?...« (Götzen-Dämmerung II 1.)

Aber nicht nur ihnen gilt diese Frage, denn sie repräsentiren nur die äusserste Spitze dessen, worin die ganze Entwicklung der Menschheit gipfelt. Der stumpfen und dumpfen Einheitlichkeit seines ursprünglichen Thierbewusstseins entrissen, ist der Mensch durch die Weiterbildung seiner Geistesfähigkeiten in Zwiespalt mit dem Naturgrund gerathen, in dem seine Kraft wurzelt. Er ist damit zu einer Halbheit, zu einem Zwitterding geworden, das ersichtlich seine Erklärung und Daseinsberechtigung nicht aus sich selber schöpfen kann,--? er ist der verkörperte Uebergang zu Etwas, das noch nicht entdeckt, noch nicht geschaffen ist, und als ein solcher Uebergang ist der Mensch das krankhafteste,--»das noch nicht _festgestellte_ Thier.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 62). So haftet der Decadenz-Charakter dem Menschenthum als solchem an und nicht nur einer einzelnen Form, einem einzelnen Gebiet desselben.

Wir finden demnach die ersten Anfänge der Decadenz, des Niederganges ungebrochenen Lebens, schon im Entstehen aller Cultur,--da wo sich die wilde Bestie Mensch, das »menschliche Raubthier«, durch den ersten socialen Zwang in seiner ungezügelten Freiheit beengt fühlt. »Jene furchtbaren Bollwerke, mit denen sich die staatliche Organisation gegen die alten Instinkte der Freiheit schützte-- -- --brachten zu Wege, dass alle jene Instinkte des wilden freien schweifenden Menschen sich rückwärts, sich _gegen den Menschen selbst_ wandten.« »Alle Instinkte, welche sich nicht nach Aussen entladen, _wenden sich nach Innen_-- ist das, was ich die _Verinnerlichung_ des Menschen nenne: damit wächst erst das an den Menschen heran, was man später seine »Seele« nennt. Die ganze innere Welt, ursprünglich dünn wie zwischen zwei Häute eingespannt, hat Tiefe, Breite, Höhe bekommen, als die Entladung des Menschen _nach Aussen_ gehemmt worden ist.« »Der Mensch, der sich, aus Mangel an äusseren Feinden und Widerständen, eingezwängt in eine drückende Enge und Regelmässigkeit der Sitte, ungeduldig selbst zerriss, verfolgte, annagte, aufstörte, misshandelte, dies an den Gitterstangen seines Käfigs sich wund stossende Thier,-- -- --. Mit ihm aber war die grösste und unheimlichste Erkrankung eingeleitet, von welcher die Menschheit bis heute nicht genesen ist, das Leiden des Menschen--_an sich_: als die Folge einer gewaltsamen Abtrennung von der thierischen Vergangenheit, einer Kriegserklärung gegen die alten Instinkte, auf denen bis dahin seine Kraft, Lust und Furchtbarkeit beruhte.« (Zur Genealogie der Moral II 16.)

Wenn dementsprechend die Krankhaftigkeit des Menschen gewissermaassen sein Normalzustand, seine specifisch menschliche Natur selbst ist, und die Begriffe Erkrankung und Entwicklung als nahezu identisch gefasst werden, so müssen wir natürlich auch am _Ausgang_ einer langen culturellen Entwicklung wieder der nämlichen Decadenz als Resultat begegnen. Sie hat nur das Aussehen verändert. Es sind die Zeiten langer friedlicher Gewöhnung, in denen sie in ihrer neuen Form auftritt, Zeiten, in denen das strenge Zusammenhalten, die harte Zucht und Unterordnung der Einzelnen nicht mehr als nothwendig erscheinen, sondern die Mittel zu einer sorgloseren und volleren Selbstauslebung reichlich vorhanden sind. Die starre Gleichförmigkeit, zu der durch eine

Jahrhunderte währende Schulung Alle herangezüchtet worden sind, beginnt sich aufzulösen und dem Spiel des Individuellen Platz zu machen. »Die Variation, sei es als Abartung (in's Höhere, Feinere, Seltnere), sei es als Entartung und Monstrosität, ist plötzlich in der grössten Fülle und Pracht auf dem Schauplatz, der Einzelne wagt einzeln zu sein und sich abzuheben.« »Lauter neue Wozu's, lauter neue Womit's, keine gemeinsamen Formeln mehr, Missverständniss und Missachtung mit einander im Bunde, der Verfall, Verderb und die höchsten Begierden schauerlich verknotet, das Genie der Rasse aus allen Füllhörnern des Guten und Schlimmen überquellend, ein verhängnissvolles Zugleich von Frühling und Herbst.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 262.)

Wenn in der zuerst geschilderten ursprünglichen Decadenzform die Leidenschaften des Menschen sich gegen ihn selbst wenden, ihn bedrohen und zerfleischen, weil er sich nicht nach Aussen hin entladen, nicht wehren kann,--so gerathen sie jetzt aus dem entgegengesetzten Grunde in einen gleichen Innenkrieg miteinander, weil keine Verhältnisse mehr vorhanden sind, gegen die der Mensch sich zu wehren hätte, nichts, was seine Kriegskraft nach Aussen hin abzuziehen vermöchte. Im zahmen Frieden des geordneten Lebens hat der inzwischen so stark verinnerlichte Mensch nur noch sich selbst zum Kampfplatz seiner ungeberdigen Triebe. Sobald diese sich zu regen anfangen, beginnt er wiederum, an sich zu leiden, »Dank den wild gegeneinander gewendeten, gleichsam explodirenden Egoismen«, die sein überaus complicirt gewordenes Wesen in sich begreift, und durch die es allmälig alle Geschlossenheit der Persönlichkeit wieder einbüsst. In diesem Stadium bildet der Mensch das Endglied einer einzigen ungeheuer langen Entwicklungskette, deren einzelne Ringe ihm alle einverleibt sind, als die Summe der gesammten allmälig angezüchteten intellektuellen, moralischen und socialen »Menschlichkeit« nebst sämmtlichen nur allzu lebendigen Instinkterinnerungen an die zurückliegende Thierheit.

Aber wenn diese beiden Formen der Decadenz mit Nothwendigkeit der menschlichen Natur entspringen und unumgängliche Durchgangsphasen für deren Weiterbildung zu etwas Höherem sind, so gibt es daneben noch eine dritte Art der Decadenz, welche die geschilderten Krankheitszustände unheilbar zu machen und die Möglichkeit einer Wiedergenesung zu verhindern droht. Das ist die falsche Weltdeutung, die unrichtige Lebensauffassung, die durch jenes Leiden und jene Krankheit gezeitigt wird. Es ist die Aufforderung zur Askese in gleichviel welcher Form, zur Abkehr vom Leben und seinen Schmerzen, zur Hingebung an die Müdigkeit, die als Folge des immerwährenden »Krieges der man ist« auftritt. Ein solches asketisches Ideal predigen nicht nur alle Religionen und Moralen, sondern auch jeder Intellektualismus, der das Denken auf Kosten des Lebens unterstützt und das Ideal der »Wahrheit« dem Ideal einer möglichsten Lebenssteigerung entgegensetzt. Das wahre Heilmittel für diese um sich greifende Corruption bestände gerade in der vollen Hinwendung zum Leben, damit aus dem chaotischen Reichthum durcheinander ringender Gegensätze eine neue höhere Gesundheit geboren werde.

»Man ist nur _fruchtbar_ um den Preis, an Gegensätzen reich zu sein (Götzen-Dämmerung V 3), vorausgesetzt, dass noch genügende Kraft da ist, sie zu tragen, sie zu _ertragen_. Dann ist scheinbare Auflösung und Decadenz, dann ist alle sogenannte Corruption »nur ein Schimpfname für die Herbstzeiten«,--d. h. für die Zeiten der abfallenden Blätter, aber auch der reifenden Früchte. Insofern kann Decadenz und Fortschritt ein und dasselbe bedeuten: den Fortschritt dem nothwendigen Ende zu,--»Es hilft nichts: man muss vorwärts, will sagen _Schritt für Schritt weiter in der décadence_.-- -- --Man kann diese Entwicklung _hemmen_ und, durch Hemmung, die Entartung selber stauen, aufsammeln, vehementer und _plötzlicher_ machen: mehr kann man nicht.« (Götzen-Dämmerung IX 43.) Ein solches Ende, eine solche tragische Verknüpfung von vorwärts und niederwärts wird dadurch erklärt, dass der Mensch nicht in sich selbst seine Erfüllung findet, sondern über sich selbst hinaus drängt nach etwas Höherem, als er ist. Es ist »mit der Thatsache einer gegen sich selbst gekehrten, -- --Thierseele auf Erden etwas so Neues, Tiefes,-- --Widerspruchsvolles und _Zukunftsvolles_ gegeben«,--dass daraus die Zuversicht auf eine mögliche, neue Über-Art des Menschlichen geschöpft werden kann. Es ist, als ob sich damit »Etwas ankündige, Etwas vorbereite, als ob der Mensch kein Ziel, sondern nur ein Weg, ein Zwischenfall, eine Brücke, ein grosses Versprechen sei.« (Zur Genealogie der Moral II 16.) »Der Mensch ist ein Seil, geknüpft zwischen Thier und Übermensch,--ein Seil über einem Abgrunde.-- --Was gross ist am Menschen, das ist, dass er eine Brücke und kein Zweck ist: was geliebt werden kann am Menschen, das ist, dass er ein _Übergang_ und ein _Untergang_ ist.« (Also sprach Zarathustra I 12.) Die Decadenzerscheinungen können daher der Menschheit zu Zeiten des hereinbrechenden Unterganges und der sich ankündigenden Neugeburt ebenso wenig erspart bleiben als »einem schwangeren Weibe die Widerlichkeiten und Wunderlichkeiten der Schwangerschaft: »-- -- --als welche man vergessen muss, um sich des Kindes zu freuen.«

Die Einsicht in die durchgängige »Allzumenschlichkeit« der Triebe, die Nietzsche früher so stark betont hatte, wird hier also nicht aufgegeben, sondern noch möglichst _verschärft_ und zum Ausgangspunkt seiner neuen Menschheitstheorie genommen. Aus einer verstandeskalten Einsicht hat sie sich ihm zu einem _Gemüthsaffekt_ gesteigert, und als solcher gewinnt sie eine so ungeheure Bedeutung, dass sie alle seine Seelen- und Gedankenkräfte aufwühlt, bis ihm in Zorn, Gram und Entsetzen neue

»Flügel und quellenahnende Kräfte« (Also sprach Zarathustra III 77) wachsen, mit denen er sich über sie erhebt. Aus dem _Accent_, den er auf seine ehemalige Einsicht legt, aus den äussersten Consequenzen, die er aus ihr zieht, quillt ihm die übermächtige Sehnsucht nach seiner neuen Theorie, nach dem Gedanken einer Selbstopferung des Allzumenschlichen für das Uebermenschliche.

Wie sich in dem erkenntnisstheoretischen Theile von Nietzsches neuer Lehre die Abhängigkeit des Logischen vom Seelischen, des Gedankenlebens vom Gemüthsleben wiederspiegelt, so tritt uns in jenem Menschheitsbilde einer leidenden Ueberfülle zum Zweck einer Neugeburt die Erklärung seines eigenen Wesens entgegen: die Selbstopferung durcheinanderringender Triebe zur Entbindung höchster Schaffenskraft. Aus dem tiefen, ihm stets gegenwärtigen Gefühl eigener Krankhaftigkeit, eigenen Leidens ist seine Decadenzlehre hervorgegangen. Auch von ihr gilt, was von allen Theorien seiner letzten Philosophie gilt: die schmerzlichen psychischen Vorgänge, die bei ihm bisher die _Ursache_ und _Begleiterscheinung_ der verschiedenen Erkenntnissprocesse waren, werden nunmehr zum _Erkenntniss_-inhalt selbst.

Der Gedanke einer überreich gewordenen, sich opfernden Menschheit ist es denn auch, von dem aus Nietzsche, zurückblickend, den ganzen Gang der Menschheits-Entwicklung begreift. Um desswillen allein war jene lange und peinvolle Zähmung ursprünglicher Thierwildheit nöthig, obgleich sie den Menschen zum Decadenten heranzüchtet, und er ihr schliesslich doch wieder entwächst. Ihr Sinn ist es gewesen, ihn mit der ganzen Fülle seiner Innerlichkeit zu bereichern und ihn dann zum Herrn dieses Reichthums und seiner selbst zu machen. Das konnte nur durch einen langen harten Zwang geschehen, in dem sein Wille, als, der eines noch Unmündigen, gleichsam unter Schlägen und Strafen zur Mündigkeit erzogen wurde. So lernte der Mensch einen _längeren_ und _tieferen_ Willen haben, als das vergessliche, vom Augenblick beherrschte, dem Augenblicksimpulse unterworfene Thier. Er lernte für sein Wollen einstehen--er wurde »das Thier, das _versprechen darf_«. Alle Menschheitserziehung ist im Grunde eine Art von _Mnemotechnik_: sie löst das Problem, wie dem unberechenbaren Willen ein _Gedächtniss einzuverleiben_ sei. »Für sich gut sagen dürfen und mit Stolz, also auch zu sich _Ja sagen dürfen_--das ist--- eine _späte_ Frucht:--wie lange musste diese Frucht herb und sauer am Baume hängen! Stellen wir uns--ans Ende des ungeheuren Prozesses, dorthin, wo der Baum endlich seine Früchte zeitigt, wo die Societät und ihre Sittlichkeit der Sitte endlich zu Tage bringt, _wozu_ sie nur das Mittel war: so finden wir als reifste Frucht-- --das souveraine _Individuum_, das nur sich selbst gleiche,-- --, kurz den Menschen des eignen unabhängigen langen Willens, der _versprechen darf_.« (Zur Genealogie der Moral II I ff.) Dieser Selbstgewissheit des freigewordenen, herrgewordenen Individuums entspricht eine neue Art von _Gewissen_, nachdem der Mensch den Moral Vorstellungen und Idealbegriffen des Herkommens--seinen strengen, nunmehr überflüssig gewordenen Erziehern--entwachsen ist, und damit das alte Gewissen seine Wurzel und Berechtigung in ihm verloren hat.

Auch die Willenstheorie Nietzsches weist eine Verschmelzung seiner ehemaligen metaphysischen Anschauungen mit einem wissenschaftlichen Determinismus auf. Als Jünger Schopenhauers unterschied Nietzsche gleich diesem zwischen dem mysteriösen Willen »an sich«, der die Grundlage der Schopenhauerischen Metaphysik ausmacht, und dem Willen, wie er für unsere menschliche Wahrnehmung in die Erscheinung tritt. Er nannte ihn also frei, insofern die letzten Gründe seines Seins und Wesens jenseits unserer gesammten Erfahrungswelt liegen, jenseits des für diese geltenden Causalitätsgesetzes; unfrei, insofern die einzelne Willenserscheinung uns nur wahrnehmbar wird innerhalb des unzerreissbaren Netzes des allgemeinen Causalzusammenhangs. Nachdem Nietzsche dann mehrere Jahre einem consequenten Determinismus gehuldigt hatte, hält er auch jetzt noch an der Ansicht fest, dass der »Wille« sich am Gängelbande der ihn bestimmenden Einflüsse sozusagen erst seinen Namen verdiene. Aber was er als Determinist hinsichtlich der mysteriösen _Herkunft_ und Abstammung des Willens leugnet, das versucht er dafür an das _Ziel_ und _Ende_ der Willensentwicklung zu stellen. Ist nämlich in Folge der von ihm geschilderten langen Willenszüchtung durch Zwang und äussere Beeinflussung ein reifer, selbstgewisser, dem Augenblick entwachsener und das Leben beherrschender Wille allmählich _geschaffen worden_, so ist er damit in einem Sinne frei geworden, dem gegenüber die Deterministen Unrecht bekommen: denn nun lassen sich seine Handlungen nicht länger aus einer bestimmten Zeit und Umgebung ableiten, nun wird er durch nichts mehr als durch sich selbst, d. h. durch seine _gewaltig angewachsene und rücksichtslos explodirende Stärke_ bestimmt,--er ist reines, von der Zeit gelöstes Machtbewusstsein. Allerdings ist dieses sein Wesen nicht mehr _metaphysischer_ Natur, denn es ist geworden, es ist das _Resultat_ einer Entwicklungsreihe, und die erreichte Freiheit des Willens ist die Tochter der Nothwendigkeit und strengsten Bedingtheit des Willens. Aber es ist dennoch etwas Mystisches um diese Freiheit, denn sie wendet sich nunmehr als eine _unbedingte_ Macht umgestaltend und umschaffend _gegen_ eben die natürlichen Bedingungen, denen sie entsprungen. Die Welt der Wirklichkeit in ihrer uns allein zugänglichen und begreiflichen Entwicklung hatte Nietzsche in seiner positivistischen Zeit als das Werthvollste schätzen gelernt, indem er sich gegen die andersgesinnten Metaphysiker mit dem Wort kehrte: »Alles Fertige, Vollkommene wird angestaunt, alles Werdende unterschätzt,« (Menschliches, Allzumenschliches I 162)--blos weil man die Entstehungsursachen des ersteren nicht mehr

nachprüfen, nicht mehr durchschauen kann. Nun gelangt er zu dem gleichen Anstaunen des Fertiggewordenen und scheinbar Vollkommenen; und alles Werdende erscheint ihm nur noch schätzenswerth, insofern es der Weg dazu ist. Die Bedingtheit aller Dinge wird von ihm auch jetzt zugestanden, aber nur, weil aus ihr heraus irgend wann einmal eine über alle Bedingtheit und Erfahrung hinausgehende mystische Bedeutsamkeit aller Dinge sich offenbaren soll. Von der Machtstärke des freigewordenen Willens hängt diese Bedeutsamkeit ab, denn von ihm wird sie in die Dinge hineinerschaffen; darum will Nietzsche an Stelle des »freien« und »unfreien« Willens der Deterministen den Ausdruck »_starker_ und _schwacher_ Wille« gesetzt sehen (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 21) und die gesammte Psychologie aufgefasst wissen als »Morphologie und _Entwicklungslehre des Willens zur Macht_«. (Ebendas. 23.)

Der Willensmächtige ist also jederzeit der im höchsten Grade »Unzeitgemässe«, er ist Derjenige, in dem _Genie_ geworden ist, was sich durch lange Zeit hindurch in der Menschheit vorbereitet hat. Im Genie strömt frei aus, was von der Menschheit in Unfreiheit und Knechtschaft erlernt wurde. Genies sind wie »Explosivstoffe, in denen eine ungeheure Kraft aufgehäuft ist; ihre Voraussetzung ist immer, historisch und physiologisch, dass lange auf sie hin gesammelt, gehäuft, gespart und bewahrt worden ist,-- -- --die Zeit, in der sie erscheinen, ist zufällig; dass sie fast immer über dieselbe Herr werden, liegt nur darin, dass sie stärker, dass sie _älter_ sind, dass länger auf sie hin gesammelt worden ist;-- -- --die Zeit ist relativ immer viel jünger, dünner, unmündiger, unsicherer, kindischer.«-- -- --»Der grosse Mensch ist ein Ende;-- -- --Das Genie--in Werk, in That-- ist nothwendig ein Verschwender: _dass es sich ausgiebt_, ist seine Grösse.... Der Instinkt der Selbsterhaltung ist gleichsam ausgehängt; der übergewaltige Druck der ausströmenden Kräfte verbietet ihm jede solche Obhut und Vorsicht.« (Götzen-Dämmerung IX 44.)

Im Genie tritt also, wenigstens nach einer bestimmten Richtung, in ausserordentlichem Grade das zu Tage was den Menschen befähigen soll, von seiner Art zu einer Ueber-Art fortzuschreiten, eine Selbstvergeudung zu Gunsten einer Neuschöpfung, ein verschwenderischer Reichthum, in dessen Gaben sich die ganze Vergangenheit abgelagert hat, und in dem sie zugleich ganz und gar Fruchtbarkeit geworden ist,--Zukunftsbefruchtung. Denke man sich nun ein Genie, das nicht, gleich anderen Genies, seine Genialität nur auf einem oder einigen Gebieten besitzt, sondern in Bezug auf das gesammte Menschheitsbewusstsein,--so etwa, dass in ihm wirksam und lebendig ausströmt, was je in demselben gelebt und gewirkt: ein solches Genie wäre das Bild des Menschen, aus dem der Uebermensch geboren wird. Es würde in sich die ganze Vergangenheit überschauen und zusammenfassen, ja, es enthielte in sich »die ganze Linie Mensch, bis zu ihm selbst hin noch«, und deshalb müsste sich in ihm plötzlich Weg und Ziel der Menschheitszukunft offenbaren. Zum ersten Mal erhielte durch den Machtwillen eines solchen Offenbarers die Menschheitsentwicklung Richtung, Ziel und Zukunft, alle Dinge eine innere und endgiltige Bedeutsamkeit:--mit einem Wort, zum ersten Mal erstände der Philosoph als der Schaffende, wie Nietzsche ihn sich denkt: als der Willensmächtige, der Menschheitsgenius, der das Leben in sich Begreifende, an dem offenbar wird, was Nietzsche vom Denken überhaupt sagt: es sei »in der That viel weniger ein Entdecken, als ein Wiedererkennen, Wiedererinnern, eine Rück- und Heimkehr in einen fernen uralten Gesammt-Haushalt der Seele, aus dem jene Begriffe einstmals herausgewachsen sind:--Philosophien ist insofern eine Art von Atavismus höchsten Ranges.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 20.) Alles Höchste eine Art von Atavismus,--darin liegt der wunderlich _reaktionäre_ Charakter der ganzen letzten Philosophie Nietzsches, der sie am schärfsten von der seiner vorhergehenden Periode unterscheidet. Es ist ein Versuch, an Stelle der metaphysischen Verherrlichung bestimmter Dinge und Begriffe die ihres Alters und ihrer weit zurückliegenden Herkunft zu setzen. Er nimmt das »Wiedererinnern« und »Wiedererkennen« nur deshalb nicht im Sinne Platos, weil er meint, es durch die ungeheuer lange Zeitstrecke des Bestehens alles Denkens ebenso bedeutsam und übermenschlich fassen zu können. Deshalb gilt ihm, dass von allem Hochgearteten nur das Aelteste das Zukunftbestimmende sei,[2] dass Werth und Vornehmheit der Dinge ausschliesslich an das Alter gebunden seien: erst am Ende angelangt, weisen sie ihren Schatz auf, weisen sie sich als Macht, Freiheit und unabhängig gewordene Kraft aus. »Wer (die guten Dinge) _hat_, ist ein Andrer, als wer sie erwirbt. Alles Gute ist Erbschaft: was nicht ererbt ist, ist unvollkommen, ist Anfang ... « (Götzen-Dämmerung IX 47), vornehm ist: »was sich nicht improvisiren lässt.« Nichts ist mithin pöbelhafter, unvornehmer, als das Werdende und der Bringer des Werdenden und Neuen: der moderne Mensch und der moderne Geist, der von seiner Zeit ganz und gar bedingt und daher ganz und gar Sklavengeist ist. Herrengeist kann er erst werden, nachdem ihm Jahrhunderte und Jahrtausende einverleibt sind, und er dadurch selbst ein »Unzeitgemässer«, »zeitlose Genialität« geworden ist.

»Demokratismus war jeder Zeit die Niedergangs-Form der organisirenden Kraft:-- -- --Damit es Institutionen giebt, muss es-- --Wille, Instinkt, Imperativ geben, antiliberal bis zur Bosheit: den Willen zur Tradition, zur Autorität, zur Verantwortlichkeit auf Jahrhunderte hinaus, zur _Solidarität_ von Geschlechter-Ketten vorwärts und rückwärts in infinitum.« (Götzen-Dämmerung IX 39.) Es ist interessant, durch Vergleichung der entsprechenden Stellen in Nietzsches vorhergehenden Werken zu sehen, welche Wandlung in der Auffassung einer Theorie der blosse Gefühlsumschlag bei ihm hervorzurufen vermag, und wie unversöhnlich sich dadurch die Gegensätze sofort zuspitzen. Jetzt geisselt er die »pöbelhafte[3] Gleichmacherei« aller Menschen und die zahmen

Friedenszustände, in denen keine rohen Barbarengewalten mehr aufkommen können, welche die gesunde Kraft alter Zeiten in die ermattete und entkräftete Gegenwart hinübertragen würden. Barbaren sind »die _ganzeren_ Menschen (was auf jeder Stufe auch so viel mit bedeutet, als »die ganzeren Bestien«--).« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 257.) Diese ganzeren Menschen und ganzeren Bestien erscheinen in einem solchen Gesellschaftszustand als böse und gefährlich, sie werden zu Verbrechern gestempelt und demgemäss behandelt,-- ja, sie _sind_ kraft ihrer stärkeren Naturtriebe die geborenen Verbrecher und Biecher der bestehenden Ordnung. »Der Verbrecher-Typus, das ist der Typus des starken Menschen unter ungünstigen Bedingungen,-- -- --Ihm fehlt die Wildniss, eine gewisse freiere und gefährlichere Natur und Daseinsform, in der Alles, was Waffe und Wehr im Instinkt des starken Menschen ist, _zu Recht besteht_. Seine _Tugenden_ sind von der Gesellschaft in Bann gethan.« (Götzen-Dämmerung IX 45.) Das Freiheitsideal, wonach einem _Jeden_ eine gewisse Freiheit zukommt, das also auch den Schwächsten und Geringsten zur Freiheit der Bewegung gelangen lässt, steht dem seinen gerade entgegen: seine rücksichtslose Auslebung fordert immer die Vergewaltigung Anderer, seine Stärke äussert sich unwillkürlich und nothwendig in einem Zertreten jeder ihn umgebenden Schwäche. Der Grund aber dieser in ihm ausbrechenden Stärke der Instinkte ist, dass er sozusagen von einer älteren Kultur-stufe herkommt, ein älteres Stück Menschenthum darstellt: dass er, mit einem Wort, gleich dem Willensmächtigen und dem Genie, im höchsten Grade atavistisch veranlagt ist. Mag diese ihm von Alters her innewohnende Instinktmacht an sich noch so unedler Natur sein, edel ist sie schon dadurch, dass sie einen Durchbruch lang angesammelter Fülle, einen starken Explosivstoff darstellt, mit welchem die Vergangenheit die Zukunft befruchtet. Wo der Verbrecher sehr stark, wo er also zugleich ein Genie seiner Art und ein »Willensfreier« ist, da gelingt es ihm manchmal, die herrschende Zeitrichtung seiner atavistischen Sonderart entsprechend zu leiten und das ihm widerstrebende Zeitalter unter seinen Tyrannenwillen zu beugen. Ein Beispiel hierfür ist Napoleon, den Nietzsche ähnlich auffasst wie Taine. Auch ihm erscheint es von der grössten Bedeutsamkeit, dass Napoleon ein Nachkomme der Tyrannen-Genies der Renaissance-Zeit ist, der, nach Corsica verpflanzt, in der Wildheit und Ursprünglichkeit der dortigen Sitten das Erbe seiner Vorfahren unangetastet in sich bewahren konnte, um endlich mit der Gewalt desselben das moderne Europa zu unterjochen, das ihm einen ganz anderen Spielraum der Kraftentladung bot, als einst Italien seinen Ahnen geboten hatte. Nietzsches Bewunderung für den grossen Corsen gehört seiner letzten Geistesperiode an, wie er auch die italienische Renaissance früher wesentlich anders auffasste.[4]

In der Urgesundheit seiner gewaltthätigen Instinktkraft und seines rückhaltlosen Egoismus wurde Napoleon nun für Nietzsche das Idealbild der geborenen Herrennatur, wie sie sein soll, und wie wir sie auch heute noch brauchen, um Alles auszurotten, was durch die Sklavennatur der modernen Menschen an moralischen Rücksichten und weichlichen Regungen grossgezogen worden ist. Wir kommen damit zu Nietzsches viel besprochener und vielfach überschätzter Unterscheidung zwischen Herren-Moral und Sklaven-Moral. Anfangs ging Nietzsche auch hier von positivistischen Anregungen aus. Wie schon erwähnt, gab Rées damals im Werden begriffenes Werk »Die Entstehung des Gewissens« den Anlass, mit dem Freunde das ganze Material, dessen dieser für seine eigenen Zwecke bedurfte, durchzusprechen,--namentlich auch den etymologischen und historischen Zusammenhang der Begriffe vornehm-stark-gut, niedrig-schwach-schlecht in der ältesten Moral oder auf der sozusagen vormoralischen Culturstufe. Die Art, wie diese Gespräche und gemeinsamen Studien noch einmal von den beiden Freunden aufgenommen wurden, war charakteristisch für die Beziehung, in der Nietzsche auch jetzt noch zu den positivistischen Anschauungen stand: er hörte den Gedanken derselben noch einmal geduldig zu, entnahm ihnen hie und da die Anregung oder das Material zu eigenem Denken, wandte sich aber hierbei bereits feindlich gegen seine ehemaligen Genossen.

In Rées Werk wurde die historische Verschiebung des Urtheils zu Gunsten aller wohlwollenden, gleichmachenden Regungen als ein natürlicher und allmählicher Uebergang zu höher entwickelten Gesellschaftsformen aufgefasst: die anfängliche Verherrlichung der raubthierhaften Kraft und Selbstsucht weicht immer mehr der Einführung milderer Sitten und Gesetze, bis endlich in der christlichen Moral das Mitleid und die Nächstenliebe als höchstes Gebot religiös sanktionirt erscheint. In seiner persönlichen Abschätzung des moralischen Phänomens war Rée indessen weit davon entfernt, sich auf die Seite der englischen Utilitarier zu stellen, denen er in seinen wissenschaftlichen Anschauungen sonst am nächsten kommt. Für Nietzsche hingegen spitzte sich, in Folge seiner veränderten persönlichen Auffassung des Moralischen, der geschichtlich gegebene Unterschied zwischen den beiden verschiedenen Verthbestimmungen dessen, was »gut« heisst, zu zwei unversöhnlichen Gegensätzen zu: zu einem Kampf zwischen Herren-Moral und Sklaven-Moral, der ungeschlichtet bis in unsere Tage hineinreicht. Die ungemein grosse Bedeutung, die alles Willensmächtige und Instinktstarke für ihn gewonnen hatte, verleitete ihn, darin die einzig mögliche Quelle aller gesunden Moral zu erblicken, in der Sanktionirung wohlwollender Regungen hingegen ein tödtliches Uebel, an dem die ganze Menschheit bis heute kranke. Seine bisherige Zurückführung aller moralischen Werthurtheile auf den Nutzen, die Gewohnheit und das Vergessen der ursprünglichen Nützlichkeitsgründe erschien ihm nunmehr als unrichtig: eine solche Entstehung konnte sich höchstens für die Sklaven-Moral schicken, für die andere musste ein vornehmerer Ursprung gefunden werden. Denn vornehm ist es, ein Ding ohne

Rücksicht auf den Nutzen gut oder schlecht zu nennen, und so verfährt die Herrennatur: sie empfindet sich selbst in ihrem Wesen und allen ihren Regungen als »gut« und sieht auf Alles, was diesen nicht entspricht, also auf alles Schwache, Abhängige, Furchtsame, mit unwillkürlicher und halb unbewusster Geringschätzung als auf das »Schlechte« herab. Ganz anders entsteht die Sklaven-Moral dieser Geringgeschätzten, dieser »Schlechten«: sie entsteht nicht spontan und von sich selbst aus, sondern auf dem Boden des Ressentiment als eine Art Racheakt: sie nennt alles »böse«, hassenswerth, was den herrschenden Ständen angehört, und erst von da aus erfindet sie, als etwas Abgeleitetes, _ihren_ Begriff »gut« für sämmtliche jenen _entgegengesetzte_ Eigenschaften,--also für das Schwache, Unterdrückte, Leidende. Auf der einen Seite steht mithin das »unschuldbewusste Raubthier«, das starke, »frohlockende Ungeheuer«, das sogar die schlimmsten Thaten, wenn es sie selbst begeht, mit einem »Übermuthe und seelischen Gleichgewichte« vollbringt, wie »einen Studentenstreich« (Zur Genealogie der Moral I 11), auf der anderen Seite der Unterdrückte, Hassgeübte, dessen Seele ohnmächtig nach Rache dürstet, während er die Moral des Mitleids und der erbarmenden Nächstenliebe zu predigen scheint. Zu einem vollkommenen Idealbild ist dieser letztere Typus im Christenthum ausgearbeitet worden, das Nietzsche ohne Weiteres als einen ungeheuren Racheakt des Judenthums an der selbstherrlichen antiken Welt auffasst. Dass die Juden den Stifter des Christenthums gekreuzigt und seine Religion verleugnet haben, soll die eigentliche Feinheit dieses Racheplanes gewesen sein, damit die anderen Völker unbedenklich »an diesem Köder anbeissen«.[5] Es ist aber nicht nothwendig, Nietzsche in allen seinen Erklärungen und seiner bisweilen gewagten Geschichts-Interpretation nachzugehen, weil die eigentliche _Bedeutsamkeit_ dieser Anschauung für seine Philosophie an anderer Stelle liegt, als wo man sie gemeinhin sucht. Im Bedürfniss, Alles möglichst zu verallgemeinern und wissenschaftlich zu begründen, hat Nietzsche versucht, Etwas, dessen Bedeutung für ihn innerhalb eines verborgenen seelischen Problems lag, aus der Menschheitsgeschichte zu entwickeln und in sie hineinzulegen. Deshalb ist es zu bedauern, wenn das Eigenartige in Nietzsches Gedankengang verwischt wird, indem man daran die falsche Seite über Gebühr betont: die der Wissenschaftlichkeit. Auch von diesen Hypothesen Nietzsches gilt es, und ganz besonders von diesen, dass man sie nicht theoretisch nehmen darf, um den originellen Kern aus ihnen herauszuschälen. Nicht was die Seelengeschichte der Menschheit sei, sondern wie seine eigene Seelengeschichte als diejenige der ganzen Menschheit aufzufassen sei, das war für ihn die Grundfrage. Im schärfsten Gegensatz zu der philologischen Genauigkeit, mit der er anfänglich und im Wesentlichen auch in der vorhergehenden Periode Geschichte und Philosophie interpretirt hatte, spielt jetzt die exakte wissenschaftliche Forschung keine Rolle mehr neben seinen genialen Einfällen und Ideen,--und sie konnte auch keine mehr spielen, weil Nietzsche verhindert war, wissenschaftlich zu arbeiten.

Von allen Studien, die er jetzt noch streifen mochte, gelten daher seine Worte aus der »Fröhlichen Wissenschaft« (166)--dass wir »_Immer in unserer Gesellschaft« bleiben_, auch wo wir wähnen, Fremdes aufzunehmen: »Alles, was meiner Art ist, in Natur und Geschichte, redet zu mir, lobt mich, treibt mich vorwärts, tröstet mich--: das Andere höre ich nicht oder vergesse es gleich.« »_Grenze unseres Hörsinns_: Man hört nur die Fragen, auf welche man im Stande ist, eine Antwort zu finden.« (Ebendaselbst 196.) »Wie gross auch die Habsucht meiner Erkenntniss ist: ich kann aus den Dingen nichts Anderes herausnehmen, als was mir schon gehört,-- das Besitzthum Anderer bleibt in den Dingen zurück.« (Ebendaselbst 242.)

Bei einer so willkürlichen Behandlung des Materials zu Gunsten seiner philosophischen Hypothesen entfernte er sich viel weiter von sachlicher Beobachtung und Begründung, wurde er viel subjektiver bestimmt in seinen Schlüssen und Folgerungen, als in den Jahren, wo er sich noch bewusst auf das innerlich Erlebte beschränkte. Jetzt wurde aus dem innerlich Bedeutsamen das nach Aussen hin Bestimmende und Gesetzgebende und er selber der »grosse Gewalt-Herr«, der »gewitzte Unhold, der mit seiner Gnade und Ungnade alles Vergangene zwänge und zwängte: bis es ihm Brücke würde und Vorzeichen und Herold und Hahnenschrei.« (Also sprach Zarathustra III 74.)

Für Nietzsches seelisches Problem handelt es sich von vornherein weniger darum, den Gegensatz zwischen Herren-Moral und Sklaven-Moral geschichtlich richtig zu fixiren, als um Feststellung der Thatsache, dass der Mensch, so wie er bis heute von unten herauf geworden ist, _beide_ Gegensätze in sich trägt, dass er das leidende Resultat einer solchen Instinkt-Widersprüchlichkeit, einer solchen Einverleibung von Doppel-Werthungen ist. Wenn wir uns Nietzsches Decadenz-Schilderung entsinnen, so finden wir in ihr den Menschen als geborene Herren-Natur, d. h. in ursprünglich ungezähmter Kraft und Wildheit, aber geknechtet und zum gehorchenden Sklaven gemacht durch den socialen Zwang, durch die Thatsache der beginnenden Kultur selbst. Alle Kultur als solche beruht für Nietzsche auf einem solchen Krankmachen, Sklavischmachen des Menschen, und ausdrücklich bemerkt er, dass ohne diesen Vorgang, ohne gewaltsam gegen sich selbst gekehrt zu werden, die menschliche Seele »flach« und »dünn« geblieben wäre. Seine ursprüngliche Herren-Natur ist noch nichts als ein herrliches Thier-Exemplar und zur Weiterentwickelung erst befähigt durch die _Wunden_, die ihrer Kraft beigebracht werden,--denn in der Qual dieser Wunden muss sie lernen, sich selbst zu zerfleischen, sich an sich selbst zu rächen, ihre Ohnmacht in nach Innen gekehrten Leidenschaften auszulassen: _alles dies ausschliesslich auf dem Boden des sklavischen Ressentiment_. »Das Wesentliche,-- -- --wie es scheint, ist, nochmals gesagt, dass

lange und in Einer Richtung _gehorcht_ werde: dabei kommt-- --auf die Dauer immer Etwas heraus, dessentwillen es sich lohnt, auf Erden zu leben.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 188.) Nun gilt dieser Decadenz-Zustand Nietzsche allerdings nicht nur als überwindbar, sondern geradezu als die nothwendige Voraussetzung für den daraus zu züchtenden willenslangen, affektstarken, selbstsicheren Menschen, aber man beachte wohl: Dieser vollendete Mensch mit seiner vertieften und individualisirten Herren-Natur soli keineswegs seinem naiven Egoismus leben, nicht die Vorurtheile und Sklavenketten abstreifen, um sich Selbstzweck zu sein, sondern er soll zum Erstling einer höheren Menschengattung werden und für ihre Neugeburt sich opfern, denn, wie wir gesehen, stellte ja für Nietzsche der Gipfel der Entwickelung den Untergang der Menschheit dar, indem diese nur der Uebergang zu etwas Höherem, eine Brücke, ein Mittel ist. Je grösser daher ein Mensch ist, je mehr Genie, je mehr Gipfel in einem jeden Sinne, um so mehr ist er auch ein Ende, eine Selbstvergeudung, ein Ausströmen letzter Kräfte,--»zum Vernichten bereit im Siegen!« (Also sprach Zarathustra III 91.) Er soll »etwas Vollkommenes, zu-Ende-Gerathenes, Glückliches, Mächtiges, Triumphirendes«, nur werden, damit er »zu Neuem, zu noch Schwererem, Fernerem bereit« sei, »wie ein Bogen, den alle Noth immer nur noch straffer anzieht«, (Zur Genealogie der Moral I 12) ein Bogen, dessen Pfeil nach dem Uebermenschen zielt. So wird er denn zu einem Kampfplatze widerstrebender und einander bekriegender Triebe, aus deren schmerzlicher Fülle allein alle Entwickelung hervorgeht; es zeigt sich in ihm wieder jenes Durcheinander von Herrschenwollen und Dienen müssen, von Vergewaltigung des Einen durch den Andren,--woraus einst alle Kultur geworden, und woraus nun eine Ueber-Kultur als letzte und höchste Schöpfung entstehen soll. Er ist kein Friedvoller und sich selbst Geniessender, sondern ein Kämpfender und Selbst-Untergang. Er wiederholt also _in sich_ und auf Grund seiner vollkommen individualisirten und geistesfreien Persönlichkeit genau dasselbe, was einst auf die Menschheit _von Aussen her_, durch Knechtung, als ein aufgezwungenes Erziehungsmittel wirkte,--wir finden in ihm wieder »diese heimliche Selbst-Vergewaltigung, diese Künstler-Grausamkeit, diese Lust, sich selbst als einem schweren widerstrebenden leidenden Stoffe eine Form zu geben, einen Willen, eine Kritik, einen Widerspruch, eine Verachtung, ein Nein einzubrennen, diese unheimliche und entsetzlich-lustvolle Arbeit einer mit sich selbst willig-zwiespältigen Seele, welche sich leiden macht, aus Lust am Leidenmachen. (Zur Genealogie der Moral II 18.) Denn gerade die vollendetste und umfassendste Seele muss am klarsten und unwid erruf lichsten das Grundgesetz des Lebens in sich zum Ausdruck bringen, welches heisst: »Ich bin das, _was sich immer selber überwinden muss_«. (Also sprach Zarathustra II 49.)

Es ist nicht zu verkennen, wie sehr Nietzsche seinen eignen Seelenzustand diesen Theorien untergelegt, wie stark er sein eignes Wesen in ihnen wiedergespiegelt, und wie er endlich dem tiefsten Bedürfniss desselben das Grundgesetz des Lebens selbst entnommen hat. Seine leidvolle »Seelen-Vielspältigkeit«, seine gewaltsame »Zweispaltung« in einen sich opfernden, anbetenden und in einen beherrschenden, vergöttlichten Wesenstheil liegt seinem gesammten Bilde der Menschheitsentwickelung zu Grunde. Ueberall, wo er von Herren- und Sklaven-Naturen spricht, muss man dessen eingedenk bleiben, dass er von sich selbst spricht, getrieben von der Sehnsucht einer leidenden und unharmonischen Natur nach ihrem Wesens-Gegensatz und von dem Verlangen, zu einem solchen als zu seinem Gott aufblicken zu können. Sein eigenes Ich schildert er, wenn er vom Sklaven sagt: »sein Geist liebt Schlupfwinkel, Schleichwege und Hinterthüren, alles Versteckte muthet ihn an als _seine_ Welt, _seine_ Sicherheit, _sein_ Labsal«; (Zur Genealogie der Moral I 10)--und er beschreibt sein Gegenbild in der handelnden, frohen, instinktsicheren, unbekümmerten Herren-Natur, dem ursprünglichen Thatenmenschen. Aber indem er das Eine die Voraussetzung des Andren sein lässt, indem er die Menschen-Natur als solche zu dem Schauplatz macht, auf dem sich diese beiden Gegensätze immer wieder treffen, um sich gegenseitig zu überwinden, fasst er sie als _Entwickelungsstufen innerhalb desselben Wesens_, die, historisch betrachtet, Gegensätze bleiben, sich aber im Einzelwesen, psychologisch betrachtet, als eine _Wesenstheilung innerhalb des entwickelungsfähigen Menschen erweisen_. Daher ist seine Auffassung des geschichtlichen Kampfes zwischen Herren- und Sklaven-Naturen in seiner ganzen Bedeutung nichts als eine vergröberte Illustration dessen, was im höchsten Einzelmenschen vorgeht, des grausamen Seelenprozesses, durch den dieser sich in Opfergott und Opferthier spalten muss.

Erst jetzt lässt sich feststellen, was eigentlich Nietzsches »Umwerthung aller Werthe«, aller bisherigen Moralund Idealauffassungen bedeutet, und wie sie sich zum _asketischen Ideal_ verhält, in dem jetzt alle religiösen und moralischen Ideale für Nietzsche zusammengefasst sind. Diese Umwerthung aller Werthe beginnt allerdings damit, dass sie jeglicher Askese den Krieg erklärt,--beginnt mit einer Heiligsprechung des »Allzumenschlichen« im Menschen, das bisher geschmäht und unterdrückt wurde, weil das Natürliche und Sinnliche dem Ueber-natürlichen und Uebersinnlichen im Wege stand, an das man als an eine unumstösslich gegebene Thatsache glaubte. Nietzsches Zukunftsphilosoph aber glaubt nicht langer, dass irgend ein Uebermenschenthum _gegeben_ sei, es müsste denn erst _geschaffen_ werden durch den Menschen selbst, und dazu verfügt er ja über kein andres Material als über die elementare Lebenskraft der Natur, wie sie ist. Es gilt also nicht mehr, das Diesseits in ein höheres Jenseits möglichst restlos zu verflüchtigen, sondern die ganze Fülle eines reichen, ungeahnt herrlichen Jenseits mitten aus dem Diesseits hervorzulocken.[6] Daher giebt er den verachteten, gefürchteten, misshandelten Trieben, den Leidenschaften

des »natürlichen« noch von keiner Moral zurechtgestutzten Menschen ihr Existenzrecht wieder. Mit der Ueberzeugung, dass es nicht auf eine Scheidung von guten und bösen Kräften ankomme, sondern auf eine Stärkung und äusserste Steigerung der Lebenskraft überhaupt, damit das Leben aus sich selbst heraus seinen höchsten Zweck verwirklichen könne, ist es gegeben, »dass dem Menschen sein Bösestes nöthig ist zu seinem Besten,--dass alles Böseste seine beste _Kraft_ ist und der härteste Stein dem höchsten Schaffenden; und dass der Mensch besser _und_ böser werden muss«. (Also sprach Zarathustra III 97.)

Als ein Fürsprecher des Lebens soll der Mensch sich in seiner Tugend ausgeben, preisgeben, verschwenden; aber indem er sein eigenes Selbst zu seiner Tugend umtauft, soll er sie zu einer Machtfülle in sich steigern, die ihn endlich zersprengt gleich einem zu engen Gefäss: er soll sie nur besitzen, um von ihr besessen zu werden. Zu einem so kraftquellenden Uebermaass anwachsend, verschlingt sie endlich ihn und seinen Einzelwillen in der Gluth und Empfindung des Ganzen,--wandelt sie sich ihm zur Brücke, auf welcher er dem Untergange zuschreitet: »Der Mensch ist Etwas, das überwunden werden muss: und darum sollst du deine Tugenden lieben,--denn du wirst an ihnen zu Grunde gehen«. (Ebendaselbst I 47.) »Ich liebe Den, dessen Seele übervoll ist, so dass er sich selber vergisst, und alle Dinge in ihm sind: so werden alle Dinge sein Untergang.« (Ebendaselbst I 14.)

So gleichbedeutend hiernach _egoistische Kraftauslebung_ und _Tugend_ im ersten Augenblick erscheinen mögen, so tief bleiben sie doch in Wahrheit von einander geschieden. Wohl ist der Werthunterschied zwischen den menschlichen Kräften und Eigenschaften, den alle Moral als einen qualitativen auffasst, im Grunde völlig ins Quantitative verlegt, aber die willige und begeisterte Hingabe an diese das Selbst zerstörende Kraftsteigerung begreift darum nicht minder einen Werthunterschied der Gesinnung in sich. Die Verwerflichkeit der Gesinnung wird betont, wenn es heisst, dass nicht das Böse der Menschengrösse schlimmster Feind sei, sondern -dass sein Bösestes so gar klein ist! Ach dass sein Bestes so gar klein ist!« (Ebendaselbst III 97.) Das _Uebermaass_ ist der Weg _zum Uebermenschlichen_, deshalb geht diesem der Ruf voran: »Wo ist doch der Blitz, der euch mit seiner Zunge lecke? Wo ist der Wahnsinn, mit dem ihr geimpft werden müsstet?--Seht, ich lehre euch den Übermenschen: der ist dieser Blitz, der ist dieser Wahnsinn!--« (Ebendaselbst I 11.)

Daher darf man den Weg, den Nietzsche zur Erreichung seines Idealzieles wählt, nicht mit diesem Ziele selbst verwechseln; er betrachtet die Herrschaft der »furchtbaren Instinkte« nur als ein Mittel, dessen er für den höchsten Endzweck bedarf. Ganz mit Unrecht und in grobem Missverständniss ist ihm vorgeworfen worden, sein »Uebermensch« trage statt der Züge eines Jesus die eines Cesare Borgia, oder sonst eines lasterhaften Unmenschen. In Wahrheit ist der »Unmensch« dem »Uebermenschen« nicht Vorbild, sondern nur Sockel; er stellt sozusagen den unbehauenen Granitblock dar, der gefordert wird, um auf demselben eine Götterstatue aufzurichten. Und diese Götterstatue des Uebermenschen-Ideals ist in Art und Wesen nicht nur von ihm verschieden, sondern ihm geradezu entgegengesetzt. Dabei wird der Gegensatz so tief und scharf gefasst, wie es selbst in der asketischesten Moral nicht der Fall ist. Alle Moral strebt nur eine Verbesserung und Verschönerung des Menschlichen an, während Nietzsche davon ausgeht, dass eine ganz neue Species, eine Ueberart, geschaffen werden müsse. Was bisher als ein Uebergang von Niederem zu Höherem galt, unter Beibehaltung des charakteristisch Menschlichen im Idealbilde, das fasst Nietzsche als einen vollständigen Bruch, als den Kampf sich befehdender Gegensätze auf; was bisher nur ein Gradesunterschied zwischen dem »natürlichen« und dem »moralischen« Menschen innerhalb des beiden gemeinsamen Menschsems war, das wird bei Nietzsche zu einem absoluten Wesensgegensatz zwischen dem Naturmenschen und dem Uebeimenschen. Deshalb kann man sagen: Betrachtet man den _Moral-Weg_, den Nietzsche einschlägt, so ist für denselben allerdings das Anti-Asketische bezeichnend, indem er nicht dem steilen und steinigen Pfade der Selbstentsagung gleicht, sondern mitten in eine tropische Wildniss unbekümmerten Selbstgenusses führt. Fasst man hingegen Nietzsches _Moral-Ziel_ genauer ins Auge, so erweist es sich als völlig asketischer Natur, indem es den Menschen nicht nur erheben, sondern vollständig über ihn hinausgehen, ihn nicht nur läutern, sondern ihn vollständig aufheben will. Einerseits also bekämpft Nietzsche die übliche Moral wegen ihres asketischen Grund Charakters, wegen ihrer Geringachtung und Verdammung der untermenschlichen Begierden, denen er, als der Kraftquelle im Menschen, so hohen Werth zuspricht; "andrerseits aber bekämpft er die herrschende Moral nicht minder heftig in dem, worin sie ihm nicht asketisch genug ist. Er wendet sich grundsätzlich gegen ihren optimistischen Glauben, als ob auf dem Wege einer bestimmten Läuterung der Mensch einem Idealziele nahegebracht werden könne; denn der Mensch ist nach Nietzsches Meinung unfähig hierzu, und daher beruht alle sogenannte Veredelung auf einer blossen Schwächung der elementaren Lebenskraft. »Nackt hatte ich einst Beide gesehn, den grössten Menschen und den kleinsten Menschen: allzuähnlich einander,--allzumenschlich auch den Grössten noch!« (Also sprach Zarathustra III 98.) Der Versuch aller Moral, das Menschenwesen einem Idealwesen anzuähneln, ergiebt nur eine unwirkliche Nachahmung auf Kosten der wirklichen Kraft, und alle moralische Umwandlung ist deshalb nur eine Art von ästhetischer Verschleierung des geschwächten, aber sonst völlig unveränderten menschlichen Wesens. »Wie? Ein grosser Mann? Ich sehe immer nur den Schauspieler seines eignen Ideals.« (Jenseits von Gut und Böse 97.) »Ich suchte nach grossen Menschen, ich fand immer nur die _Affen_ ihres Ideals.« (Götzen-Dämmerung I 39.)

Aus dieser pessimistischen Auffassung des Menschlichen entspringt der extrem-asketische Grundzug, den das Idealziel in Nietzsches Philosophie erhält; dasselbe ist nur erreichbar durch den Untergang des Menschen. Und dieser Grundzug tritt in der Folge um so extremer hervor, je prinzipieller Nietzsche alles Asketische zu verleugnen und auszumerzen bemüht ist. Je ausschliesslicher am Anfang die Steigerung der egoistischen Kraft gefordert wird, desto ungeheurer erscheint am Ende der Entwickelung die Forderung, das eigene Selbst aufzugeben, damit Raum für den Uebermenschen geschafft werde. Hiess es zuerst: Der Mensch ist Etwas, das böse, wild und grausam werden muss, so heisst es schliesslich: »Der Mensch ist Etwas, das überwunden werden muss«,--alle erlangte Grausamkeit und Wildheit ist letzten Endes nur dazu da, um sich gegen den Menschen selbst zu kehren und ihn zu vernichten.

So unversöhnlich fallen die beiden Seiten von Nietzsches Ethik auseinander, die er in ein und demselben Gebot zusammenfasst,--in dem ersten und einzigen Moralgesetz, das in die neuen Werthtafeln eingegraben wird: »Werdet hart!« (Also sprach Zarathustra III 90 = Götzen-Dämmerung, Schluss.) Aus dem Wort: »Werdet hart!« blickt in der That deutlich das Doppelantlitz der Nietzsche-Moral, mit seinen Zügen voll tyrannischer Grausamkeit und asketischer Entsagung. Denn hart werden bedeutet einmal die Widerstandskraft gegen alle weichen und wohlwollenden Regungen, die Versteinerung im egoistischen Selbstgenuss, kurz: Härte gegen Andere, guten Willen zur Ausübung herrischer Macht; das andere Mal aber bedeutet es die Härte gegen sich selbst, als den Untergehenden, der zermalmt werden muss,--es bedeutet: Euch adelt die Härte in demselben Sinne, wie sie den Stein adelt, den der Künst Author: Frank Frost Abbott

Release date: August 19, 2004 [eBook #13226] Most recently updated: October 28, 2024

Language: English

Other information and formats: www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/13226

Credits: Produced by Distributed Proofreaders

*** START OF THE PROJECT GUTENBERG EBOOK THE COMMON PEOPLE OF ANCIENT ROME ***

[Transcriber's note: This book makes use of the Roman denarius symbol. Because this symbol is not available in Unicode, it has been replaced by the ROMAN NUMERAL TEN (U+2169) with a COMBINING LONG STROKE OVERLAY (U+0336) in the UTF-8 version.]

The Common People of Ancient Rome

Studies of Roman Life and Literature

By

Frank Frost Abbott

Kennedy Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in Princeton University

New York Charles Scribner's Sons

Copyright, 1911, by Charles Scribner's Sons

Printed in the United States of America

Dedicated to J. H. A.

Prefatory Note

This book, like the volume on "Society and Politics in Ancient Rome," deals with the life of the common people, with their language and literature, their occupations and amusements, and with their social, political, and economic conditions. We are interested in the common people of Rome because they made the Roman Empire what it was. They carried the Roman standards to the Euphrates and the Atlantic; they lived abroad as traders, farmers, and soldiers to hold and Romanize the provinces, or they stayed at home,

working as carpenters, masons, or bakers, to supply the daily needs of the capital.

The other side of the subject which has engaged the attention of the author in studying these topics has been the many points of similarity which arise between ancient and modern conditions, and between the problems which the Roman faced and those which confront us. What policy shall the government adopt toward corporations? How can the cost of living be kept down? What effect have private benefactions on the character of a people? Shall a nation try to introduce its own language into the territory of a subject people, or shall it allow the native language to be used, and, if it seeks to introduce its own tongue, how can it best accomplish its object? The Roman attacked all these questions, solved some of them admirably, and failed with others egregiously. His successes and his failures are perhaps equally illuminating, and the fact that his attempts to improve social and economic conditions run through a period of a thousand years should make the study of them of the greater interest and value to us.

Of the chapters which this book contains, the article on "The Origin of the Realistic Romance among the Romans" appeared originally in _Classical Philology_, and the author is indebted to the editors of that periodical for permission to reprint it here. The other papers are now published for the first time.

It has not seemed advisable to refer to the sources to substantiate every opinion which has been expressed, but a few references have been given in the foot-notes mainly for the sake of the reader who may wish to follow some subject farther than has been possible in these brief chapters. The proofs had to be corrected while the author was away from his own books, so that he was unable to make a final verification of two or three of the citations, but he trusts that they, as well as the others, are accurate. He takes this opportunity to acknowledge his indebtedness to Dr. Donald Blythe Durham, of Princeton University, for the preparation of the index.

Frank Frost Abbott. Einsiedeln, Switzerland _September 2, 1911_

Contents

How Latin Became the Language of the World The Latin of the Common People The Poetry of the Common People of Rome: I. Their Metrical Epitaphs II. Their Dedicatory and Ephemeral Verses The Origin of the Realistic Romance Among the Romans Diocletian's Edict and the High Cost of Living Private Benefactions and Their Effect on the Municipal Life of the Romans Some Reflections on Corporations and Trade-Guilds A Roman Politician, Gaius Scribonius Curio Gaius Matius, a Friend of Cæsar

Index

The Common People of Ancient Rome

How Latin Became the Language of the World

How the armies of Rome mastered the nations of the world is known to every reader of history, but the story of the conquest by Latin of the languages of the world is vague in the minds of most of us. If we should ask ourselves how it came about, we should probably think of the world-wide supremacy of Latin as a natural result of the world-wide supremacy of the Roman legions or of Roman law. But in making this assumption we should be shutting our eyes to the history of our own times. A conquered people does not necessarily accept, perhaps it has not commonly accepted, the tongue of its master. In his "Ancient and Modern Imperialism" Lord Cromer states that in India only one hundred people in every ten thousand can read and write English, and this condition exists after an occupation of one hundred and fifty years or more. He adds: "There does not appear the least prospect of French supplanting Arabic in Algeria." In comparing the results of ancient and modern methods perhaps he should have taken into account the fact that India and Algeria have literatures of their own, which most of the outlying peoples subdued by Rome did not have, and these literatures may have strengthened the resistance which the tongue of the conquered people has offered to that of the conqueror, but, even when allowance is made for this fact, the difference in resultant conditions is surprising. From its narrow confines, within a little district on the banks of the Tiber, covering, at the close of the fifth century B.C., less than a hundred square miles, Latin spread through Italy and the islands of the Mediterranean, through France, Spain, England, northern Africa, and the Danubian provinces, triumphing over all the other tongues of those regions more completely than Roman arms triumphed over the peoples using them.

In tracing the story we must keep in our mind's eye the linguistic geography of Italy, just as we must remember the political geography of the peninsula in following Rome's territorial expansion. Let us think at the outset, then, of a little strip of flat country on the Tiber, dotted here and there with hills crowned with villages. Such hill towns were Rome, Tusculum, and Præneste, for instance. Each of them was the stronghold and market-place of the country immediately about it, and therefore had a life of its own, so that although Latin was spoken in all of them it varied from one to the other. This is shown clearly enough by the inscriptions which have been found on the sites of these ancient towns,[1] and as late as the close of the third century before our era, Plautus pokes fun in his comedies at the provincialism of Præneste.

The towns which we have mentioned were only a few miles from Rome. Beyond them, and occupying central Italy and a large part of southern Italy, were people who spoke Oscan and the other Italic dialects, which were related to Latin, and yet quite distinct from it. In the seaports of the south Greek was spoken, while the Messapians and Iapygians occupied Calabria. To the north of Rome were the mysterious Etruscans and the almost equally puzzling Venetians and Ligurians. When we follow the Roman legions across the Alps into Switzerland, France, England, Spain, and Africa, we enter a jungle, as it were, of languages and dialects. A mere reading of the list of tongues with which Latin was brought into contact, if such a list could be drawn up, would bring weariness to the flesh. In the part of Gaul conquered by Cæsar, for instance, he tells us that there were three independent languages, and sixty distinct states, whose peoples doubtless differed from one another in their speech. If we look at a map of the Roman world under Augustus, with the Atlantic to bound it on the west, the Euphrates on the east, the desert of Sahara on the south, and the Rhine and Danube on the north, and recall the fact that the linguistic conditions which Cæsar found in Gaul in 58 B.C. were typical of what confronted Latin in a great many of the western, southern, and northern provinces, the fact that Latin subdued all these different tongues, and became the every-day speech of these different peoples, will be recognized as one of the marvels of history. In fact, so firmly did it establish itself, that it withstood the assaults of the invading Gothic, Lombardic, Frankish, and Burgundian, and has continued to hold to our own day a very large part of the territory which it acquired some two thousand years ago.

That Latin was the common speech of the western world is attested not only by the fact that the languages of France, Spain, Roumania, and the other Romance countries descend from it, but it is also clearly shown by the thousands of Latin inscriptions composed by freeman and freedman, by carpenter, baker, and soldier, which we find all over the Roman world.

How did this extraordinary result come about? It was not the conquest of the world by the common language of Italy, because in Italy in early days at least nine different languages were spoken, but its subjugation by the tongue spoken in the city of Rome. The traditional narrative of Rome, as Livy and others relate it, tells us of a struggle with the neighboring Latin hill towns in the early days of the Republic, and the ultimate formation of an alliance between them and Rome. The favorable position of the city on the Tiber for trade and defence gave it a great advantage over its rivals, and it soon became the commercial and political centre of the neighboring territory. The most important of these villages, Tusculum, Præneste, and Lanuvium, were not more than twenty miles distant, and the people in them must have come constantly to Rome to attend the markets, and in later days to vote, to hear political speeches, and to listen to plays in the theatre. Some of them probably heard the jests at the expense of their dialectal peculiarities which Plautus introduced into his comedies. The younger generations became ashamed of their provincialisms; they imitated the Latin spoken in the metropolis, and by the second century of our era, when the Latin grammarians have occasion to cite dialectal peculiarities from Latium outside Rome, they quote at second-hand from Varro of the first century B.C., either because they will not take the trouble to use their own ears or because the differences which were noted in earlier days had ceased to exist. The first stage in the conquest of the world by the Latin of Rome comes to an end, then, with the extension of that form of speech throughout Latium.

Beyond the limits of Latium it came into contact with Oscan and the other Italic dialects, which were related to Latin, but of course were much farther removed from it than the Latin of Tusculum or Lanuvium had been,[2] so that the adoption of Latin was not so simple a matter as the acceptance of Roman Latin by the villages of Latium near Rome had been.

The conflict which went on between Latin and its Italic kinsmen is revealed to us now and then by a Latin inscription, into which Oscan or Umbrian forms have crept.[3] The struggle had come to an end by the beginning of our era. A few Oscan inscriptions are found scratched on the walls of Pompeii after the first earthquake, in 63 A.D., but they are late survivals, and no Umbrian inscriptions are known of a date subsequent to the first century B.C.

The Social War of 90-88 B.C., between Rome and the Italians, was a turning-point in the struggle between Latin and the Italic dialects, because it marks a change in the political treatment of Rome's dependencies in Italy. Up to this time she had followed the

policy of isolating all her Italian conquered communities from one another. She was anxious to prevent them from conspiring against her. Thus, with this object in view, she made differences in the rights and privileges granted to neighboring communities, in order that, not being subject to the same limitations, and therefore not having the same grievances, they might not have a common basis for joint action against her. It would naturally be a part of that policy to allow or to encourage the retention by the several communities of their own dialects. The common use of Latin would have enabled them to combine against her with greater ease. With the conclusion of the Social War this policy gave way before the new conception of political unity for the people of Italian stock, and with political unity came the introduction of Latin as the common tongue in all official transactions of a local as well as of a federal character. The immediate results of the war, and the policy which Rome carried out at its close of sending out colonies and building roads in Italy, contributed still more to the larger use of Latin throughout the central and southern parts of the peninsula. Samnium, Lucania, and the territory of the Bruttii suffered severely from depopulation; many colonies were sent into all these districts, so that, although the old dialects must have persisted for a time in some of the mountain towns to the north of Rome, the years following the conclusion of the Social War mark the rapid disappearance of them and the substitution of Latin in their place. Campania took little part in the war, and was therefore left untouched. This fact accounts probably for the occurrence of a few Oscan inscriptions on the walls of Pompeii as late as 63 A.D.

We need not follow here the story of the subjugation of the Greek seaports in southern Italy and of the peoples to the north who spoke non-Italic languages. In all these cases Latin was brought into conflict with languages not related to itself, and the situation contains slightly different elements from those which present themselves in the struggle between Latin and the Italic dialects. The latter were nearly enough related to Latin to furnish some support for the theory that Latin was modified by contact with them, and this theory has found advocates,[4] but there is no sufficient reason for believing that it was materially influenced. An interesting illustration of the influence of Greek on the Latin of every-day life is furnished by the realistic novel which Petronius wrote in the middle of the first century of our era. The characters in his story are Greeks, and the language which they speak is Latin, but they introduce into it a great many Greek words, and now and then a Greek idiom or construction.

The Romans, as is well known, used two agencies with great effect in Romanizing their newly acquired territory, viz., colonies and roads. The policy of sending out colonists to hold the new districts was definitely entered upon in the early part of the fourth century, when citizens were sent to Antium, Tarracina, and other points in Latium. Within this century fifteen or twenty colonies were established at various points in central Italy. Strategic considerations determined their location, and the choice was made with great wisdom. Sutrium and Nepete, on the borders of the Ciminian forest, were "the gates of Etruria"; Fregellæ and Interamna commanded the passage of the river Liris; Tarentum and Rhegium were important ports of entry, while Alba Fucens and Carsioli guarded the line of the Valerian road.

This road and the other great highways which were constructed in Italy brought not only all the colonies, but all parts of the peninsula, into easy communication with the capital. The earliest of them was built to Capua, as we know, by the great censor Appius Claudius, in 312 B.C., and when one looks at a map of Italy at the close of the third century before our era, and sees the central and southern parts of the peninsula dotted with colonies, the Appian Way running from Rome south-east to Brundisium, the Popillian Way to Rhegium, the Flaminian Way north-east to Ariminum, with an extension to Cremona, with the Cassian and Aurelian ways along the western coast, the rapidity and the completeness with which the Latin language overspread Italy ceases to be a mystery. A map of Spain or of France under the Empire, with its network of roads, is equally illuminating.

The missionaries who carried Roman law, Roman dress, Roman ideas, and the Latin language first through central, southern, and northern Italy, and then to the East and the West, were the colonist, the merchant, the soldier, and the federal official. The central government exempted the Roman citizen who settled in a provincial town from the local taxes. As these were very heavy, his advantage over the native was correspondingly great, and in almost all the large towns in the Empire we find evidence of the existence of large guilds of Roman traders, tax-collectors, bankers, and land-owners.[5] When Trajan in his romantic eastern campaign had penetrated to Ctesiphon, the capital of Parthia, he found Roman merchants already settled there. Besides the merchants and capitalists who were engaged in business on their own account in the provinces, there were thousands of agents for the great Roman corporations scattered through the Empire. Rome was the money centre of the world, and the great stock companies organized to lend money, construct public works, collect taxes, and engage in the shipping trade had their central offices in the capital whence they sent out their representatives to all parts of the world.

The soldier played as important a part as the merchant in extending the use of Latin. Tacitus tells us that in the reign of Augustus there were twenty-five legions stationed in the provinces. If we allow 6,000 men to a legion, we should have a total of 150,000 Roman soldiers scattered through the provinces. To these must be added the auxiliary troops which were made up of natives who,

at the close of their term of service, were probably able to speak Latin, and when they settled among their own people again, would carry a knowledge of it into ever-widening circles. We have no exact knowledge of the number of the auxiliary troops, but they probably came to be as numerous as the legionaries.[6] Soldiers stationed on the frontiers frequently married native women at the end of their term of service, passed the rest of their lives in the provinces, and their children learned Latin.

The direct influence of the government was no small factor in developing the use of Latin, which was of course the official language of the Empire. All court proceedings were carried on in Latin. It was the language of the governor, the petty official, and the tax-gatherer. It was used in laws and proclamations, and no native could aspire to a post in the civil service unless he had mastered it. It was regarded sometimes at least as a _sine qua non_ of the much-coveted Roman citizenship. The Emperor Claudius, for instance, cancelled the Roman citizenship of a Greek, because he had addressed a letter to him in Latin which he could not understand. The tradition that Latin was the official language of the world was taken up by the Christian church. Even when Constantine presided over the Council at Nicæa in the East, he addressed the assembly in Latin.

The two last-mentioned agencies, the Latin of the Roman official and the Latin of the church, were the influences which made the language spoken throughout the Empire essentially uniform in its character. Had the Latin which the colonist, the merchant, and the soldier carried through Italy and into the provinces been allowed to develop in different localities without any external unifying influence, probably new dialects would have grown up all over the world, or, to put it in another way, probably the Romance languages would have come into existence several centuries before they actually appeared. That unifying influence was the Latin used by the officials sent out from Rome, which all classes eagerly strove to imitate. Naturally the language of the provinces did not conform in all respects to the Roman standard. Apuleius, for instance, is aware of the fact that his African style and diction are likely to offend his Roman readers, and in the introduction to his _Metamorphoses_ he begs for their indulgence. The elder Seneca in his _Controversiae_ remarks of a Spanish fellow-countryman "that he could never unlearn that well-known style which is brusque and rustic and characteristic of Spain," and Spartianus in his Life of Hadrian tells us that when Hadrian addressed the senate on a certain occasion, his rustic pronunciation excited the laughter of the senators. But the peculiarities in the diction of Apuleius and Hadrian seem to have been those which only a cultivated man of the world would notice. They do not appear to have been fundamental. In a similar way the careful studies which have been made of the thousands of inscriptions found in the West[7], dedicatory inscriptions, guild records, and epitaphs show us that the language of the common people in the provinces did not differ materially from that spoken in Italy. It was the language of the Roman soldier, colonist, and trader, with common characteristics in the way of diction, form, phraseology, and syntax, dropping into some slight local peculiarities, but kept essentially a unit by the desire which each community felt to imitate its officials and its upper classes.

The one part of the Roman world in which Latin did not gain an undisputed pre-eminence was the Greek East. The Romans freely recognized the peculiar position which Greek was destined to hold in that part of the Empire, and styled it the _altera lingua_. Even in Greek lands, however, Latin gained a strong hold, and exerted considerable influence on Greek[8].

In a very thoughtful paper on "Language-Rivalry and Speech-Differentiation in the Case of Race-Mixture,"[9] Professor Hempl has discussed the conditions under which language-rivalry takes place, and states the results that follow. His conclusions have an interesting bearing on the question which we are discussing here, how and why it was that Latin supplanted the other languages with which it was brought into contact.

He observes that when two languages are brought into conflict, there is rarely a compromise or fusion, but one of the two is driven out of the field altogether by the other. On analyzing the circumstances in which such a struggle for supremacy between languages springs up, he finds four characteristic cases. Sometimes the armies of one nation, though comparatively small in numbers, conquer another country. They seize the government of the conquered land; their ruler becomes its king, and they become the aristocracy. They constitute a minority, however; they identify their interests with those of the conquered people, and the language of the subject people becomes the language of all classes. The second case arises when a country is conquered by a foreign people who pour into it with their wives and children through a long period and settle permanently there. The speech of the natives in these circumstances disappears. In the third case a more powerful people conquers a country, establishes a dependent government in it, sends out merchants, colonists, and officials, and establishes new towns. If such a province is held long enough, the language of the conqueror prevails. In the fourth and last case peaceful bands of immigrants enter a country to follow the humbler callings. They are scattered among the natives, and succeed in proportion as they learn the language of their adopted country. For their children and grandchildren this language becomes their mother tongue, and the speech of the invaded nation holds its ground.

The first typical case is illustrated by the history of Norman-French in England, the second by that of the European colonists in America; the Latinization of Spain, Gaul, and other Roman provinces furnishes an instance of the third, and our own experience with European immigrants is a case of the fourth characteristic situation. The third typical case of language-conflict is the one with which we are concerned here, and the analysis which we have made of the practices followed by the Romans in occupying newly acquired territory, both in Italy and outside the peninsula, shows us how closely they conform to the typical situation. With the exception of Dacia, all the provinces were held by the Romans for several centuries, so that their history under Roman rule satisfies the condition of long occupation which Professor Hempl lays down as a necessary one. Dacia which lay north of the Danube, and was thus far removed from the centres of Roman influence, was erected into a province in 107 A.D., and abandoned in 270. Notwithstanding its remoteness and the comparatively short period during which it was occupied, the Latin language has continued in use in that region to the present day. It furnishes therefore a striking illustration of the effective methods which the Romans used in Latinizing conquered territory.[10]

We have already had occasion to notice that a fusion between Latin and the languages with which it was brought into contact, such a fusion, for instance, as we find in Pidgin-English, did not occur. These languages influenced Latin only by way of making additions to its vocabulary. A great many Greek scientific and technical terms were adopted by the learned during the period of Roman supremacy. Of this one is clearly aware, for instance, in reading the philosophical and rhetorical works of Cicero. A few words, like rufus, crept into the language from the Italic dialects. Now and then the Keltic or Iberian names of Gallic or Spanish articles were taken up, but the inflectional system and the syntax of Latin retained their integrity. In the post-Roman period additions to the vocabulary are more significant. It is said that about three hundred Germanic words have found their way into all the Romance languages.[11] The language of the province of Gaul was most affected since some four hundred and fifty Gothic, Lombardic, and Burgundian words are found in French alone, such words as boulevard, homard, and blesser. Each of the provinces of course, when the Empire broke up, was subjected to influences peculiar to itself. The residence of the Moors in Spain, for seven hundred years, for instance, has left a deep impress on the Spanish vocabulary, while the geographic position of Roumanian has exposed it to the influence of Slavic, Albanian, Greek, Magyar, and Turkish.[12] A sketch of the history of Latin after the breaking up of the Empire carries us beyond the limits of the question which we set ourselves at the beginning and out of the domain of the Latinist, but it may not be out of place to gather together here a few of the facts which the Romance philologist has contributed to its later history, because the life of Latin has been continuous from the foundation of the city of Rome to the present day.

In this later period the question of paramount interest is, why did Latin in one part of the world develop into French, in another part into Italian, in another into Spanish? One answer to this question has been based on chronological grounds.[13] The Roman soldiers and traders who went out to garrison and to settle in a newly acquired territory, introduced that form of Latin which was in use in Italy at the time of their departure from the peninsula. The form of speech thus planted there developed along lines peculiar to itself, became the dialect of that province, and ultimately the (Romance) language spoken in that part of Europe. Sardinia was conquered in 241 B.C., and Sardinian therefore is a development of the Latin spoken in Italy in the middle of the third century B.C., that is of the Latin of Livius Andronicus. Spain was brought under Roman rule in 197 B.C., and consequently Spanish is a natural outgrowth of popular Latin of the time of Plautus. In a similar way, by noticing the date at which the several provinces were established down to the acquisition of Dacia in 107 A.D., we shall understand how it was that the several Romance languages developed out of Latin. So long as the Empire held together the unifying influence of official Latin, and the constant intercommunication between the provinces, preserved the essential unity of Latin throughout the world, but when the bonds were broken, the naturally divergent tendencies which had existed from the beginning, but had been held in check, made themselves felt, and the speech of the several sections of the Old World developed into the languages which we find in them to-day.

This theory is suggestive, and leads to several important results, but it is open to serious criticism, and does not furnish a sufficient explanation. It does not seem to take into account the steady stream of emigrants from Italy to the provinces, and the constant transfer of troops from one part of the world to another of which we become aware when we study the history of any single province or legion. Spain was acquired, it is true, in 197 B.C., and the Latin which was first introduced into it was the Latin of Plautus, but the subjugation of the country occupied more than sixty years, and during this period fresh troops were steadily poured into the peninsula, and later on there was frequently an interchange of legions between Spain and the other provinces. Furthermore, new communities of Roman citizens were established there even down into the Empire, and traders were steadily moving into the province. In this way it would seem that the Latin of the early second century which was originally carried into Spain must have been constantly undergoing modification, and, so far as this influence goes, made approximately like the Latin spoken elsewhere in the Empire.

A more satisfactory explanation seems to be that first clearly propounded by the Italian philologist, Ascoli. His reasoning is that when we acquire a foreign language we find it very difficult, and often impossible, to master some of the new sounds. Our ears do not catch them exactly, or we unconsciously substitute for the foreign sound some sound from our own language. Our vocal organs, too, do not adapt themselves readily to the reproduction of the strange sounds in another tongue, as we know from the difficulty which we have in pronouncing the French nasal or the German guttural. Similarly English differs somewhat as it is spoken by a Frenchman, a German, and an Italian. The Frenchman has a tendency to import the nasal into it, and he is also inclined to pronounce it like his own language, while the German favors the guttural. In a paper on the teaching of modern languages in our schools, Professor Grandgent says:[14] "Usually there is no attempt made to teach any French sounds but _u_ and the four nasal vowels; all the rest are unquestioningly replaced by the English vowels and consonants that most nearly resemble them." The substitution of sounds from one's own language in speaking a foreign tongue, and the changes in voice-inflection, are more numerous and more marked if the man who learns the new language is uneducated and acquires it in casual intercourse from an uneducated man who speaks carelessly.

This was the state of things in the Roman provinces of southern Europe when the Goths, Lombards, and other peoples from the North gradually crossed the frontier and settled in the territory of Latin-speaking peoples. In the sixth century, for instance, the Lombards in Italy, the Franks in France, and the Visigoths in Spain would each give to the Latin which they spoke a twist peculiar to themselves, and out of the one Latin came Italian, out of the second, the language of France, and out of the third, Spanish. This initial impulse toward the development of Latin along different lines in Italy, France, and Spain was, of course, reinforced by differences in climate, in the temperaments of the three peoples, in their modes of life, and in their political and social experiences. These centrifugal forces, so to speak, became effective because the political and social bonds which had held Italy, France, and Spain together were now loosened, and consequently communication between the provinces was less frequent, and the standardizing influence of the official Latin of Rome ceased to keep Latin a uniform thing throughout the Empire.

One naturally asks why Latin survived at all, why the languages of the victorious Germanic peoples gave way to it. In reply to this question it is commonly said that the fittest survived, that the superiority of Roman civilization and of the Latin language gave Latin the victory. So far as this factor is to be taken into account, I should prefer to say that it was not so much the superiority of Latin, although that may be freely recognized, as it was the sentimental respect which the Germans and their leaders had for the Empire and for all its institutions. This is shown clearly enough, for instance, in the pride which the Visigothic and Frankish kings showed in holding their commissions from Rome, long after Rome had lost the power to enforce its claims upon them; it is shown in their use of Latin as the language of the court and of the official world. Under the influence of this sentiment Germanic rulers and their peoples imitated the Romans, and, among other things, took over their language. The church probably exerted considerable influence in this direction. Many of the Germans had been converted to Christianity before they entered the Empire, and had heard Latin used in the church services and in the hymns. Among cultivated people of different countries, it was the only medium of communication, and was accepted as the lingua franca of the political and ecclesiastical world, and the traditional medium of expression for literary and legal purposes.

Perhaps, however, one element in the situation should be given more weight than any of the facts just mentioned. Many of the barbarians had been allowed to settle in a more or less peaceful fashion in Roman territory, so that a large part of the western world came into their possession by way of gradual occupation rather than by conquest.[15] They became peasant proprietors, manual laborers, and soldiers in the Roman army. Perhaps, therefore, their occupation of central and southern Europe bears some resemblance to the peaceful invasion of this country by immigrants from Europe, and they may have adopted Latin just as the German or Scandinavian adopts English.

This brings us to the last important point in our inquiry. What is the date before which we shall call the language of the Western Empire Latin, and after which it is better to speak of French, Spanish, and Italian? Such a line of division cannot be sharply drawn, and will in a measure be artificial, because, as we shall attempt to show in the chapter which follows on the "Latin of the Common People," Latin survives in the Romance languages, and has had a continuous life up to the present day. But on practical grounds it is convenient to have such a line of demarcation in mind, and two attempts have been made to fix it. One attempt has been based on linguistic grounds, the other follows political changes more closely. Up to 700 A.D. certain common sound-changes take place in all parts of the western world.[16] After that date, roughly speaking, this is not the case. Consequently at that time we may say that unity ceased. The other method of approaching the subject leads to essentially the same conclusion, and shows us why unity ceased to exist.[17] In the sixth century the Eastern Emperor Justinian conceived the idea of reuniting the Roman world, and actually recovered and held for a short time Italy, southern Spain, and Africa. This attempt on his part aroused a national spirit

among the peoples of these lands, and developed in them a sense of their national independence and individuality. They threw off the foreign yoke and became separate peoples, and developed, each of them, a language of its own. Naturally this sentiment became effective at somewhat different periods in different countries. For France the point may be fixed in the sixth century, for Spain and Italy, in the seventh, and at these dates Latin may be said to take the form of French, Spanish, and Italian.

The Latin of the Common People

Unless one is a professional philologist he feels little interest in the language of the common people. Its peculiarities in pronunciation, syntax, phraseology, and the use of words we are inclined to avoid in our own speech, because they mark a lack of cultivation. We test them by the standards of polite society, and ignore them, or condemn them, or laugh at them as abnormal or illogical or indicative of ignorance. So far as literature goes, the speech of the common people has little interest for us because it is not the recognized literary medium. These two reasons have prevented the average man of cultivated tastes from giving much attention to the way in which the masses speak, and only the professional student has occupied himself with their language. This is unfortunate because the speech of the common people has many points of interest, and, instead of being illogical, is usually much more rigid in its adherence to its own accepted principles than formal speech is, which is likely to be influenced by convention or conventional associations. To take an illustration of what I have in mind, the ending _-s_ is the common mark in English of a plural form. For instance, "caps," "maps," "lines," and "places" are plurals, and the corresponding singular forms are "cap," "map," "line," and "place." Consequently, granted the underlying premise, it is a perfectly logical and eminently scientific process from the forms "relapse" (pronounced, of course, "relaps") and "species" to postulate a corresponding singular, and speak of "a relap" and "a specie," as a negro of my acquaintance regularly does. "Scrope" and "lept," as preterites of "scrape" and "leap," are correctly formed on the analogy of "broke" and "crept," but are not used in polite society.

So far as English, German, or French go, a certain degree of general interest has been stimulated lately in the form which they take in every-day life by two very different agencies, by the popular articles of students of language, and by realistic and dialect novels. But for our knowledge of the Latin of the common people we lack these two all-important sources of information. It occurred to only two Roman writers, Petronius and Apuleius, to amuse their countrymen by writing realistic stories, or stories with realistic features, and the Roman grammarian felt an even greater contempt for popular Latin or a greater indifference to it than we feel to-day. This feeling was shared, as we know, by the great humanists of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when the revival of interest in the Greek and Latin languages and literatures begins. Petrarch, Poggio Bracciolini, and the other great leaders in the movement were concerned with the literary aspects of the classics, and the scholars of succeeding generations, so far as they studied the language, confined their attention to that of the great Latin stylists. The first student to conceive of the existence of popular Latin as a form of speech which differed from formal literary Latin, seems to have been the French scholar, Henri Étienne. In a little pamphlet on the language and style of Plautus, written toward the end of the sixteenth century, he noted the likeness between French and the language of the Latin dramatist, without, however, clearly perceiving that the reason for this similarity lay in the fact that the comedies of Plautus reflect the spoken language of his time, and that French and the other Romance languages have developed out of this, rather than from literary Latin. Not until the middle of the eighteenth century was this truth clearly recognized, and then almost simultaneously on both sides of the Rhine.

It was left for the nineteenth century, however, to furnish scientific proof of the correctness of this hypothesis, and it was a fitting thing that the existence of an unbroken line of connection between popular Latin of the third century before our era, and the Romance languages of the nineteenth century, should have been established at the same time by a Latinist engaged in the study of Plautus, and a Romance philologist working upward toward Latin. The Latin scholar was Ritschl, who showed that the deviations from the formal standard which one finds in Plautus are not anomalies or mistakes, but specimens of colloquial Latin which can be traced down into the later period. The Romance philologist was Diez, who found that certain forms and words, especially those from the vocabulary of every-day life, which are common to many of the Romance languages, are not to be found in serious Latin literature at all, but occur only in those compositions, like comedy, satire, or the realistic romance, which reflect the speech of the every-day man. This discovery made it clear that the Romance languages are related to folk Latin, not to literary Latin. It is sixty years since the study of vulgar Latin was put on a scientific basis by the investigations of these two men, and during that period the Latinist and the Romance philologist have joined hands in extending our knowledge of it. From the Latin side a great impetus was given to the work by the foundation in 1884 of Wölfflin's _Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik_. This periodical, as is well known, was intended to prepare the way for the publication of the Latin _Thesaurus_, which the five German Academies are now bringing out.

One of its primary purposes, as its title indicates, was to investigate the history of Latin words, and in its first number the editor called attention to the importance of knowing the pieces of literature in which each Latin word or locution occurred. The results have been very illuminating. Some words or constructions or phrases are to be found, for instance, only in comedy, satire, and the romance. They are evidently peculiar to vulgar Latin. Others are freely used in these types of literature, but sparingly employed in historical or rhetorical works. Here again a shade of difference is noticeable between formal and familiar usage. The method of the Latinist then is essentially one of comparison and contrast. When, for instance, he finds the word _equus_ regularly used by serious writers for "horse," but _caballus_ employed in that sense in the colloquial compositions of Lucilius, Horace, and Petronius, he comes to the conclusion that _caballus_ belongs to the vocabulary of every-day life, that it is our "nag."

The line of reasoning which the Romance philologist follows in his study of vulgar Latin is equally convincing. The existence of a large number of words and idioms in French, Spanish, Italian, and the other Romance languages can be explained only in one of three ways. All these different languages may have hit on the same word or phrase to express an idea, or these words and idioms may have been borrowed from one language by the others, or they may come from a common origin. The first hypothesis is unthinkable. The second is almost as impossible. Undoubtedly French, for instance, borrowed some words from Spanish, and Spanish from Portuguese. It would be conceivable that a few words originating in Spain should pass into France, and thence into Italy, but it is quite beyond belief that the large element which the languages from Spain to Roumania have in common should have passed by borrowing over such a wide territory. It is clear that this common element is inherited from Latin, out of which all the Romance languages are derived. Out of the words, endings, idioms, and constructions which French, Spanish, Italian, and the other tongues of southern Europe have in common, it would be possible, within certain limits, to reconstruct the parent speech, but fortunately we are not limited to this material alone. At this point the Latinist and the Romance philologist join hands. To take up again the illustration already used, the student of the Romance languages finds the word for "horse" in Italian is cavallo, in Spanish caballo, in French cheval, in Roumanian cal, and so on. Evidently all these forms have come from caballus, which the Latinist finds belongs to the vocabulary of vulgar, not of formal, Latin. This one illustration out of many not only discloses the fact that the Romance languages are to be connected with colloquial rather than with literary Latin, but it also shows how the line of investigation opened by Diez, and that followed by Wölfflin and his school, supplement each other. By the use of the methods which these two scholars introduced, a large amount of material bearing on the subject under discussion has been collected and classified, and the characteristic features of the Latin of the common people have been determined. It has been found that five or six different and independent kinds of evidence may be used in reconstructing this form of speech.

We naturally think first of the direct statements made by Latin writers. These are to be found in the writings of Cicero, Quintilian, Seneca the Rhetorician, Petronius, Aulus Gellius, Vitruvius, and the Latin grammarians. The professional teacher Quintilian is shocked at the illiterate speech of the spectators in the theatres and circus. Similarly a character in Petronius utters a warning against the words such people use. Cicero openly delights in using every-day Latin in his familiar letters, while the architect Vitruvius expresses the anxious fear that he may not be following the accepted rules of grammar. As we have noticed above, a great deal of material showing the differences between formal and colloquial Latin which these writers have in mind, may be obtained by comparing, for instance, the Letters of Cicero with his rhetorical works, or Seneca's satirical skit on the Emperor Claudius with his philosophical writings. Now and then, too, a serious writer has occasion to use a bit of popular Latin, but he conveniently labels it for us with an apologetic phrase. Thus even St. Jerome, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, says: "Don't look a gift horse in the mouth, as the vulgar proverb has it." To the ancient grammarians the "mistakes" and vulgarisms of popular speech were abhorrent, and they have fortunately branded lists of words and expressions which are not to be used by cultivated people. The evidence which may be had from the Romance languages, supplemented by Latin, not only contributes to our knowledge of the vocabulary of vulgar Latin, but it also shows us many common idioms and constructions which that form of speech had. Thus, "I will sing" in Italian is canterò (=cantar[e]-ho), in Spanish, cantaré (=cantar-he), in French, chanterai (=chanter-ai), and similar forms occur in some of the other Romance languages. These forms are evidently made up of the Latin infinitive cantare, depending on habeo ("I have to sing"). But the future in literary Latin was cantabo, formed by adding an ending, as we know, and with that the Romance future can have no connection. However, as a writer in the _Archiv_ has pointed out,[18] just such analytical tense forms as are used in the Romance languages to-day are to be found in the popular Latin sermons of St. Jerome. From these idioms, common to Italian, French, and Spanish, then, we can reconstruct a Latin formation current among the common people. Finally a knowledge of the tendencies and practices of spoken English helps us to identify similar usages when we come upon them in our reading of Latin. When, for instance, the slave in a play of Plautus says: "Do you catch on" (tenes?), "I'll touch the old man for a loan" (tangam senem, etc.), or "I put it over him" (ei os sublevi) we recognize specimens of Latin slang, because all of the metaphors involved are in current use to-day. When one of the freedmen in Petronius remarks: "You ought not to

do a good turn to nobody" (neminem nihil boni facere oportet) we see the same use of the double negative to which we are accustomed in illiterate English. The rapid survey which we have just made of the evidence bearing on the subject establishes beyond doubt the existence of a form of speech among the Romans which cannot be identified with literary Latin, but it has been held by some writers that the material for the study of it is scanty. However, an impartial examination of the facts ought not to lead one to this conclusion. On the Latin side the material includes the comedies of Plautus and Terence, and the comic fragments, the familiar odes of Catullus, the satires of Lucilius, Horace, and Seneca, and here and there of Persius and Juvenal, the familiar letters of Cicero, the romance of Petronius and that of Apuleius in part, the Vulgate and some of the Christian fathers, the Journey to Jerusalem of St. Ætheria, the glossaries, some technical books like Vitruvius and the veterinary treatise of Chiron, and the private inscriptions, notably epitaphs, the wall inscriptions of Pompeii, and the leaden tablets found buried in the ground on which illiterate people wrote curses upon their enemies.

It is clear that there has been preserved for the study of colloquial Latin a very large body of material, coming from a great variety of sources and running in point of time from Plautus in the third century B.C. to St. Ætheria in the latter part of the fourth century or later. It includes books by trained writers, like Horace and Petronius, who consciously adopt the Latin of every-day life, and productions by uneducated people, like St. Ætheria and the writers of epitaphs, who have unwittingly used it.

St. Jerome says somewhere of spoken Latin that "it changes constantly as you pass from one district to another, and from one period to another" (et ipsa Latinitas et regionibus cotidie mutatur et tempore). If he had added that it varies with circumstances also, he would have included the three factors which have most to do in influencing the development of any spoken language. We are made aware of the changes which time has brought about in colloquial English when we compare the conversations in Fielding with those in a present-day novel. When a spoken language is judged by the standard of the corresponding literary medium, in some of its aspects it proves to be conservative, in others progressive. It shows its conservative tendency by retaining many words and phrases which have passed out of literary use. The English of the Biglow Papers, when compared with the literary speech of the time, abundantly illustrates this fact. This conservative tendency is especially noticeable in districts remote from literary centres, and those of us who are familiar with the vernacular in Vermont or Maine will recall in it many quaint words and expressions which literature abandoned long ago. In Virginia locutions may be heard which have scarcely been current in literature since Shakespeare's time. Now, literary and colloquial Latin were probably drawn farther apart than the two corresponding forms of speech in English, because Latin writers tried to make the literary tongue as much like Greek in its form as possible, so that literary Latin would naturally have diverged more rapidly and more widely from conversational Latin than formal English has drawn away from colloquial English.

But a spoken language in its development is progressive as well as conservative. To certain modifying influences it is especially sensitive. It is fond of the concrete, picturesque, and novel, and has a high appreciation of humor. These tendencies lead it to invent many new words and expressions which must wait months, years, perhaps a generation, before they are accepted in literature. Sometimes they are never accepted. The history of such words as buncombe, dude, Mugwump, gerrymander, and joy-ride illustrate for English the fact that words of a certain kind meet a more hospitable reception in the spoken language than they do in literature. The writer of comedy or farce, the humorist, and the man in the street do not feel the constraint which the canons of good usage put on the serious writer. They coin new words or use old words in a new way or use new constructions without much hesitation. The extraordinary material progress of the modern world during the last century has undoubtedly stimulated this tendency in a remarkable way, but it would seem as if the Latin of the common people from the time of Plautus to that of Cicero must have been subjected to still more innovating influences than modern conversational English has. During this period the newly conquered territories in Spain, northern Africa, Greece, and Asia poured their slaves and traders into Italy, and added a great many words to the vocabulary of every-day life. The large admixture of Greek words and idioms in the language of Petronius in the first century of our era furnishes proof of this fact. A still greater influence must have been felt within the language itself by the stimulus to the imagination which the coming of these foreigners brought, with their new ideas, and their new ways of looking at things, their strange costumes, manners, and religions.

The second important factor which affects the spoken language is a difference in culture and training. The speech of the gentleman differs from that of the rustic. The conversational language of Terence, for instance, is on a higher plane than that of Plautus, while the characters in Plautus use better Latin than the freedmen in Petronius. The illiterate freedmen in Petronius speak very differently from the freemen in his story. Sometimes a particular occupation materially affects the speech of those who pursue it. All of us know something of the linguistic eccentricities of the London cabman, the Parisian thief, or the American hobo. This particular influence cannot be estimated so well for Latin because we lack sufficient material, but some progress has been made in detecting

the peculiarities of Latin of the nursery, the camp, and the sea.

Of course a spoken language is never uniform throughout a given area. Dialectal differences are sure to develop. A man from Indiana and another from Maine will be sure to notice each other's peculiarities. Even the railway, the newspaper, and the public school will never entirely obliterate the old differences or prevent new ones from springing up. Without these agencies which do so much to promote uniformity to-day, Italy and the rest of the Empire must have shown greater dialectal differences than we observe in American English or in British English even.

For the sake of bringing out clearly some of the points of difference between vulgar and formal Latin we have used certain illustrations, like _caballus_, where the two forms of speech were radically opposed to each other, but of course they did not constitute two different languages, and that which they had in common was far greater than the element peculiar to each, or, to put it in another way, they in large measure overlapped each other. Perhaps we are in a position now to characterize colloquial Latin and to define it as the language which was used in conversation throughout the Empire with the innumerable variations which time and place gave it, which in its most highly refined form, as spoken in literary circles at Rome in the classical period, approached indefinitely near its ideal, literary Latin, which in its most unconventional phase was the rude speech of the rabble, or the "sermo inconditus" of the ancients. The facts which have just been mentioned may be illustrated by the accompanying diagrams.

[Illustration: Fig. I]

[Illustration: Fig. II]

[Illustration: Fig. III]

[Illustration: Fig. IV]

In Fig. I the heavy-lined ellipse represents the formal diction of Cicero, the dotted line ellipse his conversational vocabulary. They overlap each other through a great part of their extent, but there are certain literary locutions which would rarely be used by him in conversation, and certain colloquial words and phrases which he would not use in formal writing. Therefore the two ellipses would not be coterminous. In Fig. II the heavy ellipse has the same meaning as in Fig. I, while the space enclosed by the dotted line represents the vocabulary of an uneducated Roman, which would be much smaller than that of Cicero and would show a greater degree of difference from the literary vocabulary than Cicero's conversational stock of words does. The relation of the uncultivated Roman's conversational vocabulary to that of Cicero is illustrated in Fig. III, while Fig. IV shows how the Latin of the average man in Rome would compare, for instance, with that of a resident of Lugudunum, in Gaul.

This naturally brings us to consider the historical relations of literary and colloquial Latin. In explaining them it has often been assumed that colloquial Latin is a degenerate form of literary Latin, or that the latter is a refined type of the former. Both these theories are equally false. Neither is derived from the other. The true state of the case has never been better put than by Schuchardt, who says: "Vulgar Latin stands with reference to formal Latin in no derivative relation, in no paternal relation, but they stand side by side. It is true that vulgar Latin came from a Latin with fuller and freer forms, but it did not come from formal Latin. It is true that formal Latin came from a Latin of a more popular and a cruder character, but it did not come from vulgar Latin. In the original speech of the people, preliterary Latin (the prisca Latinitas), is to be found the origin of both; they were twin brothers."

Of this preliterary Latin we have no record. The best we can do is to infer what its characteristics were from the earliest fragments of the language which have come down to us, from the laws of the Twelve Tables, for instance, from the religious and legal formulæ preserved to us by Varro, Cicero, Livy, and others, from proverbs and popular sayings. It would take us too far afield to analyze these documents here, but it may be observed that we notice in them, among other characteristics, an indifference to strict grammatical structure, not that subordination of clauses to a main clause which comes only from an appreciation of the logical relation of ideas to one another, but a co-ordination of clauses, the heaping up of synonymous words, a tendency to use the analytical rather than the synthetical form of expression, and a lack of fixity in the forms of words and in inflectional endings. To illustrate some of these traits in a single example, an early law reads "if [he] shall have committed a theft by night, if [he] shall have killed him, let him be regarded as put to death legally" (si nox furtum faxsit, si im occisit, iure caesus esto).[19] We pass without warning from one subject, the thief, in the first clause to another, the householder, in the second, and back to the thief again in the third. Cato in his book on Agriculture writes of the cattle: "let them feed; it will be better" (pascantur; satius erit), instead of saying: "it will be better for them to feed" (or "that they feed"). In an early law one reads: "on the tablet, on the white surface" (in tabula, in albo), instead of "on the white tablet" (in alba tabula). Perhaps we may sum up the general characteristics of this preliterary Latin

out of which both the spoken and written language developed by saying that it showed a tendency to analysis rather than synthesis, a loose and variable grammatical structure, and a lack of logic in expression.

Livius Andronicus, Nævius, and Plautus in the third century before our era show the language as first used for literary purposes, and with them the breach between the spoken and written tongues begins. So far as Livius Andronicus, the Father of Latin literature, is concerned, allowance should be made without doubt for his lack of poetic inspiration and skill, and for the fact that his principal work was a translation, but even making this allowance the crude character of his Latin is apparent, and it is very clear that literary Latin underwent a complete transformation between his time and that of Horace and Virgil. Now, the significant thing in this connection is the fact that this transformation was largely brought about under an external influence, which affected the Latin of the common people only indirectly and in small measure. Perhaps the circumstances in which literary Latin was placed have never been repeated in history. At the very outset it was brought under the sway of a highly developed literary tongue, and all the writers who subsequently used it earnestly strove to model it after Greek. Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Accius, and Pacuvius were all of Greek origin and familiar with Greek. They, as well as Plautus and Terence, translated and adapted Greek epics, tragedies, and comedies. Several of the early writers, like Accius and Lucilius, interested themselves in grammatical subjects, and did their best to introduce system and regularity into their literary medium. Now, Greek was a highly inflected, synthetical, regular, and logical medium of literary expression, and it was inevitable that these qualities should be introduced into Latin. But this influence affected the spoken language very little, as we have already noticed. Its effect upon the speech of the common people would be slight, because of the absence of the common school which does so much to-day to hold together the spoken and written languages.

The development then of preliterary Latin under the influence of this systematizing, synthetical influence gave rise to literary Latin, while its independent growth more nearly in accordance with its original genius produced colloquial Latin. Consequently, we are not surprised to find that the people's speech retained in a larger measure than literary Latin did those qualities which we noticed in preliterary Latin. Those characteristics are, in fact, to be expected in conversation. When a man sets down his thoughts on paper he expresses himself with care and with a certain reserve in his statements, and he usually has in mind exactly what he wants to say. But in speaking he is not under this constraint. He is likely to express himself in a tautological, careless, or even illogical fashion. He rarely thinks out to the end what he has in mind, but loosely adds clauses or sentences, as new ideas occur to him.

We have just been thinking mainly about the relation of words to one another in a sentence. In the treatment of individual words, written and spoken Latin developed along different lines. In English we make little distinction between the quantity of vowels, but in Latin of course a given vowel was either long or short, and literary tradition became so fixed in this matter that the professional poets of the Augustan age do not tolerate any deviation from it. There are indications, however, that the common people did not observe the rules of quantity in their integrity. We can readily understand why that may have been the case. The comparative carelessness, which is characteristic of conversation, affects our pronunciation of words. When there is a stress accent, as there was in Latin, this is especially liable to be the case. We know in English how much the unaccented syllables suffer in a long word like "laboratory." In Latin the long unaccented vowels and the final syllable, which was never protected by the accent, were peculiarly likely to lose their full value. As a result, in conversational Latin certain final consonants tended to drop away, and probably the long vowel following a short one was regularly shortened when the accent fell on the short syllable, or on the syllable which followed the long one. Some scholars go so far as to maintain that in course of time all distinction in quantity in the unaccented vowels was lost in popular Latin. Sometimes the influence of the accent led to the excision of the vowel in the syllable which followed it. Probus, a grammarian of the fourth century of our era, in what we might call a "Guide to Good Usage"[20] or "One Hundred Words Mispronounced," warns his readers against masclus and anglus for masculus and angulus. This is the same popular tendency which we see illustrated in "lab'ratory."

The quality of vowels as well as their quantity changed. The obscuring of certain vowel sounds in ordinary or careless conversation in this country in such words as "Latun" and "Amurican" is a phenomenon which is familiar enough. In fact a large number of our vowel sounds seem to have degenerated into a grunt. Latin was affected in a somewhat similar way, although not to the same extent as present-day English. Both the ancient grammarians in their warnings and the Romance languages bear evidence to this effect.

We noticed above that the final consonant was exposed to danger by the fact that the syllable containing it was never protected by the accent. It is also true that there was a tendency to do away with any difficult combination of consonants. We recall in English the current pronunciations, "February," and "Calwell" for Caldwell. The average Roman in the same way was inclined to follow the line of least resistance. Sometimes, as in the two English examples just given, he avoided a difficult combination of consonants by dropping one of them. This method he followed in saying santus for sanctus, and scriserunt for scripserunt, just as in vulgar English

one now and then hears "slep" and "kep" for the more difficult "slept" and "kept." Sometimes he lightened the pronunciation by metathesis, as he did when he pronounced interpretor as interpertor. A third device was to insert a vowel, as illiterate English-speaking people do in the pronunciations "ellum" and "Henery." In this way, for instance, the Roman avoided the difficult combinations -mn- and -chn- by saying mina and techina for the historically correct mna and techna. Another method of surmounting the difficulty was to assimilate one of the two consonants to the other. This is a favorite practice of the shop-girl, over which the newspapers make merry in their phonetical reproductions of supposed conversations heard from behind the counter. Adopting the same easy way of speaking, the uneducated Roman sometimes said isse for ipse, and scritus for scriptus. To pass to another point of difference, the laws determining the incidence of the accent were very firmly established in literary Latin. The accent must fall on the penult, if it was long, otherwise on the antepenult of the word. But in popular Latin there were certain classes of words in whose case these principles were not observed.

The very nature of the accent probably differed in the two forms of speech. In preliterary Latin the stress was undoubtedly a marked feature of the accent, and this continued to be the case in the popular speech throughout the entire history of the language, but, as I have tried to prove in another paper,[21] in formal Latin the stress became very slight, and the pitch grew to be the characteristic feature of the accent. Consequently, when Virgil read a passage of the _Æneid_ to Augustus and Livia the effect on the ear of the comparatively unstressed language, with the rhythmical rise and fall of the pitch, would have been very different from that made by the conversation of the average man, with the accented syllables more clearly marked by a stress.

In this brief chapter we cannot attempt to go into details, and in speaking of the morphology of vulgar Latin we must content ourselves with sketching its general characteristics and tendencies, as we have done in the case of its phonology. In English our inflectional forms have been reduced to a minimum, and consequently there is little scope for differences in this respect between the written and spoken languages. From the analogy of other forms the illiterate man occasionally says: "I swum," or, "I clumb," or "he don't," but there is little chance of making a mistake. However, with three genders, five declensions for nouns, a fixed method of comparison for adjectives and adverbs, an elaborate system of pronouns, with active and deponent, regular and irregular verbs, four conjugations, and a complex synthetical method of forming the moods and tenses, the pitfalls for the unwary Roman were without number, as the present-day student of Latin can testify to his sorrow. That the man in the street, who had no newspaper to standardize his Latin, and little chance to learn it in school, did not make more mistakes is surprising. In a way many of the errors which he did make were historically not errors at all. This fact will readily appear from an illustration or two. In our survey of preliterary Latin we had occasion to notice that one of its characteristics was a lack of fixity in the use of forms or constructions. In the third century before our era, a Roman could say audibo or audiam, contemplor or contemplo, senatus consultum or senati consultum. Thanks to the efforts of the scientific grammarian, and to the systematizing influence which Greek exerted upon literary Latin, most verbs were made deponent or active once for all, a given noun was permanently assigned to a particular declension, a verb to one conjugation, and the slight tendency which the language had to the analytical method of forming the moods and tenses was summarily checked. Of course the common people tried to imitate their betters in all these matters, but the old variable usages persisted to some extent, and the average man failed to grasp the niceties of the new grammar at many points. His failures were especially noticeable where the accepted literary form did not seem to follow the principles of analogy. When these principles are involved, the common people are sticklers for consistency. The educated man conjugates: "I don't," "you don't," "he doesn't," "we don't," "they don't"; but the anomalous form "he doesn't" has to give way in the speech of the average man to "he don't." To take only one illustration in Latin of the effect of the same influence, the present infinitive active of almost all verbs ends in -re, e.g., amare, monere, and regere. Consequently the irregular infinitive of the verb "to be able," posse, could not stand its ground, and ultimately became potere in vulgar Latin. In one respect in the inflectional forms of the verb, the purist was unexpectedly successful. In comedy of the third and second centuries B.C., we find sporadic evidence of a tendency to use auxiliary verbs in forming certain tenses, as we do in English when we say: "I will go," "I have gone," or "I had gone." This movement was thoroughly stamped out for the time, and does not reappear until comparatively late.

In Latin there are three genders, and the grammatical gender of a noun is not necessarily identical with its natural gender. For inanimate objects it is often determined simply by the form of the noun. Sella, seat, of the first declension, is feminine, because almost all nouns ending in -a are feminine; hortus, garden, is masculine, because nouns in -us of its declension are mostly masculine, and so on. From such a system as this two results are reasonably sure to follow. Where the gender of a noun in literary Latin did not conform to these rules, in popular Latin it would be brought into harmony with others of its class. Thus stigma, one of the few neuter nouns in -a, and consequently assigned to the third declension, was brought in popular speech into line with sella and the long list of similar words in -a, was made feminine, and put in the first declension. In the case of another class of words, analogy was supplemented by a mechanical influence. We have noticed already that the tendency of the stressed syllable in a

word to absorb effort and attention led to the obscuration of certain final consonants, because the final syllable was never protected by the accent. Thus hortus in some parts of the Empire became hortu in ordinary pronunciation, and the neuter caelum, heaven, became caelu. The consequent identity in the ending led to a confusion in the gender, and to the ultimate treatment of the word for "heaven" as a masculine. These influences and others caused many changes in the gender of nouns in popular speech, and in course of time brought about the elimination of the neuter gender from the neo-Latin languages.

Something has been said already of the vocabulary of the common people. It was naturally much smaller than that of cultivated people. Its poverty made their style monotonous when they had occasion to express themselves in writing, as one can see in reading St. Ætheria's account of her journey to the Holy Land, and of course this impression of monotony is heightened by such a writer's inability to vary the form of expression. Even within its small range it differs from the vocabulary of formal Latin in three or four important respects. It has no occasion, or little occasion, to use certain words which a formal writer employs, or it uses substitutes for them. So testa was used in part for caput, and bucca for os. On the other hand, it employs certain words and phrases, for instance vulgar words and expletives, which are not admitted into literature.

In its choice of words it shows a marked preference for certain suffixes and prefixes. It would furnish an interesting excursion into folk psychology to speculate on the reasons for this preference in one case and another. Sometimes it is possible to make out the influence at work. In reading a piece of popular Latin one is very likely to be impressed with the large number of diminutives which are used, sometimes in the strict sense of the primitive word. The frequency of this usage reminds one in turn of the fact that not infrequently in the Romance languages the corresponding words are diminutive forms in their origin, so that evidently the diminutive in these cases crowded out the primitive word in popular use, and has continued to our own day. The reason why the diminutive ending was favored does not seem far to seek. That suffix properly indicates that the object in question is smaller than the average of its kind. Smallness in a child stimulates our affection, in a dwarf, pity or aversion. Now we give expression to our emotion more readily in the intercourse of every-day life than we do in writing, and the emotions of the masses are perhaps nearer the surface and more readily stirred than are those of the classes, and many things excite them which would leave unruffled the feelings of those who are more conventional. The stirring of these emotions finds expression in the use of the diminutive ending, which indirectly, as we have seen, suggests sympathy, affection, pity, or contempt. The ending -osus for adjectives was favored because of its sonorous character. Certain prefixes, like de-, dis-, and ex-, were freely used with verbs, because they strengthened the meaning of the verb, and popular speech is inclined to emphasize its ideas unduly.

To speak further of derivation, in the matter of compounds and crystallized word groups there are usually differences between a spoken and written language. The written language is apt to establish certain canons which the people do not observe. For instance, we avoid hybrid compounds of Greek and Latin elements in the serious writing of English. In formal Latin we notice the same objection to Greco-Latin words, and yet in Plautus, and in other colloquial writers, such compounds are freely used for comic effect. In a somewhat similar category belong the combinations of two adverbs or prepositions, which one finds in the later popular Latin, some of which have survived in the Romance languages. A case in point is ab ante, which has come down to us in the Italian avanti and the French avant. Such word-groups are of course debarred from formal speech.

In examining the vocabulary of colloquial Latin, we have noticed its comparative poverty, its need of certain words which are not required in formal Latin, its preference for certain prefixes and suffixes, and its willingness to violate certain rules, in forming compounds and word-groups, which the written language scrupulously observes. It remains for us to consider a third, and perhaps the most important, element of difference between the vocabularies of the two forms of speech. I mean the use of a word in vulgar Latin with another meaning from that which it has in formal Latin. We are familiar enough with the different senses which a word often has in conversational and in literary English. "Funny," for instance, means "amusing" in formal English, but it is often the synonym of "strange" in conversation. The sense of a word may be extended, or be restricted, or there may be a transfer of meaning. In the colloquial use of "funny" we have an extension of its literary sense. The same is true of "splendid," "jolly," "lovely," and "awfully," and of such Latin words as "lepidus," "probe," and "pulchre." When we speak of "a splendid sun," we are using splendid in its proper sense of shining or bright, but when we say, "a splendid fellow," the adjective is used as a general epithet expressing admiration. On the other hand, when a man of a certain class refers to his "woman," he is employing the word in the restricted sense of "wife." Perhaps we should put in a third category that very large colloquial use of words in a transferred or figurative sense, which is illustrated by "to touch" or "to strike" when applied to success in getting money from a person. Our current slang is characterized by the free use of words in this figurative way.

Under the head of syntax we must content ourselves with speaking of only two changes, but these were far-reaching. We have already noticed the analytical tendency of preliterary Latin. This tendency was held in check, as we have just observed, so far as

verb forms were concerned, but in the comparison of adjectives and in the use of the cases it steadily made headway, and ultimately triumphed over the synthetical principle. The method adopted by literary Latin of indicating the comparative and the superlative degrees of an adjective, by adding the endings -ior and -issimus respectively, succumbed in the end to the practice of prefixing plus or magis and maxime to the positive form. To take another illustration of the same characteristic of popular Latin, as early as the time of Plautus, we see a tendency to adopt our modern method of indicating the relation which a substantive bears to some other word in the sentence by means of a preposition rather than by simply using a case form. The careless Roman was inclined to say, for instance, magna pars de exercitu, rather than to use the genitive case of the word for army, magna pars exercitus. Perhaps it seemed to him to bring out the relation a little more clearly or forcibly.

The use of a preposition to show the relation became almost a necessity when certain final consonants became silent, because with their disappearance, and the reduction of the vowels to a uniform quantity, it was often difficult to distinguish between the cases. Since final -m was lost in pronunciation, _Asia_ might be nominative, accusative, or ablative. If you wished to say that something happened in Asia, it would not suffice to use the simple ablative, because that form would have the same pronunciation as the nominative or the accusative, Asia(m), but the preposition must be prefixed, _in Asia_. Another factor cooperated with those which have already been mentioned in bringing about the confusion of the cases. Certain prepositions were used with the accusative to indicate one relation, and with the ablative to suggest another. _In Asia_, for instance, meant "in Asia," _in Asiam_, "into Asia." When the two case forms became identical in pronunciation, the meaning of the phrase would be determined by the verb in the sentence, so that with a verb of going the preposition would mean "into," while with a verb of rest it would mean "in." In other words the idea of motion or rest is disassociated from the case forms. From the analogy of _in_ it was very easy to pass to other prepositions like _per_, which in literary Latin took the accusative only, and to use these prepositions also with cases which, historically speaking, were ablatives.

In his heart of hearts the school-boy regards the periodic sentences which Cicero hurled at Catiline, and which Livy used in telling the story of Rome as unnatural and perverse. All the specious arguments which his teacher urges upon him, to prove that the periodic form of expression was just as natural to the Roman as the direct method is to us, fail to convince him that he is not right in his feeling--and he _is_ right. Of course in English, as a rule, the subject must precede the verb, the object must follow it, and the adverb and attribute adjective must stand before the words to which they belong. In the sentence: "Octavianus wished Cicero to be saved," not a single change may be made in the order without changing the sense, but in a language like Latin, where relations are largely expressed by inflectional forms, almost any order is possible, so that a writer may vary his arrangement and grouping of words to suit the thought which he wishes to convey. But this is a different matter from the construction of a period with its main subject at the beginning, its main verb at the end, and all sorts of subordinate and modifying clauses locked in by these two words. This was not the way in which the Romans talked with one another. We can see that plainly enough from the conversations in Plautus and Terence. In fact the Latin period is an artificial product, brought to perfection by many generations of literary workers, and the nearer we get to the Latin of the common people the more natural the order and style seem to the English-speaking person. The speech of the uneducated freedmen in the romance of Petronius is interesting in this connection. They not only fail to use the period, but they rarely subordinate one idea to another. Instead of saying "I saw him when he was an ædile," they are likely to say "I saw him; he was an ædile then."

When we were analyzing preliterary Latin, we noticed that the co-ordination of ideas was one of its characteristics, so that this trait evidently persisted in popular speech, while literary Latin became more logical and complex.

In the preceding pages we have tried to find out the main features of popular Latin. In doing so we have constantly thought of literary Latin as the foil or standard of comparison. Now, strangely enough, no sooner had the literary medium of expression slowly and painfully disassociated itself from the language of the common people than influences which it could not resist brought it down again to the level of its humbler brother. Its integrity depended of course upon the acceptance of certain recognized standards. But when flourishing schools of literature sprang up in Spain, in Africa, and in Gaul, the paramount authority of Rome and the common standard for the Latin world which she had set were lost. When some men tried to imitate Cicero and Quintilian, and others, Seneca, there ceased to be a common model of excellence. Similarly a careful distinction between the diction of prose and verse was gradually obliterated. There was a loss of interest in literature, and professional writers gave less attention to their diction and style. The appearance of Christianity, too, exercised a profound influence on literary Latin. Christian writers and preachers made their appeal to the common people rather than to the literary world. They, therefore, expressed themselves in language which would be readily understood by the average man, as St. Jerome frankly tells us his purpose was. The result of these influences, and of others, acting on literary Latin, was to destroy its unity and its carefully developed scientific system, and to bring it nearer

and nearer in its genius to popular Latin, or, to put it in another way, the literary medium comes to show many of the characteristics of the spoken language. Gregory of Tours, writing in the sixth century, laments the fact that he is unfamiliar with grammatical principles, and with this century literary Latin may be said to disappear.

As for popular Latin, it has never ceased to exist. It is the language of France, Spain, Italy, Roumania, and all the Romance countries to-day. Its history has been unbroken from the founding of Rome to the present time. Various scholars have tried to determine the date before which we shall call the popular speech vulgar Latin, and after which it may better be styled French or Spanish or Italian, as the case may be. Some would fix the dividing line in the early part of the eighth century A.D., when phonetic changes common to all parts of the Roman world would cease to occur. Others would fix it at different periods between the middle of the sixth to the middle of the seventh century, according as each section of the old Roman world passed definitely under the control of its Germanic invaders. The historical relations of literary and colloquial Latin would be roughly indicated by the accompanying diagram, in which preliterary Latin divides, on the appearance of literature in the third century B.C., into popular Latin and literary Latin. These two forms of speech develop along independent lines until, in the sixth century, literary Latin is merged in popular Latin and disappears. The unity for the Latin tongue thus secured was short lived, because within a century the differentiation begins which gives rise to the present-day Romance languages.

It may interest some of the readers of this chapter to look over a few specimens of vulgar Latin from the various periods of its history.

(a) The first one is an extract from the Laws of the Twelve Tables. The original document goes back to the middle of the fifth century B.C., and shows us some of the characteristics of preliterary Latin. The non-periodic form, the omission of pronouns, and the change of subject without warning are especially noticeable.

"Si in ius vocat, ito. Ni it, antestamino, igitur em (=eum) capito. Si calvitur pedemve struit, manum endo iacito (=inicito). Si morbus aevitasve (=aetasve) vitium escit, iumentum dato: si nolet, arceram ne sternito."

[Illustration:

1 Preliterary Latin. 2 Vulgar Latin 3 Literary Latin 4-8 The Romance languages.

]

(b) This passage from one of Cicero's letters to his brother (_ad Q. fr._ 2, 3, 2) may illustrate the familiar conversational style of a gentleman in the first century B.C. It describes an harangue made by the politician Clodius to his partisans.

"Ille furens et exsanguis interrogabat suos in clamore ipso quis esset qui plebem fame necaret. Respondebant operae: 'Pompeius.' Quem ire vellent. Respondebant: 'Crassum.' Is aderat tum Miloni animo non amico. Hora fere nona quasi signo dato Clodiani nostros consputare coeperunt. Exarsit dolor. Vrgere illi ut loco nos moverent."

(c) In the following passage, Petronius, 57, one of the freedmen at Trimalchio's dinner flames out in anger at a fellow-guest whose bearing seems to him supercilious. It shows a great many of the characteristics of vulgar Latin which have been mentioned in this paper. The similarity of its style to that of the preliterary specimen is worth observing. The great number of proverbs and bits of popular wisdom are also noticeable.

"Et nunc spero me sic vivere, ut nemini iocus sim. Homo inter homines sum, capite aperto ambulo; assem aerarium nemini debeo; constitutum habui nunquam; nemo mihi in foro dixit 'redde, quod debes.' Glebulas emi, lamelullas paravi; viginti ventres pasco et canem; contubernalem meam redemi, ne quis in sinu illius manus tergeret; mille denarios pro capite solvi; sevir gratis factus sum; spero, sic moriar, ut mortuus non erubescam."

(d) This short inscription from Pompeii shows some of the peculiarities of popular pronunciation. In ortu we see the same difficulty in knowing when to sound the aspirate which the cockney Englishman has. The silence of the final -m, and the reduction of ae to e are also interesting. Presta mi sinceru (=sincerum): si te amet que (=quae) custodit ortu (=hortum) Venus.

(e) Here follow some of the vulgar forms against which a grammarian, probably of the fourth century, warns his readers. We notice that the popular "mistakes" to which he calls attention are in (1) syncopation and assimilation, in (2) the use of the diminutive for the primitive, and pronouncing au as o, in (3) the same reduction of ct to t (or tt) which we find in such Romance forms as Ottobre, in (4) the aspirate falsely added, in (5) syncopation and the confusion of v and b, and in (6) the silence of final -m.

(1) frigida non fricda (2) auris non oricla (3) auctoritas non autoritas (4) ostiae non hostiae (5) vapulo non baplo (6) passim non passi

(f) The following passages are taken from Brunot's "Histoire de la langue Fraçaise," p. 144. In the third column the opening sentence of the famous Oath of Strasburg of 842 A.D. is given. In the other columns the form which it would have taken at different periods is set down. These passages bring out clearly the unbroken line of descent from Latin to modern French.

The Oath of Strasburg of 842

Classic Latin

Per Dei amorem et per christiani populi et nostram communem salutem, ab hac die, quantum Deus scire et posse mini dat, servabo hunc meum fratrem Carolum

Spoken Latin, Seventh Cent.

For deo amore et por chrestyano pob(o)lo et nostro comune salvamento de esto die en avante en quanto Deos sabere et podere me donat, sic salvarayo eo eccesto meon fradre Karlo

Actual Text

Pro deo amur et pro christian poblo et nostro commun salvament, d'ist di en avant, in quant Deus savir et podir me dunat, si salvarai eo cist meon fradre Karlo

French, Eleventh Cent.

Por dieu amor et por del crestüen poeple et nostre comun salvement, de cest jorn en avant, quant que Dieus saveir et podeir me donet, si salverai jo cest mien fredre Charlon

French, Fifteenth Cent.

Pour l'amour Dieu et pour le sauvement du chrestien peuple et le nostre commun, de cest jour en avant, quant que Dieu savoir et pouvoir me done, si sauverai je cest mien frere Charle

Modern French

Pour l'amour de Dieu et pour le salut commun du peuple chrétien et le nôtre, à partir de ce jour, autant que Dieu m'en donne le savoir et le pouvoir, je soutiendrai mon frère Charles

The Poetry of the Common People of Rome

I. Their Metrical Epitaphs

The old village churchyard on a summer afternoon is a favorite spot with many of us. The absence of movement, contrasted with the life just outside its walls, the drowsy humming of the bees in the flowers which grow at will, the restful gray of the stones and the green of the moss give one a feeling of peace and quiet, while the ancient dates and quaint lettering in the inscriptions carry us far from the hurry and bustle and trivial interests of present-day life. No sense of sadness touches us. The stories which the stones tell are so far removed from us in point of time that even those who grieved at the loss of the departed have long since followed their friends, and when we read the bits of life history on the crumbling monuments, we feel only that pleasurable emotion which, as Cicero says in one of his letters, comes from our reading in history of the little tragedies of men of the past. But the epitaph deals with the common people, whom history is apt to forget, and gives us a glimpse of their character, their doings, their beliefs, and their views of life and death. They furnish us a simple and direct record of the life and the aspirations of the average man, the record of a life not interpreted for us by the biographer, historian, or novelist, but set down in all its simplicity by one of the common people themselves.

These facts lend to the ancient Roman epitaphs their peculiar interest and charm. They give us a glimpse into the every-day life of the people which a Cicero, or a Virgil, or even a Horace cannot offer us. They must have exerted an influence, too, on Roman

character, which we with our changed conditions can scarcely appreciate. We shall understand this fact if we call to mind the differences between the ancient practices in the matter of burial and our own. The village churchyard is with us a thing of the past. Whether on sanitary grounds, or for the sake of quiet and seclusion, in the interest of economy, or not to obtrude the thought of death upon us, the modern cemetery is put outside of our towns, and the memorials in it are rarely read by any of us. Our fathers did otherwise. The churchyard of old England and of New England was in the middle of the village, and "short cuts" from one part of the village to another led through its enclosure. Perhaps it was this fact which tempted our ancestors to set forth their life histories more fully than we do, who know that few, if any, will come to read them. Or is the world getting more reserved and sophisticated? Are we coming to put a greater restraint upon the expression of our emotions? Do we hesitate more than our fathers did to talk about ourselves? The ancient Romans were like our fathers in their willingness or desire to tell us of themselves. Perhaps the differences in their burial practices, which were mentioned above, tempted them to be communicative, and sometimes even garrulous. They put their tombstones in a spot still more frequented than the churchyard. They placed them by the side of the highways, just outside the city walls, where people were coming or going constantly. Along the Street of Tombs, as one goes out of Pompeii, or along the great Appian Way, which runs from Rome to Capua, Southern Italy and Brundisium, the port of departure for Greece and the Orient, they stand on both sides of the roadway and make their mute appeals for our attention. We know their like in the enclosure about old Trinity in New York, in the burial ground in New Haven, or in the churchyards across the water. They tell us not merely the date of birth and death of the deceased, but they let us know enough of his life to invest it with a certain individuality, and to give it a flavor of its own.

Some 40,000 of them have come down to us, and nearly 2,000 of the inscriptions upon them are metrical. This particular group is of special interest to us, because the use of verse seems to tempt the engraver to go beyond a bare statement of facts and to philosophize a bit about the present and the future. Those who lie beneath the stones still claim some recognition from the living, for they often call upon the passer-by to halt and read their epitaphs, and as the Roman walked along the Appian Way two thousand years ago, or as we stroll along the same highway to-day, it is in silent converse with the dead. Sometimes the stone itself addresses us, as does that of Olus Granius:[22] "This mute stone begs thee to stop, stranger, until it has disclosed its mission and told thee whose shade it covers. Here lie the bones of a man, modest, honest, and trusty--the crier, Olus Granius. That is all. It wanted thee not to be unaware of this. Fare thee well." This craving for the attention of the passer-by leads the composer of one epitaph to use somewhat the same device which our advertisers employ in the street-cars when they say: "Do not look at this spot," for he writes: "Turn not your eyes this way and wish not to learn our fate," but two lines later, relenting, he adds: "Now stop, traveller...within this narrow resting-place,"[23] and then we get the whole story. Sometimes a dramatic, lifelike touch is given by putting the inscription into the form of a dialogue between the dead and those who are left behind. Upon a stone found near Rome runs the inscription:[24] "Hail, name dear to us, Stephanus,...thy Moschis and thy Diodorus salute thee." To which the dead man replies: "Hail chaste wife, hail Diodorus, my friend, my brother." The dead man often begs for a pleasant word from the passer-by. The Romans, for instance, who left Ostia by the highway, read upon a stone the sentiment:[25] "May it go well with you who lie within and, as for you who go your way and read these lines, 'the earth rest lightly on thee' say." This pious salutation loses some of the flavor of spontaneity in our eyes when we find that it had become so much of a convention as to be indicated by the initial letters of the several words: S(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis). The traveller and the departed exchange good wishes on a stone found near Velitræ:[26]

"May it go well with you who read and you who pass this way, The like to mine and me who on this spot my tomb have built."

One class of passers-by was dreaded by the dweller beneath the stone--the man with a paint-brush who was looking for a conspicuous spot on which to paint the name of his favorite political candidate. To such an one the hope is expressed "that his ambition may be realized, provided he instructs his slave not to paint this stone."[27]

These wayside epitaphs must have left an impress on the mind and character of the Roman which we can scarcely appreciate. The peasant read them as he trudged homeward on market days, the gentleman, as he drove to his villa on the countryside, and the traveller who came from the South, the East, or the North. In them the history of his country was set forth in the achievements of her great men, her prætors and consuls, her generals who had conquered and her governors who had ruled Gaul, Spain, Africa, and Asia. In them the public services, and the deeds of charity of the rich and powerful were recorded and the homely virtues and self-sacrifices of the humbler man and woman found expression there. Check by jowl with the tomb of some great leader upon whom the people or the emperor had showered all the titles and honors in their power might stand the stone of the poor physician, Dionysius,[28] of whom it is said "to all the sick who came to him he gave his services free of charge; he set forth in his deeds what he taught in his precepts."

But perhaps more of the inscriptions in verse, and with them we are here concerned, are in praise of women than of men. They make clear to us the place which women held in Roman life, the state of society, and the feminine qualities which were held in most esteem. The world which they portray is quite another from that of Ovid and Juvenal. The common people still hold to the old standards of morality and duty. The degeneracy of smart society has made little progress here. The marriage tie is held sacred; the wife and husband, the parent and child are held close to each other in bonds of affection. The virtues of women are those which Martinianus records on the stone of his wife Sofroniola:[29]

"Purity, loyalty, affection, a sense of duty, a yielding nature, and whatever qualities God has implanted in women."

(Castitas fides earitas pietas obsequium Et quaecumque deus faemenis inesse praecepit.)

Upon a stone near Turin,[30] Valerius wrote in memory of his wife the simple line:

"Pure in heart, modest, of seemly bearing, discreet, noble-minded, and held in high esteem."

(Casta pudica decens sapiens Generosa probata.)

Only one discordant note is struck in this chorus of praise. This fierce invective stands upon an altar at Rome:[31] "Here for all time has been set down in writing the shameful record of the freedwoman Acte, of poisoned mind, and treacherous, cunning, and hard-hearted. Oh! for a nail, and a hempen rope to choke her, and flaming pitch to burn up her wicked heart."

A double tribute is paid to a certain Statilia in this naïve inscription:[32] "Thou who wert beautiful beyond measure and true to thy husbands, didst twice enter the bonds of wedlock...and he who came first, had he been able to withstand the fates, would have set up this stone to thee, while I, alas! who have been blessed by thy pure heart and love for thee for sixteen years, lo! now I have lost thee." Still greater sticklers for the truth at the expense of convention are two fond husbands who borrowed a pretty couplet composed in memory of some woman "of tender age," and then substituted upon the monuments of their wives the more truthful phrase "of middle age,"[33] and another man warns women, from the fate of his wife, to shun the excessive use of jewels.[34]

It was only natural that when men came to the end of life they should ask themselves its meaning, should speculate upon the state after death, and should turn their thoughts to the powers which controlled their destiny. We have been accustomed to form our conceptions of the religion of the Romans from what their philosophers and moralists and poets have written about it. But a great chasm lies between the teachings of these men and the beliefs of the common people. Only from a study of the epitaphs do we know what the average Roman thought and felt on this subject. A few years ago Professor Harkness, in an admirable article on "The Scepticism and Fatalism of the Common People of Rome," showed that "the common people placed no faith in the gods who occupy so prominent a place in Roman literature, and that their nearest approach to belief in a divinity was their recognition of fate," which "seldom appears as a fixed law of nature...but rather as a blind necessity, depending on chance and not on law." The gods are mentioned by name in the poetic epitaphs only, and for poetic purposes, and even here only one in fifty of the metrical inscriptions contains a direct reference to any supernatural power. For none of these deities, save for Mother Earth, does the writer of an epitaph show any affection. This feeling one may see in the couplet which reads:[35] "Mother Earth, to thee have we committed the bones of Fortunata, to thee who dost come near to thy children as a mother," and Professor Harkness thoughtfully remarks in this connection that "the love of nature and appreciation of its beauties, which form a distinguishing characteristic of Roman literature in contrast to all the other literatures of antiquity, are the outgrowth of this feeling of kinship which the Italians entertained for mother earth."

It is a little surprising, to us on first thought, that the Roman did not interpose some concrete personalities between himself and this vague conception of fate, some personal agencies, at least, to carry out the decrees of destiny. But it will not seem so strange after all when we recall the fact that the deities of the early Italians were without form or substance. The anthropomorphic teachings of Greek literature, art, and religion found an echo in the Jupiter and Juno, the Hercules and Pan of Virgil and Horace, but made no impress on the faith of the common people, who, with that regard for tradition which characterized the Romans, followed the fathers in their way of thinking.

A disbelief in personal gods hardly accords with faith in a life after death, but most of the Romans believed in an existence of some sort in the world beyond. A Dutch scholar has lately established this fact beyond reasonable doubt, by a careful study of the epitaphs in verse.[36] One tombstone reads:[37]

"Into nothing from nothing how quickly we go,"

and another:[38]

"Once we were not, now we are as we were,"

and the sentiment, "I was not, I was, I am not, I care not" (non fui, fui, non sum, non euro) was so freely used that it is indicated now and then merely by the initial letters N.f.f.n.s.n.c., but compared with the great number of inscriptions in which belief in a life after death finds expression such utterances are few. But how and where that life was to be passed the Romans were in doubt. We have noticed above how little the common people accepted the belief of the poets in Jupiter and Pluto and the other gods, or rather how little their theology had been influenced by Greek art and literature. In their conception of the place of abode after death, it is otherwise. Many of them believe with Virgil that it lies below the earth. As one of them says in his epitaph:[39]

"No sorrow to the world below I bring."

Or with other poets the departed are thought of as dwelling in the Elysian fields or the Isles of the Blessed. As one stone cries out to the passer-by:[40] "May you live who shall have said. 'She lives in Elysium,'" and of a little girl it is said:[41] "May thy shade flower in fields Elysian." Sometimes the soul goes to the sky or the stars: "Here lies the body of the bard Laberius, for his spirit has gone to the place from which it came;"[42] "The tomb holds my limbs, my soul shall pass to the stars of heaven."[43] But more frequently the departed dwell in the tomb. As one of them expresses it: "This is my eternal home; here have I been placed; here shall I be for aye." This belief that the shade hovers about the tomb accounts for the salutations addressed to it which we have noticed above, and for the food and flowers which are brought to satisfy its appetites and tastes. These tributes to the dead do not seem to accord with the current Roman belief that the body was dissolved to dust, and that the soul was clothed with some incorporeal form, but the Romans were no more consistent in their eschatology than many of us are.

Perhaps it was this vague conception of the state after death which deprived the Roman of that exultant joy in anticipation of the world beyond which the devout Christian, a hundred years or more ago, expressed in his epitaphs, with the Golden City so clearly pictured to his eye, and by way of compensation the Roman was saved from the dread of death, for no judgment-seat confronted him in the other world. The end of life was awaited with reasonable composure. Sometimes death was welcomed because it brought rest. As a citizen of Lambsesis expresses it:[44] "Here is my home forever; here is a rest from toil;" and upon a woman's stone we read:[45]

"Whither hast thou gone, dear soul, seeking rest from troubles, For what else than trouble hast thou had throughout thy life?"

But this pessimistic view of life rarely appears on the monuments. Not infrequently the departed expresses a certain satisfaction with his life's record, as does a citizen of Beneventum, who remarks:[46] "No man have I wronged, to many have I rendered services," or he tells us of the pleasure which he has found in the good things of life, and advises us to enjoy them. A Spanish epitaph reads:[47] "Eat, drink, enjoy thyself, follow me" (es bibe lude veni). In a lighter or more garrulous vein another says:[48] "Come, friends, let us enjoy the happy time of life; let us dine merrily, while short life lasts, mellow with wine, in jocund intercourse. All these about us did the same while they were living. They gave, received, and enjoyed good things while they lived. And let us imitate the practices of the fathers. Live while you live, and begrudge nothing to the dear soul which Heaven has given you." This philosophy of life is expressed very succinctly in: "What I have eaten and drunk I have with me; what I have foregone I have lost,"[49] and still more concretely in:

"Wine and amours and baths weaken our bodily health, Yet life is made up of wine and amours and baths."[50]

Under the statue of a man reclining and holding a cup in his hand, Flavius Agricola writes:[51] "Tibur was my native place; I was called Agricola, Flavius too.... I who lie here as you see me. And in the world above in the years which the fates granted, I cherished my dear soul, nor did the god of wine e'er fail me.... Ye friends who read this, I bid you mix your wine, and before death comes, crown your temples with flowers, and drink.... All the rest the earth and fire consume after death." Probably we should be wrong in tracing to the teachings of Epicurus, even in their vulgarized popular form, the theory that the value of life is to be estimated by the material pleasure it has to offer. A man's theory of life is largely a matter of temperament or constitution. He may find support for it in the teachings of philosophy, but he is apt to choose a philosophy which suits his way of thinking rather than to let his views of life be determined by abstract philosophic teachings. The men whose epitaphs we have just read would probably have been hedonists if Epicurus had never lived. It is interesting to note in passing that holding this conception of life naturally presupposes the acceptance of one of the notions of death which we considered above--that it ends all.

In another connection, a year or two ago, I had occasion to speak of the literary merit of some of these metrical epitaphs,[52] of their interest for us as specimens of the literary compositions of the common people, and of their value in indicating the æsthetic taste of the average Roman. It may not be without interest here to speak of the literary form of some of them a little more at length than was possible in that connection. Latin has always been, and continues to be among modern peoples, a favored language for epitaphs and dedications. The reasons why it holds its favored position are not far to seek. It is vigorous and concise. Then again in English and in most modern languages the order which words may take in a given sentence is in most cases inexorably fixed by grammatical necessity. It was not so with Latin. Its highly inflected character made it possible, as we know, to arrange the words which convey an idea in various orders, and these different groupings of the same words gave different shades of meaning to the sentence, and different emotional effects are secured by changing the sequence in which the minor conceptions are presented. By putting contrasted words side by side, or at corresponding points in the sentence, the impression is heightened. When a composition takes the form of verse the possibilities in the way of contrast are largely increased. The high degree of perfection to which Horace brought the balancing and interlocking of ideas in some of his Odes, illustrates the great advantage which the Latin poet had over the English writer because of the flexibility of the medium of expression which he used. This advantage was the Roman's birthright, and lends a certain distinction even to the verses of the people, which we are discussing here. Certain other stylistic qualities of these metrical epitaphs, which are intended to produce somewhat the same effects, will not seem to us so admirable. I mean alliteration, play upon words, the acrostic arrangement, and epigrammatic effects. These literary tricks find little place in our serious verse, and the finer Latin poets rarely indulge in them. They seem to be especially out of place in an epitaph, which should avoid studied effects and meretricious devices. But writers in the early stages of a literature and common people of all periods find a pleasure in them. Alliteration, onomatopœia, the pun, and the play on words are to be found in all the early Latin poets, and they are especially frequent with literary men like Plautus and Terence, Pacuvius and Accius, who wrote for the stage, and therefore for the common people. One or two illustrations of the use of these literary devices may be sufficient. A little girl at Rome, who died when five years old, bore the strange name of Mater, or Mother, and on her tombstone stands the sentiment:[53] "Mater I was by name, mater I shall not be by law." "Sepulcrum hau pulcrum pulcrai feminae" of the famous Claudia inscription,[54] Professor Lane cleverly rendered "Site not sightly of a sightly dame." Quite beyond my power of translating into English, so as to reproduce its complicated play on words, is the appropriate epitaph of the rhetorician, Romanius Iovinus:[55]

"Docta loqui doctus quique loqui docuit."

A great variety of verses is used in the epitaphs, but the dactylic hexameter and the elegiac are the favorites. The stately character of the hexameter makes it a suitable medium in which to express a serious sentiment, while the sudden break in the second verse of the elegiac couplet suggests the emotion of the writer. The verses are constructed with considerable regard for technique. Now and then there is a false quantity, an unpleasant sequence, or a heavy effect, but such blemishes are comparatively infrequent. There is much that is trivial, commonplace, and prosaic in these productions of the common people, but now and then one comes upon a phrase, a verse, or a whole poem which shows strength or grace or pathos. An orator of the late period, not without vigor, writes upon his tombstone:[56] "I have lived blessed by the gods, by friends, by letters."

(Vixi beatus dis, amicis, literis.)

A rather pretty, though not unusual, sentiment occurs in an elegiac couplet to a young girl,[57] in which the word amoena is the adjective, meaning "pleasant to see," in the first, while in the second verse it is the girl's name: "As a rose is amoena when it blooms in the early spring time, so was I Amoena to those who saw me."

(Ut rosa amoena homini est quom primo tempore floret. Quei me viderunt, seic Amoena fui.)

There is a touch of pathos in the inscription which a mother put on the stone of her son:[58] "A sorrowing mother has set up this monument to a son who has never caused her any sorrow, except that he is no more," and in this tribute of a husband:[59] "Out of my slender means now that the end has come, my wife, all that I could do, this gift, a small small one for thy deserts, have I made." The epitaph of a little girl, named Felicia, or Kitty, has this sentiment in graceful verse:[60] "Rest lightly upon thee the earth, and over thy grave the fragrant balsam grow, and roses sweet entwine thy buried bones." Upon the stone of a little girl who bore the name of Xanthippe, and the nickname Iaia, is an inscription with one of two pretty conceits and phrases. With it we may properly bring to an end our brief survey of these verses of the common people of Rome. In a somewhat free rendering it reads in part:[61] "Whether the thought of death distress thee or of life, read to the end. Xanthippe by name, yclept also Iaia by way of jest, escapes from sorrow since her soul from the body flies. She rests here in the soft cradle of the earth,... comely, charming, keen of mind, gay in discourse. If there be aught of compassion in the gods above, bear her to the sun and light."

II. Their Dedicatory and Ephemeral Verses

In the last paper we took up for consideration some of the Roman metrical epitaphs. These compositions, however, do not include all the productions in verse of the common people of Rome. On temples, altars, bridges, statues, and house walls, now and then, we find bits of verse. Most of the extant dedicatory lines are in honor of Hercules, Silvanus, Priapus, and the Cæsars. Whether the two famous inscriptions to Hercules by the sons of Vertuleius and by Mummius belong here or not it is hard to say. At all events, they were probably composed by amateurs, and have a peculiar interest for us because they belong to the second century B.C., and therefore stand near the beginning of Latin letters; they show us the language before it had been perfected and adapted to literary purposes by an Ennius, a Virgil, and a Horace, and they are written in the old native Saturnian verse, into which Livius Andronicus, "the Father of Latin literature," translated the Odyssey. Consequently they show us the language before it had gained in polish and lost in vigor under the influence of the Greeks. The second of these two little poems is a finger-post, in fact, at the parting of the ways for Roman civilization. It was upon a tablet let into the wall of the temple of Hercules, and commemorates the triumphant return to Rome of Mummius, the conqueror of Corinth. It points back to the good old days of Roman contempt for Greek art, and ignorance of it, for Mummius, in his stupid indifference to the beautiful monuments of Corinth, made himself the typical Philistine for all time. It points forward to the new Greco-Roman civilization of Italy, because the works of art which Mummius is said to have brought back with him, and the Greeks who probably followed in his train, augmented that stream of Greek influence which in the next century or two swept through the peninsula.

In the same primitive metre as these dedications is the Song of the Arval Brothers, which was found engraved on a stone in the grove of the goddess Dea Dia, a few miles outside of Rome. This hymn the priests sang at the May festival of the goddess, when the farmers brought them the first fruits of the earth. It has no intrinsic literary merit, but it carries us back beyond the great wars with Carthage for supremacy in the western Mediterranean, beyond the contest with Pyrrhus for overlordship in Southern Italy, beyond the struggle for life with the Samnites in Central Italy, beyond even the founding of the city on the Tiber, to a people who lived by tilling the soil and tending their flocks and herds.

But we have turned away from the dedicatory verses. On the bridges which span our streams we sometimes record the names of the commissioners or the engineers, or the bridge builders responsible for the structure. Perhaps we are wise in thinking these prosaic inscriptions suitable for our ugly iron bridges. Their more picturesque stone structures tempted the Romans now and then to drop into verse, and to go beyond a bare statement of the facts of construction. Over the Anio in Italy, on a bridge which Narses, the great general of Justinian, restored, the Roman, as he passed, read in graceful verse:[62] "We go on our way with the swift-moving waters of the torrent beneath our feet, and we delight on hearing the roar of the angry water. Go then joyfully at your ease, Quirites, and let the echoing murmur of the stream sing ever of Narses. He who could subdue the unyielding spirit of the Goths has taught the rivers to bear a stern yoke."

It is an interesting thing to find that the prettiest of the dedicatory poems are in honor of the forest-god Silvanus. One of these poems, Titus Pomponius Victor, the agent of the Cæsars, left inscribed upon a tablet[63] high up in the Grecian Alps. It reads: "Silvanus, half-enclosed in the sacred ash-tree, guardian mighty art thou of this pleasaunce in the heights. To thee we consecrate in verse these thanks, because across the fields and Alpine tops, and through thy guests in sweetly smelling groves, while justice I dispense and the concerns of Cæsar serve, with thy protecting care thou guidest us. Bring me and mine to Rome once more, and grant that we may till Italian fields with thee as guardian. In guerdon therefor will I give a thousand mighty trees." It is a pretty picture. This deputy of Cæsar has finished his long and perilous journeys through the wilds of the North in the performance of his duties. His face is now turned toward Italy, and his thoughts are fixed on Rome. In this "little garden spot," as he calls it, in the mountains he pours out his gratitude to the forest-god, who has carried him safely through dangers and brought him thus far on his homeward way, and he vows a thousand trees to his protector. It is too bad that we do not know how the vow was to be paid--not by cutting down the trees, we feel sure. One line of Victor's little poem is worth quoting in the original. He thanks Silvanus for conducting him in safety "through the mountain heights, and through Tuique luci suave olentis hospites." Who are the _hospites_? The wild beasts of the forests, we suppose. Now _hospites_ may, of course, mean either "guests" or "hosts," and it is a pretty conceit of Victor's to think of the wolves and bears as the guests of the forest-god, as we have ventured to render the phrase in the translation given above. Or, are they Victor's hosts, whose characters have been so changed by Silvanus that Victor has had friendly help rather than fierce attacks from them?

A very modern practice is revealed by a stone found near the famous temple of Æsculapius, the god of healing, at Epidaurus in Argolis, upon which two ears are shown in relief, and below them the Latin couplet:[64] "Long ago Cutius Gallus had vowed these

ears to thee, scion of Phœbus, and now he has put them here, for thou hast healed his ears." It is an ancient ex-voto, and calls to mind on the one hand the cult of Æsculapius, which Walter Pater has so charmingly portrayed in Marius the Epicurean, and on the other hand it shows us that the practice of setting up ex-votos, of which one sees so many at shrines and in churches across the water to-day, has been borrowed from the pagans. A pretty bit of sentiment is suggested by an inscription[65] found near the ancient village of Ucetia in Southern France: "This shrine to the Nymphs have I built, because many times and oft have I used this spring when an old man as well as a youth."

All of the verses which we have been considering up to this point have come down to us more or less carefully engraved upon stone, in honor of some god, to record some achievement of importance, or in memory of a departed friend. But besides these formal records of the past, we find a great many hastily scratched or painted sentiments or notices, which have a peculiar interest for us because they are the careless effusions or unstudied productions of the moment, and give us the atmosphere of antiquity as nothing else can do. The stuccoed walls of the houses, and the sharp-pointed stylus which was used in writing on wax tablets offered too strong a temptation for the lounger or passer-by to resist. To people of this class, and to merchants advertising their wares, we owe the three thousand or more graffiti found at Pompeii. The ephemeral inscriptions which were intended for practical purposes, such as the election notices, the announcements of gladiatorial contests, of houses to rent, of articles lost and for sale, are in prose, but the lovelorn lounger inscribed his sentiments frequently in verse, and these verses deserve a passing notice here. One man of this class in his erotic ecstasy writes on the wall of a Pompeian basilica:[66] "May I perish if I'd wish to be a god without thee." That hope sprang eternal in the breast of the Pompeian lover is illustrated by the last two lines of this tragic declaration:[67]

"If you can and won't, Give me hope no more. Hope you foster and you ever Bid me come again to-morrow. Force me then to die Whom you force to live A life apart from you. Death will be a boon, Not to be tormented. Yet what hope has snatched away To the lover hope gives back."

This effusion has led another passer-by to write beneath it the Delphic sentiment: "May the man who shall read this never read anything else." The symptoms of the ailment in its most acute form are described by some Roman lover in the verses which he has left us on the wall of Caligula's palace, on the Palatine:[68]

"No courage in my heart, No sleep to close my eyes, A tide of surging love Throughout the day and night."

This seems to come from one who looks upon the lover with a sympathetic eye, but who is himself fancy free:

"Whoever loves, good health to him, And perish he who knows not how, But doubly ruined may he be Who will not yield to love's appeal."[69]

The first verse of this little poem,

"Quisquis amat valeat, pereat qui nescit amare,"

represented by the first couplet of the English rendering, calls to mind the swinging refrain which we find a century or two later in the _Pervigilium Veneris_, that last lyrical outburst of the pagan world, written for the eve of the spring festival of Venus:

"Cras amet qui nunquam amavit quique amavit eras amet."

(To-morrow he shall love who ne'er has loved And who has loved, to-morrow he shall love.)

An interesting study might be made of the favorite types of feminine beauty in the Roman poets. Horace sings of the "golden-haired" Pyrrhas, and Phyllises, and Chloes, and seems to have had an admiration for blondes, but a poet of the common people, who has recorded his opinion on this subject in the atrium of a Pompeian house, shows a more catholic taste, although his freedom of judgment is held in some constraint:

"My fair girl has taught me to hate Brunettes with their tresses of black. I will hate if I can, but if not, 'Gainst my will I must love them also."[70]

On the other hand, one Pompeian had such an inborn dread of brunettes that, whenever he met one, he found it necessary to take an appropriate antidote, or prophylactic:

"Whoever loves a maiden dark By charcoal dark is he consumed. When maiden dark I light upon I eat the saving blackberry."[71]

These amateur poets do not rely entirely upon their own Muse, but borrow from Ovid, Propertius, or Virgil, when they recall sentiments in those writers which express their feelings. Sometimes it is a tag, or a line, or a couplet which is taken, but the borrowings are woven into the context with some skill. The poet above who is under compulsion from his blonde sweetheart, has taken the second half of his production verbatim from Ovid, and for the first half of it has modified a line of Propertius. Other writers have set down their sentiments in verse on more prosaic subjects. A traveller on his way to the capital has scribbled these lines on the wall, perhaps of a wine-shop where he stopped for refreshment:[72]

"Hither have we come in safety. Now I hasten on my way, That once more it may be mine To behold our Lares, Rome."

At one point in a Pompeian street, the eye of a straggler would catch this notice in doggerel verse:[73]

"Here's no place for loafers. Lounger, move along!"

On the wall of a wine-shop a barmaid has thus advertised her wares:[74]

"Here for a cent is a drink, Two cents brings something still better. Four cents in all, if you pay, Wine of Falernum is yours."

It must have been a lineal descendant of one of the parasites of Plautus who wrote:[75]

"A barbarian he is to me At whose house I'm not asked to dine."

Here is a sentiment which sounds very modern:

"The common opinion is this: That property should be divided."[76]

This touch of modernity reminds one of another group of verses which brings antiquity into the closest possible touch with some present-day practices. The Romans, like ourselves, were great travellers and sightseers, and the marvels of Egypt in particular appealed to them, as they do to us, with irresistible force. Above all, the great statue of Memnon, which gave forth a strange sound when it was struck by the first rays of the rising sun, drew travellers from far and near. Those of us who know the Mammoth Cave, Niagara Falls, the Garden of the Gods, or some other of our natural wonders, will recall how fond a certain class of visitors are of immortalizing themselves by scratching their names or a sentiment on the walls or the rocks which form these marvels. Such inscriptions We find on the temple walls in Egypt--three of them appear on the statue of Memnon, recording in verse the fact that the writers had visited the statue and heard the voice of the god at sunrise. One of these Egyptian travellers, a certain Roman lady journeying up the Nile, has scratched these verses on a wall of the temple at Memphis:[77]

"The pyramids without thee have I seen, My brother sweet, and yet, as tribute sad, The bitter tears have poured adown my cheek, And sadly mindful of thy absence now I chisel here this melancholy note."

Then follow the name and titles of the absent brother, who is better known to posterity from these scribbled lines of a Cook's tourist than from any official records which have come down to us. All of these pieces of popular poetry which we have been discussing thus far were engraved on stone, bronze, stucco, or on some other durable material. A very few bits of this kind of verse, from one to a half dozen lines in length, have come down to us in literature. They have the unique distinction, too, of being specimens of Roman folk poetry, and some of them are found in the most unlikely places. Two of them are preserved by a learned commentator on the Epistles of Horace. They carry us back to our school-boy days. When we read

"The plague take him who's last to reach me,"[78]

we can see the Roman urchin standing in the market-place, chanting the magic formula, and opposite him the row of youngsters on tiptoe, each one waiting for the signal to run across the intervening space and be the first to touch their comrade. What visions of early days come back to us--days when we clasped hands in a circle and danced about one or two children placed in the centre of the ring, and chanted in unison some refrain, upon reading in the same commentator to Horace a ditty which runs:[79]

"King shall you be If you do well. If you do ill You shall not be."

The other bits of Roman folk poetry which we have are most of them preserved by Suetonius, the gossipy biographer of the Cæsars. They recall very different scenes. Cæsar has returned in triumph to Rome, bringing in his train the trousered Gauls, to mingle on the street with the toga-clad Romans. He has even had the audacity to enroll some of these strange peoples in the Roman senate, that ancient body of dignity and convention, and the people chant in the streets the ditty:[80]

"Cæsar leads the Gauls in triumph, In the senate too he puts them. Now they've donned the broad-striped toga And have laid aside their breeches."

Such acts as these on Cæsar's part led some political versifier to write on Cæsar's statue a couplet which contrasted his conduct with that of the first great republican, Lucius Brutus:

"Brutus drove the kings from Rome, And first consul thus became. This man drove the consuls out, And at last became the king."[81]

We may fancy that these verses played no small part in spurring on Marcus Brutus to emulate his ancestor and join the conspiracy against the tyrant. With one more bit of folk poetry, quoted by Suetonius, we may bring our sketch to an end. Germanicus Cæsar, the flower of the imperial family, the brilliant general and idol of the people, is suddenly stricken with a mortal illness. The crowds throng the streets to hear the latest news from the sick-chamber of their hero. Suddenly the rumor flies through the streets that the crisis is past, that Germanicus will live, and the crowds surge through the public squares chanting:

"Saved now is Rome, Saved too the land, Saved our Germanicus."[82]

The Origin of the Realistic Romance among the Romans

One of the most fascinating and tantalizing problems of literary history concerns the origin of prose fiction among the Romans. We can trace the growth of the epic from its infancy in the third century before Christ as it develops in strength in the poems of Nævius, Ennius, and Cicero until it reaches its full stature in the _Æneid_, and then we can see the decline of its vigor in the _Pharsalia_, the _Punica_, the _Thebais_, and _Achilleis_, until it practically dies a natural death in the mythological and historical poems of Claudian. The way also in which tragedy, comedy, lyric poetry, history, biography, and the other types of literature in prose and verse came into existence and developed among the Romans can be followed with reasonable success. But the origin and early history of the novel is involved in obscurity. The great realistic romance of Petronius of the first century of our era is without a legally recognized ancestor and has no direct descendant. The situation is the more surprising when we recall its probable size in its original form. Of course only a part of it has come down to us, some one hundred and ten pages in all. Its great size probably proved fatal to its preservation in its complete form, or at least contributed to that end, for it has been estimated that it ran from six hundred to nine hundred pages, being longer, therefore, than the average novel of Dickens and Scott. Consequently we are not dealing with a bit of ephemeral literature, but with an elaborate composition of a high degree of excellence, behind which we should expect to find a long line of development. We are puzzled not so much by the utter absence of anything in the way of prose fiction before the time of Petronius as by the difficulty of establishing any satisfactory logical connection between these pieces of literature and the romance of Petronius. We are bewildered, in fact, by the various possibilities which the situation presents. The work shows points of similarity with several antecedent forms of composition, but the gaps which lie in any assumed line of descent are so great as to make us question its correctness.

If we call to mind the present condition of this romance and those characteristic features of it which are pertinent to the question at issue, the nature of the problem and its difficulty also will be apparent at once. Out of the original work, in a rather fragmentary form, only four or five main episodes are extant, one of which is the brilliant story of the Dinner of Trimalchio. The action takes place for the most part in Southern Italy, and the principal characters are freedmen who have made their fortunes and degenerate freemen who are picking up a precarious living by their wits. The freemen, who are the central figures in the novel, are involved in a great variety of experiences, most of them of a disgraceful sort, and the story is a story of low life. Women play an important rôle in the narrative, more important perhaps than they do in any other kind of ancient literature--at least their individuality is more marked. The efficient motif is erotic. I say the efficient, because the conventional motif which seems to account for all the misadventures of the anti-hero Encolpius is the wrath of an offended deity. A great part of the book has an atmosphere of satire about it which piques our curiosity and baffles us at the same time, because it is hard to say how much of this element is inherent in the subject itself, and how much of it lies in the intention of the author. It is the characteristic of parvenu society to imitate smart society to the best of its ability, and its social functions are a parody of the like events in the upper set. The story of a dinner party, for instance, given by such a _nouveau riche_ as Trimalchio, would constantly remind us by its likeness and its unlikeness, by its sins of omission and commission, of a similar event in correct society. In other words, it would be a parody on a proper dinner, even if the man who described the event knew nothing about the usages of good society, and with no ulterior motive in mind set down accurately the doings of his upstart characters. For instance, when Trimalchio's chef has three white pigs driven into the dining-room for the ostensible purpose of allowing the guests to pick one out for the next course, with the memory of our own monkey breakfasts and

horseback dinners in mind, we may feel that this is a not improbable attempt on the part of a Roman parvenu to imitate his betters in giving a dinner somewhat out of the ordinary. Members of the smart set at Rome try to impress their guests by the value and weight of their silver plate. Why shouldn't the host of our story adopt the more direct and effective way of accomplishing the same object by having the weight of silver engraved on each article? He does so. It is a very natural thing for him to do. In good society they talk of literature and art. Why isn't it natural for Trimalchio to turn the conversation into the same channels, even if he does make Hannibal take Troy and does confuse the epic heroes and some late champions of the gladiatorial ring?

In other words, much of that which is satirical in Petronius is so only because we are setting up in our minds a comparison between the doings of his rich freedmen and the requirements of good taste and moderation. But it seems possible to detect a satirical or a cynical purpose on the part of the author carried farther than is involved in the choice of his subject and the realistic presentation of his characters. Petronius seems to delight in putting his most admirable sentiments in the mouths of contemptible characters. Some of the best literary criticism we have of the period, he presents through the medium of the parasite rhetorician Agamemnon. That happy phrase characterizing Horace's style, "curiosa felicitas," which has perhaps never been equalled in its brevity and appositeness, is coined by the incorrigible poetaster Eumolpus. It is he too who composes and recites the two rather brilliant epic poems incorporated into the _Satirae_, one of which is received with a shower of stones by the bystanders. The impassioned eulogy of the careers of Democritus, Chrysippus, Lysippus, and Myron, who had endured hunger, pain, and weariness of body and mind for the sake of science, art, and the good of their fellow-men, and the diatribe against the pursuit of comfort and pleasure which characterized the people of his own time, are put in the mouth of the same _roué_ Eumolpus.

These situations have the true Horatian humor about them. The most serious and systematic discourse which Horace has given us, in his Satires, on the art of living, comes from the crack-brained Damasippus, who has made a failure of his own life. In another of his poems, after having set forth at great length the weaknesses of his fellow-mortals, Horace himself is convicted of being inconsistent, a slave to his passions, and a victim of hot temper by his own slave Davus. We are reminded again of the literary method of Horace in his Satires when we read the dramatic description of the shipwreck in Petronius. The blackness of night descends upon the water; the little bark which contains the hero and his friends is at the mercy of the sea; Lichas, the master of the vessel, is swept from the deck by a wave, Encolpius and his comrade Giton prepare to die in each other's embrace, but the tragic scene ends with a ridiculous picture of Eumolpus bellowing out above the roar of the storm a new poem which he is setting down upon a huge piece of parchment. Evidently Petronius has the same dread of being taken too seriously which Horace shows so often in his Satires. The cynical, or at least unmoral, attitude of Petronius is brought out in a still more marked way at the close of this same passage. Of those upon the ill-fated ship the degenerates Encolpius, Giton, and Eumolpus, who have wronged Lichas irreparably, escape, while the pious Lichas meets a horrible death. All this seems to make it clear that not only does the subject which Petronius has treated inevitably involve a satire upon contemporary society, but that the author takes a satirical or cynical attitude toward life.

Another characteristic of the story is its realism. There are no marvellous adventures, and in fact no improbable incidents in it. The author never obtrudes his own personality upon us, as his successor Apuleius sometimes does, or as Thackeray has done. We know what the people in the story are like, not from the author's description of them, but from their actions, from the subjects about which they talk, and from the way in which they talk. Agamemnon converses as a rhetorician might talk, Habinnas like a millionnaire stone-cutter, and Echion like a rag-dealer, and their language and style are what we should expect from men of their standing in society and of their occupations. The conversations of Trimalchio and his freedmen guests are not witty, and their jests are not clever. This adherence to the true principles of realism is the more noteworthy in the case of so brilliant a writer as Petronius, and those of us who recall some of the preternaturally clever conversations in the pages of Henry James and other contemporary novelists may feel that in this respect he is a truer artist than they are.

The novel of Petronius has one other characteristic which is significant, if we attempt to trace the origin of this type of literature. It is cast in the prose-poetic form, that is, passages in verse are inserted here and there in the narrative. In a few cases they are quoted, but for the most part they are the original compositions of the novelist. They range in length from couplets to poems of three hundred lines. Sometimes they form an integral part of the narrative, or again they illustrate a point, elaborate an idea in poetry, or are exercises in verse.

We have tried to bring out the characteristic features of this romance in order that we may see what the essential elements are of the problem which faces one in attempting to explain the origin of the type of literature represented by the work of Petronius. What was there in antecedent literature which will help us to understand the appearance on Italian soil in the first century of our era of a long erotic story of adventure, dealing in a realistic way with every-day life, marked by a satirical tone and with a leaning toward the

prose-poetic form? This is the question raised by the analysis, which we have made above, of the characteristics of the story. We have no ambitious hope of solving it, yet the mere statement of a puzzling but interesting problem is stimulating to the imagination and the intellect, and I am tempted to take up the subject because the discovery of certain papyri in Egypt within recent years has led to the formulation of a new theory of the origin of the romance of perilous adventure, and may, therefore, throw some light on the source of our realistic novel of every-day life. My purpose, then, is to speak briefly of the different genres of literature of the earlier period with which the story of Petronius may stand in some direct relation, or from which the suggestion may have come to Petronius for his work. Several of these lines of possible descent have been skilfully traced by others. In their views here and there I have made some modifications, and I have called attention to one or two types of literature, belonging to the earlier period and heretofore unnoticed in this connection, which may help us to understand the appearance of the realistic novel.

It seems a far cry from this story of sordid motives and vulgar action to the heroic episodes of epic poetry, and yet the _Satirae_ contain not a few more or less direct suggestions of epic situations and characters. The conventional motif of the story of Petronius is the wrath of an offended deity. The narrative in the _Odyssey_ and the _Æneid_ rests on the same basis. The ship of their enemy Lichas on which Encolpius and his companions are cooped up reminds them of the cave of the Cyclops; Giton hiding from the town-crier under a mattress is compared to Ulysses underneath the sheep and clinging to its wool to escape the eye of the Cyclops, while the woman whose charms engage the attention of Encolpius at Croton bears the name of Circe. It seems to be clear from these reminiscences that Petronius had the epic in mind when he wrote his story, and his novel may well be a direct or an indirect parody of an epic narrative. Rohde in his analysis of the serious Greek romance of the centuries subsequent to Petronius has postulated the following development for that form of story: Travellers returning from remote parts of the world told remarkable stories of their experiences. Some of these stories took a literary form in the _Odyssey_ and the Tales of the Argonauts. They appeared in prose, too, in narratives like the story of Sinbad the Sailor, of a much later date. A more definite plot and a greater dramatic intensity were given to these tales of adventure by the addition of an erotic element which often took the form of two separated lovers. Some use is made of this element, for instance, in the relations of Odysseus and Penelope, perhaps in the episode of Æneas and Dido, and in the story of Jason and Medea. The intrusion of the love motif into the stories told of demigods and heroes, so that the whole narrative turns upon it, is illustrated by such tales in the Metamorphoses of Ovid as those of Pyramus and Thisbe, Pluto and Proserpina, or Meleager and Atalanta. The love element, which may have been developed in this way out of its slight use in the epic, and the element of adventure form the basis of the serious Greek romances of Antonius Diogenes, Achilles Tatius, and the other writers of the centuries which follow Petronius.

Before trying to connect the _Satirae_ with a serious romance of the type just mentioned, let us follow another line of descent which leads us to the same objective point, viz., the appearance of the serious story in prose. We have been led to consider the possible connection of this kind of prose fiction with the epic by the presence in both of them of the love element and that of adventure. But the Greek novel has another rather marked feature. It is rhetorical, and this quality has suggested that it may have come, not from the epic, but from the rhetorical exercise. Support has been given to this theory within recent years by the discovery in Egypt of two fragments of the Ninos romance. The first of these fragments reveals Ninos, the hero, pleading with his aunt Derkeia, the mother of his sweetheart, for permission to marry his cousin. All the arguments in support of his plea and against it are put forward and balanced one against the other in a very systematic way. He wins over Derkeia. Later in the same fragment the girl pleads in a somewhat similar fashion with Thambe, the mother of Ninos. The second fragment is mainly concerned with the campaigns of Ninos. Here we have the two lovers, probably separated by the departure of Ninos for the wars, while the hero, at least, is exposed to the danger of the campaign.

The point was made after the text of this find had been published that the large part taken in the tale by the carefully balanced arguments indicated that the story grew out of exercises in argumentation in the rhetorical schools.[83] The elder Seneca has preserved for us in his _Controversiae_ specimens of the themes which were set for students in these schools. The student was asked to imagine himself in a supposed dilemma and then to discuss the considerations which would lead him to adopt the one or the other line of conduct. Some of these situations suggest excellent dramatic possibilities, conditions of life, for instance, where suicide seemed justifiable, misadventures with pirates, or a turn of affairs which threatened a woman's virtue. Before the student reached the point of arguing the case, the story must be told, and out of these narratives of adventure, told at the outset to develop the dilemma, may have grown the romance of adventure, written for its own sake. The story of Ninos has a peculiar interest in connection with this theory, because it was probably very short, and consequently may give us the connecting link between the rhetorical exercise and the long novel of the later period, and because it is the earliest known serious romance. On the back of the papyrus which contains it are some farm accounts of the year 101 A.D. Evidently by that time the roll had become waste paper, and the story itself may have been composed a century or even two centuries earlier. So far as this second theory is concerned, we

may raise the question in passing whether we have any other instance of a genre of literature growing out of a school-boy exercise. Usually the teacher adapts to his purpose some form of creative literature already in existence.

Leaving this objection out of account for the moment, the romance of love and perilous adventure may possibly be then a lineal descendant either of the epic or of the rhetorical exercise. Whichever of these two views is the correct one, the discovery of the Ninos romance fills in a gap in one theory of the origin of the realistic romance of Petronius, and with that we are here concerned. Before the story of Ninos was found, no serious romance and no title of such a romance anterior to the time of Petronius was known. This story, as we have seen, may well go back to the first century before Christ, or at least to the beginning of our era. It is conceivable that stories like it, but now lost, existed even at an earlier date. Now in the century, more or less, which elapsed between the assumed date of the appearance of these Greek narratives and the time of Petronius, the extraordinary commercial development of Rome had created a new aristocracy--the aristocracy of wealth. In harmony with this social change the military chieftain and the political leader who had been the heroes of the old fiction gave way to the substantial man of affairs of the new, just as Thaddeus of Warsaw has yielded his place in our present-day novels to Silas Lapham, and the bourgeois erotic story of adventure resulted, as we find it in the extant Greek novels of the second and third centuries of our era. If we can assume that this stage of development was reached before the time of Petronius we can think of his novel as a parody of such a romance. If, however, the bourgeois romance had not appeared before 50 A.D., then, if we regard his story as a parody of a prose narrative, it must be a parody of such an heroic romance as that of Ninos, or a parody of the longer heroic romances which developed out of the rhetorical narrative. If excavations in Egypt or at Herculaneum should bring to light a serious bourgeois story of adventure, they would furnish us the missing link. Until, or unless, such a discovery is made the chain of evidence is incomplete.

The two theories of the realistic romance which we have been discussing assume that it is a parody of some anterior form of literature, and that this fact accounts for the appearance of the satirical or cynical element in it. Other students of literary history, however, think that this characteristic was brought over directly from the Milesian tale[84] or the Menippean satire.[85] To how many different kinds of stories the term "Milesian tale" was applied by the ancients is a matter of dispute, but the existence of the short story before the time of Petronius is beyond question. Indeed we find specimens of it. In its commonest form it presented a single episode of every-day life. It brought out some human weakness or foible. Very often it was a story of illicit love. Its philosophy of life was: No man's honesty and no woman's virtue are unassailable. In all these respects, save in the fact that it presents one episode only, it resembles the _Satirae_ of Petronius. At least two stories of this type are to be found in the extant fragments of the novel of Petronius. One of them is related as a well-known tale by the poet Eumolpus, and the other is told by him as a personal experience. More than a dozen of them are imbedded in the novel of Apuleius, the _Metamorphoses_, and modern specimens of them are to be seen in Boccaccio and in Chaucer. In fact they are popular from the twelfth century down to the eighteenth. Long before the time of Petronius they occur sporadically in literature. A good specimen, for instance, is found in a letter commonly attributed to Æschines in the fourth century B.C. As early as the first century before Christ collections of them had been made and translated into Latin. This development suggests an interesting possible origin of the realistic romance. In such collections as those just mentioned of the first century B.C., the central figures were different in the different stories, as is the case, for instance, in the Canterbury Tales. Such an original writer as Petronius was may well have thought of connecting these different episodes by making them the experiences of a single individual. The Encolpius of Petronius would in that case be in a way an ancient Don Juan. If we compare the Arabian Nights with one of the groups of stories found in the Romances of the Round Table, we can see what this step forward would mean. The tales which bear the title of the Arabian Nights all have the same general setting and the same general treatment, and they are put in the mouth of the same story-teller. The Lancelot group of Round Table stories, however, shows a nearer approach to unity since the stories in it concern the same person, and have a common ultimate purpose, even if it is vague. When this point had been reached the realistic romance would have made its appearance. We have been thinking of the realistic novel as being made up of a series of Milesian tales. We may conceive of it, however, as an expanded Milesian tale, just as scholars are coming to think of the epic as growing out of a single hero-song, rather than as resulting from the union of several such songs.

To pass to another possibility, it is very tempting to see a connection between the _Satirae_ of Petronius and the prologue of comedy. Plautus thought it necessary to prefix to many of his plays an account of the incidents which preceded the action of the play. In some cases he went so far as to outline in the prologue the action of the play itself in order that the spectators might follow it intelligently. This introductory narrative runs up to seventy-six lines in the _Menaechmi_, to eighty-two in the _Rudens_, and to one hundred and fifty-two in the _Amphitruo_. In this way it becomes a short realistic story of every-day people, involving frequently a love intrigue, and told in the iambic senarius, the simplest form of verse. Following it is the more extended narrative of the comedy itself, with its incidents and dialogue. This combination of the condensed narrative in the story form, presented usually as a

monologue in simple verse, and the expanded narrative in the dramatic form, with its conversational element, may well have suggested the writing of a realistic novel in prose. A slight, though not a fatal, objection to this theory lies in the fact that the prologues to comedy subsequent to Plautus changed in their character, and contain little narrative. This is not a serious objection, for the plays of Plautus were still known to the cultivated in the later period.

The mime gives us still more numerous points of contact with the work of Petronius than comedy does.[86] It is unfortunate, both for our understanding of Roman life and for our solution of the question before us, that only fragments of this form of dramatic composition have come down to us. Even from them, however, it is clear that the mime dealt with every-day life in a very frank, realistic way. The new comedy has its conventions in the matter of situations and language. The matron, for instance, must not be presented in a questionable light, and the language is the conversational speech of the better classes. The mime recognizes no such restrictions in its portrayal of life. The married woman, her stupid husband, and her lover are common figures in this form of the drama, and if we may draw an inference from the lately discovered fragments of Greek mimes, the speech was that of the common people. Again, the new comedy has its limited list of stock characters--the old man, the tricky slave, the parasite, and the others which we know so well in Plautus and Terence, but as for the mime, any figure to be seen on the street may find a place in it--the rhetorician, the soldier, the legacy-hunter, the inn-keeper, or the town-crier. The doings of kings and heroes were parodied. We are even told that a comic Hector and Achilles were put on the stage, and the gods did not come off unscathed. All of these characteristic features of the mime remind us in a striking way of the novel of Petronius. His work, like the mime, is a realistic picture of low life which presents a great variety of characters and shows no regard for conventional morals. It is especially interesting to notice the element of parody, which we have already observed in Petronius, in both kinds of literary productions. The theory that Petronius may have had the composition of his _Satirae_ suggested to him by plays of this type is greatly strengthened by the fact that the mime reached its highest point of popularity at the court in the time of Nero, in whose reign Petronius lived. In point of fact Petronius refers to the mime frequently. One of these passages is of peculiar significance in this connection. Encolpius and his comrades are entering the town of Croton and are considering what device they shall adopt so as to live without working. At last a happy idea occurs to Eumolpus, and he says: "Why don't we construct a mime?" and the mime is played, with Eumolpus as a fabulously rich man at the point of death, and the others as his attendants. The rôle makes a great hit, and all the vagabonds in the company play their assumed parts in their daily life at Croton with such skill that the legacy-hunters of the place load them with attentions and shower them with presents. This whole episode, in fact, may be thought of as a mime cast in the narrative form, and the same conception may be applied with great plausibility to the entire story of Encolpius.

We have thus far been attacking the question with which we are concerned from the side of the subject-matter and tone of the story of Petronius. Another method of approach is suggested by the Menippean satire,[87] the best specimens of which have come down to us in the fragments of Varro, one of Cicero's contemporaries. These satires are an _olla podrida_, dealing with all sorts of subjects in a satirical manner, sometimes put in the dialogue form and cast in a _mélange_ of prose and verse. It is this last characteristic which is of special interest to us in this connection, because in the prose of Petronius verses are freely used. Sometimes, as we have observed above, they form an integral part of the narrative, and again they merely illustrate or expand a point touched on in the prose. If it were not aside from our immediate purpose it would be interesting to follow the history of this prose-poetical form from the time of Petronius on. After him it does not seem to have been used very much until the third and fourth centuries of our era. However, Martial in the first century prefixed a prose prologue to five books of his Epigrams, and one of these prologues ends with a poem of four lines. The several books of the _Silvae_ of Statius are also preceded by prose letters of dedication. That strange imitation of the _Aulularia_ of Plautus, of the fourth century, the _Querolus_, is in a form half prose and half verse. A sentence begins in prose and runs off into verse, as some of the epitaphs also do. The Epistles of Ausonius of the same century are compounded of prose and a great variety of verse. By the fifth and sixth centuries, a _mélange_ of verse or a combination of prose and verse is very common, as one can see in the writings of Martianus Capella, Sidonius Apollinaris, Ennodius, and Boethius. It recurs again in modern times, for instance in Dante's _La Vita Nuova_, in Boccaccio, _Aucassin et Nicolette_, the _Heptameron_, the _Celtic Ballads_, the _Arabian Nights_, and in _Alice in Wonderland_.

A little thought suggests that the prose-poetic form is a natural medium of expression. A change from prose to verse, or from one form of verse to another, suggests a change in the emotional condition of a speaker or writer. We see that clearly enough illustrated in tragedy or comedy. In the thrilling scene in the _Captives of Plautus_, for example, where Tyndarus is in mortal terror lest the trick which he has played on his master, Hegio, may be discovered, and he be consigned to work in chains in the quarries, the verse is the trochaic septenarius. As soon as the suspense is over, it drops to the iambic senarius. If we should arrange the commoner Latin verses in a sequence according to the emotional effects which they produce, at the bottom of the series would stand the iambic senarius. Above that would come trochaic verse, and we should rise to higher planes of exaltation as we read the

anapæstic, or cretic, or bacchiac. The greater part of life is commonplace. Consequently the common medium for conversation or for the narrative in a composition like comedy made up entirely of verse is the senarius. Now this form of verse in its simple, almost natural, quantitative arrangement is very close to prose, and it would be a short step to substitute prose for it as the basis of the story, interspersing verse here and there to secure variety, or when the emotions were called into play, just as lyric verses are interpolated in the iambic narrative. In this way the combination of different kinds of verse in the drama, and the prosimetrum of the Menippean satire and of Petronius, may be explained, and we see a possible line of descent from comedy and this form of satire to the _Satirae_.

These various theories of the origin of the romance of Petronius--that it may be related to the epic, to the serious heroic romance, to the bourgeois story of adventure developed out of the rhetorical exercise, to the Milesian tale, to the prologue of comedy, to the _verse-mélange_ of comedy or the mime, or to the prose-poetical Menippean satire--are not, of necessity, it seems to me, mutually exclusive. His novel may well be thought of as a parody of the serious romance, with frequent reminiscences of the epic, a parody suggested to him by comedy and its prologue, by the mime, or by the short cynical Milesian tale, and cast in the form of the Menippean satire; or, so far as subject-matter and realistic treatment are concerned, the suggestion may have come directly from the mime, and if we can accept the theory of some scholars who have lately studied the mime, that it sometimes contained both prose and verse, we may be inclined to regard this type of literature as the immediate progenitor of the novel, even in the matter of external form, and leave the Menippean satire out of the line of descent. Whether the one or the other of these explanations of its origin recommends itself to us as probable, it is interesting to note, as we leave the subject, that, so far as our present information goes, the realistic romance seems to have been the invention of Petronius.

Diocletian's Edict and the High Cost of Living

The history of the growth of paternalism in the Roman Empire is still to be written. It would be a fascinating and instructive record. In it the changes in the character of the Romans and in their social and economic conditions would come out clearly. It would disclose a strange mixture of worthy and unworthy motives in their statesmen and politicians, who were actuated sometimes by sympathy for the poor, sometimes by a desire for popular favor, by an honest wish to check extravagance or immorality, or by the fear that the discontent of the masses might drive them into revolution. We should find the Roman people, recognizing the menace to their simple, frugal way of living which lay in the inroads of Greek civilization, and turning in their helplessness to their officials, the censors, to protect them from a demoralization which, by their own efforts, they could not withstand. We should find the same officials preaching against race suicide, extravagant living, and evasion of public duties, and imposing penalties and restrictions in the most autocratic fashion on men of high and low degree alike who failed to adopt the official standards of conduct. We should read of laws enacted in the same spirit, laws restricting the number of guests that might be entertained on a single occasion, and prescribing penalties for guests and host alike, if the cost of a dinner exceeded the statutory limit. All this belongs to the early stage of paternal government. The motives were praiseworthy, even if the results were futile.

With the advent of the Gracchi, toward the close of the second century before our era, moral considerations become less noticeable, and paternalism takes on a more philanthropic and political character. We see this change reflected in the land laws and the corn laws. To take up first the free distribution of land by the state, in the early days of the Republic colonies of citizens were founded in the newly conquered districts of Italy to serve as garrisons on the frontier. It was a fair bargain between the citizen and the state. He received land, the state, protection. But with Tiberius Gracchus a change comes in. His colonists were to be settled in peaceful sections of Italy; they were to receive land solely because of their poverty. This was socialism or state philanthropy. Like the agrarian bill of Tiberius, the corn law of Gaius Gracchus, which provided for the sale of grain below the market price, was a paternal measure inspired in part by sympathy for the needy. The political element is clear in both cases also. The people who were thus favored by assignments of land and of food naturally supported the leaders who assisted them. Perhaps the extensive building of roads which Gaius Gracchus carried on should be mentioned in this connection. The ostensible purpose of these great highways, perhaps their primary purpose, was to develop Italy and to facilitate communication between different parts of the peninsula, but a large number of men was required for their construction, and Gaius Gracchus may well have taken the matter up, partly for the purpose of furnishing work to the unemployed. Out of these small beginnings developed the socialistic policy of later times. By the middle of the first century B.C., it is said that there were three hundred and twenty thousand persons receiving doles of corn from the state, and, if the people could look to the government for the necessities of life, why might they not hope to have it supply their less pressing needs? Or, to put it in another way, if one politician won their support by giving them corn, why might not another increase his popularity by providing them with amusement and with the comforts of life? Presents of oil and

clothing naturally follow, the giving of games and theatrical performances at the expense of the state, and the building of porticos and public baths. As the government and wealthy citizens assumed a larger measure of responsibility for the welfare of the citizens, the people became more and more dependent upon them and less capable of managing their own affairs. An indication of this change we see in the decline of local self-government and the assumption by the central administration of responsibility for the conduct of public business in the towns of Italy. This last consideration suggests another phase of Roman history which a study of paternalism would bring out--I mean the effect of its introduction on the character of the Roman people.

The history of paternalism in Rome, when it is written, might approach the subject from several different points. If the writer were inclined to interpret history on the economic side, he might find the explanation of the change in the policy of the government toward its citizens in the introduction of slave labor which, under the Republic, drove the free laborer to the wall and made him look to the state for help, in the decline of agriculture, and the growth of capitalism. The sociologist would notice the drift of the people toward the cities and the sudden massing there of large numbers of persons who could not provide for themselves and in their discontent might overturn society. The historian who concerns himself with political changes mainly, would notice the socialistic legislation of the Gracchi and their political successors and would connect the growth of paternalism with the development of democracy. In all these explanations there would be a certain measure of truth.

But I am not planning here to write a history of paternalism among the Romans. That is one of the projects which I had been reserving for the day when the Carnegie Foundation should present me with a wooden sword and allow me to retire from the arena of academic life. But, alas! the trustees of that beneficent institution, by the revision which they have lately made of the conditions under which a university professor may withdraw from active service, have in their wisdom put off that day of academic leisure to the Greek Kalends, and my dream vanishes into the distance with it.

Here I wish to present only an episode in this history which we have been discussing, an episode which is unique, however, in ancient and, so far as I know, in modern history. Our knowledge of the incident comes from an edict of the Emperor Diocletian, and this document has a direct bearing on a subject of present-day discussion, because it contains a diatribe against the high cost of living and records the heroic attempt which the Roman government made to reduce it. In his effort to bring prices down to what he considered a normal level, Diocletian did not content himself with such half-measures as we are trying in our attempts to suppress combinations in restraint of trade, but he boldly fixed the maximum prices at which beef, grain, eggs, clothing, and other articles could be sold, and prescribed the penalty of death for any one who disposed of his wares at a higher figure. His edict is a very comprehensive document, and specifies prices for seven hundred or eight hundred different articles. This systematic attempt to regulate trade was very much in keeping with the character of Diocletian and his theory of government. Perhaps no Roman emperor, with the possible exception of Hadrian, showed such extraordinary administrative ability and proposed so many sweeping social reforms as Diocletian did. His systematic attempt to suppress Christianity is a case in point, and in the last twenty years of his reign he completely reorganized the government. He frankly introduced the monarchical principle, fixed upon a method of succession to the throne, redivided the provinces, established a carefully graded system of officials, concerned himself with court etiquette and dress, and reorganized the coinage and the system of taxation. We are not surprised therefore that he had the courage to attack this difficult question of high prices, and that his plan covered almost all the articles which his subjects would have occasion to buy.

It is almost exactly two centuries since the first fragments of the edict dealing with the subject were brought to light. They were discovered in Caria, in 1709, by William Sherard, the English consul at Smyrna. Since then, from time to time, other fragments of tablets containing parts of the edict have been found in Egypt, Asia Minor, and Greece. At present portions of twenty-nine copies of it are known. Fourteen of them are in Latin and fifteen in Greek. The Greek versions differ from one another, while the Latin texts are identical, except for the stone-cutters' mistakes here and there. These facts make it clear that the original document was in Latin, and was translated into Greek by the local officials of each town where the tablets were set up. We have already noticed that specimens of the edict have not been found outside of Egypt, Greece, and Asia Minor, and this was the part of the Roman world where Diocletian ruled. Scholars have also observed that almost all the manufactured articles which are mentioned come from Eastern points. From these facts it has been inferred that the edict was to apply to the East only, or perhaps more probably that Diocletian drew it up for his part of the Roman world, and that before it could be applied to the West it was repealed.

From the pieces which were then known, a very satisfactory reconstruction of the document was made by Mommsen and published in the _Corpus of Latin Inscriptions_.[88]

The work of restoration was like putting together the parts of a picture puzzle where some of the pieces are lacking. Fragments are still coming to light, and possibly we may have the complete text some day. As it is, the introduction is complete, and perhaps four-fifths of the list of articles with prices attached are extant. The introduction opens with a stately list of the titles of the two Augusti and the two Cæsars, which fixes the date of the proclamation as 301 A.D. Then follows a long recital of the circumstances which have led the government to adopt this drastic method of controlling prices. This introduction is one of the most extraordinary pieces of bombast, mixed metaphors, loose syntax, and incoherent expressions that Latin literature possesses. One is tempted to infer from its style that it was the product of Diocletian's own pen. He was a man of humble origin, and would not live in Rome for fear of being laughed at on account of his plebeian training. The florid and awkward style of these introductory pages is exactly what we should expect from a man of such antecedents.

It is very difficult to translate them into intelligible English, but some conception of their style and contents may be had from one or two extracts. In explaining the situation which confronts the world, the Emperor writes: "For, if the raging avarice ... which, without regard for mankind, increases and develops by leaps and bounds, we will not say from year to year, month to month, or day to day, but almost from hour to hour, and even from minute to minute, could be held in check by some regard for moderation, or if the welfare of the people could calmly tolerate this mad license from which, in a situation like this, it suffers in the worst possible fashion from day to day, some ground would appear, perhaps, for concealing the truth and saying nothing; ... but inasmuch as there is only seen a mad desire without control, to pay no heed to the needs of the many, ... it seems good to us, as we look into the future, to us who are the fathers of the people, that justice intervene to settle matters impartially, in order that that which, long hoped for, humanity itself could not bring about may be secured for the common government of all by the remedies which our care affords.... Who is of so hardened a heart and so untouched by a feeling for humanity that he can be unaware, nay that he has not noticed, that in the sale of wares which are exchanged in the market, or dealt with in the daily business of the cities, an exorbitant tendency in prices has spread to such an extent that the unbridled desire of plundering is held in check neither by abundance nor by seasons of plenty!"

If we did not know that this was found on tablets sixteen centuries old, we might think that we were reading a newspaper diatribe against the cold-storage plant or the beef trust. What the Emperor has decided to do to remedy the situation he sets forth toward the end of the introduction. He says: "It is our pleasure, therefore, that those prices which the subjoined written summary specifies, be held in observance throughout all our domain, that all may know that license to go above the same has been cut off.... It is our pleasure (also) that if any man shall have boldly come into conflict with this formal statute, he shall put his life in peril.... In the same peril also shall he be placed who, drawn along by avarice in his desire to buy, shall have conspired against these statutes. Nor shall he be esteemed innocent of the same crime who, having articles necessary for daily life and use, shall have decided hereafter that they can be held back, since the punishment ought to be even heavier for him who causes need than for him who violates the laws."

The lists which follow are arranged in three columns which give respectively the article, the unit of measure, and the price.[89]

Frumenti K■M■ Hordei K■M■ unum ■■ c(entum) Centenum sive sicale " " " ■■ sexa(ginta) Mili pisti " " " ■■ centu(m) Mili integri " " ■■ quinquaginta'

The first item (frumentum) is wheat, which is sold by the K■M■ (kastrensis modius=18½ quarts), but the price is lacking. Barley is sold by the kastrensis modius at ■■ centum (centum denarii = 43 cents) and so on.

Usually a price list is not of engrossing interest, but the tables of Diocletian furnish us a picture of material conditions throughout the Empire in his time which cannot be had from any other source, and for that reason deserve some attention. This consideration emboldens me to set down some extracts in the following pages from the body of the edict:

Extracts from Diocletian's List of Maximum Prices

I

In the tables given here the Latin and Greek names of the articles listed have been turned into English. The present-day accepted measure of quantity--for instance, the bushel or the quart--has been substituted for the ancient unit, and the corresponding price for the modern unit of measure is given. Thus barley was to be sold by the kastrensis modius (=18½ quarts) at 100 denarii (=43.5 cents). At this rate a bushel of barley would have brought 74.5 cents. For convenience in reference the numbers of the chapters and of the items adopted in the text of Mommsen are used here. Only selected articles are given.

(Unit of Measure, the Bushel)

1 Wheat 2 Barley 74.5 cents 3 Rye 45 " 4 Millet, ground 74.5 " 6 Millet, whole 37 " 7 Spelt, hulled 74.5 " 8 Spelt, not hulled 22.5 " 9 Beans, ground 74.5 " 10 Beans, not ground 45 " 11 Lentils 74.5 " 12-16 Peas, various sorts 45-74.5 " 17 Oats 22.5 " 31 Poppy seeds $1.12 34 Mustard $1.12 35 Prepared mustard, quart 6 "

II

(Unit of Measure, the Quart)

1a Wine from Picenum 22.5 cents 2 Wine from Tibur 22.5 " 7 Wine from Falernum 22.5 " 10 Wine of the country 6 " 11-12 Beer 1.5-3 "

III

(Unit of Measure, the Quart)

1a Oil, first quality 30.3 cents 2 Oil, second quality 18 " 5 Vinegar 4.3 " 8 Salt, bushel 74.5 " 10 Honey, best 30.3 " 11 Honey, second quality 15 "

IV

(Unit, Unless Otherwise Noted, Pound Avoirdupois)

1a Pork 7.3 cents 2 Beef 4.9 " 3 Goat's flesh or mutton 4.9 " 6 Pig's liver 9.8 " 8 Ham, best 12 " 21 Goose, artificially fed (1) 87 " 22 Goose, not artificially fed (1) 43.5 " 23 Pair of fowls 36 " 29 Pair of pigeons 10.5 " 47 Lamb 7.3 " 48 Kid 7.3 " 50 Butter 9.8 "

V

(Unit, the Pound)

1a Sea fish with sharp spines 14.6 cents 2 Fish, second quality 9.7 " 3 River fish, best quality 7.3 " 4 Fish, second quality 4.8 " 5 Salt fish 8.3 " 6 Oysters (by the hundred) 43.5 " 11 Dry cheese 7.3 " 12 Sardines 9.7 "

VI

1 Artichokes, large (5) 4.3 cents 7 Lettuce, best (5) 1.7 " 9 Cabbages, best (5) 1.7 " 10 Cabbages, small (10) 1.7 " 18 Turnips, large (10) 1.7 " 24 Watercress, per bunch of 20 4.3 " 28 Cucumbers, first quality (10) 1.7 " 29 Cucumbers, small (20) 1.7 " 34 Garden asparagus, per bunch (25) 2.6 " 35 Wild asparagus (50) 1.7 " 38 Shelled green beans, quart 3 " 43 Eggs (4) 1.7 " 46 Snails, large (20) 1.7 " 65 Apples, best (10) 1.7 " 67 Apples, small (40) 1.7 " 78 Figs, best (25) 1.7 " 80 Table grapes (2.8 pound) 1.7 " 95 Sheep's milk, quart 6 " 96 Cheese, fresh, quart 6 "

VII

(Where (k) Is Set Down the Workman Receives His "Keep" Also)

1a Manual laborer (k) 10.8 cents 2 Bricklayer (k) 21.6 " 3 Joiner (interior work) (k) 21.6 " 3a Carpenter (k) 21.6 " 4 Lime-burner (k) 21.6 " 5 Marble-worker (k) 26 " 6 Mosaic-worker (fine work) (k) 26 " 7 Stone-mason (k) 21.6 " 8 Wall-painter (k) 32.4 " 9 Figure-painter (k) 64.8 " 10 Wagon-maker (k) 21.6 " 11 Smith (k) 21.6 " 12 Baker (k) 21.6 " 13 Ship-builder, for sea-going ships (k) 26 " 14 Ship-builder, for river boats (k) 21.6 " 17 Driver, for camel, ass, or mule (k) 10.8 " 18 Shepherd (k) 8.7 " 20 Veterinary, for cutting, and straightening hoofs, per animal 2.6 " 22 Barber, for each man .9 cent 23 Sheep-shearer, for each sheep (k) .9 " 24a Coppersmith, for work in brass, per pound 3.5 cents 25 Coppersmith, for work in copper, per pound 2.6 " 26 Coppersmith for finishing vessels, per pound 2.6 " 27 Coppersmith, for finishing figures and statues, per pound 1.7 " 29 Maker of statues, etc., per day (k) 32.4 " 31 Water-carrier, per day (k) 10.9 " 32 Sewer-cleaner, per day (k) 10.9 " 33 Knife-grinder, for old sabre 10.9 " 36 Knife-grinder, for double axe 3.5 " 39 Writer, 100 lines best writing 10.9 " 40 Writer, 100 lines ordinary writing 8.7 " 41 Document writer for record of 100 lines 4.3 " 42 Tailor, for cutting out and finishing overgarment of first quality 26.1 " 43 Tailor, for cutting out and finishing overgarment of second quality 17.4 " 44 For a large cowl 10.9 " 45 For a small cowl 8.7 " 46 For trousers 8.7 " 52 Felt

horse-blanket, black or white, 3 pounds weight 43.5 " 53 Cover, first quality, with embroidery, 3 pounds weight $1.09 64 Gymnastic teacher, per pupil, per month 21.6 cents 65 Employee to watch children, per child, per month 21.6 " 66 Elementary teacher, per pupil, per month 21.6 " 67 Teacher of arithmetic, per pupil, per month 32.6 " 68 Teacher of stenography, per pupil, per month 32.6 " 69 Writing-teacher, per pupil, per month 21.6 " 70 Teacher of Greek, Latin, geometry, per pupil, per month 87 " 71 Teacher of rhetoric, per pupil, per month $1.09 72 Advocate or counsel for presenting a case $1.09 73 For finishing a case $4.35 74 Teacher of architecture, per pupil, per month 43.5 cents 75 Watcher of clothes in public bath, for each patron .9 cent

VIII

1a Hide, Babylonian, first quality $2.17 2 Hide, Babylonian, second quality $1.74 4 Hide, Phœnician (?) 43 cents 6a Cowhide, unworked, first quality $2.17 7 Cowhide, prepared for shoe soles $3.26 9 Hide, second quality, unworked $1.31 10 Hide, second quality, worked $2.17 11 Goatskin, large, unworked 17 cents 12 Goatskin, large, worked 22 " 13 Sheepskin, large, unworked 8.7 " 14 Sheepskin, large, worked 18 " 17 Kidskin, unworked 4.3 " 18 Kidskin, worked 7 " 27 Wolfskin, unworked 10.8 " 28 Wolfskin, worked 17.4 " 33 Bearskin, large, unworked 43 " 39 Leopardskin, unworked $4.35 41 Lionskin, worked $4.35

IX

5a Boots, first quality, for mule-drivers and peasants, per pair, without nails 52 cents 6 Soldiers' boots, without nails 43 " 7 Patricians' shoes 65 " 8 Senatorial shoes 43 " 9 Knights' shoes 30.5 " 10 Women's boots 26 " 11 Soldiers' shoes 32.6 " 15 Cowhide shoes for women, double soles 21.7 " 16 Cowhide shoes for women, single soles 13 " 20 Men's slippers 26 " 21 Women's slippers 21.7 "

XVI

8a Sewing-needle, finest quality 1.7 cents 9 Sewing-needle, second quality .9 cent

XVII

1 Transportation, 1 person, 1 mile .9 cent 2 Rent for wagon, 1 mile 5 cents 3 Freight charges for wagon containing up to 1,200 pounds, per mile 8.7 " 4 Freight charges for camel load of 600 pounds, per mile 3.5 " 5 Rent for laden ass, per mile 1.8 " 7 Hay and straw, 3 pounds .9 cent

XVIII

1a Goose-quills, per pound 43.5 cents 11a Ink, per pound 5 " 12 Reed pens from Paphos (10) 1.7 " 13 Reed pens, second quality (20) 1.7 "

XIX

1 Military mantle, finest quality $17.40 2 Undergarment, fine $8.70 3 Undergarment, ordinary $5.44 5 White bed blanket, finest sort, 12 pounds weight $6.96 7 Ordinary cover, 10 pounds weight $2.18 28 Laodicean Dalmatica [_i.e., a tunic with sleeves_] $8.70 36 British mantle, with cowl $26.08 39 Numidian mantle, with cowl $13.04 42 African mantle, with cowl $6.52 51 Laodicean storm coat, finest quality $21.76 60 Gallic soldier's cloak $43.78 61 African soldier's cloak $2.17

XX

1a For an embroiderer, for embroidering a half-silk undergarment, per ounce 87 cents 5 For a gold embroiderer, if he work in gold, for finest work, per ounce $4.35 9 For a silk weaver, who works on stuff half-silk, besides "keep," per day 11 cents

XXI

2 For working Tarentine or Laodicean or other foreign wool, with keep, per pound 13 cents 5 A linen weaver for fine work, with keep, per day 18 "

XXII

4 Fuller's charges for a cloak or mantle, new 13 cents 6 Fuller's charges for a woman's coarse Dalmatica, new 21.7 " 9 Fuller's charges for a new half-silk undergarment 76 " 22 Fuller's charges for a new Laodicean mantle. 76 "

XXIII

1 White silk, per pound $52.22

XXIV

1 Genuine purple silk, per pound $652.20 2 Genuine purple wool, per pound $217.40 3 Genuine light purple wool, per pound $139.26 8 Nicæan scarlet wool, per pound $6.53

XXV

1 Washed Tarentine wool, per pound 76 cents 2 Washed Laodicean wool, per pound 65 " 3 Washed wool from Asturia, per pound 43.5 " 4 Washed wool, best medium quality, per pound 21.7 " 5 All other washed wools, per pound 10.8 "

XXVI

7a Coarse linen thread, first quality, per pound $3.13 8 Coarse linen thread, second quality, per pound $2.61 9 Coarse linen thread, third quality, per pound $1.96

XXX

1 Pure gold in bars or in coined pieces, per pound 50,000 denarii 3 Artificers, working in metal, per pound $21.76 4 Gold-beaters, per pound $13.06

Throughout the lists, as one may see, articles are grouped in a systematic way. First we find grain and vegetables; then wine, oil, vinegar, salt, honey, meat, fish, cheese, salads, and nuts. After these articles, in chapter VII, we pass rather unexpectedly to the wages of the field laborer, the carpenter, the painter, and of other skilled and unskilled workmen. Then follow leather, shoes, saddles, and other kinds of raw material and manufactured wares until we reach a total of more than eight hundred articles. As we have said, the classification is in the main systematic, but there are some strange deviations from a systematic arrangement. Eggs, for instance, are in table VI with salads, vegetables, and fruits. Bücher, who has discussed some phases of this price list, has acutely surmised that perhaps the tables in whole, or in part, were drawn up by the directors of imperial factories and magazines. The government levied tribute "in kind," and it must have provided depots throughout the provinces for the reception of contributions from its subjects. Consequently in making out these tables it would very likely call upon the directors of these magazines for assistance, and each of them in making his report would naturally follow to some extent the list of articles which the imperial depot controlled by him, carried in stock. At all events, we see evidence of an expert hand in the list of linens, which includes one hundred and thirty-nine articles of different qualities.

As we have noticed in the passage quoted from the introduction, it is unlawful for a person to charge more for any of his wares than the amount specified in the law. Consequently, the prices are not normal, but maximum prices. However, since the imperial lawgivers evidently believed that the necessities of life were being sold at exorbitant rates, the maximum which they fixed was very likely no greater than the prevailing market price. Here and there, as in the nineteenth chapter of the document, the text is given in tablets from two or more places. In such cases the prices are the same, so that apparently no allowance was made for the cost of carriage, although with some articles, like oysters and sea-fish, this item must have had an appreciable value, and it certainly should have been taken into account in fixing the prices of "British mantles" or "Gallic soldiers' cloaks" of chapter XIX. The quantities for which prices are given are so small--a pint of wine, a pair of fowls, twenty snails, ten apples, a bunch of asparagus--that evidently Diocletian had the "ultimate consumer" in mind, and fixed the retail price in his edict. This is fortunate for us, because it helps us to get at the cost of living in the early part of the fourth century. There is good reason for believing that the system of barter prevailed much more generally at that time than it does to-day. Probably the farmer often exchanged his grain, vegetables, and eggs for shoes and cloth, without receiving or paying out money, so that the money prices fixed for his products would not affect him in every transaction as they would affect the present-day farmer. The unit of money which is used throughout the edict is the copper denarius, and fortunately the value of a pound of fine gold is given as 50,000 denarii. This fixes the value of the denarius as .4352 cent, or approximately four-tenths of a cent. It is implied in the introduction that the purpose of the law is to

protect the people, and especially the soldiers, from extortion, but possibly, as Bücher has surmised, the emperor may have wished to maintain or to raise the value of the denarius, which had been steadily declining because of the addition of alloy to the coin. If this was the emperor's object, possibly the value of the denarius is set somewhat too high, but it probably does not materially exceed its exchange value, and in any case, the relative values of articles given in the tables are not affected.

The tables bring out a number of points of passing interest. From chapter II it seems to follow that Italian wines retained their ancient pre-eminence, even in the fourth century. They alone are quoted among the foreign wines. Table VI gives us a picture of the village market. On market days the farmer brings his artichokes, lettuce, cabbages, turnips, and other fresh vegetables into the market town and exposes them for sale in the public square, as the country people in Italy do to-day. The seventh chapter, in which wages are given, is perhaps of liveliest interest. In this connection we should bear in mind the fact that slavery existed in the Roman Empire, that owners of slaves trained them to various occupations and hired them out by the day or job, and that, consequently the prices paid for slave labor fixed the scale of wages. However, there was a steady decline under the Empire in the number of slaves, and competition with them in the fourth century did not materially affect the wages of the free laborer. It is interesting, in this chapter, to notice that the teacher and the advocate (Nos. 66-73) are classed with the carpenter and tailor. It is a pleasant passing reflection for the teacher of Greek and Latin to find that his predecessors were near the top of their profession, if we may draw this inference from their remuneration when compared with that of other teachers. It is worth observing also that the close association between the classics and mathematics, and their acceptance as the corner-stone of the higher training, to which we have been accustomed for centuries, seems to be recognized (VII, 70) even at this early date. We expect to find the physician mentioned with the teacher and advocate, but probably it was too much even for Diocletian's skill, in reducing things to a system, to estimate the comparative value of a physician's services in a case of measles and typhoid fever.

The bricklayer, the joiner, and the carpenter (VII, 2-3a), inasmuch as they work on the premises of their employer, receive their "keep" as well as a fixed wage, while the knife-grinder and the tailor (VII, 33, 42) work in their own shops, and naturally have their meals at home. The silk-weaver (XX, 9) and the linen-weaver (XXI, 5) have their "keep" also, which seems to indicate that private houses had their own looms, which is quite in harmony with the practices of our fathers. The carpenter and joiner are paid by the day, the teacher by the month, the knife-grinder, the tailor, the barber (VII, 22) by the piece, and the coppersmith (VII, 24a-27) according to the amount of metal which he uses. Whether the difference between the prices of shoes for the patrician, the senator, and the knight (IX, 7-9) represents a difference in the cost of making the three kinds, or is a tax put on the different orders of nobility, cannot be determined. The high prices set on silk and wool dyed with purple (XXIV) correspond to the pre-eminent position of that imperial color in ancient times. The tables which the edict contains call our attention to certain striking differences between ancient and modern industrial and economic conditions. Of course the list of wage-earners is incomplete. The inscriptions which the trades guilds have left us record many occupations which are not mentioned here, but in them and in these lists we miss any reference to large groups of men who hold a prominent place in our modern industrial reports--I mean men working in printing-offices, factories, foundries, and machine-shops, and employed by transportation companies. Nothing in the document suggests the application of power to the manufacture of articles, the assembling of men in a common workshop, or the use of any other machine than the hand loom and the mill for the grinding of corn. In the way of articles offered for sale, we miss certain items which find a place in every price-list of household necessities, such articles as sugar, molasses, potatoes, cotton cloth, tobacco, coffee, and tea. The list of stimulants (II) is, in fact, very brief, including as it does only a few kinds of wine and beer.

At the present moment, when the high cost of living is a subject which engages the attention of the economist, politician, and householder, as it did that of Diocletian and his contemporaries, the curious reader will wish to know how wages and the prices of food in 301 A.D. compare with those of to-day. In the two tables which follow, such a comparison is attempted for some of the more important articles and occupations.

Articles of Food[90]

Price in 301 A.D. Price in 1906 A.D.

Wheat, per bushel 33.6 cents $1.19[91] Rye, per bushel 45 " 79 cents[91] Beans, per bushel 45 " $3.20 Barley, per bushel 74.5 " 55 cents[91] Vinegar, per quart 4.3 " 5-7 " Fresh pork, per pound 7.3 " 14-16 " Beef, per pound 4.9 " { 9-12 " {15-18 " Mutton, per pound 4.9 " 13-16 " Ham, per pound 12 " 18-25 " Fowls, per pair 26 " Fowls, per pound 14-18 " Butter, per pound 9.8 " 26-32 " Fish, river, fresh, per pound 7.3 " 12-15 " Fish, sea, fresh, per pound 9-14 " 8-14 cents Fish, salt, per pound 8.3 " 8-15 " Cheese, per pound 7.3 " 17-20 " Eggs, per dozen 5.1 " 25-30 " Milk, cow's, per quart 6-8 " Milk, sheep's, per quart 6 "

Wages Per Day

Unskilled workman 10.8 cents (k)[92] $1.20-2.24[93] Bricklayer 21.6 " (k) 4.50-6.50 Carpenter 21.6 " (k) 2.50-4.00 Stone-mason 21.6 " (k) 3.70-4.90 Painter 32.4 " (k) 2.75-4.00 Blacksmith 21.6 " (k) 2.15-3.20 Ship-builder 21-26 " (k) 2.15-3.50

We are not so much concerned in knowing the prices of meat, fish, eggs, and flour in 301 and 1911 A.D. as we are in finding out whether the Roman or the American workman could buy more of these commodities with the returns for his labor. A starting point for such an estimate is furnished by the Eighteenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor, on the "Cost of Living and Retail Prices of Food" (1903), and by Bulletin No. 77 of the Bureau of Labor (1908). In the first of these documents (pp. 582, 583) the expenditure for rent, fuel, food, and other necessities of life in 11,156 normal American families whose incomes range from $200 to $1,200 per year is given. In the other report (p. 344 _f._) similar statistics are given for 1,944 English urban families. In the first case the average amount spent per year was $617, of which $266, or a little less than a half of the entire income, was used in the purchase of food. The statistics for England show a somewhat larger relative amount spent for food. Almost exactly one-third of this expenditure for the normal American family was for meat and fish.[94] Now, if we take the wages of the Roman carpenter, for instance, as 21 cents per day, and add one-fourth or one-third for his "keep," those of the same American workman as $2.50 to $4.00, it is clear that the former received only a ninth or a fifteenth as much as the latter, while the average price of pork, beef, mutton, and ham (7.3 cents) in 301 A.D. was about a third of the average (19.6 cents) of the same articles to-day. The relative averages of wheat, rye, and barley make a still worse showing for ancient times while fresh fish was nearly as high in Diocletian's time as it is in our own day. The ancient and modern prices of butter and eggs stand at the ratio of one to three and one to six respectively. For the urban workman, then, in the fourth century, conditions of life must have been almost intolerable, and it is hard to understand how he managed to keep soul and body together, when almost all the nutritious articles of food were beyond his means. The taste of meat, fish, butter, and eggs must have been almost unknown to him, and probably even the coarse bread and vegetables on which he lived were limited in amount. The peasant proprietor who could raise his own cattle and grain would not find the burden so hard to bear.

Only one question remains for us to answer. Did Diocletian succeed in his bold attempt to reduce the cost of living? Fortunately the answer is given us by Lactantius in the book which he wrote in 313-314 A.D., "On the Deaths of Those Who Persecuted (the Christians)." The title of Lactantius's work would not lead us to expect a very sympathetic treatment of Diocletian, the arch-persecutor, but his account of the actual outcome of the incident is hardly open to question. In Chapter VII of his treatise, after setting forth the iniquities of the Emperor in constantly imposing new burdens on the people, he writes: "And when he had brought on a state of exceeding high prices by his different acts of injustice, he tried to fix by law the prices of articles offered for sale. Thereupon, for the veriest trifles much blood was shed, and out of fear nothing was offered for sale, and the scarcity grew much worse, until, after the death of many persons, the law was repealed from mere necessity." Thus came to an end this early effort to reduce the high cost of living. Sixty years later the Emperor Julian made a similar attempt on a small scale. He fixed the price of corn for the people of Antioch by an edict. The holders of grain hoarded their stock. The Emperor brought supplies of it into the city from Egypt and elsewhere and sold it at the legal price. It was bought up by speculators, and in the end Julian, like Diocletian, had to acknowledge his inability to cope with an economic law.

Private Benefactions and Their Effect on the Municipal Life of the Romans

In the early days the authority of the Roman father over his wife, his sons, and his daughters was absolute. He did what seemed to him good for his children. His oversight and care extended to all the affairs of their lives. The state was modelled on the family and took over the autocratic power of the paterfamilias. It is natural to think of it, therefore, as a paternal government, and the readiness with which the Roman subordinated his own will and sacrificed his personal interests to those of the community seems to show his acceptance of this theory of his relation to the government. But this conception is correct in part only. A paternal government seeks to foster all the common interests of its people and to provide for their common needs. This the Roman state did not try to do, and if we think of it as a paternal government, in the ordinary meaning of that term, we lose sight of the partnership between state supervision and individual enterprise in ministering to the common needs and desires, which was one of the marked features of Roman life. In fact, the gratification of the individual citizen's desire for those things which he could not secure for himself depended in the Roman Empire, as it depends in this country, not solely on state support, but in part on state aid, and in part on private generosity. We see the truth of this very clearly in studying the history of the Roman city. The phase of Roman life which we have just noted may not fit into the ideas of Roman society which we have hitherto held, but we can understand it as no other people can, because in the United States and in England we are accustomed to the co-operation of private initiative and state action in the

establishment and maintenance of universities, libraries, museums, and all sorts of charitable institutions.

If we look at the growth of private munificence under the Republic, we shall see that citizens showed their generosity particularly in the construction of public buildings, partly or entirely at their own expense. In this way some of the basilicas in Rome and elsewhere which served as courts of justice and halls of exchange were constructed. The great Basilica Æmilia, for instance, whose remains may be seen in the Forum to-day, was constructed by an Æmilius in the second century before our era, and was accepted as a charge by his descendants to be kept in condition and improved at the expense of the Æmilian family. Under somewhat similar conditions Pompey built the great theatre which bore his name, the first permanent theatre to be built in Rome, and always considered one of the wonders of the city. The cost of this structure was probably covered by the treasure which he brought back from his campaigns in the East. In using the spoils of a successful war to construct buildings or memorials in Rome, he was following the example of Mummius, the conqueror of Corinth, and other great generals who had preceded him. The purely philanthropic motive does not bulk largely in these gifts to the citizens, because the people whose armies had won the victories were part owners at least of the spoils, and because the victorious leader who built the structure was actuated more by the hope of transmitting the memory of his achievements to posterity in some conspicuous and imperishable monument than by a desire to benefit his fellow citizens.

These two motives, the one egoistic and the other altruistic, actuated all the Roman emperors in varying degrees. The activity of Augustus in such matters comes out clearly in the record of his reign, which he has left us in his own words. This remarkable bit of autobiography, known as the "Deeds of the Deified Augustus," the Emperor had engraved on bronze tablets, placed in front of his mausoleum. The original has disappeared, but fortunately a copy of it has been found on the walls of a ruined temple at Ancyra, in Asia Minor, and furnishes us abundant proof of the great improvements which he made in the city of Rome. We are told in it that from booty he paid for the construction of the Forum of Augustus, which was some four hundred feet long, three hundred wide, and was surrounded by a wall one hundred and twenty feet high, covered on the inside with marble and stucco. Enclosed within it and built with funds coming from the same source was the magnificent temple of Mars the Avenger, which had as its principal trophies the Roman standards recovered from the Parthians. This forum and temple are only two items in the long list of public improvements which Augustus records in his imperial epitaph, for, as he proudly writes: "In my sixth consulship, acting under a decree of the senate, I restored eighty-two temples in the city, neglecting no temple which needed repair at the time." Besides the temples, he mentions a large number of theatres, porticos, basilicas, aqueducts, roads, and bridges which he built in Rome or in Italy outside the city.

But the Roman people had come to look for acts of generosity from their political as well as from their military leaders, and this factor, too, must be taken into account in the case of Augustus. In the closing years of the Republic, candidates for office and men elected to office saw that one of the most effective ways of winning and holding their popularity was to give public entertainments, and they vied with one another in the costliness of the games and pageants which they gave the people. The well-known case of Cæsar will be recalled, who, during his term as ædile, or commissioner of public works, bankrupted himself by his lavish expenditures on public improvements, and on the games, in which he introduced three hundred and twenty pairs of gladiators for the amusement of the people. In his book, "On the Offices," Cicero tells us of a thrifty rich man, named Mamercus, who aspired to public office, but avoided taking the ædileship, which stood in the regular sequence of minor offices, in order that he might escape the heavy outlay for public entertainment expected of the ædile. As a consequence, when later he came up for the consulship, the people punished him by defeating him at the polls. To check the growth of these methods of securing votes, Cicero, in his consulship, brought in a corrupt practices act, which forbade citizens to give gladiatorial exhibitions within two years of any election in which they were candidates. We may doubt if this measure was effective. The Roman was as clever as the American politician in accomplishing his purpose without going outside the law. Perhaps an incident in the life of Cicero's young friend, Curio, is a case in point. It was an old Roman custom to celebrate the ninth day after a burial as a solemn family festival, and some time in the second century before our era the practice grew up of giving gladiatorial contests on these occasions. The versatile Curio, following this practice, testified his respect for his father's memory by giving the people such elaborate games that he never escaped from the financial difficulties in which they involved him. However, this tribute of pious affection greatly enhanced his popularity, and perhaps did not expose him to the rigors of Cicero's law.

These gifts from generals, from distinguished citizens, and from candidates for office do not go far to prove a generous or philanthropic spirit on the part of the donors, but they show clearly enough that the practice of giving large sums of money to embellish the city, and to please the public, had grown up under the Republic, and that the people of Rome had come to regard it as the duty of their distinguished fellow citizens to beautify the city and minister to their needs and pleasures by generous private

contributions.

All these gifts were for the city of Rome, and for the people of the city, not for the Empire, nor for Italy. This is characteristic of ancient generosity or philanthropy, that its recipients are commonly the people of a single town, usually the donor's native town. It is one of many indications of the fact that the Roman thought of his city as the state, and even under the Empire he rarely extended the scope of his benefactions beyond the walls of a particular town. The small cities and villages throughout the West reproduced the capital in miniature. Each was a little world in itself. Each of them not only had its forum, its temples, colonnades, baths, theatres, and arenas, but also developed a political and social organization like that of the city of Rome. It had its own local chief magistrates, distinguished by their official robes and insignia of office, and its senators, who enjoyed the privilege of occupying special seats in the theatre, and it was natural that the common people at Ostia, Ariminum, or Lugudunum, like those at Rome, should expect from those whom fortune had favored some return for the distinctions which they enjoyed. In this way the prosperous in each little town came to feel a sense of obligation to their native place, and this feeling of civic pride and responsibility was strengthened by the same spirit of rivalry between different villages that the Italian towns of the Middle Ages seem to have inherited from their ancestors, a spirit of rivalry which made each one eager to surpass the others in its beauty and attractiveness. Perhaps there have never been so many beautiful towns in any other period in history as there were in the Roman Empire, during the second century of our era, and their attractive features--their colonnades, temples, fountains, and works of art--were due in large measure to the generosity of private citizens. We can make this statement with considerable confidence, because these benefactions are recorded for us on innumerable tablets of stone and bronze, scattered throughout the Empire.

These contributions not only helped to meet the cost of building temples, colonnades, and other structures, but they were often intended to cover a part of the running expenses of the city. This is one of the novel features of Roman municipal life. We can understand the motives which would lead a citizen of New York or Boston to build a museum or an arch in his native city. Such a structure would serve as a monument to him; it would give distinction to the city, and it would give him and his fellow citizens æsthetic satisfaction tion But if a rich New Yorker should give a large sum to mend the pavement in Union Square or extend the sewer system on Canal Street, a judicial inquiry into his sanity would not be thought out of place. But the inscriptions show us that rich citizens throughout the Roman Empire frequently made large contributions for just such unromantic purposes. It is unfortunate that a record of the annual income and expenses of some Italian or Gallic town has not come down to us. It would be interesting, for instance, to compare the budget of Mantua or Ancona, in the first century of our era, with that of Princeton or Cambridge in the twentieth. But, although we rarely know the sums which were expended for particular purposes, a mere comparison of the objects for which they were spent is illuminating. The items in the ancient budget which find no place in our own, and vice versa, are significant of certain striking differences between ancient and modern municipal life.

Common to the ancient and the modern city are expenditures for the construction and maintenance of public buildings, sewers, aqueducts, and streets, but with these items the parallelism ends. The ancient objects of expenditure which find no place in the budget of an American town are the repair of the town walls, the maintenance of public worship, the support of the baths, the sale of grain at a low price, and the giving of games and theatrical performances. It is very clear that the ancient legislator made certain provisions for the physical and spiritual welfare of his fellow citizens which find little or no place in our municipal arrangements to-day. If, among the sums spent for the various objects mentioned above, we compare the amounts set apart for religion and for the baths, we may come to the conclusion that the Roman read the old saying, "Cleanliness is next to godliness" in the amended form "Cleanliness is next above godliness." No city in the Empire seems to have been too small or too poor to possess public baths, and how large an item of annual expense their care was is clear from the fact that an article of the Theodosian code provided that cities should spend at least one-third of their incomes on the heating of the baths and the repair of the walls. The great idle population of the city of Rome had to be provided with food at public expense. Otherwise riot and disorder would have followed, but in the towns the situation was not so threatening, and probably furnishing grain to the people did not constitute a regular item of expense. So far as public entertainments were concerned, the remains of theatres and amphitheatres in Pompeii, Fiesole, Aries, Orange, and at many other places to-day furnish us visible evidence of the large sums which ancient towns must have spent on plays and gladiatorial games. In the city of Rome in the fourth century, there were one hundred and seventy-five days on which performances were given in the theatres, arenas, and amphitheatres.

We have been looking at the items which were peculiar to the ancient budget. Those which are missing from it are still more indicative, if possible, of differences between Roman character and modes of life and those of to-day. Provision was rarely made for schools, museums, libraries, hospitals, almshouses, or for the lighting of streets. No salaries were paid to city officials; no expenditure was made for police or for protection against fire, and the slaves whom every town owned probably took care of the

public buildings and kept the streets clean. The failure of the ancient city government to provide for educational and charitable institutions, means, as we shall see later, that in some cases these matters were neglected, that in others they were left to private enterprise. It appears strange that the admirable police and fire system which Augustus introduced into Rome was not adopted throughout the Empire, but that does not seem to have been the case, and life and property must have been exposed to great risks, especially on festival days and in the unlighted streets at night. The rich man could be protected by his bodyguard of clients, and have his way lighted at night by the torches which his slaves carried, but the little shopkeeper must have avoided the dark alleys or attached himself to the retinue of some powerful man. Some of us will recall in this connection the famous wall painting at Pompeii which depicts the riotous contest between the Pompeians and the people of the neighboring town of Nuceria, at the Pompeian gladiatorial games in 50 B.C., when stones were thrown and weapons freely used. What scenes of violence and disorder there must have been on such occasions as these, without systematic police surveillance, can be readily imagined.

The sums of money which an ancient or a modern city spends fall in two categories--the amounts which are paid out for permanent improvements, and the running expenses of the municipality. We have just been looking at the second class of expenditures, and our brief examination of it shows clearly enough that the ancient city took upon its shoulders only a small part of the burden which a modern municipality assumes. It will be interesting now to see how far the municipal outlay for running expenses was supplemented by private generosity, and to find out the extent to which the cities were indebted to the same source for their permanent improvements. A great deal of light is thrown on these two questions by the hundreds of stone and bronze tablets which were set up by donors themselves or by grateful cities to commemorate the gifts made to them. The responsibility which the rich Roman felt to spend his money for the public good was unequivocally stated by the poet Martial in one of his epigrams toward the close of the first century of our era. The speaker in the poem tells his friend Pastor why he is striving to be rich--not that he may have broad estates, rich appointments, fine wines, or troops of slaves, but "that he may give and build for the public good" ("ut donem, Pastor, et ædificem"), and this feeling of stewardship found expression in a steady outpouring of gifts in the interests of the people.

The practice of giving may well have started with the town officials. We have already noticed that in Rome, under the Republic, candidates for office, in seeking votes, and magistrates, in return for the honors paid them, not infrequently spent large sums on the people. In course of time, in the towns throughout the Empire this voluntary practice became a legal obligation resting on local officials. This fact is brought out in the municipal charter of Urso,[95] the modern Osuna, in Spain. Half of this document, engraved on tablets, was discovered in Spain about forty years ago, and makes a very interesting contribution to our knowledge of municipal life. A colony was sent out to Urso, in 44 B.C., by Julius Cæsar, under the care of Mark Antony, and the municipal constitution of the colony was drawn up by one of these two men. In the seventieth article, we read of the duumvirs, who were the chief magistrates: "Whoever shall be duumvirs, with the exception of those who shall have first been elected after the passage of this law, let the aforesaid during their magistracy give a public entertainment or plays in honor of the gods and goddesses Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, for four days, during the greater part of the day, so far as it may be done, at the discretion of the common councillors, and on these games and this entertainment let each one of them spend from his own money not less than two thousand sesterces." The article which follows in the document provides that the ædiles, or the officials next in rank, shall give gladiatorial games and plays for three days, and one day of races in the circus, and for these entertainments they also must spend not less than two thousand sesterces.

Here we see the modern practice reversed. City officials, instead of receiving a salary for their services, not only serve without pay, but are actually required by law to make a public contribution. It will be noticed that the law specified the minimum sum which a magistrate _must_ spend. The people put no limit on what he _might_ spend, and probably most of the duumvirs of Urso gave more than $80, or, making allowance for the difference in the purchasing value of money, $250, for the entertainment of the people. In fact a great many honorary inscriptions from other towns tell us of officials who made generous additions to the sum required by law. So far as their purpose and results go, these expenditures may be compared with the "campaign contributions" made by candidates for office in this country. There is a strange likeness and unlikeness between the two. The modern politician makes his contribution before the election, the ancient politician after it. In our day the money is expended largely to provide for public meetings where the questions of the day shall be discussed. In Roman times it was spent upon public improvements, and upon plays, dinners, and gladiatorial games. Among us public sentiment is averse to the expenditure of large sums to secure an election. The Romans desired and expected it, and those who were open-handed in this matter took care to have a record of their gifts set down where it could be read by all men.

On general grounds we should expect our system to have a better effect on the intelligence and character of the people, and to secure better officials. The discussion of public questions, even in a partisan way, brings them to the attention of the people, sets the people thinking, and helps to educate voters on political and economic matters. If we may draw an inference from the election posters in Pompeii, such subjects played a small part in a city election under the Empire. It must have been demoralizing, too, to a Pompeian or a citizen of Salona to vote for a candidate, not because he would make the most honest and able duumvir or ædile among the men canvassing for the office, but because he had the longest purse. How our sense of propriety would be shocked if the newly elected mayor of Hartford or Montclair should give a gala performance in the local theatre to his fellow-citizens or pay for a free exhibition by a circus troupe! But perhaps we should overcome our scruples and go, as the people of Pompeii did, and perhaps our consciences would be completely salved if the aforesaid mayor proceeded to lay a new pavement in Main Street, to erect a fountain on the Green, or stucco the city hall. Naturally only rich men could be elected to office in Roman towns, and in this respect the same advantages and disadvantages attach to the Roman system as we find in the practice which the English have followed up to the present time of paying no salary to members of the House of Commons, and in our own practice of letting our ambassadors meet a large part of their legitimate expenses.

The large gifts made to their native towns by rich men elected to public office set an example which private citizens of means followed in an extraordinary way. Sometimes they gave statues, or baths, or fountains, or porticos, and sometimes they provided for games, or plays, or dinners, or lottery tickets. Perhaps nothing can convey to our minds so clear an impression of the motives of the donors, the variety and number of the gifts, and their probable effect on the character of the people as to read two or three specimens of these dedicatory inscriptions. The citizens of Lanuvium, near Rome, set up a monument in honor of a certain Valerius, "because he cleaned out and restored the water courses for a distance of three miles, put the pipes in position again, and restored the two baths for men and the bath for women, all at his own expense."[96] A citizen of Sinuessa leaves this record: "Lucius Papius Pollio, the duumvir, to his father, Lucius Papius. Cakes and mead to all the citizens of Sinuessa and Cædici; gladiatorial games and a dinner for the people of Sinuessa and the Papian clan; a monument at a cost of 12,000 sesterces."[97] Such a catholic provision to suit all tastes should certainly have served to keep his father from being forgotten. A citizen of Beneventum lays claim to distinction because "he first scattered tickets among the people by means of which he distributed gold, silver, bronze, linen garments, and other things."[98] The people of Telesia, a little town in Campania, pay this tribute to their distinguished patron: "To Titus Fabius Severus, patron of the town, for his services at home and abroad, and because he, first of all those who have instituted games, gave at his own expense five wild beasts from Africa, a company of gladiators, and a splendid equipment, the senate and citizens have most gladly granted a statue."[99] The office of patron was a characteristic Roman institution. Cities and villages elected to this position some distinguished Roman senator or knight, and he looked out for the interests of the community in legal matters and otherwise.

This distinction was held in high esteem, and recipients of it often testified their appreciation by generous gifts to the town which they represented, or were chosen patrons because of their benefactions. This fact is illustrated in the following inscription from Spoletium: "Gaius Torasius Severus, the son of Gaius, of the Horatian tribe, quattuorvir with judicial power, augur, in his own name, and in the name of his son Publius Meclonius Proculus Torasianus, the pontiff, erected (this) on his land (?) and at his own expense. He also gave the people 250,000 sesterces to celebrate his son's birthday, from the income of which each year, on the third day before the Kalends of September, the members of the Common Council are to dine in public, and each citizen who is present is to receive eight _asses_. He also gave to the seviri Augustales, and to the priests of the Lares, and to the overseers of the city wards, 120,000 sesterces, in order that from the income of this sum they might have a public dinner on the same day. Him, for his services to the community, the senate has chosen patron of the town."[100] A town commonly showed its appreciation of what had been done for it by setting up a statue in honor of its benefactor, as was done in the case of Fabius Severus, and the public squares of Italian and provincial towns must have been adorned with many works of art of this sort. It amuses one to find at the bottom of some of the commemorative tablets attached to these statues, the statement that the man distinguished in this way, "contented with the honor, has himself defrayed the cost of the monument." To pay for a popular testimonial to one's generosity is indeed generosity in its perfect form. The statues themselves have disappeared along with the towns which erected them, but the tablets remain, and by a strange dispensation of fate the monument which a town has set up to perpetuate the memory of one of its citizens is sometimes the only record we have of the town's own existence.

The motives which actuated the giver were of a mixed character, as these memorials indicate. Sometimes it was desire for the applause of his fellow citizens, or for posthumous fame, which influenced a donor; sometimes civic pride and affection. In many cases it was the compelling force of custom, backed up now and then, as we can see from the inscriptions, by the urgent demands of the populace. Out of this last sentiment there would naturally grow a sense of the obligation imposed by the possession of

wealth, and this feeling is closely allied to pure generosity. In fact, it would probably be wrong not to count this among the original motives which actuated men in making their gifts, because the spirit of devotion to the state and to the community was a marked characteristic of Romans in the republican period.

The effects which this practice of giving had on municipal life and on the character of the people are not without importance and interest. The lavish expenditure expected of a magistrate and the ever-increasing financial obligations laid upon him by the central government made municipal offices such an intolerable burden that the charter of Urso of the first century A.D., which has been mentioned above, has to resort to various ingenious devices to compel men to hold them. The position of a member of a town council was still worse. He was not only expected to contribute generously to the embellishment and support of his native city, but he was also held responsible for the collection of the imperial taxes. As prosperity declined he found this an increasingly difficult thing to do, and seats in the local senate were undesirable. The central government could not allow the men responsible for its revenues to escape their responsibility. Consequently, it interposed and forced them to accept the honor. Some of them enlisted in the army, or even fled into the desert, but whenever they were found they were brought back to take up their positions again. In the fourth century, service in the common council was even made a penalty imposed upon criminals. Finally, it became hereditary, and it is an amusing but pathetic thing to find that this honor, so highly prized in the early period, became in the end a form of serfdom.

We have been looking at the effects of private generosity on official life. Its results for the private citizen are not so clear, but it must have contributed to that decline of independence and of personal responsibility which is so marked a feature of the later Empire. The masses contributed little, if anything, to the running expenses of government and the improvement of the city. The burdens fell largely upon the rich. It was a system of quasi-socialism. Those who had, provided for those who had not--not merely markets and temples, and colonnades, and baths, but oil for the baths, games, plays, and gratuities of money. Since their needs were largely met by others, the people lost more and more the habit of providing for themselves and the ability to do so. When prosperity declined, and the wealthy could no more assist them, the end came.

The objects for which donors gave their money seem to prove the essentially materialistic character of Roman civilization, because we must assume that those who gave knew the tastes of the people. Sometimes men like Pliny the Younger gave money for libraries or schools, but such gifts seem to have been relatively infrequent. Benefactions are commonly intended to satisfy the material needs or gratify the desire of the people for pleasure.

Under the old régime charity was unknown. There were neither almshouses nor hospitals, and scholars have called attention to the fact that even the doles of corn which the state gave were granted to citizens only. Mere residents or strangers were left altogether out of consideration, and they were rarely included within the scope of private benevolence. In the following chapter, in discussing the trades-guilds, we shall see that even they made no provision for the widow or orphan, or for their sick or disabled members. It was not until Christianity came that the poor and the needy were helped because of their poverty and need.

Some Reflections on Corporations and Trades-Guilds

In a recent paper on "Ancient and Modern Imperialism," read before the British Classical Association, Lord Cromer, England's late consul-general in Egypt, notes certain points of resemblance between the English and the Roman methods of dealing with alien peoples. With the Greeks no such points of contact exist, because, as he remarks, "not only was the imperial idea foreign to the Greek mind; the federal conception was equally strange." This similarity between the political character and methods of the Romans and Anglo-Saxons strikes any one who reads the history of the two peoples side by side. They show the same genius for government at home, and a like success in conquering and holding foreign lands, and in assimilating alien peoples. Certain qualities which they have in common contribute to these like results. Both the Roman and the Anglo-Saxon have been men of affairs; both have shown great skill in adapting means to an end, and each has driven straight at the immediate object to be accomplished without paying much heed to logic or political theory. A Roman statesman would have said "Amen!" to the Englishman's pious hope that "his countrymen might never become consistent or logical in politics." Perhaps the willingness of the average Roman to co-operate with his fellows, and his skill in forming an organization suitable for the purpose in hand, go farther than any of the other qualities mentioned above to account for his success in governing other peoples as well as his own nation.

Our recognition of these striking points of resemblance between the Romans and ourselves has come from a comparative study of the political life of the two peoples. But the likeness to each other of the Romans and Anglo-Saxons, especially in the matter of associating themselves together for a common object, is still more apparent in their methods of dealing with private affairs. A characteristic and amusing illustration of the working of this tendency among the Romans is furnished by the early history of

monasticism in the Roman world. When the Oriental Christian had convinced himself of the vanity of the world, he said: "It is the weakness of the flesh and the enticements of the wicked which tempt me to sin. Therefore I will withdraw from the world and mortify the flesh." This is the spirit which drove him into the desert or the mountains, to live in a cave with a lion or a wolf for his sole companion. This is the spirit which took St. Anthony into a solitary place in Egypt. It led St. Simeon Stylites to secure a more perfect sense of aloofness from the world, and a greater security from contact with it by spending the last thirty years of his life on the top of a pillar near Antioch. In the Western world, which was thoroughly imbued with the Roman spirit, the Christian who held the same view as his Eastern brother of the evil results flowing from intercourse with his fellow men, also withdrew from the world, but he withdrew in the company of a group of men who shared his opinions on the efficacy of a life of solitude. A delightful instance of the triumph of the principle of association over logic or theory! We Americans can understand perfectly the compelling force of the principle, even in such a case as this, and we should justify the Roman's action on the score of practical common sense. We have organizations for almost every conceivable political, social, literary, and economic purpose. In fact, it would be hard to mention an object for which it would not be possible to organize a club, a society, a league, a guild, or a union. In a similar way the Romans had organizations of capitalists and laborers, religious associations, political and social clubs, and leagues of veterans.

So far as organizations of capitalists are concerned, their history is closely bound up with that of imperialism. They come to our notice for the first time during the wars with Carthage, when Rome made her earliest acquisitions outside of Italy. In his account of the campaigns in Spain against Hannibal's lieutenants, Livy tells us[101] of the great straits to which the Roman army was reduced for its pay, food, and clothing. The need was urgent, but the treasury was empty, and the people poverty-stricken. In this emergency the prætor called a public meeting, laid before it the situation in Spain, and, appealing to the joint-stock companies to come to the relief of the state, appointed a day when proposals could be made to furnish what was required by the army. On the appointed day three _societates_, or corporations, offered to make the necessary loans to the government; their offers were accepted, and the needs of the army were met. The transaction reminds us of similar emergencies in our civil war, when syndicates of bankers came to the support of the government. The present-day tendency to question the motives of all corporations dealing with the government does not seem to color Livy's interpretation of the incident, for he cites it in proof of the patriotic spirit which ran through all classes in the face of the struggle with Carthage. The appearance of the joint-stock company at the moment when the policy of territorial expansion is coming to the front is significant of the close connection which existed later between imperialism and corporate finance, but the later relations of corporations to the public interests cannot always be interpreted in so charitable a fashion.

Our public-service companies find no counter-part in antiquity, but the Roman societies for the collection of taxes bear a resemblance to these modern organizations of capital in the nature of the franchises, as we may call them, and the special privileges which they had. The practice which the Roman government followed of letting out to the highest bidder the privilege of collecting the taxes in each of the provinces, naturally gave a great impetus to the development of companies organized for this purpose. Every new province added to the Empire opened a fresh field for capitalistic enterprise, in the way not only of farming the taxes, but also of loaning money, constructing public works, and leasing the mines belonging to the state, and Roman politicians must have felt these financial considerations steadily pushing them on to further conquests.

But the interest of the companies did not end when Roman eagles had been planted in a new region. It was necessary to have the provincial government so managed as to help the agents of the companies in making as much money as possible out of the provincials, and Cicero's year as governor of Cilicia was made almost intolerable by the exactions which these agents practised on the Cilicians, and the pressure which they brought to bear upon him and his subordinates. His letters to his intimate friend, Atticus, during this period contain pathetic accounts of the embarrassing situations in which loaning companies and individual capitalists at Rome placed him. On one occasion a certain Scaptius came to him[102], armed with a strong letter of recommendation from the impeccable Brutus, and asked to be appointed prefect of Cyprus. His purpose was, by official pressure, to squeeze out of the people of Salamis, in Cyprus, a debt which they owed, running at forty-eight per cent interest. Upon making some inquiry into the previous history of Scaptius, Cicero learned that under his predecessor in Cilicia, this same Scaptius had secured an appointment as prefect of Cyprus, and backed by his official power, to collect money due his company, had shut up the members of the Salaminian common council in their town hall until five of them died of starvation. In domestic politics the companies played an equally important rôle. The relations which existed between the "interests" and political leaders were as close in ancient times as they are to-day, and corporations were as unpartisan in Rome in their political alliances as they are in the United States. They impartially supported the democratic platforms of Gaius Gracchus and Julius Cæsar in return for valuable concessions, and backed the candidacy of the constitutionalist Pompey for the position of commander-in-chief of the fleets and armies acting against the Eastern pirates, and against Mithridates, in like expectation of substantial returns for their help. What gave the companies their

influence at the polls was the fact that their shares were very widely held by voters. Polybius, the Greek historian, writing of conditions at Rome in the second century B.C., gives us to understand that almost every citizen owned shares in some joint-stock company[103]. Poor crops in Sicily, heavy rains in Sardinia, an uprising in Gaul, or "a strike" in the Spanish mines would touch the pocket of every middle-class Roman.

In these circumstances it is hard to see how the Roman got on without stock quotations in the newspapers. But Cæsar's publication of the _Acta Diurna_, or proceedings of the senate and assembly, would take the place of our newspapers in some respects, and the crowds which gathered at the points where these documents were posted, would remind us of the throngs collected in front of the bulletin in the window of a newspaper office when some exciting event has occurred. Couriers were constantly arriving from the agents of corporations in Gaul, Spain, Africa, and Asia with the latest news of industrial and financial enterprises in all these sections. What a scurrying of feet there must have been through the streets when the first news reached Rome of the insurrection of the proletariat in Asia in 88 B.C., and of the proclamation of Mithridates guaranteeing release from half of their obligations to all debtors who should kill money-lenders! Asiatic stocks must have dropped almost to the zero point. We find no evidence of the existence of an organized stock exchange. Perhaps none was necessary, because the shares of stock do not seem to have been transferable, but other financial business arising out of the organization of these companies, like the loaning of money on stock, could be transacted reasonably well in the row of banking offices which ran along one side of the Forum, and made it an ancient Wall Street or Lombard Street.

"Trusts" founded to control prices troubled the Romans, as they trouble us to-day. There is an amusing reference to one of these trade combinations as early as the third century before our era in the Captives of Plautus.[104] The parasite in the play has been using his best quips and his most effective leads to get an invitation to dinner, but he can't provoke a smile, to say nothing of extracting an invitation. In a high state of indignation he threatens to prosecute the men who avoid being his hosts for entering into an unlawful combination like that of "the oil dealers in the Velabrum." Incidentally it is a rather interesting historical coincidence that the pioneer monopoly in Rome, as in our day, was an oil trust--in the time of Plautus, of course, an olive-oil trust. In the "Trickster," which was presented in 191 B.C., a character refers to the mountains of grain which the dealers had in their warehouses.[105] Two years later the "corner" had become so effective that the government intervened, and the curule ædiles who had charge of the markets imposed a heavy fine on the grain speculators.[106] The case was apparently prosecuted under the Laws of the Twelve Tables of 450 B.C., the Magna Charta of Roman liberty. It would seem, therefore, that combinations in restraint of trade were formed at a very early date in Rome, and perhaps Diocletian's attempt in the third century of our era to lower the cost of living by fixing the prices of all sorts of commodities was aimed in part at the same evil. As for government ownership, the Roman state made one or two essays in this field, notably in the case of mines, but with indifferent success.

Labor was as completely organized as capital.[107] In fact the passion of the Romans for association shows itself even more clearly here, and it would be possible to write their industrial history from a study of their trades-unions. The story of Rome carries the founding of these guilds back to the early days of the regal period. From the investigations of Waltzing, Liebenam, and others their history can be made out in considerable detail. Roman tradition was delightfully systematic in assigning the founding of one set of institutions to one king and of another group to another king. Romulus, for instance, is the war king, and concerns himself with military and political institutions. The second king, Numa, is a man of peace, and is occupied throughout his reign with the social and religious organization of his people. It was Numa who established guilds of carpenters, dyers, shoemakers, tanners, workers in copper and gold, fluteplayers, and potters. The critical historian looks with a sceptical eye on the story of the kings, and yet this list of trades is just what we should expect to find in primitive Rome. There are no bakers or weavers, for instance, in the list. We know that in our own colonial days the baking, spinning, and weaving were done at home, as they would naturally have been when Rome was a community of shepherds and farmers. As Roman civilization became more complex, industrial specialization developed, and the number of guilds grew, but during the Republic we cannot trace their growth very successfully for lack of information about them. Corporations, as we have seen, played an important part in politics, and their doings are chronicled in the literature, like oratory and history, which deals with public questions, but the trades-guilds had little share in politics; they were made up of the obscure and weak, and consequently are rarely mentioned in the writings of a Cicero or a Livy.

It is only when the general passion for setting down records of all sorts of enterprises and incidents on imperishable materials came in with the Empire that the story of the Roman trades-union can be clearly followed. It is a fortunate thing for us that this mania swept through the Roman Empire, because it has given us some twenty-five hundred inscriptions dealing with these organizations of workmen. These inscriptions disclose the fact that there were more than eighty different trades organized into guilds in the city of Rome alone. They included skilled and unskilled laborers, from the porters, or _saccarii_, to the goldsmiths, or _aurifices_. The

names of some of them, like the _pastillarii_, or guild of pastile-makers, and the _scabillarii_, or castanet-players, indicate a high degree of industrial specialization. From one man's tombstone even the conclusion seems to follow that he belonged to a union of what we may perhaps call checker-board makers. The merchants formed trade associations freely. Dealers in oil, in wine, in fish, and in grain are found organized all over the Empire. Even the perfumers, hay-dealers, and ragmen had their societies. No line of distinction seems to be drawn between the artist and the artisan. The mason and the sculptor were classed in the same category by Roman writers, so that we are not surprised to find unions of men in both occupations. A curious distinction between the professions is also brought out by these guild inscriptions. There are unions made up of physicians, but none of lawyers, for the lawyer in early times was supposed to receive no remuneration for his services. In point of fact the physician was on a lower social plane in Rome than he was even among our ancestors. The profession was followed almost exclusively by Greek freedmen, as we can see from the records on their tombstones, and was highly specialized, if we may judge from the epitaphs of eye and ear doctors, surgeons, dentists, and veterinarians. To the same category with the physician and sculptor belong the architect, the teacher, and the chemist. Men of these professions pursued the _artes liberales_, as the Romans put it, and constituted an aristocracy among those engaged in the trades or lower professions. Below them in the hierarchy came those who gained a livelihood by the _artes ludicræ_, like the actor, professional dancer, juggler, or gladiator, and in the lowest caste were the carpenters, weavers, and other artisans whose occupations were _artes vulgares et sordidæ_.

In the early part of this chapter the tendency of the Romans to form voluntary associations was noted as a national characteristic. This fact comes out very clearly if we compare the number of trades-unions in the Western world with those in Greece and the Orient. Our conclusions must be drawn of course from the extant inscriptions which refer to guilds, and time may have dealt more harshly with the stones in one place than in another, or the Roman government may have given its consent to the establishment of such organizations with more reluctance in one province than another; but, taking into account the fact that we have guild inscriptions from four hundred and seventy-five towns and villages in the Empire, these elements of uncertainty in our conclusions are practically eliminated, and a fair comparison may be drawn between conditions in the East and the West. If we pick out some of the more important towns in the Greek part of the Roman world, we find five guilds reported from Tralles in Caria, six from Smyrna, one from Alexandria, and eleven from Hierapolis in Phrygia. On the other hand, in the city of Rome there were more than one hundred, in Brixia (modern Brescia) seventeen or more, in Lugudunum (Lyons) twenty at least, and in Canabæ, in the province of Dacia, five. These figures, taken at random for some of the larger towns in different parts of the Empire, bring out the fact very clearly that the western and northern provinces readily accepted Roman ideas and showed the Roman spirit, as illustrated in their ability and willingness to co-operate for a common purpose, but that the Greek East was never Romanized. Even in the settlements in Dacia, which continued under Roman rule only from 107 to 270 A.D., we find as many trades-unions as existed in Greek towns which were held by the Romans for three or four centuries. The comparative number of guilds and of guild inscriptions would, in fact, furnish us with a rough test of the extent to which Rome impressed her civilization on different parts of the Empire, even if we had no other criteria. We should know, for instance, that less progress had been made in Britain than in Southern Gaul, that Salona in Dalmatia, Lugudunum in Gaul, and Mogontiacum (Mainz) in Germany were important centres of Roman civilization. It is, of course, possible from a study of these inscriptions to make out the most flourishing industries in the several towns, but with that we are not concerned here.

These guilds which we have been considering were trades-unions in the sense that they were organizations made up of men working in the same trade, but they differed from modern unions, and also from mediaeval guilds, in the objects for which they were formed. They made no attempt to raise wages, to improve working conditions, to limit the number of apprentices, to develop skill and artistic taste in the craft, or to better the social or political position of the laborer. It was the need which their members felt for companionship, sympathy, and help in the emergencies of life, and the desire to give more meaning to their lives, that drew them together. These motives explain the provisions made for social gatherings, and for the burial of members, which were the characteristic features of most of the organizations. It is the social side, for instance, which is indicated on a tombstone, found in a little town of central Italy. After giving the name of the deceased, it reads: "He bequeathed to his guild, the rag-dealers, a thousand sesterces, from the income of which each year, on the festival of the Parentalia, not less than twelve men shall dine at his tomb."[108] Another in northern Italy reads: "To Publius Etereius Quadratus, the son of Publius, of the _Tribus Quirina_, Etereia Aristolais, his mother, has set up a statue, at whose dedication she gave the customary banquet to the union of rag-dealers, and also a sum of money, from the income of which annually, from this time forth, on the birthday of Quadratus, April 9, where his remains have been laid, they should make a sacrifice, and should hold the customary banquet in the temple, and should bring roses in their season and cover and crown the statue; which thing they have undertaken to do."[109] The menu of one of these dinners given in Dacia[110] has come down to us. It includes lamb and pork, bread, salad, onions, and two kinds of wine. The cost

of the entertainment amounted to one hundred and sixty-nine _denarii_, or about twenty-seven dollars, a sum which would probably have a purchasing value to-day of from three to four times that amount.

The "temple" or chapel referred to in these inscriptions was usually semicircular, and may have served as a model for the Christian oratories. The building usually stood in a little grove, and, with its accommodations for official meetings and dinners, served the same purpose as a modern club-house. Besides the special gatherings for which some deceased member or some rich patron provided, the guild met at fixed times during the year to dine or for other social purposes. The income of the society, which was made up of the initiation fees and monthly dues of the members, and of donations, was supplemented now and then by a system of fines. At least, in an African inscription we read: "In the Curia of Jove. Done November 27, in the consulship of Maternus and Atticus.... If any one shall wish to be a flamen, he shall give three amphorae of wine, besides bread and salt and provisions. If any one shall wish to be a magister, he shall give two amphorae of wine.... If any one shall have spoken disrespectfully to a flamen, or laid hands upon him, he shall pay two denarii.... If any one shall have gone to fetch wine, and shall have made away with it, he shall give double the amount."[111]

The provision which burial societies made for their members is illustrated by the following epitaph:

"To the shade of Gaius Julius Filetio, born in Africa, a physician, who lived thirty-five years. Gaius Julius Filetus and Julia Euthenia, his parents, have erected it to their very dear son. Also to Julius Athenodorus, his brother, who lived thirty-five years. Euthenia set it up. He has been placed here, to whose burial the guild of rag-dealers has contributed three hundred denarii."[112] People of all ages have craved a respectable burial, and the pathetic picture which Horace gives us in one of his Satires of the fate which befell the poor and friendless at the end of life, may well have led men of that class to make provisions which would protect them from such an experience, and it was not an unnatural thing for these organizations to be made up of men working in the same trade. The statutes of several guilds have come down to us. One found at Lanuvium has articles dealing particularly with burial regulations. They read in part:[113]

"It has pleased the members, that whoever shall wish to join this guild shall pay an initiation fee of one hundred sesterces, and an amphora of good wine, as well as five _asses_ a month. Voted likewise, that if any man shall not have paid his dues for six consecutive months, and if the lot common to all men has befallen him, his claim to a burial shall not be considered, even if he shall have so stipulated in his will. Voted likewise, that if any man from this body of ours, having paid his dues, shall depart, there shall come to him from the treasury three hundred sesterces, from which sum fifty sesterces, which shall be divided at the funeral pyre, shall go for the funeral rites. Furthermore, the obsequies shall be performed on foot."

Besides the need of comradeship, and the desire to provide for a respectable burial, we can see another motive which brought the weak and lowly together in these associations. They were oppressed by the sense of their own insignificance in society, and by the pitifully small part which they played in the affairs of the world. But if they could establish a society of their own, with concerns peculiar to itself which they would administer, and if they could create positions of honor and importance in this organization, even the lowliest man in Rome would have a chance to satisfy that craving to exercise power over others which all of us feel, to hold titles and distinctions, and to wear the insignia of office and rank. This motive worked itself out in the establishment of a complete hierarchy of offices, as we saw in part in an African inscription given above. The Roman state was reproduced in miniature in these societies, with their popular assemblies, and their officials, who bore the honorable titles of quæstor, curator, prætor, ædile, and so forth.

To read these twenty-five hundred or more inscriptions from all parts of the Empire brings us close to the heart of the common people. We see their little ambitions, their jealousies, their fears, their gratitude for kindness, their own kindliness, and their loyalty to their fellows. All of them are anxious to be remembered after death, and provide, when they can do so, for the celebration of their birthdays by members of the association. A guild inscription in Latium, for instance, reads:[114] "Jan. 6, birthday of Publius Claudius Veratius Abascantianus, [who has contributed] 6,000 sesterces, [paying an annual interest of] 180 denarii." "Jan. 25, birthday of Gargilius Felix, [who has contributed] 2,000 sesterces, [paying an annual interest of] 60 denarii," and so on through the twelve months of the year.

It is not entirely clear why the guilds never tried to bring pressure to bear on their employers to raise wages, or to improve their position by means of the strike, or by other methods with which we are familiar to-day. Perhaps the difference between the ancient and modern methods of manufacture helps us to understand this fact. In modern times most articles can be made much more cheaply by machinery than by hand, and the use of water-power, of steam, and of electricity, and the invention of elaborate

machines, has led us to bring together a great many workmen under one roof or in one factory. The men who are thus employed in a single establishment work under common conditions, suffer the same disadvantages, and are brought into such close relations with one another that common action to improve their lot is natural. In ancient times, as may be seen in the chapter on Diocletian's edict, machinery was almost unknown, and artisans worked singly in their own homes or in the houses of their employers, so that joint action to improve their condition would hardly be expected.

Another factor which should probably be taken into account is the influence of slavery. This institution did not play the important rôle under the Empire in depressing the free laborer which it is often supposed to have played, because it was steadily dying out; but an employer could always have recourse to slave labor to a limited extent, and the struggling freedmen who had just come up from slavery were not likely to urge very strongly their claims for consideration.

In this connection it is interesting to recall the fact that before slavery got a foothold in Rome, the masses in their struggle with the classes used what we think of to-day as the most modern weapon employed in industrial warfare. We can all remember the intense interest with which we watched the novel experience which St. Petersburg underwent some six years ago, when the general strike was instituted. And yet, if we accept tradition, that method of bringing the government and society to terms was used twice by the Roman proletariat over two thousand years ago. The plebeians, so the story goes, unable to get their economic and political rights, stopped work and withdrew from the city to the Sacred Mount. Their abstention from labor did not mean the going out of street lamps, the suspension of street-car traffic, and the closing of factories and shops, but, besides the loss of fighting men, it meant that no more shoes could be had, no more carpentry work done, and no more wine-jars made until concessions should be granted. But, having slaves to compete with it, and with conditions which made organization difficult, free labor could not hope to rise, and the unions could take no serious step toward the improvement of the condition of their members. The feeling of security on this score which society had, warranted the government in allowing even its own employees to organize, and we find unions of government clerks, messengers, and others. The Roman government was, therefore, never called upon to solve the grave political and economic questions which France and Italy have had to face in late years in the threatened strikes of the state railway and postal employees.

We have just been noticing how the ancient differed from the modern trades-union in the objects which it sought to obtain. The religious character which it took seems equally strange to us at first sight. Every guild put itself under the protection of some deity and was closely associated with a cult. Silvanus, the god of the woods, was a natural favorite with the carpenters, Father Bacchus with the innkeepers, Vesta with the bakers, and Diana with those who hunted wild animals for the circus. The reason for the choice of certain other divine patrons is not so clear. Why the cabmen of Tibur, for instance, picked out Hercules as their tutelary deity, unless, like Horace in his Satires, the ancient cabman thought of him as the god of treasure-trove, and, therefore, likely to inspire the giving of generous tips, we cannot guess. The religious side of Roman trade associations will not surprise us when we recall the strong religious bent of the Roman character, and when we remember that no body of Romans would have thought of forming any kind of an organization without securing the sanction and protection of the gods. The family, the clan, the state all had their protecting deities, to whom appropriate rites were paid on stated occasions. Speaking of the religious side of these trade organizations naturally reminds one of the religious associations which sprang up in such large numbers toward the end of the republican period and under the Empire. They lie outside the scope of this chapter, but, in the light of the issue which has arisen in recent years between religious associations and the governments of Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal, it is interesting to notice in passing that the Roman state strove to hold in check many of the ancient religious associations, but not always with much success. As we have noticed, its attitude toward the trade-guilds was not unfriendly. In the last days of the Republic, however, they began to enter politics, and were used very effectively in the elections by political leaders in both parties.[115] In fact the fortunes of the city seemed likely to be controlled by political clubs, until severe legislation and the transfer of the elections in the early Empire from the popular assemblies to the senate put an end to the use of trade associations for political purposes. It was in the light of this development that the government henceforth required all newly formed trades-unions to secure official authorization.

The change in the attitude of the state toward these organizations, as time went on, has been traced by Liebenam in his study of Roman associations. The story of this change furnishes an interesting episode in the history of special privilege, and may not be without profit to us. The Roman government started with the assumption that the operation of these voluntary associations was a matter of public as well as of private concern, and could serve public interests. Therefore their members were to be exempted from some of the burdens which the ordinary citizen bore. It was this reasoning, for instance, which led Trajan to set the bakers free from certain charges, and which influenced Hadrian to grant the same favors to those associations of skippers which supplied Rome with food. In the light of our present-day discussion it is interesting also to find that Marcus Aurelius granted them the right to manumit

slaves and receive legacies--that is, he made them juridical persons. But if these associations were to be fostered by law, in proportion as they promoted the public welfare, it also followed logically that the state could put a restraining hand upon them when their development failed to serve public interests in the highest degree. Following this logical sequence, the Emperor Claudius, in his efforts to promote a more wholesome home life, or for some other reason not known to us, forbade the eating-houses or the delicatessen shops to sell cooked meats or warm water. Antoninus Pius, in his paternal care for the unions, prescribed an age test and a physical test for those who wished to become members. Later, under the law a man was allowed to join one guild only. Such a legal provision as this was a natural concomitant of the concession of privileges to the unions. If the members of these organizations were to receive special favors from the state, the state must see to it that the rolls were not padded. It must, in fact, have the right of final supervision of the list of members. So long as industry flourished, and so long as the population increased, or at least remained stationary, this oversight by the government brought no appreciable ill results. But when financial conditions grew steadily worse, when large tracts of land passed out of cultivation and the population rapidly dwindled, the numbers in the trades-unions began to decline. The public services, constantly growing heavier, which the state required of the guilds in return for their privileges made the loss of members still greater. This movement threatened the industrial interests of the Empire and must be checked at all hazards. Consequently, taking another logical step in the way of government regulation in the interests of the public, the state forbade men to withdraw from the unions, and made membership in a union hereditary. Henceforth the carpenter must always remain a carpenter, the weaver a weaver, and the sons and grandsons of the carpenter and the weaver must take up the occupation of their fathers, and a man is bound forever to his trade as the serf is to the soil.

A Roman Politician

(Gaius Scribonius Curio)

The life of Gaius Scribonius Curio has so many points of interest for the student of Roman politics and society, that one is bewildered by the variety of situations and experiences which it covers. His private character is made up of a _mélange_ of contradictory qualities, of generosity, and profligacy, of sincerity and unscrupulousness. In his public life there is the same facile change of guiding principles. He is alternately a follower of Cicero and a supporter of his bitterest enemy, a Tory and a Democrat, a recognized opponent of Cæsar and his trusted agent and adviser. His dramatic career stirs Lucan to one of his finest passages, gives a touch of vigor to the prosaic narrative of Velleius, and even leads the sedate Pliny to drop into satire.[116] Friend and foe have helped to paint the picture. Cicero, the counsellor of his youth, writes of him and to him; Cælius, his bosom friend, analyzes his character; Cæsar leaves us a record of his military campaigns and death, while Velleius and Appian recount his public and private sins. His story has this peculiar charm, that many of the incidents which make it up are related from day to day, as they occurred, by his contemporaries, Cicero and Cælius, in the confidential letters which they wrote to their intimate friends. With all the strange elements which entered into it, however, his career is not an unusual one for the time in which he lived. Indeed it is almost typical for the class to which he belonged, and in studying it we shall come to know something more of that group of brilliant young men, made up of Cælius, Antony, Dolabella, and others, who were drawn to Cæsar's cause and played so large a part in bringing him success. The life of Curio not only illuminates social conditions in the first century before our era, but it epitomizes and personifies the political history of his time and the last struggles of the Republic. It brings within its compass the Catilinarian conspiracy, the agitation of Clodius, the formation of the first triumvirate, the rivalry of Cæsar and Pompey, and the civil war, for in all these episodes Curio took an active part.

Students of history have called attention to the striking way in which the members of certain distinguished Roman families from generation to generation kept up the political traditions of the family. The Claudian family is a striking case in point. Recognition of this fact helps us to understand Curio. His grandfather and his father were both prominent orators and politicians, as Cicero tells us in his Brutus.[117] The grandfather reached the praetorship in the year in which Gaius Gracchus was done to death by his political opponents, while Curio pater was consul, in 76 B.C., when the confusion which followed the breaking up of the constitution and of the party of Sulla was at its height. Cicero tells us that the second Curio had "absolutely no knowledge of letters," but that he was one of the successful public speakers of his day, thanks to the training which he had received at home. The third Curio, with whom we are concerned here, was prepared for public life as his father had been, for Cicero remarks of him that "although he had not been sufficiently trained by teachers, he had a rare gift for oratory."[118]

On this point Cicero could speak with authority, because Curio had very possibly been one of his pupils in oratory and law. At least the very intimate acquaintance which he has with Curio's character and the incidents of his life, the fatherly tone of Cicero's letters to him, and the fact that Curio's nearest friends were among his disciples make this a natural inference. How intimate this relation

was, one can see from the charming picture which Cicero draws, in the introductory chapters of his Essay on Friendship, of his own intercourse as a young man with the learned Augur Scævola. Roman youth attended their counsellor and friend when he went to the forum to take part in public business, or sat with him at home discussing matters of public and private interest, as Cicero and his companions sat on the bench in the garden with the pontiff Scævola, when he set forth the discourse of Lælius on friendship, and thus, out of his experience, the old man talked to the young men about him upon the conduct of life as well as upon the technical points of law and oratory. So many of the brilliant young politicians of this period had been brought into close relations with Cicero in this way, that when he found himself forced out of politics by the Cæsarians, he whimsically writes to his friend Pætus that he is inclined to give up public life and open a school, and not more than a year before his death he pathetically complains that he has not leisure even to take the waters at the spa, because of the demands which are made upon him for lessons in oratory.

If it did not take us too far from our chosen subject, it would be interesting to stop and consider at length what effect Cicero's intimate relations with these young men had upon his character, his political views, his personal fortunes, and the course of politics. That they kept him young in his interests and sympathies, that they kept his mind alert and receptive, comes out clearly in his letters to them, which are full of jest and raillery and enthusiasm. That he never developed into a Tory, as Catulus did, or became indifferent to political conditions, as Lucullus did, may have been due in part to his intimate association with this group of enthusiastic young politicians. So far as his personal fortunes were concerned, when the struggle between Cæsar and Pompey came, these former pupils of Cicero had an opportunity to show their attachment and their gratitude to him. _They_ were followers of Cæsar, and _he_ cast in his lot with Pompey. But this made no difference in their relations. To the contrary, they gave him advice and help; in their most hurried journeys they found time to visit him, and they interceded with Cæsar in his behalf. To determine whether he influenced the fortunes of the state through the effect which his teachings had upon these young men would require a paper by itself. Perhaps no man has ever had a better opportunity than Cicero had in their cases to leave a lasting impression on the political leaders of the coming generation. Curio, Cælius, Trebatius, Dolabella, Hirtius, and Pansa, who were Cæsar's lieutenants, in the years when their characters were forming and their political tendencies were being determined, were moulded by Cicero. They were warmly attached to him as their guide, philosopher, and friend, and they admired him as a writer, an orator, and an accomplished man of the world. Later they attached themselves to Cæsar, and while they were still under his spell, Cicero's influence over their political course does not seem to count for so much, but after Cæsar's death, the latent effect of Cicero's friendship and teaching makes itself clearly felt in the heroic service which such men as Hirtius and Pansa rendered to the cause of the dying Republic. Possibly even Curio, had he been living, might have been found, after the Ides of March, fighting by the side of Cicero.

Perhaps there is no better way of bringing out the intimate relations which Curio and the other young men of this group bore to the orator than by translating one of Cicero's early letters to him. It was written in 53 B.C., when the young man was in Asia, just beginning his political career as quæstor, or treasurer, on the staff of the governor of that province, and reads:[119]

"Although I grieve to have been suspected of neglect by you, still it has not been so annoying to me that my failure in duty is complained of by you as pleasant that it has been noticed, especially since, in so far as I am accused, I am free from fault. But in so far as you intimate that you long for a letter from me, you disclose that which I know well, it is true, but that which is sweet and cherished--your love, I mean. In point of fact, I never let any one pass, who I think will go to you, without giving him a letter. For who is so indefatigable in writing as I am? From you, on the other hand, twice or thrice at most have I received a letter, and then a very short one. Therefore, if you are an unjust judge toward me, I shall condemn you on the same charge, but if you shall be unwilling to have me do that, you must show yourself just to me.

"But enough about letters; I have no fear of not satisfying you by writing, especially if in that kind of activity you will not scorn my efforts. I _did_ grieve that you were away from us so long, inasmuch as I was deprived of the enjoyment of most delightful companionship, but now I rejoice because, in your absence, you have attained all your ends without sacrificing your dignity in the slightest degree, and because in all your undertakings the outcome has corresponded to my desires. What my boundless affection for you forces me to urge upon you is briefly put. So great a hope is based, shall I say, on your spirit or on your abilities, that I do not hesitate to beseech and implore you to come back to us with a character so moulded that you may be able to preserve and maintain this confidence in you which you have aroused. And since forgetfulness shall never blot out my remembrance of your services to me, I beg you to remember that whatever improvements may come in your fortune, or in your station in life, you would not have been able to secure them, if you had not as a boy in the old days followed my most loyal and loving counsels. Wherefore you ought to have such a feeling toward us, that we, who are now growing heavy with years, may find rest in your love and your youth."

In a most unexpected place, in one of Cicero's fiery invectives against Antony,[120] we come upon an episode illustrating his affectionate care of Curio during Curio's youth. The elder Curio lies upon a couch, prostrate with grief at the wreck which his son has brought on the house by his dissolute life and his extravagance. The younger Curio throws himself at Cicero's feet in tears. Like a foster-father, Cicero induces the young man to break off his evil habits, and persuades the father to forgive him and pay his debts. This scene which he describes here, reminds us of Curio's first appearance in Cicero's correspondence, where, with Curio's wild life in mind, he is spoken of as _filiola Curionis_.[121]

It is an appropriate thing that a man destined to lead so stormy a life as Curio did, should come on the stage as a leader in the wild turmoil of the Clodian affair. What brought the two Curios to the front in this matter as champions of Cicero's future enemy Clodius, it is not easy to say. It is interesting to notice in passing, however, that our Curio enters politics as a Democrat. He was the leader, in fact, of the younger element in that party, of the "Catilinarian crowd," as Cicero styles them, and arrayed himself against Lucullus, Hortensius, Messala, and other prominent Conservatives. What the methods were which Curio and his followers adopted, Cicero graphically describes.[122] They blocked up the entrances to the polling places with professional rowdies, and allowed only one kind of ballots to be distributed to the voters. This was in 61 B.C., when Curio can scarcely have been more than twenty-three years old.

In the following year Cæsar was back in Rome from his successful proprætorship in Spain, and found little difficulty in persuading Pompey and Crassus to join him in forming that political compact which controlled the fortunes of Rome for the next ten years. As a part of the agreement, Cæsar was made consul in 59 B.C., and forced his radical legislation through the popular assembly in spite of the violent opposition of the Conservatives. This is the year, too, of the candidacy of Clodius for the tribunate. Toward both these movements the attitude of Curio is puzzling. He reports to Cicero[123] that Clodius's main object in running for the tribunate is to repeal the legislation of Cæsar. It is strange that a man who had been in the counsels of Clodius, and was so shrewd on other occasions in interpreting political motives, can have been so deceived. We can hardly believe that he was double-faced toward Cicero. We must conclude, I think, that his strong dislike for Cæsar's policy and political methods colored his view of the situation. His fierce opposition to Cæsar is the other strange incident in this period of his life. Most of the young men of the time, even those of good family, were enthusiastic supporters of Cæsar. Curio, however, is bitterly opposed to him.[124] Perhaps he resented Cæsar's repression of freedom of speech, for he tells Cicero that the young men of Rome will not submit to the high-handed methods of the triumvirs, or perhaps he imbibed his early dislike for Cæsar from his father, whose sentiments are made clear enough by a savage epigram at Cæsar's expense, which Suetonius quotes from a speech of the elder Curio.[125] At all events he is the only man who dares speak out. He is the idol of the Conservatives, and is surrounded by enthusiastic crowds whenever he appears in the forum. He is now the recognized leader of the opposition to Cæsar, and a significant proof of this fact is furnished at the great games given in honor of Apollo in the summer of 59. When Cæsar entered the theatre there was faint applause; when Curio entered the crowd rose and cheered him, "as they used to cheer Pompey when the commonwealth was safe."[126] Perhaps the mysterious Vettius episode, an ancient Titus Oates affair, which belongs to this year, reflects the desire of the triumvirs to get rid of Curio, and shows also their fear of his opposition. This unscrupulous informer is said to have privately told Curio of a plot against the life of Pompey, in the hope of involving him in the meshes of the plot. Curio denounced him to Pompey, and Vettius was thrown into prison, where he was afterward found dead, before the truth of the matter could be brought out. Of course Curio's opposition to Cæsar effected little, except, perhaps, in drawing Cæsar's attention to him as a clever politician.

To Curio's quæstorship in Asia reference has already been made. It fell in 53 B.C., and from his incumbency of this office we can make an approximate estimate of his date of birth. Thirty or thirty-one was probably the minimum age for holding the quæstorship at this time, so that Curio must have been born about 84 B.C. From Cicero's letter to him, which has been given above, it would seem to follow that he had performed his duties in his province with eminent success. During his absence from Rome his father died, and with his father's death one stimulating cause of his dislike for Cæsar may have disappeared. To Curio's absence in his province we owe six of the charming letters which Cicero wrote to him. In one of his letters of this year he writes:[127] "There are many kinds of letters, as you well know, but one sort, for the sake of which letter-writing was invented, is best recognized: I mean letters written for the purpose of informing those who are not with us of whatever it may be to our advantage or to theirs that they should know. Surely you are not looking for a letter of this kind from me, for you have correspondents and messengers from home who report to you about your household. Moreover, so far as my concerns go, there is absolutely nothing new. There are two kinds of letters left which please me very much: one, of the informal and jesting sort; the other, serious and weighty. I do not feel that it is unbecoming to adopt either of these styles. Am I to jest with you by letter? On my word I do not think that there is a citizen who can laugh in these days. Or shall I write something of a more serious character? What subject is there on which Cicero can write seriously to Curio, unless it be concerning the commonwealth? And on this matter this is my situation: that I neither dare to set

down in writing that which I think, nor wish to write what I do not think."

The Romans felt the same indifference toward affairs in the provinces that we show in this country, unless their investments were in danger. They were wrapped up in their own concerns, and politics in Rome were so absorbing in 53 B.C. that people in the city probably paid little attention to the doings of a quæstor in the far-away province of Asia. But, as the time for Curio's return approached, men recalled the striking rôle which he played in politics in earlier days, and wondered what course he would take when he came back. Events were moving rapidly toward a crisis. Julia, Cæsar's daughter, whom Pompey had married, died in the summer of 54 B.C., and Crassus was defeated and murdered by the Parthians in 53 B.C. The death of Crassus brought Cæsar and Pompey face to face, and Julia's death broke one of the strongest bonds which had held these two rivals together. Cæsar's position, too, was rendered precarious by the desperate struggle against the Belgæ, in which he was involved in 53 B.C. In Rome the political pot was boiling furiously. The city was in the grip of the bands of desperadoes hired by Milo and Clodius, who broke up the elections during 53 B.C., so that the first of January, 52, arrived with no chief magistrates in the city. To a man of Curio's daring and versatility this situation offered almost unlimited possibilities, and recognizing this fact, Cicero writes earnestly to him,[128] on the eve of his return, to enlist him in support of Milo's candidacy for the consulship. Curio may have just arrived in the city when matters reached a climax, for on January 18, 52 B.C., Clodius was killed in a street brawl by the followers of Milo, and Pompey was soon after elected sole consul, to bring order out of the chaos, if possible.

Curio was not called upon to support Milo for the consulship, because Milo's share in the murder of Clodius and the elevation of Pompey to his extra-constitutional magistracy put an end to Milo's candidacy. What part he took in supporting or in opposing Pompey's reform legislation of 52 B.C., and what share he had in the preliminary skirmishes between Cæsar and the senate during the early part of 51, we have no means of knowing. As the situation became more acute, however, toward the end of the year, we hear of him again as an active political leader. Cicero's absence from Rome from May, 51 to January, 49 B.C., is a fortunate thing for us, for to it we owe the clever and gossipy political letters which his friend Cælius sent him from the capital. In one of these letters, written August 1, 51 B.C., we learn that Curio is a candidate for the tribunate for the following year, and in it we find a keen analysis of the situation, and an interesting, though tantaizingly brief, estimate of his character. Coming from an intimate friend of Curio, it is especially valuable to us. Cælius writes:[129] "He inspires with great alarm many people who do not know him and do not know how easily he can be influenced, but judging from my hopes and wishes, and from his present behavior, he will prefer to support the Conservatives and the senate. In his present frame of mind he is simply bubbling over with this feeling. The source and reason of this attitude of his lies in the fact that Cæsar, who is in the habit of winning the friendship of men of the worst sort at any cost whatsoever, has shown a great contempt for him. And of the whole affair it seems to me a most delightful outcome, and the view has been taken by the rest, too, to such a degree that Curio, who does nothing after deliberation, seems to have followed a definite policy and definite plans in avoiding the traps of those who had made ready to oppose his election to the tribunate--I mean the Lælii, Antonii, and powerful people of that sort." Without strong convictions or a settled policy, unscrupulous, impetuous, radical, and changeable, these are the qualities which Cælius finds in Curio, and what we have seen of his career leads us to accept the correctness of this estimate. In 61 he had been the champion of Clodius, and the leader of the young Democrats, while two years later we found him the opponent of Cæsar, and an ultra-Conservative. It is in the light of his knowledge of Curio's character, and after receiving this letter from Cælius, that Cicero writes in December, 51 B.C., to congratulate him upon his election to the tribunate. He begs him "to govern and direct his course in all matters in accordance with his own judgment, and not to be carried away by the advice of other people." "I do not fear," he says, "that you may do anything in a fainthearted or stupid way, if you defend those policies which you yourself shall believe to be right.... Commune with yourself, take yourself into counsel, hearken to yourself, determine your own policy."

The other point in the letter of Cælius, his analysis of the political situation, so far as Curio is concerned, is not so easy to follow. Cælius evidently believes that Curio had coquetted with Cæsar and had been snubbed by him, that his intrigues with Cæsar had at first led the aristocracy to oppose his candidacy, but that Cæsar's contemptuous treatment of his advances had driven him into the arms of the senatorial party. It is quite possible, however, that an understanding may have been reached between Cæsar and Curio even at this early date, and that Cæsar's coldness and Curio's conservatism may both have been assumed. This would enable Curio to pose as an independent leader, free from all obligations to Cæsar, Pompey, or the Conservatives, and anxious to see fair play and safeguard the interests of the whole people, an independent leader who was driven over in the end to Cæsar's side by the selfish and factious opposition of the senatorial party to his measures of reform and his advocacy of even-handed justice for both Cæsar and Pompey.[130]

Whether Curio came to an understanding with Cæsar before he entered on his tribunate or not, his policy from the outset was well calculated to make the transfer of his allegiance seem forced upon him, and to help him carry over to Cæsar the support of those who were not blinded by partisan feelings. Before he had been in office a fortnight he brought in a bill which would have annulled the law, passed by Cæsar in his consulship, assigning land in Campania to Pompey's veterans.[131] The repeal of this law had always been a favorite project with the Conservatives, and Curio's proposal seemed to be directed equally against Cæsar and Pompey. In February of 50 B.C. he brought in two bills whose reception facilitated his passage to the Cæsarian party. One of them provided for the repair of the roads, and, as Appian tells us,[132] although "he knew that he could not carry any such measure, he hoped that Pompey's friends would oppose him so that he might have that as an excuse for opposing Pompey." The second measure was to insert an intercalary month. It will be remembered that before Cæsar reformed the calendar, it was necessary to insert an extra month in alternate years, and 50 B.C. was a year in which intercalation was required. Curio's proposal was, therefore, a very proper one. It would recommend itself also on the score of fairness. March 1 had been set as the day on which the senate should take up the question of Cæsar's provinces, and after that date there would be little opportunity to consider other business. Now the intercalated month would have been inserted, in accordance with the regular practice, after February 23, and by its insertion time would have been given for the proper discussion of the measures which Curio had proposed. Incidentally, and probably this was in Curio's mind, the date when Cæsar might be called upon to surrender his provinces would be postponed. The proposal to insert the extra month was defeated, and Curio, blocked in every move by the partisan and unreasonable opposition of Pompey and the Conservatives, found the pretext for which lie had been working, and came out openly for Cæsar.[133] Those who knew him well were not surprised at the transfer of his allegiance. It was probably in fear of such a move that Cicero had urged him not to yield to the influence of others, and when Cicero in Cilicia hears the news, he writes to his friend Cælius: "Is it possible? Curio is now defending Cæsar! Who would have expected it?--except myself, for, as surely as I hope to live, _I_ expected it. Heavens! how I miss the laugh we might have had over it." Looking back, as we can now, on the political rôle which Curio played during the next twelve months, it seems strange that two of his intimate friends, who were such far-sighted politicians as Cicero and Cælius were, should have underestimated his political ability so completely. It shows Cæsar's superior political sagacity that he clearly saw his qualities as a leader and tactician. What terms Cæsar was forced to make to secure his support we do not know. Gossip said that the price was sixty million sesterces,[134] or more than two and a half million dollars. He was undoubtedly in great straits. The immense sums which he had spent in celebrating funeral games in honor of his father had probably left him a bankrupt, and large amounts of money were paid for political services during the last years of the republic. Naturally proof of the transaction cannot be had, and even Velleius Paterculus, in his savage arraignment of Curio,[135] does not feel convinced of the truth of the story, but the tale is probable.

It was high time for Cæsar to provide himself with an agent in Rome. The month of March was near at hand, when the long-awaited discussion of his provinces would come up in the senate. His political future, and his rights as a citizen, depended upon his success in blocking the efforts of the senate to take his provinces from him before the end of the year, when he could step from the proconsulship to the consulship. An interval of even a month in private life between the two offices would be all that his enemies would need for bringing political charges against him that would effect his ruin. His displacement before the end of the year must be prevented, therefore, at all hazards. To this task Curio addressed himself, and with surpassing adroitness. He did not come out at once as Cæsar's champion. His function was to hold the scales true between Cæsar and Pompey, to protect the Commonwealth against the overweening ambition and threatening policy of both men. He supported the proposal that Cæsar should be called upon to surrender his army, but coupled with it the demand that Pompey also should be required to give up his troops and his proconsulship. The fairness of his plan appealed to the masses, who would not tolerate a favor to Pompey at Cæsar's expense. It won over even a majority of the senate. The cleverness of his policy was clearly shown at a critical meeting of the senate in December of the year 50 B.C. Appian tells us the story:[136] "In the senate the opinion of each member was asked, and Claudius craftily divided the question and took the votes separately, thus: 'Shall Pompey be deprived of his command?' The majority voted against the latter proposition, and it was decreed that successors to Cæsar should be sent. Then Curio put the question whether both should lay down their commands, and twenty-two voted in the negative, while three hundred and seventy went back to the opinion of Curio in order to avoid civil discord. Then Claudius dismissed the senate, exclaiming: 'Enjoy your victory and have Cæsar for a master!'" The senate's action was vetoed, and therefore had no legal value, but it put Cæsar and Curio in the right and Pompey' s partisans in the wrong.

As a part of his policy of defending Cæsar by calling attention to the exceptional position and the extra-constitutional course of Pompey, Curio offset the Conservative attacks on Cæsar by public speeches fiercely arraigning Pompey for what he had done during his consulship, five years before. When we recall Curio's biting wit and sarcasm, and the unpopularity of Pompey's

high-handed methods of that year, we shall appreciate the effectiveness of this flank attack.

Another weapon which he used freely was his unlimited right of veto as tribune. As early as April Cælius appreciated how successful these tactics would be, and he saw the dilemma in which they would put the Conservatives, for he writes to Cicero: "This is what I have to tell you: if they put pressure at every point on Curio, Cæsar will defend his right to exercise the veto; if, as seems likely, they shrink [from overruling him], Cæsar will stay [in his province] as long as he likes." The veto power was the weapon which he used against the senate at the meeting of that body on the first of December, to which reference has already been made. The elections in July had gone against Cæsar. Two Conservatives had been returned as consuls. In the autumn the senate had found legal means of depriving Cæsar of two of his legions. Talk of a compromise was dying down. Pompey, who had been desperately ill in the spring, had regained his strength. He had been exasperated by the savage attacks of Curio. Sensational stories of the movements of Cæsar's troops in the North were whispered in the forum, and increased the tension. In the autumn, for instance, Cæsar had occasion to pay a visit to the towns in northern Italy to thank them for their support of Mark Antony, his candidate for the tribunate, and the wild rumor flew to Rome that he had advanced four legions to Placentia,[137] that his march on the city had begun, and tumult and confusion followed. It was in these circumstances that the consul Marcellus moved in the senate that successors be sent to take over Cæsar's provinces, but the motion was blocked by the veto of Curio, whereupon the consul cried out: "If I am prevented by the vote of the senate from taking steps for the public safety, I will take such steps on my own responsibility as consul." After saying this he darted out of the senate and proceeded to the suburbs with his colleague, where he presented a sword to Pompey, and said: "My colleague and I command you to march against Cæsar in behalf of your country, and we give you for this purpose the army now at Capua, or in any other part of Italy, and whatever additional forces you choose to levy."[138] Curio had accomplished his purpose. He had shown that Pompey as well as Cæsar was a menace to the state; he had prevented Cæsar's recall; he had shown Antony, who was to succeed him in the tribunate, how to exasperate the senate into using coercive measures against his sacrosanct person as tribune and thus justify Cæsar's course in the war, and he had goaded the Conservatives into taking the first overt step in the war by commissioning Pompey to begin a campaign against Cæsar without any authorization from the senate or the people.

The news of the unconstitutional step taken by Marcellus and Pompey reached Rome December 19 or 20. Curio's work as tribune was done, and on the twenty-first of the month he set out for the North to join his leader. The senate would be called together by the new consuls on January 1, and since, before the reform in the calendar, December had only twenty-nine days, there were left only eight days for Curio to reach Cæsar's head-quarters, lay the situation before him, and return to the city with his reply. Ravenna, where Cæsar had his head-quarters, was two hundred and forty miles from Rome. He covered the distance, apparently, in three days, spent perhaps two days with Cæsar, and was back in Rome again for the meeting of the senate on the morning of January 1. Consequently, he travelled at the rate of seventy-five or eighty miles a day, twice the rate of the ordinary Roman courier.

We cannot regret too keenly the fact that we have no account of Curio's meeting with Cæsar, and his recital to Cæsar of the course of events in Rome. In drawing up the document which was prepared at this conference, Cæsar must have been largely influenced by the intimate knowledge which Curio had of conditions in the capital, and of the temper of the senate. It was an ultimatum, and, when Curio presented it to the senate, that body accepted the challenge, and called upon Cæsar to lay down his command on a specified date or be declared a public enemy. Cæsar replied by crossing the border of his province and occupying one town after another in northern Italy in rapid succession. All this had been agreed upon in the meeting between Curio and Cæsar, and Velleius Paterculus[139] is probably right in putting the responsibility for the war largely on the shoulders of Curio, who, as he says, brought to naught the fair terms of peace which Cæsar was ready to propose and Pompey to accept. The whole situation points to the conclusion that Cæsar did not desire war, and was not prepared for it. Had he anticipated its immediate outbreak, he would scarcely have let it arise when he had only one legion with him on the border, while his other ten legions were a long distance away.

From the outset Curio took an active part in the war which he had done so much to bring about, and it was an appropriate thing that the closing events in his life should have been recorded for us by his great patron, Cæsar, in his narrative of the Civil War. On the 18th or 19th of January, within ten days of the crossing of the Rubicon, we hear of his being sent with a body of troops to occupy Iguvium,[140] and a month later he is in charge of one of the investing camps before the stronghold of Corfinium.[141] With the fall of Corfinium, on the 21st of February, Cæsar's rapid march southward began, which swept the Pompeians out of Italy within a month and gave Cæsar complete control of the peninsula. In that brilliant campaign Curio undoubtedly took an active part, for at the close of it Cæsar gave him an independent commission for the occupation of Sicily and northern Africa. No more important command could have been given him, for Sicily and Africa were the granaries of Rome, and if the Pompeians continued to hold

them, the Cæsarians in Italy might be starved into submission. To this ill-fated campaign Cæsar devotes the latter half of the second book of his Civil War. In the beginning of his account of it he remarks: "Showing at the outset a total contempt for the military strength of his opponent, Publius Attius Varus, Curio crossed over from Sicily, accompanied by only two of the four legions originally given him by Cæsar, and by only five hundred cavalry."[142] The estimate which Cælius had made of him was true, after all, at least in military affairs. He was bold and impetuous, and lacked a settled policy. Where daring and rapidity of movement could accomplish his purpose, he succeeded, but he lacked patience in finding out the size and disposition of the enemy's forces and calmness of judgment in comparing his own strength with that of his foe. It was this weakness in his character as a military leader which led him to join battle with Varus and Juba's lieutenant, Saburra, without learning beforehand, as he might have done, that Juba, with a large army, was encamped not six miles in the rear of Saburra. Curio's men were surrounded by the enemy and cut down as they stood. His staff begged him to seek safety in flight, but, as Cæsar writes,[143] "He answered without hesitation that, having lost the army which Cæsar had entrusted to his charge, he would never return to look him in the face, and with that answer he died fighting."

Three years later the fortunes of war brought Cæsar to northern Africa, and he traversed a part of the region where Curio's luckless campaign had been carried on. With the stern eye of the trained soldier, he marked the fatal blunders which Curio had made, but he recalled also the charm of his personal qualities, and the defeat before Utica was forgotten in his remembrance of the great victory which Curio had won for him, single-handed, in Rome. Even Lucan, a partisan of the senate which Curio had flouted, cannot withhold his admiration for Curio's brilliant career, and his pity for Curio's tragic end. As he stands in imagination before the fallen Roman leader, he exclaims:[144] "Happy wouldst thou be, O Rome, and destined to bless thy people, had it pleased the gods above to guard thy liberty as it pleased them to avenge its loss. Lo! the noble body of Curio, covered by no tomb, feeds the birds of Libya. But to thee, since it profiteth not to pass in silence those deeds of thine which their own glory defends forever 'gainst the decay of time, such tribute now we pay, O youth, as thy life has well deserved. No other citizen of such talent has Rome brought forth, nor one to whom the law would be indebted more, if he the path of right had followed out. As it was, the corruption of the age ruined the city when desire for office, pomp, and the power which wealth gives, ever to be dreaded, had swept away his wavering mind with sidelong flood, and the change of Curio, snared by the spoils of Gaul and the gold of Cæsar, was that which turned the tide of history. Although mighty Sulla, fierce Marius, the blood-bespattered Cinna, and all the line of Cæsar's house have held our throats at their mercy with the sword, to whom was e'er such power vouchsafed? All others bought, _he_ sold the state."

Gaius Matius, a Friend of Cæsar

"_Non enim Cæsarem ... sum secutus, sed amicum_."

Gaius Matius, the subject of this sketch, was neither a great warrior, nor statesman, nor writer. If his claim to remembrance rested on what he did in the one or the other of these rôles, he would long ago have been forgotten. It is his genius for friendship which has kept his memory green, and that is what he himself would have wished. Of his early life we know little, but it does not matter much, because the interest which he has for us centres about his relations to Cæsar in early manhood. Being of good birth, and a man of studious tastes, he probably attended the University at Athens, and heard lectures there as young Cicero and Messala did at a later period. He must have been a man of fine tastes and cultivation, for Cicero, in writing to a friend, bestows on Matius the title "doctissimus," the highest literary compliment which one Roman could pay another, and Apollodorus of Pergamum dedicated to him his treatise on rhetoric. Since he was born about 84 B.C., he returned from his years of study at Athens about the time when Cæsar was setting out on his brilliant campaign in Gaul. Matius joined him, attracted perhaps by the personal charms of the young proconsul, perhaps by the love of adventure, perhaps, like his friend Trebatius, by the hope of making a reputation.

At all events he was already with Cæsar somewhere in Gaul in 53 B.C., and it is hard to think of an experience better suited to lay bare the good and the bad qualities in Cæsar's character than the years of camp life which Matius spent with him in the wilds of Gaul and Britain. As aide-de-camp, or orderly, for such a position he probably held, his place was by Cæsar's side. They forded the rivers together, walked or rode through woodland or open side by side, shared the same meagre rations, and lay in the same tent at the end of the day's march, ready to spring from the ground at a moment's warning to defend each other against attack from the savage foe. Cæsar's narrative of his campaigns in Gaul is a soldier's story of military movements, and perhaps from our school-boy remembrance of it we may have as little a liking for it as Horace had for the poem of Livius Andronicus, which he studied under "Orbilius of the rods," but even the obscurities of the Latin subjunctive and ablative cannot have blinded us entirely to the romance of the desperate siege of Alesia and the final struggle which the Gauls made to drive back the invader. Matius shared with Cæsar all the hardships and perils of that campaign, and with Cæsar he witnessed the final scene of the tragedy when Vercingetorix, the

heroic Gallic chieftain, gave up his sword, and the conquest of Gaul was finished. It is little wonder that Matius and the other young men who followed Cæsar were filled with admiration of the man who had brought all this to pass.

It was a notable group, including Trebatius, Hirtius, Pansa, Oppius, and Matius in its number. All of them were of the new Rome. Perhaps they were dimly conscious that the mantle of Tiberius Gracchus had fallen upon their leader, that the great political struggle which had been going on for nearly a century was nearing its end, and that they were on the eve of a greater victory than that at Alesia. It would seem that only two of them, Matius and Trebatius, lived to see the dawning of the new day. But it was not simply nor mainly the brilliancy of Cæsar as a leader in war or in politics which attracted Matius to him. As he himself puts it in his letter to Cicero: "I did not follow a Cæsar, but a friend." Lucullus and Pompey had made as distinguished a record in the East as Cæsar had in the West, but we hear of no such group of able young men following their fortunes as attached themselves to Cæsar. We must find a reason for the difference in the personal qualities of Cæsar, and there is nothing that more clearly proves the charm of his character than the devotion to him of this group of men. In the group Matius is the best representative of the man and the friend. When Cæsar came into his own, Matius neither asked for nor accepted the political offices which Cæsar would gladly have given him. One needs only to recall the names of Antony, Labienus, or Decimus Brutus to realize the fact that Cæsar remembered and rewarded the faithful services of his followers. But Matius was Cæsar's friend and nothing more, not his master of the horse, as Antony was, nor his political and financial heir, as Octavius was. In his loyalty to Cæsar he sought for no other reward than Cæsar's friendship, and his services to him brought with them their own return. Indeed, through his friend he suffered loss, for one of Cæsar's laws robbed him of a part of his estate, as he tells us, but this experience did not lessen his affection. How different his attitude was from that of others who professed a friendship for Cæsar! Some of them turned upon their leader and plotted against his life, when disappointed in the favors which they had received at his hands, and others, when he was murdered, used his name and his friendship for them to advance their own ambitious designs. Antony and Octavius struggle with each other to catch the reins of power which have fallen from his hands; Dolabella, who seems to regard himself as an understudy of Cæsar, plays a serio-comic part in Rome in his efforts to fill the place of the dead dictator; while Decimus Brutus hurries to the North to make sure of the province which Cæsar had given him.

From these men, animated by selfishness, by jealousy, by greed for gain, by sentimentalism, or by hypocritical patriotism, Matius stands aloof, and stands perhaps alone. For him the death of Cæsar means the loss of a friend, of a man in whom he believed. He can find no common point of sympathy either with those who rejoice in the death of the tyrant, as Cicero does, for he had not thought Cæsar a tyrant, nor with those who use the name of Cæsar to conjure with. We have said that he accepted no political office. He did accept an office, that of procurator, or superintendent, of the public games which Cæsar had vowed on the field of Pharsalus, but which death had stepped in to prevent him from giving, and it was in the pious fulfilment of this duty which he took upon himself that he brought upon his head the anger of the "auctores libertatis," as he ironically calls them. He had grieved, too, at the death of Cæsar, although "a man ought to rate the fatherland above a friend," as the liberators said. Matius took little heed of this talk. He had known of it from the outset, but it had not troubled him. Yet when it came to his ears that his friend Cicero, to whom he had been attached from boyhood, to whom he had proved his fidelity at critical moments, was among his accusers, he could not but complain bitterly of the injustice. Through a common friend, Trebatius, whose acquaintance he had made in Gaul, he expresses to Cicero the sorrow which he feels at his unkindness. What Cicero has to say in explanation of his position and in defence of himself, we can do no better than to give in his own words:

"_Cicero to Matins, greeting:_[145]

"I am not yet quite clear in my own mind whether our friend Trebatius, who is as loyal as he is devoted to both of us, has brought me more sorrow or pleasure: for I reached my Tusculan villa in the evening, and the next day, early in the morning, he came to see me, though he had not yet recovered his strength. When I reproved him for giving too little heed to his health, he said that nothing was nearer his heart than seeing me. 'There's nothing new,' say I? He told me of your grievance against me, yet before I make any reply in regard to it, let me state a few facts.

"As far back as I can recall the past I have no friend of longer standing than you are; but long duration is a thing characteristic of many friendships, while love is not. I loved you on the day I met you, and I believed myself loved by you. Your subsequent departure, and that too for a long time, my electoral canvass, and our different modes of life did not allow our inclination toward one another to be strengthened by intimacy; still I saw your feeling toward me many years before the Civil War, while Cæsar was in Gaul; for the result which you thought would be of great advantage to me and not of disadvantage to Cæsar himself you accomplished: I mean in bringing him to love me, to honor me, to regard me as one of his friends. Of the many confidential

communications which passed between us in those days, by word of mouth, by letter, by message, I say nothing, for sterner times followed. At the breaking out of the Civil War, when you were on your way toward Brundisium to join Cæsar, you came to me to my Formian villa. In the first place, how much did that very fact mean, especially at those times! Furthermore, do you think I have forgotten your counsel, your words, the kindness you showed? I remember that Trebatius was there. Nor indeed have I forgotten the letter which you sent to me after meeting Cæsar, in the district near Trebula, as I remember it. Next came that ill-fated moment when either my regard for public opinion, or my sense of duty, or chance, call it what you will, compelled me to go to Pompey. What act of kindness or thoughtfulness either toward me in my absence or toward my dear ones in Rome did you neglect? In fact, whom have all my friends thought more devoted to me and to themselves than you are? I came to Brundisium. Do you think I have forgotten in what haste, as soon as you heard of it, you came hurrying to me from Tarentum? How much your presence meant to me, your words of cheer to a courage broken by the fear of universal disaster! Finally, our life at Rome began. What element did our friendship lack? In most important matters I followed your advice with reference to my relations toward Cæsar; in other matters I followed my own sense of duty. With whom but myself, if Cæsar be excepted, have you gone so far as to visit his house again and again, and to spend there many hours, oftentimes in the most delightful discourse? It was then too, if you remember, that you persuaded me to write those philosophical essays of mine. After his return, what purpose was more in your thoughts than to have me as good a friend of Cæsar as possible? This you accomplished at once.

"What is the point, then, of this discourse, which is longer than I had intended it should be? This is the point, that I have been surprised that you, who ought to see these things, have believed that I have taken any step which is out of harmony with our friendly relations, for beside these facts which I have mentioned, which are undisputed and self-evident facts, there are many more intimate ties of friendship which I can scarcely put in words. Everything about you charms me, but most of all, on the one hand, your perfect loyalty in matters of friendship, your wisdom, dignity, steadfastness; on the other hand, your wit, refinement, and literary tastes.

"Wherefore--now I come back to the grievance--in the first place, I did not think that you had voted for that law; in the second place, if I had thought so, I should never have thought that you had done it without some sufficient reason. Your position makes whatever you do noticeable; furthermore, envy puts some of your acts in a worse light than the facts warrant. If you do not hear these rumors I do not know what to say. So far as I am concerned, if I ever hear them I defend you as I know that _I_ am always defended by _you_ against _my_ detractors. And my defence follows two lines: there are some things which I always deny _in toto_, as, for instance, the statement in regard to that very vote; there are other acts of yours which I maintain were dictated by considerations of affection and kindness, as, for instance, your action with reference to the management of the games. But it does not escape you, with all your wisdom, that, if Cæsar was a king--which seems to me at any rate to have been the case--with respect of your duty two positions may be maintained, either the one which I am in the habit of taking, that your loyalty and friendship to Cæsar are to be praised, or the one which some people take, that the freedom of one's fatherland is to be esteemed more than the life of one's friend. I wish that my discussions springing out of these conversations had been repeated to you.

"Indeed, who mentions either more gladly or more frequently than I the two following facts, which are especially to your honor? The fact that you were the most influential opponent of the Civil War, and that you were the most earnest advocate of temperance in the moment of victory, and in this matter I have found no one to disagree with me. Wherefore I am grateful to our friend Trebatius for giving me an opportunity to write this letter, and if you are not convinced by it, you will think me destitute of all sense of duty and kindness; and nothing more serious to me than that or more foreign to your own nature can happen."

In all the correspondence of Cicero there is not a letter written with more force and delicacy of feeling, none better suited to accomplish its purpose than this letter to Matius. It is a work of art; but in that fact lies its defect, and in that respect it is in contrast to the answer which it called forth from Matius, The reply of Matius stands on a level with another better-known non-Ciceronian epistle, the famous letter of condolence which Servius wrote to Cicero after the death of Cicero's daughter, Tullia; but it is finer, for, while Servius is stilted and full of philosophical platitudes, Matius, like Shakespeare's Antony, "only speaks right on," in telling Cicero of his grief at Cæsar's death, of his indignation at the intolerant attitude of the assassins, and his determination to treasure the memory of Cæsar at any cost. This is his letter:

"_Matius to Cicero, greeting_[146]

"I derived great pleasure from your letter, because I saw that you held such an opinion about me as I had hoped you would hold, and wished you to hold; and although, in regard to that opinion, I had no misgivings, still, inasmuch as I considered it a matter of the greatest importance, I was anxious that it should continue unchanged. And then I was conscious of having done nothing to offend

any good citizen; therefore I was the less inclined to believe that you, endowed as you are with so many excellent qualities, could be influenced by any idle rumors, especially as my friendship toward you had been and was sincere and unbroken. Since I know that matters stand in this respect as I have wished them to stand, I will reply to the charges, which you have often refuted in my behalf in such a way as one would expect from that kindness of heart characteristic of you and from our friendship. It is true that what men said against me after the death of Cæsar was known to me. They call it a sin of mine that I sorrow over the death of a man dear to me, and because I grieve that he whom I loved is no more, for they say that 'fatherland should be above friendship,' just as if they had proved already that his death has been of service to the state. But I will make no subtle plea. I confess that I have not attained to your high philosophic planes; for, on the one hand, in the Civil War I did not follow a Cæsar, but a friend, and although I was grieved at the state of things, still I did not desert him; nor, on the other hand, did I at any time approve of the Civil War, nor even of the reason for strife, which I most earnestly sought to extinguish when it was kindling. Therefore, in the moment of victory for one bound to me by the closest ties, I was not captivated by the charm either of public office or of gold, while his other friends, although they had less influence with him than I, misused these rewards in no small degree. Nay, even my own property was impaired by a law of Cæsar's, thanks to which very law many who rejoice at the death of Cæsar have remained at Rome. I have worked as for my own welfare that conquered citizens might be spared.

"Then may not I, who have desired the welfare of all, be indignant that he, from whom this favor came, is dead? especially since the very men who were forgiven have brought him both unpopularity and death. You shall be punished, then, they say, 'since you dare to disapprove of our deed.' Unheard of arrogance, that some men glory in their crime, that others may not even sorrow over it without punishment! But it has always been the unquestioned right, even of slaves, to fear, to rejoice, to grieve according to the dictates of their own feelings rather than at the bidding of another man; of these rights, as things stand now, to judge from what these champions of freedom keep saying, they are trying to deprive us by intimidation; but their efforts are useless. I shall never be driven by the terrors of any danger from the path of duty or from the claims of friendship, for I have never thought that a man should shrink from an honorable death; nay, I have often thought that he should seek it. But why are they angry at me, if I wish them to repent of their deed? for I desire to have Cæsar's death a bitter thing to all men.

"'But I ought as a citizen to desire the welfare of the state.' Unless my life in the past and my hope for the future, without words from me, prove that I desire that very end, I do not seek to establish the fact by words. Wherefore I beg you the more earnestly to consider deeds more than words, and to believe, if you feel that it is well for the right to prevail, that I can have no intercourse with dishonorable men. For am I now, in my declining years, to change that course of action which I maintained in my youth, when I might even have gone astray with hope of indulgence, and am I to undo my life's work? I will not do so. Yet I shall take no step which may be displeasing to any man, except to grieve at the cruel fate of one most closely bound to me, of one who was a most illustrious man. But if I were otherwise minded, I would never deny what I was doing lest I should be regarded as shameless in doing wrong, a coward and a hypocrite in concealing it.

"'Yet the games which the young Cæsar gave in memory of Cæsar's victory I superintended.' But that has to do with my private obligation and not with the condition of the state; a duty, however, which I owed to the memory and the distinguished position of a dear friend even though he was dead, a duty which I could not decline when asked by a young man of most excellent promise and most worthy of Cæsar. 'I even went frequently to the house of the consul Antony to pay my respects!' to whom you will find that those who think that I am lacking in devotion to my country kept coming in throngs to ask some favor forsooth or secure some reward. But what arrogance this is that, while Cæsar never interfered with my cultivating the friendship of men whom I pleased, even when he himself did not like them, these men who have taken my friend from me should try to prevent me by their slander from loving those whom I will.

"But I am not afraid lest the moderation of my life may prove too weak to withstand false reports, or that even those who do not love me because of my loyalty to Cæsar may not prefer to have friends like me rather than like themselves. So far as I myself am concerned, if what I prefer shall be my lot, the life which is left me I shall spend in retirement at Rhodes; but if some untoward circumstance shall prevent it, I shall live at Rome in such a wise as to desire always that right be done. Our friend Trebatius I thank heartily in that he has disclosed your sincere and friendly feeling toward me, and has shown me that him whom I have always loved of my own free will I ought with the more reason to esteem and honor. Bene vale et me dilige."

With these words our knowledge of Matius comes almost to an end. His life was prolonged into the imperial period, and, strangely enough, in one of the few references to him which we find at a later date, he is characterized as "the friend of Augustus" (divi Augusti amicus). It would seem that the affection which he felt for Cæsar he transferred to Cæsar's heir and successor. He still holds no office or title. In this connection it is interesting to recall the fact that we owe the best of Cicero's philosophical work to him,

the "Academics," the "De Finibus," and the "Tusculan Questions," for Cicero tells us in his letter that he was induced to write his treatises on philosophy by Matius. It is a pleasant thing to think that to him we may also be indebted for Cicero's charming essay "On Friendship." The later life of Matius, then, we may think was spent in retirement, in the study of philosophy, and in the pursuit of literature. His literary pursuits give a homely and not unpleasant touch to his character. They were concerned with gastronomy, for Columella, in the first century of our era, tells us[147] that Matius composed three books, bearing the titles of "The Cook," "The Butler," and "The Picklemaker," and his name was transmitted to a later generation in a dish known as "mincemeat à la Matius" (_minutal Matianum_).[148] He passes out of the pages of history in the writings of Pliny the Elder as the man who "invented the practice of clipping shrubbery."[149] To him, then, we perhaps owe the geometrical figures, and the forms of birds and beasts which shrubs take in the modern English garden. His memory is thus ever kept green, whether in a way that redounds to his credit or not is left for the reader to decide.

Index

Acta Diurna. Anoyran monument. Anglo-Saxons, compared with Romans, in government; in private affairs. Arval Hymn, the. Ascoli's theory of the differentiation of the Romance languages. Augustus, "Res Gestæ"; his benefactions.

Batha, a municipal expense. Benefactions, private, co-operation with the government; _objects_; comparison of ancient and modern objects; of Æmilius; of Pompey; of Augustus; motives; expected of prominent men; attempts at regulation; a recognized responsibility; a legal obligation on municipal officials; offices thereby limited to the rich; of rich private citizens; effect on municipal life and character; on private citizens; charity. Burial societies.

Cælius, estimate of Curio. Cæsar, expenditures as sedile; and Curio; secures Curio as agent in Rome; unprepared for civil war; _et passim_ in chapters on Curio and Matius. Cato the elder, his diction. Charity. Church, the Christian, influence on the spread of Latin. Cicero, quotation from a letter in colloquial style; his "corrupt practices act,"; and Scaptius; and Curio; _correspondence_ with Matius. Civic pride of Romans. Civil war, outbreak of. Combinations in restraint of trade; government intervention. Common people, their language logical; progressive and conservative elements. Common people of Rome, their language (see _Latin, colloquial_); their religious beliefs; philosophy of life; belief in future life. Controversiae of the schools of rhetoric. Corporations; aid the government; collect taxes; in politics; many small stockholders. Cromer, Lord, "Ancient and Modern Imperialism,". Curio, funeral games in his father's honor; character; family; relations with Cicero; beginning of public life; relations with Cæsar; openly espouses Cæsar's cause; popularity; as quæstor; in the Clodian affair; Cælius's opinion of him; as tribune; relations with Pompey; forces conservatives to open hostilities; his part in the civil war; death.

Dacia, Latin in. Dialects in Italy, their disappearance. Diez, the Romance philologist. Diocletian's policy; his edict to regulate prices; content; discovery of document; amount extant; date; style; provisions of the edict; extracts; discussion; made prices uniform; its prices are retail; interesting deductions; effect; repeal.

English language in India. Epitaphs, deal with the common people; length of Roman epitaphs; along Appian Way; sentiments expressed; show religious beliefs; gods rarely named; Mother Earth. Epitaphs, metrical, praises of women predominate; literary merit; art. Étienne, Henri, first scholar to notice colloquial Latin.

Food, cost of, comparison with to-day; free distribution of.

Gracchi, the. Greek language, in Italy; not conquered by Latin; influence on Latin. Gröber's theory of the differentiation of the Romance languages; criticism of. Guilds; were non-political; inscriptional evidence; comparison of conditions in East and West; objects; dinners; temples; rules; no attempts to raise wages; religious character; began to enter politics; attitude of government toward; decline.

Hempl's theory of language rivalry. Horace, his "curiosa felicitas,".

Inscription from Pompeii, in colloquial Latin.

Julia, death of. Julian's edict to regulate the price of grain.

Labor-unions. (See _Guilds_.) Lactantius, "On the Deaths of Those Who Persecuted (the Christians),". Languages spoken in Italy in the early period; influence of other languages on Latin, 22. (See also _Greek_.) Latin language, extent; unifying influences; uniformity; evidence of inscriptions; causes of its spread; colonies; roads; merchants; soldiers; government officials; the church; its

superiority not a factor; sentiment a cause; "peaceful invasion,". Latin, colloquial, its study neglected till recently; first noticed in modern times by Henri Étienne; its forms, how determined; ancient authority for its existence; evidence of the Romance languages; aid derived from a knowledge of spoken English; analytical formation of tenses; slang; extant specimens; causes of variation; external influences on; influence of culture; definition of colloquial Latin; relation to literary Latin; careless pronunciation; accent different from literary Latin; confusion of genders; monotonous style; tendencies in vocabulary, 64-7: in syntax; effect of loss of final letters; reunion with literary Latin; still exists in the Romance languages; date when it became the separate Romance language; specimens quoted. Latin, literary, modelled on Greek; relation to colloquial Latin; standardized by grammarians; style unnatural; reunion with colloquial Latin; disappearance. Latin, preliterary. Laws of the Twelve Tables; excerpt from. Living, cost of, comparison with to-day. Livius Andronicus. Lucan's account of the death of Curio.

Matius, Gaius, early life and character; with Cæsar in Gaul; friendship with Cæsar, _passim_; accepted no office; devotion to Cæsar; unpopularity due to it; correspondence with Cicero; defence of his devotion to Cæsar; prompted Cicero's best philosophical works; later life; literary works. Menippean satire. Milesian tales. Money, unit of.

Nævius. Ninus romance; and Petronius.

Organization, of capitalists (see _Corporations_); of labor (see _Guilds_). Oscan.

Paternalism, beginnings of, in Rome; effect on people. Patron, office of; benefactions of. Pervigilium Veneris. Petronius, Satiræ; excerpt from; original size; motif; Trimalchio's Dinner; satirical spirit; literary criticism; Horatian humor; cynical attitude; realism; prose-poetic form; origin of this genre of literature; the Satiræ and the epic; and the heroic romance; and the Menippean satire; and the Milesian tale; and the prologue of comedy; and the mime; the Satiræ perhaps a mixture of many types; originated with Petronius. Plautus. Poetry of the common people, dedicatory; ephemeral; graffiti; borrowed from the Augustan poets; folk poetry; children's jingles. Pompey, his benefactions; ordered to march against Cæsar; _et passim_ in chapter on Curio. Prices, controlled by corporations; attempts at government regulation. Probus, the "Appendix" of. Prose-poetic form.

Ritschl, the Plautine scholar. Romance, the realistic, origin obscure. (See _Petronius, Satiræ_.) Romance languages, causes of their differentiation, Gröber's theory; Ascoli's theory; date of their beginning; descended from colloquial Latin; reasons of their agreement; common source. Romances, the Greek, theory of origin.

Salaries of municipal officers. (See also _Wages_.) Scaptius and Cicero. Seneca the elder, "Controversiæ,". Strasburg oath. Strikes.

Theatres a municipal expense. Trimalchio's Dinner.

Umbrian. Urso, constitution of.

Wages in Roman times; compared with to-day; and guilds; and slavery. (See also _Salaries_.)

Footnotes

[1] _Cf._ A. Ernout, _Le Parler de Préneste_, Paris, 1905.

[2] The relation between Latin and the Italic dialects may be illustrated by an extract or two from them with a Latin translation. An Umbrian specimen may be taken from one of the bronze tablets found at Iguvium, which reads in Umbrian: Di Grabouie, saluo seritu ocrem Fisim, saluam seritu totam Iiouinam (_Iguvinian Tables_ VI, a. 51), and in Latin: Deus Grabovi, salvam servato arcem Fisiam, salvam servato civitatem Iguvinam. A bit of Oscan from the Tabula Bantina (Tab. Bant. 2, 11) reads: suaepis contrud exeic fefacust auti comono hipust, molto etanto estud, and in Latin: siquis contra hoc fecerit aut comitia habuerit, multa tanta esto.

[3] _Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum_, IX, 782, furnishes a case in point.

[4] _Cf._ G. Mohl, _Introduction à la chronologie du Latin vulgaire_, Paris, 1899.

[5] Pauly-Wissowa, _Real-Encyclopadie_, IV, 1179 _ff._

[6] Marquardt, _Römische Staatsverwaltung_, II, p. 463.

[7] _Cf._, _e.g._, Pirson, _La langue des inscriptions Latines de la Gaule_, Bruxelles, 1901; Carnoy, _Le Latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions_, Bruxelles, 1906; Hoffmann, _De titulis Africæ Latinis quæstiones phoneticæ_, 1907; Kuebler, _Die lateinische Sprache auf afrikanischen Inschriften_ (_Arch, für lat. Lex._, vol. VIII), and Martin, _Notes on the Syntax of the Latin Inscriptions Found in Spain_, Baltimore, 1909.

[8] _Cf._ L. Hahn, _Rom und Romanismus im griechisch-römischen Osten_ (esp. pp. 222-268), Leipzig, 1906.

[9] _Proceedings of the American Philological Association_, XXIX (1898), pp. 31-47. For a different theory of the results of language-conflict, _cf._ Gröber, _Grundriss der romanischen Philologie_, I, pp. 516, 517.

[10] A very interesting sketch of the history of the Latin language in this region may be seen in Ovide Densusianu's _Histoire de la langue Roumaine_, Paris, 1902.

[11] Gorra, _Lingue Neolatine_, pp. 66-68.

[12] Gröber, _Grundriss der romanischen Philologie_, pp. 517 and 524.

[13] _Cf._ Gröber in _Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik_, I, p. 210 _ff._

[14] _Is Modern-Language Teaching a Failure?_ Chicago, 1907.

[15] _Cf._ Abbott, _History of Rome_, pp. 246-249.

[16] Schuchardt, _Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins, I_, 103 _ff._

[17] _Cf._ Gröber, _Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik_, I, 45.

[18] Thielmann, _Archiv_, II, 48 _ff._; 157 _ff._

[19] From the "Laws of the Twelve Tables" of the fifth century B.C. See Bruns, _Fontes iuris Romani antiqui_, sixth edition, p. 31.

[20] _Appendix Probi_, in Keil's _Grammatici Latini_, IV, 197 _ff._

[21] "The Accent in Vulgar and Formal Latin," in _Classical Philology_, II (1907), 445 _ff._

[22] Bücheler, _Carmina Latina epigraphica_, No. 53. The originals of all the bits of verse which are translated in this paper may be found in the collection whose title is given here. Hereafter reference to this work will be by number only.

[23] No. 443.

[24] No. 92.

[25] No. 128.

[26] No. 127.

[27] No. 876.

[28] No. 1414.

[29] No. 765.

[30] No. 843.

[31] No. 95.

[32] No. 1578.

[33] Nos. 1192 and 1472.

[34] No. 1037.

[35] No. 1039.

[36] G. W. Van Bleek, Quae de hominum post mortem eondicione doceant carmina sepulcralia Latina.

[37] No. 1495.

[38] No. 1496.

[39] No. 86.

[40] No. 1465.

[41] No. 1143.

[42] No. 1559.

[43] No. 1433.

[44] No. 225.

[45] No. 143.

[46] No. 83.

[47] No. 1500.

[48] No. 190.

[49] No. 244.

[50] No. 1499.

[51] No. 856.

[52] Society and Politics in Ancient Rome, p. 183.

[53] No. 562.

[54] No. 52.

[55] No. 1251.

[56] No. 106.

[57] No. 967.

[58] No. 152.

[59] No. 1042.

[60] No. 1064.

[61] No. 98.

[62] Bücheler, _Carmina Latino epigraphica_, No. 899.

[63] No. 19.

[64] No. 866.

[65] No. 863.

[66] No. 937.

[67] No. 949.

[68] No. 943.

[69] No. 945.

[70] No. 354.

[71] _Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum_, IV, 6892.

[72] Bücheler, No. 928.

[73] No. 333.

[74] No. 931.

[75] No. 933.

[76] No. 38.

[77] No. 270.

[78] Habeat scabiem quisquis ad me venerit novissimus.

[79] Rex erit qui recte faciet, qui non faciet non erit.

[80]

Gallos Cæsar in triumphum ducit, idem in curiam; Galli bracas deposuerunt, latum clavom sumpserunt.

[81]

Brutus quia reges eiecit, consul primus factus est; Hic quia consoles eiecit, rex postremo factus est.

[82] Salva Roma, salva patria, salvus est Germanicus.

[83] _Cf._ Schmid, "Der griechische Roman," _Neue Jahrb._, Bd XIII (1904), 465-85; Wilcken, in _Hermes_, XXVIII, 161 _ff._, and in _Archiv f. Papyrusforschung_, I, 255 _ff._; Grenfell-Hunt, _Fayûm Towns and Their Papyri_ (1900), 75 _ff._, and _Rivista di Filologia_, XXIII, I _ff._

[84] Some of the important late discussions of the Milesian tale are by Bürger, _Hermes_ (1892), 351 _ff._; Norden, _Die antike Kunstprosa_, II, 602, 604, n.; Rohde, _Kleine Schriften_, II, 25 _ff._; Bürger, _Studien zur Geschichte d. griech. Romans_, I (_Programm von Blankenburg a. H._, 1902); W. Schmid, _Neue Jahrb. f. d. klass. Alt._ (1904), 474 _ff._; Lucas, "Zu den Milesiaca des Aristides," _Philologus_, 61 (1907), 16 _ff._

[85] On the origin of the _prosimetrum cf._ Hirzel, _Der Dialog_, 381 _ff._; Norden, _Die antike Kunstprosa_, 755.

[86] _Cf._ Rosenbluth, _Beiträge zur Quellenkunde von Petrons Satiren_. Berlin, 1909.

[87] This theory in the main is suggested by Rohde, _Der griechische Roman_, 2d ed., 267 (Leipzig, 1900), and by Ribbeck, _Geschichte d. röm. Dichtung_, 2d ed., III, 150.

[88] _Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum_, vol. III, pp. 1926-1953. Mommsen's text with a commentary has been published by H. Blümner, in _Der Maximaltarif des Diocletian_, Berlin, 1893. A brief description of the edict may be found in the Pauly-Wissowa _Real-Encyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft_, under "Edictum Diocletiani," and K. Bücher has discussed some points in it in the _Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft_, vol. L (1894), pp. 189-219 and 672-717.

[89] The method of arrangement may be illustrated by an extract from the first table, which deals with grain and vegetables.

[90] The present-day prices which are given in the third column of these two tables are taken from Bulletin No. 77 of the Bureau of Labor, and from the majority and minority reports of the Select Committee of the U.S. Senate on "Wages and Prices of Commodities" (Report, No. 912, Documents, Nos. 421 and 477). In setting down a number to represent the current price of an article naturally a rough average had to be struck of the rates charged in different parts of the country. Bulletin No. 77, for instance, gives the retail price charged for butter at 226 places in 68 different cities, situated in 39 different States. At one point in Illinois the price quoted in 1906 was 22 cents, while at a point in Pennsylvania 36 cents was reported, but the prevailing price throughout the country ranged from 26 to 32, so that these figures were set down in the table. A similar method has been adopted for the other items. A special difficulty arises in the case of beef, where the price varies according to the cut. The price of wheat is not given in

the extant fragment of the edict, but has been calculated by Blümner from statements in ancient writers. So far as the wages of the ancient and modern workman are concerned we must remember that the Roman laborer in many cases received "keep" from his employer. Probably from one-third to three-sevenths should be added to his daily wage to cover this item. Statistics published by the Department of Agriculture show that the average wage of American farm laborers per month during 1910 was $27.50 without board and $19.21 with board. The item of board, therefore, is three-sevenths of the money paid to the laborer when he keeps himself. One other point of difference between ancient and modern working conditions must be borne in mind in attempting a comparison. We have no means of knowing the length of the Roman working day. However, it was probably much longer than our modern working day, which, for convenience' sake, is estimated at eight hours.

[91] Wholesale price in 1909.

[92] Receives "keep" also.

[93] Eight-hour day assumed.

[94] _Cf._ Report of the Commissioner of Labor, pp. 622-625. In England between one-third and one-fourth; _cf._ Bulletin, No. 77, p. 345.

[95] _Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum_, II, 5489.

[96] Wilmanns, _Exempla Inscriptionum Latinarum_, 1772.

[97] _Ibid._, 2037.

[98] _Ibid._, 1859.

[99] _Ibid._, 2054.

[100] _Ibid._, 2099.

[101] 23:48_f._

[102] _Cic., ad Att._, 5.21. 10-13; 6.1. 5-7; 6.2.7; 6.3.5.

[103] 6.17.

[104] _Captivi_, 489 _ff._

[105] _Livy_, 38. 35.

[106] Plautus, _Pseudolus_, 189.

[107] Some of the most important discussions of workmen's guilds among the Romans are to be found in Waltzing's _Etude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains_, 3 vols., Louvain, 1895-9; Liebenam's _Zur Geschichte und Organisation des römischen Vereinswesen_, Leipzig, 1890; Ziebarth's _Das Griechische Vereinswesen_, Leipzig, 1896, pp. 96-110; Kornemann's article, "Collegium," in the Pauly-Wissowa _Real Encyclopadie_. Other literature is cited by Waltzing, I, pp. 17-30, and by Kornemann, IV, columns 479-480.

[108] _Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum_, XI, 5047.

[109] _Ibid._, V, 7906.

[110] _Ibid._, III, p. 953.

[111] _Ibid._, VIII, 14683.

[112] _Ibid._, III, 3583.

[113] _Ibid._, XIV, 2112.

[114] _Ibid._, XIV, 326.

[115] _E.g._, Clodius and Milo.

[116] Lucan, 4. 814 _ff._; Velleius, 2. 48; Pliny, Nat. Hist., 7. 116 _ff._

[117] Cicero, Brutus, 122, 210, 214.

[118] _Ibid._, 280.

[119] Cicero, _Epist. ad Fam._, 2. 1.

[120] Cicero, _Phil._, 2. 45 _f._

[121] Cicero, _ad Att._, 1. 14. 5.

[122] _Ibid._, 1. 14. 5.

[123] _Ibid._, 2. 12. 2.

[124] _Ibid._, 2.7.3; 2.8.1; 2.12.2.

[125] Suet., _Julius_, 52.

[126]_Ad Att._, 2. 19. 3.

[127] _Ad fam._, 2.4.

[128] _Ibid._, 2.6.

[129]_Ibid._, 8. 4. 2.

[130] Dio's account (40. 61) of Curio's course seems to harmonize with this interpretation.

[131] "Cicero, _ad fam._, 8.10.4.

[132] White's Civil Wars of Appian, 2.27.

[133] Cicero, _ad fam._, 8.6.5.

[134] Valerius Maximus, 9.1.6.

[135] Vell. Pat., 2.48.

[136] Civil Wars, 2.30.

[137] _Ad Att._, 6.9.4.

[138] Civil Wars of Appian, 2.31.

[139] Velleius Paterculus, 2.48.

[140] Cæsar, Civil War, 1. 12.

[141] _Ibid._, 1.182

[142] _Ibid._, 2.23.

[143] _Ibid._, 2.42.

[144] _Pharsalia_, 4. 807-824.

[145] Cicero, _Epistulæ ad famiares_, 11.27.

[146] Cicero, _Epist. ad fam._, 11.28.

[147] 12.46.1.

[148] Apicius, 4.174.

[149] _Naturalis Historia_, 12.13.

==========

The origin and development of the moral ideas

Edward Westermarck

Project Gutenberg Release: May 19, 2016 · eBook #52106

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MORAL IDEAS

[Macmillan icon]

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

LONDON . BOMBAY . CALCUTTA MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

NEW YORK . BOSTON . CHICAGO DALLAS . SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.

TORONTO

THE ORIGIN

AND DEVELOPMENT

OF THE

MORAL IDEAS

BY

EDWARD WESTERMARCK, PH.D., LL.D.

MARTIN WHITE PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FINLAND, HELSINGFORS

AUTHOR OF "THE HISTORY OF HUMAN MARRIAGE"

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I

SECOND EDITION

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON

1924.

COPYRIGHT

First Edition 1906 _Second Edition_ 1912 _Reprinted_ 1924

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE

THE frequent references made in the present work, on my own authority, to customs and ideas prevalent among the natives of Morocco, require a word of explanation. Seeing the close connection between moral opinions and magic and religious beliefs, I thought it might be useful for me to acquire first-hand knowledge of the folk-lore of some non-European people, and for various reasons I chose Morocco as my field of research. During the four years I spent there, largely among its country population, I have not only collected anthropological data, but tried to make myself familiar with the native way of thinking; and I venture to believe that this has helped me to understand various customs occurring at a stage of civilisation different from our own. I purpose before long to publish the detailed results of my studies in a special monograph on the popular religion and magics of the Moors.

For these researches I have derived much material support from the University of Helsingfors. I am also indebted to the Russian Minister at Tangier, M. B. de Bacheracht, for his kindness in helping me on several occasions when I was dependent on the Sultan's Government. All the time I have had the valuable assistance of my Moorish friend Shereef [(]Abd-es-Salâm el-Ba[k.][k.]âli, to whom credit {vi} is due for the kind reception I invariably received from peasants and mountaineers, not generally noted for friendliness towards Europeans.

I beg to express my best thanks to Mr. Stephen Gwynn for revising the first thirteen chapters, and to Mr. H. C. Minchin for revising the remaining portion of the book. To their suggestions I am indebted for the improvement of many phrases and expressions. I have likewise to thank my friend Mr. Alex. F. Shand for kindly reading the proofs of the earlier chapters and giving me the benefit of his opinion.

Throughout the work the reader will easily find how much I owe to British science and thought--a debt which is greater than I can ever express.

E. W.

London,

January, 1906.

* * * * *

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

THE present edition is only a reprint of the first, with a few inaccurate expressions corrected.

E. W.

London,

July, 1912.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY

The origin of the present investigation, p. 1.--Its subject-matter, p. 1 _sq._--Its practical usefulness, p. 2 _sq._

CHAPTER I

THE EMOTIONAL ORIGIN OF MORAL JUDGMENTS

The moral concepts essentially generalisations of tendencies in certain phenomena to call forth moral emotions, pp. 4-6.--The assumed universality or "objectivity" of moral judgments, p. 6 _sq._--Theories according to which the moral predicates derive all their import from reason, "theoretical" or "practical," p. 7 _sq._--Our tendency to objectivise moral judgments, no sufficient ground for referring them to the province of reason, p. 8 _sq._--This tendency partly due to the comparatively uniform nature of the moral consciousness, p. 9.--Differences of moral estimates resulting from circumstances of a purely intellectual character, pp. 9-11.--Differences of an emotional origin, pp. 11-13.--Quantitative, as well as qualitative, differences, p. 13.--The tendency to objectivise moral judgments partly due to the authority ascribed to moral rules, p. 14.--The origin and nature of this authority, pp. 14-17.--General moral truths non-existent, p. 17 _sq._--The object of scientific ethics not to fix rules for human conduct, but to study

the moral consciousness as a fact, p. 18.--The supposed dangers of ethical subjectivism, pp. 18-20.

CHAPTER II

THE NATURE OF THE MORAL EMOTIONS

The moral emotions of two kinds: disapproval, or indignation, and approval, p. 21.--The moral emotions retributive emotions, disapproval forming a sub-species of resentment, and approval a sub-species of retributive kindly emotion, _ibid._--Resentment an aggressive attitude of mind toward a cause of pain, p. 22 _sq._--Dr. Steinmetz's suggestion that revenge is essentially rooted in the feeling of power and superiority, and originally "undirected," pp. 23-27.--The true import of the facts adduced as evidence for this hypothesis, pp. 27-30.--The collective responsibility usually involved in the institution of the blood-feud, pp. 30-32.--Explanation of it, pp. 32-35.-- {viii} The strong tendency to discrimination which characterises resentment not wholly lost even behind the veil of common responsibility, p. 35 _sq._--Revenge among the lower animals, p. 37 _sq._--Violation of the "self-feeling" a common incentive to resentment, p. 38 _sq._--But the reaction of the wounded "self-feeling" not necessarily, in the first place, concerned with the infliction of pain, p. 39 _sq._--Revenge only a link in a chain of emotional phenomena for which "non-moral resentment" may be used as a common name, p. 40.--The origin of these phenomena, pp. 40-42.--Moral indignation closely connected with anger, p. 42 _sq._--Moral indignation, like non-moral resentment, a reactionary attitude of mind directed towards the cause of inflicted pain, though the reaction sometimes turns against innocent persons, pp. 43-48.--In their administration of justice gods still more indiscriminate than men, pp. 48-51.--Reasons for this, p. 51 _sq._--Sin looked upon in the light of a contagious matter, charged with injurious energy, pp. 52-57.--The curse looked upon as a baneful substance injuring or destroying anybody to whom it cleaves, p. 57 _sq._--The tendency of curses to spread, pp. 58-60.--Their tendency to contaminate those who derive their origin from the infected individual, p. 60 _sq._--The vicarious suffering involved in sin-transference not to be confounded with vicarious expiatory sacrifice, p. 61.--Why scapegoats are sometimes killed, pp. 61-64.--Why sacrificial victims are sometimes used as scapegoats, p. 64 _sq._--Vicarious expiatory sacrifices, pp. 65-67.--The victim accepted as a substitute on the principle of social solidarity, p. 67 _sq._--Expiatory sacrifices offered as ransoms, p. 68 _sq._--Protests of the moral consciousness against the infliction of penal suffering upon the guiltless, pp. 70-72.

CHAPTER III

THE NATURE OF THE MORAL EMOTIONS (_continued_)

Whilst, in the course of mental evolution, the true direction of the hostile reaction involved in moral disapproval has become more apparent, its aggressive character has become more disguised, p. 73.--Kindness to enemies not a rule in early ethics, p. 73 _sq._--At the higher stages of moral development retaliation condemned and forgiveness of enemies laid down as a duty, pp. 74-77.--The rule of retaliation and the rule of forgiveness not radically opposed to each other, p. 77 _sq._--Why enlightened and sympathetic minds disapprove of resentment and retaliation springing from personal motives, p. 78 _sq._--The aggressive character of moral disapproval has also become more disguised by the different way in which the aggressiveness displays itself, p. 79.--Retributive punishment condemned, and the end of punishment considered to be either to deter from crime, or to reform the criminal, or to repress crime by eliminating or secluding him, pp. 79-81.--Objections to these theories, p. 82 _sq._--Facts which, to some extent, fill up the gap between the theory of retribution and the utilitarian theories of punishment, pp. 84-91.--The aggressive element in moral disapproval has undergone a change which tends to conceal its true nature by narrowing the channel in which it discharges itself, deliberate and discriminating resentment being apt to turn against the will rather than against the willer, p. 91 _sq._--Yet it is the instinctive desire to inflict counter-pain that gives to moral indignation its most important characteristic, p. 92 _sq._--Retributive kindly emotion a friendly attitude of mind towards a cause of pleasure, p. 93 _sq._--Retributive kindly emotion among the lower animals, p. 94.--Its intrinsic object, p. 94 _sq._--The want of discrimination which is sometimes found in retributive kindness, p. 95.--Moral approval a kind of retributive kindly emotion, _ibid._--Moral approval sometimes bestows its favours upon undeserving individuals for the merits of others, pp. 95-97.--Explanation of this, p. 97 _sq._--Protests against the notion of vicarious merit, p. 98 _sq._

{ix} CHAPTER IV

THE NATURE OF THE MORAL EMOTIONS (_concluded_)

Refutation of the opinion that moral emotions only arise in consequence of moral judgments, p. 100 _sq._--However, moral judgments, being definite expressions of moral emotions, help us to discover the true nature of these emotions, p.

101.--Disinterestedness and apparent impartiality characteristics by which moral indignation and approval are distinguished from other, non-moral, kinds of resentment or retributive kindly emotion, pp. 101-104.--Besides, a moral emotion has a certain flavour of generality, p. 104 _sq._--The analysis of the moral emotions which has been attempted in this and the two preceding chapters holds true not only of such emotions as we feel on account of the conduct of others, but of such emotions as we feel on account of our own conduct as well, pp. 105-107.

CHAPTER V

THE ORIGIN OF THE MORAL EMOTIONS

We may feel disinterested resentment, or disinterested retributive kindly emotion, on account of an injury inflicted, or a benefit conferred, upon another person with whose pain, or pleasure, we sympathise, and in whose welfare we take a kindly interest, p. 108.--Sympathetic feelings based on association, p. 109 _sq._--Only when aided by the altruistic sentiment sympathy induces us to take a kindly interest in the feelings of our neighbours, and tends to produce disinterested retributive emotions, p. 110 _sq._--Sympathetic resentment to be found in all animal species which possess altruistic sentiments, p. 111 _sq._--Sympathetic resentment among savages, p. 113 _sq._--Sympathetic resentment may not only be a reaction against sympathetic pain, but may be directly produced by the cognition of the signs of anger (punishment, language, &c.), pp. 114-116.--Disinterested antipathies, p. 116 _sq._--Sympathy springing from an altruistic sentiment may also produce disinterested kindly emotion, p. 117.--Disinterested likings, _ibid._--Why disinterestedness, apparent impartiality, and the flavour of generality have become characteristics by which so-called moral emotions are distinguished from other retributive emotions, p. 117 _sq._--Custom not only a public habit, but a rule of conduct, p. 118.--Custom conceived of as a moral rule, p. 118 _sq._--In early society customs the only moral rules ever thought of, p. 119.--The characteristics of moral indignation to be sought for in its connection with custom, p. 120.--Custom characterised by generality, disinterestedness, and apparent impartiality, p. 120 _sq._--Public indignation lies at the bottom of custom as a moral rule, p. 121 _sq._--As public indignation is the prototype of moral disapproval, so public approval is the prototype of moral approval, p. 122.--Moral disapproval and approval have not always remained inseparably connected with the feelings of any special society, p. 122 _sq._--Yet they remain to the last public emotions if not in reality, then as an ideal, p. 123.--Refutation of the opinion that the original form of the moral consciousness has been the individual's own conscience, p. 123 _sq._--The antiquity of moral resentment, p. 124.--The supposition that remorse is unknown among the lower races contradicted by facts, p. 124 _sq._--Criticism of Lord Avebury's statement that modern savages seem to be almost entirely wanting in moral feeling, pp. 125-129.--The antiquity of moral approval, p. 129 _sq._

{x} CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF THE PRINCIPAL MORAL CONCEPTS

Our analysis to be concerned with moral concepts formed by the civilised mind, p. 131.--Moral concepts among the lower races, pp. 131-133.--Language a rough generaliser, p. 133.--Analysis of the concepts _bad_, _vice_, and _wrong_, p. 134.--Of _ought_ and _duty_, pp. 134-137.--Of _right_, as an adjective, pp. 137-139.--Of _right_, as a substantive, p. 139 _sq._--Of the relations between _rights_ and _duties_, p. 140 _sq._--Of _injustice_ and _justice_, pp. 141-145.--Of _good_, pp. 145-147.--Of _virtue_, pp. 147-149.--Of the relation between _virtue_ and _duty_, p. 149 _sq._--Of _merit_, p. 150 _sq._--Of the relation between _merit_ and _duty_, p. 151 _sq._--The question of the _super-obligatory_, pp. 152-154.--The question of the morally _indifferent_, pp. 154-157.

CHAPTER VII

CUSTOMS AND LAWS AS EXPRESSIONS OF MORAL IDEAS

How we can get an insight into the moral ideas of mankind at large, p. 158.--The close connection between the habitualness and the obligatoriness of custom, p. 159.--Though every public habit is not a custom, involving an obligation, men's standard of morality is not independent of their practice, p. 159 _sq._--The study of moral ideas to a large extent a study of customs, p. 160.--But custom never covers the whole field of morality, and the uncovered space grows larger in proportion as the moral consciousness develops, p. 160 _sq._--At the lower stages of civilisation custom the sole rule for conduct, p. 161.--Even kings described as autocrats tied by custom, p. 162.--In competition with law custom frequently carries the day, p. 163 _sq._--Custom stronger than law and religion combined, p. 164.--The laws themselves command obedience more as customs than as laws, _ibid._--Many laws were customs before they became laws, p. 165.--The transformation of customs into laws, p. 165 _sq._--Laws as expressions of moral ideas, pp. 166-168.--Punishment and indemnification, p. 168 _sq._--Definition of punishment, p. 169 _sq._--Savage

punishments inflicted upon the culprit by the community at large, pp. 170-173.--By some person or persons invested with judicial authority, pp. 173-175.--The development of judicial organisation out of a previous system of lynch-law, p. 175.--Out of a previous system of private revenge, p. 176.--Public indignation displays itself not only in punishment, but to a certain extent in the custom of revenge, p. 176 _sq._--The social origin of the _lex talionis_, pp. 177-180.--The transition from revenge to punishment, and the establishment of a central judicial and executive authority, pp. 180-183.--The jurisdiction of chiefs, p. 183 _sq._--The injured party or the accuser acting as executioner, but not as judge, p. 184_sq._--The existence of punishment and judicial organisation among a certain people no exact index to its general state of culture, p. 185.--The supposition that punishment has been intended to act as a deterrent, p. 185 _sq._--Among various semi-civilised and civilised peoples the criminal law has assumed a severity which far surpasses the rigour of the _lex talionis_, pp. 186-183.--Wanton cruelty not a general characteristic of the public justice of savages, pp. 188-190. Legislators referring to the deterrent effects of punishment, p. 190 _sq._--The practice of punishing criminals in public, p. 191 _sq._--The punishment actually inflicted on the criminal in many cases much less severe than the punishment with which the law threatens him, p. 192 _sq._--The detection of criminals was in earlier times much rarer and more uncertain than it is now, p. 193.--The chief explanation of the great severity of certain {xi} criminal codes lies in their connection with despotism or religion or both, pp. 193-198.--Punishment may also be applied as a means of deterring from crime, p. 198 _sq._--But the scope which justice leaves for determent pure and simple is not wide, p. 199.--The criminal law of a community on the whole a faithful exponent of moral sentiments prevalent in that community at large, pp. 199-201.

CHAPTER VIII

THE GENERAL NATURE OF THE SUBJECTS OF ENLIGHTENED MORAL JUDGMENTS

Definitions of the term "conduct," p. 202 _sq._--The meaning of the word "act," p. 203 _sq._--The meaning of the word "intention," p. 204.--There can be only one intention in one act, p. 204 _sq._ The moral judgments which we pass on acts do not really relate to the event, but to the intention, p. 205 _sq._--A person morally accountable also for his deliberate wishes, p. 206.--A deliberate wish is a volition, p. 206 _sq._--The meaning of the word "motive," p. 207.--Motives which are volitions fall within the sphere of moral valuation, _ibid._--The motive of an act may be an intention, but an intention belonging to another act, _ibid._--Even motives which consist of non-volitional conations may indirectly exercise much influence on moral judgments, p. 207 _sq._--Refutation of Mill's statement that "the motive has nothing to do with the morality of the action," p. 208 _sq._--Moral judgments really passed upon men as acting or willing, not upon acts or volitions in the abstract, p. 209. --Forbearances morally equivalent to acts, p. 209 _sq._--Distinction between forbearances and omissions, p. 210.--Moral judgments refer not only to willing, but to not-willing as well, not only to acts and forbearances, but to omissions, p. 210 _sq._--Negligence, heedlessness, and rashness, p. 211.--Moral judgments of blame concerned with not-willing only in so far as this not-willing is attributed to a defect of the "will," p. 211 _sq._--Distinction between conscious omissions and forbearances, and between not-willing to refrain from doing and willing to do, p. 212.--The "known concomitants of acts," p. 213.--Absence of volitions also gives rise to moral praise, p. 213 _sq._--The meaning of the term "conduct," p. 214.--The subject of a moral judgment is, strictly speaking, a person's will, or character, conceived as the cause either of volitions or of the absence of volitions, p. 214 _sq._--Moral judgments that are passed on emotions or opinions really refer to the will, p. 215 _sq._

CHAPTER IX

THE WILL AS THE SUBJECT OF MORAL JUDGMENT AND THE INFLUENCE OF EXTERNAL EVENTS

Cases in which no distinction is made between intentional and accidental injuries, pp. 217-219.--Yet even in the system of self-redress intentional or foreseen injuries often distinguished from unintentional and unforeseen injuries, pp. 219-221.--A similar distinction made in the punishments inflicted by many savages, p. 221 _sq._--Uncivilised peoples who entirely excuse, or do not punish, persons for injuries which they have inflicted by mere accident, p. 222 _sq._--Peoples of a higher culture who punish persons for bringing about events without any fault of theirs, pp. 223-226.--At the earlier stages of civilisation gods, in particular, attach undue importance to the outward aspect of conduct, pp. 226-231.--Explanation of all these facts, pp. 231-237.--The great influence which the outward event exercises upon moral estimates even among ourselves, pp. 238-240. --Carelessness generally not punished if no injurious result follows, p. 241.--An unsuccessful attempt to commit a criminal act, if punished at all, as a rule punished much less {xii} severely than the accomplished act, p. 241 _sq._--Exceptions to this rule, p. 242.--The question, which attempts should be punished, p. 243.--The stage at which an attempt begins to be criminal, and the distinction between attempts and acts of preparation, p. 243 _sq._--The rule that an outward event is requisite for the infliction of punishment, p. 244 _sq._--Exceptions to this rule, p. 245.--Explanation of laws referring to unsuccessful attempts, pp. 245-247.--Moral approval

influenced by external events, p. 247.--Owing to its very nature, the moral consciousness, when sufficiently influenced by thought, regards the will as the only proper object of moral disapproval or praise, p. 247 _sq._

CHAPTER X

AGENTS UNDER INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY

An agent not responsible for anything which he could not be aware of, p. 249.--The irresponsibility of animals, pp. 249-251.--Resentment towards an animal which has caused some injury, p. 251.--At the lower stages of civilisation animals deliberately treated as responsible beings, _ibid._--The custom of blood-revenge extended to the animal world, pp. 251-253.--Animals exposed to regular punishment, pp. 253-255. --The origin of the mediæval practice of punishing animals, p. 255 _sq._ --Explanation of the practice of retaliating upon animals, pp. 256-260. --At the earlier stages of civilisation even inanimate things treated as if they were responsible agents, pp. 260-262.--Explanation of this, pp. 262-264.--The total or partial irresponsibility of childhood and early youth, pp. 264-267.--According to early custom, children sometimes subject to the rule of retaliation, p. 267. --Parents responsible for the deeds of their children, p. 267 _sq._--In Europe there has been a tendency to raise the age at which full legal responsibility commences, p. 268 _sq._--The irresponsibility of idiots and madmen, p. 269 _sq._--Idiots and insane persons objects of religious reverence, p. 270 _sq._--Lunatics treated with great severity or punished for their deeds, pp. 271-274.--Explanation of this, p. 274 _sq._--The ignorance of which lunatics have been victims in the hands of lawyers, pp. 275-277.--The total or partial irresponsibility of intoxicated persons, p. 277 _sq._--Drunkenness recognised as a ground of extenuation, pp. 278-280.--Not recognised as a ground of extenuation, p. 280 _sq._--Explanation of these facts, p. 281 _sq._

CHAPTER XI

MOTIVES

Motives considered only in proportion as the moral judgment is influenced by reflection, p. 283.--Little consideration for the sense of duty as a motive, _ibid._--Somewhat greater discrimination shown in regard to motives consisting of powerful non-volitional conations, p. 283 _sq._--Compulsion as a ground of extenuation, p. 284 _sq._--"Compulsion by necessity," pp. 285-287.--Self-defence, pp. 288-290.--Self-redress in the case of adultery, and other survivals of the old system of self-redress, pp. 290-294.--The moral distinction made between an injury which a person inflicts deliberately, in cold blood, and one which he inflicts in the heat of the moment, on provocation, pp. 294-297.--Explanation of this distinction, p. 297 _sq._--The pressure of a non-volitional motive on the will as a ground of extenuation, p. 298 _sq._--That moral judgments are generally passed, in the first instance, with reference to acts immediately intended, and consider motives only in proportion as the judgment is influenced by reflection, holds good not only of moral blame, but of moral praise, pp. 299-302.

{xiii} CHAPTER XII

FORBEARANCES AND CARELESSNESS--CHARACTER

Why in early moral codes the so-called negative commandments are much more prominent than the positive commandments, p. 303.--The little cognisance which the criminal laws of civilised nations take of forbearances and omissions, p. 303 _sq._--The more scrutinising the moral consciousness, the greater the importance which it attaches to positive commandments, p. 304 _sq._--Yet the customs of all nations contain not only prohibitions, but positive injunctions as well, p. 305.--The unreflecting mind apt to exaggerate the guilt of a person who out of heedlessness or rashness causes harm by a positive act, _ibid._--Early custom and law may be anxious enough to trace an event to its source, pp. 305-307.--But they easily fail to discover where there is guilt or not, and, in case of carelessness, to determine the magnitude of the offender's guilt, p. 307 _sq._--The opinion that a person is answerable for all the damage which directly ensues from an act of his, even though no foresight could have reasonably been expected to look out for it, p. 308 _sq._--On the other hand, little or no censure passed on him whose want of foresight or want of self-restraint is productive of suffering, if only the effect is sufficiently remote, p. 309 _sq._--The moral emotions may as naturally give rise to judgments on human character as to judgments on human conduct, p. 310.--Even when a moral judgment immediately refers to a distinct act, it takes notice of the agent's will as a whole, p. 310 _sq._--The practice of punishing a second or third offence more severely than the first, p. 311 _sq._--The more a moral judgment is influenced by reflection, the more it scrutinises the character which manifests itself in that individual piece of conduct by which the judgment is occasioned, p. 312 _sq._--But however superficial it be, it always refers to a will conceived of as a continuous entity, p. 313.

CHAPTER XIII

WHY MORAL JUDGMENTS ARE PASSED ON CONDUCT AND CHARACTER--MORAL VALUATION AND FREE-WILL

Explanation of the fact that moral judgments are passed on conduct and character, p. 314.--The correctness of this explanation proved by the circumstance that not only moral emotions, but non-moral retributive emotions as well, are felt with reference to phenomena exactly similar in nature to those on which moral judgments are passed, pp. 314-319.--Whether moral or non-moral, a retributive emotion is essentially directed towards a sensitive and volitional entity, or self, conceived of as the cause of pleasure or the cause of pain, p. 319.--The futility of other attempts to solve the problem, p. 319 _sq._--The nature of the moral emotions also gives us the key to the problem of the co-existence of moral responsibility with the general law of cause and effect, p. 320.--The theory according to which responsibility, in the ordinary sense of the term, and moral judgments generally, are inconsistent with the notion that the human will is determined by causes, p. 320 _sq._--Yet, as a matter of fact, moral indignation and moral approval are felt by determinists and libertarians alike, p. 321 _sq._--Explanation of the fallacy which lies at the bottom of the conception that moral valuation is inconsistent with determinism, p. 322.--Causation confounded with compulsion, pp. 322-324.--The difference between fatalism and determinism, pp. 324-326.--The moral emotions not concerned with the origin of the innate character, p. 326.

{xiv} CHAPTER XIV

PRELIMINARY REMARKS--HOMICIDE IN GENERAL

Necessity of restricting the investigation to the more important modes of conduct with which the moral consciousness is concerned, p. 327 _sq._--The six groups into which these modes of conduct may be divided, p. 328.--The most sacred duty which we owe to our fellow-creatures generally considered to be regard for their lives, _ibid._--Among various uncivilised peoples human life said to be held very cheap, p. 328 _sq._--Among others homicide or murder said to be hardly known, p. 329 _sq._--In other instances homicide expressly said to be regarded as wrong, p. 330 _sq._--In every society custom prohibits homicide within a certain circle of men, p. 331.--Savages distinguish between an act of homicide committed within their own community and one where the victim is a stranger, pp. 331-333.--In various instances, however, the rule, "Thou shalt not kill," applies even to foreigners, p. 333 _sq._--Some uncivilised peoples said to have no wars, p. 334.--Savages' recognition of intertribal rights in times of peace obvious from certain customs connected with their wars, p. 334 _sq._--Savage custom does not always allow indiscriminate slaughter even in warfare, p. 335 _sq._--The readiness with which savages engage in war, p. 337.--The old distinction between injuries committed against compatriots and harm done to foreigners remains among peoples more advanced in culture, p. 337 _sq._--The readiness with which such peoples wage war on foreign nations, and the estimation in which the successful warrior is held, pp. 338-340.--The life of a guest sacred, p. 340.--The commencement of international hostilities preceded by special ceremonies, _ibid._--Warfare in some cases condemned, or a distinction made between just and unjust war, pp. 340-342.--Even in war the killing of an enemy under certain circumstances prohibited, either by custom or by enlightened moral opinion, pp. 342-344.

CHAPTER XV

HOMICIDE IN GENERAL (_continued_)

Homicide of any kind condemned by the early Christians, p. 345.--Their total condemnation of warfare, p. 345 _sq._--This attitude towards war was soon given up, pp. 346-348.--The feeling that a soldier scarcely could make a good Christian, p. 348.--Penance prescribed for those who had shed blood in war, p. 348 _sq._--Wars forbidden by popes, p. 349. --The military Christianity of the Crusades, pp. 348-352.--Chivalry, pp. 352-354.--The intimate connection between chivalry and religion displayed in tournaments, p. 354 _sq._--The practice of private war, p. 355 _sq._--The attitude of the Church towards private war, p. 356.--The Truce of God, p. 357.--The main cause of the abolition of private war was the increase of the authority of emperors or kings, p. 357 _sq._--War looked upon as a judgment of God, p. 358.--The attitude adopted by the great Christian congregations towards war one of sympathetic approval, pp. 359-362.--Religious protests against war, pp. 362-365.--Freethinkers' opposition to war, pp. 365-367.--The idea of a perpetual peace, p. 367.--The awakening spirit of nationalism, and the glorification of war, p. 367 _sq._--Arguments against arbitration, p. 368.--The opposition against war rapidly increasing, p. 368 _sq._--The prohibition of needless destruction in war, p. 369 _sq._--The survival, in modern civilisation, of the old feeling that the life of a foreigner is not equally sacred with that of a countryman, p. 370.--The behaviour of European colonists towards coloured races, p. 370 _sq._

{xv} CHAPTER XVI

HOMICIDE IN GENERAL (_concluded_)

Sympathetic resentment felt on account of the injury suffered by the victim a potent cause of the condemnation of homicide, p. 372 _sq._--No such resentment felt if the victim is a member of another group, p. 373.--Why extra-tribal homicide is approved of, _ibid._--Superstition an encouragement to extra-tribal homicide, _ibid._--The expansion of the altruistic sentiment largely explains why the prohibition of homicide has come to embrace more and more comprehensive circles of men, _ibid._--Homicide viewed as an injury inflicted upon the survivors, p. 373 _sq._--Conceived as a breach of the "King's peace," p. 374.--Stigmatised as a disturbance of public tranquillity and an outrage on public safety, _ibid._--Homicide disapproved of because the manslayer gives trouble to his own people, p. 374 _sq._--The idea that a manslayer is unclean, pp. 375-377.--The influence which this idea has exercised on the moral judgment of homicide, p. 377.--The disapproval of the deed easily enhanced by the spiritual danger attending on it, as also by the inconvenient restrictions laid on the tabooed manslayer and the ceremonies of purification to which he is subject, p. 377 _sq._--The notion of a persecuting ghost may be replaced by the notion of an avenging god, pp. 378-380.--The defilement resulting from homicide particularly shunned by gods, p. 380 _sq._--Priests forbidden to shed human blood, p. 381 _sq._--Reasons for Christianity's high regard for human life, p. 382.

CHAPTER XVII

THE KILLING OF PARENTS, SICK PERSONS, CHILDREN-FETICIDE

Parricide the most aggravated form of murder, pp. 383-386.--The custom of abandoning or killing parents who are worn out with age or disease, p. 386 _sq._--Its causes, pp. 387-390.--The custom of abandoning or killing persons suffering from some illness, p. 391 _sq._--Its causes, p. 392 _sq._--The father's power of life and death over his children, p. 393 _sq._--Infanticide among many savage races permitted or even enjoined by custom, pp. 394-398.--The causes of infanticide, and how it has grown into a regular custom, pp. 398-402.--Among many savages infanticide said to be unheard of or almost so, p. 402 _sq._--The custom of infanticide not a survival of earliest savagery, but seems to have grown up under specific conditions in later stages of development, p. 403.--Savages who disapprove of infanticide, p. 403 _sq._--The custom of infanticide in most cases requires that the child should be killed immediately or soon after its birth, p. 404 _sq._--Infanticide among semi-civilised or civilised races, pp. 405-411.--The practice of exposing new-born infants vehemently denounced by the early Fathers of the Church, p. 411.--Christian horror of infanticide, p. 411 _sq._--The punishment of infanticide in Christian countries, p. 412 _sq._--Feticide among savages, p. 413 _sq._--Among more civilised nations, p. 414 _sq._--According to Christian views, a form of murder, p. 415 _sq._--Distinctions between an _embryo informatus_ and an _embryo formatus_, p. 416 _sq._--Modern legislation and opinion concerning feticide, p. 417.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE KILLING OF WOMEN, AND OF SLAVES--THE CRIMINALITY OF HOMICIDE INFLUENCED BY DISTINCTIONS OF CLASS

The husband's power of life and death over his wife among many of the lower races, p. 418 _sq._--The right of punishing his wife capitally not universally {xvi} granted to the husband in uncivilised communities, p. 419.--The husband's power of life and death among peoples of a higher type, _ibid._--Uxoricide punished less severely than matricide, p. 419 _sq._--The estimate of a woman's life sometimes lower than that of a man's, sometimes equal to it, sometimes higher, p. 420 _sq._--The master's power of life and death over his slave, p. 421 _sq._--The right, among many savages, of killing his slave at his own discretion expressly denied to the master, p. 422 _sq._--The murder of another person's slave largely regarded as an offence against the property of the owner, but not exclusively looked upon in this light, p. 423.--When the system of blood-money prevails, the price paid for the life of a slave less than that paid for the life of a freeman, _ibid._--Among the nations of archaic culture, also, the life of a slave held in less estimation than that of a freeman, but not even the master in all circumstances allowed to put his slave to death, pp. 423-426.--Efforts of the Christian Church to secure the life of the slave against the violence of the master, p. 426.--But neither the ecclesiastical nor the secular legislation gave him the same protection as was bestowed upon the free member of the Church and State, pp. 426-428.--In modern times, in Christian countries, the life of the negro slave was only inadequately protected by law, p. 428 _sq._--Why the life of a slave is held in so little regard, p. 429.--The killing of a freeman by a slave, especially if the victim be his owner, commonly punished more severely than if the same act were done by a free person, p. 429 _sq._--In the estimate of life a distinction also made between different classes of freemen, p. 430 _sq._--The magnitude of the crime may depend not only on the rank of the victim, but on the rank of the manslayer as well, pp. 431-433. --Explanation of this influence of class, p. 433.--In progressive societies each member of the society at last admitted to be born with an equal claim to the right to live, _ibid._

CHAPTER XIX

HUMAN SACRIFICE

The prevalence of human sacrifice, pp. 434-436.--This practice much more frequently found among barbarians and semi-civilised peoples than among genuine savages, p. 436 _sq._--Among some peoples it has been noticed to become increasingly prevalent in the course of time, p. 437.--Human sacrifice partly due to the idea that gods have an appetite for human flesh or blood, p. 437 _sq._--Sometimes connected with the idea that gods require attendants, p. 438.--Moreover, an angry god may be appeased simply by the death of him or those who aroused his anger, or of some representative of the offending community, or of somebody belonging to the kin of the offender, pp. 438-440.--Human sacrifice chiefly a method of life-insurance, based on the idea of substitution, p. 440.--Human victims offered in war, before a battle, or during a siege, p. 440 _sq._--For the purpose of stopping or preventing epidemics, p. 441 _sq._--For the purpose of putting an end to a devastating famine, p. 442 _sq._--For the purpose of preventing famine, p. 443 _sq._--Criticism of Dr. Frazer's hypothesis that the human victim who is killed for the purpose of ensuring good crops is regarded as a representative of the corn-spirit and is slain as such, pp. 444-451.--Human victims offered with a view to getting water, p. 451 _sq._--With a view to averting perils arising from the sea or from rivers, pp. 452-454.--For the purpose of preventing the death of some particular individual, especially a chief or a king, from sickness, old age, or other circumstances, pp. 454-457.--For the purpose of helping other men into existence, p. 457 _sq._--The killing of the first-born child, or the first-born son, p. 458 _sq._--Explanation of this practice, pp. 459-461.--Human sacrifices offered in connection with the foundation of buildings, p. 461 _sq._--The building-sacrifice, like other kinds of human sacrifice, probably based on the idea of substitution, pp.462-464. --The belief that {xvii} the soul of the victim is converted into a protecting demon, p. 464 _sq._--The human victim regarded as a messenger, p. 465 _sq._--Human sacrifice not an act of wanton cruelty, p. 466.--The king or chief sometimes sacrificed, _ibid._--The victims frequently prisoners of war or other aliens, or slaves, or criminals, pp. 466-468.--The disappearance of human sacrifice, p. 468.--Human sacrifice condemned, p. 465 _sq._--Practices intended to replace it, p. 469.--Human effigies or animals offered instead of men, p. 469 _sq._--Human sacrifices succeeded by practices involving the effusion of human blood without loss of life, p. 470.--Bleeding or mutilation practised for the same purpose as human sacrifice, p. 470 _sq._--Why the penal sacrifice of offenders has outlived all other forms of human sacrifice, p. 471.--Human beings sacrificed to the dead in order to serve them as slaves, wives, or companions, pp. 472-474.--This custom dwindling into a survival, p. 475.--The funeral sacrifice of men and animals also seems to involve an intention to vivify the spirits of the deceased with blood, p. 475 _sq._--Manslayers killed in order to satisfy their victims' craving for revenge, p. 476.

CHAPTER XX

BLOOD-REVENGE AND COMPENSATION--THE PUNISHMENT OF DEATH

The prevalence of the custom of blood-revenge, pp. 477-479.--Blood-revenge regarded not only as a right, but as a duty, p. 479 _sq._--This duty in the first place regarded as a duty to the dead, whose spirit is believed to find no rest after death until the injury has been avenged, p. 481 _sq._--Blood-revenge a form of human sacrifice, p. 482.--Blood-revenge also practised on account of the injury inflicted on the survivors, p. 482 _sq._--Murder committed within the family or kin left unavenged, p. 483.--The injury inflicted on the relatives of the murdered man suggests not only revenge, but reparation, _ibid._--The taking of life for life may itself, in a way, serve as compensation, p. 483 _sq._--Various methods of compensation, p. 484.--The advantages of the practice of composition, p. 484 _sq._--Its disadvantages, p. 485.--The importance of these disadvantages depends on the circumstances in each special case, p. 486 _sq._--Among many peoples the rule of revenge strictly followed, and to accept compensation considered disgraceful, p. 487.--The acceptance of compensation does not always mean that the family of the slain altogether renounce their right of revenge, p. 487 _sq._--The acceptance of compensation allowed as a justifiable alternative for blood-revenge, or even regarded as the proper method of settling the case, p. 488 _sq._--The system of compensation partly due to the pressure of some intervening authority, p. 489 _sq._--The adoption of this method for the settling of disputes a sign of weakness, p. 491.--When the central power of jurisdiction is firmly established, the rule of life for life regains its sway, _ibid._--A person may forfeit his right to live by other crimes besides homicide, p. 491 _sq._--Opposition to and arguments against capital punishment, pp. 492-495.--Modern legislation has undergone a radical change with reference to capital punishment, p. 495.--Arguments against its abolition, p. 495 _sq._--The chief motive for retaining it in modern legislation, p. 496.

CHAPTER XXI

THE DUEL

Duelling resorted to as a means of bringing to an end hostilities between different groups of people, p. 497 _sq._--Duels fought for the purpose of settling disputes between individuals, either by conferring on the victor the right of possessing {xviii} the object of the strife, or by gratifying a craving for revenge and wiping off the affront, pp. 498-502.--The circumstances to which these customs are due, p. 503 _sq._--The duel as an ordeal or "judgment of God," p. 504 _sq._--The judicial duel fundamentally derived its efficacy as a means of ascertaining the truth from its connection with an oath, p. 505 _sq._ How it came to be regarded as an appeal to the justice of God, p. 506 _sq._--The decline and disappearance of the judicial duel, p. 507.--The modern duel of honour, pp. 507-509.--Its causes, p. 509.--Arguments adduced in support of it, p. 509 _sq._

CHAPTER XXII

BODILY INJURIES

In the case of bodily injuries the magnitude of the offence, other things being equal, proportionate to the harm inflicted, pp. 511-513.--The degree of the offence also depends on the station of the parties concerned, and in some cases the infliction of pain held allowable or even a duty, p. 513.--Children using violence against their parents, _ibid._--Parents' right to inflict corporal punishment on their children, p. 513 _sq._--The husband's right to chastise his wife, pp. 514-516.--The master's right to inflict corporal punishment on his slave, p. 516 _sq._--The maltreatment of another person's slave regarded as an injury done to the master, rather than to the slave, p. 517.--Slaves severely punished for inflicting bodily injuries on freemen, p. 510.--The penalties or fines for bodily injuries influenced by the class or rank of the parties when both of them are freemen, p. 518 _sq._--Distinction between compatriots and aliens with reference to bodily injuries, p. 519.--The infliction of sufferings on vanquished enemies, p. 519 _sq._--The right to bodily integrity influenced by religious differences, p. 520--Forfeited by the commission of a crime, p. 520 _sq._--Amputation or mutilation of the offending member has particularly been in vogue among peoples of culture, p. 521 _sq._--The disappearance of corporal punishment in Europe, p. 522.--Corporal punishment has been by preference a punishment for poor and common people or slaves, p. 522 _sq._--The status of a person influencing his right to bodily integrity with reference to judicial torture, p. 523 _sq._--Explanation of the moral notions regarding the infliction of bodily injuries, p. 524.--The notions that an act of bodily violence involves a gross insult, and that corporal punishment disgraces the criminal more than any other form of penalty, p. 524 _sq._

CHAPTER XXIII

CHARITY AND GENEROSITY

The mother's duty to rear her children, p. 526.--The husband's and father's duty to protect and support his family, pp. 526-529.--The parents' duty of taking care of their offspring in the first place based on the sentiment of parental affection, p. 529.--The universality not only of the maternal, but of the paternal, sentiment in mankind, pp. 529-532.--Marital affection among savages, p. 532.--Explanation of the simplest paternal and marital duties, p. 533--Children's duty of supporting their aged parents, pp. 533-538. The duty of assisting brothers and sisters, p. 538.--Of assisting more distant relatives, pp. 538-540.--Uncivilised peoples as a rule described as kind towards members of their own community or tribe, enjoin charity between themselves as a duty, and praise generosity as a virtue, pp. 540-546.--Among many savages the old people, in particular, have a claim to support and assistance, p. 546.--The sick often carefully attended to, pp. 546-548.-- {xix} Accounts of uncharitable savages, p. 548 _sq._--Among semi-civilised and civilised nations charity universally regarded as a duty, and often strenuously enjoined by their religions, pp. 549-556.--In the course of progressing civilisation the obligation of assisting the needy has been extended to wider and wider circles of men, pp. 556-558.--The duty of tending wounded enemies in war, p. 558.--Explanation of the gradual expansion of the duty of charity, p. 559.--This duty in the first place based on the altruistic sentiment, p. 559 _sq._--Egoistic motives for the doing of good to fellow-creatures, p. 560.--By niggardliness a person may expose himself to supernatural dangers, pp. 560-562.--Liberality may entail supernatural reward, p. 562 _sq._ --The curses and blessings of the poor partly account for the fact that charity has come to be regarded as a religious duty, pp. 563-565.--The chief cause of the extraordinary stress which the higher religions put on the duty of charity seems to lie in the connection between almsgiving and sacrifice, the poor becoming the natural heirs of the god, p. 565.--Instances of sacrificial food being left for, or distributed among, the poor, p. 565 _sq._--Almsgiving itself regarded as a form of sacrifice, or taking the place of it, pp. 566-569.

CHAPTER XXIV

HOSPITALITY

Instances of great kindness displayed by savages towards persons of a foreign race, pp. 570-572.--Hospitality a universal custom among the lower races and among the peoples of culture at the earlier stages of their civilisation, pp. 572-574.--The stranger treated with special marks of honour, and enjoying extraordinary privileges as a guest, pp. 574-576.--Custom may require that hospitality should be shown even to an enemy, p. 576 _sq._--To protect a guest looked upon as a most stringent duty, p. 577 _sq._--Hospitality in a remarkable degree associated with religion, pp. 578-580.--The rules of hospitality in the main based on egoistic considerations, p. 581.--The stranger, supposed to bring with him good luck or blessings, pp. 581-583.--The blessings of a stranger considered exceptionally powerful, p. 583 _sq._--The visiting stranger regarded as a potential source of evil, p. 584.--His evil wishes and curses greatly feared, owing partly to his quasi-supernatural character, partly to the close contact in which he comes with the host and his belongings, pp. 584-590.--Precautions taken against the visiting stranger, pp. 590-593.--Why no payment is received from a guest, p. 593 _sq._--The duty of hospitality limited by time, p. 594 _sq._--The cause of this, p. 595 _sq._--The decline of hospitality in progressive communities, p. 596.

CHAPTER XXV

THE SUBJECTION OF CHILDREN

The right of personal freedom never absolute, p. 597.--Among some savages a man's children are in the power of the head of their mother's family or of their maternal uncle, p. 597 _sq._--Among the great bulk of existing savages children are in the power of their father, though he may to some extent have to share his authority with the mother, p. 598 _sq._--The extent of the father's power subject to great variations, p. 599.--Among some savages the father's authority practically very slight, p. 599 _sq._--Other savages by no means deficient in filial piety, p. 600 _sq._--The period during which the paternal authority lasts, p. 601 _sq._--Old age commands respect and gives authority, pp. 603-605.--Superiority of age also gives a certain amount {xx} of power, p. 605 _sq._--The reverence for old age may cease when the grey-head becomes an incumbrance to those around him, and imbecility may put an end to the father's authority over his family, p. 606 _sq._--Paternal, or parental, authority and filial reverence at their height among peoples of archaic culture, pp. 607-613.--Among these peoples we also meet with reverence for the elder brother, for persons of a superior age generally, and especially for the aged, p. 614 _sq._--Decline of the paternal authority in Europe, p. 615 _sq._--Christianity not unfavourable to the emancipation of children, though obedience to parents was enjoined as a Christian duty, p. 616 _sq._--The Roman notions of paternal rights and filial duties have to some extent survived in Latin countries, p. 617 _sq._--Sources of the parental authority, p. 618 _sq._--Among savages, in particular, filial regard is largely regard for one's elders or the aged, p. 619.--Causes of the regard for old age, pp. 619-621.--The chief cause of the connection between filial submissiveness and religious beliefs the extreme importance attached to parental curses and blessings, pp. 621-626.--Why the blessings and curses of parents are supposed to possess an unusual power, p. 626 _sq._--Explanation of the extraordinary development of the paternal authority in the archaic State, p. 627 _sq._--Causes of the downfall of the paternal power, p. 628.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE SUBJECTION OF WIVES

Among the lower races the wife frequently said to be the property or slave of her husband, p. 629 _sq._--Yet even in such cases custom has not left her entirely destitute of rights, p. 630 _sq._--The so-called absolute authority of husbands over their wives not to be taken too literally, p. 631 _sq._--The bride-price does not _eo ipso_ confer on the husband absolute rights over her, p. 632 _sq._--The hardest drudgeries of life often said to be imposed on the women, p. 633 _sq._--In early society each sex has its own pursuits, p. 634.--The rules according to which the various occupations of life are divided between the sexes are on the whole in conformity with the indications given by nature, p. 635 _sq._--This division of labour emphasised by custom and superstition, p. 636 _sq._--It is apt to mislead the travelling stranger, p. 637.--It gives the wife authority within the circle which is exclusively her own, _ibid._--Rejection of the broad statement that the lower races in general hold their women in a state of almost complete subjection, pp. 638-646.--The opinion that a people's civilisation may be measured by the position held by the women not correct, at least so far as the earlier stages of culture are concerned, p. 646 _sq._--The position of woman among the peoples of archaic civilisation, pp. 647-653.--Christianity tended to narrow the remarkable liberty granted to married women under the Roman Empire, p. 653 _sq._--Christian orthodoxy opposed to the doctrine that marriage should be a contract on the footing of perfect equality between husband and wife, p. 654 _sq._--Criticism of the hypothesis that the social _status_ of women is connected with the system of tracing descent, p. 655 _sq._--The authority of a husband who lives with his wife in the house or community of her father, p. 656 _sq._--Wives' subjection to their husbands in the first place due to the men's instinctive desire to exert power, and to the natural

inferiority of women in such qualities of body and mind as are essential for personal independence, p. 657.--Elements in the sexual impulse which lead to domination on the part of the man and to submission on the part of the woman, p. 657 _sq._--But if the man's domination is carried beyond the limits of female love, the woman feels it as a burden, p. 658 _sq._--In extreme cases of oppression, at any rate, the community at large would sympathise with her, and the public resentment against the oppressor would result in customs or laws limiting the {xxi} husband's rights, p. 659.--The offended woman may count upon the support of her fellow-sisters, _ibid._--The children's affection and regard for their mother gives her power, _ibid._--The influence which economic conditions exercise on the position of woman, pp. 659-661.--The status of wives connected with the ideas held about the female sex in general, p. 661.--Woman regarded as intellectually and morally vastly inferior to man, especially among nations more advanced in culture, pp. 661-663. --Progress in civilisation has exercised an unfavourable influence on the position of woman by widening the gulf between the sexes, p. 663.--Religion has contributed to her degradation by regarding her as unclean, p. 663 _sq._--Women excluded from religious worship and sacred functions, pp. 664-666.--The notion that woman is unclean, however, gives her a secret power over her husband, as women are supposed to be better versed in magic than men, pp. 666-668.--The curses of women greatly feared, p. 668.--Woman as an asylum, p. 668 _sq._--In archaic civilisation the _status_ of married women was affected by the fact that the house-father was invested with some part of the power which formerly belonged to the clan, p. 669.--Causes of the decrease of the husband's authority over his wife in modern civilisation, _ibid._

CHAPTER XXVII

SLAVERY

Definition of slavery, p. 670 _sq._--The distribution of slavery and its causes among savages, pp. 671-674.--The earliest source of slavery was probably war or conquest, p. 674 _sq._--Intra-tribal slavery among savages, p. 675 _sq._--The master's power over his slave among slave-holding savages, pp. 676-678.--Among the lower races slaves are generally treated kindly, pp. 678-680.--Intra-tribal slaves, especially such as are born in the house, generally treated better than extra-tribal or purchased slaves, p. 680 _sq._--Slavery among the nations of archaic culture, pp. 681-693.--The attitude of Christianity towards slavery, pp. 693-700.--The supposed causes of the extinction of slavery in Europe, pp. 697-701.--The chief cause the transformation of slavery into serfdom, p. 701.--Serfdom only a transitory condition leading up to a state of entire liberty, pp. 701-703.--The attitude of the Church towards serfdom, p. 703 _sq._--The negro slavery in the colonies of European countries and the Southern States of America, and the legislation relating to it, pp. 704-711.--The support given to it by the clergy, pp. 711-713.--The want of sympathy for, or positive antipathy to, the coloured race, p. 713 _sq._--The opinions regarding slavery and the condition of slaves influenced by altruistic considerations, p. 714 _sq._--The condition of slaves influenced by the selfish considerations of their masters, p. 715 _sq._

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MORAL IDEAS

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MORAL IDEAS

INTRODUCTORY

THE main object of this book will perhaps be best explained by a few words concerning its origin.

Its author was once discussing with some friends the point how far a bad man ought to be treated with kindness. The opinions were divided, and, in spite of much deliberation, unanimity could not be attained. It seemed strange that the disagreement should be so radical, and the question arose, Whence this diversity of opinion? Is it due to defective knowledge, or has it a merely sentimental origin? And the problem gradually expanded. Why do the moral ideas in general differ so greatly? And, on the other hand, why is there in many cases such a wide agreement? Nay, why are there any moral ideas at all?

Since then many years have passed, spent by the author in trying to find an answer to these questions. The present work is the result of his researches and thoughts.

The first part of it will comprise a study of the moral concepts: right, wrong, duty, justice, virtue, merit, &c. Such a study will be found to require an examination into the moral emotions, their nature and origin, as also into the relations between these emotions and the various {2} moral concepts. There will then be a discussion of the phenomena to which such concepts are applied--the subjects of moral judgments. The general character of these phenomena will be scrutinised, and an answer sought to the question why facts

of a certain type are matters of moral concern, while other facts are not. finally, the most important of these phenomena will be classified, and the moral ideas relating to each class will be stated, and, so far as possible, explained.

An investigation of this kind cannot be confined to feelings and ideas prevalent in any particular society or at any particular stage of civilisation. Its subject-matter is the moral consciousness of mankind at large. It consequently involves the survey of an unusually rich and varied field of research--psychological, ethnographical, historical, juridical, theological. In the present state of our knowledge, when monographs on most of the subjects involved are wanting, I presume that such an undertaking is, strictly speaking, too big for any man; at any rate it is so for the writer of this book. Nothing like completeness can be aimed at. Hypotheses of varying degrees of probability must only too often be resorted to. Even the certainty of the statements on which conclusions are based is not always beyond a doubt. But though fully conscious of the many defects of his attempt, the author nevertheless ventures to think himself justified in placing it before the public. It seems to him that one of the most important objects of human speculation cannot be left in its present state of obscurity; that at least a glimpse of light must be thrown upon it by researches which have extended over some fifteen years; and that the main principles underlying the various customs of mankind may be arrived at even without subjecting these customs to such a full and minute treatment as would be required of an anthropological monograph.

Possibly this essay, in spite of its theoretical character, may even be of some practical use. Though rooted in the emotional side of our nature, our moral {3} opinions are in a large measure amenable to reason. Now in every society the traditional notions as to what is good or bad, obligatory or indifferent, are commonly accepted by the majority of people without further reflection. By tracing them to their source it will be found that not a few of these notions have their origin in sentimental likings and antipathies, to which a scrutinising and enlightened judge can attach little importance; whilst, on the other hand, he must account blamable many an act and omission which public opinion, out of thoughtlessness, treats with indifference. It will, moreover, appear that a moral estimate often survives the cause from which it sprang. And no unprejudiced person can help changing his views if he be persuaded that they have no foundation in existing facts.

CHAPTER I

THE EMOTIONAL ORIGIN OF MORAL JUDGMENTS

THAT the moral concepts are ultimately based on emotions either of indignation or approval, is a fact which a certain school of thinkers have in vain attempted to deny. The terms which embody these concepts must originally have been used--indeed they still constantly are so used--as direct expressions of such emotions with reference to the phenomena which evoked them. Men pronounced certain acts to be good or bad on account of the emotions those acts aroused in their minds, just as they called sunshine warm and ice cold on account of certain sensations which they experienced, and as they named a thing pleasant or painful because they felt pleasure or pain. But to attribute a quality to a thing is never the same as merely to state the existence of a particular sensation or feeling in the mind which perceives it. Such an attribution must mean that the thing, under certain circumstances, makes a certain impression on the mind. By calling an object warm or pleasant, a person asserts that it is apt to produce in him a sensation of heat or a feeling of pleasure. Similarly, to name an act good or bad, ultimately implies that it is apt to give rise to an emotion of approval or disapproval in him who pronounces the judgment. Whilst not affirming the actual existence of any specific emotion in the mind of the person judging or of anybody else, the predicate of a moral judgment attributes to the subject a tendency to arouse an emotion. The moral {5} concepts, then, are essentially generalisations of tendencies in certain phenomena to call forth moral emotions.

However, as is frequently the case with general terms, these concepts are mentioned without any distinct idea of their contents. The relation in which many of them stand to the moral emotions is complicated; the use of them is often vague; and ethical theorisers, instead of subjecting them to a careful analysis, have done their best to increase the confusion by adapting the meaning of the terms to fit their theories. Very commonly, in the definition of the goodness or badness of acts, reference is made, not to their tendencies to evoke emotions of approval or indignation, but to the causes of these tendencies, that is, to those qualities in the acts which call forth moral emotions. Thus, because good acts generally produce pleasure and bad acts pain, goodness and badness have been identified with the tendencies of acts to produce pleasure or pain. The following statement of Sir James Stephen is a clearly expressed instance of this confusion, so common among utilitarians:--"Speaking generally, the acts which are called right do promote, or are supposed to promote general happiness, and the acts which are called wrong do diminish, or are supposed to diminish it. I say, therefore, that this is what the words 'right' and 'wrong' mean, just as the words 'up' and 'down' mean that which

points from or towards the earth's centre of gravity, though they are used by millions who have not the least notion of the fact that such is their meaning, and though they were used for centuries and millenniums before any one was or even could be aware of it."[1] So, too, Bentham maintained that words like "ought," "right," and "wrong," have no meaning unless interpreted in accordance with the principle of utility;[2] and James Mill was of opinion that "the very morality" of the act lies, not in the sentiments raised in the breast of him who perceives or contemplates it, but in "the consequences of the act, good or evil, and their being {6} within the intention of the agent."[3] He adds that a rational assertor of the principle of utility approves of an action "because it is good," and calls it good "because it conduces to happiness."[4] This, however, is to invert the sequence of the facts, since, properly speaking, an act is called good because it is approved of, and is approved of by an utilitarian in so far as it conduces to happiness.

[Footnote 1: Stephen, _Liberty_, _Equality_, _Fraternity_, p. 338.]

[Footnote 2: Bentham, _Principles of Morals and Legislation_, p. 4.]

[Footnote 3: James Mill, _Fragment on Mackintosh_, pp. 5, 376.]

[Footnote 4: _Ibid._ p. 368.]

Such confusion of terms cannot affect the real meaning of the moral concepts. It is true that he who holds that "actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness,"[5] may, by a merely intellectual process, pass judgment on the moral character of particular acts; but, if he is an utilitarian from conviction, his first principle, at least, has an emotional origin. The case is similar with many of the moral judgments ordinarily passed by men. They are applications of some accepted general rule: conformity or non-conformity to the rule decides the rightness or wrongness of the act judged of. But whether the rule be the result of a person's independent deductions, or be based upon authority, human or divine, the fact that his moral consciousness recognises it as valid implies that it has an emotional sanction in his own mind.

[Footnote 5: Stuart Mill, _Utilitarianism_, p. 9 _sq._]

Whilst the import of the predicate of a moral judgment may thus in every case be traced back to an emotion in him who pronounces the judgment, it is generally assumed to possess the character of universality or "objectivity" as well. The statement that an act is good or bad does not merely refer to an individual emotion; as will be shown subsequently, it always has reference to an emotion of a more public character. Very often it even implies some vague assumption that the act must be recognised as good or bad by everybody who possesses a sufficient knowledge of the case and of all attendant circumstances, and who has a "sufficiently developed" {7} moral consciousness. We are not willing to admit that our moral convictions are a mere matter of taste, and we are inclined to regard convictions differing from our own as errors. This characteristic of our moral judgments has been adduced as an argument against the emotionalist theory of moral origins, and has led to the belief that the moral concepts represent qualities which are discerned by reason.

Cudworth, Clarke, Price, and Reid are names which recall to our mind a theory according to which the morality of actions is perceived by the intellect, just as are number, diversity, causation, proportion. "Morality is eternal and immutable," says Richard Price. "Right and wrong, it appears, denote what actions are. Now whatever any thing is, that it is, not by will, or degree, or power, but by nature and necessity. Whatever a triangle or circle is, that it is unchangeably and eternally. . . . The same is to be said of right and wrong, of moral good and evil, as far as they express real characters of actions. They must immutably and necessarily belong to those actions of which they are truly affirmed."[6] And as having a real existence outside the mind, they can only be discerned by the understanding. It is true that this discernment is accompanied with an emotion: "Some impressions of pleasure or pain, satisfaction or disgust, generally attend our perceptions of virtue and vice. But these are merely their effects and concomitants, and not the perceptions themselves, which ought no more to be confounded with them, than a particular truth (like that for which Pythagoras offered a hecatomb) ought to be confounded with the pleasure that may attend the discovery of it."[7]

[Footnote 6: Price, _Review of the Principal Questions in Morals_, pp. 63, 74 _sq._]

[Footnote 7: _Ibid._ p. 63.]

According to another doctrine, the moral predicates, though not regarded as expressions of "theoretical" truth, nevertheless derive all their import from reason from "practical" or "moral" reason, as it is variously {8} called. Thus Professor Sidgwick holds that the fundamental notions represented by the word "ought" or "right," which moral judgments contain expressly or by implication, are essentially different from all notions representing facts of physical or psychical experience, and he refers such judgments to the

"reason," understood as a faculty of cognition. By this he implies "that what ought to be is a possible object of knowledge, _i.e._, that what I judge ought to be, must, unless I am in error, be similarly judged by all rational beings who judge truly of the matter." The moral judgments contain moral _truths_, and "cannot legitimately be interpreted as judgments respecting the present or future existence of human feelings or any facts of the sensible world."[8]

[Footnote 8: Sidgwick, _Methods of Ethics_, pp. 25, 33 _sq._]

Yet our tendency to objectivise the moral judgments is no sufficient ground for referring them to the province of reason. If, in this respect, there is a difference between these judgments and others that are rooted in the subjective sphere of experience, it is, largely, a difference in degree rather than in kind. The aesthetic judgments, which indisputably have an emotional origin, also lay claim to a certain amount of "objectivity." By saying of a piece of music that it is beautiful, we do not merely mean that it gives ourselves aesthetic enjoyment, but we make a latent assumption that it must have a similar effect upon everybody who is sufficiently musical to appreciate it. This objectivity ascribed to judgments which have a merely subjective origin springs in the first place from the similarity of the mental constitution of men, and, generally speaking, the tendency to regard them as objective is greater in proportion as the impressions vary less in each particular case. If "there is no disputing of tastes," that is because taste is so extremely variable; and yet even in this instance we recognise a certain "objective" standard by speaking of a "bad" and a "good" taste. On the other hand, if the appearance of objectivity in the moral judgments is so illusive as to {9} make it seem necessary to refer them to reason, that is partly on account of the comparatively uniform nature of the moral consciousness.

Society is the school in which men learn to distinguish between right and wrong. The headmaster is Custom, and the lessons are the same for all. The first moral judgments were pronounced by public opinion; public indignation and public approval are the prototypes of the moral emotions. As regards questions of morality, there was, in early society, practically no difference of opinion; hence a character of universality, or objectivity, was from the very beginning attached to all moral judgments. And when, with advancing civilisation, this unanimity was to some extent disturbed by individuals venturing to dissent from the opinions of the majority, the disagreement was largely due to facts which in no way affected the moral principle, but had reference only to its application.

Most people follow a very simple method in judging of an act. Particular modes of conduct have their traditional labels, many of which are learnt with language itself; and the moral judgment commonly consists simply in labelling the act according to certain obvious characteristics which it presents in common with others belonging to the same group. But a conscientious and intelligent judge proceeds in a different manner. He carefully examines all the details connected with the act, the external and internal conditions under which it was performed, its consequences, its motive; and, since the moral estimate in a large measure depends upon the regard paid to these circumstances, his judgment may differ greatly from that of the man in the street, even though the moral standard which they apply be exactly the same. But to acquire a full insight into all the details which are apt to influence the moral value of an act is in many cases anything but easy, and this naturally increases the disagreement. There is thus in every advanced society a diversity of opinion regarding the moral value of certain modes of conduct which results from circumstances of a purely {10} intellectual character--from the knowledge or ignorance of positive facts,--and involves no discord in principle.

Now it has been assumed by the advocates of various ethical theories that all the differences of moral ideas originate in this way, and that there is some ultimate standard which must be recognised as authoritative by everybody who understands it rightly. According to Bentham, the rectitude of utilitarianism has been contested only by those who have not known their own meaning:--"When a man attempts to combat the principle of utility . . . his arguments, if they prove anything, prove not that the principle is wrong, but that, according to the applications he supposes to be made of it, it is misapplied."[9] Mr. Spencer, to whom good conduct is that "which conduces to life in each and all," believes that he has the support of "the true moral consciousness," or "moral consciousness proper," which, whether in harmony or in conflict with the "pro-ethical" sentiment, is vaguely or distinctly recognised as the rightful ruler.[10] Samuel Clarke, the intuitionist, again, is of opinion that if a man endowed with reason denies the eternal and necessary moral differences of things, it is the very same "as if a man that has the use of his sight, should at the same time that he beholds the sun, deny that there is any such thing as light in the world; or as if a man that understands Geometry or Arithmetick, should deny the most obvious and known proportions of lines or numbers."[11] In short, all disagreement as to questions of morals is attributed to ignorance or misunderstanding.

[Footnote 9: Bentham, _Principles of Morals and Legislation_, p. 4 _sq._]

[Footnote 10: Spencer, _Principles of Ethics_, i. 45, 337 _sq._]

[Footnote 11: Clarke, _Discourse concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion_, p. 179.]

The influence of intellectual considerations upon moral judgments is certainly immense. We shall find that the evolution of the moral consciousness to a large extent consists in its development from the unreflecting to the reflecting, from the unenlightened to the enlightened. All higher emotions are determined by cognitions, they arise {11} from "the presentation of determinate objective conditions";[12] and moral enlightenment implies a true and comprehensive presentation of those objective conditions by which the moral emotions, according to their very nature, are determined. Morality may thus in a much higher degree than, for instance, beauty be a subject of instruction and of profitable discussion, in which persuasion is carried by the representation of existing data. But although in this way many differences may be accorded, there are points in which unanimity cannot be reached even by the most accurate presentation of facts or the subtlest process of reasoning.

[Footnote 12: Marshall, _Pain_, _Pleasure_, _and Aesthetics_, p. 83.]

Whilst certain phenomena will almost of necessity arouse similar moral emotions in every mind which perceives them clearly, there are others with which the case is different. The emotional constitution of man does not present the same uniformity as the human intellect. Certain cognitions inspire fear in nearly every breast; but there are brave men and cowards in the world, independently of the accuracy with which they realise impending danger. Some cases of suffering can hardly fail to awaken compassion in the most pitiless heart; but the sympathetic dispositions of men vary greatly, both in regard to the beings with whose sufferings they are ready to sympathise, and with reference to the intensity of the emotion. The same holds good for the moral emotions. The existing diversity of opinion as to the rights of different classes of men and of the lower animals, which springs from emotional differences, may no doubt be modified by a clearer insight into certain facts, but no perfect agreement can be expected as long as the conditions under which the emotional dispositions are formed remain unchanged. Whilst an enlightened mind _must_ recognise the complete or relative irresponsibility of an animal, a child, or a madman, and _must_ be influenced in its moral judgment by the motives of an act--no intellectual enlightenment, no scrutiny of facts, can decide how far the interests of the {12} lower animals should be regarded when conflicting with those of men, or how far a person is bound, or allowed, to promote the welfare of his nation, or his own welfare, at the cost of that of other nations or other individuals. Professor Sidgwick's well-known moral axiom, "I ought not to prefer my own lesser good to the greater good of another,"[13] would, if explained to a Fuegian or a Hottentot, be regarded by him, not as self-evident, but as simply absurd; nor can it claim general acceptance even among ourselves. Who is that "Another" to whose greater good I ought not to prefer my own lesser good? A fellow-countryman, a savage, a criminal, a bird, a fish--all without distinction? It will, perhaps, be argued that on this, and on all other points of morals, there would be general agreement, if only the moral consciousness of men were sufficiently developed.[14] But then, when speaking of a "sufficiently developed" moral consciousness (beyond insistence upon a full insight into the governing facts of each case), we practically mean nothing else than agreement with our own moral convictions. The expression is faulty and deceptive, because, if intended to mean anything more, it presupposes an objectivity of the moral judgments which they do not possess, and at the same time seems to be proving what it presupposes. We may speak of an intellect as sufficiently developed to grasp a certain truth, because truth is objective; but it is not proved to be objective by the fact that it is recognised as true by a "sufficiently developed" intellect. The objectivity of truth lies in the recognition of facts as true by all who understand them _fully_, whilst the appeal to a _sufficient_ knowledge assumes their objectivity. To the verdict of a perfect intellect, that is, an intellect which knows everything existing, all would submit; but we can form no idea of a moral consciousness which could lay claim to a similar authority. If the believers in an all-good {13} God, who has revealed his will to mankind, maintain that they in this revelation possess a perfect moral standard, and that, consequently, what is in accordance with such a standard must be objectively right, it may be asked what they mean by an "all-good" God. And in their attempt to answer this question, they would inevitably have to assume the objectivity they wanted to prove.

[Footnote 13: Sidgwick, _op. cit._ p. 383.]

[Footnote 14: This, in fact, was the explanation given by Professor Sidgwick himself in a conversation which I had with him regarding his moral axioms.]

The error we commit by attributing objectivity to moral estimates becomes particularly conspicuous when we consider that these estimates have not only a certain quality, but a certain quantity. There are different degrees of badness and goodness, a duty may be more or less stringent, a merit may be smaller or greater.[15] These quantitative differences are due to the emotional origin of all moral concepts. Emotions vary in intensity almost indefinitely, and the moral emotions form no exception to this rule. Indeed, it may be fairly doubted whether the same mode of conduct ever arouses exactly the same degree of indignation or approval in any two

individuals. Many of these differences are of course too subtle to be manifested in the moral judgment; but very frequently the intensity of the emotion is indicated by special words, or by the way in which the judgment is pronounced. It should be noticed, however, that the quantity of the estimate expressed in a moral predicate is not identical with the intensity of the moral emotion which a certain mode of conduct arouses on a special occasion. We are liable to feel more indignant if an injury is committed before our eyes than if we read of it in a newspaper, and yet we admit that the degree of wrongness is in both cases the same. The quantity of moral estimates is determined by the intensity of the emotions which their objects tend to evoke under exactly similar external circumstances.

[Footnote 15: It will be shown in a following chapter why there are no degrees of rightness. This concept implies accordance with the moral law. The adjective "right" means that duty is fulfilled.]

{14} Besides the relative uniformity of moral opinions, there is another circumstance which tempts us to objectivise moral judgments, namely, the authority which, rightly or wrongly, is ascribed to moral rules. From our earliest childhood we are taught that certain acts _are_ right and that others _are_ wrong. Owing to their exceptional importance for human welfare, the facts of the moral consciousness are emphasised in a much higher degree than any other subjective facts. We are allowed to have our private opinions about the beauty of things, but we are not so readily allowed to have our private opinions about right and wrong. The moral rules which are prevalent in the society to which we belong are supported by appeals not only to human, but to divine, authority, and to call in question their validity is to rebel against religion as well as against public opinion. Thus the belief in a moral order of the world has taken hardly less firm hold of the human mind than the belief in a natural order of things. And the moral law has retained its authoritativeness even when the appeal to an external authority has been regarded as inadequate. It filled Kant with the same awe as the star-spangled firmament. According to Butler, conscience is "a faculty in kind and in nature supreme over all others, and which bears its own authority of being so."[16] Its supremacy is said to be "felt and tacitly acknowledged by the worst no less than by the best of men."[17] Adam Smith calls the moral faculties the "vicegerents of God within us," who "never fail to punish the violation of them by the torments of inward shame and self-condemnation; and, on the contrary, always reward obedience with tranquillity of mind, with contentment, and self-satisfaction."[18] Even Hutcheson, who raises the question why the moral sense should not vary in different men as the palate does, considers it {15} "to be naturally destined to command all the other powers."[19]

[Footnote 16: Butler, 'Sermon II.--Upon Human Nature,' in _Analogy of Religion_, _&c._ p. 403.]

[Footnote 17: Dugald Stewart, _Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers of Man_, i. 302.]

[Footnote 18: Adam Smith, _Theory of Moral Sentiments_, p. 235.]

[Footnote 19: Hutcheson, _System of Moral Philosophy_, i. 61.]

Authority is an ambiguous word. It may indicate knowledge of truth, and it may indicate a rightful power to command obedience. The authoritativeness attributed to the moral law has often reference to both kinds of authority. The moral lawgiver lays down his rules in order that they should be obeyed, and they are authoritative in so far as they have to be obeyed. But he is also believed to know what is right and wrong, and his commands are regarded as expressions of moral truths. As we have seen, however, this latter kind of authority involves a false assumption as to the nature of the moral predicates, and it cannot be justly inferred from the power to command. Again, if the notion of an external lawgiver be put aside, the moral law does not generally seem to possess supreme authority in either sense of the word. It does not command obedience in any exceptional degree; few laws are broken more frequently. Nor can the regard for it be called the mainspring of action; it is only one spring out of many, and variable like all others. In some instances it is the ruling power in a man's life, in others it is a voice calling in the desert; and the majority of people seem to be more afraid of the blame or ridicule of their fellowmen, or of the penalties with which the law threatens them, than of "the vicegerents of God" in their own hearts. That mankind prefer the possession of virtue to all other enjoyments, and look upon vice as worse than any other misery,[20] is unfortunately an imagination of some moralists who confound men as they are with men as they ought to be.

[Footnote 20: _Idem_, _Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue_, p. 248.]

It is said that the authority of the moral law asserts itself every time the law is broken, that virtue bears in itself its own reward, and vice its own punishment. But, to be sure, conscience is a very unjust retributer. The more a person habituates himself to virtue the more he {16} sharpens its sting, the deeper he sinks in vice the more he blunts it. Whilst the best men have the most sensitive consciences, the worst have hardly any conscience at all. It is argued that the habitual sinner has rid himself of remorse at a great

cost;[21] but it may be fairly doubted whether the loss is an adequate penalty for his wickedness. We are reminded that men are rewarded for good and punished for bad acts by the moral feelings of their neighbours. But public opinion and law judge of detected acts only. Their judgment is seldom based upon an exhaustive examination of the case. They often apply a standard which is itself open to criticism. And the feelings with which men regard their fellow-creatures, and which are some of the main sources of human happiness and suffering, have often very little to do with morality. A person is respected or praised, blamed or despised, on other grounds than his character. Nay, the admiration which men feel for genius, courage, pluck, strength, or accidental success, is often superior in intensity to the admiration they feel for virtue.

[Footnote 21: Ziegler, _Social Ethics_, p. 103.]

In spite of all this, however, the supreme authority assigned to the moral law is not altogether an illusion. It really exists in the minds of the best, and is nominally acknowledged by the many. By this I do not refer to the universal admission that the moral law, whether obeyed or not, ought under all circumstances to be obeyed; for this is the same as to say that what ought to be ought to be. But it is recognised, in theory at least, that morality, either alone or in connection with religion, possesses a higher value than anything else; that rightness and goodness are preferable to all other kinds of mental superiority, as well as of physical excellence. If this theory is not more commonly acted upon, that is due to its being, in most people, much less the outcome of their own feelings than of instruction from the outside. It is ultimately traceable to some great teacher whose own mind was ruled by the ideal of moral perfection, and whose {17} words became sacred on account of his supreme wisdom, like Confucius or Buddha,[22] or on religious grounds, like Jesus. The authority of the moral law is thus only an expression of a strongly developed, overruling moral consciousness. It can hardly, as Mr. Sidgwick maintains, be said to "depend upon" the conception of the objectivity of duty.[23] On the contrary, it must be regarded as a cause of this conception--not only, as has already been pointed out, where it is traceable to some external authority, but where it results from the strength of the individual's own moral emotions. As clearness and distinctness of the conception of an object easily produces the belief in its truth, so the intensity of a moral emotion makes him who feels it disposed to objectivise the moral estimate to which it gives rise, in other words, to assign to it universal validity. The enthusiast is more likely than anybody else to regard his judgments as true, and so is the moral enthusiast with reference to his moral judgments. The intensity of his emotions makes him the victim of an illusion.

[Footnote 22: "Besides the ideal king, the personification of Power and Justice, another ideal has played an important part in the formation of early Buddhist ideas regarding their Master. . . . It was the ideal of a perfectly Wise Man, the personification of Wisdom, the Buddha" (Rhys Davids, _Hibbert Lectures on Some Points in the History of Buddhism_, p. 141).]

[Footnote 23: Sidgwick, _op. cit._ p. 104.]

The presumed objectivity of moral judgments thus being a chimera, there can be no moral truth in the sense in which this term is generally understood. The ultimate reason for this is, that the moral concepts are based upon emotions, and that the contents of an emotion fall entirely outside the category of truth. But it may be true or not that we have a certain emotion, it may be true or not that a given mode of conduct has a tendency to evoke in us moral indignation or moral approval. Hence a moral judgment is true or false according as its subject has or has not that tendency which the predicate attributes to it. If I say that it is wrong to resist evil, and yet resistance to evil has no tendency whatever to call {18} forth in me an emotion of moral disapproval, then my judgment is false.

If there are no general moral truths, the object of scientific ethics cannot be to fix rules for human conduct, the aim of all science being the discovery of some truth. It has been said by Bentham and others that moral principles cannot be proved because they are first principles which are used to prove everything else.[24] But the real reason for their being inaccessible to demonstration is that, owing to their very nature, they can never be true. If the word "Ethics," then, is to be used as the name for a science, the object of that science can only be to study the moral consciousness as a fact.[25]

[Footnote 24: Bentham, _Principles of Morals and Legislation_, p. 4. _Cf._ Höffding, _Etik_, p. 43.]

[Footnote 25: _Cf._ Simmel, _Einleitung in die Moralwissenschaft_, i. p. iii. _sq._; Westermarck, 'Normative und psychologische Ethik,' in _Dritter Internationaler Congress für Psychologie in München_, p. 428 _sq._]

Ethical subjectivism is commonly held to be a dangerous doctrine, destructive to morality, opening the door to all sorts of libertinism. If that which appears to each man as right or good, stands for that which is right or good; if he is allowed to make his own law, or to make no law at all; then, it is said, everybody has the natural right to follow his caprice and inclinations, and to hinder

him from doing so is an infringement on his rights, a constraint with which no one is bound to comply provided that he has the power to evade it. This inference was long ago drawn from the teaching of the Sophists,[26] and it will no doubt be still repeated as an argument against any theorist who dares to assert that nothing can be said to be truly right or wrong.

[Footnote 26: Zeller, _History of Greek Philosophy_, ii. 475.]

To this argument may, first, be objected that a scientific theory is not invalidated by the mere fact that it is likely to cause mischief. The unfortunate circumstance that there do exist dangerous things in the world, proves that something may be dangerous and yet true. Another question is whether any scientific truth really is mischievous {19} on the whole, although it may cause much discomfort to certain people. I venture to believe that this, at any rate, is not the case with that form of ethical subjectivism which I am here advocating. The charge brought against the Sophists does not at all apply to it. I do not even subscribe to that beautiful modern sophism which admits every man's conscience to be an infallible guide. If we had to recognise, or rather if we did recognise, as right everything which is held to be right by anybody, savage or Christian, criminal or saint, morality would really suffer a serious loss. But we do not, and we cannot, do so. My moral judgments are my own judgments; they spring from my own moral consciousness; they judge of the conduct of other men not from their point of view but from mine, not with primary reference to their opinions about right and wrong, but with reference to my own. Most of us indeed admit that, when judging of an act, we also ought to take into consideration the moral conviction of the agent, and the agreement or disagreement between his doing and his idea of what he ought to do. But although we hold it to be wrong of a person to act against his conscience, we may at the same time blame him for having such a conscience as he has. Ethical subjectivism covers all such cases. It certainly does not allow everybody to follow his own inclinations; nor does it lend sanction to arbitrariness and caprice. Our moral consciousness belongs to our mental constitution, which we cannot change as we please. We approve and we disapprove because we cannot do otherwise. Can we help feeling pain when the fire burns us? Can we help sympathising with our friends? Are these phenomena less necessary or less powerful in their consequences, because they fall within the subjective sphere of experience? So, too, why should the moral law command less obedience because it forms part of our own nature?

Far from being a danger, ethical subjectivism seems to me more likely to be an acquisition for moral practice. {20} Could it be brought home to people that there is no absolute standard in morality, they would perhaps be somewhat more tolerant in their judgments, and more apt to listen to the voice of reason. If the right has an objective existence, the moral consciousness has certainly been playing at blindman's buff ever since it was born, and will continue to do so until the extinction of the human race. But who does admit this? The popular mind is always inclined to believe that it possesses the knowledge of what _is_ right and wrong, and to regard public opinion as the reliable guide of conduct. We have, indeed, no reason to regret that there are men who rebel against the established rules of morality; it is more deplorable that the rebels are so few, and that, consequently, the old rules change so slowly. Far above the vulgar idea that the right is a settled something to which everybody has to adjust his opinions, rises the conviction that it has its existence in each individual mind, capable of any expansion, proclaiming its own right to exist, and, if need be, venturing to make a stand against the whole world. Such a conviction makes for progress.

CHAPTER II

THE NATURE OF THE MORAL EMOTIONS

IN the preceding chapter it was asserted, in general terms, that the moral concepts are based on emotions, and the leading arguments to the contrary were met. We shall now proceed to examine the nature of the moral emotions.

These emotions are of two kinds: disapproval, or indignation, and approval. They have in common characteristics which make them moral emotions, in distinction from others of a non-moral character, but at the same time both of them belong to a wider class of emotions, which I call retributive emotions. Again, they differ from each other in points which make each of them allied to certain non-moral retributive emotions, disapproval to anger and revenge, and approval to that kind of retributive kindly emotion which in its most developed form is gratitude. They may thus, on the one hand, be regarded as two distinct divisions of the moral emotions, whilst, on the other hand, disapproval, like anger and revenge, forms a sub-species of resentment, and approval, like gratitude, forms a sub-species of retributive kindly emotion. The following diagram will help to elucidate the matter:--

Retributive Emotions. | ---------- | | Resentment. Retributive Kindly Emotion. | | ---------- ---------- | | | Anger and Moral Moral Non-moral retributive Revenge. disapproval. approval Kindly Emotion, | | including Gratitude. ---------- | Moral Emotions.

{22} That moral disapproval is a kind of resentment and akin to anger and revenge, and that moral approval is a kind of retributive kindly emotion and akin to gratitude, are, of course, statements which call for proof. An analysis of all these emotions, and a detailed study of the causes which evoke them, will, I hope, bear out the correctness of my classification. In this connection only the analysis can be attempted. The study of causes will be involved in the treatment of the subjects of moral judgments.

Resentment may be described as an aggressive attitude of mind towards a cause of pain. Anger is sudden resentment, in which the hostile reaction against the cause of pain is unrestrained by deliberation. Revenge, on the other hand, is a more deliberate form of non-moral resentment, in which the hostile reaction is more or less restrained by reason and calculation.[1] It is impossible, however, to draw any distinct limit between these two types of resentment, as also to discern where an actual desire to inflict pain comes in. In its primitive form, anger, even when directed against a living being, contains a vehement impulse to remove the cause of pain without any real desire to produce suffering.[2] Anger is strikingly shown by many fish, and notoriously by sticklebacks when their territory is invaded by other sticklebacks. In such circumstances of provocation the whole animal changes colour, and, darting at the trespasser, shows rage and fury in every movement;[3] but we can hardly believe that any idea of inflicting pain is present to its mind. As we proceed still lower down the scale of animal life we find the conative element itself gradually dwindle away until nothing is left but mere reflex action.

[Footnote 1: _Cf._ Ribot, _Psychology of the Emotions_, p. 220 _sqq._]

[Footnote 2: There are some good remarks on this in Mr. Hiram Stanley's _Studies in the Evolutionary Psychology of Feeling_, p. 138 _sq._]

[Footnote 3: Romanes, _Animal Intelligence_, p. 246 _sqq._]

That the fury of an injured animal turns against the real or assumed cause of its injury is a matter of notoriety, and everybody knows that the same is the case with the {23} anger of a child. No doubt, as Professor Sully observes, "hitting out right and left, throwing things down on the floor and breaking them, howling, wild agitated movements of the arms and whole body, these are the outward vents which the gust of childish fury is apt to take."[4] But, on the other hand, we know well enough that Darwin's little boy, who became a great adept at throwing books and sticks at any one who offended him,[5] was in this respect no exceptional child. Towards the age of one year, according to M. Perez, children "will beat people, animals, and inanimate objects if they are angry with them; they will throw their toys, their food, their plate, anything, in short, that is at hand, at the people who have displeased them."[6] That a similar discrimination characterises the resentment of a savage is a fact upon which it is necessary to dwell at some length for the reason that it has been disputed, and because there are some seeming anomalies which require an explanation.

[Footnote 4: Sully, _Studies in Childhood_, p. 232 _sq._]

[Footnote 5: Darwin, 'Biographical Sketch of an Infant,' in _Mind_, ii. 288.]

[Footnote 6: Perez, _first Three Years of Childhood_, p. 66 _sq._]

In a comprehensive work,[7] Dr. Steinmetz has made the feeling of revenge the object of a detailed investigation, which cannot be left unnoticed. The ultimate conclusions at which he has arrived are these: Revenge is essentially rooted in the feeling of power and superiority. It arises consequently upon the experience of injury, and its aim is to enhance the "self-feeling" which has been lowered or degraded by the injury suffered. It answers this purpose best if it is directed against the aggressor himself, but it is not essential to it that it should take any determinate direction, for, _per se_, and originally, it is "undirected."[8]

[Footnote 7: _Ethnologische Studien zur ersten Entwicklung der Strafe_.]

[Footnote 8: Strictly speaking, this theory is not new. Dr. Paul Rée, in his book _Die Entstehung des Gewissens_, has pronounced revenge to be a reaction against the feeling of inferiority which the aggressor impresses upon his victim. The injured man, he says (_ibid._ p. 40) is naturally reluctant to feel himself inferior to another man, and consequently strives, by avenging the aggression, to show himself equal or even superior to the aggressor. A similar view was previously expressed by Schopenhauer (_Parerga und Paralipomena_, ii. 475 _sq._). But Dr. Steinmetz has elaborated his theory with an independence and fulness which make any question of priority quite insignificant.]

{24} We are told, in fact, that the first stage through which revenge passed within the human race was characterised by a total, or almost total, want of discrimination. The aim of the offended man was merely to raise his injured "self-feeling" by inflicting pain upon

somebody else, and his savage desire was satisfied whether the man on whom he wreaked his wrath was guilty or innocent.[9] No doubt, there were from the outset instances in which the offender himself was purposely made the victim, especially if he was a fellow-tribesman; but it was not really due to the feeling of revenge if the suffering was inflicted upon him, in preference to others. Even primitive man must have found out that vengeance directed against the actual culprit, besides being a strong deterrent to others, was a capital means of making a dangerous person harmless. However, Dr. Steinmetz adds, these advantages should not be overestimated, as even indiscriminate revenge has a deterring influence on the malefactor.[10] In early times, then, vengeance, according to Dr. Steinmetz, was in the main "undirected."

[Footnote 9: Steinmetz, _op. cit._ i. 355, 356, 359, 561.]

[Footnote 10: _Ibid._ i. 362.]

At the next stage it becomes, he says, somewhat less indiscriminate. A proper victim is sought for even in cases of what we should call natural death, which the savage generally attributes to the ill-will of some foe skilled in sorcery;[11] though indeed Dr. Steinmetz doubts whether in such cases the unfortunate sufferer is really supposed to have committed the deed imputed to him.[12] At all events, a need is felt of choosing somebody for a victim, and "undirected" vengeance gradually gives way to "directed" vengeance. A rude specimen of this is the blood-feud, in which the individual culprit is left out of consideration, but war is carried on against the group of which he is a member, either his family or his tribe. And {25} from this system of joint responsibility we finally come, by slow degrees, says Dr. Steinmetz, to the modern conception, according to which punishment should be inflicted upon the criminal and nobody else.[13] Dr. Steinmetz believes that the _vis agens_ in this long process of evolution lies in the intellectual development of the human race: man found out more and more distinctly that the best means of restraining wrongs was to punish a certain person, namely, the wrong-doer.[14] On this utilitarian calculation our author lays much stress in the latter part of his investigation; whereas in another place he observes that a revenge which is directed against the offender is particularly apt to remove the feeling of inferiority, by effectually humiliating the hitherto triumphant foe.[15]

[Footnote 11: _Ibid._ i. 356 _sq._]

[Footnote 12: _Ibid._ i. 359 _sq._]

[Footnote 13: Steinmetz, _op. cit._ i. 361.]

[Footnote 14: _Ibid._ i. 358, 359, 361 _sq._]

[Footnote 15: _Ibid._ i. 111.]

In this historical account the main points of interest are the initial stage of "undirected" vengeance, and the way in which such vengeance gradually became discriminate. If, in primitive times, a man did not care in the least on whom he retaliated an injury, then of course the direction of his vengeance could not be essential to the revenge itself, but would be merely a later appendix to it. The question is, what evidence can Dr. Steinmetz adduce to support his theory? Of primitive man we have no direct experience; no savage people now existing is a faithful representative of him, either physically or mentally. Yet however greatly the human race has changed, primitive man is not altogether dead. Traits of his character still linger in his descendants; and of primitive revenge, we are told, there are sufficient survivals left.[16]

[Footnote 16: _Ibid._ i. 364.]

Under the heading "Perfectly Undirected Revenge," Dr. Steinmetz sets out several alleged cases of such so-called survivals[17] 1. An Indian of the Omaha tribe, who was kicked out of a trading establishment which he had been forbidden to enter, declared in a rage that he would revenge himself for an injury so gross, and, "seeking some object to destroy, he encountered a {26} sow and pigs, and appeased his rage by putting them all to death." 2. The people of that same tribe believe that if a man who has been struck by lightning is not buried in the proper way, and in the place where he has been killed, his spirit will not rest in peace, but will walk about till another person is slain by lightning and laid beside him. 3. At the burial of a Loucheux Indian, the relatives sometimes will cut and lacerate their bodies, or, as sometimes happens, will, "in a fit of revenge against fate," stab some poor, friendless person who may be sojourning among them. 4. The Navahoes, when jealous of their wives, are apt to wreak their spleen and ill-will upon the first person whom they chance to meet. 5. The Great Eskimo, as it is reported, once after a severe epidemic swore to kill all white people who might venture into their country. 6. The Australian father, whose little child happens to hurt itself, attacks his innocent neighbours, believing that he thus distributes the pain among them and consequently lessens the suffering of the child. 7.

The Brazilian Tupis ate the vermin which molested them, for the sake of revenge; and if one of them struck his foot against a stone, he raged over it and bit it, whilst, if he were wounded with an arrow, he plucked it out and gnawed the shaft. 8. The Dacotahs avenge theft by stealing the property of the thief or of somebody else. 9. Among the Tshatrali (Pamir), if a man is robbed of his meat by a neighbour's dog, he will, in a fit of rage, not only kill the offending dog, but will, in addition, kick his own. 10. In New Guinea the bearers of evil tidings sometimes get knocked on the head during the first outburst of indignation evoked by their news. 11. Some natives of Motu, who had rescued two shipwrecked crews and safely brought them to their home in Port Moresby, were attacked there by the very friends of those they had saved, the reason for this being that the Port Moresby people were angry at the loss of the canoes, and could not bear that the Motuans were happy while they themselves were in trouble. 12. Another story from New Guinea tells us of a man who killed some innocent persons, because he had been disappointed in his plans and deprived of valuable property. 13. Among the Maoris it sometimes happened that the friends of a murdered man killed the first man who came in their way, whether enemy or friend. 14. Among the same people, chiefs who had suffered some loss often used to rob their subjects of property in order to make good the damage. 15. If the son of a Maori is hurt, his maternal relatives, to whose tribe he is considered to belong, come to pillage his father's house or village. 16. If {27} a tree falls on a Kuki his fellows chop it up, and if one of that tribe kills himself by falling from a tree the tree from which he fell is promptly cut down. 17. In some parts of Daghestan, when the cause of a death is unknown, the relatives of the deceased declare some person chosen at random to have murdered him, and retaliate his death upon that person.

[Footnote 17: _Ibid._ i. 318 _sqq._]

I have been obliged to enumerate all these cases for the reason that a theory cannot be satisfactorily refuted unless on its own ground. I may confess at once that I scarcely ever saw an hypothesis vindicated by the aid of more futile evidence. The cases 7 and 16 illustrate just the reverse of "undirected" revenge, and, when we take into consideration the animistic beliefs of savages, present little to astonish us. In case 17 the guilt is certainly imputed to somebody at random, but only when the culprit is unknown. Cases 1, 4, 10 and 12 and perhaps also 11, imply that revenge is taken upon an innocent party in a fit of passion; in cases 1 and 12 the offender himself cannot be got at, in case 10 the man who is knocked on the head appears for the moment as the immediate cause of the grief or indignation evoked, while case 11 exhibits envy combined with extreme ingratitude. In case 9 the anger is chiefly directed against the "guilty" dog, and against the "innocent" one evidently by an association of ideas. Cases 8 and 14 illustrate indemnification for loss of property, and in case 8 the thief himself is specifically mentioned first. In case 15 the revenging attack is made upon the property of those people among whom the child lives, and who may be considered responsible for the loss its maternal clan sustains by the injury. Case 6 merely shows the attempt of a superstitious father to lessen the suffering of his child. As regards case 5, Petitot, who has recorded it, says expressly that the white people were supposed to have caused the epidemic by displeasing the god Tornrark.[18] Case 2 points to a superstitious belief which is interesting enough in itself, but which, so far as I can see, is without any bearing whatever on the point we are discussing. Case 3 looks like a death-offering. The stabbing of an innocent person is mentioned in connection with, or rather as an alternative to, the self-laceration of the mourners, which last has probably a sacrificial character. Moreover, there is in this case no question of a culprit. In case 13, finally, the idea of sacrifice is very conspicuous. Dr. Steinmetz has borrowed his statement from Waitz, whose account is incomplete. Dieffenbach, the original authority, says that the custom in question was called by the Maori _taua tapu_, _i.e._, sacred fight, {28} or _taua toto_, _i.e._, fight for blood. He describes it as follows:--"If blood has been shed, a party sally forth and kill the first person they fall in with, whether an enemy or belonging to their own tribe; even a brother is sacrificed. If they do not fall in with anybody, the _tohunga_ (that is, the priest) pulls up some grass, throws it into a river, and repeats some incantation. After this ceremony, the killing of a bird, or any living thing that comes in their way, is regarded as sufficient, provided that blood is actually shed. All who participate in such an excursion are _tapu_, and are not allowed either to smoke or to eat anything but indigenous food."[19] It seems probable that this ceremony was undertaken in order to appease the enraged spirit of the dead,[20] and at the same time it may have been intended to refresh the spirit with blood.[21] The question, however, is, Why was not his death avenged upon the actual culprit? To this Dr. Steinmetz would answer that the deceased was thought to be indiscriminate in his craving for vengeance.[22] But so far as the resentment of the dead is concerned, the "sacred fight" of the Maoris only seems to illustrate the impulsive character of anger. From Dieffenbach's description of it, it is obvious that the friends of the slain man considered it to be a matter of paramount importance that blood should be shed immediately. If no human being came in their way, an animal was killed, but then an incantation was uttered beforehand. I presume that the reason for this was the terror which the supposed wrath of the dead man's spirit struck into the living, combined perhaps with the idea that it was in immediate need of fresh blood. The Maoris considered all spirits of the dead to be maliciously inclined towards them,[23] and the ghost of a person who had died a violent death was certainly looked upon as especially dangerous. The craving for instantaneous shedding of blood is even more conspicuous in another case

which may be appropriately mentioned in this connection. The Aetas of the Philippine Islands, we are told, "do not always {29} wait for the death of the afflicted before they bury him. Immediately after the body has been deposited in the grave, it becomes necessary, according to their usages, that his death should be avenged. The hunters of the tribe go out with their lances and arrows to kill the first living creature they meet with, whether a man, a stag, a wild hog, or a buffalo."[24] Dr. Steinmetz himself quotes some other instances from the same group of islands, in which, when a man dies, his nearest kinsmen go out to requite his death by the death of the first man who comes in their way.[25] It is worth noticing that the Philippine Islanders have the very worst opinion of their ghosts, and believe that these are particularly bloodthirsty soon after death.[26]

[Footnote 18: Petitot, _Les Grands Esqimaux_, p. 207 _sq._]

[Footnote 19: Dieffenbach, _Travels in New Zealand_, ii. 127.]

[Footnote 20: _Cf._ _ibid._ ii. 129.]

[Footnote 21: The latter object is suggested by some funeral ceremonies which will be noticed in a following chapter. Among the Dyaks, "a father who lost his child would go out and kill the first man he met, as a funeral ceremony," believing that he thus provided the deceased with a slave to accompany him to the habitation of souls (Tylor, _Primitive Culture_, i. 459). Among the Garos, it was formerly the practice, "whenever the death of a great man amongst them occurred, to send out a party of assassins to murder and bring back the head of the first Bengali they met. The victims so immolated would, it was supposed, be acceptable to their gods" (Dalton, _Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal_, p. 68).]

[Footnote 22: _Cf._ Steinmetz, _op. cit._ i. 343.]

[Footnote 23: Taylor, _Te Ika a Maui_, p. 221.]

[Footnote 24: Earl, _Papuans_, p. 132.]

[Footnote 25: Steinmetz, _op. cit._ i. 335 _sq._]

[Footnote 26: Blumentritt, 'Der Ahnencultus der Malaien des Philippinen-Archipels' in _Mittheilungen der Geogr. Gesellsch. in Wien_, xxv. 166 _sqq._ De Mas, _Informe sobre el estado de las Islas filipinas en 1842_, _Orijen, &c._ p. 15.]

Dr. Steinmetz also refers to some statements according to which, among certain Australian tribes, the relatives of a person who dies avenge his death by killing an innocent man.[27] But in these cases the avenged death, though "natural" according to our terminology, is, in the belief of the savages, caused by sorcery, and the revenge is not so indiscriminate as Dr. Steinmetz seems to assume. Among the Wellington tribe, as appears from a statement which he quotes himself, it is the sorcerer's life that must be taken for satisfaction.[28] In New South Wales, after the dead man has been interrogated as to the cause of his death, his kinsmen are resolute in taking vengeance, if they "imagine that they have got sure indications of the perpetrator of the wrong."[29] Among the Central Australian natives, "not infrequently the dying man will whisper in the ear of a _Railtchawa_, or medicine man, the name of the man whose magic is killing him," and if this be not done, "there is no difficulty, by some other method, of fixing sooner or later on the guilty party"; but only after the culprit has been revealed by the medicine man is it decided by a council of the old men whether an avenging party is to be arranged or not.[30] Among the aborigines of West Australia, the survivors are "pretty busy in seeking out" the sorcerer who is supposed to have caused the death of their friend.[31]

[Footnote 27: Steinmetz, _op. cit._ i. 337 _sq._]

[Footnote 28: Hale, _U.S. Exploring Expedition Vol. VI.--Ethnography and Philology_, p. 115; quoted by Steinmetz, _op. cit._ i. 337.]

[Footnote 29: Fraser, _Aborigines of New South Wales_, p. 86.]

[Footnote 30: Spencer and Gillen, _Native Tribes of Central Australia_, p. 476 _sq._]

[Footnote 31: Calvert, _Aborigines of Western Australia_, p. 20 _sq._]

{30} To sum up: all the facts which Dr. Steinmetz has adduced as evidence for his hypothesis of an original stage of "undirected" revenge only show that, under certain circumstances, either in a fit of passion, or when the actual offender is unknown or out of reach, revenge may be taken on an innocent being, wholly unconnected with the inflicter of the injury which it is sought to revenge. There is such an intimate connection between the experience of injury and the hostile reaction by which the injured individual gives

vent to his passion, that the reaction does not fail to appear even when it misses its aim. Anger, as Seneca said, "does not rage merely against its object, but against every obstacle which it encounters on its way."[32] Many infants, when angry and powerless to hurt others, "strike their heads against doors, posts, walls of houses, and sometimes on the floor."[33] Well known are the "amucks" of the Malays, in which "the desperado assails indiscriminately friend and foe," and, with dishevelled hair and frantic look, murders or wounds all whom he meets without distinction.[34] But all this is not revenge; it is sudden anger or blind rage. Nor is it revenge in the true sense of the word if a person who has been humiliated by his superior retaliates on those under him. It is only the outburst of a wounded "self-feeling," which, when not directed against its proper object, can afford no adequate consolation to a revengeful man.

[Footnote 32: Seneca, _De ira_, iii. 1.]

[Footnote 33: Stanley Hall, 'A Study of Anger,' in _American Jour. of Psychology_, x. 554.]

[Footnote 34: Crawfurd, _History of the Indian Archipelago_, i. 67. _Cf._ Ellis, 'The Amok of the Malays,' in _Jour. of Mental Science_, xxxix. 325 _sqq._ In the Andaman Islands, it is not uncommon for a man "to vent his ill-temper, or show his resentment at any act, by destroying his own property as well as that of his neighbours" (Man, 'Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands,' in _Jour. Anthr. Inst._ xii. 111). Among the Kar Nicobarese, when a quarrel takes place, in serious cases, a man will probably burn his own house down (Kloss, _In the Andamans and Nicobars_, p. 310). But in these instances it is not certain whether the offended party destroys his own property in blind rage, or with some definite object in view.]

In the institution of the blood-feud some sort of collective responsibility is usually involved.[35] If the {31} offender is of another family than his victim, some of his relatives may have to expiate his deed.[36] If he belongs to another clan, the whole clan may be held responsible for it.[37] And if he is a member of another tribe, the vengeance may be wreaked upon his fellow-tribesmen indiscriminately.[38]

[Footnote 35: _Cf._ Post, _Anfänge des Staats- und Rechtsleben_, p. 180; Rée, _op. cit._ p. 49 _sq._; Steinmetz, _op. cit._ i. ch. vi.]

[Footnote 36: Besides the authorities quoted _infra_, see Leuschner, in Steinmetz, _Rechtsverhältnisse von eingeborenen Völkern in Afrika und Ozeanien_, (Bakwiri); _ibid._ p. 49 (Banaka and Bapuku); Rautanen, _ibid._ p. 341 (Ondonga); Walter, _ibid._ p. 390 (natives of Nossi-Bé and Mayotte, near Madagascar); von Langsdorf, _Voyages and Travels_, i. 132 (Nukahivans); Forbes, _A Naturalist's Wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago_, p. 473 (Timorese); Foreman, _Philippine Islands_, p. 213 (Igorrotes of Luzon); Kovalewsky, in _Jour. Anthr. Inst._ xxv. 113 (people of Daghestan); _Idem_, _Coutume contemporaine et loi ancienne_, p. 248 _sq._ (Ossetes); Merzbacher, _Aus den Hochregionen des Kaukasus_, ii. 51 (Khevsurs).]

[Footnote 37: Bridges, in _A Voice for South America_, xiii. 207 (Fuegians). Dorsey, 'Omaha Sociology,' in _Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn._ iii. 369. Ridley, in _Jour. Anthr. Inst._ ii. 268 (Kamilaroi in Australia). Godwin-Austen, _ibid._ ii. 394 (Garo Hill tribes).]

[Footnote 38: von Martins, _Beiträge zur Ethnographie Amerika's_, i. 127 _sqq._ (Brazilian Indians). Crawfurd, _op. cit._ iii. 124 (natives of Celebes). Kohler, in _Zeitschr. f. vgl. Rechtswiss._ vii. 383 (Goajiros of Columbia). _Ibid._ vii. 376 (Papuans of New Guinea). Curr, _The Australian Race_, i. 70. Scaramucci and Giglioli, 'Notizie sui Danakil,' in _Archivio per l'antropologia e la etnologia_, xiv. 39. Leuschner, in Steinmetz, _Rechtsverhältnisse_, p. 23 (Bakwiri). _Ibid._ p. 49 (Banaka and Bapuku).]

"Among the Fuegians," says Mr. Bridges, "etiquette and custom require that all the relatives of a murdered person should . . . visit their displeasure upon every connection of the manslayers, each personally." The avengers of blood would by no means be satisfied with a party of natives if they should actually deliver up into their hands a manslayer, or kill him themselves, "but would yet exact from all the murderer's friends tribute or infliction of injuries with sticks or stones."[39] Among the Indians of British Columbia and Vancouver Island, "grudges are handed down from father to son for generations, and friendly relations are never free from the risk of being interrupted."[40] Among the Greenlanders, the revenge for a murder generally "costs the executioner himself, his children, cousins, or other relatives their lives; or if these are inaccessible, some other acquaintance in the neighbourhood."[41] Among the Maoris, blood-revenge might be taken on any relative of the homicide, "no matter how distant."[42] In Tana, {32} revenge "is often sought in the death of the brother, or some other near relative of the culprit."[43] Among the Kabyles, "la vengeance peut porter sur chacun des membres de la famille du meurtrier, quel qu'il soit."[44] The Bedouins, according to Burckhardt, "claim the blood not only from the actual homicide, but from all his relations; and it is these claims that constitute the right of _thár_, or the blood-revenge."[45] Among the people of Ibrim, in Nubia, on the other hand, the same traveller observes, "it is

not considered as sufficient to retaliate upon any person within the fifth degree of consanguinity, as among the Bedouins of Arabia; only the brother, son, or first cousin can supply the place of the murderer."[46] Traces of collective responsibility in connection with blood-revenge are found among the Hebrews.[47] It has prevailed, or still prevails, among the Japanese[48] and Coreans,[49] the Persians[50] and Hindus,[51] the ancient Greeks[52] and Teutons.[53] It was a rule among the Welsh[54] and the Scotch in former days,[55] and is so still in Corsica,[56] Albania,[57] and among some of the Southern Slavs.[58] In Montenegro, if a homicide who cannot be caught himself has no relatives, revenge is sometimes taken on some inhabitant of the village or district to which he belongs, or even on a person who only is of the same religion and nationality as the murderer.[59] In Albania, under similar circumstances, the victim may be a person who has had nothing else to do with the offender than that he has perhaps once been speaking to him.[60]

[Footnote 39: Bridges, in _South American Missionary Magazine_, xiii. 151 _sqq._]

[Footnote 40: Macfie, _Vancouver Island and British Columbia_, p. 470.]

[Footnote 41: Cranz, _History of Greenland_, i. 178.]

[Footnote 42: Shortland, _Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders_, p. 213 _sq._ _Cf._ _ibid._ p. 218 _sq._]

[Footnote 43: Turner, _Samoa_, p. 317.]

[Footnote 44: Hanoteau and Letourneux, _La Kabylie_, iii. 61.]

[Footnote 45: Burckhardt, _Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys_, p. 85. See, also, Layard, _Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon_, p. 306; Lane, _Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians_, i. 133.]

[Footnote 46: Burckhardt, _Travels in Nubia_, p. 128.]

[Footnote 47: _2 Samuel_, xiv. 7. _Cf._ _ibid._ xxi.]

[Footnote 48: Dautremer, 'The Vendetta or Legal Revenge in Japan,' in _Trans. Asiatic Soc. Japan_, xiii. 84.]

[Footnote 49: Griffis, _Corea_, p. 227.]

[Footnote 50: Spiegel, _Erânische Alterthumskunde_, iii. 687. Polak, _Persien_, ii. 96.]

[Footnote 51: Dubois, _Description of the Character, Manners, and Customs of the People of India_, p. 195.]

[Footnote 52: Leist, _Alt-arisches Jus Gentium_, p. 424.]

[Footnote 53: _Gotlands-Lagen_, 13.]

[Footnote 54: Walter, _Das alte Wales_, p. 138.]

[Footnote 55: Mackintosh, _History of Civilisation in Scotland_, ii. 279.]

[Footnote 56: Gregorovius, _Wanderings in Corsica_, i. 179.]

[Footnote 57: Gop[vc]evi['c], _**Oberalbanien und seine Liga_, p. 324 _sqq._]

[Footnote 58: Miklosich, 'Die Blutrache bei den Slaven,' in _Denkschriften der kaiserl. Akademie d. Wissensch. Philos.-histor. Classe_, Vienna, xxxvi. 131, 146 _sq._ Krauss, _Sitte und Brauch der Südslaven_, p. 39.]

[Footnote 59: Lago, _Memorie sulla Dalmazia_, ii. 90.]

[Footnote 60: Gop[vc]evi['c], _op. cit._ p. 325.]

There is no difficulty in explaining these facts. The following statement made by Mr. Romilly with reference {33} to the Solomon Islanders has, undoubtedly, a much wider application:--"In the cases which call for punishment, the difficulties in the way of capturing the actual culprits are greater than any one, who has not been engaged in this disagreeable work, can imagine."[61] Though it may happen that a manslayer is abandoned by his own people,[62] the system of blood-revenge more often seems to imply, not only that all the members of a group are engaged, more or less effectually, in the act of revenge, but that they mutually protect each other against the avengers. A homicide frequently provokes a war,[63] in which family stands against family, clan

against clan, or tribe against tribe. In such cases the whole group take upon themselves the deed of the perpetrator, and any of his fellows, because standing up for him, becomes a proper object of revenge. The guilt extends itself, as it were, in the eyes of the offended party. So, also, any person who lives on friendly terms with the offender, or is supposed to sympathise with him, is liable to arouse a feeling of resentment, and may consequently, in extreme cases, have to expiate his crime. Moreover, because of the close relationship which exists between the members of the sam__e group, the actual culprit will be mortified by any successful attack that the avengers make on his people, and, if he be dead, its painful and humiliating effects may still be supposed to reach his spirit. "When the offender himself is beyond the reach of direct attack," says Mr. Wilkins, "it is not beneath a Bengali's view to try to wound him through his children or other members of his family."[64] Among the South Slavonians, in a similar case, the avengers of blood first attempt to kill the father, brother, {34} or grown-up son of the murderer, "so as to inflict upon him a very heavy and painful loss"; and only when this has been tried in vain, are more distant relatives attacked.[65] The Bedouins of the Euphrates even prefer killing the chief man among the murderer's relations within the second degree to taking his own life, on the principle, "You have killed my cousin, I will kill yours."[66] And the Californian Nishinam "consider that the keenest and most bitter revenge which a man can take is, not to slay the murderer himself, but his dearest friend."[67] In these instances vengeance is exacted with reference rather to the loss suffered by the survivors than to the injury committed against the murdered man, the culprit being subjected to a deprivation similar to that which he has inflicted himself. So, also, among the Marea, if a commoner is slain by a nobleman, his death is not avenged directly on the slayer, but on some commoner who is subservient to him.[68] If, again, among the Quianganes of Luzon, a noble is killed by a plebeian, another nobleman, of the kin of the murderer, must be killed, while the murderer himself is ignored.[69] If, among the Igorrotes, a man slays a woman of another house, her nearest kinsman endeavours to slay a woman belonging to the household of the homicide, but to the guilty man himself he does nothing.[70] In all these cases the culprit is not lost sight of; vengeance is invariably wreaked upon somebody connected with him. But any consideration of guilt or innocence is overshadowed by the blind subordination to that powerful rule which requires strict equivalence between injury and punishment--an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth--and which, when strained to the utmost, cannot allow the life of a man to be sacrificed for that of a woman, or the life of a nobleman to be {35} sacrificed for that of a commoner, or the life of a commoner to expiate the death of a noble. This rule, as we shall see later on, is not suggested by revenge itself, but is due to the influence of other factors which intermingle with this feeling, and help, with it, to determine the action.

[Footnote 61: Romilly, _Western Pacific and New Guinea_, p. 81. _Cf._ Friedrichs, 'Mensch und Person,' in _Das Ausland_, 1891, p. 299.]

[Footnote 62: See, _e.g._, Scott Robertson, _The Káfirs of the Hindu-Kush_, p. 440.]

[Footnote 63: Dr. Post's statement (_Die Geschlechtsgenossenschaft der Urzeit_, p. 156) that the blood-revenge "characterisirt sich . . . ganz und gar als ein Privatkrieg zwischen zwei Geschlechtsgenossenschaften," however, is not quite correct in this unqualified form, as may be seen, _e.g._, from von Martius's description of the blood-revenge of the Brazilian Indians, _op. cit._ i. 127 _sqq._]

[Footnote 64: Wilkins, _Modern Hinduism_, p. 411.]

[Footnote 65: Krauss, _op. cit._ p. 39.]

[Footnote 66: Blunt, _Bedouin Tribes of the Euphrates_, ii. 206 _sq._]

[Footnote 67: Powers, _Tribes of California_, p. 320.]

[Footnote 68: Munzinger, _Ostafrikanische Studien_, p. 243.]

[Footnote 69: Blumentritt, quoted by Spencer, _Principles of Ethics_, i. 370 _sq._]

[Footnote 70: Jagor, _Travels in the Philippines_, p. 213.]

Nevertheless, the strong tendency to discrimination which characterises resentment, is not wholly lost even behind the veil of common responsibility. Mr. Howitt has come to the conclusion that, among the Australian Kurnai, if a homicide has been committed by an alien tribe, the feud "cannot be satisfied but by the death of the offender," although it is carried on, not against him alone, but against the whole group of which he is a member.[71] It is only "if they fail to secure the guilty person" that the natives of Western Victoria consider it their duty to kill one of his nearest relatives.[72] Concerning the West Australian aborigines, Sir George Grey

observes, "The first great principle with regard to punishments is, that all the relations of a culprit, in the event of his not being found, are implicated in his guilt; if, therefore, the principal cannot be caught, his brother or father will answer nearly as well, and failing these, any other male or female relative, who may fall into the hands of the avenging party."[73] Among the Papuans of the Tami Islands, revenge may be taken on some other member of the murderer's family only if it is absolutely impossible to catch the guilty person himself.[74] That the blood-revenge is in the first place directed against the malefactor, and against some relative of his only if he cannot be found out, is expressly stated with reference to various peoples in different parts of the world;[75] and it is {36} probable that much more to the same effect might have been discovered, if the observers of savage life had paid more attention to this particular aspect of the matter. Among the Fuegians, the most serious riots take place when a manslayer, whom some one wishes to punish, takes refuge with his relations or friends.[76] Von Martius remarks of the Brazilian Indians in general that, even when an intertribal war ensues from the committing of homicide, the nearest relations of the killed person endeavour, if possible, to destroy the culprit himself and his family.[77] With reference to the Creek Indians, Mr. Hawkins says that though, if a murderer flies and cannot be caught, they will take revenge upon some innocent individual belonging to his family, they are "generally earnest of themselves, in their endeavours to put the guilty to death."[78] The same is decidedly the case in those parts of Morocco where the blood-feud still prevails.

[Footnote 71: Fison and Howitt, _Kamilaroi and Kurnai_, p. 221.]

[Footnote 72: Dawson, _Australian Aborigines_, p. 71.]

[Footnote 73: Grey, _Journals of Expeditions_, ii. 239.]

[Footnote 74: Bamler, quoted by Kohler, in _Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss._ xiv. 380.]

[Footnote 75: Riedel, _De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua_, p. 434 (natives of Wetter). Chalmers, _Pioneering in New Guinea_, p. 179. Kohler, in _Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss._ xiv. 446 (some Marshall Islanders). Merker, quoted by Kohler, _ibid._ xv. 53 _sq._ (Wadshagga). Brett, _Indian Tribes of Guiana_, p. 357. Bernau, _Missionary Labours in British Guiana_, p. 57. Dall, _Alaska_, p. 416. Boas, 'The Central Eskimo,' in _Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn._ vi. 582. Jacob, _Leben der vorislâmischen Beduinen_, p. 144. Kovalewsky, _Coutume contemporaine_, p. 248 (Ossetes). Popovi['c], _Recht und Gericht in Montenegro_, p. 69; Lago, _op. cit._ ii. 90 (Montenegrines). Miklosich, _loc. cit._ p. 131 (Slavs). Wilda, _Strafrecht der Germanen_, p. 173 _sq._ (ancient Teutons).]

[Footnote 76: Hyades and Deniker, _Mission scientifique du Cap Horn_, vii. 375.]

[Footnote 77: von Martius, _op. cit._ i. 128.]

[Footnote 78: Hawkins, in _Trans. American Ethn. Soc._ iii. 67.]

Not only has Dr. Steinmetz failed to prove his hypothesis that revenge was originally "undirected," but this hypothesis is quite opposed to all the most probable ideas we can form with regard to the revenge of early man. For my own part I am convinced that we may obtain a good deal of knowledge about the primitive condition of the human race, but not by studying modern savages only. I have dealt with this question at some length in another place,[79] and wish now merely to point out that those general physical and psychical qualities which are not only common to all races of mankind, but which are shared by them with the animals most allied to man, may be assumed to have been present also in the earlier stages of {37} human development. Now, concerning revenge among animals, more especially among monkeys, many anecdotes have been told by trustworthy authorities, and in every case the revenge has been clearly directed against the offender.

[Footnote 79: _History of Human Marriage_, p. 3 _sqq._]

On the authority of a zoologist "whose scrupulous accuracy was known to many persons," Darwin relates the following story:--"At the Cape of Good Hope an officer had often plagued a certain baboon, and the animal, seeing him approaching one Sunday for parade, poured water into a hole and hastily made some thick mud, which he skilfully dashed over the officer as he passed by, to the amusement of many bystanders. For long afterwards the baboon rejoiced and triumphed whenever he saw his victim."[80] Prof. Romanes considers this to be a good instance of "what may be called brooding resentment deliberately preparing a satisfactory revenge."[81] This, I think, is to put into the statement somewhat more than it really contains; but at all events it records a case of revenge, in the sense in which Dr. Steinmetz uses the word. The same may be said of other instances mentioned by so accurate observers as Brehm and Rengger in their descriptions of African and American monkeys, and of various examples of resentment in

elephants and even in camels.[82] According to Palgrave, the camel possesses the passion of revenge, and in carrying it out "shows an unexpected degree of far-thoughted malice, united meanwhile with all the cold stupidity of his usual character." The following instance, which occurred in a small Arabian town, deserves to be quoted, since it seems to have escaped the notice of the students of animal psychology. "A lad of about fourteen had conducted a large camel, laden with wood, from that very village to another at half an hour's distance or so. As the {38} animal loitered or turned out of the way, its conductor struck it repeatedly, and harder than it seems to have thought he had a right to do. But not finding the occasion favourable for taking immediate quits, it 'bode its time'; nor was that time long in coming. A few days later the same lad had to re-conduct the beast, but unladen, to his own village. When they were about half way on the road, and at some distance from any habitation, the camel suddenly stopped, looked deliberately round in every direction, to assure itself that no one was within sight, and, finding the road far and near clear of passers-by, made a step forward, seized the unlucky boy's head in its monstrous mouth, and lifting him up in the air flung him down again on the earth with the upper part of his skull completely torn off, and his brains scattered on the ground."[83] We are also told that elephants, though very sensitive to insults, are never provoked, even under the most painful or distracting circumstances, to hurt those from whom they have received no harm.[84] Sometimes animals show a remarkable degree of discrimination in finding out the proper object for their resentment. It is hardly surprising to read that a baboon, which was molested in its cage with a stick, tried to seize, not the stick, but the hand of its tormentor.[85] More interesting is the "revenge" which an elephant at Versailles inflicted upon a certain artist who had employed his servant to tease the animal by making a feint of throwing apples into its mouth:--"This conduct enraged the elephant; and, as if it knew that the painter was the cause of this teasing impertinence, instead of attacking the servant, it eyed the master, and squirted at him from its trunk such a quantity of water as spoiled the paper on which he was drawing."[86]

[Footnote 80: Darwin, _Descent of Man_, p. 69.]

[Footnote 81: Romanes, _Animal Intelligence_, p. 478.]

[Footnote 82: Brehm, _Thierleben_, i. 156. _Idem_, _From North Pole to Equator_, p. 305. Rengger (_Naturgeschichte der Säugethiere von Paraguay_, p. 52) gives the following information about the Cay:--"Fürchtet er . . . seinen Gegner, so nimmt er seine Zuflucht zur Verstellung, und sucht sich erst dann an ihm zu rächen, wenn er ihn unvermuthet überfallen kann. So hatte ich einen Cay, welcher mehrere Personen die ihn oft auf eine grobe Art geneckt hatten, in einem Augenblicke lass, wo sie im besten Vernehmen mit ihm zu sein glaubten. Nach verübter That kletterte er schnell auf einen hohen Balken, wo man ihm nicht beikommen konnte, und grinste schadenfroh den Gegenstand seiner Rache an." See, moreover, Watson, _The Reasoning Power in Animals_, especially pp. 20, 21, 24, 156 _sq._; Romanes, _op. cit._ p. 387 _sqq._; but also Morgan, _Animal Life and Intelligence_, p. 401 _sq._]

[Footnote 83: Palgrave, _Narrative of a Year's Journey through Central and Eastern Arabia_, i. 40.]

[Footnote 84: Watson, _op. cit._ p. 26 _sq._]

[Footnote 85: Aas, _Sjaeleliv og intelligens hos Dyr_, i. 72.]

[Footnote 86: Smellie, _Philosophy of Natural History_, i. 448.]

I find it inconceivable that anybody, in the face of such facts, could still believe that the revenge of early man was at first essentially indiscriminating, and became gradually discriminating from considerations of social expediency. But by this I certainly do not mean to deny that violation of the "self-feeling" is an extremely common and powerful incentive to resentment. It is so {39} among savage[87] and civilised men alike; even dogs and monkeys get angry when laughed at. Nothing more easily rouses in us anger and a desire for retaliation, nothing is more difficult to forgive, than an act which indicates contempt, or disregard of our feelings. Long after the bodily pain of a blow has ceased, the mental suffering caused by the insult remains and calls for vengeance. This is an old truth often told. According to Seneca, "the greater part of the things which enrage us are insults, not injuries."[88] Plutarch observes that, though different persons fall into anger for different reasons, yet in nearly all of them is to be found the idea of their being despised or neglected.[89] "Contempt," says Bacon, "is that which putteth an edge upon anger, as much, or more, than the hurt itself."[90] But, indeed, there is no need to resort to different principles in order to explain the resentment excited by different kinds of pain. In all cases revenge implies, primordially and essentially, a desire to cause pain or destruction in return for hurt suffered, whether the hurt be bodily or mental; and, if to this impulse is added a desire to enhance the wounded "self-feeling," that does not interfere with the true nature of the primary feeling of revenge. There are genuine specimens of resentment without the co-operation of self-regarding pride;[91] and, on the other hand, the reaction of the wounded "self-feeling" is not necessarily, in the

first place, concerned with the infliction of pain. If a person has written a bad book which is severely criticised, he may desire to repair his reputation by writing a better book, not by humiliating his critics; and if he attempts the latter rather than the former, he does so, not merely in order to enhance his "self-feeling," {40} but because he is driven on by revenge. Dr. Boas tells us that the British Columbia Indian, when his feelings are hurt, sits down or lies down sullenly for days without partaking of food, and that, "when he rises his first thought is, not how to take revenge, but to show that he is superior to his adversary.[92]

[Footnote 87: Turner, 'Ethnology of the Ungava District,' in _Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn._ xi. 270 (Hudson Bay Indians). Georgi, _Russia_, iii. 205 (Aleuts). Sarasin, _Ergebnisse naturwiss. Forschungen auf Ceylon_, iii. 537 (Veddahs). von Wrede, _Reise in [H.]adhramaut_, p. 157 (Bedouins). Winterbottom, _Native Africans in the Neighbourhood of Sierra Leone_, i. 211.]

[Footnote 88: Seneca, _De ira_, iii. 28.]

[Footnote 89: Plutarch, _De cohibenda ira_, 12.]

[Footnote 90: Bacon, 'Essay LVII. Of Anger,' in _Essays_, p. 514.]

[Footnote 91: Bain, _Emotions and the Will_, p. 177.]

[Footnote 92: Boas, _First General Report on the Indians of British Columbia_, read at the Newcastle-upon-Tyne meeting of the British Association, 1889, p. 19.]

In the feeling of gratification which results from successful resentment, the pleasure of power or superiority also may form a very important element, but it is never the exclusive element.[93] As the satisfaction of every desire is accompanied by pleasure, so the satisfaction of the desire involved in resentment gives a pleasure by itself. The angry or revengeful man who succeeds in what he aims at, delights in the pain he inflicts for the very reason that he desired to inflict it.

[Footnote 93: _Cf._ Ribot, _op. cit._ p. 221 _sq._]

Revenge thus only forms a link in a chain of emotional phenomena, for which "non-moral resentment" may be used as a common name. In this long chain there is no missing link. Anger without any definite desire to cause suffering, anger with such a desire, more deliberate resentment--all these phenomena are so inseparably connected with each other that no one can say where one passes into another. Their common characteristic is that they are mental states marked by an aggressive attitude towards the cause of pain.

As to their origin, the evolutionist can hardly entertain a doubt. Resentment, like protective reflex action, out of which it has gradually developed, is a means of protection for the animal. Its intrinsic object is to remove a cause of pain, or, what is the same, a cause of danger. Two different attitudes may be taken by an animal towards another which has made it feel pain: it may either shun or attack its enemy. In the former case its action is prompted by fear, in the latter by anger, and it depends on the circumstances which of these emotions is the actual {41} determinant. Both of them are of supreme importance for the preservation of the species, and may consequently be regarded as elements in the animal's mental constitution which have been acquired by means of natural selection in the struggle for existence. We have already noted that, originally, the impulse of attacking the enemy could hardly have been guided by a representation of the enemy as suffering. But, as a successful attack is necessarily accompanied by such suffering, the desire to produce it naturally, with the increase of intelligence, entered as an important element in resentment. The need for protection thus lies at the foundation of resentment in all its forms.

This view is not new. More than one hundred and fifty years before Darwin, Shaftesbury wrote of resentment in these words:--"Notwithstanding its immediate aim be indeed the ill or punishment of another, yet it is plainly of the sort of those [affections] which tend to the advantage and interest of the self-system, the animal himself; and is withal in other respects contributing to the good and interest of the species."[94] A similar opinion is expressed by Butler, according to whom the reason and end for which man was made liable to anger is, that he might be better qualified to prevent and resist violence and opposition, while deliberate resentment "is to be considered as a weapon, put into our hands by nature, against injury, injustice, and cruelty."[95] Adam Smith, also, believes that resentment has "been given us by nature for defence, and for defence only," as being "the safeguard of justice and the security of innocence."[96] Exactly the same view is taken by several modern evolutionists as regards the "end" of resentment, though they, of course, do not rest contented with saying that this feeling has been given us by nature, but try to explain in what way it has developed. "Among members of the same species," says Mr. Herbert Spencer, "those individuals which have not, in any considerable degree, resented aggressions, must have ever tended to disappear, and to have

left behind those which have with some effect made counter-aggressions."[97] Mr. {42} Hiram Stanley, too, quoting Junker's statement regarding the pigmies of Africa, that "they are much feared for their revengeful spirit,"[98] observes that, "other things being equal, the most revengeful are the most successful in the struggle for self-conservation and self-furtherance."[99] This evolutionist theory of revenge has been criticised by Dr. Steinmetz, but in my opinion with no success. He remarks that the _feeling_ of revenge could not have been of any use to the animal, even though the _act_ of vengeance might have been useful.[100] But this way of reasoning, according to which the whole mental life would be excluded from the influence of natural selection, is based on a false conception of the relation between mind and body, and, ultimately, on a wrong idea of cause and effect.

[Footnote 94: Shaftesbury, 'Inquiry concerning Virtue or Merit,' ii. 2. 2, in _Characteristicks_, ii. 145.]

[Footnote 95: Butler, 'Sermon VIII.--Upon Resentment,' _op. cit._ p. 457.]

[Footnote 96: Adam Smith, _Theory of Moral Sentiments_, p. 113.]

[Footnote 97: Spencer, _Principles of Ethics_, i. 361.]

[Footnote 98: Junker, _Travels in Africa during the Years 1882-1886_, p. 85.]

[Footnote 99: Hiram Stanley, _op. cit._ p. 180. _Cf._ also Guyau, _Esquisse d'une Morale sans obligation ni sanction_, p. 162 _sq._]

[Footnote 100: Steinmetz, _Ethnol. Studien, &c._ i. 135.]

From non-moral resentment we shall pass to the emotion of moral indignation. That this is closely connected with anger is indicated by language itself: we may feel indignant on other than moral grounds, and we may feel "righteous anger." The relationship between these emotions is also conspicuous in their outward expressions, which, when the emotion is strong enough, present similar characteristics. When possessed with strong moral indignation, a person looks as if he were angry,[101] and so he really is, in the wider sense of the term. This relationship has not seldom been recognised by moralists, though it has more often been forgotten. Some two thousand years ago Polybius wrote:--"If a man has been rescued or helped in an hour of danger, and, instead of showing gratitude to his preserver, seeks to do him harm, it is clearly probable that the rest will be displeased and offended with him when they know it, sympathising with their neighbour and imagining themselves in his case. Hence arises a notion in every breast of the meaning and theory of duty, which is in fact the beginning and end of justice."[102] Hartley regarded resentment and gratitude {43} as "intimately connected with the moral sense."[103] Adam Smith made the resentment of "the impartial spectator" a corner-stone of his theory of the moral sentiments.[104] Butler found the essential difference between sudden and deliberate anger to consist in this, that the "natural proper end" of the latter is "to remedy or prevent only that harm which implies, or is supposed to imply, injury or moral wrong."[105] And to Stuart Mill, the sentiment of justice, at least, appeared to be derived from "the animal desire to repel or retaliate a hurt or damage to oneself, or to those with whom one sympathises."[106]

[Footnote 101: Notice, for instance, Michelangelo's Moses.]

[Footnote 102: Polybius, _Historiae_, vi. 6.]

[Footnote 103: Hartley, _Observations on Man_, i. 520.]

[Footnote 104: Adam Smith, _op. cit._ _passim_.]

[Footnote 105: Butler, _op. cit._ p. 458.]

[Footnote 106: Stuart Mill, _Utilitarianism_, p. 79.]

Moral indignation, or disapproval, like non-moral resentment, is a reactionary attitude of mind directed towards the cause of inflicted pain. In a subsequent chapter we shall see that both are in a similar way determined by the answer given to the question, What is the cause of the pain?--a fact which, whilst strongly confirming their affinity, throws light upon some of the chief characteristics of the moral consciousness. Nay, moral indignation resembles non-moral resentment even in this respect that, in various cases, the aggressive reaction turns against innocent persons who did not commit the injury which gave rise to it. The collective responsibility assumed in certain types of blood-revenge is an evidence of this in so far as such revenge is not merely a matter of individual practice, but has the sanction of custom. And even punishment, which, in the strict sense of the term, is a more definite expression

of public, or moral, indignation than the custom of private retaliation, is often similarly indiscriminate.

Like revenge, and for similar reasons, punishment sometimes falls on a relative of the culprit in cases when he himself cannot be caught. In Fiji, says Mr. Williams, "the virtue of vicarious suffering is recognised." It once happened that a warrior left his charged musket so {44} carelessly that it went off and killed and wounded some individuals, whereupon he fled himself. His case was judged worthy of death by the chiefs of the tribe, and the offender's aged father was in consequence seized and strangled.[107]

[Footnote 107: Williams and Calvert, _Fiji_, p. 24.]

In other cases an innocent person is killed for the offence of another, not because the offender cannot be seized, but with a view to inflicting on him a loss, according to the rule of like for like. The punishment, then, is meant for the culprit, though the chief sufferer is somebody else. According to the Laws of [Hv]ammurabi, "if a builder has built a house for a man and has not made strong his work, and the house he built has fallen, and he has caused the death of the owner, that builder shall be put to death." But "if he has caused the son of the owner of the house to die, one shall put to death the son of that builder."[108] Similarly, "if a man has struck a gentleman's daughter and caused her to drop what is in her womb, he shall pay ten shekels of silver for what was in her womb." But "if that woman has died, one shall put to death his daughter."[109] The following custom which Mr. Gason reports, as existing among the Australian Dieyerie, in case a man should unintentionally kill another in a fight, is probably based on a similar principle:--"Should the offender have an elder brother, then he must die in his place; or, should he have no elder brother, then his father must be his substitute; but in case he has no male relative to suffer for him, then he himself must die."[110]

[Footnote 108: _Laws of [Hv]ammurabi_, 229 _sq._]

[Footnote 109: _Ibid._ 209 _sq._]

[Footnote 110: Gason, 'Manners and Customs of the Dieyerie Tribe,' in Woods, _Native Tribes of South Australia_, p. 265.]

This extreme disregard of the suffering of guiltless persons is probably not so much due to downright callousness as to a strong feeling of family solidarity. The same feeling is very obvious in those numerous instances in which both the criminal himself and members of his family are implicated in the punishment.

{45} Among the Atkha Aleuts, the punishment for certain offences was sometimes carried so far as to include the wife of the offender.[111] Among the E[(w]e-speaking peoples of the Slave Coast, "a person found guilty of having procured, or endeavoured to procure, the death of another through the agency of the gods Huntin and Loko, is put to death, and his family is generally enslaved as well."[112] Among the Matabele, if a person is declared by the witch-doctor to have caused injury to somebody else by making charms, he "is immediately put to death, his wife and the whole of his family sharing his fate."[113] Among the Shilluks of the White Nile, "murder is punished with death to the criminal and the forfeiture of wives and children to the Sultan, who retains them in bondage."[114] Among the Kafirs, in cases of trespasses against the king, the sentence falls not only on the individual, but on his whole house.[115] In Madagascar, the code of native laws, up to recent time, reduced for many offences the culprit's wife and children to slavery.[116] In some parts of the Malay Archipelago, according to Crawfurd, a father and child are considered almost inseparable, hence when the one is punished the other seldom escapes.[117] In Bali, the law prescribes that for certain kinds of sorcery the offender shall be put to death. It adds, "If the matter be very clearly made out, let the punishment of death be extended to his father and his mother, to his children and to his grand-children; let none of them live; let none connected with one so guilty remain on the face of the land, and let their goods be in like manner confiscated."[118]

[Footnote 111: Petroff, 'Report on Alaska,' in _Tenth Census of the United States_, p. 158.]

[Footnote 112: Ellis, _E[(w]e-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast_, p. 225.]

[Footnote 113: Decle, _Three Years in Savage Africa_, p. 153.]

[Footnote 114: Petherick, _Travels in Central Africa_, ii. 3.]

[Footnote 115: Ratzel, _History of Mankind_, ii. 445.]

[Footnote 116: Sibree, _The Great African Island_, p. 181. Ellis, _History of Madagascar_, i. 174, 175, 193.]

[Footnote 117: Crawfurd, _op. cit._ i. 82.]

[Footnote 118: _Ibid._ iii. 138.]

The Chinese doctrine of responsibility is to a great extent based upon family solidarity; in great crimes all the male relatives of the offender are held responsible for his deed. Every male relative, of whatever degree, who may be dwelling under the roof of a man guilty of treason, is doomed to death, with the exception of young boys, who are allowed their lives, but on the condition that they are made eunuchs for service in the imperial palace.[119] In ancient Mexico, traitors and conspirators were not only themselves killed, but their children and relatives {46} were made slaves to the fourth generation.[120] According to an Athenian law, a man who committed sacrilege or betrayed his country was banished with all his children.[121] Aristotle mentions a case of sacrilege in which "the bones of the guilty dead were disentombed and cast beyond the borders of Attica; the living clan were condemned to perpetual exile, and the city was subsequently purified."[122] The Macedonian law involved in punishment the kindred of conspirators against the monarch.[123] Dionysius of Halicarnassus states that some of the Greeks "think it reasonable to put to death the sons of tyrants together with their fathers, whereas others punish them with perpetual banishment"; and he contrasts this with the Roman principle that "the sons shall be exempted from all punishment, whose fathers are offenders, whether they happen to be the sons of tyrants, of parricides, or of traitors."[124] But after the end of the Marsic, and civil wars, this rule was transgressed;[125] and later on Arcadius, though expressly ordaining that the punishment of the crime shall extend to the criminal alone,[126] took a different view of the punishment for treason. By a special extension of his imperial clemency, he allows the sons of the criminal to live, although in strict justice, being tainted with hereditary guilt, they ought to suffer the punishment of their father. But they shall be incapable of inheritance; they shall be abandoned to the extreme of poverty and perpetual indigence; they shall be excluded from all honours and from the participation of religious rites; the infamy of their father shall ever attend them, and such shall be the misery of their condition, that life shall be a punishment and death a comfort.[127] Among the Anglo-Saxons, before the time of Cnut, the child, even the infant in the cradle, was liable to be sold into slavery for the payment of penalties incurred by the father, being "held by the covetous to be equally guilty as if it had discretion."[128] Even later, the child of an outlaw, following the condition of the father, also became an outlaw; and this grievance was only partly remedied by Edward the Confessor, who relieved from the consequences of the father's outlawry such children as were born before he was {47} outlawed, but not such as were born afterwards.[129] During the Middle Ages it was the invariable rule to confiscate the entire property of an impenitent heretic, a rule which was justified on the ground that his crime is so great that something of his impurity falls upon all related to him.[130] The Pope Alexander IV. also excluded the descendants of an heretic to the second generation from all offices in the Church.[131] Owing to religious influence, illegitimate children were not only deprived of the title to inheritance, but they were treated by some law-books as almost rightless beings, on a par with robbers and thieves.[132] If a person committed suicide, his goods were confiscated, and, according to a French mediæval law, his wife was besides deprived of her own private property.[133] Even in the latter half of the eighteenth century, in France, in the case of an attempt made against the life of the king, the whole family of the criminal was banished.[134] Nay, in various European countries, up to quite recent times--in England till 1870--forfeiture of property has been the punishment prescribed for certain crimes, including suicide;[135] which means, if not actually the imposition of penalties on the survivors in a case where the culprit himself is out of reach, at least a gross disregard of their ordinary rights of property. It is hardly necessary to point out how often, in the very society in which we live, "social punishments" are inflicted upon children for their father's wrongs.

[Footnote 119: Douglas, _Society in China_, p. 71 _sq._ _Ta Tsing Leu Lee_, sec. ccliv. p. 270.]

[Footnote 120: Bancroft, _Native Races of the Pacific States_, ii. 459.]

[Footnote 121: Meursius, _Themis Attica_, ii. 2, in Gronovius, _Thesaurus Graecarum Antiquitatum_, v. 1968.]

[Footnote 122: Aristotle, _De republica Atheniensium_ 1. _Cf._ _ibid._ 20.]

[Footnote 123: Curtius Rufus, _De gestis Alexandri Magni_, vi. 11. 20.]

[Footnote 124: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, _Antiquitates Romanae_, viii. 80.]

[Footnote 125: _Ibid._ viii. 80.]

[Footnote 126: _Codex Iustinianus_, ix. 47. 22.]

[Footnote 127: _Ibid._ ix. 8. 5.]

[Footnote 128: Laws of Cnut, ii. 77. _Cf._ Lappenberg, _History of England under the Anglo-Saxon Kings_, ii. 414; Wilda, _op. cit._ p. 906.]

[Footnote 129: _Leges Edwardi Confessoris_, 19.]

[Footnote 130: Lecky, _History of Rationalism in Europe_, ii. 36, n. 1. Eicken, _Geschichte und System der mittelalterlichen Weltanschauung_, p. 572 _sq._ Paramo, _De origine et progressu Sancti Inquisitionis_ p. 587 _sq._]

[Footnote 131: Eicken, _op. cit._ p. 573.]

[Footnote 132: _Ibid._ p. 573.]

[Footnote 133: Du Boys, _Histoire du droit criminel des peuples modernes_, ii. 236.]

[Footnote 134: Hertz, _Voltaire und die französische Strafrechtspflege im achtzehnten Jahrhundert_, p. 27.]

[Footnote 135: Stephen, _History of the Criminal Law of England_, i. 487 _sq._; iii. 105.]

For the explanation of these facts we have to remember what has been said before about collective responsibility in the case of revenge. Speaking of the Chinese doctrine of family solidarity, Dr. de Groot observes that, "under the influence of this doctrine, families, not men individually, came to be regarded, from the Government's point of view, as the smallest particles, the molecules of the nation, each individual being swallowed up in the circle of his kinsfolk."[136] Such a doctrine assumes that the other members of the family-group are, in a way, accessories {48} to any crime committed by a fellow-member. "Human nature," says Lord Kames, "is not so perverse, as without veil or disguise to punish a person acknowledged to be innocent. An irregular bias of imagination, which extends the qualities of the principal to its accessories, paves the way to that unjust practice. This bias, strengthened by indignation against an atrocious criminal, leads the mind hastily to conclude, that all his connections are partakers of his guilt."[137] Among the ancients we also meet with a strong belief that, according to the course of nature, wicked fathers have wicked sons. "That which is begot," says Plutarch, "is not, like some production of art unlike the begetter, for it proceeds from him, and is not merely produced by him, so that it appropriately receives his share, whether that be honour or punishment."[138] To destroy, or to make harmless, the family of an offender may be, not only an act of retaliation, but a precaution; according to an old Greek adage, "a man is a fool if he kills the father and leaves the sons alive."[139] This especially holds good for treason, which generally suggests accomplices; and of all crimes for which penalties are imposed upon other individuals besides the culprit, treason is probably the most common. This crime is also particularly apt to evoke the hatred of those who have the power to punish, hence the punishment of it, being closely allied to an act of revenge, is often inflicted without due discrimination. Moreover, by being extended to the criminal's family, the punishment falls more heavily upon himself as well. Again, in case the crime is of a sacrilegious character, it is supposed to pollute everybody connected with the criminal, and even the whole community where he dwells.

[Footnote 136: de Groot, _Religious System of China_ (vol. ii. book) i. 539.]

[Footnote 137: Kames, _Sketches of the History of Man_, iv. 148.]

[Footnote 138: Plutarch, _De sera numinis vindicta_, 16. _Cf._ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, _op. cit._ viii. 80.]

[Footnote 139: Schmidt, _Ethik der alten Griechen_, ii. 126.]

In their administration of justice, gods are still more indiscriminate than men. They hold the individual responsible for the whole to which he belongs. They {49} punish the community for the sins of one of its members. They visit the iniquity of the fathers and forefathers upon the children and descendants.

The Sibuyaus, a tribe belonging to the Sea Dyaks, "are of opinion that an unmarried girl proving with child must be offensive to the superior powers, who, instead of always chastising the individual, punish the tribe by misfortunes happening to its members. They, therefore, on the discovery of the pregnancy fine the lovers, and sacrifice a pig to propitiate offended Heaven, and to avert that sickness or those misfortunes that might otherwise follow; and they inflict heavy mulcts for every one who may have suffered from any severe accident, or who may have been drowned within a month before the religious atonement was made."[140] According to Chinese beliefs, whole kingdoms are punished for the conduct of their rulers by spirits who act as avengers with orders or approval from the _Tao_, or Heaven.[141] Prevalent opinion in China, continuously inspired anew by literature of all times and ages, further admits that spiritual vengeance may come down upon the culprit's offspring in the form of disease or death.[142] When a maimed or deformed child is born the Japanese say that its parents or ancestors must have committed some great sin.[143] The Vedic people ask Varuna to forgive the wrongs committed by their fathers.[144] Says the poet:--"What we ourselves have sinned in mercy

pardon; my own misdeeds do thou, O god, take from me, and for another's sin let me not suffer."[145] According to the ancient Greek theory of divine retribution, the community has to suffer for the sins of some of its members, children for the sins of their fathers.[146] Hesiod says that often a whole town is punished with famine, pestilence, barrenness of its women, or loss of its army or vessels for the misdeeds of a single individual.[147] Cr[oe]sus atoned by the forfeiture of his kingdom for the crime of Gyges, his fifth ancestor, who had murdered his master and usurped his throne.[148] Cytissorus brought down the anger of gods upon his descendants by {50} rescuing Athamas, whom the Achaians intended to offer up as an expiatory sacrifice on behalf of their country.[149] When hearing of the death of his wife, Theseus exclaims, "This must be a heaven-sent calamity in consequence of the sins of an ancestor, which from some remote source I am bringing on myself."[150] According to Hebrew notions, sin affects the nation through the individual and entails guilt on succeeding generations.[151] The anger of the Lord is kindled against the children of Israel on account of Achan's sin.[152] The sin of the sons of Eli is visited on his whole house from generation to generation.[153] Because Saul has slain the Gibeonites, the Lord sends, in the days of David, a three years' famine, which ceases only when seven of Saul's sons are hanged.[154] The sins of Manasseh are expiated even by the better generation under Josiah.[155] The notion of a jealous God who visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Him,[156] is also frequently met with in the Old Testament Apocrypha. "The inheritance of sinners' children shall perish, and their posterity shall have a perpetual reproach."[157] "The seed of an unrighteous bed shall be rooted out."[158] The same idea has survived among Christian peoples. It was referred to in Canon Law as a principle to be imitated by human justice,[159] and by Innocent III. in justification of a bull which authorised the confiscation of the goods of heretics.[160] Up to quite recent times it was a common belief in Scotland that the punishment of the cruelty, oppression, or misconduct of an individual descended as a curse on his children to the third and fourth generation. It was not confined to the common people; "all ranks were influenced by it; and many believed that if the curse did not fall upon the first or second generation it would inevitably descend upon the succeeding."[161] In the dogma that the whole human race is condemned on {51} account of the sin of its first parents, the doctrine of collective responsibility has reached its pitch.

[Footnote 140: St. John, _Life in the Forests of the Far East_, i. 63.]

[Footnote 141: de Groot, _op. cit._ (vol. iv. book) ii. 432, 435. Davis, _China_, ii. 34 _sq._]

[Footnote 142: de Groot, _op. cit._ (vol. iv. book) ii. 452.]

[Footnote 143: Griffis, _Mikado's Empire_, p. 472.]

[Footnote 144: _Rig-Veda_, vii. 86. 5. _Cf._ _Atharva-Veda_, v. 30. 4; x. 3. 8.]

[Footnote 145: _Rig-Veda_, ii. 28. 9. _Cf._ _ibid._ vi. 51. 7; vii. 52. 2.]

[Footnote 146: Nägelsbach, _Nachhomerische Theologie des griechischen Volksglaubens_, p. 34 _sq._ Schmidt, _op. cit._ i. 67 _sqq._ Farnell, _Cults of the Greek States_, i. 76 _sq._]

[Footnote 147: Hesiod, _Opera et dies_, 240 _sqq._]

[Footnote 148: Herodotus, i. 91.]

[Footnote 149: _Ibid._ vii. 197.]

[Footnote 150: Euripides, _Hippolytus_, 831 _sq._]

[Footnote 151: Oehler, _Theology of the Old Testament_, i. 236. Dorner, _System of Christian Doctrine_, ii. 325. Montefiore, _Hibbert Lectures_, p. 103. Robertson Smith, _Religion of the Semites_, p. 421. Schultz, _Old Testament Theology_, ii. 308. Bernard, 'Sin,' in Hastings, _Dictionary of the Bible_, iv. 530, 534.]

[Footnote 152: _Joshua_, vii. 1.]

[Footnote 153: _1 Samuel_, ii. 27 _sqq._]

[Footnote 154: _2 Samuel_, xxi. 1 _sqq._]

[Footnote 155: _Deuteronomy_, i. 37; iii. 26; iv. 21. _2 Kings_, xxiii. 26; xxiv. 3. _Jeremiah_, xv. 4 _sqq._]

[Footnote 156: _Exodus_, xx. 5; xxiv. 7, _Numbers_, xiv. 18. _Deuteronomy_, v. 9. _Cf._ _Leviticus_, xxvi. 39.]

[Footnote 157: _Ecclesiasticus_, xli. 6. _Cf._ _ibid._ xvi. 4; xli. 5, 7 _sqq._]

[Footnote 158: _Wisdom of Solomon_, iii. 16. _Cf._ _ibid._ iii. 12, 13, 17 _sqq._]

[Footnote 159: Eicken, _op. cit._ p. 572.]

[Footnote 160: Lecky, _History of Rationalism in Europe_, ii. 37 n.]

[Footnote 161: Stewart, _Sketches of the Character, &c., of the Highlanders of Scotland_, p. 127.]

Men originally attribute to their gods mental qualities similar to their own, and imagine them to be no less fierce and vindictive than they are themselves. Thus the retribution of a god is, in many cases, nothing but an outburst of sudden anger, or an act of private revenge, and as such particularly liable to comprise, not only the offender himself, but those connected with him. Plutarch even argued that the punishments inflicted by gods on cities for ill-deeds committed by their former inhabitants allowed of a just defence, on the ground that a city is "one continuous entity, a sort of creature that never changes from age, or becomes different by time, but is ever sympathetic with and conformable to itself," and therefore "answerable for whatever it does or has done for the public weal, as long as the community by its union and federal bonds preserves its unity."[162] He further observes that a bad man is not bad only when he breaks out into crime, but has the seeds of vice in his nature, and that the deity, knowing the nature and disposition of every man, prefers stifling crime in embryo to waiting till it becomes ripe.[163]

[Footnote 162: Plutarch, _De sera numinis vindicta_, 15.]

[Footnote 163: _Ibid._ 20.]

But there are yet special reasons for extending the retribution of a god beyond the limits of individual guilt. Whilst the resentment of a man is a matter of experience, that of a god is a matter of inference. That some particular case of suffering is a divine punishment, is inferred either from its own peculiar character, suggesting the direct interference of a god, or from the assumption that a certain act, on account of its offensiveness, cannot be left unpunished. Now experience shows that, in many instances, the sinner himself escapes all punishment, leading a happy life till his death; hence the conclusion is near at hand that any grave misfortune which befalls his descendants, is the delayed retribution of the offended {52} god.[164] Such a conclusion is quite in harmony with the common notions of divine power. It especially forces itself upon a mind which has no idea of a hell with _post mortem_ punishments for the wicked. And, where the spirit of a man after his death is believed to be still ardently concerned for the welfare of his family,[165] the affliction of his descendants naturally appears as a punishment inflicted upon himself. As Dr. de Groot observes, the doctrine of the Chinese, that spiritual vengeance may descend on the offender's offspring, tallies perfectly with their conception "that the severest punishment which may be inflicted on one, both in his present life and the next, is decline or extermination of his male issue, leaving nobody to support him in his old age, nobody to protect him after his death from misery and hunger by caring for his corpse and grave, and sacrificing to his manes."[166]

[Footnote 164: _Cf._ Isocrates, _Oratio de pace_, 120; Cicero, _De natura Deorum_, iii. 38; Nägelsbach, _op. cit._ p. 33 _sq._]

[Footnote 165: _Cf._ Schmidt, _op. cit._ i. 71 _sq._ (ancient Greeks).]

[Footnote 166: de Groot, _op. cit._ (vol. iv. book) ii. 452.]

The retributive sufferings which innocent persons have to undergo in consequence of the sins of the guilty, are not always supposed to be inflicted upon them directly, as a result of divine resentment. They are often attributed to infection. Sin is looked upon in the light of a contagious matter which may be transmitted from parents to children, or be communicated by contact.

This idea is well illustrated by the funeral ceremonies of the Tahitians. "When the house for the dead had been erected, and the corpse placed upon the platform or bier, the priest ordered a hole to be dug in the earth or floor near the foot of the platform. Over this he prayed to the god by whom it was supposed the spirit of the deceased had been required. The purport of his prayer was that all the dead man's sins, and especially that for which his soul had been called to the _po_, might be deposited there, that they might not attach in any degree to the survivors, and that the anger of the god might be appeased." All who were employed in embalming the dead were also, during the process, carefully avoided by every person, {53} as the guilt of the crime for which the deceased had died was believed to contaminate such as came in contact with the corpse; and as soon as the ceremony of depositing the sins in the hole was over, all who had touched the body or the garments of the deceased, which were buried or destroyed, fled precipitately into the sea to cleanse themselves from the pollution.[167] In one part of New Zealand "a service was

performed over an individual, by which all the sins of the tribe were supposed to be transferred to him, a fern stalk was previously tied to his person, with which he jumped into the river and there unbinding, allowed it to float away to the sea, bearing their sins with it."[168] The Iroquois White Dog Feast, which was held every year in January, February, or early in March,[169] implied, according to most authorities, a ceremony of sin-transference.[170] The following description of it is given by Mrs. Jemison, a white woman who was captured by the Indians in the year 1755:--Two white dogs, without spot or blemish, are strangled and hung near the door of the council-house. On the fourth or fifth day the "committee," consisting of from ten to twenty active men who have been appointed to superintend the festivities, "collect the evil spirit, or drive it off entirely, for the present, and also concentrate within themselves all the sins of their tribe, however numerous or heinous. On the eighth or ninth day, the committee having received all the sin, as before observed, into their own bodies, they take down the dogs, and after having transfused the whole of it into one of their own number, he, by a peculiar sleight of hand, or kind of magic, works it all out of himself into the dogs. The dogs, thus loaded with all the sins of the people, are placed upon a pile of wood that is directly set on fire. Here they are burnt, together with the sins with which they were loaded."[171] Among the Badágas of India, at a burial, "an elder, standing by the corpse, offers up a prayer that the dead may not go to hell, that the sins committed on earth may be forgiven, and that the sins may be borne by a calf, which is let loose in the jungle and used thenceforth for no manner of work."[172] At Utch-Kurgan, in Turkestan, Mr. Schuyler saw an old man, constantly {54} engaged in prayer, who was said to be an _iskatchi_, that is, "a person who gets his living by taking on himself the sins of the dead, and thenceforth devoting his life to prayer for their souls."[173]

[Footnote 167: Ellis, _Polynesian Researches_, i. 401 _sqq._]

[Footnote 168: Taylor, _Te Ika a Maui_, p. 101.]

[Footnote 169: Beauchamp, 'Iroquois White Dog Feast,' in _American Antiquarian_, vii. 236 _sq._ Hale, 'Iroquois Sacrifice of the White Dog,' _ibid._ vii. 7.]

[Footnote 170: Beauchamp, _loc. cit._ p. 237 _sq._]

[Footnote 171: Seaver, _Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison_, p. 158 _sqq._ _Cf._ Mr. Clark's description, quoted by Beauchamp, _loc. cit._ p. 238.]

[Footnote 172: Thurston, 'Badágas of the Nilgiris,' in the Madras Government Museum's _Bulletin_, ii. 4. _Cf._ Metz, _Tribes inhabiting the Neilgherry Hills_, p. 78; Graul, _Reise nach Ostindien_, iii. 296 _sqq._]

[Footnote 173: Schuyler, _Turkistan_, ii. 28.]

In ancient Peru, an Inca, after confession of guilt, bathed in a neighbouring river, and repeated this formula:--"O thou River, receive the sins I have this day confessed unto the Sun, carry them down to the sea, and let them never more appear."[174] According to Vedic beliefs, sin is a contamination which may be inherited, or contracted in various ways,[175] and of which the sinner tries to rid himself by transferring it to some enemy,[176] or by invoking the gods of water or fire.[177] It is washed out by Varuna, in his capacity of a water-god,[178] and by Trita, another water-god,[179] and even by "the Waters" in general, as appears from the prayer addressed to them:--"O Waters, carry off whatever sin is in me and untruth."[180] For a similar reason, as it seems, water became in the later, Brahmanic age, the "essence (sap) of immortality"[181] and the belief in its purifying power still survives in modern India. No sin is too heinous to be removed, no character too black to be washed clean, by the waters of Ganges.[182] At sacred places of pilgrimage on the banks of rivers, the Hindus perform special religious shavings for the purpose of purifying soul and body from pollution; and persons who have committed great crimes or are troubled by uneasy consciences, travel hundreds of miles to such holy places where "they may be released from every sin by first being relieved of every hair and then plunging into the sacred stream."[183] So, also, according to Hindu beliefs, contact with cows purifies, and, as in the Parsi ritual, the dung and urine of cows have the power of preventing or cleansing away not only material, but moral defilements.[184] In post-Homeric Greece, individuals and a whole people were cleansed from their sins by water or some other material means of purification.[185] Plutarch, after observing {55} that "there are other properties that have connection and communication, and that transfer themselves from one thing to another with incredible quickness and over immense distances," asks whether it is "more wonderful that Athens should have been smitten with a plague which started in Arabia, than that, when the Delphians and Sybarites became wicked, vengeance should have fallen on their descendants."[186] The Hebrews annually laid the sins of the people upon the head of a goat, and sent it away into the wilderness;[187] and they cleansed every impurity with consecrated water or the sprinkling of blood.[188] To this day, the Jews in Morocco, on their New-Year's day, go to the sea-shore, or to some spring, and remove their sins by throwing stones into the water. The words of the Psalmist, "wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin,"[189] were

not altogether a figure of speech; nor is Christian baptism originally a mere symbol. Its result is forgiveness of sins;[190] by the water, as a medium of the Holy Ghost, "the stains of sin are washed away."[191] That sin is contagious has been expressly stated by Christian writers. Novatian says that "the one is defiled by the sin of the other, and the idolatry of the transgressor passes over to him who does not transgress."[192]

[Footnote 174: Tylor, _Primitive Culture_, ii. 435.]

[Footnote 175: _Atharva-Veda_, v. 30. 4; x. 3. 8; vii. 64. i. _sq._ _Cf._ Oldenberg, _Religion des Veda_, p. 290.]

[Footnote 176: _Rig-Veda_, x. 36. 9; x. 37. 12.]

[Footnote 177: _Ibid._ x. 164. 3. _Atharva-Veda_, vii. 64. 2. _Cf._ Kaegi, _Rig-Veda_, p. 157; Oldenberg, _op. cit._ pp. 291-298, 319 _sqq._]

[Footnote 178: _Cf._ Hopkins, _Religions of India_ pp. 65 n. 1, 66.]

[Footnote 179: _Atharva-Veda_, vi. 113. 1 _sqq._]

[Footnote 180: _Rig-Veda_, i. 23. 22. Sin is also looked upon as a galling chain from the captivity of which release is besought (_ibid._ i. 24. 9, 13 _sq._; ii. 27. 16; ii. 28. 5; v. 85. 8; vi. 74. 3; &c.).]

[Footnote 181: Hopkins, _op. cit._ p. 196.]

[Footnote 182: Monier Williams, _Br[=a]hmanism and Hind[=u]uism_, p. 347.]

[Footnote 183: _Ibid._ p. 375.]

[Footnote 184: Barth, _Religions of India_, p. 264. _Laws of Manu_, iii. 206; v. 105, 121, 124; xi. 110, 203, 213.]

[Footnote 185: Stengel, _Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer_, p. 138 _sqq._]

[Footnote 186: Plutarch, _De sera numinis vindicta_, 14.]

[Footnote 187: _Leviticus_, xvi.]

[Footnote 188: _Numbers_, viii. 7; xix. 4-9, 13 _sqq._; xxxi. 23. _Leviticus_, xvi. 14 _sqq._]

[Footnote 189: _Psalms_, li. 2.]

[Footnote 190: Harnack, _op. cit._ ii. 140 _sqq._]

[Footnote 191: _Catechism of the Council of Trent_, ii. 2. 10, p. 162.]

[Footnote 192: Quoted by Harnack, _op. cit._ ii. 119.]

In this materialistic conception of sin there is an obvious confusion between cause and effect, between the sin and its punishment. Sin is looked upon as a substance charged with injurious energy, which will sooner or later discharge itself to the discomfort or destruction of anybody who is infected with it. The sick Chinese says of his disease, "it is my sin," instead of saying, "it is the punishment of my sin."[193] Both in Hebrew and in the Vedic language the word for sin is used in a similar way.[194] "In the consciousness of the pious Israelite," Professor Schultz observes, "sin, guilt, and punishment, are ideas so directly connected that the words for them are interchangeable."[195] {56} The prophets frequently and emphatically declare that there is in sin itself a power which must destroy the sinner.[196] So, too, as M. Bergaigne points out, there is in the Vedic notion of sin, "la croyance à une sorte de vertu propre du péché, grâce à laquelle il produit de lui-même son effet nécessaire, à savoir le châtiment du pécheur."[197] Sins are thus treated like diseases, or the germs of diseases, of which patients likewise try to rid themselves by washing or burning, or which are described in the very language often applied to sins as fetters which hold them chained.[198] All kinds of evil are in this way materialised. The Shamanistic peoples of Siberia, says Georgi, "hold evil to be a self-existing substance which they call by an infinitude of particular names."[199] According to Moorish ideas, _l-bas_, or "misfortune," is a kind of infection, which may be contracted by contact and removed by water or fire; hence in all parts of Morocco water- and fire-ceremonies are performed annually, either on the _(]âshur_-eve or at midsummer, _l-[(]an[s.]ara_, for the purpose of purifying men, animals, and fruit-trees.[200] And just as the Moors, on these {57} occasions, rid themselves of _l-bas_, so, in modern Greece, the women make

a fire on Midsummer Eve, and jump over it, crying, "I leave my sins."[201]

[Footnote 193: Edkins, _Religion in China_, p. 134.]

[Footnote 194: Holzman, 'Sünde und Sühne in den Rigvedahymnen und den Psalmen,' in _Zeitschr. f. Völkerpsychologie_, xv. 9.]

[Footnote 195: Schultz, _op. cit._ ii. 306. _Cf._ Curtiss, _Primitive Semitic Religion To-day_, p. 124 _sqq._]

[Footnote 196: _Ibid._ ii. 308 _sq._]

[Footnote 197: Bergaigne, _Religion védique_, iii. 163. _Cf._ _Rig-Veda_, x. 132. 5.]

[Footnote 198: Oldenberg, _op. cit._ p. 288.]

[Footnote 199: Georgi, _Russia_, iii. 257.]

[Footnote 200: The various methods of transferring or expelling evil, which abundantly illustrate the materialistic notions held about it, have been treated by Dr. Frazer with unrivalled learning (_The Golden Bough_), iii. 1 _sqq._ I have little doubt that the fire- and water-ceremonies, once practised all over Europe on a certain day every year, belong to the same group of rites. "The best general explanation of these European fire-festivals," says Dr. Frazer (_ibid._ iii. 300), "seems to be the one given by Mannhardt, namely, that they are sun-charms or magical ceremonies intended to ensure a proper supply of sunshine for men, animals, and plants." But it should be noticed that in Europe, as in Morocco, a purificatory purpose is expressly ascribed to them by the very persons by whom they are practised (see Frazer, _op. cit._ iii. 238 _sqq._), that they alternate with lustration by water (see Grimm, _Teutonic Mythology_, ii. 588 _sqq._). On the other hand, in Dr. Frazer's exhaustive description of these ceremonies I fail to discover a single fact which would make Mannhardt's hypothesis at all probable. Dr. Frazer says (_op. cit._ iii. 301), "The custom of rolling a burning wheel down a hillside, which is often observed at these times, seems a very natural imitation of the sun's course in the sky." To me it appears as a method of distributing the purificatory energy over the fields or vineyards. Notice, for instance, the following statements:--In the Rhon Mountains, Bavaria, "a wheel wrapt in combustibles, was kindled and rolled down the hill; and the young people rushed about the fields with their burning torches and brooms. . . . In neighbouring villages of Hesse . . . it is thought that wherever the burning wheels roll, the fields will be safe from hail and storm" (_ibid._ iii. 243 _sq._). At Volkmarsen, in Hesse, "in some places tar-barrels or wheels wrapt in straw used to be set on fire, and then sent rolling down the hillside. In others the boys light torches and whisps of straw at the bonfires and rush about brandishing them in their hands" (_ibid._ iii. 254). In Münsterland, "boys with blazing bundles of straw run over the fields to make them fruitful" (_ibid._ iii. 255). Dr. Frazer says (_ibid._ iii. 301), "The custom of throwing blazing discs, shaped liked suns, into the air is probably also a piece of imitative magic." But why should it not, in conformity with other practices, be regarded as a means of purifying the air? According to old writers, the object of Midsummer fires was to disperse the aerial dragons (_ibid._ iii. 267). It would carry me too far from my subject to enter into further details. I have dealt with the matter in my article 'Midsummer Customs in Morocco.' in _Folk-Lore_, xvi. 27-47.]

[Footnote 201: Grimm, _Teutonic Mythology_, ii. 623.]

Closely connected with the primitive conception of sin, is that of a curse. In fact, the injurious energy attributed to a sinful act, is in many cases obviously due to the curse of a god. The curse is looked upon as a baneful substance, as a miasma which injures or destroys anybody to whom it cleaves. The curse of Moses was said to lie on mount Ebal, ready to descend with punishments whenever there was an occasion for it.[202] The Arabs, when being cursed, sometimes lay themselves down on the ground so that the curse, instead of hitting them, may fly over their bodies.[203] According to Teutonic notions, curses alight, settle, cling, they take flight, and turn home as birds to their nests.[204] It is the vulgar opinion in Ireland "that a curse once uttered must alight on something: it will float in the air seven years, and may descend any moment on the party it was aimed at; if his guardian angel but forsake him, it takes forthwith the shape of some misfortune, sickness or temptation, and strikes his devoted head."[205] We shall later on see that curses are communicated through material media. In some parts of Morocco, if a man is not powerful enough to avenge an infringement on his marriage-bed, he leaves seven tufts of hair on his head and goes to another tribe to ask for help. This is _l-[(]âr_, a conditional curse, which is first seated in the tufts, and {58} from there transferred to those whom he invokes. Similarly, a person under the vow of blood-revenge lets his hair grow until he has fulfilled his vow. The oath clings to his hair, and will fall upon his head if he violates it.[206]

[Footnote 202: _Deuteronomy_, xi. 29.]

[Footnote 203: Goldziher, _Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie_, i. 29. Wellhausen, _Reste arabischen Heidentums_, p. 139, n. 4.]

[Footnote 204: Grimm, _op. cit._ iv. 1690.]

[Footnote 205: _Ibid._ iii. 1227. Wood-Martin, _Traces of the Elder Faiths of Ireland_ ii, 57 _sq._]

[Footnote 206: The same practice prevailed among the ancient Arabs (Wellhausen, _op. cit._ p. 122), and some other cases are recorded by Dr. Frazer (_op. cit._ i. 370 _sq._). I cannot accept Wellhausen's explanation (_op. cit._ p. 124) that the hair is allowed to grow for the purpose of being sacrificed when the vow is fulfilled.]

Generally, a curse follows the course which is indicated by the curser. But it does not do so in every case, and it has a tendency to spread. In ancient India[207] and among the Arabs[208] and Hebrews,[209] there was a belief that a curse, especially if it was undeserved, might fall back on the head of him who uttered it. The same belief prevailed, or still prevails, among the Irish;[210] so, also, according to an English proverb, "curses, like chickens, come home to roost." According to Plato, the curse of a father or mother taints everything with which it comes in contact. Any one who is found guilty of assaulting a parent, shall be for ever banished from the city into the country, and shall abstain from the temples; and "if any freeman eat or drink, or have any other sort of intercourse with him, or only meeting him have voluntarily touched him, he shall not enter into any temple, nor into the agora, nor into the city, until he is purified; for he should consider that he has become tainted by a curse."[211] Plutarch asks whether Jupiter's priest was forbidden to swear for the reason that "the peril of perjury would reach in common to the whole commonwealth, if a wicked, godless, and forsworn person should have the charge and superintendence of the prayers, vows, and sacrifices made on behalf of the city."[212] The Romans believed that certain horrid imprecations had such power, that not only the object of them never escaped their influence, but that the person who used them also was sure {59} to be unhappy.[213] Among the Arinzes, an oath is reckoned a terrible thing:--"They do not suffer a person, who has been under the necessity of expurgating himself in so dreadful a manner, to remain among them: he is sent into exile."[214] According to Bedouin notions, a solemn oath should only be taken at a certain distance from the camp, "because the magical nature of the oath might prove pernicious to the general body of Arabs, were it to take place in their vicinity."[215] "To take an oath of any sort," says Burckhardt, "is always a matter of great concern among the Bedouins. It seems as if they attached to an oath consequences of a supernatural kind. . . . A Bedouin, even in defence of his own right, will seldom be persuaded to take a solemn oath before a kadhy, or before the tomb of a sheikh or saint, as they are sometimes required to do; and would rather forfeit a small sum than expose himself to the dreaded consequences of an oath."[216] Exactly the same holds good for the Moors. The conditional self-curse is supposed in some degree to pollute the swearer even though the condition referred to in the oath be only imaginary, in other words, though he do not perjure himself. This, I think, is the reason why, among the Berbers in the South of Morocco, persons who have been wrongly accused of a crime, sometimes entirely undress themselves in the sanctuary where they are going to swear. They believe that, if they do so, the saint will punish the accuser; and I conclude that at the bottom of this belief there is a vague idea that the absence of all clothes will prevent the oath from clinging to themselves. They say that it is bad not only to swear, but even to be present when an oath is taken by somebody else. And at Demnat, in the Great Atlas, I was told that when a person has made oath at a shrine, he avoids going back to his house the same way as he came, since otherwise, at least if he {60} has sworn false, his family as well as himself would have to suffer.

[Footnote 207: _Atharva-Veda_, ii. 7. 5.]

[Footnote 208: Goldziher, _Abhandlungen_, i. 38 _sq._]

[Footnote 209: _Ecclesiasticus_, xxi. 27.]

[Footnote 210: Wood-Martin, _op. cit._ ii. 57 _sq._]

[Footnote 211: Plato, _Leges_, ix. 881.]

[Footnote 212: Plutarch, _Questiones Romanae_, 44.]

[Footnote 213: _Idem_, _Vita Cassi_, 16.]

[Footnote 214: Georgi, _op. cit._ iii. 54 _sq._]

[Footnote 215: Burckhardt, _Bedouins and Wahábys_, p. 73.]

[Footnote 216: _Ibid._ p. 165.]

If a curse is infectious, it is naturally liable to contaminate those who derive their origin from the infected individual. The house of Glaucus was utterly extirpated from Sparta, in accordance with the words of the oracle, "There is a nameless son of the Oath-god who has neither hands nor feet; he pursues swiftly, until, having seized, he destroys the whole race, and all the house."[217] So, too, the Erinyes visited the sins of the fathers even on the children and grandchildren;[218] and the Erinyes were originally only personifications of curses.[219] It is said in the Ecclesiasticus:--"A man that useth much swearing shall be filled with iniquity, and the plague shall never depart from his house. . . . If he swear in vain, he shall not be innocent, but his house shall be full of calamities."[220] Casalis remarks of the Basutos, that "the dreadful consequences that the curse of Noah has had for Ham and his descendants appear quite natural to these people."[221] The Dharkâr and Majhwâr in Mirzapur, believe that a person who forswears himself will lose his property and his children;[222] but as we do not know the contents of the oath, it is possible that the destruction of the latter is not ascribed to mere contagion, but is expressly imprecated on them by the swearer.[223] Among the Rejangs of Sumatra, {61} "any accident that happens to a man, who has been known to take a false oath, or to his children or grandchildren, is carefully recorded in memory, and attributed to this sole cause."[224] Among the Karens the following story is told:--"Anciently there was a man who had ten children, and he cursed one of his brethren, who had done him no injury; but the curse did the man no harm, and he did not die. Then the curse returned to the man who sent it, and all his ten children died."[225] The Moors are fond of cursing each other's father or mother, or grandfather, or grandfather's father, such a curse being understood to involve their descendants as well. The Rev. R. Taylor says of the Maoris, "To bid you go and cook your father would be a great curse, but to tell a person to go and cook his great-grandfather would be far worse, because it included every individual who has sprung from him."[226]

[Footnote 217: Herodotus, vi. 86. _Cf._ Hesiod, _Opera et dies_, 282 _sqq._]

[Footnote 218: Aeschylus, _Eumenides_, 934 _sqq._]

[Footnote 219: Aeschylus (_Eumenides_, 416 _sq._) expressly designates the Erinyes by the title of "curses" ([Greek: a)rai\]), and Pausanias derives the name Erinys from an Arcadian word signifying a fit of anger. _Cf._ von Lasaulx, 'Der fluch bei Griechen und Römern,' in _Verzeichnis der Vorlesungen an der Julius-Maximilians-Universitaet zu Würzburg im Sommer-Semester_ 1843, p. 8; Müller, _Dissertations on the Eumenides of Aeschylus_, p. 155 _sqq._; Rohde, 'Paralipomena,' in _Rheinisches Museum für Philologie_, 1895, p. 16 _sq._]

[Footnote 220: _Ecclesiasticus_, xxiii. 11. _Cf._ _ibid._ xli. 5 _sqq._; _Wisdom of Solomon_, iii. 12 _sq._, xii. 11.]

[Footnote 221: Casalis, _Basutos_, p. 305.]

[Footnote 222: Crooke, _Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh_, ii. 287; iii. 444. _Cf._ _ibid._ i. 132.]

[Footnote 223: Among these tribes it is usual to swear by "putting a bamboo on the head," or "touching a broad-sword, touching the feet of a Brâhman, holding a cow's tail, touching Ganges water." But among many of the other tribes described by Mr. Crooke, persons swear on the heads of their children (_ibid._ i. 11, 130, 172; ii. 96, 138, 339, 357; iii. 40, 113, 251, 262; iv. 35), or with a son or grandson in the arms (_ibid._ ii. 428), and in such cases the death of the child would naturally be expected to follow perjury as a direct result of it. Among the Kol, the usual form of an oath is, "May my children die if I lie" (_ibid._ iii. 313).]

[Footnote 224: Marsden, _History of Sumatra_, p. 240.]

[Footnote 225: Mason, in _Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal_, xxxvii. pt. ii. 137.]

[Footnote 226: Taylor, _Te Ika a Maui_, p. 208.]

Thus, from the conception that sins and curses are contagious it follows that an innocent person may have to suffer for the sin of another. His suffering does not necessarily relieve the sinner from punishment; sin, like an infectious disease, may spread without vacating the seat of infection. But, as we have seen, it may also be transferred, and sin-transference involves vicarious suffering. At the same time, this kind of vicarious suffering must not be confounded with vicarious expiatory sacrifice. As a general rule, the scapegoat is driven or cast away, not killed. The exceptions to this rule seem to be due to two different causes. On the one hand, the scapegoat may be chased to death, or perhaps be pushed over a precipice,[227] for the sake of ridding the community as {62} effectively as possible of the evils loaded on the victim. Thus the Bhotiyás of Juhár take a dog, make him drunk, "and having fed him with sweetmeats, lead him round the village and let him loose. They then chase and kill him with sticks and stones, and believe

that by so doing no disease or misfortune will visit the village during the year."[228] On the other hand, the transference of evil may be combined with a sacrifice. But of such a combination only a few instances are recorded, and most of them are ambiguous. Considering further that in these cases, or at least in the best known of them, the act of transference takes place _after_ the victim has been killed, it seems to me extremely probable that we have here to do with a fusion of two distinct rites into one, and that the victim is not offered up as a sacrifice in its capacity of a scapegoat, but, once sacrificed, has been made use of as a conductor for all the evils with which the people are beset.

[Footnote 227: According to the Mishna, the Hebrew scapegoat was not allowed to go free in the wilderness, but was killed by being pushed over a precipice (Robertson Smith, _Religion of the Semites_, p. 418). See also the ambiguous passage in Servius, _In Virgilii Aeneidos_, iii. 57.]

[Footnote 228: Atkinson, 'Notes on the History of Religion in the Himálaya of the N.W. Provinces,' in _Jour. Asiatic Soc. Bengal_, liii. pt. i. 62.]

In his list of scapegoats, Dr. Frazer refers to a case of human sacrifice witnessed by the Rev. J. C. Taylor at Onitsha, on the Niger.[229] A young woman was drawn, with her face to the earth, from the king's house to the river. As the people drew her along, they cried, "Wickedness! Wickedness!" so as to notify to the passers-by to screen themselves from witnessing the dismal scene. The sacrifice was to take away the iniquities of the land. The body was dragged along in a merciless manner "as if the weight of all their wickedness were thus carried away"; and it was finally drowned in the river. Our informant also heard that there was a man killed, as a sacrifice for the sins of the king. "Thus two human beings were offered as sacrifices, to propitiate their heathen deities, thinking that they would thus atone for the individual sins of those who had broken God's laws during the past year. . . . Those who had fallen into gross sins during the past year--such as incendiarisms, thefts, fornications, adulteries, witchcrafts, incests, slanders, &c.--were expected to pay in twenty-eight _ngugus_, or _£_2 0_s._ 7½_d._, as a fine; and this money was taken into the interior, to purchase two sickly persons, to be {63} offered as a sacrifice for all these abominable crimes--one for the land, and one for the river."[230] As will be seen in a following chapter, human sacrifices to rivers are very common in the Niger country. In the cases mentioned by the English missionary, the idea of vicarious expiation is obvious. But I find no evidence of actual sin-transference.

[Footnote 229: Frazer, _op. cit._ iii. 109 _sq._]

[Footnote 230: Crowther and Taylor, _Gospel on the Banks of the Niger_, p. 344 _sq._]

Dr. Frazer further mentions a custom which, according to Strabo, prevailed among the Albanians of the Eastern Caucasus.[231] In the temple of the Moon they kept a number of sacred slaves, of whom many were inspired and prophesied. When one of these men exhibited more than usual symptoms of inspiration or insanity, the high priest had him bound with a sacred chain and maintained him in luxury for a year. At the end of the year he was anointed with unguents and led forth to be sacrificed. A man thrust a sacred spear into his side, piercing his heart. From the manner in which the victim fell, omens were drawn as to the welfare of the commonwealth. Then the body was carried to a certain spot where all the people stood upon it as a purificatory ceremony.[232] Dr. Frazer maintains that "the last circumstance clearly indicates that the sins of the people were transferred to the victim, just as the Jewish priest transferred the sins of the people to the scapegoat by laying his hand on the animal's head."[233] So it may be, although, in my opinion, the purificatory ceremony described by Strabo also allows of another interpretation. The victim was evidently held to be saturated with magic energy; this is commonly the case with men, or animals, or even inanimate things, that are offered in sacrifice, and in the present instance the man was regarded as holy already, long before he was slain. To stand on the corpse, then, might have been regarded as purifying in consequence of the benign virtue inherent in it, just as, according to Muhammedan notions, contact with a saint cures disease, not by transferring it to the saint, but by annihilating it or expelling it from the body of the patient. But whether the ceremony in question involved the idea of sin-transference or not, there is no indication that the sacrifice of the slave was of an expiatory character. The same may be said both of the Egyptian sacrifice of a bull, mentioned by Herodotus, and of the white dog sacrifice performed by the Iroquois. The Egyptians first invoked the god and slew the bull. They then cut off his head and flayed the body. Next {64} they took the head, and heaped imprecations on it, praying that, if any evil was impending either over those who sacrificed or over the land of Egypt, it might be made to fall upon that head. And finally, they either sold the head to Greek traders or threw it into the river[234]--which shows that the real scapegoat, the head, was not regarded as a sacrifice to the god. Among the Iroquois, also, the victims were slain before the sins of the people were transferred to them. According to Hale's and Morgan's accounts of this rite, which have reference to different tribes of the Iroquois, no mention of sin-transference is made in the hymn which accompanied the sacrifice.[235] Only blessings were invoked. This was the beginning of the chant:--"Now we are about to offer this victim adorned for the sacrifice, in hope that the act will be pleasing and acceptable to

the All-Ruler, and that he will so adorn his children, the red men, with his blessings, when they appear before him."[236] Mr. Morgan even denies that the burning of the dog had the slightest connection with the sins of the people, and states that "in the religious system of the Iroquois, there is no recognition of the doctrine of atonement for sin, or of the absolution or forgiveness of sins."[237]

[Footnote 231: Frazer, _op. cit._ iii. 112 _sq._]

[Footnote 232: Strabo, xi. 4. 7.]

[Footnote 233: Frazer, _op. cit._ iii. 113.]

[Footnote 234: Herodotus, ii. 39.]

[Footnote 235: Hale, in _American Antiquarian_, vii. 10 _sqq._ Morgan, _League of the Iroquois_, p. 217 _sq._]

[Footnote 236: Hale, _loc. cit._ p. 10.]

[Footnote 237: Morgan, _op. cit._ p. 216.]

I think we can see the reason why, in some cases, a sacrificial victim is used as scapegoat. The transference of sins or evils is not looked upon as a mere "natural" process, it can hardly be accomplished without the aid of mysterious, magic energy. Among the Berbers of Ait Zel[t.]n, in Southern Morocco, sick people used to visit a miracle-working wild olive-tree, growing in the immediate vicinity of the supposed grave of Sîdi Butlîla. They there relieve themselves of their complaints by tying a woollen string to one of its branches; in case of headache the patient previously winds the string three times round the top of his head, whilst, in case of fever, he spits on the string, and, when tying it to the tree, says, "I left my fever in thee, O wild olive-tree." He believes that he may thus transfer his disease to this tree because there is _baraka_, "benign virtue," in it; he would not expect to be cured {65} by tying the string to any ordinary tree. This illustrates a principle of probably world-wide application. In Morocco, and, I presume, in other countries where disease-transference is believed in, rags tied to a tree are a sure indication that the tree is regarded as holy. Similarly I venture to believe that the transference of sins and evils to a scapegoat is generally supposed to require magic aid of some kind or other. Among the Hebrews, it took place on the Day of Atonement only, and the act was performed by the high-priest.[238] Among the Iroquois, it was by "a kind of magic" that the sins of the people were worked into the white dogs;[239] and that the animals themselves were held to be charged with supernatural energy, appears from the fact that, according to one account, the ashes of the pyre on which one of them was burnt were "gathered up, carried through the village, and sprinkled at the door of every house."[240] Considering, then, that sacrificial victims, owing to their close contact with the deities to whom they are offered, are held more or less sacred, the idea of employing them as scapegoats is certainly near at hand. But this does not make the sacrifice expiatory. In fact, I know of no instance of an expiatory sacrifice being connected with a ceremony of sin-transference. Hence the materialistic conception of sin hardly helps to explain the belief that the sins of a person may be atoned by another person being offered as a sacrifice to the offended god.

[Footnote 238: _Leviticus_, xvi. 21.]

[Footnote 239: Seaver, _op. cit._ p. 160.]

[Footnote 240: Beauchamp, _loc. cit._ p. 239.]

A sacrifice is expiatory if its object is to avert the supposed anger or indignation of a superhuman being from those on whose behalf it is offered. In various cases the offended god is thought to be appeased only by the death of a man. But it is not always necessary that the victim should be the actual offender. The death of a substitute may expiate his guilt. The expiatory sacrifice may be vicarious.

We shall see, in a subsequent chapter, that, as a general {66} rule, human victims are sacrificed for the purpose of saving the lives of the sacrificers: before the beginning of a battle or during a siege, previously to a dangerous sea-expedition, during epidemics, famines, or on other similar occasions, when murderous designs are attributed to some superhuman being on whose will the lives of men are supposed to depend. But these sacrifices are not always expiatory in nature. A god may desire to cause the death of men not only because he is offended, but because he delights in human flesh, or because he wants human attendants, or--no one knows exactly why. It is impossible to find out in each particular case whether the sacrifice is meant to be an expiation or not; it is not certain that the sacrificers know it themselves. Yet in many instances there can be no doubt that its object is to serve as a

vicarious atonement.

In Eastern Central Africa, "if a freeman were to set fire to the grass or reeds beside a lake, and cause a great conflagration close to the chosen abode of the deity, he is liable to be offered up to the god that is thus annoyed," but if he be the owner of many slaves he can easily redeem himself by offering one of them in his place.[241] The Ojibways, it is said, were once visited with an epidemic, which they regarded as a divine punishment sent them on account of their wickedness; and when all other efforts failed, "it was decided that the most beautiful girl of the tribe should enter a canoe, push into the channel just above the Sault, and throw away her paddle."[242] In B[oe]otia, a drunken man having killed a priest of Dionysus Aegobolus, and a pestilence having broken out immediately after, the calamity was regarded as a judgment on the people for the sacrilege, and the oracle of Delphi ordered them to expiate it by sacrificing to the god a blooming boy.[243] In his work on the Jews, Philo of Byblus states that "it was the custom among the ancients in cases of great dangers, that the rulers of a city or a nation, in order to avert universal destruction, should give the dearest of their children to be killed as a ransom offered to avenging demons."[244] The idea that sins could be expiated by the death of one who {67} had not deserved it, was familiar to the Hebrews. It was said that "the death of the righteous makes atonement."[245] The passage in Isaiah liii. 12 was interpreted of Moses, who "poured out his soul unto death[246] and was numbered with the transgressors (the generation that died in the wilderness) and bare the sin of many "that he might atone for the sin of the golden calf.[247] Ezekiel suffered "that he might wipe out the transgressions of Israel."[248] And of the Maccabaean martyrs it is said, "Having become as it were a vicarious expiation for the sins of the nation, and through the blood of those godly men and their atoning death, divine providence saved Israel which had before been evil entreated."[249] In these cases, of course, there was no sacrifice in the proper sense of the term, but they obviously illustrate the same characteristic of the divine mind. In fact, the death of Christ, by which he atoned and obliterated the sins of all ages, was conceived as a sacrifice, or spoken of in sacrificial figures.[250]

[Footnote 241: Macdonald, _Africana_, i. 96 _sq._]

[Footnote 242: Dorman, _Origin of Primitive Superstitions_, p. 208.]

[Footnote 243: Pausanias, ix. 8. 2.]

[Footnote 244: Eusebius, _Praeparatio Evangelica_, i. 10. 40 (Migne, _Patrologia_, Ser. Gr. xxi. 85).]

[Footnote 245: Moore, in Cheyne and Black, _Encyclopaedia Biblica_, iv. 4226.]

[Footnote 246: _Exodus_, xxxii. 32.]

[Footnote 247: _S[=o][t.][=a]h_, 14 A, quoted by Moore, _loc. cit._ col. 4226.]

[Footnote 248: _Sanhedrin_, 39 A, quoted _ibid._ col. 4226.]

[Footnote 249: _4 Maccabaeans_, xvii. 22, quoted _ibid._ col. 4232.]

[Footnote 250: See Moore, _loc. cit._ col. 4229 _sqq._]

It is said that, according to early ideas, "it did not essentially concern divine justice that the punishment of faults committed should fall precisely on the guilty; what did concern it was that it should fall on some one, that it should have its accomplishment."[251] Men, we are told, could not fail to discern that a transgression produces suffering as its consequence, and, seeing this, they "associate suffering with the expiation of sin, and, in atoning for their transgressions, they mark their contrition by the suffering which they inflict vicariously on the victim. They argue thus: 'I have broken a law of God. God exacts pain as a consequence of such a breach. I will therefore slay this lamb, and its sufferings shall make the atonement requisite.'"[252] But, so far as I can see, this interpretation of the idea of vicarious expiation is not supported by facts. The victim whose suffering or death is calculated to appease the wrathful god is not anybody {68} at random, whosoever he may be. He is a representative of the community which has incurred the anger of the god, and is accepted as a substitute on the principle of social solidarity. So, also, according to the Western Church, Christ discharged the punishment due to the sins of mankind and propitiated the justice of his Father, in his capacity of a man, as a representative of the human race; whereas in the East, where it was maintained that the _deity_ suffered (though he suffered through the human nature which he had made his own), the idea of substitution could hardly take root, since, as Harnack remarks, "the dying _God_-man really represented no one."[253] The Greek Church regarded the death of Christ as a ransom for mankind paid to the devil, and this doctrine was also accepted by the most important of the Western Fathers, although it flatly contradicted their own theory of atonement.[254] There can be no doubt that expiatory sacrifices are frequently offered as ransoms,

in other words, that the god or demon is supposed to be appeased, not by the suffering of the victim, but by the gift. Among men it often occurs that the offended party is induced by some material compensation to desist from avenging the injury--in many societies such placability is even prescribed by custom,--and something similar is naturally believed to be the case with gods. From this point of view, of course, it is not necessary that the victim should be a person who is connected with the offender by ties of social solidarity, although he may still be regarded as in a way a substitute. He may be an alien or a slave; or animals or inanimate things may be offered to expiate the sins of men. Among the Dacotahs, "for the expiation of sins or crimes a sacrifice is made of some kind of an animal."[255] Of the Melanesian sacrifices, says Dr. Codrington, "some are propitiatory, substituting an animal for the person who has offended."[256] The Shánárs of Tinnevelly offer up a {69} goat, a sheep, or a fowl, in order "to appease the angry demon, and induce him to remove the evil he has inflicted, or abstain from the infliction he may meditate."[257] It would be almost absurd to suppose that in similar cases the suffering or death of the animal is looked upon in the light of a vicarious _punishment_. Of the Hebrew sin-offering, Professor Kuenen aptly remarks:--[258]"According to the Israelite's notion, Yahveh in his clemency permits the soul of the animal sacrificed to take the place of that of the sacrificer. No transfer of guilt to the animal sacrificed takes place: the blood of the latter is clean and remains so, as is evident from the very fact that this blood is put upon the altar; it is a token of mercy on Yahveh's part that he accepts it. . . . Nor can it be asserted that the animal sacrificed undergoes the punishment in the place of the transgressor: this is said nowhere, and therefore, in any case, gives another, more sharply defined idea than that which the Israelite must have formed for himself; moreover, it is irreconcilable with the rule that the indigent may bring the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour as a sin-offering."[259] It should also be noticed that a purifying effect was ascribed to contact with the victim's blood: the high priest should put or sprinkle some blood upon the altar "and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel."[260]

[Footnote 251: Réville, _Prolegomena of the History of Religions_, p. 135.]

[Footnote 252: Baring-Gould, _Origin and Development of Religious Belief_, i. 387 _sq._]

[Footnote 253: Harnack, _op. cit._ iii. 312 _sqq._]

[Footnote 254: _Ibid._ iii. 307, 315 n. 2.]

[Footnote 255: Schoolcraft, _Indian Tribes of the United States_, ii. 196.]

[Footnote 256: Codrington, _Melanesians_, p. 127.]

[Footnote 257: Percival, _Land of the Veda_, p. 309 _sq._ _Cf._ Caldwell, _Tinnevelly Shánárs_, p. 37.]

[Footnote 258: Kuenen, _Religion of Israel_, ii. 266 _sq._]

[Footnote 259: _Leviticus_, v. 11 _sqq._]

[Footnote 260: _Ibid._ xvi. 18 _sq._]

To sum up:--The fact that punishments for offences are frequently inflicted, or are supposed to be inflicted, by men or gods upon individuals who have not committed those offences, is explicable from circumstances which in no way clash with our thesis that moral indignation is, in its essence, directed towards the assumed cause of inflicted pain. In many cases the victim, in accordance with the doctrine of collective responsibility, is punished because he is considered to be involved in the guilt--even when he is really innocent--or because he is regarded as a fair {70} representative of an offending community. In other cases, he is supposed to be polluted by a sin or a curse, owing to the contagious nature of sins and curses. The principle of social solidarity also accounts for the efficacy ascribed to vicarious expiatory sacrifices; but in many instances expiatory sacrifices only have the character of a ransom or bribe.

And whilst thus our thesis as to the true direction of moral indignation is not in the least invalidated by facts, apparently, but only apparently, contradictory, it is, on the other hand, strongly supported by the protest which the moral consciousness, when sufficiently guided by discrimination and sympathy, enters against the infliction of penal suffering upon the guiltless. Such a protest is heard from various quarters, both with reference to human justice and with reference to the resentment of gods.

Confucius taught that the vices of a father should not discredit a virtuous son.[261] Plato lays down the rule that "the disgrace and punishment of the father is not to be visited on the children"; on the contrary, he says, if the children of a criminal who has been punished capitally avoid the wrongs of their father, they shall have glory, and honourable mention shall be made of them, "as

having nobly and manfully escaped out of evil into good."[262] According to Roman law, "crimen vel poena paterna nullam maculam filio infligere potest."[263] "Nothing," says Seneca, "is more unjust than that any one should inherit the quarrels of his father."[264] The Deuteronomist enjoins, "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own {71} sin."[265] Lawgivers have been anxious to restrict the blood-feud to the actual culprit. The Koran forbids the avenger of blood to kill any other person than the manslayer himself.[266] In England, according to a law of Edmund, the feud was not to be prosecuted against the kindred of the slayer, unless they made his misdeed their own by harbouring him.[267] So, also, in Sweden, in the thirteenth century, the blood feud was limited by law to the guilty individual;[268] and we meet with a similar restriction in Slavonic law-books.[269]

[Footnote 261: _Lun Yü_, vi. 4. _Cf._ _Thâi-Shang_ 4.]

[Footnote 262: Plato, _Leges_, ix. 854 _sqq._ Plato makes an exception for those whose fathers, grandfathers, and great-grandfathers have successively undergone the penalty of death: "Such persons the city shall send away with all their possessions to the city and country of their ancestors, retaining only and wholly their appointed lot" (_ibid._ ix. 856). But this enactment had no doubt a purely utilitarian foundation, the offspring of a thoroughly wicked family being considered a danger to the city.]

[Footnote 263: _Digesta_, xlviii. 19. 26. _Cf._ _ibid._ xlviii. 19. 20.]

[Footnote 264: Seneca, _De ira_, ii. 34. _Cf._ Cicero, _De officiis_, i. 25.]

[Footnote 265: _Deuteronomy_, xxiv. 16. _Cf._ _2 Kings_ xiv. 6.]

[Footnote 266: _Koran_, xvii. 35.]

[Footnote 267: _Laws of Edmund_, ii. 1.]

[Footnote 268: Nordström, _Bidrag till den svenska samhälls-författningens historia_, ii. 103, 334, 335, 399. Wilda, _op. cit._ p. 174.]

[Footnote 269: Kovalewsky, _Coutume contemporaine_, p. 248. In Montenegro it was enjoined by Daniel I. (Post, _Anfänge des Staats- und Rechtsleben_, p. 181).]

Passing to the vengeance of gods: according to the Atharva-Veda, Agni, who forgives sin committed through folly and averts Varuna's wrath, also frees from the consequence of a sin committed by a man's father or mother.[270] Theognis asks, "How, O king of immortals, is it just that whoso is aloof from unrighteous deeds, holding no transgression, nor sinful oath, but being righteous, should suffer what is not just?"[271] According to Bion, the deity, in punishing the children of the wicked for their fathers' crimes, is more ridiculous than a doctor administering a potion to a son or grandson for a father's or grandfather's disease.[272] The early Greek notion of an inherited curse was modified into the belief that the curse works through generations because the descendants each commit new acts of guilt.[273] The persons who prohibited the sons of such as had been proscribed by Sylla, from standing candidates for their fathers' honours, and from being admitted into the senate, were supposed to have been punished by the gods for this injustice:--"In process of time," says Dionysius of Halicarnassus, "a blameless punishment, the avenger of their crimes, pursued {72} them, by which they themselves were brought down from the greatest height of glory, to the lowest degree of obscurity; and none, even, of their race are now left, but women."[274] Among the Hebrews, Jeremiah and Ezekiel broke with the old notion of divine vengeance. The law of individual responsibility, which had already previously been laid down as a principle of human justice, was to be extended to the sphere of religion.[275] "Every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge."[276] "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."[277]

[Footnote 270: _Atharva-Veda_, v. 30. 4. _Cf._ Macdonell, _Vedic Mythology_, p. 98.]

[Footnote 271: Theognis, 743 _sqq._]

[Footnote 272: Plutarch, _De sera numinis vindicta_ 19. _Cf._ _ibid._ 12; Cicero, _De natura Deorum_, iii. 38.]

[Footnote 273: Farnell, _op. cit._ i. 77. Maine, _Ancient Law_, p. 127.]

[Footnote 274: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, _op. cit._ viii. 80.]

[Footnote 275: _Cf._ Montefiore, _op. cit._ p. 220; Kuenen, _op. cit._ ii. 35 _sq._]

[Footnote 276: _Jeremiah_, xxxi. 30.]

[Footnote 277: _Ezekiel_, xviii. 20. For Talmudic views, see Deutsch, _Literary Remains_, p. 52.]

CHAPTER III

THE NATURE OF THE MORAL EMOTIONS (_continued_)

IT was said in the last chapter that moral disapproval is a sub-species of resentment, and that resentment is, in its essence, an aggressive attitude of mind towards an assumed cause of pain. It was shown that, in the course of mental evolution, the true direction of the hostile reaction involved in moral disapproval has become more apparent. We shall now see that, at the same time, its aggressive character has become more disguised.

This is evidenced by the changed opinion about anger and revenge which we meet at the higher stages of moral development. Retaliation is condemned, and forgiveness of injuries is laid down as a duty.

The rule that a person should be forbearing and kind to his enemy has no place in early ethics.

"Let those that speak evil of us perish. Let the enemy be clubbed, swept away, utterly destroyed, piled in heaps. Let their teeth be broken. May they fall headlong into a pit. Let us live, and let our enemies perish." Such were the requests which generally concluded the prayers of the Fijians.[1] A savage would find nothing objectionable in them. On the contrary, he regards revenge as a duty,[2] and forgiveness of enemies as a sign of weakness, or cowardice, or want of honour.[3] Nor {74} is this opinion restricted to the savage world. In the Old Testament the spirit of vindictiveness pervades both the men and their god. The last thing with which David on his death-bed charged Solomon was to destroy an enemy whom he himself had spared.[4] Sirach counts among the nine causes of a man's happiness to see the fall of his enemy.[5] The enemies of Yahveh can expect no mercy from him, but utter destruction is their lot.[6] To do good to a friend and to do harm to an enemy was a maxim of the ancient Scandinavians.[7] It was taken for a matter of course by popular opinion in Greece[8] and Rome. According to Aristotle, "it belongs to the courageous man never to be worsted"; to take revenge on a foe rather than to be reconciled is just, and therefore honourable.[9] Cicero defines a good man as a person "who serves whom he can, and injures none except when provoked by injury."[10] Except in domestic life and in the case of friends, Professor Seeley observes, "people not only did not forgive their enemies, but did not wish to do so, nor think better of themselves for having done so. That man considered himself fortunate who on his deathbed could say, in reviewing his past life, that no one had done more good to his friends or more mischief to his enemies. This was the celebrated felicity of Sulla; this the crown of Xenophon's panegyric on Cyrus the Younger."[11]

[Footnote 1: Fison, quoted by Codrington, _Melanesians_, p. 147, n. 1.]

[Footnote 2: See _infra_, on Blood-revenge.]

[Footnote 3: _Cf._ Domenech, _Great Deserts of North America_, ii. 97, 338, 438 (Dacotahs); Boas, _first General Report on the Indians of British Columbia_, p. 38; Baker, _Albert N'yanza_ i. 240 _sq._ (Latukas).]

[Footnote 4: _1 Kings_, ii. 8 _sq._]

[Footnote 5: _Ecclesiasticus_, xxv. 7.]

[Footnote 6: _Cf._ Montefiore, Hibbert Lectures, p. 40.]

[Footnote 7: Maurer, _Bekehrung des Norwegischen Stammes_, ii. 154 _sq._]

[Footnote 8: Maury, _Histoire des religions de la Grèce antique_, i. 383. Schmidt, _Ethik der alten Griechen_, ii. 309 _sqq._]

[Footnote 9: Aristotle, _Rhetorica_, i. 9. 24. _Cf._ Aeschylus, _Choeophori_, 309 _sqq._; Plato, _Meno_, p. 71; Xenophon, _Memorabilia_, ii. 6. 35.]

[Footnote 10: Cicero, _De officiis_, iii. 19. iii. 19. _Cf._ _ibid._ ii. 14; but _cf._ also _ibid._ i. 25, where it is said that nothing is more worthy of a great and a good man than placability and moderation.]

[Footnote 11: Seeley, _Ecce Homo_, p. 273.]

But side by side with the doctrine of resentment, we meet, among peoples of culture, the doctrine of forgiveness.

"Recompense injury with kindness," says Lao-Tsze.[12] According to Mencius, "a benevolent man does not lay up anger, nor cherish resentment against his brother, but only regards him with affection and love."[13] In the laws of Manu the following rule is laid down for the twice-born man:--"Against an angry man let him not in return show anger, let him bless {75} when he is cursed."[14] It is said in the Buddhistic Dhammapada: "Hatred does not cease by hatred at any time; hatred ceases by love, this is an old rule . . . . Among men who hate us we dwell free from hatred. . . . Let a man overcome anger by love, let him overcome evil by good; let him overcome the greedy by liberality, the liar by truth."[15] According to one of the Pahlavi texts, we ought not to indulge in wrathfulness; wrath is one of the fiends besetting man, and "goodness is little in the mind of a man of wrath."[16]

[Footnote 12: _Tâo Teh King_, ii. 63. 1. According to _Thâi-Shang_, 4, a bad man "broods over resentment without ceasing."]

[Footnote 13: Mencius, v. 1. 3. 2.]

[Footnote 14: _Laws of Manu_, vi. 48. _Cf._ _ibid._ viii. 313; Monier-Williams, _Indian Wisdom_, pp. 444, 446; Muir, _Additional Moral and Religious Passages, rendered from the Sanskrit_, p. 30.]

[Footnote 15: _Dhammapada_, i. 5; xv. 197; xvii. 223. _Cf._ _J[=a]taka Tales_, i. 22; Oldenberg, _Buddha_, p. 298.]

[Footnote 16: _Dînâ-î-Maînôg-î Khirad_, ii. 16; xli. 11; xxxix. 26.]

In Leviticus hatred is condemned:--"Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart. . . . Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people."[17] Sirach, whom I have already quoted, says in another passage, "Forgive thy neighbour the hurt that he has done unto thee, so shall thy sins also be forgiven when thou prayest."[18] According to the Talmud, "whosoever does not persecute them that persecute him, whosoever takes an offence in silence, he who does good because of love, he who is cheerful under his sufferings they are the friends of God, and of them the Scripture says, And they shall shine forth as does the sun at noon-day."[19] The Koran, whilst repeating the old rule, "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,"[20] at the same time teaches that Paradise is "for those who repress their rage, and those who pardon men; God loves the kind."[21] Muhammedan tradition puts the following words in the mouth of the Prophet:--"Say not, if people do good to us, we will do good to them, and if people oppress us, we will oppress them: but resolve that if people do good to you, you will do good to them, and if they oppress you, oppress them not again."[22] Professor Goldziher emphasises Muhammed's opposition to the traditional rule of the Arabs that an enemy is a proper object of hatred;[23] and Syed Ameer Ali has collected various passages from the writings of Muhammedan scholars, which prove that, {76} in spite of what has often been said to the contrary, forgiveness of injuries is by no means foreign to the spirit of Islam.[24] Thus the author of the Kashshâf prescribes, "Seek again him who drives you away; give to him who takes away from you; pardon him who injures you: for God loveth that you should cast into the depth of your souls the roots of His perfections."[25] That "the sandal-tree perfumes the axe that fells it," is a saying in everyday use among the Muhammedans of India.[26] And Lane often heard Egyptians forgivingly say, on receiving a blow from an equal, "God bless thee," "God requite thee good," "Beat me again."[27]

[Footnote 17: _Leviticus_, xix. 17 _sq._ _Cf._ _Exodus_, xxiii. 4.]

[Footnote 18: _Ecclesiasticus_, xxviii. 2. _Cf._ _ibid._ x, 6; _Proverbs_, xxv. 21.]

[Footnote 19: Deutsch, _Literary Remains_, p. 58. _Cf._ Katz, _Der wahre Talmudjude_, p. 11, _sq._]

[Footnote 20: _Koran_, ii. 190: "Whoso transgresses against you, transgress against him like as he transgressed against you."]

[Footnote 21: _Ibid._ iii. 125. _Cf._ _ibid._ xxiii. 98; xxiv. 22; xli. 34.]

[Footnote 22: Lane-Poole, _Speeches and Table-Talk of Mohammad_, p. 147.]

[Footnote 23: Goldziher, _Mohammedanische Studien_, i. 15 _sq._]

[Footnote 24: Ameer Ali, _Ethics of Islam_, p. 26 _sqq._]

[Footnote 25: _Ibid._ p. 7. _Idem_, _Life and Teachings of Mohammed_, p. 280.]

[Footnote 26: Poole, _Studies in Mohammedanism_, p. 226.]

[Footnote 27: Lane, _Modern Egyptians_, p. 314 _sq._]

The principles of forgiveness had also advocates in Greece and Rome. In one of the Platonic dialogues, Socrates says, "We ought not to retaliate or render evil for evil to any one, whatever evil we may have suffered from him"; though he wisely adds that "this opinion has never been held, and never will be held, by any considerable number of persons."[28] The Stoics strongly condemned anger as unnatural and unreasonable. "Mankind is born for mutual assistance, anger for mutual ruin."[29] "Anger is a crime of the mind; . . . it often is even more criminal than the faults with which it is angry."[30] He is the best and purest "who pardons others as if he sinned himself daily, but avoids sinning as if he never pardoned."[31] "If any one is angry with you, meet his anger by returning benefits for it."[32] "The cynic loves those who beat him."[33]

[Footnote 28: Plato, _Crito_, p. 49.]

[Footnote 29: Seneca, _De ira_, i. 5.]

[Footnote 30: _Ibid._ i. 16; ii. 6.]

[Footnote 31: Pliny, _Epistolæ_, ix. 22 (viii. 22).]

[Footnote 32: Seneca, _op. cit._ ii. 34.]

[Footnote 33: Epictetus, _Dissertationes_, iii. 22, 54.]

Forgiveness of enemies is thus by no means an exclusively Christian tenet, although it has never before or after been inculcated with the same emphasis as it was by Jesus. "Love your enemies; bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you."[34] When St. Peter asked, "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times?" Jesus replied, "I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven,"[35]--that is, as often as he repeats the offence. It would seem that Jesus by these sentences expressly forbade men to avenge themselves, or even {77} to feel resentment on their own behalf; and so also he was understood by St. Paul.[36]

[Footnote 34: _St. Matthew_, v. 44. _Cf._ _ibid._ v. 39 _sq._; vi. 14 _sq._; _St. Luke_, vi. 27 _sqq._; xvii. 3 _sq._; _St. Mark_, xi. 25 _sq._]

[Footnote 35: _St. Matthew_, xviii. 21 _sq._]

[Footnote 36: _Romans_, xii. 19 _sqq._; _1 Thessalonians_, v. 14 _sq._; _Colossians_, iii. 12 _sq._]

The rule of retaliation and the rule of forgiveness, however, are not so radically opposed to each other as they appear to be. What the latter condemns is, in reality, not every kind of resentment, but non-moral resentment; not impartial indignation, but personal hatred. It prohibits revenge, but not punishment. According to the Laws of Manu, crime was so indispensably to be followed by punishment, that if the king pardoned a thief or a perpetrator of violence, instead of slaying or striking him, the guilt fell on the king;[37] and if Lao-tsze was an enemy to the infliction of any kind of suffering, it was because he held that in a well-governed State the necessity for punishment could not arise, as crime would cease to exist.[38] The Chinese book, _Merits and Errors Scrutinised_, which regards it as a merit to refrain from avenging an injury, adds that, "if a man should omit to avenge the injuries of his parents, it would become an error."[39] Jesus was certainly not free from righteous indignation. It does not appear that he ever forgave the legalists who sinned against the kingdom of God, and he told his disciples that, if a brother who had trespassed against his brother neglected to hear the church, he should be looked upon as a heathen and a publican.[40] Christian writers have laid much stress upon the circumstance that Jesus enjoined men to forgive their own enemies, but not to abstain from resenting injuries done to others. According to Thomas Aquinas, "the good bear with the wicked to this extent, that, so far as it is proper to do so, they patiently endure at their hands the injuries done to themselves; but they do not bear with them to the extent of enduring the injuries done to God and their neighbours. For Chrysostom says, 'For it {78} is praiseworthy to be patient under one's own wrongs, but the height of impiety to dissemble injuries done to God.'"[41] Practically, at least, Christianity has not altered the validity of the Aristotelian rule that anger admits not only of an excess, but of a defect, and that we ought to feel angry at certain things.[42] As Plutarch says, we even think those worthy of hatred who are not vexed at hateful individuals; and we can sympathise with the man who, hearing somebody praise Charillus, king of Sparta, for his gentleness, replied, "How can Charillus be good, who is not harsh

even to the bad?"[43] Moreover, the belief in a transcendental retributive justice, in an ultimate punishment of badness, which we meet with in Taouism,[44] Brahmanism, Buddhism,[45] Christianity,[46] side by side with the doctrine of forgiveness, is based upon the demand that wrong should be resented.

[Footnote 37: _Laws of Manu_, viii. 316, 346 _sq._ _Cf._ _Gautama_, xii. 45; _Âpastamba_, i. 9. 25. 5.]

[Footnote 38: Douglas, _Confucianism and Taouism_, p. 204.]

[Footnote 39: 'Merits and Errors scrutinised,' in _Indo-Chinese Gleaner_, iii. 153.]

[Footnote 40: _St. Matthew_, xviii. 15 _sqq._]

[Footnote 41: Thomas Aquinas, _Summa Theologia_, ii.-ii. 108. 1. 2. _Cf._ Lactantius, _De ira Dei_, 17.]

[Footnote 42: Aristotle, _Ethica Nicomachea_, ii. 7. 10; iii. 1. 24; iv. 5. 3 _sqq._]

[Footnote 43: Plutarch, _De invidia et odio_, 5.]

[Footnote 44: Douglas, _op. cit._ p. 257.]

[Footnote 45: _Dhammapada_, i. 15, 17; x. 137 _sqq._]

[Footnote 46: _Cf._ _Romans_, xii. 19: "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."]

It is easy to see why enlightened and sympathetic minds disapprove of resentment and retaliation springing from personal motives. Such resentment is apt to be partial. It is too often directed against persons whom impartial reflection finds to be no proper objects of indignation, and still more frequently it is unduly excessive. As Butler ays, "we are in such a peculiar situation, with respect to injuries done to ourselves, that we can scarce any more see them as they really are, than our eye can see itself."[47] "As bodies seem greater in a mist, so do little matters in a rage"; hence the old rule that we ought not to punish whilst angry.[48] The more the moral consciousness is influenced by sympathy, the more severely it condemns any retributive infliction of pain which it regards as undeserved; and it seems to be in the first place with a {79} view to preventing such injustice that teachers of morality have enjoined upon men to love their enemies. It would, indeed, be absurd to blame a person for expressing moral indignation at an act simply because he himself happens to be the offended party; practically we allow him to be even more indignant than the impartial spectator would be, whereas excessive placability often meets with censure. Like Aristotle, we maintain that "to submit to insult, or to overlook an insult offered to our friends, shows a slavish spirit"[49]; and we agree with the Confucian maxims, that injuries should be recompensed, not with kindness, but with justice, and that nobody but he who deserves it should be an object of hatred.[50]

[Footnote 47: Butler, 'Sermon IX.--Upon Forgiveness of Injuries,' in _Analogy of Religion, &c._, p. 469.]

[Footnote 48: Plutarch, _De cohibenda ira_, 11. Montaigne, _Essais_, ii. 31 (_Oeuvres_, p. 396).]

[Footnote 49: Aristotle, _Ethica Nicomachea_, 5. 6.]

[Footnote 50: _Lun Yü_ xiv. 36. 3; xvii. 9. 1, 5; xvii. 24. 1. Douglas, _Confucianism and Taouism_, p. 9. _Cf._ _Chung Yung_, x. 3; xxxi. 1; xxxiii. 4.]

At the same time, the injunctions of moralists that unjust resentment should be suppressed, are far from introducing any absolutely new element into the estimation of conduct. They only represent a higher stage of a process of moral development the early phases of which are found already in primitive societies. Even the savage who enjoins revenge as a duty, regards revenge under certain circumstances as wrong.[51] The restraining rule of like for like, as we shall see, is an instance of this.

[Footnote 51: Concerning the Dacotahs, Prescott observes, "There are cases where the Indians say retaliation is wrong, and they try to prevent it" (Schoolcraft, _Indian Tribes_, ii. 197).]

The aggressive character of moral disapproval has become more disguised, not only by the more scrutinising attitude towards the resentment and retaliation which distinguishes the moral consciousness of a higher type, but by the different way in which the aggressiveness displays itself. The infliction of suffering merely for the sake of retribution is condemned, and the rule is laid down that we should hate, not the sinner, but only the sin.

Punishment, which expresses more or less faithfully the moral indignation of the society which inflicts it, is externally similar to an act of revenge; it causes, or is intended {80} to cause, pain in return for inflicted pain. For ages it was looked upon as a matter of course that if a person had committed an offence he should have to suffer for it. This is still the notion of the multitude, as also of a host of theorisers, who, by calling punishment an expiation, or a reparation, or a restoration of the disturbed equilibrium of justice, only endeavour to give a philosophical sanction to a very simple fact, the true nature of which they too often have failed to grasp. The infliction of pain, however, is not an act which the moral consciousness regards with indifference, even in the case of a criminal; and to many enlightened minds with keen sympathy for human suffering, it has appeared both unreasonable and cruel that the State should wilfully torment him to no purpose. But whilst retributive punishment has been condemned, punishment itself has been defended; it is only looked upon in a different light, not as an end by itself, but as a means of attaining an end. It is to be inflicted, not because wrong has been done, but in order that wrong be not done. Its object is held to be, either to deter from crime, or to reform the criminal, or by means of elimination or seclusion, to make it physically impossible for him to commit fresh crimes.

These views were expressed already in Greek and Roman antiquity.[52] According to Plato, a reasonable man punishes for the sake of deterring from wickedness, or with a view to correcting the offender.[53] Aristotle looks upon punishment as a moral medicine.[54] Seneca maintains that the law, in punishing wrong, aims at three ends: "either that it may correct him whom it punishes, or that his punishment may render other men better, or that, by bad men being put out of the way, the rest may live without fear."[55] In modern times all these theories have had, and still have, their numerous adherents. According to Hugo Grotius, "men are so bound together by their common {81} nature, that they ought not to do each other harm, except for the sake of some good to be attained"; hence "man is not rightly punished by man merely for the sake of punishing"; advantage alone makes punishment right--"either the advantage of the offender, or of him who suffers by the offence, or of persons in general."[56] For a long time the view taken by Hobbes, that "the aym of Punishment is not a revenge, but terrour,"[57] remained the leading doctrine on the subject, among philosophers, as well as legislators. It was shared by Montesquieu,[58] Beccaria,[59] and filangieri,[60] by Anselm von Feuerbach[61] and Schopenhauer,[62] and, in the main, by Bentham.[63] During the nineteenth century the principle of determent was largely superseded by the principle of reformation; whilst certain contemporary criminologists--like some previous ones[64]--are of opinion that punishment should aim to repress crime by an "absolute" or "relative elimination" of the criminal, that is, in extreme cases by killing him, but generally by incarcerating him in a criminal lunatic asylum, or by banishing him for ever or for a certain period, or by interdicting him from a particular neighbourhood.[65]

[Footnote 52: _Cf._ Laistner, _Das Recht in der Strafe_, p. 9 _sqq._; Thonissen, _Le droit pénal de la république Athénienne_, p. 418 _sqq._]

[Footnote 53: Plato, _Protagoras_, p. 324. _Idem_, _Politicus_, p. 293. _Idem_, _Gorgias_, p. 479. _Idem_, _Leges_, ix. 854; xi. 934; xii. 944.]

[Footnote 54: Aristotle, _Ethica Nicomachea_, ii. 3. 4.]

[Footnote 55: Seneca, _De clementia_, i. 22. _Cf._ _Idem_, _De ira_, i. 19.]

[Footnote 56: Grotius, _De iure belli et pacis_, ii. 20. 4 _sqq._]

[Footnote 57: Hobbes, _Leviathan_, ii. 28, p. 243.]

[Footnote 58: Montesquieu, _Lettres Persanes_, 81.]

[Footnote 59: Beccaria, _Dei delitti e delle pene_, _passim_.]

[Footnote 60: filangieri, _La scienza della legislazione_, iii. 2. 27, vol. iv. 13 _sq._]

[Footnote 61: von Feuerbach-Mittermaier, _Lehrbuch des gemeinen in Deutschland gültigen Peinlichen Rechts_, p. 38 _sqq._]

[Footnote 62: Schopenhauer, _Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung_, ii. 683 _sqq._]

[Footnote 63: Bentham, _Principles of Morals and Legislation_, p. 170 _sq._ n. 1: ". . . Example is the most important end of all." _Idem_, _Rationale of Punishment_, p. 19 _sqq._]

[Footnote 64: See von Feuerbach-Mittermaier, _op. cit._ p. 40.]

[Footnote 65: Garofalo, _Criminologie_, p. 251 _sqq._ Ferri, _Criminal Sociology_, p. 204 _sqq._]

The advocates of these various theories are unanimous in condemning retributive punishment as wrong. Without the grounds of social defence, says M. Guyau, "the punishment would be as blameworthy as the crime, and . . . the lawgivers and the judges, by deliberately condemning the guilty to punishment, would become their fellows."[66] For my own part I believe, on the contrary, that those who would venture to carry out all the consequences to which the theories of social defence or of reformation might lead, would be regarded even as more criminal than those they punished, not only by the {82} opponents, but probably by the very supporters of the theories in question. A brief statement of some of those consequences will, I hope, suffice to prove that punishment can hardly be guided exclusively by utilitarian considerations, but requires the sanction of the retributive emotion of moral disapproval.

[Footnote 66: Guyau, _Esquisse d'une morale sans obligation ni sanction_, p. 148.]

The principle of repressing crime by eliminating the criminal may at once be put aside, because it has no reference to the _punishment_ of criminals, although it contains a suggestion--and a most excellent one indeed--as to the proper mode of treating them. Their exclusion from the company of their fellow-men--not to speak of their elimination by death--certainly entails suffering, but, according to the principle with which we are dealing, this suffering is not _intended_. On the other hand, punishment, in the ordinary sense of the word, always involves an express intention to inflict pain, whatever be the object for which pain is inflicted. We do not punish an ill-natured dog when we tie him up so as to prevent him from doing harm, nor do we punish a lunatic by confining him in a madhouse.

According to the principle of determent, the infliction of suffering in consequence of an offence is justified as a means of increasing public safety. The offender is sacrificed for the common weal. But why the offender only? It is quite probable that a more effective way of deterring from crime would be to punish his children as well; and if the notion of justice derived all its import from the result achieved by the punishment, there would be nothing unjust in doing so. The only objection which, from this point of view, might ever be raised against the practice of visiting the wrongs of the fathers upon the children, is that it is needlessly severe; the innocence of the children could count for nothing. Nor do I see why the law should not allow our own judges now and then to follow the example of their Egyptian colleague who in an intricate lawsuit caused a person avowedly innocent to be bastinadoed with the hope that whoever was the real {83} culprit might be induced to confess out of compassion.[67] Moreover, if the object of punishment is merely preventive, the heaviest punishment should be threatened where the strongest motive is needed to restrain. Consequently, an injury committed under great temptation, or in a passion, should be punished with particular severity; whereas a crime like parricide might be treated with more indulgence than other kinds of homicide, owing to the restraining influence of filial affection. Could the moral consciousness approve of this?

[Footnote 67: Burckhardt, _Arabic Proverbs_, p. 103 _sq._]

Again, if punishment were to be regulated by the principle of reforming the criminal, the result would in some cases be very astonishing. There is no more incorrigible set of offenders than habitual vagrants and drunkards, whereas experience has shown that the most easily reformed of all offenders is often some person who has committed a serious crime. According to the reformation theory, the latter should soon be set free, whilst the petty offender might have to be shut up for all his life. Nay more, if the criminal proves absolutely incorrigible, and not the slightest hope of his reformation is left, there would no longer be any reason for punishing him at all.[68] The reformationist may also be asked why he does not try some more humane method of improving people's characters than by the infliction of suffering.

[Footnote 68: _Cf._ Morrison, _Crime and its Causes_, p. 203; Durkheim, _Division du travail social_, p. 94.]

It may seem strange that theories which are open to such objections should have been able to attract so many intelligent partisans. These theories must at least possess a certain plausibility. If punishment on the one hand springs from moral indignation, and on the other hand is frequently interpreted as a means either of deterring from crime or of reforming the criminal, there must obviously be some connection between these ends and the retributive aim of moral resentment. There must be certain facts which, to some extent, fill up the gap between the theory of retribution and the other theories of punishment.

{84} The doctrine of determent regards punishment as a means of preventing crime. A crime always involves the infliction of pain; and the one thing which men try to prevent for its own sake is pain. The one thing which arouses resentment is likewise pain. There must consequently be a general coincidence between the acts which people resent and the acts which the law would punish if it were framed on the principle of determent. But the resemblance between the desire to deter and resentment is greater still. Resentment is not only aroused by pain, but is a hostile attitude towards its cause, and its intrinsic object is to remove this cause,

that is, to prevent pain. An act of moral resentment is therefore apt to resemble a punishment inflicted with a view to deterring from crime, provided that the punishment is directed against the cause of crime--the criminal himself--and is not unduly severe.

The doctrine of reformation aims at the removal of a criminal disposition of mind by improving the offender. Moral resentment likewise aims at the removal of a volitional cause of pain, by bringing about repentance in the offender. That repentance ought to be followed by forgiveness, partial or total, is a widely recognised moral claim.

According to the Chinese Penal Code, whoever, having committed an injury which can be repaired by restitution or compensation, surrenders himself voluntarily, and acknowledges his guilt to a magistrate, before it is otherwise discovered, shall be freely pardoned, though all claims upon his property shall be duly liquidated.[69] In Madagascar, according to a law made in 1828, "all the fines shall be reduced one-half, according to the nature of the fines, if the persons guilty accuse themselves."[70] According to Zoroastrianism, one element of atonement consists in repentance, as manifested by avowal of the guilt and by the recital of a formula, the _Patet_.[71] It is said in the Laws of Manu:--"In proportion as a man who has done wrong, himself {85} confesses it, even so far he is freed from guilt, as a snake from its slough. . . . He who has committed a sin and has repented, is freed from that sin, but he is purified only by the resolution of ceasing to sin and thinking 'I will do so no more.'"[72] According to the Rig-Veda, Varuna inflicts terrible punishments on the hardened criminal, but is merciful to him who repents; to Varuna the cry of anguish from remorse ascends, and before him the sinner comes to discharge himself of the burden of his guilt by confession.[73] So, also, Zeus pardons the repentant.[74] The main doctrine of Judaism on the subject of atonement is comprised in the single word Repentance. No teachers, says Mr. Montefiore, "exalted the place and power of repentance more than the Rabbis. There was no sin for which in their eyes a true repentance could not obtain forgiveness from God."[75] According to the Talmud, a space of only two fingers' breadth lies between Hell and Heaven: the sinner has only to repent sincerely, and the gates to everlasting bliss will spring open.[76] Jesus commanded his disciples to forgive injuries if followed by repentance:--"If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him."[77]

[Footnote 69: _Ta Tsing Leu Lee_, sec. xxv. p. 27 _sq._]

[Footnote 70: Ellis, _History of Madagascar_, i. 386.]

[Footnote 71: Darmesteter, in _Sacred Books of the East_, iv. p. lxxxvi.]

[Footnote 72: _Laws of Manu_, xi. 229, 231. _Cf._ _ibid._ xi. 228, 230.]

[Footnote 73: _Rig-Veda_, i. 25. 1 _sq._; ii. 28. 5 _sqq._; v. 85. 7 _sq._; vii. 87. 7, 88. 6 _sq._, 89. 1 _sqq._ Barth, _Religions of India_, p. 17.]

[Footnote 74: _Ilias_, ix. 502 _sqq._]

[Footnote 75: Montefiore, _op. cit._ pp. 524, 335 n.]

[Footnote 76: Deutsch, _Literary Remains_, p. 53. _Cf._ _ibid._ p. 56; Katz, _Der wahre Talmudjude_, p. 87 _sq._; Kohler, 'Atonement,' in _Jewish Encyclopedia_, ii. 279; Moore, 'Sacrifice' in Cheyne and Black, _Encyclopædia Biblica_, iv. 4224 _sq._]

[Footnote 77: _St. Luke_, xvii. 3 _sq._]

But repentance not only blunts the edge of moral indignation and recommends the offender to the mercy of men and gods: it is the sole ground on which pardon can be given by a scrupulous judge. When sufficiently guided by deliberation and left to itself, without being unduly checked by other emotions, the feeling of moral resentment is apt to last as long as its cause remains unaltered, that is until the will of the offender has ceased to be offensive; and it ceases to be offensive only when he acknowledges his guilt and repents. It is true that the mere performance of certain ceremonies is frequently supposed to relieve the performer of his sins,[78] and that the {86} same end is thought to be attained by pleasing God in some way or other, by sacrifice, or alms-giving, or the like. Men even lay claim to divine forgiveness as a right belonging to them in virtue of some meritorious deeds of theirs, according to the doctrine of _opera supererogativa_--a doctrine which, in substance, is not restricted to Roman Catholicism, but is found, in a more or less developed form, in Judaism,[79] Muhammedanism,[80] Brahmanism,[81] and degenerated Buddhism.[82] But all such ideas are objectionable to the moral consciousness of a higher type. They are based on the crude notion that sin is a material substance which may be removed by material means; or on the belief that an offender may compound with the deity for sinning against him, in the same way as he pacifies his injured neighbour, by bribery or flattery; or on the assumptions that by a good or meritorious deed

a man has done more than his duty, that a good deed stands in the same relation to a bad deed as a claim to a debt, that the claim is made on the same person to whom the debt is due, namely, God--even though it beinclihedinclihed only by his mercy--and that the debt consequently may be compensated by the claim in the same way as the payment of a certain sum may compensate for a loss inflicted. This doctrine attaches badness and goodness to external acts rather than to mental facts. Reparation implies compensation for a loss. The loss may be compensated by the bestowal of a corresponding advantage; but no reparation can be given for badness. Badness can only be forgiven, and moral forgiveness can be granted only on condition that the agent's mind has undergone a radical alteration for the better, that the badness of the will has given way to repentance.[83] Hence the Reformation {87} proscribed offerings for the redemption of sins, together with the trade in indulgences; and we meet with an analogous movement in other comparatively advanced forms of religion. In reformed Brahmanism, repentance is declared to be the only means of redeeming trespasses.[84] The idea expressed in the Psalms, that God delights not in burnt offerings, but that the sacrifices of God are a broken and a contrite heart,[85] became the prevailing opinion among the Rabbis, most of whom regarded repentance as the _conditio sine quâ non_ of expiation and the forgiveness of sins.[86] Let us also remember that he who commanded his followers to forgive a brother for his sin, at the same time pronounced the qualification: "if he repent."[87]

[Footnote 78: _Supra_, p. 53 _sqq._ Heriot, _Travels through the Canadas_, p. 378 (ancient Mexicans). Adair, _History of the American Indians_, p. 150. Krasheninnikoff, _History of Kamchatka_, p. 178. Williams and Calvert, _Fiji_, p. 24.]

[Footnote 79: Montefiore, _op. cit._ p. 525 _sqq._]

[Footnote 80: _Koran_, xi. 116. Sell, _Faith of Islám_, p. 220 _sq._ According to Muhammadanism, however, it is only "little sins" that are forgiven if some good actions are done, whereas "great sins" can only be forgiven after due repentance (_ibid._ p. 214).]

[Footnote 81: Wheeler, _History of India_, ii. 475.]

[Footnote 82: _Indo-Chinese Gleaner_, iii. 150, 161, 164. Davis, _China_, ii. 48.]

[Footnote 83: This point was certainly not overlooked by the Catholic moralists, but even the most ardent apology cannot explain away the idea of reparation in the Catholic doctrine of the justification of man (_cf._ Manzoni, _Osservazioni sulla Morale Cattolica_, p. 100). Penance consists of contrition, confession, and satisfaction, and contrition itself is chiefly "a willingness to compensate" (_Catechism of the Council of Trent_, ii. 5. 22).]

[Footnote 84: Goblet d'Alviella, _Hibbert Lectures on the Origin and Growth of the Conception of God_, p. 263.]

[Footnote 85: _Psalms_, li. 16 _sq._]

[Footnote 86: Moore, _loc. cit._ col. 4225.]

[Footnote 87: _Cf._ Martineau, _Types of Ethical Theory_, ii. 203.]

That moral indignation is appeased by repentance, and that repentance is the only proper ground for forgiveness, is thus due, not to the specifically moral character of such indignation, but to its being a form of resentment. This is confirmed by the fact that an angry and revengeful man is apt to be in a similar way influenced by the sincere apologies of the offender. As Aristotle said, men are placable in regard to those who acknowledge and repent their guilt: "there is proof of this in the case of chastising servants; for we chastise more violently those who contradict us, and deny their guilt; but towards such as acknowledge themselves to be justly punished, we cease from our wrath."[88] To take an instance from the savage world. The Caroline Islander, according to Mr. Christian, "is inclined to be revengeful, and will bide his time patiently until his opportunity comes. Yet he is not implacable, and counts reconciliation a noble and a princely thing. There is a form of etiquette to be observed on {88} these occasions--a present (_katom_) is made, an apology offered--a piece of sugar-cane accepted by the aggrieved party--honour is satisfied and the matter ends."[89] In the case of revenge, external satisfaction or material compensation is often allowed to take the place of genuine repentance, and the humiliation of the adversary may be sufficient to quiet the angry passion. But the revenge felt by a reflecting mind is not so readily satisfied. It wants to remove the cause which aroused it. The object which resentment is chiefly intent upon, Adam Smith observes, "is not so much to make our enemy feel pain in his turn, as to make him conscious that he feels it upon account of his past conduct, to make him repent of that conduct, and to make him sensible, that the person whom he injured did not deserve to be treated in that manner."[90] The delight of revenge, says Bacon, "seemeth to be not so much in doing the hurt, as in making the party repent."[91]

[Footnote 88: Aristotle, _Rhetorica_, ii. 3. 5.]

[Footnote 89: Christian, _Caroline Islands_, p. 72.]

[Footnote 90: Adam Smith, _Theory of Moral Sentiments_, p. 138 _sq._]

[Footnote 91: Bacon, 'Essay IV. Of Revenge,' in _Essays_, p. 45. _Cf._ Montaigne, _Essais_, ii. 27 (_Oeuvres_, p. 384).]

We can now see the origin of the idea that the true end of punishment is the reformation of the criminal. This idea merely emphasises the most humane element in resentment, the demand that the offender's will shall cease to be offensive. The principle of reformation has thus itself a retributive origin. This explains the fact, otherwise inexplicable, that the amendment which it has in view is to be effected by the infliction of pain. It also accounts for the inconsistent attitude of the reformationist towards incorrigible offenders, already commented upon. Resentment gives way to forgiveness only in the case of repentance, not in the case of incorrigibility. Hence, not even the reformationist regards incorrigibility as a legitimate ground for exempting a person from punishment, although this flatly contradicts his theory about the true aim of all punishment.

Thus the theories both of determent and of reformation are ultimately offspring of the same emotion that first {89} induced men to inflict punishment on their fellow-creatures. It escaped the advocates of these theories that they themselves were under the influence of the very principle they fought against, because they failed to grasp its true import. Rightly understood, resentment is preventive in its nature, and, when sufficiently deliberate, regards the infliction of suffering as a means rather than as an end. It not only gives rise to punishment, but readily suggests, as a proper end of punishment, either determent or amendment or both. But, first of all, moral resentment wants to raise a protest against wrong. And the immediate aim of punishment has always been to give expression to the righteous indignation of the society which inflicts it.

Now it may be thought that men have no right to give vent to their moral resentment in a way which hurts their neighbours unless some benefit may be expected from it. In the case of many other emotions, we hold that the conative element in the emotion ought not to be allowed to develop into a distinct volition or act; and it would seem that a similar view might be taken with reference to the aggressiveness inherent in moral disapproval. It is a notion of this kind that lies at the bottom of the utilitarian theories of punishment. They are protests against purposeless infliction of pain, against crude ideas of retributive justice, against theories hardly in advance of the low feelings of the popular mind. Therefore, they mark a stage of higher refinement in the evolution of the moral consciousness; and if the principles of determent and reformation are open to objections which will be shared by almost everyone, that is due to other circumstances than their demand that punishment should serve a useful end. As we have seen, they ignore the fact that a punishment, in order to be recognised as just, must not transgress the limits set down by moral disapproval, that it must not be inflicted on innocent persons, that it must be proportioned to the guilt, that offenders who are amenable to discipline must not be treated more severely {90} than incorrigible criminals. These theories also seem to exaggerate the deterring or reforming influence which punishments exercise upon criminals,[92] whilst, in another respect, they take too narrow a view of its social usefulness. Whether its voice inspire fear or not, whether it wake up a sleeping conscience or not, punishment, at all events, tells people in plain terms what, in the opinion of the society, they ought not to do. It gives the multitude a severe lesson in public morality; and it is difficult to see how quite the same effect could be attained by any other method. Retaliation is such a spontaneous expression of indignation, that people would hardly realise the offensiveness of an act which evokes no signs of resentment. Of course, punishment, in the legal sense of the term, is only one form--the most concrete form--of public retaliation; it is, indeed, probable that public opinion exercises a greater influence on men than punishment would do without its aid.[93] But punishment, in combination with public opinion, has no doubt to some extent an educating, and not merely a deterring, influence upon the members of a society. As Sir James Stephen observes, "the sentence of the law is to the moral sentiment of the public in relation to any offence what a seal is to hot wax. It converts into a permanent final judgment what might otherwise be a transient sentiment."[94] finally, it must not be overlooked that the infliction of punishment upon the perpetrator of a grave offence gratifies a strong general desire, and, even though the pain which always accompanies an unsatisfied desire would by itself afford no sufficient justification for subjecting the offence to such intense {91} suffering, other more serious consequences might easily result from leaving him unpunished. The public indignation might find a vent in some less regular and less discriminating mode of retaliation, like lynching; or, on the other hand, by remaining unsatisfied, the desire might dwindle away from want of nourishment, and the moral standard suffer a corresponding loss.

[Footnote 92: On the limited efficiency of punishment as a deterrent, see Ferri, _op. cit._ p. 82 _sq._ On the moral insensibility of the instinctive and habitual criminal, and absence of remorse, see Havelock Ellis, _The Criminal_, p. 124 _sqq._]

[Footnote 93: _Cf._ Locke, _Essay concerning Human Understanding_, ii. 28. 12 (_Philosophical Works_, p. 283); Shaftesbury, 'Inquiry concerning Virtue and Merit,' i. 3. 3, in _Characteristicks_, ii. 64.]

[Footnote 94: Stephen, _History of the Criminal Law of England_, ii. 81. _Cf._ Shaftesbury, _op. cit._ ii. 64: "As to punishments and rewards, their efficacy is not so much from the fear or expectation which they raise, as from a natural esteem of virtue, and detestation of villainy, which is awaken'd and excited by these publick expressions of the approbation and hatred of mankind in each case."]

However, it is not to be believed that, in practice, the infliction of punishment is, or ever will be, regulated merely by considerations of social utility, even within the limits of what is recognised as legitimate by the moral sentiment. The retributive desire is so strong, and appears so natural, that we can neither help obeying it, nor seriously disapprove of its being obeyed. The theory that we have a right to punish an offender only in so far as, by doing so, we promote the general happiness, really serves in the main as a justification for gratifying such a desire, rather than as a foundation for penal practice. Moreover, this theory refers, and pretends to refer, only to outward behaviour--to punishment, not to the emotion from which punishment springs. It condemns the retributive act, not the retributive desire.

But at the same time the aggressive element in the emotion itself has undergone a change, which tends to conceal its true nature by partly leading it into a new channel, or, rather, by narrowing the channel in which it discharges itself. Resentment is directed against the cause of the offence by which it was aroused--broadly speaking, the offender. But when duly reflecting upon the matter, we cannot fail to admit that the real cause was not the offender as a whole, but his will. Deliberate and discriminating resentment is therefore apt to turn against the will rather than against the willer; as we have seen, it is desirous to inflict pain on the offender chiefly as a means of removing the cause of pain suffered, _i.e._, the existence of the bad will. If this is the case with deliberate resentment in general, it must particularly be the case with moral indignation, which is more likely to be {92} influenced by sympathy, and hence more discriminate, than non-moral resentment. This fact gives rise to the moral commandment that we should hate, not the sinner, but the sin. The hostile reaction should be focussed on the will of the offender, and his sensibility should be regarded merely as an instrument through which the will is worked upon. But there is little hope that such a demand can ever be strictly enforced. Professor Sidgwick justly remarks that, though moralists try to distinguish between anger directed "against the act" and anger directed "against the agent," it may be fairly doubted whether it is within the capacity of ordinary human nature to maintain this distinction in practice.[95] The will which offends, and the sensibility which suffers, cannot seriously be looked upon as two different entities the one of which should not be punished for the fault of the other. The person himself is held responsible for the offence. The hostile reaction turns against his will because only by acting upon the will can the cause of pain be removed. But since the remotest ages the aggressive attitude towards this cause has been connected with an instinctive desire to produce counter-pain; and, though we may recognise that such a desire, or rather the volition into which it tends to develop, may be morally justifiable only if it is intended to remove the cause of pain, we can hardly help being indulgent to the gratification of a human instinct which seems to be well nigh ineradicable. It is the instinctive desire to inflict counter-pain that gives to moral indignation its most important characteristic. Without it, moral condemnation and the ideas of right and wrong would never have come into existence. Without it, we should no more condemn a bad man than a poisonous plant. The reason why moral judgments are passed on volitional beings, or their acts, is not merely that they are volitional, but that they are sensitive as well; and however much we try to concentrate our indignation on the act, it derives its peculiar flavour from being directed {93} against a sensitive agent. I have heard persons of a highly sympathetic cast of mind assert that a wrong act awakens in them only sorrow, not indignation; but though sorrow be the predominant element in their state of mind, I believe that, on a close inspection, they would find there another emotion as well, one in which there is immanent an element of hostility, however slight. It is true that the intensity of moral indignation cannot always be measured by the actual desire to cause pain to the offender; but its intensity seems nevertheless to be connected with the amount of suffering which the indignant man is willing to let the offender undergo in consequence of the offence. Which of us could ever, quite apart from any utilitarian considerations, feel the same sympathy with a person who suffers on account of his badness as with one who suffers innocently? It is one of the most interesting facts related to the moral consciousness of a higher type, that it in vain condemns the gratification of the very desire from which it sprang. It is like a man of low extraction, who, in spite of all acquired refinement, bears his origin stamped on his face.

[Footnote 95: Sidgwick, _Methods of Ethics_, p. 364.]

* * * * *

Whilst resentment is a hostile attitude of mind towards a cause of pain, retributive kindly emotion is a friendly attitude of mind towards a cause of pleasure. Just as in the lower forms of anger there is hardly any definite desire to produce suffering, only a vehement desire to remove the cause of pain, so in the lower form of retributive kindly emotion there is hardly any definite desire to produce pleasure, only a friendly endeavour to retain the cause of the pleasure experienced. When the emotion contains a definite desire to give pleasure in return for pleasure received, and at the same time is felt by the favoured party in his capacity of being himself the object of the benefit, it is called gratitude. We often find intermingled with gratitude a feeling of indebtedness; he upon whom a benefit has been conferred feels himself as a debtor, and regards the benefactor as his creditor. This feeling has {94} even been represented as essential to, or as a condition of, gratitude;[96] but it is not implied in what I here understand by gratitude. It is one thing to be grateful, and another thing to feel that it is one's duty to be grateful. A depression of the "self-feeling," a feeling of humiliation, also frequently accompanies gratitude as a motive for requiting the benefit; but it is certainly not an element in gratitude itself.

[Footnote 96: Horwicz, _Psychologische Analysen_, ii. 333: "Ohne dieses Gefühl des Verbundenseins . . . . kann keine Dankbarkeit auskommen." _Cf._ Milton, _Paradise Lost_, iv. 52 _sqq._]

Retributive kindly emotion is a much less frequent phenomenon in the animal kingdom than is the emotion of resentment. In many animal species not even the germ of it is found, and where it occurs it is generally restricted within narrow limits. Anybody may provoke an animal's anger, but only towards certain individuals it is apt to feel retributive kindliness. The limits for this emotion are marked off by the conditions under which altruistic sentiments in general tend to arise--a subject which will be discussed in another connection. Indeed, social affection is itself essentially retributive. Gregarious animals take pleasure in each other's company, and with this pleasure is intimately associated kindly feeling towards its cause, the companion himself. Social affection presupposes reciprocity; it is not only a friendly sentiment towards another individual, but towards an individual who is conceived of as a friend.

The intrinsic object of retributive kindliness being to retain a cause of pleasure, we may assume that the definite desire to produce pleasure in return for pleasure received is due to the fact that such a desire materially promotes the object in question--exactly in the same way as the definite desire to inflict pain in return for pain inflicted has become an element in resentment because such a desire promotes the intrinsic object of resentment, the removal of the cause of pain. And as natural selection accounts for the origin of resentment, so it also accounts for the {95} origin of retributive kindly emotion. Both of these emotions are useful states of mind; by resentment evils are averted, by retributive kindliness benefits are secured. That there is such a wide difference in their prevalence is explicable from the simple facts that gregariousness--which is the root of social affection, and, largely at least, a condition of the rise of retributive kindly emotions--is an advantage only to some species, not to all, and that even gregarious animals have many enemies, but few friends.

In some cases the friendly reaction in retributive kindliness is directed towards individuals who have in no way been the cause of the pleasure which gave rise to the emotion. So intimate is the connection between the stimulus and the reaction, that he who is made happy often feels a general desire to make others happy.[97] But such an indiscriminate reaction is only an offset of the emotion with which we are here concerned. Moreover, retributive kindly emotion often confers benefits upon somebody nearly related to the benefactor, if he himself be out of reach, or in addition to benefits conferred on him. But in such cases the gratitude towards the benefactor is the real motive.

[Footnote 97: That a happy man wants to see glad faces around him, is also due to another cause, which has been pointed out by Dr. Hirn (_Origins of Art_, p. 83): from their expression he wants to derive further nourishment and increase for his own feeling.]

That moral approval--by which I understand that emotion of which moral praise or reward is the outward manifestation--is a kind of retributive kindly emotion and as such allied to gratitude, will probably be admitted without much hesitation.[98] Its friendly character is not, like the hostile character of moral disapproval, disguised by any apparently contradictory facts. To confer a benefit upon a person is not generally regarded as wrong, unless, indeed, it involves an encroachment on somebody's rights or is contrary to the feeling of justice. And that moral approval sometimes bestows its favours upon undeserving {96} individuals for the merits of others, can no more invalidate the fact that it is essentially directed towards the cause of pleasure, than the occasional infliction of punishments upon innocent individuals invalidates the fact that moral disapproval is essentially directed against the cause of pain. Unmerited rewards are explicable on grounds analogous to those to which we have traced unmerited punishments.

[Footnote 98: The relationship between gratitude and moral approval has been recognised by Hartley (_Observations on Man_, i. 520) and Adam Smith (_Theory of Moral Sentiments_, _passim_).]

The doctrine of family solidarity leads, not only to common responsibility for crimes, but to common enjoyment of merits.

In Madagascar, exemption from punishment was claimed by the descendants of persons who had rendered any particular service to the sovereign or the State, as also by other branches of the family, on the same plea.[99] According to Chinese ideas, the virtuous conduct of any individual will result, not only in prosperity to himself, but in a certain quantity of happiness to his posterity, unless indeed the personal wickedness of some of the descendants neutralise the benefits which would otherwise accrue from the virtue of the ancestor;[100] and, conversely, the Chinese Government confers titles of nobility upon the dead parents of a distinguished son.[101] The idea that the dead share in _punya_ or _pâpa_, that is, the merit or demerit of the living, and that the happiness of a man in the next life depends on the good works of his descendants, was early familiar to the civilised natives of India; almost all legal deeds of gift contain the formula that the gift is made "for the increase of the _punya_ of the donor and that of his father and mother."[102]

[Footnote 99: Ellis, _History of Madagascar_, 376.]

[Footnote 100: Giles, _Strange Stories from a Chinese Studio_, i. 426, n. 3; ii. 384, n. 63. Doolittle, _Social Life of the Chinese_, ii. 398.]

[Footnote 101: Giles, _op. cit._ i. 305, n. 6. Wells Williams, _Middle Kingdom_, i. 422.]

[Footnote 102: Barth, _Religions of India_, p. 52, n. 4.]

But the vicarious efficacy of good deeds is not necessarily restricted to the members of the same family.

In a hymn of the Rig-Veda we find the idea that the merits or the pious may benefit their neighbours.[103] According to one of the Pahlavi texts, persons who are wholly unable to perform good works are supposed to be entitled to a share of any supererogatory good works performed by others.[104] The Chinese believe that {97} whole kingdoms are blessed by benevolent spirits for the virtuous conduct of their rulers.[105] Yahveh promised not to destroy Sodom for the sake of ten righteous, provided that so many righteous could be found in the town.[106] The doctrine of vicarious reward or satisfaction through good works is, in fact, more prevalent than the doctrine of vicarious punishment. Jewish theology has a great deal more to say about the acceptance of the merits of the righteous on behalf of the wicked, than about atonement through sacrifice.[107] The Muhammedans, who know nothing of vicarious suffering as a means of expiation, confer merits upon their dead by reciting chapters of the Koran and almsgiving, and some of them allow the pilgrimage to Mecca to be done by proxy.[108] Christian theology itself maintains that salvation depends on the merit of the passion of Christ; and from early times the merits of martyrs and saints were believed to benefit other members of the Church.[109]

[Footnote 103: _Rig-Veda_, vii. 35. 4.]

[Footnote 104: _Dînâ-î-Maînôg-î Khirad_ xv. 3.]

[Footnote 105: de Groot, _Religious System of China_ (vol. iv. book) ii. 435.]

[Footnote 106: _Genesis_, xviii. 32.]

[Footnote 107: Robertson Smith, _Religion of the Semites_, p. 424, n. 1.]

[Footnote 108: Lane, _Modern Egyptians_, pp. 247, 248, 532. Sell, _op. cit._ pp. 242, 278, 287, 288, 298. _Cf._ Wallin, _Första Resa från Cairo till Arabiska öknen_, p. 103.]

[Footnote 109: Harnack, _History of Dogma_, ii. 133, n. 3.]

For the explanation of these and similar facts various circumstances have to be considered. Good deeds may be so pleasing to a god as to induce him to forgive the sins of the wicked in accordance with the rule that anger yields to joy. There is solidarity not only between members of the same family, but between members of the same social unit; hence the virtues of individuals may benefit the whole community to which they belong. The Catholic theologian argues that, since we are all regenerated unto Christ by being washed in the same baptism, made partakers of the same sacraments, and, especially, of the same meat and drink, the body and blood of Christ, we are all members of the same body. "As, then, the foot does not perform its functions solely for itself, but also for the benefit of the eyes; and as the eyes exercise their sight, not for their own, but for the common benefit of all the members; so should works of satisfaction be deemed common to all the members of the {98} Church."[110] Moreover, virtues, like sins, are

believed to be in a material way transferable. In Upper Bavaria, when a dead person is laid out, a cake of flour is placed on his breast in order to absorb the virtues of the deceased, whereupon the cake is eaten by the nearest relatives.[111] And we are told that, in a certain district in the north of England, if a child is brought to the font at the same time as a body is committed to the ground, whatever was "good" in the deceased person is supposed to be transferred to the little child, since God does not allow any "goodness" to be buried and lost to the world, and such "goodness" is most likely to enter a little child coming to the sacrament of Baptism.[112] A blessing, also, no less than a curse, is looked upon in the light of material energy; goodness is not required for the acquisition of it, mere contact will do. Blessings are hereditary:--"The just man walketh in his integrity: his children are blessed after him."[113]

[Footnote 110: _Catechism of the Council of Trent_, ii. 5. 72.]

[Footnote 111: _Am Urquell_, ii. 101.]

[Footnote 112: Peacock, 'Executed Criminals and Folk-Medicine,' in _Folk-Lore_, vii. 280.]

[Footnote 113: _Proverbs_, xx. 7.]

It is no doubt more becoming for a god to pardon the sinner on account of the merits of the virtuous, than to punish the innocent for the sins of the wicked. It shows that his compassion overcomes his wrath; and the mercy of the deity is, among all divine attributes, that on which the higher monotheistic religions lay most stress. Allah said, "Whoso doth one good act, for him are ten rewards, and I also give more to whomsoever I will; and whoso doth ill, its retaliation is equal to it, or else I forgive him."[114] Nevertheless, the moral consciousness of a higher type can hardly approve that the wicked should be pardoned for the sake of the virtuous, or that the reward for an act should be bestowed upon anybody else than the agent. The doctrine of vicarious merit or recompense is not just; it involves that badness is unduly ignored; it is based on crude ideas of goodness and merit. The theory of _opera supererogativa_, as we have seen, attaches badness {99} and goodness to external acts rather than to mental facts, and assumes that reparation can be given for badness, whereas the scrutinising moral judge only forgives badness in case it is superseded by repentance. If thus a bad act cannot be compensated by a good one, even though both be performed by one and the same person, it can still less be compensated by the good act of another man. From various quarters we hear protests against the notion of vicarious merit--protests which emphasise the true direction of moral reward. Ezekiel, who reproved the old idea that the children's teeth are set on edge because the fathers have eaten sour grapes, also taught that a wicked son is to reap no benefit from the blessings bestowed upon a righteous father.[115] "Fear the day," says the Koran, "wherein no soul shall pay any recompense for another soul."[116] The Buddhistic Dhammapada contains the following passage, which sums up our whole argument:--"By oneself the evil is done, by oneself one suffers; by oneself evil is left undone, by oneself one is purified. The pure and the impure stand and fall by themselves, no one can purify another."[117]

[Footnote 114: Lane-Poole, _Speeches and Table-Talk of Mohammad_, p. 147.]

[Footnote 115: _Ezekiel_, xviii. 5 _sqq._]

[Footnote 116: _Koran_, ii. 44.]

[Footnote 117: _Dhammapada_, xii. 165.]

CHAPTER IV

THE NATURE OF THE MORAL EMOTIONS (_concluded_)

WE have seen that moral disapproval is a form of resentment, and that moral approval is a form of retributive kindly emotion. It still remains for us to examine in what respects these emotions differ from kindred non-moral emotions--disapproval from anger and revenge, approval from gratitude--in other words, what characterises them as specifically _moral_ emotions.

It is a common opinion, held by all who regard the intellect as the source of moral concepts, that moral emotions only arise in consequence of moral judgments, and that, in each case, the character of the emotion is determined by the predicate of the judgment. We are told that, when the intellectual process is completed, when the act in question is definitely classed under such or such a moral category, then, and only then, there follows instantaneously a feeling of either approbation or disapprobation as the case may be.[1] When we hear of a murder, for instance, we must discern the wrongness of the act before we can feel moral indignation at it.

[Footnote 1: Fleming, _Manual of Moral Philosophy_, p. 97 _sqq._ Fowler, _Principles of Morals_, ii. 198 _sqq._]

It is true that a moral judgment may be followed by a moral emotion, that the finding out the tendency of a certain mode of conduct to evoke indignation or approval is apt to call forth such an emotion, if there was none before, or otherwise to increase the one existing. It is, moreover, true that the predicate of a moral judgment, as {101} well as the generalisation leading up to such a predicate, may give a specific colouring to the approval or disapproval which it produces, quite apart from the general characteristics belonging to that emotion in its capacity of a moral emotion; the concepts of duty and justice, for instance, no doubt have a peculiar flavour of their own. But for all this, moral emotions cannot be described as resentment or retributive kindliness called forth by moral judgments. Such a definition would be a meaningless play with words. Whatever emotions may follow moral judgments, such judgments could never have been pronounced unless there had been moral emotions antecedent to them. Their predicates, as was pointed out above, are essentially based on generalisations of tendencies in certain phenomena to arouse moral emotions; hence the criterion of a moral emotion can in no case depend upon its proceeding from a moral judgment. But at the same time moral judgments, being definite expressions of moral emotions, naturally help us to discover the true nature of these emotions.

The predicate of a moral judgment always involves a notion of disinterestedness. When pronouncing an act to be good or bad, I mean that it is so, quite independently of any reference it might have to my own interests. A moral judgment may certainly have a selfish motive; but then it, nevertheless, pretends to be disinterested, which shows that disinterestedness is a characteristic of moral concepts as such. This is admitted even by the egoistic hedonist, who maintains that we approve and condemn acts from self-love. According to Helvetius, it is the love of consideration that a virtuous man takes to be in him the love of virtue; and yet everybody pretends to love virtue for its own sake, "this phrase is in every one's mouth and in no one's heart."[2]

[Footnote 2: Helvetius, _De l'Homme_, i. 263.]

If the moral concepts are essentially generalisations of tendencies in certain phenomena to call forth moral emotions, and, at the same time, contain the notion of {102} disinterestedness, we must conclude that the emotions from which they spring are felt disinterestedly. Of this fact we find an echo--more or less faithful--in the maxims of various ethical theorisers, as well as practical moralists. We find it in the utilitarian demand that, in regard to his own happiness and that of others, an agent should be "as strictly impartial as a disinterested and benevolent spectator";[3] in the "rule of righteousness" laid down by Samuel Clarke, that "We so deal with every man, as in like circumstances we could reasonably expect he should with us";[4] in Kant's formula, "Act only on that maxim which thou canst at the same time will to become a universal law";[5] in Professor Sidgwick's so-called axiom, "I ought not to prefer my own lesser good to the greater good of another";[6] in the biblical sayings, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,"[7] and, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."[8] The same fact is expressed in the Indian Mahabharata, where it is said:--"Let no man do to another that which would be repugnant to himself; this is the sum of righteousness; the rest is according to inclination. In refusing, in bestowing, in regard to pleasure and to pain, to what is agreeable and disagreeable, a man obtains the proper rule by regarding the case as like his own."[9] Similar words are ascribed to Confucius.[10] When Tsze-kung asked if there is any one word which may serve as a rule of practice for all one's life, the Master answered, "Is not Reciprocity such a word? What you do not want done to yourself, do not do to {103} others." And in another utterance Confucius showed that the rule had for him not only a negative, but a positive form. He said that, in the way of the superior man, there are four things to none of which he himself had as yet attained; to serve his father as he would require his son to serve him, to serve his prince as he would require his minister to serve him, to serve his elder brother as he would require his younger brother to serve him, and to set the example in behaving to a friend as he would require the friend to behave to him.[11]

[Footnote 3: Stuart Mill, _Utilitarianism_, p. 24.]

[Footnote 4: Clarke, _Discourse concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion_, p. 201.]

[Footnote 5: Kant, _Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten_, sec. 2 (_Sämmtliche Werke_, iv. 269).]

[Footnote 6: Sidgwick, _Methods of Ethics_, p. 383. However, as we have seen above, this so-called "axiom" is not a correct representation of the disinterestedness of moral emotions.]

[Footnote 7: _Leviticus_, xix. 18. _St. Matthew_, xxii. 39.]

[Footnote 8: _St. Matthew_, vii. 12. _Cf._ _St. Luke_, vi. 31.]

[Footnote 9: _Mahabharata_, xiii. 5571 _sq._, in Muir, _Religious and Moral Sentiments, rendered from Sanskrit Writers_, p. 107. _Cf._ _Panchatantra_, iii. (Benfey's translation, ii. 235).]

[Footnote 10: _Lun Yü_, xv. 23. _Cf._ _ibid._ xii. 2; _Chung Yung_, xiii. 3.]

[Footnote 11: _Chung Yung_, xiii. 4.]

This "golden rule" is not, as has been sometimes argued, a rule of retaliation.[12] It does not say, "Do to others what they wish to do to you"; it says, "Do to others what you wish, or require, them to do to you." It brings home to us the fact that moral rules are general rules, which ought to be obeyed irrespectively of any selfish considerations. If formulated as an injunction that we should treat our neighbour in the same manner as we consider that he, under exactly similar circumstances, ought to treat us, it is simply identical with the sentence, "Do your duty," with emphasis laid on the disinterestedness which is involved in the very conception of duty. So far, St. Augustine was right in saying that "Do as thou wouldst be done by" is a sentence which all nations under heaven are agreed upon.[13]

[Footnote 12: Letourneau, _L'évolution religieuse dans les diverses races humaines_, p. 553.]

[Footnote 13: St. Augustine, quoted by Lilly, _Right and Wrong_, p. 106.]

Disinterestedness, however, is not the only characteristic by which moral indignation and approval are distinguished from other, non-moral, kinds of resentment or retributive kindly emotion. It is, indeed, itself a form of a more comprehensive quality which characterises moral emotions--apparent impartiality. If I pronounce an act done to a friend or to an enemy to be either good or bad, that implies that I assume it to be so independently of the fact that the person to whom the act is done is my friend or my enemy. Conversely, if I pronounce an {104} act done by a friend or by an enemy to be good or bad, that implies that I assume the act to be either good or bad independently of my friendly or hostile feelings towards the agent. All this means that resentment and retributive kindly emotion are moral emotions in so far as they are assumed by those who feel them to be uninfluenced by the particular relationship in which they stand, both to those who are immediately affected by the acts in question, and to those who perform those acts. A moral emotion, then, is tested by an imaginary change of the relationship between him who approves or disapproves of the mode of conduct by which the emotion was evoked and the parties immediately concerned, whilst the relationship between the parties themselves is left unaltered. At the same time it is not necessary that the moral emotion should be really impartial. It is sufficient that it is tacitly assumed to be so, nay, even that it is not knowingly partial. In attributing different rights to different individuals, or classes of individuals, we are often, in reality, influenced by the relationship in which we stand to them, by personal sympathies and antipathies; and yet those rights may be moral rights, in the strict sense of the term, not mere preferences, namely, if we assume that any impartial judge would recognise our attribution of rights as just, or even if we are unaware of its partiality. Similarly, when the savage censures a homicide committed upon a member of his own tribe, but praises one committed upon a member of another tribe, his censure and praise are certainly influenced by his relations to the victim, or to the agent, or to both. He does not reason thus: it is blamable to kill a member of one's own tribe, and it is praiseworthy to kill a member of a foreign tribe--whether the tribe be mine or not. Nevertheless, his blame and his praise must be regarded as expressions of moral emotions.

Finally, a moral emotion has a certain flavour of generality. We have previously noticed that a moral judgment very frequently implies some vague assumption {105} that it must be shared by everybody who possesses both a sufficient knowledge of the case and a "sufficiently developed" moral consciousness. We have seen, however, that this assumption is illusory. It cannot, consequently, be regarded as a _conditio sine quâ non_ for a moral judgment, unless, indeed, it be maintained that such a judgment, owing to its very nature, is necessarily a chimera--an opinion which, to my mind, would be simply absurd. But, though moral judgments cannot lay claim to universality or "objectivity," it does not follow that they are merely individual estimates. Even he who fully sees their limitations must admit that, when he pronounces an act to be good or bad, he gives expression to something more than a personal opinion, that his judgment has reference, not only to his own feelings, but to the feelings of others as well. And this is true even though he be aware that his own conviction is not shared by those around him, nor by anybody else. He then feels that it _would be_ shared if other people knew the act and all its attendant circumstances as well as he does himself, and if, at the same time, their emotions were as refined as are his own. This feeling gives to his approval or indignation a touch of generality, which belongs to public approval and public indignation, but which is never found in any merely individual emotion of gratitude or revenge.

* * * * *

The analysis of the moral emotions which has been attempted in this and the two preceding chapters, holds good, not only for such emotions as we feel on account of the conduct of others, but for such emotions as we feel on account of our own conduct as well. Moral self-condemnation is a hostile attitude of mind towards one's self as the cause of pain, moral self-approval is a kindly attitude of mind towards one's self as a cause of pleasure. Genuine remorse, though focussed on the will of the person who feels it, involves, vaguely or distinctly, some desire to suffer. The repentant man wants to think of the wrong he has committed, he wants clearly to realise {106} its wickedness; and he wants to do this, not merely because he desires to become a better man, but because it gives him some relief to feel the sting in his heart. If punished for his deed, he willingly submits to the punishment. The Philippine Islander, says Mr. Foreman, if he recognises a fault by his own conscience, will receive a flogging without resentment or complaint, although, "if he is not so convinced of the misdeed, he will await his chance to give vent to his rancour."[14] We may feel actual hatred towards ourselves, we may desire to inflict bodily suffering upon ourselves as a punishment for what we have done;[15] nay, there are instances of criminals, guilty of capital offences, having given themselves up to the authorities in order to appease their consciences by suffering the penalty of the law.[16] Yet the desire to punish ourselves has a natural antagonist in our general aversion to pain, and this often blunts the sting of the conscience. Suicide prompted by remorse, which sometimes occurs even among savages,[17] is to be regarded rather as a method of putting an end to agonies, than as a kind of self-execution; and behind the self-torments of the sinner frequently lurks the hopeful prospect of heavenly bliss. Self-approval, again, is not merely joy at one's own conduct, but is a kindly emotion, a friendly attitude towards one's self. Such an attitude, for instance, lies at the bottom of the feeling that one's own conduct merits praise or reward.

[Footnote 14: Foreman, _Philippine Islands_, p. 185. _Cf._ Hinde, _The Last of the Masai_, p. 34; Zöller, _Das Togoland_, p. 37.]

[Footnote 15: _Cf._ Jodl, _Lehrbuch der Psychologie_, p. 675.]

[Footnote 16: von Feuerbach, _Aktenmässige Darstellung merkwürdiger Verbrechen_, i. 249; ii. 473, 479 _sq._ von Lasaulx, _Sühnopfer der Griechen und Römer_, p. 6.]

[Footnote 17: See _infra_, on Suicide.]

Not every form of self-reproach or of self-approval is a moral emotion--no more than is every form of resentment or retributive kindly emotion towards other persons. We may be angry with ourselves on account of some act of ours which is injurious to our own interests. He who has lost at play may be as vexed at himself as he who has {107} cheated at play, and the egoist may bitterly reproach himself for having yielded to a momentary impulse of benevolence, or even to conscience itself. In order to be moral emotions, our self-condemnation and self-approval must present the same characteristics as make resentment and retributive kindliness moral emotions when they are felt with reference to the conduct of other people. A person does not feel remorse when he reproaches himself from an egoistic motive, or when he afterwards regrets that he has sacrificed the interests of his children to the impartial claim of justice. Nor does a person feel moral self-approval when he is pleased with himself for having committed an act which he recognises as selfish or unjust. And besides being disinterested and apparently impartial, remorse and moral self-approval have a flavour of generality. As Professor Baldwin remarks, moral approval or disapproval, not only of other people, but of one's self, "is never at its best except when it is accompanied, in the consciousness which has it, with the knowledge or belief that it is also socially shared."[18] Indeed, almost inseparable from the moral judgments which we pass on our own conduct seems to be the image of an impartial outsider who acts as our judge.

[Footnote 18: Baldwin, _Social and Ethical Interpretation in Mental Development_, p. 314.]

CHAPTER V

THE ORIGIN OF THE MORAL EMOTIONS

WE have found that resentment and retributive kindly emotion are easily explicable from their usefulness, both of them having a tendency to promote the interests of the individuals who feel them. This explanation also holds good for the moral emotions, in so far as they are retributive emotions: it accounts for the hostile attitude of moral disapproval towards the cause of pain, and for the friendly attitude of moral approval towards the cause of pleasure. But it still remains for us to discover the origin of those elements in the moral emotions by which they are distinguished from other, non-moral, retributive emotions. First, how shall we explain their disinterestedness?

We have to distinguish between different classes of conditions under which disinterested retributive emotions arise. In the first place, we may feel disinterested resentment, or disinterested retributive kindly emotion, on account of an injury inflicted, or a benefit conferred, upon another person with whose pain, or pleasure, we sympathise, and in whose welfare we take a kindly interest. Our retributive emotions are, of course, always reactions against pain, or pleasure, felt by ourselves; this holds true for the moral emotions as well as for revenge and gratitude. The question to be answered, then, is, Why should we, quite disinterestedly, feel pain calling forth indignation because our neighbour is hurt, and pleasure calling forth approval because he is benefited?

{109} That a certain act causes pleasure or pain to the by-stander is partly due to the close association which exists between these feelings and their outward expressions. The sight of a happy face tends to produce some degree of pleasure in him who sees it; the sight of the bodily signs of suffering tends to produce a feeling of pain. In either case the feeling of the spectator is the result of a process of reproduction, the perception of the physical manifestation of the feeling recalling the feeling itself on account of the established association between them.

Sympathetic pain or pleasure may also be the result of an association between cause and effect, between the cognition of a certain act or situation and the feeling generally produced by this act or situation. A blow may cause pain to the spectator before he has witnessed its effect on the victim. The sympathetic feeling is of course stronger when both kinds of association concur in producing it, than when it is the result of only one. As Adam Smith observes, "general lamentations which express nothing but the anguish of the sufferer, create rather a curiosity to inquire into his situation, along with some disposition to sympathise with him, than any actual sympathy that is very sensible."[1] On the other hand, the sympathy which springs from an association between cause and effect is much enhanced by the perception of outward signs of pleasure or pain in the individual with whom we sympathise.

[Footnote 1: Adam Smith, _Theory of Moral Sentiments_, p. 7.]

But the sympathetic feeling which results from association alone is not what is generally understood by sympathy. Arising merely from the habitual connection of certain cognitions with certain feelings in the experience of the spectator, it is, strictly speaking, not at all concerned with the _feelings_ of the other person. It is not a reflex of what he feels--which, indeed, is a matter of complete indifference--and the activity which it calls forth is thoroughly selfish. If it is a feeling of pain, the spectator naturally, for his own sake, tries to get rid of it; but this {110} may be done by turning the back upon the sufferer, and looking out for some diversion. The sympathetic feeling which springs from association alone, may also produce a benevolent or hostile reaction against its immediate cause: the smiling face often evokes a kindly feeling towards the smiler, and "the sight of suffering often directs irritation against the sufferer."[2] In such cases it is the other person himself, rather than his benefactor or his tormentor, that is regarded as cause by the sympathiser. When based on association alone, the sympathetic feeling thus lacks the most vital characteristic of sympathy, in the popular sense of the term: it lacks kindliness.[3]

[Footnote 2: Leslie Stephen, _Science of Ethics_, p. 243.]

[Footnote 3: The difference between sympathy and kindly ("tender") emotion has been commented upon by Professor Ribot (_Psychology of the Emotions_, p. 233), and by Mr. Shand, in his excellent chapter on the 'Sources of Tender Emotion,' in Stout's _Groundwork of Psychology_, p. 198 _sqq._]

Sympathy, in the ordinary use of the word, requires the co-operation of the altruistic sentiment or affection--a disposition of mind which is particularly apt to display itself as kindly emotion towards other beings. This sentiment,[4] only, induces us to take a kindly interest in the feelings of our neighbours. It involves a tendency, or willingness, and, when strongly developed, gives rise to an eager desire, to sympathise with their pains and pleasures. Under its influence, our sympathetic feeling is no longer a mere matter of association; we take an active part in its production, we direct our attention to any circumstance which we believe may affect the feelings of the person whom we love, to any external manifestation of his emotions. We are anxious to find out his joys and sorrows, so as to be able to rejoice with him and to suffer with him, and, especially, when he stands in need of it, to console or to help him. For the altruistic sentiment is not merely willingness to sympathise; it is above all a conative {111} disposition to do good. The latter aptitude must be regarded rather as the cause than as the result of the former; affection is not, as Adam Smith maintained,[5] merely habitual sympathy, or its necessary consequence. It is true that sympathetic pain, unaided by kindliness, may induce a person to relieve the suffering of his neighbour, instead of shutting his eyes to it; but then he does so, not out of regard to the feelings of the sufferer, but simply to free himself of a painful cognition. Nor must it be supposed that the altruistic sentiment prompts to assistance only by strengthening the sympathetic feeling. The sight of the wounded traveller may have caused no less pain to the Pharisee than to the good Samaritan; yet it would have been impossible for the Samaritan to dismiss his pain by going

away, since he felt a desire to assist the wounded, and his desire would have been left ungratified if he had not stopped by the wayside. To the egoist, the relief offered to the sufferer is a means of suppressing the sympathetic pain; to the altruist, the sympathetic pain is, so to say, a means of giving relief. The altruist wants to know, to feel the pain of his neighbour, because he desires to help him. Why are the most kind-hearted people often the most cheerful, if not because they think of alleviating the misery of their fellow-creatures, instead of indulging in the sympathetic pain which it evokes?

[Footnote 4: I use the word "sentiment" in the sense proposed by Mr. Shand, in his article, 'Character and the Emotions,' in _Mind_, N.S. v. 203 _sqq._, and adopted by Professor Stout, _op. cit._ p. 221 _sqq._ Sentiments cannot be actually felt at any one moment; "they are complex mental dispositions, and may, as divers occasions arise, give birth to the whole gamut of the emotions" (_ibid._ p. 223 _sq._).]

[Footnote 5: Adam Smith, _op. cit._ p. 323.]

It is obvious, then, that sympathy aided by the altruistic sentiment--sympathy in the common sense--tends to produce disinterested retributive emotions. When we to some extent identify, as it were, our feelings with those of our neighbour, we naturally look upon any person who causes him pleasure or pain as the cause of our sympathetic pleasure or pain, and are apt to experience towards that person a retributive emotion similar in kind, if not always in degree, to the emotion which we feel when we are ourselves benefited or injured. In all animal species which possess altruistic sentiments in some form or other, we may be sure to find sympathetic resentment as their accompaniment. {112} A mammalian mother is as hostile to the enemy of her young as to her own enemy. Among social animals whose gregarious instinct has developed into social affection,[6] sympathetic resentment is felt towards the enemy of any member of the group; they mutually defend each other, and this undoubtedly involves some degree of sympathetic anger. With reference to animals in confinement and domesticated animals, many striking instances of this emotion might be quoted, even in cases when injuries have been inflicted on members of different species to which they have become attached. Professor Romanes' terrier, "whenever or wherever he saw a man striking a dog, whether in the house, or outside, near at hand or at a distance, ... used to rush in to interfere, snarling and snapping in a most threatening way."[7] Darwin makes mention of a little American monkey in the Zoological Gardens of London which, when seeing a great baboon attack his friend, the keeper, rushed to the rescue and by screams and bites so distracted the baboon, that the man was able to escape.[8] The dog who flies at any one who strikes, or even touches, his master, is a very familiar instance of sympathetic resentment. The Rev. Charles Williams mentions a dog at Liverpool who saved a cat from the hands of some young ruffians who were maltreating it: he rushed in among the boys, barked furiously at them, terrified them into flight, and carried the cat off in his mouth, bleeding and almost senseless, to his kennel, where he laid it on the straw, and nursed it.[9] In man, sympathetic resentment begins at an early age. Professor Sully mentions a little boy under four who was indignant at any picture where an animal suffered.[10]

[Footnote 6: The connection between social affection and the gregarious instinct will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.]

[Footnote 7: Romanes, _Animal Intelligence_, p. 440.]

[Footnote 8: Darwin, _Descent of Man_, p. 103. _Cf._ Fisher, in _Revue Scientifique_, xxxiii. 618. A curious instance of a terrier "avenging" the death of another terrier, his inseparable friend, is mentioned by Captain Medwin (_Angler in Wales_, ii. 162-164, 197, 216 _sq._).]

[Footnote 9: Williams, _Dogs and their Ways_, p. 43.]

[Footnote 10: Sully, _Studies of Childhood_, p. 250.]

The altruistic sentiments of mankind will be treated at {113} length in subsequent chapters. We shall find reason to believe that not only maternal, but to some extent, paternal and conjugal affection, prevailed in the human race from ancient times, and that social affection arose in those days when the conditions of life became favourable to an expansion of the early family, when the chief obstacle to a gregarious life--scarcity of food--was overcome, and sociality, being an advantage to man, became his habit. There are still savages who live in families rather than in tribes, but we know of no people among whom social organisation outside the family is totally wanting. Later discoveries only tend to confirm Darwin's statement that, though single families or only two or three together, roam the solitudes of some savage lands, they always hold friendly relations with other families inhabiting the same district; such families occasionally meeting in council and uniting for their common defence.[11] But as a general rule, to which there are few exceptions, the lower races live in communities larger than family groups, and all the members of the community are united with one another by common interests and common feelings. Of the harmony, mutual good-will, and sense of solidarity,

which under normal conditions prevail in these societies, much evidence will be adduced in following pages. Mr. Melville's remark with reference to some Marquesas cannibals may be quoted as to some extent typical. "With them," he says, "there hardly appeared to be any difference of opinion upon any subject whatever. . . . They showed this spirit of unanimity in every action of life: everything was done in concert and good fellowship."[12] When a member of the group is hurt, the feeling of unanimity takes the form of public resentment. As Robertson observed long ago, "in small communities, every man is touched with the injury or affront offered to the body of which he is a member, as if it were a personal attack upon his own honour or safety. The desire of revenge is communicated from breast to breast, {114} and soon kindles into rage."[13] Speaking of some Australian savages, Mr. Fison remarks:--"To the savage, the whole gens is the individual, and he is full of regard for it. Strike the gens anywhere, and every member of it considers himself struck, and the whole body corporate rises up in arms against the striker."[14] Nobody will deny that there is a disinterested element in this public resentment, even though every member of the group consider the enemy of any other member to be actually his own enemy as well, and, partly, hate him as such.

[Footnote 11: Darwin, _op. cit._ p. 108.]

[Footnote 12: Melville, _Typee_, p. 297 _sq._]

[Footnote 13: Robertson, _History of America_, i. 350. _Cf._ Clifford's theory of the "tribal self" (_Lectures and Essays_, p. 290 _sqq._). He says (_ibid._ p. 291), "The savage is not only hurt when anybody treads on his foot, but when anybody treads on his tribe."]

[Footnote 14: Fison and Howitt, _Kamilaroi and Kurnai_, p. 170.]

Our explanation of what has here been called "sympathetic resentment," however, is not yet complete. This emotion, as we have seen, may be a reaction against sympathetic pain; but it may also be directly produced by the cognition of the signs of anger. In the former case it is, strictly speaking, independent of the _emotion_ of the injured individual; we may feel resentment on his behalf though he himself feels none. In the latter case it is a reflected emotion, felt independently of the cause of the original emotion of which it is a reflection--as when the yells and shrieks of a street dog-fight are heard, and dogs from all sides rush to the spot, each dog being apparently ready to bite any of the others. In the former case, it is, by the medium of sympathetic pain, closely connected with the inflicted injury; in the latter case it may even be the reflection of an emotion which is itself sympathetic, and the origin of which is perhaps out of sight. In an infuriated crowd the one gets angry because the other is angry, and very often the question, Why? is hardly asked. This form of sympathetic resentment is of considerable importance both as an originator and as a communicator of moral ideas. To teach that a certain act is wrong is to teach that it is an object, and a proper object, of moral indignation, and the aim of the instructor {115} is to inspire a similar indignation in the mind of the pupil. An intelligent teacher tries to attain this end by representing the act in such a light as to evoke disapproval independently of any appeal to authority; but, unfortunately, in many cases where the duties of current morality are to be enjoined, he cannot do so--for a very obvious reason. Of various acts which, though inoffensive by themselves, are considered wrong, he can say little more than that they are forbidden by God and man; and if, nevertheless, such acts are not only professed, but actually felt, to be wrong, that is due to the fact that men are inclined to sympathise with the resentment of persons for whom they feel regard. It is this fact that accounts for the connection between the punishment of an act and the consequent idea that it deserves to be punished. We shall see that the punishment which society inflicts is, as a rule, an expression of its moral indignation; but there are instances in which the order is reversed, and in which human, or, as it may be supposed, divine, punishment or anger is the cause, and moral disapproval the effect. Children, as everybody knows, grow up with their ideas of right and wrong graduated, to a great extent, according to the temper of the father or mother;[15] and men are not seldom, as Hobbes said, "like little children, that have no other rule of good and evill manners, but the correction they receive from their Parents, and Masters."[16] The case is the same with any outbreak of public resentment, with any punishment inflicted by society at large. However selfish it may be in its origin, to whatever extent it may spring from personal motives, it always has a tendency to become in some degree disinterested, each individual not only being angry on his own behalf, but at the same time reflecting the anger of everybody else.

[Footnote 15: _Cf._ Baring-Gould, _Origin and Developwent of Religious Belief_, i. 212.]

[Footnote 16: Hobbes, _Leviathan_, i. 2, p. 76.]

Any means of expressing resentment may serve as a communicator of the emotion. Besides punishment, language deserves special mention. Moral disapproval may {116} be evoked by the very sounds of certain words, like "murder," "theft," "cowardice," and others, which not merely indicate the commission of certain acts, but also express the opprobrium attached to them. By being

called a "liar," a person is more disgraced than by any plain statement of his untruthfulness; and by the use of some strong word the orator raises the indignation of a sympathetic audience to its pitch.

All the cases of disinterested resentment which we have hitherto considered fall under the heading of sympathetic resentment. But there are other cases into which sympathy does not enter at all. Resentment is not always caused by the infliction of an injury; it may be called forth by any feeling of pain traceable to a living being as its direct or indirect cause. Quite apart from our sympathy with the sufferings of others, there are many cases in which we feel hostile towards a person on account of some act of his which in no way interferes with our interests, which conflicts with no self-regarding feeling of ours. There are in the human mind what Professor Bain calls "disinterested antipathies," sentimental aversions "of which our fellow-beings are the subjects, and on account of which we overlook our own interest quite as much as in displaying our sympathies and affections."[17] Differences of taste, habit, and opinion, are particularly apt to create similar dislikes, which, as will be seen, have played a very prominent part in the moulding of the moral consciousness. When a certain act, though harmless by itself (apart from the painful impression it makes upon the spectator), fills us with disgust or horror, we may feel no less inclined to inflict harm upon the agent, than if he had committed an offence against person, property, or good name. And here, again, our resentment is sympathetically increased by our observing a similar disgust in others. We are easily affected by the aversions and likings of our neighbours. As Tucker said, "we grow to love things we perceive {117} them fond of, and contract aversions from their dislikes."[18]

[Footnote 17: Bain, _Emotions and the Will_, p. 268.]

[Footnote 18: Tucker, _Light of Nature Pursued_, i. 154.]

We have already seen that sympathy springing from an altruistic sentiment may produce, not only disinterested resentment, but disinterested retributive kindly emotion as well. When taking a pleasure in the benefit bestowed on our neighbour, we naturally look with kindness upon the benefactor; and just as sympathetic resentment may be produced by the cognition of the outward signs of resentment, so sympathetic retributive kindly emotion may be produced by the signs of retributive kindliness. Language communicates emotions by terms of praise, as well as by terms of condemnation; and a reward, like a punishment, tends to reproduce the emotion from which it sprang. Moreover, men have disinterested likings, as they have disinterested dislikes. As an instance of such likings may be mentioned the common admiration of courage when felt irrespectively of the object for which it is displayed.

Having thus found the origin of disinterested retributive emotions, we have at the same time partly explained the origin of the moral emotions. But, as we have seen, disinterestedness is not the sole characteristic by which moral indignation and approval are distinguished from other retributive emotions: a moral emotion is assumed to be impartial, or, at least, is not knowingly partial, and it is coloured by the feeling of being publicly shared. However, the real problem which we have now to solve is not how retributive emotions may become apparently impartial and be coloured by a feeling of generality, but why disinterestedness, apparent impartiality, and the flavour of generality have become characteristics by which so-called moral emotions are distinguished from other retributive emotions. The solution of this problem lies in the fact that society is the birthplace of the moral consciousness; that the first moral judgments expressed, not the private emotions of isolated individuals, but emotions which were {118} felt by the society at large; that tribal custom was the earliest rule of duty.

Customs have been defined as public habits, as the habits of a certain circle, a racial or national community, a rank or class of society. But whilst being a habit, custom is at the same time something else as well. It not merely involves a frequent repetition of a certain mode of conduct, it is also a rule of conduct. As Cicero observes, the customs of a people "are precepts in themselves."[19] We say that "custom commands," or "custom demands," and speak of it as "strict" and "inexorable"; and even when custom simply allows the commission of a certain class of actions, it implicitly lays down the rule that such actions are not to be interfered with.

[Footnote 19: Cicero, _De Officiis_, i. 41.]

The rule of custom is conceived of as a moral rule, which decides what is right and wrong.[20] "Les loix de la conscience," says Montaigne, "que nous disons naistre de nature, naissent de la coustume."[21] Mr. Howitt once said to a young Australian native with whom he was speaking about the food prohibited during initiation, "But if you were hungry and caught a female opossum, you might eat it if the old men were not there." The youth replied, "I could not do that; it would not be right"; and he could give no other reason than that it would be wrong to disregard the customs of his people.[22] Mr. Bernau says of the British Guiana Indians:--"Their moral sense of good and evil is entirely regulated by the customs and practices inherited from their forefathers. What their predecessors believed and did must have been right, and they deem it the height of presumption to suppose that any

could think and act otherwise."[23] The moral evil of the pagan Greenlanders "was all that was contrary to laws and customs, as {119} regulated by the angakoks," and when the Danish missionaries tried to make them acquainted with their own moral conceptions, the result was that they "conceived the idea of virtue and sin as what was pleasing or displeasing to Europeans, as according or disaccording with their customs and laws."[24] "The Africans, like most heathens," Mr. Rowley observes, "do not regard sin, according to their idea of sin, as an offence against God, but simply as a transgression of the laws and customs of their country."[25] The Ba-Ronga call derogations of universally recognised custom _yila_, prohibited, tabooed.[26] The Bedouins of the Euphrates "make no appeal to conscience or the will of God in their distinctions between right and wrong, but appeal only to custom."[27] According to the laws of Manu, the custom handed down in regular succession since time immemorial "is called the conduct of virtuous men."[28] The Greek idea of the customary, [Greek: to\ no/mimon], shows the close connection between morality and custom; and so do the words [Greek: e)/thos, ê)/thos], and [Greek: e)thika/], the Latin _mos_ and _moralis_, the German _Sitte_ and _Sittlichkeit_.[29] Moreover, in early society, customs are not only moral rules, but the only moral rules ever thought of. The savage strictly complies with the Hegelian command that no man must have a private conscience. The following statement, which refers to the Tinnevelly Shanars, may be quoted as a typical example:--"Solitary individuals amongst them rarely adopt any new opinions, or any new course of procedure. They follow the multitude to do evil, and they follow the multitude to do good. They think in herds."[30]

[Footnote 20: _Cf._ Austin, _Lectures on Jurisprudence_, i. 104; Tönnies, 'Philosophical Terminology,' in _Mind_, N.S., viii. 304. Von Jhering (_Zweck im Recht_, ii. 23) defines the German _Sitte_ as "die im Leben des Volks sich bildende verpflichtende Gewohnheit"; and a similar view is expressed by Wundt (_Ethik_, p. 128 _sq._).]

[Footnote 21: Montaigne, _Essais_, i. 22 (_[OE]uvres_, p. 48).]

[Footnote 22: Fison and Howitt, _op. cit._ p. 256 _sq._]

[Footnote 23: Bernau, _Missionary Labours in British Guiana_, p. 60.]

[Footnote 24: Rink, _Greenland_, p. 201 _sq._]

[Footnote 25: Rowley, _Religion of the Africans_, p. 44.]

[Footnote 26: Junod, _Ba-Ronga_, p. 477.]

[Footnote 27: Blunt, _Bedouin Tribes of the Euphrates_, ii. 224.]

[Footnote 28: _Laws of Manu_, ii. 18.]

[Footnote 29: For the history of these words, see Wundt, _op. cit._ p. 19 _sqq._ For other instances illustrating the moral character of custom, see Maclean, _Compendium of Kafir Law and Customs_, p. 34 (Amaxosa); Macpherson, _Memorials of Service in India_, p. 94 (Kandhs); Kubary, _Ethnographische Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Karolinischen Inselgruppe_, i. 73 (Pelew Islanders); Smith, _Chinese Characteristics_, p. 119.]

[Footnote 30: Caldwell, _Tinnevelly Shanars_, p. 69.]

Disobedience to custom evokes public indignation. In {120} the lower stages of civilisation, especially, custom is a tyrant who binds man in iron fetters, and who threatens the transgressor, not only with general disgrace, but often with bodily suffering. "To believe that man in a savage state is endowed with freedom either of thought or action," says Sir G. Grey, "is erroneous in the highest degree";[31] and this statement is corroborated by an array of facts from all quarters of the savage world.[32] Now, as the rule of custom is a moral rule, the indignation aroused by its transgression is naturally a moral emotion. Moreover, where all the duties incumbent on a man are expressed in the customs of the society to which he belongs, it is obvious that the characteristics of moral indignation are to be sought for in its connection with custom. The most salient feature of custom is its generality. Its transgression calls forth public indignation; hence the flavour of generality which characterises moral disapproval. Custom is fixed once for all, and takes no notice of the preferences of individuals. By recognising the validity of a custom, I implicitly admit that the custom is equally binding for me and for you and for all the other members of the society. This involves disinterestedness; I admit that a breach of the custom is equally wrong whether I myself am immediately concerned in the act or not. It also involves apparent impartiality; I assume that my condemnation of the act is independent of the relationship in which the parties concerned in it stand to me personally, or, at least, I am not aware that my condemnation is influenced by any {121} such relationship. And this holds good whatever be the origin of the custom. Though customs are very frequently rooted in public sympathetic resentment or in

public disinterested aversions, they may have a selfish and partial origin as well. At first the leading men of the society may have prohibited certain acts because they found them disadvantageous to themselves, or to those with whom they particularly sympathised. Where custom is an oppressor of women, this oppression may certainly be traced back to the selfishness of men. Where custom sanctions slavery, it is certainly not impartial to the slaves. Yet in the one case as in the other, I assume custom to be in the right, irrespectively of my own station, and I even expect the women and slaves themselves to be of the same opinion. Such an expectation is by no means a chimera. Under normal social conditions, largely owing to men's tendency to share sympathetically the resentment of their superiors, the customs of a society are willingly submitted to, and recognised as right, by the large majority of its members, whatever may be their station. Among the Rejangs of Sumatra, says Marsden, "a man without property, family, or connections, never, in the partiality of self-love, considers his own life as being of equal value with that of a man of substance."[33] However selfish, however partial a certain rule may be, it becomes a true custom, a moral rule, as soon as the selfishness or the partiality of its makers is lost sight of.

[Footnote 31: Grey, _Journals of Expeditions in North-West and Western Australia_, ii. 217.]

[Footnote 32: Tylor, 'Primitive Society,' in _Contemporary Review_, xxi. 706. _Idem_, _Anthropology_, p. 408 _sq._ Avebury, _Origin of Civilisation_, p. 466 _sqq._ Eyre, _Journals of Expeditions into Central Australia_, ii. 384, 385, 388. Curr, _The Australian Race_, i. 51. Mathew, 'Australian Aborigines,' in _Jour. and Proceed. Roy. Soc. N.S. Wales_, xxiii. 398. _Idem_, _Eaglehawk and Crow_, p. 93. Taplin, 'Narrinyeri,' in Woods, _Native Tribes of South Australia_, pp. 35, 136 _sq._ Hawtrey, 'Lengua Indians of the Paraguayan Chaco,' in _Jour. Anthr. Inst._ xxxi. 292. Murdoch, 'Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition,' in _Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethn._ ix. 427 _sq._ (Point Barrow Eskimo). Holm, 'Ethnologisk Skizze af Angmagsalikerne,' in _Meddelelser om Grönland_, x. 85. Nansen, _First Crossing of Greenland_, ii. 295. Johnston, _British Central Africa_, p. 452. New, _Life, Wanderings, and Labours in Eastern Africa_, p. 110 (Wanika). Scott Robertson, _Káfirs of the Hindu-Kush_, p. 183 _sq._]

[Footnote 33: Marsden, _History of Sumatra_, p. 247.]

It will perhaps be argued that, by deriving the characteristics of moral indignation from its connection with custom, we implicitly contradict our initial assumption that moral emotions lie at the bottom of all moral judgments. But it is not so. Custom is a moral rule only on account of the indignation called forth by its transgression. In its ethical aspect it is nothing but a generalisation of emotional tendencies, applied to certain modes of conduct, and transmitted from generation to generation. Public indignation lies at the bottom of it. In its capacity {122} of a rule of duty, custom, _mos_, is derived from the emotion to which it gave its name.

As public indignation is the prototype of moral disapproval, so public approval, expressed in public praise, is the prototype of moral approval. Like public indignation, public approval is characterised by a flavour of generality, by disinterestedness, by apparent impartiality. But of these two emotions public indignation, being at the root of custom and leading to the infliction of punishment, is by far the more impressive. Hence it is not surprising that the term "moral" is etymologically connected with _mos_, which always implies the existence of a social rule the transgression of which evokes public indignation. Only by analogy it has come to be applied to the emotion of approval as well.

Though taking their place in the system of human emotions as public emotions felt by the society at large, moral disapproval and approval have not always remained inseparably connected with the feelings of any special society. The unanimity of opinion which originally characterised the members of the same social unit was disturbed by its advancement in civilisation. Individuals arose who found fault with the moral ideas prevalent in the community to which they belonged, criticising those ideas on the basis of their own individual feelings. Such rebels are certainly no less justified in speaking in the name of morality true and proper, than is society itself. The emotions from which their opposition against public opinion springs may be, in nature, exactly similar to the approval or disapproval felt by the society at large, though they are called forth by different facts or, otherwise, differ from these emotions in degree. They may present the same disinterestedness and apparent impartiality--indeed, dissent from the established moral ideas largely rises from the conviction that the apparent impartiality of public feelings is an illusion. As will be seen, the evolution of the moral consciousness involves a progress in impartiality and justice; it tends towards an equalisation {123} of rights, towards an expansion of the circle within which the same moral rules are held applicable; and this process is in no small degree effected by the efforts made by high-minded individuals to raise public opinion to their own standard of right. Nay, as we have already noticed, individual moral feelings do not even lack that flavour of generality which characterises the resentment and approval felt unanimously by a body of men. Though, perhaps, persecuted by his own people as an outcast, the moral dissenter does not regard himself as the advocate of a mere private opinion.[34] Even when standing alone, he feels that his conviction is shared at least by an ideal society, by all those who see the matter as clearly as he does himself, and who are animated with equally wide

sympathies, an equally broad sense of justice. Thus the moral emotions remain to the last public emotions--if not in reality, then as an ideal.

[Footnote 34: _Cf._ Pollock, _Essays in Jurisprudence and Ethics_, p. 309.]

The fact that the earliest moral emotions were public emotions implies that the original form of the moral consciousness cannot, as is often asserted, have been the individual's own conscience. Dr. Martineau's observation, that the inner springs of other men's actions may be read off only by inference from our own experience, by no means warrants his conclusion that the moral consciousness is at its origin engaged in self-estimation, instead of circuitously reaching this end through a prior critique upon our fellow-men.[35] The moral element which may be contained in the emotion of self-reproach or self-approval, is generally to such an extent mixed up with other and non-moral elements, that it can be disentangled only by a careful process of abstraction, guided by the feelings of other people with reference to our conduct or by our own feelings with reference to the conduct of others. The moral emotion of remorse presupposes some notion of right and wrong, and the application of this notion to one's own conduct. Hence it could never have {124} been distinguished as a special form of, or element in, the wider emotion of self-reproach, unless the idea of morality had been previously derived from another source. The similarity between regret and remorse is so close, that in certain European languages there is only one word for both.[36]

[Footnote 35: Martineau, _Types of Ethical Theory_, ii. 29 _sqq._]

[Footnote 36: As, in Swedish, the word _ånger_.]

* * * * *

From what has been said above it is obvious that moral resentment is of extreme antiquity in the human race, nay, that the germ of it is found even in the lower animal world, among social animals capable of feeling sympathetic resentment. The origin of custom as a moral rule no doubt lies in a very remote period of human history. We have no knowledge of a savage people without customs, and, as will be seen subsequently, savages often express their indignation in a very unmistakable manner when their customs are transgressed. Various data prove that the lower races have some feeling of justice, the flower of all moral feelings. And the supposition that remorse is unknown among them,[37] is not only unfounded, but contradicted by facts. Indeed, genuine remorse is so hidden an emotion even among ourselves, that it cannot be expected to be very conspicuous among savages. As we have seen, it requires a certain power of abstraction, as well as great impartiality of feeling, and must therefore be sought for at the highest reaches of the moral consciousness rather than at its lowest degrees. But to suppose that savages are entirely without a conscience is quite contrary to what we may infer from the great regard in which they hold their customs, as also contrary to the direct statements of travellers who have taken some pains to examine the matter. The answer given by the young Australian when asked by Mr. Howitt whether he might not eat a female opossum if the old men were not present,[38] certainly indicates conscientious respect for a moral rule, and is, as Mr. Fison observes, "a striking instance of that 'moral {125} feeling' which Sir John Lubbock denies to savages."[39] Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden asserts that, among the people whom he had in his service, he found the Negroes, in their sense of duty, not inferior, but rather superior to the Europeans.[40] Mr. New says of the Wanika:--"Conscience lives in them as the vicegerent of Almighty God, and is ever excusing or else accusing them. It may be blunted, hardened, resisted, and largely suppressed, but there it is."[41] M. Arbousset once desired some Bechuanas to tell him whether the blacks had a conscience. "Yes, all have one," they said in reply. "And what does it say to them?" "It is quiet when they do well and torments them when they sin." "What do you call sin?" "The theft, which is committed trembling, and the murder from which a man purifies and re-purifies himself, but which always leaves remorse."[42] Mr. Washington Matthews refers to a passage in a Navaho story which "shows us that he who composed this tale knew what the pangs of remorse might be, even for an act not criminal, as we consider it, but merely ungenerous and unfilial."[43]

[Footnote 37: Avebury, _Origin of Civilisation_, pp. 421, 426.]

[Footnote 38: See _supra_, p. 118.]

[Footnote 39: Fison and Howitt, _op. cit._ p. 257 n.]

[Footnote 40: Hübbe-Schleiden, _Ethiopien_, p. 184 _sq._]

[Footnote 41: New, _op. cit._ p. 96.]

[Footnote 42: Arbousset and Daumas, _Exploratory Tour to the North-East of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope_, p. 322.]

[Footnote 43: Matthews, 'Study of Ethics among the Lower Races,' in _Journal of American Folk-Lore_, xii. 7.]

A different opinion as to the existence of moral feelings among savages has been expressed by Lord Avebury. To him even modern savages seem to be "almost entirely wanting in moral feeling"; and he says that he has "been forced to this conclusion, not only by the direct statements of travelers but by the general tenor of their remarks, and especially by the remarkable absence of repentance and remorse among the lower races of men."[44] The importance of the subject renders {126} it necessary to scrutinise the facts which Lord Avebury has adduced in support of his conclusion.

[Footnote 44: Avebury, _op. cit._ pp. 414, 426. Lord Avebury quotes Burton's statement that in Eastern Africa, as also among the Yoruba negroes, conscience does not exist, and that "repentance" expresses regret for missed opportunities of mortal crime. Speaking of the stage of savagery represented by the Bakaïri, Dr. von den Steinen likewise observes (_Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens_, p. 351), "Goodness and badness exist only in the crude sense of doing to others what is agreeable or disagreeable, but the moral consciousness, and the ideal initiative, influenced neither by prospect of reward nor fear of punishment, are entirely lacking." Lippert maintains (_Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit_, i. 27) "dass sich das Gewissen beim Naturmenschen nicht als 'Selbsttadel,' sondern nur als Furcht zeigt."]

Mr. Neighbors states that, among the Comanches of Texas, "no individual action is considered a crime, but every man acts for himself according to his own judgment, unless some superior power--for instance, that of a popular chief--should exercise authority over him." Another writer says, "The Redskin has no moral sense whatever." Among the Basutos, according to Casalis, morality "depends so entirely upon social order that all political disorganisation is immediately followed by a state of degeneracy, which the re-establishment of order alone can rectify." Similar accounts are given as regards Central Africa and some other places. Thus at Jenna, and in the surrounding districts, "whenever a town is deprived of its chief, the inhabitants acknowledge no law--anarchy, troubles, and confusion immediately prevail, and till a successor is appointed all labour is at an end." The Damaras "seem to have no perceptible notion of right or wrong." The Tasmanians were "without any moral views and impressions." Eyre says of the Australians that they have "no moral sense of what is just and equitable in the abstract"; and a missionary had very great difficulty in conveying to those natives any idea of sin. The Kacharis had "in their own language no words for sin, for piety, for prayer, for repentance"; and of another of the aboriginal tribes of India Mr. Campbell remarks that they "are . . . said to be without moral sense." Lord Avebury in this connection even quotes a statement to the effect that the expressions which the Tonga Islanders have for ideas like vice and injustice "are equally applicable to other things." The South American Indians of the Gran Chaco are said by the missionaries to "make no distinction between right and wrong, and have therefore neither fear nor hope of any present or future punishment or reward, nor any mysterious terror of some supernatural power." Finally, Lord Avebury observes that religion, except in the more advanced races, has no moral aspect or influence, that the deities are almost invariably regarded as evil, and that the belief in a future state is not at first associated with reward or punishment.[45]

[Footnote 45: Avebury, _op. cit._ p. 417 _sqq._]

Many of the facts referred to by Lord Avebury do not at all presuppose the absence of moral feelings. It is difficult to see why the malevolence of gods should prevent men from having notions of right and wrong, and we know from the Old Testament itself that there may be a moral law without Paradise {127} and Hell. The statement concerning the Comanches only implies that, among them, individual freedom is great; whilst the social disorder which prevails among various peoples at times of political disorganisation indicates that the cohesiveness of the political aggregate is weak, as well as a certain discrepancy between moral ideas and moral practice. In Morocco, also, the death of a Sultan is immediately followed by almost perfect anarchy, and yet the people recognise both the moral tenets of the Koran and the still more stringent tenets of their ancient customs. As to the Basutos, Casalis expressly states that they have the idea of moral evil, and represent it in their language by words which mean ugliness, or damage, or debt, or incapacity;[46] and M. Arbousset once heard a Basuto say, on an unjust judgment being pronounced, "The judge is powerful, therefore we must be silent; if he were weak, we should all cry out about his injustice."[47] Moreover, a people may be unconscious of what is just "in the abstract," and of moral "notions," in the strict sense of the term, and at the same time, in concrete cases, distinguish between right and wrong, just and unjust. Of the Western Australians, Mr. Chauncy expressly says that they have a keen sense of justice, and mentions an instance of it;[48] whilst our latest authorities on the Central Australians observe that, though their moral code differs radically from ours, "it cannot be denied that their conduct is governed by it, and that any known breaches are dealt with both surely and severely."[49] As regards the Tonga Islanders, Mariner states that "their ideas of honour and justice do not very much differ from ours except in degree, they considering some things more honourable than we should, and others much less so"; and in another place he says that "the notions of the Tonga people, in respect to honour and

justice . . . are tolerably well defined, steady and universal," though not always acted upon.[50] The statement that the American Indians have "no moral sense whatever," sounds very strange when compared with what is known about their social and moral life; Buchanan, for instance, asserts that they "have a strong innate sense of justice."[51] Of course, there may be diversity of opinion as to what constitutes the "moral sense"; if the conception of sin or other theological notions are regarded as essential to it, it is probably {128} wanting in a large portion of mankind, and not only in the least civilised. When missionaries or travellers deny to certain savages moral feelings and ideas, they seem chiefly to mean feelings or ideas similar to their own.

[Footnote 46: Casalis, _Basutos_, p. 304.]

[Footnote 47: Arbousset and Daumas, _op. cit._ p. 389.]

[Footnote 48: Brough Smyth, _Aborigines of Victoria_, ii. 228.]

[Footnote 49: Spencer and Gillen, _Native Tribes of Central Australia_, p. 46.]

[Footnote 50: Mariner, _Natives of the Tonga Islands_, ii. 159, 163.]

[Footnote 51: Buchanan, _Sketches of the History, &c., of the North American Indians_, p. 158.]

Of many savage and barbarous peoples it is directly affirmed that they have a sense of justice. Mr. Man says concerning the Andaman Islanders, "Certain traits which have been noticeable in their dealings with us would give colour to the belief that they are not altogether lacking in the sense of honour, and have some faint idea of the meaning of justice."[52] Colonel Dalton states that, among the Korwás on the highlands of Sirgúja, when several persons are implicated in one offence, he has found them "most anxious that to each should be ascribed his fair share of it, and no more, the oldest of the party invariably taking on himself the chief responsibility as leader or instigator, and doing his utmost to exculpate as unaccountable agents the young members of the gang."[53] The Aleuts, according to Veniaminof, are "naturally inclined to be just," and feel deeply undeserved injuries.[54] Kolben, who is nowadays recognised as a good authority,[55] wrote of the Hottentots, "The strictness and celerity of the Hottentot justice are things in which they outshine all Christendom."[56] Missionaries have wondered that, among the Zulus, "in the absence for ages of all revealed truth and all proper religious instruction, there should still remain so much of mental integrity, so much ability to discern truth and justice, and withal so much regard for these principles in their daily intercourse with one another."[57] Zöller ascribes to the Negro a well-developed feeling of justice. "No European," he says, "at least no European child, could discriminate so keenly between just and unjust punishment."[58] Mr. Hinde observes:--"One of the most marked characteristics of black people is their keen perception of justice. They do not resent merited punishment where it is coupled with justice upon other matters. The Masai have their sense of justice particularly strongly developed."[59] Dieffenbach writes of the Maoris, "There is a high natural sense of justice amongst them; {129} and it is from us that they have learnt that many forbidden things can be done with impunity, if they can only be kept secret."[60] Justice is a virtue which always commands respect among the Bedouins, and "injustice on the part of those in power is almost impossible. Public opinion at once asserts itself; and the Sheykh, who should attempt to override the law, would speedily find himself deserted."[61]

[Footnote 52: Man, in _Jour. Anthr. Inst._ xii. 92.]

[Footnote 53: Dalton, _Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal_, p. 230.]

[Footnote 54: Veniaminof, quoted by Dall, _Alaska_, p. 398.]

[Footnote 55: Theophilus Hahn remarks (_The Supreme Being of the Khoi-Khoi_, p. 40) that Kolben's reports have been doubted by European writers without any good reason.]

[Footnote 56: Kolben, _Present State of the Cape of Good Hope_, i. 301. _Cf._ _ibid._ i. 339.]

[Footnote 57: Quoted by Tyler, _Forty Years among the Zulus_, p. 197.]

[Footnote 58: Zöller, _Kamerun_, ii. 92. _Cf._ _Idem_, _Das Togoland_, p. 37.]

[Footnote 59: Hinde, _The Last of the Masai_, p. 34. _Cf._ Foreman, _Philippine Islands_, p. 185.]

[Footnote 60: Dieffenbach, _Travels in New Zealand_, ii. 106.]

[Footnote 61: Blunt, _Bedouin Tribes of the Euphrates_, ii. 224 _sqq._]

Much less conspicuous than the emotion of public resentment is the emotion of public approval. These public emotions are largely of a sympathetic character, and, whilst a tendency to sympathetic resentment is always involved in the sentiment of social affection, a tendency to sympathetic retributive kindly emotion is not. Among the lower animals this latter emotion seems hardly to occur at all, and in men it is often deplorably defective. Resentment towards an enemy is itself, as a rule, a much stronger emotion than retributive kindly emotion towards a friend. And, as for the sympathetic forms of these emotions, it is not surprising that the altruistic sentiment is more readily moved by the sight of pain than by the sight of pleasure,[62] considering that its fundamental object is to be a means of protection for the species. Moreover, sympathetic retributive kindliness has powerful rivals in the feelings of jealousy and envy, which tend to make the individual hostile both towards him who is the object of a benefit and towards him who bestows it. As an ancient writer observes, "many suffer with their friends when the friends are in distress, but are envious of them when they prosper."[63] But though these circumstances are a hindrance to the rise of retributive kindly emotions of a sympathetic kind, they do not prevent public approval in a case when the whole society profits by a benefit, nor have they any bearing on those disinterested instinctive likings of which I have spoken above. I think, then, we may {130} safely conclude that public praise and moral approval occurred, to some degree, even in the infancy of human society. It will appear from numerous facts recorded in following chapters, that the moral consciousness of modern savages contains not only condemnation, but praise.

[Footnote 62: _Cf._ Jodl, _Lehrbuch der Psychologie_, p. 686.]

[Footnote 63: Schmidt, _Ethik der alten Griechen_, i. 259.]

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF THE PRINCIPAL MORAL CONCEPTS

WE have assumed that the moral concepts are essentially generalisations of tendencies in certain phenomena to call forth moral emotions. We have further assumed that there are two kinds of moral emotions: indignation and approval. If these assumptions hold good, either indignation or approval must be at the bottom of every moral concept. That such is really the case will, I think, become evident from the present chapter, in which the principal of those concepts will be analysed.

Our analysis will be concerned with moral concepts formed by the civilised mind. Whilst the most representative of English terms for moral estimates have equivalents in the other European languages, I do not take upon myself to decide to what extent they have equivalents in non-European tongues. That all existing peoples, even the very lowest, have moral emotions is as certain as that they have customs, and there can be no doubt that they give expression to those emotions in their speech. But it is another question how far their emotions have led to such generalisations as are implied in moral concepts. Concerning the Fuegians M. Hyades observes, "Les idées abstraites sont chez eux à peu près nulles. Il est difficile de définir exactement ce qu'ils appellent un homme bon et un homme méchant; mais à coup sûr ils n'ont pas la notion de ce qui est bon ou mauvais, abstraction faite de l'individu ou de l'objet auquel ils appliqueraient l'un ou l'autre {132} de ces attributs."[1] The language of the Californian Karok, though rich in its vocabulary, is said to possess no equivalent for "virtue."[2] In the aboriginal tongues of the highlanders of Central India "there seem to be no expressions for abstract ideas, the few such which they possess being derived from the Hindí. . . . . The nomenclature of religious ceremony, of moral qualities, and of nearly all the arts of life they possess, are all Hindí."[3] On a strict examination of the language of the Tonga Islanders, Mariner could discover "no words essentially expressive of some of the higher qualities of human merit, as virtue, justice, humanity; nor of the contrary, as vice, injustice, cruelty, &c. They have indeed expressions for these ideas," he adds, but these expressions "are equally applicable to other things. To express a virtuous or good man, they would say, _tangata lillé_, a good man, or _tangata loto lillé_, a man with a good mind; but the word lillé, good (unlike our word virtuous), is equally applicable to an axe, canoe, or anything else."[4] Of the Australian natives about Botany Bay and Port Jackson Collins wrote, "That they have ideas of a distinction between good and bad is evident from their having terms in their language significant of these qualities." A fish of which they never ate, was _wee-re_, or bad, whereas the kangaroo was _bood-yer-re_, or good; and these expressions were used not only for qualities which they perceived by their senses, but for all kinds of badness and goodness, and were the only terms they had for wrong and right. "Their enemies were wee-re; their friends bood-yer-re. On our speaking of cannibalism, they expressed great horror at the mention, and said it was wee-re. On seeing any of our people punished or reproved for ill-treating them, they expressed their approbation, and said it was bood-yer-re, it was right."[5]

[Footnote 1: Hyades and Deniker, _Mission scientifique du Cap Horn_, vii. 251.]

[Footnote 2: Powers, _Tribes of California_, p. 22.]

[Footnote 3: Forsyth, _Highlands of Central India_, p. 139.]

[Footnote 4: Mariner, _Natives of the Tonga Islands_, ii. 147 _sq._]

[Footnote 5: Collins, _English Colony in New South Wales_, i. 548 _sq._]

{133} Considering, moreover, that even the European languages make use of such general terms as "good" and "bad" for the purpose of expressing moral qualities, it seems likely that, originally, moral concepts were not clearly differentiated from other more comprehensive generalisations, and that they assumed a more definite shape only by slow degrees. At the same time we must not expect to find the beginning of this process reflected in the vocabularies of languages. There is every reason to believe that a savage practically distinguishes between the "badness" of a man and the "badness" of a piece of food, although he may form no clear idea of the distinction. As Professor Wundt observes, "the phenomena of language do not admit of direct translation back again into ethical processes: the ideas themselves are different from their vehicles of expression, and here as everywhere the external mark is later than the internal act for which it stands."[6] Language is a rough generaliser; even superficial resemblance between different phenomena often suffices to establish linguistic identity between them. Compare the rightness of a line with the rightness of conduct, the wrongness of an opinion with the wrongness of an act. And notice the different significations given to the verb "ought" in the following sentences:--"They ought to be in town by this time, as the train left Paris last night"; "If you wish to be healthy you ought to rise early"; "You ought always to speak the truth." Though it may be shown that in these statements the predicate "ought" signifies something which they all have in common--the reference to a rule,[7]--we must by no means assume that this constitutes the essence of the moral "ought," or gives us the clue to its origin.

[Footnote 6: Wundt, _Ethik_, p. 36 (English translation, p. 44).]

[Footnote 7: _Cf._ Stephen, _Liberty, Equality, Fraternity_, p. 343 _sq._]

Discarding all questions of etymology as irrelevant to our subject,[8] we shall, in our analysis of moral concepts, {134} endeavour to fix the true import of each concept by examining how, and under what circumstances, the term expressing it is generally applied. We shall restrict ourselves to the principal, typical terms which are used as predicates in moral judgments. If we succeed in proving that they are all fundamentally derived from either moral indignation or moral approval, there can be no reasonable doubt as to the origin of the rest.

[Footnote 8: The attempt to apply the philological method to an examination of moral concepts has, in my opinion, proved a failure--which may be seen from Mr. Baynes' book on _The Idea of God and the Moral Sense in the Light of Language_.]

The tendency in a phenomenon to arouse moral indignation is directly expressed by the term _bad_, and a disposition of mind which is characterised by some special kind of badness is called _vice_. Closely allied to the term "bad" is the term _wrong_. But there is a difference in the use of these words. Whilst "bad" may be applied both to a person's character and to his conduct, only his conduct may be said to be "wrong." The reason for this is that the concept of moral wrongness is modelled on the idea of a moral law, the breach of which is regarded as "wrong." And, by laying down a moral law, we only enjoin a certain mode of conduct; we do not command a person to have a certain character.

The moral law is expressed by the term _ought_, a term which, in modern ethics, generally occupies a central position among moral predicates. The notion which it embodies is frequently looked upon as ultimate and incapable of analysis--"too elementary" (to quote Professor Sidgwick) "to admit of any formal definition."[9] This view, I think, instead of simplifying the matter, has been one of the chief causes of the prevailing confusion in ethical thought.

[Footnote 9: Sidgwick, _Methods of Ethics_, p. 33.]

Far from being a simple notion, "ought" appears to me clearly decomposable, even though it have a special flavour of its own. First of all, it expresses a conation. When I feel that I ought to do a thing, I experience an impulse to do it, even though some opposite impulse may finally determine my action. And when I say to another man, "You ought to do this, or that," there is certainly implied {135} a purpose to influence his action in a certain direction. In the notion of _duty_, the ethical import of which is identical with that of "ought," this conative element is not so obvious.

Closely connected with the conative nature of "ought" is the imperative character it is apt to assume. But, though frequently used imperatively, "ought" is not necessarily and essentially imperative. Even if the "ought" which I address to myself, in a figurative sense, may be styled a command, it is hardly appropriate to speak of a present command with reference to past actions. The

common phrase, "You ought to have done this, or that," cannot be called a command.

The conation expressed in "ought" is determined by the idea that the mode of conduct which ought to be performed is not, or will possibly not be, performed. It is also this idea of its not being performed that determines the emotion which gives to "ought" the character of a moral predicate. The doing of what ought not to be done, or the omission of what ought not to be omitted, is apt to call forth moral indignation--this is the most essential fact involved in the notion of "ought." Every "ought"-judgment contains implicitly a negation. Nobody would ever have dreamt of laying down a moral rule if the idea of its transgression had not presented itself to his mind. We may reverse the words of the Apostle,[10] and say that where no transgression is, there is no law. When Solon was asked why he had specified no punishment for one who had murdered a father, he replied that he supposed it could not occur to any man to commit such a crime.[11] Similarly, the modern Shintoist concludes that the primæval Japanese were pure and holy from the fact that they are represented as a people who had no moral commandments.[12] It is this prohibitive character of "ought" that has imparted to duty that idea of antagonism to inclination which has found its most famous expression {136} in the Kantian ethics, and which made Bentham look upon the word itself as having in it "something disagreeable and repulsive."[13] It is the intrinsic connection between "ought" and "wrong" that has given to duty the most prominent place in ethical speculation whenever moral pessimism has been predominant. Whilst the ancient Greeks, with whom happiness was the state of nature, never spoke of duty, but held virtue to be the Supreme Good, Christianity, on the other hand, which looked upon man as a being born and bred in sin, regarded morals pre-eminently as the science of duty. Then, again, in modern times, Kant's categorical imperative came as a reaction against that moral optimism which once more had given the preference to virtue, considering everything in the world or in humanity as beautiful and good from the very beginning.[14] It is also worth noting that the feeling of self-complacency connected with the consciousness of having acted in accordance with the law of duty, has no distinctively expressive name in ordinary language, while the opposite feeling is known by so familiar and distinctive a term as "remorse." This is not, as has been said,[15] "a significant indication of the moral condition of mankind," but a significant indication of the true import of the notion of duty itself.

[Footnote 10: _Romans_, iv. 15.]

[Footnote 11: Diogenes Laërtius, _Solon_, 10. Cicero, _Pro S. Roscio Amerino_, 25.]

[Footnote 12: Griffis, _Religions of Japan_, p. 72.]

[Footnote 13: Bentham, _Deontoiogy_, i. 10.]

[Footnote 14: Ziegler, _Social Ethics_, pp. 22, 75 _sq._]

[Footnote 15: Murray, _Introduction to Ethics_, p. 108.]

It is not, then, in the emotion of approval that we must seek for the origin of this concept. We may undoubtedly applaud him who is faithful to his duty, but the idea of duty involves no applause. There is no contradiction in the omission of an act being disapproved of and the performance of it being praised. "Ought" and "duty" express only the tendency of an omission to call forth disapproval, and say nothing about the consequences of the act's performance. The conscientious man refuses the homage paid to him, by saying, "I have only done my duty." Duty is a "stern {137} lawgiver," who threatens with punishment, but promises no reward.[16]

[Footnote 16: The intrinsic connection between duty and disapproval has previously been noticed by Stuart Mill (in a note to James Mill's _Analysis of the Human Mind_, ii. 325), according to whom "no case can be pointed out in which we consider anything as a duty, and any act or omission as immoral or wrong, without regarding the person who commits the wrong and violates the duty as a fit object of punishment." _Cf._ also Bain, _Emotions and the Will_, ch. 15, and Gizycki, _Introduction to the Study of Ethics_, English adaptation by Stanton Coit, p. 102 _sq._]

The ideas of "ought" and "duty" thus spring from the same source as the ideas of "bad" and "wrong." To say that a man ought to do a thing is, so far as the morality of his action is concerned, the very same thing as to say that it is bad, or wrong, of him not to do it--in other words, that the not-doing of it has a tendency to call forth moral disapproval.

"Wrong" is popularly regarded as the opposite of _right_, and they are really contradictories, but only within the sphere of positive moral valuation. We do not call the actions of irresponsible beings, like animals or infants, "right," although they are not wrong; nor do we pronounce morally indifferent actions of responsible beings to be "right," unless we wish thereby especially to mark their moral value as not being wrong. An act which is permissible is of course not wrong, and so far it may be said to be right; but it

would be more accurate to say that people have _a_ right to do it. The adjective "right," in its strict sense, refers to cases from which the indifferent is excluded. A right action is, on a given occasion, _the_ right action, and other alternatives are wrong. "Right" is thus closely related to "ought," but at the same time "right" and "obligatory" are not identical. I cannot quite subscribe to the view of Professor Sidgwick, that "in the recognition of conduct as 'right' is involved an authoritative prescription to do it."[17] What is right is in accordance with the moral law; the adjective "right" means that duty is fulfilled. It is true that the super-obligatory also is right. But "right" takes no notice of the super-obligatory as distinct from the obligatory, and what goes {138} beyond duty always involves the fulfilment of some duty. It may be admitted to be "not only right," but not to be more right. Right has no comparative. A duty is either fulfilled or not, and unless it be perfectly fulfilled the conduct is wrong. There are degrees of wrongness and of goodness, as the moral indignation and the moral approval may be stronger or weaker, but there are no degrees of rightness.

[Footnote 17: Sidgwick, _op. cit._ p. 106.]

The fact that the right action is a duty fulfilled accounts for the erroneous opinion so generally held by ethical writers that "right" is intrinsically connected with moral approval.[18] The choice of the right alternative may give us satisfaction and call forth in us an emotion of approval. This emotion may be the motive for our pointing out the rightness of the act, and the judgment in which we do so may even intrinsically contain applause. The manner in which the judgment "That is right," is pronounced, often shows that it is meant to be an expression of praise. But this does not imply that the concept "right" by itself has reference to moral approval and involves praise. It only means that in one word is expressed a certain concept--the concept that a duty is fulfilled--_plus_ an emotion of approval. That "right" _per se_ involves no praise is obvious from the fact that we regard it as perfectly right to pay a debt and to keep a promise, or to abstain from killing, robbing, or lying, although such acts or omissions generally have no tendency whatever to evoke in us an emotion of moral approval.

[Footnote 18: Hutcheson, _Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections, with Illustrations on the Moral Sense_, p. 279. Clifford, _Lectures and Essays_, pp. 294, 304 _sq._ Fowler and Wilson, _Principles of Morals_, ii. 199. Alexander, _Moral Order and Progress_, p. 399.]

The concept of "right," then, as implying that the opposite mode of conduct would have been wrong, ultimately derives its moral significance from moral disapproval. This may seem strange considering that "right" is commonly looked upon as positive and "wrong" as its negation. But we must remember that language and popular conceptions in these matters start {139} from the notion of a moral rule or command. It is a matter of paramount importance that such modes of conduct as are apt to arouse moral indignation should be avoided. People try to prevent them by prohibitions and injunctions, often emphasised by threats of penalties for the transgressors. The whole moral and social discipline is based upon commands; customs are rules of conduct, and so are laws. It is natural, then, that the notion of a command should figure uppermost in popular conceptions of morality. Obedience to the command is right, a breach of it is wrong. But the fact which gives birth to the command itself is the indignation called forth by the act which the command forbids, or by the omission of that which it enjoins.

I have spoken here of "right" as an adjective. Used as a substantive, to denote _a right_, it also, in whatever sense it be used, expresses a concept which is rooted in the emotion of moral disapproval. To have a right to do a thing is to be allowed to do it, either by positive law, in the case of a legal right, or by the moral law, in the case of a moral right; in other words, to have a moral right to do a thing means that it is not wrong to do it. But generally the concept of "a right" means something more than this. From the fact that an act is allowable, that it is not wrong, it follows, as a rule, that it ought not to be prevented, that no hindrance ought to be put in the way of its performance; and this character of inviolability is largely included in the very concepts of rights. That a man has a right to live does not merely mean that he commits no wrong by supporting his life, but it chiefly means that it would be wrong of other people to prevent him from living, that it is their duty not to kill him, or even, as the case may be, that it is their duty to help him to live. And in order to constitute a right in him, the duty in question must be a duty _to him_. That a right belonging to A is not merely a duty incumbent on B, but a duty _to_ A incumbent on B, will become evident from an example. To kill another {140} person's slave may be condemned as an injury done to the slave himself, in which case it is a duty to the slave not to kill him; or to kill another person's slave may be condemned on account of the loss it causes to the master, in which case it is deemed a duty to the master not to kill the slave. In the latter case we can hardly say that the duty of not killing the slave constitutes a right to live in the slave--it only constitutes a right in the master to retain his slave alive, not to be deprived of him by an act causing his death.

So commonly does the conception of a right belonging to a person contain the idea of a duty which other persons owe him, that it seems necessary to point out the existence of rights in which no such idea is involved. A man's right to defend his country, for instance, does not intrinsically imply that it is wrong of the enemy to disable him from doing so. But, on the other hand, there are

rights which are nothing else than duties towards those who have the rights. A right is not always a person's right to a certain activity, or to abstaining from a certain activity; it may have exclusive reference to other people's acts or omissions. That a man has the right to be rewarded by his country only means that his country is under an obligation to reward him. That a father has a right to be obeyed by his children only means that it is a duty incumbent on his children to obey him. That a person has the right of bodily integrity only means that it is wrong to inflict on him a bodily injury. These rights may, no doubt, if violated, give rise to certain rights of activity: a man may have a right to claim the reward which is due to him, a father to exact from his children the obedience which they owe him, a person who is wronged to defend himself. But the rights of claiming a reward, of exacting obedience, of resisting wrong, are certainly not identical with the rights of being rewarded, of being obeyed, of not being wronged.

It is commonly said that rights have their corresponding duties. But if this expression is to be used, it must be {141} remembered that the duty which "corresponds" to a right, as a matter of fact, is either included in that right or simply identical with it. The identity between the right and the duty, then, consists in this, that the notion of a right belonging to a person is identical with the notion of a duty towards him. Rights and duties are not identical in the sense that it is always a duty to insist on a right, though this has been urged.[19] If anybody prevents me from making use of my right it may no doubt be deemed a duty on my part not to tolerate the wrong committed against me, but nothing of the kind is involved in the concept of a right. And the same may be said with reference to the assertion that a right to do a thing is always, at the same time, a duty to do it--an assertion which is a consequence of the doctrine that there is nothing morally indifferent and nothing that goes beyond duty; in other words, that all conduct of responsible beings is either wrong or obligatory. Even if this doctrine were psychologically correct--which it is not--even if there were a constant coincidence between the acts which a person has a right to perform and acts which it is his duty to perform, that would not constitute identity between the concepts of rights and duties. According to the meaning of a right, A's right may be B's duty towards A, but A's right cannot be A's duty towards B or anybody else.

[Footnote 19: Alexander, _op. cit._ p. 146 _sq._]

Closely connected with the notions of wrongness and rightness are the notions of _injustice_ and _justice_. Injustice, indeed, is a kind of wrongness. To be unjust is always to be unjust to somebody, and this implies a doing of wrong to somebody, a violation of somebody's right. "Justice," again, is a kind of rightness. It involves the notion that a duty to somebody, a duty corresponding to a right, is fulfilled;[20] we say that justice "demands" that it should be fulfilled. As an act is "right" if its omission {142} is wrong, so an act is "just," in the strict sense of the word, if its omission is unjust. But, like the adjective "right," the adjective "just" is also sometimes used in a wider sense, to denote that something is "not unjust." As non-obligatory acts that are "not wrong" can hardly be denied to be "right," so non-obligatory acts that are "not unjust" can hardly be denied to be "just," although they are not demanded by justice.

[Footnote 20: According to the _Institutiones_ of Justinian (i. 1. 1) "justice is the constant and perpetual will to render to each one his right,"--"justitia est constans et perpetua voluntas jus suum cuique tribuens."]

At the same time, "injustice" and "justice" are not simply other names for violating or respecting rights. Whenever we style an act "unjust," we emphasise that it involves partiality. We do not denominate murder and robbery unjust, but wrong or criminal, because the partiality involved in their commission is quite obscured by their general wrongness or criminality; but we at once admit their gross injustice when we consider that the murderer and robber indulged their own inclinations with utter disregard of their neighbours' rights. And we look upon "unjust" as an exceedingly appropriate term for a judge who condemns an innocent man with the intention to save the culprit, and for an employer who keeps for himself a profit which he ought to share with his employees. Again, when we style an act "just," in the strict sense of the term, we point out that an undue preference would have been shown to somebody by its omission. It is true that, as Adam Smith observes, "we may often fulfil all the rules of justice by sitting still and doing nothing,"[21] and that the man who barely abstains from violating either the person or the estate or the reputation of his neighbours so far does justice to them; but in such a case we hardly apply the epithet "just," simply because there is no reason for emphasising the partiality involved in the opposite mode of conduct. On the other hand, we say it is just, or, more emphatically, that justice demands, that the innocent should not suffer in the place of the guilty, or that the employer should give his employees all their dues.

[Footnote 21: Adam Smith, _Theory of Moral Sentiments_, p. 117.]

It is necessary to note that the impartiality which justice {143} demands is impartiality within the recognised order of rights, whether these rights themselves have a partial origin or not. A father is unjust if he gives away property to one of his children in preference

to others, in case all of them are recognised to have a right to an equal share in his property, even though it be only a conditional right; and a man is unjust if he keeps for himself a profit to which another man has an equal right. But in a society which regards slavery as a morally permissible institution, a man is not necessarily deemed unjust if he beats a slave in a case where it would have been wrong to beat a freeman. However, in the case of unequal rights, justice admits of no greater difference of treatment than what the difference in rights implies. It may be just to punish a man who by a crime has forfeited that right to be protected from wilfully inflicted pain which every law-abiding citizen possesses, but it is unjust to extend the inequality between his condition and the condition of others beyond the inequality of their rights by inflicting upon him a punishment which is unduly severe.

It is the emphasis laid on the duty of impartiality that gives justice a special prominence in connection with punishments and rewards. A man's rights depend to a great extent upon his actions. Other things being equal, the criminal has not the same rights to inviolability as regards reputation, or freedom, or property, or life, as the innocent man; the miser and egoist have not the same rights as the benefactor and the philanthropist. On these differences in rights due to differences in conduct, the terms "just" and "unjust" lay stress; for in such cases an injustice would have been committed if the rights had been equal. When we say of a criminal that he has been "justly" imprisoned we point out that he was no victim of undue partiality, as he had forfeited the general right to freedom on account of his crime. When we say of a benefactor that he has been "justly" rewarded, we point out that no favour was partially bestowed upon him in preference to others, as he had acquired the special right of being rewarded. But the {144} "justice" of a punishment or a reward, strictly speaking, involves something more than this; as we have seen, what is strictly "just" is always the discharge of a duty corresponding to a right which would have been in a partial manner disregarded by a transgression of the duty. If it is just that a person should be rewarded, he ought to be rewarded, and to fulfil this duty is to do him justice. Again, if it is just that a person should be punished, he ought to be punished, and his not being punished is an injustice to other persons. It is an injustice towards all those whose condemnation of the wrong act finds its recognised expression in the punishment, inasmuch as their rightful claim that the criminal should be punished, their right of resisting wrong, is thereby violated in favour of the wrong-doer. Moreover, his not being punished is an injustice towards other criminals, who have been punished for similar acts, in so far as they have a right to demand that no undue preference should be shown to anybody whose guilt is equal to theirs. Retributive justice may admit of a certain latitude as to the retribution. It may be a matter of small concern from the community's point of view whether men are fined or imprisoned for the commission of a certain crime. But it may be a demand of justice that, under equal circumstances, all of them should be punished with the same severity, since the crime has equally affected their rights.

The emphasis which "injustice" lays on the partiality of a certain mode of conduct always involves a condemnation of that partiality. Like every other kind of wrongness, "injustice" is thus a concept which is obviously based on the emotion of moral disapproval. And so is the concept of "justice," whether it involves the notion that an injustice would be committed if a certain duty were not fulfilled, or it is simply used to denote that a certain mode of conduct is "not unjust." But there is yet another sense in which the word "just" is applied. It may emphasise the impartiality of an act in a tone of praise. Considering how difficult it is to be perfectly impartial and to give every man his due, especially when one's own interests are {145} concerned, it is only natural that men should be applauded for being just, and consequently that to call a person just should often be to praise him. So, also, "justice" is used as the name for a virtue, "the mistress and queen of all virtues."[22] But all this does not imply that an emotion of moral approval enters into the concept of justice. It only means that one word is used to express a certain concept--a concept which, as we have seen, ultimately derives its import from moral disapproval--_plus_ an emotion of approval. That the concept of justice by itself involves no reference to the emotion of moral approval appears from the fact that it is no praise to say of an act that it is "only just."

[Footnote 22: Cicero, _De officiis_, iii. 6.]

* * * * *

From the concepts springing from moral disapproval we pass to those springing from moral approval. Foremost among these ranks the concept _good_.[23]

[Footnote 23: Professor Bain, who takes a very legal view of the moral consciousness, maintains (_Emotions and the Will_, p. 292) that "positive good deeds and self-sacrifice . . . transcend the region of morality proper, and occupy a sphere of their own." A similar opinion has been expressed by Prof. Durkheim (_Division du travail social_), and, more recently, by Dr. Lagerborg, in his interesting essay, 'La nature de la morale' (_Revue internationale de Sociologie_, xi. 466). Prof. Durkheim argues (p. 30) that it would be "contraire à toute méthode" to include under the same heading acts which are obligatory and acts which are objects of admiration, and at the same time exempt from all regulation. "Si donc, pour rester fidèle à l'usage, on réserve aux premiers la

qualification de moraux, on ne saurait la donner également aux seconds." But I fail to see that ordinary usage recognises regulation as the test of morality. On the contrary, terms like "goodness" and "virtue," though having no reference whatever to any moral rule, have always hitherto been applied to qualities avowedly moral.]

Though "good," being affixed to a great variety of objects, takes different shades of meaning in different cases, there is one characteristic common to everything called "good." This is hardly, as Mr. Spencer maintains,[24] its quality of being well adapted to a given end. It is true that the good knife is one which will cut, the good gun one which carries far and true. But I fail to see that "good" in a moral sense involves any idea of an adaptation to a given purpose, and, by calling conduct {146} "good," we certainly do not mean that it "conduces to life in each and all." "Good" simply expresses approval or praise of something on account of some quality which it possesses. A house is praised as "good" because it fulfils the end desired, a wine because it has an agreeable taste, a man on account of his moral worth. "Good," as a moral epithet, involves a praise which is the outward expression of the emotion of moral approval, and is affixed to a subject of moral valuation on account of its tendency to call forth such an emotion.

[Footnote 24: Spencer, _Principles of Ethics_, i. 21 _sqq._]

"Good" has commonly been identified with "right," but such an identification is incorrect. A father does right in supporting his young children, inasmuch as he, by supporting them, discharges a duty incumbent upon him, but we do not say that he does a good deed by supporting them, or that it is good of him to do so. Nor do we call it good of a man not to kill or rob his neighbours, although his conduct is so far right. The antithesis between right and wrong is, in a certain sense at least, contradictory, the antithesis between good and bad is only contrary. Every act--provided that it falls within the sphere of positive moral valuation--that is not wrong is right, but every act that is not bad is not necessarily good. Just as we may say of a thing that it is "not bad," and yet refuse to call it "good," so we may object to calling the simple discharge of a duty "good," although the opposite mode of conduct would be bad. On the other hand, no confusion of ethical concepts is involved in attributing goodness to the performance of a duty, or, in other words, praising a man for an act the omission of which would have incurred blame. To say of one and the same act that it is right and that it is good, really means that we look upon it from different points of view. Since moral praise expresses a benevolent attitude of mind, it is commendable for a man not to be niggard in his acknowledgment of other people's right conduct; whereas, self-praise being objectionable, only the other point of view is deemed proper when he passes a {147} judgment upon himself. He may say, without incurring censure, "I have done my duty, I have done what is right," but hardly, "I have done a good deed"; and it would be particularly obnoxious to say, "I am a good man." The best man even refuses to be called good by others:--"Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God."[25]

[Footnote 25: _St. Matthew_, xix. 17.]

Whilst "goodness" is the general expression for moral praise, _virtue_ denotes a disposition of mind which is characterised by some special kind of goodness. He who is habitually temperate possesses the virtue of temperance, he who is habitually just the virtue of justice. And even when a man is simply said to be "virtuous," this epithet is given to him, more or less distinctly, with reference to some branch of goodness which constitutes his virtue. A Supreme Being, to whom is attributed perfect goodness, is not called virtuous, but good.

It was the opinion of Aristotle that virtue is imperfect so long as the agent cannot do the virtuous action without a conflict of impulses. Others maintain, on the contrary, that virtue essentially expresses effort, resistance, and conquest. It has been represented as "mediation through pain";[26] according to Kant, it is "the moral disposition in struggle."[27] But I do not see that virtue presupposes struggle, nor that it is lessened by being exercised with little or no effort. A virtue consists in the disposition to will or not to will acts of a certain kind, and is by no means reduced by the fact that no rival impulses make themselves felt. It is true that by struggle and conquest a man may display more virtue, namely, the virtue of self-restraint in addition to the virtue gained by it. The vigorous and successful contest against temptation constitutes a virtue by itself. For instance, the quality of mind which is exhibited in a habitual and victorious effort to conquer strong sexual passions is a virtue distinguishable from that of chastity. But even this virtue of {148} resisting seductive impulses is not greater, _ceteris paribus_, in proportion as the victory is more difficult. Take two men with equally strong passions and equally exposed to temptations, who earnestly endeavour to lead a chaste life. He who succeeds with less struggle, thanks to his greater power of will, is surely inferior neither in chastity nor in self-restraint. Suppose, again, that the two men were exposed to different degrees of temptation. He who overcomes the greater temptation _displays_ more self-restraint; yet the other man may possess this virtue in an equal degree, and his chastity is certainly not made greater thereby. He may have more merit, but merit is not necessarily proportionate to virtue.

[Footnote 26: Laurie, _Ethica_, p. 253 _sqq._]

[Footnote 27: Kant, _Kritik der praktischen Vernunft_, i. 1. 3 (_Sämmtliche Werke_, v. 89).]

The virtues are broad generalisations of mental dispositions which, on the whole, are regarded as laudable. Owing to their stereotyped character, it easily happens, in individual cases, that the possession of a virtue confers no merit upon the possessor; and, at least from the point of view of the enlightened moral consciousness, a man's virtues are no exact gauge of his moral worth. In order to form a just opinion of the value of a person's character, we must take into account the strength of his instinctive desires and the motives of his conduct. There are virtues that pay no regard to this. A sober man, who has no taste for intoxicants, possesses the virtue of sobriety in no less degree than a man whose sobriety is the result of a difficult conquest over a strong desire. He who is brave with a view to be applauded is not, as regards the virtue of courage, inferior to him who faces dangers merely from a feeling of duty. The only thing that the possession of a virtue presupposes is that it should have been tried and tested. We cannot say that people unacquainted with intoxicants possess the virtue of sobriety, and that a man who never had anything to spend distinguishes himself for frugality. For to attribute a virtue to somebody is always to bestow upon him some degree of praise, and it is no praise, only irony, to say of a man that he "makes a virtue of necessity."

{149} Attempts have been made to reconcile the Aristotelian and the Kantian views of the relation between virtue and effort, by saying that virtue is the harmony won and merit is the winning of it.[28] This presupposes that a man to whom virtue is natural has had his fights. But, surely, it is not always so. Who could affirm that every temperate, or charitable, or just man has acquired the virtue only as a result of inward struggle? There are people to whom some virtues at least are natural from the beginning, and others who acquire them with a minimum of effort.

[Footnote 28: Dewey, _Study of Ethics_, p. 133 _sq._ Simmel, _Einleitung in die Moralwissenschaft_, i. 228. _Cf._ also Shaftesbury 'Inquiry concerning Virtue and Merit,' i. 2. 4, in _Characteristicks_, ii. 36 _sqq._]

There has been much discussion about the relation between virtue and duty. It has been said that "they are co-extensive, the former describing conduct by the quality of the agent's mind, the latter by the nature of the act performed";[29] that they express the same ideal, virtue subjectively, duty objectively;[30] or that virtue, in its proper sense, is "the quality of character that fits for the discharge of duty," and that it "only lives in the performance of duty."[31] At the same time it is admitted that "the distinctive mark of virtue seems to lie in what is beyond duty," and that "though every virtue is a duty, and every duty a virtue, there are certain actions to which it is more natural to apply the term virtuous."[32] Prof. Sidgwick, again, in his elaborate chapter on 'Virtue and Duty,' remarks that he has "thought it best to employ the terms so that virtuous conduct may include the performance of duty as well as whatever good actions may be commonly thought to go beyond duty; though recognising that virtue in its ordinary use is most conspicuously manifested in the latter."[33]

[Footnote 29: Alexander, _op. cit._ p. 244.]

[Footnote 30: Grote, _Treatise on the Moral Ideals_, p. 22. _Cf._ Seth, _Study of Ethical Principles_, p. 239.]

[Footnote 31: Muirhead, _Elements of Ethics_, p. 190 n.*]

[Footnote 32: Alexander, _op. cit._ p. 243 _sq._]

[Footnote 33: Sidgwick, _op. cit._ p. 221.]

It can be no matter of surprise that those who regard the notion of "duty" as incapable of being analysed, or {150} who fail to recognise its true import, are embarrassed by its relation to virtue. We do not call it a virtue if a man habitually abstains from killing or robbing, or pays his debts, or performs a great number of other duties. We do call chastity and temperance and justice virtues, although we regard it as obligatory on a man to be chaste, temperate, just. We also call hospitality, generosity, and charity virtues in cases where they go beyond the strict limits of duty. "The relation of virtue and duty is complicated," says Professor Alexander.[34] "In its common use each term seems to include something excluded from the other," observes Professor Sidgwick.[35] But, indeed, the relation is not complicated, for there is no other intrinsic relation between them than their common antagonism to "wrong." That something is a duty implies that its non-performance tends to evoke moral indignation, that it is a virtue implies that its performance tends to evoke moral approval. That the virtues actually cover a comparatively large field of the province of duty is simply owing to their being dispositions of mind. We may praise the habits of justice and gratitude, even though we find nothing praiseworthy in an isolated just or grateful act.

[Footnote 34: Alexander, _op. cit._ p. 244.]

[Footnote 35: Sidgwick, _op. cit._ p. 219.]

There has been no less confusion with regard to the relation between duty and _merit_. Like the notions of "good" and "virtue," the "meritorious" derives its origin from the emotion of moral approval; but while the former merely express a tendency to give rise to such an emotion, "meritorious" implies that the object to which it refers merits praise, that it has a just claim to praise, or, in other words, that it ought to be recognised as good. This makes the term "meritorious" more emphatic than the term "good," but at the same time it narrows its province in a peculiar way. Just as the expression that something ought to be done implies the idea of its not being done, so the word "meritorious" suggests the idea of goodness which may fail of due recognition. And as it is meaningless to speak of duty in a case where the {151} opposite mode of conduct is entirely out of the question, so it would be an absurdity to attribute merit to somebody for an act the goodness of which is universally admitted. Thus "meritorious" involves a restriction. It would be almost blasphemous to call the acts of a God conceived to be infinitely good meritorious, since it would suggest a limitation of his goodness.

The emphatic claim to praiseworthiness made by the "meritorious" has rendered it objectionable to a great number of moralists. It has been identified with the "super-obligatory"--a conception which is to many an abomination. From what has been said above, however, it is manifest that they are not identical. As the discharge of a duty may be regarded as a good act, so it may also be regarded as an act which ought to be recognised as good. Practically, no doubt, there is a certain antagonism between duty and merit. We praise, and, especially, we regard as deserving praise, only what is above the average,[36] and we censure what is below it. No merit is conferred upon him who performs a duty which is seldom transgressed, or the transgression of which would actually incur punishment or censure. We do not think that a man ought to be praised for what his own interest prompts him to perform; and, since the transgression of a moral command which is usually obeyed is generally censured or punished, there is under ordinary circumstances nothing meritorious in performing a duty. But though thus probably most acts which are deemed meritorious fall outside the limits of duty as roughly drawn by the popular mind, we are on the other hand often disposed to attribute merit to a man on account of an act which, from a strict point of view, is his duty, but a duty which most people, under the same circumstances, would have left undischarged. This shows that the antagonism between duty and merit is not absolute. And in the concept of merit _per se_ no such antagonism is involved.

[Footnote 36: Merit, as Professor Alexander puts it (_op. cit._ p. 196), "expresses the interval which separates the meritorious from the average."]

{152} I confess that I fail to grasp what those writers really mean who identify the "meritorious" with the "super-obligatory," and at the same time deny the existence of any super-obligatory. Do they shut their eyes to the important psychical fact indicated by the term "merit," or do they look upon it as a chimera inconsistent with a sufficiently enlightened moral consciousness? For my own part, I cannot see how the moral consciousness could dispense with the idea that there are actions which merit praise or reward, which ought to be praised or rewarded. The denial of merit can be defended from a purely theological point of view, but then only with regard to man's relation to God. It is obvious that a fallen being who is sinning even when he does his best, could not be recognised as good by God and could have no merit. But it is hardly just, nor is it practically possible, that a man should measure his fellow-man by a superhuman standard of perfection, and try to suppress the natural emotion of moral approval and the claims springing from it, by persuading himself that there is no mortal being who ever does anything which ought to be recognised as good.

Quite distinct from the question of merit, then, is that of the _super-obligatory_. Can a man do more than his duty, or, in other words, is there anything good which is not at the same time a duty? The answer depends on the contents given to the commandments of duty, hence it may vary without affecting the concept of duty itself. If we consider that there is an obligation on every man to promote the general happiness to the very utmost of his ability, we must also maintain that nobody can ever do anything good beyond his duty. The same is the case if we regard "self-realisation," or a "normal" exercise of his natural functions, as a man's fundamental duty. In all these cases "to aim at acting beyond obligation," as Price puts it,[37] is "the same with aiming at acting contrary to obligation, and doing more than is fit to be done, the same with doing wrong." It can hardly be denied, however, {153} that those who hold similar views have actually two standards of duty, one by which they measure man and his doings in the abstract, with reference to a certain ideal of life which they please to identify with duty, and another by which they are guided in their practical moral judgments upon their own and their neighbours' conduct. The conscientious man is apt to judge himself more severely than he judges others, partly because he knows his own case better than theirs,[38] and partly because he is naturally

afraid of being intolerant and unjust. He may indeed be unwilling to admit that he ever can do more than his duty, seeing how difficult it is even to do what he ought to do, and impressed, as he would be, with the feeling of his own shortcomings. Yet I do not see how he could conscientiously deny that he has omitted to do many praiseworthy or heroic deeds without holding himself blamable for such omissions.

[Footnote 37: Price, _Review of the Principal Questions in Morals_, p. 204 _sq._]

[Footnote 38: _Cf._ Sidgwick, _op. cit._ p. 221.]

Professor Sidgwick observes that "we should not deny that it is, in some sense, a man's strict duty to do whatever action he judges most excellent, so far as it is in his power."[39] This, as it seems to me, is not a matter of course, and nothing of the kind is involved in the notion of duty itself. We must not confound the moral law with the moral ideal. Duty is the minimum of morality, the supreme moral ideal of the best man is the maximum of it. Those who sum up the whole of morality in the word "ought" identify the minimum and the maximum, but I fail to see that morality is better for this. Rather it is worse. The recognition of a "super-obligatory" does not lower the moral ideal; on the contrary it raises it, or at any rate makes it more possible to vindicate the moral law and to administer it justly. It is nowadays a recognised principle in legislation that a law loses part of its weight if it cannot be strictly enforced. If the realisation of the highest moral ideal is commanded by a moral law, such a law will always remain a dead letter, and morality will gain nothing. Far above the anxious {154} effort to fulfil the commandments of duty stands the free and lofty aspiration to live up to an ideal, which, unattainable as it may be, threatens neither with blame nor remorse him who fails to reach its summits. Does not experience show that those whose thoughts are constantly occupied with the prescriptions of duty are apt to become hard and intolerant?

[Footnote 39: _Ibid._ p. 219.]

Those who deny the existence of anything morally "praiseworthy" which is not a duty, are also generally liable to deny the existence of anything morally _indifferent_ in the conduct of responsible beings. The "super-obligatory" and the "indifferent" have this in common, that they are "ultra-obligatory," and the denial of the one as well as of the other is an expression of the same tendency to look upon the moral law as the sole fact of the moral consciousness. Even Utilitarianism cannot consistently admit of anything indifferent within the province of moral valuation, since two opposite modes of conduct can hardly produce absolutely the same sum of happiness. Such a repudiation of the "indifferent" being quite contrary to the morality of common sense, which, after all, no ethical theory can afford to neglect, considerable ingenuity has been wasted on vain attempts to show that the "indifferent" is nothing but a rude popular conception unable to keep its ground against a thoroughgoing examination. Professor Ziegler ironically asks:--"Such outward matters as eating and drinking are surely morally indifferent? And yet is eating and drinking too much, is spending too much time in outdoor exercise, is lounging idly about, morally indifferent? or, on the other hand, is it morally allowable or wholesome to reduce oneself and make oneself weak and ill by fasting, or to become a hypochondriac by continually staying indoors?"[40] This argument, however, involves a confusion of different volitions. The fact that eating or drinking generally, or eating or drinking too much or too little, are no matters of indifference, surely does not prevent {155} eating or drinking on some certain occasion from being indifferent. Mr. Bradley again observes:--"It is right and a duty that the sphere of indifferent detail should exist. It is a duty that I should develop my nature by private choice therein. Therefore, _because_ that is a duty, it is a duty _not_ to make a duty of every detail; and thus in every detail I have done my duty."[41] This statement also shows a curious confusion of entirely different facts. It may be very true that it is a duty to recognise certain actions as indifferent. This is one thing by itself. But it is quite another thing to perform those actions. And if it is a duty to recognise certain actions as indifferent how could it possibly at the same time be held a duty to perform them?

[Footnote 40: Ziegler, _op. cit._ p. 85.]

[Footnote 41: Bradley, _Ethical Studies_, p. 195, n. 1.]

It has been maintained that the sphere of the indifferent forms the totality of "ought"; that when the same end may be reached by a variety of means, an action may be indifferent merely in relation to the choice of means, but not so far as regards the attainment of the end, and hence is only apparently indifferent.[42] "If it is my moral duty to go from one town to another," says Mr. Bradley, "and there are two roads which are equally good, it is indifferent to the proposed moral duty _which_ road I take; it is not indifferent _that_ I do take one or the other; and whichever road I do take, I am doing my duty on it, and hence it is far from indifferent: my walking on road A is a matter of duty in reference to the end, though not a matter of duty if you consider it against walking on road B; and so with B--but I can escape the sphere of duty neither on A nor on B." All this is true, but forms no argument against the

"indifferent." The statement, "You ought to go to the town and to take either road A or B," refers to two volitions which are regarded as wrong, namely, the volition not to go to the town at all, and the volition to take any road not A or B; and it {156} refers also to two pairs of volitions in reference to which it indicates that the choice between the volitions constituting each pair is indifferent. You may choose to take road A or not to take it; you may choose to take road B or not to take it. The "indifferent" is always an alternative between contradictories. It can therefore never form part of an "ought"-totality, being itself a totality as complete as possible. This is somewhat disguised by a judgment which makes an obligation of a choice between A and B, but becomes conspicuous if we consider a simple case of indifference. Suppose that it is considered indifferent whether you speak or do not speak on a certain occasion. What is here the "ought" that forms the totality of the indifferent? Would there be any sense in saying that you ought either to speak or not to speak? or is the alternative, speaking--not speaking, only a link in an indefinite chain of alternatives, each of which is by itself indifferent, in a relative sense, but the sum of which forms the "ought"? You may be permitted--it will perhaps be argued--in a given moment to speak or to abstain from speaking, to write or to abstain from writing, to read or to abstain from reading, and so on; but however wide the province of the permissible may be, there must always be a limit inside which you ought to remain. That you do this or that may be a matter of indifference, but only of relative indifference, for it is not indifferent what you do on the whole; hence there is nothing absolutely indifferent. Such an argument, however, involves a misapprehension of the true meaning of the "indifferent." The predicate expressing indifference refers to certain definite volitions and their contradictories, not to the whole of a man's conduct in a certain moment. The whole of a man's conduct is never indifferent. But neither is the whole of a man's conduct ever wrong. In the moment when a murderer kills his victim he is fulfilling an endless number of duties: he abstains from stealing, lying, committing adultery, suicide, and so on. The predicate "wrong" only marks the moral {157} character of a special mode of conduct. Why should not the indifferent be allowed to do the same?

[Footnote 42: Simmel, _op. cit._ i. 35 _sqq._ Alexander, _op. cit._ p. 50 _sqq._ Murray, _op. cit._ p. 26 _sq._ Bradley, _op. cit._ p. 195 _sq._]

It has, finally, been observed that the so-called "indifferent" is something "the morality of which can only be individually determined."[43] This remark calls attention to the fact that no mode of conduct can be regarded as indifferent without a careful consideration of individual circumstances, and that much which is apparently indifferent is not really so. This, however, does not involve an abolition of the indifferent. Such an abolition would be the extreme of moral intolerance. He who tried to put it into practice would be the most insupportable of beings, and to himself life would be unbearable. Fortunately, such a man has never existed. The attempts to make every action, even the most trivial, of responsible beings a matter of moral concern, are only theoretical fancies without practical bearing, a hollow and flattering tribute to the idol of Duty.

[Footnote 43: Martensen, _Christian Ethics_, p. 415.]

CHAPTER VII

CUSTOMS AND LAWS AS EXPRESSIONS OF MORAL IDEAS

MORAL ideas are expressed in moral judgments. We have hitherto examined the predicates of such judgments, the import and origin of the moral concepts. Now a much wider field or research remains for us to traverse. We shall direct our attention to the subjects of moral judgments, to the mass of phenomena which, among different peoples and in different ages, have had a tendency to call forth moral blame and moral praise. We shall discuss the general characteristics which all these phenomena have in common. We shall classify the most important of them, and study the moral ideas held with reference to the phenomena of each class separately. And in both cases we shall not only analyse, but try to find an answer to the question, Why?--the ultimate aim of all scientific research. But before entering upon this vast undertaking, we must define the lines on which it is to be conducted. How can we get an insight into the moral ideas of mankind at large?

In answering this question I need not dwell upon such obvious means of information as direct experience, or records of moral maxims and sentiments found in proverbs, literary and philosophical works, and religious codes. The sources which, from an evolutionary point of view, are of the most comprehensive importance for our study, are tribal and national customs and laws. It is to these sources that the present chapter will be devoted.

{159} We have seen that a custom, in the strict sense of the word, is not merely the habit of a certain circle of men, but at the same time involves a moral rule. There is a close connection between these two characteristics of custom: its habitualness and its obligatoriness. Whatever be the foundation for a certain practice, and however trivial it may be, the unreflecting mind has a

tendency to disapprove of any deviation from it for the simple reason that such a deviation is unusual. As Abraham Tucker observes, "it is a constant argument among the common people, that a thing must be done, and ought to be done, because it always has been done."[1] Children show respect for the customary,[2] and so do savages. "If you ask a Kaffir why he does so and so, he will answer--'How can I tell? It has always been done by our forefathers.'"[3] The only reason which the Eskimo can give for some of their present customs, to which they adhere from fear of ill report among their people, is that "the old Innuits did so, and therefore they must."[4] In the behaviour of the Aleut, who "is bashful if caught doing anything unusual among his people,"[5] and in the average European's dread of appearing singular, we recognise the influence of the same force of habit.

[Footnote 1: Tucker, _Light of Nature_, ii. 593. _Cf._ also Simmel, _Einleitung in die Moralwissenschaft_, i. 65 _sqq._]

[Footnote 2: Sully, _Studies of Childhood_, p. 280 _sq._]

[Footnote 3: Leslie, _Among the Zulus and Amatongas_, p. 146.]

[Footnote 4: Hall, _Arctic Researches_, p. 569.]

[Footnote 5: Dall, _Alaska_, p. 396.]

On the other hand, it should be remembered that not every public habit is a custom, involving an obligation; certain practices, though very general in a society, may even be reprobated by almost every one of its members. The habits of a people must therefore be handled with discretion by the student of moral ideas. Yet when he has no reason to conclude as to some special habit that it is held obligatory, he may, probably always, be sure that it is either allowed, or, in spite of all assurances of its wickedness, that the disapproval of it is not generally very deep or genuine. In a community where lying is a {160} prevailing vice, truthfulness cannot be regarded as a very sacred duty; and where sexual immorality is widely spread, the public condemnation of it always smacks of hypocrisy. Men's standard of morality is not independent of their practice. The conscience of a community follows the same rule as the conscience of an individual. "Commit a sin twice," says the Talmud, "and you will think it perfectly allowable."[6] Hence for the study of the inmost convictions of a nation, its "bad habits" form a valuable complement to its professed opinions.

[Footnote 6: Deutsch, _Literary Remains_, p. 58.]

The dictates of custom being dictates of morality, it is obvious that the study of moral ideas will, to a large extent, be a study of customs. But at the same time it should be borne in mind that custom never covers the whole field of morality, and that the uncovered space grows larger in proportion as the moral consciousness develops. Being a rule of duty, custom may only indirectly be an expression of moral approval, by claiming, in certain cases, that goodness should be rewarded. But even when demanding praise, custom is not always a reliable exponent of merit; it includes politeness, and politeness is a great deceiver. Custom may compel us to praise a man for form's sake, when he deserves no praise, and to thank him when he deserves no thanks. Moreover, custom regulates external conduct only. It tolerates all kinds of volitions and opinions if not openly expressed. It does not condemn the heretical mind, but the heretical act. It demands that under certain circumstances certain actions shall be either performed or omitted, and, provided that this demand is fulfilled, it takes no notice of the motive of the agent or omitter. Again, in case the course of conduct prescribed by custom is not observed, the mental facts connected with the transgression, if regarded at all, are dealt with in a rough and ready manner, according to general rules which hardly admit of individualisation. Yet the incongruity between custom and morality which ensues from these circumstances is on {161} the whole more apparent than real. It is rather an incongruity between different moral standards. The unreflecting moral consciousness, like custom, cares comparatively little for the internal aspect of conduct. It does not ask whether a man goes to church on Sunday from a religious motive or from fear of public opinion; it does not ask whether he stays at home from love of ease or from dissent of belief and avoidance of hypocrisy. It is ready to blame as soon as the dictate of custom is disobeyed. The rule of custom is the rule of duty at early stages of development. Only progress in culture lessens its sway.

Finally, the moral ideas which are expressed in the customs of a certain circle of men are not necessarily shared by every one of its members. This may, in the present connection, be considered a matter of slight importance by him who regards morality as "objectively" realised in the customs of a people, and who denies the individual the right to a private conscience. But from the subjective point of view which I am vindicating, individual conviction has a claim to equal consideration with public opinion, nay frequently, to higher respect, representing as it does in many cases a higher morality, a moral standard more purified by reflection and impartiality. At the lower stages of civilisation, however, where a man is led by his feelings more than by his thoughts, such a differentiation of moral ideas hardly occurs. The opinions of the many are the opinions of all, and the customs of a society are

recognised as rules of duty by all its members.

In primitive society custom stands for law, and even where social organisation has made some progress it may still remain the sole rule for conduct.[7] The authority of {162} a chief does not necessarily involve a power to make laws. Even kings who are described as autocrats may be as much tied by custom as is any of their subjects.

[Footnote 7: Cranz, _History of Greenland_, i. 170. Dall, _op. cit._ p. 381 (Tuski). Dobrizhoffer, _Account of the Abipones_, p. 95. Shooter, _Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country_, p. 101 _sq._ Holden, _Past and Future of the Kaffir Races_, p. 336. Mungo Park, _Travels in the Interior of Africa_, p. 16. Scaramucci and Giglioli, 'Notizie sui Danakil,' in _Archivio per l'antropologia e la etnologia_, xiv. 39. Earl, _Papuans_, p. 105 (Arru Islanders). Forbes, _A Naturalist's Wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago_, p. 473 (Timorese). Dalton, _Ethnology of Bengal_, p. 51 (Manipuris). Rockhill, _Land of the Lamas_, p. 220 (Eastern Tibetans).]

The Rejangs of Sumatra "do not acknowledge a right in the chiefs to constitute what laws they think proper, or to repeal or alter their ancient usages, of which they are extremely tenacious and jealous." There is no word in their language which signifies law, and the chiefs, in pronouncing their decisions are not heard to say, "So the law directs," but, "Such is the custom."[8] According to Ellis, "the veneration of the Malagasy for the customs derived from tradition, or any accounts of their ancestors . . . influences both their public and private habits; and upon no individual is it more imperative than upon their monarch, who, absolute as he is in other respects, wants either the will or the power to break through the long-established regulations of a superstitious people."[9] The king of Ashanti, although represented as a despotic monarch, is nevertheless under an obligation to observe the national customs which have been handed down to the people from remote antiquity, and a practical disregard of this obligation, in the attempt to change some of the old customs, cost one of the kings his throne.[10] "The Africans," says Mr. Winwood Reade, with special reference to Dahomey, "have sometimes their enlightened kings, as the old barbarians had their sages and their priests. But it is seldom in the power of the heads of a people to alter those customs which have been held sacred from time immemorial."[11] The Basutos, among whom "the chiefs have the right of making laws and publishing regulations required by the necessities of the times," regard such laws, or _molaos_, as inferior to the _mekhoas_, "the use and wont," which constitute the real laws of the country.[12] Among the ancient Irish, there was no sovereign authority competent to enact a new law, the function of the king being merely, as chief of the tribal assembly, to see that the proper customs were observed.[13]

[Footnote 8: Marsden, _History of Sumatra_, p. 217.]

[Footnote 9: Ellis, _History of Madagascar_, i. 359.]

[Footnote 10: Beecham, _Ashantee and the Gold Coast_, p. 90 _sq._ _Cf._ Stuhlmann, _Mit Emin Pascha ins Herz von Afrika_, p. 523 (A-l[=u]r).]

[Footnote 11: Reade, _Savage Africa_, p. 52 _sq._]

[Footnot

Release date: February 9, 2006 [eBook #17720]

Language: English

Other information and formats: www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/17720

Credits: Produced by Thierry Alberto, Jeannie Howse and the Online Distributed Proofreaders Europe at http://dp.rastko.net.

*** START OF THE PROJECT GUTENBERG EBOOK HISTORY OF ANCIENT CIVILIZATION ***

Produced by Thierry Alberto, Jeannie Howse and the Online Distributed Proofreaders Europe at http://dp.rastko.net.

* * * * *

+----------+ | | | Transcriber's Note: | | | | Bolded text is distinguished by =='s at start and finish. | | Italicized text is distinguished by _'s at start and finish. | | | +----------+

HISTORY OF

ANCIENT CIVILIZATION

BY

CHARLES SEIGNOBOS

DOCTOR OF LETTERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS

LONDON T. FISHER UNWIN ADELPHI TERRACE MCMVII

(_All rights reserved_)

EDITOR'S NOTE

In preparing this volume, the Editor has used both the three-volume edition and the two-volume edition of the "Histoire de la Civilisation." He has usually preferred the order of topics of the two-volume edition, but has supplemented the material therein with other matter drawn from the three-volume edition.

A few corrections to the text have been given in foot-notes. These notes are always clearly distinguished from the elucidations of the author.

A.H.W.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PREHISTORIC TIMES. Prehistoric archaeology--Prehistoric remains; their antiquity--Prehistoric science--The four ages.

THE ROUGH STONE AGE. Remains found in the gravels--The cave-men.

THE POLISHED STONE AGE. Lake-villages--Megalithic monuments.

THE BRONZE AGE. Bronze--Bronze objects.

THE IRON AGE. Iron--Iron weapons--Epochs of the Iron Age.

Conclusions: How the four ages are to be conceived; uncertainties; solved questions.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY AND THE DOCUMENTS. History--Legends--History in general--Great divisions of history--Ancient history--Modern history--The Middle Ages.

SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS. Books--Monuments--Inscriptions--Languages--Lacunae.

RACES AND PEOPLES. Anthropology--The races--Civilized peoples--Aryans and Semites.

CHAPTER III

THE EGYPTIANS. Egypt--The country--The Nile--Fertility of the soil--The accounts of Herodotus--Champollion--Egyptologists--Discoveries.

THE EGYPTIAN EMPIRE. Antiquity of the Egyptian people--Memphis and the pyramids--Egyptian civilization--Thebes--The Pharaoh--The subjects--Despotism--Isolation of the Egyptians.

RELIGION OF THE EGYPTIANS. The gods--Osiris--Ammon-ra--Gods with animal heads--Sacred animals--The bull Apis--Worship of the dead--Judgment of the soul--Mummies--Book of the Dead--The arts--Industry--Architecture--Tombs--Temples--Sculpture--Painting--Literature-- Destinies of the Egyptian civilization.

CHAPTER IV

THE ASSYRIANS AND BABYLONIANS. Chaldea--The land--The people--The cities.

THE ASSYRIANS--Assyria--Origins--Ancient accounts--Modern discoveries-- Inscriptions on bricks--Cuneiform writing--The Assyrian people--The king--Fall of the Assyrian Empire.

THE BABYLONIANS. The second Chaldean empire--Babylon--The Tower of Babylon.

CUSTOMS AND RELIGION. Customs--Religion--The gods--Astrology-- Sorcery--The sciences.

THE ARTS. Architecture--Palaces--Sculpture.

CHAPTER V

THE ARYANS OF INDIA. The Aryans--Aryan languages--The Aryan people.

PRIMITIVE RELIGION OF THE HINDOOS. The Aryans on the Indus--The Vedas--The gods--Indra--Agni--The cult--Worship of ancestors.

BRAHMANIC SOCIETY. The Hindoos on the Ganges--Castes--The Impure--The Brahmans--The new religion of Brahma--Transmigration of souls-- Character of this religion--The rites--Purity--Penances--The monks.

BUDDHISM. Buddha--Nirvana--Charity--Fraternity--Tolerance--Later history of Buddhism--Changes in Buddhism--Buddha transformed into a god--Mechanical prayer--Amelioration of manners.

CHAPTER VI

THE PERSIANS. The religion of Zoroaster--Iran--The Iranians-- Zoroaster--The Zend-Avesta--Ormuzd and Ahriman--Angels and demons-- Creatures of Ormuzd and Ahriman--The cult--Morality--Funerals-- Destiny of the soul--Character of Mazdeism.

THE PERSIAN EMPIRE. The Medes--The Persians--Cyrus--The inscription of Behistun--The Persian empire--The satrapies--Revenues of the empire--The Great King--Services rendered by the Persians--Susa and Persepolis--Persian architecture.

CHAPTER VII

THE PHOENICIANS. The Phoenician people--The land--The cities--Phoenician ruins--Organization of the Phoenician--Tyre--Carthage--Carthaginian army--The Carthaginians--The Phoenician religion.

PHOENICIAN COMMERCE. Occupations of the Phoenicians--Caravans--Marine commerce--Commodities--Secret kept by the Phoenicians--Colonies-- Influence of the Phoenicians--The alphabet.

CHAPTER VIII

THE HEBREWS. Origin of the Hebrew people--The Bible--The Hebrews--The patriarchs--The Israelites--The call of Moses--Israel in the desert--The Promised Land.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL. One God--The people of God--The covenant--The Ten Commandments--The Law--Religion constituted the Jewish people.

THE EMPIRE OF ISRAEL. The Judges--The Hangs--Jerusalem--The tabernacle--The temple.

THE PROPHETS. Disasters of Israel--Sentiments of the Israelites--The prophets--The new teaching--The Messiah.

THE JEWISH PEOPLE. Return to Jerusalem--The Jews--The synagogues-- Destruction of the temple--The Jews after the dispersion.

CHAPTER IX

GREECE AND THE GREEKS. The country--The sea--The climate--Simplicity of Greek life--The people--Origin of the Greeks--Legends--The Trojan War--The Homeric Poems--The Greeks at the time of Homer--The Dorians--The Ionians--The Hellenes--The cities.

THE HELLENES BEYOND THE SEA. Colonization--Character of the colonies-- Traditions touching the colonies--Importance of the Greek colonies.

CHAPTER X

GREEK RELIGION. The gods--Polytheism--Anthropomorphism--Mythology--Local gods--The great gods--Attributes of the gods--Olympus and Zeus--Morality of the Greek mythology.

THE HEROES. Various sorts of heroes--Presence of the heroes-- Intervention of the heroes.

WORSHIP. Principle of the cult of the gods--The great Feasts--the sacred games--Omens--Oracles--Amphictyonies.

CHAPTER XI

SPARTA. The People--Laconia--The Helots--The Perioeci--Condition of the Spartiates.

EDUCATION. The children--The girls--The discipline--Laconism--Music-- The dance--Heroism of the women.

INSTITUTIONS. The kings and the council--The ephors--The army--The hoplites--The phalanx--Gymnastics--Athletes--Role of the Spartiates.

CHAPTER XII

ATHENS. Origins of the Athenian people--Attica--Athens--The revolutions in Athens--Reforms of Cleisthenes.

THE ATHENIAN PEOPLE. The slaves--The foreigners--The citizens.

THE GOVERNMENT. The assembly--The courts--The magistrates--Character of the government--The demagogues.

PRIVATE LIFE. Children--Marriage--Women.

CHAPTER XIII

WARS. The Persian wars--Origin of these wars--Comparison of the two adversaries--First Persian war--Second Persian war--Reasons for the victory of the Greeks--Results of the wars.

WARS OF THE GREEKS AMONG THEMSELVES. The Peloponnesian war--War with Sparta--Savage character of the wars--Effects of these wars.

CHAPTER XIV

THE ARTS IN GREECE. Athens in the time of Pericles--Pericles--Athens and her monuments--Importance of Athens.

LETTERS. Orators--Sages--Sophists--Socrates and the philosophers--The chorus--Tragedy and comedy--Theatre.

ARTS. The Grecian temples--Characteristics of Grecian architecture--Sculpture--Pottery--Painting.

CHAPTER XV

THE GREEKS IN THE ORIENT. Asia before Alexander--Decadence of the Persian empire--Expedition of the Ten Thousand--Agesilaus.

CONQUEST OF ASIA BY ALEXANDER. Macedon--Philip--Demosthenes--The Macedonian supremacy--Alexander--The phalanx--Departure of Alexander--Victories of Granicus, Issus, and Arbela--Death of Alexander--Projects of Alexander.

THE HELLENES IN THE ORIENT. Dismemberment of the empire of Alexander-- The Hellenistic kingdoms--Alexandria--Museum--Pergamum.

CHAPTER XVI

LATER PERIOD OF GREEK HISTORY. Decadence of the cities--Rich and poor--Strife between rich and poor--Democracy and oligarchy--The tyrants--Exhaustion of Greece.

THE ROMAN CONQUEST. The leagues--The allies of the Romans--The last struggles.

THE HELLENES IN THE OCCIDENT. Influence of Greece on Rome-- Architecture--Sculpture--Literature--Epicureans and Stoics.

CHAPTER XVII

ANCIENT PEOPLES OF ITALY. The Etruscans--Etruria--The Etruscan people-- The Etruscan tombs--Industry and commerce--Religion--The augurs-- Influence of the Etruscans.

THE ITALIAN PEOPLE. Umbrians and Oscans--The Sacred Spring--The Samnites--The Greeks of Italy.

LATINS AND ROMANS. The Latins--Rome--Roma Quadrata and the Capitol.

CHAPTER XVIII

RELIGION AND THE FAMILY. Religion--The Roman gods--Form of the gods--Principle of the Roman religion--Worship--Formalism-- Prayer--Omens--The priests.

WORSHIP OF ANCESTORS. The dead--Worship of the dead--Cult of the hearth.

THE FAMILY. Religion of the family--Marriage--Women--Children--Father of the family.

CHAPTER XIX

THE ROMAN CITY. Formation of the Roman people--The kings--The Roman people--The plebeians--Strife between patricians and plebeians-- The tribunes of the plebs--Triumph of the plebs.

THE ROMAN PEOPLE. Right of citizenship--The nobles--The knights--The plebs--Freedmen.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC. The comitia--Magistrates--Censors-- Senate--The course of offices.

CHAPTER XX

ROMAN CONQUEST. The Roman army--Military service--The levy--Legions and allies--Military exercises--Camp--Order of battle--Discipline-- Colonies &ad military roads.

CHARACTER OF THE CONQUESTS. War--Conquest of Italy--Punic wars--Hannibal--Conquest of the Orient--Conquest of barbarian lands--The triumph--Booty--Allies of Rome--Motives of conquest.

RESULTS OF THE CONQUESTS. Empire of the Roman people--The public domain--Agrarian laws.

CHAPTER XXI

THE CONQUERED PEOPLES. The provincials--Provinces--The proconsuls-- Tyranny and oppression of the proconsuls--The publicans--Bankers-- Defencelessness of the provincials.

SLAVERY. Sale of slaves--Condition of slaves--Number of slaves--Urban slaves--Rural slaves--Treatment of slaves--Ergastulum and mill-- Character of the slaves--Revolts--Admission to citizenship.

CHAPTER XXII

TRANSFORMATION OF LIFE IN ROME. Influence of Greece and the Orient.

CHANGES IN RELIGION. Greek gods--The Bacchanals--Superstitions of the Orient--Sceptics.

CHANGES IN MANNERS. The old customs--Cato the Elder--The new manners-- Oriental luxury--Greek humanity--Lucullus--The new education--New status of women--Divorce.

CHAPTER XXIII

FALL OF THE REPUBLIC. Causes of the decadence--Destruction of the peasant class--The city plebs--Electoral corruption--Corruption of the Senate--Corruption of the army.

THE REVOLUTION. Necessity of the revolution--Civil wars--The Gracchi-- Marius and Sulla--Pompey and Caesar--End of the Republic--Need of peace--Power of the individual.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE EMPIRE AT ITS HEIGHT. The twelve Caesars--The emperor--Apotheosis-- Senate and people--The praetorians--Freedmen of the emperors-- Despotism and disorder.

THE CENTURY OF THE ANTONINES. Marcus Aurelius--Conquests of the Antonines.

IMPERIAL INSTITUTIONS. Extent of the empire in the second century-- Permanent army--Deputies and agents of the emperor--Municipal life--Imperial regime.

SOCIAL LIFE UNDER THE EMPIRE. The continued decadence at Rome--The shows--Theatre--Circus--Amphitheatre--Gladiators--The Roman peace--Fusion of the peoples--Superstitions.

CHAPTER XXV

ARTS AND SCIENCES IN ROME. Letters--Imitation of the Greeks--The Augustan Age--Orators and rhetoricians--Importance of the Latin literature and language--Arts--Sculpture and painting-- Architecture--Characteristics of Roman architecture--Rome and its monuments.

ROMAN LAW. The Twelve Tables--Symbolic process--Formalism-- Jurisprudence--The praetor's edict--Civil law and the law of nations--Written reason.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Origin of Christianity--Christ--Charity-- Equality--Poverty and humility--The kingdom of God.

FIRST CENTURIES OF THE CHURCH. Disciples and apostles--The church-- Sacred books--Persecutions--Martyrs--Catacombs.

THE MONKS OF THE THIRD CENTURY. Solitaries--Asceticism--Cenobites.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE LATER EMPIRE. The revolutions of the third century--Military anarchy--Worship of Mithra--Taurobolia--Confusion of religions.

REGIME OF THE LATER EMPIRE. Reforms of Diocletian and Constantine-- Constantinople--The palace--The officials--Society of the later empire.

CHURCH AND STATE. Triumph of Christianity--Organization of the church--Councils--Heretics--Paganism--Theodosius.

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGINS OF CIVILIZATION

PREHISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGY

=Prehistoric Remains.=--One often finds buried in the earth, weapons, implements, human skeletons, debris of every kind left by men of whom we have no direct knowledge. These are dug up by the thousand in all the provinces of France, in Switzerland, in England, in all Europe; they are found even in Asia and Africa. It is probable that they exist in all parts of the world.

These remains are called prehistoric because they are more ancient than written history. For about fifty years men have been engaged in recovering and studying them. Today most museums have a hall, or at least, some cases filled with these relics. A museum at Saint-German-en-Laye, near Paris, is entirely given up to prehistoric remains. In Denmark is a collection of more than

30,000 objects. Every day adds to the discoveries as excavations are made, houses built, and cuts made for railroads.

These objects are not found on the surface of the ground, but ordinarily buried deeply where the earth has not been disturbed. They are recovered from a stratum of gravel or clay which has been deposited gradually and has fixed them in place safe from the air, a sure proof that they have been there for a long time.

=Prehistoric Science.=--Scholars have examined the debris and have asked themselves what men have left them. From their skeletons, they have tried to construct their physical appearance; from their tools, the kind of life they led. They have determined that these instruments resemble those used by certain savages today. The study of all these objects constitutes a new science, Prehistoric Archaeology.[1]

=The Four Ages.=--Prehistoric remains come down to us from very diverse races of men; they have been deposited in the soil at widely different epochs since the time when the mammoth lived in western Europe, a sort of gigantic elephant with woolly hide and curved tusks. This long lapse of time may be divided into four periods, called Ages:

1. The Rough Stone Age.

2. The Polished Stone Age.

3. The Bronze Age.

4. The Iron Age.

The periods take their names from the materials used in the manufacture of the tools,--stone, bronze, iron. These epochs, however, are of very unequal length. It may be that the Rough Stone Age was ten times as long as the Age of Iron.

THE ROUGH STONE AGE

=Gravel Debris.=--The oldest remains of the Stone Age have been found in the gravels. A French scholar found between 1841 and 1853, in the valley of the Somme, certain sharp instruments made of flint. They were buried to a depth of six metres in gravel under three layers of clay, gravel, and marl which had never been broken up. In the same place they discovered bones of cattle, deer, and elephants. For a long time people made light of this discovery. They said that the chipping of the flints was due to chance. At last, in 1860, several scholars came to study the remains in the valley of the Somme and recognized that the flints had certainly been cut by men. Since then there have been found more than 5,000 similar flints in strata of the same order either in the valley of the Seine or in England, and some of them by the side of human bones. There is no longer any doubt that men were living at the epoch when the gravel strata were in process of formation. If the strata that cover these remains have always been deposited as slowly as they are today, these men whose bones and tools we unearth must have lived more than 200,000 years ago.

=The Cave Men.=--Remains are also found in caverns cut in rock, often above a river. The most noted are those on the banks of the Vezere, but they exist in many other places. Sometimes they have been used as habitations and even as graves for men. Skeletons, weapons, and tools are found here together. There are axes, knives, scrapers, lance-points of flint; arrows, harpoon-points, needles of bone like those used by certain savages to this day. The soil is strewn with the bones of animals which these men, untidy like all savages, threw into a corner after they had eaten the meat; they even split the bones to extract the marrow just as savages do now. Among the animals are found not only the hare, the deer, the ox, the horse, the salmon, but also the rhinoceros, the cave-bear, the mammoth, the elk, the bison, the reindeer, which are all extinct or have long disappeared from France. Some designs have been discovered engraved on the bone of a reindeer or on the tusk of a mammoth. One of these represents a combat of reindeer; another a mammoth with woolly hide and curved tusks. Doubtless these men were the contemporaries of the mammoth and the reindeer. They were, like the Esquimaux of our day, a race of hunters and fishermen, knowing how to work in flint and to kindle fires.

POLISHED STONE AGE

=Lake Dwellings.=--In 1854, Lake Zurich being very low on account of the unusual dryness of the summer, dwellers on the shore of the lake found, in the mud, wooden piles which had been much eaten away, also some rude utensils. These were the remains of an ancient village built over the water. Since this time more than 200 similar villages have been found in the lakes of Switzerland. They have been called Lake Villages. The piles on which they rest are trunks of trees, pointed and driven into the lake-bottom to a depth of several yards. Every village required 30,000 to 40,000 of these.

A wooden platform was supported by the pile work and on this were built wooden houses covered with turf. Objects found by the hundred among the piles reveal the character of the life of the former inhabitants. They ate animals killed in the chase--the deer, the boar, and the elk. But they were already acquainted with such domestic animals as the ox, the goat, the sheep, and the dog. They knew how to till the ground, to reap, and to grind their grain; for in the ruins of their villages are to be found grains of wheat and even fragments of bread, or rather unleavend cakes. They wore coarse cloths of hemp and sewed them into garments with needles of bone. They made pottery but were very awkward in its manufacture. Their vases were poorly burned, turned by hand, and adorned with but few lines. Like the cave-men, they used knives and arrows of flint; but they made their axes of a very hard stone which they had learned to polish. This is why we call their epoch the Polished Stone Age. They are much later than the cave-men, for they know neither the mammoth nor the rhinoceros, but still are acquainted with the elk and the reindeer.[2]

=Megalithic Monuments.=--Megalith is the name given to a monument formed of enormous blocks of rough stone. Sometimes the rock is bare, sometimes covered with a mass of earth. The buried monument is called a _Tumulus_ on account of its resemblance to a hill. When it is opened, one finds within a chamber of rock, sometimes paved with flag-stones. The monuments whose stone is above ground are of various sorts. The _Dolmen_, or table of rock, is formed of a long stone laid flat over other stones set in the ground. The _Cromlech_, or stone-circle, consists of massive rocks arranged in a circle. The _Menhir_ is a block of stone standing on its end. Frequently several menhirs are ranged in line. At Carnac in Brittany four thousand menhirs in eleven rows are still standing. Probably there were once ten thousand of these in this locality. Megalithic monuments appear by hundreds in western France, especially in Brittany; almost every hill in England has them; the Orkney Islands alone contain more than two thousand. Denmark and North Germany are studded with them; the people of the country call the tumuli the tombs of the giants.

Megalithic monuments are encountered outside of Europe--in India, and on the African coast. No one knows what people possessed the power to quarry such masses and then transport and erect them. For a long time it was believed that the people were the ancient Gauls, or Celts, whence the name Celtic Monuments. But why are like remains found in Africa and in India?

When one of these tumuli still intact is opened, one always sees a skeleton, often several, either sitting or reclining; these monuments, therefore, were used as tombs. Arms, vases, and ornaments are placed at the side of the dead. In the oldest of these tombs the weapons are axes of polished stone; the ornaments are shells, pearls, necklaces of bone or ivory; the vases are very simple, without handle or neck, decorated only with lines or with points. Calcined bones of animals lie about on the ground, the relics of a funeral repast laid in the tomb by the friends of the dead. Amidst these bones we no longer find those of the reindeer, a fact which proves that these monuments were constructed after the disappearance of this animal from western Europe, and therefore at a time subsequent to that of the lake villages.

THE AGE OF BRONZE

=Bronze Age.=--As soon as men learned to smelt metals, they preferred these to stone in the manufacture of weapons. The metal first to be used was copper, easier to extract because found free, and easier to manipulate since it is malleable without the application of heat. Pure copper, however, was not employed, as weapons made of it were too fragile; but a little tin was mixed with it to give it more resistance. It is this alloy of copper and tin that we call bronze.

=Bronze Utensils.=--Bronze was used in the manufacture of ordinary tools--knives, hammers, saws, needles, fish-hooks; in the fabrication of ornaments--bracelets, brooches, ear-rings; and especially in the making of arms--daggers, lance-points, axes, and swords. These objects are found by thousands throughout Europe in the mounds, under the more recent dolmens, in the turf-pits of Denmark, and in rock-tombs. Near these objects of bronze, ornaments of gold are often seen and, now and then, the remains of a woollen garment. It cannot be due to chance that all implements of bronze are similar and all are made according to the same alloy. Doubtless they revert to the same period of time and are anterior to the coming of the Romans into Gaul, for they are never discovered in the midst of debris of the Roman period. But what men used them? What people invented bronze? Nobody knows.

THE IRON AGE

=Iron.=--As iron was harder to smelt and work than bronze, it was later that men learned how to use it. As soon as it was appreciated that iron was harder and cut better than bronze, men preferred it in the manufacture of arms. In Homer's time iron is still a precious metal reserved for swords, bronze being retained for other purposes. It is for this reason that many tombs contain confused remains of utensils of bronze and weapons of iron.

=Iron Weapons.=--These arms are axes, swords, daggers, and bucklers. They are ordinarily found by the side of a skeleton in a coffin of stone or wood, for warriors had their arms buried with them. But they are found also scattered on ancient battle-fields or lost at the bottom of a marsh which later became a turf-pit. There were found in a turf-pit in Schleswig in one day 100 swords, 500 lances, 30 axes, 460 daggers, 80 knives, 40 stilettos--and all of iron. Not far from there in the bed of an ancient lake was discovered a great boat 66 feet long, fully equipped with axes, swords, lances, and knives.

It is impossible to enumerate the iron implements thus found. They have not been so well preserved as the bronze, as iron is rapidly eaten away by rust. At the first glance, therefore, they appear the older, but in reality are more recent.

=Epoch of the Iron Age.=--The inhabitants of northern Europe knew iron before the coming of the Romans, the first century before Christ. In an old cemetery near the salt mines of Hallstadt in Austria they have opened 980 tombs filled with instruments of iron and bronze without finding a single piece of Roman money. But the Iron Age continued under the Romans. Almost always iron objects are found accompanied by ornaments of gold and silver, by Roman pottery, funeral urns, inscriptions, and Roman coins bearing the effigy of the emperor. The warriors whom we find lying near their sword and their buckler lived for the most part in a period quite close to ours, many under the Merovingians, some even at the time of Charlemagne. The Iron Age is no longer a prehistoric age.

CONCLUSIONS

=How the Four Ages are to be Conceived.=--The inhabitants of one and the same country have successively made use of rough stone, polished stone, bronze, and iron. But all countries have not lived in the same age at the same time. Iron was employed by the Egyptians while yet the Greeks were in their bronze age and the barbarians of Denmark were using stone. The conclusion of the polished stone age in America came only with the arrival of Europeans. In our own time the savages of Australia are still in the rough stone age. In their settlements may be found only implements of bone and stone similar to those used by the cave-men. The four ages, therefore, do not mark periods in the life of humanity, but only epochs in the civilization of each country.

=Uncertainties.=--Prehistoric archaeology is yet a very young science. We have learned something of primitive men through certain remains preserved and discovered by chance. A recent accident, a trench, a landslip, a drought may effect a new discovery any day. Who knows what is still under ground? The finds are already innumerable. But these rarely tell us what we wish to know. How long was each of the four ages? When did each begin and end in the various parts of the world? Who planned the caverns, the lake villages, the mounds, the dolmens? When a country passes from polished stone to bronze, is it the same people changing implements, or is it a new people come on the scene? When one thinks one has found the solution, a new discovery often confounds the archaeologists. It was thought that the Celts originated the dolmens, but these have been found in sections which could never have been traversed by Celts.

=What has been determined.=--Three conclusions, however, seem certain:

1.--Man has lived long on the earth, familiar as he was with the mammoth and the cave-bear; he lived at least as early as the geological period known as the Quaternary.

2.--Man has emerged from the savage state to civilized life; he has gradually perfected his tools and his ornaments from the awkward axe of flint and the necklace of bears' teeth to iron swords and jewels of gold. The roughest instruments are the oldest.

3.--Man has made more and more rapid progress. Each age has been shorter than its predecessor.

FOOTNOTES:

[1] It originated especially with French, Swiss, and scholars.

[2] According to Lubbock (Prehistoric Times, N.Y., 1890, p. 212) the reindeer was not known to the Second Stone Age.--ED.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY AND THE RECORDS

HISTORY

=Legends.=--The most ancient records of people and their doings are transmitted by oral tradition. They are recited long before they are written down and are much mixed with fable. The Greeks told how their heroes of the oldest times had exterminated monsters, fought with giants, and battled against the gods. The Romans had Romulus nourished by a wolf and raised to heaven. Almost all peoples relate such stories of their infancy. But no confidence is to be placed in these legends.

=History.=--History has its true beginning only with authentic accounts, that is to say, accounts written by men who were well informed. This moment is not the same with all peoples. The history of Egypt commences more than 3,000 years before Christ; that of the Greeks ascends scarcely to 800 years before Christ; Germany has had a history only since the first century of our era; Russia dates back only to the ninth century; certain savage tribes even yet have no history.

=Great Divisions of History.=--The history of civilization begins with the oldest civilized people and continues to the present time. Antiquity is the most remote period, Modern Times the era in which we live.

=Ancient History.=--Ancient History begins with the oldest known nations, the Egyptians and Chaldeans (about 3,000 years before our era), and surveys the peoples of the Orient, the Hindoos, Persians, Phoenicians, Jews, Greeks, and last of all the Romans. It terminates about the fifth century A.D., when the Roman empire of the west is extinguished.

=Modern History.=--Modern History starts with the end of the fifteenth century, with the invention of printing, the discovery of America and of the Indies, the Renaissance of the sciences and arts. It concerns itself especially with peoples of the West, of Spain, Italy, France, Germany, Russia, and America.

=The Middle Age.=--Between Antiquity and Modern Times about ten centuries elapse which belong neither to ancient times (for the civilization of Antiquity has perished) nor to modern (since modern civilization does not yet exist). This period we call the Middle Age.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE HISTORY OF ANCIENT PEOPLES

=The Sources.=--The Assyrians, Greeks, and Romans are no longer with us; all the peoples of antiquity have passed away. To know their religion, their customs, and arts we have to seek for instruction in the remains they have left us. These are books, monuments, inscriptions, and languages, and these are our means for the study of ancient civilizations. We term these _sources_ because we draw our knowledge from them. Ancient History flows from these sources.

=Books.=--Ancient peoples have left written records behind them. Some of these peoples had sacred books--for example, the Hindoos, the Persians, and the Jews; the Greeks and Romans have handed down to us histories, poems, speeches, philosophical treatises. But books are very far from furnishing all the information that we require. We do not possess a single Assyrian or Phoenician book. Other peoples have transmitted very few books to us. The ancients wrote less than we, and so they had a smaller literature to leave behind them; and as it was necessary to transcribe all of this by hand, there was but a small number of copies of books. Further, most of these manuscripts have been destroyed or have been lost, and those which remain to us are difficult to read. The art of deciphering them is called Palaeography.

=The Monuments.=--Ancient peoples, like ourselves, built monuments of different sorts: palaces for their kings, tombs for the dead, fortresses, bridges, aqueducts, triumphal arches. Of these monuments many have fallen into ruin, have been razed, shattered by the enemy or by the people themselves. But some of them survive, either because there was no desire to destroy them, or because men could not. They still stand in ruins like the old castles, for repairs are no longer made; but enough is preserved to enable us to comprehend their former condition. Some of them are still above ground, like the pyramids, the temples of Thebes and of the island of Philae, the palace of Persepolis in Persia, the Parthenon in Greece, the Colosseum in Rome, and the Maison Carree and Pont du Gard in France. Like any modern monument, these are visible to the traveller. But the majority of these monuments have been recovered from the earth, from sand, from river deposits, and from debris. One must disengage them from this thick covering, and excavate the soil, often to a great depth. Assyrian palaces may be reached only by cutting into the hills. A trench of forty feet is necessary to penetrate to the tombs of the kings of Mycenae. Time is not the only agency for covering these ruins; men have aided it. When the ancients wished to build, they did not, as we do, take the trouble to level off the space, nor to clear the site. Instead of removing the debris, they heaped it together and built above it. The new edifice in turn fell into ruins and its debris was added to that of more remote time; thus there were formed several strata of remains. When Schliemann excavated the site of Troy, he had passed through five beds of debris; these were five ruined villages one above another, the oldest at a depth of fifty feet.

By accident one town has been preserved to us in its entirety. In 79 A.D. the volcano of Vesuvius belched forth a torrent of liquid lava and a rain of ashes, and two Roman cities were suddenly buried, Herculaneum by lava, and Pompeii by ashes; the lava burnt the objects it touched, while the ashes enveloped them, preserving them from the air and keeping them intact. As we remove the ashes, Pompeii reappears to us just as it was eighteen centuries ago. One still sees the wheel-ruts in the pavement, the designs traced on the walls with charcoal; in the houses, the pictures, the utensils, the furniture, even the bread, the nuts, and olives, and here and there the skeleton of an inhabitant surprised by the catastrophe. Monuments teach us much about the ancient peoples. The science of monuments is called Archaeology.

=Inscriptions.=--By inscriptions one means all writings other than books. Inscriptions are for the most part cut in stone, but some are on plates of bronze. At Pompeii they have been found traced on the walls in colors or with charcoal. Some have the character of commemorative inscriptions just as these are now attached to our statues and edifices; thus in the monument of Ancyra the emperor Augustus publishes the story of his life.

The greatest number of inscriptions are epitaphs graven on tombs. Certain others fill the function of our placards, containing, as they do, a law or a regulation that was to be made public. The science of inscriptions is called Epigraphy.

=Languages.=--The languages also which ancient peoples spoke throw light on their history. Comparing the words of two different languages, we perceive that the two have a common origin--an evidence that the peoples who spoke them were descended from the same stock. The science of languages is called Linguistics.

=Lacunae.=--It is not to be supposed that books, monuments, inscriptions, and languages are sufficient to give complete knowledge of the history of antiquity. They present many details which we could well afford to lose, but often what we care most to know escapes us. Scholars continue to dig and to decipher; each year new discoveries of inscriptions and monuments are made; but there remain still many gaps in our knowledge and probably some of these will always exist.

RACES AND PEOPLES

=Anthropology.=--The men who people the earth do not possess exact resemblances, some differing from others in stature, the form of the limbs and the head, the features of the face, the color of the hair and eyes. Other differences are found in language, intelligence, and sentiments. These variations permit us to separate the inhabitants of the earth into several groups which we call races. A _race_ is the aggregate of those men who resemble one another and are distinguished from all others. The common traits of a race--its characteristics--constitute the type of the race. For example, the type of the negro race is marked by black skin, frizzly hair, white teeth, flat nose, projecting lips, and prominent jaw. That part of Anthropology which concerns itself with races and their sub-divisions is called Ethnology.[3] This science is yet in its early development on account of its complete novelty, and is very complex since types of men are very numerous and often very difficult to differentiate.

=The Races.=--The principal races are:

1.--The White race, which inhabits Europe, the north of Africa, and western Asia.

2.--The Yellow race in eastern Asia to which belong the Chinese, the Mongols, Turks, and Hungarians, who invaded Europe as conquerors. They have yellow skin, small regular eyes, prominent cheek-bones, and thin beard.

3.--The Black race, in central Africa. These are the Negroes, of black skin, flat nose, woolly hair.

4.--The Red race, in America. These are the Indians, with copper-colored skin and flat heads.

=Civilized Peoples.=--Almost all civilized peoples belong to the white race. The peoples of the other races have remained savage or barbarian, like the men of prehistoric times.[4]

It is within the limits of Asia and Africa that the first civilized peoples had their development--the Egyptians in the Nile valley, the Chaldeans in the plain of the Euphrates. They were peoples of sedentary and peaceful pursuits. Their skin was dark, the hair short and thick, the lips strong. Nobody knows their origin with exactness and scholars are not agreed on the name to give them (some terming them Cushites, others Hamites). Later, between the twentieth and twenty-fifth centuries B.C. came bands of martial shepherds who had spread over all Europe and the west of Asia--the Aryans and the Semites.

=The Aryans and the Semites.=--There is no clearly marked external difference between the Aryans and the Semites. Both are of the white race, having the oval face, regular features, clear skin, abundant hair, large eyes, thin lips, and straight nose. Both peoples were originally nomad shepherds, fond of war. We do not know whence they came, nor is there agreement whether the Aryans came from the mountain region in the northwest of the Himalayas or from the plains of Russia. What distinguishes them is their spiritual bent and especially their language, sometimes also their religion. Scholars by common consent call those peoples Aryan who speak an Aryan language: in Asia, the Hindoos and Persians; in Europe, the Greeks, Italians, Spaniards, Germans, Scandinavians, Slavs (Russians, Poles, Serfs), and Celts.[5]

Similarly, we call Semites those peoples who speak a Semitic language: Arabs, Jews and Syrians. But a people may speak an Aryan or a Semitic language and yet not be of Aryan or Semitic race; a negro may speak English without being of English stock. Many of the Europeans whom we classify among the Aryans are perhaps the descendants of an ancient race conquered by the Aryans and who have adopted their language, just as the Egyptians received the language of the Arabs, their conquerors.

These two names (Aryan and Semite), then, signify today rather two groups of peoples than two distinct races. But even if we use the terms in this sense, one may say that all the greater peoples of the world have been Semites or Aryans. The Semitic family included the Phoenicians, the people of commerce; the Jews, the people of religion; the Arabs, the people of war. The Aryans, some finding their homes in India, others in Europe, have produced the nations which have been, and still are, foremost in the world--in antiquity, the Hindoos, a people of great philosophical and religious ideas; the Greeks, creators of art and of science; the Persians and Romans, the founders, the former in the East, the latter in the West, of the greatest empires of antiquity; in modern times, the Italians, French, Germans, Dutch, Russians, English and Americans.

The history of civilization begins with the Egyptians and the Chaldeans; but from the fifteenth century before our era, history concerns itself only with the Aryan and Semitic peoples.

FOOTNOTES:

[3] Ethnography is the study of races from the point of view of their objects and customs.

[4] The Chinese only of the yellow race have elaborated among themselves an industry, a regular government, a polite society. But placed at the extremity of Asia they have had no influence on other civilized peoples. [The Japanese should be included.--ED.]

[5] The English and French are mixtures of Celtic and German blood.

CHAPTER III

ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE EAST

THE EGYPTIANS

=The Land of Egypt.=--Egypt is only the valley of the Nile, a narrow strip of fertile soil stretching along both banks of the stream and shut in by mountains on either side, somewhat over 700[6] miles in length and 15 in width. Where the hills fall away, the Delta begins, a vast plain cut by the arms of the Nile and by canals. As Herodotus says, Egypt is wholly the gift of the Nile.

=The Nile.=--Every year at the summer solstice the Nile, swollen by the melted snows of Abyssinia, overflows the parched soil of Egypt. It rises to a height of twenty-six or twenty-seven feet, sometimes even to thirty-three feet.[7] The whole country becomes a lake from which the villages, built on eminences, emerge like little islands. The water recedes in September; by December it has returned to its proper channel. Everywhere has been left a fertile, alluvial bed which serves the purpose of fertilization. On the softened earth the peasant sows his crop with almost no labor. The Nile, then, brings both water and soil to Egypt; if the river should fail, Egypt would revert, like the land on either side of it, to a desert of sterile sand where the rain never falls. The Egyptians are conscious of their debt to their stream. A song in its honor runs as follows: "Greeting to thee, O Nile, who hast revealed thyself throughout the land, who comest in peace to give life to Egypt. Does it rise? The land is filled with joy, every heart exults, every being receives its food, every mouth is full. It brings bounties that are full of delight, it creates all good things, it makes the grass to spring up for the beasts."

=Fertility of the Country.=--Egypt is truly an oasis in the midst of the desert of Africa. It produces in abundance wheat, beans, lentils, and all leguminous foods; palms rear themselves in forests. On the pastures irrigated by the Nile graze herds of cattle and

goats, and flocks of geese. With a territory hardly equal to that of Belgium, Egypt still supports 5,500,000 inhabitants. No country in Europe is so thickly populated, and Egypt in antiquity was more densely thronged than it is today.

=The Accounts of Herodotus.=--Egypt was better known to the Greeks than the rest of the Orient. Herodotus had visited it in the fifth century B.C. He describes in his History the inundations of the Nile, the manners, costume, and religion of the people; he recounts events of their history and tales which his guides had told him. Diodorus and Strabo also speak of Egypt. But all had seen the country in its decadence and had no knowledge of the ancient Egyptians.

=Champollion.=--The French expedition to Egypt (1798-1801) opened the country to scholars. They made a close examination of the Pyramids and ruins of Thebes, and collected drawings and inscriptions. But no one could decipher the hieroglyphs, the Egyptian writing. It was an erroneous impression that every sign in this writing must each represent a word. In 1821 a French scholar, Champollion, experimented with another system. An official had reported that there was an inscription at Rosetta in three forms of writing--parallel with the hieroglyphs was a translation in Greek. The name of King Ptolemy, was surrounded with a cartouche.[8] Champollion succeeded in finding in this name the letters P, T, O, L, M, I, S. Comparing these with other names of kings similarly enclosed, he found the whole alphabet. He then read the hieroglyphs and found that they were written in a language like the Coptic, the language spoken in Egypt at the time of the Romans, and which was already known to scholars.

=Egyptologists.=--Since Champollion, many scholars have travelled over Egypt and have ransacked it thoroughly. We call these students Egyptologists, and they are to be found in every country of Europe. A French Egyptologist, Mariette (1821-1881), made some excavations for the Viceroy of Egypt and created the museum of Boulak. France has established in Cairo a school of Egyptology, directed by Maspero.

=Discoveries.=--Not every country yields such rich discoveries as does Egypt. The Egyptians constructed their tombs like houses, and laid in them objects of every kind for the use of the dead--furniture, garments, arms, and edibles. The whole country was filled with tombs similarly furnished. Under this extraordinarily dry climate everything has been preserved; objects come to light intact after a burial of 4,000 or 5,000 years. No people of antiquity have left so many traces of themselves as the Egyptians; none is better known to us.

THE EGYPTIAN EMPIRE

=Antiquity of the Egyptian People.=--An Egyptian priest said to Herodotus, "You Greeks are only children." The Egyptians considered themselves the oldest people of the world. Down to the Persian conquest (520[9] B.C.) there were twenty-six dynasties of kings. The first ran back 4,000 years,[10] and during these forty centuries Egypt had been an empire. The capital down to the tenth dynasty (the period of the Old Empire) was at Memphis in Lower Egypt, later, in the New Empire, at Thebes in Upper Egypt.

=Memphis and the Pyramids.=--Memphis, built by the first king of Egypt, was protected by an enormous dike. The village has existed for more than five thousand years; but since the thirteenth century the inhabitants have taken the stones of its ruins to build the houses of Cairo; what these people left the Nile recaptured. The Pyramids, not far from Memphis, are contemporaneous with the old empire; they are the tombs of three kings of the fourth dynasty. The greatest of the pyramids, 480 feet high, required the labor of 100,000 men for thirty years.[11] To raise the stones for it they built gradually ascending platforms which were removed when the structure was completed.

=Egyptian Civilization.=--The statues, paintings, and instruments which are taken from the tombs of this epoch give evidence of an already civilized people. When all the other eminent nations of antiquity--the Hindoos, Persians, Jews, Greeks, Romans--were still in a savage state, 3,500 years before our era, the Egyptians had known for a long time how to cultivate the soil, to weave cloths, to work metals, to paint, sculpture, and to write; they had an organized religion, a king, and an administration.

=Thebes.=--At the eleventh dynasty Thebes succeeds Memphis as capital. The ruins of Thebes are still standing. They are marvellous, extending as they do on both banks of the Nile, with a circuit of about seven miles. On the left bank there is a series of palaces and temples which lead to vast cemeteries. On the right bank two villages, Luxor and Karnak, distant a half-hour one from the other, are built in the midst of the ruins. They are united by a double row of sphinxes, which must have once included more than 1,000 of these monuments. Among these temples in ruins the greatest was the temple of Ammon at Karnak. It was surrounded by a wall of over one and one-third miles in length; the famous Hall of Columns, the greatest in the world, had a length of 334 feet, a width of 174 feet,[12] and was supported by 134 columns; twelve of these are over 65 feet high. Thebes was for 1,500 years the capital and sacred city, the residence of kings and the dwelling-place of the priests.

=The Pharaoh.=--The king of Egypt, called Pharaoh, was esteemed as the son of the Sun-god and his incarnation on earth; divinity was ascribed to him also. We may see in a picture King Rameses II standing in adoration before the divine Rameses who is sitting between two gods. The king as man adores himself as god. Being god, the Pharaoh has absolute power over men; as master, he gives his orders to his great nobles at court, to his warriors, to all his subjects. But the priests, though adoring him, surround and watch him; their head, the high priest of the god Ammon, at last becomes more powerful than the king; he often governs under the name of the king and in his stead.

=The Subjects of Pharaoh.=--The king, the priests, the warriors, the nobles, are proprietors of all Egypt; all the other people are simply their peasants who cultivate the land for them. Scribes in the service of the king watch them and collect the farm-dues, often with blows of the staff. One of these functionaries writes as follows to a friend, "Have you ever pictured to yourself the existence of the peasant who tills the soil. The tax-collector is on the platform busily seizing the tithe of the harvest. He has his men with him armed with staves, his negroes provided with strips of palm. All cry, 'Come, give us grain,' If the peasant hasn't it, they throw him full length on the earth, bind him, draw him to the canal, and hurl him in head foremost."

=Despotism.=--The Egyptian people has always been, and still is, gay, careless, gentle, docile as an infant, always ready to submit to tyranny. In this country the cudgel was the instrument of education and of government. "The young man," said the scribes, "has a back to be beaten; he hears when he is struck." "One day," says a French traveller, "finding myself before the ruins of Thebes, I exclaimed, 'But how did they do all this?' My guide burst out laughing, touched me on the arm and, showing me a palm, said to me, 'Here is what they used to accomplish all this. You know, sir, with 100,000 branches of palms split on the backs of those who always have their shoulders bare, you can build many a palace and some temples to boot.'"

=Isolation of the Egyptians.=--The Egyptians moved but little beyond their borders. As the sea inspired them with terror, they had no commerce and did not trade with other peoples. They were not at all a military nation. Their kings, it is true, often went on expeditions at the head of mercenaries either against the negroes of Ethiopia or against the tribes of Syria. They gained victories which they had painted on the walls of their palaces, they brought back troops of captives whom they used in building monuments; but they never made great conquests. Foreigners came more to Egypt than Egyptians went abroad.

=Religion of the Egyptians.=--"The Egyptians," said Herodotus, "are the most religious of all men." We do not know any people so devout; almost all their paintings represent men in prayer before a god; almost all their manuscripts are religious books.

=Egyptian Gods.=--The principal deity is a Sun-god, creator, beneficent, "who knows all things, who exists from the beginning." This god has a divine wife and son. All the Egyptians adored this trinity; but not all gave it the same name. Each region gave a different name to these three gods. At Memphis they called the father Phtah, the mother Sekhet, the son Imouthes; at Abydos they called them Osiris, Isis, and Horus; at Thebes, Ammon, Mouth, and Chons. Then, too, the people of one province adopted the gods of other provinces. Further, they made other gods emanate from each god of the trinity. Thus the number of gods was increased and religion was complicated.

=Osiris.=--These gods have their history; it is that of the sun; for the sun appeared to the Egyptians, as to most of the primitive peoples, the mightiest of beings, and consequently a god. Osiris, the sun, is slain by Set, god of the night; Isis, the moon, his wife, bewails and buries him; Horus, his son, the rising sun, avenges him by killing his murderer.

=Ammon-ra.=--Ammon-ra, god of Thebes, is represented as traversing heaven each day in a bark ("the good bark of millions of years"); the shades of the dead propel it with long oars; the god stands at the prow to strike the enemy with his lance. The hymn which they chanted in his honor is as follows: "Homage to thee; thou watchest favoringly, thou watchest truly, O master of the two horizons.... Thou treadest the heavens on high, thine enemies are laid low. The heaven is glad, the earth is joyful, the gods unite in festal cheer to render glory to Ra when they see him rising in his bark after he has overwhelmed his enemies. O Ra, give abounding life to Pharaoh, bestow bread for his hunger (belly), water for his throat, perfumes for his hair."

=Animal-Headed Gods.=--The Egyptians often represented their gods with human form, but more frequently under the form of a beast. Each god has his animal: Phtah incarnates himself in the beetle, Horus in the hawk, Osiris in the bull. The two figures often unite in a man with the head of an animal or an animal with the head of a man. Every god may be figured in four forms: Horus, for example, as a man, a hawk, as man with the head of a hawk, as a hawk with the head of a man.

=Sacred Animals.=--What did the Egyptians wish to designate by this symbol? One hardly knows. They, themselves, came to regard as sacred the animals which served to represent the gods to them: the bull, the beetle, the ibis, the hawk, the cat, the

crocodile. They cared for them and protected them. A century before the Christian era a Roman citizen killed a cat at Alexandria; the people rose in riot, seized him, and, notwithstanding the entreaties of the king, murdered him, although at the same time they had great fear of the Romans. There was in each temple a sacred animal which was adored. The traveller Strabo records a visit to a sacred crocodile of Thebes: "The beast," said he, "lay on the edge of a pond, the priests drew near, two of them opened his mouth, a third thrust in cakes, grilled fish, and a drink made with meal."

=The Bull Apis.=--Of these animal gods the most venerated was the bull Apis. It represented at once Osiris and Phtah and lived at Memphis in a chapel served by the priests. After its death it became an Osiris (Osar-hapi), it was embalmed, and its mummy deposited in a vault. The sepulchres of the "Osar-hapi" constituted a gigantic monument, the Serapeum, discovered in 1851 by Marietta.

=Cult of the Dead.=--The Egyptians adored also the spirits of the dead. They seem to have believed at first that every man had a "double" (Ka), and that when the man was dead his double still survived. Many savage peoples believe this to this day. The Egyptian tomb in the time of the Old Empire was termed "House of the Double." It was a low room arranged like a chamber, where for the service of the double there were placed all that he required, chairs, tables, beds, chests, linen, closets, garments, toilet utensils, weapons, sometimes a war-chariot; for the entertainment of the double, statues, paintings, books; for his sustenance, grain and foods. And then they set there a double of the dead in the form of a statue in wood or stone carved in his likeness. At last the opening to the vault was sealed; the double was enclosed, but the living still provided for him. They brought him foods or they might beseech a god that he supply them to the spirit, as in this inscription, "An offering to Osiris that he may confer on the Ka of the deceased N. bread, drink, meat, geese, milk, wine, beer, clothing, perfumes--all good things and pure on which the god (_i.e._ the Ka) subsists."

=Judgment of the Soul.=--Later, originating with the eleventh dynasty, the Egyptians believed that the soul flew away from the body and sought Osiris under the earth, the realm into which the sun seemed every day to sink. There Osiris sits on his tribunal, surrounded by forty-two judges; the soul appears before these to give account of his past life. His actions are weighed in the balance of truth, his "heart" is called to witness. "O heart," cries the dead, "O heart, the issue of my mother, my heart when I was on earth, offer not thyself as witness, charge me not before the great god." The soul found on examination to be bad is tormented for centuries and at last annihilated. The good soul springs up across the firmament; after many tests it rejoins the company of the gods and is absorbed into them.

=Mummies.=--During this pilgrimage the soul may wish to re-enter the body to rest there. The body must therefore be kept intact, and so the Egyptians learned to embalm it. The corpse was filled with spices, drenched in a bath of natron, wound with bandages and thus transformed into a mummy. The mummy encased in a coffin of wood or plaster was laid in the tomb with every provision necessary to its life.

=Book of the Dead.=--A book was deposited with the mummy, the Book of the Dead, which explains what the soul ought to say in the other world when it makes its defence before the tribunal of Osiris: "I have never committed fraud; ... I have never vexed the widow; ... I have never committed any forbidden act; ... I have never been an idler; ... I have never taken the slave from his master; ... I never stole the bread from the temples; ... I never removed the provisions or the bandages of the dead; I never altered the grain measure; ... I never hunted sacred beasts; I never caught sacred fish; ... I am pure; ... I have given bread to the hungry, water to the thirsty, clothing to the naked; I have sacrificed to the gods, and offered funeral feasts to dead." Here we see Egyptian morality: observance of ceremonies, respect for everything pertaining to the gods, sincerity, honesty, and beneficence.

THE ARTS

=Industry.=--The Egyptians were the first to practice the arts necessary to a civilized people. From the first dynasty, 3,000[13] years B.C., paintings on the tomb exhibit men working, sowing, harvesting, beating and winnowing grain; we have representations of herds of cattle, sheep, geese, swine; of persons richly clothed, processions, feasts where the harp is played--almost the same life that we behold 3,000 years later. As early as this time the Egyptians knew how to manipulate gold, silver, bronze; to manufacture arms and jewels, glass, pottery, and enamel; they wove garments of linen and wool, and cloths, transparent or embroidered with gold.

=Architecture.=--They were the oldest artists of the world. They constructed enormous monuments which appear to be eternal, for down to the present, time has not been able to destroy them. They never built, as we do, for the living, but for the gods and for the dead, _i.e._, temples and tombs. Only a slight amount of debris is left of their houses, and even the palaces of their kings in

comparison with the tombs appear, in the language of the Greeks, to be only inns. The house was to serve only for a lifetime, the tomb for eternity.

=Tombs.=--The Great Pyramid is a royal tomb. Ancient tombs ordinarily had this form. In Lower Egypt there still remain pyramids arranged in rows or scattered about, some larger, others smaller. These are the tombs of kings and nobles. Later the tombs are constructed underground, some under earth, others cut into the granite of the hills. Each generation needs new ones, and therefore near the town of living people is built the richer and greater city of the dead (necropolis).

=Temples.=--The gods also required eternal and splendid habitations. Their temples include a magnificent sanctuary, the dwelling of the god, surrounded with courts, gardens, chambers where the priests lodge, wardrobes for his jewels, utensils, and vestments. This combination of edifices, the work of many generations, is encircled with a wall. The temple of Ammon at Thebes had the labors of the kings of all the dynasties from the twelfth to the last. Ordinarily in front of the temple a great gate-way is erected, with inclined faces--the pylone. On either side of the entrance is an obelisk, a needle of rock with gilded point, or perhaps a colossus in stone representing a sitting giant. Often the approach to the temple is by a long avenue rimmed with sphinxes.

Pyramids, pylones, colossi, sphinxes, and obelisks characterize this architecture. Everything is massive, compact, and, above all, immense. Hence these monuments appear clumsy but indestructible.

=Sculpture.=--Egyptian sculptors began with imitating nature. The oldest statues are impressive for their life and freshness, and are doubtless portraits of the dead. Of this sort is the famous squatting scribe of the Louvre.[14] But beginning with the eleventh dynasty the sculptor is no longer free to represent the human body as he sees it, but must follow conventional rules fixed by religion. And so all the statues resemble one another--parallel legs, the feet joined, arms crossed on the breast, the figure motionless; the statues are often majestic, but always stiff and monotonous. Art has ceased to reproduce nature and is become a conventional symbol.

=Painting.=--The Egyptians used very solid colors; after 5,000 years they are still fresh and bright. But they were ignorant of coloring designs; they knew neither tints, shadows, nor perspective. Painting, like sculpture, was subject to religious rules and was therefore monotonous. If fifty persons were to be represented, the artist made them all alike.

=Literature.=--The literature of the Egyptians is found in the tombs--not only books of medicine, of magic and of piety, but also poems, letters, accounts of travels, and even romances.

=Destiny of the Egyptian Civilization.=--The Egyptians conserved their customs, religion, and arts even after the fall of their empire. Subjects of the Persians, then the Greeks, and at last of the Romans, they kept their old usages, their hieroglyphics, their mummies and sacred animals. At last between the third and second centuries A.D., Egyptian civilization was slowly extinguished.

FOOTNOTES:

[6] Following the curves of the stream.--ED.

[7] In some localities, _e.g._ Thebes, the flood is even higher.--ED.

[8] An enclosing case.

[9] 525 B.C.--ED.

[10] The chronology of early Egyptian history is uncertain. Civilization existed in this land much earlier than was formerly supposed.--ED.

[11] According to Petrie ("History of Egypt," New York, 1895, i., 40) _twenty years_ were consumed.--ED.

[12] Perrot and Chipiez ("History of Ancient Egyptian Art," London. 1883, i., 365) give 340 feet by 170.--ED.

[13] Probably much earlier than this.--ED.

[14] The Louvre Museum in Paris has an excellent collection of Egyptian subjects.

CHAPTER IV

ASSYRIANS AND BABYLONIANS

CHALDEA

=The Land.=--From the high and snowy mountains of Armenia flow two deep and rapid rivers, the Tigris to the east, the Euphrates to the west. At first in close proximity, they separate as they reach the plain. The Tigris makes a straight course, the Euphrates a great detour towards the sandy deserts; then they unite before emptying into the sea. The country which they embrace is Chaldea. It is an immense plain of extraordinarily fertile soil; rain is rare and the heat is overwhelming. But the streams furnish water and this clayey soil when irrigated by canals becomes the most fertile in the world. Wheat and barley produce 200-fold; in good years the returns are 300-fold. Palms constitute the forests and from these the people make their wine, meal and flour.[15]

=The People.=--For many centuries, perhaps as long as Egypt, Chaldea has been the abode of civilized peoples. Many races from various lands have met and mingled in these great plains. There were Turanians of the yellow race, similar to the Chinese, who came from the north-east; Cushites, deep brown in color, related to the Egyptians, came from the east; Semites, of the white race, of the same stock as the Arabs, descended from the north.[16] The Chaldean people had its origin in this mixture of races.

=The Cities.=--Chaldean priests related that their kings had ruled for 150,000 years. While this is a fable, they were right in ascribing great antiquity to the Chaldean empire. The soil of Chaldea is everywhere studded with hills and each of these is a mass of debris, the residue of a ruined city. Many of these have been excavated and many cities brought to view, (Our, Larsam, Bal-ilou), and some inscriptions recovered. De Sarsec, a Frenchman, has discovered the ruins of an entire city, overwhelmed by the invader and its palace destroyed by fire. These ancient peoples are still little known to us; many sites remain to be excavated when it is hoped new inscriptions will be found. Their empire was destroyed about 2,300 B.C.; it may then have been very old.[17]

THE ASSYRIANS

=Assyria.=--The country back of Chaldea on the Tigris is Assyria. It also is fertile, but cut with hills and rocks. Situated near the mountains, it experiences snow in winter and severe storms in summer.

=Origins.=--Chaldea had for a long time been covered with towns while yet the Assyrians lived an obscure life in their mountains. About the thirteenth century B.C. their kings leading great armies began to invade the plains and founded a mighty empire whose capital was Nineveh.

=Ancient Accounts.=--Until about forty years ago we knew almost nothing of the Assyrians--only a legend recounted by the Greek Diodorus Siculus. Ninus, according to the story, had founded Nineveh and conquered all Asia Minor; his wife, Semiramis, daughter of a goddess, had subjected Egypt, after which she was changed into the form of a dove. Incapable kings had succeeded this royal pair for the space of 1,300 years; the last, Sardanapalus, besieged in his capital, was burnt with his wives. This romance has not a word of truth in it.

=Modern Discoveries.=--In 1843, Botta, the French consul at Mossoul, discovered under a hillock near the Tigris, at Khorsabad, the palace of an Assyrian king. Here for the first time one could view the productions of Assyrian art; the winged bulls cut in stone, placed at the gate of the palace were found intact and removed to the Louvre Museum in Paris. The excavations of Botta drew the attention of Europe, so that many expeditions were sent out, especially by the English; Place and Layard investigated other mounds and discovered other palaces. These ruins had been well preserved, protected by the dryness of the climate and by a covering of earth. They found walls adorned with bas-reliefs and paintings; statues and inscriptions were discovered in great number. It was now possible to study on the ground the plan of the structures and to publish reproductions of the monuments and inscriptions.

The palace first discovered, that of Khorsabad, had been built by King Sargon at Nineveh, the site of the capital of the Assyrian kings. The city was built on several eminences, and was encircled by a wall 25 to 30 miles[18] in length, in the form of a quadrilateral. The wall was composed of bricks on the exterior and of earth within. The dwellings of the city have disappeared leaving no traces, but we have recovered many palaces constructed by various kings of Assyria. Nineveh remained the residence of the kings down to the time that the Assyrian empire was destroyed by the Medes and Chaldeans.

=Inscriptions on the Bricks.=--In these inscriptions every character is formed of a combination of signs shaped like an arrow or wedge, and this is the reason that this style of writing is termed cuneiform (Latin _cuneus_ and _forma_). To trace these signs the writer used a stylus with a triangular point; he pressed it into a tablet of soft clay which was afterwards baked to harden it and to

make the impression permanent. In the palace of Assurbanipal a complete library of brick tablets has been found in which brick serves the purpose of paper.

=Cuneiform Writing.=--For many years the cuneiform writing has occupied the labors of many scholars impatient to decipher it. It has been exceedingly difficult to read, for, in the first place, it served as the writing medium of five different languages--Assyrian, Susian, Mede, Chaldean, and Armenian, without counting the Old Persian--and there was no knowledge of these five languages. Then, too, it is very complicated, for several reasons:

1. It is composed at the same time of symbolic signs, each of which represents a word (sun, god, fish), and of syllabic signs, each of which represents a syllable.

2. There are nearly two hundred syllabic signs, much alike and easy to confuse.

3. The same sign is often the representation of a word and a syllable.

4. Often (and this is the hardest condition) the same sign is used to represent different syllables. Thus the same sign is sometimes read "ilou," and sometimes "an." This writing was difficult even for those who executed it. "A good half of the cuneiform monuments which we possess comprises guides (grammars, dictionaries, pictures), which enable us to decipher the other half, and which we consult just as Assyrian scholars did 2,500 years ago."[19]

Cuneiform inscriptions have been solved in the same manner as the Egyptian hieroglyphics--there was an inscription in three languages--Assyrian, Mede, and Persian. The last gave the key to the other two.

=The Assyrian People.=--The Assyrians were a race of hunters and soldiers. Their bas-reliefs ordinarily represent them armed with bow and lance, often on horseback. They were good knights--alert, brave, clever in skirmish and battle; also bombastic, deceitful, and sanguinary. For six centuries they harassed Asia, issuing from their mountains to hurl themselves on their neighbors, and returning with entire peoples reduced to slavery. They apparently made war for the mere pleasure of slaying, ravaging, and pillaging. No people ever exhibited greater ferocity.

=The King.=--Following Asiatic usage they regarded their king as the representative of God on earth and gave him blind obedience. He was absolute master of all his subjects, he led them in battle, and at their head fought against other peoples of Asia. On his return he recorded his exploits on the walls of his palace in a long inscription in which he told of his victories, the booty which he had taken, the cities burned, the captives beheaded or flayed alive. We present some passages from these stories of campaigns:

Assurnazir-hapal in 882 says, "I built a wall before the great gates of the city; I flayed the chiefs of the revolt and with their skins I covered this wall. Some were immured alive in the masonry, others were crucified or impaled along the wall. I had some of them flayed in my presence and had the wall hung with their skins. I arranged their heads like crowns and their transfixed bodies in the form of garlands."

In 745 Tiglath-Pilezer II writes, "I shut up the king in his royal city. I raised mountains of bodies before his gates. All his villages I destroyed, desolated, burnt. I made the country desert, I changed it into hills and mounds of debris."

In the seventh century Sennacherib wrote: "I passed like a hurricane of desolation. On the drenched earth the armor and arms swam in the blood of the enemy as in a river. I heaped up the bodies of their soldiers like trophies and I cut off their extremities. I mutilated those whom I took alive like blades of straw; as punishment I cut off their hands." In a bas-relief which shows the town of Susa surrendering to Assurbanipal one sees the chiefs of the conquered tortured by the Assyrians; some have their ears cut off, the eyes of others are put out, the beard torn out, while some are flayed alive. Evidently these kings took delight in burnings, massacres, and tortures.

=Ruin of the Assyrian Empire.=--The Assyrian regime began with the capture of Babylon (about 1270). From the ninth century the Assyrians, always at war, subjected or ravaged Babylonia, Syria, Palestine, and even Egypt. The conquered always revolted, and the massacres were repeated. At last the Assyrians were exhausted. The Babylonians and Medes made an alliance and destroyed their empire. In 625 their capital, Nineveh, "the lair of lions, the bloody city, the city gorged with prey," as the Jewish prophets call it, was taken and destroyed forever. "Nineveh is laid waste," says the prophet Nahum, "who will bemoan her?"

THE BABYLONIANS

=The Second Chaldean Empire.=--In the place of the fallen Assyrian empire there arose a new power--in ancient Chaldea. This has received the name Babylonian Empire or the Second Chaldean Empire. A Jewish prophet makes one say to Jehovah, "I raise up the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation which shall march through the breadth of the land to possess dwelling places that are not theirs. Their horses are swifter than leopards. Their horsemen spread themselves; (their horsemen) shall fly as the eagle that hasteth to eat." They were a people of knights, martial and victorious, like the Assyrians. They subjected Susiana, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Jordan. But their regime was short: founded in 625, the Babylonian Empire was overthrown by the Persians in 538 B.C.

=Babylon.=--The mightiest of its kings, Nebuchadrezzar (or Nebuchadnezzar), 604-561, who destroyed Jerusalem and carried the Jews into captivity, built many temples and places in Babylon, his capital. These monuments were in crude brick as the plain of the Euphrates has no supply of stone; in the process of decay they have left only enormous masses of earth and debris. And yet it has been possible on the site of Babylon to recover some inscriptions and to restore the plan of the city. The Greek Herodotus who had visited Babylon in the fifth century B.C., describes it in detail. The city was surrounded by a square wall cut by the Euphrates; it covered about 185 square miles, or seven times the extent of Paris. This immense space was not filled with houses; much of it was occupied with fields to be cultivated for the maintenance of the people in the event of a siege. Babylon was less a city than a fortified camp. The walls equipped with towers and pierced by a hundred gates of brass were so thick that a chariot might be driven on them. All around the wall was a large, deep ditch full of water, with its sides lined with brick. The houses of the city were constructed of three or four stories. The streets intersected at right angles. The bridge and docks of the Euphrates excited admiration; the fortified palace also, and the hanging gardens, one of the seven wonders of the world. These gardens were terraces planted with trees, supported by pillars and rows of arches.

=Tower of Babylon.=--Hard by the city Nebuchadnezzar had aimed to rebuild the town of Babel. "For the admiration of men," he says in an inscription: "I rebuilt and renovated the wonder of Borsippa, the temple of the seven spheres of the world. I laid the foundations and built it according to its ancient plan." This temple, in the form of a square, comprised seven square towers raised one above another, each tower being dedicated to one of the seven planets and painted with the color attributed by religion to this planet. They were, beginning with the lowest: Saturn (black), Venus (white), Jupiter (purple), Mercury (blue), Mars (vermilion), the moon (silver), the sun (gold). The highest tower contained a chapel with a table of gold and magnificent couch whereon a priestess kept watch continually.

CUSTOMS AND RELIGION

=Customs.=--We know almost nothing of these peoples apart from the testimony of their monuments, and nearly all of these refer to the achievements of their kings. The Assyrians are always represented at war, hunting, or in the performance of ceremonies; their women never appear on the bas-reliefs; they were confined in a harem and never went into public life. The Chaldeans on the contrary, were a race of laborers and merchants, but of their life we know nothing. Herodotus relates that once a year in their towns they assembled all the girls to give them in marriage; they sold the prettiest, and the profits of the sale of these became a dower for the marriage of the plainest. "According to my view," he adds, "this is the wisest of all their laws."

=Religion.=--The religion of the Assyrians and Chaldeans was the same, for the former had adopted that of the latter. It is very obscure to us, since it originated, like that of the Chaldean people, in a confusion of religions very differently mingled. The Turanians, like the present yellow race of Siberia, imagined the world full of demons (plague, fever, phantoms, vampires), engaged in prowling around men to do them harm; sorcerers were invoked to banish these demons by magical formulas. The Cushites adored a pair of gods, the male deity of force and the female of matter. The Chaldean priests, united in a powerful guild, confused the two religions into a single one.

=The Gods.=--The supreme god at Babylon is Ilou; in Assyria, Assur. No temple was raised to him. Three gods proceed from him: Anou, the "lord of darkness," under the figure of a man with the head of a fish and the tail of an eagle; Bel, the "sovereign of spirits," represented as a king on the throne; Nouah, the "master of the visible world," under the form of a genius with four extended wings. Each has a feminine counterpart who symbolizes fruitfulness. Below these gods are the Sun, the Moon, and the five planets, for in the transparent atmosphere of Chaldea the stars shine with a brilliancy which is strange to us; they gleam like deities. To these the Chaldeans raised temples, veritable observatories in which men who adored them could follow all their motions.

=Astrology.=--The priests believed that these stars, being powerful deities, had determining influence on the lives of men. Every man comes into the world under the influence of a planet and this moment decides his destiny; one may foretell one's fortune if the star under which one is born is known. This is the origin of the horoscope. What occurs in heaven is indicative of what will come to

pass on earth; a comet, for example, announces a revolution. By observing the heavens the Chaldean priests believed they could predict events. This is the origin of Astrology.

=Sorcery.=--The Chaldeans had also magical words; these were uttered to banish spirits or to cause their appearance. This custom, a relic of the Turanian religion, is the origin of sorcery. From Chaldea astrology and sorcery were diffused over the Roman empire, and later over all Europe. In the formulas of sorcery of the sixteenth century corrupted Assyrian words may still be detected.[20]

=Sciences.=--On the other hand it is in Chaldea that we have the beginning of astronomy. From this land have come down to us the zodiac, the week of seven days in honor of the seven planets; the division of the year into twelve months, of the day into twenty-four hours, of the hour into sixty minutes, of the minute into sixty seconds. Here originated, too, the system of weights and measures reckoned on the unit of length, a system adopted by all the ancient peoples.

ARTS

=Architecture.=--We do not have direct knowledge of the art of the Chaldeans, since their monuments have fallen to ruin. But the Assyrian artists whose works we possess imitated those of Chaldea, and so we may form a judgment at the same time of the two countries. The Assyrians like the Chaldeans built with crude, sun-dried brick, but they faced the exterior of the wall with stone.

=Palaces.=--They constructed their palaces[21] on artificial mounds, making these low and flat like great terraces. The crude brick was not adapted to broad and high arches. Halls must therefore be straight and low, but in compensation they were very long. An Assyrian palace, then, resembled a succession of galleries; the roofs were flat terraces provided with battlements. At the gate stood gigantic winged bulls. Within, the walls were covered now with panelling in precious woods, now with enamelled bricks, now with plates of sculptural alabaster. Sometimes the chambers were painted, and even richly encrusted marbles were used.

=Sculpture.=--The sculpture of the Assyrian palaces is especially admirable. Statues, truly, are rare and coarse; sculptors preferred to execute bas-reliefs similar to pictures on great slabs of alabaster. They represented scenes which were often very complicated--battles, chases, sieges of towns, ceremonies in which the king appeared with a great retinue. Every detail is scrupulously done; one sees the files of servants in charge of the feast of the king, the troops of workmen who built his palace, the gardens, the fields, the ponds, the fish in the water, the birds perched over their nests or flitting from tree to tree. Persons are exhibited in profile, doubtless because the artist could not depict the face; but they possess dignity and life. Animals often appeared, especially in hunting scenes; they are ordinarily made with a startling fidelity. The Assyrians observed nature and faithfully reproduced it; hence the merit of their art.

The Greeks themselves learned in this school, by imitating the Assyrian bas-reliefs. They have excelled them, but no people, not even the Greeks, has better known how to represent animals.

FOOTNOTES:

[15] A Persian song enumerates 300 different uses of the palm.

[16] Or perhaps from the east (Arabia).--ED.

[17] Recent discoveries confirm the view of a very ancient civilization--ED.

[18] Somewhat exaggerated. See Perrot and Chipiez, "History of Art in Assyria and Chaldea," ii., 60; and Maspero, "Passing of the Empires," p. 468.--ED.

[19] Lenormant, "Ancient History."

[20] For example, hilka, hilka, bescha, bescha (begone! begone! bad! bad!)

[21] The temples were pyramidal, of stones or terraces similar to the tower of Borsippa.

CHAPTER V

THE ARYANS OF INDIA

THE ARYANS

=Aryan Languages.=--The races which in our day inhabit Europe--Greeks and Italians to the south, Slavs in Russia, Teutons in Germany, Celts in Ireland--speak very different languages. When, however, one studies these languages closely, it is perceived that all possess a stock of common words, or at least certain roots. The same roots occur in Sanscrit, the ancient language of the Hindoos, and also in Zend, the ancient tongue of the Persians. Thus,

Father--pere (French), pitar (Sanscrit), pater (Greek and Latin). It is the same word pronounced in various ways. From this (and other such examples) it has been concluded that all--Hindoos, Persians, Greeks, Latins, Celts, Germans, Slavs--once spoke the same language, and consequently were one people.

=The Aryan People.=--These peoples then called themselves Aryans and lived to the north-west of India, either in the mountains of Pamir, or in the steppes of Turkestan or Russia; from this centre they dispersed in all directions. The majority of the people--Greeks, Latins, Germans, Slavs--forgot their origin; but the sacred books of the Hindoos and the Persians preserve the tradition. Effort has been made[22] to reconstruct the life of our Aryan ancestors in their mountain home before the dispersion. It was a race of shepherds; they did not till the soil, but subsisted from their herds of cattle and sheep, though they already had houses and even villages.

It was a fighting race; they knew the lance, the javelin, and shield. Government was patriarchal; a man had but one wife; as head of the family he was for his wife, his children, and his servants at once priest, judge, and king. In all the countries settled by the Aryans they have followed this type of life--patriarchal, martial, and pastoral.

PRIMITIVE RELIGION OF THE HINDOOS

=The Aryans on the Indus.=--About 2,000 years before our era some Aryan tribes traversed the passes of the Hindu-Kush and swarmed into India. They found the fertile plains of the Indus inhabited by a people of dark skin, with flat heads, industrious and wealthy; they called these aborigines Dasyous (the enemy). They made war on them for centuries and ended by exterminating or subjecting them; they then gradually took possession of all the Indus valley (the region of the five rivers).[23] They then called themselves Hindoos.

=The Vedas.=--These people were accustomed in their ceremonies to chant hymns (vedas) in honor of their gods. These chants constituted a vast compilation which has been preserved to the present time. They were collected, perhaps, about the fourteenth century B.C. when the Aryans had not yet passed the Indus. The hymns present to us the oldest religion of the Hindoos.

=The Gods.=--The Hindoo calls his gods devas (the resplendent). Everything that shines is a divinity--the heavens, the dawn, the clouds, the stars--but especially the sun (Indra) and fire (Agni).

=Indra.=--The sun, Indra, the mighty one, "king of the world and master of creatures," bright and warm, traverses the heavens on a car drawn by azure steeds; he it is who hurls the thunderbolt, sends the rain, and banishes the clouds. India is a country of violent tempests; the Hindoo struck with this phenomenon explained it in his own fashion. He conceived the black cloud as an envelope in which were contained the waters of heaven; these beneficent waters he called the gleaming cows of Indra. When the storm is gathering, an evil genius, Vritra, a three-headed serpent, has driven away the cows and enclosed them in the black cavern whence their bellowings are heard (the far-away rumblings of thunder). Indra applies himself to the task of finding them; he strikes the cavern with his club, the strokes of which are heard (the thunderbolt), and the forked tongue of the serpent (the lightning) darts forth. At last the serpent is vanquished, the cave is opened, the waters released fall on the earth, Indra the victor appears in glory.

=Agni.=--Fire (Agni, the tireless) is regarded as another form of the sun. The Hindoo, who produces it by rapidly rubbing two pieces of wood together, imagines that the fire comes from the wood and that the rain has placed it there. He conceives it then as the fire of heaven descended to earth; in fact, when one places it on the hearth, it springs up as if it would ascend toward heaven. Agni dissipates darkness, warms mankind, and cooks his food; it is the benefactor and the protector of the house. It is also "the internal fire," the soul of the world; even the ancestor of the human race is the "son of lightning." Thus, heat and light, sources of all life, are the deities of the Hindoo.

=Worship.=--To adore his gods he strives to reproduce what he sees in heaven. He ignites a terrestrial fire by rubbing sticks, he nourishes it by depositing on the hearth, butter, milk, and soma, a fermented drink. To delight the gods he makes offerings to them of fruits and cakes; he even sacrifices to them cattle, rams and horses; he then invokes them, chanting hymns to their praise. "When thou art bidden by us to quaff the soma, come with thy sombre steeds, thou deity whose darts are stones. Our celebrant is

seated according to prescription, the sacred green is spread, in the morning stones have been gathered together. Take thy seat on the holy sward; taste, O hero, our offering to thee. Delight thyself in our libations and our chants, vanquisher of Vritra, thou who art honored in these ceremonies of ours, O Indra."

The Hindoo thinks that the gods, felicitated by his offerings and homage, will in their turn make him happy. He says naively, "Give sacrifice to the gods for their profit, and they will requite you. Just as men traffic by the discussion of prices, let us exchange force and vigor, O Indra. Give to me and I will give to you; bring to me and I will bring to you."

=Ancestor Worship.=--At the same time the Hindoo adores his ancestors who have become gods, and perhaps this cult is the oldest of all. It is the basis of the family. The father who has transmitted the "fire of life" to his children makes offering every day at his hearth-fire, which must never be extinguished, the sacrifice to gods and ancestors, and utters the prayers. Here it is seen that among Hindoos, as among other Aryans, the father is at once a priest and a sovereign.

THE BRAHMANIC SOCIETY

=The Hindoos on the Ganges.=--The Hindoos passing beyond the region of the Indus, between the fourteenth and tenth century B.C. conquered all the immense plains of the Ganges. Once settled in this fertile country, under a burning climate, in the midst of a people of slaves, they gradually changed customs and religion. And so the Brahmanic society was established. Many works in Sanscrit are preserved from this time, which, with the Vedas, form the sacred literature of the Hindoos. The principal are the great epic poems, the Mahabarata, which has more than 200,000 verses; the Ramayana with 50,000, and the laws of Manou, the sacred code of India.

=Caste.=--In this new society there were no longer, as in the time of the Vedas, poets who chanted hymns to the gods. The men who know the prayers and the ceremonies are become theologians by profession; the people revere and obey them. The following is their conception of the structure of society: the supreme god, Brahma, has produced four kinds of men to each of whom he has assigned a mission. From his mouth he drew the Brahmans, who are, of course, the theologians; their mission is to study, to teach the hymns, to perform the sacrifices. The Kchatrias have come from his arms; these are the warriors who are charged with the protection of the people. The Vaicyas proceed from the thigh; they must raise cattle, till the earth, loan money at interest, and engage in commerce. The Soudras issue from his foot; their only mission is to serve all the others.

There were already in the Aryan people theologians, warriors, artisans, and below them aborigines reduced to slavery. These were classes which one could enter and from which one could withdraw. But the Brahmans determined that every man should be attached to the condition in which he was born, he and his descendants for all time. The son of a workman could never become a warrior, nor the son of a warrior a theologian. Thus each is chained to his own state. Society is divided into four hereditary and closed castes.

=The Unclean.=--Whoever is not included in one of the four castes is unclean, excluded from society and religion. The Brahmans reckoned forty-four grades of outcasts; the last and the lowest is that of the pariahs; their very name is an insult. The outcasts may not practise any honorable trade nor approach other men. They may possess only dogs and asses, for these are unclean beasts. "They must have for their clothing the garments of the dead; for plates, broken pots; ornaments of iron; they must be ceaselessly on the move from one place to another."

=The Brahmans.=--In the organization of society the Brahmans were assigned the first place. "Men are the first among intelligent beings; the Brahmans are the first among men. They are higher than warriors, than kings, even. As between a Brahman of ten years of age and a Kchatria of one hundred years, the Brahman is to be regarded as the father." These are not priests as in Egypt and Chaldea, but only men who know religion, and pass their time in reading and meditating on the sacred books; they live from presents made to them by other men. To this day they are the dominating class of India. As they marry only among themselves, better than the other Hindoos they have preserved the Aryan type and have a clearer resemblance to Europeans.

=The New Religion of Brahma.=--The Brahmans did not discard the ancient gods of the Vedas, they continued to adore them. But by sheer ingenuity they invented a new god. When prayers are addressed to the gods, the deities are made to comply with the demands made on them, as if they thought that prayer was more powerful than the gods. And so prayer (Brahma) has become the highest of all deities. He is invoked with awe:[24] "O god, I behold in thy body all the gods and the multitudes of living beings. I am powerless to regard thee in thine entirety, for thou shinest like the fire and the sun in thine immensity. Thou art the Invisible, thou art the supreme Intelligence, thou art the sovereign treasure of the universe, without beginning, middle, or end; equipped with infinite

might. Thine arms are without limit, thine eyes are like the moon and the sun, thy mouth hath the brightness of the sacred fire. With thyself alone thou fillest all the space between heaven and earth, and thou permeatest all the universe." Brahma is not only supreme god; he is the soul of the universe. All beings are born from Brahma, all issue naturally from him, not as a product comes from the hands of an artisan, but "as the tree from the seed, as the web from the spider." Brahma is not a deity who has created the world; he is the very substance of the world.

=Transmigration of Souls.=--There is, then, a soul, a part of the soul of Brahma, in every being, in gods, in men, in animals, in the very plants and stones. But these souls pass from one body into another; this is the transmigration of souls. When a man dies, his soul is tested; if it is good, it passes into the heaven of Indra there to enjoy felicity; if it is bad, it falls into one of the twenty-eight hells, where it is devoured by ravens, compelled to swallow burning cakes, and is tormented by demons. But souls do not remain forever in heaven or in the hells; they part from these to begin a new life in another body. The good soul rises, entering the body of a saint, perhaps that of a god; the evil soul descends, taking its abode in some impure animal--in a dog, an ass, even in a plant. In this new state it may rise or fall. And this journey from one body to another continues until the soul by degrees comes to the highest sphere. From lowest to highest in the scale, say the Brahmans, twenty-four millions of years elapse. At last perfect, the soul returns to the level of Brahma from which it descends and is absorbed into it.

=Character of this Religion.=--The religion of the Aryans, simple and happy, was that of a young and vigorous people. This is complicated and barren; it takes shape among men who are not engaged in practical life; it is enervated by the heat and vexatious of life.

=Rites.=--The practice of the religion is much more complicated. Hymns and sacrifices are still offered to the gods, but the Brahmans have gradually invented thousands of minute customs so that one's life is completely engaged with them. For all the ceremonies of the religious life there are prayers, offerings, vows, libations, ablutions. Some of the religious requirements attach themselves to dress, ornaments, etiquette, drinking, eating, mode of walking, of lying down, of sleeping, of dressing, of undressing, of bathing. It is ordered: "That a Brahman shall not step over a rope to which a calf is attached; that he shall not run when it rains; that he shall not drink water in the hollow of his hand; that he shall not scratch his head with both his hands. The man who breaks clods of earth, who cuts grass with his nails or who bites his nails is, like the outcast, speedily hurried to his doom." An animal must not be killed, for a human soul may perhaps be dwelling in the body; one must not eat it on penalty of being devoured in another life by the animals which one has eaten.

All these rites have a magical virtue; he who observes them all is a saint; he who neglects any of them is impious and destined to pass into the body of an animal.

=Purity.=--The principal duty is keeping one's self pure; for every stain is a sin and opens one to the attack of evil spirits. But the Brahmans are very scrupulous concerning purity: men outside of the castes, many animals, the soil, even the utensils which one uses are so many impure things; whoever touches these is polluted and must at once purify himself. Life is consumed in purifications.

=Penances.=--For every defect in the rites, a penance is necessary, often a terrible one. He who involuntarily kills a cow must clothe himself in its skin, and for three months, day and night, follow and tend a herd of cows. Whoever has drunk of arrack[25] must swallow a boiling liquid which burns the internal organs until death results.

=The Monks.=--To escape so many dangers and maintain purity, it is better to leave the world. Often a Brahman when he has attained to a considerable age withdraws to the desert, fasts, watches, refrains from speech, exposes himself naked to the rain, holds himself erect between four fires under the burning sun. After some years, the solitary becomes "penitent"; then his only subsistence is from almsgiving; for whole days he lifts an arm in the air uttering not a word, holding his breath; or perchance, he gashes himself with razor-blades; or he may even keep his thumbs closed until the nails pierce the hands. By these mortifications he destroys passion, releases himself from this life, and by contemplation rises to Brahma. And yet, this way of salvation is open only to the Brahman; and even he has the right to withdraw to the desert only in old age, after having studied the Vedas all his life, practised all the rites, and established a family.

BUDDHISM

=Buddha.=--Millions of men who were not Brahmans, suffered by this life of minutiae and anguish. A man then appeared who brought a doctrine of deliverance. He was not a Brahman, but of the caste of the Kchatrias, son of a king of the north. To the age of

twenty-nine he had lived in the palace of his father. One day he met an old man with bald head, of wrinkled features, and trembling limbs; a second time he met an incurable invalid, covered with ulcers, without a home; again he fell in with a decaying corpse devoured by worms. And so, thought he, youth, health, and life are nothing for they offer no resistance to old age, to sickness, and to death. He had compassion on men and sought a remedy. Then he met a religious mendicant with grave and dignified air; following his example he decided to renounce the world. These four meetings had determined his calling.

Buddha fled to the desert, lived seven years in penitence, undergoing hunger, thirst, and rain. These mortifications gave him no repose. He ate, became strong, and found the truth. Then he reentered the world to preach it; he made disciples in crowds who called him Buddha (the scholar); and when he died after forty-five years of preaching, Buddhism was established.

=Nirvana.=--To live is to be unhappy, taught Buddha. Every man suffers because he desires the goods of this world, youth, health, life, and cannot keep them. All life is a suffering; all suffering is born of desire. To suppress suffering, it is necessary to root out desire; to destroy it one must cease from wishing to live, "emancipate one's self from the thirst of being." The wise man is he who casts aside everything that attaches to this life and makes it unhappy. One must cease successively from feeling, wishing, thinking. Then, freed from passion, volition, even from reflection, he no longer suffers, and can, after his death, come to the supreme good, which consists in being delivered from all life and from all suffering. The aim of the wise man is the annihilation of personality: the Buddhists call it Nirvana.

=Charity.=--The Brahmans also considered life as a place of suffering and annihilation as felicity. Buddha came not with a new doctrine, but with new sentiments.

The religion of the Brahmans was egoistic. Buddha had compassion on men, he loved them, and preached love to his disciples. It was just this word of sympathy of which despairing souls were in need. He bade to love even those who do us ill. Purna, one of his disciples, went forth to preach to the barbarians. Buddha said to him to try him, "There are cruel, passionate, furious men; if they address angry words to you, what would you think?" "If they addressed angry words to me," said Purna, "I should think these are good men, these are gentle men, these men who attack me with wicked words but who strike me neither with the hand nor with stones." "But if they strike you, what would you think?" "I should think that those were good men who did not strike me with their staves or with their swords." "But if they did strike you with staff and sword, what would you think then?" "That those are good men who strike me with staff and sword, but do not take my life." "But if they should take your life?" "I should think them good men who delivered me with so little pain from this body filled as it is with pollution." "Well, well, Purna! You may dwell in the country of the barbarians. Go, proceed on the way to complete Nirvana and bring others to the same goal."

=Fraternity.=--The Brahmans, proud of their caste, assert that they are purer than the others. Buddha loves all men equally, he calls all to salvation even the pariahs, even the barbarians--all he declares are equal. "The Brahman," said he, "just like the pariah, is born of woman; why should he be noble and the other vile?" He receives as disciples street-sweepers, beggars, cripples, girls who sleep on dung-hills, even murderers and thieves; he fears no contamination in touching them. He preaches to them in the street in language simple with parables.

=Tolerance.=--The Brahmans passed their lives in the practice of minute rites, regarding as criminal whoever did not observe them. Buddha demanded neither rites nor exertions. To secure salvation it was enough to be charitable, chaste, and beneficent. "Benevolence," says he, "is the first of virtues. Doing a little good avails more than the fulfilment of the most arduous religious tasks. The perfect man is nothing unless he diffuses himself in benefits over creatures, unless he comforts the afflicted. My doctrine is a doctrine of mercy; this is why the fortunate in the world find it difficult."

=Later History of Buddhism.=--Thus was established about 500 years before Christ a religion of an entirely new sort. It is a religion without a god and without rites; it ordains only that one shall love his neighbor and become better; annihilation is offered as supreme recompense. But, for the first time in the history of the world, it preaches self-renunciation, the love of others, equality of mankind, charity and tolerance. The Brahmans made bitter war upon it and extirpated it in India. Missionaries carried it to the barbarians in Ceylon, in Indo-China, Thibet, China, and Japan. It is today the religion of about 500,000,000[26] people.

=Changes in Buddhism.=--During these twenty centuries Buddhism has undergone change. Buddha had himself formed communities of monks. Those who entered these renounced their family, took the vow of poverty and chastity; they had to wear filthy rags and beg their living. These religious rapidly multiplied; they founded convents in all Eastern Asia, gathered in councils to fix the doctrine, proclaimed dogmas and rules. As they became powerful they, like the Brahmans, came to esteem themselves as above the rest of the faithful. "The layman," they said, "plight to support the religious and consider himself much honored that the

holy man accepts his offering. It is more commendable to feed one religious than many thousands of laymen." In Thibet the religious, men and women together, constitute a fifth of the entire population, and their head, the Grand Lama, is venerated as an incarnation of God.

At the same time that they transformed themselves into masters, the Buddhist religious constructed a complicated theology, full of fantastic figures. They say there is an infinite number of worlds. If one surrounded with a wall a space capable of holding 100,000 times ten millions of those worlds, if this wall were raised to heaven, and if the whole space were filled with grains of mustard, the number of the grains would not even then equal one-half the number of worlds which occupy but one division of heaven. All these worlds are full of creatures, gods, men, beasts, demons, who are born and who die. The universe itself is annihilated and another takes its place. The duration of each universe is called _kalpa_; and this is the way we obtain an impression of a kalpa: if there were a rock twelve miles in height, breadth, and length, and if once in a century it were only touched with a piece of the finest linen, this rock would be worn and reduced to the size of a kernel of mango before a quarter of a kalpa had elapsed.

=Buddha Transformed into a God.=--It no longer satisfied the Buddhists to honor their founder as a perfect man; they made him a god, erecting idols to him, and offering him worship. They adored also the saints, his disciples; pyramids and shrines were built to preserve their bones, their teeth, their cloaks. From every quarter the faithful came to venerate the impression of the foot of Buddha.

=Mechanical Prayer.=--Modern Buddhists regard prayer as a magical formula which acts of itself. They spend the day reciting prayers as they walk or eat, often in a language which they do not understand. They have invented prayer-machines; these are revolving cylinders and around these are pasted papers on which the prayer is written; every turn of the cylinder counts for the utterance of the prayer as many times as it is written on the papers.

=Amelioration of Manners.=--And yet Buddhism remains a religion of peace and charity. Wherever it reigns, kings refrain from war, and even from the chase; they establish hospitals, caravansaries, even asylums for animals. Strangers, even Christian missionaries, are hospitably received; they permit the women to go out, and to walk without veiling themselves; they neither fight nor quarrel. At Bangkok, a city of 400,000 souls, hardly more than one murder a year is known.

Buddhism has enfeebled the intelligence and sweetened the character.[27]

FOOTNOTES:

[22] The process is as follows: when a word (or rather a root) is found in several Aryan languages at once, it is admitted that this was in use before the dispersion occurred, and therefore the people knew the object designated by the word.

[23] The Punjab.--ED.

[24] Prayer of the Mahabarata cited by Lenormant.

[25] A spirituous liquor made by the natives.--ED.

[26] A high estimate.--ED.

[27] India is for us the country of the Vedas, the Brahmans, and Buddha. We know the religion of the Hindoos, but of their political history we are ignorant.

CHAPTER VI

THE PERSIANS

THE RELIGION OF ZOROASTER

=Iran.=--Between the Tigris and the Indus, the Caspian Sea and the Persian Gulf rises the land of Iran, five times as great as France,[28] but partly sterile. It is composed of deserts of burning sand and of icy plateaux cut by deep and wooded valleys. Mountains surround it preventing the escape of the rivers which must lose themselves in the sands or in the salt lakes. The climate is harsh, very uneven, torrid in summer, frigid in winter; in certain quarters one passes from 104 deg. above zero to 40 deg. below, from the cold of Siberia to the heat of Senegal. Violent winds blow which "cut like a sword." But in the valleys along the rivers the soil is fertile. Here the peach and cherry are indigenous; the country is a land of fruits and pastures.

=The Iranians.=--Aryan tribes inhabited Iran. Like all the Aryans, they were a race of shepherds, but well armed and warlike. The Iranians fought on horseback, drew the bow, and, to protect themselves from the biting wind of their country, wore garments of skin sewed on the body.

=Zoroaster.=--Like the ancient Aryans, they first adored the forces of nature, especially the sun (Mithra). Between the tenth and seventh[29] centuries before our era their religion was reformed by a sage, Zarathustra (Zoroaster). We know nothing certainly about him except his name.

=The Zend-Avesta.=--No writing from the hand of Zoroaster is preserved to us; but his doctrine, reduced to writing long after his death, is conserved in the Zend-Avesta (law and reform), the sacred books of the Persians. It was a compilation written in an ancient language (the Zend) which the faithful themselves no longer understood. It was divided into twenty-one books, inscribed on 12,000 cow skins, bound by golden cords. The Mohammedans destroyed it when they invaded Persia. But some Persian families, faithful to the teaching of Zoroaster, fled into India. Their posterity, whom we call Parsees, have there maintained the old religion. An entire book of the Zend-Avesta and fragments of two others have been found among them.

=Ormuzd and Ahriman.=--The Zend-Avesta is the sacred book of the religion of Zoroaster. According to these writings Ahura Mazda (Ormuzd), "the omniscient sovereign," created the world. He is addressed in prayer in the following language: "I invoke and celebrate the creator, Ahura Mazda, luminous, glorious, most intelligent and beautiful, eminent in purity, who possessest the good knowledge, source of joy, who hast treated us, hast fashioned us, and hast nourished us." Since he is perfect in his goodness, he can create only that which is good. Everything bad in the world has been created by an evil deity, Angra Manyou, (Ahriman), the "spirit of anguish."

=Angels and Demons.=--Over against Ormuzd, the god and the creator, is Ahriman, wicked and destructive. Each has in his service a legion of spirits. The soldiers of Ormuzd are the good angels (yazatas), those of Ahriman the evil demons (devs). The angels dwell in the East in the light of the rising sun; the demons in the West in the shadows of the darkness. The two armies wage incessant warfare; the world is their battleground, for both troops are omnipresent. Ormuzd and his angels seek to benefit men, to make them good and happy; Ahriman and his demons gnaw around them to destroy them, to make them unhappy and wicked.

=Creatures of Ormuzd and Ahriman.=--Everything good on the earth is the work of Ormuzd and works for good; the sun and fire that dispel the night, the stars, fermented drinks that seem to be liquid fire, the water that satisfies the thirst of man, the cultivated fields that feed him, the trees that shade him, domestic animals--especially the dog,[30] the birds (because they live in the air), among all these the cock since he announces the day. On the other hand everything that is baneful comes from Ahriman and tends to evil: the night, drought, cold, the desert, poisonous plants, thorns, beasts of prey, serpents, parasites (mosquitoes, fleas, bugs) and animals that live in dark holes--lizards, scorpions, toads, rats, ants. Likewise in the moral world life, purity, truth, work are good things and come from Ormuzd; death, filth, falsehood, idleness are bad, and issue from Ahriman.

=Worship.=--From these notions proceed worship and morality. Man ought to adore the good god[31] and fight for him. According to Herodotus, "The Persians are not accustomed to erect statues, temples, or altars to their gods; they esteem those who do this as lacking in sense for they do not believe, as the Greeks do, that the gods have human forms."[32] Ormuzd manifests himself only under the form of fire or the sun. This is why the Persians perform their worship in the open air on the mountains, before a lighted fire. To worship Ormuzd they sing hymns to his praise and sacrifice animals in his honor.

=Morality.=--Man fights for Ormuzd in aiding his efforts and in overcoming Ahriman's. He wars against darkness in supplying the fire with dry wood and perfumes; against the desert in tilling the soil and in building houses; against the animals of Ahriman in killing serpents, lizards, parasites, and beasts of prey. He battles against impurity in keeping himself clean, in banishing from himself everything that is dead, especially the nails and hair, for "where hairs and clipped nails are, demons and unclean animals assemble." He fights against falsehood by always being truthful. "The Persians," says Herodotus,[33] "consider nothing so shameful as lying, and after falsehood nothing so shameful as contracting debts, for he who has debts necessarily lies." He wars against death by marrying and having many children. "Terrible," says the Zend-Avesta, "are the houses void of posterity."

=Funerals.=--As soon as a man is dead his body belongs to the evil spirit. It is necessary, then, to remove it from the house. But it ought not to be burned, for in this way the fire would be polluted; it should not be buried, for so is the soil defiled; nor is it to be drowned, and thus contaminate the water. These dispositions of the corpse would bring permanent pollution. The Persians resorted to a different method. The body with face toward the sun was exposed in an elevated place and left uncovered, securely fixed with stones; the bearers then withdrew to escape the demons, for they assemble "in the places of sepulture, where reside sickness,

fever, filth, cold, and gray hairs." Dogs and birds, pure animals, then come to purify the body by devouring it.

=Destiny of the Soul.=--The soul of the dead separates itself from the body. In the third night after death it is conducted over the "Bridge of Assembling" (Schinvat) which leads to the paradise above the gulf of inferno. There Ormuzd questions it on its past life. If it has practised the good, the pure spirits and the spirits of dogs support it and aid it in crossing the bridge and give it entrance into the abode of the blest; the demons flee, for they cannot bear the odor of virtuous spirits. The soul of the wicked, on the other hand, comes to the dread bridge, and reeling, with no one to support it, is dragged by demons to hell, is seized by the evil spirit and chained in the abyss of darkness.

=Character of Mazdeism.=--This religion originated in a country of violent contrasts, luxuriant valleys side by side with barren steppes, cool oases with burning deserts, cultivated fields and stretches of sand, where the forces of nature seem engaged in an eternal warfare. This combat which the Iranian saw around him he assumed to be the law of the universe. Thus a religion of great purity was developed, which urged man to work and to virtue; but at the same time issued a belief in the devil and in demons which was to propagate itself in the west and torment all the peoples of Europe.

THE PERSIAN EMPIRE

=The Medes.=--Many were the tribes dwelling in Iran; two of these have become noted in history--the Medes and the Persians. The Medes at the west, nearer the Assyrians, destroyed Nineveh and its empire (625). But soon they softened their manners, taking the flowing robes, the indolent life, the superstitious religion of the degenerate Assyrians. They at last were confused with them.

=The Persians.=--The Persians to the east preserved their manners, their religion, and their vigor. "For twenty years," says Herodotus, "the Persians teach their children but three things--to mount a horse, to draw the bow, and to tell the truth."

=Cyrus.=--About 550 Cyrus, their chief, overthrew the king of the Medes, reunited all the peoples of Iran, and then conquered Lydia, Babylon, and all Asia Minor. Herodotus recounts in detail a legend which became attached to this prince. Cyrus himself in an inscription says of himself, "I am Cyrus, king of the legions, great king, mighty king, king of Babylon, king of Sumir and Akkad, king of the four regions, son of Cambyses, great king of Susiana, grand-son of Cyrus, king of Susiana."

=The Inscription of Behistun.=--The eldest son of Cyrus, Cambyses, put to death his brother Smerdis and conquered Egypt. What occurred afterward is known to us from an inscription. Today one may see on the frontier of Persia, in the midst of a plain, an enormous rock, cut perpendicularly, about 1,500 feet high, the rock of Behistun. A bas-relief carved on the rock represents a crowned king, with left hand on a bow; he tramples on one captive while nine other prisoners are presented before him in chains. An inscription in three languages relates the life of the king: "Darius the king declares, This is what I did before I became king. Cambyses, son of Cyrus, of our race, reigned here before me. This Cambyses had a brother Smerdis, of the same father and the same mother. One day Cambyses killed Smerdis. When Cambyses had killed Smerdis the people were ignorant that Smerdis was dead. After this Cambyses made an expedition to Egypt and while he was there the people became rebellious; falsehood was then rife in the country, in Persia, in Media and the other provinces. There was at that time a magus named Gaumata; he deceived the people by saying that he was Smerdis, the son of Cyrus. Then the whole people rose in revolt, forsook Cambyses and went over to the pretender. After this Cambyses died from a wound inflicted by himself.

"After Gaumata had drawn away Persia, Media, and the other countries from Cambyses, he followed out his purpose: he became king. The people feared him on account of his cruelty: he would have killed the people so that no one might learn that he was not Smerdis, the son of Cyrus. Darius the king declares there was not a man in all Persia or in Media who dared to snatch the crown from this Gaumata, the magus. Then I presented myself, I prayed Ormuzd. Ormuzd accorded me his protection.... Accompanied by faithful men I killed this Gaumata and his principal accomplices. By the will of Ormuzd I became king. The empire which had been stolen from our race I restored to it. The altars that Gaumata, the magus, had thrown down I rebuilt to the deliverance of the people; I received the chants and the sacred ceremonials." Having overturned the usurper, Darius had to make war on many of the revolting princes, "I have," said he, "won nineteen battles and overcome nine kings."

=The Persian Empire.=--Darius then subjected the peoples in revolt and reestablished the empire of the Persians. He enlarged it also by conquering Thrace and a province of India. This empire reunited all the peoples of the Orient: Medes and Persians, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Jews, Phoenicians, Syrians, Lydians, Egyptians, Indians; it covered all the lands from the Danube on the west to the Indus on the east, from the Caspian Sea on the north to the cataracts of the Nile on the south. It was the greatest empire up to this time. One tribe of mountaineers, the last to come, thus received the heritage of all the empires of Asia.

=The Satrapies.=--Oriental kings seldom concerned themselves with their subjects more than to draw money from them, levy soldiers, and collect presents; they never interfered in their local affairs. Darius, like the rest, left each of the peoples of his empire to administer itself according to its own taste, to keep its language, its religion, its laws, often its ancient princes. But he took care to regulate the taxes which his subjects paid him. He divided all the empire into twenty[34] districts called satrapies. There were in the same satrapy peoples who differed much in language, customs, and beliefs; but each satrapy was to pay a fixed annual tribute, partly in gold and silver, partly in natural products (wheat, horses, ivory). The satrap, or governor, had the tribute collected and sent it to the king.

=Revenues of the Empire.=--The total revenue of the king amounted to sixteen millions of dollars and this money was paid by weight. This sum was in addition to the tributes in kind. These sixteen millions of dollars, if we estimate them by the value of the metals at this time, would be equivalent to one hundred and twenty millions in our day. With this sum the king supported his satraps, his army, his domestic servants and an extravagant court; there still remained to him every year enormous ingots of metal which accumulated in his treasuries. The king of Persia, like all the Orientals, exercised his vanity in possessing an immense treasure.

=The Great King.=--No king had ever been so powerful and rich. The Greeks called the Persian king The Great King. Like all the monarchs of the East, the king had absolute sway over all his subjects, over the Persians as well as over tributary peoples. From Herodotus one can see how Cambyses treated the great lords at his court. "What do the Persians think of me?" said he one day to Prexaspes, whose son was his cupbearer. "Master, they load you with praises, but they believe that you have a little too strong desire for wine." "Learn," said Cambyses in anger, "whether the Persians speak the truth. If I strike in the middle of the heart of your son who is standing in the vestibule, that will show that the Persians do not know what they say." He drew his bow and struck the son of Prexaspes. The youth fell; Cambyses had the body opened to see where the shot had taken effect The arrow was found in the middle of the heart. The prince, full of joy said in derision to the father of the young man, "You see that it is the Persians who are out of their senses; tell me if you have seen anybody strike the mark with so great accuracy." "Master," replied Prexaspes, "I do not believe that even a god could shoot so surely."[35]

=Services Rendered by the Persians.=--The peoples of Asia have always paid tribute to conquerors and given allegiance to despots. The Persians, at least, rendered them a great service: in subjecting all these peoples to one master they prevented them from fighting among themselves. Under their domination we do not see a ceaseless burning of cities, devastation of fields, massacre or wholesale enslavement of inhabitants. It was a period of peace.

=Susa and Persepolis.=--The kings of the Medes and Persians, following the example of the lords of Assyria, had palaces built for them. Those best known to us are the palaces at Susa and Persepolis. The ruins of Susa have been excavated by a French engineer,[36] who has discovered sculptures, capitals, and friezes in enameled bricks which give evidence of an advanced stage of art. The palace of Persepolis has left ruins of considerable mass. The rock of the hill had been fashioned into an enormous platform on which the palace was built. The approach to it was by a gently rising staircase so broad that ten horsemen could ascend riding side by side.

=Persian Architecture.=--Persian architects had copied the palaces of the Assyrians. At Persepolis and Susa, as in Assyria, are flat-roofed edifices with terraces, gates guarded by monsters carved in stone, bas-reliefs and enameled bricks, representing hunting-scenes and ceremonies. At three points, however, the Persians improved on their models:

(1) They used marble instead of brick; (2) they made in the halls painted floors of wood; (3) they erected eight columns in the form of trunks of trees, the slenderest that we know, twelve times as high as they were thick.

Thus their architecture is more elegant and lighter than that of Assyria.

The Persians had made little progress in the arts. But they seem to have been the most honest, the sanest, and the bravest people of the time. For two centuries they exercised in Asia a sovereignty the least cruel and the least unjust that it had ever known.

FOOTNOTES:

[28] That is, of about the same area as that part of the United States east of the Mississippi, with Minnesota and Iowa. Modern Persia is not two-thirds of this area.--ED.

[29] Most historians place Zoroaster before 1000 B.C.--ED.

[30] "I created the dog," said Ormuzd, "with a delicate scent and strong teeth, attached to man, biting the enemy to protect the herds. Thieves and wolves come not near the sheep-fold when the dog is on guard, strong in voice and defending the flocks."

[31] Certain Persian heretics of our day, on the contrary, adore only the evil god, for, they say, the principle of the good being in itself good and indulgent does not require appeasing. They are called Yezidis (worshippers of the devil).

[32] Herod., i., 131.

[33] i., 138.

[34] Herodotus mentions 20, but we find as many as 31 enumerated in the inscriptions.

[35] Herod., iii., 34, 35. Compare also iii., 78, 79; and the book of Esther.

[36] M. Dieulafoi.

CHAPTER VII

THE PHOENICIANS

THE PHOENICIAN PEOPLE

=The Land.=--Phoenicia is the narrow strip of country one hundred and fifty miles long by twenty-four to thirty wide, shut in between the sea of Syria and the high range of Lebanon. It is a succession of narrow valleys and ravines confined by abrupt hills which descend towards the sea; little torrents formed by the snows or rain-storms course through these in the early spring; in summer no water remains except in wells and cisterns. The mountains in this quarter were always covered with trees; at the summit were the renowned cedars of Lebanon, on the ridges, pines and cypresses; while lower yet palms grew even to the sea-shore. In the valleys flourished the olive, the vine, the fig, and the pomegranate.

=The Cities.=--At intervals along the rocky coast promontories or islands formed natural harbors. On these the Phoenicians had founded their cities; Tyre and Arad were each built on a small island. The people housed themselves in dwellings six to eight stories in height. Fresh water was ferried over in ships. The other cities, Gebel, Beirut, and Sidon arose on the mainland. The soil was inadequate to support these swarms of men, and so the Phoenicians were before all else seamen and traders.

=Phoenician Ruins.=--Not a book of the Phoenicians has come down to us, not even their sacred book. The sites of their cities have been excavated. But, in the words of the scholar sent to do this work, "Ruins are not preserved, especially in countries where people are not occupied with them," and the Syrians are not much occupied with ruins. They have violated the tombs to remove the jewels of the dead, have demolished edifices to secure stone for building purposes, and Mussulman hatred of chiseled figures has shattered the sculptures.[37] Very little is found beyond broken marble, cisterns, wine-presses cut in the rock and some sarcophagi hewn in rock. All this debris gives us little information and we know very little more of the Phoenicians than Greek writers and Jewish prophets have taught us.

=Political Organization of the Phoenicians.=--The Phoenicians never built an empire. Each city had its little independent territory, its assemblies, its king, and its government. For general state business each city sent delegates to Tyre, which from the thirteenth century B.C. was the principal city of Phoenicia. The Phoenicians were not a military people, and so submitted themselves to all the conquerors--Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians. They fulfilled all their obligations to them in paying tribute.

=Tyre.=--From the thirteenth century Tyre was the most notable of the cities. Its island becoming too small to contain it, a new city was built on the coast opposite. Tyrian merchants had founded colonies in every part of the Mediterranean, receiving silver from the mines of Spain and commodities from the entire ancient world. The prophet Isaiah[38] calls these traders princes; Ezekiel[39] describes the caravans which came to them from all quarters. It is Hiram, a king of Tyre, from whom Solomon asked workmen to build his palace and temple at Jerusalem.

=Carthage.=--A colony of Tyre surpassed even her in power. In the ninth century some Tyrians, exiled by a revolution, founded on the shore of Africa near Tunis the city of Carthage. A woman led them, Elissar, whom we call Dido (the fugitive). The inhabitants of the country, says the legend, were willing to sell her only as much land as could be covered by a bull's hide; but she cut the hide in strips so narrow that it enclosed a wide territory; and there she constructed a citadel. Situated at the centre of the Mediterranean,

provided with two harbors, Carthage flourished, sent out colonies in turn, made conquests, and at last came to reign over all the coasts of Africa, Spain, and Sardinia. Everywhere she had agencies for her commerce and subjects who paid her tribute.

=The Carthaginian Army.=--To protect her colonies from the natives, to hold her subjects in check who were always ready to revolt, a strong army was necessary. But the life of a Carthaginian was too valuable to risk it without necessity. Carthage preferred to pay mercenary soldiers, recruiting them among the barbarians of her empire and among the adventurers of all countries. Her army was a bizarre aggregation in which all languages were spoken, all religions practised, and in which every soldier wore different arms and costume. There were seen Numidians clothed in lion skins which served them as couch, mounted bareback on small fleet horses, and drawing the bow with horse at full gallop; Libyans with black skins, armed with pikes; Iberians from Spain in white garments adorned with red, armed with a long pointed sword; Gauls, naked to the girdle, bearing enormous shields and a rounded sword which they held in both hands; natives of the Balearic Islands, trained from infancy to sling with stones or balls of lead. The generals were Carthaginians; the government distrusted them, watched them closely, and when they were defeated, had them crucified.

=The Carthaginians.=--Carthage had two kings, but the senate was the real power, being composed of the richest merchants of the city. And so every state question for this government became a matter of commerce. The Carthaginians were hated by all other peoples, who found them cruel, greedy, and faithless. And yet, since they had a good fleet, had money to purchase soldiers, and possessed an energetic government, they succeeded in the midst of barbarous and divided peoples in maintaining their empire over the western Mediterranean for 300 years (from the sixth to the third century B.C.).

=The Phoenician Religion.=--The Phoenicians and the Carthaginians had a religion similar to that of the Chaldeans. The male god, Baal, is a sun-god; for the sun and the moon are in the eyes of the Phoenicians the great forces which create and which destroy. Each of the cities of Phoenicia has therefore its divine pair: at Sidon it is Baal Sidon (the sun) and Astoreth (the moon); at Gebel, Baal Tammouz and Baaleth; at Carthage, Baal-Hamon, and Tanith. But the same god changes his name according as he is conceived as creator or destroyer; thus Baal as destroyer is worshipped at Carthage under the name of Moloch. These gods, represented by idols, have their temples, altars, and priests. As creators they are honored with orgies, with tumultuous feasts; as destroyers, by human victims. Astoreth, the great goddess of Sidon, whom they represented by the crescent of the moon and the dove, had her cult in the sacred woods. Baal Moloch is figured at Carthage as a bronze colossus with arms extended and lowered. When they wished to appease him they laid children in his hands who fell at once into a pit of fire. During the siege of Carthage by Agathocles the principal men of the city sacrificed to Moloch as many as two hundred of their children.

This sensual and sanguinary religion inspired other peoples with horror, but they imitated it. The Jews sacrificed to Baal on the mountains; the Greeks adored Astarte of Sidon under the name of Aphrodite, and Baal Melkhart of Tyre under the name of Herakles.

PHOENICIAN COMMERCE

=Phoenicians Occupations.=--Crowded into a small territory, the Phoenicians gained their livelihood mainly from commerce. None of the other peoples of the East--the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, the Assyrians, nor the barbarian tribes of the West (Spaniards, Gauls, Italians) had a navy. The Phoenicians alone in this time dared to navigate. They were the commission merchants of the old world; they went to every people to buy their merchandise and sold them in exchange the commodities of other countries. This traffic was by caravan with the East, by sea with the West.

=Caravans.=--On land the Phoenicians sent caravans in three directions:

1.--Towards Arabia, from which they brought gold, agate, and onyx, incense and myrrh, and the perfumes of Arabia; pearls, spices, ivory, ebony, ostrich plumes and apes from India.

2.--Towards Assyria, whence came cotton and linen cloths, asphalt, precious stones, perfumery, and silk from China.

3.--Towards the Black Sea, where they went to receive horses, slaves, and copper vases made by the mountaineers of the Caucasus.

=Marine Commerce.=--For their sea commerce they built ships from the cedars of Lebanon to be propelled by oars and sails. In their sailing it was not necessary to remain always in sight of the coast, for they knew how to direct their course by the polar star. Bold mariners, they pushed in their little boats to the mouth of the Mediterranean; they ventured even to pass through the strait of

Gibraltar or, as the ancients called it, the Pillars of Hercules, and took the ocean course to the shores of England, and perhaps to Norway, Phoenicians in the service of a king of Egypt started in the seventh century B.C. to circumnavigate Africa, and returned, it is said, at the end of three years by the Red Sea. An expedition issuing from Carthage skirted the coast of Africa to the Gulf of Guinea; the commander Hanno wrote an account of the voyage which is still preserved.

=Commodities.=--To civilized peoples the Phoenicians sold the products of their industry. In barbarous countries they went to search for what they could not find in the Orient. On the coast of Greece they gathered shell-fish from which they extracted a red tint, the purple; cloths colored with purple were used among all the peoples of ancient times for garments of kings and great lords.

From Spain and Sardinia they brought the silver which the inhabitants took from the mines. Tin was necessary to make bronze, an alloy of copper and tin, but the Orient did not furnish this, and so they sought it even on the coasts of England, in the Isles of Tin (the Cassiterides). In every country they procured slaves. Sometimes they bought them, as lately the slavers bought negroes on the coast of Africa, for all the peoples of this time made commerce in slaves; sometimes they swooped down on a coast, threw themselves on the women and children and carried them off to be retained in their own cities or to be sold abroad; for on occasion they were pirates and did not scruple to plunder strangers.

=The Secrets Kept by the Phoenicians.=--The Phoenicians did not care to have mariners of other peoples come into competition with them. On the return from these far countries they concealed the road which they had travelled. No one in antiquity knew where were the famous Isles of the Cassiterides from which they got their tin. It was by chance that a Greek ship discovered Spain, with which the Phoenicians had traded for centuries. Carthage drowned the foreign merchants whom they found in Sardinia or on the shore of Gibraltar. Once a Carthaginian merchantman, seeing a strange ship following it, was run aground by the pilot that the foreigner might not see where he was going.

=Colonies.=--In the countries where they traded, the Phoenicians founded factories, or branch-houses. They were fortified posts on a natural harbor. There they landed their merchandise, ordinarily cloths, pottery, ornaments, and idols.[40] The natives brought down their commodities and an exchange was made, just as now European merchants do with the negroes of Africa. There were Phoenician markets in Cyprus, in Egypt, and in all the then barbarous countries of the Mediterranean--in Crete, Greece, Sicily, Africa, Malta, Sardinia, on the coasts of Spain at Malaga and Cadiz, and perhaps in Gaul at Monaco. Often around these Phoenician buildings the natives set up their cabins and the mart became a city. The inhabitants adopted the Phoenician gods, and even after the city had become Greek, the cult of the dove-goddess was found there (as in Cythera), that of the god Melkhart (as at Corinth), or of the god with the bull-face that devours human victims (as in Crete).

=Influence of the Phoenicians.=--It is certain that the Phoenicians in founding their trading stations cared only for their own interest. But it came to pass that their colonies contributed to civilization. The barbarians of the West received the cloths, the jewels, the utensils of the peoples of the East who were more civilized, and, receiving them, learned to imitate them. For a long time the Greeks had only vases, jewels, and idols brought by the Phoenicians, and these served them as models. The Phoenicians brought simultaneously from Egypt and from Assyria industry and commodities.

=The Alphabet.=--At the same time they exported their alphabet. The Phoenicians did not invent writing. The Egyptians knew how to write many centuries before them, they even made use of letters each of which expressed its own sound, as in our alphabet. But their alphabet was still encumbered with ancient signs which represented, some a syllable, others an entire word. Doubtless the Phoenicians had need of a simpler system for their books of commerce. They rejected all the syllabic signs and ideographs, preserving only twenty-two letters, each of which marks a sound (or rather an articulation of the language). The other peoples imitated this alphabet of twenty-two letters. Some, like the Jews, wrote from right to left just as the Phoenicians themselves did; others, like the Greeks, from left to right. All have slightly changed the form of the letters, but the Phoenician alphabet is found at the basis of all the alphabets--Hebrew, Lycian, Greek, Italian, Etruscan, Iberian, perhaps even in the runes of the Norse. It is the Phoenicians that taught the world how to write.

FOOTNOTES:

[37] Renan ("Mission de Phenicio," p. 818) says, "I noticed at Tripolis a sarcophagus serving as a public fountain and the sculptured face of it was turned to the wall. I was told that a governor had placed it thus so as not to provide distractions for the inhabitants."

[38] See ch. xxiii.

[39] See chs. xxvi., xxvii., xxviii.

[40] These idols, one of their principal exports, are found wherever the Phoenicians traded.

CHAPTER VIII

THE HEBREWS

ORIGIN OF THE HEBREW PEOPLE

=The Bible.=--The Jews united all their sacred books into a single aggregation which we call by a Greek name the Bible, that is to say, the Book. It is the Book par excellence. The sacred book of the Jews became also the sacred book of the Christians. The Bible is at the same time the history of the Jewish nation, and all that we know of the sacred people we owe to the sacred books.

=The Hebrews.=--When the Semites had descended from the mountains of Armenia into the plains of the Euphrates, one of their tribes, at the time of the first Chaldean empire, withdrew to the west, crossed the Euphrates, the desert, and Syria and came to the country of the Jordan beyond Phoenicia. This tribe was called the Hebrews, that is to say, the people from beyond the river. Like the majority of the Semites they were a race of nomadic shepherds. They did not till the soil and had no houses; they moved from place to place with their herds of cattle, sheep, and camels, seeking pasturage and living in tents as the Arabs of the desert do to this day. In the book of Genesis one has a glimpse of this nomad life.

=The Patriarchs.=--The tribe was like a great family; it was composed of the chief, his wives, his children, and his servants. The chief had absolute authority over all; for the tribe he was father, priest, judge, and king. We call these tribal chiefs patriarchs. The principal ones were Abraham and Jacob; the former the father of the Hebrews, the latter of the Israelites. The Bible represents both of them as designed by God to be the scions of a sacred people. Abraham made a covenant with God that he and his descendants would obey him; God promised to Abraham a posterity more numerous than the stars of heaven. Jacob received from God the assurance that a great nation should issue from himself.

=The Israelites.=--Moved by a vision Jacob took the name of Israel (contender with God). His tribe was called Beni-Israel (sons of Israel) or Israelites. The Bible records that, driven by famine, Jacob abandoned the Jordan country to settle with all his house on the eastern frontier of Egypt, to which Joseph, one of his sons who had become minister of a Pharaoh, invited him. There the sons of Israel abode for several centuries. Coming hither but seventy in number, they multiplied, according to the Bible, until they became six hundred thousand men, without counting women and children.

=The Call of Moses.=--The king of Egypt began to oppress them, compelling them to make mortar and bricks for the construction of his strong cities. It was then that one of them, Moses, received from God the mission to deliver them. One day while he was keeping his herds on the mountain, an angel appeared to him in the midst of a burning bush, and he heard these words: "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob. I have seen the affliction of my people which is in Egypt, I have heard their cry against their oppressors, I know their sorrows. And I am come down to deliver them out of the hands of the Egyptians and to bring them to a land flowing with milk and honey, to the place of the Canaanites.... Come now therefore and I will send thee unto Pharaoh that thou mayest bring forth my people, the children of Israel, out of Egypt."[41] The Israelites under the guidance of Moses fled from Egypt (the Exodus); they journeyed to the foot of Mount Sinai, where they received the law of God, and for an entire generation wandered in the deserts to the south of Syria.

=Israel in the Desert.=--Often the Israelites wished to turn back. "We remember," said they, "the fish which we ate in Egypt, the cucumbers, melons, leeks, and onions. Let us appoint a chief who will lead us back to Egypt." Moses, however, held them to obedience. At last they reached the land promised by God to their race.

=The Promised Land.=--It was called the land of Canaan or Palestine; the Jews named it the land of Israel, later Judea. Christians have termed it =the= Holy Land. It is an arid country, burning with heat in the summer, but a country of mountains. The Bible describes it thus: "Jehovah thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills, a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig-trees, and pomegranates; a land of oil olive and honey, wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack anything in it." The Israelites according to their estimate were then 601,700 men capable of bearing arms, divided among twelve tribes, ten descended from Jacob, two from Joseph; this enumeration does not include the Levites or priests to the number of 23,000. The land was occupied by several small peoples who were called Canaanites. The Israelites exterminated them and at last occupied their territory.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

=One God.=--The other ancient peoples adored many gods; the Israelites believed in but one God, immaterial, who made the world and governs it. "In the beginning," says the book of Genesis, "God created the heavens and the earth." He created plants and animals, he "created man in his own image." All men are the handiwork of God.

=The People of God.=--But among all mankind God has chosen the children of Israel to make of them "his people." He called Abraham and said to him, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after me ... to be a God unto thee and to thy seed." He appeared to Jacob: "I am God," said he to him, "the God of thy father; fear not to go down into Egypt, for I will make of thee there a great nation." When Moses asks his name, he replies, "Thou shalt say to the children of Israel, The Lord, the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob hath sent me unto you. This is my name forever."

=The Covenant.=--There is, then, a covenant between the Israelites and God. Jehovah (the Eternal) loves and protects the Israelites, they are "a holy nation," "his most precious jewel among all the nations." He promises to make them mighty and happy. In return, the Israelites swear to worship him, to serve him, to obey him in everything as a lawgiver, a judge, and a sovereign.

=The Ten Commandments.=--Jehovah, lawgiver of the Israelites, dictated his precepts to Moses on Mount Sinai amidst lightnings and thunderings. They were inscribed on two tables, the Tables of the Law, in these terms:

"Hear, O Israel, I am Jehovah, thy God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, from the land of bondage." (Then follow the ten commandments to be found in the twentieth chapter of the book of Exodus.)

=The Law.=--Beside the ten commandments, the Israelites are required to obey many other divine ordinances. These are all delivered to them in the first five books of the Bible, the Pentateuch, and constitute the Law of Israel. The Law regulates the ceremonies of religion, establishes the feasts--including the Sabbath every seven days, the Passover in memory of the escape from Egypt, the week of harvest, the feast of Tabernacles during the vintage; it organizes marriage, the family, property, government, fixes the penalty of crimes, indicates even foods and remedies. It is a code at once religious, political, civil and penal. God the ruler of the Israelites has the right to regulate all the details of their lives.

=Religion has made the Jewish People.=--The Israelites did not receive with docility the government of God. Moses on his death-bed could say to the Levites in delivering to them the book of the law, "Take this book that it may be a witness against you, Israel, for I know thy rebellion and thy stiff neck" (Deut. xxxi. 27). "During my life you have been rebellious against the Lord, and how much more after my death." During these centuries some of the Israelites, often the majority of the nation, had been idolaters. They became similar to the other Semites of Syria. Only the Israelites who remained faithful to God formed the Jewish people. It is the religion of Jehovah which has transformed an obscure tribe into the holy nation, a small nation, but one of the most significant in the history of the world.

THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL

=The Judges.=--Once established in Palestine the Hebrews remained divided for several centuries. "In those days," says the Bible, "there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes." Often the Israelites forgot Jehovah and served the gods of neighboring tribes. Then "the anger of the Lord was kindled against the Israelites, and he delivered them into the hands of their enemies." When they had repented and had humbled themselves, "the Lord raised up judges who delivered them out of the hand of those that spoiled them." "But it came to pass that at the death of the judge they corrupted themselves anew ... bowing themselves to other gods." These judges--Gideon, Jephthah, Samson--were warriors who came in the name of Jehovah to free the people. Then they fell at once into idolatry again and their servitude was repeated.

=The Kings.=--At last the Israelites were wearied and asked of Samuel, the high-priest, that he would give them a king. Samuel unwillingly placed Saul at their head. This king should have been the ready servant of the will of God; he dared to disobey him, upon which the high-priest said to him, "Thou hast rejected the word of the Lord and the Lord hath rejected thee from being king over Israel." A war-chief, David, was set in his place. He defeated all the enemies of Israel, captured from them Mount Zion, and transferred his capital thither. This was Jerusalem.

=Jerusalem.=--Compared with Babylon or Thebes, Jerusalem was a poor capital. The Hebrews were not builders; their religion prevented them from raising temples; the houses of individuals were shaped like cubes of rock which may be seen today on the sides of Lebanon in the midst of vines and fig-trees. But Jerusalem was the holy city of the Hebrews. The king had his palace

there--the palace of Solomon, who astonished the Hebrews with his throne of ivory; Jehovah had his temple there, the first Hebrew temple.

=The Tabernacle.=--The emblem of the covenant between God and Israel was a great chest of cedar-wood furnished with rings of gold, which contained the tables of the Law. This was borne before the people on high feast-days; it was the Ark of the Covenant. To preserve this ark and necessary objects of worship, Moses is said to have made the Tabernacle--a pavilion of wood covered with skins and hangings. It was a portable temple which the Hebrews carried with them until they could erect a true temple in the promised land.

=The Temple.=--The Temple of Jerusalem, built at last under Solomon, was divided into three parts:

1.--To the rear, the Holy of Holies, in which rested the ark of the covenant; the high-priest only had the right to enter here, and that but once a year.

2.--In the middle, the Holy Place, in which were kept the altar of incense, the candle-stick with the seven arms, the table of shew-bread; the priests entered to burn incense and to present the offerings.

3.--At the front, the Court open to the people, where the victims were sacrificed on the great altar.

The Temple of Jerusalem was from the first the centre of the nation; from all Palestine the people came to be present at the ceremonies. The high-priest who directed the worship was a person sometimes of greater power than the king.

THE PROPHETS

=Disasters of Israel.=--Solomon was the last king who enjoyed great power. After him ten tribes separated themselves and constituted the kingdom of Israel, whose inhabitants worshipped the golden calves and the gods of the Phoenicians. Two tribes only remained faithful to Jehovah and to the king at Jerusalem; these formed the kingdom of Judah (977).[42] The two kingdoms exhausted their energies in making war on each other. Then came the armies of the Eastern conquerors; Israel was destroyed by Sargon, king of Assyria (722); Judah, by Nabuchodonosor (Nebuchadrezzar), king of Chaldea (586).

=Sentiments of the Israelites.=--Faithful Israelites regarded these woes as a chastisement: God was punishing his people for their disobedience; as before, he delivered them from their conquerors. "The children of Israel had sinned against Jehovah, their God, they had built them high places in every city, they imitated the nations around them, although the Lord had forbidden them to do like them; they made them idols of brass; they bowed themselves before all the host of heaven [the stars], they worshipped Baal. It is for this that Jehovah rejected all the race of Israel, he afflicted them and delivered them into the hands of those that plundered them."

=The Prophets.=--Then appeared the prophets, or as they were called, the Seers: Elijah, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Ezekiel. Usually they came from the desert where they had fasted, prayed, and given themselves to meditation. They came in the name of Jehovah, not as warriors in judgment, but as preachers. They called the Israelites to repent, to overthrow their idols, to return to Jehovah; they foretold all the woes that would come upon them if they did not reconcile themselves to him. They preached and uttered prophecies at the same time.

=The New Teaching.=--These men on fire with the divine spirit found the official religion at Jerusalem mean and cold. Why should they, like the idolaters, slaughter cattle and burn incense to the honor of God? "Hear the word of Jehovah," says Isaiah: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices? I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and of the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats.... Bring no more vain oblations, your incense is an abomination to me.... When ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you ... for your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean ... cease to do evil, learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.... Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow." In place of sacrifices, the prophets would set justice and good works.

=The Messiah.=--Israel deserved its afflictions, but there would be a limit to the chastisement. "O my people," says Isaiah in the name of Jehovah, "be not afraid of the Assyrian: he shall smite thee with a rod ... after the manner of Egypt ... for yet a very little while and the indignation shall cease ... and the burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder." The prophets taught the people to look for the coming of Him who should deliver them; they prepared the way for the Messiah.

THE JEWISH PEOPLE

=Return to Jerusalem.=--The children of Judah, removed to the plain of the Euphrates, did not forget their country, but sang of it in their chants: "By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down, yea, we wept when we remembered Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof, for there they that carried us away required a song ... saying, 'Sing us one of the songs of Zion.' How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" After seventy years of captivity, Cyrus, victor over Babylon, allowed the Israelites to return to Palestine. They rebuilt Jerusalem, reconstructed the temple, restored the feasts, and recovered the sacred books. As a sign that they were again the people of Jehovah they renewed the covenant with him; it was a formal treaty, written and signed by the chiefs of the people.

=The Jews.=--The little kingdom of Jerusalem maintained itself for seven centuries, governed now by a king, now by the high-priest, but always paying tribute to the masters of Syria--to the Persians first, later to the Macedonians and the Syrians, and last of all to the Romans. Faithful to the end to Jehovah, the Jews (their proper name since the return) continued to live the law of Moses, to celebrate at Jerusalem the feasts and the sacrifices. The high-priest, assisted by a council of the elders, preserved the law; scribes copied it and doctors expounded it to the people. The faithful obliged themselves to observe it in the smallest details. The Pharisees were eminent among them for their zeal in fulfilling all its requirements.

=The Synagogues.=--Meanwhile the Jews for the sake of trade were pushing beyond the borders of Judaea into Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and even to Italy. Some of them were to be found in all the great cities--Alexandria, Damascus, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth and Rome. Dispersed among the Gentiles, the Jews were strenuous to preserve their religion. They raised no temples, for the law prevented this; there could be but one Jewish temple, that at Jerusalem, where they celebrated the solemn feasts. But they joined themselves together to read and comment on the word of God. These places of assembling were called Synagogues, from a Greek word signifying meetings.

=Destruction of the Temple.=--The Christ appeared at this moment. The Jews crucified him and persecuted his disciples not only in Judaea but in every city where they found them in any number. In the year 70 A.D. Jerusalem, in revolt against the Romans, was taken by assault, and all the inhabitants were massacred or sold into slavery. The Romans burnt the temple and carried away the sacred utensils. From that time there was no longer a centre of the Jewish religion.

=Fortunes of the Jews after the Dispersion.=--The Jewish nation survived the ruin of its capital. The Jews, scattered throughout the world, learned to dispense with the temple. They preserved their sacred books in the Hebrew tongue. Hebrew is the primitive language of Israel; the Jews since the return from Babylon no longer spoke it, but adopted the languages of the neighboring peoples--the Syriac, the Chaldean, and especially the Greek. The Rabbis, however, instructed in the religion, still learned the Hebrew, explained it, and commented on the Scripture.[43] Thus the Jewish religion was preserved, and, thanks to it, the Jewish people. It made converts even among the Gentiles; there were in the empire proselytes, that is, people who practised the religion of Jehovah without being of the Jewish race.

The Christian Church, powerful since the fourth century, commenced to persecute the Jews. This persecution has endured to this day in all Christian countries. Usually the Jews were tolerated on account of their wealth and because they transacted all banking operations; but they were kept apart, not being permitted to hold any office. In the majority of cities they were compelled to wear a special costume, to live in a special quarter,[44] gloomy, filthy, unhealthy, and sometimes at Easter time to send one of their number to suffer insult. The people suspected them of poisoning fountains, of killing children, of profaning the consecrated host; often the people rose against them, massacred them, and pillaged their houses. Judges under the least pretext had them imprisoned, tortured, and burned. Sometimes the church tried to convert them by force; sometimes the government exiled them _en masse_ from the country and confiscated their goods. The Jews at last disappeared from France,[45] from Spain, England, and Italy. In Portugal, Germany, and Poland, and in the Mohammedan lands they maintained themselves. From these countries after the cessation of persecution they returned to the rest of Europe.

FOOTNOTES:

[41] Exodus iii, 1-10.

[42] There is much uncertainty regarding the chronology of this period.--ED.

[43] The Talmud is the accumulation of these commentaries.

[44] The Jewish Quarter at Rome was called the Ghetto. This name has since been applied to all Jewish quarters.

[45] Except at Avignon, on the domains of the Pope, and in Alsace-Lorraine.

CHAPTER IX

GREECE AND THE GREEKS

=The Country.=--Greece is a very little country (about 20,000 square miles), hardly larger than Switzerland; but it is a country of great variety, bristling with mountains, indented with gulfs--a country originally constituted to influence mightily the character of the men who inhabited it.

A central chain, the Pindus, traverses Greece through the centre and covers it with its rocky system. Toward the isthmus of Corinth it becomes lower; but the Peloponnesus, on the other side of the isthmus, is elevated about 2,000 feet above the sea level, like a citadel crowned with lofty chains, abrupt and snowy, which fall perpendicularly into the sea. The islands themselves scattered along the coast are only submerged mountains whose summits rise above the surface of the sea. In this diverse land there is little tillable ground, but almost everywhere bare rock. The streams, like brooks, leave between their half-dried channel and the sterile rock of the mountain only a narrow strip of fertile soil. In this beautiful country are found some forests, cypresses, laurels, palms, here and there vines scattered on the rocky hillsides; but there are no rich harvests and no green pasturages. Such a country produces wiry mountaineers, active and sober.

=The Sea.=--Greece is a land of shores: smaller than Portugal, it has as great a coast-line as Spain. The sea penetrates it to a great number of gulfs, coves, and indentations; it is ordinarily surrounded with projecting rocks, or with approaching islands that form a natural port. This sea is like a lake; it has not, like the ocean, a pale and sombre color; usually it is calm, lustrous, and, as Homer says, "of the color of violets."

No sea lends itself better to navigation with small ships. Every morning the north wind rises to conduct the barques of Athens to Asia; in the evening the south wind brings them back to port. From Greece to Asia Minor the islands are placed like stepping-stones; on a clear day the mariner always has land in view. Such a sea beckons people to cross it.

And so the Greeks have been sailors, traders, travellers, pirates, and adventurers; like the Phoenicians, they have spread over all the ancient world, carrying with them the merchandise and the inventions of Egypt, of Chaldea, and of Asia.

=The Climate.=--The climate of Greece is mild. In Athens it freezes hardly once in twenty years; in summer the heat is moderated by the breeze from the sea.[46] Today the people still lie in the streets from the month of May to September. The air is cool and transparent; for many leagues could once be seen the crest of the statue of Pallas. The contours of distant mountains are not, as with us, enveloped in haze, but show a clear line against the clear sky. It is a beautiful country which urges man to take life as a feast, for everything is happy about him. "Walking at night in the gardens, listening to the grasshoppers, playing the lute in the clear of the moon, going to drink at the spring at the mountain, carrying with him some wine that he may drink while he sings, spending the days in dancing--these are Greek pleasures, the joys of a race poor, economical, and eternally young."

=Simplicity of Greek Life.=--In this country men are not melted with the heat nor stiffened with cold; they live in the open air gay and at slight expense. Food in great quantity is not required, nor warm clothing, nor a comfortable house. The Greek could live on a handful of olives and a sardine. His entire clothing consisted of sandals, a tunic, a large mantle; very often he went bare-footed and bare-headed. His house was a meagre and unsubstantial building; the air easily entered through the walls. A couch with some coverings, a coffer, some beautiful vases, a lamp,--this was his furniture. The walls were bare and whitened with lime. This house was only a sleeping place.

THE PEOPLE

=Origin of the Greeks.=--The people who inhabited this charming little land were an Aryan people, related to the Hindoos and the Persians, and like them come from the mountains of Asia or the steppes beyond the Caspian Sea. The Greeks had forgotten the long journey made by their ancestors; they said that they, like the grasshoppers, were the children of the soil.[47] But their language and the names of their gods leave no doubt of their origin.... Like all the Aryans, the primitive Greeks nourished themselves with milk and with the flesh of their herds; they moved about under arms, always ready to fight, and grouped themselves in tribes governed by patriarchs.

=The Legends.=--The Greeks like all the other ancient peoples were ignorant of their origin. They neither knew whence their ancestors had come nor when they had established themselves in Greece, nor what they had done there. To preserve the exact memory of things as they occur, there is need of some means of fixing them; but the Greeks did not know how to write; they did not employ writing until about the eighth century B.C. They had no way of calculating the number of years. Later they adopted the usage of counting the years according to the great feast which was celebrated every four years at Olympia; a period of four years was called an olympiad. But the first olympiad was placed in 776 B.C., and the chronology of the Greeks does not rise beyond this date.

And yet they used to tell in Greece a great number of legends about this primitive period. These were especially the exploits of ancient kings and of heroes who were adored as demi-gods. These stories were so mingled with fable that it is impossible to know how much truth they may contain. They said at Athens that the first king, Cecrops, was half man and half serpent; at Thebes, that Cadmus, founder of the city, had come from Phoenicia to seek his sister Europa who had been stolen by a bull; that he had killed a dragon and had sowed his teeth, from which was sprung a race of warriors, and that the noble families of Thebes descended from these warriors. At Argos it was said that the royal family was the issue of Pelops to whom Zeus had given a shoulder of ivory to replace the one devoured by a goddess. Thus each country had its legends and the Greeks continued to the end to relate them and to offer worship to their ancient heroes--Perseus, Bellerophon, Herakles, Theseus, Minos, Castor and Pollux, Meleager, OEdipus. The majority of the Greeks, even among the better educated, admitted, at least in part, the truth of these traditions. They accepted as historical facts the war between the two sons of OEdipus, king of Thebes, and the expedition of the Argonauts, sailing forth in quest of the Golden Fleece, which was guarded by two brazen-footed bulls vomiting flames.

=The Trojan War.=--Of all these legends the most fully developed and the most celebrated was the legend of the Trojan War. It recounted that about the twelfth century, Troy, a rich and powerful city, held sway over the coast of Asia. Paris, a Trojan prince, having come to Greece, had abducted Helen, wife of Menelaus, king of Sparta. Agamemnon, king of Argos, made a league of the kings of Greece; a Greek army went in a fleet of two hundred galleys to besiege Troy. The siege endured ten years because the supreme god, Zeus, had taken the side of the Trojans. All the Greek chiefs participated in this adventure. Achilles, the bravest and the most beautiful of these, killed Hector, the principal defender of Troy, and dragged his corpse around the city; he fought clad in divine armor which had been presented him by his mother, a goddess of the sea; in turn he died, shot by an arrow in the heel. The Greeks, despairing of taking the city by force, employed a trick: they pretended to depart, and left an immense horse of wood in which were concealed the chiefs of the army. The Trojans drew this horse into the city; during the night the chiefs came forth and opened the city to the Greeks. Troy was burnt, the men slaughtered, the women led away as slaves. But the chiefs of the Greeks on their return were beset by tempest. Some perished in the sea, others were cast on foreign shores. Odysseus, the most crafty of the chiefs, was for ten years buffeted from one land to another, losing successively all his ships, himself the sole survivor of the disasters.

All antiquity had steadfast faith in the Trojan War. 1184 B.C. was set as the date of the ending of the siege, and men pointed out the site of the city. In 1874 Schliemann purposed to excavate this site; it was necessary to traverse the debris of many cities which lay over it; at last at a depth of about fifty feet he found in the deepest bed of debris the traces of a mighty city reduced to ashes, and in the ruins of the principal edifice a casket filled with gems of gold which he called the Treasury of Priam. There was no inscription, and the city, the whole wall of which we have been able to bring to light, was a very small one. A large number of small, very rude idols have been found, which represent an owl-headed goddess (the Greeks thus represented the goddess Pallas). Beyond this no proof has been found that this city was called Troy.

=The Homeric Poems.=--It is the two poems attributed to Homer which have made the taking of Troy renowned throughout the world--the Iliad, which related the combats of the Greeks and the exploits of Achilles before Troy; and the Odyssey, which recounts the adventures of Odysseus (Ulysses) after the capture of Troy.

These two poems were handed down for centuries without being committed to writing; the rhapsodists, wandering singers, knew long passages from them by heart and recited them at feasts. It is not till the sixth century that Pisistratus, a prince of Athens, had them collected and edited.[48] The two poems became from that time and always remained the most admired works of Greek literature.

The Greeks said that the author of these poems was Homer, a Greek of Ionia, who lived about the tenth or the ninth century B.C. They represented him as a blind old man, poor and a wanderer. Seven towns disputed the honor of being his birth-place. This tradition was received without hesitation. But at the end of the eighteenth century a German scholar, Wolf, noticed certain

contradictions in these poems, and at last asserted that they were not the work of a single poet, but a collection of fragments from several different poets. This theory has been attacked and supported with great energy: for a half century men have flown into a passion for or against the existence of Homer. Today we begin to think the problem insoluble. What is certain is that these poems are very old, probably of the ninth century. The Iliad was composed in Asia Minor and is perhaps the result of the union of two poems--one dedicated to the combats of the Trojans, and the other to the adventures of Achilles. The Odyssey appears to be the work of one author; but it cannot be affirmed that it is of the same author as the Iliad.

=The Greeks at the Time of Homer.=--We are not able to go back very far in the history of the Greeks; the Homeric poems are their oldest historical document. When these were composed, about the ninth century B.C., there was not yet any general name to designate all the inhabitants of Greece: Homer mentions them under the names of their principal tribes. From his description it appears that they have made some progress since their departure from Asia. They know how to till the ground, how to construct strong cities and to organize themselves into little peoples. They obey kings; they have a council of old men and an assembly of the people. They are proud of their institutions, they despise their less advanced neighbors, the Barbarians, as they call them. Odysseus, to show how rude the Cyclops were, says, "They have no rules of justice nor places where they deliberate; each one governs himself, his wife, and children, and has no association with others." But these Greeks themselves are half barbarians; they do not know how to write, to coin money, nor the art of working in iron. They hardly dare to trust themselves on the sea and they imagine that Sicily is peopled with monsters.

=The Dorians.=--Dorians was the name given to those sons of the mountaineers who had come from the north and had expelled or subjected those dwelling in the plains and on the shore of the Peloponnesus; the latter, crowded into too narrow limits, sent colonies into Asia. Of these mountain bands the most renowned came from a little canton called Doris and preserved the name Dorians. These invaders told how certain kings of Sparta, the posterity of Herakles, having been thrust out by their subjects, had come to seek the Dorians in their mountains. These people of the mountains, moved by their love for Herakles, had followed his descendants and had replaced them on their throne. By the same stroke they dispossessed the inhabitants and took their place. They were a martial, robust, and healthy race, accustomed to cold, to meagre food, to a scant existence. Men and women wore a short tunic which did not reach to the knee. They spoke a rude and primitive dialect. The Dorians were a race of soldiers, always obliged to keep themselves under arms; they were the least cultivated in Greece, since, situated far from the sea, they preserved the customs of the barbarous age; they were the most Greek because, being isolated, they could neither mingle with strangers nor imitate their manners.

=The Ionians.=--The peoples of Attica, the isles, and the coast of Asia were called Ionians; no one knows the origin of the name. Unlike the Dorians, they were a race of sailors or traders, the most cultured of Greece, gaining instruction from contact with the most civilized peoples of the Orient; the least Greek, because they associated with Asiatics and had in part adopted their dress. They were peaceful and industrious, living luxuriously, speaking a smooth dialect, and wearing long flowing garments like the Orientals.

=The Hellenes.=--Dorians and Ionians--these are the two opposing races, the most remarkable of Greece, and the most powerful: Sparta is Dorian, Athens is Ionian. But the majority of the Greeks are neither Dorians nor Ionians: they are called AEolians, a vague name which covers very different peoples.

All the Greeks from early times take the name "Hellenes" which they have kept to this day. What is the origin of the term? They did not know any more than we: they said only that Dorus and AEolus were sons of Hellen, and Ion was his grandson.

=Cities.=--The Hellenes were still in little peoples as at the time of Homer. The land of Greece, cut by mountains and sea, breaks naturally into a large number of small cantons, each isolated from its neighbor by an arm of the sea or by a wall of rocks, so that it is easy to defend the land and difficult to communicate with other parts. Each canton constituted a separate state which was called a city. There were more than a hundred of these; counting the colonies, more than a thousand. To us a Greek state seems a miniature. The whole of Attica was but little larger than the state of Delaware, and Corinth or Megara was much smaller. Usually the state was only a city with a strip of shore and a harbor, or some villages scattered in the plain around a citadel. From one state one sees the citadel, mountains, or harbor of the next state. Many of them count their citizens only by thousands; the largest included hardly 200,000 or 300,000.

The Hellenes never formed one nation; they never ceased to fight and destroy one another. And yet all spoke the same language, worshipped the same gods, and lived the same sort of a life. In these respects they recognized the bonds of a common race and

distinguished themselves from all other peoples whom they called barbarians and regarded with disdain.

THE HELLENES BEYOND SEA

=Colonization.=--The Hellenes did not inhabit Greece alone. Colonists from the Greek cities had gone forth to found new cities in all the neighboring countries. There were little states in all the islands of the Archipelago, over all the coast of Asia Minor, in Crete and Cyprus, on the whole circumference of the Black Sea as far as the Caucasus and the Crimea, along the shore of Turkey in Europe (then called Thrace), on the shore of Africa, in Sicily, in south Italy, and even on the coasts of France and Spain.

=Character of These Colonies.=--Greek colonies were being founded all the time from the twelfth century to the fifth; they issued from various cities and represented all the Greek races--Dorian, Ionian, and AEolian. They were established in the wilderness, in an inhabited land, by conquest, or by an agreement with the natives. Mariners, merchants, exiles, or adventurers were their founders. But with all this diversity of time, place, race, and origin, the colonies had common characteristics: they were established at one stroke and according to certain fixed rules. The colonists did not arrive one by one or in small bands; nor did they settle at random, building houses which little by little became a city, as is the case now with European colonists in America. All the colonists started at once under a leader, and the new city was founded in one day. The foundation was a religious ceremony; the "founder" traced a sacred enclosure, constructed a sacred hearth, and lighted there the holy fire.

=Traditions Concerning the Colonists.=--The old stories about the founding of some of these colonies enable us to see how they differed from modern colonies. The account of the settlement of Marseilles runs as follows: Euxenus, a citizen of Phocaea, coming to Gaul in a merchant galley, was invited by a Gallic chief to the marriage of his daughter; according to the custom of this people, the young girl about the time of the feast entered bearing a cup which she was to present to the one whom she would choose for a husband; she stopped before the Greek and offered him the cup. This unpremeditated act appeared to have been inspired from heaven; the Gallic chief gave his daughter to Euxenus and permitted him and his companions to found a city on the gulf of Marseilles. Later the Phocaeans, seeing their city blockaded by the Persian army, loaded on their ships their families, their movables, the statues and treasures of their temple and went to sea, abandoning their city. As they started, they threw into the sea a mass of red-hot iron and swore never to return to Phocaea until the iron should rise to the surface of the water. Many violated this oath and returned; but the rest continued the voyage and after many adventures came to Marseilles.

At Miletus the Ionians who founded the city had brought no wives with them; they seized a city inhabited by the natives of Asia, slaughtered all the men, and forcibly married the women and girls of the families of their victims. It was said that the women, affronted in this manner, swore never to eat food with their captors and never to call them by the name of husband; this custom was for centuries preserved among the women of Miletus.[49]

The colony at Cyrene in Africa was founded according to the express command of the oracle of Apollo. The inhabitants of Thera, who had received this order, did not care to go to an unknown country. They yielded only at the end of seven years since their island was afflicted with dearth; they believed that Apollo had sent misfortune on them as a penalty. Nevertheless the citizens who were sent out attempted to abandon the enterprise, but their fellow-citizens attacked them and forced them to return. After having spent two years on an island where no success came to them, they at last came to settle at Cyrene, which soon became a prosperous city.[50]

=Importance of the Colonies.=--Wherever they settled, the colonists constituted a new state which in no respect obeyed the mother town from which they had come out. And so the whole Mediterranean found itself surrounded by Greek cities independent one of the others. Of these cities many became richer and more powerful than their mother towns; they had a territory which was larger and more fertile, and in consequence a greater population. Sybaris, it was said, had 300,000 men who were capable of bearing arms. Croton could place in the field an infantry force of 120,000 men. Syracuse in Sicily, Miletus in Asia had greater armies than even Sparta and Athens. South Italy was termed Great Greece. In comparison with this great country fully peopled with Greek colonies the home country was, in fact, only a little Greece. And so it happened that the Greeks were much more numerous in the neighboring countries than in Greece proper; and among these people of the colonies figure a good share of the most celebrated names: Homer, Alcaeus, Sappho, Thales, Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Democritus, Empedocles, Aristotle, Archimedes, Theocritus, and many others.

FOOTNOTES:

[46] "Balmy and clement," says Euripides, "is our atmosphere. The cold of winter has no extremes for us, and the shafts of the sun do not wound."

[47] Autochthones.

[48] The story of the collection of the Homeric poems by Pisistratus is without foundation--"eine blosse Fabel." Busolt, "Griechische Geschichte." Gotha, 1893, i., 127.--ED.

[49] Probably this custom has another origin the recollection of which was lost.--ED.

[50] Herodotus, iv., 150-158.

CHAPTER X

GREEK RELIGION

=The Gods. Polytheism.=--The Greeks, like the ancient Aryans, believed in many gods. They had neither the sentiment of infinity nor that of eternity; they did not conceive of God as one for whom the heavens are only a tent and the earth a foot-stool. To the Greeks every force of nature--the air, the sun, the sea--was divine, and as they did not conceive of all these phenomena as produced by one cause, they assigned each to a particular god. This is the reason that they believed in many gods. They were polytheists.

=Anthropomorphism.=--Each god was a force in nature and carried a distinct name. The Greeks, having a lively imagination, figured under this name a living being, of beautiful form and human characteristics. A god or goddess was represented as a beautiful man or woman. When Odysseus or Telemachus met a person peculiarly great and beautiful, they began by asking him if he were not a god. Homer in describing the army pictured on the shield of Achilles adds, "Ares and Athena led the army, both clad in gold, beautiful and great, as becomes the gods, for men were smaller." Greek gods are men; they have clothing, palaces, bodies similar to ours; if they cannot die, they can at least be wounded. Homer relates how Ares, the god of war, struck by a warrior, fled howling with pain. This fashion of making gods like men is what is called _Anthropomorphism_.

=Mythology.=--The gods, being men, have parents, children, property. Their mothers were goddesses, their brothers were gods, and their children other gods or men who were half divine. This genealogy of the gods is what is called the _Theogony_. The gods have also a history; we are told the story of their birth, the adventures of their youth, their exploits. Apollo, for example, was born on the island of Delos to which his mother Latona had fled; he slew a monster which was desolating the country at the foot of Parnassus. Each canton of Greece had thus its tales of the gods. These are called myths; the sum of them is termed _Mythology_, or the history of the gods.

=The Local Gods.=--The Greek gods, even under their human form, remained what they were at first, phenomena of nature. They were thought of both as men and as forces of nature. The Naiad is a young woman, but at the same time a bubbling fountain. Homer represents the river Xanthus as a god, and yet he says, "The Xanthus threw itself on Achilles, boiling with fury, full of tumult, foam, and the bodies of the dead." The people itself continued to say "Zeus rains" or "Zeus thunders." To the Greek the god was first of all rain, storm, heaven, or sun, and not the heaven, sun, or earth in general, but that corner of the heaven under which he lived, the land of his canton, the river which traversed it. Each city, then, had its divinities, its sun-god, its earth-goddess, its sea-god, and these are not to be confounded with the sun, the earth, and the sea of the neighboring city. The Zeus of Sparta is not the same as the Zeus of Athens; in the same oath one sometimes invokes two Athenas or two Apollos. A traveller who would journey through Greece[51] would therefore meet thousands of local gods (they called them Poliades, or gods of the city). No torrent, no wood, no mountain was without its own deity,[52] although often a minor divinity, adored only by the people of the vicinity and whose sanctuary was only a grotto in the rock.

=The Great Gods.=--Above the innumerable legion of local gods of each canton the Greeks imagined certain great divinities--the heaven, the sun, the earth, and the sea--and these everywhere had the same name, and had their temple or sanctuary in every place. Each represented one of the principal forces of nature. These gods common to all the Greeks were never numerous; if all are included, we have hardly twenty.[53] We have the bad habit of calling them by the name of a Latin god. The following are their true names: Zeus (Jupiter), Hera (Juno), Athena (Minerva), Apollo, Artemis (Diana), Hermes (Mercury), Hephaistos (Vulcan), Hestia (Vesta), Ares (Mars), Aphrodite (Venus), Poseidon (Neptune), Amphitrite, Proteus, Kronos (Saturn), Rhea (Cybele), Demeter (Ceres), Persephone (Proserpina), Hades (Pluto), Dionysos (Bacchus). It is this little group of gods that men worshipped

in all the temples, that men ordinarily invoked in their prayers.

=Attributes of the Gods.=--Each of these great gods had his form, his costume, his instruments (which we call his attributes); it is thus that the faithful imagined him and that the sculptors represented him. Each has his character which is well known to his worshippers. Each has his role in the world, performing his determined functions, ordinarily with the aid of secondary divinities who obey him.

Athena, virgin of clear eye, is represented standing, armed with a lance, a helmet on the head, and gleaming armor on the breast. She is the goddess of the clear air, of wisdom, and of invention, a goddess of dignity and majesty.

Hephaistos, the god of fire, is figured with a hammer and in the form of a lame and ugly blacksmith. It is he who forges the thunderbolt.

Artemis, shy maiden, armed with bow and quiver, courses the forests hunting with a troop of nymphs. She is the goddess of the woods, of the chase, and of death.

Hermes, represented with winged sandals, is the god of the fertile showers. But he has other offices; he is the god of streets and squares, the god of commerce, of theft, and of eloquence. He it is who guides the souls of the dead, the messenger of the gods, the deity presiding over the breeding of cattle.

Almost always a Greek god has several functions, quite dissimilar to our eyes, but to the Greeks bearing some relation to one another.

=Olympus and Zeus.=--Each one of these gods is like a king in his own domain. Still the Greeks had remarked that all the forces of nature do not operate by chance and that they act in harmony; the same word served them for the idea of order and of universe. They supposed, then, that the gods were in accord for the administration of the world, and that they, like men, had laws and government among them.

In the north of Greece there was a mountain to whose snowy summit no man had ever climbed. This was Olympus. On this summit, which was hidden by clouds from the eyes of men, it was imagined the gods assembled. Meeting under the light of heaven, they conferred on the affairs of the world. Zeus, the mightiest of them, presided over the gathering: he was god of the heavens and of the light, the god "who masses the clouds," who launches the thunderbolt--an old man of majestic mien, with long beard, sitting on a throne of gold. It is he who commands and the other gods bow before him. Should they essay to resist, Zeus menaces them; Homer makes him say,[54] "Bind to heaven a chain of gold, and all of you, gods or goddesses, throw your weight upon it; all your united efforts cannot draw Zeus, the sovereign ordainer, to the earth. On the contrary, if I wished to draw the chain to myself, I should bring with it the earth and the very sea. Then I would attach it to the summit of Olympus and all the universe would be suspended. By so much am I superior to gods and men."

=Morality of the Greek Mythology.=--The greater part of their gods were conceived by the Greeks as violent, sanguinary, deceitful, dissolute. They ascribed to them scandalous adventures or dishonest acts. Hermes was notorious for his thieving, Aphrodite for her coquetry, Ares for his ferocity. All were so vain as to persecute those who neglected to offer sacrifices to them. Niobe had seen all her children pierced with arrows by Apollo because she herself had boasted of her numerous family. The gods were so jealous that they could not endure seeing a man thoroughly happy; prosperity for the Greeks was the greatest of dangers, for it never failed to draw the anger of the gods, and this anger became a goddess (Nemesis) about whom were told such anecdotes as the following: Once Polycrates of Samos, become very powerful, feared the jealousy of the gods; and so a ring of gold which he still retained was cast into the sea that his good fortune might not be unmixed with evil. Some time after, a fisherman brought to Polycrates an enormous fish and in its belly was found the ring. This was a certain presage of evil. Polycrates was besieged in his city, taken, and crucified. The gods punished him for his good fortune.

Greek mythology was immoral in that the gods gave bad examples to men. The Greek philosophers were already saying this and were inveighing against the poets who had published these stories. A disciple of Pythagoras affirmed that his master, descending to hell, had seen the soul of Homer hanging to a tree and that of Hesiod bound to a column to punish them for calumniating the gods. "Homer and Hesiod," Said Xenophanes, "attribute to the gods all the acts which among men are culpable and shameful; there is but one god who neither in body nor in soul resembles men." And he added this profound remark: "If oxen and lions had hands and could manipulate like men, they would have made gods with bodies similar to their own, horses would have framed gods with horses' bodies, and cattle with cattle's.... Men think that the gods have their feelings, their voice, and their body." Xenophanes

was right; the primitive Greeks had created their gods in their own image. As they were then sanguinary, dissolute, jealous, and vain, their gods were the same. Later, as the people became better, their descendants were shocked with all these vices; but the history and the character of the gods were fixed by the ancient traditions, and later generations, without daring to change them, had received the gross and dishonest gods of their ancestors.

THE HEROES

=The Hero.=--The hero in Greece is a man who has become illustrious, and after death a mighty spirit--not a god, but a demi-god. The heroes do not live on Olympus in the heaven of the gods, they do not direct the life of the world. And yet they, too, possess a power higher than that of any human, and this permits them to aid their friends and destroy their enemies. For this reason the Greeks rendered them worship as to the gods and implored their protection. There was not a city, not a tribe, not a family but had its hero, a protecting spirit which it adored.

=Different Kinds of Heroes.=--Of these heroes many are legendary persons (Achilles, Odysseus, Agamemnon); some without doubt never existed (Herakles, OEdipus); others like Hellen, Dorus, AEolus are only names. But their worshippers regarded them as men of the olden time; and, in fact, the most of the heroes lived at one time. Many are historical personages: generals like Leonidas, Lysander; philosophers like Democritus and Aristotle; legislators like Lycurgus and Solon. The people of Croton adored even one of their fellow-citizens, Philip by name, because he had been in his time the most beautiful man in Greece. The leader who had guided a band of colonists and founded a city became for the inhabitants the Founder; a temple was raised to him and every year sacrifices were offered to him. The Athenian Miltiades was thus worshipped in a city of Thrace. The Spartiate Brasidas, killed in the defence of Amphipolis, had divine honors paid to him in that city, for the inhabitants had come to regard him as their Founder.

=Presence of the Heroes.=--The hero continued to reside in the place where his body was interred, either in his tomb or in the neighborhood. A story told by Herodotus (v. 67) depicts this belief in a lively way. The city of Sicyon adored the hero Adrastus and in a public place was a chapel dedicated to his honor. Cleisthenes, the tyrant of Sicyon, took a fancy to rid himself of this hero. He went to the oracle at Delphi to ask if it would aid him in expelling Adrastus. The oracle replied to his question that Adrastus was king of the Sicyonians and Cleisthenes was a brigand. The tyrant, not daring to evict the hero, adopted a ruse; he sent to Thebes to seek the bones of Melanippus, another hero, and installed them with great pomp in the sanctuary of the city. "He did this," says Herodotus, "because Melanippus during his life had been the greatest enemy of Adrastus and had killed his brother and his son-in-law." Then he transferred to Melanippus the festivals and the sacrifices formerly paid to the honor of Adrastus. He was persuaded, and all the Greeks with him, that the hero would be irritated and would flee.

=Intervention of the Heroes.=--The heroes have divine power; like the gods, they can according to their whim send good or evil. The poet Stesichorus had spoken ill of the famous Helen (that Helen who the legend states was carried away to Troy); he suddenly became blind; when he retracted what he had said, the heroine restored his sight.

The protecting heroes of a city kept it from plagues and famine and even fought against its enemies. At the battle of the Marathon the Athenian soldiers saw in the midst of them Theseus, the mythical founder of Athens, clad in shining armor. During the battle of Salamis the heroes Ajax and Telamon, once kings of Salamis, appeared on the highest point of the island extending their hands to the Greek fleet. "It is not we," said Themistocles, "that have vanquished the Persians; it is the gods and heroes." In "OEdipus at Colonus," a tragedy of Sophocles, OEdipus at the point of death receives the visit of the king of Athens and of the king of Thebes, both of whom as gods request him to have his body interred in their territory, and to become a protecting hero. OEdipus at last consents to be buried in the soil of the Athenians, and says to the king, "Dead, I shall not be a useless inhabitant of this country, I shall be a rampart for you, stronger than millions of warriors." In himself alone a hero was as efficient as a whole army; his spirit was mightier than all living men.

WORSHIP

=Principles of Worship of the Gods.=--Gods and heroes, potent as they were, bestowed on men all good or evil fortune according to their will. It was dangerous to have them against you, wise to have them on your side. They were conceived as like men, irritated if they were neglected, contented if they were venerated. On this principle worship was based. It consisted in doing things agreeable to the gods to obtain their favor. Plato expresses as follows[55] the thought of the common man, "To know how to say and do those things that are pleasing to the gods, either in prayers or in offerings, this is piety which brings prosperity to individuals

and to states. The reverse is impiety which ruins everything." "It is natural," says Xenophon at the end of his treatise on Cavalry, "that the gods should favor those especially who not only consult them in need, but honor them in the day of prosperity." Religion was first of all a contract; the Greek sought to delight the gods and in return required their services. "For a long time," says a priest of Apollo to his god, "I have burned fat bullocks for you; now grant my petitions and discharge your arrows against my enemies."

=The Great Festivals.=--Since the gods had the feelings of men they were to be pleased in the same way as men. Wine, cakes, fruits, food were brought to them. Palaces were built for them. Festivals were given in their honor, for they were "joyous gods" who loved pleasure and beautiful spectacles. A festival was not, as with us, purely an occasion of rejoicing, but a religious ceremony. On those days free from the daily toil men were required to rejoice in public before the god. The Greek, without doubt, delighted in these fetes; but it is for the god and not for himself that he celebrates them. "The Ionians," says an ancient hymn to Apollo, "delight thee with trial of strength, the hymn, and the dance."

=The Sacred Games.=--From these diversions offered to the gods originated the solemn games. Each city had them to the honor of its gods; ordinarily only its citizens were admitted to them; but in four districts of Greece were celebrated games at which all Greeks could be present and participate. These are called the Four Great Games.

The principal of these four festivals was that at Olympia. This was given every four years in honor of Zeus and continued five or six days. The multitude coming from all parts of Greece filled the amphitheatre. They commenced by sacrificing victims and addressing prayers to Zeus and the other gods. Then came the contests; they were:

The foot-race around the stadion.

The Pentathlon, so called because it comprised five exercises. The competitors were to leap, run from one end of the stadion to the other, make a long throw of the metal discus, hurl the javelin, and wrestle.

Boxing, in which one fought with arms bound with thongs of hide.

The chariot races, which were held in the hippodrome; the cars were light and were drawn by four horses.

The judges of the games were clothed in purple, crowned with laurel. After the combat a herald proclaimed before the whole assembly the name of the victor and of his city. A crown of olive was the only reward given him; but his fellow-citizens on his return received him as a conquering hero; sometimes they threw down a section of the city wall to give him entrance. He arrived in a chariot drawn by four horses, clothed in purple, escorted by all the people. "These victories which we leave today to the athletes of the public shows appeared then the greatest of all. Poets of greatest renown celebrated them; Pindar, the most illustrious lyric poet of antiquity, has hardly done more than sing of chariot races. It is related that a certain Diagoras, who had seen his two sons crowned on the same day, was borne in triumph by them in the sight of the spectators. The people, holding such an honor too great for a mortal, cried out, 'Perish, Diagoras, for after all you cannot become a god.' Diagoras, suffocated with emotion, died in the arms of his sons. In his eyes and the eyes of the Greeks the fact that his sons possessed the stoutest fists and the nimblest limbs in Greece was the acme of earthly happiness."[56] The Greeks had their reasons for thus admiring physical prowess: in their wars in which they fought hand to hand the most vigorous athletes were the best soldiers.

=Omens.=--In return for so much homage, so many festivals and offerings, the Greeks expected no small amount of service from their gods. The gods protected their worshippers, gave them health, riches, victory. They preserved them from the evils that menaced them, sending signs which men interpreted. These are called Omens. "When a city," says Herodotus,[57] "is about to suffer some great misfortune, this is usually anticipated by signs. The people of Chios had omens of their defeat: of a band of one hundred youths sent to Delphi but two returned; the others had died of the plague. About the same time the roof of a school of the city fell on the children who were learning to read; but one escaped of the one hundred and twenty. Such were the anticipating signs sent them by the deity."

The Greeks regarded as supernatural signs, dreams, the flight of birds in the heavens, the entrails of animals sacrificed--in a word, everything that they saw, from the tremblings of the earth and eclipses to a simple sneeze. In the expedition to Sicily, Nicias, the general of the Athenians, at the moment of embarking his army for the retreat, was arrested by an eclipse of the moon; the gods, thought he, had sent this prodigy to warn the Athenians not to continue their enterprise. And so Nicias waited; he waited twenty-seven days offering sacrifices to appease the gods. During this inactivity the enemy closed the port, destroyed the fleet, and exterminated his army. The Athenians on learning this news found but one thing with which to reproach Nicias: he should have known that for an army in retreat the eclipse of the moon was a favorable sign. During the retreat of the Ten Thousand, Xenophon,

the general, making an address to his soldiers, uttered this sentiment: "With the help of the gods we have the surest hope that we shall save ourselves with glory." At this point a soldier sneezed. At once all adored the god who had sent this omen. "Since at the very instant when we are deliberating concerning our safety," exclaimed Xenophon, "Zeus the savior has sent us an omen, let us with one consent offer sacrifices to him."[58]

=The Oracles.=--Often the god replies to the faithful who consult him not by a mute sign, but by the mouth of an inspired person. The faithful enter the sanctuary of the god seeking responses and counsel. These are Oracles.

There were oracles in many places in Greece and Asia. The most noted were at Dodona in Epirus, and at Delphi, at the foot of Mount Parnassus. At Dodona it was Zeus who spoke by the rustling of the sacred oaks. At Delphi it was Apollo who was consulted. Below his temple, in a grotto, a current of cool air issued from a rift in the ground. This air the Greeks thought[59] was sent by the god, for he threw into a frenzy those who inhaled it. A tripod was placed over the orifice, a woman (the Pythia), prepared by a bath in the sacred spring, took her seat on the tripod, and received the inspiration. At once, seized with a nervous frenzy, she uttered cries and broken sentences. Priests sitting about her caught these expressions, set them to verse, and brought them to him who sought advice of the god.

The oracles of the Pythia were often obscure and ambiguous. When Croesus asked if he should make war on the Persians, the reply was, "Croesus will destroy a great empire." In fact, a great empire was destroyed, but it was that of Croesus.

The Spartans had great confidence in the Pythia, and never initiated an expedition without consulting her. The other Greeks imitated them, and Delphi thus became a sort of national oracle.

=Amphictyonies.=--To protect the sanctuary of Delphi twelve of the principal peoples of Greece had formed an association called an Amphictyony.[60] Every year deputies from these peoples assembled at Delphi to celebrate the festival of Apollo and see that the temple was not threatened; for this temple contained immense wealth, a temptation to pillage it. In the sixth century the people of Cirrha, a neighboring city of Delphi, appropriated these treasures.[61] The Amphictyons declared war against them for sacrilege. Cirrha was taken and destroyed, the inhabitants sold as slaves, the territory left fallow. In the fourth century the Amphictyons made war on the Phocidians also who had seized the treasury of Delphi, and on the people of Amphissa who had tilled a field dedicated to Apollo.

Still it is not necessary to believe that the assembly of the Amphictyons ever resembled a Greek senate. It was concerned only with the temple of Apollo, not at all with political affairs. It did not even prevent members of the Amphictyony fighting one another. The oracle and the Amphictyony of Delphi were more potent than the other oracles and the other amphictyonies; but they never united the Greeks into a single nation.

FOOTNOTES:

[51] See the account of the traveller Pausanias.

[52] "There are," says Hesiod, "30,000 gods on the fruitful earth."

[53] Greek scholars formed a select society of twelve gods and goddesses, but their choice was arbitrary, and all did not agree on the same series. The Greeks of different countries and of different epochs often represented the same god under different forms. Further, the majority of the gods seem to us to have vague and undetermined attributes; this is because they were not the same everywhere.

[54] Iliad, viii., 18.

[55] In the dialogue "Eutyphron."

[56] Taine, "Philosophy of Art."

[57] Herodotus, vi., 27

[58] Xenophon, "Anabasis," iii, 2.

[59] This idea gained currency only in the later periods of Grecian history.--ED.

[60] There were similar amphictyonies at Delos, Calauria, and Onchestus.

[61] The special charge against Cirrha was the levying of toll on pilgrims coming to Delphi.--ED.

CHAPTER XI

SPARTA

THE PEOPLE

=Laconia.=--When the Dorian mountaineers invaded the Peloponnesus, the main body of them settled at Sparta in Laconia. Laconia is a narrow valley traversed by a considerable stream (the Eurotas) flowing between two massive mountain ranges with snowy summits. A poet describes the country as follows: "A land rich in tillable soil, but hard to cultivate, deep set among perpendicular mountains, rough in aspect, inaccessible to invasion." In this enclosed country lived the Dorians of Sparta in the midst of the ancient inhabitants who had become, some their subjects, others their serfs. There were, then, in Laconia three classes: Helots, Perioeci, Spartiates.

=The Helots.=--The Helots dwelt in the cottages scattered in the plain and cultivated the soil. But the land did not belong to them--indeed, they were not even free to leave it. They were, like the serfs of the Middle Ages, peasants attached to the soil, from father to son. They labored for a Spartiate proprietor who took from them the greater part of the harvest. The Spartiates instructed them, feared them, and ill treated them. They compelled them to wear rude garments, beat them unreasonably to remind them of their servile condition, and sometimes made them intoxicated to disgust their children with the sight of drunkenness. A Spartiate poet compares the Helots to "loaded asses stumbling under their burdens and the blows inflicted."

=The Perioeci.=--The Perioeci (those who live around) inhabited a hundred villages in the mountains or on the coast. They were sailors, they engaged in commerce, and manufactured the objects necessary to life. They were free and administered the business of their village, but they paid tribute to the magistrates of Sparta and obeyed them.

=Condition of the Spartiates.=--Helots and Perioeci despised the Spartiates, their masters. "Whenever one speaks to them of the Spartiates," says Xenophon,[62] "there isn't one of them who can conceal the pleasure he would feel in eating them alive." Once an earthquake nearly destroyed Sparta: the Helots at once rushed from all sides of the plain to massacre those of the Spartiates who had escaped the catastrophe. At the same time the Perioeci rose and refused obedience. The Spartiates' bearing toward the Perioeci was certain to exasperate them. At the end of a war in which many of the Helots had fought in their army, they bade them choose those who had especially distinguished themselves for bravery, with the promise of freeing them. It was a ruse to discover the most energetic and those most capable of revolting. Two thousand were chosen; they were conducted about the temples with heads crowned as an evidence of their manumission; then the Spartiates put them out of the way, but how it was done no one ever knew.[63]

And yet the oppressed classes were ten times more, numerous than their masters. While there were more than 200,000 Helots and 120,000 Perioeci, there were never more than 9,000 Spartiate heads of families. In a matter of life and death, then, it was necessary that a Spartiate be as good as ten Helots. As the form of battle was hand-to-hand, they needed agile and robust men. Sparta was like a camp without walls; its people was an army always in readiness.

EDUCATION

=The Children.=--They began to make soldiers of them at birth. The newly-born infant was brought before a council; if it was found deformed, it was exposed on the mountain to die; for an army has use only for strong men. The children who were permitted to grow up were taken from their parents at the age of seven years and were trained together as members of a group. Both summer and winter they went bare-foot and had but a single mantle. They lay on a heap of reeds and bathed in the cold waters of the Eurotas. They ate little and that quickly and had a rude diet. This was to teach them not to satiate the stomach. They were grouped by hundreds, each under a chief. Often they had to contend together with blows of feet and fists. At the feast of Artemis they were beaten before the statue of the goddess till the blood flowed; some died under this ordeal, but their honor required them not to weep. They were taught to fight and suffer.

Often they were given nothing to eat; provision must be found by foraging. If they were captured on these predatory expeditions, they were roughly beaten. A Spartiate boy who had stolen a little fox and had hidden it under his mantle, rather than betray himself let the animal gnaw out his vitals. They were to learn how to escape from perplexing situations when they were in the field.

They walked with lowered glance, silent, hands under the mantle, without turning the head and "making no more noise than statues." They were not to speak at table and were to obey all men that they encountered. This was to accustom them to discipline.

=The Girls.=--The other Greeks kept their daughters secluded in the house, spinning flax. The Spartiates would have robust women capable of bearing vigorous children. The girls, therefore, were trained in much the same manner as the boys. In their gymnasia they practised running, leaping, throwing the disc and Javelin. A poet describes a play in which Spartiate girls "like colts with flowing manes make the dust fly about them." They were reputed the healthiest and bravest women in Greece.

=The Discipline.=--The men, too, have their regular life and this a soldier's life. The presence of many enemies requires that no one shall weaken. At seventeen years the Spartiate becomes a soldier and this he until he is sixty. The costume, hour of rising and retiring, meals, exercise--everything is fixed by regulations as in barracks.

Since the Spartiate engages only in war, he is to prepare himself for that; he exercises himself in running, leaping, and wielding his arms; he disciplines all the members of the body--the neck, the arms, the shoulders, the legs, and that too, every day. He has no right to engage in trade, to pursue an industry, nor to cultivate the earth; he is a soldier and is not to allow himself to be diverted to any other occupation. He cannot live at his pleasure with his own family; the men eat together in squads; they cannot leave the country without permission. It is the discipline of a regiment in the enemy's territory.

=Laconism.=--These warriors had a rude life, with clean-cut aims and proud disposition. They spoke in short phrases--or as we say, laconically--the word has still persisted. The Greeks cited many examples of these expressions. To a garrison in danger of being surprised the government sent this message, "Attention!" A Spartan army was summoned by the king of Persia to lay down his arms; the general replied, "Come and take them." When Lysander captured Athens, he wrote simply, "Athens is fallen."

=Music. The Dance.=--The arts of Sparta were those that pertained to an army. The Dorian conquerors brought with them a peculiar sort of music--the Dorian style, serious, strong, even harsh. It was military music; the Spartiates went into battle to the sound of the flute so that the step might be regular.

Their dance was a military movement. In the "Pyrrhic" the dancers were armed and imitated all the movements of a battle; they made the gestures of striking, of parrying, of retreating, and of throwing the javelin.

=Heroism of the Women.=--The women stimulated the men to combat; their exhibitions of courage were celebrated in Greece, so much so that collections of stories of them were made.[64] A Spartan mother, seeing her son fleeing from battle, killed him with her own hand, saying; "The Eurotas does not flow for deer." Another, learning that her five sons had perished, said, "This is not what I wish to know; does victory belong to Sparta?" "Yes." "Then let us render thanks to the gods."

THE INSTITUTIONS OF SPARTA

=The Kings and the Council.=--The Spartiates had at first, like the other Greeks, an assembly of the people. All these institutions were preserved, but only in form. The kings, descendants of the god Herakles, were loaded with honors; they were given the first place at the feasts and were served with a double portion; when they died all the inhabitants made lamentation for them. But no power was left to them and they were closely watched.

The Senate was composed of twenty-eight old men taken from the rich and ancient families, appointed for life; but it did not govern.

=The Ephors.=--The real masters of Sparta were the Ephors (the name signifies overseers), five magistrates who were renewed every year. They decided peace and war, and had judicial functions; when the king commanded the army, they accompanied him, directed the operations, and sometimes made him return. Usually they consulted the senators and took action in harmony with them. Then they assembled the Spartiates in one place, announced to them what had been decided and asked their approbation. The people without discussing the matter approved the action by acclamation. No one knew whether he had the right to refuse assent; accustomed to obey, the Spartiate never refused. It was, therefore, an aristocracy of governing families. Sparta was not a country of equality. There were some men who were called Equals, but only because they were equal among themselves. The others were termed Inferiors and had no part in the government.

=The Army.=--Thanks to this regime, the Spartiates preserved the rude customs of mountaineers; they had no sculptors, no architects, no orators, no philosophers. They had sacrificed everything to war; they became "adepts in the military art,"[65] and instructors of the other Greeks. They introduced two innovations especially: a better method of combat, a better method of athletic exercise.

=The Hoplites.=--Before them the Greeks marched into battle in disorder; the chiefs, on horseback or in a light chair, rushed ahead, the men following on foot, armed each in his own fashion, helter-skelter, incapable of acting together or of resisting. A battle reduced itself to a series of duels and to a massacre. At Sparta all the soldiers had the same arms; for defence, the breastplate covering the chest, the casque which protected the head, the greaves over the legs, the buckler held before the body. For offence the soldier had a short sword and a long lance. The man thus armed was called a hoplite. The Spartan hoplites were drawn up in regiments, battalions, companies, squads, almost like our armies. An officer commanded each of these groups and transmitted to his men the orders of his superior officer, so that the general in chief might have the same movement executed throughout the whole army. This organization which appears so simple to us was to the Greeks an astonishing novelty.

=The Phalanx.=--Come into the presence of the enemy, the soldiers arrange themselves in line, ordinarily eight ranks deep, each man close to his neighbor, forming a compact mass which we call a Phalanx. The king, who directs the army, sacrifices a goat to the gods; if the entrails of the victim are propitious, he raises a chant which all the army takes up in unison. Then they advance. With rapid and measured step, to the sound of the flute, with lance couched and buckler before the body, they meet the enemy in dense array, overwhelm him by their mass and momentum, throw him into rout, and only check themselves to avoid breaking the phalanx. So long as they remain together each is protected by his neighbor and all form an impenetrable mass on which the enemy could secure no hold. These were rude tactics, but sufficient to overcome a disorderly troop. Isolated men could not resist such a body. The other Greeks understood this, and all, as far as they were able, imitated the Spartans; everywhere men were armed as hoplites and fought in phalanx.

=Gymnastics.=--To rush in orderly array on the enemy and stand the shock of battle there was need of agile and robust men; every man had to be an athlete. The Spartans therefore organized athletic exercises, and in this the other Greeks imitated them; gymnastics became for all a national art, the highest esteemed of all the arts, the crowning feature of the great festivals.

In the most remote countries, in the midst of the barbarians of Gaul or of the Black Sea, a Greek city was recognized by its gymnasium. There was a great square surrounded by porticoes or walks, usually near a spring, with baths and halls for exercise. The citizens came hither to walk and chat: it was a place of association. All the young men entered the gymnasium; for two years or less they came here every day; they learned to leap, to run, to throw the disc and the javelin, to wrestle by seizing about the waist. To harden the muscles and strengthen the skin they plunged into cold water, dispensed with oil for the body, and rubbed the flesh with a scraper (the strigil).

=Athletes.=--Many continued these exercises all their lives as a point of honor and became Athletes. Some became marvels of skill. Milo of Croton in Italy, it was said, would carry a bull on his shoulders; he stopped a chariot in its course by seizing it from behind. These athletes served sometimes in combats as soldiers, or as generals. Gymnastics were the school of war.

=Role of the Spartiates.=--The Spartans taught the other Greeks to exercise and to fight. They always remained the most vigorous wrestlers and the best soldiers, and were recognized as such by the rest of Greece. Everywhere they were respected. When the rest of the Greeks had to fight together against the Persians, they unhesitatingly took the Spartans as chiefs--and with justice, said an Athenian orator.

FOOTNOTES:

[62] "Hellenica," iii., 3, 6.

[63] See Thucydides, iv., 80.

[64] A collection by Plutarch is still preserved.

[65] A phrase of Xenophon.

CHAPTER XII

ATHENS

THE ATHENIAN PEOPLE

=Attica.=--The Athenians boasted of having always lived in the same country; their ancestors, according to their story, originated from the soil itself. The mountaineers who conquered the south land passed by the country without invading it; Attica was hardly a

temptation to them.

Attica is composed of a mass of rocks which in the form of a triangle advances into the sea. These rocks, renowned for their blocks of marble and for the honey of their bees,[66] are bare and sterile. Between them and the sea are left three small plains with meagre soil, meanly watered (the streams are dry in summer) and incapable of supporting a numerous population.

=Athens.=--In the largest of these plains, a league from the sea, rises a massive isolated rock: Athens was built at its foot. The old city, called the Acropolis, occupied the summit of the rock.

The inhabitants of Attica commenced, not by forming a single state, but by founding scattered villages, each of which had its own king and its own government. Later all these villages united under one king,[67] the king of Athens, and established a single city. This does not mean that all the people came to dwell in one town. They continued to have their own villages and to cultivate their lands; but all adored one and the same protecting goddess, Athena, divinity of Athens, and all obeyed the same king.

=Athenian Revolutions.=--Later still the kings were suppressed. In their place Athens had nine chiefs (the archons) who changed every year. This whole history is little known to us for no writing of the time is preserved. They used to say that for centuries the Athenians had lived in discord; the nobles (Eupatrids) who were proprietors of the soil oppressed the peasants on their estates; creditors held their debtors as slaves. To reestablish order the Athenians commissioned Solon, a sage, to draft a code of laws for them (594).

Solon made three reforms:

1. He lessened the value of the money, which allowed the debtors to release themselves more easily.

2. He made the peasants proprietors of the land that they cultivated. From this time there were in Attica more small proprietors than in any other part of Greece.

3. He grouped all the citizens into four classes according to their incomes. Each had to pay taxes and to render military service according to his wealth, the poor being exempt from taxation and military service.

After Solon the Athenians were subject to Pisistratus, one of their powerful and clever citizens; but in 510 the dissensions revived.

=Reforms of Cleisthenes.=--Cleisthenes, leader of one of the parties, used the occasion to make a thoroughgoing revolution.

There were many strangers in Athens, especially seamen and traders who lived in Piraeus near the harbor. Cleisthenes gave them the rights of citizenship and made them equal[68] to the older inhabitants. From this time there were two populations side by side--the people of Attica and those of Piraeus. A difference of physical features was apparent for three centuries afterward: the people of Attica resembled the rest of the Greeks; those in Piraeus resembled Asiatics. The Athenian people thus augmented was a new people, the most active in Greece.

THE ATHENIAN PEOPLE

In the fifth century the society of Athens was definitely formed: three classes inhabited the district of Attica--slaves, foreigners, and citizens.

=The Slaves.=--The slaves constituted the great majority of the population; there was no man so poor that he did not have at least one slave; the rich owned a multitude of them, some as many as five hundred. The larger part of the slaves lived in the house occupied with grinding grain, kneading bread, spinning and weaving cloth, performing the service of the kitchens, and in attendance on their masters. Others labored in the shops as blacksmiths, as dyers, or in stone quarries or silver mines. Their master fed them but sold at a profit everything which they produced, giving them in return nothing but their living. All the domestic servants, all the miners, and the greater part of the artisans were slaves. These men lived in society but without any part in it; they had not even the disposition of their own bodies, being wholly the property of other men. They were thought of only as objects of property; they were often referred to as "a body" ({~GREEK SMALL LETTER SIGMA~}{~GREEK SMALL LETTER OMEGA~}{~GREEK SMALL LETTER MU~}{~GREEK SMALL LETTER ALPHA~}). There was no other law for them than the will of their master, and he had all power over them--to make them work, to imprison them, to deprive them of their sustenance, to beat them. When a citizen went to law, his adversary had the right to require that the former's slaves should be put to the torture to tell what they knew. Many Athenian orators commend this usage as an ingenious means for obtaining true testimony. "Torture," says the orator Isaeus, "is the

surest means of proof; and so when you wish to clear up a contested question, you do not address yourselves to freemen, but, placing the slaves to the torture, you seek to discover the truth."

=Foreigners.=--The name Metics was applied to people of foreign origin who were established in Athens. To become a citizen of Athens it was not enough, as with us, to be born in the country; one must be the son of a citizen. It might be that some aliens had resided in Attica for several generations and yet their family not become Athenian. The metics could take no part in the government, could not marry a citizen, nor acquire land. But they were personally free, they had the right of commerce by sea, of banking and of trade on condition that they take a patron to represent them in the courts. There were in Athens more than ten thousand families of metics, the majority of them bankers or merchants.

=The Citizens.=--To be a citizen of Athens it was necessary that both parents should be citizens. The young Athenian, come to maturity at about eighteen years of age, appeared before the popular assembly, received the arms which he was to bear and took the following oath: "I swear never to dishonor these sacred arms, not to quit my post, to obey the magistrates and the laws, to honor the religion of my country." He became simultaneously citizen and soldier. Thereafter he owed military service until he was sixty years of age. With this he had the right to sit in the assembly and to fulfil the functions of the state.

Once in a while the Athenians consented to receive into the citizenship a man who was not the son of a citizen, but this was rare and a sign of great favor. The assembly had to vote the stranger into its membership, and then nine days after six thousand citizens had to vote for him on a secret ballot. The Athenian people was like a closed circle; no new members were admitted except those pleasing to the old members, and they admitted few beside their sons.

THE GOVERNMENT OF ATHENS

=The Assembly.=--The Athenians called their government a democracy (a government by the people). But this people was not, as with us, the mass of inhabitants, but the body of citizens, a true aristocracy of 15,000 to 20,000 men who governed the whole nation as masters. This body had absolute power, and was the true sovereign of Athens. It assembled at least three times a month to deliberate and to vote. The assembly was held in the open air on the Pnyx; the citizens sat on stone benches arranged in an amphitheatre; the magistrates before them on a platform opened the session with a religious ceremony and a prayer, then a herald proclaimed in a loud voice the business which was to occupy the assembly, and said, "Who wishes to speak?" Every citizen had the right to this privilege; the orators mounted the tribune according to age. When all had spoken, the president put the question; the assembly voted by a show of hands, and then dissolved.

=The Courts.=--The people itself, being sovereign, passed judgment in the courts. Every citizen of thirty years of age could participate in the judicial assembly (the Heliaea). The heliasts sat in the great halls in sections of five hundred; the tribunal was, then, composed of one thousand to fifteen hundred judges. The Athenians had no prosecuting officer as we have; a citizen took upon himself to make the accusation. The accused and the accuser appeared before the court; each delivered a plea which was not to exceed the time marked off by a water-clock. Then the judges voted by depositing a black or white stone. If the accuser did not obtain a certain number of votes, he himself was condemned.

=The Magistrates.=--The sovereign people needed a council to prepare the business for discussion and magistrates to execute their decisions. The council was composed of five hundred citizens drawn by lot for one year. The magistrates were very numerous: ten generals to command the army, thirty officials for financial administration, sixty police officials to superintend the streets, the markets, weights and measures, etc.[69]

=Character of This Government.=--The power in Athens did not pertain to the rich and the noble, as in Sparta. In the assembly everything was decided by a majority of votes and all the votes were equal. All the jurors, all the members of the council, all the magistrates except the generals were chosen by lot. The citizens were equal not only in theory, but also in practice. Socrates said[70] to a well-informed Athenian who did not dare to speak before the people: "Of what are you afraid? Is it of the fullers, the shoe-makers, the masons, the artisans, or the merchants? for the assembly is composed of all these people."

Many of these people had to ply their trade in order to make a living, and could not serve the state gratuitously; and so a salary was instituted: every citizen who sat in the assembly or in the courts received for every day of session three obols (about eight cents of our money), a sum just sufficient to maintain life at that time. From this day the poor administered the government.

=The Demagogues.=--Since all important affairs whether in the assembly or in the courts were decided by discussion and discourse, the influential men were those who knew how to speak best. The people accustomed themselves to listen to the orators,

to follow their counsels, to charge them with embassies, and even to appoint them generals. These men were called Demagogues (leaders of the people). The party of the rich scoffed at them: in a comedy Aristophanes represents the people (Demos) under the form of an old man who has lost his wits: "You are foolishly credulous, you let flatterers and intriguers pull you around by the nose and you are enraptured when they harangue you." And the chorus, addressing a charlatan, says to him, "You are rude, vicious; you have a strong voice, an impudent eloquence, and violent gestures; believe me, you have all that is necessary to govern Athens."

PRIVATE LIFE

The Athenians created so many political functions that a part of the citizens was engaged in fulfilling them. The citizen of Athens, like the functionary or soldier of our days, was absorbed in public affairs. Warring and governing were the whole of his life. He spent his days in the assembly, in the courts, in the army, at the gymnasium, or at the market. Almost always he had a wife and children, for his religion commanded this, but he did not live at home.

=The Children.=--When a child came into the world, the father had the right to reject it. In this case it was laid outside the house where it died from neglect, unless a passer-by took it and brought it up as a slave. In this custom Athens followed all the Greeks. It was especially the girls that were exposed to death. "A son," says a writer of comedy, "is always raised even if the parents are in the last stage of misery; a daughter is exposed even though the parents are rich."

If the father accepted the child, the latter entered the family. He was left at first in the women's apartments with the mother. The girls remained there until the day of their marriage; the boys came out when they were seven years old. The boy was then entrusted to a preceptor (pedagogue), whose business it was to teach him to conduct himself well and to obey. The pedagogue was often a slave, but the father gave him the right to beat his son. This was the general usage in antiquity.

Later the boy went to school, where he learned to read, write, cipher, recite poetry, and to sing in the chorus or to the sound of the flute. At last came gymnastics. This was the whole of the instruction; it made men sound in body and calm in spirit--what the Greeks called "good and beautiful."

To the young girl, secluded with her mother, nothing of the liberal arts was taught; it was thought sufficient if she learned to obey. Xenophon represents a rich and well-educated Athenian speaking thus of his wife with Socrates: "She was hardly twenty years old when I married her, and up to that time she had been subjected to an exacting surveillance; they had no desire that she should live, and she learned almost nothing. Was it not enough that one should find in her a woman who could spin the flax to make garments, and who had learned how to distribute duties to the slaves?" When her husband proposed that she become his assistant, she replied with great surprise, "In what can I aid you? Of what am I capable? My mother has always taught me that my business was to be prudent." Prudence or obedience was the virtue which was required of the Greek woman.

=Marriage.=--At the age of fifteen the girl married. The parents had chosen the husband; it might be a man from a neighboring family, or a man who had been a long-time friend of the father, but always a citizen of Athens. It was rare that the young girl knew him; she was never consulted in the case. Herodotus, speaking of a Greek, adds: "This Callias deserves mention for his conduct toward his daughters; for when they were of marriageable age he gave them a rich dowry, permitted them to choose husbands from all the people, and he then married them to the men of their choice."

=Athenian Women.=--In the inner recess of the Athenian house there was a retired apartment reserved for the women--the Gynecaeum. Husband and relatives were the only visitors; the mistress of the household remained here all day with her slaves; she directed them, superintended the house-keeping, and distributed to them the flax for them to spin. She herself was engaged with weaving garments. She left the house seldom save for the religious festivals. She never appeared in the society of men: "No one certainly would venture," says the orator Isaeus, "to dine with a married woman; married women do not go out to dine with men or permit themselves to eat with strangers." An Athenian woman who frequented society could not maintain a good reputation.

The wife, thus secluded and ignorant, was not an agreeable companion. The husband had taken her not for his life-long companion, but to keep his house in order, to be the mother of his children, and because Greek custom and religion required that he should marry. Plato says that one does not marry because he wants to, but "because the law constrains him." And the comic poet Menander had found this saying: "Marriage, to tell the truth, is an evil, but a necessary evil." And so the women in Athens, as in most of the other states of Greece, always held but little place in society.

FOOTNOTES:

[66] The marble of Pentelicus and the honey of Hymettus.

[67] This legendary king was called Theseus.

[68] Certain limitations, however, are referred to below, under "Metics."--ED.

[69] Not to mention the Archons, whom they had not ventured to suppress.

[70] Xenophon, "Memorabilia," iii., 7, 6.

CHAPTER XIII

WARS OF THE GREEKS

THE PERSIAN WARS

=Origin of the Persian Wars.=--While the Greeks were completing the organization of their cities, the Persian king was uniting all the nations of the East in a single empire. Greeks and Orientals at length found themselves face to face. It is in Asia Minor that they first meet.

On the coast of Asia Minor there were rich and populous colonies of the Greeks;[71] Cyrus, the king of Persia, desired to subject them. These cities sent for help to the Spartans, who were reputed the bravest of the Greeks, and this action was reported to Cyrus; he replied,[72] "I have never feared this sort of people that has in the midst of the city a place where the people assemble to deceive one another with false oaths." (He was thinking of the market-place.) The Greeks of Asia were subdued and made subject to the Great King.

Thirty years later King Darius found himself in the presence of the Greeks of Europe. But this time it was the Greeks that attacked the Great King. The Athenians sent twenty galleys to aid the revolting Ionians; their soldiers entered Lydia, took Sardis by surprise and burned it. Darius revenged himself by destroying the Greek cities of Asia, but he did not forget the Greeks of Europe. He had decreed, they say, that at every meal an officer should repeat to him: "Master, remember the Athenians." He sent to the Greek cities to demand earth and water, a symbol in use among the Persians to indicate submission to the Great King. Most of the Greeks were afraid and yielded. But the Spartans cast the envoys into a pit, bidding them take thence earth and water to carry to the king. This was the beginning of the Median wars.

=Comparison of the Two Adversaries.=--The contrast between the two worlds which now entered into conflict is well marked by Herodotus[73] in the form of a conversation of King Xerxes with Demaratus, a Spartan exile: "'I venture to assure you,' said Demaratus, 'that the Spartans will offer you battle even if all the rest of the Greeks fight on your side, and if their army should not amount to more than one thousand men.' 'What!' said Xerxes, 'one thousand men attack so immense an army as mine! I fear your words are only boasting; for although they be five thousand, we are more than one thousand to one. If they had a master like us, fear would inspire them with courage; they would march under the lash against a larger army; but being free and independent, they will have no more courage than that with which nature has endowed them.' 'The Spartans,' replied Demaratus, 'are not inferior to anybody in a hand-to-hand contest, and united in a phalanx they are the bravest of all men. Yet, though free, they have an absolute master, the Law, which they dread more than all your subjects do you; they obey it, and this law requires them to stand fast to their post and conquer or die.'" This is the difference between the two parties to the conflict: on the one side, a multitude of subjects united by force under a capricious master; on the other, little martial republics whose citizens govern themselves according to laws which they respect.

=First Persian War.=--There were two Persian wars. The first was simply an expedition against Athens; six hundred galleys sent by Darius disembarked a Persian army on the little plain of Marathon, seven hours distant from Athens.

Religious sentiment prevented the Spartans from taking the field before the full moon, and it was still only the first quarter; the Athenians had to fight alone.[74] Ten thousand citizens armed as hoplites camped before the Persians. The Athenians had ten generals, having the command on successive days; of these Miltiades, when his turn came, drew up the army for battle. The Athenians charged the enemy in serried ranks, but the Persians seeing them advancing without cavalry and without archers, thought them fools. It was the first time that the Greeks had dared to face the Persians in battle array. The Athenians began by turning both flanks, and then engaged the centre, driving the Persians in disorder to the sea and forcing them to reembark on their ships.

The victory of Marathon delivered the Athenians and made them famous in all Greece (490).

=Second Persian War.=--The second war began ten years later with an invasion. Xerxes united all the peoples of the empire, so that the land force amounted, as some say, to 1,700,000 men.[75] There were Medes and Persians clad in sleeved tunics, armed with cuirasses of iron, bucklers, bows and arrows; Assyrians with cuirass of linen, armed with clubs pointed with iron; Indians clad in cotton with bows and arrows of bamboo; savages of Ethiopia with leopard skins for clothing; nomads armed only with lassos; Phrygians armed with short pikes; Lydians equipped like Greeks; Thracians carrying javelins and daggers. The enumeration of these fills twenty chapters in Herodotus.[76] These warriors brought with them a crowd equally numerous of non-combatants, of servants, slaves, women, together with a mass of mules, horses, camels, and baggage wagons.

This horde crossed the Hellespont by a bridge of boats in the spring of 480. For seven days and nights it defiled under the lash. Then traversing Thrace, it marched on Greece, conquering the peoples whom it met.

The Persian fleet, 1,200 galleys strong, coasted the shores of Thrace, passing through the canal at Mount Athos which Xerxes had had built for this very purpose.

The Greeks, terrified, submitted for the most part to the Great King and joined their armies to the Persian force. The Athenians sent to consult the oracle of Delphi, but received only the reply; "Athens will be destroyed from base to summit." The god being asked to give a more favorable response, replied, "Zeus accords to Pallas [protectress of Athens] a wall of wood which alone shall not be taken; in that shall you and your children find safety." The priests of whom they asked the interpretation of this oracle bade the Athenians quit Attica and go to establish themselves elsewhere. But Themistocles explained the "wall of wood" as meaning the ships; they should retire to the fleet and fight the Persians on sea.

Athens and Sparta, having decided on resistance, endeavored to form a league of the Greeks against the Persians. Few cities had the courage to enter it, and these placed themselves under the command of the Spartans. Four battles in one year settled the war. At Thermopylae, Leonidas, king of Sparta, who tried to bar the entrance to a defile was outflanked and overwhelmed. At Salamis, the Persian fleet, crowded into a narrow space where the ships embarrassed one another, was defeated by the Greek navy (480). At Plataea the rest of the Persian army left in Greece was annihilated by the Greek hoplites; of 300,000 men but 40,000 escaped. The same day at Mycale, on the coast of Asia, an army of the Greeks landed and routed the Persians (479). The Greeks had conquered the Great King.

=Reasons for the Greek Victory.=--The Median war was not a national war between Greeks and barbarians. All the Greeks of Asia and half the Greeks of Europe fought on the Persian side. Many of the other Greeks gave no assistance. In reality it was a fight of the Great King and his subjects against Sparta, Athens, and their allies.

The conquest of this great horde by two small peoples appeared at that time as a prodigy. The gods, said the Greeks, had fought for them. But there is less wonder when we examine the two antagonists more closely: the Persian army was innumerable, and Xerxes had thought that victory was a matter of numbers. But this multitude was an embarrassment to itself. It did not know where to secure food for itself, it advanced but slowly, and it choked itself on the day of combat. Likewise the ships arranged in too close order drove their prows into neighboring ships and shattered their oars. Then in this immense crowd there were, according to Herodotus, many men but few soldiers. Only the Persians and Medes, the flower of the army, fought with energy; the rest advanced only under the lash, they had come under pressure to a war which had no interest for them, ill-armed and without discipline, ready to desert as soon as no one was watching them. At Plataea the Medes and Persians were the only ones to do any fighting; the subjects kept aloof.

The Persian soldiers were ill-equipped; they were embarrassed by their long robes, the head was poorly protected by a felt hat, the body ill-defended by a shield of wicker-work. For arms they had a bow, a dagger, and a very short pike; they could fight only at a great distance or hand-to-hand. The Spartans and their allies, on the contrary, secure in the protection of great buckler, helmet and greaves, marched in solid line and were irresistible; they broke the enemy with their long pikes and at once the battle became a massacre.

=Results of the Persian Wars.=--Sparta had commanded the troops, but as Herodotus says,[77] it was Athens who had delivered Greece by setting an example of resistance and constituting the fleet of Salamis. It was Athens who profited by the victory. All the Ionian cities of the Archipelago and of the coast of Asia revolted and formed a league against the Persians. The Spartans, men of the mountains, could not conduct a maritime war, and so withdrew; the Athenians immediately became chiefs of the league. In

476[78] Aristides, commanding the fleet, assembled the delegates of the confederate cities. They decided to continue the war against the Great King, and engaged to provide ships and warriors and to pay each year a contribution of 460 talents ($350,000). The treasure was deposited at Delos in the temple of Apollo, god of the Ionians. Athens was charged with the leadership of the military force and with collecting the tax. To make the agreement irrevocable Aristides had a mass of hot iron cast into the sea, and all swore to maintain the oaths until the day that the iron should mount to the surface.

A day came, however, when the war ceased, and the Greeks, always the victors, concluded a peace, or at least a truce,[79] with the Great King. He surrendered his claim on the Asiatic Greeks (about 449).

What was to become of the treaty of Aristides? Were the confederate cities still to pay their contribution now that there was no more fighting? Some refused it even before the war was done. Athens asserted that the cities had made their engagements in perpetuity and forced them to pay them.

The war finished, the treasury at Delos had no further use; the Athenians transferred the money to Athens and used it in building their monuments. They maintained that the allies paid for deliverance from the Persians; they, therefore, had no claim against Athens so long as she defended them from the Great King. The allies had now become the tributaries of Athens: they were now her subjects. Athens increased the tax on them, and required their citizens to bring their cases before the Athenian courts; she even sent colonists to seize a part of their lands. Athens, mistress of the league, was sovereign over more than three hundred cities spread over the islands and the coasts of the Archipelago, and the tribute paid her amounted to six hundred talents a year.

STRIFE AMONG THE GREEK STATES

=The Peloponnesian War.=--After the foundation of the Athenian empire in the Archipelago the Greeks found themselves divided between two leagues--the maritime cities were subject to Athens; the cities of the interior remained under the domination of Sparta. After much preliminary friction war arose between Sparta and her continental allies on the one side and Athens and her maritime subjects on the other. This was the _Peloponnesian War_. It continued twenty-seven years (431-404), and when it ceased, it was revived under other names down to 360.

These wars were complicated affairs. They were fought simultaneously on land and sea, in Greece, Asia, Thrace, and Sicily, ordinarily at several points at once. The Spartans had a better army and ravaged Attica; the Athenians had a superior fleet and made descents on the coasts of the Peloponnesus. Then Athens sent its army to Sicily where it perished to the last man (413); Lysander, a Spartan general, secured a fleet from the Persians and destroyed the Athenian fleet in Asia (405). The Athenian allies who fought only under compulsion abandoned her. Lysander took Athens, demolished its walls, and burnt its ships.

=Wars against Sparta.=--Sparta was for a time mistress on both land and sea. "In those days," says Xenophon, "all cities obeyed when a Spartan issued his orders." But soon the allies of Sparta, wearied of her domination, formed a league against her. The Spartans, driven at first from Asia, still maintained their power in Greece for some years by virtue of their alliance with the king of the Persians (387). But the Thebans, having developed a strong army under the command of Epaminondas, fought them at Leuctra (371) and at Mantinea (362). The allies of Sparta detached themselves from her, but the Thebans could not secure from the rest of the Greeks the recognition of their supremacy. From this time no Greek city was sovereign over the others.

=Savage Character of These Wars.=--These wars between the Greek cities were ferocious. A few incidents suffice to show their character. At the opening of the war the allies of Sparta threw into the sea all the merchants from cities hostile to them. The Athenians in return put to death the ambassadors of Sparta without allowing them to speak a word. The town of Plataea was taken by capitulation, and the Spartans had promised that no one should be punished without a trial; but the Spartan judges demanded of every prisoner if during the war he had rendered any service to the Peloponnesians; when the prisoner replied in the negative, he was condemned to death. The women were sold as slaves. The city of Mitylene having revolted from Athens was retaken by her. The Athenians in an assembly deliberated and decreed that all the people of Mitylene should be put to death. It is true that the next day the Athenians revised the decree and sent a second ship to carry a more favorable commission, but still more than one thousand Mityleneans were executed.

After the Syracusan disaster all the Athenian army was taken captive. The conquerors began by slaughtering all the generals and many of the soldiers. The remainder were consigned to the quarries which served as prison. They were left there crowded together for seventy days, exposed without protection to the burning sun of summer, and then to the chilly nights of autumn. Many died from sickness, from cold and hunger--for they were hardly fed at all; their corpses remained on the ground and infected the air. At last

the Syracusans drew out the survivors sold them into slavery.

Ordinarily when an army invaded a hostile state it levelled the houses, felled the trees, burned the crops and killed the laborers. After battle it made short shrift of the wounded and killed prisoners in cold blood. In a captured city everything belonged to the captor: men, women, children were sold as slaves. Such was at this time the right of war. Thucydides sums up the case as follows:[80] "Business is regulated between men by the laws of justice when there is obligation on both sides; but the stronger does whatever is in his power, and the weaker yields. The gods rule by a necessity of their nature because they are strongest; men do likewise."

=Results of These Wars.=--These wars did not result in uniting the Greeks into one body. No city, Sparta more than Athens, was able to force the others to obey her. They only exhausted themselves by fighting one another. It was the king of Persia who profited by the strife. Not only did the Greek cities not unite against him, but all in succession allied themselves with him against the other Greeks. In the notorious Peace of Antalcidas (387) the Great King declared that all the Greek cities of Asia belonged to him, and Sparta recognized this claim. Athens and Thebes did as much some years later. An Athenian orator said, "It is the king of Persia who governs Greece; he needs only to establish governors in our cities. Is it not he who directs everything among us? Do we not summon the Great King as if we were his slaves?" The Greeks by their strife had lost the vantage that the Median war had gained for them.

FOOTNOTES:

[71] Twelve Ionian colonies, twelve AEolian, four Dorian.

[72] Herod., i., 153.

[73] Herod., vii., 103, 104.

[74] 1,000 Plataeans came to the assistance of the Athenians.--ED.

[75] Herodotus's statements of the numbers in Xerxes' army are incredible.--ED.

[76] Herod., vii., 61-80.

[77] vii., 139.

[78] The chronology of these events is uncertain.--ED.

[79] Called the Peace of Cimon, but it is very doubtful whether Cimon really concluded a treaty. [With more right may it be called the Peace of Callias, who was probably principal ambassador.--ED.]

[80] In his chapters on the Mityleneans.

CHAPTER XIV

THE ARTS IN GREECE

ATHENS AT THE TIME OF PERICLES

=Pericles.=--In the middle of the fifth century Athens found herself the most powerful city in Greece. Pericles, descended from one of the noble families, was then the director of the affairs of the state. He wasted neither speech nor personality, and never sought to flatter the vanity of the people. But the Athenians respected him and acted only in accordance with his counsels; they had faith in his knowledge of all the details of administration, of the resources of the state, and so they permitted him to govern. For forty years Pericles was the soul of the politics of Athens; as Thucydides his contemporary said, "The democracy existed in name; in reality it was the government of the first citizen."

=Athens and Her Monuments.=--In Athens, as in the majority of Greek cities, the houses of individuals were small, low, packed closely together, forming narrow streets, tortuous and ill paved. The Athenians reserved their display for their public monuments. Ever after they levied heavy war taxes on their allies they had large sums of money to expend, and these were employed in erecting beautiful edifices. In the market-place they built a portico adorned with paintings (the Poikile), in the city a theatre, a temple in honor of Theseus, and the Odeon for the contests in music. But the most beautiful monuments rose on the rock of the Acropolis

as on a gigantic pedestal. There were two temples of which the principal, the Parthenon, was dedicated to Athena, protecting goddess of the city; a colossal statue of bronze which represented Athena; and a staircase of ornamental character leading up to the Propylaea. Athens was from this time the most beautiful of the Greek cities.[81]

=Importance of Athens.=--Athens became at the same time the city of artists. Poets, orators, architects, painters, sculptors--some Athenians by birth, others come from all corners of the Greek world--met here and produced their masterpieces. There were without doubt many Greek artists elsewhere than at Athens; there had been before the fifth century, and there were a long time afterward; but never were so many assembled at one time in the same city. Most of the Greeks had fine sensibilities in matters of art; but the Athenians more than all others had a refined taste, a cultivated spirit and love of the beautiful. If the Greeks have gained renown in the history of civilization, it is that they have been a people of artists; neither their little states nor their small armies have played a great role in the world. This is why the fifth century is the most beautiful moment in the history of Greece; this is why Athens has remained renowned above all the rest of the Greek cities.

LETTERS

=The Orators.=--Athens is above all the city of eloquence. Speeches in the assembly determine war, peace, taxes, all state business of importance; speeches before the courts condemn or acquit citizens and subjects. Power is in the hands of the orators; the people follow their counsels and often commit to them important public functions: Cleon is appointed general; Demosthenes directs the war against Philip.

The orators have influence; they employ their talents in eloquence to accuse their political enemies. Often they possess riches, for they are paid for supporting one party or the other: AEschines is retained by the king of Macedon; Demosthenes accepts fees from the king of Persia.

Some of the orators, instead of delivering their own orations, wrote speeches for others. When an Athenian citizen had a case at court, he did not desire, as we do, that an advocate plead his case for him; the law required that each speak in person. He therefore sought an orator and had him compose a speech which he learned by heart and recited before the tribunal.

Other orators travelled through the cities of Greece speaking on subjects which pleased their fancy. Sometimes they gave lectures, as we should say.

The oldest orators spoke simply, limiting themselves to an account of the facts without oratorical flourishes; on the platform they were almost rigid without loud speaking or gesticulation. Pericles delivered his orations with a calm air, so quietly, indeed, that no fold of his mantle was disturbed. When he appeared at the tribune, his head, according to custom, crowned with leaves, he might have been taken, said the people, "for a god of Olympus." But the orators who followed wished to move the public. They assumed an animated style, pacing the tribune in a declamatory and agitated manner. The people became accustomed to this form of eloquence. The first time that Demosthenes came to the tribune the assembly shouted with laughter; the orator could not enunciate, he carried himself ill. He disciplined himself in declamation and gesture and became the favorite of the people. Later when he was asked what was the first quality of the orator, he replied, "Action, and the second, action, and the third, action." Action, that is delivery, was more to the Greeks than the sense of the discourse.

=The Sages.=--For some centuries there had been, especially among the Greeks of Asia, men who observed and reflected on things. They were called by a name which signifies at once wise men and scholars. They busied themselves with physics, astronomy, natural history, for as yet science was not separated from philosophy. Such were in the seventh century the celebrated Seven Sages of Greece.

=The Sophists.=--About the time of Pericles there came to Athens men who professed to teach wisdom. They gathered many pupils and charged fees for their lessons. Ordinarily they attacked the religion, customs, and institutions of Greek cities, showing that they were not founded on reason. They concluded that men could not know anything with certainty (which was quite true for their time), that men can know nothing at all, and that nothing is true or false: "Nothing exists," said one of them, "and if it did exist, we could not know it." These professors of scepticism were called sophists. Some of them were at the same time orators.

=Socrates and the Philosophers.=--Socrates, an old man of Athens, undertook to combat the sophists. He was a poor man, ugly, and without eloquence. He opened no school like the sophists but contented himself with going about the city, conversing with those he met, and leading them by the force of his questions to discover what he himself had in mind. He sought especially the young men and gave them instruction and counsel. Socrates made no pretensions as a scholar: "All my knowledge," said he, "is to

know that I know nothing." He would call himself no longer a sage, like the others, but a philosopher, that is to say, a lover of wisdom. He did not meditate on the nature of the world nor on the sciences; man was his only interest. His motto was, "Know thyself." He was before all a preacher of virtue.

As he always spoke of morals and religion, the Athenians took him for a sophist.[82] In 399 he was brought before the court, accused "of not worshipping the gods of the city, of introducing new gods, and of corrupting the youth." He made no attempt to defend himself, and was condemned to death. He was then seventy years old.

Xenophon, one of his disciples, wrote out his conversations and an apology for him.[83] Another disciple, Plato, composed dialogues in which Socrates is always the principal personage. Since this time Socrates has been regarded as the "father of philosophy." Plato himself was the head of a school (429-348); Aristotle (384-322), a disciple of Plato, summarized in his books all the science of his time. The philosophers that followed attached themselves to one or the other of these two masters: the disciples of Plato called themselves Academicians,[84] those of Aristotle, Peripatetics.[85]

=The Chorus.=--It was an ancient custom of the Greeks to dance in their religious ceremonies. Around the altar dedicated to the god a group of young men passed and repassed, assuming noble and expressive attitudes, for the ancients danced with the whole body. Their dance, very different from ours, was a sort of animated procession, something like a solemn pantomime. Almost always this religious dance was accompanied by chants in honor of the god. The group singing and dancing at the same time was called the Chorus. All the cities had their festival choruses in which the children of the noblest families participated after long time of preparation. The god required the service of a troop worthy of him.

=Tragedy and Comedy.=--In the level country about Athens the young men celebrated in this manner each year religious dances in honor of Dionysos, the god of the vintage. One of these dances was grave; it represented the actions of the god. The leader of the chorus played Dionysos, the chorus itself the satyrs, his companions. Little by little they came to represent also the life of the other gods and the ancient heroes. Then some one (the Greeks call him Thespis) conceived the idea of setting up a stage on which the actor could play while the chorus rested. The spectacle thus perfected was transferred to the city near the black poplar tree in the market. Thus originated Tragedy.

The other dance was comic. The masked dancers chanted the praises of Dionysos mingled with jeers addressed to the spectators or with humorous reflections on the events of the day. The same was done for the comic chorus as for the tragic chorus: actors were introduced, a dialogue, all of a piece, and the spectacle was transferred to Athens. This was the origin of Comedy. This is the reason that from this time tragedy has been engaged with heroes, and comedy with every-day life.

Tragedy and comedy preserved some traces of their origin. Even when they were represented in the theatre, they continued to be played before the altar of the god. Even after the actors mounted on the platform had become the most important personages of the spectacle, the choir continued to dance and to chant around the altar. In the comedies, like the masques in other days, sarcastic remarks on the government came to be made; this was the Parabasis.

=The Theatre.=--That all the Athenians might be present at these spectacles there was built on the side of the Acropolis the theatre of Dionysos which could hold 30,000 spectators. Like all the Greek theatres, it was open to heaven and was composed of tiers of rock ranged in a half-circle about the orchestra where the chorus performed and before the stage where the play was given.

Plays were produced only at the time of the festivals of the god, but then they continued for several days in succession. They began in the morning at sunrise and occupied all the time till torch-light with the production of a series of three tragedies (a trilogy) followed by a satirical drama. Each trilogy was the work of one author. Other trilogies were presented on succeeding days, so that the spectacle was a competition between poets, the public determining the victor. The most celebrated of these competitors were AEschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. There were also contests in comedy, but there remain to us only the works of one comic poet, Aristophanes.

THE ARTS

=Greek Temples.=--In Greece the most beautiful edifices were constructed to the honor of the gods, and when we speak of Greek architecture it is their temples that we have in mind.

A Greek temple is not, like a Christian church, designed to receive the faithful who come thither to pray. It is the palace[86] where the god lives, represented by his idol, a palace which men feel under compulsion to make splendid. The mass of the faithful do not

enter the interior of the temple; they remain without, surrounding the altar in the open air.

At the centre of the temple is the "chamber" of the god, a mysterious sanctuary without windows, dimly lighted from above.[87] On the pavement rises the idol of wood, of marble, or of ivory, clad in gold and adorned with garments and jewels. The statue is often of colossal size; in the temple of Olympia Zeus is represented sitting and his head almost touches the summit of the temple. "If the god should rise," they said, "his head would shatter the roof." This sanctuary, a sort of reliquary for the idol, is concealed on every side from the eyes. To enter, it is necessary to pass through a porch formed by a row of columns.

Behind the "chamber" is the "rear-chamber" in which are kept the valuable property of the god--his riches,[88] and often the gold and silver of the city. The temple is therefore storehouse, treasury, and museum.

Rows of columns surround the building on four sides, like a second wall protecting the god and his treasures. There are three orders of columns which differ in base and capital, each bearing the name of the people that invented it or most frequently used it. They are, in the order of age, the Doric, the Ionic, and the Corinthian. The temple is named from the style of the columns supporting it.

Above the columns, around the edifice are sculptured surfaces of marble (the metopes) which alternate with plain blocks of marble (the triglyphs). Metopes and triglyphs constitute the frieze.

The temple is surmounted with a triangular pediment adorned with statues.

Greek temples were polychrome, that is to say, were painted in several colors, yellow, blue, and red. For a long time the moderns refused to believe this; it was thought that the Greeks possessed too sober taste to add color to an edifice. But traces of painting have been discovered on several temples, which cannot leave the matter in doubt. It has at last been concluded, on reflection, that these bright colors were to give a clearer setting to the lines.

=Characteristics of Greek Architecture.=--A Greek temple appears at first a simple, bare edifice; it is only a long box of stone set upon a rock; the facade is a square surmounted by a triangle. At first glance one sees only straight lines and cylinders. But on nearer inspection "it is discovered[89] that not a single one of these lines is truly straight." The columns swell at the middle, vertical lines are slightly inclined to the centre, and horizontal lines bulge a little at the middle. And all this is so fine that exact measurements are necessary to detect the artifice. Greek architects discovered that, to produce a harmonious whole, it is necessary to avoid geometrical lines which would appear stiff, and take account of illusions in perspective. "The aim of the architect," says a Greek writer, "is to invent processes for deluding the sight."

Greek artists wrought conscientiously for they worked for the gods. And so their monuments are elaborated in all their parts, even in those that are least in view, and are constructed so solidly that they exist to this day if they have not been violently destroyed. The Parthenon was still intact in the seventeenth century. An explosion of gunpowder wrecked it.

The architecture of the Greeks was at once solid and elegant, simple and scientific. Their temples have almost all disappeared; here and there are a very few,[90] wholly useless, in ruins, with roofs fallen in, often nothing left but rows of columns. And yet, even in this state, they enrapture those who behold them.

=Sculpture.=--Among the Egyptians and the Assyrians sculpture was hardly more than an accessory ornament of their edifices; the Greeks made it the principal art. Their most renowned artists, Phidias, Praxiteles, and Lysippus, were sculptors.

They executed bas-reliefs to adorn the walls of a temple, its facade or its pediment. Of this style of work is the famous frieze of the Panathenaic procession which was carved around the Parthenon, representing young Athenian women on the day of the great festival of the goddess.[91]

They sculptured statues for the most part, of which some represented gods and served as idols; others represented athletes victorious in the great games, and these were the recompense of his victory.

The most ancient statues of the Greeks are stiff and rude, quite similar to the Assyrian sculptures. They are often colored. Little by little they become graceful and elegant. The greatest works are those of Phidias in the fifth century and of Praxiteles in the fourth. The statues of the following centuries are more graceful, but less noble and less powerful.

There were thousands of statues in Greece,[92] for every city had its own, and the sculptors produced without cessation for five centuries. Of all this multitude there remain to us hardly fifteen complete statues. Not a single example of the masterpieces

celebrated among the Greeks has come down to us. Our most famous Greek statues are either copies, like the Venus of Milo, or works of the period of the decadence, like the Apollo of the Belvidere.[93] Still there remains enough, uniting the fragments of statues and of bas-reliefs which are continually being discovered,[94] to give us a general conception of Greek sculpture.

Greek sculptors sought above everything else to represent the most beautiful bodies in a calm and noble attitude. They had a thousand occasions for viewing beautiful bodies of men in beautiful poses, at the gymnasium, in the army, in the sacred dances and choruses. They studied them and learned to reproduce them; no one has ever better executed the human body.

Usually in a Greek statue the head is small, the face without emotion and dull. The Greeks did not seek, as we do, the expression of the face; they strove for beauty of line and did not sacrifice the limbs for the head. In a Greek statue it is the whole body that is beautiful.

=Pottery.=--The Greeks came to make pottery a real art. They called it Ceramics (the potter's art), and this name is still preserved. Pottery had not the same esteem in Greece as the other arts, but for us it has the great advantage of being better known than the others. While temples and statues fell into ruin, the achievements of Greek potters are preserved in the tombs. This is where they are found today. Already more than 20,000 specimens have been collected in all the museums of Europe. They are of two sorts:

1. Painted vases, with black or red figures, of all sizes and every form;

2. Statuettes of baked earth; hardly known twenty years ago, they have now attained almost to celebrity since the discovery of the charming figurines of Tanagra in Boeotia. The most of them are little idols, but some represent children or women.

=Painting.=--There were illustrious painters in Greece--Zeuxis, Parrhasius, and Apelles. We know little of them beyond some anecdotes, often doubtful, and some descriptions of pictures. To obtain an impression of Greek painting we are limited to the frescoes found in the houses of Pompeii, an Italian city of the first century of our era. This amounts to the same as saying we know nothing of it.

FOOTNOTES:

[81] The moderns have called this time the Age of Pericles, because Pericles was then governing and was the friend of many of these artists; but the ancients never employed the phrase.

[82] See Aristophanes' "Clouds."

[83] The "Memorabilia" and "Apologia."

[84] Because Plato had lectured in the gardens of a certain Academus.

[85] Because Aristotle had given instruction while moving about. [Or rather from a favorite walk (Peripatus) in the Lyceum.--ED.]

[86] The Greek word for temple signifies "dwelling."

[87] But not by a square opening in the roof as formerly supposed.--ED. See Gardner, "Ancient Athens," N.Y., 1902, p. 268.

[88] The Parthenon contained vases of gold and silver, a crown of gold, shields, helmets, swords, serpents of gold, an ivory table, eighteen couches, and quivers of ivory.

[89] Boutmy, "Philosophie de l'Architecture en Grece."

[90] The most noted are the Parthenon at Athens and the temple of Poseidon at Paestum, in south Italy.

[91] Knights and other subjects were also shown.--ED.

[92] Even in the second century after the Romans had pillaged Greece to adorn their palaces, there were many thousands of statues in the Greek cities.

[93] It is not certain that the Apollo Belvidere was not a Roman copy.

[94] In the ruins of Olympia has been found a statue of Hermes, the work of Praxiteles.

CHAPTER XV

THE GREEKS IN THE ORIENT

ASIA BEFORE ALEXANDER

=Decadence of the Persian Empire.=--The Greeks, engaged in strife, ceased to attack the Great King; they even received their orders from him. But the Persian empire still continued to become enfeebled. The satraps no longer obeyed the government; each had his court, his treasure, his army, made war according to his fancy, and in short, became a little king in his province. When the Great King desired to remove a satrap, he had scarcely any way of doing it except by assassinating him. The Persians themselves were no longer that nation before which all the Asiatic peoples were wont to tremble. Xenophon, a Greek captain, who had been in their pay, describes them as follows: "They recline on tapestries wearing gloves and furs. The nobles, for the sake of the pay, transform their porters, their bakers, and cooks into knights--even the valets who served them at table, dressed them or perfumed them. And so, although their armies were large, they were of no service, as is apparent from the fact that their enemies traversed the empire more freely than their friends. They no longer dared to fight. The infantry as formerly was equipped with buckler, sword, and axe, but they had no courage to use them. The drivers of chariots before facing the enemy basely allowed themselves to be overthrown at once or leaped down from the cars, so that these being no longer under control injured the Persians more than the enemy. For the rest, the Persians do not disguise their military weakness, they concede their inferiority and do not dare to take the field except there are Greeks in their army. They have for their maxim 'never to fight Greeks without Greek auxiliaries on their side.'"

=Expedition of the Ten Thousand.=--This weakness was very apparent when in 400 Cyrus, brother of the Great King Artaxerxes, marched against him to secure his throne. There were then some thousands of adventurers or Greek exiles who hired themselves as mercenaries. Cyrus retained ten thousand of them. Xenophon, one of their number, has written the story of their expedition.

This army crossed the whole of Asia even to the Euphrates without resistance from any one.[95] They at last came to battle near Babylon. The Greeks according to their habit broke into a run, raising the war-cry. The barbarians took flight before the Greeks had come even within bow-shot. The Greeks followed in pursuit urging one another to keep ranks.

When the war-chariots attacked them, they opened their ranks and let them through. Not a Greek received the least stroke with the exception of one only who was wounded with an arrow. Cyrus was killed; his army disbanded without fighting, and the Greeks remained alone in the heart of a hostile country threatened by a large army. And yet the Persians did not dare to attack them, but treacherously killed their five generals, twenty captains, and two hundred soldiers who had come to conclude a truce.

The friendless mercenaries elected new chiefs, burned their tents and their chariots, and began their retreat. They broke into the rugged mountains of Armenia, and notwithstanding famine, snow, and the arrows of the natives who did not wish to let them pass, they came to the Black Sea and returned to Greece after traversing the whole Persian empire. At their return (399) their number amounted still to 8,000.

=Agesilaus.=--Three years after, Agesilaus, king of Sparta, with a small army invaded the rich country of Asia Minor, Lydia, and Phrygia. He fought the satraps and was about to invade Asia when the Spartans ordered his return to fight the armies of Thebes and Athens. Agesilaus was the first of the Greeks to dream of conquering Persia. He was distressed to see the Greeks fighting among themselves. When they announced to him the victory at Corinth where but eight Spartans had perished and 10,000 of the enemy, instead of rejoicing he sighed and said, "Alas, unhappy Greece, to have lost enough men to have subjugated all the barbarians!" He refused one day to destroy a Greek city. "If we exterminate all the Greeks who fail of their duty," said he, "where shall we find the men to vanquish the barbarians?" This feeling was rare at that time. In relating these words of Agesilaus Xenophon, his biographer, exclaims, "Who else regarded it as a misfortune to conquer when he was making war on peoples of his own race?"

CONQUEST OF ASIA BY ALEXANDER

=Macedon.=--Sparta and Athens, exhausted by a century of wars, had abandoned the contest against the king of Persia. A new people resumed it and brought it to an end; these were the Macedonians. They were a very rude people, crude, similar to the ancient Dorians, a people of shepherds and soldiers. They lived far to the north of Greece in two great valleys that opened to the sea. The Greeks had little regard for them, rating them as half barbarians; but since the kings of Macedon called themselves sons of Herakles they had been permitted to run their horses in the races of the Olympian games. This gave them standing as Greeks.

=Philip of Macedon.=--These kings ruling in the interior, remote from the sea, had had but little part in the wars of the Greeks. But in 359 B.C. Philip ascended the throne of Macedon, a man young, active, bold, and ambitious. Philip had three aims:

1. To develop a strong army;

2. To conquer all the ports on the coast of Macedon;

3. To force all the other Greeks to unite under his command against the Persians.

He consumed twenty-four years in fulfilling these purposes and succeeded in all. The Greeks let him alone, often even aided him; in every city he bribed partisans who spoke in his favor. "No fortress is impregnable," said he, "if only one can introduce within it a mule laden with gold." And by these means he took one after another all the cities of northern Greece.

=Demosthenes.=--The most illustrious opponent of Philip was the orator Demosthenes. The son of an armorer, he was left an orphan at the age of seven, and his guardians had embezzled a part of his fortune. As soon as he gained his majority he entered a case against them and compelled them to restore the property. He studied the orations of Isaeus and the history of Thucydides which he knew by heart. But when he spoke at the public tribune he was received with shouts of laughter; his voice was too feeble and his breath too short. For several years he labored to discipline his voice. It is said that he shut himself up for months with head half shaved that he might not be tempted to go out, that he declaimed with pebbles in his mouth, and on the sea-shore, in order that his voice might rise above the uproar of the crowd. When he reappeared on the tribune, he was master of his voice, and, as he preserved the habit of carefully preparing all his orations, he became the most finished and most potent orator of Greece.

The party that then governed Athens, whose chief was Phocion, wished to maintain the peace: Athens had neither soldiers nor money enough to withstand the king of Macedon. "I should counsel you to make war," said Phocion, "when you are ready for it." Demosthenes, however, misunderstood Philip, whom he regarded as a barbarian; he placed himself at the service of the party that wished to make war on him and employed all his eloquence to move the Athenians from their policy of peace. For fifteen years he seized every occasion to incite them to war; many of his speeches have no other object than an attack on Philip. He himself called these Philippics, and there are three of them. (The name Olynthiacs has been applied to the orations delivered with the purpose of enlisting the Athenians in the aid of Olynthus when it was besieged by Philip.) The first Philippic is in 352. "When, then, O Athenians, will you be about your duty? Will you always roam about the public places asking one of another: What is the news? Ah! How can there be anything newer than the sight of a Macedonian conquering Athens and dominating Greece? I say, then, that you ought to equip fifty galleys and resolve, if necessary, to man them yourselves. Do not talk to me of an army of 10,000 or of 20,000 aliens that exists only on paper. I would have only citizen soldiers."

In the third Philippic (341) Demosthenes calls to the minds of the Athenians the progress made by Philip, thanks to their inaction. "When the Greeks once abused their power to oppress others, all Greece rose to prevent this injustice; and yet today we suffer an unworthy Macedonian, a barbarian of a hated race, to destroy Greek cities, celebrate the Pythian games, or have them celebrated by his slaves. And the Greeks look on without doing anything, just as one sees hail falling while he prays that it may not touch him. You let increase his power without taking a step to stop it, each regarding it as so much time gained when he is destroying another, instead of planning and working for the safety of Greece, when everybody knows that the disaster will end with the inclusion of the most remote."

At last, when Philip had taken Elatea on the borders of Boeotia, the Athenians, on the advice of Demosthenes, determined to make war and to send envoys to Thebes. Demosthenes was at the head of the embassy; he met at Thebes an envoy come from Philip; the Thebans hesitated. Demosthenes besought them to bury the old enmities and to think only of the safety of Greece, to defend its honor and its history. He persuaded them to an alliance with Athens and to undertake the war. A battle was fought at Chaeronea in Boeotia, Demosthenes, then at the age of forty-eight, serving as a private hostile. But the army of the Athenians and Thebans, levied in haste, was not equal to the veterans of Philip and was thrown into rout.

=The Macedonian Supremacy.=--Philip, victorious at Chaeronea, placed a garrison in Thebes and offered peace to Athens. He then entered the Peloponnesus and was received as a liberator among the peoples whom Sparta had oppressed. From this time he met with no resistance. He came to Corinth and assembled delegates from all the Greek states (337)[96] except Sparta.

Here Philip published his project of leading a Greek army to the invasion of Persia. The delegates approved the proposition and made a general confederation of all the Greek states. Each city was to govern itself and to live at peace with its neighbors. A general council was initiated to prevent wars, civil dissensions, proscriptions, and confiscations.

This confederacy made an alliance with the king of Macedon and conferred on him the command of all the Greek troops and navies. Every Greek was prohibited making war on Philip on pain of banishment.

=Alexander.=--Philip of Macedon was assassinated in 336. His son Alexander was then twenty years old. Like all the Greeks of good family he was accustomed to athletic exercises, a vigorous fighter, an excellent horseman (he alone had been able to master Bucephalus, his war-horse). But at the same time he was informed in politics, in eloquence, and in natural history, having had as teacher from his thirteenth to his seventeenth year Aristotle, the greatest scholar of Greece. He read the Iliad with avidity, called this the guide to the military art, and desired to imitate its heroes. He was truly born to conquer, for he loved to fight and was ambitious to distinguish himself. His father said to him, "Macedon is too small to contain you."

=The Phalanx.=--Philip left a powerful instrument of conquest, the Macedonian army, the best that Greece had seen. It comprised the phalanx of infantry and a corps of cavalry.

The phalanx of Macedonians was formed of 16,000 men ranged with 1,000 in front and 16 men deep. Each had a sarissa, a spear about twenty feet in length. On the field of battle the Macedonians, instead of marching on the enemy facing all in the same direction, held themselves in position and presented their pikes to the enemy on all sides, those in the rear couching their spears above the heads of the men of the forward ranks. The phalanx resembled "a monstrous beast bristling with iron," against which the enemy was to throw itself. While the phalanx guarded the field of battle, Alexander charged the enemy at the head of his cavalry. This Macedonian cavalry was a distinguished body formed of young nobles.

=Departure of Alexander.=--Alexander started in the spring of 334 with 30,000 infantry (the greater part of these Macedonians) and 4,500 knights; he carried only seventy talents (less than eighty thousand dollars) and supplies for forty days. He had to combat not only the crowd of ill-armed peoples such as Xerxes had brought together, but an army of 50,000 Greeks enrolled in the service of the Great King under a competent general, Memnon of Rhodes. These Greeks might have withstood the invasion of Alexander, but Memnon died and his army dispersed. Alexander, delivered from his only dangerous opponent, conquered the Persian empire in two years.

=Victories of Granicus, Issus, and Arbela.=--Three victories gave the empire to Alexander. In Asia Minor he overthrew the Persian troops stationed behind the river Granicus (May, 333). At Issus, in the ravines of Cilicia, he routed King Darius and his army of 600,000 men (November, 333). At Arbela, near the Tigris, he scattered and massacred a still more numerous army (331).

This was a repetition of the Median wars. The Persian army was ill equipped and knew nothing of manoeuvring; it was embarrassed with its mass of soldiers, valets, and baggage. The picked troops alone gave battle, the rest were scattered and massacred. Between the battles the conquest was only a triumphal progress. Nobody resisted (except the city of Tyre, commercial rival of the Greeks); what cared the peoples of the empire whether they were subject to Darius or Alexander? Each victory gave Alexander the whole of the country: the Granicus opened Asia Minor, Issus Syria and Egypt, Arbela the rest of the empire.

=Death of Alexander.=--Master now of the Persian empire Alexander regarded himself as the heir of the Great King. He assumed Persian dress, adopted the ceremonies of the Persian court and compelled his Greek generals to prostrate themselves before him according to Persian usage. He married a woman of the land and united eighty of his officers to daughters of the Persian nobles. He aimed to extend his empire to the farthest limits of the ancient kings and advanced even to India, warring with the combative natives. After his return with his army to Babylon (324), he died at the age of thirty-three, succumbing to a fever of brief duration (323).

=Projects of Alexander.=--It is very difficult to know exactly what Alexander's purposes were. Did he conquer for the mere pleasure of it? Or did he have a plan? Did he wish to fuse into one all the peoples of his empire? Was he following the example already set him by Persia? Or did he, perhaps, imitate the Great King simply for vain-glory? And so of his intentions we know nothing. But his acts had great results. He founded seventy cities--many Alexandrias in Egypt, in Tartary, and even in India. He distributed to his subjects the treasures that had been uselessly hoarded in the chests of the Great King. He stimulated Greek scholars to study the plants, the animals, and the geography of Asia. But what is of special importance, he prepared the peoples of the Orient to receive the language and customs of the Greeks. This is why the title "Great" has been assigned to Alexander.

THE HELLENES IN THE ORIENT

=Dissolution of the Empire of Alexander.=--Alexander had united under one master all the ancient world from the Adriatic to the Indus, from Egypt to the Caucasus. This vast empire endured only while he lived. Soon after his death his generals disputed as to who should succeed him; they made war on one another for twenty years, at first under the pretext of supporting some one of the house of Alexander--his brother, his son, his mother, his sisters or one of his wives, later openly in their own names.

Each had on his side a part of the Macedonian army or some of the Greek mercenary soldiers. The Greeks were thus contending among themselves who should possess Asia. The inhabitants were indifferent in these wars as they had been in the strife between the Greeks and the Persians. When the war ceased, there remained but three generals; from the empire of Alexander each of them had carved for himself a great kingdom: Ptolemy had Egypt, Seleucus Syria, Lysimachus Macedonia. Other smaller kingdoms were already separated or detached themselves later: in Europe Epirus; in Asia Minor, Pontus, Bithynia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Pergamos; in Persia, Bactriana and Parthia. Thus the empire of Alexander was dismembered.

=The Hellenistic Kingdoms.=--In these new kingdoms the king was a Greek; accustomed to speak Greek, to adore the Greek gods, and to live in Greek fashion, he preserved his language, his religion, and his customs. His subjects were Asiatics, that is to say, barbarians; but he sought to maintain a Greek court about him; he recruited his army with Greek mercenaries, his administrative officers were Greeks, he invited to his court Greek poets, scholars, and artists.

Already in the time of the Persian kings there were many Greeks in the empire as colonists, merchants, and especially soldiers. The Greek kings attracted still more of these. They came in such numbers that at last the natives adopted the costume, the religion, the manners, and even the language of the Greeks. The Orient ceased to be Asiatic, and became Hellenic. The Romans found here in the first century B.C. only peoples like the Greeks and who spoke Greek.[97]

=Alexandria.=--The Greek kings of Egypt, descendants of Ptolemy,[98] accepted the title of Pharaoh held by the ancient kings, wore the diadem, and, like the earlier sovereigns, had themselves worshipped as children of the Sun. But they surrounded themselves with Greeks and founded their capital on the edge of the sea in a Greek city, Alexandria, a new city established by the order of Alexander.

Built on a simple plan, Alexandria was more regular than other Greek cities. The streets intersected at right angles; a great highway 100 feet broad and three and one-half miles in length traversed the whole length of the city. It was bordered with great monuments--the Stadium where the public games were presented, the Gymnasium, the Museum, and the Arsineum. The harbor was enclosed with a dike nearly a mile long which united the mainland to the island of Pharos. At the very extremity of this island a tower of marble was erected, on the summit of which was maintained a fire always burning to guide the mariners who wished to enter the port. Alexandria superseded the Phoenician cities and became the great port of the entire world.

=The Museum.=--The Museum was an immense edifice of marble connected with the royal palace. The kings of Egypt purposed to make of it a great scientific institution.

The Museum contained a great library.[99] The chief librarian had a commission to buy all the books that he could find. Every book that entered Egypt was brought to the library; copyists transcribed the manuscript and a copy was rendered the owner to indemnify him. Thus they collected 400,000 volumes, an unheard-of number before the invention of printing. Until then the manuscripts of celebrated books were scarce, always in danger of being lost; now it was known where to find them. In the Museum were also a botanical and zooelogical garden, an astronomical observatory, a dissecting room established notwithstanding the prejudices of the Egyptians, and even a chemical laboratory.[100]

The Museum provided lodgings for scholars, mathematicians, astronomers, physicians, and grammarians. They were supported at the expense of the state; often to show his esteem for them the king dined with them. These scholars held conferences and gave lectures. Auditors came from all parts of the Greek world; it was to Alexandria that the youth were sent for instruction. In the city were nearly 14,000 students.

The Museum was at once a library, an academy, and a school--something like a university. This sort of institution, common enough among us, was before that time completely unheard of. Alexandria, thanks to its Museum, became the rendezvous for all the Orientals--Greeks, Egyptians, Jews, and Syrians; each brought there his religion, his philosophy, his science, and all were mingled together. Alexandria became and remained for several centuries the scientific and philosophical capital of the world.

=Pergamum.=--The kingdom of Pergamum in Asia Minor was small and weak. But Pergamum, its capital, was, like Alexandria, a city of artists and of letters. The sculptors of Pergamum constituted a celebrated school in the third century before our era.[101]

Pergamum, like Alexandria, possessed a great library where King Attalus had assembled all the manuscripts of the ancient authors.

It was at Pergamum that, to replace the papyrus on which down to that time they used to write, they invented the art of preparing skins. This new paper of Pergamum was the parchment on which the manuscripts of antiquity have been preserved.

FOOTNOTES:

[95] An episode told by Xenophon shows what fear the Greeks inspired. One day, to make a display before the queen of Cilicia, Cyrus had his Greeks drawn up in battle array. "They all had their brazen helmets, their tunics of purple, their gleaming shields and greaves. The trumpet sounded, and the soldiers, with arms in action, began the charge; hastening their steps and raising the war-cry, they broke into a run. The barbarians were terrified; the Cilician queen fled from her chariot, the merchants of the market abandoning their goods took to flight, and the Greeks returned with laughter to their tents."

[96] There were two assemblies in Corinth--the first in, 338, the second in 337.--ED.

[97] The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles composed in Asia Minor were written in Greek.

[98] They were called Lagidae from the father of Ptolemy I.

[99] The library of the Museum was burnt during the siege of Alexandria by Caesar. But it had a successor in the Serapeum which contained 300,000 volumes. This is said to have been burnt in the seventh century by the Arabs. [The tale of the destruction of the library under orders of Omar is doubtful.--ED.]

[100] King Ptolemy Philadelphus who had great fear of death passed many years searching for an elixir of life.

[101] There still remain to us some of the statues executed by the orders of King Attalus to commemorate his victory over the Gauls of Asia.

CHAPTER XVI

THE LAST YEARS OF GREECE

DECADENCE OF THE GREEK CITIES

=Rich and Poor.=--In almost all the Greek cities the domains, the shops of trade, the merchant ships, in short, all the sources of financial profit were in the hands of certain rich families. The other families, that is to say, the majority of the citizens,[102] had neither lands nor money. What, then, could a poor citizen do to gain a livelihood? Hire himself as a farmer, an artisan, or a sailor? But the proprietors already had their estates, their workshops, their merchantmen manned by slaves who served them much more cheaply than free laborers, for they fed them ill and did not pay them. Could he work on his own account? But money was very scarce; he could not borrow, since interest was at the rate of ten per cent. Then, too, custom did not permit a citizen to become an artisan. "Trade," said the philosophers, "injures the body, enfeebles the soul and leaves no leisure to engage in public affairs." "And so," says Aristotle, "a well-constituted city ought not to receive the artisan into citizenship." The citizens in Greece constituted a noble class whose only honorable functions, like the nobles of ancient France, were to govern and go to war; working with the hands was degrading. Thus by the competition of slaves and their exalted situation the greater part of the citizens were reduced to extreme misery.

=Social Strife.=--The poor governed the cities and had no means of living. The idea occurred to them to despoil the rich, and the latter, to resist them, organized associations. Then every Greek city was divided into two parties: the rich, called the minority, and the poor, called the majority or the people. Rich and poor hated one another and fought one another. When the poor got the upper hand, they exiled the rich and confiscated their goods; often they even adopted these two radical measures:

1. The abolition of debts;

2. A new partition of lands.

The rich, when they returned to power, exiled the poor. In many cities they took this oath among themselves: "I swear always to be an enemy to the people and to do them all the injury I can."

No means were found of reconciling the two parties: the rich could not persuade themselves to surrender their property; the poor were unwilling to die of hunger. According to Aristotle all revolutions have their origin in the distribution of wealth. "Every civil war," says Polybius, "is initiated to subvert wealth."

They fought savagely, as is always the case between neighbors. "At Miletus the poor were at first predominant and forced the rich to flee the city. But afterwards, regretting that they had not killed them all, they took the children of the exiles, assembled them in barns and had them trodden under the feet of cattle. The rich reentered the city and became masters of it. In their turn they seized the children of the poor, coated them with pitch, and burned them alive."

=Democracy and Oligarchy.=--Each of the two parties--rich and poor--had its favorite form of government and set it in operation when the party held the city. The party of the rich was the Oligarchy which gave the government into the hands of a few people. That of the poor was the Democracy which gave the power to an assembly of the people. Each of the two parties maintained an understanding with the similar party in the other cities. Thus were formed two leagues which divided all the Greek cities: the league of the rich, or Oligarchy, the league of the poor, or Democracy. This regime began during the Peloponnesian War. Athens supported the democratic party, Sparta the oligarchic. The cities in which the poor had the sovereignty allied themselves with Athens; the cities where the rich governed, with Sparta. Thus at Samos when the poor gained supremacy they slew two hundred of the rich, exiled four hundred of them, and confiscated their lands and houses. Samos then adopted a democratic government and allied itself with Athens. The Spartan army came to besiege Samos, bringing with it the rich exiles of Samos who wished to return to the city by force. The city was captured, set up an oligarchy, and joined the league of Sparta.

=The Tyrants.=--At length, the poor perceived that the democratic form of government did not give them strength enough to maintain the contest. In most of the cities they consented to receive a chief. This chief was called Tyrant. He governed as master without obeying any law, condemning to death, and confiscating property at will. Mercenaries defended him against his enemies. The following anecdote represents the policy of the tyrants: "Periander, tyrant of Corinth, sent one day to Thrasybulus, tyrant of Miletus, to ask what conduct he ought to follow in order to govern with safety. Thrasybulus led the envoy into the field end walked with him through the wheat, striking off with his staff all heads that were higher than the others. He sent off the envoy without further advice." The messenger took him for a fool, but Periander understood: Thrasybulus was counselling him to slay the principal citizens.

Everywhere the rich were killed by the tyrant and their goods confiscated; often the wealth was distributed among the poor. This is why the populace always sustained the tyrant.

There were tyrants in Greece from the sixth century; some, like Pisistratus, Polycrates, and Pittacus, were respected for their wisdom. At that time every man was called tyrant who exercised absolute power outside the limits of the constitution; it was not a title of reproach.

But when the tyrants made incessant warfare on the rich they became sanguinary and so were detested. Their situation is depicted in the famous story of Damocles. This Damocles said to Dionysius, tyrant of Syracuse, "You are the happiest of men." "I will show you the delight of being a tyrant," replied Dionysius. He had Damocles served with a sumptuous feast and ordered his servants to show the guest the same honors as to himself. During the feast Damocles raised his eyes and perceived a sword suspended to the ceiling held only by a horse hair, and hanging directly over his head. The comparison was a striking one--the tyrant's life hung only by a thread. The rich, his enemies, watched for an opportunity to cut it, for it was regarded as praiseworthy to assassinate a tyrant. This danger irritated him and made him suspicious and cruel. He dared not trust anybody, believed himself secure only after the massacre of all his enemies, and condemned the citizens to death on the slightest suspicion. Thus the name tyrant became a synonym of injustice.

=Exhaustion of Greece.=--The civil wars between rich and poor continued for nearly three centuries (430-150 B.C.). Many citizens were massacred, a greater number exiled. These exiles wandered about in poverty. Knowing no trade but that of a soldier, they entered as mercenaries into the armies of Sparta, Athens, the Great King, the Persian satraps--in short, of anybody who would hire them. There were 50,000 Greeks in the service of Darius against Alexander. It was seldom that such men returned to their own country.

Thus the cities lost their people. At the same time families became smaller, many men preferring not to marry or raise children, others having but one or two. "Is not this," says Polybius, "the root of the evil, that of these two children war or sickness removes one, then the home becomes deserted and the city enfeebled?" A time came when there were no longer enough citizens in the

towns to resist a conqueror.

THE ROMAN CONQUEST

=The Greek Leagues.=--The most discerning of the Greeks commenced to see the danger during the second war of Rome with Carthage. In an assembly held at Naupactus in 207 B.C. a Greek orator said, "Turn your eyes to the Occident; the Romans and Carthaginians are disputing something else than the possession of Italy. A cloud is forming on that coast, it increases, and impends over Greece."[103]

The Greek cities at this time grouped themselves in two leagues hostile to each other. Two little peoples, the AEtolians and Achaeans, had the direction of them; they commanded the armies and determined on peace and war, just as Athens and Sparta once did. Each league supported in the Greek states one of the two political parties--the AEtolian League the democratic, the Achaean League[104] the oligarchical.

=The Roman Allies.=--Neither of the two leagues was strong enough to unite all the Greek states. The Romans then appeared. Philip, the king of Macedon (197), and later Antiochus,[105] the king of Syria (193-169), made war on them. Both were beaten. Rome destroyed their armies and made them surrender their fleets.

Perseus, the new king of Macedon, was conquered, made prisoner, and his kingdom overthrown (167).[106] The Greeks made no effort to unite for the common defence; rich and poor persisted in their strife, and each hated the other more than the foreigner. The democratic party allied itself with Macedon, the oligarchical party called in the Romans.[107] While the Theban democrats were fighting in the army of Philip, the Theban oligarchs opened the town to the Roman general. At Rhodes all were condemned to death who had acted or spoken against Rome. Even among the Achaeans, Callicrates, a partisan of the Romans, prepared a list of a thousand citizens whom he accused of having been favorable to Perseus; these suspects were sent to Rome where they were held twenty years without trial.

=The Last Fight.=--The Romans were not at first introduced as enemies. In 197 the consul Flamininus, after conquering the king of Macedon, betook himself to the Isthmus of Corinth and before the Greeks assembled to celebrate the games, proclaimed that "all the Greek peoples were free." The crowd in transports of joy approached Flamininus to thank him; they wished to salute their liberator, see his form, touch his hand; crowns and garlands were cast upon him. The pressure upon him was so great that he was nearly suffocated.

The Romans seeing themselves in control soon wished to command. The rich freely recognized their sovereignty; Rome served them by shattering the party of the poor. This endured for forty years. At last in 147, Rome being engaged with Carthage, the democratic party gained the mastery in Greece and declared war on the Romans. A part of the Greeks were panic-stricken; many came before the Roman soldiers denouncing their compatriots and themselves; others betook themselves to a safe distance from the cities; some hurled themselves into wells or over precipices. The leaders of the opposition confiscated the property of the rich, abolished debts, and gave arms to the slaves. It was a desperate contest. Once overcome, the Achaeans reassembled an army and marched to the combat with their wives and children. The general Dioeus shut himself in his house with his whole family and set fire to the building. Corinth had been the centre of the resistance; the Romans entered it, massacred the men, and sold the women and children as slaves. The city full of masterpieces of art was pillaged and burnt; pictures of the great painters were thrown into the dust, Roman soldiers lying on them and playing at dice.

THE HELLENES IN THE OCCIDENT

=Influence of Greece on Rome.=--The Romans at the time of their conquest of the Greeks were still only soldiers, peasants, and merchants; they had no statues, monuments, literature, science, or philosophy. All this was found among the Greeks. Rome sought to imitate these, as the Assyrian conquerors imitated the Chaldeans, as the Persians did the Assyrians. The Romans kept their costume, tongue, and religion, and never confused these with those of the Greeks. But thousands of Greek scholars and artists came to establish themselves in Rome and to open schools of literature and of eloquence. Later it was the fashion for the youth of the great Roman families to go as students to the schools of Athens and Alexandria. Thus the arts and science of the Greeks were gradually introduced into Rome. "Vanquished Greece overcame her savage conqueror," says Horace, the Roman poet; "she brought the arts to uncultured Latium."

=Architecture.=--The Romans had a national architecture. But they borrowed the column from the Greeks and often imitated their buildings. Many Roman temples resemble a Greek temple.

A wealthy Roman's house is composed ordinarily of two parts: the first, the ancient Roman house; the other is only a Greek house added to the first.

=Sculpture.=--The Greeks had thousands of statues, in temples, squares of the city, gymnasia, and in their dwellings. The Romans regarded themselves as the owners of everything that had belonged to the vanquished people. Their generals, therefore, removed a great number of statues, transporting them to the temples and the porticos of Rome. In the triumph of AEmilius Paullus, victor over the king of Macedon (Perseus), a notable spectacle was two hundred and fifty cars full of statues and paintings.

Soon the Romans became accustomed to adorn with statues their theatres, council-halls, and private villas; every great noble wished to have some of them and gave commissions for them to Greek artists. Thus a Roman school of sculpture was developed which continued to imitate ancient Greek models. And so it was Greek sculpture, a little blunted and disfigured, which was spread over all the world subject to the Romans.

=Literature.=--The oldest Latin writer was a Greek, Livius Andronicus, a freedman, a schoolmaster, and later an actor. The first works in Latin were translations from the Greek. Livius Andronicus had translated the Odyssey and several tragedies. The Roman people took pleasure in Greek pieces and would have no others. Even the Roman authors who wrote for the theatre did nothing but translate or arrange Greek tragedies and comedies. Thus the celebrated works of Plautus and of Terence are imitations of the comedies of Menander and of Diphilus, now lost to us.

The Romans imitated also the Greek historians. For a long time it was the fashion to write history, even Roman history, in Greek.

The only great Roman poets declare themselves pupils of the Greeks. Lucretius writes only to expound the philosophy of Epicurus; Catullus imitates the poets of Alexander; Vergil, Theocritus and Homer; Horace translates the odes of the Greek lyrics.

=Epicureans and Stoics.=--The Romans had a practical and literal spirit, very indifferent to pure science and metaphysics. They took interest in Greek philosophy only so far as they believed it had a bearing on morals.

Epicureans and Stoics were two sects of Greek philosophers. The Epicureans maintained that pleasure is the supreme good, not sensual pleasure, but the calm and reasonable pleasure of the temperate man; happiness consists in the quiet enjoyment of a peaceful life, surrounded with friends and without concern for imaginary goods. For the Stoics the supreme good is virtue, which consists in conducting one's self according to reason, with a view to the good of the whole universe. Riches, honor, health, beauty, all the goods of earth are nothing for the wise man; even if one torture him, he remains happy in the possession of the true good.

The Romans took sides for one or the other philosophy, usually without thoroughly comprehending either. Those who passed for Epicureans spent their lives in eating and drinking and even compared themselves to swine. Those calling themselves Stoics, like Cato and Brutus, affected a rude language, a solemn demeanor and emphasized the evils of life. Nevertheless these doctrines, spreading gradually, aided in destroying certain prejudices of the Romans. Epicureans and Stoics were in harmony on two points: they disdained the ancient religion and taught that all men are equal, slaves or citizens, Greeks or barbarians. Their Roman disciples renounced in their school certain old superstitions, and learned to show themselves less cruel to their slaves, less insolent toward other peoples.

The conquest of Greece by the Romans gave the arts, letters, and morals of the Greeks currency in the west, just as the conquest of the Persian empire by the Greeks had carried their language, customs, and religion into the Orient.

FOOTNOTES:

[102] In almost all the Greek cities there was no middle class. In this regard Athens with its thirteen thousand small proprietors is a remarkable exception.

[103] Polybius, v., 104.

[104] The Achaean league had illustrious leaders. In the third century, Aratus, who for twenty-seven years (251-224) traversed Greece, expelling tyrants, recalling the rich and returning to them their property and the government; in the second century Philopoemen, who fought the tyrants of Sparta and died by poison.

[105] There were two kings of Syria by the name of Antiochus, between 193 and 169.--ED.

[106] The decisive battle (Pydna) was fought in 168. Perseus walked in the triumph of Paullus the next year.--ED.

[107] The party policies of the Greeks of this period were hardly so clearly drawn as the above would seem to indicate. Thus the Achaean League allied itself with Macedon against the AEtolians and against Sparta. The AEtolians leagued with the Romans against Macedon.--ED.

CHAPTER XVII

ROME

ANCIENT PEOPLES OF ITALY

THE ETRUSCANS

=Etruria.=--The word Italy never signified for the ancients the same as for us: the Po Valley (Piedmont and Lombardy) was a part of Gaul. The frontier country at the north was Tuscany. The Etruscans who dwelt there have left it their name (Tusci).

Etruria was a country at once warm and humid; the atmosphere hung heavily over the inhabitants. The region on the shore of the sea where the Etruscans had most of their cities is the famous Maremma, a wonderfully fertile area, covered with beautiful forests, but where the water having no outlet forms marshes that poison the air. "In the Maremma," says an Italian proverb, "one gets rich in a year, but dies in six months."

=The Etruscan People.=--The Etruscans were for the ancients, and are still for us, a mysterious people. They had no resemblance to their neighbor's, and doubtless they came from a distance--from Germany, Asia, or from Egypt; all these opinions have been maintained, but no one of them is demonstrated.

We are ignorant even of the language that they spoke. Their alphabet resembles that of the Greeks, but the Etruscan inscriptions present only proper names, and these are too short to furnish a key to the language.

The Etruscans established twelve cities in Tuscany, united in a confederation, each with its own fortress, its king, and its government. They had colonies on both coasts, twelve in Campania in the vicinity of Naples, and twelve more in the valley of the Po.

=Etruscan Tombs.=--There remain to us from the Etruscans only city walls and tombs.

When an Etruscan tomb is opened, one perceives a porch supported by columns and behind this chambers with couches, and bodies laid on these. Round about are ornaments of gold, ivory, and amber; purple cloths, utensils, and especially large painted vases. On the walls are paintings of combats, games, banquets, and fantastic scenes.

=Industry and Commerce.=--The Etruscans knew how to turn their fertile soil to some account, but they were for the most part mariners and traders. Like the Phoenicians they made long journeys to seek the ivory of India, amber from the Baltic, tin, the Phoenician purple, Egyptian jewels adorned with hieroglyphics, and even ostrich eggs. All these objects are found in their tombs. Their navies sailed to the south as far as Sicily. The Greeks hated them and called them "savage Tyrrhenians" or "Etruscan pirates." At this time every mariner on occasion was a pirate, and the Etruscans were especially interested to exclude the Greeks so that they might keep for themselves the trade of the west coast of Italy.

The famous Etruscan vases, which have been taken from the tombs by the thousand to enrich our museums, were imitations of Greek vases, but manufactured by the Etruscans. They represent scenes from Greek mythology, especially the combats about Troy; the human figures are in red on a black ground.

=Religion.=--The Etruscans were a sombre people. Their gods were stern, often malevolent. The two most exalted gods were "the veiled deities," of whom we know nothing. Below these were the gods who hurled the lightning and these form a council of twelve gods. Under the earth, in the abode of the dead, were gods of evil omen. These are represented on the Etruscan vases. The king of the lower world, Mantus, a winged genius, sits with crown on his head and torch in his hand. Other demons armed with sword or club with serpents in their hands receive the souls of the dead; the principal of these under the name Charun (the Charon of the Greeks), an old man of hideous form, bears a heavy mallet to strike his victims. The souls of the dead (the Manes) issue from the

lower world three days in the year, wandering about the earth, terrifying the living and doing them evil. Human victims are offered to appease their lust for blood. The famous gladiatorial combats which the Romans adopted had their origin in bloody sacrifices in honor of the dead.

=The Augurs.=--The Etruscans used to say that a little evil spirit named Tages issued one day from a furrow and revealed to the people assembled the secrets of divination. The Etruscan priests who called themselves haruspices or augurs had rules for predicting the future. They observed the entrails of victims, the thunderbolt, but especially the flight of birds (whence their name "augurs"). The augur at first with face turned to the north, holding a crooked staff in his hand, describes a line which cuts the heavens in two sections; the part to the right is favorable, to the left unfavorable. A second line cutting the first at right angles, and others parallel to these form in the heavens a square which was called the Temple. The augur regarded the birds that flew in this square: some like the eagle have a lucky significance; others like the owl presage evil.

The Etruscans predicted the future destiny of their own people. They are the only people of antiquity who did not expect that they were to persist forever. Etruria, they said, was to endure ten centuries. These centuries were not of exactly one hundred years each, but certain signs marked the end of each period. In the year 44, the year of the death of Caesar, a comet appeared; an Etruscan haruspex stated to the Romans in an assembly of the people that this comet announced the end of the ninth century and the beginning of the tenth, the last of the Etruscan people.

=Influence of the Etruscans.=--The Romans, a semi-barbarous people, always imitated their more civilized neighbors, the Etruscans. They drew from them especially the forms of their religion: the costume of the priests and of the magistrates, the religious rites, and the art of divining the future from birds (the auspices). When the Romans found a city, they observe the Etruscan rites: the founder traces a square enclosure with a plough with share of bronze, drawn by a white bull and a white heifer. Men follow the founder and carefully cast the clods of earth from the side of the furrow. The whole ditch left by the plough is sacred and is not to be crossed. To allow entrance to the enclosure, it is necessary that the founder break the ditch at certain points, and he does this by lifting the plough and carrying it an instant; the interval made in this manner remains profane and it becomes the gate by which one enters. Rome itself was founded according to these rites. It was called Roma Quadrata, and it was said that the founder had killed his brother to punish him for crossing the sacred furrow. Later the limits of Roman colonies and of camps, and even the bounds of domains were always traced in conformity with religious rules and with geometrical lines.

The Roman religion was half Etruscan. The Fathers of the church were right, therefore, in calling Etruria the "Mother of Superstitions."

THE ITALIAN PEOPLE

=Umbrians and Oscans.=--In the rugged mountains of the Apennines, to the east and south of the Roman plain, resided numerous tribes. These peoples did not bear the same name and did not constitute a single nation. They were Umbrians, Sabines, Volscians, AEquians, Hernicans, Marsians, and Samnites. But all spoke almost the same language, worshipped the same gods, and had similar customs. Like the Persians, Hindoos, and Greeks, they were of Aryan race; secluded in their mountains, remote from strangers, they remained like the Aryans of the ancient period; they lived in groups with their herds scattered in the plains; they had no villages nor cities. Fortresses erected on the mountains defended them in time of war. They were brave martial people, of simple and substantial manners. They later constituted the strength of the Roman armies. A proverb ran: "Who could vanquish the Marsians without the Marsians?"

=The Sacred Spring.=--In the midst of a pressing danger, the Sabines, according to a legend, believing their gods to be angry, decided to appease their displeasure by sacrificing to the god of war and of death everything that was born during a certain spring. This sacrifice was called a "Sacred Spring." All the children born in this year belonged to the god. Arrived at the age of manhood, they left the country and journeyed abroad. These exiles formed several groups, each taking for guide one of the sacred animals of Italy, a woodpecker, a wolf, or a bull, and followed it as a messenger of the god. Where the animal halted the band settled itself. Many peoples of Italy, it was said, had originated in these colonies of emigrants and still preserved the name of the animal which had led their ancestors. Such were, the Hirpines (people of the wolf), the Picentines (people of the woodpecker), and the Samnites whose capital was named Bovianum (city of the ox).

=The Samnites.=--The Samnites were the most powerful of all. Settled in the Abruzzi, a paradise for brigands, they descended into the fertile plains of Naples and of Apulia and put Etruscan and Greek towns to ransom.

The Samnites fought against the Romans for two centuries; although always beaten because they had no central administration and no discipline they yet reopened the war. Their last fight was heroic. An old man brought to the chiefs of the army a sacred book written on linen. They formed in the interior of the camp a wall of linen, raised an altar in the midst of it, and around this stood soldiers with unsheathed swords. One by one the bravest of the warriors entered the precinct. They swore not to flee before the enemy and to kill the fugitives. Those who took the oath, to the number of 16,000, donned linen garments. This was the "linen legion"; it engaged in battle, and was slaughtered to the last man.

=The Greeks of Italy.=--All south Italy was covered with Greek colonies, some, like Sybaris, Croton, and Tarentum, very populous and powerful. But the Greeks did not venture on the Roman coast for fear of the Etruscans. Except the city of Cumae the Greek colonies down to the third century had almost no relations with the Romans.

=The Latins.=--The Latins dwelt in the country of hills and ravines to the south of the Tiber, called today the Roman Campagna. They were a small people, their territory comprising no more than one hundred square miles. They were of the same race as the other Italians, similar to them in language, religion, and manners, but slightly more advanced in civilization. They cultivated the soil and built strong cities. They separated themselves into little independent peoples. Each people had its little territory, its city, and its government. This miniature state was called a city. Thirty Latin cities had formed among themselves a religious association analogous to the Greek amphictyonies. Every year they celebrated a common festival, when their delegates, assembled at Alba, sacrificed a bull in honor of their common god, the Latin Jupiter.

=Rome.=--On the frontier of Latium, on the borders of Etruria, in the marshy plain studded with hills that followed the Tiber, rose the city of Rome, the centre of the Roman people scattered in the plain. The land was malarial and dreary; but the situation was good. The Tiber served as a barrier against the enemy from Etruria, the hills were fortresses. The sea was but six leagues away, far enough to escape fear of pirates, and near enough to permit the transportation of merchandise. The port of Ostia at the mouth of the Tiber was a suburb of Rome, as Piraeus was of Athens. The locality was therefore agreeable to a people of soldiers and merchants.

=Roma Quadrata and the Capitol.=--Of the first centuries of Rome we know only some legends, and the Romans knew no more than we. Rome, they said, was a little square town, limited to the Palatine Hill. The founder whom they called Romulus had according to the Etruscan forms traced the circuit with the plough. Every year, on the 21st of April, the Romans celebrated the anniversary of these ceremonies: a procession marched about the primitive enclosure and a priest fixed a nail in a temple in commemoration of it. It was calculated that the founding had occurred in the year 754[108] B.C.

On the other hills facing the Palatine other small cities rose. A band of Sabine mountaineers established themselves on the Capitoline, a group of Etruscan adventurers[109] on Mount Coelius; perhaps there were still other peoples. All these small settlements ended with uniting with Rome on the Palatine. A new wall was built to include the seven hills. The Capitol was then for Rome what the Acropolis was for Athens: here rose the temples of the three protecting deities of the city--Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, and the citadel that contained the treasure and the archives of the people. In laying the foundations, it was said there was found a human head recently cleft from the body; this head was a presage that Rome should become the head of the world.

FOOTNOTES:

[108] Rather 753 B.C.--ED.

[109] There were three tribes in old Rome, the Ramnes on the Palatine, the Tities or Sabines on the Capitoline, and the Luceres; but whether the last were Etruscans or Ramnians or neither is uncertain.--ED.

CHAPTER XVIII

ROMAN RELIGION

=The Roman Gods.=--The Romans, like the Greeks, believed that everything that occurs in the world was the work of a deity. But in place of a God who directs the whole universe, they had a deity for every phenomenon which they saw. There was a divinity to make the seed sprout, another to protect the bounds of the fields, another to guard the fruits. Each had its name, its sex, and its functions.

The principal gods were Jupiter, god of the heaven; Janus, the two-faced god (the deity who opens); Mars, god of war; Mercury, god of trade; Vulcan, god of fire; Neptune, god of the sea; Ceres, goddess of grains, the Earth, the Moon, Juno, and Minerva.

Below these were secondary deities. Some personified a quality--for example, Youth, Concord, Health, Peace. Others presided over a certain act in life: when the infant came into the world there were a god to teach him to speak, a goddess to teach him to drink, another charged with knitting his bones, two to accompany him to school, two to take him home again. In short, there was a veritable legion of minor special deities.

Other gods protected a city, a certain section of a mountain, a forest; every river, every fountain, every tree had its little local divinity. It is this that makes an old woman in a Latin romance exclaim, "Our country is so full of gods that it is much easier to find a god than a man."

=Form of the Gods.=--The Romans, unlike the Greeks, did not give their gods a precise form. For a long time there was no idol in Rome; they worshipped Jupiter under the form of a rock, Mars under that of a sword. It was later that they imitated the wooden statues of the Etruscans and the marbles of the Greeks. Perhaps they did not at first conceive of the gods as having human forms.

Unlike the Greeks they did not imagine marriage and kinship among their gods; they had no legends to tell of these relationships; they knew of no Olympus where the gods met together. The Latin language had a very significant word for designating the gods: they were called Manifestations. They were the manifestations of a mysterious divine power. This is why they were formless, without family relationship, without legends. Everything that was known of the gods was that each controlled a natural force and could benefit or injure men.

=Principles of the Roman Religion.=--The Roman was no lover of these pale and frigid abstractions; he even seemed to fear them. When he invoked them, he covered his face, perhaps that he might not see them. But he thought that they were potent and that they would render him service, if he knew how to please them. "The man whom the gods favor," says Plautus, "they cause to gain wealth."

The Roman conceives of religion as an exchange of good offices; the worshipper brings offerings and homage; the god in return confers some advantage.[110] If after having made a present to the god the man receives nothing, he considers himself cheated. During the illness of Germanicus the people offered sacrifices for his restoration. When it was announced that Germanicus was dead, the people in their anger overturned the altars and cast the statues of the gods into the streets, because they had not done what was expected of them. And so in our day the Italian peasant abuses the saint who does not give him what he asks.

=Worship.=--Worship, therefore, consists in doing those things that please the gods. They are presented with fruits, milk, wine, or animal sacrifices. Sometimes the statues of the gods are brought from their temples, laid on couches, and served with a feast. As in Greece, magnificent homes (temples[111]) were built for them, and diversions were arranged for them.

=Formalism.=--But it is not enough that one make a costly offering to the gods. The Roman gods are punctilious as to form; they require that all the acts of worship, the sacrifices, games, dedications, shall proceed according to the ancient rules (the rites). When one desires to offer a victim to Jupiter, one must select a white beast, sprinkle salted meal on its head, and strike it with an axe; one must stand erect with hands raised to heaven, the abode of Jupiter, and pronounce a sacred formula. If any part of the ceremonial fails, the sacrifice is of no avail; the god, it is thought, will have no pleasure in it. A magistrate may be celebrating games in honor of the protecting deities of Rome; "if he alters a word in his formula, if a flute-player rests, if the actor stops short, the games do not conform to the rites; they must be recommenced."[112]

And so the prudent man secures the assistance of two priests, one to pronounce the formula, the other to follow the ritual accurately.

Every year the Arval Brothers, a college of priests, assemble in a temple in the environs of Rome where they perform a sacred dance and recite a prayer; this is written in an archaic language which no one any longer comprehends, so much so that at the beginning of the ceremony a written formulary must be given to each of the priests. And yet, ever since the time that they ceased to comprehend it, they continued to chant it without change. This is because the Romans hold before all to the letter of the law in dealing with their gods. This exactness in performing the prescribed ritual is for them their religion. And so they regarded themselves as "the most religious of men." "On all other points we are the inferiors or only the equals of other peoples, but we excel all in religion, that is, the worship we pay the gods."

=Prayer.=--When the Roman prays, it is not to lift his soul and feel himself in communion with a god, but to ask of him a service. He is concerned, then, first to find the god who can render it. "It is as important," says Varro, "to know what god can aid us in a special case as to know where the carpenter and baker live." Thus one must address Ceres if one wants rich harvests, Mercury to make a fortune, Neptune to have a happy voyage. Then the suppliant dons the proper garments, for the gods love neatness; he brings an offering, for the gods love not that one should come with empty hands. Then, erect, the head veiled, the worshipper invokes the god. But he does not know the exact name of the god, for, say the Romans, "no one knows the true names of the gods." He says, then, for example, "Jupiter, greatest and best, or whatever is the name that thou preferrest...." Then he proposes his request, taking care to use always the clearest expressions so that the god may make no mistake. If a libation is offered, one says, "Receive the homage of this wine that I am pouring"; for the god might think that one would present other wine and keep this back. The prayers, too, are long, verbose, and full of repetitions.

=Omens.=--The Romans, like the Greeks, believe in omens. The gods, they think, know the future, and they send signs that permit men to divine them. Before undertaking any act, the Roman consults the gods. The general about to engage in battle examines the entrails of victims; the magistrates before holding an assembly regards the passing birds (called "taking the auspices"). If the signs are favorable, the gods are thought to approve the enterprise; if not, they are against it. The gods often send a sign that had not been requested. Every unexpected phenomenon is the presage of an event. A comet appeared before the death of Caesar and was thought to have announced it.

When the assembly of the people deliberates and it thunders, it is because Jupiter does not wish that anything shall be decided on that day and the assembly must dissolve. The most insignificant fact may be interpreted as a sign--a flash of lightning, a word overheard, a rat crossing the road, a diviner met on the way. And so when Marcellus had determined on an enterprise, he had himself carried in a closed litter that he might be sure of not seeing anything which could impose itself on him as a portent.

These were not the superstitions of the populace; the republic supported six augurs charged with predicting the future. It carefully preserved a collection of prophecies, the Sibylline Books. It had sacred chickens guarded by priests. No public act--assembly, election, deliberation--could be done without the taking of the auspices, that is to say, observation of the flight of birds. In the year 195 it was learned that lightning had struck a temple of Jupiter and that it had hit a hair on the head of the statue of Hercules; a governor wrote that a chicken with three feet had been hatched; the senate assembled to discuss these portents.

=The Priests.=--The priest in Rome, as in Greece, is not charged with the care of souls, he exists only for the service of the god. He guards his temple, administers his property, and performs the ceremonies in his honor. Thus the guild of the Salii (the leapers) watches over a shield which fell from heaven, they said, and which was adored as an idol; every year they perform a dance in arms, and this is their sole function.

The augurs predict the future. The pontiffs superintend the ceremonies of worship; they regulate the calendar and fix the festivals to be celebrated on the various days of the year.

Neither the priests, the augurs, nor the pontiffs form a separate class. They are chosen from among the great families and continue to exercise all the functions of state--judging, presiding over assemblies, and commanding armies. This is the reason that the Roman priests, potent as they were, did not constitute, as in Egypt, a sacerdotal caste. At Rome it was a state religion, but not a government by the priests.

=The Dead.=--The Romans, like the Hindoos and the Greeks, believed that the soul survived the body. If care were taken to bury the body according to the proper rites, the soul went to the lower world and became a god; otherwise the soul could not enter the abode of the dead, but returned to the earth terrifying the living and tormenting them until suitable burial was performed. Pliny the Younger[113] relates the story of a ghost which haunted a house and terrified to death all the inhabitants of the dwelling; a philosopher who was brave enough to follow it discovered at the place where the spectre stopped some bones which had not been buried in the proper manner. The shade of the Emperor Caligula wandered in the gardens of the palace; it was necessary to disinter the body and bury it anew in regular form.

=Cult of the Dead.=--It was of importance, therefore, to both the living and the dead that the rites should be observed. The family of the deceased erected a funeral pile, burned the body on it, and placed the ashes in an urn which was deposited in the tomb, a little chapel dedicated to the Manes,[114] _i.e._, the souls that had become gods. On fixed days of the year the relatives came to the tomb to bring food; doubtless they believed that the soul was in need of nourishment, for wine and milk were poured on the earth, flesh of victims was burned, and vessels of milk and cakes were left behind. These funeral ceremonies were perpetuated for an

indefinite period; a family could not abandon the souls of its ancestors, but continued to maintain their tomb and the funeral feasts. In return, these souls which had become gods loved and protected their posterity. Each family, therefore, had its guardian deities which they called Lares.

=Cult of the Hearth.=--Each family had a hearth, also, that it adored. For the Romans, as for the Hindoos, fire was a god and the hearth an altar. The flame was to be maintained day and night, and offerings made on the hearth of oil, fat, wine, and incense; the fire then became brilliant and rose higher as if nourished by the offering.

Before beginning his meal the Roman thanked the god of the hearth, gave him a part of the food, and poured out for him a little wine (this was the libation). Even the sceptical Horace supped with his slaves before the hearth and offered libation and prayer.

Every Roman family had in its house a sanctuary where were to be found the Lares, the souls of the ancestors, and the altar of the hearth. Rome also had its sacred hearth, called Vesta, an ancient word signifying the hearth itself. Four virgins of the noblest families, the Vestals, were charged with keeping the hearth, for it was necessary that the flame should never be extinguished, and the care of it could be confided only to pure beings. If a Vestal broke her vow, she was buried alive in a cave, for she had committed sacrilege and had endangered the whole Roman people.

THE FAMILY

=Religion of the Family.=--All the members of a family render worship to the same ancestors and unite about the same hearth. They have therefore the same gods, and these are their peculiar possession. The sanctuary where the Lares[115] were kept was concealed in the house and no stranger was to approach it. Thus the Roman family was a little church; it had its religion and its worship to which no others than its members had access. The ancient family was very different from the modern, having its basis in the principles of religion.

=Marriage.=--The first rule of this religion is that one should be the issue of a regular marriage if one is to have the right of adoring the ancestors of the family. Roman marriage, therefore, is at the start a religious ceremony. The father of the bride gives her away outside the house when a procession conducts her to the house of the groom chanting an ancient sacred refrain, "Hymen, O Hymen!" The bride is then led before the altar of the husband where water and fire are presented, and there in the presence of the gods of the family the bride and groom divide between them a cake of meal. Marriage at this period was called confarreatio (communion through the cake). Later another form of marriage was invented. A relative of the bride in the presence of witnesses sells her to the husband who declares that he buys her for his wife. This is marriage by sale (coemptio).

For the Romans as for the Greeks marriage is a religious duty; religion ordains that the family should not become extinct. The Roman, therefore, declares when he marries that he takes his wife to perpetuate the family through their children. A noble Roman who sincerely loved his wife repudiated her because she brought him no children.

=The Roman Woman.=--The Roman woman is never free. As a young girl, she belongs to her father who chooses her husband for her; married, she comes under the power of her husband--the jurisconsults say she is under his "manus," _i.e._, she is in the same position as his daughter. The woman always has a master who has the right of life and death over her. And yet, she is never treated like a slave. She is the equal in dignity of her husband; she is called the mother of the family (materfamilias) just as her husband is called the father of the family (paterfamilias). She is the mistress in the house, as he is the master. She gives orders to the slaves whom she charges with all the heavy tasks--the grinding of the grain, the making of bread, and the cooking. She sits in the seat of honor (the atrium), spins and weaves, apportions work to the slaves, watches the children, and directs the house. She is not excluded from association with the men, like the Greek woman; she eats at the table with her husband, receives visitors, goes into town to dinner, appears at the public ceremonies, at the theatre, and even at the courts. And still she is ordinarily uncultured; the Romans do not care to instruct their daughters; the quality which they most admire in woman is gravity, and on her tomb they write by way of eulogy, "She kept the house and spun linen."

=The Children.=--The Roman child belongs to the father like a piece of property. The father has the right of exposing him in the street. If he accepts the child, the latter is brought up at first in the house. Girls remain here until marriage; they spin and weave under the supervision of their mother. The boys walk to the fields with their father and exercise themselves in arms. The Romans are not an artistic people; they require no more of their children than that they know how to read, write, and reckon; neither music nor poetry is taught them. They are brought up to be sober, silent, modest in their demeanor, and obedient.

=The Father of the Family.=--The master of the house was called by the Romans the father of the family. The paterfamilias is at once the proprietor of the domain, the priest of the cult of the ancestors, and the sovereign of the family. He reigns as master in his house. He has the right of repudiating his wife, of rejecting his children, of selling them, and marrying them at his pleasure. He can take for himself all that belongs to them, everything that his wife brings to him, and everything that his children gain; for neither the wife nor the children may be proprietors. Finally he has over them all[116] the "right of life and death," that is to say, he is their only judge. If they commit crime, it is not the magistrate who punishes them, but the father of the family who condemns them. One day (186 B.C.) the Roman Senate decreed the penalty of death for all those who had participated in the orgies of the cult of Bacchus. The men were executed, but for all the women who were discovered among the guilty, it was necessary that the Senate should address itself to the fathers of families, and it was these who condemned to death their wives or their daughters. "The husband," said the elder Cato, "is the judge of the wife, he can do with her as he will; if she has committed any fault, he chastises her; if she has drunk wine, he condemns her; if she has been unfaithful to him, he kills her." When Catiline conspired against the Senate, a senator perceived that his own son had taken part in the conspiracy; he had him arrested, judged him, and condemned him to death.

The power of the father of the family endured as long as life; the son was never freed from it. Even if he became consul, he remained subject to the power of his father. When the father died, the sons became in turn fathers of families. As for the wife, she could never attain freedom; she fell under the power of the heir of her husband; she could, then, become subject to her own son.

FOOTNOTES:

[110] A legend represents King Numa debating with Jupiter the terms of a contract: "You will sacrifice a head to me?" says Jupiter. "Very well," says Numa, "the head of an onion that I shall take in my garden." "No," replies Jupiter, "but I want something that pertains to a man." "We will give you then the tip of the hair." "But it must be alive." "Then we will add to this a little fish." Jupiter laughed and consented to this.

[111] In Rome, as in Greece, the temple was called a house.

[112] The remark is Cicero's.

[113] Pliny, Epistles, vii, 27. See another story in Plautus's Mostellaria.

[114] The letters D.M. found on Roman tombs are the initials of Dei Manes.

[115] They were called the Penates, that is to say, the gods of the interior.

[116] In the language of the Roman law the wife, children, and slaves "are not their own masters."

CHAPTER XIX

THE ROMAN CITY

FORMATION OF THE ROMAN PEOPLE

=The Kings.=--Tradition relates that Rome for two centuries and a half was governed by kings. They told not only the names of these kings and the date of their death, but the life of each.

They said there were seven kings. Romulus, the first king, came from the Latin city of Alba, founded the hamlet on the Palatine, and killed his brother who committed the sacrilege of leaping over the sacred furrow encircling the settlement; he then allied himself with Tatius, a Sabine king. (A legend of later origin added that he had founded at the foot of the hill-city a quarter surrounded with a palisade where he received all the adventurers who wished to come to him.)

Numa Pompilius, the second king, was a Sabine. It was he who organized the Roman religion, taking counsel with a goddess, the nymph Egeria who dwelt in a wood.

The third king, Tullus Hostilius, was a warrior. He made war on Alba, the capital of the Latin confederation, took and destroyed it.

Ancus Martius, the fourth king, was the grandson of Numa and built the wooden bridge over the Tiber and founded the port of Ostia through which commerce passed up the river to Rome.

The last three kings were Etruscans. Tarquin the Elder enlarged the territory of Rome and introduced religious ceremonies from Etruria. Servius Tullius organized the Roman army, admitting all the citizens without distinction of birth and separating them into centuries (companies) according to wealth. The last king, Tarquinius Superbus, oppressed the great families of Rome; some of the nobles conspired against him and succeeded in expelling him. Since this time there were no longer any kings. The Roman state, or as they said, the commonwealth (res publica) was governed by the consuls, two magistrates elected each year.

It is impossible to know how much truth there is in this tradition, for it took shape a long time after the Romans began to write their history, and it includes so many legends that we cannot accept it in its entirety.

Attempt has been made to explain these names of kings as symbols of a race or class. The early history of Rome has been reconstructed in a variety of ways, but the greater the labor applied to it, the less the agreement among students with regard to it.

=The Roman People.=--About the fifth century before Christ there were in Rome two classes of people, the patricians and the plebeians. The patricians were the descendants of the old families who had lived from remote antiquity on the little territory in the vicinity of the city; they alone had the right to appear in the assembly of the people, to assist in religious ceremonies, and to hold office. Their ancestors had founded the Roman state, or as they called it, the Roman city (Civitas), and these had bequeathed it to them. And so they were the true people of Rome.

=The Plebs.=--The plebeians were descended from the foreigners[117] established in the city, and especially from the conquered peoples of the neighboring cities; for Rome had gradually subjected all the Latin cities and had forcibly annexed their inhabitants. Subjects and yet aliens, they obeyed the government of Rome, but they could have no part in it. They did not possess the Roman religion and could not participate in its ceremonies. They had not even the right of intermarrying with the patrician families. They were called the plebs (the multitude) and were not considered a part of the Roman people. In the old prayers we still find this formula: "For the welfare of the people and the plebs of Rome."

=Strife between Patricians and Plebeians.=--The people and the plebs were like two distinct peoples, one of masters, the other of subjects. And yet the plebeians were much like the patricians. Soldiers, like them, they served in the army at their own cost and suffered death in the service of the Roman people; peasants like them, they lived on their domains. Many of the plebeians were rich and of ancient family. The only difference was that they were descended from a great family of some conquered Latin city, while the patricians were the scions of an old family in the conquering city.

=Tribunes of the Plebs.=--One day, says the legend, the plebeians, finding themselves mistreated, withdrew under arms to a mountain, determined to break with the Roman people. The patricians in consternation sent to them Menenius Agrippa who told them the fable of the members and the stomach. The plebs consented to return but they made a treaty with the people. It was agreed that their chiefs (they called them tribunes of the plebs) should have the right of protecting the plebeians against the magistrates of the people and of prohibiting any measure against them. All that was necessary was to pronounce the word "Veto" (I forbid); this single word stopped everything; for religion prevented attacks on a tribune under penalty of being devoted to the infernal gods.

=Triumph of the Plebs.=--The strife between the two orders beginning at the end of the fifth century continued for two centuries (494 B.C. to about 300 B.C.).[118]

The plebeians, much more numerous and wealthy, ended by gaining the victory. They first secured the adoption of laws common to the two orders; afterward that marriage should be permitted between the patricians and the plebeians. The hardest task was to obtain the high magistracies, or, as it was said, "secure the honors." Religious scruple ordained, indeed, that before one could be named as a magistrate, the gods must be asked for their approval of the choice. This was determined by inspecting the flight of birds ("taking the auspices"). But the old Roman religion allowed the auspices to be taken only on the name of a patrician; it was not believed that the gods could accept a plebeian magistrate. But there were great plebeian families who were bent on being the equals of the patrician families in dignity, as they were in riches and in importance. They gradually forced the patricians to open to them all the offices, beginning with the consulship, and ending with the great pontifical office (Pontifex Maximus). The first plebeian consul was named in 366 B.C., the first plebeian pontifex maximus in 302 B.C.[119] Patricians and plebeians then coalesced and henceforth formed but one people.

THE ROMAN PEOPLE

=The Right of Citizenship.=--The _people_ in Rome, as in Greece, is not the whole of the inhabitants, but the body of citizens. Not every man who lives in the territory is a citizen, but only he who has the right of citizenship. The citizen has numerous privileges:

1. He alone is a member of the body politic; he alone has the right of voting in the assemblies of the Roman people, of serving in the army, of being present at the religious ceremonials at Rome, of being elected a Roman magistrate. These are what were called public rights.

2. The citizen alone is protected by the Roman law; he only has the right of marrying legally, of becoming the father of a family, that is to say, of being master of his wife and his children, of making his will, of buying or selling. These were the private rights.

Those who were not citizens were not only excluded from the army and the assembly, but they could not marry, could not possess the absolute power of the father, could not hold property legally, could not invoke the Roman law, nor demand justice at a Roman tribunal. Thus the citizens constituted an aristocracy amidst the other inhabitants of the city. But they were not equal among themselves; there were class differences, or, as the Romans said, ranks.

=The Nobles.=--In the first rank are the nobles. A citizen is noble when one of his ancestors has held a magistracy, for the magisterial office in Rome is an honor, it ennobles the occupant and also his posterity.

When a citizen becomes aedile, praetor, or consul, he receives a purple-bordered toga, a sort of throne (the curule chair), and the right of having an image made of himself. These images are statuettes, at first in wax, later in silver. They are placed in the atrium, the sanctuary of the house, near the hearth and the gods of the family; there they stand in niches like idols, venerated by posterity. When any one of the family dies, the images are brought forth and carried in the funeral procession, and a relative pronounces the oration for the dead. It is these images that ennoble a family that preserves them. The more images there are in a family, the nobler it is. The Romans spoke of those who were "noble by one image" and those who were "noble by many images."

The noble families of Rome were very few (they would not amount to 300), for the magistracies which conferred nobility were usually given to men who were already noble.

=The Knights.=--Below the nobles were the knights. They were the rich who were not noble. Their fortune as inscribed on the registers of the treasury must amount to at least 400,000[120] sesterces. They were merchants, bankers, and contractors; they did not govern, but they grew rich. At the theatre they had places reserved for them behind the nobles.

If a knight were elected to a magistracy, the nobles called him a "new man" and his son became noble.

=The Plebs.=--Those who were neither nobles nor knights formed the mass of the people, the plebs. The majority of them were peasants, cultivating a little plat in Latium or in the Sabine country. They were the descendants of the Latins or the Italians who were subjugated by the Romans. Cato the Elder in his book on Agriculture gives us an idea of their manners: "Our ancestors, when they wished to eulogize a man, said 'a good workman,' 'a good farmer'; this encomium seemed the greatest of all."[121]

Hardened to work, eager for the harvest, steady and economical, these laborers constituted the strength of the Roman armies. For a long time they formed the assembly too, and dictated the elections. The nobles who wished to be elected magistrates came to the parade-ground to grasp the hand of these peasants ("prensare manus," was the common expression). A candidate, finding the hand of a laborer callous, ventured to ask him, "Is it because you walk on your hands?" He was a noble of great family, but he was not elected.

=The Freedmen.=--The last of all the citizens are the freedmen, once slaves, or the sons of slaves. The taint of their origin remains on them; they are not admitted to service in the Roman army and they vote after all the rest.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC

=The Comitia.=--The government of Rome called itself a republic (Respublica), that is to say, a thing of the people. The body of citizens called the people was regarded as absolute master in the state. It is this body that elects the magistrates, votes on peace and war, and that makes the laws. "The law," say the jurisconsults, "is what the Roman people ordains." At Rome, as in Greece, the people do not appoint deputies, they pass on the business itself. Even after more than 500,000 men scattered over all Italy were admitted into the citizenship, the citizens had to go in person to Rome to exercise their rights. The people, therefore, meet at but one place; the assembly is called the Comitia.

A magistrate convokes the people and presides over the body. Sometimes the people are convoked by the blast of the trumpet and come to the parade-ground (the Campus Martius), ranging themselves by companies under their standards. This is the Comitia by centuries. Sometimes they assemble in the market-place (the forum) and separate themselves into thirty-five groups, called tribes. Each tribe in turn enters an enclosed space where it does its voting. This is the Comitia by tribes. The magistrate who convokes the assembly indicates the business on which the suffrages are to be taken, and when the assembly has voted, it dissolves. The people are sovereign, but accustomed to obey their chiefs.

=The Magistrates.=--Every year the people elect officials to govern them and to them they delegate absolute power. These are called magistrates (those who are masters). Lictors march before them bearing a bundle of rods and an axe, emblems of the magisterial powers of chastising and condemning to death. The magistrate has at once the functions of presiding over the popular assembly and the senate, of sitting in court, and of commanding the army; he is master everywhere. He convokes and dissolves the assembly at will, he alone renders judgment, he does with the soldiers as he pleases, putting them to death without even taking counsel with his officers. In a war against the Latins Manlius, the Roman general, had forbidden the soldiers leaving camp: his son, provoked by one of the enemy, went forth and killed him; Manlius had him arrested and executed him immediately.

According to the Roman expression, the magistrate has the power of a king; but this power is brief and divided. The magistrate is elected for but one year and he has a colleague who has the same power as himself. There are at once in Rome two consuls who govern the people and command the armies, and several praetors to serve as subordinate governors or commanders and to pronounce judgment. There are other magistrates, besides--two censors, four aediles to supervise the public ways and the markets, ten tribunes of the plebs, and quaestors to care for the state treasure.

=The Censors.=--The highest of all the magistrates are the censors. They are charged with taking the census every five years, that is to say, the enumeration of the Roman people. All the citizens appear before them to declare under oath their name, the number of their children and their slaves, the amount of their fortune; all this is inscribed on the registers. It is their duty, too, to draw up the list of the senators, of the knights, and of the citizens, assigning to each his proper rank in the city. They are charged as a result with making the lustrum, a great ceremony of purification which occurs every five years.[122]

On that day all the citizens are assembled on the Campus Martius arranged in order of battle; thrice there are led around the assembly three expiatory victims, a bull, a ram, and a swine; these are killed and their blood sprinkled on the people; the city is purified and reconciled with the gods.

The censors are the masters of the registration and they rank each as they please; they may degrade a senator by striking him from the senate-list, a knight by not registering him among the knights, and a citizen by not placing his name on the registers of the tribes. It is for them an easy means of punishing those whom they regard at fault and of reaching those whom the law does not condemn. They have been known to degrade citizens for poor tillage of the soil and for having too costly an equipage, a senator because he possessed ten pounds of silver, another for having repudiated his wife. It is this overweening power that the Romans call the supervision of morals. It makes the censors the masters of the city.

=The Senate.=--The Senate is composed of about 300 persons appointed by the censor. But the censor does not appoint at random; he chooses only rich citizens respected and of high family, the majority of them former magistrates. Almost always he appoints those who are already members of the Senate, so that ordinarily one remains a senator for life. The Senate is an assembly of the principal men of Rome, hence its authority. As soon as business is presented, one of the magistrates convokes the senators in a temple, lays the question before them, and then asks "what they think concerning this matter." The senators reply one by one, following the order of dignity. This is what they call "consulting the Senate," and the judgment of the majority is a senatus consultum (decree of the Senate). This conclusion is only advisory as the Senate has no power to make laws; but Rome obeys this advice as if it were a law. The people have confidence in the senators, knowing that they have more experience than themselves; the magistrates do not dare to resist an assembly composed of nobles who are their peers. And so the Senate regulates all public business: it declares war and determines the number of the armies; it receives ambassadors and makes peace; it fixes the revenues and the expenses. The people ratify these measures and the magistrates execute them. In 200 B.C. the Senate decided on war with the king of Macedon, but the people in terror refused to approve it: the Senate then ordered a magistrate to convoke the comitia anew and to adopt a more persuasive speech. This time the people voted for the war. In Rome it was the people who reigned, just as is the case with the king in England, but it was the Senate that governed.

=The Offices.=--Being magistrate or senator in Rome is not a profession. Magistrates or senators spend their time and their money without receiving any salary. A magistracy in Rome is before all an honor. Entrance to it is to nobles, at most to knights, but always to the rich; but these come to the highest magistracies only after they have occupied all the others. The man who aims one day to govern Rome must serve in the army during ten campaigns. Then he may be elected quaestor and he receives the administration of the state treasury. After this he becomes aedile, charged with the policing of the city and with the provision of the corn supply. Later he is elected praetor and gives judgment in the courts. Later yet, elected consul, he commands an army and presides over the assemblies. Then only may he aspire to the censorship. This is the highest round of the ladder and may be reached hardly before one's fiftieth year. The same man has therefore, been financier, administrator, judge, general, and governor before arriving at this original function of censor, the political distribution of the Roman people. This series of offices is what is called the "order of the honors." Each of these functions lasts but one year, and to rise to the one next higher a new election is necessary. In the year which precedes the voting one must show one's self continually in the streets, "circulate" as the Romans say (_ambire_: hence the word "ambition"), to solicit the suffrages of the people. For all this time it is the custom to wear a white toga, the very sense of the word "candidate" (white garment).

FOOTNOTES:

[117] Probably some of the plebeians originated in non-noble Roman families.--ED.

[118] We know the story of this contest only through Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus; their very dramatic account has become celebrated, but it is only a legend frequently altered by falsifiers.

[119] The pontificate was opened to the plebeians by the Ogulnian Law of 300 B.C. The first plebeian pontifex maximus was in 254 B.C. Livy, Epitome, xviii.--ED.

[120] This qualification was set in the last century of the republic.--ED.

[121] He cites several of their old proverbs: "A bad farmer is one who buys what his land can raise." "It is bad economy to do in the day what can be done at night."

[122] After the completion of the census.--ED.

CHAPTER XX

ROMAN CONQUEST

THE ROMAN ARMY

=Military Service.=--To be admitted to service in the Roman army one must be a Roman citizen. It is necessary to have enough wealth to equip one's self at one's own expense, for the state furnishes no arms to its soldiers; down to 402 B.C. it did not even pay them. And so only those citizens are enrolled who are provided with at least a small fortune. The poor (called the proletariat) are exempt from service, or rather, they have no right to serve. Every citizen who is rich enough to be admitted to the army owes the state twenty campaigns; until these are completed the man remains at the disposition of the consul and this from the age of seventeen to forty-six. In Rome, as in the Greek cities, every man is at once citizen and soldier. The Romans are a people of small proprietors disciplined in war.

=The Levy.=--When there was need of soldiers, the consul ordered all the citizens qualified for service to assemble at the Capitol. There the officers elected by the people chose as many men as were necessary to form the army. This was the enrolment (the Romans called it the Choice); then came the military oath. The officers first took the oath, and then the rank and file; they swore to obey their general, to follow him wherever he led them and to remain under the standards until he released them from their oath. One man pronounced the formula and each in turn advanced and said, "I also." From this time the army was bound to the general by the bonds of religion.

=Legions and Allies.=--The Roman army was at first called the Legion (levy). When the people increased in number, instead of one legion, several were formed.

The legion was a body of 4,200 to 5,000 men, all Roman citizens. The smallest army had always at least one legion, every army commanded by a consul had at least two. But the legions constituted hardly a half of the Roman army. All the subject peoples in

Italy were required to send troops, and these soldiers, who were called allies, were placed under the orders of Roman officers. In a Roman army the allies were always a little more numerous than the citizens of the legions. Ordinarily with four legions (16,800 men) there were enrolled 20,000 archers and 40,000 horse from the allies. In the Second Punic War, in 218 B.C., 26,000 citizens and 45,000 allies were drawn for service. Thus the Roman people, in making war, made use of its subjects as well as of its citizens.

=Military Exercises.=--Rome had no gymnasium; the future soldiers exercised themselves on the parade-ground, the Campus Martius, on the other side of the Tiber. There the young man marched, ran, leaped under the weight of his arms, fenced with his sword, hurled the javelin, wielded the mattock, and then, covered with dust and with perspiration, swam across the Tiber. Often the older men, sometimes even the generals, mingled with the young men, for the Roman never ceased to exercise. Even in the campaign the rule was not to allow the men to be unoccupied; once a day, at least, they were required to take exercise, and when there was neither enemy to fight nor intrenchment to erect, they were employed in building roads, bridges, and aqueducts.

=The Camp.=--The Roman soldier carried a heavy burden--his arms, his utensils, rations for seventeen days, and a stake, in all sixty Roman pounds. The army moved more rapidly as it was not encumbered with baggage. Every time that a Roman army halted for camp, a surveyor traced a square enclosure, and along its lines the soldiers dug a deep ditch; the earth which was excavated, thrown inside, formed a bank which they fortified with stakes. The camp was thus defended by a ditch and a palisade. In this improvised fortress the soldiers erected their tents, and in the middle was set the Praetorium, the tent of the general. Sentinels mounted guard throughout the night, and so prevented the army from being surprised.

=The Order of Battle.=--In the presence of the enemy the soldiers did not form in a solid mass, as did the Greeks. The legion was divided into small bodies of 120 men, called maniples because they had for standards bundles of hay.[123] The maniples were ranged in quincunx form in three lines, each separated from the neighboring maniple in such a way as to manoeuvre separately. The soldiers of the maniples of the first line hurled their javelins, grasped their swords, and began the battle. If they were repulsed, they withdrew to the rear through the vacant spaces. The second line of the maniples then in turn marched to the combat. If it was repulsed, it fell back on the third line. The third line was composed of the best men of the legion and was equipped with lances. They received the others into their ranks and threw themselves on the enemy. The army was no longer a single mass incapable of manoeuvring; the general could form his lines according to the nature of the ground. At Cynoscephalae, where for the first time the two most renowned armies of antiquity met, the Roman legion and the Macedonian phalanx, the ground was bristling with hills; on this rugged ground the 16,000 Macedonion hoplites could not remain in order, their ranks were opened, and the Roman platoons threw themselves into the gaps and demolished the phalanx.

=Discipline.=--The Roman army obeyed a rude discipline. The general had the right of life and death over all his men. The soldier who quitted his post or deserted in battle was condemned to death; the lictors bound him to a post, beat him with rods, and cut off his head; or the soldiers may have killed him with blows of their staves. When an entire body of troops mutinied, the general separated the guilty into groups of ten and drew by lot one from every group to be executed. This was called decimation (from decimus, the tenth). The others were placed on a diet of barley-bread and made to camp outside the lines, always in danger of surprise from the enemy. The Romans never admitted that their soldiers were conquered or taken prisoners: after the battle of Cannae the 3,000 soldiers who escaped the carnage were sent by the senate to serve in Sicily without pay and without honors until the enemy should be expelled from Italy; the 8,000 left in the camp were taken by Hannibal who offered to return them for a small ransom, but the senate refused to purchase them.

=Colonies and Military Roads.=--In the countries that were still only partially subject, Rome established a small garrison. This body of soldiers founded a town which served as a fortress, and around about it the lands were cut into small domains and distributed to the soldiers. This is what they called a Colony. The colonists continued to be Roman citizens and obeyed all commands from Rome. Quite different from a Greek colony which emancipated itself even to the point of making war on its mother city, the Roman colony remained a docile daughter. It was only a Roman garrison posted in the midst of the enemy. Almost all these military posts were in Italy, but there were others besides; Narbonne and Lyons were once Roman colonies.

To hold these places and to send their armies to a distance the Romans built military roads. These were causeways constructed in a straight line, of limestone, stone, and sand. The Romans covered their empire with them. In a land like France there is no part where one does not find traces of the Roman roads.

CHARACTER OF THE CONQUEST

=War.=--There was at Rome a temple consecrated to the god Janus whose gates remained open while the Roman people continued at war. For the five hundred years of the republic this temple was closed but once and that for only a few years. Rome, then, lived in a state of war. As it had the strongest army of the time, it finished by conquering all the other peoples and by overcoming the ancient world.

=Conquest of Italy.=--Rome began by subjecting her neighbors, the Latins, first, then the little peoples of the south, the Volscians, the AEquians, the Hernicans, later the Etruscans and the Samnites, and finally the Greek cities. This was the hardest and slowest of their conquests: beginning with the time of the kings, it did not terminate until 266, after four centuries of strife.[124]

The Romans had to fight against peoples of the same race as themselves, as vigorous and as brave as they. Some who were not content to obey they exterminated. The rich plains of the Volscians became a swampy wilderness, uninhabitable even to the present time, the gloomy region of the Pontine marshes.

In the land of the Samnites there were still recognizable, three hundred years after the war, the forty-five camps of Decius and the eighty-six of Fabius, less apparent by the traces of their intrenchments than by the solitude of the neighborhood.

=The Punic Wars.=--Come into Sicily, Rome antagonized Carthage. Then began the Punic wars (that is to say, against the Phoenicians). There were three of these wars. The first, from 264 to 241, was determined by naval battles; Rome became mistress of Sicily. It was related that Rome had never had any war-ships, that she took as a model a Carthaginian galley cast ashore by accident on her coast and began by exercising her oarsmen in rowing on the land. This legend is without foundation for the Roman navy had long endured. This is the Roman account of this war: the Roman consul Duillius had vanquished the Carthaginian fleet at Mylae (260); a Roman army had disembarked in Africa under the lead of Regulus, had been attacked and destroyed (255); Regulus was sent as a prisoner to Rome to conclude a peace, but persuading the Senate to reject it, he returned to Carthage where he perished by torture. The war was concentrated in Sicily where the Carthaginian fleet, at first victorious at Drepana, was defeated at the AEgates Islands; Hamilcar, besieged on Mount Eryx, signed the peace.

The second war (from 218 to 201) was the work of Hannibal.

The third war was a war of extermination: the Romans took Carthage by assault, razed it, and conquered Africa.

These wars had long made Rome tremble. Carthage had the better navy, but its warriors were armed adventurers fighting not for country but for pay, lawless, terrible under a general like Hannibal.

=Hannibal.=--Hannibal, who directed the whole of the second war and almost captured Rome, was of the powerful family of the Barcas. His father Hamilcar had commanded a Carthaginian army in the first Punic war and had afterwards been charged with the conquest of Spain. Hannibal was then but a child, but his father took him with him. The departure of an army was always accompanied by sacrifices to the gods of the country; it was said that Hamilcar after the sacrifice made his infant son swear eternal enmity to Rome.

Hannibal, brought up in the company of the soldiers, became the best horseman and the best archer of the army. War was his only aim in life; his only needs, therefore, were a horse and arms. He had made himself so popular that at the death of Hasdrubal who was in the command of the army, the soldiers elected him general without waiting for orders from the Carthaginian senate. Thus Hannibal found himself at the age of twenty-one at the head of an army which was obedient only to himself. He began war, regardless of the senate at Carthage, by advancing to the siege of Saguntum, a Greek colony allied with Rome; he took this and destroyed it.

The glory of Hannibal was that he did not wait for the Romans, but had the audacity to march into Italy to attack them. As he had no fleet, he resolved to advance by land, through the Pyrenees, crossing the Rhone and the Alps. He made sure of the alliance of the Gallic peoples and penetrated the Pyrenees with an army of 60,000 men, African and Spanish mercenaries, and with 37 war-elephants. A Gallic people wished to stop him at the Rhone, but he sent a detachment to pass the river some leagues farther up the stream and to attack the Gauls in the rear; the mass of the army crossed the river in boats, the elephants on great rafts.

He next ascended the valley of the Isere and arrived at the Alps at the end of October; he crossed them regardless of the snow and the attacks of the mountaineers; many men and horses rolled down the precipices. But nine days were consumed in attaining the summits of the Alps. The descent was very difficult; the pass by which he had to go was covered with ice and he was compelled to cut a road out of the rock. When he arrived in the plain, the army was reduced to half its former number.

Hannibal met three Roman armies in succession, first at the Ticinus, next on the banks of the Trebia, and last near Lake Trasimenus in Etruria. He routed all of them. As he advanced, his army increased in number; the warriors of Cisalpine Gaul (northern Italy) joined him against the Romans. He took up position beyond Rome in Apulia, and it was here that the Roman army came to attack him. Hannibal had an army only half as large as theirs, but he had African cavalrymen mounted on swift horses; he formed his lines in the plain of Cannae so that the Romans had the sun in their face and the dust driven by the wind against them; the Roman army was surrounded and almost annihilated (216). It was thought that Hannibal would march on Rome, but he did not consider himself strong enough to do it. The Carthaginian senate sent him no reenforcements. Hannibal endeavored to take Naples and to have Rome attacked by the king of Macedon; he succeeded only in gaining some towns which Rome besieged and destroyed. Hannibal remained nine years in south Italy; at last his brother Hasdrubal started with the army of Spain to assist him, and made his way almost to central Italy. The two Carthaginian armies marched to unite their forces, each opposed by a Roman army under the command of a consul. Nero, facing Hannibal, had the audacity to traverse central Italy and to unite with his colleague who was intrenched against Hasdrubal. One morning Hasdrubal heard the trumpets sounding twice in the camp of the Romans, a sign that there were two consuls in the camp. He believed his brother was conquered and so retreated; the Romans pursued him, he was killed and his entire army massacred. Then Nero rejoined the army which he had left before Hannibal and threw the head of Hasdrubal into the Carthaginian camp (207). Hannibal, reduced to his own troops, remained in Calabria for five years longer. The descent of a Roman army on Africa compelled him to leave Italy; he massacred the Italian soldiers who refused to accompany him and embarked for Carthage (203). The battle of Zama (202) terminated the war. Hannibal had counted as usual on drawing the Romans within his lines and surrounding them; but Scipio, the Roman general, kept his troops in order and on a second attack threw the enemy's army into rout. Carthage was obliged to treat for peace; she relinquished everything she possessed outside of Africa, ceding Spain to the Romans. She bound herself further to surrender her navy and the elephants, to pay over $10,000,000 and to agree not to make war without the permission of Rome.

Hannibal reorganized Carthage for a new war. The Romans, disturbed at this, demanded that the Carthaginians put him to death. Hannibal fled to Antiochus, king of Syria, and proposed to him to incite a revolt in Italy against Rome; but Antiochus, following the counsel of his courtiers, distrusted Hannibal and invaded Greece, where his army was captured. Hannibal withdrew to the king of Bithynia. The Romans sent Flamininus thither to take him, but Hannibal, seeing his house surrounded, took the poison which he always had by him (183).

=Conquests of the Orient.=--The Greek kings, successors of the generals of Alexander, divided the Orient among themselves. The most powerful of these took u

[... TRUNCATED at 800,000 chars for file-size management — full text in original source ...]

==========

The Joyful Wisdom ("La Gaya Scienza")

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche

Project Gutenberg Release: May 22, 2016 · eBook #52124

THE JOYFUL WISDOM

("LA GAYA SCIENZA")

BY

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE

TRANSLATED BY

THOMAS COMMON

WITH POETRY RENDERED BY

PAUL V. COHN

AND

MAUDE D. PETRE

I stay to mine own house confined, _Nor graft my wits on alien stock_ _And mock at every master mind_ _That never at itself could mock._

The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche

The First Complete and Authorised English Translation

Edited by Dr Oscar Levy

Volume Ten

T.N. FOULIS

13 & 15 FREDERICK STREET

EDINBURGH: AND LONDON

1910

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL NOTE PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION JEST, RUSE, AND REVENGE: A PRELUDE IN RHYME BOOK FIRST BOOK SECOND BOOK THIRD BOOK FOURTH: SANCTUS JANUARIUS BOOK FIFTH: WE FEARLESS ONES APPENDIX: SONGS OF PRINCE FREE-AS-A-BIRD

EDITORIAL NOTE

"The Joyful Wisdom," written in 1882, just before "Zarathustra," is rightly judged to be one of Nietzsche's best books. Here the essentially grave and masculine face of the poet-philosopher is seen to light up and suddenly break into a delightful smile. The warmth and kindness that beam from his features will astonish those hasty psychologists who have never divined that behind the destroyer is the creator, and behind the blasphemer the lover of life. In the retrospective valuation of his work which appears in "Ecce Homo" the author himself observes with truth that the fourth book, "Sanctus Januarius," deserves especial attention: "The

whole book is a gift from the Saint, and the introductory verses express my gratitude for the most wonderful month of January that I have ever spent." Book fifth "We Fearless Ones," the Appendix "Songs of Prince Free-as-a-Bird," and the Preface, were added to the second edition in 1887.

The translation of Nietzsche's poetry has proved to be a more embarrassing problem than that of his prose. Not only has there been a difficulty in finding adequate translators--a difficulty overcome, it is hoped, by the choice of Miss Petre and Mr Cohn,--but it cannot be denied that even in the original the poems are of unequal merit. By the side of such masterpieces as "To the Mistral" are several verses of comparatively little value. The Editor, however, did not feel justified in making a selection, as it was intended that the edition should be complete. The heading, "Jest, Ruse and Revenge," of the "Prelude in Rhyme" is borrowed from Goethe.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

1.

Perhaps more than one preface would be necessary for this book; and after all it might still be doubtful whether any one could be brought nearer to the _experiences_ in it by means of prefaces, without having himself experienced something similar. It seems to be written in the language of the thawing-wind: there is wantonness, restlessness, contradiction and April-weather in it; so that one is as constantly reminded of the proximity of winter as of the _victory_ over it: the victory which is coming, which must come, which has perhaps already come.... Gratitude continually flows forth, as if the most unexpected thing had happened, the gratitude of a convalescent--for _convalescence_ was this most unexpected thing. "Joyful Wisdom": that implies the Saturnalia of a spirit which has patiently withstood a long, frightful pressure--patiently, strenuously, impassionately, without submitting, but without hope--and which is now suddenly o'erpowered with hope, the hope of health, the _intoxication_ of convalescence. What wonder that much that is unreasonable and foolish thereby comes to light: much wanton tenderness expended even on problems which have a prickly hide, and are not therefore fit to be fondled and allured. The whole book is really nothing but a revel after long privation and impotence: the frolicking of returning energy, of newly awakened belief in a to-morrow and after-to-morrow; of sudden sentience and prescience of a future, of near adventures, of seas open once more, and aims once more permitted and believed in. And what was now all behind me! This track of desert, exhaustion, unbelief, and frigidity in the midst of youth, this advent of grey hairs at the wrong time, this tyranny of pain, surpassed, however, by the tyranny of pride which repudiated the _consequences_ of pain--and consequences are comforts,--this radical isolation, as defence against the contempt of mankind become morbidly clairvoyant, this restriction upon principle to all that is bitter, sharp, and painful in knowledge, as prescribed by the _disgust_ which had gradually resulted from imprudent spiritual diet and pampering--it is called Romanticism,--oh, who could realise all those feelings of mine! He, however, who could do so would certainly forgive me everything, and more than a little folly, boisterousness and "Joyful Wisdom"--for example, the handful of songs which are given along with the book on this occasion,--songs in which a poet makes merry over all poets in a way not easily pardoned.--Alas, it is not only on the poets and their fine "lyrical sentiments" that this reconvalescent must vent his malignity: who knows what kind of victim he seeks, what kind of monster of material for parody will allure him ere long? _Incipit tragœdia,_ it is said at the conclusion of this seriously frivolous book; let people be on their guard! Something or other extraordinarily bad and wicked announces itself: _incipit parodia,_ there is no doubt....

2.

--But let us leave Herr Nietzsche; what does it matter to people that Herr Nietzsche has got well again?... A psychologist knows few questions so attractive as those concerning the relations of health to philosophy, and in the case when he himself falls sick, he carries with him all his scientific curiosity into his sickness. For, granting that one is a person, one has necessarily also the philosophy of one's personality; there is, however, an important distinction here. With the one it is his defects which philosophise, with the other it is his riches and powers. The former _requires_ his philosophy, whether it be as support, sedative, or medicine, as salvation, elevation, or self-alienation; with the latter it is merely a fine luxury, at best the voluptuousness of a triumphant gratitude, which must inscribe itself ultimately in cosmic capitals on the heaven of ideas. In the other more usual case, however, when states of distress occupy themselves with philosophy (as is the case with all sickly thinkers--and perhaps the sickly thinkers preponderate in the history of philosophy), what will happen to the thought itself which is brought under the _pressure_ of sickness? This is the important question for psychologists: and here experiment is possible. We philosophers do just like a traveller who resolves to awake at a given hour, and then quietly yields himself to sleep: we surrender ourselves temporarily, body and soul, to the sickness, supposing we become ill--we shut, as it were, our eyes on ourselves. And as the traveller knows that something _does not_ sleep,

that something counts the hours and will awake him, we also know that the critical moment will find us awake--that then something will spring forward and surprise the spirit _in the very act,_ I mean in weakness, or reversion, or submission, or obduracy, or obscurity, or whatever the morbid conditions are called, which in times of good health have the _pride_ of the spirit opposed to them (for it is as in the old rhyme: "The spirit proud, peacock and horse are the three proudest things of earthly source"). After such self-questioning and self-testing, one learns to look with a sharper eye at all that has hitherto been philosophised; one divines better than before the arbitrary by-ways, side-streets, resting-places, and _sunny_ places of thought, to which suffering thinkers, precisely as sufferers, are led and misled: one knows now in what direction the sickly _body_ and its requirements unconsciously press, push, and allure the spirit--towards the sun, stillness, gentleness, patience, medicine, refreshment in any sense whatever. Every philosophy which puts peace higher than war, every ethic with a negative grasp of the idea of happiness, every metaphysic and physic that knows a _finale,_ an ultimate condition of any kind whatever, every predominating, æsthetic or religious longing for an aside, a beyond, an outside, an above--all these permit one to ask whether sickness has not been the motive which inspired the philosopher. The unconscious disguising of physiological requirements under the cloak of the objective, the ideal, the purely spiritual, is carried on to an alarming extent,--and I have often enough asked myself, whether on the whole philosophy hitherto has not generally been merely, an interpretation of the body, and a _misunderstanding of the body._ Behind the loftiest estimates of value by which the history of thought has hitherto been governed, misunderstandings of the bodily constitution, either of individuals, classes, or entire races are concealed. One may always primarily consider these audacious freaks of metaphysic, and especially its answers to the question of the _worth_ of existence, as symptoms of certain bodily constitutions; and if, on the whole, when scientifically determined, not a particle of significance attaches to such affirmations and denials of the world, they nevertheless furnish the historian and psychologist with hints so much the more valuable (as we have said) as symptoms of the bodily constitution, its good or bad condition, its fullness, powerfulness, and sovereignty in history; or else of its obstructions, exhaustions, and impoverishments, its premonition of the end, its will to the end. I still expect that a philosophical _physician,_ in the exceptional sense of the word--one who applies himself to the problem of the collective health of peoples, periods, races, and mankind generally--will some day have the courage to follow out my suspicion to its ultimate conclusions, and to venture on the judgment that in all philosophising it has not hitherto been a question of "truth" at all, but of something else,--namely, of health, futurity, growth, power, life....

3.

It will be surmised that I should not like to take leave ungratefully of that period of severe sickness, the advantage of which is not even yet exhausted in me: for I am sufficiently conscious of what I have in advance of the spiritually robust generally, in my changeful state of health. A philosopher who has made the tour of many states of health, and always makes it anew, has also gone through just as many philosophies: he really _cannot_ do otherwise than transform his condition on every occasion into the most ingenious posture and position,--this art of transfiguration _is_ just philosophy. We philosophers are not at liberty to separate soul and body, as the people separate them; and we are still less at liberty to separate soul and spirit. We are not thinking frogs, we are not objectifying and registering apparatuses with cold entrails,--our thoughts must be continually born to us out of our pain, and we must, motherlike, share with them all that we have in us of blood, heart, ardour, joy, passion, pang, conscience, fate and fatality. Life--that means for us to transform constantly into light and flame all that we are, and also all that we meet with; we _cannot_ possibly do otherwise. And as regards sickness, should we not be almost tempted to ask whether we could in general dispense with it? It is great pain only which is the ultimate emancipator of the spirit; for it is the teacher of the _strong suspicion_ which makes an X out of every U[1], a true, correct X, _i.e.,_ the ante-penultimate letter.... It is great pain only, the long slow pain which takes time, by which we are burned as it were with green wood, that compels us philosophers to descend into our ultimate depths, and divest ourselves of all trust, all good-nature, veiling, gentleness, and averageness, wherein we have perhaps formerly installed our humanity. I doubt whether such pain "improves" us; but I know that it _deepens_ us. Be it that we learn to confront it with our pride, our scorn, our strength of will, doing like the Indian who, however sorely tortured, revenges himself on his tormentor with his bitter tongue; be it that we withdraw from the pain into the oriental nothingness--it is called Nirvana,--into mute, benumbed, deaf self-surrender, self-forgetfulness, and self-effacement: one emerges from such long, dangerous exercises in self-mastery as another being, with several additional notes of interrogation, and above all, with the _will_ to question more than ever, more profoundly, more strictly, more sternly, more wickedly, more quietly than has ever been questioned hitherto. Confidence in life is gone: life itself has become a _problem._--Let it not be imagined that one has necessarily become a hypochondriac thereby! Even love of life is still possible--only one loves differently. It is the love of a woman of whom one is doubtful.... The charm, however, of all that is problematic, the delight in the X, is too great in those more spiritual and more spiritualised men, not to spread itself again and

again like a clear glow over all the trouble of the problematic, over all the danger of uncertainty, and even over the jealousy of the lover. We know a new happiness....

4.

Finally (that the most essential may not remain unsaid), one comes back out of such abysses, out of such severe sickness, and out of the sickness of strong suspicion--_new-born,_ with the skin cast; more sensitive, more wicked, with a finer taste for joy, with a more delicate tongue for all good things, with a merrier disposition, with a second and more dangerous innocence in joy; more childish at the same time, and a hundred times more refined than ever before. Oh, how repugnant to us now is pleasure, coarse, dull, drab pleasure, as the pleasure-seekers, our "cultured" classes, our rich and ruling classes, usually understand it! How malignantly we now listen to the great holiday-hubbub with which "cultured people" and city-men at present allow themselves to be forced to "spiritual enjoyment" by art, books, and music, with the help of spirituous liquors! How the theatrical cry of passion now pains our ear, how strange to our taste has all the romantic riot and sensuous bustle which the cultured populace love become (together with their aspirations after the exalted, the elevated, and the intricate)! No, if we convalescents need an art at all, it is _another_ art--a mocking, light, volatile, divinely serene, divinely ingenious art, which blazes up like a clear flame, into a cloudless heaven! Above all, an art for artists, only for artists! We at last know better what is first of all necessary _for it--_namely, cheerfulness, _every_ kind of cheerfulness, my friends! also as artists:--I should like to prove it. We now know something too well, we men of knowledge: oh, how well we are now learning to forget and _not_ know, as artists! And as to our future, we are not likely to be found again in the tracks of those Egyptian youths who at night make the temples unsafe, embrace statues, and would fain unveil, uncover, and put in clear light, everything which for good reasons is kept concealed[2]. No, we have got disgusted with this bad taste, this will to truth, to "truth at all costs," this youthful madness in the love of truth: we are now too experienced, too serious, too joyful, too singed, too profound for that.... We no longer believe that truth remains truth when the veil is withdrawn from it: we have lived long enough to believe this. At present we regard it as a matter of propriety not to be anxious either to see everything naked, or to be present at everything, or to understand and "know" everything. "Is it true that the good God is everywhere present?" asked a little girl of her mother: "I think that is indecent":--a hint to philosophers! One should have more reverence for the _shame-facedness_ with which nature has concealed herself behind enigmas and motley uncertainties. Perhaps truth is a woman who has reasons for not showing her reasons? Perhaps her name is Baubo, to speak in Greek?... Oh, those Greeks! They knew how _to live:_ for that purpose it is necessary to keep bravely to the surface, the fold and the skin; to worship appearance, to believe in forms, tones, and words, in the whole Olympus of appearance! Those Greeks were superficial--_from profundity!_ And are we not coming back precisely to this point, we dare-devils of the spirit, who have scaled the highest and most dangerous peak of contemporary thought, and have looked around us from it, have _looked down_ from it? Are we not precisely in this respect--Greeks? Worshippers of forms, of tones, and of words? And precisely on that account--artists?

RUTA, near GENOA _Autumn,_ 1886.

[1] This means literally to put the numeral X instead of the numeral V (formerly U); hence it means to double a number unfairly, to exaggerate, humbug, cheat.--TR.

[2] An allusion to Schiller's poem: "The Veiled Image of Sais."--TR.

JEST, RUSE AND REVENGE.

A PRELUDE IN RHYME.

1.

Invitation.

Venture, comrades, I implore you, On the fare I set before you, You will like it more to-morrow, Better still the following day: If yet more you're then requiring, Old success I'll find inspiring, And fresh courage thence will borrow Novel dainties to display.

2.

My Good Luck.

Weary of Seeking had I grown, So taught myself the way to Find: Back by the storm I once was blown, But follow now, where drives the wind.

3.

Undismayed.

Where you're standing, dig, dig out: Down below's the Well: Let them that walk in darkness shout: "Down below--there's Hell!"

4.

Dialogue.

_A._ Was I ill? and is it ended? Pray, by what physician tended? I recall no pain endured!

_B._ Now I know your trouble's ended: He that can forget, is cured.

5.

To the Virtuous.

Let our virtues be easy and nimble-footed in motion, Like unto Homer's verse ought they to come _and to go_.

6.

Worldly Wisdom.

Stay not on level plain, Climb not the mount too high. But half-way up remain-- The world you'll best descry!

7.

Vademecum--Vadetecum.

Attracted by my style and talk You'd follow, in my footsteps walk? Follow yourself unswervingly, So--careful!--shall you follow me.

8.

The Third Sloughing

My skin bursts, breaks for fresh rebirth, And new desires come thronging: Much I've devoured, yet for more earth The serpent in me's longing. 'Twixt stone and grass I crawl once more, Hungry, by crooked ways, To eat the food I ate before, Earth-fare all serpents praise!

9.

My Roses.

My luck's good--I'd make yours fairer, (Good luck ever needs a sharer), Will you stop and pluck my roses?

Oft mid rocks and thorns you'll linger, Hide and stoop, suck bleeding finger-- Will you stop and pluck my roses?

For my good luck's a trifle vicious, Fond of teasing, tricks malicious-- Will you stop and pluck my roses?

10.

The Scorner.

Many drops I waste and spill, So my scornful mood you curse: Who to brim his cup doth fill, Many drops _must_ waste and spill-- Yet he thinks the wine no worse.

11.

The Proverb Speaks.

Harsh and gentle, fine and mean, Quite rare and common, dirty and clean, The fools' and the sages' go-between: All this I will be, this have been, Dove and serpent and swine, I ween!

12.

To a Lover of Light.

That eye and sense be not fordone E'en in the shade pursue the sun!

13.

For Dancers.

Smoothest ice, A paradise To him who is a dancer nice.

14.

The Brave Man.

A feud that knows not flaw nor break, Rather then patched-up friendship, take.

15.

Rust.

Rust's needed: keenness will not satisfy! "He is too young!" the rabble loves to cry.

16.

Excelsior.

"How shall I reach the top?" No time For thus reflecting! Start to climb!

17.

The Man of Power Speaks. Ask never! Cease that whining, pray! Take without asking, take alway!

18.

Narrow Souls.

Narrow souls hate I like the devil, Souls wherein grows nor good nor evil.

19.

Accidentally a Seducer[1]

He shot an empty word Into the empty blue; But on the way it met A woman whom it slew.

20.

For Consideration.

A twofold pain is easier far to bear Than one: so now to suffer wilt thou dare?

21.

Against Pride.

Brother, to puff thyself up ne'er be quick: For burst thou shalt be by a tiny prick!

22.

Man and Woman.

"The woman seize, who to thy heart appeals!" Man's motto: woman seizes not, but steals.

23.

Interpretation.

If I explain my wisdom, surely 'Tis but entangled more securely, I can't expound myself aright: But he that's boldly up and doing, His own unaided course pursuing, Upon my image casts more light!

24.

A Cure for Pessimism.

Those old capricious fancies, friend! You say your palate naught can please, I hear you bluster, spit and wheeze, My love, my patience soon will end! Pluck up your courage, follow me-- Here's a fat toad! Now then, don't blink, Swallow it whole, nor pause to think! From your dyspepsia you'll be free!

25.

A Request.

Many men's minds I know full well, Yet what mine own is, cannot tell. I cannot see--my eye's too near-- And falsely to myself appear. 'Twould be to me a benefit Far from myself if I could sit, Less distant than my enemy, And yet my nearest friend's too nigh-- 'Twixt him and me, just in the middle! What do I ask for? Guess my riddle.

26.

My Cruelty.

I must ascend an hundred stairs, I must ascend: the herd declares I'm cruel: "Are we made of stone?" I must ascend an hundred stairs: All men the part of stair disown.

27.

The Wanderer.

"No longer path! Abyss and silence chilling!" Thy fault! To leave the path thou wast too willing! Now comes the test! Keep cool--eyes bright and clear! Thou'rt lost for sure, if thou permittest--fear.

28.

Encouragement for Beginners.

See the infant, helpless creeping-- Swine around it grunt swine-talk-- Weeping always, naught but weeping, Will it ever learn to walk? Never fear! Just wait, I swear it Soon to dance will be inclined, And this babe, when two legs bear it, Standing on its head you'll find.

29.

Planet Egoism.

Did I not turn, a rolling cask, Ever about myself, I ask, How could I without burning run Close on the track of the hot sun?

30.

The Neighbour.

Too nigh, my friend my joy doth mar, I'd have him high above and far, Or how can he become my star?

31.

The Disguised Saint.

Lest we for thy bliss should slay thee, In devil's wiles thou dost array thee, Devil's wit and devil's dress. But in vain! Thy looks betray thee And proclaim thy holiness.

32.

The Slave.

_A._ He stands and listens: whence his pain? What smote his ears? Some far refrain? Why is his heart with anguish torn?

_B._ Like all that fetters once have worn, He always hears the clinking--chain!

33.

The Lone One.

I hate to follow and I hate to lead. Obedience? no! and ruling? no, indeed! Wouldst fearful be in others' sight? Then e'en _thyself_ thou must affright: The people but the Terror's guidance heed. I hate to guide myself, I hate the fray. Like the wild beasts I'll wander far afield. In Error's pleasing toils I'll roam Awhile, then lure myself back home, Back home, and--to my self-seduction yield.

34.

Seneca et hoc Genus omne.

They write and write (quite maddening me) Their "sapient" twaddle airy, As if 'twere _primum scribere,_ _Deinde philosophari._

35.

Ice.

Yes! I manufacture ice: Ice may help you to digest: If you _had_ much to digest, How you would enjoy my ice!

36.

Youthful Writings.

My wisdom's A and final O Was then the sound that smote mine ear. Yet now it rings no longer so, My youth's eternal Ah! and Oh! Is now the only sound I hear.[2]

37.

Foresight.

In yonder region travelling, take good care! An hast thou wit, then be thou doubly ware! They'll smile and lure thee; then thy limbs they'll tear: Fanatics' country this where wits are rare!

38.

The Pious One Speaks.

God loves us, _for_ he made us, sent us here!-- "Man hath made God!" ye subtle ones reply. His handiwork he must hold dear, And _what he made_ shall he deny? There sounds the devil's halting hoof, I fear.

39.

In Summer.

In sweat of face, so runs the screed, We e'er must eat our bread, Yet wise physicians if we heed "Eat naught in sweat," 'tis said. The dog-star's blinking: what's his need? What tells his blazing sign? In sweat of face (so runs _his_ screed) We're meant to drink

our wine!

40.

Without Envy.

His look betrays no envy: and ye laud him? He cares not, asks not if your throng applaud him! He has the eagle's eye for distance far, He sees you not, he sees but star on star!

41.

Heraclitism.

Brethren, war's the origin Of happiness on earth: Powder-smoke and battle-din Witness friendship's birth! Friendship means three things, you know,-- Kinship in luckless plight, Equality before the foe Freedom--in death's sight!

42.

Maxim of the Over-refined.

"Rather on your toes stand high Than crawl upon all fours, Rather through the keyhole spy Than through the open doors!"

43.

Exhortation.

Renown you're quite resolved to earn? My thought about it Is this: you need not fame, must learn To do without it!

44.

Thorough.

I an inquirer? No, that's not my calling Only _I weigh a lot_--I'm such a lump!-- And through the waters I keep falling, falling, Till on the ocean's deepest bed I bump.

45.

The Immortals. "To-day is meet for me, I come to-day," Such is the speech of men foredoomed to stay. "Thou art too soon," they cry, "thou art too late," What care the Immortals what the rabble say?

46.

Verdicts of the Weary.

The weary shun the glaring sun, afraid, And only care for trees to gain the shade.

47.

Descent.

"He sinks, he falls," your scornful looks portend: The truth is, to your level he'll descend. His Too Much Joy is turned to weariness, His Too Much Light will in your darkness end.

48.

Nature Silenced[3] Around my neck, on chain of hair, The timepiece hangs--a sign of care. For me the starry course is o'er, No sun and shadow as before, No cockcrow summons at the door, For nature tells the time no more! Too many clocks her voice have drowned, And droning law has dulled her sound.

49.

The Sage Speaks.

Strange to the crowd, yet useful to the crowd, I still pursue my path, now sun, now cloud, But always pass above the crowd!

50.

He lost his Head....

She now has wit--how did it come her way? A man through her his reason lost, they say. His head, though wise ere to this pastime lent, Straight to the devil--no, to woman went!

51.

A Pious Wish.

"Oh, might all keys be lost! 'Twere better so And in all keyholes might the pick-lock go!" Who thus reflects ye may as--picklock know.

52.

Foot Writing.

I write not with the hand alone, My foot would write, my foot that capers, Firm, free and bold, it's marching on Now through the fields, now through the papers.

53.

"_Human, All-too-Human._" ...

Shy, gloomy, when your looks are backward thrust, Trusting the future where yourself you trust, Are you an eagle, mid the nobler fowl, Or are you like Minerva's darling owl?

54.

To my Reader.

Good teeth and a digestion good I wish you--these you need, be sure! And, certes, if my book you've stood, Me with good humour you'll endure.

55.

The Realistic Painter.

"To nature true, complete!" so he begins. Who complete Nature to his canvas _wins?_ Her tiniest fragment's endless, no constraint Can know: he paints just what his _fancy_ pins: What does his fancy pin? What he _can_ paint!

56.

Poets' Vanity.

Glue, only glue to me dispense, The wood I'll find myself, don't fear! To give four senseless verses sense-- That's an achievement I revere!

57.

Taste in Choosing.

If to choose my niche precise Freedom I could win from fate, I'd be in midst of Paradise-- Or, sooner still--before the gate!

58.

The Crooked Nose.

Wide blow your nostrils, and across The land your nose holds haughty sway: So you, unhorned rhinoceros, Proud mannikin, fall forward aye! The one trait with the other goes: A straight pride and a crooked nose.

59.

The Pen is Scratching....

The pen is scratching: hang the pen! To scratching I'm condemned to sink! I grasp the inkstand fiercely then And write in floods of flowing ink. How broad, how full the stream's career! What luck my labours doth requite! 'Tis true, the writing's none too clear-- What then? Who reads the stuff I write?

60.

Loftier Spirits.

This man's climbing up--let us praise him-- But that other we love From aloft doth eternally move, So above even praise let us raise him, He _comes_ from above!

61.

The Sceptic Speaks.

Your life is half-way o'er; The clock-hand moves; your soul is thrilled with fear, It roamed to distant shore And sought and found not, yet you--linger here!

Your life is half-way o'er; That hour by hour was pain and error sheer: _Why stay?_ What seek you more? "That's what I'm seeking--reasons why I'm here!"

62.

Ecce Homo.

Yes, I know where I'm related, Like the flame, unquenched, unsated, I consume myself and glow: All's turned to light I lay my hand on, All to coal that I abandon, Yes, I am a flame, I know!

63.

Star Morality[4]

Foredoomed to spaces vast and far, What matters darkness to the star?

Roll calmly on, let time go by, Let sorrows pass thee--nations die!

Compassion would but dim the light That distant worlds will gladly sight.

To thee one law--be pure and bright!

[1] Translated by Miss M. D. Petre.

[2] A and O, suggestive of Ah! and Oh! refer of course to Alpha and Omega, the first and last letters of the Greek alphabet.--TR.

[3] Translated by Miss M. D. Petre.

[4] Translated by Miss M. D. Petre.

BOOK FIRST

1.

_The Teachers of the Object of Existence.--_Whether I look with a good or an evil eye upon men, I find them always at one problem, each and all of them: to do that which conduces to the conservation of the human species. And certainly not out of any

sentiment of love for this species, but simply because nothing in them is older, stronger, more inexorable and more unconquerable than that instinct,--because it is precisely _the essence_ of our race and herd. Although we are accustomed readily enough, with our usual short-sightedness, to separate our neighbours precisely into useful and hurtful, into good and evil men, yet when we make a general calculation, and reflect longer on the whole question, we become distrustful of this defining and separating, and finally leave it alone. Even the most hurtful man is still perhaps, in respect to the conservation of the race, the most useful of all; for he conserves in himself, or by his effect on others, impulses without which mankind might long ago have languished or decayed. Hatred, delight in mischief, rapacity and ambition, and whatever else is called evil--belong to the marvellous economy of the conservation of the race; to be sure a costly, lavish, and on the whole very foolish economy:--which has, however, hitherto preserved our race, _as is demonstrated to us._ I no longer know, my dear fellow-man and neighbour, if thou _canst_ at all live to the disadvantage of the race, and therefore, "unreasonably" and "badly"; that which could have injured the race has perhaps died out many millenniums ago, and now belongs to the things which are no longer possible even to God. Indulge thy best or thy worst desires, and above all, go to wreck!--in either case thou art still probably the furtherer and benefactor of mankind in some way or other, and in that respect thou mayest have thy panegyrists--and similarly thy mockers! But thou wilt never find him who would be quite qualified to mock at thee, the individual, at thy best, who could bring home to thy conscience its limitless, buzzing and croaking wretchedness so as to be in accord with truth! To laugh at oneself as one would have to laugh in order to laugh _out of the veriest truth,_--to do this, the best have not hitherto had enough of the sense of truth, and the most endowed have had far too little genius! There is perhaps still a future even for laughter! When the maxim, "The race is all, the individual is nothing,"--has incorporated itself in humanity, and when access stands open to every one at all times to this ultimate emancipation and irresponsibility.--Perhaps then laughter will have united with wisdom, perhaps then there will be only "joyful wisdom." Meanwhile, however, it is quite otherwise, meanwhile the comedy of existence has not yet "become conscious" of itself, meanwhile it is still the period of tragedy, the period of morals and religions. What does the ever new appearing of founders of morals and religions, of instigators of struggles for moral valuations, of teachers of remorse of conscience and religious war, imply? What do these heroes on this stage imply? For they have hitherto been the heroes of it, and all else, though solely visible for the time being, and too close to one, has served only as preparation for these heroes, whether as machinery and coulisse, or in the rôle of confidants and valets. (The poets, for example, have always been the valets of some morality or other.)--It is obvious of itself that these tragedians also work in the interest of the _race,_ though they may believe that they work in the interest of God, and as emissaries of God. They also further the life of the species, _in that they further the belief in life._ "It is worthwhile to live"--each of them calls out,--"there is something of importance in this life; life has something behind it and under it; take care!" That impulse, which rules equally in the noblest and the ignoblest, the impulse to the conservation of the species, breaks forth from time to time as reason and passion of spirit; it has then a brilliant train of motives about it, and tries with all its power to make us forget that fundamentally it is just impulse, instinct, folly and baselessness. Life _should_ beloved, _for_...! Man _should_ benefit himself and his neighbour, _for_...! And whatever all these _shoulds_ and _fors_ imply, and may imply in future! In order that that which necessarily and always happens of itself and without design, may henceforth appear to be done by design, and may appeal to men as reason and ultimate command,--for that purpose the ethiculturist comes forward as the teacher of design in existence; for that purpose he devises a second and different existence, and by means of this new mechanism he lifts the old common existence off its old common hinges. No! he does not at all want us to _laugh_ at existence, nor even at ourselves--nor at himself; to him an individual is always an individual, something first and last and immense, to him there are no species, no sums, no noughts. However foolish and fanatical his inventions and valuations may be, however much he may misunderstand the course of nature and deny its conditions--and all systems of ethics hitherto have been foolish and anti-natural to such a degree that mankind would have been ruined by any one of them had it got the upper hand,--at any rate, every time that "the hero" came upon the stage something new was attained: the frightful counterpart of laughter, the profound convulsion of many individuals at the thought, "Yes, it is worth while to live! yes, I am worthy to live!"--life, and thou, and I, and all of us together became for a while _interesting_ to ourselves once more.--It is not to be denied that hitherto laughter and reason and nature have _in the long run_ got the upper hand of all the great teachers of design: in the end the short tragedy always passed over once more into the eternal comedy of existence; and the "waves of innumerable laughters"--to use the expression of Æschylus--must also in the end beat over the greatest of these tragedies. But with all this corrective laughter, human nature has on the whole been changed by the ever new appearance of those teachers of the design of existence,--human nature has now an additional requirement, the very requirement of the ever new appearance of such teachers and doctrines of "design." Man has gradually become a visionary animal, who has to fulfil one more condition of existence than the other animals: man _must_ from time to time believe that he knows _why_ he exists; his species cannot flourish without periodically confiding in life! Without the belief in _reason in life!_ And always from time to time will the human race decree anew that "there is something which really may not be laughed at." And the most clairvoyant philanthropist will add that "not only laughing and joyful

wisdom, but also the tragic with all its sublime irrationality, counts among the means and necessities for the conservation of the race!"--And consequently! Consequently! Consequently! Do you understand me, oh my brothers? Do you understand this new law of ebb and flow? We also shall have our time!

2.

The Intellectual Conscience.--I have always the same experience over again, and always make a new effort against it; for although it is evident to me I do not want to believe it: _in the greater number of men the intellectual conscience is lacking;_ indeed, it would often seem to me that in demanding such a thing, one is as solitary in the largest cities as in the desert. Everyone looks at you with strange eyes and continues to make use of his scales, calling this good and that bad; and no one blushes for shame when you remark that these weights are not the full amount,--there is also no indignation against you; perhaps they laugh at your doubt. I mean to say that _the greater number of people_ do not find it contemptible to believe this or that, and live according to it, _without_ having been previously aware of the ultimate and surest reasons for and against it, and without even giving themselves any trouble about such reasons afterwards,--the most Sifted men and the noblest women still belong to this "greater number." But what is kind-heartedness, refinement and genius to me, if he who has these virtues harbours indolent sentiments in belief and judgment, if _the longing for certainty_ does not rule in him, as his innermost desire and profoundest need--as that which separates higher from lower men! In certain pious people I have found a hatred of reason, and have been favourably disposed to them for it: their bad intellectual conscience at least still betrayed itself in this manner! But to stand in the midst of this _rerum concordia discors_ and all the marvellous uncertainty and ambiguity of existence, _and not to question,_ not to tremble with desire and delight in questioning, not even to hate the questioner--perhaps even to make merry over him to the extent of weariness--that is what I regard as _contemptible,_ and it is this sentiment which I first of all search for in every one--some folly or other always persuades me anew that every man has this sentiment, as man. This is my special kind of unrighteousness.

3.

Noble and Ignoble.--To ignoble natures all noble, magnanimous sentiments appear inexpedient, and on that account first and foremost, as incredible: they blink with their eyes when they hear of such matters, and seem inclined to say," there will, no doubt, be some advantage therefrom, one cannot see through all walls;"--they are jealous of the noble person, as if he sought advantage by back-stair methods. When they are all too plainly convinced of the absence of selfish intentions and emoluments, the noble person is regarded by them as a kind of fool: they despise him in his gladness, and laugh at the lustre of his eye. "How can a person rejoice at being at a disadvantage, how can a person with open eyes want to meet with disadvantage! It must be a disease of the reason with which the noble affection is associated";--so they think, and they look depreciatingly thereon; just as they depreciate the joy which the lunatic derives from his fixed idea. The ignoble nature is distinguished by the fact that it keeps its advantage steadily in view, and that this thought of the end and advantage is even stronger than its strongest impulse: not to be tempted to inexpedient activities by its impulses--that is its wisdom and inspiration. In comparison with the ignoble nature the higher nature is _more irrational:_--for the noble, magnanimous, and self-sacrificing person succumbs in fact to his impulses, and in his best moments his reason _lapses_ altogether. An animal, which at the risk of life protects its young, or in the pairing season follows the female where it meets with death, does not think of the risk and the death; its reason pauses likewise, because its delight in its young, or in the female, and the fear of being deprived of this delight, dominate it exclusively; it becomes stupider than at other times, like the noble and magnanimous person. He possesses feelings of pleasure and pain of such intensity that the intellect must either be silent before them, or yield itself to their service: his heart then goes into his head, and one henceforth speaks of "passions." (Here and there to be sure, the antithesis to this, and as it were the "reverse of passion," presents itself; for example in Fontenelle, to whom some one once laid the hand on the heart with the words, "What you have there, my dearest friend, is brain also.") It is the unreason, or perverse reason of passion, which the ignoble man despises in the noble individual, especially when it concentrates upon objects whose value appears to him to be altogether fantastic and arbitrary. He is offended at him who succumbs to the passion of the belly, but he understands the allurement which here plays the tyrant; but he does not understand, for example, how a person out of love of knowledge can stake his health and honour on the game. The taste of the higher nature devotes itself to exceptional matters, to things which usually do not affect people, and seem to have no sweetness; the higher nature has a singular standard of value. Yet it is mostly of the belief that it has _not_ a singular standard of value in its idiosyncrasies of taste; it rather sets up its values and non-values as the generally valid values and non-values, and thus becomes incomprehensible and impracticable. It is very rarely that a higher nature has so much reason over and above as to understand and deal with everyday men as such; for the most part it believes in its passion as if it were the concealed passion of every one, and precisely in this belief it is full of ardour and eloquence. If then such exceptional men do not perceive themselves as exceptions,

how can they ever understand the ignoble natures and estimate average men fairly! Thus it is that they also speak of the folly, inexpediency and fantasy of mankind, full of astonishment at the madness of the world, and that it will not recognise the "one thing needful for it."--This is the eternal unrighteousness of noble natures.

4.

_That which Preserves the Species.--_The strongest and most evil spirits have hitherto advanced mankind the most: they always rekindled the sleeping passions--all orderly arranged society lulls the passions to sleep; they always reawakened the sense of comparison, of contradiction, of delight in the new, the adventurous, the untried; they compelled men to set opinion against opinion, ideal plan against ideal plan. By means of arms, by upsetting boundary-stones, by violations of piety most of all: but also by new religions and morals! The same kind of "wickedness" is in every teacher and preacher of the _new--_which makes a conqueror infamous, although it expresses itself more refinedly, and does not immediately set the muscles in motion (and just on that account does not make so infamous!) The new, however, is under all circumstances the _evil,_ as that which wants to conquer, which tries to upset the old boundary-stones and the old piety; only the old is the good! The good men of every age are those who go to the roots of the old thoughts and bear fruit with them, the agriculturists of the spirit. But every soil becomes finally exhausted, and the ploughshare of evil must always come once more.--There is at present a fundamentally erroneous theory of morals which is much celebrated, especially in England: according to it the judgments "good" and "evil" are the accumulation of the experiences of that which is "expedient" and "inexpedient"; according to this theory, that which is called good is conservative of the species, what is called evil, however, is detrimental to it. But in reality the evil impulses are just in as high a degree expedient, indispensable, and conservative of the species as the good:--only, their function is different.

5.

Unconditional Duties.--All men who feel that they need the strongest words and intonations, the most eloquent gestures and attitudes, in order to operate _at all_--revolutionary politicians, socialists, preachers of repentance with or without Christianity, with all of whom there must be no mere half-success,--all these speak of "duties," and indeed, always of duties, which have the character of being unconditional--without such they would have no right to their excessive pathos: they know that right well! They grasp, therefore, at philosophies of morality which preach some kind of categorical imperative, or they assimilate a good lump of religion, as, for example, Mazzini did. Because they want to be trusted unconditionally, it is first of all necessary for them to trust themselves unconditionally, on the basis of some ultimate, undebatable command, sublime in itself, as the ministers and instruments of which, they would fain feel and announce themselves. Here we have the most natural, and for the most part, very influential opponents of moral enlightenment and scepticism: but they are rare. On the other hand, there is always a very numerous class of those opponents wherever interest teaches subjection, while repute and honour seem to forbid it. He who feels himself dishonoured at the thought of being the _instrument_ of a prince, or of a party and sect, or even of wealthy power (for example, as the descendant of a proud, ancient family), but wishes just to be this instrument, or must be so before himself and before the public--such a person has need of pathetic principles which can at all times be appealed to:--principles of an unconditional _ought,_ to which a person can subject himself without shame, and can show himself subjected. All more refined servility holds fast to the categorical imperative, and is the mortal enemy of those who want to take away the unconditional character of duty: propriety demands this from them, and not only propriety.

6.

_Loss of Dignity.--_Meditation has lost all its dignity of form; the ceremonial and solemn bearing of the meditative person have been made a mockery, and one would no longer endure a wise man of the old style. We think too hastily and on the way and while walking and in the midst of business of all kinds, even when we think on the most serious matters; we require little preparation, even little quiet:--it is as if each of us carried about an unceasingly revolving machine in his head, which still works, even under the most unfavourable circumstances. Formerly it was perceived in a person that on some occasion he wanted to think--it was perhaps the exception!--that he now wanted to become wiser and collected his mind on a thought: he put on a long face for it, as for a prayer, and arrested his step-nay, stood still for hours on the street when the thought "came"--on one or on two legs. It was thus "worthy of the affair"!

7.

_Something for the Laborious.--_He who at present wants to make moral questions a subject of study has an immense field of labour before him. All kinds of passions must be thought about singly, and followed singly throughout periods, peoples, great and insignificant individuals; all their rationality, all their valuations and elucidations of things, ought to come to light! Hitherto all that has given colour to existence has lacked a history: where would one find a history of love, of avance, of envy, of conscience, of piety, of cruelty? Even a comparative history of law, as also of punishment, has hitherto been completely lacking. Have the different divisions of the day, the consequences of a regular appointment of the times for labour, feast, and repose, ever been made the object of investigation? Do we know the moral effects of the alimentary substances? Is there a philosophy of nutrition? (The ever-recurring outcry for and against vegetarianism proves that as yet there is no such philosophy!) Have the experiences with regard to communal living, for example, in monasteries, been collected? Has the dialectic of marriage and friendship been set forth? The customs of the learned, of trades-people, of artists, and of mechanics--have they already found their thinkers? There is so much to think of thereon! All that up till now has been considered as the "conditions of existence," of human beings, and all reason, passion and superstition in this consideration--have they been investigated to the end? The observation alone of the different degrees of development which the human impulses have attained, and could yet attain, according to the different moral climates, would furnish too much work for the most laborious; whole generations, and regular co-operating generations of the learned, would be needed in order to exhaust the points of view and the material here furnished. The same is true of the determining of the reasons for the differences of the moral climates ("_on what account_ does this sun of a fundamental moral judgment and standard of highest value shine here--and that sun there?"). And there is again a new labour which points out the erroneousness of all these reasons, and determines the entire essence of the moral judgments hitherto made. Supposing all these labours to be accomplished, the most critical of all questions would then come into the foreground: whether science is in a position to _furnish_ goals for human action, after it has proved that it can take them away and annihilate them--and then would be the time for a process of experimenting, in which every kind of heroism could satisfy itself, an experimenting for centuries, which would put into the shade all the great labours and sacrifices of previous history. Science has not hitherto built its Cyclopic structures; for that also the time will come.

8.

_Unconscious Virtues.--_All qualities in a man of which he is conscious--and especially when he presumes that they are visible and evident to his environment also--are subject to quite other laws of development than those qualities which are unknown to him, or imperfectly known, which by their subtlety can also conceal themselves from the subtlest observer, and hide as it were behind nothing--as in the case of the delicate sculptures on the scales of reptiles (it would be an error to suppose them an adornment or a defence--for one sees them only with the microscope; consequently, with an eye artificially strengthened to an extent of vision which similar animals, to which they might perhaps have meant adornment or defence, do not possess!). Our visible moral qualities, and especially our moral qualities _believed to be_ visible, follow their own course,--and our invisible qualities of similar name, which in relation to others neither serve for adornment nor defence, _also follow their own course:_ quite a different course probably, and with lines and refinements, and sculptures, which might perhaps give pleasure to a God with a divine microscope. We have, for example, our diligence, our ambition, our acuteness: all the world knows about them,--and besides, we have probably once more _our_ diligence, _our_ ambition, _our_ acuteness; but for these--our reptile scales--the microscope has not yet been invented!--And here the adherents of instinctive morality will say, "Bravo! He at least regards unconscious virtues as possible--that suffices us!"--Oh, ye unexacting creatures!

9.

Our Eruptions.--Numberless things which humanity acquired in its earlier stages, but so weakly and embryonically that it could not be noticed that they were acquired, are thrust suddenly into light long afterwards, perhaps after the lapse of centuries: they have in the interval become strong and mature. In some ages this or that talent, this or that virtue seems to be entirely lacking, as it--is in some men; but let us wait only for the grandchildren and grandchildren's children, if we have time to wait,--they bring the interior of their grandfathers into the sun, that interior of which the grandfathers themselves were unconscious. The son, indeed, is often the betrayer of his father; the latter understands himself better since he has got his son. We have all hidden gardens and plantations in us; and by another simile, we are all growing volcanoes, which will have their hours of eruption:--how near or how distant this is, nobody of course knows, not even the good God.

10.

A Species of Atavism.--I like best to think of the rare men of an age as suddenly emerging after-shoots of past cultures, and of their persistent strength: like the atavism of a people and its civilisation --there is thus still something in them to _think of!_ They now seem strange, rare, and extraordinary: and he who feels these forces in himself has to foster them in face of a different, opposing world; he has to defend them, honour them, and rear them to maturity: and he either becomes a great man thereby, or a deranged and eccentric person, if he does not altogether break down betimes. Formerly these rare qualities were usual, and were consequently regarded as common: they did not distinguish people. Perhaps they were demanded and presupposed; it was impossible to become great with them, for indeed there was also no danger of becoming insane and solitary with them.--It is principally in the _old-established_ families and castes of a people that such after-effects of old impulses present themselves, while there is no probability of such atavism where races, habits, and valuations change too rapidly. For the _tempo_ of the evolutional forces in peoples implies just as much as in music; for our case an _andante_ of evolution is absolutely necessary, as the _tempo_ of a passionate and slow spirit:--and the spirit of conserving families is certainly of _that_ sort.

11.

Consciousness.--Consciousness is the last and latest development of the organic, and consequently also the most unfinished and least powerful of these developments. Innumerable mistakes originate out of consciousness, which, "in spite of fate," as Homer says, cause an animal or a man to break down earlier than might be necessary. If the conserving bond of the instincts were not very much more powerful, it would not generally serve as a regulator: by perverse judging and dreaming with open eyes, by superficiality and credulity, in short, just by consciousness, mankind would necessarily have broken down: or rather, without the former there would long ago have been nothing more of the latter! Before a function is fully formed and matured, it is a danger to the organism: all the better if it be then thoroughly tyrannised over! Consciousness is thus thoroughly tyrannised over--and not least by the pride in it! It is thought that here is _the quintessence_ of man; that which is enduring, eternal, ultimate, and most original in him! Consciousness is regarded as a fixed, given magnitude! Its growth and intermittences are denied! It is accepted as the "unity of the organism"!--This ludicrous overvaluation and misconception of consciousness has as its result the great utility that a too rapid maturing of it has thereby been _hindered._ Because men believed that they already possessed consciousness, they gave themselves very little trouble to acquire it--and even now it is not otherwise! It is still an entirely new _problem_ just dawning on the human eye, and hardly yet plainly recognisable: _to embody knowledge in ourselves_ and make it instinctive,--a problem which is only seen by those who have grasped the fact that hitherto our _errors_ alone have been embodied in us, and that all our consciousness is relative to errors!

12.

_The Goal of Science.--_What? The ultimate goal of science is to create the most pleasure possible to man, and the least possible pain? But what if pleasure and pain should be so closely connected that he who _wants_ the greatest possible amount of the one _must_ also have the greatest possible amount of the other,--that he who wants to experience the "heavenly high jubilation,"[1] must also be ready to be "sorrowful unto death"?[2] And it is so, perhaps! The Stoics at least believed it was so, and they were consistent when they wished to have the least possible pleasure, in order to have the least possible pain from life. (When one uses the expression: "The virtuous man is the happiest," it is as much the sign-board of the school for the masses, as a casuistic subtlety for the subtle.) At present also ye have still the choice: either the _least possible pain,_ in short painlessness--and after all, socialists and politicians of all parties could not honourably promise more to their people,--or the _greatest possible amount of pain,_ as the price of the growth of a fullness of refined delights and enjoyments rarely tasted hitherto! If ye decide for the former, if ye therefore want to depress and minimise man's capacity for pain, well, ye must also depress and minimise his _capacity for enjoyment._ In fact, one can further the one as well as the other goal _by science!_ Perhaps science is as yet best known by its capacity for depriving man of enjoyment, and making him colder, more statuesque, and more Stoical. But it might also turn out to be the _great pain-bringer!_--And then, perhaps, its counteracting force would be discovered simultaneously, its immense capacity for making new sidereal worlds of enjoyment beam forth!

[1] Allusions to the song of Clara in Goethe's "Egmont."--TR.

13.

The Theory of the Sense of Power.--We exercise our power over others by doing them good or by doing them ill--that is all we care for! _Doing ill_ to those on whom we have to make our power felt; for pain is a far more sensitive means for that purpose than pleasure:--pain always asks concerning the cause, while pleasure is inclined to keep within itself and not look backward. _Doing

good_ and being kind to those who are in any way already dependent on us (that is, who are accustomed to think of us as their _raison d'être);_ we want to increase their power, because we thus increase our own; or we want to show them the advantage there is in being in our power,--they thus become more contented with their position, and more hostile to the enemies of _our_ power and readier to contend with to If we make sacrifices in doing good or in doing ill, it does not alter the ultimate value of our actions; even if we stake our life in the cause, as martyrs for the sake of our church, it is a sacrifice to _our_ longing for power, or for the purpose of conserving our sense of power. He who under these circumstances feels that he "is in possession of truth" how many possessions does he not let go, in order to preserve this feeling! What does he not throw overboard, in order to keep himself "up,"--that is to say, _above_ the others who lack the truth. Certainly the condition we are in when we do ill is seldom so pleasant, so purely pleasant as that in which we practise kindness,--it is an indication that we still lack power, or it betrays ill-humour at this defect in us; it brings with it new dangers and uncertainties as to the power we already possess, and clouds our horizon by the prospect of revenge, scorn, punishment and failure. Perhaps only tee most susceptible to the sense of power and eager for it, will prefer to impress the seal of power on the resisting individual.--those to whom the sight of the already subjugated person as the object of benevolence is a burden and a tedium. It is a question how a person is accustomed to _season_ his life; it is a matter of taste whether a person would rather have the slow or the sudden to safe or the dangerous and daring increase of power,--he seeks this or that seasoning always according to his temperament. An easy booty is something contemptible to proud natures; they have an agreeable sensation only at the sight of men of unbroken spirit who could be enemies to them, and similarly, also, at the sight of all not easily accessible possession; they are often hard toward the sufferer, for he is not worthy of their effort or their pride,--but they show themselves so much the more courteous towards their _equals,_ with whom strife and struggle would in any case be full of honour, _if_ at any time an occasion for it should present itself. It is under the agreeable feelings of _this_ perspective that the members of the knightly caste have habituated themselves to exquisite courtesy toward one another.--Pity is the most pleasant feeling in those who have not much pride, and have no prospect of great conquests: the easy booty--and that is what every sufferer is--is for them an enchanting thing. Pity is said to be the virtue of the gay lady.

14.

What is called Love.--The lust of property, and love: what different associations each of these ideas evoke!--and yet it might be the same impulse twice named: on the one occasion disparaged from the standpoint of those already possessing (in whom the impulse has attained something of repose,--who are now apprehensive for the safety of their "possession"); on the other occasion viewed from the standpoint of the unsatisfied and thirsty, and therefore glorified as "good." Our love of our neighbour,--is it not a striving after new _property?_ And similarly our love of knowledge, of truth; and in general all the striving after novelties? We gradually become satiated with the old and securely possessed, and again stretch out our hands; even the finest landscape in which we live for three months is no longer certain of our love, and any kind of more distant coast excites our covetousness: the possession for the most part becomes smaller through possessing. Our pleasure in ourselves seeks to maintain itself by always transforming something new _into ourselves,_--that is just possessing. To become satiated with a possession, that is to become satiated with ourselves. (One can also suffer from excess,--even the desire to cast away, to share out, may assume the honourable name of "love.") When we see any one suffering, we willingly utilise the opportunity then afforded to take possession of him; the beneficent and sympathetic man, for example, does this; he also calls the desire for new possession awakened in him, by the name of "love," and has enjoyment in it, as in a new acquisition suggesting itself to him. The love of the sexes, however, betrays itself most plainly as the striving after possession: the lover wants the unconditioned, sole possession of the person longed for by him; he wants just as absolute power over her soul as over her body; he wants to be loved solely, and to dwell and rule in the other soul as what is highest and most to be desired. When one considers that this means precisely to _exclude_ all the world from a precious possession, a happiness, and an enjoyment; when one considers that the lover has in view the impoverishment and privation of all other rivals, and would like to become the dragon of his golden hoard, as the most inconsiderate and selfish of all "conquerors" and exploiters; when one considers finally that to the lover himself, the whole world besides appears indifferent, colourless, and worthless, and that he is ready to make every sacrifice, disturb every arrangement, and put every other interest behind his own,--one is verily surprised that this ferocious lust of property and injustice of sexual love should have been glorified and deified to such an extent at all times; yea, that out of this love the conception of love as the antithesis of egoism should have been derived, when it is perhaps precisely the most unqualified expression of egoism. Here, evidently, the non-possessors and desirers have determined the usage of language,--there were, of course, always too many of them. Those who have been favoured with much possession and satiety, have, to be sure, dropped a word now and then about the "raging demon," as, for instance, the most lovable and most beloved of all the Athenians--Sophocles; but Eros always laughed at such revilers,--they were always his greatest favourites.--There is, of course, here and there on this terrestrial sphere a kind of sequel to love, in which that covetous longing of

two persons for one another has yielded to a new desire and covetousness, to a _common,_ higher thirst for a superior ideal standing above them: but who knows this love? Who has experienced it? Its right name is _friendship._

15.

Out of the Distance.--This mountain makes the whole district which it dominates charming in every way, and full of significance. After we have said this to ourselves for the hundredth time, we are so irrationally and so gratefully disposed towards it, as the giver of this charm, that we fancy it must itself be the most charming thing in the district--and so we climb it, and are undeceived. All of a sudden, both it and the landscape around us and under us, are as it were disenchanted; we had forgotten that many a greatness, like many a goodness, wants only to be seen at a certain distance, and entirely from below, not from above,--it is thus only that _it operates._ Perhaps you know men in your neighbourhood who can only look at themselves from a certain distance to find themselves at all endurable, or attractive and enlivening; they are to be dissuaded from self-knowledge.

16.

_Across the Plank.--_One must be able to dissimulate in intercourse with persons who are ashamed of their feelings; they take a sudden aversion to anyone who surprises them in a state of tenderness, or of enthusiastic and high-running feeling, as if he had seen their secrets. If one wants to be kind to them in such moments one should make them laugh, or say some kind of cold, playful wickedness:--their feeling thereby congeals, and they are again self-possessed. But I give the moral before the story.--We were once on a time so near one another in the course of our lives, that nothing more seemed to hinder our friendship and fraternity, and there was merely a small plank between us. While you were just about to step on it, I asked you: "Do you want to come across the plank to me?" But then you did not want to come any longer; and when I again entreated, you were silent. Since then mountains and torrents, and whatever separates and alienates, have interposed between us, and even if we wanted to come to one another, we could no longer do so! When, however, you now remember that small plank, you have no longer words,--but merely sobs and amazement.

17.

Motivation of Poverty.--We cannot, to be sure, by any artifice make a rich and richly-flowing virtue out of a poor one, but we can gracefully enough reinterpret its poverty into necessity, so that its aspect no longer gives pain to us, and we cease making reproachful faces at fate on account of it. It is thus that the wise gardener does who puts the tiny streamlet of his garden into the arms of a fountain-nymph, and thus motivates the poverty:--and who would not like him need the nymphs!

18.

Ancient Pride.--The ancient savour of nobility is lacking in us, because the ancient slave is lacking in our sentiment. A Greek of noble descent found such immense intermediate stages, and such a distance betwixt his elevation and that ultimate baseness, that he could hardly even see the slave plainly: even Plato no longer saw him entirely. It is otherwise with us, accustomed as we are to the _doctrine_ of the equality of men, although not to the equality itself. A being who has not the free disposal of himself and has not got leisure,--that is not regarded by us as anything contemptible; there is perhaps too much of this kind of slavishness in each of us, in accordance with the conditions of our social order and activity, which are fundamentally different from those of the ancients.--The Greek philosopher went through life with the secret feeling that there were many more slaves than people supposed--that is to say, that every one was a slave who was not a philosopher. His pride was puffed up when he considered that even the mightiest of the earth were thus to be looked upon as slaves. This pride is also unfamiliar to us, and impossible; the word "slave" has not its full force for us even in simile.

19.

Evil.--Test the life of the best and most productive men and nations, and ask yourselves whether a tree which is to grow proudly heavenward can dispense with bad weather and tempests: whether disfavour and opposition from without, whether every kind of hatred, jealousy, stubbornness, distrust, severity, greed, and violence do not belong to the _favouring_ circumstances without which a great growth even in virtue is hardly possible? The poison by which the weaker nature is destroyed is strengthening to the strong individual--and he does not call it poison.

20.

Dignity of Folly.--Several millenniums further on in the path of the last century!--and in everything that man does the highest prudence will be exhibited: but just thereby prudence will have lost all its dignity. It will then, sure enough, be necessary to be prudent, but it will also be so usual and common, that a more fastidious taste will feel this necessity as _vulgarity._ And just as a tyranny of truth and science would be in a position to raise the value of falsehood, a tyranny of prudence could force into prominence a new species of nobleness. To be noble--that might then mean, perhaps, to be capable of follies.

21.

To the Teachers of Unselfishness.--The virtues of a man are called _good,_ not in respect to the results they have for himself, but in respect to the results which we expect therefrom for ourselves and for society:--we have all along had very little unselfishness, very little "non-egoism" in our praise of the virtues! For otherwise it could not but have been seen that the virtues (such as diligence, obedience, chastity, piety, justice) are mostly _injurious_ to their possessors, as impulses which rule in them too vehemently and ardently, and do not want to be kept in co-ordination with the other impulses by the reason. If you have a virtue, an actual, perfect virtue (and not merely a kind of impulse towards virtue!)--you are its _victim!_ But your neighbour praises your virtue precisely on that account! One praises the diligent man though he injures his sight, or the originality and freshness of his spirit, by his diligence; the youth is honoured and regretted who has "worn himself out by work," because one passes the judgment that "for society as a whole the loss of the best individual is only a small sacrifice! A pity that this sacrifice should be necessary! A much greater pity it is true, if the individual should think differently and regard his preservation and development as more important than his work in the service of society!" And so one regrets this youth, not on his own account, but because a devoted _instrument,_ regardless of self--a so-called "good man," has been lost to society by his death. Perhaps one further considers the question, whether it would not have been more advantageous for the interests of society if he had laboured with less disregard of himself, and had preserved himself longer-indeed one readily admits an advantage therefrom but one esteems the other advantage, namely, that a _sacrifice_ has been made, and that the disposition of the sacrificial animal has once more been _obviously_ endorsed--as higher and more enduring. It is accordingly, on the one part, the instrumental character in the virtues which is praised when the virtues are praised, and on the other part the blind, ruling impulse in every virtue which refuse to let itself be kept within bounds by the general advantage to the individual; in short, what is praised is the unreason in the virtues, in consequence of which the individual allows himself to be transformed into a function of the whole. The praise of the virtues is the praise of something which is privately injurious to the individual; it is praise of impulses which deprive man of his noblest self-love, and the power to take the best care of himself. To be sure, for the teaching and embodying of virtuous habits a series of effects of virtue are displayed, which make it appear that virtue and private advantage are closely related,--and there is in fact such a relationship! Blindly furious diligence, for example, the typical virtue of an instrument, is represented as the way to riches and honour, and as the most beneficial antidote to tedium and passion: but people are silent concerning its danger, its greatest dangerousness. Education proceeds in this manner throughout: it endeavours, by a series of enticements and advantages, to determine the individual to a certain mode of thinking and acting, which, when it has become habit, impulse and passion, rules in him and over him, _in opposition to his ultimate advantage,_ but "for the general good." How often do I see that blindly furious diligence does indeed create riches and honours, but at the same time deprives the organs of the refinement by virtue of which alone an enjoyment of riches and honours is possible; so that really the main expedient for combating tedium and passion, simultaneously blunts the senses and makes the spirit refractory towards new stimuli! (The busiest of all ages--our age--does not know how to make anything out of its great diligence and wealth, except always more and more wealth, and more and more diligence; there is even more genius needed for laying out wealth than for acquiring it!--Well, we shall have our "grandchildren"!) If the education succeeds, every virtue of the individual is a public utility, and a private disadvantage in respect to the highest private end,--probably some psycho-æsthetic stunting, or even premature dissolution. One should consider successively from the same standpoint the virtues of obedience, chastity, piety, and justice. The praise of the unselfish, self-sacrificing, virtuous person--he, consequently, who does not expend his whole energy and reason for _his own_ conservation, development, elevation, furtherance and augmentation of power, but lives as regards himself unassumingly and thoughtlessly, perhaps even indifferently or ironically--this praise has in any case not originated out of the spirit of unselfishness! The "neighbour" praises unselfishness because _he profits by it!_ If the neighbour were "unselfishly" disposed himself, he would reject that destruction of power, that injury for _his_ advantage, he would thwart such inclinations in their origin, and above all he would manifest his unselfishness just by _not giving it a good name!_ The fundamental contradiction in that morality which at present stands in high honour is here indicated: the _motives_ to such a morality are in antithesis to its _principle!_ That with which this morality wishes to prove itself, refutes it out of its criterion of what is moral! The maxim, "Thou shalt renounce thyself and offer thyself as a sacrifice," in order not to be inconsistent with its own morality, could only be decreed by a being who himself renounced his own advantage thereby, and who perhaps in the required self-sacrifice of

individuals brought about his own dissolution. As soon; however, as the neighbour (or society) recommended altruism _on account of its utility,_ the precisely antithetical proposition, "Thou shalt seek thy advantage even at the expense of everybody else," was brought into use: accordingly, "thou shalt," and "thou shalt not," are preached in one breath!

22.

_L'Ordre du jour pour le Roi.--_The day commences: let us begin to arrange for this day the business and fêtes of our most gracious lord, who at present is still pleased to repose. His Majesty has bad weather to-day: we shall be careful not to call it bad; we shall not speak of the weather,--but we shall go through to-day's business somewhat more ceremoniously and make the fêtes somewhat more festive than would otherwise be necessary. His Majesty may perhaps even be sick: we shall give the last good news of the evening at breakfast, the arrival of M. Montaigne, who knows how to joke so pleasantly about his sickness,--he suffers from stone. We shall receive several persons (persons!--what would that old inflated frog, who will be among them, say, if he heard this word! "I am no person," he would say, "but always the thing itself")--and the reception will last longer than is pleasant to anybody; a sufficient reason for telling about the poet who wrote over his door, "He who enters here will do me an honour; he who does not--a favour."--That is, forsooth, saying a discourteous thing in a courteous manner! And perhaps this poet is quite justified on his part in being discourteous; they say that his rhymes are better than the rhymester. Well, let him still make many of them, and withdraw himself as much as possible from the world: and that is doubtless the significance of his well-bred rudeness! A prince, on the other hand, is always of more value than his "verse," even when--but what are we about? We gossip,' and the whole court believes that we have already been at work and racked our brains: there is no light to be seen earlier than that which burns in our window.--Hark! Was that not the bell? The devil! The day and the dance commence, and we do not know our rounds! We must then improvise,--all the world improvises its day. To-day, let us for once do like all the world!--And therewith vanished my wonderful morning dream, probably owing to the violent strokes of the tower-clock, which just then announced the fifth hour with all the importance which is peculiar to it. It seems to me that on this occasion the God of dreams wanted to make merry over my habits,--it is my habit to commence the day by arranging it properly, to make it endurable _for myself_ and it is possible that I may often have done this too formally, and too much like a prince.

23.

The Characteristics of Corruption.--Let us observe the following characteristics in that condition of society from time to time necessary, which is designated by the word "corruption." Immediately upon the appearance of corruption anywhere, a motley _superstition_ gets the upper hand, and the hitherto universal belief of a people becomes colourless and impotent in comparison with it; for superstition is free-thinking of the second rank,--he who gives himself over to it selects certain forms and formulæ which appeal, to him, and permits himself a right of choice. The superstitious man is always much more of a "person," in comparison with the religious man, and a superstitious society will be one in which there are many individuals, and a delight in individuality. Seen from this standpoint superstition always appears as a _progress_ in comparison with belief, and as a sign that the intellect becomes more independent and claims to have its rights. Those who reverence the old religion and the religious disposition then complain of corruption,--they have hitherto also determined the usage of language, and have given a bad repute to superstition, even among the freest spirits. Let us learn that it is a symptom of _enlightenment._--Secondly, a society in which corruption takes a hold is blamed for _effeminacy:_ for the appreciation of war, and the delight in war, perceptibly diminish in such a society, and the conveniences of life are now just as eagerly sought after as were military and gymnastic honours formerly. But one is accustomed to overlook the fact that the old national energy and national passion, which acquired a magnificent splendour in war and in the tourney, has now transferred itself into innumerable private passions, and has merely become less visible; indeed in periods of "corruption" the quantity and quality of the expended energy of a people is probably greater than ever, and the individual spends it lavishly, to such an extent as could not be done formerly--he was not then rich enough to do so! And thus it is precisely in times of "effeminacy" that tragedy runs at large in and out of doors, it is then that ardent love and ardent hatred are born, and the flame of knowledge flashes heavenward in full blaze.--Thirdly, as if in amends for the reproach of superstition and effeminacy, it is customary to say of such periods of corruption that they are milder, and that cruelty has then greatly diminished in comparison with the older, more credulous, and stronger period. But to this praise I am just as little able to assent as to that reproach: I only grant so much--namely, that cruelty now becomes more refined, and its older forms are henceforth counter to the taste; but the wounding and torturing by word and look reaches its highest development in times of corruption,--it is now only that _wickedness_ is created, and the delight in wickedness. The men of the period of corruption are witty and calumnious; they know that there are yet other ways of murdering than by the dagger and the ambush--they know also that all that is _well said_ is believed in.--Fourthly, it is when "morals decay" that those beings whom one calls tyrants first make their appearance; they are the forerunners of the

individual, and as it were early matured _firstlings._ Yet a little while, and this fruit of fruits hangs ripe and yellow on the tree of a people,--and only for the sake of such fruit did this tree exist! When the decay has reached its worst, and likewise the conflict of all sorts of tyrants, there always arises the Cæsar, the final tyrant, who puts an end to the exhausted struggle for sovereignty, by making the exhaustedness work for him. In his time the individual is usually most mature, and consequently the "culture" is highest and most fruitful, but not on his account nor through him: although the men of highest culture love to flatter their Cæsar by pretending that they are _his_ creation. The truth, however, is that they need quietness externally, because they have disquietude and labour internally. In these times bribery and treason are at their height: for the love of the _ego,_ then first discovered, is much more powerful than the love of the old, used-up, hackneyed "father-land"; and the need to be secure in one way or other against the frightful fluctuations of fortune, opens even the nobler hands, as soon as a richer and more powerful person shows himself ready to put gold into them. There is then so little certainty with regard to the future; people live only for the day: a psychical condition which enables every deceiver to play an easy game,--people of course only let themselves be misled and bribed "for the present," and reserve for themselves futurity and virtue. The individuals, as is well known, the men who only live for themselves, provide for the moment more than do their opposites, the gregarious men, because they consider themselves just as incalculable as the future; and similarly they attach themselves willingly--to despots, because they believe themselves capable of activities and expedients, which can neither reckon on being understood by the multitude, nor on finding favour with them--but the tyrant or the Cæsar understands the rights of the individual even in his excesses, and has an interest in speaking on behalf of a bolder private morality, and even in giving his hand to it For he thinks of himself, and wishes people to think of him what Napoleon once uttered in his classical style--"I have the right to answer by an eternal 'thus I am' to everything about which complaint is brought against me. I am apart from all the world, I accept conditions from nobody. I wish people also to submit to my fancies, and to take it quite as a simple matter, if I should indulge in this or that diversion." Thus spoke Napoleon once to his wife, when she had reasons for calling in question the fidelity of her husband. The times of corruption are the seasons when the apples fall from the tree: I mean the individuals, the seed-bearers of the future, the pioneers of spiritual colonisation, and of a new construction of national and social unions. Corruption is only an abusive term for the _harvest time_ of a people.

24.

_Different Dissatisfactions.--_The feeble and as it were feminine dissatisfied people, have ingenuity for beautifying and deepening life; the strong dissatisfied people--the masculine persons among them to continue the metaphor--have ingenuity for improving and safeguarding life. The former show their weakness and feminine character by willingly letting themselves be temporarily deceived, and perhaps even by putting up with a little ecstasy and enthusiasm on a time, but on the whole they are never to be satisfied, and suffer from the incurability of their dissatisfaction; moreover they are the patrons of all those who manage to concoct opiate and narcotic comforts, and on that account are averse to those who value the physician higher than the priest,--they thereby encourage the _continuance_ of actual distress! If there had not been a surplus of dissatisfied persons of this kind in Europe since the time of the Middle Ages, the remarkable capacity of Europeans for constant _transformation_ would perhaps not have originated at all; for the claims of the strong dissatisfied persons are too gross, and really too modest to resist being finally quieted down. China is an instance of a country in which dissatisfaction on a grand scale and the capacity for transformation have died out for many centuries; and the Socialists and state-idolaters of Europe could easily bring things to Chinese conditions and to a Chinese "happiness," with their measures for the amelioration and security of life, provided that they could first of all root out the sicklier, tenderer, more feminine dissatisfaction and Romanticism which are still very abundant among us. Europe is an invalid who owes her best thanks to her incurability and the eternal transformations of her sufferings; these constant new situations, these equally constant new dangers, pains, and make-shifts, have at last generated an intellectual sensitiveness which is almost equal to genius, and is in any case the mother of all genius.

25.

Not Pre-ordained to Knowledge.--There is a pur-blind humility not at all rare, and when a person is afflicted with it, he is once for all disqualified for being a disciple of knowledge. It is this in fact: the moment a man of this kind perceives anything striking, he turns as it were on his heel and says to himself: "You have deceived yourself! Where have your wits been! This cannot be the truth!"--and then, instead of looking at it and listening to it with more attention, he runs out of the way of the striking object as if intimidated, and seeks to get it out of his head as quickly as possible. For his fundamental rule runs thus: "I want to see nothing that contradicts the usual opinion concerning things! Am _I_ created for the purpose of discovering new truths? There are already too many of the old ones."

26.

What is Living?--Living--that is to continually eliminate from ourselves what is about to die; Living--that is to be cruel and inexorable towards all that becomes weak and old in ourselves and not only in ourselves. Living--that means, there fore to be without piety toward the dying, the wrenched and the old? To be continually a murderer?--And yet old Moses said: "Thou shalt not kill!"

27.

The Self-Renouncer.--What does the self-renouncer do? He strives after a higher world, he wants to fly longer and further and higher than all men of affirmation--he _throws away many things_ that would impede his flight, and several things among them that are not valueless, that are not unpleasant to him: he sacrifices them to his desire for elevation. Now this sacrificing, this casting away, is the very thing which becomes visible in him: on that account one calls him a self-renouncer, and as such he stands before us, enveloped in his cowl, and as the soul of a hair-shirt. With this effect, however, which he makes upon us he is well content: he wants to keep concealed from us his desire, his pride, his intention of flying _above_ us.--Yes! He is wiser than we thought, and so courteous towards us--this affirmer! For that is what he is, like us, even in his self-renunciation.

28.

Injuring with ones best Qualities.--Out strong points sometimes drive us so far forward that we cannot any longer endure our weaknesses, and we perish by them: we also perhaps see this result beforehand, but nevertheless do not want it to be otherwise. We then become hard towards that which would fain be spared in us, and our pitilessness is also our greatness. Such an experience, which must in the end cost us our Hie, is a symbol of the collective effect of great men upon others and upon their epoch:--it is just with their best abilities, with that which only _they_ can do, that they destroy much that is weak, uncertain, evolving, and _willing,_ and are thereby injurious. Indeed, the case may happen in which, taken on the whole, they only do injury, because their best is accepted and drunk up as it were solely by those who lose their understanding and their egoism by it, as by too strong a beverage; they become so intoxicated that they go breaking their limbs on all the wrong roads where their drunkenness drives them.

29.

Adventitious Liars.--When people began to combat the unity of Aristotle in France, and consequently also to defend it, there was once more to be seen that which has been seen so often, but seen so unwillingly:--_people imposed false reasons on themselves_ on account of which those laws ought to exist, merely for the sake of not acknowledging to themselves that they had _accustomed_ themselves to the authority of those laws, and did not want any longer to have things otherwise. And people do so in every prevailing morality and religion, and have always done so: the reasons and intentions behind the habit, are only added surreptitiously when people begin to combat the habit, and _ask_ for reasons and intentions. It is here that the great dishonesty of the conservatives of all times hides:--they are adventitious liars.

30.

_The Comedy of Celebrated Men.--_Celebrated men who _need_ their fame, as, for instance, all politicians, no longer select their associates and friends without fore-thought: from the one they want a portion of the splendour and reflection of his virtues; from the other they want the fear-inspiring power of certain dubious qualities in him, of which everybody is aware; from another they steal his reputation for idleness and basking in the sun, because it is advantageous for their own ends to be regarded temporarily as heedless and lazy:--it conceals the fact that they lie in ambush; they now use the visionaries, now the experts, now the brooders, now the pedants in their neighbourhood, as their actual selves for the time; but very soon they do not need them any longer! And thus while their environment and outside die off continually, everything seems to crowd into this environment, and wants to become a "character" of it; they are like great cities in this respect. Their repute is continually in process of mutation, like their character, for their changing methods require this change, and they show and _exhibit_ sometimes this and sometimes that actual or fictitious quality on the stage; their friends and associates, as we have said, belong to these stage properties. On the other hand, that which they aim at must remain so much the more steadfast, and burnished and resplendent in the distance,--and this also sometimes needs its comedy and its stage-play.

31.

Commerce and Nobility.--Buying and selling is now regarded as something ordinary, like the art of reading and writing; everyone is now trained to it even when he is not a tradesman exercising himself daily in the art; precisely as formerly in the period of uncivilised humanity, everyone was a hunter and exercised himself day by day in the art of hunting. Hunting was then something common: but just as this finally became a privilege of the powerful and noble, and thereby lost the character of the commonplace and the ordinary--by ceasing to be necessary and by becoming an affair of fancy and luxury,--so it might become the same some day with buying and selling. Conditions of society are imaginable in which there will be no selling and buying, and in which the necessity for this art will become quite lost; perhaps it may then happen that individuals who are less subjected to the law of the prevailing condition of things will indulge in buying and selling as a _luxury of sentiment. _ It is then only that commerce would acquire nobility, and the noble would then perhaps occupy themselves just as readily with commerce as they have done hitherto with war and politics: while on the other hand the valuation of politics might then have entirely altered. Already even politics ceases to be the business of a gentleman; and it is possible that one day it may be found to be so vulgar as to be brought, like all party literature and daily literature, under the rubric: "Prostitution of the intellect."

32.

Undesirable Disciples.--What shall I do with these two youths! called out a philosopher dejectedly, who "corrupted" youths, as Socrates had once corrupted them,--they are unwelcome disciples to me. One of them cannot say "Nay," and the other says "Half and half" to everything. Provided they grasped my doctrine, the former would _suffer_ too much, for my mode of thinking requires a martial soul, willingness to cause pain, delight in denying, and a hard skin,--he would succumb by open wounds and internal injuries. And the other will choose the mediocre in everything he represents, and thus make a mediocrity of the whole,--I should like my enemy to have such a disciple.

33.

Outside the Lecture-room.--"In order to prove that man after all belongs to the good-natured animals, I would remind you how credulous he has been for so long a time. It is now only, quite late, and after an immense self-conquest, that he has become a _distrustful_ animal,--yes! man is now more wicked than ever."--I do not understand this; why should man now be more distrustful and more wicked?--"Because now he has science,--because he needs to have it!"--

34.

Historia abscondita.--Every great man has a power which operates backward; all history is again placed on the scales on his account, and a thousand secrets of the past crawl out of their lurking-places--into _his_ sunlight. There is absolutely no knowing what history may be some day. The past is still perhaps undiscovered in its essence! There is yet so much reinterpreting ability needed!

35.

Heresy and Witchcraft.--To think otherwise than is customary--that is by no means so much the activity of a better intellect, as the activity of strong, wicked inclinations,--severing, isolating, refractory, mischief-loving, malicious inclinations. Heresy is the counterpart of witchcraft, and is certainly just as little a merely harmless affair, or a thing worthy of honour in itself. Heretics and sorcerers are two kinds of bad men; they have it in common that they also feel themselves wicked; their unconquerable delight is to attack and injure whatever rules,--whether it be men or opinions. The Reformation, a kind of duplication of the spirit of the Middle Ages at a time when it had no longer a good conscience, produced both of these kinds of people in the greatest profusion.

36.

Last Words.-It will be recollected that the Emperor Augustus, that terrible man, who had himself as much in his own power and could be silent as well as any wise Socrates, became indiscreet about himself in his last words; for the first time he let his mask fall, when he gave to understand that he had carried a mask and played a comedy,--he had played the father of his country and wisdom on the throne well, even to the point of illusion! _Plaudite amid, comœdia finita est!--_The thought of the dying Nero: _qualis artifex pereo!_ was also the thought of the dying Augustus: histrionic conceit! histrionic loquacity! And the very counterpart to the dying Socrates!--But Tiberius died silently, that most tortured of all self-torturers,--_he_ was _genuine_ and not a stage-player! What may have passed through his head in the end! Perhaps this: "Life--that is a long death. I am a fool, who shortened the lives of so many!

Was _I_ created for the purpose of being a benefactor? I should have given them eternal life: and then I could have _seen them dying_ eternally. I had such good eyes _for that: qualis spectator pereo!_" When he seemed once more to regain his powers after a long death-struggle, it was considered advisable to smother him with pillows,--he died a double death.

37.

Owing to three Errors.--Science has been furthered during recent centuries, partly because it was hoped that God's goodness and wisdom would be best understood therewith and thereby--the principal motive in the soul of great Englishmen (like Newton); partly because the absolute utility of knowledge was believed in, and especially the most intimate connection of morality, knowledge, and happiness--the principal motive in the soul of great Frenchmen (like Voltaire); and partly because it was thought that in science there was something unselfish, harmless, self-sufficing, lovable, and truly innocent to be had, in which the evil human impulses did not at all participate--the principal motive in the soul of Spinoza, who felt himself divine, as a knowing being:--it is consequently owing to three errors that science has been furthered.

38.

Explosive People.--When one considers how ready are the forces of young men for discharge, one does not wonder at seeing them decide so uncritically and with so little selection for this or that cause: _that_ which attracts them is the sight of eagerness for a cause, as it were the sight of the burning match--not the cause itself. The more ingenious seducers on that account operate by holding out the prospect of an explosion to such persons, and do not urge their cause by means of reasons; these powder-barrels are not won over by means of reasons!

39.

Altered Taste.--The alteration of the general taste is more important than the alteration of opinions; opinions, with all their proving, refuting, and intellectual masquerade, are merely symptoms of altered taste, and are certainly _not_ what they are still so often claimed to be, the causes of the altered taste. How does the general taste alter? By the fact of individuals, the powerful and influential persons, expressing and tyrannically enforcing without any feeling of shame, _their hoc est ridiculum, hoc est absurdum;_ the decisions, therefore, of their taste and their disrelish:--they thereby lay a constraint upon many people, out of which there gradually grows a habituation for still more, and finally a _necessity for all._ The fact, however, that these individuals feel and "taste" differently, has usually its origin in a peculiarity of their mode of life, nourishment, or digestion, perhaps in a surplus or deficiency of the inorganic salts in their blood and brain, in short in their _physis;_ they have, however, the courage to avow their physical constitution, and to lend an ear even to the most delicate tones of its requirements: their æsthetic and moral judgments are those "most delicate tones" of their _physis._

40.

The Lack of a noble Presence.--Soldiers and their leaders have always a much higher mode of comportment toward one another than workmen and their employers. At present at least, all militarily established civilisation still stands high above all so-called industrial civilisation; the latter, in its present form, is in general the meanest mode of existence that has ever been. It is simply the law of necessity that operates here: people want to live, and have to sell themselves; but they despise him who exploits their necessity and _purchases_ the workman. It is curious that the subjection to powerful, fear-inspiring, and even dreadful individuals, to tyrants and leaders of armies, is not at all felt so painfully as the subjection to such undistinguished and uninteresting persons as the captains of industry; in the employer the workman usually sees merely a crafty, blood-sucking dog of a man, speculating on every necessity, whose name, form, character, and reputation are altogether indifferent to him. It is probable that the manufacturers and great magnates of commerce have hitherto lacked too much all those forms and attributes of a _superior race,_ which alone make persons interesting; if they had had the nobility of the nobly-born in their looks and bearing, there would perhaps have been no socialism in the masses of the people. For these are really ready for _slavery_ of every kind, provided that the superior class above them constantly shows itself legitimately superior, and _born_ to command--by its noble presence! The commonest man feels that nobility is not to be improvised, and that it is his part to honour it as the fruit of protracted race-culture,--but the absence of superior presence, and the notorious vulgarity of manufacturers with red, fat hands, brings up the thought to him that it is only chance and fortune that has here elevated the one above the other; well then--so he reasons with himself--let _us_ in our turn tempt chance and fortune! Let us in our turn throw the dice!--and socialism commences.

41.

_Against Remorse.--_The thinker sees in his own actions attempts and questionings to obtain information about something or other; success and failure are _answers_ to him first and foremost. To vex himself, however, because something does not succeed, or to feel remorse at all--he leaves that to those who act because they are commanded to do so, and expect to get a beating when their gracious master is not satisfied with the result.

42.

Work and Ennui--In respect to seeking work for the sake of the pay, almost all men are alike at present in civilised countries; to all of them work is a means, and not itself the end; on which account they are not very select in the choice of the work, provided it yields an abundant profit. But still there are rarer men who would rather perish than work without _delight_ in their labour: the fastidious people, difficult to satisfy, whose object is not served by an abundant profit, unless the work itself be the reward of all rewards. Artists and contemplative men of all kinds belong to this rare species of human beings; and also the idlers who spend their life in hunting and travelling, or in love-affairs and adventures. They all seek toil and trouble in so far as these are associated with pleasure, and they want the severest and hardest labour, if it be necessary. In other respects, however, they have a resolute indolence, even should impoverishment, dishonour, and danger to health and life be associated therewith. They are not so much afraid of ennui as of labour without pleasure; indeed they require much ennui, if _their_ work is to succeed with them. For the thinker and for all inventive spirits ennui is the unpleasant "calm" of the soul which precedes the happy voyage and the dancing breezes; he must endure it, he must _await_ the effect it has on him:--it is precisely _this_ which lesser natures cannot at all experience! It is common to scare away ennui in every way, just as it is common to labour without pleasure. It perhaps distinguishes the Asiatics above the Europeans, that they are capable of a longer and profounder repose; even their narcotics operate slowly and require patience, in contrast to the obnoxious suddenness of the European poison, alcohol.

43.

What the Laws Betray.--One makes a great mistake when one studies the penal laws of a people, as if they were an expression of its character; the laws do not betray what a people is, but what appears to them foreign, strange, monstrous, and outlandish. The laws concern themselves with the exceptions to the morality of custom; and the severest punishments fall on acts which conform to the customs of the neighbouring peoples. Thus among the Wahabites, there are only two mortal sins: having another God than the Wahabite God, and--smoking (it is designated by them as "the disgraceful kind of drinking"). "And how is it with regard to murder and adultery?"-asked the Englishman with astonishment on learning these things. "Well, God is gracious and pitiful!" answered the old chief.--Thus among the ancient Romans there was the idea that a woman could only sin mortally in two ways: by adultery on the one hand, and--by wine-drinking on the other. Old Cato pretended that kissing among relatives had only been made a custom in order to keep women in control on this point; a kiss meant: did her breath smell of wine? Wives had actually been punished by death who were surprised taking wine: and certainly not merely because women under the influence of wine sometimes unlearn altogether the art of saying No; the Romans were afraid above all things of the orgiastic and Dionysian spirit with which the women of Southern Europe at that time (when wine was still new in Europe) were sometimes visited, as by a monstrous foreignness which subverted the basis of Roman sentiments; it seemed to them treason against Rome, as the embodiment of foreignness.

44.

The Believed Motive.--However important it may be to know the motives according to which mankind has really acted hitherto, perhaps the _belief_ in this or that motive, and therefore that which mankind has assumed and imagined to be the actual mainspring of its activity hitherto, is something still more essential for the thinker to know. For the internal happiness and misery of men have always come to them through their belief in this or that motive,--_not_ however, through that which was actually the motive! All about the latter has an interest of secondary rank.

45.

Epicurus.--Yes, I am proud of perceiving the character of Epicurus differently from anyone else perhaps, and of enjoying the happiness of the afternoon of antiquity in all that I hear and read of him:--I see his eye gazing out on a broad whitish sea, over the shore-rocks on which the sunshine rests, while great and small creatures play in its light, secure and calm like this light and that eye itself. Such happiness could only have been devised by a chronic sufferer, the happiness of an eye before which the sea of

existence has become calm, and which can no longer tire of gazing at the surface and at the variegated, tender, tremulous skin of this sea. Never previously was there such a moderation of voluptuousness.

46.

_Our Astonishment--_There is a profound and fundamental satisfaction in the fact that science ascertains things that _hold their ground,_ and again furnish the basis for new researches:--it could certainly be otherwise. Indeed, we are so much convinced of all the uncertainty and caprice of our judgments, and of the everlasting change of all human laws and conceptions, that we are really astonished _how persistently_ the results of science hold their ground! In earlier times people knew nothing of this changeability of all human things; the custom of morality maintained the belief that the whole inner life of man was bound to iron necessity by eternal fetters:--perhaps people then felt a similar voluptuousness of astonishment when they listened to tales and fairy stories. The wonderful did so much good to those men, who might well get tired sometimes of the regular and the eternal. To leave the ground for once! To soar! To stray! To be mad!--that belonged to the paradise and the revelry of earlier times; while our felicity is like that of the shipwrecked man who has gone ashore, and places himself with both feet on the old, firm ground--in astonishment that it does not rock.

47.

The Suppression of the Passions.--When one continually prohibits the expression of the passions as something to be left to the "vulgar," to coarser, bourgeois, and peasant natures--that is, when one does not want to suppress the passions themselves, but only their language and demeanour, one nevertheless realises _therewith_ just what one does not want: the suppression of the passions themselves, or at least their weakening and alteration,--as the court of Louis XIV. (to cite the most instructive instance), and all that was dependent on it, experienced. The generation _that followed,_ trained in suppressing their expression, no longer possessed the passions themselves, but had a pleasant, superficial, playful disposition in their place,--a generation which was so permeated with the incapacity to be ill-mannered, that even an injury was not taken and retaliated, except with courteous words. Perhaps our own time furnishes the most remarkable counterpart to this period: I see everywhere (in life, in the theatre, and not least in all that is written) satisfaction at all the _coarser_ outbursts and gestures of passion; a certain convention of passionateness is now desired,--only not the passion itself! Nevertheless _it_ will thereby be at last reached, and our posterity will have a _genuine savagery,_ and not merely a formal savagery and unmannerliness.

48.

_Knowledge of Distress.--_Perhaps there is nothing by which men and periods are so much separated from one another, as by the different degrees of knowledge of distress which they possess; distress of the soul as well as of the body. With respect to the latter, owing to lack of sufficient self-experience, we men of the present day (in spite of our deficiencies and infirmities), are perhaps all of us blunderers and visionaries in comparison with the men of the age of fear--the longest of all ages,--when the individual had to protect himself against violence, and for that purpose had to be a man of violence himself. At that time a man went through a long schooling of corporeal tortures and privations, and found even in a certain kind of cruelty toward himself, in a voluntary use of pain, a necessary means for his preservation; at that time a person trained his environment to the endurance of pain; at that time a person willingly inflicted pain, and saw the most frightful things of this kind happen to others without having any other feeling than for his own security. As regards the distress of the soul however, I now look at every man with respect to whether he knows it by experience or by description; whether he still regards it as necessary to simulate this knowledge, perhaps as an indication of more refined culture; or whether, at the bottom of his heart, he does not at all believe in great sorrows of soul, and at the naming of them calls to mind a similar experience as at the naming of great corporeal sufferings, such as tooth-aches, and stomach-aches. It is thus, however, that it seems to be with most people at present. Owing to the universal inexperience of both kinds of pain, and the comparative rarity of the spectacle of a sufferer, an important consequence results: people now hate pain far more than earlier man did, and calumniate it worse than ever; indeed people nowadays can hardly endure the _thought_ of pain, and make out of it an affair of conscience and a reproach to collective existence. The appearance of pessimistic philosophies is not at all the sign of great and dreadful miseries; for these interrogative marks regarding the worth of life appear in periods when the refinement and alleviation of existence already deem the unavoidable gnat-stings of the soul and body as altogether too bloody and wicked; and in the poverty of actual experiences of pain, would now like to make _painful general ideas_ appear as suffering of the worst kind.--There might indeed be a remedy for pessimistic philosophies and the excessive sensibility which seems to me the real "distress of the present":--but perhaps this remedy already sounds too cruel, and would itself be reckoned among the symptoms

owing to which people at present conclude that "existence is something evil." Well! the remedy for "the distress" is _distress._

49.

_Magnanimity and allied Qualities.--_Those paradoxical phenomena, such as the sudden coldness in the demeanour of good-natured men, the humour of the melancholy, and above all _magnanimity,_ as a sudden renunciation of revenge or of the gratification of envy--appear in men in whom there is a powerful inner impulsiveness, in men of sudden satiety and sudden disgust. Their satisfactions are so rapid and violent that satiety, aversion and flight into the antithetical taste, immediately follow upon them: in this contrast the convulsion of feeling liberates itself, in one person by sudden coldness, in another by laughter, and in a third by tear and self-sacrifice. The magnanimous person appears to me--at least that kind of magnanimous person who has always made most impression--as a man with the strongest thirst for vengeance, to whom a gratification presents itself close at hand, and who _already_ drinks it off _in imagination_ so copiously, thoroughly, and to the last drop, that an excessive, rapid disgust follows this rapid licentiousness;--he now elevates himself "above himself," as one says, and forgives his enemy, yea, blesses and honours him. With this violence done to himself, however, with this mockery of his impulse to revenge, even still so powerful he merely yields to the new impulse, the disgust which has become powerful, and does this just as impatiently and licentiously, as a short time previously he _forestalled,_ and as it were exhausted, the joy of revenge with his fantasy. In magnanimity there is the same amount of egoism as in revenge, but a different quality of egoism.

50.

The Argument of Isolation.--The reproach of conscience, even in the most conscientious, is weak against the feeling: "This and that are contrary to the good morals of _your_ society." A cold glance or a wry mouth on the part of those among whom and for whom one has been educated, is still _feared_ even by the strongest. What is really feared there? Isolation! as the argument which demolishes even the best arguments for a person or cause!--It is thus that the gregarious instinct speaks in us.

51.

_Sense for Truth.--_Commend me to all scepticism where I am permitted to answer: "Let us put it to the test!" But I don't wish to hear anything more of things and questions which do not admit of being tested. That is the limit of my "sense for truth": for bravery has there lost its right.

52.

_What others Know of us.--_That which we know of ourselves and have in our memory is not so decisive for the happiness of our life as is generally believed. One day it flashes upon our mind what _others_ know of us (or think they know)--and then we acknowledge that it is the more powerful. We get on with our bad conscience more easily than with our bad reputation.

53.

_Where Goodness Begins.--_Where bad eyesight can no longer see the evil impulse as such, on account of its refinement,--there man sets up the kingdom of goodness; and the feeling of having now gone over into the kingdom of goodness brings all those impulses (such as the feelings of security, of comfortableness, of benevolence) into simultaneous activity, which were threatened and confined by the evil impulses. Consequently, the duller the eye so much the further does goodness extend! Hence the eternal cheerfulness of the populace and of children! Hence the gloominess and grief (allied to the bad conscience) of great thinkers.

54.

_The Consciousness of Appearance.--_How wonderfully and novelly, and at the same time how awfully and ironically, do I feel myself situated with respect to collective existence, with my knowledge! I have _discovered_ for myself that the old humanity and animality, yea, the collective primeval age, and the past of all sentient being, continues to meditate, love, hate, and reason in me,--I have suddenly awoke in the midst of this dream, but merely to the consciousness that I just dream, and that I _must_ dream on in order not to perish; just as the sleep-walker must dream on in order not to tumble down. What is it that is now "appearance" to me! Verily, not the antithesis of any kind of essence,--what knowledge can I assert of any kind of essence whatsoever, except merely the predicates of its appearance! Verily not a dead mask which one could put upon an unknown X, and which to be sure one could also remove! Appearance is for me the operating and living thing itself; which goes so far in its self-mockery as to make me feel that

here there is appearance, and Will o' the Wisp, and spirit-dance, and nothing more,--that among all these dreamers, I also, the "thinker," dance my dance, that the thinker is a means of prolonging further the terrestrial dance, and in so far is one of the masters of ceremony of existence, and that the sublime consistency and connectedness of all branches of knowledge is perhaps, and will perhaps, be the best means for _maintaining_ the universality of the dreaming, the complete, mutual understandability of all those dreamers, and thereby _the duration of the dream_.

55.

The Ultimate Nobility of Character.--What then makes a person "noble"? Certainly not that he makes sacrifices; even the frantic libertine makes sacrifices. Certainly not that he generally follows his passions; there are contemptible passions. Certainly not that he does something for others, and without selfishness; perhaps the effect of selfishness is precisely at its greatest in the noblest persons.--But that the passion which seizes the noble man is a peculiarity, without his knowing that it is so: the use of a rare and singular measuring-rod, almost a frenzy: the feeling of heat in things which feel cold to all other persons: a divining of values for which scales have not yet been invented: a sacrificing on altars which are consecrated to an unknown God: a bravery without the desire for honour: a self-sufficiency which has superabundance, and imparts to men and things. Hitherto, therefore, it has been the rare in man, and the unconsciousness of this rareness, that has made men noble. Here, however, let us consider that everything ordinary, immediate, and indispensable, in short, what has been most preservative of the species, and generally the _rule_ in mankind hitherto, has been judged unreasonable and calumniated in its entirety by this standard, in favour of the exceptions. To become the advocate of the rule--that may perhaps be: the ultimate form and refinement in which nobility of character will reveal itself on earth.

56.

The Desire for Suffering.--When I think of the desire to do something, how it continually tickles and stimulates millions of young Europeans, who cannot endure themselves and all their ennui,--I conceive that there must be a desire in them to suffer something, in order to derive from their suffering a worthy motive for acting, for doing something. Distress is necessary! Hence the cry of the politicians, hence the many false trumped-up, exaggerated "states of distress" of all possible kinds, and the blind readiness to believe in them. This young world desires that there should arrive or appear _from the outside--not_ happiness--but misfortune; and their imagination is already busy beforehand to form a monster out of it, so that they may afterwards be able to fight with a monster. If these distress-seekers felt the power to benefit themselves, to do something for themselves from internal sources, they would also understand how to create a distress of their own, specially their own, from internal sources. Their inventions might then be more refined, and their gratifications might sound like good music: while at present they fill the world with their cries of distress, and consequently too often with the _feeling of distress_ in the first place! They do not know what to make of themselves--and so they paint the misfortune of others on the wall; they always need others! And always again other others!--Pardon me, my friends, I have ventured to paint my _happiness_ on the wall.

BOOK SECOND

57.

To the Realists.--Ye sober beings, who feel yourselves armed against passion and fantasy, and would gladly make a pride and an ornament out of your emptiness, ye call yourselves realists, and give to understand that the world is actually constituted as it appears to you; before you alone reality stands unveiled, and ye yourselves would perhaps be the best part of it,--oh, ye dear images of Sais! But are not ye also in your unveiled condition still extremely passionate and dusky beings compared with the fish, and still all too like an enamoured artist?[1]--and what is "reality" to an enamoured artist! Ye still carry about with you the valuations of things which had their origin in the passions and infatuations of earlier centuries! There is still a secret and ineffaceable drunkenness embodied in your sobriety! Your love of "reality," for example--oh, that is an old, primitive "love"! In every feeling, in every sense-impression, there is a portion of this old love: and similarly also some kind of fantasy, prejudice, irrationality, ignorance, fear, and whatever else has become mingled and woven into it. There is that mountain! There is that cloud! What is "real" in them? Remove the phantasm and the whole human _element_ therefrom, ye sober ones! Yes, if ye could do _that!_ If ye could forget your origin, your past, your preparatory schooling,--your whole history as man and beast! There is no "reality" for us--nor for you either, ye sober ones,--we are far from being so alien to one another as ye suppose; and perhaps our good-will to get beyond drunkenness is just as respectable as your belief that ye are altogether _incapable_ of drunkenness.

[1] Schiller's poem, "The Veiled Image of Sais," is again referred to here.--TR.

58.

Only as Creators!--It has caused me the greatest trouble, and for ever causes me the greatest trouble, to perceive that unspeakably more depends upon _what things are called,_ than on what they are. The reputation, the name and appearance, the importance, the usual measure and weight of things--each being in origin most frequently an error and arbitrariness thrown over the things like a garment, and quite alien to their essence and even to their exterior--have gradually, by the belief therein and its continuous growth from generation to generation, grown as it were on-and-into things and become their very body; the appearance at the very beginning becomes almost always the essence in the end, and _operates_ as the essence! What a fool he would be who would think it enough to refer here to this origin and this nebulous veil of illusion, in order to _annihilate_ that which virtually passes for the world--namely, so-called "reality"! It is only as creators that we can annihilate!--But let us not forget this: it suffices to create new names and valuations and probabilities, in order in the long run to create new "things."

59.

We Artists!--When we love a woman we have readily a hatred against nature, on recollecting all the disagreeable natural functions to which every woman is subject; we prefer not to think of them at all, but if once our soul touches on these things it twitches impatiently, and glances, as we have said, contemptuously at nature:--we are hurt; nature seems to encroach upon our possessions, and with the profanest hands. We then shut our ears against all physiology, and we decree in secret that "we will hear nothing of the fact that man is something else than _soul and form!"_ "The man under the skin" is an abomination and monstrosity, a blasphemy of God and of love to all lovers.--Well, just as the lover still feels with respect to nature and natural functions, so did every worshipper of God and his "holy omnipotence" feel formerly: in all that was said of nature by astronomers, geologists, physiologists, and physicians, he saw an encroachment on his most precious possession, and consequently an attack,--and moreover also an impertinence of the assailant! The "law of nature" sounded to him as blasphemy against God; in truth he would too willingly have seen the whole of mechanics traced back to moral acts of volition and arbitrariness:--but because nobody could render him this service, he _concealed_ nature and mechanism from himself as best he could, and lived in a dream. Oh, those men of former times understood how to _dream,_ and did not need first to go to sleep!--and we men of the present day also still understand it too well, with all our good-will for wakefulness and daylight! It suffices to love, to hate, to desire, and in general to feel _immediately_ the spirit and the power of the dream come over us, and we ascend, with open eyes and indifferent to all danger, the most dangerous paths, to the roofs and towers of fantasy, and without any giddiness, as persons born for climbing--we the night-walkers by day! We artists! We concealers of naturalness! We moon-struck and God-struck ones! We death-silent, untiring wanderers on heights which we do not see as heights, but as our plains, as our places of safety!

60.

Women and their Effect in the Distance.--Have I still ears? Am I only ear, and nothing else besides? Here I stand in the midst of the surging of the breakers, whose white flames fork up to my feet;--from all sides there is howling, threatening, crying, and screaming at me, while in the lowest depths the old earth-shaker sings his aria hollow like a roaring bull; he beats such an earth-shaker's measure thereto, that even the hearts of these weathered rock-monsters tremble at the sound. Then, suddenly, as if born out of nothingness, there appears before the portal of this hellish labyrinth, only a few fathoms distant,--a great sailing-ship gliding silently along like a ghost. Oh, this ghostly beauty! With what enchantment it seizes me! What? Has all the repose and silence in the world embarked here? Does my happiness itself sit in this quiet place, my happier ego, my second immortalised self? Still not dead, but also no longer living? As a ghost-like, calm, gazing, gliding, sweeping, neutral being? Similar to the ship, which, with its white sails, like an immense butterfly, passes over the dark sea! Yes! Passing _over_ existence! That is it! That would be it!--It seems that the noise here has made me a visionary? All great noise causes one to place happiness in the calm and the distance. When a man is in the midst of _his_ hubbub, in the midst of the breakers of his plots and plans, he there sees perhaps calm, enchanting beings glide past him, for whose happiness and retirement he longs--_they are women._ He almost thinks that there with the women dwells his better self; that in these calm places even the loudest breakers become still as death, and life itself a dream of life. But still! but still! my noble enthusiast, there is also in the most beautiful sailing-ship so much noise and bustling, and alas, so much petty, pitiable bustling! The enchantment and the most powerful effect of women is, to use the language of philosophers, an effect at a distance, an _actio in distans;_ there belongs thereto, however, primarily and above all,--_distance!_

6l.

In Honour of Friendship.--That the sentiment of friendship was regarded by antiquity as the highest sentiment, higher even than the most vaunted pride of the self-sufficient and wise, yea, as it were its sole and still holier brotherhood, is very well expressed by the story of the Macedonian king who made the present of a talent to a cynical Athenian philosopher from whom he received it back again. "What?" said the king, "has he then no friend?" He therewith meant to say, "I honour this pride of the wise and independent man, but I should have honoured his humanity still higher, if the friend in him had gained the victory over his pride. The philosopher has lowered himself in my estimation, for he showed that he did not know one of the two highest sentiments--and in fact the higher of them!"

62.

_Love.--_Love pardons even the passion of the beloved.

63.

Woman in Music--How does it happen that warm and rainy winds bring the musical mood and the inventive delight in melody with them? Are they not the same winds that fill the churches and give women amorous thoughts?

64.

Sceptics.--I fear that women who have grown old are more sceptical in the secret recesses of their hearts than any of the men; they believe in the superficiality of existence as in its essence, and all virtue and profundity is to them only the disguising of this "truth," the very desirable disguising of a _pudendum,_--an affair, therefore, of decency and modesty, and nothing more!

65.

Devotedness.--There are noble women with a certain poverty of spirit, who, in order to _express_ their profoundest devotedness, have no other alternative but to offer their virtue and modesty: it is the highest thing they have. And this present is often accepted without putting the recipient under such deep obligation as the giver supposed,--a very melancholy story!

66.

_The Strength of the Weak.--_Women are all skilful in exaggerating their weaknesses, indeed they are inventive in weaknesses, so as to seem quite fragile ornaments to which even a grain of dust does harm; their existence is meant to bring home to man's mind his coarseness, and to appeal to his conscience. They thus defend themselves against the strong and all "rights of might."

67.

Self-dissembling.--She loves him now and has since been looking forth with as quiet confidence as a cow; but alas! It was precisely his delight that she seemed so fitful and absolutely incomprehensible! He had rather too much steady weather in himself already! Would she not do well to feign her old character? to feign indifference? Does not--love itself advise her _to do so? Vivat comœdia!_

68.

Will and Willingness.--Some one brought a youth to a wise man, and said, "See, this is one who is being corrupted by women!" The wise man shook his head and smiled. "It is men," he called out, "who corrupt women; and everything that women lack should be atoned for and improved in men--for man creates for himself the ideal of woman, and woman moulds herself according to this ideal."--"You are too tender-hearted towards women," said one of the bystanders, "you do not know them!" The wise man answered: "Man's attribute is will, woman's attribute is willingness--such is the law of the sexes, verily! a hard law for woman! All human beings are innocent of their existence, women, however, are doubly innocent; who could have enough of salve and gentleness for them!"--"What about salve! What about gentleness!" called out another person in the crowd, "we must educate women better!"--"We must educate men better," said the wise man, and made a sign to the youth to follow him.--The youth, however, did not follow him.

69.

_Capacity for Revenge--_That a person cannot and consequently will not defend himself, does not yet cast disgrace upon him in our eyes; but we despise the person who has neither the ability nor the good-will for revenge--whether it be a man or a woman. Would a woman be able to captivate us (or, as people say, to "fetter" us) whom we did not credit with knowing how to employ the dagger (any kind of dagger) skilfully _against us_ under certain circumstances? Or against herself; which in a certain case might be the severest revenge (the Chinese revenge).

70.

_The Mistresses of the Masters--_A powerful contralto voice, as we occasionally hear it in the theatre, raises suddenly for us the curtain on possibilities in which we usually do not believe; all at once we are convinced that somewhere in the world there may be women with high, heroic, royal souls, capable and prepared for magnificent remonstrances, resolutions, and self-sacrifices, capable and prepared for domination over men, because in them the best in man, superior to sex, has become a corporeal ideal. To be sure, it is not the intention of the theatre that such voices should give such a conception of women; they are usually intended to represent the ideal male lover, for example, a Romeo; but, to judge by my experience, the theatre regularly miscalculates here, and the musician also, who expects such effects from such a voice. People do not believe in _these_ lovers; these voices still contain a tinge of the motherly and housewifely character, and most of all when love is in their tone.

71.

_On Female Chastity.--_There is something quite astonishing and extraordinary in the education of women of the higher class; indeed, there is perhaps nothing more paradoxical. All the world is agreed to educate them with as much ignorance as possible _in eroticis,_ and to inspire their soul with a profound shame of such things, and the extremest impatience and horror at the suggestion of them. It is really here only that all the "honour" of woman is at stake; what would one not forgive them in other respects! But here they are intended to remain ignorant to the very backbone:--they are intended to have neither eyes, ears, words, nor thoughts for this, their "wickedness"; indeed knowledge here is already evil. And then! To be hurled as with an awful thunderbolt into reality and knowledge with marriage--and indeed by him whom they most love and esteem: to have to encounter love and shame in contradiction, yea, to have to feel rapture, abandonment, duty, sympathy, and fright at the unexpected proximity of God and animal, and whatever else besides! all at once!--There, in fact, a psychic entanglement has been effected which is quite unequalled! Even the sympathetic curiosity of the wisest discerner of men does not suffice to divine how this or that woman gets along with the solution of this enigma and the enigma of this solution; what dreadful, far-reaching suspicions must awaken thereby in the poor unhinged soul; and forsooth, how the ultimate philosophy and scepticism of the woman casts anchor at this point!--Afterwards the same profound silence as before and often even a silence to herself, a shutting of her eyes to herself.--Young wives on that account make great efforts to appear superficial and thoughtless the most ingenious of them simulate a kind of impudence.--Wives easily feel their husbands as a question-mark to their honour, and their children as an apology or atonement,--they require children, and wish for them in quite another spirit than a husband wishes for them.--In short, one cannot be gentle enough towards women!

72.

Mothers.--Animals think differently from men with respect to females; with them the female is regarded as the productive being. There is no paternal love among them, but there is such a thing as love of the children of a beloved, and habituation to them. In the young, the females find gratification for their lust of dominion; the young are a property, an occupation, something quite comprehensible to them, with which they can chatter: all this conjointly is maternal love,--it is to be compared to the love of the artist for his work. Pregnancy has made the females gentler, more expectant, more timid, more submissively inclined; and similarly intellectual pregnancy engenders the character of the contemplative, who are allied to women in character:--they are the masculine mothers.--Among animals the masculine sex is regarded as the beautiful sex.

73.

_Saintly Cruelty.--_A man holding a newly born child in his hands came to a saint. "What should I do with this child," he asked, "it is wretched, deformed, and has not even enough of life to die" "Kill it," cried the saint with a dreadful voice, "kill it, and then hold it in thy arms for three days and three nights to brand it on thy memory:--thus wilt thou never again beget a child when it is not the time for thee to beget."--When the man had heard this he went away disappointed; and many found fault with the saint because he had advised cruelty; for he had advised to kill the child. "But is it not more cruel to let it live?" asked the saint.

74.

_The Unsuccessful--_Those poor women always fail of success who become agitated and uncertain, and talk too much in presence of him whom they love; for men are most successfully seduced by a certain subtle and phlegmatic tenderness.

75.

The Third Sex.--"A small man is a paradox, but still a man,--but a small woman seems to me to be of another sex in comparison with well-grown ones"--said an old dancing-master. A small woman is never beautiful--said old Aristotle.

76.

The greatest Danger.--Had there not at all times been a larger number of men who regarded the cultivation of their mind--their "rationality"--as their pride, their obligation, their virtue, and were injured or shamed by all play of fancy and extravagance of thinking--as lovers of "sound common sense":--mankind would long ago have perished! Incipient _insanity_ has hovered, and hovers continually over mankind as its greatest danger: it is precisely the breaking out of inclination in feeling, seeing, and hearing; the enjoyment of the unruliness of the mind; the delight in human unreason. It is not truth and certainty that is the antithesis of the world of the insane, but the universality and all-obligatoriness of a belief, in short, non-voluntariness in forming opinions. And the greatest labour of human beings hitherto has been to agree with one another regarding a number of things, and to impose upon themselves a _law of agreement_--indifferent whether these things are true or false. This is the discipline of the mind which has preserved mankind;--but the counter-impulses are still so powerful that one can really speak of the future of mankind with little confidence. The ideas of things still continually shift and move, and will perhaps alter more than ever in the future; it is continually the most select spirits themselves who strive against universal obligatoriness--the investigators of _truth_ above all! The accepted belief, as the belief of all the world, continually engenders a disgust and a new longing in the more ingenious minds; and already the slow _tempo_ which it demands for all intellectual processes (the imitation of the tortoise, which is here recognised as the rule) makes the artists and poets runaways:--it is in these impatient spirits that a downright delight in delirium breaks out, because delirium has such a joyful _tempo!_ Virtuous intellects, therefore, are needed--ah! I want to use the least ambiguous word,--_virtuous stupidity_ is needed, imperturbable conductors of the _slow_ spirits are needed, in order that the faithful of the great collective belief may remain with one another and dance their dance further: it is a necessity of the first importance that here enjoins and demands. _We others are the exceptions and the danger,_--we eternally need protection--Well, there can actually be something said in favour of the exceptions _provided that they never want to become the rule._

77.

The Animal with good Conscience.--It is not unknown to me that there is vulgarity in everything that pleases Southern Europe--whether it be Italian opera (for example, Rossini's and Bellini's), or the Spanish adventure-romance (most readily accessible to us in the French garb of Gil Blas)--but it does not offend me, any more than the vulgarity which one encounters in a walk through Pompeii, or even in the reading of every ancient book: what is the reason of this? Is it because shame is lacking here, and because the vulgar always comes forward just as sure and certain of itself as anything noble, lovely, and passionate in the same kind of music or romance? "The animal has its rights like man, so let it run about freely; and you, my dear fellow-man, are still this animal, in spite of all!"--that seems to me the moral of the case, and the peculiarity of southern humanity. Bad taste has its rights like good taste, and even a prerogative over the latter when it is the great requisite, the sure satisfaction, and as it were a universal language, an immediately intelligible mask and attitude; the excellent, select taste on the other hand has always something of a seeking, tentative character, not fully certain that it understands,--it is never, and has never been popular! The _masque_ is and remains popular! So let all this masquerade run along in the melodies and cadences, in the leaps and merriment of the rhythm of these operas! Quite the ancient life! What does one understand of it, if one does not understand the delight in the masque, the good conscience of all masquerade! Here is the bath and the refreshment of the ancient spirit:--and perhaps this bath was still more necessary for the rare and sublime natures of the ancient world than for the vulgar.--On the other hand, a vulgar turn in northern works, for example in German music, offends me unutterably. There is _shame_ in it, the artist has lowered himself in his own sight, and could not even avoid blushing: we are ashamed with him, and are so hurt because we surmise that he believed he had to lower himself on our account.

78.

_What we should be Grateful for.--_It is only the artists, and especially the theatrical artists, who have furnished men with eyes and ears to hear and see with some pleasure what everyone is in himself, what he experiences and aims at: it is only _they_ who have taught us how to estimate the hero that is concealed in each of these common-place men, and the art of looking at ourselves from a distance as heroes, and as it were simplified and transfigured--the art of "putting ourselves on the stage" before ourselves. It is thus only that we get beyond some of the paltry details in ourselves! Without that art we should be nothing but foreground, and would live absolutely under the spell of the perspective which makes the closest and the commonest seem immensely large and like reality in itself.--Perhaps there is merit of a similar kind in the religion which commanded us to look at the sinfulness of every individual man with a magnifying-glass, and made a great, immortal criminal of the sinner; in that it put eternal perspectives around man, it taught him to see himself from a distance, and as something past, something entire.

79.

_The Charm of Imperfection.--_I see here a poet, who, like so many men, exercises a higher charm by his imperfections than by all that is rounded off and takes perfect shape under his hands,--indeed, he derives his advantage and reputation far more from his actual limitations than from his abundant powers. His work never expresses altogether what he would really like to express, what he _would like to have seen:_ he appears to have had the foretaste of a vision and never the vision itself:--but an extraordinary longing for this vision has remained in his soul; and from this he derives his equally extraordinary eloquence of longing and craving. With this he raises those who listen to him above his work and above all "works," and gives them wings to rise higher than hearers have ever risen before, thus making them poets and seers themselves; they then show an admiration for the originator of their happiness, as if he had led them immediately to the vision of his holiest and ultimate verities, as if he had reached his goal, and had actually _seen_ and communicated his vision. It is to the advantage of his reputation that he has not really arrived at his goal.

80.

Art and Nature.--The Greeks (or at least the Athenians) liked to hear good talking: indeed they had an eager inclination for it, which distinguished them more than anything else from non-Greeks. And so they required good talking even from passion on the stage, and submitted to the unnaturalness of dramatic verse with delight:--in nature, forsooth, passion is so sparing of words! so dumb and confused! Or if it finds words, so embarrassed and irrational and a shame to itself! We have now, all of us, thanks to the Greeks, accustomed ourselves to this unnaturalness on the stage, as we endure that other unnaturalness, the _singing_ passion, and willingly endure it, thanks to the Italians.--It has become a necessity to us, which we cannot satisfy out of the resources of actuality, to hear men talk well and in full detail in the most trying situations: it enraptures us at present when the tragic hero still finds words, reasons, eloquent gestures, and on the whole a bright spirituality, where life approaches the abysses, and where the actual man mostly loses his head, and certainly his fine language. This kind of _deviation from nature_ is perhaps the most agreeable repast for man's pride: he loves art generally on account of it, as the expression of high, heroic unnaturalness and convention. One rightly objects to the dramatic poet when he does not transform everything into reason and speech, but always retains a remnant of _silence:_--just as one is dissatisfied with an operatic musician who cannot find a melody for the highest emotion, but only an emotional, "natural" stammering and crying. Here nature _has to_ be contradicted! Here the common charm of illusion _has to_ give place to a higher charm! The Greeks go far, far in this direction--frightfully far! As they constructed the stage as narrow as possible and dispensed with all the effect of deep backgrounds, as they made pantomime and easy motion impossible to the actor, and transformed him into a solemn, stiff, masked bogey, so they have also deprived passion itself of its deep background, and have dictated to it a law of fine talk; indeed, they have really done everything to counteract the elementary effect of representations that inspire pity and terror: _they did not want pity and terror,_--with due deference, with the highest deference to Aristotle! but he certainly did not hit the nail, to say nothing of the head of the nail, when he spoke about the final aim of Greek tragedy! Let us but look at the Grecian tragic poets with respect to _what_ most excited their diligence, their inventiveness, and their emulation,--certainly it was not the intention of subjugating the spectators by emotion! The Athenian went to the theatre _to hear fine talking!_ And fine talking was arrived at by Sophocles!--pardon me this heresy!--It is very different with _serious opera:_ all its masters make it their business to prevent their personages being understood. "An occasional word picked up may come to the assistance of the inattentive listener; but on the whole the situation must be self-explanatory,--the _talking_ is of no account!"--so they all think, and so they have all made fun of the words. Perhaps they have only lacked courage to express fully their extreme contempt for words: a little additional insolence in Rossini, and he would have allowed la-la-la-la to be sung throughout--and it might have been the rational course! The personages of the opera are _not_ meant to be believed "in their words," but in their tones! That is the difference, that is the fine _unnaturalness_ on account of which people go to the opera! Even the _recitativo secco_ is not really intended to be heard as words and text: this kind of half-music is meant rather in the first place to

give the musical ear a little repose (the repose from _melody,_ as from the sublimest, and on that account the most straining enjoyment of this art),--but very soon something different results, namely, an increasing impatience, an increasing resistance, a new longing for _entire_ music, for melody.--How is it with the art of Richard Wagner as seen from this standpoint? Is it perhaps the same? Perhaps otherwise? It would often seem to me as if one needed to have learned by heart both the words _and_ the music of his creations before the performances; for without that--so it seemed to me--me _may hear_ neither the words, nor even the music.

81.

Grecian Taste--"What is beautiful in it?"--asked a certain geometrician, after a performance of the _Iphigenia--_"there is nothing proved in it!" Could the Greeks have been so far from this taste? In Sophocles at least "everything is proved."

82.

Esprit Un-Grecian.--The Greeks were exceedingly logical and plain in all their thinking; they did not get tired of it, at least during their long flourishing period, as is so often the case with the French; who too willingly made a little excursion into the opposite, and in fact endure the spirit of logic only when it betrays its _sociable_ courtesy, its sociable self-renunciation, by a multitude of such little excursions into its opposite. Logic appears to them as necessary as bread and water, but also like these as a kind of prison-fare, as soon as it is to be taken pure and by itself. In good society one must never want to be in the right absolutely and solely, as all pure logic requires; hence the little dose of irrationality in all French _esprit_.--The social sense of the Greeks was far less developed than that of the French in the present and the past; hence, so little _esprit_ in their cleverest men, hence, so little wit, even in their wags, hence--alas! But people will not readily believe these tenets of mine, and how much of the kind I have still on my soul!--_Est res magna tacere_--says Martial, like all garrulous people.

83.

Translations.--One can estimate the amount of the historical sense which an age possesses by the way in which it makes _translations_ and seeks to embody in itself past periods and literatures. The French of Corneille, and even the French of the Revolution, appropriated Roman antiquity in a manner for which we would no longer have the courage--owing to our superior historical sense. And Roman antiquity itself: how violently, and at the same time how naïvely, did it lay its hand on everything excellent and elevated belonging to the older Grecian antiquity! How they translated these writings into the Roman present! How they wiped away intentionally and unconcernedly the wing-dust of the butterfly moment! It is thus that Horace now and then translated Alcæus or Archilochus, it is thus that Propertius translated Callimachus and Philetas (poets of equal rank with Theocritus, if we _be allowed_ to judge): of what consequence was it to them that the actual creator experienced this and that, and had inscribed the indication thereof in his poem!--as poets they were averse to the antiquarian, inquisitive spirit which precedes the historical sense; as poets they did not respect those essentially personal traits and names, nor anything peculiar to city, coast, or century, such as its costume and mask, but at once put the present and the Roman in its place. They seem to us to ask: "Should we not make the old new for ourselves, and adjust _ourselves_ to it? Should we not be allowed to inspire this dead body with our soul? for it is dead indeed: how loathsome is everything dead!"--They did not know the pleasure of the historical sense; the past and the alien was painful to them, and as Romans it was an incitement to a Roman conquest. In fact, they conquered when they translated,--not only in that they omitted the historical: they added also allusions to the present; above all, they struck out the name of the poet and put their own in its place--not with the feeling of theft, but with the very best conscience of the _Imperium Romanum_.

84.

_The Origin of Poetry.--_The lovers of the fantastic in man, who at the same time represent the doctrine of instinctive morality, draw this conclusion: "Granted that utility has been honoured at all times as the highest divinity, where then in all the world has poetry come from?--this rhythmising of speech which thwarts rather than furthers plainness of communication, and which, nevertheless, has sprung up everywhere on the earth, and still springs up, as a mockery of all useful purpose! The wildly beautiful irrationality of poetry refutes you, ye utilitarians! The wish _to get rid of_ utility in some way--that is precisely what has elevated man, that is what has inspired him to morality and art!" Well, I must here speak for once to please the utilitarians,--they are so seldom in the right that it is pitiful! In the old times which called poetry into being, people had still utility in view with respect to it, and a very important utility--at the time when rhythm was introduced into speech, that force which arranges all the particles of the sentence anew, commands the choosing of the words, recolours the thought, and makes it more obscure, more foreign, and more distant: to be

sure a _superstitious utility!_ It was intended that a human entreaty should be more profoundly impressed upon the Gods by virtue of rhythm, after it had been observed that men could remember a verse better than an unmetrical speech. It was likewise thought that people could make themselves audible at greater distances by the rhythmical beat; the rhythmical prayer seemed to come nearer to the ear of the Gods. Above all, however, people wanted to have the advantage of the elementary conquest which man experiences in himself when he hears music: rhythm is a constraint; it produces an unconquerable desire to yield, to join in; not only the step of the foot, but also the soul itself follows the measure,--probably the soul of the Gods also, as people thought! They attempted, therefore, to _constrain_ the Gods by rhythm, and to exercise a power over them; they threw poetry around the Gods like a magic noose. There was a still more wonderful idea, and it has perhaps operated most powerfully of all in the originating of poetry. Among the Pythagoreans it made its appearance as a philosophical doctrine and as an artifice of teaching: but long before there were philosophers music was acknowledged to possess the power of unburdening the emotions, of purifying the soul, of soothing the _ferocia animi_--and this was owing to the rhythmical element in music. When the proper tension and harmony of the soul were lost a person had to _dance_ to the measure of the singer,--that was the recipe of this medical art. By means of it Terpander quieted a tumult, Empedocles calmed a maniac, Damon purged a love-sick youth; by means of it even the maddened, revengeful Gods were treated for the purpose of a cure. This was effected by driving the frenzy and wantonness of their emotions to the highest pitch, by making the furious mad, and the revengeful intoxicated with vengeance all the orgiastic cults seek to discharge the _ferocia_ of a deity all at once, and thus make an orgy, so that the deity may feel freer and quieter afterwards, and leave man in peace. _Melos,_ according to its root, signifies a soothing agency, not because the song is gentle itself, but because its after-effect is gentle.--And not only in the religious song, but also in the secular song of the most ancient times, the prerequisite is that the rhythm should exercise a magical influence; for example, in drawing water, or in rowing: the song is for the enchanting of the spirits supposed to be active thereby; it makes them obliging, involuntary and the instruments of man. And as often as a person acts he has occasion to sing, _every_ action is dependent on the assistance of spirits: magic song and incantation appear to be the original form of poetry. When verse also came to be used in oracles--the Greeks said that the hexameter was invented at Delphi,--the rhythm was here also intended to exercise a compulsory influence. To make a prophecy--that means originally (according to what seems to me the probable derivation of the Greek word) to determine something; people thought they could determine the future by winning Apollo over to their side: he who, according to the most ancient idea, is far more than a foreseeing deity. According as the formula is pronounced with literal and rhythmical correctness, it determines the future: the formula, however, is the invention of Apollo, who as the God of rhythm, can also determine the goddesses of fate--Looked at and investigated as a whole, was there ever anything _more serviceable_ to the ancient superstitious species of human being than rhythm? People could do everything with it: they could make labour go on magically; they could compel a God to appear, to be near at hand, and listen to them; they could arrange the future for themselves according to their will; they could unburden their own souls of any kind of excess (of anxiety, of mania, of sympathy, of revenge), and not only their own souls, but the souls of the most evil spirits,--without verse a person was nothing, by means of verse a person became almost a God. Such a fundamental feeling no longer allows itself to be fully eradicated,--and even now, after millenniums of long labour in combating such superstition, the very wisest of us occasionally becomes the fool of rhythm, be it only that one _perceives_ a thought to be _truer_ when it has a metrical form and approaches with a divine hopping. Is it not a very funny thing that the most serious philosophers, however anxious they are in other respects for strict certainty, still appeal to _poetical sayings_ in order to give their thoughts force and credibility? and yet it is more dangerous to a truth when the poet assents to it than when he contradicts it! For, as Homer says, "Minstrels speak much falsehood!"--

85.

The Good and the Beautiful.--Artists, glorify continually--they do nothing else,--and indeed they glorify all those conditions and things that have a reputation, so that man may feel himself good or great, or intoxicated, or merry, or pleased and wise by it. Those _select_ things and conditions whose value for human _happiness_ is regarded as secure and determined, are the objects of artists: they are ever lying in wait to discover such things, to transfer them into the domain of art. I mean to say that they are not themselves the valuers of happiness and of the happy ones, but they always press close to these valuers with the greatest curiosity and longing, in order immediately to use their valuations advantageously. As besides their impatience, they have also the big lungs of heralds and the feet of runners, they are generally always among the first to glorify the _new_ excellency, and often _seem_ to be the first who have called it good and valued it as good. This, however, as we have said, is an error; they are only faster and louder than the actual valuers:--And who then are these?--They are the rich and the leisurely.

86.

_The Theatre.--_This day has given me once more strong and elevated sentiments, and if I could have music and art in the evening, I know well what music and art I should _not_ like to have; namely, none of that which would fain intoxicate its hearers and _excite_ them to a crisis of strong and high feeling,--those men with commonplace souls, who in the evening are not like victors on triumphal cars, but like tired mules to whom life has rather too often applied the whip. What would those men at all know of "higher moods," unless there were expedients for causing ecstasy and idealistic strokes of the whip!--and thus they have their inspirers as they have their wines. But what is their drink and their drunkenness to _me!_ Does the inspired one need wine? He rather looks with a kind of disgust at the agency and the agent which are here intended to produce an effect without sufficient reason,--an imitation of the high tide of the soul! What? One gives the mole wings and proud fancies--before going to sleep, before he creeps into his hole? One sends him into the theatre and puts great magnifying-glasses to his blind and tired eyes? Men, whose life is not "action" but business, sit in front of the stage and look at strange beings to whom life is more than business? "This is proper," you say, "this is entertaining, this is what culture wants!"--Well then! culture is too often lacking in me, for this sight is too often disgusting to me. He who has enough of tragedy and comedy in himself surely prefers to remain away from the theatre; or as an exception, the whole procedure--theatre and public and poet included--becomes for him a truly tragic and comic play, so that the performed piece counts for little in comparison. He who is something like Faust and Manfred, what does it matter to him about the Fausts and Manfreds of the theatre!--while it certainly gives him something to think about _that_ such figures are brought into the theatre at all. The _strongest_ thoughts and passions before those who are not capable of thought and passion--but of _intoxication_ only! And _those_ as a means to this end! And theatre and music the hashish-smoking and betel-chewing of Europeans! Oh, who will narrate to us the whole history of narcotics!--It is almost the history of "culture," the so-called higher culture!

87.

_The Conceit of Artists._I think artists often do not know what they can do best, because they are too conceited, and have set their minds on something loftier than those little plants appear to be, which can grow up to perfection on their soil, fresh, rare, and beautiful. The final value of their own garden and vineyard is superciliously underestimated by them, and their love and their insight are not of the same quality. Here is a musician, who, more than any one else, has the genius for discovering the tones peculiar to suffering, oppressed, tortured souls, and who can endow even dumb animals with speech. No one equals him in the colours of the late autumn, in the indescribably touching happiness of a last, a final, and all too short enjoyment; he knows a chord for those secret and weird midnights of the soul when cause and effect seem out of joint, and when every instant something may originate "out of nothing." He draws his resources best of all out of the lower depths of human happiness, and so to speak, out of its drained goblet, where the bitterest and most nauseous drops have ultimately, for good or for ill, commingled with the sweetest. He knows the weary shuffling along of the soul which can no longer leap or fly, yea, not even walk; he has the shy glance of concealed pain, of understanding without comfort, of leave-taking without avowal; yea, as the Orpheus of all secret misery, he is greater than anyone; and in fact much has been added to art by him which was hitherto inexpressible and not even thought worthy of art, and which was only to be scared away, by words, and not grasped many small and quite microscopic features of the soul: yes, he is the master of miniature. But he does not _wish_ to be so! His _character_ is more in love with large walls and daring frescoes! He fails to see that his _spirit_ has a different taste and inclination, and prefers to sit quietly in the corners of ruined houses:--concealed in this way, concealed even from himself, he there paints his proper masterpieces, all of which are very short, often only one bar in length,--there only does he become quite good, great, and perfect, perhaps there only.--But he does not know it! He is too conceited to know it.

88.

Earnestness for the Truth.--Earnest for the truth! What different things men understand by these words! Just the same opinions, and modes of demonstration and testing which a thinker regards as a frivolity in himself, to which he has succumbed with shame at one time or other,--just the same opinions may give to an artist, who comes in contact with them and accepts them temporarily, the consciousness that the profoundest earnestness for the truth has now taken hold of him, and that it is worthy of admiration that, although an artist, he at the same time exhibits the most ardent desire for the antithesis of the apparent. It is thus possible that a person may, just by his pathos of earnestness, betray how superficially and sparingly his intellect has hitherto operated in the domain of knowledge.--And is not everything that we consider _important_ our betrayer? It shows where our motives lie, and where our motives are altogether lacking.

89.

Now and Formerly.--Of what consequence is all our art in artistic products, if that higher art, the art of the festival, be lost by us? Formerly all artistic products were exhibited on the great festive-path of humanity, as tokens of remembrance, and monuments of high and happy moments. One now seeks to allure the exhausted and sickly from the great suffering-path of humanity for a wanton moment by means of works of art; one furnishes them with a little ecstasy and insanity.

90.

_Lights and Shades.--_Books and writings are different with different thinkers. One writer has collected together in his book all the rays of light which he could quickly plunder and carry home from an illuminating experience; while another gives only the shadows, and the grey and black replicas of that which on the previous day had towered up in his soul.

91.

_Precaution.--_Alfieri, as is well known, told a great many falsehoods when he narrated the history of his life to his astonished contemporaries. He told falsehoods owing to the despotism toward himself which he exhibited, for example, in the way in which he created his own language, and tyrannised himself into a poet:--he finally found a rigid form of sublimity into which he _forced_ his life and his memory; he must have suffered much in the process.--I would also give no credit to a history of Plato's life written by himself, as little as to Rousseau's, or to the _Vita nuova_ of Dante.

92.

Prose and Poetry.--Let it be observed that the great masters of prose have almost always been poets as well, whether openly, or only in secret and for the "closet"; and in truth one only writes good prose _in view of poetry!_ For prose is an uninterrupted, polite warfare with poetry; all its charm consists in the fact that poetry is constantly avoided and contradicted; every abstraction wants to have a gibe at poetry, and wishes to be uttered with a mocking voice; all dryness and coolness is meant to bring the amiable goddess into an amiable despair; there are often approximations and reconciliations for the moment, and then a sudden recoil and a burst of laughter; the curtain is often drawn up and dazzling light let in just while the goddess is enjoying her twilights and dull colours; the word is often taken out of her mouth and chanted to a melody while she holds her fine hands before her delicate little ears:--and so there are a thousand enjoyments of the warfare, the defeats included, of which the unpoetic, the so-called prose--men know nothing at all:--they consequently write and speak only bad prose! _Warfare is the father of all good things,_ it is also the father of good prose!--There have been four very singular and truly poetical men in this century who have arrived at mastership in prose, for which otherwise this century is not suited, owing to lack of poetry, as we have indicated. Not to take Goethe into account, for he is reasonably claimed by the century that produced him, I look only on Giacomo Leopardi, Prosper Mérimée, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Walter Savage Landor the author of _Imaginary Conversations,_ as worthy to be called masters of prose.

93.

But why, then, do you Write?--A: I do not belong to those who _think_ with the wet pen in hand; and still less to those who yield themselves entirely to their passions before the open ink-bottle, sitting on their chair and staring at the paper. I am always vexed and abashed by writing; writing is a necessity for me,--even to speak of it in a simile is disagreeable. B: But why, then, do you write? A: Well, my dear Sir, to tell you in confidence, I have hitherto found no other means of _getting rid of_ my thoughts. B: And why do you wish to get rid of them? A: Why I wish? Do I really wish! I must--B: Enough! Enough!

94.

Growth after Death.--Those few daring words about moral matters which Fontenelle threw into his immortal _Dialogues of the Dead,_ were regarded by his age as paradoxes and amusements of a not unscrupulous wit; even the highest judges of taste and intellect saw nothing more in them,--indeed, Fontenelle himself perhaps saw nothing more. Then something incredible takes place: these thoughts become truths! Science proves them! The game becomes serious! And we read those dialogues with a feeling different from that with which Voltaire and Helvetius read them, and we involuntarily raise their originator into another and _much higher_ class of intellects than they did.--Rightly?' Wrongly?

95.

Chamfort.--That such a judge of men and of the multitude as Chamfort should side with the multitude, instead of standing apart in philosophical resignation and defence--I am at a loss to explain this, except as follows:--There was an instinct in him stronger than his wisdom, and it had never been gratified: the hatred against all _noblesse_ of blood; perhaps his mother's old and only too explicable hatred, which was consecrated in him by love of her,--an instinct of revenge from his boyhood, which waited for the hour to avenge his mother. But then the course of his life, his genius, and alas! most of all, perhaps, the paternal blood in his veins, had seduced him to rank and consider himself equal to the _noblesse--_for many, many years! In the end, however, he could not endure the sight of himself, the "old man" under the old _régime,_ any longer; he got into a violent, penitential passion, and _in this state_ he put on the raiment of the populace as _his_ special kind of hair-shirt! His bad conscience was the neglect of revenge.--If Chamfort had then been a little more of the philosopher, the Revolution would not have had its tragic wit and its sharpest sting; it would have been regarded as a much more stupid affair, and would have had no such seductive influence on men's minds. But Chamfort's hatred and revenge educated an entire generation; and the most illustrious men passed through his school. Let us but consider that Mirabeau looked up to Chamfort as to his higher and older self, from whom he expected (and endured) impulses, warnings, and condemnations,--Mirabeau, who as a man belongs to an entirely different order of greatness, as the very foremost among the statesman-geniuses of yesterday and to-day.--Strange, that in spite of such a friend and advocate--we possess Mirabeau's letters to Chamfort--this wittiest of all moralists has remained unfamiliar to the French, quite the same as Stendhal, who has perhaps had the most penetrating eyes and ears of any. Frenchman of _this_ century. Is it because the latter had really too much of the German and the Englishman in his nature for the Parisians to endure him?--while Chamfort, a man with ample knowledge of the profundities and secret motives of the soul, gloomy, suffering, ardent--a thinker who found laughter necessary as the remedy of life, and who almost gave himself up as lost every day that he had not laughed,--seems much more like an Italian, and related by blood to Dante and Leopardi, than like a Frenchman. One knows Chamfort's last words: "_Ah! mon ami,_" he said to Sieyès, "_je m'en vais enfin de ce monde, où il faut que le cœur se brise ou se bronze_--." These were certainly not the words of a dying Frenchman.

96.

_Two Orators.--_Of these two orators the one arrives at a full understanding of his case only when he yields himself to emotion; it is only this that pumps sufficient blood and heat into his brain to compel his high intellectuality to reveal itself The other attempts, indeed, now and then to do the same: to state his case sonorously, vehemently, and spiritedly with the aid of emotion,--but usually with bad success. He then very soon speaks obscurely and confusedly; he exaggerates, makes omissions, and excites suspicion of the justice of his case: indeed, he himself feels this suspicion, and the sudden changes into the coldest and most repulsive tones (which raise a doubt in the hearer as to his passionateness being genuine) are thereby explicable. With him emotion always drowns the spirit; perhaps because it is stronger than in the former. But he is at the height of his power when he resists the impetuous storm of his feeling, and as it were scorns it; it is then only that his spirit emerges fully from its concealment, a spirit logical, mocking and playful, but nevertheless awe-inspiring.

97.

The Loquacity of Authors.--There is a loquacity of anger--frequent in Luther, also in Schopenhauer. A loquacity which comes from too great a store of conceptual formulæ, as in Kant. A loquacity which comes from delight in ever new modifications of the same idea: one finds it in Montaigne. A loquacity of malicious natures: whoever reads writings of our period will recollect two authors in this connection. A loquacity which comes from delight in fine words and forms of speech: by no means rare in Goethe's prose. A loquacity which comes from pure satisfaction in noise and confusion of feelings: for example in Carlyle.

98.

In Honour of Shakespeare.--The best thing I could say in honour of Shakespeare, _the man,_ is that he believed in Brutus, and cast not a shadow of suspicion on the kind of virtue which Brutus represents! It is to him that Shakespeare consecrated his best tragedy--it is at present still called by a wrong name,--to him, and to the most terrible essence of lofty morality. Independence of soul!--that is the question at issue! No sacrifice can be too great there: one must be able to sacrifice to it even one's dearest friend, although he be the grandest of men, the ornament of the world, the genius without peer,--if one really loves freedom as the freedom of great souls, and if _this_ freedom be threatened by him:--it is thus that Shakespeare must have felt! The elevation in which he places Cæsar is the most exquisite honour he could confer upon Brutus; it is thus only that he lifts into vastness the inner problem of his hero, and similarly the strength of soul which could cut _this knot!--_And was it actually political freedom that impelled the

poet to sympathy with Brutus,--and made him the accomplice of Brutus? Or was political freedom merely a symbol for something inexpressible? Do we perhaps stand before some sombre event or adventure of the poet's own soul, which has remained unknown, and of which he only cared to speak symbolically? What is all Hamlet-melancholy in comparison with the melancholy of Brutus!--and perhaps Shakespeare also knew this, as he knew the other, by experience! Perhaps he also had his dark hour and his bad angel, just as Brutus had them!--But whatever similarities and secret relationships of that kind there may have been, Shakespeare cast himself on the ground and felt unworthy and alien in presence of the aspect and virtue of Brutus:--he has inscribed the testimony thereof in the tragedy itself. He has twice brought in a poet in it, and twice heaped upon him such an impatient and extreme contempt, that it sounds like a cry,--like the cry of self-contempt. Brutus, even Brutus loses patience when the poet appears, self-important, pathetic and obtrusive, as poets usually are,--persons who seem to abound in the possibilities of greatness, even moral greatness, and nevertheless rarely attain even to ordinary uprightness in the philosophy of practice and of life "He may know the times, _but I know his temper_,--away with the jigging fool!"--shouts Brutus. We may translate this back into the soul of the poet that composed it.

99.

_The Followers of Schopenhauer.--_What one sees at the contact of civilized peoples with barbarians,--namely, that the lower civilization regularly accepts in the first place the vices, weaknesses and excesses of the higher; then, from that point onward, feels the influence of a charm; and finally, by means of the appropriated vices and weaknesses also allows something of the valuable influence of the higher culture to leaven it:-one can also see this close at hand and without journeys to barbarian peoples, to be sure, somewhat refined and spiritualised, and not so readily palpable. What are the German followers of _Schopenhauer_ still accustomed to receive first of all from their master?--those who, when placed beside his superior culture, must deem themselves sufficiently barbarous to be first of all barbarously fascinated and seduced by him. Is it his hard matter-of-fact sense, his inclination to clearness and rationality, which often makes him appear so English, and so unlike Germans? Or the strength of his intellectual conscience, which _endured_ a life-long contradiction of "being" and "willing," and compelled him to contradict himself constantly even in his writings on almost every point? Or his purity in matters relating to the Church and the Christian God?--for here he was pure as no German philosopher had been hitherto, so that he lived and died "as a Voltairian." Or his immortal doctrines of the intellectuality of intuition, the apriority of the law of causality, the instrumental nature of the intellect, and the non-freedom of the will? No, nothing of this enchants, nor is felt as enchanting; but Schopenhauer's mystical embarrassments and shufflings in those passages where the matter-of-fact thinker allowed himself to be seduced and corrupted by the vain impulse to be the unraveller of the world's riddle: his undemonstrable doctrine of _one will_ ("all causes are merely occasional causes of the phenomenon of the will at such a time and at such a place," "the will to live, whole and undivided, is present in every being, even in the smallest, as perfectly as in the sum of all that was, is, and will be"); his _denial of the individual_ ("all lions are really only one lion," "plurality of individuals is an appearance," as also _development_ is only an appearance: he calls the opinion of Lamarck "an ingenious, absurd error"); his fantasy about _genius_ ("in æsthetic contemplation the individual is no longer an individual, but a pure, will-less, painless, timeless subject of knowledge," "the subject, in that it entirely merges in the contemplated object, has become this object itself"); his nonsense about _sympathy,_ and about the outburst of the _principium individuationis_ thus rendered possible, as the source of all morality; including also such assertions as, "dying is really the design of existence," "the possibility should not be absolutely denied that a magical effect could proceed from a person already dead":--these, and similar _extravagances_ and vices of the philosopher, are always first accepted and made articles of faith; for vices and extravagances are always easiest to imitate, and do not require a long preliminary practice. But let us speak of the most celebrated of the living Schopenhauerians, Richard Wagner.--It has happened to him as it has already happened to many an artist: he made a mistake in the interpretation of the characters he created, and misunderstood the unexpressed philosophy of the art peculiarly his own. Richard Wagner allowed himself to be misled by Hegel's influence till the middle of his life; and he did the same again when later on he read Schopenhauer's doctrine between the lines of his characters, and began to express himself with such terms as "will," "genius," and "sympathy." Nevertheless it will remain true that nothing is more counter to Schopenhauer's spirit than the essentially Wagnerian element in Wagner's heroes: I mean the innocence of the supremest selfishness, the belief in strong passion as the good in itself, in a word, the Siegfried trait in the countenances of his heroes. "All that still smacks more of Spinoza than of me,"--Schopenhauer would probably have said. Whatever good reasons, therefore, Wagner might have had to be on the outlook for other philosophers than Schopenhauer, the enchantment to which he succumbed in respect to this thinker, not only made him blind towards all other philosophers, but even towards science itself; his entire art is more and more inclined to become the counterpart and complement of the Schopenhauerian philosophy, and it always renounces more emphatically the higher ambition to become the counterpart and complement of human knowledge and science. And not only is he allured thereto by the whole mystic pomp of this philosophy

(which would also have allured a Cagliostro), the peculiar airs and emotions of the philosopher have all along been seducing him as well! For example, Wagner's indignation about the corruption of the German language is Schopenhauerian; and if one should commend his imitation in this respect, it is nevertheless not to be denied that Wagner's style itself suffers in no small degree from all the tumours and turgidities, the sight of which made Schopenhauer so furious; and that, in respect to the German-writing Wagnerians, Wagneromania is beginning to be as dangerous as only some kinds of Hegelomania have been. From Schopenhauer comes Wagner's hatred of the Jews, to whom he cannot do justice even in their greatest exploit: are not the Jews the inventors of Christianity! The attempt of Wagner to construe Christianity as a seed blown away from Buddhism, and his endeavour to initiate a Buddhistic era in Europe, under a temporary approximation to Catholic-Christian formulas and sentiments, are both Schopenhauerian. Wagner's preaching in favour of pity in dealing with animals is Schopenhauerian; Schopenhauer's predecessor here, as is well known, was Voltaire, who already perhaps, like his successors, knew how to disguise his hatred of certain men and things as pity towards animals. At least Wagner's hatred of science, which manifests itself in his preaching, has certainly not been inspired by the spirit of charitableness and kindness--nor by the _spirit_ at all, as is sufficiently obvious.--Finally, it is of little importance what the philosophy of an artist is, provided it is only a supplementary philosophy, and does not do any injury to his art itself. We cannot be sufficiently on our guard against taking a dislike to an artist on account of an occasional, perhaps very unfortunate and presumptuous masquerade; let us not forget that the dear artists are all of them something of actors--and must be so; it would be difficult for them to hold out in the long run without stage-playing. Let us be loyal to Wagner in that which is _true_ and original in him,--and especially in this point, that we, his disciples, remain loyal to ourselves in that which is true and original in us. Let us allow him his intellectual humours and spasms, let us in fairness rather consider what strange nutriments and necessaries an art like his _is entitled to,_ in order to be able to live and grow! It is of no account that he is often wrong as a thinker; justice and patience are not _his_ affair. It is sufficient that his life is right in his own eyes, and maintains its right,--the life which calls to each of us: "Be a man, and do not follow me--but thyself! thyself!" _Our_ life, also ought to maintain its right in our own eyes! We also are to grow and blossom out of ourselves, free and fearless, in innocent selfishness! And so, on the contemplation of such a man, these thoughts still ring in my ears to-day, as formerly: "That passion is better than stoicism or hypocrisy; that straight-forwardness, even in evil, is better than losing oneself in trying to observe traditional morality; that the free man is just as able to be good as evil, but that the unemancipated man is a disgrace to nature, and has no share in heavenly or earthly bliss; finally, that _all who wish to be free must become so through themselves,_ and that freedom falls to nobody's lot as a gift from Heaven." (_Richard Wagner in Bayreuth,_ Vol. I. of this Translation, pp. 199-200).

100.

Learning to do Homage.--One must learn the art of homage, as well as the art of contempt. Whoever goes in new paths and has led many persons therein, discovers with astonishment how awkward and incompetent all of them are in the expression of their gratitude, and indeed how rarely gratitude _is able_ even to express itself. It is always as if something comes into people's throats when their gratitude wants to speak so that it only hems and haws, and becomes silent again. The way in which a thinker succeeds in tracing the effect of his thoughts, and their transforming and convulsing power, is almost a comedy: it sometimes seems as if those who have been operated upon felt profoundly injured thereby, and could only assert their independence, which they suspect to be threatened, by all kinds of improprieties. It needs whole generations in order merely to devise a courteous convention of gratefulness; it is only very late that the period arrives when something of spirit and genius enters into gratitude Then there is usually some one who is the great receiver of thanks, not only for the good he himself has done, but mostly for that which has been gradually accumulated by his predecessors, as a treasure of what is highest and best.

101.

Voltaire--Wherever there has been a court, it has furnished the standard of good-speaking and with this also the standard of style for writers The court language, however, is the language of the courtier who _has no profession,_ and who even in conversations on scientific subjects avoids all convenient, technical expressions, because they smack of the profession; on that account the technical expression, and everything that betrays the specialist, is a _blemish of style_ in countries which have a court culture. At present, when all courts have become caricatures of past and present times, one is astonished to find even Voltaire unspeakably reserved and scrupulous on this point (for example, in his judgments concerning such stylists as Fontenelle and Montesquieu),--we are now, all of us, emancipated from court taste, while Voltaire was its _perfecter!_

102.

_A Word for Philologists.--_It is thought that there are books so valuable and royal that whole generations of scholars are well employed when through their efforts these books are kept genuine and intelligible,--to confirm this belief again and again is the purpose of philology. It presupposes that the rare men are not lacking (though they may not be visible), who actually know how to use such valuable books:--those men perhaps who write such books themselves, or could write them. I mean to say that philology presupposes a noble belief,--that for the benefit of some few who are always "to come," and are not there, a very great amount of painful, and even dirty labour has to be done beforehand: it is all labour _in usum Delphinorum_.

103.

German Music.--German music, more than any other, has now become European music; because the changes which Europe experienced through the Revolution have therein alone found expression: it is only German music that knows how to express the agitation of popular masses, the tremendous artificial uproar, which does not even need to be very noisy,--while Italian opera, for example, knows only the choruses of domestics or soldiers, but not "the people." There is the additional fact that in all German music a profound _bourgeois_ jealousy of the _noblesse_ can be traced, especially a jealousy of _esprit_ and _élégance,_ as the expressions of a courtly, chivalrous, ancient, and self-confident society. It is not music like that of Goethe's musician at the gate, which was pleasing also "in the hall," and to the king as well; it is not here said: "The knights looked on with martial air; with bashful eyes the ladies." Even the Graces are not allowed in German music without a touch of remorse; it is only with Pleasantness, the country sister of the Graces that the German begins to feel morally at ease--and from this point up to his enthusiastic, learned, and often gruff "sublimity" (the Beethoven-like sublimity), he feels more and more so. If we want to imagine the man of _this_ music,--well, let us just imagine Beethoven as he appeared beside Goethe, say, at their meeting at Teplitz: as semi-barbarism beside culture, as the masses beside the nobility, as the good-natured man beside the good and more than "good" man, as the visionary beside the artist, as the man needing comfort beside the comforted, as the man given to exaggeration and distrust beside the man of reason, as the crank and self-tormenter, as the foolishly enraptured, blessedly unfortunate, sincerely immoderate man! as the pretentious and awkward man,--and altogether as the "untamed man": it was thus that Goethe conceived and characterised him, Goethe, the exceptional German, for whom a music of equal rank has not yet been found!--Finally, let us consider whether the present continually extending contempt of melody and the stunting of the sense for melody among Germans should not be understood as a democratic impropriety and an after-effect of the Revolution? For melody has such an obvious delight in conformity to law, and such an aversion to everything evolving, unformed and arbitrary, that it sounds like a note out of the _ancient_ European regime, and as a seduction and guidance back to it.

104.

The Tone of the German Language.--We know whence the German originated which for several centuries has been the universal literary language of Germany. The Germans, with their reverence for everything that came from the _court,_ intentionally took the chancery style as their pattern in all that they had to _write,_ especially in their letters, records, wills, &c. To write in the chancery style, that was to write in court and government style,--that was regarded as something select, compared with the language of the city in which a person lived. People gradually drew this inference, and spoke also as they wrote,--they thus became still more select in the forms of their words, in the choice of their terms and modes of expression, and finally also in their tones: they affected a court tone when they spoke, and the affectation at last became natural. Perhaps nothing quite similar has ever happened elsewhere:--the predominance of the literary style over the talk, and the formality and affectation of an entire people becoming the basis of a common and no longer dialectical language. I believe that the sound of the German language in the Middle Ages, and especially after the Middle Ages, was extremely rustic and vulgar; it has ennobled itself somewhat during the last centuries, principally because it was found necessary to imitate so many French, Italian, and Spanish sounds, and particularly on the part of the German (and Austrian) nobility, who could not at all content themselves with their mother-tongue. But notwithstanding this practice, German must have sounded intolerably vulgar to Montaigne, and even to Racine: even at present, in the mouths of travellers among the Italian populace, it still sounds very coarse, sylvan, and hoarse, as if it had originated in smoky rooms and outlandish districts.--Now I notice that at present a similar striving after selectness of tone is spreading among the former admirers of the chancery style, and that the Germans are beginning to accommodate themselves to a peculiar "witchery of sound," which might in the long run become an actual danger to the German language,--for one may seek in vain for more execrable sounds in Europe. Something mocking, cold, indifferent and careless in the voice: that is what at present sounds "noble" to the Germans--and I hear the approval of this nobleness in the voices of young officials, teachers, women, and trades-people; indeed, even the little girls already imitate this German of the officers. For the officer, and in fact the Prussian officer is the inventor of these tones: this same officer, who as soldier and professional man possesses that admirable tact for modesty which the Germans as a whole might

well imitate (German professors and musicians included!). But as soon as he speaks and moves he is the most inmodest and inelegant figure in old Europe--no doubt unconsciously to himself! And unconsciously also to the good Germans, who gaze at him as the man of the foremost and most select society, and willingly let him "give them his tone." And indeed he gives it to them!--in the first place it is the sergeant-majors and non-commissioned officers that imitate his tone and coarsen it. One should note the roars of command, with which the German cities are absolutely surrounded at present, when there is drilling at all the gates: what presumption, furious imperiousness, and mocking coldness speaks in this uproar! Could the Germans actually be a musical people?--It is certain that the Germans martialise themselves at present in the tone of their language: it is probable that, being exercised to speak martially, they will finally write martially also. For habituation to definite tones extends deeply into the character:--people soon have the words and modes of expression, and finally also the thoughts which just suit these tones! Perhaps they already write in the officers' style; perhaps I only read too little of what is at present written in Germany to know this. But one thing I know all the surer: the German public decorations which also reach places abroad, are not inspired by German music, but just by that new tone of tasteless arrogance. Almost in every speech of the foremost German statesman, and even when he makes himself heard through his imperial mouth-piece, there is an accent which the ear of a foreigner repudiates with aversion: but the Germans endure it,--they endure themselves.

105.

_The Germans as Artists.--_When once a German actually experiences passion (and not only, as is usual, the mere inclination to it), he then behaves just as he must do in passion, and does not think further of his behaviour. The truth is, however, that he then behaves very awkwardly and uglily, and as if destitute of rhythm and melody; so that onlookers are pained or moved thereby, but nothing more--_unless_ he elevate himself to the sublimity and enrapturedness of which certain passions are capable. Then even the German becomes _beautiful._ The consciousness of the _height at which_ beauty begins to shed its charm even over Germans, forces German artists to the height and the super-height, and to the extravagances of passion: they have an actual, profound longing, therefore, to get beyond, or at least to look beyond the ugliness and awkwardness--into a better, easier, more southern, more sunny world. And thus their convulsions are often merely indications that they would like to _dance:_ these poor bears in whom hidden nymphs and satyrs, and sometimes still higher divinities, carry on their game!

106.

Music as Advocate.--"I have a longing for a master of the musical art," said an innovator to his disciple, "that he may learn from me my ideas and speak them more widely in his language: I shall thus be better able to reach men's ears and hearts. For by means of tones one can seduce men to every error and every truth: who could _refute_ a tone?"--"You would, therefore, like to be regarded as irrefutable?" said his disciple. The innovator answered: "I should like the germ to become a tree. In order that a doctrine may become a tree, it must be believed in for a considerable period; in order that it may be believed in it must be regarded as irrefutable. Storms and doubts and worms and wickedness are necessary to the tree, that it may manifest its species and the strength of its germ; let it perish if it is not strong enough! But a germ is always merely annihilated,--not refuted!"--When he had said this, his disciple called out impetuously: "But I believe in your cause, and regard it as so strong that I will say everything against it, everything that I still have in my heart."--The innovator laughed to himself and threatened the disciple with his finger. "This kind of discipleship," said he then, "is the best, but it is dangerous, and not every kind of doctrine can stand it."

107.

Our Ultimate Gratitude to Art.--If we had not approved of the Arts and invented this sort of cult of the untrue, the insight into the general untruth and falsity of things now given us by science--an insight into delusion and error as conditions of intelligent and sentient existence--would be quite unendurable. _Honesty_ would have disgust and suicide in its train. Now, however, our honesty has a counterpoise which helps us to escape such consequences;--namely, Art, as the _good-will_ to illusion. We do not always restrain our eyes from rounding off and perfecting in imagination: and then it is no longer the eternal imperfection that we carry over the river of Becoming--for we think we carry a _goddess,_ and are proud and artless in rendering this service. As an æsthetic phenomenon existence is still _endurable_ to us; and by Art, eye and hand and above all the good conscience are given to us, _to be able_ to make such a phenomenon out of ourselves. We must rest from ourselves occasionally by contemplating and looking down upon ourselves, and by laughing or weeping _over_ ourselves from an artistic remoteness: we must discover the _hero,_ and likewise the _fool,_ that is hidden in our passion for knowledge; we must now and then be joyful in our folly, that we may continue to be joyful in our wisdom! And just because we are heavy and serious men in our ultimate depth, and are rather weights than men,

there is nothing that does us so much good as the _fool's cap and bells:_ we need them in presence of ourselves--we need all arrogant, soaring, dancing, mocking, childish and blessed Art, in order not to lose the _free dominion over things_ which our ideal demands of us. It would be _backsliding_ for us, with our susceptible integrity, to lapse entirely into morality, and actually become virtuous monsters and scarecrows, on account of the over-strict requirements which we here lay down for ourselves. We ought also to _be able_ to stand _above_ morality, and not only stand with the painful stiffness of one who every moment fears to slip and fall, but we should also be able to soar and play above it! How could we dispense with Art for that purpose, how could we dispense with the fool?--And as long as you are still _ashamed_ of yourselves in any way, you still do not belong to us!

BOOK THIRD

108.

New Struggles.--After Buddha was dead people showed his shadow for centuries afterwards in a cave,--an immense frightful shadow. God is dead:--but as the human race is constituted, there will perhaps be caves for millenniums yet, in which people will show his shadow.--And we--we have still to overcome his shadow!

109.

Let us be on our Guard.--Let us be on our guard against thinking that the world is a living being. Where could it extend itself? What could it nourish itself with? How could it grow and increase? We know tolerably well what the organic is; and we are to reinterpret the emphatically derivative, tardy, rare and accidental, which we only perceive on the crust of the earth, into the essential, universal and eternal, as those do who call the universe an organism? That disgusts me. Let us now be on our guard against believing that the universe is a machine; it is assuredly not constructed with a view to _one_ end; we invest it with far too high an honour with the word "machine." Let us be on our guard against supposing that anything so methodical as the cyclic motions of our neighbouring stars obtains generally and throughout the universe; indeed a glance at the Milky Way induces doubt as to whether there are not many cruder and more contradictory motions there, and even stars with continuous, rectilinearly gravitating orbits, and the like. The astral arrangement in which we live is an exception; this arrangement, and the relatively long durability which is determined by it, has again made possible the exception of exceptions, the formation of organic life. The general character of the world, on the other hand, is to all eternity chaos; not by the absence of necessity, but in the sense of the absence of order, structure, form, beauty, wisdom, and whatever else our æsthetic humanities are called. Judged by our reason, the unlucky casts are far oftenest the rule, the exceptions are not the secret purpose; and the whole musical box repeats eternally its air, which can never be called a melody,--and finally the very expression, "unlucky cast" is already an anthropomorphising which involves blame. But how could we presume to blame or praise the universe! Let us be on our guard against ascribing to it heartlessness and unreason, or their opposites; it is neither perfect, nor beautiful, nor noble; nor does it seek to be anything of the kind, it does not at all attempt to imitate man! It is altogether unaffected by our æsthetic and moral judgments! Neither has it any self-preservative instinct, nor instinct at all; it also knows no law. Let us be on our guard against saying that there are laws in nature. There are only necessities: there is no one who commands, no one who obeys, no one who transgresses. When you know that there is no design, you know also that there is no chance: for it is only where there is a world of design that the word "chance" has a meaning. Let us be on our guard against saying that death is contrary to life. The living being is only a species of dead being, and a very rare species.--Let us be on our guard against thinking that the world eternally creates the new. There are no eternally enduring substances; matter is just another such error as the God of the Eleatics. But when shall we be at an end with our foresight and precaution! When will all these shadows of God cease to obscure us? When shall we have nature entirely undeified! When shall we be permitted to _naturalise_ ourselves by means of the pure, newly discovered, newly redeemed nature?

110.

Origin of Knowledge.--Throughout immense stretches of time the intellect produced nothing but errors; some of them proved to be useful and preservative of the species: he who fell in with them, or inherited them, waged the battle for himself and his offspring with better success. Those erroneous articles of faith which were successively transmitted by inheritance, and have finally become almost the property and stock of the human species, are, for example, the following:--that there are enduring things, that there are equal things, that there are things, substances, and bodies, that a thing is what it appears, that our will is free, that what is good for me is also good absolutely. It was only very late that the deniers and doubters of such propositions came forward,--it was only very late that truth made its appearance as the most impotent form of knowledge. It seemed as if it were impossible to get along with

truth, our organism was adapted for the very opposite; all its higher functions, the perceptions of the senses, and in general every kind of sensation, co-operated with those primevally embodied, fundamental errors. Moreover, those propositions became the very standards of knowledge according to which the "true" and the "false" were determined--throughout the whole domain of pure logic. The _strength_ of conceptions does not, therefore, depend on their degree of truth, but on their antiquity, their embodiment, their character as conditions of life. Where life and knowledge seemed to conflict, there has never been serious contention; denial and doubt have there been regarded as madness. The exceptional thinkers like the Eleatics, who, in spite of this, advanced and maintained the antitheses of the natural errors, believed that it was possible also _to live_ these counterparts: it was they who devised the sage as the man of immutability, impersonality and universality of intuition, as one and all at the same time, with a special faculty for that reverse kind of knowledge; they were of the belief that their knowledge was at the same time the principle of _life._ To be able to affirm all this, however, they had to _deceive_ themselves concerning their own condition: they had to attribute to themselves impersonality and unchanging permanence, they had to mistake the nature of the philosophic individual, deny the force of the impulses in cognition, and conceive of reason generally as an entirely free and self-originating activity; they kept their eyes shut to the fact that they also had reached their doctrines in contradiction to valid methods, or through their longing for repose or for exclusive possession or for domination. The subtler development of sincerity and of scepticism finally made these men impossible; their life also, and their judgments, turned out to be dependent on the primeval impulses and fundamental errors of all sentient being.--The subtler sincerity and scepticism arose wherever two antithetical maxims appeared to be _applicable_ to life, because both of them were compatible with the fundamental errors; where, therefore, there could be contention concerning a higher or lower degree of _utility_ for life; and likewise where new maxims proved to be, not necessarily useful, but at least not injurious, as expressions of an intellectual impulse to play a game that was like all games innocent and happy. The human brain was gradually filled with such judgments and convictions; and in this tangled skein there arose ferment, strife and lust for power. Not only utility and delight, but every kind of impulse took part in the struggle for "truths": the intellectual struggle became a business, an attraction, a calling, a duty, an honour--: cognizing and striving for the true finally arranged themselves as needs among other needs. From that moment, not only belief and conviction, but also examination, denial, distrust and contradiction became _forces;_ all "evil" instincts were subordinated to knowledge, were placed in its service, and acquired the prestige of the permitted, the honoured, the useful, and finally the appearance and innocence of the _good._ Knowledge, thus became a portion of life itself, and as life it became a continually growing power: until finally the cognitions and those primeval, fundamental errors clashed with each other, both as life, both as power, both in the same man. The thinker is now the being in whom the impulse to truth and those life-preserving errors wage their first conflict, now that the impulse to truth has also _proved_ itself to be a life-preserving power. In comparison with the importance of this conflict everything else is indifferent; the final question concerning the conditions of life is here raised, and the first attempt is here made to answer it by experiment. How far is truth susceptible of embodiment?--that is the question, that is the experiment.

111.

Origin of the Logical.--Where has logic originated in men's heads? Undoubtedly out of the illogical, the domain of which must originally _have_ been immense. But numberless beings who reasoned otherwise than we do at present, perished; albeit that they may have come nearer to truth than we! Whoever, for example, could not discern the "like" often enough with regard to food, and with regard to animals dangerous to him, whoever, therefore, deduced too slowly, or was too circumspect in his deductions, had smaller probability of survival than he who in all similar cases immediately divined the equality. The preponderating inclination, however, to deal with the similar as the equal--an illogical inclination, for there is nothing equal in itself--first created the whole basis of logic. It was just so (in order that the conception of substance should originate, this being indispensable to logic, although in the strictest sense nothing actual corresponds to it) that for a long period the changing process in things had to be overlooked, and remain unperceived; the beings not seeing correctly had an advantage over those who saw everything "in flux." In itself every high degree of circumspection in conclusions, every sceptical inclination, is a great danger to life. No living being might have been preserved unless the contrary inclination--to affirm rather than suspend judgment, to mistake and fabricate rather than wait, to assent rather than deny, to decide rather than be in the right--had been cultivated with extraordinary assiduity.--The course of logical thought and reasoning in our modern brain corresponds to a process and struggle of impulses, which singly and in themselves are all very illogical and unjust; we experience usually only the result of the struggle, so rapidly and secretly does this primitive mechanism now operate in us.

112.

Cause and Effect.--We say it is "explanation"; but it is only in "description" that we are in advance of the older stages of knowledge and science. We describe better,--we explain just as little as our predecessors. We have discovered a manifold succession where the naïve man and investigator of older cultures saw only two things, "cause" and "effect," as it was said; we have perfected the conception of becoming, but have not got a knowledge of what is above and behind the conception. The series of "causes" stands before us much more complete in every case; we conclude that this and that must first precede in order that that other may follow--but we have not _grasped_ anything thereby. The peculiarity, for example, in every chemical process seems a "miracle," the same as before, just like all locomotion; nobody has "explained" impulse. How could we ever explain! We operate only with things which do not exist, with lines, surfaces, bodies, atoms, divisible times, divisible spaces--how can explanation ever be possible when we first make everything a _conception,_ our conception! It is sufficient to regard science as the exactest humanising of things that is possible; we always learn to describe ourselves more accurately by describing things and their successions. Cause and effect: there is probably never any such duality; in fact there is a _continuum_ before us, from which we isolate a few portions;--just as we always observe a motion as isolated points, and therefore do not properly see it, but infer it. The abruptness with which many effects take place leads us into error; it is however only an abruptness for us. There is an infinite multitude of processes in that abrupt moment which escape us. An intellect which could see cause and effect as a _continuum,_ which could see the flux of events not according to our mode of perception, as things arbitrarily separated and broken--would throw aside the conception of cause and effect, and would deny all conditionality.

113.

The Theory of Poisons.--So many things have to be united in order that scientific thinking may arise, and all the necessary powers must have been devised, exercised, and fostered singly! In their isolation, however, they have very often had quite a different effect than at present, when they are confined within the limits of scientific thinking and kept mutually in check:--they have operated as poisons; for example, the doubting impulse, the denying impulse, the waiting impulse, the collecting impulse, the disintegrating impulse. Many hecatombs of men were sacrificed ere these impulses learned to understand their juxtaposition and regard themselves as functions of one organising force in one man! And how far are we still from the point at which the artistic powers and the practical wisdom of life shall co-operate with scientific thinking, so that a higher organic system may be formed, in relation to which the scholar, the physician, the artist, and the lawgiver, as we know them at present, will seem sorry antiquities!

114.

The Extent of the Moral.--We construct a new picture, which we see immediately with the aid of all the old experiences which we have had, _always according to the degree_ of our honesty and justice. The only experiences are moral experiences, even in the domain of sense-perception.

115.

The Four Errors.--Man has been reared by his errors: firstly, he saw himself always imperfect; secondly,-he attributed to himself--imaginary qualities; thirdly, he felt himself in a false position in relation to the animals and nature; fourthly, he always devised new tables of values, and accepted them for a time as eternal and unconditioned, so that at one time this, and at another time that human impulse or state stood first, and was ennobled in consequence. When one has deducted the effect of these four errors, one has also deducted humanity, humaneness, and "human dignity."

116.

Herd-Instinct.--Wherever we meet with a morality we find a valuation and order of rank of the human impulses and activities. These valuations and orders of rank are always the expression of the needs of a community or herd: that which is in the first place to _its_ advantage--and in the second place and third place--is also the authoritative standard for the worth of every individual. By morality the individual is taught to become a function of the herd, and to ascribe to himself value only as a function. As the conditions for the maintenance of one community have been very different from those of another community, there have been very different moralities; and in respect to the future essential transformations of herds and communities, states and societies, one can prophesy that there will still be very divergent moralities. Morality is the herd-instinct in the individual.

117.

The Herd's Sting of Conscience.--In the longest and remotest ages of the human race there was quite a different sting of conscience from that of the present day. At present one only feels responsible for what one intends and for what one does, and we have our pride in ourselves. All our professors of jurisprudence start with this sentiment of individual independence and pleasure, as if the source of right had taken its rise here from the beginning. But throughout the longest period in the life of mankind there was nothing more terrible to a person than to feel himself independent. To be alone, to feel independent, neither to obey nor to rule, to represent an individual--that was no pleasure to a person then, but a punishment; he was condemned "to be an individual." Freedom of thought was regarded as discomfort personified. While we feel law and regulation as constraint and loss, people formerly regarded egoism as a painful thing, and a veritable evil. For a person to be himself, to value himself according to his own measure and weight--that was then quite distasteful. The inclination to such a thing would have been regarded as madness; for all miseries and terrors were associated with being alone. At that time the "free will" had bad conscience in close proximity to it; and the less independently a person acted, the more the herd-instinct, and not his personal character, expressed itself in his conduct, so much the more moral did he esteem himself. All that did injury to the herd, whether the individual had intended it or not, then caused him a sting of conscience--and his neighbour likewise, indeed the whole herd!--It is in this respect that we have most changed our mode of thinking.

118.

_Benevolence--_Is it virtuous when a cell transforms itself into the function of a stronger cell? It must do so. And is it wicked when the stronger one assimilates the other? It must do so likewise: it is necessary, for it has to have abundant indemnity and seeks to regenerate itself. One has therefore to distinguish the instinct of appropriation and the instinct of submission in benevolence, according as the stronger or the weaker feels benevolent. Gladness and covetousness are united in the stronger person, who wants to transform something to his function: gladness and desire-to-be-coveted in the weaker person, who would like to become a function.--The former case is essentially pity, a pleasant excitation of the instinct of appropriation at the sight of the weak: it is to be remembered, however, that "strong" and "weak" are relative conceptions.

119.

No Altruism!/--I see in many men an excessive impulse and delight in wanting to be a function; they strive after it, and have the keenest scent for all those positions in which precisely _they_ themselves can be functions. Among such persons are those women who transform themselves into just that function of a man that is but weakly-developed in him, and then become his purse, or his politics, or his social intercourse. Such beings maintain themselves best when they insert themselves in an alien organism; if they do not succeed they become vexed, irritated, and eat themselves up.

120.

Health of the Soul.--The favourite medico-moral formula (whose originator was Ariston of Chios), "Virtue is the health of the soul," would, for all practical purposes, have to be altered to this: "Thy virtue is the health of thy soul." For there is no such thing as health in itself, and all attempts to define a thing in that way have lamentably failed. It is necessary to know thy aim, thy horizon, thy powers, thy impulses, thy errors, and especially the ideals and fantasies of thy soul, in order to determine _what health_ implies even for thy _body._ There are consequently innumerable kinds of physical health; and the more one again permits the unique and unparalleled to raise its head, the more one unlearns the dogma of the "Equality of men," so much the more also must the conception of a normal health, together with a normal diet and a normal course of disease, be abrogated by our physicians. And then only would it be time to turn our thoughts to the health and disease of the _soul,_ and make the special virtue of everyone consist in its health; but, to be sure, what appeared as health in one person might appear as the contrary of health in another. In the end the great question might still remain open:--Whether we could _do without_ sickness for the development of our virtue, and whether our thirst for knowledge and self-knowledge would not especially need the sickly soul as well as the sound one; in short, whether the mere will to health is not a prejudice, a cowardice, and perhaps an instance of the subtlest barbarism and unprogressiveness?

121.

Life no Argument.--We have arranged for ourselves a world in which we can live--by the postulating of bodies, lines, surfaces, causes and effects, motion and rest, form and content: without these articles of faith no one could manage to live at present! But for all that they are still unproved. Life is no argument; error might be among the conditions of life.

122.

The Element of Moral Scepticism in Christianity.--Christianity also has made a great contribution to enlightenment, and has taught moral scepticism --in a very impressive and effective manner, accusing and embittering, but with untiring patience and subtlety; it annihilated in every individual the belief in his virtues: it made the great virtuous ones, of whom antiquity had no lack, vanish for ever from the earth, those popular men, who, in the belief in their perfection, walked about with the dignity of a hero of the bull-fight. When, trained in this Christian school of scepticism, we now read the moral books of the ancients, for example those of Seneca and Epictetus, we feel a pleasurable superiority, and are full of secret insight and penetration,--it seems to us as if a child talked before an old man, or a pretty, gushing girl before La Rochefoucauld:--we know better what virtue is! After all, however, we have applied the same scepticism to all _religious_ states and processes, such as sin, repentance, grace, sanctification, &c., and have allowed the worm to burrow so well, that we have now the same feeling of subtle superiority and insight even in reading all Christian books:--we know also the religious feelings better! And it is time to know them well and describe them well, for the pious ones of the old belief die out also; let us save their likeness and type, at least for the sake of knowledge.

123.

Knowledge more than a Means.--Also _without_ this passion--I refer to the passion for knowledge--science would be furthered: science has hitherto increased and grown up without it. The good faith in science, the prejudice in its favour, by which States are at present dominated (it was even the Church formerly), rests fundamentally on the fact that the absolute inclination and impulse has so rarely revealed itself in it, and that science is regarded _not_ as a passion, but as a condition and an "ethos." Indeed, _amour-plaisir_ of knowledge (curiosity) often enough suffices, _amour-vanité_ suffices, and habituation to it, with the afterthought of obtaining honour and bread; it even suffices for many that they do not know what to do with a surplus of leisure, except to continue reading, collecting, arranging, observing and narrating; their "scientific impulse" is their ennui. Pope Leo X once (in the brief to Beroaldus) sang the praise of science; he designated it as the finest ornament and the greatest pride of our life, a noble employment in happiness and in misfortune; "without it," he says finally, "all human undertakings would be without a firm basis,--even with it they are still sufficiently mutable and insecure!" But this rather sceptical Pope, like all other ecclesiastical panegyrists of science, suppressed his ultimate judgment concerning it. If one may deduce from his words what is remarkable enough for such a lover of art, that he places science above art it is alter all, however, only from politeness that he omits to speak of that which he places high above all science: the "revealed truth," and the "eternal salvation o the soul,"--what are ornament, pride, entertainment and security of life to him, in comparison thereto? "Science is something of secondary rank, nothing ultimate or unconditioned, no object of passion"--this judgment was kept back in Leos soul: the truly Christian judgment concerning science! In antiquity its dignity and appreciation were lessened by the fact that, even among its most eager disciples, the striving after _virtue_ stood foremost and that people thought they had given the highest praise to knowledge when they celebrated it as the best means to virtue. It is something new in history that knowledge claims to be more than a means.

124.

In the Horizon of the Infinite.--We have left the land and have gone aboard ship! We have broken down the bridge behind us,--nay, more, the land behind us! Well, little ship! look out! Beside thee is the ocean; it is true it does not always roar, and sometimes it spreads out like silk and gold and a gentle reverie. But times will come when thou wilt feel that it is infinite, and that there is nothing more frightful than infinity. Oh, the poor bird that felt itself free, and now strikes against the walls of this cage! Alas, if home-sickness for the land should attack thee, as if there had been more _freedom_ there,--and there is no "land" any longer!

125.

The Madman.--Have you ever heard of the madman who on a bright morning lighted a lantern and ran to the market-place calling out unceasingly: "I seek God! I seek God!"--As there were many people standing about who did not believe in God, he caused a great deal of amusement. Why! is he lost? said one. Has he strayed away like a child? said another. Or does he keep himself hidden? Is he afraid of us? Has he taken a sea-voyage? Has he emigrated?--the people cried out laughingly, all in a hubbub. The insane man jumped into their midst and transfixed them with his glances. "Where is God gone?" he called out. "I mean to tell you! _We have killed him,_--you and I! We are all his murderers! But how have we done it? How were we able to drink up the sea? Who gave us the sponge to wipe away the whole horizon? What did we do when we loosened this earth from its sun? Whither does it now move? Whither do we move? Away from all suns? Do we not dash on unceasingly? Back-wards, sideways, forewards,

in all directions? Is there still an above and below? Do we not stray, as through infinite nothingness? Does not empty space breathe upon us? Has it not become colder? Does not night come on continually, darker and darker? Shall we not have to light lanterns in the morning? Do we not hear the noise of the grave-diggers who are burying God? Do we not smell the divine putrefaction?--for even Gods putrefy! God is dead! God remains dead! And we have killed him! How shall we console ourselves, the most murderous of all murderers? The holiest and the mightiest that the world has hitherto possessed, has bled to death under our knife,--who will wipe the blood from us? With what water could we cleanse ourselves? What lustrums, what sacred games shall we have to devise? Is not the magnitude of this deed too great for us? Shall we not ourselves have to become Gods, merely to seem worthy of it? There never was a greater event,--and on account of it, all who are born after us belong to a higher history than any history hitherto!"--Here the madman was silent and looked again at his hearers; they also were silent and looked at him in surprise. At last he threw his lantern on the ground, so that it broke in pieces and was extinguished. "I come too early," he then said, "I am not yet at the right time. This prodigious event is still on its way, and is travelling,--it has not yet reached men's ears. Lightning and thunder need time, the light of the stars needs time, deeds need time, even after they are done, to be seen and heard. This deed is as yet further from them than the furthest star,--_and yet they have done it!"--It_ is further stated that the madman made his way into different churches on the same day, and there intoned his _Requiem æternam deo._ When led out and called to account, he always gave the reply: "What are these churches now, if they are not the tombs and monuments of God?"--

126.

Mystical Explanations.--Mystical explanations are regarded as profound; the truth is that they do not even go the length of being superficial.

127.

_After-Effect of the most Ancient Religiousness.--_The thoughtless man thinks that the Will is the only thing that operates, that willing is something simple, manifestly given, underived, and comprehensible in itself. He is convinced that when he does anything, for example, when he delivers a blow, it is _he_ who strikes, and he has struck because he _willed_ to strike. He does not notice anything of a problem therein, but the feeling of _willing_ suffices to him, not only for the acceptance of cause and effect, but also for the belief that he _understands_ their relationship. Of the mechanism of the occurrence, and of the manifold subtle operations that must be performed in order that the blow may result, and likewise of the incapacity of the Will in itself to effect even the smallest part of those operations--he knows nothing. The Will is to him a magically operating force; the belief in the Will as the cause of effects is the belief in magically operating forces. In fact, whenever he saw anything happen, man originally believed in a Will as cause, and in personally _willing_ beings operating in the background,--the conception of mechanism was very remote from him. Because, however, man for immense periods of time believed only in persons (and not in matter, forces, things, &c.), the belief in cause and effect has become a fundamental belief with him, which he applies everywhere when anything happens,--and even still uses instinctively as a piece of atavism of remotest origin. The propositions, "No effect without a cause," and "Every effect again implies a cause," appear as generalisations of several less general propositions:--"Where there is operation there has been _willing_." "Operating is only possible on _willing_ beings." "There is never a pure, resultless experience of activity, but every experience involves stimulation of the Will" (to activity, defence, revenge or retaliation). But in the primitive period of the human race, the latter and the former propositions were identical, the first were not generalisations of the second, but the second were explanations of the first.--Schopenhauer, with his assumption that all that exists is something _volitional,_ has set a primitive mythology on the throne; he seems never to have attempted an analysis of the Will, because he _believed_ like everybody in the simplicity and immediateness of all volition:--while volition is in fact such a cleverly practised mechanical process that it almost escapes the observing eye. I set the following propositions against those of Schopenhauer:--Firstly, in order that Will may arise, an idea of pleasure and pain is necessary. Secondly, that a vigorous excitation may be felt as pleasure or pain, is the affair of the _interpreting_ intellect, which, to be sure, operates thereby for the most part unconsciously to us, and one and the same excitation _may_ be interpreted as pleasure or pain. Thirdly, it is only in an intellectual being that there is pleasure, displeasure and Will; the immense majority of organisms have nothing of the kind.

128.

_The Value of Prayer.--_Prayer has been devised for such men as have never any thoughts of their own, and to whom an elevation of the soul is unknown, or passes unnoticed; what shall these people do in holy places and in all important situations in life which require repose and some kind of dignity? In order at least that they may not _disturb,_ the wisdom of all the founders of religions,

the small as well as the great, has commended to them the formula of prayer, as a long mechanical labour of the lips, united with an effort of the memory, and with a uniform, prescribed attitude of hands and feet--_and_ eyes! They may then, like the Tibetans, chew the cud of their "_om mane padme hum,"_ innumerable times, or, as in Benares, count the name of the God Ram-Ram-Ram (etc., with or without grace) on their fingers; or honour Vishnu with his thousand names of invocation, Allah with his ninety-nine; or they may make use of the prayer-wheels and the rosary: the main thing is that they are settled down for a time at this work, and present a tolerable appearance; their mode of prayer is devised for the advantage of the pious who have thought and elevation of their own. But even these have their weary hours when a series of venerable words and sounds, and a mechanical, pious ritual does them good. But supposing that these rare men--in every religion the religious man is an exception--know how to help themselves, the poor in spirit do not know, and to forbid them the prayer-babbling would mean to take their religion from them, a fact which Protestantism brings more and more to light. All that religion wants with such persons is that they should _keep still_ with their eyes, hands, legs, and all their organs: they thereby become temporarily beautified and--more human-looking!

129.

The Conditions for God.--"God himself cannot subsist without wise men," said Luther, and with good reason; but "God can still less subsist without unwise men,"--good Luther did not say that!

130.

_A Dangerous Resolution.--_The Christian resolution to find the world ugly and bad, has made the world ugly and bad.

131.

Christianity and Suicide.--Christianity made use of the excessive longing for suicide at the time of its origin as a lever for its power: it left only two forms of suicide, invested them with the highest dignity and the highest hopes, and forbade all others with dreadful threatenings. But martyrdom and the slow self-annihilation of the ascetic were permitted.

132.

Against Christianity.--It is now no longer our reason, but our taste that decides against Christianity.

133.

Axioms.--An unavoidable hypothesis on which mankind must always fall back again, is in the long run _more powerful_ than the most firmly believed belief in something untrue (like the Christian belief). In the long run: that means a hundred thousand years hence.

134.

Pessimists as Victims.--When a profound dislike of existence gets the upper hand, the after-effect of a great error in diet of which a people has been long guilty comes to light. The spread of Buddhism (_not_ its origin) is thus to a considerable extent dependent on the excessive and almost exclusive rice-fare of the Indians, and on the universal enervation that results therefrom. Perhaps the modern, European discontentedness is to be looked upon as caused by the fact that the world of our forefathers, the whole Middle Ages, was given to drink, owing to the influence of German tastes in Europe: the Middle Ages, that means the alcoholic poisoning of Europe.--The German dislike of life (including the influence of the cellar-air and stove-poison in German dwellings), is essentially a cold-weather complaint.

135.

Origin of Sin--Sin, as it is at present felt wherever Christianity prevails or has prevailed is a Jewish feeling and a Jewish invention; and in respect to this background of all Christian morality Christianity has in fact aimed at "Judaising" the whole world. To what an extent this has succeeded in Europe is traced most accurately in our remarkable alienness to Greek antiquity--a world without the feeling of sin--in our sentiments even at present; in spite of all the good will to approximation and assimilation, which whole generations and many distinguished individuals have not failed to display. "Only when thou _repentest_ is God gracious to thee"--that would arouse the laughter or the wrath of a Greek: he would say, "Slaves may have such sentiments." Here a mighty being, an almighty being, and yet a revengeful being, is presupposed; his power is so great that no injury whatever can be done to

him except in the point of honour. Every sin is an infringement of respect, a _crimen læsæ majestatis divinæ_?--and nothing more! Contrition, degradation, rolling-in-the-dust,--these are the first and last conditions on which his favour depends: the restoration, therefore, of his divine honour! If injury be caused otherwise by sin, if a profound, spreading evil be propagated by it, an evil which, like a disease, attacks and strangles one man after another--that does not trouble this honour-craving Oriental in heaven; sin is an offence against him, not against mankind!--to him on whom he has bestowed his favour he bestows also this indifference to the natural consequences of sin. God and mankind are here thought of as separated as so antithetical that sin against the latter cannot be at all possible,--all deeds are to be looked upon _solely with respect to their supernatural consequences,_ and not with respect to their natural results: it is thus that the Jewish feeling, to which all that is natural seems unworthy in itself, would have things. The _Greeks,_ on the other hand, were more familiar with the thought that transgression also may have dignity,--even theft, as in the case of Prometheus, even the slaughtering of cattle as the expression of frantic jealousy, as in the case of Ajax; in their need to attribute dignity to transgression and embody it therein, they invented _tragedy,_--an art and a delight, which in its profoundest essence has remained alien to the Jew, in spite of all his poetic endowment and taste for the sublime.

136.

The Chosen People.--The Jews, who regard themselves as the chosen people among the nations, and that too because they are the moral genius among the nations (in virtue of their capacity for _despising_ the human in themselves _more_ than any other people)--the Jews have a pleasure in their divine monarch and saint similar to that which the French nobility had in Louis XIV. This nobility had allowed its power and autocracy to be taken from it, and had become contemptible: in order not to feel this, in order to be able to forget it, an _unequalled_ royal magnificence, royal authority and plenitude of power was needed, to which there was access only for the nobility. As in accordance with this privilege they raised themselves to the elevation of the court, and from that elevation saw everything under them,--saw everything contemptible,--they got beyond all uneasiness of conscience. They thus elevated intentionally the tower of the royal power more and more into the clouds, and set the final coping-stone of their own power thereon.

137.

Spoken in Parable.--A Jesus Christ was only possible in a Jewish landscape--I mean in one over which the gloomy and sublime thunder-cloud of the angry Jehovah hung continually. Here only was the rare, sudden flashing of a single sunbeam through the dreadful, universal and continuous nocturnal-day regarded as a miracle of "love," as a beam of the most unmerited "grace." Here only could Christ dream of his rainbow and celestial ladder on which God descended to man; everywhere else the clear weather and the sun were considered the rule and the commonplace.

138.

_The Error of Christ.--_The founder of Christianity thought there was nothing from which men suffered so much as from their sins:--it was his error, the error of him who felt himself without sin, to whom experience was lacking in this respect! It was thus that his soul filled with that marvellous, fantastic pity which had reference to a trouble that even among his own people, the inventors of sin, was rarely a great trouble! But Christians understood subsequently how to do justice to their master, and how to sanctify his error into a "truth."

139.

_Colour of the Passions.--_Natures such as the apostle Paul, have an evil eye for the passions; they learn to know only the filthy, the distorting, and the heart-breaking in them,--their ideal aim, therefore, is the annihilation of the passions; in the divine they see complete purification from passion. The Greeks, quite otherwise than Paul and the Jews, directed their ideal aim precisely to the passions, and loved, elevated, embellished and deified them: in passion they evidently not only felt themselves happier, but also purer and diviner than otherwise.--And now the Christians? Have they wished to become Jews in this respect? Have they perhaps become Jews?

140.

_Too Jewish.--_If God had wanted to become an object of love, he would first of all have had to forgo judging and justice:-a judge, and even a gracious judge, is no object of love. The founder of Christianity showed too little of the finer feelings in this respect--being a Jew.

141.

Too Oriental.--What? A God who loves men provided that they believe in him, and who hurls frightful glances and threatenings at him who does not believe in this love! What? A conditioned love as the feeling of an almighty God! A love which has not even become master of the sentiment of honour and of the irritable desire for vengeance! How Oriental is all that! "If I love thee, what does it concern thee?"[1] is already a sufficient criticism of the whole of Christianity.

142.

Frankincense.--Buddha says: "Do not flatter thy benefactor!" Let one repeat this saying in a Christian church:--it immediately purifies the air.

143.

The Greatest Utility of Polytheism.--For the individual to set up his _own_ ideal and derive from it his laws, his pleasures and his rights--_that_ has perhaps been hitherto regarded as the most monstrous of all human aberrations, and as idolatry in itself; in fact, the few who have ventured to do this have always needed to apologise to themselves, usually in this wise: "Not I! not I! but _a God,_ through my instrumentality!" It was in the marvellous art and capacity for creating Gods--in polytheism--that this impulse was permitted to discharge itself, it was here that it became purified, perfected, and ennobled; for it was originally a commonplace and unimportant impulse, akin to stubbornness, disobedience and envy. To be _hostile_ to this impulse towards the individual ideal,--that was formerly the law of every morality. There was then only one norm, "the man"--and every people believed that it _had_ this one and ultimate norm. But above himself, and outside of himself, in a distant over-world, a person could see a _multitude of norms:_ the one God was not the denial or blasphemy of the other Gods! It was here that individuals were first permitted, it was here that the right of individuals was first respected. The inventing of Gods, heroes, and supermen of all kinds, as well as co-ordinate men and undermen--dwarfs, fairies, centaurs, satyrs, demons, devils--was the inestimable preliminary to the justification of the selfishness and sovereignty of the individual: the freedom which was granted to one God in respect to other Gods, was at last given to the individual himself in respect to laws, customs and neighbours. Monotheism, on the contrary, the rigid consequence of the doctrine of one normal human being--consequently the belief in a normal God, beside whom there are only false, spurious Gods--has perhaps been the greatest danger of mankind in the past: man was then threatened by that premature state of inertia, which, so far as we can see, most of the other species of animals reached long ago, as creatures who all believed in one normal animal and ideal in their species, and definitely translated their morality of custom into flesh and blood. In polytheism man's free-thinking and many-sided thinking had a prototype set up: the power to create for himself new and individual eyes, always newer and more individualised: so that these are no _eternal_ horizons and perspectives.

[1] This means that true love does not look for reciprocity.

144.

Religious Wars.--The greatest advance of the masses hitherto has been religious war, for it proves that the masses have begun to deal reverently with conceptions of things. Religious wars only result when human reason generally has been refined by the subtle disputes of sects; so that even the populace becomes punctilious and regards trifles as important, actually thinking it possible that the "eternal salvation of the soul" may depend upon minute distinctions of concepts.

145.

Danger of Vegetarians.--The immense prevalence of rice-eating impels to the use of opium and narcotics, in like manner as the immense prevalence of potato-eating impels to the use of brandy:--it also impels, however, in its more subtle after-effects to modes of thought and feeling which operate narcotically. This is in accord with the fact that those who promote narcotic modes of thought and feeling, like those Indian teachers, praise a purely vegetable diet, and would like to make it a law for the masses: they want thereby to call forth and augment the need which _they_ are in a position to satisfy.

146.

_German Hopes.--_Do not let us forget that the names of peoples are generally names of reproach. The Tartars, for example, according to their name, are "the dogs"; they were so christened by the Chinese. _"Deutschen"_ (Germans) means originally

"heathen": it is thus that the Goths after their conversion named the great mass of their unbaptized fellow-tribes, according to the indication in their translation of the Septuagint, in which the heathen are designated by the word which in Greek signifies "the nations." (See Ulfilas.)--It might still be possible for the Germans to make an honourable name ultimately out of their old name of reproach, by becoming the first _non-Christian_ nation of Europe; for which purpose Schopenhauer, to their honour, regarded them as highly qualified. The work of _Luther_ would thus be consummated,--he who taught them to be anti-Roman, and to say: "Here _I_ stand! _I_ cannot do otherwise!"--

147.

Question and Answer.--What do savage tribes at present accept first of all from Europeans? Brandy and Christianity, the European narcotics.--And by what means are they fastest ruined?--By the European narcotics.

148.

Where Reformations Originate.--At the time of the great corruption of the church it was least of all corrupt in Germany: it was on that account that the Reformation originated _here,_ as a sign that even the beginnings of corruption were felt to be unendurable. For, comparatively speaking, no people was ever more Christian than the Germans at the time of Luther; their Christian culture was just about to burst into bloom with a hundred-fold splendour,--one night only was still lacking; but that night brought the storm which put an end to all.

149.

The Failure of Reformations.--It testifies to the higher culture of the Greeks, even in rather early ages, that attempts to establish new Grecian religions frequently failed; it testifies that quite early there must have been a multitude of dissimilar individuals in Greece, whose dissimilar troubles were not cured by a single recipe of faith and hope. Pythagoras and Plato, perhaps also Empedocles, and already much earlier the Orphic enthusiasts, aimed at founding new religions; and the two first-named were so endowed with the qualifications for founding religions, that one cannot be sufficiently astonished at their failure: they just reached the point of founding sects. Every time that the Reformation of an entire people fails and only sects raise their heads, one may conclude that the people already contains many types, and has begun to free itself from the gross herding instincts and the morality of, custom,--a momentous state of suspense, which one is accustomed to disparage as decay of morals and corruption, while it announces the maturing of the egg and the early rupture of the shell. That Luther's Reformation succeeded in the north, is a sign that the north had remained backward in comparison with the south of Europe, and still had requirements tolerably uniform in colour and kind; and there would have been no Christianising of Europe at all, if the culture of the old world of the south had not been gradually barbarized by an excessive admixture of the blood of German barbarians, and thus lost its ascendency. The more universally and unconditionally an individual, or the thought of an individual, can operate, so much more homogeneous and so much lower must be the mass that is there operated upon; while counter-strivings betray internal counter-requirements, which also want to gratify and realise themselves. Reversely, one may always conclude with regard to an actual elevation of culture, when powerful and ambitious natures only produce a limited and sectarian effect: this is true also for the separate arts, and for the provinces of knowledge. Where there is ruling there are masses: where there are masses there is need of slavery. Where there is slavery the individuals are but few, and have the instincts and conscience of the herd opposed to them.

150.

Criticism of Saints.--Must one then, in order to have a virtue, be desirous of having it precisely in its most brutal form?--as the Christian saints desired and needed;--those who only _endured_ life with the thought that at the sight of their virtue self-contempt might seize every man. A virtue with such an effect I call brutal.

151.

The Origin of Religion.--The metaphysical requirement is not the origin of religions, as Schopenhauer claims, but only a _later sprout_ from them. Under the dominance of religious thoughts we have accustomed ourselves to the idea of "another (back, under, or upper) world," and feel an uncomfortable void and privation through the annihilation of the religious illusion;--and then "another world" grows out of this feeling once more, but now it is only a metaphysical world, and no longer a religious one. That however which in general led to the assumption of "another world" in primitive times, was _not_ an impulse or requirement, but an _error_ in the interpretation of certain natural phenomena, a difficulty of the intellect.

152.

The greatest Change.--The lustre and the hues of all things have changed! We no longer quite understand how earlier men conceived of the most familiar and frequent things,--for example, of the day, and the awakening in the morning: owing to their belief in dreams the waking state seemed to them differently illuminated. And similarly of the whole of life, with its reflection of death and its significance: our "death" is an entirely different death. All events were of a different lustre, for a God shone forth in them; and similarly of all resolutions and peeps into the distant future: for people had oracles, and secret hints, and believed in prognostication. "Truth" was conceived in quite a different manner, for the insane could formerly be regarded as its mouthpiece--a thing which makes _us_ shudder, or laugh. Injustice made a different impression on the feelings: for people were afraid of divine retribution, and not only of legal punishment and disgrace. What joy was there in an age when men believed in the devil and tempter! What passion was there when people saw demons lurking close at hand! What philosophy was there when doubt was regarded as sinfulness of the most dangerous kind, and in fact as an outrage on eternal love, as distrust of everything good, high, pure, and compassionate!--We have coloured things anew, we paint them over continually,--but what have we been able to do hitherto in comparison with the _splendid colouring_ of that old master!--I mean ancient humanity.

153.

Homo poeta.--"I myself who have made this tragedy of tragedies altogether independently, in so far as it is completed; I who have first entwined the perplexities of morality about existence, and have tightened them so that only a God could unravel them--so Horace demands!--I have already in the fourth act killed all the Gods--for the sake of morality! What is now to be done about the fifth act? Where shall I get the tragic _dénouement!_ Must I now think about a comic _dénouement_?"

154.

Differences in the Dangerousness of Life.--You don't know at all what you experience; you run through life as if intoxicated, and now and then fall down a stair. Thanks however to your intoxication you still do not break your limbs: your muscles are too languid and your head too confused to find the stones of the staircase as hard as we others do! For, us life is a greater danger: we are made of glass--alas, if we should _strike against_ anything! And all is lost if we should _fall_!

155.

What we Lack.--We love the _grandeur_ of Nature, and have discovered it; that is because human grandeur is lacking in our minds. It was the reverse with the Greeks: their feeling towards Nature was quite different from ours.

156.

The most Influential Person.--The fact that a person resists the whole spirit of his age, stops it at the door and calls it to account, _must_ exert an influence! It is indifferent whether he wishes to exert an influence; the point is that he _can_.

157.

Mentiri.--Take care!--he reflects: he will have a lie ready immediately. This is a stage in the civilisation of whole nations. Consider only what the Romans expressed by _mentiri!_

158.

An Inconvenient Peculiarity.--To find everything deep is an inconvenient peculiarity: it makes one constantly strain one's eyes, so that in the end one always finds more than one wishes.

159.

Every Virtue has its Time.--The honesty of him who is at present inflexible often causes him remorse; for inflexibility is the virtue of a time different from that in which honesty prevails.

160.

In Intercourse with Virtues.--One can also be undignified and flattering towards a virtue.

161.

To the Admirers of the Age.--The runaway priest and the liberated criminal are continually making grimaces; what they want is a look without a past. But have you ever seen men who know that their looks reflect the future, and who are so courteous to you, the admirers of the "age," that they assume a look without a future?--

162.

Egoism.--Egoism is the _perspective_ law of our sentiment, according to which the near appears large and momentous, while in the distance the magnitude and importance of all things diminish.

163.

After a Great Victory.--The best thing in a great victory is that it deprives the conqueror of the fear of defeat. "Why should I not be worsted for once?" he says to himself, "I am now rich enough to stand it."

164.

Those who Seek Repose.--I recognise the minds that seek repose by the many _dark_ objects with which they surround themselves: those who want to sleep darken their chambers, or creep into caverns. A hint to those who do not know what they really seek most, and would like to know!

165.

The Happiness of Renunciation.--He who has absolutely dispensed with something for a long time will almost imagine, when he accidentally meets with it again, that he has discovered it,--and what happiness every discoverer has! Let us be wiser than the serpents that lie too long in the same sunshine.

166.

Always in our own Society.--All that is akin to me in nature and history speaks to me, praises me, urges me forward and comforts me--: other things are unheard by me, or immediately forgotten. We are only in our own society always.

167.

Misanthropy and Philanthropy.--We only speak about being sick of men when we can no longer digest them, and yet have the stomach full of them. Misanthropy is the result of a far too eager philanthropy and "cannibalism,"--but who ever bade you swallow men like oysters, my Prince Hamlet?

168.

Concerning an Invalid.--"Things go badly with him!"--What is wrong?--" He suffers from the longing to be praised, and finds no sustenance for it."--Inconceivable! All the world does honour to him, and he is reverenced not only in deed but in word!--"Certainly, but he is dull of hearing for the praise. When a friend praises him it sounds to him as if the friend praised himself; when an enemy praises him, it sounds to him as if the enemy wanted to be praised for it; when, finally, some one else praises him--there are by no means so many of these, he is so famous!--he is offended because they neither want him for a friend nor for an enemy; he is accustomed to say: 'What do I care for those who can still pose as the all-righteous towards me!'"

169.

Avowed Enemies.--Bravery in presence of an enemy is a thing by itself: a person may possess it and still be a coward and an irresolute num-skull. That was Napoleon's opinion concerning the "bravest man" he knew, Murat:--whence it follows that avowed enemies are indispensable to some men, if they are to attain to _their_ virtue, to their manliness, to their cheerfulness.

170.

With, the Multitude.--He has hitherto gone with the multitude and is its panegyrist; but one day he will be its opponent! For he follows it in the belief that his laziness will find its advantage thereby: he has not yet learned that the multitude is not lazy enough for him! that it always presses forward! that it does not allow any one to stand still!--And he likes so well to stand still!

171.

Fame.--When the gratitude of many to one casts aside all shame, then fame originates.

172.

The Perverter of Taste.--A: "You are a perverter of taste--they say so everywhere!" B: "Certainly! I pervert every one's taste for his party:--no party forgives me for that."

173.

To be Profound and to Appear Profound.--He who knows that he is profound strives for clearness; he who would like to appear profound to the multitude strives for obscurity. The multitude thinks everything profound of which it cannot see the bottom; it is so timid and goes so unwillingly into the water.

174.

Apart.--Parliamentarism, that is to say, the public permission to choose between five main political opinions, insinuates itself into the favour of the numerous class who would fain _appear_ independent and individual, and like to fight for their opinions. After all, however, it is a matter of indifference whether one opinion is imposed upon the herd, or five opinions are permitted to it.--He who diverges from the five public opinions and goes apart, has always the whole herd against him.

175.

Concerning Eloquence.--What has hitherto had the most convincing eloquence? The rolling of the drum: and as long as kings have this at their command, they will always be the best orators and popular leaders.

176.

Compassion.--The poor, ruling princes! All their rights now change unexpectedly into claims, and all these claims immediately sound like pretensions! And if they but say "we," or "my people," wicked old Europe begins laughing. Verily, a chief-master-of-ceremonies of the modern world would make little ceremony with them; perhaps he would decree that "_les souverains rangent aux parvenus._"

177.

On "Educational Matters."--In Germany an important educational means is lacking for higher men; namely, the laughter of higher men; these men do not laugh in Germany.

178.

For Moral Enlightenment.--The Germans must be talked out of their Mephistopheles--and out of their Faust also. These are two moral prejudices against the value of knowledge.

179.

_Thoughts.--_Thoughts are the shadows of our sentiments--always however obscurer, emptier and simpler.

180.

The Good Time for Free Spirits.--Free Spirits take liberties even with regard to Science--and meanwhile they are allowed to do so,--while the Church still remains!--In so far they have now their good time.

181.

Following and Leading.--A: "Of the two, the one will always follow, the other will always lead, whatever be the course of their destiny. _And yet_ the former is superior to the other in virtue and intellect." B: "And yet? And yet? That is spoken for the others; not for me, not for us!--_Fit secundum regulam._"

182.

In Solitude.--When one lives alone one does not speak too loudly, and one does not write too loudly either, for one fears the hollow reverberation--the criticism of the nymph Echo.--And all voices sound differently in solitude!

183.

The Music of the Best Future.--The first musician for me would be he who knew only the sorrow of the profoundest happiness, and no other sorrow: there has not hitherto been such a musician.

184.

Justice.--Better allow oneself to be robbed than have scarecrows around one--that is my taste. And under all circumstances it is just a matter of taste--and nothing more!

185.

Poor.--He is now poor, but not because everything has been taken from him, but because he has thrown everything away:--what does he care? He is accustomed to find new things.--It is the poor who misunderstand his voluntary poverty.

186.

Bad Conscience.--All that he now does is excellent and proper--and yet he has a bad conscience with it all. For the exceptional is his task.

187.

Offensiveness in Expression.--This artist offends me by the way in which he expresses his ideas, his very excellent ideas: so diffusely and forcibly, and with such gross rhetorical artifices, as if he were speaking to the mob. We feel always as if "in bad company" when devoting some time to his art.

188.

Work.--How closely work and the workers now stand even to the most leisurely of us! The royal courtesy in the words: "We are all workers," would have been a cynicism and an indecency even under Louis XIV.

189.

The Thinker.--He is a thinker: that is to say, he knows how to take things more simply than they are.

190.

Against Eulogisers.--A: "One is only praised by one's equals!" B: "Yes! And he who praises you says: 'You are my equal!'"

191.

Against many a Vindication.--The most perfidious manner of injuring a cause is to vindicate it intentionally with fallacious arguments.

192.

The Good-natured.--What is it that distinguishes the good-natured, whose countenances beam kindness, from other people? They feel quite at ease in presence of a new person, and are quickly enamoured of him; they therefore wish him well; their first opinion is: "He pleases me." With them there follow in succession the wish to appropriate (they make little scruple about the person's worth), rapid appropriation, joy in the possession, and actions in favour of the person possessed.

193.

Kant's Joke.--Kant tried to prove, in a way that dismayed "everybody," that "everybody" was in the right:--that was his secret joke. He wrote against the learned, in favour of popular prejudice; he wrote, however, for the learned and not for the people.

194.

The "Open-hearted" Man.--That man acts probably always from concealed motives; for he has always communicable motives on his tongue, and almost in his open hand.

195.

Laughable!--See! See! He runs _away_ from men--: they follow him, however, because he runs _before_ them,--they are such a gregarious lot!

196.

The Limits of our Sense of Hearing.--We hear only the questions to which we are capable of finding an answer.

197.

Caution therefore!--There is nothing we are fonder of communicating to others than the seal of secrecy--together with what is under it.

198.

Vexation of the Proud Man.--The proud man is vexed even with those who help him forward: he looks angrily at his carriage-horses.

199.

Liberality.--Liberality is often only a form of timidity in the rich.

200.

Laughing.--To laugh means to love mischief, but with a good conscience.

201.

In Applause.--In applause there is always some kind of noise: even in self-applause.

202.

A Spendthrift.--He has not yet the poverty of the rich man who has counted all his treasure,--he squanders his spirit with the irrationalness of the spendthrift Nature.

203.

Hic niger est.--Usually he has no thoughts,--but in exceptional cases bad thoughts come to him.

204.

Beggars and Courtesy.--"One is not discourteous when one knocks at a door with a stone when the bell-pull is awanting"--so think all beggars and necessitous persons, but no one thinks they are in the right.

205.

Need.--Need is supposed to be the cause of things; but in truth it is often only the result of things.

206.

During the Rain.--It rains, and I think of the poor people who now crowd together with their many cares, which they are unaccustomed to conceal; all of them, therefore, ready and anxious to give pain to one another, and thus provide themselves with a pitiable kind of comfort, even in bad weather. This, this only, is the poverty of the poor!

207.

The Envious Man.--That is an envious man--it is not desirable that he should have children; he would be envious of them, because he can no longer be a child.

208.

A Great Man!--Because a person is "a great man," we are not authorised to infer that he is a man. Perhaps he is only a boy, or a chameleon of all ages, or a bewitched girl.

209.

A Mode of Asking for Reasons.--There is a mode of asking for our reasons which not only makes us forget our best reasons, but also arouses in us a spite and repugnance against reason generally:-a very stupefying mode of questioning, and really an artifice of tyrannical men!

210.

Moderation in Diligence.--One must not be anxious to surpass the diligence of one's father--that would make one ill.

211.

Secret Enemies.--To be able to keep a secret enemy--that is a luxury which the morality even of the highest-minded persons can rarely afford.

212.

Not Letting oneself be Deluded.--His spirit has bad manners, it is hasty and always stutters with impatience; so that one would hardly suspect the deep breathing and the large chest of the soul in which it resides.

213.

The Way to Happiness.--A sage asked of a fool the way to happiness. The fool answered without delay, like one who had been asked the way to the next town: "Admire yourself, and live on the street!" "Hold," cried the sage, "you require too much; it suffices to admire oneself!" The fool replied: "But how can one constantly admire without constantly despising?"

214.

Faith Saves.--Virtue gives happiness and a state of blessedness only to those who have a strong faith in their virtue:--not, however, to the more refined souls whose virtue consists of a profound distrust of themselves and of all virtue. After all, therefore, it is "faith that saves" here also!--and be it well observed, _not_ virtue!

215.

The Ideal and the Material.--You have a noble ideal before your eyes: but are you also such a noble stone that such a divine image could be formed out of you? And without that--is not all your labour barbaric sculpturing? A blasphemy of your ideal?

216.

Danger in the Voice.--With a very loud voice a person is almost incapable of reflecting on subtle matters.

217.

Cause and Effect.--Before the effect one believes in other causes than after the effect.

218.

My Antipathy.--I do not like those people who, in order to produce an effect, have to burst like bombs, and in whose neighbourhood one is always in danger of suddenly losing one's hearing--or even something more.

219.

The Object of Punishment.--The object of punishment is to improve him _who punishes,_--that is the ultimate appeal of those who justify punishment.

220.

Sacrifice.--The victims think otherwise than the spectators about sacrifice and sacrificing: but they have never been allowed to express their opinion.

221.

Consideration.--Fathers and sons are much more considerate of one another than mothers and daughters.

222.

Poet and Liar.--The poet sees in the liar his foster-brother whose milk he has drunk up; the latter has thus remained wretched, and has not even attained to a good conscience.

223.

Vicariousness of the Senses.--"We have also eyes in order to hear with them,"--said an old confessor who had grown deaf; "and among the blind he that has the longest ears is king."

224.

Animal Criticism.--I fear the animals regard man as a being like themselves, seriously endangered by the loss of sound animal understanding;--they regard him perhaps as the absurd animal, the laughing animal, the crying animal, the unfortunate animal.

225.

The Natural.--"Evil has always had the great effect! And Nature is evil! Let us therefore be natural!"--so reason secretly the great aspirants after effect, who are too often counted among great men.

226.

The Distrustful and their Style.--We say the strongest things simply, provided people are about us who believe in our strength:--such an environment educates to "simplicity of style." The distrustful, on the other hand, speak emphatically; they make things emphatic.

227.

Fallacy, Fallacy.--He cannot rule himself; therefore that woman concludes that it will be easy to rule him, and throws out her lines to catch him;--the poor creature, who in a short time will be his slave.

228.

Against Mediators.--He who attempts to mediate between two decided thinkers is rightly called mediocre: he has not an eye for seeing the unique; similarising and equalising are signs of weak eyes.

229.

Obstinacy and Loyalty.--Out of obstinacy he holds fast to a cause of which the questionableness has become obvious,--he calls that, however, his "loyalty."

230.

Lack of Reserve.--His whole nature fails to _convince_--that results from the fact that he has never been reticent about a good action he has performed.

231.

The "Plodders."--Persons slow of apprehension think that slowness forms part of knowledge.

232.

Dreaming.--Either one does not dream at all, or one dreams in an interesting manner. One must learn to be awake in the same fashion:--either not at all, or in an interesting manner.

233.

The most Dangerous Point of View.--What I now do, or neglect to do, is as important _for all that is to come,_ as the greatest event of the past: in this immense perspective of effects all actions are equally great and small.

234.

Consolatory Words of a Musician.--"Your life does not sound into people's ears: for them you live a dumb life, and all refinements of melody, all fond resolutions in following or leading the way, are concealed from them. To be sure you do not parade the thoroughfares with regimental music,--but these good people have no right to say on that account that your life is lacking in music. He that hath ears let him hear."

235.

Spirit and Character.--Many a one attains his full height of character, but his spirit is not adapted to the elevation,--and many a one reversely.

236.

To Move the Multitude.--Is it not necessary for him who wants to move the multitude to give a stage representation of himself? Has he not first to translate himself into the grotesquely obvious, and then _set forth_ his whole personality and cause in that vulgarised and simplified fashion?

237.

The Polite Man.--"He is so polite!"--Yes, he has always a sop for Cerberus with him, and is so timid that he takes everybody for Cerberus, even you and me,--that is his "politeness."

238.

Without Envy.--He is wholly without envy, but there is no merit therein: for he wants to conquer a land which no one has yet possessed and hardly any one has even seen.

239.

The Joyless Person.--A single joyless person is enough to make constant displeasure and a clouded heaven in a household; and it is only by a miracle that such a person is lacking!--Happiness is not nearly such a contagious disease;--how is that?

240.

On the Sea-Shore.--I would not build myself a house (it is an element of my happiness not to be a house-owner!). If I had to do so, however, I should build it, like many of the Romans, right into the sea,--I should like to have some secrets in common with that beautiful monster.

241.

Work and Artist.--This artist is ambitious and nothing more; ultimately, however, his work is only a magnifying-glass, which he offers to every one who looks in his direction.

242.

Suum cuique.--However great be my greed of knowledge, I cannot appropriate aught of things but what already belongs to me,--the property of others still remains in the things. How is it possible for a man to be a thief or a robber?

243.

Origin of "Good" and "Bad."--He only will devise an improvement who can feel that "this is not good."

244.

Thoughts and Words.--Even our thoughts we are unable to render completely in words.

245.

Praise in Choice.--The artist chooses his subjects; that is his mode of praising.

246.

Mathematics.--We want to carry the refinement and rigour of mathematics into all the sciences, as far as it is in any way possible, not in the belief that we shall apprehend things in this way, but in order thereby to _assert_ our human relation to things. Mathematics is only a means to general and ultimate human knowledge.

247.

Habits.--All habits make our hand wittier and our wit unhandier.

248.

Books.--Of what account is a book that never carries us away beyond all books?

249.

The Sigh of the Seeker of Knowledge.--"Oh, my covetousness! In this soul there is no disinterestedness--but an all-desiring self, which, by means of many individuals, would fain see as with _its own_ eyes, and grasp as with _its own_ hands--a self bringing back even the entire past, and wanting to lose nothing that could in anyway belong to it! Oh, this flame of my covetousness! Oh, that I were reincarnated in a hundred individuals!"--He who does not know this sigh by experience, does not know the passion of the seeker of knowledge either.

250.

Guilt.--Although the most intelligent judges of the witches, and even the witches themselves, were convinced of the guilt of witchcraft, the guilt, nevertheless, was not there. So it is with all guilt.

251.

Misunderstood Sufferers.--Great natures suffer otherwise than their worshippers imagine; they suffer most severely from the ignoble, petty emotions of certain evil moments; in short, from doubt of their own greatness;--not however from the sacrifices and martyrdoms which their tasks require of them. As long as Prometheus sympathises with men and sacrifices himself for them, he is happy and proud in himself; but on becoming envious of Zeus and of the homage which mortals pay him--then Prometheus suffers!

252.

Better to be in Debt.--"Better to remain in debt than to pay with money which does not bear our stamp!"--that is what our sovereignty prefers.

253.

Always at Home.--One day we attain our _goal_--and then refer with pride to the long journeys we have made to reach it. In truth, we did not notice that we travelled. We got into the habit of thinking that we were _at home_ in every place.

254.

Against Embarrassment.--He who is always thoroughly occupied is rid of all embarrassment.

255.

Imitators.--A: "What? You don't want to have imitators?" B: "I don't want people to do anything _after_ me; I want every one to do something _before_ himself (as a pattern to himself)--just as _I_ do." A: "Consequently--?"

256.

Skinniness.--All profound men have their happiness in imitating the flying-fish at times, and playing on the crests of the waves; they think that what is best of all in things is their surface: their skinniness--_sit venia verbo_.

257.

From Experience.--A person often does not know how rich he is, until he learns from experience what rich men even play the thief on him.

258.

The Deniers of Chance.--No conqueror believes in chance.

259.

From Paradise.--"Good and Evil are God's prejudices"--said the serpent.

260.

One times One.--One only is always in the wrong, but with two truth begins.--One only cannot prove himself right; but two are already beyond refutation.

261.

Originality.--What is originality? To _see_ something that does not yet bear a name, that cannot yet be named, although it is before everybody's eyes. As people are usually constituted, it is the name that first makes a thing generally visible to them.--Original persons have also for the most part been the namers of things.

262.

Sub specie æterni.--A: "You withdraw faster and faster from the living; they will soon strike you out of their lists!"--B: "It is the only way to participate in the privilege of the dead." A: "In what privilege?"--B: "No longer having to die."

263.

Without Vanity.--When we love we want our defects to remain concealed,--not out of vanity, but lest the person loved should suffer therefrom. Indeed, the lover would like to appear as a God,--and not out of vanity either.

264.

What we Do.--What we do is never understood, but only praised and blamed.

265.

Ultimate Scepticism.--But what after all are man's truths?--They are his _irrefutable_ errors.

266.

Where Cruelty is Necessary.--He who is great is cruel to his second-rate virtues and judgments.

267.

With a high Aim.--With a high aim a person is superior even to justice, and not only to his deeds and his judges.

268.

What makes Heroic?--To face simultaneously one's greatest suffering and one's highest hope.

269.

What dost thou Believe in?--In this: That the weights of all things must be determined anew.

270.

What Saith thy Conscience?--"Thou shalt become what thou art."

271.

Where are thy Greatest Dangers?--In pity.

272.

What dost thou Love in others?--My hopes.

273.

Whom dost thou call Bad?--Him who always wants to put others to shame.

274.

What dost thou think most humane?--To spare a person shame.

275.

What is the Seal of Attained Liberty?--To be no longer ashamed of oneself.

BOOK FOURTH

SANCTUS JANUARIUS

Thou who with cleaving fiery lances The stream of my soul from its ice dost free, Till with a rush and a roar it advances To enter with glorious hoping the sea: Brighter to see and purer ever, Free in the bonds of thy sweet constraint,-- So it praises thy wondrous endeavour, January, thou beauteous saint!

Genoa, January 1882.

276.

For the New Year.--I still live, I still think; I must still live, for I must still think. _Sum, ergo cogito: cogito, ergo sum._ To-day everyone takes the liberty of expressing his wish and his favourite thought: well, I also mean to tell what I have wished for myself to-day, and what thought first crossed my mind this year,--a thought which ought to be the basis, the pledge and the sweetening of all my future life! I want more and more to perceive the necessary characters in things as the beautiful:--I shall thus be one of those who beautify things. _Amor fati:_ let that henceforth be my love! I do not want to wage war with the ugly. I do not want to accuse, I do not want even to accuse the accusers. _Looking aside,_ let that be my sole negation! And all in all, to sum up: I wish to be at any time hereafter only a yea-sayer!

277.

Personal Providence.--There is a certain climax in life, at which, notwithstanding all our freedom, and however much we may have denied all directing reason and goodness in the beautiful chaos of existence, we are once more in great danger of intellectual bondage, and have to face our hardest test. For now the thought of a personal Providence first presents itself before us with its most persuasive force, and has the best of advocates, apparentness, in its favour, now when it is obvious that all and everything that happens to us always _turns out for the best._ The life of every day and of every hour seems to be anxious for nothing else but always to prove this proposition anew; let it be what it will, bad or good weather, the loss of a friend, a sickness, a calumny, the non-receipt of a letter, the spraining of one's foot, a glance into a shop-window, a counter-argument, the opening of a book, a dream, a deception:--it shows itself immediately, or very soon afterwards, as something "not permitted to be absent,"--it is full of profound significance and utility precisely _for us!_ Is there a more dangerous temptation to rid ourselves of the belief in the Gods of Epicurus, those careless, unknown Gods, and believe in some anxious and mean Divinity, who knows personally every little hair on our heads, and feels no disgust in rendering the most wretched services? Well--I mean in spite of all this! we want to leave the Gods alone (and the serviceable genii likewise), and wish to content ourselves with the assumption that our own practical and theoretical skilfulness in explaining and suitably arranging events has now reached its highest point. We do not want either to think too highly of this dexterity of our wisdom, when the wonderful harmony which results from playing on our instrument sometimes surprises us too much: a harmony which sounds too well for us to dare to ascribe it to ourselves. In fact, now and then there is one who plays _with_ us--beloved Chance: he leads our hand occasionally, and even the all-wisest Providence could not devise any finer music than that of which our foolish hand is then capable.

278.

The Thought of Death.--It gives me a melancholy happiness to live in the midst of this confusion of streets, of necessities, of voices: how much enjoyment, impatience and desire, how much thirsty life and drunkenness of life comes to light here every moment! And yet it will soon be so still for all these shouting, lively, life-loving people! How everyone's shadow, his gloomy travelling-companion stands behind him! It is always as in the last moment before the departure of an emigrant-ship: people have more than ever to say to one another, the hour presses, the ocean with its lonely silence waits impatiently behind all the noise--so greedy, so certain of its prey! And all, all, suppose that the past has been nothing, or a small matter, that the near future is everything: hence this haste, this crying, this self-deafening and self-overreaching! Everyone wants to be foremost in this future,--and yet death and the stillness of death are the only things certain and common to all in this future! How strange that this sole thing that is certain and common to all, exercises almost no influence on men, and that they are the _furthest_ from regarding themselves as the brotherhood of death! It makes me happy to see that men do not want to think at all of the idea of death! I would fain do something to make the idea of life even a hundred times _more worthy of their attention_.

279.

Stellar Friendship.--We were friends, and have become strangers to each other. But this is as it ought to be, and we do not want either to conceal or obscure the fact, as if we had to be ashamed of it. We are two ships, each of which has its goal and its course; we may, to be sure, cross one another in our paths, and celebrate a feast together as we did before,--and then the gallant ships lay quietly in one harbour, and in one sunshine, so that it might have been thought they were already at their goal, and that they had had one goal. But then the almighty strength of our tasks forced us apart once more into different seas and into different zones, and perhaps we shall never see one another again,--or perhaps we may see one another, but not know one another again; the different seas and suns have altered us! That we had to become strangers to one another is the law to which we are _subject_: just by that shall we become more sacred to one another! Just by that shall the thought of our former friendship become holier! There is probably some immense, invisible curve and stellar orbit in which our courses and goals, so widely different, may be _comprehended_ as small stages of the way,--let us raise ourselves to this thought! But our life is too short, and our power of vision too limited for us to be more than friends in the sense of that sublime possibility.--And so we will _believe_ in our stellar friendship, though we should have to be terrestrial enemies to one another.

280.

Architecture for Thinkers.--An insight is needed (and that probably very soon) as to what is specially lacking in our great cities--namely, quiet, spacious, and widely extended places for reflection, places with long, lofty colonnades for bad weather, or for too sunny days, where no noise of wagons or of shouters would penetrate, and where a more refined propriety would prohibit loud

praying even to the priest: buildings and situations which as a whole would express the sublimity of self-communion and seclusion from the world. The time is past when the Church possessed the monopoly of reflection, when the _vita contemplativa_ had always in the first place to be the _vita religiosa:_ and everything that the Church has built expresses this thought. I know not how we could content ourselves with their structures, even if they should be divested of their ecclesiastical purposes: these structures speak a far too pathetic and too biassed speech, as houses of God and places of splendour for supernatural intercourse, for us godless ones to be able to think _our thoughts_ in them. We want to have _ourselves_ translated into stone and plant, we want to go for a walk in _ourselves_ when we wander in these halls and gardens.

281.

Knowing how to Find the End.--Masters of the first rank are recognised by knowing in a perfect manner how to find the end, in the whole as well as in the part; be it the end of a melody or of a thought, be it the fifth act of a tragedy or of a state affair. The masters of the second degree always become restless towards the end, and seldom dip down into the sea with such proud, quiet equilibrium as for example, the mountain-ridge at _Porto fino_--where the Bay of Genoa sings its melody to an end.

282.

The Gait.--There are mannerisms of the intellect by which even great minds betray that they originate from the populace, or from the semi-populace--it is principally the gait and step, of their thoughts which betray them; they cannot _walk._ It was thus that even Napoleon, to his profound chagrin, could not walk "legitimately" and in princely fashion on occasions when it was necessary to do so properly, as in great coronation processions and on similar occasions: even there he was always just the leader of a column--proud and brusque at the same time, and very self-conscious of it all.--It is something laughable to see those writers who make the folding robes of their periods rustle around them: they want to cover their _feet_.

283.

Pioneers.--I greet all the signs indicating that a more manly and warlike age is commencing, which will, above all, bring heroism again into honour! For it has to prepare the way for a yet higher age, and gather the force which the latter will one day require,--the age which will carry heroism into knowledge, and _wage war_ for the sake of ideas and their consequences. For that end many brave pioneers are now needed, who, however, cannot originate out of nothing,--and just as little out of the sand and slime of present-day civilisation and the culture of great cities: men silent, solitary and resolute, who know how to be content and persistent in invisible activity: men who with innate disposition seek in all things that which is _to be overcome_ in them: men to whom cheerfulness, patience, simplicity, and contempt of the great vanities belong just as much as do magnanimity in victory and indulgence to the trivial vanities of all the vanquished: men with an acute and independent judgment regarding all victors, and concerning the part which chance has played in the winning of victory and fame: men with their own holidays, their own work-days, and their own periods of mourning; accustomed to command with perfect assurance, and equally ready, if need be, to obey, proud in the one case as in the other, equally serving their own interests: men more imperilled, more productive, more happy! For believe me!--the secret of realising the largest productivity and the greatest enjoyment of existence is _to live in danger!_ Build your cities on the slope of Vesuvius! Send your ships into unexplored seas! Live in war with your equals and with yourselves! Be robbers and spoilers, ye knowing ones, as long as ye cannot be rulers and possessors! The time will soon pass when you can be satisfied to live like timorous deer concealed in the forests. Knowledge will finally stretch out her hand for that which belongs to her:--she means to _rule_ and _possess,_ and you with her!

284.

Belief in Oneself--In general, few men have belief in themselves:--and of those few some are endowed with it as a useful blindness or partial obscuration of intellect (what would they perceive if they could see _to the bottom of themselves!_). The others must first acquire the belief for themselves: everything good, clever, or great that they do, is first of all an argument against the sceptic that dwells in them: the question is how to convince or persuade _this sceptic,_ and for that purpose genius almost is needed. They are signally dissatisfied with themselves.

285.

Excelsior!--"Thou wilt never more pray, never more worship, never more repose in infinite trust--thou refusest to stand still and dismiss thy thoughts before an ultimate wisdom, an ultimate virtue, an ultimate power,--thou hast no constant guardian and friend in

thy seven solitudes--thou livest without the outlook on a mountain that has snow on its head and fire in its heart--there is no longer any requiter for thee, nor any amender with, his finishing touch--there is no longer any reason in that which happens, or any love in that which will happen to thee--there is no longer any resting-place for thy weary heart, where it has only to find and no longer to seek, thou art opposed to any kind of ultimate peace, thou desirest the eternal recurrence of war and peace:--man of renunciation, wilt thou renounce in all these things? Who will give thee the strength to do so? No one has yet had this strength!"--There is a lake which one day refused to flow away, and threw up a dam at the place where it had hitherto discharged: since then this lake has always risen higher and higher. Perhaps the very renunciation will also furnish us with the strength with which the renunciation itself can be borne; perhaps man will ever rise higher and higher from that point onward, when he no longer _flows out_ into a God.

286.

A Digression.--Here are hopes; but what will you see and hear of them, if you have not experienced glance and glow and dawn of day in your own souls? I can only suggest--I cannot do more! To move the stones, to make animals men--would you have me do that? Alas, if you are yet stones and animals, you must seek your Orpheus!

287.

Love of Blindness.--"My thoughts," said the wanderer to his shadow, "ought to show me where I stand, but they should not betray to me _whither I go._ I love ignorance of the future, and do not want to come to grief by impatience and anticipatory tasting of promised things."

288.

Lofty Moods.--It seems to me that most men do not believe in lofty moods, unless it be for the moment, or at the most for a quarter of an hour,--except the few who know by experience a longer duration of high feeling. But to be absolutely a man with a single lofty feeling, the incarnation of a single lofty mood--that has hitherto been only a dream and an enchanting possibility: history does not yet give us any trustworthy example of it Nevertheless one might also some day produce such men--when a multitude of favourable conditions have been created and established, which at present even the happiest chance is unable to throw together. Perhaps that very state which has hitherto entered into our soul as an exception, felt with horror now and then, may be the usual condition of those future souls: a continuous movement between high and low, and the feeling of high and low, a constant state of mounting as on steps, and at the same time reposing as on clouds.

289.

Aboard Ship!--When one considers how a full philosophical justification of his mode of living and thinking operates upon every individual--namely, as a warming, blessing, and fructifying sun, specially shining on him; how it makes him independent of praise and blame, self-sufficient, rich and generous in the bestowal of happiness and kindness; how it unceasingly transforms the evil to the good, brings all the energies to bloom and maturity, and altogether hinders the growth of the greater and lesser weeds of chagrin and discontent --one at last cries out importunately: Oh, that many such new suns were created! The evil man, also, the unfortunate man, and the exceptional man, shall each have his philosophy, his rights, and his sunshine! It is not sympathy with them that is necessary!--we must unlearn this arrogant fancy, notwithstanding that humanity has so long learned it and used it exclusively,--we have not to set up any confessor, exorcist, or pardoner for them! It is a new _justice,_ however, that is necessary! And a new solution! And new philosophers! The moral earth also is round! The moral earth also has its antipodes! The antipodes also have their right to exist! there is still another world to discover--and more than one! Aboard ship! ye philosophers!

290.

One Thing is Needful--To "give style" to one's character--that is a grand and a rare art! He who surveys all that his nature presents in its strength and in its weakness, and then fashions it into an ingenious plan, until everything appears artistic and rational, and even the weaknesses enchant the eye--exercises that admirable art. Here there has been a great amount of second nature added, there a portion of first nature has been taken away:--in both cases with long exercise and daily labour at the task. Here the ugly, which does not permit of being taken away, has been concealed, there it has been re-interpreted into the sublime. Much of the vague, which refuses to take form, has been reserved and utilised for the perspectives:--it is meant to give a hint of the remote and immeasurable. In the end, when the work has been completed, it is revealed how it was the constraint of the same taste that organised and fashioned it in whole and in part: whether the taste was good or bad is of less importance than one

thinks,--it is sufficient that it was _a taste!_--It will be the strong imperious natures which experience their most refined joy in such constraint, in such confinement and perfection under their own law; the passion of their violent volition lessens at the sight of all disciplined nature, all conquered and ministering nature: even when they have palaces to build and gardens to lay out, it is not to their taste to allow nature to be free.--It is the reverse with weak characters who have not power over themselves, and _hate_ the restriction of style: they feel that if this repugnant constraint were laid upon them, they would necessarily become _vulgarised_ under it: they become slaves as soon as they serve, they hate service. Such intellects--they may be intellects of the first rank--are always concerned with fashioning and interpreting themselves and their surroundings as _free_ nature--wild, arbitrary, fantastic, confused and surprising: and it is well for them to do so, because only in this manner can they please themselves! For one thing is needful: namely, that man should _attain to_ satisfaction with himself--be it but through this or that fable and artifice: it is only then that man's aspect is at all endurable! He who is dissatisfied with himself is ever ready to avenge himself on that account: we others will be his victims, if only in having always to endure his ugly aspect. For the aspect of the ugly makes one mean and sad.

291.

Genoa.--I have looked upon this city, its villas and pleasure-grounds, and the wide circuit of its inhabited heights and slopes, for a considerable time: in the end I must say that I see _countenances_ out of past generations,--this district is strewn with the images of bold and autocratic men. They have _lived_ and have wanted to live on--they say so with their houses, built and decorated for centuries, and not for the passing hour: they were well disposed to life, however ill-disposed they may often have been towards themselves. I always see the builder, how he casts his eye on all that is built around him far and near, and likewise on the city, the sea, and the chain of mountains; how he expresses power and conquest with his gaze: all this he wishes to fit into _his_ plan, and in the end make it his _property,_ by its becoming a portion of the same. The whole district is overgrown with this superb, insatiable egoism of the desire to possess and exploit; and as these men when abroad recognised no frontiers, and in their thirst for the new placed a new world beside the old, so also at home everyone rose up against everyone else, and devised some mode of expressing his superiority, and of placing between himself and his neighbour his personal illimitableness. Everyone won for himself his home once more by over-powering it with his architectural thoughts, and by transforming it into a delightful sight for his race. When we consider the mode of building cities in the north, the law and the general delight in legality and obedience, impose upon us: we thereby divine the propensity to equality and submission which must have ruled in those builders. Here, however, on turning every corner you find a man by himself, who knows the sea, knows adventure, and knows the Orient, a man who is averse to law and to neighbour, as if it bored him to have to do with them, a man who scans all that is already old and established, with envious glances: with a wonderful craftiness of fantasy, he would like, at least in thought, to establish all this anew, to lay his hand upon it, and introduce his meaning into it--if only for the passing hour of a sunny afternoon, when for once his insatiable and melancholy soul feels satiety, and when only what is his own, and nothing strange, may show itself to his eye.

292.

To the Preachers of Morality.--I do not mean to moralise, but to those who do, I would give this advice: if you mean ultimately to deprive the best things and the best conditions of all honour and worth, continue to speak of them in the same way as heretofore! Put them at the head of your morality, and speak from morning till night of the happiness of virtue, of repose of soul, of righteousness, and of reward and punishment in the nature of things: according as you go on in this manner, all these good things will finally acquire a popularity and a street-cry for themselves: but then all the gold on them will also be worn off, and more besides: all the gold _in them_ will have changed into lead. Truly, you understand the reverse art of alchemy, the depreciating of the most valuable things! Try, just for once, another recipe, in order not to realise as hitherto the opposite of what you mean to attain: _deny_ those good things, withdraw from them the applause of the populace and discourage the spread of them, make them once more the concealed chastities of solitary souls, and say: _morality is something forbidden!_ Perhaps you will thus attract to your cause the sort of men who are only of any account, I mean the _heroic._ But then there must be something formidable in it, and not as hitherto something disgusting I Might one not be inclined to say at present with reference to morality what Master Eckardt says: "I pray God to deliver me from God!"

293.

Our Atmosphere.--We know it well: in him who only casts a glance now and then at science, as when taking a walk (in the manner of women, and alas! also like many artists), the strictness in its service, its inexorability in small matters as well as in great, its rapidity in weighing, judging and condemning, produce something of a feeling of giddiness and fright. It is especially terrifying to

him that the hardest is here demanded, that the best is done without the reward of praise or distinction; it is rather as among soldiers--almost nothing but blame and sharp reprimand _is heard_; for doing well prevails here as the rule, doing ill as the exception; the rule, however, has, here as everywhere, a silent tongue. It is the same with this "severity of science" as with the manners and politeness of the best society: it frightens the uninitiated. He, however, who is accustomed to it, does not like to live anywhere but in this clear, transparent, powerful, and highly electrified atmosphere, this _manly_ atmosphere. Anywhere else it is not pure and airy enough for him: he suspects that _there_ his best art would neither be properly advantageous to anyone else, nor a delight to himself, that through misunderstandings half of his life would slip through his fingers, that much foresight, much concealment, and reticence would constantly be necessary,--nothing but great and useless losses of power! In _this_ keen and clear element, however, he has his entire power: here he can fly! Why should he again go down into those muddy waters where he has to swim and wade and soil his wings!--No! There it is too hard for us to live! we cannot help it that we are born for the atmosphere, the pure atmosphere, we rivals of the ray of light; and that we should like best to ride like it on the atoms of ether, not away from the sun, but _towards the sun_! That, however, we cannot do:--so we want to do the only thing that is in our power: namely, to bring light to the earth, we want to be "the light of the earth!" And for that purpose we have our wings and our swiftness and our severity, on that account we are manly, and even terrible like the fire. Let those fear us, who do not know how to warm and brighten themselves by our influence!

294.

Against the Disparagers of Nature.--They are disagreeable to me, those men in whom every natural inclination forthwith becomes a disease, something disfiguring, or even disgraceful. _They_ have seduced us to the opinion that the inclinations and impulses of men are evil; _they_ are the cause of our great injustice to our own nature, and to all nature! There are enough of men who _may_ yield to their impulses gracefully and carelessly: but they do not do so, for fear of that imaginary "evil thing" in nature! _That is the cause_ why there is so little nobility to be found among men: the indication of which will always be to have no fear of oneself, to expect nothing disgraceful from oneself, to fly without hesitation whithersoever we are impelled--we free-born birds! Wherever we come, there will always be freedom and sunshine around us.

295.

Short-lived Habits.--I love short-lived habits, and regard them as an invaluable means for getting a knowledge of _many_ things and various conditions, to the very bottom of their sweetness and bitterness; my nature is altogether arranged for short-lived habits, even in the needs of its bodily health, and in general, _as far as_ I can see, from the lowest up to the highest matters. I always think that _this_ will at last satisfy me permanently (the short-lived habit has also this characteristic belief of passion, the belief in everlasting duration; I am to be envied for having found it and recognised it), and then it nourishes me at noon and at eve, and spreads a profound satisfaction around me and in me, so that I have no longing for anything else, not needing to compare, or despise, or hate. But one day the habit has had its time: the good thing separates from me, not as something which then inspires disgust in me--but peaceably, and as though satisfied with me, as I am with it; as if we had to be mutually thankful, and _thus_ shook hands for farewell. And already the new habit waits at the door, and similarly also my belief--indestructible fool and sage that I am!--that this new habit will be the right one, the ultimate right one. So it is with me as regards foods, thoughts, men, cities, poems, music, doctrines, arrangements of the day, and modes of life.--On the other hand, I hate _permanent_ habits, and feel as if a tyrant came into my neighbourhood, and as if my life's breath _condensed,_ when events take such a form that permanent habits seem necessarily to grow out of them: for example, through an official position, through constant companionship with the same persons, through a settled abode, or through a uniform state of health. Indeed, from the bottom of my soul I am gratefully disposed to all my misery and sickness, and to whatever is imperfect in me, because such things leave me a hundred back-doors through which I can escape from permanent habits. The most unendurable thing, to be sure, the really terrible thing, would be a life without habits, a life which continually required improvisation:--that would be my banishment and my Siberia.

296.

A Fixed Reputation.--A fixed reputation was formerly a matter of the very greatest utility; and wherever society continues to be ruled by the herd-instinct, it is still most suitable for every individual _to give_ to his character and business _the appearance_ of unalterableness,--even when they are not so in reality. "One can rely on him, he remains the same"--that is the praise which has most significance in all dangerous conditions of society. Society feels with satisfaction that it has a reliable _tool_ ready at all times in the virtue of this one, in the ambition of that one, and in the reflection and passion of a third one,--it honours this _tool-like

nature,_ this self-constancy, this unchangeableness in opinions, efforts, and even in faults, with the highest honours. Such a valuation, which prevails and has prevailed everywhere simultaneously with the morality of custom, educates "characters," and brings all changing, re-learning, and self-transforming into _disrepute._ Be the advantage of this mode of thinking ever so great otherwise, it is in any case the mode of judging which is most injurious _to knowledge:_ for precisely the good-will of the knowing one ever to declare himself unhesitatingly as _opposed_ to his former opinions, and in general to be distrustful of all that wants to be fixed in him--is here condemned and brought into disrepute. The disposition of the thinker, as incompatible with a "fixed reputation," is regarded as _dishonourable,_ while the petrifaction of opinions has all the honour to itself:--we have at present still to live under the interdict of such rules! How difficult it is to live when one feels that the judgment of many millenniums is around one and against one. It is probable that for many millenniums knowledge was afflicted with a bad conscience, and there must have been much self-contempt and secret misery in the history of the greatest intellects.

297.

Ability to Contradict--Everyone knows at present that the ability, to endure contradiction is a good indication of culture. Some people even know that the higher man courts opposition, and provokes it, so as to get a cue to his hitherto unknown partiality. But the _ability_ to contradict, the attainment of a _good_ conscience in hostility to the accustomed, the traditional and the hallowed,--that is more than both the above-named abilities, and is the really great, new and astonishing thing in our culture, the step of all steps of the emancipated intellect: who knows that?--

298.

A Sigh.--I caught this notion on the way, and rapidly took the readiest, poor words to hold it fast, so that it might not again fly away. But it has died in these dry words, and hangs and flaps about in them--and now I hardly know, when I look upon it, how I could have had such happiness when I caught this bird.

299.

What one should Learn from Artists.--What means have we for making things beautiful, attractive, and desirable, when they are not so?--and I suppose they are never so in themselves! We have here something to learn from physicians, when, for example, they dilute what is bitter, or put wine and sugar into their mixing-bowl; but we have still more to learn from artists, who in fact, are continually concerned in devising such inventions and artifices. To withdraw from things until one no longer sees much of them, until one has even to see things into them, _in order to see them at all_--or to view them from the side, and as in a frame--or to place them so that they partly disguise themselves and only permit of perspective views--or to look at them through coloured glasses, or in the light of the sunset--or to furnish them with a surface or skin which is not fully transparent: we should learn all this from artists, and moreover be wiser than they. For this fine power of theirs usually ceases with them where art ceases and life begins; _we,_ however, want to be the poets of our lives, and first of all in the smallest and most commonplace matters.

300.

Prelude to Science.--Do you believe then that the sciences would have arisen and grown up if the sorcerers, alchemists, astrologers and witches had not been their forerunners; those who, with their promisings and foreshadowings, had first to create a thirst, a hunger, and a taste for _hidden and forbidden_ powers? Yea, that infinitely more had to be _promised_ than could ever be fulfilled, in order that something might be fulfilled in the domain of knowledge? Perhaps the whole of _religion,_ also, may appear to some distant age as an exercise and a prelude, in like manner as the prelude and preparation of science here exhibit themselves, though _not_ at all practised and regarded as such. Perhaps religion may have been the peculiar means for enabling individual men to enjoy but once the entire self-satisfaction of a God and all his self-redeeming power. Indeed!--one may ask--would man have learned at all to get on the tracks of hunger and thirst for _himself,_ and to extract satiety and fullness out of _himself,_ without that religious schooling and preliminary history? Had Prometheus first to _fancy_ that he had _stolen_ the light, and that he did penance for the theft,--in order finally to discover that he had created the light, _in that he had longed for the light,_ and that not only man, but also _God,_ had been the work of _his_ hands and the clay in his hands? All mere creations of the creator?--just as the illusion, the theft, the Caucasus, the vulture, and the whole tragic Prometheia of all thinkers?

301.

Illusion of the Contemplative.--Higher men are distinguished from lower, by seeing and hearing immensely more, and in a thoughtful manner--and it is precisely this that distinguishes man from the animal, and the higher animal from the lower. The world always becomes fuller for him who grows up to the full stature of humanity; there are always more interesting fishing-hooks, thrown out to him; the number of his stimuli is continually on the increase, and similarly the varieties of his pleasure and pain,--the higher man becomes always at the same time happier and unhappier. An _illusion,_ however, is his constant accompaniment all along: he thinks he is placed as a _spectator_ and _auditor_ before the great pantomime and concert of life; he calls his nature a _contemplative nature,_ and thereby overlooks the fact that he himself is also a real creator, and continuous poet of life,--that he no doubt differs greatly from the _actor_ in this drama, the so-called practical man, but differs still more from a mere onlooker or spectator _before_ the stage. There is certainly _vis contemplativa,_ and re-examination of his work peculiar to him as poet, but at the same time, and first and foremost, he has the _vis creativa,_ which the practical man or doer _lacks,_ whatever appearance and current belief may say to the contrary. It is we, who think and feel, that actually and unceasingly _make_ something which did not before exist: the whole eternally increasing world of valuations, colours, weights, perspectives, gradations, affirmations and negations. This composition of ours is continually learnt, practised, and translated into flesh and actuality, and even into the commonplace, by the so-called practical men (our actors, as we have said). Whatever has _value_ in the present world, has not it in itself, by its nature,--nature is always worthless:--but a value was once given to it, bestowed upon it and it was _we_ who gave and bestowed! We only have created the world _which is of any account to man!_--But it is precisely this knowledge that we lack, and when we get hold of it for a moment we have forgotten it the next: we misunderstand our highest power, we contemplative men, and estimate ourselves at too low a rate,--we are neither as _proud nor as happy_ as we might be.

302.

The Danger of the Happiest Ones.--To have fine senses and a fine taste; to be accustomed to the select and the intellectually best as our proper and readiest fare; to be blessed with a strong, bold, and daring soul; to go through life with a quiet eye and a firm step, ever ready for the worst as for a festival, and full of longing for undiscovered worlds and seas, men and Gods; to listen to all joyous music, as if there perhaps brave men, soldiers and seafarers, took a brief repose and enjoyment, and in the profoundest pleasure of the moment were overcome with tears and the whole purple melancholy of happiness: who would not like all this to be _his_ possession, his condition! It was the _happiness of Homerr_! The condition of him who invented the Gods for the Greeks,--nay, who invented _his_ Gods for himself! But let us not conceal the fact that with this happiness of Homer in one's soul, one is more liable to suffering than any other creature under the sun! And only at this price do we purchase the most precious pearl that the waves of existence have hitherto washed ashore! As its possessor one always becomes more sensitive to pain, and at last too sensitive: a little displeasure and loathing sufficed in the end to make Homer disgusted with life. He was unable to solve a foolish little riddle which some young fishers proposed to him! Yes, the little riddles are the dangers of the happiest ones!--

303.

Two Happy Ones.--Certainly this man, notwithstanding his youth, understands the _improvisation of life,_ and astonishes even the acutest observers. For it seems that he never makes a mistake, although he constantly plays the most hazardous games. One is reminded of the improvising masters of the musical art, to whom even the listeners would fain ascribe a divine _infallibility_ of the hand, notwithstanding that they now and then make a mistake, as every mortal is liable to do. But they are skilled and inventive, and always ready in a moment to arrange into the structure of the score the most accidental tone (where the jerk of a finger or a humour brings it about), and to animate the accident with a fine meaning and soul.--Here is quite a different man: everything that he intends and plans fails with him in the long run. That on which he has now and again set his heart has already brought him several times to the abyss, and to the very verge of ruin; and if he has as yet got out of the scrape, it certainly has not been merely with a "black eye." Do you think he is unhappy over it? He resolved long ago not to regard his own wishes and plans as of so much importance. "If this does not succeed with me," he says to himself, "perhaps that will succeed; and on the whole I do not know but that I am under more obligation to thank my failures than any of my successes. Am I made to be headstrong, and to wear the bull's horns? That which constitutes the worth and the sum of life _for me,_ lies somewhere else; I know more of life, because I have been so often on the point of losing it; and just on that account I _have_ more of life than any of you!"

304.

In Doing we Leave Undone.--In the main all those moral systems are distasteful to me which say: "Do not do this! Renounce! Overcome thyself!" On the other hand I am favourable to those moral systems which stimulate me to do something, and to do it

again from morning till evening, to dream of it at night, and think of nothing else but to do it _well,_ as well as is possible for _me_ alone! From him who so lives there fall off one after the other the things that do not pertain to such a life: without hatred or antipathy, he sees _this_ take leave of him to-day, and _that_ to-morrow, like the yellow leaves which every livelier breeze strips from the tree: or he does not see at all that they take leave of him, so firmly is his eye fixed upon his goal, and generally forward, not sideways, backward, or downward. "Our doing must determine what we leave undone; in that we do, we leave undone"--so it pleases me, so runs _my placitum._ But I do not mean to strive with open eyes for my impoverishment; I do not like any of the negative virtues whose very essence is negation and self-renunciation.

305.

_Self-control--_Those moral teachers who first and foremost order man to get himself into his own power, induce thereby a curious infirmity in him--namely, a constant sensitiveness with reference to all natural strivings and inclinations, and as it were, a sort of itching. Whatever may henceforth drive him, draw him, allure or impel him, whether internally or externally--it always seems to this sensitive being as if his self-control were in danger: he is no longer at liberty to trust himself to any instinct, to any free flight, but stands constantly with defensive mien, armed against himself, with sharp distrustful eye, the eternal watcher of his stronghold, to which office he has appointed himself. Yes, he can be _great_ in that position! But how unendurable he has now become to others, how difficult even for himself to bear, how impoverished and cut off from the finest accidents of his soul! Yea, even from all further _instruction! _ For we must be able to lose ourselves at times, if we want to learn something of what we have not in ourselves.

306.

Stoic and Epicurean.--The Epicurean selects the situations, the persons, and even the events which suits his extremely sensitive, intellectual constitution; he renounces the rest--that is to say, by far the greater part of experience--because it would be too strong and too heavy fare for him. The Stoic, on the contrary, accustoms himself to swallow stones and vermin, glass-splinters and scorpions, without feeling any disgust: his stomach is meant to become indifferent in the end to all that the accidents of existence cast into it:--he reminds one of the Arabic sect of the Assaua, with which the French became acquainted in Algiers; and like those insensible persons, he also likes well to have an invited public at the exhibition of his insensibility, the very thing the Epicurean willingly dispenses with:--he has of course his "garden"! Stoicism may be quite advisable for men with whom fate improvises, for those who live in violent times and are dependent on abrupt and changeable individuals. He, however, who _anticipates_ that fate will permit him to spin "a long thread," does well to make his arrangements in Epicurean fashion; all men devoted to intellectual labour have done it hitherto! For it would be a supreme loss to them to forfeit their fine sensibility, and to acquire the hard, stoical hide with hedgehog prickles in exchange.

307.

In Favour of Criticism.--Something now appears to thee as an error which thou formerly lovedst as a truth, or as a probability: thou pushest it from thee and imaginest that thy reason has there gained a victory. But perhaps that error was then, when thou wast still another person--thou art always another person,--just as necessary to thee as all thy present "truths," like a skin, as it were, which concealed and veiled from thee much which thou still mayst not see. Thy new life, and not thy reason, has slain that opinion for thee: _thou dost not require it any longer,_ and now it breaks down of its own accord, and the irrationality crawls out of it as a worm into the light. When we make use of criticism it is not something arbitrary and impersonal,--it is, at least very often, a proof that there are lively, active forces in us, which cast a skin. We deny, and must deny, because something in us _wants_ to live and affirm itself, something which we perhaps do not as yet know, do not as yet see!--So much in favour of criticism.

308.

_The History of each Day.--_What is it that constitutes the history of each day for thee? Look at thy habits of which it consists: are they the product of numberless little acts of cowardice and laziness, or of thy bravery and inventive reason? Although the two cases are so different, it is possible that men might bestow the same praise upon thee, and that thou mightst also be equally useful to them in the one case as in the other. But praise and utility and respectability may suffice for him whose only desire is to have a good conscience,--not however for thee, the "trier of the reins," who hast a _consciousness of the conscience!_

309.

Out of the Seventh Solitude.--One day the wanderer shut a door behind him, stood still, and wept. Then he said: "Oh, this inclination and impulse towards the true, the real, the non-apparent, the certain! How I detest it! Why does this gloomy and passionate taskmaster follow just _me?_ I should like to rest, but it does not permit me to do so. Are there not a host of things seducing me to tarry! Everywhere there are gardens of Armida for me, and therefore there will ever be fresh separations and fresh bitterness of heart! I must set my foot forward, my weary wounded foot: and because I feel I must do this, I often cast grim glances back at the most beautiful things which could not detain me--_because_ they could not detain me!"

310.

Will and Wave.--How eagerly this wave comes hither, as if it were a question of its reaching something! How it creeps with frightful haste into the innermost corners of the rocky cliff! It seems that it wants to forestall some one; it seems that something is concealed there that has value, high value.--And now it retreats somewhat more slowly, still quite white with excitement,--is it disappointed? Has it found what it sought? Does it merely pretend to be disappointed?--But already another wave approaches, still more eager and wild than the first, and its soul also seems to be full of secrets, and of longing for treasure-seeking. Thus live the waves,--thus live we who exercise will!--I do not say more.--But what! Ye distrust me? Ye are angry at me, ye beautiful monsters? Do ye fear that I will quite betray your secret? Well! Just be angry with me, raise your green, dangerous bodies as high as ye can, make a wall between me and the sun--as at present! Verily, there is now nothing more left of the world save green twilight and green lightning-flashes. Do as ye will, ye wanton creatures, roar with delight and wickedness--or dive under again, pour your emeralds down into the depths, and cast your endless white tresses of foam and spray over them--it is all the same to me, for all is so well with you, and I am so pleased with you for it all: how could I betray _you!_ For--take this to heart!--I know you and your secret, I know your race! You and I are indeed of one race! You and I have indeed one secret!

311.

Broken Lights.--We are not always brave, and when we are weary, people of our stamp are liable to lament occasionally in this wise:--"It is so hard to cause pain to men--oh, that it should be necessary! What good is it to live concealed, when we do not want to keep to ourselves that which causes vexation? Would it not be more advisable to live in the madding crowd, and compensate individuals for sins that are committed, and must be committed, against mankind in general? Foolish with fools, vain with the vain, enthusiastic with enthusiasts? Would that not be reasonable when there is such an inordinate amount of divergence in the main? When I hear of the malignity of others against me--is not my first feeling that of satisfaction? It is well that it should be so!--I seem to myself to say to them--I am so little in harmony with you, and have so much truth on my side: see henceforth that ye be merry at my expense as often as ye can! Here are my defects and mistakes, here are my illusions, my bad taste, my confusion, my tears, my vanity, my owlish concealment, my contradictions! Here you have something to laugh at! Laugh then, and enjoy yourselves! I am not averse to the law and nature of things, which is that defects and errors should give pleasure!--To be sure, there were once 'more glorious' times, when as soon as any one got an idea, however moderately new it might be, he would think himself so _indispensable_ as to go out into the street with it, and call to everybody: 'Behold! the kingdom of heaven is at hand!'--I should not miss myself, if I were a-wanting. We are none of us indispensable!"--As we have said, however, we do not think thus when we are brave; we do not think _about it_ at all.

312.

My Dog.--I have given a name to my pain, and call it "a dog,"--it is just as faithful, just as importunate and shameless, just as entertaining, just as wise, as any other dog--and I can domineer over it, and vent my bad humour on it, as others do with their dogs, servants, and wives.

313.

No Picture of a Martyr.--I will take my cue from Raphael, and not paint any more martyr-pictures. There are enough of sublime things without its being necessary to seek sublimity where it is linked with cruelty; moreover my ambition would not be gratified in the least if I aspired to be a sublime executioner.

314.

New Domestic Animals.--I want to have my lion and my eagle about me, that I may always have hints and premonitions concerning the amount of my strength or weakness. Must I look down on them to-day, and be afraid of them? And will the hour

come once more when they will look up to me, and tremble?--

315.

The Last Hour.--Storms are my danger. Shall I have my storm in which I perish, as Oliver Cromwell perished in his storm? Or shall I go out as a light does, not first blown out by the wind, but grown tired and weary of itself--a burnt-out light? Or finally, shall I blow myself out, so as _not to burn out?_

316.

Prophetic Men.--Ye cannot divine how sorely prophetic men suffer: ye think only that a fine "gift" has been given to them, and would fain have it yourselves,--but I will express my meaning by a simile. How much may not the animals suffer from the electricity of the atmosphere and the clouds! Some of them, as we see, have a prophetic faculty with regard to the weather, for example, apes (as one can observe very well even in Europe,--and not only in menageries, but at Gibraltar). But it never occurs to us that it is their _sufferings_--that are their prophets! When strong positive electricity, under the influence of an approaching cloud not at all visible, is suddenly converted into negative electricity, and an alteration of the weather is imminent, these animals then behave as if an enemy were approaching them, and prepare for defence, or flight: they generally hide themselves,--they do not think of the bad weather as weather, but as an enemy whose hand they already _feel!_

317.

Retrospect.--We seldom become conscious of the real pathos of any period of life as such, as long as we continue in it, but always think it is the only possible and reasonable thing for us henceforth, and that it is altogether _ethos_ and not _pathos_[1]--to speak and distinguish like the Greeks. A few notes of music to-day recalled a winter and a house, and a life of utter solitude to my mind, and at the same time the sentiments in which I then lived: I thought I should be able to live in such a state always. But now I understand that it was entirely pathos and passion, something comparable to this painfully bold and truly comforting music,--it is not one's lot to have these sensations for years, still less for eternities: otherwise one would become too "ethereal" for this planet.

[1] The distinction between ethos and pathos in Aristotle is, broadly, that between internal character and external circumstance.--P. V. C.

318.

Wisdom in Pain.--In pain there is as much wisdom as in pleasure: like the latter it is one of the best self-preservatives of a species. Were it not so, pain would long ago have been done away with; that it is hurtful is no argument against it, for to be hurtful is its very essence. In pain I hear the commanding call of the ship's captain: "Take in sail!" "Man," the bold seafarer, must have learned to set his sails in a thousand different ways, otherwise he could not have sailed long, for the ocean would soon have swallowed him up. We must also know how to live with reduced energy: as soon as pain gives its precautionary signal, it is time to reduce the speed--some great danger, some storm, is approaching, and we do well to "catch" as little wind as possible--It is true that there are men who, on the approach of severe pain, hear the very opposite call of command, and never appear more proud, more martial, or more happy than when the storm is brewing; indeed, pain itself provides them with their supreme moments! These are the heroic men, the great _pain-bringers_ of mankind: those few and rare ones who need just the same apology as pain generally,--and verily, it should not be denied them! They are forces of the greatest importance for preserving and advancing the species, be it only because they are opposed to smug ease, and do not conceal their disgust at this kind of happiness.

319.

As Interpreters of our Experiences.--One form of honesty has always been lacking among founders of religions and their kin:--they have never made their experiences a matter of the intellectual conscience. "What did I really experience? What then took place in me and around me? Was my understanding clear enough? Was my will directly opposed to all deception of the senses, and courageous in its defence against fantastic notions?"--None of them ever asked these questions, nor to this day do any of the good religious people ask them. They have rather a thirst for things which are _contrary to reason,_ and they don't want to have too much difficulty in satisfying this thirst,--so they experience "miracles" and "regenerations," and hear the voices of angels! But we who are different, who are thirsty for reason, want to look as carefully into our experiences as in the case of a scientific experiment, hour by hour, day by day! We ourselves want to be our own experiments, and our own subjects of experiment.

320.

On Meeting Again.--A: Do I quite understand you? You are in search of something? _Where,_ in the midst of the present, actual world, is _your_ niche and star? Where can _you_ lay yourself in the sun, so that you also may have a surplus of well-being, that your existence may justify itself? Let everyone do that for himself--you seem to say, --and let him put talk about generalities, concern for others and society, out of his mind!--B: I want more; I am no seeker. I want to create my own sun for myself.

321.

A New Precaution.--Let us no longer think so much about punishing, blaming, and improving! We shall seldom be able to alter an individual, and if we should succeed in doing so, something else may also succeed, perhaps unawares: _we_ may have been altered by him! Let us rather see to it that our own influence on _all that is to come_ outweighs and overweighs his influence! Let us not struggle in direct conflict!--all blaming, punishing, and desire to improve comes under this category. But let us elevate ourselves all the higher! Let us ever give to our pattern more shining colours! Let us obscure, the other by our light! No! We do not mean to become _darker_ ourselves on his account, like those who punish and are discontented! Let us rather go aside! Let us look away!

322.

A Simile.--Those thinkers in whom all the stars move in cyclic orbits, are not the most profound. He who looks into himself, as into an immense universe, and carries Milky Ways in himself, knows also how irregular all Milky Ways are; they lead into the very chaos and labyrinth of existence.

323.

Happiness in Destiny.--Destiny confers its greatest distinction upon us when it has made us fight for a time on the side of our adversaries. We are thereby _predestined_ to a great victory.

324.

In Media Vita.--No! Life has not deceived me! On the contrary, from year to year I find it richer, more desirable and more mysterious--from the day on which the great liberator broke my fetters, the thought that life may be an experiment of the thinker--and not a duty, not a fatality, not a deceit!--And knowledge itself may be for others something different; for example, a bed of ease, or the path to a bed of ease, or an entertainment, or a course of idling,--for me it is a world of dangers and victories, in which even the heroic sentiments have their arena and dancing-floor. _"Life as a means to knowledge"_--with this principle in one's heart, one can not only be brave, but can even _live joyfully and laugh joyfully!_ And who could know how to laugh well and live well, who did not first understand the full significance of war and victory?

325.

What Belongs to Greatness.--Who can attain to anything great if he does not feel in himself the force and will _to inflict_ great pain? The ability to suffer is a small matter: in that line, weak women and even slaves often attain masterliness. But not to perish from internal distress and doubt when one inflicts great suffering and hears the cry of it--that is great, that belongs to greatness.

326.

Physicians of the Soul and Pain.--All preachers of morality, as also all theologians, have a bad habit in common: all of them try to persuade man that he is very ill, and that a severe, final, radical cure is necessary. And because mankind as a whole has for centuries listened too eagerly to those teachers, something of the superstition that the human race is in a very bad way has actually come over men: so that they are now far too ready to sigh; they find nothing more in life and make melancholy faces at each other, as if life were indeed very hard _to endure._ In truth, they are inordinately assured of their life and in love with it, and full of untold intrigues and subtleties for suppressing everything disagreeable, and for extracting the thorn from pain and misfortune. It seems to me that people always speak _with exaggeration_ about pain and misfortune, as if it were a matter of good behaviour to exaggerate here: on the other hand people are intentionally silent in regard to the number of expedients for alleviating pain; as for instance, the deadening of it, feverish flurry of thought, a peaceful position, or good and bad reminiscences, intentions, and hopes,--also many kinds of pride and fellow-feeling, which have almost the effect of anæsthetics: while in the greatest degree of pain fainting takes place of itself. We understand very well how to pour sweetness on our bitterness, especially on the bitterness of

our soul; we find a remedy in our bravery and sublimity, as well as in the nobler delirium of submission and resignation. A loss scarcely remains a loss for an hour: in some way or other a gift from heaven has always fallen into our lap at the same moment--a new form of strength, for example: be it but a new opportunity for the exercise of strength! What have the preachers of morality not dreamt concerning the inner "misery" of evil men! What _lies_ have they not told us about the misfortunes of impassioned men! Yes, lying is here the right word: they were only too well aware of the overflowing happiness of this kind of man, but they kept silent as death about it; because it was a refutation of their theory, according to which happiness only originates through the annihilation of the passions and the silencing of the will! And finally, as regards the recipe of all those physicians of the soul and their recommendation of a severe radical cure, we may be allowed to ask: Is our life really painful and burdensome enough for us to exchange it with advantage for a Stoical mode of living, and Stoical petrification? We do _not_ feel _sufficiently miserable_ to have to feel ill in the Stoical fashion!

327.

Taking Things Seriously.--The intellect is with most people an awkward, obscure and creaking machine, which is difficult to set in motion: they call it "_taking a thing seriously_" when they work with this machine and want to think well--oh, how burdensome must good thinking be to them! That delightful animal, man, seems to lose his good-humour whenever he thinks well; he becomes "serious"! And "where there is laughing and gaiety, thinking cannot be worth anything: "--so speaks the prejudice of this serious animal against all "Joyful Wisdom."--Well, then! Let us show that it is prejudice!

328.

Doing Harm to Stupidity.--It is certain that the belief in the reprehensibility of egoism, preached with such stubbornness and conviction, has on the whole done harm to egoism (_in favour of the herd-instinct,_ as I shall repeat a hundred times!), especially by depriving it of a good conscience, and by bidding us seek in it the source of all misfortune. "Thy selfishness is the bane of thy life"--so rang the preaching for millenniums: it did harm, as we have said, to selfishness, and deprived it of much spirit, much cheerfulness, much ingenuity, and much beauty; it stultified and deformed and poisoned selfishness!--Philosophical antiquity, on the other hand, taught that there was another principal source of evil: from Socrates downwards, the thinkers were never weary of preaching that "your thoughtlessness and stupidity, your unthinking way of living according to rule, and your subjection to the opinion of your neighbour, are the reasons why you so seldom attain to happiness,--we thinkers are, as thinkers, the happiest of mortals." Let us not decide here whether this preaching against stupidity was more sound than the preaching against selfishness; it is certain, however, that stupidity was thereby deprived of its good conscience:--those philosophers _did harm to stupidity._

329.

Leisure and Idleness.--There is an Indian savagery, a savagery peculiar to the Indian blood, in the manner in which the Americans strive after gold: and the breathless hurry of their work--the characteristic vice of the new world--already begins to infect old Europe, and makes it savage also, spreading over it a strange lack of intellectuality. One is now ashamed of repose: even long reflection almost causes remorse of conscience. Thinking is done with a stop-watch, as dining is done with the eyes fixed on the financial newspaper; we live like men who are continually "afraid of letting opportunities slip." "Better do anything whatever, than nothing"--this principle also is a noose with which all culture and all higher taste may be strangled. And just as all form obviously disappears in this hurry of workers, so the sense for form itself, the ear and the eye for the melody of movement, also disappear. The proof of this is the _clumsy perspicuity_ which is now everywhere demanded in all positions where a person would like to be sincere with his fellows, in intercourse with friends, women, relatives, children, teachers, pupils, leaders and princes,--one has no longer either time or energy for ceremonies, for roundabout courtesies, for any _esprit_ in conversation, or for any _otium_ whatever. For life in the hunt for gain continually compels a person to consume his intellect, even to exhaustion, in constant dissimulation, overreaching, or forestalling: the real virtue nowadays is to do something in a shorter time than another person. And so there are only rare hours of sincere intercourse _permitted:_ in them, however, people are tired, and would not only like "to let themselves go," but _to stretch their legs_ out wide in awkward style. The way people write their _letters_ nowadays is quite in keeping with the age; their style and spirit will always be the true "sign of the times." If there be still enjoyment in society and in art, it is enjoyment such as over-worked slaves provide for themselves. Oh, this moderation in "joy" of our cultured and uncultured classes! Oh, this increasing suspiciousness of all enjoyment! _Work_ is winning over more and more the good conscience to its side: the desire for enjoyment already calls itself "need of recreation," and even begins to be ashamed of itself. "One owes it to one's health," people say, when they are caught at a picnic. Indeed, it might soon go so far that one could not yield to the desire for

the _vita contemplativa_ (that is to say, excursions with thoughts and friends), without self-contempt and a bad conscience.--Well! Formerly it was the very reverse: it was "action" that suffered from a bad conscience. A man of good family _concealed_ his work when need compelled him to labour. The slave laboured under the weight of the feeling that he did something contemptible:--the "doing" itself was something contemptible. "Only in _otium_ and _bellum_ is there nobility and honour:" so rang the voice of ancient prejudice!

330.

Applause.--The thinker does not need applause or the clapping of hands, provided he be sure of the clapping of his own hands: the latter, however, he cannot do without. Are there men who could also do without this, and in general without any kind of applause? I doubt it: and even as regards the wisest, Tacitus, who is no calumniator of the wise, says: _quando etiam sapientibus gloriæ cupido novissima exuitur_--that means with him: never.

331.

Better Deaf than Deafened.--Formerly a person wanted to have his _calling,_ but that no longer suffices to-day, for the market has become too large,--there has now to be _bawling._ The consequence is that even good throats outcry each other, and the best wares are offered for sale with hoarse voices; without market-place bawling and hoarseness there is now no longer any genius.--It is, sure enough, an evil age for the thinker: he has to learn to find his stillness betwixt two noises, and has to pretend to be deaf until he finally becomes so. As long as he has not learned this, he is in danger of perishing from impatience and headaches.

332.

The Evil Hour.--There has perhaps been an evil hour for every philosopher, in which he thought: What do I matter, if people should not believe my poor arguments!--And then some malicious bird has flown past him and twittered: "What do you matter? What do you matter?"

333.

What does Knowing Mean?--Non ridere, non lugere, neque detestari, sed intelligere! says Spinoza, so simply and sublimely, as is his wont. Nevertheless, what else is this _intelligere_ ultimately, but just the form in which the three other things become perceptible to us all at once? A result of the diverging and opposite impulses of desiring to deride, lament and execrate? Before knowledge is possible each of these impulses must first have brought forward its one-sided view of the object or event. The struggle of these one-sided views occurs afterwards, and out of it there occasionally arises a compromise, a pacification, a recognition of rights on all three sides, a sort of justice and agreement: for in virtue of the justice and agreement all those impulses can maintain themselves in existence and retain their mutual rights. We, to whose consciousness only the closing reconciliation scenes and final settling of accounts of these long processes manifest themselves, think on that account that _intelligere_ is something conciliating, just and good, something essentially antithetical to the impulses; whereas it is only _a certain relation of the impulses to one another._ For a very long time conscious thinking was regarded as the only thinking: it is now only that the truth dawns upon us that the greater part of our intellectual activity goes on unconsciously and unfelt by us; I believe, however, that the impulses which are here in mutual conflict understand rightly how to make themselves felt by _one another,_ and how to cause pain:--the violent sudden exhaustion which overtakes all thinkers, may have its origin here (it is the exhaustion of the battle-field). Aye, perhaps in our struggling interior there is much concealed _heroism,_ but certainly nothing divine, or eternally-reposing-in-itself, as Spinoza supposed. _Conscious_ thinking, and especially that of the philosopher, is the weakest, and on that account also the relatively mildest and quietest mode of thinking: and thus it is precisely the philosopher who is most easily misled concerning the nature of knowledge.

334.

_One must Learn to Love.--_This is our experience in music: we must first _learn_ in general _to hear,_ to hear fully, and to distinguish a theme or a melody, we have to isolate and limit it as a life by itself; then we need to exercise effort and good-will in order _to endure_ it in spite of its strangeness we need patience towards its aspect and expression and indulgence towards what is odd in it:--in the end there comes a moment when we are _accustomed_ to it, when we expect it, when it dawns upon us that we should miss it if it were lacking; and then it goes on to exercise its spell and charm more and more, and does not cease until we have become its humble and enraptured lovers, who want it, and want it again, and ask for nothing better from the world.--It is thus

with us, however, not only in music: it is precisely thus that we have _learned to love_ everything that we love. We are always finally recompensed for our good-will, our patience reasonableness and gentleness towards what is unfamiliar, by the unfamiliar slowly throwing off its veil and presenting itself to us as a new, ineffable beauty:--that is its _thanks_ for our hospitality. He also who loves himself must have learned it in this way: there is no other way. Love also has to be learned.

335.

Cheers for Physics!--How many men are there who know how to observe? And among the few who do know,--how many observe themselves? "Everyone is furthest from himself"--all the "triers of the reins" know that to their discomfort; and the saying, "Know thyself," in the mouth of a God and spoken to man, is almost a mockery. But that the case of self-observation is so desperate, is attested best of all by the manner in which _almost everybody_ talks of the nature of a moral action, that prompt, willing, convinced, loquacious manner, with its look, its smile, and its pleasing eagerness! Everyone seems inclined to say to you: "Why, my dear Sir, that is precisely _my_ affair! You address yourself with your question to him who _is authorised_ to answer, for I happen to be wiser with regard to this matter than in anything else. Therefore, when a man decides that '_this is right_,' when he accordingly concludes that '_it must therefore be done,_ and thereupon _does_ what he has thus recognised as right and designated as necessary--then the nature of his action is _moral!"_ But, my friend, you are talking to me about three actions instead of one: your deciding, for instance, that "this is right," is also an action,--could one not judge either morally or immorally? _Why_ do you regard this, and just this, as right?--"Because my conscience tells me so; conscience never speaks immorally, indeed it determines in the first place what shall be moral!"--But why do you _listen_ to the voice of your conscience? And in how far are you justified in regarding such a judgment as true and infallible? This _belief_--is there no further conscience for it? Do you know nothing of an intellectual conscience? A conscience behind your "conscience"? Your decision, "this is right," has a previous history in your impulses, your likes and dislikes, your experiences and non-experiences; "_how_ has it originated?" you must ask, and afterwards the further question: "_what_ really impels me to give ear to it?" You can listen to its command like a brave soldier who hears the command of his officer. Or like a woman who loves him who commands. Or like a flatterer and coward, afraid of the commander. Or like a blockhead who follows because he has nothing to say to the contrary. In short, you can give ear to your conscience in a hundred different ways. But _that_ you hear this or that judgment as the voice of conscience, consequently, _that_ you feel a thing to be right--may have its cause in the fact that you have never thought about your nature, and have blindly accepted from your childhood what has been designated to you as _right:_ or in the fact that hitherto bread and honours have fallen to your share with that which you call your duty,--it is "right" to you, because it seems to be _your_ "condition of existence" (that you, however, have a _right_ to existence seems to you irrefutable!). The _persistency_ of your moral judgment might still be just a proof of personal wretchedness or impersonality; your "moral force" might have its source in your obstinacy--or in your incapacity to perceive new ideals! And to be brief: if you had thought more acutely, observed more accurately, and had learned more, you would no longer under all circumstances call this and that your "duty" and your "conscience": the knowledge _how moral judgments have in general always originated_ would make you tired of these pathetic words,--as you have already grown tired of other pathetic words, for instance "sin," "salvation," and "redemption."--And now, my friend, do not talk to me about the categorical imperative! That word tickles my ear, and I must laugh in spite of your presence and your seriousness. In this connection I recollect old Kant, who, as a punishment for having _gained possession surreptitiously_ of the "thing in itself"--also a very ludicrous affair!--was imposed upon by the categorical imperative, and with that in his heart _strayed back again_ to "God," the "soul," "freedom," and "immortality," like a fox which strays back into its cage: and it had been _his_ strength and shrewdness which had _broken open_ this cage!--What? You admire the categorical imperative in you? This "persistency" of your so-called moral judgment? This absoluteness of the feeling that "as I think on this matter, so must everyone think"? Admire rather your _selfishness_ therein! And the blindness, paltriness, and modesty of your selfishness! For it is selfishness in a person to regard _his_ judgment as universal law, and a blind, paltry and modest selfishness besides, because it betrays that you have not yet discovered yourself, that you have not yet created for yourself any personal, quite personal ideal:--for this could never be the ideal of another, to say nothing of all, of every one!--He who still thinks that "each would have to act in this manner in this case," has not yet advanced half a dozen paces in self-knowledge: otherwise he would know that there neither are, nor can be, similar actions,--that every action that has been done, has been done in an entirely unique and inimitable manner, and that it will be the same with regard to all future actions; that all precepts of conduct (and even the most esoteric and subtle precepts of all moralities up to the present), apply only to the coarse exterior,--that by means of them, indeed, a semblance of equality can be attained, _but only a semblance,_--that in outlook and retrospect, _every_ action is, and remains, an impenetrable affair, --that our opinions of the "good," "noble" and "great" can never be proved by our actions, because no action is cognisable,--that our opinions, estimates, and tables of values are certainly among the most powerful levers in the mechanism of our actions, that in every single case, nevertheless, the law of their mechanism is

untraceable. Let us _confine_ ourselves, therefore, to the purification of our opinions and appreciations, and to the _construction of new tables of value of our own:_--we will, however, brood no longer over the "moral worth of our actions"! Yes, my friends! As regards the whole moral twaddle of people about one another, it is time to be disgusted with it! To sit in judgment morally ought to be opposed to our taste! Let us leave this nonsense and this bad taste to those who have nothing else to do, save to drag the past a little distance further through time, and who are never themselves the present,--consequently to the many, to the majority! We, however, _would seek to become what we are,--_the new, the unique, the incomparable, making laws for ourselves and creating ourselves! And for this purpose we must become the best students and discoverers of all the laws and necessities in the world. We must be _physicists_ in order to be _creators_ in that sense--whereas hitherto all appreciations and ideals have been based on _ignorance_ of physics, or in _contradiction_ thereto. And therefore, three cheers for physics! And still louder cheers for that which _impels_ us thereto--our honesty.

336.

Avarice of Nature--Why has nature been so niggardly towards humanity that she has not let human beings shine, this man more and that man less, according to their inner abundance of light? Why have not great men such a fine visibility in their rising and setting as the sun? How much less equivocal would life among men then be!

337.

_Future "Humanity."--_When I look at this age with the eye of a distant future, I find nothing so remarkable in the man of the present day as his peculiar virtue and sickness called "the historical sense." It is a tendency to something quite new and foreign in history: if this embryo were given several centuries and more, there might finally evolve out of it a marvellous plant, with a smell equally marvellous, on account of which our old earth might be more pleasant to live in than it has been hitherto. We moderns are just beginning to form the chain of a very powerful, future sentiment, link by link,--we hardly know what we are doing. It almost seems to us as if it were not the question of a new sentiment, but of the decline of all old sentiments:--the historical sense is still something so poor and cold, and many are attacked by it as by a frost, and are made poorer and colder by it. To others it appears as the indication of stealthily approaching age, and our planet is regarded by them as a melancholy invalid, who, in order to forget his present condition, writes the history of his youth. In fact, this is one aspect of the new sentiment. He who knows how to regard the history of man in its entirety as _his own history,_ feels in the immense generalisation all the grief of the invalid who thinks of health, of the old man who thinks of the dream of his youth, of the lover who is robbed of his beloved, of the martyr whose ideal is destroyed, of the hero on the evening of the indecisive battle which has brought him wounds and the loss of a friend. But to bear this immense sum of grief of all kinds, to be able to bear it, and yet still be the hero who at the commencement of a second day of battle greets the dawn and his happiness, as one who has an horizon of centuries before and behind him, as the heir of all nobility, of all past intellect, and the obligatory heir (as the noblest) of all the old nobles; while at the same time the first of a new nobility, the equal of which has never been seen nor even dreamt of: to take all this upon his soul, the oldest, the newest, the losses, hopes, conquests, and victories of mankind: to have all this at last in one soul, and to comprise it in one feeling:--this would necessarily furnish a happiness which man has not hitherto known,--a God's happiness, full of power and love, full of tears and laughter, a happiness which, like the sun in the evening, continually gives of its inexhaustible riches and empties into the sea,--and like the sun, too, feels itself richest when even the poorest fisherman rows with golden oars! This divine feeling might then be called--humanity!

338.

The Will to Suffering and the Compassionate.--Is it to your advantage to be above all compassionate? And is it to the advantage of the sufferers when you are so? But let us leave the first question for a moment without an answer.--That from which we suffer most profoundly and personally is almost incomprehensible and inaccessible to every one else: in this matter we are hidden from our neighbour even when he eats at the same table with us. Everywhere, however, where we are _noticed_ as sufferers, our suffering is interpreted in a shallow way; it belongs to the nature of the emotion of pity to _divest_ unfamiliar suffering of its properly personal character:--our "benefactors" lower our value and volition more than our enemies. In most benefits which are conferred on the unfortunate there is something shocking in the intellectual levity with which the compassionate person plays the rôle of fate: he knows nothing of all the inner consequences and complications which are called misfortune for _me_ or for _you!_ The entire economy of my soul and its adjustment by "misfortune," the uprising of new sources and needs, the closing up of old wounds, the repudiation of whole periods of the past--none of these things which may be connected with misfortune preoccupy the dear

sympathiser. He wishes _to succour,_ and does not reflect that there is a personal necessity for misfortune; that terror, want, impoverishment, midnight watches, adventures, hazards and mistakes are as necessary to me and to you as their opposites, yea, that, to speak mystically, the path to one's own heaven always leads through the voluptuousness of one's own hell. No, he knows nothing thereof. The "religion of compassion" (or "the heart") bids him help, and he thinks he has helped best when he has helped most speedily! If you adherents of this religion actually have the same sentiments towards yourselves which you have towards your fellows, if you are unwilling to endure your own suffering even for an hour, and continually forestall all possible misfortune, if you regard suffering and pain generally as evil, as detestable, as deserving of annihilation, and as blots on existence, well, you have then, besides your religion of compassion, yet another religion in your heart (and this is perhaps the mother of the former)--_the religion of smug ease._ Ah, how little you know of the _happiness_ of man, you comfortable and good-natured ones!--for happiness and misfortune are brother and sister, and twins, who grow tall together, or, as with you, _remain small_ together! But now let us return to the first question.--How is it at all possible for a person to keep to _his_ path! Some cry or other is continually calling one aside: our eye then rarely lights on anything without it becoming necessary for us to leave for a moment our own affairs and rush to give assistance. I know there are hundreds of respectable and laudable methods of making me stray _from my course,_ and in truth the most "moral" of methods! Indeed, the opinion of the present-day preachers of the morality of compassion goes so far as to imply that just this, and this alone is moral:--to stray from _our_ course to that extent and to run to the assistance of our neighbour. I am equally certain that I need only give myself over to the sight of one case of actual distress, and I, too, _am_ lost! And if a suffering friend said to me, "See, I shall soon die, only promise to die with me"--I might promise it, just as--to select for once bad examples for good reasons--the sight of a small, mountain people struggling for freedom,. would bring me to the point of offering them my hand and my life. Indeed, there is even a secret seduction in all this awakening of compassion, and calling for help: our "own way" is a thing too hard and insistent, and too far removed from the love and gratitude of others,--we escape from it and from our most personal conscience, not at all unwillingly, and, seeking security in the conscience of others, we take refuge in the lovely temple of the "religion of pity." As soon now as any war breaks out, there always breaks out at the same time a certain secret delight precisely in the noblest class of the people: they rush with rapture to meet the new danger of _death,_ because they believe that in the sacrifice for their country they have finally that long-sought-for permission--the permission _to shirk their aim:_--war is for them a detour to suicide, a detour, however, with a good conscience. And although silent here about some things, I will not, however, be silent about my morality, which says to me: Live in concealment in order that thou _mayest_ live to thyself. Live _ignorant_ of that which seems to thy age to be most important! Put at least the skin of three centuries betwixt thyself, and the present day! And the clamour of the present day, the noise of wars and revolutions, ought to be a murmur to thee! Thou wilt also want to help, but only those whose distress thou entirely _understandest,_ because they have _one_ sorrow and _one_ hope in common with thee--thy _friends:_ and only in _the_ way that thou helpest thyself:--I want to make them more courageous, more enduring, more simple, more joyful! I want to teach them that which at present so few understand, and the preachers of fellowship in sorrow least of all:--namely, _fellowship in joy!_

339.

Vita femina.--To see the ultimate beauties in a work--all knowledge and good-will is not enough; it requires the rarest, good chance for the veil of clouds to move for once from the summits, and for the sun to shine on them. We must not only stand at precisely the right place to see this, our very soul itself must have pulled away the veil from its heights, and must be in need of an external expression and simile, so as to have a hold and remain master of itself. All these, however, are so rarely united at the same time that I am inclined to believe that the highest summit of all that is good, be it work, deed, man, or nature, has hitherto remained for most people, and even for the best, as something concealed and shrouded:--that, however, which unveils itself to us, _unveils itself to us but once._ The Greeks indeed prayed: "Twice and thrice, everything beautiful!" Ah, they had their good reason to call on the Gods, for ungodly actuality does not furnish us with the beautiful at all, or only does so once! I mean to say that the world is overfull of beautiful things, but it is nevertheless poor, very poor, in beautiful moments, and in the unveiling of those beautiful things. But perhaps this is the greatest charm of life: it puts a gold-embroidered veil of lovely potentialities over itself, promising, resisting, modest, mocking, sympathetic, seductive. Yes, life is a woman!

340.

The Dying Socrates.---I admire the courage and wisdom of Socrates in all that he did, said--and did not say. This mocking and amorous demon and rat-catcher of Athens, who made the most insolent youths tremble and sob, was not only the wisest babbler that has ever lived, but was just as great in his silence. I would that he had also been silent in the last moment of his life,--perhaps he might then have belonged to a still higher order of intellects. Whether it was death, or the poison, or piety, or

wickedness--something or other loosened his tongue at that moment, and he said: "O Crito, I owe a cock to Asclepios." For him who has ears, this ludicrous and terrible "last word" implies: "O Crito, _life is a long sickness!"_ Is it possible! A man like him, who had lived cheerfully and to all appearance as a soldier,--was a pessimist! He had merely put on a good demeanour towards life, and had all along concealed his ultimate judgment, his profoundest sentiment! Socrates, Socrates _had suffered from life!_ And he also took his revenge for it--with that veiled, fearful, pious, and blasphemous phrase! Had even a Socrates to revenge himself? Was there a grain too little of magnanimity in his superabundant virtue? Ah, my friends! We must surpass even the Greeks!

341.

The Heaviest Burden.--What if a demon crept after thee into thy loneliest loneliness some day or night, and said to thee: "This life, as thou livest it at present, and hast lived it, thou must live it once more, and also innumerable times; and there will be nothing new in it, but every pain and every joy and every thought and every sigh, and all the unspeakably small and great in thy life must come to thee again, and all in the same series and sequence--and similarly this spider and this moonlight among the trees, and similarly this moment, and I myself. The eternal sand-glass of existence will ever be turned once more, and thou with it, thou speck of dust!"--Wouldst thou not throw thyself down and gnash thy teeth, and curse the demon that so spake? Or hast thou once experienced a tremendous moment in which thou wouldst answer him: "Thou art a God, and never did I hear anything so divine!" If that thought acquired power over thee as thou art, it would transform thee, and perhaps crush thee; the question with regard to all and everything: "Dost thou want this once more, and also for innumerable times?" would lie as the heaviest burden upon thy activity! Or, how wouldst thou have to become favourably inclined to thyself and to life, so as _to long for nothing more ardently_ than for this last eternal sanctioning and sealing?--

342.

Incipit Tragœdia.--When Zarathustra was thirty years old, he left his home and the Lake of Urmi, and went into the mountains. There he enjoyed his spirit and his solitude, and for ten years did not weary of it. But at last his heart changed,--and rising one morning with the rosy dawn, he went before the sun and spake thus to it: "Thou great star! What would be thy happiness if thou hadst not those for whom thou shinest! For ten years hast thou climbed hither unto my cave: thou wouldst have wearied of thy light and of the journey, had it not been for me, mine eagle, and my serpent. But we awaited thee every morning, took from thee thine overflow, and blessed thee for it. Lo! I am weary of my wisdom, like the bee that hath gathered too much honey; I need hands outstretched to take it. I would fain bestow and distribute, until the wise have once more become joyous in their folly, and the poor happy in their riches. Therefore must I descend into the deep, as thou doest in the evening, when thou goest behind the sea and givest light also to the nether-world, thou most rich star! Like thee must I _go down,_ as men say, to whom I shall descend. Bless me then, thou tranquil eye, that canst behold even the greatest happiness without envy! Bless the cup that is about to overflow, that the water may flow golden out of it, and carry everywhere the reflection of thy bliss! Lo! This cup is again going to empty itself, and Zarathustra is again going to be a man."--Thus began Zarathustra's down-going.

BOOK FIFTH

FEARLESS ONES

"Carcasse, tu trembles? Tu tremblerais bien davantage, tu savais, où je te mène." _Turenne._

343.

What our Cheerfulness Signifies.--The most important of more recent events--that "God is dead," that the belief in the Christian God has become unworthy of belief--already begins to cast its first shadows over Europe. To the few at least whose eye, whose _suspecting_ glance, is strong enough and subtle enough for this drama, some sun seems to have set, some old, profound confidence seems to have changed into doubt: our old world must seem to them daily more darksome, distrustful, strange and "old." In the main, however, one may say that the event itself is far too great, too remote, too much beyond most people's power of apprehension, for one to suppose that so much as the report of it could have _reached_ them; not to speak of many who already knew _what_ had taken place, and what must all collapse now that this belief had been undermined,--because so much was built upon it, so much rested on it, and had become one with it: for example, our entire European morality. This lengthy, vast and uninterrupted process of crumbling, destruction, ruin and overthrow which is now imminent: who has realised it sufficiently to-day to

have to stand up as the teacher and herald of such a tremendous logic of terror, as the prophet of a period of gloom and eclipse, the like of which has probably never taken place on earth before?... Even we, the born riddle-readers, who wait as it were on the mountains posted 'twixt to-day and to-morrow, and engirt by their contradiction, we, the firstlings and premature children of the coming century, into whose sight especially the shadows which must forthwith envelop Europe _should_ already have come--how is it that even we, without genuine sympathy for this period of gloom, contemplate its advent without any _personal_ solicitude or fear? Are we still, perhaps, too much under the _immediate effects_ of the event--and are these effects, especially as regards _ourselves,_ perhaps the reverse of what was to be expected--not at all sad and depressing, but rather like a new and indescribable variety of light, happiness, relief, enlivenment, encouragement, and dawning day?... In fact, we philosophers and "free spirits" feel ourselves irradiated as by a new dawn by the report that the "old God is dead"; our hearts overflow with gratitude, astonishment, presentiment and expectation. At last the horizon seems open once more, granting even that it is not bright; our ships can at last put out to sea in face of every danger; every hazard is again permitted to the discerner; the sea, _our_ sea, again lies open before us; perhaps never before did such an "open sea" exist.--

344.

To what Extent even We are still Pious.--It is said with good reason that convictions have no civic rights in the domain of science: it is only when a conviction voluntarily condescends to the modesty of an hypothesis, a preliminary standpoint for experiment, or a regulative fiction, that its access to the realm of knowledge, and a certain value therein, can be conceded,--always, however, with the restriction that it must remain under police supervision, under the police of our distrust.--Regarded more accurately, however, does not this imply that only when a conviction _ceases_ to be a conviction can it obtain admission into science? Does not the discipline of the scientific spirit just commence when one no longer harbours any conviction?... It is probably so: only, it remains to be asked whether, _in order that this discipline may commence,_ it is not necessary that there should already be a conviction, and in fact one so imperative and absolute, that it makes a sacrifice of all other convictions. One sees that science also rests on a belief: there is no science at all "without premises." The question whether _truth_ is necessary, must not merely be affirmed beforehand, but must be affirmed to such an extent that the principle, belief, or conviction finds expression, that "there is _nothing more necessary_ than truth, and in comparison with it everything else has only secondary value."--This absolute will to truth: what is it? Is it the will _not to allow ourselves to be deceived?_ Is it the will _not to deceive?_ For the will to truth could also be interpreted in this fashion, provided one included under the generalisation, "I will not deceive," the special case, "I will not deceive myself." But why not deceive? Why not allow oneself to be deceived?--Let it be noted that the reasons for the former eventuality belong to a category quite different from those for the latter: one does not want to be deceived oneself, under the supposition that it is injurious, dangerous, or fatal to be deceived,--in this sense science would be a prolonged process of caution, foresight and utility; against which, however, one might reasonably make objections. What? is not-wishing-to-be-deceived really less injurious, less dangerous, less fatal? What do you know of the character of existence in all its phases to be able to decide whether the greater advantage is on the side of absolute distrust, or of absolute trustfulness? In case, however, of both being necessary, much trusting _and_ much distrusting, whence then should science derive the absolute belief, the conviction on which it rests, that truth is more important than anything else, even than every other conviction? This conviction could not have arisen if truth _and_ untruth had both continually proved themselves to be useful: as is the case. Thus--the belief in science, which now undeniably exists, cannot have had its origin in such a utilitarian calculation, but rather _in spite of_ the fact of the inutility and dangerousness of the "Will to truth," of "truth at all costs," being continually demonstrated. "At all costs": alas, we understand that sufficiently well, after having sacrificed and slaughtered one belief after another at this altar!--Consequently, "Will to truth" does _not_ imply, "I will not allow myself to be deceived," but--there is no other alternative--"I will not deceive, not even myself": _and thus we have reached the realm of morality._ For, let one just ask oneself fairly: "Why wilt thou not deceive?" especially if it should seem--and it does seem--as if life were laid out with a view to appearance, I mean, with a view to error deceit, dissimulation, delusion, self-delusion; and when on the other hand it is a matter of fact that the great type of life has always manifested itself on the side of the most unscrupulous πολ■τροποι. Such an intention might perhaps, to express it mildly, be a piece of Quixotism, a little enthusiastic craziness; it might also, however, be something worse, namely, a destructive principle, hostile to life.... "Will to Truth,"--that might be a concealed Will to Death.--Thus the question Why is there science? leads back to the moral problem: _What in general is the purpose of morality,_ if life, nature, and history are "non-moral"? There is no doubt that the conscientious man in the daring and extreme sense in which he is presupposed by the belief in science, _affirms thereby a world other than_ that of life, nature, and history; and in so far as he affirms this "other world," what? must he not just thereby--deny its counterpart, this world, _our_ world?... But what I have in view will now be understood, namely, that it is always a _metaphysical belief_ on which our belief in science rests,--and that even we knowing ones of to-day, landless and anti-metaphysical, still take _our_ fire from the conflagration kindled by a belief a millennium

old, the Christian belief, which was also the belief of Plato, that God is truth, that the truth is divine.... But what if this itself always becomes more untrustworthy, what if nothing any longer proves itself divine, except it be error, blindness, and falsehood;--what if God himself turns out to be our most persistent lie?--

345.

Morality as a Problem.--A defect in personality revenges itself everywhere: an enfeebled, lank, obliterated, self-disavowing and disowning personality is no longer fit for anything good--it is least of all fit for philosophy. "Selflessness" has no value either in heaven or on earth; the great problems all demand _great love,_ and it is only the strong, well-rounded, secure spirits, those who have a solid basis, that are qualified for them. It makes the most material difference whether a thinker stands personally related to his problems, having his fate, his need, and even his highest happiness therein; or merely impersonally, that is to say, if he can only feel and grasp them with the tentacles of cold, prying thought. In the latter case I warrant that nothing comes of it: for the great problems, granting that they let themselves be grasped at all, do not let themselves be _held_ by toads and weaklings: that has ever been their taste--a taste also which they share with all high-spirited women.--How is it that I have not yet met with any one, not even in books, who seems to have stood to morality in this position, as one who knew morality as a problem, and this problem as _his own_ personal need, affliction, pleasure and passion? It is obvious that up to the present morality has not been a problem at all; it has rather been the very ground on which people have met after all distrust, dissension and contradiction, the hallowed place of peace, where thinkers could obtain rest even from themselves, could recover breath and revive. I see no one who has ventured to _criticise_ the estimates of moral worth. I miss in this connection even the attempts of scientific curiosity, and the fastidious, groping imagination of psychologists and historians, which easily anticipates a problem and catches it on the wing, without rightly knowing what it catches. With difficulty I have discovered some scanty data for the purpose of furnishing a _history of the origin_ of these feelings and estimates of value (which is something different from a criticism of them, and also something different from a history of ethical systems). In an individual case I have done everything to encourage the inclination and talent for this kind of history--in vain, as it would seem to me at present. There is little to be learned from those historians of morality (especially Englishmen): they themselves are usually, quite unsuspiciously, under the influence of a definite morality, and act unwittingly as its armour-bearers and followers--perhaps still repeating sincerely the popular superstition of Christian Europe, that the characteristic of moral action consists in abnegation, self-denial, self-sacrifice, or in fellow-feeling and fellow-suffering. The usual error in their premises is their insistence on a certain _consensus_ among human beings, at least among civilised human beings, with regard to certain propositions of morality, from thence they conclude that these propositions are absolutely binding even upon you and me; or reversely, they come to the conclusion that _no_ morality is binding, after the truth has dawned upon them that among different peoples moral valuations are _necessarily_ different: both of which conclusions are equally childish follies. The error of the more subtle amongst them is that they discover and criticise the probably foolish opinions of a people about its own morality, or the opinions of mankind about human morality generally (they treat accordingly of its origin, its religious sanctions, the superstition of free will, and such matters), and they think that just by so doing they have criticised the morality itself. But the worth of a precept, "Thou shalt," is fundamentally different from and independent of such opinions about it, and must be distinguished from the weeds of error with which it has perhaps been overgrown: just as the worth of a medicine to a sick person is altogether independent of the question whether he has a scientific opinion about medicine, or merely thinks about it as an old wife would do. A morality could even have grown _out of_ an error: but with this knowledge the problem of its worth would not even be touched.--Thus, no one hitherto has tested the _value_ of that most celebrated of all medicines, called morality: for which purpose it is first of all necessary for one--_to call it in question._ Well, that is just our work.--

346.

Our Note of Interrogation.--But you don't understand it? As a matter of fact, an effort will be necessary in order to understand us. We seek for words; we seek perhaps also for ears. Who are we after all? If we wanted simply to call ourselves in older phraseology, atheists, unbelievers, or even immoralists, we should still be far from thinking ourselves designated thereby: we are all three in too late a phase for people generally to conceive, for _you,_ my inquisitive friends, to be able to conceive, what is our state of mind under the circumstances. No! we have no longer the bitterness and passion of him who has broken loose, who has to make for himself a belief, a goal, and even a martyrdom out of his unbelief! We have become saturated with the conviction (and have grown cold and hard in it) that things are not at all divinely ordered in this world, nor even according to human standards do they go on rationally, mercifully, or justly: we know the fact that the world in which we live is ungodly, immoral, and "inhuman,"--we have far too long interpreted it to ourselves falsely and mendaciously, according to the wish and will of our veneration, that is to say, according to our _need._ For man is a venerating animal! But he is also a distrustful animal: and that the world is _not_ worth what we

believed it to be worth is about the surest thing our distrust has at last managed to grasp. So much distrust, so much philosophy! We take good care not to say that the world is of _less_ value: it seems to us at present absolutely ridiculous when man claims to devise values _to surpass_ the values of the actual world,--it is precisely from that point that we have retraced our steps; as from an extravagant error of human conceit and irrationality, which for a long period has not been recognised as such. This error had its last expression in modern Pessimism; an older and stronger manifestation in the teaching of Buddha; but Christianity also contains it, more dubiously, to be sure, and more ambiguously, but none the less seductive on that account. The whole attitude of "man _versus_ the world," man as world-denying principle, man as the standard of the value of things, as judge of the world, who in the end puts existence itself on his scales and finds it too light--the monstrous impertinence of this attitude has dawned upon us as such, and has disgusted us,--we now laugh when we find, "Man _and_ World" placed beside one another, separated by the sublime presumption of the little word "and"! But how is it? Have we not in our very laughing just made a further step in despising mankind? And consequently also in Pessimism, in despising the existence cognisable _by us?_ Have we not just thereby awakened suspicion that there is an opposition between the world in which we have hitherto been at home with our venerations--for the sake of which we perhaps _endure_ life--and another world _which we ourselves are:_ an inexorable, radical, most profound suspicion concerning ourselves, which is continually getting us Europeans more annoyingly into its power, and could easily face the coming generation with the terrible alternative: Either do away with your venerations, or--_with yourselves!"_ The latter would be Nihilism--but would not the former also be Nihilism? This is _our_ note of interrogation.

347.

Believers and their Need of Belief.--How much _faith_ a person requires in order to flourish, how much "fixed opinion" he requires which he does not wish to have shaken, because he _holds_ himself thereby--is a measure of his power (or more plainly speaking, of his weakness). Most people in old Europe, as it seems to me, still need Christianity at present, and on that account it still finds belief. For such is man: a theological dogma might be refuted to him a thousand times,--provided, however, that he had need of it, he would again and again accept it as "true,"--according to the famous "proof of power" of which the Bible speaks. Some have still need of metaphysics; but also the impatient _longing for certainty_ which at present discharges itself in scientific, positivist fashion among large numbers of the people, the longing by all means to get at something stable (while on account of the warmth of the longing the establishing of the certainty is more leisurely and negligently undertaken):--even this is still the longing for a hold, a support; in short, the _instinct of weakness,_ which, while not actually creating religions, metaphysics, and convictions of all kinds, nevertheless--preserves them. In fact, around all these positivist systems there fume the vapours of a certain pessimistic gloom, something of weariness, fatalism, disillusionment, and fear of new disillusionment--or else manifest animosity, ill-humour, anarchic exasperation, and whatever there is of symptom or masquerade of the feeling of weakness. Even the readiness with which our cleverest contemporaries get lost in wretched corners and alleys, for example, in Vaterländerei (so I designate Jingoism, called _chauvinisme_ in France, and "_deutsch_" in Germany), or in petty æsthetic creeds in the manner of Parisian _naturalisme_ (which only brings into prominence and uncovers--_that_ aspect of nature which excites simultaneously disgust and astonishment--they like at present to call this aspect _la vérité vraie_, or in Nihilism in the St Petersburg style (that is to say, in the _belief in unbelief,_ even to martyrdom for it):--this shows always and above all the need of belief, support, backbone, and buttress.... Belief is always most desired, most pressingly needed, where there is a lack of will: for the will, as emotion of command, is the distinguishing characteristic of sovereignty and power. That is to say, the less a person knows how to command, the more urgent is his desire for that; which commands, and commands sternly,--a God, a prince, a caste, a physician, a confessor, a dogma, a party conscience. From whence perhaps it could be inferred that the two world-religions, Buddhism and Christianity, might well have had the cause of their rise, and especially of their rapid extension, in an extraordinary _malady of the will_ And in truth it has been so: both religions lighted upon a longing, monstrously exaggerated by malady of the will, for an imperative, a "Thou-shalt," a longing going the length of despair; both religions were teachers of fanaticism in times of slackness of will-power, and thereby offered to innumerable persons a support, a new possibility of exercising will, an enjoyment in willing. For in fact fanaticism is the sole "volitional strength" to which the weak and irresolute can be excited, as a sort of hypnotising of the entire sensory-intellectual system, in favour of the over-abundant nutrition (hypertrophy) of a particular point of view and a particular sentiment, which then dominates--the Christian calls it his _faith._ When a man arrives at the fundamental conviction that he _requires_ to be commanded, he becomes "a believer." Reversely, one could imagine a delight and a power of self-determining, and a _freedom_ of will, whereby a spirit could bid farewell to every belief, to every wish for certainty, accustomed as it would be to support itself on slender cords and possibilities, and to dance even on the verge of abysses. Such a spirit would be the _free spirit par excellence._

348.

The Origin of the Learned.--The learned man in Europe grows out of all the different ranks and social conditions, like a plant requiring no specific soil: on that account he belongs essentially and involuntarily to the partisans of democratic thought. But this origin betrays itself. If one has trained one's glance to some extent to recognise in a learned book or scientific treatise the intellectual _idiosyncrasy_ of the learned man--all of them have such idiosyncrasy,--and if we take it by surprise, we shall almost always get a glimpse behind it of the "antecedent history" of the learned man and his family, especially of the nature of their callings and occupations. Where the feeling finds expression, "That is at last proved, I am now done with it," it is commonly the ancestor in the blood and instincts of the learned man that approves of the "accomplished work" in the nook from which he sees things;--the belief in the proof is only an indication of what has been looked upon for ages by a laborious family as "good work." Take an example: the sons of registrars and office-clerks of every kind, whose main task has always been to arrange a variety of material, distribute it in drawers, and systematise it generally, evince, when they become learned men, an inclination to regard a problem as almost solved when they have systematised it There are philosophers who are at bottom nothing but systematising brains--the formal part of the paternal occupation has become its essence to them. The talent for classifications, for tables of categories, betrays something; it is not for nothing that a person is the child of his parents. The son of an advocate will also have to be an advocate as investigator: he seeks as a first consideration, to carry the point in his case, as a second consideration, he perhaps seeks to be in the right. One recognises the sons of Protestant clergymen and schoolmasters by the naïve assurance with which as learned men they already assume their case to be proved, when it has but been presented by them staunchly and warmly: they are thoroughly accustomed to people _believing_ in them,--it belonged to their fathers' "trade"! A Jew, contrariwise, in accordance with his business surroundings and the past of his race, is least of all accustomed--to people believing him. Observe Jewish scholars with regard to this matter,--they all lay great stress on logic, that is to say, on _compelling_ assent by means of reasons; they know that they must conquer thereby, even when race and class antipathy is against them, even where people are unwilling to believe them. For in fact, nothing is more democratic than logic: it knows no respect of persons, and takes even the crooked nose as straight. (In passing we may remark that in respect to logical thinking, in respect to _cleaner_ intellectual habits, Europe is not a little indebted to the Jews; above all the Germans, as being a lamentably _déraisonnable_ race, who, even at the present day, must always have their "heads washed"[1] in the first place. Wherever the Jews have attained to influence, they have taught to analyse more subtly, to argue more acutely, to write more clearly and purely: it has always been their problem to bring a people "to _raison._")

[1] In German the expression _Kopf zu waschen,_ besides the literal sense, also means "to give a person a sound drubbing."--TR.

349.

The Origin of the Learned once more.--To seek self-preservation merely, is the expression of a state of distress, or of limitation of the true, fundamental instinct of life, which aims at the _extension of power,_ and with this in view often enough calls in question self-preservation and sacrifices it. It should be taken as symptomatic when individual philosophers, as for example, the consumptive Spinoza, have seen and have been obliged to see the principal feature of life precisely in the so-called self-preservative instinct:--they have just been men in states of distress. That our modern natural sciences have entangled themselves so much with Spinoza's dogma (finally and most grossly in Darwinism, with its inconceivably one-sided doctrine of the "struggle for existence"--), is probably owing to the origin of most of the inquirers into nature: they belong in this respect to the people, their forefathers have been poor and humble persons, who knew too well by immediate experience the difficulty of making a living. Over the whole of English Darwinism there hovers something of the suffocating air of over-crowded England, something of the odour of humble people in need and in straits. But as an investigator of nature, a person ought to emerge from his paltry human nook: and in nature the state of distress does not _prevail,_ but superfluity, even prodigality to the extent of folly. The struggle for existence is only an _exception,_ a temporary restriction of the will to live; the struggle, be it great or small, turns everywhere on predominance, on increase and expansion, on power, in conformity to the will to power, which is just the will to live.

350.

In Honour of Homines Religiosi.--The struggle against the church is certainly (among other things--for it has a manifold significance) the struggle of the more ordinary, cheerful, confiding, superficial natures against the rule of the graver, profounder, more contemplative natures, that is to say, the more malign and suspicious men, who with long continued distrust in the worth of life, brood also over their own worth:--the ordinary instinct of the people, its sensual gaiety, its "good heart," revolts against them. The entire Roman Church rests on a Southern suspicion of the nature of man (always misunderstood in the North), a suspicion whereby the European South has succeeded, to the inheritance of the profound Orient--the mysterious, venerable Asia--and its

contemplative spirit. Protestantism was a popular insurrection in favour of the simple, the respectable, the superficial (the North has always been more good-natured and more shallow than the South), but it was the French Revolution that first gave the sceptre wholly and solemnly into the hands of the "good man" (the sheep, the ass, the goose, and everything incurably shallow, bawling, and fit for the Bedlam of "modern ideas").

351.

In Honour of Priestly Natures.--I think that philosophers have always felt themselves very remote from that which the people (in all classes of society nowadays) take for wisdom: the prudent, bovine placidity, piety, and country-parson meekness, which lies in the meadow and _gazes at_ life seriously and ruminatingly:--this is probably because philosophers have not had sufficiently the taste of the "people," or of the country-parson, for that kind of wisdom. Philosophers will also perhaps be the last to acknowledge that the people _should_ understand something of that which lies furthest from them, something of the great _passion_ of the thinker, who lives and must live continually in the storm-cloud of the highest problems and the heaviest responsibilities (consequently, not gazing at all, to say nothing of doing so indifferently, securely, objectively). The people venerate an entirely different type of men when on their part they form the ideal of a "sage," and they are a thousand times justified in rendering homage with the highest eulogies and honours to precisely that type of men--namely, the gentle, serious, simple, chaste, priestly natures and those related to them,--it is to them that the praise falls due in the popular veneration of wisdom. And to whom should the multitude have more reason to be grateful than to these men who pertain to its class and rise from its ranks, but are persons consecrated, chosen, and _sacrificed_ for its good--they themselves believe themselves sacrificed to God,--before whom every one can pour forth his heart with impunity, by whom he can _get rid_ of his secrets, cares, and worse things (for the man who "communicates himself" gets rid of himself, and he who has "confessed" forgets). Here there exists a great need: for sewers and pure cleansing waters are required also for spiritual filth, and rapid currents of love are needed, and strong, lowly, pure hearts, who qualify and sacrifice themselves for such service of the non-public health-department--for it _is_ a sacrificing, the priest is, and continues to be, a human sacrifice.... The people regard such sacrificed, silent, serious men of "faith" as "_wise,"_ that is to say, as men who have become sages, as "reliable" in relation to their own unreliability. Who would desire to deprive the people of that expression and that veneration?--But as is fair on the other side, among philosophers the priest also is still held to belong to the "people," and is _not_ regarded as a sage, because, above all, they themselves do not believe in "sages," and they already scent "the people" in this very belief and superstition. It was _modesty_ which invented in Greece the word "philosopher," and left to the play-actors of the spirit the superb arrogance of assuming the name "wise"--the modesty of such monsters of pride and self-glorification as Pythagoras and Plato.--

352.

_Why we can hardly Dispense with Morality.--_The naked man is generally an ignominious spectacle--I speak of us European males (and by no means of European females!). If the most joyous company at table suddenly found themselves stripped and divested of their garments through the trick of an enchanter, I believe that not only would the joyousness be gone and the strongest appetite lost;--it seems that we Europeans cannot at all dispense with the masquerade that is called clothing. But should not the disguise of "moral men," the screening under moral formulæ and notions of decency, the whole kindly concealment of our conduct under conceptions of duty, virtue, public sentiment, honourableness, and disinterestedness, have just as good reasons in support of it? Not that I mean hereby that human wickedness and baseness, in short, the evil wild beast in us, should be disguised; on the contrary, my idea is that it is precisely as _tame animals_ that we are an ignominious spectacle and require moral disguising,--that the "inner man" in Europe is far from having enough of intrinsic evil "to let himself be seen" with it (to be _beautiful_ with it). The European disguises himself _in morality_ because he has become a sick, sickly, crippled animal, who has good reasons for being "tame," because he is almost an abortion, an imperfect, weak and clumsy thing.... It is not the fierceness of the beast of prey that finds moral disguise necessary, but the gregarious animal, with its profound mediocrity, anxiety and ennui. _Morality dresses up the European_--let us acknowledge it!--in more distinguished, more important, more conspicuous guise--in "divine" guise--

353.

The Origin of Religions.--The real inventions of founders of religions are, on the one hand, to establish a definite mode of life and everyday custom, which operates as _disciplina voluntatis,_ and at the same time does away with ennui; and on the other hand, to give to that very mode of life an _interpretation,_ by virtue of which it appears illumined with the highest value; so that it henceforth becomes a good for which people struggle, and under certain circumstances lay down their lives. In truth, the second of these

inventions is the more essential: the first, the mode of life, has usually been there already, side by side, however, with other modes of life, and still unconscious of the value which it embodies. The import, the originality of the founder of a religion, discloses itself usually in the fact that he _sees_ the mode of life, _selects_ it, and _divines_ for the first time the purpose for which it can be used, how it can be interpreted. Jesus (or Paul) for example, found around him the life of the common people in the Roman province, a modest, virtuous, oppressed life: he interpreted it, he put the highest significance and value into it--and thereby the courage to despise every other mode of life, the calm fanaticism of the Moravians, the secret, subterranean self-confidence which goes on increasing, and is at last ready "to overcome the world" (that is to say, Rome, and the upper classes throughout the empire). Buddha, in like manner, found the same type of man,--he found it in fact dispersed among all the classes and social ranks of a people who were good and kind (and above all inoffensive), owing to indolence, and who likewise owing to indolence, lived abstemiously, almost without requirements. He understood that such a type of man, with all its _vis inertiæ,_ had inevitably to glide into a belief which promises _to avoid_ the return of earthly ill (that is to say, labour and activity generally),--this "understanding" was his genius. The founder of a religion possesses psychological infallibility in the knowledge of a definite, average type of souls, who have not yet _recognised_ themselves as akin. It is he who brings them together: the founding of a religion, therefore, always becomes a long ceremony of recognition.--

354.

The "Genius of the Species."--The problem of consciousness (or more correctly: of becoming conscious of oneself) meets us only when we begin to perceive in what measure we could dispense with it: and it is at the beginning of this perception that we are now placed by physiology and zoology (which have thus required two centuries to overtake the hint thrown out in advance by Leibnitz). For we could in fact think, feel, will, and recollect, we could likewise "act" in every sense of the term, and nevertheless nothing of it all need necessarily "come into consciousness" (as one says metaphorically). The whole of life would be possible without its seeing itself as it were in a mirror: as in fact even at present the far greater part of our life still goes on without this mirroring,--and even our thinking, feeling, volitional life as well, however painful this statement may sound to an older philosopher. _What_ then is _the purpose_ of consciousness generally, when it is in the main _superfluous_?--Now it seems to me, if you will hear my answer and its perhaps extravagant supposition, that the subtlety and strength of consciousness are always in proportion to the _capacity for communication_ of a man (or an animal), the capacity for communication in its turn being in proportion to the _necessity for communication:_ the latter not to be understood as if precisely the individual himself who is master in the art of communicating and making known his necessities would at the same time have to be most dependent upon others for his necessities. It seems to me, however, to be so in relation to whole races and successions of generations: where necessity and need have long compelled men to communicate with their fellows and understand one another rapidly and subtly, a surplus of the power and art of communication is at last acquired as if it were a fortune which had gradually accumulated, and now waited for an heir to squander it prodigally (the so-called artists are these heirs, in like manner the orators, preachers, and authors: all of them men who come at the end of a long succession, "late-born" always, in the best sense of the word, and as has been said, _squanderers_ by their very nature). Granted that this observation is correct, I may proceed further to the conjecture that _consciousness generally has only been developed under the pressure of the necessity for communication,_--that from the first it has been necessary and useful only between man and man (especially between those commanding and those obeying) and has only developed in proportion to its utility Consciousness is properly only a connecting network between man and man,--it is only as such that it has had to develop; the recluse and wild-beast species of men would not have needed it The very fact that our actions, thoughts, feelings and motions come within the range of our consciousness--at least a part of them--is the result of a terrible, prolonged "must" ruling man's destiny: as the most endangered animal he _needed_ help and protection; he needed his fellows, he was obliged to express his distress, he had to know how to make himself understood--and for all this he needed "consciousness" first of all: he had to "know" himself what he lacked, to "know" how he felt, and to "know" what he thought. For, to repeat it once more, man, like every living creature, thinks unceasingly, but does not know it; the thinking which is becoming _conscious of itself_ is only the smallest part thereof, we may say, the most superficial part, the worst part:--for this conscious thinking alone _is done in words, that is to say, in the symbols for communication,_ by means of which the origin of consciousness is revealed. In short, the development of speech and the development of consciousness (not of reason, but of reason becoming self-conscious) go hand in hand. Let it be further accepted that it is not only speech that serves as a bridge between man and man, but also the looks, the pressure and the gestures; our becoming conscious of our sense impressions, our power of being able to fix them, and as it were to locate them outside of ourselves, has increased in proportion as the necessity has increased for communicating them to _others_ by means of signs. The sign-inventing man is at the same time the man who is always more acutely self-conscious; it is only as a social animal that man has learned to become conscious of himself,--he is doing so still, and doing so more and more.--As is

obvious, my idea is that consciousness does not properly belong to the individual existence of man, but rather to the social and gregarious nature in him; that, as follows therefrom, it is only in relation to communal and gregarious utility that it is finely developed; and that consequently each of us, in spite of the best intention of _understanding_ himself as individually as possible, and of "knowing himself," will always just call into consciousness the non-individual in him, namely, his "averageness"; --that our thought itself is continuously as it were _outvoted_ by the character of consciousness--by the imperious "genius of the species" therein--and is translated back into the perspective of the herd. Fundamentally our actions are in an incomparable manner altogether personal, unique and absolutely individual--there is no doubt about it; but as soon as we translate them into consciousness, they _do not appear so any longer ..._. This is the proper phenomenalism and perspectivism as I understand it: the nature of _animal consciousness_ involves the notion that the world of which we can become conscious is only a superficial and symbolic world, a generalised and vulgarised world;--that everything which becomes conscious _becomes_ just thereby shallow, meagre, relatively stupid,--a generalisation, a symbol, a characteristic of the herd; that with the evolving of consciousness there is always combined a great, radical perversion, falsification, superficialisation, and generalisation. Finally, the growing consciousness is a danger, and whoever lives among the most conscious Europeans knows even that it is a disease. As may be conjectured, it is not the antithesis of subject and object with which I am here concerned: I leave that distinction to the epistemologists who have remained entangled in the toils of grammar (popular metaphysics). It is still less the antithesis of "thing in itself" and phenomenon, for we do not "know" enough to be entitled even _to make such a distinction._ Indeed, we have not any organ at all for _knowing,_ or for "truth": we "know" (or believe, or fancy) just as much as may be _of use_ in the interest of the human herd, the species; and even what is here called "usefulness" is ultimately only a belief, a fancy, and perhaps precisely the most fatal stupidity by which we shall one day be ruined.

355.

The Origin of our Conception of "Knowledge"--I take this explanation from the street. I heard one of the people saying that "he knew me," so I asked myself: What do the people really understand by knowledge? what do they want when they seek "knowledge"? Nothing more than that what is strange is to be traced back to something _known._ And we philosophers--have we really understood _anything more_ by knowledge? The known, that is to say, what we are accustomed to so that we no longer marvel at it, the commonplace, any kind of rule to which we are habituated, all and everything in which we know ourselves to be at home:--what? is our need of knowing not just this need of the known? the will to discover in everything strange, unusual, or questionable, something which no longer disquiets us? Is it not possible that it should be the _instinct of fear_ which enjoins upon us to know? Is it not possible that the rejoicing of the discerner should be just his rejoicing in the regained feeling of security?... One philosopher imagined the world "known" when he had traced it back to the "idea": alas, was it not because the idea was so known, so familiar to him? because he had so much less fear of the "idea"--Oh, this moderation of the discerners! let us but look at their principles, and at their solutions of the riddle of the world in this connection! When they again find aught in things, among things, or behind things that is unfortunately very well known to us, for example, our multiplication table, or our logic, or our willing and desiring, how happy they immediately are! For "what is known is understood": they are unanimous as to that. Even the most circumspect among them think that the known is at least _more easily understood_ than the strange; that for example, it is methodically ordered to proceed outward from the "inner world," from "the facts of consciousness," because it is the world which is _better known to us!_ Error of errors! The known is the accustomed, and the accustomed is the most difficult of all to "understand," that is to say, to perceive as a problem, to perceive as strange, distant, "outside of us."... The great certainty of the natural sciences in comparison with psychology and the criticism of the elements of consciousness--_unnatural_ sciences, as one might almost be entitled to call them--rests precisely on the fact that they take _what is strange_ as their object: while it is almost like something contradictory and absurd _to wish_ to take generally what is not strange as an object....

356.

In what Manner Europe will always become "more Artistic."--Providing a living still enforces even in the present day (in our transition period when so much ceases to enforce) a definite _rôle_ on almost all male Europeans, their so-called callings; some have the liberty, an apparent liberty, to choose this rôle themselves, but most have it chosen for them. The result is strange enough. Almost all Europeans confound themselves with their rôle when they advance in age; they themselves are the victims of their "good acting," they have forgotten how much chance, whim and arbitrariness swayed them when their "calling" was decided--and how many other rôles they _could_ perhaps have played: for it is now too late! Looked at more closely, we see that their characters have actually _evolved_ out of their rôle, nature out of art. There were ages in which people believed with unshaken confidence, yea, with piety, in their predestination for this very business, for that very mode of livelihood, and would not

at all acknowledge chance, or the fortuitous rôle, or arbitrariness therein. Ranks, guilds, and hereditary trade privileges succeeded] with the help of this belief, in rearing those extraordinary broad towers of society which distinguished the Middle Ages, and of which at all events one thing remains to their credit: capacity for duration (and duration is a thing of the first rank on earth!). But there are ages entirely the reverse, the properly democratic ages, in which people tend to become more and more oblivious of this belief, and a sort of impudent conviction and quite contrary mode of viewing things comes to the front, the Athenian conviction which is first observed in the epoch of Pericles, the American conviction of the present day, which wants also more and more to become a European conviction: whereby the individual is convinced that he can do almost anything, that he _can play almost any rôle,_ whereby everyone makes experiments with himself, improvises, tries anew, tries with delight, whereby all nature ceases and becomes art.... The Greeks, having adopted this _rôle-creed--_--an artist creed, if you will--underwent step by step, as is well known, a curious transformation, not in every respect worthy of imitation: _they became actual stage-players;_ and as such they enchanted, they conquered all the world, and at last even the conqueror of the world, (for the _Græculus histrio_ conquered Rome, and _not_ Greek culture, as the naïve are accustomed to say...). What I fear, however, and what is at present obvious, if we desire to perceive it, is that we modern men are quite on the same road already; and whenever a man begins to discover in what respect he plays a rôle, and to what extent he _can_ be a stage-player, he _becomes_ a stage-player.... A new flora and fauna of men thereupon springs up, which cannot grow in more stable, more restricted eras--or is left "at the bottom," under the ban and suspicion of infamy; thereupon the most interesting and insane periods of history always make their appearance, in which "stage-players," _all_ kinds of stage-players, are the real masters. Precisely thereby another species of man is always more and more injured, and in the end made impossible: above all the great "architects"; the building power is now being paralysed; the courage that makes plans for the distant future is disheartened; there begins to be a lack of organising geniuses. Who is there who would now venture to undertake works for the completion of which millenniums would have to be _reckoned_ upon? The fundamental belief is dying out, on the basis of which one could calculate, promise and anticipate the future in one's plan, and offer it as a sacrifice thereto, that in fact man has only value and significance in so far as he is _a stone in a great building;_ for which purpose he has first of all to be _solid,_ he has to be a "stone."... Above all, not a--stage-player! In short--alas! this fact will be hushed up for some considerable time to come!--that which from henceforth will no longer be built, and _can_ no longer be built, is--a society in the old sense of the term; to build that structure everything is lacking, above all, the material. _None of us are any longer material for a society:_ that is a truth which is seasonable at present! It seems to me a matter of indifference that meanwhile the most short-sighted, perhaps the most honest, and at any rate the noisiest species of men of the present day, our friends the Socialists, believe, hope, dream, and above all scream and scribble almost the opposite; in fact one already reads their watchword of the future-: "free society," on all tables and walls. Free society? Indeed! Indeed! But you know, gentlemen, sure enough whereof one builds it? Out of wooden iron! Out of the famous wooden iron! And not even out of wooden....

357.

The old Problem: "What is German?"--Let us count up apart the real acquisitions of philosophical thought for which we have to thank German intellects: are they in any allowable sense to be counted also to the credit of the whole race? Can we say that they are at the same time the work of the "German soul," or at least a symptom of it, in the sense in which we are accustomed to think, for example, of Plato's ideomania, his almost religious madness for form, as an event and an evidence of the "Greek soul"? Or would the reverse perhaps be true? Were they individually as much _exceptions_ to the spirit of the race, as was, for example, Goethe's Paganism with a good conscience? Or as Bismarck's Macchiavelism was with a good conscience, his so-called "practical politics" in Germany? Did our philosophers perhaps even go counter to the _need_ of the "German soul"? In short, were the German philosophers really philosophical _Germans_?--I call to mind three cases. Firstly, _Leibnitz's_ incomparable insight--with which he obtained the advantage not only over Descartes, but over all who had philosophised up to his time,--that consciousness is only an accident of mental representation, and _not_ its necessary and essential attribute; that consequently what we call consciousness only constitutes a state of our spiritual and psychical world (perhaps a morbid state), and is _far from being that world itself_:--is there anything German in this thought, the profundity of which has not as yet been exhausted? Is there reason to think that a person of the Latin race would not readily have stumbled on this reversal of the apparent?--for it is a reversal. Let us call to mind secondly, the immense note of interrogation which _Kant_ wrote after the notion of causality. Not that he at all doubted its legitimacy, like Hume: on the contrary, he began cautiously to define the domain within which this notion has significance generally (we have not even yet got finished with the marking out of these limits). Let us take thirdly, the astonishing hit of _Hegel,_ who stuck at no logical usage or fastidiousness when he ventured to teach that the conceptions of kinds develop _out of one another:_ with which theory the thinkers in Europe were prepared for the last great scientific movement, for Darwinism--for without Hegel there would have been no Darwin. Is there anything German in this Hegelian innovation which first introduced the decisive

conception of evolution into science?--Yes, without doubt we feel that there is something of ourselves "discovered" and divined in all three cases; we are thankful for it, and at the same time surprised; each of these three principles is a thoughtful piece of German self-confession, self-understanding, and self-knowledge. We feel with Leibnitz that "our inner world is far richer, ampler, and more concealed"; as Germans we are doubtful, like Kant, about the ultimate validity of scientific knowledge of nature, and in general about whatever _can_ be known _causaliter:_ the _knowable_ as such now appears to us of _less_ worth. We Germans should still have been Hegelians, even though there had never been a Hegel, inasmuch as we (in contradistinction to all Latin peoples) instinctively attribute to becoming, to evolution, a profounder significance and higher value than to that which "is"--we hardly believe at all in the validity of the concept "being." This is all the more the case because we are not inclined to concede to our human logic that it is logic in itself, that it is the only kind of logic (we should rather like, on the contrary, to convince ourselves that it is only a special case, and perhaps one of the strangest and most stupid).--A fourth question would be whether also _Schopenhauer_ with his Pessimism, that is to say, the problem of _the worth of existence,_ had to be a German. I think not. The event _after_ which this problem was to be expected with certainty, so that an astronomer of the soul could have calculated the day and the hour for it--namely, the decay of the belief in the Christian God, the victory of scientific atheism,--is a universal European event, in which all races are to have their share of service and honour. On the contrary, it has to be ascribed precisely to the Germans--those with whom Schopenhauer was contemporary,--that they delayed this victory of atheism longest, and endangered it most. Hegel especially was its retarder _par excellence,_ in virtue of the grandiose attempt which he made to persuade us at the very last of the divinity of existence, with the help of our sixth sense, "the historical sense." As philosopher, Schopenhauer was the _first_ avowed and inflexible atheist we Germans have had: his hostility to Hegel had here its motive. The non-divinity of existence was regarded by him as something understood, palpable, indisputable; he always lost his philosophical composure and got into a passion when he saw anyone hesitate and beat about the bush here. It is at this point that his thorough uprightness of character comes in: unconditional, honest atheism is precisely the _preliminary condition_ for his raising the problem, as a final and hardwon victory of the European conscience, as the most prolific act of two thousand years' discipline to truth, which in the end no longer tolerates the _lie_ of the belief in a God.... One sees what has really gained the victory over the Christian God--, Christian morality itself, the conception of veracity, taken ever more strictly, the confessional subtlety of the Christian conscience, translated and sublimated to the scientific conscience, to intellectual purity at any price. To look upon nature as if it were a proof of the goodness and care of a God; to interpret history in honour of a divine reason, as a constant testimony to a moral order in the world and a moral final purpose; to explain personal experiences as pious men have long enough explained them, as if everything were a dispensation or intimation of Providence, something planned and sent on behalf of the salvation of the soul: all that is now _past,_ it has conscience _against_ it, it is regarded by all the more acute consciences as disreputable and dishonourable, as mendaciousness, femininism, weakness, and cowardice,--by virtue of this severity, if by anything, we are _good_ Europeans, the heirs of Europe's longest and bravest self-conquest. When we thus reject the Christian interpretation, and condemn its "significance" as a forgery, we are immediately confronted in a striking manner with the _Schopenhauerian_ question: _Has existence then a significance at all?_--the question which will require a couple of centuries even to be completely heard in all its profundity. Schopenhauer's own answer to this question was--if I may be forgiven for saying so--a premature, juvenile reply, a mere compromise, a stoppage and sticking in the very same Christian-ascetic, moral perspectives, _the belief in which had got notice to quit_ along with the belief in God.... But he _raised_ the question--as a good European, as we have said, and _not_ as a German.--Or did the Germans prove at least by the way in which they seized on the Schopenhauerian question, their inner connection and relationship to him, their preparation for his problem, and their _need_ of it? That there has been thinking and printing even in Germany since Schopenhauer's time on the problem raised by him,--it was late enough!--does not at all suffice to enable us to decide in favour of this closer relationship; one could, on the contrary, lay great stress on the peculiar _awkwardness_ of this post-Schopenhauerian Pessimism--Germans evidently do not behave themselves here as in their element. I do not at all allude here to Eduard von Hartmann; on the contrary, my old suspicion is not vanished even at present that he is _too clever_ for us; I mean to say that as arrant rogue from the very first, he did not perhaps make merry solely over German Pessimism--and that in the end he might probably "bequeathe" to them the truth as to how far a person could bamboozle the Germans themselves in the age of bubble companies. But further, are we perhaps to reckon to the honour of Germans, the old humming-top, Bahnsen, who all his life spun about with the greatest pleasure around his realistically dialectic misery and "personal ill-luck,"--was _that_ German? (In passing I recommend his writings for the purpose for which I myself have used them, as anti-pessimistic fare, especially on account of his _elegantia psychologica,_ which, it seems to me, could alleviate even the most constipated body and soul). Or would it be proper to count such dilettanti and old maids as the mawkish apostle of virginity, Mainländer, among the genuine Germans? After all he was probably a Jew (all Jews become mawkish when they moralise). Neither Bahnsen, nor Mainländer, nor even Eduard von Hartmann, give us a reliable grasp of the question whether the pessimism of Schopenhauer (his frightened glance into an undeified

world, which has become stupid, blind, deranged and problematic, his _honourable_ fright) was not only an exceptional case among Germans, but a _German_ event: while everything else which stands in the foreground, like our valiant politics and our joyful Jingoism (which decidedly enough regards everything with reference to a principle sufficiently unphilosophical: _"Deutschland, Deutschland, über Alles"_[2] consequently _sub specie speciei,_ namely, the German _species_), testifies very plainly to the contrary. No! The Germans of to-day are _not_ pessimists! And Schopenhauer was a pessimist, I repeat it once more, as a good European, and _not_ as a German.

[2] "_Germany, Germany, above all_": the first line of the German national song.--TR.

358.

The Peasant Revolt of the Spirit.--We Europeans find ourselves in view of an immense world of ruins, where some things still tower aloft, while other objects stand mouldering and dismal, where most things however already lie on the ground, picturesque enough--where were there ever finer ruins?--overgrown with weeds, large and small. It is the Church which is this city of decay: we see the religious organisation of Christianity shaken to its deepest foundations. The belief in God is overthrown, the belief in the Christian ascetic ideal is now fighting its last fight. Such a long and solidly built work as Christianity--it was the last construction of the Romans!--could not of course be demolished..all at once; every sort of earthquake had to shake it, every sort of spirit which perforates, digs, gnaws and moulders had to assist in the work of destruction. But that which is strangest is that those who have exerted themselves most to retain and preserve Christianity, have been precisely those who did most to destroy it,--the Germans. It seems that the Germans do not understand the essence of a Church. Are they not spiritual enough, or not distrustful enough to do so? In any case the structure of the Church rests on a _southern_ freedom and liberality of spirit, and similarly on a southern suspicion of nature, man, and spirit,--it rests on a knowledge of man an experience of man, entirely different from what the north has had. The Lutheran Reformation in all its length and breadth was the indignation of the simple against something "complicated." To speak cautiously, it was a coarse, honest misunderstanding, in which much is to be forgiven,--people did not understand the mode of expression of a _victorious_ Church, and only saw corruption; they misunderstood the noble scepticism, the _luxury_ of scepticism and toleration which every victorious, self-confident power permits.... One overlooks the fact readily enough at present that as regards all cardinal questions concerning power Luther was badly endowed; he was fatally short-sighted, superficial and imprudent--and above all, as a man sprung from the people, he lacked all the hereditary qualities of a ruling caste, and all the instincts for power; so that his work, his intention to restore the work of the Romans, merely became involuntarily and unconsciously the commencement of a work of destruction. He unravelled, he tore asunder with honest rage, where the old spider had woven longest and most carefully. He gave the sacred books into the hands of everyone,--they thereby got at last into the hands of the philologists, that is to say, the annihilators of every belief based upon books. He demolished the conception of "the Church" in that he repudiated the belief in the inspiration of the Councils: for only under the supposition that the inspiring spirit which had founded the Church still lives in it, still builds it, still goes on building its house, does the conception of "the Church" retain its power. He gave back to the priest sexual intercourse: but three-fourths of the reverence of which the people (and above all the women of the people) are capable, rests on the belief that an exceptional man in this respect will also be an exceptional man in other respects. It is precisely here that the popular belief in something superhuman in man, in a miracle, in the saving God in man, has its most subtle and insidious advocate. After Luther had given a wife to the priest, he had _to take from him_ auricular confession; that was psychologically right: but thereby he practically did away with the Christian priest himself, whose profoundest utility has ever consisted I in his being a sacred ear, a silent well, and a grave for secrets. "Every man his own priest"--behind such formulæ and their bucolic slyness, there was concealed in Luther the profoundest hatred of "higher men," and of the rule of "higher men," as the Church had conceived them. Luther disowned an ideal which he did not know how to attain, while he seemed to combat and detest the degeneration thereof. As a matter of fact, he, the impossible monk, repudiated the _rule_ of the _homines religiosi_; he consequently brought about precisely the same thing within the ecclesiastical social order that he combated so impatiently in the civic order,--namely a "peasant insurrection."--As to all that grew out of his Reformation afterwards, good and bad, which can at present be almost counted up--who would be naïve enough to praise or blame Luther simply on account of these results? He is innocent of all; he knew not what he did. The art of making the European spirit shallower especially in the north, or more _good-natured,_ if people would rather hear it designated by a moral expression, undoubtedly took a clever step in advance in the Lutheran Reformation; and similarly there grew out of it the mobility and disquietude of the spirit, its thirst for independence, its belief in the right to freedom, and its "naturalness." If people wish to ascribe to the Reformation in the last instance the merit of having prepared and favoured that which we at present honour as "modern science," they must of course add that it is also accessory to bringing about the degeneration of the modern scholar, with his lack of reverence, of shame and of profundity; and

that it is also responsible for all naïve candour and plain-dealing in matters of knowledge, in short for the _plebeianism of the spirit_ which is peculiar to the last two centuries, and from which even pessimism hitherto, has not in any way delivered us. "Modern ideas" also belong to this peasant insurrection of the north against the colder, more ambiguous, more suspicious spirit of the south, which has built itself its greatest monument in the Christian Church. Let us not forget in the end what a Church is, and especially in contrast to every "State": a Church is above all an authoritative organisation which secures to the _most spiritual_ men the highest rank, and _believes_ in the power of spirituality so far as to forbid all grosser appliances of authority. Through this alone the Church is under all circumstances a _nobler_ institution than the State.--

359.

Vengeance on Intellect, and other Backgrounds of Morality.--Morality--where do you think it has its most dangerous and rancorous advocates?--There, for example, is an ill-constituted man, who does not possess enough of intellect to be able to take pleasure in it, and just enough of culture to be aware of the fact; bored, satiated, and a self-despiser; besides being cheated unfortunately by some hereditary property out of the last consolation, the "blessing of labour," the self-forgetfulness in the "day's work "; one who is thoroughly ashamed of his existence--perhaps also harbouring some vices,--and who on the other hand (by means of books to which he has no right, or more intellectual society than he can digest), cannot help vitiating himself more and more, and making himself vain and irritable: such a thoroughly poisoned man--for intellect becomes poison, culture becomes poison, possession becomes poison, solitude becomes poison, to such ill-constituted beings--gets at last into a habitual state of vengeance and inclination for vengeance.... What do you think he finds necessary, absolutely necessary in order to give himself the appearance in his own eyes of superiority over more intellectual men, so as to give himself the delight of _perfect revenge,_ at least in imagination? It is always _morality_ that he requires, one may wager on it; always the big moral words, always the high-sounding words: justice, wisdom, holiness, virtue; always the Stoicism of gestures (how well Stoicism hides what one does _not_ possess!); always the mantle of wise silence, of affability, of gentleness, and whatever else the idealist-mantle is called, in which the incurable self-despisers and also the incurably conceited walk about. Let me not be misunderstood: out of such born _enemies of the spirit_ there arises now and then the rare specimen of humanity who is honoured by the people under the name of saint or sage: it is out of such men that there arise those prodigies of morality that make a noise, and make history,--St Augustine was one of these men. Fear of the intellect, vengeance on the intellect--Oh! how often have these powerfully impelling vices become the root of virtues! Yea, virtue _itself!_--And asking the question among ourselves, even the philosopher's pretension to wisdom, which has occasionally been made here and there on the earth, the maddest and most immodest of all pretensions,--has it not always been _above all_ in India as well as in Greece, _a means of concealment?_ Sometimes, perhaps, from the point of view of education which hallows so many lies, it is a tender regard for growing and evolving persons, for disciples who have often to be guarded against themselves by means of the belief in a person (by means of an error). In most cases, however, it is a means of concealment for a philosopher, behind which he seeks protection, owing to exhaustion, age, chilliness, or hardening; as a feeling of the approaching end, as the sagacity of the instinct which animals have before their death,--they go apart, remain at rest, choose solitude, creep into caves, become _wise_.... What? Wisdom a means of concealment of the philosopher from--intellect?--

360.

Two Kinds of Causes which are Confounded.--It seems to me one of my most essential steps and advances that I have learned to distinguish the cause of an action generally from the cause of an action in a particular manner, say, in this direction, with this aim. The first kind of cause is a quantum of stored-up force, which waits to be used in some manner, for some purpose; the second kind of cause, on the contrary, is something quite unimportant in comparison with the first, an insignificant hazard for the most part, in conformity with which the quantum of force in question "discharges" itself in some unique and definite manner: the lucifer-match in relation to the barrel of gunpowder. Among those insignificant hazards and lucifer-matches I count all the so-called "aims," and similarly the still more so-called "occupations" of people: they are relatively optional, arbitrary, and almost indifferent in relation to the immense quantum of force which presses on, as we have said, to be used up in any way whatever. One generally looks at the matter in a different manner: one is accustomed to see the _impelling_ force precisely in the aim (object, calling, &c.), according to a primeval error,--but it is only the _directing_ force; the steersman and the steam have thereby been confounded. And yet it is not even always a steersman, the directing force.... Is the "aim" the "purpose," not often enough only an extenuating pretext, an additional self-blinding of conceit, which does not wish it to be said that the ship _follows_ the stream into which it has accidentally run? That it "wishes" to go that way, _because_ it _must_ go that way? That it has a direction, sure enough, but--not a steersman? We still require a criticism of the conception of "purpose."

361.

The Problem of the Actor--The problem of the actor has disquieted me the longest; I was uncertain (and am sometimes so still) whether one could not get at the dangerous conception of "artist"--a conception hitherto treated with unpardonable leniency--from this point of view. Falsity with a good conscience; delight in dissimulation breaking forth as power, pushing aside, overflowing, and sometimes extinguishing the so-called "character"; the inner longing to play a rôle, to assume a mask, to put on an _appearance;_ a surplus of capacity for adaptations of every kind, which can no longer gratify themselves in the service of the nearest and narrowest utility: all that perhaps does not pertain _solely_ to the actor in himself?... Such an instinct would develop most readily in families of the lower class of the people, who have had to pass their lives in absolute dependence, under shifting pressure and constraint, who (to accommodate themselves to their conditions, to adapt themselves always to new circumstances) had again and again to pass themselves off and represent themselves as different persons,--thus having gradually qualified themselves to adjust the mantle to _every_ wind, thereby almost becoming the mantle itself, as masters of the embodied and incarnated art of eternally playing the game of hide and seek, which one calls _mimicry_ among the animals:--until at last this ability, stored up from generation to generation, has become domineering, irrational and intractable, till as instinct it begins to command the other instincts, and begets the actor and "artist" (the buffoon, the pantaloon, the Jack-Pudding, the fool, and the clown in the first place, also the classical type of servant, Gil Blas: for in such types one has the precursors of the artist, and often enough even of the "genius"). Also under higher social conditions there grows under similar pressure a similar species of men: only the histrionic instinct is there for the most part held strictly in check by another instinct, for example, among "diplomatists";--for the rest, I should think that it would always be open to a good diplomatist to become a good actor on the stage, provided his dignity "allowed" it. As regards the _Jews,_ however, the adaptable people _par excellence,_ we should, in conformity to this line of thought, expect to see among them a world-wide historical institution at the very first, for the rearing of actors, a proper breeding-place for actors; and in fact the question is very pertinent just now: what good actor at present is _not--_a Jew? The Jew also, as a born literary man, as the actual ruler of the European press, exercises this power on the basis of his histrionic capacity: for the literary man is essentially an actor,--he plays the part of "expert," of "specialist."--Finally _women._ If we consider the whole history of women, are they not _obliged_ first of all, and above all to be actresses? If we listen to doctors who have hypnotised women, or, finally, if we love them--and let ourselves be "hypnotised" by them--what is always divulged thereby? That they "give themselves airs," even when they--"give themselves." ... Woman is so artistic ...

362.

My Belief in the Virilising of Europe.--We owe it to Napoleon (and not at all to the French Revolution, which had in view the "fraternity" of the nations, and the florid interchange of good graces among people generally) that several warlike centuries, which have not had their like in past history, may now follow one another--in short, that we have entered upon _the classical age of war,_ war at the same time scientific and popular, on the grandest scale (as regards means, talents and discipline), to which all coming millenniums will look back with envy and awe as a work of perfection:--for the national movement out of which this martial glory springs, is only the counter_-choc_ against Napoleon, and would not have existed without him. To him, consequently, one will one day be able to attribute the fact that _man_ in Europe has again got the upper hand of the merchant and the Philistine; perhaps even of "woman" also, who has become pampered owing to Christianity and the extravagant spirit of the eighteenth century, and still more owing to "modern ideas." Napoleon, who saw in modern ideas, and accordingly in civilisation, something like a personal enemy, has by this hostility proved himself one of the greatest continuators of the Renaissance: he has brought to the surface a whole block of the ancient character, the decisive block perhaps, the block of granite. And who knows but that this block of ancient character will in the end get the upper hand of the national movement, and will have to make itself in a _positive_ sense the heir and continuator of Napoleon:--who, as one knows, wanted _one_ Europe, which was to be _mistress of the world._--

363.

_How each Sex has its Prejudice about Love.--_Notwithstanding all the concessions which I am inclined to make to the monogamie prejudice, I will never admit that we should speak of _equal_ rights in the love of man and woman: there are no such equal rights. The reason is that man and woman understand something different by the term love,--and it belongs to the conditions of love in both sexes that the one sex does _not_ presuppose the same feeling, the same conception of "love," in the other sex. What woman understands by love is clear enough: complete surrender (not merely devotion) of soul and body, without any motive, without any reservation, rather with shame and terror at the thought of a devotion restricted by clauses or associated with conditions. In this absence of conditions her love is precisely a _faith:_ woman has no other.--Man, when he loves a woman, _wants_ precisely this

love from her; he is consequently, as regards himself, furthest removed from the prerequisites of feminine love; granted, however, that there should also be men to whom on their side the demand for complete devotion is not unfamiliar,--well, they are really--not men. A man who loves like a woman becomes thereby a slave; a woman, however, who loves like a woman becomes thereby a _more perfect_ woman. ... The passion of woman in its unconditional renunciation of its own rights presupposes in fact that there does _not_ exist on the other side an equal _pathos,_ an equal desire for renunciation: for if both renounced themselves out of love, there would result--well, I don't know what, perhaps a _horror vacui?_ Woman wants to be taken and accepted as a possession, she wishes to be merged in the conceptions of "possession" and "possessed"; consequently she wants one who _takes,_ who does not offer and give himself away, but who reversely is rather to be made richer in "himself"--by the increase of power, happiness and faith which the woman herself gives to him. Woman gives herself, man takes her.--I do not think one will get over this natural contrast by any social contract, or with the very best will to do justice, however desirable it may be to avoid bringing the severe, frightful, enigmatical, and unmoral elements of this antagonism constantly before our eyes. For love, regarded as complete, great, and full, is nature, and as nature, is to all eternity something "unmoral."_--Fidelity_ is accordingly included in woman's love, it follows from the definition thereof; with man fidelity _may_ readily result in consequence of his love, perhaps as gratitude or idiosyncrasy of taste, and so-called elective affinity, but it does not belong to the _essence_ of his love--and indeed so little, that one might almost be entitled to speak of a natural opposition between love and fidelity in man, whose love is just a desire to possess, and _not_ a renunciation and giving away; the desire to possess, however, comes to an end every time with the possession.... As a matter of fact it is the more subtle and jealous thirst for possession in a man (who is rarely and tardily convinced of having this "possession"), which makes his love continue; in that case it is even possible that his love may increase after the surrender,--he does not readily own that a woman has nothing more to "surrender" to him.--

364.

The Anchorite Speaks.--The art of associating with men rests essentially on one's skilfulness (which presupposes long exercise) in accepting a repast, in taking a repast, in the cuisine of which one has no confidence. Provided one comes to the table with the hunger of a wolf everything is easy "the worst society gives thee _experience_"-- Mephistopheles says; but one has not always this wolf's-hunger when one needs it! Alas! how difficult are our fellow-men to digest! First principle: to stake one's courage as in a misfortune, to seize boldly, to admire oneself at the same time, to take one's repugnance between one's teeth, to cram down one's disgust. Second principle: to "improve" one's fellow-man, by praise for example, so that he may begin to sweat out his self-complacency; or to seize a tuft of his good or "interesting" qualities, and pull at it till one gets his whole virtue out, and can put him under the folds of it. Third principle: self-hypnotism. To fix one's eye on the object of one's intercourse as on a glass knob, until, ceasing to feel pleasure or pain thereat, one falls asleep unobserved, becomes rigid, and acquires a fixed pose: a household recipe used in married life and in friendship, well tested and prized as indispensable, but not yet scientifically formulated. Its proper name is--patience.--

365.

The Anchorite Speaks once more.--We also have intercourse with "men," we also modestly put on the clothes in which people know us (_as such,_) respect us and seek us; and we thereby mingle in society, that is to say, among the disguised who do not wish to be so called; we also do like a prudent masqueraders, and courteously dismiss all curiosity which has not reference merely to our "clothes" There are however other modes and artifices for "going about" among men and associating with them: for example, as a ghost,-which is very advisable when one wants to scare them, and get rid of them easily. An example: a person grasps at us, and is unable to seize us. That frightens him. Or we enter by a closed door. Or when the lights are extinguished. Or after we are dead The latter is the artifice of _posthumous_ men _par excellence._ ("What?" said such a one once impatiently, "do you think we should delight in enduring this strangeness, coldness, death-stillness about us, all this subterranean, hidden, dim, undiscovered solitude, which is called life with us, and might just as well be called death, if we were not conscious of what _will arise_ out of us,--and that only after our death shall we attain to _our_ life and become living, ah! very living! we posthumous men!"--)

366.

At the Sight of a Learned Book.--We do not belong to those who only get their thoughts from books, or at the prompting of books,--it is our custom to think in the open air, walking, leaping, climbing, or dancing on lonesome mountains by preference, or close to the sea, where even the paths become thoughtful. Our first question concerning the value of a book, a man, or a piece of music is: Can it walk? or still better: Can it dance?... We seldom read; we do not read the worse for that--oh, how quickly we divine

how a person has arrived at his thoughts:--if it is by sitting before an ink-bottle with compressed belly and head bent over the paper: oh, how quickly we are then done with his book! The constipated bowels betray themselves, one may wager on it, just as the atmosphere of the room, the ceiling of the room, the smallness of the room, betray themselves.--These were my feelings when closing a straightforward, learned book, thankful, very thankful, but also relieved.... In the book of a learned man there is almost always something oppressive and oppressed: the "specialist" comes to light somewhere, his ardour, his seriousness, his wrath, his over-estimation of the nook in which he sits and spins, his hump--every specialist has his hump. A learned book also always mirrors a distorted soul: every trade distorts. Look at our friends again with whom we have spent our youth, after they have taken possession of their science: alas! how the reverse has always taken place! Alas! how they themselves are now for ever occupied and possessed by their science! Grown into their nook, crumpled into unrecognisability, constrained, deprived of their equilibrium, emaciated and angular everywhere, perfectly round only in one place,--we are moved and silent when we find them so. Every handicraft, granting even that it has a golden floor,[3] has also a leaden ceiling above it, which presses and presses on the soul, till it is pressed into a strange and distorted shape. There is nothing to alter here. We need not think that it is at all possible to obviate this disfigurement by any educational artifice whatever. Every kind of _perfection_ is purchased at a high price on earth, where everything is perhaps purchased too dear; one is an expert in one's department at the price of being also a victim of one's department. But you want to have it otherwise--"more reasonable," above all more convenient--is it not so, my dear contemporaries? Very well! But then you will also immediately get something different: instead of the craftsman and expert, you will get the literary man, the versatile, "many-sided "littérateur, who to be sure lacks the hump--not taking account of the hump or bow which he makes before you as the shopman of the intellect and the "porter" of culture--, the littérateur, who _is_ really nothing, but "represents" almost everything: he plays and "represents" the expert, he also takes it upon himself in all modesty _to see that he is_ paid, honoured and celebrated in this position.--No, my learned friends! I bless you even on account of your humps! And also because like me you despise the littérateurs and parasites of culture! And because you do not know how to make merchandise of your intellect! And have so many opinions which cannot be expressed in money value! And because you do not represent anything which you _are_ not! Because your sole desire is to become masters of your craft; because you reverence every kind of mastership and ability, and repudiate with the most relentless scorn everything of a make-believe, half-genuine, dressed-up, virtuoso, demagogic, histrionic nature in _litteris et artibus_--all that which does not convince you by its absolute _genuineness_ of discipline and preparatory training, or cannot stand your test! (Even genius does not help a person to get over such a defect, however well it may be able to deceive with regard to it: one understands this if one has once looked closely at our most gifted painters and musicians,--who almost without exception, can artificially and supplementarily appropriate to themselves (by means of artful inventions of style, make-shifts, and even principles), the _appearance_ of that genuineness, that solidity of training and culture; to be sure, without thereby deceiving themselves, without thereby imposing perpetual silence on their bad consciences. For you know of course that all great modern artists suffer from bad consciences?...)

[3] An allusion to the German Proverb, "Handwerk hat einen goldenen Boden."--TR.

367.

_How one has to Distinguish first of all in Works of Art--_Everything that is thought, versified, painted and composed, yea, even built and moulded, belongs either to monologic art, or to art before witnesses. Under the latter there is also to be included the apparently monologic art which involves the belief in God, the whole lyric of prayer; because for a pious man there is no solitude,--we, the godless, have been the first to devise this invention. I know of no profounder distinction in all the perspective of the artist than this: Whether he looks at his growing work of art (at "himself--") with the eye of the witness; or whether he "has forgotten the world," as is the essential thing in all monologic art,--it rests _on forgetting,_ it is the music of forgetting.

368.

_The Cynic Speaks.--_My objections to Wagner's music are physiological objections. Why should I therefore begin by disguising them Under æsthetic formulæ? My "point" is that I can no longer breathe freely when this music begins to operate on me; my _foot_ immediately becomes indignant at it and rebels: for what it needs is time, dance and march; it demands first of all from music the ecstasies which are in _good_ walking, striding, leaping and dancing. But do not my stomach, my heart, my blood and my bowels also protest? Do I not become hoarse unawares under its influence? And then I ask myself what my body really _wants_ from music generally. I believe it wants to have _relief:_ so that all animal functions should be accelerated by means of light, bold, unfettered, self-assured rhythms; so that brazen, leaden life should be gilded by means of golden, good, tender harmonies. My melancholy would fain rest its head in the hiding-places and abysses of _perfection:_ for this reason I need music. What do I care

for the drama! What do I care for the spasms of its moral ecstasies, in which the "people" have their satisfaction! What do I care for the whole pantomimic hocus-pocus of the actor!... It will now be divined that I am essentially anti-theatrical at heart,--but Wagner on the contrary, was essentially a man of the stage and an actor, the most enthusiastic mummer-worshipper that has ever existed, even among musicians!... And let it be said in passing that if Wagner's theory was that "drama is the object, and music is only the means to it,"--his _practice_ on the contrary from beginning to end has been to the effect that "attitude is the object, drama and even music can never be anything else but means to _this._" Music as a means of elucidating, strengthening and intensifying dramatic poses and the actor's appeal to the senses, and Wagnerian drama only an opportunity for a number of dramatic attitudes! Wagner possessed, along with all other instincts, the dictatorial instinct of a great actor in all and everything, and as has been said, also as a musician.--I once made this clear with some trouble to a thorough-going Wagnerian, and I had reasons for adding:--"Do be a little more honest with yourself: we are not now in the theatre. In the theatre we are only honest in the mass; as individuals we lie, we belie even ourselves. We leave ourselves at home when we go to the theatre; we there renounce the right to our own tongue and choice, to our taste, and even to our courage as we possess it and practise it within our own four walls in relation to God and man. No one takes his finest taste in art into the theatre with him, not even the artist who works for the theatre: there one is people, public, herd, woman, Pharisee, voting animal, democrat, neighbour, and fellow-creature; there even the most personal conscience succumbs to the levelling charm of the 'great multitude'; there stupidity operates as wantonness and contagion; there the neighbour rules, there one _becomes_ a neighbour...." (I have forgotten to mention what my enlightened Wagnerian answered to my physiological objections: "So the fact is that you are really not healthy enough for our music?"--)

369.

Juxtapositions in us.--Must we not acknowledge to ourselves, we artists, that there is a strange discrepancy in us; that on the one hand our taste, and on the other hand our creative power, keep apart in an extraordinary manner, continue apart, and have a separate growth;--I mean to say that they have entirely different gradations and _tempi_ of age, youth, maturity, mellowness and rottenness? So that, for example, a musician could all his life create things which _contradicted_ all that his ear and heart, spoilt for listening, prized, relished and preferred:--he would not even require to be aware of the contradiction! As an almost painfully regular experience shows, a person's taste can easily outgrow the taste of his power, even without the latter being thereby paralysed or checked in its productivity. The reverse, however, can also to some extent take place,--and it is to this especially that I should like to direct the attention of artists. A constant producer, a man who is a "mother" in the grand sense of the term, one who no longer knows or hears of anything except pregnancies and child-beds of his spirit, who has no time at all to reflect and make comparisons with regard to himself and his work, who is also no longer inclined to exercise his taste, but simply forgets it, letting it take its chance of standing, lying or falling,--perhaps such a man at last produces works _on which he is then quite unfit to pass a judgment:_ so that he speaks and thinks foolishly about them and about himself. This seems to me almost the normal condition with fruitful artists,--nobody knows a child worse than its parents--and the rule applies even (to take an immense example) to the entire Greek world of poetry and art, which was never "conscious" of what it had done....

370.

What is Romanticism?--It will be remembered perhaps, at least among my friends, that at first I assailed the modern world with some gross errors and exaggerations, but at any rate with _hope_ in my heart. I recognised--who knows from what personal experiences?--the philosophical pessimism of the nineteenth century as the symptom of a higher power of thought, a more daring courage and a more triumphant _plenitude_ of life than had been characteristic of the eighteenth century, the age of Hume, Kant, Condillac, and the sensualists: so that the tragic view of things seemed to me the peculiar _luxury_ of our culture, its most precious, noble, and dangerous mode of prodigality; but nevertheless, in view of its overflowing wealth, a _justifiable_ luxury. In the same way I interpreted for myself German music as the expression of a Dionysian power in the German soul: I thought I heard in it the earthquake by means of which a primeval force that had been imprisoned for ages was finally finding vent--indifferent as to whether all that usually calls itself culture was thereby made to totter. It is obvious that I then misunderstood what constitutes the veritable character both of philosophical pessimism and of German music,--namely, their _Romanticism._ What is Romanticism? Every art and every philosophy may be regarded as a healing and helping appliance in the service of growing, struggling life: they always presuppose suffering and sufferers. But there are two kinds of sufferers: on the one hand those that suffer from _overflowing vitality,_ who need Dionysian art, and require a tragic view and insight into life; and on the other hand those who suffer from _reduced vitality,_ who seek repose, quietness, calm seas, and deliverance from themselves through art or knowledge, or else intoxication, spasm, bewilderment and madness. All Romanticism in art and knowledge responds to the twofold craving of the _latter;_ to them Schopenhauer as well as Wagner responded (and responds),--to name those most celebrated and decided

romanticists, who were then _misunderstood_ by me (_not_ however to their disadvantage, as may be reasonably conceded to me). The being richest in overflowing vitality, the Dionysian God and man, may not only allow himself the spectacle of the horrible and questionable, but even the fearful deed itself, and all the luxury of destruction, disorganisation and negation. With him evil, senselessness and ugliness seem as it were licensed, in consequence of the overflowing plenitude of procreative, fructifying power, which can convert every desert into a luxuriant orchard. Conversely, the greatest sufferer, the man poorest in vitality, would have most need of mildness, peace and kindliness in thought and action: he would need, if possible, a God who is specially the God of the sick, a "Saviour"; similarly he would have need of logic, the abstract intelligibility of existence--for logic soothes and gives confidence;--in short he would need a certain warm, fear-dispelling narrowness and imprisonment within optimistic horizons. In this manner I gradually began to understand Epicurus, the opposite of a Dionysian pessimist;--in a similar manner also the "Christian," who in fact is only a type of Epicurean, and like him essentially a romanticist:--and my vision has always become keener in tracing that most difficult and insidious of all forms of _retrospective inference,_ in which, most mistakes have been made--the inference from the work to its author from the deed to its doer, from the ideal to him who _needs_ it, from every mode of thinking and valuing to the imperative _want_ behind it.--In regard to all æsthetic values I now avail myself of this radical distinction: I ask in every single case, "Has hunger or superfluity become creative here?" At the outset another distinction might seem to recommend itself more--it is far more conspicuous,--namely, to have in view whether the desire for rigidity, for perpetuation, for _being_ is the cause of the creating, or the desire for destruction, for change, for the new, for the future--for _becoming._ But when looked at more carefully, both these kinds of desire prove themselves ambiguous, and are explicable precisely according to the before-mentioned, and, as it seems to me, rightly preferred scheme. The desire for _destruction,_ change and becoming, may be the expression of overflowing power, pregnant with futurity (my _terminus_ for this is of course the word "Dionysian"); but it may also be the hatred of the ill-constituted, destitute and unfortunate, which destroys, and _must_ destroy, because the enduring, yea, all that endures, in fact all being, excites and provokes it. To understand this emotion we have but to look closely at our anarchists. The will to _perpetuation_ requires equally a double interpretation. It may on the one hand proceed from gratitude and love:--art of this origin will always be an art of apotheosis, perhaps dithyrambic, as with Rubens, mocking divinely, as with Hafiz, or clear and kind-hearted as with Goethe, and spreading a Homeric brightness and glory over everything (in this case I speak of _Apollonian_ art). It may also, however, be the tyrannical will of a sorely-suffering, struggling or tortured being, who would like to stamp his most personal, individual and narrow characteristics, the very idiosyncrasy of his suffering, as an obligatory law and constraint on others; who, as it were, takes revenge on all things, in that he imprints, enforces and brands _his_ image, the image of _his_ torture, upon them. The latter is _romantic pessimism_ in its most extreme form, whether it be as Schopenhauerian will-philosophy, or as Wagnerian music:--romantic pessimism, the last _great_ event in the destiny of our civilisation. (That there _may be_ quite a different kind of pessimism, a classical pessimism--this presentiment and vision belongs to me, as something inseparable from me, as my _proprium_ and _ipsissimum;_ only that the word "classical" is repugnant to my ears, it has become far too worn, too indefinite and indistinguishable. I call that pessimism of the future,--for it is coming! I see it coming!--_Dionysian_ pessimism.)

371.

We Unintelligible Ones.--Have we ever complained among ourselves of being misunderstood, misjudged, and confounded with others; of being calumniated, misheard, and not heard? That is just our lot--alas, for a long time yet! say, to be modest, until 1901--, it is also our distinction; we should not have sufficient respect for ourselves if we wished it otherwise. People confound us with others--the reason of it is that we ourselves grow, we change continually, we cast off old bark, we still slough every spring, we always become younger, higher, stronger, as men of the future, we thrust our roots always more powerfully into the deep--into evil--, while at the same time we embrace the heavens ever more lovingly, more extensively, and suck in their light ever more eagerly with all our branches and leaves. We grow like trees--that is difficult to understand, like all life!--not in one place, but everywhere, not in one direction only, but upwards and outwards, as well as inwards and downwards. At the same time our force shoots forth in stem, branches, and roots; we are really no longer free to do anything separately, or to _be_ anything separately.... Such is our lot, as we have said: we grow in _height;_ and even should it be our calamity--for we dwell ever closer to the lightning!--well, we honour it none the less on that account; it is that which we do not wish to share with others, which we do not wish to bestow upon others, the fate of all elevation, _our_ fate....

372.

_Why we are not Idealists.--_Formerly philosophers were afraid of the senses: have we, perhaps, been far too forgetful of this fear? We are at present all of us sensualists, we representatives of the present and of the future in philosophy,--_not_ according to theory, however, but in _praxis,_ in practice.... Those former philosophers, on the contrary, thought that the senses lured them out

of _their_ world, the cold realm of "ideas," to a dangerous southern island, where they were afraid that their philosopher-virtues would melt away like snow in the sun. "Wax in the ears," was then almost a condition of philosophising; a genuine philosopher no longer listened to life, in so far as life is music, he _denied_ the music of life--it is an old philosophical superstition that all music is Sirens' music.--Now we should be inclined at the present day to judge precisely in the opposite manner (which in itself might be just as false), and to regard _ideas,_ with their cold, anæmic appearance, and not even in spite of this appearance, as worse seducers than the senses. They have always lived on the "blood" of the philosopher, they always consumed his senses, and indeed, if you will believe me, his "heart" as well. Those old philosophers were heartless: philosophising was always a species of vampirism. At the sight of such figures even as Spinoza, do you not feel a profoundly enigmatical and disquieting sort of impression? Do you not see the drama which is here performed, the constantly _increasing pallor_--, the spiritualisation always more ideally displayed? Do you not imagine some long-concealed blood-sucker in the background, which makes its beginning with the senses, and in the end retains or leaves behind nothing but bones and their rattling?--I mean categories, formulæ, and _words_(for you will pardon me in saying that what _remains_ of Spinoza, _amor intellectualis dei,_ is rattling and nothing more! What is _amor,_ what is _deus,_ when they have lost every drop of blood?...) _In summa:_ all philosophical idealism has hitherto been something like a disease, where it has not been, as in the case of Plato, the prudence of superabundant and dangerous healthfulness, the fear of _overpowerful_ senses, and the wisdom of a wise Socratic.--Perhaps, is it the case that we moderns are merely not sufficiently sound _to require_ Plato's idealism? And we do not fear the senses because----

373.

"Science" as Prejudice.--It follows from the laws of class distinction that the learned, in so far as they belong to the intellectual middle-class, are debarred from getting even a sight of the really _great_ problems and notes of interrogation. Besides, their courage, and similarly their outlook, does not reach so far,--and above all, their need, which makes them investigators, their innate anticipation and desire that things should be constituted _in such and such a way_, their fears and hopes are too soon quieted and set at rest. For example, that which makes the pedantic Englishman, Herbert Spencer, so enthusiastic in his way, and impels him to draw a line of hope, a horizon of desirability, the final reconciliation of "egoism and altruism" of which he dreams,--that almost causes nausea to people like us:--a humanity with such Spencerian perspectives as ultimate perspectives would seem to us deserving of contempt, of extermination! But the _fact_ that something has to be taken by him as his highest hope, which is regarded, and may well be regarded, by others merely as a distasteful possibility, is a note of interrogation which Spencer could not have foreseen.... It is just the same with the belief with which at present so many materialistic natural-scientists are content, the belief in a world which is supposed to have its equivalent and measure in human thinking and human valuations, a "world of truth" at which we might be able ultimately to arrive with the help of our insignificant, four-cornered human reason! What? do we actually wish to have existence debased in that fashion to a ready-reckoner exercise and calculation for stay-at-home mathematicians? We should not, above all, seek to divest existence of its _ambiguous_ character: _good_ taste forbids it, gentlemen, the taste of reverence for everything that goes beyond your horizon! That a world-interpretation is alone right by which _you_ maintain your position, by which investigation and work can go on scientifically in _your_ sense (you really mean _mechanically?_), an interpretation which acknowledges numbering, calculating, weighing, seeing and handling, and nothing more--such an idea is a piece of grossness and naïvety, provided it is not lunacy and idiocy. Would the reverse not be quite probable, that the most superficial and external characters of existence--its most apparent quality, its outside, its embodiment--should let themselves be apprehended first? perhaps alone allow themselves to be apprehended? A "scientific" interpretation of the world as you understand it might consequently still be one of the _stupidest,_ that is to say, the most destitute of significance, of all possible world-interpretations--I say this in confidence to my friends the Mechanicians, who to-day like to hobnob with philosophers, and absolutely believe that mechanics is the teaching of the first and last laws upon which, as upon a ground-floor, all existence must be built. But an essentially mechanical world would be an essentially _meaningless_ world! Supposing we valued the _worth_ of a music with reference to how much it could be counted, calculated, or formulated --how absurd such a "scientific" estimate of music would be! What would one have apprehended, understood, or discerned in it! Nothing, absolutely nothing of what is really "music" in it!...

374.

Our new "Infinite"--How far the perspective character of existence extends, or whether it have any other character at all, whether an existence without explanation, without "sense" does not just become "nonsense," whether, on the other hand, all existence is not essentially an _explaining_ existence--these questions, as is right and proper, cannot be determined even by the most diligent and severely conscientious analysis and self-examination of the intellect, because in this analysis the human intellect cannot avoid

seeing itself in its perspective forms, and _only_ in them. We cannot see round our corner: it is hopeless curiosity to want to know what other modes of intellect and perspective there _might_ be: for example, whether any kind of being could perceive time backwards, or alternately forwards and backwards (by which another direction of life and another conception of cause and effect would be given). But I think that we are to-day at least far from the ludicrous immodesty of decreeing from our nook that there _can_ only be legitimate perspectives from that nook. The world, on the contrary, has once more become "infinite" to us: in so far we cannot dismiss the possibility that it _contains infinite interpretations._ Once more the great horror seizes us--but who would desire forthwith to deify once more _this_ monster of an unknown world in the old fashion? And perhaps worship _the_ unknown thing as _the_ "unknown person" in future? Ah! there are too many _ungodly_ possibilities of interpretation comprised in this unknown, too much devilment, stupidity and folly of interpretation,--our own human, all too human interpretation itself, which we know....

375.

Why we Seem to be Epicureans.--We are cautious, we modern men, with regard to final convictions, our distrust lies in wait for the enchantments and tricks of conscience involved in every strong belief, in every absolute Yea and Nay: how is this explained? Perhaps one may see in it a good deal of the caution of the "burnt child," of the disillusioned idealist; but one may also see in it another and better element, the joyful curiosity of a former lingerer in a corner, who has been brought to despair by his nook, and now luxuriates and revels in its antithesis, in the unbounded, in the "open air in itself." Thus there is developed an almost Epicurean inclination for knowledge, which does not readily lose sight of the questionable character of things; likewise also a repugnance to pompous moral phrases and attitudes, a taste that repudiates all coarse, square contrasts, and is proudly conscious of its habitual reserve. For _this too_ constitutes our pride, this easy tightening of the reins in our headlong impulse after certainty, this self-control of the rider in his most furious riding: for now, as of old, we have mad, fiery steeds under us, and if we delay, it is certainly least of all the danger which causes us to delay....

376.

Our Slow Periods.--It is thus that artists feel, and all men of "works," the maternal species of men: they always believe at every chapter of their life--a work always makes a chapter--that they have now reached the goal itself; they would always patiently accept death with the feeling: "we are ripe for it." This is not the expression of exhaustion,--but rather that of a certain autumnal sunniness and mildness, which the work itself, the maturing of the work, always leaves behind in its originator. Then the _tempo_ of life slows down--turns thick and flows with honey--into long pauses, into the belief in _the_ long pause....

377.

_We Homeless Ones.--_Among the Europeans of to-day there are not lacking those who may call themselves homeless ones in a way which is at once a distinction and an honour; it is by them that my secret wisdom and _gaya scienza_ is especially to be laid to heart! For their lot is hard, their hope uncertain; it is a clever feat to devise consolation for them. But what good does it do! We children of the future, how _could_ we be at home in the present? We are unfavourable to all ideals which could make us feel at home in this frail, broken-down, transition period; and as regards the "realities" thereof, we do not believe in their _endurance. _ The ice which still carries has become very thin: the thawing wind blows; we ourselves, the homeless ones, are an agency that breaks the ice, and the other too thin "realities."... We "preserve" nothing, nor would we return to any past age; we are not at all "liberal," we do not labour for "progress," we do not need first to stop our ears to the song of the market-place and the sirens of the future--their song of "equal rights," "free society," "no longer either lords or slaves," does not allure us! We do not by any means think it desirable that the kingdom of righteousness and peace should be established on earth (because under any circumstances it would be the kingdom of the profoundest mediocrity and Chinaism); we rejoice in all men, who like ourselves love danger, war and adventure, who do not make compromises, nor let themselves be captured, conciliated and stunted; we count ourselves among the conquerors; we ponder over the need of a new order of things, even of a new slavery--for every strengthening and elevation of the type "man" also involves a new form of slavery. Is it not obvious that with all this we must feel ill at ease in an age which claims the honour of being the most humane, gentle and just that the sun has ever seen? What a pity that at the mere mention of these fine words, the thoughts at the bottom of our hearts are all the more unpleasant, that we see therein only the expression--or the masquerade--of profound weakening, exhaustion, age, and declining power! What can it matter to us with what kind of tinsel an invalid decks out his weakness? He may parade it as his _virtue;_ there is no doubt whatever that weakness makes people gentle, alas, so gentle, so just, so inoffensive, so "humane"!--The "religion of pity," to which people would like to persuade us--yes, we

know sufficiently well the hysterical little men and women who need this religion at present as a cloak and adornment! We are no humanitarians; we should not dare to speak of our "love of mankind"; for that, a person of our stamp is not enough of an actor! Or not sufficiently Saint-Simonist, not sufficiently French. A person must have been affected with a _Gallic_ excess of erotic susceptibility and amorous impatience even to approach mankind honourably with his lewdness.... Mankind! Was there ever a more hideous old woman among all old women (unless perhaps it were "the Truth": a question for philosophers)? No, we do not love Mankind! On the other hand, however, we are not nearly "German" enough (in the sense in which the word "German" is current at present) to advocate nationalism and race-hatred, or take delight in the national heart-itch and blood-poisoning, on account of which the nations of Europe are at present bounded off and secluded from one another as if by quarantines. We are too unprejudiced for that, too perverse, too fastidious; also too well-informed, and too much "travelled." We prefer much rather to live on mountains, apart and "out of season," in past or coming centuries, in order merely to spare ourselves the silent rage to which we know we should be condemned as witnesses of a system of politics which makes the German nation barren by making it vain, and which is a _petty_ system besides:--will it not be necessary for this system to plant itself between two mortal hatreds, lest its own creation should immediately collapse? Will it not _be obliged_ to desire the perpetuation of the petty-state system of Europe?... We homeless ones are too diverse and mixed in race and descent for "modern men," and are consequently little tempted to participate in the falsified racial self-admiration and lewdness which at present display themselves in Germany, as signs of German sentiment, and which strike one as doubly false and unbecoming in the people with the "historical sense." We are, in a word--and it shall be our word of honour!--_good Europeans,_ the heirs of Europe, the rich, over-wealthy heirs, but too deeply obligated heirs of millenniums of European thought. As such, we have also outgrown Christianity, and are disinclined to it--and just because we have grown _out of_ it, because our forefathers were Christians uncompromising in their Christian integrity, who willingly sacrificed possessions and positions, blood and country, for the sake of their belief. We--do the same. For what, then? For our unbelief? For all sorts of unbelief? Nay, you know better than that, my friends! The hidden _Yea_ in you is stronger than all the Nays and Perhapses, of which you and your age are sick; and when you are obliged to put out to sea, you emigrants, it is--once more a _faith_ which urges you thereto!...

378.

"And once more Grow Clear."--We, the generous and rich in spirit, who stand at the sides of the streets like open fountains and would hinder no one from drinking from us: we do not know, alas! how to defend ourselves when we should like to do so; we have no means of preventing ourselves being made _turbid_ and dark,--we have no means of preventing the age in which we live casting its "up-to-date rubbish" into us, or of hindering filthy birds throwing their excrement, the boys their trash, and fatigued resting travellers their misery, great and small, into us. But we do as we have always done: we take whatever is cast into us down into our depths--for we are deep, we do not forget--_and once more grow clear_...

379.

The Fool's Interruption.--It is not a misanthrope who has written this book: the hatred of men costs too dear to-day. To hate as they formerly hated _man,_ in the fashion of Timon, completely, without qualification, with all the heart, from the pure _love_ of hatred--for that purpose one would have to renounce contempt:--and how much refined pleasure, how much patience, how much benevolence even, do we owe to contempt! Moreover we are thereby the "elect of God": refined contempt is our taste and privilege, our art, our virtue perhaps, we, the most modern amongst the moderns!... Hatred, on the contrary, makes equal, it puts men face to face, in hatred there is honour; finally, in hatred there is _fear,_ quite a large amount of fear. We fearless ones, however, we, the most intellectual men of the period, know our advantage well enough to live without fear as the most intellectual persons of this age. People will not easily behead us, shut us up, or banish us; they will not even ban or burn our books. The age loves intellect, it loves us, and needs us, even when we have to give it to understand that we are artists in despising; that all intercourse with men is something of a horror to us; that with all our gentleness, patience, humanity and courteousness, we cannot persuade our nose to abandon its prejudice against the proximity of man; that we love nature the more, the less humanly things are done by her, and that we love art _when_ it is the flight of the artist from man, or the raillery of the artist at man, or the raillery of the artist at himself....

380.

"_The Wanderer" Speaks._--In order for once to get a glimpse of our European morality from a distance, in order to compare it with other earlier or future moralities, one must do as the traveller who wants to know the height of the towers of a city: for that purpose he _leaves_ the city. "Thoughts concerning moral prejudices," if they are not to be prejudices concerning prejudices, presuppose a

position _outside of_ morality, some sort of world beyond good and evil, to which one must ascend, climb, or fly--and in the given case at any rate, a position beyond _our_ good and evil, an emancipation from all "Europe," understood as a sum of inviolable valuations which have become part and parcel of our flesh and blood. That one does _want_ to get outside, or aloft, is perhaps a sort of madness, a peculiar, unreasonable "thou must"--for even we thinkers have our idiosyncrasies of "unfree will"--: the question is whether one _can_ really get there. That may depend on manifold conditions: in the main it is a question of how light or how heavy we are, the problem of our "specific gravity." One must be _very light_ in order to impel one's will to knowledge to such a distance, and as it were beyond one's age, in order to create eyes for oneself for the survey of millenniums, and a pure heaven in these eyes besides! One must have freed oneself from many things by which we Europeans of to-day are oppressed, hindered, held down, and made heavy. The man of such a "Beyond," who wants to get even in sight of the highest standards of worth of his age, must first of all "surmount" this age in himself--it is the test of his power--and consequently not only his age, but also his past aversion and opposition _to_ his age, his suffering _caused by_ his age, his unseasonableness, his Romanticism....

381.

The Question of Intelligibility.--One not only wants to be understood when one writes, but also--quite as certainly--_not_ to be understood. It is by no means an objection to a book when someone finds it unintelligible: perhaps this might just have been the intention of its author,--perhaps he did not _want_ to be understood by "anyone." A distinguished intellect and taste, when it wants to communicate its thoughts, always selects its hearers; by selecting them, it at the same time closes its barriers against "the others." It is there that all the more refined laws of style have their origin: they at the same time keep off, they create distance, they prevent "access" (intelligibility, as we have said,)--while they open the ears of those who are acoustically related to them. And to say it between ourselves and with reference to my own case,--I do not desire that either my ignorance, or the vivacity of my temperament, should prevent me being understood by _you,_ my friends: I certainly do not desire that my vivacity should have that effect, however much it may impel me to arrive quickly at an object, in order to arrive at it at all. For I think it is best to do with profound problems as with a cold bath--quickly in, quickly out. That one does not thereby get into the depths, that one does not get deep enough _down_--is a superstition of the hydrophobic, the enemies of cold water; they speak without experience. Oh! the great cold makes one quick!--And let me ask by the way: Is it a fact that a thing has been misunderstood and unrecognised when it has only been touched upon in passing, glanced at, flashed at? Must one absolutely sit upon it in the first place? Must one have brooded on it as on an egg? _Diu noctuque incubando,_ as Newton said of himself? At least there are truths of a peculiar shyness and ticklishness which one can only get hold of suddenly, and in no other way,--which one must either _take by surprise,_ or leave alone.... Finally, my brevity has still another value: on those questions which pre-occupy me, I must say a great deal briefly, in order that it may be heard yet more briefly. For as immoralist, one has to take care lest one ruins innocence, I mean the asses and old maids of both sexes, who get nothing from life but their innocence; moreover my writings are meant to fill them with enthusiasm, to elevate them, to encourage them in virtue. I should be at a loss to know of anything more amusing than to see enthusiastic old asses and maids moved by the sweet feelings of virtue: and "that have I seen"--spake Zarathustra. So much with respect to brevity; the matter stands worse as regards my ignorance, of which I make no secret to myself. There are hours in which I am ashamed of it; to be sure there are likewise hours in which I am ashamed of this shame. Perhaps we philosophers, all of us, are badly placed at present with regard to knowledge: science is growing, the most learned of us are on the point of discovering that we know too little. But it would be worse still if it were otherwise,--if we knew too much; our duty is and remains first of all, not to get into confusion about ourselves. We _are_ different from the learned; although it cannot be denied that amongst other things we are also learned. We have different needs, a different growth, a different digestion: we need more, we need also less. There is no formula as to how much an intellect needs for its nourishment; if, however, its taste be in the direction of independence, rapid coming and going, travelling, and perhaps adventure for which only the swiftest are qualified, it prefers rather to live free on poor fare, than to be unfree and plethoric. Not fat, but the greatest suppleness and power is what a good dancer wishes from his nourishment,--and I know not what the spirit of a philosopher would like better than to be a good dancer. For the dance is his ideal, and also his art, in the end likewise his sole piety, his "divine service."...

382.

Great Healthiness.--We, the new, the nameless, the hard-to-understand, we firstlings of a yet untried future--we require for a new end also a new means, namely, a new healthiness, stronger, sharper, tougher, bolder and merrier than any healthiness hitherto. He whose soul longs to experience the whole range of hitherto recognised values and desirabilities, and to circumnavigate all the coasts of this ideal "Mediterranean Sea," who, from the adventures of his most personal experience, wants to know how it feels to be a conqueror and discoverer of the ideal--as likewise how it is with the artist, the saint, the legislator, the sage, the scholar, the

devotee, the prophet, and the godly Nonconformist of the old style:--requires one thing above all for that purpose, _great healthiness--_such healthiness as one not only possesses, but also constantly acquires and must acquire, because one continually sacrifices it again, and must sacrifice it!--And now, after having been long on the way in this fashion, we Argonauts of the ideal, who are more courageous perhaps than prudent, and often enough shipwrecked and brought to grief, nevertheless, as said above, healthier than people would like to admit, dangerously healthy, always healthy again,--it would seem, as if in recompense for it all, that we have a still undiscovered country before us, the boundaries of which no one has yet seen, a beyond to all countries and corners of the ideal known hitherto, a world so over-rich in the beautiful, the strange, the questionable, the frightful, and the divine, that our curiosity as well as our thirst for possession thereof, have got out of hand--alas! that nothing will now any longer satisfy us! How could we still be content with _the man of the present day_ after such peeps, and with such a craving in our conscience and consciousness? What a pity; but it is unavoidable that we should look on the worthiest aims and hopes of the man of the present day with ill-concealed amusement, and perhaps should no longer look at them. Another ideal runs on before us, a strange, tempting ideal, full of danger, to which we should not like to persuade any one, because we do not so readily acknowledge any one's _right thereto:_ the ideal of a spirit who plays naïvely (that is to say involuntarily and from overflowing abundance and power) with everything that has hitherto been called holy, good, inviolable, divine; to whom the loftiest conception which the people have reasonably made their measure of value, would already imply danger, ruin, abasement, or at least relaxation, blindness, or temporary self-forgetfulness; the ideal of a humanly superhuman welfare and benevolence, which may often enough appear _inhuman,_ for example, when put by the side of all past seriousness on earth, and in comparison with all past solemnities in bearing, word, tone, look, morality and pursuit, as their truest involuntary parody,--but with which, nevertheless, perhaps _the great seriousness_ only commences, the proper interrogation mark is set up, the fate of the soul changes, the hour-hand moves, and tragedy _begins_....

383.

Epilogue.---But while I slowly, slowly finish the painting of this sombre interrogation-mark, and am still inclined to remind my readers of the virtues of right reading--oh, what forgotten and unknown virtues--it comes to pass that the wickedest, merriest, gnome-like laughter resounds around me: the spirits of my book themselves pounce upon me, pull me by the ears, and call me to order. "We cannot endure it any longer," they shout to me, "away, away with this raven-black music. Is it not clear morning round about us? And green, soft ground and turf, the domain of the dance? Was there ever a better hour in which to be joyful? Who will sing us a song, a morning song, so sunny, so light and so fledged that it will _not_ scare the tantrums,--but will rather invite them to take part in the singing and dancing. And better a simple rustic bagpipe than such weird sounds, such toad-croakings, grave-voices and marmot-pipings, with which you have hitherto regaled us in your wilderness, Mr Anchorite and Musician of the Future! No! Not such tones! But let us strike up something more agreeable and more joyful!"--You would like to have it so, my impatient friends? Well! Who would not willingly accede to your wishes? My bagpipe is waiting, and my voice also--it may sound a little hoarse; take it as it is! don't forget we are in the mountains! But what you will hear is at least new; and if you do not understand it, if you misunderstand the _minstrel,_ what does it matter! That--has always been "The Minstrel's Curse."[4] So much the more distinctly can you hear his music and melody, so much the better also can you--dance to his piping. _Would you like_ to do that?...

[4] Title of the well-known poem of Uhland.--TR.

APPENDIX

SONGS OF PRINCE FREE-AS-A-BIRD

TO GOETHE.[1]

"The Undecaying" Is but thy label, God the betraying Is poets' fable.

Our aims all are thwarted By the World-wheel's blind roll: "Doom," says the downhearted, "Sport," says the fool.

The World-sport, all-ruling, Mingles false with true: The Eternally Fooling Makes us play, too!

THE POET'S CALL.

As 'neath a shady tree I sat After long toil to take my pleasure, I heard a tapping "pit-a-pat" Beat prettily in rhythmic measure. Tho' first I scowled, my face set hard, The sound at length my sense entrapping Forced me to speak like any bard, And keep true time unto the tapping.

As I made verses, never stopping, Each syllable the bird went after, Keeping in time with dainty hopping! I burst into unmeasured laughter! What, you a poet? You a poet? Can your brains truly so addled be? "Yes, yes, good sir, you are a poet," Chirped out the pecker, mocking me.

What doth me to these woods entice? The chance to give some thief a trouncing? A saw, an image? Ha, in a trice My rhyme is on it, swiftly pouncing! All things that creep or crawl the poet Weaves in his word-loom cunningly. "Yes, yes, good sir, you are a poet," Chirped out the pecker, mocking me.

Like to an arrow, methinks, a verse is, See how it quivers, pricks and smarts When shot full straight (no tender mercies!) Into the reptile's nobler parts!

Wretches, you die at the hand of the poet, Or stagger like men that have drunk too free. "Yes, yes, good sir, you are a poet," Chirped out the pecker, mocking me.

So they go hurrying, stanzas malign, Drunken words--what a clattering, banging!-- Till the whole company, line on line, All on the rhythmic chain are hanging. Has he really a cruel heart, your poet? Are there fiends who rejoice, the slaughter to see "Yes, yes, good sir, you are a poet," Chirped out the pecker, mocking me.

So you jest at me, bird, with your scornful graces? So sore indeed is the plight of my head? And my heart, you say, in yet sorrier case is? Beware! for my wrath is a thing to dread! Yet e'en in the hour of his wrath the poet Rhymes you and sings with the selfsame glee. "Yes, yes, good sir, you are a poet," Chirped out the pecker, mocking me.

IN THE SOUTH.[2]

I swing on a bough, and rest My tired limbs in a nest, In the rocking home of a bird, Wherein I perch as his guest, In the South!

I gaze on the ocean asleep, On the purple sail of a boat; On the harbour and tower steep, On the rocks that stand out of the deep, In the South!

For I could no longer stay, To crawl in slow German way; So I called to the birds, bade the wind Lift me up and bear me away To the South!

No reasons for me, if you please; Their end is too dull and too plain; But a pair of wings and a breeze, With courage and health and ease, And games that chase disease From the South!

Wise thoughts can move without sound,-But I've songs that I can't sing alone; So birdies, pray gather around, And listen to what I have found In the South! . . . . . "You are merry lovers and false and gay, "In frolics and sport you pass the day; "Whilst in the North, I shudder to say, "I worshipped a woman, hideous and gray, "Her name was Truth, so I heard them say, "But I left her there and I flew away "To the South!"

BEPPA THE PIOUS.

While beauty in my face is, Be piety my care, For God, you know, loves lasses, And, more than all, the fair. And if yon hapless monkling Is fain with me to live, Like many another monkling, God surely will forgive.

No grey old priestly devil, But, young, with cheeks aflame--Who e'en when sick with revel, Can jealous be and blame. To greybeards I'm a stranger, And he, too, hates the old: Of God, the world-arranger, The wisdom here behold!

The Church has ken of living, And tests by heart and face. To me she'll be forgiving! Who will not show me grace? I lisp with pretty halting, I curtsey, bid "good day," And with the fresh defaulting I wash the old away!

Praise be this man-God's guerdon, Who loves all maidens fair, And his own heart can pardon The sin he planted there.

While beauty in my face is, With piety I'll stand, When age has killed my graces, Let Satan claim my hand!

THE BOAT OF MYSTERY.

Yester-eve, when all things slept-- Scarce a breeze to stir the lane-- I a restless vigil kept, Nor from pillows sleep could gain, Nor from poppies nor--most sure Of opiates--a conscience pure.

Thoughts of rest I 'gan forswear, Rose and walked along the strand, Found, in warm and moonlit air, Man and boat upon the sand, Drowsy both, and drowsily Did the boat put out to sea.

Passed an hour or two perchance, Or a year? then thought and sense Vanished in the engulfing trance Of a vast Indifference. Fathomless, abysses dread Opened--then the vision fled.

Morning came: becalmed, the boat Rested on the purple flood: "What had happened?" every throat Shrieked the question: "was there-- Blood?" Naught had happened! On the swell We had slumbered, oh, so well!

AN AVOWAL OF LOVE

(_during which, however, the poet fell into a pit_).

Oh marvel! there he flies Cleaving the sky with wings unmoved--what force Impels him, bids him rise, What curb restrains him? Where's his goal, his course?

Like stars and time eterne He liveth now in heights that life forswore, Nor envy's self doth spurn: A lofty flight were't, e'en to see him soar!

Oh albatross, great bird, Speeding me upward ever through the blue! I thought of her, was stirred To tears unending--yea, I love her true!

SONG OF A THEOCRITEAN GOATHERD.

Here I lie, my bowels sore, Hosts of bugs advancing, Yonder lights and romp and roar! What's that sound? They're dancing!

At this instant, so she prated, Stealthily she'd meet me: Like a faithful dog I've waited, Not a sign to greet me!

She promised, made the cross-sign, too, Could her vows be hollow? Or runs she after all that woo, Like the goats I follow?

Whence your silken gown, my maid? Ah, you'd fain be haughty, Yet perchance you've proved a jade With some satyr naughty!

Waiting long, the lovelorn wight Is filled with rage and poison: Even so on sultry night Toadstools grow in foison.

Pinching sore, in devil's mood, Love doth plague my crupper: Truly I can eat no food: Farewell, onion-supper!

Seaward sinks the moon away, The stars are wan, and flare not: Dawn approaches, gloomy, grey, Let Death come! I care not!

"SOULS THAT LACK DETERMINATION."

Souls that lack determination Rouse my wrath to white-hot flame! All their glory's but vexation, All their praise but self-contempt and shame!

Since I baffle their advances, Will not clutch their leading-string, They would wither me with glances Bitter-sweet, with hopeless envy sting.

Let them with fell curses shiver, Curl their lip the livelong day! Seek me as they will, forever Helplessly their eyes shall go astray!

THE FOOL'S DILEMMA.

Ah, what I wrote on board and wall With foolish heart, in foolish scrawl, I meant but for their decoration!

Yet say you, "Fools' abomination! Both board and wall require purgation, And let no trace our eyes appal!"

Well, I will help you, as I can, For sponge and broom are my vocation As critic and as waterman.

But when the finished work I scan, I'm glad to see each learned owl With "wisdom" board and wall defoul.

RIMUS REMEDIUM

(_or a Consolation to Sick Poets_).

From thy moist lips, O Time, thou witch, beslavering me, Hour upon hour too slowly drips In vain--I cry, in frenzy's fit, "A curse upon that yawning pit, A curse upon Eternity!"

The world's of brass, A fiery bullock, deaf to wail: Pain's dagger pierces my cuirass, Wingéd, and writes upon my bone: "Bowels and heart the world hath none, Why scourge her sins with anger's flail?"

Pour poppies now, Pour venom, Fever, on my brain! Too long you test my hand and brow: What ask you? "What--reward is paid?" A malediction on you, jade, And your disdain!

No, I retract, 'Tis cold--I hear the rain importune-- Fever, I'll soften, show my tact: Here's gold--a coin--see it gleam! Shall I with blessings on you beam, Call you "good fortune"?

The door opes wide, And raindrops on my bed are scattered, The light's blown out--woes multiplied! He that hath not an hundred rhymes, I'll wager, in these dolorous times We'd see him shattered!

MY BLISS.

Once more, St Mark, thy pigeons meet my gaze, The Square lies still, in slumbering morning mood: In soft, cool air I fashion idle lays, Speeding them skyward like a pigeon's brood: And then recall my minions To tie fresh rhymes upon their willing pinions. My bliss! My bliss!

Calm heavenly roof of azure silkiness, Guarding with shimmering haze yon house divine! Thee, house, I love, fear--envy, I'll confess, And gladly would suck out that soul of thine! "Should I give back the prize?" Ask not, great pasture-ground for human eyes! My bliss! My bliss!

Stern belfry, rising as with lion's leap Sheer from the soil in easy victory, That fill'st the Square with peal resounding, deep Wert thou in French that Square's "accent aigu"? Were I for ages set In earth like thee, I know what silk-meshed net---- My bliss! My bliss!

Hence, music! First let darker shadows come, And grow, and merge into brown, mellow night! Tis early for your pealing, ere the dome Sparkle in roseate glory, gold-bedight While yet 'tis day, there's time For strolling, lonely muttering, forging rhyme-- My bliss! My bliss!

COLUMBUS REDIVIVUS.

Thither I'll travel, that's my notion, I'll trust myself, my grip, Where opens wide and blue the ocean I'll ply my Genoa ship.

New things on new the world unfolds me, Time, space with noonday die: Alone thy monstrous eye beholds me, Awful Infinity!

SILS-MARIA.

Here sat I waiting, waiting, but for naught! Beyond all good and evil--now by light wrought

To joy, now by dark shadows--all was leisure, All lake, all noon, all time sans aim, sans measure.

Then one, dear friend, was swiftly changed to twain, And Zarathustra left my teeming brain....

A DANCING SONG TO THE MISTRAL WIND.[3]

Wildly rushing, clouds outleaping, Care-destroying, Heaven sweeping, Mistral wind, thou art my friend! Surely 'twas one womb did bear us, Surely 'twas one fate did pair us, Fellows for a common end.

From the crags I gaily greet you, Running fast I come to meet you, Dancing while you pipe and sing. How you bound across the ocean, Unimpeded, free in motion, Swifter than with boat or wing!

Through my dreams your whistle sounded, Down the rocky stairs I bounded To the golden ocean wall; Saw you hasten, swift and glorious, Like a river, strong, victorious, Tumbling in a waterfall.

Saw you rushing over Heaven, With your steeds so wildly driven, Saw the car in which you flew; Saw the lash that wheeled and quivered, While the hand that held it shivered, Urging on the steeds anew.

Saw you from your chariot swinging, So that swifter downward springing Like an arrow you might go Straight into the deep abysses, As a sunbeam falls and kisses Roses in the morning glow.

Dance, oh! dance on all the edges, Wave-crests, cliffs and mountain ledges, Ever finding dances new! Let our knowledge be our gladness, Let our art be sport and madness, All that's joyful shall be true!

Let us snatch from every bower, As we pass, the fairest flower, With some leaves to make a crown; Then, like minstrels gaily dancing, Saint and witch together prancing, Let us foot it up and down.

Those who come must move as; quickly As the wind--we'll have no sickly, Crippled, withered, in our crew.; Off with hypocrites and preachers, Proper folk and prosy teachers, Sweep them from our heaven blue.

Sweep away all sad grimaces, Whirl the dust into the faces Of the dismal sick and cold! Hunt them from our breezy places, Not for them the wind that braces, But for men of visage bold.

Off with those who spoil earth's gladness, Blow away all clouds of sadness, Till our heaven clear we see; Let me hold thy hand, best fellow, Till my joy like tempest bellow! Freest thou of spirits free!

When thou partest, take a token Of the joy thou hast awoken, Take our wreath and fling it far; Toss it up and catch it never, Whirl it on before thee ever, Till it reach the farthest star.

[1] This poem is a parody of the "Chorus Mysticus" which concludes the second part of Goethe's "Faust." Bayard Taylor's translation of the passage in "Faust" runs as follows:--

"All things transitory But as symbols are sent, Earth's insufficiency Here grows to Event: The Indescribable Here it is done: The Woman-Soul leadeth us Upward and on!"

[2] Translated by Miss M. D. Petre. Inserted by permission of the editor of the _Nation,_ in which it appeared on April 17, 1909.

[3] Translated by Miss M. D. Petre. Inserted by permission of the editor of the _Nation,_ in which it appeared on May 15, 1909.

End of Project Gutenberg's The Joyful Wisdom, by Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche

==========

Enfranchisement of women

Harriet Hardy Taylor MillThe Project Gutenberg eBook of La Igualdad Social y Política y sus Relaciones con la Libertad

Project Gutenberg Release: July 05, 2016 · eBook #52502

Nota del Transcriptor:

Se ha respetado la ortografía y la acentuación del original.

Errores obvios de imprenta han sido corregidos.

Páginas en blanco han sido eliminadas.

Letras itálicas son denotadas con _líneas_.

Letras oscuras son denotadas con =signos de igual=.

Las versalitas (letras mayúsculas de tamaño igual a las minúsculas) han sido sustituidas por letras mayúsculas de tamaño normal.

LA IGUALDAD SOCIAL Y POLÍTICA

Y SUS RELACIONES CON LA LIBERTAD

OBRAS DE DOÑA CONCEPCIÓN ARENAL

TOMOS PUBLICADOS

I. _El visitador del pobre_, 2 pesetas Madrid, 2,50 provincias.

II. _La Beneficencia, la Filantropía y la Caridad_, 2 pesetas Madrid, 2,50 provincias.

III. _Cartas á los delincuentes_, 3,50 pesetas Madrid, 4 provincias.

IV. _La mujer del porvenir._--_La mujer de su casa_, 2,50 pesetas Madrid, 3 provincias.

V Y VI. _Estudios penitenciarios_, 5 pesetas Madrid, 6 provincias.

VII Y VIII. _Cartas á un obrero y Cartas á un señor_, 5 pesetas Madrid, 6 provincias.

IX. _Ensayo sobre el derecho de gentes_, 4,50 pesetas Madrid, 5 provincias.

X. _Las colonias penales en la Australia, y la pena de deportación_, 3 pesetas Madrid, 3,50 provincias.

XI. _La instrucción del pueblo_, 3 pesetas Madrid, 3,50 provincias.

XII. _El derecho de gracia._--_El reo, el pueblo y el verdugo._--_El delito colectivo_, 2,50 pesetas Madrid, 3 provincias.

XIII. _El visitador del preso_, 2 pesetas Madrid, 2,50 provincias.

XIV. _Informes penitenciarios_, 2 pesetas Madrid, 2,50 provincias.

XV Y XVI. _El pauperismo_, 6 pesetas Madrid, 7 provincias.

XVII. _Memoria sobre la igualdad_ (inédita).

A quien solicite la colección le será enviada certificada con sólo recibir el valor de ella en Madrid.

Estos tomos se hallan de venta en la librería de D. Victoriano Suárez, Preciados, 48, MADRID.

OBRAS COMPLETAS

DE

D.ª CONCEPCIÓN ARENAL

TOMO DECIMOSÉPTIMO

LA IGUALDAD SOCIAL Y POLÍTICA

Y SUS RELACIONES CON LA LIBERTAD

[Ilustración]

MADRID

LIBRERÍA DE VICTORIANO SUÁREZ 48, Preciados, 48

1898

Est. tip. «Sucesores de Rivadeneyra».--Paseo de San Vicente 20.

INTRODUCCIÓN.[1]

[1] Este trabajo fué hecho en 1862, y revisado por vez primera en 1876. No debió mi madre darlo por terminado en esa fecha, cuando en 1892 volvió otra vez á repasar lo hecho en 1862 y 1876. En esta labor había llegado hasta el final del capítulo II de la segunda parte; pero ni aun lo anterior lo consideraba concluído, puesto que el borrador del índice tiene entre paréntesis la indicación de (provisional).--F. G. A.

Basta considerar la frecuencia con que se habla de _igualdad_, el calor con que se discute, la multitud de personas que toman parte en la discusión ó se interesan en ella, la vehemencia con que se ataca y se defiende, la pertinacia con que se afirma ó se niega, la confianza con que se invoca como un medio de salvación, el horror con que se rechaza como una causa de ruina; basta observar estos contrastes, no sólo reproducidos, sino crecientes, para sospechar que la igualdad no es una de esas ideas fugaces que pasan con las circunstancias que las han producido, sino que tiene raíces profundas en la naturaleza del hombre, y es, por lo tanto, un elemento poderoso y permanente de las sociedades humanas.

Esta sospecha se confirma, pasando á convencimiento, al ver en la historia la igualdad luchando con el privilegio; vencida, no exterminada, rebelarse cuando se la creía para siempre bajo el yugo; existir, si no en realidad, en idea y esperanza, y, derecho ó aspiración, aparecer en todo pueblo que tiene poderosos gérmenes de vida.

Aspiración generosa, instinto depravado, impulso ciego, deseo razonable, sueño loco; bajo todas estas formas se presenta la igualdad, ya matrona venerable, con balanza equitativa como la justicia, ya furia, que agita en sus manos rapaces tea incendiaria.

La igualdad en la abyección; la igualdad en el derecho; un populacho vil que quiere pasar, sobre todos, el nivel de su ignominia; un pueblo digno que se opone á que la justicia sea privilegio: el pensador, buen amigo de las multitudes, que procura ilustrarlas; el fanático ó el ambicioso, que las extravía, todos hablan de igualdad, aunque cada uno la comprenda de distinta manera.

Esta diferencia en el modo de concebir una misma cosa se observa en otras muchas; pero tal vez en ninguna es más perceptible que en la igualdad, porque no hay quizás aspiración que tan fácilmente pase de razonable á absurda, cuyos verdaderos límites sean tan fáciles de traspasar, que se ramifique y extienda tanto á todas las esferas de la vida, ni que haga tan estrecha alianza con una pasión implacable y vil: la envidia. La envidia enciende sus rencores y destila su veneno en los individuos y en las multitudes que convierten la igualdad en bandera de exterminio, y por eso son á veces tan sordas á la voz de la razón y á las súplicas de la misericordia.

Estudiando la igualdad en el pasado, no se la ve seguir un curso más ó menos rápido, más ó menos regular; su brillo no crece con las luces de la inteligencia; su marcha no es paralela á la del progreso humano: tiene resplandores de relámpago, movimientos vertiginosos, y á veces cada paso asemeja á una erupción. Esto no es decir que carezca de ley, no; el huracán y la tempestad tienen la suya; pero es considerar cuán difícil ha de ser la observación de un fenómeno relacionado con tantos otros, y que no puede conocerse bien sino conociéndolos todos.

Mas por dificultoso que sea el estudio, parece necesario; la igualdad no se invoca ya por unos pocos, sino por el mayor número; no se limita á una ú otra esfera de la vida, pretende invadirlas todas, y sin saber lo que es, ni los obstáculos que halla, ni el modo de vencerlos, se pretende suprimir el tiempo necesario, el trabajo indispensable, y supliendo la fuerza con la violencia, lograr instantáneamente lo que sólo se realizará en el porvenir, ó lo que no podrá realizarse nunca. Estas aspiraciones las tiene el que padece, con la impaciencia de quien sufre, con la cólera del que halla un remedio ó un alivio que supone negado por la injusticia y el egoísmo. Y no son cientos ni miles, sino millones de cóleras impacientes y doloridas, que piden á la igualdad un recurso para su penuria y una satisfacción para su amor propio. Y estos millones de impacientes iracundos comunican entre sí; es decir, que multiplican su impaciencia y su ira, que, contenida á intervalos, y á intervalos desenfrenada, es amenazadora siempre.

Enfrente de los que esperan en la igualdad están los que la temen, los que ven en ella una cosa monstruosa, imposible, absurda, injusta; un sueño de la fiebre popular, un producto de las malas pasiones de la plebe, ó un medio de explotarlas. Para éstos, la igualdad es sinónimo de anarquía, de caos, de degradación, hasta el punto que _igualarse_ viene á ser _rebajarse_, y persona _distinguida_ equivale á persona _digna_.

El antagonismo no puede ser más evidente: lo que para éstos es un atentado, para aquéllos es un derecho; aberración para unos, dogma para otros.

Los dogmas se creen; los partidarios de la igualdad, las multitudes al menos, creen en ella, la afirman con la seguridad del que no ha pensado, con la vehemencia del que espera, y, como todo ignorante que sea apasionado, están dispuestos á imponer la creencia.

El dogmatismo que suele aplicarse á las cosas espirituales aquí interviene en las materiales, y no tiene un reducido número de oráculos en el aula ó en el templo, sino que abre cátedra donde quiera, en calles y plazas, en caminos y en veredas. El dogmatismo filosófico y religioso tiene máximas y preceptos que son promesas, reglas que enfrenan las pasiones, y aunque influya en las cosas materiales, no se dirige tan inmediata y directamente á ellas como el dogma de la igualdad. No se trata ya sólo de ser todos igualmente hijos de Dios, que no hará más distinción que entre justos y pecadores; de ser juzgados por la misma ley penal, y de suprimir todo privilegio en la política, sino de promulgar la económica de modo que desaparezcan las diferencias en las cosas que importan más, porque no se da tanto valor á tener voto en los comicios como pan y comodidades en casa. La insurrección económica, la huelga, es la más frecuente, casi la única, y manifiesta adónde se quiere aplicar el nivel con más empeño.

Mientras otros dogmas pierden prestigio, el de la igualdad aumenta el número de sus prosélitos, y extiende su acción en cada individuo; no hay fenómeno social en que no aparezca su influencia, difícil determinar hasta dónde llegará, al menos como aspiración. ¿Quién pone límites á la fe y á la esperanza?

Y, no obstante, se comprende la necesidad de ponerlos cuando la esperanza y la fe no se alimentan de espirituales promesas para otra vida, sino que quieren realizarse en ésta con la posesión inmediata de ventajas positivas y materiales bienes. Agréguese que éstos no se buscan siempre por la persuasión, sino recurriendo á la fuerza, y es de temer que la apelación á ella se repita más y más si no se contiene la fermentación de las impaciencias. Uno de los medios de contenerlas es discutirlas; citar ante el tribunal de la razón á los contendientes; oirlos con imparcialidad; no negar el derecho porque sea nuevo ni porque sea viejo, sino atendiendo á la justicia; precaverse contra la pasión, que no siempre es vocinglera; contra el egoísmo, que puede ser cínico ó hipócrita; determinar bien los puntos esenciales que se discuten para quitar al asunto mucho de lo vago que hoy tiene; señalar las contradicciones que hayan podido pasar desapercibidas, pero que en los hechos dan lugar á choques y conflictos, y de este modo contribuir á que, respecto á la igualdad, se tenga opinión que se discute, un elemento social que se analiza, y no un dogma que se impone ó un arma con que se amenaza.

PARTE PRIMERA.

De la igualdad considerada social y filosóficamente.

CAPÍTULO PRIMERO.

NOCIONES GENERALES.

La idea de _igualdad_ supone la de _diferencia_: si no se hubiesen notado maneras de ser diferentes, no cabía afirmar que las hubiera iguales; no se diría que los hombres lo eran, sino comprendiendo que pueden dejar de serlo. Que los aficionados á los estudios psicológicos, que propenden á ver _sucesivos_ fenómenos que tal vez son _simultáneos_, discutan si la noción de igualdad ha seguido ó precedido á la de diferencia; á nosotros nos basta hacer constar que si todos fueran, se sintieran y se supieran iguales, no se discutiría acerca de la igualdad, viviríamos sin afirmarla ni negarla, sin notarla; no habría idea de ella, como no existiría la de salud si no se hubieran visto vivientes enfermos ni se concibiera que pudiesen estarlo. Anterior, posterior ó simultánea, negación ó afirmación de semejanzas ó de diferencias, la igualdad y la desigualdad coexisten de tal manera, que no puede concebirse la una sin la otra, y que el estudio de cualquiera de ellas es el estudio de entrambas.

Si, pues, desde el primer momento que meditamos sobre la igualdad la vemos que coexiste con la desigualdad, y que no se concibe sin ella, la primera consecuencia que sacaremos es que entrambas existen necesariamente, que son indestructibles la una como la otra, y que ni el nivel ni el privilegio pueden ser un medio permanente de establecer la paz y la justicia, porque uno y otro prescinden de la naturaleza de las cosas. Los defensores del privilegio niegan las semejanzas, los niveladores las diferencias, sin ver que unas y otras se prueban en el hecho mismo de tener idea de igualdad y desigualdad. Sus grados, clase y resultados darán lugar á discusiones y dudas; pero que al menos quede fuera de ella que la igualdad y la desigualdad se suponen mutuamente, coexisten son un elemento necesario que se puede modificar, combinar de este ó del otro modo, pero no suprimir; y la razón nos pone á cubierto de los radicalismos que entienden arrancar de raíz los abusos ó los errores, cuando no hacen más que prescindir de lo que es esencial á la naturaleza humana.

La igualdad supone comparación, y la comparación cosas ó personas que han de ser comparadas. Ya se sabe que todo sér es _idéntico á sí mismo_; de modo que, cuando se dice _igual_, evidentemente hay que referirse á _otro_. Igualdad supone _pluralidad_ de personas ó cosas que no se aislan, sino que, por el contrario, se aproximan para compararlas ó ser comparadas.

Un _número_ de seres, una _aproximación_ suficiente, una _comparación_ de sus cualidades, son condiciones indispensables para decir ó negar que hay igualdad. Ésta supone, pues, colectividad que juzga y resuelve si algunos, muchos ó todos sus individuos han de equipararse. Por pocos que éstos sean, la igualdad es un fenómeno _social_, y por groseros que se los suponga, la igualdad está precedida de una comparación, de un juicio.

En consecuencia, la igualdad, ya se afirme, ya se niegue, no se puede considerar en una cosa aislada: como quiera que se comprenda el modo de ser de una persona, no se la _iguala_ ó _diferencia_ por lo que en ella se observe en absoluto, sino por lo relativo que con otros tenga de común ó diferente. No siendo la igualdad personal, sino colectiva, tiene más fuerza y menos independencia que lo que depende del solo individuo; y si se conociera mejor, tendría menos osadía y menos desfallecimientos como un elemento positivo y coartado que no se puede extender indefinidamente ni suprimir.

La igualdad, como aspiración, existe en varios grados y formas, según el pueblo en que aparece y el individuo que á ella aspira; pero en ninguna circunstancia esta aspiración existe sola, sino con otras, ya del individuo que la siente, ya de los que con él están relacionados. El mismo que desea _igualarse_ con los que están más arriba, quiere _distinguirse_ de los iguales, y se indigna de ser _confundido_ con los inferiores. El espíritu de dominación, tan hostil al de igualdad, coexiste con él, y cuando no hay una fuerza que le sofoque, ó una razón que le enfrene, se revela: pueden verse sus tendencias avasalladoras en el niño que pretende imponer su voluntad, y más aún en el loco, que no sólo quiere que prevalezca la suya, sino que con frecuencia se reviste de autoridad superior ó poder omnipotente. Cierto que no se pueden aplicar á los hombres cuerdos las observaciones hechas en los niños y en los locos, pero tampoco pueden dejar de considerarse como datos; porque en el niño están los elementos del hombre; no ha dejado de serlo el loco por estarlo, y su extravío no consiste en tener instintos, facultades ó sentimientos que falten á los demás, sino en la preponderancia desordenada de alguno de ellos. La frecuencia con que los locos se creen personas muy superiores por sus riquezas, talentos ó autoridad, hace sospechar que existe en el hombre una propensión á elevarse sobre los otros, sospecha que pasa á convencimiento notando que la vanidad y espíritu de dominación son tan comunes en el hombre como hostiles á la igualdad. Si hay en el corazón humano un elemento que impulsa á _igualarse_, hay otro que induce á distinguirse, como se puede notar que existe á la vez el instinto del mando y el de la obediencia. Estos impulsos iniciales pueden y deben constituir una armonía: no se diga que son fatalmente hostiles, pero no se desconozca su antagonismo y se crea que la igualdad puede establecerse sin lucha y brotar espontáneamente donde quiera que no se contraría la natural propensión del hombre. Éste, por el contrario, propende á la desigualdad, porque es vano, porque quiere distinguirse, y para lograrlo sacrifica muchas veces su sosiego, su vida y hasta su deber. Desde la noble emulación que inspira al héroe en el campo de batalla y al sabio en su gabinete, al bestial arrojo del torero, y el artificio costoso de la coqueta elegante, hay un mundo de esenciales diferencias, pero se nota un factor común, el deseo de distinguirse; es tan fuerte este deseo, que anima al hombre en las circunstancias más varias de la vida;

sofoca el ¡ay! del enfermo que siente penetrar en sus carnes el cuchillo de amputación, y la voz de la conciencia de la mujer de moda se mezcla á los motivos nobles del hombre virtuoso y á los viles del criminal. Seguramente hay servidores, y aun mártires, de la religión, de la ciencia y de la humanidad, en quienes no influye el deseo de distinguirse y hacer que su nombre no se confunda con los otros, pero son excepciones; la regla general es que el individuo, siempre que puede, procura hacerse notable por alguna cosa; que si halla grados establecidos procura colocarse en los superiores, y que sólo los que están en el último piden nivelación. Hay, pues, que tener presente el hecho de que en lo íntimo de la naturaleza humana existe un impulso antagónico á la igualdad: el deseo de distinguirse.

Siendo el hombre un compuesto complicadísimo de elementos que se combinan de diversos modos, no es cosa sencilla y fácil de estudiar la igualdad: puede referirse á la fuerza, á la belleza física, á la resistencia para el trabajo, la fatiga, el dolor, y contra las causas que alteran la salud; á la nobleza ó vileza de carácter, á su entereza ó debilidad, á la actividad ó apatía, al cumplimiento ú olvido del deber, al egoísmo ó la abnegación, y, en fin, á las varias facultades intelectuales. Las aptitudes diversas, las variaciones combinadas de diverso modo, dan lugar á diferencias infinitas en lo físico, en lo moral, en lo intelectual. La igualdad y la desigualdad están constituídas por un gran número de igualdades y desigualdades que modifican y son modificadas: así como del _mismo_ peso ó estatura de dos hombres no se puede inferir su igualdad física, porque uno puede ser feo ó enfermo, otro bello y hermoso, tampoco por ninguna cualidad moral ó aptitud de la inteligencia se puede saber si será igual á otro que tenga aquella misma aptitud ó cualidad. Y como esto sucede, no sólo al comparar un individuo con otro, sino todos entre sí; como hay que ir reconociendo diferencias y combinaciones de ellas para conocer igualdades, este conocimiento es muy difícil, y muy común, careciendo de él, resolver como si se tuviera. El que habla resueltamente de igualdad, ¿puede responder siempre á esta pregunta? ¿De qué igualdad se trata? No; y la física, la moral y la intelectual constituyen clases muy diferentes, y dentro de ellas, variedades infinitas. Sólo clasificando estas diferentes especies de igualdad pueden conocerse, y sólo conociéndolas negar y concederse con razón.

Siendo los elementos de la igualdad físicos, morales é intelectuales, hay que tenerlos todos presentes para establecerla; si se prescinde de ellos, la igualdad es una palabra, un abuso de la fuerza, la ilusión que desaparece ó el rodillo que nivela aplastando lo que sobresale, jamás el equilibrio de una armonía duradera.

La igualdad tiene, sin duda, profundas raíces en el corazón humano; pero además de que halla otros espontáneos impulsos igualmente arraigados que la contrarían, ninguna planta vive por la raíz sola: no basta decir que una aspiración es natural para que sea realizable; al contrario, el hombre está lleno de aspiraciones que rara vez ó nunca realiza. No creemos que sean inútiles; pero no es éste el lugar de discutir cómo pueden utilizarse, sino de consignar que las aspiraciones no son, ni profecías, ni oráculos, sino impulsos que es necesario enfrenar, ó cuando menos dirigir. Para apreciar los grados de realidad que pueden tener las aspiraciones, cierto que ha de tenerse en cuenta la naturaleza humana, pero cuidando de distinguir que hay inmensas diferencias entre el _natural_ de un salvaje, de un bárbaro ó de un hombre civilizado, y aun dentro de la civilización, según sus grados, tendencias y lugar que en ella se ocupa, entre unos hombres y otros; de modo que, cuando se habla de conformarse á las aspiraciones naturales, es necesario investigar cuáles son, porque el natural varía.

Aun cuando la igualdad sea aspiración legítima y realizable, no puede prescindir del principio _no hay derecho contra el derecho_, ni afirmar que el suyo es el más sagrado, que no tiene límites fijos, que su uso no está sujeto al abuso, y, en fin, que puede sustituirse con una maza la balanza de la justicia. Pero desde que la igualdad es derecho, es sagrado como cualquier otro, indestructible como todos; y siendo preciado como pocos, y haciendo como ninguno fácil la alianza de la razón y las pasiones, negarle es tan imprudente como injusto.

De todo lo cual se infiere que la igualdad es un problema social de los más complicados y difíciles de resolver.

CAPÍTULO II.

DE LA IGUALDAD, DE LA IDENTIDAD, DE LA SEMEJANZA Y DE LA EQUIVALENCIA.

La igualdad sin diferencia alguna entre las personas, sabido es que no existe, y aun las cosas que no acertamos á distinguir no son idénticas. Si lo parecen las hojas de un árbol ó las arenas del mar, es porque no las observamos bien, ó porque no tenemos medios adecuados de observación: á medida que ésta se perfecciona más, halla más diferencias; tanto, que conocer es distinguir. Nos parecen iguales las ovejas de un rebaño que el pastor no confunde, y dos gotas de agua que ponemos como ejemplo de cosas idénticas, con el auxilio del microscopio se ve que no lo son.

Si la igualdad entre los hombres no es, no puede ser la _identidad_, resultará, pues, _de cierto grado de semejanza_. Pero ¿qué grados de semejanza bastan para constituir la igualdad? ¿Cómo se miden estos grados? Hé aquí dos preguntas que es preciso hacer y difícil contestar. Por difícil que sea hay que contestarlas, porque ya se conceda la igualdad ó se niegue, necesario es razonar la concesión ó la negativa: reflexionemos, pues, sobre el asunto.

Hay que poner ruedas á un vagón, y han de ser _iguales_. ¿Qué necesitamos para decir que lo son? No que sean idénticas, sino que su semejanza sea bastante para resistir igualmente por cierto tiempo, para que se adapten á la vía de un modo análogo, no tengan demasiado rozamiento al rodar por ella, no descarrilen en las circunstancias normales, y no produzcan movimientos violentos y grandes desniveles en los carruajes.

Necesitamos una balanza: los brazos, los platillos, han de ser iguales. ¿Cuándo decimos que lo son? Cuando tienen la suficiente semejanza para que los pesos que hacemos con ella tengan la necesaria exactitud. Según tengamos que pesar patatas, oro ó gases, exigiremos entre las partes simétricas del aparato más igualdad, grados de semejanza proporcionados á los de exactitud que deseamos en el peso.

Necesitamos varios aparatos para elevar agua, iguales, y decimos que lo son cuando los cuerpos de bomba y los émbolos tienen bastante semejanza para efectuar próximamente el mismo trabajo.

Construímos una escalera con peldaños, que tenemos por iguales si á la vista lo parecen, asemejándose bastante para que al andar por ella no se tenga la molestia que resultaría de su mucha desigualdad.

Podrían multiplicarse los ejemplos, resultando siempre que en las obras materiales se llama igualdad cierto grado de semejanza.

Debe observarse, además, que tácita ó expresamente se prescinde, al calificar de iguales las cosas, de diferencias que, aun cuando grandes, no influyen de una manera apreciable en su utilidad para el servicio que han de prestar. Así, decimos que dos bombas son iguales si tienen las mismas dimensiones y efectúan el mismo trabajo, aunque estén pintadas de un color diferente.

Si de las obras pasamos á los operarios, observaremos que éstos se califican también de iguales cuando sus productos se asemejan lo bastante para ser igualmente útiles. Llamamos iguales á dos zapateros que nos hacen por el mismo dinero botas que no difieren de un modo apreciable en apariencia y servicio.

Pero en cuanto pasamos de la _obra_ al _obrero_, surgen multitud de elementos que hacen el problema complicado, de sencillo que era. En la balanza podíamos prescindir de todas las diferencias que no influyesen para la exactitud del peso; en el zapatero no podemos prescindir de todas las que no se refieran á la hechura de las botas. Puede ser un hombre que padece una enfermedad contagiosa transmisible por el calzado que manipula; un tramposo que pide paga anticipada y olvida ó niega la que ha recibido; un ratero que echa mano y guarda el cubierto ó la joya que halló al paso en nuestra casa; un criminal que entra en ella para combinar, con otros malvados, el modo de asaltarla. ¿Puede parecemos igual al que está sano de cuerpo y es exacto en sus cuentas y honrado en sus procederes? Seguramente que no.

Si en vez de calzar se trata de enseñar á un hijo, todavía notaremos más diferencias importantes entre dos maestros iguales respecto á ciencia, y habilidad y celo en transmitirla. No nos basta ya que no sean tramposos, ni cometan ninguna acción penada por la ley; necesitamos que sus maneras sean cultas, su lenguaje decoroso, su proceder digno, su conducta intachable, á fin de que no dé mal ejemplo, haciendo más daño con su obra inmoral que provecho con su obra científica: en este caso la igualdad necesita mucho mayor número de semejanzas. Estas han de ser más para que haya igualdad entre dos amigos.

Podemos decir (y con exactitud muchas veces) que nos son iguales dos operarios que trabajan del mismo modo; mas para afirmar la misma igualdad en dos personas que aspiran á la mano de una hija, ¡cuánto mayor número de semejanzas no necesitamos! La comparación se extiende entonces á lo físico, á lo moral, á lo intelectual. Edad, robustez, belleza, costumbres, ideas, carácter, aptitud, posición social, todo lo comparamos, observando analogías y diferencias, inconvenientes y ventajas, perjuicios y compensaciones; son aquí tantas las semejanzas que se necesitan para establecer la igualdad, que será muy raro que un padre, aun obrando con fría razón y recta conciencia, sin dejarse llevar de simpatías ciegas, ni vanidades locas, piense que es igual un hombre á otro para marido de su hija.

Se ve que en las relaciones de los hombres, aun las más sencillas y del orden físico, aun para la obra más mecánica, la igualdad que se establece no es puramente material; y se ve también que entran en ella más elementos físicos, morales é intelectuales, á medida que la relación se establece en más amplia esfera, aumentando entonces el número de semejanzas necesarias para

constituir igualdad.

Parece, pues, bastante claro que al contestar á la pregunta: _¿Qué grados de semejanza se necesitan para establecer la igualdad?_, no podemos referirnos á escala y números fijos, ni aplicar la misma regla comparando balanzas y escaleras, que hombres, ni éstos lo mismo si se trata de hacer calzado ó la felicidad de las personas que amamos.

De todo lo cual se infiere que _igualdad es aquel grado de semejanza_ NECESARIA _para el fin á que se destinan las cosas ó personas que se comparan_. Ya sacaremos las consecuencias de este principio, á nuestro parecer muy importante.

¿Qué es _equivalencia_? La etimología de la palabra lo indica: _equivalente_ es lo que _vale igual_. La igualdad aquí se refiere, no á la naturaleza de la cosa comparada, sino al aprecio que de ella se hace, al valor que tiene. Una moneda de oro, una medida de trigo, una pieza de paño, un pedazo de hierro, cosas son que se parecen muy poco entre sí, y, no obstante, pueden ser equivalentes, cambiarse unas por otras, y tomarse indistintamente como pago de una deuda. La equivalencia de las personas se establece según condiciones que varían mucho más que respecto á las cosas: las circunstancias, los errores, las pasiones, la abnegación, el egoísmo, el vicio, la virtud, el crimen, la inocencia, todo contribuye á que una persona sea tenida en poco ó en mucho, y á que se considere que vale más, menos ó lo mismo que otra con quien se la compara.

Menos fuerza muscular puede suplirse con mayor destreza; una cualidad moral, una aptitud intelectual con otra ó con mayor perseverancia en el trabajo y constancia para el bien. Aunque no se suplan las disposiciones ó las obras, pueden éstas tener un valor igual y ser equivalentes. Un albañil y un cantero no se suplen, ni un cantante y un director de orquesta; pero siendo igualmente necesarios éstos para ejecutar una ópera y aquéllos para hacer una casa, dadas ciertas circunstancias su trabajo podrá tener un valor igual, y sus servicios considerarse como equivalentes. Un médico y un abogado no se suplen en lo relativo á su profesión, pero los servicios que prestan, aunque muy diversos, pueden valer lo mismo. La muerte del que la arrostra voluntariamente por la patria en el campo de batalla, ó por la humanidad en una epidemia, con ser muy distintas son igualmente heroicas. Hay equivalencias en el arte y en la industria, en lo intelectual y en lo moral, en todo.

Pero estas equivalencias, ¿qué grados de _analogías_ necesitan? Aquí empieza la gran dificultad; porque un valor, cualquiera que sea, es cosa relativa á los medios, necesidades é ideas de quien le calcula y determina, y dos cosas análogas y equivalentes para uno, para otro no tienen analogía, ni pueden ser comparadas, ó si lo son es para apreciarlas de muy diferente modo. El entusiasta por la música y el que la considera como un ruido menos desagradable que otros; el aficionado á toros y el que detesta esta diversión, ¿podrán ponerse de acuerdo sobre la _equivalencia_ de los servicios que presta un torero y un cantante? El que llama sueños á las especulaciones filosóficas, y el que cree no hay elevación ni dignidad sino en ellas; el que no considera como verdadero trabajo sino al manual, y el que le califica de degradante, ¿podrán convenir en la equivalencia de la obra de un filósofo y de un picapedrero?

Es un gran auxiliar de la igualdad la equivalencia; por medio de ella pueden ponerse al _mismo nivel social_ los que tienen aptitudes, méritos, posiciones diferentes, estableciendo compensaciones armónicas y durables en vez de esas especies de rodillos que quieren pasarse por la sociedad como por las carreteras para igualar por presión, aplastando todo lo que sobresale. El que observa la variedad de aptitudes que especifica y aumenta la división de trabajo, y duda tal vez de poder hallar bastantes semejanzas para establecer la igualdad, ve un modo de suplir á la semejanza con la equivalencia, y se apresura á señalarla como poderoso elemento de equilibrio estable. Y como el ánimo al discurrir sobre los grandes problemas sociales es raro que no esté inquieto; como el asunto es carne viva que palpita, que siente, que sufre; como estas palpitaciones y estos sufrimientos se comunican al que los estudia con deseo de calmarlos, cuando se halla ó se cree hallar un calmante, es difícil que al desear su eficacia no se exagere.

Fácil es, por tanto, caer en exageración al graduar lo que al equilibrio social puede contribuir la equivalencia; mas sin considerarla como una panacea, parécenos que puede calificarse de remedio en algunos casos, y siempre de elemento armónico de razonable igualdad. Al congratularse de que exista, y al contar con él, hay que precaverse de exagerar su poder, y, sobre todo, de no imaginar que es independiente. La equivalencia puede penetrar muy adentro en el organismo social, pero no influir sin ser influída, y sin un previo, largo y difícil trabajo para calmar pasiones, desvanecer errores, satisfacer intereses y hacer concurrir al bien elementos cuyas armonías no se sospechan al ver sus aparentes antagonismos.

Pero si parece indudable que la equivalencia puede contribuir de un modo eficaz á establecer la igualdad, tampoco tiene duda que su cooperación ofrece dificultades cuya magnitud conviene apreciar bien, para que no se conviertan en insuperables obstáculos. Por una parte, si pueden ponerse al mismo nivel, no sólo los que son iguales, sino también aquellos que valen igualmente, claro es

que aumenta el número de personas que se igualaron, socialmente consideradas; pero este aumento requiere condiciones difíciles, es más dificultoso determinar equivalencias que igualdades. Comparar dos médicos entre sí, un médico con un naturalista ó un abogado, un poeta con un piloto, un ingeniero con un albañil, un artista con un artesano, ofrece dificultades crecientes á medida de las diferencias: ya no se buscan semejanzas que se llaman igualdades, hay que observar analogías para determinar equivalencias. Este trabajo se ve claramente es mucho más delicado y difícil, aunque se hiciera con toda calma, despreocupación y justicia; pero suele faltar esta justicia, esta despreocupación, esta calma, y suele medirse el valor de las diferentes clases como miden la temperatura los que no tienen termómetro, y según sienten calor ó frío, dicen que una casa está fría ó caliente. ¿Qué escala, qué regla hay para graduar las equivalencias sociales? Si no nos pagamos de palabras y de apariencias, veremos que no existen reglas fijas; y reflexionando sobre el caso, notaremos que las escalas es inevitable que sean variables con las ideas, las pasiones, las necesidades y la manera de ser de los que las forman. El pueblo guerrero y descreído no puede conceder equivalencia entre el combatiente impávido y el piadoso sacerdote; el ignorante y vicioso, entre el sabio que le quiere instruir y el cómico, el cantante ó el torero que le divierten: donde se cree en la diferencia real de las castas y de las clases, no hay equivalencia posible entre los que figuran en las primeras y los que pertenecen á las últimas. Cada cambio en las ideas, en los intereses, en las necesidades, en las pasiones, produce otro en la escala que gradúa el valor social de los hombres; se establecen equivalencias donde antes no podían existir, se niegan las reconocidas, y se declara superior al que antes estaba más abajo, y viceversa. Mirados con desprecio los que toman parte en las representaciones teatrales, su oficio es vil, y ellos equiparados á los más indignos; pasan años, no muchos, para tan notable cambio, y el que era un histrión infame se convierte en un actor, en un artista apreciable, eminente, sublime, inmortal, según los casos, y la equivalencia que antes se buscaba en las últimas capas sociales, se establece en las primeras.

Un gran número de artes y oficios vedados por la ley ó por la opinión á toda persona digna, y hoy apreciados ú honrados, han variado la graduación de la escala y los elementos de la equivalencia. Estudiándolos se ve que crecen estos elementos, que cada descubrimiento, cada invención, cada camino que se abre á la actividad inteligente del hombre, es un nuevo medio de equipararle á otros que ocupaban una posición más aventajada, y aumenta el número de los que, siendo equivalentes, pueden ser y son considerados como iguales: la rapidez del progreso en este sentido no puede desconocerse. No es necesario subir mucho en la historia de los pueblos para ver que no había equivalencia social respecto á las clases elevadas más que en dos: el sacerdote y el guerrero. Entre éstas y las demás mediaba un abismo; la equivalencia era imposible. Después la toga se equiparó al hábito y á la coraza; así pasó mucho tiempo, y aún los ancianos recuerdan aquel en que ninguna persona noble que no tuviera lo suficiente para vivir de sus rentas podía dedicarse más que á las armas, á la iglesia ó al estudio de las leyes: la equivalencia, que se había extendido un poco, se limitaba, no obstante, al derecho, la teología y la milicia; hoy han dilatado su esfera las ciencias, las artes, la industria, el comercio, modos infinitos de desplegar dignamente la actividad humana, que, manifestándose de diferente modo y aplicándose á objetos diversos, tienen igual utilidad y merecen igual aprecio.

No es posible observar, siquiera sea muy por encima, la marcha de la civilización sin ver como factor creciente de la igualdad la equivalencia, y sin notar que este crecimiento es constante, graduado, sólido, resulta de causas poderosas y permanentes, es lógico, en fin.

Pero quien dice lógica, dice encadenamiento ordenado y necesario de verdades, dice un inmenso poder y una regla severa, una gran fuerza y una estrecha sujeción, y para que las consecuencias sean irresistibles es indispensable que las premisas sean ciertas. No es una escuela, un club, un orador de tribuna ó de esquina los que pueden decir á un hombre ó á una multitud tú vales tanto como otra multitud ú otro hombre: esta declaración puede hacerse aplaudir en una hora da entusiasmo, ó servir de bandera en un día de motín; pero no constituirá un derecho si no recae sobre hechos positivos y constantes. Nuevas ideas, nuevas necesidades físicas, morales é intelectuales, y quien las satisfaga realmente, es condición precisa para aumentar de un modo estable el número de los equivalentes sociales, ó variar el lugar de la escala que ocupan. La adivinación no se ha convertido en buenaventura descendiendo del oráculo á la gitana, sino porque son ya pocos y de los que están muy abajo los que creen que hay artes ocultas para predecir lo futuro. El ingeniero no se ha puesto á nivel de las profesiones más honradas sino porque satisface una necesidad generalmente sentida. El cómico no pasó de histrión infame á actor apreciado sino porque se ha hecho artista en un pueblo que gusta del arte; y donde el torero recoge aplausos y dinero, y el filósofo vive olvidado en la miseria, es porque la falta de ideas y el trastorno de las pocas que hay produce la inversión de las escalas sociales y que los últimos sean los primeros, y viceversa.

Así, pues, la equivalencia, auxiliar poderoso de la igualdad, crece constante pero lógicamente; tiene poder, pero está sujeta á leyes; puede influir mucho, pero no puede prescindir de necesidades, de ideas y, lo que es más triste, ni aun de errores é

injusticias. En vano un individuo ó una colectividad dirán á otra colectividad ó á otro individuo: valemos tanto como vosotros, y será cierto y lo probarán; si los demás no lo comprenden así, si hay quien tiene interés en negarlo y medios de hacer que su interés prevalezca, la equivalencia, por más justa que sea, no será menos imposible. No la realiza, pues, quien pretende imponerla; antes la desacredita, contribuyendo á que se la declare imposible, cuando no es más que prematura.

Resumiendo. No se debe confundir la igualdad con la identidad, porque no existen dos personas entre las cuales no haya diferencia alguna.

Igualdad no es una cosa absoluta y fija, sino relativa y variable, según el objeto con que se establece; así hemos podido definirla _aquel grado de semejanza necesario para el fin á que se destinan las cosas ó las personas comparadas_.

Equivalencia es el valor igual que tienen las cosas ó las personas, no por sus muchos grados de semejanza, _sino por ser igualmente apreciadas del que las califica_.

Tendremos ocasión de recordar más adelante estas verdades y necesidad de apoyarnos en ellas.

CAPÍTULO III.

ORIGEN Y PROGRESOS DE LA DESIGUALDAD.

Es tan cierto lo que decíamos en nuestro primer capítulo, de que sin haber observado diferencias no habría ocurrido pensar en igualdades, aquéllas y éstas están en relación tan constante, íntima y necesaria, que al estudiar la igualdad hallaremos de continuo la desigualdad, sin que nos sea posible hacer investigaciones sobre la una, sin analizar la otra, y anotando que, bien definida cualquiera de ellas, es fácil definirlas entrambas con exactitud.

Si la IGUALDAD _es aquel grado de semejanza necesaria para el fin á que se destinan las cosas ó las personas que se comparan, la_ DESIGUALDAD _será aquel grado de diferencia por el cual las cosas ó las personas no puedan servir igualmente al mismo fin_.

El origen de la desigualdad del hombre, que es la que nos proponemos estudiar, está en la naturaleza, entendiendo por naturaleza del hombre no sólo su organismo físico, sus necesidades materiales y los medios de satisfacerlas, sino su sér completo, físico, moral é intelectual.

Sin dejarse llevar de la imaginación ó del espíritu de sistema afirmando acerca del hombre prehistórico lo que no puede saberse, cabe asegurar que los primeros hombres no eran iguales entre sí, en el sentido de ser idénticos, ni aun tenían todos aquel grado de semejanzas en virtud del cual sirvieran igualmente á cuantos fines pudiesen proponerse en la sociedad más ruda.

Para evitar equívocos convendrá consignar que entendemos por hombre un viviente físicamente organizado en lo esencial, como lo están los hombres de hoy: intelectualmente, capaz de distinguir el bien del mal; y moralmente, con poder de elegir y realizar el uno ó el otro. El que no tenga estas condiciones podrá ser hombre para el naturalista, pero no lo es para el que se ocupa de ciencias morales y políticas.

Entre los primeros hombres los habría deformes, feos, débiles, enfermizos, y bien constituídos, bellos, fuertes, robustos; estas desigualdades físicas, por ser las más perceptibles y las más importantes entre hordas salvajes, no serían las únicas; individuos habría más resueltos para buscar el peligro, más firmes para arrostrarle, más circunspectos, más valerosos, más astutos para triunfar en la lucha continua que era condición de existencia. Que entre ellos había desigualdades se comprende desde luego observando que existen hasta entre los animales, y más á medida que ocupan un lugar más elevado en la escala. Entre los domésticos, que son los que conocemos un poco mejor, podemos notar diferencias de belleza, de fuerza, y hasta de inteligencia y de carácter; no se concibe, pues, que dejen de existir entre los hombres, ni se ha encontrado sociedad por ruda que sea en que algunos no se distinguieran de los otros, ya fuese por elevarse, ya por no llegar al nivel común. No hay pueblo sin jefe, ni donde la tradición no recuerde algunas personas distinguidas. Que se los suponga venidos de remotas regiones ó descendientes de los dioses, es lo cierto que se conserva el recuerdo de hombres que no eran iguales á los otros, que inventaron artes útiles, llevaron á cabo heroicas hazañas ó las cantaron.

Por rudo que sea el hombre primitivo, por decisivas que sean para él las inferioridades y superioridades físicas, también le importan en cierta medida, al menos, las intelectuales, porque además de la fuerza muscular necesita alguna inteligencia á fin de utilizarla. Un genio enfermizo no tendría autoridad en un pueblo bárbaro, pero tampoco un atleta imbécil.

Por todo lo que pensamos, observamos y sabemos, donde quiera que hay sociedad de hombres se notan en ellos desemejanzas bastante marcadas para que sean calificadas de desiguales, ya se compare su fuerza, ya su inteligencia. Estas diferencias son necesarias, sin que puedan evitarlas aquellos á quienes perjudican, ni conseguirlas aquellos á quienes favorecen. No depende de nadie nacer feo ó hermoso, enfermo ó robusto, limitado ó inteligente; todas estas desigualdades naturales son también fatales.

Aunque sea de paso, debemos advertir que decimos _fatal_ en el sentido de _inevitable_, no en el de _ciego_ y menos de _injusto_. En cualquiera época que estudiemos á los hombres hallamos desigualdad natural entre ellos, lo cual en parte se explica como necesario á la sociabilidad, y en parte no. En todo estudio se llega á un _non plus ultra_; se encuentra lo desconocido, lo inexplicable, que unos dan por explicado sin estarlo, otros llaman misterio, y otros absurdo ó injusticia: nosotros somos de los que le llamamos misterio. Le hay en la desigualdad congénita de los hombres; cuando es, será porque debe ser; pero aun los que no vean en ella la justicia divina, no pueden negarse á la evidencia de que está en la naturaleza humana. Providencial ó fatal, es innegable la desigualdad de los hombres de todos los tiempos y lugares; y cualquiera que sea el grado de su cultura, ésta modifica, no destruye el hecho primitivo de las grandes diferencias individuales.

Pero el hombre no es sólo un organismo físico, un conjunto de facultades intelectuales, sino también un sér moral; además de bello ó feo, endeble ó fuerte, limitado ó inteligente, puede ser _bueno_ ó _malo_, y el serlo depende de él, de él solo; no hay aquí fatalidad; todo el que hace mal, si está en su cabal juicio, es porque quiere hacerlo. En cualquier lugar donde existen hombres los hay malos y buenos, peores y mejores; toda colectividad que tiene recuerdos, conserva la memoria de bondades ejemplares, de virtudes á toda prueba, de abnegaciones sin límites, al propio tiempo que necesita reprimir hechos atentatorios al orden y que, si se generalizasen, harían imposible la sociedad. El excepcionalmente bueno y el excepcionalmente malo, el que se reverencia con amor y el que se persigue con odio, el justo y el delincuente, son los extremos de la desigualdad moral, cuyos intermedios varían al infinito. Pero si las diferencias físicas é intelectuales se reciben, las morales se crean, su origen está en la libertad del hombre, en su voluntad recta ó torcida.

Son tres los elementos (físico, intelectual y moral) que entran en la desigualdad; de los dos primeros no se dispone, del último sí, y con él puede reaccionar de tal modo sobre los otros que venga á ser preponderante en vez de estar supeditado. ¿Quién no conoce personas que por falta de moralidad han destruido un físico fuerte, y otras delicadas que se han fortalecido con la constancia en un buen régimen que no es posible sino á los que tienen buena conducta? Por donde quiera se ven ejemplos de ventajas conseguidas respecto á los que nacieron mejor dotados, de desigualdades físicas invertidas por la moralidad ó la falta de ella; de modo que en muchos casos, aun aquellas dotes que parecen recibidas fatalmente, pueden conquistarse con la voluntad recta y perderse con la voluntad torcida; lo último, sobre todo, es indefectible; la organización más privilegiada no resiste al desorden y al vicio, que no tarda en rebajar á los que la Naturaleza había elevado al nacer.

Aunque no tan grande como la robustez, la belleza es una gran ventaja que está muy desigualmente distribuída. ¿Pero puede conservarse la belleza que se _recibe_ sin la moralidad de que se dispone? ¿Cuánto tiempo dura la belleza del hombre crapuloso, de la mujer liviana, del malvado, en cuyo rostro contraído no tardan en reflejarse sus pensamientos siniestros? Poco dura, fugaz es, y ellos muy pronto inferiores, aun estéticamente considerados, á los que tienen la hermosura del alma. El efecto útil de la belleza para el que la tiene, es la impresión que produce. ¿Y quién no sabe que esta impresión depende muchas veces menos de las dotes físicas recibidas que de las morales consecuencia de la voluntad? ¿Quién no conoce personas que no son hermosas, y hasta que son feas, pero que, no obstante, agradan, son simpáticas, porque la dulzura del carácter, la bondad del corazón, la paz del espíritu, la rectitud de la conciencia, se revelan en el rostro, cuyo atractivo no está en las formas, ni en el color, sino que es un reflejo de la belleza del alma? _Son feos porque quieren_, decía uno con gran asombro de los que no comprendían cuanta verdad hay en esta frase; variándola un poco, diciendo:--son _desagradables_ porque quieren--puede sostenerse su exactitud, porque el que tiene voluntad de ser bueno lo es, y siéndolo, no habrá en su aspecto exterior nada repulsivo, y, por el contrario, tendrá siempre algo que agrada y atrae.

De otras desventajas físicas triunfa también la voluntad fortaleciendo con el ejercicio órganos débiles y utilizando con la perseverancia aptitudes que sin ella habrían sido inútiles.

En el orden intelectual aparece aún mucho mayor el poder de la voluntad; y aunque no sea absolutamente cierto, como se ha dicho, _que el genio es la paciencia_, es decir, la perseverancia, es decir, la voluntad, sin ella muy firme no hay genio. Nadie nace genio. Pueden recibirse al nacer facultades superiores; pero si no se cultivan, se atrofian, sucumben en germen por falta de una voluntad firme y recta.

En general, los hombres grandes son hombres morales, y muchos que hubieran sido eminentes se quedan en medianías por falta de moralidad. No sólo el vicio debilita las facultades; no sólo el amor propio exagerado, la vanidad, la codicia, todas las formas del egoísmo limitan el horizonte, dan puntos de vista mezquinos, impiden elevarse á las grandes alturas desde donde solamente se descubre la verdad, sino que sin amor á ella, sin impulsos nobles, grandes, que destruyan los miserables movimientos del yo mezquino, es difícil la inspiración sostenida que constituye los grandes hombres. Porque la inspiración no se limita á los artistas y á los poetas; sin ella nada grande se crea, se comprende ni se adivina, é inspirados estaban Platón, Leibniz, Copérnico y Watt, como Homero, Milton y Murillo. Sin trabajo, sin energía no hay inspiración posible; y como el trabajo es obra de la voluntad, y cuando ésta se tuerce viene la perversión que degrada y debilita, resulta que hasta en el genio, que es la aptitud excepcional que requiere más dotes naturales que se reciben desigualmente al nacer, hasta en el genio influye poderosamente, á veces de una manera decisiva, el elemento moral: hay muchos hombres que nacieron con facultades eminentes, y para ser grandes no les ha faltado más que ser buenos, y otros que, por serlo en sumo grado, se elevan más que ellos con menos dotes naturales.

Pero dejando al genio, que es la excepción rara, y viniendo al talento y á la inteligencia que, sin llegar á él, tienen mayor ó menor el común de los hombres, ¿quién no ve cómo influye en su desarrollo y aprovechamiento la voluntad de cultivarla y el modo de dirigirla? No es necesario extender mucho la vista; en derredor y muy cerca pueden observarse aptitudes inútiles ó que por culpa suya ha vuelto contra sí el mismo que las tenía, y facultades comunes, y aun limitadas, que ha utilizado grandemente el trabajo y la perseverancia. Si el genio es _poder_ y _querer_, la inteligencia del común de los hombres es principalmente _querer_, y las desigualdades que en ellos se notan son, por lo general, consecuencia de la voluntad torcida ó recta, débil ó fuerte, que rehuye el trabajo ó persevera en él, que da el tónico de la buena conciencia ó el debilitante deletéreo de la perversión. Es frecuente ver personas que han adquirido una reputación ó una fortuna, que se han distinguido sin tener dotes naturales superiores, y por sólo el resorte moral de una conducta ordenada, de un trabajo perseverante; y es asimismo grande el número de los excepcionalmente aptos y dispuestos, que gráficamente se llaman _perdidos_, y que, en efecto, pierden las facultades de que no usan ó que emplean en su daño.

Verdades son éstas que todo el mundo sabe, por lo cual no hay para qué insistir en ellas, y sí sólo en las consecuencias que deben sacarse; éstas nos parecen muy importantes, por lo que no estará mal repetirlas y determinarlas bien; pueden formularse así:

El hombre se compone de elementos físicos, morales é intelectuales;

Los intelectuales y los físicos los recibe al nacer con una desigualdad que no está en su mano evitar;

Los morales son obra suya; puede ser bueno ó malo, mejor ó peor, según quiera; en la esfera moral la desigualdad es obra suya, y en ella no se rebaja sin culpa, ni se eleva sin mérito.

Pero en la unidad armónica que constituye la persona humana, los elementos intelectual y físico reciben poderosas influencias del moral; de modo que el hombre no sólo _puede_ ser bueno ó malo porque _quiere_, sino que su voluntad influye poderosamente en su fuerza física, en su robustez, en su belleza y en su inteligencia.

Los elementos intelectuales y físicos que fatalmente parecen establecer una inevitable desigualdad, están neutralizados por el elemento moral que no pasa un nivel ciego aplastando lo que sobresale, sino que ordena justas compensaciones, suprime naturales desigualdades y establece otras que son consecuencia de una voluntad firme ó débil, torcida ó recta, y parecen premios merecidos y castigos justos.

Así, pues, aquella desigualdad congénita que parecía tan grande y tan fatal, observada de cerca no es tan fatal, ni tan grande; porque además de ser en parte necesaria para la armonía social, en parte está condicionada moralmente: no es el destino ciego que eleva ó rebaja, sino una ley en virtud de la cual pueden descender ó sobresalir, según quieran emplear bien ó mal las facultades recibidas.

Esto no es decir que siempre suceda así, ni que muchas veces no suceda lo contrario. Hay organizaciones tan débiles que el régimen más severo no fortifica; deformidades cuya fealdad no puede dejar de ser repulsiva; entendimientos tan cortos que no logra poner al nivel común el trabajo más perseverante; y dolores terribles de noble origen que contraen el rostro y le desfiguran: la voluntad, que basta siempre para ser bueno, no en todas ocasiones tiene poder bastante contra un físico enfermizo ó desagradable ó una inteligencia muy limitada. Es innegable, pues, que hay desigualdades congénitas inevitables, dichosas para unos, desdichadas para otros; hay misterio en esta desigualdad original: este es un hecho; pero no debe exagerarse su

importancia, ni darle más alcance del que tiene, ni dejar de ver, al lado del elemento _fatal_ de la desigualdad, un correctivo en la voluntad del hombre y su libre albedrío, que condiciona moralmente inconvenientes y ventajas que parecían haberse recibido sin condición alguna.

Así, pues, al estudiar la desigualdad la vemos desde su origen resultar de las diferencias congénitas de los hombres, fatales para ellos, pero condicionadas por el elemento voluntario de la voluntad libre. Y esto es tan cierto, tan esencial de la naturaleza humana, que en las hordas salvajes, en los pueblos bárbaros, en las naciones civilizadas, donde quiera que estudiemos la igualdad, veremos siempre el fatalismo modificado, neutralizado ó vencido por el elemento moral, que en ningún caso deja de ejercer grande influencia en el modo de establecer las jerarquías sociales ó de suprimirlas. La pasión ó el espíritu de secta ó de escuela, ni el delirio de las iras populares, no son los que nos dan niveladores tan ciegos é insensatos como ellos, sino que la naturaleza humana, y á nuestro parecer la voluntad divina, nos ofrece compensaciones para las diferencias y medios de realizar la igualdad en el elemento moral, en la voluntad y libre albedrío del hombre.

El origen de la desigualdad, en parte misteriosa, en parte de fácil explicación, fatal en alguna manera y hasta cierto punto consecuencia de la voluntad del hombre, está siempre en la naturaleza humana, y, por tanto, puede variar en sus grados y formas, pero no desaparecer.

¿Y la desigualdad aumenta ó disminuye con la civilización? ¿Sus progresos están en razón directa ó inversa de los del pueblo donde se estudia?

Los primeros progresos de las sociedades deben ser desfavorables á la igualdad, y podrá favorecerla ó perjudicarla una civilización más adelantada, según circunstancias que varían casi al infinito: tal vez podría decirse, respecto á la cultura de los pueblos, que la igualdad está en los extremos, y en medio la desigualdad; pero si esto se estableciera como regla tendría demasiadas excepciones, que, bien estudiadas, pondrían de manifiesto la influencia del elemento moral que hemos señalado.

La igualdad debe estar en su máximo grado en los pueblos salvajes. En lo físico, los débiles perecen al nacer ó en la infancia; hay un mínimum muy elevado de robustez y de fuerza indispensable para vivir: los que tienen menos sucumben; sólo pueden distinguirse los que tienen más. No viviendo los lisiados, enfermizos, enfermos ni deformes, disminuyen los elementos de la fealdad, y tampoco tiene muchos la hermosura en medio de una existencia materialmente tan penosa y con tan escasos recursos para embellecerse: esto no es decir que todos sean igualmente fuertes y bellos; pero están muy limitadas las diferencias físicas, y en su grado máximo la igualdad.

En lo intelectual, la esfera de acción se halla también muy reducida: ni artes, ni ciencias, ni industria, ni comercio; ninguno de los infinitos medios que sirven para poner de manifiesto la diferencia de aptitudes y la superioridad de facultades. Más destreza, más astucia para la caza, mayor disposición para las empresas de la guerra, un poco más ó menos de arte para preservarse de la intemperie ó arrostrarla con menor peligro, son los únicos modos de diferenciarse por debajo ó sobre el nivel común.

La esfera moral tiene también límites estrechos: son imposibles la mayor parte de los vicios de la civilización y las opuestas virtudes. No hay bebidas con que embriagarse; el trabajo, que es condición de vida, y el cansancio, que hace necesarias largas horas de reposo, disminuyen las del ocio. Lo rudo de la vida y la escasez de alimentos ponen límites á la incontinencia, y la general pobreza á los ataques á la propiedad: los de las personas tienen rara vez objeto, y siempre peligro, entre hombres á quienes pocas veces se puede robar, y que, fuertes y habituados al peligro, se defienden valerosamente. No habiendo apenas goces, la tentación de gozar no impulsa á apoderarse de lo ajeno; el egoísmo tiene carácter más negativo; las pasiones feroces apenas hallan freno, y es posible satisfacerlas igualmente sin reprobación, y antes con público aplauso. Son imposibles y no existe siquiera idea de la mayor parte de las virtudes, y apenas hay ni se concibe más que la fortaleza para sufrir el dolor y arrostrar la muerte. Este modo de ser como encadenado por las necesidades físicas, por la dificultad de satisfacerlas; esta limitación de ideas, han de dar cierta uniformidad á los afectos y á las determinaciones. Sin duda que desde luego serán diferentes; sin duda habrá personas mejores y peores, de carácter más débil y más firme, de voluntad más ó menos enérgica, más ó menos recta, más ó menos incontrastable; pero todas las diferencias se encerrarán en un círculo muy limitado. Los goces, como las privaciones, se parecen; el dolor y el placer tienen una generalidad uniforme, que difícilmente da lugar á la envidia ni á la compasión, al daño ni al consuelo: cuando unos tienen hambre ó frío, los otros padecen de frío y de hambre; cuando unos carecen de albergue, los otros no le hallan; cuando unos se ven en peligro, lo están los otros también. En aquel estado en que los hombres se ven obligados, por una necesidad _absoluta_, á tener un género de vida _idéntico_, no deben aparecer apenas las diferencias naturales que, cual semillas en terreno impropio para que germinen, desaparecen sin haberse desarrollado. Como Chateaubriand saludaba en el

cementerio de aldea _á los héroes sin victoria_, en las tumbas de un pueblo primitivo podrían saludarse ambiciosos sin poder, filósofos sin ideas, poetas sin lira: en semejante estado social, la igualdad está en su grado máximo.

Apenas el hombre trabaja con más perfección, de modo que no necesite estar trabajando siempre, aquella necesidad imperiosa ciegamente niveladora disminuye. El más hábil, el más previsor realiza algunas economías, tentación para el que no las tiene, recurso para el que por medio de ellas puede entregarse á un reposo fecundo. Aparecen el malhechor que se apodera de lo ajeno, el vicioso que se entrega á una brutal sensualidad, el que extasiado contempla los sublimes espectáculos de la Naturaleza, el que observa ó adivina las leyes del mundo físico, y el que desciende á lo íntimo de su sér, á su conciencia y á su corazón, para investigar las del mundo moral. Tan pronto como los hombres dejan de estar apremiados por necesidades imprescindibles é idénticas, empiezan á rebajarse los unos, á elevarse los otros. Uno contempla el cielo, observa los movimientos de los astros y es el primer astrónomo; otro quiere fertilizar la tierra, inventa un instrumento para removerla y es el primer mecánico; aquél entra en sí mismo, y se pregunta quién es y cómo es, observa la creación, busca al Creador y es el primer filósofo. A medida que los conocimientos se acumulan, se multiplican, se diferencian mayor número de facultades ó todas entran en actividad, y las desigualdades se marcan más cada vez. Hay sabios é ignorantes, héroes y criaturas viles, criminales y santos. La necesidad general del trabajo continuo é idéntico para no perecer de hambre, era como un punto céntrico del cual no era posible alejarse mucho; pero á medida que el pueblo se civiliza, el círculo se ensancha, los radios se multiplican y extienden, y los hombres que marchan en direcciones opuestas se alejan cada vez más.

Pero este aumento de la desigualdad con el de la civilización no es graduado; no se verifica en virtud del desarrollo desigual de facultades diferentes; no concurren á él en proporciones razonables los elementos físico, intelectual y moral que constituyen el hombre que reposada y equitativamente se eleva ó desciende, según que ha recibido mayores dotes ó las aprovecha mejor. Desde los primeros albores de la vida de los pueblos se ve una causa permanente y poderosa, subversiva del orden y de la justicia, que no se tiene en cuenta para elevar y rebajar: esta causa de desigualdades establecidas _ab irato_, es la guerra.

La guerra, respecto al asunto que nos ocupa, es subversiva del orden principalmente en tres conceptos:

Por el modo de calificar á los hombres para elevarlos y rebajarlos;

Por los medios empleados para elevar;

Por la escala que establece para los de arriba y para los de abajo, ó más bien por el abismo que abre entre unos y otros.

La guerra no pedía al hombre para elevarle una superioridad verdadera, que consiste en la armonía de sus facultades y en la superioridad de algunas: fuerza física, valor y alguna destreza para utilizarle era todo lo que necesitaba para sobreponer un individuo ó un pueblo respecto de otros pueblos ú otros individuos. No exigía del hombre que declaraba superior que fuese completo y armónico; le bastaba mutilado, por decirlo así, y hasta monstruoso: podía ser de limitado entendimiento y depravada moral, incapaz de comprender nada elevado ni hacer nada bueno; podía ser hasta excepcionalmente malo, y, no obstante, calificarse de superior, de grande, y lograr prestigio, poder, riqueza. En vez de concurrir á su elevación todas las dotes naturales verdaderamente humanas, y la voluntad para utilizarlas, bastábanle pocas cualidades ó alguna pasión que las suplía. Parece claro este hecho: que la guerra tiene un criterio _limitado é injusto_ para calificar á los hombres, elevándolos conforme á sus necesidades, que son las de la lucha, y no las de la justicia. Y si puede ensalzar y ensalza muchas veces á los menos inteligentes y más perversos, ¿qué reglas aplica á los que deprime? No serán equitativas, porque, en general, no se puede dar á un hombre más de lo que merece, sin que otro reciba menos de lo que es debido; y en este caso particular, el motivo que lleva á prescindir de todas las circunstancias malas que no perjudican para el combate, hace desdeñar las buenas que en él no se utilizan, y al batallador limitado ó perverso que se eleva corresponde el inteligente bondadoso que se rebaja, porque le repugna la lucha, la sangre, el estrago, porque ama la vida y respeta la de los otros. En vano habrá recibido altas dotes que puede y quiere utilizar en bien de sus semejantes; le faltan las que la guerra necesita, y es condenado ignominiosamente á formar parte de la masa que se desdeña y humilla.

Si el criterio de la guerra para establecer la desigualdad entre los hombres es limitado é injusto, los medios que pone á su disposición para elevarlos no son más equitativos. Muchas fuerzas ciegas que sigan el impulso de una que se reconoce superior, séalo ó no; muchas voluntades que guardan silencio para oir la voz de una sola voluntad que se impone; obediencias incondicionales é instantáneas, tan sordas al temor de la muerte como á las amonestaciones de la conciencia, y con la falta de responsabilidad, la depresión moral que rebaja. Autoridad sin límites, brillos deslumbradores, opresiones continuas necesarias ó calificadas de tales; el hábito de ver el hecho convertido en derecho, la fuerza en ley, la fortuna en mérito, todo hace que los

medios empleados por la guerra sean propios para elevar á los que debían quedar muy abajo, y rebajar á los que debieran ser ensalzados.

La guerra forma una escala en que están á inmensa distancia el soldado y el jefe, y abre un abismo entre el vencedor y el vencido. Nada más contrario á la igualdad que un ejército disciplinado, á no ser el pueblo que conquista. En un principio, el exterminio establece la igualdad ante la muerte; pero cuando se empieza á conceder la vida á los vencidos se convierten en esclavos con este ó el otro nombre, con más duras ó más tolerables condiciones; entonces se inician las grandes desigualdades, que van creciendo como la avalancha que desciende por la montaña nevada. Los opresores que se elevaron suben cada vez más; los oprimidos que descendieron quedan cada vez más abajo. Hay clases, hay castas: la organización social forma alrededor de los hombres como un círculo de hierro que nadie puede romper, y fatalmente encadenado, debe morir allí porque allí nació. Una vez establecidas estas desigualdades, el nacimiento da un brillo que nada obscurece, ó una infamia que ningún mérito borra: cuando esto sucede en un pueblo, aunque no se sepa su historia, bien puede asegurarse que se compone de conquistadores y conquistados, porque sólo la embriaguez sangrienta del triunfo puede dictar tales leyes, y sólo puede admitirlas el pánico de la derrota. Una vez establecidas, una vez abierto el abismo que separa los fuertes, los nobles, los explotadores de los débiles, viles y explotados, todo parece concurrir á aumentar el poderío de los unos y la humillación de los otros. Se ha dicho con verdad que los que nacen _en_ la esclavitud nacen _para_ la esclavitud, que se aumenta y perpetúa degradando á los esclavos. Sobre ellos pesa lo más rudo de la obra social; y como trabajan sin descanso, sufren sin quejas, viven sin goces y mueren sin rebeldías, parece natural que vivan, sufran y mueran así, de tal modo que no sólo los hombres de la fuerza bruta, sino los pensadores y los filósofos, tienen por natural, por equitativa, por razonable la más injusta de las desigualdades, la que las crea todas, la que separa á los hombres en esclavos y dueños, la que da á unos poder, riqueza, consideración, y á los otros miseria, impotencia é ignominia; la que envilece el trabajo y ennoblece el ocio.

A veces, la casta guerrera ó la nación conquistadora no son bastante fuertes para rebajar al mismo nivel todo lo que está por debajo de ella y gradúa la desigualdad como el feudalismo, y la servidumbre de los vencidos como Roma, creando diques escalonados donde vayan á estrellarse las oleadas que levanta el sentimiento de la justicia ó el dolor de la desesperación.

Así, pues, la guerra, por la clase de personas que encumbra, por la altura á que las eleva, por los medios que emplea para elevarlas, por lo mucho que rebaja á los que deprime y los motivos que para rebajarlos tiene porque hace de unos más, de otros menos que hombres, porque distribuye ventajas y perjuicios con exceso y sin criterio, y, en fin, porque da á todo esto la consistencia necesaria, no sólo para que se sostenga, sino para que se perpetúe: la guerra puede decirse que ha sido la causa más poderosa y general de desniveles sociales, y efecto de ella son hoy todavía muchas desigualdades cuyo origen no siempre se le atribuye.

Las religiones del mundo antiguo han contribuído también á que los hombres se eleven y se rebajen por motivos que no son ni diferencias naturales, ni méritos ó culpas, y antes bien proporcionando ventajas á veces en razón inversa de los merecimientos. Mientras la Divinidad es el Omnipotente incomprensible y temido que ninguno pretende conocer, que todos procuran hacerse propicio atrayendo su benevolencia ó aplacando su cólera, cada cual es el ministro de su propio culto, y la religión establece las diferencias del merecimiento, no las desigualdades de la jerarquía. Pero desde que lo incomprensible se convierte en misterio que algunos pretenden explicar, desde que hay dogma y sacerdote, hay superioridades espirituales que no tardan en convertirse en dictaduras, que en pueblos groseros se materializan. El sacerdocio forma casta privilegiada, hace alianza con la de los guerreros, y fortifica, sancionándola en nombre de Dios, la desigualdad más injusta entre los hombres. Parece que el panteísmo de la mayor parte de las religiones del mundo antiguo debía contribuir á la igualdad; pero el dogma, que abruma al hombre, que le anonada, que le quita fuerza y dignidad, que enerva todos los resortes de la persona hasta aniquilarla moralmente, es no un enemigo, sino un aliado de las profundas distinciones entre las clases: dada una masa que se predispone á la humillación, á quien se priva de energía para la resistencia, y que consiente en rebajarse, habrá siempre alguno, varios ó muchos que se eleven para oprimirla y explotarla.

Aun en los pueblos donde no hay casta sacerdotal, ni teocracia, forman los sacerdotes un cuerpo privilegiado, que, depositario de la verdad, no la comunican á todos igualmente. Los iniciados en los grandes misterios son pocos, y el Verbo divino no mora entre la muchedumbre, condenada á vivir en la miseria, en el envilecimiento y en el error. La desigualdad decretada en el campo de batalla se bendice y se consolida en el templo.

Así, pues, los progresos de la civilización son los de la desigualdad:

Porque dan lugar á que se cultiven facultades diferentes, se desplieguen actividades más ó menos enérgicas, y se manifiesten voluntades débiles ó fuertes, rectas ó torcidas;

Porque la guerra pierde el carácter de defensiva; no tiene ya por objeto vivir, sino engrandecerse, la conquista; sustituye al exterminio la esclavitud, y cuando los vencidos son esclavos, los vencedores dejan de ser compañeros;

Porque la religión hace del sacerdocio casta, ó al menos cuerpo privilegiado que da sus oráculos al pueblo supersticioso y grosero, arrojándole el error como se arroja á los perros la carne emponzoñada.

¿Y los progresos de la civilización llevarán consigo indefectible y eternamente los de la desigualdad? Lo primero es inevitable dada la naturaleza humana: la desigualdad crece en las primeras sociedades, que viven de guerra, de ignorancia y de superstición; pero tiene un límite, puede tenerle al menos, pasado el cual decrecerá é irá acercándose al mínimum posible. ¿Cómo se perpetúa? ¿Cómo disminuye? Procuremos investigarlo.

CAPÍTULO IV.

CÓMO SE PERPETÚA LA DESIGUALDAD INJUSTA.

La desigualdad en las masas, clases ó castas tiene los mismos elementos que en los individuos: el físico, el intelectual, el moral, y las diferencias que en un principio tal vez no existían, y las superioridades que eran acaso imaginarias, pueden llegar con el tiempo á ser reales y positivas. La violencia ó la astucia hizo la _clase_ ó la _casta_, que el tiempo puede convertir en _raza_; es decir, en un modo de ser físico, intelectual y moral diferente y superior en los privilegiados.

En lo físico, cuando por espacio de muchas generaciones unos se alimentan bien y trabajan poco, y otros viven en la miseria y abrumados de trabajo, si se mantienen perfectamente separados, al cabo de siglos, los descendientes de los primeros tendrán una superioridad física natural.

Además de lo que influye en el desarrollo de la inteligencia un físico endeble y enfermizo, ¿qué medios tiene de cultivarla el que no dispone de otro patrimonio que un trabajo material abrumador, ni puede ver en ella un medio de romper el círculo de hierro que le encadena en su clase? ¿Cómo y para qué ha de instruirse? No lo intenta. Embrutecido ha visto á su padre como le verán sus hijos; y cuando pasan una y otra y muchas generaciones de hombres que no han pensado, sus descendientes tienen menos actividad intelectual, menos inclinación y disposición para pensar. No se hereda el genio ni el talento, ni aun siquiera una regular inteligencia; porque todo esto, para que se haga perceptible por sus frutos, necesita el concurso de la voluntad: no se heredan individualmente aptitudes intelectuales; cualquiera sabe que hay tontos, hijos de personas de talento, y viceversa; pero numerosas colectividades, que desde largo tiempo cultivan ó no su inteligencia, y permanecen separadas, se irán diferenciando; la educación, de individual pasará á ser colectiva, producirá diferencias positivas y permanentes según las cuales la clase que se instruye, no sólo tiene la ventaja de instruirse, sino la de tener mayor aptitud natural para aprender.

En lo moral, la voluntad del hombre, su conciencia, su libre albedrío, limitan mucho la influencia de su posición social; en todas puede ser bueno, justo, santo, y lo es. Pero si su virtud no depende de su estado, y antes puede acrisolarse en el más humilde, es difícil que cuando nace muy abajo tenga condiciones de carácter que no favorezcan las desigualdades establecidas, y que sea digno, firme sin violencia, perseverante sin terquedad, contra los que intentan rebajarle, cuando ve que todos los suyos se humillan, se cansan, ceden.

Así, pues, establecida la desigualdad de las clases, y más aún de las castas, tiende á modificar á los hombres física, moral é intelectualmente, á convertir con el transcurso del tiempo en positivas, diferencias que eran imaginarias, y á perpetuarse dando ventajas naturales y permanentes que apoyan, fortifican, y en cierta medida legitiman las sociales. Y todo esto, no de individuo á individuo, sino de unas á otras colectividades.

Semejantes desigualdades, que de imaginarias llegan á ser positivas, parecen naturales, necesarias, justas, no sólo al vulgo, no sólo á la soberbia de los opresores y á la degradación de los oprimidos, sino á los que viven en la esfera elevada de las ideas y que no debían contaminarse con la injusticia del hecho, al establecer el derecho. Los grandes filósofos declaran conforme á él, la más inicua de las desigualdades, y proclaman la esclavitud como base indispensable del orden social. La ciencia, la religión, la fuerza proclaman la desigualdad como un axioma, como un dogma, como una institución veneranda, y la institución se venera y se consolida. La desigualdad extrema que priva á una clase de derechos, y casi no impone á otra deberes, las deprava á entrambas; y si alguna idea, si alguna creencia, si algún sentimiento no produce reacción moral fuerte en favor de una razonable igualdad, los

pueblos decaen, viven en el marasmo de la degradación y de la desdicha, ó son oprimidos y aun aniquilados fácilmente por otros, inferiores tal vez, bajo el punto de vista intelectual, pero superiores moralmente y donde no se han establecido esas diferencias extremas que convierten á unos hombres en semi-dioses y á otros en animales de carga.

CAPÍTULO V.

¿CUÁNDO, CÓMO Y CON QUÉ CONSECUENCIAS SE PERPETÚA LA DESIGUALDAD Ó SE RESTABLECE LA IGUALDAD?

Hemos visto que el resultado inevitable de la civilización, dada la naturaleza del hombre, es el progreso de la desigualdad, que se gradúa más y más á medida que aumentan los medios de diferenciarse. Valerosos heroicos y rebaños cobardes; ricos y pobres; ignorantes y sabios; todos los esplendores de la gloria, del genio, del lujo; todas las vilezas de la abyección, del embrutecimiento y de la miseria, crecen paralelas y separan cada vez más á los que elevan y á los que rebajan. Entonces llega una hora suprema en la vida de los pueblos, hora que decide de su prosperidad y á veces de su existencia, hora en que aceptan las divisiones de clases y de castas ó se rebelan contra el privilegio y piden derechos para todos, igualdad. Se comprende que ha de ser larga y terrible la lucha de los esclavos contra los señores, de los pobres contra los ricos, de los ignorantes contra los sabios; y se comprende también que si la igualdad es cosa fácil en una horda inculta, es muy difícil en un pueblo civilizado. Por más dificultosa que sea, es necesaria, en cierta medida, como la justicia, y se va reclamando y obteniendo en medio de combates, de exageraciones, de injusticias. Los que la piden y los que la niegan suelen desconocer sus condiciones, hasta dónde es preciso que llegue, de dónde no puede pasar, cómo es relativa al estado social del pueblo que la exige, y con frecuencia se ve en los privilegiados procedimientos para sostener la desigualdad que conduce al aniquilamiento y en los niveladores actos para establecer la igualdad salvaje.

En medio de esta lucha que inmola tantas víctimas y en que perecen tantos mártires, el trabajo se va lavando de la nota de infamia que le manchaba; la guerra se humaniza, no sólo en el sentido de no exterminar á los vencidos, sino en el de no oprimirlos, y tiende á igualarlos con los vencedores, ó los iguala absolutamente; el privilegio de las armas se convierte en una carga, en una profesión ó en un oficio; la religión llama á los hombres hermanos; la ciencia se difunde y se hace casi siempre aliada de los pequeños: es niveladora, no en el sentido de aplastar lo que sobresale, sino en el de elevar lo que está debajo; la miseria y la riqueza no se aproximan, pero se condicionan de diferente modo; no tienen el fatalismo inmóvil que las caracterizaba; puede ser rico y lo es muchas veces el hijo del pobre, y el del millonario muere en la miseria; ésta hará por mucho tiempo terribles estragos; pero nunca tantos como en los países en que hay la desigualdad de clases que no pueden confundirse, de castas eternamente separadas.

Las naciones, bajo el punto de vista que nos ocupa, forman dos grandes grupos: uno, de las que no reaccionan contra la desigualdad cuando ha llegado el caso en que es un elemento verdaderamente deletéreo, y se inmovilizan, decaen ó perecen; otro, de las que protestan, se rebelan, luchan contra los privilegios y los suprimen. Dependiendo la igualdad de causas tan varias, siendo tan influyente en todos los elementos sociales y tan influída por ellos, según circunstancias que varían al infinito, hallará mayores dificultades para establecerse, tendrá más combates, más vicisitudes, más derrotas, y avanzará rápida ó paulatinamente. Pero en todo caso, para el pueblo que llega á una civilización adelantada, el progreso, el verdadero progreso, que es á la vez material, intelectual y moral, no puede continuar sin el de la igualdad. Así la vemos crecer más despacio ó más de prisa, pero crecer siempre, en todos los pueblos verdaderamente prósperos y grandes.

¿Pero basta igualar á los hombres que forman una nación para que ésta sea digna y feliz? Seguramente que no. La igualdad forma parte de la justicia, no la constituye; y cuando el nivel está muy bajo, cuando significa la abyección de todos, menor será el daño si sobresalen algunos, y menos malas serán las aristocracias que el despotismo de uno solo sobre muchedumbres que, como rebaños, se esquilan y degüellan. Los defensores del privilegio presentan en su apoyo, no sólo aristocracias florecientes y democracias en decadencia, sino pueblos que fueron grandes mientras tuvieron profundas diferencias de castas ó clases, y para los cuales la igualdad fué la ruina.

Hay que distinguir, como hemos indicado, el nivel de la instrucción, del honor y de la virtud, del que establece el vicio, la ignominia y la ignorancia; hay que tomar la historia en largos períodos, sin lo cual no puede darnos lecciones. Llegados los pueblos á aquel grado de civilización en que la desigualdad inevitable subía al máximum, que degrada y arruina si no se reacciona contra ella, ¿quiénes son los que tienen interés y deseo de ponerle coto? Los que ha oprimido física, intelectual y moralmente: los pobres, los ignorantes, los viles; y como no es posible el instantáneo cambio que los iguale á los superiores, la transformación es lenta, y en algunos casos imposible. La desigualdad llega á ser como un miembro que es necesario cortar, pero al amputarle se ve que ha

sido inútil; el organismo todo estaba inficionado, la fiebre purulenta sobreviene, y la muerte es inevitable. De la misma manera decaen ó perecen los pueblos de los cuales desaparece una institución que los ha corrompido sin remedio. Lejos de abonarse una aristocracia por los extravíos de la democracia que la sigue, se condena, y la igualdad no hace más que reflejar y revelar los vicios del privilegio; sólo se puede defender éste cuando puede transformarse, cuando tiene en sí bastantes elementos morales é intelectuales para ser humano y expansivo, de manera que su sombra no mate, sino que, por el contrario, pueda crecer en ella la práctica del deber y la idea del derecho. La desigualdad exagerada, la casta, la clase inmóvil, paraliza y arruina al pueblo que en el momento necesario no reacciona, y será arrastrado á su ruina por una minoría privilegiada, ó por la mayoría niveladora que proclame el derecho cuando ya no es capaz de practicar el deber. La plebe envilecida y poderosa que sucede á una aristocracia, lejos de abonarla es su condenación, porque es su obra.

El privilegio en el mundo civilizado y cristiano no desaparece entre las ruinas del pueblo que dominó; antes, por el contrario, va transformándose en derecho y dando lugar, no á la igualdad que rebaja, sino á la que eleva. Los patricios no son arrastrados por el oleaje pestilente de un populacho vil, sino convertidos en ciudadanos é igualados á los que intelectual y moralmente no son inferiores á ellos ó los aventajan. Sin duda pasiones y errores producen tempestades; pero después que pasan, y aun en medio de ellas, el nivel moral é intelectual se eleva más cada día, y las diferencias disminuyen, no porque los de arriba descienden, sino porque los de abajo suben. En todas las naciones que progresan, progresa la igualdad, y puede afirmarse que, en la medida justa, es un elemento indispensable de bienestar y grandeza.

Y ¿cómo sabremos cuándo la supresión del privilegio precede á la ruina de un pueblo, y cuándo á su engrandecimiento? Fácil es investigarlo. Basta saber si se nivela rebajando á los de arriba, ó elevando á los de abajo: si lo primero, la igualdad es la muerte; si lo segundo, la vida.

Todos los pueblos han pasado, pasan ó pasarán por esa crisis de su civilización en que la desigualdad inevitable llega á un máximum incompatible con el progreso si no se reacciona contra ella. Y ¿por qué esta reacción se verifica en unos países y en otros no, es á veces saludable, á veces dañosa, y caminando todos al privilegio por vías muy parecidas, unos le conservan, otros le suprimen con buen éxito, y algunos se arruinan al arruinarle? No sabemos si habrá quien pueda dar respuesta satisfactoria á la pregunta: por nuestra parte, estamos muy lejos de tener ciencia bastante para conocer las causas de tan varios efectos, y nos limitaremos á señalar una que nos parece de suma importancia.

Comparando los pueblos que reaccionan á tiempo, y para bien suyo, contra la desigualdad, y los que para su mal la perpetúan ó la destruyen, se ve que los primeros no son siempre ni más ricos ni más inteligentes que los segundos, y que en muchos casos son más pobres y menos ilustrados, de modo que el elemento material é intelectual es inferior en ellos. Y siendo esto así, teniendo la desventaja de la mayor pobreza é ignorancia, ¿cómo realizan el progreso de suprimir á tiempo la desigualdad excesiva que corroe á otros? ¿Cuál fuerza los impulsa y los sostiene? La fuerza moral. Los pueblos en que el hombre es más digno, más justo, más humano, menos egoísta, menos débil para dejarse arrastrar por los vicios que degradan, mejor dispuesto para sentir los nobles y piadosos sentimientos que impulsan á la abnegación y al sacrificio; los pueblos más morales, en fin, son los que tienen pecheros que pueden transformarse en ciudadanos, aristocracias en que los señores son hombres con virtud y conciencia bastante para comprender los deberes de humanidad y practicarlos hasta dejar en ocasiones á sus pares, y formar en las filas de los plebeyos, y pelear á su lado y morir por ellos. En estos pueblos, los de abajo tienen corazón, la dignidad, aunque no sea más que latente, del hombre honrado; los de arriba tienen entrañas, y todos algo que repugna aceptar é imponer perpetuamente la servidumbre y la tiranía sin límites. Podrán ser más pobres y más ignorantes; pero son más dignos que los que oprimen sin misericordia y se dejan oprimir sin protesta, y la reacción contra desigualdades irritantes se verifica en virtud principalmente del elemento moral.

Esta verdad merece ser consignada, porque encierra, á nuestro parecer, una lección importante. Si pueblos ricos y cultos se han inmovilizado ó sucumbido en desigualdades incompatibles con el progreso, por falta de resorte moral; si por tenerle, otros inferiores en cultura, han suprimido privilegios que eran obstáculo insuperable á su bienestar, ¿no se pone en evidencia la gran parte que el elemento moral tiene para realizar la igualdad? De pueblo á pueblo el hecho es de más bulto, no más positivo que de clase á clase ó de individuo á individuo. En vano se mejorará la situación económica de las masas, y aun se les dará alguna instrucción; si están desmoralizadas no subirá su nivel, y antes es posible que descienda, y que á medida que se enriquecen (con riqueza relativa) se rebajen, porque usando en perjuicio de sus deberes los mayores recursos de que disponen, se alejan más cada vez de la igualdad en el derecho, y sólo para la común abyección quedan aptos.

No llevamos, procuramos, al menos, no llevar á ningún asunto espíritu de sistema ni exclusivismos, muy perjudiciales al descubrimiento de la verdad. No negamos, cuando se trata de las instituciones y modo de ser de un pueblo, la importancia que

tiene el elemento intelectual y físico ó económico; pero no suele darse la que tiene al moral; se conviene en que cierto grado de miseria y de ignorancia hace imposible la igualdad en el derecho; pero no se recuerda bastante que es también incompatible con la depravación y que exige un mínimum de virtud como de bienestar y de cultura. Por eso conviene recordar el testimonio de la historia; ver pueblos de una civilización adelantada abrumados por privilegios odiosos ó envilecidos bajo el nivel de la servidumbre por falta de resorte moral; y observando este hecho en el presente y en el pasado, en derredor nuestro y en remotos países, nos convenceremos de que no es fortuito, sino necesario, y que luchan contra las leyes de la naturaleza humana los que pretenden elevar socialmente al hombre que moralmente está rebajado.

No se puede hacer un ciudadano de un mendigo, de un loco, ni de un malvado; y en la casa de beneficencia, en el manicomio ó en el presidio pueden estudiarse bien, porque están en relieve los insuperables obstáculos que para igualar á los hombres sin rebajarlos opone la falta de lo necesario físico, intelectual y moral.

Sin este necesario no hay salud del cuerpo ni tampoco del alma, y los hombres que no están sanos de espíritu son tan inhábiles para la igualdad en el derecho como para el servicio militar cuando tienen defectos físicos.

Así, pues, al que olvida la importancia del elemento moral recordémosela, y la del físico é intelectual á los que hablan de igualdad en el derecho al que no la comprende, al que tiene hambre y á satisfacerla se limitan todas sus aspiraciones. Nunca se ha visto, y puede asegurarse que jamás se verá, que los hombres se igualen elevándose si su pobreza en todos conceptos llega á ser miseria. A veces, una idea, un sentimiento, suplen inferioridades y nivelan: la fe, el amor, la ciencia, la patria hallan mártires sublimes entre los hombres más obscuros, que la abnegación y el heroísmo sacan de su humilde esfera para elevarlos á la gloria y á la inmortalidad. Y no sólo individuos, sino que hay en la vida de los pueblos horas en que las muchedumbres, impulsadas por una idea ó un sentimiento, se igualan á los más altos; pero ya se prevee, y además puede observarse, que estas explosiones de entusiasmo no sirven para marcar la cultura permanente á que llegan las colectividades, ni establecen la regla de su marcha normal y progresiva: ayer dieron mártires y héroes, hoy ó mañana darán tiranos y esclavos; el nivel era como el de las aguas de una inundación, que desaparece con ellas y deja al descubierto todas las desigualdades del terreno. No hay igualdad permanente sino la que es armónica, ni armónica sino aquella que contiene, en grado mayor ó menor, pero siempre suficiente, los tres elementos esenciales del hombre, físico, intelectual y moral. Si no se estableciera esto por el raciocinio, lo pondría de manifiesto la historia de los progresos de la igualdad y de las inútiles tentativas para realizarla en el derecho.

Una vez iniciada con buen éxito la reacción contra desigualdades injustas, van disminuyendo ó desaparecen muchas que, en fuerza de ser antiguas y positivas, parecían naturales y necesarias. Derribado el obstáculo que se opone á que los hombres cultiven sus aptitudes varias, y se multipliquen, no dentro de una clase ó casta, sino según sus condiciones económicas, afectivas é intelectuales, sucederán dos cosas de capital importancia.

Las ventajas físicas é intelectuales, la superioridad moral, no serán dones de la naturaleza ó merecimientos de la virtud, que esteriliza constante y fatalmente la organización social, sino que podrán, con mayor ó menor esfuerzo, pero podrán al fin elevar á los humildes y rebajar á los soberbios que no tienen aptitud adecuada ni voluntad recta para sostenerse á la altura en que los colocó la suerte. La ciencia, el poder y la riqueza no estarán vedados á nadie ni serán patrimonio de ninguno, y lejos de abrumar sin remedio á los de abajo, podrán servir de estímulo á sus aspiraciones levantadas. Las dotes naturales y la voluntad recta y firme, la voluntad débil y torcida ó la escasa inteligencia, cuando no hay una institución que tuerza ó paralice sus determinaciones libres, producen continuos cambios de posición, en que los pobres de ayer son los ricos de hoy, y en que el que nació en la clase más humilde muere potentado. Las armas y las letras, la ciencia y el poder, la religión y el arte, el comercio y la industria, tendrán eminencias que han venido de muy abajo, y se establecerá un movimiento de ascenso y descenso que tiende á confundir lo que antes parecía irremisiblemente separado.

Cuando las clases pueden confundirse y más ó menos se confunden, no tienden á formar _razas_, es decir, á acumular por espacio de muchas generaciones ventajas é inconvenientes, disposiciones que se trasmiten, diferencias que de sociales han pasado á ser fisiológicas, ventajas é inferioridades que explican en los unos la humillación y en los otros la soberbia. No se inmovilizan las masas en el aislamiento de las clases, y las inferiores progresarán de dos modos: ilustrándose y participando de la herencia de otras más ilustradas.

Así, pues, como las desigualdades injustas producen efectos que tienden á perpetuarlas cuando se reacciona contra ellas, la igualdad en el derecho, una vez iniciada, prepara sus propios progresos, lleva en sí las condiciones de su incremento y, como la fama, adquiere fuerza marchando.

CAPÍTULO VI.

¿EN QUÉ ESFERA SE ESTABLECE PRIMERAMENTE LA IGUALDAD?

En cualquier pueblo que nos propongamos estudiar podremos ver:

Palacios monumentales, casas lujosas, habitaciones cómodas, albergues en que no hay comodidad, tugurios, chozas, cuevas que parecen inhabitables y que lo son bajo el punto de vista higiénico;

Costosos trajes de ricas telas, encajes primorosos, piedras preciosas, oro y perlas, vestidos modestos, ropas ordinarias ó burdas, harapos y desnudez;

Refinamientos en el atavío y cuidado de la persona, pomadas, jabones, aguas olorosas, cosméticos, tintes, pinturas, todo género de afeite cuyo objeto es hermosearla, esmero razonable, limpieza higiénica, descuido perjudicial, abandono completo y suciedad repugnante;

Mesa opípara artísticamente preparada, manjares variados y exquisitos que en costosa profusión ofrecen servidores de frac, alimentos sustanciosos y abundantes, comida necesaria, escasa, insuficiente, hambre;

Paredes cubiertas de seda, suelos de alfombra, techos artesonados, cortinajes, adornos, raso, terciopelo, oro, maderas primorosamente esculpidas, ajuar elegante, cómodo, decente, pobre, miserable, en que no hay silla donde sentarse ni cama en que dormir;

Variedad de carruajes y de soberbios caballos, coche modesto y propio, vehículo alquilado, botas impermeables, zapatos que dejan pasar la humedad, pies descalzos;

Torrentes de luz que reflejan espejos venecianos y jarrones de Sèvres, alumbrado suficiente, escaso, obscuridad completa por falta de medios de alumbrarse;

Fuego sostenido por el combustible más caro que se ve á través de la tallada pantalla de cristal, atmósfera tibia en Diciembre y perfumada por plantas olorosas, temperatura conveniente, muy baja, insoportable, en que el frío duele y mata;

Costosas diversiones que se suceden, recreo razonable, trabajo abrumador, ocio aburrido;

Multitud de impresiones recibidas en ciudades y países diversos, variedad de objetos que se ven ó se conocen, monotonía de una existencia en cuyo limitado horizonte se descubren pocas cosas y siempre las mismas;

Prestigio, gloria, aplauso, buen nombre, obscuridad, desprecio, humillación, ignominia;

Poder, mando, subordinación, obediencia incondicional;

Ciencia profunda, extenso saber, instrucción, ignorancia.

Todos estos contrastes, que parecen rebuscados con empeño, se ofrecen como espontáneamente á la observación, y aun diríamos á la simple vista de cualquiera que la fije en los fenómenos sociales. En todos los países, más ó menos, siempre comprendiendo numerosas colectividades, existen estas profundas diferencias. Y á pesar de ellas, y aunque se acumulen, lo cual es muy frecuente, ¿puede establecerse igualdad? ¿Cómo, en qué, para qué se establecerá entre personas tan distintas? ¿Puede ser para ellos más que una palabra con que se disfraza una ilusión ó un engaño? ¿En qué pueden ser iguales aquel pobre y aquel rico, aquel poderoso y aquel débil, aquel sabio y aquel ignorante? ¿Qué poder nivelador rebajará á los unos ó elevará á los otros? ¿Existe, puede existir ese poder? Sí, ese poder existe; es la voluntad del hombre, su libre albedrío, su fuerza moral.

Por ella es bueno ó malo, digno ó infame, santo ó malhechor; se iguala á los primeros ó desciende hasta los últimos, y en medio de tantas diferencias hace posible y cierta _la igualdad ante la ley_.

¿Ante qué ley? puede preguntarse, porque hay muchas leyes. Cierto; la ley política puede negarle ó concederle voto, según sea pobre ó rico, instruído ó ignorante; la ley de Beneficencia puede darle ó negarle permiso para pedir limosna, según sea un individuo aislado, ó pertenezca á una colectividad legalmente constituída; la ley de instrucción pública puede prohibirle que enseñe, ó autorizarle para enseñar, según que tenga ó no las circunstancias requeridas; pero en medio de estas y otras desigualdades, en todo pueblo que pretende llamarse culto existe _la igualdad ante la ley civil y ante la ley penal_. Las mismas

condiciones se exigen para los contratos de los pobres y de los ricos, y es igualmente justiciable un delincuente, cualquiera que sea su posición social, su ignorancia ó su ciencia. No siempre sucedió así, ni hace mucho tiempo que sucede; pero hoy nos causaría tanta indignación como asombro que la tramitación legal difiriese según la importancia de los procesados ó contratantes; que las penas se aplicasen, no según los delitos, sino según las personas que los cometían, y que dependiese de la calidad del muerto que el matador pagase con la vida ó con algunas monedas. Nada de esto puede suceder ya, y parece tan natural que no suceda, que las personas que lo ignoran no suponen que nunca haya sucedido. En la historia se encuentran estas distinciones; en el recto juicio y en la conciencia, no.

Como la igualdad ante la ley penal ni es una imposición pasajera de un déspota omnipotente ni de la plebe amotinada; como se la ve razonada, crecer, afirmarse á medida que las naciones se ilustran y se constituyen conforme á derecho, puede considerarse como un hecho que permanecerá. Pero todo hecho permanente tiene una causa que lo es también. ¿Y cuál puede ser esta causa en el asunto que nos ocupa? Esta causa no puede ser más que un elemento _común_, alguna gran semejanza entre esos mismos hombres en que se perciben diferencias tan notables bajo otros respectos, pero que en alguno pueden ser y se consideran como iguales. Esa causa, ese elemento común es el moral; y como todos (los sanos de espíritu) distinguen el mal del bien, pueden realizar el uno ó el otro y son responsables ó beneméritos igualmente con diferencias personales, pero no de clase, se prescinde de ésta para juzgarlos moralmente y se los iguala.

Por más que digan los que pretenden separar la moral del derecho como cosas independientes, no sólo el derecho no puede separarse de la moral, sino que el progreso consiste en que se unan cada vez más íntimamente, y el ideal en que no hubiese ninguna inmoralidad que no pudiera ser y no fuese penada por la ley. No podemos extendernos sobre este asunto sin pasar los límites del que nos ocupa; pero hemos debido hacer esta indicación para salir al encuentro á una réplica posible contra lo dicho, de que la igualdad moral es el origen, base y afianzamiento de la igualdad ante la ley penal.

El pobre y el ignorante, como el millonario y el docto, ama á sus hijos y es amado de sus padres; es buen amigo, fiel confidente; tiene sentimientos y afectos y determinaciones dignas; respeta la propiedad ajena, la vida de los otros hombres, por cuyo bien inmola á veces la suya. El filósofo moralista encuentra allí una moralidad responsable, tan _responsable_ como la de un gran señor ó un sabio, y una personalidad _respetable_ en la misma medida; y el legislador, partiendo de este hecho, declara á los hombres iguales ante la ley penal. Pueden no ser todos electores, ni elegibles, ni catedráticos, ni ingenieros; pero todos pueden ser honrados, deben serlo y faltan cuando no lo son: según los grados de la falta, no según el que ocupa el que la comete, se impone la pena, que es, que debe ser al menos, consecuencia de una inmoralidad que la ley ha calificado justiciable.

¿Es _idéntico_ el conocimiento que tiene del mal que hace un hombre rudo y un hombre ilustrado? Puede que lo sea y puede que no. Puede que lo sea, porque el que sabe sumar, por ejemplo, aunque no sepa álgebra, ni cálculo diferencial, suma tan bien como el más consumado matemático, y el mal hecho podrá ser tan claro y sencillo para la conciencia, como para el entendimiento el que dos y dos son cuatro. El pensador sabrá la filosofía de las matemáticas y la del derecho que el letrado ignora; mas para sumar y conducirse bien basta la razón práctica, y no son menester especulaciones metafísicas ni conceptos trascendentales.

Como la identidad no existe entre las personas, ni aun en las cosas que podemos observar, la igualdad hemos dicho que es aquel grado de semejanza necesario al objeto que nos proponemos al hacer la comparación. Al comparar moralmente á un rico y á un pobre, á un sabio y á un ignorante, á través de sus muchas diferencias encontramos entre ellos la semejanza _necesaria_ y _suficiente_ para declararlos _iguales_ ante la ley civil y ante la ley penal, é iguales los declaramos; y esta declaración no es ilusoria como otras que carecen de fundamento, sino que es real, positiva, practicable y practicada, como que tiene por base un hecho cierto universalmente reconocido.

Así, la moral, que hemos visto tan poderosa para establecer igualdad entre las personas que en virtud de su voluntad recta ó torcida se rebajan ó se elevan, utilizando ó haciendo inútiles ó perjudiciales los altos dones que han recibido; la moral, que en los pueblos influye poderosamente para que reaccionen contra la desigualdad injusta, cuando es ya incompatible con el progreso y produce la decadencia; la moral, que para el bien de las naciones como de los individuos puede suplir tantas cosas y no puede ser suplida por ninguna; la moral conserva siempre su carácter nivelador, en el buen sentido de la palabra, el carácter de igualar elevando y en su esfera más propia, en aquella en que su influencia es mayor, es donde primero se establece la igualdad, porque es donde realmente existe primero.

El que los derechos civiles preceden á los políticos y la igualdad ante la ley penal se establece en medio de las mayores desigualdades, es un hecho de todos conocido; pero conviene recordarle y tener en cuenta las causas que le producen, á saber:

Que en la esfera moral es donde primero se establece la igualdad;

Que para establecer la igualdad basta la semejanza _necesaria_.

Las diferencias se perciben á primera vista; pero reflexionando se ve que el orden moral, religioso y jurídico tiene por condición la semejanza. Los preceptos, las reglas, las leyes, no pueden obligar á todos por igual, sino porque en todos hallan igualmente aptitudes bastantes para comprenderlas y cumplimentarlas.

CAPÍTULO VII.

LÍMITES DE LA IGUALDAD.

Los límites de la igualdad pueden variar mucho de hecho y de derecho, según los establezca la fuerza y el error, ó la razón y la justicia; pero aunque varíen han de existir, porque en lo humano todo los tiene, y porque un elemento de la organización social, sea el que fuere, no puede prescindir de los otros, no siendo único, ni dejar de ser condicional si ha de ser armónico. Las condiciones variarán con los tiempos y lugares; _à priori_ no pueden señalarse detalladamente; pero sí afirmar que existirán, y que, no habiendo derecho contra el derecho, los de la igualdad no pueden destruir ni invalidar otros.

Pocos hay que no sepan esto; pero muchos son los que lo olvidan y quieren llevar la igualdad donde no puede ir y darle una extensión que no está en la naturaleza de las cosas.

La igualdad estará limitada más ó menos; pero estará siempre limitada:

Por las diferencias naturales;

Por las que produce la voluntad del hombre;

Por lo que se llama la fortuna;

Por la ley, que tiende á aumentar la desigualdad cuando existe;

Por las necesidades sociales;

Por el Derecho.

LAS DIFERENCIAS NATURALES pueden ser tan grandes que produzcan desigualdad inevitable; hay dotes de alto precio que ninguna voluntad iguala, y desventajas que el más firme propósito no compensa. El gran talento para la guerra, las ciencias, las artes, la política, el comercio, la industria, descollará dadas ciertas circunstancias, sin que sea posible que la medianía se ponga á su nivel por más que emplee un trabajo intenso y perseverante; por el contrario, hay ineptitudes que se esforzarían en vano para subir ni aun adonde están los medianos. Tales casos, por ser raros, no dejan de existir y de ejercer una influencia mayor ó menor, según muchas circunstancias, pero siempre positiva é inevitable. Esto se entiende en la esfera física é intelectual, que en la moral ya sabemos que la altura depende de la voluntad de elevarse. Los hombres, á medida que vivan en condiciones más parecidas, creemos que se parecerán más y que habrá menos desigualdades naturales; pero, más ó menos, existirán siempre, y en cierta medida son necesarias para que los hombres vivan en una sociedad culta y progresiva.

LAS DIFERENCIAS QUE PRODUCE LA VOLUNTAD DEL HOMBRE son causa más poderosa de desigualdad que las naturales. Las grandes ventajas ó desventajas congénitas son raras, y muy común suplir éstas con una resolución firme y perseverante ó esterilizar aquéllas con la flojedad ó perversión del ánimo. Ya hemos recordado más arriba el hecho bien conocido y muy general de los que la determinación firme, débil ó torcida, ó eleva, ó rebaja, y si aquí lo repetimos es para hacer notar que, en mayor ó menor grado, tiene que ser inevitable y permanente, porque depende de la voluntad libre del hombre, á quien no se puede trazar una órbita para que sin salir de ella gire como los astros. El nivel moral podrá elevarse y se elevará; habrá más voluntades firmes y rectas, pero no se concibe que deje de haber desviaciones, y quien esté por encima y por debajo del nivel común, y grados en la virtud y en el vicio, en la santidad y en el crimen. El poder del libre albedrío del hombre, sobre permanente, como que forma parte de su naturaleza, se extiende á lo físico, á lo intelectual, á lo moral, á todo su sér. Las ventajas de la belleza, de la robustez, del talento, ó los inconvenientes contrarios, no ejercen una influencia decisiva fuera de su círculo de acción propia: por más capacidad que tenga un hombre no logrará convertirse de feo en hermoso, ni viceversa, y por más robusto que sea, no trocará en facultades intelectuales su fuerza muscular, ni con ella las destruirá tampoco. El poder de suplir en gran parte muchas ventajas ó hacerlas

completamente inútiles, y aun perjudiciales, no existe más que en la voluntad del hombre: ella es, puede ser, un elemento nivelador; pero en cierta medida será siempre una causa de desigualdad, porque no se concibe que los hombres no _usen desigualmente_ de medios de que disponen, aunque éstos fuesen iguales.

LO QUE SE LLAMA FORTUNA influye en la posición de los hombres, en su bienestar ó su desdicha. La fortuna, en el sentido de acaso, no existe; hay Providencia, ó, para los que no creen en ella, encadenamiento de causas y efectos, _causalidad_, no _casualidad_; pero, de todos modos, hay efectos de cuyas causas no dispone el hombre, y que influyen para que se eleve ó quede muy abajo. Sin duda que se atribuyen á la suerte muchos bienes, obra del mérito; muchos males, consecuencia de faltas; pero también es cierto que hay prosperidades y desdichas por razones que no se alcanzan, por justicia que no se comprende. Lejos, muy lejos de nosotros negar esa justicia y esa razón porque está por encima de la nuestra: la acatamos profunda y sinceramente; pero no por eso hemos de dejar de ver en lo que se llama fortuna un elemento de desigualdad, tal vez justa, pero indudablemente positiva.

LA LEY QUE TIENDE Á AUMENTAR LA DESIGUALDAD CUANDO EXISTE, la llamamos así porque nos parece tener el carácter de ley, es decir, de regla general y necesaria. Si establecemos un nivel, sea en lo físico, en lo intelectual ó en lo moral, veremos la tendencia á elevarse más los que están sobre él y á rebajarse los que quedan por debajo.

En lo físico, el que es fuerte y robusto puede allegar medios de subsistencia con que acrecentar esa robustez; el que es débil, está expuesto á la miseria, que aumentará su debilidad; el que dispone de un capital, halla facilidades para acrecentarle, mayores cuanto es mayor: la riqueza atrae la riqueza y la multiplica; el que es pobre, al menor contratiempo se empobrece más, cae en la miseria: hay una fuerza que empuja, al uno á la opulencia, al otro á la ruina.

En el que empieza á instruirse, la adquirida instrucción le da medios y facilidades para aumentarla; le inspira el deseo también por el amor á la ciencia ó el convencimiento de su utilidad; el que es ignorante y continúa siéndolo, aun en el caso de que pueda procurarse instrucción, no la procura, porque, no teniendo idea de las ventajas y de los goces del saber, no los busca; cuanto más tiempo pasa, más difícil le será el trabajo intelectual y tendrá menos deseo de vencer esta dificultad; su inteligencia se atrofiará como un órgano que no se usa, y por gravitación intelectual, el uno irá subiendo hasta ilustrarse, el otro descendiendo hasta embrutecerse.

El hombre virtuoso halla goces y facilidades para la virtud, que le elevan en ella cada vez más. Vencidos, tiene sus impulsos egoístas, sus apetitos groseros, sus ímpetus iracundos: luchó, triunfó, y ha llegado á aquella altura en que no comprende cómo pueda hacer mal á sabiendas en cosa grave, y en que su naturaleza, ennoblecida por su firme voluntad, tiene por ley hacer bien; este bien tiende á acrecentarse como los tesoros del rico. El hombre vicioso se debilita á medida que cede; cada falta es una derrota que le predispone á ser derrotado; á los efectos deprimentes del mal se añade el hábito de cometerle, y la pendiente hacia él es tan rápida, que sin una reacción fuerte, así como el que se elevó en la virtud puede llegar á ser santo, el que descendió se halla en peligro de ser criminal, y vemos esas criaturas que parecen impecables é incorregibles.

Pueden limitarse los casos (y creemos que se limitarán más cada vez) de miseria física, moral é intelectual; pero si cualquiera de ellos llega, por el hecho de existir propende á crecer, y nos parece que las grandes desigualdades, de cualquier género que sean, tienden á aumentarse, como la distancia entre dos líneas no paralelas que se prolongan.

LAS NECESIDADES SOCIALES imponen cierto grado de desigualdad por la división de trabajo y por las diferencias que en el obrero lleva consigo la diferente clase de obra. Sin duda que se va reconociendo, y más cada vez, como un factor común al apreciar el valor de las personas y sus desemejanzas; este factor común es el elemento humano, la cualidad de hombre que todos tienen; pero aunque ésta nivele á los más humildes con los más elevados bajo ciertos conceptos, siempre sucederá que de las múltiples necesidades de una civilización adelantada hayan de resultar trabajos diversos que exigen aptitudes diferentes y combinaciones en el arte, en la ciencia, en la industria, en el comercio, muy propias para establecer desigualdades. Estas combinaciones podrán neutralizarse con otras, no destruirse, porque son indispensables en las necesidades crecientes de la creciente civilización.

EL DERECHO será límite á la igualdad siempre que contra él quiera girar fuera de su órbita. Un elemento social por mucho tiempo comprimido suele aparecer haciendo explosión; y como si quisiera vengarse de haber sido negado negando, pretende, no sólo su natural y debida influencia, sino la que corresponde á otros, y porque fué desconocido quiere ser preponderante. Algo de esto acontece con la igualdad, que, á consecuencia de depresiones injustas, pide nivelaciones imposibles. Contra sus extravíos no habría remedio más eficaz que el conocimiento del Derecho, si se generalizara; él encauzaría esa corriente que tiende á

desbordarse, y en ocasiones se desborda. Cuando hay un derecho que lo es verdaderamente, no puede invalidarse por ninguna pretensión, injusta desde que pretende destruirle, y definiendo bien y marcando los límites de todos, se sabe de dónde no puede pasar cada uno. Esto es á la verdad bien sencillo y bien sabido, mas no por todos, y precisamente lo ignoran aquellos á quienes más convendría saberlo para no hacer de la igualdad alguna cosa absoluta, incondicionada y absorbente de todos los elementos sociales.

En virtud de la igualdad ante el Derecho, existe á veces la desigualdad entre los hombres; porque no teniendo todos iguales títulos, sería injusta su pretensión de igualarse. El malhechor que está preso y el hombre honrado que goza de libertad; el ignorante á quien se prohibe una profesión y el instruído á quien se autoriza para ejercerla; el pródigo á quien hay que quitar la administración de sus bienes, y el encargado por la ley para administrarlos, personas son que aparecen desiguales precisamente en virtud de la igualdad del Derecho, que, dando á cada uno lo que le es debido, no puede dar lo mismo á los que merecen de un modo tan diferente. A unos se debe una prisión, un tutor ejemplar, una camisa de fuerza; á otros el público aprecio, una corona, una estatua; y el que pretendiera identificar aquéllos y éstos, hollaría el Derecho en vez de establecerle.

Cierto que importa mucho antes consignar los derechos cerciorarse bien de que lo son; mas porque pueda haberlos mal definidos y aun en desacuerdo con la justicia, no se ha de atacar en su principio la santidad del Derecho ni prescindir de él alegando otro, sea el que fuere. Y como es raro, muy raro, que un derecho carezca enteramente de justicia, que en su motivo de ser no tenga alguna razón de ser, es necesario analizarle bien antes de declararle incompatible con otro que le destruya. Y de todos modos, y aunque la injusticia sea evidente, ni autoriza otra, ni con otra se neutraliza, sino que, por el contrario, se suma con ella. La igualdad fuera del derecho no estará fuera de él por atacar á alguno que á su vez no le haya respetado. Si yo, por ser igual al que tiene reloj, se lo quito á un ladrón que le ha robado, aunque mi derecho á la igualdad no esté limitado por el de propiedad, que él no tiene, lo estará por el de algún otro, puesto que es claro mi deber de no apropiarme lo que en ningún concepto puedo considerar como mío.

Así, pues, variarán los límites, pero siempre los hallará el derecho á la igualdad en otros derechos.

PARTE SEGUNDA.

De la igualdad, socialmente considerada.

CAPÍTULO PRIMERO.

INFLUENCIA RECÍPROCA DE LOS ELEMENTOS FÍSICO, INTELECTUAL Y MORAL, Y DE LA SEMEJANZA NECESARIA Y SUFICIENTE PARA ESTABLECER LA IGUALDAD.

Cuando se observa en las sociedades los progresos de la igualdad y las dificultades que para progresar halla, es fácil notar que éstas provienen en gran parte del desequilibrio de elementos que deberían armonizarse.

El hombre, sér físico, intelectual y moral, no puede consolidar ninguna institución social, y menos perpetuarla, si prescinde de sus condiciones morales, intelectuales ó físicas.

La igualdad necesita _semejanzas suficientes_ entre aquellos que ha de igualar, y sin las cuales pretenderá realizarse en vano.

Estas semejanzas no han de ser parciales, sino abarcar totalmente la existencia del hombre. Uno ú otro individuo podrá, con voluntad y virtudes excepcionales, sobreponerse á circunstancias abrumadoras; pero la regla es que, cualesquiera que sean los principios que se proclamen y las leyes que se promulguen en la vida de la sociedad, no hay igualdad _positiva_ sin semejanza _suficiente_.

Cuando falta albergue, sustento y vestido, en la miseria extrema, ¿puede igualarse el hombre que la padece al que tiene recursos superabundante? ¿Puede prescindir del frío y del hambre para cultivar las facultades de su espíritu? ¿Puede triunfar de la fuerza tiránica de las necesidades no satisfechas, hasta el punto de avasallarlas para que no le embrutezcan? ¿Puede sobreponerse por su carácter á su desventura, elevarse en una situación que humilla y hacer respetar una dignidad cubierta de harapos? Si en lo posible y por excepción cabe que suceda todo esto, la regla será siempre la que vemos en la práctica: que la miseria física lleva consigo la intelectual, y la moral en parte.

Y al que es moralmente miserable, ¿de qué le sirven los recursos materiales suficientes y aun superabundantes? ¿No vemos al vicioso y al criminal inutilizar ó volver contra sí y contra la sociedad los bienes y las dotes que había recibido de la fortuna ó de la naturaleza? Igual ó superior á los que estaban al nivel común, ¿no ha descendido hasta los más bajos? ¿No le vemos rehusar el trabajo material y el del espíritu, ó incapaz de trabajar á fuerza de excesos ó por el hábito de la holganza? ¿De qué le servirá la igualdad ante la ley que le allanó los caminos de la fortuna, si él se labra su desgracia y es propio é insuperable obstáculo á su bienestar?

La miseria intelectual prepara también las otras: cierto que la honradez es compatible con muchos grados de ignorancia. Siendo el lazo moral el más fuerte y necesario para que los hombres puedan vivir asociados, y la moralidad la condición más precisa para su moralización, Dios ha provisto á esta imperiosa necesidad dándoles la intuición del mal y del bien y el libre albedrío para realizarle. Basta poca inteligencia para ser bueno y aun para ser justo; pero alguna se necesita, y más cuando se vive en un pueblo ilustrado. La vida social en parte es armonía, en parte lucha, y fácil es notar que nuestra existencia es utilizar armonías y triunfar de dificultades. Para lo que es armónico puede bastar lo espontáneo, lo intuitivo, lo que todo hombre cabal sabe sin aprenderlo; mas para la lucha se necesitan armas iguales, y no las tiene el que carece absolutamente de cultura en un país muy civilizado. La desventaja se gradúa; pero puede ser extrema y tal, que esta desigualdad lleve á otras, sin que haya más medio de evitarlas que evitándola.

El hombre embrutecido en un pueblo culto, recibe escasa remuneración por su trabajo; éste es más rudo, con frecuencia malsano, ó porque lo sea en sí, ó porque no se tomen las precauciones debidas para sanearle. El operario, ó lo ignora, ó se conduce como si lo ignorase, ya por descuido, ya por una especie de fatalismo, muy propio de la ignorancia, ya, en fin, porque otros están prontos á aceptar las condiciones que él no acepte, y la necesidad de vivir le impone la de recibir la ley económica, por dura que sea. Resulta que la inferioridad intelectual origina la física por el mucho trabajo, á veces malsano y poco retribuído, y en consecuencia, alimento escaso ó mala vivienda. Así se ha degradado físicamente la población de muchas comarcas, antes notables por su robustez y belleza, hoy débiles y con gran número de individuos deformes. No puede entrar en nuestro plan hacernos cargo de las causas todas que han producido tan deplorable efecto, que sólo hemos citado en apoyo de nuestra aserción de que una desigualdad grande en un elemento de los que constituyen el hombre influye sobre los otros y puede desnivelarlos.

Para que la igualdad que se defiende en los libros, se proclama en las Constituciones y se promulga en los códigos pueda ser un hecho social, es necesario que no halle desniveles tan grandes y tan generalizados que imposibiliten el equilibrio estable, el cual exige un _mínimum_ de semejanza en el modo de ser de los asociados. Esta semejanza, hay que repetirlo, no basta que sea parcial; no ha de limitarse á uno de los elementos de la humanidad, sino comprenderlos todos, porque donde quiera que haya grandes masas de hombres en la miseria extrema, en la depravación suma ó en la ignorancia absoluta, se pretenderá en vano igualarlos con los que estén en circunstancias opuestas. Hemos dicho _ó_ porque, según se ha visto, una inferioridad produce otras; es fuerza que arrastra ó virus que inficiona, y empresa ilusoria hacer independiente en el organismo social lo que en la naturaleza tiene dependencia mutua.

Así, pues, para que la igualdad se establezca en el derecho y la justicia es necesario que los hombres no se hallen en circunstancias que la hagan imposible por esenciales diferencias en lo físico, lo moral ó lo intelectual, y que paralelamente marchen los progresos económicos, los intelectuales y los morales.

Se preguntará, tal vez, si para establecer la igualdad en el derecho han de ser todos ricos, sabios ó justos. Responderemos recordando que la _igualdad_ no es la _identidad_, sino aquel grado de _semejanza suficiente_ al fin á que han de concurrir los términos de la comparación. Los términos de la comparación aquí son hombres, y lo que hay que investigar es la semejanza que basta para que en la sociedad se consideren como iguales.

Ya sabemos que los grados de semejanza necesarios para calificar dos cosas de iguales varían según la clase de ellas y objeto á que se las destina: con las personas acontece lo propio. Aplicando este principio á la práctica social, tal vez pueda auxiliamos para evitar errores ó, por lo menos, la confusión que les es muy propicia.

Un hombre cae herido en la calle; el agresor huye: cualquiera que pasa tiene aptitud moral y legal para restañar la sangre que corre de las heridas del primero y detener al segundo; es un acto humano y social, para el que son iguales el rico y el pobre, el sabio y el ignorante, el mayor y el menor de edad, el que está privado de derechos civiles como el que goza de ellos, y á nadie se acusará de haberse extralimitado al apoderarse del criminal y auxiliar á su víctima. Sométese el hecho á la acción de los tribunales, y la igualdad se limita: jurado y juez no puede ser el primero que pasa por la calle; se necesitan condiciones que la ley

marca, y sólo los que las tienen son iguales para aquel objeto: lo propio acontece para dar dictamen facultativo y para servir de testigo. El círculo de la igualdad se limita en las funciones sociales á medida que éstas exigen condiciones que unos tienen y de que otros carecen.

Para asistir con fruto á una escuela de instrucción primaria no se necesita conocimientos previos; hay que saber las primeras letras para la segunda enseñanza, y tener ésta para adquirir la superior: la igualdad, que tenía una extensión casi ilimitada en la escuela, va reduciéndose más, á medida que se refiere á cosas más diferentes.

Un testador considera iguales, para testigos de su testamento, á todos los hombres, con pocas excepciones; pero ¡cuán diferentes le parecen para albaceas, y más aún si busca entre ellos al tutor de las tiernas criaturas que su muerte deja en la orfandad!

Podrían multiplicarse los ejemplos en prueba de que la igualdad en la práctica, conforme dejamos indicado en la teoría, es una cosa relativa y varia que exige diversos grados de semejanza.

Hay, pues, igualdad social, ó puede y debe haberla, cuando existe la de aptitudes, para el caso en que se establece la comparación; si no, no.

Existe el riesgo de chocar en dos opuestos escollos, que son: prescindir de la _semejanza necesaria_, y no hacerse cargo de la _semejanza suficiente_. Pretender que los hombres sin las condiciones morales é intelectuales indispensables para igualarlos sean iguales, ó negar que pueden serlo cuando tienen las que bastan, aunque no las tengan todas.

El orden físico, la igualdad _suficiente_ para sostener la salud y vigor del cuerpo, no exige que todos tengan la misma clase de vestido, de habitación y de alimento, sino que ninguno carezca de ropas, de albergue y de comida. Lo _necesario fisiológico_ es lo que basta para establecer la igualdad física, y nada importa que los manjares sean menos regalados, el traje más basto y la casa más reducida y modesta. El que no tiene hambre, ni frío, ni vive en una habitación malsana, es _suficientemente igual_ al que disfruta de todos los refinamientos del lujo. La vanidad, la gula y la molicie podrán pedir mayores semejanzas; pero á la fisiología y á la higiene le bastan éstas, y no sólo habrá igualdad, sino superioridad física en los que tienen lo necesario respecto de los que disfrutan de lo superfluo, porque la sobriedad no suele ser compañera del mucho regalo. Que cada uno procure por medios honrados mejorar su posición material, y tener mayor desahogo y comodidades, no es vituperable, y aun laudable puede ser; pero que en el orden fisiológico se dé el nombre de necesidad á los caprichos, á las vanidades y á los apetitos indómitos; que se ponga por condición del orden social lo que no lo es del orden natural, y se considere como una desgracia ó como una injusticia la falta de igualdad completa en el alimento, el vestido y la habitación, errores son de gran bulto y fatales consecuencias. Aquel á quien no falta nada para robustecerse y vivir con salud, es esencialmente igual en lo físico á los mayores potentados, y probablemente superior á ellos, y la semejanza suficiente para establecer la igualdad en este punto la tienen todos los que no carecen de lo _necesario fisiológico_.

En lo moral, la igualdad la constituye el cumplimiento de las leyes y de aquellos deberes que, sin obligar legalmente, son moralmente obligatorios para todo hombre honrado. El que no perturba la sociedad con sus delitos, ni la familia con sus vicios, podrá ser mejor ó peor que otro, pero tiene la semejanza suficiente para ser declarado igual en todas las funciones sociales que no exijan más que moralidad. Administrará sus bienes ó los de otro, podrá ser tutor y curador, será apto para toda especie de contratos en las mismas condiciones que los más favorecidos, y su dignidad será respetada, y su palabra creída, y su testimonio hará fe. Cierto que en los millones de hombres que hay en estas circunstancias hay millones de diferencias; pero existe la semejanza bastante para que á ninguno se niegue aquella consideración y derechos que resultan de ser calificados de moralmente iguales para el fin que se propone la sociedad al clasificarlos. Las personales diferencias se tienen en cuenta para los casos especiales: cuando se necesita virtud, abnegación, heroísmo, no basta cualquiera; hay que buscar sobre el nivel común alguno que luche esforzadamente ó se inmole; pero en la generalidad de los casos no se exige á la de las personas más de lo que todos pueden y deben dar.

En lo intelectual se diversifican mucho más las diferencias por la división de trabajo; pero, prescindiendo de las aptitudes profesionales, artísticas, industriales y científicas, si los abogados y los ingenieros y los comerciantes se diferencian mucho entre sí, como hombres tienen muchas ideas y conocimientos comunes, que lo son también á otros menos instruídos. El que sabe leer bien aunque sea ignorante, leerá lo mismo que una persona instruída cuando sólo de leer se trate, y para pasar lista á una cuadrilla de obreros servirá lo mismo que el más eminente literato: lo propio puede decirse del que sabe escribir, aunque no sepa más, cuando es bastante este conocimiento, ó tenga el de la aritmética elemental, etc. En lo que se llama la masa del pueblo podrá no haber suficiente conocimiento del bien y del mal para hacer leyes, pero se le supone el bastante siempre que se la

declara obligada á obedecerlas: no pueden en justicia ser igualmente obligatorias para todos si no son igualmente comprendidas en aquello que es indispensable conocer para obedecerlas. El primer jurisconsulto de la nación y el más rudo labriego tienen _igual_ el conocimiento _suficiente_ para saber que deben respetar la propiedad ajena, y con razón son declarados iguales ante la ley penal, y penados si la infringen. El ejercicio de los derechos civiles exige, no sólo cierto grado de moralidad, sino de inteligencia: al idiota ó al loco se le priva de ellos por incapaz del conocimiento necesario que tienen la inmensa mayoría de los hombres. Respecto á los derechos políticos, como la pasión suele mezclarse, no sólo en su práctica, sino en su teoría, no se ve tan claro cuándo el elemento intelectual no basta, y cuándo es suficiente; mas por difícil que sea investigarle, el hecho existe, y en este caso, como en todos, de la semejanza necesaria debe resultar la igualdad.

Aunque no lo notemos, la sociedad marcha en virtud, no sólo de necesidades y sentimientos semejantes, sino también de conocimientos, y sería imposible sin ellos. La ley que se promulga, el decreto que se da, la empresa que se organiza, el libro que se publica, el drama que se representa, la obra caritativa que se funda, parten de un conocimiento semejante, de un modo de ser intelectual bastante parecido y generalizado para que lo que se dice á un hombre sea inteligible para todos en grado suficiente. Sin esto, lo repetimos, la sociedad sería imposible, y una causa poderosa de desequilibrio y convulsiones sociales es el desconocimiento del grado de semejanza intelectual necesario para establecer igualdad, negándola cuando debía concederse ó concediéndola cuando debería negarse. Semejanzas y diferencias condicionan la sociedad humana, é importa mucho conocerlas bien para que las igualdades que se establezcan ó se rechacen sean consecuencias lógicas y estables, y no contradicciones pasajeras.

El _mínimum_ de semejanza intelectual necesario para realizar la igualdad, lo mismo que el moral y el físico, no permanecen estacionarios, sino que caminan á medida que la sociedad progresa. Lo _necesario fisiológico_ del hombre primitivo no basta para que viva el ciudadano: la ignorancia más completa puede pasar por sentido común, y aun por buen sentido en un país bárbaro, y no en una nación culta: un salvaje distinguido por su moralidad estará tan por debajo del nivel general en un pueblo civilizado, que con los mismos procederes que le hacían recomendable en su horda, irá á presidio. No hay, pues, que buscar en el arsenal de la historia armas que tal vez son inútiles, ni hablar de la naturaleza humana como de cosa eternamente idéntica y totalmente inmodificable. Cierto que el hombre sobre la tierra tiene condiciones de que no podrá salir nunca; cierto que no podrá respirar sin oxígeno, ni ser moral sin justicia, ni feliz sin amar alguna cosa; pero dentro de los límites que no podrá traspasar jamás tiene movimientos de bastante amplitud, y variaciones de bastante trascendencia, para que no se llame á la simetría inmóvil orden natural, y ley de la historia á reglas establecidas sin estudio suficiente de la naturaleza humana.

De los grados de semejanza que bastaron ó no en un país, no puede inferirse los que serán indispensables en otro que se halla en condiciones diferentes. Así, por ejemplo, donde la religión autoriza las castas y forma una con el sacerdocio, será necesaria mayor semejanza, mucho mayor, para establecer una igualdad cualquiera, que en el pueblo que llama á Dios padre y fraterniza en su amor, y no admite diferencias ante su ley y eterna justicia. En los que se hallan en este caso puede haber desigualdades enormes; se necesitarán á veces, para suprimirlas, no sólo _semejanzas suficientes_, sino _superioridades indudables_; pero esto será efecto de otras causas que neutralicen la influencia de la religión. Prescindiendo de su influencia ó de otra poderosa, podrán suponerse facilidades que no existen ó calificar de insuperables obstáculos que se pueden vencer; pero á pesar de contradicciones aparentes, siempre será un hecho cierto la influencia recíproca de los elementos físico, moral é intelectual, y que es inútil, cuando no hay la semejanza necesaria, decretar la igualdad, y peligroso negarla cuando existe semejanza suficiente.

CAPÍTULO II.

¿QUÉ LÍMITE DEBE TENER LA DESIGUALDAD?

La desigualdad que está en la organización del hombre, es una condición de la sociedad; pero es condición humana querer justificar el abuso de las cosas con la necesidad de su uso, y exagerar hasta la injusticia lo que en su origen es justo. La desigualdad de las condiciones es necesaria, es buena contenida en ciertos límites, pero cuando los pasa es inicua y es absurda.

Cuando existe la esclavitud de la ley ó la de la miseria; cuando con éste ó con el otro nombre hay castas en la sociedad; cuando entre las clases se abren abismos que es imposible salvar, el filósofo que estudia el corazón humano observa cómo se envilece y se deprava, y el que estudia los fenómenos sociales nota la gran perturbación que en la sociedad se introduce.

Ya hemos visto en la primera parte de este escrito cómo se desmoralizan las clases cuando se aislan unas de otras, é inútil es advertir que el aislamiento es tanto mayor cuanto más grande es la desigualdad. A los desórdenes que una desigualdad

exagerada, depravando los sentimientos, introduce en el mundo moral, hay que añadir los que llevan al mundo económico el lujo y la miseria.

No puede entrar en el plan de nuestra obra extendernos en consideraciones acerca de los males que en pos de sí llevan la miseria y el lujo, males de que, por otra parte, han hablado largamente célebres autores, tanto sagrados como profanos; pero no podemos menos de detenernos un momento á recordar una verdad que, por más sencilla y trivial que parezca, se desconoce y se niega por personas ilustradas en otras materias, á saber: _el lujo de los ricos es siempre perjudicial á los pobres_.

El lujo, dicen sus partidarios, es útil, sostiene la industria y el comercio. Suprimid los espejos de Venecia, los encajes de Bruselas, los jarrones de Sèvres, las alfombras rizadas, los dorados techos, los brillantes carruajes, las joyas de labor exquisita; ¿qué va á ser de tantos miles de familias como ganan el pan haciendo esas prodigiosas superfluidades? Ya lo veis: el lujo da de comer á innumerables familias, que sin él quedarían en la calle; el lujo es útil, ¿á qué declamar contra él? No somos declamadores, ni aun queremos dirigirnos al corazón presentando el horrible é inmoral contraste que ofrecen esas primorosas obras que, para contentar los vanidosos caprichos de la opulencia, salen de manos de la miseria; sólo queremos hacer notar que, cuando en medio de una familia hambrienta y desnuda vemos un objeto cuyo principal valor consiste en el ímprobo trabajo de sus individuos, un objeto brillante, preciosísimo, de una perfección fabulosa, cruel contraste con todo lo que le rodea, luz siniestra en un cuadro sombrío, insultador de dolores, provocador de iras, recuerdo constante de placeres y de goces, de que el pobre es desdichado instrumento, si la indignación y la lástima se elevan en nuestra alma, no es un afecto inmotivado; y meditando sobre aquella escena, no decimos como en presencia de otras tristes: «Está en el orden de las cosas», sino: «Está en la insensatez de los hombres».

El lujo es una inevitable consecuencia de la desigualdad de condiciones en un pueblo civilizado, lo sabemos; pero désele la sanción de la necesidad y no la de la consecuencia; dígase: «Es un mal inevitable»; y no: «Es un bien, y como tal debe fomentarse».

Veamos qué nos dice la Economía política de las ventajas que el lujo tiene para los pobres que trabajan en satisfacer sus caprichos. La humanidad es una gran familia; sus individuos se dedican: unos á labrar la tierra, otros á cambiar sus productos, otros á fabricar vestidos, etc., etc. Fijémonos en un grupo cualquiera, por ejemplo, el que está encargado de hacer camisas. Unos hilan y tejen telas ordinarias, otros medianas, otros finas, finísimas otros. Aquí se cosen camisas de munición, allá con más esmero; en otra parte se bordan, adornándolas con caprichos primorosos. Ved un día y otro, y una y otra noche, aquellas pobres mujeres perdiendo la vista y la paciencia, haciendo con la aguja _labores_ como pintadas, sacando hilos que apenas se ven, pegando encajes. Ved aquel hombre que lleva una camisa que supone tres, cuatro, seis meses de trabajo; ved aquellos otros que no tienen camisa. El tiempo que se gasta en hilar y tejer y bordar aquella tela finísima que ha de cubrir á uno, hace falta para preparar la más tosca que debía cubrir á los otros: en la sociedad, como en una familia mal gobernada que no tiene más que lo preciso, cuando malgasta una parte de su haber en superfluidades, carece luego de las cosas necesarias. El valor de un objeto cualquiera no es, por regla general, más que la representación del trabajo que ha costado. ¿Cuántas casas modestas pueden hacerse con el trabajo que necesita un palacio ó con el capital, que es lo mismo? Y como el capital de la sociedad, dividido por el número de individuos que la componen, basta apenas para cubrir sus primeras necesidades, en la balanza de la economía social quitáis á lo necesario todo lo que añadís á lo superfluo. ¿Qué habían de hacer los que viven de las industrias que satisfacen el lujo? Dedicarse á las que tienen por objeto cubrir la necesidad. Mientras se borda una sábana, se pueden coser ciento ó mil, y así de las demás cosas. Es decir, que ese lujo tan ventajoso para la industria, aun prescindiendo de lo que desmoraliza, de lo que insulta, de lo que envanece y de lo que irrita, considerándole sólo bajo el punto de vista de la producción de la riqueza, es un gran perturbador de la economía social, que arranca los brazos á las tareas de la necesidad para dedicarlos á las tareas del capricho.

Habiendo admitido como necesaria la desigualdad de condiciones, y siendo el lujo su consecuencia, ¿por qué declamamos contra él? ¿Pero no se debe buscar ningún correctivo á los males que no pueden cortarse de raíz? En vez de poner diques á su fatal corriente, ¿deberá abrírseles ancho paso para que inunden la sociedad y la trastornen? ¿Es lo mismo que haya un desdichado ó que haya ciento, que corra una lágrima ó que una multitud de criaturas viertan el llanto de la desesperación? Arrojemos con triste silencio en la sima de la necesidad todas las víctimas que pide para llenarse, pero no arrojemos ni una más. ¿Es tan corto el tributo de dolores que la naturaleza de las cosas exige para que vayamos á aumentarle insensatos ó crueles?

La desigualdad de condiciones es justa porque es necesaria; pero allí donde acaba la necesidad acaba el derecho. Así, por ejemplo, es necesario que se respete la propiedad de los bienes legalmente adquiridos. Es necesario que se deje á su dueño la facultad de disponer de ellos en favor de quien le parezca; pero es absurdo que se favorezca la acumulación exagerada de la propiedad con leyes perjudiciales á la sociedad y que no están _en la naturaleza de las cosas_. Las leyes todas, ¿no deberían

tener la tendencia altamente filosófica y moral de restablecer el equilibrio siempre que se rompe inclinándose la balanza del lado de la acumulación de la riqueza? No somos niveladores; nadie que haya seguido nuestro pensamiento podrá acusarnos de tales. Queremos eminencias en el mundo social, pero proporcionadas como las del mundo físico. Queremos montañas que atraigan las aguas del cielo y dirijan su curso sobre la tierra, pero no tan altas que no se pueda respirar en su cima y que nos roben la luz del sol.

Los límites de la desigualdad de condiciones están en la necesidad y en la justicia. ¿La justicia y la necesidad no son una misma cosa? La justicia puede no ser necesaria cuando el mayor número no la cree tal. Además, si el sentimiento de la justicia es eterno como innato en el hombre, su fórmula varía: la justicia de hoy no es la de hace diez y ocho siglos, como la del siglo XXX no será la nuestra. La fórmula de la justicia es el resultado de las ideas, y debe variar á medida que éstas cambian.

La necesidad que constituye el derecho de la sociedad, ¿constituye también el del individuo? Unos lo afirman, lo niegan otros, y los de más allá admiten el principio con esta salvedad: «En tanto que su aplicación sea posible». Y como las palabras necesario y posible son de una elasticidad suma, podremos entrar en discusiones interminables; veamos si por otro medio llegamos á ponernos de acuerdo acerca de los límites que la justicia impone á la desigualdad de condiciones, y hasta qué punto una necesidad puede constituir un derecho.

Casi todos los grandes errores son grandes verdades exageradas ó torcidas, y este origen, que hasta cierto punto los ennoblece en la esfera moral, los hace más peligrosos en la práctica. Un error que lo es por sus cuatro costados, digámoslo así, no es difícil de demostrar; pero cuando está emparentado con la verdad y enlazado con grandes principios de justicia, el problema se complica mucho. Los que afirman y los que niegan se mezclan en la lucha, y más de una vez el golpe dirigido á un contrario cae sobre un amigo. Luego, al ostentar los trofeos conquistados en el combate, se nota que el que se apoderó de la verdad arrastró, confundido con ella, una parte del error, y el que hizo presa en éste lleva unida á él una gran porción de verdad: algo de esto se nota en los que niegan y sostienen el principio de igualdad; sus errores están mezclados con verdades, y de ahí la dificultad de poner en claro los unos y las otras.

Imaginemos tres grandes hombres, por ejemplo: Hernán Cortés, Watt, Leibniz; y tres hombres vulgares: un soldado que sólo sabe manejar sus armas, un obrero ocupado toda su vida en mover una lima, un cajista que sin saber leer coloca maquinalmente las letras en el orden en que las ve colocadas. ¿Estos hombres son iguales? ¡Qué absurdo! ¿Y no habrá alguna circunstancia de la vida en que estos seis hombres sean iguales en alguna cosa y tengan derechos iguales? Veámoslo.

Debemos advertir á los fanáticos de la desigualdad, que vamos á presentar, como base de nuestro razonamiento, un ejemplo sumamente favorable para ellos. Ponemos enfrente la plebe y la aristocracia de la naturaleza, no la de la fortuna, mas, colocamos al _genio educado_ enfrente _del sentido común sin educar_: no se dirá que esquivamos las dificultades.

Hé aquí nuestros seis hombres encerrados en una habitación, y ocupados según su _necesidad_ los de abajo, según su _aptitud_ los de arriba. De repente la composición del aire cambia en términos que se hace irrespirable; todos dejan sus trabajos, sienten angustias mortales, sucumben si no salen de allí. ¿Qué se infiere de esto? Que el conquistador de Méjico y el oscuro soldado, el gran mecánico y el ignorante obrero, el profundo filósofo y el que sin comprenderlos imprime sus pensamientos, tienen igual necesidad de aire respirable, y por lo tanto igual derecho á él. Esta concesión la haremos sin dificultad; hay aire respirable gratis por todas partes, y, no obstante, debemos ser muy cautos al hacer concesiones, porque la legitimidad de un derecho no está en la facilidad de satisfacerle, sino en su justicia: suponemos que, á pesar de nuestra advertencia, nuestros adversarios, porque probablemente los tendremos, conceden la _igualdad de derechos respecto á la atmósfera_.

Nuestros seis hombres se hallan en un subterráneo reducidísimo, con una pequeña abertura en la parte superior por donde apenas entra aire puro para el que está cerca de ella; los gases mefíticos descienden á la parte inferior y sofocan al desdichado que allí permanece mucho tiempo. Los tres grandes hombres, ¿tendrán _derecho_ á excluir del aire respirable á sus compañeros, ó estarán en el _deber_ de alternar con ellos en el bien de respirar libremente y en el mal de respirar con dificultad? Si los hombres eminentes son los más fuertes y emplean la fuerza en privar á sus compañeros de una condición de vida, con todo su saber y su mérito, ¿no nos parecerán miserables, mil veces acreedores á la suerte de los que inmolan? Parece que en esto todos debemos estar conformes, y que si antes quedó consignada _la igualdad de derechos á la atmósfera_, ahora deberemos añadir: _en cualquiera circunstancia_. Prosigamos.

Nuestros seis hombres reclusos se hallan privados de alimento por espacio de dos días; una mano amiga les proporciona manjares insuficientes para saciar su hambre voraz, pero bastantes á impedir que sucumban si los reparten con equidad.

¿Deberán distribuirlos en razón del mérito ó de la necesidad de cada uno? ¿Estará bien que Watt deje morir de hambre al obrero por saciarse con su ración, diciendo: «Soy el que ha creado la máquina de vapor»? Todos estaremos de acuerdo en que no. Por eso en un buque donde escasean los víveres, en una plaza sitiada, la media, el tercio, el cuarto de ración se da á todos igualmente conforme á su necesidad y no conforme á su categoría. ¿Qué quiere decir esto? Esto quiere decir que la sociedad, al menos la sociedad cristiana del siglo XIX, admite en principio que en un buque, en una plaza sitiada, _mientras haya quien carezca de lo estrictamente necesario, ninguno tiene derecho á lo superfluo_. ¿Y qué se hace de este principio cuando los hombres salen de un estrecho recinto para vivir libremente donde les parezca? Este principio, ¿no puede salir de los muros de una prisión, de la cubierta de un buque ó del recinto de una plaza? ¿Qué es el derecho? Un principio de justicia sancionado tácita ó expresamente por el mayor número. ¿Y la justicia varía en una misma época y en un mismo pueblo según la localidad? Pero se dirá: varía la situación, y no se puede aplicar la misma ley á casos diferentes. En las circunstancias normales, todo el mundo tiene aire para respirar y mercados abundantes donde puede proveerse de lo necesario. ¿Todo el mundo? ¿Y los que viven hacinados en una miserable buhardilla, en un húmedo sótano? ¿Y los que no tienen con qué comprar nada en esta plaza cuya abundancia es tan tranquilizadora para la sociedad? La miseria establece un bloqueo bien estrecho alrededor del miserable. ¿Qué diferencia existe entre el que no halla qué comprar y el que no tiene medios de comprar lo que halla? Una tan sólo: que para el primero debe ser mucho más fácil la resignación que para el segundo.

Mas se dice: «No hay muertes por asfixia en las reducidas moradas que la miseria habita, y por regla general nadie se muere de hambre en las calles ni en las plazas». Cierto, la miseria, por regla general, no presenta casos _fulminantes_. La atmósfera infecta, la humedad, la mala alimentación, la falta de abrigo, el excesivo trabajo, alteran la salud mucho antes que quiten la vida. Hay una enfermedad larga, muy larga, que tiene un nombre griego, con el cual la sociedad se tranquiliza completamente; á lo que parece, no es responsable más que de las muertes repentinas, que no estén bautizadas por la Patología.

¿Qué hacer para obligar á la sociedad á que sea lógica y admita las consecuencias de sus principios? ¿Formaremos una larga lista de derechos? ¿Reclamaremos ese derecho que se llama sufragio universal, ó el derecho al trabajo, etcétera, etc.? No, ciertamente; los abandonaremos sin dificultad, pidiendo sólo el derecho á la vida. Pero ¿es esto practicable? Hasta donde lo sea será justo, porque _derecho imposible_ es la fórmula de todas las revoluciones abortadas, y nosotros no queremos revolución más que en las ideas; en las cosas queremos reforma. Queremos que haya pobres y ricos, pero no miserables y potentados. Nos resignamos á que unos anden á pie y otros en coche; pero no que unos vayan descalzos y otros que tengan media docena de carruajes. Queremos que unos se calienten en un barreño con lumbre, y otros á una magnífica chimenea; pero no que unos se mueran de frío y otros gasten sumas inmensas para tener en la zona templada ó glacial plantas exóticas á la temperatura de los trópicos. Y ¿qué somos nosotros que estas cosas queremos? ¿Llevamos el nombre de alguna escuela de esas cuyas doctrinas amenazan el orden social? Nada de eso; somos simplemente cristianos y vivimos en el siglo XIX.

No abogamos por una igualdad absurda é imposible; pero queremos que se reconozca el principio del derecho de igualdad á la vida, y que las leyes todas tengan la tendencia de hacer imposible, ó por lo menos más y más difícil, lo que pudiera llamarse los delirios del lujo, y cuya reacción son los sangrientos extravíos de la miseria.

Y este _derecho_ á la vida, ¿cuándo podrá convertirse en _hecho_? Este derecho, como todos, será practicable cuando esté en el buen sentido, y practicado cuando esté en el sentido común. En cuanto á los peligros de sentar ciertos principios más fáciles de llevar á la pasión que á la práctica, los deploramos, pero están en la naturaleza de las cosas. Desde que un derecho se establece como tal por los pensadores, hasta que se admite por los más y pasa á ser hecho, transcurren á veces siglos de agitación y de lucha entre los que le reclaman como _justo_ y los que le niegan como _imposible_. Lucha tan inevitable como las epidemias, las erupciones volcánicas y las tempestades. De ningún pensador referirá la Historia que dijo: _la justicia sea y la justicia fué_. No; la justicia para brillar ha menester largos combates, sangrientos, pero menos dolorosos que el reinado tranquilo de la iniquidad.

CAPÍTULO III.

CONSECUENCIAS DE LA DESIGUALDAD SOCIAL DEL HOMBRE Y LA MUJER.

No puede entrar en nuestro plan, porque sería salirnos del asunto que tratamos, discutir sobre si las facultades intelectuales de la mujer son ó no inferiores á las del hombre; basta á nuestro propósito considerar:

1.º Si tiene la mujer más facultades intelectuales que cultiva;

2.º Si de la falta de cultura resulta para ella desigualdad;

3.º Si esta desigualdad se gradúa de modo que la rebaje respecto al hombre;

4.º Consecuencias de que esté rebajada.

¿TIENE LA MUJER MÁS FACULTADES INTELECTUALES QUE CULTIVA? Hay opiniones acerca de si conviene ó no que la mujer se instruya, y también sobre el alcance de su inteligencia; pero no respecto al hecho constante y comprobado de que es apta para trabajos intelectuales, industriales y artísticos á que no se había dedicado hasta aquí y á que no se dedica aún en los pueblos poco cultos: en los más civilizados la mujer adquiere conocimientos científicos, artísticos, mercantiles é industriales que prueban de una manera concluyente su aptitud para ellos, y más, á medida que se le dan mayores facilidades para aprender.

En España, aunque poco, también ha progresado la enseñanza de la mujer, poniendo de manifiesto que tiene aptitud para las ciencias, las artes, la industria y el comercio. Las leyes, las costumbres, su ignorancia misma, se oponen en muchos países á que se instruya; pero en ninguno se ha visto que sea incapaz de aprovecharse de la instrucción á medida que la recibe y que no se eleve en la escala intelectual. En los Estados Unidos, en Suecia, en Inglaterra, en Rusia, donde quiera que no se le prohibe la actividad intelectual, la despliega iniciándose en las ciencias, ejerciendo artes á que exclusivamente se dedicaban los hombres y tomando parte en los procedimientos de la industria, en las operaciones mercantiles, etc., etc. Prescindiendo, según dejamos indicado, de si sus facultades intelectuales son iguales ó equivalentes á las del hombre, parece fuera de toda duda que tiene más que ha cultivado hasta aquí y que cultiva aun en los pueblos donde mejor se la instruye.

¿DE LA FALTA DE CULTURA RESULTA PARA LA MUJER DESIGUALDAD RESPECTO DEL HOMBRE? Basta formular la pregunta para determinar la respuesta afirmativa. Es patente la desigualdad que resulta entre dos personas de las cuales una estudia, aprende, sabe, y la otra no recibe instrucción alguna. La esposa del hombre de ciencia, del artista, del industrial, del comerciante, nada entiende, por lo común, ni sabe de la profesión de su marido: unidos están por el afecto; intereses comunes tienen, y, no obstante, en las cosas del entendimiento se hallan separados por la diferencia esencial que existe entre quien sabe lo necesario y el que lo ignora todo. Por preocupado que esté un hombre con un problema cualquiera, no lo consultará con su mujer, ni aun le hablará de él, porque, en general, no lo comprendería mejor que la criada. Existe, pues, entre el hombre y la mujer de la misma clase una desigualdad evidente que resulta de la ignorancia de ésta y la instrucción de aquél; y como el elemento intelectual, si es influído, como sabemos, también influye en el moral y el físico, las desigualdades de inteligencia determinarán otras, y tanto más, cuanto la civilización esté más adelantada y la cultura sea mayor. Sucede respecto á los sexos algo parecido á lo que acontece con las clases: no las hay en una horda salvaje, y se van formando y aumentando sus diferencias á medida que el pueblo se civiliza. Así también la desigualdad intelectual que no existe entre la mujer y el hombre cuando la ignorancia es común á entrambos, va graduándose á medida que el saber se aumenta si no se instruye más que uno solo. Y no es necesario recurrir á la Historia para estudiar en sus diferentes épocas el hecho, sino que puede observarse hoy en cualquier pueblo, porque en todos existen, aun simultáneamente, clases cuya cultura constituye gran diferencia entre el hombre y la mujer, y otras en que son igualmente rudas las personas de los dos sexos.

Este último caso comprende un número menor del que á primera vista se creería, porque aun entre el hombre y la mujer que parecen igualmente rudos, suele tener el primero alguna mayor cultura. Se pone algún mayor cuidado en enviarle á la escuela, y sabe leer, escribir y contar con más frecuencia y algo mejor. Además, la educación industrial del hombre, aun del pueblo, es muy diferente de la que recibe la mujer, á quien están vedados casi todos los oficios que exigen arte y aprendizaje. Son muy desiguales los conocimientos de la obrera y los que tiene un oficial ó maestro de cualquier oficio, exigiendo la práctica de la mayor parte de ellos conocimientos ó habilidad que están muy por encima de la educación industrial de las mujeres: todo esto es bastante sabido para que no sea necesario insistir más.

LA DESIGUALDAD QUE EXISTE ENTRE EL HOMBRE Y LA MUJER, ¿REBAJA Á ÉSTA? las evidentes desigualdades que hemos recordado y todo el mundo sabe, constituyen _inferioridades_ respecto á la mujer. ¿Cabe dudar que el que _ignora_ es inferior al que _sabe_, en cualquier asunto, lo mismo que se trate de escribir un libro ó de imprimirle, de hacer un puente ó un par de botas? La inferioridad de la mujer no se limita á una ú otra esfera social, sino que llega á todas; no sabe la teoría de las ciencias ni la práctica de las artes y oficios; para la obra intelectual no se la admite, y para la artística é industrial sólo en pocos casos y en la clase ínfima.

De esta inferioridad científica y artística resultan otras. No siéndole posible á la mujer el ejercicio de las profesiones, artes ú oficios lucrativos, se agolpa, puede decirse se apiña alrededor de los pocos trabajos manuales á que puede dedicarse, y cuyo precio se rebaja en términos que hacen, por lo común, imposible que viva de su trabajo; la depreciación de éste resulta de una concurrencia

desesperada, de la poca consideración que merece la trabajadora y de otras causas que no hay para qué investiguemos, bastándonos aquí consignar el efecto, que es la imposibilidad de que la mujer con su trabajo gane lo suficiente para vivir.

Inferior en la esfera intelectual y en la artística, con una inferioridad tan general y constante, la mujer tiene que resultar, y resulta, rebajada.

Pasadas las idolatrías del amor, y prescindiendo de ciertos sentimientos caballerosos y tiernos afectos de familia, la mujer ocupa un lugar muy inferior al hombre en la opinión, en la ley, en las costumbres, y su desigualdad llega á un grado que la rebaja.

Nos causa extrañeza, repugnancia ó indignación el proceder de los salvajes que abusan de la fuerza para hacer trabajar á sus mujeres mientras ellos huelgan, convirtiéndolas en bestias de carga; pero el proceder de los hombres civilizados hasta aquí, si es menos brutal, no ha sido mucho más justo. ¿No es un hecho de fuerza y un abuso de ella la prohibición de que las mujeres se dediquen á profesiones y oficios para los cuales tienen reconocida aptitud? La desigualdad que resulta, ¿no es consecuencia de la _muscular_ más bien que de la intelectual, y un verdadero salvajismo el no dejar á las mujeres más que aquellos trabajos que por muchas circunstancias han llegado á ser abrumadores para ellos?

Las mujeres, infinitamente más ignorantes y más pobres que los hombres, han de ser menos consideradas y aumentar su descrédito en estados sociales donde el saber y la riqueza tienen mayor importancia cada día. Prescindiendo de excepciones, y observando lo que hay en el fondo de apariencias que engañan, la regla y la realidad es que la pobreza intelectual de la mujer la lleva á la miseria económica, lo cual la rebaja, y que, en circunstancias desfavorables y frecuentes, de su penuria y desprestigio resulta su abyección.

CONSECUENCIAS DE QUE LA MUJER ESTÉ REBAJADA. Las consecuencias de la desigualdad que deprime y rebaja á la mujer son:

Legales;

Físicas;

Intelectuales;

Morales.

Las enunciamos en el orden inverso de su importancia.

Consecuencias legales. La mujer fué considerada como esclava, primero; después, como sierva, y por último, como menor: todas las legislaciones de los pueblos civilizados se han modificado en favor suyo y con tendencia á igualarla; pero esa tendencia, más ó menos marcada, realizándose más lentamente ó con mayor rapidez, no es todavía un hecho en pueblo alguno, porque no hay uno solo en que la mujer y el hombre sean iguales ante la ley. Sin derechos políticos, mermados los civiles, incapacitada legalmente para las profesiones y para los cargos públicos, en el veto de la ley halla el reflejo de la opinión y un insuperable obstáculo á su actividad y razonable independencia. Proclamada legalmente su inferioridad intelectual, tenida, en parte, como menor, estas circunstancias no son atenuantes cuando delinque: el legislador, que la considera inferior para utilizar las ventajas sociales, la trata como igual al hombre para penarla, y aun en ciertos casos le exige responsabilidad mayor y la pena más severamente. La ley, que le cierra las puertas de los establecimientos del Estado, le abre las del lupanar; la ley, que no le permite publicar un libro sin permiso de su marido, no le exige el de su padre para entrar en la casa de prostitución legalmente autorizada.

Consecuencias físicas. La mujer, como trabajadora, no está ni aun al nivel de los obreros menos inteligentes y más débiles respecto al salario. Es tal su desprestigio y el desdén que inspira, que la misma obra, sin más que porque ella la hace, se paga menos que si la hiciera el hombre; cualquiera labor que realice, cualquier cargo que desempeñe, es siempre con rebaja en la retribución respecto á las personas del otro sexo que prestan igual servicio; y esto no es sólo un hecho, sino que parece un derecho, y cosa muy natural que un hombre gane más que una mujer.

Como tales hechos son generales y constantes; como las mujeres están incapacitadas para el ejercicio de las profesiones y oficios lucrativos; como los pocos trabajos á que pueden dedicarse están mal retribuídos, y peor si son desempeñados por ellas; como además no hallan trabajo, resulta que su situación económica es aflictiva; que no teniendo medios de subsistencia, no pueden tener independencia; que se casan de cualquier modo, se prostituyen _ó se matan para ganar la vida_, según una frase que parece carecer de sentido y le tiene bien terrible.

De las diez ó doce horas de trabajo continuo y sedentario, con el cual la mujer no gana para procurarse lo necesario fisiológico, resulta una vida que se pierde ó cuando menos se debilita por el exceso de fatiga y falta de alimentación. Es raro, muy raro, que pronto ó á la larga no enfermen las mujeres que viven de su trabajo, y más raro aún que tengan la robustez necesaria para que, si llegan á ser madres, no engendren una prole raquítica. Esos niños endebles y escrofulosos pueden serlo por muchas causas; pero una muy poderosa es que deben la existencia á madres que han trabajado mucho y comido poco, y con su sangre y su leche empobrecida dejan una prole cuya debilidad es el reflejo de su desdicha. La inmensa mayoría de las mujeres necesita trabajar para vivir; se halla sin trabajo ó tiene que aceptar los rudos, peor retribuídos y más mecánicos; siendo considerada cual máquina, débil; necesitando mucha fuerza para transmitir una parte á sus hijos como madre y como nodriza, y no teniendo esa fuerza, de su debilidad resulta la de la prole y una concausa poderosa para la degeneración de la raza.

La situación económica de la mujer, su falta de recursos propios, dan también otro resultado, los matrimonios prematuros, cuyas consecuencias físicas son deplorables. El hombre suele esperar, para casarse, á concluir su carrera, á tener un oficio ó modo de vivir, á quedar libre del servicio militar, etc., etc.: la mujer, que no tiene más carrera que la del matrimonio, lo celebra, por regla general, en cuanto halla con quién. Aunque sea muy joven, aunque sea una niña, aunque esté muy lejos de la plenitud de vida necesaria para transmitirla robusta, será madre de hijos endebles, y ella se debilitará ó perderá tal vez la salud. Esta consecuencia física del estado social de la mujer tiene mayor importancia de la que tal vez se supone.

Resultado en gran parte de la miseria y de la ignorancia es la prostitución, cuyas consecuencias físicas son envenenar las generaciones y degradar las razas, sin que basten á evitarlo las llamadas policía de costumbres y leyes de higiene. Habrá virus físico mientras haya cáncer moral, y cáncer moral en tanto que la masa de las mujeres sea tan pobre y tan ignorante, esté tan rebajada, tan abajo, en la escala social, que al menor tropiezo se halle en peligro inminente de caer en la prostitución.

Consecuencias intelectuales.--Pensadores, filántropos, hombres ilustrados y caritativos, amantes de la ciencia y de la humanidad, no comprenden cómo ésta no va más de prisa por las vías del progreso. Academias, cátedras, liceos, tribunas, escuelas, libros, revistas, ¡cuántos medios de difundir rápidamente la ciencia, que no obstante se comunica tan despacio! ¿Cuál será la causa? Muchas puede haber; pero una, y muy poderosa, es sin duda la ignorancia de la mujer, punto de apoyo para el error, obstáculo para la difusión de la verdad. El publicista la demuestra, cree demostrarla á todos, sin hacerse cargo de que las mujeres en general, ó no ven la demostración, ó no la comprenden, y que lo escrito llega á ellas muchas veces traducido por quien de propósito ó sin querer lo traduce mal.

Al calcular la suma de instrucción respecto á ciertas clases, no se tiene en cuenta que la mitad de las personas que pertenecen á ellas no son instruídas. La madre, la esposa, la hija, la hermana del hombre de ciencia, lejos de ayudarle á difundirla, es indiferente, se convierte en un obstáculo para que se difunda, ó se hace aliada de los que la combaten: esto tiene excepciones, y más en los pueblos más cultos, pero en los que lo son poco, es la regla. Aunque la posición social de la mujer es muy desventajosa, no deja de ejercer grande influencia respecto á la familia, en la que no propaga verdades que desconoce ó que tiene por errores. Además, la gestión económica de la casa es suya, y no es raro que auxilie pecuniariamente á los que combate su marido, y que para coadyuvar á difundir las ideas de éste no pueda hacer nunca economías. Si el antagonismo llega á convertirse en lucha, sucede muchas veces que el hombre se cansa y cede, y por lo que él llama paz contribuye pecuniariamente al poder de los que le hacen la guerra. Lejos de haber unidad de pensamiento en la familia respecto á muchas cosas esenciales, las mujeres, ó no le tienen, ó piensan de distinto modo que los hombres.

Si la mujer se halla sola, viuda ó soltera, y tiene bienes de fortuna, todavía está en peor situación y más expuesta á ser instrumento de error, con su riqueza y su ignorancia. Bajo pretexto de guiarla, no faltará quien la extravíe y se cobre bien el trabajo de persuadirla de que va por el camino mejor. Como si la mujer no es apta para adquirir lo es para heredar, la herencia, en las clases acomodadas, pone á su disposición capitales considerables, que en parte, en mucha parte, se emplean contra la verdad. Cuando falta armonía entre los medios materiales é intelectuales, resulta siempre daño: el obrero se embriaga y se corrompe; la mujer es explotada en provecho del error, y esclava de él, se cree libre porque tiene doradas las cadenas.

Así, pues, rebajada la mujer bajo el punto de vista de la inteligencia, contribuye poderosamente á rebajar el nivel intelectual del hombre; es una red invisible para muchos, pero tupida y resistente, en que se aprisiona el pensamiento, resultando que la civilización camina como un cojo, y cae con frecuencia por la desigualdad excesiva de los miembros que le sirven para marchar.

Consecuencias morales.--La posición social de la mujer, que la reduce á la ignorancia, á la pobreza, á la miseria, á la dependencia, ha de ser fatal á su dignidad, ha de rebajarla moralmente, y en efecto, la rebaja: si así no sucediese, sería preciso

concluir que el miserable ignorante es el que está en mejores condiciones para ser virtuoso. Las estadísticas criminales de todos los países ponen de manifiesto que es mucho mayor el número de hombres penados que de mujeres; pero el nivel moral de éstas no sube en la proporción que baja el número de los que entran en las penitenciarías. Las estadísticas criminales prescinden de un dato de que no pueden prescindir las morales; prescinden de la prostitución, que la ley tolera ó autoriza, y que la moral condena. Una prostituta está moralmente más rebajada y es socialmente más perjudicial que gran número de las personas condenadas por los tribunales.

La prostitución de que hablamos como daño físico, lo es mucho mayor moral; y si los males del alma fuesen perceptibles como los del cuerpo, no habría leproso tan repugnante como una prostituta.

Ese azote físico y moral de las sociedades, ¿sería posible que existiera más que como excepción rara, si la mujer no fuera miserable, física é intelectualmente, y no estuviese rebajada en concepto del hombre y en el suyo propio? La desigualdad social excesiva de los sexos hace, entre otros males, el de disminuir la dignidad y anular en parte la personalidad de la mujer: cuando las condiciones de ésta la ponen en el caso de descender más, baja aún, y resulta la prostituta. Lo que hay en ella de más repugnante, de verdaderamente monstruoso, resulta de su falta de personalidad. Forma parte de la sociedad; tiene derechos civiles; es hija, madre, hermana, hasta esposa, y _no es persona_: no, no es persona; por eso la desprecia el último hombre aunque sea un criminal; por eso es tan abyecta y repulsiva. Y como esta monstruosidad moral no es un hecho raro; como son miles, muchos miles de criaturas las que inoculan su virus y salpican su ignominia sobre la sociedad que las tolera, vienen á constituir un elemento perturbador en alto grado, poderoso, constante é incompatible con la moral. En los atentados contra ella se hallan por todas partes cómplices livianos, codiciosos ó ignorantes, y el hecho se repite, se generaliza, hasta el punto de que se atreve á llamarse derecho, y vive al amparo de la ley, y hay una cosa que es al mismo tiempo abominable y lícita. Todo esto sucede por contagio; son las emanaciones de la podredumbre, que, por ser tanta, vicia la atmósfera y empaña la esfera, que debiera ser inmaculada, desde donde da sus oráculos la justicia.

Como la prostituta es físicamente tan repugnante y dañina, hace apartar la vista ó que se la mire principalmente por esta fase, y no llama bastante la atención de todos hacia su deformidad moral. Y en ella es donde principalmente debemos fijarnos; porque el hombre está en su inteligencia y en su voluntad, y ofuscación de la una y perversión de la otra hay en todo daño que hace. En el causado por la mujer liviana hay maldad y absurdo, casi podría decirse irracionalidad, por ser completamente irracional un proceder que lleva consigo la perdición segura, inevitable y sabida de quien así procede.

Pero ¿cómo se verifica esto? ¿Cómo hay miles, tantos miles de criaturas que se lanzan á un daño cierto y conocido, que aceptan su perdición, que arrojan su cuerpo al muladar del vicio y se suicidan moralmente? ¿Cuál es la causa de que se repita tanto un hecho que parece tan preternatural y fuera de razón? Respecto á la mujer, este hecho como generalizado, como permanente, como verdadera calamidad social, no se explica por las pasiones y los instintos pervertidos y desenfrenados que, cuando más, producirían la prostituta como el ladrón y el asesino: decimos _cuando más_, porque, dada á la mujer la personalidad que hoy le falta, y la instrucción y medios de subsistencia que no tiene, habría de vencer para prostituirse más repugnancias, hacer peores cálculos, prescindir más de su verdadero interés que el hombre que infringe las leyes pasando á vías de hecho ó apropiándose lo ajeno. La naturaleza humana explica la prostitución de uno ú otro individuo, pero de masas no puede explicarse sino por el estado social, por la inferioridad que, según él, tiene la mujer respecto del hombre.

Sin llegar al extremo de la _mujer perdida_, frase gráfica con que se expresa que ha desaparecido moralmente; sin llegar á este extremo, la desigualdad social de la mujer tiene consecuencias deplorables. Es una de ellas el matrimonio prematuro, que si tiene inconvenientes físicos, también morales, haciendo esposas, madres, amas de casa, á criaturas sin la circunspección y la experiencia que no pueden tener los pocos años, é indispensables para la dirección moral de la familia y material del hogar. Aunque una mujer sea muy joven, aunque sea niña, si hay ocasión de casarla se aprovecha, porque podría no presentarse otra, y ella no tiene más carrera. Tardará aún años en ser mayor según la ley, en poder disponer para la venta de algunos metros de tierra; pero dispone del orden doméstico, del porvenir de sus hijos que no sabe educar, de la paz, de la dicha del hogar y del honor de su marido: todo esto se pone con frecuencia en manos de una niña. Es en parte falta de la ley; pero las leyes ya se sabe que son el reflejo ó el eco de las ideas y de las costumbres, y mientras la mujer no tenga verdadera personalidad, ni más posición social que la que le da el matrimonio, ha de apresurarse á contraerle.

Las mujeres, no sólo se casan pronto por tener prisa de casarse, sino que muchas veces se casan mal. El amor, la conveniencia de circunstancias y caracteres, no se atiende bastante, en ocasiones no se atiende nada, por considerar solamente la necesidad de tener una posición social, un sostén, una persona que provea al sustento de la que por sí no puede ganarle, y evitar la situación

precaria y tal vez aflictiva de la mujer soltera cuando sus padres han muerto y se han casado sus hermanos. Todos estos cálculos que tienen que hacerse, que es imposible que no se hagan, han de producir consecuencias morales deplorables, uniendo á los que no se unirían sin la especie de fuerza mayor, resultado de la inferioridad social de la mujer.

La desigualdad intelectual es también una causa perturbadora del buen orden y moralidad de la familia. No sólo se encomienda por completo á los extraños la instrucción del niño, sino que éste, vista la ignorancia de su madre, propende á desdeñarla, propensión que es una concausa de la falta de respeto que hoy menguan tantos otros motivos. La influencia de la madre, tan necesaria para el niño y para el joven, tiene que resentirse de su inferioridad intelectual, y si por muchas circunstancias no se disminuye, no es raro que sirva para extraviar al hijo que debía dirigir: el sentimiento, el instinto, no ordenados por la razón ilustrada, pueden arrastrar ciegamente ó retraer con cálculos egoístas.

Si la ignorancia es un mal en la madre, lo es también para la esposa, que no será la compañera de su marido siempre que entre ellos haya una gran desigualdad intelectual. Cuando el amor ha dejado ya de dar importancia á todas las fruslerías, ¿qué es el trato entre una persona instruída, seria, y otra ignorante y frívola? No puede tener aquella intimidad constante, resultado de una armonía que no existe, y el hombre busca la compañía de sus amigos, la mujer, de sus amigas, porque es natural complacerse en la sociedad con sus iguales. En fuerza de ver esta separación intelectual de los sexos que la produce tan profunda en las familias, no se repara en ella, ni se notan sus malas consecuencias. No son mejores para la moral que la actividad de espíritu de la mujer no se emplee en cosas racionales y serias, y se vuelva toda á los caprichos de la moda y á los desenfrenos del lujo, con ruina de la fortuna de su marido y no pocas veces de su honor. De la falta de instrucción de la mujer, de la educación que se la da, de su posición social, falta contradictoria, anómala, resultan contrastes absurdos y daños grandes, todo en perjuicio de la moralidad y de las costumbres; y como las costumbres y la moralidad son la piedra angular de todo bien en un pueblo, urge disminuir el desnivel que existe entre los sexos.

Con riesgo de ser pesados hemos de repetirnos, porque nos importa mucho ser claros y no dar lugar á equívocos ni torcidas interpretaciones en algunos puntos esenciales. La igualdad no es en los sexos, ni en nada, la identidad; no queremos entre la mujer y el hombre la igualdad _absoluta_, sino la _suficiente_ para la armonía que hoy no existe, que no puede existir por desigualdades excesivas. No pretendemos que las mujeres sean militares, sino que no sean rechazadas de aquellas profesiones y oficios para que resulten aptas, y que no se declare su ineptitud sin que esté probada por la experiencia. No queremos lo que se entiende por la mujer _emancipada_, sino lo que debe entenderse por la mujer _independiente_; no queremos el _amor libre_, sino el matrimonio _contraído con libertad_, y en él, con las diferencias naturales y convenientes, las semejanzas necesarias para que sean la base firme de la virtud y prosperidad de los pueblos.

CAPÍTULO IV.

LA IGUALDAD ANTE LA LEY, ¿ES LA IGUALDAD ANTE LA JUSTICIA?

Hay en nuestra época una deplorable tendencia á convertir la aritmética en ciencia social, á tomar á los hombres como cantidades, y hacer con ellos operaciones de adición y de resta, lo cual no sólo conduce al error, sino que le consagra dándole un aire de verdad matemáticamente demostrada. Los partidarios más acérrimos de la igualdad sancionan á veces las más injustas desigualdades, porque, arrastrados del espíritu de siglo, sustituyen la aritmética á la lógica.

Igualdad ante la ley.--¿Qué significa esta frase? Que no hay ningún privilegiado; es decir, que legalmente no se puede evitar ningún castigo, alcanzar ninguna recompensa, ni obtener ventaja alguna en virtud del nacimiento ni de la posición social. Esta es la teoría.

Notaremos primero que no hay, como algunos dicen, cosas muy buenas en teoría y muy malas en la práctica, porque es un contrasentido sostener como bueno lo que es impracticable, ó lo que practicado hace mal. La ignorancia tiene maligna propensión á rebajar el valor de las fórmulas científicas y hacer á la verdad responsable de las consecuencias del error que se disfrazó con su nombre: así, pues, un mal en la práctica, supone un error en la teoría.

Sería necesario escribir un tratado completo de legislación para ver en qué se convierte prácticamente el principio de _igualdad ante la ley_. Esto no es posible, ni es preciso tampoco, porque, siendo nuestro objeto sentar principios generales, nos bastará tomar una ley, y demostrada en ella la causa del error, fácil nos será por analogía juzgar las leyes todas. Examinaremos la ley de reemplazo para el servicio militar.

No hace muchos años se eximían de este servicio los nobles; vienen los partidarios de la igualdad, y gritan: «¡Injusticia! ¡Cómo! ¡Porque esa mujer ha nacido duquesa podrá tener sus hijos á su lado, y porque la otra nació pobre se los arrancarán, á ella que le hacen más falta! ¡Se conviene en que las contribuciones deben pagarlas todas las clases, y esa que apenas el hábito puede hacer que se nombre sin horror, esa que se llama _contribución de sangre_, la pagará una clase sola! ¡Siendo principio de equidad reconocida que cada uno contribuya al sostenimiento de las cargas del Estado según los bienes que tiene que conservar en él, el que posee poco, el que tal vez no posee nada, ofrece su vida para conservar el orden y defender la patria, y lo que poseen los que están eximidos de defenderla! ¡Injusticia! ¡Iniquidad! ¡Abajo el privilegio! ¡Igualdad ante la ley!»

La igualdad se establece; todos nacen soldados, el duque y el proletario; la suerte decide luego el que debe tomar las armas. Mirad las listas: el Excmo. Sr. Duque de N., al lado de Pedro Fernández; esto ya es otra cosa; al fin las leyes empiezan á ser justas; ante ellas todos somos iguales. Del servicio militar puede uno eximirse por dinero; todos tienen derecho á comprar su licencia absoluta por 8.000 reales[2], lo mismo el Duque de N., que Pedro Fernández. ¿Lo _mismo_? ¡Pero si Pedro Fernández no tiene 8.000 reales, si no _puede_ tenerlos! ¡Si la ley lo sabe, y parte de este conocimiento, porque si todos _pudieran_ eximirse no habría ejército! Entonces, ¿qué se ha hecho de la igualdad ante la ley? ¿Qué se ha hecho? Ha quedado reducida á un cambio de nombre. La desigualdad de antes estaba escrita en un pergamino y se llamaba ejecutoria, y la de ahora está escrita en un papel y se llama billete de banco. Pues ¡valía la pena de verter tanta sangre y hacer tanto ruido para llegar á este resultado!

[2] Era el precio de la redención cuando esto se escribió.

Pero son muchos más los que logran eximirse por el nuevo método, y es ya una ventaja, y grande, porque los bienes se miden por el número de personas que pueden participar de ellos. Es verdad; el número de los que se eximen es mayor que era; pero la ley cuenta con esto, y llama á las armas 27.000 hombres, por ejemplo, en lugar de 25.000, contando con que 2.000 se redimirán; es decir, que el número de los privilegiados aumenta, y disminuye el de los que deben pagar la contribución de sangre; y no siendo menor el cupo, claro está que les ha de tocar á más. Es decir, que en nombre de la igualdad se hace que la más terrible de las desigualdades pese sobre el pueblo más que pesaba.

Supongamos que para establecer la igualdad verdaderamente decimos:--«No se admite más exención que la incapacidad física; el Duque de N. y Pedro Fernández serán soldados, sin poder presentar en su lugar billetes de banco, ni hombres comprados: ahora sí que se establece la igualdad verdadera, la verdadera justicia.»

Pedro Fernández se pone su uniforme de paño no más ordinario del que acostumbra á gastar; toma el fusil, cuyo peso no le agobia, porque está acostumbrado á trabajos materiales; duerme en una cama que no es peor que la suya; marcha sin esfuerzo á paso redoblado. El Duque no puede sufrir el roce de aquel paño tan basto; el peso del fusil le abruma, y es imposible que él duerma en aquella cama, ni que ande á pie tan aprisa, él que no tiene costumbre de andar sino en coche ó á caballo. Lo que Pedro hace sin esfuerzo, á él le causa una fatiga abrumadora; le costará la vida, porque en una marcha, un día de mucho frío ó de mucho calor, sucumbirá. Hé aquí otro caso en que en nombre de la igualdad se echan sobre dos clases pesos desiguales. ¿Cuál es el origen del mal? El mal está en el error de que al establecer la igualdad ante la ley se parte del principio de que los hombres son iguales y se hallan en las mismas circunstancias, y como esto no es verdad, la igualdad ante la ley es mentira.

¿Qué hacer? No es éste el lugar de indicarlo. Nuestro asunto tiene una especie de fuerza centrífuga que tiende á lanzarnos fuera; pero combatiremos esta tendencia encerrándonos en él. Creemos haber dicho bastante para probar que la igualdad ante la ley, como generalmente se entiende, y la igualdad ante la justicia, no son una misma cosa.

CAPÍTULO V.

DE LA EQUIVALENCIA.

Hemos indicado ya que la equivalencia ensancha el círculo de la igualdad social, y conviene recordarlo por lo que el hecho influye al presente y por la mayor importancia que tiene cada vez.

Según queda dicho, á la igualdad salvaje sucedieron las desigualdades bárbaras y semibárbaras, que en castas ó clases, fatalmente separadas, marcaban á cada hombre su camino y á cada masa su grado. Roto por el progreso el estrecho molde en que se encerraba la actividad humana, ésta halló nuevos caminos y multiplicó los medios de perfección moral é intelectual y de progreso material. La abnegación no se limitó al heroísmo en los combates, sino que desafió la muerte en la epidemia, en el apostolado, en la investigación de la verdad, y tuvieron mártires la filantropía, la fe y la ciencia. Con los modos de hacer bien y las

fatigas y peligros de realizarle, se multiplicaron los generosamente dispuestos á padecer esas fatigas y arrostrar esos peligros, que, variados en forma y modo, se confunden en la elevada unidad del amor al bien y abnegación sublime.

La inteligencia aumentó casi al infinito sus diferentes manifestaciones, cultivándose de distintos modos convergentes todos al centro de la verdad: para buscarla pueden separarse los hombres, mas desde el momento que la hallan se aproximan.

Si hubo infinitos modos de ser santo y de ser sabio, también de allegar bienes de fortuna, y la prosperidad material pudo venir por multitud de caminos que le abrían las artes, el comercio y la industria.

Multiplicáronse los casos en que personas que empleaban su actividad de distinto modo, eran tenidas por igualmente útiles y apreciables; y clasificados como de valer igual, por la equivalencia llegaron á la igualdad.

El número de estos casos es cada día mayor, y así conviene, siendo el único medio de dar á las fibras del organismo social una elasticidad que las impida romperse. Con la igualdad crecen las aspiraciones á igualarse, y si en proporción no aumentan los medios, los sacudimientos son inevitables, ó lo que es todavía peor, habrá odios y desalientos que, sin energía para hacer explosión, son corrosivos y atacan á las fuentes de vida material y moral de los pueblos.

A medida que aumenta el caudal de los conocimientos humanos, se ven las íntimas relaciones que tienen unos con otros, su enlace íntimo y los mutuos servicios que se prestan los que cultivan las ciencias al parecer menos afines. Lo propio acontece con el organismo social, y á medida que se conoce mejor, se comprende la importancia de todos sus órganos, la necesidad de armonizarlos, y el absurdo y la injusticia de excluir de la consideración y del aprecio los que no pueden excluirse de la realidad, porque es esencial para la vida. Desde el momento en que las sociedades se consideran como organismos, los individuos que las componen tienen que ir dejando de ser _partes de una masa_ para convertirse en _elementos de una armonía_: esta armonía sería imposible si no pudiera contribuir á ella más que la igualdad uniforme, simétrica, rígida, por decirlo así, que exige condiciones idénticas; pero es factible con la equivalencia que aprecia _méritos iguales en servicios distintos_.

Ciertamente que las preocupaciones se han opuesto y se oponen aún á admitir la equivalencia de ciertos servicios, que el trabajo material no se considera propio de una persona digna; pero á medida que el obrero mecánico necesita ser más inteligente, á medida que el trabajo de la inteligencia y de la mano se confunden, necesariamente ha de variar la consideración que inspira el trabajador. Los oficiales de marina se creerían rebajados siendo maquinistas; pero ya se irá reconociendo el absurdo y el perjuicio de que no lo sean: un capitán de barco mira con desdén al maquinista, que por de pronto tiene más sueldo que él, y no tardará en tener igual consideración, ó en ser uno mismo el que dirige la máquina y manda el barco, cuando se vaya comprendiendo mejor que las manchas que se lavan no envilecen, y que en todo _mandar_ debe ser _dirigir_.

Pero las preocupaciones dan lugar á hechos y tienen consecuencias que no varían sino con mucha lentitud, y no hay cosa más absurda ni peligrosa en la práctica social que calcular por lo que _debiera ser_, prescindiendo de lo _que es_. El hecho, el más injusto, el que nos parezca menos razonable, ha tenido _motivo_ de ser que se consideró como razón, y si no lo era, ó no lo es ya, si la causa se invalida, el efecto no se puede aniquilar instantáneamente. Reconocida la injusticia de las castas, proclamada la igualdad, ¿la ley que la establece podrá suprimir en el mismo día la soberbia de los de arriba, la abyección de los de abajo, los vicios del que manda sin freno y del que obedece sin condición? Cierto que las castas se deben suprimir; pero verdad también que es necesario precaverse contra la ilusión de que ningún hecho social se puede arrancar de raíz sin que deje germen ni consecuencias, y que la demostración lógica ó el mandato de la ley rectifican inmediatamente la voluntad, desvanecen el error, rompen el hábito y modifican el carácter. Las categorías sociales que por no ser legales no son menos positivas, necesitan también tiempo para variar, porque la opinión, su única legisladora, no puede modificarlas sino modificándose, lo cual no se verifica de una manera instantánea. La opinión va admitiendo equivalencias sociales, admite más cada vez; pero no hay que pedirle que inmediatamente las acepte todas, ni desesperar porque rechaza algunas. Hay que darle tiempo para que dilate la esfera de la dignidad, y también para que se hagan dignos los que debe dignificar. Del hecho de privar á una clase de consideración, suele resultar que llega un momento en que no la merece; si este estado se prolonga, deja huella, casi siempre profunda, y aunque no sea indeleble, tampoco fácil de borrar: si necesita un titánico esfuerzo para morir con honra el que ha nacido con nota de infamia, tampoco sin firme resolución y perseverancia se eleva moralmente mucho el que es tenido en poco; de modo que las consecuencias de una injusticia tienen apariencia de justificarla, y positivamente la fortifican para con muchos que miran la humillación de una clase rebajada como argumento á favor de los que la rebajaron.

Para que á la equivalencia de los servicios vaya correspondiendo la de los méritos, y la igualdad se extienda y cimiente en bases sólidas, no ha de calificarse de imposible lo hacedero, ni tener por fácil lo que no lo es; no debe llamarse derecho al hecho, ni

tampoco prescindir de él y, cerrando los ojos á sus consecuencias inevitables, gastar en negarlas la fuerza que debe emplearse en procurar que vayan desapareciendo. Para que una clase logre la misma consideración social que otra, no basta que tanto como ella sirva á la sociedad; es necesario que además se haga respetar por sus condiciones morales é intelectuales, sin lo cual jamás conseguirá que haya relación entre lo que sirve y lo que merece. ¿Por qué ciertas obras se califican de viles? Por el envilecimiento del obrero: haced á éste respetable, y la obra quedará ennoblecida.

Se clama contra la explotación de la debilidad por la fuerza; pero sería bien no rebelarse contra la naturaleza humana, comprender lo que es inevitable en ella, y ver que el problema no consiste en que los fuertes no abusen de los débiles, sino en que no haya débiles ó en que haya pocos. En una obra cualquiera, escalónense los que han de llevarla á cabo, desde el rico capitalista hasta el miserable bracero; dése al que es explotado por los de arriba la facultad de explotar al que está debajo, y se verá cómo aquella masa se convierte en explotadores y explotados de varias categorías, hasta que llega una que no tiene debajo á nadie, ni halla compensación á la dura ley que recibe, con la que impone. Esto sucede en todas partes y siempre; y si se analizan los elementos del fenómeno, si se pregunta por qué no hay relación exacta entre los servicios y las remuneraciones, ni posibilidad de establecer equivalencias sociales más equitativas, se verá que la inferioridad moral ó intelectual, ó las dos reunidas en el obrero explotado, son la causa de que se tase tan bajo la obra, y que no puede aumentar el número de equivalencias sociales sino en la medida que aumentan las analogías y semejanzas entre los que han de figurar á la misma altura.

Cualquiera dirección que tomen los amigos de la igualdad, siempre hallarán en su camino condiciones morales é intelectuales; y aunque comprendan y hagan valer todo el alcance de la equivalencia, verán que tampoco puede prescindir de lo que el hombre debe y conoce, y que ni los decretos, ni las leyes, ni los motines, ni las rebeliones lograrán que se tengan por _equivalentes_ los servicios que prestan personas muy _desiguales_.

CAPÍTULO VI.

QUE LOS HOMBRES NO HAN MENESTER OCUPAR EN LA SOCIEDAD POSICIONES IGUALES PARA SER IGUALMENTE DICHOSOS.

Suelen encomiarse las ventajas de la pobreza por los que no han sido pobres, de la medianía por los que aspiraban á salir de ella, y de la moderación y templanza por los que tal vez tienen una ambición sin límites. Diríase que hay circunstancias en que no se predica la resignación sino para ponerla á prueba, ni la virtud sino para explotarla. Mas aunque esto acontezca alguna vez ó muchas, no deja de ser cierto que la dicha no está sujeta como esclava á los caprichos de la fortuna.

Parécenos que deben huirse dos extremos: ni tomar como historia el cuento de que para hallar un hombre feliz fué necesario buscarle entre los que no tenían camisa, ni creer que se necesitan ricas galas para ser dichoso y que lo es todo el que las tiene.

La miseria es desdichada, hay que reconocerlo, siquiera no sea más que para no insultarla con plácemes hipócritas ó ignorantes.

El que tiene hambre ó frío, el que carece de albergue racional, de cama, del preciso descanso después de un trabajo rudo, aunque se ría, aunque esté alegre alguna vez, es desdichado; se le observa en un momento de expansión, y se le envidia; en una hora de insensatez, y se le desprecia; pero tomando su vida entera, tal como es, sustituyendo á la apariencia la realidad, á nadie que razone y sienta bien deja de inspirar lástima.

Ninguna persona de entendimiento y de corazón puede prescindir de la miseria, ya la sienta como una desdicha compadecida, ya la contemple como un espectro amenazador; mas por terrible que parezca ó simpática que sea, no debe considerarse cual regla, sino cual excepción, que será más rara á medida que los hombres sean más racionales y mejores. Cuando la miseria toma grandes proporciones; cuando se extiende á masas y persiste en afligirlas; cuando, en vez de ser una desgracia individual y pasajera, es un fenómeno social permanente, puede asegurarse que la sociedad está mal organizada, que los hombres no comprenden su conveniencia y su deber ó le pisan, que á sus relaciones no preside la justicia. Así acontece muchas veces, porque los pueblos emplean sus esfuerzos y sus tesoros no en disminuir su miseria moral y material, sino en aumentarla; de modo que, siendo tan grande, parece como inevitable. Pero no es la magnitud de un mal, sino su índole, la que hay que tener en cuenta para declararle sin remedio; y como al estudiar la miseria permanente y en grandes proporciones se ve que es consecuencia de errores é injusticias á que puede y debe oponerse la justicia y la verdad, y como la verdad y justicia solamente son eternas, necesarias y propias para servir de regla, todo lo que á ellas es contrario debe considerarse como contingente y combatirse como dañoso y perecedero.

El hecho de la miseria, que en algunos países es una excepción, debe serlo en todos, y al estudiar esta dolorosa desigualdad, debemos considerarla, no como una parte del organismo social, sino como una dolencia que sólo por culpa del hombre tiene carácter contagioso y se hace crónica.

La miseria, la _falta de lo necesario fisiológico_, lo repetimos, es una positiva y gran desgracia, y el que la padece no puede hallar equivalencias, ni compensaciones que le igualen para la felicidad, con el que posee lo indispensable: esta es la regla, que no invalidan ciertas excepciones. Porque haya un miserable alegre y un opulento que se desespere y se suicide; porque ciertas individuales condiciones se sobrepongan á todas las circunstancias exteriores, no hay que negar á éstas la influencia que por lo común tienen.

Pero desde el momento en que el hombre no puede con razón llamarse miserable; desde que tiene trabajando lo necesario para vivir; desde que no es más que _pobre_, puede ser dichoso, tan dichoso, más acaso que los que le aventajan en bienes de fortuna. No faltan pruebas de esta verdad; pero suele faltar quien las aprecie en su verdadero valor, quien prescinda de apariencias, quien se despoje de vanidades y envidias que tienen la pretensión de definir la felicidad que dificultan. Es deplorable, porque el conocimiento de la felicidad verdadera contribuiría á lograrla, como aleja de ella el desconocer los esenciales elementos de que se compone. Hay aspiraciones que sólo tienen un limitado número de individuos, pero á ser feliz todo el mundo aspira: el sabio y el ignorante, el noble y el plebeyo, el vano y el humilde, el rico y el pobre, el bueno y hasta el malvado. Ya se comprende la importancia de que todos estudien lo que á todos interesa, lo que todos buscan, lo que todos se afanan por encontrar y lo que muy pocos conocen. ¿Por qué quieren los hombres ser iguales á los que están más arriba en riqueza, en poder, en consideración? Por ser igualmente dichosos: éste es el fin; lo demás son medios, no siempre legítimos ni adecuados, para conseguirle, muchas veces propios para alejarlos de él. Multitudes de hombres que van con infinita fatiga haciéndose daño á sí propios y á los demás, no son muchas veces sino criaturas que buscan la felicidad donde no está ó por caminos que no conducen á ella.

Hay una propensión muy marcada á tomar por base de la felicidad la que sirve de regla para establecer la contribución: _la renta_. ¿Un hombre tiene doce mil duros? Es dichoso. ¿Doce mil reales? La vida es para él llevadera. ¿Dos mil? Es desgraciado. Esta opinión no se funda en ningún razonamiento; pero es frecuente que las opiniones más resueltas sean las menos razonadas. El error de que la dicha está en razón directa de la riqueza, es de los más perturbadores y dañinos; da la sed de goces materiales, la fiebre del oro y la idea de buscar un fin por medios que le hacen imposible.

Los bienes espirituales se multiplican á medida que son más los que de ellos disfrutan; la ciencia aumenta con el número de los que la poseen, y la virtud con los virtuosos. La verdad, la justicia y la belleza abundan á medida que es mayor la multitud de los que de ellas gozan; pero con los bienes materiales no sucede lo mismo, tienen una limitación propia de su naturaleza inferior y terrenal. Ved aquel público numeroso que escucha la defensa del inocente ó la acusación del culpable, los acentos sublimes de la música ó la voz augusta de la verdad. Hay allí personas de todas clases; unas van en coche, otras á pie y mal calzadas, quién sale de un palacio levantándose hastiado de la opípara mesa, quién deja su tugurio y hace un sacrificio de tiempo ó de dinero, de las dos cosas tal vez, para formar parte de la concurrencia. ¡Cuánta desigualdad material en aquellos hombres! Pero el abogado habla, el músico hace oir las armonías de su instrumento, el pensador revela los misterios de la ciencia, y las desigualdades de la fortuna desaparecen, y cada uno goza del arte, siente la justicia y aprende la verdad según las facultades de su corazón y de su inteligencia, desapareciendo las diferencias de la posición social y estableciéndose otras que nada tienen que ver con ella. Siempre que el hombre se eleva de las cosas materiales á las del espíritu, brinda á los demás hombres con la participación igual y completa de los bienes que posee; siempre que se rebaja á no preciar más goces que los materiales, tiende á excluir de ellos á los otros y á establecer desigualdades. El coche del que le tiene es suyo, y porque es suyo no puede ser de otro; la belleza de un cuadro es de los que le contemplan, de todos á la vez, sin que la parte que toma cada uno merme la de los demás, y antes por el contrario aumentándola.

No hay que insistir en verdades tan sencillas y claras; pero conviene sacar algunas de sus principales consecuencias más íntimamente relacionadas con el asunto que nos ocupa. La igualdad en la dicha la quieren todos los hombres; el hacer consistir la dicha en los bienes materiales es una propensión muy generalizada; los bienes materiales, cuya posesión excluye á otro posesor, tienen una tendencia exclusiva y antiniveladora; de manera que al absurdo de suponer que la felicidad guarda proporción con la riqueza, se une el de imaginar que ésta puede ser el patrimonio de todo el mundo.

Para que los hombres sean igualmente dichosos es necesario establecer entre ellos niveles de inteligencia, de bondad, de virtud, no de renta, ó de producto del trabajo, que siendo suficiente para cubrir las verdaderas necesidades, lo es también para procurar la verdadera dicha.

¿Quién ha formado la estadística de los dolores y de los goces humanos? ¿Quién puede formarla? Este hombre está desnudo, descalzo, hambriento; es un mal evidente para la multitud que al pasar le compadece; aquel otro tiene amor, odio, ambición, envidia, remordimientos, sed de venganza, de poder, de fama ó de oro: su alma se agita en terrible lucha, su corazón destila hiel y rebosa amargura; son males que la muchedumbre no percibe, y si va á pie no repara en él, y si va en coche le envidia. Los inconvenientes de la pobreza son ostensibles; pero se repara poco en los infinitos medios que emplea la criminal codicia para dañar al rico: disfrazada de amor, engaña á sus hijos y se los arranca; adula sus pasiones, y le extravía sus debilidades y le pone en ridículo; acecha sus extravagancias, y le hace declarar loco; acibara sus últimos momentos para arrancar un legado, y ríe sobre su tumba, si acaso no la abre prematuramente. Mas los peligros exteriores de la _riqueza_ son los menos terribles; la gran dificultad para que sea dichoso el que posée superabundantemente medios de fortuna consiste en que necesita proporción entre ellos y los morales, y que á la superioridad económica corresponda la superioridad moral.

El problema de la vida del pobre es relativamente sencillo: sus deberes son, por regla general, negativos; sus extravíos están en gran parte limitados por la necesidad de un trabajo constante y la falta de medios pecuniarios. De la posición humilde viene la templanza en los deseos, esa clave de la felicidad que el pobre recibe casi gratis, que el rico logra tan difícilmente. El que no está sujeto por las necesidades materiales y verdaderas de la existencia, tiene que imponer silencio á las ficticias del egoísmo y que encadenar el desenfreno de todas las pasiones. Si se entiende por pasión lo que á nuestro parecer debe entenderse, _todo deseo vehemente contra razón ó justicia que persiste y mortifica_, se comprenderá cuán grande puede llegar á ser la esfera de las pasiones y cómo se dilata á medida que el hombre se eleva en la escala social. Hay pasiones detonantes, por decirlo así, que todo el mundo conoce, porque hacen ruido al hacer explosión; pero hay otras, las más, que pasan desapercibidas, clavando en silencio su aguijón ó destilando su virus corrosivo. La pasión, que es sinónimo de sufrimiento, tiene muchos caminos para llegar al rico y muy pocos para llegar al pobre, que por lo común cifra su ventura en tener cubiertas sus necesidades materiales; el poder satisfacerlas, ni aun le ocurre al rico que sea un bien, y teniéndole se cree y es desgraciado, y sufre y se desespera.

Otro grande enemigo de la felicidad del rico es el amor propio, monstruo voraz nunca satisfecho que pide más cuanto más le damos. Él amuebla la casa, atavía á la persona, dispone la comida, señala el número de servidores y determina la clase de trabajo, el modo de viajar, de divertirse, y, en fin, lo dispone todo. El gusto, la conveniencia, la razón, muchas veces el sosiego, la vida y hasta la honra, se sacrifican á sus exigencias sin límites. Como líquido incoloro, toma el color del vaso que le contiene, y con flexibilidad infinita se acomoda á todas las formas del cuerpo que enlaza; se adapta á las puerilidades de la vanidad y á las soberbias del orgullo; codicia un dije, un traje, un mueble, el poder, la fama, y según con quien habla, va diciendo:--Viste con elegancia, ten casa lujosa, anda en coche, sé literato notable, poeta aplaudido, músico ó pintor laureado, hombre de ciencia insigne, general, banquero, diputado, senador, ministro ó secretario de ayuntamiento.

¡Qué vértigos de cólera, ó qué angustias de pena, cuando otro alcanza el puesto que se ambicionaba, ó recibe los aplausos que se clavan como espinas en el corazón del que los quería para sí! ¡Qué facilidad para crear aspiraciones, qué dificultad para satisfacerlas! ¡Qué desdicha sacar las condiciones de bienestar fuera de sí mismo y cifrarle en lo que piensan ó sienten ó dicen los otros!

El amor propio necesita espectadores; los busca como instrumentos de satisfacción y los halla convertidos en tiranos, cuyos mandatos obedece en cambio de un aplauso que mendiga y no siempre logra. Esa dependencia de los demás; esa verdadera esclavitud de los que prefieren inspirar envidia á merecer respeto; ese someterse incondicionalmente al _qué dirán_ de los que tal vez no saben lo que dicen; ese espíritu que vive de prestado y en la mayor de las miserias, puesto que no tiene satisfacción legítima que pueda llamar suya, todo es consecuencia del amor propio excitado y fuera de sus razonables límites. Se dirá que no los traspasa en todos los ricos, ni deja de extralimitarse en algunos pobres; no negaremos que suceda así; pero es igualmente cierto que, por regla general, donde la vanidad impera, donde el amor propio tortura, donde las pasiones hacen verdaderos estragos, es en los ricos, no en los pobres. Estos, sin saberla, siguen la sabia máxima de

Iguala con la vida el pensamiento,

y no van de continuo con sus aspiraciones donde sus medios no pueden llegar, ni dan cuerpo, convirtiéndolos en desgracias, á los devaneos de la imaginación.

La fortuna, como una madre inconsiderada, suele hacer infelices á los hijos que mima. Halagados por ella, son tan débiles, tan susceptibles, tan impresionables, que la menor contrariedad los irrita, el más pequeño contratiempo los desespera; ellos son los que se crean esas situaciones envidiadas que les parecen insoportables; ellos los que, teniendo tantos caminos que elegir, no van

por ninguno y llaman abismo á una depresión cualquiera. El hombre necesita luchar, es de ley que luche; y combate por combate, no siempre es el más rudo el que tiene que sostener el pobre, sujeto constantemente á pruebas que no sufre el rico, que en cambio pasa por otras que aquél ignora.

La estadística de la felicidad no puede hacerse, sea que no exista sino por excepción rara, sea que se oculte ó que se halle donde no la buscan los que pretenden estudiarla; pero el contento es más general y más visible, y ciertamente no se observa que esté en proporción de la renta. Donde quiera que se reunen muchas personas de varias clases, en viajes, paseos, diversiones públicas, no se ve que la alegría se mida por el precio de las localidades, y antes puede afirmarse que los que se divierten más son los que pagan menos. Las personas que parecen hastiadas, que vuelven en el teatro la espalda al escenario y se aburren viajando en coches de primera ó en salones, no son los menos favorecidos de la fortuna.

Se dirá, y es cierto, que la alegría no es la felicidad; pero si el estudio de ésta presenta dificultades insuperables, ofrece menos el comparativo de la desgracia, sobre todo si la observamos donde aparece en relieve, en la desesperación suprema que conduce á la muerte voluntaria. Que un suicida supone muchos desesperados y un desesperado muchos infelices; que siendo la clase pobre más numerosa da el menor número de suicidas, cosas son ciertas, sabidas, y lógica es la consecuencia de que no debe ser más general la felicidad entre aquellos en que es más frecuente la desesperación.

Cada edad, cada estado, cada situación, cada clase tiene sus ventajas y sus inconvenientes, sus disgustos y sus satisfacciones, sus penas y sus consuelos; nada más perjudicial ni menos conforme á la verdad que cortar por un mismo patrón la dicha de criaturas diferentes, y pretender que no pueden llegar á ella sino por un camino y pagando á la entrada una cantidad fija y crecida.

El joven con las ideas y sentimientos de su edad no comprende que el viejo deje de ser desgraciado; pasan los años y es feliz de un modo que le parecía imposible. El guerrero no puede imaginar la dicha de la mujer piadosa que cura las heridas que él hace, y cuya vida es más envidiable que la suya; los que distan mucho en ocupaciones, medios é ideas, no comprenden que pueda haber ventura tan diferente de la que ellos tienen ó desean. Pero no dejándose dominar por las propias impresiones ni extraviar por apariencias, y observando las diferentes clases sociales en sus dolores y en sus alegrías, se ve que son igualmente dichosos los que ocupan posiciones más desiguales y que hay compensaciones providenciales que los hombres desconocen con frecuencia por su culpa y para su desdicha. La Providencia, que ha dado á cada sér una organización apropiada al medio en que ha de vivir, al colocar al hombre en una sociedad en que hay necesariamente desigualdades, no sujetó á ellas nada verdaderamente importante, nada esencial. En la virtud y en la dicha, en la salud del cuerpo y en la del alma entran elementos que no dependen de la fortuna, cuyos caprichos no afectan más que á las superficies de la existencia y á los hombres superficiales. El dolor y la dicha tienen misterios que ningún hombre, ninguno, puede penetrar; desigualdades terriblemente enigmáticas, pero no proporcionales á las de la posición social, ni dependientes de ella.

Bien sería que nos convenciéramos de que hay inconvenientes y ventajas propias de cada situación, compensaciones que existen, aunque no sean ostensibles, diferencias exteriores que no alteran la igualdad íntima, y que el que nace príncipe no tiene más probabilidades de ser dichoso que el que nació pastor. El convencimiento de esta verdad calmaría la fiebre de poder y de riqueza que hace delirar á generaciones extraviadas; aniquilaría un poderoso instigador de iras populares; pondría de manifiesto que, salvo algunas criaturas excepcionales, que son el secreto de Dios, salvo los casos de miseria, obra impía del hombre, la posible felicidad sobre la tierra, como el sol, brilla para todos.

CAPÍTULO VII.

LA PROPIEDAD Y LA IGUALDAD[3].

[3] Hemos utilizado para este capítulo la excelente obra del Sr. D. Gumersindo de Azcárate, _Ensayo sobre la historia del derecho de propiedad_.

En toda discusión, para que sea posible, hay algún punto esencial en que convienen los que discuten, y damos por supuesto, al escribir este capítulo, que el lector piensa, como nosotros, que no puede haber sociedad sin propiedad constituída en tal ó cual forma, condicionada de ésta ó de la otra manera, pero propiedad en fin.

Si el hombre es propietario, como es sociable, por ley de su naturaleza, tal vez no sea inútil investigar, aunque fuese brevemente, de qué manera influye la propiedad en la igualdad, puesto que esta influencia ni puede ser nula ni es evitable.

Porque los niveladores sociales atacan la propiedad con más ó menos violencia, con más ó menos lógica, pero la atacan siempre. ¿Están todos ciegos, furiosos ó de mala fe? ¿Cómo á muchos siglos de distancia, y con grandes diferencias en el clima, la religión, la cultura, el estado social, se repiten los mismos ataques, á veces en idéntica forma y en ocasiones con las mismas palabras? La permanencia del efecto revela la de la causa, y su poder, cuando persiste en medio de tantas cosas como desaparecen, y sobrenada en las tempestades de guerras, trastornos y revoluciones.

Han acusado, acusan y acusarán á la propiedad de establecer grandes diferencias entre los hombres, y aunque el cargo pueda ser exagerado ó injusto, según las circunstancias, el hecho es cierto: entre la propiedad, tal como está constituída siempre que por los niveladores es atacada, y la igualdad, hay antagonismo que no se debe disimular, sino analizar. Recordemos que la igualdad no puede tener derecho contra el derecho; recordemos que no le es dado cambiar las leyes de la Naturaleza y de las sociedades humanas; recordemos, por último, que el fin primero del hombre no es ser igual á otro, sino ser justo, perfeccionarse: teniendo presentes estas premisas, y sacando de ellas sus lógicas consecuencias, llegaremos á conclusiones que, tristes ó consoladoras, si son ciertas, hay que aceptarlas y someternos á la verdad, que á nadie se somete.

Tratando de su influencia sobre la igualdad, conviene distinguir la propiedad colectiva de la individual. La propiedad colectiva (que, entiéndase bien, no es el comunismo), igualando á los propietarios, iguala, hasta cierto punto, á los hombres que forman el grupo poseedor en común. Decimos _hasta cierto punto_ porque aun en los pueblos en que la propiedad era colectiva ha existido siempre más ó menos propiedad individual, influída por las diferencias de los individuos, y á su vez influyente en su desigualdad social. Aunque la tierra no fuese de nadie, los frutos repartidos para ser utilizados tenían que ser apropiados; aunque los bosques pertenecieran á todos, la caza era del que la mataba, y del que le pescaba el pescado, por más que los ríos y los mares no constituyen propiedad de ninguno. La colectiva evita sin duda la grande acumulación de fortunas, pero no las nivela tan completamente como se ha supuesto por algunos. El individuo, aun en los pueblos primitivos, ha sido dueño exclusivo de alguna cosa, ha tenido ventajas físicas, intelectuales y cualidades morales que le han hecho más rico que otro con menos recursos y moralidad: esto respecto á los copropietarios de un grupo en que la tierra se posee en común, que entre los grupos unos respecto de otros había mayores diferencias. La prioridad en apropiarse un terreno más fértil; bosques más abundantes de caza, ó ríos de pesca; la victoria en los combates; más servicios hechos al jefe del pequeño ó grande Estado, ó su mayor largueza; ventajas físicas, intelectuales ó morales, alguna ó varias de estas circunstancias combinadas hacían que las colectividades propietarias fuesen unas ricas y otras pobres. Aun en nuestros días vemos pueblos con propios de gran valor, otros que nada poseen, y al lado del concejo en cuyos montes se pudre la leña, el que no tiene qué quemar.

La propiedad, aun la colectiva, no es niveladora, sino que, por el contrario, propende á establecer la desigualdad entre los propietarios; y si todas las mañanas se hiciera un reparto que los igualara, todas las noches los habría más ricos y más pobres.

La propiedad colectiva ni se presenta de una manera invariablemente uniforme, ni deja de comprender sus desventajas, ni pasa á ser individual sin términos medios y variaciones. Ya todo es común, cultivo y aprovechamiento; ya se señala á cada individuo el trabajo de cierta porción de tierra; ya se distribuye ésta por cierto tiempo y por lotes que vuelven al fondo común para ser adjudicados de nuevo alternativamente á sus temporales poseedores. Más adelante, las tierras, una gran parte al menos, pasan á ser propiedad de las familias, pero han de permanecer en ellas; no han de poder enajenarlas, ni donarlas, ni legarlas, y cuando esto se consiente es con ciertas condiciones. El legislador se precave contra la desigualdad, que ve, que palpa, que teme; pone límites á la extensión de las posesiones; permite que, incultas, se las apropie el que las cultive; dispone que, periódicamente, se restablezca la igualdad, restableciendo la primitiva distribución que se había hecho por partes iguales, y según tiempos y lugares, toma diferentes medidas encaminadas á evitar la acumulación de la riqueza. La lucha es larga, entre la igualdad, que pretende poner trabas á la propiedad, y ésta, que intenta romperlas todas; entre el espíritu de la propiedad colectiva y el de la individual; entre el Estado, que pasa fácilmente de la tutela á la opresión, y el individuo, que tiende á convertir la libertad en licencia. ¿Esta lucha ha terminado? Algunos pretenden que sí, y que logra completa victoria la propiedad individual, única compatible con los derechos del individuo y los progresos de la civilización, aunque poco favorable á la igualdad.

Aunque el individuo haya poseído siempre alguna cosa exclusivamente suya, y aunque las colectividades fuesen unas más ricas que otras, lo cierto es que la propiedad territorial en común, ó la posesión transitoria, eran favorables á la nivelación de las fortunas. Pero, ya lo hemos dicho, por querida que sea para los hombres la igualdad, no puede ser el único objeto de su existencia, ni pueden ellos sacrificarle todos los otros. A ser iguales en la miseria, prefieren salir de ella algunos, ó muchos; y como para esto hay que desplegar una grande energía _personal_, el fruto de ella tiende irremisiblemente á convertirse en propiedad _individual_. Así como la caza fué siempre del cazador, y del pescador la pesca, donde quiera que el hombre llevó mucha destreza, mucha inteligencia, mucha fatiga ó peligro para realizar una obra, quiso tener en ella una parte _suya_ proporcional al

trabajo que había empleado. En un pueblo primitivo, esta parte constituye riqueza que se consume, no que se acumula, y la desigualdad pasajera no era grande; pero, como hemos visto más arriba, á medida que un pueblo se civiliza, pueden manifestarse y utilizarse las diferentes aptitudes, y los que física, intelectual ó moralmente valen más, allegan recursos, realizan economías, son más ricos. Aunque la tierra continuase propiedad común, ó igualmente repartida é inmovilizada, diferentes industrias ofrecían cada vez más vasto campo á la energía inteligente del individuo y eran origen de propiedad individual. La agricultura ¿podía permanecer mucho tiempo petrificada en medio de elementos de vida más poderosos cada vez? Los brazos vigorosos ni las inteligencias activas ¿irían á cultivar la tierra común que perezosamente removían los débiles, los holgazanes ó los incapaces, para compartir por igual con ellos el fruto de tan diferente trabajo? ¿No quedaría el cultivo de la tierra encomendado á las manos más torpes y endebles y á las inteligencias más obtusas, incapaces de fecundarla? _A priori_ se comprende, la experiencia lo demuestra, y la historia presenta la propiedad colectiva en los pueblos primitivos, haciéndose individual á medida que se civilizan. De que el hecho es constante no cabe duda, y que es inevitable también parece claro.

Tenemos pues:

Que el hombre es sociable;

Que no hay sociedad sin propiedad;

Que la propiedad colectiva en un principio, se hace individual cuando adelanta la civilización;

Que la propiedad individual no es favorable á la igualdad.

¿Significa esto que por una pendiente inevitable, fatal, á medida que un pueblo se civiliza aumenta en él la desigualdad de las fortunas, de manera que los ricos son más opulentos y los pobres más miserables? Debemos confesar que á eso tienden muchos elementos de la civilización; pero hay otros que combaten esta tendencia, y el problema consiste, no en negar aquella parte de mal que entre sus bienes produce el progreso, sino en reconocerla; en ver hasta qué punto es inevitable, y hasta dónde puede evitarse y por qué medios.

Así como al empezar este capítulo dábamos por supuesto que el lector consideraría la propiedad como necesaria, para continuarle suponemos que reconoce el grave daño de la gran acumulación de riquezas al lado de la miseria suma.

La propiedad no puede volver á ser colectiva, ni inmovilizarse, ni mutilarse, ni tener límites en cuanto á su extensión: su libertad ha de ser respetada como la del propietario, pero cuidando de que no se convierta en licencia, porque comprenderla como el derecho de usar y de abusar de la cosa poseída, más es comprometerla que consolidarla: no ha de ser ni una víctima ni un ídolo; que no se salte ningún cercado, pero que en todos haya una puerta por donde entren la ley y la justicia.

La propiedad influyente é influída, emancipando unas veces al propietario y otras participando de su servidumbre, tiene con la igualdad relaciones tan estrechas, que como ella, establece entre los hombres primitivos pocas diferencias, que van creciendo con la civilización, hasta que llegan á un punto en que la riqueza se acumula, tiene movimientos vertiginosos ó inmovilidad pétrea, cae en manos rapaces ó muertas, y entonces viene el malestar, las convulsiones, y si el estado de la propiedad no cambia, los pueblos van á la decadencia ó á la ruina.

Todos los países en que se proclama el progreso, y que progresan verdaderamente, han modificado la propiedad en sentido favorable á la igualdad; pero sería un error suponer que la obra está concluída y la lucha terminada.

Los igualitarios individualistas sostienen que la libertad basta para establecer la armonía entre los propietarios, y que la propiedad individual más absoluta es la única posible y el mejor auxiliar de la igualdad: los niveladores conservan una hostilidad especial contra la propiedad inmueble, y pretenden volver á la propiedad colectiva; y todos suelen prescindir bastante del elemento moral como si la riqueza se distribuyera como giran los astros, en virtud de leyes físicas.

Si el hombre fuera perfecto, sería justo nada más que con ser libre; pero su imperfección hace indispensable coartar su libertad en sus relaciones con los otros, lo mismo como propietario que en cualquier otro concepto. La libertad es un medio, no un objeto; es parte integrante del sér racional, no todo; es un medio de llegar á la armonía, no la armonía misma; es un elemento que no ha de sacrificarse á otro, pero que no puede exigir que se le inmole ninguno. Proclamad al propietario libre de hacer cuanto quiera de su propiedad, y la sustraerá al pago de los tributos; opondrá con ella un insuperable obstáculo á las obras públicas; sacrificará á los operarios con que la beneficia, por la falta de higiene ó mezquindad de retribución; depositará materias inflamables, sin precaución alguna, en el centro de las ciudades; llevará el desenfreno del monopolio adonde no pueda seguirle la concurrencia; alquilará

casas inhabitables, coches donde peligra la vida de los viajeros; venderá vino envenenado, trigo averiado, pescado podrido, etc., etc. Todo esto y mucho más hará la propiedad si se la deja hacer lo que quiere, y tanto como otra cosa, y más que muchas, necesita estar sujeta á reglas: que sean justas es lo que debe procurarse, porque pretender que no las necesita es desconocer la naturaleza del propietario, es decir, del hombre.

Estas reglas no pueden ser fijas; lo que era imposible ayer, es hacedero hoy y será insuficiente mañana: la cuestión es siempre comprender bien la justicia y aplicarla á la propiedad como á las demás cosas. Si no hay derecho á pasar un nivel sobre los propietarios, despojando á los de arriba por favorecer á los de abajo, tampoco á repartir los tributos de modo que pesen más sobre los que poseen menos, ni á favorecer la acumulación con loterías, rifas y herencias que ni estrechan los lazos de familia, antes á veces los aflojan, ni son ley de la Naturaleza ni voluntad del testador. Sin salirse de las vías de la justicia pueden tomarse muchas medidas para disminuir el poder absorbente de la riqueza, que tiende á crecer, como la miseria, en rápida progresión: fijándose bien en los males que consigo lleva la excesiva desigualdad de fortunas, justo debe parecer disminuirla por medios equitativos que no chocasen con los respetables sentimientos de familia ni lastimaran los legítimos intereses.

Si es un anacronismo irrealizable convertir, en nombre de la igualdad, al Estado en posesor único; si los que tal pretenden son verdaderos retrógrados, tampoco podemos considerar como progreso el privar al campesino del prado y del monte común, de modo que no pueda tener ya vaca, oveja ni cerdo, y robe leña para cocer los alimentos y no morirse de frío. ¿Qué medidas se toman contra los ataques á la propiedad hechos en virtud de necesidades imperiosas y ocasiones continuas? ¿Dejarlos impunes? Está mal. ¿Penarlos? No está bien; y en este caso, y en otros muchos, resulta acrecentamiento de miseria y conflictos para la conciencia y el orden, de lo que para muchos es el ideal en materia de propiedad, á saber: que toda sea individual, sin que parte alguna quede en común. No vayamos á buscar á los bosques de los celtas, los eslavos y los germanos oráculos para la constitución de la propiedad; pero no creamos tampoco que el Derecho romano es la Buena nueva, y que basta anunciarla para regenerar económicamente á las naciones: el progreso no es predominio exclusivo de un elemento cualquiera; tomemos de cada civilización lo que tiene de humano, de general, de permanente, que es lo único justo, y arrostremos la desdeñosa calificación de _eclécticos_ más bien que merecer la de exclusivos ó insensatos.

Si los que combaten las exageraciones de la propiedad individual no exageraran á su vez, se habría adelantado más para la solución del problema, porque suponerle resuelto nos parece ilusión peligrosa.

Hay que deplorar los obstáculos que opone el egoísmo ciego y la inmoralidad y la ignorancia á que se aumente ni aun se conserve lo poseído en común: el prado no se limpia ni se abona, el monte se tala, el ferrocarril se administra mal, y cuando la comunidad no es bastante moral é inteligente para ser justa, se la combate con ventaja, se la expropia, y aun se la despoja en virtud de razones aparentes que explotan otros egoísmos y otras inmoralidades. Cuando lo que es de todos pretende utilizarlo cada uno, y no quiere cuidarlo nadie; cuando hay muchos dispuestos á atacarlo con persistencia, y nadie á defenderlo resueltamente; cuando los principales interesados en que se conserve, y hasta donde sea posible se aumente, son débiles por falta de inteligencia y no comprenden lo que les conviene ó no saben hacer valer su derecho, los bienes comunes que favorecían la igualdad se acumularán en pocas manos. Dadas estas circunstancias, el mal no podrá evitarse, pero que al menos no se convierta en ideal, felicitando á la sociedad porque tiene una desdicha más.

La lucha seguirá por mucho tiempo; esperemos que no será eterna entre los que, sabiéndolo ó sin saberlo, favorecen la acumulación de la propiedad, y los que pretenden que se distribuya más igualmente: pueden contribuir las leyes á este último resultado; pero sobre que las leyes son el reflejo de las ideas y de los sentimientos, no hay legislación, cualquiera que ella sea, capaz de impedir la excesiva acumulación de la propiedad en pueblos donde hay pocas virtudes y mucha ignorancia. Todas las huelgas resueltas arbitrariamente por poderes niveladores; todos los decretos socialistas, y todas las leyes agrarias, no impedirán que sea miserable el ignorante desmoralizado y que cerca de él no posea excesivas riquezas el inteligente que no repara en los medios de acumularlas. ¿De qué le sirvieron á Esparta corrompida las leyes de Licurgo, ni á Roma degradada las disposiciones igualitarias de sus emperadores? En los Códigos había disposiciones favorables á la igual distribución de la riqueza, en las plazas muchedumbres hambrientas y en los palacios magnates cuyo lujo y repugnante glotonería han pasado á la historia. Ahora, después y siempre acontecerá algo parecido, porque la naturaleza del hombre no cambia esencialmente; y cuando á los progresos materiales no siguen los morales é intelectuales generalizados, la civilización da grandes medios para acumular riquezas é impulsos irresistibles que lanzan á la miseria.

La igualdad no debe combatir á la propiedad que no traspasa los justos límites, ni puede evitar que los pase sino elevando el nivel moral é intelectual: la condición no es fácil de llenar, pero es aún más difícil sustituirla por ninguna otra.

CAPÍTULO VIII.

DE LA ASOCIACIÓN Y DE LA IGUALDAD.

Es común emplear indistintamente la palabra _Asociación_ y la de _Sociedad_ para expresar la reunión de personas que unen sus esfuerzos con un fin dado y bajo una regla que admiten. Así vemos que se dice Asociación de socorros mutuos, Asociación internacional, Sociedad de San Vicente de Paúl, Sociedad para la reforma de las prisiones, etc., etc. Conviene, sin embargo, fijarse en que es un modo de expresarse impropio, que la confusión de las palabras influye en la de las cosas, y que el socialismo debe en parte sus progresos á confundir la asociación con la sociedad: las esenciales diferencias que entre estas dos existen creemos que pueden reducirse á tres:

1.ª En la Sociedad se reunen los hombres para todos los fines de la vida; en la Asociación solamente para uno ó varios que al constituirla determinan.

2.ª En la Asociación se entra y se sale voluntariamente, siendo el asociado dueño de aceptar ó no sus condiciones y de separarse de ella cuando no considera su marcha conforme al objeto que se propone, ó éste ha dejado de parecerle útil ó justo: de la Sociedad formamos parte queriéndolo ó sin quererlo, y aunque se dirija mal ó se extravíe, no podemos separarnos de ella, ni aun dejar de contribuir en cierta medida á darle medios para que realice los fines que reprobamos. ¿Qué hará el que no esté conforme con la organización social de un país? ¿Irse á otro? De hecho es imposible que millones de hombres abandonen la patria, y en la nueva habría también cosas con que no estuvieran conformes y á las que tendrían que contribuir.

3.ª La Asociación puede arrojar de sí á los asociados que no cumplen las condiciones pactadas, ó por cualquier motivo se hacen indignos de pertenecer á ella; la sociedad tiene que conservar en su seno á los que se ajustan á sus reglas, y á los que faltan á ellas, á los que son un elemento de prosperidad, á los que son causa de ruina, á los que la honran, á los que la avergüenzan, á todos. Los mismos criminales que recluye no los arroja de sí, sino que les señala una manera especial de existencia correspondiente á su manera de proceder especial también, y sólo rechaza al corto número de los que suprime condenándolos á muerte.

Indicado este deslinde que nos pareció conveniente entre la Sociedad y la Asociación, veamos si esta última es siempre favorable á la igualdad.

No hay que tener una ciega confianza en la asociación, ni suponerle un poder infaliblemente curativo de ciertas llagas sociales; es un poderoso instrumento, no cabe duda, pero que hace bien ó mal según el modo de manejarle y el objeto conque se emplea: muchos ejemplos pueden citarse, por desgracia, pasados y presentes, de asociaciones que no se proponen un fin bueno, ó si lo es, pretenden llegar á él por malos medios, y al lado de los que reunen los esfuerzos de los débiles se ven los que combinan los medios de los poderosos para hacer su poder irresistible.

Así, pues, en la igualdad racional, en la igualdad que se realiza dentro de la justicia elevando á los de abajo, no rebajando á los de arriba, ¿qué influencia ejercen las asociaciones? Según sean. Toda asociación inmoral, ya por el objeto que se propone ó por los medios que emplea, es contraria á la igualdad aunque la proclame y en apariencia la favorezca.

Asociaciones hay que han alcanzado un buen fin por medios legítimos, y no obstante pueden calificarse de perjudiciales y contrarias á la igualdad por el abuso que de su gran poder han hecho: dada la miserable condición humana, fuerza que no se equilibra, fuerza perturbadora; y como no suele hallarse ordenada por la conciencia de los que la ejercen, necesita otra enfrente que la contenga en sus justos límites.

Cualquiera que sea el fin que se proponga y los medios que emplee, debe también reprobarse toda asociación que no vive á la luz del día y cautelosamente se oculta: hoy, en la casi totalidad de los pueblos cultos, no tienen razón de ser esos misterios, y asociación donde hay secreto envuelve en él inmoralidad, daño grande, y puede decirse que es antisocial. Con el secreto va la abdicación de la conciencia de los asociados, que reciben en las tinieblas impulso para moverse, más como máquinas que como personas; va como un depósito de materias explosivas que detona á voluntad del que la tiene, tal vez, torcida por algún fanatismo ciego ó interés vil. Dentro de la sociedad caben numerosas asociaciones; pero aquellas donde hay secreto más bien que órganos funcionando para contribuir á la salud, pueden considerarse como focos purulentos que comprometen la vida.

Tal vez podría ser un buen medio de juzgar una asociación observar las consecuencias de la igualdad entre sus miembros: si siendo iguales hay en ellos armonía permanente sin severa disciplina, puede asegurarse que se proponen un buen fin por buenos medios y no abusan de los que tienen. Las asociaciones entre buenos prosperan tanto más, cuanto ellos son más semejantes; en las que forman los perversos es fatal la igualdad, la codicia se disputa la ganancia ó la presa, la vanidad choca á impulsos de la envidia, y la ira sangrienta lanza á los crueles unos contra otros. Entre los que son igualmente malos no hay paz sino impuesta por el miedo de alguno que es peor, y entre los que sin serlo hacen daño asociados no hay igualdad tampoco, sino jerarquías omnipotentes y obediencias ciegas. Asociación sin secreto, en que hay armonía permanente siendo los asociados iguales y libres, conocedores y responsables de lo que hacen, puede decirse que es asociación beneficiosa para la sociedad en cuyo seno vive; si no tiene estas condiciones, hará daño, y mucho.

Difícil parece juzgar si hasta el presente la igualdad ha recibido más mal que bien de la asociación: duda es muy fundada, y problema histórico difícil de resolver; pero si con respecto á lo pasado el ánimo se queda perplejo, por lo que hace al presente parece claro que más veces es obstáculo que auxiliar de la igualdad la asociación. ¿Hay que renunciar á ella, que perseguirla, que matarla? No: no es renunciable, ni mortal, sino inevitable y fecundo instrumento de progreso y de vida, pero no inofensivo, y como esas grandes ruedas motoras, da poderoso impulso, pero ¡ay de aquel á quien engancha y voltea! Pone en comunicación instantánea los antípodas, perfora montañas, abre istmos, generaliza verdades, consuela penas; pero también las causa, también difunde el error, también paraliza muchos movimientos vitales con sus aceradas y acaso invisibles redes, también está impulsada á veces por el fanatismo y la codicia, también extravía á los que había de guiar y abruma á los que debiera sostener.

No hay más medio de combatir las asociaciones perjudiciales que oponerles las útiles; la influencia de la asociación no puede neutralizarse sino con la asociación; y para que muchas igualdades que se escriben no sean letra muerta; para que enfrente de colectividades poderosas el individuo no sucumba, es necesario que se una á otro y otros y muchos individuos, que se asocie en el derecho y por el derecho contra los que intentan atacarle. La asociación es una fuerza inmensa; ¿quién lo duda? Pero, como la locomotora, necesita carriles y maquinista, las vías de la justicia de donde no pueda apartarse, la mano de la inteligencia que regule sus movimientos; si no, se estrella ó atropella, y aunque es posible que proclame la igualdad, es seguro que no la sirve.

PARTE TERCERA.

De la igualdad considerada políticamente y en sus relaciones con la libertad.

CAPÍTULO PRIMERO.

DE LA IGUALDAD SOCIAL Y DE LA IGUALDAD POLÍTICA.

Hemos visto cómo el máximum de la igualdad existe en los pueblos salvajes; cómo á medida que los hombres se civilizan se van diferenciando más y más, y cómo llega un momento en que la desigualdad excede los justos límites, y si no se reacciona contra ella viene indefectiblemente la decadencia ó la ruina. En los pueblos civilizados y cristianos se verificó esta reacción[4]; las trabas, los privilegios, han desaparecido ó van desapareciendo; las clases no se inmovilizan ni se cierran; por la escala social pueden subir todos los que pongan en ella pie firme y mano robusta, y al que está arriba no se le arroja porque venga de muy abajo, ni aun se le pregunta de dónde salió. Al ver á tantos como se han elevado por su actividad, por su inteligencia, por su valor ó por su fortuna; cómo van desapareciendo de las leyes y de las costumbres barreras insuperables; cómo tiene coche el que anduvo con los pies descalzos, y es diputado, ministro, duque, el hijo de un artesano, los amigos de la igualdad tal vez la saluden alegres suponiendo que su reino llega y que impera sin excepción y sin obstáculo.

[4] En Rusia se está verificando.

La conclusión carecería de exactitud; se marcha hacia la igualdad, es cierto; pero, lejos de haber llegado á ella, estamos en un momento histórico en que las diferencias han llegado á un límite que no alcanzaron nunca, y de poco sirve que por escrito se nieguen ó se borren de los códigos si están en los hechos y viven en las entrañas de la sociedad. ¿Cuándo tuvo el magnate refinamientos de lujo, comodidades sibaríticas que contrastasen con la miseria tanto como hoy? ¿Cuando la virtud triunfó de tantos halagos y tentaciones, ni la maldad empleó medios tan eficaces y horrendos para hacer daño? ¿Cuándo la dignidad y la belleza brilló como entre esas masas abyectas y deformes que la concurrencia, la división de trabajo, el alcohol y la prostitución desfigura y degrada? ¿Cuándo estuvieron tan lejos las eminencias del saber y los que nada saben? Nunca: hay que verlo claro y decirlo resueltamente: el mal, si no es irremediable, es positivo, grave, y no pequeño el error y el peligro de predicar la igualdad

política y tratar de realizarla prescindiendo de diferencias tan radicales. Vivimos en una sociedad que lleva en su seno desigualdades de tal magnitud y extensión, que no pueden armonizarse con doctrinas, escuelas, partidos y leyes que establecen la igualdad, y han de resultar decepciones, choques y conflictos continuos de la contradicción entre las ideas, los códigos y los hechos.

Es cierto que hoy (en muchos países, al menos) ningún privilegio vincula la riqueza en una clase; ninguna ley escrita se opone á que todos lleguen al poder y á la fortuna; pero ¿no hay mucho de ilusorio y de mentido en estas facilidades? Si la gleba tuvo siervos, también la industria los tiene, y el niño que trabaja antes de tener fuerzas, que tiene vicios antes de tener pasiones, que vive en una atmósfera infecta física y moralmente, en su ignorancia y en su degradación, lleva la ley de raza que le condena á una condición servil. Y de estas criaturas hay miles y millones en fábricas, en minas, en talleres, ó viviendo en los campos entre los animales y poco menos embrutecidos que ellos, ó de mendicidad por los caminos, ó de no se sabe qué por calles y plazas. ¿Acaso pueden los códigos ni las constituciones nivelar semejantes abismos sociales, ni subir á grande altura á los que han nacido en ellos? ¿Qué es la libertad en que se los deja para que se eleven, la igualdad que se les predica? Todo será menos una idea que puedan realizar en bien suyo y de la sociedad. Alguna criatura de esas que tienen en si fuerza superior á todos los obstáculos, aprovechará su aptitud legal para elevarse algo, mucho, tal vez hasta la cima; pero esto no es posible sino por excepción rara, y la regla será que no basta promulgar la igualdad y la libertad para destruir desigualdades esenciales y servidumbres degradantes. Que hoy existen estas desigualdades y estas servidumbres, se ve con sólo abrir los ojos, y que las causas que las producen son generales y profundas también se comprende sin estudio muy detenido. Esta sociedad en que se dice á los hombres que todos son iguales, que deben disfrutar sin condición de todos los derechos políticos, está organizada de modo que hay en ella desigualdades permanentes, esenciales, no de individuos, sino de masas, ó lo que es lo mismo, causas de perturbación constante en la existencia de elementos contradictorios y poderosos que chocan entre sí.

Todos elegibles y todos electores: esta es la fórmula de la igualdad política, el ideal de la democracia, y sería el nuestro si en razón ó justicia todos tuvieran aptitud para ser elegidos y para elegir.

La política parece que es alguna cosa fácil que cualquiera puede saber, ó ciencia infusa congénita en los predestinados, ó misterioso conocimiento que se comunica al ungido con una credencial ó una acta por la voluntad del pueblo ó del rey. No se proclama la igualdad para el ejercicio de ninguna profesión; con título ó sin él, se quiere que el médico sepa medicina, leyes el abogado, ciencias exactas, físicas y sus necesarias aplicaciones el ingeniero; no se permite que nadie sin estudios previos cure á una vaca ó á un caballo, y para poner la mano en las llagas sociales, para influir directa y poderosamente en la prosperidad, en la moralidad, en la honra de un país; para estar al frente de una provincia, de un centro directivo; para ser embajador, senador, ministro ó diputado, no se exige garantía alguna intelectual, ni moral, y sin ciencia y sin experiencia se administra, se gobierna y se manda.

Dicen que la política todo lo invade, lo trastorna y lo mancha; pero no se notan bastante los elementos de anarquía que lleva en su seno una política que da acceso á los puestos más importantes como se da entrada en los teatros sin más que enseñar un billete que se llama credencial. De este modo no hay ineptitud que no se habilite, medianía que no se aliente, inmoralidad que no se estimule, ambición bastarda que no se justifique, ni desorden sin excusa, ni escándalo que no tenga precedentes. En la política, por la política y para la política se cometen indignidades que avergonzarían fuera de ella, y para elevarse ó sostenerse hacen los hombres políticos cosas que no harían en su propiedad como propietarios, en el ejército como militares, en las obras como ingenieros, á la cabecera del enfermo como médicos, en los tribunales como jueces, ni aun en el foro como abogados.

Y ¿qué es la política ante la cual todos son iguales y que admite servidores y oráculos sin condición alguna? ¿Es alguna cosa de poca importancia ó de influencia pasajera que brilla ó escandaliza momentáneamente, sin llegar con su beneficio ó su daño á las entrañas de la sociedad? No, por desgracia. La política administra, organiza los servicios del Estado y dispone las condiciones que han de tener los que han de prestarlos. La política nombra al empleado probo é inteligente, ó al incapaz venal y defraudador de la Hacienda; la política pone la correspondencia pública en manos diligentes y honradas, ó torpes y rapaces; la política premia la lealtad y el valor, ó los posterga á la traición vil ó cruel; la política protege y honra á la ciencia, ó procura escarnecerla y la persigue; la política envía á los desvalidos, representantes del Estado, que los socorren ó que los explotan; la política pide con parsimonia soldados y dinero, ó es pródiga de los bienes del pueblo que empobrece y de la sangre de los hombres que sacrifica; la política aplica los recursos del Estado adonde son útiles, ó perjudiciales, y patrocina la ignorancia, ó difunde la instrucción; la política pone coto al crimen, ó le alienta con la impunidad y tal vez le premia; la política promulga leyes buenas y malas, las respeta ó las infringe. Todas estas cosas realiza la política, según es ignorante ó ilustrada, inmoral ó equitativa, y ya se ve su importancia inmensa. El que, viendo el giro que toma, dice que _no quiere meterse en política_ y se aleja totalmente de ella, tal

vez no piensa en la gravedad de su determinación y todo lo que abandona á los que reprueba y pone en manos que no le parecen puras.

Pero la política no se hace sola; obra es de los hombres, y no puede ser indiferente para ella las condiciones que impone á los que admite y el poder que les da. Atendidas las ideas y sentimientos, el modo de ser de los pueblos hoy, aun de los más cultos, la política no puede ser la fase mejor de un país moralmente considerado, y si es posible que se purgue de todas sus impurezas, ese día no llegó, y, según todas las apariencias, está muy lejos aún. La política internacional es la _diplomacia_, sinónimo de astucia, de engaño, de abuso hipócrita de la fuerza, de abandono del amigo leal, de alianza con el enemigo odioso, todo á impulso de pasiones ciegas ó cálculos egoístas. La política nacional no se sustrae tan cínicamente á toda ley equitativa, no proclama tan alto la omnipotencia de su poder, ni se cree tan desligada de la justicia; pero no deja por eso de asestarle terribles golpes. Debe reconocerse que una parte del mal (más ó menos, según los países) es inevitable, pero que otra podía minorarse, y que si la política será siempre ó por mucho tiempo la esfera menos diáfana y elevada en que gire la actividad de un pueblo, algo puede purificarse modificando una organización, ó más bien una anarquía, que con aparente igualdad establece el privilegio para la ignorancia atrevida y poco escrupulosa.

El primer bien de suprimir esta anarquía sería limitar la esfera de acción de la política y, por consiguiente, sus medios de perturbación. Si en vez de esa igualdad anárquica que incondicionalmente da acceso á la casi totalidad de los cargos públicos se impusieran condiciones de ingreso y de ascenso, y una razonable jerarquía, organizando la Administración, se purificaría en cuanto es posible la política. Uno de los más poderosos elementos que la corrompen es la facultad de recompensar á los que emplea, y de seducir la ambición ó la pobreza con la perspectiva de un cambio ventajoso. Quitad á la política ese campo de igualdad anárquica donde crecen tantas malas hierbas; quitadle el poder de dar destinos, y pondréis coto á su inmoralidad poniéndole á su poder. Medios corruptores tendrá todavía, pero se limitarán mucho con una jerarquía fuerte en la Administración, donde no puede quitar y poner, ni aun trasladar á su antojo.

Si la política que manda hallara un obstáculo á sus desmanes en el orden jerárquico administrativo, la política que aspira á mandar se moralizaría también; si los que conspiran no ofreciesen destinos y empleos y pudieran darlos el día en que triunfen, tendrían menos secuaces y más honrados.

Aun para los cargos puramente políticos no deberían ser todos igualmente elegibles y nombrables. Ya que no se pueda evitar, por ahora al menos, que el nuevo ministro nombre nuevos gobernadores, siquiera que tenga que nombrarlos entre personas con ciertas condiciones de ciencia y de experiencia, y que se necesitasen también para formar parte del gobierno y de la representación nacional.

¿Se evitarían con esto todos los males, ni aun el mayor número? Creemos que no. ¿Se disminuirían algo, acaso bastante? Nos parece que sí. Cuantos más elementos sociales se sustraigan al poder de la política, tanto menos temibles serán sus abusos, que se limitarían así de dos modos: purificando en lo posible su esfera de acción, y reduciéndola; porque con la facilidad de hacer mal crece el deseo de hacerle, y si todos los poderes sin límites se desmoralizan, es porque la injusticia constante é impunemente repetida forma como un foco purulento que inficiona la voluntad y hasta la inteligencia.

Si no creemos que cualquiera puede ser elegido y nombrado para cargos políticos ó administrativos que la política se apropia, desmoralizándose y desmoralizándolos, tampoco somos de parecer que cualquiera puede elegir y nombrar, sino que la elección y el nombramiento deben hacerse por quien sepa lo que hace y quiera hacerlo bien.

Donde sea muy grande la desigualdad social, no puede ser una verdad la igualdad política. Con la miseria y la ignorancia generalizada, ¿qué resultado dará el sufragio universal? ¿Qué es el _voto_ del que no puede tener _opinión_? Este voto será llevado al bien ó al mal; y cuando el mal sea más fácil, cuando sus corrientes sean más fuertes, como no es escrupuloso en los medios que emplea, el voto del que le da sin saber lo que hace, es de temer que se deposite en la urna del cálculo, de la intriga ó de la ambición. Unos pocos más atrevidos, menos escrupulosos, más diestros, arrastran á la ciega multitud, y resulta que el sufragio universal, lejos de hacer prevalecer la opinión del mayor número, da el triunfo á la voluntad de unos pocos, que sofocan la opinión verdadera bajo el peso de la fuerza numérica. Si la multitud, en vez de ser arrastrada, arrastra por un momento, las cosas no irán mejor, porque la ignorancia omnipotente aspira siempre á lo _imposible_; la muchedumbre no tarda en verle delante de sí como un abismo; se aterra, se para y pide que la aparten de allí, sin detenerse mucho en las condiciones que le impone el que se ofrece á servirla de guía.

Sobre que el sufragio universal no es un medio de saber lo que quiere la mayoría, su voluntad, caso de investigarse por este medio, no debe admitirse como regla sino en tanto que se ajuste á la razón, y nos parece que no estaba fuera de ella el que ha dicho que «la voz del pueblo era la voz de Dios, _cuando no era la voz del diablo_». No hay que creer en la infalibilidad de las mayorías, ni en su acierto, cuando no tienen elementos para juzgar de lo que deciden.

Los que pretenden dar al pueblo un _poder_ que no está en armonía con su _saber_, le comprometen más que le sirven; le dan una arma que no sabe manejar, y no es raro que con ella se hiera. ¡Cuántos déspotas se han elevado en virtud del sufragio universal, cuántas leyes hechas por el pueblo contra el pueblo mismo! Si no tiene la instrucción y la independencia suficiente, es el regimiento que recibe del coronel la orden de votar; la aldea que dirige el párroco ó el señor de la tierra; la fábrica cuyos operarios siguen al dueño de ella ó á algún otro que tal vez no los guíe mejor.

No pretendemos que los derechos políticos constituyan privilegio, sino que se condicionen razonablemente de modo que puedan ser una verdad y que no se vuelvan precisamente contra aquellos mismos á quienes se dan. Lo que la ley debe en nuestro concepto buscar principalmente, es saber, independencia y dignidad. El mendigo; el dedicado al servicio doméstico; el soldado[5]; el colono que absolutamente depende del señor; el que no tiene ni instrucción primaria, ni industrial, y no sabe sino remover mecánicamente la tierra, ó elevar pesos ó variarlos de un sitio á otro, á ningunos de éstos daríamos derechos políticos, porque de hecho no son ellos los que lo ejercen, sino alguno que así puede dirigirlos como extraviarlos, y muchas veces los extravía.

[5] Mientras el ejército esté organizado como lo está hoy, no debe equivocarse el _soldado_ con el _ciudadano armado_.

Puesto que la moralidad (salvo en los casos de intervención de los tribunales) es imposible de investigar, la ley electoral debe buscar la capacidad y la independencia; donde quiera que haya alguna instrucción industrial ó literaria, allí debe dar voto; y si esta instrucción no existe, no se deberá suplir con un recibo del que recauda los impuestos. La independencia se dirá que está más en la moralidad y en el carácter que en la posición, y así es cierto; no hay posición que asegure de la servidumbre, de la codicia, del cálculo ambicioso, de las pasiones violentas ó viles que dan el voto contra razón y conciencia; pero esto sólo prueba los límites de donde no puede pasar la ley y su impotencia para suplir la falta de moralidad.

En un país corrompido, tiene que estarlo la política, haya igualdad ó privilegio, tengan derechos políticos unos pocos, un gran número ó todos; pero no pone remedio á esta dolencia, antes la agrava, el sufragio universal. Los que abogan por él en un pueblo ignorante y sin costumbres políticas, parece que no saben cómo se ejerce; porque aun cuando fuera razonable atenerse á la voluntad de los más cuando no está ilustrada, no hay medio de saber esa voluntad; lo repetimos, aunque ni decirlo debiera ser necesario para todo el que no se niegue á la evidencia y no cierre los ojos á la realidad de cómo pasan las cosas: conceder voto á todos incondicionalmente, cuando todos no tienen la ilustración y la independencia necesaria, es dejar en manos de unos pocos un poder inmenso é irresponsable, lanzar al mundo político una porción de ceros que no tienen más valor que el que les da una cifra que se pone delante para mal ó para bien, generalmente para mal.

La sociedad debe hacer de modo que no haya en su seno masas que nada entienden de derechos políticos, que no les dan valor alguno, que carecen de independencia para ejercerlos; pero cuando estas masas existen, la ley política no ha de prescindir de ellas, ni suponer que se regeneran con admitirlas á votar. La ley electoral tiene que tomar las cosas como están, y los hombres como son, en el momento en que se promulga; á otras leyes y disposiciones incumbe procurar que sean lo que deben ser, con aptitud intelectual y moral que no haga ilusoria ó peligrosa la legal.

La igualdad política no puede ser independiente de la social; tiene que haber una relación íntima entre la instrucción y bienestar de un pueblo y sus derechos políticos si no han de ser letra muerta ó causa de daño. ¿Quiere esto decir que es necesario que todos sean ricos y doctores para establecer el sufragio universal?

No; recordemos lo dicho anteriormente: la igualdad es la _semejanza necesaria_ entre las personas ó cosas que se comparan según el objeto á que se destinan; y cuando se comparan dos hombres con el objeto de que elijan un diputado, se los puede calificar de igualmente aptos aunque difieran mucho respecto á cultura y riqueza. Reconocer la semejanza _suficiente_ y no prescindir de la _necesaria_, esto debe hacer la ley política al conceder ó negar derechos.

La ley electoral hoy vigente en España[6] se aproxima á lo que, en nuestro concepto, debe ser la que favorezca una razonable igualdad. Con quitar el voto á quien no sabe leer y escribir por mucha contribución que pague, y dárselo á obreros que no sólo tienen instrucción primaria, sino alguna industrial, nos parece que en este punto se llevaría la igualdad política hasta donde debe llevarse, sirviendo mejor á la democracia que con esas concesiones que no puede utilizar y que tantas veces lo convierten en

daño y descrédito suyo.

[6] Cuando se escribió había sufragio restringido.

Se dice que si las masas no tienen voto, si no toman parte en la formación de la ley, ésta se hará en daño de ellas. Esto es cierto en parte, en parte nada más, y no se evita con la incondicional igualdad política, porque, ya lo hemos dicho, no es lo mismo _tener voto_ para la elección de legisladores, que _tener parte_ en la formación de las leyes.

Decimos que el mal no es cierto sino _en parte_, porque impulsados por motivos muy diferentes de ambición, de vanidad, de orgullo, de amor á la justicia, de lástima por la desgracia, por haber salido del pueblo ó por amarle sin pertenecer á él, hay muchos que hacen suya su causa, viven defendiéndola y acaso mueren por defenderla. Mejor sería que él solo sostuviera su derecho, que no necesitara de campeones, pero debe hacerse constar que los tiene.

Los redentores políticos del pueblo no suelen salir de sus filas, pero no hay que concluir de aquí que su redención sea imposible: concurren á ella el sentimiento universal de la justicia, los ambiciosos que la invocan y hasta cierto punto tienen que servirla para que les sirva de arma; los hijos de ese mismo pueblo que, ilustrándose por las armas ó por las letras, dejan de pertenecer á él, pero no se olvidan, y quieren defender sus derechos y consolar sus dolores; los que, habiendo nacido en las clases privilegiadas, desertan noblemente, y van á formar en las filas de los débiles para instruirlos y disciplinarlos: éstos son los elementos del verdadero progreso. Pero de los ambiciosos salen esos despertadores de las malas pasiones de la multitud, que se elevan adulándola. De los que se han emancipado por su mérito, salen los vengativos que por amor propio quieren humillar á las altas clases que los han humillado ó los humillan. De los generosos desertores salen los entusiastas que, juzgando á los otros por sí mismos, creen el bien fácil de realizar porque en su noble alma no halla obstáculos. Así no faltan nunca visionarios que formulan errores, furiosos que los sostienen y astutos descreídos que los utilizan: así el progreso humano ve salir de entre sus partidarios tal vez los mayores obstáculos que necesita vencer.

Como no puede haber derechos imposibles, el sufragio universal no puede ser un derecho. ¿Qué se busca en el sufragio universal? La opinión del mayor número. ¿Y cuando el mayor número no tiene opinión? Se busca una quimera. Si alguna vez la instrucción se generaliza bastante para que el sentido común y el buen sentido sean una misma cosa, podrá establecerse la igualdad política; mientras esto no suceda, no existirá aunque se escriba en la ley, y nótese que en la ley no debe existir nunca lo que no puede existir en la sociedad, á menos de socavar una de las bases del derecho.

¿Cuál deberá ser la medida de la desigualdad de los derechos políticos? Si fuera posible, la capacidad del que ha de ejercerlos. Los votos deberían pesarse, pero la imperfección humana se ve en la triste necesidad de contarlos, y el código político, como el criminal, necesita establecer cierta igualdad, no porque la igualdad sea la justicia, sino porque la justicia es imposible. La ley no puede decir á N., ingeniero: «Tu opinión valdrá veinte votos»; y á su ayudante: «La tuya valdrá dos», porque ni es posible medir con exactitud los grados de inteligencia, ni, caso de que lo fuese, se aceptaría por el mayor número la clasificación; pero la ley puede decir al obrero que cava la tierra en ese mismo camino trazado por la inteligencia educada de un hombre ilustrado: «Tú no puedes tener voto, porque tu ignorancia no te permite tener opinión.»

La ley es justa cuando, para dar derechos políticos á los ciudadanos, les exige una garantía de capacidad; la ley es injusta siempre que niega voto al que _puede_ tener opinión. El legislador debe investigar con sagacidad y buena fe qué profesiones ú oficios suponen cierto grado de inteligencia para concederles los derechos políticos, para que no se vea el absurdo y la injusticia de que un hombre que tiene, que debe tener, mucha más capacidad que otro por su posición social, carezca del voto que á aquél se concede porque paga contribución _directa_.

El espíritu de la ley no es, ó por lo menos no debe ser, considerar la riqueza de los ciudadanos como una garantía de acierto en la elección de sus representantes; no falta quien la considere así, y aun ha habido alguno que ha pretendido que si el que paga mil reales de contribución tiene un voto, el que paga mil duros debe tener veinte; de modo que los grandes capitalistas y los grandes propietarios depositarían en las urnas electorales su voto, equivalente á quinientos ó mil de los del común de los electores. Esto, por más absurdo que parezca, es lógico si la riqueza se toma como garantía de acierto en la elección y se sienta como base: _el que no tiene que perder no debe votar_, porque _¿con qué derecho vota las contribuciones el que no ha de pagarlas?_

La ley, al exigir cierto grado de riqueza para conceder derechos políticos, no puede buscar sino una garantía de capacidad. Supone que cierto grado de pobreza es incompatible con el cultivo de la inteligencia; y así como excluye al que no tiene edad para que sus facultades intelectuales se hayan desarrollado, debe excluir también al que no puede cultivarlas por su posición social. La

desigualdad ante la ley política no tiene, no puede tener, otro fundamento.

Salvo los casos de miseria extrema, la independencia del elector está en su conciencia y en su carácter, no en su posición social, que sólo sirve para evaluar el precio de su voto.

En cuanto á negarlo á los pobres _porque no tienen qué perder_, es un absurdo. El sufragio universal no puede ser un derecho, porque no puede ser una verdad; pero si los pobres pudieran tener opinión, ¿quién se atrevería á negarles el derecho de emitirla? ¡No tienen qué perder!

Cuando los ricos defraudan, dilapidan, ó por falta de concierto emplean mal las rentas del Estado, y aumentan los gastos y votan contribuciones, ¿quién las paga sino los pobres, y sobre quién pesan con más dureza? La contribución _molesta_ al rico: al pobre le oprime, le arruina tal vez. Cuando los ricos tienen mal montadas las cárceles, ¿quiénes hacen en ellas su aprendizaje, que les conduce á presidio ó al patíbulo? Los pobres. Cuando los ricos no fomentan la agricultura, ni la industria, ni el comercio, ¿quiénes emigran á climas remotos y mortíferos que les son fatales? Los pobres. Cuando los ricos no se esfuerzan en generalizar la instrucción, ¿sobre quiénes caen las fatales consecuencias de la ignorancia? Sobre los pobres. Cuando los ricos hacen leyes injustas, ¿quiénes sufren su influencia fatal? Los pobres. Cuando los ricos no atienden como deben los establecimientos de beneficencia, ¿quiénes padecen en ellos? Los pobres. Cuando los ricos proclaman como una necesidad imprescindible la creación de grandes ejércitos, ¿quiénes dan sus hijos para formarlos? Los pobres. Cuando los ricos declaran la guerra, ¿qué sangre corre en ella? ¡La sangre de los pobres! Y todavía se dice que los pobres no están interesados en el orden _porque no tienen qué perder_. ¿Qué se entiende por _perder_, ó qué se entiende por _orden_?

El pobre es el más interesado en que las leyes sean equitativas; pero el pobre es muy ignorante y no puede contribuir á formarlas: darle derechos políticos es darle un arma que le arrancarán con engaño para emplearla contra él. Este es el verdadero, el único argumento contra el sufragio universal.

Y, sobre negarle, ¿qué importa no estar de acuerdo acerca de los motivos por que se niega? Importa mucho. Si el legislador comprende que la inteligencia es la única garantía que puede y debe buscar, porque la estadística no arroja datos sobre la moralidad, salvo en el caso extremo de que el elector se halle bajo la acción de los tribunales; si el legislador comprende que no debe excluir más que á los muy ignorantes, á los muy viciosos y á los criminales, la ley buscará por todos los medios la capacidad tanto en los electores como en los elegidos, y será justa y equitativa.

La teoría de la igualdad, de que es consecuencia el sufragio universal, en pueblos que no están bastante educados políticamente, es un absurdo que conduce á otro; la que niega derechos políticos á los pobres porque no tienen qué perder, es un absurdo que conduce á una iniquidad.

CAPÍTULO II.

DE LA IGUALDAD Y DE LA LIBERTAD.

Claro está que, al tratar _de las relaciones de la igualdad con la libertad_, se habla de la política; pero ¿constituye la libertad una situación perfectamente definida, y la palabra que la expresa significa una cosa idéntica para todos los que la pronuncian? Parécenos que no. Al decir la libertad de Esparta, de Atenas, de Roma, de las Repúblicas italianas, de Inglaterra, de los Estados Unidos, de Francia, de España, de Italia, de Portugal, ¿no se significan con una misma palabra cosas muy diferentes? La libertad existe con la esclavitud, con el privilegio, con la privación de derechos políticos de la gran mayoría de la nación dominada por la aristocracia, y con la participación de la clase media ó del pueblo todo en el gobierno y poder legislativo. Pueblos constituídos de modos diferentes y aun opuestos, se dice que son ó han sido libres, y Bruto que mata á César en nombre de la libertad, se parecía muy poco á los regicidas modernos que la invocan.

Si la libertad significa cosas tan diferentes según los tiempos y lugares, ¿no tendrá siempre y donde quiera algún elemento común, algo que la hace amable para sus partidarios, santa para sus mártires? Como, á través de tantas diferencias, las religiones tienen de común la idea de Dios, de un poder grande, eterno y justo, ¿no habrá también en la libertad una idea elevada y permanente que inspira al ciudadano de Atenas, de Roma, de Madrid y de Londres? A nuestro parecer este factor común existe, y es _la idea de ley_; aquella dignidad que da al hombre obedecerla y cumplirla como expresión de la justicia, en vez de humillarse ante la voluntad de un déspota ó de un tirano. Esta ley varía según el estado moral é intelectual del pueblo que rige; sus beneficios comprenden á unos pocos, á muchos, á todos, y es la libertad aristocrática, burguesa ó democrática; pero es ley siempre, y por

eso los pueblos le dan el mismo nombre y, si no están degradados, la saludan con respeto.

La ley es regla de justicia, tal como la comprende el legislador ó como la cree practicable; puede equivocarse de dos modos: ó desconociendo la justicia en principio, ó la situación del pueblo donde quiere realizarla. Cualquiera que sea la esfera de acción de la libertad, no se sustrae á las condiciones de toda regla de justicia; puede ser mal comprendida y mal aplicada.

La justicia no se conoce como una verdad matemática ó física; no se hace su _descubrimiento_ en un día para siempre, sino que poco á poco se va comprendiendo y á medida que se practica; por eso la libertad puede ser privilegio ó licencia, equitativa ó injusta, verdadera ó quimérica, elemento de bienestar ó de ruina, según que se armonice ó no con la justicia y las condiciones de inteligencia y moralidad del pueblo que la invoca.

De aquí se infiere que la libertad no puede sustraerse á la influencia del progreso, que se perfecciona á medida de él, y que el pueblo más libre será el pueblo más adelantado. Muchos hechos pasados y presentes podrán citarse tal vez para contradecir lo dicho; pero la contradicción será aparente y fundada en no definir bien el progreso, que es perfección moral y material, ni la libertad, que es ley equitativa y armónica con esta perfección en el pueblo que rige.

Acaso se citen las hordas salvajes cuyos individuos son libres, ó á Mme. Staël que ha dicho: _la libertad es antigua y el despotismo moderno_; si hubiese exactitud en la frase, no la habría en la afirmación de que el hombre progresa.

El salvaje es esclavo de las leyes físicas y de las necesidades materiales: el hambre, la sed, el frío, el calor, son los dueños y señores de su existencia, empleada en luchar con animales feroces ó con hombres que le disputan la comida y el albergue. Esta esclavitud es tan grande, tan continua, tan general y tan fatal, que se hace exclusiva de ninguna otra; ¿qué medios tiene el tirano, ni qué atractivos la tiranía ó el despotismo, en un pueblo que el hambre dispersa de día y el cansancio reune de noche? Las leyes físicas y fisiológicas son las únicas que imperan allí, y llamar libertad á la servidumbre que imponen, es hablar con bien poca exactitud. Si se dice que el salvaje no es esclavo de su compañero de horda, se dice bien; si se afirma que es un hombre libre, no, y basta para convencerse tener idea de lo que es libertad.

Entendemos por libertad _el ejercicio armónico de las relaciones de los hombres que componen un pueblo, condicionadas por la ley que concurren á formar directa ó indirectamente_.

La definición podrá no ser buena, se darán otra ú otras mejores; pero en ninguna cabrá la situación del salvaje, independiente, no libre, y cuya independencia no puede confundirse con la libertad, porque no es una armonía establecida por el derecho, sino una negación que resulta del aislamiento. Así como la igualdad en el estado salvaje es la miseria y la ignorancia de todos, la libertad es el poder que tiene cada uno de utilizar sus fuerzas físicas para buscar sustento y defenderse de cualquiera agresión ó vengarla. El abuso de la fuerza (en el escaso número de relaciones sociales del salvaje) está contenido, no por la idea del derecho, sino por otra fuerza, y cuando ésta no existe, lejos de haber libertad hay opresión; la mujer se esclaviza y el prisionero se inmola.

Más adelante se perdona la vida á los vencidos, que pierden la libertad, y se establecen esclavitudes y servidumbres de distintos grados y formas que, variando y adaptándose al medio social que los rodea, se sostienen en medio de imperios y repúblicas que se derrumban y parecen haber hallado el secreto de la inmortalidad. La ruda Esparta, la culta Atenas, Roma la maestra del derecho, los independientes hijos de los bosques de la Germania y de la Galia, ungidos por el sacerdote cristiano, todos tienen esclavos y siervos, y los humillan, oprimen y explotan.

Eso que se llama _libertad antigua_ es la de unos pocos hombres libres en medio de muchedumbres esclavas ó siervas, tan abrumadas á veces y tan envilecidas, que carecen de aptitud para emanciparse, se petrifican en inmovilidad desesperada, ó se agitan en orgías políticas, cayendo embriagadas á los pies del tirano común. El árbol se conoce por sus frutos, y no lo han sido de bendición los de la libertad de las repúblicas antiguas, ni podían serlo, porque los hombres libres que tienen esclavos, ó los emancipan ó se corrompen, y la corrupción mata la libertad. Esta no marcha ordenada y paralelamente con la servidumbre, no pueden armonizarse, una de los dos destruirá á la otra ó será destruída.

Y ¿cuáles son las relaciones de la igualdad con la libertad? ¿Se favorecen? ¿Se perjudican? ¿El nivel se convierte fácilmente en yugo, ó basta que los hombres sean iguales para que sean libres?

Deben notarse las analogías que existen entre la marcha de la igualdad y la de la libertad. De la igualdad salvaje hay que pasar por la desigualdad de la barbarie y de la civilización imperfecta, hasta llegar á la igualdad de los pueblos cultos y prósperos; de la independencia salvaje hay que pasar por dependencias, servidumbres y esclavitudes en que no existe ó es un privilegio la libertad,

que sólo puede constituir el patrimonio de todos, en los pueblos más avanzados.

Para saber cuáles son las relaciones de la igualdad con la libertad, y si mutuamente se favorecen ó se combaten, hay que determinar bien la condición de entrambas.

La igualdad en la ignorancia, en la miseria, en el envilecimiento, no es auxiliar, sino enemiga de la libertad, y en el pueblo en que este deplorable nivel exista, si algunos se elevan sobre él y aspiran á ser libres y lo consiguen, su privilegio será un progreso, un bien, y esta libertad aristocrática preferible á la servidumbre de todos sin más norma que la voluntad del tirano. Hemos dicho ya que la idea de libertad lleva consigo la de _ley_, y preferible es que algunos vivan á su amparo á que todos estén fuera de ella. Más vale que la libertad sea un privilegio como en Esparta, en Atenas, en Roma y en muchos pueblos cristianos hasta estos últimos tiempos, que el despotismo sin límites de Oriente.

Si es preferible que la libertad exista como privilegio á que no exista, es seguro que en esta condición excepcional no puede vivir mucho tiempo; tiene que ensanchar cada vez más la esfera de sus beneficios; que admitir en sus filas á los que han nacido en su seno; que alimentar en él á los que combaten muchos de sus principios, y transformarlos; que transmitir en derredor la luz de su inteligencia y la dignidad de su nobleza; que extender la honra para poner límites á la ignominia y, en fin, que llevar en sus entrañas un germen poderoso de amor á la humanidad para poder un día fraternizar con el pueblo. Cuando estas condiciones faltan, la libertad que no puede comunicarse y extenderse muere á manos del populacho, de una oligarquía ó de un tirano.

Si la igualdad en la miseria, la ignorancia y la ignominia no puede ser favorable á la libertad, también son incompatibles con ella las grandes diferencias esenciales y permanentes que constituyen la efímera libertad privilegiada. La libertad que echa raíces es la que se extiende, la que en armonía con la igualdad, que consiste en elevar á los de abajo, no en deprimir á los de arriba, es progresiva y cuenta cada día mayor número de hombres libres, es decir, de hombres _verdaderamente_ iguales ante la ley, que la comprenden, que la respetan y que contribuyen á formarla.

Decimos _verdaderamente_, porque hay muchas igualdades que, por más que se consignan en los códigos, no son verdad: tal es la igualdad política que da voto al que no tiene opinión ó no puede expresarla libremente; tal la igualdad social que admite á redimirse del servicio militar á los que, viviendo en la miseria ó en la pobreza, es de todo punto imposible que se rediman; estos llamados derechos no son favorables á la libertad, que no puede tener por aliada sino la igualdad verdadera y digna, no la que alucina con ficciones ó degrada en la ignominia común.

La igualdad racional y posible no nivela las fortunas, pero tiende á disminuir el número de los opulentos y de los miserables, y en consecuencia los vicios, favoreciendo la libertad, porque el gran aliado del despotismo es la corrupción.

La igualdad tiende á ennoblecer el trabajo hasta el manual; y como el trabajo es moralizador, favorece la libertad.

La igualdad tiende á elevar la idea que el hombre forma de sí mismo; y como el creerse digno conduce á serlo, semejante persuasión es un auxiliar de la libertad.

La igualdad tiende á generalizar la instrucción y favorece la libertad.

La igualdad tiende á confundir las clases, á que fraternicen los hombres; disminuye sus desdenes, sus odios, sus iras, y facilita la armonía necesaria á la libertad.

La igualdad, que supone que, como el derecho, la fuerza está en todos, dificulta que la de uno solo sofoque la libertad.

La igualdad tiene amor á la obra social en que toma parte, y predispone á obedecer á la ley, á formarla y consolidar la libertad.

La igualdad, que despierta muchas ambiciones, opone con su gran número un obstáculo á la ambición de uno solo, que pudiera ser fatal á la libertad.

La igualdad, aunque extraviada por la ira pueda recurrir á la violencia, en su estado normal ama la paz, y es contraria al militarismo, tan peligroso para la libertad.

La igualdad da solidez al urdimbre social; multiplica las piezas que ajustan, las ruedas que engranan, las fuerzas que se transmiten de un modo fácil, los movimientos que cambian de dirección sin paralizarse ni precipitarse. Cuando no hay diferencias esenciales generalizadas, permanentes, irritantes, imposibles de borrar; cuando por la escala social se sube y se baja continuamente; cuando no se sabe dónde empieza una clase y dónde acaba otra; cuando intereses, ideas, pasiones, errores, todo

se cruza, y toma y deja algo al cruzarse, y tiende á entretejerse, en semejante estado social los sacudimientos ni serán tan frecuentes, ni tendrán tanta violencia, ni podrán desencajar los miembros sociales tan fuertemente articulados, haciendo necesarias las dictaduras que aniquilan la libertad.

Todo elemento social es á la vez influído é influyente; pero entre la igualdad y la libertad hay tan íntimas relaciones y tan perfectas armonías, que para saber si la igualdad es verdadera basta saber si hace hombres libres, y para juzgar de la libertad no hay más que ver si tiende á que sean iguales.

CAPÍTULO III.

LA LEY QUE EMANA DE LOS PRIVILEGIOS, ¿SERÁ BENEFICIOSA PARA TODOS?

Entendemos por privilegio un derecho que no tiene su base en la justicia: se nos dirá tal vez que nosotros abogamos también por los privilegios puesto que combatimos la teoría de la igualdad y el sufragio universal, que es su consecuencia, y que los ciudadanos á quienes en virtud de su capacidad concedemos los derechos políticos son otros tantos privilegiados con respecto al gran número á quien negamos este derecho: no hay más diferencia que las condiciones con que concedemos este privilegio; pero esta diferencia es tan esencial, que, cambiando completamente la índole del derecho, no puede recibir el nombre de privilegio sino confundiendo cosas que no se parecen.

Cuando la instrucción y la moralidad están limitadas á un número muy corto de personas, limitar á ellas los derechos políticos no es concederles un privilegio, sino darles lo que les pertenece; lo que reclamarán, con razón, en nombre del bien del Estado, único origen legítimo de los derechos políticos. Éstos deben extenderse á medida que la ilustración se extiende; y si hay una clase de ciudadanos que, siendo tan ilustrada como otra, no tiene los mismos derechos políticos, hay privilegio, injusticia, y habrá lucha y revolución. La oligarquía, la aristocracia y la democracia son legítimas siempre que son lógicas, y según la ilustración esté en algunos, en muchos ó en todos.

Pero es una gran desgracia para un pueblo que, en circunstancias particulares, establezcan por la fuerza, ó su poca ilustración establezca por necesidad, una forma de gobierno en que sólo tome parte una clase poco numerosa y apartada de las otras por su elevada posición. Esta clase gobernará en provecho suyo, y la dureza de su egoísmo no estará suavizada por la simpatía, por la benevolencia, ni aun por la justicia; porque ya hemos visto que, al dividirse los hombres en clases muy distantes unas de otras, se depravan, se hacen hostiles, y mutuamente se desprecian ó se aborrecen. El gran señor poderoso y altivo no está dispuesto á mirar como semejantes á los individuos de esa plebe miserable y embrutecida, y los oprimirá sin compasión ni remordimiento. Así, por ejemplo, el lord inglés, para vender sus granos á un precio exorbitante prohibirá la importación de cereales, sin cuidarse de que los pobres se mueran de hambre, y no se modificará la horrible ley en nombre de la humanidad ni de la justicia, _sino en nombre de las necesidades de la industria_; ya se ha dicho _que la aristocracia no tiene entrañas_.

La ley hecha por un corto número de personas no podrá ser equitativa ni conveniente á la generalidad. El magnate, no sólo tiene su interés para extraviarle, sino su orgullo y su desdén. Con la más completa seguridad de conciencia niega todo derecho á los que desprecia, y si alguna vez hace la más pequeña concesión, la considera como un acto de heroísmo que no sabe agradecer la plebe ingrata.

A medida que aumenta el número de los que toman parte en la formación de la ley, ésta es más equitativa y humana, no sólo porque están representados los intereses de diferentes clases, sino porque contribuyen á formarla otras ideas, _otros sentimientos_. Creemos que no se nos acusará de _sentimentalismo_ porque hablamos de sentimientos al tratar de los elementos que entran en la formación de las leyes. Los sentimientos del hombre influyen en todos los actos de su vida, le impelen hacia el bien ó hacia el mal, y ante su voz poderosa, más de una vez la razón y hasta la conciencia aparecen mudas.

Cuando los legisladores, en vez de pertenecer á una clase apartada del pueblo y que le desdeña, pertenecen á clases diferentes que están cerca de él, que con él simpatizan, que conocen sus virtudes, que comprenden sus dolores, que tal vez le deben sus más ilustres hijos, la ley refleja esta diferencia. El hombre lleva sus sentimientos al santuario de las leyes, como los lleva á todas partes: allí influyen en su conducta; y cuanto sean más humanitarios, las leyes que formulen serán más beneficiosas para la humanidad.

En igualdad de todas las demás circunstancias, la ley será tanto más justa cuanto sea mayor el número de clases que contribuyen á formarla; por eso deben extenderse los derechos políticos hasta donde sea compatible con la ilustración. Si alguna vez nos

parece hallar á esta regla excepciones, no es porque las tenga, sino porque acaso tomamos los problemas sociales por problemas políticos, desconocemos la influencia que aquéllos ejercen en éstos, y somos como el químico que atribuye á un cuerpo propiedades que no tiene, porque ignora que son dos los que contribuyen al fenómeno que pretende explicar.

CAPÍTULO IV.

¿ES LO MISMO IGUALDAD QUE DEMOCRACIA?

La igualdad entre los que no tienen ningún derecho y obedecen á la voluntad de uno solo ó á la ley que de él emana, es el gobierno despótico ó absoluto, no la democracia. La igualdad en el derecho político puede mirarse como sinónimo de democracia; cuando todos tienen los mismos derechos políticos, todos contribuyen igualmente á la formación de la ley, al menos en teoría, y democracia es lo mismo que igualdad.

Pero la igualdad política, la que más se debate, la que más se estudia, la que con más energía se reclama, es la menos importante, y si ha de ser algo más que una palabra vana, debe tener su raíz en la igualdad moral é intelectual. ¿Esta igualdad sigue la misma progresión que la igualdad política? ¿El pueblo está en el estado de cumplir los deberes que son consecuencia de los derechos que para él se piden? ¿No hay contradicción ninguna entre el estado social y el estado político á que tienden las sociedades modernas? La igualdad política, la democracia, ¿no tiene algún obstáculo más poderoso que las preocupaciones, los privilegios escritos y las bayonetas? Investiguémoslo.

Hemos dicho ya en la primera parte de este escrito que la igualdad intelectual de los hombres está en razón inversa de su civilización; hagamos algunas comparaciones para fijar más nuestras ideas sobre este importante asunto.

Suprimamos algunos siglos en el tiempo ó algunos centenares de leguas en el espacio. Allí están una piragua y un gran navío. ¿Qué diferencia notamos entre los tripulantes de la primera? Apenas son perceptibles; tal vez un poco más de vigor, de destreza..... en caso de necesidad aquellos hombres pueden suplirse mutuamente sin que sufra trastorno la dirección de la pequeña nave. Trasladémonos al navío: ¡qué distancia del grumete al piloto! El uno es una especie de máquina que por el resorte de la voz de mando sube ó baja, va á la derecha ó á la izquierda; el otro sabe las leyes del mundo físico, determina los movimientos de los astros; es una especie de encantador que á través de las tempestades y de las tinieblas traza un camino por la inmensidad de los mares, y le sigue sin vacilar y sin extraviarse. Probad, si os parece, á sustituir este hombre con el otro, y pronto veréis á la nave zozobrar entre escollos ó estrellarse contra las rocas.

Allí está un hombre que representa una farsa grotesca y á quien desdeñosamente llamamos _histrión_. Si enferma, si muere, poca dificultad habrá en que le sustituya otro de la compañía; cualquiera, aunque sea el que está encargado de subir y bajar el telón. Y ¿cómo reemplazar al artista, al gran artista de nuestros días, á ese mágico que nos agita, que nos conmueve, que nos aterra, que nos electriza, que nos tiene pendientes de su gesto, de su instrumento ó de su voz, que nos hace sentir con su corazón y llorar con sus ojos? ¡Qué diferencia entre esta privilegiada criatura y el comparsa que sale á blandir maquinalmente una espada que no corta, ó lleva en sus manos un instrumento que no suena!

En aquel pelotón de hombres armados hay un jefe algo más diestro y valeroso que la mayor parte de los hombres que le siguen; pero si cae no es difícil hallarle relevo: las maniobras de la pequeña hueste son tan sencillas que hay pocos que no sean capaces de dirigirlas. Mirad ese jefe de Estado Mayor, de artillería ó de ingenieros; ha pasado su vida estudiando; es un sabio; tiene un papel delante y en la mano un compás; medita profundamente: comparadle con el soldado que monda patatas para el rancho.....

Mirad aquellos dos hombres que se dedican á una industria cualquiera; el uno se llama oficial y el otro maestro, pero se echa de ver que el maestro ha sido aprendiz y que el oficial podrá llegar á ser maestro; éste no sabe la razón de la mayor parte de las cosas que practica; aquél imita las que le ve hacer; pronto sabrá tanto como él, pronto sabrá más acaso. Pero hé aquí que pasan unos cuantos siglos, la industria se perfecciona, toma proporciones gigantescas, y en vez de estar dominada por la rutina, viene á ser dirigida por la ciencia. Entrad en esa inmensa fábrica. Ved centenares de hombres haciendo cabezas de alfileres ó pulimentando mangos de cuchillos. Su inteligencia para nada se necesita; el hábito hace que desempeñen maquinalmente la tarea que les está encomendada. Siempre en la misma postura, hacen siempre idénticos movimientos, ejercitan los mismos músculos, pueden mirarse como otras tantas máquinas. Las facultades de su alma se enervan, se extinguen por falta de ejercicio; su cuerpo se desfigura, se debilita; un miembro adquiere un desarrollo anormal, y los otros se extenúan en la inacción. ¿Qué es esto? ¿Cómo se consiente que por sistema el hombre se degrade física y moralmente? ¿Qué organización es la que exige para consolidarse el sacrificio de la dignidad humana? ¡Qué queréis! La ciencia ha dicho que se hace mejor lo que se hace siempre; la

división de trabajo es una indispensable condición del progreso de la industria, y el progreso de la industria es la primera necesidad de un pueblo. Bien está: si la industria reclama víctimas, arrojádselas; entréguensele miles de hombres para que los convierta en máquinas. ¡Si al menos su obra fuera completa! Pero esas máquinas sufren y hacen sufrir, son desdichadas y culpables. Contemplad esas máquinas humanas, pequeños apéndices de los grandes motores, y luego, dejando el taller, subid al despacho del ingeniero. Mirad esa cabeza encanecida antes de tiempo por el estudio, esa frente contraída por la meditación. Asombraos del caudal de conocimientos que ese hombre posee, de la fácil seguridad con que ejecuta prodigios que no comprendéis y se suceden ante vuestros pasmados ojos. ¿Y quién es ese hombre que discurre con él gravemente y tiene el aire de discutir un negocio de Estado, ese hombre que ha salido de un palacio, que ha venido en coche, que habla de las naciones de Europa ó del mundo, y de su ilustración y de sus recursos, que ha viajado, que posee un capital inmenso? Es el dueño de la fábrica, una persona muy instruída, muy inteligente, muy activa, porque la industria en grande escala, la que hace tantos prodigios, necesita actividad, inteligencia y grandes capitales, y como los necesita, los tiene, porque las sociedades modernas no niegan á la industria nada, absolutamente nada de lo que pide.

Mirad aquel hombre mugriento que presta sobre ropa vieja algunas cortas cantidades, y á quien se da desdeñosamente el nombre de _usurero_; ved ese otro, creación de las sociedades modernas, que brilla por su fausto, que deslumbra por sus riquezas, que tiene talento é influencia política; es un capitalista que presta al Rey ó al Gobierno, y recibe en garantía una nación.

No hay por qué continuar estos paralelos: de lo dicho resulta bastante claro que el dogma de la igualdad ha venido al mundo precisamente cuando los hombres son más desiguales. Y no sólo las necesidades de la industria y el estado social exigen de unos pocos grande instrucción é inteligencia y embrutecen las masas, sino que, á medida que los pueblos se han civilizado, los ricos son más ricos y los pobres más pobres. ¿Es éste el estado definitivo de la sociedad? No queremos creerlo, pero es el estado actual. En los grandes centros industriales y las ciudades populosas es cada día mayor la distancia que separa al rico, cuyo lujo aumenta todos los días, del pobre, cada vez más amenazado de la miseria extrema. ¿Qué decimos en las ciudades? En los campos se alza el cultivador capitalista que aplica el vapor á la agricultura, el ganadero opulento al lado del infeliz proletario que ha visto ó verá en breve llegar el día en que no tenga un palmo de terreno común en que pueda cortar un palo de leña, ó mantener una vaca, ni una oveja. Sin entrar en discusiones que no son de este lugar sobre estos fenómenos sociales, notemos solamente que se dice á los hombres: _sois iguales_ cuando hay más diferencias en el desarrollo de sus facultades intelectuales, en su fortuna y en sus goces; el lujo tiene refinamientos, y la miseria angustias que no conocían las sociedades menos civilizadas.

La democracia, al prescindir de la desigualdad social, no la destruye; por el contrario, hace más fatales sus consecuencias, porque se arroja sin precaución en brazos del peligro. A veces cae, ó se para, asombrada de hallar obstáculos invencibles, de ver que de sus propias filas salen tiros que la hieren, por no haber observado que la igualdad política está muchas veces combatida por la desigualdad social.

La democracia adora ciegamente el becerro de oro. Está sedienta de goces materiales, de riqueza, y se preocupa más de producirla que de su distribución. Toma á veces medidas tan insensatas, tan poco en armonía con el objeto que se propone, que no parece sino que ha resuelto suicidarse con una disolución de oro.

El mundo marcha á la democracia; pero es bien que sepa los obstáculos que ha de hallar en el camino para que se prepare á vencerlos; es bien que no se lisonjee con facilidades que no existen. Cuando se sienta como derecho un principio imposible de convertir en hecho, la lucha es inevitable, la lucha con su siniestro acompañamiento de exageraciones, de iras, de represalias. Las represalias en los combates materiales son hombres que se sacrifican; en los del entendimiento, verdades que se inmolan, errores que se enaltecen. Nuestros adversarios, ¿niegan una verdad que sostenemos? Nosotros negaremos inmediatamente otra que ellos afirman. ¿Se parapetan detrás de un error? Levantaremos otro enfrente para guarecernos de sus tiros.

La democracia, como la aristocracia, como todas las instituciones sociales, llama calumnias á las verdades que le dicen sus enemigos, y justicia á las lisonjas de sus parciales. La democracia, que, como empieza á ser poderosa, empieza á ser adulada y á tener pretensiones de infalible, no siempre ve claro, ni escucha distintamente; y deslumbrada por el brillo de sus triunfos, no echa de ver que amamanta en su seno la desigualdad, contribuyendo á que tome proporciones alarmantes. Cerniéndose en la región de las ideas, no teme que los hechos puedan servirle de peligroso obstáculo.

CONCLUSIÓN.

Al terminar nuestro trabajo, no creemos dejar apurada la materia; pero sí nos parece haber tocado los puntos de mayor interés y planteado los problemas de más importancia que la igualdad ofrece. La cuestión está erizada de dificultades, y no obstante, después de haberlas considerado de cerca, no nos parecen tan insuperables. ¿Dependerá esto de que el hombre se familiariza con todo, y el hábito le hace indiferente á la vista del peligro que le aterraba, ó en que, realmente, apartando el error y la pasión del problema de la igualdad, no hay en él nada que deba alarmar ni exasperar á clase alguna? Esta última suposición nos parece la verdadera; y así como el estudio de la Naturaleza convence más y más de la sabiduría del Hacedor, al profundizar en el de la sociedad se ve que si Dios consiente al hombre moverse conforme á su albedrío en una ancha estera, no le abandona, y escribe en su organización leyes eternas que le sirven de antorcha cuando los errores obscurecen la luz de la verdad, y de dique cuando las pasiones se desbordan.

Apartando de la cuestión todo lo que á ella han llevado el espíritu de escuela y de partido, el interés y la cólera, ¿qué es lo que vemos en ella?

La desigualdad de condiciones, que tiene su origen en la naturaleza y su justificación en la necesidad.

El peligro de llevarla más allá de los límites necesarios, y como, pasándolos, los sentimientos se pervierten y las razas se degradan.

La tendencia innata del hombre á reconocer la autoridad, á respetar la jerarquía, á establecer el orden.

Lo absurdo de desplegar grande aparato de fuerza para establecer lo que se establecería por sí solo.

La necesidad de la jerarquía, sin la cual no es posible la sociedad.

La imposibilidad de establecer la jerarquía natural; la conveniencia de aproximarse á ella cuanto sea posible.

La injusticia de atribuir á la jerarquía más derechos de los que tiene, suponiendo que puede pasar los límites que la razón y la humanidad le imponen.

El error de creer que la igualdad ante la ley es la igualdad ante la justicia, y el más fatal todavía de imaginar que la ventura está en razón de la riqueza.

El peligro de dar voto al que no tiene opinión, y la imposibilidad de que realmente pueda tomar parte en la formación de la ley el que tiene su conciencia expuesta á las tentaciones de la miseria, y su razón á las del error.

La imposibilidad de que sea beneficiosa para todos la ley hecha por unos pocos.

El riesgo que la desigualdad aumentada por la civilización presenta á la democracia.

Las facilidades que la igualdad ofrece á la medianía; los obstáculos que opone á las altas concepciones del entendimiento; y, en fin, las razones por las cuales debe considerarse que la igualdad es más bien favorable que enemiga de la libertad.

Examinada la cuestión con imparcialidad, ¿no hay motivo para calmar las iras de los de abajo y el desdén de los de arriba? ¿No se ven claramente los límites puestos por la necesidad y la justicia, y que nadie puede traspasar sin ser insensato ó perverso? ¿No se descubre la profunda raíz de cosas que intentamos derribar por juzgarlas someramente arraigadas, y el íntimo enlace de hechos que suponíamos aislados? ¿No se percibe la razón de ser en muchos fenómenos que aparecían como hijos del capricho ó de la iniquidad? ¿No nos sentimos inclinados á creer alguna cosa que se nos presentaba como dudosa, á dudar alguna que juzgábamos evidente? ¿No hemos modificado algo nuestro modo de pensar ó de sentir? ¿No somos un poco más tolerantes con las pretensiones de los que están más arriba ó más abajo, y con los errores de todos? Después de haber estudiado el problema social de la igualdad, ¿no nos sentimos más fuertes para convencer, y con una mayor tolerancia para ser convencidos?

No nos atrevemos á esperar que se impresione y modifique de este modo el ánimo de los que hayan leído este escrito; pero consistirá en que no hemos tratado el asunto como debía tratarse. ¡Dichoso el que, colocándose á la altura que requiere, haga brillar la verdad con todo su esplendor! ¡Dichoso el que desvanezca con irresistible lógica vanas esperanzas y temores insensatos! ¡Dichoso el que arranque de raíz tantos peligrosos sofismas, y dé al derecho tan ancha base que pueda resistir las oleadas del error, del interés y de la cólera! ¡Dichoso el que, viendo la cuestión de la igualdad por todas sus fases, pueda mostrarla cual es, y sustituya á las prevenciones hostiles los afectos benévolos! ¿Pero quién es bastante poderoso para conseguirlo, para intentarlo siquiera?

En nuestra época, las luchas materiales, aisladas de las del entendimiento, si por acaso existen, duran poco; todo brazo que se levanta y hiere y vuelve á herir, sabiéndolo ó sin saberlo, obedece á una idea, y si pudiera establecerse la armonía en las regiones de la inteligencia, reinaría muy pronto en el mundo material: de aquí la importancia de la teoría, y su poder y su responsabilidad. La teoría forma escuela; la escuela forma partido; el partido forma en batalla las masas armadas ó los ejércitos, y los ejércitos y las masas, acentuando su cólera con el estruendo de la artillería, escriben con sangre todo lo que han aprendido. El error y la pasión, llamando derecho á una igualdad imposible ó á un privilegio injusto, han formado el símbolo de la guerra; apresurémonos á rectificar las ideas, á investigar la verdad, y sin más que formularla, escribiremos el símbolo de la paz.

No podemos concluir este escrito sin manifestar un recelo que nos aflige. El lector, ¿dudará de la sinceridad de nuestras palabras porque á veces parece como que sostenemos el pro y el contra de todas las opiniones, ejercitándonos en una especie de equilibrios intelectuales?

Acaso se disguste de ver que no somos aristócratas, ni demócratas, partidarios del privilegio, ni niveladores, y aun sospeche de nuestra fe política notando nuestros recios ataques á campos opuestos, porque en materias en que la pasión deja rara vez de tomar parte en los fallos, suele llamarse escepticismo á la imparcialidad. Y no es que nosotros presumamos de la nuestra: hemos empezado y concluímos desconfiando de ella; mas queremos hacer notar que el asunto está entre dos escollos: ser parciales ó parecer escépticos; tal vez hemos dado en entrambos, porque no basta ser sincero para ser exacto; hay una imparcialidad que está en la inteligencia, y consiste en ver todos los lados de una cuestión; hay otra, la del corazón, que consiste en decir con lisura lo que se ve: nosotros no podemos responder más que de esta última.

Nuestro modo de discurrir podrá chocar alguna vez con las preocupaciones de la gente despreocupada, que son las más arraigadas; pero cuando hemos creído ver clara la verdad, no hemos vacilado en formularla, porque el error es una arma que acaba siempre por dispararse contra el que la emplea, y hay riesgo en suprimir la lógica de los razonamientos no pudiendo suprimir la de las cosas. ¿De qué sirve decir al pueblo ni á los poderosos: «Marchad por el vasto campo que os abre nuestro buen deseo», si se verán detenidos por la realidad, esa jaula férrea, cuyas barras no ceden nunca y rompen los miembros del que intenta forzarlas? ¿Cuál es el más amigo del pueblo? ¿El que niega la existencia de sus males y los cubre con recamado manto, ó el que los pone de manifiesto para curarlos? ¿Son un bálsamo para los dolores reales las mentidas seguridades de que no existen? La beatitud que proporciona el error es como la del opio: mata al que á ella se entrega, y la verdad es la lanza fabulosa, cura las heridas que hace.

FIN.

ÍNDICE.

Págs.

INTRODUCCIÓN 5

PARTE PRIMERA.

De la igualdad considerada social y filosóficamente.

CAPÍTULO I.--Nociones generales 13

CAPÍTULO II.--De la igualdad, de la identidad, de la semejanza y de la equivalencia 23

CAPÍTULO III.--Origen y progresos de la desigualdad 41

CAPÍTULO IV.--Cómo se perpetúa la desigualdad injusta 69

CAPÍTULO V.--¿Cuándo, cómo y con qué consecuencias se perpetúa la desigualdad ó se restablece la igualdad? 73

CAPÍTULO VI.--¿En qué esfera se establece primeramente la igualdad? 89

CAPÍTULO VII.--Límites de la igualdad 99

PARTE SEGUNDA.

De la igualdad socialmente considerada.

CAPÍTULO I.--Influencia recíproca de los elementos físico, intelectual y moral, y de la semejanza necesaria y suficiente para establecer la igualdad 111

CAPÍTULO II.--¿Qué límite debe tener la desigualdad? 127

CAPÍTULO III.--Consecuencias de la desigualdad social del hombre y la mujer 143

CAPÍTULO IV.--La igualdad ante la ley ¿es la igualdad ante la justicia? 167

CAPÍTULO V.--De la equivalencia 173

CAPÍTULO VI.--Que los hombres no han menester ocupar en la sociedad posiciones iguales para ser igualmente dichosos 181

CAPÍTULO VII.--La propiedad y la igualdad 197

CAPÍTULO VIII.--De la asociación y de la igualdad 213

PARTE TERCERA.

De la igualdad considerada políticamente y en sus relaciones con la libertad.

CAPÍTULO I.--De la igualdad social y de la igualdad política 221

CAPÍTULO II.--De la igualdad y de la libertad 245

CAPÍTULO III.--La ley que emana de los privilegios ¿será beneficiosa para todos? 257

CAPÍTULO IV.--¿Es lo mismo igualdad que democracia? 263

CONCLUSIÓN 273

LIBRERÍA DE VICTORIANO SUÁREZ

PRECIADOS, 48.

=Agulló y Prats.=--Índice de la legislación hipotecaria de España é islas adyacentes y su reglamento, y de las disposiciones dictadas para la aplicación de aquéllas, etc., etc.--Barcelona, 1897; un tomo en 8.º, 5 pesetas.

=Angulo Laguna.=--Estudios sobre la condición jurídica de los hijos ilegítimos, según los principios y el Código civil vigente, con un prólogo de D. Federico de Castro.--Madrid, 1895; un tomo en 4.º, 2,50 pesetas.

=Anuario de Legislación y jurisprudencia española=, por la Redacción de la _Revista de los Tribunales y de legislación universal_; primer año de publicación, 1897.--Madrid, 1898; un tomo en 4.º, 10 pesetas.

=Brusa.=--Prolegómenos de Derecho penal, por Emilio Brusa, Profesor de Derecho penal en la Universidad de Turín, con un apéndice sobre el Derecho penal español (Historia y fuentes).--Madrid, 1897; un tomo en 8.º mayor, 7 pesetas.

=Burgess.=--Ciencia política y Derecho constitucional comparado.--Madrid, 1898; dos tomos en 4.º, 14 pesetas.

=Código civil Venezolano= (El nuevo), con un estudio crítico-comparativo con el español, y anotado por la Redacción de la _Revista de los Tribunales y de legislación universal_.--Madrid, 1897; un tomo en 4.º, 5 pesetas.

=Código civil del Imperio Alemán= (Texto y comentarios al), promulgado el 18 de Agosto de 1896, con la exposición de motivos, ley de introducción y disposiciones transitorias.--Un tomo en 4.º, 11 pesetas.

=Cogliolo.=--Estudios acerca de la evolución del Derecho privado, con un prólogo y notas de Rafael de Ureña.--Madrid, 1898; un tomo en 4.º, 4 pesetas.

=Colección= de las instituciones políticas y jurídicas de los pueblos modernos, dirigida su publicación y anotada por el Excmo. Sr. D. Vicente Romero Girón y D. Alejo García Moreno.--Madrid, 1883-94; trece tomos en 4.º mayor, 211 pesetas.

--Apéndice I. Complemento de las instituciones. Nuevas leyes y Códigos, decretos, tratados, reglamentos, etc., etc., publicados en 1893-94: Venezuela.--Estados Unidos.--Argentina.--Mejicana.--Guatemala.--Nicaragua.--Costa Rica.--Del Salvador.--Perú y Brasileña.--Madrid, 1895; un tomo en 4.º, 16 pesetas.

--II. Publicados en 1894: España.--Portugal.--Italia.--Francia. --Bélgica.--Suiza.--Alemania.--Prusia.--Austria-Hungría.--Rumanía. --Rusia.--Suecia y Noruega é Inglaterra.--Madrid, 1895; 16 pesetas.

--III. Publicados en 1895: México.--El Salvador.--Costa Rica.--Perú. --Bolivia.--Uruguay.--Argentina.--Venezuela.--Honduras.--Nicaragua. --Guatemala.--Chile.--Paraguay.--Colombia.--Estados Unidos Anglo-Americanos.--Brasil.--Madrid, 1896; un tomo en 4.º, 16 pesetas.

--IV. Publicados en 1895: Portugal.--Francia.--Italia.--Grecia. --Bélgica.--Holanda.--Suiza.--Austria-Hungría.--Rumanía.--Servia. --Turquía.--Alemania y Prusia.--Rusia.--Suecia y Noruega.--Dinamarca. --Inglaterra.--Madrid, 1896; en 4.º, 16 pesetas.

--V. Publicados en 1896: Venezuela.--República Dominicana.--México. --Costa Rica.--República Mayor de Centro-América.--Salvador. --Honduras.--Nicaragua.--Guatemala.--Perú.--Paraguay.--Chile. --Bolivia.--Estados Unidos Anglo-Americanos.--Colombia.--Argentina. --Uruguay.--Brasil.--En 4.º, 16 pesetas.

--VI. Publicados en 1896-97: Alemania.--Austria--Hungría.--Suiza. --Francia.--Bélgica.--Holanda.--Portugal.--Italia.--Grecia.--Servia. --Rusia.--Suecia y Noruega.--Dinamarca.--Inglaterra.--Egipto.--Túnez. --Argelia.--Protectorado Alemán del Sudoeste Africano.--República Sud Africana.--Orange.--Madagascar.--China.--Japón.--En 4.º, 16 pesetas. En pasta española, 2 pesetas más por tomo.

=Escuder.=--Locos y anómalos.--Contiene entre otras importantes cosas: El veterinario de Sueca.--Morillo.--Galeote.--El parricida de Carcagente.--Anomalías sexuales.--La reproducción.--Degeneración de amor.--Espermatorrea.--Epilepsia genérica.--Psicopatía sexual orgánica.--Aberraciones genésicas.--Anomalías sociales.--Degenerados.--Delincuentes.--Borrachos.--Hipnotismo.--El tratamiento de los locos.--El manicomio.--Curación del loco, etc., etc.--Madrid 1895; un tomo en 8.º, 4 pesetas.

=España.=--Tratado práctico del testamento ológrafo.--Madrid, 1896; un tomo en 8.º, 1,50 pesetas.

=García y Romero de Tejada.=--El libro del jurado.--Prontuario teórico-práctico para la más fácil y acertada aplicación del Código penal á los delitos de que conocen los tribunales populares.--1894-97; dos tomos en 4.º, 23 pesetas.

=Giner= (D. F.) y =Calderón= (D. A.).--_Curso de Filosofía del Derecho._--Contiene éste resumen de los principales problemas de la filosofía del Derecho; un preliminar relativo al conocimiento usual del Derecho; una introducción referente al concepto, enciclopedia, fuentes y método de la filosofía del Derecho, y las partes general, especial y orgánica de esta ciencia. En la parte general se trata del concepto del Derecho, sus esferas, relaciones, categorías y elementos, y de la vida jurídica. En la especial, estúdianse las divisiones del Derecho, como derecho de la personalidad y de los fines, y, por último, en la parte orgánica se investiga el Estado, especialmente como Estado del individuo.--Madrid, 1898; tomo I, en 4.º, 7,50 pesetas. Tomo II, en preparación.

=Gómez Acebo y Cortina= (D. José) y =Díaz Merry= (D. Ricardo).--Diccionario general de jurisprudencia contencioso-administrativa.--Colección, por orden alfabético de materias, de todas las sentencias dictadas en asuntos contencioso-administrativos, desde la creación del Consejo de Estado hasta 1888 inclusive.--Madrid, 1889; un tomo en 4.º, 18 pesetas.

=González Cedrón.=--Tratado de contabilidad para la estructura, comprobación y justificación de las cuentas provinciales de la Hacienda pública.--Madrid, 1897; 2 pesetas.

=González Serrano= (D. Urbano).--Estudio sobre los principios de la moral con relación á la doctrina positivista.--1,50 pesetas.

=Gómez y González.=--Faltas subsanables é insubsanables de los documentos públicos sujetos á registros, _en forma_ de Diccionario.--Cárdenas, 1890; un tomo en 4.º, 10 pesetas.

=Goodnow.=--Derecho administrativo comparado, Análisis de los sistemas administrativos de los Estados Unidos, Inglaterra, Francia y Alemania.--Madrid, 1897-98; dos tomos en 4.º, 14 pesetas.

=Heffter.=--Derecho internacional público de Europa. Traducción de Gabino Lizárraga, abogado del ilustre Colegio de Madrid, etc., Esta obra, cuyo mérito está reconocido por todo el mundo, y de que son evidente prueba las traducciones que se han hecho á casi todas lenguas. Su interés no puede desconocerse, al considerar que en ella se tratan todas las cuestiones internacionales, lo mismo en la paz que en la guerra.--Un tomo en 4.º, de 553 páginas, 8 pesetas.

=Janet.=--La familia, lecciones de filosofía moral, obra premiada por la Academia francesa, traducida por el Dr. Luis Marco.--Madrid, 1897; un tomo en 4.º, 5 pesetas.

=Manual del Abogado y del funcionario judicial=, con una extensa introducción sobre el concepto, fundamento é historia de la abogacía; contiene nuevos estatutos de los Colegios de Abogados, disposiciones de las leyes orgánicas, Código civil, penal, Justicia militar, Leyes de enjuiciamiento civil y criminal, del Jurado, de lo Contencioso, del Timbre, Impuestos, Ordenanzas de los Juzgados, Audiencias y Tribunal Supremo, etc., etc., por la redacción de la _Revista de los Tribunales_.--Madrid, 1895; un tomo en 8.º, tela, 4 pesetas.

=Manresa y Navarro.=--Comentarios á la ley de Enjuiciamiento civil, reformada conforme á las bases aprobadas por la ley de 21 de Junio de 1880, publicada para la Península por Real decreto de 3 de Febrero de 1881, y para las islas de Cuba y Puerto Rico por el de 25 de Septiembre de 1885; con los formularios correspondientes á todos los juicios.--Madrid, 1881-97; seis tomos en 4.º, 66 pesetas.

--Comentarios al Código civil español.--Madrid, 1890-98; cinco tomos en 4.º, 51 pesetas.--Tomo sexto en prensa.

=Melgar y Abreu.=--Tratado de expropiación forzosa por causa de utilidad pública, con un prólogo del Excelentísimo Sr. D. Francisco Silvela.--Madrid, 1889; un tomo en 8.º, 6 pesetas.

=Menger.=--El Derecho civil y los pobres, por Antonio Menger, profesor de Derecho en la Universidad de Viena, versión española con la autorización del autor y precedido de un estudio sobre el _Derecho_ y _la Cuestión social_, por D. Adolfo Posada, profesor de Derecho político y administrativo en la Universidad de Oviedo.--Madrid, 1898; un tomo en 8.º mayor.

=Pulido.=--Grandes problemas, por D. Ángel Pulido Fernández, de la Real Academia de Medicina. Contiene: Al Sr. D. M. Menéndez Pelayo.--La alimentación de los pueblos.--El alcoholismo.--El arte médico.--La doctrina bacteriológica.--La despoblación de España.--Madrid, 1892; un tomo en 8.º, 3 pesetas.

--Plumazos de un viajero. París.--Bruselas.--Holanda.--Alemania.--Austria-Hungría.--La Universidad alemana.--El estudiante alemán.--Madrid, 1883; un tomo en 8.º, 3 pesetas.

--El gran pueblo. El monasterio del Paular.--La disección (Descripciones de viaje.)--Madrid, 1893; un tomo en 8.º, con ilustraciones de D. R. Pulido y fotograbados de L. Romea, 3 pesetas.

--Miniaturas científicas: Colección de tesis, con un prólogo de D. José Echegaray. Los temas tratados llevan los siguientes títulos: Medicina árabe.--Educación física de la mujer.--El corro de niñas.--Evolución de las enfermedades.--La Medicina y la pintura.--El Poema de la circulación.--Madrid, 1894; un tomo en 8.º, 3 pesetas.

--La emoción oratoria.--Madrid, 1896; un tomo en 8.º mayor, 3 pesetas.

--La pena capital en España.--Madrid, 1897; un tomo en 8.º, 2 pesetas.

=Ramella.=--Tratado de la correspondencia en materia civil y mercantil, seguido de un estudio referente á la legislación española, por Lorenzo Benito.--Madrid, 1898; un tomo en 4.º, 8 pesetas.

=Repertorio de los Juzgados municipales=, ó sea compilación metodica y práctica de cuantas disposiciones legislativas, fundamentales y complementarias necesitan conocer los jueces, fiscales y secretarios, con aclaraciones y formularios de todas clases, por A. M. L., publicado por la _Revista de los Tribunales_.--Madrid, 1897; un tomo en 8.º, 6 pesetas.

=Riquelme.=--Elementos de Derecho público internacional, con explicación de todas las reglas que, según los tratados, estipulaciones, leyes vigentes y costumbres, constituyen el Derecho internacional español, Madrid, 1875; un tomo en 4.º, de 520 páginas, 6 pesetas.

=Sánchez Ocaña.=--Reglamento de policía minera, anotado y concordado con la vigente legislación general de minas, y con las leyes y reglamentos de Bélgica, Francia, Italia y demás países mineros de Europa, etc., etc.--Madrid, 1897; un tomo en 4.º mayor,

2,50 pesetas.

=Serrano de la Pedrosa.=--El Derecho del pataleo, la política.--Madrid, 1894; un tomo en 8.º, 2 pesetas.

=Villarrazo y González.=--Memoria sobre algunas reformas necesarias en la legislación penal española.--Loja, 1895; 2 pesetas.

Los precios marcados son á la rústica y para Madrid.

==========

The Will to Power: An Attempted Transvaluation of All Values. Book III and IV

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche

Project Gutenberg Release: August 28, 2016 · eBook #52915

THE

WILL TO POWER

AN ATTEMPTED

TRANSVALUATION OF ALL VALUES

By

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE

TRANSLATED BY

ANTHONY M. LUDOVICI

VOL. II

BOOKS III AND IV

T.N. FOULIS

13 & 15 FREDERICK STREET

EDINBURGH: AND LONDON

1913

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

THIRD BOOK. THE PRINCIPLES OF A NEW VALUATION.

I. THE WILL TO POWER IN SCIENCE--

_(a)_ The Method of Investigation _(b)_ The Starting-Point of Epistemology _(c)_ The Belief in the "Ego." Subject _(d)_ Biology of the Instinct of Knowledge. Perspectivity _(e)_ The Origin of Reason and Logic _(f)_ Consciousness _(g)_ Judgment. True--False _(h)_ Against Causality _(i)_ The Thing-in-Itself and Appearance _(k)_ The Metaphysical Need _(l)_ The Biological Value of Knowledge _(m)_ Science

II. THE WILL TO POWER IN NATURE--

1. The Mechanical Interpretation of the World 2. The Will to Power as Life-- _(a)_ The Organic Process _(b)_ Man 3. Theory of the Will to Power and of Valuations

III. THE WILL TO POWER AS EXEMPLIFIED IN

SOCIETY AND IN THE INDIVIDUAL

1. Society and the State 2. The Individual

IV. THE WILL TO POWER IN ART

FOURTH BOOK. DISCIPLINE AND BREEDING.

I. THE ORDER OF RANK--

1. The Doctrine of the Order of Rank 2. The Strong and the Weak 3. The Noble Man 4. The Lords of the Earth 5. The Great Man 6. The Highest Man as Lawgiver of the Future

II. DIONYSUS

III. ETERNAL RECURRENCE

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

For the history of the text constituting this volume I would refer readers to my preface to _The Will to Power,_ Books I, and II., where they will also find a brief explanation of the actual title of the complete work.

In the two books before us Nietzsche boldly carries his principle still further into the various departments of human life, and does not shrink from showing its application even to science, to art, and to metaphysics.

Throughout Part I. of the Third Book we find him going to great pains to impress the fact upon us that science is as arbitrary as art in its mode of procedure, and that the knowledge of the scientist is but the outcome of his inexorable will to power interpreting facts in the terms of the self-preservative conditions of the particular order of human beings to which he belongs. In Aphorisms 515 and 516, which are typical of almost all the thought expressed in Part I., Nietzsche says distinctly: "The object is not 'to know,' but to schematise,--to impose as much regularity and form upon chaos as our practical needs require."

Unfamiliarity, constant change, and the inability to reckon with possibilities, are sources of great danger: hence, everything _must_ be explained, assimilated, and rendered capable of calculation, if Nature is to be mastered and controlled.

Schemes for interpreting earthly phenomena must be devised which, though they do not require to be absolute or irrefutable, must yet favour the maintenance of the kind of men that devises them. Interpretation thus becomes all important, and facts sink down to the rank of raw material which must first be given some shape (some sense--always anthropocentric) before they can become serviceable.

Even the development of reason and logic Nietzsche consistently shows to be but a spiritual development of the physiological function of digestion which compels an organism to make things "like" (to "assimilate") before it can absorb them (Aph. 510). And seeing that he denies that hunger can be a first motive (Aphs. 651-656), and proceeds to show that it is the amœba's will to power which makes it extend its pseudopodia in search of what it can appropriate, and that, once the appropriated matter is enveloped, it is a process of making _similar_ which constitutes the process of absorption, reason itself is by inference acknowledged to be merely a form of the same fundamental will.

An interesting and certainly inevitable outcome of Nietzsche's argument appears in Aph. 516, where he declares that even our inability to deny and affirm one and the same thing is not in the least necessary, _but only a sign of inability._

The whole argument of Part I. tends to draw science ever nearer and nearer to art (except, of course, in those cases in which science happens to consist merely of an ascertainment of facts), and to prove that the one like the other is no more than a means of gaining some foothold upon the slippery soil of a world that is for ever in flux.

In the rush and pell-mell of Becoming, some milestones must be fixed for the purposes of human orientation. In the torrent of evolutionary changes pillars must be made to stand, to which man can for a space hold tight and collect his senses. Science, like art, accomplishes this for us, and it is our will to power which "creates the impression of Being out of Becoming" (Aph. 517).

According to this standpoint, then, consciousness is also but a weapon in the service of the will to power, and it extends or contracts according to our needs (Aph. 524). It might disappear altogether (Aph. 523), or, on the other hand, it might increase and make our life more complicated than it already is. But we should guard against making it the Absolute behind Becoming, simply because it happens to be the highest and most recent evolutionary form (Aph. 709). If we had done this with each newly acquired characteristic, sight itself, which is a relatively recent development, would also have required to have been deified.

Pantheism, Theism, Unitarianism--in fact all religions in which a _conscious_ god is worshipped, are thus aptly classed by Nietzsche as the result of man's desire to elevate that which is but a new and wonderful instrument of his will to power, to the chief place in the imaginary world beyond (eternal soul), and to make it even the deity itself (God Omniscient).

With the question of Truth we find Nietzsche quite as ready to uphold his thesis as with all other questions. He frankly declares that "the criterion of truth lies in the enhancement of the feeling of power" (Aph. 534), and thus stands in diametrical opposition to Spencer, who makes constraint or inability the criterion of truth. (See _Principles of Psychology,_ new edition, chapter ix.... "the unconceivableness of its negation is the ultimate test of the truth of a proposition.")

However paradoxical Nietzsche's view may seem, we shall find that it is actually substantiated by experience; for the activity of our senses certainly convinces us more or less according to the degree to which it is provoked. Thus, if we walked for long round a completely dark room, and everything yielded, however slightly, to our touch, we should remain quite unconvinced that we were in a room at all, more particularly if--to suppose a still more impossible case--the floor yielded too. What provokes great activity in the bulbs of our fingers, then, likewise generates the sensation of truth.

From this Nietzsche proceeds to argue that what provokes the strongest sentiments in ourselves is also true to us, and, from the standpoint of thought, "that which gives thought the greatest sensation of strength" (Aph. 533).

The provocation of intense emotion, and therefore the provocation of that state in which the body is above the normal in power, thus becomes the index to truth; and it is a very remarkable thing that two prominent English thinkers should, at the very end of their careers, have practically admitted this, despite the fact that all their philosophical productions had been based upon a completely different belief. I refer, of course, to Spencer and Buckle, who both upheld the view that in a system of thought the emotional factor is of the highest importance.

It follows from all this, that lies and false doctrines may quite conceivably prove to be even more preservative to species than truth itself, and although this is a view we have already encountered in the opening aphorisms of _Beyond Good and Evil,_ in Aph, 538 this volume we find it further elucidated by Nietzsche's useful demonstration of the fact that "the easier way of thinking always triumphs over the more difficult way"; and that logic, inasmuch as it facilitated classification and orderly thought, ultimately "got to act like truths."

Before leaving Part I., with which it would be impossible to deal in full, a word or two ought to be said in regard to Nietzsche's views concerning the belief in "cause and effect." In the _Genealogy of Morals_ (1st Essay, Aph. 13), we have already read a forecast of our author's more elaborate opinions on this question, and the aphorism in question might be read with advantage in conjunction with the discussion on the subject found in this book (Aphs. 545-555).

The whole of Nietzsche's criticism, however, resolves itself into this, that the doctrine of causality begins with an unnecessary duplication of all that happens. Language, and its origin among a people uneducated in thoughts and concepts, is at the root of this scientific superstition, and Nietzsche traces its evolution from the primeval and savage desire always to find a "doer" behind every deed: to find some one who is responsible and who, being known, thus modifies the unfamiliarity of the deed which requires explaining. "The so-called instinct of causality [of which Kant speaks with so much assurance] is nothing more than the fear of the unfamiliar."

In Aph. 585 (A), we have a very coherent and therefore valuable exposition of much that may still seem obscure in Nietzsche's standpoint, and we might almost regard this aphorism as the key to the epistemology of the Will to Power. When we find the "will to truth" defined merely as "the longing for a stable world," we are in possession of the very leitmotiv of Nietzsche's thought throughout Part I., and most of what follows is clearly but an elaboration of this thought.

In Part II. Nietzsche reveals himself as utterly opposed to all mechanistic and materialistic interpretations of the Universe. He exalts the spirit and repudiates the idea that mere pressure from without--naked environment--is to be held responsible (and often guilty!) for all that materialistic science would lay at its door. Darwin again comes in for a good deal of sharp criticism; and, to those who are familiar with the nature of Nietzsche's disagreement with this naturalist, such aphorisms as Nos. 643, 647, 649, 651, 684, 685, will be of special interest. There is one question of great moment, which all Nietzsche's perfectly sincere and profoundly serious deprecation of the Darwinian standpoint ought to bring home to all Englishmen who have perhaps too eagerly endorsed the conclusions of their own British school of organic evolution, and that is, to what extent were Malthus, and afterwards his disciple Darwin, perhaps influenced in their analysis of nature by preconceived notions drawn from the state of high pressure which

prevailed in the thickly-populated and industrial country in which they both lived?

It is difficult to defend Darwin from the fundamental attack which Nietzsche directs at the very root of his teaching, and which turns upon the question of the motive of all Life's struggle. To assume that the motive is always a "struggle for existence" presupposes the constant presence of two conditions--want and over-population,--an assumption which is absolutely non-proven, and it likewise lends a peculiarly ignoble and cowardly colouring to the whole of organic life, which not only remains unsubstantiated in fact, but which the struggle for power completely escapes. In Part III., which, throughout, is pretty plain sailing, Aphorism 786 contains perhaps the most important statements. Here morality is shown to be merely an instrument, but this time it is the instrument of the gregarious will to power. In the last paragraph of this aphorism Nietzsche shows himself quite antagonistic to Determinism, because of its intimate relation to, and its origin in, a mechanistic interpretation of the Universe. But we should always remember that, inasmuch as Nietzsche would distribute beliefs, just as others distribute bounties--that is to say, according to the needs of those whom he has in view, we must never take for granted that a belief which he deprecates for one class of man ought necessarily, according to him, to be denied another class.

Hard as it undoubtedly is to bear this in mind, we should remember that his appeal is almost without interruption made to higher men, and that doctrines and creeds which he condemns for them he would necessarily exalt in the case of people who were differently situated and otherwise constituted. Christianity is a case in point (see _Will to Power,_ vol. i. Aph. 132).

We now come to Part IV., which is possibly the most important part of all, seeing that it treats of those questions which may be regarded as Nietzsche's most constant concern from the time when he wrote his first book.

The world as we now see and know it, with all that it contains which is beautiful, indifferent, or ugly, from a human standpoint, is, according to Nietzsche, the creation of our own valuing minds. Perhaps only a few people have had a hand in shaping this world of values. Maybe their number could be counted on the fingers of two hands; but still, what Nietzsche insists upon is, that it is human in its origin. Our whole outlook, everything that gives us joy or pain, must at one time or other have been valued for us, and in persisting in these valuations we, as the acclimatised herd, are indebted to our artists, to our higher men, to all those in history, who at some time or other have dared to stand up and to declare emphatically that _this_ was ugly and that _that_ was beautiful, and to fight, and if necessary to die, for their opinion.

Religion, morality, and philosophy, while they all aim at so-called universal Truth, tend to depreciate the value of life in the eyes of exceptional men. Though they establish the "beautiful" for the general stock, and in that way enhance the value of life for that stock, they contradict higher men's values, and, by so doing, destroy their innocent faith in the world. For the problem here is not, what value is true?--but, what value is most conducive to the highest form of human life on earth?

Nietzsche would fain throw all the burden of valuing upon the Dionysian artist him who speaks about this world out of the love and plenitude of power that is in his own breast, him who, from the very health that is within him, cannot look out upon life without transfiguring it, hallowing it, blessing it, and making it appear better, bigger, and more beautiful. And, in this view, Nietzsche is quite consistent; for, if we must accept his conclusion that our values are determined for us by our higher men, then it becomes of the highest importance that these valuers should be so constituted that their values may be a boon and not a bane to the rest of humanity.

Alas! only too often, and especially in the nineteenth century, have men who lacked this Dionysian spirit stood up and valued the world; and it is against these that Nietzsche protests. It is the bad air they have spread which he would fain dispel.

An to what art means to the artist himself, apart from its actual effect on the world, Nietzsche would say that it is a manner of discharging his will to power. The artist tries to stamp his opinion of what is desirable, and of what is beautiful or ugly, upon his contemporaries and the future; it is in this valuing that his impulse to prevail finds its highest expression. Hence the instinctive economy of artists in sex matters--that is to say, in precisely that quarter whither other men go when their impulse to prevail urges them to action. Nietzsche did not of course deny the sensual nature of artists (Aph. 815); all he wished to make plain was this, that an artist who was not moderate, _in eroticis,_ while engaged upon his task, was open to the strongest suspicion.

In the Fourth Book Nietzsche is really at his very best. Here, while discussing questions such as "The Order of Rank," he is so thoroughly in his exclusive sphere, that practically every line, even if it were isolated and taken bodily from the context, would bear the unmistakable character of its author. The thought expressed in Aphorism 871 reveals a standpoint as new as it is necessary. So used have we become to the practice of writing and legislating for a mass, that we have forgotten the rule that prevails even in

our own navy--that the speed of a fleet is measured by its slowest vessel.

On the same principle, seeing that all our philosophies and moralities have hitherto been directed at a mass and at a mob, we find that their elevation must of necessity be decided by the lowest of mankind. Thus all passions are banned, because base men do not know how to enlist them in their service. Men who are masters of themselves and of others, men who understand the management and privilege of passion, become the most despised of creatures in such systems of thought, because they are confounded with the vicious and licentious; and the speed of mankind's elevation thus gets to be determined by humanity's slowest vessels.

Aphorisms 881, 882, 886 fully elucidate the above considerations, while in 912, 916, 943, and 951 we have plans of a constructive teaching which the remainder of Part I. elaborates.

And now, following Nietzsche carefully through Part II. (Dionysus), what is the inevitable conclusion of all we have read? This analysis of the world's collective values and their ascription to a certain "will to power" may now seem to many but an exhaustive attempt at a new system of nomenclature, and little else. As a matter or fact it is very much more than this. By mean? of it Nietzsche wishes to show mankind how much has lain, and how much still lies, in man's power By laying his finger on everything and declaring to man that it was human will that created it. Nietzsche wished to give man the courage of this will, and a clean conscience in exercising it. For it was precisely this very will to power which had been most hated and most maligned by everybody up to Nietzsche's time.

Long enough, prompted by the fear of attributing any one of his happiest thoughts to this hated fundamental will, had man ascribed all his valuations and all his most sublime inspirations to something outside himself,--whether this something were a God, a principle, or the concept Truth. But Nietzsche's desire was to show man how human, all too human, have been the values that have appeared heretofore; he wished to prove, that to the rare sculptors of values, the world, despite its past, is still an open field of yielding clay, and in pointing to what the will to power has done until now, Nietzsche suggests to these coming sculptors what might still be done, provided they fear nothing, and have that innocence and that profound faith in the fundamental will which others hitherto have had in God, Natural Laws, Truth, and other euphemistic fictions.

The doctrine of Eternal Recurrence, to which Nietzsche attached so much importance that it may be regarded almost as the inspiration which led to his great work, _Thus Spake Zarathustra,_ ought to be understood in the light of a purely disciplinary and chastening creed. In one of his posthumous works we find Nietzsche saying: "The question which thou shalt have to answer before every deed that thou doest;--is this such a deed as I am prepared to perform an incalculable number of times,--is the best ballast." Thus it is obvious that, feeling the need of something in his teaching which would replace the metaphysics of former beliefs, he applied the doctrine of Eternal Recurrence to this end. Seeing, however, that even among Nietzscheans themselves there is considerable doubt concerning the actual value of the doctrine as a ruling belief, it does not seem necessary to enter here into the scientific justification which he claims for it. Suffice it to say that, as knowledge stands at present, the statement that the world will recur eternally in small things as in great, is still a somewhat daring conjecture--a conjecture, however, which would have been entirely warrantable if its disciplinary value had been commensurate with its daring.

ANTHONY M. LUDOVICI.

THIRD BOOK.

THE PRINCIPLES OF A NEW VALUATION.

I.

THE WILL TO POWER IN SCIENCE.

(a) The Method of Investigation.

466.

The distinguishing feature of our nineteenth century is not the triumph of _science,_ but the triumph of the scientific _method_ over science.

467.

The history of scientific methods was regarded by Auguste Comte almost as philosophy itself.

468.

The great _Methodologists:_ Aristotle, Bacon, Descartes, Auguste Comte.

469.

The most valuable knowledge is always discovered last: but the most valuable knowledge consists of _methods._

All methods, all the hypotheses on which the science of our day depends, were treated with the profoundest contempt for centuries: on their account a man used to be banished from the society of _respectable_ people--he was held to be an "_enemy of God,_" a reviler of the highest ideal, a madman.

We had the whole _pathos_ of mankind against us,--our notion of what "truth" ought to be, of what the service of truth ought to be, our objectivity, our method, our calm, cautious and distrustful manner were altogether _despicable...._ At bottom, that which has kept men back most, is an æsthetic taste: they believed in the picturesque effect of truth; what they demanded of the scientist was, that he should make a strong appeal to their imagination.

From the above, it would almost seem as if the very _reverse_ had been achieved, as if a sudden _jump_ had been made: as a matter of fact, the schooling which the moral hyperboles afforded, gradually prepared the way for that _milder form of pathos_ which at last became incarnate in the scientific man....

Conscientiousness in small things, the self-control of the religious man, was a preparatory school for the scientific character, as was also, in a very pre-eminent sense, the attitude of mind which makes a man _take problems seriously,_ irrespective of what personal advantage he may derive from them....

_(b)_ The Starting-point of Epistemology.

470.

Profound disinclination to halt once and for all at any collective view of the world. The charm of the opposite point of view: the refusal to relinquish the stimulus residing in the enigmatical.

471.

The hypothesis that, at bottom, things proceed in such a moral fashion that _human reason must be right,_ is a mere piece of good-natured and simple-minded trustfulness, the result of the belief in Divine truthfulness--God regarded as the Creator of all things.--These concepts are our inheritance from a former existence in a Beyond.

472.

The contradiction of the so-called "facts of consciousness." Observation a thousand times more difficult, error is perhaps the absolute _condition_ of observation.

473.

The intellect cannot criticise itself, simply because it can be compared with no other kind of intellect, and also because its ability to know would only reveal itself in the presence of "actual reality"; that is to say, because, in order to criticise the intellect, we should have to be higher creatures with "absolute knowledge." This would presuppose the existence of _something,_ a "thing-in-itself," apart from all the perspective kinds of observation and senso-spiritual perception. But the psychological origin of the belief in _things,_ forbids our speaking of "things in themselves."

474.

The idea that a sort of adequate relation exists between _subject_ and _object,_ that the object is something which _when seen from inside_ would be a subject, is a well-meant invention which, I believe, has seen its best days. The measure of that which we are conscious of, is perforce entirely dependent upon the coarse utility of the function of consciousness: how could this little garret-prospect of consciousness warrant our asserting anything in regard to "subject" and "object," which would bear any relation to reality!

475.

Criticism of modern philosophy: erroneous starting-point, as if there were such things as "facts of consciousness"--and no _phenomenalism_ in _introspection._

476.

"Consciousness"--to what extent is the idea which is thought of, the idea of will, or the idea of a feeling (_which is known by us alone_), quite superficial? Our _inner_ world is also "appearance."

477.

I am convinced of the phenomenalism of the _inner_ world also: everything that reaches our consciousness is utterly and completely adjusted, simplified, schematised, interpreted, the _actual_ process of inner "perception," the _relation of causes_ between thoughts, feelings, desires, between subject and object, is absolutely concealed from us, and may be purely imaginary. This "_inner_ world of appearance" is treated with precisely the same forms and procedures as the "outer" world. We never come across a single "fact": pleasure and pain are more recently evolved intellectual phenomena....

Causality evades us; to assume the existence of an immediate causal relation between thoughts, as Logic does, is the result of the coarsest and most clumsy observation. There are _all sorts of passions_ that may intervene between two thoughts: but the interaction is too rapid--that is why we _fail to recognise_ them, that is why we actually _deny_ their existence....

"Thinking," as the epistemologists understand _\r_ it, never takes place at all: it is an absolutely gratuitous fabrication, arrived at by selecting one element from the process and by eliminating all the rest--an artificial adjustment for the purpose of the understanding....

The "mind," _something that thinks_: at times, even, "the mind absolute and pure"--this concept is an evolved and second result of false introspection, which believes in "thinking": in the first place an act is imagined here which does not really occur at all, _i.e._ "thinking"; and, _secondly,_ a subject-substratum is imagined in which every process of this thinking has its origin, and nothing else--that is to say, _both the action and the agent are fanciful._

478.

Phenomenalism must not be sought in the wrong quarter: nothing is more phenomenal, or, to be more precise, nothing is so much _deception,_ as this inner world, which we observe with the "inner sense."

Our belief that the will is a cause was so great, that, according to our personal experiences in general, we projected a cause into all phenomena (_i.e._ a certain motive is posited as the cause of all phenomena).

We believe that the thoughts which follow one upon the other in our minds are linked by some sort of causal relation: the logician, more especially, who actually speaks of a host of facts which have never once been seen in reality, has grown accustomed to the prejudice that thoughts _are the cause_ of thoughts.

We believe--and even our philosophers believe it still--that pleasure and pain are the causes of reactions, that the very purpose of pleasure and pain is to occasion reactions. For hundreds of years, pleasure and pain have been represented as the _motives_ for every action. Upon reflection, however, we are bound to concede that everything would have proceeded in exactly the same way, according to precisely the same sequence of cause and effect, if the states "pleasure" and "pain" had been entirely absent; and that we are simply deceived when we believe that they actually cause anything:--they are the _attendant phenomena,_ and they have quite a different purpose from that of provoking reactions; they are in themselves effects involved in the process of reaction which takes place.

In short: Everything that becomes conscious is a final phenomenon, a conclusion--and is the cause of nothing; all succession of phenomena in consciousness is absolutely atomistic.--And we tried to understand the universe from the _opposite_ point of view--as if nothing were effective or real, save thinking, feeling, willing! ...

479.

The phenomenalism of the "inner world!" A chronological inversion takes place, so that the cause reaches consciousness as the effect.--We know that pain is projected into a certain part of the body although it is not really situated there; we have learnt that all sensations which were ingenuously supposed to be conditioned by the outer world are, as a matter of fact, conditioned by the inner world: that the real action of the outer world never takes place in a way of which we can become conscious.... That fragment of the outer world of which we become conscious, is born after the effect produced by the outer world has been recorded, and is subsequently interpreted as the "cause" of that effect....

In the phenomenalism of the "inner world," the chronological order of cause and effect is inverted. The fundamental fact of "inner experience" is, that the cause is imagined after the effect has been recorded.... The same holds good of the sequence of thoughts: we seek for the reason of a thought, before it has reached our consciousness; and then the reason reaches consciousness first, whereupon follows its effect. All our dreams are the interpretation of our collective feelings with the view of discovering the possible causes of the latter; and the process is such that a condition only becomes conscious, when the supposed causal link has reached consciousness.[1]

The whole of "inner experience" is founded on this: that a cause is sought and imagined which accounts for a certain irritation in our nerve-centres, and that it is only the cause which is found in this way which reaches consciousness; this cause may have absolutely nothing to do with the real cause--it is a sort of groping assisted by former "inner experiences," that is to say, by memory. The memory, however, retains the habit of old interpretations,--that is to say, of erroneous causality,--so that "inner experience" comprises in itself all the results of former erroneous fabrications of causes. Our "outside world," as we conceive it every instant, is indissolubly bound up with the old error of cause: we interpret by means of the schematism of "the thing," etc.

"Inner experience" only enters consciousness when it has found a language which the individual can _understand_--that is to say, a translation of a certain condition into conditions with which he is _familiar;_ "understand" means simply this: to be able to express something new in the terms of something old or familiar. For instance, "I feel unwell"--a judgment of this sort presupposes a _very great and recent neutrality on the part of the observer:_ the simple man always says, "This and that make me feel unwell,"--he begins to be clear concerning his indisposition only after he has discovered a reason for it.... This is what I call _a lack of philological_ knowledge; to be able to read a text, _as such,_ without reading an interpretation into it, is the latest form of "inner experience,"--it is perhaps a barely possible form....

[Footnote 1: When in our dream we hear a bell ringing, or a tapping at our door, we scarcely ever wake before having already accounted for the sound, in the terms of the dream-world we were in.--TR.]

480.

There are no such things as "mind," reason, thought, consciousness, soul, will, or truth: they all belong to fiction, and can serve no purpose. It is not a question of "subject and object," but of a particular species of animal which can prosper only by means of a certain _exactness,_ or, better still, _regularity_ in recording its perceptions (in order that experience may be capitalised)....

Knowledge works as an _instrument_ of power. It is therefore obvious that it increases with each advance of power....

The purpose of knowledge: in this case, as in the case of "good" or "beautiful," the concept must be regarded strictly and narrowly from an anthropocentric and biological standpoint. In order that a particular species may maintain and increase its power, its conception of reality must contain enough which is calculable and constant to allow of its formulating a scheme of conduct. _The utility of preservation_--and _not_ some abstract or theoretical need to eschew deception--stands as the motive force behind the development of the organs of knowledge; ... they evolve in such a way that their observations may suffice for our preservation. In other words, the _measure_ of the desire for knowledge depends upon the extent to which _the Will to Power_ grows in a certain species: a species gets a grasp of a given amount of reality, _in order to master it, in order to enlist that amount in its service._

(c) The Belief in the "Ego." Subject.

481.

In opposition to Positivism, which halts at phenomena and says, "These are only _facts_ and nothing more," I would say: No, facts are precisely what is lacking, all that exists consists of _interpretations._ We cannot establish any fact "in itself": it may even be nonsense to desire to do such a thing. "Everything is _subjective,_" ye say: but that in itself is _interpretation._ The subject is nothing given, but something superimposed by fancy, something introduced behind.--Is it necessary to set an interpreter behind the interpretation already to hand? Even that would be fantasy, hypothesis.

To the extent to which knowledge has any sense at all, the world is knowable: but it may be interpreted _differently,_ it has not one sense behind it, but hundreds of senses.--"Perspectivity."

It is our needs that _interpret the world_; our instincts and their impulses for and against. Every instinct is a sort of thirst for power; each has its point of view, which it would fain impose upon all the other instincts as their norm.

482.

Where our ignorance really begins, at that point from which we can see no further, we set a word; for instance, the word "I," the word "do," the word "suffer"--these concepts may be the horizon lines of our knowledge, but they are not "truths."

483.

Owing to the phenomenon "thought," the ego is taken for granted; but up to the present everybody believed, like the people, that there was something unconditionally certain in the notion "I think," and that by analogy with our understanding of all other causal reactions this "I" was the given _cause_ of the thinking. However customary and indispensable this fiction may have become now, this fact proves nothing against the imaginary nature of its origin; it might be a life-preserving belief and _still_ be _false._

484.

"Something is thought, therefore there is something that thinks": this is what Descartes' argument amounts to. But this is tantamount to considering our belief in the notion "_substance_" as an "_a priori_" truth:--that there must be something "that thinks" when we think, is merely a formulation of a grammatical custom which sets an agent to every action. In short, a metaphysico-logical postulate is already put forward here--and it is not merely _an ascertainment of fact...._ On Descartes' lines nothing absolutely certain is attained, but only the fact of a very powerful faith.

If the proposition be reduced to "Something is thought, therefore there are thoughts," the result is mere tautology; and precisely the one factor which is in question, the "_reality_ of thought," is not touched upon,--so that, in this form, the apparitional character of thought cannot be denied. What Descartes _wanted_ to prove was, that thought not only had _apparent reality,_ but absolute reality.

485.

The concept _substance_ is an outcome of the concept _subject,_ and not conversely! If we surrender the concept soul, the subject, the very conditions for the concept "substance" are lacking. _Degrees of Being_ are obtained, but Being is lost.

Criticism of "_reality_": what does a _"plus or minus of reality"_ lead to, the gradation of Being in which we believe?

The degree of our feeling of _life_ and _power_ (the logic and relationship of past life) presents us with the measure of "Being," "reality," "non-appearance."

Subject i this is the term we apply to our belief in an _entity_ underlying all the different moments of the most intense sensations of reality; we regard this belief as the effect of a cause,--and we believe in our belief to such an extent that, on its account alone, we imagine "truth," "reality," "substantiality."--a "Subject" is the fiction which would fain make us believe that several similar states were the effect of one substratum: but we it was who first _created_ the "similarity" of these states; the similising and adjusting of them is the _fact--not_ their similarity (on the contrary, this ought rather to be denied).

486.

One would have to know what _Being_ is, in order to be able to _decide_ whether this or that is real (for instance, "the facts of consciousness"); it would also be necessary to know what _certainty_ and _knowledge_ are, and so forth.--But, as we do _not_ know these things, a criticism of the faculty of knowledge is nonsensical: how is it possible for an instrument to criticise itself, when it is itself that exercises the critical faculty. It cannot even define itself!

487.

Should not all philosophy ultimately disclose the first principles on which the reasoning processes depend?--that is to say, our _belief_ in the "ego" as a substance, as the only reality according to which, alone, we are able to ascribe reality to things? The oldest realism at length comes to light, simultaneously with man's recognition of the fact that his whole religious history is no more than a history of soul-superstitions. _Here there is a barrier;_ our very thinking, itself, involves that belief (with its distinctions--substance, accident, action, agent, etc.); to abandon it would mean to cease from being able to think.

But that a belief, however useful it may be for the preservation of a species, has nothing to do with the truth, may be seen from the fact that we _must_ believe in time, space, and motion, without feeling ourselves compelled to regard them as absolute realities.

488.

_The psychological origin of our belief in reason.--_The ideas "reality," "Being," are derived from our _subject-_feeling.

"Subject," interpreted through ourselves so that the ego may stand as substance, as the cause of action, as the _agent._

The metaphysico-logical postulates, the belief in substance, accident, attribute, etc. etc., draws its convincing character from our habit of regarding all our actions as the result of our will: so that the ego, as substance, does not vanish in the multiplicity of changes.--_But there is no such thing as will._ We have no categories which allow us to separate a "world as thing-in-itself," from "a world of appearance." All our _categories of reason_ have a sensual origin: they are deductions from the empirical world. "The soul," "the ego"--the history of these concepts shows that here, also, the oldest distinction ("_spiritus_," "life") obtains....

If there is nothing material, then there can be nothing immaterial. The concept no longer _means_ anything.

No subject-"atoms." The sphere of a subject _increasing_ or _diminishing_ unremittingly, the centre of the system continually _displacing_ itself, in the event of the system no longer being able to organise the appropriated mass, it divides into two. On the other hand, it is able, without destroying it, to transform a weaker subject into one of its own functionaries, and, to a certain extent, to compose a new entity with it. Not a "substance," but rather something which in itself strives after greater strength; and which wishes to "preserve" itself only indirectly (it wishes to _surpass_ itself).

489.

Everything that reaches consciousness as an entity is already enormously complicated: we never have anything more than the _semblance of an entity._

The phenomenon of the _body_ is the richer, more distinct, and more tangible phenomenon: it should be methodically drawn to the front, and no mention should be made of its ultimate significance.

490.

The assumption of a _single subject_ is perhaps not necessary, it may be equally permissible to assume a plurality of subjects, whose interaction and struggle lie at the bottom of our thought and our consciousness in general. A sort of _aristocracy_ of "cells" in which the ruling power is vested? Of course an aristocracy of equals, who are accustomed to ruling co-operatively, and understand how to command?

My hypotheses. The subject as a plurality. Pain intellectual and dependent upon the judgment harmful, projected. The effect always "unconscious": the inferred and imagined cause is projected, it _follows_ the event. Pleasure is a form of pain. The only kind of power that exists is of the same nature as the power of will: a commanding of other subjects which thereupon alter themselves. The unremitting transientness and volatility of the subject. "Mortal soul." _Number_ as perspective form.

491.

The belief in the body is more fundamental than the belief in the soul: the latter arose from the unscientific observation of the agonies of the body. (Something which leaves it. The belief in the _truth of dreams_)

492.

The body and physiology the starting-point: why?--We obtain a correct image of the nature of our subject-entity, that is to say, as a number of regents at the head of a community (not as "souls" or as "life-forces") as also of the dependence of these regents upon their subjects, and upon the conditions of a hierarchy, and of the division of labour, as the means ensuring the existence of the part and the whole. We also obtain a correct image of the way in which the living entities continually come into being and expire, and we see how eternity cannot belong to the "subject"; we realise that the struggle finds expression in obeying as well as in commanding, and that a fluctuating definition of the limits of power is a factor of life. The comparative _ignorance_ in which the ruler is kept, of the individual performances and even disturbances taking place in the community, also belong to the conditions under which government may be carried on. In short, we obtain a valuation even of _want-of-knowledge,_ of seeing-things-generally-as-a-whole, of simplification, of falsification, and of perspective. What is most important, however, is, that we regard the ruler and his subjects as of the _same kind,_ all feeling, willing, thinking--and that wherever we see or suspect movement in a body, we conclude that there is co-operative-subjective and invisible life. Movement as a symbol for the eye; it denotes that something has been felt, willed, thought.

The danger of directly questioning the subject _concerning_ the subject, and all spiritual self-reflection, consists in this, that it might be a necessary condition of its activity to interpret itself _erroneously._ That is why we appeal to the body and lay the evidence of sharpened senses aside: or we try and see whether the subjects themselves cannot enter into communication with us.

_(d)_ Biology of the Instinct of Knowledge. Perspectivity.

493.

Truth is that kind of error without which a certain species of living being cannot exist. The value for _Life_ is ultimately decisive.

494.

It is unlikely that our "knowledge" extends farther than is exactly necessary for our self-preservation. Morphology shows us how the senses and the nerves as well as the brain evolve in proportion as the difficulties of acquiring sustenance increase.

495.

If the morality of "Thou shalt not lie" be refuted, the sense for truth will then have to justify itself before another tribunal--as a means to the preservation of man, _as Will to Power._

Likewise our love of the beautiful: it is also the _creative will._ Both senses stand side by side; the sense of truth is the means wherewith the power is appropriated to adjust things according to one's taste. The love of adjusting and reforming--a primeval love! We can only _take cognisance_ of a world which we ourselves have _made._

496.

Concerning the multifariousness of knowledge. The tracing of _its_ relation to many other things (or the relation of kind)--how should "knowledge" be of another? The way to know and to investigate is in itself among the conditions of life; that is why the conclusion that there could be no other kind of intellect (for ourselves) than the kind which serves the purpose of our preservation is an excessively hasty one: this _actual_ condition may be only an accidental, not in the least an essential; one.

Our apparatus for acquiring knowledge is not adjusted for knowledge.

497.

The most strongly credited a priori "truths" are, to my mind, mere assumptions pending further investigation; for instance, the law of causation is a belief so thoroughly acquired by practice and so completely assimilated, that to disbelieve in it would mean the ruin of our kind. But is it therefore true? What an extraordinary conclusion! As if truth were proved by the mere fact that man survives!

498.

To what extent is our _intellect_ also a result of the conditions of life?--We should not have it did we not _need_ to have it, and we should not have it _as_ we have it, if we did not need it _as_ we need it--that is to say, if we could live otherwise.

499.

Thinking in a primitive (inorganic) state is to _persevere in forms,_ as in the case of the crystal.--In _our_ thought, the _essential factor_ is the harmonising of the new material with the old schemes (= Procrustes' bed), the _assimilation_ of the unfamiliar.

500.

The perception of the senses projected outwards: "inwards" and "outwards"--does the _body_ command here?

The same equalising and ordering power which rules in the idioplasma, also rules in the incorporation of the outer world: our sensual perceptions are already the _result_ of this process of _adaptation_ and _harmonisation_ in regard to _all_ the past in us; they do not follow directly upon the "impression."

501.

All thought, judgment, perception, regarded as an act of _comparing_[2] has as a first condition the act of _equalising,_ and earlier still the act of _"making equal."_ The process of making equal is the same as the assimilation by the amœba of the nutritive matter it appropriates.

"Memory" late, in so far as the equalising instinct appears to have been _subdued_: the difference is preserved. Memory--a process of classification and collocation; active--who?

[Footnote 2: The German word _vergleichen,_ meaning "to compare," contains the root "equal" _(gleich)_ which cannot be rendered in English. TR.]

502.

In regard to the _memory,_ we must unlearn a great deal: here we meet with the greatest temptation to assume the existence of a "soul," which, irrespective of time, reproduces and recognises again and again, etc. What I have experienced, however, continues to live "in the memory"; I have nothing to do with it when memory "comes," my will is inactive in regard to it, as in the case of the coming and going of a thought. Something happens, of which I become conscious: now something similar comes--who has called it forth? Who has awakened it?

503.

The whole apparatus of knowledge is an abstracting and simplifying apparatus--not directed at knowledge, but at the _appropriation_ of things: "end" and "means" are as remote from the essence of this apparatus as "concepts" are. By the "end" and the "means" a process is appropriated (--a process is _invented_ which may be grasped), but by "_concepts_" one appropriates the "things" which constitute the process.

504.

Consciousness begins outwardly as co-ordination and knowledge of impressions,--at first it is at the point which is remotest from the biological centre of the individual; but it is a process which deepens and which tends to become more and more an inner function, continually approaching nearer to the centre.

505.

Our perceptions, as we understand them--that is to say, the sum of all those perceptions the consciousness whereof was useful and essential to us and to the whole organic processes which preceded us: therefore they do not include all perceptions (for instance, not the electrical ones);--that is to say, we have _senses_ only for a definite selection of perceptions--such perceptions as concern us with a view to our self-preservation. _Consciousness extends so far only as it is useful._ There can be no doubt that all

our sense-perceptions are entirely permeated by valuations (useful or harmful--consequently, pleasant or painful). Every particular colour; besides being a colour, expresses a value to us (although we seldom admit it, or do so only after it has affected us exclusively for a long time, as in the case of convicts in gaol or lunatics). Insects likewise react in different ways to different colours: some like this shade, the others that. Ants are a case in point.

506.

In the beginning _images_ how images originate in the mind must be explained. Then _words,_ applied to images. Finally _concepts,_ possible only when there are words--the assembling of several pictures into a whole which is not for the eye but for the ear (word). The small amount of emotion which the "word" generates,--that is, then, which the view of the similar pictures generates, for which one word is used,--this simple emotion is the common factor, the basis of a concept. That weak feelings should all be regarded as alike, _as the same,_ is the fundamental fact. There is therefore a confusion of two very intimately associated feelings in the _ascertainment_ of these feelings;--but who is it that ascertains? _Faith_ is the very first step in every sensual impression: a sort of yea-saying is the _first_ intellectual activity! A "holding-a-thing-to-be-true" is the beginning. It were our business, therefore, to explain how the "holding-of-a-thing-to-be-true" arose! What sensation lies beneath the comment "true"?

507.

The _valuation_, "I believe that this and that is so," is the essence of "truth." In all valuations, the conditions of _preservation_ and of _growth_ find expression. All our _organs and senses_ of knowledge have been developed only in view of the conditions of preservation and growth. The _trust_ in reason and its categories, the trust in dialectics, and also the _valuation_ of logic, prove only that _experience_ has taught the usefulness of these things to life: not their "truth." The prerequisites of all living things and of their lives is: that there should be a large amount of faith, that it should be possible to pass definite judgments on things, and that _there should be no doubt_ at all concerning all essential values. Thus it is necessary that something should be assumed to be true, _not_ that it _is_ true.

"The _real_ world and the world of _appearance_"-- I trace this contrast to the _relation of values._ We have posited _our_ conditions of existence as the _attributes of being_ in general. Owing to the fact that, in order to prosper, we must be stable in our belief, we developed the idea that the real world was neither a changing nor an evolving one, but a world of _being._

_(e)_ The Origin of Reason and Logic.

508.

Originally there was chaos among our ideas. Those ideas which were able to stand side by side remained over, the greater number perished--and are still perishing.

509.

The kingdom of desires out of which logic grew: the gregarious instinct in the background. The assumption of similar facts is the first condition for "similar souls." _For the purpose of mutual understanding and government._

510.

Concerning the _origin of logic._ The fundamental proneness to _equalise_ things and to _see them equal_, gets to be modified, and kept within bounds, by the consideration of what is useful or harmful--in fact, by considerations of success: it then becomes adapted in suchwise as to be gratified in a milder way, without at the same time denying life or endangering it. This whole process corresponds entirely with that external and mechanical process (which is its symbol) by which the _protoplasm_ continually assimilates, makes equal to itself, what it appropriates, and arranges it according to its own forms and requirements.

511.

Likeness and Similarity.

1. The coarser the organ the more apparent likenesses it sees;

2. The mind _will_ have likeness--that is to say, the identification of one sensual impression with others already experienced: just as the body _assimilates_ inorganic matter.

For the understanding of Logic:--

The will which tends to see likeness everywhere is the will to power--the belief that something is so and so (the essence of a judgment), is the result of a will which _would fain have it_ as similar as possible.

512.

Logic is bound up with the proviso: granted _that identical cases exist_. As a matter of fact, before one can think and conclude in a logical fashion, _this_ condition _must_ first be assumed. That is to say, the will to _logical truth_ cannot be consummated before a fundamental falsification of all phenomena has been assumed. From which it follows that an instinct rules here, which is capable of employing both means: first, falsification; and secondly, the carrying out of its own point of view: logic does not spring from a will to truth.

513.

The inventive force which devised the categories, worked in the service of our need of security, of quick intelligibility, in the form of signs, sounds, and abbreviations.--"Substance," "subject," "object," "Being," "Becoming," are not matters of metaphysical truth. It was the powerful who made the names of things into law, and, among the powerful, it was the greatest artists in abstraction who created the categories.

514.

A moral--that is to say, a method of living which long experience and experiment have tested and proved efficient, at last enters consciousness as a law, as dominant.... And then the whole group of related values and conditions become part of it: it becomes venerable, unassailable, holy, true; a necessary part of its evolution is that its origin should be forgotten.... That is a sign that it has become master. Exactly the same thing might have happened with the categories of reason: the latter, after much groping and many trials, might have proved true through relative usefulness.... A stage was reached when they were grasped as a whole, and when they appealed to consciousness as a whole,--when belief in them was commanded,--that is to say, when they acted as if they commanded.... From that time forward they passed as a priori, as beyond experience, as irrefutable. And, possibly, they may have been the expression of no more than a certain practicality answering the ends of a race and a species,--their usefulness alone is their "truth."

515.

The object is, not "to know," but to schematise,--to impose as much regularity and form upon chaos, as our practical needs require. In the formation of reason, logic, and the categories, it was a need in us that was the determining power: not the need "to know," but to classify, to schematise, for the purpose of intelligibility and calculation. (The adjustment and interpretation of all similar and equal things,--the same process, which every sensual impression undergoes, is the development of reason!) No pre-existing "idea" had anything to do with it: but utility, which teaches us that things can be reckoned with and managed, only when we view them roughly as equal.... _Finality_ in reason is an effect, not a cause: Life degenerates with every other form of reason, although constant attempts are being made to attain to those other forms of reason;--for Life would then become too obscure, too unequal.

The categories are "truths" only in the sense that they are the conditions of our existence, just as Euclid's Space is a conditional "truth." (Between ourselves, as no one will maintain that men are absolutely necessary, reason, as well as Euclid's Space, are seen to be but an idiosyncrasy of one particular species of animals, one idiosyncrasy alone among many others....)

The subjective constraint which prevents one from contradicting here, is a biological constraint: the instinct which makes us see the utility of concluding as we do conclude, is in our blood, we _are_ almost this instinct.... But what simplicity it is to attempt to derive from this fact that we possess an absolute truth! ... The inability to contradict anything is a proof of impotence but not of "truth."

516.

We are not able to affirm and to deny one and the same thing: that is a principle of subjective experience--which is not in the least "necessary," _but only a sign of inability._

If, according to Aristotle, the _principium contradictionis_ is the most certain of all principles; if it is the most ultimate of all, and the basis of every demonstration; if the principle of every other axiom lie within it: then one should analyse it all the more severely, in order to discover how many assumptions _already lie_ at its root. It either assumes something concerning reality and Being, as if these had become known in some other sphere--that is to say, as if it were _impossible_ to ascribe the opposite attributes to it; or the proposition means: that the opposites _should_ not be ascribed to it. In that case, logic would be an imperative, _not_ directed at the knowledge of truth, but at the adjusting and fixing of a world _which must seem true to us._

In short, the question is a debatable one: are the axioms of logic adequate to reality, or are they measures and means by which alone we can, _create_ realities, or the concept "reality"?... In order to affirm the first alternative, however, one would, as we have seen, require a previous knowledge of Being; which is certainly not the case. The proposition therefore contains no _criterion of truth,_ but an _imperative_ concerning that which _should_ pass as true.

Supposing there were no such thing as A identical with itself, as every logical (and mathematical) proposition presupposes, and that A is in itself an _appearance,_ then logic would have a mere world _of appearance_ as its first condition. As a matter of fact, we believe in that proposition, under the influence of an endless empiricism which seems to _confirm_ it every minute. The "thing"--that is the real substratum of A; _our belief in things_ is the first condition of our faith in logic. The A in logic is, like the atom, a reconstruction of the thing.... By not understanding this, and by making logic into a criterion of _real being,_ we are already on the road to the classification of all those hypostases, substance, attribute, object, subject, action, etc., as realities--that is to say, the conception of a metaphysical world or a "real world" (--_this is, however, once more the world of appearance..._).

The primitive acts of thought, affirmation, and negation, the holding of a thing for true, and the holding of a thing for not true,--in so far as they do not only presuppose a mere habit, but the very _right_ to postulate truth or untruth at all,--are already dominated by a belief, _that there is such a thing as knowledge for us,_ and _that judgments can really hit the truth:_ in short, logic never doubts that it is able to pronounce something concerning truth in itself (--that is to say, that to the thing which is in itself true, no opposite attributes _can_ be ascribed).

In this belief there _reigns_ the sensual and coarse prejudice that our sensations teach us _truths_ concerning things,--that I cannot at the same moment of time say of one and the same thing that it is _hard_ and _soft._ (The instinctive proof, "I cannot have two opposite sensations at once," is quite _coarse_ and _false_.)

That all contradiction in concepts should be forbidden, is the result of a belief, that we _are able_ to form concepts, that a concept not only characterises but also _holds_ the essence of a thing.... As a matter of fact, logic (like geometry and arithmetic) only holds good of _assumed existences which we have created._ Logic is _the attempt on our part to understand the actual world according to a scheme of Being devised by ourselves; or, more exactly, it is our attempt at making the actual world more calculable and more susceptible to formulation, for our own purposes...._

517.

In order to be able to think and to draw conclusions, it is necessary to _acknowledge that which exists:_ logic only deals with formulæ for things which are constant. That is why this acknowledgment would not in the least prove reality: "that which is" is part of our optics. The ego regarded as Being (not affected by either Becoming or evolution).

The _assumed world_ of subject, substance, reason, etc., is necessary, an adjusting, simplifying falsifying, artificially-separating power resides in us. "Truth" is the will to be master over the manifold sensations that reach consciousness; it is the will to _classify_ phenomena according to definite categories. In this way we start out with a belief in the "true nature" of things (we regard phenomena as real).

The character of the world in the process of Becoming _is not susceptible of formulation;_ it is "false" and "contradicts itself." _Knowledge_ and the process of _evolution_ exclude each other. _Consequently,_ knowledge must be something else: it must be preceded by a will to make things knowable, a kind of Becoming in itself must create the _illusion_ of _Being._

518.

If our "ego" is the only form of Being, according to which we make and understand all Being: very good! In that case it were very proper to doubt whether an _illusion_ of perspective were not active here--the apparent unity which everything assumes in our eyes on the horizon-line. Appealing to the body for our guidance, we are confronted by such appalling manifoldness, that for the sake of

method it is allowable to use that phenomenon which is _richer_ and more easily studied as a clue to the understanding of the poorer phenomenon.

Finally: admitting that all is Becoming, _knowledge is only possible when based on a belief in Being._

519.

If there is "only one form of Being, the ego," and all other forms of Being are made in its own image,--if, in short, the belief in the "ego," together with the belief in logic, stands and falls with the metaphysical truth of the categories of reason: if, in addition, the "ego" is shown to be something that is _evolving: then----_

520.

The continual transitions that occur, forbid our speaking of the "individual," etc.; the "number" of beings itself fluctuates. We should know nothing of time or of movement, if, in a rough way, we did not believe we saw things "standing still" behind or in front of things moving. We should also know just as little about cause and effect, and without the erroneous idea of "empty space" we should never have arrived at the concept of space at all. The principle of identity is based on the "fact of appearance" that there are some things alike. Strictly speaking, it would not be possible to "understand" and "know" an evolving world; something which is called "knowledge" exists only in so far as the "understanding" and "knowing" intellect already finds an adjusted and rough world to hand, fashioned out of a host of mere appearances, but become fixed _to_ the extent in which this kind of appearance has helped to preserve life; only to this extent is "knowledge" possible--that is to say, as a measuring of earlier and more recent errors by one another.

521.

Concerning logical appearance.--The concept "individual" and the concept "species" are equally false and only apparent. "_Species_" only expresses the fact that an abundance of similar creatures come forth at the same time, and that the speed of their further growth and of their further transformation has been made almost imperceptible for a long time: so that the actual and trivial changes and increase of growth are of no account at all (--a stage of evolution in which the process of evolving is not visible, so that, not only does a state of equilibrium _seem_ to have been reached, but the road is also made clear for the error of supposing _that an actual goal has been reached_--and that evolution had a goal...).

The form seems to be something enduring, and therefore valuable; but the form was invented merely by ourselves; and however often "the same form is attained," it does not signify that it _is the same form,--because something new always appears_; and we alone, who compare, reckon the new with the old, in so far as it resembles the latter, and embody the two in the unity of "form." As if a _type_ had to be reached and were actually intended by the formative processes.

Form, species, law, idea, purpose--the same fault is made in respect of all these concepts, namely, that of giving a false realism to a piece of fiction: as if all phenomena were infused with some sort of obedient spirit--an artificial distinction is here made between that _which_ acts and that _which_ guides action (but both these things are only fixed in order to agree with our metaphysico-logical dogma: they are not "facts").

We should not interpret this _constraint_ in ourselves, to imagine concepts, species, forms, purposes, and laws ("_a world of identical cases_") as if we were in a position to construct a _real world_; but as a constraint to adjust a world by means of which _our existence_ will be ensured: we thereby create a world which is determinable, simplified, comprehensible, etc., for us.

The very same constraint is active in _the functions of the senses_ which support the reason--by means of simplification, coarsening, accentuation, and interpretation; whereon all "recognition," all the ability of making one's self intelligible rests. Our _needs_ have made our senses so precise, that the "same world of appearance" always returns, and has thus acquired the semblance of _reality._

Our subjective constraint to have faith in logic, is expressive only of the fact that long before logic itself became conscious in us, we did nothing _save introduce its postulates into the nature of things:_ now we find ourselves in their presence,--we can no longer help it,--and now we would fain believe that this constraint is a guarantee of "truth." We it was who created the "thing," the "same thing," the subject, the attribute, the action, the object, the substance, and the form, after we had carried the process of equalising, coarsening, and simplifying as far as possible. The world _seems_ logical to us, because we have already made it logical.

522.

Fundamental solution.--We believe in reason: this is, however, the philosophy of colourless _concepts._ Language is built upon the most _naïf_ prejudices.

Now we read discord and problems into things, because we are able to _think only_ in the form of language--we also believe in the "eternal truth" of "wisdom" (for instance, subject, attribute, etc.).

We cease from thinking if we do not wish to think under the control of language; the most we can do is to attain to an attitude of doubt concerning the question whether the boundary here really is a boundary.

Rational thought is a process of interpreting according to a scheme which we cannot reject.

(_f_) Consciousness.

523.

There is no greater error than that of making psychical and physical phenomena the two faces, the two manifestations of the same substance. By this means nothing is explained: the concept _"substance"_ is utterly useless as a means of explanation. _Consciousness_ may be regarded as secondary, almost an indifferent and superfluous thing, probably destined to disappear and to be superseded by perfect automatism--

When we observe mental phenomena we may be likened to the deaf and dumb who divine the spoken word, which they do not hear, from the movements of the speaker's lips. From the appearance of the inner mind we draw conclusions concerning invisible and other phenomena, which we could ascertain if our powers of observation were adequate for the purpose.

For this inner world we have no finer organs, and that is why a _complexity which is thousandfold_ reaches our consciousness as a simple entity, and we invent a process of causation in it, despite the fact that we can perceive no cause either of the movement or of the change--the sequence of thoughts and feelings is nothing more than their becoming visible to consciousness. That this sequence has anything to do with a chain of causes is not worthy of belief: consciousness never communicates an example of cause and effect to us.

524.

The part "consciousness" plays,--It is essential that one should not mistake the part that "consciousness plays" it is our _relation to the outer world; it was the outer world that developed it._ On the other hand, the _direction_--that is to say, the care and cautiousness which is concerned with the inter-relation of the bodily functions, does _not_ enter into our consciousness any more than does the _storing activity_ of the intellect: that there is a superior controlling force at work in these things cannot be doubted--a sort of directing committee, in which the various _leading desires_ make their votes and their power felt. "Pleasure" and "pain" are indications which reach us from this sphere: as are also _acts of will_ and _ideas._

In short: That which becomes conscious has causal relations which are completely and absolutely concealed from our knowledge--the sequence of thoughts, feelings, and ideas, in consciousness, does not signify that the order in which they come is a causal order: it is _so apparently,_ however, in the highest degree. We have _based_ the whole of our notion of _intellect, reason, logic,_ etc., upon this _apparent truth_ (all these things do not exist: they are imaginary syntheses and entities), and we then projected the latter into and _behind_ all things!

As a rule _consciousness_ itself is understood to be the general sensorium and highest ruling centre; albeit, it is only a _means of communication:_ it was developed by intercourse, and with a view to the interests of intercourse.... "Intercourse" is understood, here, as "relation," and is intended to cover the action of the outer world upon us and our necessary response to it, as also our actual influence _upon_ the outer world. It is _not_ the conducting force, but an _organ of the latter._

525.

My principle, compressed into a formula which savours of antiquity, of Christianity, Scholasticism, and other kinds of musk: in the concept, "God is _spirit,_" God as perfection is "_denied...._"

526.

Wherever people have observed a certain unity in the grouping of things, _spirit_ has always been regarded as the cause of this co-ordination: an assumption for which reasons are entirely lacking. Why should the idea of a complex fact be one of the conditions of that fact? Or why should the _notion_ of a complex fact have to precede it as its cause?

We must be on our guard against explaining _finality_ by the spirit: there is absolutely no reason whatever for ascribing to spirit the peculiar power of organising and systematising. The domain of the nervous system is much more extensive: the realm of consciousness is superadded. In the collective process of adaptation and systematising, consciousness plays no part at all.

527.

Physiologists, like philosophers, believe that consciousness increases in _value_ in proportion as it _gains_ in clearness: the most lucid consciousness and the most logical and impassive thought are of the _first_ order. Meanwhile--according to what standard is this value determined?--In regard to the _discharge of will-power_ the most superficial and _most simple_ thought is the most useful--it might therefore, etc. etc. (because it leaves few motives over).

Precision in action is opposed to the _far-sighted_ and often uncertain judgments of _caution:_ the latter is led by the _deeper_ instinct.

528.

The chief error of psychologists: they regard the indistinct idea as of a lower _kind_ than the distinct; but that which keeps at a distance from our consciousness and which is therefore _obscure, may_ on that very account be quite clear in itself. _The fact that a thing becomes obscure_ is a question _of the perspective of consciousness._

529.

The great misapprehensions:--

(1) The senseless _overestimation of consciousness,_ its elevation to the dignity of an entity: "a spirit," "a soul," something that feels, thinks, and wills;

(2) The spirit regarded as a _cause,_ especially where finality, system, and co-ordination appear;

(3) Consciousness classed as the highest form attainable, as the most superior kind of being, as "God";

(4) Will introduced wherever effects are observed;

(5) The "real world" regarded as the spiritual world, accessible by means of the facts of consciousness;

(6) Absolute knowledge regarded as the faculty of consciousness, wherever knowledge exists at all.

Consequences:--

Every step forward consists of a step forward in consciousness; every step backwards is a step into unconsciousness (unconsciousness was regarded as a falling-back upon the _passions_ and _senses--_as a state of _animalism ..._.)

Man approaches reality and real being through dialectics: man _departs_ from them by means of instincts, senses, and automatism....

To convert man into a spirit, would mean to make a god of him: spirit, will, goodness--all one.

All goodness must take its root in spirituality, must be a fact of consciousness.

Every step made towards _something better_ can be only a step forward in _consciousness._

(g) Judgment. True--false.

530.

Kant's theological bias, his unconscious dogmatism, his moral outlook, ruled, guided, and directed him.

The πρ■τον ψε■δος: how is the fact knowledge possible? Is knowledge a fact at all? What is knowledge? If we do not _know_ what knowledge is, we cannot possibly reply to the question, Is there such a thing as knowledge? Very _fine!_ But if I do not already "know" whether there is, or can be, such a thing as knowledge, I cannot reasonably ask the question, "What is knowledge?" Kant _believes_ in the fact of knowledge: what he requires is a piece of _naïveté: the knowledge of knowledge!_

"Knowledge is judgment." But judgment is a belief that something is this or that! And not knowledge! "All knowledge consists in synthetic judgments" which have the character of being _universally true_ (the fact is _so_ in all cases, and does not change), and which have the character of being _necessary_ (the reverse of the proposition cannot be imagined to exist).

The _validity_ of a belief in knowledge is always taken for granted; as is also the _validity_ of the feelings which conscience dictates. Here _moral ontology_ is the _ruling_ bias.

The conclusion, therefore, is: (1) there are propositions which we believe to be universally true and necessary.

(2) This character of universal truth and of necessity cannot spring from experience.

(3) Consequently it must base itself upon no experience at all, _but upon something else_, it must be derived from another source of knowledge!

Kant concludes (1) that there are some propositions which hold good only on one condition; (2) this condition is that they do not spring from experience, but from pure reason.

Thus, the question is, whence do we derive our reasons for _believing_ in the truth of such propositions? No, whence does our belief get its cause? But the _origin of a belief,_ of a strong conviction, is a psychological problem: and very limited and narrow experience frequently brings about such a belief! _It already presupposes_ that there are not only "data _a posteriori_" but also "data _a priori_"-- that is to say, "previous to experience." Necessary and universal truth cannot be given by experience: it is therefore quite clear that it has come to us without experience at all?

There is no such thing as an isolated judgment!

An isolated judgment is never "true," it is never knowledge; only in _connection with,_ and when _related to,_ many other judgments, is a guarantee of its truth forthcoming.

What is the difference between true and false belief? What is knowledge? He "knows" it, that is heavenly! Necessary and universal truth cannot be given by experience! It is therefore independent of experience, _of_ all experience! The view which comes quite _a priori,_ and therefore independent of all experience, _merely out of reason,_ is "pure knowledge"!

"The principles of logic, the principle of identity and of contradiction, are examples of pure knowledge, because they precede all experience."--But these principles are not cognitions, but _regulative articles of faith._

In order to establish the _a priori_ character (the pure rationality) of mathematical axioms, space _must be conceived as a form of pure reason._

Hume had declared that there were no _a priori_ synthetic judgments. Kant says there are--the mathematical ones! And if there are such judgments, there may also be such things as metaphysics and a knowledge of things by means of pure reason!

Mathematics is possible under conditions which are _not_ allowed to metaphysics. All human knowledge is either experience or mathematics.

A judgment is synthetic--that is to say, it co-ordinates various ideas. It is _a priori_--that is to say, this co-ordination is universally true and necessary, and is arrived at, not by sensual experience, but by pure reason.

If there are such things as _a priori_ judgments, then reason must be able to co-ordinate: co-ordination is a form. Reason must _possess a formative faculty._

Judging is our oldest faith; it is our habit of believing this to be true or false, of asserting or denying, our certainty that something is thus and not otherwise, our belief that we really "know"--_what_ is believed to be true in all judgments?

What are _attributes_?--We did not regard changes in ourselves merely as such, but as "things in themselves," which are strange to us, and which we only "perceive"; and we did _not_ class them as phenomena, but as Being, as "attributes"; and in addition we invented a creature to which they attach themselves--that is to say, we made the _effect_ the _working cause,_ and _the latter_ we made _Being._ But even in this plain statement, the concept "effect" is arbitrary: for in regard to those changes which occur in us, and of which we are convinced we ourselves are _not_ the cause, we still argue that they must be effects: and this is in accordance with the belief that "every change must have its author";--but this belief in itself is already mythology; for it _separates_ the working _cause from_ the cause in work. When I say the "lightning flashes," I set the flash down, once as an action and a second time as a subject acting; and thus a thing is fancifully affixed to a phenomenon, which is not one with it, but which is _stable,_ which _is,_ and does not "come."--_To make the phenomenon the working cause,_ and to make _the effect into a thing--into Being:_ this is the _double_ error, or _interpretation,_ of which we are guilty.

532.

The _Judgment_--that is the faith: "This and this is so. In every judgment, therefore, there lies the admission that an "identical" case has been met with: it thus takes some sort of comparison for granted, with the help of the memory. Judgment does _not_ create the idea that an identical case seems to be there. It believes rather that it actually perceives such a case; it works on the hypothesis that there are such things as identical cases. But what is that much _older_ function called, which must have been active much earlier, and which in itself equalises unequal cases and makes them alike? What is that second function called, which with this first one as a basis, etc. etc, "That which provokes the same sensations as another thing is equal to that other thing": but what is that called which makes sensations equal, which regards them as equal?--There could be no judgments if a sort of equalising process were not active within all sensations: memory is only possible by means of the underscoring of all that has already been experienced and learned. Before a judgment can be formed, _the process of assimilation must already have been completed_: thus, even here, an intellectual activity is to be observed which does not enter consciousness in at all the same way as the pain which accompanies a wound. Probably the psychic phenomena correspond to all the organic functions--that is to say, they consist of assimilation, rejection, growth, etc.

The essential thing is to start out from the body and to use it as the general clue. It is by far the richer phenomenon, and allows of much more accurate observation. The belief in the body is much more soundly established than the belief in spirit.

"However strongly a thing may be believed, the degree of belief is no criterion of its truth." But what is truth? Perhaps it is a form of faith, which has become a condition of existence? Then _strength_ would certainly be a criterion; for instance, in regard to causality.

533.

Logical accuracy, transparency, considered as the criterion of truth ("_omne illud verum est, quod clare et distincte percipitur._"--Descartes): by this means the mechanical hypothesis of the world becomes desirable and credible.

But this is gross confusion: like _simplex sigillum veri._ Whence comes the knowledge that the real nature of things stands in _this_ relation to our intellect? Could it not be otherwise? Could it not be this, that the hypothesis which gives the intellect the greatest feeling of power and security, is _preferred, valued,_ and marked as _true_--The intellect sets its _freest_ and _strongest faculty_ and _ability_ as the criterion of what is most valuable, consequently of what is _true...._

"True"--from the standpoint of sentiment--is that which most provokes sentiment ("I");

from the standpoint of thought--is that which gives thought the greatest sensation of strength;

from the standpoint of touch, sight, and hearing--is that which calls forth the greatest resistance.

Thus it is the _highest degrees of activity_ which awaken belief in regard to the _object_, in regard to its "reality." The sensations of strength, struggle, and resistance convince the subject that there is something which is being resisted.

534.

The criterion of truth lies in the enhancement of the feeling of power.

535.

According to my way of thinking, "truth" does not necessarily mean the opposite of error, but, in the most fundamental cases, merely the relation of different errors to each other: thus one error might be older, deeper than another, perhaps altogether ineradicable, one without which organic creatures like ourselves could not exist; whereas other errors might not tyrannise over us to that extent as conditions of existence, but when measured according to the standard of those other "tyrants," could even be laid aside and "refuted." Why should an irrefutable assumption necessarily be "true"? This question may exasperate the logicians who limit _things_ according to the limitations they find in themselves: but I have long since declared war with this logician's optimism.

536.

Everything simple is simply imaginary, but not "true." That which is real and true is, however, neither a unity nor reducible to a unity.

537.

What is truth?--Inertia; _that_ hypothesis which brings satisfaction, the smallest expense of intellectual strength, etc.

538.

First proposition. The _easier_ way of thinking always triumphs over the more difficult way;--_dogmatically_: _simplex sigillum veri_.--_Dico_: to suppose that _clearness_ is any proof of truth, is absolute childishness. . . .

Second proposition. The teaching of Being, of things, and of all those constant entities, is a _hundred times more easy_ than the teaching of _Becoming_ and of evolution. . .

Third proposition. Logic was intended to be a method of _facilitating_ thought: a _means of expression_, --not truth. . . . Later on it got to _act_ like truth. . . .

539.

Parmenides said: "One can form no concept of the non-existent";--we are at the other extreme, and say, "That Of which a concept can be formed, is certainly fictional."

540.

There are many kinds of eyes. Even the Sphinx has eyes--therefore there must be many kinds of "truths," and consequently there can be no truth.

541.

Inscriptions over the porch of a modern lunatic asylum.

"That which is necessarily true in thought must be necessarily true in morality."--HERBERT SPENCER.

"The ultimate test of the truth of a proposition is the inconceivableness of its negation,"--HERBERT SPENCER.

542.

If the character of existence were false,:--and this would be possible,--what would truth then be, all our truth? ... An unprincipled falsification of the false? A higher degree of falseness? ...

543.

In a world which was essentially false, truthfulness would be an _anti-natural tendency_: its only purpose would be to provide a means of attaining to a _higher degree of falsity._ For a world of truth and Being to be simulated, the truthful one would first have to be created (it being understood that he must believe himself to be "truthful").

Simple, transparent, not in contradiction with himself, lasting, remaining always the same to himself, free from faults, sudden changes, dissimulation, and form: such a man conceives a world of Being as "_God_" in His own image.

In order that truthfulness may be possible, the whole sphere in which man moves must be very tidy, small, and respectable: the advantage in every respect must be with the truthful one.--Lies, tricks, dissimulations, must cause astonishment.

544.

"Dissimulation" increases in accordance with the rising _order of rank_ among organic beings. In the inorganic world it seems to be entirely absent. There power opposes power quite roughly _--ruse_ begins in the organic world; plants are already masters of it. The greatest men, such as Cæsar and Napoleon (see Stendhal's remark concerning him),[3] as also the higher races (the Italians), the Greeks (Odysseus); the most supreme cunning, belongs to the very _essence_ of the elevation of man. ... The problem of the actor. My Dionysian ideal.... The optics of all the organic functions, of all the strongest vital instincts: the power which _will_ have error in all life; error as the very first principle of thought itself. Before "thought" is possible, "fancy" must first have done its work; the _picturing_ of identical cases, of the _seemingness_ of identity, is more primeval than the cognition of identity.

[Footnote 3: The reference to Stendhal here, seems to point to a passage in his _Life of Napoleon_ (Preface, p. xv) of which Nietzsche had made a note in another place, and which reads: "Une croyance presque instinctive chez moi c'est que tout homme puissant ment quand il parle et à plus forte raison quand il écrit."]

_(h)_ Against Causality.

545.

I believe in absolute space as the basis of force, and I believe the latter to be limited and formed. Time, eternal. But space and time as things in themselves do not exist. "Changes" are only appearances (or mere processes of our senses to us); if we set recurrence, however regular, between them, nothing is proved beyond the fact that it has always happened so. The feeling that _post hoc_ is _propter hoc,_ is easily explained as the result of a misunderstanding, it is comprehensible. But appearances cannot be "causes"!

546.

The interpretation of a phenomenon, _either_ as an action _or_ as the endurance of an action (that is to say, every action involves the suffering of it), amounts to this: every change, every differentiation, presupposes the existence of an agent and somebody acted upon, _who_ is "altered."

547.

Psychological history of the concept _subject._ The body, the thing, the "whole," which is visualised by the eye, awakens the thought of distinguishing between an action and an agent; the idea that the agent is the cause of the action, after having been repeatedly refined, at length left the "subject" over.

548.

Our absurd habit of regarding a mere mnemonic sign or abbreviated formula as an independent being, and ultimately as a _cause_; as, for instance, when we say of lightning that it flashes, even the little word "I." A sort of double-sight in seeing which makes sight a _cause of seeing in itself_: this was the feat in the invention of the "subject" of the "ego."

549.

"Subject," "object," "attribute"--these distinctions have been _made,_ and are now used like schemes to cover all apparent facts. The false fundamental observation is this, that I believe it is I who does something, who suffers something, who "has" something, who "has" a quality.

550.

In every judgment lies the whole faith in subject, attribute, or cause and effect (in the form of an assumption that every effect is the result of activity, and that all activity presupposes an agent), and even this last belief is only an isolated case of the first, so that faith remains as the most fundamental belief! there are such things as subjects, everything that happens is related attributively to a subject of some sort.

I notice something, and try to discover the reason of it: originally this was, I look for an _intention_ behind it, and, above all, I look for one who has an intention, for a subject, an agent: every phenomenon is an action, formerly intentions were seen behind _all_ phenomena, this is our oldest habit. Has the animal also this habit? As a living organism, is it not also compelled to interpret things through itself. The question why? is always a question concerning the _causa finalis,_ and the general "purpose" of things. We have no sign of the "sense of the efficient cause"; in this respect Hume is quite right, habit (but not only that of the individual) allows us to expect that a certain process, frequently observed, will follow upon another, but nothing more! That which gives us such an extraordinarily firm faith in causality, is not the rough habit of observing the sequence of processes, but our _inability_ to _interpret_ a phenomenon otherwise than as the result of _design._ It is the _belief in_ living and thinking things, as the only agents of _causation_; it is the belief in will, in design--the belief that all phenomena are actions, and that all actions presuppose an agent; it is the belief in the "subject." Is not this belief in the concepts subject and object an arrant absurdity?

Question: Is the design the cause of a phenomenon? Or is that also illusion? Is it not the phenomenon itself?

551.

A criticism of the concept "cause."--We have absolutely no experience concerning _cause_, viewed psychologically we derive the whole concept from the subjective conviction, that _we_ ourselves are causes--that is to say, that the arm moves.... _But that is an error._ We distinguish ourselves, the agents, from the action, and everywhere we make use of this scheme--we try to discover an agent behind every phenomenon. What have we done? We have _misunderstood_ a feeling of power, tension, resistance, a muscular feeling, which is already the beginning of the action, and posited it as a cause; or we have understood the will to do this or that, as a cause, because the action follows it. There is no such thing as "Cause," in those few cases in which it seemed to be given, and in which we projected it out of ourselves in_ order to understand a phenomenon,_ it has been shown to be an illusion. Our understanding of a phenomenon consisted in our inventing a subject who was responsible for something happening, and for the manner in which it happened. In our concept "cause" we have embraced our feeling of will, our feeling of "freedom," our feeling of responsibility and our design to do an action: _causa efficiens_ and _causa finalis_ are fundamentally one.

We believed that an effect was explained when we could point to a state in which it was inherent. As a matter of fact, we invent all causes according to the scheme of the effect: the latter is known to us.... On the other hand, we are not in a position to say of any particular thing how it will "act." The thing, the subject the will, the design--all inherent in the conception "cause." We try to discover things in order to explain why something has changed. Even the "atom" is one of these fanciful inventions like the "thing" and the "primitive subject."...

At last we understand that things--consequently also atoms--effect nothing: _because they are non-existent;_ and that the concept causality is quite! useless. Out of a necessary sequence of states, the latter's causal relationship does _not_ follow (that would be equivalent to extending their _active principle_ from 1 to 2, to 3, to 4, to 5). _There is no such thing as a cause or an effect._ From the standpoint of language we do not know how to rid ourselves of them. But that does not matter. If I imagine _muscle_ separated from its "effects," I have denied it....

In short: _a phenomenon is neither effected nor capable of effecting. Causa_ is a _faculty to effect something,_ superadded fancifully to what happens....

The interpretation of causality is an illusion.... A "thing" is the sum of its effects, synthetically united by means of a concept, an image. As a matter of fact, science has robbed the concept causality of all meaning, and has reserved it merely as an allegorical formula, which has made it a matter of indifference whether cause or effect be put on this side or on that. It is asserted that in two complex states (centres of force) the quantities of energy remain constant.

The calculability of a phenomenon does not lie in the fact that a rule is observed, or that a necessity is obeyed, or that we have projected a law of causality into every phenomenon: it lies in the _recurrence of "identical cases."_

There is no such thing as a _sense of causality,_ as Kant would have us believe. We are aghast, we feel insecure, we will have something familiar, which can be relied upon.... As soon as we are shown the existence of something old in a new thing, we are

pacified. The so-called instinct of causality is nothing more than the _fear of the unfamiliar_, and the attempt at finding something in it which is already _known._--It is not a search for causes, but for the familiar.

552.

To combat determinism and teleology.--From the fact that something happens regularly, and that its occurrence may be reckoned upon, it does not follow that it happens _necessarily._ If a quantity of force determines and conducts itself in a certain way in every particular case, it does not prove that it has "no free will." "Mechanical necessity" is not an established fact: it was _we_ who first read into the nature of all phenomena. We interpreted the possibility of _formularising_ phenomena as a result of the dominion of necessary law over all existence. But it does not follow, because I do a determined thing, that I am bound to do it. _Compulsion_ cannot be demonstrated in things: all that the rule proves is this, that one and the same phenomenon is not another phenomenon. Owing to the very fact that we fancied the existence of subjects "_agents_" in things, the notion arose that all phenomena are the _consequence_ of a _compulsory force_ exercised over the subject--exercised by whom? once more by an "agent." The concept "Cause and Effect" is a dangerous one, so long as people believe in something that _causes,_ and a something that is _caused._

_(a)_ Necessity is not an established fact, but an interpretation.

***

_(b)_ When it is understood that the "subject" is nothing that _acts,_ but only a thing of fancy, there is much that follows.

Only with the subject as model we invented _thingness_ and read it into the pell-mell of sensations. If we cease from believing in the _acting_ subject, the belief in _acting_ things, in reciprocal action, in cause and effect between phenomena which we call things, also falls to pieces.

In this case the world of _acting atoms_ also disappears: for this world is always assumed to exist on the pre-determined grounds that subjects are necessary.

Ultimately, of course, _the "thing-in-itself"_ also disappears: for at bottom it is the conception of a "subject-in-itself." But we have seen that the subject is an imaginary thing. The antithesis "thing-in-itself" and "appearance" is untenable; but in this way the concept "_appearance_" also disappears.

***

_(c)_ If we abandon the idea of the acting _subject,_ we also abandon the _object_ acted upon. Duration, equality to self, Being, are inherent neither in what is called subject, nor in what is called object: they are complex phenomena, and in regard to other phenomena are apparently durable--they are distinguishable, for instance, by the different tempo with which they happen (repose--movement, fixed --loose: all antitheses which do not exist in themselves and by means of which _differences of degree_ only are expressed; from a certain limited point of view, though, they seem to be antitheses. There are no such things as antitheses; it is from logic that we derive our concept of contrasts--and starting out from its standpoint we spread the error over all things).

***

_(d)_ If we abandon the ideas "subject" and "object"; then we must also abandon the idea _"substance"_--and therefore its various modifications too; for instance: "matter," "spirit," and other hypothetical things, "eternity and the immutability of matter," etc. We are then rid of _materiality._

***

From a moral standpoint _the world is false._ But inasmuch as morality itself is a part of this world, morality also is false. The will to truth is a process of _establishing things_, it is a process of _making_ things true and lasting, a total elimination of that _false_ character, a transvaluation of it into _being._ Thus, "truth" is not something which is present and which has to be found and discovered; it is something _which has to be created_ and which _gives_ its name _to a process,_ or, better still, to the Will to overpower, which in itself has no purpose: to introduce truth is a _processus in infinitum,_ an _active determining_--it is not a process of becoming conscious of something, which in itself is fixed and determined. It is merely a word for "The Will to Power."

Life is based on the hypothesis of a belief in stable and regularly recurring things, the mightier it is, the more vast must be the world of knowledge and the world called being. Logicising, rationalising, and systematising are of assistance as means of existence.

Man projects his instinct of truth, his "aim," to a certain extent beyond himself, in the form of a metaphysical world of Being, a "thing-in-itself," a world already to hand. His requirements as a creator make him _invent_ the world in which he works in advance; he anticipates it: this anticipation (this faith in truth) is his mainstay.

***

All phenomena, movement, Becoming, regarded as the establishment of relations of degree and of force, as a contest....

***

As soon as we _fancy_ that some one is responsible for the fact that we are thus and thus, etc. (God, Nature), and that we ascribe our existence, our happiness, our misery, our _destiny,_ to that some one, we corrupt the _innocence of Becoming_ for ourselves. We then have some one who wishes to attain to something by means of us and with us.

***

The "welfare of the individual" is just as fanciful as the "welfare of the species": the first is _not_ sacrificed to the last; seen from afar, the species is just as fluid as the individual. "The _preservation_ of the species" is only a result of the _growth_ of the species--that is to say, _of the overcoming of the species_ on the road to a stronger kind.

***

Theses:--The apparent conformity of means to end ("the conformity of means to end which far surpasses the art of man) is merely the result of that "_Will to Power_" which manifests itself in all phenomena:--_To become stronger_ involves a process of ordering, which may well be mistaken for an attempted conformity of means to end:--The _ends_ which are apparent are not intended but, as soon as a superior power prevails over an inferior power, and the latter proceeds to work as a function of the former, an order of _rank_ is established, an organisation which must give rise to the idea that there is an arrangement of means and ends.

Against apparent "_necessity_":--

This is only an expression for the fact that a certain power is not also something else.

Against the apparent conformity of means to ends":--

The latter is only an _expression_ for the order among the spheres of power and their interplay.

_(i)_ The Thing-in-Itself and Appearance.

553.

The foul blemish on Kant's criticism has at last become visible even to the coarsest eyes: Kant had no right to his distinction "_appearance_" and "_thing-in-itself,_"--in his own writings he had deprived himself of the right of differentiating any longer in this old and hackneyed manner, seeing that he had condemned the practice of drawing any conclusions concerning the cause of an appearance from the appearance itself, as unallowable in accordance with his conception of the idea of causality and its _purely intraphenomenal_ validity, and this conception, on the other hand, already anticipates that _differentiation,_ as if the "thing in itself" were not only inferred but actually _given._

554.

It is obvious that neither things-in-themselves _nor_ appearances can be related to each other in the form of cause and effect: and from this it follows that the concept "cause and effect" is _not applicable_ in a philosophy which believes in things-in-themselves and in appearances. Kant's mistake--... As a matter of fact, from a psychological standpoint, the concept "cause and effect" is derived from an attitude of mind which believes it sees the action of will upon will everywhere, which believes only in living things, and at bottom only in souls (not in things). Within the mechanical view of the world (which is logic and its application to space and time) that concept is reduced to the mathematical formula with which--and this is a fact which cannot be sufficiently emphasised--nothing is ever understood, but rather _defined_--deformed.

555.

The greatest of all fables is the one relating to knowledge. People would like to know how things-in-themselves are constituted: but behold, there are no things-in-themselves! But even supposing there _were_ an "in-itself," an unconditional thing, it could on that very account _not be known_! Something unconditioned cannot be known: otherwise it would not be unconditioned! Knowing, however, is always a process of "coming into relation with something"; the knowledge-seeker, on this principle, wants the thing, which he would know, to be nothing to him, and to be nothing to anybody at all: and from this there results a contradiction,--in the first place, between this _will_ to know, and this desire that the thing to be known _should_ be nothing to him (wherefore know at all then?); and secondly, because something which is nothing to anybody, does not even _exist,_ and therefore cannot be known. Knowing means: "to place one's self in relation with something," to feel one's self conditioned by something and one's self conditioning it under all circumstances, then, it is a process of _making stable or fixed,_ of _defining,_ of _making conditions conscious_ (not a process of _sounding_ things, creatures, or objects in-themselves).

556.

A "thing-in-itself" is just as absurd as a "sense-in-itself," a "meaning-in-itself." There is no such thing as a "fact-in-itself," _for a meaning must always be given to it before it can become a fact._

The answer to the question, "What is that?" is a process of _fixing a meaning_ from a different standpoint. The "_essence_" the "_essential factor,_" is something which is only seen as a whole in perspective, and which presupposes a basis which is multifarious. Fundamentally the question is "What is that for me?" (for us, for everything that lives, etc. etc.).

A thing would be defined when all creatures had asked and answered this question, "What is that?" concerning it. Supposing that one single creature, with its own relations and standpoint in regard to all things, were lacking, that thing would still remain undefined.

In short: the essence of a thing is really only an _opinion_ concerning that "thing." Or, better still; "_it is worth_" is actually what is meant by _"it is"_ or by "that is."

One may not ask: "_Who_ interprets, then?" for the act of interpreting _itself_ as a form of the Will to Power, manifests itself (not as "Being," but as a _process,_ as _Becoming_) as a passion.

The origin of "things" is wholly the work of the idealising, thinking, willing, and feeling subject. The concept thing as well as all its attributes.--Even "the subject" is a creation of this order, a "thing" like all others: a simplification, aiming at a definition of the _power_ that fixes, invents, and thinks, as such, as distinct from all isolated fixing, inventing, and thinking. Thus a capacity defined or distinct from all other individual capacities; at bottom action conceived collectively in regard to all the action which has yet to come (action and the probability of similar action).

557.

The qualities of a thing are its effects upon other "things."

If one imagines other "things" to be non-existent, a thing has no qualities.

That is to say; _there is nothing without other things._

That is to say; there is no "thing-in-itself."

558.

The thing-in-itself is nonsense. If I think all the "relations," all the "qualities" all the "activities" of a thing, away, the thing itself does _not_ remain: for "thingness" was only _invented fancifully_ by us to meet certain logical needs--that is to say, for the purposes of definition and comprehension (in order to correlate that multitude of relations, qualities, and activities).

559.

"Things which have a nature _in themselves_"--a dogmatic idea, which must be absolutely abandoned.

560.

That things should have a _nature in themselves,_ quite apart from interpretation and subjectivity, _is a perfectly idle hypothesis_: it would presuppose that _interpretation_ and the _act of being subjective_ are not essential, that a thing divorced from all its relations can still be a thing.

Or, the other way round: the apparent _objective_ character of things; might it not be merely the result of a _difference of degree_ within the subject perceiving?--could not that which changes slowly strike us as being objective, lasting, Being, "in-itself"?--could not the objective view be only a false way of conceiving things and a contrast _within_ the perceiving subject?

561.

If all unity were only unity as organisation. But the "thing" in which we believe was _invented_ only as a substratum to the various attributes. If the thing "acts," it means: we regard _all the other_ qualities which are to hand, and which are momentarily latent, as the cause accounting for the fact that one individual quality steps forward--that is to say, _we take the sum of its qualities--x--_as the cause of the quality _x_; which is obviously _quite_ absurd and imbecile!

All unity is _only so_ in the form of _organisation_ and _collective action:_ in the same way as a human community is a unity--that is to say, _the reverse of_ atomic _anarchy_; thus it is a body politic, which _stands for_ one, yet _is_ not one.

562.

"At some time in the development of thought, a point must have been reached when man became conscious of the fact that what he called the _qualities of a thing_ were merely the sensations of the feeling subject: and thus the qualities ceased from belonging to the thing." The "thing-in-itself" remained over. 'The distinction between the thing-in-itself and the thing-for-us, is based upon that older and artless observation which would fain grant energy to things: but analysis revealed that even force was only ascribed to them by our fancy, as was also--substance. "The thing affects a subject?" Thus the root of the idea of substance is in language, not in things outside ourselves! The thing-in-itself is not a problem at all!

Being will have to be conceived as a sensation which is no longer based upon anything quite devoid of sensation.

In movement no new _meaning_ is given to feeling. That which is, cannot be the substance of movement: it is therefore a form of Being.

_N.B._--The explanation of life may be sought, in the first place, through mental images of phenomena which _precede_ it (purposes);

Secondly, through mental images of phenomena which follow behind it (the mathematico-physical explanation).

The two should not be confounded. Thus: the physical explanation, which is the symbolisation of the world by means of feeling and thought, cannot in itself make feeling and thinking originate again and show its derivation: physics must rather construct the world of feeling, consistently _without feeling or purpose _ right up to the highest man. And teleology is only a _history of purposes,_ and is never physical.

563.

Our method of acquiring "knowledge" is limited to a process of establishing _quantities,_ but we can by no means help feeling the difference of quantity as differences of _quality._ Quality is merely a _relative_ truth for _us_; it is not a "thing-in-itself."

Our senses have a certain definite quantum as a mean, within the limits of which they perform their functions--that is to say, we become conscious of bigness and smallness in accordance with the conditions of our existence. If we sharpened or blunted our senses tenfold, we should perish--that is to say, we feel even _proportions_ as _qualities_ in regard to our possibilities of existence.

564.

But could not all _quantities_ be merely tokens of _qualities_? Another consciousness and scale of desires must correspond to greater power in fact, another point of view; growth in itself is the expression of a desire _to become more;_ the desire for a greater _quantum_ springs from a certain _quale,_ in a purely quantitative world, everything would be dead, stiff, and motionless.--The

reduction of all qualities to quantities is nonsense: it is discovered that they can only stand together, an analogy--

565.

Qualities are our insurmountable barriers; we cannot possibly help feeling mere _differences of quantity_ as something fundamentally different from quantity--that is to say, as _qualities,_ which we can no longer reduce to terms of quantity. But everything in regard to which the word "knowledge" has any sense at all, belongs to the realm of reckoning, weighing, and measuring, to quantity whereas, conversely, all our valuations (that is to say, our sensations) belong precisely to the realm of qualities, _i.e._ to those truths which belong to us alone and to our point of view, and which absolutely cannot be "known." It is obvious that every one of us, different creatures, must feel different qualities, and must therefore live in a different world from the rest. Qualities are an idiosyncrasy proper to human nature; the demand that these our human interpretations and values, should be general and perhaps real values, belongs to the hereditary madnesses of human pride.

566.

The "real world," in whatever form it has been conceived hitherto--was always the world of appearance _over again._

567.

The world of appearance, _i.e._ a world regarded in the light of values; ordered, selected according to values--that is to say, in this case, according to the standpoint of utility in regard to the preservation and the increase of power of a certain species of animals.

It is _the point of view,_ then, which accounts for the character of "appearance." As if a world could remain over, when the point of view is cancelled! By such means _relativity_ would also be cancelled!

Every centre of energy has its _point of view_ of the whole of the _remainder_ of the world--that is to say, its perfectly definite _valuation,_ its mode of action, its mode of resistance. The "world of appearance" is thus reduced to a specific kind of action on the world proceeding from a centre.

But there is no other kind of action: and the "world" is only a word for the collective play of these actions. _Reality_ consists precisely in this particular action and reaction of every isolated factor against the whole.

There no longer remains a shadow of a _right_ to speak here of "appearance." ...

The _specific way of reacting_ is the only way of reacting; we do not know how many kinds and what sort of kinds there are.

But there is no "_other,_" no "real," no essential being,--for thus a world _without_ action and reaction would be expressed....

The antithesis: world of appearance and real world, is thus reduced to the antitheses "world" and "nonentity."

568.

A criticism of the concept "_real and apparent_ world."--Of these two the first is a mere fiction, formed out of a host of imaginary things.

Appearance itself belongs to reality: it is a form of its being; _i.e._ in a world where there is no such thing as being, a certain calculable world of _identical_ cases must first be created through _appearance;_ a _tempo_ in which observation and comparison is possible, etc.

"Appearance" is an adjusted and simplified world, in which our _practical_ instincts have worked: for us it is perfectly true: for we _live_ in it, we can live in it: _this is the proof_ of its truth as far as we are concerned....

The world, apart from the fact that we have to live in it--the world, which we have _not_ adjusted to our being, our logic, and our psychological prejudices--does _not_ exist as a world "in-itself"; it is essentially a world of relations: under certain circumstances it has a _different aspect_ from every different point at which it is seen: it presses against every point, and every point resists it--and these collective relations are in every case _incongruent._

The _measure of power_ determines what _being_ possesses the other measure of power: under what form, force, or constraint, it acts or resists.

Our particular case is interesting enough: we have created a conception in order to be able to live in a world, in order to perceive just enough to enable us to _endure_ life in that world....

569.

The nature of our psychological vision is determined by the fact--

(1) That _communication_ is necessary, and that for communication to be possible something must be stable, simplified, and capable of being stated precisely (above all, in the so-called _identical_ case). In order that it may be communicable, it must be felt as something _adjusted,_ as "_recognisable_." The material of the senses, arranged by the understanding, reduced to coarse leading features, made similar to other things, and classified with its like. Thus: the indefiniteness and the chaos of sense-impressions are, as it were, _made logical._

(2) The _phenomenal_ world is the adjusted world which _we believe to be real,_ Its "reality" lies in the constant return of similar, familiar, and related things, in their _rationalised character,_ and in the belief that we are here able to reckon and determine.

(3) The opposite of this phenomenal world is not "the real world," but the amorphous and unadjustable world consisting of the chaos of sensations--that is to say, _another kind_ of phenomenal; world, a world which to us is "unknowable."

(4) The question how things-in-themselves are constituted, quite apart from our sense-receptivity and from the activity of our understanding, must be answered by the further question: how were we able to know _that things existed?_ "Thingness" is one of our own inventions. The question is whether there are not a good many more ways of creating such a world of appearance--and whether this creating, rationalising, adjusting, and falsifying be not the best-guaranteed _reality_ itself: in short, whether that which "fixes the meaning of things" is not the only reality: and whether the "effect of environment upon us" be not merely the result of such will-exercising subjects.... The other "creatures" act upon us; our _adjusted_ world of appearance is an arrangement and an _overpowering_ of its activities: a sort of _defensive_ measure. _The subject alone is demonstrable_; the _hypothesis_ might be advanced _that subjects are all that exist,_--that "object" is only a form of action of subject upon subject ... a _modus of the subject._

_(k)_ The Metaphysical Need.

570.

If one resembles all the philosophers that have gone before, one can have no eyes for what has existed and what will exist--one sees only what _is._ But as there is no such thing as Being; all that the philosophers had to deal with was a host of _fancies,_ this was their "world."

571.

To assert the _existence_ as a whole of things concerning which we know nothing, simply because there is an advantage in not being able to know anything of them, was a piece of artlessness on Kant's part, and the result of the recoil-stroke of certain needs--especially in the realm of morals and metaphysics.

572.

An artist cannot endure reality; he turns away or back from it: his earnest opinion is that the worth of a thing consists in that nebulous residue of it which one derives from colour, form, sound, and thought; he believes that the more subtle, attenuated, and volatile, a thing or a man becomes, _the more valuable he becomes: the less real,_ the greater the worth. This is Platonism: but Plato was guilty of yet further audacity in the matter of turning tables--he measured the degree of reality according to the degree of value, and said: The more there is of "idea" the more there is of Being. He twisted the concept "reality" round and said: "What ye regard as real is an error, and the nearer we get to the 'idea' the nearer we are to 'truth.'"--Is this understood? It was the _greatest of all rechristenings:_ and because Christianity adopted it, we are blind to its astounding features. At bottom, Plato, like the artist he was, _placed appearance before_ Being! and therefore lies and fiction before truth! unreality before actuality!--He was, however, so convinced of the value of appearance, that he granted it the attributes of "Being," "causality," "goodness," and "truth," and, in short, all those things which are associated with value.

The concept value itself regarded as a cause: first standpoint.

The ideal granted all attributes, conferring honour: second standpoint.

573.

The idea of the "true world" or of "God" as absolutely spiritual, intellectual, and good, is an _emergency measure_ to the extent to which the _antagonistic_ instincts are all-powerful....

Moderation and existing humanity is reflected exactly in the humanisation of the gods. The Greeks of the strongest period, who entertained no fear whatever of themselves, but on the contrary were pleased with themselves, brought down their gods to all their emotions.

The spiritualisation of the idea of God is thus very far from being a sign of _progress_: one is heartily conscious of this when one reads Goethe--in his works the vaporisation of God into virtue and spirit is felt as being upon a lower plane.

574.

The nonsense of all metaphysics shown to reside in the derivation of the conditioned out of the unconditioned.

It belongs to the nature of thinking that it adds the unconditioned to the conditioned, that it invents it--just as it thought of and invented the "ego" to cover the multifariousness of its processes i it measures the world according to a host of self-devised measurements--according to its fundamental fictions "the unconditioned," "end and means," "things," "substances," and according to logical laws, figures, and forms.

There would be nothing which could be called knowledge, if thought did not first so _re-create_ the world into "things" which are in its own image. It is only _through_ thought that there is _untruth._

The _origin_ of thought, like that of _feelings,_ cannot be traced: but that is _no_ proof of its primordiality or absoluteness! It simply shows that we cannot get _behind it,_ because we have nothing else save thought and feeling.

575.

To know is to _point to past experience:_ in its nature it is a _regressus in infinitum._ That which halts (in the face of a so-called _causa prima_ or the unconditioned, etc.) is _laziness,_ weariness.

576.

Concerning the psychology of metaphysics--the influence of fear. That which has been most feared, the cause of the _greatest suffering_ (lust of power, voluptuousness, etc.), has been treated with the greatest amount of hostility by men, and eliminated from the "real" world. Thus the _passions_ have been step by step _struck out,_ God posited as the opposite of evil--that is to say, reality is conceived to be the _negation of the passions and the emotions_ (i.e. _nonentity_).

Irrationality, impulsive action, accidental action, is, moreover, hated by them (as the cause of incalculable suffering). _Consequently_ they denied this element in the absolute, and interpreted it as absolute "rationality" and "conformity of means to ends."

Change and _perishability_ were also feared; and by this fear an oppressed soul is revealed, full of distrust and painful experiences (the case with _Spinoza_: a man differently constituted would have regarded this change as a charm).

A nature overflowing and _playing_ with energy, would call precisely the _passions, irrationality_ and _change, good_ in a eudemonistic sense, together with their consequences: danger, contrast, ruin, etc.

577.

Against the value of that which always remains the same (remember Spinoza's artlessness and Descartes' likewise), the value of the shortest and of the most perishable, the seductive flash of gold on the belly of the serpent _vita_----

578.

Moral values in epistemology itself:--

The faith in reason--why not mistrust?

The "real world" is the good world--why?

Appearance, change, contradiction, struggle, regarded as immoral: the desire for a world which _knows nothing_ of these things.

The transcendental world discovered, _so that_ a place may be kept for "moral freedom" (as in Kant).

Dialectics as the road to virtue (in Plato and Socrates: probably because sophistry was held to be the road to immorality).

Time and space are ideal: consequently there is unity in the essence of things; consequently no sin, no evil, no imperfection, a _justification_ of God.

Epicurus _denied_ the possibility of knowledge, in order to keep the moral (particularly the hedonistic) values as the highest.

Augustine does the same, and later Pascal ("corrupted reason"), in favour of Christian values.

Descartes' contempt for everything variable; likewise Spinoza's.

579.

Concerning the psychology of metaphysics.--This world is only apparent: _therefore_ there must be a real world;--this world is conditioned: _consequently_ there must be an unconditioned world;--this world is contradictory: _consequently_ there is a world free from contradiction;--this world is evolving: _consequently_ there is somewhere a static world:--a host of false conclusions (blind faith in reason: if A exists, then its opposite B must also _exist_). Pain _inspires these conclusions_: at bottom they are _withes_ that such a world might exist; the hatred of a world which leads to suffering is likewise revealed by the fact that another and _better_ world is imagined: the _resentment_ of the metaphysician against reality is creative here.

The second series of questions: _wherefore_ suffer? ... and from this a conclusion is derived concerning the relation of the real world to our apparent, changing, suffering, and contradictory world: (1) Suffering as the consequence of error: how is error possible? (2) Suffering as the consequence of guilt: how is guilt possible? (A host of experiences drawn from the sphere of nature or society, universalised and made absolute.) But if the conditioned world be causally determined by the unconditioned, then the _freedom to err, to be sinful,_ must also be derived from the same quarter: and once more the question arises, _to what purpose?_ ... The world of appearance, of Becoming, of contradiction, of suffering, is therefore _willed; to what purpose?_

The error of these conclusions; two contradictory concepts are formed--because one of them corresponds to a reality, the other "_must_" also correspond to a reality. "_Whence_" would one otherwise derive its contradictory concept? _Reason_ is thus a source of revelation concerning the absolute.

But the _origin_ of the above contradictions _need not necessarily_ be a supernatural source of reason: it is sufficient to oppose t_he real genesis_ of the concepts, this springs from practical spheres, from utilitarian spheres, hence the _strong faith_ it commands _(one is threatened with ruin_ if one's conclusions are not in conformity with this reason; but this fact is no "_proof_" of what the latter asserts).

The preoccupation of metaphysicians with pain, is quite artless. "Eternal blessedness": psychological nonsense. Brave and creative men never make pleasure and pain ultimate questions--they are incidental conditions: both of them must be desired when one _will attain to_ something. It is a sign of fatigue and illness in these metaphysicians and religious men, that they should press questions of pleasure and pain into the foreground. Even _morality_ in their eyes derives its great importance _only_ from the fact that it is regarded as an essential condition for abolishing pain.

The same holds good of the preoccupation with appearance and error the cause of pain. A superstition that happiness and truth are related (confusion: happiness in "certainty," in "faith").

580.

To what extent are the various _epistemological positions_ (materialism, sensualism, idealism) consequences of valuations? The source of the highest feelings of pleasure ("feelings of value") may also judge concerning the problem of _reality_!

The measure of _positive knowledge_ is quite a matter of indifference and beside the point; as witness the development of Indici.

The Buddhistic _negation_ of reality in general (appearance pain) is perfectly consistent: undemonstrability, inaccessibility, lack of categories, not only for an "absolute world," but a recognition of the _erroneous procedures_ by means of which the whole concept has been reached. "Absolute reality," "Being in itself," a contradiction. In a world of _Becoming,_ reality is merely a _simplification_ for the purpose of practical ends, or a _deception_ resulting from the coarseness of certain organs, or a variation in the tempo of Becoming.

The logical denial of the world and Nihilism is a consequence of the fact that we must oppose nonentity with Being, and that Becoming is denied. ("_Something_" becomes.)

581.

Being and _Becoming._--"_Reason_" developed upon a sensualistic basis upon the _prejudices of the senses_--that is to say, with the belief in the truth of the judgment of the senses.

"Being," as the generalisation of the concept "_Life_" (breath), "to be animate," "to will," "to act upon," "become."

The opposite is: "to be inanimate," "_not_ to become," "_not_ to will." _Thus_: "Being" is _not_ opposed to "not-Being," to "appearance," nor is it opposed to death (for only that can be dead which can also live).

The "soul," the "ego," posited as _primeval facts;_ and introduced wherever _there is Becoming._

582.

Being--we have no other idea of it than that which we derive from "_living._"--How then can everything "be" dead?

583.

_A._

I see with astonishment that science resigns itself to-day to the fate of being reduced to the world of appearance: we certainly have no organ of knowledge for the real world--be it what it may.

At this point we may well ask: With what organ of knowledge is this contradiction established?...

The fact that a world which is accessible to our organs is also understood to be dependent upon these organs, and the fact that we should understand a world as subjectively conditioned, are _no_ proofs of the actual _possibility_ of an objective world. Who urges us to believe that subjectivity _is_ real or essential?

The absolute is even an absurd concept: an "absolute mode of existence" is nonsense, the concept "being," "thing," is always _relative_ to us.

The trouble is that, owing to the old antithesis "apparent" and "real," the correlative valuations "of little value" and "absolutely valuable" have been spread abroad.

The world of appearance does not strike us as a "valuable" world; appearance is on a lower plane than the highest value. Only a "real" world can be absolutely "valuable"....

Prejudice of prejudices! It is perfectly possible in itself that the real nature of things would be so unfriendly, so opposed to the first conditions of life, that appearance is necessary in order to make life possible.... This is certainly the case in a large number of situations--for instance, marriage.

Our empirical world would thus be conditioned, even in its limits to knowledge, by the instinct of self-preservation, we regard that as good, valuable, and true, which favours the preservation of the species....

_(a)_ We have no categories which allow us to distinguish between a real and an apparent world. (At the most, there could exist a world of appearance, but not _our_ world of appearance.)

_(b)_ Taking the _real_ world for granted, it might still be the _less valuable_ to us; for the quantum of illusion might be of the highest order, owing to its value to us as a preservative measure. (Unless _appearance_ in itself were sufficient to condemn anything?)

_(c)_ That there exists a correlation between the _degrees of value_ and the _degrees of reality_ (so that the highest values also possessed the greatest degree of reality), is a metaphysical postulate which starts out with the hypothesis that we _know_ the order of rank among values; and that this order is a _moral_ one. It is only on this hypothesis that _truth_ is necessary as a definition of all that is of a superior value.

_B._

It is of cardinal importance that the _real world_ should be suppressed. It is the most formidable inspirer of doubts, and depredator of values, concerning the _world which we are_: it was our most dangerous_ attempt_ heretofore on the life of Life.

War against all the hypotheses upon which a real world has been imagined. The notion that _moral values_ are the _highest_ values, belongs to this hypothesis.

The superiority of the moral valuation would be refuted, if it could be shown to be the result of an _immoral_ valuation--a specific case of real immorality: it would thus reduce itself to an _appearance,_ and as an _appearance_ it would cease from having any right to condemn appearance.

_C._

Then the "Will to Truth" would have to be examined psychologically: it is not a moral power, but a form of the Will to Power. This would have to be proved by the fact that it avails itself of every _immoral_ means there is; above all, of the metaphysicians.

At the present moment we are face to face with the necessity of testing the assumption that moral values are the highest values, _Method in research_ is attained only when all _moral prejudices_ have been overcome: it represents a conquest over morality....

584.

The aberrations of philosophy are the outcome of the fact that, instead of recognising in logic and the categories of reason merely a means to the adjustment of the world for utilitarian ends (that is to say, especially, a useful _falsification_), they were taken to be the criterion of truth--particularly of _reality._ The "criterion of truth" was, as a matter of fact, merely the _biological utility of a systematic falsification of this sort, on principle:_ and, since a species of animals knows nothing more important than its own preservation, it was indeed allowable here to speak of "truth." Where the artlessness came in, however, was in taking this anthropocentric idiosyncrasy as the _measure of things,_ as the canon for recognising the "real" and the "unreal": in short, in making a relative thing absolute. And behold, all at once, the world fell into the two halves, "real" and "apparent": and precisely that world which man's reason had arranged for him to live and to settle in, was discredited. Instead of using the forms as mere instruments for making the world manageable and calculable, the mad fancy of philosophers intervened, and saw that in these categories the concept of that world is given which does not correspond to the concept of the world in which man lives.... The means were misunderstood as measures of value, and even used as a condemnation of their original purpose....

The purpose was, to deceive one's self in a useful way: the means thereto was the invention of forms and signs, with the help of which the confusing multifariousness of life could be reduced to a useful and wieldy scheme.

But woe! a _moral category_ was now brought into the game: no creature would deceive itself, no creature may deceive itself--consequently there is only a will to truth. What is "truth"?

The principle of contradiction provided the scheme: the real world to which the way is being sought cannot be in contradiction with itself, cannot change, cannot evolve, has no beginning and no end.

That is the greatest error which has ever been committed, the really fatal error of the world: it was believed that in the forms of reason a criterion of reality had been found--whereas their only purpose was to master reality, by _misunderstanding_ it intelligently....

And behold, the world became false precisely owing to the qualities _which constitute its reality,_ namely, change, evolution, multifariousness, contrast, contradiction, war. And thenceforward the whole fatality was there.

1. How does one get rid of the false and merely apparent world? (it was the real and only one).

2. How does one become one's self as remote as possible from the world of appearance? (the concept of the perfect being as a contrast to the real being; or, more correctly still, as _the contradiction of life_....).

The whole direction of values was towards the _slander of life_; people deliberately confounded ideal dogmatism with knowledge in general: so that the opposing parties also began to reject _science_ with horror.

Thus the road to science was _doubly_ barred: first, by the belief in the real world; and secondly, by the opponents of this belief. Natural science and psychology were (1) condemned in their objects, (2) deprived of their artlessness....

Everything is so absolutely bound and related to everything else in the real world, that to condemn, or to _think away_ anything, means to condemn and think away the whole. The words "this should not be," "this ought not to be," are a farce.... If one imagines the consequences, one would ruin the very source of Life by suppressing everything which is in any sense whatever _dangerous or destructive._ Physiology proves this _much better_!

We see how morality _(a) poisons_ the whole concept of the world, _(b)_ cuts off the way to _science, (c)_ dissipates and undermines all real instincts (by teaching that their root is _immoral_).

We thus perceive a terrible tool of decadence at work, which succeeds in remaining immune, thanks to the holy names and holy attitudes it assumes.

585.

The awful recovery of our _consciousness:_ not of the individual, but of the human species. Let us reflect; let us think backwards; let us follow the narrow and broad highway.

_A._

Man seeks "the truth": a world that does not contradict itself, that does not deceive, that does not change, a _real_ world--a world in which there is no suffering: contradiction, deception, variability---the causes of suffering! He does not doubt that there is such a thing as a world as it ought to be; he would fain find a road to it. (Indian criticism: even the ego is apparent and _not_ real.)

Whence does man derive the concept of _reality_? --Why does he make variability, deception, contradiction, the origin of _suffering;_ why not rather of his happiness? ...

The contempt and hatred of all that perishes, changes, and varies: whence comes this valuation of stability? Obviously, the will to truth is _merely_ the longing for a _stable world._

The senses deceive; reason corrects the errors: _therefore,_ it was concluded, reason is the road to a static state; the most _spiritual_ ideas must be nearest to the "real world."--It is from the senses that the greatest number of misfortunes come they are cheats, deluders, and destroyers.

Happiness can be promised only by Being: change and happiness exclude each other. The loftiest desire is thus to be one with Being. That is the formula for the way to happiness.

In summa: The world as it _ought_ to be exists; this world in which we live is an error--this our world should _not_ exist.

The belief in Being shows itself only as a result: the real primum _mobile_ is the disbelief in Becoming, the mistrust of Becoming, the scorn of all Becoming....

What kind of a man reflects in this way? An unfruitful, _suffering_ kind, a world-weary kind. If we try and fancy what the opposite kind of man would be like, we have a picture of a creature who would not require the belief in Being; he would rather despise it as dead, tedious, and indifferent....

The belief that the world which ought to be, is, really exists, is a belief proper to the unfruitful, _who do not wish to create a world as it should be._ They take it for granted, they seek for means and ways of attaining to it. "The will to truth"--_is the impotence of the will to create._

To recognise that something } Antagonism in is _thus_ or _thus:_ } the degrees of To act so that something will } energy in be _thus_ or _thus:_ } various natures.

The fiction of a world which corresponds to our desires; psychological artifices and interpretations calculated to associate all that we honour and regard as pleasant, with this _real world._

"The will to truth" at this stage is essentially _the art of interpretation:_ to which also belongs that interpretation which still possesses strength.

The same species of men, grown one degree poorer, _no longer possessed of the power_ to interpret and to create fictions, produces the Nihi_lists._ A Nihilist is the man who says of the world as it is, that it ought _not_ to exist, and of the world as it ought to be, that it does not exist. According to this, existence (action, suffering, willing, and feeling) has no sense: the pathos of the "in vain" is the Nihilist's pathos--and as pathos it is moreover an _inconsistency_ on the part of the Nihilist.

He who is not able to introduce his will into things, the man without either will or energy, at least invests them with some meaning, _i.e._ he believes that a will is already in them.

The degree of a man's _will-power_ may be measured from the extent to which he can dispense with the meaning in things, from the extent to which he is able to endure a world without meaning: _because he himself arranges a small portion of it._

The _philosophical objective view of things_ may thus be a sign of poverty both of will and of energy. For energy organises what is closest and next; the "scientists," whose only desire is to _ascertain_ what exists, are such as cannot arrange things _as they ought to be._

The _artists,_ an intermediary species, they at least set up a symbol of what should exist,--they are productive inasmuch as they actually _alter_ and transform; not like the scientists, who leave everything as it is.

The connection between philosophers and the pessimistic religions; the same species of man (_they attribute the highest degree of reality_ to the _things which are valued highest_).

The connection between philosophers and moral men and their evaluations (the _moral_ interpretation of the world as the sense of the world: after the collapse of the religious sense).

The overcoming of philosophers by the annihilation of the world of being: intermediary period of Nihilism; before there is sufficient strength present to transvalue values, and to make the world of becoming, and of appearance, the _only_ world to be deified and called good.

_B._

Nihilism as a normal phenomenon may be a symptom of increasing _strength_ or of increasing _weakness_:--

Partly owing to the fact that the strength _to create_ and _to will_ has grown to such an extent, that it no longer requires this collective interpretation and introduction of a _sense_ ("present duties," state, etc.);

Partly owing to the fact that even the creative power necessary to invent sense, declines, and disappointment becomes the ruling condition. The inability to _believe_ in a sense becomes "unbelief."

What is the meaning of _science_ in regard to both possibilities?

(1) It is a sign of strength and self-control; it shows an _ability_ to dispense with healing, consoling worlds of illusion.

(2) It is also able to undermine, to dissect, to disappoint, and to weaken.

_C._

The belief in truth, the need of holding to something which is believed to be true: psychological reduction apart from the valuations that have existed hitherto. Fear and laziness.

At the same time _unbelief:_ Reduction. In what way does it acquire a _new value,_ if a real world does not exist at all (by this means the capacity of valuing, which hitherto has been _lavished_ upon the world of being, becomes free once more).

586.

The _real_ and the _ "apparent" world._

_A._

The _erroneous concepts_ which proceed from this concept are of three kinds:--

_(a)_ An unknown world:--we are adventurers, we are inquisitive,--that which is known to us makes us weary (the danger of the concept lies in the fact it suggests that "this" world is known to us....);

(b) Another world, where things are different:--something in us draws comparisons, and thereby our calm submission and our silence lose their value--perhaps all will be for the best, we have not hoped in vain.... The world where things are different--who knows?--where we ourselves will be different....

_(c)_ A _real_ world:--that is the most singular blow and attack which we have ever received; so many things have become encrusted in the word "true," that we involuntarily give these to the "real world"; the _real_ world must also be a _truthful_ world, such a one as would not deceive us or make fools of us; to believe in it in this way is to be almost _forced_ to believe (from convention, as is the case among people worthy of confidence).

***

The concept, "the _unknown_ world," suggests that this world is known to us (is tedious);

The concept, "the other world," suggests that this world _might be different,_ it suppresses necessity and fate (it is useless to _submit_ and to _adapt one's self_);

The concept, _the true world,_ suggests that this world is untruthful, deceitful, dishonest, not genuine, and not essential, and _consequently_ not a world calculated to be useful to us (it is unadvisable to become adapted to it; _better_ resist it).

***

Thus we _escape_ from "this" world in three different ways:----

_(a)_ With our _curiosity_--as though the interesting part was somewhere else;

_(b)_ With our _submission_--as though it was not necessary to submit, as though this world was not an ultimate necessity;

_(c)_ With our _sympathy_ and respect--as though this world did not deserve them, as though it was mean and dishonest towards us....

In summa: we have become revolutionaries in three different ways; we have made _x_ our criticism of the "known world."

_B._

The first step to reason: to understand to what extent we have been _seduced,_--for it might be _precisely_ the reverse:

_(a)_ The _unknown_ world could be so constituted as to give us a liking for "this" world--it may be a more stupid and meaner form of existence.

_(b)_ The other world, very far from taking account of our desires which were never realised here, might be part of the mass of things which _this_ world makes possible for us; to learn to know this world would be a means of satisfying us,

_(c)_ The _true_ world: but who actually says that the apparent world must be of less value than the true world? Do not our instincts contradict this judgment? Is not man eternally occupied in creating an imaginative world, because he will have a better world than reality? _In the first place,_ how do we know that _our_ world is _not_ the true world? ... for it might be that the other world is the world of "appearance" (as a matter of fact, the Greeks, for instance, actually imagined a _region of shadows, a life of appearance,_ beside _real_ existence). And finally, what right have we to establish _degrees of reality,_ as it were? That is something different from an unknown world--that is already the _will to know something of the unknown._ The "other," the "unknown" world--good! but to speak of the "true world" is as good as "_knowing_ something about it,"--that is the _contrary_ of the

assumption of an _x_-world....

In short, the world _x_ might be in every way a more tedious, a more inhuman, and a less dignified world than this one.

It would be quite another matter if it were assumed that there were several _x_-worlds--that is to say, every possible kind of world besides our own. But this has _never been assumed...._

_C._

Problem: why has the _image of the other world_ always been to the disadvantage of "this" one--that is to say, always stood as a criticism of it; what does this point to?--

A people that are proud of themselves, and who are on the ascending path of Life, always; picture _another_ existence as lower and less valuable than theirs; they regard the strange unknown world as their enemy, as their opposite; they feel no curiosity, but rather repugnance in regard to what is strange to them.... Such a body of men would never admit that another people were the "true people"....

The very fact that such a distinction is possible,--that this world should be called the world of appearance, and that the other should be called the true world,--is symptomatic.

The places of origin of the idea, of "another world":

The philosopher who invents a rational world where _reason_ and logical functions are adequate:--this is the root of the "true" world.

The religious man who invents a "divine world";--this is the root of the "denaturalised" and the "anti-natural" world.

The moral man who invents a "free world":--this is the root of the good, the perfect, the just, and the holy world.

The _common factor_ in the three places of origin: _psychological_ error, physiological confusion.

With what attributes is the "other world," as it actually appears in history, characterised? With the stigmata of philosophical, religious, and moral prejudices.

The "other world" as it appears in the light of these facts, is _synonymous_ with _not-Being,_ with not-living, with the _will_ not to live....

General aspect: it was the instinct of the _fatigue of living,_ and not that of life, which created the "other world."

Result: philosophy, religion, and morality are _symptoms of decadence._

_(l)_ The Biological Value of Knowledge.

587.

It might seem as though I had evaded the question concerning "certainty". The reverse is true: but while raising the question of the criterion of certainty, I wished to discover the weights and measures with which men had weighed heretofore--and to show that the question concerning certainty is already in itself a _dependent_ question, a question of the second rank.

588.

The question of values is more _fundamental_ than the question of certainty: the latter only becomes serious once the question of values has been answered.

Being and appearance, regarded psychologically, yield no "Being in itself," no criterion for reality, but only degrees of appearance, measured according to the strength of the sympathy which we feel for appearance.

There is no struggle for existence between ideas and observations, but only a struggle for supremacy--the vanquished idea is _not annihilated,_ but only _driven to the background_ or _subordinated. There is no such thing as annihilation in intellectual spheres._

589.

"End and means" "Cause and effect" "Subject and object" "Action and suffering" "Thing-in-itself and appearance"

As interpretations (_not_ as established facts)--and in what respect were they perhaps necessary interpretations? (as "preservative measures")--all in the sense of a Will to Power.

590.

Our values are _interpreted into the heart_ of things.

Is there, then, any _sense_ in the absolute?

Is not sense necessarily _relative-sense_ and perspective?

All sense is Will to Power (all relative senses may be identified with it).

591.

The desire for "established facts"--Epistemology: how much pessimism there is in it!

592.

The antagonism between the "true world," as pessimism depicts it, and a world in which it were possible to live--for this the rights of _truth_ must be tested. It is necessary to measure all these "ideal forces" according to the standard of life, in order to understand the nature of that antagonism: the struggle of sickly, desperate life, cleaving to a beyond, against healthier, more foolish, more false, richer, and fresher life. Thus it is not "truth" struggling with Life, but _one_ kind of Life with another kind.--But the former would fain be the _higher_ kind!--Here we must prove that some order of rank is necessary,--that the first problem is _the order of rank among kinds of Life._

593.

The belief, "It is _thus_ and _thus,_" must be altered into the will, "Thus and thus _shall it be._"

_(m)_ Science.

594.

Science hitherto has been a means of disposing of the confusion of things by hypotheses which "explain everything"--that is to say, it has been the result of the intellect's repugnance to chaos. This same repugnance takes hold of me when I contemplate _myself;_ I should like to form some kind of representation of my inner world for myself by means of a _scheme,_ and thus overcome intellectual confusion. Morality was a simplification of this sort: it taught man as _recognised,_ as _known,_--Now we have annihilated morality--we have once more grown _completely obscure_ to ourselves! I know that I know nothing _about myself. Physics_ shows itself to be a _boon_ for the mind: science (as the road to _knowledge_) acquires a new charm after morality has been laid aside--and _owing to the fact_ that we find consistency here alone, we must _order_ our lives in accordance with it so that it may help us to _preserve it. _ This results in a sort of _practical meditation_ concerning the _conditions of our existence_ as investigators.

595.

Our first principles: no God: no purpose: limited energy. We will take good care to _avoid_ thinking out and prescribing the necessary lines of thought for the lower orders.

596.

No "_moral_ education" of humanity: but the _disciplinary school of scientific errors_ is necessary, because truth disgusts and creates a dislike of life, provided a man is not already irrevocably launched upon his _way,_ and bears the consequences of his honest standpoint with tragic pride.

597.

The first principle of _scientific work:_ faith in the union and continuance of scientific work, so that the individual may undertake to work at any point, however small, and feel sure that his efforts _will not be in vain._

There is a great paralysing force: to work _in vain,_ to struggle _in vain._

***

The periods of _hoarding,_ when energy and power are stored, to be utilised later by subsequent periods: _Science_ as a _half-way house,_ at which the mediocre, more multifarious, and more complicated beings find their most natural gratification and means of expression: all those who do well to avoid _action._

598.

A. philosopher recuperates his strength in a way quite his own, and with other means: he does it, for instance, with Nihilism. The belief _that there is no such thing as truth,_ the Nihilistic belief, is a tremendous relaxation for one who, as a warrior of knowledge, is unremittingly struggling with a host of hateful truths. For truth is ugly.

599.

The "purposelessness of all phenomena": the belief in this is the result of the view that all interpretations hitherto have been false, it is a generalisation on the part of discouragement and weakness--it is not a necessary belief.

The arrogance of man: when he sees no purpose, he _denies_ that there can be one!

600.

The unlimited ways of interpreting the world: every interpretation is a symptom of growth or decline.

Unity (monism) is a need of inertia; Plurality in interpretation is a sign of strength. One should not _desire to deprive_ the world of its disquieting and enigmatical nature.

601.

Against the desire for reconciliation and peaceableness. To this also belongs every attempt on the part of monism.

602.

This relative world, this world for the eye, the touch, and the ear, is very false, even when adjusted to a much more sensitive sensual apparatus. But its comprehensibility, its clearness, its practicability, its beauty, will begin to _near their end_ if we _refine_ our senses, just as beauty ceases to exist when the processes of its history are reflected upon: the arrangement of the _end_ is in itself an illusion. Let it suffice, that the more coarsely and more superficially it is understood, the _more valuable,_ the more definite, the more beautiful and important the world then seems. The more deeply one looks into it, the further our valuation retreats from our view,-_senselessness approaches!_ We have created the world that has any value! Knowing this, we also perceive that the veneration of truth is already the _result of illusion_--and that it is much more necessary to esteem the formative, simplifying, moulding, and romancing power.

"All is false--everything is allowed!"

Only as the result of a certain bluntness of vision and the desire for simplicity does the beautiful and the "valuable" make its appearance: in itself it is purely fanciful.

603.

We know that the destruction of an illusion does not necessarily produce a truth, but only one more piece of _ignorance;_ it is the extension of our "empty space," an increase in our "waste."

604.

Of what alone can _knowledge_ consist?--"Interpretation," the introduction of a sense into things, _not_ "explanation" (in the majority of cases a new interpretation of an old interpretation which has grown incomprehensible and little more than a mere sign). There is no such thing as an established fact, everything fluctuates, everything, is intangible, yielding; after all, the most lasting of all things are our opinions.

605.

The ascertaining of "truth" and "untruth," the ascertaining of facts in general, is fundamentally different from the creative _placing,_ forming, moulding, subduing, and _willing_ which lies at the root of _philosophy. To give a sense to things_--this duty always remains _over,_ provided _no sense already lies in them._ The same holds good of sounds, and also of the fate of nations they are susceptible of the most varied interpretations and turns, _for different purposes._

A higher duty is to _fix a goal_ and to mould facts according to it: _that is,_ the _interpretation of action,_ and not merely a _transvaluation_ of concepts.

606.

Man ultimately finds nothing more in things than he himself has laid in them--this process of finding again is science, the actual process of laying a meaning in things, is art, religion, love, pride. In both, even if they are child's play, one should show good courage and one should plough ahead; on the one hand, to find again, on the other,--we are the other,--to lay a sense in things.

607.

Science: its two sides:--

In regard to the individual;

In regard to the complex of culture ("levels of culture")

--antagonistic valuation in regard to this and that side.

608.

The development of science tends ever more to transform the known into the unknown: its aim, however, is to do the _reverse,_ and it starts out with the instinct of tracing the unknown to the known.

In short, science is laying the road to _sovereign ignorance,_ to a feeling that "knowledge" does not exist at all, that it was merely a form of haughtiness to dream of such a thing; further, that we have not preserved the smallest notion which would allow us to class knowledge even as a _possibility_ that "knowledge" is a contradictory idea. We _transfer_ a primeval myth and piece of human vanity into the land of hard facts: we can _allow_ a thing-in-itself as a concept, just as little as we can _allow_ "knowledge-in-itself." The _misleading_ influence of "numbers and logic," the misleading influence of "laws."

Wisdom is an attempt to _overcome_ the perspective valuations (_i.e._ the "will to power"): it is a principle which is both unfriendly to Life, and also decadent; a symptom in the case of the Indians, etc.; _weakness_ of the power of appropriation.

609.

It does not suffice for you to see in what ignorance man and beast now live; you must also have and learn the _desire_ for _ignorance._ It is necessary that you should know that without this form of ignorance life itself would be impossible, that it is merely a vital condition under which, alone, a living organism can preserve itself and prosper: a great solid belt of ignorance must stand about you.

610.

Science--the transformation of Nature into concepts for the purpose of governing Nature--that is part of the rubric _means._

But the _purpose_ and _will_ of mankind must grow in the same way, the intention in regard to the whole.

611.

Thought is the strongest and most persistently exercised function in all stages of life--and also in every act of perception or apparent experience! Obviously it soon becomes the _mightiest_ and _most exacting_ of all functions, and in time tyrannises over other powers. Ultimately it becomes "passion in itself."

612.

The right to great passion must be reclaimed for the investigator, after self-effacement and the cult of "objectivity" have created a false order of rank in this sphere. Error reached its zenith when Schopenhauer taught: _in the release from passion and_ in will alone lay the road to "truth," to knowledge; the intellect freed from will _could not help_ seeing the true and actual essence of things. The same error in art: as if everything became _beautiful_ the moment it was regarded without will.

613.

The contest for supremacy among the passions, and the dominion of one of the passions over the intellect.

614.

To "humanise" the world means to feel ourselves ever more and more masters upon earth.

615.

Knowledge, among a higher class of beings, will also take new forms which are not yet necessary.

616.

That the _worth of the world_ lies in our interpretations (that perhaps yet other interpretations are possible somewhere, besides mankind's); that the interpretations made hitherto were perspective valuations, by means of which we were able to survive in life, _i.e._ in the Will to Power and in the growth of power; that every _elevation of man_ involves the overcoming of narrower interpretations; that every higher degree of strength or power attained, brings new views in its train, and teaches a belief in new horizons--these doctrines lie scattered through all my works. The world that _concerns us at all_ is false--that is to say, is not a fact; but a romance, a piece of human sculpture, made from a meagre sum of observation; it is "in flux"; it is something that evolves, a great revolving lie continually moving onwards and never getting any nearer to truth--for there is no such thing as "truth."

617.

Recapitulation:--

To _stamp_ Becoming with the character of Being--this is the highest _Will to Power._

The twofold falsification, by the senses on the one hand, by the intellect on the other, with the view of maintaining a world of being, of rest, of equivalent cases, etc.

That _everything recurs,_ is the very nearest _approach of a world of Becoming to a world of Being, the height of contemplation._

It is out of the values which have been attributed to Being, that the condemnation of, and dissatisfaction with, Becoming, have sprung: once such a world of Being had been invented.

The metamorphoses of Being (body, God, ideas, natural laws, formulæ, etc.).

"Being" as appearance the twisting round of values: appearance was that which _conferred the values._

Knowledge in itself in a world of Becoming is impossible; how can knowledge be possible at all, then? Only as a mistaking of one's self, as will to power, as will to deception.

Becoming is inventing, willing, self-denying, self-overcoming; no subject but an action, it places things, it is creative, no "causes and effects."

Art is the will to overcome Becoming, it is a process of eternalising, but short-sighted, always according to the perspective, repeating, as it were in a small way, the tendency of the whole.

That which _all life_ shows, is to be regarded as a reduced formula for the collective tendency: hence the new definition of the concept "Life" as "will to power."

Instead of "cause and effect," the struggle of evolving factors with one another, frequently with the result that the opponent is absorbed; no constant number for Becoming.

The uselessness of old ideals for the interpretation of all that takes place, once their bestial origin and utility have been recognised, they are, moreover, all hostile to life.

The uselessness of the mechanical theory--it gives the impression that there _can be no purpose._

All the _idealism_ of mankind, hitherto, is on the point of turning into _Nihilism_--may be shown to be a belief in absolute _worth_lessness, _i.e. purpose_lessness.

The annihilation of ideals, the new desert waste the new arts which will help us to endure it--_amphibia_ that we are!

First principles, bravery, patience, no "stepping-back," not too much ardour to get to the fore. (_N.B._--Zarathustra constantly maintaining an attitude of parody towards all former values, as the result of his overflowing energy.)

II.

THE WILL TO POWER IN NATURE.

1. The Mechanical Interpretation of the World.

618.

Of all the interpretations of the world attempted heretofore, the _mechanical_ one seems to-day to stand most prominently in the front. Apparently it has a clean conscience on its side; for no science believes inwardly in progress and success unless it be with the help of mechanical procedures. Every one knows these procedures: "reason" and "purpose" are allowed to remain out of consideration as far as possible; it is shown that, provided a sufficient amount of time be allowed to elapse, everything can evolve out of everything else, and no one attempts to suppress his malicious satisfaction, when the "apparent design in the fate" of a plant or of the yolk of an egg, may be traced to stress and thrust in short, people are heartily glad to pay respect to this principle of profoundest stupidity, if I may be allowed to pass a playful remark concerning these serious matters. Meanwhile, among the most select intellects to be found in this movement, some presentiment of evil, some anxiety is noticeable, as if the theory had a rent in it, which sooner or later might be its last: I mean the sort of rent which denotes the end of all balloons inflated with such theories.

Stress and thrust themselves cannot be "explained," one cannot get rid of the _actio in distans._ The belief even in the ability to explain is now lost, and people peevishly admit that one can only describe, not explain that the dynamic interpretation of the world, with its denial of "empty space" and its little agglomerations of atoms, will soon get the better of physicists: although in this way _Dynamis_ is certainly granted an inner quality.

619.

The triumphant concept "_energy_" with which our physicists created God and the world, needs yet to be completed: it must be given an inner will which I characterise as the "_Will to Power_"--that is to say, as an insatiable desire to manifest power; or the application and exercise of power as a creative instinct, etc. Physicists cannot get rid of the "_actio in distans_" in their principles; any more than they can a repelling force (or an attracting one). There is no help for it, all movements, all "appearances," all "laws" must be understood as _symptoms_ of an _inner_ phenomenon, and the analogy of man must be used for this purpose. It is possible to trace all the instincts of an animal to the will to power; as also all the functions of organic life to this one source.

620.

Has anybody ever been able to testify to a _force!_ No, but to _effects,_ translated into a completely strange language. Regularity in sequence has so spoilt us, _that we no longer wonder at the wonderful process._

621.

A force of which we cannot form any idea, is an empty word, and ought to have no civic rights in the city of science: and the same applies to the purely mechanical powers of attracting and repelling by means of which we can form an image of the world--no more!

622.

Squeezes and kicks are something incalculably recent, evolved and not primeval. They presuppose something which holds together and _can_ press and strike! But how could it hold together?

623.

There is nothing _unalterable_ in chemistry: this is only appearance, a mere school prejudice. We it was who _introduced_ the unalterable, taking it from metaphysics as usual, Mr. Chemist. It is a mere superficial judgment to declare that the diamond, graphite, and carbon are identical. Why? Simply because no loss of substance can be traced in the scales! Well then, at least they have something in common; but the work of the molecules in the process of changing from one form to the other, an action we can neither see nor weigh, is just exactly what makes one material something different--with specifically different qualities.

624.

Against the physical _atom._--In order to understand the world, we must be able to reckon it up; in order to be able to reckon it up, we must be aware of constant causes; but since we find no such constant causes in reality, we _invent_ them for ourselves and call them atoms. This is the origin of the atomic theory.

The possibility of calculating the world, the possibility of expressing all phenomena by means of formulæ--is that really "understanding"? What would be understood of a piece of music, if all that were calculable in it and capable of being expressed in formulas, were reckoned up?--Thus "constant causes", things, substances, something "unconditioned," were therefore _invented_;--what has been attained thereby?

625.

The mechanical concept of "movement" is already a translation of the original process into the _language of symbols of the eye and the touch._

The concept _atom,_ the distinction between the "seat of a motive force and the force itself," is a _language of symbols derived from our logical and physical world._

It does not lie within our power to alter our means of expression: it is possible to understand to what extend they are but symptomatic. To demand an _adequate means of expression is nonsense_: it lies at the heart of a language, of a medium of communication, to express _relation_ only.... The concept "truth" is _opposed to good sense._ The whole province of truth--_falseness_ only applies to the relations between beings, not to an "absolute." There is no such thing as a "being in itself" (_relations_ in the first place constitute being), any more than there can be "knowledge in itself."

626.

"_The feeling of force_ cannot proceed from movement: feeling in general cannot proceed from movement."

"Even in support of this, an apparent experience is the only evidence: in a substance (brain) feeling is generated through transmitted motion (stimuli). But generated? Would this show that the feeling did _not_ yet exist there _at all_? so that its appearance would _have_ to be regarded as the _creative act_ of the intermediary--motion? The feelingless condition of this substance is only an hypothesis! not an experience! Feeling, therefore is the _quality_ of the substance: there actually are substances that feel."

"Do we learn from certain substances that they have _no_ feeling? No, we merely cannot tell that they have any. It is impossible to seek the origin of feeling in non-sensitive substance."--_Oh what hastiness!_

627.

"To attract" and "to repel", in a purely mechanical sense, is pure fiction: a word. We cannot imagine an attraction without a _purpose.--_ Either the will to possess one's self of a thing, or the will to defend one's self from a thing or to repel it--_that_ we

"understand"; that would be an interpretation which we could use.

In short, the psychological necessity of believing in causality lies in the _impossibility of imagining a process without a purpose_: but of course this says nothing concerning truth or untruth (the justification of such a belief)! The belief in _causæ_ collapses with the belief in τ■λει (against Spinoza and his causationism).

628.

It is an illusion to suppose that something is _known,_ when all we have is a mathematical formula of what has happened; it is only _characterised, described;_ no more!

629.

If I bring a regularly recurring phenomenon into a formula, I have facilitated and shortened my task of characterising the whole phenomenon, etc. But I have not thereby ascertained a "law," I have only replied to the question: How is it that something recurs here? It is a supposition that the formula corresponds to a complex of really unknown forces and the discharge of forces; it is pure mythology to suppose that forces here obey a law, so that, as the result of their obedience, we have the same phenomenon every time.

630.

I take good care not to speak of chemical "_laws_": to do so savours of morality. It is much more a question of establishing certain relations of power: the stronger becomes master of the weaker, in so far as the latter cannot maintain its degree of independence,--here there is no pity, no quarter, and, still less, any observance of "law."

631.

The unalterable sequence of certain phenomena does not prove any "law," but a relation of power between two or more forces. To say, "But it is precisely this relation that remains the same!" is no better than saying, "One and the same force cannot be another force."--It is not a matter of _sequence,_ but a matter of _interdependence,_ a process in which the procession of moments do _not_ determine each other after the manner of cause and effect....

The separation of the "action" from the "agent"; of the phenomenon from the _worker_ of that phenomenon: of the process from one that is not process, but lasting, _substance,_ thing, body, soul, etc.; the attempt to understand a life as a sort of shifting of things and a changing of places; of a sort of "being" or stable entity: this ancient mythology established the belief in "cause and effect," once it had found a lasting form in the functions of speech and grammar.

632.

The "regularity" of a sequence is only a metaphorical expression, not a fact, just _as if_ a rule were followed here! And the same holds good of "conformity to law." We find a formula in order to express an ever-recurring kind of succession of phenomena: but that does not show that we have _discovered a law_; much less a force which is the cause of a recurrence of effects. The fact that something always happens thus or thus, is interpreted here as if a creature always acted thus or thus as the result of obedience to a law or to a lawgiver: whereas apart from the "law" it would be free to act differently. But precisely that inability to act otherwise might originate in the creature itself, it might be that it did not act thus or thus in response to a law, but simply because it was so constituted. It would mean simply: that something cannot also be something else; that it cannot be first this, and then something quite different; that it is neither free nor the reverse, but merely thus or thus. _The fault lies in thinking a subject into things._

633.

To speak of two consecutive states, the first as "cause," and the second as "effect," is false. The first state cannot bring about anything, the second has nothing effected in it.

It is a question of a struggle between two elements unequal in power: a new adjustment is arrived at, according to the measure of power each possesses. The second state is something fundamentally different from the first (it is not its effect): the essential thing Is, that the factors which engage in the struggle leave it with different quanta of power.

634.

A. criticism of Materialism.--Let us dismiss the two popular concepts, Necessity and Law, from this idea: the first introduces a false constraint, the second a false liberty into the world. "Things" do not act regularly, they follow no _rule:_ there are no things (that is our fiction); neither do they act in accordance with any necessity. There is no obedience here: for, the fact that _something is_ as it is, strong or weak, is not the result of obedience or of a rule or of a constraint....

The degree of resistance and the degree of superior power--this is the question around which all phenomena turn: if we, for our own purposes and calculations, know how to express this in formulas and "laws," all the better for us! But that does not mean that we have introduced any "morality" into the world, just because we have fancied it as obedient.

There are no laws: every power draws its last consequence at every moment. Things are calculable precisely owing to the fact that there is no possibility of their being otherwise than they are.

A quantum of power is characterised by the effect it produces and the influence it resists. The adiaphoric state which would be thinkable in itself, is entirely lacking. It is essentially a will to violence and a will to defend one's self against violence. It is not self-preservation: every atom exercises its influence over the whole of existence--it is thought out of existence if one thinks this radiation of will-power away. That is why I call it a quantum of "_Will to Power_"; with this formula one can express the character which cannot be abstracted in thought from mechanical order, without suppressing the latter itself in thought.

The translation of the world of effect into a _visible_ world--a world for the eye--is the concept "movement." Here it is always understood that _something_ has been moved,--whether it be the fiction of an atomic globule or even of the abstraction of the latter, the dynamic atom, something is always imagined that has an effect--that is to say, we have not yet rid ourselves of the habit into which our senses and speech inveigled us. Subject and object, an agent to the action, the action and that which does it separated: we must not forget that all this signifies no more than semeiotics and--nothing real. Mechanics as a teaching of _movement_ is already a translation of phenomena into man's language of the senses.

635.

We are in need of "unities" in order to be able to reckon: but this is no reason for supposing that "unities" actually _exist._ We borrowed the concept "unity" from our concept "ego,"--our very oldest article of faith. If we did not believe ourselves to be unities we should never have formed the concept "thing." Now--that is to say, somewhat late in the day, we are overwhelmingly convinced that our conception of the concept "ego" is no security whatever for a real entity. In order to maintain the mechanical interpretation of the world theoretically, we must always make the reserve that it is with fictions that we do so: the concept of _movement_ (derived from the language of our senses) and the concept of the _atom_ (= entity, derived from our psychical experience) are based upon a _sense-prejudice_ and a _psychological prejudice._

Mechanics formulates consecutive phenomena, and it does so semeiologically, in the terms of the senses and of the mind (that all influence is _movement_; that where there is movement something is at work moving): it does not touch the question of the causal force.

The _mechanical_ world is imagined as the eye and the sense of touch alone could imagine a world (as "moved"),--in such a way as to be calculable,--as to simulate causal entities "things" (atoms) whose effect is constant (the transfer of the false concept of subject to the concept atom).

The mixing together of the concept of numbers, of the concept of thing (the idea of subject), of the concept of activity (the separation of that which is the cause, and the effect), of the concept of movement: all these things are phenomenal; our eye and our _psychology_ are still in it all.

If we eliminate these adjuncts, nothing remains over but dynamic quanta, in a relation of tension to all other dynamic quanta: the essence of which resides in their relation to all other quanta, in their "influence" upon the latter. The will to power, not Being, not Becoming, but a _pathos_--is the elementary fact, from these first results a Becoming, an influencing....

636.

The physicists believe in a "true world" after their own kind; a fixed _systematising of atoms_ to perform necessary movements, and holding good equally of all creatures, so that, according to them, the "world of appearance" reduces itself to the side of general

and generally-needed Being, which is accessible to every one according to his kind (accessible and also adjusted,--made "subjective"). But here they are in error. The atom which they postulate is arrived at by the logic of that perspective of consciousness; it is in itself therefore a subjective fiction. This picture of the world which they project is in no way essentially different from the subjective picture: the only difference is, that it is composed simply with more extended senses, but certainly with _our_ senses.... And in the end, without knowing it, they left something out of the constellation: precisely the necessary _perspective factor,_ by means of which every centre of power--and not man alone--constructs the rest of the world _from its point of view_--that is to say, measures it, feels it, and moulds it according to its degree of strength.... They forgot to reckon with this perspective-fixing power, in "true being,"--or, in school-terms, subject-being. They suppose that this was "evolved" and added;--but even the chemical investigator needs it: it is indeed _specific Being,_ which determines action and reaction according to circumstances.

Perspectivity is only a complex form, of specificness. My idea is that every specific body strives to become master of all space, and to extend its power (its will to power), and to thrust back everything that resists it. But inasmuch as it is continually meeting the same endeavours on the part of other bodies, it concludes by coming to terms with those (by "combining" with those) which are sufficiently related to it--_and thus they conspire together for power._ And the process continues.

637.

Even in the inorganic world all that concerns an atom of energy is its immediate neighbourhood: distant forces balance each other. Here is the root of _perspectivity,_ and it explains why a living organism is "egoistic" to the core.

638.

Granting that the world disposed of a quantum of force, it is obvious that any transposition of force to any place would affect the whole system--thus, besides the causality of _sequence,_ there would also be a dependence, _contiguity,_ and _coincidence._

639.

The only possible way of upholding the sense of the concept "God" would be: to make _Him not_ the motive force, but the condition of _maximum power,_ an _epoch;_ a point in the further development of the _Will to Power;_ by means of which subsequent evolution just as much as former evolution--up to Him--could be explained.

Viewed mechanically, the energy of collective Becoming remains constant; regarded from the economical standpoint, it ascends to its zenith and then recedes therefrom in order to remain eternally rotatory. This "_Will to Power_" expresses itself in the _interpretation in the manner in which the strength is used._--The conversion of energy into life; "life in its highest power" thenceforward appears as the goal. The same amount of energy, at different stages of development, means different things.

That which determines growth in Life is the economy which becomes ever more sparing and methodical, which achieves ever more and more with a steadily decreasing amount of energy.... The ideal is the principle of the least possible expense....

The only thing _that is proved_ is that the world is _not_ striving towards a state of stability. Consequently its zenith must not be conceived as a state of absolute equilibrium....

The dire necessity of the same things happening in the course of the world, as in all other things, is not an eternal determinism reigning over all phenomena, but merely the expression of the fact that the impossible is not possible; that a given force cannot be different from that given force; that a given quantity of resisting force does not manifest itself otherwise than in conformity with its degree of strength;--to speak of events as being necessary is tautological.

2. The Will to Power as Life.

(a) The Organic Process.

640.

Man imagines that he was present at the generation of the organic world: what was there to be observed, with the eyes and the touch, in regard to these processes? How much of it can be put into round numbers? What rules are noticeable in the movements? Thus, man would fain arrange all phenomena as if they were _for the eye and for the touch,_ as if they were forms of motion: he will

discover _formules_ wherewith to _simplify_ the unwieldy mass of these experiences.

The reduction of all phenomena to the level of men with senses and with mathematics. It is a matter of making _an inventory of human experiences:_ granting that man, or rather the _human eye and the ability to form concepts,_ have been the eternal witnesses of all things.

641.

A plurality of forces bound by a common nutritive process we call "Life." To this nutritive process all so-called feeling, thinking, and imagining belong as means--that is to say, (1) in the form of opposing other forces; (2) in the form of an adjustment of other forces according to mould and rhythm; (3) the form of a valuation relative to assimilation and excretion.

642.

The bond between the inorganic and the organic world must lie in the repelling power exercised by every atom of energy. "Life" might be defined as a lasting form of _force-establishing processes,_ in which the various contending forces, on their part, grow unequally. To what extent does counter-strife exist even in obedience? Individual power is by no means surrendered through it. In the same way, there exists in the act of commanding, an acknowledgment of the fact that the absolute power of the adversary has not been overcome, absorbed, or dissipated. "Obedience," and "command," are forms of the game of war.

643.

The Will to Power _interprets_ (an organ in the process of formation has to be interpreted): it defines, it determines gradations, differences of power. Mere differences of power could not be aware of each other as such: something must be there which _will_ grow, and which interprets all other things that would do the same, according to the value of the latter. In sooth, all interpretation is but a means in itself to become master of something. (Continual _interpretation_ is the first principle of the organic process.)

644.

Greater complexity, sharp differentiation, the contiguity of the developed organs and functions, with the disappearance of intermediate members--if _that_ is _perfection,_ then there is a Will to Power apparent in the organic process by means of whose _dominating, shaping,_ and _commanding_ forces it is continually increasing the sphere of its power, and persistently simplifying things within that sphere, it _grows_ imperatively.

"Spirit" is only a means and an instrument in the service of higher life, in the service of the elevation of life.

645.

"_Heredity,_" as something quite incomprehensible, cannot be used as an explanation, but only as a designation for the identification of a problem. And the same holds good of "_adaptability._" As a matter of fact, the account of morphology, even supposing it were perfect, _explains_ nothing, it merely describes an enormous fact. _How_ a given organ gets to be used for any particular purpose is not explained. There is just as little explained in regard to these things by the assumption of _causæ finales_ as by the assumption of _causæ efficientes._ The concept "causa" is only a means of expression, no _more_; a means of designating a thing.

646.

They are analogies; for instance, our _memory_ may suggest another kind of memory which makes itself felt in heredity, development, and forms. Our _inventive_ and experimentative powers suggest another kind of inventiveness in the application of instruments to new ends, etc.

That which we call our "_consciousness_" is quite guiltless of any of the essential processes of our preservation and growth; and no human brain could be so subtle as to construct anything more than a machine--to which every organic process is infinitely superior.

647.

Against Darwinism.--The use of an organ does _not_ explain its origin, on the contrary! During the greater part of the time occupied in the formation of a certain quality, this quality does not help to preserve the individual; it is of no use to him, and particularly not in his struggle with external circumstances and foes.

What is ultimately "useful"? It is necessary to ask, "Useful for what"?

For instance, that which promotes the _lasting powers_ of the individual might be unfavourable to his strength or his beauty; that which preserves him might at the same time fix him and keep him stable throughout development. On the other hand, a _deficiency,_ a state of _degeneration,_ may be of the greatest possible use, inasmuch as it acts as a stimulus to other organs. In the same way, a _state of need_ may be a condition of existence, inasmuch as it reduces an individual to that modicum of means which, though it _keeps him together,_ does not allow him to squander his strength.--The individual himself is the struggle of parts (for nourishment, space, etc.): his development involves the _triumph,_ the _predominance,_ of isolated parts; the _wasting away,_ or the "development into organs," of other parts.

The influence of "environment" is nonsensically _overrated_ in Darwin, the essential factor in the process of life is precisely the tremendous inner power to shape and to create forms, which merely _uses, exploits_ "environment."

The new forms built up by this inner power are not produced with a view to any end; but, in the struggle between the parts, a new form does not exist long _without_ becoming related to some kind of semi-utility, and, according to its use, develops itself ever more and more perfectly.

648.

"Utility" in respect of the acceleration of the speed of evolution, is a different kind of "utility" from that which is understood to mean the greatest possible stability and staying power of the evolved creature.

649.

"Useful" in the sense of Darwinian biology means: that which favours a thing in its struggle with others. But in my opinion the _feeling of being surcharged,_ the feeling accompanying an _increase in strength,_ quite apart from the utility of the struggle, is the actual _progress_: from these feelings the will to war is first derived.

650.

Physiologists should bethink themselves before putting down the instinct of self-preservation as the cardinal instinct of an organic being. A living thing seeks above all to _discharge_ its strength: "_self-preservation" _ is only one of the results thereof.--Let us beware of _superfluous_ teleological principles!--one of which is the whole concept of "self-preservation."[4]

[Footnote 4: See _Beyond Good and Evil,_ in this edition, Aph. 13.]

651.

The most-fundamental--and most primeval activity of a protoplasm cannot be ascribed to a will to self-preservation, for it absorbs an amount of material which is absurdly out of proportion with the needs of its preservation: and what is more, it does _not_ "preserve itself" in the process, but actually falls to _pieces...._ The instinct which rules here, must account for this total absence in the organism of a desire to preserve itself: hunger is already an interpretation based upon the observation of a more or less complex organism (hunger is a specialised and later form of the instinct; it is an expression of the system of divided labour, in the service of a higher instinct which rules the whole).

652.

It is just as impossible to regard _hunger_ as the _primum mobile,_ as it is to take self-preservation to be so. Hunger, considered as the result of insufficient nourishment, means hunger as the result of a will to power _which can no longer dominate_ It is not a question of replacing a loss, it is only later on, as the result of the division of labour, when the Will to Power has discovered other and quite different ways of gratifying itself, that the appropriating lust of the organism is _reduced_ to hunger--to the need of replacing what has been lost.

653.

We can but laugh at the false "_Altruism_" of biologists: propagation among the amœbæ appears as a process of jetsam, as an advantage to them. It is an excretion of useless matter.

654.

The division of a protoplasm into two takes place when its power is no longer sufficient to subjugate the matter it has appropriated: procreation is the result of impotence.

In the cases in which the males seek the females and become one with them, procreation is the result of hunger.

655.

The weaker vessel is driven to the stronger from a need of nourishment; it desires to get under it, if possible to become _one_ with it. The stronger, on the contrary, defends itself from others; it refuses to perish in this way; it prefers rather to split itself into two or more parts in the process of growing. One may conclude that the greater the urgency seems to become one with something else, the more weakness in some form is present. The greater the tendency to variety, difference, inner decay, the more strength is actually to hand.

The instinct to cleave to something, and the instinct to repel something, are in the inorganic as in the organic world, the uniting bond. The whole distinction is a piece of hasty judgment.

The will to power in every combination of forces, _defending itself against the stronger and coming down unmercifully upon the weaker, is more correct._

N. B. _All processes may be regarded as "beings"._

656.

The will to power can manifest itself only against _obstacles;_ it therefore goes in search of what resists it--this is the primitive tendency of the protoplasm when it extends its _pseudopodia_ and feels about it. The act of appropriation and assimilation is, above all, the result of a desire to overpower, a process of forming, of additional building and rebuilding, until at last the subjected creature has become completely a part of the superior creature's sphere of power, and has increased the latter.--If this process of incorporation does not succeed, then the whole organism falls to pieces; and the _separation_ occurs as the result of the will to power: in order to prevent the escape of that which has been subjected, the will to power falls into two wills (under some circumstances without even abandoning completely its relation to the two).

"Hunger" is only a more narrow adaptation, once the fundamental instinct of power has won power of a more abstract kind.

657.

What is "passive"?

To be hindered in the outward movement of grasping: it is thus an act of resistance and reaction.

What is "active"?

To stretch out for power.

"Nutrition"...

Is only a derived phenomenon; the primitive form of it was the will to stuff everything inside one's own skin.

"Procreation"...

Only derived; originally, in those cases In which one will was unable to organise the collective mass it had appropriated, an _opposing will_ came into power, which undertook to effect the separation and establish a new centre of organisation, after a struggle with the original will.

"Pleasure"...

Is a feeling of power (presupposing the existence of pain).

658.

(1) The organic functions shown to be but forms of the fundamental will, the will to power,--and buds thereof.

(2) The will to power specialises itself as will to nutrition, to property, to _tools,_ to servants (obedience), and to rulers: the body as an example.--The stronger will directs the weaker. There is no other form of causality than that of will to will. It is not to be explained mechanically.

(3) Thinking, feeling, willing, in all living organisms. What is a desire if it be not: a provocation of the feeling of power by an obstacle (or, better still, by rhythmical obstacles and resisting forces)--so that it surges through it? Thus in all pleasure pain is understood.--If the pleasure is to be very great, the pains preceding it must have been very long, and the whole bow of life must have been strained to the utmost.

(4) Intellectual functions. The will to shaping, forming, and making like, etc.

(b) Man.

659.

With the body as clue.--Granting that the "_soul_" was only an attractive and mysterious thought, from which philosophers rightly, but reluctantly, separated themselves--that which they have since learnt to put in its place is perhaps even more attractive and even more mysterious. The human _body,_ in which the whole of the most distant and most recent past of all organic life once more becomes living and corporal, seems to flow through, this past and right over it like a huge and inaudible torrent; the body is a more wonderful thought than the old "soul." In all ages the body, as our actual property, as our most certain being, in short, as our ego, has been more earnestly believed in than the spirit (or the "soul," or the subject, as the school jargon now calls it). It has never occurred to any one to regard his stomach as a strange or a divine stomach; but that there is a tendency and a predilection in man to regard all his thoughts as "inspired," all his values as "imparted to him by a God," all his instincts as dawning activities--this is proved by the evidence of every age in man's history. Even now, especially among artists, there may very often be noticed a sort of wonder, and a deferential hesitation to decide, when the question occurs to them, by what means they achieved their happiest work, and from which world the creative thought came down to them: when they question in this way, they are possessed by a feeling of guilelessness and childish shyness. They dare not say: "That came from me; it was my hand which threw that die." Conversely, even those philosophers and theologians, who in their logic and piety found the most imperative reasons for regarding their body as a deception (and even as a deception overcome and disposed of), could not help recognising the foolish fact that the body still remained: and the most unexpected proofs of this are to be found partly in Pauline and partly in Vedantic philosophy. But what does _strength of faith_ ultimately mean? Nothing!--A strong faith might also be a foolish faith!--There is food for reflection.

And supposing the faith in the body were ultimately but the result of a conclusion; supposing it were a false conclusion, as idealists declare it is, would it not then involve some doubt concerning the trustworthiness of the spirit itself which thus causes us to draw wrong conclusions?

Supposing the plurality of things, and space, and time, and motion (and whatever the other first principles of a belief in the body may be) were errors--what suspicions would not then be roused against the spirit which led us to form such first principles? Let it suffice that the belief in the body is, at any rate for the present, a much stronger belief than the belief in the spirit, and he who would fain undermine it assails the authority of the spirit most thoroughly in so doing!

660.

The Body as an Empire.

The aristocracy in the body, the majority of the rulers (the fight between the cells and the tissues).

Slavery and the division of labour: the higher type alone possible through the _subjection_ of the lower to a function.

Pleasure and pain, not contraries. The feeling of power.

"Nutrition" only a result of the insatiable lust of appropriation in the Will to Power.

"Procreation": this is the decay which supervenes when the ruling cells are too weak to organise appropriated material.

It is the _moulding_ force which will have a continual supply of new material (more "force"). The masterly construction of an organism out of an egg.

"The mechanical interpretation": recognises only quantities: but the real energy is in the quality. Mechanics can therefore only describe processes; it cannot explain them.

"Purpose." We should start out from the "sagacity" of plants.

The concept of "meliorism": _not_ only greater complexity, but greater _power_ (it need not be only greater masses).

Conclusion concerning the evolution of man: the road to perfection lies in the bringing forth of the most powerful individuals, for whose use the great masses would be converted into mere tools (that is to say, into the most intelligent and flexible tools possible).

661.

Why is all _activity,_ even that of a _sense,_ associated with pleasure? Because, before the activity was possible, an obstacle or a burden was done away with. Or, rather, because all action is a process of overcoming, of becoming master of, and of _increasing_ the _feeling of power_? The pleasure of thought. Ultimately it is not only the feeling of power, but also the pleasure of creating and of contemplating the _creation:_ for all activity enters our consciousness in the form of "works."

662.

Creating is an act of selecting and of finishing the thing selected. (In every act of the will, this is the essential element.)

663.

All phenomena which are the result of intentions may be reduced to _the intention of increasing power._

664.

When we do anything, we are conscious of a _feeling of strength;_ we often have this sensation before the act--that is to say, while imagining the thing to do (as, for instance, at the sight of an enemy, of an obstacle, which we feel _equal to_): it is always an accompanying sensation. Instinctively we think that this feeling of strength is the cause of the action, that it is the "motive force." Our belief in causation is the belief in force and its effect; it is a transcript of our experience: in which we identify force and the feeling of force.--Force, however, never moves things; the strength which is conscious "does not set the muscles moving." "Of such a process we have no experience, no idea." "We experience as little concerning force as a motive power, as concerning the _necessity_ of a movement." Force is said to be the constraining element! "All we know is that one thing follows another;--we know nothing of either compulsion or arbitrariness in regard to the one following the other. Causality is first invented by thinking compulsion into the sequence of processes. A certain "understanding" of the thing is the result--that is to say, we humanise the process a little, we make it more "familiar"; the familiar is the known habitual fact of _human compulsion associated with the feeling of force._

665.

I have the intention of extending my arm; taking it for granted that I know as little of the physiology of the human body and of the mechanical laws of its movements as the man in the street, what could there be more vague, more bloodless, more uncertain than this intention compared with what follows it? And supposing I were the astutest of mechanics, and especially conversant with the formulæ which are applicable in this case, I should not be able to extend my arm one whit the better. Our "knowledge" and our "action" in this case lie coldly apart: as though in two different regions.--Again: Napoleon carries out a plan of campaign--what does that mean? In this case, everything concerning the consummation of the campaign is _known,_ because everything must be done through words of command: but even here subordinates are taken for granted, who apply and adapt the general plan to the particular emergency, to the degree of strength, etc.

666.

For ages we have always ascribed the value of an action, of a character, of an existence, to the _intention,_ to the _purpose_ for which it was done, acted, or lived: this primeval idiosyncrasy of taste ultimately takes a dangerous turn provided the lack of intention and purpose in all phenomena comes ever more to the front in consciousness. With it a general depreciation of all values seems to be preparing: "All is without sense."--This melancholy phrase means: "All sense lies in the intention, and if the intention is absolutely lacking, then sense must be lacking too." In conformity with this valuation, people were forced to place the value of life in a a life after death, or in the progressive development of ideas, or of mankind, or of the people, or of man to superman; but in this way the _progressus in infinitum_ of purpose had been reached: it was ultimately necessary to find one's self a place in the process of the world (perhaps with the disdæmonistic outlook, it was a process which led to nonentity).

In regard to this point, "_purpose_" needs a somewhat more severe criticism: it ought to be recognised that an action _is never caused by a purpose;_ that an object and the means thereto are interpretations, by means of which certain points in a phenomena are selected and accentuated, at the cost of other, more numerous, points, that every time something is done for a purpose, something fundamentally different, and yet other things happen; that in regard to the action done with a purpose, the case is the same as with the so-called purposefulness of the heat which is radiated from the sun: the greater part of the total sum is squandered; a portion of it, which is scarcely worth reckoning, has a "purpose," has "sense"; that an "end" with its "means" is an absurdly indefinite description, which indeed may be able to command as a precept, as "will," but presupposes a system of obedient and trained instruments, which, in the place of the indefinite, puts forward a host of determined entities _(i.e._ we imagine a system of _clever_ but narrow intellects who postulate end and means, in order to be able to grant our only known "end," the rôle of the "cause of an action,"--a proceeding to which we have no right: it is tantamount to solving a problem by placing its solution in an inaccessible world which we cannot observe).

Finally, why could not an "end" be merely an _accompanying feature_ in the series of changes among the active forces which bring about the action--a pale stenographic symbol stretched in consciousness beforehand, and which serves as a guide to what happens, even as a symbol of what happens, _not_ as its cause?--But in this way we criticise _will_ itself: is it not an illusion to regard that which enters consciousness as will-power, as a cause? Are not all conscious phenomena only final phenomena--the lost links in a chain, but apparently conditioning one another in their sequence within the plane of consciousness? This might be an illusion.

667.

Science does _not_ inquire what impels us to will: on the contrary, it _denies_ that _willing_ takes place at all, and supposes that something quite different has happened--in short, that the belief in "will" and "end" is an illusion. It does not inquire into the _motives_ of an action, as if these had been present in consciousness previous to the action, but it first divides the action up into a group of phenomena, and then seeks the previous history of this mechanical movement--but _not_ in the terms of feeling, perception, and thought; from this quarter it can never accept the explanation: perception is precisely the matter of science, _which has to be explained._--The problem of science is precisely to explain the world, _without_ taking perceptions as the cause: for that would mean regarding _perceptions_ themselves as the _cause_ of perceptions. The task of science is by no means accomplished.

Thus: either there is _no_ such thing as will,--the hypothesis of science,--or the will is _free_. The latter assumption represents the prevailing feeling, of which we cannot rid ourselves, even if the hypothesis of science were _proved._

The popular belief in cause and effect is founded on the principle that free will _is the cause of every effect:_ thereby alone do we arrive at the feeling of causation. And thereto belongs also the feeling that every cause is _not_ an effect, but always only a cause--if will is the cause. "Our acts of will are _not necessary_"--this lies in the very _concept of "will."_ The effect necessarily comes _after_ the cause--that is what we feel. It is merely a _hypothesis_ that even our willing is compulsory in every case.

668.

"To will" is not "to desire," to strive, to aspire to; it distinguishes itself from that through the _passion of commanding._

There is no such thing as "willing," but only the willing of _something:_ the _aim_ must not be severed from the state--as the epistemologists sever it. "Willing," as they understand it, is no more possible than "thinking": it is a pure invention.

It is essential to willing that something should be _commanded_ (but that does not mean that the will is carried into effect).

The general _state of tension,_ by virtue of which a force seeks to discharge itself, is not "willing."

669.

"Pain" and "pleasure" are the most absurd _means of expressing_ judgments, which of course does not mean that the judgments which are enunciated in this way must necessarily be absurd. The elimination of all substantiation and logic, a yes or no in the reduction to a passionate desire to have or to reject, an imperative abbreviation, the utility of which is irrefutable: that is pain and pleasure. Its origin is in the central sphere of the intellect; its prerequisite is an infinitely accelerated process of perceiving, ordering, co-ordinating, calculating, concluding: pleasure and pain are always final phenomena, they are never causes.

As to deciding what provokes pain and pleasure, that is a question which depends upon the _degree of power:_ the same thing, when confronted with a small quantity of power, may seem a danger and may suggest the need of speedy defence, and when confronted with the consciousness of greater power, may be a voluptuous stimulus and may be followed by a feeling of pleasure.

All feelings of pleasure and pain presuppose a _measuring of collective utility_ and _collective harmfulness_: consequently a sphere where there is the willing of an object (of a condition) and the selection of the means thereto. Pleasure and pain are never "original facts."

The feelings of pleasure and pain are _reactions of the will_ (emotions) in which the intellectual centre fixes the value of certain supervening changes as a collective value, and also as an introduction of contrary actions.

670.

The belief in "emotions"--Emotions are a fabrication of the intellect, an invention of _causes_ which do not exist. All general _bodily sensations_ which we do not understand are interpreted intellectually--that is to say, a _reason_ is sought why we feel thus or thus among certain people or in certain experiences. Thus something disadvantageous dangerous, and strange is taken for granted, as if it were the cause of our being indisposed; as a matter of fact, it gets _added to_ the indisposition, so as to make our condition thinkable.--Mighty rushes of blood to the brain, accompanied by a feeling of suffocation, are _interpreted_ as anger: the people and things which provoke our anger are a means of relieving our physiological condition. Subsequently, after long habituation, certain processes and general feelings are so regularly correlated that the sight of certain processes provokes that condition of general feeling, and induces vascular engorgements, the ejection of seminal fluid, etc.: we then say that the "emotion is provoked by propinquity."

Judgments already inhere in pleasure and pain: stimuli become differentiated, according as to whether they increase or reduce the feeling of power.

The belief in willing. To believe that a thought may be the cause of a mechanical movement is to believe in miracles. The _consistency of science_ demands that once we have made the world _thinkable_ for ourselves by means of pictures, we should also make the emotions, the desires, the will, etc., _thinkable_--that is to say, we should _deny_ them and treat them as _errors of the intellect._

671.

Free will or no free will?--There is _no such thing_ as "_Will_": that is only a simplified conception on the part of the understanding, like "matter."

All actions must first be prepared and made possible mechanically before they can be willed. Or, _in most cases_ the "_object_" of an action enters the brain only after everything is prepared for its accomplishment. The object is an inner "stimulus"--nothing _more._

672.

The most proximate prelude to an action relates to that action: but _further back still_ there lies a preparatory history which covers _a far wider field:_ the individual action is only a factor in a much more extensive and _subsequent_ fact. The shorter and the longer processes are not reported.

673.

The theory of _chance:_ the soul is a selecting and self-nourishing being, which is persistently extremely clever and creative (this _creative_ power is commonly overlocked! it is taken to be merely passive).

I recognised the _active_ and creative _power_ within the accidental.--Accident is in itself nothing more than _the clashing of creative impulses._

674.

Among the enormous multiplicity of phenomena to be observed in an organic being, that part which becomes _conscious_ is a mere means: and the particle of "virtue," "self abnegation," and other fanciful inventions, are denied in a most thoroughgoing manner by the whole of the remaining phenomena. We would do well to study our organism in all its immorality....

The animal functions are, as a matter of fact, a million times more important than all beautiful states of the soul and heights of consciousness: the latter are an overflow, in so far as they are not needed as instruments in the service of the animal functions. The whole of _conscious_ life: the spirit together with the soul, the heart, goodness, and virtue; in whose service does it work? In the greatest possible perfection of the means (for acquiring nourishment and advancement) serving the fundamental animal functions: above all, the _ascent of the line of Life._

That which is called "flesh" and "body" is of such incalculably greater importance, that the rest is nothing more than a small appurtenance. To continue the chain of life _so that it becomes ever more powerful_--that is the task.

But now observe how the heart, the soul, virtue, and spirit together conspire formally to thwart this purpose: as _if they_ were the object of every endeavour! ... The _degeneration of life_ is essentially determined by the extraordinary _fallibility of consciousness,_ which is held at bay least of all by the instincts, and thus commits the gravest and profoundest _errors._

Now could any more insane extravagance of vanity be imagined than to measure the _value_ of existence according to the _pleasant or unpleasant feelings of this consciousness_? It is obviously only a means: and pleasant or unpleasant feelings are also no more than means.

According to what standard is the objective value measured? According to the quantity of _increased_ and _more organised power_ alone.

675.

The value of all _valuing._--My desire would be to see the agent once more identified with the action, after action has been deprived of all meaning by having been separated in thought from the agent; I should like to see the notion of doing _something,_ the idea of a "purpose," of an "intention," of an object, reintroduced into the action, after action has been made insignificant by having been artificially separated from these things.

All "objects," "purposes," "meanings," are only manners of expression and metamorphoses of the one will inherent in all phenomena; of the will to power. To have an object, a purpose, or an intention, in fact _to will_ generally, is equivalent to the desire for _greater strength,_ for fuller growth, and for the _means_ thereto _in addition._

The most general and fundamental instinct in all action and willing is precisely on that account the one which is least known and is most concealed; for in practice we always follow its bidding, for the simple reason that we _are_ in ourselves its bidding....

All valuations are only the results of, and the narrow points of view in _servings this_ one will: valuing _in itself_ is nothing save this, _--will to power._

To criticise existence from the standpoint of any one of these values is utter nonsense and error. Even supposing that a process of annihilation follows from such a value, even so this process is in the service of this will.

The _valuation of existence itself!_ But existence is this valuing itself!--and even when we say "no," we still do what we _are._

We ought now to perceive the _absurdity_ of this pretence at judging existence; and we ought to try and discover _what_ actually takes place there. It is symptomatic.

676.

Concerning the Origin of our Valuations.

We are able to analyse our body, and by doing so we get the same idea of it as of the stellar system, and the differences between organic and inorganic lapses. Formerly the movements of the stars were explained as the effects of beings consciously pursuing a purpose: this is no longer required, and even in regard to the movements of the body and its changes, the belief has long since been abandoned that they can be explained by an appeal to a consciousness which has a determined purpose. By far the greater number of movements have nothing to do with consciousness at all: _neither have they anything to do with sensation._ Sensations and thoughts are extremely _rare_ and _insignificant_ things compared with the innumerable phenomena occurring every second.

On the other hand, we believe that a certain conformity of means to ends rules over the very smallest phenomenon, which it is quite beyond our deepest science to understand; a sort of cautiousness, selectiveness, co-ordination, and repairing process, etc. In short, we are in the presence of an _activity_ to which it would be necessary to ascribe an _incalculably higher and more extensive intellect_ than the one we are acquainted with. We learn to _think less of_ all that is conscious: we unlearn the habit of making ourselves responsible for ourselves, because, as conscious beings fixing purposes, we are but the smallest part of ourselves.

Of the numerous influences taking effect every second, for instance, air, electricity, we feel scarcely anything at all. There might be a number of forces, which, though they never make themselves felt by us, yet influence us continually. Pleasure and pain are very rare and scanty phenomena, compared with the countless stimuli with which a cell or an organ operates upon another cell or organ.

It is the phase of the _modesty of consciousness._ Finally, we can grasp the conscious ego itself, merely as an instrument in the service of that higher and more extensive intellect: and then we may ask whether all conscious _willing,_ all conscious _purposes,_ all _valuations,_ are not perhaps only means by virtue of which something essentially _different is attained,_ from that which consciousness supposes. We _mean_: it is a question of our _pleasure_ and _pain_ but pleasure and pain might be the means whereby we _had something to do_ which lies outside our consciousness.

This is to show how very _superficial_ all conscious phenomena really are; how an action and the image of it differ; how _little_ we know about what _precedes_ an action; how fantastic our feelings, "freewill," and "cause and effect" are; how thoughts and images, just like words, are only signs of thoughts; the impossibility of finding the grounds of any action; the superficiality of all praise and blame; how _essentially our_ conscious life is composed of _fancies_ and _illusion_; how all our words merely stand for fancies (our emotions too), and how the _union of mankind_ depends upon the transmission and continuation of these fancies: whereas, at bottom, the real union of mankind by means of procreation pursues its unknown way. Does this belief in the common fancies of men really _alter_ mankind? Or is the whole body of ideas and valuations only an expression in itself of unknown changes? _Are there_ really such things as will, purposes, thoughts, values? Is the whole of conscious life perhaps no more than _mirage_? Even when values seem to _determine_ the actions of a man, they are, as a matter of fact, doing something quite different! In short, granting that a certain conformity of means to end might be demonstrated in the action of nature, without the assumption of a ruling ego: could not _our_ notion of purposes, and our will, etc., be only a _symbolic language_ standing for something quite different--that is to say, something not-willing and unconscious? only the thinnest semblance of that natural conformity of means to end in the organic world, but not in any way different therefrom?

Briefly, perhaps the whole of mental development is a matter of the _body:_ it is the consciously recorded history of the fact that a _higher body is forming._ The organic ascends to higher regions. Our longing to know Nature is a means by virtue of which the body would reach perfection. Or, better still, hundreds of thousands of experiments are made to alter the nourishment and the mode of living of the _body_: the body's consciousness and valuations, its kinds of pleasure and pain, are _signs of these changes and experiments. In the end, it is not a question concerning man; for he must be surpassed._

677.

To what Extent are all Interpretations of the World Symptoms of a Ruling Instinct.

The _artistic_ contemplation of the world: to sit before the world and to survey it. But here the analysis of æsthetical contemplation, its reduction to cruelty, its feeling of security, its judicial and detached attitude, etc., are lacking. The artist himself must be taken, together with his psychology (the criticism of the instinct of play, as a discharge of energy, the love of change, the love of bringing one's soul in touch with strange things, the absolute egoism of the artist, etc.). What instincts does he sublimate?

The _scientific_ contemplation of the world: a criticism of the psychological longing for science, the desire to make everything comprehensible; the desire to make everything practical, useful, capable of being exploited--to what extent this is anti-æsthetic. Only that value counts, which may be reckoned in figures. How it happens that a mediocre type of man preponderates under the influence of science. It would be terrible if even history were to be taken possession of in this way--the realm of the superior, of the judicial. What instincts are here sublimated!

The religious contemplation of the world: a criticism of the religious man. It is not necessary to take the moral man as the type, but the man who has extreme feelings of exaltation and of deep depression, and who interprets the former with thankfulness or suspicion without, however, seeking their origin in _himself_ (nor the latter either). The man who essentially feels anything but free, who sublimates his conditions and states of submission.

The _moral_ contemplation of the world. The feelings peculiar to certain social ranks are projected into the universe: stability, law, the making of things orderly, and the making of things alike, are _sought_ in the highest spheres, because they are valued most highly,--above everything or behind everything.

What is _common_ to all: the ruling instincts _wish to be regarded_ as _the highest values in general,_ even as the _creative_ and _ruling powers._ It is understood that these instincts either oppose or overcome each other (join up synthetically, or alternate in power). Their profound antagonism is, however, so great, that in those cases in which they _all_ insist upon being gratified, a man of very thorough _mediocrity_ is the outcome.

678.

It is a question whether the origin of our apparent "knowledge" is not also a mere offshoot of our _older valuations,_ which are so completely assimilated that they belong to the very basis of our nature. In this way only _the more recent_ needs engage in battle _with results of the oldest needs._

The world is seen, felt, and interpreted thus and thus, in order that organic life may be preserved with this particular manner of interpretation. Man is _not_ only an individual, but the continuation of collective organic life in one definite line. The fact that _man_ survives, proves that a certain species of interpretations (even though it still be added to) has also survived; that, as a system, this method of interpreting has not changed. "Adaptation."

Our "dissatisfaction," our "ideal," etc., may possibly be the _result_ of this incorporated piece of interpretation, of our particular point of view: the organic world may ultimately perish owing to it just as the division of labour in organisms may be the means of bringing about the ruin of the whole, if one part happen to wither or weaken. The _destruction_ of organic life, and even of the highest form thereof, must follow the same principles as the destruction of the individual.

679.

Judged from the standpoint of the theory of descent, _individuation_ shows the continuous breaking up of one into two, and the equally continuous annihilation of individuals _for the sake of a few_ individuals, which evolution bears onwards; the greater mass always perishes ("the body").

The fundamental phenomena: _innumerable individuals are sacrificed for the sake of a few,_ in order to make the few possible.--One must not allow one's self to be deceived; the case is the same with _peoples_ and _races_: they produce the "body" for the generation of isolated and valuable _individuals,_ who continue the great process.

680.

I am opposed to the theory that the individual studies the interests of the _species,_ or of posterity, at the cost of his own advantage: all this is only apparent.

The excessive importance which he attaches to the _sexual instinct_ is not the _result_ of the latter's importance to the species, for procreation is the actual performance of the individual, it is his greatest interest, and therefore it is his _highest expression of power_ (not judged from the standpoint of consciousness, but from the very centre of the individual).

681.

The _fundamental errors_ of the biologists who have lived hitherto: it is not a matter of the species, but of rearing stronger individuals (the many are only a means).

Life is _not_ the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations, but will to power, which, proceeding from inside, subjugates and incorporates an ever-increasing quantity of "external" phenomena.

These biologists _continue_ the moral valuations ("the absolutely higher worth of Altruism," the antagonism towards the lust of dominion, towards war, towards all that which is not useful, and towards all order of rank and of class).

682.

In natural science, the moral depreciation of the _ego_ still goes hand in hand with the overestimation of the _species._ But the species is quite as illusory as the ego: a false distinction has been made. The ego is a hundred times _more_ than a mere unit in a chain of creatures; it is the chain _itself,_ in every possible respect, and the species is merely an abstraction suggested by the multiplicity and partial similarity of these chains. That the individual is _sacrificed_ to the species, as people often say he is, is not a fact at all: it is rather only an example of false interpretation.

683.

The formula of the _"progress"-superstition_ according to a famous physiologist of the cerebral regions:--

"L'animal ne fait jamais de progrès comme espèce. L'homme seul fait de progrès comme espèce."

No.

684.

Anti-Darwin.--The _domestication of man:_ what definite value can it have, or has domestication in itself a definite value?--There are reasons for denying the latter proposition.

Darwin's school of thought certainly goes to great pains to convince us of the reverse: it would fain prove that the influence of domestication may be profound and fundamental. For the time being, we stand firmly as we did before; up to the present no results save very superficial modification or degeneration have been shown to follow upon domestication. And everything that escapes from the hand and discipline of man, returns almost immediately to its original natural condition. The type remains constant, man cannot "_dénaturer la nature_."

Biologists reckon upon the struggle for existence, the death of the weaker creature and the survival of the most robust, most gifted combatant; on that account they imagine a _continuous increase in the perfection of all creatures._ We, on the contrary, have convinced ourselves of the fact, that in the struggle for existence, accident serves the cause of the weak quite as much as that of the strong; that craftiness often supplements strength with advantage; that the _prolificness_ of a species is related in a remarkable manner to that species _chances of destruction_....

Natural Selection is also credited with the power of slowly effecting unlimited metamorphoses: it is believed that every advantage is transmitted by heredity, and strengthened in the course of generations (when heredity is known to be so capricious that ...); the happy adaptations of certain creatures to very special conditions of life, are regarded as the result of _surrounding influences._ Nowhere, however, are examples of _unconscious selection_ to be found (absolutely nowhere). The most different individuals associate one with the other; the extremes become lost in the mass. Each vies with the other to maintain his kind; those creatures whose appearance shields them from certain dangers, do not alter this appearance when they are in an environment quite devoid of danger.... If they live in places where their coats or their hides do not conceal them, they do not adapt themselves to their surroundings in any way.

The _selection of the most beautiful_ has been so exaggerated, that it greatly exceeds the instincts for beauty in our own race! As a matter of fact, the most beautiful creature often couples with the most debased, and the largest with the smallest. We almost always see males and females taking advantage of their first chance meeting, and manifesting no taste or selectiveness at all.--Modification through climate and nourishment--but as a matter of fact unimportant.

There are no _intermediate forms.--_

The growing evolution of creatures is assumed. All grounds for this assumption are entirely lacking. Every type has its _limitations_: beyond these evolution cannot carry it.

My general point of view. First proposition: Man as a species is _not_ progressing. Higher specimens are indeed attained; but they do not survive. The general level of the species is not raised.

Second proposition: Man as a species does not represent any sort of progress compared with any other animal. The whole of the animal and plant world does not develop from the lower to the higher.... but all simultaneously, haphazardly, confusedly, and at variance. The richest and most complex forms--and the term "higher type" means no more than this--perish more easily: only the lowest succeed in maintaining their apparent imperishableness. The former are seldom attained, and maintain their superior position with difficulty, the latter are compensated by great fruitfulness.--In the human race, also, the _superior specimens,_ the happy cases of evolution, are the first to perish amid the fluctuations of chances for and against them. They are exposed to every form of decadence: they are extreme, and, on that account alone, already decadents.... The short duration of beauty, of genius, of the Cæsar, is _sui generis:_ such things are not hereditary. The _type_ is inherited, there is nothing extreme or particularly "happy" about a type----It is not a case of a particular fate, or of the "evil will" of Nature, but merely of the concept "superior type": the higher type is an example of an incomparably greater degree of complexity a greater sum of co-ordinated elements: but on this account disintegration becomes a thousand times more threatening. "Genius" is the sublimest machine in existence--hence it is the most fragile.

Third propositio:: The domestication (culture) of man does not sink very deep. When it does sink far below the skin it immediately becomes degeneration (type: the Christian). The wild man (or, in moral terminology, the _evil_ man) is a reversion to Nature--and, in a certain sense, he represents a recovery, a _cure_ from the effects of "culture." ...

685.

Anti-Darwin.--What surprises me most on making a general survey of the great destinies of man, is that I invariably see the reverse of what to-day Darwin and his school sees or _will_ persist in seeing: selection in favour of the stronger, the better-constituted, and the progress of the species. Precisely the reverse of this stares one in the face: the suppression of the lucky cases, the uselessness of the more highly constituted types, the inevitable mastery of the mediocre, and even of those who are _below mediocrity._ Unless we are shown some reason why man is an exception among living creatures, I incline to the belief that Darwin's school is everywhere at fault. That will to power, in which I perceive the ultimate reason and character of all change, explains why it is that selection is never in favour of the exceptions and of the lucky cases: the strongest and happiest natures are weak when they are confronted with a majority ruled by organised gregarious instincts and the fear which possesses the weak. My general view of the world of values shows that in the highest values which now sway the destiny of man, the happy cases among men, the select specimens do not prevail: but rather the decadent specimens,--perhaps there is nothing more interesting in the world than this _unpleasant_ spectacle....

Strange as it may seem, the strong always have to be upheld against the weak; and the well-constituted against the ill-constituted, the healthy against the sick and physiologically botched. If we drew our morals from reality, they would read thus: the mediocre are more valuable than the exceptional creatures, and the decadent than the mediocre; the will to nonentity prevails over the will to life--and the general aim now is, in Christian, Buddhistic, Schopenhauerian phraseology: "It is better not to be than to be."

I _protest_ against this formulating of reality into a moral: and I loathe Christianity with a deadly loathing, because it created sublime words and attitudes in order to deck a revolting truth with all the tawdriness of justice, virtue, and godliness....

I see all philosophers and the whole of science on their knees before a reality which is the reverse of "the struggle for life," as Darwin and his school understood it--that is to say, wherever I look, I see those prevailing and surviving, who throw doubt and suspicion upon life and the value of life.--The error of the Darwinian school became a problem to me: how can one be so blind as to make _this_ mistake?

That _species_ show an ascending tendency, is the most nonsensical assertion that has ever been made: until now they have only manifested a dead level. There is nothing whatever to prove that the higher organisms have developed from the lower. I see that the lower, owing to their numerical strength, their craft, and ruse, now preponderate,--and I fail to see an instance in which an accidental change produces an advantage, at least not for a very long period: for it would be necessary to find some reason why an accidental change should become so very strong.

I do indeed find the "cruelty of Nature" which is so often referred to; but in a different place: Nature is cruel, but against her lucky and well-constituted children; she protects and shelters and loves the lowly.

In short, the increase of a species' power, as the result of the preponderance of its particularly well-constituted and strong specimens, is perhaps less of a certainty than that it is the result of the preponderance of its mediocre and lower specimens ... in the case of the latter, we find great fruitfulness and permanence: in the case of the former, the besetting dangers are greater, waste is more rapid, and decimation is more speedy.

686.

Man as he has appeared up to the present is the embryo of the man of the future; _all_ the formative powers which are to produce the latter, already lie in the former: and owing to the fact that they are enormous, the more _promising for the future_ the modern individual happens to be, the more _suffering_ falls to his lot. This is the profoundest concept of _suffering._ The formative powers clash.--The isolation of the individual need not deceive one--as a matter of fact, some uninterrupted current does actually flow through all individuals, and does thus unite them. The fact that they feel themselves isolated, is the _most powerful spur_ in the process of setting themselves the loftiest of aims: their search for happiness is the means which keeps together and moderates the formative powers, and keeps them from being mutually destructive.

687.

Excessive intellectual strength sets _itself_ new goals; it is not in the least satisfied by the command and the leadership of the inferior world, or by the preservation of the organism, of the "individual."

We are _more_ than the individual: we are the whole chain itself, with the tasks of all the possible futures of that chain in us.

3. Theory of the Will to Power and of Valuations.

688.

The unitary view of psychology.--We are accustomed to regard the development of a vast number of forms as compatible with one single origin.

My theory would be: that the will to power is the primitive motive force out of which all other motives have been derived;

That it is exceedingly illuminating to substitute _power_ for individual "happiness" (after which every living organism is said to strive): "It strives after power, after _more_ power";--happiness is only a symptom of the feeling of power attained, a consciousness of difference (it does not strive after happiness: but happiness steps in when the object is attained, after which the organism has striven: happiness is an accompanying, not an actuating factor);

That all motive force is the will to power; that there is no other force, either physical, dynamic, or psychic.

In our science, where the concept cause and effect is reduced to a relationship of complete equilibrium, and in which it seems desirable for the _same_ quantum of force to be found on either side, _all idea of a motive power is absent_: we only apprehend results, and we call these equal from the point of view of their content of force....

It is a matter of mere experience that change never ceases: at bottom we have not the smallest grounds for assuming that any one particular change must follow upon any other. On the contrary, any state which has been attained would seem almost forced to maintain itself intact if it had not within itself a capacity for not desiring to maintain itself.... Spinoza's proposition concerning "self-preservation" ought as a matter of fact to put a stop to change. But the proposition is false; the contrary is true. In all living organisms it can be clearly shown that they do everything not to remain as they are, but to become greater....

689.

"Will to power" and causality.--From a psychological point of view the idea of "cause" is our feeling of power in the act which is called willing--our concept effect is the superstition that this feeling of power is itself the force which moves things....

A state which accompanies an event and is already an effect of that event is deemed "sufficient cause" of the latter; the tense relationship of our feeling of power (pleasure as the feeling of power) and of an obstacle being overcome--are these things

illusions?

If we translate the notion "cause" back into the only sphere which is known to us, and out of which we have taken it, we cannot imagine _any change_ in which the will to power is not inherent. We do not know how to account for any change which is not a _trespassing_ of one power on another.

Mechanics only show us the results, and then only in images (movement is a figure of speech); gravitation itself has no mechanical cause, because it is itself the first cause of mechanical results.

The will to _accumulate force_ is confined to the phenomenon of life, to nourishment, to procreation, to inheritance, to society, states, customs, authority. Should we not be allowed to assume that this will is the motive power also of chemistry?--and of the cosmic order?

Not only conservation of energy, but the minimum amount of waste; so that the only reality is this: _the will of every centre of power to become stronger_--not self-preservation, but the desire to appropriate, to become master, to become more, to become stronger.

Is the fact that science is possible a proof of the principle of causation--"From like causes, like effects"--"A permanent law of things"--"Invariable order"? Because something is calculable, is it therefore on that account necessary?

If something happens thus, and thus only, it is not the manifestation of a "principle," of a "law," of "order." What happens is that certain quanta of power begin to operate, and their essence is to exercise their power over all other quanta of power. Can we assume the existence of a striving after power without a feeling of pleasure and pain, _i.e._ without the sensation of an increase or a decrease of power? Is mechanism only a language of signs for the concealed fact of a world of fighting and conquering quanta of will-power? All mechanical first-principles, matter, atoms, weight, pressure, and repulsion, are not facts in themselves, but interpretations arrived at with the help of psychical fictions.

Life, which is our best known form of being, is altogether "will to the accumulation of strength"--all the processes of life hinge on this: everything aims, not at preservation, but at accretion and accumulation. Life as an individual case (a hypothesis which may be applied to existence in general) strives after the maximum feeling of power; life is essentially a striving after more power; striving itself is only a straining after more power; the most fundamental and innermost thing of all is this will. (Mechanism is merely the semeiotics of the results.)

690.

The thing which is the cause of the existence of development cannot in the course of investigation be found above development; it should neither be regarded as "evolving" nor as evolved ... the "will to power" cannot have been evolved.

691.

What is the relation of the whole of the organic process towards the rest of nature?--Here the fundamental will reveals itself.

692.

Is the "will to power" a kind of will, or is it identical with the concept will? Is it equivalent to desiring or commanding; is it the will which Schopenhauer says is the essence of things?

My proposition is that the will of psychologists hitherto has been an unjustifiable generalisation, and that there is no such thing as this sort of will, that instead of the development of one will into several forms being taken as a fact, the character of will has been cancelled owing to the fact that its content, its "whither," was subtracted from it: in Schopenhauer this is so in the highest degree; what he calls "will" is merely an empty word. There is even less plausibility in the will to live: for life is simply one of the manifestations of the will to power; it is quite arbitrary and ridiculous to suggest that everything is striving to enter into this particular form of the will to power.

693.

If the innermost essence of existence is the will to power; if happiness is every increase of power, and unhappiness the feeling of not being able to resist, of not being able to become master: may we not then postulate happiness and pain as cardinal facts? Is will possible without these two oscillations of yea and nay? But who feels happiness? ... Who will have power? ... Nonsensical

question! If the essence of all things is itself will to power, and consequently the ability to feel pleasure and pain! Albeit: contrasts and obstacles are necessary, therefore also, relatively, units which trespass on one another.

694.

According to the obstacles which a force seeks with a view of overcoming them, the measure of the failure and the fatality thus provoked must increase, and in so far as every force can only manifest itself against some thing that opposes it, an element of unhappiness is necessarily inherent in every action. But this pain acts as a greater incitement to life, and increases the will to power.

695.

If pleasure and pain are related to the feeling of power, life would have to represent such an increase in power that the difference, the "plus," would have to enter consciousness. A dead level of power, if maintained, would have to measure its happiness in relation to depreciations of that level, _i.e._ in relation to states of unhappiness and not of happiness.... The will to an increase lies in the essence of happiness: that power is enhanced, and that this difference becomes conscious.

In a state of decadence after a certain time the opposite difference becomes conscious, that is decrease: the memory of former strong moments depresses the present feelings of happiness in this state comparison reduces happiness.

696.

It is not the satisfaction of the will which is the cause of happiness (to this superficial theory I am more particularly opposed--this absurd psychological forgery in regard to the most simple things), but it is that the will is always striving to overcome that which stands in its way. The feeling of happiness lies precisely in the discontentedness of the will, in the fact that without opponents and obstacles it is never satisfied. "The happy man": a gregarious ideal.

697.

The normal discontent of our instincts--for instance, of the instinct of hunger, of sex, of movement--contains nothing which is in itself depressing; it rather provokes the feeling of life, and, whatever the pessimists may say to us, like all the rhythms of small and irritating stimuli, it strengthens. Instead of this discontent making us sick of life, it is rather the great stimulus to life.

(Pleasure might even perhaps be characterised as the rhythm of small and painful stimuli.)

698.

Kant says: "These lines of Count Verri's (_Sull' indole del piacere e del dolore;_ 1781) I confirm with absolute certainty: 'Il solo principio motore dell' uomo è il dolore. Il dolore precede ogni piacere. Il piacere non è un essere positivo.'"[5]

[Footnote 5: _On the Nature of Pleasure and Pain._ "The only motive force of man is pain. Pain precedes every pleasure. Pleasure is not a positive thing."--Tr.]

699.

Pain is something different from pleasure--I mean it is not the latter's opposite.

If the essence of pleasure has been aptly characterised as the feeling of increased power (that is to say, as a feeling of difference which presupposes comparison), that does not define the nature of pain. The false contrasts which the people, and consequently the language, believes in, are always dangerous fetters which impede the march of truth. There are even cases where a kind of pleasure is conditioned by a certain rhythmic sequence of small, painful stimuli: in this way a very rapid growth of the feeling of power and of the feeling of pleasure is attained. This is the case, for instance, in tickling, also in the sexual tickling which accompanies the coitus: here we see pain acting as the ingredient of happiness. It seems to be a small hindrance which is overcome, followed immediately by another small hindrance which once again is overcome--this play of resistance and resistance overcome is the greatest excitant of that complete feeling of overflowing and surplus power which constitutes the essence of happiness.

The converse, which would be an increase in the feeling of pain through small intercalated pleasurable stimuli, does not exist: pleasure and pain are not opposites.

Pain is undoubtedly an intellectual process in which a judgment is inherent--the judgment harmful, in which long experience is epitomised. There is no such thing as pain in itself. It is not the wound that hurts, it is the experience of the harmful results a wound may have for the whole organism, which here speaks in this deeply moving way, and is called pain. (In the case of deleterious influences which were unknown to ancient man, as, for instance, those residing in the new combination of poisonous chemicals, the hint from pain is lacking, and we are lost.)

That which is quite peculiar in pain is the prolonged disturbance, the quivering subsequent to a terrible shock in the ganglia of the nervous system. As a matter of fact, nobody suffers from the cause of pain (from any sort of injury, for instance), but from the protracted disturbance of his equilibrium which follows upon the shock. Pain is a disease of the cerebral centres--pleasure is no disease at all.

The fact that pain may be the cause of reflex actions has appearances and even philosophical prejudice in its favour. But in very sudden accidents, if we observe closely, we find that the reflex action occurs appreciably earlier than the feeling of pain. I should be in a bad way when I stumbled if I had to wait until the fact had struck the bell of my consciousness, and until a hint of what I had to do had been telegraphed back to me. On the contrary, what I notice as clearly as possible is, that first, in order to avoid a fall, reflex action on the part of my foot takes place, and then, after a certain measurable space of time, there follows quite suddenly a kind of painful wave in my forehead. Nobody, then, reacts to pain. Pain is subsequently projected into the wounded quarter--but the essence of this local pain is nevertheless not the expression of a kind of local wound, it is merely a local sign, the strength and nature of which is in keeping with the severity of the wound, and of which the nerve centres have taken note. The fact that as the result of this shock the muscular power of the organism is materially reduced, does not prove in any way that the essence of pain is to be sought in the lowering of the feeling of power.

Once more let me repeat: nobody reacts to pain: pain is no "cause" of action. Pain itself is a reaction; the reflex movement is another and earlier process--both originate at different points....

700.

The message of pain: in itself pain does not announce that which has been momentarily damaged, but the significance of this damage for the individual as a whole.

Are we to suppose that there are any pains which "the species" feel, and which the individual does not?

701.

"The sum of unhappiness outweighs the sum of happiness: consequently it were better that the world did not exist"--"The world is something which from a rational standpoint it were better did not exist, because it occasions more pain than pleasure to the feeling subject"--this futile gossip now calls itself pessimism!

Pleasure and pain are accompanying factors, not causes; they are second-rate valuations derived from a dominating value,--they are one with the feeling "useful," "harmful," and therefore they are absolutely fugitive and relative. For in regard to all utility and harmfulness there are a hundred different ways of asking "what for?"

I despise this pessimism of sensitiveness: it is in itself a sign of profoundly impoverished life.

702.

Man does not seek happiness and does not avoid unhappiness. Everybody knows the famous prejudices I here contradict. Pleasure and pain are mere results, mere accompanying phenomena--that which every man, which every tiny particle of a living organism will have, is an increase of power. In striving after this, pleasure and pain are encountered; it is owing to that will that the organism seeks opposition and requires that which stands in its way.... Pain as the hindrance of its will to power is therefore a normal feature, a natural ingredient of every organic phenomenon; man does not avoid it, on the contrary, he is constantly in need of it: every triumph, every feeling of pleasure, every event presupposes an obstacle overcome.

Let us take the simplest case, that of primitive nourishment; the protoplasm extends its pseudopodia in order to seek for that which resists it,--it does not do so out of hunger, but owing to its will to power. Then it makes the attempt to overcome, to appropriate, and to incorporate that with which it comes into contact--what people call "nourishment" is merely a derivative, a utilitarian application, of the primordial will to become stronger.

Pain is so far from acting as a diminution of our feeling of power, that it actually forms in the majority of cases a spur to this feeling,--the obstacle is the stimulus of the will to power.

703.

Pain has been confounded with one of its subdivisions, which is exhaustion: the latter does indeed represent a profound reduction and lowering of the will to power, a material loss of strength--that is to say, there is _(a)_ pain as the stimulus to an increase or power, and _(b)_ pain following upon an expenditure of power; in the first case it is a spur, in the second it is the outcome of excessive spurring.... The inability to resist is proper to the latter form of pain: the provocation of that which resists is proper to the former.... The only happiness which is to be felt in the state of exhaustion is that of going to sleep; in the other case, happiness means triumph.... The great confusion of psychologists consisted in the fact that they did not keep these two kinds of happiness--that of falling asleep, and that of triumph--sufficiently apart. Exhausted people will have repose, slackened limbs, peace and quiet--and these things constitute the bliss of Nihilistic religions and philosophies, the wealthy in vital strength, the active, want triumph, defeated opponents, and the extension of their feeling of power over ever wider regions. Every healthy function of the organism has this need,--and the whole organism constitutes an intricate complexity of systems struggling for the increase of the feeling of power....

704.

How is it that the fundamental article of faith in all psychologies is a piece of most outrageous contortion and fabrication? "Man strives after happiness," for instance--how much of this is true? In order to understand what life is, and what kind of striving and tenseness life contains, the formula should hold good not only of trees and plants, but of animals also. "What does the plant strive after?"--But here we have already invented a false entity which does not exist,--concealing and denying the fact of an infinitely variegated growth, with individual and semi-individual starting-points, if we give it the clumsy title "plant" as if it were a unit. It is very obvious that the ultimate and smallest "individuals" cannot be understood in the sense of metaphysical individuals or atoms; their sphere of power is continually shifting its ground: but with all these changes, can it be said that any of them strives after happiness?--All this expanding, this incorporation and growth, is a search for resistance; movement is essentially related to states of pain: the driving power here must represent some other desire if it leads to such continual willing and seeking of pain.--To what end do the trees of a virgin forest contend with each other? "For happiness"?--For power! ...

Man is now master of the forces of nature, and master too of his own wild and unbridled feelings (the passions have followed suit, and have learned to become useful)--in comparison with primeval man, the man of to-day represents an enormous quantum of power, but not an increase in happiness! How can one maintain, then, that he has striven after happiness?..

705.

But while I say this I see above me, and below the stars, the glittering rat's-tail of errors which hitherto has represented the greatest inspiration of man: "All happiness is the result of virtue all virtue is the result of free will"!

Let us transvalue the values: all capacity is the outcome of a happy organisation, all freedom is the outcome of capacity (freedom understood here as facility in self-direction. Every artist will understand me).

706.

"The value of life."--Every life stands by itself; all existence must be justified, and not only life,--the justifying principle must be one through which life itself speaks.

Life is only a means to something: it is the expression of the forms of growth in power.

707.

The "conscious world" cannot be a starting-point for valuing: an "objective" valuation is necessary.

In comparison with the enormous and complicated antagonistic processes which the collective life of every organism represents, its conscious world of feelings, intentions, and valuations, is only a small slice. We have absolutely no right to postulate this particle of consciousness as the object, the wherefore, of the collective phenomena of life: the attainment of consciousness is obviously only an additional means to the unfolding of life and to the extension of its power. That is why it is a piece of childish simplicity to set up happiness, or intellectuality, or morality, or any other individual sphere of consciousness, as the highest value: and maybe to justify "the world" with it.

This is my fundamental objection to all philosophical and moral cosmologies and theologies, to all wherefores and highest values that have appeared in philosophies and philosophic religions hitherto. A kind of means is misunderstood as the object itself: conversely life and its growth of power were debased to a means.

If we wished to postulate an adequate object of life it would not necessarily be related in any way with the category of conscious life; it would require rather to explain conscious life as a mere means to itself....

The "denial of life" regarded as the object of life, the object of evolution! Existence--a piece of tremendous stupidity! Any such mad interpretation is only the outcome of life's being measured by the factors of consciousness (pleasure and pain, good and evil). Here the means are made to stand against the end--the "unholy," absurd, and, above all, disagreeable means: how can the end be any use when it requires such means? But where the fault lies is here--instead of looking for the end which would explain the necessity of such means, we posited an end from the start which actually excludes such means, _i.e._ we made a desideratum in regard to certain means (especially pleasurable, rational, and virtuous) into a rule, and then only did we decide what end would be desirable....

Where the fundamental fault lies is in the fact that, instead of regarding consciousness as an instrument and an isolated phenomenon of life in general, we made it a standard, the highest value in life: it is the faulty standpoint of _a parte ad totum,_--and that is why all philosophers are instinctively seeking at the present day for a collective consciousness, a thing that lives and wills consciously with all that happens, a "Spirit," a "God." But they must be told that it is precisely thus that life is converted into a monster; that a "God" and a general sensorium would necessarily be something on whose account the whole of existence would have to be condemned.... Our greatest relief came when we eliminated the general consciousness which postulates ends and means--in this way we ceased from being necessarily pessimists.... Our greatest indictment of life was the existence of God.

708.

Concerning the value of "Becoming."--If the movement of the world really tended to reach a final state, that state would already have been reached. The only fundamental fact, however, is that it does not tend to reach a final state: and every philosophy and scientific hypothesis (_e.g._ materialism) according to which such a final state is necessary, is refuted by this fundamental fact.

I should like to have a concept of the world which does justice to this fact. Becoming ought to be explained without having recourse to such final designs. Booming must appear justified at every instant (or it must defy all valuation: which has unity as its end); the present must not under any circumstances be justified by a future, nor must the past be justified for the sake of the present. "Necessity" must not be interpreted in the form of a prevailing and ruling collective force or as a prime motor; and still less as the necessary cause of some valuable result. But to this end it is necessary to deny a collective consciousness for Becoming,--a "God," in order that life may not be veiled under the shadow of a being who feels and knows as we do and yet _wills_ nothing: "God" is useless if he wants nothing; and if he do want something, this presupposes a general sum of suffering and irrationality which lowers the general value of Becoming. Fortunately any such general power is lacking (a suffering God overlooking everything, a general sensorium and ubiquitous Spirit, would be the greatest indictment of existence).

Strictly speaking nothing of the nature of Being must be allowed to remain,--because in that case Becoming loses its value and gets to be sheer and superfluous nonsense.

The next question, then, is: how did the illusion Being originate (why was it obliged to originate);

Likewise: how was it that all valuations based upon the hypothesis that there was such a thing as Being came to be depreciated.

But in this way we have recognised that this hypothesis concerning Being is the source of all the calumny that has been directed against the world (the "Better world," the "True world" the "World Beyond," the "Thing-in-itself").

(1) Becoming has no final state, it does not tend towards stability.

(2) Becoming is not a state of appearance, the world of Being is probably only appearance.

(3) Becoming is of precisely the same value at every instant; the sum of its value always remains equal: expressed otherwise, it has no value; for that according to which it might be measured, and in regard to which the word value might have some sense, is entirely lacking. The collective value of the world defies valuation; for this reason philosophical pessimism belongs to the order of farces.

709.

We should not make our little desiderata the judges of existence! Neither should we make culminating evolutionary forms (_e.g._ mind) the "absolute" which stands behind evolution!

710.

Our knowledge has become scientific to the extent in which it has been able to make use of number and measure. It might be worth while to try and see whether a scientific order of values might not be constructed according to a scale of numbers and measures representing energy.... All other values are matters of prejudice, simplicity, and misunderstanding. They may all be reduced to that scale of numbers and measures representing energy. The ascent in this scale would represent an increase of value, the descent a diminution.

But here appearance and prejudice are against one (moral values are only apparent values compared with those which are physiological).

711.

Why the standpoint of "value" lapses:--

Because in the _"whole process of the universe" the work of mankind does not come under consideration_; because a general process (viewed in the light of a system) does not exist.

Because there is no such thing as a whole; because no _depreciation of human_ existence or human aims can be made in regard to something that does not exist.

Because "necessity," "causality," "design," are merely useful "_semblances._"

Because the aim is _not_ "the increase of the sphere of consciousness," _but the increase of power_; in which increase the utility of consciousness is also contained; and the same holds good of pleasure and pain.

Because a mere _means_ must not be elevated to the highest criterion of value (such as states of consciousness like pleasure and pain, if consciousness is in itself only a means).

Because the world is not an organism at all, but a thing of chaos; because the development of "intellectuality" is only a means tending relatively to extend the duration of an organisation.

Because all "desirability" has no sense in regard to the general character of existence.

712.

"God" is the culminating moment: life is an eternal process of deifying and undeifying. _But withal there is no zenith of values,_ but only a zenith of _power._

Absolute _exclusion of mechanical and materialistic interpretations._ they are both only expressions of inferior states, of emotions deprived of all spirit (of the "will to power").

The retrograde movement front the zenith of development (the intellectualisation of power on some slave-infected soil) may be shown to be the _result_ of the highest degree of energy _turning against_ itself, once it no longer has anything to organise, and utilising its power in order to _disorganise._

_(a)_ The ever-increasing _suppression_ of societies, and the latter's subjection by a smaller number of stronger individuals.

(b) The ever-increasing suppression of the privileged and the strong, hence the rise of democracy, and ultimately of _anarchy,_ in the elements.

713.

Value is the highest amount of power that a man can assimilate--a man, not mankind! Mankind is much more of a means than an end. It is a question of type: mankind is merely the experimental material; it is the overflow of the ill-constituted--a field of ruins.

714.

Words relating to values are merely banners planted on those spots where a _new blessedness_ was discovered--a new _feeling._

715.

The standpoint of "value" is the same as that of the _conditions_ of _preservation_ and _enhancement,_ in regard to complex creatures of relative stability appearing in the course of evolution.

There are no such things as lasting and ultimate entities, no atoms, no monads: here also "permanence" was first introduced by ourselves (from practical, utilitarian, and other motives).

"The forms that rule"; the sphere of the subjugated is continually extended; or it decreases or increases according to the conditions (nourishment) being either favourable or unfavourable.

"Value" is essentially the standpoint for the increase or decrease of these dominating centres (pluralities in any case; for "unity" cannot be observed anywhere in the nature of development).

The means of expression afforded by language are useless for the purpose of conveying any facts concerning "development": the need of positing a rougher world of stable existences and things forms part of our _eternal desire for preservation._ We may speak of atoms and monads in a relative sense: and this is certain, _that the smallest world is the most stable world ..._. There is no such thing as will: there are only punctuations of will, which are constantly increasing and decreasing their power.

III

THE WILL TO POWER AS EXEMPLIFIED IN SOCIETY AND THE INDIVIDUAL.

1. Society and the State.

716.

We take it as a principle that only individuals feel any responsibility. Corporations are invented to do what the individual has not the courage to do. For this reason all communities are vastly more upright and instructive, as regards the nature of man, than the individual who is too cowardly to have the courage of his own desires.

All altruism is the prudence of the private man. societies are not mutually altruistic. The commandment, "Thou shalt love thy next-door neighbour," has never been extended to thy neighbour in general. Rather what Manu says is probably truer: "We must conceive of all the States on our own frontier, and their allies, as being hostile, and for the same reason we must consider all of their neighbours as being friendly to us."

The study of society is invaluable, because man in society is far more childlike than man individually. Society has never regarded virtue as anything else than as a means to strength, power, and order. Manu's words again are simple and dignified: "Virtue could hardly rely on her own strength alone. Really it is only the fear of punishment that keeps men in their limits, and leaves every one in peaceful possession of his own."

717.

The State, or _unmorality_ organised, is from within--the police, the penal code, status, commerce, and the family; and from without, the will to war, to power, to conquest and revenge.

A multitude will do things an individual will not, because of the division of responsibility, of command and execution; because the virtues of obedience, duty, patriotism, and local sentiment are all introduced; because feelings of pride, severity, strength, hate, and revenge in short, all typical traits are upheld, and these are characteristics utterly alien to the herd-man.

718.

You haven't, any of you, the courage either to kill or to flog a man. But the huge machinery of the State quells the individual and makes him decline to be answerable for his own deed (obedience, loyalty, etc.).

Everything that a man does in the service of the State is against his own nature. Similarly, everything he learns in view of future service of the State. This result is obtained through division of labour (so that responsibility is subdivided too):--

The legislator--and he who fulfils the law.

The teacher of discipline--and those who have grown hard and severe under discipline.

719.

A division of labour among the emotions exists inside society, making individuals and classes produce an imperfect, but more useful, kind of soul. Observe how every type in society has become atrophied with regard to certain emotions with the view of fostering and accentuating other emotions.

Morality may be thus justified:--

Economically,--as aiming at the greatest possible use of all individual power, with the view of preventing the waste of exceptional natures.

Æsthetically,--as the formation of fixed types, and the pleasure in one's own.

Politically,--as the art of bearing with the severe divergencies of the degrees of power in society.

Psychologically, as an imaginary preference for the bungled and the mediocre, in order to preserve the weak.

720.

Man has one terrible and fundamental wish; he desires power, and this impulse, which is called freedom, must be the longest restrained. Hence ethics has instinctively aimed at such an education as shall restrain the desire for power; thus our morality slanders the would-be tyrant, and glorifies charity, patriotism, and the ambition of the herd.

721.

Impotence to power, how it disguises itself and plays the hypocrite, as obedience, subordination, the pride of duty and morality, submission, devotion, love (the idolisation and apotheosis of the commander is a kind of compensation, and indirect self-enhancement). It veils itself further under fatalism and resignation, objectivity, self-tyranny, stoicism, asceticism, self-abnegation, hallowing. Other disguises are: criticism, pessimism, indignation, susceptibility, beautiful soul, virtue, self--deification, philosophic detachment, freedom from contact with the world (the realisation of impotence disguises itself as disdain).

There is a universal need to exercise some kind of power, or to create for one's self the appearance of some power, if only temporarily, in the form of intoxication.

There are men who desire power simply for the sake of the happiness it will bring; these belong chiefly to political parties. Other men have the same yearning, even when power means visible disadvantages, the sacrifice of their happiness, and well-being; they are the ambitious. Other men, again, are only like dogs in a manger, and will have power only to prevent its falling into the hands of others on whom they would then be dependent.

722.

If there be justice and equality before the law, what would thereby be abolished?--Suspense, enmity, hatred. But it is a mistake to think that you thereby increase happiness; for the Corsicans rejoice in more happiness than the Continentals.

723.

Reciprocity and the expectation of a reward is one of the most seductive forms of the devaluation of mankind. It involves that equality which depreciates any gulf as immoral.

724.

Utility is entirely dependent upon the object to be attained,--the wherefore? And this wherefore, this purpose, is again dependent upon the degree of power. Utilitarianism is not, therefore, a fundamental doctrine; it is only a story of sequels, and cannot be made obligatory for all.

725.

Of old, the State was regarded theoretically as a utilitarian institution; it has now become so in a practical sense. The time of kings has gone by, because people are no longer worthy of them. They do not wish to see the symbol of their ideal in a king, but only a means to their own ends. That's the whole truth.

726.

I am trying to grasp the absolute sense of the communal standard of judgment and valuation, naturally without any intention of deducing morals.

The degree of psychological falsity and denseness required in order to sanctify the emotions essential to preservation and expansion of power, and to create a good conscience for them.

The degree of stupidity required in order that general rules and values may remain possible (including education, formation of culture, and training).

The degree of inquisitiveness, suspicion, and intolerance required in order to deal with exceptions, to suppress them as criminals, and thus to give them bad consciences, and to make them sick with their own singularity.

727.

Morality is essentially a shield, a means of defence; and, in so far, it is a sign of the imperfectly developed man (he is still in armour; he is still stoical).

The fully developed man is above all provided with _weapons:_ he is a man who _attacks._

The weapons of war are converted into weapons of peace (out of scales and carapaces grow feathers and hair).

728.

The very notion, "living organism", implies that there must be growth,--that there must be a striving after an extension of power, and therefore a process of absorption of other forces. Under the drowsiness brought on by moral narcotics, people speak of the right of the individual to _defend himself;_ on the same principle one might speak of his right to _attack_: for _both_--and the latter more than the former--are necessities where all living organisms are concerned: aggressive and defensive egoism are not questions of choice or even of "free will," but they are fatalities of life itself.

In this respect it is immaterial whether one have an individual, a living body, or "an advancing society" in view. The right to punish (or society's means of defence) has been arrived at only through a misuse of the word "right": a right is acquired only by contract, but self-defence and self-preservation do not stand upon the basis of a contract. A people ought at least, with quite as much justification, to be able to regard its lust of power, either in arms, commerce, trade, or colonisation, as a right the right of growth, perhaps.... When the instincts of a society ultimately make it give up war and renounce conquest, it is decadent: it is ripe for democracy and the rule of shopkeepers. In the majority of cases, it is true, assurances of peace are merely stupefying draughts.

729.

The maintenance of the military State is the last means of adhering to the great tradition of the past; or, where it has been lost, to revive it. By means of it the superior or strong type of man is preserved, and all institutions and ideas which perpetuate enmity and order of rank in States, such as national feeling, protective tariffs, etc., may on that account seem justified.

730.

In order that a thing may last longer than a person (that is to say, in order that a work may outlive the individual who has created it), all manner of limitations and prejudices must be imposed upon people. But how? By means of love, reverence, gratitude towards the person who created the work, or by means of the thought that our ancestors fought for it, or by virtue of the feeling that the safety of our descendants will be secured if we uphold the work--for instance, the _polis._ Morality is essentially the means of; making something survive the individual, because it makes him of necessity a slave. Obviously the aspect from above is different from the aspect from below, and will lead to quite different interpretations. How is organised power _maintained_?--By the fact that countless generations sacrifice themselves to its cause.

731.

Marriage, property, speech, tradition, race, family, people, and State, are each links in a chain--separate parts which have a more or less high or low origin. Economically they are justified by the surplus derived from the advantages of uninterrupted work and multiple production, as weighed against the disadvantages of greater expense in barter and the difficulty of making things last. (The working parts are multiplied, and yet remain largely idle. Hence the cost of producing them is greater, and the cost of maintaining them by no means inconsiderable.) The advantage consists in avoiding interruption and incident loss. Nothing is more expensive than a start. "The higher the standard of living, the greater will be the expense of maintenance, nourishment, and propagation, as also the risk and the probability of an utter fall on reaching the summit."

732.

In bourgeois marriages, naturally in the best sense of the word marriage, there is no question whatsoever of love any more than there is of money. For on love no institution can be founded. The whole matter consists in society giving leave to two persons to satisfy their sexual desires under conditions obviously designed to safeguard social order. Of course there must be a certain attraction between the parties and a vast amount of good nature, patience, compatibility, and charity in any such contract. But the word love should not be misused as regards such a union. For two lovers, in the real and strong meaning of the word, the satisfaction of sexual desire is unessential; it is a mere symbol. For the one side, as I have already said, it is a symbol of unqualified submission: for the other, a sign of condescension--a sign of the appropriation of property. Marriage, as understood by the real old nobility, meant the breeding forth of the race (but are there any nobles nowadays? _Quaeritur_),--that is to say, the maintenance of a fixed definite type of ruler, for which object husband and wife were sacrificed. Naturally the first consideration here had nothing to do with love; on the contrary! It did not even presuppose that mutual sympathy which is the _sine qua non_ of the bourgeois marriage. The prime consideration was the interest of the race, and in the second place came the interest of a particular class. But in the face of the coldness and rigour and calculating lucidity of such a noble concept of marriage as prevailed among every healthy aristocracy, like that of ancient Athens, and even of Europe during the eighteenth century, we warm-blooded animals, with our miserably oversensitive hearts, we "moderns," cannot restrain a slight shudder. That is why love as a passion, in the big meaning of this word, was invented for, and in, an aristocratic community--where convention and abstinence are most severe.

733.

Concerning the future of marriage. A super-tax on inherited property, a longer term of military service for bachelors of a certain minimum age within the community.

Privileges of all sorts for fathers who lavish boys upon the world, and perhaps plural votes as well.

A medical certificate as a condition of any marriage, endorsed by the parochial authorities, in which a series of questions addressed to the parties and the medical officers must be answered ("family histories").

As a counter-agent to prostitution, or as its ennoblement, I would recommend leasehold marriages (to last for a term of years or months), with adequate provision for the children.

Every marriage to be warranted and sanctioned by a certain number of good men and true, of the parish, as a parochial obligation.

734.

Another commandment of philanthropy.--There are cases where to have a child would be a crime--for example, for chronic invalids and extreme neurasthenics. These people should be converted to chastity, and for this purpose the music of _Parsifal_ might at all events be tried. For Parsifal himself, that born fool, had ample reasons for not desiring to propagate. Unfortunately, however, one of the regular symptoms of exhausted stock is the inability to exercise any self-restraint in the presence of stimuli, and the tendency to respond to the smallest sexual attraction. It would be quite a mistake, for instance, to think of Leopardi as a chaste man. In such cases the priest and moralist play a hopeless game: it would be far better to send for the apothecary. Lastly, society here has a positive duty to fulfil, and of all the demands that are made on it, there are few more urgent and necessary than this one. Society as the trustee of life, is responsible to life for every botched life that comes into existence, and as it has to atone for such lives, it ought consequently to make it impossible for them ever to see the light of day: it should in many cases actually prevent the act of procreation, and may, without any regard for rank, descent, or intellect, hold in readiness the most rigorous forms of compulsion and restriction, and, under certain circumstances, have recourse to castration. The Mosaic law, "Thou shalt do no murder," is a piece of ingenuous puerility compared with the earnestness of this forbidding of life to decadents, "Thou shalt not beget"!!! ... For life itself recognises no solidarity or equality of rights between the healthy and unhealthy parts of an organism. The latter must at all cost be _eliminated,_ lest the whole fall to pieces. Compassion for decadents, equal rights for the physiologically botched--this would be the very pinnacle of immorality, it would be setting up Nature's most formidable opponent as morality itself!

735.

There are some delicate and morbid natures, the so-called idealists, who can never under any circumstances rise above a coarse, immature crime: yet it is the great justification of their anæmic little existence, it is the small requital for their lives of cowardice and falsehood to have been for one _instant_ at least--strong. But they generally collapse after such an act.

736.

In our civilised world we seldom hear of any but the bloodless, trembling criminal, overwhelmed by the curse and contempt of society, doubting even himself, and always belittling and belying his deeds--a misbegotten sort of criminal; that is why we are opposed to the idea that _all great men have been criminals_ (only in the grand style, and neither petty nor pitiful), that crime must be inherent in greatness (this at any rate is the unanimous verdict of all those students of human nature who have sounded the deepest waters of great souls). To feel one's self adrift from all questions of ancestry, conscience, and duty--this is the danger with which every great man is confronted. Yet this is precisely what he desires: he desires the great goal, and consequently the means thereto.

737.

In times when man is led by reward and punishment, the class of man which the legislator has in view is still of a low and primitive type: he is treated as one treats a child. In our latter-day culture, general degeneracy removes all sense from reward and punishment. This determination of action by the prospect of reward and punishment presupposes young, strong, and vigorous races. In effete races impulses are so irrepressible that a mere idea has no force whatever. Inability to offer any resistance to a stimulus, and the feeling that one must react to it: this excessive susceptibility of decadents makes all such systems of punishment and reform altogether senseless.

The idea "amelioration" presupposes a normal and strong creature whose action must in some way be balanced or cancelled if he is not to be lost and turned into an enemy of the community.

738.

The effect of prohibition. Every power which forbids and which knows how to excite fear in the person forbidden creates a guilty conscience. (That is to say, a person has a certain desire but is conscious of the danger of gratifying it, and is consequently forced to be secretive, underhand, and cautious.) Thus any prohibition deteriorates the character of those who do not willingly submit

themselves to it, but are constrained thereto.

739.

"Punishment and reward."--These two things stand or fall together. Nowadays no one will accept a reward or acknowledge that any authority should have the power to punish. Warfare has been reformed. We have a desire: it meets with opposition: we then see that we shall most easily obtain it by coming to some agreement--by drawing up a contract. In modern society where every one has given his assent to a certain contract, the criminal is a man who breaks that contract. This at least is a clear concept. But in that case, anarchists and enemies of social order could not be tolerated.

740.

Crimes belong to the category of revolt against the social system, A rebel is not punished, he is simply suppressed. He _may_ be an utterly contemptible and pitiful creature; but there is nothing intrinsically despicable about rebellion in fact, in our particular society revolt is far from being disgraceful. There are cases in which a rebel deserves honour precisely because he is conscious of certain elements in society which cry aloud for hostility; for such a man rouses us from our slumbers. When a criminal commits but one crime against a particular person, it does not alter the fact that all his instincts urge him to make a stand against the whole social system. His isolated act is merely a symptom.

The idea of punishment ought to be reduced to the concept of the suppression of revolt, a weapon against the vanquished (by means of long or short terms of imprisonment). But punishment should not be associated in any way with contempt. A criminal is at all events a man who has set his life, his honour, his freedom at stake; he is therefore a man of courage. Neither should punishment be regarded as penance or retribution, as though there were some recognised rate of exchange between crime and punishment. Punishment does not purify, simply because crime does not sully.

A criminal should not be prevented from making his peace with society, provided he does not belong to the race of criminals. In the latter case, however, he should be opposed even before he has committed an act of hostility. (As soon as he gets into the clutches of society the first operation to be performed upon him should be that of castration.) A criminal's bad manners and his low degree of intelligence should not be reckoned against him. Nothing is more common than that he should misunderstand himself (more particularly when his rebellious instinct--the rancour of the _unclassed_--has not reached consciousness simply because he has not read enough). It is natural that he should deny and dishonour his deed while under the influence of fear at its failure. All this is quite distinct from those cases in which, psychologically speaking, the criminal yields to an incomprehensible impulse, and attributes a motive to his deed by associating it with a merely incidental and insignificant action (for example, robbing a man, when his real desire was to take his blood).

The worth of a man should not be measured by any one isolated act. Napoleon warned us against this. Deeds which are only skin-deep are more particularly insignificant. If we have no crime--let us say no murder--on our conscience; why is it? It simply means that a few favourable circumstances have been wanting in our lives. And supposing we were induced to commit such a crime would our worth be materially affected? As a matter of fact, we should only be despised, if we were not credited with possessing the power to kill a man under certain circumstances. In nearly every crime certain qualities come into play without which no one would be a true man. Dostoievsky was not far wrong when he said of the inmates of the penal colonies in Siberia, that they constituted the strongest and most valuable portion of the Russian people. The fact that in our society the criminal happens to be a badly nourished and stunted animal is simply a condemnation of our system. In the days of the Renaissance the criminal was a flourishing specimen of humanity, and acquired his own virtue for himself,--Virtue in the sense of the Renaissance--that is to say, _virtù;_ free from moralic acid.

It is only those whom we do not despise that we are able to elevate. Moral contempt is a far greater indignity and insult than any kind of crime.

741.

Shame was first introduced into punishment when certain penalties were inflicted on persons held in contempt, such as slaves. It was a despised class that was most frequently punished, and thus it came to pass that punishment and contempt were associated.

742.

In the ancient idea of punishment a religious concept was immanent, namely, the retributive power of chastisement. Penalties purified; in modern society, however, penalties degrade. Punishment is a form of paying off a debt: once it has been paid, one is freed from the deed for which one was so ready to suffer. Provided belief in the power of punishment exist, once the penalty is paid a feeling of relief and lightheartedness results, which is not so very far removed from a state of convalescence and health. One has made one's peace with society, and one appears to one's self more dignified pure.... To-day, however, punishment isolates even more than the crime; the fate behind the sin has become so formidable that it is almost hopeless. One rises from punishment still an enemy of society. Henceforward it reckons yet another enemy against it. The _jus talionis_ may spring from the spirit of retribution (that is to say, from a sort of modification of the instinct of revenge); but in the Book of Manu, for instance, it is the need of having some equivalent in order to do penance, or to become free in a religious sense.

743.

My pretty radical note of interrogation in the case of all more modern laws of punishment is this: should not the punishment fit the crime?--for in your heart of hearts thus would you have it. But then the susceptibility of the particular criminal to pain would have to be taken into account. In other words, there should be no such thing as a preconceived penalty for any crime--no fixed penal code. But as it would be no easy matter to ascertain the degree of sensitiveness of each individual criminal, punishment would have to be abolished in practice? What a sacrifice! Is it not? Consequently ...

744.

Ah! and the philosophy of jurisprudence! That is a science which, like all moral sciences, has not even been wrapped in swaddling-clothes yet. Even among jurists who consider themselves liberal, the oldest and most valuable significance of punishment is still misunderstood--it is not even known. So long as jurisprudence does not build upon a new foundation--on history and comparative anthropology--it will never cease to quarrel over the fundamentally false abstractions which are fondly imagined to be the "philosophy of law," and which have nothing whatever to do with modern man. The man of to-day, however, is such a complicated woof even in regard to his legal valuation that he allows of the most varied interpretation.

745.

An old Chinese sage once said he had heard that when mighty empires were doomed they began to have numberless laws.

746.

Schopenhauer would have all rapscallions castrated, and all geese shut up in convents. But from what point of view would this be desirable? The rascal has at least this advantage over other men--that he is not mediocre; and the fool is superior to us inasmuch as he does not suffer at the sight of mediocrity. It would be better to widen the gulf--that is to say, roguery and stupidity should be increased. In this way human nature would become broader ... but, after all, this is Fate, and it will happen, whether we desire it or not. Idiocy and roguery are increasing: this is part of modern progress.

747.

Society, to-day, is full of consideration, tact, and reticence, and of good-natured respect for other people's rights--even for the exactions of strangers. To an even greater degree is there a certain charitable and instinctive depreciation of the worth of man as shown by all manner of trustful habits. Respect for men, and not only for the most virtuous, is perhaps the real parting of the ways between us and the Christian mythologists also have our good share of irony even when listening to moral sermons. He who preaches morality to us debases himself in our eyes and becomes almost comical. Liberal-mindedness regarding morality is one of the best signs of our age. In cases where it is most distinctly wanting, we regard it as a sign of a morbid condition (the case of Carlyle in England, of Ibsen in Norway, and Schopenhauer's pessimism throughout Europe). If there is anything which can reconcile us to our own age, it is precisely the amount of immorality which it allows itself without falling in its own estimation--very much the reverse! In what, then, does the superiority of culture over the want of culture consist--of the Renaissance, for instance, over the Middle Ages? In this alone: the greater quantity of acknowledged immorality. From this it necessarily follows that the very _zenith_ of human development _must_ be regarded by the moral fanatic as the _non plus ultra_ of corruption (in this connection let us recall Savonarola's judgment of Florence, Plato's indictment of Athens under Pericles, Luther's condemnation of Rome, Rousseau's anathemas against the society of Voltaire, and Germany's hostility to Goethe).

A little more fresh air, for Heaven's sake! This ridiculous condition of Europe _must_ not last any longer. Is there a single idea behind this bovine nationalism? What possible value can there be in encouraging this arrogant self-conceit when everything to-day points to greater and more common interests?--at a moment when the spiritual dependence and denationalisation, which are obvious to all, are paving the way for the reciprocal _rapprochements_ and fertilisations which make up the real value and sense of present-day culture! ... And it is precisely now that "the new German Empire" has been founded upon the most thread-bare and discredited of ideas--universal suffrage and equal right for all.

Think of all this struggling for advantage among conditions which are in every way degenerate: of this culture of big cities, of newspapers, of hurry and scurry, and of "aimlessness"! The economic unity of Europe must necessarily come--and with it, as a reaction, the pacivist movement.

A pacivist party, free from all sentimentality, which forbids its children to wage war; which forbids recourse to courts of justice; which forswears all fighting, all contradiction, and all persecution: for a while the party of the oppressed, and later the powerful party:--this party would be opposed to everything in the shape of revenge and resentment.

There will also be a war party, exercising the same thoroughness and severity towards itself, which will proceed in precisely the opposite direction.

749.

The princes of Europe should really consider whether as a matter of fact they can dispense with our services--with us, the immoralists. We are to-day the only power which can win a victory without allies: and we are therefore far and away the strongest of the strong. We can even do without lying, and let me ask what other power can dispense with this weapon? A strong temptation fights for us; the strongest, perhaps, that exists--the temptation of truth.... Truth? How do I come by this word? I must withdraw it: I must repudiate this proud word. But no. We do not even want it--we shall be quite able to achieve our victory of power without its help. The real charm which fights for us, the eye of Venus which our opponents themselves deaden and blind--this charm is the magic of the extreme. The fascination which everything extreme exercises: we immoralists--we are in every way the extremists.

750.

The corrupted ruling classes have brought ruling into evil odour. The State administration of justice is a piece of cowardice, because the great man who can serve as a standard is lacking. At last the feeling of insecurity becomes so great that men fall in the dust before any sort of will-power that commands.

751.

"The will to power" is so loathed in democratic ages that the whole of the psychology of these ages seems directed towards its belittlement and slander. The types of men who sought the highest honours are said to have been Napoleon! Cæsar! and Alexander!--as if these had not been precisely the greatest _scorners_ of honour.

And Helvetius would fain show us that we strive after power in order to have those pleasures which are at the disposal of the mighty--that is to say, according to him, this striving after power is the will to pleasure--hedonism!

752.

According as to whether a people feels: "the rights, the keenness of vision, and the gifts of leading, etc., are with the few" or "with the many"--it constitutes En oligarchic or a democratic community.

Monarchy represents the belief in a man who is completely superior a leader, a saviour, a demigod.

Aristocracy represents the belief in a chosen few--in a higher caste.

Democracy represents the disbelief in all great men and in all elite societies: everybody is everybody else's equal, "At bottom we are all herd and mob."

753.

I am opposed to Socialism because it dreams ingenuously of goodness, truth, beauty, and equal rights (anarchy pursues the same ideal, but in a more brutal fashion).

I am opposed to parliamentary government and the power of the press, because they are the means whereby cattle become masters.

754.

The arming of the people means in the end the arming of the mob.

755.

Socialists are particularly ridiculous in my eyes, because of their absurd optimism concerning the "good man" who is supposed to be waiting in their cupboard, and who will come into being when the present order of society has been overturned and has made way for natural instincts. But the opposing party is quite as ludicrous, because it will not see the act of violence which lies beneath every law, the severity and egoism inherent in every kind of authority. "I and my kind will rule and prevail. Whoever degenerates will be either expelled or annihilated."--This was the fundamental feeling of all ancient legislation. The idea of a higher order of man is hated much more profoundly than monarchs themselves. Hatred of aristocracy always uses hatred of monarchy as a mask.

756.

How treacherous are all parties! They bring to light something concerning their leaders which the latter, perhaps, have hitherto kept hidden beneath a bushel with consummate art.

757.

Modern Socialism would fain create a profane counterpart to jesuitism: everybody a perfect instrument. But as to the object of it all, the purpose of it--this has not yet been ascertained.

758.

The slavery of to-day: a piece of barbarism. Where are the masters for whom these slaves work? One must not always expect the simultaneous appearance of the two complementary castes of society.

Utility and pleasure are slave theories of life.

"The blessing of work" is an ennobling phrase for slaves. Incapacity for leisure.

759.

There is no such thing as a right to live, a right to work, or a right to be happy: in this respect man is not different from the meanest worm.

760.

We must undoubtedly think of these things as uncompromisingly as Nature does: they preserve the species.

761.

We should look upon the needs of the masses with ironic compassion: they want something which we have got--Ah!

762.

European democracy is only in a very slight degree the manifestation of unfettered powers. It represents, above all, the unfettering of laziness, fatigue, and _weakness_.

753.

Concerning the future of the workman--Workmen men should learn to regard their duties as _soldiers_ do. They receive emoluments, incomes, but they do not get wages!

There is no relationship between _work done_ and money received; the individual should, _according to his kind,_ be so placed as to _perform_ the _highest_ that is compatible with his powers.

764.

Noblemen ought one day to live as the bourgeois do now--but above them, distinguishing themselves by the simplicity of their wants--the superior caste will then live in a poorer and simpler way and yet be in possession of power.

For lower orders of mankind the reverse valuations hold good: it is a matter of implanting "virtues" in them. Absolute commands, terrible compulsory methods, in order that they may rise above mere ease in life. The remainder may obey, but their vanity demands that they may feel themselves dependent, not upon great men, but upon principles.

765.

"_The Atonement of all Sin?_"

People speak of the profound injustice of the social arrangement, as it the fact that one man is born in favourable circumstances and that another is born in unfavourable ones--or that one should possess gifts the other has not, were on the face of it an injustice. Among the more honest of these opponents of society this is what is said: "We, with all the bad, morbid, criminal qualities which we acknowledge we possess, are only the inevitable result of the oppression for ages of the weak by the strong"; thus they insinuate their evil natures into the consciences of the ruling classes. They threaten and storm and curse. They become virtuous from sheer indignation--they don't want to have become bad men and _canaille_ for nothing. The name for this attitude, which is an invention of the last century, is, if I am not mistaken, pessimism; and even that pessimism which is the outcome of indignation. It is in this attitude of mind that history is judged, that it is deprived of its inevitable fatality, and that responsibility and even guilt is discovered in it. For the great desideratum is to find guilty people in it. The botched and the bungled, the decadents of all kinds, are revolted at themselves, and require sacrifices in order that they may not slake their thirst for destruction upon themselves (which might, indeed, be the most reasonable procedure). But for this purpose they at least require a semblance of justification, _i.e._ a theory according to which the fact of their existence, and of their character, may be expiated by a scapegoat. This scapegoat may be God,--in Russia such resentful atheists are not wanting,--or the order of society, or education and upbringing, or the Jews, or the nobles, or, finally, the well-constituted of every kind. "It is a sin for a man to have been born in decent circumstances, for by so doing he disinherits the others, he pushes them aside, he imposes upon them the curse of vice and of work.... How can I be made answerable for my misery; surely some one must be responsible for it, or I could not bear to live."...

In short, resentful pessimism discovers responsible parties in order to create a pleasurable sensation for itself--revenge.... "Sweeter than honey"--thus does even old Homer speak of revenge.

***

The fact that such a theory no longer meets with understanding--or rather, let us say, contempt is accounted for by that particle of Christianity which still circulates in the blood of every one of us; it makes us tolerant towards things simply because we scent a Christian savour about them.... The Socialists appeal to the Christian instincts; this is their really refined piece of cleverness.... Thanks to Christianity, we have now grown accustomed to the superstitious concept of a soul--of an immortal soul, of soul monads, which, as a matter of fact, hails from somewhere else, and which has only become inherent in certain cases--that is to say, become incarnate in them--by accident: but the nature of these cases is not altered, let alone determined by it. The circumstances of society, of relationship, and of history are only accidents for the soul, perhaps misadventures: in any case, the world is not their work. By means of the idea of soul the individual is made transcendental; thanks to it, a ridiculous amount of importance can be attributed to him.

As a matter of fact, it was Christianity which first induced the individual to take up this position of judge of all things. It made megalomania almost his duty: it has made everything temporary and limited subordinate to eternal rights! What is the State, what is society, what are historical laws, what is physiology to me? Thus speaks something from beyond Becoming, an immutable entity throughout history: thus speaks something immortal, something divine--it is the soul!

Another Christian, but no less insane, concept has percolated even deeper into the tissues of modern ideas: the concept of the equality of all souls before God. In this concept the prototype of all theories concerning equal rights is to be found. Man was first taught to stammer this proposition religiously: later, it was converted into a moral; no wonder he has ultimately begun to take it

seriously, to take it _practically_!--that is to say, politically, socialistically, resento-pessimistically.

Wherever responsible circumstances or people have been looked for, it was the _instinct of revenge_ that sought them. This instinct of revenge obtained such an ascendancy over man in the course of centuries that the whole of metaphysics, psychology, ideas of society, and, above all, morality, are tainted with it. Man has nourished this idea of responsibility to such an extent that he has introduced the bacillus of vengeance into everything. By means of it he has made God Himself ill, and killed innocence in the universe, by tracing every condition of things to acts of will, to intentions, to responsible agents. The whole teaching of will, this most fatal fraud that has ever existed in psychology hitherto, was invented essentially for the purpose of punishment. It was the social utility of punishment that lent this concept its dignity, its power, and its truth. The originator of that psychology, that we shall call volitional psychology, must be sought in those classes which had the right of punishment in their hands; above all, therefore, among the priests who stood on the very pinnacle of ancient social systems: these people wanted to create for themselves the right to wreak revenge--they wanted to supply God with the privilege of vengeance. For this purpose; man was declared "free": to this end every action had to be regarded as voluntary, and the origin of every deed had to be considered as lying in consciousness. But by such propositions as these ancient psychology is refuted.

To-day, when Europe seems to have taken the contrary direction; when we halcyonians would fain withdraw, dissipate, and banish the concept of guilt and punishment with all our might from the world; when our most serious endeavours are concentrated upon purifying psychology, morality, history, nature, social institutions and privileges, and even God Himself, from this filth; in whom must we recognise our most mortal enemies? Precisely in those apostles of revenge and resentment, in those who are _par excellence_ pessimists from indignation, who make it their mission to sanctify their filth with the name of "righteous indignation."... We others, whose one desire is to reclaim innocence on behalf of Becoming, would fain be the missionaries of a purer thought, namely, that no one is responsible for man's qualities; neither God, nor society, nor his parents, nor his ancestors, nor himself--in fact, that no one is to blame for him ... The being who might be made responsible for a man's existence, for the fact that he is constituted in a particular way, or for his birth in certain circumstances and in a certain environment, is absolutely lacking.--_And it is a great blessing that such a being is non-existent ..._. We are _not_ the result of an eternal design, of a will, of a desire: there is no attempt being made with us to attain to an "ideal of perfection," to an "ideal of happiness," to an "ideal of virtue,"--and we are just as little the result of a mistake on God's part in the presence of which He ought to feel uneasy (a thought which is known to be at the very root of the Old Testament). There is not a place nor a purpose nor a sense to which we can attribute our existence or our kind of existence. In the first place, no one is in a position to do this: it is quite impossible to judge, to measure, or to compare, or even to deny the whole universe! And why?--For five reasons, all accessible to the man of average intelligence: for instance, _because there is no existence outside the universe ..._ and let us say it again, this is a great blessing, for therein lies the whole innocence of our lives.

2. The Individual.

766.

Fundamental errors: to regard the _herd_ as an aim instead of the individual! The herd is only a means and nothing _more_! But nowadays people are trying to understand _the herd_ as they would an individual, and to confer higher rights upon it than upon isolated personalities. Terrible mistake!! In addition to this, all that makes for gregariousness, _e.g._ sympathy, is regarded as the _more valuable_ side of our natures.

767.

The individual is something quite _new,_ and capable of _creating new things._ He is something absolute, and all his actions are quite his own. The individual in the end has to seek the valuation for his actions in himself: because he has to give an individual meaning even to traditional words and notions. His interpretation of a formula is at least personal, even if he does not create the formula itself: at least as an interpreter he is creative.

768.

The "ego" oppresses and kills. It acts like an organic cell. It is predatory and violent. It would fain regenerate itself--pregnancy. It would fain give birth to its God and see all mankind at its feet.

769.

Every living organism gropes around as far as its power permits, and overcomes all that is weaker than itself: by this means it finds pleasure in its own existence. The _increasing "humanity"_ of this tendency consists in the fact that we are beginning to feel ever more subtly how difficult it is really to _absorb_ others: while we could show our power by injuring him, his will _estranges_ him from us, and thus makes him less susceptible of being overcome.

770.

The degree of resistance which has to be continually overcome in order to remain _at the top,_ is the measure of _freedom,_ whether for individuals or for societies: freedom being understood as positive power, as will to power. The highest form of individual freedom, of sovereignty, would, according to this, in all probability be found not five feet away from its opposite--that is to say, where the danger of slavery hangs over life, like a hundred swords of Damocles. Let any one go through the whole of history from this point of view: the ages when the individual reaches perfect maturity, _i.e._ the free ages, when the classical type, _sovereign man,_ is attained to--these were certainly not humane times!

There should be no choice: either one must be uppermost or nethermost--like a worm, despised, annihilated, trodden upon. One must have tyrants against one in order to become a tyrant, _i.e._ in order to be free. It is no small advantage to have a hundred swords of Damocles suspended over one: it is only thus that one learns to dance, it is only thus that one attains to any freedom in one's movements.

771.

Man more than any other animal was originally _altruistic_--hence his slow growth (child) and lofty development. Hence, too, his extraordinary and latest kind of egoism.--Beasts of prey are much more _individualistic._

772.

A criticism of _selfishness._ The involuntary ingenuousness of La Rochefoucauld, who believed that he was saying something bold, liberal, and paradoxical (in his days, of course, truth in psychological matters was something that astonished people) when he said. "_Les grandes âmes ne sont pas celles qui ont moins de passions et plus de vertus que les âmes communes, mais seulement celles qui ont de plus grands desseins._" Certainly, John Stuart Mill (who calls Chamfort the _noble_ and philosophical La Rochefoucauld of the eighteenth century) recognises in him merely an astute and keen-sighted observer of all that which is the result of habitual selfishness in the human breast, and he adds: "A noble spirit is unable to see the necessity of a constant observation of _baseness_ and _contemptibility_, unless it were to show against what corrupting influences a lofty spirit and a noble character were able to triumph."

773.

The Morphology of the Feelings of Self.

First standpoint--To what extent are _sympathy_ or _communal feelings,_ the lower or preparatory states, at a time when personal self-esteem and initiative in valuation, on the part of individuals, are not yet possible?

Second standpoint.--To what extent is the zenith of collective self-esteem, the pride in the distinction of the clan, the feeling of inequality and a certain abhorrence of mediation, of equal rights and of reconciliation, the school for individual self-esteem? It may be this in so far as it compels the individual to represent the pride of the community --he is obliged to speak and act with tremendous self-respect, because he stands for the community And the same holds good when the individual regards himself as the instrument or speaking-tube of a godhead.

Third standpoint.--To what extent do these forms of impersonality invest the individual with enormous importance? In so far as higher powers are using him as an intermediary: religious shyness towards one's self is the condition of prophets and poets.

Fourth standpoint.--To what extent does responsibility for a whole educate the individual in foresight, and give him a severe and terrible hand, a calculating and cold heart, majesty of bearing and of action--things which he would not allow himself if he stood only for his own rights?

In short, collective self-esteem is the great preparatory school for personal sovereignty. The noble caste is that which creates the heritage of this faculty.

774.

The disguised forms of will to power:--

(1) _The desire for freedom,_ for independence for equilibrium, for peace, for _co-ordination._ Also that of the anchorite, the "Free-Spirit." In its lowest form, the will to live at all costs--the instinct of self-preservation.

(2) Subordination, with the view of satisfying the will to power of a whole community; submissiveness, the making of one's self indispensable and useful to him who has the power; love, a secret path to the heart of the powerful, in order to become his master.

(3) The feeling of duty, conscience, the imaginary comfort of belonging to a higher order than those who actually hold the reins of power; the acknowledgment of an order of rank which allows of judging even the more powerful, self-depreciation; the discovery of new _codes of morality_ (of which the Jews are a classical example).

775.

_Praise and gratitude as forms of will to power.--_Praise and gratitude for harvests, for good weather, victories, marriages, and peace--all festivals need a subject on which feeling can be outpoured. The desire is to make all good things that happen to one appear as though they had been done to one: people will have a donor. The same holds good of the work of art: people are not satisfied with it alone, they must praise the artist.--What, then, is praise? It is a sort of compensation for benefits received, a sort of giving back, a manifestation of _our_ power--for the man who praises assents to, blesses, values, _judges_. he arrogates to himself the right to give his consent to a thing, to be able to confer honours. An increased feeling of happiness or of liveliness is also an increased feeling of power, and it is as a result of this feeling that a man _praises_ (it is as the outcome of this feeling that he invents a donor, a "subject"). Gratitude is thus revenge of a lofty kind: it is most severely exercised and demanded where equality and pride both require to be upheld--that is to say, where revenge is practised to its fullest extent.

776.

Concerning the Machiavellism of Power.

The _will to power_ appears:--

_(a)_ Among the oppressed and slaves of all kinds, in the form of will to "_freedom_": the mere fact of breaking loose from something seems to be an end in itself (in a religio-moral sense: "One is only answerable to one's own conscience"; "evangelical freedom," etc. etc.),

_(b)_ In the case of a stronger species, ascending to power, in the form of the will to overpower. If this fails, then it shrinks to the "will to justice"--that is to say, to the will to the same measure of rights as the ruling caste possesses.

_(c)_ In the case of the strongest, richest, most independent, and most courageous, in the form of "love of humanity," of "love of the people," of the "gospel," of "truth" of "God," of "pity," of self sacrifice," etc. etc.; in the form of overpowering, of deeds of capture, of imposing service on some one, of an instinctive reckoning of one's self as part of a great mass of power to which one attempts to give a direction: the hero, the prophet, the Cæsar, the Saviour, the bell-wether. (The love of the sexes also belongs to this category, it will overpower something, possess it utterly, and it looks like self-abnegation. At bottom it is only the love of one's instrument, of one's "horse"--the conviction that things belong to one because one is in a position to use them.)

"Freedom," "Justice," "Love"!!!

777.

Love.--Behold this love and pity of women--what could be more egoistic? ... And when they do sacrifice themselves and their honour or reputation, to whom do they sacrifice themselves? To the man? Is it not rather to an unbridled desire? These desires are quite as selfish, even though they may be beneficial to others and provoke gratitude. ... To what extent can such a hyperfœtation of one valuation sanctify everything else!!

778.

"Senses," "Passions.".--When the fear of the senses and of the passions and of the desires becomes so great as to warn us against them, it is already a symptom of _weakness:_ extreme measures always characterise abnormal conditions. That which is lacking here, or more precisely that which is decaying, is the power to resist an impulse: when one feels instinctively that one must yield,--that is to say, that one must react,--then it is an excellent thing to avoid opportunities (temptations).

The stimulation of the senses is only a temptation in so far as those creatures are concerned whose systems are easily swayed and influenced: on the other hand, in the case of remarkable constitutional obtuseness and hardness, strong stimuli are necessary in order to set the functions in motion. Dissipation can only be objected to in the case of one who has no right to it; and almost all passions have fallen into disrepute thanks to those who were not strong enough to convert them to their own advantage.

One should understand that passions are open to the same objections as illnesses: yet we should not be justified in doing without illnesses, and still less without passions. We require the abnormal; we give life a tremendous shock by means of these great illnesses.

In detail the following should be distinguished:--

(1) The _dominating passion,_ which may even bring the supremest form of health with it: in this case the co-ordination of the internal system and its functions to perform one task is best attained,--but this is almost a definition of health.

(2) The antagonism of the passions the double, treble, and multiple soul in one breast:[6] this is very unhealthy; it is a sign of inner ruin and of disintegration, betraying and promoting an internal dualism and anarchy--unless, of course, one passion becomes master. _Return to health._

(3) The juxtaposition of passions without their being either opposed or united with one another. Very often transitory, and then, as soon as order is established, this condition may be a healthy one. A most interesting class of men belong to this order, the chameleons; they are not necessarily at loggerheads with themselves, they are both happy and secure, but they cannot develop--their moods lie side by side, even though they may seem to lie far apart. They change, but they become nothing.

[Footnote 6: This refers to Goethe's _Faust._ In Part I., Act I., Scene 11., we find Faust exclaiming in despair: "Two souls, alas! within my bosom throne!" See Theodore Martin's _Faust,_ translated into English verse.--Tr.]

779.

The quantitative estimate of aims and its influence upon the valuing standpoint, the _great_ and the _small_ criminal. The greatness or smallness of the aims will determine whether the doer feels respect for himself with it all, or whether he feels pusillanimous and miserable.

The degree of intellectuality manifested in the means employed may likewise influence our valuation. How differently the philosophical innovator, experimenter, and man of violence stands out against robbers, barbarians, adventurers!--There is a semblance of disinterestedness in the former.

Finally, noble manners, bearing, courage, self-confidence,--how they alter the value of that which is attained by means of them!

***

Concerning the optics of valuation:--

The influence of the greatness or smallness of the aims.

The influence of the intellectuality of the means. The influence of the behaviour in action. The influence of success or failure. The influence of opposing forces and their value. The influence of that which is permitted and that which is forbidden.

780.

The tricks by means of which actions, measures, and passions are legitimised, which from an individual standpoint are no longer good form or even in good taste.--

Art, which allows us to enter such strange worlds, makes them tasteful to us.

Historians prove its justification and reason; travels, exoticism, psychology, penal codes, the lunatic asylum, the criminal, sociology.

Impersonality (so that as media of a collective whole we allow ourselves these passions and action--the Bar, juries, the bourgeois, the soldier, the minister, the prince, society, "critics") makes us feel that we are _sacrificing something._

781.

Preoccupations concerning one's self and one's eternal salvation are not expressive either of a rich or of a self-confident nature, for the latter lets all questions of eternal bliss go to the devil,--it is not interested in such matters of happiness it is all power, deeds, desires; it imposes itself upon things; it even violates things. The Christian is a romantic hypochondriac who does not stand firmly on his legs.

Whenever hedonistic views come to the front, one can always presuppose the existence of pain and a certain ill-constitutedness.

782.

"The growing autonomy of the individual"--Parisian philosophers like M. Fouillée talk of such things: they would do well to study the _race moutonnière_ for a moment; for they belong to it. For Heaven's sake open your eyes, ye sociologists who deal with the future! The individual grew strong under quite opposite conditions: ye describe the extremest weakening and impoverishment of man; ye actually want this weakness and impoverishment, and ye apply the whole lying machinery of the old ideal in order to achieve your end. Ye are so constituted that ye actually regard your gregarious wants as an ideal! Here we are in the presence of an absolute lack of psychological honesty.

783.

The two traits which characterise the modern European are apparently antagonistic _individualism and the demand for equal rights_: this I am at last beginning to understand. The individual is an extremely vulnerable piece of vanity: this vanity, when it is conscious of its high degree of susceptibility to pain, demands that every one should be made equal; that the individual should only stand _inter pares_. But in this way a social race is depicted in which, as a matter of fact, gifts and powers are on the whole equally distributed. The pride which would have loneliness and but few appreciators is quite beyond comprehension: really "great" successes are only attained through the masses--indeed, we scarcely understand yet that a mob success is in reality only a small success; because _pulchrum est paucorum hominum._

No morality will countenance order of rank among men, and the jurists know nothing of a communal conscience. The principle of individualism rejects _really great_ men, and demands the most delicate vision for, and the speediest discovery of, a talent among people who are almost equal; and inasmuch as every one has some modicum of talent in such late and civilised cultures (and can, therefore, expect to receive his share of honour), there is a more general buttering-up of modest merits to-day than there has ever been. This gives the age the appearance of _unlimited justice._ Its want of justice is to be found not in its unbounded hatred of tyrants and demagogues, even in the arts; but in its detestation of noble natures who scorn the praise of the many. The demand for equal rights (that is to say, the privilege of sitting in judgment on everything and everybody) is anti-aristocratic.

This age knows just as little concerning the absorption of the individual, of his mergence into a great type of men who do not want to be personalities. It was this that formerly constituted the distinction and the zeal of many lofty natures (the greatest poets among them); or of the desire to be a _polis,_ as in Greece; or of Jesuitism, or of the Prussian Staff Corps, and bureaucracy; or of apprenticeship and a continuation of the tradition of great masters: to all of which things, non-social conditions and the absence of _petty vanity_ are necessary.

784.

Individualism is a modest and still unconscious form of will to power; with it a single human unit seems to think it sufficient to free himself from the preponderating power of society (or of the State or Church). He does not set himself up in opposition as a _personality,_ but merely as a unit; he represents the rights of all other individuals as against the whole. That is to say, he instinctively places himself on a level with every other unit: what he combats he does not combat as a person, but as a representative of units against a mass.

Socialism is merely an agitatory measure of individualism: it recognises the fact that in order to attain to something, men must organise themselves into a general movement--into a "power." But what the Socialist requires is not society as the object of the individual, _but society as a means of making many individuals possible_: this is the instinct of Socialists, though they frequently deceive themselves on this point (apart from this, however, in order to make their kind prevail, they are compelled to deceive others to an enormous extent). Altruistic moral preaching thus enters into the service of individual egoism,--one of the most common frauds of the nineteenth century.

Anarchy is also merely an agitatory measure of Socialism; with it the Socialist inspires fear, with fear he begins to fascinate and to terrorise: but what he does above all is to draw all courageous and reckless people to his side, even in the most intellectual spheres.

In spite of all this, individualism is the most modest stage of the will to power.

***

When one has reached a certain degree of independence, one always longs for more: separation in proportion to the degree of force; the individual is no longer content to regard himself as equal to everybody, he actually _seeks for his peer_--he makes himself stand out from others. Individualism is followed by a development in groups and organs; correlative tendencies join up together and become powerfully active: now there arise between these centres of power, friction, war, a reconnoitring of the forces on either side, reciprocity, understandings, and the regulation of mutual services. Finally, there appears an order of rank.

Recapitulation--

1. The individuals emancipate themselves.

2. They make war, and ultimately agree concerning equal rights (justice is made an end in itself).

3. Once this is reached, the actual differences in degrees of power begin to make themselves felt, and to a greater extent than before (the reason being that on the whole peace is established, and innumerable small centres of power begin to create differences which formerly were scarcely noticeable). Now the individuals begin to form groups, these strive after privileges and preponderance, and war starts afresh in a milder form.

People demand freedom only when they have no power. Once power is obtained, a preponderance thereof is the next thing to be coveted; if this is not achieved (owing to the fact that one is still too weak for it), then _"justice" i.e. "equality_ of power" become the objects of desire.

785.

The rectification of the concept "egoism."--When one has discovered what an error the "individual" is, and that every single creature represents the whole process of evolution (not alone "inherited," but in "himself"), the individual then acquires _an inordinately great importance._ The voice of instinct is quite right here. When this instinct tends to decline, _i.e._ when the individual begins to seek his worth in his services to others, one may be sure that exhaustion and degeneration have set in. An altruistic attitude of mind, when it is fundamental and free from all hypocrisy, is the instinct of creating a second value for one's self in the service of other egoists. As a rule, however, it is only apparent--a circuitous path to the preservation of one's own feelings of vitality and worth.

786.

The History of Moralisation and Demoralisation.

Proposition one.--There are no such things as moral actions: they are purely imaginary. Not only is it impossible to demonstrate their existence (a fact which Kant and Christianity, for instance, both acknowledged) but they are not even possible. Owing to psychological misunderstanding, a man invented an _opposite_ to the instinctive impulses of life, and believed that a new species of instinct was thereby discovered: a _primum mobile_ was postulated which does not exist at all. According to the valuation which gave rise to the antithesis "moral" and "immoral," one should say: _There is nothing else on earth but immoral intentions and actions._

Proposition two.----The whole differentiation, "moral" and "immoral," arises from the assumption that both moral and immoral actions are the result of a spontaneous will--in short, that such a will exists; or in other words, that moral judgments can only hold good with regard to intuitions and actions _that are free._ But this whole order of actions and intentions is purely imaginary: the only world to which the moral standard could be applied does not exist at all: _there is no such thing as a moral or an immoral action._

The _psychological error_ out of which the antithesis "moral" and "immoral" arose is: "selfless," "unselfish," "self-denying"--all unreal and fantastic.

A false dogmatism also clustered around the concept "ego"; it was regarded as atomic, and falsely opposed to a non-ego; it was also liberated from Becoming, and declared to belong to the sphere of Being. The false materialisation of the ego: this (owing to the belief in individual immortality) was made an article of faith under the pressure of _religio-moral discipline._ According to this artificial liberation of the ego and its transference to the realm of the absolute, people thought that they had arrived at an antithesis in values which seemed quite irrefutable--the single ego and the vast non-ego. It seemed obvious that the value of the individual ego could only exist in conjunction with the vast non-ego, more particularly in the sense of being subject to it and existing only for its sake. Here, of course, the gregarious instinct determined the direction of thought: nothing is more opposed to this instinct than the sovereignty of the individual. Supposing, however, that the ego be absolute, then its value must lie in _self-negation._

Thus: (1) the false emancipation of the "individual" as an atom;

(2) The gregarious self-conceit which abhors the desire to remain an atom, and regards it as hostile.

(3) As a result: the overcoming of the individual by changing his aim.

(4) At this point there appeared to be actions that were self-effacing: around these actions a whole sphere of antitheses was fancied.

(5) It was asked, in what sort of actions does man most strongly assert himself? Around these (sexuality, covetousness, lust for power, cruelty, etc. etc.) hate, contempt, and anathemas were heaped: it was believed that there could be such things as selfless impulses. Everything selfish was condemned, everything unselfish was in demand.

(6) And the result was: what had been done? A ban had been placed on the strongest, the most natural, yea, the only genuine impulses, henceforward, in order that an action might be praiseworthy, there must be no trace in it of any of those genuine impulses--_monstrous fraud in psychology._ Every kind of "self-satisfaction" had to be remodelled and made possible by means of misunderstanding and adjusting one's self _sub specie boni._ Conversely: that species which found its advantage in depriving mankind of its self-satisfaction, the representatives of the gregarious instincts, _e.g._ the priests and the philosophers, were sufficiently crafty and psychologically astute to show how selfishness ruled everywhere. The Christian conclusion from this was: "Everything is sin, even our virtues. Man is utterly undesirable. Selfless actions are impossible." Original sin. In short, once man had opposed his instincts to a purely imaginary world of the good, he concluded by despising himself as incapable of performing "good" actions.

_N.B._ In this way Christianity represents a step forward in the sharpening of psychological insight: La Rochefoucauld and Pascal. It perceived the essential equality of human actions, and the equality of their values as a whole (all immoral).

***

Now the first serious object was to rear men in whom self-seeking impulses were extinguished. _priests, saints._ And if people doubted that perfection was possible, they did not doubt what perfection was.

The psychology of the saint and of the priest and of the "good" man, must naturally have seemed purely phantasmagorical. The real motive of all action had been declared bad: therefore, in order to make action still possible, deeds had to be prescribed which, though not possible, had to be declared possible and sanctified. They now honoured and idealised things with as much falsity as they had previously slandered them.

Inveighing against the instincts of life came to be regarded as holy and estimable. The priestly ideal was: absolute chastity, absolute obedience, absolute poverty! The lay ideal: alms, pity, self-sacrifice, renunciation of the beautiful, of reason, and of sensuality, and a dark frown for all the strong qualities that existed.

***

An advance is made: the slandered instincts attempt to re-establish their rights (_e.g._ Luther's Reformation, the coarsest form of moral falsehood under the cover of "Evangelical freedom"), they are rechristened with holy names.

The calumniated instincts try to demonstrate that they are necessary in order that the virtuous instincts may be possible. _Il faut vivre, afin de vivre pour autrui:_ egoism as a means to an end.[7]

But people go still further: they try to grant both the egoistic and altruistic impulses the right to exist--equal rights for both--from the utilitarian standpoint.

People go further: they see greater utility in placing the egoistic rights before the altruistic--greater utility in the sense of more happiness for the majority, or of the elevation of mankind, etc. etc. Thus the rights of egoism begin to preponderate, but under the cloak of an extremely altruistic standpoint--the collective utility of humanity.

An attempt is made to reconcile the altruistic mode of action with the natural order of things. Altruism is sought in the very roots of life. Altruism and egoism are both based upon the essence of life and nature.

The disappearance of the opposition between them is dreamt of as a future possibility. Continued adaptation, it is hoped, will merge the two into one.

At last it is seen that altruistic actions are merely a species of the egoistic--and that the degree to which one loves and spends one's self is a proof of the extent of one's individual power and personality. In short, that the more evil man can be made, the better he is, and that one cannot be the one without the other. At this point the curtain rises which concealed the monstrous fraud of the psychology that has prevailed hitherto.

***

Results.--There are only immoral intentions and actions; the so-called moral actions must be shown to be immoral. All emotions are traced to a single will, the will to power, and are called essentially equal. The concept of life: in the apparent antithesis good and evil, degrees of power in the instincts alone are expressed. A temporary order of rank is established according to which certain instincts are either controlled or enlisted in our service. Morality is justified: economically, etc.

***

Against proposition two.--Determinism: the attempt to rescue the moral world by transferring it to the unknown.

Determinism is only a manner of allowing ourselves to conjure our valuations away, once they have lost their place in a world interpreted mechanistically. Determinism must therefore be attacked and undermined at all costs: just as our right to distinguish between an absolute and phenomenal world should be disputed.

[Footnote 7: Spencer's conclusion in the _Data of Ethics._--Tr.]

787.

It is absolutely necessary to emancipate ourselves from motives: otherwise we should not be allowed to attempt to sacrifice ourselves or to neglect ourselves! Only the innocence of Becoming gives us the highest courage and the highest freedom.

788.

A clean conscience must be restored to the evil man--has this been my involuntary endeavour all the time? for I take as the evil man him who is strong (Dostoievsky's belief concerning the convicts in prison should be referred to here).

789.

Our new "freedom." What a feeling of relief there is in the thought that we emancipated spirits do not feel ourselves harnessed to any system of teleological aims. Likewise that the concepts reward and punishment have no roots in the essence of existence! Likewise that good and evil actions are not good or evil in themselves, but only from the point of view of the self-preservative tendencies of certain species of humanity! Likewise that our speculations concerning pleasure and pain are not of cosmic, far less then of metaphysical, importance! (That form of pessimism associated with the name of Hartmann, which pledges itself to put even

the pain and pleasure of existence into the balance, with its arbitrary confinement in the prison and within the bounds of pre-Copernican thought, would be something not only retrogressive, but degenerate, unless it be merely a bad joke on the part of a "Berliner."[8])

[Footnote 8: "Berliner"--The citizens of Berlin are renowned in Germany for their poor jokes.--Tr.]

790.

If one is clear as to the "wherefore" of one's life, then the "how" of it can take care of itself.

It is already even a sign of disbelief in the wherefore and in the purpose and sense of life--in fact, it is a sign of a lack of will--when the value of pleasure and pain step into the foreground, and hedonistic and pessimistic teaching becomes prevalent; and self-abnegation, resignation, virtue, "objectivity," _may,_ at the very least, be signs that the most important factor is beginning to make its absence felt.

791.

Hitherto there has been no German culture. It is no refutation of this assertion to say that there have been great anchorites in Germany (Goethe, for instance); for these had their own culture. But it was precisely around them, as though around mighty, defiant, and isolated rocks, that the remaining spirit of Germany, _as their antithesis,_ lay that is to say, as a soft, swampy, slippery soil, upon which every step and every footprint of the rest of Europe made an impression and created forms. German culture was a thing devoid of character and of almost unlimited yielding power.

792.

Germany, though very rich in clever and well-informed scholars, has for some time been so excessively poor in great souls and in mighty minds, that it almost seems to have forgotten what a great soul or a mighty mind is; and to-day mediocre and even ill-constituted men place themselves in the market square without the suggestion of a conscience-prick or a sign of embarrassment, and declare themselves great men, reformers, etc. Take the case of Eugen Dühring, for instance, a really clever and well-informed scholar, but a man who betrays with almost every word he says that he has a miserably small soul, and that he is horribly tormented by narrow envious feelings; moreover, that it is no mighty overflowing, benevolent, and spendthrift spirit that drives him on, but only the spirit of ambition! But to be ambitious in such an age as this is much more unworthy of a philosopher than ever it was: to-day, when it is the mob that rules, when it is the mob that dispenses the honours.

793.

My "future": a severe polytechnic education. Conscription; so that as a rule every man of the higher classes should be an officer, whatever else he may be besides.

IV.

THE WILL TO POWER IN ART.

794.

Our religion, morality, and philosophy are decadent human institutions. The counter-agent. Art.

795.

The _Artist-philosopher._ A higher concept of art. Can man stand at so great a distance from his fellows as to mould them? (Preliminary exercises thereto:--

1. To become a self-former, an anchorite.

2. To do what artists have done hitherto, _i.e._ to reach a small degree of perfection in a certain medium.)

796.

Art as it appears without the artist, _i.e._ as a body, an organisation (the Prussian Officers' Corps, the Order of the Jesuits). To what extent is the artist merely a preliminary stage? The world regarded as a self-generating work of art.

797.

The phenomenon, "artist," is the easiest to see through: from it one can look down upon the fundamental instincts of power, of nature, etc., even of religion and morality.

"Play," uselessness--as the ideal of him who is overflowing with power, as the ideal of the child. The childishness of God, παῖς παίζων.

798.

Apollonian, Dionysian. There are two conditions in which art manifests itself in man even as a force of nature, and disposes of him whether he consent or not: it may be as a constraint to visionary states, or it may be an orgiastic impulse. Both conditions are to be seen in normal life, but they are then somewhat weaker: in dreams and in moments of elation or intoxication.[9]

But the same contrast exists between the dream state and the state of intoxication; both of these states let loose all manner of artistic powers within us, but each unfetters powers of a different kind. Dreamland gives us the power of vision, of association, of poetry: intoxication gives us the power of grand attitudes, of passion, of song, and of dance.

[Footnote 9: German: "Rausch."--There is no word in English for the German expression "Rausch." When Nietzsche uses it, he means a sort of blend of our two words: intoxication and elation.--Tr.]

799.

Sexuality and voluptuousness belong to the Dionysiac intoxication: but neither of them is lacking in the Apollonian state. There is also a difference of tempo between the states.... _The extreme peace of certain feelings of intoxication_ (or, more strictly, the slackening of the feeling of time, and the reduction of the feeling of space) is wont to reflect itself in the vision of the most restful attitudes and states of the soul. The classical style essentially represents repose, simplification, foreshortening, and concentration--the _highest feeling of power_ is concentrated in the classical type. To react with difficulty: great consciousness: no feeling of strife.

800.

The feeling of intoxication is, as a matter of fact, equivalent to a sensation of _surplus power_: it is strongest in seasons of rut: new organs, new accomplishments, new colours, new forms. Embellishment is an outcome of _increased power._ Embellishment is merely an expression of a triumphant will, of an increased state of co-ordination, of a harmony of all the strong desires, of an infallible and perpendicular equilibrium. Logical and geometrical simplification is the result of an increase of power: conversely, the mere aspect of such a simplification increases the sense of power in the beholder.... The zenith of development: the grand style.

Ugliness signifies _the decadence of a type_: contradiction and faulty co-ordination among the inmost desires--this means a decline in the _organising_ power, or, psychologically speaking, in the will. The condition of pleasure which is called intoxication is really an exalted feeling of power. ... Sensations of space and time are altered; inordinate distances are traversed by the eye, and only then become visible; the extension of the vision over greater masses and expanses; the refinement of the organ which apprehends the smallest and most elusive things; divination, the power of understanding at the slightest hint, at the smallest suggestion; intelligent sensitiveness; _strength_ as a feeling of dominion in the muscles, as agility and love of movement, as dance, as levity and quick time; strength as the love of proving strength, as bravado, adventurousness, fearlessness, indifference in regard to life and death.... All these elated moments of life stimulate each other; the world of images and of imagination of the one suffices as a suggestion for the other: in this way states finally merge into each other, which might do better to keep apart, _e.g._ the feeling of religious intoxication and sexual irritability (two very profound feelings, always wonderfully co-ordinated. What is it that pleases almost all pious women, old or young? Answer: a saint with beautiful legs, still young, still innocent). Cruelty in tragedy and pity (likewise normally correlated). Spring-time, dancing, music, --all these things are but the display of one sex before the other,--as also that "infinite yearning of the heart" peculiar to Faust.

Artists when they are worth anything at all are men of strong propensities (even physically), with surplus energy, powerful animals, sensual; without a certain overheating of the sexual system a man like Raphael is unthinkable.... To produce music is also in a sense to produce children; chastity is merely the economy of the artist, and in all creative artists productiveness certainly ceases with sexual potency.... Artists should not see things as they are; they should see them fuller, simpler, stronger: to this end, however, a kind of youthfulness, of vernality, a sort of perpetual elation, must be peculiar to their lives.

801.

The states in which we transfigure things and make them fuller, and rhapsodise about them, until they reflect our own fulness and love of life back upon us: sexuality, intoxication, post-prandial states, spring, triumph over our enemies, scorn, bravado, cruelty, the ecstasy of religious feeling. But three elements above all are active: _sexuality, intoxication, cruelty_; all these belong to the oldest _festal joys_ of mankind, they also preponderate in budding artists.

Conversely: there are things with which we meet which already show us this transfiguration and fulness, and the animal world's response thereto is a state of excitement in the spheres where these states of happiness originate. A blending of these very delicate shades of animal well-being and desires is the _æsthetic state._ The latter only manifests itself in those natures which are capable of that spendthrift and overflowing fulness of bodily vigour; the latter is always the _primum mobile._ The sober-minded man, the tired man, the exhausted and dried-up man (_e.g._ the scholar), can have no feeling for art, because he does not possess the primitive force of art, which is the tyranny of inner riches: he who cannot give anything away cannot feel anything either.

"Perfection"--In these states (more particularly in the case of sexual love) there is an ingenuous betrayal of what the profoundest instinct regards as the highest, the most desirable, the most valuable, the ascending movement of its type; also of the condition towards which it is actually striving. Perfection: the extraordinary expansion of this instinct's feeling of power, its riches, its necessary overflowing of all banks.

802.

Art reminds us of states of physical vigour: it may be the overflow and bursting forth of blooming life in the world of pictures and desires; on the other hand, it may be an excitation of the physical functions by means of pictures and desires of exalted life--an enhancement of the feeling of life, the latter's stimulant.

To what extent can ugliness exercise this power? In so far as it may communicate something of the triumphant energy of the artist who has become master of the ugly and the repulsive; or in so far as it gently excites our lust of cruelty (in some circumstances even the lust of doing harm to ourselves, self-violence, and therewith the feeling of power over ourselves).

803.

"Beauty" therefore is, to the artist, something which is above all order of rank, because in beauty contrasts are overcome, the highest sign of power thus manifesting itself in the conquest of opposites; and achieved without a feeling of tension: violence being no longer necessary, everything submitting and obeying so easily, and doing so with good grace; this is what delights the powerful will of the artist.

804.

The biological value of _beauty_ and _ugliness._ That which we feel instinctively opposed to us æsthetically is, according to the longest experience of mankind, felt to be harmful, dangerous, and worthy of suspicion: the sudden utterance of the æsthetic instinct, _e.g._ in the case of loathing, implies an act of judgment. To this extent beauty lies within the general category of the biological values, useful, beneficent, and life-promoting: thus, a host of stimuli which for ages have been associated with, and remind us of, useful things and conditions, give us the feeling of beauty, _i.e._ the increase of the feeling of power (not only things, therefore, but the sensations which are associated with such things or their symbols). In this way beauty and ugliness are recognised as determined by our most fundamental self-preservative values. Apart from this, it is nonsense to postulate anything as beautiful or ugly. Absolute beauty exists just as little as absolute goodness and truth. In a particular case it is a matter of the self-preservative conditions of a certain type of man: thus the gregarious man will have quite a different feeling for beauty from the exceptional or super-man.

It is the optics of things in the foreground which only consider immediate consequences, from which the value beauty (also goodness and truth) arises.

All instinctive judgments are short-sighted in regard to the concatenation of consequences: they merely advise what must be done forthwith. Reason is essentially an obstructing apparatus preventing the immediate response to instinctive judgments: it halts, it calculates, it traces the chain of consequences further.

Judgments concerning beauty and ugliness are short-sighted (reason is always opposed to them): but they are convincing in the highest degree; they appeal to our instincts in that quarter where the latter decide most quickly and say yes or no with least hesitation, even before reason can interpose.

The most common affirmations of beauty stimulate each other reciprocally; where the æsthetic impulse once begins to work, a whole host of other and foreign perfections crystallise around the "particular form of beauty." It is impossible to remain objective, it is certainly impossible to dispense with the interpreting, bestowing, transfiguring, and poetising power (the latter is a stringing together of affirmations concerning beauty itself). The sight of a beautiful woman....

Thus (1) judgment concerning beauty is short-sighted; it sees only the immediate consequences.

(2) It smothers the object which gives rise to it with a charm that is determined by the association of various judgments concerning beauty, which, however, are quite alien to the _essence of the particular object._ To regard a thing as beautiful is necessarily to regard it falsely (that is why incidentally love marriages are from the social point of view the most unreasonable form of matrimony).

805.

Concerning the genesis of Art. That making perfect and seeing perfect, which is peculiar to the cerebral system overladen with sexual energy (a lover alone with his sweetheart at eventide transfigures the smallest details: life is a chain of sublime things, "the misfortune of an unhappy love affair is more valuable than anything else"); on the other hand, everything perfect and beautiful operates like an unconscious recollection of that amorous condition and of the point of view peculiar to it--all perfection, and the whole of the beauty of things, through contiguity, revives aphrodisiac bliss. (Physiologically it is the creative instinct of the artist and the distribution of his semen in his blood.) The desire for art and beauty is an indirect longing for the ecstasy; of sexual desire, which gets communicated to the brain. The world become perfect through "love."

806.

Sensuality in its various disguises.--(1) As idealism (Plato), common to youth, constructing a kind of concave-mirror in which the image of the beloved is an incrustation, an exaggeration, a transfiguration, an attribution of infinity to everything. (2) In the religion of love, "a fine young man," "a beautiful woman," in some way divine; a bridegroom, a bride of the soul. (3) In art, as a decorating force, _e.g._ just as the man sees the woman and makes her a present of everything that can enhance her personal charm, so the sensuality of the artist adorns an object with everything else that he honours and esteems, and by this means perfects it (or idealises it). Woman, knowing what man feels in regard to her, tries to meet his idealising endeavours half-way by decorating herself, by walking and dancing well, by expressing delicate thoughts: in addition, she may practise modesty, shyness, reserve--prompted by her instinctive feeling that the idealising power of man increases with all this, (In the extraordinary finesse of woman's instincts, modesty must not by any means be considered as conscious hypocrisy: she guesses that it is precisely artlessness and real shame which seduces man most and urges him to an exaggerated esteem of her. On this account, woman is ingenuous, owing to the subtlety of her instincts which reveal to her the utility of a state of innocence. A wilful closing of one's eyes to one's self.... Wherever dissembling has a stronger influence by being unconscious it actually becomes unconscious.)

807.

What a host of things can be accomplished by the state of intoxication which is called by the name of love, and which is something else besides love!--And yet everybody has his own experience of this matter. The muscular strength of a girl suddenly increases as soon as a man comes into her presence: there are instruments with which this can be measured. In the case of a still closer relationship of the sexes, as, for instance, in dancing and in other amusements which society gatherings entail, this power increases to such an extent as to make real feats of strength possible: at last one no longer trusts either one's eyes, or one's watch! Here at all events we must reckon with the fact that dancing itself, like every form of rapid movement, involves a kind of intoxication of the whole nervous, muscular, and visceral system. We must therefore reckon in this case with the collective effects of a double

intoxication.--And how clever it is to be a little off your head at times! There are some realities which we cannot admit even to ourselves: especially when; we are women and have all sorts of feminine, _"pudeurs."..._Those young creatures dancing over there are obviously beyond all reality: they are dancing only with a host of tangible ideals: what is more, they even see ideals sitting around them, their mothers!... An opportunity for quoting _Faust._ They look incomparably fairer, do these pretty creatures, when they have lost their head a little; and how well they know it too, they are even more delightful _because_ they know it! Lastly, it is their finery which inspires them; their finery is their third little intoxication. They believe in their dressmaker as in their God: and who would destroy this faith in them? Blessed is this faith! And self-admiration is healthy! Self-admiration can protect one even from cold! Has a beautiful woman, who knew she was well-dressed, ever caught cold? Never yet on this earth! I even suppose a case in which she has scarcely a rag on her.

808.

If one should require the most astonishing proof of how far the power of transfiguring, which comes of intoxication, goes, this proof is at hand in the phenomenon of love; or what is called love in all the languages and silences of the world. Intoxication works to such a degree upon reality in this passion that in the consciousness of the lover the cause of his love is quite suppressed, and something else seems to take its place,--a vibration and a glitter of all the charm-mirrors of Circe.... In this respect to be man or an animal makes no difference: and still less does spirit, goodness, or honesty. If one is astute, one is befooled astutely; if one is thick-headed, one is befooled in a thick-headed way. But love, even the love of God, saintly love, "the love that saves the soul," are at bottom all one; they are nothing but a fever which has reasons to transfigure itself--a state of intoxication which does well to lie about itself.... And, at any rate, when a man loves, he is a good liar about himself and to himself: he seems to himself transfigured, stronger, richer, more perfect; he _is_ more perfect.... _Art_ here acts as an organic function: we find it present in the most angelic instinct "love"; we find it as the greatest stimulus of life--thus art is sublimely utilitarian, even in the fact that it lies.... But we should be wrong to halt at its power to lie: it does more than merely imagine; it actually transposes values. And it not only transposes the _feeling_ for values: the lover actually _has_ a greater value; he is stronger. In animals this condition gives rise to new weapons, colours, pigments, and forms, and above all to new movements, new rhythms, new love-calls and seductions. In man it is just the same. His whole economy is richer, mightier, and _more complete_ when he is in love than when he is not. The lover becomes a spendthrift; he is rich enough for it. He now dares; he becomes an adventurer, and even a donkey in magnanimity and innocence; his belief in God and in virtue revives, because he believes in love. Moreover, such idiots of happiness acquire wings and new capacities, and even the door to art is opened to them.

If we cancel the suggestion of this intestinal fever from the lyric of tones and words, what is left to poetry and music? ... _L'art pour l'art_ perhaps; the professional cant of frogs shivering outside in the cold, and dying of despair in their swamp.... Everything else was created by love.

809.

All art works like a suggestion on the muscles and the senses which were originally active in the ingenuous artistic man; its voice is only heard by artists--it speaks to this kind of man, whose constitution is attuned to such subtlety in sensitiveness. The concept "layman" is a misnomer. The deaf man is not a subdivision of the class, whose ears are sound. All art works as a _tonic;_ it increases strength, it kindles desire _(i.e._ the feeling of strength), it excites all the more subtle recollections of intoxication; there is actually a special kind of memory which underlies such states--a distant flitful world of sensations here returns to being.

Ugliness is the contradiction of art. It is that which art _excludes,_ the _negation_ of art: wherever decline, impoverishment of life, impotence, decomposition, dissolution, are felt, however remotely, the æsthetic man reacts with his _No._ Ugliness _depresses_: it is the sign of depression. It _robs_ strength, it impoverishes, it weighs down, ... Ugliness _suggests_ repulsive things. From one's states of health one can test how an indisposition may increase one's power of fancying ugly things. One's selection of things, interests, and questions becomes different. Logic provides a state which is next of kin to ugliness: heaviness, bluntness. In the presence of ugliness equilibrium is lacking in a mechanical sense: ugliness limps and stumbles--the direct opposite of the godly agility of the dancer.

The æsthetic state represents an overflow _of means of communication_ as well as a condition of extreme sensibility to stimuli and signs. It is the zenith of communion and transmission between living creatures; it is the source of languages. In it, languages, whether of signs, sounds, or glances, have their birthplace. The richer phenomenon is always the beginning: our abilities are subtilised forms of richer abilities. But even to-day we still listen with our muscles, we even read with our muscles.

Every mature art possesses a host of conventions as a basis: in so far as it is a language. Convention is a condition of great art, _not_ an obstacle to it.... Every elevation of life likewise elevates the power of communication, as also the understanding of man. _The power of living in other people's souls_ originally had nothing to do with morality, but with a physiological irritability of suggestion: "sympathy," or what is called "altruism," is merely a product of that psycho-motor relationship which is reckoned as spirituality (psycho-motor induction, says Charles Féré). People never communicate a thought to one another: they communicate a movement, an imitative sign which is then interpreted as a thought.

810.

Compared with music, communication by means of words is a shameless mode of procedure; words reduce and stultify; words make impersonal; words make common that which is uncommon.

811.

It is exceptional states that determine the artist--such states as are all intimately related and entwined with morbid symptoms, so that it would seem almost impossible to be an artist without being ill.

The physiological conditions which in the artist become moulded into a "personality," and which, to a certain degree, may attach themselves to any man:--

(1) Intoxication, the feeling of enhanced power; the inner compulsion to make things a mirror of one's own fulness and perfection.

(2) The extreme sharpness of certain senses, so that they are capable of understanding a totally different language of signs--and to create such a language (this is a condition which manifests itself in some nervous diseases); extreme susceptibility out of which great powers of communion are developed; the desire to speak on the part of everything that is capable of making-signs; a need of being rid of one's self by means of gestures and attitudes; the ability of speaking about one's self in a hundred different languages--in fact, a state of _explosion._

One must first imagine this condition as one in which there is a pressing and compulsory desire of ridding one's self of the ecstasy of a state of tension, by all kinds of muscular work and movement; also as an involuntary _co-ordination_ of these movements with inner processes (images, thoughts, desires)--as a kind of automatism of the whole muscular system under the compulsion of strong stimuli acting from within; the inability to resist reaction; the apparatus of resistance is also suspended. Every inner movement (feeling, thought, emotion) is accompanied by _vascular changes,_ and consequently by changes in colour, temperature, and secretion. The suggestive power of music, its "_suggestion mentale._"

(3) _The compulsion to imitate:_ extreme irritability, by means of which a certain example becomes contagious--a condition is guessed and represented merely by means of a few signs.... A complete picture is visualised by one's inner consciousness, and its effect soon shows itself in the movement of the limbs,--in a certain suspension of the _will_ (Schopenhauer!!!!). A sort of blindness and deafness towards the external world,--the realm of admitted stimuli is sharply defined.

This differentiates the artist from the layman (from the spectator of art): the latter reaches the height of his excitement in the mere act of apprehending: the former in giving--and in such a way that the antagonism between these two gifts is not only natural but even desirable. Each of these states has an opposite standpoint--to demand of the artist that he should have the point of view of the spectator (of the critic) is equivalent to asking him to impoverish his creative power.... In this respect the same difference holds good as that which exists between the sexes: one should not ask the artist who gives to become a woman--to _"receive."_

Our æsthetics have hitherto been women's æsthetics, inasmuch as they have only formulated the experiences of what is beautiful, from the point of view of the receivers in art. In the whole of philosophy hitherto the artist has been lacking ... _i.e._ as we have already suggested, a necessary fault: for the artist who would begin to understand himself would therewith begin to mistake himself--he must not look backwards, he must not look at all; he must give.--It is an honour for an artist to have no critical faculty; if he can criticise he is mediocre, he is modern.

812.

Here I lay down a series of psychological states as signs of flourishing and complete life, which to-day we are in the habit of regarding as morbid. But, by this time, we have broken ourselves of the habit of speaking of healthy and morbid as opposites: the

question is one of degree, what I maintain on this point is that what people call healthy nowadays represents a lower level of that which under favourable circumstances actually would be healthy--that we are relatively sick....

The artist belongs to a much stronger race. That which in us would be harmful and sickly, is natural in him. But people object to this that it is precisely the impoverishment of the machine which renders this extraordinary power of comprehending every kind of suggestion possible: _e.g._ our hysterical females.

An overflow of spunk and energy may quite as well lead to symptoms of partial constraint, sense hallucinations, peripheral sensitiveness, as a poor vitality does--the stimuli are differently determined, the effect is the same.... What is not the same is above all the ultimate result; the extreme torpidity of all morbid natures, after their nervous eccentricities, has nothing in common with the states of the artist, who need in no wise repent his best moments.... He is rich enough for it all: he can squander without becoming poor.

Just as we now feel justified in judging genius as a form of neurosis, we may perhaps think the same of artistic suggestive power,--and our artists are, as a matter of fact, only too closely related to hysterical females!!! This, however, is only an argument against the present day, and not against artists in general.

The inartistic states are: objectivity, reflection suspension of the will ... (Schopenhauer's scandalous misunderstanding consisted in regarding art as a mere bridge to the denial of life)... The inartistic states are: those which impoverish, which subtract, which bleach, under which life suffers--the Christian.

813.

The modern artist who, in his physiology, is next of kin to the hysteric, may also be classified as a character belonging to this state of morbidness. The hysteric is false,--he lies from the love of lying, he is admirable in all the arts of dissimulation,--unless his morbid vanity hood-wink him. This vanity is like a perpetual fever which is in need of stupefying drugs, and which recoils from no self-deception and no farce that promises it the most fleeting satisfaction. (The incapacity for pride and the need of continual revenge for his deep-rooted self-contempt, this is almost the definition of this man's vanity.)

The absurd irritability of his system, which makes a crisis out of every one of his experiences, and sees dramatic elements in the most insignificant occurrences of life, deprives him of all calm reflection; he ceases from being a personality, at most he is a rendezvous of personalities of which first one and then the other asserts itself with barefaced assurance. Precisely on this account he is great as an actor _i_ all these poor will-less people, whom doctors study so profoundly, astound one through their virtuosity in mimicking, in transfiguration, in their assumption of almost any character required.

814.

Artists are not men of great passion, despite all their assertions to the contrary both to themselves and to others. And for the following two reasons: they lack all shyness towards themselves (they watch themselves live, they spy upon themselves, they are much too inquisitive), and they also lack shyness in the presence of passion (as artists they exploit it). Secondly, however, that vampire, their talent, generally forbids them such an expenditure of energy as passion demands.--A man, who has a talent is sacrificed to that talent; he lives under the vampirism of his talent.

A man does not get rid of his passion by reproducing it, but rather he is rid of it if he is able to reproduce it. (Goethe teaches the reverse, but it seems as though he deliberately misunderstood himself here--from a sense of delicacy.)

815.

Concerning a reasonable mode of life.--.Relative, chastity, a fundamental and shrewd caution in regard to _erotica,_ even in thought, may be a reasonable mode of life even in richly equipped and perfect natures. But this principle applies more particularly to artists; it belongs to the best wisdom of their lives. Wholly trustworthy voices have already been raised in favour of this view, _e.g._ Stendhal, Th. Gautier, and Flaubert. The artist is perhaps in his way necessarily a sensual man, generally susceptible, accessible to everything, and capable of responding to the remotest stimulus or suggestion of a stimulus. Nevertheless, as a rule he is in the power of his work, of his will to mastership, really a sober and often even a chaste man. His dominating instinct will have him so: it does not allow him to spend himself haphazardly. It is one and the same form of strength which is spent in artistic conception and in the sexual act: there is only one form of strength. The artist who yields in this respect, and who spends himself, is

betrayed: by so doing he reveals his lack of instinct, his lack of will in general. It may be a sign of decadence,--in any case it reduces the value of his art to an incalculable degree.

816.

Compared with the artist, the scientific man, regarded as a phenomenon, is indeed a sign of a certain storing-up and levelling-down of life (but also of an increase of strength, severity, hardness, and will-power). To what extent can falsity and indifference towards truth and utility be a sign of youth, of childishness, in the artist? ... Their habitual manner, their unreasonableness, their ignorance of themselves, their indifference to "eternal values," their seriousness in play, their lack of dignity; clowns and gods in one; the saint and the rabble.... Imitation as an imperious instinct.--Do not artists of ascending life and artists of degeneration belong to all phases? ... Yes!

817.

Would any link be missing in the whole chain of science and art, if woman, if woman's work, were excluded from it? Let us acknowledge the exception--it proves the rule--that woman is capable of perfection in everything which does not constitute a work: in letters, in memoirs, in the most intricate handiwork--in short, in everything which is not a craft; and just precisely because in the things mentioned woman perfects herself, because in them she obeys the only artistic impulse in her nature,--which is to captivate.... But what has woman to do with the passionate indifference of the genuine artist who sees more importance in a breath, in a sound, in the merest trifle, than in himself?--who with all his five fingers gropes for his most secret and hidden treasures?--who attributes no value to anything unless it knows how to take shape (unless it surrenders itself, unless it visualises itself in some way). Art as it is practised by artists--do you not understand what it is? is it not an outrage on all _our pudeurs? ..._ Only in this century has woman dared to try her hand at literature ("_Vers la canaille plumière écrivassière,"_ to speak with old Mirabeau): woman now writes, she now paints, she is losing her instincts. And to what purpose, if one may put such a question?

818.

A man is an artist to the extent to which he regards everything that inartistic people call "form" as the actual substance, as the "principal" thing. With such ideas a man certainly belongs to a world upside down: for henceforward substance seems to him something merely formal,--his own life included.

819.

A sense for, and a delight in, nuances (which is characteristic of modernity), in that which is not general, runs counter to the instinct which finds its joy and its strength in grasping what is typical: like Greek taste in its best period. In this there is an overcoming of the plenitude of life; restraint dominates, the peace of the strong soul which is slow to move and which feels a certain repugnance towards excessive activity is defeated. The general rule, the law, is honoured and made prominent, conversely, the exception is laid aside, and shades are suppressed. All that which is firm, mighty, solid, life resting on a broad and powerful basis, concealing its strength this pleases: _i.e._ it corresponds with what we think of ourselves.

820.

In the main I am much more in favour of artists than any philosopher that has appeared hitherto: artists, at least, did not lose sight of the great course which life pursues; they loved the things "of this world,"--they loved their senses. To strive after "spirituality," in cases where this is not pure hypocrisy or self-deception, seems to me to be either a misunderstanding, a disease, or a cure, I wish myself, and all those who live without the troubles of a puritanical conscience, and who are able to live in this way, an ever greater spiritualisation and multiplication of the senses. Indeed, we would fain be grateful to the senses for their subtlety, power, and plenitude, and on that account offer them the best we have in the way of spirit. What do we care about priestly and metaphysical anathemas upon the senses? We no longer require to treat them in this way: it is a sign of well-constitutedness when a man like Goethe clings with ever greater joy and heartiness to the "things of this world"--in this way he holds firmly to the grand concept of mankind, which is that man becomes the glorifying power of existence when he learns to glorify himself.

821.

Pessimism in art?--The artist gradually learns to like for their own sake, those means which bring about the condition of æsthetic elation; extreme delicacy and glory of colour, definite delineation, quality of tone; distinctness where in normal conditions distinctness is absent. All distinct things, all nuances, in so far as they recall extreme degrees of power which give rise to intoxication, kindle this feeling of intoxication by association;--the effect of works of art is the excitation of the state which creates art, of æsthetic intoxication.

The essential feature in art is its power of perfecting existence, its production of perfection and plenitude; art is essentially the affirmation, the blessing, and the deification of existence.... What does a pessimistic art signify? Is it not a _contradictio_?--Yes.--Schopenhauer is in error when he makes certain works of art serve the purpose of pessimism. Tragedy does not teach "resignation." ... To represent terrible and questionable things is, in itself, the sign of an instinct of power and magnificence in the artist; he doesn't fear them.... There is no such thing as a pessimistic, art.... Art affirms. Job affirms. But Zola? and the Goncourts?--the things they show us are ugly, their reason, however, for showing them to us is their love of ugliness ... I don't care what you say! You simply deceive yourselves if you think otherwise.--What a relief Dostoievsky is!

822.

If I have sufficiently initiated my readers into the doctrine that even "goodness," in the whole comedy of existence, represents a form of exhaustion, they will now credit Christianity with consistency for having conceived the good to be the ugly. In this respect Christianity was right.

It is absolutely unworthy of a philosopher to say that "the good and the beautiful are one"; if he should add "and also the true," he deserves to be thrashed. Truth is ugly.

Art is with us in order that we may not perish through truth.

823.

Moralising tendencies may be combated with art. Art is freedom from moral bigotry and philosophy _à la_ Little Jack Horner: or it may be the mockery of these things. The flight to Nature, where beauty and terribleness are coupled. The concept of the great man.

--Fragile, useless souls-de-luxe, which are disconcerted by a mere breath of wind, "beautiful souls."

--Ancient ideals, in their inexorable hardness and brutality, ought to be awakened, as the mightiest of monsters that they are.

--We should feel a boisterous delight in the psychological perception of how all moralised artists become worms and actors without knowing it.

--The falsity of art, its immorality, must be brought into the light of day.

--The "fundamental idealising powers" (sensuality, intoxication, excessive animality) should be brought to light.

824.

Modern counterfeit practices in the arts: regarded as necessary--that is to say, as fully in keeping with the needs most proper to the modern soul.

The gaps in the gifts, and still more in the education, antecedents, and schooling of modern artists, are now filled up in this way:--

First: A less artistic public is sought which is capable of unlimited love (and is capable of falling on its knees before a personality). The superstition of our century, the belief in "genius," assists this process.

Secondly; Artists harangue the dark instincts of the dissatisfied, the ambitious, and the self-deceivers of a democratic age: the importance of poses.

Thirdly: The procedures of one art are transferred to the realm of another; the object of art is confounded with that of science, with that of the Church, or with that of the interests of the race (nationalism), or with that of philosophy--a man rings all bells at once, and awakens the vague suspicion that he is a god.

Fourthly: Artists flatter women, sufferers, and indignant folk. Narcotics and opiates are made to preponderate in art. The fancy of cultured people, and of the readers of poetry and ancient history, is tickled.

825.

We must distinguish between the "public" and the "select"; to satisfy the public a man must be a charlatan to-day, to satisfy the select he _will_ be a virtuoso and nothing else. The geniuses peculiar to our century overcame this distinction, they were great for both; the great charlatanry of Victor Hugo and Richard Wagner was coupled with such genuine virtuosity that it even satisfied the most refined artistic connoisseurs. This is why greatness is lacking: these geniuses had a double outlook; first, they catered for the coarsest needs, and then for the most refined.

826.

False "accentuation": (1) In romanticism, this unremitting "_expressivo_" is not a sign of strength, but of a feeling of deficiency;

(2) Picturesque music, the so-called dramatic kind, is above all easier (as is also the brutal scandalmongering and the juxtaposition of facts and traits in realistic novels);

(3) "Passion" as a matter of nerves and exhausted souls; likewise the delight in high mountains, deserts, storms, orgies, and disgusting details,--in bulkiness and massiveness (historians, for instance); as a matter of fact, there is actually a cult of exaggerated feelings (how is it that in stronger ages art desired just the opposite--a restraint of passion?);

(4) The preference for exciting materials (_Erotica_ or _Socialistica_ or _Pathologica_): all these things are the signs of the style of public that is being catered for to-day--that is to say, for overworked, absentminded, or enfeebled people.

Such people must be tyrannised over in order to be affected.

827.

Modern art is the art of tyrannising. A coarse and salient definiteness in delineation; the motive simplified into a formula; formulæ tyrannise. Wild arabesques within the lines; overwhelming masses, before which the senses are confused; brutality in coloration, in subject-matter, in the desires. Examples: Zola, Wagner, and, in a more spiritualised degree, Taine. Hence logic, massiveness, and brutality.

828.

In regard to the painter: _Tous ces modernes sont des poètes qui ont voulu être peintres, L'un a cherché des drames dans l'histoire, l'autre des scènes de mœurs, celui ci traduit des religions, celui là une philosophie._ One imitates Raphael, another the early Italian masters. The landscapists employ trees and clouds in order to make odes and elegies. Not one is simply a painter; they are all archæologists, psychologists, and impresarios of one or another kind of event or theory. They enjoy our erudition and our philosophy. Like us, they are full, and too full, of general ideas. They like a form, not because it is what it is, but because of what it expresses. They are the scions of a learned, tormented, and reflecting generation, a thousand miles away from the Old Masters who never read, and only concerned themselves with feasting their eyes.

829.

At bottom, even Wagner's music, in so far as it stands for the whole of French romanticism, is literature: the charm of exoticism (strange times, customs, passions), exercised upon sensitive cosy-corner people. The delight of entering into extremely distant and prehistoric lands to which books lead one, and by which means the whole horizon is painted with new colours and new possibilities.... Dreams of still more distant and unexploited worlds; disdain of the boulevards. ... For Nationalism, let us not deceive ourselves, is also only a form of exoticism.... Romantic musicians merely relate what exotic books have made of them: people would fain experience exotic sensations and passions according to Florentine and Venetian taste; finally they are satisfied to look for them in an image.... The essential factor is the kind of novel desire, the desire to imitate, the desire to live as people have lived once before in the past, and the disguise and dissimulation of the soul.... Romantic art is only an emergency exit from defective "reality."

The attempt to perform new things: revolution, Napoleon. Napoleon represents the passion of new spiritual possibilities, of an extension of the soul's domain.

The greater the debility of the will, the greater the extravagances in the desire to feel, to represent, and to dream new things.--The result of the excesses which have been indulged in: an insatiable thirst for unrestrained feelings.... Foreign literatures afford the strongest spices.

830.

Winckelmann's and Goethe's Greeks, Victor Hugo's Orientals, Wagner's Edda characters, Walter Scott's Englishmen of the thirteenth century--some day the whole comedy will be exposed! All of it was disproportionately historical and false, _but_--modern.

831.

Concerning the characteristics of national genius in regard to the strange and to the borrowed--

English genius vulgarises and makes realistic everything it sees;

The French whittles down, simplifies, rationalises, embellishes;

The German muddles, compromises, involves, and infects everything with morality;

The Italian has made by far the freest and most subtle use of borrowed material, and has enriched it with a hundred times more beauty than it ever drew out of it: it is the richest genius, it had the most to bestow.

832.

The Jews, with Heinrich Heine and Offenbach, approached genius in the sphere of art. The latter was the most intellectual and most high-spirited satyr, who as a musician abided by great tradition, and who, for him who has something more than ears, is a real relief after the sentimental and, at bottom, degenerate musicians of German romanticism.

833.

Offenbach; trench music imbued with Voltaire's intellect, free, wanton, with a slight sardonic grin, but clear and intellectual almost to the point of banality (Offenbach never titivates), and free from the _mignardise_ of morbid or blond-Viennese sensuality.

834.

If by artistic genius we understand the most consummate freedom within the law, divine ease, and facility in overcoming the greatest difficulties, then Offenbach has even more right to the title genius than Wagner has. Wagner is heavy and clumsy: nothing is more foreign to him than the moments of wanton perfection which this clown Offenbach achieves as many as five times, six times, in nearly every one of his buffooneries. But by genius we ought perhaps to understand something else.

835.

Concerning "music."--French, German, and Italian music. (Our most debased periods in a political sense are our most productive. The Slavs?)--The ballet, which is the outcome of excessive study of the history of strange civilisations, has become master of opera.--Stage music and musicians music.--It is an error to suppose that what Wagner composed was _a. form_: it was rather formlessness. The possibilities of dramatic construction have yet to be discovered.--Rhythm. "Expression" at all costs. Harlotry in instrumentation.--All honour to Heinrich Schütz; all honour to Mendelssohn: in them we find an element of Goethe, but nowhere else! (We also find another element of Goethe coming to blossom in Rahel; a third element in Heinrich Heine.)

836.

Descriptive music leaves reality to work its effects alone.... All these kinds of art are easier, and more easy to imitate; poorly gifted people have recourse to them. The appeal to the instincts; suggestive art.

837.

Concerning our modern music.--The decay of melody, like the decay of "ideas," and of the freedom of intellectual activity, is a piece of clumsiness and obtuseness, which is developing itself into new feats of daring and even into principles;--in the end man has only the principles of his gifts, or of his lack of gifts.

"Dramatic music"--nonsense! It is simply bad music.... "Feeling" and "passion" are merely substitutes when lofty intellectuality and the joy of it (_e.g._ Voltaire's) can no longer be attained. Expressed technically, feeling and "passion" are easier; they presuppose a much poorer kind of artist. The recourse to drama betrays that an artist is much more a master in tricky means than in genuine ones. To-day we have both dramatic painting and dramatic poetry, etc.

838.

What we lack in music is an æsthetic which would impose laws upon musicians and give them a conscience; and as a result of this we lack a real contest concerning "principles."--For as musicians we laugh at Herbart's velleities in this department just as heartily as we laugh at Schopenhauer's. As a matter of fact, tremendous difficulties present themselves here. We no longer know on what basis to found our concepts of what is exemplary, masterly, perfect. With the instincts of old loves and old admiration we grope about in a realm of values, and we almost believe, "that is good which pleases us".... I am always suspicious when I hear people everywhere speak innocently of Beethoven as a "classic"; what I would maintain, and with some seventy, is that, in other arts, a classic is the very reverse of Beethoven. But when the complete and glaring dissolution of style, Wagner's so-called dramatic style, is taught and honoured as exemplary, as masterly, as progressive, then my impatience exceeds all bounds. Dramatic style in music, as Wagner understood it, is simply renunciation of all style whatever; it is the assumption that something else, namely, drama, is a hundred times more important than music. Wagner can paint; he does not use music for the sake of music, with it he accentuates attitudes; he is a poet. Finally he made an appeal to beautiful feelings and heaving breasts, just as all other theatrical artists have done, and with it all he converted women and even those whose souls thirst for culture to him. But what do women and the uncultured care about music? All these people have no conscience for art: none of them suffer when the first and fundamental virtues of an art are scorned and trodden upon in favour of that which is merely secondary (as _ancilla dramaturgica_). What good can come of all extension in the means of expression, when that which is expressed, art itself, has lost all its law and order? The picturesque pomp and power of tones, the symbolism of sound, rhythm, the colour effects of harmony and discord, the suggestive significance of music, the whole sensuality of this art which Wagner made prevail--it is all this that Wagner derived, developed, and drew out of music. Victor Hugo did something very similar for language: but already people in France are asking themselves, in regard to the case of Victor Hugo, whether language was not corrupted by him, whether reason, intellectuality, and thorough conformity to law in language are not suppressed when the sensuality of expression is elevated to a high place? Is it not a sign of decadence that the poets in France have become plastic artists, and that the musicians of Germany have become actors and culturemongers?

839.

To-day there exists a sort of musical pessimism even among people who are not musicians. Who has not met and cursed the confounded youthlet who torments his piano until it shrieks with despair, and who single-handed heaves the slime of the most lugubrious and drabby harmonies before him? By so doing a man betrays himself as a pessimist.... It is open to question, though, whether he also proves himself a musician by this means. I for my part could never be made to believe it. Wagnerite _pur sang_ is unmusical, he submits to the elementary forces of music very much as a woman submits to the will of the man who hypnotises her--and in order to be able to do this he must not be made suspicious _in rebus musicis et musicantibus_ by a too severe or too delicate conscience. I said "very much as"--but in this respect I spoke perhaps more than a parable. Let any one consider the means which Wagner uses by preference, when he wishes to make an effect (means which for the greater part he first had to invent), they are appallingly similar to the means by which a hypnotist exercises his power (the choice of his movements, the general colour of his orchestration; the excruciating evasion of consistency, and fairness and squareness, in rhythm; the creepiness, the soothing touch, the mystery, the hysteria of his "unending melody"). And is the condition to which the overture to _Lohengrin,_ for instance, reduces the men, and still more the women, in the audience, so essentially different from the somnambulistic trance? On one occasion after the overture in question had been played, I heard an Italian lady say, with her eyes half closed, in a way in which female Wagnerites are adepts: "_Come si dorme con questa musica!_"[10]

[Footnote 10: "How the music makes one sleep!"--Tr.]

840.

Religion in music.--What a large amount of satisfaction all religious needs get out of Wagnerian music, though this is never acknowledged or even understood! How much prayer, virtue, unction, virginity, salvation, speaks through this music!... Oh what capital this cunning saint, who leads and seduces us back to everything that was once believed in, makes out of the fact that he may dispense with words and concepts! ... Our intellectual conscience has no need to feel ashamed--it stands apart--if any old instinct puts its trembling lips to the rim of forbidden philtres.... This is shrewd and healthy, and, in so far as it betrays a certain shame in regard to the satisfaction of the religious instinct, it is even a good sign.... Cunning Christianity: the type of the music which came from the "last Wagner."

841.

I distinguish between courage before persons, courage before things, and courage on paper. The latter was the courage of David Strauss, for instance. I distinguish again between the courage before witnesses and the courage without witnesses: the courage of a Christian, or of believers in God in general, can never be the courage without witnesses--but on this score alone Christian courage stands condemned. Finally, I distinguish between the courage which is temperamental and the courage which is the fear of fear; a single instance of the latter kind is moral courage. To this list the courage of despair should be added.

This is the courage which Wagner possessed. His attitude in regard to music was at bottom a desperate one. He lacked two things which go to make up a good musician: nature and nurture, the predisposition for music and the discipline and schooling which music requires. He had courage: out of this deficiency he established a principle; he invented a kind of music for himself. The dramatic music which he invented was the music which he was able to compose,--its limitations are Wagner's limitations.

And he was misunderstood!--Was he really misunderstood?... Such is the case with five-sixths of the artists of to-day. Wagner is their Saviour: five-sixths, moreover, is the "lowest proportion." In any case where Nature has shown herself without reserve, and wherever culture is an accident, a mere attempt, a piece of dilettantism, the artist turns instinctively--what do I say?--I mean enthusiastically, to Wagner; as the poet says: "Half drew he him, and half sank he."[11]

[Footnote 11: This is an adapted quotation from Goethe's poem, "The Fisherman." The translation is E. A. Bowring's.--Tr.]

842.

"Music" and the grand style. The greatness of an artist is not to be measured by the beautiful feelings which he evokes: let this belief be left to the girls. It should be measured according to the extent to which he approaches the grand style, according to the extent to which he is capable of the grand style. This style and great passion have this in common--that they scorn to please; that they forget to persuade; that they command: that they will.... To become master of the chaos which is in one; to compel one's inner chaos to assume form; to become consistent, simple, unequivocal, mathematical, law this is the great ambition here. By means of it one repels; nothing so much endears people to such powerful men as this,--a desert seems to lie around them, they impose silence upon all, and awe every one with the greatness Of their sacrilege.... All arts know this kind of aspirant to the grand style: why are they absent in music? Never yet has a musician built as that architect did who erected the Palazzo Pitti.... This is a problem. Does music perhaps belong to that culture in which the reign of powerful men of various types is already at an end? Is the concept "grand style" in fact a contradiction of the soul of music,--of "the Woman" in our music? ...

With this I touch upon the cardinal question: how should all our music be classified? The age of classical taste knows nothing that can be compared with it: it bloomed when the world of the Renaissance reached its evening, when "freedom" had already bidden farewell to both men and their customs--is it characteristic of music to be Counter-Renaissance? Is music, perchance, the sister of the baroque style, seeing that in any case they were contemporaries? Is not music, modern music, already decadence? ...

I have put my finger before on this question: whether music is not an example of Counter-Renaissance art? whether it is not the next of kin to the baroque style? whether it has not grown in Opposition to all classic taste, so that any aspiration to classicism is forbidden by the very nature of music?

The answer to this most important of all questions of values would not be a very doubtful one, if people thoroughly understood the fact that music attains to its highest maturity and plenitude as romanticism--likewise as a reactionary movement against classicism.

Mozart, a delicate and lovable soul, but quite eighteenth century, even in his serious lapses ... Beethoven, the first great romanticist according to the French conception of romanticism, just as Wagner is the last great romanticist ... both of them are instinctive opponents of classical taste, of severe style--not to speak of "grand" in this regard.

843.

Romanticism: an ambiguous question, like all modern questions.

The æsthetic conditions are twofold:--

The abundant and generous, as opposed to the seeking and the desiring.

844.

A romanticist is an artist whose great dissatisfaction with himself makes him productive--; who looks away from himself and his fellows, and sometimes, therefore, looks backwards.

845.

Is art the result of dissatisfaction with reality? or is it the expression of gratitude for happiness experienced? In the first case, it is romanticism; in the second, it is glorification and dithyramb (in short, apotheosis art): even Raphael belongs to this, except for the fact that he was guilty of the duplicity of having defied the appearance of the Christian view of the world. He was thankful for life precisely where it was not exactly Christian.

With a moral interpretation the world is insufferable; Christianity was the attempt to overcome the world with morality: _i.e._ to deny it. _In praxi_ such a mad experiment--an imbecile elevation of man above the world--could only end in the beglooming, the dwarfing, and the impoverishment of mankind: the only kind of man who gained anything by it, who was promoted by it, was the most mediocre, the most harmless and gregarious type.

Homer as an apotheosis artist; Rubens also. Music has not yet had such an artist.

The idealisation of the great criminal (the feeling for his greatness) is Greek; the depreciation, the slander, the contempt of the sinner, is Judæo-Christian.

846.

Romanticism and its opposite. In regard to all æsthetic values I now avail myself of this fundamental distinction: in every individual case I ask myself has hunger or has superabundance been creative here? At first another distinction might perhaps seem preferable, it is far more obvious,--_e.g._ the distinction which decides whether a desire for stability, for eternity, for Being, or whether a desire for destruction, for change, for Becoming, has been the cause of creation. But both kinds of desire, when examined more closely, prove to be ambiguous, and really susceptible of interpretation only according to that scheme already mentioned and which I think is rightly preferred.

The desire for destruction, for change, for Becoming, may be the expression of an overflowing power pregnant with promises for the future (my term for this, as is well known, is Dionysian); it may, however, also be the hate of the ill-constituted, of the needy and of the physiologically botched, that destroys, and must destroy, because such creatures are indignant at, and annoyed by everything lasting and stable.

The act of immortalising can, on the other hand, be the outcome of gratitude and love: an art which has this origin is always an apotheosis art; dithyrambic, as perhaps with Rubens, happy, as perhaps with Hafiz; bright and gracious, and shedding a ray of glory over all things, as in Goethe. But it may also, however, be the outcome of the tyrannical will of the great sufferer who would make the most personal, individual, and narrow trait about him, the actual idiosyncrasy of his pain--in fact, into a binding law and imposition, and who thus wreaks his revenge upon all things by stamping, branding, and violating them with the image of his torment. The latter case is romantic pessimism in its highest form, whether this be Schopenhauerian voluntarism or Wagnerian music.

847.

It is a question whether the antithesis, classic and romantic, does not conceal that other antithesis, the active and the reactive.

848.

In order to be a classic, one must be possessed of all the strong and apparently contradictory gifts and passions: but in such a way that they run in harness together, and culminate simultaneously in elevating a certain species of literature or art or politics to its height and zenith (they must not do this after that elevation has taken place ...). They must reflect the complete state (either of a people or of a culture), and express its most profound and most secret nature, at a time when it is still stable and not yet discoloured by the imitation of foreign things (or when it is still dependent ...); not a reactive but a deliberate and progressive spirit, saying Yea in all circumstances, even in its hate.

"And does not the highest personal value belong thereto?" It is worth considering whether moral prejudices do not perhaps exercise their influence here, and whether great moral loftiness is not perhaps a contradiction of the classical? ... Whether the moral monsters must not necessarily be romantic in word and deed? Any such preponderance of one virtue over others (as in the case of the moral monster) is precisely what with most hostility counteracts the classical power in equilibrium, supposing a people manifested this moral loftiness and were classical notwithstanding, we should have to conclude boldly that they were also on the same high level in immorality! this was perhaps the case with Shakespeare (provided that he was really Lord Bacon).

849.

Concerning the future. Against the romanticism of great passion.--We must understand how a certain modicum of coldness, lucidity, and hardness is inseparable from all classical taste: above all consistency, happy intellectuality, "the three unities," concentration, hatred of all feeling, of all sentimentality, of all _esprit,_ hatred of all multiformity, of all uncertainty, evasiveness, and of all nebulosity, as also of all brevity, finicking, prettiness and good nature. Artistic formulæ must not be played with: life must be remodelled so that it should be forced to formulate itself accordingly.

It is really an exhilarating spectacle which we have only learned to laugh at quite recently, because we have only seen through it quite recently: this spectacle of Herder's, Winckelmann's, Goethe's, and Hegel's contemporaries claiming that they had rediscovered the classical ideal ... and at the same time, Shakespeare! And this same crew of men had scurvily repudiated all relationship with the classical school of France! As if the essential principle could not have been learnt as well here as elsewhere! ... But what people wanted was "nature," and "naturalness": Oh, the stupidity of it! It was thought that classicism was a kind of naturalness!

Without either prejudice or indulgence we should try and investigate upon what soil a classical taste can be evolved. The hardening, the simplification, the strengthening, and the bedevilling of man are inseparable from classical taste. Logical and psychological simplification. A contempt of detail, of complexity, of obscurity.

The romanticists of Germany do not protest against classicism, but against reason, against illumination, against taste, against the eighteenth century.

The essence of romantico-Wagnerian music is the opposite of the classical spirit.

The will to unity (because unity tyrannises. _e.g._ the listener and the spectator), but the artist's inability to tyrannise over himself where it is most needed--that is to say, in regard to the work itself (in regard to knowing what to leave out, what to shorten, what to clarify, what to simplify). The overwhelming by means of masses (Wagner, Victor Hugo, Zola, Taine).

850.

The Nihilism of artists.--Nature is cruel in her cheerfulness; cynical in her sunrises. We are hostile to emotions. We flee thither where Nature moves our senses and our imagination, where we have nothing to love, where we are not reminded of the moral semblances and delicacies of this northern nature; and the same applies to the arts. We prefer that which no longer reminds us of good and evil. Our moral sensibility and tenderness seem to be relieved in the heart of terrible and happy Nature, in the fatalism of the senses and forces. Life without goodness.

Great well-being arises from contemplating Nature's indifference to good and evil.

No justice in history, no goodness in Nature. That is why the pessimist when he is an artist prefers those historical subjects where the absence of justice reveals itself with magnificent simplicity, where perfection actually comes to expression--and likewise he prefers that in Nature, where her callous evil character is not hypocritically concealed, where that character is seen in perfection.... The Nihilistic artist betrays himself in willing and preferring cynical history and cynical Nature.

851.

What is tragic?--Again and again I have pointed to the great misunderstanding of Aristotle in maintaining that the tragic emotions were the two depressing emotions--fear and pity. Had he been right, tragedy would be an art unfriendly to life: it would have been necessary to caution people against it as against something generally harmful and suspicious. Art, otherwise the great stimulus of life, the great intoxicant of life, the great will to life, here became a tool of decadence, the hand-maiden of pessimism and ill-health (for to suppose, as Aristotle supposed, that by exciting these emotions we thereby purged people of them, is simply an error). Something which habitually excites fear or pity, disorganises, weakens, and discourages: and supposing Schopenhauer were right in thinking that tragedy taught resignation (_i.e._ a meek renunciation of happiness, hope, and of the will to live), this would presuppose an art in which art itself was denied. Tragedy would then constitute a process of dissolution; the instinct of life would destroy itself in the instinct of art. Christianity, Nihilism, tragic art, physiological decadence; these things would then be linked, they would then preponderate together and assist each other onwards--downwards.... Tragedy would thus be a symptom of decline.

This theory may be refuted in the most cold-blooded way, namely, by measuring the effect of a tragic emotion by means of a dynamometer The result would be a fact which only the bottomless falsity of a doctrinaire could misunderstand: that tragedy is a tonic. If Schopenhauer refuses to see the truth here, if he regards general depression as a tragic condition, if he would have informed the Greeks (who to his disgust were not "resigned") that they did not firmly possess the highest principles of life: it is only owing to his _parti pris,_ to the need of consistency in his system, to the dishonesty of the doctrinaire--that dreadful dishonesty which step for step corrupted the whole psychology of Schopenhauer (he who had arbitrarily and almost violently misunderstood genius, art itself, morality, pagan religion, beauty, knowledge, and almost everything).

852.

The tragic artist.--Whether, and in regard to what, the judgment "beautiful" is established is a question of an individual's or of a people's strength The feeling of plenitude, of overflowing strength (which gaily and courageously meets many an obstacle before which the weakling shudders)--the feeling of power utters the judgment "beautiful" concerning things and conditions which the instinct of impotence can only value as hateful and ugly. The _flair_ which enables us to decide whether the objects we encounter are dangerous, problematic, or alluring, likewise determines our æsthetic Yea. ("This is beautiful," is an affirmation).

From this we see that, generally speaking, a preference for questionable and terrible things is a symptom of strength; whereas the taste for pretty and charming trifles is characteristic of the weak and the delicate. The love of tragedy is typical of strong ages and characters: its _non plus ultra_ is perhaps the _Divina Commedia._ It is the heroic spirits which in tragic cruelty say Yea unto themselves: they are hard enough to feel pain as a pleasure.

On the other hand, supposing weaklings desire to get pleasure from an art which was not designed for them, what interpretation must we suppose they would like to give tragedy in order to make it suit their taste? They would interpret their own feeling of value into it: _e.g._ the "triumph of the moral order of things," or the teaching of the "uselessness of existence," or the incitement to "resignation" (or also half-medicinal and half-moral outpourings, _à la_ Aristotle). Finally, the art of terrible natures, in so far as it may excite the nerves, may be regarded by the weak and exhausted as a stimulus: this is now taking place, for instance, in the case of the admiration meted out to Wagner's art. A test of man's well-being and consciousness of power is the extent to which he can acknowledge the terrible and questionable character of things, and whether he is in any need of a faith at the end.

This kind of artistic pessimism is precisely the reverse of that religio-moral pessimism which suffers from the corruption of man and the enigmatic character of existence: the latter insists upon deliverance, or at least upon the hope of deliverance. Those who suffer, doubt, and distrust themselves,--the sick, in other words,--have in all ages required the transporting influence of visions in order to be able to exist at all (the notion "blessedness" arose in this way). A similar case would be that of the artists of decadence, who at bottom maintain a Nihilistic attitude to life, and take refuge in the beauty of form,--in those select cases in which Nature is perfect, in which she is indifferently great and indifferently beautiful. (The "love of the beautiful" may thus be something very different from the ability to see or create the beautiful: it may be the expression of impotence in this respect.) The most convincing artists are those who make harmony ring out of every discord, and who benefit all things by the gift of their power and inner harmony: in every work of art they merely reveal the symbol of their inmost experiences--their creation is gratitude for life.

The depth of the tragic artist consists in the fact that his æsthetic instinct surveys the more remote results, that he does not halt shortsightedly at the thing that is nearest, that he says Yea to the whole cosmic economy, which justifies the terrible, the evil, and the questionable; which more than justifies it.

853.

Art in the "Birth of Tragedy."

I.

The conception of the work which lies right in the background of this book, is extraordinarily gloomy and unpleasant: among all the types of pessimism which have ever been known hitherto, none seems to have attained to this degree of malice. The contrast of a true and of an apparent world is entirely absent here: there is but one world, and it is false, cruel, contradictory, seductive, and without sense. A world, thus constituted is the true world. We are in need of lies in order to rise superior to this reality, to this truth--that is to say, in order to live.... That lies should be necessary to life is part and parcel of the terrible and questionable character of existence.

Metaphysics, morality, religion, science, in this book, all these things are regarded merely as different forms of falsehood: by means of them we are led to believe in life. "Life, must inspire confidence"; the task which this imposes upon us is enormous. In order to solve, this problem man must already be a liar in his heart, but he must above all else be an artist. And he is that. Metaphysics, religion, morality, science, all these things are but the offshoot of his will to art, to falsehood, to a flight from "truth," to a denial of "truth." This ability, this artistic capacity _par excellence_ of man--thanks to which he overcomes reality with lies,--is a quality which he has in common with all other forms of existence. He himself is indeed a piece of reality, of truth, of nature: how could he help being also a piece of genius in prevarication!

The fact that the character of existence is misunderstood, is the profoundest and the highest secret motive behind everything relating to virtue, science, piety, and art. To be blind to many things, to see many things falsely, to fancy many things: Oh, how clever man has been in those circumstances in which he believed he was anything but clever! Love, enthusiasm, "God"--are but subtle forms of ultimate Self-deception; they are but seductions to life and to the belief in life! In those moments when man was deceived, when he had befooled himself and when he believed in life: Oh, how his spirit swelled within him! Oh, what ecstasies he had! What power he felt! And what artistic triumphs in the feeling of power! ... Man had once more become master of "matter,"--master of truth! ... And whenever man rejoices it is always in the same way: he rejoices as an artist, his power is his joy, he enjoys falsehood as his power....

II.

Art and nothing else! Art is the great means of making life possible, the great seducer to life, the great stimulus of life.

Art is the only superior counter-agent to all will to the denial of life; it is _par excellence_ the anti-Christian, the anti-Buddhistic, the anti-Nihilistic force.

Art is the alleviation of the seeker after knowledge,--of him who recognises the terrible and questionable character Of existence, and who will recognise it,--of the tragic seeker after knowledge.

Art is the alleviation of the man of action,--of him who not only sees the terrible and questionable character of existence, but also lives it, will live it,--of the tragic and warlike man, the hero. Art is the alleviation of the sufferer,--as the way to states in which pain is willed, is transfigured, is deified, where suffering is a form of great ecstasy.

III.

It is clear that in this book pessimism, or, better still, Nihilism, stands for "truth." But truth is not postulated as the highest measure of value, and still less as the highest power. The will to appearance, to illusion, to deception, to becoming, and to change (to objective deception), is here regarded as more profound, as more primeval, as more metaphysical than the will to truth, to reality, to appearance: the latter is merely a form of the will to illusion. Happiness is likewise conceived as more primeval than pain: and pain is considered as conditioned, as a consequence Of the will to happiness (of the will to Becoming, to growth, to forming, i.e. to creating; in creating, however, destruction is included). The highest state of Yea-saying to existence is conceived as one from which the greatest pain may not be excluded: the tragico-Dionysian state.

IV.

In this way this book is even anti-pessimistic, namely, in the sense that it teaches something which is stronger than pessimism and which is more "divine" than truth: Art. Nobody, it would seem, would be more ready seriously to utter a radical denial of life, an actual denial of action even more than a denial of life, than the author of this book. Except that he knows--for he has experienced it, and perhaps experienced little else!--that art is of more value than truth.

Even in the preface, in which Richard Wagner is, as it were, invited to join with him in conversation, the author expresses this article of faith, this gospel for artists; "Art is the only task of life, art is the metaphysical activity of life...."

FOURTH BOOK

DISCIPLINE AND BREEDING.

I.

THE ORDER OF RANK.

1. The Doctrine of the Order of Rank.

854.

In this age of universal suffrage, in which everybody is allowed to sit in judgment upon everything and everybody, I feel compelled to re-establish the order of rank.

855.

Quanta of power alone determine rank and distinguish rank: nothing else does.

856.

The will to power.--How must those men be constituted who would undertake this transvaluation? The order of rank as the order of power: war and danger are the prerequisites which allow of a rank maintaining its conditions. The prodigious example: man in Nature--the weakest and shrewdest creature making himself master, and putting a yoke upon all less intelligent forces.

857.

I distinguish between the type which represents ascending life and that which represents decay, decomposition and weakness. Ought one to suppose that the question of rank between these two types can be at all doubtful?

858.

The modicum of power which you represent decides your rank; all the rest is cowardice.

859.

The advantages of standing detached from one's age.--Detached from the two movements, that of individualism and that of collectivist morality; for even the first does not recognise the order of rank, and would give one individual the same freedom as another. My thoughts are not concerned with the degree of freedom which should be granted to the one or to the other or to all, but with the degree of power which the one or the other should exercise over his neighbour or over all; and more especially with the question to what extent a sacrifice of freedom, or even enslavement, may afford the basis for the cultivation, of a _superior_ type. In plain words: _how could one sacrifice the development of mankind_ in order to assist a higher species than man to come into being.

860.

Concerning rank.--The terrible consequences of "equality"--in the end everybody thinks he has the right to every problem. All order of rank has vanished.

861.

It is necessary for _higher_ men to declare war upon the masses! In all directions mediocre people are joining hands in order to make themselves masters. Everything that pampers, that softens, and that brings the "people" or "woman" to the front, operates in favour of universal suffrage,--that is to say, the dominion of _inferior_ men. But we must make reprisals, and draw the whole state of affairs (which commenced in Europe with Christianity) to the light of day and to judgment.

862.

A teaching is needed which is strong enough to work in a _disciplinary_ manner; it should operate in such a way as to strengthen the strong and to paralyse and smash up the world-weary.

The annihilation of declining races. The decay of Europe. The annihilation of slave-tainted valuations. The dominion of the world as a means to the rearing of a higher type. The annihilation of the humbug which is called morality (Christianity as a hysterical kind of honesty in this regard: Augustine, Bunyan.) The annihilation of universal suffrage--that is to say, that system by means of which the lowest natures prescribe themselves as a law for higher natures. The annihilation of mediocrity and its prevalence. (The one-sided, the individuals--peoples; constitutional plenitude should be aimed at by means of the coupling of opposites; to this end race-combinations should be tried.) The new kind of courage--no _a priori_ truths (those who were accustomed to believe in something sought such truths!), but _free_ submission to a ruling thought, which has its time; for instance, time conceived as the quality of space, etc.

2. The Strong and the Weak.

863.

The notion, "strong and weak man" resolves itself into this, that in the first place much strength is inherited--the man is a total sum; in the other, _not yet enough_ (inadequate inheritance, subdivision of the inherited qualities). Weakness may be a _starting_ phenomenon: _not yet enough_; or a final phenomenon: "no more."

The determining point is there where great strength is present, or where a great amount of strength can be discharged. The mass, as the sum-total of the _weak,_ reacts _slowly;_ it defends itself against much for which it is too weak,--against that for which it has no use; it _never_ creates, it _never_ takes a step forward. This is opposed to the theory which denies the strong individual and would maintain that the "masses do everything." The difference is similar to that which obtains between separated generations: four or even five generations may lie between the masses and him who is the moving spirit--it is a _chronological_ difference.

The _values of the weak_ are in the van, because the strong have adopted them in order to _lead_ with them.

864.

Why the weak triumph.--On the whole, the sick and the weak have more _sympathy_ and are more "humane"; the sick and the weak have more intellect, and are more changeable more variegated, more entertaining--more malicious; the sick alone invented _malice._ (A morbid precocity is often to be observed among rickety, scrofulitic, and tuberculous people.) _Esprit:_ the property of older races; Jews, Frenchmen, Chinese. (The anti-Semites do not forgive the Jews for having both intellect--and money. Anti-Semites--another name for "bungled and botched.")

The sick and the weak have always had _fascination_ on their side; they are more _interesting_ than the healthy: the fool and the saint--the two most interesting kinds of men.... Closely related thereto is the "genius." The "great adventurers and criminals" and all great men, the most healthy in particular, have always been _sick_ at certain periods of their lives--great disturbances of the emotions, the passion for power, love, revenge, are all accompanied by very profound perturbations. And, as for decadence, every man who does not die prematurely manifests it in almost every respect--he therefore knows from experience the instincts which belong to it: for _half his life_ nearly every man is decadent.

And finally, woman! _One-half of mankind is weak,_ chronically sick, changeable, shifty woman requires strength in order to cleave to it; she also requires a religion of the weak which glorifies weakness, love, and modesty as divine: or, better still, she makes the strong weak--she _rules_ when she succeeds in overcoming the strong. Woman has always conspired with decadent types,--the priests, for instance, against the mighty, against the "strong," against _men._ Women avail themselves of children for the cult of

piety, pity, and love:--the _mother_ stands as the symbol of _convincing_ altruism.

Finally, the increase of civilisation with its necessary correlatives, the increase of morbid elements, of the _neurotic_ and _psychiatric_ and of the _criminal._ A sort of _intermediary species_ arises, the artist. He is distinct from those who are criminals as the result of weak wills and of the fear of society, although they may not yet be ripe for the asylum; but he has antennas which grope inquisitively into both spheres, this specific plant of culture, the modern artist, painter, musician, and, above all, novelist, who designates his particular kind of attitude with the very indefinite word "naturalism."... Lunatics, criminals, and realists[1] are on the increase: this is the sign of a growing culture plunging forward at headlong speed--that is to say, its excrement, its refuse, the rubbish that is shot from it every day, is beginning to acquire more importance, the retrogressive movement _keeps pace_ with the advance.

Finally, _the social mishmash,_ which is the result of revolution, of the establishment of equal rights, and of the superstition, the "equality of men." Thus the possessors of the instincts of decline (of resentment, of discontent, of the lust of destruction, of anarchy and Nihilism), as also the instincts of slavery, of cowardice, of craftiness, and of rascality, which are inherent among those classes of society which have long been suppressed, are beginning to get infused into the blood of all ranks. Two or three generations later, the race can no longer be recognised--everything has become _mob._ And thus there results a collective instinct against _selection,_ against every kind of _privilege_, and this instinct operates with such power, certainty, hardness, and cruelty that, as a matter of fact, in the end, even the privileged classes have to submit: all those who still wish to hold on to power flatter the mob, work with the mob, and must have the mob on their side--the "geniuses" _above all._ The latter become the _heralds_ of those feelings with which the mob can be inspired,--the expression of pity, of honour, even for all that suffers, all that is low and despised, and has lived under persecution, becomes predominant (types: Victor Hugo, Richard Wagner).--The rise of the mob signifies once more the rise of old values.

In the case of such an extreme movement, both in tempo and in means, as characterises our civilisation, man's ballast is shifted. Those men whose worth is greatest, and whose mission, as it were, is to compensate for the very great danger of such a morbid movement,--such men become dawdlers _par excellence_; they are slow to accept anything, and are tenacious; they are creatures that are relatively lasting in the midst of this vast mingling and changing of elements. In such circumstances power is necessarily relegated to the _mediocre: mediocrity,_ as the trustee and bearer of the future, consolidates itself against the rule of the mob and of eccentricities (both of which are, in most cases, united). In this way a new antagonist is evolved for exceptional men--or in certain cases a new temptation. Provided that they do not adapt themselves to the mob, and stand up for what satisfies the instincts of the disinherited, they will find it necessary to be "mediocre" and sound. They know: _mediocritas_ is also _aurea,_--it alone has command of money and _gold_ (of all that glitters ...).... And, once more, old virtue and the whole superannuated world of ideals in general secures a gifted host of special-pleaders.... Result: mediocrity acquires intellect, wit, and genius, it becomes entertaining, and even seductive.

***

Result.--A high culture can only stand upon a broad basis, upon a strongly and soundly consolidated mediocrity. In its service and assisted by it, _science_ and even art do their work. Science could not wish for a better state of affairs: in its essence it belongs to a middle-class type of man,--among exceptions it is out of place,--there is not anything aristocratic and still less anything anarchic in its instincts.--The power of the middle classes is then upheld by means of commerce, but, above all, by means of money-dealing: the instinct of great financiers is opposed to everything extreme--on this account the Jews are, for the present, the most _conservative_ power in the threatening and insecure conditions of modern Europe. They can have no use either for revolutions, for socialism, or for militarism: if they would have power, and if they should need it, even over the revolutionary party, this is only the result of what I have already said, and it in no way contradicts it. Against other extreme movements they may occasionally require to excite terror by showing how much power is in their hands. But their instinct itself is inveterately conservative and "mediocre, ... Wherever power exists, they know how to become mighty; but the application of their power always takes the same direction. The polite term for _mediocre,_ as is well known, is the word _"Liberal."_

Reflection.--It is all nonsense to suppose that this general _conquest of values_ is anti-biological. In order to explain it, we ought to try and show that it is the result of a certain interest of life to maintain the type "man," even by means of this method which leads to the prevalence of the weak and the physiologically botched--if things were otherwise, might man not cease to exist? Problem ...

The _enhancement_ of the type may prove fatal to the _maintenance of the species._ Why?--The experience of history shows that strong races _decimate_ each other _mutually,_ by means of war, lust for power, and venturousness; the strong emotions; wastefulness (strength is no longer capitalised, disturbed mental systems arise from excessive tension); their existence is a costly affair in short, they persistently give rise to friction _between themselves;_ periods of _profound slackness_ and torpidity intervene: all great ages have to be _paid for...._ The strong are, after all, weaker, less wilful, and more absurd than the average weak ones.

They are _squandering_ races. "_Permanence,_" in itself, can have no value: that which ought to be preferred thereto would be a shorter life for the species, but a life _richer_ in creations. It would remain to be proved that, even as things are, a richer sum of creations is attained than in the case of the shorter existence; _i.e._ that man, as a storehouse of power, attains to a much higher degree of dominion over things under the conditions which have existed hitherto.... We are here face to face with a problem of _economics._

[Footnote 1: The German word is "Naturalist," and really means "realist" in a bad sense.--Tr.]

865.

The state of mind which calls itself "idealism," and which will neither allow mediocrity to be mediocre nor woman to be woman! Do not make everything uniform! We should have a clear idea of how _dearly we have to pay for the establishment of a virtue;_ and that virtue is nothing generally desirable, but a _noble piece of madness,_ a beautiful exception, which gives us the privilege of feeling elated....

866.

It is _necessary_ to show _that a counter-movement is inevitably associated_ with any increasingly economical consumption of men and mankind, and with an ever more closely involved "machinery" of interests and services. I call this counter-movement the _separation of the luxurious surplus of mankind:_ by means of it a stronger kind, a higher type, must come to light, which has other conditions for its origin and for its maintenance than the average man. My concept, my metaphor for this type is, as you know, the word "Superman." Along the first road, which can now be completely surveyed, arose adaptation, stultification, higher Chinese culture, modesty in the Instincts, and satisfaction at the sight of the belittlement of man--a kind of _stationary level of mankind._ If ever we get that inevitable and imminent, general control of the economy of the earth, then mankind _can_ be used as machinery and find its best purpose in the service of this economy--as an enormous piece of clock-work consisting of ever smaller and ever more subtly adapted wheels; then all the dominating and commanding elements will become ever more superfluous; and the whole gains enormous energy, while the individual factors which compose it represent but small modicums of strength and of _value._ To oppose this dwarfing and adaptation of man to a specialised kind of utility, a reverse movement is needed -the procreation of the _synthetic_ man who _embodies_ everything and _justifies_ it; that man for whom the turning of mankind into a machine is a first condition of existence, for whom the rest of mankind is but soil on which he can devise his _higher mode_ of existence.

He is in need of the _opposition_ of the masses, of those who are "levelled down"; he requires that feeling of distance from them; he stands upon them, he lives on them. This higher form of _aristocracy_ is the form of the future. From the moral point of view, the collective machinery above described, that solidarity of all wheels, represents the most extreme example in the _exploitation of mankind_: but it presupposes the existence of those for whom such an exploitation would have some _meaning.[2]_ Otherwise it would signify, as a matter of fact, merely the general depreciation of the type man,--a _retrograde phenomenon_ on a grand scale.

Readers are beginning to see what I am combating--namely, _economic_ optimism: as if the genera] welfare of everybody must necessarily increase with the growing self-sacrifice of everybody. The very reverse seems to me to be the case, _the self-sacrifice of everybody amounts to a collective loss;_ man becomes _inferior_--so that nobody knows what end this monstrous purpose has served. A wherefore? a _new_ wherefore?--this is what mankind requires.

[Footnote 2: This sentence for ever distinguishes Nietzsche's aristocracy from our present plutocratic and industrial one, for which, at the present moment at any rate, it would be difficult to discover some meaning.--Tr.]

867.

The recognition of the _increase of collective power:_ we should calculate to what extent the ruin of individuals, of castes, of ages, and of peoples, is included in this general increase.

The transposition of the _ballast_ of a culture. The _cost_ of every vast growth: who bears it? _Why must it be enormous at the present time?_

868.

General aspect of the future European: the latter regarded as the most intelligent servile animal, very industrious, at bottom very modest, inquisitive to excess, multifarious, pampered, weak of will,--a chaos of cosmopolitan passions and intelligences. How would it be possible for a stronger race to be bred from him?--Such a race as would have a classical taste? The classical taste: this is the will to simplicity, to accentuation, and to happiness made visible, the will to the terrible, and the courage for psychological _nakedness_ (simplification is the outcome of the will to accentuate; allowing happiness as well as nakedness to become visible is a consequence of the will to the terrible ...). In order to fight one's way out of that chaos, and up to this form, a certain _disciplinary constraint_ is necessary: a man should have to choose between either going to the dogs or _prevailing._ A ruling race can only arise amid terrible and violent conditions. Problem: where are the _barbarians_ of the twentieth century? Obviously they will only show themselves and consolidate themselves after enormous socialistic crises. They will consist of those elements which are capable of the _greatest hardness towards themselves,_ and which can guarantee the _most enduring will-power._

869.

The mightiest and most dangerous passions of man, by means of which he most easily goes to rack and ruin, have been so fundamentally banned that mighty men themselves have either become impossible or else must regard themselves as _evil,_ "harmful and prohibited." The losses are heavy, but up to the present they have been necessary. Now, however, that a whole host of counter-forces has been reared, by means of the temporary suppression of these passions (the passion for dominion, the love of change and deception), their liberation has once more become possible: they will no longer possess their old savagery. We can now allow ourselves this tame sort of barbarism: look at our artists and our statesmen!

870.

The root of all evil: that the slave morality of modesty, chastity, selflessness, and absolute obedience should have triumphed. Dominating natures were thus condemned (1) to hypocrisy, (2) to qualms of conscience,--creative natures regarded themselves as rebels against God, uncertain and hemmed in by eternal values.

The barbarians showed that the ability o_f keeping within the bounds of moderation_ was not in the scope of their powers: they feared and slandered the passions and instincts of nature--likewise the aspect of the ruling Cæsars and castes. On the other hand, there arose the suspicion that all _restraint_ is a form of weakness or of incipient old age and fatigue (thus La Rochefoucauld suspects that "virtue" is only a euphemism in the mouths of those to whom vice no longer affords any pleasure). The capacity for restraint was represented as a matter of hardness, self-control, asceticism, as a fight with the devil, etc. etc. The natural _delight_ of æsthetic natures, in measure; _the pleasure derived from the beauty of measure,_ was _overlooked_ and _denied,_ because that which was desired was an anti-eudæmonistic morality. The belief in the pleasure which comes of restraint has been lacking hitherto--this pleasure of a rider on a fiery steed! The moderation of weak natures was confounded with the restraint of the strong!

In short, the best things have been blasphemed because weak or immoderate swine have thrown a bad light upon them--the best men have _remained concealed_--and have often _misunderstood_ themselves.

871.

Vicious and _unbridled people_: their depressing influence upon the _value of the pussions._ It was the appalling barbarity of morality which was principally responsible in the Middle Ages for the compulsory recourse to a veritable "league _of_ virtue"--and this was coupled with an equally appalling exaggeration of all that which constitutes the value of man. Militant "civilisation" (taming) is in need of all kinds of irons and tortures in order to maintain itself against terrible and beast-of-prey natures.

In this case, contusion, although it may have the most nefarious influences, is quite natural: that which _men of power and will are able to demand of themselves_ gives them the standard for what they may also allow themselves. Such natures are the very opposite of the _vicious_ and the _unbridled;_ although under certain circumstances they may perpetrate deeds for which an inferior man would be convicted of vice and intemperance.

In this respect the concept, "_all men are equal before God_" does an extraordinary amount of harm; actions and attitudes of mind were forbidden which belonged to the prerogative of the strong alone, just as if they were in themselves unworthy of man. All the tendencies of strong men were brought into disrepute by the fact that the defensive weapons of the most weak (even of those who were weakest towards themselves) were established as a standard of valuation.

The confusion went so far that precisely the great _virtuosos_ of life (whose self-control presents the sharpest contrast to the vicious and the unbridled) were branded with the most opprobrious names. Even to this day people feel themselves compelled to disparage a Cæsar Borgia: it is simply ludicrous. The Church has anathematised German Kaisers owing to their vices: as if a monk or a priest had the right to say a word as to what a Frederick II. should allow himself. Don Juan is sent to hell: this is very _naïf._ Has anybody ever noticed that all interesting men are lacking in heaven? ... This is only a hint to the girls, as to where they may best find salvation. If one think at all logically, and also have a profound insight into that which makes a great man, there, can be no doubt at all that the Church has dispatched all "great men" to Hades--its fight is _against_ all "greatness in man."

872.

The rights which a man arrogates to himself are relative to the duties which he sets himself, and to the tasks which he feels _capable of performing._ The great majority of men have no right to life, and are only a misfortune to their higher fellows.

873.

The misunderstanding of egoism: on the part of _ignoble natures_ who know nothing of the lust of conquest and the insatiability of great love, and who likewise know nothing of the overflowing feelings of power which make a man wish to overcome things, to force them over to himself, and to lay them on his heart, the power which impels an artist to his material. It often happens also that the active spirit looks for a field for its activity. In ordinary "egoism" it is precisely the ... "non-ego," the _profoundly mediocre creature,_ the member of the herd, who wishes to maintain himself--and when this is perceived by the rarer, more subtle, and less mediocre natures, it revolts them. For the judgment of the latter is this: "We are the _noble_! It is much more important to maintain _us_ than _that_ cattle!"

874.

The degeneration of the ruler and of the ruling classes has been the cause of all the great disorders in history! Without the Roman Cæsars and Roman society, Christianity would never have prevailed.

When it occurs to inferior men to doubt whether higher men exist, then the danger is great I It is then that men finally discover that there are virtues even among inferior, suppressed, and poor-spirited men, and that everybody is equal before God: which is the _non plus ultra_ of all confounded nonsense that has ever appeared on earth! For in the end higher men begin to measure themselves according to the standard of virtues upheld by the slaves--and discover that they are "proud," etc., and that all their _higher_ qualities should be condemned.

When Nero and Caracalla stood at the helm, it was then that the paradox arose: "The lowest man is of more value than that one on the throne!" And thus the path was prepared for an _image of God_ which was as remote as possible from the image of the mightiest,--God on the Cross!

875.

Higher man and gregarious man.--When great men are _wanting,_ the great of the past are converted into demigods or whole gods: the rise of religions proves that mankind no longer has any pleasure in man ("nor in woman neither," as in Hamlet's case). Or a host of men are brought together in a heap, and it is hoped that as a Parliament they will operate just as tyrannically.

Tyrannising is the distinctive quality of great men; they make inferior men stupid.

876.

Buckle affords the best example of the extent to which a plebeian agitator of the mob is incapable of arriving at a clear idea of the concept, "higher nature." The opinion which he _combats_ so passionately--that "great men," individuals, princes, statesmen, geniuses, warriors, are the levers and _causes_ of all great movements, is instinctively misunderstood by him, as if it meant that all that was essential and valuable in such a "higher man," was the fact that he was capable of setting masses in motion; in short, that

his sole merit was the effect he produced.... But the "higher nature" of the great man resides precisely in being different, in being unable to communicate with others, in the loftiness of his rank--_not_ in any sort of effect he may produce even though this be the shattering of both hemispheres.

877.

The Revolution made Napoleon possible: that is its justification. We ought to desire the anarchical collapse of the whole of our civilisation if such a reward were to be its result. Napoleon made nationalism possible: that is the latter's excuse.

The value of a man (apart, of course, from morality and immorality: because with these concepts a man's _worth_ is not even skimmed) does not lie in his utility; because he would continue to exist even if there were nobody to whom he could be useful. And why could not that man be the very pinnacle of manhood who was the source of the worst possible effects for his race: so high and so superior, that in his presence everything would go to rack and ruin from envy?

878.

To appraise the value of a man according to his _utility_ to mankind, or according to what he costs it, or the _damage_ he is able to inflict upon it, is just as good and just as bad as to appraise the value of a work of art according to its _effects._ But in this way the value of one man compared with another is not even touched upon. The "moral valuation," in so far as it is _social_ measures men altogether according to their effects. But what about the man who has his own taste on his tongue, who is surrounded and concealed by his isolation, uncommunicative and not to be communicated with; a man whom no one has fathomed yet--that is to say, a creature of a higher, and, at any rate, _different_ species, how would ye appraise his worth, seeing that ye cannot know him and can compare him with nothing?

Moral valuation was the cause of the most enormous obtuseness of judgment: the value of a man in himself is _underrated,_ well-nigh _overlooked,_ practically _denied._ This is the remains of simple-minded teleology: the value of man _can only be measured with regard to other men._

879.

To be obsessed by moral considerations presupposes a very low grade of intellect: it shows that the instinct for special rights, for standing apart, the feeling of freedom in creative natures, in "children of God" (or of the devil), is lacking. And irrespective of whether _he_ preaches a ruling morality or _criticises_ the prevailing ethical code from the point of view of his own ideal: by doing these things a man shows that he belongs to the herd--even though he may be what it is most in need of--that is to say, a "shepherd."

880.

We should substitute morality by the will to our own ends, and _consequently_ to the means to them.

881.

Concerning the order of rank.--What is it that constitutes the _mediocrity_ of the typical man? That he does not understand that things necessarily have _their other side;_ that he combats evil conditions as if they could be dispensed with, that he will not take the one with the other; that he would fain obliterate and erase the _specific character of a thing,_ of a circumstance, of an age, and of a person, by calling only a portion of their qualities good, and suppressing the remainder. The "desirability" of the mediocre is that which we others combat: their _ideal_ is something which shall no longer contain anything harmful, evil, dangerous, questionable, and destructive. We recognise the reverse of this: that with every growth of man his other side must grow as well; that the highest man, if such a concept be allowed, would be that man who would represent _the antagonistic character of existence_ most strikingly, and would be its glory and its only justification.... Ordinary men may only represent a small corner and nook of this natural character; they perish the moment the multifariousness of the elements composing them, and the tension between their antagonistic traits, increases: but this is the prerequisite for greatness in man. That man should become better and at the same time more evil, is my formula for this inevitable fact.

The majority of people are only piecemeal and fragmentary examples of man: only when all these creatures are jumbled together does one whole man arise Whole ages and whole peoples in this sense, have a fragmentary character about them; it may perhaps

be part of the economy of human development that man should develop himself only piecemeal. But, for this reason, one should not forget that the only important consideration is the rise of the synthetic man; that inferior men, and by far the great majority of people, are but rehearsals and exercises out of which here and there a whole man may arise; a man who is a human milestone, and who indicates how far mankind has advanced up to a certain point. Mankind does not advance in a straight line,--often a type is attained which is again lost (for instance, with all the efforts of three hundred years, we have not reached the men of the Renaissance again, and in addition to this we must not forget that the man of the Renaissance was already behind his brother of classical antiquity).

882.

The superiority of the Greek and the man of the Renaissance is recognised, but people would like to produce them without the conditions and causes of which they were the result.

883.

"Purification of taste" can only be the result of the _strengthening_ of the type. Our society to-day represents only the cultivating systems, the cultivated man is _lacking._ The great _synthetic man,_ in whom the various forces for attaining a purpose are correctly harnessed together, is altogether wanting. The specimen we possess is the _multifarious_ man, the most interesting form of chaos that has ever existed: but _not_ the chaos _preceding_ the creation of the world, but that following it: _Goethe_ as the most beautiful expression of the type (_completely and utterly un-Olympian_!)[3]

[Footnote 3: The Germans always call Goethe the Olympian.--Tr.]

884.

Handel, Leibniz, Goethe, and Bismarck, are characteristic of the _strong German type._ They lived with equanimity, surrounded by contrasts. They were full of that agile kind of strength which cautiously avoids convictions and doctrines, by using the one as a weapon against the other, and reserving absolute freedom for themselves.

885.

Of this I am convinced, that if the rise of great and rare men had been made dependent upon the voices of the multitude (taking for granted, of course, that the latter knew the qualities which belong to greatness, and also the price that all greatness pays for its self-development), then there would never have been any such thing as a great man!

The fact that things pursue their course _independently_ of the voice of the many, is the reason why, a few astonishing things have taken place on earth.

886.

The Order of Rank in Human Values.

_(a)_ A man should not be valued according to isolated acts. _Epidermal actions._ Nothing is more rare than a _personal_ act. Class, rank, race, environment, accident--all these things are much more likely to be expressed in an action or deed than the "personality" of the doer.

_(b)_ We should on no account jump to the conclusion that there are many people who are personalities. Some men are but conglomerations of personalities, whilst the majority are not even _one._ In all cases in which those average qualities preponderate, which ensure the maintenance of the species, to be a personality would involve unnecessary expense, it would be a luxury in fact, it would be foolish to demand of anybody that he should be a personality. In such circumstances everybody is a channel or a transmitting vessel.

_(c)_ A "personality" is a relatively _isolated_ phenomenon; in view of the superior importance of the continuation of the race at an average level, a personality might even be regarded as something _hostile to nature._ For a personality to be possible, timely isolation and the necessity for an existence of offence and defence, are prerequisites; something in the nature of a walled enclosure, a capacity for shutting out the world; but above all, a much _lower degree of sensitiveness_ than the average man has, who is too easily infected with the views of others.

The first _question_ concerning the _order of rank:_ how far is a man disposed to be _solitary_ or _gregarious?_ (in the latter case, his value consists in those qualities which secure the survival of his tribe or his type; in the former case, his qualities are those which distinguish him from others, which isolate and defend him, and make his _solitude possible_).

Consequence: the solitary type should not be valued from the standpoint of the gregarious type, or _vice versâ._

Viewed from above, both types are necessary; as is likewise their antagonism,--and nothing is _more_ thoroughly reprehensible than the "desire" which would develop a _third_ thing out of the two ("virtue" as hermaphroditism). This is as little worthy of desire as the equalisation and reconciliation of the sexes. The _distinguishing qualities must be developed ever more and more,_ the gulf must _be made ever wider...._

The concept of _degeneration_ in both cases: the approximation of the qualities of the herd to those of solitary creatures: and _vice versâ_--in short, when they begin to _resemble_ each other. This concept of degeneration is beyond the sphere of moral judgments.

887.

Where the _strongest natures_ are to be sought. The ruin and degeneration of the _solitary_ species is much greater and more terrible: they have the instincts of the herd, and the tradition of values, against them; their weapons of defence, their instincts of self-preservation, are from the beginning insufficiently strong and reliable--fortune must be peculiarly favourable to them if they are _to prosper_ (they prosper best in the lowest ranks and dregs of society; if ye are seeking _personalities_ it is there that ye will find them with much greater certainty than in the middle classes!)

When the dispute between ranks and classes, which aims at equality of rights, is almost settled, the fight will begin against the _solitary person._ (In a certain sense _the latter can maintain and develop himself most easily in a democratic society:_ there where the coarser means of defence are no longer necessary, and a certain habit of order, honesty, justice, trust, is already a general condition.) The _strongest_ must be most tightly bound, most strictly watched, laid in chains and supervised: this is the instinct of the herd. To them belongs a régime of self-mastery, of ascetic detachment, of "duties" consisting in exhausting work, in which one can no longer call one's soul one's own.

888.

I am attempting an _economic_ justification of virtue. The object is to make man as useful as possible, and to make him approximate as nearly as one can to an infallible machine: to this end he must be equipped with _machine-like virtues_ (he must learn to value those states in which he works in a most mechanically useful way, as the highest of all: to this end it is necessary to make him as disgusted as possible with the other states, and to represent them as very dangerous and despicable).

Here is the first stumbling-block: the tediousness and monotony which all mechanical activity brings with it. To learn to endure _this_--and not only to endure it, but to see tedium enveloped in a ray of exceeding charm: this hitherto has been the task of all higher schools. To learn something which you don't care a fig about, and to find precisely your "duty" in this "objective" activity; to learn to value happiness and duty as things apart; this is the invaluable task and performance of higher schools. It is on this account that the philologist has, hitherto, been the educator _per se:_ because his activity, in itself, affords the best pattern of magnificent monotony in action; under his banner youths learn to "swat": first prerequisite for the thorough fulfilment of mechanical duties in the future (as State officials, husbands, slaves of the desk, newspaper readers, and soldiers). Such an existence may perhaps require a philosophical glorification and justification more than any other: pleasurable feelings must be valued by some sort of infallible tribunal, as altogether of inferior rank; "duty _per se_" perhaps even the pathos of reverence in regard to everything unpleasant,--must be demanded imperatively as that which is above all useful, delightful, and practical things.... A mechanical form of existence regarded as the highest and most respectable form of existence, worshipping itself (type: Kant as the fanatic of the formal concept "Thou shalt").

889.

The economic valuation of all the ideals that have existed hitherto--that is to say, the selection and rearing of definite passions and states at the cost of other passions and states. The lawgiver (or the instinct of the community) selects a number of states and passions the existence of which guarantees the performance of regular actions (mechanical actions would thus be the result of the

regular requirements of those passions and states).

In the event of these states and passions containing ingredients which were painful, a means would have to be found for overcoming this painfulness by means of a valuation; pain would have to be interpreted as something valuable, as something pleasurable in a higher sense. Conceived in a formula: "_How does something unpleasant become pleasant?_" For instance, when our obedience and our submission to the law become honoured, thanks to the energy, power, and self-control they entail. The same holds good of our public spirit, of our neighbourliness, of our patriotism, our "humanisation," our "altruism," and our "heroism." The _object of all idealism_ should, be to induce people to do unpleasant things cheerfully.

890.

The _belittlement_ of man must be held as the chief aim for a long while: because what is needed in the first place is a broad basis from which a stronger species of man may arise (to what extent hitherto has _every stronger_ species of man arisen from a _substratum of inferior people?_).

891.

The absurd and contemptible form of idealism which would not have mediocrity mediocre, and which instead of feeling triumphant at being exceptional, becomes _indignant_ at cowardice, falseness, pettiness, and wretchedness. _We should not wish things to be any different,_ we should make the gulfs even _wider_!--The higher types among men should be compelled to distinguish themselves by means of the sacrifices which they make to their own existence.

Principal point of view; distances must be established, but _no contrasts must be created._ The _middle classes_ must be dissolved, and their influence decreased: this is the principal means of maintaining distances.

892.

Who would dare to disgust the mediocre of their mediocrity! As you observe, I do precisely the reverse: every step away from mediocrity--thus do I teach--leads to _immorality._

893.

To hate mediocrity is unworthy of a philosopher: it is almost a note of interrogation to his "_right_ to philosophy." It is precisely because he is the exception that he must protect the rule and ingratiate all mediocre people.

894.

What I combat: that an exceptional form should make war upon the rule--instead of understanding that the continued existence of the rule is the first condition of the value of the exception. For instance, there are women who, instead of considering their abnormal thirst for knowledge as a distinction, would fain dislocate the whole status of womanhood.

895.

The _increase of strength_ despite the temporary ruin of the individual:--

A new level must be established;

We must have a method of storing up forces for the maintenance of small performances, in opposition to economic waste;

Destructive nature must for once be reduced to an _instrument_ of this economy of the future;

The weak must be maintained, because there is an enormous mass of _finicking_ work to be done;

The weak and the suffering must be upheld in their belief that existence is still possible;

Solidarity must be implanted as an instinct opposed to the instinct of fear and servility;

War must be made upon accident, even upon the accident of "the great man."

896.

War upon _great_ men justified on economic grounds. Great men are dangerous; they are accidents, exceptions, tempests, which are strong enough to question things which it has taken time to build and establish. Explosive material must not only be discharged harmlessly, but, if possible, its discharge must be _prevented_ altogether, this is the fundamental instinct of all civilised society.

897.

He who thinks over the question of how the type man may be elevated to its highest glory and power, will realise from the start that he must place himself beyond morality; for morality was directed in its essentials at the opposite goal--that is to say, its aim was to arrest and to annihilate that glorious development wherever it was in process of accomplishment. For, as a matter of fact, development of that sort implies that such an enormous number of men must be subservient to it, that a _counter-movement_ is only too natural: the weaker, more delicate, more mediocre existences, find it necessary to take up sides _against_ that glory of life and power; and for that purpose they must get a new valuation of themselves by means of which they are able to condemn, and if possible to destroy, life in this high degree of plenitude. Morality is therefore essentially the expression of hostility to life, in so far as it would overcome vital types.

898.

The strong of the future.--To what extent necessity on the one hand and accident on the other have attained to conditions from which a _stronger species_ may be reared: this we are now able to understand and to bring about consciously; we can now create those conditions under which such an elevation is possible.

Hitherto education has always aimed at the utility of society: _not_ the greatest possible utility for the future, but the utility of the society actually extant. What people required were "instruments" for this purpose. Provided the _wealth of forces were greater,_ it would be possible to think of a draft being made upon them, the aim of which would not be the utility of society, but some future utility.

The more people grasped to what extent the present form of society was in such a state of transition as sooner or later to be _no longer able to exist for its own sake,_ but only as a means in the hands of a stronger race, the more _this task would have to be brought forward._

The increasing belittlement of man is precisely the impelling power which leads one to think of the cultivation of a _stronger race:_ a race which would have a surplus precisely there where the dwarfed species was weak and growing weaker (will, responsibility, self-reliance, the ability to postulate aims for one's self).

The means would be those which history teaches: _isolation_ by means of preservative interests which would be the reverse of those generally accepted; exercise in transvalued valuations; distance as pathos; a clean conscience in what to-day is most despised and most prohibited.

The _levelling_ of the mankind of Europe is the great process which should not be arrested; it should even be accelerated. The necessity of _cleaving gulfs,_ of _distance,_ of the _order of rank,_ is therefore imperative; but not the necessity of retarding the process above mentioned.

This _levelled-down_ species requires justification as soon as it is attained: its justification is that it exists for the service of a higher and sovereign race which stands upon it and can only be elevated upon its shoulders to the task which it is destined to perform. Not only a ruling race whose task would be consummated in ruling alone: but a race with _vital spheres_ of its own, with an overflow of energy for beauty, bravery, culture, and manners, even for the most abstract thought; a yea-saying race which would be able to allow itself every kind of great luxury--strong enough to be able to dispense with the tyranny of the imperatives of virtue, rich enough to be in no need of economy or pedantry; beyond good and evil; a forcing-house for rare and exceptional plants.

899.

Our psychologists, whose glance dwells involuntarily upon the symptoms of decadence, lead us to mistrust intellect ever more and more. People persist in seeing only the weakening, pampering, and sickening effects of intellect, but there are now going to appear:--

New Cynics The union of intellectual barbarians Experimentalists superiority with well-being Conquerors and an overflow of strength.

900.

I point to something new: certainly for such a democratic community there is a danger of barbarians; but these are sought only down below. There is also _another kind of barbarians_ who come from the heights: a kind of conquering and ruling natures, which are in search of material that they can mould. Prometheus was a barbarian of this stamp.

901.

Principal standpoint: one should not suppose the mission of a higher species to be the _leading_ of inferior men (as Comte does, for instance); but the inferior should be regarded as the _foundation_ upon which a higher species may live their higher life--upon which alone they _can stand._ The conditions under which a _strong, noble_ species maintains itself (in the matter of intellectual discipline) are precisely the reverse of those under which the industrial masses--the tea-grocers _à la_ Spencer--subsist. Those qualities which are within the grasp only of the _strongest_ and most _terrible_ natures, and which make their existence possible leisure, adventure, disbelief, and even dissipation--would necessarily ruin mediocre natures --and does do so--when they possess them. In the case of the latter industry, regularity, moderation, and strong "conviction" are in their proper place--in short, all "gregarious virtues": under their influence these mediocre men become perfect.

902.

Concerning the ruling types. The shepherd as opposed to the "lord" (the former is only a means to the maintenance of the herd; the latter, the _purpose_ for which the herd exists).

903.

The temporary preponderance of social valuations is both comprehensible and useful; it is a matter of building a _foundation_ upon which a _stronger_ species will ultimately be made possible. The standard of strength: to be able to live under the transvalued valuations, and to desire them for all eternity. State and society regarded as a sub-structure: economic point of view, education conceived as breeding.

904.

A consideration which "free spirits" _lack_: that the same discipline which makes a strong nature still stronger, and enables it to go in for big undertakings, _breaks up and withers the mediocre_: doubt --_la largeur de cœur_--experiment--independence.

905.

The hammer. How should men who must value in the opposite way be constituted?--Men who possess _all_ the qualities of the modern soul, but are strong enough to convert them into real health? The means to their task.

906.

The strong man, who is mighty in the instincts of a strong and healthy organisation, digests his deeds just as well as he digests his meals; he even gets over the effects of heavy fare: in the main, however, he is led by an inviolable and severe instinct which prevents his doing anything which goes against his grain, just as he never does anything against his taste.

907.

Can we _foresee_ the favourable circumstances under which creatures of the highest value might arise? It is a thousand times too complicated, and the probabilities of failure are _very great:_ on that account we cannot be inspired by the thought of striving after them! Scepticism.--To oppose this we can enhance courage, insight, hardness, independence, and the feeling of responsibility; we can also subtilise and learn to forestall the delicacy of the scales, so that favourable accidents may be enlisted on our side.

908.

Before we can even think of acting, an enormous amount of work requires to be done. In the main, however, _a cautious exploitation_ of the present conditions would be our best and most advisable course of action. The actual _creation_ of conditions such as those which occur by accident, presupposes the existence of _iron_ men such as have not yet lived. Our first task must be to make the personal ideal _prevail_ and _become realised_! He who has understood the nature of man and _the origin of mankind's greatest specimens, shudders before man and takes flight from all action_: this is the result of inherited valuations!!

My consolation is, that the nature of man is _evil,_ and this guarantees his _strength_!

909.

The typical forms of self-development, or the eight principal questions:--

1. Do we want to be more multifarious or more simple than we are?

2. Do we want to be happier than we are, or more indifferent to both happiness and unhappiness?

3. Do we want to be more satisfied with ourselves, or more exacting and more inexorable?

4. Do we want to be softer, more yielding, and more human than we are, or more inhuman?

5. Do we want to be more prudent than we are, or more daring?

6. Do we want to attain a goal, or do we want to avoid all goals (like the philosopher, for instance, who scents a boundary, a _cul-de-sac,_ a prison, a piece of foolishness in every goal)?

7. Do we want to become more respected, or more feared, or more _despised_?

8. Do we want to become tyrants, and seducers, or do we want to become shepherds and gregarious animals?

910.

The type of my disciples.--To such men as _concern vie in any way_ I wish suffering, desolation, sickness, ill-treatment, indignities of all kinds. I wish them to be acquainted with profound self-contempt, with the martyrdom of self-distrust, with the misery of the defeated: I have no pity for them; because I wish them to have the only thing which to-day proves whether a man has any value or not, namely, _the capacity of sticking to his guns._

911.

The happiness and self-contentedness of the lazzaroni, or the blessedness of "beautiful souls," or the consumptive love of Puritan pietists, proves nothing in regard to _the order of rank_ among men. As a great educator one ought inexorably to thrash a race of such blissful creatures into unhappiness. The danger of belittlement and of a slackening of powers follows immediately I am _opposed_ to happiness _à la_ Spinoza or _à la_ Epicurus, and to all the relaxation of contemplative states. But when virtue is the means to such happiness, well then, _one must master even virtue._

912.

I cannot see how any one can make up for having missed going to _a good school_ at the proper time. Such a person does not know himself; he walks through life without ever having learned to walk. His soft muscles betray themselves at every step. Occasionally life itself is merciful enough to make a man recover this lost and severe schooling: by means of periods of sickness, perhaps, which exact the utmost will-power and self-control; or by means of a sudden state of poverty, which threatens his wife and child, and which may force a man to such activity as will restore energy to his slackened tendons, and a _tough spirit_ to his will to life. The most desirable thing of all, however, is, under all circumstances to have severe discipline _at the right time, i.e._ at that age when it makes us proud that people should expect great things from us. For this is what distinguishes hard schooling, as good schooling, from every other schooling, namely, that a good deal is demanded, that a good deal is severely exacted; that goodness, nay even excellence itself, is required as if it were normal; that praise is scanty, that leniency is non-existent; that blame is sharp, practical, and without reprieve, and has no regard to talent and antecedents. We are in every way in need of such a school: and this holds good of corporeal as well as of spiritual things; it would be fatal to draw distinctions here! The same discipline makes the soldier and the scholar efficient; and, looked at more closely, there is no true scholar who has not the instincts of a true soldier in

his veins. To be able to command and to be able to obey in a proud fashion; to keep one's place in rank and file, and yet to be ready at any moment to lead; to prefer danger to comfort; not to weigh what is permitted and what is forbidden in a tradesman's balance; to be more hostile to pettiness, slyness, and parasitism than to wickedness. What is it that one _learns_ in a hard school?--_to obey_ and _to command._

913.

We should _repudiate_ merit--and do only that which stands above all praise and above all understanding.

914.

The new forms of morality:--

Faithful vows concerning that which one wishes to do or to leave undone; complete and definite abstention from many things. Tests as to whether one is _ripe_ for such discipline.

915.

It is my desire to _naturalise asceticism:_ I would substitute the old intention of asceticism, "self-denial," by my own intention, _self-strengthening:_ a gymnastic of the will; a period of abstinence and occasional fasting of every kind, even in things intellectual; a casuistry in deeds, in regard to the opinions which we derive from our powers; we should try our hand at adventure and at deliberate dangers. (_Dîners chez Magny:_ all intellectual gourmets with spoilt stomachs.) _Tests_ ought also to be devised for discovering a man's power in keeping his word.

916.

The things which have become _spoilt_ through having been abused by the Church:--

(1) _Asceticism._--People have scarcely got the courage yet to bring to light the natural utility and necessity of asceticism for the purpose of the _education of the will._ Our ridiculous world of education, before whose eyes the useful State official hovers as an ideal to be striven for, believes that it has completed its duty when it has instructed or trained the brain; it never even suspects that something else is first of all necessary --the education of _will-power;_ tests are devised for everything except for the most important thing of all: whether a man can _will,_ whether he can _promise;_ the young man completes his education without a question or an inquiry having been made concerning the problem of the highest value of his nature.

(2) _Fasting:_--In every sense--even as a means of maintaining the capacity for taking pleasure in all good things (for instance, to give up reading for a while, to hear no music for a while, to cease from being amiable for a while: one ought also to have fast days for one's virtues).

(3) _The monastery._--Temporary isolation with severe seclusion from all letters, for instance; a kind of profound introspection and self-recovery, which does not go out of the way of "temptations," but out of the way of "duties"; a stepping out of the daily round of one's environment; a detachment from the tyranny of stimuli and external influences, which condemns us to expend our power only in reactions, and does not allow it to gather volume until it bursts into spontaneous activity (let anybody examine our scholars closely: they only think reflexively, _i.e._ they must first read before they can think).

(4) _Feasts._--A man must be very coarse in order not to feel the presence of Christians and Christian values as oppressive, so oppressive as to send all festive moods to the devil. By feasts we understand: pride, high-spirits, exuberance; scorn of all kinds of seriousness and Philistinism; a divine saying of Yea to one's self, as the result of physical plenitude and perfection--all states to which the Christian cannot honestly say Yea. _A feast is a pagan thing par excellence._

(5) The _courage of ones own nature: dressing-up in morality,_--To be able to call one's passions good without the help of a moral formula: this is the standard which measures the extent to which a man is able to say Yea to his own nature, namely, how much or how little he has to have recourse to morality.

(6) _Death._--The foolish physiological fact must be converted into a moral necessity. One should live in such a way that _one may have the will to die at the right time_!

917.

To feel ones self stronger or, expressed otherwise: happiness always presupposes a comparison (not necessarily with others, but with one's self, in the midst of a state of growth, and without being conscious that one is comparing).

Artificial accentuation: whether by means of exciting chemicals or exciting errors ("hallucinations.")

Take, for instance, the Christian's feeling of _security_; he feels himself strong in his confidence, in his patience, and his resignation: this artificial accentuation he owes to the fancy that he is protected by a God. Take the feeling of _superiority,_ for instance: as when the Caliph of Morocco sees only globes on which his three united kingdoms cover four-fifths of the space. Take the feeling of _uniqueness,_ for instance: as when the European imagines that culture belongs to Europe alone, and when he regards himself as a sort of abridged cosmic process; or, as when the Christian makes all existence revolve round the "Salvation of man."

The question is, where does one begin to feel the pressure of constraint: it is thus that different degrees are ascertained. A philosopher for instance, in the midst of the coolest and most transmontane feats of abstraction feels like a fish that enters its element: while colours and tones oppress him; not to speak of those dumb desires--of that which others call "the ideal."

918.

A healthy and vigorous little boy will look up sarcastically if he be asked: "Wilt thou become virtuous?"--but he immediately becomes eager if he be asked: "Wilt thou become stronger than thy comrades?"

***

How does one become stronger?--By deciding slowly; and by holding firmly to the decision once it is made. Everything else follows of itself. Spontaneous and changeable natures: both species of the weak. We must not confound ourselves with them; we must feel distance--betimes!

Beware of good-natured people!. Dealings with them make one torpid. All environment is good which makes one exercise those defensive and; aggressive powers which are instinctive in man. All one's inventiveness should apply itself to putting one's power of will to the test.... _Here_ the determining factor must be recognised as something which is not knowledge, astuteness, or wit.

One must learn to command betimes,--likewise to obey. A man must learn modesty and tact in modesty: he must learn to distinguish and to honour where modesty is displayed; he must likewise distinguish and honour wherever he bestows his confidence.

What does one repent most? One's modesty; the fact that one has not lent an ear to one's most individual needs; the fact that one has mistaken one's self; the fact that one has esteemed one's self low; the fact that one has lost all delicacy of hearing in regard to one's instincts.--This want of reverence in regard to one's self is avenged by all sorts of losses: in health, friendship, well-being, pride, cheerfulness, freedom, determination, courage. A man never forgives himself, later on, for this want of genuine egoism: he regards it as an objection and as a cause of doubt concerning his real ego.

919.

I should like man to begin by _respecting_ himself: everything else follows of itself. Naturally a man ceases from being anything to others in this way: for this is precisely what they are least likely to forgive. "What? a man who respects himself?"[4] This is something quite different from the blind instinct to _love_ one's self. Nothing is more common in the love of the sexes or in that duality which is called ego, than a certain contempt for that which is loved the fatalism of love.

[Footnote 4: Cf. Disraeli in _Tancred:_ "Self-respect, too, is a superstition of past ages.... It is not suited to these times; it is much too arrogant, too self-conceited, too egoistical. No one is important enough to have self-respect nowadays" (book iii. chap. v.).--Tr.]

920.

"I will have this or that"; "I would that this or that were so"; "I know that this or that is so the degrees of power: the man of _will,_ the man of _desire,_ the man of _fate._

921.

The means by which a strong species maintains itself:--

It grants itself the right of exceptional actions, as a test of the power of self-control and of freedom.

It abandons itself to states in which a man is not allowed to be anything else than a barbarian.

It tries to acquire strength of will by every kind of asceticism.

It is not expansive, it practises silence; it is cautious in regard to all charms.

It learns to obey in such a way that obedience provides a test of self-maintenance. Casuistry is carried to its highest pitch in regard to points of honour.

It never argues, "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander,"--but conversely! it regards reward, and the ability to repay, as a privilege, as a distinction.

It does not covet _other_ people's virtues.

922.

The way in which one has to treat raw savages and the impossibility of dispensing with barbarous methods, becomes obvious, in practice, when one is transplanted, with all one's European pampering, to a spot such as the Congo, or anywhere else where it is necessary to maintain one's mastery over barbarians.

923.

Warlike and peaceful people.--Art thou a man who has the instincts of a warrior in thy blood? If this be so, another question must be put. Do thy instincts impel thee to attack or to defend? The rest of mankind, all those whose instincts are not warlike, desire peace, concord, freedom, "equal rights": these things are but names and steps for one and the same thing. Such men only wish to go where it is not necessary for them to defend themselves,--such men become discontented with themselves when they are obliged to offer resistance: they would fain create circumstances in which war is no longer necessary. If the worst came to the worst, they would resign themselves, obey, and submit: all these things are better than waging war--thus does the Christian's instinct, for instance, whisper to him. In the born warrior's character there is something of armour, likewise in the choice of his circumstances and in the development of every one of his qualities, weapons are best evolved by the latter type, shields are best devised by the former.

What expedients and what virtues do the unarmed and the undefended require in order to survive--and even to conquer?

924.

What will become of a man who no longer has any reasons for either defence or attack? What will remain of his _passions_ when he has lost those which form his defence and his weapons?

925.

A marginal note to a _niaiserie anglaise_: "Do not to others that which you would not that they should do unto you." This stands for wisdom; this stands for prudence; this stands as the very basis of morality as "a golden maxim." John Stuart Mill believes in it (and what Englishman does not?).... But the maxim does not bear investigation. The argument, Do not as you would not be done by, forbids action which produce harmful results; the thought behind always is that an action is invariably requited. What if some one came forward with the _"Principe"_ in his hands, and said: "We must do those actions alone which enable us to steal a march on others,--and which deprive others of the power of doing the same to us"?--On the other hand, let us remember the Corsican who pledges his honour to vendetta. He too does not desire to have a bullet through him; but the prospect of one, the probability of getting one, does not deter him from vindicating his honour.... And in all really decent actions are we not intentionally indifferent as to what result they will bring? To avoid an action which might have harmful results,--that would be tantamount to forbidding all decent actions in general.

Apart from this, the above maxim is valuable because it betrays a certain _type of man_: it is the instinct of the herd which formulates itself through him,--we are equal, we regard each other as equal: as I am to thee so art thou to me.--In this community equivalence of actions is really believed in--an equivalence which never under any circumstances manifests itself in real conditions. It is impossible to requite every action: among real individuals equal actions do not exist, consequently there can be no such thing as "requital." ... When I do anything, I am very far from thinking that any man is able to do anything at all like it: the action belongs to me.... Nobody can pay me back for anything I do; the most that can be done is to make me the victim of another action.

926.

Against John Stuart Mill.--I abhor the man's vulgarity when he says: "What is right for one man is right for another"; "Do not to others that which you would not that they should do unto you. Such principles would fain establish the whole of human traffic _upon mutual services,_ so that every action would appear to be a cash payment for something done to us. The hypothesis here is ignoble to the last degree: it is taken for granted that there is some sort of equivalence in value between my actions and thine; the most personal value Of an action is simply cancelled in this manner (that part of an action which has no equivalent and which cannot be remunerated). "Reciprocity" is a piece of egregious vulgarity; the mere fact that what I do _cannot_ and _may_ not be done by another, that there is _no such thing as equivalence_ (except in those _very select circles_ where one actually has one's equal, _inter pares_), that in a really profound sense a man never requites because he is something _unique_ in himself and can only do _unique_ things,--this fundamental conviction contains the cause of _aristocratic aloofness from the mob_, because the latter believes in equality, and _consequently_ in the feasibility of equivalence and "reciprocity."

927.

The suburban Philistinism of moral valuations and of its concepts "useful" and "harmful" is well founded; it is the necessary point of view of a community which is only able to see and survey _immediate and proximate_ consequences. The _State_ and the _political man_ are already in need of a more _super-moral_ attitude of mind: because they have to calculate concerning a much more complicated tissue of consequences. An economic policy for the whole world should be possible which could look at things in such broad perspective that all its isolated demands would seem for the moment not only unjust, but arbitrary.

928.

"_Should one follow one's feelings?_"--To set one's life at stake on the impulse of the moment, and actuated by a generous feeling, has little worth, and does not even distinguish one. Everybody is alike in being capable of this--and in behaving in this way with determination, the criminal, the bandit, and the Corsican certainly outstrip the honest man.

A higher degree of excellence would be to overcome this impulse, and to refrain from performing an heroic deed at its bidding--and to remain cold, _raisonnable_, free from the tempestuous surging of concomitant sensations of delight.... The same holds good of pity: it must first be _sifted through_ reason; without this it becomes just as dangerous as any other passion.

The _blind yielding_ to a passion, whether it be generosity, pity, or hostility, is the cause of the greatest evil. Greatness of character does not consist in not possessing these passions--on the contrary, a man should possess them to a terrible degree: but he should lead them by the bridle.. and even this he should not do out of love of control, but merely because....

929.

"To give up one's life for a cause"--very effective. But there are many things for which one gives up one's life: the passions, one and all, will be gratified. Whether one's life be pledged to pity, to anger, or to revenge--it matters not from the point of view of value. How many have not sacrificed their lives for pretty girls--and even what is worse, their health! When one has temperament, one instinctively chooses the most dangerous things: if one is a philosopher, for instance, one chooses the adventures of speculation; if one is virtuous, one chooses immorality. One kind of man will risk nothing, another kind will risk everything. Are we despisers of life? On the contrary, what we seek is life raised to a higher power, life in danger.... But, let me repeat, we do not, on that account, wish to be more virtuous than others, Pascal, for instance, wished to risk nothing, and remained a Christian. That perhaps was virtuous.----A man always sacrifices something.

930.

How many _advantages_ does not a man sacrifice! To how small an extent does he seek his own profit! All his emotions and passions wish to assert their rights, and how remote a passion is From that cautious utility which consists in personal profit!

A man does _not_ strive after "happiness"; one must be an Englishman to be able to believe that a man is always seeking his own advantage. Our desires long to violate things with passion--their overflowing strength seeks obstacles.

931.

All passions are generally _useful,_ some directly, others indirectly; in regard to utility it is absolutely impossible to fix upon any gradation of values,--however certainly the forces of nature in general may be regarded as good (_i.e._ useful), from an economic point of view, they are still the sources of much that is terrible and much that is fatally irrevocable. The most one might say would be, that the mightiest passions are the most valuable: seeing that no stronger sources of power exist.

932.

All well-meaning, helpful, good-natured attitudes of mind have _not_ come to be honoured on account of their usefulness: but because they are the conditions peculiar to _rich souls_ who are able to bestow and whose value consists in their vital exuberance. Look into the eyes of the benevolent man! In them you will see the exact reverse of self-denial, of hatred of self, of Pascalism.

933.

In short, what we require is to dominate the passions and not to weaken or to extirpate them!--The greater the dominating power of the will, the greater the freedom that may be given to the passions.

The "great man" is so, owing to the free scope which he gives to his desires, and to the still greater power which knows how to enlist these magnificent monsters into its service.

The "good man" in every stage of civilisation is at one and the same time the _least dangerous_ and the _most useful:_ a sort of medium; the idea formed of such a man by the common mind is that he is some one _whom one has no reason to fear, but whom one must not therefore despise._

Education: essentially a means of _ruining_ exceptions in favour of the rule. Culture: essentially the means of directing taste against the exceptions in favour of the mediocre.

Only when a culture can dispose of an overflow of force, is it capable of being a hothouse for the luxurious culture of the exception, of the experiment, of the danger, of the _nuance: this_ is the tendency of _every_ aristocratic culture.

934.

All questions of strength: to what extent ought one to try and prevail against the preservative measures of society and the latter's prejudices?--to what extent ought one to unfetter _one's terrible qualities,_ through which so many go to the dogs?--to what extent ought one to run counter to _truth,_ and take up sides with its most questionable aspects?--to what extent ought one to oppose suffering, self-contempt, pity, disease, vice, when it is always open to question whether one can ever master them (what does not kill us makes us _stronger..._.)?--and, finally, to what extent ought one to acknowledge the rights of the rule, of the common-place, of the petty, of the good, of the upright, in fact of the average man, without thereby allowing one's self to become vulgar? ... The strongest test of character is to resist being ruined by the seductiveness of goodness. _Goodness_ must be regarded as a luxury, as a refinement, as a _vice._

3. The Noble Man.

935.

Type. real goodness, nobility, greatness of soul, as the result of vital wealth: which does not give in order to receive--and which has no desire to _elevate_ itself by being good, _squandering_ is typical of genuine goodness, vital _personal_ wealth is its prerequisite.

936.

Aristocracy.--Gregarious ideals at present culminating in the highest standard of value for society. It has been attempted to give them a cosmic, yea, and even a metaphysical, value.--I defend _aristocracy_ against them.

Any society which would of itself preserve a feeling of respect and _délicatesse_ in regard to freedom, must consider itself as an exception, and have a force against it from which it distinguishes itself, and upon which it looks down with hostility.

The more rights I surrender and the more I level myself down to others, the more deeply do I sink into the average and ultimately into the greatest number. The first condition which an aristocratic society must have in order to maintain a high degree of freedom among its members, is that extreme tension which arises from the presence of the most _antagonistic_ instincts in all its units: from their will to dominate....

If ye would fain do away with strong contrasts and differences of rank, ye will also abolish, strong love, lofty attitudes of mind, and the feeling of individuality.

***

Concerning the _actual_ psychology of societies based upon freedom and equality.--What is it that tends to _diminish_ in such a society?

The will to be _responsible for ones self_ (the loss of this is a sign of the decline of autonomy); the ability to defend and to attack, even in spiritual matters; the power of command; the sense of reverence, of subservience, the ability to be silent, _great passion,_ great achievements, tragedy and cheerfulness.

937.

In 1814 Augustin Thierry read what Montlosier had said in his work, _De la Monarchie française:_ he answered with a cry of indignation, and set himself to his task. That emigrant had said:

"_Race d'affranchis, race d'esclaves arrachés de nos mains, peuple tributaire, peuple nouveau, licence vous fut octroyée d'être libres, et non pas à nous d'être nobles; pour nous tout est de droit, pour vous tout est de grâce, nous ne sommes point de votre communauté; nous sommes un tout par nous mêmes._"

938.

How constantly the aristocratic world shears and weakens itself ever more and more! By means of its noble instincts it abandons its privileges, and owing to its refined and excessive culture, it takes an interest in the people, the weak, the poor, and the poetry of the lowly, etc.

939.

There is such a thing as a noble and dangerous form of carelessness, which allows of profound conclusions and insight: the carelessness of the self-reliant and over-rich soul, which has never _troubled_ itself about friends, but which knows only hospitality and knows how to practise it; whose heart and house are open to all who will enter--beggar, cripple, or king. This is genuine sociability: he who is capable of it has hundreds of "friends," but probably not one friend.

940.

The teaching μηδ■ν ■γαν applies to men with overflowing strength,--not to the mediocre, ■γκρ■τεια and ■σκησις are only steps to higher things. Above them stands "golden Nature."

"Thou shalt"--unconditional obedience in Stoics, in Christian and Arabian Orders, in Kant's philosophy (it is immaterial whether this obedience is shown to a superior or to a concept).

Higher than "Thou shalt" stands "I will" (the heroes); higher than "I will" stands "I am" (the gods of the Greeks).

Barbarian gods express nothing of the pleasure of restraint,--they are neither simple, nor light-hearted, nor moderate.

941.

The essence of our gardens and palaces (and to the same extent the essence of all yearning after riches) is _the desire to rid the eye of disorder and vulgarity, and to build a home for our soul's nobility._

The majority of people certainly believe that they will develop higher natures when those beautiful and peaceful things have operated upon them: hence the exodus to Italy, hence all travelling, etc., and all reading and visits to theatres. _People want to be formed_--that is the kernel of their labours for culture! But the strong, the mighty, would themselves _have a hand in the forming, and would fain have nothing strange about them_!

It is for this reason, too, that men go to open Nature, not to find themselves, but to lose themselves and to forget themselves. The desire "_to get away from one's self_" is proper to all weaklings, and to all those who are discontented with themselves.

942.

The only nobility is that of birth and blood. (I do not refer here to the prefix "Lord" and _L'almanac de Gotha_: this is a parenthesis for donkeys.) Wherever people speak of the "aristocracy of intellect," reasons are generally not lacking for concealing something, it is known to be a password among ambitious Jews. Intellect alone does not ennoble; on the contrary, something is always needed _to ennoble intellect._--What then is needed?--Blood.

943.

What is noble?

--External punctiliousness; because this punctiliousness hedges a man about, keeps him at a distance, saves him from being confounded with somebody else.

A frivolous appearance in word, clothing, and bearing, with which stoical hardness and self-control protect themselves from all prying inquisitiveness or curiosity.

--A slow step and a slow glance. There are not too many valuable things on earth: and these come and wish to come of themselves to him who has value. We are not quick to admire.

--We know how to bear poverty, want, and even illness.

--We avoid small honours owing to our mistrust of all who are over-ready to praise: for the man who praises believes he understands what he praises: but to understand--Balzac, that typical man of ambition, betrayed the fact _comprendre c'est égaler._

--Our doubt concerning the communicativeness of our hearts goes very deep; to us, loneliness is not a matter of choice, it is imposed upon us.

--We are convinced that we only have duties to our equals, to others we do as we think best: we know that justice is only to be expected among equals (alas! this will not be realised for some time to come),

--We are ironical towards the "gifted"; we hold the belief that no morality is possible without good birth.

--We always feel as if we were those who had to dispense honours: while he is not found too frequently who would be worthy of honouring us.

--We are always disguised: the higher a man's nature the more is he in need of remaining incognito. If there be a God, then out of sheer decency He ought only to show Himself on earth in the form of a man.

--We are capable of _otium,_ of the unconditional conviction that although a handicraft does not shame one in any sense, it certainly reduces one's rank. However much we may respect "industry," and know how to give it its due, we do not appreciate it in a bourgeois sense, or after the manner of those insatiable and cackling artists who, like hens, cackle and lay eggs, and cackle again.

--We protect artists and poets and any one who happens to be a master in something; but as creatures of a higher order than those, who only know how to do something, who are only "productive men," we do not confound ourselves with them.

--We find joy in all _forms_ and ceremonies; we would fain foster everything formal, and we are convinced that courtesy is one of the greatest virtues; we feel suspicious of every kind of _laisser aller,_ including the freedom of the press and of thought; because, under such conditions, the intellect grows easy-going and coarse, and stretches its limbs.

--We take pleasure in women as in a perhaps daintier, more delicate, and more ethereal kind of creature. What a treat it is to meet creatures who have only dancing and nonsense and finery in their minds! They have always been the delight of every tense and profound male soul, whose life is burdened with heavy responsibilities.

--We take pleasure in princes and in priests, because in big things, as in small, they actually uphold the belief in the difference of human values, even in the estimation of the past, and at least symbolically.

--We are able to keep silence _i_ but we do not breathe a word of this in the presence of listeners.

--We are able to endure long enmities: we lack the power of easy reconciliations.

--We have a loathing of demagogism, of enlightenment, of amiability, and plebeian familiarity.

--We collect precious things, the needs of higher and fastidious souls; we wish to possess nothing in common. We want to have our own books, our _own_ landscapes.

--We protest against evil and fine experiences, and take care not to generalise too quickly. The individual case: how ironically we regard it when it has the bad taste to put on the airs of a rule!

--We love that which is _naïf,_ and _naïf_ people, but as spectators and higher creatures; we think Faust is just as simple as his Margaret.

--We have a low estimation of good people, because they are gregarious animals: we know how often an invaluable golden drop of goodness lies concealed beneath the most evil, the most malicious, and the hardest exterior, and that this single grain outweighs all the mere goody-goodiness of milk-and-watery souls.

--We don't regard a man of our kind as refuted by his vices, nor by his tomfooleries. We are well aware that we are not recognised with ease, and that we have every reason to make our foreground very prominent.

944.

What is noble?--The fact that one is constantly forced to be playing a part. That one is constantly searching for situations in which one is forced to put on airs. That one leaves happiness to the _greatest number:_ the happiness which consists of inner peacefulness, of virtue, of comfort, and of Anglo-angelic-back-parlour-smugness, _à la_ Spencer. That one instinctively seeks for heavy responsibilities. That one knows how to create enemies everywhere, at a pinch even in one's self. That one contradicts the _greatest number,_ not in words at all, but by continually behaving differently from them.

945.

Virtue (for instance, truthfulness) is _our_ most noble and most dangerous luxury. We must not decline the disadvantages which it brings in its train.

946.

We refuse to be _praised:_ we do what serves our purpose, what gives us pleasure, or what we are obliged to do.

947.

What is chastity in a man? It means that his taste in sex has remained noble; that _in eroticis_ he likes neither the brutal, the morbid, nor the clever.

948.

The concept of honour is founded upon the belief in select society, in knightly excellences, in the obligation of having continually to play a part. In essentials it means that one does not take one's life too seriously, that one adheres unconditionally to the most dignified manners in one's dealings with everybody (at least in so far as they do not belong to "us"); that one is neither familiar, nor good-natured, nor hearty, nor modest, except _inter pares_; that one is _always playing a part._

949.

The fact that one sets one's life, one's health, and one's honour at stake, is the result of high spirits and of an overflowing and spendthrift will: it is not the result of philanthropy, but of the fact that every danger kindles our curiosity concerning the measure of our strength, and provokes our courage.

950.

Eagles swoop down straight nobility of soul is best revealed by the magnificent and proud foolishness with which it makes its _attacks._

951.

War should be made against all namby-pamby ideas of _nobility_!--A certain modicum of brutality cannot be dispensed with: no more than we can do without a certain approximation to criminality. "Self-satisfaction" must _not_ be allowed; a man should look upon himself with an adventurous spirit; he should experiment with himself and run risks with himself--no beautiful soul-quackery should be tolerated. I want to give _a more robust ideal_ a chance of prevailing.

952.

"Paradise is under the shadow of a swordsman"--this is also a symbol and a test-word by which souls with noble and warrior-like origin betray and discover themselves.

953.

The two paths.--There comes a period when man has a surplus amount of power at his disposal. Science aims at establishing the _slavery of nature._

Then man acquires the _leisure_ in which to develop himself into something new and more lofty. _A new aristocracy._ It is then that a large number of virtues which are now _conditions of existence_ are superseded.--Qualities which are no longer needed are on that account lost. We no longer need virtues: _consequently_ we are losing them (likewise the morality of "one thing is needful," of the salvation of the soul, and of immortality: these were means wherewith to make man capable of enormous self-tyranny, through the emotion of great fear!!!).

The different kinds of needs by means of whose discipline man is formed: need teaches work, thought, and self-control.

***

Physiological purification and strengthening. The new aristocracy is in need of an opposing body which it may combat: it must be driven to extremities in order to maintain itself.

The two futures of mankind: (1) the consequence of a levelling-down to mediocrity, (2) conscious aloofness and self-development.

A doctrine which would cleave a _gulf:_ it maintains the _highest and the lowest species_ (it destroys the intermediate).

The aristocracies, both spiritual and temporal, which have existed hitherto prove nothing _against_ the necessity of a new aristocracy.

4. The Lords of the Earth.

954.

A certain question constantly recurs to us; it is perhaps a seductive and evil question; may it be whispered into the ears of those who have a right to such doubtful problems--those strong souls of to-day whose dominion over themselves is unswerving: is it not high time, now that the type "gregarious animal" is developing ever more and more in Europe, to set about rearing, thoroughly, artificially, and consciously, an opposite type, and to attempt to establish the latter's virtues? And would not the democratic movement itself find for the first time a sort of goal, salvation, and justification, if some one appeared who availed himself of it--so that at last, beside its new and sublime product, slavery (for this must be the end of European democracy), that higher species of ruling and Cæsarian spirits might also be produced, which would stand upon it, hold to it, and would elevate themselves through it?

This new race would climb aloft to new and hitherto impossible things, to a broader vision, and to its task on earth.

955.

The aspect of the European of to-day makes me very hopeful. A daring and ruling race is here building itself up upon the foundation of an extremely intelligent, gregarious mass. It is obvious that the educational movements for the latter are not alone prominent nowadays.

956.

The same conditions which go to develop the gregarious animal also force the development of the leaders.

957.

The question, and at the same time the task, is approaching with hesitation, terrible as Fate, but nevertheless inevitable: how shall the earth as a whole be ruled? And to what end shall man as a whole--no longer as a people or as a race--be reared and trained?

Legislative moralities are the principal means by which one can form mankind, according to the fancy of a creative and profound will: provided, of course, that such an artistic will of the first order gets the power into its own hands, and can make its creative will prevail over long periods in the form of legislation, religions, and morals. At present, and probably for some time to come, one will seek such colossally creative men, such really great men, as I understand them, in vain: they will be lacking, until, after many disappointments, we are forced to begin to understand why it is they are lacking, and that nothing bars with greater hostility their rise and development, at present and for some time to come, than that which is now called _the_ morality in Europe. Just as if there were no other kind of morality, and could be no other kind, than the one we have already characterised as herd-morality. It is this morality which is now striving with all its power to attain to that green-meadow happiness on earth, which consists in security, absence of danger, ease, facilities for livelihood, and, last but not least, "if all goes well," even hopes to dispense with all kinds of shepherds and bell-wethers. The two doctrines which it preaches most universally are "equality of rights" and "pity for all sufferers"--and it even regards suffering itself as something which must be got rid of absolutely. That such ideas may be modern leads one to think very poorly of modernity. He, however, who has reflected deeply concerning the question, how and where the plant man has hitherto grown most vigorously, is forced to believe that this has always taken place under the opposite conditions; that to this end the danger of the situation has to increase enormously, his inventive faculty and dissembling powers have to fight their way up under long oppression and compulsion, and his will to life has to be increased to the unconditioned will to power, to over-power: he believes that danger, severity, violence, peril in the street and in the heart, inequality of rights, secrecy, stoicism, seductive art, and devilry of every kind--in short, the opposite of all gregarious desiderata--are necessary for the elevation of man. Such a morality with opposite designs, which would rear man upwards instead of to comfort and mediocrity; such a morality, with the intention of producing a ruling caste--the future lords of the earth--must, in order to be taught at all, introduce itself as if it were in some way correlated to the prevailing moral law, and must come forward under the cover of the latter's words and forms. But seeing that, to this end, a host of transitionary and deceptive measures must be discovered, and that the life of a single individual stands for almost nothing in view of the accomplishment of such lengthy tasks and aims, the first thing that must be done is to rear _a new kind_ of man in whom the duration of the necessary will and the necessary instincts is guaranteed for many generations. This must be a new kind of ruling species and caste--this ought to be quite as clear as the somewhat lengthy and not easily expressed consequences of this thought. The aim should be to prepare a _transvaluation of values_ for a particularly strong kind of man, most highly gifted in intellect and will, and, to this end, slowly and cautiously to liberate in him a whole host of slandered instincts hitherto held in check: whoever meditates about this problem belongs to us, the free spirits--certainly not to that kind of "free spirit" which has existed hitherto: for these desired practically the reverse. To this order, it seems to me, belong, above all, the pessimists of Europe, the poets and thinkers of a revolted idealism, in so far as their discontent with existence in general must _consistently_ at least have led them to be dissatisfied with the man of the present; the same applies to certain insatiably ambitious artists who courageously and unconditionally fight against the gregarious animal for the special rights of higher men, and subdue all herd-instincts and precautions of more exceptional minds by their seductive art. Thirdly and lastly, we should include in this group all those critics and historians by whom the discovery of the Old World, which has begun so happily--this was the work of the _new_ Columbus, of German intellect--will be courageously _continued_ (for we still stand in the very first stages of this conquest). For in the Old World, as a matter of fact, a different and more lordly morality ruled than that of to-day; and the man of antiquity, under the educational ban of his morality, was a stronger and deeper man than the man of to-day--up to the present he has been the only well-constituted man. The temptation, however, which from antiquity to the present day has always exercised its power on such

lucky strokes of Nature, _i.e._ on strong and enterprising souls, is, even at the present day, the most subtle and most effective of anti-democratic and anti-Christian powers, just as it was in the time of the Renaissance.

958.

I am writing for a race of men which does not yet exist: for "the lords of the earth."

In Plato's _Theages_ the following passage will be found: "Every one of us would like if possible to be master of mankind; if possible, a _God!" This_ attitude of mind must be reinstated in our midst.

Englishmen, Americans, and Russians.

959.

That primeval forest-plant Man always appears where the struggle for power has been waged longest. _Great_ men.

Primeval forest creatures, the _Romans._

960.

From now henceforward there will be such favourable first conditions for greater ruling powers as have never yet been found on earth. And this is by no means the most important point. The establishment has been made possible of international race unions which will set themselves the task of rearing a ruling race, the future "lords of the earth"--a new, vast aristocracy based upon the most severe self-discipline, in which the will of philosophical men of power and artist-tyrants will be stamped upon thousands of years: a higher species of men which, thanks to their preponderance of will, knowledge, riches, and influence, will avail themselves of democratic Europe as the most suitable and supple instrument they can have for taking the fate of the earth into their own hands, and working as artists upon man himself. Enough! The time is coming for us to transform all our views on politics.

5. The Great Man.

961.

I will endeavour to see at which periods in history great men arise. The significance of despotic moralities that have lasted a long time: they strain the bow, provided they do not break it.

962.

A great man,--a man whom Nature has built up and invented in a grand style,--What is such a man? _First,_ in his general course of action his consistency is so broad that owing to its very breadth it can be surveyed only with difficulty, and consequently misleads; he possesses the capacity of extending his will over great stretches of his life, and of despising and rejecting all small things, whatever most beautiful and "divine" things of the world there may be among them. _Secondly,_ he is _colder, harder, less cautious and more free from the fear of "public opinion";_ he does not possess the virtues which are compatible with respectability and with being respected, nor any of those things which are counted among the "virtues of the herd." If he is unable to _lead_, he walks alone; he may then perchance grunt at many things which he meets on his way. _Thirdly_, he asks for no "compassionate" heart, but servants, instruments; in his dealings with men his one aim is _to make_ something out of them. He knows that he cannot reveal himself to anybody: he thinks it bad taste to become familiar; and as a rule he is not familiar when people think he is. When he is not talking to his soul, he wears a mask. He would rather lie than tell the truth, because lying requires more spirit and _will_. There is a loneliness within his heart which neither praise nor blame can reach, because he is his own judge from whom is no appeal.

963.

The great man is necessarily a sceptic (I do not mean to say by this that he must appear to be one), provided that greatness consists in this: to _will_ something great, together with the means thereto. Freedom from any kind of conviction is a factor in his _strength of will_. And thus it is in keeping with that "enlightened form of despotism" which every great passion exercises. Such a passion enlists intellect in its service; it even has the courage for unholy means; it creates without hesitation; it allows itself convictions, it even _uses_ them, but it never submits to them. The need of faith and of anything unconditionally negative or

affirmative is a proof of weakness; all weakness is weakness of will. The man of faith, the believer, is necessarily an inferior species of man. From this it follows that "all freedom of spirit," _i.e._ instinctive scepticism, is the prerequisite of greatness.

964.

The great man is conscious of his power over a people, and of the fact that he coincides temporarily with a people or with a century--this _magnifying_ of his self-consciousness as _causa_ and _voluntas_ is _misunderstood_ as "altruism": he feels driven to _means_ of communication: all great men are _inventive_ in such means. They want to form great communities in their own image; they would fain give multiformity and disorder definite shape; it stimulates them to behold chaos.

The misunderstanding of love. There is a _slavish_ love which subordinates itself and gives itself away--which idealises and deceives itself; there is a _divine_ species of love which despises and loves at the same time, and which _remodels_ and _elevates_ the thing it loves.

The object is to attain that enormous _energy of greatness_ which can model the man of the future by means of discipline and also by means of the annihilation of millions of the bungled and botched, and which can yet avoid _going to ruin_ at the sight of the suffering _created_ thereby, the like of which has never been seen before.

965.

The revolution, confusion, and distress of whole peoples is in my opinion of less importance than _the misfortunes which attend great individuals in their development._ We must not allow ourselves to be deceived: the many misfortunes of all these small folk do not together constitute a sum-total, except in the feelings of _mighty_ men.--To think of one's self in moments of great danger, and to draw ones own advantage from the calamities of thousands in the case of the man who differs very much from the common ruck--may be a sign of a great character which is able to master its feeling of pity and justice.

966.

In contradistinction to the animal, man has developed such a host of _antagonistic_ instincts and impulses in himself, that he has become master of the earth by means of this synthesis.--Moralities are only the expression of local and limited _orders of rank in_ this multifarious world of instincts which prevent man from perishing through their _antagonism._ Thus a masterful instinct so weakens and subtilises the instinct which opposes it that it becomes an _impulse_ which provides the _stimulus_ for the activity of the principal instinct.

The highest man would have the greatest multifariousness in his instincts, and he would _possess_ these in the relatively strongest degree in which he is able to endure them. As a matter of fact, wherever the plant, man, is found strong, mighty instincts are to be found opposing each other (_e.g._ Shakespeare), but they are subdued.

967.

Would one not be justified in reckoning all great men among the _wicked?_ This is not so easy to demonstrate in the case of individuals. They are so frequently capable of masterly dissimulation that they very often assume the airs and forms of great virtues. Often, too, they seriously reverence virtues, and in such a way as to be passionately hard towards themselves; but as the result of cruelty. Seen from a distance such things are liable to deceive. Many, on the other hand, misunderstand themselves; not infrequently, too, a great mission will call forth great qualities, _e.g._ justice. The essential fact is: the greatest men may also perhaps have great virtues, but then they also have the opposites of these virtues. I believe that it is precisely out of the presence of these opposites and of the feelings they suscitate, that the great man arises,--for the great man is the broad arch which spans two banks lying far apart.

968.

In _great men_ we find the specific qualities of life in their highest manifestation: injustice, falsehood, exploitation. But inasmuch as their effect has always been _overwhelming,_ their essential nature has been most thoroughly misunderstood, and interpreted as goodness. The type of such an interpreter would be Carlyle.[5]

[Footnote 5: This not only refers to _Heroes and Hero-Worship,_ but doubtless to Carlyle's prodigious misunderstanding of Goethe a misunderstanding which still requires to be put right by a critic untainted by Puritanism.--Tr.]

969.

Generally speaking, everything _is worth no more and no less than one has paid for it._ This of course does not hold good in the case of an isolated individual; the great capacities of the individual have no relation whatsoever to that which he has done, sacrificed, and suffered for them. But if one should examine the previous history of his race one would be sure to find the record of an extraordinary storing up and capitalising of power by means of all kinds of abstinence, struggle, industry, and determination. It is because the great man has cost so much, and not because he stands there as a miracle, as a gift from heaven, or as an accident, that he became great: "Heredity" is a false notion. A man's ancestors have always paid the price of what he is.

970.

The danger of modesty. To adapt ourselves too early to duties, societies, and daily schemes of work in which accident may have placed us, at a time when neither our powers nor our aim in life has stepped peremptorily into our consciousness; the premature certainty of conscience and feeling of relief and of sociability which is acquired by this precocious, modest attitude, and which appears to our minds as a deliverance from those inner and outer disturbances of our feelings--all this pampers and keeps a man down in the most dangerous fashion imaginable. To learn to respect things which people about us respect, as if we had no standard or right of our own to determine values; the strain of appraising things as others appraise them, _counter_ to the whisperings of our inner taste, which also has a conscience of its own, becomes a terribly subtle kind of constraint: and if in the end no explosion takes place which bursts all the bonds of love and morality at once, then such a spirit becomes withered, dwarfed, feminine, and objective. The reverse of this is bad enough, but still it is better than the foregoing: to suffer from one's environment, from its praise just as much as from its blame; to be wounded by it and to fester inwardly without betraying the fact; to defend one's self involuntarily and suspiciously against its love; to learn to be silent, and perchance to conceal this by talking; to create nooks and safe, lonely hiding-places where one can go and take breath for a moment, or shed tears of sublime comfort--until at last one has grown strong enough to say: "What on earth have I to do with you?" and to go _one's_ way alone.

971.

Those men who are in themselves destinies, and whose advent is the advent of fate, the whole race of _heroic_ bearers of burdens: oh! how heartily and gladly would they have respite from themselves for once in a while!--how they crave after stout hearts and shoulders, that they might free themselves, were it but for an hour or two, from that which oppresses them! And how fruitlessly they crave! ... They wait; they observe all that passes before their eyes: no man even cometh nigh to them with a thousandth part of their suffering and passion, no man guesseth to what end they have waited.... At last, at last, they learn the first lesson of their life: to wait no longer; and forthwith they learn their second lesson: to be affable, to be modest; and from that time onwards to endure everybody and every kind of thing--in short, to endure still a little more than they had endured theretofore.

6. The Highest Man as Lawgiver of the Future.

972.

The lawgivers of the future.--After having tried for a long time in vain to attach a particular meaning to the word "philosopher,"--for I found many antagonistic traits, I recognised that we can distinguish between two kinds of philosophers:--

(1) Those who desire to establish any large system of values (logical or moral);

(2) Those who are the _lawgivers_ of such valuations.

The former try to seize upon the world of the present or the past, by embodying or abbreviating the multifarious phenomena by means of signs: their object is to make it possible for us to survey, to reflect upon, to comprehend, and to utilise everything that has happened hitherto--they serve the purpose of man by using all past things to the benefit of his future.

The second class, however, are _commanders;_ they say: "Thus shall it be!" They alone determine the "whither" and the "wherefore," and that which will be useful and beneficial to man; they have command over the previous work of scientific men, and all knowledge is to them only a means to their creations. This second kind of philosopher seldom appears; and as a matter of fact their situation and their danger is appalling. How often have they not intentionally blindfolded their eyes in order to shut out the sight of the small strip of ground which separates them from the abyss and from utter destruction. Plato, for instance, when he

persuaded himself that "the good," as he wanted it, was not Plato's good, but "the good in itself," the eternal treasure which a certain man of the name of Plato had chanced to find on his way! This same will to blindness prevails in a much coarser form in the case of the founders of religion; their "Thou shalt" must on no account sound to their ears like "I will,"--they only dare to pursue their task as if under the command of God; their legislation of values can only be a burden they can bear if they regard it as "revelation," in this way their conscience is not crushed by the responsibility.

As soon as those two comforting expedients--that of Plato and that of Muhammed--have been overthrown, and no thinker can any longer relieve his conscience with the hypothesis "God" or "eternal values," the claim of the lawgiver to determine new values rises to an awfulness which has not yet been experienced. Now those elect, on whom the faint light of such a duty is beginning to dawn, try and see whether they cannot escape it--as their greatest danger--by means of a timely side-spring: for instance, they try to persuade themselves that their task is already accomplished, or that it defies accomplishment, or that their shoulders are not broad enough for such burdens, or that they are already taken up with burdens closer to hand, or even that this new and remote duty is a temptation and a seduction, drawing them away from all other duties; a disease, a kind of madness. Many, as a matter of fact, do succeed in evading the path appointed to them: throughout the whole of history we can see the traces of such deserters and their guilty consciences. In most cases,, however, there comes to such men of destiny that hour of delivery, that autumnal season of maturity, in which they are forced to do that which they did not even "wish to do": and that deed before which in the past they have trembled most, falls easily and unsought from the tree, as an involuntary deed, almost as a present.

973.

The human horizon.--Philosophers may be conceived as men who make the greatest efforts to _discover_ to what extent man can _elevate_ himself--this holds good more particularly of Plato: how far man's _power_ can extend. But they do this as individuals; perhaps the instinct of Cæsars and of all founders of states, etc., was greater, for it preoccupied itself with the question how far man could be urged forward in _development_ under "favourable circumstances." What they did not sufficiently understand, however, was the nature of favourable circumstances. The great question: "Where has the plant 'man' grown most magnificently heretofore? In order to answer this, a comparative study of history is necessary.

974.

Every fact and every work exercises a fresh persuasion over every age and every new species of man. History always enunciates new truths.

975.

To remain objective, severe, firm, and hard while making a thought prevail is perhaps the best forte of artists; but if for this purpose any one have to work upon human material (as teachers, statesmen, have to do, etc.), then the repose, the coldness, and the hardness soon vanish. In natures like Cæsar and Napoleon we are able to divine something of the nature of "disinterestedness" in their work on their marble, whatever be the number of men that are sacrificed in the process. In this direction the future of higher men lies: to bear the greatest responsibilities and not to go to rack and ruin through them.--Hitherto the deceptions of inspiration have almost always been necessary for a man not to lose faith in his own hand, and in his right to his task.

976.

The reason why philosophers are mostly failures. Because among the conditions which determine them there are qualities which generally ruin other men:--

(1) A philosopher must have an enormous multiplicity of qualities; he must be a sort of abbreviation of man and have all man's high and base desires: the danger of the contrast within him, and of the possibility of his loathing himself;

(2) He must be inquisitive in an extraordinary number of ways: the danger of versatility;

(3) He must be just and honest in the highest sense, but profound both in love and hate (and in injustice);

(4) He must not only be a spectator but a lawgiver: a judge and defendant (in so far as he is an abbreviation of the world);

(5) He must be extremely multiform and yet firm and hard. He must be supple.

977.

The really _regal_ calling of the philosopher (according to the expression of Alcuin the Anglo-Saxon): "_Prava corrigere, et recta corroborare, et sancta sublimare._"

978.

The new philosopher can only arise in conjunction with a ruling class, as the highest spiritualisation of the latter. Great politics, the rule of the earth, as a proximate contingency, the total _lack of principles_ necessary thereto.

979.

Fundamental concept: the new values must first be created--this remains _our duty_! The philosopher must be our lawgiver. New species. (How the greatest species hitherto [for instance, the Greeks] were reared: this kind of accident must now be _consciously_ striven for.)

980.

Supposing one thinks of the philosopher as an educator who, looking down from his lonely elevation, is powerful enough to draw long chains of generations up to him: then he must be granted the most terrible privileges of a great educator. An educator never says what he himself thinks; but only that which he thinks it is good for those whom he is educating to hear upon any subject. This dissimulation on his part must not be found out; it is part of his masterliness that people should believe in his honesty, he must be capable of all the means of discipline and education: there are some natures which he will only be able to raise by means of lashing them with his scorn; others who are lazy, irresolute, cowardly, and vain, he will be able to affect only with exaggerated praise. Such a teacher stands beyond good and evil, but nobody must know that he does.

981.

We must _not_ make men "better," we must _not_ talk to them about morality in any form as if "morality in itself," or an ideal kind of man in general, could be taken for granted; but we must _create circumstances_ in which _stronger men are necessary,_ such as for their part will require a morality (or, better still: a bodily and spiritual discipline) which makes men strong, and upon which they will consequently insist! As they will need one so badly, they will have it.

We must not let ourselves be seduced by blue eyes and heaving breasts: _greatness of soul has absolutely nothing romantic about it. And unfortunately nothing whatever amiable either._

982.

From warriors we must learn: (1) to associate death with those interests for which we are fighting--that makes us venerable; (2) we must learn to _sacrifice_ numbers, and to take our cause sufficiently seriously not to spare men; (3) we must practise inexorable discipline, and allow ourselves violence and cunning in war.

983.

The _education_ which rears those _ruling_ virtues that allow a man to become master of his benevolence and his pity: the great disciplinary virtues ("Forgive thine enemies" is mere child's play beside them), _and the passions of the creator, must be elevated_ to the heights--we must cease from carving marble! The exceptional and powerful position of those creatures (compared with that of all princes hitherto): the Roman Cæsar with Christ's soul.

984.

We must not separate greatness of soul from intellectual greatness. For the former involves _independence_; but without intellectual greatness independence should not be allowed; all it does is to create disasters even in its lust of well-doing and of practising "justice." Inferior spirits _must_ obey, consequently they cannot be possessed of greatness.

985.

The more lofty philosophical man who is surrounded by loneliness, not because he wishes to be alone, but because he is what he is, and cannot find his equal: what a number of dangers and torments are reserved for him, precisely at the present time, when we have lost our belief in the order of rank, and consequently no longer know how to understand or honour this isolation! Formerly the sage almost sanctified himself in the consciences of the mob by going aside in this way; to-day the anchorite sees himself as though enveloped in a cloud of gloomy doubt and suspicions. And not alone by the envious and the wretched: in every well-meant act that he experiences he is bound to discover misunderstanding, neglect, and superficiality. He knows the crafty tricks of foolish pity which makes these people feel so good and holy when they attempt to save him from his own destiny, by giving him more comfortable situations and more decent and reliable society. Yes, he will even get to admire the unconscious lust of destruction with which all mediocre spirits stand up and oppose him, believing all the while that they have a holy right to do so! For men of such incomprehensible loneliness it is necessary to put a good stretch of country between them and the officiousness of their fellows: this is part of their prudence. For such a man to maintain himself uppermost to-day amid the dangerous maelstroms of the age which threaten to draw him under, even cunning and disguise will be necessary. Every attempt he makes to order his life in the present and with the present, every time he draws near to these men and their modern desires, he will have to expiate as if it were an actual sin: and withal he may look with wonder at the concealed wisdom of his nature, which after every one of these attempts immediately leads him back to himself by means of illnesses and painful accidents.

986.

"Maledetto colui _che contrista, un spirto immortal!"_ MANZONI (_Conte di Carmagnola,_ Act II.)

987.

The most difficult and the highest form which man can attain is the most seldom successful: thus the history of philosophy reveals a superabundance of bungled and unhappy cases of manhood, and its march is an extremely slow one; whole centuries intervene and suppress what has been achieved: and in this way the connecting-link is always made to fail. It is an appalling history, this history of the highest men, of the sages.--What is most often damaged is precisely the recollection of great men, for the semi-successful and botched cases of mankind misunderstand them and overcome them by their "successes." Whenever an "effect" is noticeable, the masses gather in a crowd round it; to hear the inferior and the poor in spirit having their say is a terrible ear-splitting torment for him who knows and trembles at the thought, that the fate of man depends upon the success of its highest types. From the days of my childhood I have reflected upon the sage's conditions of existence, and I will not conceal my happy conviction that in Europe he has once more become possible--perhaps only for a short time.

988.

These new philosophers begin with a description of a systematic order of rank and difference of value among men,--what they desire is, alas precisely the reverse of an assimilation and equalisation of man: they teach estrangement in every sense, they cleave gulfs such as have never yet existed, and they would fain have man become more evil than he ever was. For the present they live concealed and estranged even from each other. For many reasons they will find it necessary to be anchorites and to wear masks--they will therefore be of little use in the matter of seeking for their equals. They will live alone, and probably know the torments of all the loneliest forms of loneliness. Should they, however, thanks to any accident, meet each other on the road, I wager that they would not know each other, or that they would deceive each other in a number of ways.

989.

"Les philosophes ne sont pas faits pour s'aimer. Les aigles ne volent point en compagnie. Il faut laisser cela aux perdrix, aux étourneaux ... Planer au-dessus et avoir des griffes, voila le lot des grands génies."--GALIANI.

990.

I forgot to say that such philosophers are cheerful, and that they like to sit in the abyss of a perfectly clear sky: they are in need of different means for enduring life than other men; for they suffer in a different way (that is to say, just as much from the depth of their contempt of man as from their love of man).--The animal which suffered most on earth discovered for itself _--laughter._

991.

Concerning the misunderstanding of "cheerfulness." --It is a temporary relief from long tension; it is the wantonness, the Saturnalia of a spirit, which is consecrating and preparing itself for long and terrible resolutions. The "fool" in the form of "science."

992.

The new order of rank among spirits; tragic natures no longer in the van.

993.

It is a comfort to me to know that over the smoke and filth of human baseness there is a _higher and brighter_ mankind, which, judging from their number, must be a small race (for everything that is in any way distinguished is _ipso facto_ rare). A man does not belong to this race because he happens to be more gifted, more virtuous, more heroic, or more loving than the men below, but because he is _colder, brighter, more far-sighted, and more lonely;_ because he endures, prefers, and even insists upon, loneliness as the joy, the privilege, yea, even the condition of existence; because he lives amid clouds and lightnings as among his equals, and likewise among sunrays, dewdrops, snowflakes, and all that which must needs come from the heights, and which in its course moves ever from heaven to earth. The desire to look aloft is not our desire.--Heroes, martyrs, geniuses, and enthusiasts of all kinds, are not quiet, patient, subtle, cold, or slow enough for us.

994.

The absolute conviction that valuations above and below are different; that innumerable experiences are wanting to the latter: that when looking upwards from below misunderstandings are necessary.

995.

How do men attain to great power and to great tasks? All the virtues and proficiences of the body and the soul are little by little laboriously acquired, through great industry, self-control, and keeping one's self within narrow bounds, through a frequent, energetic, and genuine repetition of the same work and of the same hardships; but there are men who are the heirs and masters of this slowly acquired and manifold treasure of virtues and proficiences because, owing to happy and reasonable marriages and also to lucky accidents, the acquired and accumulated forces of many generations, instead of being squandered and subdivided, have been assembled together by means of steadfast struggling and willing. And thus, in the end, a man appears who is such a monster of strength, that he craves for a monstrous task. For it is our power which has command of us: and the wretched intellectual play of aims and intentions and motivations lies only in the foreground--however much weak eyes may recognise the principal factors in these things.

990.

The sublime man has the highest value, even when he is most delicate and fragile, because an abundance of very difficult and rare things have been reared through many generations and united in him.

997.

I teach that there are higher and lower men, and that a single individual may under certain circumstances justify whole millenniums of existence --that is to say, a wealthier, more gifted, greater, and more complete man, as compared with innumerable imperfect and fragmentary men.

998.

Away from rulers and rid of all bonds, live the highest men: and in the rulers they have their instruments.

999.

The order of rank: he who _determines_ values and leads the will of millenniums, and does this by leading the highest natures--he _is the highest man._

1000.

I fancy I have divined some of the things that lie hidden in the soul of the highest man; perhaps every man who has divined so much must go to ruin: but he who has seen the highest man must do all he can to make him _possible._ Fundamental thought: we must make the future the standard of all our valuations--and not seek the laws for our conduct behind us.

1001.

Not "mankind," but _Superman_ is the goal!

1002.

"Come l'uom s'eterna...."--_Inf._ xv. 85.

II.

DIONYSUS.

1003.

To _him who is one of Nature's lucky strokes,_ to, him unto whom my heart goes out, to him who is carved from one integral block, which is hard, sweet, and fragrant--to him from whom even my nose can derive some pleasure--let this book be dedicated.

He enjoys that which is beneficial to him.

His pleasure in anything ceases when the limits of what is beneficial to him are overstepped.

He divines the remedies for partial injuries; his illnesses are the great stimulants of his existence.

He understands how to exploit his serious accidents.

He grows stronger under the misfortunes which threaten to annihilate him.

He instinctively gathers from all he sees, hears, and experiences, the materials for what concerns him most,--he pursues a selective principle,--he rejects a good deal.

He reacts with that tardiness which long caution and deliberate _pride_ have bred in him,--he tests the stimulus: whence does it come? whither does it lead? He does not submit.

He is always in his own company, whether his intercourse be with books, with men, or with Nature.

He honours anything by choosing it, by conceding to it, by trusting it.

1004.

We should attain to such a height, to such a lofty eagle's ledge, in our observation, as to be able to understand that everything happens, _just as it ought to happen_: and that all "imperfection," and the pain it brings, belong to all that which is most eminently desirable.

1005.

Towards 1876 I experienced a fright; for I saw that everything I had most wished for up to that time was being compromised. I realised this when I perceived what Wagner was actually driving at: and I was bound very fast to him--by all the bonds of a profound similarity of needs, by gratitude, by the thought that he could not be replaced, and by the absolute void which I saw facing me.

Just about this time I believed myself to be inextricably entangled in my philology and my professorship--in the accident and last shift of my life: I did not know how to get out of it, and was tired, used up, and on my last legs.

At about the same time I realised that what my instincts most desired to attain was precisely the reverse of what Schopenhauer's instincts wanted--that is to say, a _justification of life,_ even where it was most terrible, most equivocal, and most false: to this end, I had the formula "_Dionysian_" in my hand.

Schopenhauer's interpretation of the "absolute" as _will_ was certainly a step towards that concept of the "absolute" which supposed it to be necessarily good, blessed, true, and integral, but Schopenhauer did not understand how to deify this will: he remained suspended in the moral-Christian ideal. Indeed, he was still so very much under the dominion of Christian values, that, once he could no longer regard the absolute as God, he had to conceive it as evil, foolish, utterly reprehensible. He did not realise that there is an infinite number of ways of being different, and even of being God.

1006.

Hitherto, moral values have been the highest values: does anybody doubt this? If we bring down the values from their pedestal, we thereby alter _all_ values; the principle of their _order of rank_ which has prevailed hitherto is thus overthrown.

1007.

Transvalue values--what does this mean? It implies that all spontaneous motives, all new, future, and stronger motives, are still extant; but that they now appear under false names and false valuations, and have not yet become conscious of themselves.

We ought to have the courage to become, conscious, and to affirm all that which has been _attained_--to get rid of the humdrum character of old valuations, which makes us unworthy of the best and strongest things that we have achieved.

1008.

Any doctrine would be superfluous for which everything is not already prepared in the way of accumulated forces and explosive material. A transvaluation of values can only be accomplished when there is a tension of new needs, and a new set of needy people who feel all old values as painful,--although they are not conscious of what is wrong.

1009.

The standpoint from which my values are determined: is abundance or desire active? ... Is one a mere spectator, or is one's own shoulder at the wheel--is one looking away or is one turning aside? ... Is one acting spontaneously, as the result of accumulated strength, or is one merely reacting to a goad or to a stimulus? ... Is one simply acting as the result of a paucity of elements, or of such an overwhelming dominion over a host of elements that this power enlists the latter into its service if it requires them? ... Is one a _problem_ one's self or is one a _solution_ already? ... Is _one perfect_ through the smallness of the task, or _imperfect_ owing to the extraordinary character of the aim? ... Is one genuine or only an _actor;_ is one genuine as an actor, or only the bad copy of an actor? is one a representative or the creature represented? Is one a personality or merely a rendezvous of personalities? ... Is one ill from a disease or from surplus health? Does one lead as a shepherd, or as an "exception" (third alternative: as a fugitive)? Is one in need of dignity, or can one play the clown? Is one in search of resistance, or is one evading it? Is one imperfect owing to one's precocity or to one's tardiness? Is it one's nature to say yea, or no, or is one a peacock's tail of garish parts? Is one proud enough not to feel ashamed even of one's vanity? Is one still able to feel a bite of conscience (this species is becoming rare; formerly conscience had to bite too often: it is as if it now no longer had enough teeth to do so)? Is one still capable of a "duty"? (there are some people who would lose the whole joy of their lives if they were _deprived_ of their duty--this holds good especially of feminine creatures, who are born subjects).

1010.

Supposing our common comprehension of the universe were a _misunderstanding,_ would it be possible to conceive of a form of _perfection,_ within the limits of which even such a _misunderstanding as this_ could be sanctioned?

The concept of a _new_ form of perfection: that which does _not_ correspond to our logic, to our "beauty," to our "good," to our "truth," might be perfect in a _higher_ sense even than our ideal is.

1011.

Our most important limitation: we must not deify the unknown; we are just beginning to know so little. The false and wasted endeavours.

Our "new world": we must ascertain to what extent we are the _creators_ of our valuations--we will thus be able to put "sense" into history.

This belief in truth is reaching its final logical conclusion in us--ye know how it reads: that if there is anything at all that must be worshipped it is _appearance;_ that _falsehood_ and _not_ truth is--divine.

1012.

He who urges rational thought forward, thereby also drives its antagonistic power--mysticism and foolery of every kind--to new feats of strength.

We should recognise that every movement is (1) _partly_ the manifestation of fatigue resulting from a previous movement (satiety after it, the malice of weakness towards it, and disease); and (2) _partly_ a newly awakened accumulation of long slumbering forces, and therefore wanton, violent, healthy.

1013.

Health and morbidness: let us be careful! The standard is the bloom of the body, the agility, courage, and cheerfulness of the mind--but also, of course, how much _morbidness a man can bear and overcome,_--and convert into health. That which would send more delicate natures to the dogs, belongs to the stimulating means of _great_ health.

1014.

It is only a question of power: to have all the morbid traits of the century, but to balance them I by means of overflowing, plastic, and rejuvenating power. The _strong_ man.

1015.

_Concerning the strength of the nineteenth century.--_We are more mediæval than the eighteenth century; not only more inquisitive or more susceptible to the strange and to the rare. We have revolted against the _Revolution,_ ... We have freed ourselves from the fear of reason, which was the spectre of the eighteenth century: we once more dare to be childish, lyrical, absurd, in a word, we are musicians. And we are just as little frightened of the _ridiculous_ as of the _absurd._ The _devil_ finds that he is tolerated even by God:[6] better still, he has become interesting as one who has been misunderstood and slandered for ages,--we are the saviours of the devil's honour.

We no longer separate the great from the terrible. We reconcile good things, in all their complexity, with the very _worst_ things; we have overcome the _desideratum_ of the past (which wanted goodness to grow without the increase of evil). The _cowardice_ towards the ideal, peculiar to the Renaissance, has diminished--we even dare to aspire to the latter's morality. _Intolerance_ towards priests and the Church has at the same time come to an end; "It is immoral to believe in God"--but this is precisely what we regard as the best possible justification of this belief.

On all these things we have conferred the civic rights of our minds. We do not tremble before the back side of "good things" (we even look for it, we are brave and inquisitive enough for that), of Greek antiquity, of morality, of reason, of good taste, for instance (we reckon up the losses which we incur with all this treasure: we almost reduce ourselves to poverty with such a treasure). Neither do we conceal the back side of "evil things" from ourselves.

[Footnote 6: This is reminiscent of Goethe's _Faust,_ See "Prologue in Heaven."--Tr.]

1016.

That which does us honour.--If anything does us honour, it is this: we have transferred our seriousness to other things; all those things which have been despised and laid aside as base by all ages, we regard as important--on the other hand, we surrender "fine feelings" at a cheap rate.

Could any aberration be more dangerous than the contempt of the body? As if all intellectuality were not thereby condemned to become morbid, and to take refuge in the _vapeurs_ of "idealism"!

Nothing that has been thought out by Christians and idealists holds water: we are more radical. We have discovered the "smallest world" everywhere as the most decisive.

The paving-stones in the streets, good air in our rooms, food understood according to its worth: we value all the _necessaries_ of life seriously, and _despise_ all "beautiful soulfulness" as a form of "levity and frivolity." That which has been most despised hitherto, is now pressed into the front rank.

1017

In the place of Rousseau's "man of Nature," the nineteenth century has discovered a much _more genuine_ image of "Man,"--it had the courage to do this.... On the whole, the Christian concept of man has in a way been reinstalled. What we have not had the courage to do, was to call precisely this "man _par excellence_," good, and to see the future of mankind guaranteed in him. In the same way, we did not dare to regard the _growth in the terrible side_ of man's character as an accompanying feature of every advance in culture; in this sense we are still under the influence of the Christian ideal, and side with it against paganism, and likewise against the Renaissance concept of _virtù._ But the key of culture is not to be found in this way: and _in praxi_ we still have the forgeries of history in favour of the "good man" (as if he alone constituted the progress of humanity) and the _socialistic ideal (i.e._ the _residue_ of Christianity and of Rousseau in the de-Christianised world).

The fight against the eighteenth century: it meets with its _greatest conquerors_ in _Goethe_ and _Napoleon._ Schopenhauer, too, fights against the eighteenth century; but he returns involuntarily to the seventeenth--he is a modern Pascal, with Pascalian valuations, _without_ Christianity. Schopenhauer was not strong enough to invent a _new yea._

Napoleon: we see the necessary relationship between the higher and the terrible man. "Man" reinstalled, and her due of contempt and fear restored to woman. Highest activity and health are the signs of the great man; the straight line and grand style rediscovered in action; the mightiest of all instincts, that of life itself,--the lust of dominion,--heartily welcomed.

1018.

(_Revue des deux mondes,_ 15th February 1887. Taine concerning Napoleon) "Suddenly the master faculty reveals itself: the _artist,_ which was latent in the politician, comes forth from his scabbard; he creates _dans l'idéal et l'impossible._ He is once more recognised as that which he is: the posthumous brother of Dante and of Michelangelo; and verily, in view of the definite contours of his vision, the intensity, the coherence, and inner consistency of his dream, the depth of his meditations, the superhuman greatness of his conception, he is their equal: _son génie a la même taille et la même structure; il est un des trois esprits souverains de la renaissance italienne._"

Nota bene. Dante, Michelangelo, Napoleon.

1019.

Concerning the pessimism of strength. In the internal economy of _the primitive_ man's soul, the _fear_ of evil preponderates. What is _evil!_ Three kinds of things: accident, uncertainty, the unexpected. How does primitive man combat evil?--He conceives it as a thing of reason, of power, even as a person. By this means he is enabled to make treaties with it, and generally to operate upon it in advance--to forestall it.

--Another expedient is to declare its evil and harmful character to be but apparent: the consequences of accidental occurrences, and of uncertainty and the unexpected, are interpreted as _well-meant,_ as reasonable.

--A third means is to interpret evil, above all, as merited: evil is thus justified as a punishment.

--In short, _man submits to in_ all religious and moral interpretations are but forms of submission to evil.--The belief that a good purpose lies behind all evil, implies the renunciation of any desire to combat it.

Now, the history of every culture shows a diminution of this _fear of the accidental, of the uncertain, and of the unexpected._ Culture means precisely, to learn to reckon, to discover causes, to acquire the power of forestalling events, to acquire a belief in necessity. With the growth of culture, man is able to dispense with that primitive form of submission to evil (called religion or morality), and that "justification of evil." Now he wages war against "evil,"--he gets rid of it. Yes, a state of security, of belief in law and the possibility of calculation, is possible, in which consciousness regards these things with tedium,--in which the joy of the accidental, of the uncertain, and of the unexpected, actually becomes a spur.

Let us halt a moment before this symptom of _highest_ culture, I call it the _pessimism of strength._ Man now no longer requires a "justification of evil"; justification is precisely what he abhors: he enjoys evil, _pur, cru_; he regards purposeless evil as the most interesting kind of evil. If he had required a God in the past, he now delights in cosmic disorder without a God, a world of accident, to the essence of which terror, ambiguity, and seductiveness belong.

In a state of this sort, it is precisely _goodness_ which requires to be justified--that is to say, it must either have an evil and a dangerous basis, or else it must contain a vast amount of stupidity: _in which case it still pleases._ Animality no longer awakens terror now; a very intellectual and happy wanton spirit in favour of the animal in man, is, in such periods, the most triumphant form of spirituality. Man is now strong enough to be able to feel ashamed of _a belief in God:_ he may now play the part of the devil's advocate afresh. If in practice he pretends to uphold virtue, it will be for those reasons which lead virtue to be associated with subtlety, cunning, lust of gain, and a form of the lust of power.

This pessimism of strength also ends in a _theodicy, i.e._ in an absolute saying of yea to the world--but the same arguments will be raised in favour of life which formerly were raised against it: and in this way, in a conception of this world _as the highest ideal possible,_ which has been effectively attained.

1020.

The principal kinds of pessimism:--

The pessimism of _sensitiveness_ (excessive irritability with a preponderance of the feelings of pain).

The pessimism of the _will that is not free_ (otherwise expressed: the lack of resisting power against stimuli).

The pessimism of _doubt_ (shyness in regard to everything fixed, in regard to all grasping and touching).

The psychological conditions which belong to these different kinds of pessimism, may all be observed in a lunatic asylum, even though they are there found in a slightly exaggerated form. The same applies to "Nihilism" (the penetrating feeling of nonentity).

What, however, is the nature of Pascal's moral pessimism, and the _metaphysical pessimism_ of the Vedânta-Philosophy? What is the nature of the _social pessimism_ of anarchists (as of Shelley), and of the pessimism of compassion (like that of Leo Tolstoy and of Alfred de Vigny)?

Are all these things not also the phenomena of decay and sickness?... And is not excessive seriousness in regard to moral values, or in regard to "other-world" fictions, or social calamities, or _suffering_ in general, of the same order? All such _exaggeration_ of a single and narrow standpoint is in itself a sign of sickness. The same applies to the preponderance of a negative over an affirmative attitude!

In this respect we must not confound with the above: the joy of saying and doing _no,_ which is the result of the enormous power and tenseness of an affirmative attitude--peculiar to all rich and mighty men and ages. It is, as it were, a luxury, a form of courage too, which opposes the terrible, which has sympathy with the frightful and the questionable, because, among other things, one is terrible and questionable: the _Dionysian_ in will, intellect, and taste.

1021.

My Five "Noes."

(1) My fight against _the feeling of sin_ and the introduction of the notion of _punishment_ into the physical and metaphysical world, likewise into psychology and the interpretation of history. The recognition of the fact that all philosophies and valuations hitherto have been saturated with morality.

(2) My identification and my discovery of the _traditional_ ideal, of the Christian ideal, even where the dogmatic form of Christianity has been wrecked. The _danger of the Christian ideal_ resides in its valuations, in that which can dispense with concrete expression: my struggle against _latent Christianity_ (for instance, in music, in Socialism).

(3) My struggle against the eighteenth century of Rousseau, against his "Nature," against his "good man," his belief in the dominion of feeling--against the pampering, weakening, and moralising of man: an ideal born of the _hatred of aristocratic culture,_ which in practice is the dominion of unbridled feelings of resentment, and invented as a standard for the purpose of war (the Christian

morality of the feeling of sin, as well as the morality of resentment, is an attitude of the mob).

(4) My fight against _Romanticism,_ in which the ideals of Christianity and of Rousseau converge, but which possesses at the same time a yearning for that _antiquity_ which knew of sacerdotal and aristocratic culture, a yearning for _virtù,_ and for the "strong man"--something extremely hybrid; a false and imitated kind of _stronger_ humanity, which appreciates extreme conditions in general and sees the symptom of strength in them ("the cult of passion"; an imitation of the most expressive _forms, furore espressivo,_ originating not out of plenitude, but out _of want)._--(In the nineteenth century there are some things which are born out of relative plenitude--_i.e._ out of _well-being;_ cheerful music, etc.--among poets, for instance, Stifter and Gottfried Keller give signs of more strength and inner well-being than--. The great strides of engineering, of inventions, of the natural sciences and of history (?) are relative products of the strength and self-reliance of the nineteenth century.)

(5) My struggle against the _predominance of gregarious instincts,_ now science makes common cause with them; against the profound hate with which every kind of order of rank and of aloofness is treated.

1022.

From the pressure of plenitude, from the tension of forces that are continually increasing within us and which cannot yet discharge themselves, a condition is produced which is very similar to that which precedes a storm: we--like Nature's sky--become overcast. I hat, too, is "pessimism.".. A teaching which puts an end to such a condition by the fact that it _commands_ something: a transvaluation of values by means of which the accumulated forces are given a channel, a direction, so that they explode into deeds and flashes of lightning-does not in the least require to be a hedonistic teaching: in so far as it _releases strength_ which was compressed to an agonising degree, it brings happiness.

1023.

Pleasure appears with the feeling of power.

Happiness means that the consciousness of power and triumph has begun to prevail.

Progress is the strengthening of the type, the ability to exercise great will-power, everything else is a misunderstanding and a danger.

1024.

There comes a time when the old masquerade and moral togging-up of the passions provokes repugnance: _naked Nature;_ when the _quanta_ of _power_ are recognised as _decidedly_ simple (as _determining rank_); when _grand style_ appears again as the result of great passion.

1025.

The purpose of culture _would have_ us enlist everything terrible, step by step and experimentally, into its service; but before it is _strong enough_ for this it must combat, moderate, mask, and even curse everything terrible.

Wherever a culture points to anything as evil, it betrays its _fear_ and therefore weakness.

Thesis: everything good is the evil of yore which has been rendered serviceable. _Standard:_ the more terrible and the greater the passions may be which an age, a people, and an individual are at liberty to possess, because they are able to use them as _a means, the higher is their culture:_ the more mediocre, weak, submissive, and cowardly a man may be, the more things he will regard as _evil:_ according to him the kingdom of evil is the largest. The lowest man will see the kingdom of evil (_i.e._ that which is forbidden him and which is hostile to him) everywhere.

1026.

It is not a fact that "happiness follows virtue"--but it is the mighty man who first _declares his happy state to be virtue._

Evil actions belong to the mighty and the virtuous: bad and base actions belong to the subjected.

The mightiest man, the creator, would have to be the most evil, inasmuch as he makes his ideal prevail over all men in _opposition_ to their ideals, and remoulds them according to his own image.

Evil, in this respect, means hard, painful, enforced.

Such men as Napoleon must always return and always settle our belief in the self-glory of the individual afresh: he himself, however, was corrupted by the means he had to stoop to, and had _lost noblesse_ of character. If he had had to prevail among another kind of men, he could have availed himself of other means; and thus it would not seem _necessary_ that a Cæsar _must become bad._

1027.

Man is a combination of the _beast_ and the _super-beast_; higher man a combination of the monster and the superman:[7] these opposites belong to each other. With every degree of a man's growth towards greatness and loftiness, he also grows downwards into the depths and into the terrible: we should not desire the one without the other;--or, better still: the more fundamentally we desire the one, the more completely we shall achieve the other.

[Footnote 7: The play on the German words: "Unthier" and "Überthier," "Unmensch" and "Übermensch," is unfortunately not translatable.--Tr.]

1028.

Terribleness belongs to greatness: let us not deceive ourselves.

1029.

I have taught the knowledge of such terrible things, that all "Epicurean contentment" is impossible concerning them. Dionysian pleasure is the only _adequate_ kind here: _I was the first to discover the tragic._ Thanks to their superficiality in ethics, the Greeks misunderstood it. Resignation is not the lesson of tragedy, but only the misunderstanding of it! The yearning for nonentity is the _denial_ of tragic wisdom, its opposite!

1030.

A rich and powerful soul not only gets over painful and even terrible losses, deprivations, robberies, and insults: it actually leaves such dark infernos in possession of still greater plenitude and power; and, what is most important of all, in possession of an increased blissfulness in love. I believe that he who has divined something of the most fundamental conditions of love, will understand Dante for having written over the door of his Inferno: "I also am the creation of eternal love."

1031.

To have travelled over the whole circumference of the modern soul, and to have sat in all its corners--my ambition, my torment, and my happiness.

Veritably to have _overcome_ pessimism, and, as the result thereof, to have acquired the eyes of a Goethe--full of love and goodwill.

1032.

The first question is by no means whether we are satisfied with ourselves; but whether we are satisfied with anything at all. Granting that we should say yea to any single moment, we have then affirmed not only ourselves, but the whole of existence. For nothing stands by itself, either in us or in other things: and if our soul has vibrated and rung with happiness, like a chord, once only and only once, then all eternity was necessary in order to bring about that one event,--and all eternity, in this single moment of our affirmation, was called good, was saved, justified, and blessed.

1033.

The passions which _say yea._ I ride, happiness, health, the love of the sexes, hostility and war, reverence, beautiful attitudes, manners, strong will, the discipline of lofty spirituality, the will to power, and gratitude to the Earth and to Life: all that is rich, that

would fain bestow, and that refreshes, gilds, immortalises, and deifies Life--the whole power of the virtues that _glorify_--all declaring things good, saying yea, and doing yea.

1034.

We, many or few, who once more dare to live in a world _purged of morality_, we _pagans_ in faith, we are probably also the first who understand what a _pagan faith_ is: to be obliged to imagine higher creatures than man, but to imagine them _beyond_ good and evil; to be compelled to value all higher existence as _immoral_ existence. We believe in Olympus, and _not_ in the "man on the cross."

1035.

The more modern man has exercised his idealising power in regard to a _God_ mostly by _moralising the latter_ ever more and more--what does that mean?--nothing good, a diminution in man's strength.

As a matter of fact, the reverse would be possible: and indications of this are not wanting. God imagined as emancipation from morality, comprising the whole of the abundant assembly of Life's contrasts, and _saving_ and _justifying_ them in a divine agony. God as the beyond, the superior elevation, to the wretched _cul-de-sac_ morality of "Good and Evil."

1036.

A humanitarian God cannot be _demonstrated_ from the world that is known to us: so much are ye driven and forced to conclude to-day. But what conclusion do ye draw from this? "He cannot be demonstrated to _us_": the scepticism of knowledge. You all _fear_ the conclusion: "From the world that is known to us quite a different God would be _demonstrable,_ such a one as would certainly not be humanitarian"--and, in a word, you cling fast to your God, and invent a world for Him which _is unknown to us._

1037.

Let us banish the highest good from our concept of God: it is unworthy of a God. Let us likewise banish the highest wisdom: it is the vanity of philosophers who have perpetrated the absurdity of a God who is a monster of wisdom: the idea was to make Him as like them as possible. No! God _as the highest power_--that is sufficient!--Everything follows from that, even--"the world"!

1038

And how many new Gods are not still possible! I, myself, in whom the religious--that is to say, the god-_creating_ instinct occasionally becomes active at the most inappropriate moments: how very differently the divine has revealed itself every time to me! ... So many strange things have passed before me in those timeless moments, which fall into a man's life as if they came from the moon, and in which he absolutely no longer knows how old he is or how young he still may be! ... I would not doubt that there are several kinds of gods.... Some are not wanting which one could not possibly imagine without a certain halcyonic calm and levity.... Light feet perhaps belong to the concept "God". Is it necessary to explain that a _God_ knows how to hold Himself preferably outside all Philistine and rationalist circles? also (between ourselves) beyond good and evil? His outlook is a _free_ one--as Goethe would say.--And to invoke the authority of Zarathustra, which cannot be too highly appreciated in this regard: Zarathustra goes as far as to confess, "I would only believe in a God who knew how to _dance_ ..."

Again I say: how many new Gods are not still possible! Certainly Zarathustra himself is merely an old atheist: he believes neither in old nor in new gods. Zarathustra says, _"he would"_--but Zarathustra will not.... Take care to understand him well.

The type God conceived according to the type of creative spirits, of "great men."

1039.

And how many new _ideals_ are not, at bottom, still possible? Here is a little ideal that I seize upon every five weeks, while upon a wild and lonely walk, in the azure moment of a blasphemous joy. To spend one's life amid delicate and absurd things; a stranger to reality, half-artist, half-bird, half-metaphysician; without a yea or a nay for reality, save that from time to time one acknowledges it, after the manner of a good dancer, with the tips of one's toes; always tickled by some happy ray of sunlight; relieved and encouraged even by sorrow --for sorrow _preserves_ the happy man; fixing a little tail of jokes even to the most holy thing: this, as is clear, is the ideal of a heavy spirit, a ton in weight _of the spirit of gravity._

1040.

From the military-school of the soul. (Dedicated to the brave, the good-humoured, and the abstinent.)

I should not like to undervalue the amiable virtues; but greatness of soul is not compatible with them. Even in the arts, grand style excludes all merely pleasing qualities.

***

In times of painful tension and vulnerability, choose war. War hardens and develops muscle.

***

Those who have been deeply wounded have the Olympian laughter; a man only has what he needs.

***

It has now already lasted ten years: no sound any longer _reaches_ me--a land without rain. A man must have a vast amount of humanity at his disposal in order not to pine away in such drought.[8]

[Footnote 8: For the benefit of those readers who are not acquainted with the circumstances of Nietzsche's life, it would be as well to point out that this is a purely personal plaint, comprehensible enough in the mouth of one who, like Nietzsche, was for years a lonely anchorite.--Tr.]

1041.

My new road to an affirmative attitude.--Philosophy, as I have understood it and lived it up to the present, is the voluntary quest of the repulsive and atrocious aspects of existence. From the long experience derived from such wandering over ice and desert, I learnt to regard quite differently everything that had been philosophised hitherto: the _concealed_ history of philosophy, the psychology of its great names came into the light for me. "How much truth can a spirit _endure_; for how much truth is it _daring_ enough?"--this for me was the real measure of value. Error is a piece of _cowardice_ ... every victory on the part of knowledge, is the _result_ of courage, of hardness towards one's self, of cleanliness towards one's self.... The kind of _experimental philosophy_ which I am living, even anticipates the possibility of the most fundamental Nihilism, on principle: but by this I do not mean that it remains standing at a negation, at a _no,_ or at a will to negation. It would rather attain to the very reverse--to a _Dionysian affirmation_ of the world, as it is, without subtraction, exception, or choice--it would have eternal circular motion: the same things, the same reasoning, and the same illogical concatenation. The highest state to which a philosopher can attain: to maintain a Dionysian attitude to Life--my formula for this is _amor fati._

To this end we must not only consider those aspects of life which have been denied hitherto, as: _necessary,_ but as desirable, and not only desirable to those aspects which have been affirmed hitherto (as complements or first prerequisites, so to speak), but for their own sake, as the more powerful, more terrible, and more _veritable_ aspects of life, in which the latter's will expresses itself most clearly.

To this end, we must also value that aspect of existence which alone has been affirmed until now; we must understand whence this valuation arises, and to how slight an extent it has to do with a Dionysian valuation of Life: I selected and understood that which in this respect says "yea" (on the one hand, the instinct of the sufferer; on the other, the gregarious instinct; and thirdly, the _instinct of the greater number_ against the exceptions).

Thus I divined to what extent a stronger kind of man must necessarily imagine--the elevation and enhancement of man in another direction: _higher creatures,_ beyond good and evil, beyond those values which bear the stamp of their origin in the sphere of suffering, of the herd, and of the greater number--I searched for the data of this topsy-turvy formation of ideals in history (the concepts "pagan," "classical," "noble," have been discovered afresh and brought forward).

1042.

We should demonstrate to what extent the religion of the Greeks was _higher_ than Judæo-Christianity. The latter triumphed because the Greek religion was degenerate (and decadent).

1043.

It is not surprising that a couple of centuries have been necessary in order to link up again--a couple of centuries are very little indeed.

1044.

There must be some people who sanctify functions, not only eating and drinking, and not only in memory of them, or in harmony with them; but this world must be for ever glorified anew, and in a novel fashion.

1045.

The most intellectual men feel the ecstasy and charm of _sensual_ things in a way which other men --those with "fleshy hearts"--cannot possibly imagine, and ought not to be able to imagine: they are sensualists with the best possible faith, because they grant the senses a more fundamental value than that fine sieve, that thinning and mincing machine, or whatever it is called, which in the language of the people is termed _"spirit"_ The strength and power of the senses--this is the most essential thing in a sound man who is one of Nature's lucky strokes: the splendid beast must first be there--otherwise what is the value of all "humanisation"?

1046.

(1) We want to hold fast to our senses, and to the belief in them--and accept their logical conclusions! The hostility to the senses in the philosophy that has been written up to the present, has been man's greatest feat of nonsense.

(2) The world now extant, on which all earthly and living things have so built themselves, that it now appears as it does (enduring and proceeding slowly), we would fain _continue building_--not criticise it away as false!

(3) Our valuations help in the process of building; they emphasise and accentuate. What does it mean when whole religions say: "Everything is bad and false and evil"? This condemnation of the whole process can only be the judgment of the failures!

(4) True, the failures might be the greatest sufferers and therefore the most subtle! The contented might be worth little!

(5) We must understand the fundamental _artistic_ phenomenon which is called "Life,"--_the formative_ spirit, which constructs under the most unfavourable circumstances: and in the slowest manner possible----The _proof_ of all its combinations must first be given afresh: _it maintains itself._

1047.

Sexuality, lust of dominion, the pleasure derived from appearance and deception, great and joyful gratitude to Life and its typical conditions--these things are essential to all paganism, and it has a good conscience on its side.--_That which is hostile to Nature_ (already in Greek antiquity) combats paganism in the form of morality and dialectics.

1040.

An anti-metaphysical view of the world--yes, but an artistic one.

1049.

Apollo's misapprehension: the eternity of beautiful forms, the aristocratic prescription, "_Thus shall it ever be!_"

Dionysus. Sensuality and cruelty. The perishable nature of existence might be interpreted as the joy of procreative and destructive force, as _unremitting creation._

1050.

The word "_Dionysian_" expresses: a constraint to unity, a soaring above personality, the common-place, society, reality, and above the abyss of the _ephemeral_, the passionately painful sensation of superabundance, in darker, fuller, and more fluctuating conditions; an ecstatic saying of yea to the collective character of existence, as that which remains the same, and equally mighty and blissful throughout all change, the great pantheistic sympathy with pleasure and pain, which declares even the most terrible

and most questionable qualities of existence good, and sanctifies them; the eternal will to procreation, to fruitfulness, and to recurrence; the feeling of unity in regard to the necessity of creating and annihilating.

The word "_Apollonian_" expresses: the constraint to be absolutely isolated, to the typical "individual," to everything that simplifies, distinguishes, and makes strong, salient, definite, and typical to freedom within the law.

The further development of art is just as necessarily bound up with the antagonism of these two natural art-forces, as the further development of mankind is bound up with the antagonism of the sexes. The plenitude of power and restraint, the highest form of self-affirmation in a cool, noble, and reserved kind of beauty: the Apollonianism of the Hellenic will.

This antagonism of the Dionysian and of the Apollonian in the Greek soul, is one of the great riddles which made me feel drawn to the essence of Hellenism. At bottom, I troubled about nothing save the solution of the question, why precisely Greek Apollonianism should have been forced to grow out of a Dionysian soil: the Dionysian Greek had need of being Apollonian; that is to say in order to break his will to the titanic, to the complex, to the uncertain, to the horrible by a will to measure, to simplicity, and to submission to rule and concept. Extravagance, wildness, and Asiatic tendencies lie at the root of the Greeks. Their courage consists in their struggle with their Asiatic nature: they were not given beauty, any more than they were given Logic and moral! naturalness: in them these things are victories, they are willed and fought for--they constitute the _triumph_ of the Greeks.

1051.

It is clear that only the rarest and most lucky cases of humanity can attain to the highest and most sublime human joys in which Life celebrates its own glorification; and this only happens when these rare creatures themselves and their forbears have lived a long preparatory life leading to this goal, without, however, having done so consciously. It is then that an overflowing wealth of multifarious forces and the most agile power of "free will" and lordly command exist together in perfect concord in one man; then the intellect is just as much at ease, or at home, in the senses as the senses are at ease or at home in it; and everything that takes place in the latter must give rise to extraordinarily subtle joys in the former. And _vice versâ:_ just think of this _vice versâ_ for a moment in a man like Hafiz; even Goethe, though to a lesser degree, gives some idea of this process. It is probable that, in such perfect and well-constituted men, the most sensual functions are finally transfigured by a symbolic elatedness of the highest intellectuality; in themselves they feel a kind of _deification of the body_ and are most remote from the ascetic philosophy of the principle "God is a Spirit": from this principle it is clear that the ascetic is the "botched man" who declares only that to be good and "God" which is absolute, and which judges and condemns.

From that height of joy in which man feels himself completely and utterly a deified form and self-justification of nature, down to the joy of healthy peasants and healthy semi-human beasts, the whole of this long and enormous gradation of the light and colour of _happiness_ was called by the Greek--not without that grateful quivering of one who is initiated into secret, not without much caution and pious silence--by the godlike name: _Dionysus._ What then _do_ all modern men--the children of a crumbling, multifarious, sick and strange age _know_ of the _compass_ of Greek happiness, how _could_ they know anything about it! Whence would the slaves of "modern ideas" derive their right to Dionysian feasts!

When the Greek body and soul were in full "bloom," and not, as it were, in states of morbid exaltation and madness, there arose the secret symbol of the loftiest affirmation and transfiguration of life and the world that has ever existed. There we have a _standard_ beside which everything that has grown since must seem too short, too poor, too narrow: if we but pronounce the word "Dionysus" in the presence of the best of more recent names and things, in the presence of Goethe, for instance, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare, or Raphael, in a trice we realise that our best things and moments are _condemned._ Dionysus is a _judge!_ Am I understood? There can be no doubt that the Greeks sought to interpret, by means of their Dionysian experiences, the final mysteries of the "destiny of the soul" and everything they knew concerning the education and the purification of man, and above all concerning the absolute hierarchy and inequality of value between man and man. There is the deepest experience of all Greeks, which they conceal beneath great silence,--_we do not know the Greeks_ so long as this hidden and sub-terranean access to them remains obstructed. The indiscreet eyes of scholars will never perceive anything in these things, however much learned energy may still have to be expended in the service of this excavation--; even the noble zeal of such friends of antiquity as Goethe and Winckelmann, seems to savour somewhat of bad form and of arrogance, precisely in this respect. To wait and to prepare oneself; to await the appearance of new sources of knowledge; to prepare oneself in solitude for the sight of new faces and the sound of new voices; to cleanse one's soul ever more and more of the dust and noise, as of a country fair, which is peculiar to this age; to _overcome_ everything Christian by something super-Christian, and not only to rid oneself of it,--for the Christian doctrine is the

counter-doctrine to the Dionysian; to rediscover the _South_ in oneself, and to stretch a clear, glittering, and mysterious southern sky above one; to reconquer the southern healthiness and concealed power of the soul, once more for oneself; to increase the compass of one's soul step by step, and to become more supernational, more European, more super-European, more Oriental, and finally more _Hellenic_--for Hellenism was, as a matter of fact, the first great union and synthesis of everything Oriental, and precisely on that account, the _beginning_ of the European soul, the discovery of _our "new_ world":--he who lives under such imperatives, who knows what he may not encounter some day? Possibly--a _new dawn!_

1052.

The two types; Dionysus and Christ on the Cross. We should ascertain whether the typically _religious_ man is a decadent phenomenon (the great innovators are one and all morbid and epileptic); but do not let us forget to include that type of the religious man who is _pagan._ Is the pagan cult not a form of gratitude for, and affirmation of, Life? Ought not its most representative type to be an apology and deification of Life? The type of a well-constituted and ecstatically overflowing spirit! The type of a spirit which absorbs the contradictions and problems of existence, and which _solves_ them!

At this point I set up the _Dionysus_ of the Greeks: the religious affirmation of Life, of the whole of Life, not of denied and partial Life (it is typical that in this cult the sexual act awakens ideas of depth, mystery, and reverence).

Dionysus _versus_ "Christ"; here you have the contrast. It is _not_ a difference in regard to the martyrdom,--but the latter has a different meaning. Life itself--Life s eternal fruitfulness and recurrence caused anguish, destruction, and the will to annihilation. In the other case, the suffering of the "Christ as the Innocent One" stands as an objection against Life, it is the formula of Life's condemnation.--Readers will guess that the problem concerns the meaning of suffering; whether a Christian or a tragic meaning be given to it. In the first case it is the road to a holy mode of existence; in the second case _existence itself is regarded as sufficiently holy_ to justify an enormous amount of suffering. The tragic man says yea even to the most excruciating suffering: he is sufficiently strong, rich, and capable of deifying, to be able to do this; the Christian denies even the happy lots on earth: he is weak, poor, and disinherited enough to suffer from life in any form. God on the Cross is a curse upon Life, a signpost directing people to deliver themselves from it;--Dionysus cut into pieces is a _promise_ of Life: it will be for ever born anew, and rise afresh from destruction.

III.

ETERNAL RECURRENCE.

1053.

My philosophy reveals the triumphant thought through which all other systems of thought must ultimately perish. It is the great disciplinary thought: those races that cannot bear it are doomed; those which regard it as the greatest blessing are destined to rule.

1054.

The _greatest_ of all fights: for this purpose a new _weapon_ is required.

A hammer: a terrible alternative must be created. Europe must be brought face to face with the logic of facts, and confronted with the question whether its will for ruin is really earnest.

General levelling down to mediocrity must be avoided. Rather than this it would be preferable to perish.

1055.

A pessimistic attitude of mind and a pessimistic doctrine and ecstatic Nihilism, may in certain circumstances even prove indispensable to the philosopher--that is to say, as a mighty form of pressure, or hammer, with which he can smash up degenerate, perishing races and put them out of existence; with which he can beat a track to a new order of life, or instil a longing for nonentity in those who are degenerate and who desire to perish.

1056.

I wish to teach the thought which gives unto many the right to cancel their existences--the great disciplinary thought.

1057.

_Eternal Recurrence. _ A prophecy.

1. The exposition of the doctrine and its _theoretical_ first principles and results.

2. The proof of the doctrine.

3. Probable results which will follow from its being _believed._ (It makes everything break open.)

_(a)_ The means of enduring it.

_(b)_ The means of ignoring it.

4. Its place in history is a means.

The period _of_ greatest danger. The foundation of an oligarchy _above_ peoples and their interests: education directed at establishing a political policy for humanity in general.

A counterpart of Jesuitism.

1058.

The two greatest philosophical points of view (both discovered by Germans).

(a) That of _becoming_ and that of _evolution._

(b) That based upon the _values of existence_ (but the wretched form of German pessimism must first be overcome!)--

Both points of view reconciled by me in a decisive manner.

Everything becomes and returns for ever, _escape is impossible!_

Granted that we _could_ appraise the value of existence, what would be the result of it? The thought of recurrence is a principle _of selection_ in the service of _power_ (and barbarity!).

The ripeness of man for this thought.

1059.

1. The thought of eternal recurrence: its first principles which must necessarily be true if it were true. What its result is.

2. It is the most _oppressive_ thought: its probable results, provided it be not prevented, that is to say, provided all values be not transvalued.

3. The means of _enduring it:_ the transvaluation of all values. Pleasure no longer to be found in certainty, but in uncertainty; no longer "cause and effect," but continual creativeness; no longer the will to self-preservation, but to power; no longer the modest expression "it is all _only_ subjective," but "it is all _our_ work! let us be proud of it."

1060.

In order to endure the thought of recurrence, freedom from morality is necessary; new means against the _fact pain_ (pain regarded as the instrument, as the father of pleasure; there is no accretive consciousness of pain); pleasure derived from all kinds of uncertainty and tentativeness, as a counterpoise to extreme fatalism; suppression of the concept "necessity"; suppression of the "will"; suppression of "absolute knowledge."

Greatest elevation of man's _consciousness of strength,_ as that which creates superman.

1061.

The two extremes of thought--the materialistic and the platonic--are reconciled in _eternal recurrence_: both are regarded as ideals.

1062.

If the universe had a goal, that goal would have been reached by now. If any sort of unforeseen final state existed, that state also would have! been reached. If it were capable of any halting or stability of any being, it would only have possessed this capability of becoming stable for one instant in its development; and again becoming would have been at an end for ages, and with it all thinking and all "spirit." The fact of "intellects" being in a _state of development_ proves that the universe can have no goal, no final state, and is incapable of being. But the old habit of thinking of some purpose in regard to all phenomena, and of thinking of a directing and creating deity in regard to the universe, is so powerful, that the thinker has to go to great pains in order to avoid thinking of the very aimlessness of the world as intended. The idea that the universe intentionally evades a goal, and even knows artificial means wherewith it prevents itself from falling into a circular movement, must occur to all those who would fain attribute to the universe the capacity of eternally regenerating itself--that is to say, they would fain impose upon a finite, definite force which is invariable in quantity, like the universe, the miraculous gift of renewing its forms and its conditions _for all eternity._ Although the universe is no longer a God, it must still be capable of the divine power of creating and transforming; it must forbid itself to relapse into any one of its previous forms; it must not only have the intention, but also the means, of avoiding any sort of repetition, every second of its existence, even, it must control every single one of its movements, with the view of avoiding goals, final states, and repetitions and all the other results of such an unpardonable and insane method of thought and desire. All this is nothing more than the old religious mode of thought and desire, which, in spite of all, longs to believe that in some way or other the universe resembles the old, beloved, infinite, and infinitely-creative God--that in some way or other "the old God still lives"--that longing of Spinoza's which is expressed in the words "_deus sive natura_" (what he really felt was "_natura sive deus_"). Which, then, is the proposition and belief in which the decisive change, the present _preponderance_ of the scientific spirit over the religious and god-fancying spirit, is best formulated? Ought it not to be: the universe, as force, must not be thought of as unlimited, because it cannot be thought of in this way,--we forbid ourselves the concept _infinite_ force, because it is _incompatible_ with the idea of force? Whence it follows that the universe lacks the power of eternal renewal.

1063.

The principle of the conservation of energy inevitably involves _eternal recurrence._

1064.

That a state of equilibrium has never been reached, proves that it is impossible, but in infinite space it must have been reached. Likewise in spherical space. The _form_ of space must be the cause of the eternal movement, and ultimately of all imperfection. That "energy" and "stability" and "immutability" are contradictory. The measure of energy (dimensionally) is fixed though it is essentially fluid.

"That which is timeless" must be refuted, any given moment of energy, the absolute conditions for a new distribution of all forces are present, it cannot remain stationary. Change is part of its essence, therefore time is as well; by this means, however, the necessity of change has only been established once more in theory.

1065.

A certain emperor always bore the fleeting nature of all things in his mind, in order not to value them too seriously, and to be able to live quietly in their midst. Conversely, everything seems to me much too important for it to be so fleeting, I seek an eternity for everything: ought one to pour the most precious salves and wines into the sea? My consolation is that everything that has been is eternal: the sea will wash it up again.

1066.

The new concept of the universe. The universe exists; it is nothing that grows into existence and that passes out of existence. Or, better still, it develops, it passes away, but it never began to develop, and has never ceased from passing away; it _maintains_ itself in both states. It lives on itself, its excrements are its nourishment.

We need not concern ourselves for one instant with the hypothesis of a _created_ world. The concept create is to-day utterly indefinable and unrealisable; it is but a word which hails from superstitious ages, nothing can be explained with a word. The last attempt that was made to conceive of a world that _began_ occurred quite recently, in many cases with the help of logical

reasoning,--generally, too, as you will guess, with an ulterior theological motive.

Several attempts have been made lately to show that the concept that "the universe has an infinite past (_regressus in infinitum_) is contradictory, it was even demonstrated, it is true, at the price of confounding the head with the tail. Nothing can prevent me from calculating backwards from this moment of time, and of saying: "I shall never reach the end"; just as I can calculate without end in a forward direction, from the same moment. It is only when I wish to commit the error--I shall be careful to avoid it--of reconciling this correct concept of a _regressus in infinitum_ with the absolutely unrealisable concept of a finite _progressus_ up to the present; only when I consider the direction (forwards or backwards) as logically indifferent, that I take hold of the head--this very moment--and think I hold the tail: this pleasure I leave to you, Mr. Dühring!...

I have come across this thought in other thinkers before me, and every time I found that it was determined by other ulterior motives (chiefly theological, in favour of a _creator spiritus)._ If the universe were in any way able to congeal, to dry up, to perish; or if it were capable of attaining to a state of equilibrium; or if it had any kind of goal at all which a long lapse of time, immutability, and finality reserved for it (in short, to speak metaphysically, if becoming could resolve itself into being or into nonentity), this state ought already to have been reached.

But it has not been reached: it therefore follows.... This is the only certainty we can grasp, which can serve as a corrective to a host of cosmic hypotheses possible in themselves. If, for instance, materialism cannot consistently escape the conclusion of a finite state, which William Thomson has traced out for it, then materialism is thereby refuted.

If the universe may be conceived as a definite quantity of energy, as a definite number of centres of energy,--and every other concept remains indefinite and therefore useless,--it follows therefrom that the universe must go through a calculable number of combinations in the great game of chance which constitutes its existence. In infinity, at some moment or other, every possible combination must once have been realised; not only this, but it must have been realised an infinite number of times. And inasmuch as between every one of these combinations and its next recurrence every other possible combination would necessarily have been undergone, and since every one of these combinations would determine the whole series in the same order, a circular movement of absolutely identical series is thus demonstrated: the universe is thus shown to be a circular movement which has already repeated itself an infinite number of times, and which plays its game for all eternity.--This conception is not simply materialistic; for if it were this, it would not involve an infinite recurrence of identical cases, but a finite state. Owing to the fact that the universe has not reached this finite state, materialism shows itself to be but an imperfect and provisional hypothesis.

1067.

And do ye know what "the universe" is to my mind? Shall I show it to you in my mirror? This universe is a monster of energy, without beginning or end; a fixed and brazen quantity o; energy which grows neither bigger nor smaller, which does not consume itself, but only alters its face; as a whole its bulk is immutable, it is a household without either losses or gains, but likewise without increase and without sources of revenue, surrounded by nonentity as by a frontier, it is nothing vague or wasteful, it does not stretch into infinity; but it is a definite quantum of energy located in limited space, and not in space which would be anywhere empty. It is rather energy everywhere, the play of forces and force-waves, at the same time one and many, agglomerating here and diminishing there, a sea of forces storming and raging in itself, for ever changing, for ever rolling back over in calculable ages to recurrence, with an ebb and flow of its forms, producing the most complicated things out of the most simple structures; producing the most ardent, most savage, and most contradictory things out of the quietest, most rigid, and most frozen material, and then returning from multifariousness to uniformity, from the play of contradictions back into the delight of consonance, saying yea unto itself, even in this homogeneity of its courses and ages; for ever blessing itself as something which recurs for all eternity,--a becoming which knows not satiety, or disgust, or weariness:--this, my Dionysian world of eternal self-creation, of eternal self-destruction, this mysterious world of twofold voluptuousness; this, my "Beyond Good and Evil" without aim, unless there is an aim in the bliss of the circle, without will, unless a ring must by nature keep goodwill to itself,--would you have a name for my world? A _solution_ of all your riddles? Do ye also want a light, ye most concealed, strongest and most undaunted men of the blackest midnight?--_This world is the Will to Power--and nothing else!_ And even ye yourselves are this will to power--and nothing besides!

==========

Shakspeare and His Times [Vol. 1 of 2]

Nathan Drake

Project Gutenberg Release: November 28, 2016 · eBook #53625

Transcriber's Notes: Words in italics in the original are surrounded with _underscores_. Words in a Saxon font in the original are surrounded with +plus+ signs. Words in blackletter in the original are surrounded with =equal= signs. Characters superscripted in the original are surrounded by {braces}. Ellipses match the original. In footnotes and attributions, commas and periods seem to be used interchangeably. They remain as printed. Variations in spelling, hyphenation, and accents remain as in the original unless noted. A complete list of corrections follows the text.

[Illustration: SHAKSPEARE.

Engraved by W. T. Fry after a Cast made by M{r}. George Bullock from the Monumental Bust at Stratford-upon-Avon.]

SHAKSPEARE

AND

HIS TIMES:

INCLUDING THE BIOGRAPHY OF THE POET; CRITICISMS ON HIS GENIUS AND WRITINGS; A NEW CHRONOLOGY OF HIS PLAYS; A DISQUISITION ON THE OBJECT OF HIS SONNETS; AND A HISTORY OF _THE MANNERS, CUSTOMS, AND AMUSEMENTS, SUPERSTITIONS, POETRY, AND ELEGANT LITERATURE OF HIS AGE_.

BY NATHAN DRAKE, M.D. AUTHOR OF "LITERARY HOURS," AND OF "ESSAYS ON PERIODICAL LITERATURE."

Triumph my Britain! thou hast one to show, To whom all scenes of Europe homage owe.— ————— Soul of the age, The applause, delight, the wonder of our stage, My Shakspeare, rise! BEN JONSON.

The very age and body of the time, his form and pressure. SHAKSPEARE.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON: PRINTED FOR T. CADELL AND W. DAVIES, IN THE STRAND. 1817.

Printed by A. Strahan, Printers-Street, London.

PREFACE.

Though two centuries have now elapsed, since the death of Shakspeare, no attempt has hitherto been made to render him the medium for a comprehensive and connected view of the Times in which he lived.

Yet, if any man be allowed to fill a station thus conspicuous and important, Shakspeare has undoubtedly the best claim to the distinction; not only from his pre-eminence as a dramatic poet, but from the intimate relation which his works bear to the manners, customs, superstitions, and amusements of his age.

Struck with the interest which a work of this kind, if properly executed, might possess, the author was induced, several years ago, to commence the undertaking, with the express intention of blending with the detail of manners, &c. such a portion of criticism, biography, and literary history, as should render the whole still more attractive and complete.

In attempting this, it has been his aim to place Shakspeare in the fore-ground of the picture, and to throw around him, in groups more or less distinct and full, the various objects of his design; giving them prominency and light, according to their greater or smaller connection with the principal figure.

More especially has it been his wish, to infuse throughout the whole plan, whether considered in respect to its entire scope, or to the parts of which it is composed, that degree of unity and integrity, of relative proportion and just bearing, without which neither harmony, simplicity, nor effect, can be expected, or produced.

With a view, also, to distinctness and perspicuity of elucidation, the whole has been distributed into three parts or pictures, entitled,—"SHAKSPEARE IN STRATFORD;"—"SHAKSPEARE IN LONDON;"— "SHAKSPEARE IN RETIREMENT;"—which, though inseparably united, as forming but portions of the same story, and harmonized by the same means, have yet, both in subject and execution, a peculiar character to support.

The _first_ represents our Poet in the days of his youth, on the banks of his native Avon, in the midst of rural imagery, occupations, and amusements; in the _second_, we behold him in the capital of his country, in the centre of rivalry and competition, in the active pursuit of reputation and glory; and in the _third_, we accompany the venerated bard to the shades of retirement, to the bosom of domestic peace, to the enjoyment of unsullied fame.

It has, therefore, been the business of the author, in accordancy with his plan, to connect these delineations with their relative accompaniments; to incorporate, for instance, with the first, what he had to relate of the _country_, as it existed in the age of Shakspeare; its manners, customs, and characters; its festivals, diversions, and many of its superstitions; opening and closing the subject with the biography of the poet, and binding the intermediate parts, not only by a perpetual reference to his drama, but by their own constant and direct tendency towards the developement of the one object in view.

With the _second_, which commences with Shakspeare's introduction to the stage as an actor, is combined the poetic, dramatic, and general literature of the times, together with an account of _metropolitan_ manners and diversions, and a full and continued criticism on the poems and plays of our bard.

After a survey, therefore, of the Literary world, under the heads of Bibliography, Philology, Criticism, History, Romantic, and Miscellaneous Literature, follows a View of the Poetry of the same period, succeeded by a critique on the juvenile productions of Shakspeare, and including a biographical sketch of Lord Southampton, and a new hypothesis on the origin and object of the Sonnets.

Of the immediately subsequent description of diversions, &c. the Economy of the Stage forms a leading feature, as preparatory to a History of Dramatic Poetry, previous to the year 1590; and this is again introductory to a discussion concerning the Period when Shakspeare commenced a writer for the theatre; to a new chronology of his plays, and to a criticism on each drama; a department which is interspersed with dissertations on the _fairy mythology_, the _apparitions_, the _witchcraft_, and the _magic_ of Shakspeare; portions of popular credulity which had been, in reference to this distribution, omitted in detailing the superstitions of the country.

This second part is then terminated by a summary of Shakspeare's dramatic character, by a brief view of dramatic poetry during his connection with the stage, and by the biography of the poet to the close of his residence in London.

The _third_ and last of these delineations is, unfortunately, but too short, being altogether occupied with the few circumstances which distinguish the last three years of the life of our bard, with a review of his disposition and moral character, and with some notice of the first tributes paid to his memory.

It will readily be admitted, that the materials for the greater part of this arduous task are abundant; but it must also be granted, that they are dispersed through a vast variety of distant and unconnected departments of literature; and that to draw forth, arrange, and give a luminous disposition to, these masses of scattered intelligence, is an achievement of no slight magnitude, especially when it is considered, that no step in the progress of such an undertaking can be made, independent of a constant recurrence to authorities.

How far the author is qualified for the due execution of his design, remains for the public to decide; but it may, without ostentation, be told, that his leisure, for the last thirty years, has been, in a great decree, devoted to a line of study immediately associated with the subject; and that his attachment to old English literature has led him to a familiarity with the only sources from which, on such a topic, authentic illustration is to be derived.

He will likewise venture to observe, that, in the style of criticism which he has pursued, it has been his object, an ambitious one it is true, to unfold, in a manner more distinct than has hitherto been effected, the peculiar character of the poet's drama; and, lastly, to

produce a work, which, while it may satisfy the poetical antiquary, shall, from the variety, interest, and integrity of its component parts, be equally gratifying to the general reader.

Hadleigh, Suffolk, April 7th, 1817.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.

PART I.

SHAKSPEARE IN STRATFORD.

CHAP. I.

Birth of Shakspeare — Account of his Family — Orthography of his Name. _Page_ 1

CHAP. II.

The House in which Shakspeare was born — Plague at Stratford, June 1564 — Shakspeare educated at the Free-school of Stratford — State of Education, and of Juvenile Literature in the Country at this period — Extent of Shakspeare's acquirements as a Scholar. 21

CHAP. III.

Shakspeare, after leaving School, follows his Father's Trade — Statement of Aubrey — Probably present in his Twelfth Year at Kenelworth, when Elizabeth visited the Earl of Leicester — Tradition of Aubrey concerning him — Whether there is reason to suppose that, after leaving his Father, he was placed in an Attorney's Office, who was likewise Seneschal or Steward of some Manor — Anecdotes of Shakspeare — Allusions in his Works to Barton, Wilnecotte, and Barston, Villages in Warwickshire — Earthquake in 1580 alluded to — Whether, after leaving School, he acquired any Knowledge of the French and Italian languages. 34

CHAP. IV.

Shakspeare married to Anne Hathaway — Account of the Hathaways — Cottage at Shottery — Birth of his eldest Child, Susanna — Hamnet and Judith baptized — Anecdote of Shakspeare — Shakspeare apparently settled in the Country. 59

CHAP. V.

A View of Country-Life during the Age of Shakspeare — Its _Manners and Customs_ — Rural Characters; the Country-Gentleman — the Country-Coxcomb — the Country-Clergyman — the Country-Schoolmaster — the Farmer or Yeoman, his Mode of Living — the Huswife, her Domestic Economy — the Farmer's Heir — the Poor Copyholder — the Downright Clown, or Plain Country-Boor. 68

CHAP. VI.

A View of Country-Life during the Age of Shakspeare — _Manners and Customs continued_ — Rural Holidays and Festivals; New-Year's Day — Twelfth Day — Rock-Day — Plough-Monday — Shrove-tide — Easter-tide — Hock-tide — May-Day — Whitsuntide — Ales; Leet-ale — Lamb-ale — Bride-ale — Clerk-ale — Church-ale — Whitsun-ale — Sheep-shearing Feast — Candlemas-Day — Harvest-Home — Seed-cake Feast — Martinmas — Christmas. 123

CHAP. VII.

A View of Country-Life during the Age of Shakspeare — _Manners and Customs_, continued — Wakes — Fairs — Weddings — Christenings — Burials. 209

CHAP. VIII.

View of Country-Life during the Age of Shakspeare, continued — _Diversions_ — The Itinerant Stage — Cotswold Games — Hawking — Hunting — Fowling — Fishing — Horse-racing — The Quintaine — The Wild-goose Chase — Hurling — Shovel-board — Juvenile Sports — Barley-breake — Parish-Top. 246

CHAP. IX.

View of Country-Life during the Age of Shakspeare, continued — An Account of some of its _Superstitions_; Winter-Night's Conversation — Peculiar Periods devoted to Superstition — St. Paul's Day — St. Swithen's Day — St. Mark's Day — Childermas — St. Valentine's Day — Midsummer-Eve — Michaelmas — All Hallow-Eve — St. Withold — Omens — Charms — Sympathies — Superstitious Cures — Miscellaneous Superstitions. 314

CHAP. X.

Biography of Shakspeare resumed — His Irregularities — Deer-stealing in Sir Thomas Lucy's Park — Account of the Lucy family — Daisy-hill, the Keeper's Lodge, where Shakspeare was confined, on the Charge of stealing Deer — Shakspeare's Revenge — Ballad on Lucy — Severe Prosecution by Sir Thomas — never forgotten by Shakspeare — this Cause, and probably also Debt, as his Father was now in reduced Circumstances, induced him to leave the Country for London about 1586 — Remarks on this Removal. 401

PART II.

SHAKSPEARE IN LONDON.

CHAP. I.

Shakspeare's Arrival in London about the Year 1586, when twenty-two Years of Age — Leaves his Family at Stratford, visiting them occasionally — His Introduction to the Stage — His Merits as an Actor. 413

CHAP. II.

Shakspeare commences a Writer of Poetry, probably about the year 1587, by the composition of his Venus and Adonis — Historical Outline of Polite Literature, during the Age of Shakspeare — General passion for Letters — Bibliography — Shakspeare's Attachment to Books — Philology — Criticism — Shakspeare's Progress in both — History, general, local, and personal, Shakspeare's Acquaintance with — Miscellaneous Literature. 426

CHAP. III.

View of Romantic Literature during the Age of Shakspeare — Shakspeare's Attachment to, and Use of, Romances, Tales, and Ballads. 518

CHAP. IV.

View of Miscellaneous Poetry during the same period. 594

[Illustration: _Five genuine Autographs of Shakspeare_

N{o}. 1 is from Shakspeare's Mortgage 1612-13.

2 is from M{r}. Malone's plate II. N{o}. X.

3 is from the first brief of Shakspeare's Will.

4 is from the second brief of the Will.

5 is from the third brief of the Will.]

SHAKSPEARE AND HIS TIMES.

PART I.

SHAKSPEARE IN STRATFORD.

CHAPTER I.

BIRTH OF SHAKSPEARE—HIS FAMILY—THE ORTHOGRAPHY OF HIS NAME.

William Shakspeare, the object almost of our idolatry as a dramatic poet, was born at Stratford-upon-Avon, in Warwickshire, on the 23d of April, 1564, and he was baptized on the 26th of the same month.

Of his family, not much that is certain can be recorded; but it would appear, from an instrument in the College of Heralds, confirming the grant of a coat of arms to John Shakspeare in 1599, that his great grandfather had been rewarded by Henry the Seventh, "for his faithefull and approved service, with lands and tenements given to him in those parts of Warwickshire, where," proceeds this document, "they have continued by some descents in good reputation and credit." Notwithstanding this assertion, however, no such grant, after a minute examination, made by Mr. Malone in the chapel of the Rolls, has been discovered; whence we have reason to infer, that the heralds have been mistaken in their statement, and that the bounty of the monarch was directed through a different channel. From the language, indeed, of two rough draughts of a prior grant of arms to John Shakspeare in 1596, it is probable that the service alluded to was of a military cast, for it is there expressly said, that he was rewarded "for his faithful and _valiant_ service," a term, perhaps, implying the heroism of our poet's ancestor in the field of Bosworth.

That the property, thus bestowed upon the family of Shakspeare, descended to John, the father of the poet, and contributed to his influence and respectability, there is no reason to doubt. From the register, indeed, and public writings relating to Stratford, Mr. Rowe has justly inferred, that the Shakspeares were of good figure and fashion there, and were considered as gentlemen. We may presume, however, that the patrimony of Mr. John Shakspeare, the parent of our great dramatist, was not very considerable, as he found the profits of business necessary to his support. He was, in fact, a wool-stapler, and, there is reason to suppose, in a large way; for he was early chosen a member of the corporation of his town, a situation usually connected with respectable circumstances, and soon after, he filled the office of high bailiff or chief magistrate of that body. The record of these promotions has been thus given from the books of the corporation.

"Jan. 10, in the 6th year of the reign of our sovereign lady Queen Elizabeth, John Shakspeare passed his Chamberlain's accounts."

"At the Hall holden the eleventh day of September, in the eleventh year of the reign of our sovereign lady Elizabeth, 1569, were present Mr. John Shakspeare, High Bailiff."[2:A]

It was during the period of his filling this important office, that he first obtained a grant of arms; and, in a note annexed to the subsequent patent of 1596, now in the College of Arms[2:B], it is stated that he was likewise a justice of the peace, and possessed of lands and tenements to the amount of 500_l._ The final confirmation of this grant took place in 1599, in which his shield and coat are described to be, _In a field of gould upon a bend sable, a speare of the first, the poynt upward, hedded argent_; and for his crest or cognisance, _A falcon with his wyngs displayed, standing on a wrethe of his coullers, supporting a speare armed hedded, or steeled sylver_.[3:A]

Mr. John Shakspeare married, though in what year is not accurately known, the daughter and heir of Robert Arden, of Wellingcote, in the county of Warwick, who is termed, in the Grant of Arms of 1596, "a gentleman of worship." The Arden, or Ardern family, appears to have been of considerable antiquity; for, in Fuller's Worthies, Rob. Arden de Bromwich, ar. is among the names of the gentry of this county returned by the commissioners in the twelfth year of King Henry the Sixth, 1433; and in the eleventh and sixteenth years of Elizabeth, A. D. 1562 and 1568, Sim. Ardern, ar. and Edw. Ardrn, ar. are enumerated, by the same author, among the sheriffs of Warwickshire.[3:B] It is well known that the woodland part of this county was formerly denominated Ardern, though, for the sake of euphony, frequently softened towards the close of the sixteenth century, into the smoother appellation of Arden; hence it is not improbable, that the supposition of Mr. Jacob, who reprinted, in 1770, the Tragedy of Arden of Feversham, a play which was originally published in 1592, may be correct; namely that Shakspeare, the poet, was _descended by the female line_ from the unfortunate individual whose tragical death is the subject of this drama; for though the name of this gentleman was originally Ardern, he seems early to have experienced the fate of the county district, and to have had his surname harmonized by a similar omission. In consequence of this marriage, Mr. John Shakspeare and his posterity were allowed, by the College of Heralds, to impale their arms with the ancient arms of the Ardrns of Wellingcote.[3:C]

Of the issue of John Shakspeare by this connection, the accounts are contradictory and perplexed; nor is it absolutely ascertained, whether he had only one wife, or whether he might not have had two, or even three. Mr. Rowe, whose narrative has been usually followed, has given him _ten_ children, among whom he considers _William_ the poet, as the _eldest_ son.[4:A] The Register, however, of the parish of Stratford-upon-Avon, which commences in 1558, is incompatible with this statement; for, we there find _eleven_ children ascribed to John Shakspeare, _ten_ baptized, and _one_, the baptism of which had taken place before the commencement of the Register, buried.[4:B] The dates of these baptisms, and of two or three other events, recorded in this Register, it will be necessary, for the sake of elucidation, to transcribe:

"_Jone_, daughter of John Shakspere, was baptized Sept. 15, 1558.

"_Margaret_, daughter of John Shakspere, was buried April 30, 1563.

"WILLIAM, son of John Shakspere, was baptized April 26, 1564.

"_Gilbert_, son of John Shakspere, was baptized Oct. 3, 1566.

"_Jone_[4:C], daughter of John Shakspere, was baptized April 15, 1569.

"_Anne_, daughter of Mr. John Shakspere, was baptized Sept. 28, 1571.

"_Richard_, son of Mr. John Shakspere, was baptized March 11, 1573-4.

"_Edmund_, son of Mr. John Shakspere, was baptized May 3, 1580.

"_John Shakspere_ and Margery Roberts were married Nov. 25, 1584.

"_Margery_, wife of John Shakspere, was buried Oct. 29, 1587.

"_Ursula_, daughter of John Shakspere, was baptized March 11, 1588.

"_Humphrey_, son of John Shakspere, was baptized May 24, 1590.

"_Philip_, son of John Shakspere, was baptized Sept. 21, 1591.

"Mr. _John Shakspere_ was buried Sept. 8, 1601.

"_Mary Shakspere_, widow, was buried Sept. 9, 1608."

Now it is evident, that if the ten children which were baptized, according to this Register, between the years 1558 and 1591, are to be ascribed to the father of our poet, he must necessarily have had _eleven_, in consequence of the record of the decease of his daughter Margaret. He must also have had three wives, for we find his second wife, Margery, died in 1587, and the death of a third, Mary, a widow, is noticed in 1608.

It was suggested to Mr. Malone[5:A], that very probably, Mr. John Shakspeare had a son born to him, as well as a daughter, before the commencement of the Register, and that this his eldest son, was, as is customary, named after his father, John; a supposition which, (as no other child was baptized by the Christian name of the old gentleman,) carries some credibility with it, and was subsequently acquiesced in by Mr. Malone himself.

In this case, therefore, the marriage recorded in the Register, is that of John Shakspeare the _younger_ with Margery Roberts, and the three children born between 1588 and 1591, Ursula, Humphrey, and Philip, the issue of this John, not by the first, but by a second marriage; for as Margery Shakspeare died in 1587, and Ursula was baptized in 1588-9, these children must have been by the Mary Shakspeare, whose death is mentioned as occurring in 1608, and as she is there denominated a _widow_; the younger John must consequently have died before that date.

The result of _this_ arrangement will be, that the father of our poet had only _nine_ children, and that WILLIAM was not the eldest, but the _second_ son.

On either plan, however, the account of Mr. Rowe is equally inaccurate; and as the introduction of an elder son involves a variety of suppositions, and at the same time nothing improbable is attached to the consideration of this part of the Register in the light in which it usually appears, that is, as allusive solely to the father, it will, we think, be the better and the safer mode, to rely upon it,

according to its more direct and literal import. This determination will be greatly strengthened by reflecting, that old Mr. Shakspeare was, on the authority of the last instrument granting him a coat of arms, living in 1599; that on the testimony of the Register, taken in the common acceptation, he was not buried until September 1601; and that in no part of the same document is the epithet _younger_ annexed to the name of John Shakspeare, a mark of distinction which there is every reason to suppose would have been introduced, had the father and a son of the same Christian name been not only living at the same time in the same town, but the latter likewise a parent.

That the circumstances of Mr. John Shakspeare were, at the period of his marriage, and for several years afterwards, if not affluent, yet easy and respectable, there is every reason to suppose, from his having filled offices of the first trust and importance in his native town; but, from the same authority which has induced us to draw this inference, another of a very different kind, with regard to a subsequent portion of his life, may with equal confidence be taken. In the books of the corporation of Stratford it is stated, that—

"At the hall holden Nov. 19th, in the 21st year of the reign of our sovereign lady Queen Elizabeth, it is ordained, that every Alderman shall be taxed to pay weekly 4_d._, saving _John Shakspeare_ and Robert Bruce, who shall not be taxed to pay any thing; and every burgess to pay 2_d._" Again,

"At the hall holden on the 6th day of September, in the 28th year of our sovereign lady Queen Elizabeth:

"At this hall William Smith and Richard Courte are chosen to be Aldermen in the places of John Wheler and John Shakspeare, for that Mr. Wheler doth desire to be put out of the company, and Mr. Shakspeare doth not come to the halls, when they be warned, nor hath not done of long time."[6:A]

The conclusion to be drawn from these memoranda must unavoidably be, that, in 1579, ten years after he had served the office of High Bailiff, his situation, in a pecuniary light, was so much reduced, that, on this account, he was excused the weekly payment of 4_d._; and that, in 1586, the same distress still subsisting, and perhaps in an aggravated degree, he was, on the plea of non-attendance, dismissed the corporation.

The causes of this unhappy change in his circumstances cannot now, with the exception of the burthen of a large and increasing family, be ascertained; but it is probable, that to this period is to be referred, if there be any truth in the tradition, the report of Aubrey, that "William Shakspeare's father was a butcher." This anecdote, he affirms, was received from the neighbours of the bard, and, on this account, merits some consideration.[7:A]

We are indebted to Mr. Howe for the first intimation concerning the trade of John Shakspeare; his declaration, derived also from tradition, that he was a "considerable dealer in wool," appears confirmed by subsequent research. From a window in a room of the premises which originally formed part of the house at Stratford, in which Shakspeare the poet was born, and a part of which premises has for many years been occupied as a public-house, with the sign of the Swan and Maidenhead, a pane of glass was taken, about five and forty years ago, by Mr. Peyton, the then master of the adjoining Inn called The White Lion. This pane, now in the possession of his son, is nearly six inches in diameter, and perfect, and on it are painted the arms of the merchants of the wool-staple—_Nebule on a chief gules, a lion passant or_. It appears, from the style in which it is finished, to have been executed about the time of Shakspeare, the father, and is undoubtedly a strong corroborative proof of the authenticity of Mr. Rowe's relation.[7:B]

These traditionary anecdotes, though apparently contradictory, may easily admit of reconcilement, if we consider, that between the employment of a wool-dealer, and a butcher, there is no small affinity; "few occupations," observes Mr. Malone, "can be named which are more naturally connected with each other."[8:A] It is highly probable, therefore, that during the period of John Shakspeare's distress, which we know to have existed in 1579, when our poet was but fifteen years of age, he might have had recourse to this more humble trade, as in many circumstances connected with his customary business, and as a great additional means of supporting a very numerous family.

That the necessity for this union, however, did not exist towards the latter part of his life, there is much reason to imagine, both from the increasing reputation and affluence of his son William, and from the fact of his applying to the College of Heralds, in 1596 and 1599, for a grant of arms; events, of which the first, considering the character of the poet, must almost necessarily have led to, and the second directly pre-supposes, the possession of comparative competence and respectability.

The only remaining circumstance which time has spared us, relative to the personal conduct of John Shakspeare, is, that there appears some foundation to believe that, a short time previous to his death, he made a confession of his faith, or spiritual will; a document still in existence, the discovery and history of which, together with the declaration itself, will not improperly find a place at the close of this commencing chapter of our work.

About the year 1770, a master-bricklayer, of the name of Mosely, being employed by Mr. Thomas Hart, the fifth in descent, in a direct line, from the poet's sister, Joan Hart, to new-tile the house in which he then lived, and which is supposed to be that under whose roof the bard was born, found hidden between the rafters and the tiling of the house, a manuscript, consisting of six leaves, stitched together, in the form of a small book. This manuscript Mosely, who bore the character of an honest and industrious man, gave (without asking or receiving any recompense) to Mr. Peyton, an alderman of Stratford; and this gentleman very kindly sent it to Mr. Malone, through the medium of the Rev. Mr. Davenport, vicar of Stratford. It had, however, previous to this transmission, unfortunately been deprived of the first leaf, a deficiency which was afterwards supplied by the discovery, that Mosely, who had now been dead about two years, had copied a great portion of it, and from his transcription the introductory parts were supplied.[9:A] The daughter of Mosely and Mr. Hart, who were both living in the year 1790, agreed in a perfect recollection of the circumstances attending the discovery of this curious document, which consists of the following fourteen articles.

1.

"In the name of God, the Father, Sonne and Holy Ghost, the most holy and blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, the holy host of archangels, angels, patriarchs, prophets, evangelists, apostles, saints, martyrs, and all the celestial court and company of heaven: I John Shakspear, an unworthy member of the holy Catholic religion, being at this my present writing in perfect health of body, and sound mind, memory, and understanding, but calling to mind the uncertainty of life and certainty of death, and that I may be possibly cut off in the blossome of my sins, and called to render an account of all my transgressions externally and internally, and that I may be unprepared for the dreadful trial either by sacrament, pennance, fasting, or prayer, or any other purgation whatever, do in the holy presence above specified, of my own free and voluntary accord, make and ordaine this my last spiritual will, testament, confession, protestation, and confession of faith, hopinge hereby to receive pardon for all my sinnes and offences, and thereby to be made partaker of life everlasting, through the only merits of Jesus Christ my saviour and redeemer, who took upon himself the likeness of man, suffered death, and was crucified upon the crosse, for the redemption of sinners.

2.

"_Item_, I John Shakspear doe by this present protest, acknowledge, and confess, that in my past life I have been a most abominable and grievous sinner, and therefore unworthy to be forgiven without a true and sincere repentance for the same. But trusting in the manifold mercies of my blessed Saviour and Redeemer, I am encouraged by relying on his sacred word, to hope for salvation, and be made partaker of his heavenly kingdom, as a member of the celestial company of angels, saints, and martyrs, there to reside for ever and ever in the court of my God.

3.

"_Item_, I John Shakspear doe by this present protest and declare, that as I am certain I must passe out of this transitory life into another that will last to eternity, I do hereby most humbly implore and intreat my good and guardian angell to instruct me in this my solemn preparation, protestation, and confession of faith, at least spiritually, in will adoring and most humbly beseeching my Saviour, that he will be pleased to assist me in so dangerous a voyage, to defend me from the snares and deceites of my infernal enemies, and to conduct me to the secure haven of his eternal blisse.

4.

"_Item_, I John Shakspear doe protest that I will also passe out of this life, armed with the last sacrament of extreme unction: the which if through any let or hindrance I should not then be able to have, I doe now also for that time demand and crave the same; beseeching his Divine Majesty that he will be pleased to anoynt my senses both internall and externall with the sacred oyle of his infinite mercy, and to pardon me all my sins committed by seeing, speaking, feeling, smelling, hearing, touching, or by any other way whatsoever.

5.

"_Item_, I John Shakspear doe by this present protest, that I will never through any temptation whatsoever despaire of the divine goodness, for the multitude and greatness of my sinnes; for which, although I confesse that I have deserved hell, yet will I steadfastly hope in God's infinite mercy, knowing that he hath heretofore pardoned many as great sinners as myself, whereof I have good warrant sealed with his sacred mouth, in holy writ, whereby he pronounceth that he is not come to call the just, but sinners.

6.

"_Item_, I John Shakspear do protest, that I do not know that I have ever done any good worke meritorious of life everlasting: and if I have done any, I do acknowledge that I have done it with a great deale of negligence and imperfection; neither should I have been able to have done the least without the assistance of his divine grace. Wherefore let the devill remain confounded: for I doe in no wise presume to merit heaven by such good workes alone, but through the merits and bloud of my Lord and Saviour Jesus, shed upon the cross for me most miserable sinner.

7.

"_Item_, I John Shakspear do protest by this present writing, that I will patiently endure and suffer all kind of infirmity, sickness, yea, and the paine of death itself: wherein if it should happen, which God forbid, that through violence of paine and agony, or by subtilty of the devill, I should fall into any impatience or temptation of blasphemy, or murmuration against God, or the Catholic faith, or give any signe of bad example, I do henceforth, and for that present, repent me, and am most heartily sorry for the same: and I do renounce all the evill whatsoever, which I might have then done or said; beseeching his divine clemency that he will not forsake me in that grievous and paignefull agony.

8.

"_Item_, I John Shakspear, by virtue of this present testament, I do pardon all the injuries and offences that any one hath ever done unto me, either in my reputation, life, goods, or any other way whatsoever; beseeching sweet Jesus to pardon them for the same; and I do desire that they will doe the like by me whome I have offended or injured in any sort howsoever.

9.

"_Item_, I John Shakspear do here protest, that I do render infinite thanks to his Divine Majesty for all the benefits that I have received, as well secret as manifest, and in particular for the benefit of my creation, redemption, sanctification, conservation, and vocation to the holy knowledge of him and his true Catholic faith: but above all for his so great expectation of me to pennance, when he might most justly have taken me out of this life, when I least thought of it, yea, even then, when I was plunged in the durty puddle of my sinnes. Blessed be therefore and praised, for ever and ever, his infinite patience and charity.

10.

"_Item_, I John Shakspear do protest, that I am willing, yea, I do infinitely desire and humbly crave, that of this my last will and testament the glorious and ever Virgin Mary, mother of God, refuge and advocate of sinners, (whom I honour specially above all saints,) may be the chiefe executresse, togeather with these other saints, my patrons, (Saint Winefride,) all whome I invoke and beseech to be present at the hour of my death, that she and they comfort me with their desired presence, and crave of sweet Jesus that he will receive my soul into peace.

11.

"_Item_, In virtue of this present writing, I John Shakspear do likewise most willingly and with all humility constitute and ordaine my good angell for defender and protector of my soul in the dreadfull day of judgment, when the finall sentence of eternall life or death shall be discussed and given: beseeching him that, as my soule was appointed to his custody and protection when I lived, even so he will vouchsafe to defend the same at that houre, and conduct it to eternall bliss.

12.

"_Item_, I John Shakspear do in like manner pray and beseech all my dear friends, parents, and kinsfolks, by the bowells of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that since it is uncertain what lot will befall me, for fear notwithstanding least by reason of my sinnes I be to

pass and stay a long while in purgatory, they will vouchsafe to assist and succour me with their holy prayers and satisfactory workes, especially with the holy sacrifice of the masse, as being the most effectual means to deliver soules from their torments and paines; from the which, if I shall by God's gracious goodnesse, and by their vertuous workes, be delivered, I do promise that I will not be ungratefull unto them for so great a benefitt.

13.

"_Item_, I John Shakspear doe by this my last will and testament bequeath my soul, as soon as it shall be delivered and loosened from the prison of this my body, to be entombed in the sweet and amorous coffin of the side of Jesus Christ; and that in this life-giving sepulcher it may rest and live, perpetually enclosed in that eternall habitation of repose, there to blesse for ever and ever that direful iron of the launce, which, like a charge in a censore, formes so sweet and pleasant a monument within the sacred breast of my Lord and Saviour.

14.

"_Item_, Lastly I John Shakspear doe protest, that I will willingly accept of death in what manner soever it may befall me, conforming my will unto the will of God; accepting of the same in satisfaction for my sinnes, and giving thanks unto his Divine Majesty for the life he hath bestowed upon me. And if it please him to prolong or shorten the same, blessed be he also a thousand thousand times; into whose most holy hands I commend my soul and body, my life and death: and I beseech him above all things, that he never permit any change to be made by me John Shakspear of this my aforesaid will and testament. Amen.

"I John Shakspeare have made this present writing of protestation, confession, and charter, in presence of the blessed Virgin Mary, my angell guardian, and all the celestial court, as witnesses hereunto: the which my meaning is, that it be of full value now presently and for ever, with the force and vertue of testament, codicill, and donation in course of death; confirming it anew, being in perfect health of soul and body, and signed with mine own hand; carrying also the same about me, and for the better declaration hereof, my will and intention is that it be finally buried with me after my death.

"Pater noster, Ave maria, Credo.

"Jesu, son of David, have mercy on me.—Amen."[14:A]

If the intention of the testator, as expressed in the close of this will, were carried into effect, then, of course, the manuscript which Mosely found, must necessarily have been a copy of that which was buried in the grave of John Shakspeare.

Mr. Malone, to whom, in his edition of Shakspeare, printed in 1790, we are indebted for this singular paper, and for the history attached to it, observes, that he is unable to ascertain, whether it was drawn up by John Shakspeare the father, or by John his _supposed_ eldest son; but he says, "I have taken some pains to ascertain the authenticity of this manuscript, and, after a very careful inquiry, am perfectly satisfied that it is genuine."[15:A] In the "Inquiry," however, which he published in 1796, relative to the Ireland papers, he has given us, though without assigning any reasons for his change of opinion, a very different result: "In my conjecture," he remarks, "concerning the writer of that paper, I certainly was mistaken; for I have since obtained documents that clearly prove it could not have been the composition of any one of our poet's family."[15:B]

In the "Apology" of Mr. George Chalmers "for the Believers in the Shakspeare-Papers," which appeared in the year subsequent to Mr. Malone's "Inquiry," a new light is thrown upon the origin of this confession. "From the sentiment, and the language, this confession appears to be," says this gentleman, "the effusion of a Roman Catholic mind, and was probably drawn up by some Roman Catholic priest.[15:C] If these premises be granted, it will follow, as a fair deduction, that the family of Shakspeare were Roman Catholics; a circumstance this, which is wholly consistent with what Mr. Malone is now studious to inculcate, viz. "that this confession could not have been the composition of any of our poet's family." The thoughts, the language, the orthography, all demonstrate the truth of my conjecture, though Mr. Malone did not perceive this truth, when he first published this paper in 1790. But, it was the performance of a _clerke_, the undoubted work of the family-priest. The conjecture, that Shakspeare's family were Roman Catholics, is strengthened by the fact, that his father declined to attend the corporation meetings, and was at last removed from the corporate body."[16:A]

This conjecture of Mr. Chalmers appears to us in its leading points very plausible; for that the father of our poet might be a Roman Catholic is, if we consider the very unsettled state of his times with regard to religion, not only a possible but a probable supposition: in which case, it would undoubtedly have been the office of the spiritual director of the family to have drawn up such a paper as that

which we have been perusing. It was the fashion also of the period, as Mr. Chalmers has subsequently observed, to draw up confessions of religious faith, a fashion honoured in the observance by the great names of Lord Bacon, Lord Burghley, and Archbishop Parker[16:B]. That he declined, however, attending the corporation-meetings of Stratford from religious motives, and that his removal from that body was the result of non-attendance from _such a cause_, cannot readily be admitted; for we have clearly seen that his defection was owing to pecuniary difficulties; nor is it, in the least degree, probable that, after having honourably filled the highest offices in the corporation without scruple, he should at length, and in a reign too popularly protestant, incur expulsion from an avowed motive of this kind; especially as we have reason to suppose, from the mode in which this profession was concealed, that the tenets of the person whose faith it declares, were cherished in secret.

From an accurate inspection of the hand-writing of this will, Mr. Malone infers that it cannot be attributed to an earlier period than the year 1600[16:C], whence it follows that, if dictated by, or drawn up at the desire of, John Shakspeare, his death soon sealed the confession of his faith; for, according to the register, he was buried on September 8th, 1601.

Such are the very few circumstances which reiterated research has hitherto gleaned relative to the father of our poet; circumstances which, as being intimately connected with the history and character of his son, have acquired an interest of no common nature. Scanty as they must be pronounced, they lead to the conclusion that he was a moral and industrious man; that when fortune favoured him, he was not indolent, but performed the duties of a magistrate with respectability and effect, and that in the hour of adversity he exerted every nerve to support with decency a numerous family.

Before we close this chapter, it may be necessary to state, that the very orthography of the name of Shakspeare has occasioned much dispute. Of Shakspeare the father, no autograph exists; but the _poet_ has left us several, and from these, and from the monumental inscriptions of his family, must the question be decided; the latter, as being of the least authority, we shall briefly mention, as exhibiting, in Dugdale, three varieties,—_Shakespeare_; _Shakespere_, and _Shakspeare_. The former present us with _five_ specimens which, singular as it may appear, all vary, either in the mode of writing, or mode of spelling. The first is annexed to a mortgage executed by the poet in 1613, and appears thus, _W{m} Shakspe{a}_: the second is from a deed of bargain and sale, relative to the same transaction, and of the same period, and signed, _William Shaksper■_: the third, fourth, and fifth are taken from the _Will_ of Shakspeare executed in March 1616, consisting of three _briefs_ or sheets, to each of which his name is subscribed. These signatures, it is remarkable, differ considerably, especially in the surnames; for in the first brief we find _William Shackspere_; in the second, _Willm Shakspe re_, and in the third, _William Shakspeare_. It has been supposed, however, that, according to the practice in Shakspeare's time, the name in the first sheet was written by the scrivener who drew the will.

In the year 1790, Mr. Malone, from an inspection of the mortgage, pronounced the genuine orthography to be _Shakspeare_[17:A]; in 1796, from consulting the deed of sale, he altered his opinion, and declared that the poet's own mode of spelling his name was, beyond a possibility of doubt, that of _Shakspere_, though for reasons which he should assign in a subsequent publication, he should still continue to write the name _Shakspeare_.[18:A]

To this decision, relative to the genuine orthography, Mr. Chalmers cannot accede; and for this reason, that, "when the testator subscribed his name, for the _last time_, he _plainly_ wrote Shakspe_a_re."[18:B]

It is obvious, therefore, that the controversy turns upon, whether there be, or be not, an _a_ introduced in the second syllable of the last signature of the poet. Mr. Malone, on the suggestion of an anonymous correspondent, thinks that there is not, this gentleman having clearly shown him, "that though there was a superfluous stroke when the poet came to write the letter _r_ in his last signature, probably from the tremor of his hand, there was no _a_ discoverable in that syllable; and that this name, like both the other, was written _Shakspere_."[18:C]

From the annexed plate of autographs, which is copied from Mr. Chalmers's Apology, and presents us with very perfect fac-similes of the signatures, it is at once evident, that the assertion of the anonymous correspondent, that the last signature, "_like both the other_, was written Shakspere," cannot be correct; for the surname in the first brief is written Sha_c_kspere, and, in the second, Shakspe re. Now the _hiatus_ in this second signature is unaccounted for in the fac-simile given by Mr. Malone[18:D]; but in the plate of Mr. Chalmers it is found to have been occasioned by the intrusion of the word _the_ of the _preceding line_, a circumstance which, very probably, might prevent the introduction of the controverted letter. It is likewise, we think, very evident that something more than _a superfluous stroke_ exists between the _e_ and _r_ of the last signature, and that the variation is, indeed, too material to have originated from any supposed tremor of the hand.

Upon the whole, it may, we imagine, be safely reposed on as a fact, that Shakspeare was not uniform in the orthography of his own name; that he sometimes spelt it _Shakspere_ and sometimes _Shakspeare_; but that no other variation is extant which can claim a similar authority.[19:A] It is, therefore, nearly a matter of indifference which of _these two_ modes of spelling we adopt; yet, as his last signature appears to have included the letter _a_, it may, for the sake of consistency, be proper silently to acquiesce in its admission.

FOOTNOTES:

[2:A] Communicated to Mr. Malone by the Rev. Mr. Davenport, vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon.

[2:B] Vincent, vol. clvii. p. 24.

[3:A] See the instrument, at full length, Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 146, edit. of 1803.

[3:B] The History of the Worthies of England, part iii. fol. 131, 132.

[3:C] See Shakspeare's coat of arms, Reed's Shaksp. vol. i. p. 146.

[4:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 58, 59.

[4:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 133.

[4:C] "It was common in the age of Queen Elizabeth to give the same Christian name to two children successively. This was undoubtedly done in the present instance. The former Jone having probably died, (though I can find no entry of her burial in the Register, nor indeed of many of the other children of John Shakspeare) the name of Jone, a very favourite one in those days, was transferred to another new-born child."—Malone from Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 134.

[5:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 136.

[6:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 58.

[7:A] MS. Aubrey, Mus. Ashmol. Oxon. Lives, p. 1. fol. 78, a. (Inter Cod. Dugdal.) Vide Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iii. p. 213.

[7:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iii. p. 214. and Ireland's Picturesque Views on the Upper or Warwickshire Avon, p. 190, 191. Since this passage was written, however, the proof which it was supposed to contain, has been completely annihilated. "If John Shakspeare's occupation in life," observes Mr. Wheeler, "want confirmation, this circumstance will unfortunately not answer such a purpose; for old Thomas Hart constantly declared that his great uncle, Shakspeare Hart, a glazier of this town, who had the new glazing of the chapel windows, where it is known, from Dugdale, that such a shield existed, brought it from thence, and introduced it into his own window."—Wheeler's Guide to Stratford, pp. 13, 14.

[8:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iii. p. 214.

[9:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iii. p. 197, 198.

[14:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iii. p. 199. et seq.

[15:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iii. p. 197.

[15:B] Malone's Inquiry, p. 198, 199.

[15:C] As a specimen, let us take the beginning of this declaration of faith, and see still stronger terms in the conclusion of this protestation, _confession_, and charter.

[16:A] "The place too, the roof of the house where this confession was found, proves, that it had been therein concealed, during times of persecution, for the holy Catholick religion." Apology, p. 198, 199.

[16:B] Chalmers's Apology, p. 200.

[16:C] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iii. p. 198.

[17:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 149.

[18:A] Malone's Inquiry, p. 120

[18:B] Chalmers's Apology, p. 235.

[18:C] Malone's Inquiry, p. 117, 118.

[18:D] Inquiry, Plate II. No. 12.

[19:A] A want of uniformity in the spelling of names, was a species of negligence very common in the time of Shakspeare, and may be observed, remarks Mr. Chalmers, "with regard to the principal poets of that age; as we may see in _England's Parnassus_, a collection of poetry which was published in 1600: thus,

S_y_dney S_i_dney. Spen_s_er Spen_c_er. Jonson Johnson Jhonson. Dekker Dekkar. Markeham Markham. Sylv_i_ster Sylv_e_ster S_i_lvester. Sackwill Sackuil. Fitz Geffrey Fitzjeffry Fitz Jeffr_a_y. France Fraunce. Mid_l_eton Mid_d_leton. G_u_ilpin G_i_lpin. Achelly Achely Achilly Achillye. Dra_y_ton Dra_i_ton. Danie_l_ Daniel_l_. Dav_i_s Davi_e_s. Marlo_w_ Marlo_we_. M_a_rston M_u_rston. Fair_e_fax Fa_ir_fax. K_i_d K_y_d.

Yet, it is remarkable, that in this collection of diversities, our dramatist's name is uniformly spelt Shakespeare: in whatever manner this celebrated name may have been pronounced in Warwickshire, it certainly was spoken in London, with the _e_ soft, thus, Shak_e_speare: in the registers of the Stationers' Company, it is written, Shakes_pere_, and Shakes_peare_." Chalmers's Supplemental Apology, p. 129, 130.

A curious proof of the uncertain orthography of the poet's surname among his contemporaries and immediate successors, may be drawn from a pamphlet, entitled, "The great Assizes holden in Parnassus by Apollo and his Assessours: at which Sessions are arraigned, Mercurius Britannicus, &c. &c. London: Printed by Richard Cotes for Edward Husbands, and are to be sold at his shop in the Middle Temple. 1645. qto. 25 leaves."

In this rare tract, among the list of the jurors is found the name of our bard, written William _Shakespeere_; and in the body of the poem, it is given _Shakespeare_, and _Shakespear_. _Vide_ British Bibliographer, vol. i. p. 513.

CHAPTER II.

THE HOUSE IN WHICH SHAKSPEARE WAS BORN—PLAGUE AT STRATFORD, JUNE 1564—SHAKSPEARE EDUCATED AT THE FREE-SCHOOL OF STRATFORD—STATE OF EDUCATION, AND OF JUVENILE LITERATURE IN THE COUNTRY AT THIS PERIOD—EXTENT OF SHAKSPEARE'S ACQUIREMENTS AS A SCHOLAR.

The experience of the last half century has fully proved, that every thing relative to the history of our immortal dramatist has been received, and received justly too, by the public with an avidity proportional to his increasing fame. What, if recorded of a less celebrated character, might be deemed very uninteresting, immediately acquires, when attached to the mighty name of Shakspeare, an importance nearly unparalleled. No apology, therefore, can be necessary for the introduction of any fact or circumstance, however minute, which is, in the slightest degree, connected with his biography; tradition, indeed, has been so sparing of her communications on this subject, that every addition to her little store has been hitherto welcomed with the most lively sensation of pleasure, nor will the attempt to collect and embody these scattered fragments be unattended with its reward.

The birth-place of our poet, the spot where he drew the first breath of life, where Fancy

—— "fed the little prattler, and with songs Oft sooth'd his wond'ring ears,"

has been the object of laudable curiosity to thousands, and happily the very roof that sheltered his infant innocence can still be pointed out. It stands in Henley-street, and, though at present forming two separate tenements, was originally but one house.[21:A] The premises are still in possession of the Hart family, _now_ the _seventh_ descendants, in a direct line, from Jone the sister of the poet. From the plate in Reed's Shakspeare, which is a correct representation of the existing state of this humble but interesting dwelling, it will appear, that one portion of it is occupied by the Swan and Maidenhead public-house, and the other by a butcher's shop, in which the son of old Mr. Thomas Hart, mentioned in the last chapter, still carries on his father's trade.[22:A] "The kitchen of this house," says Mr. Samuel Ireland, "has an appearance sufficiently interesting, abstracted from its claim to notice as relative to the Bard. It is a subject very similar to those that so frequently employed the rare talents of Ostade, and therefore cannot be deemed unworthy the pencil of an inferior artist. In the corner of the chimney stood an old oak-chair, which had for a number of

years received nearly as many adorers as the celebrated shrine of the Lady of Loretto. This relic was purchased, in July 1790, by the Princess Czartoryska, who made a journey to this place, in order to obtain intelligence relative to Shakspeare; and being told he had often sat in this chair, she placed herself in it, and expressed an ardent wish to become a purchaser; but being informed that it was not to be sold at any price, she left a handsome gratuity to old Mrs. Hart, and left the place with apparent regret. About four months after, the anxiety of the Princess could no longer be withheld, and her secretary was dispatched express, as the fit agent, to purchase this treasure at any rate: the sum of twenty guineas was the price fixed on, and the secretary and chair, with a proper certificate of its authenticity on stamped paper, set off in a chaise for London."[23:A] The elder Mr. Hart, who died about the year 1794, aged sixty-seven, informed Mr. Samuel Ireland, that he well remembered, when a boy, having dressed himself, with some of his playfellows, as Scaramouches (such was his phrase), in the wearing-apparel of Shakspeare; an anecdote of which, if we consider the lapse of time, it may be allowed us to doubt the credibility, and to conclude that the recollection of Mr. Hart had deceived him.

Little more than two months had passed over the head of the infant Shakspeare, when he became exposed to danger of such an imminent kind, that we have reason to rejoice he was not snatched from us even while he lay in the cradle. He was born, as we have already recorded, on the 23d of April, 1564; and on the 30th of the June following, the plague broke out at Stratford, the ravages of which dreadful disease were so violent, that between this last date and the close of December, not less than two hundred and thirty-eight persons perished; "of which number," remarks Mr. Malone, "probably two hundred and sixteen died of that malignant distemper; and one only of the whole number resided, not in Stratford, but in the neighbouring town of Welcombe. From the two hundred and thirty-seven inhabitants of Stratford, whose names appear in the Register, twenty-one are to be subducted, who, it may be presumed, would have died in six months, in the ordinary course of nature; for in the five preceding years, reckoning, according to the style of that time, from March 25. 1559, to March 25. 1564, two hundred and twenty-one persons were buried at Stratford, of whom two hundred and ten were townsmen: that is, of these latter, forty-two died each year at an average. Supposing one in thirty-five to have died annually, the total number of the inhabitants of Stratford at that period was one thousand four hundred and seventy; and consequently the plague, in the last six months of the year 1564, carried off more than a seventh part of them. Fortunately for mankind it did not reach the house in which the infant Shakspeare lay; for not one of that name appears in the dead list. May we suppose, that, like Horace, he lay secure and fearless in the midst of contagion and death, protected by the Muses, to whom his future life was to be devoted, and covered over:—

———————— "_sacrâ Lauroque, collataque myrto, Non sine Diis animosus infans_."[24:A]

It is now impossible to ascertain with any degree of certainty the mode which was adopted in the education of this aspiring genius; all that time has left us on the subject is, that he was sent, though but for a short period, to the free-school of Stratford, a seminary founded in the reign of Henry the Sixth, by the Rev. —— Jolepe, M. A., a native of the town; and which, after sharing, at the general dissolution of chantries, religious houses, &c. the usual fate, was restored and patronised by Edward the Sixth, a short time previous to his death. Here it was, that he acquired the _small Latin and less Greek_, which Jonson has attributed to him, a mode of phraseology from which it must be inferred, that he was at _least acquainted_ with _both_ languages; and, perhaps, we may add, that he who has obtained some knowledge of Greek, however slight, may, with little hesitation, be supposed to have proceeded considerably beyond the limits of mere elementary instruction in Latin.

At the period when Shakspeare was sent to school, the study of the classical languages had made, since the era of the revival of literature, a very rapid progress. Grammars and Dictionaries, by various authors, had been published[25:A]; but the grammatical institute then in general use, both in town and country, was the Grammar of Henry the Eighth, which, by the order of Queen Elizabeth, in her Injunctions of 1559, was admitted, to the exclusion of all others: "Every schoolmaster," says the thirty-ninth Injunction, "shall teach the grammar set forth by King Henrie the Eighth, of noble memorie, and continued in the time of Edward the Sixth, and _none other_;" and in the Booke of certain Cannons, 1571, it is again directed, "that no other grammar shall be taught, but only that which the Queen's Majestie hath commanded to be read in all schooles, through the whole realm."

With the exception of Wolsey's _Rudimenta Grammatices_, printed in 1536, and taught in his school at Ipswich, and a similar work of Collet's, established in his seminary in St. Paul's churchyard, this was the grammar publicly and universally adopted, and without doubt the instructor of Shakspeare in the language of Rome.

Another initiatory work, which we may almost confidently affirm him to have studied under the tuition of the master of the free-school at Stratford, was the production of one Ockland, and entitled EIPHNAPXIA, _sive_ ELIZABETHA. The object of this book, which is written in Latin verse, is to panegyrise the characters and government of Elizabeth and her ministers, and it was,

therefore, enjoined by authority to be read as a classic in every grammar-school, and to be indelibly impressed upon the memory of every young scholar in the kingdom; "a matchless contrivance," remarks Bishop Hurd, "to imprint a sense of loyalty on the minds of the people."[26:A]

To these school-books, to which, being introduced by compulsory edicts, there is no doubt Shakspeare was indebted for some learning and much loyalty, may be added, as another resource to which he was directed by his master, the Dictionary of Syr Thomas Elliot, declaring Latin by English, as greatly improved and enriched by Thomas Cooper in 1552. This lexicon, the most copious and celebrated of its day, was received into almost every school, and underwent numerous editions, namely, in 1559, and in 1565, under the title of _Thesaurus Linguæ Romanæ et Britannicæ_, and again in 1573, 1578, and 1584. Elizabeth not only recommended the lexicon of Cooper, and professed the highest esteem for him, in consequence of the great utility of his work toward the promotion of classical literature, but she more substantially expressed her opinion of his worth by promoting him to the deanery of Gloucester in 1569, and to the bishoprics of Lincoln and Winchester in 1570 and 1584, at which latter see he died on the 29th of April, 1594.[27:A]

Thus far we may be allowed, on good grounds, to trace the very books which were placed in the hands of Shakspeare, during his short noviciate in classical learning; to proceed farther, would be to indulge in mere conjecture, but we may add, and with every just reason for the inference, that from these productions, and from the few minor classics which he had time to study at this seminary, all that the most precocious genius, at such a period of life, and under so transient a direction of the mind to classic lore, could acquire, was obtained.[27:B]

The universality of classical education about the era of 1575, when, it is probable, Shakspeare had not long entered on the acquisitions of the Latin elements, was such that no person of rank or property could be deemed accomplished who had not been thoroughly imbued with the learning and mythology of Greece and Rome. The knowledge which had been previously confined to the clergy or professed scholars, became now diffused among the nobility and gentry, and even influenced, in a considerable degree, the minds and manners of the softer sex. Elizabeth herself led the way in this career of erudition, and she was soon followed by the ladies of her court, who were taught, as Warton observes, not only to distil strong waters, but to construe Greek.[28:A]

The fashion of the court speedily became, to a certain extent, the fashion of the country, and every individual possessed of a decent competency, was solicitous that his children should acquire the literature in vogue. Had the father of our poet continued in prosperous circumstances, there is every reason to conclude that his son would have had the opportunity of acquiring the customary erudition of the times; but we have already seen, that in 1579 he was so reduced in fortune, as to be excused a weekly payment of 4_d._, a state of depression which had no doubt existed some time before it attracted the notice of the corporation of Stratford.

One result therefore of these pecuniary difficulties was the removal of young Shakspeare from the free-school, an event which has occasioned, among his biographers and numerous commentators, much controversy and conjecture as to the extent of his classical attainments.

From the short period which tradition allows us to suppose that our poet continued under the instruction of a master, we have a right to conclude that, notwithstanding his genius and industry, he must necessarily have made a very superficial acquaintance with the learned languages. That he was called home to assist his father, we are told by Mr. Rowe; and consequently, as the family was numerous and under the pressure of poverty, it is not likely that he found much time to prosecute what he had commenced at school. The accounts, therefore, which have descended to us, on the authority of Ben Jonson, Drayton, Suckling, &c. that he had not much learning, that he depended almost exclusively on his _native_ genius, (_that his Latin was small and his Greek less_,) ought to have been, without scruple, admitted. Fuller, who was a diligent and accurate enquirer, has given us in his Worthies, printed in 1662, the most full and express opinion on the subject. "He was an eminent instance," he remarks, "of the truth of that rule, _Poeta non fit, sed nascitur_; one is not _made_ but _born_ a poet. Indeed his learning was _very little_, so that as _Cornish diamonds_ are not polished by any lapidary, but are pointed and smoothed even as they are taken out of the earth, so _nature_ itself was all the _art_ which was used upon him."[29:A]

Notwithstanding this uniform assertion of the contemporaries and immediate successors of Shakspeare, relative to his very imperfect knowledge of the languages of Greece and Rome, many of his modern commentators have strenuously insisted upon his intimacy with both, among whom may be enumerated, as the most zealous and decided on this point, the names of Gildon, Sewell,

Pope, Upton, Grey, and Whalley. The dispute, however, has been nearly, if not altogether terminated, by the _Essay_ of Dr. Farmer _on the Learning of Shakspeare_, who has, by a mode of research equally ingenious and convincing, clearly proved that all the passages which had been triumphantly brought forward as instances of the classical literature of Shakspeare, were taken from translations, or from original, and once popular, productions in his native tongue. Yet the _conclusion_ drawn from this essay, so far as it respects the portion of latinity which our poet had acquired and preserved, as the result of his school-education, appears to us greatly too restricted. "_He remembered_," says the Doctor, "_perhaps enough of his school-boy learning to put the Hig, hag, hog, into the mouth of Sir Hugh Evans_:" and might pick up in the writers of the time, or the course of his conversation, a familiar phrase or two of French or Italian: but his studies were most demonstratively confined to nature and his own language.[30:A]

A very late writer, in combating this part of the _conclusion_ of Dr. Farmer, has advanced an opinion in several respects so similar to our own, that it will be necessary, in justice to him and previous to any further expansion of the idea which we have embraced, to quote his words. "Notwithstanding," says he, "Dr. Farmer's essay on the deficiency of Shakspeare in learning, I must acknowledge myself to be one who does not conceive that his proofs of that fact sufficiently warrant his conclusions from them: 'that his _studies_ were demonstrably confined to nature and his own language' is, as Dr. Farmer concludes, true enough; but when it is added, 'that he only picked up in conversation a familiar phrase or two of French, or remembered enough of his school-boy's learning to put _hig, hag, hog_, in the mouths of others:' he seems to me to go beyond any evidence produced by him of so little knowledge of languages in Shakspeare. He proves indeed sufficiently, that Shakspeare chiefly read English books, by his copying sometimes minutely the very errors made in them, many of which he might have corrected, if he had consulted the original Latin books made use of by those writers: but this does not prove that he was not able to read Latin well enough to examine those originals if he chose; it only proves his indolence and indifference about accuracy in minute articles of no importance to the chief object in view of supplying himself with subjects for dramatic compositions. Do we not every day meet with numberless instances of similar and much greater oversights by persons well skilled in Greek as well as Latin, and professed critics also of the writings and abilities of others? If Shakspeare made an ignorant man pronounce the French word _bras_ like the English _brass_, and evidently on purpose, as being a probable mistake by such an unlearned speaker; has not one learned modern in writing Latin made _Paginibus_ of _Paginis_, and another mentioned a person as being born in the reign of Charles the First, and yet as dying in 1600, full twenty-five years before the accession of that king? Such mistakes arise not from ignorance, but a heedless inattention, while their thoughts are better occupied with more important subjects; as those of Shakspeare were with forming his plots and his characters, instead of examining critically a great Greek volume to see whether he ought to write _on this side of Tiber or on that side of Tiber_; which however very possibly he might not be able to read; but Latin was more universally learnt in that age, and even by women, many of whom could both write and speak it; therefore it is not likely that he should be so very deficient in that language, as some would persuade us, by evidence which does not amount to sufficient proofs of the fact. Nay, even although he had a sufficiency of Latin to understand any Latin book, if he chose to do it, yet how many in modern times, under the same circumstances, are led by mere indolence to prefer translations of them, in case they cannot read Latin with such perfect ease, as never to be at a loss for the meaning of a word, so as to be forced to read some sentences twice over before they can understand them rightly. That Shakspeare was not an eminent Latin scholar may be very true, but that he was so totally ignorant as to know nothing more than _hic, hæc, hoc_, must have better proofs before I can be convinced."[31:A]

The truth seems to be, that Shakspeare, like most boys who have spent but two or three years at a grammar-school, acquired just as much Latin as would enable him, with the assistance of a lexicon, and no little share of assiduity, to construe a minor classic; a degree of acquisition which we every day see, unless forwarded by much leisure and much private industry, immediately becomes stationary, and soon retrograde. Our poet, when taken from the free-school of Stratford, had not only to direct his attention to business, in order to assist in warding off from his father's family the menacing approach of poverty; but it is likewise probable that his leisure, as we shall notice more at large in the next chapter, was engaged in other acquisitions; and when at a subsequent period, and after he had become a married man, his efforts were thrown into a channel perfectly congenial to his taste and talents, still to procure subsistence for the day was the immediate stimulus to exertion. Under these circumstances, and when we likewise recollect that _popular_ favour and applause were essential to his success, and that nearly to the last period of his life he was a prolific caterer for the public in a species of poetry which called for no recondite or learned resources, it is not probable, nay, it is, indeed, scarcely possible, that he should have had time to cultivate and increase his classical attainments, originally and necessarily superficial. To translations, therefore, and to popular and legendary lore, he was alike directed by policy, by inclination, and by want of leisure; yet must we still agree, that, had a proficiency in the learned languages been necessary to his career, the means resided within himself, and that, on the basis merely of his school-education, although limited as we have seen it, he might, had he early and steadily directed his attention to the subject, have built the reputation of a scholar.

That the powers, however, of his vast and capacious mind, especially if we consider the shortness of his life, were not expended on such an attempt, we have reason to rejoice; for though his attainments, as a linguist, were truly trifling, yet his _knowledge_ was great, and his _learning_, in the best sense of the term, that is, as distinct from the mere acquisition of language, multifarious, and extensive beyond that of most of his contemporaries.[32:A]

It is, therefore, to his _English_ studies that we must have recourse for a due estimate of his reading and research; a subject which will be treated of in a future portion of the work.

FOOTNOTES:

[21:A] It is with some apprehension of imposition that I quote the following passage from Mr. Samuel Ireland's Picturesque Views on the River Avon. This gentleman, the father of the youth who endeavoured so grossly to deceive the public by the fabrication of a large mass of MSS. which he attributed to Shakspeare, was undoubtedly, at the time he wrote this book, the complete dupe of his son; and though, as a man of veracity and integrity, to be depended upon with regard to what originated from himself, it is possible, that the settlement which he quotes may have been derived from the same ample store-house of forgery which produced the folio volume of miscellaneous papers, &c. This settlement, in the possession of Mr. Ireland, is brought forward as a proof that the premises in Henley-street were certainly in the occupation of John Shakspeare, the father of the poet; it is dated August 14th, thirty-third of Elizabeth, 1591, and Mr. Ireland professes to give the substance of it in the subsequent terms:—"'That George Badger, senior, of Stratford upon Avon, conveys to John and William Courte, yeomen, and their heirs, in trust, &c. a messuage or tenement, with the appurtenances, in Stratford upon Avon, in a certain streete called Henley-streete, between the house of Robert Johnson on the one part, and the house of _John Shakspeare_ on the other; and also two selions (_i. e._ ridges, or ground between furrows) of land lying between the land of _Thomas Combe_, Gent. on the one hand, and Thomas Reynolde, Gent. on the other.' It is regularly executed, and livery of seisin on the 29th of the same month and year indorsed." _P._ 195, 196.

[22:A] "In a lower room of this public house," says Mr. Samuel Ireland, "which is part of the premises wherein Shakspeare was born, is a curious antient ornament over the chimney, relieved in plaister, which, from the date, 1606, that was originally marked on it, was probably put up at the time, and possibly by the poet himself: although a rude attempt at historic representation, I have yet thought it worth copying, as it has, I believe, passed unnoticed by the multitude of visitors that have been on this spot, or at least has never been made public: and to me it was enough that it held a conspicuous place in the dwelling-house of one who is himself the ornament and pride of the island he inhabited. In 1759, it was repaired and painted in a variety of colours by the old Mr. Thomas Harte before-mentioned, who assured me the motto then round it had been in the old black letter, and dated 1606. The motto runs thus:

=Golith comes with sword and spear, And David with a sling: Although Golith rage and sweare, Down David doth him bring.=" Picturesque Views, p. 192, 193.

[23:A] Picturesque Views, p. 189, 190. It is probable that Mr. Ireland, though, it appears, unconnected with the forgeries of his son, might, during his tour, be too eager in crediting the tales which were told him. One Jordan, a native of Alverton near Stratford, was for many years the usual _cicerone_ to enquirers after Shakspeare, and was esteemed not very accurate in weighing the authenticity of the anecdotes which he related.

[24:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 84, 85.

[25:A] It is possible also that the following grammars and dictionaries, independent of those mentioned in the text, may have contributed to the school-education of Shakspeare:—

1. Certain brief Rules of the Regiment or Construction of the Eight Partes of Speche, in English and Latin, 1537.

2. A short Introduction of Grammar, generallie to be used: compiled and set forth, for the bringyng up of all those that intend to attaine the knowledge of the Latin tongue, 1557.

3. The Scholemaster; or, Plaine and perfite Way of teaching Children to understand, write, and speak, the Latin Tong. By Roger Ascham. 1571.

4. Abecedarium Anglico-Latinum, pro tyrunculis, Ricardo Huloeto exscriptore, 1552.

5. The Short Dictionary, 1558.

6. A little Dictionary; compiled by J. Withals, 1559. Afterwards reprinted in 1568, 1572, 1579, and 1599; and entitled, A Shorte Dictionarie most profitable for young Beginners: and subsequently, A Shorte Dictionarie in Lat. and English.

7. The brefe Dyxcyonary, 1562.

8. Huloets Dictionary; newlye corrected, amended, and enlarged, by John Higgins, 1572.

9. Veron's Dictionary; Latin and English, 1575.

10. An Alvearie, or Quadruple Dictionarie; containing foure sundrie Tongues: namelie, English, Latine, Greeke, and Frenche. Newlie enriched with varietie of wordes, phrases, proverbs, and divers lightsome observations of grammar. By John Baret, 1580.

11. Rider's Dictionary, Latine, and English, 1589.

[26:A] Moral and Political Dialogues, vol. ii. p. 28. edit. 1788.

[27:A] That school-masters and lexicographers were not usually so well rewarded, notwithstanding the high value placed on classical literature at this period, may be drawn from the complaint of Ascham: "It is pitie," says he, "that commonlie more care is had, yea, and that amonge verie wise men, to find out rather a cunnynge man for their horse, than a cunnynge man for their children. They say nay in worde, but they do so in deede. For, to the one they will gladlie give a stipend of 200 crownes by yeare, and loth to offer to the other 200 shillings. God, that sitteth in heaven, laugheth their choice to skorne, and rewardeth their liberalitie as it should; for he suffereth them to have tame, and well ordered horse, but wilde and unfortunate children; and therefore, in the ende, they finde more pleasure in their horse than comforte in their children."—Ascham's Works, Bennet's edition, p. 212.

[27:B] It is more than possible that the Eclogues of Mantuanus the Carmelite may have been one of the school-books of Shakspeare. He is familiarly quoted and praised in the following passage from Love's Labour's Lost:—

"Hol. _Fauste, precor gelidâ quando pecus omne sub umbrâ Ruminat_,—and so forth. Ah, good old Mantua! I may speak of thee as the traveller doth of Venice:

——— _Vinegia, Vinegia, Chi non te rede, ci non te pregia._

Old Mantuan! old Mantuan! who understandeth thee not, loves thee not." Act iv. sc. 2. And his Eclogues, be it remembered, were translated and printed, together with the Latin on the opposite page, for the use of schools, before the commencement of our author's education; and from a passage quoted by Mr. Malone, from Nashe's _Apologie of Pierce Penniless_, 1593, appear to have continued in use long after its termination. "With the first and second leafe, he plaies very prettilie, and, in ordinarie terms of extenuating, verdits Pierce Pennilesse for a grammar-school wit; saies, his margine is as deeply learned as, _Fauste, precor gelidâ_." Mantuanus was translated by George Turberville in 1567, and reprinted in 1591.—_Vide_ Reed's Shakspeare, vol. vii. p. 95.

[28:A] Warton's History of English Poetry, vol. iii. p. 491.

[29:A] Worthies, p. iii. p. 126.

[30:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ii. p. 85.

[31:A] Censura Literaria, vol. ix. p. 285.

[32:A] "If it were asked from what sources," observes Mr. Capel Lofft, "_Shakspeare_ drew these abundant streams of wisdom, carrying with their current the fairest and most unfading flowers of poetry, I should be tempted to say, he had what would be now considered a very reasonable portion of Latin; he was not wholly ignorant of Greek; he had a knowledge of the French, so as to read it with ease; and I believe not less of the Italian. He was habitually conversant in the chronicles of his country. He lived with wise and highly cultivated men; with Jonson, Essex, and Southampton, in familiar friendship. He had deeply imbibed the Scriptures. And his own most acute, profound, active, and original genius (for there never was a truly great poet, nor an aphoristic writer of excellence without these accompanying qualities) must take the lead in the solution." Aphorisms from Shakspeare: Introduction, pp. xii. and xiii.

Again, in speaking of his poems, he remarks—"Transcendent as his original and singular genius was, I think it is not easy, with due attention to _these_ poems, to doubt of his having acquired, when a boy, no ordinary facility in the _classic_ language of Rome;

though his knowledge of it might be small, comparatively, to the knowledge of that great and indefatigable scholar, Ben Jonson. And when Jonson says he had 'less Greek,' had it been true that he had none, it would have been as easy for the verse as for the sentiment to have said 'no Greek.'"—Introduction, p. xxiv.

CHAPTER III.

SHAKSPEARE, AFTER LEAVING SCHOOL, FOLLOWS HIS FATHER'S TRADE—STATEMENT OF AUBREY—PROBABLY PRESENT IN HIS TWELFTH YEAR, AT KENELWORTH, WHEN ELIZABETH VISITED THE EARL OF LEICESTER—TRADITION OF AUBREY CONCERNING HIM—WHETHER THERE IS REASON TO SUPPOSE THAT, AFTER LEAVING HIS FATHER, HE WAS PLACED IN AN ATTORNEY'S OFFICE WHO WAS LIKEWISE SENESCHAL OR STEWARD OF SOME MANOR—ANECDOTES OF SHAKSPEARE—ALLUSIONS IN HIS WORKS TO BARTON, WILNECOTTE AND BARSTON, VILLAGES IN WARWICKSHIRE—EARTHQUAKE IN 1580 ALLUDED TO—WHETHER, AFTER LEAVING SCHOOL, HE ACQUIRED ANY KNOWLEDGE OF THE FRENCH AND ITALIAN LANGUAGES.

That Shakspeare, when taken from the free-school of Stratford, became an assistant to his father in the wool-trade, has been the general opinion of his biographers from the period of Mr. Rowe, who first published the tradition in 1709, to the present day. The anecdote was probably collected by Mr. Betterton the player, who visited Stratford in order to procure intelligence relative to his favourite poet, and from whom Mr. Rowe professes to have derived the greater part of his information.[34:A] A few incidental circumstances tend also to strengthen the account that both father and son were engaged in this employment, and, for a time, together: in the first place, we may mention the discovery already noticed of the arms of the merchants of the wool-staple on a window of the house in which the poet was born[34:B]; secondly, the almost certain conclusion that the poverty of John Shakspeare, which we know to have been considerable in 1579, would naturally incline him to require the assistance of his son, in the only way in which, at that time, he could be serviceable to him; and thirdly, we may adduce the following passages from the works of our Dramatist, which seem to imply a more than theoretic intimacy with his father's business. In the Winter's Tale, the Clown exclaims,

"Let me see:—Every 'leven wether—tods; every tod yields—pound and odd shilling: fifteen hundred shorn,—What comes the wool to?" _Act IV. Scene 2._

Upon this passage Dr. Farmer remarks, "that to _tod_ is used as a verb by dealers in wool; thus, they say, 'Twenty sheep ought to _tod_ fifty pounds of wool,' &c. The meaning, therefore, of the Clown's words is, 'Every eleven wether _tods_; i. e. _will produce a tod_, or twenty-eight pounds of wool; every _tod_ yields a pound and some odd shillings; what then will the wool of fifteen hundred yield?'"

"The occupation of his father," subjoins Mr. Malone, "furnished our poet with accurate knowledge on this subject; for two pounds and a half of wool is, I am told, a very good produce from a sheep at the time of shearing."

"_Every 'leven wether—tods_," adds Mr. Ritson, "has been rightly expounded to mean that the wool of _eleven sheep_ would weigh a _tod_, or 28lb. Each fleece would, therefore, be 2lb. 8oz. 11½dr., and the whole produce of _fifteen hundred shorn 136 tod_, 1 clove, 2lb. 6oz. 2dr. which _at pound and odd shilling per tod_, would yield 143_l._ 3_s._ 0_d._ Our author was too familiar with the subject to be suspected of inaccuracy.

"Indeed it appears from Stafford's _Breefe Conceipte of English Pollicye_, 1581, p. 16, that the price of a tod of wool was at that period _twenty_ or _two_ and _twenty shillings_: so that the medium price was exactly '_pound and odd shilling_.'"[35:A]

In Hamlet, the prince justly observes,

There's a divinity that _shapes our ends_, _Rough-hew_ them how we will. _Act V. Scene 2._

Lines, of which the words in italics were considered by Dr. Farmer as merely technical. "A woolman, butcher, and dealer in _skewers_," says Mr. Stevens, "lately observed to him (Dr. F.), that his nephew, an idle lad, could only _assist_ him in making them; '—he could _rough-hew_ them, but I was obliged to _shape their ends_.' To shape the ends of _wool-skewers_, i. e. to _point_ them, requires a degree of skill; any one can _rough-hew_ them. Whoever recollects the profession of Shakspeare's father, will admit that his son might be no stranger to such terms. I have frequently seen packages of wool pinned up with _skewers_."[36:A]

We may, therefore, after duly considering all the evidence that can now be obtained, pretty confidently acquiesce in the traditional account that Shakspeare was, for a time, and that immediately on his being taken from the free-school, the assistant of his father in the wool-trade; but it will be necessary here to mention, that Aubrey, on whose authority it has been related that John Shakspeare was, at one period of his life, a butcher, adds, with regard to our poet, that "when he was a boy, he exercised his father's trade;" and that "when he killed a calfe, he would do it in a _high style_, and make a speech."[36:B] That John Shakspeare, when under the pressure of adversity, might combine the two employments, which are, in a certain degree, connected with each other, we have already recorded as probable; it is very possible, also, that the following similes may have been suggested to the son, by what he had occasionally observed at home:

And as the butcher takes away the calf, And binds the wretch, and beats it when it strays, Bearing it to the bloody slaughter-house; Even so, remorseless, have they borne him hence. And as the dam runs lowing up and down, Looking the way her harmless young one went, And can do nought but wail her darling's loss; Even so, &c. &c. _Henry VI. Part II. Act III. Scene 1._

but that the father of our poet, the former bailiff of Stratford, should employ his children, instead of servants, in the slaughter of his cattle, is a position so revolting, so unnecessarily degrading on the part of the father, and, at the same time, must have been so discordant with the well-known humane and gentle cast of the poet's disposition, that we cannot, for a moment, allow ourselves to conceive that any credibility can be attached to such a report.

At what age he began to assist his father in the wool-trade, cannot now be positively ascertained; but as he was early taken from school, for this purpose, we shall probably not err far, if we suppose this change to have taken place when he was _twelve_ years old; a computation which includes a period of scholastic education sufficiently long to have imbued him with just such a portion of classical lore, as an impartial enquirer into his life and works would be willing to admit.

A short time previous to this, when our poet was in his twelfth year, and in the summer of 1575, an event occurred which must have made a great impression on his mind; the visit of Queen Elizabeth to the magnificent Earl of Leicester, at Kenelworth Castle. That young Shakspeare was a spectator of the festivities on this occasion, was first suggested by Bishop Percy[37:A], who, in his Essay on the Origin of the English Stage, speaking of the old Coventry play of Hock Tuesday, which was performed before Her Majesty during her residence at the castle, observes,—"Whatever this old play, or 'storial show,' was at the time it was exhibited to Queen Elizabeth, it had probably our young Shakspeare for a spectator, who was then in his twelfth year, and doubtless attended with all the inhabitants of the surrounding country at these 'Princely Pleasures of Kenelworth,'[37:B] _whence Stratford is only a few miles distant_. And as the Queen was much diverted with the Coventry play, 'whereat Her Majestie laught well,' and rewarded the performers with two bucks, and five marks in money: who, 'what rejoicing upon their ample reward, and what triumphing upon the good acceptance, vaunted their play was never so dignified, nor ever any players before so beatified:' but especially if our young Bard afterwards gained admittance into the castle to see a play, which the same evening, after supper, was there 'presented of a very good theme, but so set forth by the actors' well-handling, that pleasure and mirth made it seem very short,' though it lasted two good hours and more, we may imagine what an impression was made on his infant mind. Indeed the dramatic cast of many parts of that superb entertainment, which continued nineteen days, and was the most splendid of the kind ever attempted in this kingdom, must have had a very great effect on a young imagination, whose dramatic powers were hereafter to astonish the world."[38:A]

Of the gorgeous splendour, and elaborate pageantry which were displayed during this princely fete at Kenelworth, some idea may be formed from the following summary. The Earl met the Queen on Saturday the 9th of July 1575, at Long Ichington, a town seven miles from Kenelworth, where His Lordship had erected a tent, for the purpose of banqueting Her Majesty, upon such a magnificent scale, "that justly for dignity," says Laneham, "may be comparable with a beautiful palace; and for greatness and quantity, with a proper town, or rather a citadel;" and to give his readers an adequate conception of its vast magnitude, he adds that "it had seven cart load of pins pertaining to it."[38:B] At the first entrance of the Queen into His Lordship's castle a floating island was discerned upon the pool, glittering with torches, on which sat the Lady of the Lake, attended by two nymphs, who addressed Her Majesty in verse, with an historical account of the antiquity and owners of the castle; and the speech was closed with the sound of cornets, and other instruments of loud music. Within the base-court was erected a stately bridge, twenty feet wide, and seventy feet long, over which the Queen was to pass; and on each side stood columns, with presents upon them to Her Majesty from the gods. Silvanus offered a cage of wild-fowl, and Pomona various sorts of fruits; Ceres gave corn, and Bacchus wine; Neptune presented sea-fish; Mars the habiliments of war; and Phœbus all kinds of musical instruments. During the rest of her stay, varieties of sports and shows were daily exhibited. In the chase was a savage-man clad in ivy accompanied by satyrs; there were bear-baitings and fire-works, Italian tumblers, and a country brideale, running at the Quintain, and Morrice-dancing. And, that no sort of diversion might be omitted, hither came the Coventry-men and acted the old play already mentioned, called Hock Tuesday, a kind of tilting

match, representing, in dumb show, the defeat of the Danes by the English, in the reign of King Ethelred. There were besides on the pool, a Triton riding on a Mermaid eighteen feet long, and Arion upon a Dolphin. To grace the entertainment, the Queen here knighted Sir Thomas Cecil, eldest son to the lord treasurer; Sir Henry Cobham, brother to the Lord Cobham; Sir Francis Stanhope, and Sir Thomas Tresham. An estimate may be formed of the expense from the quantity of ordinary beer, that was drank upon this occasion, which amounted to three hundred and twenty hogsheads.[39:A]

To the ardent and opening mind of our youthful Bard what exquisite delight must this grand festival have imparted, the splendour of which, as Bishop Hurd remarks, "claims a remembrance even in the annals of our country."[39:B] A considerable portion of the very mythology which he had just been studying at school, was here brought before his eyes, of which the costume and language were under the direction of the first poets of the age; and the dramatic cast of the whole pageantry, whether classical or Gothic, was such, as probably to impress his glowing imagination with that bias for theatrical amusements, which afterwards proved the basis of his own glory, and of his country's poetic fame.

Here, could he revisit the glimpses of the day, how justly might he deplore, in his own inimitable language, the havoc of time, and the mutability of human grandeur; of this princely castle, once the seat of feudal hospitality, of revelry and song, and of which Laneham, in his quaint style and orthography, has observed,—"Who that considerz untoo the stately seat of _Kenelworth Castl_, the rare beauty of bilding that His Honor hath avaunced; all of the hard quarry-stone: every room so spacious, so well belighted, and so hy roofed within; so seemly too sight by du proportion without; a day tyme, on every side so glittering by glasse; a night, by continuall brightnesse of candel, fyre, and torch-light, transparent thro the lyghtsome wyndow, as it wear the _Egiptian Pharos_ relucent untoo all the _Alexandrian_ coast: or els (too talke merily with my mery freend) thus radiant, as thoogh _Phœbus_ for hiz eaz woold rest him in the _Castl_, and not every night so to travel doown untoo the _Antipodes_; heertoo so fully furnisht of rich apparell and utensilez apted in all points to the best;"[40:A] of this vast pile the very ruins are now so reduced, that the grand gateway, and the banquetting hall, eighty-six feet in length, and forty-five in width, are the only important remains.[40:B]

If Shakspeare were taken as early from school as we have supposed, and his slender attainments in latinity strongly warrant the supposition, it is more than probable, building on the traditional hint in Rowe, of his aid being _wanted at home_[42:A], that he continued to assist his father in the wool-trade for some years; that is, in all likelihood, until his sixteenth or eighteenth year. Mr. Malone, however, not adverting to this tradition, has, in a note to Rowe's Life, declared his belief, "that, _on leaving school_, Shakspeare was placed in the office of some country attorney, or the seneschal of some manor court[43:A]:" a position which we think improbable only in _point of time_; and, in justice to Mr. Malone, it must be added, that in other places he has given a much wider latitude to the period of this engagement.

The circumstances on which this conjecture has been founded, are these:—that, in the first place, throughout the dramas of Shakspeare, there is interspersed such a vast variety of legal phrases and allusions, expressed with such _technical_ accuracy, as to force upon the mind a conviction, that the person who had used them must have been intimately acquainted with the profession of the law; and, secondly, that at the close of Aubrey's manuscript anecdotes of Shakspeare, which are said to have been collected, at an early period, from the information of the neighbours of the poet, it is positively asserted, that our bard "understood Latin pretty well, for he had been in his younger years a schoolmaster in the country."[43:B]

On the first of these data, it has been observed by Mr. Malone, in his "Attempt to ascertain the Order in which the Plays of Shakspeare were written," that the poet's "knowledge of legal terms is not merely such as might be acquired by the casual observation of even his all-comprehending mind; it has the appearance of _technical_ skill; and he is so fond of displaying it on all occasions, that I suspect he was early initiated in at least the forms of law, and was employed, _while he yet remained at Stratford_, in the office of some country-attorney, who was at the same time a petty conveyancer, and perhaps also the seneschal of some manor-court."[43:C] In confirmation of this opinion, various instances are given of his legal phraseology, which we have copied in the note below[43:D]; and here we must remark that the expression, _while he yet remained at Stratford_, leaves the period of his first application to the law, from the time at which he left school to the era of his visiting London, unfixed; a portion of time which we may fairly estimate as including the lapse of _ten_ years.

With regard to the affirmation of Aubrey, that Shakspeare had been in his younger years a schoolmaster in the country, the same ingenious critic very justly remarks, that "many traditional anecdotes, though not perfectly accurate, contain an adumbration of the truth;" and then adds, "I am strongly inclined to think that the assertion contains, though not the truth, yet something like it: I mean that Shakspeare had been employed for some time in his younger years as a _teacher_ in the country; though Dr. Farmer has incontestably proved, that he could not have been a teacher of _Latin_. I have already suggested my opinion, that before his

coming to London he had acquired some share of legal knowledge in the office of a petty country-conveyancer, or in that of the steward of some manorial court. _If he began to apply to this study at the age of eighteen_, two years afterwards he might have been sufficiently conversant with conveyances to have _taught others_ the form of such legal assurances as are usually prepared by country-attorneys; and perhaps spent two or three years in this employment before he removed from Stratford to London. Some uncertain rumour of this kind might have continued to the middle of the last century, and by the time it reached Mr. Aubrey, our poet's original occupation was changed from a scrivener to that of a schoolmaster."[46:A]

In this quotation it will be immediately perceived that the period of our author's application to the study of the law, is now supposed to have occurred _at the age of eighteen_, when he must have been long removed from school, and that he is also conceived to have been a _teacher_ of what he had acquired in the profession.

These conjectures of Mr. Malone, which, in their latter and modified state, appear to me singularly happy, have met with a warm advocate in Mr. Whiter: "The anecdotes," he remarks, "which have been delivered down to us respecting our poet, appear to me neither improbable nor, when duly examined, inconsistent with each other: even those which seem least allied to probability, contain in my opinion the _adumbrata_, if not _expressa signa veritatis_. Mr. Malone has admirably sifted the accounts of _Aubrey_; and there is no truth, that is obtained by a train of reasoning not reducible to demonstration, of which I am more convinced than the conjecture of Mr. Malone, who supposes that Shakspeare, before he quitted Stratford, was employed in such matters of business as belonged to the office of a country-attorney, or the steward of a manor-court. I have stated his conjecture in general terms, that the _fact_, as it relates to our poet's _legal allusions_, might be separated from any accidental circumstances of _historical truth_. I am astonished, however, that Mr. Malone has confirmed his conjecture by so few examples. I can supply him with a very large accession."[46:B]

Mr. Chalmers, however, refuses his aid in the structure of this conjectural fabric, and asserts that Shakspeare might have derived all his technical knowledge of the law from a very few books. "From Totell's Presidents, 1572; from Pulton's Statutes, 1578; and from the Lawier's Logike, 1588."[47:A]

That these books were read by Shakspeare, there can, we think, be little doubt; but this concession by no means militates against the idea of his having been employed for a short period in some profitable branch of the law. After weighing all the evidence which can _now_ be adduced, either for or against the hypothesis, we shall probably make the nearest approximation to the truth in concluding, that the object of our research, having assisted his father for some years in the wool-trade, for which express purpose he had been early taken from school, might deem it necessary, on the prospect of approaching marriage, to acquire some additional means of supporting a domestic establishment, and, accordingly, annexed to his former occupation, or superseded it, by a knowledge of an useful branch of the law, which, by being taught to others, might prove to himself a source of revenue. Thus combining the record of Rowe with the tradition of Aubrey, and with the evidence derived from our author's own works, an inference has been drawn which, though not amounting to certainty, approaches the confine of it with no small pretensions.

Of the events and circumstances which must have occurred to Shakspeare in the interval between his leaving the free-school of Stratford, and his marriage, scarcely any thing has transpired; the following anecdote, however, which is still preserved at Stratford and the neighbouring village of Bidford, may be ascribed with greater propriety to this than to any subsequent period of his life. We shall give it in the words of the author of the "Picturesque Views on the Avon," who professes to have received it on the spot, as one of the traditional treasures of the place. Speaking of Bidford, which is still equally notorious for the excellence of its ale, and the thirsty clay of its inhabitants, he adds, "there were antiently two societies of village-yeomanry in this place, who frequently met under the appellation of Bidford Topers. It was a custom with these heroes to challenge any of their neighbours, famed for the love of good ale, to a drunken combat: among others the people of Stratford were called out to a trial of strength, and in the number of their champions, as the traditional story runs, our Shakspeare, who forswore all thin potations, and addicted himself to ale as lustily as Falstaff to his sack, is said to have entered the lists. In confirmation of this tradition we find an epigram written by Sir Asten Cockayn, and published in his poems in 1658, p. 124: it runs thus—

TO MR. CLEMENT FISHER, OF WINCOT.

SHAKSPEARE, your _Wincot_ ale hath much renown'd, That fox'd a beggar so (by chance was found Sleeping) that there needed not many a word To make him to believe he was a lord: But you affirm (and in it seems most eager) 'Twill make a lord as drunk as any beggar. Bid _Norton_ brew such ale as Shakspeare fancies Did put Kit Sly into such lordly trances: And let us meet there (for a fit of gladness) And drink ourselves merry in sober sadness.

"When the Stratford lads went over to Bidford, they found the topers were gone to Evesham fair; but were told, if they wished to try their strength with the sippers, they were ready for the contest. This being acceded to, our bard and his companions were staggered at the first outset, when they thought it adviseable to sound a retreat, while the means of retreat were practicable; and then had scarce marched half a mile, before they were all forced to lay down more than their arms, and encamp in a very disorderly and unmilitary form, under no better covering than a large crab-tree; and there they rested till morning:

"This tree is yet standing by the side of the road. If, as it has been observed by the late Mr. T. Warton, the meanest hovel to which Shakspeare has an allusion interests curiosity, and acquires an importance, surely the tree that has spread its shade over him, and sheltered him from the dews of the night, has a claim to our attention.

"In the morning, when the company awakened our bard, the story says they intreated him to return to Bidford, and renew the charge; but this he declined, and looking round upon the adjoining villages, exclaimed, 'No! I have had enough; I have drank with

Piping Pebworth, Dancing Marston, Haunted Hillbro', Hungry Grafton, Dudging Exhall, Papist Wicksford, Beggarly Broom, and Drunken Bidford.'

"Of the truth of this story I have very little doubt: it is certain that the crab-tree is known all round the country by the name of Shakspeare's crab; and that the villages to which the allusion is made, all bear the epithets here given them: the people of Pebworth are still famed for their skill on the pipe and tabor: Hillborough is now called Haunted Hillborough; and Grafton is notorious for the poverty of its soil."[50:A]

To the immediate neighbourhood indeed of Stratford, and to the adjacent country, with which, at this early period of his life, our poet seems to have been familiarised by frequent excursions either of pleasure or business, are to be found some allusions in his dramatic works. In the _Taming of the Shrew_, Christopher Sly, being treated with great ceremony and state, on waking in the bed-chamber of the nobleman, exclaims—"What, would you make me mad? Am not I Christopher Sly, old Sly's son of _Burton-Heath_; by birth a pedlar, by education a card-maker, by transmutation a bear-herd, and now by present profession a tinker? Ask Marian Hacket, the fat ale-wife of _Wincot_, if she know me not: if she say I am not fourteen pence on the score for sheer ale, score me up for the lyingest knave in Christendom. What, I am not bestraught!"[50:B]

There are two villages in Warwickshire called _Burton Dorset_ and _Burton Hastings_; but that which was the residence of old Sly, is, in all probability, _Burton on the Heath_, on the south side of the Avon, opposite to Bidford, and about eighteen miles from Stratford. The first scene of the play is described as _Before an Alehouse on a Heath_, and it is remarkable that on Burton-heath there still remains a tenement, which was formerly a public-house, under the name of Woncott or Onecott: yet there is much reason to conclude, from the mode in which Wincot is spoken of, both in this place, and in the following passage, that Burton-heath and Wincot were considerably distant: in the Second Part of King Henry IV. Davy says to Justice Shallow, "I beseech you, Sir, to countenance William Visor _of Wincot_ against Clemont Perkes of the hill[50:C]," a phraseology which seems to imply, not an insulated house, but a village, an inference which is strongly supported by the fact that _near_ Stratford there is actually a village with the closely resembling name of _Wilnecotte_, which, in the pronunciation and orthography of the common people, would almost necessarily become _Wincot_. It should likewise be mentioned that Mr. Warton is of opinion that this is the place to which Shakspeare alludes, and he adds, "the house kept by our genial hostess still remains, but is at present a mill."[51:A]

We are indebted also to the Second Part of King Henry IV. for another local allusion of a similar kind: Silence, addressing Pistol, nicknames him "goodman Puff of _Barson_[51:B]," a village which, under this appellation, and that of _Barston_, is situated between Coventry and Solyhall. It may indeed excite some surprise that we have not more allusions of this nature to commemorate; that the scenery which occurred to him early in life, and especially at this period, when the imagery drawn from nature must have been impressed on his mind in a manner peculiarly vivid and defined, when he was free from care, unshackled by a family, and at liberty to roam where fancy led him, has not been delineated in some portion of his works, with such accuracy as immediately to designate its origin. For, if we consider the excursive powers of his imagination, and the desultory and unsettled habits which tradition has ascribed to him during his youthful residence at Stratford, we may assert, without fear of contradiction, and as an undoubted truth, that his rambles into the country, and for a poet's purpose, were both frequent and extensive, and that not a stream, a wood, or hamlet, within many miles of his native town, was unvisited by him at various times and under various circumstances.

Yet, if we can seldom point out in his works any distinct reference to the actual scenery of Stratford and its neighbourhood, we may observe, that few of the remarkable events of his own time appear to have escaped his notice; and among these may be found one

which occurred at this juvenile period of his life, and to which we have an allusion in Romeo and Juliet; for though the personages of the drama exist and act in a foreign clime, yet in this, and in many similar instances, he hesitates not to describe the events of his native country as occurring wherever he has chosen to lay the scene. Thus the nurse, describing to Lady Capulet the age at which Juliet was weaned, says

'"Tis since the _earthquake_ now eleven years,"—

a line, which, as Mr. Tyrwhitt and Mr. Malone have observed[52:A], manifestly alludes to a phenomenon of this kind that had been felt throughout England in the year 1580, and of which Holinshed, the favourite historian of our bard, has given the following striking account:—"On the sixt of April (1580), being Wednesdaie in Easter weeke, about six of the clocke toward evening, a sudden earthquake happening in London, and almost generallie throughout all England, caused such an amazednesse among the people as was wonderfull for the time, and caused them to make their earnest praiers to Almighty God! The great clocke bell in the palace at Westminster strake of it selfe against the hammer with the shaking of the earth, as diverse other clocks and bels in the steeples of the cities of London and els-where did the like. The gentlemen of the Temple being then at supper, ran from the tables, and out of their hall with their knives in their hands. The people assembled at the plaie-houses in the fields, as at the Whoreater (the Theater I would saie) were so amazed, that doubting the ruine of the galleries, they made hast to be gone. A péece of the Temple church fell downe, some stones fell from Saint Paule's church in London: and at Christ's church neere to Newgate-market, in the sermon while, a stone fell from the top of the same church, which stone killed out of hand one Thomas Greie an apprentice, and another stone fell on his fellow-servant named Mabell Eueret, and so brused hir that she lived but four daies after. Diverse other at that time in that place were sore hurt, with running out of the church one over an other for feare. The tops of diverse chimnies in the citie fell downe, the houses were so shaken: a part of the castell at Bishops Stratford in Essex fell downe. This earthquake indured in or about London not passing one minute of an houre, and was no more felt. But afterward in Kent, and on the sea coast it was felt three times; and at Sandwich at six of the clocke the land not onelie quaked, but the sea also fomed, so that the ships tottered. At Dover also the same houre was the like, so that a péece of the cliffe fell into the sea, with also a péece of the castell wall there: a piece of Saltwood castell in Kent fell downe: and in the church of Hide the bels were heard to sound. A peece of Sutton church in Kent fell downe, the earthquake being there not onlie felt, but also heard. And in all these places and others in east Kent, the same earthquake was felt three times to move, to wit, at six, at nine, and at eleven of the clocke."[53:A] In this passage, to which we shall again have occasion to revert, the violence and universality of the event described, are such as would almost necessarily form an era for reference in the poet's mind; and the date, indeed, of the _prima stamina_ of the play in which the line above-mentioned is found, may be nearly ascertained by this allusion.

If, as some of his commentators have supposed, Shakspeare possessed any grammatical knowledge of the French and Italian languages, it is highly probable that the acquisition must have been obtained in the interval which took place between his quitting the grammar-school of Stratford and his marriage, a period, if our arrangement be admitted, of about six years; and consequently, any consideration of the subject will almost necessarily claim a place at the close of this chapter.

That the dramas of our great poet exhibit numerous instances in which both these languages are introduced, and especially the former, of which we have an entire scene in Henry V., will not be denied by any reader of his works; nor will any person, acquainted with the literature of his times, venture to affirm, that he might not have acquired by his own industry, and through the medium of the introductory books then in circulation, a sufficient knowledge of French and Italian for all the purposes which he had in view. We cannot therefore agree with Dr. Farmer, when he asserts, that Shakspeare's acquaintance with these languages consisted only of _a familiar phrase or two_ picked up _in the writers of the time, or the course of his conversation_.[54:A]

The corrupted state of the French and Italian passages, as found in the early editions of our poet's plays, can be no argument that he was totally ignorant of these languages; as it would apply with nearly equal force to prove that he was similarly situated with regard to his vernacular tongue, which in almost every scene of these very editions has undergone various and gross corruptions. Nor will greater conviction result, when it is affirmed that this foreign phraseology might be the interpolation of the players; for it remains to be ascertained, that they possessed a larger portion of exotic literature than Shakspeare himself.

The author of an essay on Shakspeare's learning in the _Censura Literaria_, from which we have already quoted a passage in favour of his having made some progress in latinity, is likewise of opinion that his knowledge of the French was greater than Dr. Farmer is willing to allow.

"I have been confirmed in this opinion," he observes, "by a casual discovery of Shakspeare having imitated a whole French line and description in a long French epic poem, written by Garnier, called the _Henriade_, like Voltaire's, and on the same subject, first published in 1594.

"In _As You Like It_, Shakspeare gives an affecting description of the different manners of men in the different ages of life, which closes with these lines:

"What ends this strange eventful history Is second childishness and mere oblivion, Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans every thing."

"Now—why have recourse for an insipid preposition to a language of which he is said to have been totally ignorant? I always supposed therefore that there must have been some peculiar circumstance well known in those times, which must have induced him to give this motley garb to his language:—but what that circumstance was I could not discover until I accidentally in a foreign literary journal, met with a review of a republication of that poem of Garnier at Paris, in which were inserted, as a specimen of the poem, a description of the appearance of the ghost of Admiral Coligny on the night after his murder at the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and in the following lines:

"_Sans pieds, sans mains, sans nez, sans oreilles, sans yeux, Meurtri de toutes parts; la barbe et les cheveux Poudreux, ensanglantez, chose presque incredible! Tant cette vision etoit triste et horrible!_"

"Here it immediately appeared to what author Shakspeare had gone for the archetype of his own description of the last stage of old age, which, by a parody on the above lines, he meant to represent like to that mutilated ghost; and this seems to indicate that he had read that poem in the original; for we even find the _meurtri de toutes parts_ imitated by _sans every thing_. A friend of mine formerly mentioned this to Mr. Steevens, and he has briefly noticed this parody, if I recollect rightly, in his joint edition along with Johnson[55:A], but he did not copy the original lines of Garnier; nor so far as I know any editor since; which however are too remarkable to be altogether consigned to oblivion; and it is not very likely, that any Englishman will ever read through that long dull poem; neither should I myself have known of those lines, if they had not been quoted as a specimen. Steevens's note is so very brief as to be quite obscure in regard to what consequence he thought deducible from the imitation: he seems to suggest as if there might have been some English translation of the poem published, though now unknown; this is the constant refuge for Shakspeare's knowledge of any thing written originally in another language. But even if the fact were true, yet no translator would have preserved the repetition of that word _sans_; for this he must have gone to the French poem itself, therefore must at least have been able to read that line in French, if not also the whole description of the ghost; and if that, why not able also to read other French books? It may indeed, be _supposed_, that some friend may have shown him the above description, and explained to him the meaning of the French lines, but this is only to make a second supposition in order to support a former one made without sufficient foundation: we may just as well make a single supposition at once, that he was himself able to read and understand it, since he has evidently derived from it his own description of the decrepitude of old age. Upon the whole, if his copy of a single word from Holinshed, viz. 'on _this_ side Tiber,' is a proof of his having read that historian, why also is not his copy of the repetition of _sans_, and his parody of Coligny's ghost, an equally good proof of his having read the poem of Garnier in the original French language? To reason otherwise is to say, that when he gives us bad French, this proves him not to understand it; and that when he gives us good French, applied with propriety and even with ingenuity, yet this again equally proves that he neither understood what he wrote, nor was so much as able to read the French lines, which he has thus so wittily imitated."[56:A]

Dr. Farmer has himself granted that Shakspeare _began_ to learn Latin: why then not allow, from premises still more copious and convincing, that he began likewise to learn French and Italian? That he wanted not inclination for the attempt, the frequent use of these languages in his works will sufficiently evince; that he had some leisure at the period which we have appropriated to these acquisitions, namely, between the years 1576 and 1582, few will be disposed to deny; and that he had books which might enable him to make some progress in these studies, the following list will ascertain:—

1. A Treatyse English and French right necessarye and profitable for all young Children. 1560.

2. Principal Rules of the Italian Grammar, &c. Newly corrected and imprinted by Wykes: 1560, reprinted 1567.

3. The Italian Grammar and Dictionary: By W. Thomas. 1561.

4. Lentulo's Italian Grammar, put into English: By Henry Grenthem. 1578.

5. Ploiche, Peter, Introduction to the French Tongue. 1578.

6. An Alvearie, or Quadruple Dictionarie, containing foure sundrie tongues: namelie, English, Latine, Greeke, and French: By I. Baret. 1580.[57:A]

In short, with regard to the literature of Shakspeare, the nearest approximation to the truth will be found to arise from taking a medium course between the conclusions of Dr. Farmer, and of those who have gone into a contrary extreme. That he had made some and that the usual progress in the Latin language during the short period of his school-education, it is, we think, in vain to deny; but that he ever attained the power of reading a Roman classic with facility, cannot with any probability be affirmed: it will be likewise, we are disposed to believe, equally rational and correct, if we conclude, from the evidence which his genius and his works afford, that his acquaintance with the French and Italian languages was not merely confined to the picking up _a familiar phrase or two_ from the conversation or writings of others, but that he had actually commenced, and at an early period too, the study of these languages, though, from his situation, and the circumstances of his life, he had neither the means nor the opportunity of cultivating them to any considerable extent.[58:A]

FOOTNOTES:

[34:A] "Mr. Betterton," observes Mr. Malone, "was born in 1635, and had many opportunities of collecting information relative to Shakspeare, but unfortunately the age in which he lived was not an age of curiosity. Had either he or Dryden or Sir William d'Avenant taken the trouble to visit our poet's youngest daughter, who lived till 1662, or his grand-daughter, who did not die till 1670, many particulars might have been preserved which are now irrecoverably lost. Shakspeare's sister, Joan Hart, who was only five years younger than him, died at Stratford in Nov. 1646, at the age of seventy-six; and from her undoubtedly his two daughters, and his grand-daughter Lady Bernard, had learned several circumstances of his early history antecedent to the year 1600." Reed's Shakspeare, p. 119, 120.

[34:B] It has already been observed, in a note written some years after the composition of the text, that this supposed corroboration is no longer to be depended upon.

[35:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ix. p. 322, 323.

[36:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xviii. p. 346, 347.

[36:B] Aubrey MS.—Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iii. p. 213.

[37:A] Mr. Malone is also of opinion that Shakspeare was present at this magnificent reception of Elizabeth. Vide "Inquiry," p. 150. note 82.

[37:B] So denominated from a tract, written by _George Gascoigne_ Esq., entitled "The Princely Pleasures of Kenelworth Castle." It is inserted in Nichols's Progresses of Queen Elizabeth, vol. i.

[38:A] Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, vol. i. p. 143. 4th edition.

[38:B] Nichols's Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth, vol. i. Laneham's Account of the Queen's Entertainment at Killingworth Castle, 1575, p. 50. or 78. of the original pamphlet.

[39:A] Life of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, 1727. 8vo. p. 92.

[39:B] Hurd's Moral and Political Dialogues, vol. i. p. 148. Edit. of 1788.

[40:A] Laneham's Account, p. 65. of the Original.

[40:B] The following extract from Laneham's Letter, which immediately follows the passage given in the text, and in which I have dropped the author's singular orthography, will afford the reader a curious and very entertaining description of the costly and magnificent gardens of Kenelworth Castle, gardens in which it is probable the youthful Shakpeare had more than once wandered with delight:—

"Unto this, His Honour's exquisite appointment of a beautiful garden, an acre or more of quantity, that lieth on the north there: wherein hard all along the castle-wall is reared a pleasant terrace of a ten foot high, and a twelve broad: even under foot, and fresh of fine grass; as is also the side thereof toward the garden, in which, by sundry equal distances, with obelisks, spheres, and white

bears, all of stone, upon their curious bases, by goodly shew were set: to these two fine arbours redolent by sweet trees and flowers, at each end one, the garden plot under that, with fair allies green by grass, even voided from the borders a both sides, and some (for change) with sand, not light or too soft or soily by dust, but smooth and firm, pleasant to walk on, as a sea-shore when the water is availd: then, much gracified by due proportion of four even quarters: in the midst of each, upon a base a two foot square, and high, seemly bordered of itself, a square pilaster rising pyramidally of a fifteen foot high: simmetrically pierced through from a foot beneath, until a two foot of the top: whereupon for a capital, an orb of a ten inches thick: every of these (with his base) from the ground to the top, of one whole piece; hewn out of hard porphery, and with great art and heed (thinks me) thither conveyed and there erected. Where, further also, by great cast and cost, the sweetness of savour on all sides, made so repirant from the redolent plants and fragrant herbs and flowers, in form, colour, and quantity so deliriously variant; and fruit-trees bedecked with apples, pears, and ripe cherries.

"And unto these, in the midst against the terrace, a square cage, sumptuous and beautiful, joined hard to the north wall (that a that side gards the garden as the garden the castle), of a rare form and excellency, was raised: in height a twenty foot, thirty long, and a fourteen broad. From the ground strong and close, reared breast high, whereat a soil of a fair moulding was couched all about: from that upward, four great windows a front, and two at each end, every one a five foot wide, as many more even above them, divided on all parts by a transome and architrave, so likewise ranging about the cage. Each window arched in the top, and parted from other in even distance by flat fair bolted columns, all in form and beauty like, that supported a comely cornish couched all along upon the bole square; which with a wire net, finely knit, of mashes six square, an inch wide (as it were for a flat roof) and likewise the space of every window with great cunning and comeliness, even and tight was all over-strained. Under the cornish again, every part beautified with great diamonds, emeralds, rubies, and sapphires; pointed, tabled, rok and round; garnished with their gold, by skilful head and hand, and by toil and pencil so lively expressed, as it mought be great marvel and pleasure to consider how near excellency of art could approach unto perfection of nature.

"Holes were there also and caverns in orderly distance and fashion, voided into the wall, as well for heat, for coolness, for roost a nights and refuge in weather, as also for breeding when time is. More, fair even and fresh holly-trees for pearching and proining, set within, toward each end one.

"Hereto, their diversity of meats, their fine several vessels for their water and sundry grains; and a man skilful and diligent to look to them and tend them.

"But (shall I tell you) the silver sounded lute, without the sweet touch of hand; the glorious golden cup, without the fresh fragrant wine; or the rich ring with gem, without the fair featured finger; is nothing indeed in his proper grace and use: even so His Honour accounted of this mansion, till he had placed their tenants according. Had it therefore replenished with lively birds, _English_, _French_, _Spanish_, _Canarian_, and (I am deceived if I saw not some) _African_. Whereby, whether it became more delightsome in change of tunes, and harmony to the ear; or else in difference of colours, kinds, and properties to the eye, I'll tell you if I can, when I have better bethought me.

"In the centre (as it were) of this goodly garden, was there placed a very fair fountain, cast into an eight-square, reared a four foot high; from the midst whereof a column up set in shape of two Athlants joined together a back half; the one looking east, tother west, with their hands upholding a fair formed bowl of a three foot over; from whence sundry fine pipes did lively distill continual streams into the receipt of the fountain, maintained still two foot deep by the same fresh falling water: wherein pleasantly playing to and fro, and round about, carp, tench, bream, and for variety, perch, and eel, fish fair-liking all, and large: In the top, the _ragged staff_; which with the bowl, the pillar, and eight sides beneath, were all hewn out of rich and hard white marble. A one side _Neptune_ with his tridental fuskin triumphing in his throne, trailed into the deep by his marine horses. On another, _Thetis_ in her chariot drawn by her dolphins. Then _Triton_ by his fishes. Here _Proteus_ herding his sea-bulls. There _Doris_ and her daughters solacing a sea and sands. The waves scourging with froth and foam, intermingled in place, with whales, whirlpools, sturgeons, tunnies, conchs, and wealks, all engraven by exquisite device and skill, so as I may think this not much inferior unto _Phœbus_ gates, which (Ovid says) and peradventure a pattern to this, that _Vulcan_ himself did cut: whereof such was the excellency of art, that the work in value surmounted the stuff, and yet were the gates all of clean massy silver.

"Here were things, ye see, mought inflame any mind to long after looking: but whoso was found so hot in desire, with the wreast of a cok was sure of a cooler: water spurting upward with such vehemency, as they should by and by be moistened from top to toe; the he's to some laughing, but the she's to more sport. This some time was occupied to very good pastime.

"A garden then so appointed, as wherein aloft upon sweet shawdowed walk of terrace, in heat of summer, to feel the pleasant whisking wind above, or delectable coolness of the fountain spring beneath: to taste of delicious strawberries, cherries and other fruits, even from their stalks: to smell such fragrancy of sweet odours, breathing from the plants, herbs, and flowers: to hear such natural melodious musick and tunes of birds: to have in eye, for mirth, some time these under springing streams; then, the woods, the waters (for both pool and chase were hard at hand in sight,) the deer, the people (that out of the east arbour in the base court also at hand in view,) the fruits trees, the plants, the herbs, the flowers, the change in colours, the birds flittering, the fountain streaming, the fish swimming, all in such delectable variety, order, dignity; whereby, at one moment, in one place, at hand, without travel, to have so full fruition of so many God's blessings, by entire delight unto all senses (if all can take) at once: for _etymon_ of the word worthy to be called _Paradise_: and though not so goodly as _Paradise_ for want of the fair rivers, yet better a great deal by the lack of so unhappy a tree." Pages 66-72.

[42:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 59.

[43:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 60. note 7.

[43:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iii. p. 214.

[43:C] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ii. p. 276.

[43:D]

'"——— For what in me was _purchased_, Falls upon thee in a much fairer sort.' _K. Hen. IV. P. II._

"_Purchase_ is here used in its strict legal sense, in contradistinction to an acquisition by _descent_.

'Unless the devil have him in _fee-simple, with fine and recovery_.' _Merry Wives of Windsor._

'He is 'rested _on the case_.' _Comedy of Errors._

'——— with _bills_ on their necks, Be it known unto all men by these presents,' &c. _As you like it._

'——— who writes himself armigero, in any _bill, warrant, quittance, or obligation_.' _Merry Wives of Windsor._

'Go with me to a notary, seal me there Your _single bond_.' _Merchant of Venice._

'Say, for non-payment that the debt should double.' _Venus and Adonis._

"On a conditional bond's becoming forfeited for non-payment of money borrowed, the whole penalty, which is usually the double of the principal sum lent by the obligee, was formerly recoverable at law. To this our poet here alludes.

'But the defendant doth that plea deny; To 'cide his title, is impanell'd A quest of thoughts.' _Sonnet 46._

"In _Much Ado about Nothing_, Dogberry charges the watch to keep their _fellow's counsel and their own_. This Shakspeare transferred from the oath of a grand juryman.

'And let my officers of such a nature Make an _extent_ upon his house and lands.' _As you like it._

'He was taken _with the manner_.' _Love's Labour's lost._

'_Enfeof'd_ himself to popularity.' _K. Hen. IV. P. I._

'He will seal the fee-simple of his salvation, and cut the entail from all remainders, and a perpetual succession for it perpetually.' _All's Well that ends Well._

'Why, let her _accept before excepted_.' _Twelfth Night._

'——— which is four terms or two actions;—and he shall laugh without _intervallums_.' _K. Hen. IV. P. II._

'——— keeps leets and _law-days_.' _K. Richard II._

'_Pray in aid_ for kindness.' _Anthony and Cleopatra._

"No writer but one who had been conversant with the technical language of leases and other conveyances, would have used _determination_ as synonymous to _end_. Shakspeare frequently uses the word in that sense. See vol. xii. (Reed's Shakspeare,) p. 202. n. 2.; vol. xiii. p. 127. n. 4.; and (Mr. Malone's edit.) vol. x. p. 202. n. 8. 'From and after the _determination_ of such a term,' is the regular language of conveyancers.

'Humbly complaining to Your Highness.' _K. Richard III._

'Humbly complaining to Your Lordship, your orator,' &c. are the first words of every bill in chancery.

'A kiss in fee farm! In witness whereof these parties interchangeably have set their hands and seals.' _Troilus and Cressida._

'Art thou a _feodary_ for this act?' _Cymbeline._

"See the note on that passage, vol. xviii. p. 507, 508. n. 3. Reed's edit.

'Are those _precepts_ served?' says Shallow to Davy, in _K. Henry IV._

"_Precept_ in this sense is a word only known in the office of a justice of peace.

'Tell me what state, what dignity, what honour, Can'st thou _demise_ to any child of mine?' _K. Richard III._

'——— hath _demised_, granted, and to farm let,' is the constant language of leases. What _poet_ but Shakspeare has used the word _demised_ in this sense?

"Perhaps it may be said, that our author in the same manner may be proved to have been equally conversant with the terms of divinity or physic. Whenever as large a number of instances of his ecclesiastical or medicinal knowledge shall be produced, what has now been stated will certainly not be entitled to any weight." Malone, Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ii. p. 276. n. 9.

[46:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iii. p. 222, 223.

[46:B] Whiter's Specimen of a Commentary, p. 95. note. As Mr. Whiter has not chosen to append these additional examples, I have thought it would be satisfactory to give the few which more immediately occur to my memory.

"Immediately provided in that case." _Midsummer Night's Dream._

"Royally attornied." _Winter's Tale._

"That doth _utter_ all men's ware-a." _Winter's Tale._

"Thy title is _affeer'd_." (This is a law-term for confirmed.)

"Keep leets, and law-days, and in sessions sit." _Othello._

"Why should calamity be full of words? Windy _attorneys_ to their _client_ woes." _Richard III._

"But when the heart's _attorney_ once is mute, The _client_ breaks, as desperate in his suit." _Venus and Adonis._

"So now I have confessed that he is thine, And I myself am _mortgaged to thy Will_." _Sonnet 134._

"He learn'd but, _surety-like_, to write for me, _Under that bond that him as fast doth bind_. The _statute_ of thy beauty, &c." _Sonnet 134._

[47:A] Chalmers's Apology, p. 554. The "Lawiers Logike" was written by Abraham Fraunce.

[50:A] Ireland's Picturesque Views, p. 229-233.

[50:B] Act i. sc. 2.

[50:C] Act v. sc. 1.

[51:A] Mr. Edwards and Mr. Steevens have conjectured that _Barton_ and _Woodmancot_, vulgarly pronounced _Woncot_, in Gloucestershire, might be the places meant by Shakspeare; and Mr. Tollet remarks, that _Woncot_, may be put for _Wolphmancote_, vulgarly _Ovencote_, in Warwickshire. Vide Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ix. p. 30., and vol. xii. p. 240.

[51:B] Act v. sc. 3.

[52:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xx. p. 38. n. 2.

[53:A] Holinshed's Chronicles, vol. iv. p. 126. edit. of 1808.

[54:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ii. p. 85. Mr. Capel Lofft's opinion of the Italian literature of Shakspeare is somewhat more extended than my own. "My impression," says he, "is, that Shakspeare was not unacquainted with the most popular authors in _Italian prose_: and that his ear had listened to the enchanting tones of _Petrarca_ and some others of their great poets." Preface to his Laura, p. cxcii.

[55:A] This notice does not appear in the Variorum edition of 1803.

[56:A] Censura Literaria, vol. ix. p. 287. et seq.

[57:A] Vide Chalmers's Apology, p. 549. and Bibliotheca Reediana, p. 9.

[58:A] Since these observations were written, a work has fallen into my hands under the title of "A Tour in Quest of Genealogy, through several parts of Wales, Somersetshire, and Wiltshire, in a Series of Letters to a Friend in Dublin; interspersed with a description of Stourhead and Stonehenge; together with various Anecdotes and curious Fragments from a Manuscript Collection ascribed to Shakespeare. By a Barrister." London, 1811.

These manuscripts ascribed to Shakspeare, which, from the language and sentiment of almost every line, are manifestly a mere fiction, are said to have been purchased at an auction at Carmarthen, consisting of verses and letters that passed between Shakspeare and his mistress Anne Hatheway, together with letters to and from him and others, a journal of Shakspeare, an account of many of his plays, memoirs of his life by himself, &c. I have mentioned the publication in this place, as it is worthy of remark, that the fabricator of these MSS., whoever he is, appears to have entertained an idea similar to my own, with regard to the period when our poet attempted the acquisition of the modern languages; for of the supposed memoirs said to be written by Shakspeare himself, the following, among others, is given as a specimen:—

"Having an ernest desier to lerne forraine tonges, it was mie good happ to have in mie fathere's howse an Italian, one Girolama Albergi, tho he went bye the name of Francesco Manzini, a dier of woole; but he was not what he wished to passe for; he had the breedinge of a gentilman, and was a righte sounde scholer. It was he taught me the littel Italian I know, and rubbed up my Latten; we redd Bandello's Novells together, from the which I gatherid some delliceous flowres to stick in mie dramattick poseys. He was nevew to Battisto Tibaldi, who made a translacion of the Greek poete, Homar, into Italian; he showed me a coppy of it given him by hys kinsman, Ercole Tibaldi." P. 202.

I must do the author of this literary forgery, however, the justice to say, that in taste and genius he is immeasurably beyond his youthful predecessor, and that some of the verses ascribed to _Anna_ Hatheway, as he terms her, possess no inconsiderable beauties. It is most extraordinary, however, that any individual should venture to bring forward the following lines, which are exquisitely modern in their structure, as the production of a cottage girl of the sixteenth century.

TO THE BELOVYD OF THE MUSES AND MEE.

SWEETE swanne of Avon, thou whoose art Can mould at will the human hart, Can drawe from all who reade or heare, The unresisted smile and teare:

By thee a vyllege maiden found, No care had I for measured sounde; To dresse the fleese that Willie wrought Was all I knewe, was all I sought.

At thie softe lure too quicke I flewe, Enamored of thie songe I grew; The distaffe soone was layd aside, And all mie woork thie straynes supply'd.

Thou gavest at first th' inchanting quill, And everie kiss convay'd thie skill; Unfelt, ye maides, ye cannot tell The wondrous force of suche a spell.

Nor marvell if thie breath transfuse A charme repleate with everie muse; They cluster rounde thie lippes, and thyne Distill theire sweetes improv'd on myne. ANNA HATHEWAY.

CHAPTER IV.

SHAKSPEARE MARRIED TO ANNE HATHAWAY—ACCOUNT OF THE HATHAWAYS—COTTAGE AT SHOTTERY—BIRTH OF HIS ELDEST CHILD, SUSANNA—HAMNET AND JUDITH BAPTIZED—ANECDOTE OF SHAKSPEARE—APPARENTLY SETTLED IN THE COUNTRY.

Shakspeare married and became the father of a family at a very early period; at a period, indeed, when most young men, even in his own days, had only completed their school-education. He had probably been attached also to the object of his affections, who resided very near to him, for a year or two previous to the nuptial connection, which took place in 1582; and Mr. Malone is inclined to believe that the ceremony was performed either at Hampton-Lacy, or at Billesley, in the August of that year[59:A], when consequently the poet had not attained the age of eighteen and a half!

The maiden name of the lady who had induced her lover to enter thus early on the world, with little more than his passion to console, and his genius to support them, was _Anne Hathaway_, the daughter of Richard Hathaway, a substantial yeoman, residing at Shottery, a village about a mile distant from Stratford. It appears also from the tomb-stone of his mistress[60:A] in the church of Stratford, that she must have been born in 1556, and was therefore eight years older than himself.

Of the family of the Hathaways little now, except the record of a few deaths and baptisms, can be ascertained with precision: in the register-books of the parish of Stratford, the following entry, in all probability, refers to the father of the poet's wife:—

"Johanna, daughter of _Richard Hathaway_, otherwise Gardiner, of Shottery, was baptized May 9, 1566."[60:B]

As the register does not commence before 1558, the baptism of _Anne_ could not of course be included; but it appears that the family of this Richard was pretty numerous, for Thomas his son was baptized at Stratford, April 12. 1569; John, another son, Feb. 3. 1574; and William, another son, Nov. 30. 1578.[60:C] Thomas died at Stratford in 1654-5, at the advanced age of eighty-five.[60:D] That the Hathaways have continued resident at Shottery and the neighbourhood, down to the present age, will be evident from the note below, which records their deaths to the year 1785, as inscribed on the floor, in the nave and aisle of Stratford church.[60:E]

The cottage at Shottery, in which Anne and her parents dwelt, is said to be yet standing, and is still pointed out to strangers as a subject of curiosity. It is now impossible to substantiate the truth of the tradition; but Mr. Ireland, who has given a sketch of this cottage in his Picturesque Views on the Avon, observes, "it is still occupied by the descendants of her family, who are poor and numerous. To this same humble cottage I was referred when pursuing the same inquiry, by the late Mr. Harte, of Stratford, before-mentioned. He told me there was an old oak chair, that had always in his remembrance been called Shakspeare's courting chair, with a purse that had been likewise his, and handed down from him to his grand-daughter Lady Bernard, and from her through the Hathaway family to those of the present day. From the best information I was able to collect at the time, I was induced to consider this account as authentic, and from a wish to obtain the smallest trifle appertaining to our Shakspeare, I became a purchaser of these relics. Of the chair I have here given a sketch: it is of a date sufficiently ancient to justify the credibility of its history; and as to farther proof, it must rest on the traditional opinion and the character of this poor family. The purse is about four inches square, and is curiously wrought with small black and white bugles and beads; the tassels are of the same materials. The bed and other furniture in the room where the chair stood, have the appearance of so high antiquity, as to leave no doubt but that they might all have been the furniture of this house long before the time of Shakspeare.

"The proprietor of this furniture, an old woman upwards of seventy, had slept in the bed from her childhood, and was always told it had been there since the house was built. Her absolute refusal to part with this bed at any price was one of the circumstances which led to a persuasion that I had not listened with too easy credulity to the tale she told me respecting the articles I had purchased. By the same person I was informed, that at the time of the Jubilee, the late George Garrick obtained from her a small inkstand, and a pair of fringed gloves, said to have been worn by Shakspeare."[61:A]

Of the personal charms of the poet's mistress nothing has been transmitted to us by which we can form the smallest estimate, nor can we positively ascertain whether convenience, or the attraction of a beautiful form, was the chief promoter of this early connection. Mr. Rowe merely observes, that, "in order to settle in the world after a family-manner, he thought fit to marry while he was yet very[62:A] young;" language which seems to imply that _prudence_ was the prime motive with the youthful bard. Theobald proceeds still further, and declares "it is _probable_, a view of _interest_ might partly sway his conduct in this point: for he married the daughter of a _substantial_ yeoman in his neighbourhood, _and she had the start of him in age no less than eight

years_."[62:B] Capell, on the contrary, thinks that the marriage was contracted against the wishes of his father, whose displeasure was the consequence of their union.[62:C]

A moment's consideration of the character of Shakspeare will induce us to conclude that _interest_ could not be his _leading_ object in forming the matrimonial tie. In no stage of his subsequent life does a motive of this kind appear strongly to have influenced him; and it is well known, from facts which we shall have occasion shortly to record, that his juvenility at Stratford was marked, rather by carelessness and dissipation, than by the cool calculations of pecuniary wisdom. In short, to adopt, with slight variation, a line of his own, we may confidently assert that at this period,

"Love and Liberty crept in the mind and marrow of his youth." _Timon of Athens._

Neither can we agree with Mr. Capell in supposing that the father of our bard was averse to the connection; a supposition which he has built on the idea of old Mr. Shakspeare being "a man of no little substance," and that by this marriage of his son he was disappointed in a design which he had formed of sending him to an [62:D]University! Now it has been proved that John Shakspeare was, at this period, if not in distressed yet in embarrassed circumstances, and that neither the school-education of his son, nor his subsequent employment at home, could be such as was calculated in any degree to prepare him for an academical life.

We conclude, therefore, and certainly, with every probability on our side, that the young poet's attachment to Anne Hathaway was, not only perfectly disinterested, but had met likewise with the approbation of his parents. This will appear with more verisimilitude if we consider, in the first place, that though his bride were eight years older than himself, still she could be but in her twenty-sixth year, an age compatible with youth, and with the most alluring beauty; secondly, it does not appear that the finances of young Shakspeare were in the least improved by the connection; and thirdly, we know that he remained some years at Stratford after his marriage, which it is not likely that he would have done, had he been at variance with his father.

It is to be regretted, and it is indeed somewhat extraordinary, that not a fragment of the bard's poetry, addressed to his Warwickshire beauty, has been rescued from oblivion; for that the muse of Shakspeare did not lie dormant on an occasion so propitious to her inspiration we must believe, both from the costume of the times, and from his own amatory disposition. He has himself told us that

"Never durst poet touch a pen to write, Until his ink were temper'd with love's sighs."— _Love's Labour's Lost_, act iv. sc. 3.

and we have seen that an opportunity for qualification was very early placed within his power. That he availed himself of it, there can be no doubt; and had his effusions, on this occasion, descended to posterity, we should, in all probability, have been made acquainted with several interesting particulars relative to his early life and character, and to the person and disposition of his mistress.[63:A]

Our ignorance on this subject, however, would have been compensated, had any authentic documents been preserved relative to his establishment at Stratford, in consequence of his marriage; but of his domestic arrangements, of his business or professional employment, no information, or tradition to be depended upon, has reached us. We can only infer, from the evidence produced in the preceding chapter, and from the necessity, which must now have occurred, of providing for a family-establishment, that if, as we have reason to conclude, he had entered on the exercise of a branch of the manorial law, previous to his marriage, and with a view towards that event, he would, of course, be compelled, from prudential motives, to continue that occupation, after he had become a householder, and most probably to combine with it the business of a woolstapler, either on his own separate interest, or in concert with his father.

If any further incitement were wanting to his industry, it was soon imparted; for, to the claims upon him as a husband, were added, during the following year, those which attach to the name of a parent; his eldest child, Susanna, being born in May 1583, and baptized on the 26th of the same month. Thus, scarcely had our poet completed his nineteenth year, when the most serious duties of life were imperiously forced upon his attention, under circumstances perhaps of narrow fortune not altogether calculated to render their performance easy and pleasant; a situation which, on a superficial view, would not appear adapted to afford that leisure, that free and unincumbered state of intellect, so necessary to mental exertion; but with Shakspeare the pressure of these and of pecuniary difficulties served only to awaken that energy and elasticity of mind, which, ultimately directing his talents into their proper channel, called forth the brightest and most successful emanations of a genius nearly universal.

The family of the youthful bard gathered round him with rapidity; for, in 1584-5, it was increased by the birth of twins, a son and daughter, named Hamnet and Judith, who were baptized on February the 2d, of the same year.

The boy was christened by the name of Hamnet in compliment to his god-father Mr. Hamnet Sadler, and the girl was called Judith, from a similar deference to his wife, Mrs. Judith Sadler, who acted as her sponsor. Mr. Hamnet or Hamlet Sadler, for they were considered as synonymous names, and therefore used indiscriminately[65:A], appears to have been some relation of the Shakspeare family; he is one of the witnesses to Shakspeare's will, and is remembered in it in the following manner:—"_Item_, I give and bequeath to Hamlet Sadler twenty-six shillings eight-pence, to buy him a ring." Mr. Sadler died at Stratford in October 1624, and is supposed to have been born about the year 1550. His wife was buried there March 23. 1613-14, and Mr. Malone conjectures that our poet was probably god-father to their son _William_, who was baptized at Stratford, February 5. 1597-8.[65:B] In the Stratford Register are to be found entries of the baptism of six of Mr. Sadler's children, four sons and two daughters, William being the last but one.

An anecdote of Shakspeare, unappropriated to any particular period of his life, and which may with as much, if not more, probability, be ascribed to this stage of his biography, as to any subsequent era, has been preserved as a tradition at Stratford. A drunken blacksmith, with a carbuncled face, reeling up to Shakspeare, as he was leaning over a mercer's door, exclaimed, with much vociferation,

"Now, Mr. SHAKSPEARE, tell me, if you can, The difference between a youth and a young man:"

a question which immediately drew from our poet the following reply:

"Thou son of fire, with _thy face like a maple_, The same difference as between a scalded and a coddled apple."

A part of the wit of this anecdote, which, says Mr. Malone, "was related near fifty years ago to a gentleman at Stratford, by a person then above eighty years of age, whose father might have been contemporary with Shakspeare," turns upon the comparison between the blacksmith's face and a species of maple, the bark of which, according to Evelyn, is uncommonly rough, and the grain undulated and crisped into a variety of curls.

It would appear, indeed, from a book published in 1611, under the title of _Tarleton's Jeasts_, that this fancied resemblance was a frequent source of sarcastic wit; for it is there recorded of this once celebrated comedian, that, "as he was performing some part 'at the Bull in Bishopsgate-street, where the Queen's players oftentimes played,' while he was 'kneeling down to aske his father's blessing,' a fellow in the gallery threw an apple at him, which hit him on the cheek. He immediately took up the apple, and, advancing to the audience, addressed them in these lines:

'Gentlemen, this fellow, with _his face of mapple_, Instead of a pippin hath throwne me an apple; But as for an apple he hath cast a crab, So instead of an honest woman God hath sent him a drab.'

'The people,' says the relator, 'laughed heartily; for the fellow had a quean to his wife.'"[66:A]

Shakspeare was now, to all appearance, settled in the country; he was carrying on his own and his father's business; he was married and had a family around him; a situation in which the comforts of domestic privacy might be predicted within his reach, but which augured little of that splendid destiny, that universal fame and unparalleled celebrity, which awaited his future career.

In adherence, therefore, to the plan, which we have announced, of connecting the circumstances of the times with our author's life, we have chosen this period of it, as admirably adapted for the introduction of a survey of country life and manners, its customs, diversions and superstitions, as they existed in the age of Shakspeare. These, therefore, will be the subject of the immediately following chapters, in which it shall be our particular aim, among the numerous authorities to which we shall be obliged to have recourse, to draw from the poet himself those passages which throw light upon the topics as they rise to view; an arrangement which, when it shall have been carried, in all its various branches, through the work, will clearly show, that from Shakspeare, more than from any other poet, is to be collected the history of the times in which he lived, so far as that history relates to popular usage and amusement.

FOOTNOTES:

[59:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 139. note 4.

[60:A] "Heere Lyeth Interrid The Bodye of Anne, Wife of Mr. William Shakespeare, Who Depted. This Life The 6th Day of Avgvst, 1623, Being of The Age of 67 Yeares."—Wheler's Stratford, p. 76.

[60:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 133.

[60:C] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 134. Note by Malone.

[60:D] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 128.

[60:E] "Richard Hathaway, of Shottery, died 15th April, 1692. Robert Hathaway died 4th March, 1728, aged 64. Edmund Hathaway died 14th June, 1729, aged 57. Jane his wife died 12th Dec. 1729, aged 64. John Hathaway died 11th Oct. 1731, aged 39. Abigail, wife of John Hathaway, jun. of Luddington, died 5th of May, 1735, aged 29. Mary her daughter died 13th July, 1735, aged 10 weeks. Robert Hathaway, son of Robert and Sarah Hathaway, died the 1st of March, 1723, aged 21. Ursula, wife of John Hathaway, died the 23d of Janry. 1731, aged 50. John Hathaway, sen. died the 5th of Sept. 1753, aged 73. John Hathaway, of Haddington, died the 23d of June, 1775, aged 67. S. H. 1756. S. H. 1785."—Wheler's History and Antiquities of Stratford-upon-Avon, p. 55.

[61:A] Ireland's Views, p. 206-209.

[62:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 60.

[62:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 193.

[62:C] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 355. note 1.

[62:D] Ibid.

[63:A] Building on the high credibility of Shakspeare having employed his poetical talents, at this period, on the subject nearest to his heart, two ingenious gentlemen have been so obliging as not only to furnish him with words on this occasion, but to offer these to the world as the genuine product of his genius. It is scarcely necessary to add, that I allude to the Shakspeare Papers of young Ireland; and to a Tour in Quest of Genealogy, by a Barrister.

[65:A] Thus in the will of Shakspeare we read, "I give and bequeath to _Hamlet_ Sadler;" when at the close, Mr. Sadler as a witness writes his Christian name _Hamnet_. See Malone's note on this subject, Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 135.

[65:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 158, note 1.

[66:A] Malone's Historical Account of the English Stage, Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iii. p. 140. note 4.

CHAPTER V.

A VIEW OF COUNTRY LIFE DURING THE AGE OF SHAKSPEARE;—ITS MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.—RURAL CHARACTERS.

It may be necessary, in the commencement of this chapter, to remark, that rural life, in the strict acceptation of the term, will be at present the exclusive object of attention; a survey of the manners and customs of the metropolis, and of the superior orders of society, being deferred to a subsequent portion of the work.

No higher character will, therefore, be introduced in this sketch than the _country squire_, constituting according to Harrison, who wrote about the year 1580, one of the second order of gentlemen; for these, he remarks, "be divided into two sorts, as the baronie or estate of lords (which conteineth barons and all above that degree), and also those that be no lords, as knights, esquires, and simple gentlemen."[68:A] He has also furnished us, in another place, with a more precise definition of the character under consideration. "Esquire (which we call commonlie squire) is a French word, and so much in Latine as Scutiger vel Armiger, and such are all those which beare armes, or armoires, testimonies of their race from whence they be descended. They were at the first costerels or bearers of the armes of barons, or knights, and thereby being instructed in martiall knowledge, had that name for a dignitie given to distinguish them from common souldiers called Gregarii Milities when they were together in the field."[68:B]

It is curious to mark the minute distinctions of gentlemen as detailed at this period, in the various books of _Armorie_ or _Heraldrie_. The science, indeed, was cultivated, in the days of Shakspeare, with an enthusiasm which has never since been equalled, and the treatises on the subject were consequently multitudinous.

"—— If no gentleman, why then no arms,"[69:A]

exclaims our poet; the aspirants, therefore, to this distinction were numerous, and in the _Gentleman's Academie_; or, _The Booke of St. Albans_, published by Gervase Markham in 1595, which he says in the dedication was _then_ absolutely "necessarie and behovefull to the accomplishment of the gentlemen of this flourishing ile—in the heroicall and excellent study of Armory," we find "nine sortes" and "foure maner" of gentlemen expressly distinguished.

"Of nine sortes of gentlemen:

"First, there is a gentleman of ancestry and blood.

"A gentleman of blood.

"A gentleman of coat-armour, and those are three, one of the kings badge, another of lordship, and the third of killing a pagan.

"A gentleman untriall: a gentleman Ipocrafet: a gentleman spirituall and temporall: there is also a gentleman spirituall and temporall.—

"The divers manner of gentlemen:

"There are foure maner of gentlemen, to wit, one of auncestrie, which must needes bee of blood, and three of coate-armour, and not of blood: as one a gentleman of coate-armour of the kings badge, which is of armes given him by an herauld: another is, to whome the king giveth a lordeshippe, to a yeoman by his letters pattents, and to his heires for ever, whereby hee may beare the coate-armour of the same lordeshippe: the thirde is, if a yeoman kill a gentleman, Pagan or Sarazen, whereby he may of right weare his coate-armour: and some holde opinion, that if one Christian doe kill an other, and if it be lawfull battell, they may weare each others coate-armour, yet it is not so good as where the Christian killes the Pagan."

We have also the virtues and vices proper or contrary to the character of the gentleman, the former of which are divided into five amorous and four sovereign: "the five amorous are these,—lordly of countenance, sweet in speech, wise in answere, perfitte in government and cherefull to faithfulnes: the foure soveraigne are these fewe,—oathes are no swearing, patient in affliction, knowledge of his owne birth, and to feare to offend his soveraigne."[70:A] The vices which are likewise enumerated as _nine_, are all modifications of cowardice, lechery, and drunkenness.

That the character of the gentleman was still estimated, in the reign of Elizabeth, according to this definition of the Prioress of Sopewell, we have consequently the authority of Markham to assert, who tells us, that the study of his modernised edition of the Booke of St. Albans was still "behovefull to the accomplishment of the gentleman" of 1595.

The mansion-houses of the country-gentlemen were, in the days of Shakspeare, rapidly improving both in their external appearance, and in their interior comforts. During the reign of Henry the Eighth, and even of Mary, they were, if we except their size, little better than cottages, being thatched buildings, covered on the outside with the coarsest clay, and lighted only by lattices; when Harrison wrote, in the age of Elizabeth, though the greater number of manor-houses still remained framed of timber, yet he observes, "such as be latelie builded, are c■monlie either of bricke or hard stone, or both; their roomes large and comelie, and houses of office further distant from their lodgings."[72:A] The old timber mansions, too, were now covered with the finest plaster, which, says the historian, "beside the delectable whitenesse of the stuffe itselfe, is laied on so even and smoothlie, as nothing in my judgment can be done with more exactnesse[73:A]:" and at the same time, the windows, interior decorations, and furniture were becoming greatly more useful and elegant. "Of old time our countrie houses," continues Harrison, "instead of glasse did use much lattise, and that made either of wicker or fine rifts of oke in chekerwise. I read also that some of the better sort, in and before the time of the Saxons, did make panels of horne insteed of glasse, and fix them in woodden calmes. But as horne in windows is now quite laid downe in everie place, so our lattises are also growne into lesse use, because glasse is come to be so plentifull, and within a verie little so good cheape if not better then the other.—The wals of our houses on the inner sides in like sort be either hanged with tapisterie, arras worke, or painted cloths, wherein either diverse histories, or hearbes, beasts, knots, and such like are stained, or else they are seeled with oke of our owne, or wainescot brought hither out of the east countries, whereby the roomes are not a little commanded, made warme, and much more close than otherwise they would be. As for stooves we have not hitherto used them greatlie, yet doo they now begin to be made in diverse houses of the gentrie.—Likewise in the houses of knights, gentlemen, &c. it is not geson to behold generallie their great provision of Turkie worke, pewter, brasse, fine linen, and thereto costlie cupbords of plate, worth five or six hundred or a thousand pounds, to be deemed by estimation."[73:B]

The house of every country-gentleman of property included a neat chapel and a spacious hall; and where the estate and establishment were considerable, the mansion was divided into two parts or sides, one for the state or banqueting-rooms, and the other for the household; but in general, the latter, except in baronial residences, was the only part to be met with, and when complete had the addition of parlours; thus Bacon, in his Essay on Building, describing the houshold side of a mansion, says, "I wish it divided at the first into a hall, and a chappell, with a partition betweene; both of good state and bignesse: and those not to goe all the length, but to have, at the further end, a winter, and a summer parler, both faire: and under these roomes a faire and large cellar, sunke under ground: and likewise, some privie kitchins, with butteries and pantries, and the like."[74:A] It was the custom also to have windows opening from the parlours and passages into the chapel, hall, and kitchen, with the view of overlooking or controlling what might be going on; a trait of vigilant caution, which may still be discovered in some of our ancient colleges and manor-houses, and to which Shakspeare alludes in King Henry the Eighth, where he describes His Majesty and Butts the physician entering at a window above, which overlooks the council-chamber.[74:B] We may add, in illustration of this system of architectural espionage, that Andrew Borde, when giving instructions for building a house in his _Dietarie of Health_, directs "many of the chambers to have a view into the chapel:" and that Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, in a letter, dated 1573, says, "if it please Her Majestie, she may come in through my gallerie, and see the disposition of the hall in dynner-time, at _a window opening thereunto_."[74:C]

The hall of the country-squire was the usual scene of eating and hospitality, at the upper end of which was placed the orsille or high table, a little elevated above the floor, and here the master of the mansion presided, with an authority, if not a state, which almost equalled that of the potent baron. The table was divided into upper and lower messes, by a huge saltcellar, and the rank and consequence of the visitors were marked by the situation of their seats above, and below, the saltcellar; a custom which not only distinguished the relative dignity of the guests, but extended likewise to the nature of the provision, the wine frequently circulating only above the saltcellar, and the dishes below it, being of a coarser kind than those near the head of the table. So prevalent was this uncourteous distinction, that Shakspeare, in his Winter's Tale, written about the year 1604, or 1610, designates the inferior orders of society by the term "_lower messes_."

——————————— "Lower messes, Perchance, are to this business purblind."[75:A]

Dekkar, likewise, in his play called _The Honest Whore_, 1604, mentions in strong terms the degradation of sitting beneath the salt: "Plague him, set him beneath the salt; and let him not touch a bit, till every one has had his full cut."[75:B] Hall too, in the sixth satire of his second book, published in 1597, when depicting the humiliated state of the squire's chaplain, says, that he must not

"ever presume to sit _above the salt_:"

and Jonson, in his Cynthia's Revells, speaking of a coxcomb, says, "his fashion is, not to take knowledge of him that is beneath him in clothes. He never drinkes _below the salt_." See act i. sc. 2.

This invidious regulation appears to have extended far into the seventeenth century; for Massinger in his _City Madam_, acted in 1632, thus notices it:

———————— "My proud lady Admits him to her table, marry, ever _Beneath the salt_, and there he sits the subject Of her contempt and scorn:"[75:C]

and Cartright still later:

——— "Where you are best esteem'd, You only pass under the favourable name Of humble cousins that sit _beneath the salt_." _Love's Convert._

The luxury of eating and of good cooking were well understood in the days of Elizabeth, and the table of the country-squire frequently groaned beneath the burden of its dishes; at Christmas and at Easter especially, the hall became the scene of great festivity; "in gentlemen's houses, at Christmas," says Aubrey, "the first dish that was brought to table was a boar's head, with a lemon in his mouth. At Queen's Coll. Oxon. they still retain this custom, the bearer of it bringing it into the hall, singing to an old tune an old Latin rhyme, _Apri caput defero, &c._ The first dish that was brought up to table on Easter-day was a red-herring riding away on horseback; _i. e._ a herring ordered by the cook something after the likeness of a man on horseback, set in a corn sallad. The custom of eating a gammon of bacon at Easter (which is still kept up in many parts of England) was founded on this, _viz._ to shew their abhorrence of Judaism at that solemn commemoration of our Lord's resurrection."[76:A]

Games and diversions of various kinds, such as mumming, masqueing, dancing, loaf-stealing, &c. &c. were allowed in the hall on these days; and the servants, or heralds, wore the coats of arms of their masters, and cried '_Largesse_' thrice. The hall was usually hung round with the insignia of the squire's amusements, such as hunting, shooting, fishing, &c.; but in case he were a justice of the peace, it assumed a more terrific aspect. "The halls of the justice of peace," observes honest Aubrey, "were dreadful to behold. The skreen was garnished with corslets and helmets, gaping with open mouths, with coats of mail, launces, pikes, halberts, brown bills, bucklers."[76:B]

The following admirable description of an old English hall, which still remains as it existed in the days of Elizabeth, is taken from the notes to Mr. Scott's recent poem of Rokeby, and was communicated to the bard by a friend; the story which it introduces, I have also added, as it likewise occurred in the same reign, and affords a curious though not a pleasing trait of the manners of the times; as, while it gives a dreadful instance of ferocity, it shows with what ease justice, even in the case of the most enormous crimes, might be set aside.

Littlecote-House stands in a low and lonely situation. On three sides it is surrounded by a park that spreads over the adjoining hill; on the fourth, by meadows which are watered by the river Kennet. Close on one side of the house is a thick grove of lofty trees, along the verge of which runs one of the principal avenues to it through the park. It is an irregular building of great antiquity, and was probably erected about the time of the termination of feudal warfare, when defence came no longer to be an object in a country-mansion. Many circumstances in the interior of the house, however, seem appropriate to feudal times. The hall is very spacious, floored with stones, and lighted by large transom windows, that are clothed with casements. Its walls are hung with old military accoutrements, that have long been left a prey to rust. At one end of the hall is a range of coats of mail and helmets, and there is on every side abundance of old-fashioned pistols and guns, many of them with matchlocks. Immediately below the cornice hangs a row of leathern jerkins, made in the form of a shirt, supposed to have been worn as armour by the vassals. A large oak-table, reaching nearly from one end of the room to the other, might have feasted the whole neighbourhood, and an appendage to one end of it made it answer at other times for the old game of shuffle-board. The rest of the furniture is in a suitable style, particularly an arm-chair of cumbrous workmanship, constructed of wood, curiously turned, with a high back and triangular seat, said to have been used by Judge Popham in the reign of Elizabeth. The entrance into the hall is at one end by a low door, communicating with a passage that leads from the outer door, in the front of the house, to a quadrangle within; at the other it opens upon a gloomy staircase, by which you ascend to the first floor, and, passing the doors of some bed-chambers, enter a narrow gallery, which extends along the back front of the house from one end to the other of it, and looks upon an old garden. This gallery is hung with portraits, chiefly in the Spanish dresses of the sixteenth century. In one of the bed-chambers, which you pass in going towards the gallery, is a bedstead with blue furniture, which time has now made dingy and threadbare, and in the bottom of one of the bed-curtains you are shewn a place where a small piece has been cut out and sown in again; a circumstance which serves to identify the scene of the following story:

"It was a dark rainy night in the month of November, that an old midwife sate musing by her cottage fire-side, when on a sudden she was startled by a loud knocking at the door. On opening it she found a horseman, who told her that her assistance was required immediately by a person of rank, and that she should be handsomely rewarded, but that there were reasons for keeping the affair a strict secret, and, therefore, she must submit to be blind-folded, and to be conducted in that condition to the bed-chamber of the lady. After proceeding in silence for many miles through rough and dirty lanes, they stopped, and the midwife was led into a house, which, from the length of her walk through the apartment, as well as the sounds about her, she discovered to be the seat of wealth and power. When the bandage was removed from her eyes, she found herself in a bed-chamber, in which were the lady on whose account she had been sent for, and a man of a haughty and ferocious aspect. The lady was delivered of a fine boy. Immediately the man commanded the midwife to give him the child, and, catching it from her, he hurried across the room, and threw it on the back of the fire, that was blazing in the chimney. The child, however, was strong, and by its struggles rolled itself off upon the hearth, when the ruffian again seized it with fury, and, in spite of the intercession of the midwife, and the more piteous entreaties of the mother, thrust it under the grate, and raking the live coals upon it, soon put an end to its life. The midwife, after spending some time in affording all the relief in her power to the wretched mother, was told that she must be gone. Her former conductor appeared, who again bound her eyes, and conveyed her behind him to her own home; he then paid her handsomely, and departed. The midwife was strongly agitated by the horrors of the preceding night; and she immediately made a deposition of the fact before a magistrate. Two circumstances afforded hopes of detecting the house in which the crime had been committed; one was, that the midwife, as she sate by the bed-side, had, with a view to discover the place, cut out a piece of the bed-curtain, and sown it in again; the other was, that as she had descended the staircase, she had counted the steps. Some suspicions fell upon one Darrell, at that time the proprietor of Littlecote-House and the domain around it. The house was examined, and identified

by the midwife, and Darrell was tried at Salisbury for the murder. By corrupting his judge, he escaped the sentence of the law; but broke his neck by a fall from his horse in hunting, in a few months after. The place where this happened is still known by the name of Darrell's Hill: a spot to be dreaded by the peasant whom the shades of evening have overtaken on his way.

"Littlecote-House is two miles from Hungerford, in Berkshire, through which the Bath road passes. The fact occurred in the reign of Elizabeth. All the important circumstances I have given exactly as they are told in the country." Rokeby, 4to. edit. notes, p. 102-106.

The usual fare of country-gentlemen, relates Harrison, was "foure, five, or six dishes, when they have but _small resort_;" and accordingly, we find that Justice Shallow, when he invites Falstaffe to dinner, issues the following orders: "Some pigeons, Davy; a couple of short-legged hens; a joint of mutton; and any pretty little tiny kickshaws, tell William Cook."[79:A] But on feast-days, and particularly on the festivals above-mentioned, the profusion and cost of the table were astonishing. Harrison observes that the country-gentlemen and merchants contemned butchers meat on such occasions, and vied with the nobility in the production of rare and delicate viands, of which he gives a long list[79:B]; and Massinger says,

"Men may talk of _country-christmasses_— Their thirty-pound butter'd eggs, their pies of carps tongues, Their pheasants drench'd with ambergris, the carcases Of three fat wethers bruised for gravy, to Make sauce for a single peacock; yet their feasts Were fasts, compared with the city's."[80:A]

It was the custom in the houses of the country-gentlemen to retire after dinner, which generally took place about eleven in the morning, to the garden-bower or an arbour in the orchard, in order to partake of the banquet or dessert; thus Shallow, addressing Falstaffe after dinner, exclaims, "Nay, you shall see mine orchard: where, in an _arbour_, we will eat a last year's pippin of my own graffing, with a dish of carraways, and so forth."[80:B] From the banquet it was usual to retire to evening prayer, and thence to supper, between five and six o'clock; for in Shakspeare's time, there were seldom more than two meals, dinner and supper; "heretofore," remarks Harrison, "there hath beene much more time spent in eating and drinking than commonlie is in these daies, for whereas of old we had breakfasts in the forenoone, beverages, or nuntions after dinner, and thereto reare suppers generallie when it was time to go to rest. Now these od repasts, thanked be God, are verie well left, and ech one in manner (except here and there some yoong hungrie stomach that cannot fast till dinner time) contenteth himselfe with dinner and supper onelie. The nobilitie, _gentlemen_, and merchantmen, especiallie at great meetings, doo sit commonlie till two or three of the clocke at afternoone, so that with manie is an hard matter to rise from the table to go to evening praier, and returne from thence to come time enough to supper."[81:A]

The supper which, on days of festivity, was often protracted to a late hour, and often too as substantial as the dinner, was succeeded, especially at Christmas, by gambols of various sorts, and sometimes the squire and his family would mingle in the amusements, or retiring to the tapestried parlour, would leave the hall to the more boisterous mirth of their household; then would the BLIND HARPER, who sold his _FIT of mirth for a groat_, be introduced, either to provoke the dance, or to rouse their wonder by his minstrelsy; his "matter being for the most part stories of old time, as the tale of Sir Topas, the reportes of Bevis of Southampton, Guy of Warwicke, Adam Bell, and Clymme of the Clough, and such other old romances or historical rimes, made purposely for recreation of the common people at Christmasse dinners and brideales."[81:B] Nor was the evening passed by the parlour fire-side dissimilar in its pleasures; the harp of history or romance was frequently made vocal by one of the party. "We ourselves," says Puttenham, who wrote in 1589, "have written for pleasure a little brief romance, or historical ditty, in the English tong of the Isle of Great Britaine, in short and long meetres, and by breaches or divisions, to be more commodiously sung to the harpe in places of assembly, where the company shal be desirous to heare of old adventures, and valiaunces of noble knights in times past, as are those of King Authur and his Knights of the Round Table, Sir Bevys of Southampton, Guy of Warwicke, and others like."[81:C]

The _posset_ at bed-time, closed the joyous day, a custom to which Shakspeare has occasionally alluded; thus Lady Macbeth says of the "surfeited grooms," "I have drugg'd their possets[82:A];" Mrs. Quickly tells Rugby, "Go; and we'll have a posset for't soon at night, in faith, at the latter end of a sea-coal fire[82:B];" and Page, cheering Falstaffe, exclaims, "Thou shall eat a posset to-night at my[82:C] house." Thomas Heywood also, a contemporary of Shakspeare, has particularly noticed this refection as occurring just before bed-time: "Thou shall be welcome to beef and bacon, and perhaps a bag-pudding; and my daughter Nell shall pop a _posset_ upon thee when thou goest to bed."[82:D]

In short, hospitality, a love of festivity, and an ardent attachment to the sports of the field, were prominent traits in the character of the country-gentleman in Shakspeare's days. The floor of his hall was commonly occupied by his greyhounds, and on his hand was usually to be found his favorite hawk. His conversation was very generally on the subject of his diversions; for as Master Stephen

says, "Why you know, an'a man have not skill in the hawking and hunting languages now-a-dayes, I'll not give a rush for him. They are more studied than the _Greeke_, or the _Latine_."[82:E] Classical acquirements were, nevertheless, becoming daily more fashionable and familiar with the character which we are describing; but still an intimacy with heraldry, romance, and the chroniclers, constituted the chief literary wealth of the country-gentleman. In his dress he was plain, though occasionally costly; yet Harrison complains in 1580, that the gaudy trappings of the French were creeping even into the rural and mercantile world: "Neither was it merrier," says he, "with England, than when an Englishman was knowne abroad by his owne cloth, and contented himselfe at home with his fine carsie hosen, and a meane slop: his coat, gowne, and cloak of browne, blue, or puke, with some pretie furniture of velvet or furre, and a doublet of sad tawnie, or blacke velvet, or other comelie silke, without such cuts and gawrish colours as are worne in these daies, and never brought in but by the consent of the French, who thinke themselves the gaiest men, when they have most diversities of jagges and change of colours about them."[83:A]

Of the female part of the family of the country-gentleman, we must be indulged in giving one description from Drayton, which not only particularizes the employments and dress of the younger part of the sex, but is written with the most exquisite simplicity and beauty; he is delineating the well-educated daughter of a country-knight:

"He had, as antique stories tell, A daughter cleaped Dawsabel, A maiden fair and free: And for she was her father's heir, Full well she was ycond the leir Of mickle courtesy.

The silk well couth she twist and twine, And make the fine march-pine, And with the needle work: And she couth help the priest to say His mattins on a holy day, And sing a psalm in kirk.

She wore a frock of frolic green, Might well become a maiden queen, Which seemly was to see; A hood to that so neat and fine, In colour like the columbine, Ywrought full featously.

Her features all as fresh above, As is the grass that grows by Dove, And lythe as lass of Kent. Her skin as soft as Lemster wool, As white as snow on Peakish Hull, Or swan that swims in Trent.

This maiden in a moon betime, Went forth when May was in the prime, To get sweet setywall, The honey-suckle, the harlock, The lily, and the lady-smock, To deck her summer-hall."[84:A]

Some heightening to the picture of the country-gentleman which we have just given, may be drawn from the character of the upstart squire or country-knight, as it has been pourtrayed by Bishop Earle, towards the commencement of the seventeenth century; for the absurd imitation of the one is but an overcharged or caricature exhibition of the costume of the other. The upstart country-gentleman, remarks the Bishop, "is a holiday clown, and differs only in the stuff of his clothes, not the stuff of himself, for he bare the kings sword before he had arms to wield it; yet being once laid o'er the shoulder with a knighthood, he finds the herald his friend. His father was a man of good stock, though but a tanner or usurer; he purchased the land, and his son the title. He has doffed off the name of a country-fellow, but the look not so easy, and his face still bears a relish of churne-milk. He is guarded with more gold lace than all the gentlemen of the country, yet his body makes his clothes still out of fashion. His house-keeping is seen much in the distinct families of dogs, and serving-men attendant on their kennels, and the deepness of their throats is the depth of his discourse. A hawk he esteems the true burden of nobility, and is exceeding ambitious to seem delighted in the sport, and have his fist gloved with his [84:B]jesses. A justice of peace he is to domineer in his parish, and do his neighbour wrong with more right. He will be drunk with his hunters for company, and stain his gentility with droppings of ale. He is fearful of being sheriff of the shire by instinct, and dreads the assize-week as much as the prisoner. In sum, he's but a clod of his own earth, or his land is the dunghill and he the cock that crows over it: and commonly his race is quickly run, and his children's children, though they scape hanging, return to the place from whence they came."[85:A]

Notwithstanding the hospitality which generally prevailed among the country-gentlemen towards the close of the sixteenth century, the injurious custom of deserting their hereditary halls for the luxury and dissipation of the metropolis, began to appear; and, accordingly, Bishop Hall has described in a most finished and picturesque manner the deserted mansion of his days;

"Beat the broad gates, a goodly hollow sound With double echoes doth againe rebound; But not a dog doth bark to welcome thee, Nor churlish porter canst thou chafing see: All dumb and silent, like the dead of night, Or dwelling of some sleepy Sybarite! The marble pavement hid with desert weed, With house-leek, thistle, dock, and hemlock-seed.— Look to the towered chimnies, which should be The wind-pipes of good hospitalitie:—— Lo, there th'unthankful swallow takes her rest, And fills the tunnel with her circled nest."[85:B]

That it was no very uncommon thing for country-gentlemen to spend their Christmas in London at this period, is evident from a letter preserved by Mr. Lodge, in his Illustrations of British History; it is written by William Fleetwood, afterwards Queen's Serjeant, to the Earl of Derby; is dated New Yere's Daye, 1589, and contains the following passage:—"The gentlemen of Norff. and Suffolk were commanded to dep{r}te from London before Xtemmas, and to repaire to their countries, and there to kepe hospitalitie amongest their neighbours.[86:A]" The fashion, however, of annually visiting the capital did not become general, nor did the character of the country-squire, such as it was in the days of Shakspeare, alter materially during the following century.[86:B]

The _country-clergyman_, the next character we shall attempt to notice, was distinguished, in the time of Shakspeare, by the appellation of _Sir_: a title which the poet has uniformly bestowed on the inferior orders of this profession, as _Sir_ Hugh in the Merry Wives of Windsor, _Sir_ Topas in the Twelfth Night, _Sir_ Oliver in As You like It, and _Sir_ Nathaniel in Love's Labour's lost. This custom, which was not entirely discontinued until the close of the reign of Charles II., owes its origin to the language of our universities, which confers the designation of _Dominus_ on those who have taken their first degree or bachelor of arts, and not, as has been supposed, to any claim which the clergy had upon the order of knighthood. The word _Dominus_ was naturally translated _Sir_; and as almost every clergyman had taken his first degree, it became customary to apply the term to the lower class of the hierarchy. "_Sir_ seems to have been a title," remarks Dr. Percy, "formerly appropriated to such of the inferior clergy as were only _readers_ of the service, and not admitted to be preachers, and therefore were held in the lowest estimation, as appears from a remarkable passage in Machell's MS. _Collections for the History of Westmoreland and Cumberland_, in six volumes, folio, preserved in the Dean and Chapter's library at Carlisle. The Rev. Thomas Machell, author of the Collections, lived temp. Car. II. Speaking of the little chapel of Martindale in the mountains of Westmoreland and Cumberland, the writer says, 'There is little remarkable in or about it, but a neat chapel yard, which, by the peculiar care of the old reader, _Sir Richard_[89:A], is kept clean, and as neat as a bowling-green.'

"Within the limits of myne own memory all _readers_ in chapels were called _Sirs_[89:B], and of old have been writ so; whence, I suppose, such of the laity as received the noble order of knighthood being called _Sirs_ too, for distinction sake had _Knight_ writ after them; which had been superfluous, if the title _Sir_ had been peculiar to them."[90:A]

Shakspeare has himself indeed sufficiently marked the distinction between priesthood and knighthood, when he makes Viola say, "I am one that had rather go with _Sir Priest_ than _Sir Knight_."[90:B]

Were we to estimate the diameter of the country-clergy, during the age of Elizabeth, from the sketches which Shakspeare has given us of them, I am afraid we should be induced to appreciate their utility and moral virtue on too low a scale. It will be a fairer plan to exhibit the picture from the delineation of one of their own order, a competent judge, and who was likewise a contemporary. "The apparell of our clergiemen," records Harrison, "is comlie, and, in truth, more decent than ever it was in the popish church: before the universities bound their graduats unto a stable attire, afterward usurped also even by the blind Sir Johns. For if you peruse well my chronolojie, you shall find, that they went either in diverse colors, like plaiers, or in garments of light hew, as yellow, red, greene, &c.: with their shoes piked, their haire crisped, their girdles armed with silver; their shoes, spurres, bridles, &c. buckled with like metall: their apparell (for the most part) of silke, and richlie furred; their cappes laced and butned with gold: so that to meet a priest in those daies, was to behold a peacocke that spreadeth his taile when he danseth before the henne: which now (I saie) is well reformed. Touching hospitalitie, there was never any greater used in England, sith by reason that marriage is permitted to him that will choose that kind of life, their meat and drinke is more orderly and frugallie dressed; their furniture of houshold more convenient, and better looked unto; and the poore oftener fed generallie than heretofore they have beene." Then, alluding to those who reproach the country-clergy for not being so prodigal of good cheer as in former days, he adds, "To such as doo consider of the curtailing of their livings, or excessive prices wherevnto things are growen, and how their course is limited by law, and estate looked into on every side, the cause of their so dooing is well inough perceived. This also offendeth manie, that they should after their deaths leave their substances to their wives and children: whereas they consider not, that in old time such as had no lemans nor bastards (verie few were there God wot of this sort) did leave their goods and possessions to their brethren and kinsfolk, whereby (as I can shew by good record) manie houses of gentilitie have growen and beene erected. If in anie age some one of them did found a college, almes-house, or schoole, if you looke unto these our times, you shall see no fewer deeds of charitie doone, nor better grounded upon the right stub of pietie than before. If you saie that their wives be fond, after the decease of their husbands, and bestow themselves not so advisedlie as their calling requireth, which God knoweth these curious surveiors make small accompt of in truth, further than thereby to gather matter of reprehension: I beseech you then to look into all states of the laitie, and tell me whether some duchesses, countesses, barons, or knights' wives, doo not fullie so often offend in the like as they: for Eve will be Eve, though Adam would saie naie. Not a few also find fault with our thread-bare gowns, as if not our patrons but our

wives were causes of our wo: but if it were knowne to all, that I know to have beene performed of late in Essex, where a minister taking a benefice (of lesse than twentie pounds in the Quéen's bookes so farre as I remember) was inforced to paie to his patrone, twentie quarters of otes, ten quarters of wheat, and sixtéene yéerlie of barleie, which he called hawkes-meat; and another left the like in farme to his patrone forten pounds by the yéere, which is well worth fortie at the least, the cause of our thread-bare gowns would easilie appeere, for such patrones doo scrape the wooll from our clokes."[91:A]

This delineation is, upon the whole, a favourable one; but the author in the very next page admits that the country-clergy had notwithstanding fallen into "general contempt" and "small consideration;" that the cause of this was not merely owing to the poverty of the ministry, but was for the most part attributable either to the iniquity of the patron or the immorality of the priest, will but too clearly appear from the relation of Harrison himself, and from other contemporary evidence. The historian declares that it was the custom of some patrons to "bestow advowsons of benefices upon their bakers, butlers, cookes, good archers, falconers, and horsekéepers, insted of other recompence for their long and faithfull service[92:A];" and the following letter from the Talbot papers presents us with a frightful view of the manners of the country-clergy at the commencement of the reign of James I.

"Ad. Slack to the Lady Bowes.

"Right wor{ll}.

"I understand that one Raphe Cleaton ys curate of the chappell at Buxton; his wages are, out of his neighbour's benevolence, about v{li} yearely: S{r} Charles Cavendishe had the tythes there this last yeare, ether of his owne right or my Lords, as th' inhabitants saye. The minister aforenamed differeth litle from those of the worste sorte, and hath dipt his finger both in manslaughter and p'jurie, &c. The placinge or displacing of the curate there resteth in Mr. Walker, commissarie of Bakewell, of which churche Buxton is a chappell of ease.

"I humbly thanke yo{r} Wor{pp} for yo{re} l{re} to the justices at the cessions; for S{r} Peter Fretchvell, togither w{th} Mr. Bainbrigg, were verie earnest against the badd vicar of Hope; and lykewyse S{r} Jermane Poole, and all the benche, savinge Justice Bentley, who use some vaine —— on his behalfe, and affirmed that my La. Bowes had been disprooved before My Lord of Shrowesburie in reports touching the vicar of Hope; but such answere was made therto as his mouthe was stopped: yet the latter daie, when all the justic's but himselffe and one other were rysen, he wold have had the said vicar lycensed to sell ale in his vicaredge, althoe the whole benche had comanded the contrarye; whereof S{r} Jermane Poole being adv'tised, retyrned to the benche (contradicting his speeche) whoe, w{th} Mr. Bainbrigge, made their warrant to bringe before them, him, or anie other person that shall, for him, or in his vicaridge, brue, or sell ale, &c. He ys not to bee punished by the Justices for the multytude of his women, untyll the basterds whereof he is the reputed father bee brought in. I am the more boulde to wryte so longe of this sorrie matter, in respect you maye take so much better knowledge of S{r} Jo. Bentley, and his p'tialytie in so vile a cause; and esteeme and judge of him accordinge to y{r} wisdome and good discretion. Thus, humbly cravinge p'don, I com■itt y{r} good Wors. to the everlasting Lorde, who ever keepe you. This 12th of Octob. 1609.

"Yo{r} La' humble poore tenant, at comandm{t}.

"AD. SLACK.[93:A]

"To the right wor{ll} my good Ladie, the La. Bowes of Walton, geive theise."

That men who could thus debase themselves should be held in little esteem, and their services ill requited, cannot excite our wonder; and we consequently read without surprise, that in the days of Elizabeth, the minstrel and the cook were often better paid than the priest;—thus on the books of the Stationers' Company for the year 1560, may be found the following entry:

_s._ _d._ "Item, payd to the preacher vi 2 Item, payd to the minstrell xij 0 Item, payd to the coke xv 0"[93:B]

Let us not conclude, however, that the age of Shakspeare was without instances of a far different kind, and that religion and virtue were altogether excluded from what ought to have been their most favoured abode; it will be sufficient to mention the name of _Bernard Gilpin_, the most exemplary of parish-priests, whose humility, benevolence, and exalted piety were never exceeded, and whose ministerial labours were such as to form a noble contrast to the shameful neglect of the pastoral care which existed around him. Indeed we are inclined to infer, notwithstanding the numerous individual instances of profligacy and dissipation which may be brought forward, that the country clergy then, as now, if considered in the aggregate, possessed more real virtue and utility than any other equally numerous body of men; but that aberrations from the stricter decency of their order were, as is still very properly

the case in the present day, marked with avidity, and censured with abhorrence. To the younger clergy in the country, also, was frequently committed the task of education, a labour of unspeakable importance, but in the period of which we are writing, attended too often with the most undeserved contumely and contempt. In the Scholemaster of Ascham may be found the most bitter complaints of the barbarous and disgraceful treatment of the able instructor of youth; and the following sketches of the clerical tutor from Peacham and Hall, will still further heighten and authenticate the picture. The former of these writers observes, "Such is the most base and ridiculous parsimony of many of our Gentlemen, (if I may so terme them) that if they can procure some poore Batchelor of Art from the Universitie to teach their children to say grace, and serve the cure of an impropriation, who wanting meanes and friends, will be content upon the promise of ten pounds a yeere at his first comming, to be pleased with five; the rest to be set off in hope of the next advouson, (which perhaps was sold before the young man was borne): Or if it chance to fall in his time, his lady or master tels him; 'Indeed Sir we are beholden unto you for your paines, such a living is lately falne, but I had before made a promise of it to my butler or bailiffe, for his true and extraordinary service.'

"Is it not commonly seene, that the most Gentlemen will give better wages, and deale more bountifully with a fellow who can but a dogge, or reclaime a hawke, than upon an honest, learned, and well qualified man to bring up their children? It may be, hence it is, that dogges are able to make syllogismes in the fields, when their young masters can conclude nothing at home, if occasion of argument or discourse be offered at the table."[95:A]

The domestic chaplain of Bishop Hall is touched with a glowing pencil, and while it faithfully exhibits the servile and depressed state of the poor tutor, is, at the same time, wrought up with much point and humour.

"A gentle squire would gladly entertaine Into his house some trencher-chapelaine; Some willing man, that might instruct his sons. And that would stand to good conditions. First, that he lie upon the truckle-bed, While his young maister lieth o'er his head: Second, that he do, upon no default, Never presume to sit above the salt: Third, that he never change his trencher twise; Fourth, that he use all common courtesies; Sit bare at meales, and one half rise and wait: Last, that he never his young maister beat; But he must aske his mother to define How manie jerks she would his breech should line. All these observ'd, he could contented be, To give five markes, and winter liverie."[95:B]

From the description of the character of the country clerical tutor, it is an easy transition to that of the _rural pedagogue or schoolmaster_, a personage of not less consequence in the days of Elizabeth, than in the present period. He frequently combined, indeed, in the sixteenth century, the reputation of a conjuror with that of a schoolmaster, and accordingly in the _Comedy of Errors_, _Pinch_, in the dramatis personæ, is described as "a schoolmaster, and a conjuror," and the following not very amiable portrait of his person is given towards the conclusion of the play:—

"They brought one Pinch; a hungry lean-faced villain, A meer anatomy, a mountebank, A thread-bare juggler, and a fortune-teller; A needy, hollow-eye'd, sharp-looking wretch, A living dead man: this pernicious slave, Forsooth, took him on as conjuror."[96:A]

Ben Jonson also alludes to this union of occupations when he says, "I would have ne'er a cunning _schoolemaster_ in England, I mean a Cunningman as a schoolemaster; that is, a Conjurour."[96:B]

A less formidable figure of a schoolmaster has been given us by Shakspeare, under the character of Holofernes, in _Love's Labour's Lost_, where he has drawn a full-length caricature of the too frequent pedantry of this profession. Yet Holofernes, though he speak _a leash of languages at once_, is not deficient either in ability or discrimination; he ridicules with much good sense and humour the literary fops of his day, the "rackers of orthography;" and his conversation is described by his friend, Sir Nathaniel, the Curate, as possessing all the requisites to perfection. "Sir: your reasons at dinner have been sharp and sententious; pleasant without scurrility, witty without affection, audacious without impudency, learned without opinion, and strange without heresy."[96:C] "It is very difficult," remarks Dr. Johnson, "to add any thing to this character of the schoolmaster's table-talk, and perhaps all the precepts of Castiglione will scarcely be found to comprehend a rule for conversation so justly delineated, so widely dilated, and so nicely limited."[96:D]

The country-schoolmasters in the reigns of Elizabeth and James, were, however, if we trust to the accounts of Ascham and Peacham, in general many degrees below the pedagogue of Shakspeare in ability; tyranny and ignorance appear to have been their chief characteristics; to such an extent, indeed, were they deficient in point of necessary knowledge, that Peacham, speaking of bad masters, declares, "it is a generall plague and complaint of the whole land; for, for one discreet and able teacher, you shall finde twenty ignorant and carelesse; who (among so many fertile and delicate wits as _England_ affordeth) whereas they make one scholler, they marre ten."[97:A]

Ascham had endeavoured, by every argument and mode of persuasion in his power, to check the severe and indiscriminate discipline which prevailed among the teachers in his time; it would seem in vain; for Peacham, about the year 1620, found it necessary to recommend lenity in equally strenuous terms, and has given a minute and we have no doubt a faithful picture of the various cruelties to which scholars were then subjected; a summary of the result of this conduct may be drawn, indeed, from his own words, where he says, "Masters for the most part so behave themselves, that their very name is hatefull to the scholler, who trembleth at their comming in, rejoyceth at their absence, and looketh his master (returned) in the the face, as his deadly enemy."[97:B]

To the charges of undue severity and defective literature, we must add, I am afraid, the infinitely more weighty accusation of frequent immorality and buffoonery. Ludovicus Vives, who wrote just before the age of Shakspeare, asserts, that "some schoolmasters taught Ovid's books of love to their scholars, and some made expositions, and expounded the vices[97:C];" and Peacham, at the close of the era we are considering, censures in the strongest terms their too common levity and misconduct: "the diseases whereunto some of them are very subject, are _humour_ and _folly_ (that I may say nothing of the grosse ignorance and insufficiency of many) whereby they become ridiculous and contemptible both in the schoole and abroad. Hence it comes to passe, that in many places, especially in Italy, of all professions that of _pedanteria_ is held in basest repute: the schoole-master almost in every comedy being brought upon the stage, to paralell the _Zani_ or _Pantaloun_. He made us good sport in that excellent comedy of _Pedantius_, acted in our Trinity Colledge in _Cambridge_, and if I be not deceived, in _Priscianus Vapulans_, and many of our English plays.

"I knew one, who in winter would ordinarily in a cold morning, whip his boyes over for no other purpose than to get himselfe a heat: another beat them for swearing, and all the while he sweares himself with horrible oathes, he would forgive any fault saving that.

"I had I remember myselfe (neere _S. Albanes_ in _Hertfordshire_, where I was borne) a master, who by no entreaty would teach any scholler he had, farther than his father had learned before him; as, if he had onely learned but to reade English, the sonne, though he went with him seven yeeres, should goe no further: his reason was, they would then proove saucy rogues, and controule their fathers; yet these are they that oftentimes have our hopefull gentry under their charge and tuition, to bring them in science and civility."[98:A]

We must, I apprehend, from these representations, be induced to conclude, that ignorance, despotism, and self-sufficiency were leading features in the composition of the country-schoolmaster, during this period of our annals; it would not be just, however, to infer from these premises that the larger schools were equally unfortunate in their conductors; on the contrary, most of the public seminaries of the capital, and many in the large provincial towns, were under the regulation of masters highly respectable for their erudition, men, indeed, to whom neither Erasmus nor Joseph Scaliger would have refused the title of ripe and good scholars.

We shall now pass forward, in the series of our rural characters, to the delineation of one of great importance in a national point of view, that of the substantial Farmer or Yeoman, of whom Harrison has left us the following interesting definition:—"This sort of people have a certaine preheminence, and more estimation than labourers and the common sort of artificers, and these commonlie live wealthilie, kéepe good houses, and travell to get riches. They are also for the most part farmers to gentlemen, or at the leastwise artificers, and with grazing, frequenting of markets, and kéeping of servants (not idle servants, as the gentlemen doo, but such as get both their owne and part of their masters living) do come to great welth, in somuch that manie of them are able and doo buie the lands of unthriftie gentlemen, and often setting their sonnes to the schooles, to the universities, and to the Ins of the court; or otherwise leaving them sufficient lands whereupon they may live without labour, doo make them by those meanes to become gentlemen: these were they that in times past made all France afraid. And albeit they be not called master, as gentlemen are, or sir as to knights apperteineth, but onelie John and Thomas, &c.: yet have they beene found to have doone verie good service: and the kings of England in foughten battels, were woont to remaine among them (who were their footmen) as the French kings did amongst their horssemen: the prince thereby shewing where his chiefe strength did consist."[99:A]

After this description of the rank which the farmer held in society, we shall proceed to state the mode in which he commonly lived in the age of Elizabeth; and in doing this we have chosen, as usual, to adopt at considerable length the language of our old writers; a practice to which we shall in future adhere, while detailing the manners, customs, &c. of our ancestors, a practice which has indeed peculiar advantages; for the authenticity of the source is at once apparent, the diction possesses a peculiar charm from its antique cast, and the expression has a raciness and force of colouring, which owes its origin to actual inspection, and which, consequently, it is in vain to expect, on such subjects, from modern composition.

The houses or cottages of the farmer were built, in places abounding in wood, in a very strong and substantial manner, with not more than four, six, or nine inches between stud and stud; but in the open and champaine country, they were compelled to use more flimsy materials, with here and there a girding to which they fastened their splints, and then covered the whole with thick clay to keep out the wind. "Certes this rude kind of building," says Harrison, "made the Spaniards in quéene Maries daies to wonder, but chéeflie when they saw what large diet was used in manie of these so homelie cottages, in so much that one of no small reputation amongst them said after this manner: 'These English (quoth he) have their houses made of sticks and durt, but they fare commonlie so well as the king.' Whereby it appeareth that he liked better of our good fare in such coarse cabins, than of their owne thin diet in their prince-like habitations and palaces."[100:A] The cottages of the peasantry usually consisted of but two rooms on the ground-floor, the outer for the servants, the inner for the master and his family, and they were thatched with straw or sedge; while the dwelling of the substantial farmer was distributed into several rooms above and beneath, was coated with white lime or cement, and was very neatly roofed with reed; hence Tusser, speaking of the farm-house, gives the following directions for repairing and preserving its thatch in the month of May:

"Where houses be reeded (as houses have need) Now pare of the mosse, and go beat in the reed: The juster ye drive it, the smoother and plaine, More handsome ye make it, to shut off the raine."[100:B]

A few years before the era of which we are treating, the venerable Hugh Latimer, describing in one of his impressive sermons the economy of a farmer in his time, tells us that his father, who was a yeoman, had no land of his own, but only "a farm of three or four pounds by the year at the utmost; and hereupon he tilled so much as kept half a dozen men. He had a walk for an hundred sheep; and my mother milked thirty kine. He kept his son at school till he went to the university, and maintained him there; he married his daughters with five pounds or twenty nobles a piece; he kept hospitality with his neighbours, and some alms he gave to the poor; and all this he did out of the said farm."[101:A]

Land let, at this period, it should be remembered, at about a shilling per acre; but in the reign of Elizabeth its value rapidly increased, together with a proportional augmentation of the comfort of the farmer, who even began to exhibit the elegancies and luxuries of life. Of the change which took place in rural economy towards the close of the sixteenth century, the following faithful and interesting picture has been drawn by the pencil of Harrison, who, noticing the additional splendour of gentlemen's houses, remarks,—"In times past the costlie furniture staied _there_, whereas now it is descended yet lower, even unto manie farmers, who by vertue of their old and not of their new leases, have for the most part learned also to garnish their cupbords with plate, their ioined beds with tapistrie and silke hangings, and their tables with carpets and fine naperie, whereby the wealth of our countrie (God be praised therefore, and give us grace to imploie it well) dooth infinitlie appeare. Neither doo I speake this in reproch of anie man, God is my judge, but to shew that I do rejoise rather, to see how God hath blessed us with his good gifts; and whilest I behold how that in a time wherein all things are growen to most excessive prices, and what commoditie so ever is to be had, is daily plucked from the commonaltie by such as looke in to everie trade, we doo yet find the means to obtein and atchive such furniture as here to fore hath beene unpossible. There are old men yet dwelling in the village where I remaine, which have noted three things to be marvellouslie altered in England within their sound remembrance; and other three things too too much encreased. _One_ is, the multitude of chimnies latelie erected, wheras in their yoong daies there were not above two or three, if so manie in most uplandish townes of the realme, (the religious houses, and manor places of their lords alwaies excepted, and peradventure some great personages) but ech one made his fire against a rere dosse in the hall, where he dined and dressed his meat.

"The _second_ is the great (although not generall) amendment of lodging, for (said they) our fathers (yea and wee ourselves also) have lien full oft upon straw pallets, on rough mats covered onlie with a shéet, under coverlets made of dagswain or hop harlots (I use their owne termes) and a good round log under their heads instead of a bolster or pillow. If it were so that our fathers or the good man of the house, had within seven yeares after his mariage purchased a matteres or flockebed, and thereto a sacke of chaffe to rest his head upon, he thought himselfe to be as well lodged as the lord of the towne, that peradventure laie seldome in a bed of downe or whole fethers; so well were they contented, and with such base kind of furniture: which also is not verie much amended as yet in some parts of Bedfordshire, and elsewhere further off from our southerne parts. Pillowes (said they) were thought méet onelie for women in child bed. As for servants, if they had anie shéet above them it was well, for seldome had they anie under their bodies, to kéepe them from the pricking straws that ran oft through the canvas of the pallet, and rased their hardened hides.

"The _third_ thing they tell of, is the exchange of vessell, as of treene platters into pewter, and wodden spoones into silver or tin. For so common was all sorts of tréene stuff in old time, that a man should hardlie find four péeces of pewter (of which one was peradventure a salt) in a good farmer's house, and yet for all this frugalitie (if it may so be justly called) they were scarce able to live

and paie their rents at their daies without selling of a cow, or an horsse, or more, although they paid but foure pounds at the uttermost by the yeare. Such also was their povertie, that if some one od farmer or husbandman had béene at the alehouse, a thing greatlie used in those daies, amongst six or seven of his neighbours, and there in a braverie to shew what store he had, did cast downe his purse, and therein a noble or six shillings in silver unto them (for few such men then cared for gold because it was not so readie paiment, and they were oft inforced to give a penie for the exchange of an angell) it was verie likelie that all the rest could not laie downe so much against it: whereas in my time, although peradventure foure poundes of old rent be improved to fortie, fiftie, or an hundred pounds, yet will the farmer as another palme or date trée thinke his gaines verie small toward the end of his terme, if he have not six or seven yeares rent lieing by him, therewith to purchase a new lease, beside a faire garnish of pewter on his cupbord, with so much in od vessell going about the house, thrée or foure feather beds, so manie coverlids and carpets of tapistrie, a silver salt, a bowle for wine (if not an whole neast) and a dozzen of spoones to furnish up the sute."[103:A]

To this curious delineation of the furniture and household accommodation of the farmer, it will be necessary, in order to complete the sketch, to add a few things relative to his diet and hospitality. Contrary to what has taken place in modern times, the hours for meals were later with the artificer and the husbandman than with the higher order of society; the farmer and his servants usually sitting down to dinner at one o'clock, and to supper at seven, while the nobleman and gentleman took the first at eleven in the morning, and the second at five in the afternoon.

It would appear that, from the cottage to the palace, good eating was as much cultivated in the days of Elizabeth as it has been in any subsequent period; and the rites of hospitality, more especially in the country, were observed with a frequency and cordiality which a further progress in civilisation has rather tended to check, than to increase.

Of the larder of the cotter and the shepherd, and of the hospitality of the former, a pretty accurate idea may be acquired from the simple yet beautiful strains of an old pastoral bard of Elizabeth's days, who, describing a nobleman fatigued by the chase, the heat of the weather, and long fasting, adds that he—

"Did house him in a peakish graunge, Within a forrest great:

Wheare, knowne, and welcom'd, as the place And persons might afforde, Browne bread, whig, bacon, curds, and milke, Were set him on the borde:

A cushion made of lists, a stoole Half backed with a houpe, Were brought him, and he sitteth down Besides a sorry coupe.

The poor old couple wish't their bread Were wheat, their whig were perry, Their bacon beefe, their milke and curds Weare creame, to make him mery."[104:A]

The picture of the shepherd youth is so exquisitely drawn that, though only a portion of it is illustrative of our subject, we cannot avoid giving so much of the text as will render the figure complete.

"Sweet growte, or whig, his bottle had As much as it might hold:

A sheeve of bread as browne as nut, And cheese as white as snowe, And wildings, or the season's fruite, He did in scrip bestow:

And whil'st his py-bald curre did sleepe, And sheep-hooke lay him by, On hollow quilles of oten strawe He piped melody:—

— — — — — — — With the sun He doth his flocke unfold, And all the day on hill or plaine He merrie chat can hold:

And with the sun doth folde againe; Then jogging home betime, _He turnes a crab_, or tunes a round, Or sings some merrie ryme:

Nor lackes he gleeful tales to tell, Whil'st round the bole doth trot; And sitteth singing care away, Till he to bed hath got.

Theare sleeps he soundly all the night, Forgetting morrow cares, Nor feares he blasting of his corne Nor uttering of his wares,

Or stormes by seas, or stirres on land, Or cracke of credite lost, Not spending franklier than his flocke Shall still defray the cost.

Wel wot I, sooth they say that say: More quiet nightes and daies The shepheard sleepes and wakes than he Whose cattel he doth graize."[105:A]

The lines in Italics allude to the favourite beverage of the peasantry, and the mode in which they recreated themselves over the spicy bowl. To _turne a crab_ is to roast a wilding or wild apple in the fire for the purpose of being thrown hissing hot into a bowl of nut-brown ale, into which had been previously put a toast with some spice and sugar. To this delicious compound Shakspeare has

frequently referred; thus in _Love's Labour's Lost_ one of his designations of winter is,

"When roasted crabs hiss in the bowl:"[105:B]

and Puck, describing his own wanton tricks in _Midsummer Night's Dream_, says—

"And sometime lurk I in a gossip's bowl, In very likeness of a roasted crab, And when she drinks, against her lips I bob."[106:A]

The very expression to _turn a crab_ will be found in the following passages from two old plays, in the first of which the good man says he will

"Sit down in _his_ chaire by _his_ wife faire Alison, And _turne a crabbe_ in the fire;"[106:B]

and in the second, Christmas is personified

—— "sitting in a corner _turning crabs_, Or coughing o'er a warmed pot of ale."[106:C]

Nor can we omit, in closing this series of quotations, the following stanza of a fine old song in the curious comedy of _Gammer Gurton's Needle_, first printed in 1575:

"I love no rost, but a nut brown toste, and _a crab layde in the fyre_; A lytle bread shall do me stead, much bread I not desyre.

No froste nor snow, no winde, I trow, can hurte me if I wolde, I am so wrapt, and throwly lapt of joly good ale, and olde.

Back and syde go bare, go bare, booth foote and hande go colde; But belly, God sende thee good ale ynoughe, whether it be newe or olde."[106:D]

To tell gleeful tales, "whilst round the bole doth trot," was an amusement much more common among our ancestors, during the age of Elizabeth, and the subsequent century, than it has been in any later period. The _Winter's Tale_ of Shakspeare owes its title to this custom, of which an example is placed before us in the first scene of the second act.

Her. Come Sir— —— Pray you, sit by us, And tell 's a _tale_.

Mam. Merry, or sad, shal't be?

Her. As merry as you will.[107:A]

And Burton, the first edition of whose Anatomy of Melancholy was published in 1617, enumerates, among the ordinary recreations of Winter, "merry tales of errant knights, queens, lovers, lords, ladies, giants, dwarfs, thieves, cheaters, witches, fayries, goblins, friars, &c.—which some delight to hear, some to tell; all are well pleased with;" and he remarks shortly afterwards, "when three or four good companions meet, they tell old stories by the fire-side, or in the sun, as old folks usually do, remembering afresh and with pleasure antient matters, and such like accidents, which happened in their younger years."[107:B] Milton also, in his _L'Allegro_, first printed in 1645, gives a conspicuous station

—— "to the spicy nut-brown ale, With stories told of many a feat:"

and adds,

"Thus done the tales, to bed they creep, By whispering winds soon lull'd to sleep."[107:C]

The farmer's daily diet may be drawn with sufficient accuracy from the curious old Georgic of Tusser, a poem which, more than any other that we possess, throws light upon the agricultural manners and customs of the age. In Lent, says this entertaining bard, the farmer must in the first place consume his red herring, and afterwards his salt fish, which should be kept in store, indeed, and considered as good even when Lent is past, and with these leeks and peas should be procured for pottage, with the view of saving milk, oatmeal, and bread: at Easter veale and bacon are to be the chief articles; at Martilmas salted beef, "when country folk do dainties lack:" at Midsummer, when mackrel are out of season, grasse (that is sallads, &c.) fresh beef and pease: at Michaelmas fresh herring and fatted [108:A]crones: at All Saints pork and souse, sprats and spurlings: at Christmas he enjoins the farmer to "plaie and make good cheere," and he concludes by advising him, as was the custom in Elizabeth's time, to observe Fridays, Saturdays, and Wednesdays as fish-days; to "keep embrings well and fasting dayes," and of fish and fruit be scarce, to supply their want with butter and cheese.[108:B] To these recommendations he adds, in another place, that

"Good ploughmen look weekly of custom and right, For rostmeat on sundaies, and thursday at night:"

and he subsequently gives directions for writing what he terms "husbandlie posies," that is, economical proverbs in rhyme, to be hung up in the Hall, the parlour, the Ghest's chamber, and the good man's own bed chamber.[108:C]

If the farmer have a visitor, our worthy bard is not illiberal in his allowance, but advises him to place three dishes on his table at dinner, well dressed, which, says he, will be sufficient to pleese your friend, and will _become_ your Hall.[109:A]

On days of feasting and rejoicing, however, it appears to have been a common custom for the guests to bring their victuals with them, forming as it were a pic-nic meal; thus, Harrison, describing the occasional mirth and hospitality of the farmer, says,—"In feasting the husbandmen doo exceed after their maner: especiallie at bridales, purifications of women, and such od meetings, where it is incredible to tell what meat is consumed and spent, ech one bringing such a dish, or so manie with him as his wife and he doo consult upon, but alwaies with this consideration, that the léefer fréend shall have the better provision. This also is commonlie séene at these bankets, that the good man of the house is not charged with any thing saving bread, drink, sauce, houseroome, and fire. (He then gives us the following naïve and pleasing picture of their festivity and content.) The husbandmen are sufficientlie liberall, and verie fréendlie at their tables, and when they méet, they are so merie without malice, and plaine without inward Italian or French craft and subtiltie, that it would doo a man good to be in companie among them. Herein only are the inferiour sort somewhat to be blamed, that being thus assembled, their talke is now and then such as savoureth of scurrilitie and ribaldrie, a thing naturallie incident to carters and clowns, who thinke themselves not to be merie and welcome, if their foolish veines in this behalfe be never so little restreined. This is moreover to be added in these meetings, that if they happen to stumble upon a péece of venison, and a cup of wine or verie strong beere or ale (which latter they commonlie provide against their appointed daies) they thinke their chéere so great, and themselves to have fared so well, as the lord Maior of London, with whome when their bellies be full they will not often sticke to make comparison, (saying, _I have dined so well as my lord maior_) because that of a subject there is no publike officer of anie citie in Europe, that may compare in port and countenance with him during the time of his office."[109:B]

The dress of the farmer during the middle of the sixteenth century was plain and durable; consisting, for common purposes, of coarse gray cloth or fustian, in the form of trunk-hose, frock, or doublet.

To this account of the farmer's mode of living, it will be proper to add a brief description of his coadjutor in domestic economy, the English housewife, a personage of no small importance; for, as honest Tusser has justly observed,

"House keping and husbandry, if it be good, must love one another, as cousinnes in blood. The wife to, must husband as well as the man, or farewel thy husbandry, doe what thou can."[110:A]

Of the qualifications necessary to constitute this useful character, Gervase Markham has given us a very curious detail, in his work entitled "The English Housewife;" which, though not published until the close of the Shakspearian era, appears, from the dedication to Frances, Countess Dowager of Exeter, to have been written long anterior to its transmission to the press; for it is there said, "That much of it was a manuscript which many years ago belonged to an honourable Countess, one of the greatest glories of our[110:B] kingdom." It is a delineation which, as supposed of easy practical application, does honour to the sex and to the age. After expatiating on the necessity of a religious example to her household, on the part of the good housewife, he thus proceeds:

"Next unto her sanctity and holiness of life, it is meet that our _English_ Housewife be a woman of great modesty and temperance, as well inwardly as outwardly; inwardly, as in her behaviour and carriage towards her husband, wherein she shall shun all violence of rage, passion and humour, coveting less to direct than to be directed, appearing ever unto him pleasant, amiable and delightful; and, tho' occasion of mishaps, or the mis-government of his will may induce her to contrary thoughts, yet vertuously to suppress them, and with a mild sufferance rather to call him home from his error, than with the strength of anger to abate the least spark of his evil, calling into her mind, that evil and uncomely language is deformed, though uttered even to servants; but most monstrous and ugly, when it appears before the presence of a husband: outwardly, as in her apparel, and dyet, both which she shall proportion according to the competency of her husband's estate and calling, making her circle rather strait than large: for it is a rule, if we extend to the uttermost, we take away increase; if we go a hairs bredth beyond, we enter into consumption: but if we preserve any part, we build strong forts against the adversaries of fortune, provided that such preservation be honest and conscionable: for as lavish prodigality is brutish, so miserable covetousness is hellish. Let therefore the Housewife's garments be comely and strong, made as well to preserve the health, as to adorn the person, altogether without toyish garnishes, or the gloss of light colours, and as far from the vanity of new and fantastick fashions, as near to the comely imitation of modest matrons. Let her dyet be

wholesome and cleanly, prepared at due hours, and cook'd with care and diligence, let it be rather to satisfie nature, than her affections, and _apter_ to kill _hunger_ than revive _new_ appetites; let it proceed _more_ from the provision of her own yard, than the furniture of the markets; and let it be rather esteemed for the familiar acquaintance she hath without it, than for the strangeness and rarity it bringeth from other countries.

"To conclude, _our English_ Housewife must be of chast thoughts, stout courage, patient, untired, watchful, diligent, witty, pleasant, constant in friendship, full of good neighbour-hood, wise in discourse, but not frequent therein, sharp and quick of speech, but not bitter or talkative, secret in her affairs, comfortable in her counsels, and generally skilful in the worthy knowledges which do belong to her vocation."[111:A]

These knowledges, he then states, should consist in an intimacy with domestic physic, with cookery, with the distillation of waters, with the making and preserving of wines, with the making and dying of cloth, with the conduct of dairies, and with malting, brewing, and baking; for all which he gives very ample directions. Markham, indeed, seems to have taken the greater part of this picture from his predecessor Tusser, in whose poems on husbandry may be found, among many others, the following excellent precepts for the conduct of the good house-wife:—

"In Marche and in Aprill from morning to night: in sowing and setting good huswives delight. To have in their garden or some other plot: to trim up their house and to furnish their pot.

Have millons at Mihelmas, parsneps in lent: in June, buttred beanes, saveth fish to be spent. With those and good pottage inough having than: thou winnest the heart of thy laboring man.

From Aprill begin til saint Andrew be past: so long with good huswives their dairies doe last. Good milche bease and pasture, good husbandes provide: good huswives know best all the rest how to guide.

But huswives, that learne not to make their owne cheese: with trusting of others, have thes for their feese. Their milke slapt in corners their creame al to sost: their milk pannes so flotte, that their cheeses be lost.

Where some of a kowe maketh yerely a pounde: these huswives crye creake for their voice will not sounde. The servauntes suspecting their dame, lye in waighte: with one thing or other they trudge away straight.

Then neighbour (for god's sake) if any such be: if you know a good servant, waine her to me. Such maister, suche man, and such mistres such mayde: such husbandes and huswives, suche houses araide.

For flax and for hemp, for to have of her owne: the wife must in May take good hede it be sowne. And trimme it and kepe it to serve at a nede: the femble to spin and the karle for her fede.

Good husbandes abrode seketh al wel to have: good huswives at home seketh al wel to save. Thus having and saving in place where they meete: make profit with pleasure suche couples to greete.[113:A]"

But it is in "The points of _Huswifry_ united to the comfort of _Husbandry_," of the good old poet, that we recognise the most perfect picture of the domestic economy of agricultural life in the days of Elizabeth. This material addition to the husbandry of our author appeared in 1570, and embraces a complete view of the province of the _Huswife_, with all her daily labours and duties, which are divided into—1st, _Morning Works_; 2dly, _Breakfast Doings_; 3dly, _Dinner Matters_; 4thly, _Afternoon Works_; 5thly, _Evening Works_; 6thly, _Supper-Matters_; and 7thly, _After-Supper Matters_.

From the details of this arrangement we learn, that the servants in summer rose at four, and in winter at five o'clock; that in the latter season they were called to breakfast on the appearance of the day-star, and that the huswife herself was the carver and distributer of the meat and pottage. We find, likewise, and it is the only objectionable article in the admonitions of the poet, that he recommends his dame not to scold, but to thrash heartily her maids when refractory; and he adds a circumstance rather extraordinary, but at the same time strongly recommendatory of the effects of music, that

"Such servants are oftenest painfull and good, That sing in their labour, as birds in the wood."

Dinner, he enjoins, should be taken at noon; should be quickly dispatched; and should exhibit plenty, but no dainties.

The bare table, he observes, will do as well, as if covered with a cloth, which is liable to be cut; and that wooden and pewter dishes and tin vessels for liquor are the best, as most secure; and then, with his accustomed piety, he advises the regular use of grace—

"At dinner, at supper, at morning, at night, Give thanks unto God."

As soon as dinner is over, the servants are again set to work, and he very humanely adds,

"To servant in seikness, see nothing ye grutch, A thing of a trifle shall comfort him much."

Many precepts, strictly economical, then follow, in which the huswife is directed to save her parings, drippings, and skimmings for the sake of her poultry, and for "medicine for cattle, for cart, and for shoe;" to employ the afternoon, like a good sempstress, in making and mending; to keep her maids cleanly in their persons, to call them quarterly to account, to mark and number accurately her linen, to save her feathers, to use little spice, and to make her own candle.

The business of the evening commences with preparations for supper, as soon as the hens go to roost; the hogs are then to be served, the cows milked, and as night comes on, the servants return, but none empty-handed, some bringing in wood, some logs, &c. The cattle, both without and within doors, are next to be attended to, all clothes brought into the house, and no door left unbolted, and the duties of the evening close with this injunction:

"Thou woman, whom pity becometh the best, Grant all that hath laboured time to take rest."

Supper now is spread, and the scene opens with an excellent persuasive to cheerfulness and hospitality:

"Provide for thy husband, to make him good cheer, Make merry together, while time ye be here. A-bed and at board, howsoever befall, Whatever God sendeth, be merry withall. No taunts before servants, for hindering of fame, No jarring too loud, for avoiding of shame."

The servants are then ordered to be courteous, and attentive to each other, especially at their meals, and directions are given for the next morning's work.

The last section, entitled "After-supper matters," is introduced and terminated in a very moral and impressive manner. The first couplet tells us to

"Remember those children, whose parents be poor, Which hunger, yet dare not to crave at thy door;"

the bandog is then ordered to have the bones and the scraps; the huswife looks carefully to the fire, the candle, and the keys; the whole family retire to rest, at nine in winter, and at ten in summer, and the farmer's day closes with four lines which ought to be written in letters of gold, and which, if duly observed, would ensure a great portion of the happiness obtainable by man:

"Be lowly, not sullen, if aught go amiss, What wresting may lose thee, that win with a kiss. Both bear and forbear, now and then as ye may, Then wench, God a mercy! thy husband will say."[115:A]

Frugality and domestic economy were not, however, the constant attributes of the farmer's wife in the age of which we are treating; the luxury of dress, both in England and Scotland, had already corrupted the simplicity of country-habits. Stephen Perlet, who visited Scotland in 1553, and Fines Moryson, who made a similar tour in 1598[118:A], agree in describing the dress of the common people of both countries as nearly if not altogether the same; the picture, therefore, which Dunbar has given us of the dress of a rich farmer's wife, in Scotland, during the middle of the sixteenth century, will apply, with little fear of exaggeration, to the still wealthier dames of England. He has drawn her in a robe of fine scarlet with a white hood; a gay purse and gingling keys pendant at her side from a silken belt of silver tissue; on each finger she wore two rings, and round her waste was bound a sash of grass-green silk, richly embroidered with silver.[118:B] To this rural extravagancy in dress, Warner will bear an equal testimony; for, describing two old gossips cowering over their cottage-fire, and chatting how the world was changed in their time,

"When we were maids (quoth one of them) Was no such new found pride: Then wore they shooes of ease, now of An inch-broad, corked hye: Black karsie stockings, worsted now, Yea silke of youthful'st dye:

Garters of lystes, but now of silke, Some edged deep with gold: With costlier toyes, for courser turns, Than us'd, perhaps of old.

Fring'd and ymbroidered petticoats Now begge. But heard you nam'd, Till now of late, busks, perrewigs, Maskes, plumes of feathers fram'd,

Supporters, posters, fardingales Above the loynes to waire, That be she near so bombe-thin, yet She crosse-like seems foure-squaire?

Some wives, grayheaded, shame not locks Of youthfull borrowed haire: Some, tyring arte, attyer their heads With only tresses bare:

Some, (grosser pride than which, think I, No passed age might shame) By arte, abusing nature, heads Of antick't hayre doe frame.

Once starching lack't the tearme, because Was lacking once the toy, And lack't we all these toyes and tearmes, It were no griefe but joy.—

Now dwels ech drossell in her glas: When I was yong, I wot, On holly-dayes (for sildome els Such ydell times we got) A tubb or paile of water cleere Stood us in steede of glas."[119:A]

Luxury and extravagance soon spread beyond the female circle, and the _Farmer's Heir_ of forty pounds a year, is described by Hall, in 1598, as dissipating his property on the follies and fopperies of the day.

"Vilius, the wealthy farmer, left his heire Twice twenty sterling pounds to spend by yeare:— But whiles ten pound goes to his wife's new gowne, Nor little lesse can serve to suit his owne; Whiles one piece pays her idle waiting-man, Or buys an hoode, or silver-handled fanne, Or hires a Friezeland trotter, halfe yard deepe, To drag his tumbrell through the staring Cheape; Or whiles he rideth with two liveries, And's treble rated at the subsidies; One end a kennel keeps of thriftlesse hounds; What think ye rests of all my younker's pounds To diet him, or deal out at his doore, To coffer up, or stocke his wasting store?"[119:B]

In contrast to this character, who keeps a pack of hounds, and sports a couple of liveries, it will be interesting to bring forward the picture of the _poor copyholder_, as drawn by the same masterly pencil; the description of the wretched hovel is given in all the strength of minute reality, and the avidity of the avaricious landlord is wrought up with several strokes of humour.

"Of one bay's breadth, God wot, a silly cote, Whose thatched spars are furr'd with sluttish soote A whole inch thick, shining like black-moor's brows, Through smoke that downe the headlesse barrel blows. At his bed's feete feeden his stalled teame, His swine beneath, his pullen o'er the beame. A starved tenement, such as I guesse Stands straggling on the wastes of Holdernesse: Or such as shivers on a Peake hill side, &c.— Yet must he haunt his greedy landlord's hall With often presents at each festivall: With crammed capons everie new-yeare's morne, Or with greene cheese when his sheepe are shorne: Or many maunds-full of his mellow fruite, To make some way to win his weighty suite.— The smiling landlord shews a sunshine face, Feigning that he will grant him further grace; And leers like Esop's foxe upon the crane, Whose neck he craves for his chirurgian."[120:A]

We shall close these characters, illustrative of rural manners, as they existed in the reigns of Elizabeth and James 1st, with a delineation of the _plain Country Fellow or down right Clown_, from the accurate pen of Bishop Earle, who has touched this homely subject with singular point and spirits.

"A _plain country fellow_ is one that manures his ground well, but lets himself lye fallow and untilled. He has reason enough to do his business, and not enough to be idle or melancholy. He seems to have the punishment of _Nebuchadnezzar_, for his conversation is among beasts, and his tallons none of the shortest, only he eats not grass, because he loves not sallets. His hand guides the plough, and the plough his thoughts, and his ditch and land-mark is the very mound of his meditations. He expostulates with his oxen very understandingly, and speaks gee, and ree, better than English. His mind is not much distracted with objects, but if a good fat cow come in his way, he stands dumb and astonished, and though his haste be never so great, will fix here half an hour's contemplation. His habitation is some poor thatched roof, distinguished from his barn by the loop-holes that let out smoak, which the rain had long since washed through, but for the double ceiling of bacon on the inside, which has hung there from his grandsire's time, and is yet to make rashers for posterity. His dinner is his other work, for he sweats at it as much as at his labour; he is a terrible fastner on a piece of beef, and you may hope to stave the guard off sooner. His religion is a part of his copy-hold, which he takes from his land-lord, and refers it wholly to his discretion: yet if he give him leave he is a good Christian to his power, (that is,) comes to church in his best cloaths, and sits there with his neighbours, where he is capable only of two prayers, for rain, and fair weather. He apprehends God's blessings only in a good year, or a fat pasture, and never praises him but on _good ground_. Sunday, he esteems a day to make merry in, and thinks a bag-pipe as essential to it as evening prayer, where he walks very solemnly after service with his hands coupled behind him, and censures the dancing of his parish. His compliment with his neighbour is a good thump on the back, and his salutation commonly some blunt curse. He thinks nothing to be vices, but pride and ill husbandry, from which he will gravely dissuade the youth, and has some thrifty hob-nail proverbs to clout his discourse. He is a niggard all the week, except only market-day, where, if his corn sell well, he thinks he may be drunk with a good conscience. He is sensible of no calamity but the burning a stack of corn or the overflowing of a meadow, and thinks Noah's flood the greatest plague

that ever was, not because it drowned the world, but spoiled the grass. For death he is never troubled, and if he get in but his harvest before, let it come when it will, he cares not."[122:A]

The _nine_ characters which have now passed in brief review before us, namely, the _Rural Squire_; the _Rural Coxcomb_; the _Rural Clergyman_; the _Rural Pedagogue_; the _Farmer_ or _substantial Yeoman_; the _Farmer's Wife_; the _Farmer's Heir_; the _Poor Copyholder_, and the mere _Ploughman_ or _Country Boor_, will, to a certain extent, point out the personal manners, condition, and mode of living of those who inhabited the country, during the period in which Shakspeare flourished. They have been given from the experience, and, generally, in the very words of contemporary writers, and may, therefore, be considered as faithful portraits. To complete the picture, a further elucidation of the customs of the country, as drawn from its principal occurrences and events, will be the subject of the ensuing chapter, in which the references to the works of our immortal bard will be more frequent than could take place while collecting mere out-line draughts of rural character.

FOOTNOTES:

[68:A] Holinshed's Chronicles, edit. of 1807, in six vols. 4to. vol. i. p. 276.

[68:B] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 273.

[69:A] Taming of the Shrew, act ii. sc. 1.

[70:A] Of the very rare tract from which these extracts are taken, the following is the entire title-page:—"The Gentleman's Academie; or, the Booke of St. Albans: containing three most exact and excellent Bookes: the first of Hawking, the second of all the proper Termes of Hunting, and the last of Armorie: all compiled by Juliana Barnes, in the Yere from the Incarnation of Christ 1486. And now reduced into a better method, by G. M. London. Printed for Humphrey Lownes, and are to be sold at his shop in Paules Church-yard, 1595." This curious edition of the _Booke of St. Albans_, accommodated to the days of Shakspeare, contains 95 leaves 4to. and I shall add the interesting dedication:

"To the Gentlemen of England: and all good fellowship of Huntsmen and Falconers.

"Gentlemen, this booke, intreting of Hawking, Hunting, and Armorie; the originall copie of the which was doone at St. Albans, about what time the excellent arte of printing was first brought out of Germany, and practised here in England: which booke, because of the antiquitie of the same, and the things therein contained, being so necessarie and behovefull to the accomplishment of the gentlemen of this flourishing ile, and others which take delight in either of these noble sports, or in that heroicall and excellent study of Armory, I have revived and brought again to light the same which was almost altogether forgotten, and either few or none of the perfect copies thereof remaining, except in their hands, who wel knowing the excellency of the worke, and the rarenesse of the booke, smothered the same from the world, thereby to inrich themselves in private with the knowledge of these delights. Therfore I humbly crave pardon of the precise and judicial reader, if sometimes I use the words of the ancient authour, in such plaine and homely English, as that time affoorded, not being so regardful, nor tying myself so strictly to deliver any thing in the proper and peculiar wordes and termes of arte, which for the love I beare to antiquitie, and to the honest simplicitie of those former times, I observe as wel beseeming the subject, and no whit disgracefull to the worke, our tong being not of such puritie then, as at this day the poets of our age have raised it to: of whom, and in whose behalf I wil say thus much, that our nation may only thinke herself beholding for the glory and exact compendiousnes of our longuage. Thus submitting our academy to your kind censures and friendly acceptance of the same, and requesting you to reade with indifferency, and correct with judgement; I commit you to God.

G. M."

From this dedication we learn that the original edition of the Booke of St. Albans was as scarce towards the close of the sixteenth century as at the present day; that "few or none of the perfect copies" were to be obtained; for that those were in the hands of _Bibliomaniacs_ who (like too many now existing) "smother'd them from the world." We have, therefore, every reason to conclude, from "the rarenesse (and consequent value) of the booke" of 1486, that the copy of Juliana's work in the library of Shakspeare, was the edition by Markham of 1595. I shall just add, that the copy now before me, was purchased at the Roxburgh sale, for 9_l._ 19_s._ 6_d._! It is, notwithstanding, probable, from the _peculiarities_ attending Markham's re-impression, that this sum, great as it may appear, will be exceeded at some future sale.

The attachment of _Gervase Markham_ to the subjects which employed the pen of his favourite Prioress, is very happily introduced by Mr. Dibdin, while alluding to the similar propensities of the _modern Markham_, Mr. Haslewood. "Up starts FLORIZEL, and

blows his bugle, at the annunciation of any work, new or old, upon the diversions of _Hawking_, _Hunting_, or _Fishing_! Carry him through CAMILLO'S cabinet of Dutch pictures, and you will see how instinctively, as it were, his eyes are fixed upon a sporting piece by Wouvermans. The hooded hawk, in his estimation, hath more charms than Guido's Madonna:—how he envies every rider upon his white horse!—how he burns to bestride the foremost steed, and to mingle in the fair throng, who turn their blue eyes to the scarcely bluer expanse of heaven! Here he recognises _Gervase Markham_, spurring his courser; and there he fancies himself lifting _Dame Juliana_ from her horse! Happy deception! dear fiction! says Florizel—while he throws his eyes in an opposite direction, and views every printed book upon the subject, from _Barnes_ to _Thornton_." Bibliomania, p. 729, 730.

The following very amusing description of "the difference twixt Churles and Gentlemen," will prove an adequate specimen of Markham's edition, will be appropriate to the subject in the text, and may be compared with the accurate reprint of the edition of W. De Worde by Mr. Haslewood.

"There was never gentleman, nor churle ordained, but hee had father and mother: Adam and Eve had neither father nor mother, and therefore in the sonnes of Adam and Eve, first issued out both gentleman and churle. By the sonnes of Adam and Eve, to wit, Seth, Abell, and Caine, was the royall blood divided from the rude and barbarous, a brother to murder his brother contrary to the law, what could be more ungentlemanly or vile? in that, therefore, became Caine and al his ofspring churles, both by the curse of God, and his owne father. Seth was made a gentleman through his father and mother's blessing, from whose loynes issued Noah, a gentleman by kind and linage. Noah had three sonnes truely begotten, two by the mother, named Cham and Sem, and the third by the father called Japhet, even in these three, after the world's inundation, was both gentlenes and vilenes discerned, in Cham was grose barbarisme founde towardes his owne father in discovering his privities, and deriding from whence hee proceeded. Japhet the yongest gentlemanlike reproved his brother, which was to him reputed a vertue, where Cham for his abortive vilenes became a churle both through the curse of God and his father Noah. When Noah awoke, hee said to Cham his sonne knowest not thou how it is become of Caine the sonne of Adam, and of his churlelike blood, that for them all the worlde is drowned save eight persons, and wilt thou nowe begin barbarisme againe, whereby the world in after ages shall be brought to consummation? well upon thee it shall bee and so I pray the Great one it maye fall out, for to thee I give my curse, and withall the north part of the world, to draw thine habitation unto, for there shall it be where sorrow, care, colde, and as a mischievous and unrespected churle thou shall live, which part of the earth shall be termed Europe, which is the country of churles. Japhet come hither my sonne, on thee will I raine my blessing, deare insteede of Seth: Adams sonne, I make thee a gentleman, and thy renowne shall stretch through the west part of the world, and to the end of the Occident, where wealth and grace shall flourish, there shall be thine habitation, and thy dominion shall bee called Asia, which is the cuntrie of gentlemen. And Sem my sonne, I make thee a gentleman also, to multiply the blood of Abell slaine so undeservedlie, to thee I give the orient, that part of the world which shal be called Africa, which is the country of temperateres: and thus divided Noah the world and his blessings. From the of-spring of gentlemanly Japhet came Abraham, Moyses, Aaron and the Prophets, and also the king of the right line of Mary, of whom that only absolute gentleman Jesus was borne, perfite God and perfite man, according to his manhood king of the lande of Juda and the Jewes, and gentleman by his mother Mary princesse of coat armor." Fol. 44.

[72:A] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 316.

[73:A] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 315.

[73:B] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 315. 317.

[74:A] Bacon's Essayes or Counsels, 4to. edit., 1632, p. 260.

[74:B] Act v. sc. 2.

[74:C] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xv. p. 184. note 5. by Steevens.

[75:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ix. p. 236.

[75:B] Ancient British Drama, vol. i. p. 531.

[75:C] Massinger's Plays, _apud_ Gifford, vol. iv. p. 7.

[76:A] From a MS. of Aubrey's in the Ashmole Museum, as quoted by Mr. Malcolm in his Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs of London, part i. p. 220. 4to.

[76:B] Aubrey's MS. Malcolm, p. 221, 222.

[79:A] Henry IV. part ii. act v. sc. 1.

[79:B] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 281. The particulars of the diet of our ancestors in the age of Shakspeare will be given in a subsequent part of the work.

[80:A] City Madam, act ii. sc. 1.

Gervase Markham in his English House-Wife, the first edition of which was published not long after Shakspeare's death, after mentioning in his second chapter, which treats of cookery, the manner of "ordering great feasts," closes his observations under this head, with directions for "a more humble feast, or an ordinary proportion which any good man may keep in his family, for the entertainment of his true and worthy friend;" this _humble feast_ or _ordinary proportion_, he proceeds to say, should consist for the first course of "sixteen full dishes, that is, dishes of meat that are of substance, and not empty, or for shew—as thus, for example; first, a shield of brawn with mustard; secondly, a boyl'd capon; thirdly, a boyl'd piece of beef; fourthly, a chine of beef rosted; fifthly, a neat's tongue rosted; sixthly, a pig rosted; seventhly, chewets bak'd; eighthly, a goose rosted; ninthly, a swan rosted; tenthly, a turkey rosted; the eleventh, a haunch of venison rosted; the twelfth, a pasty of venison; the thirteenth, a kid with a pudding in the belly; the fourteenth, an olive-pye; the fifteenth, a couple of capons; the sixteenth, a custard or dowsets. Now to these full dishes may be added sallets, fricases, quelque choses, and devised paste, as many dishes more which make the full service no less than two and thirty dishes, which is as much as can conveniently stand on one table, and in one mess; and after this manner you may proportion both your second and third course, holding fulness on one half of the dishes, and shew in the other, which will be both frugal in the spendor, contentment to the guest, and much pleasure and delight to the beholders." P. 100, 101. ninth edition of 1683, small 4to.

[80:B] Henry IV. part ii. act v. sc. 3.

[81:A] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 287.

[81:B] Puttenham's Art of English Poesie, p. 69, reprint of 1811.

[81:C] Ibid. p. 33.

[82:A] Macbeth, act ii. sc. 2.

[82:B] Merry Wives of Windsor, act i. sc. 4.

[82:C] Merry Wives of Windsor, act v. sc. 5.

[82:D] Heywood's Edward II. p. 1.

[82:E] Jonson's Every Man in his Humour, act i. sc. 1. Acted in the year 1598.

[83:A] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 290.

[84:A] Chalmers' Poets, vol. iv. p. 435, 436. Drayton, Fourth Eclogue.

[84:B] "A term in hawking, signifying the short straps of leather which are fastened to the hawk's legs, by which he is held on the fist, or joined to the leash." Bliss.

[85:A] Earle's Microcosmography; or a Piece of the World discovered, in Essays and Characters. Edition of 1811, by Philip Bliss.

[85:B] Hall's Satires, book v. sat. 2. printed in 1598.

[86:A] Lodge's Illustrations of British History, Biography, and Manners, in the Reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth, and James I., vol. ii. p. 383.

That this evil kept gradually increasing during the reign of James I., may be proved from the testimony of Peacham and Brathwait; the former, in his _Compleat Gentleman_, observes,—"Much doe I detest that effeminacy of the most, that burne out day and night in their beds, and by the fire side; in trifles, gaming, or courting their yellow mistresses all the winter in a city; appearing but as cuckoes in the spring, one time in the yeare to the countrey and their tenants, leaving the care of keeping good houses at

Christmas, to the honest yeomen of the countrey;" (p. 214.) and the latter, in his _English Gentleman_, addressing the rural fashionables of his day, exclaims,—"Let your countrey (I say) enjoy you, who bred you, shewing there your hospitality, where God hath placed you, and with sufficient meanes blessed you. I doe not approve of these, who fly from their countrey, as if they were ashamed of her, or had committed something unworthy of her. How blame-worthy then are these _Court-comets_, whose onely delight is to admire themselves? These, no sooner have their bed-rid _fathers_ betaken themselves to their last home, and removed from their crazie couch, but they are ready to sell a mannor for a coach. They will not take it as their fathers tooke it: their countrey houses must bee barred up, lest the poore passenger should expect what is impossible to finde, releefe to his want, or a supply to his necessity. No, the cage is opened, and all the birds are fled, not one crum of comfort remaining to succour a distressed poore one. Hospitality, which was once a _relique_ of _gentry_, and a knowne _cognizance_ to all ancient houses, hath lost her title, meerely through discontinuance: and _great houses_, which were at first founded to releeve the poore, and such needfull passengers as travelled by them, are now of no use but onely as _waymarkes_ to direct them. But whither are these _Great ones_ gone? To the _Court_; there to spend in boundlesse and immoderate riot, what their provident ancestors had so long preserved, and at whose doores so many needy soules have beene comfortably releeved." Second edition, 1633. p. 332.

In the margin of the page from which this extract is taken, occurs the following note:—"This is excellently seconded by a Princely pen, in a pithy poem directed to all persons to ranke or quality to leave the Court, and returne into their owne countrey."

[86:B] In confirmation of this remark, I shall beg leave to give, for the entertainment of my readers, the two following sketches of country-squires, as they existed towards the middle of the seventeenth, and commencement of the eighteenth century. "Mr. Hastings," relates Gilpin from Hutchin's History of Dorsetshire, "was low of stature, but strong and active, of a ruddy complexion with flaxen hair. His cloaths were always of green cloth, his house was of the old fashion; in the midst of a large park, well stocked with deer, rabbits, and fish-ponds. He had a long narrow bowling green in it; and used to play with round sand bowls. Here too he had a banquetting room built, like a stand, in a large tree. He kept all sorts of hounds, that ran buck, fox, hare, otter, and badger: and had hawks of all kinds, both long and short winged. His great hall was commonly strewed with marrow bones; and full of hawk-perches, hounds, spaniels, and terriers. The upper end of it was hung with fox-skins, of this and the last year's killing. Here and there a pole-cat was intermixed; and hunter's poles in great abundance. The parlour was a large room, compleatly furnished in the same style. On a broad hearth, paved with brick, lay some of the choicest terriers, hounds and spaniels. One or two of the great chairs had litters of cats in them, which were not to be disturbed. Of these, three or four always attended him at dinner, and a little white wand lay by his trencher, to defend it, if they were too troublesome. In the windows which were very large, lay his arrows, cross-bows, and other accoutrements. The corners of the room were filled with his best hunting and hawking poles. His oyster table stood at the lower end of the room, which was in constant use twice a day, all the year round; for he never failed to eat oysters both at dinner and supper; with which the neighbouring town of Pool supplied him. At the upper end of the room stood a small table with a double desk; one side of which held a CHURCH BIBLE; the other the BOOK OF MARTYRS. On different tables in the room lay hawk's-hoods, bells, old hats, with their crowns thrust in, full of pheasant eggs; tables, dice, cards, and store of tobacco pipes. At one end of this room was a door, which opened into a closet, where stood bottles of strong beer and wine; which never came out but in single glasses, which was the rule of the house; for he never exceeded himself nor permitted others to exceed. Answering to this closet, was a door into an old chapel; which had been long disused for devotion; but in the pulpit, as the safest place, was always to be found a cold chine of beef, a venison pasty, a gammon of bacon, or a great apple-pye, with thick crust well baked. His table cost him not much, though it was good to eat at. His sports supplied all, but beef and mutton; except on Fridays, when he had the best of fish. He never wanted a London pudding; and he always sang it in with "_My part lies therein-a_." He drank a glass or two of wine at meals; put syrup of gilly-flowers into his sack; and had always a tun glass of small beer standing by him, which he often stirred about with rosemary. He lived to be an hundred; and never lost his eye sight, nor used spectacles. He got on horseback without help; and rode to the death of the stag, till he was past four score." Gilpin's Forest Scenery; vol. ii. p. 23. 26.

Mr. Dibdin, in the second edition of his Bibliomania, the most pleasing and interesting book which Bibliography has ever produced, has quoted the above passage, and thus alludes, in his text, to the character which it describes:—"But what shall we say to Lord Shaftesbury's eccentric neighbour, HENRY HASTINGS? who, in spite of his hawks, hounds, kittens, and oysters, could not forbear to indulge his book-propensities, though in a moderate degree! Let us fancy we see him, in his eightieth year, just alighted from the toils of the chase, and listening, after dinner, with his 'single glass' of ale by his side, to some old woman with 'spectacle on nose,' who reads to him a choice passage out of John Fox's _Book of Martyrs_! A rare old boy was this Hastings." Bibliomania, p. 379.

Mr. Grose, the antiquary, has given us, in his sketches of some worn-out characters of the last age, a most amusing portrait of the country squire of Queen Anne's days: "I mean," says he, "the little independant gentleman of three hundred pounds per annum,

who commonly appeared in a plain drab or plush coat, large silver buttons, a jockey cap, and rarely without boots. His travels never exceeded the distance of the county town, and that only at assize and session time, or to attend an election. Once a week he commonly dined at the next market town, with the attornies and justices. This man went to church regularly, read the Weekly Journal, settled the parochial disputes between the parish officers at the vestry, and afterwards adjourned to the neighbouring ale-house, where he usually got drunk for the good of his country. He never played at cards but at Christmas, when a family pack was produced from the mantle-piece. He was commonly followed by a couple of grey-hounds and a pointer, and announced his arrival at a neighbours house by smacking his whip, or giving the view-halloo. His drink was generally ale, except on Christmas, the fifth of November, or some other gala days, when he would make a bowl of strong brandy punch garnished with a toast and nutmeg. A journey to London was, by one of these men, reckoned as great an undertaking, as is at present a voyage to the East Indies, and undertaken with scarce less precaution and preparation.

"The mansion of one of these 'Squires was of plaister striped with timber, not unaptly called callimanco work, or of red brick, large casemented bow windows, a porch with seats in it, and over it a study; the eaves of the house well inhabited by swallows, and the court set round with holly-hocks. Near the gate a horse-block for the conveniency of mounting.

"The hall was furnished with flitches of bacon, and the mantle-piece with guns and fishing rods of different dimensions, accompanied by the broad sword, partizan, and dagger, borne by his ancestor in the civil wars. The vacant spaces were occupied by stag's horns. Against the wall was posted King Charles's Golden Rules, Vincent Wing's Almanack, and a portrait of the Duke of Marlborough; in his window lay Baker's Chronicle, Fox's Book of Martyrs, Glanvil on Apparitions, Quincey's Dispensatory, the Complete Justice, and a Book of Farriery.

"In the corner, by the fire side, stood a large wooden two-armed chair with a cushion; and within the chimney corner were a couple of seats. Here, at Christmas, he entertained his tenants assembled round a glowing fire made of the roots of trees, and other great logs, and told and heard the traditionary tales of the village respecting ghosts and witches, till fear made them afraid to move. In the mean time the jorum of ale was in continual circulation.

"The best parlour, which was never opened but on particular occasions, was furnished with Turk-worked chain, and hung round with portraits of his ancestors; the men in the character of shepherds, with their crooks, dressed in full suits and huge full-bottomed perukes: others in complete armour or buff coats, playing on the base viol or lute. The females likewise as shepherdesses, with the lamb and crook, all habited in high heads and flowing robes.

"Alas! these men and these houses are no more!" _Grose's Olio_, 2nd edit. 1796. p. 41-44.

[89:A] Richard Berket Reader, æt. 74. MS. note.

[89:B] In the margin is a MS. note seemingly in the hand-writing of Bishop Nicholson, who gave these volumes to the library:

"Since I can remember there was not a reader in any chapel but was called _Sir_."

[90:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. v. p. 8. note.

[90:B] Twelfth Night, act iii. sc. 4.

[91:A] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 233, 234.

[92:A] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 231.

[93:A] Lodge's Illustrations, vol. iii. p. 391.

[93:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xx. p. 221. note 7.

[95:A] The Compleat Gentleman. Fashioning him absolut, in the most necessary and commendable Qualities concerning Minde or Body that may be required in a Noble Gentleman. By Henry Peacham Master of Arts: Sometime of Trinitie Colledge in Cambridge.

This book, which is written in an easy and elegant style, was published in 1622, and has been several times reprinted; it is a work of considerable interest and amusement, and throws much light on the education and literature of its times.

[95:B] Hall's Satires, Book ii. sat. 6.

[96:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xx. p. 451.

[96:B] The Staple of Newes, the third Intermeane after the third act.

[96:C] Act v. sc. 1.

[96:D] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. vii. p. 132. note 7.

[97:A] Compleat Gentleman, p. 22. edit. of 1634.

[97:B] Ibid. p. 25.

[97:C] Instruction of a Christian Woman, 4to. edit. of 1557.

[98:A] Compleat Gentleman, p. 26, 27.

[99:A] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 275.

[100:A] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 315.

[100:B] Three editions of Tusser's Poem on Husbandry are now before me; the first printed in 1557, entitled _A Hundreth good Pointes of Husbandrie_; the 4to. edition of 1586, termed _Five Hundred Pointes of Good Husbandrie_; and _Tusser Redivivus_, by Daniel Hilman, first published in 1710, and again in 1744; the quatrain just quoted is from the copy of 1744, p. 56.

[101:A] Gilpin's Life of Latimer, p. 2.

[103:A] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 317, 318.

[104:A] Warner's Albion's England, chap. 42. Chalmers's English Poets, vol. iv. p. 602.

[105:A] Warner in Chalmers's Poets, vol. iv. p. 552, 553.

[105:B] Act v. sc. 2. Song at the conclusion.

[106:A] Act ii. sc. 1.

[106:B] Damon and Pithias, 1582.

[106:C] Summer's Last Will and Testament, by Nash, 1600.

[106:D] Introductory Song to the second acte. Vide Ancient British Drama, vol. i.

[107:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ix. p. 255.

[107:B] Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, p. 172, 173., eighth edition of 1676.

[107:C] Milton's Poems by Warton, second edition, p. 56. 61.

[108:A] Crones are ewes whose teeth are so worn down, that they can no longer live in their sheep-walk; but will sometimes, if put into good pasture, thrive exceedingly.

[108:B] Tusser, 4to. edit. 1586., chap. 12. fol. 25, 26.

[108:C] Tusser, 4to. edit. 1586., fol. 138. 144, 145.

[109:A] Tusser, 4to. of 1586. fol. 133.

[109:B] Holinshed, vol. i. p. 282.

[110:A] Tusser, first edit. of 1557. title-page.

[110:B] The English House-Wife, containing the inward and outward vertues which ought to be in a Compleat Woman. Ninth edition, 1683. Dedication.

[111:A] English House-Wife, p. 2, 3, 4.

[113:A] Tusser, first edit. p. 14, 15.

[115:A] Mayor's Tusser, p. 247. ad p. 270.

Even this, and every other description of the duties of the Huswife, may be traced to "The Book of Husbandry," written by Sir Anthony Fitzherbert, of Norbury, in Derbyshire.

This gentleman, who was a Judge of the Common Pleas, in the reign of Henry the Eighth, is justly entitled to the appellation of "the father of English Husbandry." His work, the first edition of which was printed by Richard Pynson, in 1528, 4to., underwent not less than eleven editions during the sixteenth century, and soon excited among his countrymen a most beneficial spirit of emulation. Notwithstanding these numerous impressions, there are probably not ten complete copies left in the kingdom.

One of these is, however, now before me included in a thick duodecimo, of which the _first article_ is "Xenophon's treatise of householde," black letter, title wanting; the colophon, "Imprinted At London in fletestrete in the house of Thomas Berthelet. Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum." No date. The _second article_ is "The booke of Husbandrye verye profitable and necessary for all maner of persons, newlye corrected and amended by the auctor fitzherbard, with dyvers addicions put thereunto. Anno do. 1555," black letter. Colophon, "Imprinted at London in Flete strete at the signe of the Sunne over agaynst the Conduit by John Weylande." Sixty-one leaves, exclusive of the table. The _third article_ is entitled "Surveyinge," An. 1546. Colophon, "Londini in ædibus Thome Berthelet typis impress. Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum." Contains sixty leaves, black letter.

From "The booke of husbandrye," I shall extract the detail of huswifely duties, as a specimen of the work, and as a proof of the assertion at the commencement of this note.

"What workes a wyfe shoulde doe in generall.

"First in the mornyng when thou art wak■d and purpose to rise, lift up thy hand, and blis the and make a signe of the holy crosse. In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Amen. In the name of the father y{e} sonne, and the holy gost. And if thou saye a Paternoster, an Ave and a Crede, and remembre thy maker thou shalte spede much the better, and when thou art up and readye, then firste swepe thy house; dresse up the dysshe bord, and set al thynges in good order within thy house, milke y{e} kie, socle thy calves, sile by thy milke, take up thy children, and aray them, and provide for thy husbande's breakefaste, diner, souper, and for thy children and servauntes, and take thy parte wyth them. And to ordeyne corne and malt to the myll, to bake and brue withal when nede is. And mete it to the myl and fro the myl, and se that thou have thy mesure agayne besides the tole or elles the mylner dealeth not truly wyth the, or els thy corne is not drye as it should be, thou must make butter and chese when thou may, serve thy swine both mornynge and eveninge, and give thy polen meate in the mornynge, and when tyme of yeare cometh thou must take hede how thy henne, duckes and geese do ley, and to gather up their egges and when they waxe broudy to set them there as no beastes, swyne, nor other vermyne hurt them, and thou must know that al hole foted foule wil syt a moneth and all cloven foted foule wyll syt but three wekes except a peyhen and suche other great foules as craynes, bustardes, and suche other. And when they have brought forth theyr birdes to se that they be well kepte from the gleyd, crowes fully martes and other vermyn, and in the begynyng of March, or a lytle before is time for a wife to make her garden and to get as manye good sedes and herbes as she can, and specyally such as be good for the pot and for to eate and as ofte as nede shall require it must be weded, for els the wede wyll over grow the herbes, and also in Marche is time to sowe flaxe and hempe for I have heard olde huswyves say, that better is Marche hurdes than Apryll flaxe, the reason appereth, but howe it shoulde bee sowen, weded, pulled, repealed, watred, washen, dried, beten, braked, tawed, hecheled, spon, wounden, wrapped and oven, it nedeth not for me to shewe, for they be wyse ynough, and thereof may they make shetes, bordclothes, towels, shertes, smockes, and suche other necessaryes, and therefore lette thy dystaffe be alwaye redy for a pastyme, that thou be not ydell. And undoubted a woman can not get her livinge honestly with spinning on the dystaffe, but it stoppeth a gap and must nedes be had. The bolles of flaxe when they be rypled of, must be rediled from the wedes and made dry with the sunne to get out the sedes. Now be it one maner of linsede called loken sede wyll not open by the sunne, and therefore when they be drye they must be sore brusen and broken the wyves know how, and then wynowed and kept dry til peretime cum againe. Thy femell hempe must be pulled fro the chucle hempe for this beareth no sede and thou must doe by it as thou didest by the flaxe. The chucle hempe doth beare sede, and thou must be ware that birdes eate it not as it groweth, the hempe thereof is not so good as the femel hempe, but yet it wil do good service. It may fortune sometime that thou shalte have so many thinges to do that thou shalte not wel know where is best to begyn. Then take hede which thing should be the greatest losse if it were not done and in what space it woulde be done, and then thinke what is the greatest los and ther begin. But I put case that, that thing that is of the greatest losse wyll be longe in doing, that thou might do thre or iiij other thinges in the meane whyle then loke wel if all these thinges were set togyther whiche of them were greatest losse, and yf these thynges be of greater losse, and may be al done in as shorte space as the other, then do thy many thinges fyrst. It is convenient for a husbande to have

shepe of his owne for many causes, and then may his wife have part of the wooll to make her husbande and her selfe sum clothes. And at the least waye she may have the lockes of the shepe therwith to make clothes or blankets, and coverlets, or both. And if she have no wol of her owne she maye take woll to spynne of cloth makers, and by that meanes she may have a convenient living, and many tymes to do other workes. It is a wives occupacion to winow al maner of cornes, to make malte wash and wring, to make hey, to shere corne, and in time of nede to helpe her husbande to fyll the mucke wayne or donge carte, dryve the plough, to lode hey corne and such other. Also to go or ride to the market to sell butter, chese, mylke, egges, chekens, kapons, hennes, pygges, gees, and al maner of corne. And also to bye al maner of necessary thinges belonging to a houshold, and to make a true rekening and accompt to her husband what she hath receyved and what she hathe payed. And yf the husband go to the market to bye or sell as they ofte do, he then to shew his wife in lyke maner. For if one of them should use to disceive the other, he disceyveth himselfe, and he is not lyke to thryve, and therfore they must be true ether to other. I could peraventure shew the husbande of divers pointes that the wives disceve their husbandes in, and in like maner how husbandes deceve their wives. But yf I should do so, I shuld shew mo subtil pointes of disceite then other of them knew of before. And therfore me semeth best to holde my peace, leste I shuld do as the knight of the tower did the which had many faire doghters, and of fatherlie love that he oughte to them he made a boke unto a good intent that they mighte eschewe and flee from vices and folowe vertues in the which boke he sheweth that yf they were woed, moved, or styrred by any man after such a maner as is there shewed that they shuld withstande it, in the which booke he shewed so manye wayes how a man shuld attaine to his purpose to bryng a woman to vice, the which waies were so naturall and the wayes to come to theyr purpose was so subtylly contrived and craftely shewed that hard it wolde be for any woman to resist or deny their desyre. And by the sayd boke hath made both the man and the woman to know mo vyces subtylty and crafte then ever they shoulde have knowen if the boke had not bene made, the which boke he named him selfe the knighte of the tower. And thus I leave the wyves to use theyr occupations at theyr owne discression." Fol. 45, 46, 47.

[118:A] See Antiquarian Repertory, vol. i. p. 236; and Moryson's Itinerary, part iii. fol. 1617.

[118:B] The Freirs of Berwick; Pinkerton's Ancient Scotish Poems, 12mo. 2 vols. 1786. v. 2. p. 70.

[119:A] Warner's Albion's England, book ix. chap. xlvii.

[119:B] Hall's Satires, book v. satire 4.

[120:A] Hall's Satires, book v. satire 4.

[122:A] Earle's Microcosmography, p. 64. et seq. edit. of 1811, by Philip Bliss.

CHAPTER VI.

A VIEW OF _COUNTRY LIFE_ DURING THE AGE OF SHAKSPEARE; ITS MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.—RURAL HOLYDAYS, AND FESTIVALS.

The record of rural festivity and amusement, must, as far as it is unaccompanied by any detail of riot or intemperance, be a subject of pleasing contemplation to every good and cheerful mind. Labour, the destined portion of by far the greater part of human beings, requires frequent intervals of relaxation; and the encouragement of innocent diversion at stated periods, may be considered, therefore, both in a moral and political point of view, as essentially useful. The sports and amusements of our ancestors on their holydays and festivals, while they had little tendency to promote either luxury or dissipation, contributed very powerfully to preserve some of the best and most striking features of our national manners and character, and were frequently mingled with that cheerful piety which forms the most heart-felt species of devotion, where religion, mixing with the social rite, offers up the homage of a happy and contented heart.

It may be necessary here to mention, that in enumerating the various ceremonial and feast days of rural life, we have purposely omitted those which are _peculiarly_ occupied by _superstitious_ observances, as they will with more propriety be included under a subsequent chapter, appropriated to the consideration of popular superstitions.

The ushering in of the New Year, or _New Years tide_, with rejoicings, presents, and good wishes, was a custom observed, during the sixteenth century, with great regularity and parade, and was as cordially celebrated in the court of the prince as in the cottage of the peasant.

To end the old year _merrily_ and begin the new one _well_, and in _friendship_ with their neighbours, were the objects which the common people had in view in the celebration of this tide or festival. New-Years Eve, therefore, was spent in festivity and frolic by the men; and the young women of the village carried about, from door to door, a bowl of spiced ale, which they offered to the inhabitants of every house where they stopped, singing at the same time some rude congratulatory verses, and expecting some small present in return. This practice, however, which originated in pure kindness and benevolence, soon degenerated into a mere pecuniary traffic, for Selden, in his Table Talk, thus alludes to the subject, while drawing the following curious comparison: "The pope in sending relicks to princes, does as _wenches_ do by their _wassails_ at _New Years Tide_.—They _present you_ with a _cup_, and you must _drink_ of a slabby stuff; but the meaning is, you must _give_ them _money_ ten times more than it is worth."[124:A]

It was customary also, on this eve, for the young men and women to exchange their clothes, which was termed _Mumming_ or _Disguising_; and when thus dressed in each other's garments, they would go from one neighbour's cottage to another, singing, dancing, and partaking of their good cheer; a species of masquerading which, as may be imagined, was often productive of the most licentious freedoms.

On the succeeding morning, the first of the New Year, presents, called new-year's gifts, were given and received, with the mutual expression of good wishes, and particularly that of a _happy New Year_. The compliment was sometimes paid at each other's doors in the form of a song; but more generally, especially in the north of England and in Scotland, the house was entered very early in the morning, by some young men and maidens selected for the purpose, who presented the spiced bowl, and hailed you with the gratulations of the season.

The custom of interchanging gifts on this day, though now nearly obsolete, was, in the days of Shakspeare, observed most scrupulously; and not merely in the country, but, as hath been just before hinted, even in the palace of the monarch. In fact the wardrobe and jewelry of Elizabeth appear to have been supported principally by these annual contributions.

As a brief summary of these presents, though given not in the country, but at court, will yet, as including almost every rank in life, from the peer to the dustman, place in a strong light the prevalence of this custom, and point out of what these gifts usually consisted in a town, and therefore, by inference, of what they must have included in the country, its introduction will not, we should hope, be considered as altogether digressive from the nature of our subject.

To Mr. Nichols, who, in his work entitled "Queen Elizabeth's Progresses," has printed, from the original rolls in vellum, some very copious lists of New Year's gifts annually presented to this popular monarch, are we indebted for the following curious enumeration.

"From all these rolls," says he, "and more of them perhaps are still existing, it appears that the greatest part, if not all the peers and peeresses of the realm, all the bishops, the chief officers of state, and several of the Queen's houshold servants, even down to her apothecaries, master cook, serjeant of the pastry, &c. gave New Year's gifts to Her Majesty; consisting, in general, either of a sum of money, or jewels, trinkets, wearing apparel, &c. The largest sum given by any of the temporal lords was 20_l._; but the Archbishop of Canterbury gave 40_l._, the Archbishop of York 30_l._, and the other spiritual lords 20_l._ and 10_l._; many of the temporal lords and great officers, and most of the peeresses, gave rich gowns, petticoats, smocks, kirtles, silk stockings, cypres garters, sweet-bags, doblets, mantles, some embroidered with pearles, garnets, &c. looking-glasses, fans, bracelets, caskets studded with precious stones, jewels ornamented with sparks of diamonds in various devices, and other costly trinkets. Sir Gilbert Dethick, Garter King of Arms, gave a book of the states in King William the Conqueror's time, and a book of the arms of the noblemen in Henry the Fifth's time; Absolon, the master of the Savoy, a Bible covered with cloth of gold, garnished with silver, and gilt, and two plates with the royal arms; _Petruchio Ubaldino_, a book covered with vellum of Italian; Lambarde, the antiquary, his Pandecta of all the Rolls, &c. in the Tower of London. The Queen's physician presented her with a box of foreign sweetmeats; another physician with two pots, one of green ginger, the other of orange flowers; two other physicians gave each a pot of green ginger, and a pot of the rinds of lemons; her apothecaries a box of lozenges, a box of ginger candy, a box of grene ginger, a box of orange candit, a pot of conserves, a pot of wardyns condite, a box of wood with prunolyn, and two boxes of _manus Christi_; Mrs. Blanch a Parry, a little box of gold to put in cumphetts, and a little spoon of gold; Mrs. Morgan a box of cherryes, and one of aberycocks; her master cook a fayre marchepayne; her serjeant of the pastry a fayre pie of quinces oringed; a box of peaches of Jenneway (Genoa); a great pie of quynses and wardyns guilte; _Putrino_, an Italian, presented her with two pictures; _Innocent Corry_ with a box of lutestrings; _Ambrose Lupo_ with another box of lutestrings, and a glass of sweet water; _Petro Lupo_, _Josepho Lupo_, and _Cæsar Caliardo_, each with a pair of sweet gloves; a cutler with a meat knyfe with a fan haft of bone, _a conceit in it_; _Jaromy_ with twenty-four drinking-glasses; _Jeromy Bassano_ two drinking-glasses; Smyth, _dustman_, two boltes

of cambrick."[126:A]

The Queen, though she made returns in plate and other articles, took sufficient care that the balance should be in her own favour; hence, as the custom was found to be lucrative, and had indeed been practised with success by her predecessors on the throne, it was encouraged and rendered fashionable to an extent hitherto unprecedented in this kingdom. In the country, however, with the exception of the extensive households of the nobility, this interchange was conducted on the pure basis of reciprocal kindness and good will, and without any view of securing patronage or support; it was, indeed, frequently the channel through which charity delighted to exert her holy influence, and though originating in the heathen world, became sanctified by the Christian virtues.

To the rejoicings on New Year's tide succeeded, after a short interval, the observance of the TWELFTH DAY, so called from its being the twelfth after the Nativity of our Saviour, and the day on which the _Eastern Magi_, guided by the star, arrived at Bethlehem to worship the infant Jesus.

This festive day, the most celebrated of the twelve for the peculiar conviviality of its rites, has been observed in this kingdom ever since the reign of Alfred, in whose days, says Collier, "a Law was made with relation to Holidays, by virtue of which the _twelve_ days _after_ the Nativity of our Saviour were made Festivals."[127:A]

In consequence of an idea, which seems generally to have prevailed, that the _Eastern Magi_ were kings, this day has been frequently termed the _Feast of the Three Kings_; and many of the rites with which it is attended, are founded on this conception; for it was customary to elect, from the company assembled on this occasion, a king or queen, who was usually elevated to this rank by the fortuitous division of a cake containing a bean or piece of coin, and he or she to whom this symbol of distinction fell, in dividing the cake, was immediately chosen king or queen, and then forming their ministers and court from the company around, maintained their state and character until midnight.

The _Twelfth Cake_ was almost always accompanied by the _Wassail Bowl_, a composition of spiced wine or ale, or mead, or metheglin, into which was thrown roasted apples, sugar, &c. The term _Wassail_, which in our elder poets is connected with much interesting imagery, and many curious rites, appears to have been first used in this island during the well-known interview between Vortigern and Rowena. Geoffrey of Monmouth relates, on the authority of Walter Calenius, that this lady, the daughter of Hengist, knelt down, on the approach of the king, and presenting him with a cup of wine, exclaimed "Lord king _wæs heil_," that is, literally "Health be to you." Vortigern being ignorant of the Saxon language, was informed by an interpreter, that the purport of these words was to wish him health, and that he should reply by the expression _drinc-heil_, or "Drink the health;" accordingly, on his so doing, Rowena drank, and the king receiving the cup from her hand, kissed and pledged her.[128:A] Since this period, observes the historian, the custom has prevailed in Britain of using these words whilst drinking; the person who drank to another saying _was-heil_, and he who received the cup answering _drinc-heil_.

It soon afterwards became a custom in villages, on Christmas-Eve, New Year's Eve, and Twelfth Night, for itinerant minstrels to carry to the houses of the gentry, and others, where they were generally very hospitably received, a bowl of spiced wine, which being presented with the Saxon words just mentioned, was therefore called a _Wassail-bowl_. A bowl or cup of this description was likewise to be found in almost every nobleman's and gentleman's house, (and frequently of massy silver,) until the middle of the seventeenth century, and which was in perpetual requisition during the revels of Christmas. In "_The Antiquarian Repertory_, vol. i. p. 217," relates Mr. Douce, "there is an account, accompanied with an engraving, of an oaken chimney-piece in a very old house at Berlen, near Snodland in Kent, on which is carved a wassel-bowl resting on the branches of an apple-tree, alluding, probably, to part of the materials of which the liquor was composed. On one side is the word =wassheil=, and on the other =drincheile=."[129:A] "This is certainly," he adds, "a very great curiosity of its kind, and at least as old as the fourteenth century. Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March, in his will gave to Sir John Briddlewood a silver cup called _wassail_: and it appears that John Duke of Bedford, the regent, by his first will bequeathed to John Barton, his maitre d'hotel, a silver cup and cover, on which was inscribed WASHAYL."[129:B]

In consequence of the _Wassail-bowl_ being peculiar to scenes of revelry and festivity, the term _wassail_ in time became synonymous with feasting and carousing, and has been used, therefore, by many of our poets either to imply drinking and merriment, or the place where such joviality was expected to occur. Thus Shakspeare makes Hamlet say of the king "draining his draughts of Rhenish down," that he

"Keeps _wassel_:"[129:C]

and in Macbeth, the heroine of that play declares that she will convince the two chamberlains of Duncan

"With wine and _wassel_."[129:D]

In Anthony and Cleopatra also, Cæsar, advising Anthony to live more temperately, tells him to leave his

"Lascivious _wassals_."[129:E]

And lastly, in Love's Labour's Lost, Biron, describing the character of Boyet, says,

"He is wit's pedler: and retails his wares At wakes, and _wassels_, meetings, markets, fairs."[130:A]

Ben Jonson has given us two curious personifications of the Wassal; the first in his Forest, No. 3. whilst giving an account of a rural feast in the hall of Sir Robert Wroth; he says,

"The rout of rural folk come thronging in, Their rudenesse then is thought no sin— The jolly _Wassal_ walks the often round, And in their cups their cares are drown'd:"[130:B]

and the second in "Christmas, His Masque, as it was presented at Court 1616," where _Wassall_, as one of the ten children of Christmas, is represented in the following quaint manner. _Like a neat Sempster, and Songster; her Page bearing a browne bowle, drest with Ribbands, and Rosemarie before her._[130:C]

Fletcher, in his Faithful Shepherdess, has given a striking description of the festivity attendant on the Wassal bowl:

——— "The woods, or some near town That is a neighbour to the bordering down, Hath drawn them thither, 'bout some lusty sport, Or spiced _Wassel-Boul_, to which resort All the young men and maids of many a cote, Whilst the trim minstrell strikes his merry note."[130:D]

The persons thus accompanying the Wassal bowl, especially those who danced and played, were called _Wassailers_, an appellation which it was afterwards customary to bestow on all who indulged, at any season, in intemperate mirth. Hence Milton introduces his Lady in Comus making use of the term in the following beautiful passage:

————————— "Methought it was the sound Of riot and ill-manag'd merriment, Such as the jocund flute, or gamesome pipe Stirs up among the loose unletter'd hinds, When for their teeming flocks, and granges full, In wanton dance, they praise the bounteous Pan, And thank the gods amiss. I should be loath To meet the rudeness, and swill'd insolence, Of such late _wassailers_."[131:A]

During the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. the celebration of Twelfth Night was, equally with Christmas-Day, a festival through the land, and was observed with great ostentation and ceremony in both the Universities, at Court, at the Temple, and at Lincoln's and Gray's-Inn. Many of the Masques of Ben Jonson were written for the amusement of the royal family on this night, and Dugdale in his _Origines Juridicales_, has given us a long and particular account of the revelry at the Temple on each of the twelve days of Christmas, in the year 1562. It appears from this document that the hospitable rites of St. Stephen's Day, St. John's Day, and Twelfth Day, were ordered to be exactly alike, and as many of them are, in their nature, perfectly rural, and were, there is every reason to suppose, observed, to a certain extent, in the halls of the country-gentry and substantial yeomanry, a short record here, of those that fall under this description, cannot be deemed inapposite.

The breakfast on Twelfth Day is directed to be of brawn, mustard, and malmsey; the dinner of two courses, to be served in the hall, and after the first course "cometh in the Master of the Game, apparalled in green velvet: and the Ranger of the Forest also, in a green suit of satten; bearing in his hand a green bow and divers arrows, with either of them a hunting horn about their necks: blowing together three blasts of venery, they pace round about the fire three times. Then the Master of the Game maketh three curtesies," kneels down, and petitions to be admitted into the service of the Lord of the Feast.

"This ceremony performed, a huntsman cometh into the hall, with a fox and a purse-net; with a cat, both bound at the end of a staff; and with them nine or ten couple of hounds, with the blowing of hunting-horns. And the fox and cat are by the hounds set upon, and killed beneath the fire. This sport finished, the Marshal (an officer so called, who, with many others under different appellations, were created for the purpose of conducting the revels) placeth them in their several appointed places."

After the second course, the "antientest of the Masters of the Revels singeth a song, with the assistance of others there present;" and after some repose and revels, supper, consisting of two courses, is then served in the hall, and, being ended, "the Marshall presenteth himself with drums afore him, mounted upon a scaffold, born by four men; and goeth three times round about the

harthe, crying out, aloud, 'A Lord, a Lord,' &c., then he descendeth, and goeth to dance."

"This done, the Lord of Misrule (an officer whose functions will be afterwards noticed) addresseth himself to the Banquet; which ended with some minstralsye, mirth and dancing, every man departeth to rest."[133:A]

Herrick, who was the contemporary of Shakspeare for the first twenty-five years of his life, that is, from the year 1591 to 1616, has given us the following curious and pleasing account of the ceremonies of Twelfth Night, as we may suppose them to have been observed in almost every private family:

"TWELFTH-NIGHT,

OR KING AND QUEEN.

Now, now the mirth comes With the cake full of plums, Where Beane's the king of the sport here; Beside, we must know, The Pea also Must revell, as Queene, in the court here.

Begin then to chuse, This night as ye use, Who shall for the present delight here, Be a King by the lot, And who shall not Be Twelfe-day Queene for the night here.

Which knowne, let us make Joy-sops with the cake; And let not a man then be seen here, Who unurg'd will not drinke To the base from the brink A health to the King and the Queene here.

Next crowne the bowle full With gentle lambs-wooll; Adde sugar, nutmeg and ginger, With store of ale too; And thus ye must doe To make the _wassaile_ a swinger.

Give then to the King And Queene wassailing; And though with ale ye be whet here; Yet part ye from hence, As free from offence, As when ye innocent met here." _Herrick's Hesperides_, p. 376, 377.

The _Twelfth Day_ was the usual termination of the festivities of Christmas with the higher ranks; but with the vulgar they were frequently prolonged until Candlemas, to which period it was thought a point of much importance to retain a portion of their Christmas cheer.

It should not be forgotten here, that Shakspeare has given the appellation of _Twelfth Night_ to one of his best and most finished plays. No reason for this choice is discoverable in the drama itself, and from its adjunctive title of _What You Will_, it is probable, that the name was meant to be no otherwise appropriate than as designating an evening on which dramatic mirth and recreation were, by custom, peculiarly expected and always acceptable.[134:A]

It appears from a passage from Warner's Albion's England, that between Twelfth Day and Plough-Monday, a period was customarily fixed upon for the celebration of games in honour of the Distaff, and which was termed ROCK-DAY.[135:A] The notice in question is to be found in the lamentations of the Northerne-man over the decline of festivity, where he exclaims,

"_Rock_, and plow-mondaies, _gams_ sal gang, With saint-feasts and kirk sights."[135:B]

That this festival was observed not only during the immediate days of Warner and Shakspeare, but for some time afterwards, we learn from a little poem by Robert Herrick, which was probably written between the years 1630 and 1640. Herrick was born in 1591, and published his collection of poems, entitled Hesperides, in 1648. He gives us in his title the additional information that _Rock_, or _Saint Distaff's Day_, was the morrow after Twelfth Day; and he advises that it should terminate the sports of Christmas.

"SAINT DISTAFF'S OR THE MORROW AFTER TWELFTH-DAY.

Partly worke and partly play Ye must on S. _Distaff's day_: From the plough soone free your teame; Then come home and fother them. If the Maides a spinning goe, Burne the flax, and fire the tow: Scorch their plackets, but beware That ye singe no maiden-haire. Bring in pailes of water then, Let the Maides bewash the men. Give S. _Distaffe_ all the right, Then bid Christmas sport _good night_. And next morrow, every one To his owne vocation."[136:A]

The first Monday after Twelfth Day used to be celebrated by the ploughmen as a Holiday, being the season at which the labours of the plough commenced, and hence the day has been denominated PLOUGH-MONDAY. Tusser, in his poem on husbandry, after observing that the "old guise must be kept," recommends the ploughmen on this day to the hospitality of the good huswife:

"Good huswives, whom God hath enriched ynough, forget not the feasts, that belong to the plough: The meaning is only to joy and be glad, for comfort with labour, is fit to be had."

He then adds,

"Plough-Munday, next after that Twelftide is past, bids out with the plough, the worst husband is last: If plowman get hatchet, or whip to the skreene, maids loveth their cocke, if no water be seene."

These lines allude to a custom prevalent in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and which Mr. Hilman, in a note on the passage, has thus explained: "After Christmas, (which formerly, during the twelve days, was a time of very little work,) every gentleman feasted the farmers, and every farmer their servants and task-men. _Plough-monday_ puts them in mind of their business. In the morning the men and maid-servants strive who shall shew their diligence in rising earliest; if the ploughman can get his whip, his plough-staff, hatchet, or any thing that he wants in the field, by the fire-side, before the maid hath got her kettle on, then the maid loseth her _Shrovetide_ cock, and it wholly belongs to the men. Thus did our forefathers strive to allure youth to their duty, and provided them innocent mirth, as well as labour. On this _Plough-Monday_ they have a good supper and some strong drink, that they might not go immediately out of one extreme into another."[137:A]

In the northern and north-western parts of England, the entire day was usually consumed in parading the streets, and the night was devoted to festivity. The ploughmen, apparently habited only in their shirts, but in fact with flannel jackets underneath, to keep out the cold, and these shirts decorated with rose-knots of various coloured riband, went about collecting what they called "_plough-money_ for drink." They were accompanied by a plough, which they dragged along, and by music, and not unfrequently two of the party were dressed to personate an _old woman_, whom they called _Bessy_, and a _Fool_, the latter of these characters being covered with skins, with a hairy cap on his head, and the tail of some animal pendent from his back. On one of these antics was devolved the office of collecting money from the spectators by rattling a box, into which their contributions were dropped, while the rest of the ploughmen were engaged in performing a _sword-dance_, a piece of pageantry derived from our northern ancestors, and of which Olaus Magnus has left us an accurate description in his history of the Gothic nations.[137:B] It consisted, for the most part, in forming various figures with the swords, sheathed and unsheathed, commencing in slow time, and terminating in very rapid movements, which required great agility and address to be conducted with safety and effect.[137:C]

It was the opinion of Dr. Johnson that Shakspeare alluded to the _sword-dance_, where, in _Anthony and Cleopatra_, he makes his hero observe of Augustus, that

——————— "He, at Philippi, kept His sword even like a dancer."[138:A]

But Mr. Malone has remarked, with more probability, that the allusion is to the English custom of dancing with a sword _worn by the side_; in confirmation of which idea, he quotes a passage from _All's Well That Ends Well_, where Bertram, lamenting that he is kept from the wars, says,

"I shall stay here the forehorse to a smock, Creaking my shoes on the plain masonry, Till honour be bought up, and no _sword worn_. But one to _dance_ with."[138:B]

It has been observed in a preceding page, that, among the common people, the festivities of Christmas were frequently protracted to CANDLEMAS-DAY. This was done under the idea of doing honour to the Virgin Mary, whose _purification_ is commemorated by the church at this period. It was generally, remarks Bourne, "a day of festivity, and more than ordinary observation among women, and is therefore called the _Wives Feast-Day_."[138:C] The term _Candlemas_, however, seems to have arisen from a custom among the Roman Catholics, of consecrating tapers on this day, and bearing them about lighted in procession, to which they were enjoined by an edict of Pope Sergius, A. D. 684; but on what foundation is not accurately ascertained. At the Reformation, among the rites and ceremonies which were ordered to be retained in a convocation of Henry VIII., this is one, and expressedly because it was considered as symbolical of the spiritual illumination of the Gospel.[138:D]

From Candlemas to Hallowmas, the tapers which had been lighted all the winter in Cathedral and Conventual Churches ceased to be used; and so prevalent, indeed, was the relinquishment of candles on this day in domestic life, that it has laid the foundation of one of the proverbs in the collection of Mr. Ray:

On _Candlemas-day_ throw _Candle_ and _Candlestick_ away.

On this day likewise the Christmas greens were removed from churches and private houses. Herrick, who may be considered as the contemporary of Shakspeare, being five-and-twenty at the period of the poet's death, has given us a pleasing description of this observance; he abounds, indeed, in the history of local rites, and, though surviving beyond the middle of the seventeenth century, paints with great accuracy the manners and superstitions of the Shakspearean era. He has paid particular attention to the festival that we are describing, and enumerates the various greens and flowers appropriated to different seasons in a little poem entitled

"CEREMONIES FOR CANDLEMASSE EVE.

DOWN with the Rosemary and Bayes, Down with the Misleto; Instead of Holly, now up-raise The greener Box (for show).

The Holly hitherto did sway; Let Box now domineere; Untill the dancing Easter-day, On Easter's Eve appeare.

Then youthfull Box which now hath grace, Your houses to renew; Grown old, surrender must his place, Unto the crisped Yew.

When Yew is out, then Birch comes in, And many Flowers beside; Both of a fresh and fragrant kinne, To honour Whitsontide.

Green Bushes then, and sweetest Bents, With cooler Oken boughs; Come in for comely ornaments, To re-adorn the house."[140:A]

The usage which we have alluded to, of preserving the Christmas cheer and hospitality to Candlemas, is immediately afterwards recorded and connected with a singular superstition, in the following poems under the titles of

"CEREMONIES FOR CANDLEMASSE DAY.

KINDLE the Christmas Brand, and then Till sunne-set, let it burne; Which quencht, then lay it up agen, Till Christmas next returne.

Part must be kept wherewith to teend[140:B] The Christmas Log next yeare; And where 'tis safely kept, the fiend Can do no mischiefe there.——

* * * * *

End now the white-loafe, and the pye, And let all sports with Christmas dye."[140:C]

To the exorcising power of the Christmas Brand is added, in the subsequent effusion, a most alarming denunciation against those who heedlessly leave in the Hall on Candlemas Eve, any the smallest portion of the Christmas greens.

"CEREMONY UPON CANDLEMAS EVE

DOWN with the Rosemary, and so Down with the Baies, and Misletoe: Down with the Holly, Ivie, all Wherewith ye drest the Christmas Hall: That so the superstitious find No one least Branch there left behind: For look, how many leaves there be, Neglected there, maids, trust to me, So many _goblins_ you shall see."[141:A]

The next important period of feasting in the country occurred at SHROVE-TIDE, which among the Roman Catholics was the time appointed for _shriving_ or _confession of sins_, and was also observed as a _carnival_ before the commencement of Lent. The former of these ceremonies was dispensed with at the Reformation; but the rites attending the latter were for a long time supported with a rival spirit of hilarity. The Monday and Tuesday succeeding _Shrove_ Sunday, called _Collop Monday_ and _Pancake Tuesday_, were peculiarly devoted to _Shrovetide Amusement_; the first having been, in papal times, the period at which they took leave of flesh, or slices of meat, termed _collops_ in the north, which had been preserved through the winter by salting and drying, and the second was a relic of the feast preceding Lent; eggs and collops therefore on the Monday, and pancakes, as a delicacy, on the Tuesday, were duly if not religiously served up.

Tusser, in his very curious and entertaining poem on agriculture, thus notices some of the old observances at _Shrovetide_:—

"At Shroftide to shroving, go thresh the fat hen, If blindfold can kill her, then give it thy men: Maids, fritters and pancakes, ynow see ye make, Let slut have one pancake, for company sake."

For an explanation of the obsolete custom of "threshing the fat hen," we are indebted to Mr. Hilman. "The hen," says he, "is hung at a fellow's back, who has also some horse-bells about him; the rest of the fellows are blinded, and have boughs in their hands, with which they chase this fellow and his hen about some large court or small enclosure. The fellow with his hen and bells shifting as well as he can, they follow the sound, and sometimes hit him and his hen; at other times, if he can get behind one of them, they

thresh one another well favour'dly; but the jest is, the maids are to blind the fellows, which they do with their aprons, and the cunning baggages will endear their sweet-hearts with a peeping hole, whilst the others look out as sharp to hinder it. After this the hen is boil'd with bacon, and store of pancakes and fritters are made. She that is noted for lying in bed long, or any other miscarriage, hath the first pancake presented to her, which most commonly falls to the dogs share at last, for no one will own it their due." Mr. Hilman concludes his comment on the text with a singular remark; "the loss of the above laudable custom, is one of the benefits we have got by smoaking tobacco."[142:A]

Shakspeare has twice noticed this season of feasting and amusement; first, in _All's Well That Ends Well_, where he makes the Clown tell the Countess (among a string of other similes), that his answer is "as fit as a pancake for Shrove-tuesday[143:A];" and in the _Second Part of King Henry IV._ he has introduced _Silence_ singing the following song:—

"Be merry, be merry, my wife's as all;[143:B] For women are shrews, both short and tall: 'Tis merry in hall, when beards wag all, And welcome merry _shrove-tide_. Be merry, be merry, &c."

The third line of this song appears to have been proverbial, and of considerable antiquity; for Adam Davie, who flourished about 1312, has the same imagery with the same rhyme, in his _Life of Alexander_:

"Merry swithe it is in halle, When the _berdes waveth alle_."[143:C]

And the subsequent passage, quoted by Mr. Reed from a writer contemporary with Shakspeare, proves, that it was a common burden or under song in the halls of our gentry at that period:—"which done, grace said, and the table taken up, the plate presently conveyed into the pantrie, the hall summons this consort of companions (upon payne to dyne with Duke Humphfrie, or to kisse the hare's foot,) to appear at the first call: where a song is to be sung, the under song or holding whereof is, _It is merrie in haul where beards wag all._" The Serving-man's Comfort, 1598, sign. C.[144:A]

The evening of _Shrove-Tuesday_ was usually appropriated, as well in the country as in town, to the exhibition of dramatic pieces. Not only at Court, where Jonson was occasionally employed to write Masques on this night[144:B], but at both the Universities, in the provincial schools, and in the halls of the gentry and nobility, were these the amusements of _Shrovetide_, during the days of Elizabeth and James. Warton, speaking of these ephemeral plays, adds, in a note, "I have seen an anonymous comedy, APOLLO SHROVING, composed by the Master of Hadleigh-school, in Suffolk[144:C], and acted by his scholars, on Shrove-tuesday, Feb. 7, 1626, printed 1627. 8vo. published, as it seems, by E. W. _Shrove-tuesday_, as the day immediately preceding Lent, was always a day of extraordinary sport and feasting."—"Some of these festivities," he proceeds to say, "still remain in our universities. In the PERCY HOUSHOLD-BOOK, 1512, it appears, that the clergy and officers of Lord Percy's chapel performed a play _before his lordship upon Shrowftewesday at night_." Pag. 345.[144:D]

The cruel custom of _Cock-throwing_, which, until lately, was a diversion peculiar to this day, seems to have originated from the barbarous, yet less savage, amusement of _Cock-fighting_. "Every yeare on _Shrove-Tuesday_," says Fitzstephen, who wrote in the reign of Henry II., "the schoole-boyes doe bring cockes of the game to their master, and all the forenoone they delight themselves in Cock-fighting."[145:A] At what period this degenerated into Cock-throwing cannot now be ascertained; Chaucer seems to allude to it in his _Nonnes Priests' Tale_, where the Cock revenges himself on the Priest's son, because he

———————— "gave hym a knocke Upon his legges, when he was yonge and nice;"

and that it was common in the sixteenth century, we have the testimony of Sir Thomas More, who, describing the state of childhood, speaks of his skill in casting a cok-stele, that is, a stick or cudgel to throw at a cock.[145:B]

The first effective blow directed against this infamous sport, was given by the moral pencil of Hogarth, who in one of his prints called _The Four Stages of Cruelty_, has represented, among other puerile diversions, a groupe of boys _throwing at a Cock_, and, as Trusler remarks, "beating the harmless feathered animal to jelly."[145:C] The benevolent satire of this great artist gradually produced the necessary reform, and for some time past, the magistrates have so generally interdicted the practice, that the pastime may happily be considered as extinct.[145:D]

EASTER-TIDE, or the week succeeding Easter-Sunday, afforded another opportunity for rejoicing, and was formerly a season of great festivity. Not only, as bound by every tie of gratitude to do, did man rejoice on this occasion, but it was the belief of the vulgar that the sun himself partook of the exhilaration, and regularly danced on Easter-Day. To see this glorious spectacle, therefore, it was customary for the common people to rise before the sun on Easter-morning, and though, as we may conclude, they were

constantly disappointed, yet might the habit occasionally lead to serious thought and useful contemplation; metaphorically considered, indeed, the idea may be termed both just and beautiful, "for as the earth and her valleys standing thick with corn, are said _to laugh and sing_; so, on account of the Resurrection, the heavens and the sun may be said to dance for joy; or, as the Psalmist words it, the _heavens may rejoice and the earth may be glad_."[146:A]

The great amusement of the Easter-holidays consisted in playing at hand-ball, a game at which, say the ritualists Belithus and Durandus, bishops and archbishops used, upon the continent at this period, to recreate themselves with their inferior clergy[147:A]; nor was it uncommon for corporate bodies on this occasion in England to amuse themselves in a similar way with their burgesses and young people; antiently this was the custom, says Mr. Brand, at Newcastle, at the feasts of Easter and Whitsuntide, when the mayor, aldermen, and sheriff, accompanied by great numbers of the burgesses, used to go yearly at these seasons to the Forth, or little mall of the town, with the mace, sword, and cap of maintenance carried before them, and not only countenance, but frequently join in the diversions of hand-ball, dancing, &c.[147:B]

The constant prize at hand-ball, during Easter, was a _tansy-cake_, supposed to be allusive to the _bitter herbs_ used by the Jews on this festival. Selden, the contemporary of Shakspeare, speaking of our chief holidays, remarks, that "our Meats and Sports have much of them relation to Church-Works. The coffin of our _Christmas Pies_, in shape long, is in imitation of the Cratch[147:C]: our chusing Kings and Queens on Twelfth Night, hath reference to the three kings. So likewise our eating of fritters, _whipping_ of tops, _roasting_ of herrings, Jack of Lents, &c. they are all in imitation of Church-Works, emblems of martyrdom. Our _Tansies at Easter_ have reference to the _bitter Herbs_; though at the same time 'twas always the fashion for a man to have a _Gammon of Bacon_, to shew himself to be no _Jew_."[147:D] Fuller has noticed this Easter game under his Cheshire, where, explaining the origin of the proverb "When the daughter is stolen shut Pepper Gate," he says, "The mayor of the city had his daughter, as she was _playing at ball_ with other maidens in Pepper-street, stolen away by a young man through the same gate, whereupon he caused it to be shut up."[148:A]

Another custom which prevailed in this country, during the sixteenth century, at Easter, and is still kept up in some parts of the north, was that of presenting children with _eggs stained with various colours in boiling_, termed _Paste_ or more properly _Pasche Eggs_, which the young people considered in the light of _fairings_. This observance appears to have arisen from a superstition, prevalent among the Roman Catholics, that eggs were an emblem of the resurrection, and, indeed, in the Ritual of Pope Paul the Fifth, which was composed for the use of England, Ireland, and Scotland, there is a prayer for the consecration of eggs, in which the faithful servants of the Lord are directed to eat this his creature of eggs _on account of the resurrection_. On this custom Mr. Brand has well observed, that "the antient Egyptians, if the resurrection of the body had been a tenet of their faith, would perhaps have thought an _Egg_ no improper hieroglyphical representation of it. The exclusion of a living creature by incubation, after the vital principle has lain a long while dormant or extinct, is a process so truly marvellous, that if it could be disbelieved, would be thought by some a thing as incredible, as that the Author of _Life_ should be able to re-animate the _dead_."[148:B] So prevalent indeed was this custom of _egg-giving_ at Easter, that it forms the basis of an old English proverb, which, in the collection of Mr. Ray, runs thus:

"I'll warrant you for an _egg_ at _Easter_."[148:C]

A popular holiday, called HOKE-DAY, or HOCK-DAY, which used to be celebrated with much festivity in Shakspeare's native county, was usually observed on the Tuesday following the second Sunday after Easter-day. Its origin is doubtful, some antiquaries supposing it was commemorative of the massacre of the Danes in the reign of Ethelred the Unready, which took place on the 13th of November 1002; and others that it was meant to perpetuate the deliverance of the English from the tyrannical government of the Danes, by the death of Hardicanute on Tuesday the 8th of June 1041. At Coventry in Warwickshire, however, it was celebrated in memory of the former event, though the commemoration was held on a day wide apart from that on which the catastrophe occurred, a circumstance which originated in an ordinance of Ethelred himself, who transferred the sports of this day to the Monday and Tuesday in the third week after Easter. John Rouse, or Ross, the Warwickshire historian, says, that this day was distinguished by various sports, in which the people, divided into parties, used to draw each other by ropes[149:A]; a species of diversion of which Spelman has given us a more intelligible account by telling us that it "consisted in the men and women binding each other, and especially the women the men," and that the day, in consequence of this pastime, was called _Binding-Tuesday_.[149:B]

The term _hock_, by which this day is designated, is thus accounted for by Henry of Huntingdon. "The secret letters of Ethelred, directed to all parts of his kingdom from this city (Winchester), ordered that all the Danes indiscriminately should be put to death; and this was executed, as we learn from the chronicle of Wallingford, with circumstances of the greatest cruelty, even upon women

and children, in many parts: but in other places, it seems that the English, instead of killing their guests, satisfied themselves with what was called _hock-shining_, or _houghing_ them, by cutting their ham-strings, so as to render them incapable of serving in war. Hence the sports which were afterwards instituted in our city, and from thence propagated throughout the whole kingdom, obtained the name of _Hocktide merriments_."

It appears from the following passage in Laneham's Account of Queen Elizabeth's Entertainment at Kenelworth Castle, A. D. 1575, that the citizens of Coventry had lately been compelled to give up their annual amusements on _Hock Tuesday_, and took the opportunity of the queen's visit to the Earl of Leicester to petition her for a renewal of the same. "Hereto followed," says Laneham, "as good a sport (methought), presented in an historical cue, by certain good-hearted men of _Coventry_, my Lord's neighbours there; who understanding among them the thing that could not be hidden from any, how careful and studious his Honour was that by all pleasant recreations her Highness might best find herself welcome, and be made gladsome and merry (the groundwork indeed and foundation of his Lordship's mirth and gladness of us all), made petition that they mought renew now their old storial shew: Of argument how the _Danes_, whylome here in a troublous season were for quietness borne withal and suffered in peace; that anon, by outrage and importable insolency, abusing both _Ethelred_ the _King_, then, and all Estates every where beside; at the grievous complaint and counsel of _Huna_ the _King_'s chieftain in wars on a _Saint Brice_'s night, A. D. 1012 (as the book says, that falleth yearly on the thirteenth of November) were all dispatched, and the realm rid. And for because the matter mentioneth how valiantly our _English_ women for love of their country behaved themselves, expressed in actions and rymes after their manner, they thought it mought move some mirth to her Majesty the rather. The thing, said they, is grounded on story, and for pastime wont to be played in our city yearly; without ill example of manners, papistry, or any superstition; and else did so occupy the heads of a number, that likely enough would have had worse meditations; had an ancient beginning and a long continuance; till now of late laid down, they knew no cause why, unless it were by the zeal of certain their preachers, men very commendable for their behaviour and learning, and sweet in their sermons, but somewhat too sour in preaching away their pastime: Wished therefore, that as they should continue their good doctrine in pulpit, so, for matters of policy and governance of the city, they would permit them to the _Mayor_ and _Magistrates_; and said, by my faith, _Master Martyn, they would make their humble petition unto her Highness, that they might have their Plays up again_."[151:A]

As it is subsequently stated that their play was very graciously received by the queen, who commanded it to be represented again on the following Tuesday, and gave the performers two bucks, and five marks in money, we must suppose, that their petition was not rejected, and that they were allowed to renew yearly at Coventry, their favourite diversions on _Hock-Tuesday_. The observance of this day, indeed, was still partially retained in the time of Spelman, who died A. D. 1641[151:B], and even Plott, who lived until 1696, mentions it then as not totally discontinued; but the eighteenth century, we believe, never witnessed its celebration.

We have now reached that period of the year which was formerly dedicated to one of the most splendid and pleasing of our festal rites. The observance of MAY-DAY was a custom which, until the close of the reign of James the First, alike attracted the attention of the royal and the noble, as of the vulgar class. Henry the Eighth, Elizabeth, and James, patronized and partook of its ceremonies; and, during this extended era, there was scarcely a village in the kingdom but what had a _May-pole_, with its appropriate games and dances.

The origin of these festivities has been attributed to three different sources, _Classic_, _Celtic_, and _Gothic_. The first appears to us to establish the best claim to the parentage of our May-day rites, as a relique of the _Roman Floralia_, which were celebrated on the last four days of April, and on the first of May, in honour of the goddess Flora, and were accompanied with dancing, music, the wearing of garlands, strewing of flowers, &c. The _Beltein_, or rural sacrifice of the Highlanders on this day, as described by Mr. Pennant and Dr. Jamieson[152:A], seems to have arisen from a different motive, and to have been instituted for the purpose of propitiating the various noxious animals which might injure or destroy their flocks and herds. The Gothic anniversary on May-day makes a nearer approach to the general purpose of the _Floralia_, and was intended as a thanksgiving to the sun, if not for the return of flowers, fruit, and grain, yet for the introduction of a better season for fishing and hunting.[152:B]

The modes of conducting the ceremonies and rejoicings on _May-day_, may be best drawn from the writers of the Elizabethan period, in which this festival appears to have maintained a very high degree of celebrity, though not accompanied with that splendour of exhibition which took place at an earlier period in the reign of Henry the Eighth. It may be traced, indeed, from the era of Chaucer, who, in the conclusion of his _Court of Love_, has described the _Feast of May_, when

"—— Forth goth all the court both most and lest, To fetch the floures fresh, and braunch and blome— And namely hauthorn brought both page and grome And than rejoysen in their great delite: Eke ech at other throw the floures bright, The primerose, the

violete, and the gold, With fresh garlants party blew and white."[153:A]

And, it should be observed, that this, the simplest mode of celebrating May-day, was as much in vogue, in the days of Shakspeare, as the more complex one, accompanied by the morris-dance, and the games of Robin Hood. The following descriptions, by Bourne and Borlase, manifestly allude to the costume of this age, and to the simpler mode of commemorating the 1st of May: "On the _Calends_, or the 1st day of May," says the former, "commonly called _May-day_, the juvenile part of both sexes were wont to rise a little after midnight, and walk to some neighbouring wood, accompany'd with music, and the blowing of horns, where they break down branches from the trees, and adorn them with _nosegays_ and _crowns of flowers_. When this is done, they return with their booty homewards, about the rising of the sun, and make their doors and windows to triumph in the flowery spoil. The after part of the day, is chiefly spent in dancing round a tall poll, which is called a _May Poll_; which being placed in a convenient part of the village, stands there, as it were consecrated to the _Goddess of Flowers_, without the least violence offered it, in the whole circle of the year."[153:B] "An antient custom," says the latter, "still retained by the Cornish, is that of decking their doors and porches on the first of May with green sycamore and hawthorn boughs, and of planting trees, or rather stumps of trees, before their houses: and on May-eve, they from towns make excursions into the country, and having cut down a tall elm, brought it into town, fitted a straight and taper pole to the end of it, and painted the same, erect it in the most public places, and on holidays and festivals adorn it with flower garlands, or insigns and streamers."[154:A]

Now both these passages are little more than a less extended account of what Philip Stubbes was a witness of, and described, in the year 1595, in his puritanical work, entitled _The Anatomie of Abuses_. "Against Maie-day," relates this vehement declaimer, "every parish, towne, or village, assemble themselves, both men, women, and children; and either all together, or dividing themselves into companies, they goe some to the woods and groves, some to the hills and mountaines, some to one place, some to another, where they spend all the night in pleasant pastimes, and in the morning they return bringing with them, birche boughes and branches of trees to deck their assemblies withal. But their chiefest jewel they bring from thence is the maie-pole, which they bring home with great veneration, as thus—they have twentie or fortie yoake of oxen, every oxe having a sweete nosegaie of flowers tied to the tip of his hornes, and these oxen drawe home the maie-poale, their stinking idol rather, which they covered all over with flowers and hearbes, bound round with strings from the top to the bottome, and sometimes it was painted with variable colours, having two or three hundred men, women, and children following it with great devotion. And thus equipp'd it was reared with handkerchiefes and flagges streaming on the top, they strawe the ground round about it, they bind green boughs about it, they set up summer halles, bowers, and arbours, hard by it, and then fall they to banquetting and feasting, to leaping and dauncing about it, as the heathen people did at the dedication of their idolls.—I have heard it crediblie reported," he sarcastically adds, "by men of great gravity, credite, and reputation, that of fourtie, three score, or an hundred maides going to the wood, there have scarcely the third part of them returned home againe as they went."[154:B]

Browne also has given a similar description of the May-day rites in his Britannia's Pastorals:—

"As I have seene the Lady of the May Set in an arbour —— —— —— Built by the May-pole, where the jocund swaines Dance with the maidens to the bagpipe's straines, When envious night commands them to be gone, Call for the merry yongsters one by one, And for their well performance some disposes, To this a garland interwove with roses; To that a carved hooke, or well-wrought scrip, Gracing another with her cherry lip: To one her garter, to another then A handkerchiefe cast o're and o're agen; And none returneth empty, that hath spent His paynes to fill their rurall merriment."[155:A]

The custom of rising early on a May-morning to enjoy the season, and honour the day, is thus noticed by Stow:—"In the month of May," he says, "namely, on May-day in the morning, every man, except impediment, would walke into the sweete meddowes and green woods, there to rejoice their spirits, with the beauty and savour of sweet flowers, and with the harmony of birds, praysing God in their kind[155:B];" and Shakspeare has repeated references to the same observance; in _Midsummer-Night's Dream_, Lysander tells Hermia,

—— "I did meet thee once with Helena, _To do observance to a morn of May_;"[155:C]

and again, in the same play, Theseus says,—

"No doubt they rose up early, _to observe The rite of May_."[156:A]

So generally prevalent was this habit of early rising on May-day, that Shakspeare makes one of his inferior characters in _King Henry the Eighth_ exclaim,—

"Pray, sir, be patient; _'tis as much impossible_ (Unless we sweep them from the door with cannons) _To scatter them, as 'tis to make them sleep On May-day morning; which will never be_."[156:B]

Herrick, the minute describer of the customs and superstitions of his times, which were those of Shakspeare, and the _immediately_ succeeding period, has a poem called _Corinna's Going A Maying_, which includes most of the circumstances hitherto mentioned; he thus addresses his mistress:—

"Get up —— and see The dew bespangling herbe and tree: Each flower has wept, and bow'd toward the east, Above an houre since;—it is sin, Nay profanation to keep in; When as a thousand virgins on this day, Spring sooner than the lark, to fetch in May! Come, my Corinna, come; and comming marke How each field turns a street, each street a parke Made green, and trimm'd with trees; see how Devotion gives each house a bough, Or branch: each porch, each doore, ere this, An arke, a tabernacle is Made up of white-thorn neatly enterwove.—

There's not a budding boy, or girle, this day But is got up, and gone to bring in May: A deale of youth, ere this, is come Back, and with white-thorn laden home. Some have dispatcht their cakes and creame, Before that we have left to dreame: And some have wept, and woo'd, and plighted troth, And chose their priest, ere we can cast off sloth: Many a green gown has been given; Many a kisse, both odde and even: Many a glance too has been sent From out the eye, Love's firmament: Many a jest told of the keyes betraying This night, and locks pickt, yet w'are not a Maying!"[157:A]

With this, the simplest mode of celebrating the rites of May-day, was frequently united, in the days of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, a groupe of _Morris Dancers_, consisting of several characters, which were often varied both in number, appellation, and dress. The _Morris Dance_ appears to have been introduced into this kingdom about the reign of Edward the Fourth, and is, without doubt, derived from the _Morisco_, a dance peculiar to the _Moors_, and generally termed the _Spanish Morisco_, from its notoriety in Spain, during the dynasty of that people in the peninsula. The _Morris Dance_ in this country, when performed on a May-day, and not connected with the Games of Robin Hood, usually consisted of the Lady of the May, the Fool, or domestic buffoon of the 15th and 16th centuries, a Piper, and two, four, or more, Morris Dancers. The dress of these last personages, who designated the amusement, was of a very peculiar kind; they had their faces blackened to resemble the native Moors, and "in the reign of Henry the Eighth," says Mr. Douce, "they were dressed in gilt leather and silver paper, and sometimes in coats of white spangled fustian. They had purses at their girdles, and garters to which bells were attached[158:A];" but according to Stubbes, who wrote in 1595, the costume had been altered, for he tells us that they were clothed in "greene, yellow, or some other light wanton collour. And as though that were not gawdy ynough," he continues, "they bedeeke themselves with scarffes, ribbons, and laces hanged all over with golde ringes, precious stones, and other jewels: this done, they tie about either legge twentie or fourtie belles, with rich handkerchiefe in their handes, and sometimes laide a crosse over their shoulders and neckes borrowed for the most part of their pretie _Mopsies_ and loving _Bessies_ for bussing them in the darke."[158:B] Feathers, too, were usually worn in their hats, and they had occasionally bells fixed on their arms or wrists, as well as on their legs. That these jingling ornaments were characteristic of, and derived from, the genuine _Moorish Dance_, appears from a plate copied by Mr. Douce from the habits of various nations, published by Hans Weigel at Nuremberg, in 1577, and which represents the figure of an African lady of the kingdom of Fez in the act of dancing, with bells at her feet.[158:C]

It was the business of these motley figures to dance round the May-pole, which was painted of various colours; thus in Mr. Tollett's painted glass window, at Betley in Staffordshire, which represents an English May-game and morris-dance, the May-pole is stained yellow and black, in spiral lines[158:D]; and Shakspeare, in allusion to this custom, makes Hermia tell Helena, whilst ridiculing the tallness of her form, that she is a "painted May-pole[158:E];" so Stubbes, likewise, in a passage previously quoted, says, that the Maie-pole was "painted with variable colours."

That the _morris-dance_ was an almost constant attendant on the May-day festivities, may be drawn from our usual authority, the works of Shakspeare; for, in _All's Well That Ends Well_, the Clown affirms, that his answer will serve all questions

"As fit as a morris for May-day."[159:A]

But, about the commencement of the sixteenth century, or somewhat sooner, probably towards the middle of the fifteenth century, a very material addition was made to the celebration of the rites of May-day, by the introduction of the characters of Robin Hood and some of his associates. This was done with a view towards the encouragement of archery, and the custom was continued even beyond the close of the reign of James I. It is true, that the May-games in their rudest form, the mere dance of lads and lasses round a May-pole, or the simple morris with the Lady of the May, were occasionally seen during the days of Elizabeth; but the

general exhibition was the more complicated ceremony which we are about to describe.

The personages who now became the chief performers in the _morris-dance_, were four of the most popular outlaws of Sherwood forest; that Robin Hood, of whom Drayton says,—

"In this our spacious isle, I think there is not one, But he hath heard some talk of him and little John;— Of Tuck the merry friar, which many a sermon made In praise of Robin Hood, his outlaws and their trade;— "Of Robin's" mistress dear, his loved Marian, —— —— —— which wheresoe'er she came, Was sovereign of the woods, chief lady of the game: Her clothes tuck'd to the knee, and dainty braided hair, With bow and quiver arm'd;"[159:B]

characters which Warner, the contemporary of Drayton and Shakspeare, has exclusively recorded as celebrating the rites of May; for, speaking of the periods of some of our festivals, and remarking that "ere penticost begun our May," he adds,

"Tho' (_then_) Robin Hood, liell John, frier Tucke, And Marian, deftly play, And lord and ladie gang till kirke With lads and lasses gay:

Fra masse and een sang sa gud cheere And glee on ery greene."[160:A]

These four characters, therefore, _Robin Hood_, _Little John_, _Friar Tuck_, and _Maid Marian_, although no constituent parts of the original English morris, became at length so blended with it, especially on the festival of May-day, that until the practice of archery was nearly laid aside, they continued to be the most essential part of the pageantry.

In consequence of this arrangement, "the old _Robin Hood_ of England," as Shakspeare calls him[160:B], was created the King or Lord of the May, and sometimes carried in his hand, during the May-game, a painted standard.[160:C] It was no uncommon circumstance, likewise, for metrical interludes, of a comic species, and founded on the achievements of this outlaw, to be performed after the morris, on the May-pole green. In Garrick's Collection of Old Plays, occurs one, entitled "A mery Geste of Robyn Hoode, and of hys Lyfe, wyth a newe Playe _for to be played in Maye-Games_, very pleasaunte and full of pastyme;" it is printed at London, in the black letter, for William Copland, and has figures in the title page of Robin Hood and Lytel John.[160:D] Shakspeare appears to allude to these interludes when he represents Fabian, in the _Twelfth Night_, exclaiming on the approach of Sir Andrew Ague-Cheek with his challenge, "More matter for May-morning."[160:E]

Upon this introduction of Robin Hood and his companions into the celebration of May-day, his paramour _Maid Marian_, assumed the office of the former Queen of May. This far-famed lady has, according to Mr. Ritson, no part in the original and more authentic history of Robin Hood; but seems to have been first brought forward when the story of this hero became dramatised, which was at a very early period in this country; and Mr. Douce is of opinion that the name, which is a stranger to English history, has been taken from "a pretty French pastoral drama of the eleventh or twelfth century, entitled _Le jeu du berger et de la bergere_, in which the principal characters are _Robin_ and _Marian_, a shepherd and shepherdess."[161:A] This appears the more probable, as the piece was not only very popular in France, but performed at the season when the May-games took place in England.

Maid Marian, in the days of Shakspeare, was usually represented by a delicate, smooth-faced youth, who was dressed in all the fashionable finery of the times; and this assumption of the female garb gave, not without some reason, great offence to the puritanical dissenters, one of whom, exclaiming against the amusements of May-day, notices this, amongst some other abuses, in the following very curious passage:—"The abuses which are committed in your May-games are infinite. The first whereof is this, that you doe use to attyre in woman's apparrell whom you doe most commonly call _may-marrions_, whereby you infringe that straight commandment whiche is given in Deut. xxii. 5., that men must not put on women's apparrell for feare of enormities. Nay I myself have seene in a may game a troupe, the greater part whereof hath been men, and yet have they been attyred so like into women, that their faces being hidde (as they were indeede) a man coulde not discerne them from women. The second abuse, which of all other is the greatest, is this, that it hath been toulde that your morice dauncers have dannced naked in nettes: what greater enticement unto naughtiness could have been devised? The third abuse is, that you (because you will loose no tyme) doe use commonly to runne into woodes in the night time, amongst maidens, to fet bowes, in so muche as I have hearde of tenne maidens which went to fet May, and nine of them came home with childe."[162:A]

That, in consequence of this custom, effeminate and coxcomical men were sarcastically compared to _Maid Marian_, appears from a passage in a pamphlet by Barnaby Rich, who, satirising the male attire, as worn by the fops of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., cries out,—"From whence commeth this wearing, and this embroidering of long locks, this curiosity that is used amongst men, in frizeling and curling of their haire, this gentlewoman-like starcht bands, so be-edged and be-laced, _fitter for Maid Marian in a Moris

dance_, than for him that hath either that spirit or courage that shold be in a gentleman."[162:B]

It will not seem surprising that the converse of this was occasionally applicable to the female sex; and that those women who adopted masculine airs and habits should be branded with a similarity to the clown who, though personating the lady of the May, never failed, however nice or affected he might be, to disclose by the boldness and awkwardness of his gesture and manner, both his rank and sex. Thus Falstaff is represented as telling the hostess, when he means to upbraid her for her masculine appearance and conduct, that "for _woman hood_ Maid Marian may be the Deputy's wife of the ward to thee."[162:C] A fancy coronet of gilt metal, or interwoven with flowers, and a watchet coloured tunic, a kirtle or petticoat of green, as the livery of Robin Hood, were customary articles of decoration in the dress of the May-Queen.

Friar Tuck, the next of the four characters which we have mentioned as introduced into the May-games, was the chaplain of Robin Hood, and is noticed by Shakspeare, who makes one of the outlaws, in the _Two Gentlemen of Verona_, swear

"By the bare scalp of _Robin Hood's fat friar_."[163:A]

He is represented in the engraving of Mr. Tollet's window as a Franciscan friar in the full clerical tonsure; for, as Mr. T. observes in giving an account of his window, "when the parish priests were inhibited by the diocesan to assist in the May games, the Franciscans might give attendance, as being exempted from episcopal jurisdiction;" he adds that "most of Shakspeare's friars are Franciscans," and that in Sir David Dalrymple's extracts from the book of the _Universal Kirk_, in the year 1576, he is styled "chaplain to Robin Huid, king of May."[163:B]

The last of this groupe was the boon companion of Robin, the "_brave Little John_," as he is termed in one of the ballads on this popular outlaw, and who "is first mentioned," remarks Mr. Douce, "together with Robin Hood, by Fordun the Scotish historian, who wrote in the fourteenth century, and who speaks of the celebration of the story of these persons in the _theatrical performances_ of his time, and of the minstrel's songs relating to them, which he says the common people preferred to all _other romances_."[163:C]

With these _four_ personages therefore, who were deemed so inseparable, that a character in Peele's Edward I. says, "We will live and die together, like _Robin Hood_, _Little John_, _Friar Tucke_, and _Maide Marian_[163:D]," the performers in the simple English Morris, the _fool_, _Tom the Piper_, and the _Morris Dancers_, peculiarly so called from their dress and function, were, for a time, generally connected. Tom the Piper is thus mentioned by Drayton:

"Myself above Tom Piper to advance, Which so bestirs him in the Morrice-dance For penny wage."[164:A]

And Shakspeare, alluding to the violent gesticulations and music of the Morris dancers says, speaking of Cade the rebel,

———————— "I have seen him Caper upright like a _wild morisco_, Shaking the bloody darts, as he his bells."[164:B]

The music accompanying the _Morris_ and the _May-games_, was either the simple pipe, or the pipe and tabor, or the bag-pipe. In the following passage from a curious controversial pamphlet, published towards the close of the sixteenth century, the morris and the pipe and tabor are thus noticed: "If Menippus, or the man in the moone, be so quick sighted, that he beholds these bitter sweete jests, these railing outcries; this shouting at prelates to cast them downe, and heaving at Martin to hang him up for Martilmas biefe; what would he imagine otherwise, then as that stranger, which seeing a Quintessence (beside the _foole_ and the _Maid Marian_) of all the picked youth, strained out of an whole Endship, footing the _morris about a may pole_, and he, not hearing the crie of the hounds, for the barking of dogs, (that is to say) the minstrelsie for the fidling, the tune for the sound, nor the _pipe for the noise of the tabor_, bluntly demanded if they were not all beside themselves, that they so lip'd and skip'd whithout an occasion."[164:C] To this quotation Mr. Haslewood has annexed the subsequent ludicrous story from a tract entitled, _Hay any worke for Cooper_. It is a striking proof of the singular attraction and popularity of the May-games at this period:—"There is a neighbour of ours, an honest priest, who was sometimes (simple as he now stands) a vice in a play, for want of a better; his name is Gliberie of Hawstead in Essex, hee goes much to the pulpit. On a time, I thinke it was the last _May_, he went up with a full resolution to doe his businesse with great commendations. But, see the fortune of it. A boy in the church, hearing either the _summer lord with his May-game, or Robin Hood with his morice daunce_, going by the church, out goes the boye. Good Glibery, though he were in the pulpit, yet had a mind to his old companions abroad, (a company of merry grigs you must thinke them to be, as merry as a vice on a stage), seeing the boy going out, finished his matter presently with John of London's amen, saying, ha ye faith, boy! are they there? Then ha with thee, and so came downe and among them he goes."[165:A]

That the music of the _bag-pipe_ was highly esteemed in the days of Shakspeare, and even preferred to the tabor and pipe, we have a strong instance in his _Winter's Tale_, where a servant enters announcing Autolicus in the following terms: "If you did but hear the pedlar at the door, you would never dance again after a tabor and pipe; no, _the bag-pipe could not move you_[165:B];" and that especially in the country, it was a frequent accompaniment to the morris bells, the numerous collections of _madrigals_, published in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, afford many proofs. Thus, from a collection printed in 1600:

"Harke, harke, I heare the dancing And a nimble morris prancing; _The bagpipe and the morris bells_, That they are not farre hence us tells; Come let us all goe thither, And dance like friends together:"[165:C]

and from another, allusive to the May-games, edited by Thomas Morley:

"Now is the month of Maying, When merry lads are playing; Fa la la, Each with his bonny lasse, Upon the greeny grasse. Fa la la.

The spring clad all in gladness, Doth laugh at winter's sadnesse; And to the _bagpipe's_ sound, The nimphs tread out their ground.

* * * * *

About the May-pole new with glee and merriment, While as the _bagpipe_ tooted it, Thirsis and Cloe fine together footed it; Fa la la."[166:A]

The Morris and the May-game of Robin Hood attained their most perfect form when united with the _Hobby-Horse_ and the _Dragon_. Of these the former was the resemblance of the head and tail of a horse, manufactured in pasteboard, and attached to a person whose business it was, whilst he seemed to ride gracefully on its back, to imitate the prancings and curvettings of that noble animal, whose supposed feet were concealed by a foot-cloth reaching to the ground; and the latter, constructed of the same materials, was made to hiss and vibrate his wings, and was frequently attacked by the man on the hobby-horse, who then personated the character of St. George.[166:B]

In the reigns therefore of Elizabeth and James I. these eight masqueraders, consisting of _Robin Hood_, _Maid Marian_, _Friar Tuck_, _Little John_, the _Fool_, _Tom the Piper_, the _Hobby-Horse_, and the _Dragon_, with from two to ten _morris-dancers_, or, in lieu of them, the same number of _Robin Hood's men_, in coats, hoods, and hose of green, with a painted _pole_ in the centre, represented the most complete establishment of the May-game.[167:A]

All these characters may be traced, indeed, so far back as the middle of the fifteenth century; and, accordingly, Mr. Strutt, in his interesting romance, entitled "Queen-hoo Hall," has introduced a very pleasing and accurate description of the May-games and Morris of Robin Hood, which, as written in a lively and dramatic style, and not in the least differing from what they continued to be in the youthful days of Shakspeare, and before they were broken in upon by the fanaticism of the puritans, we shall copy in this place for the entertainment of our readers.

"In the front of the pavilion, a large square was staked out, and fenced with ropes, to prevent the crowd from pressing upon the performers, and interrupting the diversion; there were also two bars at the bottom of the inclosure, through which the actors might pass and repass, as occasion required.

"Six young men first entered the square, clothed in jerkins of leather, with axes upon their shoulders like woodmen, and their heads bound with large garlands of ivy-leaves intertwined with sprigs of hawthorn. Then followed,

"Six young maidens of the village, dressed in blue kirtles, with garlands of primroses on their heads, leading a fine sleek cow, decorated with ribbons of various colours, interspersed with flowers; and the horns of the animal were tipped with gold. These were succeeded by

"Six foresters, equipped in green tunics, with hoods and hosen of the same colour; each of them carried a bugle-horn attached to a baldrick of silk, which he sounded as he passed the barrier. After them came

"Peter Lanaret, the baron's chief falconer, who personified _Robin Hood_; he was attired in a bright grass-green tunic, fringed with gold; his hood and his hosen were parti-coloured, blue and white; he had a large garland of rose-buds on his head, a bow bent in his hand, a sheaf of arrows at his girdle, and a bugle-horn depending from a baldrick of light blue tarantine, embroidered with silver; he had also a sword and a dagger, the hilts of both being richly embossed with gold.

"Fabian a page, as _Little John_, walked at his right hand; and Cecil Cellerman the butler, as Will Stukely, at his left. These, with ten others of the jolly outlaw's attendants who followed, were habited in green garments, bearing their bows bent in their hands, and their arrows in their girdles. Then came

"Two maidens, in orange-coloured kirtles with white[168:A] courtpies; strewing flowers; followed immediately by

"The _maid Marian_, elegantly habited in a watchet-coloured[168:B] tunic reaching to the ground; over which she wore a white linen[168:C] rochet with loose sleeves, fringed with silver, and very neatly plaited; her girdle was of silver baudekin[168:D], fastened with a double bow on the left side; her long flaxen hair was divided into many ringlets, and flowed upon her shoulders; the top part of her head was covered with a net-work cawl of gold, upon which was placed a garland of silver, ornamented with blue violets. She was supported by

"Two bride-maidens, in sky-coloured rochets girt with crimsom girdles, wearing garlands upon their heads of blue and white violets. After them, came

"Four other females in green courtpies, and garlands of violets and cowslips: Then

"Sampson the smith, as _Friar Tuck_, carrying a huge quarter-staff on his shoulder; and Morris the mole-taker, who represented Much the miller's son, having a long pole with an inflated bladder attached to one end[169:A]: And after them

"The _May-pole_, drawn by eight fine oxen, decorated with scarfs, ribbons, and flowers of divers colours; and the tips of their horns were embellished with gold. The rear was closed by

"The _Hobby-horse_ and the _Dragon_.

"When the May-pole was drawn into the square, the foresters sounded their horns, and the populace expressed their pleasure by shouting incessantly untill it reached the place assigned for its elevation:—and during the time the ground was preparing for its reception, the barriers of the bottom of the inclosure were opened for the villagers to approach, and adorn it with ribbons, garlands, and flowers, as their inclination prompted them.

"The pole being sufficiently onerated with finery, the square was cleared from such as had no part to perform in the pageant; and then it was elevated amidst the reiterated acclamations of the spectators. The woodmen and the milk-maidens danced around it according to the rustic fashion; the measure was played by Peretto Cheveritte, the baron's chief minstrel, on the bagpipes accompanied with the pipe and labour, performed by one of his associates. When the dance was finished, Gregory the jester, who undertook to play the hobby-horse, came forward with his appropriate equipment, and, frisking up and down the square without restriction, imitated the galloping, curvetting, ambling, trotting, and other paces of a horse, to the infinite satisfaction of the lower classes of the [170:A]spectators. He was followed by Peter Parker, the baron's ranger, who personated a dragon, hissing, yelling, and shaking his wings with wonderful ingenuity; and to complete the mirth, Morris, in the character of Much, having small bells attached to his knees and elbows, capered here and there between the two monsters in the form of a dance; and as often as he came near to the sides of the inclosure, he cast slily a handful of meal into the faces of the gaping rustics, or rapped them about their heads with the bladder tied at the end of his [170:B]pole. In the mean time, Sampson, representing Friar Tuck, walked with much gravity around the square, and occasionally let fall his heavy staff upon the toes of such of the crowd as he thought were approaching more forward than they ought to do; and if the sufferers cried out from the sense of pain, he addressed them in a solemn tone of voice, advising them to count their beads, say a paternoster or two, and to beware of purgatory. These vagaries were highly palatable to the populace, who announced their delight by repeated plaudits and loud bursts of laughter; for this reason they were continued for a considerable length of time: but Gregory, beginning at last to faulter in his paces, ordered the dragon to fall back: the well-nurtured beast, being out of breath, readily obeyed, and their two companions followed their example; which concluded this part of the pastime.

"Then the archers set up a target at the lower part of the Green, and made trial of their skill in a regular succession. Robin Hood and Will Stukely excelled their comrades: and both of them lodged an arrow in the centre circle of gold, so near to each other that the difference could not readily be decided, which occasioned them to shoot again; when Robin struck the gold a second time, and Stukely's arrow was affixed upon the edge of it. Robin was therefore adjudged the conqueror; and the prize of honour, a garland of laurel embellished with variegated ribbons, was put upon his head; and to Stukely was given a garland of ivy, because he was the second best performer in that contest.

"The pageant was finished with the archery; and the procession began to move away, to make room for the villagers, who afterwards assembled in the square, and amused themselves by dancing round the May-pole in promiscuous companies, according to the ancient custom."[171:A]

In consequence of the opposition, however, of the puritans, during the close of Elizabeth's reign, who considered the rights of May-day as relics of paganism, much havoc was made among the Dramatis Personæ of this festivity. Sometimes instead of Robin and Marian, only a Lord or Lady of the day was adopted; frequently the friar was not suffered to appear, and still more frequently was the hobby-horse interdicted. This zealous interference of the sectarists was ridiculed by the poets of the day, and among the rest by Shakspeare, who quotes a line from a satirical ballad on this subject, and represents Hamlet as terming it an epitaph; "Else shall he suffer not thinking on," says he, "with the hobby-horse; whose epitaph is, _For, O, for, O, the hobby horse is forgot_."[171:B] He has the same allusion in Love's Labour's Lost[171:C]; and Ben Jonson has still more explicitly noticed the neglect into which this character in the May-games had fallen in his days.

"But see, the Hobby-horse is forgot. Foole, it must be your lot, To supply his want with faces, And some other Buffon graces;"[172:A]

and again, still more pointedly,—

"_Clo._ They should be Morris dancers by their gingle, but they have no napkins.

Coc. No, nor a hobby-horse.

Clo. Oh, he's _often forgotten_, that's no rule; but there is no maid Marian nor Friar amongst them, which is the surer mark.

Coc. Nor a Foole that I see."[172:B]

In Beaumont and Fletcher's Tragi-comedy called _Women Pleased_, the aversion of the puritans to this festive beast is strikingly depicted; where the person who was destined to perform the hobby-horse, being converted by his wife, exclaims vehemently against the task imposed upon him.

"_Hob._

I do defie thee and thy foot-cloth too, And tell thee to thy face, this prophane riding I feel it in my conscience, and I dare speak it, This unedified ambling hath brought a scourge upon us.—

Far.

Will you dance no more, neighbour?

Hob.

Surely no, Carry the beast to his crib: I have renounc'd him And all his works.

Soto.

Shall the Hobby-horse be forgot then? The hopeful Hobby-horse, shall he lye founder'd?

Hob.

I cry out on't, 'Twas the forerunning sin brought in those tilt-staves, They brandish 'gainst the church, the Devil calls _May poles_."[173:A]

From one of these puritans, named Stephen Gosson, we learn, likewise, that Morrice-dancers and Hobby-horses had been introduced even upon the stage during the early part of the reign of Elizabeth; for this writer, in a tract published about 1579, and entitled _Plays Confuted_, says, that "the Devil beeside the beautie of the houses, and the stages, sendeth in gearish apparell, maskes, ranting, tumbling, dauncing of gigges, galiardes, _morisces_, _hobbi-horses_, &c."[173:B] By the continued railings and invectives, however, of these fanatics, the May-games were, at length, so broken in upon, that had it not been for the _Book of Sports, or lawful Recreations upon Sunday after Evening-prayers, and upon Holy-days_, issued by King James in 1618, they would have been totally extinct. This curious volume permitted May-games, Morris-dances, Whitsun-ales, the setting up of May-poles, &c.[173:C]; and had it not allowed church-ales, and dancing on the Sabbath, would have been unexceptionable in its tendency; for

as honest Burton observes, in allusion to this very _Declaration_ of King James, "_Dancing_, _Singing_, _Masking_, _Mumming_, _Stage-playes_, howsoever they be heavily censured by some severe _Catoes_, yet if _opportunely_ and _soberly used_, may justly be approved. _Melius est fodere, quam saltare_, saith _Augustin_: but what is that if they delight in it? _Nemo saltat sobrius._ But in what kind of dance? I know these sports have many oppugners, whole volumes writ against them; when as all they say (if duly considered) is but _ignoratio Elenchi_; and some again, because they are now cold and wayward, past themselves, cavil at all such youthful sports in others, as he did in the Comedy; they think them, _illico nasci senes_, &c. Some out of preposterous zeal object many times trivial arguments, and because of some abuse, will quite take away the good use, as if they should forbid wine, because it makes men drunk; but in my judgment they are too stern: there _is a time for all things, a time to mourn, a time to dance_. Eccles. 3. 4. _a time to embrace, a time not to embrace_, (ver. 5.) _and nothing better than that a man should rejoice in his own works_, ver. 22. For my part, I will subscribe to the _King's Declaration_, and was ever of that mind, those _May-games_, _Wakes_, and _Whitsun-ales_, &c. if they be not at _unseasonable_ hours, may justly be permitted. Let them freely feast, sing and dance, have their _poppet-playes_, _hobby-horses_, _tabers_, _crouds_, _bag-pipes_, &c., play at _ball_, and _barley-brakes_, and what sports and recreations they like best."[174:A] All these festivities, however, on _May-day_, were again set aside, by still greater enthusiasts, during the period of the Commonwealth, and were once more revived at the Restoration; at present, few vestiges remain either of those ancient rites, or of those attendant on other popular periodical festivals.[174:B]

Several of the amusements, and some of the characters attendant on the celebration of May-day, were again introduced at WHITSUNTIDE, especially the morris-dance, which was as customary on this period of festivity as on the one immediately preceding it. Thus Shakspeare, in King Henry V., makes the Dauphin say, alluding to the youthful follies of the English monarch,

————— "Let us do it with no show of fear; No, with no more, than if we heard that England Were busied with a _Whitsun Morris-dance_."[175:A]

The rural sports and feasting at Whitsuntide were usually designated by the term _Whitsun-ales_; _ale_ being in the time of Shakspeare, and for a century or two, indeed, before him, synonymous with _festival_ or _merry-making_. Chaucer and the author of Pierce Plowman use the word repeatedly in this sense, and the following passages from our great poet, from Jonson, and from Ascham, prove that it was familiar, in their time, in the sense of simple carousing, church-feasting, and Whitsuntide recreation. Launcelot, in the _Two Gentlemen of Verona_, exclaims to Speed, "Thou hast not so much charity in thee, as to go to the _ale_ with a Christian[175:B];" and Ascham, speaking of the conduct of husbandmen, in his Toxophilus, observes that those which have their dinner and drink in the field, "have fatter barnes in the harvest, than they which will either sleape at noonetyme of the day, or els _make merye with theyr neighbours at the ale_."[175:C] In the chorus to the first act of _Pericles_, it is recorded of an old song, that

"It hath been sung at festivals, On ember-eves, and _holy-ales_."[176:A]

And Jonson says,

—— "All the neighbourhood, from old records Of antique proverbs drawn from _Whitson lords_, And their authorities at wakes and _ales_, With country precedents, and old wives tales, We bring you now."[176:B]

It will be necessary, in this place, therefore, to notice briefly, as being periods of festivity, the various _Ales_ which were observed by our ancestors in the sixteenth century. They may be enumerated under the heads of _Leet-ale_, _Lamb-ale_, _Bride-ale_, _Clerk-ale_, _Church-ale_ and _Whitsun-ale_. We shall confine our attention at present, however, principally to the two latter; for of the Lamb-ale and Bride-ale, an occasion will occur to speak more at large in a subsequent part of this chapter, and a very few words will suffice with regard to the Leet-ale and the Clerk-ale; the former being merely the dinner provided for the jury and customary tenants at the court-leet of a manor, or _View of frank pledge_, formerly held once or twice a year, before the steward of the leet[176:C]; to this court Shakspeare alludes, in his _Taming of the Shrew_, where the servant tells Sly, that in his dream he would "rail upon the hostess of the house," and threaten to

—— —— "present her at the leet:"[176:D]

and the latter, which usually took place at Easter, is thus mentioned by Aubrey in his manuscript History of Wiltshire. "In the Easter holidays was the _Clarkes-Ale_, for his private benefit and the solace of the neighbourhood."[176:E]

The _Church-ale_ was a festival instituted sometimes in honour of the church-saint, but more frequently for the purpose of contributing towards the repair or decoration of the church. On this occasion it was the business of the churchwardens to brew a

considerable quantity of strong ale, which was sold to the populace in the church-yard, and to the better sort in the church itself, a practice which, independent of the profit arising from the sale of the liquor, led to great pecuniary advantages; for the rich thought it a meritorious duty, beside paying for their ale, to offer largely to the holy fund. It was no uncommon thing indeed to have four, six, or eight of these _ales_ yearly, and sometimes one or more parishes _agreed_ to hold annually a _certain number_ of these meetings, and to contribute individually a _certain sum_. Of this a very curious proof may be drawn from the following stipulation, preserved in Dodsworth's Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library:—"The parishioners of Elveston and Okebrook, in Derbyshire, agree jointly, to brew four _Ales_, and every _Ale_ of one quarter of malt, betwixt this (the time of contract) and the feast of saint John Baptist next coming. And that every inhabitant of the said town of Okebrook shall be at the several _Ales_. And every husband and his wife shall pay two pence, and every cottager one penny, and all the inhabitants of Elveston shall have and receive all the profits and advantages coming of the said _Ales_, to the use and behoof of the said church of Elveston. And the inhabitants of Elveston shall brew _eight Ales_ betwixt this and the feast of saint John Baptist, at the which _Ales_ the inhabitants of Okebrook shall come and pay as before rehersed. And if he be away at one _Ale_, to pay at the toder Ale for both, &c."[177:A]

The date of this document is anterior to the Reformation, but that _church-ales_ were equally popular and frequent in the days of Shakspeare will be evident from the subsequent passages in Carew and Philip Stubbes. The historian of Cornwall, whose work was first printed in 1602, says that "for the church-ale, two young men of the parish are yerely chosen by their last foregoers, to be wardens; who, dividing the task, make collection among the parishioners, of what soever provision it pleaseth them voluntarily to bestow. This they imploy in brewing, baking, and other acates, against Whitsontide; upon which holy-dayes the neighbours meet at the church-house, and there merily feede on their owne victuals, contributing some petty portion to the stock; which, by many smalls, groweth to a meetley greatness: for there is entertayned a kinde of emulation betweene these wardens, who by his graciousness in gathering, and good husbandry in expending, can best advance the churches profit. Besides, the neighbour parishes at those times lovingly visit one another, and this way frankely spend their money together. The afternoones are consumed in such exercises as olde and yong folke (having leysure) doe accustomably weare out the time withall."[178:A] Stubbes in his violent philippic declares that, "in certaine townes, where drunken Bacchus bears swaie against Christmas and Easter, Whitsunday, or some other time, the churchwardens, for so they call them, of every parish, with the consent of the whole parish, provide half a score or twentie quarters of mault, whereof some they buy of the church stocke, and some is given to them of the parishioners themselves, every one conferring somewhat, according to his ability; which mault being made into very strong ale, or beer, is set to sale, either in the church or in some other place assigned to that purpose. Then, when this nippitatum, this huffe-cappe, as they call it, this nectar of life, is set abroach, well is he that can get the soonest to it, and spends the most at it, for he is counted the godliest man of all the rest, and most in God's favour, because it is spent upon his church forsooth."[178:B]

There is but too much reason to suppose that the satire of this bitter writer was not, in this instance, ill directed, and that meetings of this description, though avowedly for the express benefit of the church, were often productive of licentiousness, and consequently highly injurious both to morals and religion. A few lines from Ben Jonson will probably place this beyond doubt. In his Masque of Queens, performed at Whitehall, 1609, he represents one of his witches as exclaiming

"I had a dagger: what did I with that? Kill'd an infant, to have his fat: A Piper it got, at a _Church-ale_."[179:A]

Returning to the consideration of the _Whitsuntide_ amusements, it may be observed, that not only was the morris a constituent part in their celebration, but that the Maid Marian of the May-games was frequently introduced: thus Shirley represents one of his characters exclaiming against rural diversions in the following manner:

——— "Observe with what solemnity They keep their wakes, and throw for pewter candlestickes, How they become the morris, with whose bells They ring all into _Whitson ales_, and sweate Through twentie scarffes and napkins, till the Hobby-horse Tire, and the _maide Marrian_ dissolv'd to a gelly, Be kept for spoone meate."[179:B]

The festivities, indeed, on this occasion, as at those on May-day, were often regulated by a Lord and Lady of the _Whitsun-ales_.[179:C] Very frequently, however, there was elected only a Lord of Misrule, and as the church or holy ales were not unfrequently combined with the merriments of this season, the church-yard, especially on the sabbath-day, was too generally the scene of rejoicing. The severity of Stubbes, when censuring this profanation of consecrated ground, will scarcely be deemed too keen: "First," says he, "all the wilde heads of the parish, flocking together, chuse them a graund captaine (of mischiefe) whom they inrolle with the title of _my Lord of misrule_, and him they crowne with great solemnitie, and adopt for their king. This king annoynted, chooseth foorth twentie, fourtie, threescore, or a hundred lustie guttes like to himselfe to wait upon his lordly majesty, and to guarde his noble person.—(Here he describes the dress of the morris dancers, as quoted in a former page, and proceeds as

follows.) Thus all things set in order, then have they their hobby-horses, their dragons and other antiques, together with their baudie pipers, and thundering drummers, to strike up the _Devils Daunce_ withall: then martch this heathen company towards the church and church-yarde, their pypers pypyng, their drummers thundering, their stumpes dauncing, their belles jyngling, their handkercheefes fluttering about their heads like madde men, their hobbie horses, and other monsters skirmishing amongst the throng: and in this sorte they goe to the church like Devils incarnate, with such a confused noise, that no man can heare his owne voyce. Then the foolish people they looke, they stare, they laugh, they fleere, and mount upon formes and pewes, to see these goodly pageants solemnized in this sort. Then after this about the church they goe againe and againe, and so foorth into the church yard, where they have commonly their summer haules, their bowers, arbours, and banqetting houses set up, wherein they feast, banquet, and daunce all that day, and (peradventure) all that night too. And thus these terrestrial furies spend the Sabboth day. Another sort of fantastical fooles bring to these helhoundes (the Lord of misrule and his complices) some bread, some good ale, some new cheese, some old cheese, some custardes, some cracknels, some cakes, some flaunes, some tartes, some creame, some meat, some one thing, some another; but if they knewe that as often as they bringe anye to the maintenance of these execrable pastimes, they offer sacrifice to the Devill and Sathanas, they would repente and with drawe their handes, which God graunt they may."[180:A]

Dramatic exhibitions, called _Whitsun plays_, were common, at this season, both in town and country, and in the latter they were chiefly of a pastoral character. Shakspeare has an allusion to them in his _Winter's Tale_, where Perdita, addressing Florizel, says,

——————— "Come, take your flowers: Methinks, I play as I have seen them do in _Whitsun' pastorals_."[181:A]

Soon after Whitsuntide began the season of sheep-shearing, which was generally terminated about midsummer, and either at its commencement or close, was distinguished by the LAMB-ALE or SHEEP-SHEARING FEAST. At Kidlington in Oxfordshire, it seems to have been _ushered in_ by ceremonies of a peculiar kind, for, according to Blount, "the Monday after the Whitsun week, a fat lamb was provided, and the maidens of the town, having their thumbs tied behind them, were permitted to run after it, and she who with her mouth took hold of the lamb was declared the Lady of the Lamb, which, being killed and cleaned, but with the skin hanging upon it, was carried on a long pole before the lady and her companions to the green, attended with music, and a morisco dance of men, and another of women. The rest of the day was spent in mirth and merry glee. Next day the lamb, partly baked, partly boiled, and partly roasted, was served up for the lady's feast, where she sat, majestically at the upper end of the table, and her companions with her, the music playing during the repast, which, being finished, the solemnity ended."[181:B]

The most usual mode, however, of celebrating this important period was by a dinner, music, with songs, and the election of a Shepherd King, an office always conferred upon the individual whose flock had produced the earliest lamb. The dinner is thus enjoined by the rustic muse of Tusser:—

"Wife make us a dinner, spare flesh neither corne, Make wafers and cakes, for our sheepe must be shorne, At sheep-shearing, neighbours none other things crave, But good cheare and welcome, like neighbours to have."[182:A]

But it is from Drayton that we derive the most minute account of the festival; who in the fourteenth song of his Poly-Olbion, and still more at large in his ninth Eclogue, has given a most pleasing picture of this rural holy-day:—

"When the new-wash'd flock from the river's side, Coming as white as January's snow, The ram with nosegays bears his horns in pride, And no less brave the bell-wether doth go.

After their fair flocks in a lusty rout, Come the gay swains with bag-pipes strongly blown, And busied, though this solemn sport about, Yet had each one an eye unto his own.

And by the ancient statutes of the field, He that his flocks the earliest lamb should bring, (As it fell out then, Rowland's charge to yield) Always for that year was the shepherd's king.

And soon preparing for the shepherd's board, Upon a green that curiously was squar'd, With country cates being plentifully stor'd: And 'gainst their coming handsomely prepar'd.

New whig, with water from the clearest stream, Green plumbs, and wildings, cherries chief of feast, Fresh cheese, and dowsets, curds, and clouted cream, Spic'd syllibubs, and cyder of the best:

And to the same down solemnly they sit, In the fresh shadow of their summer bowers, With sundry sweets them every way to fit, The neighb'ring vale despoiled of her flowers.—

When now, at last, as lik'd the shepherd's king, (At whose command they all obedient were) Was pointed, who the roundelay should sing, And who again the under-song should bear."[183:A]

Shakspeare also, in his _Winter's Tale_, has presented us not only with a list of the good things necessary for a sheep-shearing feast, but he describes likewise the attentions which were due, on this occasion, from the hostess, or Shepherd's Queen.

"Let me see," says the Clown, "what I am to buy for our sheep-shearing feast? _Three pound of sugar; five pound of currants; rice_——What will this sister of mine do with rice? But my father hath made her mistress of the feast, and _she lays it on_. She hath made me four-and-twenty nosegays for the shearers: three-man song-men all[183:B], and very good ones; but they are most of them means[183:C] and bases: but one Puritan amongst them, and he sings psalms to horn-pipes. I must have _saffron_, to colour the _warden pies_; mace,—dates,—none; that's out of my note: _nutmegs, seven_; _a race, or two, of ginger_: but that I may beg;—_four pound of prunes, and as many of raisins o' the sun_."[183:D]

The culinary articles in this detail are somewhat more expensive than those enumerated by Drayton; and Mr. Steevens, in a note on this passage of the Winter's Tale, observes that "the expence attending these festivities, appears to have afforded matter of complaint. Thus, in _Questions of profitable and pleasant Concernings_, &c. 1594: 'If it be a _sheep-shearing feast_, maister Baily can entertaine you with his bill of reckonings to his maister of three sheapheard's wages, spent on _fresh cates_, besides _spices_ and _saffron pottage_."[183:E]

The shepherd's reproof to his adopted daughter, Perdita, as Polixenes remarks,

——— "the prettiest low-born lass, that ever Ran on the green-sward,"

implies indirectly the duties which were expected by the peasants, on this day, from their rural queen, and which seems to have been sufficiently numerous and laborious:—

"Fye, daughter, when my old wife liv'd, upon This day, she was both pantler, butler, cook; Both dame and servant: welcom'd all; serv'd all: Would sing her song, and dance her turn: now here, At upper end o'the table, now, ithe middle; On his shoulder, and his: her face o'fire With labour; and the thing, she took to quench it, She would to each one sip: You are retir'd, As if you were a feasted one, and not The hostess of the meeting: Pray you, bid These unknown friends to us welcome: for it is A way to make us better friends, more known. Come, quench your blushes; and present yourself That which you are, mistress o'the feast: Come on, And bid us welcome to your _sheep-shearing_, As your good flock shall prosper."[184:A]

It should be remarked that one material part of this welcome appears, from the context, to have consisted in the distribution of various flowers, suited to the ages of the respective visitors, a ceremony which was, probably, customary at this season of rejoicing.

"_Perdita._ Give me those flowers there, Dorcas.—Reverend sirs, For you there's rosemary, and rue; these keep Seeming, and savour, all the winter long: Grace, and remembrance, be to you both, And welcome to our shearing!——— ——————————— Here's flowers for you; Hot lavender, mints, savory, marjoram; The marigold, that goes to bed with the sun, And with him rises weeping; these are flowers Of middle summer, and, I think, they are given To men of middle age: You are very welcome.— ———— ———— ——— Now, my fairest friend, I would, I had some flowers of the spring, that might Become your time of day; and yours, and yours; That wear upon your virgin branches yet Your maidenheads growing:—O, these I lack, To make you garlands of."[185:A]

A custom somewhat allied to this, that of scattering flowers on the streams at _shearing time_, has been long observed in the south-west of England, and is thus alluded to as an ancient rite by Dyer, in his beautifully descriptive poem entitled _The Fleece_:

——— "With light fantastic toe, the nymphs Thither assembled, thither ev'ry swain; And o'er the dimpled stream a thousand flowers, Pale lilies, roses, violets and pinks, Mixt with the greens of burnet, mint and thyme, And trefoil, sprinkled with their sportive arms. Such custom holds along the irriguous vales, From Wreakin's brow to rocky Dolvoryn, Sabrina's early haunt."[185:B]

That one of the principal seasons of rejoicing should take place on securely collecting the fruits of the field, it is natural to expect; and accordingly, in almost every country, a HARVEST-HOME, or Feast, has been observed on this occasion.

Much of the festivity and jocular freedom however, which subsisted formerly at this period, has been worn away by the increasing refinements and distinctions of society. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and, indeed, during a part of the eighteenth, the

Harvest, or _Mell_, Supper, as it was sometimes called, from the French word _Mesler_, to mingle or mix together, was a scene not only remarkable for merriment and hospitality, but for a temporary suspension of all inequality between master and man. The whole family sate down at the same table, and conversed, danced, and sang together during the entire night without difference or distinction of any kind; and, in many places indeed, this freedom of manner subsisted during the whole period of getting in the Harvest. Thus Tusser, recommending the social equality of the Harvest-tide, exclaims,

"In harvest time, harvest folke, _servants and al_, should make _altogither_, good cheere in the hal: And fil out the blacke bol, of bleith to their song, and let them be merrie, _al harvest time long_."[186:A]

Of this ancient convivial licence, a modern rural poet has drawn a most pleasing picture, lamenting, at the same time, that the Harvest-Feast of the present day is but the phantom of what it was:—

"The aspect only with the substance gone.

* * * * *

Behold the sound oak table's massy frame Bestride the kitchen floor! the careful dame And gen'rous host invite their friends around, _While all that clear'd the crop, or till'd the ground, Are guests by right of custom:—— Here once a year Distinction low'rs its crest, The master, servant, and the merry guest, Are equal all_; and round the happy ring The reaper's eyes exulting glances fling, And, warm'd with gratitude, he quits his place, With sun-burnt hands and ale-enliven'd face, Refills the jug his honour'd host to tend, To serve at once the master and the friend; Proud thus to meet his smiles, to share his tale, His nuts, his conversation, and his ale. _Such were the days,——of days long past I sing._"[186:B]

It will be necessary to enter a little more minutely into the rites and ceremonies which accompanied this annual feast in the days of Shakspeare, and fortunately we can appeal to a few curious documents on which dependence can be placed. Hentzner, a learned German who travelled through Germany, England, France, and Italy, towards the close of the sixteenth century, and whose Itinerary, as far as it relates to this country, has been translated by the late Lord Orford, says, "as we were returning to our inn (from Windsor), we happened to meet some country people _celebrating their harvest-home_; their last load of corn they crown with flowers, having besides an image richly dressed, by which, perhaps, they would signify Ceres; this they keep moving about, while men and women, men and maid servants, riding through the streets in the cart, shout as loud as they can till they arrive at the barn."[187:A] Dr. Moresin also, another foreigner, who published, in the reign of James I., an elaborate work on the "Origin and Increase of Depravity in Religion," relates that he saw "in England the country people bringing home, in a cart from the harvest field, a figure made of corn, round which men and women were promiscuously singing, preceded by a piper and a drum."[187:B]

To this custom of accompanying home the last waggon-load of corn, at the close of harvest, with music, Shakspeare is supposed to allude in the _Merchant of Venice_, where Lorenzo tells the musicians to pierce his mistress' ear with sweetest touches,

"And draw her home with musick."[187:C]

It was usual also, not only to feast the men and women, but to reward likewise the boys and girls who were in any degree instrumental in getting in the harvest; accordingly Tusser humanely observes,

"Once ended thy harvest, let none be begilde, please such as did please thee, man, woman and _child_: Thus doing, with alwaie such helpe as they can, thou winnest the praise, of the labouring man;"[188:A]

an injunction which Mr. Hilman has further explained by subjoining to this stanza the following remark:—"Every one," says he, "that did any thing towards the Inning, must now have some reward, as ribbons, laces, rows of pins to boys and girls, if never so small, for their encouragement, and to be sure plumb-pudding."

The most minute account, however, which we can now any where meet with, of the ceremonies and rejoicings at Harvest-Home, as they existed during the prior part of the seventeenth century, and which we may justly consider as not deviating from those that accompanied the same festival in the reign of Elizabeth, is to be found among the poems of Robert Herrick, and will be valued, not exclusively for its striking illustration of the subject, but for its merit, likewise, as a descriptive piece.

"THE HOCK-CART, OR HARVEST-HOME.[188:B]

COME, Sons of Summer, by whose toile We are the Lords of wine and oile: By whose tough labours, and rough hands, We rip up first, then reap our lands. Crown'd with the eares of corne, now come, And, to the pipe, sing Harvest-home. Come forth, my Lord, and see the cart Drest up with all the country art. See, here a _Maukin_, there a sheet, As spotlesse pure, as it is sweet: The horses, mares, and frisking fillies, Clad, all, in linnen, white as lillies. The Harvest swaines, and wenches bound For joy, to see the _Hock-cart_ crown'd. About the cart, heare, how the rout Of rurall younglings raise the shout; Pressing before, some coming after, These with a shout, and these with laughter. Some blesse the cart; some kisse the sheaves; Some prank them up with oaken leaves: Some crosse the fill-horse; some with great Devotion, stroak the home-borne wheat: While other rusticks, lesse attent To prayers, then to merryment, Run after with their breeches rent. Well, on, brave boyes, to your Lord's hearth, Glitt'ring with fire; where, for your mirth, Ye shall see first the large and cheefe Foundation of your feast, fat beefe: With upper stories, mutton, veale And bacon, which makes full the meale; With sev'ral dishes standing by, As here a custard, there a pie, And here all tempting frumentie. And for to make the merry cheere, If smirking wine be wanting here, There's that, which drowns all care, stout beere; Which freely drink to your Lord's health, Then to the plough, the commonwealth; Next to your flailes, your fanes, your fats; Then to the maids with wheaten hats; To the rough sickle, and crookt sythe, Drink frollick boyes, till all be blythe. Feed, and grow fat; and as ye eat, Be mindfull, that the lab'ring neat, As you, may have their fill of meat. And know, besides, ye must revoke The patient oxe unto the yoke, And all goe back unto the plough And harrow, though they're hang'd up now. And, you must know, your Lord's word true, Feed him ye must, whose food fils you. And that this pleasure is like raine, Not sent ye for to drowne your paine, But for to make it spring againe."[189:A]

We must not forget that, during the reign of Elizabeth, another _feast-day_ fell to the lot of the husbandman, at the close of wheat-sowing, in October. This was termed, from one of the chief articles provided for the table, THE SEED-CAKE, and is no where recorded so distinctly as by the agricultural muse of Tusser:—

"Wife sometime this week, if the weather hold cleer, an end of wheat-sowing, we make for this yeere: Remember thou therefore, though I do it not, the _seed-cake_, the _pastries_, and _furmenty pot_."[190:A]

Proceeding with the year, and postponing the consideration of All Hallowmas to the chapter on superstitions, we reach the eleventh of November, or the festival of St. Martin, usually called MARTINMAS, or MARTLEMAS, a day formerly devoted to feasting and conviviality, and on which a stock of salted provisions was laid in for the winter. This custom of killing cattle, swine, &c. and _curing_ them against the approaching season, was, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, common every where, though _now_ only partially observed in a few country-villages; for smoke-dryed meat in those days was more generally relished than at present. We find Tusser, therefore, as might be expected, recommending this savoury diet; in one place saying to his farmer,—

"For Easter, at _Martilmas_, hang up a beefe— With that and the like, yer grasse beef come in, thy folke shall look cheerely, when others look thin;"[190:B]

and again,—

"_Martilmas_ beefe doth bear good tacke, When countrey folke do dainties lacke;"[190:C]

so, likewise, in _The Pinner of Wakefield_, printed in 1559,

"A piece of beef hung up since _Martlemas_."

Moresin tells us, in the reign of James I., that there were great rejoicings and feasting on this day throughout Europe, an assertion which is verified by the ancient Calendar of the church of Rome, where under the eleventh of November occur the following observations:—"Martinalia, Geniale Festum. Vina delibantur et defecantur. Vinalia veterum festum huc translatum. Bacchus in Martini figura.—The Martinalia, a genial feast. Wines are tasted of and drawn from the lees. The Vinalia, a feast of the Antients, removed to this day. Bacchus in the figure of Martin."[191:A] J. Boëmus Aubanus likewise informs us, as Mr. Brand remarks, "that in Franconia, there was a great deal of eating and drinking at this season; no one was so poor or niggardly that on the _Feast of St. Martin_ had not his dish of the _entrails_ either of _oxen_, _swine_, or _calves_. They drank, too, he says, very liberally of _wine_ on the occasion."[191:B]

In this country, merriment and good cheer were equally conspicuous on St. Martin's feast; the young danced and sang, and the old regaled themselves by the fire-side. A modern poet, who has beautifully copied the antique, under the somewhat stale pretence of discovering an ancient manuscript, presents us with a specimen of his manufacture of considerable merit, under the title of

Martilmasse Daye; this, as being referred to the age of Elizabeth, and recording, with due attention to historical costume, the mirth and revelry which used formerly to distinguish this period, may be admitted here as a species of traditional evidence of no exceptionable kind. The poem, which is supposed to have been found at Norwich, at an ancient Hostelrie, whilst under repair, consists of six stanzas, two of which, however, though possessing poetical and descriptive point, we have omitted, as not referable to any peculiar observance of the day:—

"It is the day of Martilmasse, Cuppes of ale should freelie passe; What though Wynter has begunne To push downe the summer sunne, To our fire we can betake And enjoie the cracklinge brake, Never heedinge winter's face On the day of Martilmasse.—

Some do the citie now frequent, Where costlie shews and merriment Do weare the vaporish ev'ninge out With interlude and revellinge rout; Such as did pleasure Englandes Queene, When here her royal Grace was seene,[192:A] Yet will they not this day let passe, The merrie day of Martilmasse.

Nel hath left her wool at home, The Flanderkin hath stayed his loom,[192:B] No beame doth swinge nor wheel go round Upon Gurguntums walled ground;[192:C] Where now no anchorite doth dwell To rise and pray at Lenard's bell: Martyn hath kicked at Balaam's ass, So merrie be old Martilmasse.

When the dailie sportes be done, Round the market crosse they runne, Prentis laddes, and gallant blades, Dancinge with their gamesome maids, Till the beadel, stoute and sowre, Shakes his bell, and calls the houre; Then farewell ladde and farewell lasse, To' th' merry night of Martilmasse."[193:A]

Shakspeare has an allusion to this formerly convivial day in the _Second Part of King Henry IV._, where Poins, asking Bardolph after Falstaff, says: "How doth the _martlemas_, your master?" an epithet by which, as Johnson observes, he means the latter spring, or the old fellow with juvenile passions.[193:B]

We have now to record the closing and certainly the greatest festival of the year, the celebration of CHRISTMAS, a period which our ancestors were accustomed to devote to hospitality on a very large scale, to the indulgence indeed of hilarity and good cheer for, at least, twelve days, and sometimes, especially among the lower ranks, for six weeks.

Christmas was always ushered in by the due observance of its _Eve_, first in a religious and then in a festive point of view. "Our forefathers," remarks Bourne, "when the common devotions of the _Eve_ were over, and night was come on, were wont to light up _candles_ of an uncommon size, which were called _Christmas-candles_, and to lay a _log_ of wood upon the fire, which they termed a _Yule-clog_, or Christmas-block. These were to illuminate the house, and turn the night into day; which custom, in some measure, is still kept up in the northern parts."[194:A]

This mode of rejoicing, at the winter solstice, appears to have originated with the Danes and Pagan Saxons, and was intended to be emblematical of the return of the sun, and its increasing light and heat; _gehol_ or _Geol_, Angl. Sax. _Jel_, _Jul_, _Huil_, or _Yule_, Dan. Sax. Swed., implying the idea of _revolution_ or of _wheel_, and not only designating, among these northern nations, the month of December, called _Jul_-Month, but the great feast also of this period.[194:B] On the introduction of Christianity, the illuminations of the _Eve of Yule_ were continued as representative of the _true light_ which was then ushered into the world, in the person of our Saviour, the _Day spring from on High_.

The ceremonies and festivities which were observed on Christmas-Eve during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and which in some parts of the north have been partially continued, until within these last thirty years, consisted in bringing into the house, with much parade and with vocal and instrumental harmony, the _Yule_ or _Christmas-block_, a massy piece of fire-wood, frequently the enormous root of a tree, and which was usually supplied by the carpenter attached to the family. This being placed in the centre of the great hall, each of the family, in turn, sate down upon it, sung a _Yule-Song_, and drank to a _merry Christmas_ and a _happy new year_. It was then placed on the large open hearth in the hall chimney, and, being lighted with the last year's brand, carefully preserved for this express purpose, the music again struck up, when the addition of fuel already inflamed, expedited the process, and occasioned a brilliant conflagration. The family and their friends were then feasted with _Yule-Dough_ or _Yule-cakes_, on which were impressed the figure of the child Jesus; and with bowls of _frumenty_, made from wheat cakes or creed wheat, boiled in milk, with sugar, nutmeg, &c. To these succeeded tankards of spiced ale, while preparations were usually going on among the domestics for the hospitalities of the succeeding day.

In the curious collection of Herrick is preserved a poem descriptive of some of these observances, and which was probably written for the express purpose of being sung during the kindling of the Yule-clog.

"COME, bring with a noise, My merrie, merrie boyes, The Christmas Log to the firing; While my good Dame, she Bids ye all be free, And drink to your hearts desiring.

With the last yeere's brand Light the new block, and For good success in his spending, On your psalteries play, That sweet luck may Come while the Log is a teending.[195:A]

Drink now the strong beere, Cut the white loafe here,[195:B] The while the meat is a shredding For the rare mince-pie, And the plums stand by To fill the paste that's a kneading."[195:C]

It was customary on this _eve_, likewise, to decorate the windows of every house, from the nobleman's seat to the cottage, with bay, laurel, ivy, and holly leaves, which were continued during the whole of the Christmas-holidays, and frequently until Candlemas. Stowe, in his Survey of London, particularly mentions this observance:—"Against the feast of _Christmas_," says he, "every man's house, as also their parish churches, were decked with holm, ivie, bayes, and whatsoever the season of the yeere aforded to be greene: The conduits and standards in the streetes were likewise garnished. Amongst the which, I read, that in the yeere 1444, by tempest of thunder and lightning, on the first of February at night, Paul's steeple was fired, but with great labour quenched, and toward the morning of Candlemas day, at the Leaden Hall in Cornhill, a standard of tree, beeing set up in the midst of the pavement fast in the ground, nayled full of holme and ivy, for disport of Christmas to the people; was torne up, and cast downe by the _malignant spirit_ (as was thought) and the stones of the pavement all about were cast in the streetes, and into divers houses, so that the people were sore agast at the great tempests."[196:A]

This custom, which still prevails in many parts of the kingdom, especially in our parish-churches, is probably founded on a very natural idea, that whatever is green, at this bleak season of the year, may be considered as emblematic of joy and victory, more particularly the laurel, which had been adopted by the Greeks and Romans, for this express purpose. That this was the opinion of our ancestors, and that they believed the _malignant spirit_ was envious of, and interested in destroying these symbols of their triumph, appears from the passage just quoted from Stowe.

It has been, indeed, conjectured, that this mode of ornamenting churches and houses is either allusive to numerous figurative expressions in the prophetic Scriptures typical of Christ, as the _Branch of Righteousness_, or that it was commemorative of the style in which the first Christian churches in this country were built, the materials for the erection of which being usually _wrythen wands or boughs_[196:B]; it may have, however, an origin still more remote, and fancy may trace the misletoe, which is frequently used on these occasions, to the times of the ancient Druids, an hypothesis which acquires some probability from a passage in Dr. Chandler's Travels in Greece, where he informs us, "It is related where Druidism prevailed, the _houses_ were _decked_ with _evergreens_ in _December_, that the Sylvan spirits might repair to them, and remain unnipped with frost and cold winds, until a milder season had renewed the foliage of their darling abodes."[197:A]

The morning of the Nativity was ushered in with the chaunting of _Christmas Carols_, or _Pious Chansons_. _The Christmas Carol_ was either _scriptural_ or _convivial_, the first being sung morning and evening, until the twelfth day, and the second during the period of feasting or carousing.

"As soon as the morning of the Nativity appears," says Bourne, "it is customary among the common people to sing a _Christmas Carol_, which is a song upon the birth of our Saviour, and generally sung from the Nativity to the Twelfth-day; this custom," he adds, "seems to be an imitation of the _Gloria in Excelsis_, or _Glory be to God on High_, &c. which was sung by the angels, as they hovered o'er the fields of Bethlehem on the morning of the Nativity; for even that song, as the learned Bishop Taylor observes, was a Christmas Carol. _As soon_, says he, _as these blessed Choristers had sung their Xmas Carol, and taught the Church a hymn, to put into her offices for ever, on the anniversary of this festivity; the angels_," &c.[197:B] We can well remember that, during the early period of our life, which was spent in the north of England, it was in general use for the young people to sing a _carol_ early on the morning of this great festival, and the burthen of which was,

"All the angels in heaven do sing On a Chrismas day in the morning;"

customs such as this, laudable in themselves and highly impressive on the youthful mind, are, we are sorry to say, nearly, if not totally, disappearing from the present generation.

To the carols, hymns, or pious chansons, which were sung about the streets at night, during Christmas-tide, Shakspeare has two allusions; one in _Hamlet_, where the Prince quotes two lines from a popular ballad entitled "_The Songe of Jepthah's Daughter_," and adds, "The first row of the pious chanson will show you more[198:A];" and the other in the _Midsummer-Night's Dream_, where

Titania remarks that

"No night is now with _hymn_ or _carol_ blest."[198:B]

Upon the first of these passages Mr. Steevens has observed that the "_pious chansons_ were a kind of _Christmas carols_, containing some scriptural history thrown into loose rhymes, and sung about the streets by the common people;" and upon the second, that "_hymns_ and _carols_, in the time of Shakspeare, during the season of Christmas, were sung every night about the streets, as a pretext for collecting money from house to house."

Carols of this kind, indeed, were, during the sixteenth century, sung at Christmas, through every town and village in the kingdom; and Tusser, in his _Five Hundred Pointes of Good Husbandrie_, introduces one for this season, which he orders to be sung to the tune of _King Salomon_.[198:C]

The chief object of the common people in chaunting these _nightly_ carols, from house to house, was to obtain money or _Christmas-Boxes_, a term derived from the usage of the Romish priests, who ordered masses at this time to be made to the Saints, in order to atone for the excesses of the people, during the festival of the Nativity, and as these masses were always purchased of the priest, the poor were allowed to gather money in this way with the view of liberating themselves from the consequence of the debaucheries of which they were enabled to partake, through the hospitality of the rich.

The _convivial_ or _jolie carols_ were those which were sung either by the company, or by itinerant minstrels, during the revelry that daily took place, in the houses of the wealthy, from Christmas-Eve to Twelfth Day. They were also frequently called _Wassel Songs_, and may be traced back to the Anglo-Norman period. Mr. Douce, in his very interesting "Illustrations of Shakspeare and of Ancient Manners," has given us a Christmas-carol of the thirteenth or fourteenth century written in the Norman language, and which may be regarded, says he, "as the most ancient drinking song, composed in England, that is extant. This singular curiosity," he adds, "has been written on a spare leaf in the middle of a valuable miscellaneous manuscript of the fourteenth century, preserved in the British Museum, Bibl. Regal. 16, E. 8."[199:A] To the original he has annexed a translation, admirable for its fidelity and harmony, and we are tempted to insert three stanzas as illustrative of manners and diet which still continued fashionable in the days of Shakspeare. We shall prefix the first stanza of the original, as a specimen of the language, with the observation, that from the word _Noel_, which occurs in it, Blount has derived the term _Ule_ or _Yule_; the French _Nouël_ or Christmas, he observes, the Normans corrupted to _Nuel_, and from _Nuel_ we had _Nule_, or _Ule_.[199:B]

"Seignors ore entendez a nus, De loinz sumes renuz a wous, Pur quere NOEL; Car lem nus dit que en cest hostel Soleit tenir sa feste anuel A hi cest jur."

"Lordings, from a distant home, To seek old CHRISTMAS we are come, Who loves our minstrelsy: And here, unless report mis-say, The grey-beard dwells; and on this day Keeps yearly wassel, ever gay, With festive mirth and glee.

Lordings list, for we tell you true; CHRISTMAS loves the jolly crew That cloudy care defy: His liberal board is deftly spread With manchet loaves and wastel-bread; His guests with fish and flesh are fed, Nor lack the stately pye.

Lordings, it is our hosts' command, And Christmas joins him hand in hand, To drain the brimming bowl: And I'll be foremost to obey: Then pledge me sirs, and drink away, For CHRISTMAS revels here to day And sways without controul. Now _Wassel_ to you all! and merry may ye be! But foul that wight befall, who _Drinks_ not _Health_ to me!"[200:A]

Manchet loaves, _wastel-bread_, and the _stately pye_, that is, a _peacock_ or _pheasant_ pye, were still common in the days of Shakspeare. During the prevalence of chivalry, it was usual for the knights to take their vows of enterprise, at a solemn feast, on the presentation to each knight, in turn, of a roasted peacock in a golden dish. For this was afterwards substituted, though only in a culinary light, and as the most magnificent dish which could be brought to table, a peacock in a pie, preserving as much as possible the form of the bird, with the head elevated above the crust, the beak richly gilt, and the beautiful tail spread out to its full extent. In allusion to these superb dishes a ludicrous oath was prevalent in Shakspeare's time, which he has, with much propriety, put into the mouth of Justice Shallow, who, soliciting the stay of the fat knight, exclaims,

"By _cock and pye_, sir, you shall not away to night."[201:A]

The use of the peacock, however, as one of the articles of a second course, continued to the close of the seventeenth century; for Gervase Markham, in the ninth edition of his _English House-Wife_, London 1683, enumerating the articles and ordering of a _great feast_, mentions this, among other birds, now seldom seen as objects of cookery; "then in the second course she shall first

preferr the lesser wild-fowl, as &c. then the lesser land-fowl as &c. &c. then the great wild-fowl, as _bittern_, _hearn_, _shoveler_, _crane_, bustard, and such like. Then the greater land-fowl, as PEACOCKS, phesant, _puets_, _gulls_, &c."[201:B]

Numerous collections of _Carols_, or _festal chansons_, to be sung at the various feasts and ceremonies of the Christmas-holidays, were published during the sixteenth century. One of the earliest of these was printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1521, and entitled _Christmasse carolles_. It contains, among many very curious specimens of this species of popular poetry, one, which not only contributed to the hilarity of our ancestors in the reigns of Henry, Elizabeth, and James, but is still in use, though with many alterations, in Queen's College, Oxford; it is designated as _a Carol bryngyng in the bores head_, which was the first dish served up at the baron's high table in the great hall on Christmas-day, and was usually accompanied by a procession, with the sound of trumpets and other instruments.

"_Caput Apri defero, Reddens laudes Domino._ The bores head in hande bringe I, With garlandes gay and rosemary. I pray you all synge merily, _Qui estis in convivio_.

The bores head, I understande, Is the chefe servyce in this lande: Loke wherever it be fande _Servite cum cantico_.

Be gladde lordes, both more and lasse, For this hath ordayned our stewarde To chere you all this christmasse, The bores head with mustarde."[202:A]

For the hospitality, indeed, the merriment and good cheer, which prevailed during the season of Christmas, this country was peculiarly distinguished in the sixteenth century. Setting aside the splendid manner in which this festival was kept at court, and in the capital, we may appeal to the country, in confirmation of the assertion; the hall of the nobleman and country-gentleman, and even the humbler mansions of the yeoman and husbandman, vied with the city in the exhibition of plenty, revelry, and sport. Of the mode in which the farmer and his servants enjoyed themselves, on this occasion, a good idea may be formed from the poem of Tusser, the first edition of which thus admonishes the housewife:—

"Get ivye and hull, woman deck up thyne house: and take this same brawne, for to seeth and to souse. Provide us good chere, for thou know'st the old guise: olde customes, that good be, let no man despise.

At Christmas be mery, and thanke god of all and feast thy pore neighbours, the great with the small."[202:B]

And in subsequent impressions, the articles of the _Christmas husbandlie fare_ are more particularly enumerated; for instance, good drinke, a blazing fire in the hall, brawne, pudding and souse, and mustard _with all_, beef, mutton, and pork, shred or minced pies _of the best_, pig, veal, goose, capon, and turkey, cheese, apples, and nuts, with _jolie carols_; a pretty ample provision for the rites of hospitality, and a powerful security against the inclemencies of the season!

The Hall of the baron, knight, or squire, was the seat of the same festivities, the same gambols, wassailing, mummery, and mirth, which usually took place in the palaces and mansions of the metropolis, and of these Jonson has given us a very curious epitome in his _Masque of Christmas_, where he has personified the season and its attributes in the following manner:

"_Enter CHRISTMAS with two or three of the Guard._

"He is attir'd in round hose, long stockings, a close doublet, a high crownd hat with a broach, a long thin beard, a truncheon, little ruffes, white shoes, his scarffes, and garters tyed crosse, and his drum beaten before him.—

"The names of his CHILDREN, with their attyres.

"_Mis-rule._ In a velvet cap with a sprig, a short cloake, great yellow ruffe like a reveller, his torch-bearer bearing a rope, a cheese and a basket.

"_Caroll._ A long tawny coat, with a red cap, and a flute at his girdle, his torch-bearer carrying a song booke open.

"_Minc'd Pie._ Like a fine cooke's wife, drest neat; her man carrying a pie, dish, and spoones.

"_Gamboll._ Like a tumbler, with a hoope and bells; his torch-bearer arm'd with a cole-staffe, and a blinding cloth.

"_Post And Paire._ With a paire-royall of aces in his hat; his garment all done over with payres, and purrs; his squier carrying a box, cards and counters.

"_New-Yeares-Gift._ In a blew coat, serving-man like, with an orange, and a sprig of rosemarie guilt on his head, his hat full of broaches, with a coller of gingerbread, his torch-bearer carrying a march-paine, with a bottle of wine on either arme.

"_Mumming._ In a masquing pied suite, with a visor, his torch-bearer carrying the boxe, and ringing it.

"_Wassall._ Like a neat sempster, and songster; her page bearing a browne bowle, drest with ribbands, and rosemarie before her.

"_Offering._ In a short gowne, with a porter's staffe in his hand; a wyth borne before him, and a bason by his torch-bearer.

"_Babie-Coche._ Drest like a boy, in a fine long coat, biggin, bib, muckender, and a little dagger; his usher bearing a great cake with a beane, and a pease."[203:A]

Of these personified attributes we have already noticed, at some length, the most material, such as _Misrule_, _Caroll_, _New-Year's-Gift_ and _Wassall_; to the account, however, which has been given of the Summer Lord of Misrule, from Stubbes's Anatomie of Abuses, it will be here necessary to add, that the sway of this mock prince, both in town and country, was still more absolute during the Christmas-holidays; "what time," says Holinshed, "of old ordinarie course there is alwaies one appointed to make sport in the court, called commonlie Lord of Misrule: whose office is not unknowne to such as have beene brought up in noblemen's houses, and among great house-keepers, which use liberal feasting in that season."[204:A] Stowe, likewise, has recorded, in his Survey, the universal domination of this holiday monarch. "In the feast of Christmas," he remarks, "there was in the king's house, wheresoever he was lodged, a _Lord of Misrule_, or _Master of merry desports_, and the like had yee in the house of every nobleman of honour, or good worship, were he spirituall or temporall. Amongst the which, the Maior of London, and either of the Sheriffes had their severall Lords of Misrule, ever contending without quarrell or offence, who should make the rarest pastimes to delight the beholders. These Lords beginning their rule on Alhallow Eve, continued the same til the morrow after the feast of the Purification, commonly called Candlemas-day: In all which space, there were fine and subtill disguisings, maskes and mummeries, with playing at cardes for counters, nayles and points _in every house_, more for pastime than for gaine."[204:B]

In short, the directions which are to be found for a grand Christmas in the capital, were copied with equal splendour and profusion in the houses of the opulent gentlemen in the country, who made it a point to be even lavish at this season of the year. We may, therefore, consider the following description as applying accurately to the Christmas hospitality of the Baron's hall.

"On Christmas-day, service in the church ended, the gentlemen presently repair into the hall to breakfast, with brawn, mustard, and malmsey.

"At dinner the butler, appointed for the Christmas, is to see the tables covered and furnished: and the ordinary butlers of the house are decently to set bread, napkins, and trenchers, in good form, at every table; with spoones and knives. At the first course is served in a fair and large bore's head, upon a silver platter, with minstralsye.

"Two 'servants' are to attend at supper, and to bear two fair torches of wax, next before the musicians and trumpeters, and stand above the fire with the music, till the first course be served in through the hall. Which performed, they, with the musick, are to return into the buttery. The like course is to be observed in all things, during the time of Christmas.

"At night, before supper, are revels and dancing, and so also after supper, during the twelve daies of Christmas. The Master of the Revels is, after dinner and supper, to sing a caroll, or song; and command other gentlemen then there present to sing with him and the company; and so it is very decently performed."[205:A]

Beside the revelry and dancing here mentioned, we may add, that it was customary, at this season, after the Christmas sports and games had been indulged in, until the performers were weary, to gather round the ruddy fire, and tell tales of legendary lore, or popular superstition. Herrick, recording the diversions of this period, mentions one of them as consisting of "winter's tales about the hearth[205:B];" and Grose, speaking of the source whence he had derived many of the superstitions narrated in the concluding section of his "Provincial Glossary," says, that he gives them, as they had, from age to age, been "related to a closing circle of attentive hearers, assembled in a winter's evening, round the capacious chimney of an old hall or manor-house;" and he adds, that tales of this description formed, among our ancestors, "a principal part of rural conversation, in all large assemblies, _and particularly those in Christmas holidays, during the burning of the Yule-block_."[205:C]

Of the conviviality which universally reigned during these holidays, a good estimate may be taken by a few lines from the author of Hesperides, who, addressing a friend at Christmas-tide, makes the following request:

———— "When your faces shine With bucksome meat and cap'ring wine, Remember us in cups full crown'd,— Untill the fired chesnuts leape For joy, to see the fruits ye reape From the plumpe challice, and the cup, That tempts till it be tossed up:— —— —— —— —— carouse Till Liber Pater[206:A] twirles the house About your eares;—— "Then" to the bagpipe all addresse, Till sleep takes place of wearinesse: And thus throughout, with Christmas playes, Frolick the full twelve holy-dayes."[206:B]

We shall close this detail of the ceremonies and festivities of Christmas with a passage from the descriptive muse of Mr. Walter Scott, in which he has collected, with his usual accuracy, and with his almost unequalled power of costume-painting, nearly all the striking circumstances which distinguished the celebration of this high festival, from an early period, to the close of the sixteenth century. They form a picture which must delight, both from the nature of its subject, and from the truth and mellowness of its colouring.

—— "Well our Christian sires of old Loved when the year its course had rolled, And brought blithe Christmas back again, With all his hospitable train. Domestic and religious rite Gave honour to the holy night: On Christmas eve the bells were rung;— The damsel donned her kirtle sheen; The hall was dressed with holly green; Forth to the wood did merry-men go, To gather in the misletoe. Then opened wide the baron's hall To vassal, tenant, serf and all; Power laid his rod of rule aside, And Ceremony doffed his pride. The heir with roses in his shoes, That night might village partner chuse; The lord, underogating, share The vulgar game of "post and pair." All hailed, with uncontrolled delight, And general voice, the happy night, That to the cottage, as the crown, Brought tidings of salvation down. The fire with well dried logs supplied, Went roaring up the chimney wide; The huge hall-table's oaken face, Scrubbed till it shone, the day to grace, Bore then upon its massive board No mark to part the squire and lord. Then was brought in the lusty brawn, By old blue-coated serving-man; Then the grim boar's-head frowned on high, Crested with bays and rosemary. Well can the green-garbed ranger tell, How, when, and where, the monster fell; What dogs before his death he tore, And all the baiting of the boar. The wassol round, in good brown bowls, Garnished with ribbons, blithely trowls. There the huge sirloin recked: hard by Plumb-porridge stood, and Christmas pye; Nor failed old Scotland to produce, At such high tide, her savoury goose. Then came the merry masquers in, And carols roared with blithesome din; If unmelodious was the song, It was a hearty note, and strong. Who lists may in their mumming see Traces of ancient mystery; White shirts supplied the masquerade, And smutted cheeks the visors made; But, O! what masquers, richly dight, Can boast of bosoms half so light! England was merry England, when Old Christmas brought his sports again. 'Twas Christmas broached the mightiest ale; 'Twas Christmas told the merriest tale; A Christmas gambol oft could cheer The poor man's heart through half the year."[208:A]

FOOTNOTES:

[124:A] Selden, under the article Pope. The _Table Talk_, though not printed until A. D. 1689, is a work illustrative of the era under our consideration.

[126:A] Nichols's Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth, vol. i. preface, p. 25-28.

[127:A] Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. p. 163.

[128:A] Galfred. Monumeth. l. 3. c. 1. _Robert_ of _Gloucester_ gives us a similar account of the origin of this ceremony, and makes the same observation as to its general prevalency. The rude lines of the ancient poet have been thus beautifully paraphrased in the Antiquarian Repertory:—

'Health, my Lord King,' the sweet Rowena said— 'Health,' cried the Chieftain to the Saxon maid; Then gaily rose, and, 'mid the concourse wide, Kiss'd her hale lips, and plac'd her by his side. At the soft scene such gentle thoughts abound, That healths and kisses 'mongst the guests went round: From this the social custom took its rise, We still retain, and still must keep the prize.

[129:A] "The ingenious remarker on this representation observes, that it is the figure of the old Wassel-Bowl, so much the delight of our hardy ancestors, who on the vigil of the New-Year never failed to assemble round the glowing hearth, with their chearful neighbours, and then in the spicy Wassel-Bowl (which testified the goodness of their hearts) drowned every former animosity, an example worthy modern imitation. _Wassel_ was the word, _Wassel_ every guest returned as he took the circling goblet from his friend, whilst song and civil mirth brought in the infant year." Brand's Observations, by Ellis, vol. i. p. 3.

[129:B] Douce's Illustrations of Shakspeare and of Ancient Manners, vol. ii. p. 209, 210.

[129:C] Act i. sc. 4. Reed's edit. vol. xviii. p. 64.

[129:D] Act i. sc. 7. Reed, vol. x. p. 88.

[129:E] Act i. sc. 4. Reed, vol. xvii. p. 49.

[130:A] Act v. sc. 2. Reed, vol. vii. p. 165.

[130:B] Epigrammes i. booke folio 1640, p. 50.

[130:C] Jonson's Works, fol. vol. ii. 1640.

[130:D] Act v. sc. 1.

[131:A] Warton's Milton, 2d edit. p. 160. The _Peg Tankard_, a species of Wassail-Bowl introduced by the Saxons, was still in use in the days of Shakspeare. I am in possession of one, which was given to a member of my family about one hundred and fifty years ago; it is of chased silver, containing nearly two quarts, and is divided by four pegs.

This form of the _wassail_ or _wish-health bowl_ was introduced by _Dunstan_, with the view of checking the intemperance of his countrymen, which for a time it effected; but subsequently the remedy was converted into an additional stimulus to excess; "for, refining upon Dunstan's plan, each was obliged to drink precisely to a pin, whether he could sustain a quantity of liquor equal to others or not: and to that end it became a rule, that whether they exceeded, or fell short of the prescribed bumper, they were alike compelled to drink _again_, until they reached the next mark. In the year 1102, the _priests_, who had not been backward in joining and encouraging these drunken assemblies, were ordered to avoid such abominations, and wholly to _discontinue_ the practice of "DRINKING TO PEGS." Some of these PEG or PIN CUPS, or _Bowls_, and PIN or PEG TANKARDS, are yet to be found in the cabinets of antiquaries; and we are to trace from their use some common terms yet current among us. When a person is much elated, we say he is "IN A MERRY PIN," which no doubt originally meant, he had reached that _mark_ which had deprived him of his usual sedateness and sobriety: we talk of taking a man "A PEG LOWER," when we imply we shall check him in any forwardness; a saying which originated from a regulation that deprived all those of their turn of drinking, _or of their Peg_, who had become troublesome in their liquor: from the like rule of society came also the expression of "HE IS A PEG TOO LOW," _i. e._ has been restrained too far, when we say that a person is not in equal spirits with his company; while we also remark of an individual, that he is getting on "PEG BY PEG," or, in other words, he is taking greater freedoms than he ought to do, which formerly meant, he was either drinking out of his turn, or, contrary to express regulation, did not confine himself to his proper portion, or _peg_, but drank into the _next_, thereby taking a double quantity." Brady's Clavis Calendaria, vol. ii. p. 322, 323. 1st edit.

[133:A] Nichols's Progresses of Elizabeth, vol. i. Entertainments at the Temple, &c. p. 22. 24.

[134:A] The only rite that still lingers among us on the Twelfth Day, is the election of a King and Queen, a ceremony which is now usually performed by drawing tickets, and of which Mr. Brand, in his commentary on Bourne's Antiquities of the Common People, has extracted the subsequent detail from the Universal Magazine of 1774:—"I went to a Friend's house in the country to partake of some of those innocent pleasures that constitute a merry Christmas; I did not return till I had been present at _drawing King and Queen_, and _eaten_ a _Slice_ of the _Twelfth Cake_, made by the fair hands of my good friend's Consort. After Tea Yesterday, a _noble Cake_ was produced, and two _Bowls_, containing the _fortunate chances_ for the different sexes. Our Host _filled up_ the _tickets_; the whole company, except the _King_ and _Queen_, were to be _Ministers of State_, _Maids of Honour_, or _Ladies of the Bed-chamber_.

"Our kind _Host_ and _Hostess_, whether by _design_, or _accident_ became _King_ and _Queen_. According to _Twelfth-Day Law_, each _party_ is to _support_ their _character_ till Mid-night. After supper one called for a _Kings Speech_, &c." Observations on Popular Antiquities, edit. of 1810, p. 228.

[135:A] Dr. Johnson's definition of the word _Rock_ in the sense of the text, is as follows:

"(_rock_, Danish; _rocca_, Italian; _rucca_, Spanish; _spinrock_, Dutch) A distaff held in the hand, from which the wool was spun by twirling a ball below." I shall add one of his illustrations:

"A learned and a manly soul I purpos'd her; that should with even powers, The _rock_, the spindle, and the sheers, controul Of destiny, and spin her own free hours. _Ben Jonson._"

[135:B] Chalmers's Poets, vol. iv. p. 564. Albion's England, chap. 24.

[136:A] Hesperides, p. 374.

[137:A] Tusser Redivivus, p. 79, 80.

[137:B] Olai Magni Gent. Septent. Breviar. p. 341.

[137:C] See Brand on Bourne's Antiquitates Vulgares, p. 194; and Strutt's Sports and Pastimes of the People of England, p. 307. edit. of 1810. Of this curious exhibition on _Plough-Monday_, I have often, during my boyhood, at York, been a delighted spectator, and, as far as I can now recollect, the above description appears to be an accurate detail of what took place.

[138:A] Act iii. sc. 9. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xvii. p. 171.

[138:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xvii. p. 172.

[138:C] Bourne's Antiquities apud Brand, p. 244.

[138:D] Fuller's Church History, p. 222.

[140:A] Hesperides, p. 337.

[140:B] _Teend_, to kindle.

[140:C] Hesperides, p. 337, 338.

[141:A] Hesperides, p. 361. Dramatic amusements were frequent on this day, as well in the halls of the nobility in the country, as at court. With regard to their exhibition in the latter, many documents exist; for instance, in a chronological series of Queen Elizabeth's payments for plays acted before her (from the Council Registers) is the following entry:

"18th March, 1573-4. To Richard Mouncaster, (Mulcaster, the Grammarian,) for two plays presented before her on Candlemas-day and Shrove-tuesday last, 20 marks."[141:B]

[141:B] Gentleman's Magazine, vide life of Richard Mulcaster, May, June, and July, 1800.

[142:A] Hilman's Tusser, p. 80. Mr. Hilman seems to have had as great an aversion to tobacco as King James; for, in another part of his notes, he observes, that "_Suffolk_ and _Essex_ were the counties wherein our author was a farmer, and no where are better dairies for butter, and neater housewives than there, _if too many of them at present do not smoke tobacco_." p. 19.

[143:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. viii. p. 272, 273. Act ii. sc. 2. Warner has also noticed this culinary article as appropriated to Shrove-Tuesday in his Albion's England, chapter xxiv., where, enumerating the feasts and holidays of his time, he says, they had

"At fasts-eve pan-puffes."— _Chalmers's Poets_, vol. iv. p. 564.

Shrove or _Pancake Tuesday_, is still called, in the North, _Fastens_, or _Fasterns E'en_, as preceding _Ash-Wednesday_, the first day of Lent; and the turning of these cakes in the pan is yet observed as a feat of dexterity and skill.

Of the _pancake-bell_ which used to be rung on Shrove-Tuesday, Taylor, the Water Poet, has given us the following most singular account:—"Shrove-Tuesday, at whose entrance in the morning all the whole kingdom is unquiet, but by that time the clocke strikes eleven, which (by the help of a knavish sexton) is commonly before nine, then there is a bell rung, cal'd pancake-bell, the sound whereof makes thousands of people distracted, and forgetful either of manners or humanitie." See his Works, folio, 1630. p. 115.

[143:B] —_my wife's as all_;] _i. e._ as all women are. Farmer.

[143:C] Warton's History of English Poetry, vol. i. p. 225. note (p).

[144:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xii. p. 235.

[144:B] See his Masque on the Shrove-tuesday at night 1608, and Chloridia, a Masque, at Shrove-tide, 1630.

[144:C] The author of _Apollo Shroving_ was _William Hawkins_, who likewise published "Corolla varia contexta per Guil. Haukinum scholarcham Hadleianum in agro Suffolcienci. Cantabr. ap. Tho. Buck." 12mo. 1634.

It may be observed, that _Shrove-Tuesday_ was considered by the _apprentices_ as their peculiar _holiday_, and it appears that in the days of Shakspeare, they claimed a right of punishing, at this season, women of ill-fame. To these customs Dekker and Sir Thomas Overbury allude, when the former says: "They presently (like Prentises upon Shrove-Tuesday) take the lawe into their

owne handes and do what they list." Seven Deadly Sinnes of London, 4to. p. 35. 1606. And when the latter, in his Characters, speaking of a bawd, remarks: "Nothing daunts her so much as the approach of Shrove-Tuesday;" and describing a "roaring boy," adds, "he is a supervisor of brothels, and in them is a more unlawful reformer of vice than prentices on Shrove-Tuesday."

[144:D] History of English Poetry, vol. ii. p. 387.

[145:A] Stow's Survey of London, edit. of 1618, p. 142.

[145:B] Vide Strutt's Sports and Pastimes, p. 250.

[145:C] Vide Hogarth Moralized, p. 134.

[145:D] "In some places," says Mr. Strutt, "it was a common practice to put the cock into an earthern vessel made for the purpose, and to place him in such a position that his head and tail might be exposed to view; the vessel, with the bird in it, was then suspended across the street, about twelve or fourteen feet from the ground, to be thrown at by such as chose to make trial of their skill; two-pence was paid for four throws, and he who broke the pot, and delivered the cock from his confinement, had him for a reward. At North-Walsham, in Norfolk, about forty years ago, some wags put an owl into one of these vessels; and having procured the head and tail of a dead cock, they placed them in the same position as if they had appertained to a living one; the deception was successful; and at last, a labouring man belonging to the town, after several fruitless attempts, broke the pot, but missed his prize; for the owl being set at liberty, instantly flew away, to his great astonishment, and left him nothing more than the head and tail of the dead bird, with the potsherds, for his money and his trouble; this ridiculous adventure exposed him to the continual laughter of the town's people, and obliged him to quit the place, to which I am told he returned no more." Sports and Pastimes, p. 251.

"For many years," observes Mr. Brady, "our public diaries, and monthly publications, took infinite pains to impress upon the minds of the populace a just abhorrence of such barbarities (cock-fighting and cock-throwing); and, by way of strengthening their arguments, they failed not to detail in the most pathetic terms the following fact, which for the interest it contains is here transcribed, from the Obituary of the Gentleman's Magazine for April, 1789. 'Died, April 4th, at Tottenham, JOHN ARDESOIF, esquire, a young man of large fortune, and in the splendour of his horses and carriages, rivalled by few country-gentlemen. His table was that of hospitality, where it may be said he sacrificed too much to conviviality. _Mr. Ardesoif_ was very fond of cock-fighting, and had a favourite cock upon which he had won many profitable matches. The last bet he laid upon this cock he lost, which so enraged him, that he had the bird tied to a spit, and roasted alive before a large fire. The screams of the miserable animal were so affecting, that some gentlemen who were present attempted to interfere, which so enraged _Mr. Ardesoif_, that he seized a poker, and with the most furious vehemence declared, that he would kill the first man who interfered: but in the midst of his passionate asseverations, _he fell down dead upon the spot_.' Clavis Calendaria, 1st edit. vol. i. p. 200, 201."

[146:A] Bourne's Antiquities apud Brand, p. 268.

[147:A] Bourne's Antiquities apud Brand, p. 277. "Why they should play at _Hand Ball_ at this time," observes Mr. Bourne, "rather than any other game, I have not been able to find out, but I suppose it will readily be granted, that this custom of so playing, was the original of our present recreations and diversions on Easter Holy Days," p. 277.

[147:B] Brand on Bourne, p. 280. note. The _morris dance_, of which such frequent mention is made in our old poets, was frequently performed at Easter; but, as we shall have occasion to notice this amusement, at some length, under the article "May-Day," we shall here barely notice that Warner has recorded it as an Easter diversion in the following line:

"At _Paske begun_ our _morrise_: and ere Penticost our May." _Albion's England_, Chap. xxiv.

[147:C] _Rack_ or _Manger_.

[147:D] Selden's Table-Talk, art. Christmas.

[148:A] Fuller's Worthies, p. 188.

[148:B] Bourne apud Brand, p. 316.

[148:C] The following whimsical custom, relates Mr. Brand, "is still retained at the city of Durham on these holidays. On one day the men take off the women's shoes, which are only to be redeem'd by a present; on another day the women take off the men's in like manner." Bourne apud Brand, p. 282.

Stow also records, that in the week before Easter there were "great shewes made, for the fetching in of a twisted tree, or With, as they tearmed it, out of the Woods into the King's house, and the like into every man's house of Honor or Worship," p. 150.; but whether this was general throughout the kingdom, is not mentioned.

[149:A] Vide Ross, as published by Hearne, p. 105.

[149:B] Spelman's Glossary, under the title Hock-day.

[151:A] Nichols's Progresses of Queen Elizabeth, vol. i. Laneham's Letter, p. 32-34.

[151:B] That Hock-tide was _generally_ observed in the days of Shakspeare, is evident from the following passage in Withers's "Abuses Stript and Whipt." 8vo. London. 1618.

"Who think (forsooth) because that once a yeare They can affoord the poore some slender cheere, Observe their country feasts, or common doles, And entertaine their Christmass Wassaile Boles, Or els because that, _for the Churche's good, They in defence of HOCKTIDE custome stood_: A Whitsun-ale, or some such goodly motion, The better to procure young men's devotion: What will they do, I say, that think to please Their mighty God with such fond things as these? Sure, very ill." P. 232.

[152:A] Vide Pennant's Scotland, p. 91.; and Jamieson's Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language.

[152:B] Olaus Magnus de Gentibus Septentrionalibus, lib. xv. c. 8.

[153:A] Chalmers's English Poets, vol. i. p. 378.

[153:B] Bourne's Antiquitates Vulgares apud Brand, p. 283.

[154:A] Vide Borlase's Natural History of Cornwall, &c.

[154:B] Stubbes's Anatomie of Abuses, p. 109. edit. 1595, 4to.

[155:A] Book ii. Song 4. Chalmers's Poets, vol. vi. p. 296.—It was no uncommon thing also for the milk-maids to join the procession to the May-pole on this day, leading a cow decorated with ribands of various colours, intermingled with knots of flowers, and wreathes of oaken leaves, and with the horns of the animal gilt.

[155:B] Stow's Survey of London, p. 150. 1618.

[155:C] Act i. sc. 1. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iv. p. 327.

[156:A] Act iv. sc. 1. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iv. p. 452, 453.—"The _rite_ of this month," observes Mr. Steevens, "was once so universally observed, that even authors thought their works would obtain a more favourable reception, if published on _May-day_. The following is a title-page to a metrical performance by a once celebrated poet, Thomas Churchyard:

'Come bring in _Maye_ with me, My _Maye_ is fresh and greene; A subjectes harte, an humble mind, To serve a mayden Queene.

'A discourse of rebellion, drawne forth for to warne the wanton wittes how to kepe their heads on their shoulders.

'Imprinted at London, in Flete-streat by William Griffith, Anno Domini 1570. The _first_ of _Maye_.'"

[156:B] Act v. sc. 3. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xi. p. 201.

[157:A] Herrick's Hesperides, p. 74, 75.

[158:A] Illustrations of Shakspeare, vol. ii. p. 473.

[158:B] Anatomie of Abuses, p. 107.

[158:C] Illustrations of Shakspeare, vol. ii. p. 474.

[158:D] Vide Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xi. p. 440.

[158:E] Midsummer-Night's Dream, act iii. sc. 2. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iv. p. 427.

[159:A] Act ii. sc. 2. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. viii. p. 278.

[159:B] Drayton's Poly-Olbion, Song 26. Chalmers's Poets, vol. iv. p. 373, 374.

[160:A] Warner's Albion's England, chapter 21. Chalmers's Poets, vol. iv. p. 564.

[160:B] As You Like It, act i. sc. 1. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. viii. p. 13.

[160:C] Lysons's Environs of London, vol. i. p. 227.

[160:D] Beloe's Anecdotes of Literature and scarce Books, vol. i. p. 401.

[160:E] Act iii. sc. 4. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. v. p. 364.

[161:A] Douce's Illustrations of Shakspeare, vol. ii. p. 451.

[162:A] Fetherston's Dialogue agaynst light, lewde, and lascivious dancing, 1582, 12mo. sign. D. 7. apud Douce.

[162:B] The honestie of this age, 1615, 4to. p. 35.

[162:C] First part of King Henry IV. act iii. sc. 3. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xi. p. 362.

[163:A] Act iv. sc. 1. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iv. p. 266.

[163:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xi. p. 438.

[163:C] Douce's Illustrations of Shakspeare, vol. ii. p. 450. Fordun's Scotichronicon, 1759, folio, tom. ii. p. 104. "In this time," says Stow, that is, about the year 1190, in the reign of Richard I. "were many robbers, and outlawes, among the which Robin Hood and Little John, renowned theeves, continued in woods, despoyling and robbing the goods of the rich." Annals, p. 159.

[163:D] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iv. p. 267. note by Malone.

[164:A] Eclogue iii. Chalmers's Poets, vol. iv. p. 433.

[164:B] Second Part of King Henry the Sixth, act iii. sc. 1. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xiii. p. 276.

[164:C] Plaine Percevall the peace-maker of England, &c. &c. Vide Censura Literaria, vol. ix. p. 250.

[165:A] Censura Literaria, vol. ix. p. 251.

[165:B] Act iv. sc. 3. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ix. p. 345.

[165:C] Canto Madrigals, of 5 and 6 parts, apt for the viols and voices. Made and newly published by Thomas Weelkes of the Coledge at Winchester, Organist. At London printed by Thomas Este, the assigne of Thomas Morley. 1600. 4to.

[166:A] Censura Literaria, vol. ix. p. 34.

[166:B] It is probable indeed from the subsequent Madrigal, that the Hobby-horse was frequently attached to, and provided for, by the town or village.

"Our country swains, in the morris daunce, Thus woo'd and win their brides; _Will, for our towne, the hobby horse A pleasure frolike rides_."[166:C]

[166:C] Vide Cantus primo. Madrigals to 3, 4, 5, and 6 voyces. Made and newly published by Thomas Weelkes at London, printed by Thomas Este, 1597, 4to. Censura Literaria, vol. ix. p. 9-10.

[167:A] "The English were famed," observes Dr. Grey, "for these and such like diversions; and even the old, as well as young persons, formerly followed them: a remarkable instance of which is given by Sir William Temple, (Miscellanea, Part 3. Essay of Health and Long Life,) who makes mention of a Morrice Dance in Herefordshire, from a noble person, who told him he had a pamphlet in his library written by a very ingenious gentleman of that county, which gave an account how, in such a year of King James's reign, there went about the country a sett of Morrice Dancers, composed of _ten_ men, who danced a Maid Marian, and a taber and pipe: and how these ten, one with another, made up twelve hundred years. 'Tis not so much, says he, that so many in one county should live to that age, as that they should be in vigour and humour to travel and dance." Grey's Notes on Shakspeare, vol. i. p. 382.

[168:A] _Courtpie_, in women's dress, a short vest. Strutt.

[168:B] _Watchet-coloured_, pale blue. Strutt.

[168:C] _Rochet_, a lawn garment resembling a surplice gathered at the wrists. Strutt.

[168:D] _Baudekin_, a cloth of gold tissue, with figures in silk, for female dress. Strutt.

[169:A] The mole-taker, in this place, personates the character of the _fool_ or domestic buffoon.

[170:A] The management of the hobby-horse appears to have been the most difficult part of the May-day festivities, and from the following passage in an old play, to have required some preparatory discipline. A character personating this piece of pageantry, and angry with the mayor of the town as being his rival, calls out, "Let the mayor play the hobby-horse among his brethren, an he will, I hope our towne-lads cannot want a hobby-horse. Have I practic'd my reines, my careeres, my pranckers, my ambles, my false trotts, my smooth ambles and Canterbury paces, and shall master mayor put me besides the hobby-horse? Have I borrowed the fore horse bells, his plumes and braveries, nay had his mane new shorne and frizl'd, and shall the mayor put me besides the hobby-horse?" The Vow breaker, by Sampson.

[170:B] The morris-dance in this description of the May-game seems to have been performed chiefly by the fool, with the occasional assistance of the hobby-horse, which was always decorated with bells, and the dragon.

[171:A] Strutt's Queenhoo-Hall, a romance, vol. i. p. 13. et seq.

[171:B] Act iii. sc. 2. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xviii. p. 198.

[171:C] Act iii. sc. 1. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. vii. p. 53, 54.

[172:A] Entertainment of the Queen and Prince at Althorpe. 1603. fol. edit. vol. i. p. 99.

[172:B] The Metamorphosed Gipsies, fol. edit. vol. 2. p. 65.—This folio edition of Jonson's works, in two volumes, dated 1640, is not regularly paged to the close of each volume; for instance, in vol. i. the Dramas terminate at p. 668, and then the Epigrammes, Forest, Masques, &c. commence with p. 1.

[173:A] Act iv. sc. 1.—Jonson in his _Bartholmew Fayre_, acted in the year 1614, has a character of this kind, a Baker, who has undergone a similar conversion, and is thus introduced:—

"_Win. W._ What call you the Reverend _Elder_, you told me of? your Banbury-man.

Joh. _Rabbi Busy_, Sir, he is more than an _Elder_, he is a _Prophet_, Sir.

Quar. O, I know him! a Baker, is he not?

Joh. Hee was a Baker, Sir, but hee do's dreame now, and see visions, he has given over his Trade.

Quar. I remember that too: out of a scruple hee tooke, that (in spic'd conscience) those Cakes hee made, were serv'd to _Bridales_, _May poles_, _Morrisses_, and such prophane feasts and meetings; his Christen-name is _Zeale-of-the-land_ Busye." Jonson's Works, fol. edit. vol. ii. p. vi. act i. sc. 3.

[173:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xviii. p. 198, note, Steevens.

[173:C] Wilson, censuring these indulgences, places the era of the publication of the Book of Sports under 1617, and says of it, that "some of the Bishops, pretending _Recreations_, and _liberty_ to servants and the common people (of which they carved to themselves too much already) procured the King to put out a Book to permit dancing about _May-poles_, _Church-ales_, and such debauched exercises upon the Sabbath-Day after Evening-Prayer (being a specious way to make the King, and them, acceptable to the _Rout_): which Book came out with a command, injoyning all Ministers to read it to their parishioners, and to approve of it; and those that did not, were brought into the high _Commission_, imprisoned and suspended." The History of Great Britain, being the Life and Reign of King James the First, relating to what passed from his first access to the Crown, till his death. Folio, London 1653. p. 105.

[174:A] Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, 8th edit. fol. p. 174.

[174:B] "The last May-pole in London was taken down in 1717, and conveyed to Wanstead in Essex, where it was fixed in the Park for the support of an immensely large telescope. Its original height was upwards of one hundred feet above the surface of the ground, and its station on the East side of Somerset-House, where the new church now stands.—POPE thus perpetuates its remembrance:

Amidst the area wide they took their stand, Where the tall May-pole once o'erlook'd the Strand." Clavis Calendaria, vol. i. p. 318.

[175:A] Act ii. sc. 4. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xii. p. 354.

[175:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iv. p. 231. act ii. sc. 6.

[175:C] Ascham's Works apud Bennet, p. 62, 63.

[176:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xxi. p. 155.

[176:B] Jonson's Works, fol. edit.

[176:C] "A leet," observes Bullokar, in his _English Expositor_, 1616, "is a court, or law-day, holden commonly every half year."

[176:D] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ix. p. 33. act i. sc. 2.

[176:E] Warton's History of English Poetry, vol. iii. p. 129, note.

[177:A] MSS. Bibl. Bod., vol. cxlviii. fol. 97.

[178:A] Carew's Survey of Cornwall, edit. of 1769. p. 68.

[178:B] Anatomie of Abuses, A. D. 1595.

[179:A] Jonson's Works, fol. edit. vol. i. p. 166.

[179:B] The Lady of Pleasure, act i.

[179:C] The former of which is thus noticed by Sir Philip Sidney:—

"Strephon, with leavy twigs of laurell tree, A garlant made on temples for to weare, _For he then chosen was the dignitie Of village Lord that Whitsuntide to beare_." The Countesse of Pembroke's Arcadie, 7th edit. fol. 1629. p. 84.

[180:A] Anatomie of Abuses, 1595. p. 107.

[181:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ix. p. 341. Act iv. sc. 3.—Whitsun playes or mysteries, which at first were exclusively drawn from the sacred page, may be traced to the fourteenth century; those which were performed at Chester have been attributed to Ranulph Higden, the chronicler, who died 1363.

[181:B] Blount's Ancient Tenures, p. 49, and Strutt's Sports and Pastimes, p. 316.

[182:A] Tusser apud Hilton, p. 80.

[183:A] Chalmers's Poets, vol. iv. p. 443.

[183:B] Singers of catches in three parts.

[183:C] By _means_ are meant tenors.

[183:D] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ix. p. 323, 324. Act iv. sc. 2.

[183:E] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ix. p. 323. note 5.

[184:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ix. p. 334. Act iv. sc. 3.—I believe the custom of choosing a king and queen at the sheep-shearing feast, is still continued in several of our counties; that it was commonly observed, at least, in the time of Thomson, is evident from the following lines, taken from his description of this festival:—

"One, chief, in gracious dignity enthron'd, Shines o'er the rest, the _Pas'tral Queen_, and rays Her smiles, sweet-beaming on her _Shepherd King_." Summer.

[185:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. ix. p. 334, 335. 337, 338. 340.

[185:B] Dyer's Fleece, book i. _sub finem_.

[186:A] Tusser Redivivus, p. 104. In the first edition of Tusser, 1557, this stanza is as follows:—

"Then welcome thy harvest folke, serveauntes and all: with mirth and good chere, let them furnish the hall. The harvest lorde nightly, must give thee a song: fill him then the blacke boll, or els he hath wrong." Reprint by Sir Egerton Brydges, p. 19.

[186:B] Bloomfield's Farmer's Boy, Summer, l. 299.

[187:A] Paul Hentzner's Travels in England, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, translated by Horace, late Earl of Orford. Edit. of 1797. p. 55.

[187:B] "Anglos vidi spiceam ferre domum in Rheda Imaginem circum cantantibus promiscuê viris et fœminis, præcedente tibicine aut tympano." Deprav. Rel. Orig. in verbo _Vacina_.

[187:C] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. vii. p. 376. Act v. sc. 1.

[188:A] Tusser Redivivus, p. 104.

[188:B] _Hock-cart_,—by this word is meant the _high_ or _rejoicing-cart_, and was applied to the last load of corn, as typical of the close of harvest. Thus _Hock-tide_ is derived from the Saxon _Hoah_-+tid+, or high tide, and is expressive of the height of festivity.

[189:A] Hesperides, p. 113-115.

[190:A] Tusser Redivivus, p. 81.

[190:B] Ibid. p. 147.

[190:C] Ibid. p. 77.

[191:A] Brand on Bourne's Antiquities, p. 392. note edit. 1810.

[191:B] Ibid. p. 393, 394.

[192:A] The magnificent reception of Queen Elizabeth at Norwich in 1578, has been recorded with great minuteness, in two tracts, by Bernard Goldingham and Thomas Churchyard the poet, which are reprinted in Mr. Nichols's Progresses; these accounts are likewise incorporated by Abraham Fleming as a supplement to Holinshed, and will be found in the last edition of this chronicler, in vol. iv. p. 375. The pomp and pageantry which were exhibited during this regal visit were equally gorgeous, quaint, and operose; "order was taken there," says Churchyard, "that every day, for sixe dayes together, a shew of some strange device should be seene; and the maior and aldermen appointed among themselves and their breethren, that no person reteyning to the Queene, shoulde be unfeasted, or unbidden to dinner and supper, during the space of those sixe dayes: which order was well and wisely observed, and gained their citie more fame and credite, than they wot of: for that courtesie of theirs shall remayne in perpetuall memorie, whiles the walles of their citie standeth."—Nichols's Progresses of Q. Elizabeth, vol. ii. p. 56.

[192:B] The wise policy of Elizabeth in establishing the Flemings in this country gave birth to our vast superiority in the woollen trade; and the first pageant which met the eyes of Elizabeth on her entrance into Norwich was the _artizan-strangers_ pageant, illustrative of the whole process of the manufactory, "a shewe which pleased her Majestie so greatly, as she particularly viewed the knitting and spinning of the children, perused the loombes, and noted the several workes and commodities which were made by these meanes."—Nichols's Progresses, vol. ii. p. 13.

[192:C] Gerguntum, a fabulous kind of Briton, who is supposed to have built Norwich Castle; in the procession which went out of Norwich to meet the Queen, on the 16th of August, 1578, was "one whiche represented King GURGUNT, some tyme king of Englande, whiche buylded the castle of Norwich, called Blanch Flowre, and layde the foundation of the citie. He was mounted uppon a brave courser, and was thus furnished: his body armed, his bases of greene and white silke; on his head a black velvet hat, with a plume of white feathers. There attended upon him three henchmen in white and greene: one of them did beare his helmet, the seconde his tergat, the thirde his staffe."—Nichols's Progresses, vol. ii. p. 5, 6.

[193:A] The Cabinet, vol. ii. p. 75, 76.

[193:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xii. p. 66.

[194:A] Bourne's Antiquities, p. 172.

[194:B] A great display of literature on the etymon of the word _Yule_ will be found in the _Allegories Orientales_ of M. Count de Gebelin, Paris, 1773.

[195:A] _Teending_, a word derived from the Saxon, means _kindling_.

[195:B] _White-loafe_, sometimes called at this period _wastel-bread_ or cake, from the French _wastiaux_, pastry; implied white bread well or twice baked, and was considered as a delicacy.

[195:C] Hesperides, p. 309, 310.

[196:A] Stowe's Survey of London, 4to. edit., 1618, p. 149, 150.

[196:B] Vide Gentleman's Magazine for 1765.

[197:A] Brand on Bourne's Antiquities, p. 193.

[197:B] Ibid. p. 200, 201.

[198:A] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xviii. p. 143. Act ii. sc. 2.

[198:B] Reed's Shakspeare, vol. iv. p. 361. Act ii. sc. 2.

[198:C] Chap. xxx. fol. 57. edit. 1586.

[199:A] Douce's Illustrations, vol. ii. p. 214.

[199:B] Vide Blount's Ancient Tenures of Land, and Jocular Customs of some Manors. Beckwith's edit. 8vo. 1784.

[200:A] Douce's Illustrations, vol. ii. p. 215-217. 219.

[201:A] Act v. sc. 1. Reed's Shakspeare, vol. xii. p. 213.

[201:B] English House-Wife, p. 99. The pies which he recommends immediately subsequent to this enumeration are somewhat curious, and rather of a more substantial nature than those of modern days; for instance, _red-deer pye_, _gammon of bacon pye_, _wild-bore pye_, and _roe-pye_.

[202:A] Vide Warton's History of English Poetry, vol. iii. p. 143.

[202:B] A hundreth good poyntes of husbandry, 1557. p. 10.

[203:A] Christmas, His Masque; as it was presented at Court 1616. Jonson's Works, folio edit. 1640. vol. ii.

[204:A] Holinshed's Chronicles, vol. iii. p. 1032. edit. 1808.

[204:B] Stowe's Survey of London, p. 149. edit. 1618.

[205:A] Nichols's Progresses and Processions of Queen Elizabeth, vol. i. p. 20, 21. Anno 1562.

[205:B] Hesperides, p. 145.

[205:C] Provincial Glossary, Preface, p. 8. 8vo. 1787.

[206:A] _Liber Pater_, Bacchus.

[206:B] Hesperides, p. 146. The following passages place in a strong and interesting point of view, the hospitality of our ancestors during this season of the year, and will add not a little to the impression derived from the text.

"Heretofore, noblemen and gentlemen of fair estates had their heralds who wore their coate of armes at Christmas, and at other solemne times, and cryed largesse thrice. They lived in the country like petty kings. They always eat in Gothic Halls where the Mummings and Loaf-stealing, and other Christmas sports, were performed. The hearth was commonly in the middle; whence the

saying, _round about our coal-fire_." Antiquarian Repertory, No. xxvi. from the MS. Collections of Aubrey, dated 1678.

"An English Gentleman at the opening of the great day, _i. e._ on Christmas Day in the morning, had all his tenants and neighbours entered his Hall by day-break. The strong beer was broached, and the black jacks went plentifully about with toast, sugar, nutmegg, and good Cheshire cheese. The Hackin, (the great sausage) must be boiled by day-break, or else two young men must take the maiden (_i. e._ the cook,) by the arms and run her round the market place till she is ashamed of her laziness.

"In Christmass Holidays, the tables were all spread from the first to the last; the sirloins of beef, the minced pies, the plumb-porridge, the capons, turkeys, geese, and plumb-puddings, were all brought upon the board: every one eat heartily, and was welcome, which gave rise to the proverb, 'Merry in the hall when beards wag all.'" From a Tract entitled "Round about our Coal-Fire, or Christmas Entertainments;" of which the first edition was published, I believe, about the close of the seventeenth century.

"Our ancestors considered Christmas in the double light of a holy commemoration and a cheerful festival; and accordingly distinguished it by devotion, by vacation from business, by merriment and hospitality. They seemed eagerly bent to make themselves and every body about them happy.—The great hall resounded with the tumultuous joys of servants and tenants, and the gambols they played served as amusement to the lord of the mansion and his family, who, by encouraging every art conducive to mirth and entertainment, endeavoured to soften the rigour of the season, and mitigate the influence of winter."—_The World_, No. 104.

[208:A] Scott's Marmion. Introduction to Canto Sixth. 8vo. edit. p. 300-303.

"At present, Christmas meetings," remarks Mr. Brady, "are chiefly confined to family parties, happy, it must be confessed, though less jovial in their nature; perhaps, too, less beneficial to society, because they can be enjoyed on other days not, as originally was the case, set apart for more general conviviality and sociability; not such as our old ballads proclaim, and history confirms, in which the most frigid tempers gave way to relaxation, and all in eager joy were ready to exclaim, in honour of the festivity,—

"For, since such delights are thine, CHRISTMAS, with thy bands I join." _Clavis Calendaria_, vol. ii. p. 319.

CHAPTER VII.

MANNERS AND CUSTOMS OF THE COUNTRY CONTINUED—WAKES—FAIRS—WEDDINGS—BURIALS.

Having described, in as brief a manner as was consistent with the nature of our work, the various circumstances accompanying the celebration of the most remarkable holidays and festivals, in the country, during the age of Shakspeare, from whose inimitable compositions we have drawn many pertinent illustrations on nearly all the subjects as they passed before us; we shall proceed, in the present chapter, to notice those remaining topics which are calculated to complete, on the scale adopted, a tolerably correct view of rural manners and customs, as they existed in the latter half of the sixteenth, and prior portion of the seventeenth, century.

A natural transition will carry us, from the description of the rural festival, to the gaieties of the WAKE or FAIR. Of these terms, indeed, the former originally implied the vigil which preceded the festival in honour of the Saint to whom the parish-church was dedicated; for "on the Eve of this day," remarks Mr. Borlase, in his Cornwall, "prayers were said, and hymns were sung all night in the church; and from these watchings the festivals were stiled _Wakes_; which name still continues in many parts of England, though the vigils have been long abolished."[209:A] The religious institution, however, of the _Wake_, whether held on the vigil or Saint's day, was soon forgotten; mirth and feasting early became the chief objects of this meeting[209:B], and it, at length, degenerated into something approaching towards a secular Fair. These Wakes or Fairs, which were rendered more popular in proportion as they deviated from their devotional origin, were, until the reign of Henry the Sixth, always held on a Sunday and its eve, a custom that continued to be partially observed as late as the middle of the seventeenth century; hence ale-houses, and places of public resort, in the immediate neighbourhood of church-yards, the former scene of Wakes, were still common at the close of Shakspeare's life; thus Sir Thomas Overbury, describing a Sexton, in his _Characters_, published in 1616, says: "At every church-style commonly there's an ale-house; where let him (the Sexton) bee found never so idle-pated, hee is still a grave drunkard."

The increasing licentiousness and conviviality, however, which attended these church-yard assemblies, frequented as they were by pedlars and hawkers of every description, finally occasioned their suppression in all places, at least, where much traffic was expected. In their room regular Fairs were established, to which in central or peculiar stations, the resort, at fixed periods, was immense.

Yet the _Wake_, the meeting for mere festivity and frolic, still continued in every village and small town, and though not preceded by any vigil in the church, was popularly termed the _Wake-Day_. Tusser, in his catalogue of the "Old Guise," has not forgotten this season of merriment; on the contrary, he seems to welcome its return with much cordiality:—

"Fil oven ful of flawnes, Ginnie passe not for sleepe, to morrow thy father his wake-daie wil keepe: Then every wanton may danse at hir wil, both Tomkin and Tomlin, and Jankin with Gil."[210:A]

Mr. Hilman, in his edition of Tusser, has made the following observations on this passage.—"Waking in the church," says he, "was left off because of some abuses, and we see here it was converted to wakeing at the oven. The other continued down to our author's days, and in a great many places continues still to be observed with all sorts of rural merriments; such as dancing, wrestling, cudgel-playing, &c." Bourne observes, that the feasting and sporting, on this occasion, usually lasted for two or three days[211:A]; and Bishop Hall gives an impressive idea of the revelry and glee which distinguished these rural assemblages, when he exclaims, "What should I speak of our _merry Wakes_, and May games—in all which put together, you may well say, no Greek can be _merrier_ than they."[211:B] Indeed from one end of the kingdom to the other, from north to south, it would appear, that, among the country-villages, during the reigns of Elizabeth and her two immediate successors, Wakes formed one of the principal amusements of the peasantry, and were anticipated with much eagerness and expectation. In confirmation of this we need only remark that Drayton, speaking of Lancashire, declares, that

—— "every village smokes at _wakes_ with lusty cheer;"[211:C]

and that Herrick, in Devonshire, has written a very curious little poem, entitled _The Wake_, which, as strikingly descriptive of the various business of this festivity, claims here an introduction:—

"Come Anthea, let us two Go to feast, as others do. Tarts and custards, creams and cakes, Are the junketts still at _Wakes_: Unto which the tribes resort, Where the businesse is the sport: Morris-dancers thou shalt see, Marian too in pagentrie: And a Mimick to devise Many grinning properties. Players there will be, and those Base in action as in clothes: Yet with strutting they will please The incurious villages. Neer the dying of the day, There will be a cudgell-play, Where a coxcomb will be broke, Ere a good _word_ can be spoke: But the anger ends all here, Drencht in ale, or drown'd in beere. Happy Rusticks, best content With the cheapest merriment: And possesse no other feare, Than to want the _Wake_ next yeare."[212:A]

Of the pedlars or hawkers who, in general, formed a constituent part of these _village-wakes_ an accurate idea may be drawn from the character of the pedlar Autolycus, in the _Winter's Tale_ of Shakspeare, who is delineated with the poet's customary strength of pencil, rich humour, and fidelity to nature. The wares in which he dealt are curiously enumerated in the following passages:—

"_Serv._ He hath songs, for men, or women, of all sizes; no milliner can so fit his customers with gloves[212:B]: he has the prettiest love-songs for maids; he hath ribands of all the colours i' the rainbow; points more than all the lawyers in Bohemia can learnedly handle, though they come to him by the gross; inkles, caddisses[212:C], cambricks, lawns: why, he sings them over, as they were gods or goddesses: you would think, a smock were a she-angel; he so chants to the sleeve-hand, and the work about the square on't."[212:D]

"_Enter Autolycus, singing._

"Lawn, as white as driven snow; Cyprus, black as e'er was crow; Gloves as sweet as damask roses; Masks for faces, and for noses; Bugle bracelet, necklace-amber, Perfume for a lady's chamber: Golden quoifs, and stomachers, For my lads to give their dears; Pins and poking-sticks of steel, What maids lack from head to heel: Come, buy of me, come; come buy, come buy; Buy, lads, or else your lasses cry; Come buy, &c."[213:A]

At the close of the feast Autolycus is represented as re-entering, and declaring "Ha, ha! what a fool honesty is! and trust, his sworn brother, a very simple gentleman! I have sold all my trumpery; not a counterfeit stone, not a riband, glass, pomander[213:B], brooch, table-book, ballad, knife, tape, glove, shoe-tye, bracelet, horn-ring, to keep my pack from fasting: they throng who should buy first; as if my trinkets had been hallowed, and brought a benediction to the buyer."[213:C]

In the North, the Village-Wake is still kept up, under the title of _The Hopping_, a word derived from the Anglo-Saxon, and thus applied, because dancing was the favourite amusement of these meetings. The reign of Elizabeth, indeed, was marked by a peculiar propensity to this exercise, and neither wake nor feast could be properly celebrated without the country lads and lasses footing it on the green or yard, or in bad weather, in the Manor-hall.

In an old play, entitled "A Woman Killed With Kindness," the production of Thomas Heywood, and acted in 1604, is to be found a very humorous description of one of these _Hoppings_, and particularly curious, as it enumerates the names of the dances then in vogue among these rustic performers. The poet, after remarking that now

——————————— "the mad lads And country lasses, every mother's child, With nosegays and bride laces in their hats, Dance all their country measures, rounds and jigs,"

thus introduces his couples:

"_Jenkin._ Come, Nick, take you Joan Miniver to trace withal; Jack Slime, traverse you with Sisly Milk-pail; I will take Jane Trubkin, and Roger Brickbat shall have Isabel Motley; and now strike up; we'll have a crash here in the yard.—

Jack Slime. Foot it quickly; if the music overcome not my melancholy, I shall quarrel; and if they do not suddenly strike up, I shall presently strike them down.

Jen. No quarrelling, for God's sake: truly, if you do, I shall set a knave between ye.

Jack Slime. I come to dance, not to quarrel; come, what shall it be? Rogero?

Jen. Rogero! no; we will dance 'The Beginning of the World.'

Sisly. I love no dance so well, as 'John, come kiss me now.'

Nicholas. I have ere now deserved a cushion; call for the Cushion-dance.

R. Brick. For my part, I like nothing so well as 'Tom Tyler.'

Jen. No; we'll have 'The hunting of the Fox.'

Jack Slime. 'The Hay! the Hay!' there's nothing like 'The Hay.'

Nich. I have said, do say, and will say again.

Jen. Every man agree to have it as Nick says.

All. Content.

Nich. It hath been, it now is, and it shall be.

Sisly. What? Mr. Nicholas? What?

Nich. 'Put on your smock a Monday.'

Jen. So, the dance will come cleanly off: come, for God's sake, agree of something; if you like not that, put it to the musicians; or let me speak for all, and we'll have 'Sellenger's Round.'

All. That, that, that!

Nich. No, I am resolved, thus it shall be. First take hands, then take ye to your heels.

Jen. Why, would you have us run away?

Nich. No; but I would have you shake your heels. Music, strike up. _They dance._"[214:A]

The _Fair_ or greater wake was usually held, as hath been observed, in a central situation, and its period and duration were, as at present, proclaimed by law. It was a scene of extensive business as well as of pleasure; for before provincial cities had attained either wealth or consequence, all communication between them was difficult, and neither the necessaries nor the elegances of life could be procured but at stated times, and at fixed depôts. It was usual, therefore, to go fifty or a hundred miles to one of these fairs, in order both to purchase goods and accommodations for the ensuing year, and to dispose of the superfluous products of art or cultivation. In the reign of Henry VI. the monks of the priories of Maxtoke in Warwickshire, and of Bicester in Oxfordshire, laid in their annual stores of common necessaries at Sturbridge Fair in Cambridgeshire, at least one hundred miles distant, and notwithstanding the two cities of Oxford and Coventry were in their immediate neighbourhood.[215:A] In the reign of Henry VIII., it

appears, from the Household-Book of Henry Percy, fifth Earl of Northumberland, that His Lordship's family were supplied with necessaries for the whole year from fairs. "He that stands charged with my Lordes House for the houll Yeir, if he maye possible, shall be at all Faires, where the greice Emptions shall be boughte for the House for the houll Yeir, as Wine, Wax, Beiffes, Muttons, Wheite and Malt[215:B];" and, in the reign of Elizabeth, Tusser recommends to his farmer the same plan, both for purchase and sale:

"At Bartilmewtide, or at Sturbridge faire, buie that as is needful, thy house to repaire: Then sel to thy profit, both butter and cheese, who buieth it sooner, the more he shall leese."[215:C]

That this custom prevailed until the commencement of the eighteenth century, and to nearly the same extent, is evident from a note on the just quoted lines of Tusser by Mr. Hilman. "Sturbridge Fair," says he, "stocks the country (namely, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex,) with clothes, and all other houshold necessaries; and they (the farmers) again, sell their butter and cheese, and whatever else remains on their hands; nay, there the shopkeepers supply themselves with divers sorts of commodities."

In the third year, indeed, of James I., Sturbridge Fair began to acquire such celebrity, that hackney coaches attended it from London; and it subsequently became so extensive that for several years not less than sixty coaches have been known to ply at this fair, then esteemed the largest in England.

Sturbridge Fair is still annually proclaimed, but now in such a state of decline, that its extinction, at least in a commercial light, cannot be far distant.

To these brief notices of wakes and fairs, it may be necessary to subjoin a slight detail of the state of _Country-Inns_ and Ale-houses during the age of Shakspeare.

To "take mine ease in mine inn" is a proverbial phrase, which the poet has placed in the mouth of Falstaff[216:A], and which implies a degree of comfort which has always been the peculiar attribute of an English house of public entertainment. That it was not less felt and enjoyed in Shakspeare's time than in our own, is very apparent from the accounts which have been left us by Harrison and Fynes Moryson; the former writing towards the close of the sixteenth, and the latter at the commencement of the seventeenth century. These descriptions, which are curiously faithful and highly interesting, paint the provincial hostelries of England as in a most flourishing state, and, according to Harrison, indeed, greatly superior to those which existed in the metropolis.

"Those townes," says the historian, "that we call thorowfaires, have great and sumptuous innes builded in them, for the receiving of such travellers and strange before using this eBook.

Title: The Works of William Shakespeare [Cambridge Edition] [Vol. 4 of 9]

Author: William ShakespeareThe Project Gutenberg eBook of Hamlet

This eBook is for the use of anyone anywhere in the United States and most other parts of the world at no cost and with almost no restrictions whatsoever. You may copy it, give it away or re-use it under the terms of the Project Gutenberg License included with this eBook or online at www.gutenberg.org. If you are not located in the United States, you will have to check the laws of the country where you are located before using this eBook.

Title: Hamlet

Author: William Shakespeare

Editor: Charles John Kean

Release date: January 10, 2009 [eBook #27761] Most recently updated: September 9, 2025

Language: English

Other information and formats: www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/27761

Credits: Produced by David Starner, Curtis Weyant and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at https://www.pgdp.net

*** START OF THE PROJECT GUTENBERG EBOOK HAMLET ***

Transcriber's Note: This is a heavily edited version of _Hamlet_. It was used for Charles Kean's 1859 stage production. Phrases printed in italics in the book are indicated in this electronic version by _ (underscore). Footnotes originally appeared at the bottom of each page. For this electronic version the footnotes are collected at the end of each act. In Act I, Scene 5, the word Uumix'd has been changed to Unmix'd. A closing bracket] was added to Act IV footnote 37 after _Naked on your kingdom_,. A closing bracket] was added to Act IV footnote 50 after _Venom'd stuck_,. The word o'er-crows appears in Act V, Scene 3; in footnote V.81, o'ercrows appears without a hyphen. Both are as they appear in the book.

SHAKESPEARE'S TRAGEDY

OF

HAMLET, PRINCE OF DENMARK.

ARRANGED FOR REPRESENTATION AT THE Royal Princess's Theatre

WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES,

BY CHARLES KEAN, F.S.A.

AS PERFORMED ON MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1859.

LONDON:

BRADBURY AND EVANS, 11, BOUVERIE STREET. 1859.

LONDON: BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

Dramatis Personæ

CLAUDIUS (_King of Denmark_) Mr. RYDER.

HAMLET (_son to the former and_ _nephew to the present King_). Mr. CHARLES KEAN.

POLONIUS (_Lord Chamberlain_) Mr. MEADOWS.

HORATIO (_friend To Hamlet_) Mr. GRAHAM.

LAERTES (_son To Polonius_) Mr. J. F. CATHCART.

ROSENCRANTZ } { Mr. BRAZIER. GUILDENSTERN } (_Courtiers_) { Mr. G. EVERETT. OSRICK } { Mr. DAVID FISHER.

PRIEST Mr. TERRY.

MARCELLUS Mr. PAULO.

BERNARDO Mr. DALY.

FRANCISCO Mr. COLLETT.

GHOST OF HAMLET'S FATHER Mr. WALTER LACY.

FIRST GRAVEDIGGER Mr. FRANK MATTHEWS.

SECOND GRAVEDIGGER Mr. H. SAKER.

FIRST PLAYER Mr. F. COOKE.

SECOND PLAYER Mr. ROLLESTON.

GERTRUDE (_Queen of Denmark, and_ _mother of Hamlet_) Mrs. CHARLES KEAN.

OPHELIA (_daughter of Polonius_) Miss HEATH.

ACTRESS Miss DALY.

STAGE DIRECTIONS.

R. H. means Right Hand; L. H. Left Hand; U. E. Upper Entrance; R. H. C. Enters through the Centre from the Right Hand; L. H. C. Enters through the Centre from the Left Hand.

RELATIVE POSITIONS OF THE PERFORMERS WHEN ON THE STAGE.

R. means on the Right side of the Stage; L. on the Left side of the Stage; C. Centre of the Stage; R. C. Right Centre of the Stage; L. C. Left Centre of the Stage.

The reader is supposed _to be on the Stage_, facing the audience.

PREFACE.

The play of _Hamlet_ is above all others the most stupendous monument of Shakespeare's genius, standing as a beacon to command the wonder and admiration of the world, and as a memorial to future generations, that the mind of its author was moved by little less than inspiration. _Lear_, with its sublime picture of human misery;--_Othello_, with its harrowing overthrow of a nature great and amiable;--_Macbeth_, with its fearful murder of a monarch, whose "virtues plead like angels trumpet-tongued against the deep damnation of his taking off,"--severally exhibit, in the most pre-eminent degree, all those mighty elements which constitute the perfection of tragic art--the grand, the pitiful, and the terrible. _Hamlet_ is a history of mind--a tragedy of thought. It contains the deepest philosophy, and most profound wisdom; yet speaks the language of the heart, touching the secret spring of every sense and feeling. Here we have no ideal exaltation of character, but life with its blended faults and virtues,--a gentle nature unstrung by passing events, and thus rendered "out of tune and harsh."

The original story of Hamlet is to be found in the Latin pages of the Danish historian, Saxo Grammaticus, who died in the year 1208. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, the French author, Francis de Belleforest, introduced the fable into a collection of novels, which were translated into English, and printed in a small quarto black letter volume, under the title of the "Historie of Hamblett," from which source Shakespeare constructed the present tragedy.

Saxo has placed his history about 200 years before Christianity, when barbarians, clothed in skins, peopled the shores of the Baltic. The poet, however, has so far modernised the subject as to make Hamlet a Christian, and England tributary to the "sovereign majesty of Denmark." A date can therefore be easily fixed, and the costume of the tenth and eleventh centuries may be selected for the purpose. There are but few authentic records in existence, but these few afford reason to believe that very slight difference existed between the dress of the Dane and that of the Anglo-Saxon of the same period.

Since its first representation, upwards of two centuries and a half ago, no play has been acted so frequently, or commanded such universal admiration. It draws within the sphere of its attraction both the scholastic and the unlearned. It finds a response in every breast, however high or however humble. By its colossal aid it exalts the drama of England above that of every nation, past or present. It is, indeed, the most marvellous creation of human intellect.

CHARLES KEAN.

HAMLET,

PRINCE OF DENMARK.

ACT I.

SCENE I.--ELSINORE. A PLATFORM BEFORE THE CASTLE. NIGHT.

FRANCISCO _on his post. Enter to him_ BERNARDO (L.H.)

Ber. Who's there?

Fran. (R.) Nay, answer me:[1] stand, and unfold[2] yourself.

Ber. Long live the king![3]

Fran. Bernardo?

Ber. He.

Fran. You come most carefully upon your hour.

Ber. 'Tis now struck twelve; get thee to bed, Francisco.

Fran. For this relief much thanks:

[_Crosses to_ L.]

'tis bitter cold, And I am sick at heart.

Ber. Have you had quiet guard?

Fran. Not a mouse stirring.

Ber. Well, good night. If you do meet Horatio and Marcellus, The rivals of my watch,[4] bid them make haste.

Fran. I think I hear them.--Stand, ho! Who's there?

Hor. Friends to this ground.

Mar. And liegemen to the Dane.[5]

Enter HORATIO _and_ MARCELLUS (L.H.)

Fran. Give you good night.

Mar. O, farewell, honest soldier: Who hath reliev'd you?

Fran. Bernardo hath my place. Give you good night.

[_Exit_ FRANCISCO, L.H.]

Mar. Holloa! Bernardo!

Ber. Say, What, is Horatio there?

Hor. (_Crosses to_ C.) A piece of him.[6]

Ber. (R.) Welcome, Horatio: welcome, good Marcellus.

Hor. What, has this thing appear'd again to-night?

Ber. I have seen nothing.

Mar. (L.) Horatio says, 'tis but our fantasy, And will not let belief take hold of him, Touching this dreaded sight, twice seen of us: Therefore I have entreated him, along With us, to watch the minutes of this night;[7] That, if again this apparition come, He may approve our eyes,[8] and speak to it.

Hor. Tush! tush! 'twill not appear.

Ber. Come, let us once again assail your ears, That are so fortified against our story, What we two nights have seen.[9]

Hor. Well, let us hear Bernardo speak of this.

Ber. Last night of all, When yon same star that's westward from the pole Had made his course to illume that part of heaven Where now it burns, Marcellus, and myself, The bell then beating one--

Mar. Peace, break thee off; look, where it comes again!

Enter Ghost (L.H.)

Ber. In the same figure, like the king that's dead.

Hor. Most like:--it harrows me with fear and wonder.[10]

Ber. It would be spoke to.

Mar. Speak to it, Horatio.

Hor. What art thou, that usurp'st this time of night,[11] Together with that fair and warlike form In which the majesty of buried Denmark Did sometimes march? By heaven I charge thee, speak!

Mar. It is offended.

[Ghost _crosses to_ R.]

Ber. See! it stalks away!

Hor. Stay!--speak!--speak, I charge thee, speak!

[_Exit_ Ghost, R.H.]

Mar. 'Tis gone, and will not answer.

Ber. How now, Horatio! You tremble, and look pale: Is not this something more than fantasy? What think you of it?

Hor. Before heaven, I might not this believe, Without the sensible and true avouch[12] Of mine own eyes.

Mar. Is it not like the king?

Hor. As thou art to thyself: Such was the very armour he had on, When he the ambitious Norway combated.

Mar. Thus, twice before, and jump at this dead hour,[13] With martial stalk hath he gone by our watch.

Hor. In what particular thought to work,[14] I know not; But in the gross and scope[15] of mine opinion, This bodes some strange eruption to our state.[16] In the most high and palmy[17] state of Rome, A little ere the mightiest Julius fell, The graves stood tenantless, and the sheeted dead Did squeak and gibber in the Roman streets.

Re-enter Ghost (R.H.)

But, (L.C.) soft, behold! lo, where it comes again! I'll cross it, though it blast me.

[HORATIO _crosses in front of the_ Ghost _to_ R. Ghost _crosses to_ L.]

Stay, illusion! If thou hast any sound, or use of voice,[18] Speak to me: If there be any good thing to be done, That may to thee do ease, and grace to me, Speak to me: If thou art privy to thy country's fate, Which, happily, foreknowing may avoid, O, speak! O, if thou hast uphoarded in thy life Extorted treasure in the womb of earth,[19] For which, they say, you spirits oft walk in death, Speak of it:--stay, and speak!

[_Exit_ Ghost, L.H.]

Mar. 'Tis gone! We do it wrong, being so majestical, To offer it the show of violence.

Ber. It was about to speak, when the cock crew.

Hor. And then it started like a guilty thing Upon a fearful summons.[20] I have heard, The cock, that is the trumpet of the morn, Doth with his lofty[21] and shrill-sounding throat Awake the god of day; and, at his warning, Whether in sea or fire, in earth or air, The extravagant and erring spirit[22] hies To his confine. But, look, the morn, in russet mantle clad, Walks o'er the dew of yon high eastern hill: Break we our watch up; and, by my advice, Let us impart what we have seen to-night Unto young Hamlet; for, upon my life, This spirit, dumb to us, will speak to him.

[_Exeunt_, L.H.]

SCENE II.--A ROOM OF STATE IN THE PALACE.

Trumpet March.

Enter the KING _and_ QUEEN, _preceded by_ POLONIUS, HAMLET, LAERTES,[23] Lords, Ladies, _and_ Attendants.

King. (R.C.) Though yet of Hamlet our dear brother's death The memory be green;[24] and that it us befitted To bear our hearts in grief, and our whole kingdom To be contracted in one brow of woe; Yet so far hath discretion fought with nature, That we with wisest sorrow[25] think on him, Together with remembrance of ourselves. Therefore our sometime sister, now our queen, The imperial jointress of this warlike state, Have we, as 'twere with a defeated joy,[26] Taken to wife: nor have we herein barr'd[27] Your better wisdoms, which have freely gone With this affair along:--For all, our thanks. And now, Laertes, what's the news with you? You told us of some suit; What is't, Laertes?

Laer. (R.) My dread lord, Your leave and favour[28] to return to France; From whence though willingly I came to Denmark, To show my duty in your coronation, Yet now, I must confess, that duty done, My thoughts and wishes bend again toward France, And bow them to your gracious leave and pardon.

King. Have you your father's leave? What says Polonious?

Pol. (R.) He hath, my lord, (wrung from me my slow leave By laboursome petition; and, at last, Upon his will I sealed my hard consent):[29] I do beseech you, give him leave to go.

King. Take thy fair hour, Laertes; time be thine, And thy best graces spend it at thy will![30] But now, my cousin Hamlet, and my son,----

Ham. (L.) A little more than kin, and less than kind.[31]

[Aside.]

King. How is it that the clouds still hang on you?

Ham. Not so, my lord; I am too much i'the sun.[32]

Queen.(L.C.) Good Hamlet, cast thy nighted colour[33] off, And let thine eye look like a friend on Denmark. Do not for ever with thy vailed lids[34] Seek for thy noble father in the dust: Thou know'st 'tis common, all that live must die, Passing through nature to eternity.

Ham. Ay, madam, it is common.

Queen. If it be, Why seems it so particular with thee?

Ham. Seems, madam! nay, it is; I know not seems. 'Tis not alone my inky cloak, good mother, Nor the dejected haviour of the visage, No, nor the fruitful river in the eye, Together with all forms, modes, shows of grief, That can denote me truly: These, indeed, seem, For they are actions that a man might play. But I have that within which passeth show;[35] These but the trappings[36] and the suits of woe.

King. 'Tis sweet and commendable in your nature, Hamlet, To give these mourning duties to your father: But, you must know, your father lost a father; That father lost, lost his;[37] and the survivor bound, In filial obligation, for some term To do obsequious sorrow:[38] But to perséver[39] In obstinate condolement,[40] is a course Of impious stubbornness; 'tis unmanly grief: It shows a will most incorrect to Heaven.[41] We pray you, throw to earth This unprevailing[42] woe; and think of us As of a father: for let the world take note, You are the most immediate to our throne; Our chiefest courtier, cousin, and our son.

Queen. Let not thy mother lose her prayers, Hamlet: I pray thee, stay with us; go not to Wittenberg.

Ham. I shall in all my best obey you, madam.

King. Why, 'tis a loving and a fair reply; Be as ourself in Denmark.--Madam, come; This gentle and unforc'd accord of Hamlet Sits smiling to my heart:[43] in grace whereof,[44] No jocund health that Denmark drinks to-day,[45] But the great cannon to the clouds shall tell; Re-speaking earthly thunder.

[_Trumpet March repeated. Exeunt_ KING _and_ QUEEN, _preceded by_ POLONIUS, Lords, Ladies, LAERTES, _and_ Attendants, R.H.]

Ham. O, that this too, too solid flesh would melt, Thaw, and resolve itself[46] into a dew! Or that the Everlasting had not fix'd His canon[47] 'gainst self-slaughter! O God! O God! How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable Seem to me all the uses of this world![48] Fye on't! O fye! 'tis an unweeded garden, That grows to seed; things rank and gross in nature Possess it merely.[49] That it should come to this! But two months dead!--nay, not so much, not two: So excellent a king; that was, to this, Hyperion to a satyr:[50] so loving to my mother, That he might not beteem[51] the winds of heaven Visit her face too roughly. Heaven and earth! Must I remember? why, she would hang on him, As if increase of appetite had grown By what it fed on: And yet, within a month,-- Let me not think on't,--Frailty, thy name is Woman!-- A little month; or ere those shoes were old With which she follow'd my poor father's body, Like Niobe, all tears;--she married with my uncle, My father's brother; but no more like my father Than I to Hercules. It is not, nor it cannot come to, good: But break, my heart, for I must hold my tongue!

Enter HORATIO, BERNARDO, _and_ MARCELLUS (R.H.)

Hor. Hail to your lordship!

Ham. I am glad to see you well: Horatio,--or I do forget myself.

Hor. The same, my lord, and your poor servant ever.

Ham. Sir, my good friend; I'll change that name with you:[52] And what make you from Wittenberg, Horatio?-- Marcellus?

[_Crosses to_ C.]

Mar. (R.) My good lord,

Ham. (C.) I am very glad to see you; good even, sir.

[_To_ BERNARDO, R.]

But what, in faith,[53] make you[54] from Wittenberg?[55]

Hor. (L.) A truant disposition, good my lord.

Ham. I would not hear your enemy say so; Nor shall you do mine ear that violence, To make it truster of your own report Against yourself: I know you are no truant. But what is your affair in Elsinore? We'll teach you to drink deep, ere you depart.

Hor. My lord, I came to see your father's funeral.

Ham. I pray thee, do not mock me, fellow-student; I think it was to see my mother's wedding.

Hor. Indeed, my lord, it followed hard upon.

Ham. Thrift, thrift, Horatio! the funeral bak'd meats Did coldly furnish forth the marriage tables. Would I had met my dearest foe[56] in Heaven Ere ever I had seen that day, Horatio! My father,--Methinks, I see my father.

Hor. Where, My lord?

Ham. In my mind's eye, Horatio.

Hor. I saw him once; he was a goodly king.[57]

Ham. He was a man, take him for all in all, I shall not look upon his like again.

[_Crosses to_ L.]

Hor. (C.) My lord, I think I saw him yesternight.

Ham. Saw who?

Hor. My lord, the king your father.

Ham. The king my father!

Hor. Season your admiration for a while[58] With an attent ear; till I may deliver, Upon the witness of these gentlemen, This marvel to you.

Ham. For Heaven's love, let me hear.

Hor. Two nights together had these gentlemen, Marcellus and Bernardo, on their watch, In the dead waste and middle of the night,[59] Been thus encounter'd. A figure like your father, Arm'd at all points exactly, cap-à-pé, Appears before them, and, with solemn march Goes slow and stately by them: thrice he walk'd By their oppress'd and fear-surprisèd eyes, Within his truncheon's length; whilst they, distill'd Almost to jelly with the act of fear,[60] Stand dumb, and speak not to him. This to me In dreadful secrecy impart they did; And I with them the third night kept the watch: Where, as they had deliver'd, both in time, Form of the thing, each word made true and good, The apparition comes.

Ham. But where was this?

[_Crosses to_ MARCELLUS.]

Mar. (R.) My lord, upon the platform where we watch'd.

Ham. (C.) Did you not speak to it?

Hor. (L.) My lord, I did; But answer made it none: yet once methought It lifted up its head, and did address[61] Itself to motion, like as it would speak: But, even then, the morning cock crew loud, And at the sound it shrunk in haste away; And vanish'd from our sight.

Ham. 'Tis very strange.

Hor. As I do live, my honour'd lord, 'tis true; And we did think it writ down[62] in our duty To let you know of it.

Ham. Indeed, indeed, sirs, but this troubles me. Hold you the watch to-night?

Mar. We do, my lord.

Ham. Arm'd, say you?

Mar. Arm'd, my lord.

Ham. From top to toe?

Mar. My lord, from head to foot.

Ham. Then saw you not His face?

Hor. O, yes, my lord; he wore his beaver up.[63]

Ham. What, looked he frowningly?

Hor. A countenance more In sorrow than in anger.

Ham. Pale or red?

Hor. Nay, very pale.

Ham. And fix'd his eyes upon you?

Hor. Most constantly.

Ham. I would I had been there.

Hor. It would have much amaz'd you.

Ham. Very like, Very like. Stay'd it long?

Hor. While one with moderate haste might tell a hundred.

Mar.} } Longer, Longer. _Ber._}

Hor. Not when I saw it.

Ham. His beard was grizzl'd, No?

Hor. It was, as I have seen it in his life, A sable silver'd.

Ham. I will watch to-night; Perchance, 'twill walk again.

Hor. (C.) I warrant it will.

Ham. If it assume my noble father's person, I'll speak to it, though hell itself should gape, And bid me hold my peace.

[_Crosses to_ L.] I pray you all, If you have hitherto conceal'd this sight, Let it be tenable[64] in your silence still; And whatsoever else shall hap to-night, Give it an understanding, but no tongue; I will requite your loves. So, fare you well: Upon the platform, 'twixt eleven and twelve, I'll visit you.

Hor. (R.) Our duty to your honour.

Ham. Your loves, as mine to you: Farewell.

[_Exeunt_ HORATIO, MARCELLUS, _and_ BERNARDO, R.H.]

My father's spirit in arms! all is not well; I doubt some foul play: 'would the night were come; Till then sit still, my soul: Foul deeds will rise, Though all the earth o'erwhelm them, to men's eyes. [_Exit_, L.H.]

SCENE III.--A ROOM IN POLONIUS'S HOUSE.

Enter LAERTES _and_ OPHELIA (R.H.)

Laer. (L.C.) My necessaries are embarked: farewell: And, sister, as the winds give benefit,[65] Let me hear from you.

Oph. (R.C.) Do you doubt that?

Laer. For Hamlet, and the trifling of his favour,[66] Hold it a fashion, and a toy in blood; A violet in the youth of primy nature, Forward, not permanent, sweet, not lasting, The pérfume and suppliance of a minute.[67]

Oph. No more but so?

Laer. He may not, as unvalued persons do, Carve for himself; for on his choice depends The safety and the health of the whole state. Then weigh what loss your honour may sustain, If with too credent ear you list his songs. Fear it, Ophelia, fear it, my dear sister; And keep within the rear of your affection,[68] Out of the shot and danger of desire. The chariest maid[69] is prodigal enough, If she unmask her beauty to the moon: Virtue itself scapes not calumnious strokes: Be wary, then; best safety lies in fear: Youth to itself rebels, though none else near.

Oph. I shall the effect of this good lesson keep, As watchman to my heart. But, good my brother, Do not, as some ungracious pastors do, Show me the steep and thorny way to heaven Whilst, like a puff'd and reckless libertine,[70] Himself the primrose path of dalliance treads, And recks not his own read.[71]

Laer. O, fear me not. I stay too long;--but here my father comes.

Enter POLONIUS (L.H.)

Pol. Yet here, Laertes! aboard, aboard, for shame! The wind sits in the shoulder of your sail,[72] And you are staid for. There,--my blessing with you!

[_Laying his hand on_ LAERTES' _head_.]

And these few precepts in thy memory-- Look thou charácter.[73] Give thy thoughts no tongue, Nor any unproportion'd thought[74] his act. Be thou familiar, but by no means vulgar. The friends thou hast, and their adoption tried, Grapple them to thy soul with

hooks of steel; But do not dull thy palm with entertainment Of each new-hatch'd, unfledg'd comrade. Beware Of entrance to a quarrel; but being in, Bear it, that the opposer may beware of thee. Give every man thine ear, but few thy voice: Take each man's censure,[75] but reserve thy judgment. Costly thy habit as thy purse can buy, But not express'd in fancy; rich, not gaudy: For the apparel oft proclaims the man; And they in France of the best rank and station Are most select and generous, chief in that.[76] Neither a borrower nor a lender be: For loan oft loses both itself and friend; And borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry.[77] This above all,--To thine ownself be true; And it must follow, as the night the day, Thou canst not then be false to any man. Farewell; my blessing season this in thee![78]

Laer. Most humbly do I take my leave, my lord.

[_Crosses to_ L.]

Farewell, Ophelia; and remember well What I have said to you.

Oph. (_Crosses to_ LAERTES.) 'Tis in my memory lock'd, And you yourself shall keep the key of it.[79]

Laer. Farewell.

[_Exit_ LAERTES, L.H.]

Pol. What is it, Ophelia, he hath said to you?

Oph. So please you, something touching the lord Hamlet.

Pol. Marry, well bethought: 'Tis told me, he hath very oft of late Given private time to you;[80] and you yourself Have of your audience been most free and bounteous: If it be so (as so 'tis put on me,[81] And that in way of caution), I must tell you, You do not understand yourself so clearly As it behoves my daughter, and your honour. What is between[82] you? give me up the truth.

Oph. He hath, my lord, of late, made many tenders Of his affection to me.

Pol. Affection! pooh! you speak like a green girl, Unsifted[83] in such perilous circumstance. Do you believe his tenders, as you call them?

Oph. I do not know, my lord, what I should think.

Pol. Marry, I'll teach you: think yourself a baby; That you have ta'en these tenders for true pay, Which are not sterling. Tender yourself more dearly; Or, you'll tender me a fool.

Oph. My lord, he hath impórtun'd me with love In honourable fashion.

Pol. Ay, fashion you may call it; go to, go to.

Oph. And hath given countenance to his speech, my lord, With almost all the holy vows of heaven.

Pol. Ay, springes to catch woodcocks.[84] I do know, When the blood burns, how prodigal the soul Lends the tongue vows: This is for all,-- I would not, in plain terms, from this time forth, Have you so slander any leisure moment,[85] As to give words or talk with the lord Hamlet. Look to't, I charge you: come your ways.

Oph. I shall obey, my lord.

[_Exeunt_, R.H.]

SCENE IV.--THE PLATFORM. NIGHT.

Enter HAMLET, HORATIO, _and_ MARCELLUS (L.H.U.E.)

Ham. The air bites shrewdly; it is very cold.

Hor. It is a nipping and an eager air.[86]

Ham. What hour now?

Hor. I think it lacks of twelve.

Mar. No, it is struck.

Hor. (R.C.) Indeed? I heard it not: then it draws near the season, Wherein the spirit held his wont to walk.

[_A Flourish of Trumpets, and Ordnance shot off without._]

What does this mean, my lord?

Ham. (L.C.) The king doth wake to-night,[87] and takes his rouse,[88] And, as he drains his draughts of Rhenish down, The kettle-drum and trumpet thus bray out The triumph of his pledge.

Hor. Is it a custom?

Ham. Ay, marry, is't:

[_Crosses to_ HORATIO.]

But to my mind,--though I am native here, And to the manner born,--it is a custom More honour'd in the breach than the observance.

Enter Ghost (L.H.)

Hor. (R.H.) Look, my lord, it comes!

Ham. (C.) Angels and ministers of grace defend us!-- Be thou a spirit of health or goblin damn'd, Bring with thee airs from heaven or blasts from hell, Be thy intents wicked or charitable, Thou com'st in such a questionable shape,[89] That I will speak to thee: I'll call thee--Hamlet, King, father: Royal Dane: O, answer me! Let me not burst in ignorance; but tell Why thy canoniz'd bones, hearsed in death,[90] Have burst their cerements;[91] why the sepulchre, Wherein we saw thee quietly in-urn'd, Hath op'd his ponderous and marble jaws, To cast thee up again! What may this mean, That thou, dead corse, again, in cómplete steel, Revisits thus the glimpses of the moon, Making night hideous; and we fools of nature[92] So horridly to shake our disposition[93] With thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls? Say, why is this? wherefore? what should we do?

[Ghost _beckons._]

Hor. It beckons you to go away with it, As if it some impartment did desire To you alone.

[Ghost _beckons again._]

Mar. Look, with what courteous action It waves you to a more removèd ground:[94] But do not go with it.

Hor. No, by no means.

Ham. It will not speak; then I will follow it.

Hor. Do not, my lord.

Ham. Why, what should be the fear? I do not set my life at a pin's fee;[95] And for my soul, what can it do to that, Being a thing immortal as itself?

[Ghost _beckons._]

It waves me forth again;--I'll follow it.

Hor. What if it tempt you toward the flood, my lord,[96] Or to the dreadful summit of the cliff That beetles o'er his base into the sea,[97] And there assume some other horrible form, And draw you into madness?

[Ghost _beckons._]

Ham. It waves me still.-- Go on; I'll follow thee.

Mar. You shall not go, my lord.

Ham. Hold off your hands.

Hor. Be rul'd; you shall not go.

Ham. My fate cries out, And makes each petty artery in this body As hardy as the Némean lion's nerve.[98]

[Ghost _beckons_]

Still am I call'd:--unhand me, gentlemen;

[_Breaking from them._]

By heaven, I'll make a ghost of him that lets me:--[99] I say, away!--Go on; I'll follow thee.

[_Exeunt_ Ghost _and_ HAMLET, L.H., _followed at a distance by_ HORATIO _and_ MARCELLUS.]

SCENE V.--A MORE REMOTE PART OF THE PLATFORM. NIGHT.

Re-enter Ghost _and_ HAMLET (L.H.U.E.)

Ham. (R.) Whither wilt thou lead me? Speak; I'll go no further.

Ghost. (L.) Mark me.

Ham. I will.

Ghost. My hour is almost come, When I to sulphurous and tormenting flames Must render up myself.

Ham. Alas, poor ghost!

Ghost. Pity me not, but lend thy serious hearing To what I shall unfold.

Ham. Speak; I am bound to hear.

Ghost. So art thou to revenge, when thou shalt hear.

Ham. What?

Ghost. I am thy father's spirit; Doom'd for a certain term to walk the night, And for the day confin'd to fast in fires,[100] Till the foul crimes done in my days of nature Are burnt and purg'd away. But that I am forbid To tell the secrets of my prison-house, I could a tale unfold, whose lightest word Would harrow up thy soul;[101] freeze thy young blood; Make thy two eyes, like stars, start from their spheres; Thy knotted and combinèd locks to part, And each particular hair to stand on end,[102] Like quills upon the fretful porcupine:[103] But this eternal blazon[104] must not be To ears of flesh and blood.--List, list, O, list!-- If thou didst ever thy dear father love,----

Ham. O Heaven!

Ghost. Revenge his foul and most unnatural murder.

Ham. Murder!

Ghost. Murder most foul, as in the best it is; But this most foul, strange, and unnatural.

Ham. Haste me to know it, that I, with wings as swift As meditation or the thoughts of love, May sweep to my revenge.

Ghost. I find thee apt; And duller shouldst thou be than the fat weed That rots itself in ease on Lethe wharf,[105] Wouldst thou not stir in this. Now, Hamlet, hear: 'Tis given out that, sleeping in mine orchard,[106] A serpent stung me; so the whole ear of Denmark Is by a forged process[107] of my death Rankly abus'd: but know, thou noble youth, The serpent that did sting thy father's life Now wears his crown.

Ham. O, my prophetic soul! my uncle!

Ghost. Ay, that incestuous, that adulterate beast, With witchcraft of his wit, with traitorous gifts, Won to his shameful lust The will of my most seeming virtuous queen: O, Hamlet, what a falling-off was there! From me, whose love was of that dignity, That it went hand in hand even with the vow I made to her in marriage; and to decline Upon a wretch,[108] whose natural gifts were poor To

those of mine! But, soft! methinks I scent the morning air; Brief let me be.--Sleeping within mine orchard, My custom always in the afternoon, Upon my secure[109] hour thy uncle stole, With juice of cursed hebenon[110] in a vial, And in the porches of mine ears did pour The leperous distilment; whose effect Holds such an enmity with blood of man, That, swift as quicksilver, it courses through The natural gates and alleys of the body; So did it mine; Thus was I, sleeping, by a brother's hand Of life, of crown, of queen, at once despatch'd:[111] Cut off even in the blossoms of my sin, Unhousel'd, disappointed, unanel'd;[112] No reckoning made, but sent to my account With all my imperfections on my head.

Ham. O, horrible! O, horrible! most horrible!

Ghost. If thou hast nature in thee, bear it not; Let not the royal bed of Denmark be A couch for luxury[113] and damnèd incest. But, howsoever thou pursu'st this act, Taint not thy mind, nor let thy soul contrive Against thy mother aught: leave her to Heaven, And to those thorns that in her bosom lodge, To prick and sting her. Fare thee well at once! The glow-worm shows the matin to be near, And 'gins to pale his ineffectual fire:[114] Adieu, adieu, adieu! remember me.

[_Exit_, L.H.]

Ham. Hold, hold, my heart; And you, my sinews, grow not instant old, But bear me stiffly up.--Remember thee! Ay, thou poor ghost, while memory holds a seat In this distracted globe.[115] Remember thee! Yea, from the table of my memory I'll wipe away all forms, all pressures past,[116] And thy commandment all alone shall live Within the book and volume of my brain, Unmix'd with baser matter: yes, by heaven, I have sworn't.

Hor. (_Without._) My lord, my lord,----

Mar. (_Without._) Lord Hamlet,----

Hor. (_Without._) Heaven secure him!

Ham. So be it!

Mar. (_Without._) Illo, ho, ho, my lord!

Ham. Hillo, ho, ho, boy! come, bird, come.[117]

Enter HORATIO _and_ MARCELLUS (L.H.U.E.)

Mar. (R.) How is't, my noble lord?

Hor. (L.) What news, my lord?

Ham. (C.) O, wonderful!

Hor. Good my lord, tell it.

Ham. No; You will reveal it.

Hor. Not I, my lord, by heaven.

Mar. Nor I, my lord.

Ham. How say you, then; would heart of man once think it? But you'll be secret?--

Hor.} } Ay, by heaven, my lord. _Mar._}

Ham. There's ne'er a villain, dwelling in all Denmark-- But he's an arrant knave.[118]

Hor. There needs no ghost, my lord, come from the grave To tell us this.

Ham. Why, right; you are in the right; And so, without more circumstance at all, I hold it fit that we shake hands, and part: You as your business and desire shall point you, For every man hath business and desire, Such as it is;--and, for my own poor part, Look you, I will go pray.

Hor. These are but wild and whirling words,[119] my lord.

Ham. I am sorry they offend you, heartily.

Hor. There's no offence, my lord.

Ham. Yes, by Saint Patrick,[120] but there is, Horatio, And much offence, too. Touching this vision here, It is an honest ghost, that let me tell you: For your desire to know what is between us, O'er-master it[121] as you may. And now, good friends, As you are friends, scholars, and soldiers, Give me one poor request.

Hor. What is't, my lord? We will.

Ham. Never make known what you have seen to-night.

Hor.} } My lord, we will not. _Mar._}

Ham. Nay, but swear't.

Hor. Propose the oath, my lord.

Ham. Never to speak of this that you have seen. Swear by my sword.

[HORATIO _and_ MARCELLUS _place each their right hand on_ HAMLET'S _sword._]

Ghost. (_Beneath._) Swear.

Hor. O day and night, but this is wondrous strange!

Ham. And therefore as a stranger give it welcome.[122] There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, Than are dreamt of in your philosophy. But come;-- Here, as before, never, so help you mercy, How strange or odd soe'er I bear myself, As I, perchance, hereafter shall think meet To put an antick disposition[123] on,-- That you, at such times seeing me, never shall, With arms encumber'd thus,[124] or this head-shake, Or by pronouncing of some doubtful phrase, As, _Well, we know_; or, _We could, an if we would_; or, _If we list to speak_;--or, _There be, an if they might_;-- Or such ambiguous giving out, to note That you know aught of me:--This do you swear, So grace and mercy at your most need help you!

[HORATIO _and_ MARCELLUS _again place their hands on_ HAMLET'S _sword._]

Ghost. (_Beneath._) Swear.

Ham. Rest, rest, perturbed spirit! So gentlemen, With all my love I do commend me to you: And what so poor a man as Hamlet is May do, to express his love and friending to you, Heaven willing, shall not lack.[125] Let us go in together;

[_Crosses to_ L.]

And still your fingers on your lips, I pray. The time is out of joint;--O cursèd spite, That ever I was born to set it right! Nay, come, let's go together.

[_Exeunt_ L.H.]

END OF ACT FIRST.

Notes

Act I

[Footnote I.1: _Me:_] _i.e., me_ who am already on the watch, and have a right to demand the watch-word.]

[Footnote I.2: _Unfold_] Announce, make known.]

[Footnote I.3: _Long live the King._] The watch-word.]

[Footnote I.4: _The rivals of my watch_,] _Rivals_, for partners or associates.]

[Footnote I.5: _And liegemen to the Dane._] _i.e._, owing allegiance to Denmark.]

[Footnote I.6: _A piece of him._] Probably a cant expression.]

[Footnote I.7: _To watch the minutes of this night_; This seems to have been an expression common in Shakespeare's time.]

[Footnote I.8: _Approve our eyes_,] To _approve_, in Shakespeare's age, signified to make good or establish.]

[Footnote I.9: _What we have seen._] We must here supply "with," or "by relating" before "what we have seen."]

[Footnote I.10: _It harrows me with fear and wonder._] _i.e._, it confounds and overwhelms me.]

[Footnote I.11: _Usurp'st this time of night_,] _i.e._, abuses, uses against right, and the order of things.]

[Footnote I.12: _I might not this believe, &c._] I _could_ not: it had not been permitted me, &c., without the full and perfect evidence, &c.]

[Footnote I.13: _Jump at this dead hour_,] _Jump_ and _just_ were synonymous in Shakespeare's time.]

[Footnote I.14: _In what particular thought to work_,] In what particular course to set my thoughts at work: in what particular train to direct the mind and exercise it in conjecture.]

[Footnote I.15: _Gross and scope_] Upon the whole, and in a general view.]

[Footnote I.16: _Bodes some strange eruption to our state_,] _i.e._, some political distemper, which will break out in dangerous consequences.]

[Footnote I.17: _Palmy state_] Outspread, flourishing. Palm branches were the emblem of victory.]

[Footnote I.18: _Sound, or use of voice_,] Articulation.]

[Footnote I.19:

Uphoarded in thy life Extorted treasure in the womb of earth,]

So in Decker's Knight's Conjuring, &c. "If any of them had bound the spirit of gold by any charmes _in cares_, or in iron fetters, _under the ground_, they should, _for their own soule's quiet (which, questionless, else would whine up and down_,) not for the good of their children, release it."]

[Footnote I.20:

And then it started like a guilty thing Upon a fearful summons.]

Apparitions were supposed to fly from the crowing of the cock, because it indicated the approach of day.]

[Footnote I.21: _Lofty_] High and loud.]

[Footnote I.22: _The extravagant and erring spirit_] _Extravagant_ is, got out of his bounds. _Erring_ is here used in the sense of wandering.]

[Footnote I.23: Laertes is unknown in the original story, being an introduction of Shakespeare's.]

[Footnote I.24: _Green_;] Fresh.]

[Footnote I.25: _Wisest sorrow_] Sober grief, passion discreetly reined.]

[Footnote I.26: _With a defeated joy_,] _i.e._, with joy baffled; with joy interrupted by grief.]

[Footnote I.27: _Barr'd_] Excluded--acted without the concurrence of.]

[Footnote I.28: _Your leave and favour_] The favour of your leave granted, the kind permission. Two substantives with a copulative being here, as is the frequent practice of our author, used for an adjective and substantive: an adjective sense is given to a substantive.]

[Footnote I.29: _Upon his will I sealed my hard consent:_] At or upon his earnest and importunate suit, I gave my full and final, though hardly obtained and reluctant, consent.]

[Footnote I.30:

Take thy fair hour! time be thine; And thy best graces spend it at thy will!]

Catch the auspicious moment! be time thine own! and may the exercise of thy fairest virtue fill up those hours, that are wholly at your command!]

[Footnote I.31: _A little more than kin, and less than kind._] Dr. Johnson says that _kind_ is the Teutonic word for _child_. Hamlet, therefore, answers to the titles of _cousin_ and _son_, which the king had given him, that he was somewhat more than _cousin_, and less than _son_. Steevens remarks, that it seems to have been another proverbial phrase: "The nearer we are in blood, the further we must be from love; the greater the _kindred_ is, the less the _kindness_ must be." _Kin_ is still used in the Midland Counties for _cousin_, and _kind_ signifies _nature_. Hamlet may, therefore, mean that the relationship between them had become _unnatural_.]

[Footnote I.32: _I am too much i'the sun._] Meaning, probably, his being sent for from his studies to be exposed at his uncle's marriage as his _chiefest courtier_, and being thereby placed too much in the radiance of the king's presence; or, perhaps, an allusion to the proverb, "_Out of Heaven's blessing, into the warm sun:_" but it is not unlikely that a quibble is meant between _son_ and _sun_.]

[Footnote I.33: _Nighted colour_] Black--night-like.]

[Footnote I.34: _Vailed lids_] Cast down.]

[Footnote I.35: _Which passeth show_;] _i.e._, "external manners of lament."]

[Footnote I.36: _Trappings_] _Trappings_ are "furnishings."]

[Footnote I.37: _That father lost, lost his_;] "That lost father (of your father, _i.e._, your grandfather), or father so lost, lost his.]"

[Footnote I.38: _Do obsequious sorrow:_] Follow with becoming and ceremonious observance the memory of the deceased.]

[Footnote I.39: _But to persév_er_] This word was anciently accented on the second syllable.]

[Footnote I.40: _Obstinate condolement_,] Ceaseless and unremitted expression of grief.]

[Footnote I.41: _Incorrect to Heaven._] Contumacious towards Heaven.]

[Footnote I.42: _Unprevailing_] Fruitless, unprofitable.]

[Footnote I.43: _Sits smiling to my heart:_] _To_ is _at_: gladdens my heart.]

[Footnote I.44: _In grace whereof_,] _i.e._, respectful regard or honour of which.]

[Footnote I.45: _No jocund health, that Denmark drinks to-day_,] Dr. Johnson remarks, that the king's intemperance is very strongly impressed; everything that happens to him gives him occasion to drink. The Danes were supposed to be hard drinkers.]

[Footnote I.46: _Resolve itself_] _To resolve_ is an old word signifying _to dissolve_.]

[Footnote I.47: _His canon_] _i.e._, his rule or law].

[Footnote I.48: _The uses of this world!_] _i.e._, the habitudes and usages of life.]

[Footnote I.49: _Merely._] Wholly--entirely.]

[Footnote I.50: _Hyperion to a satyr:_] An allusion to the exquisite beauty of Apollo, compared with the deformity of a satyr; that satyr, perhaps, being Pan, the brother of Apollo. Our great poet is here guilty of a false quantity, by calling Hyp■r■on, Hyp■r■on, a mistake not unusual among our English poets.]

[Footnote I.51: _Might not beteem_] _i.e._, might not allow, permit.]

[Footnote I.52: _I'll change that name with you._] _i.e._, do not call yourself my _servant_, you are my _friend_; so I shall call you, and so I would have you call me.]

[Footnote I.53: _In faith._] Faithfully, in pure and simple verity.]

[Footnote I.54: _But what make you_] What is your object? What are you doing?]

[Footnote I.55: _What, in faith, make you from Wittenberg?_] In Shakespeare's time there was a university at Wittenberg; but as it was not founded till 1502, it consequently did not exist in the time to which this play refers.]

[Footnote I.56: _My dearest foe_] _i.e._, my direst or most important foe. This epithet was commonly used to denote the strongest and liveliest interest in any thing or person, for or against.]

[Footnote I.57: _Goodly king._] _i.e._, a good king.]

[Footnote I.58:

Season your admiration for a while with an attent ear;]

_i.e._, suppress your astonishment for a short time, that you may be the better able to give your attention to what we will relate.]

[Footnote I.59: _In the dead waste and middle of the night_,] _i.e._, in the dark and desolate vast, or vacant space and middle of the night. It was supposed that spirits had permission to range the earth by night alone.]

[Footnote I.60: _With the act of fear_,] _i.e._, by the influence or power of fear.]

[Footnote I.61: _Address_] _i.e._, make ready.]

[Footnote I.62: _Writ down_] Prescribed by our own duty.]

[Footnote I.63: _He wore his beaver up._] That part of the helmet which may be lifted up, to take breath the more freely.]

[Footnote I.64: _Tenable_] _i.e._, strictly maintained.]

[Footnote I.65: _Benefit_,] Favourable means.]

[Footnote I.66: _Trifling of his favour_,] Gay and thoughtless intimation.]

[Footnote I.67: _Pérfume and suppliance of a minute._] _i.e._, an amusement to fill up a vacant moment, and render it agreeable.]

[Footnote I.68: _Keep within the rear of your affection_,] Front not the peril; withdraw or check every warm emotion: advance not so far as your affection would lead you.]

[Footnote I.69: _The chariest maid_] Chary is cautious.]

[Footnote I.70: _Puff'd and reckless libertine._] Bloated and swollen, the effect of excess; and heedless and indifferent to consequences.]

[Footnote I.71: _Recks not his own read._] _i.e._, heeds not his own lessons or counsel.]

[Footnote I.72: _Shoulder of your sail_,] A common sea phrase.]

[Footnote I.73: _Look thou charácter._] _i.e._, a word often used by Shakespeare to signify to _write, strongly infix_; the accent is on the second syllable.]

[Footnote I.74: _Unproportion'd thought_] Irregular, disorderly thought.]

[Footnote I.75: _Each man's censure_,] Sentiment, opinion.]

[Footnote I.76: _Chief in that._] _i.e._, chiefly in that.]

[Footnote I.77: _Husbandry_] _i.e._, thrift, economical prudence.]

[Footnote I.78: _Season this in thee!_] _i.e._, infix it in such a manner as that it may never wear out.]

[Footnote I.79: _Yourself shall keep the key of it._] Thence it shall not be dismissed, till you think it needless to retain it.]

[Footnote I.80: _Given private time to you_;] Spent his time in private visits to you.]

[Footnote I.81: _As so 'tis put on me_,] Suggested to, impressed on me.]

[Footnote I.82: _Is between_] _i.e._, what has passed--what intercourse had.]

[Footnote I.83: _Green girl, Unsifted_] _i.e._, inexperienced girl. Unsifted means one who has not nicely _canvassed_ and examined the peril of her situation.]

[Footnote I.84: _Woodcocks._] Witless things.]

[Footnote I.85: _Slander any leisure moment_,] _i.e._, I would not have you so disgrace your most idle moments, as not to find better employment for them than lord Hamlet's conversation.]

[Footnote I.86: _An eager air._] _Eager_ here means _sharp_, from _aigre_, French.]

[Footnote I.87: _Doth wake to-night_,] _i.e._, holds a late revel.]

[Footnote I.88: _Takes his rouse_,] _Rouse_ means drinking bout, carousal.]

[Footnote I.89: _Questionable shape_,] To _question_, in our author's time, signified to _converse_. Questionable, therefore, means _capable of being conversed with._]

[Footnote I.90: _Hearsed in death_,] Deposited with the accustomed funeral rites.]

[Footnote I.91: _Cerements_;] Those precautions usually adopted in preparing dead bodies for sepulture.]

[Footnote I.92: _Fools of nature_] _i.e._, making sport for nature.]

[Footnote I.93: _Disposition_] Frame of mind and body.]

[Footnote I.94: _Removèd ground:_] _Removed_ for _remote_.]

[Footnote I.95: _At a pin's fee_;] _i.e._, the value of a pin.]

[Footnote I.96: _What if it tempt you toward the flood, &c._] Malignant spirits were supposed to entice their victims into places of gloom and peril, and exciting in them the deepest terror.]

[Footnote I.97: _Beetles o'er his base into the sea_,] _i.e._, projects darkly over the sea.]

[Footnote I.98: _Némean lion's nerve._] Shakespeare, and nearly all the poets of his time, disregarded the quantity of Latin names. The poet has here placed the accent on the first syllable, instead of the second.]

[Footnote I.99: _That lets me:_] To let, in the sense in which it is here used, means to hinder--to obstruct--to oppose. The word is derived from the Saxon.]

[Footnote I.100: _To fast in fires_,] Chaucer has a similar passage with regard to eternal punishment--_"And moreover the misery of Hell shall be in default of meat and drink."_]

[Footnote I.101: _Harrow up thy soul_;] Agitate and convulse.]

[Footnote I.102: _Hair to stand on end_,] A common image of that day.

"_Standing_ as frighted with _erected haire_."]

[Footnote I.103: _The fretful porcupine:_] This animal being considered irascible and timid.]

[Footnote I.104: _Eternal blazon_] _i.e._, publication or divulgation of things eternal.]

[Footnote I.105: _Rots itself in ease on Lethe wharf_,] _i.e._, in indolence and sluggishness, by its torpid habits contributes to that morbid state of its juices which may figuratively be denominated rottenness.]

[Footnote I.106: _Orchard_,] Garden.]

[Footnote I.107: _Forged process_] _i.e._, false report of proceedings.]

[Footnote I.108: _Decline upon a wretch._] Stoop with degradation to.]

[Footnote I.109: _Secure_] Unguarded.]

[Footnote I.110: _Hebenon_] Hebenon is described by Nares in his Glossary, as the juice of ebony, supposed to be a deadly poison.]

[Footnote I.111: _Despatch'd:_] Despoiled--bereft.]

[Footnote I.112: _Unhousel'd, disappointed, unanel'd_;] To _housel_ is to minister the sacrament to one lying on his death bed. _Disappointed_ is the same as unappointed, which here means unprepared. _Unanel'd_ is without extreme unction.]

[Footnote I.113: _Luxury_] Lasciviousness.]

[Footnote I.114: _Pale his uneffectual fire:_] _i.e._, not seen by the light of day; or it may mean, shining without heat.]

[Footnote I.115: _In this distracted globe._] _i.e._, his head distracted with thought.]

[Footnote I.116: _Pressures past_,] Impressions heretofore made.]

[Footnote I.117: _Come, bird, come._] This is the call which falconers used to their hawk in the air when they would have him come down to them.]

[Footnote I.118:

There's ne'er a villain dwelling in all Denmark-- But he's an arrant knave.]

Hamlet probably begins these words in the ardour of confidence and sincerity; but suddenly alarmed at the magnitude of the disclosure he was going to make, and considering that, not his friend Horatio only, but another person was present, he breaks off suddenly:--"There's ne'er a villain in all Denmark that can match (perhaps he would have said) my uncle in villainy; but recollecting the danger of such a declaration, he pauses for a moment, and then abruptly concludes:--"but he's an arrant knave."]

[Footnote I.119: _Whirling words_,] Random words thrown out with no specific aim.]

[Footnote I.120: _By Saint Patrick_,] At this time all the whole northern world had their learning from Ireland; to which place it had retired, and there flourished under the auspices of this Saint.]

[Footnote I.121: _O'er-master it_] Get the better of it.]

[Footnote I.122: _Give it welcome._] Receive it courteously, as you would a stranger when introduced.]

[Footnote I.123: _Antick disposition_] _i.e._, strange, foreign to my nature, a disposition which Hamlet assumes as a protection against the danger which he apprehends from his uncle, and as a cloak for the concealment of his own meditated designs.]

[Footnote I.124: _Arms encumber'd thus_,] _i.e._, folded.]

[Footnote I.125: _Friending to you--shall not lack_] Disposition to serve you shall not be wanting.]

ACT II.

SCENE I.--A ROOM IN POLONIUS'S HOUSE.

Enter POLONIUS[1] (L.H.), _meeting Ophelia._ (R.H.)

Pol. How now, Ophelia! What's the matter?

Oph. O, my lord, my lord, I have been so affrighted!

Pol. With what, in the name of Heaven?

Oph. My lord, as I was sewing in my closet, Lord Hamlet, with his doublet all unbrac'd; Pale as his shirt; his knees knocking each other, And with a look so piteous in purport, He comes before me.

Pol. Mad for thy love?

Oph. My lord, I do not know; But, truly, I do fear it.

Pol. What said he?

Oph. He took me by the wrist, and held me hard; Then goes he to the length of all his arm; And, with his other hand thus o'er his brow, He falls to such perusal of my face As he would draw it. Long staid he so; At last,--a little shaking of mine arm, And thrice his head thus waving up and down, He rais'd a sigh so piteous and profound, As it did seem to shatter all his bulk,[2] And end his being: That done, he lets me go: And, with his head over his shoulder turn'd, He seem'd to find his way without his eyes; For out o'doors he went without their helps, And, to the last, bended their light on me.

Pol. Come, go with me; I will go seek the king. This is the very ecstacy of love;[3] What, have you given him any hard words of late?

Oph. No, my good lord; but, as you did command, I did repel his letters, and denied His access to me.

Pol. That hath made him mad. Come, go we to the king: This must be known; which, being kept close, might move More grief to hide than hate to utter love.[4] Come. [_Exeunt_ L.H.]

SCENE II.--A ROOM IN THE CASTLE.

Enter KING, QUEEN, ROSENCRANTZ, GUILDENSTERN, _and_ Attendants (R.H.)

King. (C.) Welcome, dear Rosencrantz and Guildenstern! Moreover that we much did long to see you, The need we have to use you did provoke Our hasty sending. Something have you heard Of Hamlet's transformation. What it should be, More than his father's death, that thus hath put him So much from the understanding of himself,[5] I cannot dream of: I entreat you both, That you vouchsafe your rest[6] here in our court Some little time: so by your companies To draw him on to pleasures, and to gather, Whether aught, to us unknown, afflicts him thus, That, open'd, lies within our remedy.

Queen. (R.C.) Good gentlemen, he hath much talk'd of you; And sure I am two men there are not living To whom he more adheres. If it will please you So to expend your time with us a while, Your visitation shall receive such thanks As fits a king's remembrance.

Ros. (R.) Both your majesties Might, by the sovereign power you have of us,[7] Put your dread pleasures more into command Than to entreaty.

Guil. (R.) But we both obey, And here give up ourselves, in the full bent,[8] To lay our service freely at your feet.

King. Thanks, Rosencrantz and gentle Guildenstern.

Queen. I do beseech you instantly to visit My too much changèd son. Go, some of you, And bring these gentlemen where Hamlet is. [_Exeunt_ ROSENCRANTZ, GUILDENSTERN, _and_ Attendants, R.H.]

Enter POLONIUS (L.H.)

Pol. Now do I think (or else this brain of mine Hunts not the trail of policy[9] so sure As it hath us'd to do), that I have found The very cause of Hamlet's lunacy.

King. (C.) O, speak of that; that do I long to hear.

Pol. (L.C.) My liege, and madam, to expostulate[10] What majesty should be, what duty is, Why day is day, night night, and time is time, Were nothing but to waste night, day, and time; Therefore, since brevity is the soul of wit, And tediousness the limbs and outward flourishes,-- I will be brief:--Your noble son is mad: Mad call I it; for, to define true madness, What is't, but to be nothing else but mad? But let that go.

Queen. (R.C.) More matter, with less art.

Pol. Madam, I swear I use no art at all. That he is mad, 'tis true: 'tis true 'tis pity; And pity 'tis, 'tis true: a foolish figure; But farewell it, for I will use no art. Mad let us grant him, then: and now remains That we find out the cause of this effect, Or, rather say, the

cause of this defect, For this effect defective comes by cause: Thus it remains, and the remainder thus, Perpend.[11] I have a daughter, have, while she is mine, Who, in her duty and obedience, mark, Hath given me this: Now gather, and surmise.

[Reads] _To the celestial, and my soul's idol, the most beautified Ophelia,--_[12]

That's an ill phrase, a vile phrase, _beautified_ is a vile phrase: but you shall hear. Thus:

In her excellent white bosom,[13] these, &c.[14]

Queen. Came this from Hamlet to her?

Pol. Good madam, stay awhile; I will be faithful.-- [_Reads._]

Doubt thou the stars are fire; _Doubt thou the sun doth move;_ _Doubt truth to be a liar;_ _But never doubt, I love._

O dear Ophelia, I am ill at these numbers;[15] I have not art to reckon my groans: but that I love thee best, O most best,[16] believe it. Adieu.

Thine evermore, most dear lady, whilst this machine is to him,[17] Hamlet.

This, in obedience, hath my daughter shown me: And more above,[18] hath his solicitings,[19] As they fell out by time, by means, and place, All given to my ear.

King. But how hath she Receiv'd his love?

Pol. What do you think of me?

King. As of a man faithful and honourable.

Pol. I would fain prove so. But what might you think, When I had seen this hot love on the wing (As I perceived it, I must tell you that, Before my daughter told me), what might you, Or my dear majesty your queen here, think, If I had play'd the desk or table book;[20] Or given my heart a winking, mute and dumb;[21] Or look'd upon this love with idle sight;[22] What might you think? No, I went round to work,[23] And my young mistress thus did I bespeak: _Lord Hamlet is a prince, out of thy sphere; This must not be:_ and then I precepts gave her, That she should lock herself from his resort, Admit no messengers, receive no tokens. Which done, she took the fruits of my advice;[24] And he, repuls'd (a short tale to make), Fell into sadness; thence into a weakness; Thence to a lightness; and, by this declension, Into the madness wherein now he raves, And all we mourn for.

King. Do you think 'tis this?

Queen. It may be, very likely.

Pol. Hath there been such a time (I'd fain know that,) That I have positively said, _'tis so_, When it proved otherwise?

King. Not that I know.

Pol. Take this from this, if it be otherwise:

[_Pointing to his head and shoulder._]

If circumstances lead me, I will find Where truth is hid, though it were hid indeed Within the centre.

King. How may we try it further?

Pol. You know, sometimes he walks for hours together Here in the lobby.

Queen. So he does, indeed.

Pol. At such a time I'll loose my daughter to him: Mark the encounter: if he love her not, And be not from his reason fallen thereon, Let me be no assistant for a state, But keep a farm, and carters.

King. We will try it.

Queen. But, look, where sadly the poor wretch comes reading.

Pol. Away, I do beseech you both, away: I'll board him presently.[25]

[_Exeunt_ KING _and_ QUEEN, R.H.]

Enter HAMLET, _reading_ (L.C.)

Pol. How does my good lord Hamlet?

Ham. (C.) Excellent well.

Pol. (R.) Do you know me, my lord?

Ham. Excellent well; you are a fishmonger.[26]

Pol. Not I, my lord.

Ham. Then I would you were so honest a man.

Pol. Honest, my lord!

Ham. Ay, sir; to be honest, as this world goes, is to be one man picked out of ten thousand.

Pol. That's very true, my lord.

Ham. For if the sun breed maggots in a dead dog, being a god, kissing carrion,----Have you a daughter?[27]

Pol. I have, my lord.

Ham. Let her not walk i'the sun: conception is a blessing; but as your daughter may conceive,--friend, look to't, look to't, look to't.

[_Goes up stage._]

Pol. (_Aside._) Still harping on my daughter:--yet he knew me not at first; he said I was a fishmonger.

[_Crosses to_ L.]

I'll speak to him again.--What do you read, my lord?

Ham. (C.) Words, words, words.

Pol. (L.) What is the matter, my lord?

Ham. Between who?

Pol. I mean, the matter that you read, my lord.

Ham. Slanders, sir: for the satirical rogue[28] says here that old men have grey beards; that their faces are wrinkled; their eyes purging thick amber and plum-tree gum; and that they have a plentiful lack of wit, together with most weak hams: All of which, sir, though I most powerfully and potently believe, yet I hold it not honesty to have it thus set down; for yourself, sir, shall be as old as I am, if, like a crab, you could go backward.

[_Crosses_, L.]

Pol. (_Aside._) Though this be madness, yet there's method in it. Will you walk out of the air, my lord?

Ham. Into my grave?

[_Crosses_ R.]

Pol. (L.) Indeed, that is out o' the air.--How pregnant sometimes his replies[29] are! a happiness that often madness hits on, which reason and sanity could not so prosperously be delivered of. I will leave him, and suddenly contrive the means of meeting between him and my daughter.--My honourable lord, I will most humbly take my leave of you.

Ham. (C.) You cannot, sir, take from me any thing that I will more willingly part withall, except my life, except my life, except my life.

Pol. Fare you well, my lord.

[_Exit_ POLONIUS, L.H.]

Ham. These tedious old fools!

Pol. (_Without._) You go to seek the lord Hamlet; there he is.

Ros. Heaven save you, sir!

Enter ROSENCRANTZ _and_ GUILDENSTERN (L.H.)

Guil. My honor'd lord!--

Ros. My most dear lord!--

Ham. My excellent good friends! How dost thou, Guildenstern?

[_Crosses to_ ROSENCRANTZ.]

Ah, Rosencrantz! Good lads, how do ye both? What news?

Ros. (L.) None, my lord, but that the world's grown honest.

Ham. (C.) Then is dooms-day near: but your news is not true. In the beaten way of friendship,[30] what make you at Elsinore?

Ros. To visit you, my lord; no other occasion.

Ham. Beggar that I am, I am even poor in thanks; but I thank you. Were you not sent for? Is it your own inclining? Is it a free visitation? Come, come, deal justly with me: come, come; nay, speak.

Guil. (R.) What should we say, my lord?

Ham. Any thing--but to the purpose. You were sent for; and there is a kind of confession in your looks, which your modesties have not craft enough to colour: I know the good king and queen have sent for you.

Ros. To what end, my lord?

Ham. That you must teach me. But let me conjure you, by the rights of our fellowship, [_taking their hands_,] by the consonancy of our youth,[31] by the obligation of our ever-preserved love, and by what more dear a better proposer[32] could charge you withal, be even[33] and direct with me, whether you were sent for, or no?

Ros. What say you?

[_To_ GUILDENSTERN.]

Ham. Nay, then, I have an eye of you.[34]

[_Crosses_ R.]

[_Aside._]

--if you love me, hold not off.

Guil. My lord, we were sent for.

Ham. (_Returning_ C.) I will tell you why; so shall my anticipation prevent your discovery, and your secrecy to the king and queen moult no feather.[35] I have of late (but wherefore I know not) lost all my mirth, forgone all custom of exercises; and, indeed, it goes so heavily with my disposition, that this goodly frame, the earth, seems to me a steril promontory; this most excellent canopy, the air, look you, this brave o'erhanging firmament, this majestical roof fretted with golden fire, why, it appears no other thing to me than a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours. What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving how express[36] and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon[37] of animals! And yet, to me, what is this quintessence of dust? man delights not me,--nor

woman neither, though by your smiling you seem to say so.

Ros. My lord, there was no such stuff in my thoughts.

Ham. Why did you laugh, then, when I said, _Man delights not me?_

Ros. To think, my lord, if you delight not in man, what lenten entertainment[38] the players shall receive from you: we coted them on the way;[39] and hither are they coming, to offer you service.

Ham. He that plays the king shall be welcome, his majesty shall have tribute of me; the adventurous knight shall use his foil and target; the lover shall not sigh gratis; the humorous man shall end his part in peace;[40] and the lady shall say her mind freely, or the blank verse shall halt for't.[41]--What players are they?

Ros. Even those you were wont to take such delight in, the tragedians of the city.

Ham. How chances it, they travel?[42] their residence, both in reputation and profit, was better both ways. Do they hold the same estimation they did when I was in the city? Are they so followed?

Ros. No, indeed, they are not.

Ham. It is not very strange; for my uncle is king of Denmark,[43] and those that would make mouths at him[44] while my father lived, give twenty, forty, fifty, an hundred ducats a-piece for his picture in little.[45] There is something in this more than natural, if philosophy could find it out.

[_Flourish of trumpets without._]

Guil. There are the players.

Ham. Gentlemen, you are welcome to Elsinore. Your hands. You are welcome: but my uncle-father and aunt-mother are deceived.

Guil. In what, my dear lord?

Ham. I am but mad north-north west: when the wind is southerly I know a hawk from a hern-shaw.[46]

[_Crosses_ R.]

Pol. (_Without_, L.H.) Well be with you, gentlemen!

Ham. (_Crosses_ C.) Hark you, Guildenstern;--and Rosencrantz: that great baby you see there is not yet out of his swaddling-clouts.

Ros. (R.) Haply he's the second time come to them; for they say an old man is twice a child.

Ham. I will prophesy he comes to tell me of the players; mark it.--You say right, sir: o'Monday morning; 'twas then, indeed.

Enter POLONIUS (L.H.)

Pol. My lord, I have news to tell you.

Ham. My lord, I have news to tell you. When Roscius was an actor in Rome,----

Pol. The actors are come hither, my lord.

Ham. Buz, buz![47]

Pol. Upon my honour,----

Ham. Then came each actor on his ass.[48]

Pol. The best actors in the world, either for tragedy, comedy, history, pastoral, pastorical-comical, historical-pastoral, scene indivisible, or poem unlimited: Seneca cannot be too heavy, nor Plautus too light.[49] For the law of writ and the liberty, these are the only men.[50]

Ham. _O, Jephthah, judge of Israel_,--what a treasure hadst thou!

Pol. What a treasure had he, my lord?

Ham. Why,--_One fair daughter, and no more, The which he loved passing well._

Pol. Still harping on my daughter.

[_Aside._]

Ham. Am I not i'the right, old Jephthah?

Pol. If you call me Jephthah, my lord, I have a daughter that I love passing well.

Ham. Nay, that follows not.

Pol. What follows, then, my lord?

Ham. Why, _As by lot, God wot_,[51] and then, you know, _It came to pass, As most like it was_,--The first row of the pious Chanson[52] will show you more; for look, my abridgment comes.[53]

Enter Four or Five Players (L.H.)--POLONIUS _crosses behind_ HAMLET _to_ R.H.

You are welcome, masters; welcome, all: O, old friend! Why, thy face is valanced[54] since I saw thee last; Com'st thou to beard me[55] in Denmark?--What, my young lady and mistress. By-'r-lady, your ladyship is nearer to heaven than when I saw you last, by the altitude of a chopine.[56] You are welcome. We'll e'en to't like French falconers,[57] fly at anything we see: We'll have a speech straight: Come, give us a taste of your quality;[58] come, a passionate speech.

1st Play. (L.H.) What speech, my lord?

Ham. I heard thee speak me a speech once,--but it was never acted; or, if it was, not above once; for the play, I remember, pleased not the million; 'twas caviare to the general:[59] but it was an excellent play, well digested in the scenes, set down with as much modesty as cunning.[60] One speech in it I chiefly loved; 'twas Æneas' tale to Dido; and thereabout of it especially, where he speaks of Priam's slaughter: If it live in your memory, begin at this line; let me see, let me see;--

The rugged Pyrrhus, like the Hyrcanian beast,--'tis not so: it begins with Pyrrhus:

The rugged Pyrrhus,--he, whose sable arms, _Black as his purpose, did the night resemble_, _Old grandsire Priam seeks._

Pol. (R.) 'Fore Heaven, my lord, well spoken, with good accent and good discretion.

Ham. (C.) So proceed you.

1st Play. (L.) _Anon he finds him Striking too short at Greeks; his antique sword, Rebellious to his arm, lies where it falls, Repugnant to command: Unequal match'd, Pyrrhus at Priam drives; in rage strikes wide; But with the whiff and wind of his fell sword[61] The unnerved father falls. But, as we often see, against some storm, A silence in the heavens, the rack[62] stand still, The bold wind speechless, and the orb below As hush as death; anon the dreadful thunder Doth rend the region; So, after Pyrrhus' pause, A roused vengeance sets him new a work; And never did the Cyclops' hammers fall On Mars's armour, forg'd for proof eterne, With less remorse than Pyrrhus' bleeding sword Now falls on Priam.-- Out, out, thou fickle Fortune!_

Pol. (R.) This is too long.

Ham. It shall to the barber's, with your beard.--Say on;--come to Hecuba.

1st Play. _But who, ah woe, had seen the mobled queen_--

Ham. The mobled queen?[63]

Pol. That's good; mobled queen is good.

1st Play. _Run barefoot up and down, threatening the flames; A clout upon that head Where late the diadem stood; and, for a robe, A blanket, in the alarm of fear caught up; Who this had seen, with tongue in venom steep'd, 'Gainst fortune's state would

treason have pronounced._

Pol. Look, whether he has not turned his colour, and has tears in's eyes.--Prithee, no more.

Ham. (C.) 'Tis well; I'll have thee speak out the rest of this soon.--Good, my lord, will you see the players well bestowed? Do you hear, let them be well used; for they are the abstract and brief chronicles of the time: After your death you were better have a bad epitaph than their ill report while you live.

Pol. (R.) My lord, I will use them according to their desert.

Ham. Much better: Use every man after his desert, and who shall 'scape whipping? Use them after your own honour and dignity: The less they deserve, the more merit is in your bounty. Take them in.

[_Crosses to_ R.H.]

Pol. Come, sirs.

Ham. Follow him, friends: we'll hear a play to-morrow.

[_Exit_ POLONIUS _with some of the_ Players, L.H.]

Old friend

[_Crosses to_ C.]

--My good friends

[_To_ ROSENCRANTZ _and_ GUILDENSTERN.]

I'll leave you till night: you are welcome to Elsinore--can you play the murder of Gonzago?

[_Exeunt_ ROSENCRANTZ _and_ GUILDENSTERN, R.H.]

1st Play. Ay, my lord.

Ham. We'll have it to-morrow night. You could, for a need, study a speech of some dozen or sixteen lines, which I would insert in't--could you not?

1st Play. Ay, my lord.

Ham. Very well.--Follow that lord; and look you mock him not.

[_Exit_ Player, L.H.]

Now I am alone. O, what a rogue and peasant slave am I! Is it not monstrous, that this player here, But in a fiction, in a dream of passion, Could force his soul so to his own conceit, That, from her working, all his visage wann'd;[64] Tears in his eyes, distraction in's aspect, A broken voice, and his whole function suiting With forms to his conceit?[65] And all for nothing! For Hecuba? What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba, That he should weep for her? What would he do, Had he the motive and the cue[66] for passion That I have? He would drown the stage with tears, And cleave the general ear with horrid speech; Make mad the guilty, and appal the free; Confound the ignorant, and amaze, indeed, The very faculties of eyes and ears. Yet I, A dull and muddy-mettled rascal, peak, Like John a-dreams,[67] unpregnant of my cause,[68] And can say nothing; no, not for a king, Upon whose property and most dear life A damn'd defeat was made.[69] Am I a coward? Who calls me villain? breaks my pate across? Plucks off my beard, and blows it in my face? Tweaks me by the nose? gives me the lie i'the throat, As deep as to the lungs? Who does me this, Ha? Why, I should take it: for it cannot be But I am pigeon-liver'd, and lack gall To make oppression bitter;[70] or, ere this, I should have fatted all the region kites With this slave's offal: Bloody, bawdy villain! Remorseless, treacherous, lecherous, kindless[71] villain! O, vengeance! Why, what an ass am I! This is most brave, That I, the son of a dear father murder'd, Prompted to my revenge by heaven and hell, Must, like a scold, unpack my heart with words, And fall a cursing, like a very drab, A scullion! Fye upon't! fye! About, my brains![72] I have heard That guilty creatures, sitting at a play, Have by the very cunning of the scene Been struck so to the soul, that presently They have proclaim'd their malefactions; For murder, though it have no tongue, will speak With most miraculous organ. I'll have these players Play something like the murder of my father Before mine uncle: I'll observe his looks; I'll

tent him to the quick:[73] if he do blench,[74] I know my course. The spirit that I have seen May be the devil: and the devil hath power To assume a pleasing shape; yea, and, perhaps Out of my weakness and my melancholy (As he is very potent with such spirits), Abuses me to damn me: I'll have good grounds More relative than this:[75] The play's the thing Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the king.

[_Exit_, R.H.]

END OF ACT SECOND.

Notes

Act II

[Footnote II.1: _Polonius_,] Doctor Johnson describes Polonius as "a man bred in courts, exercised in business, stored with observation, confident in his knowledge, proud of his eloquence, and declining into dotage. A man positive and confident, because he knows his mind was once strong, and knows not that it is become weak." The idea of dotage encroaching upon wisdom will solve all the phenomena of the character of Polonius.]

[Footnote II.2: _His bulk_,] Frame.]

[Footnote II.3: _Ecstacy of love_;] _i.e._, madness of love. In this sense the word is now obsolete.]

[Footnote II.4:

This must be known; which being kept close, might move More grief to hide than hate to utter love.]

_i.e._, this must be made known to the king, for (being kept secret) the hiding Hamlet's love might occasion more mischief to us from him and the queen, than the uttering or revealing of it will occasion hate and resentment from Hamlet.

It was the custom of Shakespeare's age, to conclude acts and scenes with a couplet, a custom which was continued for nearly a century afterwards.]

[Footnote II.5: _The understanding of himself_,] _i.e._, the just estimate of himself.]

[Footnote II.6: _Vouchsafe your rest_] Please to reside.]

[Footnote II.7: _Of us_,] _i.e._, over us.]

[Footnote II.8: _In the full bent_,] To the full stretch and range--a term derived from archery.]

[Footnote II.9: _The trail of policy_] The _trail_ is the _course_ of an animal pursued by the scent.]

[Footnote II.10: _Expostulate_] To _expostulate_ is to discuss, to put the pros and cons, to answer demands upon the question. _Expose_ is an old term of similar import.]

[Footnote II.11: _Perpend._] _i.e._, reflect, consider attentively.]

[Footnote II.12: _Most beautified Ophelia_,] Heywood, in his History of Edward VI., says "Katharine Parre, Queen Dowager to King Henry VIII., was a woman _beautified_ with many excellent virtues." The same expression is frequently used by other old authors.]

[Footnote II.13: _In her excellent white bosom_,] The ladies, in Shakespeare's time, wore pockets in the front of their stays.]

[Footnote II.14: _These, &c._] In our poet's time, the word _these_ was usually added at the end of the superscription of letters.]

[Footnote II.15: _I am ill at these numbers_;] No talent for these rhymes.]

[Footnote II.16: _O most best_,] An ancient mode of expression.]

[Footnote II.17: _Whilst this machine is to him_,] Belongs to, obey his impulse; so long as he is "a sensible warm motion," the similar expression to "While my wits are my own."]

[Footnote II.18: _And more above_,] _i.e._, moreover, besides.]

[Footnote II.19: _His solicitings_,] _i.e._, his love-making, his tender expressions.]

[Footnote II.20: _If I had played the desk, or table book_;] This line may either mean _if I had conveyed intelligence between them_, or, _known of their love, if I had locked up his secret in my own breast, as closely as it were confined in a desk or table book._]

[Footnote II.21: _Or given my heart a winking, mute and dumb_;] _i.e._, connived at it.]

[Footnote II.22: _With idle sight_;] _i.e._, with indifference.]

[Footnote II.23: _Round to work_,] _i.e._, roundly, without reserve.]

[Footnote II.24: _Which done, she took the fruits of my advice_;] She took the _fruits_ of advice when she obeyed advice, the advice was then made _fruitful._--JOHNSON.]

[Footnote II.25: _I'll board him presently._] Accost, address him.]

[Footnote II.26: _You are a fishmonger._] This was an expression better understood in Shakespeare's time than at present, and no doubt was relished by the audience of the Globe Theatre as applicable to the Papists, who in Queen Elizabeth's time were esteemed enemies to the Government. Hence the proverbial phrase of _He's an honest man and eats no fish_; to signify he's a friend to the Government and a Protestant.]

[Footnote II.27: _For if the sun breed maggots in a dead dog, being a god, kissing carrion,----Have you a daughter?_] _i.e._, Hamlet having just remarked that honesty is very rare in the world, adds, that since there is so little virtue, since corruption abounds everywhere, and maggots are _bred_ by the sun, which is a god, even in a dead dog, Polonius ought to take care to prevent his daughter from walking in the sun, lest she should prove _"a breeder of sinners;"_ for though _conception_ (understanding) in general be a blessing, yet as Ophelia might chance to _conceive_ (to be pregnant), it might be a calamity. Hamlet's abrupt question, _"Have you a daughter?"_ is evidently intended to impress Polonius with the belief of the Prince's madness.--MALONE.]

[Footnote II.28: _The satirical rogue_] Hamlet alludes to Juvenal, who in his 10th Satire, describes the evils of long life.]

[Footnote II.29: _How pregnant his replies_] Big with meaning.]

[Footnote II.30: _Beaten way of friendship_,] Plain track, open and unceremonious course.]

[Footnote II.31: _Rights of our fellowship and constancy of our youth_,] Habits of familiar intercourse and correspondent years.]

[Footnote II.32: _A better proposer_] An advocate of more address in shaping his aims, who could make a stronger appeal.]

[Footnote II.33: _Even_] Without inclination any way.]

[Footnote II.34: _Nay, then, I have an eye of you._] _i.e._, I have a glimpse of your meaning. Hamlet's penetration having shown him that his two friends are set over him as spies.]

[Footnote II.35: _So shall my anticipation prevent your discovery, and your secrecy to the king and queen moult no feather._] Be beforehand with your discovery, and the plume and gloss of your secret pledge be in no feather shed or tarnished.]

[Footnote II.36: _Express_] According to pattern, justly and perfectly modelled.]

[Footnote II.37: _Paragon_] Model of perfection.]

[Footnote II.38: _Lenten entertainment_] _i.e._, sparing, like the entertainments given in Lent.]

[Footnote II.39: _We coted them on the way_;] To cote, is to pass by, to pass the side of another. It appears to be a word of French origin, and was a common sporting term in Shakespeare's time.]

[Footnote II.40: _The humorous man shall end his part in peace_;] The fretful or capricious man shall vent the whole of his spleen undisturbed.]

[Footnote II.41: _The lady shall say her mind freely, or the blank verse shall halt for't._] _i.e._, the lady shall mar the measure of the verse, rather than not express herself freely and fully.]

[Footnote II.42: _Travel?_] Become strollers.]

[Footnote II.43: _It is not very strange; for my uncle is king of Denmark_;] This is a reflection on the mutability of fortune, and the variableness of man's mind.]

[Footnote II.44: _Make mouths at him_] _i.e._, deride him by antic gestures and mockery.]

[Footnote II.45: _In little._] In miniature.]

[Footnote II.46: _I know a hawk from a hern-shaw._] A hernshaw is a heron or hern. _To know a hawk from a hernshaw_ is an ancient proverb, sometimes corrupted into _handsaw_. Spencer quotes the proverb, as meaning, _wise enough to know the hawk from its game._]

[Footnote II.47: _Buz, buz!_] Sir William Blackstone states that _buz_ used to be an interjection at Oxford when any one began a story that was generally known before.]

[Footnote II.48: _Then came each actor on his ass._] This seems to be a line of a ballad.]

[Footnote II.49: _Seneca cannot be too heavy, nor Plautus too light._] An English translation of the tragedies of Seneca was published in 1581, and one comedy of Plautus, viz., the Menœchme, in 1595.]

[Footnote II.50: _For the law of writ and the liberty, these are the only men._] The probable meaning of this passage is,--_For the observance of the rules of the Drama, while they take such liberties, as are allowable, they are the only men_--_writ_ is an old word for _writing_.]

[Footnote II.51: _As by lot, God wot_,] There was an old ballad entitled the song of Jephthah, from which these lines are probably quotations. The story of Jephthah was also one of the favourite subjects of ancient tapestry.]

[Footnote II.52: _The first row of the pious Chanson_] This expression does not appear to be very well understood. Steevens tells us that the _pious chansons_ were a kind of _Christmas carols_, containing some scriptural history thrown into loose rhymes, and sung about the streets. The _first row_ appears to mean the _first division_ of one of these.]

[Footnote II.53: _My abridgment comes._] Hamlet alludes to the players, whose approach will shorten his talk.]

[Footnote II.54: _Thy face is valanced_] _i.e._, fringed with a beard. The valance is the fringes or drapery hanging round the tester of a bed.]

[Footnote II.55: _Com'st thou to beard me_] To _beard_ anciently meant to set _at defiance_. Hamlet having just told the player that his face is valanced, is playing upon the word _beard_.]

[Footnote II.56: _By the altitude of a chopine._] A chioppine is a high shoe, or rather clog, worn by the Italians. Venice was more famous for them than any other place. They are described as having been made of wood covered with coloured leather, and sometimes _even half a yard high_, their altitude being proportioned to the rank of the lady, so that they could not walk without being supported.]

[Footnote II.57: _Like French falconers_,] The French seem to have been the first and noblest falconers in the western part of Europe. The French king sent over his falconers to show that sport to King James the First.--_See Weldon's Court of King James._]

[Footnote II.58: _Quality_;] Qualifications, faculty.]

[Footnote II.59: _Caviare to the general_;] Caviare is the spawn of fish pickled, salted, and dried. It is imported from Russia, and was considered in the time of Shakespeare a new and fashionable luxury, not obtained or relished by the vulgar, and therefore used by him to signify anything above their comprehension--general is here used for the people.]

[Footnote II.60: _As much modesty as cunning._] As much propriety and decorum as skill.]

[Footnote II.61: _Falls with the whiff and wind of his fell sword_] Our author employs the same image in almost the same phrase:

"The Grecians _fall Even in the fan and wind of your fair sword._"

Tr. & Cress. V. 3. Tr.]

[Footnote II.62: _The rack_] The clouds or congregated vapour.]

[Footnote II.63: _The mobled queen?_] Mobled is veiled, muffled, disguised.]

[Footnote II.64: _All his visage wann'd_;] _i.e._, turned pale or wan.]

[Footnote II.65: _His whole functions suiting with forms to his conceit?_] _i.e._, his powers and faculties--the whole energies of his soul and body giving material forms to his passion, such as tone of voice, expression of face, requisite action, in accordance with the ideas that floated in his conceit or imagination.]

[Footnote II.66: _The cue_] The point--the direction.]

[Footnote II.67: _Like John a-dreams_,] Or dreaming John, a name apparently coined to suit a dreaming, stupid person; he seems to have been a well-known character.]

[Footnote II.68: _Unpregnant of my cause_,] _i.e._, not quickened with a new desire of vengeance; not teeming with revenge.]

[Footnote II.69: _Defeat was made._] Overthrow.]

[Footnote II.70: _Lack gall to make oppression bitter_;] _i.e._, lack gall to make me feel the bitterness of oppression.]

[Footnote II.71: _Kindless_] Unnatural.]

[Footnote II.72: _About, my brains!_] Wits to work.]

[Footnote II.73: _I'll tent him to the quick:_] _i.e._, probe him--search his wounds.]

[Footnote II.74: _Blench_,] Shrink, start aside.]

[Footnote II.75: _More relative than this:_] Directly applicable.]

ACT III.

SCENE I.--A ROOM IN THE CASTLE.

Three chairs on L.H., _one on_ R.

Enter KING _and_ QUEEN, _preceded by_ POLONIUS. OPHELIA, ROSENCRANTZ, _and_ GIULDENSTERN, _following_ (R.H.)

King. (C.) And can you, by no drift of conference, Get from him why he puts on this confusion?

Ros. (R.) He does confess he feels himself distracted; But from what cause he will by no means speak.

Guild. (R.) Nor do we find him forward[1] to be sounded But, with a crafty madness, keeps aloof, When we would bring him on to some confession Of his true state.

Queen. (R.C.) Did you assay him[2] To any pastime?

Ros. Madam, it so fell out, that certain players We o'er-raught on the way:[3] of these we told him; And there did seem in him a kind of joy To hear of it: They are about the court; And, as I think, they have already order This night to play before him.

Pol. 'Tis most true: And he beseech'd me to entreat your majesties To hear and see the matter.

King. With all my heart; and it doth much content me To hear him so inclin'd. Good gentlemen, give him a further edge, And drive his purpose on to these delights.

Ros. We shall, my lord.

[_Exeunt_ ROSENCRANTZ _and_ GUILDENSTERN, R.H.]

King. Sweet Gertrude, leave us too; For we have closely sent[4] for Hamlet hither, That he, as 'twere by accident, may here Affront Ophelia:[5] Her father and myself (lawful espials[6]), Will so bestow ourselves, that, seeing, unseen, We may of their encounter frankly judge; And gather by him, as he is behaved, If't be the affliction of his love or no That thus he suffers for.

Queen. (R.) I shall obey you: And for your part, Ophelia,

[OPHELIA _comes down_ L.H.]

I do wish That your good beauties be the happy cause Of Hamlet's wildness: so shall I hope your virtues Will bring him to his wonted way again, To both your honours.

Oph. Madam, I wish it may.

[_Exit_ QUEEN, R.H.]

Pol. Ophelia, walk you here. Gracious, so please you, We will bestow ourselves. Read on this book;

[_To_ OPHELIA.]

That show of such an exercise may colour Your loneliness. We are oft to blame in this,-- 'Tis too much prov'd,[7] that, with devotion's visage And pious action, we do sugar o'er The devil himself.

King. O, 'tis too true! how smart A lash that speech doth give my conscience!

[_Aside._]

Pol. I hear him coming: let's withdraw, my lord.

[_Exeunt_ KING _and_ POLONIUS, R.H.2 E., _and_ OPHELIA, R.H.U.E.]

Enter HAMLET (L.H.)

Ham. To be, or not to be, that is the question:[8] Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,[9] And, by opposing end them?--To die,--to sleep, No more;--and by a sleep, to say we end The heart-ache, and the thousand natural shocks That flesh is heir to: 'tis a consummation Devoutly to be wished. To die,--to sleep,-- To sleep! perchance to dream: ay, there's the rub; For in that sleep of death what dreams may come, When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,[10] Must give us pause:[11] There's the respect[12] That makes calamity of so long life; For who would bear the whips and scorns of time,[13] The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely,[14] The pangs of despised love, the law's delay, The insolence of office, and the spurns That patient merit of the unworthy takes, When he himself might his quietus make[15] With a bare bodkin?[16] Who would fardels bear,[17] To groan and sweat under a weary life, But that the dread of something after death, The undiscovered country, from whose bourn[18] No traveller returns,[19] puzzles the will, And makes us rather bear those ills we have Than fly to others that we know not of? Thus, conscience does make cowards of us all;[20] And thus the native hue of resolution Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought; And enterprises of great pith and moment,[21] With this regard, their currents turn away, And lose the name of action.[22]--

[OPHELIA _returns._]

--Soft you now![23] The fair Ophelia:--Nymph, in thy orisons[24] Be all my sins remember'd.

Oph. (R.C.) Good my lord, How does your honour for this many a day?

Ham. (L.C.) I humbly thank you; well.

Oph. My lord, I have remembrances of yours, That I have longèd long to re-deliver; I pray you, now receive them.

Ham. No, not I; I never gave you aught.

Oph. My honour'd lord, you know right well you did; And, with them, words of so sweet breath compos'd As made the things more rich: their perfume lost, Take these again; for to the noble mind Rich gifts wax poor when givers prove unkind. There, my lord.

Ham. Ha, ha! are you honest?

Oph. My lord?

Ham. Are you fair?

Oph. What means your lordship?

Ham. That if you be honest and fair, your honesty should admit no discourse to your beauty.[25]

Oph. Could beauty, my lord, have better commerce than with honesty?

Ham. Ay, truly; for the power of beauty will sooner transform honesty from what it is to a bawd, than the force of honesty can translate beauty into his likeness:[26] this was some time a paradox, but now the time gives it proof. I did love you once.

Oph. Indeed, my lord, you made me believe so.

Ham. You should not have believed me; for virtue cannot so inoculate our old stock, but we shall relish of it:[27] I loved you not.

Oph. I was the more deceived.

Ham. Get thee to a nunnery: Why wouldst thou be a breeder of sinners? I am myself indifferent honest; but yet I could accuse me of such things, that it were better my mother had not borne me: I am very proud, revengeful, ambitious; with more offences at my beck[28] than I have thoughts to put them in,[29] imagination to give them shape, or time to act them in. What should such fellows as I do, crawling between earth and heaven? We are arrant knaves, all; believe none of us. Go thy ways to a nunnery. Where's your father?

Oph. At home, my lord.

Ham. Let the doors be shut upon him, that he may play the fool nowhere but in's own house. Farewell.

Oph. O, help him, you sweet heavens!

Ham. If thou dost marry, I'll give thee this plague for thy dowry. Be thou as chaste as ice, as pure as snow, thou shalt not escape calumny. Get thee to a nunnery; farewell. Or, if thou wilt needs marry, marry a fool; for wise men know well enough what monsters you make of them. To a nunnery, go; go; go.

Oph. Heavenly powers, restore him!

Ham. I have heard of your paintings[30] too, well enough; Heaven hath given you one face, and you make yourselves another:[31] you jig, you amble, and you lisp,[32] and nickname Heaven's creatures, and make your wantonness your ignorance.[33] Go to, I'll no more of't; it hath made me mad.

[HAMLET _crosses to_ R.H.]

I say, we will have no more marriages: those that are married already, all but one,[34] shall live; the rest shall keep as they are. To a nunnery, go.

[_Exit_ HAMLET, R.H.[35]]

Oph. (L.) O, what a noble mind is here o'erthrown! The expectancy and rose of the fair state,[36] The glass of fashion[37] and the mould of form,[38] The observ'd of all observers, quite, quite down! And I, of ladies most deject and wretched, That suck'd the honey of his musick vows,[39] Now see that noble and most sovereign reason, Like sweet bells jangled, out of tune and harsh: O, woe is me, To have seen what I have seen, see what I see!

[_Exit_ OPHELIA, L.H.]

Re-enter KING _and_ POLONIUS.

King. Love! his affections do not that way tend; Nor what he spake, though it lack'd form a little, Was not like madness. There's something in his soul, O'er which his melancholy sits on brood; He shall with speed to England, For the demand of our neglected tribute: Haply, the seas, and countries different, With variable objects, shall expel This something-settled matter in his heart; Whereon his brains still beating puts him thus From fashion of himself. What think you on't?

Pol. It shall do well: But yet I do believe The origin and commencement of his grief Sprung from neglected love. My lord, do as you please; But, if you hold it fit, after the play, Let his queen mother all alone entreat him To show his grief: let her be round with him;[40] And I'll be placed, so please you, in the ear Of all their conference. If she find him not,[41] To England send him; or confine

him where Your wisdom best shall think.

King. It shall be so: Madness in great ones must not unwatch'd go.

[_Exeunt_, L.H.]

Enter HAMLET _and a_ Player (R.H.)

Ham. (C.) Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you, trippingly on the tongue: but if you mouth it, as many of our players do, I had as lief[42] the town-crier spoke my lines. Nor do not saw the air too much with your hands thus;[43] but use all gently: for in the very torrent, tempest, and (as I may say) whirlwind of your passion, you must acquire and beget a temperance that may give it smoothness. O, it offends me to the soul, to hear a robustious perrywig-pated fellow[44] tear a passion to tatters, to very rags, to split the ears of the groundlings,[45] who, for the most part, are capable of nothing but inexplicable dumb shows and noise: I would have such a fellow whipped for o'erdoing Termagant;[46] it out-herods Herod:[47] Pray you, avoid it.

1st Play. (R.) I warrant your honour.

Ham. Be not too tame neither, but let your own discretion be your tutor; suit the action to the word, the word to the action; with this special observance, that you o'erstep not the modesty of nature: for any thing so overdone is from the purpose of playing, whose end, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time its form and pressure.[48] Now, this overdone, or come tardy off,[49] though it make the unskilful laugh, cannot but make the judicious grieve; the censure of which one[50] must, in your allowance,[51] o'erweigh a whole theatre of others. O, there be players that I have seen play, and heard others praise, and that highly, not to speak it profanely,[52] that, neither having the accent of christians, nor the gait of christian, pagan, nor man, have so strutted and bellowed, that I have thought some of nature's journeymen had made men, and not made them well, they imitated humanity so abominably.

[_Crosses to_ R.]

1st Play. (L.) I hope we have reformed that indifferently[53] with us.

Ham. O, reform it altogether. And let those that play your clowns speak no more than is set down for them:[54] for there be of them that will themselves laugh, to set on some quantity of barren spectators[55] to laugh too; though, in the mean time, some necessary question[56] of the play be then to be considered: that's villainous, and shows a most pitiful ambition in the fool that uses it. Go, make you ready.

[_Exit_ Player, L.H.]

Ham. What, ho, Horatio!

Enter HORATIO (R.H.)

Hor. Here, sweet lord, at your service.

Ham. Horatio, thou art e'en as just a man As e'er my conversation cop'd withal.[57]

Hor. O, my dear lord.

Ham. Nay, do not think I flatter; For what advancement may I hope from thee, That no revenue hast, but thy good spirits, To feed and clothe thee? Why should the poor be flatter'd? No, let the candied tongue lick absurd pomp; And crook the pregnant hinges of the knee,[58] Where thrift may follow fawning. Dost thou hear? Since my dear soul[59] was mistress of her choice, And could of men distinguish, her election Hath seal'd thee for herself: for thou hast been As one, in suffering all, that suffers nothing; A man that fortune's buffets and rewards Has ta'en with equal thanks: and bless'd are those Whose blood and judgment[60] are so well co-mingled, That they are not a pipe for fortune's finger To sound what stop she please. Give me that man That is not passion's slave, and I will wear him In my heart's core, ay, in my heart of heart, As I do thee.--Something too much of this.-- There is a play to-night before the king; One scene of it comes near the circumstance Which I have told thee of my father's death: I pr'ythee when thou seest that act a-foot, Even with the very comment of thy soul[61] Observe my uncle: if his occulted guilt[62] Do not itself unkennel in one speech, It is a damned ghost that we have seen; And my imaginations are as foul As Vulcan's stithy.[63] Give him heedful note: For I mine eyes will rivet to his face; And, after, we will both our judgments join In censure of his seeming.[64]

[HORATIO _goes off_, U.E.L.H.]

March. Enter KING _and_ QUEEN, _preceded by_ POLONIUS, OPHELIA, HORATIO, ROSENCRANTZ, GUILDENSTERN, Lords, Ladies, _and_ Attendants. KING _and_ QUEEN _sit_ (L.H.); OPHELIA (R.H.)

King. (L.) How fares our cousin Hamlet?

Ham. (C.) Excellent, i'faith; of the cameleon's dish: I eat the air, promise-crammed: you cannot feed capons so.

King. I have nothing with this answer, Hamlet; these words are not mine.[65]

Ham. No, nor mine, now.[66] My lord,--you played once in the university, you say?[67]

[_To_ POLONIUS, L.]

Pol. (L.C.) That did I, my lord; and was accounted a good actor.

Ham. (C.) And what did you enact?

Pol. I did enact Julius Cæsar:[68] I was killed i'the Capitol; Brutus killed me.

Ham. It was a brute part of him to kill so capital a calf there.--Be the players ready?

Ros. Ay, my lord; they stay upon your patience.[69]

Queen. Come hither, my dear Hamlet, sit by me.

[_Pointing to a chair by her side._]

Ham. No, good mother, here's metal more attractive.

Pol. O, ho! do you mark that?

[_Aside to the_ KING.]

Ham. Lady, shall I lie in your lap?

[_Lying down at_ OPHELIA'S _feet._][70]

Oph. (R.) You are merry, my lord.

Ham. O, your only jig-maker.[71] What should a man do but be merry? for, look you, how cheerfully my mother looks, and my father died within these two hours.

Oph. Nay, 'tis twice two months, my lord.

Ham. So long? Nay, then, let the devil wear black, for I'll have a suit of sables.[72] O heavens! die two months ago, and not forgotten yet? Then there's hope a great man's memory may outlive his life half a year: But, by'r-lady, he must build churches, then.[73]

Oph. What means the play, my lord?

Ham. Miching mallecho;[74] it means mischief.

Oph. But what is the argument of the play?

Enter a Player _as_ Prologue (L.H.) _on a raised stage._

Ham. We shall know by this fellow.

Pro. _For us, and for our tragedy, Here stooping to your clemency, We beg your hearing patiently._

[_Exit_, L.H.]

Ham. Is this a prologue, or the posy of a ring?[75]

Oph. 'Tis brief, my lord.

Ham. As woman's love.

Enter a KING _and a_ QUEEN (L.H.) _on raised stage._

P. King. (R.) Full thirty times hath Phoebus' cart[76] gone round Neptune's salt wash and Tellus' orbèd ground,[77] Since love our hearts, and Hymen did our hands, Unite commutual in most sacred bands.

P. Queen. (L.) So many journeys may the sun and moon Make us again count o'er ere love be done! But, woe is me, you are so sick of late, So far from cheer and from your former state, That I distrust you. Yet, though I distrust, Discomfort you, my lord, it nothing must.

P. King. 'Faith, I must leave thee, love, and shortly too; My operant powers their functions leave to do:[78] And thou shalt live in this fair world behind, Honour'd, belov'd; and, haply one as kind For husband shalt thou----

P. Queen. O, confound the rest! Such love must needs be treason in my breast: In second husband let me be accurst! None wed the second but who kill'd the first.

Ham. That's wormwood.

[_Aside to_ HORATIO, R.]

P. King. I do believe you think what now you speak; But what we do determine oft we break.[79] So think you thou wilt no second husband wed; But die thy thoughts when thy first lord is dead.

P. Queen. Nor earth to me give food, nor heaven light! Sport and repose lock from me day and night! Both here, and hence, pursue me lasting strife, If, once a widow, ever I be wife!

P. King. 'Tis deeply sworn.

Ham. If she should break it now!--

[_To_ OPHELIA.]

P. King. Sweet, leave me here awhile; My spirits grow dull, and fain I would beguile The tedious day with sleep.

[_Reposes on a bank_, R., _and sleeps._]

P. Queen. Sleep rock thy brain; And never come mischance between us twain!

[_Exit_, L.H.]

Ham. Madam, how like you this play?

Queen. The lady doth protest too much, methinks.

Ham. O, but she'll keep her word.

King. Have you heard the argument?[80] Is there no offence in't?

Ham. No, no, they do but jest, poison in jest; no offence i'the world.

King. What do you call the play?

Ham. The mouse-trap.[81] Marry, how? Tropically.[82] This play is the image of a murder[83] done in Vienna: Gonzago is the Duke's name; his wife, Baptista: you shall see anon;--'tis a knavish piece of work: but what of that? your majesty, and we that have free souls, it touches us not: Let the galled jade wince,[84] our withers[85] are unwrung.

Enter LUCIANUS (L.H.)

This is one Lucianus, nephew to the king.

Oph. You are as good as a chorus,[86] my lord.

Ham. I could interpret between you and your love, if I could see the puppets dallying.[87] Begin, murderer; leave thy damnable faces, and begin. Come:--

----The croaking raven Doth bellow for revenge.[88]

Luc. Thoughts black, hands apt, drugs fit, and time agreeing; Confederate season, else no creature seeing; Thou mixture rank, of midnight weeds[89] collected, With Hecat's ban thrice blasted, thrice infected, Thy natural magick and dire property, On wholesome life usurp[90] immediately. [_Pours the poison into the Sleeper's Ears._]

Ham. He poisons him i' the garden for his estate. His name's Gonzago: the story is extant, and written in very choice Italian: You shall see anon how the murderer gets the love of Gonzago's wife.

King. Give me some light: away!

All. Lights, lights, lights!

[_Exeunt all_, R. _and_ L., _but_ HAMLET _and_ HORATIO.]

Ham. Why, let the strucken deer go weep,[91] The hart ungallèd play; For some must watch, while some must sleep: So runs the world away.--

O, good Horatio, I'll take the ghost's word for a thousand pounds. Didst perceive?

Hor. (R.) Very well, my lord.

Ham. (C.) Upon the talk of the poisoning.--

Hor. I did very well note him.

Ham. Ah, ah! come, some musick! come, the recorders!

[_Exit_ HORATIO, R.H.]

Enter ROSENCRANTZ _and_ GUILDENSTERN (L.H.) HAMLET _seats himself in the chair_ (R.)

Guil. (L.C.) Good my lord, vouchsafe me a word with you.

Ham. Sir, a whole history.

Guil. The king, sir,----

Ham. Ay, sir, what of him?

Guil. Is, in his retirement, marvellous distempered.[92]

Ham. With drink, sir?

Guil. No, my lord, with choler.

Ham. Your wisdom should show itself more rich to signify this to the doctor; for, for me to put him to his purgation would perhaps plunge him into more choler.

Guil. Good my lord, put your discourse into some frame, and start not so wildly from my affair.

Ham. I am tame, sir:--pronounce.

Guil. The queen, your mother, in most great affliction of spirit, hath sent me to you.

Ham. You are welcome.

Guil. Nay, good my lord, this courtesy is not of the right breed. If it shall please you to make me a wholesome answer, I will do your mother's commandment: if not, your pardon and my return shall be the end of my business.

Ham. Sir, I cannot.

Guil. What, my lord?

Ham. Make you a wholesome answer; my wit's diseased! But, sir, such answer as I can make, you shall command: or rather as you say, my mother: therefore no more, but to the matter: My mother, you say,--

Ros. (_Crosses to_ C.) Then thus she says: Your behaviour hath struck her into amazement and admiration.[93]

Ham. O wonderful son, that can so astonish a mother! But is there no sequel at the heels of this mother's admiration?--impart.

Ros. She desires to speak with you in her closet, ere you go to bed.

Ham. We shall obey, were she ten times our mother. Have you any further trade with us?[94]

Ros. My lord, you once did love me.

Ham. And do still, by these pickers and stealers.[95]

[_Rises and comes forward_, C.]

Ros. (R.) Good my lord, what is your cause of distemper? you do, surely, bar the door of your own liberty, if you deny your griefs to your friend.[96]

Ham. Sir, I lack advancement.

Ros. How can that be, when you have the voice of the king himself for your succession in Denmark?[97]

Ham. Ay, sir, but _While the grass grows_,--the proverb is something musty.[98]

Enter HORATIO _and_ Musicians (R.H.)

O, the recorders:[99]--let me see one.--So; withdraw with you:--

[_Exeunt_ HORATIO _and_ Musicians R.H. GUILDENSTERN, _after speaking privately to_ ROSENCRANTZ, _crosses behind_ HAMLET _to_ R.H.]

Why do you go about to recover the wind of me,[100] as if you would drive me into a toil?[101]

Guil. (R.) O, my lord, if my duty be too bold, my love is too unmannerly.[102]

Ham. (C.) I do not well understand that. Will you play upon this pipe?

Guil. My lord, I cannot.

Ham. I pray you.

Guil. Believe me, I cannot.

Ham. I do beseech you.

Ros. (L.) I know no touch of it, my lord.

Ham. 'Tis as easy as lying: govern these ventages with your fingers and thumb, give it breath with your mouth, and it will discourse most eloquent music.[103] Look you, these are the stops.

Guil. But these cannot I command to any utterance of harmony; I have not the skill.

Ham. Why, look you now, how unworthy a thing you make of me! You would play upon me; you would seem to know my stops; you would pluck out the heart of my mystery; you would sound me from my lowest note to the top of my compass: and there is much music, excellent voice, in this little organ; yet cannot you make it speak. 'Sdeath, do you think I am easier to be played on than a pipe? Call me what instrument you will, though you can fret me, you cannot play upon me.[104]

[_Crosses to_ L.H.]

Enter POLONIUS (R.H.)

Pol. (R.) My lord, the queen would speak with you, and presently.

Ham. (C.) Do you see yonder cloud that's almost in shape of a camel?

Pol. By the mass, and 'tis like a camel, indeed.

Ham. Methinks it is like a weasel.

Pol. It is backed like a weasel.

Ham. Or like a whale?

Pol. Very like a whale.

Ham. Then will I come to my mother by and by. They fool me to the top of my bent.[105] I will come by and by.

Pol. I will say so.

Ham. By and by is easily said.

[_Exit_ POLONIUS, R.H.

Leave me, friends.

[_Exeunt_ ROSENCRANTZ _and_ GUILDENSTERN, R.H.]

'Tis now the very witching time of night, When churchyards yawn, and hell itself breathes out Contagion to this world: Now could I drink hot blood, And do such bitter business[106] as the day Would quake to look on. Soft! now to my mother. O, heart, lose not thy nature; let not ever The soul of Nero enter this firm bosom: Let me be cruel, not unnatural; I will speak daggers to her, but use none.

[_Exit._]

SCENE II.--A ROOM IN THE SAME.

Enter KING, ROSENCRANTZ _and_ GUILDENSTERN (R.H.)

King. I like him not; nor stands it safe with us[107] To let his madness range. Therefore prepare you; I your commission will forthwith despatch, And he to England shall along with you: Arm you, I pray you, to this speedy voyage; For we will fetters put upon this fear,[108] Which now goes too free-booted.

Ros. } } We will haste us. _Guil._}

[_Cross behind the_ KING, _and exeunt_ ROSENCRANTZ _and_ GUILDENSTERN, L.H.]

Enter POLONIUS (R.H.)

Pol. My lord, he's going to his mother's closet: Behind the arras I'll convey myself,[109] To hear the process;[110] I'll warrant, she'll tax him home: And, as you said, and wisely was it said, 'Tis meet that some more audience than a mother, Since nature makes them partial, should o'erhear The speech of vantage.[111] Fare you well, my liege:

[POLONIUS _crosses to_ L.H.]

I'll call upon you ere you go to bed, And tell you what I know.

King. Thanks, dear my lord.

[_Exeunt_ POLONIUS, L.H., _and_ KING, R.H.]

SCENE III.--THE QUEEN'S CHAMBER.

Enter QUEEN _and_ POLONIUS (L.H.)

Pol. He will come straight. Look, you lay home to him:[112] Tell him his pranks have been too broad[113] to bear with, And that your grace hath screen'd and stood between Much heat and him. I'll sconce me even here.[114] Pray you, be round with him.

Queen. I'll warrant you; Fear me not:--withdraw, I hear him coming.

[POLONIUS _hides himself_, L.H.U.E.

Enter HAMLET (R.)

Ham. (R.C.) Now, mother, what's the matter?

Queen. (L.C.) Hamlet, thou hast thy father much offended.

Ham. Mother, you have my father much offended.

Queen. Come, come, you answer with an idle tongue.

Ham. Go, go, you question with a wicked tongue.

Queen. Why, how now, Hamlet!

Ham. What's the matter now?

Queen. Have you forgot me?

Ham. No, by the rood,[115] not so: You are the queen, your husband's brother's wife; And--would it were not so!--you are my mother.

Queen. Nay, then, I'll set those to you that can speak.

Ham. Come, come, and sit you down; you shall not budge; You go not till I set you up a glass Where you may see the inmost part of you.

Queen. What wilt thou do? thou wilt not murder me? Help, help, ho!

Pol.

(_Behind._)

What, ho! help!

Ham. How now! a rat?[116]

[_Draws._]

Dead, for a ducat, dead!

[HAMLET _rushes off behind the arras._]

Pol. (_Behind._) O, I am slain!

[_Falls and dies._]

Queen. O me, what hast thou done?

Ham.

(_Returning._)

Nay, I know not: Is it the king?

Queen. O, what a rash and bloody deed is this!

Ham. A bloody deed!--almost as bad, good mother, As kill a king, and marry with his brother.

Queen. As kill a king!

Ham. Ay, lady, 'twas my word.

[_Goes off behind the arras, and returns._]

Thou wretched, rash, intruding fool, farewell!

[_To the dead body of_ POLONIUS, _behind the arras_.]

I took thee for thy better. Leave wringing of your hands: Peace; sit you down,

[_To the_ QUEEN.]

And let me wring your heart: for so I shall, If it be made of penetrable stuff; If damnèd custom have not brazed it so,[117] That it be proof and bulwark against sense.[118]

Queen.

(_Sits_ R.C.)

What have I done, that thou dar'st wag thy tongue In noise so rude against me?

Ham.

(_Seated_ L.C.)

Such an act, That blurs the grace and blush of modesty; Calls virtue, hypocrite; takes off the rose From the fair forehead of an innocent love, And sets a blister there;[119] makes marriage vows As false as dicer's oaths: O, such a deed As from the body of contraction plucks The very soul;[120] and sweet religion makes A rhapsody of words.-- Ah, me, that act!

Queen. Ah me, what act?

Ham. Look here, upon this picture, and on this, The counterfeit presentment[121] of two brothers. See, what a grace was seated on this brow; Hypérion's curls;[122] the front of Jove himself; An eye like Mars, to threaten and command; A station like the herald Mercury[123] New-lighted on a heaven-kissing hill; A combination, and a form, indeed, Where every god did seem to set his seal, To give the world assurance of a man; This was your husband.--Look you now, what follows: Here is your husband; like a mildew'd ear, Blasting his wholesome brother.[124] Have you eyes? Could you on this fair mountain leave to feed, And batten on this moor?[125] Ha! have you eyes? You cannot call it love; for, at your age The hey-day in the blood[126] is tame, it's humble, And waits upon the judgment: And what judgment Would step from this to this? O shame! where is thy blush? Rebellious hell, If thou canst mutine,[127] in a matron's bones, To flaming youth let virtue be as wax, And melt in her own fire.

Queen. O, Hamlet, speak no more: Thou turn'st mine eyes into my very soul; And there I see such black and grainèd spots As will not leave their tinct.[128]

Ham. Nay, but to live In the rank sweat of an enseamed bed,----[129]

Queen. O, speak to me no more; No more, sweet Hamlet!

Ham. A murderer and a villain: A slave that is not twentieth part the tythe Of your precedent lord;--a vice of kings;[130] A cutpurse of the empire and the rule; That from a shelf the precious diadem stole, And put it in his pocket![131]

Queen. No more!

Ham. A king Of shreds and patches.[132]

[_Enter_ Ghost, R.]

Save me

[_Starts from his chair_],

and hover o'er me with your wings, You heavenly guards! What would your gracious figure?

Queen. Alas, he's mad!

[_Rising._]

Ham. (L.) Do you not come your tardy son to chide, That, laps'd in time and passion,[133] lets go by The important acting of your dread command? O, say!

Ghost. (R.) Do not forget: This visitation Is but to whet thy almost blunted purpose. But, look, amazement on thy mother sits: O, step between her and her fighting soul. Speak to her Hamlet.

Ham. How is it with you, lady?

Queen. Alas, how is't with you, That you do bend your eye on vacancy, And with the incorporal air do hold discourse? Forth at your eyes your spirits wildly peep. O gentle son,

[_Crosses to_ HAMLET.]

Upon the heat and flame of thy distemper Sprinkle cool patience.[134] Whereon do you look?

Ham. On him, on him!--Look you, how pale he glares! His form and cause conjoin'd, preaching to stones, Would make them capable.[135] Do not look upon me; Lest with this piteous action, you convert My stern effects:[136] then what I have to do Will want true colour; tears perchance, for blood.

Queen. To whom do you speak this?

Ham. Do you see nothing there?

Queen. Nothing at all; yet all that is, I see.[137]

Ham. Nor did you nothing hear?

Queen. No, nothing but ourselves.

Ham. Why, look you there! look, how it steals away!

[_Ghost crosses to_ L.]

My father in his habit as he lived![138] Look, where he goes, even now, out at the portal!

[_Exit_ Ghost, L.H. HAMLET _sinks into chair_ C. _The_ QUEEN _falls on her knees by his side._]

Queen. This is the very coinage of your brain: This bodiless creation ecstasy Is very cunning in.[139]

Ham. Ecstasy! My pulse, as yours, doth temperately keep time, And makes as healthful music: It is not madness That I have uttered: bring me to the test, And I the matter will re-word; which madness Would gambol from.[140] Mother, for love of grace,

Rising.]

Lay not that flattering unction to your soul, That not your trespass, but my madness speaks: It will but skin and film[141] the ulcerous place, Whiles rank corruption, mining all within, Infects unseen. Confess yourself to heaven; Repent what's past; avoid what is to come.

Queen. O, Hamlet! thou hast cleft my heart in twain.

Ham. O, throw away the worser part of it, And live the purer with the other half. Good night: but go not to my uncle's bed;

[_Raising the_ QUEEN.]

Assume a virtue, if you have it not. Once more, good night! And when you are desirous to be bless'd, I'll blessing beg of you.[142] For this same lord,

[_Pointing to_ POLONIUS.]

I do repent: I will bestow him, and will answer well The death I gave him. So, again, good night.

[_Exit_ QUEEN, R.H.]

I must be cruel, only to be kind: Thus bad begins, and worse remains behind.

[_Exit_ HAMLET _behind the arras_, L.H.U.E.

END OF ACT THIRD.

Notes

Act III

[Footnote III.1: _Forward_] Disposed, inclinable.]

[Footnote III.2: _Assay him to_] Try his disposition towards.]

[Footnote III.3: _O'er-raught on the way:_] Reached or overtook.]

[Footnote III.4 _Have closely sent_] _i.e._, privately sent.]

[Footnote III.5 _May here affront Ophelia:_] To affront is to come face to face--to confront.]

[Footnote III.6 _Lawful espials_,] Spies justifiably inquisitive. From the French, _espier_.]

[Footnote III.7 _Too much prov'd_,] Found by too frequent experience.]

[Footnote III.8 _To be, or not to be, that is the question:_] Hamlet is deliberating whether he should continue to live, or put an end to his existence.]

[Footnote III.9: _Or to take arms against a sea of troubles_,] _A sea of troubles_ among the Greeks grew into a proverbial usage; so that the expression figuratively means, the troubles of human life, which flow in upon us, and encompass us round like a sea.]

[Footnote III.10: _This mortal coil_,] Coil is here used in each of its senses, that of turmoil or bustle, and that which entwines or wraps round.]

[Footnote III.11: _Must give us pause:_] _i.e._, occasion for reflection.]

[Footnote III.12: _There's the respect That makes calamity of so long life_;] The _consideration_ that makes the evils of life so long submitted to, lived under.]

[Footnote III.13: _The whips and scorns of time_,] Those sufferings of body and mind, those stripes and mortifications to which, in its _course_, the life of man is subjected.]

[Footnote III.14: _Contumely_,] Contemptuousness, rudeness.]

[Footnote III.15: _His quietus make_] Quietus means the official discharge of an account: from the Latin. Particularly in the Exchequer accounts, where it is still current. Chiefly used by authors in metaphorical senses.]

[Footnote III.16: _A bare bodkin?_] Bodkin was an ancient term for a small dagger. In the margin of Stowe's Chronicle it is said that Cæsar was slain with _bodkins_.]

[Footnote III.17: _Who would fardels bear_,] Fardel is a burden. Fardellus, low Latin.]

[Footnote III.18: _From whose bourn_] _i.e._, boundary.]

[Footnote III.19: _No traveller returns_,] The traveller whom Hamlet had seen, though he appeared in the same habit which he had worn in his life-time, was nothing but a shadow, "invulnerable as the air," and, consequently, _incorporeal_. The Ghost has given us no account of the region from whence he came, being, as he himself informed us, "forbid to tell the secrets of his prison-house."--MALONE.]

[Footnote III.20: _Thus conscience does make cowards of us all_;] A state of doubt and uncertainty, a conscious feeling or apprehension, a misgiving "How our audit stands."]

[Footnote III.21: _Of great pith and moment_,] _i.e._, of great vigour and importance.]

[Footnote III.22:

With this regard, their currents turn away, _And lose the name of action._]

From this sole consideration have their drifts diverted, and lose the character and name of enterprise.]

[Footnote III.23: _Soft you now!_] A gentler pace! have done with lofty march!]

[Footnote III.24: _Nymph, in thy orisons_] _i.e._, in thy prayers. Orison is from _oraison_--French.]

[Footnote III.25: _If you be honest and fair, your honesty should admit no discourse to your beauty._] _i.e._, if you really possess these qualities, chastity and beauty, and mean to support the character of both, your honesty should be so chary of your beauty, as not to suffer a thing so fragile to entertain discourse, or to be parleyed with.

The lady interprets the words otherwise, giving them the turn best suited to her purpose.]

[Footnote III.26: _His likeness:_] Shakespeare and his contemporaries frequently use the personal for the neutral pronoun.]

[Footnote III.27: _Inoculate our old stock, but we shall relish of it:_] So change the original constitution and properties, as that no smack of them shall remain. "Inoculate our stock" are terms in gardening.]

[Footnote III.28: _With more offences at my beck_] That is, always ready to come about me--at my beck and call.]

[Footnote III.29: _Than I have thoughts to put them in, &c._] "To put a thing into thought," Johnson says, is "to think on it."]

[Footnote III.30: _I have heard of your paintings_,] These destructive aids of beauty seem, in the time of Shakespeare, to have been general objects of satire.]

[Footnote III.31: _Heaven hath given you one face, and you make yourselves another:_] _i.e._, Heaven hath given you one face, and you disfigure his image by making yourself another.]

[Footnote III.32: _You jig, you amble, and you lisp_,] This is an allusion to the manners of the age, which Shakespeare, in the spirit of his contemporaries, means here to satirise.]

[Footnote III.33: _Make your wantonness your ignorance._] You mistake by _wanton_ affectation, and pretend to mistake by _ignorance_.]

[Footnote III.34: _All but one shall live_;] _One_ is the king.]

[Footnote III.35: _To a nunnery, go. Exit Hamlet._] There is no doubt that Hamlet's attachment to Ophelia is ardent and sincere, but he treats her with apparent severity because he is aware that Ophelia has been purposely thrown in his way; that spies are about them; and that it is necessary for the preservation of his life, to assume a conduct which he thought would be attributed to madness only.]

[Footnote III.36: _The expectancy and rose of the fair state_,] The first hope and fairest flower. "The gracious mark o' the land."]

[Footnote III.37: _Glass of fashion_] Speculum consuetudinis.--CICERO.

[Footnote III.38: _The mould of form_,] The cast, in which is shaped the only perfect form.

[Footnote III.39: _Musick vows_,] Musical, mellifluous.

[Footnote III.40: _Be round with him_;] _i.e._, plain with him--without reserve.

[Footnote III.41: _If she find him not_,] Make him not out.

[Footnote III.42: _As lief_] As willingly.]

[Footnote III.43: _Thus_;] _i.e._, thrown out thus.]

[Footnote III.44: _Robustious perrywig-pated fellow_] This is a ridicule on the quantity of false hair worn in Shakespeare's time, for wigs were not in common use till the reign of Charles the Second. _Robustious_ means making an extravagant show of passion.]

[Footnote III.45: _The ears of the groundlings_,] The meaner people appear to have occupied the pit of the theatre (which had neither floor nor benches in Shakespeare's time), as they now sit in the upper gallery.]

[Footnote III.46: _O'er-doing Termagant_;] The Crusaders, and those who celebrated them, confounded Mahometans with Pagans, and supposed Mahomet, or Mahound, to be one of their deities, and Tervagant or Termagant, another. This imaginary personage was introduced into our old plays and moralities, and represented as of a most violent character, so that a ranting actor might always appear to advantage in it. The word is now used for a scolding woman.]

[Footnote III.47: _It out-herods Herod:_] In all the old moralities and mysteries this personage was always represented as a tyrant of a very violent temper, using the most exaggerated language. Hence the expression.]

[Footnote III.48: _The very age and body of the time its form and pressure._] _i.e._, to delineate exactly the manners of the age, and the particular humours of the day--_pressure_ signifying resemblance, as in a print.]

[Footnote III.49: _Come tardy off_,] Without spirit or animation; heavily, sleepily done.]

[Footnote III.50: _The censure of which one_] _i.e._, the censure of one of which.]

[Footnote III.51: _Your allowance_,] In your approbation.]

[Footnote III.52: _Not to speak it profanely_,] _i.e._, _irreverently_, in allusion to Hamlet's supposition that God had not made such men, but that they were only the handy work of God's assistants.]

[Footnote III.53: _Indifferently_] In a reasonable degree.]

[Footnote III.54: _Speak no more them is set down for them:_] Shakespeare alludes to a custom of his time, when the clown, or low comedian, as he would now be called, addressing the audience during the play, entered into a contest of raillery and sarcasm with such spectators as chose to engage with him.]

[Footnote III.55: _Barren spectators_] _i.e._, dull, unapprehensive spectators.]

[Footnote III.56: _Question_] Point, topic.]

[Footnote III.57: _Cop'd withal._] Encountered with.]

[Footnote III.58: _Pregnant hinges of the knee_,] _i.e._, bowed or bent: ready to kneel where _thrift_, that is, thriving, or emolument may follow sycophancy.]

[Footnote III.59: _Since my dear soul_] _Dear_ is out of which arises the liveliest interest.]

[Footnote III.60: _Whose blood and judgment_] Dr. Johnson says that according to the doctrine of the four humours, _desire_ and _confidence_ were seated in the blood, and judgment in the phlegm, and the due mixture of the humours made a perfect character.]

[Footnote III.61: _The very comment of thy soul_] The most intense direction of every faculty.]

[Footnote III.62: _Occulted guilt do not itself unkennel_] Stifled, secret guilt, do not develope itself.]

[Footnote III.63: _As Vulcan's stithy._] A stithy is the smith's shop, as stith is the anvil.]

[Footnote III.64: _In censure of his seeming._] In making our estimate of the appearance he shall put on.]

[Footnote III.65: _I have nothing with this answer; these words are not mine._] _i.e._, they grow not out of mine: have no relation to anything said by me.]

[Footnote III.66: _No, nor mine, now._] They are now anybody's. Dr. Johnson observes, "a man's words, says the proverb, are his own no longer than while he keeps them unspoken."]

[Footnote III.67: _You played once in the university, you say?_] The practice of acting Latin plays in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge is very ancient, and continued to near the middle of the last century.]

[Footnote III.68: _I did enact Julius Cæsar:_] A Latin play on the subject of Cassar's death, was performed at Christ-church, Oxford, in 1582.]

[Footnote III.69: _They stay upon your patience._] _Patience_ is here used for _leisure_.]

[Footnote III.70: _Lying down at Ophelia's feet._] To lie at the feet of a mistress during any dramatic representation, seems to have been a common act of gallantry.]

[Footnote III.71: _Jig-maker_,] Writer of ludicrous interludes. _A jig_ was not in Shakespeare's time only a dance, but a ludicrous dialogue in metre; many historical ballads were also called _jigs_.]

[Footnote III.72: _For I'll have a suit of sables._] Wherever his scene might be, the customs of his country were ever in Shakespeare's thoughts. A suit trimmed with sables was in our author's own time the richest dress worn by men in England. By the Statute of Apparel, 24 Henry VIII., c. 13, (_article furres_), it is ordained, that none under the degree of an _Earl_ may use _sables_.]

[Footnote III.73: _He must build churches, then._] Such benefactors to society were sure to be recorded by means of the feast day on which the patron saints and founders of churches were commemorated in every parish. This custom has long since ceased.]

[Footnote III.74: _Miching mallecho_;] To _mich_ is a provincial word, signifying _to lie hid_, or _to skulk_, or _act by stealth_. It was probably once generally used. Mallecho is supposed to be corrupted from the Spanish _Malechor_, which means a poisoner.]

[Footnote III.75: _The posy of a ring?_] Such poetry as you may find engraven on a ring.]

[Footnote III.76: _Phoebus' cart_] A chariot was anciently called a cart.]

[Footnote III.77: _Tellus' orbèd ground_,] _i.e._, the globe of the earth. Tellus is the personification of the earth, being described as the first being that sprung from Chaos.]

[Footnote III.78: _My operant powers their functions leave to do:_] _i.e._, my active energies cease to perform their offices.]

[Footnote III.79: _What we do determine, oft we break._] Unsettle our most fixed resolves.]

[Footnote III.80: _The argument?_] The subject matter.]

[Footnote III.81: _The mouse-trap._]

He calls it the mouse-trap, because it is the thing, In which he'll catch the conscience of the king.]

[Footnote III.82: _Tropically._] _i.e._, figuratively.]

[Footnote III.83: _The image of a murder_,] _i.e._, the lively portraiture, the correct and faithful representation of a murder, &c.]

[Footnote III.84: _Let the galled jade wince_,] A proverbial saying.]

[Footnote III.85: _Our withers are unwrung._] Withers is the joining of the shoulder bones at the bottom of the neck and mane of a horse. _Unwrung_ is _not pinched_.]

[Footnote III.86: _You are as good as a chorus_,] The persons who are supposed to behold what passes in the acts of a tragedy, and sing their sentiments between the acts.

The use to which Shakespeare converted the chorus, may be seen in King Henry V.]

[Footnote III.87: _I could interpret between you and your love, if I could see the puppets dallying._] This refers to the interpreter, who formerly sat on the stage at all _puppet shows_, and explained to the audience. _The puppets dallying_ are here made to signify to the agitations of Ophelia's bosom.]

[Footnote III.88:

The croaking raven _Doth bellow for revenge._]

_i.e._, begin without more delay; for the raven, foreknowing the deed, is already croaking, and, as it were, calling out for the revenge which will ensue.]

[Footnote III.89: _Midnight weeds_] The force of the epithet _midnight_, will be best displayed by a corresponding passage in Macbeth:

"Root of hemlock, _digg'd i' the dark_."]

[Footnote III.90: _Usurp_] Encroach upon.]

[Footnote III.91: _Let the strucken deer go weep_,] Shakespeare, in _As you like it_, in allusion to the wounded stag, speaks of the _big round tears_ which _cours'd one another down his innocent nose in piteous chase_. In the 13th song of Drayton's Polyolbion, is a similar passage--"_The harte weepeth at his dying; his tears are held to be precious in medicine._"]

[Footnote III.92: _Marvellous distempered._] _i.e._, discomposed.]

[Footnote III.93: _Admiration._] _i.e._, wonder.]

[Footnote III.94: _Trade with us?_] _i.e._ Occasion of intercourse.]

[Footnote III.95: _By these pickers and stealers._] _i.e._, by these hands. The phrase is taken from the Church catechism, where, in our duty to our neighbour, we are taught to keep our hands from _picking and stealing_.]

[Footnote III.96: _You do freely bar the door of your own liberty, if you deny your griefs to your friend._] By your own act you close the way against your own ease, and the free discharge of your griefs, if you open not the source of them to your friends.]

[Footnote III.97: _You have the voice of the king himself for your succession in Denmark?_] Though the crown was elective, yet regard was paid to the recommendation of the preceding prince, and preference given to royal blood, which, by degrees, produced hereditary succession.]

[Footnote III.98: _"While the grass grows,"--the proverb is something musty._] The proverb is, "_While the grass grows, the steed starves._" Hamlet alludes to his own position, while waiting for his succession to the throne of Denmark. A similar adage is, "_A slip between the cup and the lip._"]

[Footnote III.99: _Recorder._] _i.e._ A kind of flute, or pipe.]

[Footnote III.100: _Why do you go about to recover the wind of me_,] Equivalent to our more modern saying of _Get on the blind side._]

[Footnote III.101: _Into a toil?_] _i.e._, net or snare.]

[Footnote III.102: _If my duty be too bold, my love is too unmannerly._] If my sense of duty have led me too far, it is affection and regard for you that makes the carriage of that duty border on disrespect.]

[Footnote III.103: _Govern these ventages--and it will discourse most eloquent music._] Justly order these vents, or air-holes, and it will breathe or utter, &c.]

[Footnote III.104: _Though you can fret me, you cannot play upon me._] A _fret_ is a stop or key of a musical instrument. Here is, therefore, a play upon the words. Though you cannot fret, stop, or vex, you cannot play or impose upon me.]

[Footnote III.105: _They fool me to the top of my bent._] To the height; as far as they see me _incline_ to go: an allusion to the utmost flexure of a bow.]

[Footnote III.106: _Bitter business_] _i.e._, shocking, horrid business.]

[Footnote III.107: _Stands it safe with us_] Is it _consistent_ with our security.]

[Footnote III.108: _This fear_,] Bugbear.]

[Footnote III.109: _Behind the arras I'll convey myself_,] The arras-hangings, in Shakespeare's time, were hung at such a distance from the walls, that a person might easily stand behind them unperceived.]

[Footnote III.110: _To hear the process_;] The course of the conversation.]

[Footnote III.111: _The speech of vantage._] _i.e._, opportunity or advantage of secret observations.]

[Footnote III.112: _Lay home to him:_] Pointedly and closely charge him.]

[Footnote III.113: _Pranks too broad_] Open and bold.]

[Footnote III.114: _I'll 'sconce me even here._] 'Sconce and ensconce are constantly used figuratively for _hide._ In "The Merry Wives of Windsor," Falstaff says, "I will _ensconce_ me behind the arras."]

[Footnote III.115: _By the rood_,] _i.e._, the cross or crucifix.]

[Footnote III.116: _How now! a rat?_] This is an expression borrowed from the History of Hamblet.]

[Footnote III.117: _Have not braz'd it so_,] _i.e._, soldered with brass.]

[Footnote III.118: _Proof and bulwark against sense._] Against all feeling.]

[Footnote III.119: _Takes off the rose From the fair forehead of an innocent love, And sets a blister there_;] _i.e._, takes the clear tint from the brow of unspotted, untainted innocence. "True or honest as the skin between one's brows" was a proverbial expression, and is frequently used by Shakespeare.]

[Footnote III.120: _As from the body of contraction plucks The very soul_;] Annihilates the very principle of contracts. Contraction for marriage contract.]

[Footnote III.121: _The counterfeit presentment_] _i.e._, picture or mimic representation.]

[Footnote III.122: _Hypérion's curls_;] Hyperion is used by Spenser with the same error in quantity.]

[Footnote III.123: _A station like the herald Mercury_] Station is attitude--act of standing.]

[Footnote III.124:

Like a mildew'd ear, _Blasting his wholesome brother._]

This alludes to Pharaoh's dream, in the 41st chapter of Genesis.]

[Footnote III.125: _Batten on this moor?_] Batten is to feed rankly.]

[Footnote III.126: _Hey-day in the blood_] This expression is occasionally used by old authors.]

[Footnote III.127: _Thou canst mutine_] _i.e._, rebel.]

[Footnote III.128: _As will not leave their tinct._] So dyed _in grain_, that they will not relinquish or lose their tinct--are not to be discharged. In a sense not very dissimilar he presently says,

"Then what I have to do Will _want true colour_."]

[Footnote III.129: _An enseamed bed._] _i.e._, greasy bed of grossly fed indulgence.]

[Footnote III.130: _A vice of kings_;] _i.e._, a low mimick of kings. The vice was the fool of the old moralities or dramas, who was generally engaged in contests with the devil, by whom he was finally carried away. Dr. Johnson says the modern Punch is descended from the vice.]

[Footnote III.131:

From a shelf the precious diadem stole, _And put it in his pocket!_]

In allusion to the usurper procuring the crown as a common pilferer or thief, and not by open villainy that carried danger with it.]

[Footnote III.132: _A king of shreds and patches._] This is said, pursuing the idea of the _vice of kings_. The vice being dressed as a fool, in a coat of party-coloured patches.]

[Footnote III.133: _Laps'd in time and passion_,] That having suffered time to slip, and passion to cool, &c. It was supposed that nothing was more offensive to apparitions than the neglect to attach importance to their appearance, or to be inattentive to their admonitions.]

[Footnote III.134: _Cool patience._] _i.e._, moderation.]

[Footnote III.135: _Make them capable._] Make them intelligent--capable of conceiving.]

[Footnote III.136: _My stem effects:_] _i.e._, change the nature of my purposes, or what I mean to effect.]

[Footnote III.137: _Nothing at all; yet all that is, I see._] It is in perfect consistency with the belief that all spirits were not only naturally invisible, but that they possessed the power of making themselves visible to such persons only as they pleased.]

[Footnote III.138: _My father, in his habit as he lived!_] In the habit he was accustomed to wear when living.]

[Footnote III.139:

This bodiless creation ecstasy _Is very cunning in._]

_i.e._, "Such shadows are the weak brain's forgeries." Ecstasy in this place, as in many others, means a temporary alienation of mind--a fit.]

[Footnote III.140: _Gambol from._] Start away from.]

[Footnote III.141: _Skin and film_,] Cover with a thin skin.]

[Footnote III.142:

And when you are desirous to be bless'd, _I'll blessing beg of you_]

When you are desirous to receive a blessing from heaven (which you cannot, seriously, till you reform), I will beg to receive a blessing from you.]

ACT IV.

SCENE I.--A ROOM IN THE CASTLE.

Enter KING _and_ QUEEN, _from_ (R.H.) _centre._

King. There's matter in these sighs, these profound heaves: You must translate:[1] 'tis fit we understand them. How does Hamlet?

Queen. Mad as the sea and wind, when both contend Which is the mightier: In his lawless fit, Behind the arras hearing something stir, Whips out his rapier, cries _A rat, a rat!_ And, in this brainish apprehension,[2] kills The unseen good old man.

King. O heavy deed! It had been so with us, had we been there: Where is he gone?

Queen. To draw apart the body he hath kill'd.

King. The sun no sooner shall the mountains touch, But we will ship him hence: and this vile deed We must, with all our majesty and skill, Both countenance and excuse.--Ho, Guildenstern!

Enter ROSENCRANTZ _and_ GUILDENSTERN (L.H.)

Friends both, go join you with some further aid: Hamlet in madness hath Polonius slain, And from his mother's closet hath he dragg'd him: Go seek him out; speak fair, and bring the body Into the chapel.

[ROSENCRANTZ _and_ GUILDENSTERN _cross to_ R.]

I pray you, haste in this.

[_Exeunt_ ROSENCRANTZ _and_ GUILDENSTERN, R.H.]

Go, Gertrude, we'll call up our wisest friends; And let them know, both what we mean to do, And what's untimely done.

[_Exit_ QUEEN, R.C.]

How dangerous is it that this man goes loose! Yet must not we put the strong law on him: He's lov'd of the distracted multitude, Who like not in their judgment, but their eyes; And where 'tis so, the offender's scourge is weigh'd, But never the offence.[3]

Enter ROSENCRANTZ (R.)

How now! what hath befallen?

Ros. Where the dead body is bestowed, my lord, We cannot get from him.

King. But where is he?

Ros. Without, my lord; guarded, to know your pleasure.

King. Bring him before us.

Ros. Ho, Guildenstern! bring in my lord.

Enter HAMLET, GUILDENSTERN, _and_ Attendants (R.H.)

King. (C.) Now, Hamlet, where's Polonius?

Ham. (R.) At supper.

King. At supper? Where?

Ham. Not where he eats, but where he is eaten: a certain convocation of politick worms[4] are e'en at him.

King. Where's Polonius?

Ham. In Heaven; send thither to see: if your messenger find him not there, seek him i'the other place yourself. But, indeed, if you find him not within this month, you shall nose him as you go up the stairs into the lobby.

King. Go seek him there.

[_To_ GUILDENSTERN.]

Ham. He will stay till you come.

[_Exit_ GUILDENSTERN, R.H.]

King. Hamlet, this deed, for thine especial safety, Must send thee hence: Therefore prepare thyself; The bark is ready, and the wind at help,[5] For England.

Ham. For England!

King. Ay, Hamlet.

Ham. Good.

King. So is it, if thou knew'st our purposes.

Ham. I see a cherub that sees them. But, come; for England!--Farewell, dear mother.

King. Thy loving father, Hamlet.

Ham. My mother: Father and mother is man and wife; man and wife is one flesh; and so, my mother. Come, for England.

[_Exit_, R.H.]

King. Follow him at foot; tempt him with speed aboard; Away! for everything is seal'd and done.

[_Exeunt_ ROSENCRANTZ _and_ Attendants, R.H.]

And, England, if my love thou hold'st at aught, Thou may'st not coldly set[6] Our sovereign process;[7] which imports at full, By letters conjuring to that effect,[8] The present death of Hamlet. Do it, England; For thou must cure me: 'Till I know 'tis done, Howe'er my haps,[9] my joys will ne'er begin.

[_Exit_ KING, L.H.]

Enter QUEEN _and_ HORATIO (R. _centre._)

Queen. ----I will not speak with her.

Hor. She is importunate; indeed, distract: 'Twere good she were spoken with; for she may strew Dangerous conjectures in ill-breeding minds.

Queen. Let her come in.

[_Exit_ HORATIO, R.C.]

Re-enter HORATIO, _with_ OPHELIA (R. _centre._)

Oph. Where is the beauteous majesty of Denmark?

Queen. How now, Ophelia!

Oph. (C.)

[_Singing._]

How should I your true love know _From another one?_ _By his cockle hat and staff_, _And his sandal shoon._[10]

Queen. (L.C.) Alas, sweet lady, what imports this song?

Oph. Say you? nay, pray you, mark.

[_Sings._]

He is dead and gone, lady, _He is dead and gone_; _At his head a grass-green turf_, _At his heels a stone._

Enter the KING (L.H.)

Queen. Nay, but, Ophelia,----

Oph. Pray you, mark.

[_Sings._]

White his shroud as the mountain-snow, _Larded all with sweet flowers_;[11] _Which bewept to the grave did go_ _With true-love showers._

King. How do you, pretty lady?

Oph. Well, Heaven 'ield you![12]

(_Crosses to the_ KING.)

They say the owl was a baker's daughter.[13] We know what we are, but know not what we may be.

King. Conceit upon her father.[14]

Oph. Pray, you, let us have no words of this; but when they ask you what it means, say you this:

To-morrow is Saint Valentine's day, _All in the morning betime_, _And I, a maid at your window_, _To be your Valentine:_

King. Pretty Ophelia!

Oph. Indeed, without an oath, I'll make an end on't:

Then up he rose, and don'd his clothes, _And dupp'd[15] the chamber door_; _Let in the maid, that out a maid_ _Never departed more._

[_Crosses to_ R.H.]

King. (L.) How long hath she been thus?

Oph. (R.) I hope all will be well. We must be patient: but I cannot choose but weep, to think they should lay him i'the cold ground. My brother shall know of it; and so I thank you for your good counsel. Come, my coach! Good night, ladies; good night, sweet ladies; good night, good night.

[_Exit_, R.C.]

King. Follow her close; give her good watch, I pray you.

[_Exit_ HORATIO, _through centre_ R.]

O! this is the poison of deep grief; it springs All from her father's death. O, Gertrude, Gertrude, When sorrows come, they come not single spies, But in battalions!

Enter MARCELLUS (R. _centre._)

King. What is the matter?

Mar. Save yourself, my lord: The young Laertes, in a riotous head,[16] O'erbears your officers. The rabble call him lord; They cry, _Choose we: Laertes shall be king!_ Caps, hands, and tongues, applaud it to the clouds, _Laertes shall be king, Laertes king!_

[_Noise within_, R.C.]

Enter LAERTES, _armed_; Danes _following_ (R. _centre._)

Laer. Where is this king?--Sirs, stand you all without.

Dan. No, let's come in.

Laer. I pray you, give me leave.

Dan. We will, we will.

[_They retire without_, R.H.]

Laer. O, thou vile king, Give me my father.

Queen

(_Interposing._)

Calmly, good Laertes.

Laer. (R.) That drop of blood that's calm proclaims me bastard; Cries cuckold to my father; brands the harlot Even here, between the chaste unsmirched brow Of my true mother.[17]

King. (L.) What is the cause, Laertes, That thy rebellion looks so giant-like? Let him go, Gertrude; do not fear our person: There's such divinity doth hedge a king,[18] That treason can but peep to what it would, Acts little of his will. Let him go, Gertrude.

[QUEEN _obeys._]

Laer. Where is my father?

King. Dead.

Queen. But not by him.

King. Let him demand his fill.

Laer. How came he dead? I'll not be juggled with: To hell, allegiance! To this point I stand, That both the worlds I give to negligence,[19] Let come what comes; only I'll be reveng'd Most throughly for my father.

King. Who shall stay you!

Laer. My will, not all the world's:[20] And, for my means, I'll husband them so well, They shall go far with little.

King. Good Laertes, That I am guiltless of your father's death, And am most sensible in grief[21] for it, It shall as level to your judgment 'pear As day does to your eye.

Hor.

(_Without._)

Oh, poor Ophelia!

King. Let her come in.

Enter OPHELIA (R.C.), _fantastically dressed with Straws and Flowers._

Laer.

(_Goes up_ L.C.)

O rose of May! Dear maid, kind sister, sweet Ophelia! O heavens! is't possible, a young maid's wits Should be as mortal as an old man's life?

Oph. (R.C.)

They bore him barefac'd on the bier; _And on his grave rain many a tear,--_

Fare you well, my dove!

Laer.

(_Coming down_ R.)

Hadst thou thy wits, and didst persuade revenge, It could not move thus.

Oph. You must sing, _Down-a-down,[22] an you call him a-down-a._ O, how well the wheel becomes it![23] It is the false steward, that stole his master's daughter.

Laer. This nothing's more than matter.

Oph. There's rosemary, that's for remembrance;[24] pray you, love, remember: and there is pansies,[25] that's for thoughts.

Laer. A document in madness; thoughts and remembrance fitted.

Oph. There's fennel for you,

(_crosses to the_ KING _on_ L.H.)

and columbines:[26] there's rue for you;

(_turns to the_ QUEEN, _who is_ R.C.)

and here's some for me:--we may call it herb of grace o'Sundays:[27]--you may wear your rue with a difference.[28]--There's a daisy:[29]--I would give you some violets,[30] but they withered all when my father died:--They say he made a good end,----

For bonny sweet Robin is all my joy--[31]

Laer. (R.) Thought and affliction,[32] passion, hell itself, She turns to favour and to prettiness.

Oph.

And will he not come again? _And will he not come again?_ _No, no, he is dead_, _Gone to his death-bed_, _He never will come again._

His beard was white as snow, _All flaxen was his poll:_ _He is gone, he is gone_, _And we cast away moan:_ _Heaven 'a mercy on his soul!_

And of all christian souls, I pray Heaven. Heaven be wi' you.

[_Exit_ OPHELIA, R.C., QUEEN _following._]

Laer. Do you see this, O Heaven?

King. (L.C.) Laertes, I must commune with your grief,[33] Or you deny me right. Be you content to lend your patience to us, And we shall jointly labour with your soul To give it due content.

Laer. (R.C.) Let this be so; His means of death, his obscure funeral,-- No trophy, sword, nor hatchment o'er his bones,[34] No noble rite nor formal ostentation,-- Cry to be heard,[35] as 'twere from heaven to earth, That I must call't in question.

King. So you shall; And where the offence is let the great axe fall.[36] How now! what news?

Enter BERNARDO (R.H.C.)

Ber. (C.) Letters, my lord, from Hamlet: This to your majesty; this to the Queen.

King. From Hamlet! who brought them?

Ber. Sailors, my lord, they say; I saw them not.

King. Laertes, you shall hear them.-- Leave us.

[_Exit_, L.H.C.] [Reads.]

High and mighty, You shall know I am set naked on your kingdom.[37] To morrow shall I beg leave to see your kingly eyes: when I shall, first asking your pardon thereunto, recount the occasion of my sudden and more strange return. HAMLET.

What should this mean? Are all the rest come back? Or is it some abuse, and no such thing?

Laer. (R.) Know you the hand?

King. (L.) 'Tis Hamlet's character:[38] _Naked,--_

And in a postscript here, he says, _alone_. Can you advise me?

Laer. I am lost in it, my lord. But let him come; It warms the very sickness in my heart, That I shall live and tell him to his teeth, _Thus diddest thou_.

King. If it be so, Laertes, Will you be rul'd by me?

Laer. Ay, my lord; So you will not o'er-rule me to a peace.

King. To thine own peace. Some two months since, Here was a gentleman of Normandy, He made confession of[39] you; And gave you such a masterly report, For art and exercise in your defence,[40] And for your rapier most especially, That he cried out, 'twould be a sight indeed, If one could match you: this report of his Did Hamlet so envenom with his envy, That he could nothing do but wish and beg Your sudden coming o'er, to play with you. Now, out of this,----

Laer. What out of this, my lord?

King. Laertes, was your father dear to you? Or are you like the painting of a sorrow, A face without a heart?

Laer. Why ask you this?

King. Hamlet return'd shall know you are come home: We'll put on those shall praise your excellence, And set a double varnish on the fame The Frenchman gave you; bring you, in fine, together, And wager o'er your heads; he, being remiss,[41] Most generous, and free from all contriving, Will not peruse the foils:[42] so that, with ease, Or with a little shuffling, you may choose A sword unbated,[43] and, in a pass of practice,[44] Requite him for your father.

Laer. I will do't: And, for the purpose, I'll anoint my sword. I bought an unction of a mountebank, So mortal, that but dip a knife in it, Where it draws blood no cataplasm[45] so rare, Collected from all simples[46] that have virtue Under the moon, can save the thing from death That is but scratch'd withal: I'll touch my point With this contagion, that, if I gall him slightly, It may be death.

King. (L.) Let's further think of this; We'll make a solemn wager on your cunnings,[47] When in your motion[48] you are hot and dry, (As make your bouts more violent to that end,) And that he calls for drink, I'll have prepared him A chalice for the nonce;[49] whereon but sipping, If he by chance escape your venom'd stuck,[50] Our purpose may hold there. But stay, what noise?

Enter QUEEN (R.C.)

Queen. (C.) One woe doth tread upon another's heel, So fast they follow: Your sister's drown'd, Laertes.

Laer. (R.) Drown'd! O, where?

Queen. There is a willow grows aslant a brook, That shows his hoar leaves in the glassy stream; Therewith fantastick garlands did she make Of crow-flowers, nettles, daisies, and long purples;[51] There, on the pendent boughs her cornet weeds Clambering to hang, an envious sliver broke; When down her weedy trophies, and herself, Fell in the weeping brook.

Laer. I forbid my tears: But yet It is our trick:[52] nature her custom holds, Let shame say what it will: when these are gone, The woman will be out.[53] Adieu, my lord: I have a speech of fire, that fain would blaze, But that this folly drowns it.[54]

[_Exeunt._ C.]

END OF ACT FOURTH.

Notes

Act IV

[Footnote IV.1: _Translate:_] Interpret.]

[Footnote IV.2: _In this brainish apprehension_,] Distempered, brainsick mood.]

[Footnote IV.3: _Where the offender's scourge is weigh'd, But never the offence._] When an offender is popular, the people never consider what his crime was, but they scrutinise his punishment.]

[Footnote IV.4: _Politick worms_] _i.e._, artful, cunning worms.]

[Footnote IV.5: _The wind at help_,] _i.e._, ready.]

[Footnote IV.6: _May'st not coldly set_] Set is to value or estimate. "Thou may'st not _set little by it_, or _estimate it lightly_."]

[Footnote IV.7: _Our sovereign process:_] _i.e._, our royal design.]

[Footnote IV.8: _By letters conjuring to that effect_,] The verb to conjure, in the sense of to supplicate, was formerly accented on the first syllable.]

[Footnote IV.9: _Howe'er my haps_,] Chances of fortune.]

[Footnote IV.10: _His sandal shoon._] Shoon is the old plural of shoe. The verse is descriptive of a pilgrim. While this kind of devotion was in favour, love intrigues were carried on under that mask.]

[Footnote IV.11: _Larded with sweet flowers_;] _i.e._, Garnished with sweet flowers.]

[Footnote IV.12: _Heaven 'ield you._] Requite; yield you recompence.]

[Footnote IV.13: _The owl was a baker's daughter._] This is in reference to a story that was once prevalent among the common people of Gloucestershire.]

[Footnote IV.14: _Conceit upon her father._] Fancies respecting her father.]

[Footnote IV.15: _Don'd and dupp'd_] _To don_, is to _do on_, or _put on_, as _doff_ is to _do off_, or _put off_. To _dupp_ is to _do up_, or _lift up_ the latch.]

[Footnote IV.16: _In a riotous head_,] The tide, strongly flowing, is said to pour in with a great _head_.]

[Footnote IV.17: _The chaste unsmirched brow of my true mother._] _Unsmirched_ is unstained, not defiled.]

[Footnote IV.18: _Doth hedge a king_,] The word _hedge_ is used by the gravest writers upon the highest subjects.]

[Footnote IV.19: _Both the worlds I give to negligence_,] I am careless of my present and future prospects, my views in this life, as well as that which is to come.]

[Footnote IV.20: _My will, not all the world's:_] _i.e._, by my will as far as my will is concerned, not all the world shall stop me; and, as for my means, I'll husband them so well, they shall go far, though really little.]

[Footnote IV.21: _Sensible in grief_] Poignantly affected with.]

[Footnote IV.22: _You must sing Down-a-down_,] This was the burthen of an old song, well known in Shakespeare's time.]

[Footnote IV.23: _How well the wheel becomes it!_] This probably means that the song or charm is well adapted to those who are occupied at spinning at the wheel.]

[Footnote IV.24: _There's rosemary, that's for remembrance_;] Rosemary was anciently supposed to strengthen the memory, and was carried at funerals and wore at weddings. It was also considered the emblem of fidelity in lovers; and at weddings it was usual to dip the rosemary in the cup, and drink to the health of the new married couple.]

[Footnote IV.25: _There is pansies_,] _i.e._, a little flower called _heart's-ease_. Pansies in French signifies _thoughts_.]

[Footnote IV.26: _There's fennel for you, and columbines:_] Fennel was considered an emblem of flattery, and columbine was anciently supposed to be a _thankless flower_; signifying probably that the courtiers flattered to get favours, and were thankless after receiving them. Columbine was emblematical of forsaken lovers.]

[Footnote IV.27: _There's rue for you; and here's some for me:--we may call it herb of grace o' Sundays:_] Probably a quibble is meant here, as _rue_ anciently signified the same as _ruth_, _i.e._, sorrow. In the common dictionaries of Shakespeare's time, it was called _herb of grace_. Ophelia wishes to remind the Queen of the sorrow and contrition she ought to feel for her unlawful marriage; and that she may wear her rue with peculiar propriety on Sundays, when she solicits pardon for the crime which she has so much occasion to _rue_ and repent of.--MALONE.]

[Footnote IV.28: _You may wear your rue with a difference._] _i.e._, to distinguish it from that worn by Ophelia, herself: because her tears flowed from the loss of a father--those of the Queen ought to flow for her guilt.]

[Footnote IV.29: _There's a daisy:_] A daisy signified a warning to young women, not to trust the fair promises of their lovers.]

[Footnote IV.30: _I would give you some violets_,] Violets signified faithfulness.]

[Footnote IV.31: _For bonny sweet Robin is all my joy,--_] Part of an old song.]

[Footnote IV.32: _Thought and affliction_,] Thought here, as in many other places, means melancholy.]

[Footnote IV.33: _I must commune with your grief_,] _i.e._, confer, discuss, or argue with.]

[Footnote IV.34: _No trophy, sword, nor hatchment o'er his bones_,] Not only the sword, but the helmet, gauntlet, spurs, and tabard, (_i.e._, a coat whereon the armorial ensigns were anciently depicted, from whence the term _coat_ of armour), are hung over the grave of every knight.]

[Footnote IV.35: _Cry to be heard_,] All these multiplied incitements are things which cry, &c.]

[Footnote IV.36: _Let the great axe fall._] _i.e._, the axe that is to be laid to the root.]

[Footnote IV.37: _Naked on your kingdom_,] _i.e._, unprovided and defenceless.]

[Footnote IV.38: _'Tis Hamlet's character_,] Peculiar mode of shaping his letters.]

[Footnote IV.39: _Made confession of_] Acknowledged.]

[Footnote IV.40: _In your defence_,] _i.e._, "in your art and science of defence."]

[Footnote IV.41: _He, being remiss_,] _i.e._, unsuspicious, not cautious.]

[Footnote IV.42: _Peruse the foils_;] Closely inspect them.]

[Footnote IV.43: _A sword unbated_,] Not blunted, as foils are by a button fixed to the end.]

[Footnote IV.44: _In a pass of practice_,] This probably means some favourite pass, some trick of fencing, with which Hamlet was inexperienced, and by which Laertes may be sure of success.]

[Footnote IV.45: _No cataplasm_,] _i.e._, poultice--a healing application.]

[Footnote IV.46: _Collected from all simples_,] _i.e._, from all ingredients in medicine.]

[Footnote IV.47: _On your cunnings_,] _i.e._, on your dexterity.]

[Footnote IV.48: _In your motion_] Exercise, rapid evolutions.]

[Footnote IV.49: _For the nonce_;] _i.e._, present purpose or design.]

[Footnote IV.50: _Venom'd stuck_,] Thrust. Stuck was a term of the fencing school.]

[Footnote IV.51: _Long purples_,] One of the names for a species of orchis, a common English flower.]

[Footnote IV.52: _Our trick:_] Our course, or habit; a property that clings to, or makes a part of, us.]

[Footnote IV.53:

When these are gone, _The woman will be out._]

When these tears are shed, this womanish passion will be over.]

[Footnote IV.54: _But that this folly drowns it._] _i.e._, my rage had flamed, if this flood of tears had not extinguished it.]

ACT V.

SCENE I.--A CHURCH YARD.

Enter two Clowns,[1] _with spades, &c._ (L.H.U.E.)

1st Clo. (R.) Is she to be buried in christian burial that wilfully seeks her own salvation?

2nd Clo. (L.) I tell thee she is; therefore make her grave straight:[2] the crowner[3] hath set on her, and finds it christian burial.

1st Clo. How can that be, unless she drowned herself in her own defence?

2nd Clo. Why, 'tis found so.

1st Clo. It must be _se offendendo_;[4] it cannot be else. For here lies the point: If I drown myself wittingly, it argues an act: and an act hath three branches; it is, to act, to do, and to perform:[5] argal,[6] she drowned herself wittingly.

2nd Clo. Nay, but hear you, goodman delver.[7]

1st Clo. Give me leave. Here lies the water; good: here stands the man; good: If the man go to this water, and drown himself, it is, will he, nill he, he goes,[8] mark you that; but if the water come to him and drown him, he drowns not himself: argal, he that is not

guilty of his own death shortens not his own life.

2nd Clo. But is this law?

1st Clo. Ay, marry is't; crowner's-quest law.[9]

2nd Clo. Will you ha' the truth on't? If this had not been a gentlewoman, she should have been buried out of christian burial.

1st Clo. Why, there thou say'st:[10] And the more pity that great folks should have countenance in this world to drown or hang themselves, more than their even christian.[11] Come, my spade. There is no ancient gentlemen but gardeners, ditchers, and grave-makers: they hold up Adam's profession.

2nd Clo. Was he a gentleman?[12]

1st Clo. He was the first that ever bore arms. I'll put another question to thee: if thou answerest me not to the purpose, confess thyself----[13]

2nd Clo. Go to.

1st Clo. What is he that builds stronger than either the mason, the shipwright, or the carpenter?

2nd Clo. The gallows-maker; for that frame outlives a thousand tenants.

1st Clo. I like thy wit well, in good faith: the gallows does well; But how does it well? it does well to those that do ill: now, thou dost ill to say the gallows is built stronger than the church: argal, the gallows may do well to thee. To't again, come.

2nd Clo. Who builds stronger than a mason, a shipwright, or a carpenter?

1st Clo. Ay, tell me that, and unyoke.[14]

2nd Clo. Marry, now I can tell.

1st Clo. To't.

2nd Clo. Mass, I cannot tell.

1st Clo. Cudgel thy brains no more about it,[15] for your dull ass will not mend his pace with beating; and, when you are asked this question next, say, a grave-maker, the houses that he makes, last till doomsday. Go, get thee to Yaughan, and fetch me a stoup of liquor.[16]

[_Exit_ 2nd Clown, L.H.U.E.]

Enter HAMLET _and_ HORATIO (L.H.U.E.)

First Clown _digs and sings._

In youth, when I did love, did love,[17] _Methought, it was very sweet_, _To contract, O, the time, for, ah, my behove_ _O, methought, there was nothing meet._

Ham.

(_Behind the grave._)

Has this fellow no feeling of his business, he sings at grave-making?

Hor.

(_On_ HAMLET'S R.)

Custom hath made it in him a property of easiness.

Ham. 'Tis e'en so: the hand of little employment hath the daintier sense.[18]

1st Clo. _But age, with his stealing steps_, _Hath clawed me in his clutch_, _And hath shipped me into the land_, _As if I had never been such._

[_Throws up a skull._]

Ham. That skull had a tongue in it, and could sing once: How the knave jowls it to the ground, as if it were Cain's jaw-bone, that did the first murder! This might be the pate of a politician, which this ass now o'er-reaches; one that would circumvent Heaven, might it not?

Hor. It might, my lord.

[_Gravedigger throws up bones._]

Ham. Did these bones cost no more the breeding, but to play at loggats with them?[19] mine ache to think on't.

1st Clo.

[_Sings._]

A pick-axe and a spade, a spade, _For and a shrouding sheet:_[20] _O, a pit of clay for to be made_ _For such a guest is meet._

[_Throws up a skull._

Ham. There's another: Why may not that be the skull of a lawyer? Where be his quiddits now, his quillets,[21] his cases, his tenures, and his tricks? Why does he suffer this rude knave now to knock him about the sconce[22] with a dirty shovel, and will not tell him of his action of battery? I will speak to this fellow.--Whose grave's this, sirrah?

1st Clo. Mine, sir.--

[_Sings._]

O, a pit of clay for to be made _For such a guest is meet._

Ham. (R. _of grave._) I think it be thine, indeed; for thou liest in't.

1st Clo. You lie out on't, sir, and therefore it is not yours: for my part, I do not lie in't, yet it is mine.

Ham. Thou dost lie in't, to be in't, and say it is thine: 'tis for the dead, not for the quick; therefore thou liest.

1st. Clo. 'Tis a quick lie, sir; 'twill away again, from me to you.

Ham. What man dost thou dig it for?

1st Clo. For no man, sir.

Ham. What woman, then?

1st Clo. For none, neither.

Ham. Who is to be buried in't?

1st Clo. One that was a woman, sir; but, rest her soul, she's dead.

Ham. How absolute the knave is![23] we must speak by the card,[24] or equivocation will undo us,

[_To_ HORATIO, R.]

How long hast thou been a grave-maker?

1st Clo. Of all the days i'the year, I came to't that day that our last king Hamlet overcame Fortinbras.

Ham. How long's that since?

1st Clo. Cannot you tell that? every fool can tell that: It was the very day that young Hamlet was born,[25] he that is mad, and sent into England.

Ham. Ay, marry, why was he sent into England?

1st Clo. Why, because he was mad: he shall recover his wits there; or, if he do not, 'tis no great matter there.

Ham. Why?

1st Clo. 'Twill not be seen in him there; there the men are as mad as he.

Ham. How came he mad?

1st Clo. Very strangely, they say.

Ham. How strangely?

1st Clo. 'Faith, e'en with losing his wits.

Ham. Upon what ground?

1st Clo. Why, here in Denmark: I have been sexton here, man and boy, thirty years.

Ham. How long will a man lie i'the earth ere he rot?

1st Clo. 'Faith, if he be not rotten before he die, he will last you some eight year or nine year: a tanner will last you nine year.

Ham. Why he more than another?

1st Clo. Why, sir, his hide is so tanned with his trade, that he will keep out water a great while; and your water is a sore decayer of your ill-begotten dead body. Here's a skull now, hath lain in the earth three-and-twenty years.

Ham. Whose was it?

1st Clo. O, a mad fellow's it was: Whose do you think it was?

Ham. Nay, I know not.

1st Clo. A pestilence on him for a mad rogue! he poured a flagon of Rhenish on my head once. This same skull, sir, was Yorick's skull, the king's jester.

Ham. This?

[_Takes the skull._]

1st Clo. E'en that.

Ham. Alas, poor Yorick! I knew him, Horatio: a fellow of infinite jest, of most excellent fancy: he hath borne me on his back a thousand times. Here hung those lips that I have kissed I know not how oft; and now, how abhorred in my imagination it is! Where be your gibes now? your gambols? your songs? your flashes of merriment, that were wont to set the table on a roar? Not one now, to mock your own grinning? Quite chap-fallen? Now get you to my lady's chamber, and tell her, let her paint an inch thick, to this favour[26] she must come; make her laugh at that. Prithee, Horatio, tell me one thing.

Hor. What's that, my lord?

Ham. Dost thou think Alexander look'd o'this fashion i'the earth?

Hor. E'en so.

Ham. And smelt so? pah!

[_Gives the skull to HORATIO, who returns it to the grave-digger._]

Hor. E'en so, my lord.

Ham. To what base uses may we return, Horatio! Why may not imagination trace the noble dust of Alexander, till it find it stopping a bung-hole?

Hor. 'Twere to consider too curiously,[27] to consider so.

Ham. No, faith, not a jot; but to follow him thither with modesty enough, and likelihood to lead it: As thus; Alexander died, Alexander was buried, Alexander returneth to dust; the dust is earth; of earth we make loam; And why of that loam, whereto he was converted, might they not stop a beer barrel?

Imperial Cæsar,[28] dead and turn'd to clay, Might stop a hole to keep the wind away: O, that the earth, which kept the world in awe, Should patch a wall to expel the winter's flaw![29]

But soft! but soft! aside: Here comes the king, The queen, the courtiers: Who is this they follow? And with such maimèd rites?[30] This doth betoken The corse they follow did with desperate hand Fordo its own life:[31] 'Twas of some estate.[32] Couch we awhile, and mark.

[_Retiring with_ HORATIO, R.H.]

Enter Priests, &c., _in procession; the corpse of_ OPHELIA, LAERTES _and_ Mourners _following_; KING, QUEEN, _their_ Trains, _&c._

Laer.

(L. _of the grave._)

What ceremony else?

Ham. (R.) That is Laertes, A very noble youth.

1st Priest.

(R. _of the grave._)

Her obsequies have been as far enlarg'd As we have warranty: Her death was doubtful; And, but that great command o'ersways the order,[33] She should in ground unsanctified have lodged Till the last trumpet; for charitable prayers, Shards,[34] flints, and pebbles, should be thrown on her: Yet here she is allowed her virgin crants,[35] Her maiden strewments, and the bringing home Of bell and burial.[36]

Laer. Must there no more be done?

1st Priest. No more be done: We should profane the service of the dead To sing a _requiem_,[37] and such rest to her As to peace-parted souls.

Laer. O, from her fair and unpolluted flesh May violets spring! I tell thee, churlish priest,[38] A ministering angel shall my sister be, When thou liest howling.

Ham. What, the fair Ophelia!

Queen.

(_Behind the grave_, C. _with the_ KING.)

Sweets to the sweet: Farewell!

[_Scattering flowers._]

I hop'd thou shouldst have been my Hamlet's wife; I thought thy bride-bed to have deck'd, sweet maid, And not have strew'd thy grave.

Laer. O, treble woe Fall ten times treble on that cursed head, Whose wicked deed thy most ingenious sense[39] Depriv'd thee of!--Hold off the earth a while, Till I have caught her once more in mine arms:

[_Leaps into the grave._]

Now pile your dust upon the quick and dead, Till of this flat a mountain you have made, To o'ertop old Pelion,[40] or the skyish head Of blue Olympus.

Ham.

(_Advancing._)

What is he whose grief Bears such an emphasis?--whose phrase of sorrow Conjures the wand'ring stars, and makes them stand Like wonder-wounded hearers?--this is I, Hamlet the Dane.

Laer.

(L., _leaping from the grave._)

The devil take thy soul!

[_Grappling with him._]

Ham. (R.C.) Thou pray'st not well. I prithee, take thy fingers from my throat; For, though I am not splenetive and rash, Yet have I in me something dangerous, Which let thy wisdom fear: Hold off thy hand!

King. Pluck them asunder.

Queen. (C.) Hamlet, Hamlet!

Ham. (R.C.) Why, I will fight with him upon this theme Until my eyelids will no longer wag.

Queen. O my son, what theme?

Ham. I lov'd Ophelia: forty thousand brothers Could not, with all their quantity of love, Make up my sum.--What wilt thou do for her?

Queen. O, he is mad, Laertes.

Ham. Come, show me what thou'lt do: Wou'lt weep? wou'lt fight? wou'lt fast? wou'lt tear thyself? I'll do't.--Dost thou come here to whine? To outface me[41] with leaping in her grave? Be buried quick with her, and so will I: And, if thou prate of mountains, let them throw Millions of acres on us, till our ground,[42] Singeing his pate against the burning zone, Make Ossa[43] like a wart! Nay, an thou'lt mouth, I'll rant as well as thou.

Queen. This is mere madness: And thus a while the fit will work on him; Anon, as patient as the female dove, When that her golden couplets are disclos'd,[44] His silence will sit drooping.

Ham. Hear you, sir; What is the reason that you use me thus? I lov'd you ever: But it is no matter; Let Hercules himself do what he may, The cat will mew,[45] and dog will have his day.

[_Exit_, R.H.]

King. (C.) I pray thee, good Horatio, wait upon him.

[_Exit_ HORATIO, R.H.]

Good Gertrude, set some watch over your son,

[_Exit_ QUEEN, _attended_, R.H.]

Strengthen your patience in our last night's speech;[46]

[_To_ LAERTES.]

We'll put the matter to the present push.-- This grave shall have a living monument:[47] An hour of quiet shortly shall we see; Till then, in patience our proceeding be.

[_The characters group round the grave._]

SCENE II.--HALL IN THE CASTLE.

Enter HAMLET _and_ HORATIO (R.H.)

Ham. But I am very sorry, good Horatio, That to Laertes I forgot myself; For by the image of my cause,[48] I see The portraiture of his.

Hor. Peace! who comes here?

Enter OSRIC (L.H.)

Osr. Your lordship is right welcome back to Denmark.

Ham. (C.) I humbly thank you, sir.--Dost know this water-fly?[49]

Hor. (R.) No, my good lord.

Ham. Thy state is the more gracious; for 'tis a vice to know him.

Osr. (L.) Sweet lord, if your lordship were at leisure, I should impart a thing to you from his majesty.

Ham. I will receive it, sir, with all diligence of spirit.[50] Your bonnet to his right use; 'tis for the head.

Osr. I thank your lordship, 'tis very hot.

Ham. No, believe me, 'tis very cold; the wind is northerly.

Osr. It is indifferent cold, my lord, indeed.

Ham. But yet, methinks it is very sultry and hot,[51] for my complexion,--

Osr. Exceedingly, my lord; it is very sultry, as 'twere,--I cannot tell how.--But, my lord, his majesty bade me signify to you, that he has laid a great wager on your head: Sir, this is the matter,--

Ham. I beseech you, remember----

[HAMLET _moves him to put on his hat._]

Osr. Nay, good my lord; for mine ease, in good faith.[52] Sir, here is newly come to court Laertes; believe me, an absolute gentleman, full of most excellent differences, of very soft society and great showing:[53] Indeed, to speak feelingly of him,[54] he is the card or calendar of gentry,[55] for you shall find in him the continent of what part a gentleman would see.[56]

Ham. What imports the nomination of this gentleman?[57]

Osr. Of Laertes?

Ham. Of him, sir.

Osr. Sir, you are not ignorant of what excellence Laertes is--

Ham. I dare not confess that, lest I should compare with him in excellence; but, to know a man well, were to know himself.[58]

Osr. I mean, sir, for his weapon.

Ham. What is his weapon?

Osr. Rapier and dagger.

Ham. That's two of his weapons: but, well.

Osr. The king, sir, hath wagered with him six Barbary horses: against the which he has imponed,[59] as I take it, six French rapiers and poignards, with their assigns, as girdle, hangers,[60] or so: Three of the carriages, in faith, are very dear to fancy, very responsive to the hilts, most delicate carriages, and of very liberal conceit.[61]

Ham. What call you the carriages?

Osr. The carriages, sir, are the hangers.

Ham. The phrase would be more german[62] to the matter, if we could carry cannon by our sides.

Osr. The king, sir, hath laid, that in a dozen passes between yourself and him, he shall not exceed you three hits; and it would come to immediate trial, if your lordship would vouchsafe the answer.[63]

Ham. How if I answer no?[64]

Osr. I mean, my lord, the opposition of your person in trial.

Ham. Sir, it is the breathing time of day with me; let the foils be brought, the gentleman willing, and the king hold his purpose, I will win for him if I can; if not, I will gain nothing but my shame and the odd hits.

Osr. Shall I deliver you so?

Ham. To this effect, sir; after what flourish your nature will.

Osr. I commend my duty to your lordship. [_Exit_, L.H.]

Hor. (R.) You will lose this wager, my lord.

Ham. (C.) I do not think so; since he went into France, I have been in continual practice; I shall win at the odds.[65] But thou wouldst not think how ill all's here about my heart: but it is no matter.

Hor. Nay, good my lord.

Ham. It is but foolery; but it is such a kind of gain-giving,[66] as would, perhaps, trouble a woman.

Hor. If your mind dislike any thing, obey it:[67] I will forestall their repair hither, and say, you are not fit.

Ham. Not a whit, we defy augury: there is a special providence in the fall of a sparrow.

[_Exeunt_, L.H.]

SCENE III.--ROOM IN THE CASTLE.

KING _and_ QUEEN, _on a dais_, LAERTES (R.), LORDS (R.), LADIES (L.), OSRIC (R.) _and_ Attendants, _with Foils, &c., discovered_ (R.H.); _Tables_ (R. _and_ L.)-- _Flourish of Trumpets._

Enter HAMLET _and_ HORATIO (L.H.)

King. Come, Hamlet, come, and take this hand from me.

Ham. (_offering his hand to_ LAERTES) Give me your pardon, sir: I have done you wrong; But pardon it, as you are a gentleman. Let my disclaiming from a purpos'd evil Free me so far in your most generous thoughts, That I have shot my arrow o'er the house, And hurt my brother.

Laer. (R.) I am satisfied in nature, Whose motive, in this case, should stir me most To my revenge. I do receive your offer'd love like love, And will not wrong it.

Ham. I embrace it freely: And will this brother's wager frankly play. Give us the foils.

Laer. Come, one for me.

Ham. I'll be your foil, Laertes: in mine ignorance Your skill shall, like a star i'the darkest night, Stick fiery off indeed.[68]

Laer. You mock me, sir.

Ham. No, by this hand.

King. Give them the foils, young Osric. Cousin Hamlet, You know the wager?

Ham. Very well, my lord; Your grace hath laid the odds o'the weaker side.

King. I do not fear it; I have seen you both: But since he's better'd,[69] we have therefore odds.

Laer. This is too heavy, let me see another.

Ham. This likes me well. These foils have all a length?

Osr. Ay, my good lord.

King. Set me the stoups of wine[70] upon that table.--

[Pages _exeunt_ R. _and_ L.]

If Hamlet give the first or second hit, Or quit[71] in answer to the third exchange, Let all the battlements their ordnance fire; The king shall drink to Hamlet's better breath; And in the cup an union shall he throw,[72] Richer than that which four successive kings In Denmark's crown have worn.

[Pages _return with wine._]

Give me the cup; And let the kettle[73] to the trumpet speak, The trumpet to the cannoneer without, The cannons to the heavens, the heaven to earth, _Now the king drinks to Hamlet._--Come, begin; And you, the judges, bear a wary eye.

Ham. Come on, sir.

Laer. Come, my lord.

[_They play._]

Ham. One.

Laer. No.

Ham. Judgment.

Osr. A hit, a very palpable hit.

Laer. Well:--again.

King. Stay; give me drink. Hamlet, this pearl is thine;

[_Drops poison into the goblet._]

Here's to thy health.

[_Pretends to drink._] [_Trumpets sound; and cannon shot off within._]

Give him the cup.

Ham. I'll play this bout first; set it by awhile.

[Page _places the goblet on table_, L.]

Come. Another hit; What say you?

[_They play._]

Laer. A touch, a touch, I do confess.

King. Our son shall win.

Queen. The Queen carouses to thy fortune, Hamlet.[74]

Ham. Good madam!----

[_Trumpets sound._]

King. Gertrude, do not drink.

Queen. I have, my lord; I pray you, pardon me.

King. It is the poison'd cup; it is too late.

[_Aside._]

Laer. I'll hit him now And yet it is almost against my conscience.

[_Aside._]

Ham. Come, for the third, Laertes: You do but dally; I pray you, pass with your best violence; I am afeard you make a wanton of me.[75]

Laer. Say you so? come on.

[_They play._]

[LAERTES _wounds_ HAMLET; _then, in scuffling they change Rapiers, and_ HAMLET _wounds_ LAERTES.]

King. Part them; they are incensed.

Ham. Nay, come, again.

[_The_ QUEEN _falls back in her chair._]

Osr.

(_Supporting_ LAERTES, R.)

Look to the queen there, ho!

Hor.

(_Supporting_ HAMLET, L.)

How is it, my lord?

Osr. How is't, Laertes?

Laer. Why, as a woodcock to my own springe,[76] Osric; I am justly killed with mine own treachery.

Ham. How does the queen?

King. She swoons to see them bleed.

Queen. No, no, the drink, the drink,--O, my dear Hamlet,-- The drink, the drink! I am poison'd.

[_The_ QUEEN _is conveyed off the stage by her attendant_ Ladies, _in a dying state_, L.H.U.E.]

Ham. O villainy! Ho! let the doors be lock'd: Treachery! seek it out.

[LAERTES _falls._]

Laer. (R.) It is here, Hamlet: Hamlet, thou art slain; No medicine in the world can do thee good, In thee there is not half an hour's life; The treacherous instrument is in thy hand, Unbated and envenom'd:[77] the foul practice[78] Hath turn'd itself on me; lo, here I lie, Never to rise again: Thy mother's poison'd: I can no more: the king, the king's to blame.

Ham. The point Envenom'd too! Then, venom, to thy work. Here, thou incestuous, murd'rous, damnèd Dane, Follow my mother.

[_Stabs the_ KING, _who is borne away by his attendants, mortally wounded_, R.H.U.E.]

Laer. He is justly serv'd; Exchange forgiveness with me, noble Hamlet: Mine and my father's death come not upon thee, Nor thine on me!

[_Dies._]

Ham. (C.) Heaven make thee free of it! I follow thee. You that look pale and tremble at this chance, That are but mutes or audience to this act, Had I but time (as this fell sergeant, death,[79] Is strict in his arrest), O, I could tell you,-- But let it be. Horatio, Report me and my cause aright To the unsatisfied.

Hor. (L.) Never believe it: I am more an antique Roman than a Dane: Here's yet some liquor left.

[_Seizing the goblet on table_, L.]

Ham. As thou'rt a man,-- Give me the cup: let go; by heaven, I'll have it.

[_Dashes the goblet away._]

O good Horatio, what a wounded name, Things standing thus unknown, shall live behind me![80] If thou didst ever hold me in thy heart, Absènt thee from felicity awhile, And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain, To tell my story.-- O, I die, Horatio; The potent poison quite o'er-crows my spirit;[81] The rest is silence.

[_Dies_, C., OSRIC _on his_ R., _and_ HORATIO _on his_ L.]

Dead March afar off.

Curtain slowly descends.

THE END.

Notes

Act V

[Footnote V.1: _Enter two Clowns_,] These characters are not in the original story, but are introduced by Shakespeare.]

[Footnote V.2: _Make her grave straight:_] _i.e._, straightways, forthwith.]

[Footnote V.3: _The crowner_] A corruption of coroner.]

[Footnote V.4: _It must be se offendendo_;] A confusion of things as well as of terms: used for _se defendendo_, a finding of the jury in justifiable homicide.]

[Footnote V.5: _To act, to do, and to perform:_] Warburton says, this is ridicule on scholastic divisions without distinction, and of distinctions without difference.]

[Footnote V.6: _Argal_,] A corruption of the Latin word, _ergo, therefore_.]

[Footnote V.7: _Delver._] _i.e._, a digger, one that opens the ground with a spade.]

[Footnote V.8: _If the man go to this water,--it is, will he, nill he, he goes_,] Still floundering and confounding himself. He means to represent it as a _wilful_ act, and of course without any mixture of _nill_ or nolens in] it. Had he gone, as stated, whether he _would or not_, it would not have been of his own accord, or his act.]

[Footnote V.9: _Crowner's-quest law._] Crowner's-quest is a vulgar corruption of coroner's inquest.]

[Footnote V.10: _Why, there thou say'st_] Say'st something, speak'st to the purpose.]

[Footnote V.11: _More than their even christian._] An old English expression for fellow-christian.]

[Footnote V.12: _Was he a gentleman?_] Mr. Douce says this is intended as a ridicule upon heraldry.]

[Footnote V.13: _Confess thyself----_] Admit, or by acknowledgment pass sentence upon thyself, as a simpleton? "Confess, and be hanged," was a proverbial sentence.]

[Footnote V.14: _Tell me that, and unyoke._] Unravel this, and your day's work is done, your team may then unharness.]

[Footnote V.15: _Cudgel thy brains no more about it_;] _i.e._, beat about thy brains no more.]

[Footnote V.16: _A stoup of liquor._] A stoup is a jug.]

[Footnote V.17: _In youth, when I did love, did love._] The three stanzas sung here by the Grave-Digger, are extracted, with a slight variation, from a little poem called _The Aged Lover renounceth Love_, written by Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, who was beheaded in 1547. The song is to be found in Dr. Percy's _Reliques of Ancient English Poetry_.]

[Footnote V.18: _The hand of little employment hath the daintier sense._] _i.e._, its "palm less dulled or staled."]

[Footnote V.19: _But to play at loggats with them?_] A _loggat_ is a small _log_, or piece of wood; a diminutive from _log_. Hence _loggats_, as the name of an old game among the common people, and one of those forbidden by a statute of the 33rd of Henry VIII. A stake was fixed into the ground, and those who played threw _loggats_ at it.]

[Footnote V.20: _For and a shrouding sheet:_] For and is an ancient expression, answering to _and eke, and likewise_.]

[Footnote V.21: _Where be his quiddits now, his quillets_,] Quiddits are subtilties; quillets are nice and frivolous distinctions.]

[Footnote V.22: _Knock him about the sconce_] _i.e._, head.]

[Footnote V.23: _How absolute the knave is!_] Peremptory, strictly and tyrannously precise.]

[Footnote V.24: _We must speak by the card_,] The _card_ is the mariner's compass. Properly the paper on which the points of the wind are marked. Hence, _to speak by the card_, meant to speak with great exactness; true to a point.]

[Footnote V.25: _The very day that young Hamlet was born_,] It would appear by this that Hamlet was thirty years old, and knew Yorick well, who had been dead twenty-two years.]

[Footnote V.26: _Favour_] Feature, countenance, or complexion.]

[Footnote V.27: _'Twere to consider too curiously_,] Be pressing the argument with too much critical nicety, to dwell upon mere possibilities.]

[Footnote V.28: _Imperial Cæsar_,] In some edition it is _imperious_ Cæsar. Imperious was a more ancient term, signifying the same as imperial.]

[Footnote V.29: _The winter's flaw!_] _i.e._, winter's blast.]

[Footnote V.30: _Maimèd rites?_] Curtailed, imperfect.]

[Footnote V.31: _Fordo its own life:_] Destroy.]

[Footnote V.32: _'Twas of some estate._] _i.e._, of rank or station.]

[Footnote V.33: _Command o'ersways the order_,] The course which ecclesiastical rules prescribe.]

[Footnote V.34: _Shards_,] _i.e._, broken pots or tiles.]

[Footnote V.35: _Virgin crants_,] _i.e._, virgin garlands. Nares, in his Glossary, says that _crants_ is a German word, and probably Icelandic.]

[Footnote V.36: _Bringing home of bell and burial_,] Conveying to her last home with these accustomed forms of the church, and this sepulture in consecrated ground.]

[Footnote V.37: _A requiem_,] A mass performed in Popish churches for the rest of the soul of a person deceased.]

[Footnote V.38: _Churlish priest_,] Churlish is, figuratively, ill-humoured, ill-bred, uncourtly, "rustic and rude."]

[Footnote V.39: _Ingenious sense_] Life and sense.]

[Footnote V.40: _To o'ertop old Pelion_,] Pelion is one of a lofty range of mountains in Thessaly. The giants, in their war with the gods, are said to have attempted to heap Ossa and Olympus on Pelion, in order to scale Heaven.]

[Footnote V.41: _Outface me_] _i.e._, brave me.]

[Footnote V.42: _Our ground_,] The earth about us.]

[Footnote V.43: _Ossa_] A celebrated mountain in Thessaly, connected with Pelion, and in the neighbourhood of Mount Olympus.]

[Footnote V.44: _Her golden couplets are disclos'd_,] To disclose, was anciently used for to _hatch_. A pigeon never lays more than two eggs.]

[Footnote V.45: _The cat will mew, and dog, &c._] "Things have their appointed course; nor have we power to divert it," may be the sense here conveyed.]

[Footnote V.46: _Strengthen your patience in our last night's speech_;] Let the consideration of the topics then urged, confirm your resolution taken of quietly waiting events a little longer.]

[Footnote V.47: _This grave shall have a living monument:_] There is an ambiguity in this phrase. It either means an _endurable_ monument such as will outlive time, or it darkly hints at the impending fate of Hamlet.]

[Footnote V.48: _Image of my cause_,] Representation or character.]

[Footnote V.49: _Dost know this water-fly?_] Dr. Johnson remarks that a _water-fly_ skips up and down upon the surface of the water, without any apparent purpose or reason, and is thence the proper emblem of a busy trifler.]

[Footnote V.50: _All diligence of spirit._] "With the whole bent of my mind." A happy phraseology; in ridicule, at the same time that it was in conformity with the style of the airy, affected insect that was playing round him.]

[Footnote V.51: _Very sultry and hot_,] Hamlet is here playing over the same farce with Osric which he had formerly done with Polonius. The idea of this scene is evidently suggested by Juvenal.]

[Footnote V.52: _For mine ease, in good faith._] From contemporary authors this appears to have been the ordinary language of courtesy in our author's own time.]

[Footnote V.53: _An absolute--a great showing:_] A finished gentleman, full of various accomplishments, of gentle manners, and very imposing appearance.]

[Footnote V.54: _To speak feelingly of him_,] With insight and intelligence.

[Footnote V.55: _Card or calendar of gentry_,] The card by which a gentleman is to direct his course; the calendar by which he is to choose his time, that what he does may be both excellent and seasonable.]

[Footnote V.56: _The continent of what part a gentleman would see._] The word continent in this sense is frequently used by Shakespeare; _i.e._, you shall find him _containing_ and _comprising_ every quality which a _gentleman_ would desire to _contemplate_ for imitation.]

[Footnote V.57: _What imports the nomination, &c._] What is the object of the introduction of this gentleman's name?]

[Footnote V.58: _I dare not--lest I should compare--were to know himself._] No one can have a perfect conception of the measure of another's excellence, unless he shall himself come up to that standard. Dr. Johnson says, I dare not pretend to know him, lest I should pretend to an equality: no man can completely know another, but by knowing himself, which is the utmost extent of human wisdom.]

[Footnote V.59: _He has imponed_,] _i.e._, to lay down as a stake or wager. Impono.]

[Footnote V.60: _Hangers_,] That part of the girdle or belt by which the swords were suspended was, in our poet's time, called the _hangers_.]

[Footnote V.61: _Very dear to fancy--very liberal conceit._] Of exquisite invention, well adapted to their hilts, and in their conception rich and high fashioned.]

[Footnote V.62: _More german_] More a-kin.]

[Footnote V.63: _Vouchsafe the answer._] Condescend to answer, or meet his wishes.]

[Footnote V.64: _How if I answer, no?_] Reply.]

[Footnote V.65: _I shall win at the odds._] I shall succeed with the advantage that I am allowed.]

[Footnote V.66: _Gain-giving_,] Misgiving.]

[Footnote V.67: _If your mind, &c._] If you have any presentiment of evil, yield to its suggestion.]

[Footnote V.68: _Like a star i'the darkest night, stick fiery off_] Be made by the strongest relief to stand brightly prominent.]

[Footnote V.69: _Better'd_,] He stands higher in estimation.]

[Footnote V.70: _Stoups of wine_] Flagons of wine.]

[Footnote V.71: _Quit in answer_] Make the wager _quit_, or so far drawn.]

[Footnote V.72: _An union shall he throw_,] _i.e._, a fine pearl. To swallow a pearl in a draught seems to have been equally common to royal and mercantile prodigality. It may be observed that pearls were supposed to possess an exhilarating quality. It was generally thrown into the drink as a compliment to some distinguished guest, and the King in this scene, under the pretence of throwing a pearl into the cup, drops some poisonous drug into the wine.]

[Footnote V.73: _Kettle_] _i.e._, kettle drum.]

[Footnote V.74: _The Queen carouses to thy fortune, Hamlet._] _i.e._, drinks to your success.]

[Footnote V.75: _You make a wanton of me._] _i.e._, you trifle with me as if you were playing with a child.]

[Footnote V.76: _As a woodcock to my own springe._] I have run into a springe like a woodcock, and into such a noose or trap as a fool only would have fallen into; one of my own setting.]

[Footnote V.77: _Unbated, and envenom'd:_] _i.e._, having a sharp point envenomed with poison.]

[Footnote V.78: _The foul practice_] _i.e._, the wicked trick which I have practised.]

[Footnote V.79: _Fell sergeant, death_,] _i.e._, cruel sergeant--sergeant being an officer of the law.]

[Footnote V.80: _Live behind me!_] Survive me.]

[Footnote V.81: _Quite o'ercrows my spirit_;] Overpowers, exults over; no doubt an image taken from the lofty carriage of a victorious cock.]

==========

The Intermediate Sex: A Study of Some Transitional Types of Men and Women

Edward Carpenter

Project Gutenberg Release: December 18, 2016 · eBook #53763

The Intermediate Sex

Works by Edward Carpenter

ANGELS' WINGS ART OF CREATION CIVILIZATION: ITS CAUSE AND CURE DAYS WITH WALT WHITMAN DRAMA OF LOVE AND DEATH ENGLAND'S IDEAL FROM ADAM'S PEAK TO ELEPHANTA HEALING OF NATIONS INTERMEDIATE TYPES AMONG PRIMITIVE FOLK IOLÄUS: AN ANTHOLOGY OF FRIENDSHIP LOVE'S COMING OF AGE MY DAYS AND DREAMS PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN CREEDS PROMISED LAND TOWARDS DEMOCRACY TOWARDS INDUSTRIAL FREEDOM VISIT TO A GÑANI CHANTS OF LABOUR

The Intermediate Sex

A Study of Some Transitional Types of Men and Women

BY

EDWARD CARPENTER

[Illustration]

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD. RUSKIN HOUSE, 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1

First published _1908_ _Reprinted_ _1909_ " _1912_ " _1916_ " _1918_ " _1921_

[_All rights reserved._]

"_There are transitional forms between the metals and non-metals; between chemical combinations and simple mixtures, between animals and plants, between phanerogams and cryptogams, and between mammals and birds.… The improbability may henceforth be taken for granted of finding in Nature a sharp cleavage between all that is masculine on the one side and all that is feminine on the other; or that any living being is so simple in this respect that it can be put wholly on one side, or wholly on the other, of the line._"

O. WEININGER.

Prefatory Note

TO FIRST EDITION

The following papers, now collected in book-form, have been written--and some of them published--on various occasions during the last twelve or fourteen years, and in the intervals of other work; and this must be my excuse for occasional repetitions or overlapping of matter, which may be observable among them. I have thought it best, however, to leave them as they stand, as in this way each is more complete in itself. The second essay, which gives its title to the book, has already appeared in my "Love's Coming-of-Age" (edition 1906), but is reprinted here as belonging more properly to this volume.

A collection of quotations from responsible writers, who touch on various sides of the subject, is added at the end, to form an Appendix--which the author thinks will prove helpful, though he does not necessarily endorse all the opinions presented.

E. C.

Contents

Page

PREFATORY NOTE 7

I. INTRODUCTORY 9

II. THE INTERMEDIATE SEX 16

III. THE HOMOGENIC ATTACHMENT 39

IV. AFFECTION IN EDUCATION 83

V. THE PLACE OF THE URANIAN IN SOCIETY 107

APPENDIX 131

I

Introductory

The subject dealt with in this book is one of great, and one may say growing, importance. Whether it is that the present period is one of large increase in the numbers of men and women of an intermediate or mixed temperament, or whether it merely is that it is a period in which more than usual attention happens to be accorded to them, the fact certainly remains that the subject has great actuality and is pressing upon us from all sides. It is recognised that anyhow the number of persons occupying an intermediate position between the two sexes is very great, that they play a considerable part in general society, and that they necessarily present and embody many problems which, both for their own sakes and that of society, demand solution. The literature of the question has in consequence already grown to be very extensive, especially on the Continent, and includes a great quantity of scientific works, medical treatises, literary essays, romances, historical novels, poetry, etc. And it is now generally admitted that some knowledge and enlightened understanding of the subject is greatly needed for the use of certain classes--as, for instance, medical men, teachers, parents, magistrates, judges, and the like.

That there are distinctions and gradations of Soul-material in relation to Sex--that the inner psychical affections and affinities shade off and graduate, in a vast number of instances, most subtly from male to female, and not always in obvious correspondence with the outer bodily sex--is a thing evident enough to anyone who considers the subject; nor could any good purpose well be served by ignoring this fact--even if it were possible to do so. It is easy of course (as some do) to classify all these mixed or intermediate types as _bad_. It is also easy (as some do) to argue that just because they combine opposite qualities they are likely to be _good_ and valuable. But the subtleties and complexities of Nature cannot be despatched in this off-hand manner. The great probability is that, as in any other class of human beings, there will be among these too, good and bad, high and low, worthy and unworthy--some perhaps exhibiting through their double temperament a rare and beautiful flower of humanity, others a perverse and tangled ruin.

Before the facts of Nature we have to preserve a certain humility and reverence; nor rush in with our preconceived and obstinate assumptions. Though these gradations of human type have always, and among all peoples, been more or less known and recognised, yet their frequency to-day, or even the concentration of attention on them, may be the indication of some important change actually in progress. We do _not_ know, in fact, what possible evolutions are to come, or what new forms, of permanent place and value, are being already slowly differentiated from the surrounding mass of humanity. It may be that, as at some past period of evolution the worker-bee was without doubt differentiated from the two ordinary bee-sexes, so at the present time certain new types of human kind may be emerging, which will have an important part to play in the societies of the future--even though for the moment their appearance is attended by a good deal of confusion and misapprehension. It may be so; or it may not. We do not know; and the best attitude we can adopt is one of sincere and dispassionate observation of facts.

Of course wherever this subject touches on the domain of love we may expect difficult queries to arise. Yet it is here probably that the noblest work of the intermediate sex or sexes will be accomplished, as well as the greatest errors committed. It seems almost a law of Nature that new and important movements should be misunderstood and vilified--even though afterwards they may be widely approved or admitted to honour. Such movements are always envisaged first from whatever aspect they may possibly present, of ludicrous or contemptible. The early Christians, in the eyes of Romans, were chiefly known as the perpetrators of

obscure rites and crimes in the darkness of the catacombs. Modern Socialism was for a long time supposed to be an affair of daggers and dynamite; and even now there are thousands of good people ignorant enough to believe that it simply means “divide up all round, and each take his threepenny bit.” Vegetarians were supposed to be a feeble and brainless set of cabbage-eaters. The Women’s movement, so vast in its scope and importance, was nothing but an absurd attempt to make women “the apes of men.” And so on without end; the accusation in each case being some tag or last fag-end of fact, caught up by ignorance, and coloured by prejudice. So commonplace is it to misunderstand, so easy to misrepresent.

That the Uranian temperament, especially in regard to its affectional side, is not without faults must naturally be allowed; but that it has been grossly and absurdly misunderstood is certain. With a good deal of experience in the matter, I think one may safely say that the defect of the male Uranian, or Urning,[1] is _not_ sensuality--but rather _sentimentality_. The lower, more ordinary types of Urning are often terribly sentimental; the superior types strangely, almost incredibly emotional; but neither _as a rule_ (though of course there must be exceptions) are so sensual as the average normal man.

This immense capacity of emotional love represents of course a great driving force. Whether in the individual or in society, love is eminently creative. It is their great genius for attachment which gives to the best Uranian types their penetrating influence and activity, and which often makes them beloved and accepted far and wide even by those who know nothing of their inner mind. How many so-called philanthropists of the best kind (we need not mention names) have been inspired by the Uranian temperament, the world will probably never know. And in all walks of life the great number and influence of folk of this disposition, and the distinguished place they already occupy, is only realised by those who are more or less behind the scenes. It is probable also that it is this genius for emotional love which gives to the Uranians their remarkable _youthfulness_.

Anyhow, with their extraordinary gift for, and experience in, affairs of the heart--from the double point of view, both of the man and of the woman--it is not difficult to see that these people have a special work to do as reconcilers and interpreters of the two sexes to each other. Of this I have spoken at more length below (chaps. ii. and v.). It is probable that the superior Urnings will become, in affairs of the heart, to a large extent the teachers of future society; and if so that their influence will tend to the realisation and expression of an attachment less exclusively sensual than the average of to-day, and to the diffusion of this in all directions.

While at any rate not presuming to speak with authority on so difficult a subject, I plead for the necessity of a patient consideration of it, for the due recognition of the types of character concerned, and for some endeavour to give them their fitting place and sphere of usefulness in the general scheme of society.

One thing more by way of introductory explanation. The word Love is commonly used in so general and almost indiscriminate a fashion as to denote sometimes physical instincts and acts, and sometimes the most intimate and profound feelings; and in this way a good deal of misunderstanding is caused. In this book (unless there be exceptions in the Appendix) the word is used to denote the inner devotion of one person to another; and when anything else is meant--as, for instance, sexual relations and actions--this is clearly stated and expressed.

II

The Intermediate Sex.

“Urning men and women, on whose book of life Nature has written her new word which sounds so strange to us, bear such storm and stress within them, such ferment and fluctuation, so much complex material having its outlet only towards the future; their individualities are so rich and many-sided, and withal so little understood, that it is impossible to characterise them adequately in a few sentences.”--_Otto de Joux._

In late years (and since the arrival of the New Woman amongst us) many things in the relation of men and women to each other have altered, or at any rate become clearer. The growing sense of equality in habits and customs--university studies, art, music, politics, the bicycle, etc.--all these things have brought about a _rapprochement_ between the sexes. If the modern woman is a little more masculine in some ways than her predecessor, the modern man (it is to be hoped), while by no means effeminate, is a little more sensitive in temperament and artistic in feeling than the original John Bull. It is beginning to be recognised that the sexes do not or should not normally form two groups hopelessly isolated in habit and feeling from each other, but that they rather represent the two poles of _one_ group--which is the human race; so that while certainly the extreme specimens at either pole are vastly divergent, there are great numbers in the middle region who (though differing corporeally as men and women) are by emotion and temperament very near to each other.[2] We all know women with a strong dash of the masculine temperament, and we all know

men whose almost feminine sensibility and intuition seem to belie their bodily form. Nature, it might appear, in mixing the elements which go to compose each individual, does not always keep her two groups of ingredients--which represent the two sexes--properly apart, but often throws them crosswise in a somewhat baffling manner, now this way and now that; yet wisely, we must think--for if a severe distinction of elements were always maintained the two sexes would soon drift into far latitudes and absolutely cease to understand each other. As it is, there are some remarkable and (we think) indispensable types of character in whom there is such a union or balance of the feminine and masculine qualities that these people become to a great extent the interpreters of men and women to each other.

There is another point which has become clearer of late. For as people are beginning to see that the sexes form in a certain sense a continuous group, so they are beginning to see that Love and Friendship--which have been so often set apart from each other as things distinct--are in reality closely related and shade imperceptibly into each other. Women are beginning to demand that Marriage shall mean Friendship as well as Passion; that a comrade-like Equality shall be included in the word Love; and it is recognised that from the one extreme of a 'Platonic' friendship (generally between persons of the same sex) up to the other extreme of passionate love (generally between persons of opposite sex) no hard and fast line can at any point be drawn effectively separating the different kinds of attachment. We know, in fact, of Friendships so romantic in sentiment that they verge into love; we know of Loves so intellectual and spiritual that they hardly dwell in the sphere of Passion.

A moment's thought will show that the general conceptions indicated above--if anywhere near the truth--point to an immense diversity of human temperament and character in matters relating to sex and love; but though such diversity has probably always existed, it has only in comparatively recent times become a subject of study.

More than thirty years ago, however, an Austrian writer, K. H. Ulrichs, drew attention in a series of pamphlets (_Memnon_, _Ara Spei_, _Inclusa_, etc.) to the existence of a class of people who strongly illustrate the above remarks, and with whom specially this paper is concerned. He pointed out that there were people born in such a position--as it were on the dividing line between the sexes--that while belonging distinctly to one sex as far as their bodies are concerned they may be said to belong _mentally_ and _emotionally_ to the other; that there were men, for instance, who might be described as of feminine soul enclosed in a male body (_anima muliebris in corpore virili inclusa_), or in other cases, women whose definition would be just the reverse. And he maintained that this doubleness of nature was to a great extent proved by the special direction of their love-sentiment. For in such cases, as indeed might be expected, the (apparently) masculine person instead of forming a love-union with a female tended to contract romantic friendships with one of his own sex; while the apparently feminine would, instead of marrying in the usual way, devote herself to the love of another feminine.

People of this kind (_i.e._, having this special variation of the love-sentiment) he called Urnings;[3] and though we are not obliged to accept his theory about the crosswise connexion between 'soul' and 'body,' since at best these words are somewhat vague and indefinite; yet his work was important because it was one of the first attempts, in modern times, to recognise the existence of what might be called an Intermediate sex, and to give at any rate _some_ explanation of it.[4]

Since that time the subject has been widely studied and written about by scientific men and others, especially on the Continent (though in England it is still comparatively unknown), and by means of an extended observation of present-day cases, as well as the indirect testimony of the history and literature of past times, quite a body of general conclusions has been arrived at--of which I propose in the following pages to give some slight account.

Contrary to the general impression, one of the first points that emerges from this study is that 'Urnings,' or Uranians, are by no means so very rare; but that they form, beneath the surface of society, a large class. It remains difficult, however, to get an exact statement of their numbers; and this for more than one reason: partly because, owing to the want of any general understanding of their case, these folk tend to conceal their true feelings from all but their own kind, and indeed often deliberately act in such a manner as to lead the world astray--(whence it arises that a normal man living in a certain society will often refuse to believe that there is a single Urning in the circle of his acquaintance, while one of the latter, or one that understands the nature, living in the same society, can count perhaps a score or more)--and partly because it is indubitable that the numbers do vary very greatly, not only in different countries but even in different classes in the same country. The consequence of all this being that we have estimates differing very widely from each other. Dr. Grabowsky, a well-known writer in Germany, quotes figures (which we think must be exaggerated) as high as one man in every 22, while Dr. Albert Moll (_Die Conträre Sexualempfindung_, chap. 3) gives estimates varying from 1 in every 50 to as low as 1 in every 500.[5] These figures apply to such as are exclusively of the said nature, _i.e._, to those whose deepest feelings of love and friendship go out only to persons of their own sex. Of course, if in

addition are included those double-natured people (of whom there is a great number) who experience the normal attachment, with the homogenic tendency in less or greater degree superadded, the estimates must be greatly higher.

In the second place it emerges (also contrary to the general impression) that men and women of the exclusively Uranian type are by no means necessarily morbid in any way--unless, indeed, their peculiar temperament be pronounced in itself morbid. Formerly it was assumed as a matter of course, that the type was merely a result of disease and degeneration; but now with the examination of the actual facts it appears that, on the contrary, many are fine, healthy specimens of their sex, muscular and well-developed in body, of powerful brain, high standard of conduct, and with nothing abnormal or morbid of any kind observable in their physical structure or constitution. This is of course not true of all, and there still remain a certain number of cases of weakly type to support the neuropathic view. Yet it is very noticeable that this view is much less insisted on by the later writers than by the earlier. It is also worth noticing that it is now acknowledged that even in the most healthy cases the special affectional temperament of the 'Intermediate' is, as a rule, ineradicable; so much so that when (as in not a few instances) such men and women, from social or other considerations, have forced themselves to marry and even have children, they have still not been able to overcome their own bias, or the leaning after all of their life-attachment to some friend of their own sex.

This subject, though obviously one of considerable interest and importance, has been hitherto, as I have pointed out, but little discussed in this country, partly owing to a certain amount of doubt and distrust which has, not unnaturally perhaps, surrounded it. And certainly if the men and women born with the tendency in question were only exceedingly rare, though it would not be fair on that account to ignore them, yet it would hardly be necessary to dwell at great length on their case. But as the class is really, on any computation, numerous, it becomes a duty for society not only to understand them but to help them to understand themselves.

For there is no doubt that in many cases people of this kind suffer a great deal from their own temperament--and yet, after all, it is possible that they may have an important part to play in the evolution of the race. Anyone who realises what Love is, the dedication of the heart, so profound, so absorbing, so mysterious, so imperative, and always just in the noblest natures so strong, cannot fail to see how difficult, how tragic even, must often be the fate of those whose deepest feelings are destined from the earliest days to be a riddle and a stumbling-block, unexplained to themselves, passed over in silence by others.[6] To call people of such temperament 'morbid,' and so forth, is of no use. Such a term is, in fact, absurdly inapplicable to many, who are among the most active, the most amiable and accepted members of society; besides, it forms no solution of the problem in question, and only amounts to marking down for disparagement a fellow-creature who has already considerable difficulties to contend with. Says Dr. Moll, "Anyone who has seen many Urnings will probably admit that they form a by no means enervated human group; on the contrary, one finds powerful, healthy-looking folk among them;" but in the very next sentence he says that they "suffer severely" from the way they are regarded; and in the manifesto of a considerable community of such people in Germany occur these words, "The rays of sunshine in the night of our existence are so rare, that we are responsive and deeply grateful for the least movement, for every single voice that speaks in our favour in the forum of mankind."[7]

In dealing with this class of folk, then, while I do not deny that they present a difficult problem, I think that just for that very reason their case needs discussion. It would be a great mistake to suppose that their attachments are necessarily sexual, or connected with sexual acts. On the contrary (as abundant evidence shows), they are often purely emotional in their character; and to confuse Uranians (as is so often done) with libertines having no law but curiosity in self-indulgence is to do them a great wrong. At the same time, it is evident that their special temperament may sometimes cause them difficulty in regard to their sexual relations. Into this subject we need not just now enter. But we may point out how hard it is, especially for the young among them, that a veil of complete silence should be drawn over the subject, leading to the most painful misunderstandings, and perversions and confusions of mind; and that there should be no hint of guidance; nor any recognition of the solitary and really serious inner struggles they may have to face! If the problem is a difficult one--as it undoubtedly is--the fate of those people is already hard who have to meet it in their own persons, without their suffering in addition from the refusal of society to give them any help. It is partly for these reasons, and to throw a little light where it may be needed, that I have thought it might be advisable in this paper simply to give a few general characteristics of the Intermediate types.

As indicated then already, in bodily structure there is, as a rule, nothing to distinguish the subjects of our discussion from ordinary men and women; but if we take the general mental characteristics it appears from almost universal testimony that the male tends to be of a rather gentle, emotional disposition--with defects, if such exist, in the direction of subtlety, evasiveness, timidity, vanity, etc.; while the female is just the opposite, fiery, active, bold and truthful, with defects running to brusqueness and coarseness. Moreover, the mind of the former is generally intuitive and instinctive in its perceptions, with more or less of artistic feeling; while the mind of the latter is more logical, scientific, and precise than usual with the normal woman. So marked indeed are these general

characteristics that sometimes by means of them (though not an infallible guide) the nature of the boy or girl can be detected in childhood, before full development has taken place; and needless to say it may often be very important to be able to do this.

It was no doubt in consequence of the observation of these signs that K. H. Ulrichs proposed his theory; and though the theory, as we have said, does not by any means meet _all_ the facts, still it is perhaps not without merit, and may be worth bearing in mind.

In the case, for instance, of a woman of this temperament (defined we suppose as “a male soul in a female body”) the theory helps us to understand how it might be possible for her to fall _bonâ fide_ in love with another woman. Krafft-Ebing gives[8] the case of a lady (A.), 28 years of age, who fell deeply in love with a younger one (B.). “I loved her divinely,” she said. They lived together, and the union lasted four years, but was then broken by the marriage of B. A. suffered in consequence from frightful depression; but in the end--though without real love--got married herself. Her depression however only increased and deepened into illness. The doctors, when consulted, said that all would be well if she could only have a child. The husband, who loved his wife sincerely, could not understand her enigmatic behaviour. She was friendly to him, suffered his caresses, but for days afterwards remained “dull, exhausted, plagued with irritation of the spine, and nervous.” Presently a journey of the married pair led to another meeting with the female friend--who had now been wedded (but also unhappily) for three years.

“Both ladies trembled with joy and excitement as they fell into each other’s arms, and were thenceforth inseparable. The man found that this friendship relation was a singular one, and hastened the departure. When the opportunity occurred, he convinced himself from the correspondence between his wife and her ‘friend’ that their letters were exactly like those of two lovers.”

It appears that the loves of such women are often very intense, and (as also in the case of male Urnings) life-long.[9] Both classes feel themselves blessed when they love happily. Nevertheless, to many of them it is a painful fact that--in consequence of their peculiar temperament--they are, though fond of children, not in the position to found a family.

We have so far limited ourselves to some very general characteristics of the Intermediate race. It may help to clear and fix our ideas if we now describe more in detail, first, what may be called the extreme and exaggerated types of the race, and then the more normal and perfect types. By doing so we shall get a more definite and concrete view of our subject.

In the first place, then, the extreme specimens--as in most cases of extremes--are not particularly attractive, sometimes quite the reverse. In the male of this kind we have a distinctly effeminate type, sentimental, lackadaisical, mincing in gait and manners, something of a chatterbox, skilful at the needle and in woman’s work, sometimes taking pleasure in dressing in woman’s clothes; his figure not unfrequently betraying a tendency towards the feminine, large at the hips, supple, not muscular, the face wanting in hair, the voice inclining to be high-pitched, etc.; while his dwelling-room is orderly in the extreme, even natty, and choice of decoration and perfume. His affection, too, is often feminine in character, clinging, dependent and jealous, as of one desiring to be loved almost more than to love.[10]

On the other hand, as the extreme type of the homogenic female, we have a rather markedly aggressive person, of strong passions, masculine manners and movements, practical in the conduct of life, sensuous rather than sentimental in love, often untidy, and _outré_ in attire;[11] her figure muscular, her voice rather low in pitch; her dwelling-room decorated with sporting-scenes, pistols, etc., and not without a suspicion of the fragrant weed in the atmosphere; while her love (generally to rather soft and feminine specimens of her own sex) is often a sort of furor, similar to the ordinary masculine love, and at times almost uncontrollable.

These are types which, on account of their salience, everyone will recognise more or less. Naturally, when they occur they excite a good deal of attention, and it is not an uncommon impression that most persons of the homogenic nature belong to either one or other of these classes. But in reality, of course, these extreme developments are rare, and for the most part the temperament in question is embodied in men and women of quite normal and unsensational exterior. Speaking of this subject and the connection between effeminateness and the homogenic nature in men, Dr. Moll says: “It is, however, as well to point out at the outset that effeminacy does not by any means show itself in all Urnings. Though one may find this or that indication in a great number of cases, yet it cannot be denied that a very large percentage, perhaps by far the majority of them, do _not_ exhibit pronounced Effeminacy.” And it may be supposed that we may draw the same conclusion with regard to women of this class--namely, that the majority of them do not exhibit pronounced masculine habits. In fact, while these extreme cases are of the greatest value from a scientific point of view as marking tendencies and limits of development in certain directions, it would be a serious mistake to look upon them as representative cases of the whole phases of human evolution concerned.

If now we come to what may be called the more normal type of the Uranian man, we find a man who, while possessing thoroughly masculine powers of mind and body, combines with them the tenderer and more emotional soul-nature of the woman--and sometimes to a remarkable degree. Such men, as said, are often muscular and well-built, and not distinguishable in exterior structure and the carriage of body from others of their own sex; but emotionally they are extremely complex, tender, sensitive, pitiful and loving, “full of storm and stress, of ferment and fluctuation” of the heart; the logical faculty may or may not, in their case, be well-developed, but intuition is always strong; like women they read characters at a glance, and know, without knowing how, what is passing in the minds of others; for nursing and waiting on the needs of others they have often a peculiar gift; at the bottom lies the artist-nature, with the artist’s sensibility and perception. Such an one is often a dreamer, of brooding, reserved habits, often a musician, or a man of culture, courted in society, which nevertheless does not understand him--though sometimes a child of the people, without any culture, but almost always with a peculiar inborn refinement. De Joux, who speaks on the whole favourably of Uranian men and women, says of the former: “They are enthusiastic for poetry and music, are often eminently skilful in the fine arts, and are overcome with emotion and sympathy at the least sad occurrence. Their sensitiveness, their endless tenderness for children, their love of flowers, their great pity for beggars and crippled folk are truly womanly.” And in another passage he indicates the artist-nature, when he says: “The nerve-system of many an Urning is the finest and the most complicated musical instrument in the service of the interior personality that can be imagined.”

It would seem probable that the attachment of such an one is of a tender and profound character; indeed, it is possible that in this class of men we have the love sentiment in one of its most perfect forms--a form in which from the necessities of the situation the sensuous element, though present, is exquisitely subordinated to the spiritual. Says one writer on this subject, a Swiss, “Happy indeed is that man who has won a real Urning for his friend--he walks on roses, without ever having to fear the thorns”; and he adds, “Can there ever be a more perfect sick-nurse than an Urning?” And though these are _ex parte_ utterances, we may believe that there is an appreciable grain of truth in them. Another writer, quoted by De Joux, speaks to somewhat the same effect, and may perhaps be received in a similar spirit. “We form,” he says, “a peculiar aristocracy of modest spirits, of good and refined habit, and in many masculine circles are the representatives of the higher mental and artistic element. In us dreamers and enthusiasts lies the continual counterpoise to the sheer masculine portion of society--inclining, as it always does, to mere restless greed of gain and material sensual pleasures.”

That men of this kind despise women, though a not uncommon belief, is one which hardly appears to be justified. Indeed, though naturally not inclined to “fall in love” in this direction, such men are by their nature drawn rather near to women, and it would seem that they often feel a singular appreciation and understanding of the emotional needs and destinies of the other sex, leading in many cases to a genuine though what is called ‘Platonic’ friendship. There is little doubt that they are often instinctively sought after by women, who, without suspecting the real cause, are conscious of a sympathetic chord in the homogenic which they miss in the normal man. To quote De Joux once more: “It would be a mistake to suppose that all Urnings must be woman-haters. Quite the contrary. They are not seldom the faithfulest friends, the truest allies, and most convinced defenders of women.”

To come now to the more normal and perfect specimens of the homogenic _woman_, we find a type in which the body is thoroughly feminine and gracious, with the rondure and fulness of the female form, and the continence and aptness of its movements, but in which the inner nature is to a great extent masculine; a temperament active, brave, originative, somewhat decisive, not too emotional; fond of out-door life, of games and sports, of science, politics, or even business; good at organisation, and well-pleased with positions of responsibility, sometimes indeed making an excellent and generous leader. Such a woman, it is easily seen, from her special combination of qualities, is often fitted for remarkable work, in professional life, or as manageress of institutions, or even as ruler of a country. Her love goes out to younger and more feminine natures than her own; it is a powerful passion, almost of heroic type, and capable of inspiring to great deeds; and when held duly in leash may sometimes become an invaluable force in the teaching and training of girlhood, or in the creation of a school of thought or action among women. Many a Santa Clara, or abbess-founder of religious houses, has probably been a woman of this type; and in all times such women--not being bound to men by the ordinary ties--have been able to work the more freely for the interests of their sex, a cause to which their own temperament impels them to devote themselves _con amore_.

I have now sketched--very briefly and inadequately it is true--both the extreme types and the more healthy types of the ‘Intermediate’ man and woman: types which can be verified from history and literature, though more certainly and satisfactorily perhaps from actual life around us. And unfamiliar though the subject is, it begins to appear that it is one which modern thought and science will have to face. Of the latter and more normal types it may be said that they exist, and have always existed, in considerable abundance, and from that circumstance alone there is a strong probability that they have their place and purpose. As

pointed out there is no particular indication of morbidity about them, unless the special nature of their love-sentiment be itself accounted morbid; and in the alienation of the sexes from each other, of which complaint is so often made to-day, it must be admitted that they do much to fill the gap.

The instinctive artistic nature of the male of this class, his sensitive spirit, his wavelike emotional temperament, combined with hardihood of intellect and body; and the frank, free nature of the female, her masculine independence and strength wedded to thoroughly feminine grace of form and manner; may be said to give them both, through their double nature, command of life in all its phases, and a certain freemasonry of the secrets of the two sexes which may well favour their function as reconcilers and interpreters. Certainly it is remarkable that some of the world's greatest leaders and artists have been dowered either wholly or in part with the Uranian temperament--as in the cases of Michel Angelo, Shakespeare, Marlowe, Alexander the Great, Julius Cæsar, or, among women, Christine of Sweden, Sappho the poetess, and others.

III

The Homogenic Attachment

In its various forms, so far as we know them, Love seems always to have a deep significance and a most practical importance to us little mortals. In one form, as the mere semi-conscious Sex-love, which runs through creation and is common to the lowest animals and plants, it appears as a kind of organic basis for the unity of all creatures; in another, as the love of the mother for her offspring--which may also be termed a passion--it seems to pledge itself to the care and guardianship of the future race; in another, as the marriage of man and woman, it becomes the very foundation of human society. And so we can hardly believe that in its homogenic form, with which we are here concerned, it has not also a deep significance, and social uses and functions which will become clearer to us, the more we study it.

To some perhaps it may appear a little strained to place this last-mentioned form of attachment on a level of importance with the others, and such persons may be inclined to deny to the homogenic[12] or homosexual love that intense, that penetrating, and at times overmastering character which would entitle it to rank as a great human passion. But in truth this view, when entertained, arises from a want of acquaintance with the actual facts; and it may not be amiss here, in the briefest possible way, to indicate what the world's History, Literature, and Art has to say to us on this aspect of the subject, before going on to further considerations. Certainly, if the confronting of danger and the endurance of pain and distress for the sake of the loved one, if sacrifice, unswerving devotion and life-long union, constitute proofs of the reality and intensity (and let us say healthiness) of an affection, then these proofs have been given in numberless cases of such attachment, not only as existing between men, but as between women, since the world began. The records of chivalric love, the feats of enamoured knights for their ladies' sakes, the stories of Hero and Leander, etc., are easily paralleled, if not surpassed, by the stories of the Greek comrades-in-arms and tyrannicides--of Cratinus and Aristodemus, who offered themselves together as a voluntary sacrifice for the purification of Athens; of Chariton and Melanippus,[13] who attempted to assassinate Phalaris, the tyrant of Agrigentum; or of Cleomachus who in like manner, in a battle between the Chalkidians and Eretrians, being entreated to charge the latter, "asked the youth he loved, who was standing by, whether he would be a spectator of the fight; and when he said he would, and affectionately kissed Cleomachus and put his helmet on his head, Cleomachus with a proud joy placed himself in the front of the bravest of the Thessalians and charged the enemy's cavalry with such impetuosity that he threw them into disorder and routed them; and the Eretrian cavalry fleeing in consequence, the Chalkidians won a splendid victory."[14]

The annals of all nations contain similar records--though probably among none has the ideal of this love been quite so enthusiastic and heroic as among the post-Homeric Greeks. It is well known that among the Polynesian Islanders--for the most part a very gentle and affectionate people, probably inheriting the traditions of a higher culture than they now possess--the most romantic male friendships are (or were) in vogue. Says Herman Melville in "Omoo" (chap. 39), "The really curious way in which all Polynesians are in the habit of making bosom friends is deserving of remark.… In the annals of the island (Tahiti) are examples of extravagant friendships, unsurpassed by the story of Damon and Pythias--in truth much more wonderful; for notwithstanding the devotion--even of life in some cases--to which they led, they were frequently entertained at first sight for some stranger from another island." So thoroughly recognised indeed were these unions that Melville explains (in "Typee," chap. 18) that if two men of hostile tribes or islands became thus pledged to each other, then each could pass through the enemy's territory without fear of molestation or injury; and the passionate nature of these attachments is indicated by the following passage from "Omoo" (another book of Melville's):--"Though little inclined to jealousy in ordinary love-matters, the Tahitian will hear of no rivals in his _friendship_."

Even among savage races lower down than these in the scale of evolution, and who are generally accused of being governed in their love-relations only by the most animal desires, we find a genuine sentiment of comradeship beginning to assert itself--as among the Balonda[15] and other African tribes, where regular ceremonies of the betrothal of comrades take place, by the transfusion of a few drops of blood into each other's drinking-bowls, by the exchange of names,[16] and the mutual gift of their most precious possessions; but unfortunately, owing to the obtuseness of current European opinion on this subject, these and other such customs have been but little investigated and have by no means received the attention that they ought.

When we turn to the poetic and literary utterances of the more civilised nations on this subject we cannot but be struck by the range and intensity of the emotions expressed--from the beautiful threnody of David over his friend whose love was passing the love of women, through the vast panorama of the Homeric Iliad, of which the heroic friendship of Achilles and his dear Patroclus forms really the basic theme, down to the works of the great Greek age--the splendid odes of Pindar burning with clear fire of passion, the lofty elegies of Theognis, full of wise precepts to his beloved Kurnus, the sweet pastorals of Theocritus, the passionate lyrics of Sappho, or the more sensual raptures of Anacreon. Some of the dramas of Æschylus and Sophocles--as the "Myrmidones" of the former and the "Lovers of Achilles" of the latter--appear to have had this subject for their motive[17]; and many of the prose-poem dialogues of Plato were certainly inspired by it.

Then coming to the literature of the Roman age, whose materialistic spirit could only with difficulty seize the finer inspiration of the homogenic love, and which in such writers as Catullus and Martial could only for the most part give expression to its grosser side, we still find in Vergil, a noble and notable instance. His second Eclogue bears the marks of a genuine passion; and, according to some,[18] he there under the name of Alexis immortalises his own love for the youthful Alexander. Nor is it possible to pass over in this connection the great mass of Persian literature, and the poets Sadi, Hafiz, Jami, and many others, whose names and works are for all time, and whose marvellous love-songs ("Bitter and sweet is the parting kiss on the lips of a friend") are to a large extent, if not mostly, addressed to those of their own sex.[19]

Of the mediæval period in Europe we have of course but few literary monuments. Towards its close we come upon the interesting story of Amis and Amile (thirteenth century), unearthed by Mr. W. Pater from the Bibliotheca Elzeviriana.[20] Though there is historic evidence of the prevalence of the passion we may say of this period that its _ideal_ was undoubtedly rather the chivalric love than the love of comrades. But with the Renaissance in Italy and the Elizabethan period in England the latter once more comes to evidence in a burst of poetic utterance,[21] which culminates perhaps in the magnificent sonnets of Michel Angelo and of Shakespeare; of Michel Angelo whose pure beauty of expression lifts the enthusiasm into the highest region as the direct perception of the divine in mortal form;[22] and of Shakespeare--whose passionate words and amorous spirituality of friendship have for long enough been a perplexity to hide-bound commentators. Thence through minor writers (not overlooking Winckelmann[23] in Germany) we pass to quite modern times--in which, notwithstanding the fact that the passion has been much misunderstood and misinterpreted, two names stand conspicuously forth--those of Tennyson, whose "In Memoriam" is perhaps his finest work, and of Walt Whitman, the enthusiasm of whose poems on Comradeship is only paralleled by the devotedness of his labors for his wounded brothers in the American Civil War.

It will be noticed that here we have some of the very greatest names in all literature concerned; and that their utterances on this subject equal if they do not surpass, in beauty, intensity and humanity of sentiment, whatever has been written in praise of the other more ordinarily recognised love.

And when again we turn to the records of Art, and compare the way in which man's sense of Love and Beauty has expressed itself in the portrayal of the male form and the female form respectively we find exactly the same thing. The whole vista of Greek statuary shows the male passion of beauty in high degree. Yet though the statues of men and youths (by men sculptors) preponderate probably considerably, both in actual number and in devotedness of execution, over the statues of female figures, it is, as J. A. Symonds says in his "Life of Michel Angelo," remarkable that in all the range of the former there are hardly two or three that show a base or licentious expression, such as is not so very uncommon in the female statues. Knowing as we do the strength of the male physical passion in the life of the Greeks, this one fact speaks strongly for the sense of proportion which must have characterised this passion--at any rate in the most productive age of their Art.

In the case of Michel Angelo we have an artist who with brush and chisel portrayed literally thousands of human forms; but with this peculiarity, that while scores and scores of his male figures are obviously suffused and inspired by a romantic sentiment, there is hardly one of his female figures that is so,--the latter being mostly representative of woman in her part as mother, or sufferer, or prophetess or poetess, or in old age, or in any aspect of strength or tenderness, except that which associates itself especially with

romantic love. Yet the cleanliness and dignity of Michel Angelo's male figures are incontestable, and bear striking witness to that nobility of the sentiment in him, which we have already seen illustrated in his sonnets.[24]

This brief sketch may suffice to give the reader some idea of the place and position in the world of the particular sentiment which we are discussing; nor can it fail to impress him--if any reference is made to the authorities quoted--with a sense of the dignity and solidity of the sentiment, at any rate as handled by some of the world's greatest men. At the same time it would be affectation to ignore the fact that side by side with this view of the subject there has been another current of opinion leading people--especially in quite modern times in Europe--to look upon attachments of the kind in question with much suspicion and disfavour.[25] And it may be necessary here to say a few words on this latter view.

The origin of it is not far to seek. Those who have no great gift themselves for this kind of friendship--who are not in the inner circle of it, so to speak, and do not understand or appreciate its deep emotional and romantic character, have nevertheless heard of certain corruptions and excesses; for these latter leap to publicity. They have heard of the debaucheries of a Nero or a Tiberius; they have noted the scandals of the Police Courts; they have had some experience perhaps of abuses which may be found in Public Schools or Barracks; and they (not unnaturally) infer that these things, these excesses and sensualities, are the motive of comrade-attachments, and the object for which they exist; nor do they easily recognise any more profound and intimate bond. To such people physical intimacies of _any_ kind (at any rate between males) seem inexcusable. There is no distinction in their minds between the simplest or most naive expression of feeling and the gravest abuse of human rights and decency; there is no distinction between a genuine heart-attachment and a mere carnal curiosity. They see certain evils that occur or have occurred, and they think, perfectly candidly, that any measures are justifiable to prevent such things recurring. But they do not see the interior love-feeling which when it exists does legitimately demand _some_ expression. Such folk, in fact, not having the key in themselves to the real situation hastily assume that the homogenic attachment has no other motive than, or is simply a veil and a cover for, sensuality--and suspect or condemn it accordingly.

Thus arises the curious discrepancy of people's views on this important subject--a discrepancy depending on the side from which they approach it.

On the one hand we have anathemas and execrations, on the other we have the lofty enthusiasm of a man like Plato--one of the leaders of the world's thought for all time--who puts, for example, into the mouth of Phædrus (in the "Symposium") such a passage as this[26]: "I know not any greater blessing to a young man beginning life than a virtuous lover, or to the lover than a beloved youth. For the principle which ought to be the guide of men who would nobly live--that principle, I say, neither kindred, nor honour, nor wealth, nor any other motive is able to implant so well as love. Of what am I speaking? Of the sense of honour and dishonour, without which neither states nor individuals ever do any good or great work.… For what lover would not choose rather to be seen of all mankind than by his beloved, either when abandoning his post or throwing away his arms? He would be ready to die a thousand deaths rather than endure this. Or who would desert his beloved or fail him in the hour of danger? The veriest coward would become an inspired hero, equal to the bravest, at such a time; love would inspire him. That courage which, as Homer says, the god breathes into the soul of heroes, love of his own nature inspires into the lover." Or again in the "Phædrus" Plato makes Socrates say[27]: "In like manner the followers of Apollo and of every other god, walking in the ways of their god, seek a love who is to be like their god, and when they have found him, they themselves imitate their god, and persuade their love to do the same, and bring him into harmony with the form and ways of the god as far as they can; for they have no feelings of envy or jealousy towards their beloved, but they do their utmost to create in him the greatest likeness of themselves and the god whom they honour. Thus fair and blissful to the beloved when he is taken, is the desire of the inspired lover, and the initiation of which I speak into the mysteries of true love, if their purpose is effected."

* * * * *

With these few preliminary remarks we may pass on to consider some recent scientific investigations of the matter in hand. In late times--that is, during the last thirty years or so--a group of scientific and capable men chiefly in Germany, France, and Italy, have made a special and more or less impartial study of it. Among these may be mentioned Dr. Albert Moll of Berlin; R. von Krafft-Ebing, one of the leading medical authorities of Vienna, whose book on "Sexual Psychopathy" has passed into its tenth edition; Dr. Paul Moreau ("Des Aberrations du sens génésique"); Cesare Lombroso, the author of various works on Anthropology; M. A. Raffalovich ("Uranisme et unisexualité"); Auguste Forel ("Die Sexuelle Frage"); Mantegazza; K. H. Ulrichs; and last but not least, Dr. Havelock Ellis, of whose great work on the Psychology of Sex the second volume is dedicated to the subject of "Sexual Inversion."[28] The result of these investigations has been that a very altered complexion has been given to the subject. For whereas at first it was

easily assumed that the phenomena were of morbid character, and that the leaning of the love-sentiment towards one of the same sex was always associated with degeneracy or disease, it is very noticeable that step by step with the accumulation of reliable information this assumption has been abandoned. The point of view has changed; and the change has been most marked in the latest authors, such as A. Moll and Havelock Ellis.

It is not possible here to go into anything like a detailed account of the works of these various authors, their theories, and the immense number of interesting cases and observations which they have contributed; but some of the general conclusions which flow from their researches may be pointed out. In the first place their labors have established the fact, known hitherto only to individuals, that _sexual inversion_--that is the leaning of desire to one of the same sex--is in a vast number of cases quite instinctive and congenital, mentally and physically, and therefore twined in the very roots of individual life and practically ineradicable. To Men or Women thus affected with an innate homosexual bias, Ulrichs gave the name of Urning,[29] since pretty widely accepted by scientists. Some details with regard to “Urnings,” I have given in the preceding paper, but it should be said here that too much emphasis cannot be laid on the distinction between these born lovers of their own kind, and that class of persons, with whom they are so often confused, who out of mere carnal curiosity or extravagance of desire, or from the dearth of opportunities for a more normal satisfaction (as in schools, barracks, etc.) adopt some homosexual practices. It is the latter class who become chiefly prominent in the public eye, and who excite, naturally enough, public reprobation. In their case the attraction is felt, by themselves and all concerned, to be merely sensual and morbid. In the case of the others, however, the feeling is, as said, so deeply rooted and twined with the mental and emotional life that the person concerned has difficulty in imagining himself affected otherwise than he is; and to him at least his love appears healthy and natural, and indeed a necessary part of his individuality.

In the second place it has become clear that the number of individuals affected with ‘sexual inversion’ in some degree or other is very great--much greater than is generally supposed to be the case. It is however very difficult or perhaps impossible to arrive at satisfactory figures on the subject,[30] for the simple reasons that the proportions vary so greatly among different peoples and even in different sections of society and in different localities, and because of course there are all possible grades of sexual inversion to deal with, from that in which the instinct is _quite exclusively_ directed towards the same sex, to the other extreme in which it is normally towards the opposite sex but capable, occasionally and under exceptional attractions, of inversion towards its own--this last condition being probably among some peoples very widespread, if not universal.

In the third place, by the tabulation and comparison of a great number of cases and “confessions,” it has become pretty well established that the individuals affected with inversion in marked degree do not after all differ from the rest of mankind, or womankind, in any other physical or mental particular which can be distinctly indicated.[31] No congenital association with any particular physical conformation or malformation has yet been discovered; nor with any distinct disease of body or mind. Nor does it appear that persons of this class are usually of a gross or specially low type, but if anything rather the opposite--being mostly of refined, sensitive nature and including, as Krafft-Ebing points out (“Psychopathia Sexualis,” seventh ed., p. 227) a great number “highly gifted in the fine arts, especially music and poetry”; and, as Mantegazza says,[32] many persons of high literary and social distinction. It is true that Krafft-Ebing insists on the generally strong sexual equipment of this class of persons (among men), but he hastens to say that their emotional love is also “enthusiastic and exalted,”[33] and that, while bodily congress is desired, the special act with which they are vulgarly credited is in most cases repugnant to them.[34]

The only distinct characteristic which the scientific writers claim to have established is a marked tendency to nervous development in the subject, not infrequently associated with nervous maladies; but--as I shall presently have occasion to show--there is reason to think that the validity even of this characteristic has been exaggerated.

Taking the general case of men with a marked exclusive preference for persons of their own sex, Krafft-Ebing says (“P.S.” p. 256): “The sexual life of these Homosexuals is _mutatis mutandis_ just the same as in the case of normal sex-love…. The Urning loves, deifies his male beloved one, exactly as the woman-wooing man does _his_ beloved. For him, he is capable of the greatest sacrifice, experiences the torments of unhappy, often unrequited, love, of faithlessness on his beloved’s part, of jealousy, and so forth. His attention is enchained only by the male form … The sight of feminine charms is indifferent to him, if not repugnant.” Then he goes on to say that many such men, notwithstanding their actual aversion to intercourse with the female, do ultimately marry--either from ethical, as sometimes happens, or from social considerations. But very remarkable--as illustrating the depth and tenacity of the homogenic instinct[35]--and pathetic too, are the records that he gives of these cases; for in many of them a real friendship and regard between the married pair was still of no avail to overcome the distaste on the part of one to sexual intercourse with the other, or to prevent the experience of actual physical distress after such intercourse, or to check the continual flow of

affection to some third person of the same sex; and thus unwillingly, so to speak, this bias remained a cause of suffering to the end.

I have said that at the outset it was assumed that the Homogenic emotion was morbid in itself, and probably always associated with distinct disease, either physical or mental, but that the progress of the inquiry has served more and more to dissipate this view; and that it is noticeable that the latest of the purely scientific authorities are the least disposed to insist upon the theory of morbidity. It is true that Krafft-Ebing clings to the opinion that there is generally some _neurosis_, or degeneration of a nerve-centre, or _inherited tendency in that direction_, associated with the instinct; see p. 190 (seventh ed.), also p. 227, where he speaks, rather vaguely, of "an hereditary neuropathic or psychopathic tendency"--_neuro(psycho)pathische Belastung_. But it is an obvious criticism on this that there are few people in modern life, perhaps none, who could be pronounced absolutely free from such a _Belastung_! And whether the Dorian Greeks or the Polynesian Islanders or the Albanian mountaineers, or any of the other notably hardy races among whom this affection has been developed, were particularly troubled by nervous degeneration we may well doubt!

As to Moll, though he speaks[36] of the instinct as morbid (feeling perhaps in duty bound to do so), it is very noticeable that he abandons the ground of its association with other morbid symptoms--as this association, he says, is by no means always to be observed; and is fain to rest his judgment on the _dictum_ that the mere failure of the sexual instinct to propagate the species is itself pathological--a _dictum_ which in its turn obviously springs from that pre-judgment of scientists that generation is the sole object of love,[37] and which if pressed would involve the good doctor in awkward dilemmas, as for instance that every worker-bee is a pathological specimen.

Finally we find that Havelock Ellis, one of the latest writers of weight on this subject, in chapter vi. of his "Sexual Inversion," combats the idea that this temperament is necessarily morbid; and suggests that the tendency should rather be called an anomaly than a disease. He says (2nd edition, p. 186)[38] "Thus in sexual inversion we have what may fairly be called a 'sport' or variation, one of those organic aberrations which we see throughout living nature in plants and in animals."[39]

With regard to the nerve-degeneration theory, while it may be allowed that sexual inversion is not uncommonly found in connection with the specially nervous temperament, it must be remembered that its occasional association with nervous troubles or disease is quite another matter; since such troubles ought perhaps to be looked upon as the results rather than the causes of the inversion. It is difficult of course for outsiders not personally experienced in the matter to realise the great strain and tension of nerves under which those persons grow up from boyhood to manhood--or from girl to womanhood--who find their deepest and strongest instincts under the ban of the society around them; who before they clearly understand the drift of their own natures discover that they are somehow cut off from the sympathy and understanding of those nearest to them; and who know that they can never give expression to their tenderest yearnings of affection without exposing themselves to the possible charge of actions stigmatised as odious crimes.[40] That such a strain, acting on one who is perhaps already of a nervous temperament, should tend to cause nervous prostration or even mental disturbance is of course obvious; and if such disturbances are really found to be commoner among homogenic lovers than among ordinary folk we have in these social causes probably a sufficient explanation of the fact.

Then again in this connexion it must never be forgotten that the medico-scientific enquirer is bound on the whole to meet with those cases that _are_ of a morbid character, rather than with those that are healthy in their manifestation, since indeed it is the former that he lays himself out for. And since the field of his research is usually a great modern city, there is little wonder if disease colours his conclusions. In the case of Dr. Moll, who carried out his researches largely under the guidance of the Berlin police (whose acquaintance with the subject would naturally be limited to its least satisfactory sides), the only marvel is that his verdict is so markedly favorable as it is. As Krafft-Ebing says in his own preface, "It is the sad privilege of Medicine, and especially of Psychiatry, to look always on the reverse side of life, on the weakness and wretchedness of man."

Having regard then to the direction in which science has been steadily moving in this matter, it is not difficult to see that the epithet "morbid" will probably before long be abandoned as descriptive of the homogenic bias--that is, of the general sentiment of love towards a person of the same sex. That there are excesses of the passion--cases, as in ordinary sex-love, where mere physical desire becomes a mania--we may freely admit; but as it would be unfair to judge of the purity of marriage by the evidence of the Divorce courts, so it would be monstrous to measure the truth and beauty of the attachment in question by those instances which stand most prominently perhaps in the eye of the modern public; and after all deductions there remains, we contend, the vast body of cases in which the manifestation of the instinct has on the whole the character of normality and healthfulness--sufficiently so in fact to constitute this _a distinct variety of the sexual passion_. The question, of course, not being whether the instinct is _capable_ of morbid and extravagant manifestation--for that can easily be proved of any instinct--but whether it is capable of a healthy and sane expression. And this, we think, it has abundantly shown itself to be.

Anyhow the work that Science has practically done has been to destroy the dogmatic attitude of the former current opinion from which itself started, and to leave the whole subject freed from a great deal of misunderstanding, and much more open than before. If on the one hand its results have been chiefly of a negative character, and it admits that it does not understand the exact place and foundation of this attachment; on the other hand since it recognises the deeply beneficial influences of an intimate love-relation of the usual kind on those concerned, it also allows that there are some persons for whom these necessary reactions can only come from one of the same sex as themselves.

“Successful love,” says Moll (p. 125) “exercises a helpful influence on the Urning. His mental and bodily condition improves, and capacity of work increases--just as it happens in the case of a normal youth with _his_ love.” And further on (p. 173) in a letter from a man of this kind occur these words:--“The passion is I suppose so powerful, just because one looks for everything in the loved man--Love, Friendship, Ideal, and Sense-satisfaction.… As it is at present I suffer the agonies of a deep unresponded passion, which wake me like a nightmare from sleep. And I am conscious of physical pain in the region of the heart.” In such cases the love, in some degree physically expressed, of another person of the same sex, is allowed to be as much a necessity and a condition of healthy life and activity, as in more ordinary cases is the love of a person of the opposite sex.

If then the physical element which is sometimes present in the love of which we are speaking is a difficulty and a stumbling-block, it must be allowed that it is a difficulty that Nature confronts us with, and which cannot be disposed of by mere anathema and execration. The only theory--from K. H. Ulrichs to Havelock Ellis--which has at all held its ground in this matter, is that in congenital cases of sex-inversion there is a mixture of male and female elements in the same person; so that for instance in the same embryo the emotional and nervous regions may develop along feminine lines while the outer body and functions may determine themselves as distinctly masculine, or _vice versa_. Such cross-development may take place obviously in a great variety of ways, and thus possibly explain the remarkable varieties of the Uranian temperament; but in all such cases, strange as may be the problems thus arising, these problems are of Nature’s own producing and can hardly be laid to the door of the individual who has literally to bear their cross. For such individuals expressions of feeling become natural, which to others seem out of place and uncalled for; and not only natural, but needful and inevitable. To deny to such people _all_ expression of their emotion, is probably in the end to cause it to burst forth with the greater violence; and it may be suggested that our British code of manners, by forbidding the lighter marks of affection between youths and men, acts just contrary to its own purpose, and drives intimacies down into less open and unexceptionable channels.

With regard to this physical element it must also be remembered that since the homogenic love--whether between man and man, or between woman and woman--can from the nature of the case never find expression on the physical side so freely and completely as is the case with the ordinary love, it must tend rather more than the latter to run along _emotional_ channels, and to find its vent in sympathies of social life and companionship. If one studies carefully the expression of the Greek statues (see p. 9, supra) and the lesson of the Greek literature, one sees clearly that the _ideal_ of Greek life was a very continent one: the trained male, the athlete, the man temperate and restrained, even chaste, for the sake of bettering his powers. It was round this conception that the Greeks kindled their finer emotions. And so of their love: a base and licentious indulgence was not in line with it. They may not have always kept to their ideal, but there it was. And I am inclined to think that the homogenic instinct (for the reasons given above) would in the long run tend to work itself out in this direction. And consonant with this is the fact that this passion in the past (as pointed out by J. Addington Symonds in his paper on “Dantesque and Platonic Ideals of Love”[41]) has, as a matter of fact, inspired such a vast amount of heroism and romance--only paralleled indeed by the loves of Chivalry, which of course, owing to their special character, were subject to a similar Transmutation.

In all these matters the popular opinion has probably been largely influenced by the arbitrary notion that the function of love is limited to child-breeding; and that any love not concerned in the propagation of the race must necessarily be of dubious character. And in enforcing this view, no doubt the Hebraic and Christian tradition has exercised a powerful influence--dating, as it almost certainly does, from far-back times when the multiplication of the tribe was one of the first duties of its members, and one of the first necessities of corporate life.[42] But nowadays when the need has swung round all the other way it is not unreasonable to suppose that a similar revolution will take place in people’s views of the place and purpose of the non-child-bearing love.[43]

* * * * *

I have now said enough I think to show that though much in relation to the homogenic attachment is obscure, and though it may have its special pitfalls and temptations--making it quite necessary to guard against a too great latitude on the physical side; yet on its ethical and social sides it is pregnant with meaning and has received at various times in history abundant justification. It certainly

does not seem impossible to suppose that as the ordinary love has a special function in the propagation of the race, so the other has its special function in social and heroic work, and in the generation--not of bodily children--but of those children of the mind, the philosophical conceptions and ideals which transform our lives and those of society. J. Addington Symonds, in his privately printed pamphlet, “A Problem in Greek Ethics” (now published in a German translation),[44] endeavours to reconstruct as it were the genesis of comrade-love among the Dorians in early Greek times. Thus:--“Without sufficiency of women, without the sanctities of established domestic life, inspired by the memories of Achilles and venerating their ancestor Herakles, the Dorian warriors had special opportunity for elevating comradeship to the rank of an enthusiasm. The incidents of emigration into a foreign country--perils of the sea, passages of rivers and mountains, assaults of fortresses and cities, landings on a hostile shore, night-vigils by the side of blazing beacons, foragings for food, picquet service in the front of watchful foes--involved adventures capable of shedding the lustre of romance on friendship. These circumstances, by bringing the virtues of sympathy with the weak, tenderness for the beautiful, protection for the young, together with corresponding qualities of gratitude, self-devotion, and admiring attachment into play, may have tended to cement unions between man and man no less firm than that of marriage. On such connections a wise captain would have relied for giving strength to his battalions, and for keeping alive the flames of enterprise and daring.” The author then goes on to suggest that though in such relations as those indicated the physical probably had some share, yet it did not at that time overbalance the emotional and spiritual elements, or lead to the corruption and effeminacy of a later age.

At Sparta the lover was called _Eispnêlos_, the inspirer, and the younger beloved _Aïtes_, the hearer. This alone would show the partly educational aspects in which comradeship was conceived; and a hundred passages from classic literature might be quoted to prove how deeply it had entered into the Greek mind that this love was the cradle of social chivalry and heroic life. Finally it seems to have been Plato’s favorite doctrine that the relation if properly conducted led up to the disclosure of true philosophy in the mind, to the divine vision or mania, and to the remembrance or rekindling within the soul of all the forms of celestial beauty. He speaks of this kind of love as causing a “generation in the beautiful”[45] within the souls of the lovers. The image of the beloved one passing into the mind of the lover and upward through its deepest recesses reaches and unites itself to the essential forms of divine beauty there long hidden--the originals as it were of all creation--and stirring them to life excites a kind of generative descent of noble thoughts and impulses, which henceforward modify the whole cast of thought and life of the one so affected.

If there is any truth--even only a grain or two--in these speculations, it is easy to see that the love with which we are specially dealing is a very important factor in society, and that its neglect, or its repression, or its vulgar misapprehension, may be matters of considerable danger or damage to the common-weal. It is easy to see that while on the one hand marriage is of indispensable importance to the State as providing the workshop as it were for the breeding and rearing of children, another form of union is almost equally indispensable to supply the basis for social activities of other kinds. Every one is conscious that without a close affectional tie of some kind his life is not complete, his powers are crippled, and his energies are inadequately spent. Yet it is not to be expected (though it may of course happen) that the man or woman who have dedicated themselves to each other and to family life should leave the care of their children and the work they have to do at home in order to perform social duties of a remote and less obvious, though may be more arduous, character. Nor is it to be expected that a man or woman single-handed, without the counsel of a helpmate in the hour of difficulty, or his or her love in the hour of need, should feel equal to these wider activities. If--to refer once more to classic story--the love of Harmodius had been for a wife and children at home, he would probably not have cared, and it would hardly have been his business, to slay the tyrant. And unless on the other hand each of the friends had had the love of his comrade to support him, the two could hardly have nerved themselves to this audacious and ever-memorable exploit. So it is difficult to believe that anything can supply the force and liberate the energies required for social and mental activities of the most necessary kind so well as a comrade-union which yet leaves the two lovers free from the responsibilities and impedimenta of family life.

For if the slaughter of tyrants is not the chief social duty nowadays, we have with us hydra-headed monsters at least as numerous as the tyrants of old, and more difficult to deal with, and requiring no little courage to encounter. And beyond the extirpation of evils we have solid work waiting to be done in the patient and life-long building up of new forms of society, new orders of thought, and new institutions of human solidarity--all of which in their genesis must meet with opposition, ridicule, hatred, and even violence. Such campaigns as these--though different in kind from those of the Dorian mountaineers described above--will call for equal hardihood and courage, and will stand in need of a comradeship as true and valiant. And it may indeed be doubted whether the higher heroic and spiritual life of a nation is ever quite possible without the sanction of this attachment in its institutions, adding a new range and scope to the possibilities of love.[46]

Walt Whitman, the inaugurator, it may almost be said, of a new world of democratic ideals and literature, and--as one of the best of our critics has remarked--the most Greek in spirit and in performance of modern writers, insists continually on this social function of "intense and loving comradeship, the personal and passionate attachment of man to man." "I will make," he says, "the most splendid race the sun ever shone upon, I will make divine magnetic lands.… I will make inseparable cities with their arms about each others' necks, by the love of comrades." And again, in "Democratic Vistas," "It is to the development, identification, and general prevalence of that fervid comradeship (the adhesive love at least rivaling the amative love hitherto possessing imaginative literature, if not going beyond it), that I look for the counterbalance and offset of materialistic and vulgar American Democracy, and for the spiritualisation thereof.… I say Democracy infers such loving comradeship, as its most inevitable twin or counterpart, without which it will be incomplete, in vain, and incapable of perpetuating itself."

Yet Whitman could not have spoken, as he did, with a kind of authority on this subject, if he had not been fully aware that through the masses of the people this attachment was already alive and working--though doubtless in a somewhat suppressed and un-self-conscious form--and if he had not had ample knowledge of its effects and influence in himself and others around him. Like all great artists he could but give form and light to that which already existed dim and inchoate in the heart of the people. To those who have dived at all below the surface in this direction it will be familiar enough that the homogenic passion ramifies widely through all modern society, and that among the masses of the people as among the classes, even below the stolid surface and reserve of British manners, letters pass and enduring attachments are formed, differing in no very obvious respect from those correspondences which persons of opposite sex knit with each other under similar circumstances; but that hitherto while this relation has occasionally, in its grosser forms and abuses, come into public notice through the police reports, etc., its more sane and spiritual manifestations--though really a moving force in the body politic--have remained unrecognised.

It is hardly needful in these days when social questions loom so large upon us to emphasise the importance of a bond which by the most passionate and lasting compulsion may draw members of the different classes together, and (as it often seems to do) none the less strongly because they are members of different classes. A moment's consideration must convince us that such a comradeship may, as Whitman says, have "deepest relations to general politics." It is noticeable, too, in this deepest relation to politics that the movement among women towards their own liberation and emancipation, which is taking place all over the civilised world, has been accompanied by a marked development of the homogenic passion among the female sex. It may be said that a certain strain in the relations between the opposite sexes which has come about owing to a growing consciousness among women that they have been oppressed and unfairly treated by men, and a growing unwillingness to ally themselves unequally in marriage--that this strain has caused the womenkind to draw more closely together and to cement alliances of their own. But whatever the cause may be it is pretty certain that such comrade-alliances--and of quite devoted kind--are becoming increasingly common, and especially perhaps among the more cultured classes of women, who are working out the great cause of their sex's liberation; nor is it difficult to see the importance of such alliances in such a campaign. In the United States where the battle of women's independence is also being fought, the tendency mentioned is as strongly marked.

A few words may here be said about the legal aspect of this important question. It has to be remarked that the present state of the Law, both in Germany and Britain--arising as it does partly out of some of the misapprehensions above alluded to, and partly out of the sheer unwillingness of legislators to discuss the question--is really impracticable. While the Law rightly seeks to prevent acts of violence or public scandal, it may be argued that it is going beyond its province when it attempts to regulate the private and voluntary relations of adult persons to each other. The homogenic affection is a valuable social force, and in some cases a necessary element of noble human character--yet the Act of 1885 makes almost any familiarity in such cases the possible basis of a criminal charge. The Law has no doubt had substantial ground for previous statutes on this subject--dealing with a certain gross act; but in so severely condemning the least familiarity between male persons[47] we think it has gone too far. It has undertaken a censorship over private morals (entirely apart from social results) which is beyond its province, and which--even if it were its province--it could not possibly fulfil;[48] it has opened wider than ever before the door to a real, most serious social evil and crime--that of blackmailing; and it has thrown a shadow over even the simplest and most ordinary expressions of an attachment which may, as we have seen, be of great value in the national life.

That the homosexual feeling, like the heterosexual, may lead to public abuses of liberty and decency; that it needs a strict self-control; and that much teaching and instruction on the subject is needed; we of course do not deny. But as, in the case of persons of opposite sex, the law limits itself on the whole to a maintenance of public order, the protection of the weak from violence and insult,[49] and of the young from their inexperience; so we think it should be here. The much-needed teaching and the true morality on the subject must be given--as it can only be given--by the spread of proper education and ideas, and not by the clumsy

bludgeon of the statute-book.[50]

Having thus shown the importance of the homogenic or comrade-attachment, in some form, in national life, it would seem high time now that the modern peoples should recognise this in their institutions, and endeavour at least in their public opinion and systems of education to understand this factor and give it its proper place. The undoubted evils which exist in relation to it, for instance in our public schools as well as in our public life, owe their existence largely to the fact that the whole subject is left in the gutter so to speak--in darkness and concealment. No one offers a clue of better things, nor to point a way out of the wilderness; and by this very non-recognition the passion is perverted into its least satisfactory channels. All love, one would say, must have its responsibilities, else it is liable to degenerate, and to dissipate itself in mere sentiment or sensuality. The normal marriage between man and woman leads up to the foundation of the household and the family; the love between parents and children implies duties and cares on both sides. The homogenic attachment left unrecognised, easily loses some of its best quality and becomes an ephemeral or corrupt thing. Yet, as we have seen, and as I am pointing out in the following chapter, it may, when occurring between an elder and younger, prove to be an immense educational force; while, as between equals, it may be turned to social and heroic uses, such as can hardly be demanded or expected from the ordinary marriage. It would seem high time, I say, that public opinion should recognise these facts; and so give to this attachment the sanction and dignity which arise from public recognition, as well as the definite form and outline which would flow from the existence of an accepted ideal or standard in the matter. It is often said how necessary for the morality of the ordinary marriage is some public recognition of the relation, and some accepted standard of conduct in it. May not, to a lesser degree, something of the same kind (as suggested in the next chapter) be true of the homogenic attachment? It has had its place as a recognised and guarded institution in the elder and more primitive societies; and it seems quite probable that a similar place will be accorded to it in the societies of the future.

IV

Affection in Education

The place of Affection, and the need of it, as an educative force in school-life, is a subject which is beginning to attract a good deal of attention. Hitherto Education has been concentred on intellectual (and physical) development; but the affections have been left to take care of themselves. Now it is beginning to be seen that the affections have an immense deal to say in the building up of the brain and the body. Their evolution and organisation in some degree is probably going to become an important part of school management.

School friendships of course exist; and almost every one remembers that they filled a large place in the outlook of his early years; but he remembers, too, that they were not recognised in any way, and that in consequence the main part of their force and value was wasted. Yet it is evident that the first unfolding of a strong attachment in boyhood or girlhood must have a profound influence; while if it occurs between an elder and a younger school-mate, or--as sometimes happens--between the young thing and its teacher, its importance in the educational sense can hardly be overrated.

That such feelings sometimes take quite intense and romantic forms few will deny. I have before me a letter, in which the author, speaking of an attachment he experienced when a boy of sixteen for a youth somewhat older than himself, says:--

“I would have died for him ten times over. My devices and plannings to meet him (to come across him casually, as it were) were those of a lad for his sweetheart, and when I saw him my heart beat so violently that it caught my breath, and I could not speak. We met in----, and for the weeks that he stayed there I thought of nothing else--thought of him night and day--and when he returned to London I used to write him weekly letters, veritable love-letters of many sheets in length. Yet I never felt one particle of jealousy, though our friendship lasted for some years. The passion, violent and extravagant as it was, I believe to have been perfectly free from sex-feeling and perfectly wholesome and good for me. It distinctly contributed to my growth. Looking back upon it and analysing it as well as I can, I seem to see as the chief element in it an escape from the extremely narrow Puritanism in which I was reared, into a large sunny ingenuous nature which knew nothing at all of the bondage of which I was beginning to be acutely conscious.”

Shelley in his fragmentary “Essay on Friendship” speaks in the most glowing terms of an attachment he formed at school, and so does Leigh Hunt in his “Autobiography.” Says the latter:--

“If I had reaped no other benefit from Christ Hospital, the school would be ever dear to me from the recollection of the friendships I formed in it, and of the first heavenly taste it gave me of that most spiritual of the affections.… I shall never forget the impression it

made on me. I loved my friend for his gentleness, his candour, his truth, his good repute, his freedom even from my own livelier manner, his calm and reasonable kindness.… I doubt whether he ever had a conception of a tithe of the regard and respect I entertained for him, and I smile to think of the perplexity (though he never showed it) which he probably felt sometimes at my enthusiastic expressions; for I thought him a kind of angel."

It is not necessary, however, to quote authorities on such a subject as this.[51] Any one who has had experience of schoolboys knows well enough that they are capable of forming these romantic and devoted attachments, and that their alliances are often of the kind especially referred to as having a bearing on education--_i.e._, between an elder and a younger. They are genuine attractions, free as a rule, and at their inception, from secondary motives. They are not formed by the elder one for any personal ends. More often, indeed, I think they are begun by the younger, who naively allows his admiration of the elder one to become visible. But they are absorbing and intense, and on either side their influence is deeply felt and long remembered.

That such attachments _may_ be of the very greatest value is self-evident. The younger boy looks on the other as a hero, loves to be with him, thrills with pleasure at his words of praise or kindness, imitates, and makes him his pattern and standard, learns exercises and games, contracts habits, or picks up information from him. The elder one, touched, becomes protector and helper; the unselfish side of his nature is drawn out, and he develops a real affection and tenderness towards the younger. He takes all sorts of trouble to initiate his _protégé_ in field sports or studies; is proud of the latter's success; and leads him on perhaps later to share his own ideals of life and thought and work.

Sometimes the alliance will begin, in a corresponding way, from the side of the elder boy. Sometimes, as said, between a boy and a master such an attachment, or the germ of it, is found; and indeed it is difficult to say what gulf, or difference of age, or culture, or class in society, is so great that affection of this kind will not on occasion overpass it. I have by me a letter which was written by a boy of eleven or twelve to a young man of twenty-four or twenty-five. The boy was rather a wild, "naughty" boy, and had given his parents (working-class folk) a good deal of trouble. He attended, however, some sort of night-school or evening class and there conceived the strongest affection (evidenced by this letter) for his teacher, the young man in question, quite spontaneously, and without any attempt on the part of the latter to elicit it; and (which was equally important) without any attempt on his part to _deny_ it. The result was most favorable; the one force which could really reach the boy had, as it were, been found; and he developed rapidly and well.

The following extract is from a letter written by an elderly man who has had large experience as a teacher. He says--

"It has always seemed to me that the _rapport_ that exists between two human beings, whether of the same or of different sexes, is a force not sufficiently recognised, and capable of producing great results. Plato fully understood its importance, and aimed at giving what to his countrymen was more or less sensual, a noble and exalted direction.… As one who has had much to do in instructing boys and starting them in life, I am convinced that the great secret of being a good teacher consists in the possibility of that _rapport_; not only of a merely intellectual nature, but involving a certain physical element, a personal affection, almost indescribable, that grows up between pupil and teacher, and through which thoughts are shared and an influence created that could exist in no other way."

And it must be evident to every one that to the expanding mind of a small boy to have a relation of real affection with some sensible and helpful elder of his own sex must be a priceless boon. At that age love to the other sex has hardly declared itself, and indeed is not exactly what is wanted. The unformed mind requires an ideal of itself, as it were, to which it can cling or towards which it can grow. Yet it is equally evident that the relation and the success of it, will depend immensely on the character of the elder one, on the self-restraint and tenderness of which he is capable, and on the ideal of life which he has in his mind. That, possibly, is the reason why Greek custom, at least in the early days of Hellas, not only recognised friendships between elder and younger youths as a national institution of great importance, but laid down very distinct laws or rules concerning the conduct of them, so as to be a guide and a help to the elder in what was acknowledged to be a position of responsibility.

In Crete, for instance,[52] the friendship was entered into in quite a formal and public way, with the understanding and consent of relatives; the position of the elder was clearly defined, and it became his business to train and exercise the younger in skill of arms, the chase, etc.; while the latter could obtain redress at law if the elder subjected him to insult or injury of any kind. At the end of a certain period of probation, if the younger desired it he could leave his comrade; if not, he became his squire or henchman--the elder being bound to furnish his military equipments--and they fought thenceforward side by side in battle, "inspired with double valor, according to the notions of the Cretans, by the gods of war and love."[53] Similar customs prevailed in Sparta, and, in a less

defined way, in other Greek states; as, indeed, they have prevailed among many semi-barbaric races on the threshold of civilisation.

When, however, we turn to modern life and the actual situation, as for instance in the public schools of to-day, it may well be objected that we find very little of the suggested ideal, but rather an appalling descent into the most uninspiring conditions. So far from friendship being an institution whose value is recognised and understood, it is at best scantily acknowledged, and is often actually discountenanced and misunderstood. And though attachments such as we have portrayed exist, they exist underground, as it were, at their peril, and half-stifled in an atmosphere which can only be described as that of the gutter. Somehow the disease of premature sexuality seems to have got possession of our centres of education; wretched practices and habits abound, and (what is perhaps their worst feature) cloud and degrade the boys' conception of what true love or friendship may be.

To those who are familiar with large public schools the state of affairs does not need describing. A friend (who has placed some notes at my disposal) says that in his time a certain well-known public school was a mass of uncleanness, incontinence, and dirty conversation, while at the same time a great deal of genuine affection, even to heroism, was shown among the boys in their relations with one another. But "all these things were treated by masters and boys alike as more or less unholy, with the result that they were either sought after or flung aside according to the sexual or emotional instinct of the boy. No attempt was made at discrimination. A kiss was by comparison as unclean as the act of _fellatio_, and no one had any gauge or principle whatever on which to guide the cravings of boyhood." The writer then goes into details which it is not necessary to reproduce here. He (and others) were initiated in the mysteries of sex by the dormitory servant; and the boys thus corrupted mishandled each other.

Naturally in any such atmosphere as this the chances _against_ the formation of a decent and healthy attachment are very large. If the elder youth happen to be given to sensuality he has here his opportunity; if on the other hand he is _not_ given to it, the ideas current around probably have the effect of making him suspect his own affection, and he ends by smothering and disowning the best part of his nature. In both ways harm is done. The big boys in such places become either coarse and licentious or hard and self-righteous; the small boys, instead of being educated and strengthened by the elder ones, become effeminate little wretches, the favorites, the petted boys, and the "spoons" of the school. As time goes on the public opinion of the school ceases to believe in the possibility of a healthy friendship; the masters begin to presume (and not without reason) that all affection means sensual practices, and end by doing their best to discourage it.

Now this state of affairs is really desperate. There is no need to be puritanical, or to look upon the lapses of boyhood as unpardonable sins; indeed, it may be allowed, as far as that goes, that a little frivolity is better than hardness and self-righteousness; yet every one feels, and must feel, who knows anything about the matter, that the state of our schools is bad.

And it is so because, after all, purity (in the sense of continence) _is_ of the first importance to boyhood. To prolong the period of continence in a boy's life is to prolong the period of _growth_. This is a simple physiological law, and a very obvious one; and whatever other things may be said in favour of purity, it remains perhaps the most weighty. To introduce sensual and sexual habits--and one of the worst of these is self-abuse--at an early age, is to arrest growth, both physical and mental.

And what is even more, it means to arrest the capacity for affection. I believe affection, attachment--whether to the one sex or the other--springs up normally in the youthful mind in a quite diffused, ideal, emotional form--a kind of longing and amazement as at something divine--with no definite thought or distinct consciousness of sex in it. The sentiment expands and fills, as it were like a rising tide, every cranny of the emotional and moral nature; and the longer (of course within reasonable limits) its definite outlet towards sex is deferred, the longer does this period of emotional growth and development continue, and the greater is the refinement and breadth and strength of character resulting. All experience shows that a too early outlet towards sex cheapens and weakens affectional capacity.

Yet this early outlet it is which is the great trouble of our public schools. And it really does not seem unlikely that the peculiar character of the middle-class man of to-day, his undeveloped affectional nature and something of brutishness and woodenness, is largely due to the prevalent condition of the places of his education. The Greeks, with their wonderful instinct of fitness, seem to have perceived the right path in all this matter; and, while encouraging friendship, as we have seen, made a great point of modesty in early life--the guardians and teachers of every well-born boy being especially called upon to watch over the sobriety of his habits and manners.[54]

We have then in education generally, it seems to me (and whether of boys or of girls), two great currents to deal with, which cannot be ignored, and which certainly ought to be candidly recognized and given their right direction. One of these currents is that of

friendship. The other is that of the young thing's natural curiosity about sex. The latter is of course, or should be, a perfectly legitimate interest. A boy at puberty naturally wants to know--and ought to know--what is taking place, and what the uses and functions of his body are. He does not go very deep into things; a small amount of information will probably satisfy him; but the curiosity is there, and it is pretty certain that the boy, if he is a boy of any sense or character, _will_ in some shape or another get to satisfy it.

The process is really a _mental_ one. Desire--except in some abnormal cases--has not manifested itself strongly; and there is often perhaps generally, an actual repugnance at first to anything like sexual practices; but the wish for information exists and is, I say, legitimate enough.[55] In almost all human societies except, curiously, the modern nations, there have been institutions for the initiation of the youth of either sex into these matters, and these initiations have generally been associated, in the opening blossom of the young mind, with inculcation of the ideals of manhood and womanhood, courage, hardihood, and the duties of the citizen or the soldier.[56]

But what does the modern school do? It shuts a trap-door down on the whole matter. There is a hush; a grim silence. Legitimate curiosity soon becomes illegitimate of its kind; and a furtive desire creeps in, where there was no desire before. The method of the gutter prevails. In the absence of any recognition of schoolboy needs, contraband information is smuggled from one to another; chaff and 'smut' take the place of sensible and decent explanations; unhealthy practices follow; the sacredness of sex goes its way, never to return, and the school is filled with premature and morbid talk and thought about a subject which should, by rights, only just be rising over the mental horizon.

The meeting of these two currents, of ideal attachment and sexual desire, constitutes a rather critical period, even when it takes place in the normal way--_i.e._, later on, and at the matrimonial age. Under the most favorable conditions a certain conflict occurs in the mind at their first encounter. But in the modern school this conflict, precipitated far too soon, and accompanied by an artificial suppression of the nobler current and a premature hastening of the baser one, ends in simple disaster to the former. Masters wage war against incontinence, and are right to do so. But how do they wage it? As said, by grim silence and fury, by driving the abscess deeper, by covering the drain over, _and_ by confusing when it comes before them--both in their own minds and those of the boys--a real attachment with that which they condemn.

Not long ago the headmaster of a large public school coming suddenly out of his study chanced upon two boys embracing each other in the corridor. Possibly, and even probably, it was the simple and natural expression of an unsophisticated attachment. Certainly, it was nothing that in itself could be said to be either right or wrong. What did he do? He haled the two boys into his study, gave them a long lecture on the nefariousness of their conduct, with copious hints that he knew _what such things meant_, and _what they led to_, and ended by punishing both condignly. Could anything be more foolish? If their friendship was clean and natural, the master was only trying to make them feel that it was unclean and unnatural, and that a lovely and honorable thing was disgraceful; if the act was--which at least is improbable--a mere signal of lust--even then the best thing would have been to assume that it was honorable, and by talking to the boys, either together or separately, to try and inspire them with a better ideal; while if, between these positions, the master really thought the affection though honorable would lead to things undesirable, then, plainly, to punish the two was only to cement their love for each other, to give them a strong reason for concealing it, and to hasten its onward course. Yet every one knows that this is the _kind_ of way in which the subject is treated in schools. It is the method of despair. And masters (perhaps not unnaturally) finding that they have not the time which would be needed for personal dealing with each boy, nor the forces at their command by which they might hope to introduce new ideals of life and conduct into their little community, and feeling thus utterly unable to cope with the situation, allow themselves to drift into a policy of mere silence with regard to it, tempered by outbreaks of ungoverned and unreasoning severity.

I venture to think that school-masters will never successfully solve the difficulty until they boldly recognize the two needs in question, and proceed candidly to give them their proper satisfaction.

The need of information--the legitimate curiosity--of boys (and girls) must be met, (1) partly by classes on physiology, (2) partly by private talks and confidences between elder and younger, based on friendship. With regard to (1) classes of this kind are already, happily, being carried on at a few advanced schools, and with good results. And though such classes can only go rather generally into the facts of motherhood and generation they cannot fail, if well managed, to impress the young minds, and give them a far grander and more reverent conception of the matter than they usually gain.

But (2) although some rudimentary teaching on sex and lessons in physiology may be given in classes, it is obvious that further instruction and indeed any real help in the conduct of life and morals can only come through very close and tender confidences between the elder and the younger, such as exist where there is a strong friendship to begin with. It is obvious that effective help _can_ only come in this way, and that this is the only way in which it is desirable that it should come. The elder friend in this case would, one might say, naturally be, and in many instances may be, the parent, mother or father--who ought certainly to be able to impress on the clinging child the sacredness of the relation. And it is much to be hoped that parents will see their way to take this part more freely in the future. But for some unexplained reason there is certainly often a gulf of reserve between the (British) parent and child; and the boy who is much at school comes more under the influence of his elder companions than his parents. If, therefore, boys and youths cannot be trusted and encouraged to form decent and loving friendships with each other, and with their elders or juniors--in which many delicate questions could be discussed and the tradition of sensible and manly conduct with regard to sex handed down--we are indeed in a bad plight and involved in a vicious circle from which escape seems difficult.

And so (we think) the need of attachment must also be met by full recognition of it, and the granting of it expression within all reasonable limits; by the dissemination of a good ideal of friendship and the enlistment of it on the side of manliness and temperance. Is it too much to hope that schools will in time recognise comradeship as a regular institution--considerably more important, say, than “fagging”--an institution having its definite place in the school life, in the games and in the studies, with its own duties, responsibilities, privileges, etc., and serving to ramify through the little community, hold it together, and inspire its members with the two qualities of heroism and tenderness, which together form the basis of all great character?

But here it must be said that if we are hoping for any great change in the conduct of our large boys’ schools, the so-called public schools are not the places in which to look for it--or at any rate for its inception. In the first place these institutions are hampered by powerful traditions which naturally make them conservative; and in the second place their mere size and the number of boys make them difficult to deal with or to modify. The masters are overwhelmed with work; and the (necessary) division of so many boys into separate ‘houses’ has this effect that a master who introduces a better tradition into his own house has always the prospect before him that his work will be effaced by the continual and perhaps contaminating contact with the boys from the other houses. No, it will be in smaller schools, say of from 50 to 100 boys, where the personal influence of the headmaster will be a real force reaching each boy, and where he will be really able to mould the tradition of the school, that we shall alone be able to look for an improved state of affairs.[57]

No doubt the first steps in any reform of this kind are difficult; but masters are greatly hampered by the confusion in the public mind, to which we have already alluded--which so often persists in setting down any attachment between two boys, or between a boy and his teacher, to nothing but sensuality. Many masters quite understand the situation, but feel themselves helpless in the face of public opinion. Who so fit (they sometimes feel) to enlighten a young boy and guide his growing mind as one of themselves, when the bond of attachment exists between the two? Like the writer of a letter quoted in the early part of this paper they believe that “a personal affection, almost indescribable, grows up between pupil and teacher, through which thoughts are shared and an influence created that could exist in no other way.” Yet when the pupil comes along of whom all this might be true, who shows by his pleading looks the sentiment which animates him, and the profound impression which he is longing, as it were, to receive from his teacher, the latter belies himself, denies his own instinct and the boy’s great need, and treats him distantly and with coldness. And why? Simply because he dreads, even while he desires it, the boy’s confidence. He fears the ingenuous and perfectly natural expression of the boy’s affection in caress or embrace, because he knows how a bastard public opinion will interpret, or misinterpret it; and rather than run such a risk as this he seals the fountains of the heart, withholds the help which love alone can give, and deliberately nips the tender bud which is turning to him for light and warmth.[58]

The panic terror which prevails in England with regard to the expression of affection of this kind has its comic aspect. The affection exists, and is known to exist, on all sides; but we must bury our heads in the sand and pretend not to see it. And if by any chance we are compelled to recognize it, we must show our vast discernment by _suspecting_ it. And thus we fling on the dust-heap one of the noblest and most precious elements in human nature. Certainly, if the denial and suspicion of all natural affection were beneficial, we should find this out in our schools; but seeing how complete is its failure there to clarify their tone it is sufficiently evident that the method itself is wrong.

* * * * *

The remarks in this paper have chiefly had reference to boys’ schools; but they apply in the main to girls’ schools, where much the same troubles prevail--with this difference, that in girls’ schools friendships instead of being repressed are rather encouraged by

public opinion; only unfortunately they are for the most part friendships of a weak and sentimental turn, and not very healthy either in themselves or in the habits they lead to. Here too, in girls' schools, the whole subject wants facing out; friendship wants setting on a more solid and less sentimental basis; and on the subject of sex, so infinitely important to women, there needs to be sensible and consistent teaching, both public and private. Possibly the co-education of boys and girls may be of use in making boys less ashamed of their feelings, and girls more healthy in the expression of them.

At any rate the more the matter is thought of, the clearer I believe will it appear that a healthy affection must in the end be the basis of education, and that the recognition of this will form the only way out of the modern school-difficulty. It is true that such a change would revolutionise our school-life; but it will have to come, all the same, and no doubt will come _pari passu_ with other changes that are taking place in society at large.

V

The Place of the Uranian in Society

Whatever differing views there may be on the many problems which the Intermediate sexes present--and however difficult of solution some of the questions involved--there is one thing which appears to me incontestable: namely that a vast number of intermediates do actually perform most valuable social work, and that they do so partly on account and by reason of their special temperament.

This fact is not generally recognised as it ought to be, for the simple reason that the Uranian himself is not recognised, and indeed (as we have already said) tends to conceal his temperament from the public. There is no doubt that if it became widely known _who are_ the Uranians, the world would be astonished to find so many of its great or leading men among them.

I have thought it might be useful to indicate some of the lines along which valuable work is being performed, or has been performed, by people of this disposition; and in doing this I do not of course mean to disguise or conceal the fact that there are numbers of merely frivolous, or feeble or even vicious homosexuals, who practically do no useful work for society at all--_just as there are of normal people_. The existence of those who do no valuable work does not alter the fact of the existence of others whose work is of great importance. And I wish also to make it clearly understood that I use the word Uranians to indicate simply those whose lives and activities are inspired by a genuine friendship or love for their own sex, without venturing to specify their individual and particular habits or relations towards those whom they love (which relations in most cases we have no means of knowing). Some Intermediates of light and leading--doubtless not a few--are physically very reserved and continent; others are sensual in some degree or other. The point is that they are all men, or women, whose most powerful motive comes from the dedication to their own kind, and is bound up with it in some way. And if it seems strange and anomalous that in such cases work of considerable importance to society is being done by people whose affections and dispositions society itself would blame, this is after all no more than has happened a thousand times before in the history of the world.

As I have already hinted, the Uranian temperament (probably from the very fact of its dual nature and the swift and constant interaction between its masculine and feminine elements) is exceedingly sensitive and emotional; and there is no doubt that, going with this, a large number of the artist class, musical, literary or pictorial, belong to this description. That delicate and subtle sympathy with every wave and phase of feeling which makes the artist possible is also very characteristic of the Uranian (the male type), and makes it easy or natural for the Uranian man to become an artist. In the 'confessions' and 'cases' collected by Krafft-Ebing, Havelock Ellis and others, it is remarkable what a large percentage of men of this temperament belong to the artist class. In his volume on "Sexual Inversion,"[59] speaking of the cases collected by himself, Ellis says:--"An examination of my cases reveals the interesting fact that thirty-two of them, or sixty-eight per cent., possess artistic aptitude in varying degree. Galton found, from the investigation of nearly one thousand persons, that the general average showing artistic taste in England is only about thirty per cent. It must also be said that my figures are probably below the truth, as no special point was made of investigating the matter, and also that in many of my cases the artistic aptitudes are of high order. With regard to the special avocations of my cases, it must of course be said that no occupation furnishes a safeguard against inversion. There are, however, certain occupations to which inverts are specially attracted. Acting is certainly one of the chief of these. Three of my cases belong to the dramatic profession, and others have marked dramatic ability. Art, again, in its various forms, and music, exercise much attraction. In my experience, however, literature is the avocation to which inverts seem to feel chiefly called, and that moreover in which they may find the highest degree of success and reputation. At least half-a-dozen of my cases are successful men of letters."

Of Literature in this connection, and of the great writers of the world whose work has been partly inspired by the Uranian love, I have myself already spoken.[60] It may further be said that those of the modern artist-writers and poets who have done the greatest service in the way of interpreting and reconstructing _Greek_ life and ideals--men like Winckelmann, Goethe, Addington Symonds, Walter Pater--have had a marked strain of this temperament in them. And this has been a service of great value, and one which the world could ill have afforded to lose.

The painters and sculptors, especially of the renaissance period in Italy, yield not a few examples of men whose work has been similarly inspired--as in the cases of Michel Angelo, Lionardo, Bazzi, Cellini, and others. As to music, this is certainly the art which in its subtlety and tenderness--and perhaps in a certain inclination to _indulge_ in emotion--lies nearest to the Urning nature. There are few in fact of this nature who have not some gift in the direction of music--though, unless we cite Tschaikowsky, it does not appear that any thorough-going Uranian has attained to the highest eminence in this art.

Another direction along which the temperament very naturally finds an outlet is the important social work of Education. The capacity that a man has, in cases, of devoting himself to the welfare of boys or youths, is clearly a thing which ought not to go wasted--and which may be most precious and valuable. It is incontestable that a great number of men (and women) are drawn into the teaching profession by this sentiment--and the work they do is, in many cases, beyond estimation. Fortunate the boy who meets with such a helper in early life! I know a man--a rising and vigorous thinker and writer--who tells me that he owes almost everything mentally to such a friend of his boyhood, who took the greatest interest in him, saw him almost every day for many years, and indeed cleared up for him not only things mental but things moral, giving him the affection and guidance his young heart needed. And I have myself known and watched not a few such teachers, in public schools and in private schools, and seen something of the work and of the real inspiration they have been to boys under them. Hampered as they have been by the readiness of the world to misinterpret, they still have been able to do most precious service. Of course here and there a case occurs in which privilege is abused; but even then the judgment of the world is often unreasonably severe. A poor boy once told me with tears in his eyes of the work a man had done for him. This man had saved the boy from drunken parents, taken him from the slums, and by means of a club helped him out into the world. Many other boys he had rescued, it appeared, in the same way--scores and scores of them. But on some occasion or other he got into trouble, and was accused of improper familiarities. No excuse, or record of a useful life, was of the least avail. Every trumpery slander was believed, every mean motive imputed, and he had to throw up his position and settle elsewhere, his life-work shattered, never to be resumed.

The capacity for sincere affection which causes an elder man to care so deeply for the welfare of a youth or boy, is met and responded to by a similar capacity in the young thing of devotion to an elder man. This fact is not always recognised; but I have known cases of boys and even young men who would feel the most romantic attachments to quite mature men, sometimes as much as forty or fifty years of age, and only for them--passing by their own contemporaries of either sex, and caring only to win a return affection from these others. This may seem strange, but it is true. And the fact not only makes one understand what riddles there are slumbering in the breasts of our children, but how greatly important it is that we should try to read them--since here, in such cases as these, the finding of an answering heart in an elder man would probably be the younger one’s salvation.

How much of the enormous amount of philanthropic work done in the present day--by women among needy or destitute girls of all sorts, or by men among like classes of boys--is inspired by the same feeling, it would be hard to say; but it must be a very considerable proportion. I think myself that the best philanthropic work--just because it is the most personal, the most loving, and the least merely formal and self-righteous--has a strong fibre of the Uranian heart running through it; and if it should be said that work of this very personal kind is more liable to dangers and difficulties on that account, it is only what is true of the best in almost all departments.

Eros is a great leveler. Perhaps the true Democracy rests, more firmly than anywhere else, on a sentiment which easily passes the bounds of class and caste, and unites in the closest affection the most estranged ranks of society. It is noticeable how often Uranians of good position and breeding are drawn to rougher types, as of manual workers, and frequently very permanent alliances grow up in this way, which although not publicly acknowledged have a decided influence on social institutions, customs and political tendencies--and which would have a good deal more influence could they be given a little more scope and recognition. There are cases that I have known (although the ordinary commercial world might hardly believe it) of employers who have managed to attach their workmen, or many of them, very personally to themselves, and whose object in running their businesses was at least as much to provide their employees with a living as themselves; while the latter, feeling this, have responded with their best output. It is possible that something like the guilds and fraternities of the middle ages might thus be reconstructed, but on a more intimate and personal basis than in those days; and indeed there are not wanting signs that such a reconstruction is actually taking place.

The “Letters of Love and Labour” written by Samuel M. Jones of Toledo, Ohio, to his workmen in the engineering firm of which he was master, are very interesting in this connection. They breathe a spirit of extraordinary personal affection towards, and confidence in, the employees, which was heartily responded to by the latter; and the whole business was carried on, with considerable success, on the principle of a close and friendly co-operation all round.[61]

These things indeed suggest to one that it is possible that the Uranian spirit may lead to something like a general enthusiasm of Humanity, and that the Uranian people may be destined to form the advance guard of that great movement which will one day transform the common life by substituting the bond of personal affection and compassion for the monetary, legal and other external ties which now control and confine society. Such a part of course we cannot expect the Uranians to play unless the capacity for their kind of attachment also exists--though in a germinal and undeveloped state--in the breast of mankind at large. And modern thought and investigation are clearly tending that way--to confirm that it does so exist.

Dr. E. Bertz in his late study of Whitman as a person of strongly homogenic temperament[62] brings forward the objection that Whitman’s gospel of Comradeship as a means of social regeneration is founded on a false basis--because (so Dr. Bertz says) the gospel derives from an abnormality in himself, and therefore cannot possibly have a universal application or create a general enthusiasm. But this is rather a case of assuming the point which has to be proved. Whitman constantly maintains that his own disposition at any rate is normal, and that he represents the average man. And it _may_ be true, even as far as his Uranian temperament is concerned, that while this was specially developed in him the germs of it _are_ almost, if not quite, universal. If so, then the Comradeship on which Whitman founds a large portion of his message may in course of time become a general enthusiasm, and the nobler Uranians of to-day may be destined, as suggested, to be its pioneers and advance guard. As one of them himself has sung:--

These things shall be! A loftier race, Than e’er the world hath known, shall rise With flame of freedom in their souls, And light of science in their eyes. Nation with nation, land with land, In-armed shall live as comrades free; In every heart and brain shall throb The pulse of one fraternity.[63]

To proceed. The Uranian, though generally high-strung and sensitive, is by no means always dreamy. He is sometimes extraordinarily and unexpectedly practical; and such a man may, and often does, command a positive enthusiasm among his subordinates in a business organisation. The same is true of military organisation. As a rule the Uranian temperament (in the male) is not militant. War with its horrors and savagery is somewhat alien to the type. But here again there are exceptions; and in all times there have been great generals (like Alexander, Cæsar, Charles XII. of Sweden, or Frederick II. of Prussia--not to speak of more modern examples) with a powerful strain in them of the homogenic nature, and a wonderful capacity for organisation and command, which combined with their personal interest in, or attachment to, their troops, and the answering enthusiasm so elicited, have made their armies well-nigh invincible.

The existence of this great practical ability in some Uranians cannot be denied; and it points to the important work they may some day have to do in social reconstruction. At the same time I think it is noticeable that _politics_ (at any rate in the modern sense of the word, as concerned mainly with party questions and party government) is not as a rule congenial to them. The personal and affectional element is perhaps too remote or absent. Mere ‘views’ and ‘questions’ and party strife are alien to the Uranian man, as they are on the whole to the ordinary woman.

If politics, however, are not particularly congenial, it is yet remarkable how many royal personages have been decidedly homogenic in temperament. Taking the Kings of England from the Norman Conquest to the present day, we may count about thirty. And three of these, namely, William Rufus, Edward II., and James I. were homosexual in a marked degree--might fairly be classed as Urnings--while some others, like William III., had a strong admixture of the same temperament. Three out of thirty yields a high ratio--ten per cent--and considering that sovereigns do not generally choose themselves, but come into their position by accident of birth, the ratio is certainly remarkable. Does it suggest that the general percentage in the world at large is equally high, but that it remains unnoticed, except in the fierce light that beats upon thrones? or is there some other explanation with regard to the special liability of royalty to inversion? Hereditary degeneracy has sometimes been suggested. But it is difficult to explain the matter even on this theory; for though the epithet ‘degenerate’ might possibly apply to James I., it would certainly not be applicable to William Rufus and William III., who, in their different ways, were both men of great courage and personal force--while Edward II. was by no means wanting in ability.

But while the Uranian temperament has, in cases, specially fitted its possessors to become distinguished in art or education or war or administration, and enabled them to do valuable work in these fields; it remains perhaps true that above all it has fitted them, and fits them, for distinction and service in affairs of the heart.

It is hard to imagine human beings more skilled in these matters than are the Intermediates. For indeed no one else can possibly respond to and understand, as they do, all the fluctuations and interactions of the masculine and feminine in human life. The pretensive coyness and passivity of women, the rude invasiveness of men; lust, brutality, secret tears, the bleeding heart; renunciation, motherhood, finesse, romance, angelic devotion--all these things lie slumbering in the Uranian soul, ready on occasion for expression; and if they are not always expressed are always there for purposes of divination or interpretation. There are few situations, in fact, in courtship or marriage which the Uranian does not instinctively understand; and it is strange to see how even an unlettered person of this type will often read Love's manuscript easily in cases where the normal man or woman is groping over it like a child in the dark. [Not of course that this means to imply any superiority of _character_ in the former; but merely that with his double outlook he necessarily discerns things which the other misses.]

That the Uranians do stand out as helpers and guides, not only in matters of Education, but in affairs of love and marriage, is tolerably patent to all who know them. It is a common experience for them to be consulted now by the man, now by the woman, whose matrimonial conditions are uncongenial or disastrous--not generally because the consultants in the least perceive the Uranian nature, but because they instinctively feel that here is a strong sympathy with and understanding of their side of the question. In this way it is often the fate of the Uranian, himself unrecognised, to bring about happier times and a better comprehension of each other among those with whom he may have to deal. Also he often becomes the confidant of young things of either sex, who are caught in the tangles of love or passion, and know not where to turn for assistance.

I say that I think perhaps of all the services the Uranian may render to society it will be found some day that in this direction of solving the problems of affection and of the heart he will do the greatest service. If the day is coming as we have suggested--when Love is at last to take its rightful place as the binding and directing force of society (instead of the Cash-nexus), and society is to be transmuted in consequence to a higher form, then undoubtedly the superior types of Uranians--prepared for this service by long experience and devotion, as well as by much suffering--will have an important part to play in the transformation. For that the Urnings in their own lives put Love before everything else--postponing to it the other motives like money-making, business success, fame, which occupy so much space in most people's careers--is a fact which is patent to everyone who knows them. This may be saying little or nothing in favor of those of this class whose conception of love is only of a poor and frivolous sort; but in the case of those others who see the god in his true light, the fact that they serve him in singleness of heart and so unremittingly raises them at once into the position of the natural leaders of mankind.

From this fact--_i.e._, that these folk think so much of affairs of the heart--and from the fact that their alliances and friendships are formed and carried on beneath the surface of society, as it were, and therefore to some extent beyond the inquisitions and supervisions of Mrs. Grundy, some interesting conclusions flow.

For one thing, the question is constantly arising as to how Society would shape itself if _free_: what form, in matters of Love and Marriage, it would take, if the present restrictions and sanctions were removed or greatly altered. At present in these matters, the Law, the Church, and a strong pressure of public opinion interfere, compelling the observance of certain forms; and it becomes difficult to say how much of the existing order is due to the spontaneous instinct and common sense of human nature, and how much to mere outside compulsion and interference: how far, for instance, Monogamy is natural or artificial; to what degree marriages would be permanent if the Law did not make them so; what is the rational view of Divorce; whether jealousy is a necessary accompaniment of Love; and so forth. These are questions which are being constantly discussed, without finality; or not infrequently with quite pessimistic conclusions.

Now in the Urning societies a certain freedom (though not complete, of course) exists. Underneath the surface of general Society, and consequently unaffected to any great degree by its laws and customs, alliances are formed and maintained, or modified or broken, more in accord with inner need than with outer pressure. Thus it happens that in these societies there are such opportunities to note and observe human grouping under conditions of freedom, as do not occur in the ordinary world. And the results are both interesting and encouraging. As a rule I think it may be said that the alliances are remarkably permanent. Instead of the wild "general post" which so many good people seem to expect in the event of law being relaxed, one finds (except of course in a few individual cases) that common sense and fidelity and a strong tendency to permanence prevail. In the ordinary world so far has doubt gone that many to-day disbelieve in a life-long free marriage. Yet among the Uranians such a thing is, one may almost

say, common and well known; and there are certainly few among them who do not believe in its possibility.

Great have been the debates, in all times and places, concerning Jealousy; and as to how far jealousy is natural and instinctive and universal, and how far it is the product of social opinion and the property sense, and so on. In ordinary marriage what may be called social and proprietary jealousy is undoubtedly a very great factor. But this kind of jealousy hardly appears or operates in the Urning societies. Thus we have an opportunity in these latter of observing conditions where only the natural and instinctive jealousy exists. This of course is present among the Urnings--sometimes rampant and violent, sometimes quiescent and vanishing almost to _nil_. It seems to depend almost entirely upon the individual; and we certainly learn that jealousy though frequent and widespread, is not an absolutely necessary accompaniment of love. There are cases of Uranians (whether men or women) who, though permanently allied, do not object to lesser friendships on either side--and there are cases of very decided objection. And we may conclude that something the same would be true (is true) of the ordinary Marriage, the property considerations and the property jealousy being once removed. The tendency anyhow to establish a dual relation more or less fixed, is seen to be very strong among the Intermediates, and may be concluded to be equally strong among the more normal folk.

Again with regard to Prostitution. That there are a few natural-born prostitutes is seen in the Urning-societies; but prostitution in that world does not take the important place which it does in the normal world, partly because the law-bound compulsory marriage does not exist there, and partly because prostitution naturally has little chance and cannot compete in a world where alliances are free and there is an open field for friendship. Hence we may see that freedom of alliance and of marriage in the ordinary world will probably lead to the great diminution or even disappearance of Prostitution.

In these and other ways the experience of the Uranian world forming itself freely and not subject to outside laws and institutions comes as a guide--and really a hopeful guide--towards the future. I would say however that in making these remarks about certain conclusions which we are able to gather from some spontaneous and comparatively unrestricted associations, I do not at all mean to argue _against_ institutions and forms. I think that the Uranian love undoubtedly suffers from want of a recognition and a standard. And though it may at present be better off than if subject to a foolish and meddlesome regulation; yet in the future it will have its more or less fixed standards and ideals, like the normal love. If one considers for a moment how the ordinary relations of the sexes would suffer were there no generally acknowledged codes of honor and conduct with regard to them, one then indeed sees that reasonable forms and institutions are a help, and one may almost wonder that the Urning circles are so well-conducted on the whole as they are.

I have said that the Urning men in their own lives put love before money-making, business success, fame, and other motives which rule the normal man. I am sure that it is also true of them as a whole that they put love before lust. I do not feel _sure_ that this can be said of the normal man, at any rate in the present stage of evolution. It is doubtful whether on the whole the merely physical attraction is not the stronger motive with the latter type. Unwilling as the world at large is to credit what I am about to say, and great as are the current misunderstandings on the subject, I believe it is true that the Uranian men are superior to the normal men in this respect--in respect of their love-feeling--which is gentler, more sympathetic, more considerate, more a matter of the heart and less one of mere physical satisfaction than that of ordinary men.[64] All this flows naturally from the presence of the feminine element in them, and its blending with the rest of their nature. It should be expected _a priori_, and it can be noticed at once by those who have any acquaintance with the Urning world. Much of the current misunderstanding with regard to the character and habits of the Urning arises from his confusion with the ordinary _roué_ who, though of normal temperament, contracts homosexual habits out of curiosity and so forth--but this is a point which I have touched on before, and which ought now to be sufficiently clear. If it be once allowed that the love-nature of the Uranian is of a sincere and essentially humane and kindly type then the importance of the Uranian's place in Society, and of the social work he may be able to do, must certainly also be acknowledged.

FOOTNOTES

[1] For the derivation of these terms see ch. ii., p. 20, _infra_.

[2] See Appendix, pp. 139 and 140.

[3] From _Uranos_, heaven; his idea being that the Uranian love was of a higher order than the ordinary attachment. For further about Ulrichs and his theories see Appendix, pp. 157-159.

[4] Charles G. Leland ("Hans Breitmann") in his book "The Alternate Sex" (Wellby, 1904), insists much on the frequent combination of the characteristics of both sexes in remarkable men and women, and has a chapter on "The Female Mind in Man," and another

on “The Male Intellect in Woman.”

[5] Some late statistical inquiries (see “Statistische Untersuchungen,” von Dr. M. Hirschfeld, Leipzig, 1904) yield 1.5 to 2.0 per cent. as a probable ratio. See also Appendix, pp. 134-136.

[6] For instances, see Appendix, pp. 149-153.

[7] See De Joux, “Die Enterbten des Liebesglückes” (Leipzig, 1893), p. 21.

[8] “Psychopathia Sexualis,” 7th ed., p. 276.

[9] See Appendix, pp. 153-156.

[10] A good deal in this description may remind readers of history of the habits and character of Henry III. of France.

[11] Perhaps, like Queen Christine of Sweden, who rode across Europe, on her visit to Italy, in jack-boots and sitting astride of her horse. It is said that she shook the Pope’s hand, on seeing him, so heartily that the doctor had to attend to it afterwards!

[12] “Homosexual,” generally used in scientific works, is of course a bastard word. “Homogenic” has been suggested, as being from two roots, both Greek, _i.e._, “homos,” same, and “genos,” sex.

[13] “Athenæus” xiii., ch. 78.

[14] See Plutarch’s “Eroticus,” §xvii.

[15] See “Natural History of Man,” by J. G. Wood. Vol: “Africa,” p. 419.

[16] See also Livingstone’s “Expedition to the Zambesi” (Murray, 1865) p. 148.

[17] Though these two plays, except for some quotations, are lost.

[18] Mantegazza and Lombroso. See Albert Moll, “Conträre Sexualempfindung,” 2nd ed., p. 36.

[19] Though in translation this fact is often by pious fraudulence disguised.

[20] W. Pater’s “Renaissance,” pp. 8-16.

[21] Among _prose_ writers of this period, Montaigne, whose treatment of the subject is enthusiastic and unequivocal, should not be overlooked. See Hazlitt’s “Montaigne,” ch. xxvii.

[22] I may be excused for quoting here the sonnet No. 54, from J. A. Symonds’ translation of the sonnets of Michel Angelo:--

“From thy fair face I learn, O my loved lord, That which no mortal tongue can rightly say: The soul, imprisoned in her house of clay, Holpen by thee to God hath often soared: And though the vulgar, vain, malignant horde Attribute what their grosser wills obey, Yet shall this fervent homage that I pay, This love, this faith, pure joys for us afford, Lo, all the lovely things we find on earth, Resemble for the soul that rightly sees, That source of bliss divine which gave us birth: Nor have we first-fruits or remembrances Of heaven elsewhere. Thus, loving loyally, I rise to God, and make death sweet by thee.”

The labours of von Scheffler, followed by J. A. Symonds, have now pretty conclusively established the pious frauds of the nephew, and the fact that the love-poems of the elder Michel Angelo were, for the most part, written to male friends.

[23] See an interesting paper in W. Pater’s “Renaissance.”

[24] For a fuller collection of instances of this Friendship-love in the history of the world, see “Ioläus: an Anthology,” by E. Carpenter (George Allen, London. 3/- net). Also “Liebling-minne und Freundesliebe in der Welt-literatur,” von Elisar von Kupffer (Adolf Brand, Berlin, 1900).

[25] As in the case, for instance, of Tennyson’s “In Memoriam,” for which the poet was soundly rated by the _Times_ at the time of its publication.

[26] Jowett’s “Plato,” 2nd ed., vol. ii., p. 30.

[27] Jowett, vol. ii., p. 130.

[28] One ought also to mention some later writers, like Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld and Dr. von Römer, whose work though avowedly favourable to the Urning-movement, is in a high degree scientific and reliable in character.

[29] From _Uranos_--see, for derivation, p. 20, _supra_--also Plato's "Symposium," speech of Pausanias.

[30] See, for estimates, Appendix, pp. 134-136.

[31] Though there is no doubt a general _tendency_ towards femininity of type in the male Urning, and towards masculinity in the female.

[32] "Gli amori degli uomini."

[33] "Psychopathia Sexualis," 7th ed., p. 227.

[34] _Ibid_, pp. 229 and 258. See Appendix, p. 160.

[35] "How deep congenital sex-inversion roots may be gathered from the fact that the pleasure-dream of the male Urning has to do with male persons, and of the female with females."--Krafft-Ebing, "P.S.," 7th ed., p. 228.

[36] "Conträre Sexualempfindung," 2nd ed., p. 269.

[37] See "Love's Coming-of-Age," p. 22.

[38] Pub.: F. A. Davis, Philadelphia, 1901.

[39] Otto Weininger even goes further, and regards the temperament as a natural intermediate form ("Sex and Character," ch. iv.) See also Appendix, _infra_, p. 169.

[40] "Though then before my own conscience I cannot reproach myself, and though I must certainly reject the judgment of the world about us, yet I suffer greatly. In very truth I have injured no one, and I hold my love in its nobler activity for just as holy as that of normally disposed men, but under the unhappy fate that allows us neither sufferance nor recognition I suffer often more than my life can bear."--Extract from a letter given by Krafft-Ebing.

[41] See "In the Key of Blue," by J. A. Symonds (Elkin Mathews, 1893).

[42] See Appendix, pp. 162 and 163.

[43] See also "Love's Coming-of-Age," 5th ed., pp. 173, 174.

[44] See "Das Conträre Geschlechtsgefühl," von Havelock Ellis und J. A. Symonds (Leipzig, 1896).

[45] "Symposium," Speech of Socrates.

[46] It is interesting in this connection to notice the extreme fervour, almost of romance, of the bond which often unites lovers of like sex over a long period of years, in an unfailing tenderness of treatment and consideration towards each other, equal to that shown in the most successful marriages. The love of many such men, says Moll (p. 119), "developed in youth lasts at times the whole life through. I know of such men, who had not seen their first love for years, even decades, and who yet on meeting showed the old fire of their first passion. In other cases, a close love-intimacy will last unbroken for many years."

[47] Though, inconsistently enough, making no mention of females.

[48] Dr. Moll maintains (2nd ed., pp. 314, 315) that if familiarities between those of the same sex are made illegal, as immoral, self-abuse ought much more to be so made.

[49] Though it is doubtful whether the marriage-laws even do this.

[50] In France, since the adoption of the Code Napoleon, sexual inversion is tolerated under the same restrictions as normal sexuality; and according to Carlier, formerly Chief of the French Police, Paris is not more depraved in this matter than London. Italy in 1889 also adopted the principles of the Code Napoleon on this point. For further considerations with regard to the Law, see Appendix, pp. 164 and 165.

[51] For further instances, see Appendix, pp. 143-148.

[52] See Müller's "History and Antiquities of the Doric Race."

[53] Müller.

[54] Cf. the incident at the end of Plato's "Lysis," when the tutors of Lysis and Menexenus come in and send the youths home.

[55] For a useful little manual on this subject, see "How We are Born," by Mrs. N. J. (Daniel, London, price 2/-). For a general argument in favour of sex-teaching see "The Training of the Young in Laws of Sex," by Canon Lyttelton, Headmaster of Eton College (Longmans, 2/6).

[56] See J. G. Wood's "Natural History of Man," vol. "Africa," p. 324 (the Bechuanas); also vol. "Australia," p. 75.

[57] With the rapid rise which is taking place, in scope and social status, of the state day-schools, it is probable that some change of opinion will take place with regard to the wisdom of sending young boys of ten to fourteen to upper-class boarding-schools. For a boy of fifteen or sixteen and upwards the boarding-school system may have its advantages. By that time a boy is old enough to understand some questions; he is old enough to have some rational ideal of conduct, and to hold his own in the pursuit of it; and he may learn in the life away from home a lot in the way of discipline, organization, self-reliance, etc. But to send a young thing, ignorant of life, and quite unformed of character, to take his chance by day and night in the public school as it at present exists, is--to say the least--a rash thing to do.

[58] It should be also said, in fairness, that the fear of showing undue partiality, often comes in as a paralysing influence.

[59] "Studies in the Psychology of Sex," vol. ii., p. 173.

[60] See ch. ii. _supra_, also _Ioläus_, an Anthology of Friendship, by E. Carpenter.

[61] Mr. Jones became Mayor of Toledo; but died at the early age of 53. See also "Workshop Reconstruction," by C. R. Ashbee, Appendix, _infra_, p. 146.

[62] "Whitman: ein Charakterbild," by Edward Bertz (Leipzig, Max Spohr).

[63] John Addington Symonds.

[64] See Appendix, pp. 172-174.

APPENDIX

"In this country [Britain] we have too long, from a sense of mock modesty, neglected the science relating to sex. In Germany this is not so. There we find workers who have elaborated for themselves a new science, and who have given to the world knowledge which is of the very utmost importance. We now know that there are females with strong male characteristics, and _vice-versa_. Anatomically and mentally we find all shades existing from the pure genus man to the pure genus woman. Thus there has been constituted what is well named by an illustrious exponent of the science 'The Third Sex'."--Dr. JAMES BURNET, _The Medical Times and Hospital Gazette_, vol. xxxiv., No. 1497, 10th November, 1906. London.

"Every citizen of age to fulfil his duties as a citizen, whether he be a father or husband, teacher or pupil, master or servant, official or subordinate, has the right, and owes it as a duty, to know the facts of sexual inversion, to combat and to prevent debauchery, crime and vice, to learn and to teach others the place of inversion in Society, and its morals, the duties of the invert towards himself, and towards other inverts, towards the normal man, and towards women and children. And the duties of the normal man towards the invert are no less--no less difficult, no less indispensable."--M. A. RAFFALOVICH, "Uranisme et Unisexualité." Paris, 1896.

"That sex inversion is not a chance phenomenon … appears from the fact that it has been observed at all times and in all places, and among peoples quite separate from each other."--A. MOLL, "Die Conträre Sexualempfindung," 2nd Edition, p. 15. Berlin, 1893.

"Concerning the wide prevalence of sexual inversion, and of homosexual phenomena generally, there can be no manner of doubt. In Berlin, Moll states that he has himself seen between six hundred and seven hundred homosexual persons, and heard of some two hundred and fifty to three hundred others. I have much evidence as to its frequency both in England and the United States. In England, concerning which I can naturally speak with most assurance, its manifestations are well-marked for those whose eyes have been opened…. Among the professional and most cultured element of the middle class in England there must be a distinct

percentage of inverts, which may sometimes be as much as five per cent., though such estimates must always be hazardous. Among women of the same class the percentage seems to be at least double--though here the phenomena are less definite and deepseated."--HAVELOCK ELLIS, "Psychology of Sex," vol. _Sexual Inversion_, pp. 29, 30. Philadelphia, 1901.

"According to the information of De Joux in 'The Disinherited of Love,' the number of Urnings in all Europe is about five millions; about 4.5 per cent. of all males in Europe are Urnings, while only 0.1 per cent. of females are Urningins. A malady therefore--if malady it should be called--which is so widespread certainly demands our deepest interest; and it is strange that it is only since the '70's that this subject has been discussed in scientific literature.

"It is owing to this ignorance that the public mind has been dominated, and still is dominated, by the prejudice, that psychical hermaphroditism and sex-inversion are nothing but crimes, wilful crimes, whereas they proceed necessarily out of the inborn nature of such individuals."--NORBERT GRABOWSKY, "Die verkehrte Geschlechtsempfindung," p. 16. Leipzig, 1894.

Dr. HIRSCHFELD, in his "Statistischen Untersuchunge über den Prozentensatz der Homosexuellen," gives the result of various statistical investigations on this subject; and their remarkable agreement enables him to speak with some confidence. He says (p. 41), "Now we _know_ that we must reckon the numbers of those who vary from the normal, not by fractions of thousands but by fractions of hundreds. The fact that, as a result of these circular enquiries and commissions about the same figure has emerged (for the proportion of exclusively homosexual persons), namely, a figure in the neighbourhood of 1½ per cent.--this extraordinary agreement cannot possibly be a chance, but must rest on a law--a law of nature--namely, that only 90 to 95 per cent. of mankind are normally sexual by birth; that about 1½ to 2 per cent. are born pure homosexuals (say about 1,000,000 in Germany); and that between the two classes there remain some 4 per cent. who are bisexual by nature."

And again (p. 60), "But what do these figures show? They show that of 100,000 inhabitants on the average only 94,600 are sexually normal, while 5,400 vary from the normal. Of these latter 1,500 are exclusively homosexual, and 3,900 bisexual. While of these last again 700 are _predominantly_ homosexual; so that of 100,000 Germans, 2,200 (or 2.2 per cent.) are either exclusively or predominantly homosexual--making 1,200,000 for the whole German Fatherland."

"Sexual inversion has usually been regarded as psycho-pathological, as a symptom of degeneration; and those who exhibit it have been considered as physically unfit. This view, however, is falling into disrepute, especially as Krafft-Ebing, its principal champion, abandoned it in the later editions of his work. None the less, it is not generally recognised that sexual inverts may be otherwise perfectly healthy, and with regard to other social matters quite normal. When they have been asked if they would have wished matters to be different with them in this respect, they almost invariably answer in the negative."--O. WEININGER, "Sex and Character," ch. iv. Heinemann, London, 1906.

"It is a common belief that a male who experiences love for his own sex must be despicable, degraded, depraved, vicious, and incapable of humane or generous sentiments. If Greek history did not contradict this supposition, a little patient enquiry into contemporary manners would suffice to remove it."--J. ADDINGTON SYMONDS, "A Problem in Modern Ethics," p. 10.

"Mantegazza rightly insists that Urnings are found by no means only among the dregs of the people, but that they are rather to be noted in circles which in respect of culture, wealth, and social position rank among the first. Thus, among the aristocracy without doubt a great number of Urnings are to be found."--A. MOLL, _op. cit._ p. 76.

"In no rank are there so many Urnings as among servants. One may say that every third male domestic is an Urning."--DE JOUX, "Die Enterbten des Liebesglückes," p. 193. Leipzig, 1893.

"It is therefore certain, as we have seen, that many Urnings come from nervous or pathologically disposed families.… All the same, I must say that there is no proof to hand in _all_ cases of sex-inversion among men, that the individuals concerned are thus hereditarily weighted. And besides, there is the consideration that the extension, according to some authors, of hereditary trouble is at present so great that one may prove a tendency to nervous or mental maladies in almost everybody."--A. MOLL, _op. cit._, p. 221.

"The truth is that we can no more explain the inverted sex-feeling than we can the normal impulse; all the attempts at explanation of these things, and of Love, are defective."--_Ibid_, p. 253.

"Among the _penchants_ of Urnings one finds not infrequently a great partiality for Art and Music--and indeed, for active interest in the same as well as passive enjoyment … the Actor's talent is especially noticeable among some.… But it must not be thought that

Urnings are only capable of a special activity of the imagination. On the contrary, there are undoubted cases in which they contribute something in the scientific direction.… Also in Poetry do Urnings occasionally show exceptional talent; especially in love-verses addressed to men."--_Ibid_, p. 80.

"An examination of my cases [of Inverts] reveals the interesting fact that 68 per cent. possess artistic aptitude in varying degree. Galton found, from the investigation of nearly 1,000 persons that the average showing artistic tastes in England is only about 30 per cent."--HAVELOCK ELLIS, "Sexual Inversion," p. 173.

"In Antiquity, especially among the Greeks, there seem to have been numbers of men who in their emotional natures were hermaphrodites. I think that the study of psychical hermaphrodisy is most important, and will throw yet greater light on the psychology of Love itself. Observation so far already shows that the same individual at differing times can experience quite different sexual feelings."--A. MOLL, _op. cit._, p. 200.

"The Urning is capable, through the force of his love, of making the greatest sacrifices for his beloved, and on that account the love of the Urning has been often compared with Woman's love. Just as the Woman's love is stronger and more devoted than that of the normal man, just as it exceeds that of the Man in inwardness, so, according to Ulrichs should the Urning's love in this respect stand higher than that of the woman-loving Man."--_Ibid_, p. 118.

"Womanish men often know how to treat women better than manly men do. Manly men, except in most rare cases, learn how to deal with women only after long experience, and even then most imperfectly."--O. WEININGER, "Sex and Character," ch. v.

"Is it really the case that all women and men are marked off sharply from each other, the women on the one hand alike in all points, the men on the other?… There are transitional forms between the metals and non-metals, between chemical combinations and simple mixtures, between animals and plants, between phanerogams and cryptogams, and between mammals and birds.… The improbability may henceforth be taken for granted of finding in Nature a sharp cleavage between all that is masculine on the one side and all that is feminine on the other; or that any living being is so simple in this respect that it can be put wholly on one side, or wholly on the other, of the line."--WEININGER, _Ibid_, introduction, p. 2.

"Upon this, Chéron made a rather strange observation. 'We have,' she said, 'with regard to sexual distinctions, notions that were not dreamed of by the primitive simplicity of the people of the age now gone by. From the fact that there are two sexes, and only two, they for a long time drew false inferences. They concluded that a woman is simply a woman, and a man simply a man. In reality this is not so; there are women who are very much women, and women who are very little so. Such differences, concealed in former times by costume and mode of life, and masked by prejudice, stand out clearly in our society. And not only so, but they become more accentuated and apparent in each generation.'"--ANATOLE FRANCE, "Sur la Pierre Blanche," p. 301.

"In _every_ human being there are present both male and female elements, only in normal persons (according to their sex) the one set of elements is more greatly developed than the other. The chief difference in the case of homosexual persons is that in them the male and female elements are more equalized; so that when, in addition, the general development is of a high grade, we find among this class the most perfect types of humanity."--Dr. ARDUIN, "Die Frauenfrage," in _Jahrbuch der Sexuellen Zwischenstufen_, vol. ii., p. 217. Leipzig, 1900.

"The notion that human beings were originally hermaphroditic is both ancient and widespread. We find it in the book of Genesis, unless indeed there be a confusion here between two separate theories of creation. God is said to have first made man in His image, male and female in one body, and to have bidden them multiply. Later on He created the woman out of part of this primitive man." (See also the myth related by Aristophanes in Plato's Symposium.)--HAVELOCK ELLIS, "Sexual Inversion," p. 229.

"When the sexual instinct first appears in early youth, it seems to be much less specialised than normally it becomes later. Not only is it, at the outset, less definitely directed to a specific sexual end, but even the sex of its object is sometimes uncertain."--_Ibid_, p. 44.

"In me the homosexual nature is singularly complete, and is undoubtedly congenital. The most intense delight of my childhood (even when a tiny boy in my nurse's charge) was to watch acrobats and riders at the circus. This was not so much for the skilful feats as on account of the beauty of their persons. Even then I cared chiefly for the more lithe and graceful fellows. People told me that circus actors were wicked and would steal little boys, and so I came to look on my favorites as half-devil and half-angel. When I was older and could go about alone, I would often hang around the tents of travelling shows in hope of catching a glimpse of the actors. I longed to see them naked, without their tights, and used to lie awake at night, thinking of them and longing to be embraced

and loved by them."--_Ibid_, "case" ix., p. 62.

"I was fifteen years and ten-and-a-half months old when the first erotic dream announced the arrival of puberty. I had had no previous experience of sex-satisfaction, either in the Urning direction or in any other. This occurrence therefore came about quite normally. From a much earlier time, however, I had been subject partly to tender yearnings and partly to sensual longing without definite form and purpose--the two emotions being always separate from each other and never experienced for one and the same young man. These aimless sensual longings plagued me often in hours of solitude; and I could not overcome them. They showed themselves first, during my fifteenth year, when I was at school at Detmold, in the following two ways:--First, they were awakened by a drawing in Normand's "Saülen-ordnungen," of the figure of a Greek god or hero, standing there in naked beauty. This image, a hundred times put away, came again a hundred times before my mind. (I need not say it did not _cause_ the Urning temperament in me; it merely awoke what was slumbering there already--a thing that any other circumstance might have done.) Secondly, when studying in my little room, or when I lay upon my bed before going to sleep, the thought used suddenly and irresistibly to rise up in my mind--"If only a soldier would clamber through the window and come into my room!" Then my imagination painted me a splendid soldier-figure of twenty to twenty-two years old; and I was, as it were, all on fire. And yet my thoughts were quite vague, and undirected to any definite satisfaction; nor had I ever spoken a word with a real soldier."--K. H. ULRICHS, "Memnon," §77. Leipzig, 1898. See also "A Problem in Modern Ethics," p. 73.

"The friendships of this kind which I formed at School were two in number--I shall never forget the absorbing depth and intensity of them. I never talked about them to anyone else, they were much too sacred and serious for that, nor--strange as it may seem--did I ever speak of them to the boys themselves, or indeed, show any signs of affection towards them. If they had been told that I was devoted to their welfare, and willing to sacrifice myself and all I had to it (which was indeed the fact) they would have been simply astonished; more especially as they were both young boys not yet arrived at puberty.

"I am at present somewhat bitterly conscious that in these cases one of the strongest influences for good that ever came into my life was nine-tenths wasted. How much better it all might have been under more favourable surroundings it is impossible to imagine. Still, it was not without its good influence on me, though (owing to their complete ignorance of my feelings) it could have had none whatever on the boys. I was conscious of a bracing and inspiring effect on my whole nature, a confirmed health of body, and most of all, of a greatly increased capacity for work. And doubtless all this might have been intensified a thousand fold if I had been ever so little guided and encouraged by public opinion sanctioning these friendships.

"The Public School boy has after all strong feelings of honour and fairness: and I am sure much might be done by cultivating the Public Opinion of the school: making devoted and disinterested friendships highly thought of and praised, and condemning as base and mean the least attempt to befoul a young boy's purity through a gross and selfish desire for personal gratification. School public opinion would, I am sure, tend quite readily to flow in such channels. But this would demand an openness of treatment of the whole question such as does not at present exist. That the greatest force the schoolmaster has at his command should be so ignored (and so needlessly) is more than absurd: it is monstrous. And it concerns him as a teacher quite as much as the boys themselves in their relations with each other. I believe that gaining a boy's affection is the necessary preliminary to really _teaching_ him anything. Otherwise you do not really teach him at all."--_Private letter._

"I could tell you a good deal of another equally strong friendship I formed (myself twenty-five, boy fourteen) which was one of the happiest events of my life. It was acknowledged on both sides, but perfectly restrained and pure: and we saw a great deal of each other during most of the school holidays for about a year. I could have done anything with that boy, my influence over him was for the time being I should say unlimited: and undoubtedly _immense_ good accrued to us both."--_Ibid_.

"In my own school-life--as a day scholar--I had two such friendships, though of course in a day school there was not the same possibility of their development. One was with an elder boy some five years my senior, and the other with a master some twelve years older than myself. I was a shy, timid youngster, and not having a robust physique did not enter much into the ordinary athletics of the school. My elder friend was a very delicate, gentle, refined boy with a purity and loftiness of mind in striking contrast to the filthy moral atmosphere of the school at that time, but he was never censorious or self-righteous. I feel that this friendship was the most powerful influence in my early life in keeping a high ideal of conduct before me--much more powerful than the influence of home, which I do not think I was at all conscious of.

"After he left school, for Cambridge, we used to write regularly to one another--long letters, hardly ever less than three sheets in length. I remember I used to think him the most handsome man I knew, but looking now at his photo, taken about that time and

comparing it with others, I see that his features were inferior to many others of my school-fellows. At the end of his second year he died of consumption. It was during the Long Vacation, and I was abroad at the time. I remember I used to sit up late into the night writing very long letters to him about all I had seen, to interest him during his illness. I did not know how ill he really was, but I had a terrible fear that I should not see him again. When I got back and found he had just died the shock was awful. For weeks I felt as if I had not a friend in the whole world. I have never felt any loss so keenly either before or since.…

“The other friendship with my mathematical master, though not so intimate, was still of a very affectionate character. I feel I owe a great deal to it--he laid the foundation of my ideal of a teacher’s duty to his pupils.”--_Private letter._

“It is not new in itself; this, the feeling that drew Jesus to John, or Shakespeare to the youth of the sonnets, or that inspired the friendships of Greece, has been with us before, and in the new citizenship we shall need it again. The Whitmanic love of comrades is its modern expression; Democracy--as socially, not politically conceived--its basis. The thought as to how much of the solidarity of labour and the modern Trade-Union movement may be due to an unconscious faith in this principle of comradeship, is no idle one. The freer, more direct, and more genuine relationship between men, which is implied by it, must be the ultimate basis of the reconstructed Workshop.”--C. R. ASHBEE, “Workshop Reconstruction and Citizenship,” p. 160.

A case of passionate attachment between two Indian boys was told to the author of the present book by a master at a school in India. The boys--who were about sixteen years of age--were both at the same school, and were devoted friends; but the day came when they had to part. One was taken away by his parents to go to a distant part of the country. The other was inconsolable at the prospect. When the day arrived, and his companion was removed, he soon after went quietly to a well in the school precincts, jumped in, and was drowned. The news, sent on by wire, reached the departing friend while still on his journey. He said little, but at one of the stations left the train and disappeared. The train went on, but at a little distance out, the boy ran out of the bushes by the line, threw himself on the rails, and was killed.

The following is taken from one of the “cases” recorded by Havelock Ellis in his “Sexual Inversion”; “The earliest sex-impression that I am conscious of is at the age of nine or ten falling in love with a handsome boy who must have been about two years my senior. I do not recollect ever having spoken to him, but my desire, as far as I can recall, was that he should seize hold of and handle me. I have a distinct impression yet of how pleasurable even physical pain or cruelty would have been at his hands.”--HAVELOCK ELLIS, _op. cit._, “case” xiii., p. 71.

“When I was about sixteen-and-a-half years old, there came into the house a boy about two years younger than myself, who became the absorbing thought of my school-days. I do not remember a moment, from the time I first saw him to the time I left school, that I was not in love with him, and the affection was reciprocated, if somewhat reservedly. He was always a little ahead of me in books and scholarship, but as our affection ripened we spent most of our spare time together, and he received my advances much as a girl who is being wooed, a little mockingly perhaps, but with real pleasure. He allowed me to fondle and caress him, but our intimacy never went further than a kiss, and about that even was the slur of shame; there was always a barrier between us, and we never so much as whispered to one another concerning those things of which all the school obscenely talked.”--_Same case_, p. 73.

“At the age of twenty-one I began gradually to remark that I was not somehow like my comrades, that I had no pleasure in male occupations, that smoking, drinking, and card-playing gave me little satisfaction, and that I had a real death-horror of a brothel. And, as a matter of fact, I had never been in one, as on every occasion under some pretext or other I have succeeded in stealing off. I now began to think about myself; I felt myself frightfully desolate, miserable and unfortunate, and longed for a friend of the same nature as myself--yet without dreaming that there could be other such men. At the age of twenty-two I came to know a young man who at last cleared up my mind about sexual inversion and those affected with it, since he--an Urning, like myself--had fallen in love with me. The scales fell from my eyes, and I bless the day which brought light to me.… Towards woman in her sexual relation I feel a real horror, which the exercise of all my strongest powers of imagination would not avail to overcome; and indeed, I have never attempted to overcome it, since I am quite persuaded of the fruitlessness of such an attempt, which to me appears sinful and unnatural.”--KRAFFT-EBING, “Psychopathia Sexualis,” 7th edition, “case” No. 122, p. 291. Stuttgart, 1892.

“I can no longer exist without men’s love; without such I must ever remain at strife with myself.… If marriage between men existed I believe I should not be afraid of a life-long union--a thing which with a woman seems to be something impossible.… Since, however, this kind of love is reckoned criminal, by its satisfaction I can be at harmony with myself but never with the world, and necessarily in consequence must ever be somewhat out of tune; and all the more so because my character is open, and I hate lies

of all kinds. This torment, to have always to conceal everything, has forced me to confess my anomaly to a few friends, of whose understanding and reticence I am sure. Although oftentimes my condition seems to me sad enough, by reason of the difficulty of satisfaction and the general contempt of manly love, yet I am often just a little proud on account of having these anomalous feelings. Naturally, I shall never marry--but this seems to me by no means a misfortune, although I am fond of family life, and up to now have passed my time only among my own relations. I live in the hope that later I shall have a permanent loved one; such indeed I must have, else would the future seem gray and drear, and every object which folk usually pursue--honour, high position, etc.--only vain and unattractive.

“Should this hope not be fulfilled, I know that I should be unable, permanently and with pleasure, to give myself to my calling, and that I should be capable of setting aside everything in order to gain the love of a man. I feel no longer any moral scruples on account of my anomalous leaning, and generally have never been troubled because I felt myself drawn to youths.… Up to now it has only seemed to me bad and immoral to do that which is injurious to another, or which I would not wish done to myself, and in this respect I can say that I try as much as possible not to infringe on the rights of others, and am capable of being violently roused by any injustice done to others.”--_Ibid_, p. 249, “case” No. 110 (official in a factory, age 31).

“My thoughts are by no means exclusively of the body or morbidly sensual. How often at the sight of a handsome youth does a deeply enthusiastic mood come upon me, and I offer a prayer, so to speak, in the glorious words of Heine--”Du bist wie eine Blume, so hold, so schön, so rein“.… Never has a young man yet guessed my love for him, I have never corrupted or damaged the morals of one, but for many have I here and there smoothed their pathway; and then I stick at no trouble and make sacrifices such as I can only make for them.

“When thus I have a chance to have a loved friend near me, to teach, to support and help, when my unconfest love finds a loving response (though naturally not sexual), then all the unclean images fade more and more from my mind. Then does my love become almost platonic, and lifts itself up--only to sink again in the mire, when it is deprived of its proper activity.

“For the rest, I am--and I can say it without boasting--not one of the worst of men. Mentally more sensitive than most average folk, I take interest in everything that moves mankind. I am kindly-disposed, tender, and easily moved to pity, can do no injury to any animal, certainly not to a human being, but on the contrary am active in a human-friendly way, where and however I can.

“Though then before my own conscience I cannot reproach myself, and though I must certainly reject the judgment of the world about us, yet I suffer greatly. In very truth I have injured no one; and I hold my love in its nobler activity for just as holy as that of normally disposed men, but under the unhappy fate that allows us neither sufferance nor recognition, I suffer often more than my life can bear.”--_Ibid_, p. 268, “case” No. 114.

“To depict all the misery, all the unfortunate situations, the constant dread of being found out in one’s peculiarity and of becoming impossible in society--to give an idea of all this is truly more than pen or words can compass. The very thought, so soon as it arises, of losing one’s social existence and of being rejected by everybody is more torment than can be imagined. In such a case, everything, everything would be forgotten that one had ever done in the way of good; in the consciousness of his lofty morality every normally disposed man would puff himself up, however frivolously he might really have acted in the matter of his love. I know many such normal folk whose unworthy conception of their love is indeed hard for me to understand.”--_Ibid_, p. 269.

“The torturing images of betrayed love prevent my sleeping, so that I am forced, now and again, to have recourse to chloral. My dreams are only a continuation of actual life, and just as painful. How all this will end I really know not; but I suppose these root-emotions must take their own course.… The only reasonable end of the struggle is Death.”--A. MOLL, “Conträre Sexualempfindung,” 2nd edition, p. 123 (quotation from a letter).

“Weary and worn, I have passed through every tempest of anguish and despair. Years of the most racking mental agony have gone over my head without killing me. Through the long night watches I have heard the unceasing hours toll. Sleep has never been thought of by me, but I have lain on my bed trying to read some book, or have knelt by my bedside and endeavoured to raise my heart and spirit in prayer for succour or forgiveness. At last, unable to hold out any longer, with mouth tight-closed and knitted brow the Charmer has deadened my senses for one or two brief hours; but only that I may wake to a stronger and clearer perception of my hopeless condition.

“How the days have got on I know not. How I can have lived so long through such misery I know not. But torture like this is cruelly slow, whilst it is sure. It is the nature of youth to be long-enduring where Love is put to the test and a kind of occasional flicker--a

kind of mocking semblance of hope, as like to hope as the rushing meteor is to the enduring sun--helps to support the load of misery, and so to prolong it. I am hundreds of years old in this my wretchedness of every moment. I cannot battle against Love and crush it out--never! God has implanted the necessity of the sentiment in my heart; it is scarce possible not to ask oneself why has He implanted so divine an element in my nature, which is doomed to die unsatisfied, which is destined in the end to be my very death?"--_From a manuscript left to the Author by an Urning._

H. ELLIS, in Appendix D. of his book on "Sexual Inversion," speaks at some length on the School-friendships of girls: what they call "Flames" and "Raves"; of love at first sight; romance; courtship; meetings despite all obstacles; long letters; jealousy; the writing the beloved's name everywhere, etc. These alliances are sometimes sexual, but oftener not so--though full of "psychic erethism."

In the same Appendix he quotes a woman of thirty-three, who writes, "At fourteen I had my first case of love, but it was with a girl. It was insane, intense love, but had the same quality and sensations as my first love with a man at eighteen. In neither case was the object idealized: I was perfectly aware of their faults; nevertheless, my whole being was lost, immersed, in their existence. The first lasted two years, the second seven years. No love has since been so intense, but now these two persons, though living, are no more to me than the veriest stranger."

Another woman of thirty-five writes, "Girls between the ages of fourteen and eighteen at college or girls' schools often fall in love with the same sex. This is not friendship. The loved one is older, more advanced, more charming or beautiful. When I was a freshman in college I knew at least thirty girls who were in love with a senior. Some sought her because it was the fashion, but I knew that my own homage and that of many others was sincere and passionate. I loved her because she was brilliant and utterly indifferent to the love shown her. She was not pretty, though at the time we thought her beautiful. One of her adorers, on being slighted, was ill for two weeks. On her return she was speaking to me when the object of our admiration came into the room. The shock was too great, and she fainted. When I reached the senior year I was the recipient of languishing glances, original verses, roses, and passionate letters written at midnight and three in the morning."

"Passionate friendships among girls, from the most innocent to the most elaborate excursions in the direction of Lesbos, are extremely common in theatres, both among actresses, and even more among chorus and ballet-girls."--HAVELOCK ELLIS, "Sexual Inversion," p. 130.

"The love of homosexual women is often very passionate, as is that of Urnings. Just like these, the former often feel themselves blessed when they love happily. Nevertheless, to many of them, as to the Urning, is the circumstance very painful that in consequence of their antipathy to the touch of the male they are not in the position to found a family. Sometimes, when the love of a homosexual woman is not responded to, serious disturbances of the nerve-system may ensue, leading even to paroxysms of fury."--A. MOLL, _op. cit._, p. 338.

"It is noteworthy how many inverted women have, with more or less fraud, been married to the woman of their choice, the couple living happily together for long periods. I know of one case, probably unique, in which the ceremony was gone through without any deception on any side; a congenitally inverted English woman of distinguished intellectual ability, now dead, was attached to the wife of a clergyman, who, in full cognisance of all the facts of the case, privately married the two ladies in his own church."--HAVELOCK ELLIS, _op. cit._, p. 146, footnote.

"Seven or eight girls, we are told (in Montaigne's 'Journal du Voyage en Italie,' 1350), belonging to Chaumont, resolved to dress and to work as men; one of these came to Vitry to work as a weaver, and was looked upon as a well-conditioned young man, and liked by everyone. At Vitry she became betrothed to a woman, but, a quarrel arising, no marriage took place. Afterwards, 'she fell in love with a woman whom she married, and with whom she lived for four or five months, to the wife's great contentment, it is said; but having been recognised by some one from Chaumont, and brought to justice, she was condemned to be hanged. She said she would even prefer this to living again as a girl, and was hanged for using illicit inventions to supply the defects of her sex'."--_Ibid_, p. 119.

"It is evident that there must be some radical causes for the frequency of homosexuality among prostitutes. One such cause doubtless lies in the character of the prostitute's relations with men; these relations are of a professional character, and, as the business element becomes emphasized, the possibility of sexual satisfaction diminishes; at the best also there lacks the sense of social equality, the feeling of possession, and scope for the exercise of feminine affection and devotion."--_Ibid_, p. 149.

“Among the inscribed prostitutes of Berlin there are without doubt a great number who honour the love of women. I am told from well-informed sources, that about twenty-five per cent. of the prostitutes of Berlin have relations with other women.”--A. MOLL, _op. cit._, p. 331.

“Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (born in 1825 near Aurich), who for many years expounded and defended homosexual love, and whose views are said to have had some influence in drawing Westphal’s attention to the matter, was a Hanoverian legal official (Amts-assessor), himself sexually inverted. From 1864 onward, at first under the name of ‘Numa Numantius,’ and subsequently under his own name, Ulrichs published in various parts of Germany a long series of works dealing with this question, and made various attempts to obtain a revision of the legal position of the sexual invert in Germany.

“Although not a writer whose psychological views can carry much scientific weight, Ulrichs appears to have been a man of most brilliant ability, and his knowledge is said to have been of almost universal extent; he was not only well-versed in his own special subjects of jurisprudence and theology, but in many branches of natural science, as well as in archæology; he was also regarded by many as the best Latinist of his time. In 1880 he left Germany and settled in Naples, and afterwards at Aquila in the Abruzzi, whence he issued a Latin periodical. He died in 1895.”--HAVELOCK ELLIS, _op. cit._, p. 33.

Ulrichs enters into an elaborate classification of human types, with a corresponding nomenclature, which, though somewhat ponderous, has been of use. Among males, for instance, he distinguishes the quite normal man, whom he calls “Dioning,” from the invert, whom he calls “Urning.” Among Urnings, again, he distinguishes (1) those who are thoroughly manly in appearance and in mental habit and character (“Mannlings”), and who tend to love softer and younger specimens of their own sex; (2) those who are effeminate in appearance and cast of mind (“Weiblings”), and who love rougher and older men; and (3) those who are of a medium type (“Zwischen Urnings”) and love young men. Then again there is the “Urano-dioning,” who is born with a capacity of love in both directions, _i.e._, for women and for men. He is generally of the manly type. And besides these, some sub-species, like the “Uraniaster,” who is a normal man who has contracted the Urning habit, and the “Virilised Urning,” who is an Urning who has contracted the normal habit, though this is not really natural to him! The whole may be set out in a table as follows:--

{ (_a_) Normal Man or Dioning--called Uraniaster when { he acquires Urning tendencies. { The { {1. Mannling. Human { {2. Zwischen-Urning. Male { (_b_) Urning {3. Weibling. { {4. Also called Virilised Urning when he { { acquires the normal habit. { { (_c_) Urano-dioning.

If we add to this a corresponding table for the female we shall have an idea of the complication of Ulrichs’ system! Yet, complex as it is, and whatever criticisms we may make upon it, we must allow that it does not exceed the complexity of the real facts of Nature. (See K. H. ULRICHS’ “Memnon,” ch. iii.-v.)

Krafft-Ebing’s analysis of the subject is fully as elaborate as that of Ulrichs. It is given by J. A. SYMONDS in the form of a table, as follows:--

{ { Persistent. { Acquired { Episodical. { Sexual { { Psychic Hermaphrodites. Inversion { { { { { Male Habitus (Mannlings). { Congenital { Urnings { Female Habitus (Weiblings). { { { { Androgyni.

And Symonds continues:--“What is the rational explanation of the facts presented to us by the analysis which I have formulated in this table, cannot as yet be thoroughly determined. We do not know enough about the law of sex in human beings to advance a theory. Krafft-Ebing and writers of his school are at present inclined to refer them all to diseases of the nervous centres, inherited, congenital, excited by early habits of self-abuse. The inadequacy of this method I have already attempted to set forth; and I have also called attention to the fact that it does not sufficiently account for the phenomena known to us through history and through every-day experience.” [It should be noted that in later editions of his book Krafft-Ebing considerably modifies the view that these sex-variations all indicate disease.]--“A Problem in Modern Ethics,” p. 46.

Moll, speaking of the act so commonly credited to Urnings (sodomy), says:--“The common assumption is that the intercourse of Urnings consists in this. But it is a great error to suppose that this act is so frequent among them.”--A. MOLL, _op. cit._, p. 139.

And Krafft-Ebing also speaks of it as rare among true Urnings, though not uncommon among old roués and debauchees of more normal temperament.--“Psychopathia Sexualis,” 7th edition, p. 258.

“The Urning denies not only the ‘unnaturalness’ of his leanings, but also their pathological character; he protests against comparison with the lame and the deaf. The occasional coincidence of sexual inversion with other really morbid conditions settles

nothing, nor is the reminder that it is antagonistic to the purpose of race-propagation a proof; for who can assure us that Nature has intended all people for race-propagation? Even to the worker-bee Nature has not granted this function, although in her stunted female sex-organs there exists an undeniable indication or suggestion of sex-feeling."--A. MOLL, _op. cit._, p. 271. (From a letter by a sixty year old Urning.)

"Homosexuality, therefore, might be described as an abnormal variety of the sex-impulse, but hardly as a morbid variety. If you like, it might be termed an arrest of development or a kind of reversion. And this is quite in accord with the fact that the best experts in the subject have so far not discovered more psychic abnormalities among homosexuals than among heterosexuals--nor more degeneracy or signs of degeneracy."--Consulting-Physician Dr. PAUL NAECKE, in _Der Tag_, 26th Oct., 1907.

"As a result of these considerations Ulrichs concludes that there is no real ground for the persecution of Urnings except such as may be found in the repugnance felt by the vast numerical majority for an insignificant minority. The majority encourages matrimony, condones seduction, sanctions prostitution, legalises divorce, in the interest of its own sexual proclivities. It makes temporary or permanent unions illegal for the minority whose inversion of instinct it abhors. And this persecution, in the popular mind at any rate, is justified, like many other inequitable acts of prejudice or ignorance, by theological assumptions and the so-called mandates of revelation."--"A Problem in Modern Ethics," p. 83.

"We understand by 'homosexual' a person who feels himself drawn to individuals of the same sex by feelings of real love. Whether or not he acts in accordance with this homosexual feeling is, from the scientific standpoint, beside the question. Just as there are normal folk who live chastely, so there are homosexual persons whose love bears a distinctly psychic, ideal and 'platonic' character….

"The feminine impress, in the case of homosexual men, is in general best indicated by the presence of greater sensitiveness and receptivity, also by the dominance of the emotional life, by a strong artistic sense, especially in the direction of music, often too by a tendency to mysticism, and by various inclinations and habits feminine in the good or less good sense of the word. This blending of temperament, however, does not make the homosexual as such a less worthy person. He is indeed not of the same nature as the heterosexual, but he is of equal worth."--Dr M. HIRSCHFELD'S evidence as medical specialist in the Moltké-Harden trial.

"One serious objection to recognising and tolerating sexual inversion has always been that it tends to check the population. This was a sound political and social argument in the time of Moses, when a small militant tribe needed to multiply to the full extent of its procreative capacity. It is by no means so valid in our age, when the habitable portions of the globe are rapidly becoming overcrowded. Moreover, we must bear in mind that society under the existing order sanctions female prostitution, whereby men and women, though normally procreative, are sterilized to an indefinite extent."--J. A. SYMONDS, "A Problem in Modern Ethics," p. 82.

"Before Justinian, both Constantine and Theodosius passed laws against sexual inversion, committing the offenders to 'avenging flames.' But these statutes were not rigidly enforced, and modern opinion on the subject may be said to flow from Justinian's legislation. Opinion, in matters of custom and manners, always follows law. Though Imperial edicts could not eradicate a passion which is inherent in human nature, they had the effect of stereotyping extreme punishments in all the codes of Christian nations, and of creating a permanent social antipathy."--_Ibid_, p. 13.

"Our modern attitude is sometimes traced back to the Jewish Law and its survival in St. Paul's opinion on this matter. But the Jewish Law itself had a foundation. Wherever the enlargement of the population becomes a strongly-felt social need--as it was among the Jews in their exaltation of family life, and as it was when the European populations were constituted--there homosexuality has been regarded as a crime, even punishable with death…. It was in the fourth century at Rome that the strong modern opposition to it was formulated in law. The Roman race had long been decaying; sexual perversions of all kinds flourished; the population was dwindling. At the same time Christianity with its Judaic-Pauline antagonism to homosexuality was rapidly spreading. The statesmen of the day, anxious to quicken the failing pulses of national life, utilised this powerful Christian feeling. Constantine, Theodosius, Valentinian, all passed laws against homosexuality--the last, at all events, ordaining as a penalty the _vindices flammæ_." HAVELOCK ELLIS, _op. cit._, p. 206.

"At the present time, shoemakers, who make shoes to measure, deal more rationally with individuals than our teachers and school-masters do, in their application to moral principles. The sexually intermediate forms of individuals are treated exactly as if they were good examples of the ideal male or female types. There is wanted an 'orthopædic' treatment of the soul, instead of the torture caused by the application of ready-made conventional shapes. The present system stamps out much that is original,

uproots much that is truly natural, and distorts much into artificial and unnatural forms."--O. WEININGER, "Sex and Character," ch. v.

"What is new in my view is that according to it homosexuality cannot be regarded as an atavism or as due to arrested embryonic development, or to incomplete differentiation of sex; it cannot be regarded as an anomaly of rare occurrence interpolating itself in customary complete separation of the sexes. Homosexuality is merely the sexual condition of those intermediate sexual forms that stretch from one ideal sexual condition to the other ideal sexual condition. In my view, all actual organisms have both homosexuality and heterosexuality."--O. WEININGER, "Sex and Character," ch. iv.

"How is it then that in our age reputed so philanthropic, whole classes of men, on account of inborn mental abnormalities, are marked down and banned, frantically persecuted, publicly branded, and threatened with the severest legal penalties? Any one would hardly believe what gross cases of justiciary murder, morally speaking, still take place in this matter even at the end of the nineteenth century. To the pitiful ignorance of the judges, to the thousand inherited prejudices of public opinion, as well as to the mental slavery of legislative bodies, must it be ascribed that the penal code of most civilised states is still in great measure formulated in the gloomy spirit of the Middle Ages."--O. de JOUX, "Die Enterbten des Liebesglückes," p. 16.

"Up till now homosexual humanity has found itself in a peculiar position. Its mouth was closed, it could not speak. It was bound hand and foot and could not move. But now there has come an important change. Science has taken the part of these folk and defended their honour … I protest therefore earnestly that these men, whether by means of the Law or any other means, should no longer be branded in the name of Christianity."--From a letter written by a Catholic priest in reply to a circular sent by the Humane-Science Committee of Berlin. (See "Jahrbuch der Sexuellen Zwischenstufen," vol. ii., p. 177.)

"Thus the very basest of all trades, that of _chantage_ [blackmailing] is encouraged by the law.… The miserable persecuted wretch, placed between the alternative of paying money down or of becoming socially impossible, losing a valued position, and seeing dishonour burst upon himself and family, pays; and still the more he pays the greedier becomes the vampire who sucks his life-blood, until at last there lies nothing else before him except total financial ruin or disgrace. Who will be astonished if the nerves of an individual in this position are not equal to the horrid strain? In some cases the nerves give way altogether.… Alter the law and instead of increasing vice you will diminish it. The temptation to ply a disgraceful profession with the object of extorting money would be removed."--"A Problem in Modern Ethics," pp. 56 and 86.

"You will rightly infer that it is difficult for me to say exactly how I regard (morally) the homosexual tendency. Of this much, however, I am certain that even if it were possible I would not exchange my inverted nature for a normal one. I suspect that the sexual emotions and even inverted ones have a more subtle significance than is generally attributed to them; but modern moralists either fight shy of transcendental interpretations or see none, and I am ignorant and unable to solve the mystery these feelings seem to imply."--HAVELOCK ELLIS, _op. cit._, p. 65, "case" ix.

"I cannot regard my sexual feelings as unnatural or abnormal, since they have disclosed themselves so perfectly naturally and spontaneously within me. All that I have read in books or heard spoken about the ordinary sexual love, its intensity and passion, life-long devotion, love at first sight, etc., seems to me to be easily matched by my own experiences in homosexual form; and with regard to the morality of this complex subject, my feeling is that it is the same as should prevail in love between man and woman, namely: that no bodily satisfaction should be sought at the cost of another person's distress or degradation. I am sure that this kind of love is, notwithstanding the physical difficulties that attend it, as deeply stirring and ennobling as the other kind, if not more so; and I think that for a perfect relationship the actual sex-gratifications (whatever they may be) probably hold a less important place in this love than in the other."--_Ibid_, "case" vii., p. 58.

"I grew older, I entered my professional studies, and I was very diligent with them. I lived in a great capital, I moved much in general society. I had a large and lively group of friends. But always, over and over, I realised that, in the kernel, at the very root and fibre of myself, there was the throb and glow, the ebb and the surge, the seeking as in a vain dream to realise again that passion of friendship which could so far transcend the cold modern idea of the tie; the Over-Friendship, the Love-Friendship of Hellas, which meant that between man and man could exist--the sexual-psychic love. That was still possible! I knew that now. I had read it in the verses or the prose of the Greek or Latin or Oriental authors who have written out every shade of its beauty or unloveliness, its worth or debasement--from Theokritos to Martial, or Abu-Nuwas, to Platen, Michel-Angelo, Shakespeare. I had learned it from the statues of sculptors--in those lines so often vivid with a merely physical male beauty--works which beget, which sprang from, the sense of it in a race. I had half-divined it in the music of a Beethoven and a Tschaikowsky before knowing facts in the life-stories of

either of them--or of an hundred other tone-autobiographists. And I had recognised what it all meant to most people to-day--from the disgust, scorn, and laughter of my fellow-men when such an emotion was hinted at."--_Imre: a memorandum_, by XAVIER MAYNE, p. 110. Naples, R. Rispoli, 1906.

"Presently, during that same winter, accident opened my eyes wider to myself. Since then, I have needed no further knowledge from the Tree of my Good and Evil. I met with a mass of serious studies, German, Italian, French, English, from the chief European specialists and theorists on the similisexual topic; many of them with quite other views than those of my well-meaning but far too conclusive Yankee doctor (who had recommended marriage as a cure). I learned of the much-discussed theories of 'secondary sexes' and 'intersexes.' I learned of the theories and facts of homosexualism, of the Uranian Love, of the Uranian race, of the 'Sex within a Sex.' … I came to know their enormous distribution all over the world to-day; and of the grave attention that European scientists and jurists have been devoting to problems concerned with homosexualism. I could pursue intelligently the growing efforts to set right the public mind as to so ineradicable and misunderstood a phase of humanity. I realised that I had always been a member of that hidden brotherhood and Sub-Sex, or Super-Sex. In wonder too I informed myself of its deep instinctive freemasonries--even to organised ones--in every social class, every land, and every civilisation."--_Ibid_, pp. 134, 135.

"Thus in sexual inversion we have what may be fairly called a 'sport' or variation, one of those organic aberrations which we see throughout living nature, in plants and in animals."… "All these organic variations which I have here mentioned to illustrate sexual inversion, are abnormalities. It is important that we should have a clear idea as to what abnormality is. Many people imagine that what is abnormal is necessarily diseased. That is not the case, unless we give the word disease an inconveniently and illegitimately wide extension. It is both inconvenient and inexact to speak of colour-blindness, criminality and genius as diseases in the same sense as we speak of scarlet fever, tuberculosis, or general paralysis as diseases."--HAVELOCK ELLIS, _op. cit._, p. 186.

"I have had for some time past a theory about this 'Homogenic' business--I do not suppose it is new--but it is that when man reaches a certain stage of development and approaches the totality of Human Nature, there gets to exist in him, though subordinately at first, a female element as well as a male. That is to say that as he passes the various barriers, he passes the barrier of sex too, on his way to become the complete Human--the Universal."--_From a private letter._

"Great geniuses, men like Goethe, Shakespeare, Shelley, Byron, Darwin, all had the feminine soul very strongly developed in them…. As we are continually meeting in cities women who are one-quarter, or one-eighth, or so on, _male_ … so there are in the Inner Self similar half-breeds, all adapting themselves to circumstances with perfect ease. The Greeks recognised that such a being could exist even in harmony with Nature, and so beautified and idealised it as Sappho."--CHARLES G. LELAND, "The Alternate Sex," pp. 41, and 57. London, 1904.

"I have considered and inquired into this question for many years; and it has long been my settled conviction that no breach of morality is involved in homosexual love; that, like every other passion, it tends, when duly understood and controlled by spiritual feeling, to the physical and moral health of the individual and the race, and that it is only its brutal perversions which are immoral. I have known many persons more or less the subjects of this passion, and I have found them a particularly high-minded, upright, refined, and (I must add) pure-minded class of men."--_Communicated by Professor ---- in Appendix to_ HAVELOCK ELLIS'S "Sexual Inversion," p. 240.

"What from the beginning struck me most, but now appears perfectly clear and indeed necessary is that among the homosexuals there is found the _most_ remarkable class of men, namely, those whom I call _supervirile_. These men stand by virtue of the special variation of their soul-material, just as much above Man, as the normal sex man does above Woman. Such an individual is able to bewitch men by his soul-aroma, as they--though passively--bewitch him. But as he always lives in men's society, and men, so to speak, sit at his feet, it comes about that such a supervirile often climbs the very highest steps of spiritual evolution, of social position, and of manly capacity. Hence it arises that the most famous names of the world and the history of culture stand rightly or wrongly on the list of homosexuals. Names like Alexander the Great, Socrates, Plato, Julius Cæsar, Michel Angelo, Charles XII. of Sweden, William of Orange, and so forth. Not only is this so, but it must be so. As certainly as a woman's hero remains a spiritually inferior man, must a man's hero--well _be_ a man's hero, if in any way he has the stuff for it.

"Consequently the German penal code, in stamping homosexuality as a crime, puts the highest blossoms of humanity on the proscription list."--Professor Dr. JAEGER, "Die Entdeckung der Seele," pp. 268, 269.

"The licentious or garrulous or morbid types of inverts have been so honoured with publicity that the other types are even yet little known. The latter, in the maturity of their intellectual and moral nature, cease to look upon sex as the pivot of the universe. They

cease to repine about their lot. They have their mission to fulfil here below, and they try to fulfil it as best they can. In the same way we find there are heterosexual (or normal) folk who at a certain stage of their growth free themselves from the sexual life.--M. A. RAFFALOVICH, “Uranisme et Unisexualité,” p. 74.

“The well-bred, highly-cultured Urning is a complete Idealist; matter is for him only a symbol of thought, and the actual only the living expression of the Invisible.”--DE JOUX, “Die Enterbten des Liebesglückes,” p. 46.

“As nature and social law are so cruel as to impose a severe celibacy on him his whole being is consequently of astonishing freshness and superb purity, and his manners of life modest as those of a saint--a thing which, in the case of a man in blooming health and moving about in the world, is certainly very unusual.”--_Ibid_, p. 41.

“If the soul of woman in its usual form represents a secret closed with seven seals, it is--when prisoned in the sturdy body of a man and fused with some of the motives of manhood, a far more enigmatic scripture of whose sibylline meaning one can never be really sure. Only the Urning can understand the Urning.”--_Ibid_, p. 63.

“Because they (Urnings) themselves are of a very complex nature and put together of opposing elements, they seek out and love the simple, plain, and straightforward natures. Because they continually suffer from the rebellion of their desires against good taste and morals, they often long for a barbaric freedom. And because their every emotion is cut short, distracted, and worn out by the thousand doubts and suspicions of their Urning-minds, they gather to themselves men who are wont to live straight from feeling to action, and who work from untamed masterly instincts, as sure as the animals.”--_Ibid_, p. 97.

“It is true that we are often inferior to normal men in force of will, worldly wisdom, and sense of duty; but on the other hand, in depth and delicacy of feeling and every virtue of the heart, we are far superior. We cannot _love_ women, but we lament with them, and help them on the hearth and by the cradle, in need and loneliness, as their most unselfish friends.… We do not despise women because they are weak, for we are much clearer-sighted, much less prejudiced than the so-called lords of creation, much nobler, more helpful, and just-minded than they.… Anyhow, if either of the sexes has cause to withhold its respect in any degree from the other--which has the most cause? Say what you will of them, the second and third sexes--women and Urnings--are ever so much better than the brutal egotistical Men, who to-day are plunged in grossest materialism; for, with whatever corruption, both the former are still of purer heart, easier kindled towards whatever is good, and more capable of genuine enthusiasm and love of their fellows, than the latter.”--_Ibid_, p. 204.

“Embodying as he does Love, Patience, Renunciation, Humility and Mildness, the Urning should seek to soothe with his gentle hand all hurts, and to heal all wounds, which are the results of weak Man’s original sinfulness. The tender emotions in his breast, his all too soft and easily troubled heart, his delicate sensitiveness and receptiveness of all that is lofty and pure, his mildness, goodness and inexhaustible patience--all these divine gifts of his soul point clearly to the conclusion that the great framer of the world meant to create in Urnings a noble priesthood, a race of Samaritans, a severely pure order of men, in order to offer a strong counterpoise to the immoral tendencies of the human race, which increase with its increasing culture.”--_Ibid_, p. 253.

“When I review the cases I have brought forward and the mental history of the inverted I have known, I am inclined to say that if we can enable an invert to be healthy, self-restrained and self-respecting, we have often done better than to convert him to the mere feeble simulacrum of a normal man. An appeal to the _paiderastia_ of the best Greek days, and the dignity, temperance, even chastity, which it involved, will sometimes find a ready response in the emotional enthusiastic nature of the congenital invert. The ‘manly’ love celebrated by Walt Whitman in ‘Leaves of Grass,’ although it may be of more doubtful value for general use, furnishes a wholesome and robust ideal to the invert who is insensitive to normal ideals. It is by some such method of self-treatment as this that most of the more highly intelligent men and women whose histories I have already briefly recorded have at last slowly and instinctively reached a condition of relative health and peace, physical and moral.”--HAVELOCK ELLIS, “Sexual Inversion,” p. 202.

“From America a lady writes:--‘Inverts should have the courage and independence to be themselves, and to demand an investigation. If one strives to live honourably, and considers the greatest good to the greatest number, it is not a crime nor a disgrace to be an invert. I do not need the law to defend me, neither do I desire to have any concessions made for me, nor do I ask my friends to sacrifice their ideals for me. I too have ideals which I shall always hold. All that I desire--and I claim it as my right--is the freedom to exercise this divine gift of loving, which is not a menace to society nor a disgrace to me. Let it once be understood that the average invert is not a moral degenerate nor a mental degenerate, but simply a man or a woman who is less highly specialised, less completely differentiated, than other men and women, and I believe the prejudice against them will disappear, and if they live uprightly they will surely win the esteem and consideration of all thoughtful people. I know what it is to be an invert--who

feels himself set apart from the rest of mankind--to find one human heart who trusts him and understands him, and I know how almost impossible this is, and will be, until the world is made aware of these facts."--_Ibid_, p. 213.

THE END.

Printed in Great Britain by UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED, THE GRESHAM PRESS, WOKING AND LONDON

End of Project Gutenberg's The Intermediate Sex, by Edward Carpenter

==========

A Complete History of Music

W. J. Baltzell

Project Gutenberg Release: March 20, 2017 · eBook #54392

Produced by Charlene Taylor, Paul Marshall and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at http://www.pgdp.net (This file was produced from images generously made available by The Internet Archive/American Libraries.)

A COMPLETE HISTORY OF MUSIC

FOR SCHOOLS, CLUBS, AND PRIVATE READING

By W. J. BALTZELL

Contributions by

H. A. CLARKE, Mus. Doc.; ARTHUR ELSON, CLARENCE G. HAMILTON, A.M., EDWARD BURLINGAME HILL, A.B., ARTHUR L. JUDSON, FREDERIC S. LAW, AND PRESTON WARE OREM, Mus. Bac.

With Portraits, Reproductions of Instruments and Musical Examples

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

THEODORE PRESSER

1908

Copyright, 1905, by THEO. PRESSER. BRITISH COPYRIGHT SECURED.

PREFACE.

The plan of arrangement used in this book has in view a combination of the recitation and lecture systems, and affords an opportunity for teachers to apply the best principles of both. The paragraph headings should be thoroughly fixed in mind and close attention should be given to the words in heavy type and Italics that occur in the body of a paragraph; together they form a convenient outline for the lesson. The questions at the end of each lesson are to be used to test the pupils' mastery of the lesson material; all available works of reference should be consulted for fuller information than the limited space of one book will admit of, each member of the class preparing one or more abstracts to be read before the class. The review outlines and suggestions are to be used in the same way, special attention being given to written answers such as would be required in an examination.

With a view of furnishing the reader a considerable amount of material on the _growth_ of music as an art, biographical sketches have been made short, especially since so many excellent works of that description are available at a small price. Emphasis has been laid on the work of the men who developed music, on the influences which shaped their careers and the permanent value of their contributions to music. A clear knowledge of how music reached its present state is not to be had by studying books, biographical and critical; the _works_ of the composers must be examined, played and sung, compared, analyzed as to methods of construction (Form) and expression (Melody, Harmony and Rhythm), so that the student may appreciate the change from simple, elementary processes to the free, polyphonic style found in the complex modern piano and orchestral scores. Reference is made to representative compositions by classical and modern composers, which are part of the average teaching repertoire. The works of the earlier composers are not, however, readily accessible, although good examples of the style of the 16th and 17th centuries are in the cheap editions of Peters, Litolff, Augener, Breitkopf and Härtel, and Ricordi.

The plan of this book provides for two lessons a week for thirty weeks. This will occupy a school year and allow time for quizzes, reviews and examinations. If more time is available, the work may be divided into four, five or six terms and stress laid on the study of representative compositions, the preparation of short papers on the suggested topics, adding, as a feature to interest friends and music lovers generally, public programs including music.

Musical clubs will find in this book material for several years' programs, special attention having been given to the lessons on modern composers and their music, the suggestions as to class-work applying with equal force to the study classes of clubs. The individual reader should follow out the suggested historical and biographical parallels which help so strongly to fix in the mind the periods in which composers lived.

Lessons III to VI were prepared by Dr. H. A. Clarke, of the University of Pennsylvania; Lessons VIII to XIV by Mr. Arthur L. Judson, of Denison University; Lessons XV and XVI by Mr. Preston Ware Orem, Mus. Bac., of Philadelphia; Lessons XVII to XIX, XXI to XXIII, XXXVII to XL by Mr. Frederic S. Law, of Philadelphia; Lessons XXV to XXXIII by Mr. Clarence G. Hamilton, A. M., of Wellesley College; Lessons XLI to XLVIII by Mr. Edward Burlingame Hill, A. B., of Boston; Lessons L to LVI by Mr. Arthur Elson, of Boston.

W. J. B.

NOVEMBER 1, 1905. SEPTEMBER 1, 1906.

CONTENTS.

PREFACE v

INTRODUCTION 17

LESSON I. MUSIC OF THE CHINESE, JAPANESE AND HINDOOS 24 LESSON II. MUSIC OF THE BABYLONIANS, EGYPTIANS AND HEBREWS 35 LESSON III. MUSIC OF THE GREEKS: SCALES 46 LESSON IV. MUSIC OF THE GREEKS (CONCLUDED) 54 LESSON V. ECCLESIASTICAL SYSTEM 61 LESSON VI. NOTATION 70 LESSON VII. MUSIC OUTSIDE THE CHURCH 77 LESSON VIII. THE CAUSES OF POLYPHONIC DEVELOPMENT AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE POLYPHONIC ERA 88 LESSON IX. THE PARIS SCHOOL 99 LESSON X. THE GALLO-BELGIC SCHOOL 107

LESSON XI. THE ENGLISH SCHOOL 115 LESSON XII. THE SCHOOL OF THE NETHERLANDS 123 LESSON XIII. THE ITALIAN SCHOOL 131 LESSON XIV. PALESTRINA AND HIS INFLUENCE ON THE MUSIC OF THE ITALIAN SCHOOL. THE MADRIGAL 139 LESSON XV. MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS 147 LESSON XVI. THE ORGAN, ORGAN PLAYING AND ORGAN MUSIC 156 LESSON XVII. THE BEGINNING OF THE OPERA 171 LESSON XVIII. THE ORATORIO. DEVELOPMENT OF THE OPERA 179 LESSON XIX. ALESSANDRO SCARLATTI AND THE NEAPOLITAN SCHOOL 187 LESSON XX. SINGING AND SINGERS 195

LESSON XXI. OPERA IN FRANCE AND ENGLAND 203 LESSON XXII. THE OPERA IN GERMANY. HANDEL AND GLUCK 211 LESSON XXIII. MOZART TO ROSSINI 219 LESSON XXIV. THE ORATORIO 226 LESSON XXV. THE EVOLUTION OF THE PIANOFORTE 236 LESSON XXVI. THE EARLY ITALIAN CLAVIER COMPOSERS 246 LESSON XXVII. THE EARLY ENGLISH AND FRENCH CLAVIER SCHOOLS 255 LESSON XXVIII. THE GERMAN POLYPHONIC CLAVIER SCHOOLS 263 LESSON XXIX. THE GERMAN SONATA COMPOSERS TO HAYDN 274 LESSON XXX. FRANZ JOSEPH HAYDN 283

LESSON XXXI. WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART 291 LESSON XXXII. LUDWIG VAN BEETHOVEN 299 LESSON XXXIII. BEETHOVEN AND THE SONATA 307 LESSON XXXIV. THE VIOLIN AND ITS MAKERS 315 LESSON XXXV. VIOLIN PLAYING AND VIOLIN MUSIC 322 LESSON XXXVI. THE ORCHESTRA AND ABSOLUTE MUSIC 334 LESSON XXXVII. THE ROMANTIC OPERA. WEBER, SPOHR, MARSCHNER 345 LESSON XXXVIII. THE FRENCH SCHOOL OF THE 19TH CENTURY 353 LESSON XXXIX. THE ITALIAN SCHOOL OF THE 19TH CENTURY 361 LESSON XL. RICHARD WAGNER'S MUSIC DRAMAS. OTHER SCHOOLS 369

LESSON XLI. PIANO PLAYING AND COMPOSITION: CLEMENTI TO FIELD 380 LESSON XLII. FRANZ PETER SCHUBERT 391 LESSON XLIII. WEBER. MENDELSSOHN 397 LESSON XLIV. ROBERT SCHUMANN 407 LESSON XLV. FREDERIC CHOPIN 417 LESSON XLVI. FRANZ LISZT 425 LESSON XLVII. PIANISTS AND TEACHERS SINCE LISZT. I 436 LESSON XLVIII. PIANISTS AND TEACHERS SINCE LISZT. II 446 LESSON XLIX. THE ART SONG. ORATORIO AFTER MENDELSSOHN 454 LESSON L. THE SYMPHONIC POEM IN GERMANY 463

LESSON LI. GERMAN OPERA SINCE WAGNER 472 LESSON LII. OLD AND NEW SCHOOLS IN FRANCE 481 LESSON LIII. MUSICAL REGENERATION IN ITALY 491 LESSON LIV. ENGLAND AND THE NETHERLANDS 499 LESSON LV. NATIONAL SCHOOLS: BOHEMIA AND SCANDINAVIA 507 LESSON LVI. THE RUSSIAN SCHOOL 515 LESSON LVII. MUSIC IN THE

UNITED STATES 525 LESSON LVIII. AMERICAN COMPOSERS: WORKS IN LARGE INSTRUMENTAL FORMS 535 LESSON LIX. AMERICAN COMPOSERS: VOCAL FORMS; PIANO AND ORGAN.—MUSICAL LITERATURE 543 LESSON LX. MUSICAL EDUCATION 552

INDEX 561

INTRODUCTION.

=Purpose of the Study of the History of Music=.—The purpose of the study of the history of music is to trace the development of the many phases which make up modern music which we cannot but regard as a great social force, an intellectual, an uplifting force. If we consider it from the material side, it is one of magnitude; we need but think of the money invested in buildings, opera houses, schools, concert halls, publishing plants, factories, the sums spent on musical instruments, instruction, concerts, opera, etc., to recognize the commercial side. When we think of the great army of persons whose livelihood is conditioned upon musical work, upon the great audiences that support musical enterprises, we recognize the magnitude of music in a social sense, and that it offers a large field for study. These conditions, interesting as they are, represent only phases of musical work, not Music itself, and serve to show the place which Music occupies in the life of today. Our investigation is, then, a consideration of the origin and development of Music, and the means by which it took shape.

=The Place of Intellect in Music=.—When we think of Music we have in mind an organization of musical sounds into something definite, something by design, not by chance, the product of the working of the human mind with musical sounds and their effects upon the human sensibilities. So long as man accepted the various phenomena of musical sounds as isolated facts, there could be no art. But when he began to use them to minister to his pleasure and to study them and their effects, he began to form an art of music. The story of music is the record of a series of attempts on the part of man to make artistic use of the material which the ear accepts as capable of affording pleasure and as useful in expressing the innermost feelings. The raw material of music consists of the sounds considered musical, the human voice, various musical instruments and the use of this material in such ways as to affect the human sensibilities; that is, to make an impression upon the hearer which shall coincide with that of the original maker of the music who gives to his feelings expression in music. We find in music, as in other branches, that man tries to reduce phenomena to order and to definite form. The mass of musical material is vague, incoherent, disorganized. Man seeks to devise ways to use it intelligibly, and to promote esthetic pleasure. If musical sounds are to be combined simultaneously or successively, this combination should be in accordance with design, not haphazard, just as the builder of the house or the temple puts together his material according to a regular plan. Those who have been leaders in the Art of Music have labored in two ways: to _extend_ the limits of expression in music, and to find the means to _contain_ that expression. At one period stress is laid on making music expressive, at another on the medium for conveying expression to others, the latter being comprehended in the term Form. In connection with this statement, the student will do well to remember that every period of great intellectual activity, social or political, reacted upon music and the other arts; to illustrate, we need but refer to the formal, even artificial character of the music of the period preceding the French Revolution and the freedom and vigor imparted by the spirit of Romanticism which followed in the wake of that great political movement, a difference strikingly illustrated in the music of Haydn and Beethoven, Clementi and Schumann. There is also a constant action and reaction of the various racial streams of power such as the Aryan on the Semitic, East upon the West, Latin upon the Teuton, Folk-music upon the Scholastic.

=The Principles in Music=.—The leading principles in music are: Rhythm, Melody, Harmony, Color or Tone Quality, and in the execution of works of music, Dynamic Contrast, an essential factor in Expression. For ages after the birth of Music, Rhythm and Melody were the only real elements, Rhythm being first recognized. The potency of Rhythm, strong and irresistible in the early days of the race and with primitive man, is still acknowledged. Music that lacks a clearly-defined rhythm does not move the masses. Witness martial music, the dance airs and the “popular song.” All primitive languages were characterized by concise, figurative and picturesque qualities; they easily changed from the ordinary into the lofty and the impassioned. Intonation and changing inflection had much to do with meaning, as is the case with the Chinese language of today. Historians ascribe the origin of Melody to this principle of vocal expression. For years prior to the Christian Era, and long after, Rhythm and Melody were the only accepted elements of Music, and the art remained in a low grade of development. It was not until Harmony appeared, clear and unmistakable, that Music was able to claim a position equal to that accorded to the sister-arts, Poetry, Painting, Sculpture and Architecture. These principles, Rhythm, Melody and Harmony, became, when couched in the forms of expression adopted by the great masters, what we call Modern Music, and the story is one of a development from extreme simplicity to the complexity illustrated in modern orchestral scores.

=Means of Expression=.—One more phase must be mentioned here, the means used to present to others the thoughts or feelings of the composer, that is, the human voice and its artistic use, instruments of various kinds, their primitive forms and gradual development, their use singly and in combination with other instruments. This phase is peculiarly associated with modern music; for it was not until the art had freed itself from the fetters imposed by vocal music, that absolute music, availing itself of perfected instruments, came into its own. From that time development was unprecedentedly rapid.

=What is to be Brought Forward=.—The history of Music is, then, a recital of facts bearing upon the development of modern music and we shall lay stress on such facts as show a permanent impress and a solid contribution to progress in one or more of the lines marked out: Form, Expression, Melody, Rhythm, Harmony and Instrumental Color. In the study of a composer, the facts essential to the history of music are critical rather than biographical; not a life chronicle so much as a clear statement of what he specially contributed to forward the art. To gain an educational value, the facts of the history of music are to be studied so as to glean from them their significance, and an understanding of the causes and conditions which made them possible; then we go on to discern the consequences to which they in turn gave rise. No man works for himself and out of himself. He builds upon what others have done, and he builds for others. The student should discern the lesson in the past, and receive guidance for the future.

=What We Learn from Archæology=.—The history of an art such as Music must give the historical data in connection with the development of art and artists, free of all questionable and false features, and give as trustworthy, as accurate a picture of the various stages as possible. If we go backward in our research we reach a point at which ordinary records fail. If we make an inquiry into the beginnings of music we must have recourse to the findings and interpretations of Archæology. The results are by no means satisfactory. In all the digging in the ruins of the once great cities of Egypt, and Western Asia, and of Greece and Etruria as well, with perhaps one exception, no music has been brought to light, and but a few instruments, and these can scarcely be considered perfect. However, the pictorial representations on tombs, monuments, temples and houses give valuable aid, enabling scholars to reconstruct the story of music among the older civilizations. We must not forget, however, that conjecture plays a more or less prominent part in all the translations of the old hieroglyphic and cuneiform writings. We have no direct knowledge of the scales used or how the instruments were played together, what was the nature of the science and system in use. What we have is mere inference from the nature of the instruments and the representations of musicians playing their instruments, together with fragments from contemporary or later writings.

=What We Learn from Ethnology=.—Another source open to students of the beginnings of music is the material gathered by Ethnology. Those who place stress on this means of research lay down the proposition that the primitive people of the world of today occupy a mental and social stage similar to that of the primitive races from which the civilized folk of today have sprung. Therefore, they study the music, the rude chants, the dances, the instruments, etc., of various primitive tribes, and then by comparison try to indicate the various stages through which music came to have the art germ, from which the great product we know has developed.

=Some Theories=.—We can give in this lesson only a few of the theories offered by those who have discussed the matter of the origin of music: The Dance, Poetry and Music form a group which cannot readily be separated; they are not independent of each other, but most intimately connected. This view fails to take account of the fact that Music which is, externally, so closely connected with the Dance and with Poetry, is, in its essence, absolutely distinct. Schopenhauer, the philosopher from whom Richard Wagner drew inspiration, holds this view very strongly. He says: “Music is quite independent of the visible world, is absolutely ignorant of it, and could exist in a certain way if there were no world; which cannot be said of the other arts.” The other arts are essentially imitative and representative; they are based upon Nature. Some writers, the Frenchman Dubos and the English philosopher Herbert Spencer among them, claim that Music does represent Nature. They say that as the painter imitates the forms and colors he sees in nature, so the musician follows the various modulations of the voice, finding there the basic conceptions of Rhythm, Melody and Color. Singing, which Spencer considers the original music, is the emphasizing and intensifying of the properties of speech. Gurney says, _per contra_, that “Music creates audible forms, successions and combinations of tones which have no prototype in Nature and do not exist outside of Music.” Those who believe that Music is a separate entity therefore seek to trace it to a completely independent beginning.[1] Darwin offered another theory as to the way in which man arrived at Music. His idea is that the faculty of producing musical tones and rhythm was first acquired by our animal ancestors as a means of attracting the opposite sex, the faculty being developed and improved by the process of selection.

=The Conception of Fixed Scales=.—The question is sometimes raised: How did man reach the conception of fixed scales? Here again opinions differ. Some consider that the extreme notes were fixed by the average compass of the human voice in impassioned

speech, the interval being variously divided. Others claim that along with the vocal phase of music there was an instrumental side, and that the mechanical conditions in connection with instruments had bearing in the matter of organizing sounds into a scale; the rude, primitive trumpet of wood or bark, still found among forest tribes in South America and Africa, gives a series of harmonic notes. Whistles or flutes made in prehistoric times with a series of several tones, examples of combinations of little pipes, such as those known by the name of “Pan’s Pipes,” also bear on this question. Yet the facts are few and we are compelled to satisfy ourselves with mere conjecture.

REFERENCES.

Tylor.—Anthropology.

Rowbotham.—History of Music.

Smith.—The World’s Earliest Music.

Grosse.—The Beginnings of Art.

Raymond.—The Genesis of Art.

Helmholtz.—The Sensations of Tone.

Parry.—Evolution of the Art of Music.

Bosanquet.—History of Aesthetic.

Knight.—Philosophy of the Beautiful, Part II, Chap. IX.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Why do we consider music a force in civilization?

What do we mean by Expression in music?

The teacher will cite periods when “Expression” was the chief aim, when Form was.

Cite periods when intense political and intellectual upheaval reacted on music.

Give examples of the leading principles of Music.

What kind of facts are of importance to the history of Music?

What is the value of Archæology to the history of music?

Why is Ethnology valuable to the history of music?

Give several theories as to the origin of music.

Is the scale used by us the scale of all nations?

In preparing for recitation, students should get an outline of each lesson by the use of the paragraph headings and then work out the lesson by the use of the questions that follow. If the reference books suggested are available, additional reading should be done. A good plan is for the teacher to assign one or two paragraphs to a pupil and have the latter bring in such other information of interest as can be secured. Some questions may be grouped and pupils directed to prepare a short essay to be read before the class. In regard to dates, the suggestion is that pupils take turns, lesson by lesson, in presenting a plan by which to memorize them. When the period is one that can be related to some well-known event in general history, as the life of Charlemagne, the Norman Conquest of England, the Crusades, the Wars of the Roses, discovery of America, invention of printing, etc., it is well to do so; or make a well-known musician a contemporary of some artist, statesman, king, scientist, man of letters, etc. The teacher should be prepared in this manner for each lesson. Events before the Christian Era may be related to some event or character in Biblical history.

LESSON I.

MUSIC OF THE CHINESE, JAPANESE AND HINDOOS.

=Sources of Our Knowledge=.—When we study the music of the early period of the human race, we find no records such as we are storing today in our libraries. We must depend upon the discoveries of archæologists in the buried cities of early civilizations. Of contemporaneous books, properly speaking, tablets of music explaining the construction and methods of playing the musical instruments then in use we have few; if they exist they are in dead languages to which scholars are but slowly finding the key. It is true that some instruments have been found, but we can have no certainty that they are in perfect condition. The principal sources of the information we possess have been the paintings, decorations and sculptures on monuments and on the walls of buildings and tombs that have been unearthed. Early languages were largely pictorial, and records kept in this manner furnish us representations of the religious, martial, and social life of the early races.

=Countries with a Musical Past=.—The lands that offer the greatest field for the study of the music of the past are Chaldea or Babylonia and Egypt. Some of the old Greek cities, as well as cities in the western part of Asia Minor and Palestine, have been the subject of explorations. Still another country abounding in interest to the student of the music of the past is China, living, yet dead! What a contrast to Chaldea and Egypt! The civilization of the latter is dead; China, the older, is still living. These races had a common home, yet the former, having developed a high civilization and fulfilled its mission, disappeared from the face of the earth, while China, having also reached a high state of culture, has remained stagnant, all energies toward a higher level being arrested.

=The Common Home of the Race=.—Scientists place the cradle of the human race in the high plateau of Asia, extending from Persia eastward through Thibet and including part of Manchuria. The yellow race, according to some ethnologists, is the more akin to the primitive race; the other two, the white and the black, being derived from it by emigration, change of climate and mode of living. Van Aalst, the leading writer on Chinese Music, says that “the first invaders of China were a band of immigrants fighting their way among the aborigines and supposed to have come from the country south of the Caspian Sea.” It is outside the province of this work to detail the arguments that serve to show the connection of the Chinese with the other races mentioned. Berosus, the old Babylonian historian, writes: “There was originally in the land of Babylon a multitude of men of foreign race who had settled in Chaldea.” These men are known in history by the name of Akkads or Akkadians, “from the northern mountains,” Sumerians, from the “southern mountains”; that is, the highland ranges lying to the north and east of the Euphrates Valley. There were two main types among these tribes: a yellow, black-haired people, and a red type. The records show that migrations from this central home came about by reason of famines, plagues or floods. When did the black-haired, yellow people swarm off? When did the “red” people, from which Egyptian tradition claimed ancestry, go away? Probably the Chinese were the first to leave the central home, taking with them the elements of a considerable civilization, which also formed the basis of the later Chaldean, Babylonian, Assyrian and Egyptian cultures, and through various channels, of the Etrurian and Greek.

=High Place of Music Among the Chinese=.—The science of music had a high place in Chinese philosophy; the sages alone comprehend the canons, and the mandarins in music are considered superior to those in mathematics. Some most interesting dates are given, showing how early the Chinese had developed a science of music. We are told that in 2277 B. C., there were twenty-two writers on the dance and music, twenty-three on ancient music, twenty-four on playing the _Kin_ and the _Che_, and twenty-five on construction of scales. These facts imply many years of previous development before the time when works treating of the science of music would be prepared. Confucius, the chief Chinese philosopher, wrote about ancient music in 551 B. C. Unfortunately, ancient records and books were almost entirely destroyed, 246 B. C., by order of the Emperor then on the throne; he excepted from this destruction only works on medicine, agriculture and divination. A comparison of recorded dates shows that the Chinese were writing learned works on the science of music when the Pharaohs were building the pyramids.

=Sonorous Bodies=.—The Chinese have always shown a fondness for instituting likenesses between things in heaven and earth, and things intellectual and material. According to their theory, there are eight sound-giving bodies: Stone, Metal, Silk, Bamboo, Wood, Skin, Gourd and Clay.

=The Sheng=.—One of the most important musical instruments in use among the Chinese, one that is indispensable to their temple ritual, is the Sheng. This instrument is the representative of the =gourd= principle; originally the bowl was formed from a portion of a gourd or a calabash, the top being covered by a circular piece of wood with holes around the margin in which the pipes, seventeen in number, are fixed; in the side of the gourd is placed a mouthpiece or tube covered with ivory, through which the player _draws_ his breath. Each pipe is fitted with a small free reed of copper. A small hole is made in each pipe just above the bowl, which prevents a pipe from speaking when the air is drawn in by the player, unless the hole is closed by a finger. The instrument is placed to the mouth with the pipes slanting toward the right shoulder. The notes sounded by the pipes of the _Sheng_ as they are

arranged are:

[Music]

giving the following scale or series of sounds:

[Music]

four of the seventeen pipes are mutes, placed there doubtless for purposes of symmetry.

[Illustration: KIN. SE OR CHE. SHENG.]

=The Kin=.—The principle of the sound of =silk= is exemplified in the Kin or Ch'in, the strings, "made of twisted silk, being stretched over a wooden frame." This instrument was the favorite of Confucius, the great law-giver, and in _his_ time was of _great antiquity_. The number of strings was five, to agree with the five elements; the upper part was rounded, to represent the heavens; the bottom was flat, to represent the ground. The number of strings was later increased to seven, which is the favored form, tuned to G, A, C, D, E, G, A, a pentatonic scale.

=The Se=.—Another stringed instrument is the _Sê_, (also written _Che_), which had originally fifty strings. As now used, it has only twenty-five strings. Four kinds are in use, differing in size and in number of strings; it is customary that they should give the sound of two notes simultaneously, generally octaves. Some of these, used by the most skilful performers, have only thirteen or fourteen strings. The strings are plucked by two small ivory picks.

=Flutes=.—The sound of =bamboo= is exemplified in certain instruments of the flute family. The bamboo plant is used by the Chinese in very many ways; it is natural that they should use it for making musical instruments. There are two types of pipes or flutes: those blown at the end, as a whistle, and those blown across a hole near one end, as is our modern flute; the Chinese flutes are of the latter class. They varied in size and in the number of holes, from three to six, the little finger of each hand not being used. A popular flute, called the _Ti-Tzu_, has, in addition to the six finger holes, one for blowing and one covered with a thin membrane, to vary the sound. Another kind, very ancient, and much in use, according to Chinese writers during the period 2205-1122 B. C., may be called, shortly, the _Tche_. It has six finger holes, three near each end, and is pierced with another hole at the middle, across which the player blows. The scale is said to consist of six semitones, beginning with F, fifth line treble clef. The peculiar construction of this flute presents some acoustical problems.

[Illustration: TCHE.]

=Other sonorous bodies= are, =metal= from which the Chinese make gongs, bells and trumpets—they seem to have known the principle of the slide, as in the trombone, but never developed it; =stone=, certain varieties, in the shape of the letter L, pierced with a hole at the angle, suspended in a frame and struck by a hammer; =skin=, from which drums were made; =clay=, from which instruments were made in shape resembling the ocarina, familiar to us.

=Chinese Scales=.—The vocal and the instrumental music have different scales, the former _diatonic_—with two notes of the seven omitted, forming a _pentatonic_ (five-tone scale), the letters of which, since F is a favorite tonic, may be represented by F, G, A, C, D. The instrumental scales are _chromatic_ in character. When the voice is accompanied by instruments, the vocal scale is used. Singing is in unison, modified by fourths, occasionally. The singing tone is a sort of nasal sing-song, the favorite method a nasal falsetto, the mouth being nearly closed.

[Music]

This represents the concluding strophes of the Hymn to Confucius. The time is very slow; each measure represents a line of four syllables; between the lines one of the instruments gives a sort of interlude.

So much space has been taken with Chinese music because the conservatism of that race has preserved instruments and music that date back to the early history of our race.

[Illustration: KOTO.]

=Japanese Music=.—In the Japanese system we find a _pentatonic_ scale and a _semitonal_ division of the octave. Japanese music does not proceed in semitones, the chromatic scale being demanded by the custom of transposing a melody from one starting point to another, not more than fourteen sounds for a melody. A favorite Japanese instrument is of the clarinet type; it is

called the _Hichi-riki_; in length it varies from a little less than nine inches to a little more. The scale as set forth by the Institute of Tokio is from G, second line, treble staff to the A above, F, fifth line, being sharped. This instrument is played by _drawing_ in the breath. The Japanese have an instrument called the _Sho_, similar to the Chinese _Sheng_. The national instrument is the _Koto_, which has thirteen strings, tuned thus: the first, middle C sharp, the second, F sharp a fifth lower; subsequent strings ascend in order, G sharp, A, C sharp, D, F sharp, G sharp, A, C sharp, D, F sharp, G sharp; between the fourth and fifth sounds is a third, which interval, in practice, was filled by pressing the string behind the bridge, thus increasing the tension; each string can be raised a semitone or even a tone by increasing the pressure. By this means additional notes can be secured, giving a scale identical with the Greek Dorian or ecclesiastical Aeolian. Much of the popular Japanese music is written without the extra notes, and the series of tones can be characterized as a pentatonic scale based on the natural minor. Thus:

[Music]

=The Hindoos=.—Among the Asiatic races that still retain national, although not a separate political existence, and have a musical system peculiar to themselves, the Hindoos are prominent. The Hindoos belong to the Aryan race, (from which we also sprang), and had their home originally in Central Asia, probably north of the Hindoo Koosh range. When they swarmed off from the old home they made their way down through the mountains along the river valleys to the great fertile plains of India, and conquering the aboriginal races, developed the system of caste, which has had so great an influence on their religion, literature, science and art. The old Hindoo literature shows clearly the high regard in which the art of song was held. Celebrated minstrels were maintained in the royal courts whose duty it was to chant songs in praise of their patrons. Music, or song, was just as indispensable in the religious ceremonies. One of the holy books makes the statement that “Indra rejects the offering made without music.” In time the singer became a member of the priestly caste.

[Illustration: VINA. RAVANASTRON.]

=The Vina=.—From antiquity to the present time among the Hindoos pure instrumental music held almost equal place with song or accompanied vocal music. The Hindoo instruments belong to the percussion types, trumpets and trombones, nose flute, and especially to the stringed class. It is noteworthy that the simpler kinds, in which each string gives but one tone, do not exist, whereas there are many varieties of those which have fingerboards. The oldest and most important is the Vina, which consists of a wooden pipe about four feet long attached to two gourds or resonators. The seven metal strings are stretched over nineteen bridges or frets, becoming gradually higher, and touch only the last and highest one. The other eighteen serve to fix the pitch of the tone desired, as in our guitar or mandolin, the strings being set in vibration by being plucked with a metal thimble or ring like that used by zither players. Another Hindoo instrument, considered by some as the prototype of stringed instruments played with a bow, is the Ravanastron.

=Hindoo Musical Philosophy=.—Hindoo myths ascribe a divine origin to music. A close connection was established between the scale and their religious ideas. Each single tone was under the protection of a nymph, and the first syllables of the names of these nymphs, according to Clement, the French historian, were given to the tones, thus: Sa, Ri, Ga, Ma, Pa, Da, Ni, seven in all, differing in that respect from the _pentatonic_ form _usually_ found among the early races. In their endeavor to satisfy the melody of speech, the inflections of the voice in speaking, the Hindoos divided the interval of the octave into small parts, and transposed the scale freely up and down; so it is easily conceivable that their complete system recognized 960 scales, their sacred writings speaking of 16,000. In practice they contented themselves with 36, some writers say 72. The following is given as the scale:

[Music]

The principal feature of Hindoo music is the melody and rhythm, the latter being very complicated. Of harmony in our sense of the word there is no sign. In accompanying the voice the Hindoos used only the pure fifth, which they considered a perfect consonance, the fourth, an imperfect consonance, and the octave.

=High Esteem of Music Among the Hindoos=.—Music had a high place among the Hindoos, all festivities made use of it, and the private and social life demanded it. It was used freely in the Hindoo drama, the latter calling for the dance, spoken and sung dialogue and instrumental music and songs. The main reason why Hindoo music did not develop in the past centuries doubtless lies in the fact that, as in Egypt, the ruling power was vested in the priesthood, which controlled all the arts and sciences. Music was so interwoven with their religious rites and observances, and so hedged around with irrevocable and sacred laws that the slightest alteration was considered a sacrilege. In closing this section it may be added that investigators refer the gipsies, particularly those of Hungary, who are noted for their musical temperament, to Hindoo origin, probably the pariah caste. Their music, with its wild,

free rhythm and elaborate melodic embellishment, has a marked resemblance to the music of the Hindoos.

REFERENCES.

Smith.—The World's Earliest Music.

Anderson.—The Story of Extinct Civilizations.

Rice.—What is Music?

Piggott.—Music and Musical Instruments of Japan.

Day.—Musical Instruments of the Deccan.

QUESTIONS.

What is the source of our information as to the beginnings of music?

What countries are being explored by archæologists?

Where was the cradle of the human race?

Which branch was probably the first to "swarm off"?

How ancient are some Chinese records concerning music?

What are the sound-giving bodies according to Chinese theories?

Give an example of each kind.

Describe the _Sheng_, _Kin_, _Che_ and _Tche_.

What kind of scale is used in Chinese vocal music?

What is the Japanese national instrument?

What kinds of instruments did the Hindoos have? Their favorite instrument? Describe the latter.

Tell about the Hindoo scale.

Why did music among the Hindoos fail to develop?

LESSON II.

MUSIC OF THE BABYLONIANS, EGYPTIANS AND HEBREWS.

=History a Record of Change=.—History is a record of changing conditions. Nations rise into prominence and fall again; cities are built to be torn down by conquerors; even the face of the earth has changed since the days when the scions of the Aryan race began to leave their home in Central Asia. Arms of the sea have shrunk to rivers, rivers to shallow streams, the desert sands have encroached on the once fertile valleys, and choked the springs and brooks of the meadows. Geologists tell us that the great valleys were made by the alluvial deposit washed down from the hills and mountains by the streams. The Chinese followed the course of the great rivers that made toward the eastern seas, the Hindoos toward the southern ocean, and still another "swarm" followed the great rivers Euphrates and Tigris, which came from the mountains of Western Asia. The great valley lying between the desert and the mountains, a scene of waste and ruin as far back as the time of ancient Greece and Rome, was once a most important centre of population and wealth, the home for centuries of races that had reached a high degree of culture in the arts and sciences, and the seat of what may be considered the oldest of extinct civilizations. The valley was wonderfully fertile, was brought to a high degree of cultivation and supported an enormous population. As an instance of the physical changes that have taken place in this region, it may be mentioned that about 4000 B. C., the Tigris and the Euphrates entered the sea by different mouths, instead of joining as now and in the days of Abraham, the patriarch, who came from this region, and the town identified by modern scholars as "Ur of the Chaldees," which is now 150 miles up the Euphrates, was an important seaport.

=The Chaldeans=.—When the Aryans came down into this valley they found already established there a people whose records are now being unearthed, called Akkads, belonging to the Mongolian family, who had reached a high degree of cultivation in art and science. The records found show that music was an important branch of study; at a very early date the harp, pipe and cymbals are mentioned, and we infer that the people were fond of singing, since many sacred hymns have been recorded in tablets. This race, joined to others, founded the Chaldean kingdom, the capital being Babylon. In the 12th century B. C., a king of Assyria, in the northern part of the Tigris valley, conquered Babylon and thus gained the ascendancy.

=The Practice of Music Among the Babylonians=.—In the great ruins now being excavated, tablets of clay have been found which give a vivid idea of the social and religious esteem in which music was held by the Babylonians. One of these tablets, said to date back more than three thousand years B. C., contains a representation of musicians. One strikes with a hammer upon a metal plate, another carries a reed pipe, a third plays upon a harp of eleven strings, while two others beat time or give the accent by clapping their hands. Especially rich in sculpture is the palace of Sennacherib. One of the relief decorations shows a festival procession in honor of the returning conqueror. In front walk five men, three with harps, a fourth with a kind of lyre, whose strings were struck with a plectrum; the fifth bears a double flute. Two of the harpers and the lyre player dance. Then follow six women, of whom four carry harps, one blows a double flute, while the last beats a sort of drum. Following the instrumentalists come six women and six children singing, who indicate the rhythm by clapping their hands. From the fact that in these sculptures a few soldiers indicate an army, we infer that the Babylonians made use of large bodies of players and singers in their great ceremonies. These tablets indicate that the Babylonians made much use of trumpets to give signals to the armies and when great masses of the people were gathered together. That musicians were highly esteemed we judge from the fact that on one occasion Sennacherib spared the lives of musicians among his captives, all others being put to death. Since the Chaldeans, especially, were famous as astronomers and mathematicians, it is thought that they, like the Egyptian sages, had knowledge of the mathematical relations of the various intervals.

[Illustration: ASSYRIAN HARP (SAMBUCA). SANTIR.]

=Chaldean Instruments=.—Two instruments seem to be especially noticeable: the Symphonia and Sambuca. The former was carried to Palestine by the Hebrews, at the end of their captivity, and, according to their accounts, seems to have been a sort of bagpipe, an instrument particularly suited to a pastoral people like the early Chaldeans. As to the Sambuca we have no authentic knowledge; it seems, however, to have been an instrument of the zither type, held horizontally and played with a plectrum.[2] A stringed instrument, struck with a hammer, called the Santir is credited to the Assyrians.

=Egyptian Music=.—When the great Alexandrian Library of 495,000 works of Persian, Chaldean, Hebrew, Egyptian, Greek and Roman literature was partly destroyed during Julius Cæsar's battles with the native Egyptians, in 47 B. C., and finally, A. D. 391, by Christian fanatics, history suffered an irreparable loss. Treasures of learning in all branches, the records of early civilizations perished, never to be replaced. Today we are dependent upon the discoveries of explorers in the ruins of the great Egyptian cities, temples, tombs and pyramids. The Egyptians believed that articles of necessity to the living being were necessary to the individual in a future existence. If certain things could not, in reality, be placed in the tomb, a pictorial representation would have almost equal value in the invisible world. In Egyptian tombs pipes or "flutes" have been found, and in one instance, in the tomb of a musician, the bronze cymbals he played when alive. In the various tombs and ruins that have been examined by explorers, pictorial representations of practically every phase of Egyptian life have been found. The sources for our knowledge, almost wholly inferential, are, then, the various pictorial and sculptured representations of the Egyptian musical instruments and the manner in which they were used, and a few fragments of their sacred books, which were forty-two in number, two being devoted to music, although but one fragment has been found. It must be noted, further, that the Egyptian Government, although nominally a monarchy, limited, not absolute, was in reality theocratic. The priestly caste had final power, and the rules and regulations drawn up by them prescribed the minutest detail of life, crushing all possibility of independent thought and freedom of action, a condition fatal to high artistic development.

=Place of Music in Egyptian Life=.—To show the place of music in Egyptian life, the following from Ambros' history will serve admirably: "From these decorations [on the walls of tombs] we perceive that the Egyptians made great use of music. We find harps of many sizes and shapes, small and easily portable, to others beyond the height of a man, crude and of the utmost simplicity, to others elaborate and extremely rich in decoration. We note an almost endless variety of =lyres=, =guitars= and =mandolins= [that is, similar in type to the instruments we know by these names], single and double flutes, played by hands of numerous musicians, together with male and female singers. Music was used to accompany the dance, the funeral cortège,[3] the banquet and other social functions. Inscriptions show that there were musicians of high social position at the court."

=Egyptian Instruments=.—The records show a development of music from a crude simplicity in early days to a brilliant and complex system alongside of the changes in other arts and the sciences, some of the discoveries going as far back as 1625 B. C. We give illustrations of several forms of the Egyptian =harps=. The number of strings varied from three or four to twenty-one. Mr. J. F. Rowbotham, the English historian of music, says that “taking B below the bass staff as the lowest note of the Egyptian scale, (since it likely followed the Assyrian in this respect) the compass of the great harp would extend to E, first line, treble staff. The small harps of various sizes had a compass from D, third line, bass staff, to D or E above the treble staff. Another series of stringed instruments, known under the general name, lyres, had the same compass as the small harps; the lutes had a low G, (bass) string, and the highest note was C or D on the treble staff; various forms of the flutes had about the same compass; pipes, [which may be represented by the flageolet of today] had a compass of about one octave upward from E, fourth space, treble clef. Other instruments were of the percussion character, =tambourines=, =drums=, =cymbals=, etc. Although the Egyptians used their instruments in combination, there is reason to believe their practice was the alternation of groups, only occasionally using all simultaneously, to secure fulness and power of tone.”

[Illustration: HORIZONTAL HARP. SMALL HARP. GREAT HARP.]

=Philosophy and Practice of Egyptian Music=.—The consensus of opinion is that Egyptian music was melodic in character, the instruments or voices playing or singing in different octaves, rejecting other intervals. As the Greeks seem to have drawn from the Egyptians much of their practice in music, it is reasonable to suppose that they would have used harmony if the Egyptians had been accustomed to make use of it. As to the Egyptian theory of music we have no information. Since, however, Pythagoras, the Greek philosopher, was a student of the Egyptian school for priests, we infer that his teachings were founded on the science he acquired there; hence it is probable that the Egyptians were familiar with a seven-fold division of the octave and the mathematical relations of the fourth and fifth, as well as other intervals of the scale. Of the old Egyptian hymns we have no remains unless it be, as some assert, that fragments still exist among the Coptic Christians.

[Illustration: TRANSVERSE FLUTE. DOUBLE FLUTE.]

=The Hebrews=.—What a wonderful history is that of the Hebrews! It has seen nation after nation rise to power and go down. It has been enslaved, seemingly beyond all possibility of recovering a national existence, yet regained place. Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Rome, held the Hebrews, yet the latter are still with us, as a distinct race, while their conquerors have but pages of history. A glance at the history of the race will show that they touched the sources of early civilization. Abraham was a resident, according to the Bible story, of Ur in the land of the Chaldees, where a considerable civilization had been attained. From here he went to Canaan, thence to Egypt, and back again to the country east of the Red Sea. When his descendants went to Egypt they must have carried with them Syrian music and instruments, doubtless preserving a trace of Chaldean influence. It was during the four centuries’ sojourn in Egypt that the Hebrews, though for a time enslaved, gained the proportions of a nation. As their duties placed them in close relations to their masters, they gained considerable of the Egyptian science, literature, customs, etc. At that time, musicians were slaves, and tradition says that Miriam, the sister of Moses, was a slave dancing-girl and singer. We know that Moses was instructed in the learning of the Egyptian priesthood, and in that capacity officiated in some of the functions of the temple services. Such facts as these go far to justify the idea that the Hebrews gained their fundamental notions of music and musical instruments during their long sojourn in Egypt. Some writers claim that the songs of the Hebrews were adapted to Egyptian chants. The pastoral life led by the descendants of Abraham, the period of slavery which the Hebrews suffered in Egypt, and the subsequent migratory life in the wilderness were not adapted to develop a people’s song. The life in Palestine for many years was a strenuous one; and then came another period of slavery among the Assyrians, by which the Hebrew ideas were again modified.

=A Religious People=.—The Hebrews were an intensely religious people, the code delivered to them by Moses fixing the status of music up to the time of the pleasure-loving Solomon. Their music, in distinction from that of the nations around them, was not sensuous but a true _musica sacra_, in this respect more a matter of religion than of art. During the reign of David, the Levites were organized as the singers for the Temple services. Music and poetry were the chief subjects of instruction. David himself composed many of the tunes to which his Psalms were sung.

=Hebrew Poetry and Its Relation to Their Music=.—The key to the music of the Hebrews is their poetry. They grew to numbers under the most adverse circumstances, and developed a temperament indifferent to environment and elevated to high spiritual aspiration, making them an intensely religious people, whose life was little softened by artistic practice. The effect of the injunction against the making of “graven images,” as given them in the code of Moses, was to cut them off from the exercise of the esthetic faculty in sculpture or painting; their unsettled mode of life prevented outlet in architecture. So they poured out the whole strength of

their passionate, powerful natures in poetry and song. The most striking characteristic of the Hebrew poetry is the parallelism of the phrases, each sentence or complete thought being made up of two similar or contrasted thoughts, and the accompanying music must have had the same character. The following from the Psalms shows this feature:

“Lord, hear my voice: let thine ears be attentive to the voice of my supplication.” “I will not give sleep to my eyes, or slumber to mine eyelids.”

When the great choirs of men singers were organized for the Temple services, this parallelism brought about the division into two bodies, who sang alternately, a practice in use today in certain churches with ritualistic services, and known as antiphonal singing.

=Hebrew Music=.—It is unfortunate that we have no reason to believe that the hymns in use in the Jewish synagogues today are sung to the tunes of thousands of years ago, even if modified. In the various countries of Europe, Spain, Italy, Germany, Russia, the airs are quite different, suggesting that tradition has failed to deliver anything that can traced to the days of the poet-king of Israel. Some authorities find in the Gregorian chants traces of Hebrew melodies which came down from the early Christians of Jewish birth and training. Clement of Alexandria says that their songs were earnest and dignified; there must have been some special character in them as shown by the command of the Babylonians, “Sing us the songs of Zion.” The principal relation that the Hebrews have to the history of music arises from the enduring impress the works of the Psalmist and other portions of the Scriptures have made upon the music of the Christian Church.

=Hebrew Instruments=.—The Hebrews borrowed their instruments from other nations, principally from the Egyptians, the one most favored being a form of the =harp=, small enough to be portable, used to give effect to the chanting of the prophets. “To prophesy meant to sing,” and it is quite likely that Isaiah, Jeremiah and the other inspired poets uttered their thoughts in verse and song, both being extemporized.

The student should bear in mind that the various musical instruments mentioned in the Bible must be understood as types. The harp of David was not the same as our harp, the organ was not like our great church instruments, viols, sackbuts, cornets, pipes, psalteries, etc., are names given by the translators to the Hebrew terms used in the Bible. They used words with which they were familiar, and which they thought corresponded in type to the instruments used by the Hebrews.

REFERENCES.

Rowbotham.—History of Music.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. I.

Engel.—Musical Instruments.

Smith.—The World’s Earliest Music.

Anderson.—The Story of Extinct Civilizations.

Maspéro.—Ancient Egypt and Assyria.

Dickinson.—Music in the History of the Western Church.

QUESTIONS.

What great river valley was the home of the Chaldeans?

What do we know of music among the Akkads?

What evidence have we to show that the Assyrians held music in high esteem?

What instruments did they use?

How do we learn of the ideas of the Egyptians in regard to music?

Who controlled the knowledge of music and other sciences and arts? Was this beneficial to music?

What instruments did the Egyptians use?

What was the character of Egyptian music?

What was the origin of the Hebrew race?

What influences did they come under in Egypt?

What difference was there between the music of the Hebrews and that of the nations around them?

Why did they express themselves in poetry and music?

What was a leading characteristic of their poetry?

Have any ancient Hebrew melodies been preserved?

What musical instruments did the Hebrews have? What was the origin of these instruments?

LESSON III.

MUSIC OF THE GREEKS: SCALES.

When we think of Greece, it is Athens, the centre of Greek art and culture, that comes to mind. An ancient city, Athens, as history teaches us. The record is that it was founded by Cecrops, who brought a colony from Egypt, in 1556 B. C., a period when Egypt was a centre of power, wealth, education and science. Therefore we infer that these colonists brought with them to Greece the ordinary, popular music and instruments to which they had become accustomed in their home. But there was an older Greece; for late discoveries show that there were five cities, each built upon the ruins of an older city, the first one going back to 2500 B. C. These earlier inhabitants, themselves an offshoot of the great Aryan race, were absorbed by the colonists.

=Music and Myth in Greece=.—The beginnings of music in Greece are mingled with myths: Pan, Apollo, Mercury, Athene and others appear as the patrons and exemplars of the musical art. Aside from the names of the mythical gods and goddesses, there are names of human beings that stand out with clearness. These early musicians were singers or bards who chanted the songs composed in honor of chiefs and tribal heroes. Such were Hyagnis, 1506 B. C., Marsyas, his son, and Olympus the elder, Orpheus, Musæus (1426 B. C.), chief of the Eleusinian mysteries, Linus, Amphion, Thaletes, whose songs were favorites of Pythagoras; the greatest of these bards was the blind Homer, to whom the date 900 B. C. is assigned. “By the Greeks, music as an art was considered an aid in regulating by rule the inflections of the voice, to mark the places of emphasis, and to define the pauses in the recitation of their epic poetry; and the rhythm of their songs followed strictly laws that had been laid down; innovation was reprehended, and even prohibited.”[4]

=Early Greek Musicians and Writers=.—The earliest musician’s name met with in the annals of music is that of =Terpander= (676 B. C), who is said to have increased the number of strings on the lyre from four to seven. Next in order was =Pythagoras= (585-505 B. C.), who added an eighth string to the lyre. He was called the discoverer of the Tetrachord, which is still known by this name, the inventor or discoverer of the Octave Scale, also the discoverer of the ratios of the consonances; but there is no doubt that he learned all these things during his sojourn in Egypt. He is also credited with the invention of the Canon or Monochord with movable bridges, a contrivance still in use for investigating the ratios of intervals. Unfortunately none of the writings—if any ever existed—of Pythagoras have come down to us. Our knowledge of his theories is second-hand, gathered from the writings of his disciples. Pythagoras seems to have studied sound more in the manner of the acoustician than of the musician; hence his followers, or rather those who called themselves by his name, were more concerned with the ratios of sounds than with their musical effects.

Among the great philosophers who treated on music, =Aristotle= (384 B. C.) holds an important place. We find his theories expressed in one of his works called “Problems.” A pupil of his—=Aristoxenus= (350-320 B. C.), has left the most valuable treatise on music, of any of the ancients, the oldest musical work known at the present time; it is, unfortunately, not complete. Aristoxenus was a practical, in addition to being a theoretical musician; he thought that the ear was the final court of appeal in matters musical. Hence the musical world was divided into two factions: the Pythagoreans, who held that music was purely a matter for arithmetical investigation, and the Aristoxenians, who claimed that the chief end of music was to be listened to. This dispute lasted for many centuries. =Boethius=, the Roman philosopher, in his writings takes sides with the Pythagoreans and pours contempt on the mere musician. The successors of the Pythagoreans are even yet not extinct, as every now and again some wiseacre turns up with a scheme to secure just intonation, at the price of losing all that music has gained under our present system. =Plato= (430 B. C.), the greatest of philosophers, has much to say about music; but these sayings are largely incomprehensible to modern understandings.

=Euclid= (323 B. C.), the great mathematician, treated largely of music.[5] =Aristides Quintilianus= was another author of great weight. =Plutarch=, in his _Symposia_, has one devoted to music, but unfortunately the meaning of these authors is often so obscure that it cannot now be discovered. Alexandria, in Egypt, came into prominence in music when the great library was founded there by Alexander the Great, in 332 B. C. =Eratosthenes= (276-196 B. C.), the librarian, figures in the mathematics of music. When we reach the Christian Era, we meet with two more writers, =Didymus= (A. D. 60), who introduced the “minor”[6] tone into the scale, and =Claudius Ptolemy= (A. D. 130).

=The Music of Ancient Greece the Foundation of Modern European Music=.—Although the history of European music properly begins with the music of Ancient Greece, we are still very ignorant of the subject, owing to the fact that there is not in existence a note of music anterior to the Christian Era. But lately, in the ancient treasure house at Delphi, a hymn was found inscribed in marble on the inner wall. Mr. J. P. Mahaffy, an authority in matters pertaining to Greek literature, says: “The time is given by the metre, a long syllable and three short, variously placed, or two long and a short between them, in every case 5-8 in a measure.... As regards the accompaniment or harmonizing of the air, there is none extant. [As to the melody] although there is rhythm and even a recurrence of phrases to mark the close of the period, nothing worthy of being called melody in any modern sense is to be found.” The inscription dates from the third century before Christ, is a hymn to Apollo and the Muses, and consists of phrases equal to eighty measures in our modern reckoning. The blank spaces in the measure were filled in by an instrument, probably the cithara. Our knowledge is confined to the treatises of mathematicians and musicians, previously mentioned, and these works are often so obscure that there is much uncertainty as to their meaning. Besides, these writings are scattered over a period of about 800 years; that is, from 585 B. C., the date of Pythagoras, to 130 A. D., the date of Claudius Ptolemy. Numberless changes took place in the art in the course of this long period; hence the attempt to elucidate a homogeneous system by comparing these writings is about as hopeless as would be the attempt to deduce the modern system of music from the collocation of the works of Guido and Hucbald of the 10th century with those of Richter and Prout in the 19th.

[Illustration: Music HYMN TO APOLLO AND THE MUSES.]

We owe much to the labors of these bygone writers; in fact, the Greek system of music is the foundation upon which the modern system is the superstructure. No attempt will be made here to settle the many disputed points that have puzzled the learned for ten or more centuries, but a clear and concise account of all that is necessary to an understanding of the place of this system in the historical development of music will be given.

=Formation of the Greek Scale=.—The Greek Scale was founded on a tetrachord or succession of four sounds, arranged as follows:

E (half tone) F (whole tone) G (whole tone) A

It is commonly believed that these letters written on the bass staff, thus:

[Music]

represent the exact pitch, as near as may be, of this tetrachord. In early times the lyre was tuned to these four sounds, and was called the _Tetrachordon_; that is, four strings. This gracefully shaped instrument has remained to this day the symbol of music. This limited scale was extended by adding another tetrachord, which began with the last note of the first tetrachord, thus:

A—B■ C D E—F G A

making a scale of seven sounds, called the scale of _Conjunct_ or _Joined Tetrachords_; also from its seven strings, the Heptachord scale. The next step was to take in the limit of the octave. The first way adopted was to raise the highest string a whole tone, thus making it the octave of the lowest; the sixth string was also raised a whole tone to make it a whole tone below the seventh. The result was a scale of seven sounds with one degree omitted, thus:

A—B■ (C) D E E—F G A

The next form was:

E—F G A B (C) D E

It will be seen that in this scale the second tetrachord begins a whole tone above the first, instead of beginning with the final of the first. It is therefore called the scale of _Disjunct_ or _Separated Tetrachords_. The missing sound (C) is here added and the octave

scale is complete. When the lyre had seven strings, the middle string, that is, the fourth, counting from either end, was called _Mese_, which means “middle”; but this word soon gained a secondary meaning which, in time, became the most important, viz.: _Keynote_.

=The Lesser Perfect System=.—There was in use at the same time a scale called the _Lesser Perfect System_, which was made from the conjunct seven-note scale by adding another conjunct tetrachord below, thus:

A—B■ C D E—F G A (A) B—C D E

Then A was added below the first tetrachord to make an octave with the note _Mese_. This A was the lowest sound admitted in the Greek System. It was the Romans who gave to this series of sounds the first seven letters of the alphabet, which they still retain. This octave (A to A) is also the origin of our natural minor scale. This Lesser System was the scale used in the Temple rites. It continued to be used for this purpose long after the system about to be described was invented.

=The Greater Perfect System=.—This was made from the disjunct octave by adding a conjunct tetrachord below and one above, thus:

E—F G A E—F G A B—C D E (A) B—C D E

The A below was also added, thus making a scale two octaves in extent. In later times the disjunct tetrachord, B—C—D—E, was added at the top. This E was the highest note admitted in the Greek System; consequently, their music never exceeded the limits of two octaves and a fifth, and the sounds included in these systems were as follows:

[Music: Greater Perfect System without B■

Added Note Lesser Perfect System without B■]

Peculiar interest attaches to this series of sounds, because in the Middle Ages they were supposed to be the _only_ sounds admitted by the Greeks. This accounts for the fact that B was the first note that it was considered right to use in two forms.

=The Greek Scales=.—The Greeks did not by any means confine themselves to these sounds, but changed the pitch of the starting note just as we do with our scales; in other words, both of these systems might be transposed. Therefore they not only had all the sounds at command that we have, but as their scales were (theoretically, at least) tuned acoustically true, they had a great many more. But their scales were all diatonic (the scales they called Chromatic and Enharmonic will be explained later), they were all like our natural minor. When they said “Dorian Scale” they meant just what we mean when we say scale of D minor; Phrygian Scale meant E minor; Lydian Scale, F-sharp minor; Mixo-Lydian, G minor. In addition to these four scales there were three that began a fourth below, one a fourth below the Dorian, called the Hypo-Dorian, A minor; a fourth below the Phrygian, called the Hypo-Phrygian, B minor; and a fourth below the Lydian, called Hypo-Lydian, C-sharp minor; these were the standard scales of Greek music. These names, Dorian, etc., were retained in the Ecclesiastical System, but the mistake was made of supposing that the Greeks used only the fixed sounds given by the untransposed Greater System. Hence the Church Dorian has B natural, not B-flat; the Church Phrygian, F natural, not F sharp; and the Church Lydian begins on F natural, instead of on F sharp. Hence, no two church scales are alike in the positions of the halftones.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Name some of the myths connected with music among the Greeks. Consult a work on mythology.

Name the musicians and philosophers connected with Greek music; arrange them in chronological order, with dates.

State the successive points of development.

Why do we consider that the history of music as we know it today begins with Greek music?

Have we music that belongs to the Greek period?

On what was the Greek Scale founded?

How was this extended? What name did this form receive?

In what respect did the Disjunct form differ from the Conjunct?

What was the _Mese_?

What was the Lesser Perfect System?

What was the Greater Perfect System?

What was the highest note used by the Greeks? What was the lowest?

Were these systems transposable?

What is the meaning of the prefix “Hypo”?

LESSON IV.

MUSIC OF THE GREEKS (_Concluded_).

=The Greek Octave System=.—So far, everything is clear enough; but the next step is not quite so sure. The Greeks spoke of the Dorian Octave, the Phrygian Octave, and so on; and the word Octave, used in this way, has been thought to be synonymous with Scale, which is doubtful, for the following reasons:

The standard instrument of the Greeks was the octave lyre. The lowest and highest strings were tuned respectively A, fifth line bass staff, and A, second space, treble.

[Music:

Dorian Octave. Signature B■ Phrygian Octave. Signature F■

Lydian Octave. Signature F, C and G sharps. Mizo-Lydian Octave. Signature B and E flats.

Hypo-Dorian Octave. Hypo-Phrygian Octave. Signature F and C sharps.

Hypo-Lydian Octave. Signature F, C, G & D sharps.]

These were fixed sounds, but the tuning of the remaining six strings _might be changed_ at will; therefore, a series of sounds belonging to any one of these scales could be made; and it will be seen, on examining the following table, that all the seven scales may be represented _without changing the extreme notes_, A to A. Suppose we make the B flat. Now B-flat is the characteristic note of the Dorian Scale, in our term, its signature. Therefore this octave would be called the Dorian Octave, _not_ Dorian Scale. We speak of a scale as beginning and ending on its _keynote_; if it does not, we call it a scale passage in such and such a key.

The notes marked + are the keynotes (_Mese_). It will be seen at once that the positions of the halftones differ in _each_ of these octaves. One cannot help feeling a slight suspicion that some confusion between scale and octave had a great deal to do with the growth of the Ecclesiastical Scales.

One of the latest of the ancient writers on music, =Claudius Ptolemy= (about 130 A. D.), proposed that all these octaves should be transposed a _fourth lower_; this made the Dorian Octave E to E (all naturals). One result of this change is that many authorities at the present time call this the Dorian Scale, whereas it is evident that it is simply the Dorian Octave, as given above, transposed a _fourth lower_. Other scales were added from time to time, called _Hyper_-Dorian, _Hyper_-Phrygian, etc., a _fourth above_ the standard scales; but it is very uncertain whether they were in practical use; they were probably purely matters of theory.

=Characteristics Attributed to the Different Greek Scales=.—The Greeks attributed many fanciful characteristics to the various modes or scales, much as some modern musicians, Berlioz, for example, do to the different keys. But all seem to have agreed as to the Dorian. This was considered the true Greek mode, and was called severe, firm and manly, suitable for martial songs. The Lydian mode was esteemed to be effeminate, suited to love songs, possibly because the Lydian Octave corresponds with the scale of A major, and a major scale was not relished by the Greeks, any more than it was by the early ecclesiastical musicians. A more probable explanation of this attribution of different characters to the different scales is, that it was customary to use certain modes for songs on certain subjects, and the character of the poetry was transferred to the music.

=The Greek Chromatic Scale= differed altogether from what _we_ call a chromatic scale. It was made by _lowering_ the pitch of the _fourth_ and _seventh_ strings above the _keynote_ a halftone. Supposing the octave lyre to be tuned to the Hypo-Dorian

Mode or Scale, it would begin and end on the Keynote (_Mese_), thus:

[Music]

Now, by lowering D and G we get the following scale:

[Music]

This is the scale that was called Chromatic. It is said to have been at one time the most popular of all the scales, a statement we can easily credit, since it contains in itself the two world-wide five-note or _Pentatonic_ Scales, commonly known as the Scotch or Irish Scales, the most widely distributed of all scales in Europe, Asia and America.

[Music: Major pentatonic scale Minor pentatonic scale]

=The Greek Enharmonic Scale=.—The scale called Enharmonic was made thus: The fourth and seventh strings were lowered a whole tone; that is, to the pitch of the second and sixth, the second and sixth were lowered a _quartertone_, thus:

[Music]

C-flat is supposed to be halfway between B and C; F-flat halfway between E and F. Our modern system does not provide for the notation of quartertones.

[Illustration: LYRE. CITHARA. LYDIAN MAGADIS.]

=Greek Instruments=.—The standard instrument of the Greeks was the =Lyre=. It bore many names, as Lyre, Tetrachordon, Chelys, Phorminx, Cithara, etc. There may have been slight _differences_ in the _size and the number of the strings_, but great uncertainty prevails on this point. Under the name of =Flute= (_Aulos_) they seem to have included both _Flutes_ proper and instruments of the _hautboy_ or _clarinet_ family. These instruments bore a bewildering number of names, the exact meaning of which is lost. Judging from the pictorial representations that remain, the Greek instruments were inferior both in variety and extent to those of the Egyptians. They seem to have made little use of the Harp, of which instrument the Egyptians had a great variety. The Greeks seem to have used instruments chiefly, if not solely, to accompany the voice; and they appear never to have combined large numbers of instruments for any purpose. Even in their tragedies, which were performed in immense theatres open to the sky, the Chorus was limited to fifteen men, accompanied by two flutes. When accompanying the voice with the lyre they may have occasionally struck the fourth, fifth or octave of the vocal melody; but, in general, they played the voice part. Their most highly developed instrument was a variety of lyre, the strings of which passed over a bridge placed one-third of the strings' length from the lower end of the lyre, thus causing the lower part of the string to sound the octave of the upper part. The shorter part of the string was played with a plectrum in the right hand, the longer part by the fingers of the left hand. This instrument was called =Magadis=—from _Magas_, a bridge. The term _Magadize_ was eventually used to signify playing or singing in octaves, and was _synonymous_ with _Antiphony_.

[Illustration: DOUBLE FLUTE. JOINED FLUTE. PHORBEIA.]

=Greek Musical Notation=.—Our knowledge of Greek musical notation is very defective, being derived from only four or five specimens of ancient music, and a few small fragments. They appear to have used a _separate notation for each mode_, and these four hymns are apparently all in the same mode, but authorities differ as to the mode. They used the letters of their alphabet, both capital and small, written in various positions, sometimes upright, sometimes lying on one side. The notation for the lyre differed from that used for the voice. The letters representing the _vocal_ part were written _above the words_, those representing the _instrumental_ part, _below_ the _words_. These _letters represented_ the _pitch_ of the sounds, but _not_ their _duration_. The duration was regulated by the _meter_ of the poetry. Instead of a portion of one of these hymns, the first three lines of our National Hymn are given as a sample of this notation:

R R Φ Γ R Φ σ σ P σ Φ R Φ R Γ R My country 'tis of thee, Sweet land of liberty, Of thee I sing.

These letters have been interpreted as indicating the following sounds, the transposed Hypo-Lydian Scale in its old form; that is, the Lesser Perfect System with G sharp as its keynote.

[Music]

=Greek View of Harmony=.—The question has been much debated as to whether or not the Greeks practiced harmony. It seems hardly possible with such a defective notation; but the best argument against it is, that there is not a word in any of the extant treatises as to combinations and successions of these combinations, and it is impossible that any art of harmony should have existed unless some rules for its employment should have been evolved.

=Greek Terms in Music=.—The modern terminology of music is largely indebted to the Greek system, although many of the words have entirely changed their significance. The word Music itself, to the Greek, meant the whole circle of the sciences, especially Astronomy and Mathematics. Melody meant the rising and falling of the voice in either speaking or singing. Harmonia meant rather what we call Melody than our Harmony. This latter, namely, the sounding together of different sounds, was called Symphony. Antiphony originally meant singing in octaves, that is, men with women or boys. Chromatic and Enharmonic have already been explained. Diapason, now applied chiefly to organ stops, originally meant the octave; that is, “through all.” Diatonic has nearly retained its original meaning. Tone, Semitone and Tetrachord have retained their meaning, with the exception that in the modern tetrachord the halftone is at the other end.

REFERENCES.

Monro.—The Modes of Ancient Greek Music.

Rowbotham.—History of Music.

Oxford History of Music, Vol. I.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

What was the Greek use of the term Octave; “Dorian Octave,” for example?

What change did Claudius Ptolemy suggest? What confusion resulted?

What is the meaning of the prefix “Hyper”?

Explain the Greek Chromatic Scale.

Explain the Greek Enharmonic Scale.

What was the standard Greek musical instrument? What names were given to modifications of it?

What instruments were comprehended under the term _Aulos_?

How were the instruments used in accompanying the voice?

What is meant by “magadizing”?

Give an account of Greek musical notation.

Did the Greeks use “Harmony” as we understand that term?

Name some musical terms that come from the Greek. Berlioz gives the characters of different keys in his book on Instrumentation. “Auld Lang Syne” is a pentatonic melody, scale of F, with fourth and seventh omitted. Any series of five notes on the black keys of the piano will make a pentatonic scale, major character. The language of music was determined by scholars, hence the use of so many terms with Greek and Latin roots.

LESSON V.

ECCLESIASTICAL SYSTEM.

=Rome the New Centre=.—The Power that rules in the affairs of men seems to have made provision for the elevation of the whole race by diffusing at intervals of centuries, the treasures of art, science and thought accumulated by a nation of unusual power and energy. Egypt dominated the northern part of Africa, the shores of the Mediterranean and the western slopes of Asia Minor, and in course of time yielded to the advance of the Greeks, but leaving behind, as a legacy, much that has had enduring value. What had once been centred in one nation, under the control of one caste, the priests, was spread through much of the known world. Greece,

in turn, shaped the destinies of expanding civilization. In the Greek social life free art played a great part; wherever the Greeks went as merchants and colonists, they carried with them the principles of Greek art, including music. Greek musicians were accounted stars of the first magnitude in Egypt, in the Greek colonies of Italy, and later in Rome, which, after the fall of Greece as a political factor, became the political, social and artistic centre of the world; through her conquests and subsequent colonizing diffusing throughout a larger world than Egypt and Greece knew, an increased wealth of thought and action which greatly influenced later generations.

=Rome Dependent Upon Greece=.—The Romans did not show a native instinct for art. Their national qualities were essentially warlike, and were developed by years of struggle for existence. A people whose organized life was political and martial, and for so long found expression first in defence, later in conquest, would not develop a true art life. As they grew stronger they built up their collections by pillage and by purchase; they were taught music, oratory, architecture, sculpture by Greeks who sought the capital of the world. Roman nobles imitated Greek customs, learned the Greek language and literature, cultivated music according to Greek methods, used Greek instruments, such as the cithara, lyre and flute, sang Greek songs and formed companies of singers and players to furnish entertainment at their feasts and at the public spectacles. The Roman drama was modified by Greek principles, and Greek actors replaced Roman artists; the pantomime was borrowed from Egypt. Music was a favorite distraction in the high ranks of Roman society, and men known to history were skilful players or singers—Sylla, Flaccus, Calpurnius Piso, Titus, Caligula, Hadrian, and, best known of all, Nero.

[Illustration: ROMAN HORN. SYRINX.]

=Growth of Christianity=.—While the Roman Empire, in its turn, had served the purpose of the Ruling Power in the affairs of men, in secret a new force was gaining strength, one that was soon to drive pagan arts and pleasures from open cultivation. In the Catacombs, in remote sections of the great city, pursued, hunted like beasts, martyrized, the Christians clung to their faith with its simple rites of worship, in which the singing of songs was a marked feature. Whence these songs came is by no means certain, the prevailing opinion being that they were of Greek origin, modified by Hebrew influence.[7] In the course of years songs were introduced in the Christian service with no other warrant than that of tradition. During the years of persecution no systematic cultivation of music was possible. Later, when Constantine accepted the Cross, 325 A. D., and Christianity had triumphed over Paganism, the abuses became such that the ecclesiastical authorities set themselves to the task of reform and of establishing a system of song for the use of the Church.

[Music: Tonus Peregrinus as a chant]

=Origin of the Church Scales=.—It is absolutely unknown when or by whom the system of scales, known as the Church Scales, was invented. The latest writer on the Greek System was =Claudius Ptolemy= (about 130 A. D.). In 330, =Pope Sylvester= established a school for training church singers, but we have no information as to the system he employed. The name of =Ambrose=, Bishop of Milan (333-397), has for centuries been associated with what are called the _Authentic_ Scales, but there is no valid evidence whatever that he had anything to do with their adoption. The name of =Pope Gregory= (540-604) has also been associated with another set of scales called _Plagal_, with as little authority as in the previous case. There does not appear to have existed any system of notation in the time of Ambrose or Gregory. The Greek notation by letters was forgotten, and the very insufficient system of notation by Neumes had not been invented. The only writer of any authority after Ptolemy was Boethius, and he did more to confuse the subject of music than to explain it.

=Foundation of the Church Scales=.—But if we know nothing of the inventor of the Church Scales, or of the way in which they grew into their final form, we are, nevertheless, perfectly well informed of the fully-developed system which, it must be remarked, grew out of a misunderstanding of the Greek Scales. The Church Scales were founded on the Greater Perfect System of the Greeks, with this restriction, namely, that it was _not transposable_; whereas, we have seen that the various Greek modes were transpositions of either the Lesser or Greater Systems.

[Music]

This is the series of sounds from which the Church Scales were made. None of them might be _altered_ by sharp or flat, _except_ the _B_ in the second octave (and this was a later addition which was probably owing to a remembrance of the Lesser Perfect System in which the B was flat.) The Greek names were retained for the Church Scales, but as not one of the notes was inflected, it follows that the _halftones_ occur in _different_ places in every scale. The scales to which these names were given were called Authentic, those with the prefix _Hypo_ were called Plagal. In the table on the next page, the Greek and Church Scales, also the

Greek _octaves_ are given side by side.

=Confusion Between the Systems=.—We may gather from this table how the confusion between Dorian and Phrygian has arisen. The Phrygian Octave is identical with the Church Dorian, and the Dorian Octave with the Church Phrygian. A proof that the Church Scales originated in the way indicated may be found in the fact that the Church and Greek Hypo-Dorian Scales are identical, this being the only Greek Scale without a sharp or flat. The Church Hypo-Lydian was also called the Ionian Scale; its arrangement of tones and semitones is the _same_ as that of the _modern major scale_. It was not considered appropriate for church music, being looked upon as soft, effeminate and lascivious, by both Greeks and mediæval churchmen.

[Music:

GREEK OCTAVES CHURCH SCALES GREEK SCALES

At the pitch as transposed by Ptolemy

Phrygian Octave Dorian Dorian

Dorian Octave Phrygian Phrygian

Hypo-Lydian Octave Lydian Lydian

Hypo-Phrygian Octave Mixo-Lydian Mixo-Lydian

Hypo-Dorian Octave Hypo-Dorian Hypo-Dorian

Mixo-Lydian Octave Hypo-Phrygian Hypo-Phrygian

Lydian Octave Hypo-Lydian Hypo-Lydian

Phrygian Octave Hypo-Mixo-Lydian]

=Eight Modes in Use=.—The Church Scales were numbered from one to eight; the Authentic Scales were given the odd, and the Plagal Scales the even numbers, thus:

1. Dorian 2. Hypo-Dorian related scales. 3. Phrygian 4. Hypo-Phrygian related scales. 5. Lydian 6. Hypo-Lydian related scales. 7. Mixo-Lydian 8. Hypo-Mixo-Lydian related scales.

A melody in an Authentic Scale had to end on its Keynote, but a melody in a Plagal Scale ended on the Keynote of its _related_ Authentic Scale. Observe that the Dorian and Hypo-Mixo-Lydian Scales are identical; but while the former had to end on the Keynote, D, the latter ended on G, which is the fourth of its scale, and Keynote of its _related_ Authentic Scale.

Traces of these Authentic and Plagal Scales may be found in many old folk-songs. Thus, the melody of the “Last Rose of Summer” begins on the Keynote, rises in the course of the melody to the octave, but ends by falling to the Keynote; it is therefore Authentic. On the other hand, the melody of “Robin Adair” begins on the fourth _below_ the Keynote, rises to its octave, but ends on the fourth _above_ its initial note and is Plagal; thus:

[Music: Range Range

Initial Final Initial Final

LAST ROSE OF SUMMER. ROBIN ADAIR.]

The term _Hyper_ (above) was sometimes applied to the Authentic Scales. In the Greek System the _Hyper_ Scales were the same distance _above_ the standard scales that the _Hypo_ Scales were _below_. Although twelve modes were theoretically admitted in church music, it was for the most part confined to the eight modes given above.

=The Dominant=.—In addition to the keynote there was another note in every scale of almost equal importance, called the _Dominant_. This name has been retained in the modern system, but with a total _change_ of meaning. In the Church Scales it meant the _Reciting Note_, that is, the note on which the principal part of the words was chanted. In all the _Authentic_ Scales but the Phrygian, the _fifth_ of the scale is the _Dominant_; in the _Phrygian_ the _sixth_ is the _Dominant_, because the B was a changeable note, that is, might be natural or flat. The _Dominants_ of the _Plagal_ Scales are a _third below_ the Dominants of the

related Authentic Scales, except in the Hypo-Mixo-Lydian, in which the Dominant is a second below that of its related Authentic Scale. Therefore the _Dominant_ is the _sixth_ of all the _Hypo_ Scales, but the _Hypo-Phrygian_ and _Hypo-Mixo-Lydian_, in which it is the _seventh_.

=Hucbald's Scale=.—Two attempts were made in the 10th century to construct new scales, first by =Hucbald=, who founded his series of sounds on a tetrachord, in which the halftone was between the second and third, thus: A B C D. His object seems to have been to obtain a series in which a succession of perfect fourths and fifths might be secured, for which purpose he made use of the following series of sounds:

[Music]

In the first tetrachord B was flat, in the third natural; in the fourth, F was sharp. As to the use made of this scale, little or nothing is known.

=Guido's Scale=.—The other attempt, usually attributed to _Guido_, a contemporary of Hucbald, resulted in the _Hexachord_ Scale (six-note scale). This scale was formed by adding a whole tone above and below the Hucbald tetrachord, thus: G, A, B, C, D, E. To complete the series of Hexachord Scales, another sound was added, namely: the G below the A on which the Greek scales and their derivatives, the Church scales, began. The first seven letters of the Roman alphabet were used to name the sounds already in use, hence to indicate this sound the Greek letter, Gamma, was adopted. At the same time the syllables _ut_—_re_—_mi_—_fa_—_sol_—_la_ were used to name the sounds of every hexachord (precisely as the movable Do is used now); hence this lowest sound was called _Gamma-ut_, corrupted into Gamut. The sounds in the series were indicated by placing after the letter the syllables that indicated its position in all the hexachords in which it was found, thus:

G A B—C D E C D E—F G A

1. _Gamma—ut_. 2. _A—re_. 3. _B—mi_. 4. _C—Fa—ut_, because C is _fa_ in the first, and _ut_ in the second hexachord. Consequently, to a mediæval musician, _C—fa—ut_ meant what we would call C, second space bass clef.

The following table gives all the Hexachord Scales with the names of the sounds. It is of interest because this system of nomenclature persisted long after the one which gave rise to it was obsolete.

{ E la { D la sol Super { C sol fa Acute { B■ mi { B■ fa { A la mi re

{ G sol re ut { F fa ut { E la mi Acute { D la sol re Octave { C sol fa ut { B■ mi { B■ fa { A la mi re

{ G sol re ut { F fa ut { E la mi Grave { D sol re Octave { C fa ut { B mi { A re { Γ ut

The Hexachords in which the B was flat were called Soft (_Mollis_); those in which B was natural, Hard (_Dura_); the term _mollis_ has been retained in the French word _Bemol_, a flat, and in the German name for a minor key, _Moll_. The word _dura_ (hard) is also retained in the German as a name for the major key _Dur_. When the letters were used as a means of notation, the sound B-flat was indicated by the old form of the letter b, which has been retained as the sign for a flat. This was called B _rotundum_ (round B); when B natural was wanted, a stroke was put on the right side of the ■, called B _quadratum_ (squared B), the sign to this day for a natural.

REFERENCE.

Oxford History of Music, Vol. I.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

What city became the centre of life after Athens and Greece fell?

What new influence was shaping in the Roman Empire?

When did music receive official attention and reform?

What names are associated with the early history of Church Music?

On which Greek system were the Church Scales founded?

What difference exists between the Greek and the Church Scales as to the positions of the halftones?

What is meant by Authentic and Plagal?

What were the rules in regard to a melody in the Authentic forms? What Plagal? Give an example of each.

What is meant by Dominant? Was the position of the Dominant the same in each scale? Name some variations.

What attempts were made to construct new scales?

What is meant by “Gamut”?

What is meant by C—fa—ut?

What names were given to the different forms of the Hexachord? What are the modern meanings of the terms?

What is the origin of the flat and natural signs?

Note the points of similarity and difference in the three scale forms on page 65 in this lesson. As an exercise take well-known airs to see if they are Authentic or Plagal. In the “Taming of the Shrew,” by Shakespeare, is a passage in which reference is made to the names of the notes as found in this lesson. Read this passage in class.

LESSON VI.

NOTATION.

=System of Notation by Letters=.—The earliest system of Notation, attributed to =Boethius=, the Roman philosopher, seems to have been the placing of letters over the syllables, thus:

C C D B C D My country ’tis of thee.

[Music: Boethius’ Notation]

During the period of history dominated by Pope Gregory the Great, a change was made in this system by which capital letters, small letters and double letters were used, an improvement, since only the first seven letters of the alphabet were employed, thus:

[Music]

This system seems to have been used chiefly for theoretic demonstration. These two methods indicated the _pitch_ sufficiently, but _not_ the _duration_ of the sounds.

=Neumes=.—The next attempt was somewhat of a retrogression instead of an improvement. Signs called _Neumes_ were placed over the words. These signs consisted of points, lines, accents, hooks, curves, angles and a number of other characters placed more or less exactly over the syllables to which they were intended to be sung, in such manner as to show, relatively, by the distance above the text, how much the voice was to rise or fall. They did _not_ indicate _absolute pitch_ or _duration_. The number of characters in use, according to manuscripts still preserved, varied from seven to forty. In later forms they appear in the notation used for the old Plain Song melodies (Gregorian) which were recalled into general use by Pope Pius X, in 1904.

[Music:

Neumes.

Lettres.

fh f gd fff efgfd d g g hg hi h kk hg ef

Notation du treizième siècle.

Notation moderne.

Neumes.

Lettres.

gfg ef hi g g fd f de de c d gh efg f d c dd.

Notation du treizième siècle.

Notation moderne.]

=Parallel Lines=.—Another plan was to use a variable number of _lines_, writing the syllables in the spaces, thus:

[Illustration]

This clumsy contrivance indicated _relative_ pitch well enough, but _not_ the _key_—or the duration. The next step was to use lines—which varied in number—upon or between which the Neumes, which gradually changed to square notes, were written. The pitch was indicated by using a _red_ line for F, and a _yellow_ or _green_ line for C. A further improvement was, to put the letters F or C and later G on one of the lines at the beginning; the modern clefs are simply modifications of these letters.

=Characters to Indicate Duration=.—The honor of suggesting characters to indicate _duration_ is usually attributed to =Franco of Cologne=, an ecclesiastic who lived in the latter part of the 12th century; but as in the case of Gregory and Guido, we must believe that his name simply stands as representative of a period. A system is rarely the work of one man, rather a development from the labor of many. Franco's treatise on the subject marked an epoch. Up to the end of the 13th century the notes in use were the Longa, Brevis, and Semibrevis, as well as the Duplex Longa, or Maxima. The smaller values, the Minima, and the Semiminima first occur about 1300. About the middle of the 15th century white notes were introduced in place of certain of the black, the latter color being reserved only for the smaller note values. The signs underwent some change at this time. Maxima, Longa, Brevis, Semibrevis (our whole note), Minima (half note), Semiminima (quarter), Fusa (eighth), Semifusa (sixteenth).

[Illustration: Longa Brevis Semibrevis Duplex Longa or Maxima Minima Semiminima]

[Illustration: Maxima Longa Brevis Semibrevis Minima Semiminima Fusa Semifusa]

=The Beginnings of Harmony=.—Our information as to the beginning of Harmony is very vague and uncertain. As early as the Saxon times in England some rude kind of part singing, without written rules apparently, seems to have existed. The first intimations we have of any scientific attempts are _Faburden_ or _Falsoborden_ and Diaphony or Organum. Faburden consisted of singing a melody while another voice sang a _drone_ accompaniment below it; thus:

[Music]

Diaphony or Organum consisted of a succession of _fourths_ or _fifths_ and _octaves_, thus:

[Music: Two Parts Three Parts]

It has been denied by some authorities that such a barbarous manner of singing ever existed; but two considerations have been lost sight of, in making this denial: First, the fourth, fifth and octave were esteemed the _only consonances_. Secondly, the undisputed fact that as late as the time of Chaucer, if not later, what was called "discanting quatible" or "quinable" existed; this discanting was done as follows: The performer while singing a melody accompanied himself on the lute, playing the _same melody a fourth or fifth above_. It can hardly be doubted that a style of performance that was esteemed in the 15th, was perfectly satisfactory to the ears of the 10th century.

=Discant=.—Another early attempt at harmonic effect was the singing of an _extemporaneous_ part or parts with the melody, called Discanting. In course of time the Discant or Organum gradually crystallized into rules, and other intervals were accepted. Strangely enough, dissonances seem to have been admitted with great freedom, and thirds and especially sixths, were avoided. The only dissonance that was _not_ allowed was the _minor second_.

=The New Organum=.—In the 11th century, a method of combining sounds, called the New Organum, was developed. This kind of Organum admitted thirds and sixths. The following example will sufficiently illustrate this:

[Music]

=Measured Music=.—The next step in advance, and one that proved very important and far-reaching in its results on the development of music, was the invention of a notation that indicated, although not very conveniently, the _relative duration_ of sounds. Thus it became possible to express two or more parts in a permanent form. The plan of this first attempt at a notation by

means of which relative duration of notes might be expressed was very complicated. Music written with these signs was called Measured Music (_Cantus Mensurabilis_).

=The Record of Early Harmony=.—There are references to the manner of using voices in combination in the writings of several men associated with the Christian Church in its early days. =Censorinus=, who lived in the 3d century, makes mention of a practice of using a melody in octaves accompanied by the fifth to the lower note of the octave, which is also the fourth to the upper. =Cassiodorus=, in the 6th century, mentions various ways of accompanying the chant with consecutive fourths and fifths. In a work called “Sentences About Music,” written by =Bishop Isidore of Seville=, who lived in the 7th century, we read that “harmony is a modulation of the voice, the concordance of many sounds and their agreement.” In the 9th century we meet with the names of several writers: =Remi d’Auxerre= who defines harmony as “a consonance of voices, and their union in one group”; =Jean Scot Erigene= who recognized that the succession of chords composed of octaves, fifths and fourths is a rational one; =Odo= or =Otger=, a churchman of the south of France, whose work was the first to mark an epoch in the development of the art of music. Also another monk, the Fleming =Hucbald=, who lived in the 10th century. They defined consonance and dissonance, and appear to have been the first to give rules for the construction of Diaphony. Hucbald says in his “_Musica Enchiriadis_”: “Certain dissimilar sounds sung together make an agreeable effect, and this mingling of voices is sweet to the ear.”

Their immediate successor, =Guido=, has been credited, unjustly, with being the inventor of nearly every improvement in the art up to his time. The old organum closed with his. The earliest writer who treats of the new organum is =John Cotton=, in the 11th century. He was the first to promulgate the rule that contrary motion is always to be preferred to similar or oblique. He says: “At least two singers are required in diaphony formed from different sounds. While one voice sings a melody, the other surrounds it with different tones, and at the end of the phrases the two voices unite at the unison or octave.” The fullest development of the new organum was attained in the works of =Guy de Chalis=, about the close of the 12th century. He gives examples in which we find intervals of the eleventh and twelfth, a demonstration of the existence of a system differing from the Gregorian, which does not exceed the octave. In the same epoch, =Denis Lewts=, of Liége, a Carthusian monk, gives rules to fix the use of accidental signs, a flat to lower B, a sharp to raise F. He speaks of these as if they had been in use for a long time, and indicated that the idea was to avoid the occurrence of the diminished fifth or the _augmented fourth_, known in harmony as the _tritone_. This process is called _Musica Ficta_, and formed a part of the instruction of singers. The examples cited by Lewts conform to this theory, and show that although in the songs, motets and other compositions of the period the sharps and flats are not found, it is because musicians knew the principles and made the application for themselves. Instruction in those days was chiefly oral, a method which placed a premium on a retentive memory. By the time that the 13th century was reached, musical forms and melodies were widely spread, and as we look back to the 9th century it is possible to note the gradual development. Harmony always existed, in a limited sense; but it did not take on a scientific development until the Middle Ages. It is to the musicians of this latter period, from the 13th to the 15th centuries, that we must give the honor of having taken the germ of a science of harmony and of having brought it forward to mature development.

REFERENCE.

Williams.—The Story of Notation.

QUESTIONS.

Explain the earliest system of notation used for the Church scales. What was the next improvement?

State the defects.

What was the system of Notation by Neumes? Did they indicate absolute or relative pitch?

Give the successive steps making use of lines.

What was the origin of our Clef signs?

Who is credited with introducing signs to indicate Duration?

Name the signs adopted. Compare them to the notes now in use.

Explain Faburden; Diaphony; Organum; Discant; Measured Music.

Who were the early writers on the subject of music?

LESSON VII.

MUSIC OUTSIDE THE CHURCH.

Up to this, our study of music in the Christian Era has traced the development of the art as fostered by the Christian Church, and mainly among the people of Southern Europe, in whom there was a strong admixture of the Latin blood and spirit. Before going farther on this line we will look into the record of music among the races of Northern Europe.

=Music of the Gauls=.—Roman writers give us some account of the character of the music of the Gauls, which differed much from the Greco-Latin songs. Roman historians make mention of the songs of the Gallic bards, who were poets and musicians as well, composing both religious hymns and songs in honor of their heroes. According to Diodorus of Sicily, the Gauls practiced the musical art long before the Christian Era, having regular schools for the instruction of the younger bards. The instrument used in accompanying their songs was a sort of lyre, judging from representations on some gold medals made in the time of Julius Cæsar. Charlemagne ordered a collection of the early Gallic songs to be made, but the work has not survived.

=The Celtic Bards=.—The Breton bards made use of an instrument the name of which is variously spelled Crouth, Crowd, Chrotta, Crwth, played with a bow, with an opening in the upper part through which the performer placed the left hand in order to press the strings, the number of which varied from three to six. The crouth of the Welsh bards differed in some respects from those that were made use of by the Breton bards. With them, however, a form of the harp became the national instrument. The early history of Celtic music in Wales in particular, is mingled with myth. We have only the names of bards, Fingal, Fergus and Ossian, no authentic music. What is of importance to us is the secular organization of the bards. One class included poets, historians and those skilled in the science of heraldry; another class comprehended musical bards, harp players bearing the title of doctors of music, players of the six stringed crouth and singers, who must have been skilled men, since nine years' study was exacted of them.

[Illustration: BRETON CROUTH. LYRE (9TH CENT).]

[Illustration: IRISH HARP. ENGLISH HARP.]

=Ireland=.—The traditionary bard of Ireland is Fergus, whose songs were of war and heroes. When St. Patrick introduced Christianity into Ireland in the 5th century, learning and skill in the arts of poetry and music grew to be cultivated as extensively as in more favored lands. In the 10th century, the famous musician was the King O'Brien Boru, whose harp is still shown in the Dublin Museum. This has twenty-eight strings, and the sounding board, in which there are four holes, is very large at the base. After Ireland was conquered by the English its culture declined, owing to continuous wars and internal strife.

=Scotland=.—The music of the Scotch, like the other Celtic races just mentioned, is characteristic. Their harp was similar in form to the Irish; their favorite instrument was the bagpipe. King James I is credited with having done much to stimulate an interest in music among his subjects. Having been a captive in England for a period of eighteen years, he had acquired great skill in music, which was the solace of his weary hours. According to a contemporary historian, the king played a great many of the instruments in use in his day: the bagpipe, psaltery, organ, harp, lute, flute and dulcimer. The music of Scotland makes great use of the pentatonic scales, and it is likely that the original form of many of the old Scottish folk-melodies was pentatonic. A characteristic feature of Scottish music is the so-called "Scotch snap," illustrated in the short notes in the familiar air "Comin' Thro' the Rye," and in the following dance tune:

[Music: STRATHSPEY]

An instrument of so marked characteristics as those displayed by the bagpipe will naturally develop a characteristic style of music. The pipers gave extraordinary study to the mastery of their instrument and noted players acquired wonderful skill.[8]

=England=.—Until the time of the conquest of England by William of Normandy (1066), music among the Anglo-Saxons was practiced by the scalds or bards, minstrels (also called gleemen), and the monks in the monasteries. Poetry and music were much encouraged by some of the kings and Alfred the Great (849-901) was widely famed for his skill in playing the harp and as a singer. In the manuscripts belonging to these early days in England we read of such instruments as the psaltery, the rota, little harps of eleven strings, viols, called fiddles, citharas, cornets, trumpets, etc.

[Illustration: SCANDINAVIAN LUDR.]

=Scandinavia=.—The Runic style of writing,—which has numerous analogies to the neumes,—used by the northern people, presents many difficulties in the matter of translation, so that we have little chance to form an opinion as to the early music of the Scandinavian races. They have their national poems, a presentation of their myths in the Edda, and the deeds of their great heroes in the Sagas, songs which inspired both poets and musicians, an office most generally found united in one person, called a scald, (equivalent to the Saxon bard). The sagas were sung or chanted by the scalds to the accompaniment of a small harp. In 1639 and again in 1734, in the duchy of Schleswig, horns of pure gold were found which had been used in the worship of Odin, covered with Runic inscriptions, which have not yet been satisfactorily deciphered. Other instruments belonging to this period that have been discovered and preserved in museums are bronze horns somewhat curious in shape, called lüdr. These instruments have been tested by experienced horn players and give forth a fine, resonant tone. Up to the present nothing has been discovered to indicate that the northern races had a system of musical notation; melodies were undoubtedly transmitted by oral communication.

=Finland=.—The people of Finland are intensely musical and have many beautiful folk-songs. Their national epic is called the "Kalevala," and gives the history of the hero, Wainœmonien, god of music, who by the exercise of his art, became the master of the universe, analogous to the Greek myth of Orpheus. The Finnish bards used an instrument called Kantèle or Harpu, a sort of psaltery with five strings forming the first five notes of the minor scale, G fourth space, bass staff, to D above.

=Progress in Southern Europe=.—As may be gathered from the hasty survey of music among the nations in the west and north of Europe, they did not contribute to its growth during the centuries under consideration. It was in the south of Europe that the forces were forming, and not in the Church as heretofore, but outside, among the people. We cannot say who composed the songs of the people, so different in character from the songs of the Church; they seemed to spring up spontaneously and were passed from one to another orally. The _music of the Church lacked measure_ or rhythm, as we may say, while the _music of the people_, closely associated with dancing, was _rhythmic_. In fact, the scholarly musicians of that period condemned the music of the people because of its marked rhythmic character. On account of the crudeness of the early instruments, often the lack of them and of competent players, the people were accustomed to sing to their dancing, a custom still followed in certain places. The next step was an easy one, that of making new verses to familiar airs. Another factor in spreading music among the people appears in the _traveling minstrels_. Without a fixed residence, owing allegiance to no lord, by law, in many cases, out of the pale of society, these free sons of art, who began to come into prominence in the 11th century, roved from place to place, resting for the night in castle, monastery, inn or wayside camp. In return for the hospitality freely given, they sang the songs they learned from each other and in the various lands they visited. Their accomplishments in the music line were varied. One, Robert le Mains, said: "I can play the lute, the violin, the pipe, the bagpipe, the syrinx, the harp, the gigue, the gittern, the symphony, the psaltery, the organistrum, the regals, the tabor and the rote. I can sing a song well and make tales and fables."

=Trouvères=.—Another influence was also at work, one that was greatly to affect music, raising it from the level of common entertainment to an art patronized by the highest social circles. The Crusades left a permanent influence upon the people of Europe and upon the institution of Chivalry, the knightly singers (trouvères) vying with each other in verse and song, as well as in arms. Education took a higher place and schools became more numerous (12th and 13th centuries), and music was given recognition; this was the case not only in schools connected with monasteries, but also in the newly established universities, such as that at Paris. Secular music also had schools, so to speak, for, during Lent, when all gay songs were forbidden, the trouvères and minstrels would stop at some convenient point and teach their songs to all who would learn; hither the great lords would send the minstrels in their pay to renew their repertoires and learn the songs that were most favored by the polite world. It was not possible that much advance could be made in musical education, from a scientific side, for there was _no_ general _system_ of _convenient notation_. Airs were taught by playing them over, the singer with the ready ear having the advantage. Still the efforts and studies made in the monasteries and schools were not fruitless, although the systems evolved were very complicated, making the reading of music a difficult matter.

=The Music of the Period=.—It is a fortunate thing for the investigator of the history of music that, at the present time, a number of collections of the airs of the 12th and 13th centuries are still in existence; for example, in the National Library, Paris, which possesses a number of magnificent manuscripts, containing songs noted down by the French trouvères; also in the Library of the Medical School of Montpelier there is a collection of nearly four hundred songs, secular and religious, for two, three or four voices. The _melodic ideas_ of this period, as indicated by these manuscripts, were _vague_ and the _rhythms uncertain_. Yet this music, barbarous as it appears to us, was not the product of chance, as we may think; it had its rules, just like the music of today, the art of composing being called Discant, referred to in Lesson VI. Sometimes these singers of the 12th and 13th centuries tried to invent original airs, very frequently they would take several familiar airs, two, three or four and combine them in what seems to us a crude

way, yet in a manner that was pleasing to the hearers of their time. The style of the songs in use varied greatly, in spite of the poverty of musical resources. In general, a song for one voice was used only in setting the _Chansons des Gestes_, _Romances_, _Pastourelles_, _Serventois_, _Lais_ and _Jeux Partis_. The discant style was used in _Motets_, _Rondeaux_, _Conduits_; according as these latter compositions were for two, three, four or five voices, they were called _duplum_, _triplum_, _quadruplum_, and _quintuplum_.

=Troubadours=.—The cradle of the French troubadours was in Provence, the south of France. They usually belonged to the nobility, and, instead of performing their own pieces, had them performed by the _jongleurs_, only occasionally consenting to sing for some company of high-born nobles and ladies. We mention a few of those who were counted among the troubadours: Richard the Lion-Hearted, of England, Count William of Poitiers, Rambout, Count of Orange, Pierre d'Auvergne, Pierre Ramon de Toulouse, Pierre Vidal, Pons de Capdueil, poet, singer and violinist, Aimeric de Pequilain, Blagobres, a virtuoso on all instruments, Blondel de Nesle, the Chatelain de Coucy, Thibault, King of Navarre. Clement, the French historian, gives a list of 28 trouvères of the 13th century, less prominent socially than those already mentioned. The most celebrated of them and the most important from the historian's standpoint is =Adam de La Hale= or =Halle=, born 1240. He wrote many pieces, of which we have thirty-three songs, some rondeaux, six motets, some _Jeux Partis_, among the latter being a work which is regarded as a sort of comic opera, sometimes called the "first opera": "Robin and Marion"; it consists of dialogue and airs.

[Music: AIR FROM ROBIN AND MARION.]

[Illustration: INSTRUMENTS OF THE MINNESINGERS.]

=Minnesingers=.—While the trouvères and troubadours were singing in Provence and in France, an analogous association was forming in Germany, to which the name Minnesingers (_Minne_, old German, "love") was given. A list of names belonging to the 13th century includes 162 men, among whom are several occupying thrones. Names that have interest for us are Klingsor, Wolfram von Eschenbach (author of a poem on "Parcival"), Gottfried of Strassburg (author of a poem "Tristan and Isolde"), =Walter von der Vogelweide=, the =Chevalier Tannhaeuser= and Heinrich Meissen, called Frauenlob. Richard Wagner has introduced some of these men in his operas. The versification of the Minnesingers has been much admired by critics; it was filled with art as well as beauty. Their love themes differed from those of the Provençal singers in that while the poetry of the latter declared love as a gallant sentiment, the Germans gave it a loftier tone by mingling it with the Madonna sentiment.

=Folk-Song=.—While the German nobles were employing themselves in the service of art, the people were not idle. They had their tunes and their verses. The _Locheimer Liederbuch_ (1452), contains a number of songs, some of which are undoubtedly very old; they are melodious, varied in rhythm and full of naïve simplicity. Some of them are arranged in the popular _three-voice_ style, and show correct part leading, the inclination being _toward our major and minor modes_ instead of the Church Modes.

[Illustration: HANS SACHS.]

=Mastersingers=.—The most noted musical organization among the people was that of the Mastersingers (celebrated in Richard Wagner's opera); Nuremberg, Mayence, Strassburg and Frankfort were their centres. The members were organized into a Guild, just as was the case in trade affairs; they had a charter from the Emperor Charles IV. Their poetry and music were not elevated, for the members of the Guild were not of a standing and an education to give them real skill in the fine arts. The records of the Mastersingers show that the members were principally tradesmen, such as farriers, armorers, locksmiths, tailors, cobblers; yet there were some members who could lay claims to culture and higher standing, as engravers, physicians and a few gentlemen of leisure. The most conspicuous of them all was =Hans Sachs=, the cobbler-poet of Nuremberg. Their works were marked by _monotonous melody_, (for the pitch is but little varied) and a heavy, clumsy rhythm. To make up for the lack of real artistic idea they were _pedantic_ to an extreme; composition was hedged about by a multitude of rules, to which composers must give exact obedience. These rules were given in a code called Tablatura. They held contests in which the members vied in producing works exemplifying the principles of the organization.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

What country in Europe was inhabited by the Gauls?

Where did the Celts live?

What countries did the Scandinavians inhabit?

Give an account of their music.

Describe the work of minstrels, jongleurs, trouvères, troubadours.

Where did the Minnesingers live?

Tell about the Mastersingers.

Give the names of minstrels or other singers famous in history.

What was the condition of the artisan classes and guilds in the larger German cities at this time?

If possible, get the stories of the operas, “Tannhäuser” and the “Mastersingers of Nuremberg” and read them privately or in the class.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A REVIEW OF PREVIOUS LESSONS.

Give an idea of the process by which music becomes an art and what the principles of music are.

What sciences are drawn upon, and how, in the study of the beginnings of music?

What countries offer interest to the student of musical beginnings? How are these races related?

Give a summary of music among the Chinese. The Japanese. The Hindoos.

Give a summary of music among the Chaldeans. The Egyptians. The Hebrews. What points in common did these races show?

Give an account of the writers on music among the Greeks, and their works.

Describe the Scale of Conjunct Tetrachords. Disjunct Tetrachords. The Lesser Perfect System. The Greater Perfect System.

Give the names of the various Greek Scales.

Give a summary of the Greek Octave System. Describe the Chromatic and Enharmonic Scales.

Describe the Greek musical instruments; notation.

Tell the story of music among the Romans. How did the Church Scales originate? State the differences between the Greek and the Church Scales.

What is the function of the Dominant in the Church Scales? Describe the Hexachord Scales and the names of the sounds.

Describe early systems of notation in music. Describe early attempts at Harmony. What was Discant? Give a summary of the statements of the early writers on the subject of Harmony.

Give an account of music among the Gauls and Celts, the Saxons, Scandinavians, etc.

Tell about the great song movement outside the church, minstrels, etc.; the Minnesingers; the Mastersingers.

Each of these questions or several together may be made the subject of a written paper, giving a summary. Students should be encouraged to make critical examination of a subject, to institute comparisons showing progress, and the steps that mark that progress, wherein one man has drawn from a predecessor, wherein new things have been done.

LESSON VIII.

THE CAUSES OF POLYPHONIC DEVELOPMENT AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE POLYPHONIC ERA.

In the Introduction attention was called to the fact that the labors of musicians to develop an art of music varied between the effort to make artistic use of the material of music, that is, to give it definite form, and to make it express the feelings of mankind; the first is in the line of construction, the second, content. The period we now take up was concerned most deeply, in its earlier stages, as we shall see, with finding adequate and logical principles of construction by which a musical composition of more or less length could be made from a simple musical idea and in which more than one voice could be used.

This period should be studied with the greatest thoroughness, and all possible examples of music of the composers representative of the period should be examined that one may gather a clear idea of the beginnings of composition and the development that shows from one generation to the next. These first gropings after the principles are matters of extreme interest to the musician when he compares the results in the music of the twentieth century.

=The Polyphonic and Monophonic Styles=.—Students frequently express surprise that the complicated polyphonic or contrapuntal system, which began to take shape in the 11th century, should appear first, historically. The pupil in composition begins his studies with the harmonic or monophonic style and is afterwards inducted into the polyphonic style. Why did the musical art develop along polyphonic and not on the simpler lines? It is intended that this lesson and those that follow shall show some of the influences that caused the line of development to move in a polyphonic and not in a monophonic direction. One thought is important to note. The elements of the simple, monophonic style _were present_ in the music of the early centuries, in the _people's song_, principally; since, however, it was the Church that determined the direction of artistic composition, the simple, natural principles of melody-making _yielded precedence to_ a more highly organized, _intellectual process_. Before taking up the consideration of these matters it is well to get an understanding of the terms Monophony and Polyphony.

There are two methods of giving harmonic support to a melody: by adding an accompaniment of chords, in simple or elaborated form, or by dividing the notes of the chords among three or more voices, which notes are sung or played simultaneously with the melody (an example is furnished by any simple air with accompaniment or a hymn-tune in four parts, in which the "air" or melody is in the soprano); this is Monophony, (_monos_—Greek for "one," _phone_—"sound"); a second method is to add to the given melody other melodies, each independent in its movement up and down and in the duration of its successive sounds so far as concerns the movement and duration of the sounds in the given melody. This is Polyphony (_polus_, Greek for "many").

=Relation of Polyphonic to Modern Music=.—The exact relation of the Polyphonic Era to modern music has rarely been correctly estimated. Writers on this phase of the development of music are apt to lose themselves in wonder on noting the scientific growth of the art, and to express their great surprise that so peculiar an evolution should occur. This view of the question is totally inadequate. In order truly to estimate the value and influence of the period, it is necessary to inquire into the properties of the materials of musical construction which were developed, and the value of those materials as a foundation for the modern structure of music, apparently so different from the early forms, but yet so intimately related to these forms.

Polyphonic music presents to the student so complex a form as to require the aid of material imagery in order to help the mind to a proper conception of it. Perhaps no more misleading idea has been advanced than that which makes use of the Gothic cathedral as an illustration of polyphonic form. It is true that in its multiplicity and yet inter-relation of details the cathedral expresses one of the dominant ideas of polyphonic music; but here the likeness fails. A nicer perception of the subject may be gained by comparing _polyphonic music_ to the _foundation of a Gothic cathedral_, strong and massive in construction, of utmost need to the permanence of the building, but entirely lost sight of in a general view of the whole structure; the importance of the comparison being the likeness of the complex and highly-developed superstructure to monophonic or modern music, seemingly so independent of what lies beneath, but in reality, dependent upon, and intimately connected with the established basis. Only in this way can we apprehend the real value of the polyphonic foundation to our superstructure of modern music; but for that foundation our modern music must have remained in its infancy for centuries to come. No freedom of artistic expression can be gained until absolute command of the material to be used has been obtained, and the principles thoroughly assimilated by the artist.

=Polyphony and Monophony Contrasted=.—In the concrete, _polyphonic_ music may be represented by a series of lines representing _separate_ and distinct _melodies_; though a principal melody is always used, it is not supported by chords of harmonic structure but by other melodies, or transpositions of the same melody, so used as to contrast with and support each other. Polyphonic music was essentially melodic, and, as has been very aptly stated, is to be thought of horizontally. Monophonic music might best be represented by one horizontal line supported at intervals by short, perpendicular lines. In this case the horizontal line represents the only distinct melody, and the perpendicular lines the subordinate or harmonic support or accompaniment. The following example illustrates the process of using the same melody to furnish the principal idea and also the accompanying support, the latter being at the same time simply a transposition of the original melody.

[Music: Lento 1st Voice 2d Voice 3d Voice]

Polyphonic Style. Bach Fugue. Subject (or melody) enters in measure one; again, transposed to the fourth below in measure three, and one octave below in measure ten. Enough is cited to show the horizontal structure of polyphonic music.

To present the idea more clearly and for the sake of contrast, a melody with accompaniment is shown in the next illustration, giving a single melody with the subordinate chord accompaniment, the chords in whole notes indicating the harmonic structure or basis.

[Music]

Beethoven, Op. 24, Monophonic Style. Sonata for Violin and Piano. Melody enters in measure one with subordinate accompaniment.

=Search for Structural Principles=.—While this question of the relation of polyphonic music to modern music may not apply to the first step in the development of the polyphonic style, yet it furnishes a preface to a discussion of the earliest stages of polyphonic evolution. The period preceding the year 1000 A. D. was truly a _period_ of _fundamental research_ into the underlying principles of melodic and harmonic structure; but so crude and hesitating was the use of what was found that it is certain that polyphonic material was entirely misused until the birth of “measured music” dispelled this darkness by the enlightening influence of Proportion and Form. So many forms of musical growth, such as came in later years, were impossible without the mensural proportion, that is, music written so as to indicate duration, that this initial period gathered but a chaotic mass of musical material which was left undigested and unassimilated until the epoch of the Paris school.

=Beginning of Polyphony in Greek Magadizing=.—The music of the Middle Ages has great interest for the historian and the student. It stands between our music and the music of the ancients; it drove its roots deep into the ancient time and extended its branches far into the contemporaneous epoch. It is the struggle between the two elements, the changes foreshadowed and apparent that give such interest to the history of music in the Middle Ages.

Polyphonic music was long in growing. To understand clearly, one must examine it from its very _beginning_ in Greek _magadizing_, referred to in Lesson V. Music for many centuries was, in all its most important phases, entirely vocal. The ancients, probably because of the crude forms of their instruments, valued the human voice as the most suitable means of expressing the feelings through music, thus causing the peculiar phenomenon of the extremely late development of dissonances. While instruments can easily perform even the harshest of the dissonances, it is almost impossible for untrained voices to sing other than the more simple consonances. For this reason, the dependence on the voice as practically the only medium for the expression of musical ideas forced the cultivators of music to use the simple consonances of the octave, fourth and fifth. In its earliest stages music was entirely melodic and was limited to the use of one distinct melody, so that, no matter how many were singing, but _one melody_ was employed. Soon arose the problem of accommodating the voices of boys and men to the same melody. It was manifestly impossible to have men and boys sing in unison, because of the difference in the compass of their voices; so the Greeks hit upon the plan of causing them to _sing in octaves_, a plan which science sanctioned, for had not Pythagoras proven that the octave, after the unison, was the most perfect consonance? This the Greeks called Magadizing. Why the Greeks, knowing as they did the other consonances, did not magadize in the fourth and fifth cannot be explained; the only argument that can be advanced is, that their melodies were so limited in range that the voice of any man, whether tenor or bass, could without difficulty reach the highest or lowest tones of a melody in unison. While magadizing among the Greeks cannot be counted as a great advance toward the realm of polyphony and harmony, yet it was the first important step in the evolution, and as such, is important. So far, the voices singing _simultaneously_, though at a different pitch, and moving together in _similar_ time values, followed monophonic methods.

=Organum the Next Step=.—Further development did not take place until the destruction of Greek civilization had occurred and a sufficient lapse of time had allowed the Christian Church to establish itself: in a religious sense, in the hearts of the people, and in a permanent sense, by building churches and monasteries. In these monasteries we find the next great advance in magadizing, though now under the name of Diaphony or Organum. The musical learning of the time was painfully inadequate for the uses to which it was put. There remained in existence only a few of the Greek scientific scales, and those woefully distorted in form; no simple notation or musical literature; and in all probability, only a tradition in regard to the melodic construction and magadizing. Perhaps this was just as well, however, for the problem confronting these monks differed greatly from that solved by the Greeks. In the monasteries _only men’s voices were used_, and these without special regard to the compass. The problem was this: Given a melody to sing, using men’s voices of every range, from high tenor to low bass, without using independent parts. The difficulties were two in number: they had no conception of independent parts, and their melodies were of greater range than those of the Greeks, thus forbidding the practice of singing entirely in the octave or unison. The solution was reached in the following way, as indicated in the preceding lesson: If the octave, unison, fourth and fifth were consonances, why not _sing in the fourth and fifth_ as well as in the unison and octave? They had as yet no idea of singing two distinct melodies at the same time, but thought only of singing the same melody in the most consonant or agreeable manner. The result was music which sounded like the following

example; while it was crude and harsh, it gave every monk opportunity to sing simultaneously the same melody, no matter what the range of his voice:

[Music]

About the close of the ninth century, as we learned in Lesson VI, at the time of =Otger= or =Odo=, an abbot of Provence, in France, organizing had so developed as to be written for as many as four parts, using, however, only the perfect consonances, as the next example will show. In reality there are but two parts, as the two lower voices double the upper.

[Music]

=Secular Organum=.—The most remarkable advance is shown in a form called Secular Organum, probably because of some relation to the Folk-song and the common people. This form showed the use not only of perfect consonances but of the imperfect consonance of the third; and, wonderful to relate, of a second, though only in a passing sense. That such a discord should be used is a remarkable commentary on the inherent sense of harmony which seemed to exist naturally, even at that early day. This form may have had its germ in the drone bass supplied by the bagpipe, which figured in the music of the people.

[Music]

Example of Secular Organum showing use of third and second.

=The Workers=.—Two men, as was shown in the preceding lesson, were instrumental in remarkably furthering this growth of music. =Hucbald=, of St. Amand, in Flanders, was born in 840 A. D. and died in 930. He was a friend of Otger of Provence, and it is through the latter that some of Hucbald's work is preserved. Hucbald probably never wrote in organum of more than two parts, though mention is made of an organum credited to him and having in addition to the two voices, a third singing a pedal-point, or a bass on one single tone. His principal work is a manuscript on organum, a work of great reference value. =Guido of Arezzo=, born 990, died 1050, is of even more importance. Unlike Hucbald and Otger, he seems to have been more than a secluded monk, for he visited Rome and was a well-known figure in the church. He was a most active teacher, and while his chief work was in developing notation, he nevertheless contributed important material in the form of organum, writing in as many as four parts, though in respect to the use of the less perfect consonances he was very little freer than Hucbald.

A short example, extracted from an 11th century three-part composition, is given here as a specimen of the combinations and successions that were tolerated by the ears of the Middle Ages, and to show the tendency toward greater freedom in the direction of the motion of the parts, pointing toward those principles which later formed the science of Counterpoint.

[Music:

TENOR (sounds lower octave)

TENOR (sounds lower octave)

BASS]

Several interesting points may be seen in this barbarous composition: First, the imitation by the second tenor of the phrase given by the first tenor. This is evidently intentional, as this phrase occurs three times in the course of the composition and is imitated in the same way every time. This same phrase occurs near the end of the bass part (which is the theme or _Cantus_) and it _may_ have been chosen for this very reason for use in the Discant parts. Secondly, the initial and final chords, viz.: root, fifth and octave—are familiar to all students of Strict Counterpoint. Writers as late as Cherubini call this combination the best for beginning and ending Three Part Counterpoint.

=Development Determined by the Church=.—The Church and its beliefs were responsible for this singular yet not illogical development. Considering the peculiar monastic conditions, the evolution could not be expected to occur along lines which it would have taken had it been developed among the people and under the influence of the Folk-song. The learning of these monks was largely in church lore, and this, with a desire for a peculiar church music, led to the _discarding_ of the natural and vivacious _melodies_ and _rhythms_ of the _people_, for the scientific and ascetic music and discipline of monastic religion. The one great advantage of this period to modern music was the constant association with the principal intervals of the scale; an association which may be partially responsible for our modern Tonic and Dominant harmonies. On the whole, this period represents the marking out of the lines of musical development for the eight centuries following, though the men responsible for this beginning

could hardly have known or appreciated the impetus which was to be given polyphonic music by the invention of their simple devices to accommodate voices of different compass and to secure concerted singing.

REFERENCES.

Oxford History of Music, Vol. I.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. I.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, articles on Harmony, Schools of Composition, and Organum.

Hope.—Mediæval Music.

Williams.—Music of the Ancient Greeks. Hymn to Apollo. (Note small compass of the melody.)

Rowbotham.—History of Music. Chapter on “Music in the Monasteries.”

Dickinson.—History of Music in the Western Church.

Parry.—Evolution of the Art of Music, Chapter IV.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

What is meant by Monophony? Polyphony?

Make an analogy between Polyphonic music and Architecture.

Contrast Polyphony and Monophony by the use of lines.

What was the nature of the researches in music before 1000 A. D.?

How did the Greek magadizing influence musical development?

What is Organum? Secular Organum?

Who were the prominent musicians of this period?

How did the Church influence musical development?

The teacher or one of the pupils may give a summary of the Gothic style of architecture. Another pupil may give the most noted historical events coinciding with this period; also historical characters. Scholarship was cherished principally in the Church and in the monasteries, hence the predominance of Churchmen in the early history of music. Hucbald lived during the time of Alfred the Great; Guido died 16 years before the battle of Hastings (1066). A useful device in fixing the details of a lesson is for the teacher to arrange that the pupils shall question him, the questions to be of such a nature as to show that they know the lesson thoroughly.

LESSON IX.

THE PARIS SCHOOL.

=Influence of Art on Music=.—All of the fine arts, with the exception of Music had, by the year 1100, reached a fairly high stage of development due, no doubt, to the fact that they are to a great extent composed of concrete materials. Music, owing to its lack of the concrete and the inability of men literally to place their hands upon its material, had lagged behind, so that in 1100 we find only a small amount of material, and that in a most chaotic condition. This material was, however, sufficient to produce definite musical forms if united into a homogeneous whole; such a state, however, could be produced only as the result of some great influence which would galvanize the component parts into action. Fortunately, there was just such an influence, one which had passed through an evolution similar to that needed in music, though because of its more concrete form and its necessity to man, this evolution had occurred at a proportionately earlier date. This influence was an art form, a phase of architecture known as the Gothic. Gothic architecture was a form built up by the unifying of the principal styles of architecture into one uniform whole, and composed of a _multiplicity_ of _details_, but of such evident _relation to each other_ as to make a distinct art form. This form was first used in Paris about the year 1000 A. D. Music was, approximately, in the same condition as Architecture before the birth of the

Gothic principle, and needed a stimulus, a comrade art undergoing much the same evolution, to start it on its path of polyphonic development. In the year 1100 musical chaos became united into one uniform art by means of Measured Music or Proportion, thus allowing the systematizing of the mass of then existing material, and the construction of definite art forms. Since Architecture had undergone just such a change one century before, it is more than probable that the effect of this change was the starting of a similar one in Music, though the result was not to show until one hundred years after its occurrence in the kindred art.

=Paris the Centre of Europe=.—It was natural that these two great changes should take place in Paris, at that time the centre of wealth and learning for all Europe. Paris, in addition to its many other advantages, had long possessed a great university which had produced many scholars and theologians. The influence of the Church in all art was then paramount, for all art was employed in the service of the Church; Architecture gave to the Church its Gothic cathedrals; Painting and Frescoing its marvelous interior decorations; while Music made possible the richer forms of the service or liturgy. In that sense the Church, in its centre of theological study, would undoubtedly react on the practice of music and produce more beautiful forms for the service. In this period it is worthy of note that all the _famous musicians_, as before, were _monks_, or men employed in the Church, and the reason for this condition is plain: there was no art of music outside of the Church.

=Measured Music=.—Just as the use of many voices produced singing in parts, so did it produce Measured Music. To make it possible to use more than two parts at the same time it was necessary to have some definite agreement as to the value of the notes, in order to have certain uniform times for beginning, ending and performing the different portions of a composition agreeably; and so Measured Music was born. It may be said here that the different metrical divisions were not shown by means of bar lines as we now use them, but by different groupings of the notes, the time value of each depending on its relative position to the others. Perhaps of all forms produced by this system, the _Organum Purum_ was the earliest and most peculiar. It consisted of a _Cantus Firmus_ set to words, and metrical in form; a second voice freely extemporized a higher part, evidently the only rule being that the two finish together. At a late date, strict Discant sometimes alternated with the old Organum, making it much less free in character.

=The Important Forms=.—In reality, the important forms produced were entirely in strict metrical divisions. Of these, the most important were the so-called strict Organum, the Conductus, the Roundel and the Motet. Of the strict Organum very little is known, excepting that it was a strictly metrical form, differing, in that sense only, from the Organum Purum; it had also words for all parts and not only for the Cantus Firmus, as had the older forms. The Conductus, from the Latin _conducere_, to conduct, was important, and was a secular form having as its basis a popular melody or a newly invented one, secular words and much freer intervals than church compositions. Each part was expected to be melodious; and it varied from two to four in the number of voices used. It was sung during a march, a funeral cortège or procession.

[Music]

Conductus for three voices showing that each part is a distinct melody. Oxford History of Music, Vol. I.

=The Roundel=, from an historical view-point, was the most important form, for in it much use was made of Imitation. It can best be explained in the words of Walter Odington, a theorist of the time: “Let a melody, with or without a text, in one of the regular modes of rhythm, and as beautiful as possible, be devised, and let each voice sing this in turn. And at the same time let other melodies be devised to accompany it in the second and (if there be three voices) in the third voice; let them proceed in consonances, and so that when one voice ascends another descends, and let the third not follow too closely the movement of either of the others, except perhaps for the sake of greater beauty. And let all of these melodies be sung by each voice in turn.” While the use of Imitation is important in that it recognizes the _repetition_ of a set phrase as an _aid_ to _Unity_, its importance is detracted from, at least at this period, because it was not used in any of the other forms then in vogue.

[Music]

Roundel for three voices showing Imitation. There are six distinct melodic phrases, and by numbering these wherever they appear, the Imitation can readily be observed.

=Imitation a Means of Securing Unity=.—An art form must submit to the laws of the human mind, which demand that a work of art shall show three principles: Unity, Variety or Contrast and Proportion or Symmetry. The problem set before the old composers was to produce musical works which should exhibit obedience to the canons of art as determined in the sister arts which had already reached great perfection. Unity in a musical work means that it is a development of one central thought, in elaborate works, of several leading ideas. The germ of a musical composition is in the Theme. The composer’s problem is to elaborate a piece of some

length from this Theme, in that way to secure Unity of idea. If he were limited to writing in one part, he would be compelled to _repeat_ the Theme a number of times, either on the _same_ or on a _different_ degree. When he must write for three or more voices the problem becomes more complicated. Let us imagine a composer of the 12th-century at his work. He has a theme to use, like the one in the example at the end of the preceding paragraph, which he is to use in three parts. From the composers of the preceding centuries he received the principle of _transposing_ the theme a fourth or fifth or octave higher or lower, thus singing the same melody _simultaneously_ at different pitches; but this he rejects as crude; he has passed that stage and wishes to use a newer, more advanced method. Obviously his recourse will be to let each of the other two voices sing the opening theme _successively_ at the same pitch. To stop with this change would result only in three successive repetitions of the opening theme; so he makes the second and third voices sing the phrases used by the first voice after the first theme has been given, which serve as an accompaniment to the second and third entries of the first theme; thus all the voices sing the various phrases, at different times and in different successions, as shown by the numbering of the phrases. In later times the principal phrases were sung _successively and transposed_ at the same time. This principle of Imitation is the very foundation of the later complicated polyphonic system.

=The Motet=.—In the form of the Motet we note many peculiarities. Each voice had different words, though the Tenor or foundation of the composition used but _one_ single word throughout; also, the Tenor was composed of a certain metrical and melodic figure closely adhered to and built up out of some popular song. The words and the form were sacred in that they were used in worship.

=The Men of the Time=.—There are many men who wrote in these forms but it is only necessary to examine those of importance. =Franco of Cologne= (1150-1220), (dates disputed), an organist, was probably the pioneer in the adoption of Measured Music. He first advocated the use of triple meter and classified the dissonances of major and minor thirds and sixths. He used his influence _against_ the use of _consecutive fourths_ and _fifths_, and _for_ the use of _contrary motion_. The result is in many ways shown in the following example:

[Music]

=Leonin= (about 1140) and =Perotin= (his pupil) were organists at Notre Dame in Paris. The former was noteworthy in the reform of notation, while the latter is known principally for his use of crude Imitation, and a tendency not to use consecutive fourths and fifths, though he never entirely succeeded in eradicating them. =Franco of Paris= (1150———), often confused with his namesake of Cologne, was a theoretician, improved notation, and wrote a treatise on Mensural Music. =Jean de Garlande= (1170-125—) not only wrote a very valuable treatise on Mensural Music, but was also a composer of note; his writings contained specimens of Double Counterpoint, though probably used without the intention of producing them. =Jerome de Moravie= (1260) wrote a scholarly treatise on Discant, and such was his ability that he illustrated it with his own compositions, making it one of the most valuable reference works in existence. It is worthy of mention that all of these men were churchmen in the sense that their work was all done in, or with the approval of, the Church, and was therefore influenced by the peculiar beliefs and customs then obtaining in that institution. This point must ever be kept in mind, for any prolonged contact with Folk-music must have changed the entire development of the art; therefore we must regard the Church as the dominant influence of early music.

=Summary=.—The work of this period can hardly be over-estimated. First we see the influence of the Gothic in architecture, producing a corresponding unity in music; a unity which was concomitant with Measured or Mensural Music. We next see the attempt to combine metrical with unmetrical forms in the Organum Purum, and the final result in the strict form of Organum. Then we note the freedom shown in the Conductus, Roundel and Motet, as well as freedom in the use of more pleasing intervals, with the tendency to eradicate consecutive fourths and fifths; the use of contrary motion instead of parallel, and the consequent melodic freedom of the voices, and finally the use of Imitation, though perhaps unintentionally, except in the Roundel. This period then marks the acquisition not only of new intervals, new forms, new styles of melodic writing, imitation, measured music and simple counterpoint of note against note, but also forms the foundation for a rapid development by bequeathing to the Gallo-Belgic School a wealth of material, bound up with rules and only half-suspected as to its value, it is true, but broad and firm enough to sustain a mighty structure of true Polyphonic Music.

REFERENCES.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. I.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Article on Schools of Composition, section relating to early French music.

Hope.—Mediæval Music. Technical Explanation of Mensural Music.

Oxford History of Music, Vol. I, pages 74-388. Technical explanation of measured music.

Luebke.—History of Art, for an account of Byzantine, Romanesque and Gothic Architecture.

Guizot.—History of France, for an account of Paris in 1100, with a statement of manners and customs.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

How did art influence music?

What made Paris the centre of Europe?

What was Measured Music?

What forms of music were developed in this period? Explain them.

Why is Imitation a logical process toward securing Unity in musical construction?

Who are leading composers of this period?

What are the successive steps of development as shown in this period?

The historical period corresponding with this lesson extends from the death of William Rufus, son of William the Conqueror, to the death of Richard the Lion-Hearted, and includes the Crusade in which that hero was the principal figure. It will be remembered that Richard was a great patron of minstrelsy.

LESSON X.

THE GALLO-BELGIC SCHOOL.

=A New Art Centre=.—The development of any art, and more especially Music, requires the dominance of wealth, learning and general civilizing forces, to form an epoch-marking school. Paris for a time satisfactorily filled these conditions, and then gave place to a school, stronger and better equipped: that of the Netherlands. There were several reasons for this change in the centre of musical activity. So long as Paris was dominant in wealth and civilization, and so long as she maintained her supremacy in the intellectual fields of the Church and university, so long did she retain the centre of culture; but when her wealth became such as to produce degeneracy in the taste for pure art, and love of show rather than real worth became predominant, then her native pupils began to lose their intellectual strength, and the pupils from foreign countries began to furnish the real culture. The establishment of the Papal See at Avignon in the south of France doubtless contributed to the supremacy of France in music and the liberal arts. When the See was restored to Rome, in 1377, Paris and her school of music were relegated to the background. From this period on it was but a matter of time for these pupils to carry the centre of musical culture from Paris to a place possessing a foundation for musical growth, and a greater number of strong minded scholars, and where political conditions were favorable. The Netherlands surpassed Paris in all of these important particulars, though not at the time when the Paris School ceased to be of importance. There was a school of transition which filled the space left between the important work of Paris and the supremacy of the Netherlands; that school was the Gallo-Belgic, located northeast from Paris on the borderline between France and Belgium, Tournay being the centre. The school at Paris was occupied in acquiring material for use; the school of the Netherlands developed polyphonic music emotionally; the step from acquisition to arrangement of material was necessary before emotional development could occur, and that was the work of the Gallo-Belgic School. This school was located in the country of Hucbald and Odo, who had built up there, a little while before, a system of music which was the foundation of the polyphonic style, and which had prepared the people for a culture of greater value and importance. Thus we see that musical development followed the line of greatest preparation, and utilized the preparatory work furnished by these two men. And finally, it was a direct step toward the Netherlands which were even then beginning the struggle in which they were victorious, for supremacy in commerce, art, and music.

=Contribution of the Paris School=.—When the Paris school ceased to be of utmost importance to the world of music it had bequeathed to the later schools Measured Music, and its forms of Organum, Motet, Conductus and Roundel, and the use of certain not unpleasing intervals, though occasional consecutive fourths, fifths, and octaves appeared. It was, then, the business of the Gallo-Belgic school to refine these intervals, develop measured music, and so improve and develop these old primary forms,

eliminating some and evolving others, as to give the school of the Netherlands, one century later, forms pleasing in intervals and of sufficient unity and design to afford opportunity for the infusion of the emotional. In the matter of intervals much was done to develop and use the old ones, excepting the consecutive fourths and fifths which were abolished never to appear again, and many new, or previously unused intervals, were made use of. In the matter of forms, we hear no more of the crude Organum and Conductus, but a little about the Motet, and nothing at all in regard to the Roundel, as such. It is, however, due entirely to this last form that polyphonic music developed; though we hear no more of the Roundel, we do hear much in regard to the Canon, and the Canon was but a highly developed species of the Roundel.

=Imitation and the Canon=.—The use of Imitation, as we have seen, gradually became more and more important. The old monks, in the very beginning, imitated melody in the fourth and fifth; at the time of the Paris school these melodies were combined with new ones making Imitation with more than one melody, though the melody underwent no real organic development. Now we see in the inception of the Canon a development of real Imitation of only one melody, but given _Variety_ by use of the devices of Inversion, Augmentation, Diminution, etc. And not only did this occur in the Canon, but we find it also in the other forms, in a freer style, adding materially to the _Unity_. Imitation is the foundation principle of polyphonic music, and this principle was present in the crude efforts of the old monks, in the more intelligent efforts of the Paris school, and now for the first time, receives, in the Gallo-Belgic school, a partial recognition of its real value, and a commensurate use.

[Music]

Naumann, History of Music, Vol. I, page 315, extract from a chanson by Dufay. Figure 1 shows the principal melody, figure 2 shows the same at the fifth below. The entire chanson is quoted in Naumann with the various imitations fairly well marked; the student should refer to it.

=The Value of Imitation=.—We must understand, however, that mere Imitation is in itself not a remarkable phenomenon. We imitate, more or less unconsciously, in all arts, and even in our daily habits; but this would be of no lasting importance did we not take that imitation as a foundation for future development, as did the composers of this school. And in these polyphonic schools the imitation was unintentional, as a definite aid to the structure of a musical idea, until it was seen that the _imitation_ must be _confined_ to _one definite idea_ or melody. It was then that the original treatment of melodic development began, and the various devices for developing a melody, without changing its organic structure, inaugurated. This marked the beginning of a school of musical art, a school of definite, and not chance evolution; or in other words, arrangement and development of the earlier acquired ideas.

=A Technical Principle=.—A little consideration will show how the principle of Imitation was developed. The first step was to imitate a melody at a lower or higher pitch and sing the two or more versions _simultaneously_; the next step was to bring in the second and other imitating voices _successively_, at the same or different pitch; thus making the imitation more prominent. So long as composers confined their efforts to using fixed melodies, they could not go far. When they began to adapt well-known melodies and later to invent their own it became possible to make a lengthy work, this leading to a composition in which each of the accompanying voices imitated the first; sometimes only two voices used imitation, the other having a somewhat free part. A next step was to _vary_ the _imitation_, by changing the motion of the imitating part; if the melody moved up, the imitating part moved downward and _vice versa_; sometimes the movement was reversed, the imitation beginning with the last note of the phrase and proceeding to the first; sometimes it was made in notes of smaller value (diminution), sometimes in larger (augmentation). These and other devices were experimented with and worked out by the Gallo-Belgic composers. One readily sees that this is _intellectual_ work, that it puts a premium on cleverness and lays expression aside. Yet the technic of an art must first be acquired and the composers of this period were doing this in working out a system of technic in composition with Imitation as the foundation.

[Music]

Illustration from Naumann, “History of Music,” page 321, Vol. I, showing at 1 and 2 the principal melody and its imitation, and at 3, imitation and inversion. The student should examine the entire example in Naumann.

=The Work of the Gallo-Belgic School=.—We note that many of the new ideas came into being at this time, all of them, however, tending toward the arranging of material or the preparing of it for the emotional style. The Canon, and the principle of Imitation, developed a set of strict rules which tended to produce more adequate command of material and assisted in shaping the Fugue; though we, in our own day, regard these rules as positively detrimental to the real expression of emotion, yet they were necessary adjuncts to the real command of _technic_. With Imitation came Counterpoint of a more highly developed form; an inevitable step

toward the fugal style of the later polyphonic periods. And lastly came a use of _Folk-music melodies_ and the _Leading Tone_, important because they foreshadow the abandonment of the old Church Modes, and the _adoption of the Natural Scale_. This marks the important point in the Gallo-Belgic school; for with the introduction of the Natural Scale there came increasing tendency for emotional expression, which could never have occurred had the Church Modes retained their former position in music. The idea of this preparation of material for emotional development cannot be emphasized too strongly. Upon the Gallo-Belgic school rested the burden of preparing this material for the later schools, so that these could demonstrate to the world that while polyphonic music could not be surpassed as a means of expressing certain impersonal, almost religious emotions, it could not express to the fullest, the intimate, personal, emotional ideas of the romantic composers.

=The Men=.—The men of this period are more important than any that have yet been mentioned, and for that reason require more detailed study. =H. de Zeelandia= (13—-1370), a native of Flanders, was a teacher and composer, and author of a theoretical treatise with musical examples, “De Musica”; with him the use of consecutive fourths, fifths and octaves almost disappears, though it remained for a later composer to abolish these entirely. =Guillaume Dufay= (1355-1435) was the one to whom this reform must be finally accredited. He used in place of the old church form of Cantus Firmus, the popular melodies of the people with their tendency toward the Natural Scale and the use of the Leading Tone and its decisive tonality; it may be said that these melodies were not used in their entirety, or even in their original form, the rhythm and meter oftentimes being altered so that the airs were hardly recognizable, though the essential parts were there. It is Dufay who is responsible for the first intelligent use of Imitation as a basis for the Canon. =Gilles (Ægidius) Binchois= (1400-1465) was a noted composer and, with Dufay, a joint founder of the Gallo-Belgic school. He is said to have been a soldier before he entered the Church, and must have been of a light-hearted disposition, as he was called “the father of joyousness.” He was the teacher of Okeghem, Firmin Caron and of Busnois. =Antoine de Busnois= (1440-1481) was the last famous master of this school before it was merged into the school of the Netherlands. In his works one can note a further progress in smoothness of style and examples of well managed imitation. The character of the latter is so scholarly and so clearly not a matter of improvisation that we must consider him a man given to study and reflection, just the kind of character to give scientific study to the principle of Imitation.

=The Importance of this School=.—This school occupied only a short period of time (1360-1460), as compared to some of the other schools; but in that time much was done. The material taken from the Paris school was great and capable of being developed, though it was encumbered by unusual intervals and a prejudice against the more euphonious ones, and by a number of obsolete forms; so obsolete, in fact, that with perhaps one exception, the Motet, none lasted until the time of Bach. But the use of Imitation and Measured Music was sufficient for the men of the Gallo-Belgic school, and with this as a foundation, and the constantly-increasing tendency to use the Folk-music and the Natural Scale, they succeeded in so arranging their material that the men of the Netherlands had but to infuse emotion to make it produce great music. Dufay and his contemporaries had done this much: to create organically well-ordered tone combinations agreeable both in melodic and harmonic relations. Both artists and public found pleasure in the many transitions, the free use of suspensions, the altered tones and chords borrowed from other scales, in the ensemble of these methods which did not give rise in reality to chord-relations as we understand them, yet suggested something of the kind, and particularly were they pleased with the use of the variety-giving changing notes. Because the Gallo-Belgic school did not invent new forms, or develop old forms to a high degree of perfection, is no reason why it should not be given a high rank among polyphonic schools, for the process of refining and transition is often more difficult than that of inventing.

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Look up biographical references of the men mentioned in this lesson, also the explanation of Imitation and Canon.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. I.

Parry.—Evolution of the Art of Music.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Why did Paris lose her position as the centre of culture in art?

What did the Paris school contribute?

In what way was Imitation to be valuable to musical composition?

What new methods of Imitation now appear?

What are the important points in the work of the Gallo-Belgic school?

Who were the prominent musicians in this school?

What advance is marked over the work of the Paris school?

The teacher should place on the board an outline of the leading countries of Europe, Italy, France, Germany and the Netherlands, showing the cities concerned in the development of music up to the time of Bach and Handel.

The reader can appreciate that the condition of France and Paris was not favorable to the growth of art at this period, which was one of wars between England and France in the territories of the latter. In 1346, Edward III of England won the battle of Crécy; the struggle was continued for the next hundred years at intervals, when the appearance of Joan of Arc (1412-1431) assisted the French. Monasteries were left unmolested, hence the monks near the Belgian border were able to work in comparative peace and quiet.

LESSON XI.

THE ENGLISH SCHOOL.

=The English Polyphonic School= is at once the least important and the most peculiar of all the schools of the Polyphonic Period. It is usually ignored by the writers on early music, not because there was no musical culture, but because there was not continuous and original development. English writers on this phase of musical development are too apt, through a pardonable pride of nationality, to exaggerate the value of British music, and in consulting such authorities, one should be careful to examine thoroughly all proofs of a dominant national school and discard such statements as are not perfectly authenticated. It is hardly the Englishman's fault that he has had no definite culture which he may call genuinely English, for native composers have had more encouragement in England than usually falls to the lot of a creative musician. Indeed, England has always been a patron of the best in music, native or foreign, and no one nation has, as a whole, been more generous in appreciation; her treatment of Beethoven on his death-bed is a notable example of disinterested generosity. But in real, original, creative art England has had no great past; and especially is this true of the Polyphonic Period.

=A Warlike People=.—This is almost entirely due to her geographical position; there are many other reasons but they are almost all dependent on this one, and so must be treated in a subordinate sense. In her early days, England's position served as a protection and kept intact her wealth of native Folk-music; but with the advent of the Romans and the spread of the knowledge of her natural wealth, came invasion after invasion. Since the first invasion, England has never been at peace; she has either been busily engaged in repelling the enemy from her own shores, or aiding in a conquest of some less fortunate foe. These wars and conquests not only served to cultivate a militant and restless spirit, but also produced a race of fighters from natural inclination. Look at the warlike Angles and Saxons, note the mixture of Romans, Normans, Dutch and Huguenots, all at the zenith of their fighting powers, and then cease to wonder that England's greatness has been in the power to fight, to govern, to make conquests, rather than to cultivate art. England, when she reached the stage of conquering rather than defending, began to give, more than to acquire, and never reached the acquisitive stage until the present time with Elgar and the lesser lights of the new school, unless we except Shakespeare and his contemporaries in the realm of literature. England's cathedrals are but the results of European cathedral building and the unity of Government and Church; had the Church and State always been separate, it is safe to say that England would have waited much longer for her cathedrals.

=The Kindred Arts=.—Literature was the only exception; and it is not necessary to seek for a further reason than the fact that Literature, as an art, always developed before Music. Art, in painting, was in the early days borrowed from other countries, and not until modern times did England acquire a national school of Painting; a noteworthy fact, for like Literature, such an art almost always precedes a national culture of Music. But these examples of the evolution of the kindred arts of Literature and Painting are encouraging rather than discouraging, for, having attained a high standard in these, England may now hope to develop a national culture of Music. In Music much the same conditions obtained as in Literature and Painting. With the exception of one or two isolated composers, and these trained in foreign schools, England always borrowed her music; note for example, Handel, Buononcini, Mendelssohn, to quote just a few noteworthy foreign composers. Each race as it conquered England brought its own music. St. Augustine sang a Gregorian chant as he entered Canterbury; the Normans and the Dutch had their own music; and

Italian and German music long held the boards in England. Thus little time was spent in developing a native music, because the frequent wars and political troubles directed the strength into other channels than those of art; the proximity of a higher culture in Europe, and the tendencies of England's foreign rulers, enabled them to import and subsist on foreign music when they should have been developing a native style. And finally, the isolation of England in the early days, later became an actual help to the acquirement of an alien style, because of the absolute necessity for students to live abroad to acquire musical learning.

=Native Musical Life=.—There was a certain amount of native musical life, but this did not tend to produce music along the conventional lines. Of Folk-music there was much, and the development, as a general rule, was aided rather than retarded by the conquests, though the combination of Folk-music of different nationalities does not usually tend to aid its unified evolution. The only real example of noteworthy writing, in the early polyphonic school, is the canon "Sumer is icumen in," dated 1228, and attributed to an early English writer. There is no proof excepting the fact that the manuscript is in English, that the canon is of English origin; neither is there proof to the contrary. Single instances, however, do not prove the existence of an original school; and especially is this the case when that school, in its writings, far surpasses any other school of that period of which we know. In spite of the fact of the English text, and that this canon may be but one of many surviving the destruction of the English monasteries, impartial historians believe most strongly that the canon is of French origin, reset to English words and carried to England by a student of the Paris school. The Paris school was at its height at this time, and was the only school of such writing in the world; and while we have no other example of that school equal to this canon, yet it is easier to believe it to be French than English, for England had no such school at all. She had musicians (like Odington), but they were all pupils of the Paris school; and even had this work been produced in England, it would be safer to credit it to the Paris school, for the man who wrote it would, almost of necessity, have studied there. The only other way of accounting for it is to presume the date to be too early.

It is but fair to say that while this canon _may_ owe its origin to the principles of the Gallo-Belgic school, it stands alone as an article of historical interest to the musician. Nowhere on the Continent has a work of equal importance of so early a date been brought to view. Mr. Wm. Chappell, the English antiquarian, brought to light several other productions of early English composers, including a hymn in English, scored for two voices, and another in Latin, for three voices. The manuscript has been definitely attributed to the middle of the 13th century. There can be little doubt that when so many monasteries, with their treasures of learning, were suppressed and their inmates scattered, in the time of Henry VIII, owing to the national change from the Romish faith, many valuable manuscripts that would today have the utmost interest to the musical historian were destroyed.

[Music: OLD ENGLISH CANON "SUMER IS ICUMEN IN."]

[Music]

Whether this is purely English or not matters little, for it is a fine specimen and exemplifies Walter Odington's rule for the construction of a Roundel, cited in a former lesson. This is more than a mere roundel, having not only a little Inversion and much Imitation, managed in a most ingenious manner, but also the whole canon is founded on a ground bass in two parts, themselves in canonic form. This bass consists of the regulation metrical form as seen at A and the following two measures, has one measure forming a connecting passage, thus bringing in the portion marked B which is the same as A only a fifth higher; the whole forms a remarkable evidence of an early conception of the relation of the Tonic and Dominant, hardly to be believed. This metrical form is introduced, slightly changed and inverted, in the upper voices at A and B. The first voice states in all five melodies and the other voices follow at intervals of 4, 8, and 12 measures; in ending voice number two omits part of theme V, voice number three all of it and voice number four all of V and the imitation of the metrical bass.

Outside this one example, England produced little but moderately good polyphonic music in the form of motets and madrigals, and in the time of Gibbons and Purcell, sonatas and operas. There were also anthems, the old plain chant and much Folk-music, but nothing that can be considered as important. The Folk-music is all that can claim originality, and that ranks favorably with the best examples of other nations and is, indeed, in advance of that of other nations considered more musical.

=The Men of the Time=.—While English music was not, at this period, very important, there were many composers whose names at least should be familiar. After the passing of the bards and minstrels, the monks controlled the composing of music until the dissolution of the monasteries, when it passed into the hands of the schoolmen of Cambridge and Oxford, where it remains today, though there are, at present, signs of an important awakening, presaging the passing of musical power from the hands of the conservative doctors of Oxford and Cambridge, to the present generation of younger and more talented writers. =Walter Odington= (1180-1250) was a pupil of the Paris school and a theorist of note, writing on the Mensural System as exploited in the French

school. =Robert DeHandlo= (1326) was another theoretician who wrote on the same subject. =John Dunstable= (1400-1458) was contemporaneous with the men of the Gallo-Belgic school and did the same for English music in reforming it as the latter did for the foreign school. In recent years examples of his writings have been unearthed in the cathedral libraries of Trent and Bologna, as well as elsewhere, making it clear that in his lifetime he was regarded as one of the foremost composers of Europe. The theorist, Tinctoris, of the Netherlands school, considered in the next lesson, speaks of the “source and origin of the new art [Counterpoint] being among the English, the foremost of whom is John Dunstable.” A contemporary who was also well-known in Italy was John Hothby, who wrote several treatises on music. There were other musicians of prominence prior to the Reformation under Henry VIII, but we know little about them save their names. =John Merbecke= (1515-1585) adapted the Gregorian chant to the English prayer book, which was published in 1550. =Christopher Tye= (1515-1580) was a teacher and wrote much church music; so also was =Thomas Tallis= (1515-1585), one of the most learned composers of his time, who set the choral portions in the service to music. He is noted for a celebrated canon in forty parts and for a hymn-tune, known as “Tallis” or “Evening Hymn,” which contains a canon between the soprano and tenor parts. =William Byrd= (1538-1623) was another noted composer of this school, being also famous as a writer of instrumental music. Queen Elizabeth granted to Tallis and Byrd the exclusive right to print music and to rule music paper. =Orlando Gibbons= (1583-1625) wrote motets and madrigals and is known as a writer of both polyphonic and monophonic music. =Henry Purcell= (1658-1695) was the greatest composer of the English Polyphonic school, writing operas in the English and Italian style, songs, sonatas, motets and anthems. He seems to have been in many respects a very able writer and musician, but died too young to make any decided impression on his times.

=Summary=.—From this it will be seen that while England had a musical people composed of a mixture of the most musical peoples of Europe, yet because of geographical position, political disturbances, religious troubles and wars, she was never able to produce a great and commanding school. She did not lack force, but it was directed into other, and for the time being, more important channels. Almost everything of an artistic nature was borrowed, or was a transplanted culture; and while the art of music never lacked men to cultivate it, yet these men were not of the calibre of the men employed in the other works of the nation, so that so far as the Polyphonic period is concerned, England is not important, and but for such men as Dunstable and Purcell and the canon “Sumer Is Icumen In,” England might be completely ignored in respect to her influence on polyphonic development.

REFERENCES.

Crowest.—The Story of British Music. The entire book.

Davey.—History of English Music, Chapters I to V inclusive.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Article on Schools of Composition, relating to England.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. I.

Oxford History of Music, Vol. I.

QUESTIONS.

Why did Music have so uncertain a growth in England?

What is the earliest English composition of value?

What were the causes for the loss of early English music manuscripts?

What principles are shown in this old Canon?

Who were the leading composers in England in the period considered in this lesson?

LESSON XII.

THE SCHOOL OF THE NETHERLANDS.

=The Dominance of the Netherlands=.—The most important asset of a nation is its commercial activity, for upon that depends its art life. The fine arts are to an extent luxuries, and until a nation has, by commercial activity, acquired wealth, they cannot be earnestly cultivated, for all arts require from the artist his entire time and life, and until there is money and inclination enough among

the people to support an artist in his commercially non-productive state, there can be no art; hence we see a shifting of art centres in the Middle Ages, just as the commercial centres changed.

The Netherlands were preëminently fitted to carry on great commercial pursuits by virtue of their geographical situation and long combat and association with the sea. Possessing the natural outlet to a great part of Europe, it was reasonable that the Netherlands should play an important part in the Hanseatic League, and that her fleets should trade on every sea and her coffers be enriched by barter in the produce of every clime. It was a golden age for the Lowlands, from 1350 to 1625, for their trade made them one of the wealthiest and most important nations in the world. Their situation between the trading countries of the South and the North made them, as it were, the commercial exchange of Europe. The consequent wealth could not lie dormant, therefore much of it was used in building notable architectural structures, encouraging Painting, and developing the then infant art of Music. It is unnecessary to mention the famous structures which were the result of this period, and it is but necessary to name Hubert Van Eyck, Rubens, Van Dyck, to understand the prominence given to the art of Painting by the acquisition of this enormous wealth. And it is largely due to this commercial activity that the school of the Netherlands attained such an undying fame.

One other influence, and that dependent on commercial activity, produced great results. Art is not sectional, it is universal; and great art works are produced not by local influences but by association, or contact, with the world. For this reason, the intercourse with the entire world generated by the great commercial activity of the times produced the first great world School of Music. Intercourse developed emotion and produced broader and less localized view-points of life: it brought into close association the art life of different nations and infused a unity of emotion wherever it occurred. In short, Music, by being brought into contact with the ideas of the world instead of a local association, took on a universal form and feeling never before felt and never to be relinquished. For this reason, Music unconsciously advanced from Paris to the Netherlands, toward the greater sphere of influence, stopping for only a short period with the Gallo-Belgic school, where it was prepared technically for its new growth as a world form.

=The Gallo-Belgic and the Netherlands Schools Compared=.—The Gallo-Belgic school, in the control of churchmen, was isolated from any influence tending to develop a broad emotional scheme. And it is doubtful whether it could have caused any change in musical evolution, for the technical forms were not ready. And so the Gallo-Belgic school, in its retirement from the great world activities, confined itself to attaining the power to manipulate notes, for the sake of mere technical effects, leaving emotional development entirely out of consideration. With such a school, while its work was important, no real art feeling could be gained; and so the school of the Netherlands marks the departure into a new romantic school governed, to a great extent, by the emotional. The Netherlands, because of their more comprehensive view of the musical activities of the past and their constant intercourse, commercially and artistically, with all nations, acquired a more human sense of the beauty of music, and ceased to manipulate musical material for technical ends, producing instead of cold, lifeless forms, music pulsing with vigor, life and emotion. With this primary change of view-point came a direct growth of form, the Canon being perfected and immediately giving birth to the Fugue; the Madrigal and Canzona and many other lesser forms sprang into being, all capable of emotional development, and almost immediately producing great results. For the first time music was free from consecutive fourths, fifths and octaves because composers created from the standpoint of emotional beauty and not that of technical utility. The result was a musical technic capable of development, and refined beyond need of further reformation.

=The Organ and its Influence=.—The organ was the third great reformative power in this epoch. All music was vocal and no other conception could be had, for effective instruments and instrumental music were not yet in existence. The organ, because its tones were suited to accompanying the human voice and because its tone color was closely identical with that of the voice, was readily adapted to the vocal forms then in use. This gave a greater resource, for what was often technically impossible with the human voice became easy with the organ. The mechanical improvement of this instrument immediately gave greater freedom and range of technic, and it proved so well suited to polyphonic development that it aided the evolution more than any other one agency. The use of the organ must not be accounted as the beginning of instrumental music, for the organ used only adapted voice-forms, such as the Canon, Fugue, Madrigal, etc.; for this reason it is to be doubted if it aided in emotional development except by making technical resources much less restricted. In this sense, then, the technic of this school was freed from most of its former rules, and Music, previously cramped by narrow vocal restrictions, passed into the comparative freedom of the polyphonic style of the organ.

=The Men of this School= are hardly to be separated from the men of the Gallo-Belgic school. The work passes from one school to the next with little or no perceptible pause, and the first men of the later school are pupils or disciples of the last men of the Gallo-Belgic period. Another noteworthy fact is, that so great was the musical growth, of this school and the skill and learning of its followers that the composers of the Netherlands expatriated themselves and settled in all parts of Europe, founding famous schools in Paris, Madrid, Naples, Venice, Munich and Rome; the celebrated _Italian school_ is really an _offshoot_ of that of the

Netherlands. It is this overflow which marks this school as the greatest of the early polyphonic schools and shows why and how it acquired its emotional supremacy. =Jean de Okeghem= (1430-1512), pupil of Binchois, was the first prominent worker. It is difficult to class him as a composer of the Belgian or Netherlands school, for he has the earmarks of both. He lived during the supremacy of the Netherlands, but worked with the material of the Belgians. He developed the Canon to its highest technical point and took the first step toward the originating of the Fugue. To him is due the credit of introducing the use of retrograde, inverted, diminished and augmented imitation in the Canon. Much of his work was done in France. The tendency of his teaching was toward artificiality, as he delighted in puzzle canons and other exhibitions of ingenuity.

=Antonius Brumel= (1460-1520), a pupil of Okeghem, is noteworthy because of a foreshadowing of the use of chords in real harmonic progressions.

[Music: 8ve lower]

Part of a motet by Brumel, Naumann, History of Music, Vol. I, page 333, used to illustrate the idea of the harmonic feeling of some of the polyphonic writers. The rest of the composition is strictly in the polyphonic style.

=Jakob Hobrecht= (1430-1506) was the first real Dutch composer, and is noted, in his use of technical forms, for their emotional beauty rather than mechanical excellence.

[Music]

Part of a composition by Hobrecht, cited by Naumann, “History of Music,” Vol. I, page 331. Excerpt shows how strictly even this fragment is written and yet how musical it is. At 1 is shown a figure in the bass repeated in imitation a step higher at 2. At A is shown a melody imitated at B in augmentation and with altered rhythm. The student should refer to Naumann.

This is truly a remarkable work for that period, and shows that even then composers were beginning to observe the emotional power of chord relationship.

=Johann Tinctor= (1446-1511), a disciple of Okeghem, worked in Rome and Naples, and will be considered with the Italian school. =Josquin de Pres= (1450-1521), also a disciple of Okeghem, worked in Rome and Paris, and must also be considered as one of the Italian school. It may be here mentioned that he was one of the first to use music as a vehicle for expressing human emotions rather than technical power. He summed up in himself all the harmonic science of the 15th century. He was renowned through all Europe as a composer, and if his music seems to us somewhat dry and pedantic there is abundant testimony to the deep impression it made upon his contemporaries, which is a test of its power to excite and to express emotion. Compared with the works of his predecessors and even the majority of his contemporaries, Josquin’s writings show freedom from the bonds of the old scholasticism, greater simplicity and esthetic beauty. Among those of his works that have come to us is a _Miserere_ for five voices, and an _Ave Maria_ that cannot be considered other than lovely music. =Nicholas Gombert= (1495-1570), a pupil of Josquin de Pres, had a natural, tuneful and flowing style similar to that afterwards shown by Palestrina. His work was done in Madrid, and to him Spain and Portugal owe all they have of the ancient polyphonic music. =Jacob Arkadelt= (1492-1570) and =Claude Goudimel= (1510-1572) worked in Rome, =Adrian Willaert= (1480-1562) and =Cyprian de Rore= (1516-1565) in Venice, and will be considered with the Italian school. =Orlando di Lasso= (1520-1594) worked some in Italy, but mostly in Munich, where his influence was great. His style was broad, flowing and especially emotional, and as a writer of the Netherlands school his name stands as one of the very highest. =J. P. Sweelinck= (1562-1621) is the last, and while of the Netherlands, studied in Venice, but did his work at home. He was a great organist and the last great master of the school, and had the honor of being the link between it and the German school, serving as an example for Sebastian Bach. His works have recently been published in Germany. Of all these men it may be said that they developed music steadily toward the goal of emotional freedom.

=Summary=.—The great work of this school was to make _technic subservient to thought_. In all preceding schools, the material and the forms were so new and the methods of handling them so crude, that technic always dominated thought. And it was naturally so, for expression cannot come until the power to master the material has been attained; it was by this power that the Netherlands developed emotional music. But the student invariably objects and says he does not see any emotion in the polyphonic music of this period! The student must place himself in the position of these old masters, supported by the church and constantly imbibing the religious atmosphere of the institution they served, until they unconsciously expressed, in their music, the grandeur and power of their religion rather than the intimate personal feeling of modern musicians; and then the student will understand what is meant by polyphonic emotion. We must always remember that _polyphonic emotion is not monophonic

emotion_, and that its tremendous technic and complexity of device were but the means of expressing its peculiar form of emotion, which to understand, one must study diligently, and then approach with a reverent feeling.

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, article on Schools of Composition, relating to the Netherlands.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. I.

Smith.—Music; How it Came to be What it Is.

Parry.—Evolution of the Art of Music, Chapters IV and V.

Langhans.—History of Music.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Why did the Netherlands become the musical centre?

How did geographical situation favor the Netherlands in the struggle for commercial supremacy?

What circumstances gave their art a general rather than sectional character?

Compare the Gallo-Belgic and the Netherlands schools.

How did the Organ aid in development?

Who are the most famous members of this school of composition?

What are the special characteristics of each?

What is a _Miserere_?

What is an _Ave Maria_?

What was the Hanseatic League?

What was the contribution of the Netherlands school?

Consult a general history for the events which made the Netherlands so important at this time.

In selecting a historical epoch to accompany the period of the Netherlands school and its successor, the Italian school, the central figure that will be most familiar is Christopher Columbus, whose life and work covered the early period, the close of the old polyphonic school dating with Palestrina's death in 1594, 100 years after the discovery of America. This hundred years represents the flowering time of polyphony as an art.

LESSON XIII.

THE ITALIAN SCHOOL.

=Italy the New Centre=.—Music developed in the Netherlands because of commercial supremacy and the consequent world association. We shall now see it pass to Italy, but because of a very different reason. From the earliest Christian days Italy was the centre of religious influence; it is only necessary to examine history to observe the ramifications of that power in England, France, Germany, the Netherlands and other countries. This influence, often more political than religious in character, gave to the Italian Church (then the Italian State), a predominance of authority, which was a great power in religious and secular thought. This influence spread to music for various reasons. We must remember that the school at Paris was controlled by the Church, that the Gallo-Belgic school owed its foundation to the same cause, and that the men of all three schools were employed as organists by the Church. It is true that in Italy the Church had not the broadening influence of commercial intercourse, but was more than compensated for that lack by what we may call artistic intercourse. The Church was the one stable institution in these times of war in which painters could find a refuge for their works, and from which patronage flowed in a steady stream to the ever-needy artists. Thus was caused and maintained the artistic atmosphere necessary to the cultivation of Music. As an art, the Church was the only

support of artistic music. When Music originated it needed an institution to protect and foster it and safeguard its growth, and this it found in the Church; it repaid this protection by evolving a style eminently suited to the needs of the Church, but absolutely useless for the expression of secular and natural emotion. To this patronage of its peculiar art is due the importation into Italy of the best in music wherever found, to aid in these services. And so we find singers from the Netherlands engaged for the Church in Italy. This, and the fame of Italy as the home of superior singers, undoubtedly led the majority of those numerous Netherlandish masters to seek their homes abroad, and preferably in Italy. The fact that all music was vocal in style and that the Church was the only institution capable of supporting such a style, cannot be too strongly stated; for upon that depended not only the evolution of Music, but also the very life of the Polyphonic emotional style.

=Emotion in Polyphony=.—This style is worthy of examination. As a preface we must remember that we have to deal with the Church and _human voices only_, for instruments had not been perfected sufficiently for church use, excepting the organ, and that we must consider a voice because of its peculiar tonal qualities and the adaptation of vocal forms and styles to its use. This vocal style had developed gradually, through a long course of reforms, until it reached its perfection in the later polyphonic schools, and expressed the peculiar emotion suited for the services. _Lack_ of _rhythm_ was a pointed _characteristic_; for, in the first place, it had been discarded as profane, and in the next place, a long course of treatment in the management of voices to avoid anything like concerted and accentuated dissonances had produced a peculiar flowing movement which, however smooth it might be, certainly possessed no rhythmic force. Then, too, the old scale forms caused anything written in their idioms to sound grave, severe and dignified, if not harsh. The transition to the modern major and minor in the Monophonic school of 1600 and the immediate cultivation of music by the people may be taken as an example of the musical qualities of the two modes. All of these causes tended to produce a suitable form of music and an emotional expression peculiarly suited to the Roman services. In this style there was little storm and stress, little of the personal appeal to God; on the other hand, it was grave, severe and immovable, or in a better sense, impersonal in its expression. Music of the polyphonic period, even until the time of Sebastian Bach, in whose works it is well exemplified, does not show us the appeal to God from the heart of the active Christian worker, but rather the appeal to a vast impersonal and majestic God far removed from the needs and supplications of the mere individual. It was this kind of emotion that developed in the Italian Polyphonic schools. The human and more expressive emotion of the schools of the Netherlands was transmitted, in the schools of the Italian, into the high, contemplative moods of religious expression; and it was well that it should be so, for polyphonic music could never have expressed the emotion of a Beethoven; and it was not only best that it should express its own peculiar style of emotion, but inevitable that it should do so.

[Illustration: ORLANDO DI LASSO.]

=Schools Outside Italy=.—The overflow from the Netherlands concentrated its efforts on certain points or school centres. In Italy, these were Naples, Venice and Rome. There were others throughout Europe, such as Madrid, Paris and Munich, which we must consider first because of their relation to Italy. =Nicholas Gombert= (1495-1570) influenced the polyphonic development in Madrid, but so isolated was the work that nothing great resulted. =Okeghem= (1430-1512) worked longer in Paris than other masters, though several lived there for short intervals, such as Arkadelt and Goudimel. =Orlando di Lasso= (1520-1594) did almost all his work in Munich and established the most important school outside of Italy. He was a most prolific writer and can be compared in ability and style to Palestrina. His style was broad and bold and contained much of that serious and earnest character now attributed to his Teutonic associations. He wrote in all known forms and was well nigh universal in his knowledge of form, technic and expression. His facility in the art of writing was very great and was fully equalled by his love for work. Although his work has somewhat less perfection than that of his great contemporary, Palestrina, it has astonishing power of expression. It shows the force of his genius that he was able to make his works in the strict contrapuntal forms full of real feeling. He was a man of interesting personal character. The most famous of his works is his setting of seven “Penitential Psalms,” containing a number of most curious effects for unaccompanied voices, with much that is singularly characteristic and beautiful, and showing well the character of his genius.

We give part of a composition by di Lasso showing his broad style and the increasing use of what sounds suspiciously like our modern chord progressions. The lack of rhythmic effect and the holding over of notes past the accented beat is shown in this exercise. The whole example, with words, may be found in Naumann, History of Music, Vol. I, page 387.

[Music]

=The Italian School=.—But it is with the Italian schools that we are most concerned. The school at Naples had as its principal master =Johannes Tinctoris= (1446-1511) a Fleming by birth, a doctor of laws and a mathematician, one of those peculiar

combinations seldom noticed after the Paris school, and almost sure to mark the theoretician. His work was principally theoretical and his treatises are of great value. =Adrian Willaert= (1480-1562), born at Bruges, was a pupil of Jean Mouton, at Paris. After visiting Rome and Ferrara, he settled in Venice and, as organist of St. Mark's, founded an important school. He introduced the use of large double choruses which caused him to write harmonically rather than polyphonically. This influence caused him to relegate the imitative polyphonic part writing to smaller forms (motets, etc.) and to write plain chord progressions in his larger works; and before long he began to observe and to use the relationship between the Tonic and the Dominant. This tendency and the invention of the Madrigal furnished the basis for a new instrumental school at a later date. His best-known pupil, =Cipriano di Rore= (1516-1565), was short-lived, and worked in both Venice and Parma. He made some investigation into the use of chromatics, thus showing the growing tendency to abandon the Church modes for the natural scales. Following these Dutch masters came the two Gabrieli's, who were native Italians. =Andrea Gabrieli= (1510-1586) was a great organist and wrote in the style of Willaert, his famous master. =Giovanni Gabrieli= (1557-1613) was a pupil of his uncle Andrea, and carried the latter's methods further toward perfection. He also wrote for instruments in conjunction with voices, abandoning to a certain extent the _a capella_ style, and opening that epoch of instrumental music foreshadowed by Willaert in his madrigals. Rome was the centre of church government, of church art and also of church music, and as such, had the largest and greatest of Italian music schools. =Jacob Arkadelt= (1492-1570), a Netherlander, lived nineteen years in Rome and did most of his work there; he wrote both secular and sacred compositions in the strict polyphonic style, and in that of Willaert. =Claude Goudimel= (1510-1572), though a prominent master in Paris, worked much in Rome and was the teacher of Palestrina. He set to music in four parts metrical versions of the Psalms, published in 1565. In him is to be observed that clearness of expression and beauty of melodic flow with which Palestrina attained such a high point of expression.

=Palestrina=.—It remained for his pupil =Palestrina=, (Giovanni Pierlugi Sante, 1514-1594) an Italian, to reach the highest point of emotional expression and technical freedom; we must, however, rank Orlando di Lasso with him. He carried to the highest fruition the teachings of the Netherlands, tempered by the romantic and melodic tendency of the Italian nature. His writings were so free technically that they have been called simple in form; this they are, but the simplicity is the simplicity of genius. His style is melodic, and has a clearness never attained by any writer before his time, and yet his music is written in the most severe forms. He founded a school of music in Rome which, however, never produced any great masters, for it was the time when the reformation of Opera began and carried the development of music into other channels.

[Music: SOP. ALTO TENOR BASS]

The end of a composition by Palestrina, showing the melody in the upper voice instead of the tenor, as was usually the case in polyphonic compositions, and the use of our modern Minor mode. This composition, at least this last part of it taken alone, might be by a modern writer, so familiar do its progressions sound; indeed, the melody of the first two measures is strikingly similar to a progression used by Beethoven in one of his string quartets. The entire example with words may be seen in Naumann, History of Music, Vol. I, page 510.

=Summary=.—The Polyphonic Era has many important characteristics and results which make it worth while to sum it up. Its development is largely the history of the _development of vocal music_ to its highest point, and the consequent failure of it to provide accurate expression for human needs. It marks the development of scales, intervals, forms, instruments and emotion. In scales we find the trend to be always toward the natural; in intervals, toward freedom, using only the ear as a criterion; in instruments we note the development of the organ, but the lack of others which would have changed music entirely; in emotion, we note the evolution from crudeness to the highest and most polished forms of impersonal expression. The lack of the Polyphonic school was not in the intrinsic value of the music, nor in any lack of the desire to express emotion; the failure to provide a suitable means of musical expression was due to the idea of church relation to God rather than to the personal individualistic relations established by Luther. _After the Reformation_ music takes up this new idea and immediately a _secular music_, vocal and instrumental, begins to _develop_, culminating in an emotional school of a totally different and truer style than the Polyphonic. Polyphonic music expressed the old monkish ideas of religion perfectly, but monophonic music expresses the emotion of the people, a universal emotion. Polyphonic music must always be appreciated for its value, but it must be examined for its fundamental principles and reasons for being, before it can be understood. Then we may know its value as a foundation for our modern music.

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, article on Schools of Composition, section relating to Italy.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. I.

Langhans.—History of Music.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Why did the centre of music shift to Italy?

What kind of emotion is present in the polyphonic style of music?

What composers were prominent outside of Italy?

Name the prominent composers of the Italian school.

Sum up the Polyphonic Era.

Consult a history of art and give an account of the great painters, sculptors, architects and their greatest works during the century preceding the development of the Italian school.

LESSON XIV.

PALESTRINA AND HIS INFLUENCE ON THE MUSIC OF THE ITALIAN SCHOOL. THE MADRIGAL.

[Illustration: PALESTRINA.]

=A Church Composer=.—But one master of the Italian Polyphonic schools is worthy of lengthy notice, more because of his influence on the music of the Church than his contribution to the new instrumental school then only in its infancy. Palestrina, while acquainted with Galilei, the reformer of Opera, and Neri, the originator of Oratorio, and with many of the men identified with the new style of vocal and instrumental music, gave his entire life to the composing of Church music, though in his poverty-stricken condition musical work under wealthy patronage must have often appealed to him. At any rate, the farthest he ever strayed from the Church was in the composing of many madrigals, in which he excelled; it is almost certain that in these he unintentionally influenced the development of instrumental music. For the present, however, a consideration of his life and influence on Church music is more important. But for him, Church music would have lacked for at least a century that simple and individual note so often struck by himself and Bach. Palestrina, by the enormous number of his masses and by the fertility of his invention, placed the music of the Latin Church on so high a plane that no composers, at least until the time of Bach, even approached him, much less equalled him.

=Giovanni Pierluigi Sante=, known as Palestrina, after his birthplace, was born in 1514 at Palestrina, a small town southeast of Rome. His parents were peasants and the boy received but the ordinary education of his class. While very young he seems to have become a choir-boy at Rome, though it is recorded that his voice was anything but pleasing. Upon this supposition rests the statement that he was, for a short time, a pupil of Arkadelt; this is unimportant because eventually (1540) he became a pupil of Goudimel, whose influence far overshadowed that of any former teacher. In 1548 he married and four sons were the result of the union, three, however, dying at an early age and the fourth proving, in after-life, a worthless fellow. In 1551 he succeeded Arkadelt as choir-master of St. Peter's; later the dedication of three masses to Pope Julian III won him a position as singer in the Papal Choir. Owing to the jealousy of the other singers he finally lost his position, but received an appointment at the Church of _Santa Maria Maggiore_ where he stayed for ten years. Naumann says that in 1565 he received the appointment of master of the Sistine Chapel, but never occupied the position because of the opposition among the choir. Grove, however, says that in 1565 he was made composer to the Pontifical Choir and did not become master until 1585, holding the position from that time on. In 1571 he was again connected with St. Peter's; this also marks his acquaintance with Neri, for whom he wrote some music, and the founding of a music school, though it cannot have amounted to much since most authorities give no particulars in regard to it. Indeed, it is certain that he cannot have had much influence in that line, for his pupils, outside of his own family, did not amount to more than a scant half-dozen. In 1576 he was given the task of revising the Gradual and Antiphonary of the Latin Church but, with the assistance of a pupil, finished only a little more than one-half of the work. He died in 1594 and was buried in the Vatican. His life is marked by the usual jealousies and quarrels of musicians, though Palestrina himself seems to have been nobleminded and more than reasonably free from all such faults. He was in poor circumstances during his life, and his only living son was a bitter disappointment. Altogether, as we examine his life we are impressed by many things; first, his apparent failure from a worldly point

of view; secondly, the enormous amount of composing which he did; and, finally, his devotion to the Church and her music, and because of it, his glorious success as a musician, and his undying fame.

=Reform of Church Music=.—The year marking the climax of his life was 1565. The Council of Trent, by a unanimous vote, decided to prohibit the use of music in the Church unless some means could be devised to make it more devotional and suited to its purpose. Naumann says that it was the desire of the Council of Trent to simplify the music so that the people might take part in the services; but Grove claims that it was because of the use of secular music in the composition of the masses. It seems that it was customary, for part of the singers at least, to sing in services not only the _melodies of_ the _popular songs_, but _also_ the _words_, thus producing confusion and defeating the very purpose of the music. In all probability, both of these reasons had something to do with the edict. It is plain that the fundamental principle at stake was the lack of the personal devotional note (which caused this action by the Council of Trent), and it was the supplying of this want that made Palestrina the saviour of music in the Church. A committee of Cardinals was appointed to see if proper music for the service could be found. They commissioned Palestrina to write a mass and submit it for trial. When the trial came, at the home of Cardinal Vitellozzi, Palestrina submitted three masses, the last of which was the best; this he afterwards called the “Missa Papæ Marcelli.”

=Palestrina’s Style=.—In these masses Palestrina had succeeded so well in subordinating technic to expression, and in eliminating all extraneous matter, that he was hailed as the greatest musician of the Church, and honors were showered upon him. From this it would be supposed that Palestrina had shown an entire change in style, yet this was not the case. Goudimel, his master, shows traces of the so-called Palestrina style, and Palestrina himself was gradually growing into that simplicity which marked the music of his later days. This simplicity was not only simplicity of emotion but also simplicity of technic; only a man with a most consummate skill could have written such great music with such little use of showy technic. Palestrina wrote in all of the polyphonic forms, complex and simple, but he reached his highest point in his most simple works; and those works were written for his Church.

=Secular Art Song=.—The secular life of the 15th and 16th centuries, as well as the Church, had an art music, which, like the other music of the period was _vocal_, not solos with accompaniments, but _choral_, consisting of three or more parts; this we may call a species of vocal chamber music. We can trace the development of this form of musical composition to an application of the principle of Discant to secular or Folk-melodies. The minstrels, as mentioned in a previous lesson, were accustomed to improvise accompanying parts to a familiar song—a favorite custom was that of adding two parts—for the entertainment of their hearers. This process was not a haphazard one, but followed fixed rules. The absence of a simple system of notation, however, prevented the accumulation of musical records. And when minstrelsy ceased to exist as a calling, only the memory of the crude attempts of the minstrels remained. But the principle was not lost. Fortunately for the good of the art, the trained musicians of the Church took it up, and, calling to their aid the resources of their art as used in the music of the Church, applied them all to secular melodies, the songs of the people.

=The Predecessors of the Madrigal=.—Several of the forms of secular music found in Italy, the Frottole (song of the mass or crowd), and the Vilanelle (village or peasant songs), were used in a crude way by the musicians of the people as airs to which to add accompanying parts. Both Germans and English made similar use of their folk melodies. But since the text was usually of a humorous, or a witty character, the accompanying melodies or “_counterpoints_” were simple in style. The work of the trained composers along this line resulted in the Madrigal, which shows a union of the musical spirit of the people with the finest poetic art; the melodies had the style of the popular music, but they were used with technical skill.

=The Madrigal=.—The text of the madrigal was erotic in character, representing the emotions of a heart filled with noble, often hopeless love. The Italian poets Tasso and Petrarch were masters in this style of writing. The name Madrigal was first applied to this kind of lyric, and afterward became identified with the music itself. There is disagreement as to the origin of the name, the common explanation being that it comes from the word _mandra_, a sheepfold, _mandriale_, shepherd, in allusion to the frequent pastoral character of the text. The Madrigal undoubtedly owes its origin to the composers of the Flemish school. The musicians of the Netherlands, in the middle of the 15th century, had a polyphonic song, elaborate in construction, in the old Church modes, modeled doubtless on the plan of the Motet, but using the melody of some popular song as a _Cantus Firmus_. When the centre of musical power was transferred to Italy, the madrigal principle came into new hands, those of the composers of the Venetian school, who gave it the character which made it so popular.

=The Italian School=.—The first great composer in this style was Adrian Willaert. After him came Arkadelt, who published several books of madrigals. The most famous composer of madrigals was =Luca Marenzio= (1560-1599), called by his contemporaries “the sweetest swan of Italy,” whose works attained extraordinary vogue. They are extremely melodious. A composer who made

considerable use of the chromatic element was =Gesualdo=, Prince of Venusia (1560-1614). Other Italian composers of madrigals are Festa, Palestrina, Anerio, Waelrant, Orlando di Lasso, Cipriano di Rore, Vecchi and Gastoldi, the latter being credited with the introduction of the “Fa, la.”

=The English School=.—The Madrigal never displaced the Folk-song in Germany or the _Chanson_ in France, but it found a home in England, in which country a number of composers were developed whose best work is considered to be superior to that of their Italian predecessors. The period of fifty years, beginning with 1588, when the first collection of madrigals was published in London, is called the Madrigalian Era. The composers of prominence are: William Byrd, Thomas Morley, Thomas Weelkes, John Dowland, John Wilbye, Orlando Gibbons and Richard Edwardes. So great was the interest in this class of music that it was considered a necessary part of the education of a gentleman that he should be able to sing, when requested, a part in a madrigal, as we learn from a work or music study published by Thomas Morley in 1597.

=Characteristics of the Madrigal=.—The best means of securing an understanding of the Madrigal style is to study good examples, and, if possible, to hear them sung by a good choral organization. They are written in three, four, five and six parts, the five part being the one most favored. The principle of construction is _polyphonic_, imitation being freely used, cross accents being frequent on account of the syncopated style, each part being conceived as melody, not as the result of the movement of successive chords.

=Influence of the Madrigal=.—The great number of madrigals written by so many composers may be taken as an indication of the growth of musical sensibility. The creative side developed. The composer was no longer contented with taking a melody or some theme ready made, and elaborating it or accompanying it; he _invented_ his own themes, thus opening the way to the idea that each text should have a theme to suit its special character, a principle which rules in modern music. Since the themes thus took on greater significance, it became important that accompanying parts should not obscure them by over-elaboration; hence the counterpoint used became clearer and simpler, and therefore more artistic. Another fact of great significance is that frequently the madrigals were played by viols, instead of being sung by voices. Composers marked the pieces as “Apt for viols or voices.” It was also customary to sing one part and play the others on instruments, the design being to cause the melody to stand out more clearly; this aided in developing a feeling for the solo with instrumental accompaniment, a fact of great significance in preparing the way for the opera.

=Petrucci=.—Music owes a great debt to =Ottaviano Petrucci=, who is credited with devising a method for printing music from movable type. He was born in 1466, died in 1523 or shortly after that date. Before he began his great work all music was written out by hand, a fact which necessarily interfered with its circulation; the works of the great writers were jealously guarded and students had small chance to profit by the work of experienced composers. Petrucci and his successors changed this. In 1501, he printed a collection of ninety-six pieces in three and four parts by Isaac, Josquin, Hobrecht, Okeghem and others; in 1504, a collection of eighty-three motets for four, five and six voices. By the time the composers of the Venetian Madrigal school appeared on the scene, printing processes had been improved and spread more widely; thus their works could be circulated freely and made popular. We who know the tremendous power of the printing press can appreciate the new force in the development of music inaugurated by Petrucci in the early part of the 16th century.

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, articles on Palestrina and the Madrigal.

Dickinson.—Music in the History of the Western Church.

Parry.—Evolution of the Art of Music, Chapter V.

Barrett.—English Glee and Madrigal Writers.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Who was the most important of the earlier composers for the Church?

Give a sketch of his life.

What did he do for the music of the Church?

What peculiarities marked his style?

Give a brief résumé of the Council of Trent. (Consult a general history or church history.)

What attempts at part music did the Minstrels make?

Who took up this work later?

What is the origin of the word Madrigal?

Name some composers of Madrigals in Italy.

In what other country did the Madrigal take hold?

Name some of the composers in that country who cultivated the Madrigal style.

Name some characteristics of the Madrigal.

What influence did the Madrigal exert?

Who invented printing music from movable types?

If the members of the class cannot sing a madrigal or there is no choral society at hand that sings them, a string quartet can play the parts, or any combination of instruments that can represent the necessary four, five or six parts; two or four players at two pianos can give some idea. Novello & Co. publish in cheap octavo form many of the finest madrigals by the Italian and English composers. The members of the class should sing or follow the playing of each part of at least one madrigal and note its essentially melodic character. This class of compositions will also give an idea of the character of the old Church motet and the methods used in the masses.

LESSON XV.

MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

=Classification of Instruments=.—The means for the production of musical sound are few in number, and of such universality and antiquity that we cannot say when, how, or by whom they were invented. Modern skill has not added one new means, but has simply improved the contrivances by which musical sound is produced. We can, however, trace the evolution and growth of the various instruments with considerable accuracy, and to this end it is of the utmost importance to have a clear understanding of the principles upon which musical instruments are constructed, in order to avoid bewilderment among the endless variety that have been and are yet made. All instruments may be divided into three general classes: Percussion Instruments, Wind Instruments, Stringed Instruments.

=The Percussion Instruments= are the instruments of rhythm. In this class are included all instruments used for this purpose. It is universally admitted that rhythm is the very basis of music, without which it is vague and meaningless. Possibly the physical fact that lies behind rhythm is the tendency of all repeated muscular action to become regular; witness the blows of the hammer on the anvil, or the carpenter driving in a nail. The psychologic reason is that when the will has set a certain muscular action in motion, it leaves the carrying out of the command to some subordinate function, so _long as it is continuous_; but if the continuity is to be interrupted, the will must again exert itself; hence, drumbeating and rattle shaking must of necessity be rhythmic. Nearly all savages have dances of various kinds. Varieties of drum rhythms arise from the almost universal custom of accompanying dances with drums and rattles.

=Varieties of Percussion Instruments=.—Percussion instruments are almost endless in variety. The most primitive example is that of a hollow log beaten with a war-club by some prehistoric savage. The next step leads to the hollow gourd or other hollow body, across the open end of which is stretched the dried membrane of some wild animal. From these descend all the long line of drums of all sorts, ending with the modern orchestral kettle-drums (tympani) which, by means of a mechanism for changing the tension of their parchment heads, may be tuned in various keys. Percussion instruments of metal are of very ancient origin. In this category are included cymbals of various sizes and shapes, gongs of all sorts, and later, bells and triangles. Comparatively few of the percussion instruments emit sounds of any definite pitch. They were and are to a great extent noise-producing, used for the purpose of marking rhythms.

=Wind Instruments: Vibrating Column of Air in a Tube=.—The next step in advance of noise-producing instruments is the discovery of means for the production of musical sound, which differs from noise in the possession of _definite pitch_. This leads to a consideration of the wind instruments that produce sound by means of a vibrating column of air enclosed in a tube. This is an important class and has several subdivisions, as will be seen. The simplest form of the wind instrument is the plain tube, producing a single sound when blown across the top. A series of such tubes fastened together side by side constitutes the _Syrinx_ or Pan's pipe, an instrument known over all the world from the remotest ages. This is thought to be the instrument mentioned in Genesis with the Hebrew name _Ugab_—translated _organ_, in the verse: "Jubal was the father of all such as handle the harp or the organ." It is generally believed by scholars that the =Pandean Pipe= or =Syrinx= is the oldest of musical instruments; but long before a sufficient advance had been made to bind together several reeds giving different sounds, the discovery was made that sound might be produced in this way. Some prehistoric man found it out, perhaps by blowing across the top of a hollow bone. A whistle of this kind, of prehistoric make, bored from one of the bones of a reindeer's foot, was found in a bone cave in France. It may have been used as a signal, and we may imagine that it may have guided a troop of palæolithic hunters in the chase of the mammoth or rhinoceros, when these animals still roamed over the plains of Europe.

=A Tube Pierced with Holes=.—The next advance was the discovery that one tube could be made to give several sounds by piercing holes in it. The effect of piercing is equivalent to shortening the tube; thus the =Flute= came into existence. There are three forms of the flute; the simplest is the old Japanese flute, blown at the end and pierced with a few holes. Next, the endless variety of flutes blown at a hole in the side, hence called the cross flute, or _Flauto Traverso_, in German, _Querflöte_. A perfect series of these flutes may be made. From the piece of bamboo with three or four holes, up to the exquisite workmanship and musical possibilities of the orchestral Boehm flute, all these flutes are identical in principle. The third kind of flute is blown at the end and is furnished with a diaphragm, which directs the air in a thin stream against the edge of the opening. Flutes of this kind were once used under the names of =flageolet= and =recorder=. Their chief interest lies in the fact that they have served as the model for the flue pipes of the organ, from the ponderous thirty-two foot Diapason to the half-inch extreme of the Mixture.

=The Tube with a Reed=.—The next subdivision is: The tube in conjunction with a tongue or slip of cane, called a reed. Reed instruments are further divided into _single_ and _double reed_ instruments. The double reed instrument is of great antiquity and widely known. This is the instrument generally meant by the term "flute" in the ancient Greek authors. It is known in China and Thibet, and in its modern form as =Hautboy= (oboe), =English Horn= or =Bassoon=, is an important member of the modern orchestra. The beating or single reed is so-called because it is made a little larger than the orifice over which it is fixed, and therefore beats against this orifice at every vibration, closing it and causing the air to be emitted in puffs. This form of reed instrument is also widely distributed. By the Greeks it was called the Berecynthian pipe; in modern Egypt _Arghool_, in early England the Shawm, which is a corruption of an older French name—_Chalumeau_. Under the name =Clarinet= it is another important member of the orchestra. The beating reed also furnishes the model after which the reed stops of the organ are constructed.

=The Tube with the Lips of the Player=.—The last subdivision is the tube in conjunction with the lip of the performer, the lips assuming the rôle of the reed. Countless varieties of =trumpets= have been used from time immemorial, made at first from that natural tube that has given them their generic name, the "horn" of the ox or goat or antelope. The forms of the horn are endless, but from the conch shell of the Japanese or the ram's horn _Shofar_ of the Hebrews to the perfectly tuned and mechanically perfect instruments of our bands and orchestras the series is complete, and the acoustic principle in all respects identical.

=Stringed Instruments Played by Plucking=.—The stringed instruments are those which depend for their sound upon the vibration of stretched strings. This class of instruments is of very ancient origin. As in the case of the wind instruments, the discovery of the principle of the vibration of a stretched string was probably accidental. The twanging of a bow-string suggests a possible clue, or the membranes of animals used for any purpose in which tension is required. Earliest among stringed instruments are the various forms of =Harp= or =Lyre=, in which each string gives a single sound, and is put in motion by being _plucked_ by the finger or _struck_ by a rod or flat strip of wood, ivory, etc., called a _plectrum_. In the next class are included those instruments that are furnished with a neck or fingerboard, with or without frets. In this class the strings are comparatively few in number, as many sounds may be obtained from each string by altering its length by the pressure of the fingers on the neck. These instruments are also played either with the fingers or the plectrum; to this class belong the =Guitar=, =Lute=, =Mandolin=, etc.

=The Lute Family=.—For many years, until displaced by instruments of the violin family, the =Lute= occupied the foremost position among instruments. It was a favorite instrument in the East, whence it reached Spain and lower Italy. During the 14th century, it spread over all Europe, retaining its popularity from the 15th to the 17th centuries. In shape it was similar to the mandolin of the

present day. It had, however, a far greater number of strings. Five pairs of these and a single melody string lay over the keyboard, while the bass strings (finally five in number and used only as open strings) lay at the side. More elaborate forms of the lute, owing to improvements in the arrangement of the bass strings, were the =Theorbo= and the =Archilute=. For the various forms of the lute the ordinary measured notation was not used, but _special letters_ or figures were given to indicate, not the pitch of the sound, but the _proper fret_ on the fingerboard of the instrument to be used by the player. This method of notation was called =Tablature=; it differed somewhat in the various countries. Until displaced by the violin, the lute was in use as an orchestral instrument. In addition, transcriptions of all sorts of vocal and instrumental pieces were made for the lute, for home use, much in the same manner as they are at the present day made for the pianoforte.

=Stringed Instruments Played with a Bow=.—The next and most important class resembles the last in being furnished with a neck or fingerboard, but with strings put in vibration by a bow, the familiar Violin family. A German writer on the stringed instruments played with a bow gives the following as the successive steps in the evolution of the violin: Rebec, Tromba Marina, Hurdy Gurdy, Fidel (Fidula), Chrotta, Viole, and Violin. The early history of instruments is shrouded in darkness, which existed up to the 16th century. Before that time, although writers on music made reference to the instruments in use, they did not give detailed descriptions. Virdung, who published a work in 1511; Agricola, in 1528; and Gerle, in 1546, were among the first writers. Yet much confusion has arisen from the fact that these writers used different terms for the same instruments, a difficulty that confronts the student of musical history who consults German, French, or Italian works.

1. The Rebec was of Oriental origin and consisted of a wooden frame, which formed the side walls, the top and the bottom being spanned with skin, like a drum. The instrument had only two strings, and was used in accompanying singing. Later the number of strings was increased to three. In the 8th or 9th century an instrument called the _Lyra_ (Lyre) was in use. Its shape shows a change toward the pear-shaped body and narrow neck of the lute.

[Illustration: REBEC. LYRE (ACCORDING TO GERBERT). BASS VIOL.]

2. The Tromba Marina (Eng., literally, “Marine Trumpet”), which the Germans call _Trumscheit_, had a long, sonorous body, over which a strong string, like that of the ’cello D, was stretched. This string, when sounded with the bow, gave forth a harsh, somewhat nasal tone, similar to that of the 8-foot wooden organ reed-pipe. But the proper way to play it was by lightly touching the string with the finger, as in making harmonics on the violin. This gave a series of tones, according to the pitch of the open string, the same as the so-called overtones. If the string were tuned to low C, the sounds were middle C, then in succession E, G, C, D, E, F, G, A, B, C. This instrument was a favorite with choirs of nuns to accompany their singing. Another name given to this instrument from its single string is Monochord.

3. The Hurdy Gurdy, also called Vielle, Radleier (“wheel lyre”), Bettlerleier (“mendicants’ lyre”), Organistrum and Chiffonie, was a great favorite in the period from the 10th to the 12th century. This peculiar instrument consisted of a resonant body, over which four strings were stretched. It has analogies to bowed and keyed instruments. Its shape was somewhat like that of the lute or the viola d’amore or guitar. Two of the strings were tuned in unison, were stopped by an arrangement of keys, directed by the player’s left hand shortening the string, thus making it possible to play melodies of a limited compass. The other two strings were usually tuned as Tonic and Dominant, thus giving a drone like the bagpipe. The strings are set in vibration by a wooden wheel, which, being well rosined, has the function of a violin bow; this wheel is turned by a handle at the tail end of the instrument, the player using his right hand for the purpose.

4. The Chrotta (Welsh Crwth—“crooth”) is one of the oldest of string instruments played with a bow. The original home was possibly India, but in its European use it was limited to England, and especially to Wales. It was a favorite instrument of the Welsh bards. The oldest form had three strings. In its later form it was mounted with six strings, four stretched over the fingerboard and played with the bow, and two lying at the side of the fingerboard, and pinched with the thumb of the left hand.

5. Fidula (Fidel, Fiddle), equivalent to “viol,” is the comprehensive term for the string instruments of the 8th to the 14th century. Its resonant body was arched and pear-shaped. The French flattened it more and called it Gigue, the Italians Giga, the Germans Geige, the latter term still being used. Two varieties were in use—the small and the large. The former had three strings tuned in fifths, the latter four to six, usually tuned in fourths and one third. The “large” species was made in four sizes for Discant (soprano), Alto, Tenor, and Bass. The “large” instrument had no bridge such as the violin of today has, and in its rounded form was difficult to play. Later it was cut out at the sides, thus approaching the shape of our violin.

6. The Viol, which first appears in the 15th century, had a resonant body which came almost to a point back of the neck, and the upper part of the body of the instrument was smaller than the lower; the fingerboard had frets like our guitar; the edges were higher, the _f_ holes were sickle-shaped, the top was flat, and the number of strings was six. Viols were divided into two groups—those held with the arm (like our violin), those played between the knees (like our 'cello). They were named the soprano or discant viol (violetta), the alto and tenor viols, and the bass viol (gamba). The contra-bass or double bass has the viol form in certain respects.

From the viol family comes our violin through a diminution and beautifying of the form, through lessening the number of strings and doing away with the frets.

REFERENCES.

Lavignac.—Music and Musicians. Section on Instruments.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, articles on the various instruments.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

What are the general classes into which musical instruments are grouped?

Name the percussion instruments.

Name the principles of classification for wind instruments.

Give examples of each class.

What is a reed? How many kinds are in use?

What methods of producing sound are used in playing stringed instruments?

Give examples of each class.

Give a description of the lute.

Name the steps in the evolution of the violin.

The catalogues of the instruments contained in the Metropolitan Museum (Crosby-Brown Collection), New York City, will be found very useful for reference. This collection is one of the most complete in the world, and is arranged so as to show the development of instruments of the various types. They can be secured at slight expense by addressing the Museum.

LESSON XVI.

THE ORGAN, ORGAN PLAYING AND ORGAN MUSIC.

In the book of Genesis it is written: "Jubal, he was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ." It is not to be understood that the word organ in this passage meant an instrument anything like that heard in our churches at the present day. In fact, as St. Augustine tells us, there was a time when all musical instruments were called organs.

=The Germ of the Organ=.—The invention of the organ is veiled in deepest darkness. Its development from its earliest forms to its present state has occupied a period of almost two thousand years. Doubtless, the first idea of a wind instrument was suggested by the breeze blowing across the open ends of broken reeds, the discovery naturally following that reeds of different lengths gave forth sounds of varying pitch. In course of time, reeds or pipes, differing in length, began to be joined together, conveniently arranged so as to produce a succession of musical sounds, the players blowing them with the mouth. These instruments were called =Pan's Pipes=, the =Syrinx= of the ancient Greeks.

=The First Stage of Development=.—As the number of pipes was increased, the moving of the head back and forth in order to blow them became difficult. The pipes were then placed in a sort of box or wind chest, a tube being added through which the player could blow, the pipes not intended to sound being closed by the fingers. Furthermore, as the pipes were increased in number and in size, it became necessary to employ various mechanical accessories to furnish adequate wind supply, and to open and close the pipes at will, the breath and fingers of the player proving insufficient. A device was invented in the form of a slide, rule or tongue of

wood, which was placed beneath the aperture of the pipe, and perforated so as to shut off or admit wind to the pipe as it was drawn back or forth. The earliest form of bellows might be suggested by the leathern bag of the bagpipe. In this the wind pressure was unsteady and the tone necessarily disconnected.

[Illustration: PAN'S PIPES (SYRINX). EARLY FORM OF THE ORGAN.]

=The Hydraulic Organ=.—The first attempts to secure regular or steady wind pressure were made by Ctesibus, who lived at Alexandria, about 180 B. C. To him is ascribed the invention of the so-called "=Hydraulic Organ=." This term seems somewhat of a misnomer, since the water was used merely to give the necessary pressure to the bellows, and to regulate the wind supply. This method was never developed, since the device did not seem applicable to instruments of any considerable size. The trend was rather toward a wind supply from a bellows operated on the same principle as that of the blacksmith's. In the Hydraulic Organ the water was thus applied: An inverted air receiver, into which the wind was forced by a bellows, was immersed in a tank of water, the pressure of the water around and above the receiver forcing the air through an aperture at the top into the pipes, the pressure being regulated by the volume of water in the tank. The hydraulic organ continued more or less in use up to the early part of the 14th century.

=The Earliest Organs=.—The organ developed little as to size or mechanical improvements during the first ten centuries of the Christian Era, and it is difficult to trace the progressive stages in point of time, place or mechanical invention. The first organ known to the people of Western Europe was a present from the Byzantine emperor, Constantine, to Pepin the Short, Major-Domo of the Frankish Kingdom, in 742. It had brass pipes and the "keys" were struck by hands and feet. Eastern organs also came into France in the time of Charlemagne, son of Pepin. The first organ used in Germany was made in 812, modelled after the one just mentioned. In 880, the Pope ordered an organ and an organ builder from Germany, which seems to indicate that the art had found support there at an early date. Although not considered absolutely indispensable, the organ from that time on seems to have been generally adopted for use in churches. Its many imperfections gave ground for criticism, yet today it is considered, _par excellence_, the ecclesiastical instrument.

=Increase in the Size of Organs=.—The organ builders of these early days were mostly monks, Pope Sylvester II (1003) being eminent, under the name of Gerbert, prior to his election to the papacy. They built small organs called "=Portative=," and large organs called "=Positive=." The old hydraulic organ, owing to its excessive weight, was called "Positive" to distinguish it from the "Portative" or portable organ, and these terms have been perpetuated to the present time. An organ built for the Cathedral at Winchester, England, had ten keys, four hundred pipes and twenty-six bellows, which were operated by seventy men, "in the sweat of their brows." Since forty pipes were attached to a single key, it may be readily understood why its tone was compared to thunder. The keys were very large, having a deep fall, and required the whole force of the hand to press down a single one.

=Mechanical Improvements=.—The pipes in the early organs were made of copper, lead, tin, silver, glass, ivory and various woods, but experiments finally showed =tin= or =wood= to be best suited for the purpose. The earliest organs had about twelve pipes, and the larger instruments three octaves, but without the chromatic intervals. The pipes were arranged according to the sequence of tones in the old Church modes, the _octave containing_ but _three semitones_: between E-F, A-B flat and B-C. The chromatic tones were added gradually, the breadth of the keys being correspondingly reduced as the increased number of keys occupied the same space as before. Heretofore, the _wind_ had usually been _forced from_ the _bellows_ by the _weight_ of men standing upon them, but in the 10th century use began to be made of a =lever=, the bellows presumably being weighted.

=The Keyboard is Adopted=.—In the 11th century, the keyboard appeared, supplanting the levers and slides, previously in use. The first organ containing this marked improvement was made for the Cathedral at Magdeburg, Germany. It had sixteen keys. In 1350, a monk at Thorn built an organ with twenty-two keys, and in 1361 an organ was built for the Cathedral at Halberstadt with fourteen diatonic and eight chromatic tones in a compass extending from B, second line, bass staff, to A, second space, treble. This organ had three keyboards, now termed manuals.

=The Pedals=.—The invention of pedals is variously ascribed to Albert Van Os (about 1120), to Van Valbeke, of Brabant, and to a German named =Bernhard= (1470), an organist of Venice. The latter probably improved, but did not invent the pedals. The pedals at first did not exceed the compass of an octave, and were used only for sustaining prolonged tones. They were _fastened_ to the broad _manual keys_ by stout cords, thus enabling the performer to draw down the desired key with the foot. About the year 1418 the pedals began to be attached to _independent pedal-pipes_, thus imparting to the organ a certain dignity and sonority, still a chief characteristic of the instrument. After 1475, all important organs were built with pedal keyboard.

=The Introduction of Stops=.—Up to the 14th century, the different registers (set of pipes with uniform tone quality) could not be sounded separately, that is to say: _all_ the _pipes_ belonging to any one key _sounded_ when that key was depressed. At the close of the 14th century it was found possible to add =valves= to the pipes in such a manner as to cause the wind to pass through or be cut off from any series of pipes at will. The opening and closing was managed through a spring. The next improvement was to introduce a =slide= to open or close the passage of wind into the pipes. With these improvements it became possible for builders to set themselves to the improvement of the various “stops” or registers.

=Improvements in Stops=.—In the 15th century, pipes of sixteen and thirty-two feet in length began to be used, necessitating a greatly _enlarged bellows_. Pipes were _closed_ at the _top_, thereby lowering the pitch an octave. They were given _smaller diameters_, producing a softer tone quality. The _shapes_ of the pipes were _varied_, giving additional variety in tone quality.

Thus began the broad classifications of “=Open=” and “=Stopped=” pipes in all their varieties. The “=Reeds=” (pipes containing a vibrator or tongue to set the column of air in motion) were familiar to the earliest performers, but were not introduced into the organ until as late as the 14th century. Further improvements were made in the bellows at the beginning of the 16th century.

=St. Mary’s, Lübeck=.—In 1561, a three-manual organ was in use in St. Mary’s, Lübeck, Germany. To this organ all the important improvements were successively added at various intervals until it had, at the beginning of the 18th century, in the three manuals, respectively, thirteen, fourteen and fifteen stops, and in the pedal, fifteen stops. It was to hear the famous Buxtehude play upon this organ that Sebastian Bach walked fifty miles in 1705.

=Design of Improvements=.—Great improvements have been made in organ building since the time of Bach, all designed to give the player greater resources, and increased facility in the handling and control of the resources, which in the present day are simply enormous.

=The Organ in the American Colonies=.—Although the first organs heard in America were probably introduced by the Spaniards, of these there are no authentic records. According to reliable historic data, the famous old “Brattle” organ was “the first organ that ever pealed to the glory of God in this country.” It was imported from London, in 1713, by Mr. Thomas Brattle, who bequeathed it to the Brattle Street Church, Boston, directing that the parish “procure a sober person that can play skilfully thereon with a loud noise.” This organ became the property of King’s Chapel, Boston, and was used until 1756.

=No Art in Early Organ Playing=.—The organs of the early Christian period were of such a character that playing, in the sense in which we now understand the word, was out of the question. For some time the span of the hand possible to players did not exceed the distance of a fifth. If an octave was to be struck, a second player was necessary. Only with the narrowing of the keys did artistic playing become possible. In fact, organ playing has invariably reflected the style and development of contemporary musical art.

=Early Organists=.—The credit of being “father of organists” is given to =Francesco Landino=, of Florence (1325-1390), and after him to =Bernhard=, mentioned as the inventor of the organ pedals. The oldest organ compositions are some works by =Konrad Paumann= (1410-1473), who was born blind, yet, like many others since, became a thoroughly trained musician in spite of his affliction. He also played other instruments and was a fine contrapuntist. Another of the early organists is =Benedictus Ducis= (or Hertoghs), born at Bruges, about 1480. He was a pupil of Josquin des Pres. From Ducis, representing the second Flemish school, as founded by Okeghem, there is a chain almost of master and pupil, between the early masters of organ playing and polyphonic writing and Bach, who in these arts became the master of all. Paumann’s pieces show the style of composing for the instrument that was considered appropriate. They are essentially transcribed, but elaborated, vocal works. The compositions of the next organists of fame, Willaert, of Venice (1490-1562), and Cyprian di Rore (1516-1565), pupil of the former, have distinct names. _Ricercari_, _Intonationi_, _Contrapunti_, _Toccati_, _Praeambula_, and _Canzoni_, but the character remains the same, vocal pieces, elaborated and freely embellished with runs and other passage work. Later the term _Ricercari_ came to mean a sort of fantasia in fugal form, often on a popular air; _Toccata_ became a free fantasia with brilliantly figurated passages, and a _Praeambulo_ a prelude to a larger piece. Other famous organists of this period were =Bernhard Schmidt= (1520-?), German; =Claudio Merulo= (1532-1604), organist at Venice, and his successors, the two =Gabrieli’s=.

=Frescobaldi and His Successors=.—The greatest of all the organists of the earlier days, to whom the title of “Father of true organ playing” has been given, was =Girolamo Frescobaldi=, born in 1583 at Ferrara, in Italy, educated in Flanders, and from 1608 to his death in 1644 organist at St. Peter’s, Rome. His fame was so great that the spacious cathedral was often filled when he gave an organ recital. His compositions, many of which have been preserved, have a very decided contrapuntal character, whence some have called him the inventor of the organ fugue. Two prominent German organists, whose compositions were studied by Bach,

were =Caspar Kerl= (1627-1693), and =Jacob Froberger= (———1667), both of whom lived in Vienna. The most eminent organist of the 17th century was =Johann Peter Sweelinck= (1562-1621), pupil of Zarlino, the famous Italian theorist, and of Andreas Gabrieli, organist of Venice. Sweelinck occupied the position of organist at the Cathedral in Amsterdam, and gave much attention to the development of the fugal style of composition. His compositions are of the highest importance historically, since they exhibit the first known examples of the independent use of the pedals in a real fugal part. He was the most eminent organist of his time (being called the organist maker), and was the teacher of the following noted players: =Jacob Praetorius= (died at Hamburg in 1651); =Heinrich Scheidemann= (1596-1663), also located at Hamburg; =Jan Adams Reinken= (1623-1722), from 1663 organist and successor to Scheidemann at the Catherine Church, Hamburg (Bach came to Hamburg several times to hear Reinken play and to learn his style); =Samuel Scheidt= (1587-1654), organist at Halle. Some of their compositions are accessible.

[Illustration: JOHANN PETER SWEELINCK.]

Other famous organists of this period were =Johann Pachelbel= (1653-1706), located at Nuremberg (Bach studied his works as a lad); =Dietrich Buxtehude= (1637-1707), organist at Lübeck for thirty-nine years. One of the most important names of this period of development is that of =Johann Joseph Fux= (1660-1741). His "_Gradus ad Parnassum_," published in 1725, a treatise on counterpoint based on the practice of the great masters, played an important part in the training of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven.

=English Organists=.—In the history of English organ playing, the first great name to engage our attention is that of =Thomas Tallys=, born about 1520. He is called the "Father of English church music." He served under Henry VIII, Edward VI, Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth, as organist of the Chapel Royal. English organists of distinction contemporary with and succeeding Tallys were =John Merbecke=, =Richard Farrant=, =William Byrd=, =John Bull=, =Thomas Morley=, =Orlando Gibbons= (a contemporary of Frescobaldi), =Matthew Lock=, =John Blow= and =Henry Purcell=. The last mentioned, born in 1658, became organist of Westminster Abbey in 1680. The name of Purcell is one of the strongest in the history of English music. It was his ambition to found a distinctive school of English composition. Although not successful in this, he made a lasting impression on English church music and produced many charming secular works. It is on record that he stood high in the estimation of his European contemporaries.

=Culmination in Bach and Handel=.—The Polyphonic Period culminated in Bach and Handel, both born in 1685. These two, who never met, and who worked upon dissimilar lines, were the most famous organists of their day, in addition to their greatness in composition.

=The Organ and Polyphonic Music=.—Bach must be regarded as the source of modern organ composition and playing. In him polyphonic composition attained its highest perfection and the organ stands as the centre of the Polyphonic school. The development of the Opera and its influence towards a freer style in vocal and instrumental composition and the tendency of instrumental music to develop along harmonic lines had the effect of relegating polyphonic music to the Church with the organ as its chief vehicle. It is only of comparatively recent years that the organ has become a concert instrument. Bach's treatment of the instrument serves as a model for the composers of all time and the study of his works is indispensable to the development of technical command of the organ and the cultivation of the true organ style. Handel's permanent contribution to organ literature consists of sets of =Concertos=. These concertos, a number of which are still played and admired, excited the enthusiasm of Sir John Hawkins, who gives a glowing account of them in his history. =Bach= was appointed Cantor at the _St. Thomas Schule_, Leipzig, in 1723, and it was here that much of his greatest work was accomplished. In addition to his duties at the school, he directed the music in the Churches of St. Thomas and St. Nicholas. As to the relative superiority of Bach and Handel as organists, contemporary opinion seems to have differed widely. Each undoubtedly had a style of his own as shown in his published compositions. Each excelled in improvisation.

=The Chorale in Protestant Organ Music=.—In addition to his incomparable preludes and fugues, toccatas, fantasias and pieces in the larger forms, Bach made the polyphonic treatment of the =chorale= an art peculiarly his own. In fact, the German style of organ playing may be said to have developed from the chorale and from the music of the Reformation. This furnished a fresher and very different source of inspiration from the Gregorian chant which had been handled so effectively by Frescobaldi and his Italian successors.

=Marchand=.—One of the most renowned of early French organists was =Louis Marchand= (1671-1732). In 1717, while living under banishment in Dresden, he was to have entered into a trial of skill with Bach, but lost courage and departed on the morning of the appointed day. A certain triviality has at times characterized the French school of organ music, undoubtedly a reflection of the prevailing style and taste in other branches of musical composition. Of later years, however, a more serious and exalted style has

developed.

=The German School=.—To return to the German organists. A name familiar to all students of the organ is that of Rinck. =Johann C. H. Rinck= (1770-1846) was a pupil of Kittel, who in turn was a pupil of J. S. Bach. Rinck's reputation is based largely on his "Practical Organ School," a work still in use. Another name of importance is that of =Johann Gottlob Schneider= (1789-1864). He has had the reputation of being one of the greatest German organists since the time of Bach. Of the great composers since Bach, =Mendelssohn= stands conspicuous as an organist and composer of organ music. Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, although occasionally using the organ in their scores, did not compose for the instrument. Mendelssohn developed a decided fondness for the organ, which he played admirably. His six sonatas and three preludes and fugues are masterpieces. Among the representative German organists and composers should be mentioned: =Adolph Hesse= (1809-1863), author of the "Practical Organist" and a prolific composer; =Karl August Haupt= (1810-1891), a celebrated teacher, numbering among his many pupils from all countries such prominent American organists as Eugene Thayer, Clarence Eddy and J. K. Paine; =Carl Ludwig Thiele= (1816-1848) composer of some of the most difficult known works for the organ; =Gustav Merkel= (1827-1885), a prolific composer, whose sonatas are numbered among the standard works for the instrument; =J. G. Rheinberger= (1837-1901), one of the finest organists and best teachers of his time and a composer of great ability, whose twenty sonatas form a permanent addition to the best organ literature. A number of American organists were among his pupils.

=The French School=.—Prominent among organists of the French school in the 19th century may be mentioned: =L. J. A. Lefébure-Wély= (1817-1869) and =Antoine Eduard Batiste= (1820-1876). The works of both these organists are still widely played and have won much popularity. Wely has been called the "Auber of the organ." His works display fertility of melodic invention and a piquancy of harmonic treatment, but are entirely lacking in the polyphonic element. Much the same may be said of Batiste, who was a fine player and teacher, and who equalled Wely in tunefulness but not in musicianship. =Nicholas Jacques Lemmens= (1823-81), a great player (especially of Bach) and author of the celebrated "Ecole d'Orgue" may be said to have laid the foundation of the modern French school. Conspicuous among his successors have been: =Camille Saint-Saëns= (1835-——), a most versatile musician and a noted organist; =Théodore Dubois= (1837-——), =Théodore Salome= (1834-——) and =Felix Alexandre Guilmant= (1837-——). Guilmant, one of the most noted organists and composers of the present day, was a favorite pupil of Lemmens. He has been one of the most prolific composers since the time of Bach, is a master of all the resources of the modern organ, and has a fertility of invention and a fluent command of contrapuntal resources. Another eminent French organist is =C. M. Widor= (1845-——), also a composer of distinction. A powerful influence was exerted on modern organ music, as well as general composition, by the eminent organist and composer, =César Franck=, who was, for a number of years, in charge of the organ class at the Paris _Conservatoire_.

=The Italian School=.—Among recent Italian organists =Filippo Capocci= (1840-——) and =Enrico Bossi= (1861-——) are worthy of mention. Both are splendid organists and prolific composers. They are leaders in the revival of good organ playing in Italy, where a determined effort is being made to restore the art to its former supremacy.

=The English School=.—England has furnished a long line of 19th century organists of ability, prominent among whom are: =Sir John Goss= (1800-1880), =Henry Smart= (1813-1879), =E. J. Hopkins= (1818-1901), =S. S. Wesley= (1810-1876), =Dr. Wm. Spark= (1825-1897). Foremost among English organists stands the name of =Wm. T. Best= (1826-1897). He was one of the most famous concert organists of his time, but is best known to organ students by his "Arrangements from the Scores of the Great Masters," in which he demonstrated that the organ is in itself capable of reproducing certain orchestral effects without transcending its proper functions or descending to trickery. "The Organ," by =Sir John Stainer= (1840-1901), is one of the most widely used elementary works for instruction in organ playing. Dr. Stainer was the successor of Sir John Goss, at St. Paul's, London, and was appointed Professor of Music at Oxford University in 1889. =Frederic Archer= (1838-1901) has been considered one of the greatest of organ players. After a successful career in England, he came to America in 1880. He did much towards popularizing and elevating the art of organ playing in this country. Prominent among contemporary English organists stands =Edwin H. Lemare= (1865-——), who succeeded Frederic Archer as organist of Carnegie Hall, Pittsburg, in 1902. He is a skilful virtuoso, a composer of originality, and a leading representative of the modern English school.

=Modern Organ Music=.—Organ playing and composition have kept pace with the mechanical and artistic evolution of the instrument, and the lines between the various schools are becoming less closely drawn. The tendency of builders to imitate orchestral tone and effects has had influence on composers and players alike. This tendency is less noticeable in the works of the German school, where a modified polyphony still flourishes, based on the principle of the classic treatment of the chorale and growing out of the music of the Lutheran Church. The organ compositions of the modern French school are characterized by grace,

refinement and originality, coupled with a certain dignity and elegance. They combine free harmonic treatment and modern polyphony, together with certain ornate characteristics, growing out of the elaborate ceremonial music of the Latin Church, and bringing into play all the resources of tone color and expressive treatment of the modern instrument. Much the same may be said of the modern English school, which nevertheless still shows traces of the early English style, based on the dignity and purity of cathedral use and tradition. The orchestral tendency, both in composition for the organ and in the transcription of orchestral works for the instrument, shows itself more or less in all schools, and the organ, in addition to its position in the church, is becoming more and more a concert instrument. The compositions of the American organists reflect, in a measure, the characteristics of the schools in which they have been trained, and in particular show traces of the styles of the masters with whom they have chiefly studied.[9]

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Articles on the Organ, and Organists mentioned in this lesson.

Williams.—Story of the Organ.

Lahee.—The Organ and its Masters.

Matthews.—Handbook of the Organ.

Pirro.—J. S. Bach: The Organist and His Works.

Audsley, G. A.—The Art of Organ Building, 2 vols.

QUESTIONS.

In what early instrument is the germ of the organ found? Describe its gradual development.

Describe the general character of the early organs.

Describe the various mechanical improvements.

When and by whom were pedals introduced?

Mention some of the early organists.

In whom did the Polyphonic Period culminate? Who is the source of modern organ composition and playing?

Mention some German organists since the time of Bach.

Mention some prominent French and English organists of the 19th century.

Describe the modern tendencies in organ composition.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A REVIEW OF LESSONS VIII TO XVI.

Get a clear idea of the period, which includes the years between 1100 and the death of Palestrina in 1594, almost 500 years. The lesson on the organ and organ playing belongs to this period, chronologically, in part only.

The difference between the monophonic and polyphonic styles must be clearly appreciated in order to get a clear grasp of the two fundamental styles in music. Illustrations from the masters are to be placed in contrast. Polyphony developed from melodic principles, the simultaneous sounding of several melodies. Monophony depends upon a harmonic basis.

Indicate the steps in the growth of Polyphony.

How did the Church contribute?

What political and other conditions made Paris the centre of Europe in the 12th century?

What is the force of Imitation as a principle to secure Unity in musical composition? How was it used by the composers of the Paris school?

What advances in the use of Imitation did the men of the Gallo-Belgic school make?

Indicate certain historical events and name prominent personages of the periods included in this section.

Why did the early English school exercise so little influence on music?

What noted musical composition is credited to the English school? What kind of work is it?

What historical periods coincide with the English school as described in this section?

Compare the Gallo-Belgic and the Netherlands schools. What did the former contribute to the latter?

What is the musical value of the principle of the Canon?

Why did the musical centre shift respectively from Paris to Belgium, to the Netherlands and then to Italy?

Make a list of the composers of the different schools of this period and trace the connection between them.

Give a sketch of Palestrina and show his contribution to church music.

Describe the madrigal. Compare a madrigal with a modern part-song and note the difference in style.

Give the classification of musical instruments. Examples in each class.

Give a sketch of the development of the viol.

What is the germ of the principle of the organ?

What is the necessity for the use of a bellows?

What are the successive steps in improving the organ?

Mention the important players in chronological order.

Classify them in the proper schools.

Compare the German, French and English schools.

LESSON XVII.

THE BEGINNING OF THE OPERA.

=The Renaissance=.—The Opera, in its inception, was literary rather than musical in nature. It was a result of what is known as the Renaissance, so-called because its most prominent manifestation in Italy was a revival of the learning of the ancients. This phase of the movement was initiated by =Petrarch= (1304-1370), who devoted his life to the study of the classical past of Italy. The Latin classics had never been entirely lost, but those of the Greeks had become practically extinct during the dark ages which followed the conquest of the Roman Empire by the barbarians of the North, in the 5th century. The arts had been kept alive only through the fostering care of the Church, and all had taken on a conventionally ecclesiastical character. Education had declined; it was practically confined to churchmen—even kings and rulers could barely sign their names, while the people at large were sunk in gross ignorance. The revival of Latin literature through the influence of Petrarch led to an interest in the Greek classics which soon became the engrossing study of the learned. Diligent search was made for lost and forgotten manuscripts; academies of learning were founded; lectures were given on Greek philosophy. In the enthusiasm thus created it was even thought that not only the arts and literature of the ancient world might be restored, but its governmental, social and political structure as well.

=Scope of the Renaissance=.—The Renaissance, however, was not merely literary in nature. It was in reality the awakening of man from the spiritual and intellectual slumber which had bound him for nearly a thousand years. Long before it was defined it had been perceptible in many ways. First, materially, in a spirit of exploration, of adventure and enterprise. Traders and travelers startled Europe with glowing accounts of the far East; missionaries took long and dangerous voyages in the hope of converting its heathen inhabitants. An eager desire for increased commercial facilities with these favored countries by means of a westward passage brought about the discovery of America, with which modern history may be said to have opened.

With this extension of the world's boundaries, the mind of man began to expand as well. As he looked forward with eager anticipation to the future, he studied the past with an eye newly alive to the treasures of its buried culture. Instead of his former

acquiescence in being one of a dull, inert mass, serving without question those in authority over him, he began to feel and to assert his own individuality, to resist the crushing weight of feudalism which had hitherto oppressed him. Freedom of intellect, of conscience, of science, of art, was in the air.

The effect of this transition from medievalism toward modern liberty of thought and action varied with different nationalities. In northern nations it took the direction of rebellion against prevailing religious and political conditions, for example, in Germany and England. Italy, however, remained steadfast in religion and government; the revolt was against traditions in matters of art and literature. Roman law and Greek philosophy were exhumed; the classics were zealously studied for standards of taste and culture.

=Music of the Ancients=.—Notwithstanding this research, no trace was found of the music actually in use among the ancients. From the evanescent nature of the art and the total lack of examples, the elaborate descriptions of its complicated system of scales and modes given by Greek philosophers failed to yield a trustworthy clue to its real character.

It was known, however, that the _drama_, owing to the enormous proportions of the amphitheatre in which it was performed, was _musically declaimed_, and that the voices of the actors and chorus were sustained by lyres and flutes. Thus, in the Greek tragedy we find the principal features of the modern opera—scenery, dramatic action, solo and choral singing, the orchestra. It was also known that in the music of the Greeks the _word_ was the _governing principle_; that there was no independent instrumental music—nor was there elsewhere for many centuries afterward. The tone was regarded only as a means of heightening the effect of the poetry; the succession of long and short syllables dictated both rhythm and melody. Of harmony in the modern sense of the term, there was none; instruments and voices alike were in unison.

=Music Chiefly Choral=.—In the 16th century, Florence was the centre of the enthusiasm for Greek culture. She and her sister-cities in the north of Italy were the arbiters in matters of taste, of learning and erudition. There, toward the end of the century, a small group of scholars and musicians, known as the _Camerata_ (Chamber), meeting at the house of Count Bardi, discussed the possibility of reproducing the musical declamation of Greek tragedy. The time was ripe for such an experiment. The polyphonic school had reached its climax in the intricate works of =di Lasso= (1520-1594) and =Palestrina= (1514-1594). Though admirably suited to the Church, the contrapuntal style of these great composers was manifestly unfit for dramatic purposes; it could voice the aspirations of a body of worshipers swayed by a common belief, but could not express individual feeling. No voice was more important than another, all progressed according to canonic law, their complex intertwining practically destroying the essentially secular elements of accent and rhythm. It was, in short, the embodiment in music of the medievalism which had so long controlled Church and State.

Thus far the spirit of emancipation which had produced such great results in the other arts and in politics elsewhere had touched music but lightly. Attempts had been made to break the restraints of contrapuntalism, but there was a total ignorance as to what steps would prove most effective in reaching that end, and nothing definite had been accomplished. Aside from the Folk-song, which was ignored by musicians save only as it served as Cantus Firmus for their counterpoint, there was no music for the solo voice; it was conceived solely from a choral standpoint.

=The Recitative=.—Their dissatisfaction with the school of music then in vogue and the impossibility of adapting it to their purpose led to various experiments by this band of enthusiasts to discover the principles upon which the Greeks had founded the musical declamation employed in their tragedies. They argued that it must have followed as closely as possible the _inflections of the voice_ in speaking; therefore they made this their study. Thus originated the Recitative, the distinguishing feature of the lyric drama, which, though using the definite pitches of the musical scale, reproduces in its progressions and cadences the characteristic but intensified effect of an oratorical delivery of the text. It was the exact contrary of the music of the age in which the word counted for almost nothing, the art of combining independent voices and of playing them off one against the other for everything.

=The Cantata=.—The first result of their efforts was the Cantata (from _cantare_, to sing), meaning a composition for the voice in contradistinction to the Sonata (from _sonare_, to sound), which was applied to one for instruments. The Cantata had but little in common with what is now understood by the term. It was a recitation on musical intervals for a single voice accompanied by but one instrument. Anything like a formal melody was carefully avoided, and the accompaniment, generally played on the lute, was of the most unpretending character. The first of these cantatas was composed by =Vincenzo Galilei=, the father of the celebrated astronomer, on the tragic fate of Count Ugolino, as related by Dante in the _Inferno_. This, therefore, was the _first art-song_ ever composed. Unfortunately, it has been lost; but contemporary accounts tell of the profound impression it created. Other cantatas were written and sung by =Giulio Caccini= (1550-1618), a skilled and an admirable lutist as well, and all awakened the utmost

enthusiasm among the little company.

These works were known as _Nuove Musiche_ (new music) and such as have survived are, in general, painfully thin and crude to modern ears. When compared with the rich polyphony of the prevailing Church style they seem at the first blush to indicate retrogression. Progress, however, seldom advances in a direct line; it generally moves by spirals which at times apparently retreat only to mount the higher at the succeeding curve. These dull recitatives bore the _germ of emancipation_ from the scholastic laws which had heretofore prevented music from expressing individual emotion; they typify the spirit of the Renaissance and are the foundation of the art as we now know it.

=The First Opera=.—Another of the number, =Jacopo Peri= (1561-1633), also a musician, took the next step by composing music of the same style to a drama, the _Dafne_ (Daphne) of the poet Rinuccini, who was the life and soul of this attempt to revive the lost declamation of the Greeks. This was performed privately in 1595 at the Corsi Palace, and produced so strong an impression that it was repeated a number of times at the Carnival seasons of the succeeding years. In 1600, Peri was invited to compose a similar work for the marriage festivities of Henry IV of France and Maria di Medici. This was _Euridice_, also written by Rinuccini, which bears the distinction of being the _first opera_ to receive public performance, and thus introducing the new art-form to the world at large. The score of _Dafne_ has been lost, but that of _Euridice_ still exists.

It was then known as a music drama (_melo dramma_ or _dramma per la musica_); the term opera (abbreviation for _opera in musica_, that is, musical work) did not come into use until the middle of the century. The orchestra, which was played behind the scenes, consisted of a harpsichord, two lutes and a bass-viol. In addition, three lutes played a short _ritornello_ (interlude) in one scene. With this exception, the instruments were used merely to support the voice; the tonality was almost exclusively minor, and the harmony of the simplest. It is thought that Peri sang the part of Orpheus and that Francesca Caccini, daughter of the composer and one of the most gifted singers of the day, sang Euridice.

[Music: Radoppia e fiamm’e lumi al memorabil giorno, Febo ch’il carro d’or rivolgi intorno.

PART OF AN AIR BY CACCINI.]

Caccini claimed the new style as his invention, and it is certain that parts of _Euridice_ were composed by him, though Peri’s name alone appears on the title page of the published work. Emulating the success of his colleague, the former soon set the same drama to music.

=Characteristics of the Early Opera=.—The two settings are so similar that one might almost be taken for the other. Both display the same characteristics. Of dramatic feeling or characterization as understood at the present day there is no sign; development of musical thought, none whatever; a dreary waste of recitatives is but slightly relieved by the occasional flourishes (_giri e gruppi_, that is, runs and turns) allowed the singers by the taste of the times. The choruses, however, which are introduced freely, serve to vary the monotony somewhat. They exhibit a singular mingling of the old and new styles, natural under the circumstances. The voices sing either in a recitative-like unison, or begin in fugato, and later move in simple harmonic progression. Their distaste for the contrapuntal style led these reformers to reject it so far as they could. Its appearance at all is due to the fact that no other mode of writing for a number of voices had as yet been devised—a strictly harmonic treatment had not been thought of. Since, then, they were at a loss as to the management of choral masses, they were obliged to have recourse in part to old methods.

Another name associated with the Florentine school deserving mention is that of =Marco da Gagliano=, a priest who soon took the lead in the new movement. His first opera was _Dafne_ (1607), composed to Rinuccini’s drama which had already served Peri; it was a common practice in those days for composers to use the same text. As a scholar and musician, Gagliano was superior to his predecessors. He shows a greater warmth of feeling and a tendency toward melody which they considered as a lowering of their ideals.

=The Florentine School=.—One particular characteristic of the Florentine school was a sedulous _avoidance_ of anything like _extended melody_ or definite form. To the composers of this school, music was not an end in itself; it was subordinate to the distinct, _impassioned declamation_ of the poet’s verses. They held that any independent development of musical thought was a weakness; that it tended to distract the attention of the hearer from the drama, and to interfere with its logical continuity. The predominant influence was that of the scholar, not of the musician. This was to be expected from the character of the little coterie interested in the new art-form. The majority were wealthy amateurs, zealous students of the classics and aflame with the desire for the actual revival of the Greek tragedy. Peri and Caccini were the only musicians and they were strongly averse to the contrapuntal

music of the day. Its persistently ecclesiastical effect debarred it from expressing the personal feeling which was the object of their research. In the effort to escape its ban, they unwittingly emancipated their art from the control of the Church, and made it accessible to mankind in general. This, therefore, is the great service of the Florentine reformers: the establishment of a purely secular school of music susceptible of indefinite development.

Making allowance for the vast difference in means due to the practical creation of independent instrumental music since the 17th century, their practice was precisely the same as that of the modern composer who writes a music drama and uses the same term to define his work. When _Dafne_ and _Euridice_ first saw the light, however, there was neither knowledge nor experience to point the way; it was found only after a slow and laborious process of experimentation, involving the acceptance of much that was rejected after having served its turn. Though Peri and Caccini with their confrères did not succeed in the end they had in view, they accomplished far more by originating the Opera, the point of departure for the whole modern art of music.

REFERENCES.

Symonds.—The Renaissance in Italy.

Apthorp.—Opera Past and Present.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Articles on subjects mentioned in this and following lessons.

Streatfeild.—The Opera.

These general works serve for other lessons on the opera.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

What was the Renaissance?

What was the effect of this idea on music?

What was the origin of Recitative?

What was understood by _Nuove Musiche_?

Who wrote the first opera? What term was applied to this kind of musical work?

Give a description of the early opera.

Give an account of the Florentine school and their fundamental ideas.

Since the beginning of the Opera is practically the beginning of a century, the 17th, it should not be a difficult matter to keep this date in mind. It therefore antedates the settlement at Jamestown, Va., by a few years, making the beginning of American history under English auspices and the Opera coincide.

LESSON XVIII.

THE ORATORIO. DEVELOPMENT OF THE OPERA.

=The First Oratorio=.—The novelty of the new style, which was called the _stilo rappresentativo_ (representative style), the vigor and freedom it gave to an impressive delivery of the text, aroused universal attention. Among the composers who essayed it was =Emilio del Cavaliere= (1550-1599). By applying it to a sacred subject, he originated the Oratorio. Roman by birth, he had passed part of his life in Florence, and though not a member of the _Camerata_, was familiar with its aims and practice.

The germ both of the Opera and Oratorio is to be found in the Miracle Plays or so-called Mysteries of the Middle Ages. These were dramatic representations of _Bible scenes_ or _religious allegories_ by means of which a populace unable to read was taught the great truths of sacred history. Cavaliere's oratorio, _La Rappresentazione di Anima e di Corpo_ (The Representation of Soul and Body), was given in 1600 in Rome, at the Oratory of the Church of Santa Maria in Vallicella—hence its name.

[Music: PASSAGE FROM CAVALIERE'S ORATORIO.]

=Its Characteristics=.—Save for the _nature_ of the _subject_, there was no apparent difference between it and an opera. The allegorical characters taking part appeared in costume and in action. The score even gives directions by which it may be concluded with a dance if so desired. By this, however, dignified and stately movements are understood, in nowise resembling the rapid dance of modern times. The composer in his instructions for performance, which are unusually full and complete, lays great stress upon an expressive delivery of the text, and the swelling and diminishing of the tones by the singers. In vigor and characterization it far surpasses Peri's and Caccini's operas. Cavaliere's death, which occurred ten months before the production of his work, and the great popularity of the Opera, put a stop to the immediate development of the Oratorio; that was reserved for Carissimi a generation later.

=Monteverde=.—The task of taking the opera from the experimental stage and of placing it on the artistic foundation which it now occupies was accomplished by =Claudio Monteverde= (1568-1643), a man of extraordinary genius and originality. A harmonist of surpassing force and boldness, he had always rebelled against the restraints of the contrapuntal school, though, unlike Peri and Caccini, he was skilled in its intricacies. He was viol player in the band of the Duke of Mantua, and had composed masses and madrigals, many of which were severely criticised by the pedants of the day. He joined definite issue with them in his _freedom of treating dissonances_, the distinguishing feature of modern harmony. Heretofore, sevenths, ninths, augmented fourths and the like had never been heard without preparation. Monteverde, however, introduced them without regard to this restriction, little heeding the anathemas heaped upon his head by those who considered his infractions of established rules unpardonable. His ardent, restless temperament, seeking novel modes of expression, often led to wild and extravagant combinations which even today appear harsh and forced. At that time they must have seemed wilful attempts at outraging the ear and the sense of harmonic propriety. These innovations, however, are the cornerstone of modern harmony; of this as well as of the opera, Monteverde is the real founder. What are defects in his church music are excellences in his operas. The discords which disturb the serenity of a religious atmosphere are admirably fitted to produce dramatic effects and powerful climaxes. Monteverde belonged to the stage as his great contemporary, Palestrina, belonged to the church.

=Position of Music in the 17th Century=.—The interest which the success of the Florentine composers would have for a man thus gifted can be readily imagined. Yet he was obliged to wait a number of years for an opportunity to emulate their achievements. Music then was the especial pastime of the great; it was part of the state with which they surrounded themselves. Almost all titled and wealthy families had their own bands of musicians and choirs of singers. These assisted in their private chapels and lent additional eclat to seasons of festivity. Concerts and operas were given only at court or in the palaces of noblemen; public halls for any kind of musical occasion were unknown. A musician or composer could make his way only by attaching himself to a noble house or by securing a patron in court circles. _Dafne_ and _Euridice_ were made possible through the interest and protection of Count Bardi and Count Corsi. The opera was also attended with great expense. The taste of the times demanded an enormous outlay for mounting—costumes, scenery, decorations; only the extremely wealthy could afford it, and they reserved it for occasions of especial importance.

[Music: ARIADNE'S LAMENT.]

=Monteverde's First Opera=.—In 1607, the marriage of Margaret of Savoy to Francesco Gonzaga, son of the Duke of Mantua, opened the way for Monteverde's first opera, _Arianna_ (Ariadne), which was received with the utmost enthusiasm. Unfortunately, but a fragment of it remains, Ariadne's lament after her desertion by Theseus, the most celebrated opera air ever written. In its unprepared discords of the harshest nature, in the poignant expression of grief and despair so at variance with the placid art of the day, this shows how, by a single stroke, Monteverde cut loose from all the traditions of the past. In its less than a score of measures it also anticipates principles of artistic structure which were not formulated for nearly a century later and which hold good to the present day. It is said that it brought tears to every eye.

[Music: RITORNELLO BY MONTEVERDE.]

=His Second Opera=.—The following year he produced his second opera, _Orfeo_ (Orpheus), so called to distinguish it from Peri's _Euridice_ on the same subject. Though most of Monteverde's works have been lost, the score of _Orfeo_ has been preserved. It shows a surprising advance over the simplicity of the Florentine operas. First of all, in the great _expansion of the orchestra_. This numbers thirty-seven instruments which throughout are _combined in groups_ and as a whole with an art prefiguring certain effects of orchestration supposed to be purely modern. Like harmony, instrumentation dates from Monteverde. Instead of the customary vocal prologue, it begins with a _Toccata_ (instrumental prelude). The composer's keen dramatic instinct is shown by the masterly way in which he avoids the monotony of his predecessors; the recitatives are varied by the introduction of _ritornelli_, and each act

ends with a chorus and a stately passage for the orchestra. Five years later, the most famous composer of the day, he left Mantua for Venice, where until his death he was director of music at St. Mark's.

=Monteverde's Characteristics=.—Monteverde's greatest service to the opera lay in enlarging the sphere of the orchestra, and in the initiation of a thoroughly instrumental style adapted to the character of each instrument. He increased the number of players and released the orchestra from the subordinate position of being a mere support for the voice by employing it to heighten the dramatic situation. He originated many previously unknown effects, among them the _pizzicato_ and the _tremolo_ of the violins in precisely the same form as used at present. The latter so astounded the players that at first they refused to attempt it, saying that it was impossible. He endowed the Recitative with far greater freedom and depth of expression; under his hand it lost much of the dryness of the Florentine school. His manner of _writing_ for the voice was _declamatory_ rather than melodious; what traces of definite melody occur in his works are generally confined to the instruments, in which he curiously anticipates the practice of latter-day dramatic composers.

=Popularization of the Opera=.—Until 1637 the opera was restricted to royalty and the nobility. In that year the first public opera house was opened in Venice, and such was the popularity of the new amusement that before the end of the century there were no fewer than eleven in that city alone, then with a population of about 140,000. It spread through Italy with almost like rapidity, bearing in its wake an unparalleled development of the art of song.

=Change of Character=.—With its introduction to the people, it was manifestly impossible for the opera to retain its original character. So long as it was confined to the cultivated, the classical ideals of its founders met with intelligent appreciation, but when confronted with audiences drawn from the masses desirous only of being amused, a change was inevitable. Mythological and classical subjects were gradually discarded in favor of those involving intrigue and disguise; comic personages were introduced to enliven the scene. As the dramatic action was thus brought nearer the comprehension of the unlearned, so the music departed from the oratorical standards of the early school, and showed a frank _tendency toward melody_ and _regularity of form_. What was lost in elevation of theme, however, was made up by the human interest imparted to the play and the consequent endeavor of the composer to express, by his music, the varying vicissitudes of life. Thus it gained in warmth of feeling and flexibility in means of expression, while the evolution of rhythmic melody and definite musical structure laid the foundation of the art as we now have it.

=The Venetian School=.—Venice naturally became the centre of an important development of the opera. Of the numerous composers forming the Venetian school, =Francesco Cavalli= (1600-1676) and =Marco Cesti= (1620-1669) are second only in importance to Monteverde. The first was Monteverde's pupil, and had much of his broad dramatic style modified by the influences of which we have just spoken. Cesti came to Venice from Rome, where he had been the pupil of Carissimi, and brought with him the smoothness and melodic flow of his master, albeit lacking in essential power. Other names of a later date are =Giovanni Legrenzi= (1625-1690), especially noted for spirit and vivacity, and =Antonio Lotti= (1667-1740), his pupil, known by one or two charming airs which still survive.

=Carissimi and the Oratorio=.—=Giovanni Carissimi= (1604-1674), though he never wrote for the stage, was the strongest musical influence of his day. He was an ardent admirer of the new school, and adapted it in the form of oratorios and cantatas to the Church. In such works the necessity for form as regards definite tonality, distinct rhythm and melodic sequence is naturally much greater than in the Opera where music is used to illustrate the dramatic situation, and is furthermore elucidated by the action of the play. When the ear alone is obliged to pass judgment there must be evidence of design in these particulars, else the effect is confused and bewildering. Carissimi's musical instinct grasped this truth. His oratorios and cantatas show a logical arrangement of choruses and ensembles, recitatives and arias combined with a unity of effect and a clearness of characterization heretofore unknown. The choruses in particular are strongly rhythmic and far more dramatic than those which were commonly heard on the stage.

[Music: FROM "JEPHTHA" BY CARISSIMI.]

=Secularization of Church Music=.—This introduction of the new style into the Church marked the passing of the old school and strongly affected methods of dramatic composition. The public had never been in sympathy with the austere standards of the Florentine school and welcomed the appearance of _intelligible melody_ and the _spirited rhythms_ to which Carissimi gave the first direct impulse. Not only this; he fixed the form that the music of the Church was to bear for a century to come. This secularization of church music had its good and bad sides; good by reason of the greater freedom and variety of expression thus gained; bad because of the bold and mechanical imitation of Carissimi's purely formal details by his successors, which in the end

led to a tiresome monotony of style.

=Characteristics of the Venetian School=.—Thus was taken the first step toward the complete reversal of the conditions under which the early Opera had arisen. Instead of the music's being subordinate to the drama, the drama was soon to serve merely as an excuse for the music; the opera was destined to sink to the level of a concert sung in costume; the dramatic action reduced to a minimum. The Venetian school marks the turning-point in this direction. The high ideals of Monteverde and his predecessors were gradually thrust into the background; the singer began to assume precedence over the actor; truth of _expression yielded_ to the fascinations of _time_ and _tune_, which even the musically uncultivated could enjoy without bothering their heads as to real dramatic fitness. Closely connected with these tendencies was the establishment of a school of singing which, if we may believe contemporary accounts, surpassed in technical facility and brilliancy any vocal art heard either before or since that time. The result was that singers finally regarded the opera only as a field for the display of their dazzling accomplishments and in this they were willingly supported by a public eager to be entertained and amused.

REFERENCES.

Apthorp.—The Opera, Past and Present.

Elson.—The History of Opera.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, article on Opera.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Who wrote the first oratorio? In what respects did an opera and an oratorio differ?

Give an account of Monteverde and his innovations in Opera.

What was the state of music in the 17th century?

Describe Monteverde's first opera.

Describe Monteverde's second opera.

What was understood by the terms Toccata, Ritornello?

What were Monteverde's contributions to the Opera?

What change took place in the character of the Opera in the latter half of the 17th century?

Who were the prominent members of the Venetian school?

Give an account of Carissimi and his work.

Give a characterization of the Venetian school.

A short account of the Mysteries or Miracle Plays of the Middle Ages may be assigned to a pupil as special work. The Passion Play, still given today at Oberammergau, Germany, is a relic of the old-time religious plays.

LESSON XIX.

ALESSANDRO SCARLATTI AND THE NEAPOLITAN SCHOOL.

=The Neapolitan School=.—What in the Venetian school had been a _reaction_ in favor of _form_ and _melody_ became the established practice of the Neapolitan school. Political disturbances had hindered the spread of the Opera in southern Italy, particularly in Naples, but at the end of the 17th century it assumed the position formerly occupied by Florence and Venice. Before this, however, a strong influence had been exerted by certain composers in Rome, of whom Carissimi was first in importance. Had it not been for the disapproval of the Church, a definite Roman school might have arisen. Such a school would doubtless have been advantageous to the artistic growth of the Opera, since the public taste at Rome in matters of art was more serious in nature than at Naples. In 1697, public performances of opera were forbidden by the ecclesiastical authorities, and thus the seat of further development was transferred to Naples through the removal thither from Rome of =Alessandro Scarlatti= (1659-1725), the founder

of the Neapolitan school. As a lad, he had been a pupil of Carissimi and also probably of Legrenzi, whose influence is clearly seen in his early works.

=Alessandro Scarlatti=.—Scarlatti invested his operas with a melodic charm and a symmetrical form which thus far had appeared only sporadically. Fascinated by the freedom of the new style, the early composers had neglected the severe study which had been indispensable to mastery in the Contrapuntal School, and had in the main relied on natural gifts. Following the ideal of Peri and his associates, their operas were largely a succession of recitatives which in the end grew monotonous and wearisome; of form, of structure, of purely musical effect they bore but slight traces. Scarlatti saw that the time had come for a change in style—one that should combine the musical interest of the old with the dramatic spirit of the new. The foremost musician of his time, he perceived the weakness of the exclusively declamatory opera—its lack of variety and want of appeal to the public in general.

[Illustration: ALESSANDRO SCARLATTI.]

=His Characteristics=.—He was not a reformer. He lacked the strong and rugged dramatic fibre of his predecessor, Monteverde. Scholarship; an inexhaustible fund of melody, pure, polished, refined; a gift of characterization—general, not particular, and always subordinate to a keen sense of beauty—are his distinguishing characteristics. He fell in with the taste of the day and devoted his gifts to the production of works which should satisfy the musician and please the public. The solidity of his early schooling had made him a master of counterpoint, and this he applied in the construction of logically worked-out accompaniments, fuller, richer and more expressive than had been attempted by his less learned contemporaries. In nobility of conception and skill in solving contrapuntal problems he often shows that he is not unworthy the name of the “Italian Bach,” as he is sometimes called. Like Bach, also, he was one of the most prolific composers of all times. He left one hundred and fifteen operas, sixty-six of which are still extant, more than two hundred masses, besides many miscellaneous works for church and concert, both vocal and instrumental.

=His Services to the Opera=.—To the simple recitative (recitativo secco), invented by Peri, he added the important form known as the _recitativo stromentato_ (accompanied recitative). This was not strictly original with Scarlatti, since it had been introduced by Purcell in his _Dido and Eneas_ ten years before the Italian had first used it in his opera _Rosaura_ (1690). There is no probability, however, that Scarlatti was acquainted with the Englishman’s works; it is a not uncommon matter for two minds to arrive independently at the same result. In the accompanied recitative, the voice, instead of being supported by detached (_secco_) chords on the harpsichord, sometimes with the addition of a single stringed instrument, as in the simple recitative, was accompanied by the entire orchestra, which had grown to proportions undreamed-of in Peri’s day. Vastly developed by the growth of orchestral resources, it is the distinguishing feature of the modern music drama. As a rule, however, it was but little used in Scarlatti’s operas or in those of his contemporaries. Interest in the drama, as such, was fast sinking to a negligible quantity; audiences assembled to hear their favorite singers, not to follow the course of a more or less involved dramatic action. The simple recitative was, therefore, more frequently employed in order to hurry through the necessary details of the play and reach the moment when the singer could delight by his art in the aria.

[Music: AIR FROM SCARLATTI’S OPERA “TURNO ARICINO”.]

=The Aria=.—Scarlatti was not the inventor of the aria or air for the single voice in the meaning of the term as applied to a certain fixed form. Other composers had used it before him in its essential principles, but he was the _first_ to _formulate_ it into a persistent _type_, which it retained for nearly a century, despite its undramatic character. The Scarlatti aria consisted of three parts: two contrasting sections, concluding with a Da Capo or repetition of the first, expressed by the formula A B A. The principle of Repetition as an element of form is now a commonplace, but at the time it was a novelty, and the emphasis given to it by the aria fascinated the public and made it the principal feature of the opera. More than anything else, it led to its degeneration. Singers found in the aria a means of displaying their technical skill; it became the canvas on which they embroidered the most astonishing _tours de force_. The art of acting almost disappeared from the operatic stage; the poise of body and voice required for such vocal efforts banished all but a few conventional gestures.

=The Overture=.—Scarlatti’s powers were by no means confined to writing for the voice; the instrumental portions of his works give evidence of equal mastery, though the popular taste for singing allowed him but little scope for extension in this direction. His overtures in particular show a great advance over the simple preludes of the early Italian operas. He perfected what is known as the Italian Overture in contradistinction to the earlier form invented by Lully, and called the French Overture. It consisted of three movements, the first and last quick, the middle movement slow. In its arrangement, this was the direct precursor of the modern symphony. At first the two terms were interchangeable; an overture when played before an opera was called a _Sinfonia_, and

curiously enough, when played independently as a concert number it was frequently called an overture. Some of the early symphonies were even printed with one title outside and the other inside.

=The Typical Italian Opera=.—Thus at the beginning of the 18th century we find the Opera on an overwhelmingly musical basis instead of the oratorical foundation which it had in its inception. Scarlatti fixed its form for a century. He left it consisting principally of recitatives and arias, each opera containing from fifty to sixty of the latter. Aside from these there was but little formal music—only an occasional march or dance besides the overture. The simple recitative was used for ordinary dialogue; hence it was peculiarly applicable to the _Opera Buffa_ (comic opera). The accompanied recitative was reserved for situations of dramatic importance, and the aria served to express individual emotion. The chorus was employed but sparingly, generally appearing only at the end of the act to give greater eclat to the finale. The dance, which in the early Opera had played a part of some importance, was finally banished entirely from the scene, though not from the stage. It was given between the acts as an intermezzo (interlude), and thus developed into the formal ballet. Spectacular features, too, assumed great prominence.

=The Intermezzo=.—The Intermezzo has a close connection with the opera. It arose from the custom of introducing something _between the acts_ of a play or opera to entertain the audience during the necessary period of waiting. At first, songs or madrigals were sung, then by degrees the entertainment took on a dramatic form, until at last a drama was given totally independent of the principal play. Singularly enough, the acts of the two plays were performed alternately, neither having any connection with the other. The Intermezzo was always of a gayer, lighter character; thus when the incongruity of the practice became apparent, it naturally evolved into the _Opera Buffa_. This was brought about by the success of the most celebrated comic opera ever written, _La Serva Padrona_ (The Maid as Mistress), by =Giovanni Pergolesi= (1710-1736). This was originally produced (1734) as an Intermezzo between the acts of another play, and afterward made a triumphant progress through all the opera houses in Europe as an independent work.

=The Opera Buffa=.—Though for the sake of contrast, comic characters had been introduced into the opera during the early Venetian period, the _Opera Buffa_ did not reach its full development until the following century. Owing to the absence of certain conventions which had grown around the _Opera Seria_ (serious opera) it became a more characteristic mode of expression than the latter. Its melodies were fresher, its dramatic action was less restrained and truer to life, while it performed a valuable service by doing away with the strange mingling of comic and serious styles which had previously disfigured many otherwise impressive works. To it we owe the concerted Finale which is such a feature of modern grand opera. It is attributed to =Niccolo Logroscino= (1700-1763), who instead of the customary conclusion of an act by a simple duet, trio, or quartet, brought all the _Dramatis Personæ_ on the stage to take part in a characteristic ensemble. Greatly developed by later composers, such finales were for a long time confined to _Opera Buffa_, until Paisiello finally introduced them into serious opera.

=Prominent Composers of the Neapolitan School=.—It is hardly possible to mention more than a few of the numerous composers belonging to the Neapolitan school. Besides Pergolesi, the most important works of this school were composed by =Niccolo Porpora= (1685-1767), =Niccolo Jommelli= (1714-1774), =Niccolo Piccini= (1728-1800), =Giovanni Paisiello= (1741-1816) and =Domenico Cimarosa= (1749-1801). Most of these were equally at home in the _Opera Seria_ and the _Opera Buffa_, but their works in the latter style have proved the more enduring.

Porpora is more noteworthy for the singers he formed than for his forty-six operas, all of which have sunk into oblivion. He was the greatest of the many masters of singing who through their pupils made the Opera of the 18th century the field of display for the most remarkable singers the world has ever heard. Jommelli was one of the most gifted composers of his day. He spent fifteen years in Germany as capellmeister to the Duke of Wurtemburg, but the influence of this long residence in a country where musical ideals were of a more austere type than in Italy, though it added dignity and solidity to his art, was fatal to his popularity when he returned to his native land; his countrymen found his operas heavy in style and deficient in melody. Piccini was the composer of the most popular _Opera Buffa_ of the century, _Cecchina_, but is now remembered principally by the bitter feud which arose in Paris in 1787 between his admirers and those of Gluck. Paisiello's most celebrated work was _Il Barbiere di Siviglia_ (The Barber of Seville), which held the stage for thirty years until the success of Rossini's masterpiece on the same subject forced it into retirement. Cimarosa's _Il Matrimonio Segreto_ (The Secret Marriage) was an equal favorite; one of its numbers, the trio for women's voices, _Ti Faccio un Inchino_ (I make thee a reverence), sometimes appears on modern programs.

=Influence of the Neapolitan School=.—Notwithstanding the formalism of the Neapolitan school, which led to a regrettable neglect of the dramatic signification of the Opera by an over-emphasis of its musical element, it was of no small importance in the development of music in general. By fixing the principles of form and melody at a time when both were vague and undetermined,

Scarlatti laid the foundation of the great classical period, beginning with Haydn and Mozart and ending with Beethoven. This was his contribution to absolute music, which cannot exist without form, though its influence was disastrous to purity of form in the branch of the art which he particularly cultivated.

REFERENCES.

Dent.—Alessandro Scarlatti: His Life and Works.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Which Italian city now became the centre of operatic development?

Who was the founder of this new school?

Tell about his style and training.

What did he contribute to the development of the Opera?

Describe the Aria.

Describe the Overture.

Describe a typical Italian Opera.

Describe the Intermezzo.

Describe the Opera Buffa.

Who were the prominent composers of the Neapolitan school?

What was the influence of this school?

The period of Scarlatti's work extends approximately from the English Revolution of 1688, which drove James II from the throne, to the end of the reign of George I. In American Colonial history this period is one of gathering strength in the various provinces on the Atlantic Coast.

LESSON XX.

SINGING AND SINGERS.

=Early Methods of Singing=.—As has been noted by the reader, music, up to this time, developed principally along vocal lines. We have no details as to the character of the training of singers among the Chaldeans, Egyptians and Greeks except such as indicate that their idea of singing was a sort of musical declamation. Such seems also to have been the idea of the nations in the north of Europe.

We have seen that the Welsh bards were required to undergo a very thorough and exacting course of study, but the practical side of singing and the rules laid down for the training of the young minstrels is not a part of our knowledge. The songs of the early Church, sung by masses of worshipers, were of necessity simple in every way, requiring no art. It was not until the use of Discant became popular, and the Polyphonic school began to use florid writing that we can infer that there must have been some methods of training vocalists for artistic work. Although we have little or no details as to the course of training which the early singers received, we are justified in assuming that they must have possessed skill in execution of no mean order. It must not be forgotten that practically all the composers of the early Polyphonic school were singers, able to execute their own works. Hence, studies in singing must have gone hand in hand with composition. The voice parts of the masses, motets and madrigals of the composers of the 13th to the 16th centuries have absolute independence of progression, syncopations, embellishments, etc., to such an extent that it taxes the musicianship of the chorus singer of the present day to sing them; they are not only exacting in intonation, rhythm and other musical matters but also in mechanical points, such as flexibility and freedom of voice and thorough breath control.

=Influence of the Opera on Singing=.—When the Opera was established, after the declamatory style offered by the first composers had proven unsuccessful in holding the public, the florid style of the old discanters was revived and modified, which, as the Opera

developed, gave a great impetus to a systematic and thorough study of singing. The new style of melody introduced by the opera composers of the 17th century demanded purity of voice, wide range, flexibility, expressive shading and a marvelous breath control, as well as great physical endurance. Singers were expected to execute the most intricate passages, abounding in diatonic and chromatic scales, arpeggios, turns, gruppettos, trills, etc., of the most elaborate nature, passages such as are considered purely instrumental today. =Alessandro Scarlatti=, the composer, and himself a singer, is credited with having had much to do with the great development in the art of singing. He trained a number of singers and pupils, and thus founded the “old Italian” school of singing. It was natural that the art side of singing should thus develop in Italy for several reasons, notably, because Italy had a great number of highly-trained composers, the character of the language is such as to lend itself to the requirements of artistic singing, broad full vowels, soft consonants, absence of final consonants, etc., and the enthusiastic, essentially lyric temperament of the race.

=The Training of a 17th Century Singer=.—We are given an idea of the course of training which singers of the 17th century were obliged to observe in a work _Historia Musica_, published by G. A. A. Buontempi, in 1695. This contains an account of the regulations of a school for singers in Rome, directed by Virgilio Mazzocchi, in which Buontempi was a pupil: The pupils were obliged to devote one hour each day to the singing of difficult passages with the idea of acquiring experience; one hour to the practice of the trill, one to passages in agility, one to literary studies, one to vocalises and to various other technical exercises under the direction of a teacher and before a mirror to acquire the certainty that the singer did not make a faulty movement of the face, the forehead, the eyes or the mouth. This was the morning’s work. In the afternoon, a half-hour was given to theory study, the same amount to writing counterpoint on plain-song melodies, then to learning and applying the rules of composition (writing on an erasable sheet); then followed a half-hour of study of a literary nature, and the rest of the day was given to practice on the clavichord, to the composition of a psalm, motet, canzonetta, or any other kind of piece according to the pupil’s choice. Such were the common exercises of those days when the pupils were kept on duty at the school. On other days, they would go outside the Angelica Gate to sing against the famous echo that was found there, listening to the response in order to criticise their work. Other duties were to sing in nearly all the musical solemnities of the various churches, to study attentively the style of the great singers of the day, to make a report of their observations to their master, who, the better to impress the result of their studies upon the minds of his pupils, added remarks and advice as he deemed necessary. Under such discipline it is not astonishing that the Italian singers attained a high degree of excellence, and became not only distinguished singers but skilful composers as well. That the reader may gather an idea of the character of passages executed by these singers an example is given on the previous page.

[Music: AIR for BASS

FROM A “MISERERE” BY DENTICE, END OF 16TH CENTURY.]

=Growth of the Florid Style=.—As the art of singing developed, the singers increased their capricious embellishments. With the idea of securing brilliancy as well as the hope of winning success for their works, composers yielded to the exactions of singers and the depraved taste of the dilettanti. This explains the seemingly endless vocalizing and those passages of pure agility which crowd the scores of the best Italian masters of the 17th and 18th centuries. Before giving some account of the famous singers of the old Italian school it will be interesting to have a few notes upon a work on vocal music which bears upon the matter of execution.

=A Work on Singing=.—In 1725, =Pier Francesco Tosi=, a renowned singer (born about 1650, died 1730), published a work, translated into English, and published in 1742 under the title “Observations on the Florid Song, or Sentiments of the Ancient and Modern Singers,” which contains some interesting and valuable statements for the student of the history of the art of singing. The most minute principles are set forth with much grace and spirit, in all cases showing enthusiasm on the part of the author for his art and a high sense of the dignity of the profession of singing. When the discussion is in regard to certain kinds of passages in which the singer was accustomed to improvise ornaments, Tosi demands the union of five qualities: intelligence, invention, meter (rhythm), mechanism (technic) and taste; and in addition, other qualities which he calls “secondary and auxiliary graces”: the appoggiatura, the trill, the portamento di voce, phrasing. This work by Tosi and one by Marcello entitled _Le Theatre à la Mode_ throw much light on the execution of the vocal music of the 18th century.

=Seventeenth Century Singers=.—=Baldassare Ferri= (1610-1680) was one of the most renowned of the male sopranos of the old school. His voice had the greatest agility and facility, perfect intonation, a brilliant shake or trill and his breath supply seemed to be inexhaustible. In regard to his intonation, it is said that he was able to ascend and descend in one breath a two-octave scale with a continuous trill without accompaniment with such perfection of intonation that when he finished he had not varied a shade from the pitch of his starting-note. He was in high favor in the courts of Poland, Germany, Sweden and England. A medal was struck in his

honor. =Antonio Bernacchi= (1690-1756) was a pupil of =Pistocchi= (1659-1720), the most celebrated teacher in Italy at this time, whose principles are represented in Tosi's book. He commenced his career early and appeared in opera in Italy, later in England and Germany. After some years of experience with the public taste he altered his style, making great use of the florid style, a veritable embroidery of roulades, an innovation that was so successful as to be immediately followed by other singers in spite of the protests of the older school of singers. It is related that when Pistocchi heard his former pupil, he said: "Ah! woe is me! I taught thee to sing and now thou wilt play!" He sang in Handel's opera company in London, 1729-30. He then returned to Italy to take up the career of a teacher and brought out a number of fine singers. =Francesco Bernardi Senesino= (1680-1750) was a great favorite in England, where he sang in Handel's operas. His voice was exceptionally fine in quality, clear, penetrating and flexible, his technic remarkable; his style was marked by purity, simplicity and expressiveness, and his delivery of recitative was famous over all Europe. The name of Niccolo Porpora was mentioned in connection with the opera as a celebrated singing master as well as composer. No singers before or since have sung like his pupils, notably Caffarelli and Farinelli.

=Gaetano Majorano Caffarelli= (1703-1783)—the reader will note that many of the old school of musicians lived to a ripe old age—was the son of a Neapolitan peasant, who tried to repress the boy's evident musical inclinations. Cafaro, director of the Chapel Royal, at Naples, chanced to hear him sing and succeeded in getting charge of him and gave him his elementary instruction, which was followed by instruction from Porpora, who was then living in Naples. Porpora was a most exacting teacher, requiring implicit obedience and unceasing practice. The story is told that Porpora kept Caffarelli for five or six years to the unvaried study of a single page of exercises despite the pupil's most strenuous objections. At the end of the time, when Caffarelli declared he would submit no longer, the old teacher said: "Go, my son. I have nothing more to teach you. You are the greatest singer in Europe." When he first appeared in opera he sang female parts, for which his beautiful face was well-suited. Some years later he took men's parts. He gained great popularity in the leading cities of Europe and amassed an enormous fortune. He excelled in slow and pathetic airs, yet he was most admirable in the bravura style, and his technic in the trill and chromatic scales was unapproached by any other singer of his time. He was fond of introducing chromatic passages in quick movements.

=Farinelli= (1705-1782), whose real name was Carlo Broschi, was a pupil of Porpora. He made his first public appearance in Rome when he was seventeen years old. It was on this occasion that he sang the famous aria with trumpet obligato, written by his master, a piece which became so associated with him as to be demanded at all his concerts. In this piece, trumpet and voice vie with each other in holding and swelling a note of extraordinary length and volume; when the trumpeter had exhausted his breath Farinelli kept on with increased power and ended with a great vocal display. This aria called for wonderful vocal technic owing to the novelty and difficulty of the trills and variations introduced. In 1727, he engaged in a musical duel with Bernacchi, previously referred to, in which he was conquered. As a result of this he placed himself under Bernacchi's instruction, and thus perfected his wonderful talent. In 1731, at the suggestion of the Emperor Charles VI, he modified his style and devoted study to the mastery of pathos and simplicity. During his public career he won the greatest possible success in the European capitals and passed the last years of his life in wealth. Mancini, a fellow-pupil of Farinelli and later a famous singing master, says of Farinelli's voice: "It was so perfect, so powerful, so sonorous and so rich in its extent, both in the high and the low parts of the register, that its equal has never been heard in our time.... The art of taking and keeping the breath so softly and easily that no one could perceive it began and ended with him. The qualities in which he excelled were the evenness of his voice, the art of swelling its sound, the portamento, the union of the registers, a surprising agility, a graceful and pathetic style and a shake as admirable as it was rare."

A few other singers of this class may be mentioned: Giacchino Conti, called =Gizziello= (1714-1761), =Giovanni Carestini= (1705-1758?) a contralto, =Giuseppe Boschi=, the most celebrated basso of the 18th century, one of Handel's singers, and =Girolamo Crescentini= (1766-1846). So much space has been given to these singers because their work laid the principles for vocal training that have ever since been the foundation upon which the great masters and singers of later times have built their art; to these principles has been given the name of the old Italian School of Singing.

=Ill-effect of Virtuosity=.—The student who goes fully into the subject of the relation of singers to the opera will find that the great development of virtuosity among singers exerted an ill-effect and called forth a very pronounced reform in which Gluck was the leader. Singers were capable of such great vocal display, and the public showed so much enthusiasm for the brilliant feats of vocalism, and so great was the rivalry between singers and their partisans that composers vied with each other in their efforts to introduce the most difficult and florid passages possible. The text of an aria had no real value and became merely a vehicle upon which to place the dazzling vocalization of the singer. Dramatic truth was ruthlessly sacrificed. A singer, supposed to be in the very throes of death, would give a virtuosic display that would tax the lung power of a man in the most perfect physical condition. Gluck's reform consisted in requiring that the arias should express the emotions suited to the situation, thus calling for expressive singing,

not mere vocal display. The history of the opera and singing since then shows periods of change toward one idea or the other until the principles of Richard Wagner as to dramatic truth were generally accepted.

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, articles on the singers mentioned in this lesson.

QUESTIONS.

What circumstances show that the church singers of the 13th to 16th centuries must have had considerable skill in singing?

What was the influence of the opera on singing?

What was the course of training required of young singers in the 17th century?

What important work on singing dates from the early part of the 18th century? Give some of its principles.

Describe the celebrated singers of this period and their work.

What was the influence of vocal virtuosity on music?

LESSON XXI.

OPERA IN FRANCE AND ENGLAND.

=Spread of Italian Opera=.—The fame of Italian opera soon spread to other countries. Princes and kings, eager to hear the new style of music, held out golden inducements to Italian composers and singers to come to their courts; it was generally thought that none but an Italian could compose an opera or sing an aria. The consequence was that in almost all countries during the 18th century the prevailing musical influence was Italian; native composers and singers were obliged to study Italian models if they wished to attain to popular favor. In France, however, this influence was only sufficient to _modify_ without obscuring the features of an essentially national school. Independence in matters of art has always been a marked characteristic of the French; they have led rather than followed. The most distinguished names in the history of French opera have been those of foreign birth, but whatever their nationalities, all give evidence of the effect exerted upon them by the definite form, the clearness of dramatic intention demanded by the canons of French taste.

=Origin of French Opera=.—As the Italian opera was derived from the classical tragedy, so the _French opera_ had its _origin_ in the _Ballet_, the favorite form of amusement in France. The French Ballet of the 17th century was by no means confined to the dance; it was a heterogeneous mingling of dances and dialogues, songs and choruses, corresponding to the English Masque. Like the early operas in Italy, their spectacular features were on a large and expensive scale, which confined them to occasions of especial festivity at court or among the nobility. The taste for dancing had much to do with the direction taken by the opera in France; it is still characteristic of the French school, as is shown by the prominent place given to the ballet in the Grand Opera.

=Lully=.—The founder of the French school, =Jean Baptiste Lully= (1633-1687), was Italian by birth, but at the age of thirteen he was taken from his native city, Florence, to France, as a page in the service of the Chevalier de Guise. His musical gifts soon won him a place in the royal band and finally the post of court composer. He first wrote ballets in which the King (Louis XIV) himself danced, and later turned his attention to the opera.

=Italian Opera in France=.—Italian opera had already been heard in France. Through Cardinal Mazarin, an opera company from Venice had visited Paris in 1645, and two years later Peri's _Euridice_ had been given also by a Venetian troupe; but these and later performances had aroused no attempts at imitation by French composers. They contented themselves with writing ballets which were performed as intermezzos between the acts of Italian operas in order to bring them nearer the French standards of taste. The superior vocal ability of the Italians was acknowledged, but the lack of rhythmic form in their music made an unfavorable impression. The king was passionately fond of dancing; he and his courtiers frequently took part in the ballets produced at court, hence the interest lay in the drama as illustrated by the dance rather than by song.

=Beginning of French Opera=.—The first French opera to receive public performance was _Pomone_ (Pomona), in 1671, by =Robert Cambert= (1628-1677), who had previously written several others which had been performed only in private. It awakened

much more interest than the Italian operas which thus far had been heard in Paris, and incited Lully to the composition of his first opera, _Les Fêtes de l'Amour et Bacchus_ (The Feasts of Love and Bacchus), which was produced the following year. From that time until his death he composed fifteen operas, which determined the form of French opera for practically a century.

=Characteristics of Lully's Operas=.—Lully's operas, like those of the Florentine school, were on the whole _declamatory_ in style, and like them their subjects were generally taken from classical mythology. They are destitute of the sustained melody which appeared somewhat later in the Neapolitan school; but the recitatives are so skilfully varied in rhythm and show such intimate knowledge of the genius of the French language that in dramatic effect they are far superior to those of the earlier school. To the overture, the ballet, the chorus, he assigned music of a different type, rhythmic and formal in nature, thus relieving the monotony of an exclusively declamatory style. A master of stagecraft, his operas abounded in cunningly-devised spectacles and original scenic effects which excited wonder and held the attention. In short, so far as the means of the times allowed, we find in the Lully operas the well-considered balance between the musical and dramatic elements still characteristic of the French school.

=The French Overture=.—One of Lully's greatest services was the elaboration of the Overture into a larger and more dignified form. The Italians had never paid much attention to the overture. At first it appeared only as a _brief instrumental prelude_, sometimes but a few measures in length. The introduction to Monteverde's _Orfeo_, for example, consists of only nine measures which the composer directs to be played over three times to serve as overture. Later it was somewhat _extended_ in length and provided with some regularity of design, but the Overture as a fixed form dates from Lully. It began with an impressive slow movement, followed by an Allegro in fugue style. Sometimes this was all; but it generally concluded with another slow movement, often one of the stately, dignified dance tunes of the day, and often merely a repetition of the Introduction. This form was known as the French Overture, and was soon adopted by composers of all nationalities. About the middle of the 18th century it was supplanted by the Italian Overture, perfected by Scarlatti, and described in Lesson XIX.

=The Prologue=.—The overture was commonly followed by a Prologue. This had nothing to do with the action of the drama; it introduced mythological and allegorical characters who danced and sang, often paying the most fulsome adulation to the king, who was compared to the most celebrated heroes of mythology and antiquity. After the prologue, either the overture was repeated, or another and a shorter one was played. This pseudo-classical type of opera naturally flourished in the artificial atmosphere of the court on which it was dependent for favor. It lasted until the time of Gluck, when the influences which led to the great uprising of the people in the latter part of the 18th century swept it away with other traditions and conventions.

=Rameau=.—Until we come to =Jean Philippe Rameau= (1683-1764), none of Lully's successors succeeded in definitely extending the limits he had fixed. Rameau had won the name of the first theoretician of the day, and was a man of fifty when his first opera, _Hippolyte et Aricie_, was produced. Even he made no essential change in the scheme established by Lully beyond greatly enlarging the sphere of the orchestra, originating novel rhythms and bolder harmonies. This was, however, a long step in advance, since it saved the opera from sinking to the level of a dull, mechanical imitation of Lully's methods, into which contemporary composers had fallen.

=The English School=.—Italian music, in the form of the Madrigal, had been popular in England since the time of its introduction in 1598, by =Thomas Morley= (1557-1604). Native composers immediately took it into favor, a favor it has never lost; madrigals are still composed and sung in England, though elsewhere the form has been dead for nearly two centuries. The declamatory opera of the early Italian school, however, never took root. It was, as we have seen, primarily a drama in which music played a secondary part, and as such it was far too crude and lacking in human interest to appeal to a public accustomed to the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, and whose taste in music, moreover, was rather for melody than for recitative. Then, during the Protectorate, the Puritanical spirit which led to the destruction of church organs and for a time forbade all theatrical performances proved an insuperable obstacle to any development of dramatic music.

=The First English Operas=.—In 1656, Sir William Davenant, the playwright and theatrical manager, evaded this prohibition by introducing music into his plays and calling them operas. Much of this music, which was in the form of incidental songs, choruses and instrumental interludes, was written by =Henry Lawes= (1595-1662) and =Matthew Lock= (——d. 1677). The latter is well known for his music to "Macbeth," which up to within a few years was not infrequently heard in performances of the tragedy. These so-called operas had little or no effect on the development of a native school. They are principally noteworthy in being the first English operas and the first theatrical performances in England in which women appeared on the stage. Previously the parts of women had been played by boys.

=Influence of the French School=.—At the Restoration in 1660, Charles II found the prevailing style of music in England but little to his taste. Fond of the gay measures and lively dances of the French opera, in 1664 he sent =Pelham Humfrey= (1647-1674), the most talented of the boys forming the choir in the Chapel Royal, to Paris to study with Lully. Three years later he returned, and became the teacher of England's greatest composer.

=Henry Purcell=.—This was =Henry Purcell= (1658-1695), one of a family of musicians of whom he stands first. As a child he is said to have composed anthems while a chorister in the Chapel Royal, and at the age of twenty-two he composed his first opera, _Dido and Eneas_, a most remarkable work for a youth of his years. It is the only one of his dramatic works in which there is _no spoken dialogue_, its place being supplied by recitative, and therefore, strictly speaking, it was his only opera. He can never have seen an opera of this type; his acquaintance with the new style must have been largely based on what Humfrey had told him of such performances in Paris, though it is possible that he had the opportunity of studying Lully's scores. In its union of dramatic feeling and characterization with depth of musical resource, _Dido and Eneas_ was far in advance of anything that had yet appeared in France or Italy. Though it shows the influence of the French school, the sturdy English character which distinguishes all of Purcell's music is plainly apparent.

[Illustration: HENRY PURCELL.]

=Purcell's Dramatic Works=.—It was followed by a large number of works for the stage, but these were in the main merely incidental music for dramas; among them Shakespeare's "Tempest," "Midsummer Night's Dream" (known as The Fairy Queen), Dryden's "King Arthur," the last being the most important and extended in form. Unfortunately, many of them have been lost; but enough remain to show that in Purcell's early death England lost the most original musical genius she ever possessed. He founded a distinctly national school which, for the lack of a successor of equal gifts, was destined to succumb to foreign influences.

=Their Characteristics=.—His melodies bear the freshness and spontaneity of the English Folk-song at a period when music was generally cultivated, before civil wars and religious bigotry had crushed the art spirit which, during the 16th century, had made the English people the leaders in musical progress. His recitatives show a vigor and an intuitive perception of dramatic effect unsurpassed by any of his contemporaries on the Continent. He was an accomplished contrapuntist and applied his knowledge of counterpoint with admirable results to sacred music, yet never allowed it to become obtrusive in his dramatic works. In these clear, expressive melody and vigorous declamation were the distinguishing features; his learning served only to secure a natural flow of the one and an appropriate setting for the other.

=The Masque=.—The precursor of the English opera was the Masque. Like the French Ballet, this was a dramatic entertainment consisting of dialogues, dances, songs, and choruses. The subject was allegorical or mythical in nature and the mounting of the most elaborate description. The leading poets and dramatists of the day wrote many masques. The most famous was Milton's "Masque of Comus," the music by Lawes, which was performed at Ludlow Castle in 1634. The music in these masques was at first designed merely to give variety to what was in the main a pleasure to the eye, but Purcell relieved it of this subordinate character by investing it with a weight and authority which made it an integral factor in the dramatic expression.

=Typical English Opera=.—He thus fixed the form of the _English opera_ as a _play with songs, choruses, ensembles_, etc., connected by _spoken dialogue_ instead of recitatives. The music, therefore, instead of carrying on the action, is confined to the more quiet situations of the drama, such as are naturally adapted to lyrical expression. The inflexibility of this form has doubtless had much to do with the lack of development in the English School of Opera compared with the remarkable growth of other schools which have abandoned the union of the spoken with the sung word in the serious opera.

=The Ballad Opera=.—The only characteristic creation of the English school is the Ballad Opera. This had its origin in "The Beggar's Opera," produced in 1728. Slight in texture, it was simply a play with songs set to the most popular ballad tunes of the day. Its extraordinary success in the face of the financial failure of Italian opera left no doubt as to the real taste of the English people, and was decisive as to the direction taken by later composers, such as =Sir Henry Bishop= (1786-1855), =Michael Balfe= (1808-1870), =Arthur Sullivan= (1842-1901).

REFERENCES.

Davy.—History of English Music.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

What circumstances attended the spread of the Italian Opera?

Which European country was the next to take up Opera?

Who was the founder of this new school?

What efforts had been made prior to his appearance?

Describe Lully's opera form.

Describe the French Overture.

Describe the Prologue.

Who was Lully's successor?

What prevented the spread of the principles of the early Italian Opera in England?

Give names of men connected with the early history of Opera in England.

Give an account of Purcell and his works.

What was the Masque?

Describe the typical English Opera. The Ballad Opera.

The pupil will note that the development of French Opera took place in the reign of Louis XIV, and that it was after the restoration of Charles II in England that opera began there, Purcell's work ending with the close of the 17th century.

LESSON XXII.

THE OPERA IN GERMANY. HANDEL AND GLUCK.

=Opera in Germany=.—The introduction of the opera into Germany dates from 1627. In that year a German translation of Rinuccini's _Dafne_, which, it will be remembered, was the text of Peri's first opera, was set to music by =Heinrich Schuetz= (1585-1672) and performed on the occasion of the wedding of the Landgraf of Hesse. Schütz, who also composed the first German oratorio, _Die Auferstehung Christi_ (The Resurrection of Christ), had been sent by the Landgraf to study in Italy in 1609, only two years after the production of Monteverde's _Orfeo_. The score of his _Dafne_ has been lost, but it was doubtless in accordance with the principles of the Florentine school. The Thirty Years' War and its lamentable consequences prevented any immediate development of the new form. Occasional productions of Italian opera were given in several German cities, but it was not until the establishment of the Hamburg opera late in the century that the new musical movement gained a permanent footing in Germany. Even then its popularization proceeded but slowly.

[Illustration: HEINRICH SCHUETZ.]

=German Composers Barred=.—It is true that not long after the beginning of the 18th century, great interest was manifested in Italian opera at a number of courts, Berlin and Dresden in particular, but this had _no influence_ in the formation of a _national school_. Its effect indeed was the exact contrary. Singers and composers were brought from Italy; among the cultivated classes opera in German was considered a barbarism, so that native musicians met with little or no encouragement in this field. They were obliged to write their operas to an Italian text if they wished a hearing for them; the Church alone was freely open to German composers. The Church, too, was the only place where the people could hear music; public concerts were unknown and, save at Hamburg, the opera could be heard only by invitation to those who had entrée to court circles. This led to the remarkable activity in the production of sacred music which is such a feature of that period. This also, as shown by the early history of the Hamburg opera, was more in consonance with German character than the light, ephemeral operas which ruled the Italian stage.

=Characteristics of the Early German Opera=.—The Hamburg opera house was opened in 1678 with a Biblical _Singspiel_ (literally song-play) of an allegorical nature, _Adam und Eva; oder der erschaffene, gefallene und wieder aufgerichtete Mensch_ (Adam and Eve; or the Created, Fallen and Redeemed Man) by =Johann Theile= (1646-1724) a noted organist of the day and a pupil of Schütz. This was the first performance of a German opera on a public stage. The _Singspiel_ corresponds to the English ballad

opera in being a series of songs, ensembles, etc., mainly of a simple nature, connected by spoken dialogue. The curious taste of the time is shown by the choice of subject; the work itself was a survival of the Miracle Plays and Mysteries of the Middle Ages. It begins with the creation of the earth, which is formed out of chaos by characters representing the four elements; the Almighty descends by means of a flying machine and calls man into being; Lucifer succeeds in his temptation of Eve to the great joy of demons who sing an exulting chorus, etc. As the Italians took the subjects for their early operas from classical mythology, so the _Germans took_ theirs from _Bible history_. _Adam and Eve_ was followed by a series of similar _Singspiele_: _Michal and David_, _The Maccabean Mother_, _Esther_, _Cain and Abel_, and many others.

=Change of Character=.—In time, however, these gave way to operas in the Italian style. The chief agent in this change was =Reinhard Keiser= (1674-1739) who, as composer and manager, brought the Hamburg opera to its highest point. Associated with him was =Johannes Mattheson= (1681-1764), a man of many and varied gifts as singer, composer, conductor, scholar and diplomat, now chiefly remembered by his close relations with =George Frederic Handel= (1685-1759). The latter at the age of eighteen came from his native city, Halle, to Hamburg, then the musical centre of Germany, to continue his studies. Mattheson recognized the youth's genius and opened the way for the performance of his first opera, _Almira_.

=Handel and the Hamburg Opera=.—This, with _Nero_, was given in 1705 with such success that Keiser, jealous of the young composer, set them both to music himself and banished his rival's works from the stage. Handel thereupon withdrew and the year following went to Italy, where he spent several years. His connection with the Hamburg opera was too slight for him to have exercised any influence upon it; then, too, he had not yet reached artistic independence himself, and it is doubtful whether he would have made any change in the direction it was taking toward conventionalized Italian opera. At that time the Hamburg opera was rapidly losing its national character; the style mainly cultivated was that of the Neapolitan school; a tasteless mingling of languages was even allowed in one and the same opera—the recitatives were often sung in German and the arias in Italian. This decadence continued, with a consequent loss of popular favor, until in 1738 opera in German was given up entirely, and Italian opera reigned triumphant in Germany.

=The Conventionalized Italian Opera=.—Handel, on his return from Italy, finally found his way to England, where he made his home for the rest of his life. The series of operas he produced there form the _climax of the type originated by Scarlatti_, which by this time flourished on all stages to the exclusion of all others, save in France, where the ideals of Lully and his school still prevailed. Its chief aim was to afford singers an opportunity to display their accomplishments. To this end the composer directed his attention principally to the production of arias which should correspond to this demand. Exquisitely beautiful as these often were, their preponderance completely obscured the dramatic significance of the opera, and led the singers to entertain grossly exaggerated ideas of their importance. They dictated to composers, refused to sing what in their opinion failed to suit their voices, and in many ways kept the opera from rising above the low artistic level to which it had fallen. To please them, a highly artificial scheme of arrangement was adopted to which the drama was totally subservient. Only six characters were allowed, three men and three women; the arias were strictly classified according to style and assigned to the singers in a certain fixed order; no ensemble beyond a duet was permitted, and the chorus sang only in the closing finale. No matter what the dramatic exigencies might be, adherence to these formulæ was rigidly exacted.

=Handel's Operas=.—Though Handel infused a vigor of spirit and a wealth of characteristic melody into this form of opera, he made no definite attempt to escape its restrictions. Many of his most beautiful creations are buried in operas which are dead beyond possibility of resurrection on account of his acquiescence in the sentiment of his times. That this is not due to lack of innate power is shown by his oratorios.

[Illustration: CHRISTOPH WILLIBALD GLUCK.]

=Gluck and His Reform of the Opera=.—This so-called concert opera reigned with almost undisputed sway until the influence of =Christoph Willibald Gluck= (1714-1787) wrought a momentous change. Persuaded of the low estate to which the opera had been reduced, Gluck stood for a return to first principles; he advocated a ruthless sacrifice of the conventionalities which through the vanity of singers and the love of sensation on the part of the public had grown up around the opera and the placing of it upon its original foundation of the drama. He was a man of mature years when in 1762 he put his theories into practice by the production of _Orfeo_ in Vienna. He had composed many operas in the prevailing Italian style, but his judgment, formed by extensive study and travel, convinced him of the essential weakness of that school: its concentration upon the purely musical element. This he saw made of the opera a puppet-show for the display of vocal art which, great as it was from a technical point of view, was mechanical and meretricious in character. He was not alone in his condemnation; critics and thinkers such as Addison and Steele in England,

Diderot in France, Marcello and Algarotti in Italy had employed the varied resources of wit, satire and reason to expose the follies and inconsistencies of the opera. From the nature of the case, however, they could work no change; most of them were literary men who could criticise but not create.

=Gluck's Travels and their Influence=.—Gluck had traveled much. There was hardly an art-centre in Europe from Copenhagen to Naples which he had not visited for the purpose of bringing out his works. In England, he had heard Handel's oratorios, which profoundly impressed him; in Paris, he had made acquaintance with Rameau's operas. Both of these masters exercised a strong influence over his change of style; the former by his powerful handling of the chorus which had been practically banished from the Italian stage, the latter by his consistent adherence to dramatic truth of expression. He was in addition a zealous student of art and literature in all their phases; he brought to his problem not only the ear of the musician but the intellect of the scholar.

"=Orfeo=."—In _Orfeo_, Gluck took the same stand which Peri had taken in his opera on the same myth a century and a half before: the _illustration of the drama through music_ which should give it a poignancy of expression denied to the spoken word. The later composer had the immense advantage of musical resources undreamed-of at the time of the Florentine opera, but both stand upon the same artistic platform. It was a daring task that Gluck had attempted. Orpheus, robbed by death of Euridice, seeks to regain her by forcing entrance to the place of departed spirits. On his descent to the nether world he is confronted by a band of demons who bar his way, but finally melted to tears by the pathos of his song, they allow him to pass. The composer must make this appeal adequate to the effect; anything less would result in an anti-climax totally disastrous to dramatic illusion. Gluck passed this test triumphantly. Even today this scene remains one of the most powerful known to the operatic stage. _Orfeo_, in its strength and simplicity, was so opposed to the taste of the day that its victory was by no means unquestioned, but it soon won universal recognition and with its successor, _Alceste_ (1767), is the oldest opera heard at the present day.

=Gluck in Paris=.—_Alceste_ was followed by _Paride ed Elena_ (Paris and Helen), but the severity of the new style aroused such a storm of hostile criticism that the discouraged composer turned to Paris with his _Iphigenie en Aulide_ (Iphigenia in Aulis) to a French text after Racine's tragedy. Marie Antoinette, then the wife of the Dauphin, had been his pupil in Vienna, and through her influence the opera was produced, though not without arousing one of the most bitter wars in musical annals. Twelve years before, Italian _Opera Buffa_ had gained a footing in Paris. Its lightness, melodic grace, and witty dramatic situations captivated many who immediately attacked the prevailing type of French opera, of which Rameau was the head, as heavy and unmusical. This opinion was strenuously combated by others who upheld native art. Thus there were two strongly-opposed parties, one defending the Italian, the other the French school of opera. After Rameau's death, the Italian party was in the ascendency, but on Gluck's arrival with a French opera he was taken as the representative of the national school. Piccini, the most popular Italian composer of the day, was pitted against him, but it needed only the production of Gluck's _Iphigenie en Tauride_ (Iphigenia in Tauris) to crush his rival's claims. This was his last great work. He retired to Vienna, which was his home until his death.

=Influence of Gluck=.—The influence exerted by Gluck was far-reaching and permanent. The reform he initiated did not create a school—it did far more; it _profoundly affected all schools_. With no immediate followers among the composers of his time he stood alone, as he stands today, one of the most commanding figures in musical history. His _Orfeo_ marks the beginning of a new era by rescuing a great and important form of art from a decadence which had robbed it of legitimate power and effect. The opera more than any other form of music is dependent upon popular favor for existence. It is therefore peculiarly susceptible to influences which tend to lower artistic standards. Gluck, however, made it impossible that it should ever again sink to the level of the mass of crudities and puerilities from which he lifted it.

REFERENCE.

Oxford History of Music, Vol. IV.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Give an account of the introduction of opera into Germany.

Why did German composers develop slowly?

Describe the early German opera forms.

Who was the chief agent in a change?

Give an account of Handel's work in connection with German opera.

What had been the influence of singers?

What were the influences to cause Gluck to set about opera reform?

Give an account of "Orfeo."

Why did Gluck go to Paris and what success did he have there?

What was the influence of Gluck upon the future of the opera?

It will be noted that the Thirty Years' War in Germany interfered with the development of the Opera. Frederick the Great's grandfather and father laid the foundations of the Prussian kingdom. In France, Gluck's works carry us up to the period of social and political agitation preceding the French Revolution. In England, the House of Hanover is becoming more firmly established on the throne; in America, the period is that of the struggles between the French and English colonists.

LESSON XXIII.

MOZART TO ROSSINI.

=The Opera after Gluck=.—After Gluck the first great name is that of =Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart= (1756-1791). Haydn had indeed written a number of operas, but they were, in the main, light in character and exercised no influence whatever on the development of the form. At the age of twelve, Mozart had composed two operas, but the first to receive public performance was _Mitridate, Re di Ponto_ (Mithridates, King of Pontus), which was produced at Milan two years later under his own direction. This was followed by others, but these early works do not call for any extended mention. Though they abound in melody and show a maturity remarkable in so young a composer, they were frankly written to please the taste of the time and do not in any essentials depart from the accepted Italian style then in favor, as fixed by Scarlatti and his contemporaries.

=Gluck and Mozart Compared=.—It was not until _Idomeneo, Re di Creta_ (Idomeneus, King of Crete) was brought out during the Carnival season of 1781, that he demonstrated fully the gifts which made him the first dramatic composer of his time. In this he shows a great advance over the conventional opera of the period and an approach to the ideals of Gluck, though neither in _Idomeneo_ nor in any of his later operas did he attempt to embody these ideals in the uncompromising form chosen by the older master. Though contemporaries, no two composers could well be more unlike in character, temperament and methods than Gluck and Mozart. The one, a man of years, ripened through travel and study, conditioned his music according to the requirements of the drama; the other, a youth of no great intellectual endowments aside from his art, but aflame with the fire of genius, felt the drama in terms of music. Thus they approached the task from opposite sides. Not that Gluck was without feeling or Mozart without intellect; it was simply a case of the dramatist and the musician solving the problem each in his own way. At the same time it was impossible that Gluck's theories should be entirely without influence on Mozart. Even a genius must learn from his environment, and Gluck's position, though sharply disputed by the Italian school to which Mozart belonged, could not be ignored by the younger man. Then, too, Mozart had been in Paris during the height of the Gluck-Piccini controversy, and it is known that he had made a close study of _Alceste_, to which Gluck, in the form of a dedication to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, had given a preface containing a clear exposition of his principles of dramatic composition. It is hard to say, however, what direction Mozart's dramatic course might have taken had his life not been cut so pitilessly short and if his outward circumstances had been less constrained. He was obliged to adapt himself to Italian influences which at that time were all powerful.

=The Singspiel=.—As already mentioned, the first attempts at German opera took the form of the _Singspiel_, but it gradually died out during the invasion of Italian opera in Germany. Its revival and development to a higher standard was due to =Johann Adam Hiller= (1728-1804), who received his first impulse through an English ballad opera of a farcical nature, "The Devil to Pay." This was translated into German and given (1743) at Berlin with the original English melodies taken from popular ballads. Hiller set this translation to music and followed it with many others which soon acquired great vogue; one or two, for example, _Der Dorfbarbier_ (The Village Barber), are still heard in Germany. Hiller, though one of the most learned musicians of the day, the founder of the celebrated Gewandhaus Concerts in Leipzig and editor of the first musical periodical ever published, adopted a simple, natural Folk-style in these operettas, as they were also called. Goethe was particularly interested in this revival of a national form of opera; it stimulated him to the writing of the ballads which in turn acted so powerfully in developing the German song under the hands of Loewe, Schubert, Schumann and others.

=Mozart's First German Opera=.—Emperor Joseph II, wishing to establish the _Singspiel_ in Vienna, commissioned Mozart to write a German opera of a similar style. This resulted in _Die Entführung aus dem Serail_ (The Elopement from the Seraglio), and the composer's hopes of founding a national school of opera were high. Unfortunately, he was doomed to disappointment. Though _Die Entführung_ was received with enthusiasm, popular favor was averse to opera in any other tongue than Italian; the German theatre was open only a few years and with the exception of _Die Zauberflöte_, his future operas were composed to Italian texts.

=His Later Operas=.—_Le Nozze di Figaro_ (The Marriage of Figaro—1786), _Don Giovanni_ (Don Juan—1788), _Die Zauberflöte_ (The Magic Flute—1791) rank as Mozart's greatest operas. Considered as music alone, the last reaches a height which gives an idea of what he might have done in nationalizing the opera if he had been spared a score of years longer; but its confused, irrational plot stands in the way of its popularization. The same objection holds good of _Così fan Tutte_ (Women are All Alike—1790), which contains some of his most exquisite music.

=Characteristics of Mozart's Operas=.—Mozart's _conception_ of the opera is that of the _musician_, _not_ of the _dramatist_. This is plain from the indifferent texts he willingly accepted, yet so universal was his genius that he fused the two elements into a complete and consistent whole. Such a union of clearly-cut characterization and musical beauty is unknown in the opera. He made his _characters eternal types_ by means of music so apposite to their individuality that it seems in each case to spring from inward necessity, yet which as music has never been surpassed for intrinsic grace and charm. Italian melody in its best estate on a foundation of German depth and solidity is its distinguishing characteristic. This characterization is confined, however, to details and personages; of the development of the drama as a whole he apparently had but little idea. This, however, was not called for by the taste of the times; the opera was not considered from a dramatic standpoint, save by Gluck and the composers of the French school; the libretto furnished a series of situations suitable for musical illustration, not a consistent and logical dramatic action.

=Their Significance to German Art=.—Mozart marks the highest point reached by the opera of the 18th century; he also _marks the passing of Italian supremacy in Germany_. The Germans were already masters of the other great forms, the Oratorio and the Symphony; Gluck and Mozart captured the Opera also for Germany, though it was not for several decades after Mozart's death that German opera rose from its discredited position at the close of the century.

=Beethoven's Fidelio=.—A mighty impulse was given to the development of a national school by the production of _Fidelio_ (1805), Beethoven's only opera. His two great predecessors had been obliged for the most part to write their operas to French and Italian texts. =Beethoven= (1770-1827), however, showed his independence and sturdy national character by choosing a subject totally alien to the frivolous intrigues which at that time ruled the Viennese stage—a story of heroic, wifely devotion—and composed it to German words and in the German style; that is, with dialogue instead of recitative. Essentially symphonic in character, _Fidelio_ shows the same disregard of vocal limitations which characterizes the Ninth Symphony and the Mass in D. Difficult for the singers, it was still more difficult for the public. In subject and treatment it was above their heads; they turned it the cold shoulder and it soon disappeared from the boards. An appreciation of its greatness was reserved for a later day.

=Italian Composers in France and Germany=.—The popularity of Italian opera outside of Italy led to the expatriation of many Italian composers who exercised a powerful influence in France and Germany. Among these =Antonio Salieri= (1750-1825) deserves mention for his career in Vienna, where he was the successful rival of Mozart in court favor and later the teacher of Beethoven. More important was =Luigi Cherubini= (1760-1842), who found his way to Paris just before the Revolution. A master of the severe contrapuntal school, which was then passing away, Beethoven considered him the first composer of the day for the stage and studied his works zealously. Cherubini was present at the first performance of _Fidelio_, which shows strong traces of the influence exerted upon Beethoven by _Les Deux Journées_ (The Two Days, known in Germany and England as The Water Carrier), Cherubini's greatest opera. The two were on intimate terms during the stay of the latter in Vienna for the purpose of bringing out several of his operas. There was much in common between them; the Italian had the solidity, dignity and nobility of treatment generally associated with the German character. Beethoven's choice of a subject for his opera was doubtless influenced by _Les Deux Journées_; the themes of both are much the same, involving devotion and self-sacrifice of the highest order.

=Spontini and Rossini=.—Another Italian composer who went first to France and afterward to Germany was =Gasparo Spontini= (1774-1851), who with _La Vestale_ (The Vestal) enlarged the sphere of the opera in Paris. Spectacular and pompous in character, sonorous and powerful in instrumentation, it pointed directly to the type of grand opera originated by Meyerbeer nearly a generation later. In 1820, he was summoned to Berlin, where he remained as court composer and conductor for twenty-two years, a period coincident with the most significant development of the German school of opera. Spontini was the last of the many Italians who had for a century and a half borne almost uninterrupted sway in Germany.

The most brilliant and gifted of all these wandering sons of Italy was =Gioacchino Rossini= (1792-1868). As rich in melody as Mozart, though of a less refined type, he owed more to nature than to study. His first successful opera, _Tancredi_ (1813), set all Italy agog with the freshness and vivacity of its airs, and it was not long before he was the most popular composer in Europe. Gifted with prodigious facility—in one period of eight years he wrote twenty operas—his operas ruled all stages and fixed the standard by which all others were judged.

[Illustration: GIOACCHINO ROSSINI.]

=Characteristics of Rossini's Operas=.—They are, on the whole, a _reversion_ to the conventionalized opera of Handel's time in being written for the singer to exhibit his art and not to express the significance of the drama; this notwithstanding their undoubted charm, the many piquant and original touches in rhythm and harmony, the occasional suggestive instrumentation. An intensely _florid style_ is used not only in the _buffa_ school where it can readily be justified, but in operas of a tragic nature where it is manifestly out of place. In _Semiramide_, for instance, a story of battle, murder and sudden death is told in the same rippling rhythms and highly ornamented melodies that illustrate the intrigues of his _Barbiere di Siviglia_ (Barber of Seville), where they are eminently appropriate.

=His Change of Style=.—This is true, however, only of his works composed for the Italian stage. His _Guillaume Tell_ (William Tell), produced in 1829, five years after his arrival in Paris, showed the influence of his new environment by an almost startling change of style. Elevated and dramatic in treatment, shorn of redundant ornament as befits the character of the subject—taken from Schiller's play of the same name—it remains his greatest achievement; at least in serious opera. It was also his last work for the stage. It is not known by what strange caprice he practically closed his career as composer at the age of thirty-nine.

REFERENCE.

Oxford History of Music, Vol. V.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Name the most prominent successor of Gluck in opera.

Compare the two.

Describe the Singspiel.

Name some of Mozart's operas.

Mention their characteristics and influence.

Give an account of Beethoven's work in Opera.

Tell about Salieri, Cherubini, Spontini, Rossini.

Give the characteristics of Rossini's operas.

What change in his style is evident in "William Tell"?

We now approach the period preceding the American and the French Revolutions which so greatly affected the masses of Europe, an influence extended by the wars of Napoleon. Music shows traces of the powerful forces at work, losing the former artificiality and becoming more and more, in the hands of Beethoven, an expression of dramatic and personal feeling.

LESSON XXIV.

THE ORATORIO.

=Oratorio in Italy after Carissimi=.—After the beginning made by Carissimi, the next work of importance in Oratorio is that of =Alessandro Scarlatti=, who established the Aria form as explained in the study of the Opera. The composers of the Italian school of the last part of the 17th and the early part of the 18th century used practically the same methods in Opera and Oratorio, the difference being mainly in the character of the text, and in the earnestness or religious feeling of the composer. Scarlatti is also signalized by his improvements in the Recitative, which resulted in several forms made use of by his successors, _Recitativo

Secco_ and Accompanied Recitative. He wrote ten oratorios. Contemporaries whose work should be mentioned are =Antonio Caldara= (1678-1763) and =Leonardo Leo= (1694-1746), a pupil of Scarlatti, who wrote nearly a hundred works for the church, the chief one being the oratorio, _Santa Elena al Calvario_ and a _Miserere_ for a double choir. He was strong in his writing for chorus, making splendid use of the fugal style. Another contemporary of the first rank was =Alessandro Stradella= (1645-1681), whose oratorio, _San Giovanni Battista_ (St. John the Baptist) is a most beautiful work. It contains a free treatment of the accompanying instruments, the arias are clear and well-designed, the chorus writing for five parts is effective as well as ingenious, and the work as a whole shows considerable power of dramatic expression, forming a sort of transition between Scarlatti and Handel. Stradella is said to have been a pupil of Carissimi.

=Oratorio in Germany=.—In Oratorio as in Opera, the style spread to other countries, there, in the case of the Oratorio, ultimately to find a more congenial home; for the Oratorio, in Italy after the time of Stradella, seemed to lose hold on composers and public. The latter did not grasp the fact that the Oratorio had within it one element, the chorus, to give to it a definite individuality. They submitted to the public's preference for solo singing and made up their oratorios largely of conventional arias—thus inviting comparison with the Opera, and reserved their writing in choral form for their works for the Church service, such as psalms, magnificats, masses and motets. In Germany, the attitude of the people toward religious music, doubtless owing to the Reformation as well as to the serious nature of the people, was much more favorable than in Italy. This temperament is shown by the fact that when German composers cast about for themes for their oratorios they seemed to choose the story of the Passion. The oldest example of the German Oratorio is "The Resurrection of Christ," written by =Heinrich Schuetz= (1585-1672), a pupil of Giovanni Gabrieli, which was produced at Dresden in 1623. The narrative portions were committed almost entirely to the chorus. We mention also a setting of the Passion, by =Johann Sebastiani=, published in 1672, which contains interspersed chorales, sung as arias by one voice with violin accompaniment, and by =Reinhard Keiser= (1674-1739).

=Use of the Chorale=.—A step in advance was taken when German composers began to use the chorale of the German Protestant Church as the subject for contrapuntal elaboration, a tendency shown in the work of Sebastiani referred to in the preceding paragraph. The Chorale had absorbed into itself the spirit of the Volkslied, and its use supplied the medium for the public to enter fully into the spirit of the oratorio. Two composers who developed the "Passion Music" idea to its height, =Karl Heinrich Graun= (1701-1759) and =Johann Sebastian Bach=, made the Chorale an integral part of their works. The greatest work in oratorio form written by Graun was called _Der Tod Jesu_ (The Death of Jesus), which was first produced in the Cathedral at Berlin in 1755. This work consists of recitatives, airs and choruses, the fugal treatment of the latter being admirable in point of clearness of design and breadth of form. Graun used in this oratorio six chorales. _Der Tod Jesu_, owing to a bequest, is still given in Berlin.

=Bach=.—The greatest of all the settings of the Passion are those by =Johann Sebastian Bach= (1685-1750). The first work in this style by Bach was the one according to "St. John," in 1723, first performed on Good Friday, 1724, at Leipzig. This work, fine as it is, must yield to the second setting, according to "St. Matthew," first produced on Good Friday, 1729, afterward revised and given again in 1740. A few notes on the "Passion according to St. Matthew" will serve for both works. The characters introduced are Jesus, Judas, Peter, Pilate, the Apostles and the People. Certain reflections on the narrative are interpreted by a chorus. The text which furnishes the narrative is assigned to the principal tenor. Fifteen chorales of the Lutheran Church are introduced, and in the singing of these the general congregation was expected to join. The choruses contain powerful and dramatic vocal effects, and though not strictly fugal are intricate in their part-writing. A double chorus is used, each chorus having a separate orchestra and organ accompaniment. The performance of this work (St. Matthew Passion) was restricted to Leipzig in the 18th century, and was discontinued altogether in the 19th until Mendelssohn revived it in 1829. It is given very frequently at the present day during the Lenten season, in part or in full. The "Christmas Oratorio" (1734) is really a series of cantatas for each of the first days of the Christmas week, and contains no new ideas so far as form is concerned.

=Stabat Mater=.—In connection with the "Passion" reference should be made to the Latin hymn, "Stabat Mater," which has been made the subject of treatment in oratorio form, by =Palestrina=, =Giovanni Battista Pergolesi= (1710-1736) for soprano and contralto accompanied by strings and organ, =Emanuele d'Astorga= (1681-1736) for four voices with instrumental accompaniment, the more modern work, in large form, by =Gioacchino Rossini= (1792-1868), most beautiful as music if partaking too much, as critics say, of the sensuous, and the magnificent setting of =Antonin Dvo■ák= (1841-1904). This work has been placed, by musicians and the public, in the category of the world's masterpieces of choral writing.

=George Friedrich Handel= (1685-1759).—We now come to Bach's contemporary, the greatest name in the history of the Oratorio, to the composer who brought to his work a musical learning equal to that of Bach, German earnestness and mastery of contrapuntal science, tempered by knowledge of and experience in Italian vocal methods, producing simple, clear melody

supported by rich, firm harmonies, a complete mastery of the orchestra of the day, a clear understanding of the value of the chorus in working out dramatic effects; and this combination was offered a congenial field for labor in England, one of the great Protestant countries of Europe, with a deep reverence for religion and for the narratives of the Bible and the truths and lessons they enforce. This latter point is strikingly present in the texts of Handel's oratorios; the symbolic meaning of the narrative is clearly indicated and made the central thought of the work, producing a remarkable effect of Unity. As a writer has said: "Handel preaches through the voices of his chorus." The orchestra for which Handel wrote was smaller than the full orchestra to which we are accustomed today. The proportion of string players to the whole number of players was smaller, but on the other side, more than two oboes and bassoons were used; flutes were most frequently used as solo instruments or to double the part of the oboes; the clarinet Handel never used, doubtless because of its imperfections, which were not remedied until later; the brass instruments used were trumpets with kettle drums for their natural bass, horns and the three trombones, alto, tenor and bass; other instruments of a soft-voiced quality, like the harp, viola da gamba, were occasionally used for obligato accompaniments. The organ was always used, the part being written according to the figured bass system, and the harpsichord was used by the conductor. The reader who is able to analyze one of Handel's oratorio scores will be surprised to note the superb effects he makes with comparatively small resources. Compared with the polyphonic writing of his predecessors and his great contemporary, Bach, his fugues seem light and simple, but that very thing gives them their admirable clearness and purity; compared with later works, his diatonic progressions and harmonies based on common chords seem colorless, especially so in contrast with the kaleidoscopic chromatic figures and strongly dissonant harmonies of the newer school; yet in this point is the strength of Handel's works with the public; simplicity is valued more highly than complexity, naturalness rather than the indications of science.

Handel wrote seventeen works that can be classed as oratorios. The first of these was "Esther," in 1720, revised and brought out anew in 1732. In 1733 "Deborah," perhaps best-known for a powerful double chorus, was offered to the public; "Athaliah" in the same year. In 1739 came "Saul" and "Israel in Egypt," the former best-known today for its famous "Dead March," the latter for the music descriptive of the plagues. In 1741, he wrote his greatest oratorio "The Messiah," which was first performed publicly, April 13, 1742, in Dublin. In this we find a certain reflective character which recalls the Passion music of the German school. The only other oratorio which is still given in anything like entirety is "Judas Maccabæus" (1747); other works from which certain portions are still in use are "Samson" (1743), "Solomon" (1749), "Theodora" (1750), a work which Handel considered his best, and "Jephtha" (1752). Great as was Handel's fame in England, the character of his works and the forms he used made little or no impression upon German and Italian composers. =Johann Adolph Hasse= (1699-1783), =Niccolo Porpora= (1686-1767), =Antonio Sacchini= (1734-1786), =Giovanni Paisiello= (1741-1816), =Niccolo Jommelli= (1714-1774) and =Pietro Guglielmi= (1727-1804) wrote in the Italian style, and their works are, properly speaking, concert oratorios, scarcely distinguishable from the opera save by the text.

=Franz Joseph Haydn=.—The next name of importance is that of Haydn (1732-1809), who wrote "The Creation" and "The Seasons" toward the end of a long life, after his work as a composer had given him a command of musical resources excelled only by Beethoven, who did not equal him in skill in writing effectively and suitably for voices. It was in 1798 that "The Creation" was first given in Vienna. The score abounds in effective writing for the solo voices, in the florid style and in the conventional aria form, and in brilliant choruses which, however, cannot compare in dignity and breadth with those of Handel. The orchestral accompaniments are much more elaborate than those used by Handel, as can naturally be expected from a composer who had given his greatest efforts to the development of instrumental music. "The Seasons" was first performed in Vienna in 1801. It proved as successful as "The Creation." Haydn's simple, genial nature is apparent in this beautiful work, really too light to bear the name of oratorio, which has such close association with works of a deep, religious character.

=Mozart and Beethoven=.—As the orchestra developed under the masters of tone and dramatic effects, Mozart, Gluck and Beethoven, so the works in oratorio form took on a different texture. In the earlier periods, the accompaniments were subordinate, the interest was centred in the voices. But as composers realized the possibilities of the constantly-improving orchestra and the opportunities for effective combinations of voices and instruments, the tendency became more and more marked to elaborate the instrumental parts and to create an ensemble more complicated and gorgeous, based upon the orchestra and its tone-color scheme rather than on pure vocal effects. =Mozart's= "Requiem" (1791), written just before the composer's death, brings into use the most powerful dramatic resources of orchestra and voices to portray the spirit of the "mass for the dead." In oratorio, as in opera, =Beethoven= wrote but one work, "The Mount of Olives" (1803). The style is florid and operatic, somewhat in the style of the Italian composers; the resources of the orchestra are drawn upon more extensively than marked the methods of Haydn. The chorus is freely used, the "Hallelujah" being the strongest movement. The choral movements in the Ninth Symphony suggest what Beethoven might have done had he set himself to writing an oratorio in greater submission to the capacity of the human voice.

=Spohr=.—From now on, oratorio composition is associated with the masters of instrumental music, the orchestra is drawn upon for its richest and most powerful resources to work out the emotional and dramatic qualities of the texts; it is now no longer a mere accompanying instrument; it is in the highest degree essential to the effects designed by the composer. =Ludwig Spohr= (1784-1859), a great violinist, wrote his first oratorio, "_Das Jüngste Gericht_" (The Last Judgment), when he was but twenty-eight years old. A later work produced in 1826, goes by the English name "The Last Judgment," although that is not the literal translation of the German title _Die Letzten Dinge_. In this work we find the romantic idea clearly in evidence. The composer's style had been developed and individualized by his long experience as player and conductor; he was a master of the resources of instrumentation, conversant both as composer and conductor with the limitations of voices—he wrote a number of operas—so that he was prepared for the creation of a work which has a character of its own. A striking feature of this oratorio is the frequent use of chromatic progressions, which is indeed a characteristic of Spohr's writing.

=Mendelssohn=.—The next great composer in Oratorio was a German; like him also his works had their greatest reception in England, =Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy= (1809-1847). His first work, "St. Paul," was given at Düsseldorf in 1836. His greatest oratorio, one that ranks with Handel's "Messiah" in public favor, is "Elijah," which was written for the Birmingham, England, Festival. It was first produced in 1846. As a diligent and enthusiastic student of Bach, it seems natural that Mendelssohn should have adopted the great master's methods. In style "St. Paul" and "Elijah" show leanings toward Bach and the German oratorio rather than toward Handel. Mendelssohn, who produced Bach's "Passion according to St. Matthew" in Berlin, in 1827, was thoroughly familiar with the plan of the German oratorio, a mingling of narrative, dramatic and meditative or reflective elements, and especially the Chorale to represent the Church, the chorus being, properly speaking, a part of the _dramatis personæ_, representing masses of people who share in the action, while the congregation represents the reflective element. He uses a fugal style quite freely in his choruses, but a strict fugue, in the style of Handel, is rare, as the composer's feeling for emotional effects demands a freer style; the accompaniments are elaborate, partaking of the dramatic element and drawing upon the fullest resources of the orchestra. Mendelssohn had started the composition of another oratorio, "Christus," on the lines of the "Passion" music of Bach, but died before the work was completed. His "Hymn of Praise" (1840), a large choral work that is occasionally sung, well represents Mendelssohn's skill in combining vocal and orchestral effect. Riemann calls it a symphony-cantata, Parry says it "combines the qualities of a symphony and of an oratorio."

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, articles on Oratorio and on composers named in this lesson.

Parry.—Evolution of the Art of Music, Chapters VII and XIII.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Give the names of the Italian composers who followed Carissimi in the Oratorio.

What contributed to make Germany a congenial field for Oratorio?

Who are the early composers of the "Passion" music?

Give an account of Bach's work in Oratorio.

Give the names of the leading composers of the "Stabat Mater."

Describe Handel's orchestra.

Mention Handel's most important works in Oratorio form.

Give an account of Haydn's work in Oratorio.

What works did Mozart and Beethoven write in Oratorio form?

Describe Spohr's work in Oratorio.

Where did Mendelssohn's work become most popular? Give an account of his compositions in Oratorio form.

The class should, if the works are at hand, read through the text of Bach's, Handel's, Haydn's, Spohr's and Mendelssohn's oratorios, all or as many as can be secured. Each pupil may be asked to write an account of one work.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A REVIEW OF LESSONS XVII TO XXIV.

The teacher or a pupil should study the subject of the Renaissance in a history of literature and also of art, and then present to the class an abstract of the study, to show the spirit of the movement and its influence on art, especially music.

Use the paragraph heads in each chapter with the important sentences in the paragraphs to make an outline of each lesson. This is a great help in fixing the lessons in the mind in preparing for examination.

Sum up Monteverde and his work, his relations to predecessors and successors.

Why did the centre shift from Florence to Venice?

Give a sketch of Scarlatti, his life and contributions to music.

If time will permit, some pupil should prepare a short account of such composers as Pergolesi, Porpora, Piccini and Paisiello.

Give a summary of the development of the art of Singing.

A pupil should consult Grove's "Dictionary" and make a paper on the great singers of the olden times, their personality; also interesting anecdotes.

Compare the Italian Opera with the form developed by Lully and Rameau.

In what respects did the English Opera differ from the Italian and French form?

State the characteristics of the German Opera.

Handel's work in Opera, especially in England, will make an interesting study for a short paper to be read before the class by some member of it.

Gluck's career is full of interest and incident and his growth is clearly a matter of experience. A pupil can, to advantage, study his life in some biography or in Grove's Dictionary and present an abstract to the class.

In what respects did Mozart's and Beethoven's operas show differences from the conventional Italian form?

A study of Rossini's life and works is full of interest, on account of his strong personality and striking characteristics.

What is "Passion Music"? Why is it specially suited to the German Protestant Church?

Compare Handel's, Haydn's, Spohr's and Mendelssohn's work in Oratorio.

Excellent results will be obtained by having pupils prepare charts which are filled up from lesson to lesson. Take a large sheet of paper, divide it into columns, each column into quarter sections, each column representing a century, each section, twenty-five years. Add dates of birth and death of the great musicians, marking each name I, F, G, to show nationality (Italian, French, German, etc.). Another chart should show the various national schools, France, Germany, Italy, etc., by centuries and quarter centuries; another the development of such phases as opera, oratorio, singing, sonata, etc.

A very valuable chart is one showing contemporaries, in musical and general history, also parallel events, for example, the musicians who lived in a certain century, famous kings, statesmen, explorers, poets, scientists, discoveries (such as America, printing, etc.), famous battles, events in Biblical and American history, and other political events of the same century. Credit should be given in class standing for these charts.

LESSON XXV.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE PIANOFORTE.

While the violin, on account of the simplicity of its construction, arrived early at a stage of perfection, the complicated mechanism of the pianoforte required many generations and many scores of more or less successful experiments to attain anything like a corresponding plane. Indeed, such experiments are still constantly in progress; so that the pianoforte of the future may conceivably realize possibilities as far ahead of the present piano as that is ahead of its predecessors. The first attempts at piano manufacture,

however, had little in common with our modern pianos, save the principle of the combination of the keyboard with strings; since in construction and resulting tone few points of similarity exist.

=Clavier a Substitute for the Organ=.—We are probably indebted to the extensive use of the organ for the earliest combinations of keys and strings. As the demand arose for a more conveniently-keyed instrument than the large church organs, for practice or private houses, small portable organs were invented; yet even these did not satisfy the want entirely, owing to the _difficulties in their wind supply_, which required an assistant as blower. Thus the organ keyboard came to be applied, as early as the 11th century, to already existing stringed instruments which were adapted to the purpose.

=Two Classes=.—There were two classes of these, each made on the principle of the zither: namely, by stretching strings over a flat surface or box, generally across bridges, this box serving as a resonator, to reinforce the weak tone of the strings. One such instrument, in which the strings were _struck by_ little wooden _hammers_, was called the Dulcimer; another, in which the strings were sounded by _plucking_ with the fingers or by a quill, was called the Psaltery; and from these two were developed the earliest instruments of the piano class, called by the general name of “Claviers,” from _Clavis_, a key. The dulcimer type resulted in the =Clavichord=; the psaltery type in the =Harpsichord=, and, although many other names were given to varieties of these instruments, all may be placed in one of the two classes of which they are the chief representatives.

[Illustration: CYMBALUM OR DULCIMER.]

[Illustration: PSALTERY.

This instrument also came in square and other forms; strings varied from 6 to 38.]

=Principle of the Clavichord=.—The first of the Clavichord instruments had the name of Monochord, or one-stringed instrument—a name of great antiquity, first given by the Grecian Pythagoras to an instrument of one string used by him in determining the relations of tones. Similar experiments were made in the Middle Ages, in which the various tones resulting from the vibrations of parts of a string were studied by means of movable bridges; facility was gained by increasing the number of strings to four or five, tuned in unison. Next, _keys_ were applied to these in place of the bridges, which keys _struck the strings at various_ definite _points_ by means of upright pins or _tangents_, as they were called, producing varying pitches, according to the length of the part of the string allowed to sound, the remaining segment being silenced by a piece of cloth. Thus several tangents struck the same string at different points, producing different degrees of pitch. At first, when only the scales corresponding to the white keys were employed, four or five strings sufficed to sound the necessary tones, not over twenty-two in number. Later, however, when chromatic notes were adopted, the number of strings and keys was increased, so that, by the beginning of the 16th century, the keyboard had a range of three or four full octaves. From this time on, this instrument, now generally known as the Clavichord, won a popularity which extended to the beginning of the 19th century, when the Pianoforte gradually displaced it. A familiar instrument in England and Germany, it was especially cultivated by musicians of note in the latter country, even the renowned Bach preferring it to all other forms of its class.

=The Clavichord=.—In shape, the Clavichord was an oblong box, the strings of brass extending lengthwise. The fact that one string served for several keys made it impossible to sound certain intervals together; yet the device of giving a separate string to each key seems not to have come in till about the year 1725, and even then not to have been generally adopted. Without legs, the Clavichord was supported on a table when in use. Its tone was exceedingly weak and tremulous, audible only within the distance of a few feet; yet the fact that this tone could be given different degrees of intensity, and could be varied to some extent even while sounding, by a peculiar pressure on the keys (_bebung_), imbued its tone with a sympathetic quality which helps to account for the tenacity with which musicians clung to it, notwithstanding all its imperfections.

[Illustration: THE CLAVICHORD.]

=Principle of the Harpsichord=.—Instruments of the Harpsichord class were especially numerous in Italy, France and England. They differed from the Clavichord chiefly in the method of setting the string in vibration. This was done by _plucking_ the string with a quill set in a jack at the end of the key, the action so arranged that, after the key was released, the jack fell back to its place, while a damper came against the string, preventing its further vibration. Since these strings could not be used as bridges, like the tangents of the Clavichord, it was necessary from the first that each key should have a separate string. Moreover, as these strings were thus made of varying lengths and thicknesses, the Harpsichords were more often made in a triangular shape, or one like our modern grand pianos, than in the rectangular Clavichord shape. The chief defect, and the one which makers tried in vain to

remedy, lay in the fact that the _plucking_ of the strings, while producing greater brilliancy, _admitted_ of _no variation_ in its degrees of _loudness_ or _softness_.

=Virginal and Spinet=.—Several small instruments of this kind preceded its full development, differing mainly in shape and choice of materials. In England these received the name of Virginal; in France, that of Spinet. Both of these were introduced into polite society, chiefly as small house instruments of limited compass, varied sizes, and frequently with elaborate decoration. The difference between them was principally one of shape, the Virginal taking the oblong form of the Clavichord, while the Spinet was more often triangular. They appeared both with and without supports; and in some cases the strings were placed in a vertical position, as in our upright pianofortes.

[Illustration: THE VIRGINAL OR SPINET.]

=The Harpsichord=.—The Harpsichord proper was simply a larger form of the Spinet and Virginal, and was made in the form of the grand pianoforte. On account of its added brilliancy of tone, it was admirably adapted for use in the orchestra, in which it became the conductor's instrument in connection with the opera. In Italy, the terms Clavicembalo and Gravicembalo were given to it, while in Germany it was called Flügel, or wing, from its wing-shaped cover. As it became popular as a concert instrument, many inventions were added to increase the brilliancy and variety of its tone: an extra keyboard was placed above the first, as in the organ, and three or four strings were given each note, which could be used to reinforce the single-string tone, by means of the second keyboard. Moreover, various kinds of quills were invented, giving different tone qualities; and such effects were controlled by stops or pedals. These experiments were especially numerous in the 18th century, in which the rapid growth of musical resources demanded constantly more tonal possibilities. Large manufacturers, such as the Ruckers family of Antwerp, and Tabel in England, vied with each other in producing novel devices, such as the imitation of other instruments, the tuning of an extra string for each note an octave above its normal pitch, and the addition of a keyboard connected with an organ. Attempts to produce a sustained tone resulted in the Piano-Violin, in which a revolving rosined wheel was pressed by the key against the string, to continue the tone; but all such were abandoned finally as unsuccessful.

[Illustration: TWO-MANUAL HARPSICHORD.]

=Invention of the Pianoforte=.—To this exceptional activity in keyed instruments, and the final failure to produce a singing tone capable of variation in the Harpsichord, we owe the invention of the Pianoforte. In 1711, =Bartolomeo Cristofori=, a noted harpsichord maker of Tuscany, exhibited several "forte-pianos" in which the action was so constructed that the keys, when depressed, threw little _leather-headed hammers_, affixed to a bar above them, _against the strings_, thus making it possible to modulate the strength of tone by the degree of force with which the keys were struck. When the key was released, a _damper_ came against the string from beneath, _stopping further vibration_.

=Early Makers=.—Although this invention did not at first attract widespread attention, it undoubtedly formed the basis of the others which quickly followed it, and really asserted the principle afterwards adopted for the piano action. In 1716, =Marius=, a French manufacturer, submitted four models for piano actions, which, however, were never developed. Also, =Schroeter=, a German, constructed two models of piano actions, in 1717, in one of which the hammers struck on top of the strings; but neither of these was put to practical use. Finally, =Gottfried Silbermann=, of Saxony, distinguished as an organ and harpsichord maker, made two pianofortes, the action of which was evidently based on that of Cristofori, and which he exhibited to J. S. Bach. While praising them in many respects, Bach criticised them as too weak in the upper notes, and too hard to play. Silbermann was exceedingly painstaking as a workman, having the reputation of breaking to pieces with an axe even a finished product which showed any imperfection. He therefore set to work to remedy these defects, and, in 1737, produced several pianofortes which won Bach's unqualified approval.

=Superiority of the Piano=.—The Pianoforte was now placed upon a firm basis; and although many years elapsed before its resources were developed sufficiently to cause its universal adoption by musicians, the final victory over its predecessors was complete. And this victory was natural, since the Pianoforte was found capable of combining the best qualities of the Clavichord and the Harpsichord, with the addition of a tone capacity infinitely superior to either.

=Improvements=.—The story of succeeding piano manufacture and the manifold inventions and improvements relative to it is one of infinite details. Among these we notice that while Silbermann pianos were in "grand" form, =Frederici= of Gera (died 1779) constructed them in oblong or "square" shape; that the pianos of Spaeth (died 1796) and of =J. Andreas Stein= (died 1792), whose pianos were adopted for use by Mozart, showed considerable advancement. The Stein family became allied with =Andreas

Streicher=, an inventive genius, and founded a manufactory in Vienna which has maintained a high standard to the present time. The action invented by them, known as the Viennese action, differs from that of Cristofori in having the hammers annexed to the keys themselves, instead of on a bar above them; thus giving a light touch and tone. In England, the principle of the Cristofori action was developed by the renowned house of =Broadwood=, their action becoming known as the English action; while in France, =Sebastian Erhard=, or =Erard=, a Strasburg inventor, founded the Erard action, which has a double hammer movement, allowing the hammers to fall either entirely, or only partially into place after the key is struck, at the will of the performer. The “cottage” action, introduced by =William Southwell=, about 1800, was the beginning of the “upright” form, which has now entirely superseded that of the square piano. Thus, by continued experiments, the piano has gained in compass, brilliancy, sustaining power and strength of construction, to meet the constantly-increasing demands placed upon it, until the modern piano seems to possess unlimited resources, and until the unending supply of instruments of all grades from hundreds of factories is sufficient to place one of these “household orchestras” within the reach of rich and poor alike.

=Equal Temperament=.—An early difficulty in the case of keyed instruments was the matter of tuning, caused by the fact that it was found scientifically impossible to tune all the intervals of the scale at the same time to the true pitch; that is, the pitch demanded by the natural overtones of the fundamental note of the scale. At the outset, for instance, it was found that if the fifths were tuned true, the octaves would be a trifle sharp; and, conversely, if the octaves were true, the fifths would be a trifle flat. In the case of stringed instruments, where the tone was made by the performer, it could be so modified as not to conflict seriously; but with keyed instruments this was impossible. Thus, many systems of tuning or “temperaments” were tried, such as having two keys for two notes nearly in unison, like F-sharp and G-flat, most of these resulting in the possibility of playing in a few nearly related keys, to the exclusion of the others. Finally, through the influence of =J. S. Bach= (1685-1750) and the Frenchman =Rameau= (1683-1764), the simple expedient was definitely adopted of tuning the octaves true, and dividing each octave into twelve equal parts, thus uniting such notes as F-sharp and G-flat in one tone slightly out of tune with either, but not enough seriously to offend the ear. This, called “_equal temperament_,” was a great gain to music, since it not only removed a radical defect in keyed instruments, but also opened the door to that free interchange of keys which has done so much toward enriching the coloring and scope of succeeding compositions.

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, articles on the Clavichord, Virginal, Spinet, Harpsichord, Pianoforte.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. I.

Weitzmann.—History of the Pianoforte.

Brinsmead.—History of the Pianoforte.

Rimbault.—The Pianoforte: Its Origin, Progress and Construction.

Spillane.—History of the American Pianoforte.

QUESTIONS.

What principle did the first attempts at piano-making recognize?

To what circumstance are we indebted for the attempt to make an instrument of the Clavier type?

What are the two classes of stringed instruments with keyboard as known in the 11th century?

State the steps in the development of the Clavichord principle.

Describe the Clavichord.

Describe the Harpsichord principle.

Describe the Virginal and Spinet.

Describe the Harpsichord.

Who was the inventor of the Pianoforte? When did he exhibit the first instrument?

Who were the early makers?

What points of superiority did the Piano have over the Clavichord and the Harpsichord?

What successive improvements were made by various makers?

What is meant by Equal Temperament?

LESSON XXVI.

THE EARLY ITALIAN CLAVIER COMPOSERS.

=Early Instrumental Music=.—The history of pianoforte composition and playing really begins with that of the preceding keyed instruments with strings, to all of which the convenient name of “Claviers” will be given. As these early instruments were at first merely substitutes for the organ, which in turn was used simply to reduplicate voice parts, the music first played on them was in no wise different from the vocal and organ music of the day. When, moreover, music written for the organ had some features distinct from purely vocal music, it was frequently inscribed to be _played on the organ or clavier_, without discrimination.

=Influence of the Renaissance=.—As most of the patterns of musical form have proceeded from Italy, so it was there, in Venice, that instrumental music seems to have emerged from its union with vocal music, and to have assumed the elements of a style of its own. This was directly the result of the general awakening of thought after the Dark Ages, known as the Renaissance, which, leading to independent investigation in the domains of science and art, brought in the once unheard-of inventions and the discovery of new worlds, and in the other a freedom of treatment fitted to express the new ideas surging throughout the civilized world. Thus, in the first part of the 16th century, while Raphael and Michael Angelo were voicing these thoughts in their immortal creations, in Venice, a school of musicians was turning its attention toward instrumental music, and striving to produce in music a richness of color, just as the great Venetian painters, like Titian and Giorgione, were producing similar effects upon canvas. Teachers and students were congregating there, enthusiastic over the new ideas in music; and the focal point of all this activity was the Church of St. Mark’s, whose magnificent double organ furnished an incentive to genius.

=The First Sonata=.—Among these musicians were a number of apostles of the Netherlands school, of whom =Adrian Willaert= (1480-1562) was especially honored and beloved. He and his successors, as organists at St. Mark’s, wrote compositions for organ or clavier, which they taught to young ladies in the convents. Such compositions were made the more possible by the fact that into the old Church Modes, formed by using only the tones represented by the white keys of our piano, “chromatic” or _colored_ tones came to be inserted; so that, in the course of the 16th century, the modern scales, with their characteristic keynotes, or tonalities, came to vie with the old modes, and ultimately nearly to displace them, thus giving a chance for a variety and grouping of harmonies necessary in the elaboration of instrumental music. The name Sonata, or “sound” piece, was at first given indiscriminately to such instrumental works, in distinction from the Cantata, or vocal work.

=Willaert and His Pupils=.—Willaert was especially successful as a teacher, and thus left a number of accomplished pupils to carry on his labors. Of these, =Girolamo Parabosco= (1593-1609) was noted for his free fantasias, and his improvisations of sonatas on the harpsichord; while =Claudio Merulo= of Correggio (1533-1604) wrote a number of toccatas, in which the old church chorale style was relieved by contrasting passages consisting of brilliant runs. The Toccata, or _touch_ piece, had, as its characteristics, such _quick running passages_, probably first suggested by the light tone and action of the Clavier. While these runs had at first very little relevancy to one another, they were much delighted in by these early pioneers, who sported with them as a child plays with a new toy.

=The Gabrieli’s=.—Two other organists of St. Mark’s, =Andreas Gabrieli= (1510-1586), and his nephew and pupil, =Giovanni Gabrieli= (1557-1613), added to the resources of instrumental music. The first of these, a pupil of Willaert, himself became a famous teacher; and both contributed many canzone and sonatas to organ and clavier literature. In all these the subjects were distinct, and, in the canzone especially, the many quick passages and changing rhythms were used in a manner that contributed to unity.

=The Harpsichord in Opera=.—A new factor now appeared in Florence, destined greatly to further the cause of clavier music: namely, the Opera. Taking the position of the conductor’s instrument, the harpsichord became the most useful member of the orchestra, and was employed constantly to fill in vague harmonies, and to strike chords as a support to the musical declamation of the singers. Such chords were not generally written out, but were suggested by their bass note, over which figures were written to

show their positions. To this shorthand system the name of Thorough-bass was given. In this way the value of chord combinations came to be recognized, and the relationships of such chords studied entirely apart from the voice writing; so the idea of a single melody, supported by occasional chords, was transplanted from the Opera, and the modern harmonic style of music came into being.

=Dance Tunes=.—But, in this new style, the old basis for Unity in the composition, furnished by the imitation of one part by another, had to be abandoned, since only one melodic part existed at a time; hence a new _basis_ had to be found in the manner in which _harmonies succeeded_ each other. In determining such chord relationships, composers were obliged to look elsewhere than to the old Church music; and so turned their attention to the forms of Dance Tunes which had already been in use for a long time among the people in their Folk-songs, and in the performances of the wandering minstrels. Most of these dance tunes were formed in a very simple _two-part_ design of harmony, consisting in a transition from the initial key to a contrasting key, for the first part, and a return from the contrasting key to the first key, in the second part.

=Origin of the Suite=.—A book of such dances, based, however, on the clumsy church modes, was published in 1551. Later, however, such dances came to be written in the new harmonic style; and by putting together a set of dances all in the same key but differing in rhythm and mode of expression, a larger form of composition was devised, combining Variety with Unity. To this form the name of Suite was given.

[Illustration: GIROLAMO FRESCOBALDI.]

=Frescobaldi=.—Another element tending to give Unity to the composition was developed when composers learned to work out a _single subject_, or melodic phrase representing a definite musical idea, by introducing it a number of times in the course of the composition, sometimes with slight variation, but always recognizable and used in such a way as to bind the various parts the more closely together by their similarity of conception. Several organists at Rome wrote music which possessed such unity of idea. One of these was =Girolamo Frescobaldi= (1583-1644), a man who was a close student of the best Italian music of his time, and who had, moreover, been brought into contact with Netherlands ideas through travel in Belgium. On his first appearance as organist of St. Peter’s in Rome, in 1615, so great fame had preceded him that over 30,000 people are said to have attended the performance. His skill on the clavier was no less than that on the organ; and for both of these instruments he wrote Ricercari, Canzone and Capricci, which showed considerable unity of subject, together with fluency in the treatment of chromatic progressions, and a wealth of invention, which displayed itself in novel themes and unusual harmonies; his compositions are well worth study.

=Pasquini=.—In the second half of the 17th century, =Bernardo Pasquini= (1637-1710), a pupil of the opera composer Cesti, carried on the work at Rome. In his toccati he shows great freedom in departing from the strict vocal style, and his clavier works have features, like the sustained trill, which distinguish them decidedly from organ works.

=Method of Playing the Clavier=.—The method of playing the clavier used by these old masters was peculiar. In a work on the subject published by Di Ruta, about the year 1600, the rules given include holding the fingers out _flat_ on the keys, and scarcely using the thumb at all, allowing it to hang below the level of the keyboard. The scales were played each with _two_ fingers, according to fixed rules; so that smoothness combined with rapidity seems to have been made impossible.

=The Sonata and Overture=.—Starting with the harmonic form of the old dance tunes, composers now began to elaborate this to a form capable of expressing more serious ideas, by giving more definiteness to the musical subject treated, and by introducing material derived from the old vocal forms. =Corelli=, the violinist (1653-1713), and the violinists of his school, restricted the name Sonata to combinations of such movements, in distinction from the lighter forms of the Suite; and the celebrated opera composer, =Alessandro Scarlatti= (1659-1725), applied similar methods to the composition of his operatic overtures, writing them in three parts: first, a moderately fast movement, which was followed by a slow movement, the whole closing with a movement in quick tempo.

=Domenico Scarlatti=.—Clavier music lagged somewhat behind violin music, owing to the greater perfection of the violin as an instrument, and also to the popularity of the lute, which was much affected in fashionable circles. Finally, however, a man appeared who possessed the genius to develop the peculiar resources of the harpsichord to a remarkable extent. This was =Domenico Scarlatti=, the son and pupil of Alessandro Scarlatti. The latter was himself a skilful clavier player and composer; but his son attained a proficiency so far eclipsing that of any of his predecessors as to place him entirely without the pale of comparison with any of them. Domenico Scarlatti, who was born at Naples in 1683, two years before Handel and Bach, first attracted attention when about twenty-one years old, as an opera composer; but achieved his greatest successes as a virtuoso on the harpsichord, winning

a world-wide reputation for his wonderful playing, which was a revelation of what could be done with this hitherto undeveloped instrument. In one of Handel's Italian journeys a contest of skill was instituted between these two musical giants; and the result was a drawn battle so far as the harpsichord was concerned, although Handel triumphed at the organ. Scarlatti traveled about somewhat, spending most of his later life in the position of court music master at Madrid. He finally returned to his birthplace, where he died in 1757.

=Scarlatti's Use of Form=.—In the matter of form, Scarlatti developed still further the work of his predecessors, applying to the harpsichord the principles asserted by Corelli and his school. His Sonatas were written in _one movement_ only, and have very _definite subjects_, which are carried out along recognized lines. His Capriccii—short pieces written in a rhythmic and delicately staccato style—are some of his best works, and undoubtedly paved the way for the Scherzi, written by Beethoven and Mendelssohn. His compositions are short, but concise and definite.

=Scarlatti's Style of Playing=.—But his chief addition to musical material lies in the new style of playing which he invented. Novel effects, like crossing the hands, long leaps, broken chords in contrary motion, rapidly repeated notes, and runs in thirds and sixths—effects which were in many cases far ahead of his time, since they were not used by succeeding composers until a much later period—were employed by him with the utmost fluency, so that he has been aptly called the father of modern pianoforte technic.

[Music: EXAMPLES OF SCARLATTI'S STYLE.]

=Durante=.—The Neapolitan school boasted several other worthy clavier composers, who contributed in various ways to the composition of the Sonata. One of these was =Francesco Durante= (1684-1755), who wrote sonatas in two movements of different character but in the same key. The first, called a Studio, was written as a free fugue with running passages; the second, or Divertimento, was more animated and less scholastic. =Domenico Alberti= (1707-1740) composed sonatas similar in general form, but of less artistic worth, consisting as they did simply of a single-voiced melody, supported by an harmonic accompaniment having no independence of style. Much of this was in the form of broken chords, a mannerism which was afterwards used to excess, and became dubbed the "Alberti bass." This accompaniment form doubtless suited the clavichord and harpsichord, but is not so well adapted to the more sonorous modern piano. It is still used by composers for very simple accompaniments.

[Music]

=Pier Domenico Paradies= (1710-1792) deserves special mention as the writer of elegant and well-balanced clavier music. He first won success as a composer of operas, which were given in Italy, and afterwards in London, where he finally settled as clavier teacher. His sonatas have two movements, like Durante's, and contain brilliant allegros, besides attractive melodies. His two-part rapid contrapuntal work is excellent, both for musical merit and for technical study.

=Summary=.—We have seen, then, that in the 16th century, in Italy, instrumental music began to break from its union with vocal music; that the Opera brought the harpsichord especially into notice in the 17th century, on account of its availability for accompaniments, and that finally, in the 18th century, the Neapolitan composers developed for it a style which took advantage of its peculiar resources, and applied them to the enrichment of the harmonic forms which were coming into vogue.

REFERENCES.

Weitzmann.—History of Pianoforte Playing.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. I.

J. S. Shedlock.—The Pianoforte Sonata.

Henderson.—How Music Developed.

Henderson.—Preludes and Studies.

MUSICAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

Weitzmann's History, pages 291-313.

Rimbault, "The Pianoforte," pages 257, 306, 310.

Litolff edition, No. 397, second volume of “Music by Old Masters.”

Augener edition, No. 8298, Old Italian Compositions.

The Breitkopf Edition, Nos. 111, 112, 411, have reference to music for the clavier, written during the 17th and 18th centuries.

Biblioteca d’Oro, Ricordi, contains examples of the compositions of the leading composers of the 17th to 19th centuries.

QUESTIONS.

What influence did the Renaissance have on early instrumental music?

Give an account of the “sonatas” written by Willaert.

What other kinds of composition were written during this period?

What were the contributions of the Gabrieli’s?

How did the Opera influence harpsichord music?

What principles were used in making dance tunes?

What was the origin of the Suite?

How did these early composers attempt to give Unity to a composition?

Tell about the work of Frescobaldi and Pasquini.

What peculiarities of fingering were used by the early players?

What distinction did Corelli and his successors make between the Sonata and the Suite?

Describe the career of Domenico Scarlatti.

What forms did he use in his compositions?

What characteristics did he show in his playing?

Tell about the work of Durante, Alberti and Paradies.

Give the successive stages of development from the 16th to the 18th century.

LESSON XXVII.

THE EARLY ENGLISH AND FRENCH CLAVIER SCHOOLS.

=English Schools to Henry VIII=.—Popular music, both vocal and instrumental, was an early English institution. The many Folk-songs which have come down from a very early period bear witness to the English love of conviviality. Dance tunes, sometimes based on these Folk-songs, were played on the instruments of the minstrels, which, as early as 1484, included the clavichord; and the fact that such instruments were cultivated by people of higher rank is shown by the record that James IV of Scotland and his queen purchased clavichords to play upon, in 1503, while the queen of Henry VII of England bought a clavichord for her private use in 1502. The virginal is spoken of in the reign of Henry VII; Henry VIII (reigned 1509-1547), who was an accomplished musician, played upon both these instruments, and also wrote music for them.

=To Queen Elizabeth’s Time=.—Edward VI (r. 1547-1553) had three duly appointed virginal players among his court musicians; and after Elizabeth (r. 1558-1603) ascended the throne, the virginal increased in popularity; indeed, its name was formerly thought to have been derived from her as the virgin queen; although the fact that the instrument was spoken of as the virginal before her reign makes its derivation from its popularity among young ladies the more probable. Queen Elizabeth, as well as her sister Mary, received instruction in virginal playing during her early youth, and became an accomplished performer; and instances are shown of the former’s great pride in this accomplishment. In the course of her illustrious reign, when all the arts flourished to a remarkable degree, and when great wits and litterateurs vied with each other in the genius of their productions, the art of music received its

share of attention also. The fact that musical degrees were early given at the great universities, Oxford and Cambridge, tended to raise the standard of musical knowledge, and to produce a number of composers who were especially gifted in the more serious Church forms of writing. Many such, connected with the Royal Chapel and the court, wrote excellent anthems and secular part-songs; and now, attracted by the popularity of the instrument, they began to give a more worthy setting to the folk and dance tunes played on the clavier.

=Dance Tunes=.—A clavier composition is extant, dated 1555, by =William Blitheman=, an English church composer, consisting of a chorale-like melody in whole notes, accompanied first by a flowing eighth-note figure, and next by triplet quarter notes, with a third voice added later. Such a serious style prefigured the variations upon dance tunes, which were especially cultivated by =William Byrd= (1538-1623). In such variations the melody was first harmonized in simple fashion, and was afterwards played several times in the same part, with slight changes, while the accompanying parts were varied in rhythm and style, becoming generally quicker in tempo. To modern ears the result is monotonous, as the same key and time signature is maintained throughout; but the variety in presentation must have been grateful after the simplicity of the dance tunes.

=The Virginal Book=.—Other popular forms were the Fancie, in which several melodic subjects were imitated in the various voices; and the Pavane, a dance in common time, whose theme was repeated in the following Galliarde, a dance in triple time. These and other forms are used in a curious collection of clavier pieces now preserved at Cambridge, and known as Queen Elizabeth's Virginal Book. This collection, consisting of four hundred and eighteen manuscript pages, written on a six-lined staff, contains seventy compositions by Byrd, besides others by most of the composers of the Elizabethan era, like Tallis, Dr. Bull, Giles, Farnaby and many others.

=Leading Elizabethan Composers=.—Byrd was a pupil of =Thomas Tallis= (d. 1585), the renowned church composer, and together they were made organists of Queen Elizabeth's Chapel, in 1575, receiving also the sole right to print music. Another musician who deserves special mention is =Dr. John Bull= (1563-1628), who won world-wide fame as organist and clavier player, finally becoming organist at Antwerp Cathedral, which post he held until his death. His clavier compositions show great technical fluency. =Orlando Gibbons= (1583-1625), a Doctor of Music at Oxford, and organist at Westminster Abbey, wrote excellently in the prevailing style. Shakespeare testifies to the popularity of clavier playing at this time in one of his sonnets, where he speaks of the keys as

"O'er whom thy fingers walk with gentle gait."

Although these early English composers wrote with musical solidity, their compositions can scarcely be said to have added much to the development of the instrumental style, or to clavier technic; and, in fact, they amounted to little more than a side issue in music, withdrawn from the general advancement, and valuable chiefly as curiosities. The melodies were apt to be wearisome, through monotonous repetitions, the rhythms to lack variety, and the modulations to appear chiefly in the form of unsuccessful attempts.

=The Parthenia=.—During the first half of the 17th century the virginal retained its popularity, although political turmoils prevented much positive advancement in music. The "Parthenia," a volume containing the first printed collection of virginal music, appeared in 1611, composed of twenty-one pieces by Byrd, Bull and Gibbons; and a similar volume followed, with compositions for virginal and bass viol, by Robert Hole.

=Purcell=.—In the reign of Charles II (1660-1685) music again came to the fore, and was ably promoted by =Henry Purcell=, who was born in the year when Cromwell died, 1658, and died in 1695. Purcell is a shining figure in English musical history, through his ability as an opera composer, in which capacity he produced bright and pithy works, thoroughly English in spirit, and healthy in tone. He published a volume of twelve clavier sonatas in 1683, with parts also for two violins and a bass viol, founded on the model of the Italian violin sonatas, each having an Adagio, a Canzona, a slow movement and an Air. Later he published other sonatas, besides suites and separate pieces for the clavier. Upon the advent of Handel, however, the English composers became, for the most part, mere imitators of his style, which had so caught the national ear as to well-nigh eclipse all other kinds of music. The early English school, therefore, can be said to have had its last exponent in the person of Purcell.

=Rise of the French School=.—In France a school of clavier compositions developed during the brilliant reign of Louis XIV (1643-1715), which did much toward imparting elegance and polish, besides characteristic rhythms and technical figures, to clavier music. The head of this school and the personal teacher of many succeeding clavier composers and players was =Andre Champion de Chambonnières= (d. 1670), who became court clavier player to the king. He is said to have been master of a full tone on the harpsichord attained by none other than himself; he also published two books of clavier compositions, written in the pure

harmonic style, and showing the tendency toward brilliant embellishments which became a characteristic of his successors. Of his pupils, =Jean Henry d'Anglebert= (d. 1691), was clavier player at court, and published in 1689 a book containing clavier arrangements of airs and dances from the operas of Lully, with rules for their execution.

=The Couperin Family=.—Two, at least, of the famous musical family of Couperin also came under the instruction of Champion. These were =Louis Couperin= (1630-1665), and =François Couperin= (1631-1701), who, with their brother =Charles Couperin= (1638-1669), and his son =François Couperin=, called "le Grand" (1668-1733), were all at various times organists of the church of St. Gervais, at Paris. The Couperins may be considered as classic composers for the clavier, as their style, though having an harmonic basis, was mostly in the line of instrumental voice writing. The first-named published three suites of dances for clavier; and the second was eminently popular as a teacher.

=François Couperin=.—François Couperin, "le Grand," deserves special attention, and has been called the _first great composer_ distinctively _for the clavier_. He was a pupil of the organist Thomelin, and rose quickly to so commanding a position as player of the organ and clavier that, in 1701, he was appointed court clavier player and organist at the Royal Chapel. He was very accurate as a composer; and in the four books of clavier pieces which he published successively, he gave minute directions for interpreting the wealth of ornamentation with which his melodies are surrounded. Most of these pieces are _written in two voices_, with the upper melody most prominent; and they reflect the artificial show and glitter of the French court in their endless _turns_ and _embellishments_. Yet for this very reason they have amplified the resources of clavier compositions, preparing the way for composers like Scarlatti, Bach and Handel. Many of them show the French taste toward attaching definite meaning to music, by their fanciful titles, like "La tendre Nanette," "La Flatteuse"—a custom followed by others of this school. Couperin wrote also a treatise on clavier touch, and was _one of the first to make use of the thumb in playing_.

=Louis Marchand= (1669-1732) was a brilliant though dissipated figure in clavier playing. Becoming organist at the court of Versailles, he lost the post through his reckless habits, and, going to Dresden, he was somewhat subdued in his conceit by the evident superiority of Bach. On his return to Paris, he became exceedingly popular as a teacher, although his extravagant style of living brought him finally to poverty. His pupil, =Louis Claude Daquin= (1694-1772), received through him an appointment as organist at the church of St. Paul, in preference to Rameau, of whose superiority Marchand became jealous. Daquin published a number of rather superficial clavier pieces.

[Illustration: JEAN-PHILLIPPE RAMEAU.]

=Jean-Phillippe Rameau=, the last and greatest light of this school, has even greater fame as an opera composer. He was born at Dijon in 1683, and displayed so great musical talent when a mere child that, although his parents had intended him for another profession, he was finally sent to Italy to study music. After spending some time there, he joined the orchestra of an opera troupe, traveling about France and gaining an insight into dramatic composition. Upon going to Paris he studied with Marchand, who recognized and feared his talent, and who finally was the means of his leaving Paris. Later, however, he obtained an organ position outside of Paris, and soon attracted attention not only by his playing, but also by the publication, in 1726, of a treatise on Harmony. In this he _reduced_ the study of _chords_ to a _scientific foundation_, and won his title of the name of creator of the modern science of Harmony. Returning to Paris, he now secured an organ position there, and set to work upon the series of dramatic productions which made him the foremost opera composer of his day, superior even to the popular Lully. In 1737, he published another theoretical work, in which the principles of Equal Temperament, which J. S. Bach had adopted fifteen years before, were so clearly stated as to make their establishment permanent for future composers. Rameau's theories were the subject of much controversy in his day; but many distinguished contemporaries, like Rousseau and Voltaire, were his warm partisans. He died in 1764.

=Rameau's Clavier Works=.—His numerous _clavier compositions_ show great advance in freedom of expression, and are written mostly in _three parts_, with an occasional succession of full chords. Many of these have _descriptive titles_, such as "La Poule," in which the cackling of a hen is cleverly imitated. Others are in the form of dance suites. The order of Prelude, Allemande, Courante, Sarabande, Gigue was made the basis of these suites as well as those of Couperin, although this order admitted of considerable variation; and no other principle of Unity appears in them, with the exception of a _common key_.

=End of the Early French School=.—The growing importance of the German school now came to be felt in France so strongly that the French school came to lose its individuality. We therefore turn our attention to the important developments in instrumental music which were effected in Germany.

REFERENCES.

Weitzmann.—History of Pianoforte Playing.

Rimbault.—The Pianoforte.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. I.

Henderson.—Preludes and Studies.

Naylor.—An Elizabethan Virginal Book.

MUSICAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

Weitzmann's History, pages 314-329.

Rimbault.—"The Pianoforte," pages 237, 240, 245, 248, 253, 262-283, 316.

Litolff Ed., No. 397, 2nd vol. of "Music by Old Masters."

Augener Ed., Nos. 8300, 8299.

Breitkopf Ed., as for Chapter II.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Tell about early English instrumental music.

Tell about music in Queen Elizabeth's time.

Describe the Variation form used by Byrd.

What was the Virginal Book?

What was the style of the Elizabethan composers?

What was the "Parthenia"?

Give an account of Purcell and his work.

Who was the founder of the French school?

What family figures prominently in the French school?

Who was the greatest member of this family? Tell about his work.

Tell about Marchand and Daquin.

What great theorist is prominent in French clavier music? Tell about his work.

Note that the English school was at its height in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Purcell, in the reign of Charles II, being the greatest light of the school. The strength of the French school was during the reign of Louis XIV.

LESSON XXVIII.

THE GERMAN POLYPHONIC CLAVIER SCHOOL.

=German Mastery of Polyphonic Music=.—The Italians, with their quick perception of structural beauty, have been the pioneers in the invention and use of most art forms. So it happened, in the history of instrumental music, that they were the ones to invent and give to other nations the vehicle of expression, while it remained for their pupils, notably, in this case, the composers of Germany, to fill these forms out with the expression of real and deep feeling. The German tendency toward serious and philosophical thought found the intricacies of polyphonic music, or the simultaneous flow of independent melodies, admirably adapted to their need of expression; and when this style of voice writing was applied to instrumental compositions, German musicians found a branch of art

in which they were admirably qualified to excel. So, from being mere pupils of the Italians, they advanced to the production of works of much more distinguished character and deeper, richer content than was possible to mere beauty of form and melody.

=Hasler=.—In the second half of the 16th century, the clavier was popular in Germany, disputing the place of the lute as a social instrument, although organ and clavier compositions were identical, as in Italy. There is a record of the publication of two books of pieces for organ and “instrument”—by which is meant the clavier—in 1575-77, in which there were dance tunes with accompanying chords. =Hans Leo Hasler= (1564-1612), a pupil of A. Gabrieli, and fellow-student with G. Gabrieli, was especially prominent as organ and clavier player and composer during this epoch, publishing a number of such dances written for the organ or the clavier.

=Froberger=.—The devastating Thirty Years’ War (1618-48) put an end to artistic ambition during its progress. However, art quickly recovered at its close, and a number of worthy musicians appeared. An interesting figure among them, and a man who has been called the first German clavier virtuoso, was =Johann Jacob Froberger= (1605-1667). Showing great promise as a boy, he was brought to the notice of the Austrian Kaiser, Ferdinand III, who sent him to Rome, where he studied with Frescobaldi for three years. After this we hear of him as a successful performer at Paris, and, on his return to Vienna, as court organist, in which position he won widespread fame. A remarkable story is told of a perilous journey to England, where he arrived penniless, and of his subsequent recognition and his cordial reception by Charles II, who was delighted with his improvisation upon the harpsichord. Afterwards returning to Vienna, he resigned his post there, through some disagreement, and lived afterwards in retirement. In a number of Caprices, Toccatas and the like, written in the contrapuntal style, he definitely adopted the five-lined staff, and introduced many embellishments, after the French fashion. He possessed much charming melodic invention, and, in his Toccatas employed a treatment of his subject in definite sections, which afterwards appeared in the fugue form. Froberger anticipates the _program style_ of music, as he is said to have improvised descriptions of events, like that of the Count von Thurn’s crossing of the Rhine, which he depicted in twenty-six pieces.

=Johann Kaspar Kerl= (1625-90), also sent by Ferdinand III to Rome, studied there with Carissimi, the oratorio writer, becoming accomplished as an extemporizer. He occupied a number of organ positions in Vienna and Munich, also teaching the clavier, and wrote compositions which show a tendency toward the modern scale systems. =Johann Pachelbel= (1653-1706), celebrated as organ and clavier player, wrote pleasing works for the clavier, in which he tried to follow out the characteristics of the instrument. Many of these were in the form of variations. =Georg Muffat= (d. 1704) showed in his compositions a tendency toward French ornamentation, and his son =Gottlieb= (1683-1770), a pupil of the contrapuntist J. J. Fux, was organist to the Kaiser Charles VI, in Vienna, and clavier teacher to the Imperial family. His clavier compositions were in the form of Versettes and Toccatas.

=Eighteenth Century Clavier Composers=.—The Thirty Years’ War exercised a demoralizing influence upon music trades, and many excellent musicians were unable to have their compositions published in consequence. The result is, that comparatively few specimens of the works of the composers mentioned have come down to us in available form. Approaching the 18th century, we now come to a group of composers who represent the most brilliant epoch of early clavier work. Their productions, while retaining the dignity and complexity of the contrapuntal school, yet use its material with a freedom of modulation and of dissonant chords sufficient to express genuine emotional ideas through their medium.

=Reinken and Buxtehude=.—The Hamburg organist =Johann Adam Reinken= (1623-1722), a native of Holland, wrote a number of clavier compositions, publishing in 1704, pieces for two violins and harpsichord. =Dietrich Buxtehude= (1637-1707), organist at St. Mary’s Church, Lübeck, from 1668, excelled in free style of writing for clavier. The latter gave a series of Sunday evening concerts at his church which gained renown through all the surrounding country; and J. S. Bach himself is said to have walked to these concerts, a distance of fifty miles.

=Instrumental Polyphonic Forms=.—These men have been mentioned largely because their work made possible the results which Bach afterwards attained from an elaboration of what they had already accomplished. It was among such eminent German organists that the instrumental Fugue, the highest instrumental type of polyphonic music, took definite shape, consisting of an Exposition, in which the Subject, Answer and Countersubject were announced by the various voices; and a subsequent Development, in which, according to certain laws more or less strict, the material presented was carried through a variety of phases and brought finally to a triumphant close. Of other forms, like the Toccata and Canzona, the tendency came to be toward more freedom of treatment on the one hand, and an increasing definiteness and consistency on the other.

=Handel’s Early Life=.—A composer must now be mentioned whose work lay chiefly in other fields than the clavier, but who nevertheless drew much of his inspiration from the strings of the harpsichord. This was =George Frederick Handel= (1685-1759),

who was born at Halle, and whose musical genius asserted itself so strenuously that, although his father was strongly opposed, he learned the harpsichord as a mere child, and became so proficient a performer that the reigning Duke of Saxe-Weissenfels, hearing him play, insisted on his receiving a thorough musical education. So he was placed under Zachau, a competent organist and musician, at his native place, with whom he studied diligently. After his father's death he went to Hamburg, entering the orchestra of the Opera house and rising to the post of harpsichordist. Launching out as an opera composer, he began to acquire a reputation, and in 1706 went to Italy, meeting many distinguished musicians there, among them Domenico Scarlatti, with whom he had a contest as to ability as clavichordist and organist, and winning fresh laurels.

=Handel in England=.—In 1707, he became music director to the Elector of Hanover, but quickly left the post for England, where, with the exception of short intervals, he passed the remainder of his life, becoming a naturalized English subject. It was no wonder that he was so warmly attached to his adopted country, since he became the popular idol, even winning over the king, George I, formerly Elector of Hanover, who, on his accession to the throne, was at first angry with Handel for his desertion of the post in his service at Hanover.

[Illustration: GEORGE FRIEDRICH HANDEL.]

=Handel's Operas and Oratorios=.—Handel was of an irascible disposition, and, living in the artificial atmosphere of London, among wits and satirists like Dr. Johnson, Addison and Pope, he was constantly embroiled with the cabals of his rivals, and the fickleness of the public. He produced a great number of operas, most of them successful; but as theatrical manager he met with severe losses, and finally gave up opera writing in despair, and turned to the composition of oratorios. The result was that in this form he has left his most enduring and elevated compositions; for while his operas were sometimes written down to the popular taste for empty Italian melody, the lofty themes of his oratorios inspired him to his grandest and most sincere style, which, moreover, was rendered the more dramatic and intelligible by his knowledge of the requirements of his audiences.

=Handel's Clavier Works=.—Handel was an expert performer on the harpsichord, for which he wrote two sets of Suites, besides a number of single pieces. The Suites, of which the first set is by far the better, are written mostly in the _dance forms_, but with the interpolation of more serious forms, such as Airs, Variations and Fugues. The _contrapuntal style_ is here most _prominent_, although _with harmonic basis_, and with a laxity in the strictness of the voice writing, caused by the occasional use of extra notes to complete chords. Some of the variations are worked up to effective climaxes, and have running passages and broken chords, in which the resources of the clavier are cleverly drawn upon.

=Handel's Last Years=.—Handel became blind in 1752, but continued to take part in the performances of his works till the year of his death. Choleric as was his temperament, the known generosity of his nature and his devotion to the ideals of his art made him the idol of the English people. He was buried in Westminster Abbey.

=Mattheson=.—A close associate of Handel, when he was in the Hamburg orchestra, was =Johann Mattheson= (1681-1764), famed for his literary writings on musical subjects no less than for his musical ability. He wrote suites, a sonata and fugues in two parts, for clavier, which were of excellent workmanship.

=Bach's Early Life=.—But all other names in the domain of polyphonic instrumental music pale before that of =Johann Sebastian Bach=, the culmination of the school of voice writing, and the musician who put the stamp of greatness on all former styles, while at the same time acting as guide to future fields of composition. Born at Eisenach in 1685, as a scion of a family the members of which had been musical leaders for generations, he seems to have embodied in himself the sum of the genius of his forefathers. The story of his life is a prosaic one, as he filled it with unflagging industry, carrying out his unswerving ideals of his art, caring little for mere popularity, and rearing a large family of sons and daughters, some of whom proved worthy to continue his work. As a boy, he lost both parents at the age of ten, and was taught clavier playing by his elder brother, Johann Christian, who took him in charge. He seized with avidity every opportunity to study his beloved music, copying hundreds of pages of manuscript, listening to every musical performance possible, drinking in and assimilating the ideas thus gained, to reproduce them later on, stamped with his genius.

=Later Life=.—At his brother's death he went to Lüneburg as choir boy, where he became acquainted with Reinken's work. At eighteen he was violinist in the court band at Weimar, shortly afterward becoming organist at a church at Arnstadt. His next position was as court organist at Weimar, in 1708, where many of his most important organ compositions were written. This post he left in 1717 for that of court chapel-master at Anhalt-Köthen, where he remained six years, after which he went to Leipzig, as Cantor of the Thomasschule, staying there till his death, in 1750.

=Incidents of Bach's Career=.—Bach's life was not altogether a happy one, as he was much annoyed at the persecutions of his rivals; and, like Handel, he was afflicted with blindness in his last years. Never considering the element of mere popularity in his work, his greatness was little appreciated in his lifetime; and it was fifty years after his death before it began to receive recognition. A pleasant incident of his declining years was his cordial reception by Frederick the Great at his court, in 1747, where Bach's son was in favor as harpsichord player, and where Bach was shown a number of excellent new Silbermann pianofortes. It is a curious circumstance that he and Handel, although born in the same year, were destined never to meet.

=The Well-Tempered Clavichord=.—It has been stated that Bach adopted the principle of Equal Temperament for clavier tuning. In support of this he wrote twenty-four preludes and fugues, one in each major and minor key, requiring, therefore, equal temperament for their performance; and later added a second similar volume. The whole forty-eight make up the monumental work called the "Well-Tempered Clavichord"; and this work, written originally for the clavichord, has remained the bulwark of piano playing to the present day. Its fugues, written with consummate mastery of the technic of instrumental polyphony, are not only models of skill in voice writing, but also are made the vehicles of genuine moods and emotions; while each preceding prelude gives the keynote of expression to its following fugue, although written in a much freer style, frequently closely allied with the works of the purely harmonic school.

[Illustration: JOHANN SEBASTIAN BACH.]

=Bach's Other Clavier Works=.—Bach wrote also sonatas and concertos, the latter for one, two or three claviers, sometimes with string accompaniment. These works, although comprising several movements, _do not_ otherwise _coincide_ with the _harmonic sonata form_, since their style is more polyphonic, and since they are occupied mainly with the _development_ of a _single_ subject. His suites, of which he wrote two sets, called respectively English and French, are no less important, since in them the dance forms are invested with a seriousness and an artistic finish hitherto unattained. Of other clavier works, his famous "Chromatic Fantasie" has a wealth of harmonic combinations, fiery runs and arpeggios, and dramatic recitative which give it a worthy place in the Romantic school developed much later, and of whose style it was the forerunner. His "Inventions," studies written originally for his children, in two or three parts, are an excellent introduction to the study of his larger works.

=Reforms in Fingering=.—Another gift of Bach's to coming generations was his _thorough revision of clavier playing_. Raising the hand above the keys from its former flat position, he _brought the thumb into use_, and by inventing the scale fingering, afterwards universally adopted, he opened the way to the style of brilliant and smoothly running passages which was afterwards so highly developed. Thus Bach, while putting the final touch to the old forms, gave an impetus to the harmonic style, which was then in its infancy, and of which we shall now trace the course.

REFERENCES.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. I. Vol. II, Bach and Handel.

Weitzmann.—History of Pianoforte Playing.

Henderson.—Preludes and Studies.

Spitta.—Life of Bach.

Parry.—Evolution of the Art of Music, Chapter VIII.

Williams.—Bach (Master Musicians Series).

MUSICAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

Weitzmann's History, pages 330, 336.

Rimbault.—The Pianoforte, pages 299, 332, 340.

Litolff ed., No. 396, 1st volume of Music by Old Masters.

Augener ed., No. 8297.

Breitkopf Ed., as before.

Works of Handel and Bach, published in all the cheap editions.

QUESTIONS.

Compare the Italian and the German tendencies.

Give an account of Hasler.

Tell about Froberger. In what styles did he write?

Tell about Kerl, Pachelbel and the Muffats.

What advances do we find in the works of the composers of the early part of the 18th century?

What forms now begin to take definite shape?

Give a sketch of Handel's early life.

Give a sketch of Handel's work in England.

State the characteristics of Handel's clavier works.

What affliction befell him during the last years of his life?

What associate of Handel's was famous as writer and composer?

Tell about Bach's early life.

Tell about Bach's later life.

What great king invited Bach to visit his court?

Describe the "Well-Tempered Clavichord."

Mention other clavier works by Bach.

What improvements in technic did Bach introduce?

LESSON XXIX.

THE GERMAN SONATA COMPOSERS, TO HAYDN.

=Formation of Harmonic Design=.—Side by side with the ultimate development of polyphonic music in its perfected instrumental form, the forms of the new harmonic style were being worked out, by long processes of development. Finally, just as the Fugue came to be adopted as the highest form of the old school, so the Sonata was chosen as the most dignified exponent of the new art. But, while the old school arrived at a high state of perfection at the hands of Handel and Bach, the necessity for inventing and experimenting with the possibilities of the new forms made the first attempts in this direction seem childish and crude beside Bach's work; so that it was several generations after him before the harmonic style was brought to the stage at which it could be made to express ideas of equal magnitude, and do it successfully.

=Development of the Sonata=.—The original plan associated with the Sonata was that of combining several movements in such a way as to appeal, in the completed product, to all kinds of _emotion_, _intellectual_, _spiritual_ and _physical_. In the hands of its founders, the Italian violinists, the exposition of this thought had been mainly contrapuntal. We have seen how Domenico Scarlatti arrived at a style in which a single part, supported by an accompaniment, was applied to the clavier, in a manner which brought out its striking characteristics; and we have now to trace the progress of this style in Germany, up to the point where the various contributions of different composers could be united into a systematic and fixed form, sufficient for the free expression of the highest musical inspiration, and adapted to all the varied demands of instrumental music.

=Essential Elements of a Sonata=.—Certain points seem to have been generally agreed upon as necessary components of the Sonata. The first was its _union_ of _several movements_, from two up to five, or occasionally even more. The second was that the _first movement_ should display the most _ingenuity_ and _elaboration_. This movement thus came to receive the most attention,

and showed a process of evolution from the simple dance form consisting of a modulation from a principal key to a contrasting key and back again, to a _highly organised_ and conventional _art-form_—a form, moreover, of such a capacity that it could be used as the mould for the principal movement of a wide range of compositions, from a short pianoforte sonata to a grand symphony.

=Changes in the Old Dance Form=.—In this evolution, the first half of the dance form was made to consist of a Subject, either thematic or melodic, clearly defining the key, and then a modulating passage, generally freer in its runs and arpeggios, leading up to the point of contrast; and the first section was then repeated. The greatest changes took place in the second half. At first, this consisted in the repeat of the Principal Theme in the contrasting key, and a return to the first key through modulations similar to those in the first section; later, however, since this design gave little opportunity for a display of the composer's originality, the enunciation of the Subject in the contrasting key was followed by a free passage, which gave ample scope to the composer's fancy; after which the subject again appeared in the principal key, with a concluding passage in the same key.

=Establishment of the Cyclic Form=.—The form as a whole was now practically divided into three sections, and a better balance was given to this division by the omission of the second appearance of the Subject in the contrasting key, and the substitution of other material, either relevant or contrasting. The movement now assumed a cyclic form—a statement, leading to a point of contrast, a free fantasia, and finally the statement, leading to a close. This was practically the course of development of what has been named the Sonata Form, up to the time of Haydn. We are now prepared to consider the especial contributions of composers to this form.

=First Printed Clavier Sonata=.—The first printed clavier sonata seems to have been published by =Johann Kuhnau= (1660?-1722). This was in the key of B-flat, and was the last of several pieces in the same volume. In the preface, the author gives a semi-apology for its introduction, saying that he sees no reason why sonatas should not be written for the clavier as well as for any other instrument. This sonata begins with an Allegro, followed by a fugal movement; and in the following Adagio movement, the tendency to put the slow movement into a contrasting key is illustrated, as this is in D-flat major. After another Allegro, there is a _Da Capo_ to the first part.

=Other Sonatas by Kuhnau=.—It was difficult for the early sonata writers to break away entirely from the old polyphonic style; and when a part appeared in the nature of a Free Fantasia, they generally had recourse to fugal work, having _no precedent_ in _harmonic music_ to fall back upon. Thus, in his seven sonatas published in 1696, entitled "Fresh Fruits for the Clavier," which show more individuality in melodic invention, Kuhnau uses the fugal style whenever the harmonic forms fail him. These sonatas show a prevalence of ornaments, which, he says, are "sugar to sweeten the fruits." A remarkable collection of clavier pieces are his six Bible sonatas, in which the form is entirely outside of the development traced above, since the various movements of each sonata simply follow the lines of a Bible story, like that of the "Combat between David and Goliath," which they illustrate. As samples of program music, they proceed in the steps of Pachelbel, and others on record. Kuhnau studied law, and was from 1682 organist at St. Thomas' Church, at Leipzig, where he preceded J. S. Bach.

=Frederick the Great's Influence=.—A great impetus was given to German clavier music by the interest with which, like all other forms of instrumental music, it was viewed by Frederick the Great of Prussia (r. 1740-86). This warlike but thoroughly Teutonic monarch gathered at his court a brilliant coterie of instrumentalists, delighting to perform with them on his favorite instrument, the flute. Although this musical inspiration was disturbed by the wars in which he engaged, and especially by the Seven Years' War (1756-63), the growth of clavier music was nevertheless steady.

=Musical Journals=.—A number of musical journals which appeared from 1760 on, contributed also to this enthusiasm, in giving clavier composers a medium for bringing their works before the public, and also in giving them the chance to profit by one another's experiments. Many writers thus came to the fore, who aided materially in the elaboration of harmonic music material.

=Other Early Composers=.—Of these, =Gottfried Heinrich Stoelzel= (1690-1749), chapel-master at Saxe-Gotha, wrote an "enharmonic" clavier sonata in three parts, a Largo in C minor, in 4/4 time; a short fugue; and a 3/8 movement, in harmonic form, in which experiments in modulation were tried. His successor at Saxe-Gotha was =Georg Benda= (1721-95), who published a number of clavier pieces and sonatas, besides two concertos for clavier and string quartet, all of which show a desire for genuine expression in the harmonic form. The first four-hand sonatas seem to have been published by =Charles Heinrich Müller=, of Halberstadt, in 1783, and another appeared in 1784, by =Ernst Wilhelm Wolf= (1735-92), court chapel-master in Saxe-Weimar, the writer of numerous other clavier sonatas and concertos showing great purity and originality of style. At the court of Frederick the Great, at Berlin, =Christoph Nichelmann= (1717-62), a pupil of Bach, and =Carl Fasch= (1736-1800) were successively second

harpsichordists. Both wrote sonatas, those of the former in two movements, while those of the latter had generally three, of a brilliant and attractive style. =Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg= (1718-95), the distinguished Berlin theoretician, was more successful in contrapuntal work than in his sonatas, written in freer style.

=Georg Christoph Wagenseil= (1715-77), pupil of J. J. Fux, court music teacher and celebrated clavier virtuoso, wrote sonatas for clavier and violin and a number for clavier alone.

=Wilhelm Friedemann Bach=.—Perhaps the most striking developments, however, were at the hands of the sons of J. S. Bach, who were all, having come under his direct instruction, of refined musical judgment, while some of them possessed marks of his genius. Of these, =Wilhelm Friedemann Bach= (1710-84), the eldest, called the Bach of Halle, from his long residence there, studied at the University of Leipzig, distinguishing himself in mathematics; was organist at Dresden and Halle successively, and finally came to Frederick the Great's court, at Berlin, through the influence of his brother Carl. Although he possessed great gifts as a player and composer, his dissipated habits brought him to disgrace, and he died in poverty. He wrote many clavier compositions, showing a bold use of harmonies, and including sonatas which have decidedly instrumental themes and development. A large number of his father's manuscripts known to have been in his possession have been irretrievably lost.

=Johann Christian Bach=, the London Bach, youngest of J. S. Bach's sons, was born at Leipzig in 1735, and died at London in 1782. He studied with his brother, Carl, after his father's death, and, afterwards going to Italy, became organist at the Milan Cathedral. Gaining great favor in this capacity, he was appointed concert-director at London in 1759, and there he became a popular favorite, producing several operas and receiving the appointment of music master to the royal family. His Italian experiences influenced his sonata writing, as his _subjects_ are in the style of the popular, though somewhat trivial _Italian melody_. Yet he introduced some striking improvements, notably that of employing a _second contrasting subject_, instead of a mere modulating or closing passage, at the end of the first and third sections of the sonata form. His graceful and melodious works were fashionable in London society.

[Illustration: C. P. E. BACH.]

=C. P. E. Bach=.—The third and greatest of Bach's sons was =Carl Philip Emanuel Bach=, the Berlin Bach. Inheriting his father's love of genuine and forceful expression, he had no less lofty ideals of his art, though recognizing his inferiority in talent. Also, perceiving that the harmonic school was in the line of progression, he devoted himself to it, thus producing purely _harmonic works_, which were only limited by the lack of resources thus far discovered. He was born at Weimar, in 1714, and, though a student of law and philosophy at Leipzig, he finally decided to give rein to his natural bent toward the musical profession. Conducting and composing for a musical society at Frankfort, he was appointed first clavier player at the court of Frederick the Great, at Berlin, where he stayed from 1740 to 1767, in high favor on account of his sterling musicianship, and enjoying the society of many distinguished musicians of the day. In 1767, he became musical director of the principal church in Hamburg, where he remained till his death, in 1788. A vigorous worker throughout his life, he left a large number of compositions, including two hundred and ten clavier pieces and fifty-two concertos for clavier and orchestra, besides much chamber music, eighteen symphonies, oratorios and cantatas.

=C. P. E. Bach's Sonatas=.—His most enduring and important work was in connection with the pianoforte sonata, since under his hands it began to assume _definite shape_. In the six sets of sonatas published, the number of movements is generally fixed at three, of which the third is frequently in the harmonic form of the Rondo, which consists in the recurrence of a principal theme, with modulatory episodes between its appearances. Hence the order of movements, which, in the earlier writers, took all sorts of forms from fugue to dance form, becomes Allegro, Adagio, Rondo. Bach's _themes_ are also made very characteristic, founded upon some easily-recognized _instrumental figure_. In the _development_ portion of the sonata form he does not resort to the polyphonic style, but _uses phrases or sections from the first part in new combinations and keys_. Sometimes, also, the direction is given in the repeat of the first section, to introduce variations of the text at will.

=His Theoretical Works=.—Bach published at Berlin, in 1753, an essay on "The True Method of Playing the Clavier," in which he gives a definite exposition of his father's reforms in playing, treating the position of the hand, embellishments and artistic rendering, which he says should touch the hearts of the hearers. A second part, published in 1762, discusses the science of accompaniment and improvisation.

=Adoption of the Piano=.—The clavichord, notwithstanding its feeble tone, remained his favorite instrument on account of its powers of expression, in which he delighted. His brother, Johann Christian, was one of the first definitely to adopt the new

pianoforte. J. G. Müthel published in 1771 what were probably the first compositions mentioning the pianoforte for their performance, a duet for two pianofortes or harpsichords; after the time of C. P. E. Bach, clavier compositions were written in general distinctively for the pianoforte and not for the clavier.

REFERENCES.

Weitzmann.—History of Pianoforte Playing.

Shedlock.—The Pianoforte Sonata.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, article “Sonata.”

Parry’s “Evolution of the Art of Music,” Chapter IX.

Henderson.—How Music Developed, Chapter X.

MUSICAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

Weitzmann, pages 338, 340, 342-355.

Rimbault.—“The Pianoforte,” pages 357-368.

Edition Litollf, Augener, Breitkopf, as for Chapter IV.

Works of C. P. E. Bach, in Peters’ edition.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

What forms of composition were being worked out while the polyphonic style was reaching a culmination?

What style had been most prominent in the early sonata?

What points had been agreed upon as necessary in the construction of the sonata?

What changes were made from the simple dance form?

In what part of the sonata did the greatest change occur?

What was the course of development in sonata form up to Haydn?

Tell about Kuhnau and his work.

Tell about other early composers.

Tell about Wilhelm Friedemann Bach.

Tell about Johann Christoph Bach.

Tell about Carl Philip Emanuel Bach.

Tell about Carl Philip Emanuel Bach’s contribution to the development of the sonata.

What other works did C. P. E. Bach write?

A comparison of the dates from Kuhnau’s published work in Sonatas to that of C. P. E. Bach, the immediate predecessor and model for Haydn, shows that the form took definite shape in the course of about fifty years.

[Illustration: FRANZ JOSEPH HAYDN.]

LESSON XXX.

FRANZ JOSEPH HAYDN.

=The Three Great Sonata Writers=.—In the year of C. P. E. Bach's death, 1788, three men had already entered the arena as champions of that Sonata Form to which he contributed so much. Haydn was then fifty-six, Mozart thirty-two and Beethoven eighteen years of age. All three added to the glory of Vienna by making it their dwelling-place in their later years; and the three formed a triumvirate which not only gave to the Sonata a permanent and complete form, but also brought this form into absolute subservience to the expression of every variety of emotional thought.

=Haydn's Childhood=.—Franz Joseph Haydn, a native of Rohrau, in lower Austria, was born on March 31, 1732, the second of a family of twelve children. His father, an humble wheelwright, was accustomed to bring his family together in the evenings and holidays, as was the German custom, to unite in song; and the true ear and feeling for rhythm of little "Sepperl," as Joseph was called, was quickly noticeable. So a cousin of his father, who was a schoolmaster at Hainburg, was allowed to take the boy home with him, placing him in the school choir, and directing his studies, which included singing, and the playing of the violin and other instruments.

=St. Stephen's Choir, Vienna=.—George Reutter, precentor of St. Stephen's Cathedral, at Vienna, paid a visit to the school and was attracted by the child's "sweet, weak voice," as he expressed it, and offered him a position in his choir. As this was considered a rare opportunity, he was allowed to go, and at the age of eight we find him installed in the choir school at Vienna, attending the daily service and choir practice, besides the regular school studies. But Reutter seems to have lost his personal interest in the lad, neglecting him in various ways, doing nothing with his work in musical theory, and finally dropping all his tuition. Haydn was fond of mischief; and when his voice began to break and his brother Michael became soloist in his place, his cruel master took the pretext of some trifling prank to turn him adrift, penniless, into the street.

=Hardships in Vienna=.—At the age of seventeen, therefore, he wandered the streets all of one rainy November night, with no friend to whom to turn. Finally, in the morning, he met an acquaintance formerly at the school, Spangler, a tenor singer, himself nearly as poor as Haydn. Nevertheless, he took the outcast home to his garret, where he was eking out an existence with his family; and thus temporarily provided for, Haydn set about finding work to do. Small jobs, like playing in bands, or at weddings and baptisms, and singing in choirs, he eagerly sought; his spare moments he occupied in writing music for serenades or garden-parties. While undergoing these hardships, however, he was becoming familiar with the music dear to the people's heart, and also with the varied effects of instrumental combinations.

=Studies and New Friends=.—In 1750, he rented a garret in a house in Vienna, and, having secured a dilapidated spinet, set himself diligently to work to study all available musical compositions, notably those of the new sonata order, and especially the sonatas of C. P. E. Bach. Theoretical works, also, like the "Gradus ad Parnassum" of J. J. Fux, and Mattheson's work on conducting, were eagerly devoured by the youthful enthusiast. By a piece of good fortune, Metastasio, the popular opera librettist, roomed in the same house, and learning of the talent hidden away in the garret, sought Haydn out, gave him Italian lessons, and ultimately started him on the road to success by recommending him as clavier teacher to a Spanish lady, to whose daughter he gave lessons.

=Connection with Porpora=.—Her singing master was the renowned opera composer, Porpora, who recognized Haydn's talent as accompanist, and proceeded to make him useful to himself, giving him instruction in composition in return for his services, which were frequently of even a menial nature. Accompanying Porpora on his journeys, he met musicians like Wagenseil and Gluck; and at the age of twenty had written many compositions, including a mass in F, an opera and many works of the sonata order, founded on the style of C. P. E. Bach.

=Better Times=.—Better times now opened before Haydn. Gaining influential friends, he won, through them, the post of music director and composer to Count Morzin, a position which he held only a short time, since the Count gave up his musical establishment soon. But he was immediately engaged by the wealthy and cultivated Prince Paul Esterhazy, who had been charmed at hearing a symphony of Haydn's, as assistant director of music at his estate at Eisenstadt. The same year Haydn made an unhappy marriage with the daughter of Keller, a wigmaker, which he had cause to regret for the remainder of his life.

=Orchestras in Germany=.—To understand Haydn's work with the Esterhazy family, it will be necessary to review the state of music in Germany at this time. When the orchestral overtures of the Italian operas had become used as concert pieces, a great stimulus was given to this kind of music. Concertos, string quartets, trios, and, most important of all, symphonies, came to be written in great numbers; and throughout Germany a mania for orchestral music arose. Wealthy families vied with each other in the size and prestige of their musical establishments, which included instrumentalists and vocalists; and the smaller gentry even

pressed their domestic servants into the service, inducing them to study instruments, and to perform string quartets and the like on occasions. Inasmuch as a great part of the music written for these was not published, and exchange of music in manuscript between different establishments was attended with some difficulty, it was necessary that the music director should have the ability to write his own music, as well as to direct it.

=Haydn's Work at Esterhazy=.—A rare opportunity therefore opened to Haydn, with his exceptional gifts as a composer, when he was placed at the head of an establishment like that of the Esterhazys', which was perhaps the most brilliant and competent in Europe. He remained in active service with this family for thirty-three years, during which Prince Nicolas Esterhazy succeeded his brother Paul, upon the death of the latter, in 1762. Nicolas, called the "Great," on account of his love of magnificence and his lavish style of living, built a sumptuous summer palace near Süttor, in Bohemia; and here he spent most of his time, with his troup of retainers, entertaining royalty, in a style comparable with that of Versailles. Werner, his head director, who had never appreciated Haydn's gifts on account of his old-school principles, died in 1766, and Haydn, who had made a firm friend of Prince Nicolas, was given his place. The orchestra and singers were now entirely under his command; the former was increased from the original number of sixteen to thirty, all capable performers; so that his life was spent in a round of rehearsals, dramatic performances and concerts for the numerous entertainments constantly in progress. Two well-equipped theatres, one for operas and dramas, and the other for marionette plays, gave him an opportunity for adequate performances; he thus had an exceptional chance to study the effects in his numerous quartets, trios, symphonies and operas, at first hand.

=Journeys to Vienna=.—On several occasions, Prince Nicolas took his entire troupe of musicians to Vienna, where Haydn conducted the performances, meeting also the distinguished musicians of the day. It was on one of these journeys, in 1785, that he met Mozart, whose genius he was quick to appreciate, and who, from being his pupil, finally gave to Haydn the added inspiration of his own brilliant thoughts. Haydn's reputation had now spread abroad, and his compositions were eagerly looked for throughout the musical world.

=Haydn in London=.—On Prince Nicolas' death, in 1790, Prince Anton, his brother, succeeded, who, however, dismissed the orchestra, providing for Haydn by a liberal pension. Haydn's time was now his own; and he decided to settle in Vienna; but an English impresario and publisher named Salomon now offered him such exceptional inducements to come to London that he accepted the offer. He was received with great honor, being granted the degree of Doctor of Music from Oxford University. He also conducted twelve grand symphonies, especially written for this visit, which were, moreover, some of his finest productions. On a second visit, in 1794-5, he excited even greater enthusiasm; and he returned to Vienna supplied with money sufficient to insure an old age free from pecuniary want. Some of his latest works were the Austrian National Hymn, and his oratorios of "The Creation" and "The Seasons," which immediately attained a popularity that has even yet hardly diminished.

=Honors=.—Haydn, in his old age, was showered with honors both at home and abroad; a culminating point was reached when, on his seventy-sixth birthday, at a performance of "The Creation," his friends, including many representatives of royalty, united to do him honor. His genial, child-like disposition won him the sobriquet of "Papa Haydn"; and this brightness and simplicity of thought he so transmitted to his compositions that they carry his atmosphere of sunshine wherever they are performed. He died in Vienna, soon after its capture by the French, in the Napoleonic wars, May 31, 1809.

=Importance of His Work=.—Haydn has been called the father of the Symphony and the String Quartet. In neither case is this strictly true, since he had predecessors in both fields; but his work was none the less important, since he collected the scattered threads of their attempts, and wound them into a concise and definite art form, stamped with the hallmarks of his own genius. The seal of artistic completeness which he placed on the form of the Sonata was his greatest achievement; and, written in this form, his symphonies and quartets were simply an enlargement of his clavier works, the symphonies having an added Minuet movement between the second and last movements of the clavier form of sonata, thus extending the piece to larger proportions.

=Sonata-Form as Fixed by Haydn=.—In these clavier sonatas, Haydn fixed the form which had been the subject of so many experiments, once and for all. The number of movements with him is almost invariably three, of which the first, at least, is in the sonata-form. This consists of a first section, the =Exposition=, in which the first subject, a distinct melody having the Teutonic individuality, is stated, defining the principal key; and a second subject, more lengthy and diverse in character, brings on a close in the contrasting key. In the second section, or =Development=, phrases or motives from the first section are cleverly intertwined in modulating keys, with running scales or arpeggios as connecting links. These, however, lead naturally into the first subject, in its original key, which opens the third section, or =Reprise=. This section is practically like the first, save that the second subject and the close are transferred into the principal key, in which the movement ends.

=The Second Movement=.—The second, or slow movement, is cast sometimes in the same form, abbreviated, and sometimes in a simpler form. The lack of sustaining power in Haydn's pianoforte, and his attempt to atone for this by trills and ornaments, make this less successful than the other movements; a result which is also caused by the fact that intensity and depth of emotion had not yet been developed in the harmonic school of music. In key, this movement was contrasted with the first, sometimes quite sharply, as in one of the sonatas in E-flat, in which the slow movement is in E major.

=Third Movement=.—The lively third movement is frequently in the lighter form of the Rondo, or it may be a set of Variations, or a Minuet. This movement, though sprightly, is apt to be somewhat thin in its harmonies, and trivial in development. Nevertheless, these last two movements show an expansion of the forms of the older writers, and a definiteness of character which insured their future development.

=Definiteness and Unity=.—This element of absolute definiteness is the most striking feature of Haydn's work—definiteness none the less in the general form than in each individual component. Each part of each section ends with a cadence, giving it absolute finality, and making the whole a combination of small entities, which, though distinct, are yet relevant and nicely balanced.

=Humor and Freshness=.—Another quality which he introduced was that of humor, which is prominent not only in the general tone of geniality, but in little unexpected twists of harmony, melody or rhythm, which give an irresistibly comic effect. Especially is this true in his symphonies, where the various tone colors are used for such results. Especial mention should also be made of his Masses, in which tunefulness of melody and sprightly rhythms combine to give an enduring popularity. Altogether, Haydn's work is redolent of the spring of musical activity, where the novelty of each harmonic effect is employed with an outburst of joy, and where one travels, as it were, through a sunny garden, filled with the flowers of musical thoughts.

REFERENCES.

Shedlock.—The Pianoforte Sonata.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. II, chapter on Haydn.

Parry.—Evolution of the Art of Music, Chapter XI.

Weitzmann.—History of Pianoforte Playing.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, article "Haydn."

Various lives of Haydn.

Haydn appears as one of the characters in George Sand's musical novel "Consuelo."

For musical illustrations, see especially Haydn's pianoforte sonatas, in Edition Peters, No. 713, a, b, c and d, or in other cheap editions.

QUESTIONS.

Who are the three great sonata writers?

Tell about Haydn's childhood.

Tell about Haydn's life in Vienna.

Give an account of Haydn as a student.

What great singing master did he meet?

What patrons did Haydn gain? What was the value to the musical art of the patronage of the great nobles and princes?

Describe Haydn's duties and opportunities in Prince Esterhazy's service.

What great composer did Haydn meet in Vienna in 1785?

When Haydn's service ceased, to what city did he go? What works did he bring out there?

What was the importance of his work to the Sonata and the Symphony?

Describe the first movement-form as fixed by Haydn.

Describe the second movement as fixed by Haydn.

Describe the third movement as fixed by Haydn.

Name certain qualities characteristic of Haydn's music.

What great American was born in the same year as Haydn?

Name men and women of prominence who were contemporaries of Haydn.

LESSON XXXI.

WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART.

While Haydn's genius was shining steadily as a fixed star, Mozart flashed across the musical heaven, meteorlike, throwing a flood of light over the music world. The knowledge which others spent years in acquiring seemed his by birthright; and thus, although the years of his life were few, the period of his artistic activity was proportionately long.

=Mozart's Early Musical Training=.—Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart was born at Salzburg, January 27, 1756. His father, himself of some reputation as a composer and as the author of the first German violin method, was quick to perceive the child's sensitiveness toward music; and began instruction in clavier playing when Wolfgang was but four years old, teaching also his daughter, Maria Anna, five years older. Wolfgang was an exceedingly delicate and receptive child; and at the age of six he had not only acquired remarkable proficiency on the instrument, but had composed a number of little pieces, and a clavier sonata.

=First Concert Tours=.—Realizing the remarkable talent of his children, Mozart, the father, in 1762, ventured on a concert trip with them to Munich, and later to Vienna, where their playing became the sensation of the hour, and where they were received by the Emperor, Franz Josef I, at his palace. Having been presented with a small violin, Mozart acquired facility in its technic with extraordinary quickness, as also was the case when he attempted the use of organ pedals. The brilliant French court was then the Mecca of artists; and in 1763, the children were taken to Paris, where their successes were redoubled, and where they gave two brilliant concerts, after having played before the royal family at Versailles. At Paris, moreover, the opus 1 and opus 2 of the little Mozart were published, each comprising two sonatas for harpsichord, with accompaniment of violin or flute.

=England=.—Proceeding now to England, the children won fresh laurels, remaining there fifteen months; during which time Wolfgang excited the admiration of the king, George III, by his sight-reading of works by Handel, Bach and others. He also wrote other sonatas, and his first symphonies. Returning to Salzburg, after a three years' absence, Mozart applied himself to serious study, composing his first oratorio and opera, which latter was not performed in public, and also appearing as conductor at a concert in which his "Solemn Mass" was performed.

=Honors in Italy=.—Renewed triumphs awaited him in Italy, where his father took him in 1769, and where his genius was immediately recognized in the leading cities. At Rome he was honored by the Order of the Golden Spur, conferred by the Pope; and in Bologna was admitted to membership in the exclusive Philharmonic Academy, passing with ease an examination which would have appalled many mature musicians; in Milan his opera "Mitridate" was received enthusiastically, and given twenty consecutive performances, under his own direction.

=Journey to Paris=.—Returning to Salzburg, Mozart took up the post previously given him of music director to the Archbishop; but his emolument, at first wholly wanting, was insignificant, and the Archbishop, having little appreciation of his abilities, proved a thankless taskmaster. During this time he made several journeys to Milan, producing new dramatic works there; and in 1777, as his Salzburg position had become intolerable, he resolved to give it up, and to repair to Paris. Starting on this journey with his mother, he stopped at Munich, and then at Augsburg, where he became interested in the Stein pianofortes, henceforth adopting them for his concert work. At Mannheim he heard the famous orchestra, of which Stamitz was the founder, whose command of instrumental brilliancy and color made so powerful an impression upon him that he transmitted it to his succeeding orchestral compositions.

[Illustration: WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART.]

=“Idomeneo” and “Il Seraglio.”=—At Paris, he found society divided into two warring operatic factions, led by Gluck and Piccini, and averse to anything else in music. Saddened also by the death of his mother, he returned to Salzburg, and resumed his former post with the Archbishop. Receiving an order to write an opera for the Carnival at Munich, he produced his “Idomeneo” there in 1781. Shortly after, he was compelled, through ill-treatment, to break finally with the Archbishop, and he resolved to settle in Vienna. In the same year, 1782, in which he produced there his opera, “Entführung aus dem Serail,” composed by command of the Emperor, he married Constance Weber.

=Financial Troubles=.—His life from this time was a constant struggle against poverty; for notwithstanding his wonderful genius, he received only scant recognition from his patron, the Emperor, although loyal to him to the end. His existence was eked out chiefly by the sale of his compositions, which publishers purchased at a low price, by giving lessons and by playing at concerts; while the jealousy of rivals furnished a constant source of annoyance.

=“Figaro,” “Don Giovanni” and Symphonies=.—His comic opera, “The Marriage of Figaro,” produced in Vienna in 1786, came near failing through these enemies, but was an unqualified success in Prague, where, in the following year, his masterpiece, “Don Giovanni,” was produced. On a concert tour in 1786 he was offered an excellent post in the service of King Frederic Wilhelm II, of Prussia, which he refused, through loyalty to his Emperor—a devotion which received no reward save an order to write another opera. In the same year, 1789, his three most important symphonies were completed—the “Jupiter,” in C, and those in G minor and E-flat major.

=Other Operas=—=Death=.—His succeeding operas were “Così fan Tutte,” performed at Vienna in 1790; “The Clemency of Titus,” given at Prague in 1791, for the coronation festivities of King Leopold II of Bohemia, and “The Magic Flute,” produced at Vienna in 1791, which, through its German subject and style, was a signal success, especially in his own country. Discouragements and hard work now told upon him; and in the midst of his labors upon a grand Requiem, he was stricken down, and died December 5, 1791.

=Relations with Haydn=.—No one admired Mozart’s genius more than Haydn; and a proof of the latter’s freedom from the petty jealousies of lesser men is found in the fact that, while he was at first Mozart’s teacher, he was afterward glad to adopt many of the innovations which were the result of Mozart’s genius. The labors of the two men admirably supplemented each other; for Mozart assimilated and blended what Haydn had definitely stated, adorning the rugged outlines with the graceful draperies which his skill as a performer and his artistic nature dictated.

=Italian Influences=.—Thus, while Mozart adopted the form of the Sonata practically as enunciated by Haydn, he was able to impart new elements to it, drawn from his own experience and individuality. His Italian journeys, for instance, had brought him into close touch with the highly-adorned Italian opera style, then everywhere popular; and this he introduced into his instrumental _themes_, making them at once _singing_ and _graceful_ in tone. In the Sonata Form, he made the _second theme_ more definite, _contrasting_ it with the _first_, and frequently casting it in the form of an Italian style of melody, in distinction from a more terse and thematic principal subject.

=Mozart as Piano Virtuoso=.—As a virtuoso, Mozart immensely developed the resources of the piano. After the Bachs, J. S. and his son C. P. E., had established a rational scale fingering, and it was found possible to introduce passages at once quickly running and smooth upon the clavier, such scale passages became very frequent in the compositions of the time, and they were, moreover, well adapted to the light Viennese action found in the Stein pianos, which Mozart used. Hence we find _scale-runs_ as the _cornerstone of his virtuosity_, constantly employed in florid and transitional passages.

=Classic Finish=.—But Mozart’s compositions were not simply an advance in brilliancy, since his slow movements and themes are full of much genuine sentiment, and give opportunity for that expressive song-style which he emphasized so strongly. Moreover, his feeling for artistic finish caused him, by rounding off every detail, to avoid abruptness, replacing them by little delicate turns of musical expression and graceful embellishments, which give an atmosphere of _classic repose_ and finish to the whole.

=Variations=.—Embellishments of this kind are introduced invariably with such naturalness and fitness as to make them seem perfectly adapted to the subject in hand, and growing unconsciously out of it. So Mozart throws a network of _embroidery about his themes_ at their recurrence which shows their beauties to ever greater advantage. The ability to do this makes him a specially felicitous composer in the Variation form, in which some of his most attractive movements and salon pieces are written.

=Piano with Other Instruments=.—His sense of fitness is shown also in the vivid _contrasts_ which occur, especially in his Fantasias, in which brilliant passages are relieved by bits of exquisite melody, in artistic proportion. All these qualities are

manifested in his pianoforte concertos, which, while replete with flights of virtuosity, yet always subordinate, cause him to bring this into equal prominence with the piano, so that the one ably seconds the other in the attempt to produce a well-rounded and thoroughly genuine musical effect. The same qualities are exhibited in his sonatas for violin and piano, and in his piano trios.

=Especial Characteristics=.—Mozart considered three elements necessary for the true interpretation of piano music, namely, an _expressive legato touch_, _moderation_ in the rate of _speed_ of performance, and _strictness_ in adhering to the _time_ adopted. With an unfeeling touch or a breakneck velocity he had no patience, and so had no sympathy with many noted pianists of his day, and notably Clementi. It has been said that Mozart, almost from his infancy, thought in music as others do in words; and this thought in music was regulated by a sense of artistic combination and proportion which permeated all his works. As samples of virtuosity his piano works have long been surpassed by the astonishing developments since his time, and particularly by the added resources of the instrument itself; but as samples of pure and unaffected music their worth can never be diminished.

REFERENCES.

Shedlock.—The Pianoforte Sonata.

Parry.—Evolution of the Art of Music, Chapter XI.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. II, Chapter XXX.

Weitzmann.—History of Pianoforte Playing.

Jahn.—Life of Mozart.

Articles in Grove’s Dictionary on subjects treated.

MUSICAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

Works of Mozart, especially the Sonatas.

QUESTIONS.

Give a sketch of Mozart’s childhood.

Give an account of Mozart’s first concert tour.

Tell about the first trip to Italy.

What drawbacks did he suffer from his connection with the Archbishop of Salzburg?

Where did he come into contact with the piano? With a first-class orchestra?

Why was his life full of financial trouble?

Summarize his work in opera.

What additions did Mozart make to the form of the sonata as developed by Haydn?

Give an account of Mozart’s work as a virtuoso.

What qualities besides brilliancy are shown in his works?

In what form are some of his most delightful pieces written?

Tell about Mozart’s compositions for orchestra.

What three elements did Mozart consider necessary for the interpretation of piano music?

[Illustration: LUDWIG VAN BEETHOVEN.]

LESSON XXXII.

LUDWIG VAN BEETHOVEN.

=Formalism of Haydn and Mozart=.—It has been seen that the forms of harmonic music, growing out of numerous and sometimes crude experiments, were brought to a high state of perfection through the genius of Haydn and Mozart; and that they left a definite structure, nicely balanced, capable of expressing definite thoughts in a unified form, and at the same time of allowing free rein to the composer's fancy. Of their instrumental works, the definition of the musician-philosopher J. J. Rousseau (d. 1778), that "music is the art of combining sounds in a manner agreeable to the ear," gave a fitting characterization; for while a tinge of melancholy is occasionally perceptible, and there are passages of some dramatic intensity, nevertheless such elements are introduced mainly to give a pleasing contrast from the even flow of polished and idealized sound.

=Their Gift to Beethoven=.—In other words, neither Haydn nor Mozart ever sacrifices his sense of artistic finish to the expression of the heights and depths of human emotion. Putting the seal of genius upon instrumental forms, they transmitted these forms to another more colossal mind, which should make use of them, to be sure, but should absolutely subordinate them to the expression of the burning thoughts and passions of a great individuality; a mind which, like that of Shakespeare, was able to look fearlessly upon universal truths, and to bring these to the light, in this instance through the medium of tone. While their predecessors, by unwearying attempts, made possible this determination of a capable art form, so Haydn and Mozart, in their turn, paved the way for the fuller expression which Beethoven gave to music, and which would otherwise not have been possible, since the vehicle for his thoughts would have been wanting. Thus the opportunity had arrived for broadening the definition which Rousseau gave, and announcing the fact that music is the art of the expression of every emotion, whether pleasurable or painful, through the medium of highly organized sound.

=Beethoven's Early Life=.—Ludwig van Beethoven, the last and greatest of this triumvirate of sonata writers, was a native of Bonn-on-the-Rhine, where he was born December 16, 1770. His parents were lowly people, his father a tenor singer in the Elector of Cologne's chapel, and his mother a cook; and, moreover, Beethoven's early life was an unhappy one, through his father's irascible disposition and tendency toward dissipation. Beethoven, of an acutely sensitive nature, inherited his father's quick temper and annoyances at trifles, so that all through his troubled life he was constantly in a state of irritation against something or someone. Like Mozart, he showed early and unmistakable signs of a musical susceptibility; unlike him, however, the unfolding of his genius was ultimately slow, since he attained to his greatest powers much later in life than his phenomenal predecessor. His early instruction was begun with his father; but soon he was placed in the care of several local musicians: Pfeiffer, music director and oboist; Van der Eeden, the court organist; and especially the successor to the latter, Neefe (1748-1798), a man of reputation as organist and composer for the pianoforte. As a result, Beethoven played the violin well at eight, and at twelve had mastered the works of Handel and the "Well-Tempered Clavichord" of J. S. Bach. This intimate study of the best works of the old polyphonic school was of great advantage later in solidifying his gifts as a musician.

=First Compositions=.—In 1782, were published his first attempts at composition—a set of variations, and three sonatas; and these, together with his remarkable extempore playing, began to attract the attention of persons of influence. He was appointed organist at Bonn, and at sixteen was sent by the Elector Max Franz, brother of the Emperor Joseph II, to Vienna, where he received praise from Mozart, who predicted a brilliant future for him.

=The Breuning Family=.—In 1787, his mother died; and this loss, together with his father's intemperate habits, made his home extremely unpleasant. Fortunately for Beethoven, however, the enthusiasm for music which was rife in Germany at this time among people of culture and position was the cause of attracting to his side many true friends, who, appreciating his sterling qualities, were able to pardon his rough exterior and manners. Thus he was received as teacher and friend into the home of the cultivated von Breuning family, under whose refining influence he came into touch with the masterpieces of English and German literature. Here he first met his staunch friend, Count Waldstein; and here he had leisure for long walks amid the rural retreats which he heartily loved, and for meditation upon those musical ideas which he was accustomed to jot down in rough sketches, and which should later be translated into his immortal creations.

=In Vienna=.—Haydn, passing through Bonn, warmly praised a cantata of Beethoven's; and the Elector, moved by such marks of approbation, sent him again to Vienna, in 1792, for serious study. Here he was instructed by Haydn till the latter's departure for England, in 1794, when he went to Albrechtsberger, the celebrated contrapuntist, and others; but these exponents of an earlier school looked somewhat askance at the bold innovations which Beethoven introduced into recognized principles, and failed to understand the irrepressible genius which prompted them. Nothing daunted, he launched zealously into composition, supported by a growing circle of admirers to which the Elector's patronage had introduced him; and soon became a favorite at the private soirées of the nobility, where, on account of his eccentric manners, he was known as an "original," but where his wonderful extemporizing

was received with ecstasy.

=Successes as a Pianist=.—Beethoven's first public performance in Vienna occurred in 1795, when he performed his pianoforte concerto in C major at a concert. During a journey soon after, he played before King Friedrich Wilhelm II, at Berlin, who distinguished him with marks of favor, and to whom Beethoven dedicated two sonatas written for pianoforte with 'cello. Here also he met the conductor, =Friedrich Himmel= (1765-1814), a pianist and composer of high rank. We hear next of his trial of pianistic skill with Steibelt, a popular virtuoso, in which Beethoven won an overwhelming victory. With Wölfl, another distinguished rival, his relations were those of mutual esteem, and the two masters delighted to extemporize dashing capriccios on two pianofortes.

=First Period=.—The thirteen years, from 1790 to 1803, are usually considered to embrace his first period of activity as a composer, comprising his works to opus 50. His opus 1, three trios for piano, violin and 'cello, appeared in 1795, and soon after three piano sonatas, opus 2, dedicated to Haydn, were published. Among the other noteworthy works of this period were his first two symphonies, in C and D, three piano concertos, the piano sonatas including opus 27, the Kreutzer sonata for piano and violin, and his famous Septet for strings and wind instruments. In general, these compositions _follow_ closely the lines laid down by _Haydn_ and _Mozart_, although there is, notably in the piano sonatas, a gradual tendency toward freedom of expression, and the assertion of individuality.

Troubles now began to gather about him. About 1800 his hearing became defective, and the malady grew steadily from bad to worse, so that by 1816 he was obliged to use an ear-trumpet, and by 1822 he was stone-deaf. To add to his discomforts, his brothers Karl and Johann treated him shamefully, and a son of the former, to whom he was left guardian at the father's death, and upon whom he lavished a father's care, turned out a scapegrace, repaying his affection with the basest ingratitude. Weighed down by these misfortunes, Beethoven became irritable and morbid, distrusting his most faithful friends, and constantly imagining plots against himself. His utter ignorance of worldly matters, too, brought him into financial troubles, and involved his domestic affairs in a state of continual confusion.

=Second Period=.—Yet, as if to prove man's ability to rise superior to every affliction, during this very time he was writing compositions which, for joyous freshness and spiritual elevation, have been scarcely, if ever, equalled. During his second period, extending to 1815, and including his compositions to about opus 90, he adopted a _freedom of expression_ entirely untrammelled by formal limitations, enlarging and vivifying the Sonata Form, and varying it to suit his changing moods. The joy of living, with its intensity of passion and depths of emotion, is reflected in these works, which assert a character strong in its struggle against adverse fate, confidently looking toward the goal of ultimate good.

=Compositions of this Period=.—His most popular symphonies were written during this period, which embraces those from the third to the eighth, inclusive. The "Eroica," number three, was originally written in homage to Napoleon, whom Beethoven honored as the guide of the French nation toward that assertion of independence and individuality which he dearly loved; but when the news arrived that Napoleon was declared Dictator, in 1804, he tore up the dedicatory page in a fit of anger. Another of his greatest compositions was his opera of "Fidelio," upon which Beethoven spent an amazing amount of time and pains, whose overture he rewrote twice. Produced in Vienna, in 1805, soon after the occupation of the city by the French, it was received coldly; and only after several revisions did it score a success at all in keeping with its grand and inspiring conception. Several orchestral overtures; his violin concerto; an oratorio; a mass in C; some of his best chamber music, including the celebrated Rasumovsky string quartets; and his piano concertos in G and E-flat, were other fruits of about this time. Of fourteen piano sonatas, we find several which have continued in unbroken popularity, notably the two in opus 27, the "Pastorale," opus 28, the "Waldstein," opus 53, and the "Appassionata."

=Latter Years of His Life=.—The latter part of Beethoven's life, after 1815, was spent in Vienna, in a state of despondency from his troubles which his general recognition as the foremost musician of his day could scarcely alleviate. His many friends placed him, by their efforts, in comfortable pecuniary circumstances; yet he constantly imagined himself struggling with poverty. Sensitive to his affliction, he made himself exceedingly inaccessible, and passed his days in unceasing labor upon those works which eclipsed, in profundity and individuality, all of his former compositions, and which were an index to the conflicting struggles in his mind. Stone-deaf, he yet revelled in a spiritual world of tone, hearing his greatest compositions only in the realms of his imagination. An attack of pneumonia in 1826 left effects which proved lasting, and which caused his death on March 26, 1827. In his last illness he was surrounded by his circle of unfailing friends, among whom the modest Schubert was admitted; and a proof of his hold upon his countrymen is shown in the fact that 20,000 persons are said to have attended his funeral.

=Last Great Works=.—The greatest fruit of these later years was his last symphony, the Ninth, or “Choral,” in which, for the first time, he introduced voices as an aid to the instrumental climax. The free vent which he gave to his radical tendencies in this symphony, its unheard-of boldness of harmonic progressions, and its defiance of all conventional rules, aroused a storm of protest from his critics which was only lulled after succeeding generations had placed the stamp of unmistakable approval upon the work, and had recognized it as a monument of genius. Near to this in importance stands his “Solemn Mass” in D, a work imbued with all the religious fervor of his declining years.

=Sonatas of Third Period=.—Other notable achievements, in the line of chamber music, mark this period; and the last five piano sonatas, extending from opus 101 to opus 111, exhibit the same undaunted freedom that is found in the Ninth symphony. Enormous in their demands upon the pianist, they are food for none but virtuosi; but analyzed, they show a _compendium of_ all known _musical resources_, from the choral fugue to the most daring flights of harmonic expression.

=Beethoven’s Dual Personality=.—Beethoven furnishes an example of a personality whose dual nature is remarkably apparent. Often unkempt, and rude in his outward bearing, he seemed at times absolutely oblivious to his surroundings and to chafe at his bodily limitations; yet his apparent rudeness toward his friends was as often humbly atoned for by his confession of his haste in judging them. His independence of spirit could brook no submission to authority other than his own conscience; and that conscience prompted him to stand firm in support of the genuine, the pure and the ideal; firm, thus, in its abhorrence of artificiality and deceit. In his ignorance of worldly wiles he was on a par with a little child; finding his true sphere when buried in the lofty problems of his art, giving to the world the fruits of his innermost spirit, which were ever animated by nobility and truth of expression.

=Beethoven Stood Alone=.—Detesting the fetters of teaching work, he left few pupils. Among these =Ferdinand Ries= (1784-1838) enjoyed an intimate association with him, and afterwards became prominent as piano virtuoso and composer. With the great men of his day he affiliated but little. Goethe (1749-1832) he met but once, on one of his journeys; but the meeting had no further results. Like other great minds, his original ideas had to make their way amid a shower of abuse from more conventional contemporaries, who lauded as his equal or superior others whose works have long since passed into oblivion; but, fortunate in finding staunch defenders, he made steady progress against his enemies, until his position in the music world became unique and unassailable.

QUESTIONS.

What did Haydn and Mozart give to Beethoven?

Give a sketch of Beethoven’s early life.

What works did he particularly study?

What were his first compositions?

What intimate friends did he make in early life?

What city did he select as his home?

What years embrace his first period?

What are the leading works of this period?

What affliction developed in 1800?

What years compose the second period?

What changes came into his style?

Name the leading works of the second period.

Tell about Beethoven’s later life, from 1815 on.

What are the leading works of this last period?

Describe the personality of Beethoven.

LESSON XXXIII.

BEETHOVEN AND THE SONATA.

=Bach and Beethoven Contrasted=.—We now consider the exact nature of the work which Beethoven did, in distinction from that of Haydn and Mozart. It has been said that Bach gave the Old Testament in music, while Beethoven gave the New; that is, that Bach consummated the old polyphonic school, while Beethoven did an equal work for the new harmonic school. Yet this is only a half truth; for Bach, besides perfecting former styles, gave glimpses of modern chromatic modulation and free expression; while Beethoven, a student of the old masters, employed polyphonic forms as well as harmonic, making all work together to translate his thought, and so moulding them into a means of portraying every emotion as to open the door forever to the untrammelled presentment of thought, through the medium of music.

=Beethoven's Gradual Development=.—But Beethoven did not arrive at this result in an instant. It is true that, even in his early works, a distinction of style is shown which removes them from a mere imitation, but, as has been shown, he _began_ practically at the point _where Haydn and Mozart left off_, with compositions which can hardly be placed on a higher level than theirs; and, in the course of a life full of strenuous experiences, he gradually _unfolded the resources_ which he had received from his predecessors, until he made them adequate to give vent to the mighty ideas which welled from his soul. Thus we find in his works a period in which _form is rigidly observed_; and we pass thence through an era of expansion, during which _form becomes more elastic_, through the added requirements placed upon it, until the thought and emotion become so paramount that the _formal lines_ have entirely _disappeared_, and are only to be traced by careful analysis.

=Beethoven and the Orchestra=.—As the great exponent of instrumental music, Beethoven found the orchestra his best and fullest vehicle of expression. So his massive mind, grasping with ease the effects of manifold combinations of instruments, was able to mould his thoughts into terms of tone color in which each instrument should be employed to bring out the exact shade of feeling required. So the orchestra becomes with him a great individual instrument, responding to the slightest change of mood.

=Use of the Piano=.—But as a preparation for such orchestral work, Beethoven realized the value of the pianoforte. Attaining a marvelous degree of virtuosity in the use of the keyboard at an early age, he later found this of the greatest advantage in working out his ideas, and, further, in actually trying their effects upon auditors. Thus we find in his first pianoforte sonatas effects which appeared much later in the greater elaboration of his symphonies; thus also is shown the necessary imperfection of any division of his works into distinct periods, since his pianoforte style was so greatly in advance of his orchestral.

=Improvement in the Piano=.—In this connection, it is important to note that Beethoven's resources were greatly increased by the improvements which had been made in piano manufacture. The demand for instruments, created by the growing popularity of the pianoforte, stimulated manufacturers to redoubled energy in perfecting them; and, conversely, the added resources thus developed were an instigation to composers to test their abilities in the invention of new effects. Thus Beethoven was placed in command of a piano of much greater power than Mozart's; and the work of technicians, like Clementi, for whom he had great respect, was already hinting at new and marvelous possibilities.

=Added Sonority and Sustaining Power=.—This strength of construction resulted in greater sonority. Hence we find full chord progressions and rich floods of tone in Beethoven's works, in place of the dainty harmonic accompaniment of former writers. Moreover, the increase in sustaining force, enhanced by the use of the pedal, made possible a sustained legato tone for singing passages, which had formerly to be merely hinted at through shakes and other embellishments. A consequent tone variety made it possible to emphasize a single voice in this way, while the accompanying harmonies could be kept well in the background. Again, this range of tone proved an incentive for long crescendos, from the softest suspicion of sound to an overwhelming tonal climax.

=Increased Compass=.—The added range which the keyboard developed also enhanced such effects, by the chance for brilliancy in the treble, and for profundity in the bass; moreover, Beethoven was quick to make use of the variety of effects caused by _playing in the different registers_; sometimes suggesting in this way the contrast in the orchestra between different groups of instruments, such as the strings and woodwind.

=Structure of Beethoven's Sonatas=.—With such resources at his command, Beethoven was able to give a fuller scope to the Sonata than was formerly possible, filling out each movement, and perfecting it for the expression of an integral part of the general idea, and finally placing it in its proper relationship to the whole. The Sonata Form, as settled by Haydn, was made the point of departure, serving almost invariably as the basis of the first movement, and frequently, in shortened form, for the second, generally

slow, movement. For the third movement, Beethoven at first employed the Minuet, following the custom in the symphonies of Haydn and Mozart; but later this was generally omitted in the pianoforte sonatas, while in the symphonies its time was quickened into that of the dainty, sparkling Scherzo. For the finale, the Rondo form was most frequent; though, in order to give a fuller compass to the thought, a combination of the Rondo and Sonata forms was invented by Beethoven, and used even in his first sonatas. The Rondo form also appeared occasionally in the slow movement. Add that other forms, notably that of the Variation, sometimes supplanted one or the other of these, and we have the structure generally followed by Beethoven.

=Unity of Conception=.—All these movements were associated in an organic unity of conception which made one grow out of another with perfect naturalness. Sometimes, indeed, as in opus 27, a continuity of performance was indicated; always, however, the feeling of dependence of one movement upon another is present; so that the criticism made upon Haydn's symphonies, that a movement of one could be interchanged with a similar movement of any other without perceptible difference, could never be made with regard to Beethoven's works.

=Key Relationship=.—In key relationship, Beethoven struck out from stereotyped paths, frequently using _contrasting keys related to the third of the initial chord_; thus a movement or passage in C major might be followed by any key related to E, the third of the chord of C, such as E or A major or minor. The original key was most widely departed from in the slow movement, where the beauty of contrast was exceptionally noticeable.

=Number of Movements=.—The number of movements which he adopted was at first four, but this afterwards varied considerably, two or three movements prevailing; while in the fantasie-sonatas, and especially in the last five sonatas, an indefinite number of movements, some of them very short, appeared. He explained this discrepancy on the ground that he adapted the number of movements to his thought; and when he felt that he had given complete expression to this, the sonata was brought to a close.

=Development of First Movement Form=.—Of Beethoven's first movements, it may be said that no one has ever spoken with the perfect freedom and naturalness which he displays. Each part of the movement he strengthened and developed; the first section announced two themes, contrasting, but still closely identified; sometimes with a slow introduction to usher them in; the Development was given a contrapuntal treatment, solidified by rich harmonies; the third section was varied by rhythmic or tonal devices, tending to broaden its effect; and, finally, the Coda was sometimes developed to the length of a fourth section, in which reminiscences of material used previously were worked up to a fitting climax.

=Devices for Giving Unity=.—But the most evident characteristic which Beethoven put into this form was that of _Unity_, or _Continuity of idea_. This he accomplished by several means. Of these, the first was by separating the most striking parts of his subjects into short, definite phrases or motives, and by introducing these in every variety of manner throughout the movement, sometimes in a sequence on different degrees of the scale, sometimes by imitation in different voices, again by varying the length of the component notes, and finally by dropping off portions, while the portions remaining keep the idea still before the auditor. Or, some casual phrase, in an unimportant section, will strike his fancy and he will develop it with a wealth of imagery astonishing in its inventiveness.[10]

=Continuity of Various Parts=.—This constant presentment of a thematic idea also serves to bind passages closely together which, in the sonatas of Haydn and Mozart, were separated by definite pauses. Indeed, Beethoven sedulously _avoids a complete cadence_, seeking, by leading the listener eagerly on from one connecting phrase to another, to retain the interest and make it mount up higher and higher, as the effects grow in intensity. So phrases are made to overlap one another, with their boundaries practically eliminated. It has been said that Beethoven tore down the fences which Haydn and Mozart had erected between the various parts of the Sonata Form; and this is proven by the fact that, in the Beethoven sonatas, authorities frequently differ as to where one part ends and another begins, so close and continuous is the bond between them.

=Dramatic Effects in Climaxes=.—This close connection is made a ready element toward the dramatic expression which finds vent in the climaxes, made from culminating tonal effects, where the thematic phrase mounts up step by step, higher and higher, growing breathless by shortened rhythm, until the hearer is brought to the summit of dramatic intensity; and here thunderous arpeggios, mingled together by the use of the pedal, hold him spellbound with their sonorous waves of sound. The supreme passion which Beethoven does not wholly conceal even in his quieter moods appears frequently in strange, agitated rhythms and startling accents thrown upon unexpected notes or in unexpected places. He also used many more marks of expression than his predecessors.

=Freedom in Modulations=.—The boldness of his modulations has already been mentioned; and these appear with the most freedom in the development sections, where tonalities pile upon one another, until the auditor is apparently inextricably involved in a maze of harmonies; from which, naturally as the awakening from a dream, he finds himself transported back to the original key, in which the first theme is taking its course. Beethoven's sense of proportion, however, sees to it that this intricacy of keys is well prepared by the definite tonality of his original subjects, and by the final complete restatement of the original key. His harmonies frequently shocked his contemporaries by their violations of conventional rules; but they have long since been justified by succeeding musicians, who have departed from them to much bolder flights.

=Program Music=.—It has been said that Beethoven furnishes examples of the program style—that is, the depicting of definite ideas through music. We have already found a tendency of this sort among the early French clavier composers—Rameau, the Couperins and others of their school; also in some of the German writers, like Pachelbel and Kuhnau. Viewed in relation to these early composers, Beethoven's work seems to have little in common, since his nearest approach to program music was in attaching to some of his works certain moods, inspired by events or scenes. Thus he gives the name "Pathétique" to the sonata, opus 13, "Appassionata" to opus 57, "Les Adieux" to opus 81; while we have the "Pastoral" symphony, depicting the mood inspired by country scenes, and the "Eroica," showing the mood arising from the contemplation of a hero's career.

=Pianoforte Concertos=.—The same characteristics which are noted in his pianoforte sonatas appeared, developed still further, in his larger works, such as his symphonies and piano concertos. The latter, five in number, display the resources of the virtuosity of Beethoven's day, and yet keep this always subordinated to the inspired musical sentiment, with which the orchestra nobly accords. The last two of these, belonging to the maturity of his genius, amply display the powers of genuine expression.

=Variations=.—Of numerous other piano compositions, the sets of Variations are prominent. He was fond of taking some short and simply constructed musical thought, sometimes from some song or opera, and treating it in every variety of manner that his fertile genius could suggest. Such compositions, while generally playful in mood, have the finish which Beethoven never failed to give to his work.

=Beethoven's Accuracy in Writing=.—It is this seriousness toward his art which most fully accentuates the real underlying drift of his nature. In the midst of his untidy ménage, when confusion of material goods reigned about him, Beethoven nevertheless treated each work which flowed from his pen with the most careful and critical revision, never allowing it to go out until he had absolutely fixed each note in its proper place. Where his art was involved, his usually irritable nature acquired a fund of patience; so that sometimes whole scores were rewritten, until he arrived at accurate expression; and, when that point was reached, his fiat was irrevocable. It is thus a satisfaction to note that he has not left us the erratic wanderings of an eccentric mind; but the completed and matured product of a genius, speaking with authority and precision.

REFERENCES.

Weitzmann.—History of Pianoforte Playing.

Parry.—Evolution of the Art of Music, Chapter XII.

Shedlock.—The Pianoforte Sonata, Chapter VII.

Naumann.—History of Music, Vol. II, Chapter XXXII.

Schindler.—Life of Beethoven.

Other lives of Beethoven, especially that in Grove's Dictionary.

For musical illustrations, consult the works of Beethoven, especially the Pianoforte sonatas, published complete in all the cheap editions.

QUESTIONS.

Contrast Bach and Beethoven.

Characterize Beethoven's three periods.

What was the greatest means of expression in Beethoven?

What was the value of his work for the piano in relation to the orchestra?

What was the effect of the improvements in the piano of Beethoven's time over that of Mozart?

Give a statement of the Sonata as constructed by Beethoven.

What changes did he introduce: Key relationship? Number of movements?

What qualities are found in his first movement form?

How does he secure great unity and continuity of idea?

How does he secure dramatic expression?

Where does he introduce bold modulations? With what effect?

What use did Beethoven make of the program idea?

Tell about his Concertos. His Variations.

LESSON XXXIV.

THE VIOLIN AND ITS MAKERS.

=Change from the Viol to the Violin=.—The reader who has studied the principles of construction and playing of the old string instruments, as explained in Lesson XV, or examined them in museums, will not have failed to note that they were complicated and limited in technic. The members of this family were large and cumbersome, troublesome to handle and not particularly graceful or pleasing to the eye; the position in which the player was forced to hold them was difficult to maintain and not conducive to a rapid, facile technic. Now, the direction of a perfected art is always toward simplicity; the various members of the viol family were to yield place to a new instrument, a modification of the original type, and one that possessed some striking and valuable advantages over the viol. Another element that aided in the change from the viol was the efforts of composers to produce a distinctive instrumental music, a style which demanded an instrument with a higher range than the viols, corresponding to the highest female voice. Still another element to be considered was the stir in intellectual, social, political and commercial life which was evident everywhere, the product of the Renaissance. Music was influenced by this spirit; composers were seeking new forms in which to express their thoughts and were calling for new and better media for presenting them to others. As composers gained in breadth and power of conception, instruments were improved even beyond their demands; the increase in resources stimulated, in turn, the composers. At this period music was on the threshold of a splendid activity in instrumental lines, the reign of the old choral music and the contrapuntal composer was being challenged, and the way prepared for Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven.

=Beginning of the Violin=.—With regard to the violin, as in other beginnings, there is disagreement; the strongest claims are set forth for France and Italy, with German historians by no means lax in attributing the first instruments to one of their own countrymen. We give the following facts which seem to divide the honors: In the scores of Italian works of the 16th century, a part may be found for what is called the _piccolo violino alla francese_ (little French viol), a fact which would argue that an instrument of this kind, perhaps most commonly used in France, had been known for some time. The oldest known instrument of the violin type is one which bears the date 1449, and is signed Jean Kerlin, a Breton luthier (lute maker, a term applied also to violin makers), whose name is also given as Kerlino, living in Brescia, Italy, in the middle of the 15th century. About the same time there lived in Bologna, Padua and Venice, members of a celebrated lute-making family, named Duiffoprugcar, Italian equivalent for the German name, Tieffenbrucker, for the family came from the Italian Tyrol. The most celebrated member of this family was Gasparo Duiffoprugcar (Casper Tieffenbrucker), who was born about 1469, lived in Bologna until 1515, when he went to Paris. Later he removed to Lyons, where he spent the rest of his life. Six instruments having violin characteristics (high, not sloping shoulders, deeper curves in the waist and better-defined _f_ holes) are attributed to him, bearing dates of 1510, 1511, 1515 and 1517.

=Early Italian Makers=.—The next name is that of Gasparo di Salo, founder of the Brescian school of violin-making, who was born at a little village called Salo, on Lake Garda; hence his name. His model varied, sometimes it was high, at other times flat; as his instruments produced a full, sonorous tone, the model was revived in later years by Joseph Guarnerius. His tenors and double-basses are considered his finest work, his violins being a trifle small. The favorite double bass of Dragonetti, the famous contrabassist, was by di Salo; Ole Bull frequently played on a di Salo violin in his concerts. The greatest successor of di Salo was

his pupil, =Giovanni Paolo Maggini= (1590-1640), whose violins are highly prized. They are characterized by a brown varnish and a double purfling.

=The Cremona School=.—With the public the name Cremona is indissolubly connected with violin-making. In the 16th century this city was a famous art centre, rivaling Bologna in music and painting. The first great maker and founder of the Cremona school was Andrea (Andrew) Amati, born about 1520 and died 1577 or 1580.[11] He used mostly a small pattern, top and back high, the varnish amber in color. A number of his instruments furnished for the Chapel Royal of Charles IX were known to have been in Versailles prior to the French Revolution. The Amati style was continued by Andrea's two sons, Antonio (Anthony) and Hieronymus (Geronimo or Jerome) Amati. The former is said to have lived 1550-1638, the latter 1551-1635. They worked conjointly, although the latter made some experiments with a larger model than the usual Amati.

=Nicolo Amati=.—The greatest of the Amati family and the one whose instruments are still highly prized was =Nicolo (Nicolaus) Amati= (1596-1684), the son of Geronimo. He forms one of the great triumvirate of violin-making, Amati, Guarnerius and Stradivarius. At first he followed the small form adopted by his father and his uncle, although he improved on the workmanship. But about 1625, no doubt as the result of an experiment, he began to use a slightly larger pattern which is known to connoisseurs as the "Grand Amati." These instruments represent his best work and command a high price. The Amati tone is sweet, mellow yet somewhat delicate, although remarkable in purity; the instruments are unsuited to orchestral work, although admirable in chamber music, particularly of the old style. The varnish is yellowish or amber colored.

=Joseph Guarnerius=.—In our study of the piano we noted how the small, weak tone of the clavichord and harpsichord gave way before the fuller toned, sonorous pianoforte, which, with its greater possibilities, came into use at a time when composers were seeking for means to give increased breadth and power to the reproduction of their music. It would have been unfortunate for instrumental music if the small though sweet tone of the Amati violin had been accepted as the ideal. We could not have had the surging tumult of Beethoven's "Eroica" symphony, the great dramatic pictures of Wagner with the Amati to lay on the colors. More tone, more sonorousness, more virile singing was needed. One of the men to place in the hands of executants the instrument to work out the conceptions of the great composers was =Giuseppe Guarneri= or, as he is generally called, Joseph Guarnerius del Gesu. He was born at Cremona, 1683, and belonged to a family of lute and violin makers. He has been credited with having been a pupil of Stradivari, yet his instruments show no trace of that maker's influence. He seems to have been impressed with the tone-producing qualities of the di Salo violins, for his best instruments have something of their bold, vigorous style. He was an experimenter, ever seeking, it would seem, for the means of producing big, sonorous tone, and changed his model frequently, for which reason his instruments vary much in value. His work was not so highly favored by connoisseurs until Paganini showed the value of a Guarnerius from the standpoint of tone. His best instruments are now greatly admired and, because so few in good condition are known, command a high price. The date of Guarnerius' death is not known. Others of the Guarnerius family who lived and worked at Cremona were Andreas Guarnerius, uncle to Giuseppe, his son also called Joseph and known as "_filius Andreæ_" (Son of Andreas) to distinguish him from his cousin, Joseph del Gesu, another son Peter, "of Cremona," and a son of Joseph _filius Andreæ_, known as Peter of Venice.

=Antonius Stradivarius=.—The greatest of violin-makers who united in his instruments the brilliant and powerful tone of di Salo and the Brescian school and the purity and finish of the Amati was =Antonius Stradivarius= (Antonio Stradivari is the Italian form), born in 1644, one year after the death of Monteverde, and died in 1737, five years after the birth of Haydn, a period of nearly a century in which a most significant development took place in music. He was apprenticed to Nicolo Amati, and the instruments of his early years are faithful copies of that master's work; but as he grew in years and experience he improved on the Amati model, every change tending to produce a more powerful and resonant tone. The differences that strike the eye most strongly are the larger proportions, the flatter arch of the top, and the shape of the sound holes. In his earlier instruments he used a yellowish varnish; after 1684, one of a reddish tint. Stradivarius also fixed the form and adjustment of the bridge. He left two sons, Francesco and Omoboni, who finished some of their father's instruments after his death. They both died five or six years later. Pupils of Stradivarius who made excellent instruments were =Carlo Bergonzi= (1712-1750), =Lorenzo Guadagnini= (1695-1740) and his son =Johannes Baptista Guadagnini= (1750-1785) and =Alessandro Gagliano=.

=Other Makers=.—Germany's contribution to violin-making dates from =Jakob Stainer=, of Absam in Tyrol (1621-1683). Tradition has it that he learned his art at Cremona; if so, his work shows no influence of the Amati; his model is different, somewhat broader and shorter, the arch of the belly is greater, and the sound holes are set differently; the varnish varies from a brown to an amber color; the tone is sweet and quick to respond, but lacks intensity. A follower of Stainer was =Ægidius Klotz= (1653-1743), many of whose instruments were sold as of Stainer's make. France contributed no makers of great renown. The names of importance are

=Nicholas Lupot= (1758-1824), a follower of Stradivarius, and =J. B. Vuillaume= (1799-1875). In England the most distinguished names are =Richard Duke= and =Benjamin Banks= (1727-1795).

=The Violin Bow=.—A few words must be said in regard to the bow, the means for producing tone from the violin strings. In its earliest form it was simply a bow with a stretched string. Hair came into use, to replace the string, about the 13th century, and the bow lost its original shape, becoming straight for nearly its entire length, curving downward at the point. Corelli used a bow of this shape. Tartini's bow had the same shape, but was made longer. At the end of the 18th century, =François Tourte= (1747-1835), a Paris bow-maker, lengthened the bow still more, and bent it slightly inward, giving it the form familiar to us today. Viotti was the first great player to use this style of bow, and is credited with a share in perfecting it. It is no exaggeration to say that upon Tourte's improvements to the bow rests the whole fabric of modern violin-playing, with its wonderful variety of execution and consequent nuances in expression.

=The Viola and the Violoncello=.—Two other instruments of the violin type are in use, the Viola, the _tenor_ violin, and the Violoncello, the _bass_ violin; both these instruments shared in the development of the violin, and were made by the great makers, Amati, Guarnerius and Stradivarius. The Contra-bass, the bass-viol, as it is often called, while it is used to furnish the bass to the string orchestra, is a member of the viol family, having the special characteristics, sloping shoulders and flat back. Instruments were made on the violin pattern, but given up as less satisfactory than the viol type.

The impetus given to instrumental composition by the perfecting of the instruments of the string group stimulated makers to work for improvement in those belonging to the family of wind instruments, flutes, oboes, clarinets, horns, harps, etc., thus offering the means to reproduce for hearers the great conceptions of the tone-masters.

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, article on the violin.

Stoeving.—Story of the Violin.

Hart.—The Violin. Its Famous Makers and their Imitators.

Heron-Allen. Violin-Making as it Was and Is.

Haweis.—Old Violins.

QUESTIONS.

Why did the Viol type yield to the Violin?

Who is credited with being the originator of the Violin type?

Give the names of the early Italian makers.

What noted family of violin makers started the fame of Cremona?

What was the model used by the Amati family?

What improvements did Joseph Guarnerius make?

What was Stradivarius' contribution?

Who was the greatest German maker? Name French and English makers.

Compare the great makers of violins and their work.

The author suggests that a violin, viola, 'cello and double bass and the respective bows be exhibited to the class and examined, the descriptions as given in the reference works to be compared with the instruments. The catalogue of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City, contains some fine illustrations for the use of students, as well as descriptions. A copy of this should be in every teacher's library. It can be secured for a small amount by addressing the Museum as above.

LESSON XXXV.

VIOLIN PLAYING AND VIOLIN MUSIC.

=Reciprocal Influences of Instruments and Composition=.—The development of the violin, of violin playing and violin music, in a certain sense shows reciprocal influences, and went hand in hand. This was the more certain because the composers who wrote for the instrument were also players, in almost every instance the virtuosi of their times. During the polyphonic period, composers were singers or organists; during the period when the violin dominated instrumental composition, composers in that form were usually violinists. In the next period, when the pianoforte was coming to the front, the representative composers were clavier composers. And since then with but few exceptions the great composers have also been pianists.

=Earliest Violin Compositions=.—In the music of the viol period no demands were made upon the instrumental player except that he should double the voice part, which was simple, viewed from the standpoint of modern violin playing. Even later when music was written for quartets of viols the parts were vocal in character and did not exceed voices in range. The earliest known solo composition was published in 1620, by Marini. It demands but little from the executant. The next work of importance was in 1627, when Carlo Farina, an Italian living at Dresden, published a collection of pieces which show quite an advance technically, including variety of bowing, double stopping and chords. The names applied to violin compositions were: _Sonate_, _Canzone_ and _Sinfonia_, the principle of the first named being an alternation of slow and quick movements. About 1650 the term Sonata comes into general use, and a further distinction is made between _Sonata da Chiesa_ (church sonata) and _Sonata da Camera_ (chamber sonata), the former consisting of three or four movements varying in tempo, the latter being really a suite of dances, with slow and quick movements in alternation. The Church, always ready to make use of the fine arts, soon discovered the capabilities of the violin and its music, and adopted it as one of its musical forces, not merely for assisting in accompaniments but for independent performances. As a result of this patronage, the violin sonata, the only form of serious composition for the instrument, took on the severer character of the church sonata, giving an impulse toward the establishment of sonata form.

=Composers of the 17th Century=.—Among those who prepared the way for the great ones to follow was =Giovanni Battista Vitali= (1644-1692), who shows in his chamber sonatas the tendency to adopt the form of the church sonata. His name is best known in violin literature by a Chaconne with variations, which makes no inconsiderable demands on the technic of a player, and must have marked him out as a conspicuous player in his own time. This is a worthy forerunner of Bach’s great work in a similar form. In Germany the significant name is =Heinrich Biber= (1644-1704), who had a highly developed technic for that period, for his works carry the player up to the sixth position and introduce difficult double stopping and arpeggios. The next name to be noticed is =Giuseppe Torelli= (1660-1708), who lived many years in Bologna as leader of a church orchestra. He is credited with having been the first to apply the principles of construction as shown in the church sonata to concerted music, which later developed into the Concerto.

[Illustration: ARCANGELO CORELLI.]

=Corelli=.—In any great movement one man seems to sum up the best of the work of his predecessors. The name associated with putting violin music and playing on a firm foundation is that of =Arcangelo Corelli= (1653-1713), eminent both as composer and player. He was a contemporary of Guarnerius and Stradivarius, who brought the instrument to perfection. Of Corelli’s early life little is known. He traveled in France and was also in Munich for some years. In 1681 he returned to Italy, making his home at Rome. As a teacher, he acquired great fame and pupils came to him from all parts of Europe. The most eminent violinists who were under his instruction were Geminiani, Locatelli, Somis, Baptiste, and Castrucci. Corelli did not invent new forms of composition or of technic—in the latter respect he did not equal certain of his contemporaries—he was a reformer rather than an innovator. He had, however, a keen sense for effects that were specially suited to the instrument, and his conservatism put the art of playing the violin on a solid basis upon which others were able to add newer and more difficult technic. His works included forty-eight three-part sonatas for various combinations, twelve two-part sonatas for violin and cembalo, nine for two violins and cembalo, and six concertos for two violins and ’cello with a quartet accompaniment. The violin being so preëminently a singing, a melody instrument, it is singular that Corelli and his contemporaries did not grasp the principle of using clearly defined melodic themes. This fact shows that the influence of the church sonata and its rejection of a formal tune as unsuited to serious art was still strong. Therefore, while Corelli’s works do not show themes such as are characteristic of the next period of the sonata, his construction is logical and his handling of his form-material is concise and clear. The student of Form in music will find the germs of sonata-form in Corelli’s works.

=Corelli’s Pupils=.—Among Corelli’s pupils must be mentioned =Francesco Geminiani= (1680-1762), who spent part of his life in England. He published the first work of a pedagogic character, a “Method for Violin Playing,” in London, in 1740. He also

recommended holding the violin on the left side instead of on the right, as was customary in his time. =Pietro Locatelli= (1693-1764) greatly influenced the development of violin technic. =Giovanni Battista Somis= (1676-1763) lived at Turin, was the teacher of Pugnani, the instructor of Viotti. =Antonio Vivaldi= (1675-1743) devoted himself to virtuosity and influenced the Concerto from this point. He was fertile and ingenious in making new combinations and devising new effects. J. S. Bach arranged his works, sixteen for the clavier, four for the organ, and one as a concerto for four claviers and a quartet of stringed instruments. Still another name is to be mentioned, that of =Francesco Maria Veracini= (1685-1750), who greatly influenced Tartini by his playing. He was a player full of temperament, which made his playing powerfully expressive. His sonatas are bold in harmonic and melodic treatment, and well constructed. Their technical difficulty is considerable. (His lifetime coincides with Bach.)

[Illustration: GIUSEPPE TARTINI.]

=Giuseppe Tartini= (1692-1770) is one of the commanding figures of musical history. He was intended for the profession of law by his parents but, fortunately for music, did not fall in with the plan. A hasty marriage with the niece of an archbishop brought him into trouble, and he fled to a monastery, where he spent two years, devoting the greater part of his time to musical studies. At the end of this time he was allowed to rejoin his wife, and went to Venice, where he learned to know Veracini, with whom he studied to correct the faults he had acquired through pursuing his studies undirected. Again he went into retirement and gave himself up to the study of violin technic. Among other things he made some improvements in the bow, increasing the range of effects. His contemporaries ascribe to him “a fine tone, unlimited command of fingerboard and bow, perfect intonation in double stops, a most brilliant trill and double trill as well, which he could execute equally well with all fingers.” His celebrated composition “_Il Trillo del Diavolo_” (“The Devil’s Trill”) shows his skill in embellishments. A technical work “_Arte dell’ Arco_” (“The Art of Bowing”) gives a clear idea of his method in that branch of the violinist’s art. In his compositions he shows advance on Corelli and Vivaldi, for his melody is broader, his phrases more developed and clearer, his harmonies richer and better contrasted, with many passages of a strongly emotional character. He wrote a great number of pieces, sonatas and concertos. In addition to his work as player and composer, Tartini devoted himself to teaching. His school at Padua was the Mecca of violinists from all Europe. In those days there were no instruction books; Tartini’s pupils looked to him for everything, and his character as a teacher can be learned in a letter addressed by him to a pupil.[12] Tartini’s contribution to music also includes work of a theoretical character. He discovered the so-called combinational sound, by which is meant the sounding of a third sound when two tones are sounded together.[13] He published a treatise on the subject. Two pupils of Tartini’s who deserve mention are =Pietro Nardini= (1722-1793) and =Gaetano Pugnani= (1726-1803), who was also a pupil of Somis, thus uniting in himself the teachings of the two great masters, Tartini and Corelli, which he transmitted to later generations through his great pupil, Viotti.

With Tartini the violin sonata of the old type lost its place, being succeeded by the sonata for the piano which was being developed by composers, giving rise to a form that was later to be the basis of a new sonata for violin and piano in which each instrument filled an equal place. In the earlier days the tone of the clavichord and harpsichord, weak and thin, was not suited save for accompanying the full-toned brilliantly effective violin; but after Tartini’s time the instrument gained in power and sonorousness and formed a worthy helpmeet for the violin.

[Illustration: GIOVANNI BATTISTA VIOTTI.]

=Violin playing in France= was largely influenced by Italian players. Lully, the opera composer, was a violinist, but the Italian school had not developed when, as a lad, he left his native country. The Corelli principles were carried to France by =Leclair= (1687-1764), who received his training from Somis, a pupil of Corelli. His treatment of the bow showed the lightness and agility that later became distinctive of the French school. =Pierre Gaviniés= (1726-1800) lent strength to the establishment of an independent French school of playing. He is best known today by a set of difficult studies. =Giovanni Battista Viotti= (1753-1824), an Italian by birth, greatly influenced violin playing in his day. As a lad of seventeen he traveled through Europe with Pugnani, his teacher, winning great success. Later he located in Paris, teaching and composing, giving regularly private performances at which he brought out his concertos. His themes have a marked singing character, and all his writing is eminently suited to the instrument. In his concertos he used the elaborated sonata-form as developed by Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, and in his accompaniments draws fully on the resources of the orchestra. His works include a fine set of duets for two violins. His most eminent pupils were =Pierre Rode= (1774-1830) and =Pierre Marie François de Sales Baillot= (1771-1842) who with =Rodolphe Kreutzer= (1766-1831) were teachers in the Paris Conservatoire, for which they prepared the famous “Méthode de Violin.” Rode and Kreutzer are famous in violin literature for their studies for advanced players. Beethoven dedicated his great sonata for piano and violin, Op. 47, to Kreutzer, for which reason it is known by the latter’s name. In connection with the educational writers just mentioned, =Federigo Fiorillo=, born 1753, in Germany, of Italian parents, is to be noted. His thirty-six etudes or caprices rank with the works of Rode and

Kreutzer. =Antonio Lolli= (1730-1802) was a virtuoso and nothing else. His execution was marvelous, and he was, in many respects, a forerunner of Paganini.

=Violin playing in Germany= had its source and inspiration in the concert tours made in that country by the great Italian virtuosi, a number of whom lived for periods of some length at the courts of Berlin, Dresden, Mannheim and other capitals, where they trained pupils for the various ducal orchestras. The orchestra at Mannheim was the most famous for its work and sent out a number of fine players and musicians. Space does not permit the mention of these men. The first great name in the violin world of Germany is =Ludwig Spohr= (1784-1859), who was also one of the great composers of his time, his activity leading him into the domain of the oratorio and opera as well as orchestra and instrumental music. (His principal teacher was =Franz Eck= (1774-1804), who belonged to the Mannheim school.) Later he had opportunity to hear Rode, by whose playing he was much impressed. He spent some years in concertizing, and in 1822 located at Cassel as the director of the orchestra there. Here he taught many noted pupils, the best known being Ferdinand David. While Spohr was a great player and a great teacher, he influenced modern violin playing more by his compositions. Some of his concertos still figure in the violinist's repertoire and his duos and concertantes for two violins and for violin and viola are unsurpassed by any compositions in that style. In 1831, he published his "Violin School," which was a standard work for many years. The direct successor of Spohr was =Ferdinand David= (1810-1873), a great player and a great teacher who was associated with Mendelssohn in the founding of the famous Leipzig Conservatorium. From this institution David's pupils went over all Europe into positions of responsibility and reputation. His greatest pupil was =August Wilhelmj= (b. 1845). After David's death supremacy in the field of violin playing gradually fell away from Leipzig and centred in Berlin around Joseph Joachim, the Nestor of the present-day[14] violin world.

[Illustration: LUDWIG SPOHR.]

=The Vienna School=.—The southern Germans had certain characteristics wherein they differed from their northern kin; they were in closer touch with Italy and were also influenced by their Hungarian neighbors. In Beethoven's time considerable attention was given by Viennese violinists to chamber-music. Four names are prominent: =Karl Dittersdorf= (1739-1799), =Anton Wranitzky= (1756-1808), =Joseph Mayseder= (1789-1863) and =Joseph Bœhm= (1795-1876), the latter being the teacher of a number of famous violinists, =Hellmesberger=, =Dont=, =Remenyi=, =Ernst= and =Joseph Joachim= (b. 1831), the latter, representing the solid, classical style of his teacher, joined to a mastery of the technic of his instrument that enabled him to win and maintain the highest rank as virtuoso, quartet player and composer for his instrument. Up to the time of his death, August 15, 1907, he was director of the Royal High School of Music in Berlin. He was the teacher of hundreds of players, including many celebrated artists of the present day.

[Illustration: JOSEPH JOACHIM.]

[Illustration: NICOLO PAGANINI.]

=Paganini=.—The most unique, most startling figure in music belongs to the violin, a law unto himself in his playing, one for whom the violin seemed to have been perfected long years before by Guarnerius and Stradivarius and one who seemed to have been made for the violin, the hero of fictions innumerable, to whom was attributed in his day all manner of occult power. This mysterious king of the violin was =Nicolo Paganini=, born in Genoa, February 18, 1782, died May 27, 1840. Never strong in body, in his early youth he gave himself up to dissipation to such an extent that he undermined his constitution, and passed through the world as a spectre rather than as a man. Paganini was self-developed, he belonged to no school and he founded none, yet so great was his command of the technic of the violin and the bow, that no other player so profoundly influenced contemporaries and successors on the matter of virtuosity. He taught but one pupil, =Camille Sivori= (1815-1894). Paganini greatly influenced the younger French violinists of his day, among whom may be mentioned =Alard= and =Dancla=. After these men come =Charles de Bériot= (1802-1870), who represents the Belgian School, his pupil =Henri Vieuxtemps= (1820-1881) and third generation in the line of pupilage, =Eugen Ysaye= (b. 1858). Others who belong to the Belgian School are =Massart= (teacher of =Wieniawski=, =Kreisler= and others), =Léonard= (teacher of =César Thomson=, =Marsick=, =Musin=, =Marteau=, etc.). At the present time the centre of interest in the violin world has shifted to Prague, where =Ottokar Šev■ík= has sent out young violinists of the Slav race who display the most astonishing technical mastery.

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, articles on Violin Playing, Sonata, Concerto, and players mentioned in this lesson.

Stoeving.—Story of the Violin.

Ehrlich.—Celebrated Violinists.

Hart.—The Violin and its Music.

QUESTIONS.

What was the form of early violin music?

What difference was there in sonatas?

What were Corelli's contributions to music?

What were Tartini's contributions to music?

Trace the connection between the French and Italian schools.

Trace the connection between the German and the Italian schools.

Trace the connection between the Vienna and the Italian schools.

What composers contributed most largely to the educational side of violin music?

Prepare a short sketch of Paganini.

LESSON XXXVI.

THE ORCHESTRA AND ABSOLUTE MUSIC.

=The Orchestra as a Means of Expression=.—The most perfect means for expression in music is presented by the orchestra, which, in its complete form as shown today, is the result of a long development in many directions. To give us this magnificent mass-instrument required a sifting of the various instruments and the choice of those that offered the best possibilities, a perfecting of these instruments, a shaping of systems of playing them, of technic that should draw out all possible effects, and an understanding, on the part of composers, of the nature and demands of absolute music and how best to shape their conceptions in accordance with these demands. The orchestra and its music, therefore, represents the extreme height of man's work in music, for even when choral forces are joined to the orchestra, the instrumental idea dominates, as, for example, in the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven, in which the chorus is simply a _vocal band_ added to the other groups. The orchestra is a great means for musical expression because it offers to the composer the maximum of resources. In modern days, when the esthetic principle of Unity in Variety receives the most elastic interpretation due to the demand for the greatest possible contrasts in tone-color, power and in nuances, all, however, intended to exhibit and illumine the themes invented by the composer in their various transformations, in these days the orchestra is truly the most complete art-means known.

=Groups in the Orchestra=.—The orchestra is composed of groups of instruments allied by similarity of construction. The usual classification is into three main groups, =strings=, (bowed instruments), =wind= and =percussion= instruments. In the former are included the violins, viola, violoncello and double or contra-bass; =wind= instruments subordinate into =wood wind= and =brass=, the former include instruments of the flute, oboe, bassoon and clarinet families, the latter horns, trumpets, trombones, tuba or other bass instruments; the =percussion= includes kettle drums, other drums, triangles, cymbals, etc.; the =harp=, while a stringed instrument, is not included in that class. These instruments offer a great variety of effects, singly and in many possible combinations, in the peculiar effects possible by variety in playing, which in bowed instruments is considerable, and particularly by contrast with each other. While the orchestra today is in a highly developed condition, composers are seeking to extend the limits of their art by the use of more elaborate and subtle forms; so that we cannot in any wise predict the course and limits of absolute music with the almost unlimited resources at its disposal in the modern orchestra.

=Purpose in Combination=.—When we consider the orchestra as a combination of instruments we must bear in mind that this combination is the result of a definite purpose to produce music independent of restrictions such as were shown to have existed in the days of the domination of the Church. The composers of the early polyphonic period and up to the 17th century bent their efforts to the composition of choral music which was sung for many years without instrumental support. When later the organ, and still

later, viols and other instruments were drafted into the service of church music, the accompaniments were not independent of the voice, but merely doubled the various parts. Composers thought in _terms of voices_ and their limitations, _not in_ the greater range and endurance of _instruments_. Then, too, the instruments were crude and their tone lacked distinctiveness as well as the comparative sweetness and purity of the vocal music of that day. Combinations of instruments existed in the Middle Ages, but not according to a system, and were due to the executants who assembled them rather than to the demand for them in the works of composers. It was in the attempts at light dramatic music that preceded the establishment of the opera that instruments were grouped together, showing a great weakness, from our point of view, in stringed instruments played with the bow, and a corresponding preponderance of brass.

=Influence of the Opera=.—The first composers of opera and oratorio gave instrumental support to the singers, although it was very meager. Yet the opera gave the help of that great principle of invention, necessity, and composers began to experiment with various combinations of instruments to secure a more adequate accompaniment for the voice as well as to heighten the effects demanded by the drama. =Monteverde=, an independent thinker and innovator, marked out lines in which efforts should be made by successors. He studied the _characteristic effects of_ the various _groups_ and made use of them as he felt them. His orchestra for “Orfeo” (1608) was made up of two harpsichords, ten tenor viols, two bass viols, two “little French violins,” one double harp, two organs of wood, one regal, two viole de gamba, two large guitars, two cornets, two trombones, three trumpets with mutes, one octave flute, one clarion. The most significant item is found in the “little French violins,” which presages the appearance of the instrument which was, a century later, to be recognized as the backbone of the orchestra. Among the distinctive instrumental effects which Monteverde introduced was the =tremolo= for bowed string instruments as well as the =pizzicato=. In looking over the instruments of Monteverde’s orchestra we will note but _one_ wood wind, the flute. This shows that composers, doubtless through the military use of brass and drums, had accepted the latter as means for special effects. Instruments of the _wood wind_ type were still too _crude_ to be admitted. =Alessandro Scarlatti=, who did so much for the opera from the side of form and content, also contributed to the development of orchestral music. He evidently perceived the importance of having a nucleus around which to build his harmonies, a group of instruments which should furnish a firm support and which could blend the various tone qualities. With the intuition of genius he selected the =string tone= for this purpose, and in this he was greatly aided by the fact that the Amati family, and their successors, Guarnerius and Stradivarius, had already perfected the violin, although the great players were yet to come. Scarlatti wrote in four parts for the string instruments, the treble part to the first violin, the alto to the second, the tenor part to the viola, which previously had often played in unison with the double bass, while the bass part was taken by ’cellos and basses. He also added =oboes= and =bassoons= to the strings and brass. Lully in France used an orchestra similar to that adopted by Scarlatti. The =kettle-drums= now come into use. The works of Corelli and his violinist successors, which showed the possibility of writing for strings, undoubtedly influenced orchestral writing.

=Bach and Handel=.—We now come to the period of Bach and Handel, each distinct in methods, the latter the more immediately influential in the development of the orchestra, the former’s principles of writing in the =polyphonic style= not being taken up until after years by Wagner and more recently by the extreme modern composers with their free polyphony. In a Bach score each instrument had an independent part to sing, and was treated from a musical standpoint, whereas the tendency of other composers was to seek figures and passages which should be characteristic of the instrument, the standpoint of effect. This particularly applies to the wind instruments. =Handel’s= idea seemed to be the building up of great =mass effects=, his style partook of the =harmonic= rather than the polyphonic. He used all the important instruments found in the modern orchestra except the _clarinet_, although the proportion of the wind instruments to the strings is greater, due to the relatively inferior power of these instruments in Handel’s time.

=Haydn and Mozart=.—From Handel we pass to the first of his three great successors, =Haydn=, who has been called the “father of the symphony,” who determined, in fact, the course of orchestral development. And we should not overlook the fact before-mentioned, namely, that the professional violinists, most of whom were also directors of orchestras in the pay of great princes, were testing the capacities and resources of the instruments used. In the period which Haydn represents, the _proportions of the instruments_ in the orchestra were definitely _fixed_ and the size of the string band became relatively greater, the _’cello_ coming in to greater prominence in its use as a _melody instrument_. Haydn’s last symphony, written in 1795, calls for two flutes, two oboes, two clarinets, two bassoons, two kettle drums, and the usual string band. This was the combination which Haydn selected as the most useful and effective, as the result of his experience as a conductor for many years. It was to =Mozart= that the introduction of the =clarinet= into the orchestra is due, for Haydn did not employ this instrument in his earlier works. The clarinet began to take an effective form about the end of the 17th century, yet it was not until the 19th century that it received the improvements that now make it one of the most useful instruments in the orchestra, with a wonderfully facile technic and correct intonation. The greatest of these changes was the application, to the clarinet, of the system of keys and fingering invented by

=Theobald Boehm= (1794-1881) for the flute. In addition to showing the value of the clarinet as an instrument, Mozart pointed the way to some uses of the =trombone=. His E-flat Symphony is scored for one flute, two clarinets, two bassoons, two horns, two trumpets, tympani and strings; in the score of the “Jupiter” symphony, the clarinet does not appear.

=Beethoven= established the orchestra as “the composer’s instrument.” He added but little to the instruments used but he took the resources established by his predecessors and demonstrated what could be done with them. Every group of instruments was used with more detail and to produce characteristic effects both separately and in combination. In his first and second symphonies he uses the same orchestra: two flutes, two oboes, two clarinets, two bassoons, two horns, two trumpets, tympani and strings; in the “Eroica,” a third horn part is added; the fourth has the same orchestra as the first two, except that one flute is dropped; the fifth calls for piccolo, two flutes, two oboes, two clarinets, two bassoons, contra-bassoon, two horns, two trumpets, three trombones, tympani and strings; in the sixth he uses the same orchestra as in the fifth, except that he drops the contra-bassoon and one trombone; in the seventh and eighth the orchestra is the same as in his first and second symphonies. In the ninth (Choral Symphony) he calls for a larger orchestra: piccolo, two flutes, two oboes, two clarinets, two bassoons, contra-bassoon, four horns, two trumpets, three trombones, tympani, triangle, cymbals, bass drum and strings. It will be noted that Beethoven does _not use the harp_. It was not until 1820, seven years before Beethoven’s death, that Erard invented the double-action harp, an effective and a playable instrument.

=Berlioz, Wagner and Richard Strauss=.—The composer who first made an exhaustive study of orchestral instruments, their distinctive qualities, separately and in combinations, was =Berlioz=, who gave to the world his knowledge in his “Treatise on Instrumentation,” published in 1844. Berlioz gave to every one of his works a more or less distinctive quality by varying the composition of his orchestra instead of using the conventional combinations. He made frequent use of the harp, bass clarinet, English horn, bass tuba, besides other less frequently used instruments. He very much enlarged the scope of orchestral music by the new effects he devised. =Richard Wagner=, in his great music dramas, makes use of many new means of dramatic musical effects, introducing new instruments, enlarging the various families, dividing the strings into eight parts, increasing the number of brass instruments, giving to his scores a richness of power and a sonorous quality unknown before his time. =Richard Strauss= is, today, the greatest master of the technic of orchestral writing. His tone-poems make greater demands on the resources of the instruments and contain effects beyond those of Wagner.

[Illustration: HECTOR BERLIOZ.]

=Hector Berlioz= (1803-1869) was the son of a French physician, who designed him for his own profession. But the lad’s bent for music was so strong that when sent to Paris to prepare for a medical degree, he spent most of his time in going to the opera and in studying the scores of the masters. Much against the will of his parents, he determined to give up medicine and entered the _Conservatoire_. His early musical training had been far from thorough and his career was at first not successful. This added to his father’s displeasure, and he finally withdrew all support from his son, who, rather than abandon his art, struggled with the most crushing poverty until a violent illness brought on by privation reconciled his parents to his choice of a profession. After several unsuccessful attempts, he gained the great Roman Prize, which entitled him to a period of study in Italy and Germany at the cost of the State, but throughout his life he battled at home with adverse and discouraging conditions, artistic and domestic. Until after his death his works never received the recognition gladly paid them in foreign countries, where he made frequent tours for the purpose of producing them. His demand for exceptional means of performance, based upon their large scope and previously unheard-of effects, was ridiculed in France, where they were also considered dissonant and bombastic; he encountered jealousy and intrigue at every turn and bore them, too, in no patient spirit.

=His Important Works=.—As a winner of the Roman Prize, however, he had a claim on the State. Thus his great “Te Deum,” written for three choruses, soli, and orchestra, was one of several commissions from the Government and was composed for the opening of the Exposition of 1855. Another similar colossal work is his “Requiem,” with its four small orchestras of brass stationed at the corners of the principal orchestra. These cross and re-cross with thrilling effect, simulating the blowing of the last trump. His most popular and widely-known work, “The Damnation of Faust,” a dramatic cantata now frequently heard in this country and in Europe, failed to awaken the slightest interest at its first performance in 1846 and involved the composer heavily in debt. His enthusiasm for Shakespeare led to the composition of what some consider his most important work, “Romeo and Juliet,” a symphony for orchestra, solo voices and chorus. Berlioz’ genius was essentially instrumental and symphonic in character; hence, though he composed a number of operas, none was successful. Indeed, the failure of “Les Troyens” (The Trojans), the subject of which was taken from the “Æneid” and which he intended to be his masterpiece, was his death-blow.

=His Genius as an Orchestral Composer=.—Berlioz was the founder of the modern school of orchestration, as well as the pioneer in the art of expressing a definite program in terms of absolute music. Like his great contemporary, Wagner, he was no executant; he played but little and, curiously enough, only such insignificant instruments as the flute, flageolet, and guitar. The orchestra was his instrument and no one has ever had a more unerring instinct for its capabilities either as a whole or in its component parts. In the origination of weird, unearthly effects he had been anticipated by Weber, whom he greatly admired; but he went beyond him in devising bold and daring combinations, which he justified by the end in view, though it cannot be said that a refined taste always finds this end in itself justifiable. For example, in the last movement of his “Fantastic Symphony,” he pictures an execution by the guillotine. A company of witches and demons dance around the headless body and perform a burlesque requiem—the whole supposed to be a nightmare suffered by an artist under the influence of opium. Color rather than outline, thrilling and novel effects of sonority, rhythmical variety and animation, intensity of expression and dramatic climax are the principal characteristics of Berlioz’ music. Yet delicacy and charm are by no means lacking in his works. Irregular in proportion and unequal in inspiration as they frequently are, they undoubtedly entitle him to the distinction of being the greatest composer that France has yet produced.

=The Music of the Orchestra= includes Symphonies, Overtures, Symphonic Poems, Tone-Poems and Suites and the Concerto for a solo instrument with orchestral support. The symphony is an elaborated sonata, and the first movement is usually constructed on the principles recognized under the term Sonata-form; the same principles are used in the Overture, which consists of but a single movement. Liszt, in his efforts in the program music style, devised the Symphonic Poem, which aims to present a series of emotional pictures in the Symphonic style, but with the various movements continuous. He advocated deriving _all_ themes from a _common source_, transforming them rhythmically as needed to work out his conception. His successors in this style of music still use the thematic methods devised by the writers in the true symphonic style, but are free in their methods of construction and elaboration.

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, articles on the Orchestra and the various instruments used, the Sonata, Symphony, Overture, Suite, etc., and Sonata-Form.

Henderson.—The Orchestra and Orchestral Music.

QUESTIONS.

Why is the orchestra the greatest means for musical expression?

Classify the instruments used in the orchestra.

What difference is there in the combination of instruments in the modern orchestra and in the first attempts?

How did the opera influence the development of the orchestra and orchestral music?

Contrast Bach and Handel. Whose methods are used today to the greater extent?

What did Haydn and Mozart contribute?

What did Beethoven contribute?

Contrast the orchestra used by the composers mentioned.

Give an account of the work of Berlioz in the orchestral field.

Give an account of the great writers of modern times.

What form is the basis of writing for the orchestra?

SUGGESTIONS FOR A REVIEW OF LESSONS XVII TO XXIV.

Independent research on the part of pupils is essential to real mastery of a subject. The following topics can be used as subjects for short essays to be prepared by pupils. The material will be found in this book and in the reference works mentioned in connection with the various lessons.

LESSON XXV.—1. The Pianoforte in America. 2. Pianoforte Makers in the 19th Century. 3. Points of difference between the early Claviers and the Modern Piano.

LESSON XXVI.—1. Comparison between the Early Venetian schools of Painting and Music. 2. The composers of the Early Venetian school. 3. The composers of the Later Venetian school. 4. The development of the Science of Thorough-Bass.

LESSON XXVII.—1. Queen Elizabeth as a Patron of Art. 2. Characteristics of the Early French Clavier school. 3. Influence of the Early English and French Clavier schools on subsequent Writings.

LESSON XXVIII.—1. German character as reflected in early music. 2. Comparison of Bach and Handel's Clavier Works. 3. Influence exerted by the Well-Tempered Clavichord.

LESSON XXIX.—1. Comparison between the Polyphonic and Harmonic styles. 2. Musical influence of J. S. Bach's Children. 3. The First Sonatas compared with Modern Music.

LESSON XXX.—1. German appreciation of music in Haydn's time. 2. Haydn as a man. 3. Haydn's connection with Mozart.

LESSON XXXI.—1. Mozart's character. 2. Mozart's struggles with poverty. 3. Mozart's contributions to form. 4. The Viennese school of this period.

LESSON XXXII.—1. Beethoven's character as shown in his letters. 2. Beethoven's peculiarities. 3. Beethoven and his contemporaries.

LESSON XXXIII.—1. Beethoven's manner of composing. 2. Beethoven's love of nature. 3. Effect of Beethoven upon succeeding composers.

LESSON XXXIV.—1. The points of superiority of the Violin over the Viol. 2. The three great makers of violins. 3. Why the violin is called the King of Instruments.

LESSON XXXV.—1. The character of early violin music. 2. The development of violin playing and composition. 3. Arrange the great players in their respective schools.

LESSON XXXVI.—1. Classify the instruments of the orchestra. 2. Give a sketch of the development of the orchestra, instruments added, etc. 3. Contrast Beethoven's work with that of his predecessors and successors. 4. What is the form of a Symphony? In what respects does the form used by modern composers differ from that of the classical symphony?

LESSON XXXVII.

THE ROMANTIC OPERA. WEBER, SPOHR, MARSCHNER.

=The Romantic Movement=.—The revolutionary spirit which arose in Europe toward the end of the 18th century had its counterpart in a similar intellectual and artistic reaction, commonly known as the Romantic Movement. In Literature, this movement was led by France; in Music, by Germany. Briefly described, it consisted in casting aside the classical traditions which the Renaissance had imposed upon art in general and in a substitution of themes and a treatment more in consonance with the atmosphere of freedom which had inspired such momentous social and political changes.

=Its Effect on Music=.—The musician also felt the influence of the general unrest. In seeking new modes of expression, he rose to a consciousness of independence both as man and artist; he refused longer to occupy the position of an upper servant which had been decreed him by court and nobility. Mozart marked the passing of the old order of things by his indignant rejection of the humiliating conditions of service under the haughty Archbishop of Salzburg, only remembered by later generations through his connection with the musician he treated so contemptuously. Heretofore music had been the privileged entertainment of the great and wealthy. Like other privileges, it was to pass into the possession of the people, hitherto shut out from its enjoyment save in the Church. It was to draw inspiration from a rich store of Folk-lore and poetry heretofore disregarded by the scholar and the musician, but soon to be recognized as a national heritage of high import; it was to create new forms instead of being dependent on time-worn formulæ which were repressing growth and development.

=The Romantic Opera=.—The Romantic Movement had the effect of finally banishing from the stage the characters of classical mythology, the heroes and personages of antiquity who had been thought alone worthy of representation by the poets and savants

who had thus far prepared the texts for operas. In the romantic opera their places were taken by figures of legend or chivalry, elves and spirits of earth or air; the action paid no regard to the unities of time and place; it was brisk and animated and the supernatural played an important part in it. The music, instead of being governed by the restraints of definite forms, adapted itself to the varying exigencies of the drama; the sharp division between the recitative and the aria was softened by the introduction of the Scena, a peculiarly effective mingling of the features of both; the overture became an integral part of the whole by the use of themes associated with leading dramatic situations. The orchestra not only supplied an harmonic and a rhythmically interesting accompaniment but its power of independent expression was enormously enlarged; it became, so to speak, one of the _Dramatis Personæ_ and vied with the singers in indicating psychological and dramatic crises. This was largely due to the development of a new phase of instrumentation, perhaps the most striking detail of the Romantic school—that of novel and original combinations of instruments to produce varying and expressive shades of tone color. Heretofore the orchestra had been considered in the main in its more obvious divisions; sonority and beauty of tone had been the chief aim of the classical composers. =Carl Maria von Weber= (1786-1826) was the first to utilize the individual timbres of orchestral instruments to secure effects of a weird, unearthly character.

[Illustration: CARL MARIA VON WEBER.]

=Weber and the Romantic Opera=.—In his _Der Freischütz_ (The Freeshooter) we first find the union of all these characteristics. Hence Weber is rightfully considered the founder of the romantic opera; but it would be a mistake to assume that he was the originator of all its features. These had been long in the air. In Haydn, the works of Mozart and Beethoven, in the ballads of Loewe, the songs of Schubert, unmistakable romantic traits can often be found, but they are embodied in established forms. Weber, however, brought together the qualities now associated with the term romantic in music, and in applying them to the drama freed them from the restrictions of a fixed musical structure.

=Influence of “Der Freischütz.”=—The effect of _Der Freischütz_ on its production in Berlin in 1821 was instantaneous. The story of the hunter’s recourse to unholy arts in order to win success in the chase, of his rescue from Satanic power and the final triumph of good over evil; the music, fresh, vivid, essentially national in color, appealed to the people to whom the legend was well known. It meant the birth of German opera, German alike in drama and music; it gave the final blow to the supremacy of foreign influences in Germany. This success at first, however, was confined almost entirely to the people. Critics and musicians generally could not reconcile themselves to its mingling of styles; the supernatural element seemed to them exaggerated, the introduction of the Folk-song wanting in dignity. Only the greatest of them all, Beethoven, deaf and cynical as he was, realized the signification of _Der Freischütz_ as the beginning of a new era for German art. He said to Rochlitz: “Weber should now write operas—one after the other without hesitation.”

=Euryanthe=.—Weber’s next opera was _Euryanthe_, produced in 1823 in Vienna. In this he was hampered by a text of more than doubtful merit and lacking the national element which had been so strong a factor in _Der Freischütz_. The story is laid in the medieval chivalric epoch and strongly resembles Shakespeare’s _Cymbeline_. He also ventured upon an innovation which was not in favor with the German public: he set it to music throughout, the place of the dialogue customary in German opera being taken by accompanied recitative. _Euryanthe_ and Spohr’s _Jessonda_, which appeared several months before the former, were the first German operas in this style since Schütz’s _Dafne_. This and its confused plot kept _Euryanthe_ from the popular success achieved by _Der Freischütz_, yet it contains some of Weber’s most thrilling inspirations, and is the direct prototype of the modern music drama.

=Oberon=.—In _Oberon_ (1826), composed for London to an English text, Weber returned to his former manner, though somewhat against his will. He found the English opera much the same as in Purcell’s time, practically a play with music as an incidental feature rather than as an integral part of the drama. He intended casting _Oberon_ into a larger mould, reducing the dialogue and adding to the music, but this was prevented by his premature death in London two months after its production.

=Recitative and Dialogue=.—The chilling effect of alternating speech and song has already been spoken of in connection with the English opera. At that time, both English and German taste was against the use of recitative in the narrative parts of an opera. The _recitativo secco_, which it will be remembered is a recitative supported only by chords on the harpsichord or piano, sometimes accompanied with a single stringed instrument, has never met with favor outside of Italy, where its intonations nearly approach the half-singing inflections of Italian speech. The exclusive use of accompanied recitative—that is, the recitative accompanied by the full orchestra, however, delays the action and moreover appears weighty and overwrought unless applied to subjects of an elevated or heroic character. In Germany and England the desire to understand clearly the dramatic movement led to the retention of dialogue in all operas. In France a distinction was made between operas with dialogue and operas with recitative only. The first is

called Opéra Comique, originally an offshoot from the Italian _Opera Buffa_, in which the _recitativo secco_ was replaced by dialogue. Later the term assumed a technical meaning by which it was applied to all operas containing spoken dialogue whether their subjects were comic or tragic, in contradistinction to what is known as Grand Opéra, in which the accompanied recitative is used exclusively.

=The Melodrama=.—The so-called melodrama is a compromise between the dialogue and the recitative. In this the performer recites in the speaking voice while the orchestra supplies an accompaniment which seeks to intensify the dramatic situation. This device originated in Germany and has found the most favor from German composers. It was first employed by =Georg Benda= (1721-1795) in a recitation, _Ariadne in Naxos_ (1744), which created much interest. Two of the most striking instances of the melodrama are to be found in the grave-digging scene in _Fidelio_ and in the incantation scene in _Der Freischütz_. But however effective its occasional use may be, the ear suffers from the inevitable dissonance between the fixed pitches of the musical scale and the natural inflections of the speaking voice. This is now so generally recognized that it has been practically ignored by modern composers in their works for the stage.

=Spohr and the Romantic Opera=.—=Ludwig Spohr= (1784-1859), Germany's greatest violinist and a composer of eminence in many fields, wrote a number of operas. Of these, _Faust_ and _Jessonda_ stand first in showing a vein of genuine romanticism, albeit they lack the Folk-element which brought Weber's music so close to the hearts of the people. Full of beauty as they undoubtedly are, like all of Spohr's music they are weakened by the constant recurrence of certain mannerisms, such as chromatic progressions of a persistent type, enharmonic modulations, the over-frequent use of diminished intervals. Spohr exercised a strong influence in favor of the new direction on account of his high position as the most esteemed composer and performer of the day. His significance in the romantic movement consists in his being, as it were, an intermediary between the late classical period represented by Beethoven and the modern music drama. He knew Beethoven in Vienna, and in his latter days, when director of the opera in Cassel, did his utmost to introduce Wagner's early operas to the German public.

=Marschner, Weber's Successor=.—Weber's legitimate successor in the romantic opera was =Heinrich Marschner= (1795-1861). He had been associated with Weber as assistant conductor at the opera in Dresden, and a strong friendship existed between them. Weber's influence, however, was wide and far-reaching; it extended beyond the opera. Marschner's sphere was practically confined to the stage, which he enriched with a series of strongly characterized works mainly of a gloomy, uncanny nature. He shows but little of the genial art with which Weber avails himself of the supernatural merely as a background for the doing and striving of his characters, and thus never compromises the human interest they have for us. Marschner makes it the salient characteristic of his strongest works. In these his principal _Dramatis Personæ_ are demons and evil spirits who tempt and torment the innocent and loving. His first romantic opera was _Der Vampyr_ (1825) composed to a text prepared from Byron's poem, "Lord Ruthven," which is founded upon a Scotch legend. Notwithstanding the repulsive nature of the subject, its powerful treatment brought it immediate success in Germany and a little later in England. It was followed by _Der Templar und die Jüdin_ (The Templar and the Jewess), a version of Scott's "Ivanhoe." This, however, met with less success than _Der Vampyr_ or its successor, _Hans Heiling_, Marschner's masterpiece.

=The Spieloper=.—The Romantic school had a strong influence in the development of a form known as the _Spieloper_ (literally play-opera), which occupies a place between the works we have been considering and the _Singspiel_. As thoroughly German as the latter, it shows more finish and greater elaboration of musical effect. Though essentially romantic in the freedom of its scope and choice of means, its real sphere is neither the heroic nor the mystic; it concerns itself rather with the lighter aspects of life, those which require no exalted powers of imagination or wide culture to appreciate—humor, good cheer, the merriment and mirth of the people in holiday mood. =Albert Lortzing= (1803-1851) is accepted as the creator of this type, of which his most popular opera, _Zar und Zimmermann_ (Czar and the Carpenter), is the best known example.

=Influence of the Romantic Opera=.—The value of the application of all the resources of music to the unfettered delineation of feeling and emotion in all their phases inaugurated by the romantic opera can hardly be over-estimated. From the opera it has won its way into absolute music, creating new and original forms. The change it has wrought in the progress and development of the art in general is only second to the revolution occasioned by the birth of the opera itself, three centuries ago. The impulse of the romantic movement in music is far from being exhausted at the present day. On the contrary, it seems to have gathered strength and if it has reached its culmination, as some would have us believe, the signs are not yet apparent to an unprejudiced observer.

QUESTIONS.

What was the Romantic Movement? Its effect on music?

Tell about the Romantic Opera.

Who was the founder of the Romantic Opera?

Give an account of Weber's operas.

Contrast the use of Recitative and Dialogue in opera.

What is the Melodrama?

Give an account of Spohr and his work.

Give an account of Marschner and his work.

What is the Spieloper?

What was the influence of the Romantic Opera?

LESSON XXXVIII.

THE FRENCH SCHOOL OF THE XIXTH CENTURY.

=French Schools of Opéra=.—As already explained, French opera is divided into two styles, known as Opéra Comique and Grand Opéra, according to the use of dialogue or recitative. Not that this is the only difference. The Grand Opéra is naturally adapted to subjects of a large or heroic scope; the Opéra Comique, like the _Spieloper_ in Germany, to lighter episodes of a romantic or humorous nature. As will be seen, however, it not infrequently happens that the latter form is adopted for serious subjects, owing to the fact that it is generally easier for a composer to find acceptance at the Opéra Comique than at the Grand Opéra. The youthful composer or the one who has not yet acquired a name for himself is expected to win his spurs in the former before attempting to enter the latter. Hence, even if his work is somber or tragic in character he often finds it advisable to cast it into the lighter form for the sake of having it produced.

=The Opéra Comique=.—The Opéra Comique had its origin in the introduction of the Opéra Buffa in Paris by an Italian company about the middle of the 18th century, which led to the Gluck-Piccini controversy. Pergolesi's _La Serva Padrona_ in particular awakened great admiration and brought about the creation of a similar type of French opera. It was at first hardly more than an elaboration of the already existing vaudeville, or play with songs. =François Philidor= (1726-1795) and =Andre Grétry= (1741-1813) were its founders. Grace and simplicity, scrupulous adaptation of the music to the clearness of diction always demanded by French taste were its distinguishing characteristics.

=Its Development=.—=Étienne Méhul= (1763-1817), a pupil of Gluck, gave it a larger musical development and a greater depth of dramatic feeling. His _Joseph_ (1807), founded on Biblical history, is a classic of this school. Its dignity, its severe and noble style won less cordial recognition in France than in Germany; a generation later it was to exercise a decisive influence on the future creator of the music drama. It was through a performance of _Joseph_ that Richard Wagner, then director of the opera in Riga, first felt inspired to battle against the empty conventionalities of the operatic stage. Méhul's enlargement of the Opéra Comique was carried on by Cherubini, who through the ill-will of Napoleon found the doors of the Académie de Musique, the technical title of the Grand Opéra, closed against him. Even his greatest tragic opera, _Medée_ (Medea), was produced (1797) as an opéra comique without recitative and ballet, the latter being also reserved exclusively for Grand Opéra. Thus it often happened that there was little, in many cases no intrinsic difference between the music of the two schools.

=The Typical Opéra Comique=.—There was, on the other hand, a development of a type more closely corresponding to the original scheme of the Opéra Comique. Strongly influenced by the romantic tendencies of the day, its romanticism by no means resembles that of the German school as represented by Weber and his followers. This, in its appeal to the deeper emotions by the idealization of nature and recourse to the supernatural, is thoroughly alien to the Gallic temperament, and had no appreciable effect on French composers. Gaiety and humor, freshness of invention, lightness of touch, elegance and finish characterize the true Opéra Comique. Its pathos never sinks below a certain sentiment which is skilfully used rather for the sake of contrast than from any persistent attempt at awakening the more somber feelings. The singer and the actor both meet with consideration; the former by

sparkling melodies, expressive and grateful to sing, not over-burdened with the technical difficulties in which the Italian school abounds; the latter by a drama furnishing piquant situations, seasoned with wit and interesting in itself as a play.

=Boieldieu, its Founder=.—As Méhul gave the impulse to the graver, more dignified style, so =François Boieldieu= (1775-1834) laid the foundation of the typical Opéra Comique, the most original and essentially national French operatic form. His _Jean de Paris_ (John of Paris) and _La Dame Blanche_ (The White Lady) placed him at the head of this school. The latter in particular, based on a curious combination of situations taken from two of Scott's novels, "The Monastery" and "Guy Mannering," has been sung the world over and still remains an unsurpassed example of the Opéra Comique in its best estate.

=Auber=.—The most prolific composer in this style was =Daniel Auber= (1782-1871). Though he began as an amateur and after years spent in other pursuits, he outlived all his early contemporaries and became its most widely known representative. With one exception, to be noticed later, his works reveal the salient characteristics of the school—freshness and melodic charm, finesse of rhythm and instrumentation, delicacy and refinement rather than power and depth. His most popular opera, _Fra Diavolo_ (1830), has been sung on all stages and in almost all languages. Others less known but equally meritorious are _Le Maçon_ (The Mason and the Locksmith), _Le Domino Noir_ (The Black Domino) and _Les Diamants de la Couronne_ (The Crown Diamonds.)

=Hérold and Adam=.—=Louis Hérold= (1791-1833), as a pupil of Méhul, inclines to a more serious style. His _Zampa_ contains strongly romantic features which made it more successful in Germany than the melodious _Le Pré aux Clercs_ (The Clerks' Meadow—a noted duelling ground in Paris during the 17th century), though in France this vies with _La Dame Blanche_ in the distinction of being the most popular Opéra Comique in the repertory. Though less significant than any of the foregoing, =Adolphe Adam= (1803-1856), the composer of _Le Postillon de Longjumeau_ (The Postilion of Longjumeau), deserves mention for the grace and fluency of his melodies, albeit they show a decline in character and style which prefigures the decadent school of the _Opéra Bouffe_ (burlesque opera).

=Opéra Bouffe=.—The attentive observer can hardly fail to perceive that the opera as appealing to the people at large more than any other form of music is peculiarly susceptible to social and political influences. The Opéra Bouffe being a degenerate offshoot from the Opéra Comique, it is no mere accident that the period of its most extended popularity coincided with the extravagance and folly of the Second Empire. As a distinct type it is due to =Jacques Offenbach= (1819-1880), a German by birth, who took advantage of the taste of the time by turning his attention to the parody of the classical and mythological subjects which had furnished material for the early operas. Frivolous and mocking in text, sprightly and vivacious in melody and rhythm, his operettas possess undoubted piquancy and an effervescent style which for a time intoxicated the public. Their vogue was happily broken by a series of light operas of much more worth. Of these, _Les Cloches de Corneville_, known to Americans as "The Chimes of Normandy," by =Robert Planquette= (1840-1903) is the best example.

=The Influence of the Opéra Comique=.—The Opéra Comique, as founded by Boieldieu and continued by Auber and Hérold, bears a distinctively national character to a much greater degree than the more cosmopolitan Grand Opéra. Unlike this, its development was entirely due to native composers who gave it the thoroughly Gallic impress of spirit, vivacity, and truth to nature which carried it triumphantly through all the theatres of Europe. Thus it served to counteract in part the reactionary tendency of Italian opera. In Paris, as elsewhere, during the first quarter of the 19th century Italian influences were very powerful; Rossini's works and those of his imitators had the undesirable effect of reviving in a modernized form the conventionalized opera of the 18th century, the chief object of which was the display of the singer. The Opéra Comique, though limited to the lighter phases of the drama, performed a service of no small value in upholding a standard of legitimate musical expression at a time when the allurements of florid song were obscuring the dramatic ideals which Gluck had established at the cost of so much labor and effort.

=Grand Opéra=.—About the same time, important changes were impending in Grand Opéra, though these were more in the nature of a development from the type founded by Lully and afterward enlarged by Rameau, Gluck and Spontini than a revolution such as Weber and his followers had effected in Germany. They were, however, the outcome of the same romantic influences modified by the characteristic French adherence to established form. A grand opera according to tradition must have five acts, consisting of arias, ensembles, choruses, etc., connected by recitatives, with a ballet in one or two of the middle acts, generally the second and fourth.

=Its Change of Style=.—Auber's _La Muette de Portici_ (The Dumb Girl of Portici—known also as Masaniello), produced at the Académie de Musique in 1828, formed the point of departure for the new style. Though it held to the traditional form of Grand Opéra, it was in spirit, theme and treatment a startling change from the ordinarily genial works of this composer, characterized as it

was by a force and fire, a vigor and decision which he had never shown before and was never to show again. It marks the beginning of the modern historical opera, the complete abandonment of classical and ancient history as the only appropriate material for Grand Opéra. The people were brought upon the stage not as slaves or as meekly acquiescing in the will of those in authority, but as insurrectionists demanding rights of which they had been defrauded. The story of the Neapolitan fisherman leading his comrades into rebellion against their tyrannical rulers had a powerful effect in the agitated state of political affairs which culminated in the revolutions of 1830. It is significant that a performance of _La Muette de Portici_ immediately preceded the riots in Brussels, which in that year resulted in the expulsion of the Dutch from Belgium. Rossini's _William Tell_, which followed in 1829, manifested precisely the same tendencies, musically as well as dramatically. Both were destined to be cast into the shade by the works of a third composer who gave the French grand opera a style which practically dictated conditions on all stages for half a century and is still not without influence.

[Illustration: GIACOMO MEYERBEER.]

=Meyerbeer=.—This composer was =Giacomo Meyerbeer= (1791-1864), German by birth and early education, Italian by training in more mature years, and finally French by adoption. A juvenile pianist of great promise, he studied with Clementi; he went through a severe course of fugue and counterpoint with Zelter, the teacher of Mendelssohn; in composition he was a fellow-student with Weber under the famous Abbé Vogler. In Vienna he knew Beethoven and was advised by Salieri to study in Italy, where he wrote a number of Italian operas after the style of Rossini. In 1826, he went to Paris, the Mecca of all opera composers, with the design of making himself familiar with the conditions of Grand Opéra.

=His First Grand Opera=.—The result of his studies was _Robert le Diable_ (Robert the Devil) produced in 1831. This created a veritable sensation. Nothing of so comprehensive a style had been seen or heard before. Meyerbeer's cosmopolitan education, his receptive rather than original mind, enabled him to combine the outward characteristics at least of the three schools—French, German, Italian—as no one had ever attempted. The story of the arch-enemy of mankind seeking to ensnare a son by an earthly mother into sharing his lost condition, the struggle between the powers of good and evil for the mastery of the tempted soul gave full scope to such an amalgamation of styles. The ballet and spectacular effects of Lully, the supernaturalism of Weber, the roulades of Rossini were all brought together with an art that dazzled and intoxicated an admiring public.

=His Other Grand Operas=.—Five years later _Robert_ was followed by _Les Huguenots_ (The Huguenots), which achieved a still greater success, and is the one opera of Meyerbeer which continues to hold its own against the encroachments of time. In one or two episodes of _Le Prophète_ (The Prophet), which was produced in 1849, the composer reached the highest level of his creative activity, notwithstanding the manifest artificiality of his scheme. His last work, _L'Africaine_ (The African), was brought out the year after his death and like the others owed its success to a skilful mingling of all the elements, musical, spectacular, and dramatic, which go to make up this type of opera. His _L'Étoile du Nord_ (Star of the North) and _Le Pardon de Ploërmel_ (better known as Dinorah) were composed for the Opéra Comique.

=Influence of Meyerbeer=.—Meyerbeer so held the public in his grip that other composers of Grand Opéra gained but slight attention during his lifetime. Only =Jacques Halévy= (1799-1862) was able to meet him on equal terms in this field with _La Juive_ (The Jewess), in which he shows the earnest spirit of his master Cherubini. Though Meyerbeer's watchword was success at any cost and his aim to assure it by the accumulation of cunningly devised sensations rather than through the innate power of his music, his works had a powerful and, on the whole, a beneficial influence on the course of modern dramatic music. They placed living, palpitating beings on the stage instead of the cold abstractions of mythology and antiquity; the singer was forced to impersonate as well as to sing. His insistence on all means of expression—vocal, instrumental, and scenic—though often exaggerated and fatal to purity of style, led to an extension of technical ability in all these directions, and prepared the way for a master of greater power and higher aims. It must not be overlooked that Richard Wagner frankly modeled his _Rienzi_ (1842) after _Les Huguenots_, and that Meyerbeer in _Le Prophète_ shows plainly the influence of this work by his German contemporary.

QUESTIONS.

What two styles are found in French opera?

Tell about the origin of Opéra Comique.

Tell about the development of Opéra Comique.

Describe the typical opéra comique.

Mention the prominent composers in this form and their work.

Describe Opéra Bouffe.

What composers were prominent in this form?

What was the influence of the Opéra Comique?

What was the established form of Grand Opéra?

Who contributed to a change of style? What were the changes?

Give an account of Meyerbeer and his work in Opera.

What was his influence?

LESSON XXXIX.

THE ITALIAN SCHOOL OF THE XIXTH CENTURY.

=Later Italian School=.—While Meyerbeer was dominating the French stage and through it exerting a powerful influence on serious opera in all countries, the Italian school was recovering in part from the impulse given it by Rossini. The highly ornamented style which he brought into vogue was modified in the works of several composers who also gave more consideration to truth of expression. With these, melody still reigned supreme, but it was shorn of the excessive ornamentation which overloaded Rossini's music; in character and rhythm it was also more generally in accord with sentiment and situation. The florid element was by no means suppressed; it had been an integral factor in Italian music for two centuries and was too strongly entrenched in public favor to be banished so completely as it had been in the German romantic opera, but it was kept in subordination and in the main not allowed to dictate the melodic idea. This was a step in advance for the Italian school of that period, which through the fluent warblings of Rossini and his imitators, had approached dangerously near the Scarlatti-Handel type of the previous century.

=Donizetti=.—This reaction in the direction of greater simplicity and sincerity was led by =Gaetano Donizetti= (1797-1848). At first a follower of Rossini, he only attained success after the latter had ceased composing and he himself had acquired a style of his own. Donizetti was not without innate force, but his great melodic facility led him to rely upon melody rather than upon musical development or dramatic characterization. Hence his tragic operas, though often admirable in detail, lack the sustained strength demanded by their subjects. Of these, _Lucia_ (founded upon Scott's "Bride of Lammermoor") achieved the greatest popularity, while in _La Favorita_ (composed for the Grand Opéra) he shows more dramatic power than in any of his more than three-score operas. In many of his lighter works he is particularly happy; for example, in _Don Pasquale_, which compares favorably with Rossini's _Il Barbiere_, and in _L'Elisire d'Amore_ (The Elixir of Love). _La Fille du Régiment_ (The Daughter of the Regiment—written for the Opéra Comique) has made the tour of the world.

=Bellini=.—His younger contemporary, =Vincenzo Bellini= (1801-1835), on the contrary, displays no capacity for humor nor is he much better fitted to cope with the somber or the heroic. Essentially a lyrical temperament, neither broad nor deep but endowed with exquisite sensibility within certain limits, his sphere is the emotional, the tender and the elegiac. For this reason his charming opera, _La Sonnambula_ (The Somnambulist), on account of its idyllic subject, is a more representative work than _Norma_ or _I Puritani_ (The Puritans), though both enjoyed high popularity until within recent years. Much of Bellini's vogue was due to the admirable singing of a number of Italian artists who were identified with his works—Pasta, Grisi, sopranos; Mario, tenor; Tamburini, baritone; Lablache, basso, not to forget Jenny Lind, who was at her best in his operas. With their passing and the establishment of the modern school of dramatic composition, in which the voice is only one of many factors instead of being the chief element of expression, they have gradually dropped from the repertory.

=Verdi=.—A far more significant personality than either Donizetti or Bellini is =Giuseppe Verdi= (1813-1901). Not merely a melodist but a dramatist as well, his long life gave him the opportunity of profiting by the many influences which brought about the mighty musical development of the last hundred years. The fact that he did so without compromising his artistic or national individuality shows the inherent genius which gives to him the distinction of being the great Italian composer of the century. Strong and sturdy from the first, his early works, if somewhat coarse in fiber, seemed doubly powerful in contrast with those of his contemporaries, which were distinguished by sweetness and melody rather than by depth or vigor. From _Ernani_ to _Rigoletto_, from the much

sung _Trovatore_ to _Don Carlos_, to mention only a few of his thirty operas, Verdi shows a steady growth in largeness of style and command of means which culminated in _Aïda_, written for the Khedive of Egypt to celebrate the opening of the Suez canal in 1871.

[Illustration: GIUSEPPE VERDI.]

=Aïda=.—_Aïda_ is the full fruition of the Romantic movement beyond the Alps, manifested, however, in a style and manner thoroughly Italian. Unmistakably influenced by the uncompromising stand taken in Germany by Wagner, Verdi here shows the definite adoption of a new standard, yet by methods which make no decided break with what he had hitherto accomplished. In form, _Aïda_ is closely allied to the Meyerbeer type of Grand Opéra through its succession of dramatic and spectacular features, but these develop naturally in the course of the action and are combined with a sincerity and unity of effect lacking in the more artificial creations of the German composer. The florid style is strictly avoided; without the continuous flow of the music drama, the different movements, recitatives, arias, ensembles, etc., are yet more closely connected and are sustained by a richer, more fluent orchestration than he had hitherto given to his operas, the local color called for by the Egyptian theme receiving adequate consideration.

=Significance of Aïda=.—_Aïda_ marks the beginning of the new Italian school, one more in sympathy with the original conception of the opera as a drama, while retaining the characteristic Italian grace and charm of vocal treatment. This school was still further enlarged and developed by Verdi, but this extension belongs to a later period and will be considered in its logical connection.

=Wagner and the Music Drama=.—It is to =Richard Wagner= (1813-1883) that we owe the renaissance in modern form of the primitive ideal of the opera as embodied in the works of Peri and Caccini. Simple and formless as these now appear, they contain the germ of all that he has accomplished, apart from the question of means, even to the very name of music drama. This he revived because, in his opinion, the term opera had acquired a preponderantly musical signification which made it inappropriate for his later works in view of their dramatic character. An exception to the general rule of precocity among musicians, it was not until his sixteenth year that he resolved to devote himself to music. Like Weber, whom as a child he saw frequently and regarded with the utmost reverence, his early associations were with the theatre and the drama, a fact of no small significance in the careers of both. _Der Freischütz_ was his favorite opera, a liking which bore abundant fruit in later years.

[Illustration: WAGNER IN 1853.]

=His Early Operas=.—The future master of the music drama, however, began by composing operas—operas, moreover, in which he shows originality in one feature only—that of writing their texts himself, and this remained his invariable practice. In other respects they gave no hint of the startling individuality he was to unfold so unexpectedly in his _Flying Dutchman_. His first opera was _Die Feen_ (The Fairies). It was based on a fairy tale of but slight worth, and the music was strongly reminiscent of Weber and Marschner. As the work of a youth of twenty, without reputation or influence, it is hardly surprising that he found no manager willing to produce it. He was somewhat more fortunate with his second opera, _Das Liebesverbot_ (The Love Veto), an adaptation of Shakespeare's "Measure for Measure." This was performed once, in 1836, at Magdeburg, where he was director of the opera, and had thus come under the influence of the French and Italian composers then popular in Germany. The music is such a palpable imitation of Adam, Auber, Donizetti, and Bellini that it has never been given since. _Die Feen_ was never produced during his lifetime, but a few years after his death received a number of representations in Munich.

=His Sojourn in Paris=.—In 1839, he determined to go to Paris. Many foreign composers had succeeded in entering the Grand Opéra, among them Meyerbeer, then in the full flush of the renown he had gained with _Les Huguenots_. What one German had done, another might attempt. Accordingly, with the utmost faith in his star and amid manifold discouragements, Wagner made his way to the French capital, where he hoped through the influence of Meyerbeer to secure the acceptance of his _Rienzi_ at the Grand Opéra. He had prepared it from Bulwer's novel of the same name with the express intention of utilizing it as a framework for the large spectacular style demanded by the Académie de Musique. His sojourn in Paris brought him nothing but disappointment. Neither _Rienzi_ nor _Der Fliegende Holländer_ (The Flying Dutchman), which he wrote during his stay of two and a half years, was successful in winning a hearing, while he lived the greater part of the time in the most painfully straitened circumstances.

=Rienzi=.—Before long, he realized the hopelessness of his endeavor and sent _Rienzi_ to Dresden, where it was accepted and after a long delay performed in 1842. The result was a triumphant success and led to the speedy production of _The Flying Dutchman_. This, however, by no means made a similar impression. _Rienzi_ was an opera of the type made familiar by Meyerbeer, in which effect was secured by the heaping together of every device known to stagecraft. The ballet, the march of the

Messengers of Peace, the final catastrophe of the burning of Rome, had as much to do with its enthusiastic reception as the music, which was noisy, showy and brilliant, as befitted a work of such calibre.

=The Flying Dutchman. Change of Style=.—_The Flying Dutchman_, however, showed Wagner in an entirely different light. With it, instead of receiving his inspiration from without, as had been the case with the preceding operas, it came from within. On his way to Paris he had made a stormy voyage of several weeks from a port on the Baltic to London. He was familiar with the myth of the Flying Dutchman, and found that the sailors on board his ship believed it implicitly. This in connection with Heine's version of the legend, which represents the unhappy mariner as doomed to perpetual wandering on stormy seas until he finds a woman faithful unto death, made a strong impression on him, and while in Paris he wrote the poem and composed the music within seven weeks after finishing _Rienzi_. A more sudden metamorphosis of style is unknown in the history of music. The earlier work was an opera pure and simple, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, characterized by pomp, brilliancy, sonority. Its successor was conceived as a drama in which music served to emphasize the action and to intensify the emotional situations; instead of being master, it was servant; external effects were disregarded save only as they were in harmony with this conception. Not that the composer entirely achieved this ideal; _The Flying Dutchman_ displays not a few lapses into operatic conventionalities, but as a whole it was a startling and radical change which puzzled and displeased the public. They had looked for something in the style of _Rienzi_ and could make nothing of a work so contrary to the popular idea of what an opera should be. Accordingly, after a few performances, it was dropped from the repertory.

=Tannhäuser=.—Nothing daunted by the lack of favor shown his change of style, Wagner carried it to a still greater extent in his next opera, _Tannhäuser_ (1845), founded on a medieval legend. The dramatic motive of this is much the same as that of _The Flying Dutchman_, one of which Wagner was particularly fond—the power of love to redeem and save from the consequences of sin and error. _Tannhäuser_ brought about his head the full storm of hostile criticism which with _The Flying Dutchman_ had only begun to lower. He was reproached for its difficulty, for its lack of pleasing melodies, for the audacious harmonies which many critics considered inexcusable dissonances. Singers objected to the broad declamation it required; they complained that it would eventually ruin their voices.

=Lohengrin=.—This almost general dissatisfaction, however, led to no concessions by the composer in his next opera, _Lohengrin_, which marked a further advance in the unpopular direction taken by its predecessors, but it interfered with its performance. Though he was conductor of the Opéra at Dresden, he could not secure permission to produce it. Baffled and discouraged in his artistic schemes, a radical in politics, he joined the insurrectionists during the revolution of 1849. The failure of the rebellion necessitated a hasty flight from Germany. He took refuge in Switzerland and remained in exile until a proclamation of amnesty in 1861 allowed him to return. In the meantime he had sent the score of _Lohengrin_ to Liszt, then conductor of the opera at Weimar, and there it was brought out in 1850.

Lohengrin proved the turning-point in his fortunes. The romance of the subject, its dramatic treatment and undeniable beauty gradually reconciled the public to the novelty of its style. Before Wagner was relieved from his sentence of banishment it had become one of the most popular operas in Germany—he once ruefully remarked that he would soon be the only German who had not heard it.

QUESTIONS.

Who led in the changes in Italian Opera after Rossini?

Give an account of Donizetti and his work.

Give an account of Bellini and his work.

Give an account of Verdi and his earlier works.

What is the significance of Aïda in the history of Opera?

Tell about the changes that Wagner was to make.

Give an account of his early operas.

Why did he go to Paris?

Describe Rienzi, The Flying Dutchman, Tannhäuser, Lohengrin.

LESSON XL.

RICHARD WAGNER'S MUSIC DRAMAS. OTHER SCHOOLS.

=Wagner's Theory of the Music Drama=.—_Lohengrin_, like _The Flying Dutchman_, was transitional in character and led into Wagner's third manner. It was his last opera; all his later works were known as music dramas. In these he pursued unhesitatingly the logical conclusions of the theories which he expounded at great length in his controversial writings, though he was far from being always consistent with himself. Thus he reasoned that since in the spoken drama but one speaker is heard at a time, the same practice should prevail in the music drama, which would naturally do away with all concerted music, choruses, etc. This rule he observed in _The Ring of the Nibelungen_, but he wisely abandoned it in his later works. In _Die Meistersinger_ he also failed to follow his theory that mythical and legendary subjects were the only suitable material for the music drama. Briefly stated, his ultimate conclusion was as follows: that the art-work of the future, as he called it, should consist of a synthesis of all the arts. Music, poetry, painting, sculpture, architecture, he asserted, had exhausted all that was possible to them as separate arts; a higher plane could be reached hereafter only by a combination which should gain unity by subordination to a single principle. This principle he found in poetry. Beethoven, he argued, had felt the insufficiency of music alone to express his deepest inspiration, and for that reason had incorporated in his last and greatest symphony a choral movement to the words of Schiller's "Ode to Joy." In the music drama, therefore, the scene painter replaces the artist and the architect, the actor by plastic poses the sculptor, while the musician must allow his music no form but that dictated by the poet in his verses. He ascribed the thrilling effect of the Greek drama to such a union of the arts and this it was his aim to revive through his own works.

=The Leading Motive=.—The part assigned by the Greek dramatists to the chorus who expounded and commented on the events of the play was in his scheme transferred to the orchestra. This he did by means of the _Leitmotiv_ (leading motive). A leitmotiv is a characteristic theme or harmonic progression associated with each of the _Dramatis Personæ_ and which appears with such modification of mode, rhythm, or any of its component parts as the dramatic situation demands. It is not confined to personages alone; in _The Ring of the Nibelung_, for instance, the stolen gold, the ring formed from it, the sword which plays such an important part in _Die Walküre_ and in _Siegfried_ all have their corresponding motives. It is through these motives that Wagner is able to give his orchestra an all but articulate speech and to weld the music drama into an organic whole. By their transformation and development he succeeds in indicating psychological states and changes as well as material conditions and objects. Reminiscent themes of a somewhat similar nature had been used as far back as Mozart and had been employed more freely by composers of the Romantic school, notably by Weber in _Der Freischütz_ and _Euryanthe_, but they were undeveloped and elementary in character. Berlioz in his _Fantastic Symphony_ was the first to conceive a typical theme and to alter it in logical accordance with the progression of his program, but he did not adopt the practice in his operas.

[Illustration: WILHELM RICHARD WAGNER.]

=The Unending Melody=.—Beginning with _Lohengrin_, Wagner abandoned fixed forms and substituted what he called unending melody, a practically continuous flow of tone divided alike between voices and instruments. For the most part he assigned the singer a declamation as far removed from the set aria on the one hand as it was from dry recitative of the early Italian opera on the other. Yet like the latter it was conditioned by principles of speech. Like the early composers, also, his subjects with but two exceptions were mythical or legendary. This, because the supernatural and the unreal correspond more closely with the ideal element introduced by the use of song for speech than material drawn from everyday experience or from the exact chronicles of history.

=The Ring of the Nibelung=.—In the old Teutonic folk-epic, the _Nibelungen Lied_ (Lay of the Nibelung), Wagner found the inspiration for his next and most extended work. This is the great tetralogy, _Der Ring des Nibelung_ (The Ring of the Nibelung), composed of four dramas designed for continuous representation: _Das Rheingold_ (The Rhine Gold), _Die Walküre_ (The Valkyrie), _Siegfried_, _Die Götterdämmerung_ (The Twilight of the Gods). It was begun and partially finished during his stay in Switzerland, but his discouragement over what he felt to be the hopeless task of ever securing its performance led him to abandon it and to set to work on another drama which he decided should be lighter in character and less difficult to execute, in order the more readily to find acceptance.

=Tristan and Isolde=.—The result of this resolution was _Tristan und Isolde_, but far from being a return to his earlier style, as he had planned, it was and probably still is the most intricate operatic score in existence. It was accepted by the Opera in Vienna, but after fifty-seven rehearsals the singers declared themselves unable to learn it and it was given up as impossible of execution. Three years after his return to Germany an unlooked-for change took place in his fortunes. The young king of Bavaria, Ludwig II, who had just ascended the throne, had been an ardent admirer of Wagner since as a boy of fifteen he had heard _Lohengrin_. Hardly had he taken his seat before he summoned the discouraged composer to Munich and assured him support and protection. _Tristan und Isolde_ was soon brought out (1865), and Wagner busied himself with the composition of _Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg_ (The Master Singers of Nuremberg), produced in 1868.

=Die Meistersinger=.—This is his only comic work, full of hitherto unsuspected humor and geniality. The story of the young poet endeavoring to gain admission to the jealously-guarded ranks of the master singers who, notwithstanding the beauty of his song, reject him because he has violated their hide-bound rules has a distinctly autobiographic value. Wagner had endured too much from similar pedants to be lenient with the picture he drew of their prototypes in medieval Nuremberg. As strikingly diatonic in style as _Tristan und Isolde_ is chromatic, these two works are the strongest illustrations of his versatility.

=Bayreuth and the Festival Theatre=.—Wagner had long cherished the plan of a festival theatre for the performance of his _Ring of the Nibelung_. Jealousy of his favor with the king led to various intrigues which prevented the building of such a theatre in Munich. The quiet town of Bayreuth, therefore, as being a central point, was chosen, and there in 1876 the _Festspielhaus_ was opened with the first complete performance of the Tetralogy. It made a profound impression, but the expense of the undertaking was so great that it resulted in a heavy loss and the theatre was closed for a number of years. In 1882, however, it reopened with _Parsifal_ and since then its triumphant career has been part of musical history.

=Parsifal=.—Until 1903, when it was given in this country, _Parsifal_ was heard only in Bayreuth. Its semi-sacred character, its mingling of religious mysticism and sorcery, its unrivaled stage effects, its overwhelming power of climax, the consummate art of its thematic construction have made it the most discussed of Wagner's works. What place it may eventually hold in respect to the others can be decided only by time. As it is, it stands alone; a second _Parsifal_ is hardly conceivable.

=Influence of Wagner=.—Unlike Weber, Wagner did not create a school—he belonged to the school which Weber founded. Like Gluck, his influence permeated all schools but to a much greater extent; none has succeeded in escaping it. Thus far in Germany it has been felt more in the development of program music, the symphonic poem, etc., than in the music drama itself. Many have attempted to follow directly in his steps, among them =August Bungert= (1846———) with a cycle of music dramas, _Die Homerische Welt_ (The World of Homer), founded upon the Iliad and the Odyssey, and =Richard Strauss= (1864———) with his _Guntram_, _Feuersnoth_ (Fire Famine) and _Salome_, but none has yet shown the power to bend the bow of Achilles. =Engelbert Humperdinck= (1854———) is the only one of Wagner's successors to develop a new phase of the music drama. This he did by applying it to the fairy tale in his _Hänsel und Gretel_ (1893), which soon found its way to all stages, the first German opera to have such a success since the death of Wagner.

=Wagner in France=.—In France, Wagner acted at first not so much directly as indirectly, and more in his connection with the Romantic school of Weber than through his individual style as revealed in the music drama. The characteristic conservatism of the French school was shown in holding to forms which had been fixed for generations, but little by little these were filled with the new romantic spirit. This comes to the fore in =Charles Gounod= (1818-1893), whose _Faust_ (1859) has exercised a strong and lasting influence on the lyric drama in France. Though set forms are not abandoned, they are closely joined by a melodious declamation which approaches the song-speech of Wagner; the orchestration, too, is unmistakably romantic in treatment. =Georges Bizet= (1838-1875) in _Carmen_ (1875), an opéra comique notwithstanding its tragic denouement, produced a work of great individuality, which shows even more plainly the influence of modern romanticism. Had the composer's career not been cut short by his untimely death, it is possible that the French school would have maintained a more commanding position. For Paris no longer holds her former preëminence as operatic centre; she has been distanced by Bayreuth. Of late years the works that have had the most pronounced success in the French capital have been Wagner's music dramas. A little more than a generation ago, in the palmy days of Auber and Meyerbeer, a success at the Grand Opéra or the Opéra Comique had an international import and meant a speedy transference to foreign stages. Now the interest is largely local; but few of the modern French operas are heard outside of France. The influence of Wagner is evident in a new French school, consisting in the main of young composers whose works manifest strongly transitional features. At present this school is in its storm and stress period; it is yet too early to forecast its ultimate effect.

=Wagner in Italy=.—Italy proved more responsive to Wagner's influence than France. The performance of _Lohengrin_ (1868), in Bologna, created much enthusiasm among the young musicians of northern Italy, but it was the septuagenarian Verdi who inaugurated the era of the music drama by his _Otello_ (1887) and _Falstaff_ (1893). Strictly speaking, he had been anticipated by =Arrigo Boïto= (1842———), who, thrown under Wagner's influence in Germany, had followed his example in being the poet and composer alike of _Mefistofele_ (1868), a version of the Faust legend. But this was Boïto's only opera, and though he gave the initial impulse to the movement, it was Verdi who carried it to a triumphant issue.

=Verdi's Latest Style=.—_Aïda_ had been a grand opera with strong musico-dramatic tendencies. In _Otello_ and _Falstaff_, Verdi made a definite entrance into the music drama. The latter in particular, founded on Shakespeare's "Merry Wives of Windsor," is an astonishing _tour de force_ for a man of four-score years. Full of the sparkle and freshness of youth, yet in every measure revealing the ripeness of matured genius, it is one of an immortal trio of lyric comedies of which the others are Mozart's _Figaro_ and Wagner's _Meistersinger_. The set and traditional forms of the opera here disappear entirely; the music is conditioned by the text and its dramatic requirements; the orchestra supports the voices in a full, melodious, and comprehensive flow, but never overpowers them. Hardly anything can be detached from its context without losing significance and interest; and this, by the way, is one of the most distinctive peculiarities of the music drama and more than anything else points the radical difference between it and the opera. Yet though this change of manner is undoubtedly due to Wagner, Verdi is in no sense an imitator. The style remains his own and is essentially Italian in character—that is, it is based upon vocal rather than instrumental capabilities.

=The New Italian School=.—The latest development of the music drama in Italy has been in the direction of so-called naturalism. This consists in the choice of brutal phases of life for illustration, told in short, concise forms which concentrate and hasten the dramatic action. A greater contrast to the inordinately long and heroic operas of Meyerbeer and Wagner can hardly be imagined; it is more than probable, indeed, that the reaction against the excessive length of the music drama led to the great and sudden vogue of this school. The first impulse to naturalism was given by =Pietro Mascagni= (1863———) in his two-act opera, _Cavalleria Rusticana_ (Rustic Chivalry), in 1890. This is a tale of love, jealousy, and revenge told in music admirably adapted to the vivid, crude representation of elemental passions. Two years later followed _I Pagliacci_ (The Clowns) by =Ruggiero Leoncavallo= (1858———), a work of precisely the same character. Though many others have essayed the same style, these two thus far remain the most representative of their class. Their popularity has been approached only by =Giacomo Puccini= (1858———) in _La Bohême_ (The Bohemians), produced in 1896. Four years later his _Tosca_ appeared and did much to strengthen the impression given by its predecessor—that in Puccini Italy possesses her most promising dramatic composer.

=Schools Compared=.—Thus at the beginning of the 20th century we find the principles of the music drama as enunciated by Wagner influencing all the three great schools of dramatic composition. It is worthy of note, however, that these schools, though thus approaching in artistic ideals, still retain the characteristics which distinguished them from the very beginning: the Italian, melody and beauty of tone; the French, clearness of form and logical dramatic development; the German, elevation of subject and harmonic richness.

=Younger Schools=.—Younger schools having a strongly national character exist in Russia and Bohemia, but as yet they possess only local signification and have produced no practical effect outside of their respective countries. =Michael Glinka= (1803-1857) with his patriotic opera, _Life for the Czar_, founded the Russian opera in 1836. The Bohemian opera is of more recent origin and is associated principally with the names of =Friedrich Smetana= (1824-1884) and =Antonin Dvo■ák= (1841-1904).

=Resumé=.—From its dual nature, the opera is necessarily a compromise. Composed of two elements, the musical and the dramatic, it is peculiarly susceptible to disintegration; its history is a record of almost continuous veering from one to the other of these two phases. We have seen how the immense proportions of the ancient amphitheatres led to the musical declamation on which the opera is founded, from the fact that the tones of the singing voice are far more reaching than those of the voice in speaking. The Florentine experimenters, in seeking to restore this declamation, soon discovered the capabilities for emotional expression latent in the varying timbres and vastly extended range of the former. As for its musical possibilities, these were entirely beyond their ken. The steps taken in that direction they regarded with disfavor as indicating a deviation from the oratorical standards which were their sole aim. After Carissimi and Scarlatti had developed the elements of symmetrical form and melody, music emerged from this dependent condition and dictated to the drama, which sank to an almost negligible factor. The reaction led by Gluck served to restore the balance for a time, but through Rossini and his followers the pendulum again swung in the other direction. The Romantic movement then brought the drama again to the fore; the spirit of the age was behind it and all schools felt its influence, though each manifested it in characteristic fashion.

=Influence of the Opera on Music in General=.—These alternations have had a powerful effect on the development of music in general, an effect both technical and expressive in nature. From the harpsichord and the few viols used at first merely to support the voice and to give it pitch, the orchestra expanded into a large body of instruments capable in itself of dramatic utterance. From the tiny ritornello of eight measures played by three flutes in Peri's _Euridice_, there has grown an independent instrumental art of vast significance. The opera also created a school of singing which though often unworthily used for purposes of purely personal display is the basis of the vocal art of today. In short, it is not too much to say that the little band of scholars and musicians who met three centuries ago with the aim of reviving a lost art practically originated a new one.

REFERENCES.

Finck.—Wagner and His Works.

Modern Composers and Their Works.

QUESTIONS.

Give an account of Wagner's theory of the Music Drama.

What is meant by the term Leading Motive? Unending melody?

What works compose the Ring series?

Tell about "Tristan und Isolde," "Die Meistersinger."

In what city was a theatre built for Wagner's dramas?

Describe "Parsifal."

What composers has Wagner influenced?

What was his influence on French composers and the names of those most prominent; their works?

What was his influence upon the Young Italian school?

Who are the prominent members of that school?

What changes did Verdi show in his latest works?

What are the characteristics of the various schools?

Give a résumé of the development of opera.

What has been the influence of opera upon music?

REVIEW SUGGESTIONS, LESSONS XXXVII TO XL.

What was the effect of the Romantic movement on the Opera?

Write a sketch of Weber and his work in Opera.

What differences are there between Opéra Comique and Grand Opéra?

Compare the works of Spohr and Marschner with those of Weber.

Describe the typical Opéra Comique and name some notable work in this style.

What changes took place in Grand Opéra through the influence of Auber and Meyerbeer?

State the differences between the German, French and Italian opera styles.

Write a sketch of Verdi and his works.

Give an account of Wagner and the works of his first period. His second period.

What was Wagner's theory of the music drama?

Explain the two essential principles he used.

Describe Wagner's later works: "Ring" series, "Tristan und Isolde," "Die Meistersinger," "Parsifal." (Each one may be made the subject of an essay.)

How did Wagner influence opera in Italy and in France?

Give a sketch of the later schools of opera.

LESSON XLI.

PIANO PLAYING AND COMPOSITION: CLEMENTI TO FIELD.

During the period after Mozart to the beginning of the Romantic movement, one name alone attains the first rank—that of Beethoven. At the same time there are several epoch-making pianists, whose compositions display talent rather than genius, but who have each rendered indisputable service in accomplishing the transition from the classic to the romantic composers. The landmarks, so to speak, of this period are Clementi, Cramer, Hummel, Czerny, Moscheles and Field.

=Muzio Clementi= (1752-1832) was born at Rome. His father was quick to perceive his son's gift for music, and strove to develop it by the best teaching available. While he was still a lad, an Englishman, Bedford or Beckford, took young Clementi with him to England where he lived with his benefactor until 1770, perfecting himself in piano playing and composition. At his first appearances in London he created a furore, and from 1777-1780 he conducted at the piano in the Italian opera there. In 1781, he began his travels as a virtuoso. At Vienna he made the acquaintance of Josef Haydn, and also had a sort of musical combat with Mozart. Each read at sight, played his own compositions and improvised. Opinion was divided as to the outcome. Clementi displayed more virtuosity, while Mozart charmed by his singing-tone, finished phrasing and expressive style. For the following twenty years, Clementi lived in London. He became interested in a piano manufactory and when the firm failed, he established another, which is still carried on. In 1802, Clementi went on a concert-tour with two favorite pupils, J. B. Cramer and John Field. They visited Paris, Vienna and even St. Petersburg, arousing great enthusiasm everywhere. In 1810, he settled in London permanently, devoting himself to composition and business. In 1817, he published his _Gradus ad Parnassum_, a series of one hundred studies treating every branch of technic and every problem of piano playing then known.

[Illustration: MUZIO CLEMENTI.]

=Clementi as Composer and Pianist=.—In addition to his early works, Clementi composed symphonies, more than one hundred sonatas for piano, preludes, toccatas, canons and other piano music and finally the _Gradus_. As Clementi was a true Italian by temperament, and German in his education, the sonatas show the influence of Domenico Scarlatti, as well as of Haydn and Mozart. They are technically in advance of their day, though inclined to dryness musically. However, Beethoven admired them, and is said to have preferred them to those of Mozart. Clementi's monumental work, the studies, treats every difficulty and style of piano playing so very comprehensively that it is still indispensable to the student. In his youth Clementi was a bravura-player, pure and simple. "Strong in runs of thirds, but without a pennyworth of feeling" was Mozart's verdict. But later, when Clementi had become acquainted with the larger tone of the English pianos, he cultivated expressive playing. At his best, his brilliancy and facility were dazzling, and he invariably carried all before him. Considering the fundamental value of his studies, and his preëminent abilities as a pianist, it is just to give him the title of "The Father of Piano Playing."

=Johann Baptist Cramer= (1771-1858) was born at Mannheim, Germany. When he was but a year old his father moved to London. As a boy he studied the violin and the piano, as well as the theory of music, but soon showed the greater aptitude for the piano. Later he became a pupil of Clementi. Handel, Bach, Scarlatti, Haydn and Mozart were the objects of his attention, thus establishing a taste for the classics. In 1788, Cramer began a series of tours on the Continent, living at London in the intervals. In 1828, he founded the music publishing firm of J. B. Cramer & Co. He lived in Paris from 1832 to 1845, but returned to London, where he remained until his death.

=Cramer as Composer and Pianist=.—Of Cramer's numerous compositions, such as seven concertos and one hundred and five sonatas for the piano, besides variations, rondos, fantasias, etc., a quartet and quintet, little is worth survival. His representative work is a series of seventy-six studies, Op. 50, to which he afterwards added. These studies long enjoyed a reputation second only

to those of Clementi. They do not aim primarily at virtuosity, but towards the cultivation of musical style; at the same time they exhibit novelty of technical invention, and demand a decided proficiency. Thus they tend to supplement the studies of Clementi which are chiefly concerned with technic. As a performer, Cramer was greatly admired for his perfect legato, distinctness of phrasing and quiet singing tone. Beethoven is said to have preferred him to all other pianists of his time. While Cramer does not present a technical advance over Clementi, he undoubtedly did much for the cultivation of the more strictly musical qualities and thus stands for a definite progress.

[Illustration: J. B. CRAMER. J. N. HUMMEL.]

=Johann Nepomuk Hummel= (1778-1837) was born at Presburg, Hungary. His father, who had been instructor in music at a military school in Wartburg, moved to Vienna in 1786 to become director at the theatre of Schikaneder, (the author of the libretto of Mozart's opera "The Magic Flute"). Mozart soon took so deep an interest in young Hummel that he took him to live with him and taught him for two years. From 1788 to 1795, Hummel traveled as a virtuoso. On returning to Vienna he studied composition with Albrechtsberger, and received advice from Salieri and Haydn. From 1804 to 1811 he was music-director under Prince Esterhazy, Haydn's patron. In 1816, he became conductor at Stuttgart, and in 1819 he occupied a similar position at Weimar. From here he went to Russia, where he made a successful concert-tour, playing at Warsaw, where the youthful Chopin heard him. From 1825 to 1833 he traveled on concert-tours, returning to Weimar, where he passed the remainder of his life.

=Hummel as Composer and Pianist=.—Hummel's compositions include operas, ballets, masses and other church music, a quintet, trios, rondos, studies and other music for the piano, but he is best known for the piano concertos in A-flat, A minor and B minor, the sonatas in F-sharp minor and D major, the Septet, Op. 74, and a voluminous instruction-book for the piano, chiefly remarkable for its pedantry and absence of practicality. As a pupil of Mozart, he followed his teacher's form and style, without exhibiting marked creative genius. His technic is noticeable chiefly for its superficial glitter of brilliant passages, which constitute a certain development in themselves. His compositions were in great vogue at one time, and he was once even regarded as the equal of Beethoven. As a pianist, Hummel was unusual. His style was distinguished by precision, clearness, and command of brilliant effect. His influence as a concert pianist was very great, and in this direction his extension of the province of the virtuoso is considerable. He undoubtedly affected Chopin's piano style for a time and for this reason alone should claim our attention.

=Carl Czerny= (1791-1857) was born at Vienna. His father, an excellent musician, taught his son piano playing at an early age. Beethoven became interested in him, and gave him lessons. He also learned much from Hummel and Clementi. Czerny soon became in great demand as a teacher. He made concert-tours to Leipzig, Paris, London and Lombardy. For the most part he lived quietly in Vienna, teaching and composing. In 1850, his health gave way from overwork. His most celebrated pupils were Franz Liszt and Theodore Leschetizky.

=Czerny's Compositions=.—Czerny was an indefatigable and over-fluent composer who weakened his powers by over-productivity. Hence, of more than a thousand works, his masses, requiems, symphonies, overtures, chamber-music, etc., are obsolete, but his educational works are destined to live. Of many valuable sets of studies, the most used are those for Velocity, Op. 299, and Finger Training, Op. 740. Musically, they are of slight importance, but they are invaluable to this day in acquiring facility. Czerny had an immense knowledge of the higher mechanism of piano playing, and a keen perception of practical methods. His fame as a pianist was overshadowed by his ceaseless work as teacher and composer.

[Illustration: CARL CZERNY.]

=Ignaz Moscheles= (1794-1870), described as "the foremost pianist after Hummel and before Chopin," was born at Prague. He studied the piano with Dionys Weber, director of the Prague Conservatory, and at fourteen played a concerto of his own in public. After the death of his father, he went to Vienna to make his way as a teacher, and to continue his studies in composition. He soon became in great demand as a pianist and teacher, and for ten years lived the life of a traveling virtuoso. In 1824, he gave lessons to Mendelssohn, then a boy of fifteen, at Berlin. Soon after his marriage at Hamburg, in 1826, he went to London, where he remained with some interruptions for nearly twenty years of activity as pianist, teacher and conductor. In 1845, he took the post of teacher of the piano at the Leipzig Conservatory, founded by Mendelssohn.

[Illustration: IGNAZ MOSCHELES.]

=Moscheles as Composer and Pianist=.—As a composer, Moscheles was divided between his classical training and his unmistakably romantic instincts. Hence, a long list of variations, fantasias, rondos, written to please publishers, in accordance with

the fashion of the time, have not survived, but his best works, the concerto in G minor, the “Pathetic” concerto, the sonata, Op. 49, his duet for two pianos, “Hommage á Handel” and especially the studies, Op. 70 and 95, combine a respect for classic form with the growing Romantic movement. The studies may be regarded as the legitimate successors to those of Cramer, and paved the way for the more romantic etudes of Chopin. Moscheles was a solidly trained pianist of great brilliancy. He had many characteristics of the classical school; he used the pedals sparingly, he played octaves with a stiff wrist, his phrasing was precise and his accents were sharply marked; but in the brilliant style he had no rivals. He was famous for his improvisations; his cadenzas to concertos and his extempore treatments of well-known themes were marked by spontaneity, brilliance and exquisite feeling.

=John Field= (1782-1837), one of the last connecting links between the Classical and Romantic schools, was born at Dublin. Early in life, he was taken to London and apprenticed to Clementi, who gave him lessons, and employed him to show off his pianos. In 1802, he went on a concert-tour with Clementi to Paris, Germany and Russia. Field lived for many years as pianist and teacher at St. Petersburg and Moscow. After returning to England, he made a long tour through Belgium, Switzerland, and finally, Italy, where his health gave way. Shortly after he returned to Moscow, where he died.

=Field as Composer and Pianist=.—Field’s compositions in classical forms include seven concertos, four sonatas, rondos, variations, etc. They are forgotten now, although Chopin had a partiality for his concerto in A-flat and gave it to his pupils; but his lyric pieces for piano, entitled nocturnes, are still played. They are the forerunners of the type so extended and developed by Chopin. He is thus one of the first of the romanticists in spite of his classical training. In 1802, Field astonished the Parisians by his masterly playing of Bach and Handel, but his individuality later took a more romantic turn. His tone was tender and melancholy, and his phrases gently expressive. Shortly before his death, though broken in health, he created a stir in Vienna by his interpretations of his own nocturnes. In some respects his playing was akin to Chopin’s highly individual style.

=To sum up=, it will be seen that Clementi was the originator of a system of technic that has served as the foundation of modern piano playing; Cramer was the conserver of classic style and purity of standard; Hummel, as a brilliant pianist, had a decided influence on the piano playing of his time, but as a composer attempted to pass superficial brilliance for the true coin of musical substance; Czerny, one of the greatest educators in the history of piano playing, has had an immense influence through his invaluable educational works, and as the teacher of Franz Liszt, the epitome of modern piano playing, and also of Theodore Leschetizky, possibly the foremost teacher of the present day; Moscheles, the classic pianist, gave decided impetus to the cause of romanticism by his best compositions; Field, though the pupil of Clementi, prepared the way through his own individuality for the greatest piano composer of the Romantic period, Chopin, and thus became an important factor in the transition from the Classic to the Romantic period.

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, articles on Pianoforte Playing and players mentioned in this lesson.

Weitzmann.—History of Piano Playing.

Bie.—The Piano.

Fillmore.—Pianoforte Music.

QUESTIONS.

What composers form the transition from the Classic to the Romantic school?

Give a summary of this transition period.

Give a sketch of Clementi.

What was Clementi’s greatest work?

What were his contributions to piano playing?

Give a sketch of Cramer.

What work is most representative of Cramer as a composer?

Mention his contributions to piano playing.

Give an account of Hummel's life.

What classic pianist was a pupil of Mozart?

What was his influence on piano playing?

Give a sketch of Czerny's career.

Who were Czerny's most famous pupils?

What influence did he exert on piano playing?

Give a sketch of Moscheles' life.

What composer was the intimate friend of Moscheles?

What is the value of his educational works?

Give a sketch of Field's career and his influence on piano playing.

What form did Field originate?

[Illustration: FRANZ PETER SCHUBERT.]

LESSON XLII.

FRANZ PETER SCHUBERT.

The rise of the Romantic school involves a greater freedom in form, a fuller play of poetry and imagination, a general artistic evolution and independence in comparison with the formality of the Classic period. The struggle to establish these principles was long and obstinate, but the outcome was as inevitable as the victory won by Beethoven's sonata and symphonic forms over the more primitive types of Haydn and Mozart. The first departures from the classic attitude were made by Schubert, whose influence has been permanent in the development of romanticism.

=Schubert's Early Life= (1797-1816).—Franz Peter Schubert was born in a suburb of Vienna, January 31, 1797. At an early age he had lessons on the violin from his father, who was a school teacher, and on the piano, from his elder brother. He so quickly outstripped both teachers that he was sent to Michael Holzer, choir-master of the parish, who taught him piano, organ, violin, singing and theory. In later years, Holzer disclaimed the value of his instruction, saying: "If I ever wished to teach him anything new, I found he had already mastered it." After singing in the parish choir, he passed an examination for admission to the Imperial _Convict_ or school for the Royal choristers. The training included general education as well as music; there was also an orchestra among the boys in which Schubert played the violin and sometimes conducted. There were privations connected with life at the _Convict_, the practice rooms were insufferably cold, and the food insufficient. In 1810, Schubert began to compose, dating his pieces carefully, and the only check to his inspiration was the lack of music-paper, which he was too poor to buy. A generous friend made up the deficiency. In 1813, he left the _Convict_, although his general education was by no means complete, since he had neglected his studies on account of his increasing passion for composition. After leaving the _Convict_, Schubert taught elementary classes at his father's school, but the drudgery became insupportable. An ardent friend and admirer, Franz von Schober, realizing that Schubert's creative powers were greatly hampered by the conditions of his life, gave him a home. Already he had composed some of his most famous songs, including "The Erl-King."

=Later Years= (1816-1828).—From 1816 on, Schubert appears to have lived in Schober's apartments, except for two years shared with the poet Mayerhofer, and a period spent with a friend, Schwind. It is a mystery how Schubert managed to live, for he taught little, and his few publications could have brought him at best only small sums at irregular intervals. He had already failed to secure a position in a Government school of music, but in 1818 he passed the summer as music teacher to the household of Count Johann Esterhazy, in Zelescz, Hungary. The record of his life hereafter is one of incessant composition, with few interruptions or facts of interest. In 1823, he showed Weber his eighth work for the stage: "Alfonso and Estrella." The only advice he received was that "first operas, like first puppies, should be drowned." The summer of 1824 was spent again with the Esterhazys and many characteristic compositions, such as the quartet in A minor, the "Hungarian Divertissement," the piano sonata in B-flat, etc., date from this time. In 1826, Schubert failed to obtain either of two positions, which would have placed him above need, the second because, like

Beethoven, he refused to alter a trial aria to suit the voice of a capricious singer. Schubert was taken to see Beethoven during his last illness, in 1827. In 1828, he went to live with his brother Ferdinand in a new and damp house. His health, which had been troublesome before, now gave way, and he died of typhoid fever, November 28, 1828, in his thirty-second year.

=Personal Traits and Habits of Work=.—Schubert was short of stature, thickset and rather heavy in features. His face in repose was rather devoid of expression, but when interested in anything, his eyes glowed with enthusiasm and his whole appearance changed. His disposition was even and good-tempered, he was simple and trusting by nature, and could rarely be induced to put himself forward. Although receiving many favors from friends, his generosity often led him to give to others when he could ill spare it. He began composing early in the morning and worked uninterruptedly for several hours; he walked much in the afternoon or paid visits to friends, spending his evenings with congenial spirits at various taverns. Composing was the mainspring of his existence, and he often wrote down his ideas while in the midst of conversation with others. Thus he wrote his immortal “Serenade” on the back of a bill-of-fare at a tavern; a piece for four-hands while waiting at a hospital for a friend, “and dinner missed in consequence”; a movement of a string quartet was begun about midnight and finished in the early morning. Although he set many poems by Goethe, Schiller and Heine, his inspiration was quite as effectively aroused by second-rate poems of his friends Mayerhofer, von Schober, or the artless poems of Müller. Schubert was shy and reserved in what might be called “good society”; he preferred the company of congenial friends in an humbler social station. He seems to have cared little for literature, and his love of poetry was limited to its availability as texts for songs. In early life he played the violin and the viola in a family string quartet. Schubert was no virtuoso on the piano, but he played exquisite accompaniments, and he read well at sight in spite of defective eyesight. His performance was marked by earnestness and attention to the inner sentiment of the music rather than by the superficial polish of the mere pianist. It was said that no one could forget the effect of Schubert’s songs as performed by himself and his friend Vogl; the two seemed absolutely united, the ideal condition for the rendering of vocal works.

=Schubert’s Compositions=.—Schubert completed more than eleven hundred pieces in about eighteen years. Such fertility is unique in the history of composition, and is scarcely equalled even by Mozart, whose activity extended over nearly thirty years. Schubert’s powers of spontaneous invention have never been approached; he composed generally without making sketches; he seldom revised, for his ideas came faster than he could write them down. It is impossible to enumerate all Schubert’s works, but the following comprise the most important: Nine symphonies, eleven works for the stage, six masses, over seventy part-songs, choruses, etc., for various combinations, twenty-four sonatas for piano, fantasies, overtures, variations, marches and dances for piano duet, impromptus, moments musicals, fantasies, variations and over two hundred dances for piano solo, two trios for piano and strings, a quintet for strings and piano, a string quintet and several string trios, twenty-four string quartets, besides about six hundred songs with piano accompaniment and occasionally with obligatos for other instruments. It is obvious that such fertility is not consistent with evenness of quality; we must pick and choose to find the real Schubert. However, the symphonies in C and B minor (“Unfinished”), the string quartets in D minor and G major, several sonatas for piano, the impromptus, moments musicals, the fantasy in C for piano, the Hungarian Divertissement, several marches and other compositions for four hands, many charming two-hand waltzes, and, finally, such song-cycles as the “Miller-Songs,” the “Winter Journey,” those called “Swan-Songs” by the publishers, as well as about thirty separate songs “The Erl-King,” “The Wanderer,” “To Sylvia,” “The Omnipotent,” “The Young Nun,” the “Serenade,” “Hark! Hark! the Lark,” “Sei mir Gegrüsst,” “Du bist die Ruh,” “Ave Maria,” “Litany,” and others, are the works of Schubert which will live. Schubert at his best entrances us by his wonderful flow of melody, his spontaneity, his symmetrical form, which, however, is sometimes diffuse. His chief qualities lie in the simple expressiveness of his music, a direct appeal to sincerity of emotion, and to the sense of the poetic. He began by imitating the form and style of Mozart and Beethoven; but from his eighteenth year onward he developed an individuality entirely apart. Despite the virtues of his instrumental music, his great achievement was the creation of the German song, in which department he stands unrivalled in the inexhaustibility of his melody, the variety of mood which they display, the subtlety and harmonic beauty of his accompaniments, as well as art in creating vocal effects.

=Schubert’s Influence on Music=.—In abundance of resource, poetic feeling and true imagination, Schubert has brought new forces into music. His influence on romantic composers was widespread and deep. Schumann was a thorough admirer of Schubert. Schumann’s songs could hardly have come into existence but for those of Schubert, and the latter’s short pieces for piano were undoubtedly as potent an inspiration for his piano works. Brahms, too, had a real reverence for Schubert, that is plainly exhibited in his works. Despite the differences of their artistic individuality, there are traces of Schubert in the former’s songs as well as in some of his short piano pieces. Liszt’s partiality to Schubert was untiring in its zeal. He played his piano music, transcribed the “Hungarian Divertissement,” arranged some of the marches for two hands and for orchestra; he made a version of the fantasy in C for piano and orchestra, which is still popular; and, finally (perhaps his greatest service to Schubert) he transcribed no less than

fifty-seven of his songs for piano. In this form he created an interest in Schubert where the original versions were unknown, and did much to spread their renown. In spite of all shortcomings, Schubert's genius was so remarkable, and his immediate effect upon the Romantic movement so apparent and his legacy to the musical world so imperishable that it is difficult not to agree with Sir George Grove when he wrote: "There has never been one like him and there never will be another."

REFERENCES.

Grove.—Dictionary of Music and Musicians, article on Schubert.

Frost.—Life of Schubert.

Von Hellborn.—Life of Franz Schubert.

Dvo■ák.—Franz Schubert. (Century Library of Music.)

QUESTIONS.

From what rank in life did Schubert come?

Give the leading incidents in his life.

What kind of man was he physically, mentally and socially?

How did Schubert compose?

In what forms of composition did Schubert work?

What form of composition did he especially enrich?

Which of his productions have the greatest vogue today?

What influence did Schubert exert on music?

Who did much to spread a knowledge of his works?

Name some composers who have felt his force.

LESSON XLIII.

WEBER. MENDELSSOHN.

Schubert's operas had no appreciable effect on the Romantic composers, for the simple reason that they were never heard on account of the absurdities of their librettos and the weakness of their stage situations. At about the same period, a slightly older composer was beginning a series of works destined to place German Opera on a firm basis, to exercise a decided influence on Wagner, besides contributing not a little to the development of piano technic.

=Carl Maria Friedrich Ernst von Weber= was born at Eutin, December 18, 1786. His father, a restless man of many talents, was a theatrical manager during Weber's early years, when constant traveling was the rule, and music lessons the exception. His irregular early instruction under several teachers, of whom Michael Haydn was the most eminent, was supplemented by two years of solid study under the gifted and eccentric Abbé Vogler. From 1804 to 1806, Weber was music-director at the Breslau theatre, and soon made a name for himself as composer and pianist as well as conductor. After this he remained under the protection of the Duke of Wurtemburg, earning a living by giving lessons, and acting as secretary to the Duke's brother. During this period he composed an opera "Silvana," overtures, a cantata, piano music, etc. Three years of wandering, chiefly on concert tours, ensued after his banishment from Wurtemburg on account of unjustly suspected complicity in an intrigue for a position at court. To these years belong a comic opera, "Abu Hassan," the piano concertos in C and E-flat, three concertos for clarinet, the piano sonata in C, etc. In 1814 and 1815, he composed the choruses, "Lyre and Sword," and a cantata, "Battle and Victory," both the outcome of political events, and widely popular from their patriotic character. In 1816, he became music-director of the German opera at Dresden. He revived interest in German opera, stimulated public support and in the following years began the composition of "Der Freischütz," an opera thoroughly German in its character and the keystone of Weber's fame. It was not finished until 1820, for in the

meantime he wrote much of his best piano music, songs and incidental music for a gipsy play “Preciosa.” Just after the completion of his popular Concert-piece for piano and orchestra, “Der Freischütz” was given for the first time at Berlin, June 18, 1821, and the result was one of the greatest triumphs ever bestowed on a German composer. It was soon given in all the principal theatres in Germany, including Dresden, and also in Vienna. In 1823, Weber’s most ambitious opera, “Euryanthe,” was given in Vienna and proved almost a failure. Weber’s health, which had not been satisfactory for some years, showed signs of being undermined. “Euryanthe” was performed with greater success during 1824 and 1825, at Dresden, Leipzig and Berlin, where Weber was almost too ill to conduct. In spite of his ill-health he agreed to write an opera for the Covent Garden Theatre, in London, beginning the music to “Oberon” early in 1825 and finishing the last number in the spring of 1826. The performances were more than satisfactory, and Weber was received everywhere with enthusiasm. His strength was now entirely overtaxed, and he hoped to return to his family, but he died suddenly from consumption, on June 4, 1826.

=Weber’s personality= was pleasing; of excellent birth, his experience of the world through his positions as opera-director and his frequent concert-tours, made him an agreeable companion and a favorite in society. He was cultivated, well read in philosophy and science; he possessed considerable literary and critical ability. In consequence of his intellectual and social gifts, he was a new type of musician, who did much to improve the social status of the composer. He was a remarkable pianist, with an immense command of technic, original in style and eloquent in expression; also a forceful conductor.

=Weber the Composer=.—Weber is, first of all, the composer of the three operas, “Der Freischütz,” “Euryanthe” and “Oberon,” which are discussed in Lesson XXXVII. The overtures to his operas are his best orchestral works; his symphonies and chamber-music are unimportant. However, his three concertos for clarinet and orchestra are classics in the literature of that instrument. Weber’s songs are interesting for the sidelight they throw on the development of the Folk-song tendency, but in this line he was entirely overshadowed by Schubert and Schumann. However, Weber’s piano music is exceedingly important. The concertos for piano are seldom heard, but the “Concert-piece” is still amply worth study. The piano sonatas (especially those in C and A-flat) show great technical inventiveness, melodic charm and original effects, but they are less happy in point of form. Next to the sonatas in interest comes the delightful Op. 65, “Invitation to the Dance,” so well-known in Berlioz’ orchestral version. In addition are the “Momento Capriccioso,” Op. 12, the Rondo in E-flat, Op. 62, the “Polacca Brillante,” Op. 72, the Polonaise, Op. 21. Weber did much to develop the technic of the left hand; his piano compositions are thoroughly pianistic and rank high in the music of the Romantic period.

=Weber’s Influence=.—Weber’s position in the evolution of the Romantic school is extremely important. In Opera his exploration of the imaginative field in so many directions not only opened a new vein in dramatic music, but its influence was felt in every branch of composition. Thus several of Schumann’s choral works, Mendelssohn’s “Midsummer Night’s Dream” music, the “Walpurgis Night” cantata, the concert overtures, and pieces for piano and orchestra are direct musical descendants of Weber. Mendelssohn’s Concerto in G minor, the “Serenade” and “Allegro Giojoso,” his scherzos and “Songs Without Words” are the direct outcome of Weber’s example. In general, the technical style of Weber’s piano music was thoroughly absorbed by both Mendelssohn and, to some extent, Liszt, who edited Weber’s sonatas and solo pieces with tempting additions; he transcribed for piano the overtures “Jubilee,” “Freischütz” and “Oberon,” and arranged the “Polacca Brillante,” Op. 72, for piano and orchestra. Liszt was very fond of Weber’s music, his piano style was sympathetic to him, his interpretation of the Concert-piece, Op. 79, never failed to produce an overwhelming effect. Finally, Weber’s influence on Wagner must be mentioned. Wagner greatly admired Weber’s dramatic insight, his picturesqueness, and especially the poetry and novel color of his orchestral style.

MENDELSSOHN.

The influence which Mendelssohn exercised during two-thirds of the 19th century among the more conservative German musicians and in England was nothing short of extraordinary. He undoubtedly gave great impetus to the study of the classic masters, especially Bach, and his romantic tendencies were so balanced and controlled as to gain a speedy recognition for his music. Today, Mendelssohn the classicist is less admired, and his music will live chiefly for its romantic qualities.

=Mendelssohn’s Life=.—Jakob Ludwig Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy[15] was born at Hamburg, February 3, 1809. His father, a prosperous banker, moved to Berlin in 1811. His first lessons in music were given him by his mother, but he soon began to study the piano with Ludwig Berger, a pupil of Clementi, and composition with Zelter. In 1820, he began to compose systematically. In 1821, he made the acquaintance of Weber, and his enthusiasm for the romantic composer lasted all his life. In 1824, he formed a life-long friendship with Moscheles, who gave him piano lessons. Already he was remarkable for his improvisations and for playing from scores. In 1825, a trip to Paris brought him into contact with the celebrated musicians there. In this year he composed his octet

for strings, in which his individuality first asserted itself strongly. In the following summer he wrote the overture to “A Midsummer Night’s Dream,” a precocious evidence of originality. In 1827, he made the first draft of his overture “A Calm Sea and a Prosperous Voyage,” a further step into the realm of imagination. In 1829, he organized the first performance of Bach’s “St. Matthew Passion” music since the composer’s death. In this year a visit to England, where some of his compositions were performed, was followed by a trip to Scotland, the Hebrides and Wales, of which his impressions are recorded in the “Hebrides” overture, the “Scotch” symphony and other works of later years. He traveled much during the following years. In 1833, after another visit to England, where his recently composed “Italian” symphony was played, he conducted a musical festival at Düsseldorf, the first of many similar engagements. During the next few years he was constantly employed in conducting, playing and composing, especially his oratorio “St. Paul.” In 1837, he married Miss Cécile Jeanrenaud. From this time dates his second piano concerto in D minor, in which are to be seen traces of Thalberg’s piano style. During the next few years Mendelssohn lived at Leipzig. In 1843, he established a conservatory at Leipzig, long the most celebrated in Europe. Schumann, and later Moscheles, were among the teachers as well as Mendelssohn himself. In 1846, Mendelssohn’s oratorio “Elijah” was given a triumphant first performance at Birmingham under the composer’s direction. In 1847, he made his tenth visit to England for performances of “Elijah,” of his completed “Midsummer Night’s Dream” music (composed in 1845), the “Scotch” symphony and other works. The death of his sister, Fanny, following soon after those of his parents, was so great a shock to him that he went to Switzerland for a rest. He returned improved in health, but could not consider commissions for new works from England, Frankfort and Cologne. He was considering a trip to Vienna to hear Jenny Lind sing in “Elijah” when he was taken suddenly ill and died, November 4, 1847.

=Personal Traits=.—Mendelssohn is described as having an unusually animated, winning personality. He was immensely fond of society, which he could enjoy without detriment to his work. His letters describe in detail his innumerable professional engagements, his round of social festivities and his journeys with equal fidelity. Mendelssohn was fond of out-of-door life, walking, riding and swimming; he also greatly enjoyed dancing. One of his favorite relaxations was to sketch from nature or paint in water-colors. Mendelssohn was a remarkable pianist, of an unaffected type, not a virtuoso, yet his interpretations were full of vigor, charm and a thoroughly musical spirit. His improvisations were remarkable for their spontaneous invention, brilliance and science displayed, and his cadenzas to Beethoven’s 4th concerto and Mozart’s, in D minor, were striking examples of his skill. Mendelssohn was also a remarkable organist, if English testimony is to be credited. At all events, he did much to further the knowledge of Bach’s organ works. Mendelssohn’s incessant activity undoubtedly hastened his death; the amount that he compressed into his short life was incredible.

=Compositions=.—The works most representative of Mendelssohn are the “Scotch” and “Italian” symphonies, the overtures “A Calm Sea and a Prosperous Voyage,” “A Midsummer Night’s Dream,” “The Hebrides,” “Melusina,” “Ruy Blas”; the concertos and two smaller pieces for piano and orchestra; the concerto for violin; the octet for strings; two quintets and seven quartets; three quartets for piano and strings; two trios; two sonatas for piano and ’cello; for the piano, six preludes and fugues; three sonatas; the “Serious Variations”; six books of “Songs Without Words”; many smaller pieces, including the “Capriccio,” Op. 8; the “Rondo Capriccioso,” Op. 14; the Caprices, Op. 33; the Scherzo à Capriccio and others; sonatas, preludes and fugues for organ; the oratorios “St. Paul,” and “Elijah”; music to “A Midsummer Night’s Dream,” to the dramas “Athalie,” “Antigone” and “Œdipus”; the cantata “Walpurgis Night.” He also wrote a great deal of church music, psalms, hymns, motets, and cantatas for various occasions, including the “Lobgesang,” a symphony-cantata; many part-songs, duets and songs for single voice with piano accompaniment.

[Illustration: FELIX MENDELSSOHN-BARTHOLDY.]

=Mendelssohn’s Tendencies=.—Although he wrote almost exclusively in the conventional forms, Mendelssohn cannot be regarded as a continuator of the classics. In form, thematic development, counterpoint, part-writing, etc., he imitated the letter of classic example closely, but could not attain the inner spirit. To some extent he followed Bach, Handel, Mozart and Beethoven, but the chief source of his individuality is the romanticism of Weber. His piano style is adapted from that of Weber with some extensions of his own. Showered with praise as he was during his lifetime, as the possessor of all the classic virtues, we now admire him chiefly for his romanticism, timid and fastidious though it appears by comparison with the genuine innovations of Berlioz, Liszt and Wagner. In the light of the sturdy qualities of Brahms, his classicism seems superficial. His style was too polished to admit of real vigor. Nevertheless, Mendelssohn of the two symphonies, the “Midsummer Night’s Dream,” “Melusina” and “Hebrides” overture, the violin concerto, the piano concerto in G minor, the sonata for piano and ’cello in D, the scherzo of the octet, the “Serious Variations,” the Scherzo à Capriccio and some half a dozen of the “Songs Without Words” shows us a delicate and charming individuality with the refinement and decided perceptions of the poet, who regarded the world with the eyes of a romanticist recording many impressions of picturesqueness and grace, if seldom of strength.

=Mendelssohn's Influence as an Artist=.—For a time, Mendelssohn's influence was unbounded. His symphonies and overtures were considered worthy successors to those of Beethoven; his chamber-music was equally valued; his oratorios were regarded as on a level with those of Handel; his piano music, especially the "Songs Without Words," were in universal vogue. His orchestral style contained many novel features, it is true, but his chamber-music was not written in the genuine manner and is far inferior to that of the later master, Brahms. His oratorios contain some notable choruses and airs, but on the whole are only faint imitations of the real oratorio style. Still they sufficed to form the foundation of an English school of composition in this form. His piano music contains much that is trivial, but at its best undoubtedly did something to prepare the way for the deeper romanticism of Schumann, Chopin and Liszt. His songs also have far less variety of mood and lyric inspiration than those of Schubert and Schumann, but they too acted as prophets of the more vital creations to follow.

That this reverence for Mendelssohn was no mere infatuation of the moment but a sober respect can best be judged from the diversity in nationality and temperament of those who came under his influence: Gade, the Norwegian; Sterndale Bennett, the English composer and pianist; Hiller and Reinecke among the Germans, and Rubinstein from Russia. These names constitute but a small proportion of Mendelssohn's disciples, his personality dominated musical England in every branch of composition for many years; and English composers are only just beginning to throw off the yoke of adherence to the traditional oratorio form as exhibited in "St. Paul" and "Elijah." Schumann admired Mendelssohn without reserve and without a suggestion of jealousy, although the tide of popular favor neglected him for his more easily understood contemporary. Today, criticism has swung possibly too far in the opposite direction, and Mendelssohn suffers from depreciation.

REFERENCES.

Grove's and Riemann's Dictionaries.—Articles on Weber and Mendelssohn.

Benedict.—Carl Maria von Weber.

Rockstro.—Life of Mendelssohn.

Lampadius.—Life of Mendelssohn.

Reinecke.—Mendelssohn (Century Library of Music), Mendelssohn's Letters.

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

Mention the significant events in Weber's life.

Describe Weber the man.

Sketch the work of Weber as a composer.

Show the influence of Weber upon music.

Name some of Weber's best-known piano works.

What composers were greatly influenced by Weber?

Give an account of Mendelssohn's boyhood, manhood.

What educational work in music did Mendelssohn originate?

In what lines of musical work did Mendelssohn excel?

Name representative compositions of Mendelssohn.

What composers did Mendelssohn follow?

What influence did Mendelssohn exert on music?

For students who wish to study Weber's characteristics, the Momento Capriccioso, Op. 12, the "Invitation to the Dance," Op. 65, the piano sonatas in C and A-flat are the most representative, while the overtures to "Der Freischütz," "Euryanthe" and "Oberon" show his style as a dramatic composer.

The following suggestions may aid the student in his study of Mendelssohn's works: The "Italian" and "Scotch" symphonies, the "Midsummer Night's Dream," "Hebrides" and "Melusina" overtures, the Nocturne and Scherzo from the "Midsummer Night's Dream" music, the violin concerto, the concerto in G minor and the Capriccio Brillante for piano and orchestra, the pieces for piano, Op. 7, Nos. 3 and 7, the Rondo Capriccioso, Op. 14, the Caprice, Op. 16, No. 2, the Prelude and Fugue, Op. 35, No. 1, the Serious Variations, Op. 54, the Scherzo à Capriccio without opus number, and the following "Songs Without Words," Op. 19, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6; Op. 38, Nos. 2, 3, 5; Op. 62, Nos. 3, 6; Op. 67, No. 4, and Op. 102, No. 3. Liszt has made an exceedingly effective transcription of Mendelssohn's song "On the Wings of Song," which is a popular concert number today.

LESSON XLIV.

ROBERT SCHUMANN.

=The Romantic Movement before Schumann=.—Schubert gave a decided impetus to the Romantic movement through his spontaneous melody and deep fund of imagination. He infused poetry into the classic forms, his piano works in the small forms showed the way to future achievement in these lines, but especially he founded German song, which had scarcely been hinted at by Mozart and Beethoven. Although Weber extended the province of piano technic, and exhibited further possibilities of romantic feeling in combination with the rondo and sonata forms, his chief work was the realization of German opera, elsewhere described. But still another German was destined to contribute richly to romantic piano literature, to prove no mean successor to Schubert in the province of song, and to add further proofs of his genius in chamber-music, choral works and the symphony.

=Schumann's Early life=.—Robert Alexander Schumann was born at Zwickau, in Saxony, June 8, 1810. His father was a bookseller with some attainments as an author. Schumann's gift for music asserted itself early. He had piano lessons from a local organist at the age of six, and began to compose soon after. A taste for improvisation also developed. For several years his literary interests were as pronounced as those for music. He read assiduously, and was especially devoted to poetry. His general education was continued at the Zwickau Academy, where he studied until 1828. In 1827, he came under the joint influence of the writings of Jean Paul (Richter) the poet and novelist, and of Schubert's music, both of which played an important part in his mental and artistic growth. In 1828, he entered the University of Leipzig with the intention of studying law. He kept up his music, however, and not only became enthusiastic over the clavier works of Bach, but took piano lessons of Friedrich Wieck, a celebrated teacher in Leipzig. In 1829, Schumann went to Heidelberg. Here he continued his law studies in a desultory fashion, but worked with the greatest persistence at piano playing. In 1830, he resolved to study law with more seriousness, but it was intensely repugnant to him, and after some reflection, he determined, with Wieck's advice, to adopt music as a profession. Accordingly, he returned to Leipzig to study the piano with Wieck, but having the misfortune to injure a finger in his zeal for speedy perfection, he was obliged to forego the career of a virtuoso, perhaps to the great gain of music.

=Schumann's Professional Career=.—He now devoted his attention to thorough study of composition with Heinrich Dorn. In 1834, Schumann founded the "New Journal of Music" in the interests of a higher critical standard, and the furtherance of worthy compositions. During ten years of editorship, Schumann found abundant outlet for his literary interests, and his paper exerted a considerable force on public opinion. Two of his greatest piano works, the Carnival, Op. 9, and the Symphonic Studies, Op. 13, belong to the year 1834. During the years 1836 and 1837, he had some intimacy with Mendelssohn. From 1836-39 date most of Schumann's important works for the piano. In 1840, Schumann married Wieck's daughter, Clara, the celebrated pianist, after several years' struggle to gain her father's consent. Schumann's marriage was the turning-point in his artistic career, and his wife's sympathy was a great stimulus to his creative activity. In the year following his marriage, Schumann turned to song-composing, producing more than one hundred songs in this period. In 1841, he gave himself up wholly to orchestral composition, writing his symphony in B-flat, the first draft of his D minor symphony, a third work, afterwards published as Overture, Scherzo and Finale, as well as the first movement of his piano concerto. In 1842, he confined himself almost exclusively to chamber-music, composing three string quartets, the masterly quintet, Op. 44, the quartet, Op. 47, for piano and strings, and a trio. To 1845 belong the "Variations" for two pianos, and a large choral work, "Paradise and the Peri." In 1844, Schumann began the music to Goethe's "Faust," but ill-health interrupted him for more than a year. However, in 1845 he completed the piano concerto, wrote several works for pedal piano, and in 1846 finished his second symphony. In 1847, he began his opera "Genoveva," which was not given until 1850. Late in 1850 he went to Düsseldorf to take a position as director. While here he composed his third symphony. In the following years he wrote several overtures, works for solo instruments and orchestra, the overture and incidental music to Byron's "Manfred," "The Pilgrimage of the Rose" and many other choral works, including a Mass and a Requiem. Early in 1854, symptoms of a mental disorder, which had been increasing of late years, culminated in an attempt at suicide. He passed the remaining years

of his life in an asylum near Bonn, where he died July 29, 1856.

[Illustration: ROBERT SCHUMANN.]

=Schumann's Personality=.—By reason of his two-fold activity as critic and composer, Schumann was a new force in music. Highly cultivated in literature, philosophy and poetry, he possessed a keen and discerning critical taste, and a literary style that was picturesque and eloquent. Schumann was shy and reserved by nature, he talked little but observed and reflected abundantly. He was never fond of society, and as years went by he lived more and more like a hermit, absorbed in composition and family life. For ten years, however, he was in touch with the public by reason of his editorship of the "New Journal," and by his championship therein of all that was good and progressive in the music of the day, did much for the encouragement of true art. His articles on Schubert, Mendelssohn, Gade, Chopin, Berlioz, Liszt, Brahms and others formed a new epoch in musical criticism, and helped the cause of Romanticism immeasurably. No estimate of Schumann's character is complete without taking into account these distinct tendencies as critic and composer. His collected writings give a graphic illustration of his views on music, and form a supplement to his personality as expressed in his music.

=Schumann's Compositions=.—Schumann's most representative works include four symphonies and the "Overture, Scherzo and Finale," the overtures "Genoveva" and "Manfred"; three string quartets, a piano quintet, a piano quartet, three piano trios and two sonatas for piano and violin; the music to "Faust" and "Manfred"; "Paradise and the Peri," "The Pilgrimage of the Rose" and other works for solos, chorus and orchestra; more than two hundred songs; the piano concerto and two smaller works for piano and orchestra, besides a monumental series of works for piano alone. In addition there are duets, part-songs, choruses, pieces for piano duet, a concert piece for four horns and orchestra, a concerto for 'cello and orchestra, a fantasy for violin and orchestra, besides short pieces for oboe, viola, clarinet and 'cello with piano accompaniment, the opera "Genoveva," the overtures "The Bride of Messina," "Julius Cæsar" and "Herman and Dorothea," the Mass, Op. 147, and the Requiem, Op. 148.

It will be seen that Schumann wrote much in the sonata or symphonic form, yet his command of it was far from complete. In this respect and in instrumentation, Schumann was inferior to his romantic contemporary, Mendelssohn. On the other hand, he was far more original and his music has a much greater depth of sentiment, a higher sense of beauty and a noble human breadth that forms one of the highest points in the development of romanticism. What he lacked in technical attainment, he more than made up in beauty of themes, vigor and spontaneity of treatment, and thorough-going romanticism in moods. It is difficult to say which is his best symphony, they all have merits of their own; of the overtures, that to "Genoveva" (almost the only surviving portion of the opera) and "Manfred" are examples of Schumann's ardent romanticism at its best. The string-quartets are not always in quartet style and their structure is sometimes open to criticism, but they are individual and contain much that is beautiful. The piano-quartet is a genial work of great spontaneity that took Europe by storm. It was immediately hailed as the greatest work since Beethoven, although its position might now be assailed by the piano quintets by Brahms and César Franck. The piano quartet, as well as the quintet, is a pioneer in this form of chamber-music, but has not the same flow of melody as the former. The trios and sonatas for violin and piano, although not on a level with the other chamber-music, have nevertheless striking qualities to commend them. Schumann's choral music is decidedly unequal, but the "Paradise and the Peri," and portions of the "Faust" and "Manfred" music display the same breadth of human emotion so characteristic of his best music. In the field of song, Schumann is a worthy successor to Schubert. Schumann's songs have not the inexhaustible melody of Schubert's, but they are richer harmonically, the accompaniments more individual, and the character of the poems more subtly brought out.

=Schumann's Contribution to the Short Piece=.—Perhaps Schumann's most conspicuous service to music lies in his development of the short piece. In this direction he has cultivated a branch of expression, with an originality, a freedom and a richness that have no parallel in the Romantic movement except in Chopin. Mendelssohn undoubtedly did something for the short piece, but his "Songs Without Words" are limited to a few types, while Schumann made the short form serve every variety of expression. He undoubtedly owed much to the examples of Schubert with his waltzes and other dances, the impromptus and moments musicals, but in richness of resource and spontaneity of expression he went much beyond the older master. His piano style is highly distinctive; it does not offer much that is new in finger technic, but in polyphonic treatment of melodies, in striking rhythms and harmonic effects and in original use of the pedal it is remarkable. Both in the sets of small pieces, such as the "Papillons," Op. 2, the "Davidsbund Dances," Op. 6, the "Carnival," Op. 9, or the Flower pieces, Op. 19, and in the Novellettes, Op. 21, the Fantasie pieces, Op. 12, the Symphonic Studies, Op. 15, the Toccata, Op. 7, and the great Fantasy, Op. 17, Schumann displays a wealth of imaginative poetry that makes him one of the greatest romanticists in piano music. His piano works from Op. 2 to Op. 28 are matchless, although the sonatas, Op. 11 and 22, suffer from lack of coherence. The variations for two pianos, Op. 46, and the concerto, Op. 54, are models of their type. The "Album for the Young," Op. 68, the "Forest Scenes," Op. 82, the "Varied Leaves,"

Op. 99, and the “Album Leaves,” Op. 124, are all admirable, and contain a great variety of short pieces, many of which were composed early in his career. Schumann’s songs and piano pieces are the best examples of his contribution to romanticism.

Schubert and Jean Paul Richter (the romantic novelist and poet) were the earliest influences in Schumann’s studies, nevertheless he admired Beethoven greatly, and shut himself up with his quartets as a preparation for his own chamber-music. As a student in Leipzig, he was devoted to Bach’s clavier works, and later in life he renewed his enthusiasm for Bach while writing the works for pedal piano and the piano fugues. Fugal form and romantic sentiment do not go well together, however, and Schumann’s compositions in this form are not his greatest. Schumann’s influence is strongest upon composers of songs and short piano pieces. It would be difficult to name even the most representative, but the most signal example is Brahms, whose songs and piano pieces could hardly exist but for Schumann. In many of the modern Russian composers we find distinct traces of Schumann, as well as among the Frenchmen Gabriel Fauré and Vincent d’Indy, the German Adolf Jensen, the Italian Sgambati, and many others.

=Compositions Suggested for Study=.—The symphonies, overtures, the chamber-music and the larger choral works are all characteristic of Schumann at his best, but for more detailed study of his piano music and songs the following are suggested. Of the piano works, the “Papillons,” Op. 2; the “Paganini Caprice,” Op. 3, No. 2; the “Davidsbund” dances, Op. 6, Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18; the “Toccata,” Op. 7; the “Carnival,” Op. 9; the Sonata, Op. 11, especially the “Aria” and “Scherzo”; the “Fantasy Pieces,” Op. 12, entire except the “Fable”; the “Symphonic Studies,” Op. 13; the “Scenes from Childhood,” Op. 15, Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 13; the “Kreisleriana,” Op. 16, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8; the “Arabesque,” Op. 18; the “Flower Pieces,” Op. 19; the “Humoreskes,” Op. 20; the “Novellettes,” Op. 21, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8; the Sonata, Op. 22; the “Night Piece,” Op. 23, No. 4; the “Carnival Prank,” Op. 26, Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4; the “Romance,” Op. 28, No. 2; the Variations for two pianos, Op. 46; the Concerto, Op. 54; the “Album for the Young,” Op. 68; “The Happy Farmer,” “May, Lovely May,” “First Loss,” “Small Romance,” “Remembrance,” November 4, 1847 (the date of Mendelssohn’s death); “Canonic Song,” “Theme,” two pieces without name, “Northern Song”; Op. 76, Nos. 1, 3 and 4; “Forest Scenes,” Op. 82; “Entrance,” “Lovely Flower,” “Inn,” “Bird as Prophet,” “Hunting Song,” “Elves”; Op. 99, Album Leaf, and Novellette; “Album Leaves,” Op. 124, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 13, 15 and 17. Of the songs: “Dedication,” “The Nut Tree,” “The Lotus Flower,” “Highland Cradle Song,” “Two Venetian Songs,” “Thou Art like a Flower,” and “Conclusion,” “The Boy with the Magic Horn,” “To the Sunshine,” “Forest Dialogue,” “Moonlight,” “Spring Night,” “Woman’s Love and Life,” “Spring Journey,” “In the Wondrous Month of May,” “From My Tears,” “The Roses, the Lily,” “When I Look into Thine Eyes,” “I Grudge it Not,” “The Two Grenadiers,” “Folk-Song.”

REFERENCES.

Grove’s and Riemann’s Dictionaries.—Article on Schumann.

Grieg.—Robert Schumann (Century Library of Music).

Hadow.—Studies in Modern Music. (Chapter on Schumann.)

Maitland.—Schumann.

Wasielewski.—Life of Schumann.

Finck.—Chopin and Other Essays. (Chapter on Schumann.)

QUESTIONS.

Who represented the Romantic movement prior to Schumann?

Give the important events in Schumann’s early life.

Give the important events in Schumann’s professional career.

Give an account of Schumann as a man and as a critic.

How did Schumann help in musical progress?

What composers influenced him in his development?

In what forms did Schumann write?

Name representative works in the different forms.

What contribution did Schumann make to the development of the short piano piece?

What composers did Schumann influence?

[Illustration: FREDERIC CHOPIN.]

LESSON XLV.

FREDERIC CHOPIN.

=Schumann and Chopin=.—Among Schumann's many able reviews of new music, showing the keenest critical insight, none exhibit a more just appreciation of an original talent than his article on some variations by a young composer who was destined to exert so deep and widespread an influence on piano style and piano composition. Chopin's romanticism, somewhat affected at first by both Hummel and Field, is one of the most individual developments of the entire period.

=Chopin's Early life=.—Frederic Chopin was born at Zelazowa-Wola, near Warsaw, in Poland, on March 1, 1809. His father, who had served in various positions as a teacher, finally established a boarding-school in Warsaw. Chopin showed great sensitiveness towards music at an early age. His first lessons on the piano were given him by a Polish teacher of some celebrity, Adalbert Zwyny. He soon became famous as a pianist, and from the age of nine, played constantly at the houses of the nobility, and was eagerly received by them. In 1824, he entered the Warsaw Lyceum in order to pursue his general studies. About the same time he began lessons in composition with Elsner, who had a high reputation as a teacher. He had already composed pieces for the piano on his own account, and continued with such success that as early as 1825 his Op. 1, a Rondo, was published. In 1827, he left the Lyceum, and gave thereafter all his time to playing and composing. Soon after, he made great strides in composition, and many of his studies and smaller pieces, as well as his two concertos, belong to this period, or were begun then. Early in 1829, Hummel played in Warsaw, and the influence of his piano style is evident in the works of Chopin for some time to come. Later in this year, Chopin went to Vienna, where he gave two concerts, winning instant recognition both as pianist and composer. After his return to Warsaw he continued to compose much.

=Chopin's Manhood=.—A second visit to Vienna occurred toward the end of 1830. He gave concerts, came into contact with many musicians, and even found time to compose; but being dissatisfied with conditions in Vienna, determined to go to Paris. Early in 1831, after giving concerts on the way, he arrived at Paris, which was henceforth to be his home. Here he was soon thrown with many of the leading musicians, his playing caused an immediate sensation, and as at Warsaw, he was welcomed in the most exclusive society. In 1832, he began to acquire fame as a piano teacher, especially of pupils from the aristocracy. From 1833 to 1835, his compositions began to appear, and gained him much approval as a composer. In 1835, he went to Leipzig, where he saw Wieck and his daughter, afterwards Clara Schumann, Mendelssohn and Schumann. In 1837, he met Madame George Sand, the famous writer, whose influence on his life was so great. During this year the first sinister symptoms of ill-health made their appearance. With the idea of benefiting his health, Chopin passed the winter of 1838-39 on the island of Majorca, with Madame Sand and her two children. The climate had a bad effect upon him; he could compose but little, and the condition of his lungs obliged a return to France. He was so ill as to be obliged to spend several months at Marseilles, recuperating. After a summer at Nohant, Mme. Sand's country home, he was again at Paris in the fall of 1839. From 1840 to 1848, he lived in Paris, with occasional visits to Nohant in the summer, teaching as much as his health would allow, passing much time in the most aristocratic society. He seldom played in public, and would only play for pupils, or when persuaded by devoted friends to display his extraordinary gifts as a pianist. During these years, however, his health grew more and more precarious.

=The Last Years of Chopin=.—In 1847, the intimacy of Chopin and Madame Sand came to an end, for various causes, but largely because of a character caricatured from Chopin in one of Madame Sand's novels, and because she was tired of taking care of him. Ill as he was, he went to England, after a farewell concert in Paris, arriving in the spring of 1848. He gave two concerts in London with some success, besides playing at friends' houses. He went to Scotland at the instance of a pupil, Miss Stirling, gave concerts at Edinburgh and Glasgow, besides one in the interval at Manchester. During this entire tour he suffered greatly from ill-health and exhaustion, and after one more appearance in London, he returned to Paris, exceedingly ill, in January, 1849. He was not able to teach and was obliged to depend upon the generosity of friends; among them his pupil, Miss Stirling. After several months of hopeless struggle to regain his health, he died of consumption on October 17, 1849, surrounded by devoted friends.

=Chopin's Personality=.—Chopin was extremely refined and delicate by nature. He was fastidious about the color and fit of his clothes, the furnishing and arrangement of his rooms, and other details of everyday life. He was always extremely fond of society and moved in the highest circles. As a rule, he was averse to seeing much of musicians, in spite of his friendship with Liszt, Hiller, Berlioz and Schumann. As a young man he was fond of dancing, acting and practical jokes; though sensitive, he was well and strong, and able to endure rough stage-journeys. He was a capital mimic all his life, and a witty companion who pleased by his gentle irony or sarcasm. He was extremely reserved in spite of his sociability, his intimate friends (either Polish or favorite pupils) even quarrelled as to which knew him best. He was genuinely confidential only in his music. Chopin was exceedingly patriotic; he was always ready to appear in concert in behalf of Polish refugees, he corresponded untiringly with his Polish friends, and gave many proofs of his devotion to Poland, which he never forgot in spite of years of absence.

=Chopin as Pianist=.—Chopin was a pianist of extraordinary distinction, in spite of the preëminence of Liszt. His technic, founded in the school of Clementi and Cramer, with great attention to Bach, was influenced to some extent by Hummel and Field, but later became highly original, and expressive of great individuality. Although he possessed great brilliancy, the most prominent trait in his playing was its all-pervading and inexhaustible fund of poetry. It had nothing harsh, unmelodious or ungraceful. His sense of rhythm was unusually piquant, and one of its features was the skilful use of _tempo rubato_, a slight variance from strict time without disturbing it fundamentally. In later life, Chopin became disinclined to appear in public, his performances were limited to the drawing-rooms of aristocratic friends, where he would play or improvise for hours. He was never a robust pianist at his strongest, and the transparent delicacy of his playing during his last years was almost incredible.

=Chopin's Compositions=.—Chopin's music constitutes the true revelation of himself. His life, not full of action, was, however, rich in emotion and sentiment of great variety and subtlety. Its mainsprings were his patriotic love of Poland and everything connected with it, and the poetic impressionability of his temperament, which were all transferred to his music. Although Chopin composed a number of works in which he uses the orchestra, some chamber-music, and a set of Polish songs, he was first and last a composer for the piano. In addition to the works referred to, he wrote three sonatas, four ballades, four scherzos, ten polonaises, fourteen waltzes, twenty-eight studies, fifty-five mazurkas, twenty-five preludes, seventeen nocturnes, three impromptus and a fantasie-impromptu, three rondos, besides a superb fantasy, a concert allegro, a barcarolle, a berceuse, a tarantelle, a bolero, a rondo for two pianos, and a few trifles.

Of his two concertos, the second published (although the first composed) is the finer. It is riper and more poetic, the slow movement reaches a high point of lyric style, and the treatment of form throughout the concerto is less awkward. Chopin is not at home in the sonata form, the concertos are interesting in spite of, rather than on account of, their treatment of form. The piano sonatas, Op. 35 and 58, have faults of structure, and occasional incoherence, but they are so full of poetry, romantic melody and dramatic mood that one almost overlooks their technical shortcomings.

=Chopin Most Successful in Free Forms=.—The most representative works of Chopin are those in which he adopts no conventional form, but follows his own instinct entirely. Thus, in his ballades, scherzos, and especially in the fantasy, Op. 49, one finds freedom of invention and variety of treatment combined with logical development and real coherence. The ballads are dramatic poems in which sentiment and virtuosity are happily united. The scherzos are original conceptions quite distinct from the accepted type; they have bold outlines, variety of mood and demand virtuosity in their performance. The fantasy is instructive in its logical structure, there is no sign of the constraint of the sonatas, and its contents are both dramatic on a large scale and lyric by contrast. The impromptus are shorter pieces of a lyric nature, although the element of virtuosity is not lacking. The nocturnes are lyric pieces of simple form but intimate style. Their general plan was at first copied from Field, but the imitator went so far ahead of his model as almost to eclipse it. Some of them portray idyllic moods, others are sentimental or even dramatic in their outlines. The studies, Op. 10 and 25, epitomize in a remarkable way Chopin's technical innovations, and piano style. They are brilliant, poetic and highly dramatic by turns, and in their contents are the most musical studies composed up to their time.

=National Spirit in Chopin's Music=.—Chopin, the patriot, was devoted to the dances and Folk-melodies of his own country. He was thoroughly national as a composer; hence in some respects his mazurkas and polonaises are the most characteristic of his compositions. The mazurkas with their vital rhythms and novel harmonies, contain much poetry of mood and variety of expression within small limits. The polonaise, as treated by Chopin, was less a dance form, and more an independent form with characteristic rhythms. The polonaises, Op. 44 and 53, are virtually patriotic poems. The preludes are sketches of varying size; some are genuine lyrics; some frankly technical in their object; others have a distinct touch of the dramatic. Some of the waltzes suggest the _salon_, but in others Chopin has individualized the type until it has risen above its origin. Among the single pieces, the Concert Allegro is large in dimensions, very interesting technically and musically. The Barcarolle, in nocturne-form on a larger scale, is almost heroic

in its outlines, and a superb example of his mature style. Another piece equally deserving of distinction is the Berceuse, an ingenious series of variations on a persistent bass. The Tarantelle and Bolero are merely fascinating salon pieces.

Of the youthful works with orchestra, the variations on a theme from Mozart's "Don Juan" are more interesting from the novelty of their piano styles than as variations; the Fantasie on Polish themes attracts attention chiefly on account of its Folk-song character, while the "Krakowiak" rondo is remarkable for its spirited national-dance rhythms. The orchestral accompaniments to these pieces are not significant; in fact, Chopin's use of the orchestra was his weakest point. The Polish songs are unequal, and at best add little to his fame. Liszt, however, has transcribed six, of which two are frequently heard in concert, while Sgambati has arranged one.

=Originality and Freshness of Invention=.—The most extraordinary trait of Chopin as a composer is that, in spite of the limitations imposed by repeating the same form over and over again, he is almost inexhaustible in variety of expression. As the poet of lyric mood he accomplished almost as much as Schumann for the development of the short piece, while in his longer pieces of dramatic mood and large contours he has shown that the sonata-form is not the only structure by which to convey heroic sentiment. His was the most subtle originality, the most personal style which stamped itself indelibly on nearly every composition. He immeasurably broadened the technical treatment of the piano, not only as a virtuoso, but in the direction of variety of expression, delicate accentuation and exquisite tone. Among romantic composers he has done more for the advancement of piano style than anyone except Liszt. In spite of the latter's gigantic achievement, the value of Chopin's contribution is still unimpaired. From the point of view of expression, Chopin is more individual even than Schumann, but the honors as the most important composer for the piano during the Romantic period must be divided between them. Chopin's influence has been immense not only on the composers and pianists of France and Germany but also markedly among living composers in Russia. Chopin is the preëminent poet of the piano.

=Representative Compositions=.—The following list for the student contains the works and pieces most thoroughly characteristic of his genius: The sonatas, Op. 35 and 38; the scherzos, Op. 20, 31 and 39; the ballades, Op. 23, 38, 47 and 52; the polonaises, Op. 22, 26, 40, 44 and 53; the waltzes, Op. 18, Op. 34, Nos. 1 and 2; Op. 42, Op. 64, Nos. 1, 2, and Op. 69, No. 1; the studies, Op. 10, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 12; Op. 25, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11 and 12; the mazurkas, Op. 6, Nos. 1, 2; Op. 7, Nos. 1, 2, 3; Op. 17, Nos. 2, 3, 4; Op. 24, Nos. 1, 3, 4; Op. 30, Nos. 2, 4; Op. 33, Nos. 1, 3, 4; Op. 41, Nos. 1, 2; Op. 56, No. 2; Op. 59, Nos. 2 and 3; Op. 63, No. 3; Op. 68, No. 2; the nocturnes, Op. 9, Op. 15, Nos, 2, 3; Op. 27, Op. 37, Op. 48, No. 1; Op. 55, Op. 62, No. 1; the preludes, Op. 28, Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23 and 24; the prelude, Op. 45; the impromptus, Op. 29, Op. 35, Op. 51, and the Fantasie-Impromptu, Op. 66; the Fantasy, Op. 49; the Tarantelle, Op. 43; the Berceuse, Op. 57; the Barcarolle, Op. 60, and the Concert Allegro, Op. 46.

REFERENCES.

Grove's and Riemann's Dictionaries.—Article on Chopin.

Finck.—Chopin and Other Musical Essays.

Hadow.— Studies in Modern Music. (Chapter on Chopin.)

Huneker.—Chopin: The Man and His Music.

Niecks.—Frederic Chopin.

QUESTIONS.

Give an account of Chopin's early life.

Name the important events in his manhood and later life.

What were the striking traits of Chopin as a man?

What were Chopin's qualities as a pianist?

In what forms did Chopin compose?

In what form was Chopin most successful?

In which of his compositions is the national spirit strongly evident?

What characteristics do we note in Chopin as a composer?

Name some representative compositions.

What composer influenced Chopin's piano style in his early life?

What celebrated musicians were friends of Chopin?

LESSON XLVI.

FRANZ LISZT.

The piano music of Chopin and Schumann reached the highest level attained during the Romantic period, in subtle originality of style and deep human sentiment, respectively. Notwithstanding their preëminence in these particulars, a master was destined to come who summed up the entire development of piano technic in his achievements, the greatest virtuoso of the century, to whose influence all piano playing since has been obliged to acknowledge its indebtedness. In addition, his services in breaking away from symphonic tradition, in achieving propaganda for various composers of epoch-making works, including Wagner, in giving up himself as teacher without remuneration, are equally significant.

=Liszt's Early Life=.—Franz Liszt was born October 22, 1811, at Raiding, Hungary. His mother was of Austrian birth; his father, a Hungarian, occupying an official position on the estates of Prince Esterhazy, was devoted to music. Liszt was a somewhat delicate child of acute sensibilities, especially in the direction of music. At the age of six he received piano lessons from his father. The intensity of his interest in music and his phenomenal progress soon showed the uncommon extent of his gifts. At the age of nine, he gave his first concert before an audience composed largely of Hungarian nobility. His performance was so extraordinary that some of those present agreed to give Liszt a pension for six years to insure his proper education. Accordingly, father and son went to Vienna, where the boy studied the piano with Carl Czerny and composition with Salieri. Czerny put Liszt through so thorough a course of discipline that at eleven years of age Liszt was known for his playing from scores, and reading the most difficult compositions at sight. In 1823, he gave two successful concerts; Beethoven was present at the second, and publicly kissed the boy in token of his approval. Liszt's father now took him to Paris to study at the Conservatory, but the director, Cherubini, refused to allow him to enter because he was a foreigner. Liszt studied composition, however, with Paer and afterwards with Reicha. In the meantime, letters of introduction from Liszt's Hungarian patrons soon sufficed to make him known throughout the most aristocratic circles, where he created an absolute furore. A public concert produced the same results on a larger scale. Later, Liszt made two visits to England; he was received at the Court of George IV, played in private, and gave concerts. On returning to Paris, he completed an opera, which was performed in Paris. This opera and other compositions of this period have entirely disappeared. Tours through France and a third visit to England followed. In 1827, Liszt's father died, and his mother came to Paris to live; he supported her by giving lessons, and was soon in great demand as a teacher. An unfortunate love-affair caused him to consider entering the church. He lost interest in music, fell ill, and was supposed to be dead. Liszt gradually recovered, however. He now underwent a remarkable series of formative influences; he read widely, formed the acquaintance of many celebrated personages, including Chateaubriand, Lamartine, Victor Hugo and George Sand, became interested in the principles of St. Simonians, a somewhat socialistic sect, dallied with free-thinking and revolutionary tendencies, formed a friendship with the Abbé Lamennais, and became intimate with Berlioz and Chopin.

[Illustration: FRANZ LISZT.]

=Period of Preparation=.—Of far deeper result was the appearance of Paganini in Paris during 1831. Liszt bent all his energies towards devising a transcendent piano technic to reproduce Paganini's caprices on the piano. It was at this time that he laid the foundations of his gigantic achievements in piano technic, not merely in the interest of virtuosity, but for extending the limits of expression. He was also much affected by Chopin's poetic individuality. In 1834, Liszt entered into an intimacy with the Comtesse d'Agoult, which lasted for several years. Three children were born of this union, of whom two survived. One daughter married M. Ollivier, a French statesman, the other became successively Mme. von Bülow and Mme. Wagner. During this period Liszt composed much for piano, made many transcriptions, and began his literary activity on musical subjects. He gave concerts, chiefly for charity. In 1837, he made a trip to Paris to contest the supremacy of the piano with Thalberg. Among his compositions of this period may be mentioned the etudes, the Rossini transcriptions, many arrangements of Schubert's songs, the piano scores of several Beethoven symphonies, besides opera-fantasies, original pieces for piano, etc.

=Professional Activity=.—In 1838, Liszt created an extraordinary sensation by his concerts in Vienna, and from 1839 to 1847 lived the life of a traveling virtuoso, giving an unparalleled series of recitals throughout the length and breadth of Europe, which were a series of triumphs such as no artist had ever before experienced. In 1832, he was made court music-director at Weimar, his duties only requiring his presence for three months in the year. In 1847, Liszt met the Princess von Sayn-Wittgenstein, who exercised a remarkable influence over him. She persuaded him to give up his career as a virtuoso, and turn to composition. From 1848 to 1861 Liszt passed the most significant period of his life at Weimar. From his position as conductor he was of inestimable service to the cause of romantic music through his performance of operas and orchestral works by Wagner, Berlioz, Schumann, Raff, Cornelius and others. He was equally active with his pen in deference to the new artistic principles. To this epoch belong Liszt's most important orchestral works, the concertos and other compositions for piano and orchestra, many transcriptions and editions of the classics.

=Later Life=.—In 1859, opposition to Liszt's progressiveness became so pronounced that he resigned. He did not leave Weimar, however, until 1861. The rest of his life was somewhat irregularly divided between Rome, Weimar and Budapest. During the first few years at Rome he composed chiefly church music and oratorios; in 1865, he took minor orders in the Church of Rome. From 1869 on, persuaded by the Duke and Duchess of Saxe-Weimar, he passed portions of every year at Weimar in a beautiful house especially furnished for him by the Duke. Pupils flocked to him, he held a sort of musical court, and was treated with the respect due to royalty. His later years were full of activity, and generous sympathy to all that was worthy, and he was the constant object of homage and affection. In 1886, Liszt became overtaxed by a series of trips to hear his own works performed, including a reception in his honor at London. He also made exceptional effort to attend a performance of "Tristan and Isolde" at Bayreuth. A cold was speedily followed by pneumonia, from which he died on July 31, 1886.

=Liszt's Personality and Character=.—Liszt's character was remarkable for its conspicuous virtues and almost equally prominent faults. His was a large, noble nature, with deep humanitarian traits. His life was one long service to his art, accompanied in his later years by devotion to the church. Though not highly educated, except in experience of men and the world, he had an extremely keen mind, omnivorous in its tastes, and his interests were wide and penetrating. Perhaps his salient characteristics were generosity and unselfishness. Often during his career as a virtuoso he gave freely of the proceeds of his concerts to charity. After the close of his concert-tours he taught for years without remuneration. His help to younger artists was incalculable in its extent. As conductor at Weimar his motto was to help living composers first, and by his energy he did valiant work in helping Wagner's cause. Largely endowed with wit, a fund of irony and charm of manner, men and women alike almost literally fell at his feet, and it is all the more admirable that in spite of the homage so unsparingly lavished upon him, he did not swerve from his artistic purposes. The strain of mysticism so marked in his youth, became later so pronounced that he felt compelled to give it expression by entering the church.

=Liszt as a Pianist=.—Liszt was the most phenomenal pianist in the history of music. Other pianists have surpassed him in single qualities, but no one has united in so stupendous fashion as much as he. Beginning with a strictly classical education, Liszt evolved a new technic which completely summed up the difficulties of piano playing. In velocity, wide stretches, double-notes, octaves, and a whole system in itself of interlocking passages, he all but attained the impossible. He carried independence of fingers, especially in fugue playing, to a pitch hitherto unequalled. His performance of brilliant music represented the last word in bravura; in the classics his interpretation was, as Wagner says: "not reproduction, but production," so vivid and glowing was it. His so-called "orchestral style" in its bold color and rich pedal effects was as distinct from the piano playing before him as the modern orchestra was from that of Mozart and Haydn. As he assimilated everything in the field of piano playing before him, so has everything since him been forced to take his method into account.

=Liszt's Compositions=.—Among Liszt's chief compositions are the "Faust" and "Dante" symphonies, with choral epilogues; twelve symphonic poems, a form which he invented, and which is epoch-making in the development of music; many shorter orchestral works; two concertos, the Hungarian fantasy, the "Dance of Death" for piano and orchestra, besides several compositions for the same combination on themes of other composers; the oratorios "St. Elizabeth" and "Christus," a Solemn Mass, the Hungarian Coronation Mass, several other masses, twelve sacred hymns for chorus, five psalms, and many other pieces of church music, choruses for men's voices, several compositions for solos, chorus and orchestra for various festival occasions; fifty-five songs for voice with piano accompaniment; three collections containing twenty-five pieces for piano, entitled "Years of Pilgrimage," a collection of the piano pieces named "Poetic and Religious Harmonies," twelve "Etudes of Transcendent Technic," three concert studies, a sonata, two ballades, two "Legends," a concert solo, afterwards arranged as a "Pathetic" concerto, a Valse Impromptu, two polonaises, six Consolations, a Spanish Rhapsody, and nineteen Hungarian Rhapsodies are the best known of the piano

music. There are five ballades for declamation with piano accompaniment. For organ, there is a fantasy and fugue on a choral from Meyerbeer's "Prophet," a fugue on B. A. C. H., and variations on a theme from a Bach cantata.

=Liszt's Arrangements=.—Of almost equal importance with Liszt's original compositions are his matchless transcriptions. Instead of a trivial and literal process of transcribing, he penetrated the intimate spirit of the piece, and translated it into his own piano idiom, often adding considerably but always with supreme artistic effect. What is lost in fidelity of transfer is more than gained in added charm, new harmonic significance and a subtle enhancing of individuality. Liszt started the evolution of his epoch-making technic while experimenting with his arrangement of Paganini's caprices, and of Berlioz' "Fantastic Symphony." He made easy arrangements from operas of Rossini, Mercadante and Donizetti. Then he turned to setting Schubert's matchless songs for the piano, arranging in all fifty-seven; he continued by making piano scores of Beethoven's symphonies, of Rossini's overture to "William Tell," and to Weber's overtures "Jubilee," "Freischütz" and "Oberon." He also made many transcriptions from Wagner's operas, including "The Flying Dutchman," "Tannhäuser," "Lohengrin," "Die Meistersinger," "Tristan and Isolde" and "Parsifal," besides a fantasy on themes from "Rienzi," and an arrangement of the "Walhalla" motive from "The Ring of the Nibelungs." Liszt's arrangements of six preludes and fugues as well as the fantasy and fugue in G minor by Bach are not only remarkable for the extent to which they reproduce organ-effect, but as pioneers in the transfer of organ pieces to the piano, in which Liszt has been followed by Tausig, d'Albert and Busoni. In addition he transcribed fourteen songs by Schumann, thirteen by Franz, eight by Mendelssohn, seven by Beethoven, six by Chopin and two by Weber, besides an arrangement from Mendelssohn's music to "A Midsummer Night's Dream," and "piano scores" of the septets by Beethoven and Hummel. Liszt arranged Weber's "Polacca Brillante," Op. 72, and Schubert's Fantasy, Op. 15, for piano and orchestra. There are also many transcriptions of pieces by Palestrina, Di Lasso, Arcadelt, Mozart, Glinka, Dargomischky, Saint-Saëns, Verdi, Raff, Gounod, Rubinstein, Tchaikovsky, César Cui and others. Liszt scored the accompaniment of several Schubert songs for orchestra, he also orchestrated several of the Schubert four-hand marches. He also arranged many of his own songs, orchestral and choral works for piano and for organ. His transcriptions as a whole are monumental not only on account of their artistic merit, but because they served an educational purpose in spreading the works of little known composers. In this way Liszt cultivated the public taste for Schubert's songs, and brought Wagner within the reach of the average concert-goer.

=Liszt as Writer=.—As a critic, Liszt must stand as a pioneer although in a different direction from Schumann. Liszt's early essay on the position of the artist is extremely significant; his criticisms during the Weimar period, especially his analyses of Wagner's operas were of great value; his "Life of Chopin," while untrustworthy in detail and somewhat overdrawn, is nevertheless graphic; "The Gipsies and Their Music" is picturesque if not entirely accurate. Liszt's letters contain glimpses of his high qualities as well as vital presentations of his musical views. The correspondence between Wagner and Liszt gives conclusive evidence of the latter's unselfishness in Wagner's behalf.

=Liszt's Position and Influence as a Composer=.—Liszt's rank as a composer was undoubtedly overshadowed by his fame as a pianist and teacher, and by his facility as an arranger. For many years neither critics nor public would acknowledge his creative gifts. Whatever our opinion of the symphonies, the symphonic poems and the concertos, there is no doubt that Liszt rendered an inestimable service to the development of music in breaking away from the sonata form, and in demonstrating that form and substance can go hand-in-hand without detriment to organic unity and coherence. His forms are novel, his orchestration highly effective in spite of the achievements of Berlioz and Wagner in this direction. Liszt's church music and his oratorios are worthy efforts towards a reform of ecclesiastic music. His songs are truly spontaneous lyrics, which are not appreciated at their true value. In spite of Liszt's unquestioned attainments as a composer, there is a suggestion of skilful assimilation in his individuality rather than of unique and unquestioned personality. Nevertheless his influence has been vast. In his old age he encouraged Borodin and Glazounoff, he conducted works by Rimsky-Korsakoff, he made his pupils play Balakireff's "Islamey." In turn, the "new-Russian" school owes much to him. Tchaikovsky could hardly have written his symphonic poems without Liszt's pioneer work to show the way. Saint-Saëns admits a similar influence. In fact, the entire development of the symphonic poem is directly due to Liszt; it is so considerable in extent that the details cannot be examined here, but while both Wagner and Berlioz contributed much to the growth of orchestral style and individuality of expression, the originality of the symphonic poem form belongs entirely to Liszt. Thus Liszt's share in the evolution of ultra-modern orchestral music, as well as in the development of piano playing, is very important, and the greatest living composer, Richard Strauss, although also influenced by both Berlioz and Wagner, frankly avows himself to be a disciple of Liszt.

REFERENCES.

Grove’s and Riemann’s Dictionaries.—Article on Liszt.

Newman.—A Study of Liszt. (Century Library of Music.)

Ramann.—Franz Liszt as Artist and Man.

Saint-Saëns.—Franz Liszt. (Century Magazine, Feb., 1803.)

QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.

What was the nature and extent of Liszt’s early musical education?

What was the effect of his wide travels and meeting with notable persons on his character?

What set him to perfecting his technic?

Name the most important events in his career.

What educational work was the feature of his later years?

Sketch Liszt’s personality and character.

Give an account of Liszt’s contribution to piano technic.

In what styles and forms of composition did Liszt write?

What works did he transcribe for the piano?

What literary work did he do?

What composers did he influence?

What song composer was brought into greater prominence by Liszt?

Whose symphonies did he arrange for the piano?

What opera composer did he assist greatly?

What important form did Liszt originate?

What has been Liszt’s share in the development of the “modern school”?

The student who wishes to examine Liszt’s works for himself, should study the symphonies and symphonic poems in Liszt’s own arrangement for two pianos. They require, however, a technic beyond the average player. The same difficulty applies to his piano music, but the following may serve as guides to Liszt’s style: The “Lake of Wallenstadt,” and “Eclogue,” Nos. 2 and 7, in the Swiss “Years of Pilgrimage”; the “Gondoliera” and “Tarantelle” from “Venice and Naples,” the “Valse Impromptu,” “Ave Maria,” “Waldesrauschen” and “Gnomenreigen,” the pieces for Lebert and Stark’s Piano School, the Concert Studies in F minor and D-flat, the Love Dreams, the Consolations, Nos. 1, 2 and 4; the Legends, the “Benediction of God in the Solitude” and “Love Song” from “Poetic and Religious Harmonies,” and the Fantasie on “Rigoletto.” For the more advanced player may be suggested the Etudes, Nos. 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 12; the Mephisto Waltz, the Second Ballad, “Au Bord d’une Source” from the Swiss “Years of Pilgrimage,” the Second Polonaise, the “Funerailles” from “Poetic and Religious Harmonies,” the Sonata, the Hungarian Rhapsodies, Nos. 2, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, and the Spanish Rhapsody; the two concertos in E-flat and A, the Hungarian Fantasy, and the concert piece “The Dance of Death,” the Fantasy on “Don Juan.” Among the transcriptions, the Schubert songs, “Hark! Hark! the Lark,” “Du bist die Ruh,” “Frühlingsglaube,” “The Wanderer,” “By the Sea,” “Meeresstille,” “Barcarolle,” “Trockne Blumen,” “Wohin,” “Ungeduld,” “Erl-King”; the Mendelssohn song, “On Wings of Song”; the Schumann songs, “Dedication,” “To the Sunshine,” and “Spring Night”; the Weber “Slumber Song” may be suggested. Of the Wagner arrangements, “The Evening Star”, from Tannhäuser, the “Spinning Song,” from “The Flying Dutchman,” and “Isolde’s Love Death,” are the most characteristic. The Paganini Studies, Nos. 2, 3 and 5; the waltz from Gounod’s “Faust,” the Tarantelle after Auber, and the Overture to “Tannhäuser” are among the best. Of the songs, “Mignon’s Lied” and “Ueber allen Gipfeln,” “Comment disaient-ils,” “Angiolin dal biondo crin,” “Es muss ein wunderbares sein,” “Die drei Zigeuner,” and “Der du von dem Himmel bist” and “Die Lorelei” are the best.

LESSON XLVII.

PIANISTS AND TEACHERS SINCE LISZT. I.

=Introduction=.—The achievements of Liszt in developing piano technic, in enlarging the scope of piano playing through his masterly transcriptions, in variety and intensity of interpretation, have brought results that are enormous in extent and far-reaching in their developments to the generations that have succeeded him. When Liszt was in the height of his career as a virtuoso, few could master the difficulties which his epoch-making works presented. Gradually the secrets of his technic were revealed to the ambitious few; now they are almost common property. The great concert pianists of today possess a technic that would have been unique forty years ago. The repertory which all pianists worthy the name play from memory (a practice which Liszt initiated) is exceedingly extensive, while the endurance which they display and the facility with which they reproduce the masterpieces of piano literature is stupendous.

PUPILS OF LISZT.

Liszt was undoubtedly the greatest revealer of the secrets of piano playing in the 19th century, and his pupils and those who have assimilated his teachings occupy a large part of the pianistic activity of today. Among the first of Liszt's pupils to become famous were Tausig and von Bülow. =Carl Tausig=, born in 1841, died in 1871, was trained by his father, and later studied with Liszt, under whose guidance he achieved a phenomenal accuracy of technic, and a commanding power of interpretation. His short life was spent mainly in concert tours. He established a school of music in Berlin for advanced piano playing. His untimely death cut short a brilliant career. His edition of Clementi's _Gradus_ and a collection of finger exercises are invaluable to teachers and to students. =Hans von Bülow=, born in 1830, died 1894, was intended for the law, although he studied the piano as a boy under Friedrich Wieck. In 1850, he became so absorbed in Wagner's music that he abandoned all idea of the law. He studied the piano with Liszt at Weimar, and soon acquired a remarkable technic. He was never a pianist of the virtuoso type; his strength lay in striving to reproduce the intention of the composer as faithfully as possible. His interpretations of Beethoven were especially famous, although he was progressive in his tastes. In 1876, he made a tour in the United States, where he did much to advance the cause of new music. As early as 1865 he conducted performances of Wagner's operas, and later his association with orchestras at Meiningen and of the Berlin Philharmonic Society placed his reputation as a conductor in the front rank. He was extremely energetic in Wagner's behalf and did much to bring his works to a public hearing. His editions of Cramer's studies and Beethoven's sonatas are of great value.

Among Liszt's later pupils, one of the foremost is =Eugen D'Albert=, born in 1864. He received his early training in England, but in 1881, as a prize scholar, he studied with Liszt at Weimar. After brilliant concert tours through Europe, he came to America, in 1889, with Sarasate, where his ability was at once recognized. He has since largely renounced the career of virtuoso for that of composer, although he made a visit to the United States in 1905, giving a number of recitals.

=Moritz Rosenthal=, possibly the most fully equipped virtuoso technically now before the public, was born in 1862. At first a pupil of Mikuli, a disciple of Chopin, and later of Joseffy, he came ultimately to Liszt, with whom he studied for ten years. After numerous European tours he came to the United States in 1888, where he dazzled his audiences by his unusual command of technic. He reappeared in America in 1896-97, and has since made triumphal progress through Europe. As an interpreter he is less successful than as a virtuoso. He is court pianist of Roumania. He has published a collection of technical exercises with Ludwig Schytté.

=Bernhard Stavenhagen=, born in 1862, is another noted Liszt pupil. He acted as Liszt's secretary during his later years, and at the same time received lessons. In 1890, he became court pianist at Weimar. In 1894-95, he visited America. Since then he has acted as conductor at Dresden and Munich.

=Emil Sauer=, another phenomenal pupil of Liszt, was born in 1862. At first a pupil of Nicholas Rubinstein, he studied with Liszt from 1884 until the latter's death. He possesses an extraordinary technic, and is almost unrivalled for the extreme brilliancy of his effects. He has received many decorations from various courts of Europe. In 1897-98, he visited the United States, where he made a sensation. Since 1901, he has been at the head of the piano department in the Vienna Conservatory, giving his attention to pupils in the artist department.

Among other talented pupils of Liszt may be mentioned Alfred Reisenauer, Arthur Friedheim and Richard Burmeister, all of whom have been heard in this country. The foregoing account does not begin to enumerate all, merely the celebrated pupils of Liszt. Others will be referred to in the course of this and the next lesson.

=Belgian Pianists=.—In piano playing, the Brussels Conservatory is far below the level of the Paris Conservatory, although the director =Gevaërt= has a world-wide reputation for his text-book on orchestration, and the symphony concerts at the conservatory, led by him, have a high place in orchestral standards. Nevertheless, in the piano department two names deserve mention: Brassin and Dupont. =Louis Brassin= (1840-1884) studied at the Leipzig Conservatory under Moscheles, where he remained five years, winning numerous prizes. In 1866, he became first piano teacher at the Stern Conservatory in Berlin. Later he joined the Brussels Conservatory, as professor of piano playing, where he taught from 1869-1878. In 1879, he accepted a position at the St. Petersburg Conservatory, where he remained until his death, in 1884. Brassin was not only known as a fine pianist and teacher, but also by his transcriptions from “The Ring of the Nibelung.” He also composed piano pieces and even two operettas. =Auguste Dupont= (1828-1890) studied at the Liége Conservatory. After several years of wandering life, he became professor of piano at the Brussels Conservatory, a position which he held until his death, in 1890. He is known also as a composer of graceful piano pieces, a concerto and a concert-piece, in all of which the influence of Schumann is seen.

=Johannes Brahms= (1833-1897), famed both as composer and pianist, was the son of an orchestral musician in Hamburg, whose circumstances were of the humblest. As a child he developed remarkable ability as a pianist, but his first lessons in composition awakened an enthusiasm that absorbed his entire being. He was comparatively unknown when at the age of twenty Schumann brought him into public notice by hailing him as the successor of Beethoven.

Unlike most composers, Brahms was mature from the very beginning. His early works bear no trace of the uncertainty and imitation generally associated with youth, and it was this remarkable maturity that interested Schumann and gave point to his predictions for the future of the young musician. Unaffected by the pomp and glow of the ultra-romantic tendency initiated by Berlioz and culminating at present in the works of Richard Strauss, he remained true to the great classical school which rests on Bach and Palestrina. Unlike the modern impressionistic school, his art is based on essentially musical ideas and their contrapuntal treatment; it is architectural rather than pictorial. In such a scheme, color is subordinate to thematic interest, hence his instrumentation often appears heavy and austere to those who look for the brilliancy and tone painting of Liszt or Wagner. His music in general is founded on Bach and Beethoven.

[Illustration: JOHANNES BRAHMS.]

His works for the piano are large and orchestral in style, and demand a technic of their own, which was at first considered unsuited to the nature of the instrument. Von Bülow remarks that while in Bach we hear the organ, in Beethoven the orchestra, in Brahms we hear both organ and orchestra. Notwithstanding their dignity and nobility of conception, they won their way but slowly to favor. Their newness of style and difficulty of execution estranged both public and musicians. Though Brahms’ four symphonies have become reasonably familiar, his piano works have not even yet achieved widespread popularity. They comprise two concertos, three sonatas, many variations, and a host of smaller pieces—ballades, scherzos, intermezzos, capriccios, etc. Brahms never wrote for the stage but was active in all other departments of music. His greatest choral work is the “German Requiem,” composed in memory of his mother, to texts selected by himself from the Scriptures and sung in German, instead of in Latin, hence its name. He drew no little inspiration from the Folk-song, which he uses not only in the form of harmonies and rhythms distinctly based on Folk melodies, but in literal quotations serving as themes in several of his instrumental compositions. This contact with the people through their songs gives particular freshness and vigor to much of Brahms’ music, as well as a sturdy Teutonic character that stamps it as distinctively national in spirit.

It is perhaps too soon to deliver an authoritative judgment as to the ultimate rank that Brahms will take among the great composers of the past. There is no doubt, however, that he is one of the commanding figures of the last century and that he has enriched the world with a mass of noble music, all of which deserves to be known for its elevation and consummate mastery of detail.

RUSSIAN PIANISTS.

Of a somewhat independent development from Liszt, although much influenced by his personality and his method, was =Anton Rubinstein=, born in 1829, died in 1894. He studied the piano at Moscow with Villoing, who gave him so thorough a training that he had no other teacher. From 1840, after concerts in Paris, he had universal recognition as a pianist. Further European tours increased his fame. He lived successively in Berlin and Vienna, and later returned to St. Petersburg. In 1872-73, he made a remarkable tour through America, arousing an enthusiasm only equalled in later years by Paderewski. Although he passed most of his life in constant activity as a composer, he directed the Russian Symphony Concerts in St. Petersburg. As early as 1862 he founded the St. Petersburg Conservatory, which has had a prominent place in Russian music. He was a complete master of the

piano, his technic was gigantic, although his vitality of interpretation was so intense that details paled before it. His historical recitals covering the entire literature of the piano were his most conspicuous achievements as a pianist. He may be regarded as second only to Liszt, and in some respects he even surpassed him. He was disappointed at not being accorded high rank as a composer, as well as a pianist.

His brother, =Nicholas Rubinstein=, born in 1835, died in 1881, although not so distinguished a pianist, and a composer of slight account, exerted almost as strong an influence on Russian music. A pupil of Kullak, he founded the Russian Musical Society at Moscow, in 1859, and in 1864 the Moscow Conservatory, which has been exceedingly active in Russian musical affairs. He directed the Moscow Conservatory until his death; he was an intimate adviser of Tchaikovsky, while his worth as a teacher may be guessed from the prominence of his pupils, Karl Klindworth, Emil Sauer and Alexander Siloti, possibly the foremost Russian pianist today.

=Mili Balakireff=, born in 1836, has been a considerable force in Russian music, besides being a capable pianist. After studying physics and mathematics at the University of Kazan, he turned to music. In 1862, he founded a Free School of Music in St. Petersburg. Among his associates were César Cui, Nicholas Rimsky-Korsakoff, Alexander Borodine and others. He has done much to aid the Neo-Russian school of composition. His piano music is effective and highly colored, especially his fantasy on Georgian themes, “Islamey.”

=Alexander Siloti=, undoubtedly the most widely-known of Russian pianists, born at Charcow, 1863, was a pupil in piano playing of Nicholas Rubinstein, at the Moscow Conservatory. From 1883-1886, he studied with Liszt. His technic is enormous; while not intensely magnetic, his intellectual grasp of music is remarkable. He made an American tour in 1898, when he introduced much Russian piano music that was new. Although Siloti has taught at the Moscow Conservatory, he has lived of late years at Leipzig and Paris.

Among other Russian pianists are =Vassili Sapellnikoff=, born 1868, a pupil of Kessler, Louis Brassin, Sophie Menter; =Vassili Safonoff=, a pupil of Leschetizky and Zaremba in St. Petersburg, since 1887 director of the Moscow Conservatory, and more lately a conductor; =Sergei Rachmaninoff=, born 1873, a pupil of Siloti, not only a brilliant pianist but also a composer of originality; =Alexander Scriabine=, born 1872, a pupil of Safonoff, who has made successful European tours, and like Rachmaninoff, has composed much for his instrument.

Two German pianists, Henselt and Klindworth, were so associated with Russian music as to warrant their mention here. =Adolph Henselt=, born 1814, died 1889, at one time a pupil of Hummel, was for the most part self-taught. He passed most of his life in St. Petersburg, giving lessons and playing frequently in public. He also had an official position as music inspector. As a pianist, Henselt was exceedingly eminent, and may be ranked next to Rubinstein and von Bülow, although in later years nervousness prevented his playing in public. His etudes are distinct additions to the technical resources of the piano, his arrangements of Cramer etudes with second piano accompaniment are praiseworthy.

=Karl Klindworth=, born 1830, was a pupil of Nicholas Rubinstein and later, of Liszt. After living in London, he became professor of piano playing at the Moscow Conservatory, from 1868-1884. Later he settled in Berlin, became conductor of the Philharmonic Society, and opened a conservatory with von Bülow, which was merged with that of Scharwenka in 1893. Klindworth’s edition of Chopin is in some respects the best. He has also edited Beethoven’s sonatas, and he prepared the piano score of the entire “Ring of the Nibelung.”

FRENCH PIANISTS.

In presenting the famous French pianists, =Charles Henri Valentine Alkan=, born 1813, died 1888, must not be forgotten. A brilliant pianist, he claims our attention chiefly on account of his etudes, introducing novel and extremely difficult problems of technic. Musically his studies cannot be compared with those of Chopin or Liszt, but they merit attention, particularly in the modern editions.

Although =Camille Saint-Saëns= is known chiefly as a composer, he was, during his early years, a remarkable pianist. His contributions to piano literature, five concertos, etudes and smaller pieces, are all valuable.

A group of Paris Conservatory professors constitute the most distinguishing teaching talent in France today. Further than that, Paris is one of the great centres of piano playing in Europe. Its teachers follow their own traditions, yet have assimilated from Liszt.

The oldest of these is =Georges Mathias= (b. 1826), pupil of Chopin, Kalkbrenner and the Paris Conservatory, who has been professor of piano playing since 1862. =E. Delaborde=, a pupil of Alkan, Moscheles and Liszt, has taught at the Paris Conservatory since 1873. One of the most successful teachers now living is =Louis Dièmer=, born 1843, a pupil of Marmontel. Winning the first piano prize at the age of thirteen, he succeeded his former teacher in 1888. Dièmer has turned out many first prizes; he has an impeccable technic; he has done much to foster interest in the harpsichord, the oboe d'amore and other obsolete instruments. He has published valuable collections of old French harpsichord music, besides original works. A Conservatory teacher well-known in America is =Raoul Pugno=, born 1852. A pupil of the Paris Conservatory, he obtained first prizes in piano playing, organ and harmony. He came to America in 1897-98 with Ysaye and others, and again in 1902. He has taught at the Paris Conservatory since 1897. He has a superb technic, and is versatile as an interpreter. He has also composed much. A teacher of unusual insight into technic is =Isidor Philipp=, born 1863, a pupil of Mathias, Saint-Saëns and others. He possesses a flawlessly accurate technic, and has appeared frequently in public, although he devotes the greater part of his energy to teaching. He has published many valuable sets of exercises, collections of difficult passages, some transcriptions and original pieces. He has been professor at the Conservatory since 1904.

=Louis Breitner=, a pupil of the Milan Conservatory, Anton Rubinstein and Liszt, has lived for many years at Paris as pianist and teacher. He also has visited America. Among the younger French pianists are =Leon Delafosse=, =Edouard Risler=, an eclectic pianist, a pupil of Dièmer, D'Albert and Stavenhagen.

REFERENCES FOR LESSONS XLVII AND XLVIII.

Fay.—Music Study in Germany.

Walker.—My Musical Memories.

Lahee.—Pianists of the Past and Present.

Grove's Dictionary.—Article on Pianoforte Players.

Finck.—Paderewski and His Art.

Leschetizky.—Autobiography.

Mason.—Memories of a Musical Life.

Lenz.—The Great Virtuosos of our Time.

QUESTIONS.

Who were the earliest of Liszt's pupils?

Name some later pupils of Liszt.

Who are the leading exponents of the Belgian school?

Whose principles did Brahms follow?

What are the characteristics of his works?

What was Anton Rubinstein's chief characteristic as a pianist?

Whom did Nicholas Rubinstein assist greatly?

By what piano piece is Balakireff best known?

What Russian pianist has visited America?

Name two young Russian composer pianists.

Give some account of Henselt.

Who made the piano score of Wagner's "Ring of the Nibelung"?

Name some successful teachers of the piano at the Paris Conservatory. Which one has twice visited America? Which has published many valuable sets of exercises?

LESSON XLVIII.

PIANISTS AND TEACHERS SINCE LISZT. II.

One of the greatest living teachers in authority and breadth of influence is =Theodor Leschetizky=, born in 1831. A pupil of Czerny, he began to teach at the age of fifteen, having played in public since 1842. He became a teacher in the St. Petersburg Conservatory, where he taught for many years. Soon after 1880 he settled in Vienna, where he has lived ever since. Since the success of his pupil Paderewski, Leschetizky has been the most sought-after teacher in the world. He has been obliged to have assistants to prepare pupils for him. Students have come to Vienna from all parts of the world. A brilliant pianist, he has written piano music and even an opera, but his merit as a teacher is due to the foundation given him by Czerny, who acquired his traditions from Beethoven, to the keenness of his ability to prescribe for the individual needs of the pupil and the simplicity and directness of his "method." His pupils have met with great success, although he has not yet produced a second Paderewski.

=Ignaz Paderewski=, probably the greatest pianist since Liszt, although like him excelled in some respects by others, was born in 1859. A pupil of the Warsaw Conservatory, he also studied at Berlin. He taught piano at the Warsaw Conservatory from 1878-83, and also at Strassburg. Later he went to Leschetizky for a thorough course of study. After his début at Vienna, in 1887, he conquered by degrees Paris and London. His first visit to America was in 1891, when he carried all before him. Since then he has visited the United States three times, he has traveled over all Europe, and has visited Australia with overwhelming success, financial and artistic. His most noticeable qualities are a magnetic personality, a virtuoso technic, the color and piquant rhythm of his playing, and the poetry and deep human intensity of his interpretations. He has written several sets of pieces for the piano, a concerto, and a fantasy with orchestra, and an opera. His generous gift of the endowment of triennial prizes to American composers is an admirable instance of his warm-heartedness.

=Josef Slavinski=, born 1865, who studied with Stroeble, Anton Rubinstein and finally Leschetizky, is a pianist of great ability who came to the United States in 1873, and again in 1901. Other Leschetizky pupils are =Ossip Gabrilowitsch=, born 1878, also a pupil of Anton Rubinstein and the St. Petersburg Conservatory, who came to America in 1900 and 1902; =Mark Hambourg=, born in 1879, who first studied with his father, and after a tour of the United States in 1900, has had brilliant successes in Europe and England; =Martinus Sieveking=, born 1867, a pupil of Röntgen at Leipzig, who visited America in 1895 and again in 1896-97 and afterwards went to Vienna. There are many other brilliant pupils of Leschetizky, but the foregoing are some of the best known.

Paderewski has not taught, as a rule, since his great triumphs as a virtuoso, but he has made exceptions. =Sigismond Stojowski=, born 1870, was a pupil of the Paris Conservatory, where he won first prizes in piano playing and composition. Later he studied with Paderewski, and lived as pianist, teacher and composer in Paris. In 1905, he accepted the position of head of the piano department at the Institute of Musical Art, New York City. =Antoinette Szumowska-Adamowska= was born in 1868. She studied at Warsaw, and later, for several years, with Paderewski. She has made successful appearances in Europe and America. Later she accepted a position at the New England Conservatory, in Boston, U. S. A.

Another pianist of great ability who has profited by Paderewski's suggestions is =Harold Bauer=, born in 1873. A student of the violin, as well as of the piano, he did not consider making a career as a piano virtuoso until encouraged by Paderewski. In 1892, he studied with Paderewski, although he is largely self-taught, for his individuality and musical style show slight effects of Paderewski's influence. Bauer's technic is superb, although he is not a virtuoso pure and simple. His interpretations are healthy and vigorous, and especially faithful to the composers' intentions. His repertory is enormous. He has made several extremely successful tours to the United States. He has traveled also widely in Europe as well as to South America. Bauer is one of the most eminent of living artists.

Among Norwegians, =Edvard Grieg=, born 1843, is a remarkable interpreter of his own individual works. =Christian Sinding= and =Wilhelm Stenhammar= also deserve mention.

The Italians have not produced many remarkable pianists, nevertheless, several are well known. Chief among them is =Giovanni Sgambati=, born 1843, a pupil of Liszt. Sgambati has composed charming music for the piano, as well as chamber-music, a concerto and symphony. He is director of the Academy of St. Cecilia, at Rome. =Giuseppe Buonamici=, born 1846, a pupil of the Munich Conservatory and of von Bülow, has done much to promote music in Florence. He has been connected with several

musical societies in that city, and has been active as a teacher. His editions of Beethoven's sonatas, of Bertini's etudes, and a treatise on scale playing are of great value to the student. The most prominent Italian pianist, who has lived a cosmopolitan life, is =Feruccio Busoni=, born in 1866. Early in life he became a member, as a pianist, of the Bologna Philharmonic Academy, after a severe test. In 1888, he accepted a position at the Helsingfors Conservatory. In 1890, he won the Rubinstein prize as composer and pianist. Subsequently he taught the piano in the Moscow Conservatory, and later he was connected with the New England Conservatory at Boston. Since then he has lived in Europe as a pianist and conductor of ultra-modern music. Busoni has one of the most formidable technics of any pianist living. He has edited Bach's "Well-Tempered Clavichord," with many helpful technical suggestions, also the smaller preludes and inventions; he has made masterly transcriptions of Bach's organ works for the piano, of a fantasy for organ by Liszt, the same composer's "Mephisto Waltz," etc. He re-visited America in 1904.

=Stephen Heller=, born 1814, died 1888, was much influenced by Chopin. He was a talented pianist, who will be remembered chiefly by his studies, and a few other pieces, which have decided educational value.

Among other living pianists who escape classification for one reason or another are =Moritz Moszkowski=, born 1854, a pupil of the Dresden, Kullak and Stern Conservatories; while a successful pianist and teacher, he is known chiefly for his fluent and graceful piano music, although he has composed works in larger forms. =Franz Rummel=, born 1853, died 1901, a pupil of Brassin and the Brussels Conservatory, toured Europe and visited America several times; he taught at the Stern Conservatory in Berlin; =Rafael Joseffy=, born 1853, went to the Leipzig Conservatory, he then studied with Carl Tausig and later with Liszt; of late years he has taught at the National Conservatory at New York. His concert appearances have invariably been successful, although he has devoted himself largely to teaching. A pianist of especial distinction is =Vladimir de Pachmann=, born in 1848, a pupil of the Vienna Conservatory; in spite of a brilliant début he retired for many years' study; on reappearing he gave concerts over all Europe, and has made several visits to America; his chief triumphs have been as the inimitable interpreter of Chopin; =Leopold Godowsky=, born 1870, appeared as a prodigy at the age of nine; he studied at the _Hochschule_ in Berlin, made European tours, and studied with Saint-Saëns from 1887 to 1890; he taught at conservatories in Philadelphia and Chicago; in 1902, he returned to Europe, where he has given concerts constantly with phenomenal success. A composer of piano pieces, he has devised many extraordinary versions of Chopin's studies.

Among English pianists, =Frederic Lamond=, a pupil of the Raff Conservatory, of von Bülow and Liszt, and =Leonard Borwick=, a pupil of Mme. Schumann, are the best known, although there are many pianists of rising reputation.

Two young pianists deserving of especial recognition are Ernst von Dohnanyi and Josef Hofmann. =Dohnanyi=, born 1877, is a pupil of Kessler and D'Albert. In 1898, he won a double success as pianist and composer with a piano concerto. In 1900, he made a brilliant tour in America. Since then he has devoted himself largely to composition. =Josef Hofmann= was a pupil of his father, and later, of Anton Rubinstein. He played the piano when six years old; in public at the age of nine. In the following year he gave fifty-two concerts in the United States. After retiring for study under Rubinstein, he reappeared a mature artist. He has since visited America several times. Hofmann has an unusual technic; his individuality is not striking, but he is an artist of conspicuous merit.

AMERICAN PIANISTS.

The rapid progress of music in America renders it impossible to do justice to piano playing in this country. However, the pioneer work of =William Mason=, a pupil of Moscheles, Dreyschock and Liszt, active as pianist and teacher, the author of "Touch and Technic" and other technical treatises; of B. J. Lang, a pupil of his father, F. C. Hill, Salter and Alfred Jaell, an active pianist, teacher, and conductor, of W. S. B. Mathews, Otto Dresel, Ernst Perabo, and others, was of great importance. Later =Carl Baermann=, a Liszt pupil, Carl Faelten, =William Sherwood=, also a Liszt pupil, Carl Stasny, Arthur Whiting, Edward MacDowell and many others have continued the work so ably begun. =Edward MacDowell= is easily the most noted American composer-pianist. His technical equipment, personality, and interpretative gifts justly entitle him to this distinction. A pupil of Mme. Carreño, Marmontel and Carl Heymann, he has had thorough training. His pianistic career has been limited by his efforts as a composer, and by his work as Professor of Music at Columbia, which position he resigned in 1904, as well as his activity as a teacher. His studies, concertos and smaller pieces show great individuality of technical style, besides being among the most valuable contributions to piano literature since Liszt. MacDowell has appeared with leading orchestras in this country; he has given many recitals, including a tour of the United States in 1904.

WOMEN PIANISTS.

Of the many distinguished women pianists since Liszt, the most eminent was =Mme. Clara Schumann=, a pupil of her father, Friedrich Wieck. She played in public from the age of thirteen, winning instant recognition. Her marriage to Schumann diminished her public activity, but after his death in 1856, she resumed her career. She taught at the Hoch Conservatory at Frankfort, besides playing in public in Europe and England. Among other famous women pianists were Madame Clauss-Szavardy, =Mme. Arabella Goddard Davidson=, and Mme. Sophie Menter. =Mme. Teresa Carreño=, a pupil of L. M. Gottschalk and G. Mathias, has had a remarkable career as concert-pianist. =Mme. Essipoff=, a pupil of Wielhorski and Leschetizky, taught for many years at the St. Petersburg Conservatory, after brilliant concert tours. Miss Fanny Davies, a pupil of Reinecke and Mme. Schumann, Mme. Roger-Miclos and Mlle. Clotilde Kleeberg, pupils of the Paris Conservatory, are all pianists of distinction. In this country Miss Adele aus der Ohe, a pupil of Kullak and Liszt, =Mme. Bloomfield-Zeisler=, a pupil of von Wolfssohn and Leschetizky, and =Mme. Helen Hopekirk=, a pupil of the Leipzig Conservatory and of Leschetizky, now a teacher at the New England Conservatory, and =Mme. Szumowska-Adamowska=, before mentioned as a pupil of Paderewski, are all pianists of great ability.

In conclusion, it may be stated that while Liszt's pupils have done much to carry on the traditions which he originated, much has also been accomplished for the advancement of pianistic art by Leschetizky and his pupils, a remarkable group of teachers at the Paris Conservatory, and by such independent pianists as de Pachmann, Busoni, Siloti, Godowsky, Bauer and Hofmann, while many able conservatories and private teachers in America are enabling the American pianist to compete favorably with Europe.

QUESTIONS.

Who is the best-known piano teacher of today?

Name some of his famous pupils. Which one instituted prizes for American composers?

Name some pianists who have profited by Paderewski's advice. Which one has made successful tours of America?

Name the most famous Italian pianists. Which one has made masterly transcriptions of Bach and Liszt?

What pianist has made a specialty of Chopin?

What young pianist has made an especially brilliant impression in America?

Name the pioneer pianists of America.

Who is the most famous of American composer pianists?

Name some talented women pianists.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A REVIEW OF LESSONS XLI TO XLVIII.

This period is of great interest to the student, as the greater part of the piano literature in use today is the work of composers belonging to the Romantic and Post-Classical schools. It must not be forgotten that in studying the history of music the object is to learn to know the music of the best composers, not merely certain facts and dates in the lives of these composers. The works cited in the lessons give a wide latitude in the matter of choice and a clear idea of the contribution of the different composers.

LESSON XLI.—1. Take a composition by each of the composers mentioned and show its distinctive qualities. 2. Show the deeper, fuller, more poetic character of the compositions of Field as compared with Clementi.

LESSON XLII.—1. Give a sketch of Schubert the man. 2. Name the special qualities of Schubert's music. Why does he belong to the Romantic school?

LESSON XLIII.—1. What is the nature of Weber's contribution to music? 2. What are the special qualities of Mendelssohn's works?

LESSON XLIV.—1. Compare Schumann's work in the short pieces and in the large forms. In which was he the more successful? 2. Give an analysis of some of his short pieces.

LESSON XLV.—1. In what forms did Chopin do his best work? Mention some pieces as illustrations. 2. In what ways did he show national spirit? Mention pieces.

LESSON XLVI.—1. Give a sketch of the important factors in the making of Liszt the pianist. 2. What influence did he exert on music?

LESSON XLVII.—1. Compare Rubinstein and Liszt. 2. What influence did Brahms exert on music?

LESSON XLVIII.—1. Make a list of the various pianists and classify them as to nationality and school.

LESSON XLIX.

THE ART-SONG. ORATORIO AFTER MENDELSSOHN.

=Development of the Art-Song Idea=.—A most significant phase of musical activity is that centred around the art-song for solo voice. In the period before the opera, choral singing was the principal medium for vocal music. With the Opera came a style of composition from which was developed the principle of the Aria, the latter dominating both Opera and Oratorio for many years, as the form for an art-song for a solo voice. In this form, as we have seen, the production of vocal effects, the making of attractive melody, and the opportunity for virtuosic display were sought first of all. It was not until the beginning of the 19th century, when Schubert's peculiar genius asserted itself, that we meet what can be truly called the art-song, a form of composition without the artificiality of the operatic aria and with higher musicianly and artistic qualities than those that mark the people's song. Several tendencies contributed to bring this about. Gluck's theories and practice led both composers and people to pay closer attention to the text and to its delivery. The development of instrumental music, particularly the principles of thematic treatment, led composers to the inventing of new melodic and rhythmic figures that should serve as the basis of accompaniments of higher artistic quality than those founded on some variation of the Alberti bass figure. Piano technic had greatly improved, and so had the instrument. And it may also be said that the verse of this period was better suited for a dramatic musical setting than the formal, often stilted and artificial lyrics of earlier days, with their shepherds and shepherdesses and constant reference to pastoral and classical life.

=Italian, French and English Forms=.—A study of musical conditions in Italy, France, Germany and England shows a different style of the solo song in each country, each having some distinctive feature that maintains today, and one that may be said to characterize the song-idea of that people. The Italians were so taken with the opera and in the course of its development it so fully embodied the national love for sweet, graceful melody that a species of art-song apart from the opera had little or no chance to shape itself. The French _Chanson_ has never yielded place to the methods which distinguish the modern art-song. The French language has certain qualities which seem to call for a treatment that centres the attention in the voice part rather than on the song as a whole, according to the German idea. Yet French composers have produced and still make most beautiful and charming songs which unmistakably embody the national characteristics, clearness, polish and an effective singing melody. The old English Ballads are pieces of narrative verse; but the term has been used so freely and for almost every kind of verse that it is not possible to give it a precise definition. Thomas Morley, in a work on music, which he published in 1597, mentions "songs which, being sung to a dittie may likewise be danced"; in 1636, in a book called "The Principles of Musicke," the author, Butler, refers to "the infinite multitude of Ballads set to sundry pleasant and delightful tunes by cunning and witty composers, with country dances fitted to them." The principles of musical construction and the character of the text are such that we do not find in the English ballad the true germ of the art-song.

=The German "Lied"=, a poem intended for singing, as it came from the hands of the great poets, such as Goethe and Heine, seems to have afforded to composers the inspiration to the making of a style of song that should have the value of a musical setting in full consonance with the character of the text. As instrumental music developed, the _Volkslied_, the people's song, the natural medium for expression, gradually disappeared. Yet composers made use of it as a medium, such masters as Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Weber giving attention to it, although the demand for a simple, clear melody, due to the dominance of the Italian opera, and for an accompaniment that was always much subordinated, prevented the art-song (_Kunstlied_) from taking a high place. Since then the accompaniment has been given more and more prominence, less attention being paid to pure melody and more to the value of harmony and rhythm as the means for characteristic color and expression. Melody, which is made up of a succession of phrases, cannot furnish a sequence of sharp effects so readily as can well contrasted chords; hence the old idea of tune changed as harmony became better understood. The methods of song composers vary, and a classification is made by German writers: A song that has simple form and tune akin to that of the Folk-song is called "_Volksthümlich_"; one that has the same tune to the different stanzas is called strophic; one that is carefully worked out, the music illustrating every shade of meaning and emotion is called "_Durchcomponirt_"; a narrative song is called a "Ballad" or "Ballade." The great masters in song composition are Schubert, Schumann, Franz and Brahms.

=Schubert as a Song Writer=.—A consideration of Schubert's education and his general make-up shows clearly why he should seek outlet for self-expression in song rather than in the large instrumental forms. We find that he was not systematically educated

in musical science, like Mozart, Beethoven or Weber, and that he was by nature very spontaneous and amenable to external influences. Such a composer is particularly open to the effect of a poem and will turn to the small song form rather than to the elaborate instrumental forms. Many of Schubert's songs were written on the spur of the moment in response to an impulse from reading a chance bit of verse. The first reading of the poem usually gave the complete idea, both tune and accompaniment; whether it should have the simple folk-song character, a more declamatory style, strophic or the more elaborate form, depended upon the character of the text. It is fortunate for music that he was brought into contact with some of the finest lyrics in the field of poetry, such as called forth his highest powers in melody, harmony, rhythm, modulation, declamation and recitative, for he aimed to the very fullest extent possible to heighten the thought of the text by the emotional power of music. It is a phase of Schubert's genius that some of his finest songs were written before he had reached his majority.

=Schumann and His Songs=.—Schumann brought to song writing a different type of mind from that of Schubert, more poetic, more gloomy, more emotional, a fine literary training, a faculty for expression in word as well as in tone, a fund of new forms of expression in instrumental music, particularly the piano, so that we find in his songs certain elements that indicate development toward a more highly organized structure. Schumann was highly intellectual, hence we find in his songs a close union of voice and instrumental parts in working out the fundamental conception of the poet's meaning; and so deeply does he carry out this plan that the accompanist must enter most thoroughly into the singer's part, and _vice versa_, that the full effect be brought out; as compared with the songs of Schubert and Mendelssohn we can say that the latter are the "verses set to tunes, while Schumann's songs are poems in music." The piano part of a Schumann song contains the atmosphere of the poem, is an attempt to heighten the meaning by suggesting thoughts and feelings which the words, spoken or sung, cannot express; sometimes it is an entirely independent composition, and carries out to a final close the thought left unfinished by the voice, thus avoiding the conventional ending, by the singer, on the tonic chord. Schumann's effort was to express his own reading of the poet's lines by the musical means that seemed to him best suited to the purpose. To this end he refused to allow himself to be bound by conventional treatment, either of voice or instrument.

=Robert Franz= (1815-1892) combined in his songs the romanticism and general methods of Schumann, with a polyphonic treatment inspired by his deep study of Bach. He wrote to various styles of verse, hymns, love-songs, lyrics of the field, the forest, the hunter, the soldier, and though his songs lack the tender, passionate, melodious quality of Schubert's and the deep poetic feeling of Schumann's, they are nevertheless models of perfect, even elaborate workmanship in which the composer follows with great faithfulness the mood of the poet; Schumann, on the contrary, seems to project his own interpretation of the poem into his music, while Schubert seems to grasp the emotion at its highest moment and the song pours out as the spontaneous expression of the singer.

=Three Modern Writers=.—Of modern writers, those who contributed most to the development of the art-song are Wagner, Brahms and Richard Strauss, the first-named by his style and treatment of the voice and the instrumental part rather than by his songs, which are few in number. =Brahms= wrote nearly two hundred songs, varying in character and quality, and using a highly-developed accompaniment, often intricate in its construction, complicated in rhythm and restless in harmonic support, employing all the resources which his mastery of chromatic harmony placed at his disposal. He frequently wrote in the style of the Folk-song, making use of its simple melodic quality, enriching it, however, by his great skill in elaboration in the accompaniment. Brahms' songs are great favorites on concert programs. =Richard Strauss= (b. 1864) is the leading composer of today, and has used in his songs the principles that distinguish his large works. These songs are very difficult, both for voice and accompaniment, and are full of tonal coloring, for Strauss has adapted to the miniature form of the song the means of harmonic and rhythmic effects which he uses so powerfully in his orchestral scores. When well sung and well played, the hearer cannot but be absorbed by the wealth of musical effects of the highest emotional and picturesque quality displayed in Richard Strauss' songs. In a full study of songs and song writers, many more names would be mentioned; those selected for consideration in this lesson represent those who have contributed most significantly to the development of the modern art-song.

=Oratorio Composers after Mendelssohn=.—The later history of the Oratorio requires some consideration at this point. After Mendelssohn, many of the leading composers of Europe turned their attention to this form of composition, influenced, in many instances, by the splendid opportunities for production offered by the strong choral organizations and festival associations of Germany and England, as well as by the great advances made in orchestral playing, which gave to composers resources far beyond those at the hand of Mendelssohn and his predecessors. We may mention, among the Germans, =Schumann=, whose "Paradise and the Peri" was produced in 1843; =Liszt=, who was much attracted to sacred subjects, wrote two oratorios, "The Legend of St. Elizabeth" and "Christus"; =Rubinstein=, who used his great skill in tone painting with orchestral masses in "Paradise

Lost" and in his sacred opera "The Tower of Babel"; =Brahms=, whose "German Requiem" is a standard work to be done well only by thoroughly disciplined vocal and instrumental forces; and =Dvo■ák=, who has shown great power in his "Stabat Mater." Among the French writers most prominent in this form of composition are =Berlioz=, whose "Requiem" is a colossal work in which he drew upon all the resources of the orchestra to heighten the powerful, dramatic character of the text; =Gounod=, who wrote his remarkable works, "The Redemption" and "Mors et Vita" for English production; =Saint-Saëns=, whose "Noël," a Christmas work, is oratorio in style and construction, although small in dimensions; and =César Franck=, the most modern of all, whose "Beatitudes" has been made the subject of much discussion. English composers, following the lead of Handel and Mendelssohn, have given great attention to this form. =Bennett=, the friend of Mendelssohn, produced a beautiful work, "The Woman of Samaria"; =Costa=, an Italian by birth, spent a great part of his professional life in England; hence his oratorio, "Eli," may be classed with English works; =Sullivan= wrote two oratorios, "The Prodigal Son" and "The Light of the World"; =Macfarren's= "St. John the Baptist" and =Mackenzie's= "Rose of Sharon" can be classed among oratorios. The most eminent in this form at the present day is =Elgar=, "The Dream of Gerontius" and "The Apostles." Young Italy has lately shown interest in this form, the most noteworthy being the =Abbé Perosi=, who is under the patronage of the Pope. In the United States the leading representatives are =J. K. Paine=, of Harvard University, with the oratorio "St. Peter," =Dudley Buck=, "Golden Legend," and =H. W. Parker=, "Hora Novissima."

=The Cantata=.—More popular even than the Oratorio with choral societies is the Cantata, both sacred and secular, and the great increase in strong choral organizations, particularly in England, Germany, France and the United States, has resulted in the production of a number of splendid works which show dramatic power and the highest skill in handling voices and instruments. These works contain opportunities for the use of the finest quality of melody, variety of rhythm, solid harmonic or the more fluent polyphonic style, richness of harmonic coloring and every accessory in the way of tone painting by the orchestra, which such masters as Berlioz and Wagner pointed out. The important works are too many to be mentioned here; only the composers' names can be given. In Germany, Brahms, Bruch, Dvo■ák, Gade, Goetz, Hiller, Hofmann, Rheinberger; in France, Berlioz and Massenet; in England, Bennett, Corder, Cowen, Macfarren, Mackenzie, Smart, Sullivan, Coleridge-Taylor among the younger men; in the United States, Buck, Foote, Chadwick, Gilchrist, Paine, H. W. Parker, and Carl Busch.

REFERENCES.

Finck.—Songs and Song Writers.

Grove's and Riemann's Dictionaries.—Articles on composers mentioned, on Song, Lied, Volkslied, Chanson, Oratorio and Cantata.

Parry.—Evolution of the Art of Music, Chapter XIII.

Upton.—Standard Oratorios. Standard Cantatas.

QUESTIONS.

Compare the Aria and the Song.

Mention the characteristics of the Italian, French and English people's songs.

What are the characteristics of the German _Lied_?

Give a sketch of Schubert as a song writer.

Give a sketch of Schumann as a song writer.

Compare the two.

Give a sketch of Franz as a song writer.

Compare him with Schubert and Schumann.

Who are eminent among modern song writers?

Mention the special characteristics of each.

Name the leading composers of Oratorio after Mendelssohn, and their works.

What is the difference between an oratorio and a cantata?

What composers have done successful work in this line?

Songs of the leading composers, classic and modern, should be studied. The lessons on Schubert, Schumann, Liszt, etc., mention notable songs. Analyze an oratorio by one of the composers mentioned in this lesson, also one or more cantatas.

[Illustration: FELIX WEINGARTNER. GUSTAV MAHLER.

RICHARD STRAUSS. SIEGMUND HAUSEGGER.]

LESSON L.

THE SYMPHONIC POEM IN GERMANY.

=Wagner's Influence=.—The genius of Wagner produced and applied to Opera a far richer and more complicated orchestration than had existed before his day. Since then, in many periods and in many countries, composers have tried to adopt his style, and apply it to the symphonic as well as to the operatic stage. In the field of purely orchestral music, Liszt and Berlioz had already formulated a free style, and their symphonic poems, departing from the set form of the symphony, have also served as models for later composers. Almost the only recent exponent of the strict form was Johannes Brahms, for Anton Bruckner, working on similar lines, did not achieve great success with the public.

=Richard Strauss=.—For many years it was thought that Wagner's orchestration would remain unrivalled in the field of music. But Richard Strauss (born at Munich, Germany, 1864) has made a further advance in this respect, and handles the full modern orchestra with the utmost skill. Son of a court horn-player, his musical genius showed itself in his earliest years, and his studies with the court capellmeister, F. W. Meyer, resulted in the publication of several works. At first he followed Brahms and the stricter school, and his F-minor symphony is a worthy production in that form. A meeting with von Bülow led to his appointment as assistant-conductor at Meiningen. To show his ability, Strauss had to conduct, without rehearsal, his Serenade, Op. 7, for thirteen wind instruments; and the excellence of this work brought him the desired position. It was at this time that he met Alexander Ritter, a man of broad intellect and radical ideas. Under the new influence, Strauss renounced his classical style, and began to compose the tone-pictures and symphonic poems that have made his name so important. As he is the chief modern representative of the new school, his works merit detailed examination.

=His Early Symphonic Poems=.—After an Italian trip in 1886, Strauss gave his impressions of that country in the form of the symphonic fantasie "Aus Italien," his first work in the free style of subjective emotion-painting. It is in four movements, each a complete tone-picture. The first, "On the Campagna," gives a vivid impression of spacious solitude, with a hint of the pageants and battles once witnessed by this great Roman field. The second movement, "Amid Rome's Ruins," aims also to give "fantastic pictures of vanished splendor, feelings of sadness in the midst of the sunlit present." The third movement, "On the Shores of Sorrento," resembles the symphonic scherzo, while the finale gives an animated picture of "Neapolitan Folk-Life," introducing the air of "Funiculi" and other popular Italian tunes.

After four years of conducting at the Munich court theatre, Strauss settled in Weimar, where he produced three more important works. The first of these, "Macbeth," showed that he had abandoned the old form in favor of the symphonic poem, in which the different movements are fused into one large whole, free in form. The picture of Macbeth, ambitious and cruel in spite of his timidity, is ably developed, but the portrayal of Lady Macbeth brings a still stronger climax of magnificent orchestral power.

"Don Juan," the second of the three, is founded on Lenau's poem. The hero is not a ruffian adventurer, as in Da Ponte's libretto, but is depicted as an arch pessimist, hunting through the world for perfection in pleasure, but never finding it. There are restless and uncertain melodies at the opening, to illustrate the hero's unsatisfied longing. A knightly theme follows, typical of Don Juan himself. Then come various episodes, full of attractive enthusiasm, but always ending with the same vague unrest. A wild carnival, followed by sudden silence and the cutting theme of a trumpet, announce the hero's end.

"Tod und Verklärung" (Death and Transfiguration) is a work of great power and beauty. It depicts an exhausted sufferer, asleep in the quiet sick-room, dreaming of the beauty of his lost youth. Then follows a more discordant episode, which may well picture a fierce contest with the powers of disease, ending in defeated exhaustion. A third portion brings renewed memories of the morning of life; passages of joyous enthusiasm and noble aspiration suggest the high hope of youth and the glorious achievement of manhood; but again comes the struggle with the powers of Fate, ending in despair and death. The fourth part is an apotheosis,

representing the triumph of man's upward striving over death. This section contains some of the most impressive orchestral beauties in the range of Strauss' works.

=Program Music=.—In the older symphonic form, it was not necessary for the composer to suggest a title for his work. Many have done so—Beethoven in his "Pastoral Symphony," Mendelssohn in the "Scotch," for example; but the exquisite beauty of Schubert, or the romantic charm of Schumann will impress the hearer without the use of extraneous suggestions. In the modern school of program music, founded by Liszt, the composer gives the audience a more or less detailed account of the subject that inspired him, and tries to paint in tones the events or moods suggested by the title. Much, therefore, depends on the choice of the subject. If it is well-known, and gives definite suggestions of certain moods which can find expression in the orchestra, then it may receive legitimate treatment by being set to music. But if the subject is not one that lends itself to broad emotional treatment, or if the composer aims to picture definite events or objects, he is departing from the true function of his art. Music deals with expression of emotion, and should not attempt something that belongs rather to other arts, such as Literature or Painting. Many persons think that Strauss has gone too far in this direction, especially in his later works.

=His Later Symphonic Poems=.—In "Till Eulenspiegel," the hero is a mediæval rogue, whose adventures are found in an old German tale. He is a wandering mechanic, who does anything but tend to business. He is always indulging in madcap pranks, in which he manages to escape from his well-merited punishment. In the composition, Strauss has given free rein to his fancy, and portrayed, with rare orchestral skill, the fantastic jokes, the sly humor, and the rollicking disposition of the graceless rogue. The work is in rondo form, with definite themes to typify the hero. These themes form the basis of the music, and are varied and developed with infinite skill and remarkable orchestral irony.

"Also Sprach Zarathustra" (Thus Spake Zarathustra) is based on Nietzsche's mystic philosophy. Zarathustra, or Zoroaster, alms to teach the doctrine of the "Over-Man," by which man is to become a sort of demigod who rises above good and evil into realms of joy. A picture of the "Hinterweltlern," or dwellers in the Rear-World of common humanity, portrays their yearnings, their joys, and passions, while their sorrows find voice in a tender "Grave-Song." Science and its futility are represented by a fugue replete with chromatics. A passage entitled, "The Convalescent," shows the defeat of the spirit of sorrow and evil, and the triumph of joy. Then follows the wild, chaotic, but strangely-effective "Dance-Song," the exultation of the "Over-Man." Yet his triumph is not lasting, for at the close, after a sudden stroke of the bell, comes the weird "Song of the Night-Wanderer," and the piece ends mystically in two different keys, as if representing eternal doubt. Strange as this work may seem, its effect is one of vast sublimity, and Nietzsche's wild philosophy is translated into orchestral effects of remarkable grandeur.

With "Don Quixote" Strauss enters the more definite field of program music, and aims to picture events. It is cast in the variation form, but is much more free in style than that title would imply. There is a theme for the Don, clear at first, but becoming obscure and illogical, to show that he loses his sanity. He is represented by a solo 'cello, while his faithful squire Sancho, strange to say, appears mostly in viola passages. Each variation treats of one adventure. The windmills are attacked, with disastrous results. The flock of sheep are heard, bleating in full chorus until put to flight. The bands of pilgrims are dispersed as robbers. The blindfold ride through the air on the wooden horse is made realistic by the use of the theatrical wind-machine. Other adventures follow, and at the end the knightly theme recurs in a clarified form, to show Don Quixote's return to reason and death. It will readily be seen that this work is more experimental than the earlier ones.

"Ein Heldenleben" represents the fight of Strauss with his adverse critics. There are six well-marked sections. First comes the hero himself, portrayed by definite themes that are woven into a strong climax. Then his enemies are depicted, with remarkable irony, by a medley of crackling, snarling figures for woodwind. The hero's helpmate is represented by a solo violin, and in this section an instrumental love-duet is introduced. Then follows a picture of the hero's battlefield, ending in a song of victory. The hero's works of peace are then described, and the meaning of the composition is made clear by the introduction of themes from the earlier works of Strauss. The final section shows the hero's departure from an ungrateful world. This piece is grandly planned, but like other orchestral works of Strauss, its themes are not melodic and lack musical charm.

The "Sinfonia Domestica" pictures a day in the composer's family life. Here, again, the subject is one that the hearer cannot understand without an arbitrary explanation. Strauss has given no complete analysis, but has deigned to explain that the three themes in the early part represent father, mother and child, that the picture begins in the afternoon and lasts until the next morning, and that the final fugue represents the education of the child. The unmelodic style of Strauss is little suited to such a subject, and the effect is such as to make the work seem puzzling, at first, if not actually ridiculous.

=His Other Works=.—Of the two early operas by Strauss, “Guntram” and “Feuersnoth,” neither has had real success; nor does his third production, “Salome,” seem important. Guntram is a fighter for love, a member of a mystic fraternity. He rescues Freihild from the tyranny of Duke Robert, who loves her, and in the struggle he kills Robert. Freihild falls in love with him, but he must renounce her, as he knows that he killed Robert out of rivalry in love, an unworthy motive. “Feuersnoth,” lighter in style, is based on the old legend of a scornful maiden, whose pride meets punishment. All fire in the town goes out, and no light can be rekindled, save by a touch of her body; so that she finds herself exposed to the multitude. In this work, as in “Heldenleben,” Strauss has introduced veiled attacks on his critics. The music to both operas shows the usual richness of coloring and orchestral intricacy, but their themes lack the direct power of the guiding motives in Wagner’s works.

=The Songs of Strauss= are many in number, and include some with orchestral accompaniment. They show a modulatory style, combined with a rare melodic beauty that seems strange in a composer who indulges in so much orchestral ugliness. Some of these songs, such as “Traum durch die Dämmerung” or “Allerseelen,” are gems of purest water. The songs are often involved in style, but always possess unity and directness of effect. Their beauty shows that the discords in the composer’s orchestral works are intentional, and not due to lack of melodic invention. Yet it would seem as if his great mastery of instrumental coloring could have been employed as effectively in scoring beautiful themes, instead of the commonplace passages so often found in his larger works.

=Hausegger=.—Siegmund von Hausegger (Graz, Austria, 1872) is another master of the modern orchestra. His father was a musician of broad experience and sound learning, so that it is not strange that his son’s gifts developed quickly. After his regular studies at the gymnasium and the university, Siegmund took up music in earnest, under his father and Degener. His youthful works were now augmented by a piano quartet, a fantasia, the orchestral ballad “Odinsmeeresritt,” the one-act drama “Helfried,” and the opera “Zinnober,” based on a tale of Hofmann. These were followed by a number of songs and choruses, but Hausegger’s real greatness was first revealed by the “Dyonisiac Fantasie,” a symphonic poem for full orchestra. This was followed by a still greater work, “Barbarossa,” while in 1904, at the Frankfort festival, came “Wieland der Schmied.” “Barbarossa” is in three movements. The first shows the happiness of the people gradually fading into sorrow and pain, until the Barbarossa theme at last is heard; for tradition says that the great emperor is not dead, but sleeps in the mountain Kyffhäuser, waiting to arise when the need of his people is too great to be borne. The second movement is a weird, ghostly picture of the enchanted mountain and the sleeping emperor; while the last depicts his awakening, his coming forth at the head of his knights, their victory, and the rejoicing of the people. Wieland is the wonderful smith whose swords cut off a head so cleanly that it remains in place. The first movement shows his vision of the beautiful maid Schwanhilde, appearing from celestial regions; but when he would claim her, she retreats, terrified. A second part shows his sorrow and despair. In the third movement hope again triumphs, and he forges for himself a pair of wings. In the last movement the united lovers leave the dull world behind, and take their flight to regions of eternal sunlight.

=Other Orchestral Composers=.—=Gustav Mahler= (Kalisht, Bohemia, 1860) gained his musical experience as a director in some of the lesser theatres, and is largely self-taught. Besides two operas and a number of beautiful songs, he has composed five symphonies. He has tried to enlarge the symphonic form without departing from it. His symphonies all aim to express some definite thought, such as pessimism finding its cure in simple faith, love of nature leading to a high idea of Pantheism, or doubt clearing in the joys of immortality. The movements are arranged in contrasting groups, and voices are introduced, at first solo, and then often in a final chorus of triumph. Mahler’s works are planned on a grand scale, but his music is often unclear and restless in effect. =Paul Felix Weingartner= (Zara, Dalmatia, 1863) is another musician who served his apprenticeship in the smaller theatres, and became one of the world’s great conductors. He is known by his two symphonic poems, “King Lear” and “The Elysian Fields,” as well as by two symphonies in strict form, and by several chamber works. His opera “Genesius” and his classical trilogy “Orestes” are other successful works. =Jean Louis Nicodé= (Jerczik, Posen, 1853) is somewhat older than the modern tone-poets, and if less important is still noteworthy as an exponent of the program tendency. His two greatest works are the “Symphonic Variations,” Op. 27, and “Das Meer,” for male chorus, soloists, orchestra, and organ. The latter is not a cantata, but rather a great suite, in which vocal movements are balanced against orchestral numbers. Among younger men, =Hugo Kaun= is familiar to Americans because of his long sojourn in Milwaukee. His symphonic poems based on Longfellow’s “Hiawatha” show much fluency and taste. Switzerland now has its set of young composers, with =Hans Huber= as their leader in the orchestral field.

=The Present Situation=.—The rich harmonies and free modulations of Wagner, combined with the setting aside of symphonic form by Liszt, have caused the more recent composers of Germany to give up almost wholly the writing of symphonies. The free style of tone-picturing has been widely adopted, in consequence of the example of Strauss. He has gone so far that some of his works seem merely colossal experiments in this direction, and it is not improbable that a revulsion from such extreme musical

impressionism will take place some time in the future.

REFERENCES FOR LESSONS L TO LVI.

Baker.—Biographical Dictionary of Musicians.

Elson.—Modern Composers of Europe.

Hale, Philip, Editor.—Famous Composers and Their Works, new series.

Huneker, James.—Mezzotints in Modern Music.

Weingartner, Paul Felix.—The Symphony Since Beethoven.

QUESTIONS.

What was the influence of Wagner’s style on symphonic music?

What was the nature of Richard Strauss’ training and the direction of h

[... TRUNCATED at 800,000 chars for file-size management — full text in original source ...]

==========

Cecilia of the Pink Roses

Katharine Haviland-Taylor

Project Gutenberg Release: August 14, 2019 · eBook #60099

[Frontispiece: "MILK, AN' SUGAR IF YOU HAVE IT"]

CECILIA OF THE PINK ROSES

BY KATHARINE HAVILAND TAYLOR

ILLUSTRATED BY MAY WILSON PRESTON

NEW YORK GROSSET & DUNLAP PUBLISHERS

COPYRIGHT, 1917, BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

COPYRIGHT, 1917, BY THE CURTIS PUBLISHING COMPANY.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TO MY DEAR MOTHER SOURCE OF MY INNER PINK ROSES

CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I Where Is Gawd? II The Vision of a Promised Land III The First Step into Canaan IV Learning V Disgrace VI A Hint of Pink VII Santa Claus VIII A Little Touch of the Man with the Hour Glass IX Home X My Best Friend XI Acceptance XII Pain XIII A Request XIV Pink XV Firelight XVI The Mystery XVII A Relapse XVIII Forgiveness XIX Spring XX Pulling Off the Thorns XXI Pink Roses

CECILIA OF THE PINK ROSES

CHAPTER I

WHERE IS GAWD?

The Madden flat was hot and the smell of frying potatoes filled it. Two or three flies buzzed tirelessly here and there, now and again landing with sticky clingingness on a small boy of four who screamed with their advent. When this happened a girl of seven stepped from the stove and shooed them away, saying: "Aw now, Johnny!" and Johnny would quiet.

The perspiration stood out on her upper lip and there were shadows, deeper than even Irish ones should be, beneath her eyes. The sun beat in cruelly at one window which was minus a shade. At another the shade was torn and run up crookedly.

In the hall there was the sound of a scuffle, then a smart slap, and a child's whimpering wail.

"What's--that?" came in a feeble voice from the bedroom off the kitchen.

"It's the new gent in the flat across whackin' his kid," answered the small girl.

"Oh," was the weak answer, and again there was quiet, broken by the sizzle of hot fat, the tireless buzz of the flies, and now and then the little boy's cry.

"Here, Johnny," commanded the small maiden, "come have your face washed off." Johnny objected. She picked him up with decision, and set him on the table with resounding emphasis, where he screamed loudly during the rite.

The door opened. A man in overalls came in. "Hello, Paw," said Cecilia Evangeline Agnes Madden. He answered her with a grunt and kicked off his heavy shoes.

"Gawd, it's hot!" he said with his first contribution to the conversation. "Two Dagos got sunstruck. One of 'em he just went like a goldfish outa water, keeled over, then flop,--flop. The Boss he up an'--"

"Supper, Paw," said Cecilia. She pushed a chair up to the oil-clothed table, and the man settled, beginning to eat loudly. He stopped and pointed with his knife to the bedroom door. "How's she?" he asked in a grating whisper.

"She ain't so good," answered the small girl. Her eyes filled with tears and she turned away her face.

"Maw--Maw--Maw!" cried Johnny.

"Aw now!" said his sister while she picked up his hot little person to comfort him.

"Maw--Maw!" he echoed.

Cecilia looked up. Her eyes were like those of a small dog that has been whipped. "I ain't the same," she said across his brick-dust curls. "He wants _her_, I ain't the same. I do my best, but I ain't her."

The man laid aside his knife. He set his teeth on his lower lip, and then he asked a question as if afraid to.

"Has the doctor been here?"

"Yes," answered Cecilia.

"Whatud he say?"

"He sez she wasn't so good. He sez she wouldn't be no better 'til the weather was cooler an'--"

"Celie!" came in the voice from the bedroom. Cecilia put down Johnny.

"Yes, Maw," she answered gently.

"Celie!" came again in almost a scream. Celie vanished. She reappeared in a few moments. She was whiter than before.

"She throwed up fierce," she said to her father; "something fierce, an' all black. Don't you want no coffee?" The man shook his head. He reached for his shoes.

"Where yuh goin'?" asked Cecilia.

"Doctor's," she was answered. He went into the bedroom. "Well, old woman," he said loudly, "how yuh feelin', better?" The thin creature on the bed nodded, and tried to smile. The smile was rather dreadful, for it pulled long lines instead of bringing dimples. Her blue lips stretched and the lower cracked. A drop of blood stood out on it.

"Gawd, it was hot to-day," said the man. He settled by her bed in a broken-backed chair. She stretched out a thin hand toward him.

"Mary--!" he said, then choked.

"Aw, Jerry!" said the woman. In her voice was little Cecilia's tone of patience, with the lilt removed by a too hard life.

"Do yuh feel _some_ better?" he entreated.

"Sure--I do. Gimme that glass of water--" She drank a mouthful and again vomited rackingly.

"Oh, Gawd!" said Jeremiah Madden. He laid a rough hand on her forehead and she pulled it down against her cheek.

"Jerry," she said between long gasps, "I been happy. I want you should always remember that I been happy. Awful happy, Jerry."

"Oh, Gawd, Mary!" said the man. "If I'd a knew how hard you'd a had to work, I wouldn't have brung yuh!"

"Don't!" she begged. "Don't say that!" She looked at him, time faded, and with it a hot and smelling flat. She stood on a wind-swept moor. Jerry, only eighteen, stood by her. His arm was around her with that reverent touch that comes in Irish love. "I'll send fer yuh," he'd said, "after I make me fortune in America."

She had cried and clung to him. With her touch, reason and a rolling moor had faded for him. "I can't leave you," he had said, "I can't! Mary, you come with me." And Mary had come. Those days had been beautiful.... But fortunes in America did not come as advertised. Sometimes Mary thought of green turf, and the gentle drip-drip of fog, like rain. That rain that came so often.... Now she thought of it more than ever. She hoped that the Virgin would allow her a little corner of Heaven that would look like an Irish moor.... The gold the priest talked of was "grand," but heresy or not, she wanted a bit of green, with the gentle drip of rain on it.

Jeremiah bent and kissed her. Then he rubbed the spot of blood of her lip from his. "It wasn't no mistake," he said. Her eyes grew moist.

"Jerry," she said, "Celie is a good kid. She kin do fer yuh. Ain't she, right along? She won't give yuh no trouble neither. But the kid--he ain't so easy. It's the kids growin' up in America better'n their folks, that go to the devil. Watch him, Jerry, watch him good. Won't yuh now?" The man nodded; she closed her eyes. After a few moments that throbbed with the heat of the flat, she spoke again.

"Jerry," she said.

"Darlin'?"

"It's this way, Jerry. I always wanted to be a lady--"

"Yuh are!" he interrupted hotly.

[Illustration: "NOW LAUGH! PAW'S COMING HOME AND HE NEEDS ALL OUR LAUGHS"]

"No," she stated quietly, "I ain't, an' I always thought I could be. The Irish learns fast. It's this way, Jerry; if ever the time comes when you get money, you send Celie to one of them schools that learns 'em French and drawin' and such, Jerry, will yuh?"

"Before Gawd, I will, Mary. If I ever kin."

She closed her eyes and slept quietly, clinging to his hand.

The next day was Sunday so Jeremiah went to Mass and heard it with especial intention. If his thoughts were more on the gentle Saint slowly dying in a hot flat than on the Gentle Mother, who can blame him.

Jeremiah went from the baroqued church vastly comforted, and painfully aware of his Sunday collar, which had rough edges. Cecilia had rubbed soap on it, but it still scratched. Outside Jeremiah went, not in the direction of his home, but in the other. He passed a beggar's entreating wail, and then retraced his steps to bestow a penny,--and even pennies were not easily spared. Jerry was still a little child at heart. He was courting divine favour. He needed God and all the Saints on his side.

After a brisk walk of many blocks he turned into a house with a doctor's sign on it. The office was crowded; he sat, outwardly submissive, to wait his turn. "Blessed Mother," he prayed, "make him mak'er well. Mother of the Saviour--" his thoughts were a chaos. "A gold heart!" he promised rashly, even while he remembered the unpaid grocer's bill. A woman with a pallid skin and hacking cough crept from the office. Across from him a boy exhibited a burn to an interested neighbour. "Blessed Mother,--" entreated Jeremiah, even while his eyes saw the burn and he wondered how it had happened.

A crisp young person in white, who gave an impression of great coolness, said, "Your turn next." Jerry jumped and got up. Two little girls, at the Sheraton period in legs, giggled loudly at his jump, but Jerry didn't notice. He stopped on the threshold of the inner office. He twirled his hat in his hands. "Mister," he said, "it's my wife I come about." The doctor had been up all night. Added to his fact was the fact that he was fitted, emotionally, to run a morgue.

"Name?" growled the doctor. Jeremiah Madden sank to a chair and told his name, of his wife, and how sick she was. He also interspersed a few facts about Irish moors, love and business in America. And he ended with: "An my doc he sez' no one can save her but Doctor Van Dorn. He's the cancer man of New York. The only one who can possibly save her! He sez that," repeated Jeremiah. "Oh fer Gawd's sake, Doc! I can't pay yuh now but--"

The doctor swung about in his swivel chair. "My time is entirely mortgaged," he stated curtly. "I can't keep up to my work. Your wife will probably die anyway; accept the inevitable. You couldn't pay me, and I haven't the time. All New York bothers me. Good morning."

He turned back to his desk. Jeremiah went toward the door. His step was a blind shuffle. Hand on the knob, he paused. "Doc," he said, "I love her so, an' the little kids, they need her. I feel like she'd live if you'd help her. I promise I'd pay. All my life I'd pay an' thank Gawd I could--" he stopped. The doctor moved his shoulders impatiently.

"The Virgin will reward yuh--" said Jeremiah. "Oh, Doc! Fer Gawd's sake!"

"Good morning," answered the doctor with another impatient move of his shoulders. Jeremiah left. A young person in crisp white said, "Your turn next, Madam." Madam went in. "Oh, Doctor, my heart--" she began. The doctor got up to move her chair so that the light would not trouble her.

Jeremiah spent the morning in going from office to office. First he told the unfavourable report of his doctor. He met sympathy in some quarters, curt refusals in others, and worst of all he sometimes met: "Cancer of the stomach? Not much chance--"

At half after one, sick from the sunlight of the cruelly hot streets, he turned into an office for his last try. He felt numb.... His tongue was thick. He looked with resentment on a well-dressed woman who waited opposite him. "Flowers on her bunnit," he thought, "while my Mary--" He thought of his hard labour and, with bitterness, of the "Boss." He had never felt this way before. If he'd had money, he reflected, how quickly that first doctor would have helped him.... The other refusals had come from truer reasons. His own doctor's report, although Jeremiah didn't realise this, had stopped all efforts. If the doctor had said no one but Van Dorn could help her, Lord, what chance had they? This was their line of reason.

Jeremiah sat in the outer waiting room. At last his turn came. The doctor looked tired; he was gruff in his questions. "I'll come with you and look at her," he said at last. Jeremiah felt a sob rise in his throat. The doctor rang a bell.

"Tell Miss Evelyn," he said to the maid who answered him, "that we'll have to give up our drive this afternoon. She's my little girl," he explained to Jeremiah. "Her mother's dead,--I don't see as much of her as I should. A doctor has no business with a family. I'm ready. Come on."

They went out by a back door, leaving an office full of patients. The sun was hot. Jeremiah prayed fervently even while he answered the doctor's questions and responded to his pleasantries. At last they came to the building which held Jeremiah's home. They mounted the long stairs. Two or three children, playing on them, stopped their squabbling and looked after the doctor with awe.

"He's got a baby in that case," said one, a fat little girl with aggressive pig-tails.

"There is too many now," said a boy. "They don't all get fed, and they're all beat up fierce. Our teacher in that there corner mission sez as how Gawd is love. Why don't he come down here an' love?"

There was an awed silence after this. Outright heresy as it was, the immediate descent of a thunderbolt was expected.

Upstairs Jeremiah opened the door of the flat. The kitchen was full of women. Several of them sobbed loudly.... Johnny Madden sat on the table, eating a piece of bread thickly spread with molasses. On seeing Jeremiah the women were suddenly silent. Jeremiah swayed and leaned against the door.

The small Cecilia heard him and came from the bedroom.

"Paw," she said, "I'll do all I kin fer yuh. I always will.... She was happy. She sez as how she seen green fields an' rain." Jeremiah took her in his arms. He hid his face against her thin little shoulder. His shook. Cecilia was very quiet. She had not cried. She looked over her father's head at the roomful of gaping women. Something flashed across her face. Her teeth set.

"She always wanted a bunnit with pink roses on it," said Cecilia. "I don't see why Gawd didn't give her jest _one_."

The man sobbed convulsively and Cecilia remembered him. "She was happy," Cecilia said in a less assured tone. "She sez as how she seen green fields with rain on 'em like Ireland."

CHAPTER II

THE VISION OF A PROMISED LAND

As Mrs. Madden had said, "The kids that grow up better than their folks go to the devil." Cecilia felt this at eleven, for she was all of Johnny's mother, and the role was a difficult one. She had learned to spat him and kiss him judiciously, and at the proper times. She had learned to understand his marble games and to coax him into attendance at Catechism.

Cecilia had begun to understand a great many things at eleven that some of us never understand. One thing made learning easy for her,--she loved so greatly that she was often submerged into the loved, and so saw their viewpoint.

"Paw," said Cecilia. She had turned about on the piano stool, and Jeremiah looked up from his paper. "Well?" he questioned.

"I been thinking," she said, "that it would be genteel to ask the priest to supper. It ain't as though we hadn't a hired girl to do fer us, an' it would be polite."

"That's so, that's so," said Jeremiah. He laid aside his paper. "You're like your maw," he added. Cecilia knew he was pleased. She smiled happily.

"An' have ice-cream?" suggested the interested Jeremiah.

"Yes," said Cecilia, "an' chicken, an' fried potatoes, an' waffles, an' of course pie, an' biscuits, an' suchlike. I'd like to entertain Father McGowan, he's been good to us."

"Yes," answered Jeremiah. They were both silent. The vision of an overcrowded and smelling flat had come to sober them. Also the memory that always went with it.... "Play me 'The Shepherd Boy,'" said Jeremiah. He closed his eyes while Cecilia banged it out in very uneven tempo, owing to difficulties in the bass.

Johnny came in. He sat down on a lounge covered with a green and red striped cloth. He looked at Jeremiah with a supercilious expression.

"The other fellahs' fathers wears their shoes in the house," he stated coldly. "The Shepherd Boy" stopped suddenly. Cecilia went toward the "parlor." "Johnny!" she called on reaching it. Johnny followed meekly. The parlor was the torture chamber. When he went in Cecilia put her hands on his shoulders.

"Johnny," she said in her gentle little way. "Um?" he answered, wriggling beneath her hands.

"Johnny," she repeated, "it ain't polite to call down your paw."

"But Celie," objected John, "he ain't like the other fellahs' fathers. They wears collars an' shoes, _all_ the time."

"I know, dear," said Cecilia. "I know, but it ain't polite to call down your paw, an' nothing can make it so."

"Aw right," answered John sullenly. Cecilia leaned over and kissed him. John didn't mind, "none of the fellahs being around." He went back to the living room. Jeremiah had put on his shoes. He looked at Johnny, awaiting his approval.

"An' Norah," said Cecilia, excited to the point of hysteria, "you see that I get the plate with the crack in it, an' the glass with the piece outa it."

"Sure, I will," answered Norah. "Now go 'long."

Cecilia went to the dining room. They were going to eat there, because they were going to have company. Norah was not going to sit down with them either. It was to be most formal and "elegant."

And now for the decorations. Cecilia put on two candlesticks, each at a corner of the table. They did not match, but why be particular? Then she took a bunch of peonies, and, removing all foliage, jammed them tightly in a vase that had the shape of a petrified fibroid growth, and had accumulated gilt, and a seascape for decoration.

"It looks bare," said Cecilia. She went to her room and brought out a new hair-ribbon, worn only twice. She unearthed this from below a hat trimmed with pink roses. The hat was gorgeous and beautiful, but she could not wear it.... Looking on "bunnits with pink roses on 'em" always made her a little sick. The hair-ribbon was tied around the vase in a huge bow. Cecilia stood off to admire.

"Norah!" she called.

Norah appeared. "Ain't that grand?" she commented. "Now ain't it?"

"Well," answered Cecilia, "I don't care if I do say it, I think it's pretty swell! Norah, you use the blue glass butter dish, won't you?"

"Sure," answered Norah, and then with mutters of waffle batter, she disappeared. Cecilia stood a moment longer looking at the table in all its beauty. The plates were upside down. Napkins (that all matched) stood upright in tumblers. The knives and forks were crossed in what was to Cecilia the most artistic angle.

"It's grand!" she said with a little catch in her breath. "Just _swell_!" Then with a backward glance, she vanished. "I hope paw'll like it," she muttered as she went upstairs.

Father McGowan was a charming guest. He looked at the decorations and then on the small Cecilia with softened eyes: "Now I'll bet you fixed this beautiful table!" he said. Cecilia nodded, speechless. She drew a long, shaky breath. Life was so beautiful.... Father McGowan put his hand on her curls. (She sat next to him at the table.) His touch was very gentle.

"Good little woman?" inquired the priest of Jeremiah.

"She's maw and all to all of us," answered Jeremiah. There was a silence while they ate.

"This chicken," said Father McGowan, "is fine!"

"It's too brown, I'm afraid," answered Cecilia with the deprecatory attitude proper while speaking of one's own food. Her father looked at her with pride. The priest's eyes twinkled.

"Paw," said Cecilia, leaning across the table and putting her hand on her father's, "tell Father McGowan how yuh hit the boss on the ear with the brick." Jeremiah sat back in his chair, first laying his knife and fork with the eating ends on the plate and the others on the cloth. He drew a long breath and told a long tale, at which the priest laughed heartily. He ended it thus: "An' I sez, 'I ain't _dee_pendent on no man. Yuh can do yer own brick layin' an' here's one to start with!'" With that Jerry had hit him on the ear. It was a dramatic tale, and one which made Cecilia swell with pride over a wonderful paw!

The priest leaned across the table. "Have you a patent protection on those bricks?" he asked.

"Why, no," answered Jeremiah. The priest talked long and fast. Cecilia could not understand all of what he said, but he mentioned unusual qualities of Jeremiah's product. His own knowledge of such things came through a brother in the same business. The necessity of a little risk and a big push. He talked loudly, and excitedly. He mentioned Cecilia and John as the incentive to gain.... He spoke of what he knew to be true of Jeremiah's product. Jeremiah sat very silent. If what the priest said were true! They went to the living room, where, over a pitcher of beer, there was more talk, incomprehensible to Cecilia.

Then the priest smiled, and said: "All right, Jerry. In five years you'll be a millionaire. Now, Cecilia, I want to hear a piece." Cecilia sat down to play "The Shepherd Boy." Her fingers trembled so that it wasn't as good as usual, but the priest was pleased. Then she left, and wiped the rest of the dishes for Norah. Norah said that the priest was a "swell talker" and that she hadn't minded the extra work.

Cecilia went up to bed very happy. She slipped out of her pink silk dress and hung it in the closet. As she reached up, a hat, all over bobbing roses, slid from the closet shelf to the floor. Cecilia's smile faded. She put it back, and shut the door.

CHAPTER III

THE FIRST STEP INTO CANAAN

Cecilia stood in her bedroom in the new house. The paper in her bedroom was pink and hung in panels. At the top of each panel was a hip-diseased, and goitered cupid, who threw roses around,--roses that looked like frozen cabbages, and stuck in the air as if they'd been glued there. Father Madden had picked out the paper as a surprise for Celie. When she had seen it she had gasped and then kissed him very hard. He had said, "There, Celie, I knew you'd like it."

After he had gone Cecilia had looked around and said, "Oh, dear--Oh, dear!" Roses always had made her sick, and even to Cecilia, the paper was "pretty bad." And Cecilia had kissed him hard and said she loved it.

Some one tapped on the door.

"Come," said Cecilia.

"Father McGowan's down," said Norah with a point of her finger over her left shoulder. "An' the man's down with doughnuts, too." Cecilia laughed. Norah's mode of announcement always made people sound diseased. Cecilia had a mental picture of a man in the throes of doughnuts--with them breaking out all over his person.

"You can take a dozen and a half," said Cecilia, referring to the doughnut-man, "because Johnny likes them so."

Norah didn't move, but stood in the doorway surveying the tumbled room. A trunk stood in the centre, lid thrown back. From it exuded frills and tails. The bed was piled high with more frilly garb. Norah sniffed loudly. Suddenly, there were sobs and then she dissolved into many tears. "I dunno how we can do without yuh!" she explained in gulps. "Me, and Johnny and your paw. Aw, _Celie_!" Cecilia put her arms around the troubled Norah. She looked very near tears herself.

"I would rather stay with you, but maw wanted me learned to be a lady," she said. Her chin set. "I gotta do it," she added. "Paw promised her." Norah sniffed and took the apron from her face. "I know yuh gotta, dearie," she answered. Celie put her arms around the damp Norah. "Norah," she said, "you will be very good to Johnny and paw? When Johnny wants paw to wear collars all the time, you take him out and give him doughnuts to divert him, will yuh?" Norah nodded. She was sniffing again.

"And, Norah," went on Celie, "don't let the new cook use the blue glass butter dish everyday."

"N-no, dearie," answered Norah. She still stood irresolute by the door. "Celie," she said, "when they learn yuh to be a lady, don't let 'em learn yuh not to love us."

"I'll _always_ love you all," answered Cecilia. Her eyes filled with tears, and she kissed Norah.

Downstairs Father McGowan sat looking at a gilt cabinet decorated with forget-me-nots, and a variety of chrysanthemums never seen on sea or land. On the top shelf of the cabinet was a brick, lying on a red velvet bed. Father McGowan smiled and then sobered. He remembered a night three years past when he had pointed out possibilities to Jeremiah Madden, possibilities in the manufacture of the humble brick. The possibilities had amounted to more than even he had anticipated. Sometimes he questioned what he had done.... His hope lay in Cecilia. The boy, he was afraid, would not be helped by money. Perhaps he'd turn out well. Father McGowan hoped so. He'd bet on Cecilia anyway. She'd use money in the right way in a few more years.

There was a rustle at the door. Cecilia, in a new gown bought to wear at the "swell school," came in.

"Father McGowan, dear!" she said.

"Cecilia Madden, dear!" he answered. They both laughed, and then settled.

"Have you come to tell me to be a good girl at the swell school?" she questioned. The father was silent. He was looking at Cecilia's dress. The dress was of purple silk with a green velvet vest. There were ribbons looped carelessly on its gorgeousness too.

"Little Celie," said Father McGowan, "I want to tell you things and I can't. Now if you had a mother! Sometimes women do come in handy."

Cecilia nodded.

"I want to tell you," said Father McGowan, looking hard at the brick, "not to be hurt if at first the girls are stand-offish like. That's their way."

"Oh, no," said Cecilia. "I won't be, but I think they'll be nice. Mrs. De Pui says they're all of the best families with wonderful home advantages."

"Hum--" grunted Father McGowan. He did not seem much impressed. He still gave the brick his undivided attention. "And," he went on, "if you should get lonely, remember that there's one Lady you can always tell your troubles to. She won't laugh, and she always listens."

"Oh, _yes_!" said Cecilia, and she crossed herself.

Father McGowan drew a long breath. "Now," he said, "remember that if your clothes are different from theirs that your father has plenty of money to buy new ones for you. Remember that. A penance is all right, but not at fourteen."

"Why, my clothes are beautiful!" said Cecilia. She looked bewildered. "They're all silk and lace and velvet, and I haven't a low heeled pair of shoes. _French_ heels, Father McGowan, dear!"

"Cecilia Madden, dear," said Father McGowan. His look was inscrutable. He laid a hand on her hair. His touch was very gentle. "Most of all," he said, "remember never to be ashamed of your people, and always to love them. Love those who love you. Reason the truth out in your heart, and don't accept the standards of little Miss Millionairess, because she is that. Understand?"

"Yes," replied Cecilia, "I understand, but Father McGowan, I would always love paw. Wearing shoes and collars in the house is just the trimmings," she stated bravely. "His heart is genteel."

"Saint Cecilia!" said Father McGowan in a low voice, and then he muttered a few words in Latin. Cecilia did not understand them, but she bowed her head and crossed herself, and felt strong.

After Father McGowan left she stood in front of a mirror admiring a purple silk dress with green velvet trimmings. "Holy Mary," she said with quickly closed eyes, "help me not to be too stuck on my clothes!" When she opened her eyes she looked into the mirror. "Oh, it's grand!" she whispered. "I am almost pretty in it!" She drew a long, shaking breath.

The room in which Cecilia waited, while not at all like her home, impressed her. Most of the furniture looked old, and some of it showed a cracking veneer. The clock especially needed repair. It was a grandfather one, and had inlaid figures of white wood on the dark. Cecilia wondered vaguely if it couldn't be repaired and shone up? Dilapidated as she thought the furnishing, yet it left an impress. Two girls entered the room, they looked at Cecilia and tried not to smile. Cecilia wondered uncomfortably if her hat were on crooked, or whether her red silk petticoat hung out.

They selected books from a low case with leisure, then left. Outside the door Cecilia heard them giggle. One of them said, "Some one's cook."

"Every one has trouble with cooks," thought Cecilia. Then she looked down and forgot cooks. Her shoes were so beautiful! Pointed toes and high of heels. And her suit now, all over braid and buttons, with a touch of red here and there!

Even those giggling girls must have been impressed. Their clothes had been so plain. Cecilia pitied them. She decided to give them a "tasty" hair-ribbon now and then.... The waiting was so long. She wished Mrs. De Pui would come. She thought of paw and Johnny and her eyes filled with hot tears.

"Oh," she thought miserably, "if Johnny just won't reform paw! People are so happy when they aren't reforming or being reformed!"

Again she saw the station at which she'd started for Boston, her father and Johnny both sniffing. She was so glad she hadn't cried. She had so wanted to! Her breath caught in her throat. "Please, Gawd," she made mental appeal, "make them learn me to be a lady quick!"

Weren't they _ever_ coming?

The shabby clock tick-tick-ticked. The sun lowered and made more slanting rays on the floor. A maid, very smart in uniform, came in. She gave Cecilia a guilty look, then said: "This way. Mrs. De Pui will see you upstairs."

"Yes, ma'am," answered Cecilia. She followed humbly. The maid decided that her forgetfulness hadn't made much difference. She didn't think that _that_ would report her.... Cecilia went upstairs after the slender black figure. Her heart beat sickeningly. There were voices from the door at which the maid paused. Cecilia saw some girls sitting around a table at which a white-haired woman was pouring tea.

"Oh," said Cecilia impulsively, "I'm interrupting yuh at yer supper."

"No," answered Mrs. De Pui, faintly smiling; "come in. You are Cecilia?"

Cecilia nodded. Somehow the sobs that had been kept in all day, were, at the first kind voice, very near the surface. The girls smiled at each other. Cecilia wondered about her hat, or perhaps her petticoat hung out below her skirt? Mrs. De Pui motioned her to a chair.

"Annette," she said, "give our new friend some tea."

"How do you take your tea?" questioned Annette crisply.

"Milk," answered Cecilia, "an' sugar if yuh have it." She reddened. Of course they would have it. She wished she hadn't said that! She stared in acute embarrassment at her feet. Some one gave her a cup of tea, some one else a sandwich. She dipped it in the tea, then she remembered that that was not proper and reddened again. At that move the young person called Annette had suddenly choked and held her handkerchief over her mouth. The other girls looked into their cups, with the corners of their lips twitching.

A fat and dumpy-looking girl seated a little out of the group looked at Cecilia with sympathy. Mrs. De Pui spoke of a recent exhibition of water colours, with her well-bred tones trickling over the inanities she uttered, and making them sound like a reflection of thought.... Even the sun looked cold to Cecilia.

"I wish I was back in the flat," she thought, and then: "I wonder if I can bear it!"

CHAPTER IV

LEARNING

A month had passed. Cecilia quite understood what Father McGowan had meant about clothes. Cecilia wore no more French heels. She had taken down her hair and discarded her beautiful rhinestone hair-pins. Father McGowan too, it seemed, had been responsible for her admittance to the school. Cecilia had found out from Mrs. De Pui that he had written a book! This astounding fact had been divulged after Mrs. De Pui, more than usually tried by Cecilia, had said: "Your entrance here has been rather difficult for me. You see, of course, that the other girls' advantages have not been yours?"

"Oh, yes, Mrs. De Pui," answered Cecilia, and swallowed hard.

"Realising that, my dear," continued Mrs. De Pui, "I hope that you will do your utmost to develop a womanly sympathy, and broaden your character."

Cecilia said somewhat breathlessly that she would try to, very, very hard! "And," went on Mrs. De Pui, then coughed, "desist from the use of such words as 'elegant,'--'refined' (which, when used at all, is re_fine_d, not 'r_ee_fined'), and 'grand.' Such words, my dear Cecilia, are not used in----" (Mrs. De Pui nearly said polite society, but swallowed it with a horrified gulp) "are not used by persons of cultivation," she finished weakly.

Cecilia vanished. She went to her lonely room. (There were no room-mates.) She settled on the bed. By the bed, on a chair, was a pink silk dress. It had been her star play, and after a month of boarding school she was going to give it to the maid. The maid was _so_ friendly!

There were two letters on the small dressing table. Cecilia got them and read:

"Celie girl, we miss you. It ain't like it was in the house. I hope they are learning you good and the board is good. I hope they treat you good. Father McGowan was here last night. He sez he will go to see you soon. Johnny is well. Norah sez your cat is lonely too. Your father with love,

"J. MADDEN."

The other was a line from John. A petulant line, full of querulous complaint of a collarless father, redeemed to Cecilia by a word or two at the end.

"You were so good to me, Celie. I know it now." She threw herself down on the bed. Her shoulders shook miserably. Tears wet a once loved pink silk dress, "all over beads and lace."

Upstairs in another room, a group of girls were laughing uncontrollably. "You know she actually invited Annie to _sit_ down!" said one. (Annie was the slender maid.)

"That is not r_ee_fined," answered Annette. There was more wild laughter.

"_Do_ ask her up to-night," suggested a tawny haired maiden with cat-green eyes. "_Do!_ It would be simply _screamingly_ funny!"

Annette, although one of the most unkind, objected. "It doesn't seem quite nice," she said. However, as the idea promised fun, the majority ruled.

Cecilia answered the tap on her door. "Come up to your room to-night?" she echoed after the invitation. "Oh, Miss Annette, I'd be that glad to come!" she smiled, and her smile was like sunshine after rain.

"I _do_ thank you!" she said. "I do!"

Annette turned away. Cecilia closed the door, then she covered her eyes. "Gawd, thank you ever so much!" she whispered, "thank you! I _have_ been so lonely! Make them love me. Please make them love me, Gawd." Then she lifted her head. Her face shone. "I wonder what I shall wear?" she said.

To meet the ideal of one's dreams while carrying a sick cat is humiliating. And that is what happened to Cecilia Evangeline Agnes Madden. Her shadowy dream-knight had materialised into human shape through a photograph. And she met him while chaperoning a sick cat.

Two weeks before she had gone to a party in Annette Twombly's room. She'd not enjoyed the party very much, in fact she'd been rather unhappy until she saw the photograph. After that she didn't care what happened. All the romance of the Celt had leaped.... Her shadowy dreams took form. The ideal lover developed a body.

"Oh, your _heavenly_ cousin, Annette!" said the green-eyed. "I _adore_ his hair!" She stood before a large photograph, framed elaborately.

"He _is_ a sweet boy," Annette had responded, "but so particular! I never knew any one quite so fastidious. It is _fearfully_ hard to please him!"

"Does he get crushes?" asked the green-eyed.

"My dear," said Annette, "it would be impossible. He's terribly intellectual and all that, and girls so easily offend him. He doesn't say so, but he simply stops paying them any attention."

The group gathered about the picture to admire. It showed a rather nice looking boy, with an outdoor flavour, and eyes that questioned.... The face was too young to have character.

"He's had on long trousers for six years!" said Annette. There was a hushed silence. "Isn't he _divine_!" gurgled one young person at length. Cecilia had only looked. The shadowy dream man vanished. The picture boy took his place.

This day Cecilia walked alone as usual. Mrs. De Pui was an advocate of trust as a developer of "womanly instinct," so on a stipulated number of streets, the girls were allowed to walk unchaperoned. They went in little groups, all except Cecilia. She was her own small group.

To-day she walked alone, at least it seemed so, but by her Cecilia felt K. Stuyvesant Twombly. "I admire art," he was saying. His voice, curiously enough, was Mrs. De Pui's.

"So do I," agreed Cecilia. "Beauty develops us, the best of us, and brings a shining light into the soul." Cecilia stopped. Then because she was very truthful she went on: "That is not original. The man who lectures us on Art said it. He has whiskers and false teeth, I believe, for they click when he says, 'Renaissance.'" ... "Oh, Heavens!" thought Cecilia, "I will never be a lady. That would not be the way to talk to the ideal man. About teeth!--false ones!"

Then the cat had appeared. Rather Cecilia had nearly walked on it. It was a limp little grey and white heap, its fur half wet from the gutter, and eyes half closed.

"Poor pussy," said Cecilia. "You look like I feel when I'm with them what have social advantages. Poor pussy!" She was very tender toward it. She leaned above it, then picked it up. "I will bribe Annie, with dresses, to feed it," she thought. The cat began to be violently ill. Cecilia put it down.

"I say!" came in a rather husky voice, "Pussy needs some Mothersill's, doesn't she?"

Cecilia didn't understand the allusion, but she looked up smiling. The voice had been attractively hearty. After she looked up, she gasped.

"What are you going to do with it?" went on the young man.

"I thought I'd take it to my school and get the hired girl,--I mean maid,--to feed it."

"No," objected K. Stuyvesant; "it's poisoned. We'll take it to a drug store and get them to kill it."

"Oh, _no_!" said Cecilia.

"See here," said the boy, "the cat will die. I've had dogs of mine poisoned. It's the most merciful thing to have it killed. It'll only suffer and drag its life out if you take it home."

"I see," said Cecilia. "I suppose you know. It's just as you say."

"Good kid," he commented. His comment called forth an agony and elation. Cecilia wished for the longer dresses with which she'd come to school. The boy picked up the cat gently and wrapped his handkerchief about it.

"Come on," he said. "Drug store around the corner."

Cecilia followed. She could not keep up to him. Half the time she ran. The whole affair was humiliating.

"Thank the Lord no one saw me!" said the boy when they got inside the drug store. He looked at Cecilia. They both laughed.

"Sit down," he said. "I'm going to buy you a soda." Cecilia sat down. "Choclut," she ordered. He sat down opposite her, and put his arms on the sticky little table. He thought he looked on the prettiest child he'd ever seen.... She seemed entirely and only a child.

"What's your name?" he asked.

"Cecilia Evangeline Agnes Madden," she answered.

"Well, Cecilia Evangeline," he said, "don't try to eat the bottom of the glass; I'm wealthy to-day. I'm going to buy you another soda!"

"Oh," answered Cecilia, "I really oughtn't." At a motion the clerk bent above her. "C-could I have a sundae?" asked Cecilia. The boy laughed and nodded.

"Peach," said Cecilia, "with a good deal of whipped cream on top, if you please!" She smiled frankly on K. Stuyvesant. "I'm having a _fine_ time!" she said. Her sentimental dreams of him had vanished. He didn't talk a bit like the phantom, but he was _nicer_!

"What's your name, please?" she asked. She knew, but little Cecilia at fourteen was a woman.

"Keefer Stuyvesant Twombly," he answered. "Rotten name. Imagine being hailed as 'Keefer'! It sounds like some one's butler. It isn't a nice name, is it, Evangeline Cecilia?"

"No," said Cecilia. "But then, you are nice. Names and things are just trimmings. _You_ are nice," she repeated.

"So are you," returned the boy, "and I'll _bet_ you're Irish!"

"_How_ did you know?" asked Cecilia, wide-eyed. "How did you know?"

"And there she sat," said the green-eyed, "laughing with him in the most brazen way, and he bought her two sodas!"

"How vulgar," said Annette. "Was he good looking?"

"Ravishing, my dear. Alice thought that he looked like your cousin."

"That, of course, is impossible," said Annette coldly. "He _does_ happen to be here. He and his mother are at the Touraine. But as for his looking at any one like that Madden girl--! How she got in here, I can't imagine. I think that it is an imposition to be asked to meet her."

Annette surveyed her hair, and picked up a mirror. "Did you tell Mrs. De Pui?" she asked.

"Yes," answered the green-eyed; "I thought that it was my _duty_. It hurt me to do it, but I thought I _ought_ to. We watched them for the longest time. We pretended to be looking at a window full of hot water bottles."

Alice came in. She picked up the photograph of K. Stuyvesant Twombly. She nodded at the green-eyed after she looked long.... Annette saw this in the glass and glared.

CHAPTER V

DISGRACE

The day had been terrible for Cecilia. She had learned from Mrs. De Pui that she had hopelessly offended.... What she had done, Mrs. De Pui said, was an act suitable for one of the maids. Mrs. De Pui was pained. She could not believe that one of her pupils, with the womanly inspiration of the school set before her, could have so offended. It was unthinkable!

Cecilia wriggled, and swallowed with difficulty.

"Cultivate repose," ordered Mrs. De Pui coldly. Cecilia stood so rigidly that she looked like a wooden Indian. One of the girls entered. She said, "Excuse me," and backed away, plainly much interested.

"What was the boy's name, Cecilia?" asked Mrs. De Pui. Cecilia swallowed so hard that she shook. "I don't know," she answered loudly.

Then what Mrs. De Pui said was very terrible. Cecilia crawled off at last, white and shaking. She groped for her door knob. Things before her were not very clear. What Mrs. De Pui had said was very terrible, but,--but the other, her first lie, uttered with that brazen assurance.... She went in and threw herself across the bed.... She didn't cry. The hurt was too big. So her dear father and the fact that she was born in poverty made her an outcast? If so, she would stay so. "Learn her to be a lady," the breeze that came in through an inch opened window whispered. Cecilia felt it, and set her chin.

And Mrs. De Pui hadn't believed her story. Hadn't believed her.... "One more try, Cecilia, although you are a great trial both to me and my pupils," echoed through her brain in Mrs. De Pui's cold tones. Cecilia sat upright on the bed. "My heart's right," she said aloud. "I believe it's better than Annette's. Don't that count for nothing? Ain't being kind being a lady?" She stared sullenly across the room. The white furniture glittered coldly. From between the flutter of scrim curtains she saw a painfully well arranged park. Even the trees were smugly superior.

"Gawd _was_ in that flat," she said, and again aloud. A sentence came to her mind. A sentence that is shopworn and has been on the top shelf for many years. "I guess Gawd is what I feel fer paw,--" she said, half musingly,--"Love. An' fer Johnny, even when he's bad, an' Father McGowan, dear, an' Norah. Just that." ... She looked out of the window and saw the painfully well regulated trees again. "Them trees ain't so bad," she stated; "at least they ain't when I remember that they love me at home." Her face changed, for she remembered some of Mrs. De Pui's well-aimed truths. Her father,--his difference. It should always be hers, too, she decided.

Her first touch of hate came. "Gawd, make me a lady quick!" she implored. Some one tapped on the door. Cecilia opened it. Annie was there, beaming. She held a long box with stems sticking out of one end of it. "Fer you, dearie," said Annie. Cecilia opened the box with trembling hands. The box held pink roses, very, very pink roses.... On the top lay a card. On it was written in a loose, boy-hand: "For little 'A-good-deal-of-whipped-cream-on-top.'" Cecilia stared at the card, breathless.

"Annie," she-said at last, "ain't they lovely?"

"Aren't, dearie," corrected Annie, and then added, "You bet they are! You bet!" Cecilia lifted them reverently. There were three dozens of them. Her years were such that numbers and prices still counted.

"Who shall I tell _her_ they're from?" asked Annie. "Yuh got her goat, yuh know."

"Father McGowan," answered Cecilia. Suddenly the guilt of the other lie, her shame over the act unthinkable, and her new realisation of the standing of those she loved, slid from her soul. She was wildly happy. She hugged Annie.

The white furniture didn't glitter coldly. It smiled. A crowded flat was far away. The trees in a smug park were beautiful.

"One new frock," read Father McGowan, "twenty-five dollars. Hat, fifteen. 'Madam Girard's skin food, and wrinkle remover,' two dollars and fifty cents. Flat-heeled shoes, seven dollars. Taxi, one dollar and fifty-two cents. Church offering, ten cents."

Father McGowan threw back his head, and laughed loudly. Jeremiah Madden looked on him, bewildered.

"It's her cash account, yuh know. Twenty-five dollars fer one dress," he mused, with a pleased smile. "_Ain't_ she learnin' quick? But the letter," he added, with a perplexed frown appearing, "it sounds _too_ happy. The happiness is a little _too_ thick. Smells like she put it on with a paint brush jest fer show."

"Hum----" grunted Father McGowan.

He opened a pink letter sheet. At the top of it a daisy was engraved. "I give her that paper," said Jeremiah proudly. "She _was_ tickled. She sez as how none of the girls in school had nothing like it."

"I believe it," replied Father McGowan. There were heavy lines in his face. Cecilia's heart-ache lay on his shoulders, he felt, for he had made the "Brick King."

"Darling Papa:" read Father McGowan, "I was so happy to hear from you. I read your letters over and over. I love you very much. I am learning that that is the biggest thing in the world, loving people, and having them love you. I miss you, but of course I am happy.

"The School is elegant very nice, and I get enough to eat. The view from the front windows is swell beautiful. It looks right out on the Park, all over fancy foliage and rich people walking around. I sometimes walk there, and one little girl, awfully cute, with bare legs and a nurse, likes me. Yesterday she threw a kiss to me. She looked like Johnny when he was little, and we lived in the flat. It made me want to cry.

"I am very happy. You do so much for me. I will be very happy when I can come home to you and Johnny, and we can have Father McGowan to supper dinner every Saturday night. I am sending some things that look like fruit knives, but which are butter spreaders, and are used to apply butter to bread, etc. (i.e., not to eat off of).

"I am very happy. I went to one party in an exclusive girl's room. It was kind of her to ask me. I love you so much, Papa. Please kiss Johnny for me, and Norah. Tell her to use the butter spreaders daily. (_All_ the time.)

"She need not cherish the blue glass butter dish any more.

"I do love you, dear Papa. Your,

"CECILIA."

"P.S.: I send my respectful regards to Father McGowan, and thanks for getting me into this exclusive School, which caters only to sophisticated people with money.

"C."

"Well?" asked Jeremiah, after Father McGowan had laid down a pink sheet of paper with an engraved daisy at the top. "Well?"

"Hum," grunted Father McGowan, "Hum!" He stared long at a brick which lay on the top shelf of a gilt cabinet. "I'm going up to Boston," he said at length. "I'll look in on our little Cecilia."

"Will yuh, now?" asked Jeremiah. "It's kept me awake nights, thinkin' that mebbe in spite of all the expense, she wasn't happy. I wanted to go up, but Johnny sez I wasn't suitable fer a girls' school, being as I remove my collar absent-minded like (having always did it)."

"You're suitable, all right," said Father McGowan, "but since I am going up, I might as well attend to it. Hard for you to leave business, too."

"Yes," admitted Jeremiah happily. He swelled and cast a loving eye toward the brick. Then he wilted. The proud pleasure was gone. "_She_ always wanted a bunnit with pink roses on," he said in a low voice, "an' I couldn't never buy her none, an' now----!"

Father McGowan laid a hand on Jeremiah's. "There, there, Jerry!" he said. "Think how happy you're making the children!"

A sallow boy came in. He cast a sneering look at a limp figure in a gilt chair. Then, without a word, he picked up a book and went out.

Jeremiah's eyes were like a child's--the eyes of a frightened child. "Sometimes," he said in a whisper, "I'm afraid he's _ashamed_ of me!"

"No!" exploded Father McGowan, "No!"

There is nothing like the scorn of the undetected guilty for those who are exposed. Cecilia was treated to fine scorn, supercilious looks, and, worst of all, a chill overlooking; for she had allowed a boy whom she'd never met to buy her a soda water and a pink sundae! And,--what made the offence doubly revolting?--was the fact that the boy was considered by the girls a man, and that those who had seen him termed him "_Ravishing_, my dear!" He,--but let us quote: "Simply _Rav_ishing, my dear, with dark eyes and hair. _Hon_estly, he looked as if he had a secret sorrow, or was on the stage, or was _fear_fully fast. Something wonderfully interesting about him, you know. Why he would _ever_ look at _her_, I can't see,----" etc.

Cecilia sat in the corner of the shabby-impressive room. She was reading "Sordello" because it was required by the English teacher. Cecilia wasn't a bit interested, and twice the book had slipped shut, and she hadn't known at all where she'd left off, which was annoying; she was afraid she might read one page twice, and she couldn't bear the idea of that. She wondered if this Browning person could have made a success at manufacturing bricks? She judged not. He didn't seem practical, but inwardly she was sure that he could have done anything better than write poetry. She really wondered quite a little bit about him, but after the laughter of the class on her question: "Is Mr. Browning an American or does he come from the Old Country?" she had ceased to voice her speculations.

She turned the pages fretfully. There were a great many more. She hoped that Mr. Browning was dead, so that he wouldn't write any more stuff that they would be required to read. Then she berated herself soundly for this unholy wish.

Annette Twombly and a girl with tawny hair and green eyes came in. When they saw Cecilia they raised their eyebrows.

"There seems to be _no_ privacy in this place!" said Annette. Cecilia turned a page.

"And what is worse, my dear," answered the green-eyed, "one is constantly called upon to meet persons socially inferior--the kind suitable to the kitchen and associating with the policeman."

Cecilia had turned another page, but she had not read it. The print was jumping dangerously from the quick pump of her heart. "I will not move," she thought. "I will not move, nor show them that I hear."

"Imagine allowing an unknown man to buy you sodas!" said Annette, who was looking out of the window. "Isn't it utterly _hope_less?"

There was a pained silence. The hopelessness of it had evidently eaten deeply into the systems of Annette and the green-eyed.

"Milk, an' sugar, if yuh have it," mimicked the green-eyed. She scored her point. Cecilia's book closed. She got up quickly and went toward the door. There she paused with her hand on the jamb. "I hope it pleases you to make me so unhappy," she said quietly, "for otherwise I don't know what you are accomplishing." Then she went upstairs to an always lonely room. She closed the door gently and lay across the bed, staring at the ceiling. She never cried any more. She reached beneath the pillow. Her cold and moist little hand closed about the letter of a brick king.

"I love you!" she whispered fiercely. "I shall make you proud of me, but Maw, I'm glad you died before the roses came! I'm glad! I'm glad! ... They have so _many_ thorns!"

The young ladies downstairs didn't giggle as usual. They avoided each other's eyes. At last Annette said, "Upstart! How dared she speak to me that way!" It was said in an effort to reinstate her superior right to exercise the rack. The green-eyed didn't answer. She looked out of the window. At last she said carelessly, "Going to dress." And Annette was not invited to her room.

The green-eyed stood still just inside her door. She thought of a fat father, and of his code of morals. The mother whom her eyes came from was very distant.

"It has been utterly devilish!" she said loudly. "Utterly. And I did it while I read 'The Mob,' and ranted over it." Then she threw a book across the room, which spelled emotional crisis for her temperament and, this time, reform. Her green eyes were full of healthily ashamed tears.

CHAPTER VI

A HINT OF PINK

Cecilia sat well forward in the parquet seats of an opera house in Boston. Her small hand was curled up in the fat palm of a fat priest. The people who saw this smiled indulgently, then looked again; for the little girl was so pretty, and so happy, and the man's face was unusual.

The curtain had not gone up. They were a good fifteen minutes early.

"You see, Father McGowan-dear," said Cecilia, "it was not just their fault, for I am so different. I am still, but less so.... Then one day they said more than usual while I was reading that Sordello poem. (It isn't interesting, is it?)" Father McGowan smiled and shook his head. "And I thought I just couldn't stand it. I was so miserable that I even thought of taking the veil!" Father McGowan laughed suddenly. Cecilia looked at him with questioning eyes. "Go on, dear," he said gently, "and excuse a bad-mannered old priest."

She squeezed his thumb and continued: "Well, it was that day I decided to go home. I decided I could not be a lady, I mean I could not acquire a _savoir faire_ (that means a natural swellness)," explained Cecilia. Father McGowan nodded. His eyes twinkled. "So," said Cecilia, "I took all my money, and put on my hat and sneaked out. Then I walked down the block and across the Park. I saw a baby in the Park, a little girl, and she makes me think of Johnny when he was little and I took care of him. Then I thought of maw, and how she wanted me learned, I mean taught, and I went back. I am not very brave, and I wanted to cry dreadfully. I got in the hall, and there was Mrs. De Pui. She looked awfully cold, and she said, 'May I ask where you have been, Cecilia?' and then, that green-eyed girl I hated broke right in and said, 'I had a slight headache, and I asked her to post a letter for me, Mrs. De Pui. I _hope_ you don't mind.' The green-eyed girl is very rich, and so Mrs. De Pui said so sweetly that she hadn't minded at all.

"She always says 'post' instead of 'mail,' Father McGowan-dear. She spent two weeks in London last summer, and she said that the English accent became unconscious, or at least that she used it unconsciously. And she does except when she gets excited or talks fast.

"Well, she followed me upstairs, the green-eyed one, her name is Marjory, and I said, 'I do thank you.' Then I felt mean about the way I'd felt toward her, and I added, 'I am very sorry that I have hated you so.' Then she kissed me, Father McGowan-dear. Really, she did, and she said she was _glad_ I'd hated her. That it helped. She went down the hall, and paused at the turn to say, 'It is a great deal to ask, but some day I hope you'll like me!' Oh,--the curtain's going up! Look at that yellow dress. Aren't her legs _beautiful_? Mine are _so_ skinny!"

There was a burst of music, and the chorus waved their arms with the regularity of the twist of aspen leaves, when rain is coming.

Cecilia gasped. Then she sat breathless, watching every motion on the stage. A fat priest sat looking down at her. Once he took off his glasses and polished them. Something was making them misty.

The curtain went down. Cecilia gasped again, then she told of the awful, humiliating sick-cat episode, and of her disgrace in accepting a "choclut soda," and a pink sundae with whipped cream on top. Father McGowan was very understanding. He did not think it was a sin. In fact he was quite violently sure it was not. He grew very red in the face.

"What is the matter with that woman?" he asked in an entirely new, and really horribly stern tone. Cecilia didn't answer. Her startled eyes recalled him. "By George!" he said. "I forgot the candy!" and he produced from a coat pocket the most beautiful box.

"_Oh_," said Cecilia, "oh!" She smiled up into Father McGowan's face, and then added, "I can put that ribbon in a chemise. Oh, dear Father McGowan!"

"What is a priest to do," asked Father McGowan, "when all his inclinations are to kiss a young lady's hand?"

"I am so happy!" said Cecilia. Father McGowan put his other hand on the small one that lay in his. Cecilia tightened her little fingers about his thumb.

Father McGowan pushed away his plate. The chops were underdone, the potatoes soggy.

"Here's yer coffee," said Mrs. Fry. She was a perfect person for the housekeeper of a priest, being so visited with warts and a lemon expression that questioning her morals was impossible. Father McGowan stirred the coffee, then took a sip. He sighed. "Well,", he thought, "at least it makes fasting easier!"

In the hall of the rectory were twelve people. They were all shabby, and a boy of eleven sniffed with a wonderful regularity. They were all waiting to see a fat priest. A girl with sullen eyes and once pretty face looked around with defiant assurance. Opposite her on the wall hung a carved wood crucifix. When her eyes met that, she shrank, and then she'd look away, and again be sullenly brazen.

A well-dressed man rang the bell. The warted housekeeper answered it.

"I should like to see Father McGowan," he said. "I will only need a few moments of his time," he added on seeing the people waiting.

"Set down," ordered Mrs. Fry. "You'll have to wait yer turn." The man smiled. He was faintly amused. "I hardly think so," he said; "I am Doctor Van Dorn. My time is rather valuable. I can hardly waste it in that way."

"It's his rule," said Mrs. Fry, nodding her head toward the rear of the hall. "All who waits is the same. Yuh waits yer turn, or yuh goes. _He_ don't care." She had fixed her eyes above the man's head with all her words. He looked on her, frowning deeply, then said with an unconcealed irritation showing in his voice: "Will you at least take him my card?"

Mrs. Fry nodded. She held out a palm that looked damp, then went down the hall, reading the card as she walked. "He needn't be so smart," she made mental comment. "_Here_ he ain't no better than none of the rest." She went toward the table at which Father McGowan sat and shoved the card toward him. "He wants to see yuh right off, _now_," she said.

Father McGowan picked up the card, read it, and then laid it aside. "Tell him the rules," he said shortly. He turned back to a page of pink letter paper, with a daisy engraved on its top. He glanced from it to the clock. He still had twenty minutes before work began.

"Dearest Father McGowan, dear:" was written on the pink sheet. It was crossed out and below it was written, "Respected Father:--(I meant the first, but I suppose this is properer.) I can't tell you how happy you made me by the play and everything. I have put the pink ribbon in a chemise where it looks decorative, and cheers me up, as I like pink ribbons in underwear, although white are better taste. I am much happier. I am not _always_ happy, but do not tell Papa, nor any one that I am not. I _am_ much happier than I was.

"I apologise for clinging to you and kissing your hand good-bye when you left, but I am not sorry. It was very hard to let you go. Pink roses seemed _all_ thorns just then."

Father McGowan stopped reading. He looked across the room with far eyes. They were surrounded by fat wrinkles, and made small by thick lenses, but they were rather beautiful.

"I wanted to do as you suggested and try another school," he read, "but I somehow feel that I must finish what I've started, and I would like to show these girls that my soul is not purple silk trimmed with green velvet, if you can understand that; they seem to judge everything by rhinestone hair-pins, which is not a real clue to character.

"When you go to dinner with Papa, see that Norah uses the butter spreaders, which are small knives shaped like fruit knives. I will be deeply grateful. They are used for buttering bread, and so on (not to eat from).

"We are studying art. Andrea Dalsartoe, who painted the Madona of the Chair, just now. Marjory is so kind to me. She is an Episcopal but nice in every other way. They say a prayer to themselves when they go into church, too. She says, 'Peanuts, popcorn, and chewing gum, amen,' which I do not think is _very_ devout. She says it is just the right length when said _slowly_.

"You did make me so happy by that play and the candy. I have never had a better time but once, after which I was disgraced and sorry. (I had not met him socially, you know, which made it improper to eat sundaes with him, even while on an errand of mercy to a sick and dying cat.)

"We hear an orchestra every Saturday, chaperoned by our English teacher, who has asthma horribly and splutters a great deal. The music is classical and improving. I do not enjoy it very much, but there is a man in the orchestra who has an Adam's apple that wiggles and he helps me. One can always find enjoyment when looking for it, can't one? He plays a horn, and blows the spit from it often. He seems to have a great deal of spit.

"I have not thanked you the way I wanted to for the play, and everything, not forgetting the taxi ride and the sundae afterward. I do love you, Father McGowan, dear. I believe if there were more priests who believed in God, _and_ pink boxes of candy, there would be more Christians.

"Most respectfully, and lovingly, "CECILIA."

The clock struck one. Father McGowan folded up a pink sheet, and put it, in its envelope, in his pocket.

He was smiling gently. He opened the door into the hall, and the people struggled tiredly to their feet.

"Pax Tibi!" he said with a hand above his head. A girl with sullen eyes sobbed aloud. A Doctor sneered.

Much later the Doctor was admitted to a rather bare room, made tolerable by the colours of the books which lined its walls. The priest sat behind a table. They exchanged the usual formalities, then Father McGowan said: "Well?" Doctor Van Dorn shifted uneasily. "It is difficult to explain," he said. "I don't know just how to put it, but I thought you, if any one, could help me."

"I shall do all in my power to help you, if I think you need help," answered Father McGowan. The Doctor picked up a paper knife. He toyed with it, then blurted out: "I feel sure that there must be some reason for it, and that he's merely doing it from some evil wish."

"Who? Doing what?" asked Father McGowan.

The Doctor looked silly and laughed uneasily. "I'm not very coherent," he said.

"Oh, well," said Father McGowan, "we're both doctors in a way. We both meet that enough to understand it. Now take your time and tell me your story in your own way." He pushed a box of cigars across the table. "Want to smoke?" he asked with the move. The Doctor nodded and lit a cigar.

"It concerns a man named Madden," he said, "who, I have found, is one of your people. I have no proof, at least of the tangible sort, but I believe he is doing all he can to ruin me.... He is succeeding fairly well, too."

"Well, well," said Father McGowan. "Now what's he doing?"

"It began," said the Doctor, "with my hospital, which you know is a private affair, and in which some of my fellow doctors, with me, do some experimental work. The most of my clientele consists of the rather more well-known people of this city, as you know."

Father McGowan nodded. The Doctor's voice was as usual, and he began to swell a bit, with the tale of his hospital and its clientele.

"I rarely take charity work," said the Doctor. "All New York is after me...." Suddenly his face changed. "Was after me," he corrected. He studied the end of his cigar. "I did take one small chap," he went on slowly, "a charity case. He interested me. The complications were most unusual; however, you would not understand about them, and they do not influence the tale. I took him in and gave him the best of care, even to giving him a hundred-dollar room and an especial nurse. (His case was most interesting.) Well, as you know, the action of the muscles and organs is changed by anesthesia. I--ah,--I did but the slightest experimental work, keeping him well-fed, you know, and in this hundred-dollar-a-week room. The best of care, as I explained. He,--ah,--himself submitted to this slight pain when I told him that after it he would run and play as other boys. He had a natural, childish desire to run and play. Quite natural, I suppose."

"I suppose so," said Father McGowan. His tone was dry. His expression was very different from that which he had worn while reading the pink letter sheet.

"Then one day when a slight,--very slight, I assure you,--operation was absolutely necessary to his getting well, he said he would not, could not endure it. He had been quite weakened by his being in bed, and so on, but he screamed wildly. What he said was most improper and very ungrateful. He turned against us suddenly, as is the way of some when diseased." The Doctor stopped. He had grown rather white. He was again in a hundred-dollar room, which had a slat door, and no way to keep the voice of a frenzied

charity patient from the rest of his aristocratic hospital. He heard the voice again: "Gawd, no, youse devils! ... Youse are killing me! Lemme die! Oh, Mister, don't strap me down! I can't stand it no more.... Don't--don't! Christ ... Christ ... Kill me, but don't----"

The Doctor moistened his lips, and came back to the bare room in St. Mary's Rectory. "He was most ungrateful," he said to Father McGowan, "and he bit my hand when I tried to silence him." Father McGowan was looking out of the window. The Doctor went on less surely. "A woman who scrubbed the floors heard this, and, as is the way with her class, got emotionally aroused. It seems she lived in a tenement, and had lived there when Jeremiah Madden had lived across the hall, before he made his money. She went to see him. He removed the lad from my care, and with his malicious help, lied viciously about me and my work, scattering statements broadcast, and giving their statements to the papers. My own profession do not largely back me up, being, I suppose, jealous, and of little spirit. I think they recognise my skill too well to love me. You read those articles?" he asked, turning to Father McGowan.

"That has nothing to do with your narrative," answered Father McGowan. "Please go on."

"Well," said the Doctor, his well-bred voice holding a hint of frost, "it,--that is, this malicious attack,--had prejudiced many. For the good of this Madden man's soul you should help him to be truthful, not to so belittle his nature by----"

"You're worried about his soul?" said Father McGowan. "Is _that_ why you came to me?" Father McGowan smiled. The Doctor shifted in his chair. There was the staccato tap of crutches on the bare floor of the hall. The knob of the door turned.

"Father," came in a small boy's voice from the doorway, "I brung yuh a toad. I want youse to bless it. It's dead. It was a cripple, too. I found it all mashed. You'll bless it? Me an' the fellers is going to bury it. _Ain't_ it cute?"

The Doctor had not turned.

"Come in, little Saint Sebastian," said Father McGowan. The little boy gave him a look that was pathetically adoring. His crutches tapped across the bare floor. Opposite the Doctor, he looked at him. Suddenly he screamed.

"Gawd! My Gawd! Oh, Father McGowan,--_don't_--let him have me!" He clung to Father McGowan's cassock as he sobbed out his broken prayer. "Don't, Mister, don't!" he ended weakly. Father McGowan picked him up. He looked at the Doctor.

"Go," he said.

Father McGowan again settled back of a bare table. A little boy sobbed in his arms. "Will you forgive me, little Saint Sebastian?" asked Father McGowan. The child's arms tightened around his neck. Father McGowan coughed.

"We're going to have some pink ice cream," he said after an interval. "Now here's my hanky. Gentlemen don't wipe their noses on their sleeves!"

"Will--will yuh bless the toad?" asked the child, after a damp smearing of Father McGowan's handkerchief. "He was a cripple. _Ain't_ he cute, now?" he added in a tender, little voice. Then he brightened and said loudly, "But I'm glad he's dead, for they ain't no Father McGowan toads to be good to little toad-cripples!"

Father McGowan coughed, and tightened his arms about Sebastiano Santo of the slums.

"Oh, dearest Paw--I mean Papa!" said Cecilia. She clung to him. The lights of the New York station blurred through her tears. Then she veered away from him, and gathered Johnny close.

"Aw," he said, "cut it! There's one of the fellows over there." But "one of the fellows" faced the other direction, Johnny saw, and he allowed himself to hug Celie quickly. He was glad to see her, but he felt a vague resentment toward her because her coming made his throat so stuffy. He remembered the time when he used to sit on her lap and eat bread spread thickly with molasses. He didn't know quite why he was thinking of it in the Pennsylvania Station.... He remembered that he used to pull her curls and that she'd pretend to cry and then kiss him, and then they'd both laugh, and laugh. It was always a great joke. And then she'd look at the clock and fry potatoes and meat over a smelly stove, and say, "Now laugh! Paw's coming home. He needs all our laughs!"

"John dear!" said Cecilia. Johnny forgot the past, and swelled. Cecilia's use of his name made him feel a man.

"Mister, will yuh please attend to this here baggage?" he heard his father say.

"Don't call him 'Mister,'" he corrected Jeremiah in an undertone. Cecilia stepped from them to a group nearby.

"Good-bye, Marjory," John heard her say. "Yes, I _will_ come to see you. You'll come to my house, too?" She turned to a rather more cool looking young person, and added less surely, "I would love to have you, too, Miss Annette, if you'd care to come."

"I'm rather busy----" John heard the Annette person reply. Then he saw her turn away from Cecilia. His heart grew hot. "If I don't see you again," said Cecilia, "I wish you the happiest kind of a Christmas!" Annette did not reply. The Marjory girl kissed Cecilia twice. "Good-bye, little Saint," she called after Cecilia. "I'm coming to see you to-morrow!"

In the motor there was a pause for inspection. "Yuh look so different," said Jeremiah rather wistfully.

"My heart is just the same," said Cecilia. "It will always be the same." She kissed Jeremiah Madden after her words and then leaned forward and kissed Johnny. He didn't mind, none of the fellows being present. Then they were silent, for when hearts are very full they are liable to wiggle up into throats and choke people when they try to talk. At last they were out of the crowded streets and on broad ones, where other cars, taking people pleasure-bent, rolled past them.

Then the house. The house from which Cecilia had gone last September, wearing a suit all over buttons, with a touch of "tasty" red here and there.

"Norah, darling Norah!" said Cecilia. Norah's red arms drew her close, then, quite in Norah's way, she eclipsed behind a blue-checked apron, and sobbed loudly. Cecilia looked about the hall. There was some new furniture. A hat-rack that was evidently the work of a lunatic with the unrestrained use of a jig-saw.

"Look up, Celie!" ordered Jeremiah. Cecilia looked up. Strung across the hall was an elaborate electric sign. The words were made of blue, yellow and red globes. She read: "Welcome to our Darling!!!" Cecilia gasped. Then she turned to her father. "It is beautiful," she said, "and just what I wanted." She stopped and swallowed with difficulty. Then added, "Papa dear, I love you so!" Johnny smiled. He raised his eyebrows and his shoulders. Then he sniffed. He thought he smelled the scent of roses.

CHAPTER VII

SANTA CLAUS

Father McGowan, holding a cassock high about his black-clad legs, stood in the back yard of the rectory grounds. The back yard looked like those photographs entitled, "Rude shelters for the soldiers," or "Huts built by the South Australian Light Horse Brigade."

All over the brown lawn were small shacks. Some of them made of brick, some of old and weather-beaten boards, and some of these two with a smattering of very ex and sticky roofing mixed in. Father McGowan smiled. Mrs. Fry looked out of the window. Her lips tightened.

A small boy emerged from one of these affairs. Emerged on his stomach, wiggling out.

"Father McGowan," he yelled, "we got a secret passage!"

"No!" said Father McGowan enthusiastically, "No!"

Another door opened. Another boy came wiggling forth. "_We_ got a secret place to hide things in, in ours!" he said in a sing-song, mine-is-better-than-yours tone.

"Aw----!" said the first disparagingly.

Father McGowan laughed. A boy came swaggering across the lawn. He whistled, "In My Harem." He touched his hat to the priest.

"I'm going to get a case of pop," he said loudly, "an' drink it here. Mom, she gimme a candle, and Pop sez I can stay out 'til nine." After this he was instantly the centre of an awed and admiring group.

Mrs. Fry opened the door. "The 'phone wants yuh," she said shortly to Father McGowan. Father McGowan went in with evident reluctance. He wanted to hear more of the case of pop, which he knew would narrow down to two bottles.

After he'd passed through the kitchen, Mrs. Fry spoke again to her sister who sat steaming by the stove. "_He's_ like that," she said, a great love, yet vast contempt, showing in her tone. "He lets all the kids around build shacks in the backyard, and even gets 'em stuff to build with!"

"What fer?" asked the steaming one. Her bewilderment was complete.

"Oh," said Mrs. Fry, "he sez something about its bein' necessary to a boy's soul to build something and tear it down. An' pretend things that ain't. One day they calls that mess of rubbish the wilds of Sieberia, an' the next an Indian camp. An' _he_, he gets right out an' chases around with 'em. He's busted his glasses twice this month." Mrs. Fry sighed. "I kicks," she went on, "and then he sez, 'Mrs. Fry, I'm sorry, but the fact is, an aunt brought me up, awfully good woman, too, but too neat. I never pounded, and a boy needs to pound.' Then he sez, 'Now if there is anything you need for the kitchen that I can get you, Mrs. Fry, I'd be glad to.' An' what can I do? I lead an awful life because of them young rapscallions, but _he_ can't see it!"

"Well, I'll be beat!"

Mrs. Fry poured out a cup of coffee and pushed it toward her guest. "Ain't sugar high?" she said as she dumped in two lumps.

"You bet," answered her guest. "Does _he_ set and study much?" she questioned. _He_ was very interesting. Mrs. Fry drew a long breath. "He don't get no time to set," she answered. "He hardly has a chance to eat half the time besides being pestered by them kids. I never know when he'll be on time for meals. Did I tell yuh about the bath-tub?" she questioned.

The steaming shook her head.

"_It has two ally-gaters in it!_" said Mrs. Fry with emphasis.

"My Gawd!"

"Yes, one of these here kids got 'em sent him from Florida, or some furrin port, an' his mother, being a sensible woman, wouldn't have 'em near. Well, the kid comes bawlin' to Father McGowan (they always do), an' he sez, 'Now, Jimmy, don't cry. You can put 'em in my bath-tub; I only bathe once a day, and I can use a tin one. Mrs. Fry has her own bath-tub on the third floor, so she won't care.' I did, but what kin yuh do? I sez, 'I won't enter that room with them rep_tiles_ in it fer to clean it.' He sez, troubled like, 'Well, Mrs. Fry, I'll do it, or get one of the boys to. I don't mind.' Them kids messing around there. Can yuh see the way _they'd_ clean it!"

"Ain't that fierce?"

"Yes, an' he don't care so much fer it, either. He sez he _could_ hope they'd die or summer'd come. (We're going to have a pond in the backyard--to run into the cellar!) Yuh oughta see that room after he's bathed in that there tin tub. All that's missin' is Noah and Shem--we got the animiles."

There was the click of crutches in the dining room. The door opened. A small boy appeared.

"Come in, dearie," said Mrs. Fry. Her tone was softened.

"What's his name?" asked the visitor.

"He don't know," answered Mrs. Fry. "He was in the hospital one time, real sick, and lately he don't remember so good. 'Father McGowan calls him 'Sebastiano.' Want a cooky, dearie?" The boy nodded, and smiled.

Cecilia had had her friend Marjory to lunch. It had gone rather well. She recalled it as she stood looking out of a heavily glassed window into a frosted street. She, herself, had set the table. The napkins had not been set up in tumblers. The fibroid tumor vase was quite absent. There had been valley lilies in a flat bowl for the centrepiece.... She had disposed of the blue glass butter dish by dropping it. Cecilia felt strangely sad as she did it. The blue glass butter dish had once seemed so very lovely.... "Are they giving me anything to take your place?" she questioned, as it shattered on the floor. Then she called Norah, and listened to her laments as she gathered up the pieces. She had the feeling of untruth added to her little sadness.

As yet nothing had taken the place of blue glass butter dishes for small Cecilia. She still preferred rhinestone hair-pins, and French-heeled shoes to their plainer sisters. Beauty had been taken away and none substituted, at least none that she enjoyed. The only thing she really cared for was the dragging of her newly acquired French in her talk. She did this often with the proud feeling that it was what her mother had wished.

Jeremiah had said, on meeting Marjory, "Pleased to meet yuh, mam," and Cecilia had broken in with, "I love papa so much, Marjory, you must too." She had hardly known why she had made this defiant and sudden declaration. Johnny had been much impressed with Cecilia's guest. So much so that his misery was acute when Jeremiah related the incident of the brick throwing.

"I sez to him, 'Yuh can lay yer own bricks an' here's one to begin with!'" Jeremiah had said with his customary chuckle, that chuckle that always came with his proud remembrance.

"I think that was exceedingly clever of you, Mr. Madden," Marjory had replied. Cecilia had smiled on Marjory with the smile of an angel, she had also laid her hand on her father's. Johnny had squirmed.

Cecilia gazed out of the window. The air looked cold. She wondered whether she would ever get the chance to thank that Mr. Keefer Stuyvesant Twombly for those lovely flowers? They had come just at the right time. He was wonderful, as the girls said, and "ravishing," but better, he was nice. There was a scuffle at the door, Norah's voice was heard: "Now mind the _eee_-lectric sign!" she said sharply. Cecilia knew that the tree was coming in.

Late that evening Jeremiah opened the door of the pink and gold "parlour."

"Santa Claus has been here and went," he said mysteriously to Cecilia and Johnny, who sat on the stairs, "an' he's did good by yuh!"

"Now remember!" said Cecilia to Johnny, with a stern look. Johnny had been told that his disbelief in Santa Claus was not to be expressed. They scrambled up. Cecilia stopped in the door. The tree was a mass of silver and glittering lights. It was really very lovely. Mr. Madden's tastes were well suited to trimming a Christmas tree.

"Showy like, an' nothing cheap or old lookin'!" he said, as he surveyed it with proud eyes. Cecilia went toward a table on which her gifts were spread out. First, she saw a phonograph with a morning glory horn.... By it was a pink velvet box, strapped in silver. "Jewels," was written in a neat, spencerian engraving on one spot of the silver banding. There was a mother of pearl brush and comb and glass, bound in wiggly gold.

"They are lovely, Papa!" said Cecilia. "And _just_ what I wanted!"

"Looka here!" whispered Jeremiah. He pulled her toward the light the tree threw and took from his pocket a small box. He opened it slowly. Cecilia saw a chain and pendant that would have made a very good showing on the Christmas tree itself. It was plainly built for one of the rhinoceros family. It had seemed to dislike showing any partiality in gems. There was a fair smattering of all jewels present.

"Three hunderd dollars!" breathed Jeremiah Madden. His eyes shone, and he breathed quickly. "Celie," he said, "it ain't too good fer yuh! There ain't nothing I wouldn't do fer yuh!"

"I know, dear," answered the small Cecilia, "but you shouldn't. It is too much. You have made me very happy." She turned away. There was a sudden smarting beneath her eyelids.... She hated the school that had taught her a quiet manner, and to see blue glass butter dishes as a visitation rather than a glory.

"That ain't _all_!" said Jeremiah. He took hold of her arm, and led her to the other side of the room. "Throw on the lights, Johnny!" he called loudly. Cecilia felt him tremble. The lights snapped on with a too white glare. Jeremiah and Cecilia stood before a picture over which was thrown a cloth. Jeremiah drew it aside.

"It was did from a tintype," said Jeremiah softly. He looked on the face of his Irish wife. Her lips were painted a brazen carmine. Her cheeks glowed like the stage ladies' of the billboards. Around her neck were three ropes of huge pearls.

"He threw in the pearls," explained Jeremiah in a voice that shook a little, "an' fancied her up some, but them eyes,--it's your maw, Celie. Your maw that died in a two-room flat." With the last words Jeremiah had turned away. His shoulders had a limp droop. The happiness of the evening had faded.

"What's in this box?" asked Cecilia, unsteadily. It was a hat box and stood beneath the new portrait.

"Her present," answered Jeremiah. "The present I give her. Look at it, Celie. Ain't it pretty? I picked it."

Cecilia opened the box. She drew out a large, flopping hat. It was trimmed with pink roses.

The next day when Father McGowan was all ready to start for the Madden house, there was commotion in the wilds of _Sie_beria. It had been reported the day before that one of the "guys" had smoked a Piedmont, and Father McGowan, finding this so, had had

to dust him mildly with a hickory cane, hung on the back porch for that purpose.

He disliked doing this, and smoked for a good hour afterward to soothe his nerves. Mrs. Fry had watched the chastising with pleased eyes, but then, on going to the bathroom, all happiness had vanished, for one of them rep_tiles_ had crawled out of the tub. She had dropped her scrubbing cloths, and disappeared screaming.

Father McGowan had been all ready to start. He had found his hat (which had the most mysterious way of disappearing), and with an ashamed expression, he'd put a small box in his pocket.

Then the wilds of _Sie_beria had demanded attention.

"Them young devils," Mrs. Fry had said, with a bob of her head backward. "They are raising Cain! Something's wrong." She went off muttering. She still cherished and resented the encounter with the rep_tile_. Father McGowan went toward _Sie_beria. It was one of the few times in his life that he hadn't wanted to.

"_Now_ what?" he called from the back porch. A scream was the only answer. It came from one of the brick dwellings. The chastised of yesterday, Father McGowan saw going quickly over the fence.

"Oh, drat!" said Father McGowan. There were wilder howls from the brick mansion. Father McGowan went toward it. He looked for the door, then he chuckled softly, for the door was entirely gone. He took off his gloves and began to pull out the bricks.

"Walled in," he muttered.

"Lemme out! Lemme out!" came from within, in muffled tones. Then with the opening Father McGowan had made, and with the advent of light, the screams dissolved into pathetic sobs.

"When I git him!" came in moist tones. A small boy wiggled out. He had a paper covered book in his hands. "He done it," explained the boy, between sniffs, "while I was a-readin' in the secret chamber. _He_ done it. When I git him! I'll smash him! I mighta starved!" he ended pathetically.

"Well," said Father McGowan, "that is a shame! Won't you come have a piece of pie now? You must be hungry."

The boy nodded. He followed Father McGowan toward the house. "He done it," he went on, "because I told on him fer smoking. I thought I _oughta_." The sufferer's tone was pious. "My nerves is shook up," he said when they reached the porch. "I was afraid I'd starve. There's pictures in our physiologies of starving Cubans--they ain't so nice.

"Mrs. Fry," said Father McGowan, "we do need a piece of pie. Could you find us some?" Mrs. Fry muttered and went to the refrigerator. Out on the back fence the chastised called, "Yi! Yi!" A note expressing scorn. He added, "Cry baby! Cry baby!" The cry baby turned and exhibited a piece of pie. The chastised relaxed into a pained silence.

"Come here!" called Father McGowan. The boy slid from the fence and came slinking toward him. "Mrs. Fry saw you smoking," said Father McGowan. "I never listen to what you tell of each other. Here's a piece of pie for you." He looked at his watch and added in a perfunctory way, "You shouldn't have walled him in."

"I ought to have given you a Rosary," said Father McGowan. He still looked guilty, but happily so. Cecilia stood before a mirror, looking at a dainty little chain and pendant, which she'd clasped about her throat.

"I know you ought, Father McGowan, dear," she answered, "but I'm _so_ glad you didn't! It's _so_ beautiful!"

She gasped happily. Father McGowan smiled. "Papa gave me one," she said. "It--it is, that is, I love it, but I'll wear this more." She looked into Father McGowan's understanding eyes.

"I am learning," she said, "but I learned things before I went to school that I shall never forget, and that I never want to forget."

Jeremiah came in.

"You give her that?" he asked in a pleased voice. "Well! But have you saw the one I give her? _Three_ hunderd dollars! Get it, Celie, and then play us 'The Shepherd Boy.'" Celie vanished.

White-clad nurses flitted about the halls of Jeremiah Madden's house. There was a dead silence, and upstairs that druggy-sick smell.

Cecilia had been very ill. She was better, but still sick enough to keep Jeremiah anxious. He hovered about the house almost forgetting bricks, and wearing a collar all the time, as he did on Sundays. It had begun with a cold, then a cough, which (through Celia's standing on the curb, better to view a gentleman down the street who was interestingly drunk) had turned to pneumonia on both sides.

She had gone to bed protesting that she felt very well, but that her breath was not acting quite right. Then she had grown so very, very sick that she had forgotten time, life and even Jeremiah of the bricks.

Those days had been rather dreadful for Jeremiah.... He had taken to sitting just outside her door on a very upright chair. He turned the pages of "Ridpath's History of the World." He was trying to "educate himself up to Celie." ... However, he missed a great many of the pictures and only got as far as Volume One.

Each time a trim nurse would step from Cecilia's door, he would cough to get his voice in shape, and then whisper gratingly: "Excuse me, Missis, but how is she?"

"She is doing well," the white one would answer, in a tone of thin sincerity. Then Jeremiah would go back to Ridpath, miserable, and unconvinced. Once in a while he would hear Cecilia's high, little voice--"Keefer, the butler!" she repeated again and again one day. She said it in gasps, but somehow got out the words. The effort in her voice had cut Jeremiah's heart, but the words had brought a proud smile.

"Associatin' with butlers!" he whispered. "_Ain't_ she gettin' fine?"

Then Cecilia moaned of butter dishes, blue ones. Jeremiah had left his post and Ridpath's History long enough to go shopping. He bought her three butter dishes. Two of them had covers. The third boasted of a curling handle, on which perched a dove and a cupid, on a spray of something that looked like spinach in the crude state. Cecilia had been very pleased with them. She had looked on them, said, "T-thank you, _dearest_!" and then cried gently, the tears slipping down her face with pathetic regularity. She cried all that afternoon.

"I'm not good enough for you!" she gasped, "but I love you, and butter dishes!"

CHAPTER VIII

A LITTLE TOUCH OF THE MAN WITH THE HOUR GLASS

Time had been careful with Father McGowan. Perhaps he thought Father McGowan rather nice as he was, and unneedful of the lines that usually come with heart and soul expansion. Be this as it may, the fact was that he was little changed. The lenses in his glasses were a bit thicker. He had accumulated a little more tummy in the last seven years, but he still played Indian and exile in _Sie_beria with the same joy, and he was still the true father to every child who knew him.

He sat behind a bare table in a room unbeautiful except for the books which lined its walls. He was looking over his mail. He laid one letter with a foreign postmark aside.

There was a tap on the door. A small boy of nine, or thereabout, came in, sobbing wildly. "My mom, she sez you're a _Catholic_!" he gasped between sobs. "Yuh ain't, are yuh?"

"I'm afraid so," answered Father McGowan. He looked very guilty.

"Oh, dear!" replied the small boy, and sobbed more loudly.

"Now, now!" said Father McGowan. "We can't _all_ be Methodists, you know. The church wouldn't hold 'em.". The child still sobbed. "I'll tell you," went on Father McGowan; "you pray that we'll all belong to one church in Heaven. You do that. Wouldn't that be nice?"

"Uh huh," agreed the boy with tempered enthusiasm. He smeared his tears across his face with his coat sleeve. They left white streaks. "I couldn't _believe_ you was a Catholic!" he said sadly. "You're so nice, and because of the pie and all." His face was long and his eyes melancholy.

"I'm sorry," said Father McGowan, "so sorry. How's Siberia to-day?" The child reported and then vanished to do his utmost in making a convert by prayer.

Father McGowan opened the rest of his mail, and then reached toward the letter of foreign stamp. He always kept the best 'til last.

"Dearest Father McGowan-dear:--" it began in a hand characteristic of many boarding schools, and yet showing a bit of individuality--"I have wanted to write you.... So many things to do that half the time all I get accomplished is my loving of you dear people, every day a little more, though more seems impossible. I love you, and Papa and John so much. So much that when I'm away from you, and think of you, I feel quite choked. It is rather beautiful, and terrible, this caring so deeply. I do not know how I could ever say good-bye."

There was a page of Cecilia's large scrawl. It contained no news, but Father McGowan read it closely. His eyes were the same as when, years before, he had looked on a table Cecilia had decorated in honour of a big, fat, Roman priest. Suddenly he laughed. "We have a small donkey," he had read, "whom we have named Clara, after the vicar's sister. Our donkey has long ears and a religious expression, too. The vicar's sister is really very nice, but our grey donkey looks so like her that we always expect her to stop in the middle of the road and talk of missionary barrels and Sunday School treats. The latter is a form of entertainment which contains much jam, tea, many pop-eyed little girls and boys, not to omit a large stickiness. (I went to one, and poured tea down Lord Somebody's neck. It was a great condescension for him to 'stop in,' and only the fact that I am of 'mad America' saved me from a public hanging.)

"Marjory and I have splendid times. I am so glad I am with her. It is nice for me, and I think for her. Mamma Aliston is one of those poor ladies who enjoys suffering. If she had lived where I did in my younger days, she would have said: 'I ain't feelin' so well. The doctor's give me three kinds of medicine. It's me _nerves_.' As this is not in order, she mutters of draughts, and places a pudgy and diamond-ringed hand above her heart many times a day, sighing expressively. Marjory has no sympathy with her. She only says, 'Don't eat that, Mamma; it is bad for you,' about anything Mamma enjoys. I am a beautiful buffer. (Please pardon the 'beautiful'; it refers to spirit.)

"The way those two people clash is utterly dreadful. I remember always, when I hear them, Saturday nights, years ago, when the gentlemen of our building used to tumble upstairs, very drunk, and I would then hear squawks and abuses. We are all the same, but people never realise it.... I laugh inside when they talk of 'lower classes.' I laugh but sometimes it hurts a little. I am ashamed, Father McGowan, that it should.... Coming home very soon. I want to give a man named Jeremiah Madden as many years of happiness as I can. I am coming home to play 'The Shepherd Boy' every evening after a lemon pie-ed dinner.

"Father McGowan-dear, I have been worried about John.... Here I see so many heavy-eyed boys slinking into manhood. Those boys who travel with their blindly indulgent mammas and leave a man at home, alone, across the seas.

"I think if my little brother should grow up to be viciously weak, I could not bear it. I cannot see how he could, for the blood in us is too plain for fancy wickedness. Rather ours would run to fierce encounter, and, if we must be truthful, flying dish-pans. But,--well, I've dreamed of him too often lately, and I remember that he may be stepping into manhood. I wish I were better fitted to be wise with him.... I have not liked his letters, Father McGowan. His estimate of people is made in the shadow of a dollar mark...." Father McGowan read another page. On the last was written: "So, I will see you very soon, dear (excuse the liberty, but you _are_ dear!), and I am ready to take up my burdens. Those that come with money. I hope to do much and learn to do it well. You will help me?

"I shall leave Marjory and her mother in this sleepy little village, shadowed by its Cathedral. The cross that has stood for peace through many years shines from its spire and seems to bring it here. It is so lovely, Father McGowan!

"Very much love from your always grateful and loving

"CECILIA."

"But, my dear!" said Mamma Aliston, "I could not _permit_ you to return alone! Could not permit it!"

"I'm sorry," answered Cecilia, "but I must go. I have my maid. I should not be really alone."

"I don't like the look of it," said Mrs. Aliston fretfully. Then, "_Is_ Clara going to sleep! Why you girls _insist_ on having her when you could motor smoothly with a footstool and cushions and all the windows closed,--Oh! My heart!" Cecilia turned a sympathetic eye toward Mrs. Aliston. "It is nothing, my dear," said Mrs. Aliston in answer to her look, "nothing to one who is _used_ to suffering. Oh,

dear, what a sorry thing this world is, when we are poorly equipped to meet it. Who was that who passed us? Not Lady Grenville-Bowers?"

Cecilia nodded and stopped Clara so that Mrs. Aliston could feast her eyes on the holy dust titles were kicking up. It was not Lady Grenville-Bowers, but Mrs. Aliston was happily unconscious of it, and Cecilia had learned the proper use of lies. After Mrs. Aliston again settled she went back to the original subject. "Let me see," she said, speculatively; "perhaps there will be some one crossing to whom it will be suitable to confide you. I dislike so intensely this running about alone,--my dear! _please_ watch that beast! Yes, more than likely there will be some one. I know so many people, many of whom some would feel privileged to know! I'll look about. I dislike so intensely this idea of your crossing alone. It is rather, pardon me, dear, common,--middleclass. Yes, I'll look about. No doubt some one may be found."

Cecilia nodded absently. She had learned to "yes" and "no" at the proper times with Mrs. Aliston, quite without a listening attention. Strangely, she was thinking of some one else beside her father, John or Father McGowan. This some one who had been the leading man of her dreams for a great many years. In fact, ever since she had rescued a sick and dying tabby.

She had carried his true voice with her wherever she went.... Often when things called men had asked for her hand because it held money, a genuine voice had echoed through the years.

"Pussy needs some Mothersills,----" she would hear, and then with an absurdly little-girl feel for being so influenced, she would gently discourage.

There had been some who really loved; some loving with an air of condescension showing through their manner,--others truly, and with humbleness. Some poor, weak, with only love as recommendation. Some just ordinary men,--one or two made big by what they felt for small Cecilia.

And with them all, something was wrong. She heard the echo of a nice boy's voice, as he bought a small girl a "choclut soda," and a sundae all-over-whipped-cream, and she heard it while she said: "No; I'm sorry. I really can't. I'm _never_ going to marry. I hope you'll find some one you'll like _much_ more than me!"

And they had all said they never would, which is the way with young men.... Cecilia had believed the first one, then life had taught her the quick healing of some hearts, and she had smiled a little when the rest said it.

That smile was always the undoing. They usually kissed the hem of her dress, and swore to shoot themselves, and Cecilia would whisper: "Oh, _please!_ Some one will see you!" or, "Oh, _please!_ Some one might hear you!" whichever the case might be. Then they always kissed her hand and went away, and Cecilia would sigh and say, "Well, I suppose that means an awfully nice wedding present soon, to show that I'm not put out!"

Sometimes she wondered if K. Stuyvesant Twombly were living, and if so, where? Then she often decided _not_ to think of him, because it was too childish.... And then she would discover that every life must have its fairy tale, and that he was hers.... "Home!" said Mrs. Aliston, with a sigh of relief. "Oh, my poor body! 'My little body is a-weary of this world.' Who said that, Cecilia? Bernard Shaw? or Arnold Bennett?"

"No," answered Cecilia, "I think it's in the Bible, but I can't just remember."

A groom stepped forward to lead Clara away to her boudoir and dinner. Cecilia went into the cool house to write her father on a small typewriter she carried for that purpose, Jeremiah being "partial to print."

Outside the grey of the English twilight crept slowly near.... Everything was peaceful,--quiet. America were far away.

The person suitable for Cecilia's chaperon was found. She was very correct, had several chins, and was well connected. She came from Boston and mentioned this fact in a hushed tone. On talking with her, Cecilia felt as she had in the first few months of boarding school--chilled, and alone.

This morning was the one before they sailed. Miss Hutchinson had wished to go to Westminster for a last look. "You will come with me?" she had asked of Cecilia. The question had really been a statement. Cecilia replied that she would be charmed to go. She went to get a broad hat that entirely eclipsed one eye.

The sun was faintly present. "It is fine," said Miss Hutchinson, who spoke English whenever she remembered it, to show that she had lived much abroad.

"So it is," said Cecilia. "How absent-minded of the sun!" Miss Hutchinson didn't answer. She was busy showing a taxi driver the error of his ways.

"Robbers!" said Miss Hutchinson, as they settled on the stuffy cushions. Cecilia looked after a passing bus, and wistfully. She dearly loved to ride on top. They bumped along, Miss Hutchinson expatiating on some one's relatives. It seemed that one of them had been "in trade."

"Papa makes bricks," said Cecilia calmly, wondering, as she said it, whether the British soaked their shoes overnight in the "bath" to get that delightful muffiny effect and the curl up at the toes.

"My dear," said Miss Hutchinson quickly, "that is quite different. His business is on a large scale, and his fortune excuses anything. This man had been in trade in a small way?--a sweet-stuff shop, I believe, or a chemist. Something fearfully ordinary."

"Horrible!" said Cecilia. Miss Hutchinson looked at her. Cecilia's smile was strange. She hoped she was not saddled with a young person of too modern ideas for seven days.... In Westminster Miss Hutchinson went toward the Poet's Corner. Cecilia wandered outside. She paused by a small stone set in the wall. "Jane Lister, Dear Child," she read. The gentle little ghost smiled on her from those simple words. She looked long at them. She always saw the "Dear Child," quaintly frocked, smiling.

Some one paused behind her. She turned. "Isn't that almost too beautiful?" she whispered.

"Yes," answered K. Stuyvesant Twombly.

He looked on this impulsive, American girl, and smiled. Then she turned back to Jane Lister, and he raised his hat and went on.

Her eyes made his memory itch, but he could not know why. Perhaps some one whom he'd met suggested her. He met a great many people.... Uncommonly pretty, if he cared for beauty,--or girls. Then his mind turned to business interests. He was supremely American.

The girl in the cloister still gazed at a weather worn slab. "Dear child," she said, "he is alive. Oh, dear child, isn't that beautiful too?"

John was faintly smiling. A superior smile that was his own and took in no one else. He used it often on the "Gov'ner," who from it, was reduced to a pulp, and realised himself fit for nothing but supplying funds.... Father McGowan was not reduced to a pulp, but he was genuinely angry. He thought with a longing of a hickory cane which hung on the back porch of the rectory.

"How old are you, John?" asked Father McGowan.

"Eighteen," replied the overgrown boy. "Gettin' on, yes, gettin' on." He lounged back in his chair. Father McGowan leaned across the table.

"Old enough to take tender care of your sister when she gets back," he said.

"Certainly," answered John. He studied his finger nails. They were gorgeous examples of the manicure's art. John wished the old man would get on. He had a date.... He wondered what he was driving at anyway? He covered a yawn and muttered a pardon.... "Late hours," he added, in explanation.

Father McGowan again thought of a cane which hung on the back porch.

"How's your father?" he asked.

"Oh,--the Gov'ner?" replied John in a tone of entire surprise. "Really, I don't know. I haven't seen him for a week." He again looked at his finger nails then he thought of a girl he did not meet socially. His thoughts and attentions ran to that kind.

"What a rotten life a priest's would be! Staying in a dull room like this--" he thought, then became conscious of a long silence. He looked up. Father McGowan's eyes were full on him.... Space faded. John was a baby in a crowded flat. He cried, and a little, tired-eyed girl picked him up. "Aw, Johnny!" she said. Flies buzzed about. The dull hum of traffic came from the street below.

Some one called, "Celie, aw Celie! Quick!" from a room off of the kitchen. The little girl vanished. He heard unpleasant sounds, then moans.

John started up. The chair in which he'd sat overturned. "You devil!" he said to a fat priest. The dream had faded. John breathed in gasps.

"I will excuse you," said Father McGowan, "if you will remember what a sister did for you, and in return give her the greatest gift: a pride in the boy she loves. Good-night, John."

After the boy had gone, Father McGowan scratched his head, as was his manner when perplexed. "What was the matter with him?" he asked aloud. Then he sighed. The talk, he was afraid, had done little good. At first he had gotten only a supercilious smile, and then that outburst.

Well, life was only a succession of tries, and a climbing at the wall unscalable.... Father McGowan dismissed the problem, thought of the comfort of a hot bath, and then the perusing of a new book he'd just bought. "Oh, drat!" he muttered. There was a baby water snake in the tub, and the tin one did not invite a lingering. It scratched in several inconvenient spots.

Outside, John still breathed in gasps. "Home," he thought as he settled in a low, grey roadster. "I don't like her hair anyway," he offered in weak excuse for abandoning his original plan. Yes, he would be good to Cecilia. Awfully good to her.... Had her life, his,--ever been as dreadful as that flash? Cecilia should never know him otherwise than she believed him. It would be a noble deceit, lived for love of her. That was the game one played with women that one truly loved.

The _Arcania's_ decks were alive with people scurrying hither and thither, seemingly with no impulse behind their unrest, nor aim in direction.

A few souls stood very calmly by the rail, watching the steerage embarking. Their whole attitudes said, and loudly: "This is all old to me. I will have you know it is even a bore!" They were looked on with respect by the few to whom crossing was a novelty.

Cecilia was pleasantly excited. Sailing was not new to her, but she was so healthily alive that she tingled with any enthusiasm near.

"Our deck chairs are in the most absurd spot!" said Miss Hutchinson. "I told the steward what I thought of him, and them. He said he would change them. Aren't you going to look at your flowers? Your state room is full of them. I stepped in. Your maid was putting some of them in your wash bowl. I told her that would never do. You will have to use it, you know, to brush your teeth, wash, and so on, and if you're sick--it is most inconvenient to have the stand cluttered with flowers. I--ah, happened to notice Lord Ashby's card on some flowers. Where did you meet him, _dear_?"

"Sunday school treat," replied Cecilia. "I poured tea down his neck." Her reply was made in an absent way. She was scrutinising the passengers. There was a fat woman near who looked lovely! She stood within earshot of Cecilia and Cecilia heard her address her husband as "Poppa," and then a very healthy and pleasantly loud-looking maiden as "Lotty." It made Cecilia feel as if she were in the warmth of a summer sun, just to hear them. So happily natural, they were.

"_Horrid_ people!" said Miss Hutchinson loudly. She elevated a lorgnette, and looked "poppa" up and down critically. "Beer, Cincinnati," she decided in far-reaching tone. Cecilia squirmed.

"That dear baby in the steerage!" said Cecilia, to divert the offended Miss Hutchinson.

"Dirty!" commented the diverted. "So absolutely degrading the way the lower classes have children! One after the other!" ended Miss Hutchinson. Cecilia did not voice it, but she wondered what other mode of entrance into the world was possible, one at a time, rarely two, having been the style for a good many years.

The baby began to whimper. Its mother slapped it vigorously. Cecilia looked away. She hated to see a child slapped. Johnny had often been most trying. She had rarely slapped him.... Then she turned and quite forgot the hot, whimpering baby of the steerage.... K. Stuyvesant Twombly stood behind her. He recognised the impulsive girl who had spoken to him at the small tomb of "Jane Lister, dear child," and he raised his hat and smiled.

Cecilia gasped. Then, she went below, and very quickly, to see her flowers.

"Oh, but you are nice," said Cecilia, "if your name is not!" Then she looked away from K. Stuyvesant Twombly. She had not meant to say anything like that! It had simply come out!

The wind blew strongly and ruffled her hair. K. Stuyvesant Twombly watched her with a good deal of interest. She was _quite_ different from any girl he'd ever met.... She watched first the rough sea which looked like a small boy's chewing gum, laid in a safe place waiting for the next chew ... grey, indented with the marks of small teeth. Then all the sea would slip below the rail, and all of the world would be sky.

"I was named," explained K. Stuyvesant, "Keefer, after a rich uncle. He died and left all his money for the support of Lutheran missions in China. After that my mother used to faint every time she'd think of my first name."

Cecilia laughed. "I'm _so_ sorry!" she said. "Does she still faint over it?"

"She died last February," answered K. Stuyvesant quietly.

"I'm so sorry!" said Cecilia again. K. Stuyvesant didn't answer. They were quiet for a few moments, both watching the tilt, and eclipse of the sky-line. At last the man spoke. "It is tragic," he said, "to have the ones you love die, but it is more tragic to have those you have loved from instinct, and never known, die. You wonder, all the time, whether they too, are fretting because of the lost opportunity. You wonder what there was below that you didn't see.... All I remember of my mother was her hurry to get in a great number of engagements, and a chill aloofness, cultivated, I have thought since, to keep in check over-tired nerves.... If we could have once gone below the surface! Even with incivilities, if in that way, we could have known each other.... Never saw one another, fleeting glimpses...."

"You poor man!" said Cecilia.

"I'm ashamed to have said that," he said. His voice was gruff. "But,--it's been in my heart these long months,--that endless regret." He drew a shaky breath. Cecilia laid her hand on his arm. Without a shade of consciousness his hand closed around hers. "I've never told any one that before," he said. "You're awfully--different. I feel as if we'd known each other always." He turned his head and looked down at her. Their eyes met, and it was hard to look away.

"You're so dear!" he blurted out.

Cecilia, used to many men of many compliments, coloured. She squeezed his hand, and then shyly drew hers away.

Mrs. Higgenmeyer came waddling down the deck. She saw Cecilia and smiled widely. "Well, dearie!" she said in her usual carrying tone, "Lotty was looking fer yuh. She and poppa are playing rum now. She wants you should see a wireless she had from her gentleman friend."

"I'd love to!" answered Cecilia. Momma passed by. K. Stuyvesant and Cecilia laughed gently.

"I like to love and laugh," said Cecilia; "but if you leave the love out, the laughter is too liable to turn sour."

K. Stuyvesant nodded, but he hadn't heard what she said. He was undergoing new and terrifyingly beautiful sensations.

"The Higgenmeyers are dear, aren't they?" said Cecilia.

"Um hum," answered K. Stuyvesant. He turned quite boldly and stared at her, while she looked out upon the sea and sky. He wondered, while he swallowed hard, whether he had any chance. He wished he weren't such a duffer! He even wished faintly that she weren't so wonderful.

Cecilia looked up at him again, and again the warm colour came into her cheeks. Then she began to talk quickly of a recent play. Her voice was not quite steady. She wouldn't meet his eyes.

Miss Hutchinson was speaking of a paper she'd read before the Boston literati on "The Message of Ibsen." Cecilia didn't know much about Ibsen, but she thought he would have been rather surprised if he'd heard what he "really meant."

K. Stuyvesant was, as usual, with them. Cecilia and he looked at each other often. The new, disconcerting light in his eyes had given way, and was displaced for the moment by a mischievous twinkle. Cecilia was able to look at him frankly again.

Miss Hutchinson arose, untangling from her steamer blanket like a huge butterfly from a cocoon. "My point was," she said loudly, "that Ibsen is the Seer of those who SEE, but," she sighed, "there are so few of us!"

She vanished.

Cecilia giggled. "Are you one of _us_?" she asked of K. Stuyesant.

"Lord, no!" he answered laughing, and then added seriously, "I'm an awful duffer. Stupid and all that. I never used to care, but now I do. You--you don't read that kind of stuff, do you?" His appeal held a great fear.

"Oh, no!" answered Cecilia. "I stopped reading improving things after I left school, I can't bear them, and it depresses me so to use my head! I'm not a bit clever." She sighed with her last words. They were both making many confessions about their failings. Somehow it seemed necessary. Also, they both wished a great deal of the time that they were much nicer!

"You know what Stephen Leacock said about intellectual honesty?" asked Cecilia. K. Stuyvesant shook his head.

"I can't quote," said Cecilia, "but he said as you grew old you would find books had brought you more pleasure than anything except tobacco. But then, he said, you must be honest about them, reading only what you liked. That if 'Pippa Passes' didn't appeal, you should let 'Pippa' pass, that she was not for you. There was some more, but I shan't ruin it by misquoting it. It was so clever!"

K. Stuyvesant didn't answer. Because Cecilia was afraid of his silences, she began to tell him of a small brother whom she greatly loved.

"But you'll know him," she ended, "if you come to see us. You will, won't you?"

"Well, rather!" answered K. Stuyvesant. "Why, you _know_ I'm coming!" There was almost a resentment in his voice. "Cecilia," he said, with his first use of her first name, "I haven't any right, but you're so _dear_, I have to. Have I _any_ chance?" He leaned very close above her steamer chair. He had gotten quite white. "Cecilia?" he whispered in question. He reached for her hand, then drew back sharply.

"I know you meet lots of fellows much finer than I am," he went on, "and when I'm away from you I don't see how I have the nerve to hope, but I can't help it. Cecilia--dear?" The "dear" was rather muffled. K. Stuyvesant had never used it before and it stuck, even though he wanted so much to say it!

She turned her face toward him, and he could say no more.

She thought of a brick on the top shelf of a gilt cabinet. "Nothing could matter to him," she thought; "he is so dear, but I must see..."

"When we get home," she whispered, "after two months you may ask me again, if you're sure."

"Sure?" he echoed. "Sure? Oh, _heavens!_" Then he looked down at her for quite a few rather breathless moments.

After that they talked. "After two months," repeated Cecilia stubbornly. It made no impression. At last she equivocated a bit and gained her point. "I hardly know you," she said, looking away from him; "I--I prefer----"

"I don't know anything about girls," said K. Stuyvesant, "but I know I've been a dub. I'll try to be agreeable, I'll _try_ to keep this to myself. But,--you _will_ give me a chance?"

Cecilia said she would.

"Gosh,--I love----" began K. Stuyvesant; then he shook his head. Cecilia didn't mean to, but she slipped her hand in his, under the kind shelter of a blue and green checked blanket. K. Stuyvesant didn't say anything more. He only looked.

Mrs. Higgenmeyer came paddling by.

"Poppa ain't so well," she called. "He's sick to his stummick!"

"I'm--I'm sorry," answered Cecilia. She tried to pull her hand from K. Stuyvesant's. He refused to let it go. After Mrs. Higgenmeyer had passed, he spoke. "You're mine!" he said in the manner of all lovers. "You are!" His voice was gruff. Cecilia was to learn that that meant that she mattered much.

At his words Cecilia's heart turned over, but she remembered her eccentric, dear, and much-loved father, and a certain brick.

"You promised," she reminded him. "I said after two months, when I knew you. You promised."

"I'll be good," he answered dismally, "but I know you, and it's hard to think of waiting. There isn't any question of time. You're just----, well, I'm thirty-two. I'd never dreamed that I could feel this. I want to kneel when I think of you. I----" he stopped.

Cecilia drew a deep breath. They looked at each other, and the world ceased for them. They were only a chord stretched to breaking,--a chord for Heaven's tunes.

CHAPTER IX

HOME

"I tell Celie, it ain't like we couldn't buy 'em perfect. (I could pay for 'em whole.) But she sez that ain't it."

Jeremiah Madden surveyed a Greek Venus as he spoke, whose arms were quite lacking. "As fer me," he went on, "I like 'em with all their limbs with 'em,--tasty and neat. This here kind of thing makes me think of the War. There's one in the Eyetalian garden I'm going to buy a cork leg for."

The young men who surrounded Jeremiah Madden laughed loudly. The loudness of their laughter made Jeremiah a bit suspicious at first, but he reasoned they would hardly accept his hospitality and laugh at him,--it must be with him. So, vastly pleased and beaming widely, he went on with pleased pride: "This here garden cost me near a million, fixings and all. That fountain to the right (the one with the dinky bird settin' on the female's arm) cost me----" but he didn't finish, for Johnny came around the corner of a path and emerged from its boxwood protection with a cough, and then a loud inanity. He frowned on Jeremiah and the laughter of the young men stopped.

"I didn't know _you_ were here," he said coolly to the quaking Jeremiah. Jeremiah realised that he had displeased, and began unsurely, "I'll be gettin' back to work. I just left fer a few minutes, I----"

"Come on," broke in Johnny, and the group of tired-looking youths followed him, leaving Jeremiah confiding to the stone "female" of his work and of how he must get back to it. Realising himself alone, he swallowed his words, and watched the group disappear toward the tennis courts with a puzzled hurt in his face.... A half a mile away, and well below, the waters of the Sound shone brazen blue in the sunlight. Sometimes a gull swooped low, and its wings were silver. In one spot a marble wall with a Greek relief stood out in blazing white against the distant water.... Jeremiah saw all the loveliness, but he could not feel it.

"That wall cost me----" he muttered, and then stopped, hearing footsteps.

Cecilia stepped from the same path from which Johnny had made his entrance. Her hat was a broad one, hiding her face provokingly, her dress one of those "simple" affairs, so dangerous to hearts and purses.

"Dearest!" she called rather breathlessly, "I did so want to see you! I've been hunting for you everywhere!" Jeremiah put his arms around her and forgot his worry about a certain son, and even forgot the cost of things.

"Well?" he questioned gently.

"Well," she repeated after him, "I just wanted to see you." She fidgetted as she had at seven, when the request for a new skillet or pan had been necessary. Jeremiah understood, and looked down at the simple affair, talking of it, to give her time. "That dress now," he said, "ain't it kind of plain? Don't you like 'em fancied up with ruffles and lace and stuff?"

Cecilia said that perhaps it was plain, but that she rather liked it. However, she would get one all-over ruffles for Jeremiah's dear gaze. After that they were silent, Cecilia staring absently out over the deep, blue Sound.

"Papa, dear," she said at last, with a gulp. "There's a man coming out to see me,--I mean us,--for Sunday. I hope you'll like him. He--he's really nice. I hope you'll like him." She stopped for a moment and then again said: "I _do_ hope you'll like him."

"Do you want me to like him?" asked Jeremiah.

"Oh, yes," said Cecilia, "I do!" She was again looking toward the Sound. Her small, white teeth were set on her lower lip. "He's very dear," she said at last; then she plaited a pink-edged handkerchief. Jeremiah frowned. "There ain't a man fit fer yuh!" he said

crossly, "not a one!"

"Yes, there is," answered Cecilia.

"There ain't!" contradicted Jeremiah. "Does he play tennis?" he questioned, "and set around in white pants?" Jeremiah's voice had grown absolutely fierce. Cecilia laughed. "I suppose he does," she admitted, "but he works, really hard. He told me that life had only meant work for him, until----"

"Hum!" grunted Jeremiah. "Hum! Let me catch him trying to keep company with you! White tennis, and pants, and gulfing around with them funny sticks! _Lemme_ catch him!"

"Don't get so excited!" said Cecilia between little giggles. "He may not even want me. He really hasn't asked me yet."

"He ain't?" exploded Jeremiah. "He ain't? _Why_ not? Is the durn fool blind? I'd like to know why not."

Cecilia sank to a white marble seat. She was laughing helplessly. Suddenly she sobered and wiped her eyes.

"Dear," she said, "do you think I'd love you less, for--for loving some one else? Didn't you love the whole world more because of mamma? It only makes me want to be much nicer, and want to hug the earth!"

She covered her face as she finished, with slender, little hands. Jeremiah sat down by her.

"I want my bonnet with pink roses on it!" she whispered, "I _do_ want it!" He put his arms around her because he couldn't answer. A gull with silver wings swooped low. Cecilia uncovered her face, and kissed the brick king. "Which is my very prettiest dress?" she asked. "I want to wear it Saturday afternoon."

She tried to think her depression came from the night before, but half of it came from the letter which she held in her hand. She had had the strangest sinking sensation on reading it, and she _did_ love Marjory. Why it had made her feel that way was a mystery.

[Illustration: THE DINNER HAD BEEN WHAT SHE WANTED]

She opened the letter again. Its pages crackled, and sprung into their first folds as she laid them on the table. The third sheet she picked up and read: "Mamma is really quite wild about travelling with the Johnstons and I am absurdly relieved. Being with that dear lady tells on my disposition (usually perfect, you know, dear!), and I am happy to say a dutifully depressed good-bye to the water bottles and ailments which are all I know of my progenitor. I told her I would come to you for the summer months, and then perhaps go to Cousin Alice. I may go home, but I'm not sure, and such a course involves the proper dowager, who is always too proper, or too improper, and ever a bore! I shall write you again about all this, and when I shall arrive.

"Dear, I shall so enjoy being with you. You are the only good person I know who does not offend me. Perhaps because you are so unconscious of that quality. Your influence is wonderful with me.... How do you like being an 'Influence'? I have turned flippant, but you know I was serious----"

And that letter, in some strange way, had depressed Cecilia. She had wanted the summer to be a quiet one,--one in which she could learn to know a small brother, have ample time to amuse her father,--and----

Well, she was utterly ashamed, but she'd wanted it alone. It was so little of her to wish it so. Marjory had been so good to her. But,--Cecilia had dreamed of quiet evenings with the moon making a glittering path of silver on the Sound.... She'd dreamed of a big, gruff man coming toward her across soft grass.... That, and the scent of roses, pink roses.... Instead the summer would be full of Marjory's friends. Marjory had so many and such gay ones! Dancing, playing cards, motoring,--hunting pleasure with a strained intensity, running foolishly so that boredom should not overtake them.... And she had needed the summer with John. Marjory, her good friend, was not the one to show him things as Cecilia would have him see them. Cecilia sighed.

Then a little spasm of pain flickered across her face. The night before was in her mind, when John, with the friends who were visiting him, had grown too joyous. She had heard them come in in the deep night. The sounds had rung clear in the still air.

The cars they drove had come crashing through rose bushes, knocking down slender trellises.... With silly laughter, she had heard the men come toward the house. There had been unpleasant words said loudly, as if such utterances were humorous. There had been more silly laughter after them.

Cecilia had felt quite sick. She had covered her eyes and made requests of some one's else mother.... Then she had slipped into a negligee and cautiously opened her door.

The hall was empty and she went to John's room. She shook as she travelled the long hall, and she hated John's friends with a marvellous hate for one so sweet-natured. She was heart-sick and afraid. John's room was empty.

She stood there a moment, steadying herself. There were pictures scattered about the room, which made her understand things more fully. One, on a table near her, showed a pert miss, with tightly curled hair, and a dress of cheap fanciness.

"Your own little girl," was written across its corner, and then the little girl's name, "Fanchette LeMain."

Cecilia turned away. She went out into the hall. She felt as she had years ago when John was her baby. At the top of the broad and long stairs she looked down. John was on the first step, sprawled unbeautifully, his head hanging limp on his chest, his hands closed around a cerise scarf on which glittered little silver spots.

She looked about to see that no one else was there and then ran quickly down the stairs.

"I'm too heavy," said John, halfway up the stairs. He had been considerably sobered by black coffee, and more so by the sight of Cecilia. He leaned on her arm.

"I have carried you before," answered Cecilia. "When we lived in the flat, that was. I used to think that when you grew up I could lean on you. It was funny how I planned."

John didn't answer. They had reached his room and he sank to his bed and sat, blinking stupidly, on the edge of it. Cecilia slipped to her knees, and began to take off his shoes.

"Don't!" he ordered sharply. "Ring for Higgens."

"I'd rather not," answered Cecilia.

"It was the heat----" he began. Cecilia sat back on her little heels. She looked like a small girl saying her "Now I lay me----"

"It was not the heat," answered Cecilia. "When you were small I washed your mouth out with brown soap for doing that. Now do you want a drink? I'll wet this towel; you'd better put it on your head. There's the dawn," she said, looking toward the window. Then she turned and picked up a cerise scarf with silver spots on it. She folded it and laid it on the table by the photograph of Fanchette LeMain. John looked unhappy.

Cecilia put her hand on her brother's shoulder. "Good-night, dear," she said. A quiver ran across his face.

"I didn't want you to know," he whispered "You're so dear, but old-fashioned. You don't understand how a man----" he stopped, and she slipped down on the bed by him. "Everything's so beastly here. I'm so ashamed to have the fellows see dad," he went on incoherently. "Always talkin' of how things cost--always makin' breaks in grammar,--afraid of his own butler----" John's eyelids were drooping. He fell back, asleep. Cecilia got up and tried to pull him into a more comfortable position. Then she went to her own room. On the way she passed Jeremiah's. She paused by his door. She wanted to kiss him,--as she had Johnny, when, very small, he had bumped himself.

"Excuse him, Dearest," she whispered. "He's very young. Some day he'll understand, I hope." Then she went on. The dawn had come. The Sound was covered by a grey fog. Cecilia lay down to stare up at her ceiling. She did not sleep again.

At last came noises. The gardeners talked as they worked on the terrace below her windows. "Cut up rough," said one. Cecilia could hear the break of wood. The white trellis with its pink rambler had evidently suffered.

"The old man----!" said another voice expressively. They laughed a little.

"Well, the kid's a gent, anyway," said the other, loudly. "Drunk every night, and enough lady friends for a Hippodrome chorus----" they laughed again.

Cecilia turned and hid her face in the pillow. Her palms were wet.

Father McGowan was surrounded by brigands. Their burnt cork moustaches gave them a fierce expression terrible to view.

"So you saw a man climbing up the grape arbor?" questioned Father McGowan.

The spokesman wriggled a little, and then said, "Well, we didn't just see him but we heard him."

"I seen him," said the youngest brigand, whose lower lip was quivering. "I seen him. He had eyes like fire. I want--my maw! I'm scared!" The youngest brigand dissolved into tears. They ran down his cheeks and through his Kaiser Wilhelm of burnt cork, leaving a grey trail on his small chin. "I want my maw!" he repeated.

"An' las' night I seen a man down the alley. He sez 'Hello Bub.' That fierce I ran home, _I_ tell yuh!" said another of the group.

"Bet it was Jack, the Hugger," came in an ominous tone from the background. The brigands quaked. Their eyes had grown large with excitement, and fear was plain above the moustaches. One small boy who wore a horse-hair imperial, muttered of "gettin' home to study his gogerfy." He, and all the rest, cast longing eyes toward the door. The youngest mopped the tears and smeared his moustache across his face with his coat sleeve.

The fat priest got up and laid aside his pipe with reluctance. "Come on," he said; "we'll go find the villain. Come on!"

Two small boys clung to his cassock,--the rest pretended a bravado. They swaggered largely through the kitchen, where Mrs. Fry, washing the rectory dishes, glared at their intrusion. Outside the soft dark covered the fears of the brigands. Father McGowan went toward the arbour. He looked well on the frail structure, and then shook it. A black cat hissed, and jumped down.

"_I_ wasn't scared none!" said the brigand who had wanted his maw, "_I_ was just pretending!" The rest of the brigands giggled foolishly and muttered of "Foolin'."

Father McGowan tactfully spoke of the weather, and then he suggested going down to the corner drug store, where pink sodas could be bought for five cents. There was a flattering acceptance of his offer. They started off, all talking loudly to him of their large achievements. He listened and answered just at the right time, and said just the right thing. So they faded into the night, the long, black shadow with the smaller ones about it, clinging to it.

"He's takin' 'em to the drug store, I bet," said a lanky boy who was smoking in the shadows. His voice was sad.

"He must say lots of Masses," said his companion. "Every time them kids bawl around his place they get something to eat."

"Um hum," agreed the first speaker, "but he ain't no soft guy. Sometimes he licks 'em fit to kill."

Down the street the drug store screen door slapped shut smartly.

"Them five-cent sodas ain't no good anyway!" said the lanky boy. "_I_ wouldn't want none!" the other sighed.

"No," said Mrs. Fry, "he ain't here. He's went to the drug store with a mess of kids. Yuh can set, or yuh can go. _He_ don't care. That's the kind of a man _he_ is."

The man who stood on the Rectory porch said he would wait. As he stepped across the threshold Mrs. Fry recognised him as a doctor who had been uppish and sent in his card, "like he was a King." She looked critically at his boots. "Trackin' in dust all the time----" she muttered. Then she went heavily down the hall, slamming the dining-room door after her.

"_He_ never gets no rest!" she stated aloud to a picture of a dead duck, hanging by its feet. "Never no peace nor no time to smoke!" She glared at the fowl which had been given Father McGowan by Agnes O'Raddle, as she soliloquised. The erstwhile Mr. Fry, who had always been forced to smoke in the backyard, was far away.

"Well?" questioned Father McGowan. The doctor who sat across the table from him leaned forward and began to speak quickly, his breath coming between his quick words in gasps: "My wife's people had the controlling interest in this plant, and I put all my money in it. It had always paid well. A ventilator, it is, which slips beneath a raised window,--simple affair, yet good. Then this Madden man got ahold of an improved article, patented it, and started a manufactory in the same town, started it on a large scale,--advertised extensively.... Well, we're ruined. We can't compete. He sells below cost. He can't want money; he's losing now. Why does he do it? We've done everything. I've offered him----"

The bell of the telephone which stood on the desk rang sharply.

"Pardon," said Father McGowan, and then, "Why, Cecilia!" There was an interval then the doctor heard him say: "Your prettiest dress? Why they're all pretty! Why?" There was a longer interval, then a sharp "What?" from Father McGowan. A silence, and then, "Dear child! I'll be out to-morrow!" Father McGowan hung up the receiver. His manner and voice were changed and softened.

"The little boy is dead," he said to the doctor. "He was happy before he died. He grew very young, and forgot a great deal, the little boy who was in your care, I mean. Now go on, tell me more of this. Will you smoke?"

The fat priest pushed a box of cigars toward the shaking doctor.

"I--I wouldn't do that now----" began the doctor. "Something's broken me. God, I've suffered! What's that?" he ended sharply. There was the tap-tap-tap that sounded like small crutches on a polished floor. Father McGowan looked perplexed.

"It must be the vines against the window," he said, "but I didn't know it was windy. Have you a match?"

The doctor nodded, and lit his cigar. His hands shook cruelly.

"God, I've suffered!" he said hoarsely, "and I believe this Madden man has caused it all. My practice and money gone, I----" he stopped. "_Can't_ you help me?" he finished. "_Can't_ you?"

"Norah," said Cecilia, "which is my prettiest dress?"

"I dunno, dearie," replied Norah. "Yuh ain't exactly homely in none! But don't go thinkin' too much of yer looks. My maw used to say, 'Beauty's only skin deep.' She was a great one fer them sayin's."

"Norah," said Cecilia, "am I--am I what you'd call pretty?"

"That depends," said Norah, "on whether yuh like dark or light hair." She surveyed Cecilia critically, her lips sternly tight, but a proud light showing in her eyes. Since Cecilia had grown up, the Virgin had undergone a complete physical transformation for Norah. If Norah's Virgin had been on earth, she might easily have been confused with Cecilia Evangeline Agnes Madden.

"How you kin set in them corsets!" said Norah, anxious to change the subject. Cecilia laughed, then turned before a long glass which stood between windows. "I wish I hadn't been educated," said Cecilia. "I _love_ pink ones, trimmed all over with roses and lace!"

"My maw used to say, 'Handsome is as handsome does!'" said Norah sternly. Cecilia's new concern for her looks and clothes was disquieting to her. She thought with a horror of Marjory's salves, and eyebrow pencils.... Suppose Cecilia!--Norah shook her head.

A maid came in the room with a froth of lacy frills falling over her arm. She disposed of the froth, then bent above the seated Cecilia, and began taking the pins from her yellow hair. It fell loosely, with the soft, slow motion of waves, about her shoulders and well below her hips....

"_Tres joli!_" said the true worshipper of beauty, as she always did.

"Nonsense!" replied Cecilia, absently, as she always did. This was the rite, frowned on by the jealous Norah.

"I mended yer skirt," said Norah crossly. "It was tore fierce."

"Thank you, dear," said Cecilia, and then: "Josephine, which is my most pretty dress?"

Norah left, shutting the door with decision. She muttered of people who talked Eyetalian, and other Heathen languages. Then she decided it was her duty to tell Cecilia of Josephine's outrageous flirting with Mr. 'Iggens. After this lofty resolve her face cleared, and her expression, became pleasant.

She passed a heavy-eyed boy in the hall. In the early days he had often shed his tears against her shoulder.... He had found love, and understanding, exhibited by doughnuts, and bread spread thickly with brown sugar.

"Mr. John----" said Norah timidly as they were opposite.

"Huh?" he responded, with a cool look. Norah swallowed with a gulp, and went on. Her heart was heavy. Her spirit ached.

"We give him too many doughnuts," she said. Then again her face cleared.

"I'll tell Celie how they go on!" she reflected. "Then I guess she won't be so smart! Winkin' and carryin' on!" The dwelling on the iniquities of Josephine was vastly cheering. Norah almost forgot a heavy-eyed and overgrown boy, who, when little, had sobbed his troubles out against her thin shoulder, and had turned to her for soothing sugar cookies.

At the pretty little station, K. Stuyvesant was met by Cecilia.

"How'd do?" he said gruffly.

"How do you do?" said Cecilia. She had on her prettiest dress, but K. Stuyvesant Twombly didn't notice it. They disposed of the baggage question and then he settled, stiff and conscious, by her side in a small grey car.

"Pretty day," said K. Stuyvesant at last. Then he looked at Cecilia. "Gosh! I love----" He stopped suddenly and shook his head.

"Wh-what have you been doing since I saw you?" asked Cecilia.

"Thinking of you," answered K. Stuyvesant gruffly. Cecilia didn't answer. He was afraid she hadn't liked his telling her the truth, so he described a futurist exhibition, while horribly conscious that the quick beating of his heart made his voice shake.

"I'm glad you came," said Cecilia after the futurist exhibition had been described. "I wanted to see you."

"Dear!" said K. Stuyvesant loudly, and without the least effort. He sat looking down on her with a very honest and revealing look, a look that would have made any one with the least feeling bet their last cent on him.

"Two months," reminded Cecilia.... It was really too wonderful. It had to be proved. If he really cared he would wait two months.

"There's the house," she said aloud, "and on the terrace my dear brother." The car twisted between tall gate posts, and the house and terrace were lost to sight from the shading trees. A collie dog bounded out from the shrubbery and barked fiercely.

"Evangeline!" called Cecilia. "He is Norah's," she explained to K. Stuyvesant. "She named him after me."

"Who is Norah?" asked K. Stuyvesant.

"She was our 'hired girl,'" answered Cecilia, "before we ever heard of maids." K. Stuyvesant didn't reply. In a second the car was by a side entrance. "John!" called Cecilia to the languid figure on the terrace. John sauntered slowly toward them.

"Glad to know you, I'm sure," he said in his most grown-up and _blasÃ©_ manner. "Nice of you to run out to see us. We get jolly bored, you know." After this John turned toward the house. There was an old man on the broad porch, looking wistfully and undecidedly toward the group.

"Oh, the Gov'ner!" said John in a tone indescribable.

"Daddy," called Cecilia loudly, "please come here _right_ away!" The brick king came toward them eagerly. "Pleased to meet yuh," he said as he acknowledged the introduction. K. Stuyvesant spoke kindly of the beauty of the place. "It ought to be beautiful!" answered Jeremiah. "It cost enough! Them there fixings fer the garden," he went on, "them alone cost----"

"Let me take you to your room," broke in John. "Don't you want to get in cooler things?" K. Stuyvesant assented and followed John to the house. When he reached the porch he looked back. Cecilia stood with her arm through her father's. She was looking up at his face. Her smile was tender.

"Gosh!" said K. Stuyvesant, and shook his head. Then he drew a long breath and turned to follow John.

The dinner had been what she wanted, thought Cecilia. He had seen _everything_.... Jeremiah had asked the butler to "spare" him a piece of bread. He had also tucked his napkin in his collar, and then, with a quick movement, removed it, looking around as he did so to see if he'd been noticed.

John had wiggled and sighed loudly when bricks had been talked of. In an effort to gloss over the crudities he had contributed a "smart line of talk," far more impossible than any amount of money mention.

K. Stuyvesant had responded politely to everything and had avoided looking at Cecilia with a studied effort. Cecilia had been silent. She felt it better that she should not appear in this act.

"He come to me, being as I was a man with money, and I sez----" came to her again in Jeremiah's cracked voice.

"I beg pardon?" K. Stuyvesant had said, having lost it through John's interruption.

"Granted," said Jeremiah. "I sez, he come to me an'----"

K. Stuyvesant had been _so_ dear! Cecilia stood leaning on the wall with the Greek relief, as she thought her thoughts.... She looked on the Sound, which was black in the night, except for a path of white moonlight. A path that quivered silver. She looked and saw K. Stuyvesant listening to Jeremiah's talk. He _had_ been so dear! She wondered whether they'd never finish their smoke and talk, and whether he'd _ever_ come to her.

Her eyes filled with tears.

"Mamma!" she whispered to the soft dark. A fitful little breeze sprang up, seeming to answer.

He came across the soft grass slowly. His heart knelt to the little Irish girl who sat upon the white marble wall.

"Hello, Mr. K. Stuyvesant!" she called gaily.

"Hello," he answered heavily. He stood, arms on the wall, a few feet from her, looking at her boldly in the soft light. The world was full of the rhythmic surge of his pulses.... The night air seemed to beat upon him with the heat of fire, but there was no thought of touching her. He was utterly humble before his shrine. He wanted, this American man of 1915, to kneel before this little maiden.... He craved the touch of her hands on his head. He was shaken, purified, thrilled.... He repeated "two months--two months!" to still his overmastering desires. The silence had been long and had grown heavy. K. Stuyvesant was afraid of it. He gulped convulsively and almost yelled: "Great night, isn't it?"

Cecilia nodded. "Don't you want to smoke?" she asked.

"I guess I'd better," he said unsteadily, then, "Oh, Cecilia!" He reached toward her, then drew back, for John came toward them.

"Cablegram," he said languidly, "for you, Celie."

Cecilia opened it. "From Marjory," she said, after reading it by the light of John's flash. "She comes next week. You must like her," she added to Stuyvesant. "She is my best friend."

CHAPTER X

"MY BEST FRIEND"

Father McGowan frowned.

"I love him," said Cecilia. "I don't care who knows it. Where's your handkerchief? I--I guess I've lost mine."

Father McGowan supplied the handkerchief. Cecilia dabbed her eyes. "You see she's so attractive," she went on, "and I'm--I'm not so very. And then John, and everything. I'm ashamed of crying like this." She gulped again. Father McGowan covered her small hand with his. "Dear child!" he said gently. "Dear child!"

The fire leaped, spluttered and hissed with capricious change. Outside the weather was grey, with a drab touch in the air. The sky was a shivery colour. Cecilia and Father McGowan sat on a wide davenport in the library.

"Where is he now?" asked Father McGowan.

"Playing tennis with Marjory," said Cecilia. She again dabbed Father McGowan's handkerchief on her eyes.

"Oh, drat!" said Father McGowan fiercely. He put his other hand over the small one which lay in his. Cecilia tightened her fingers about his thumb.

"I've been so miserable," she said, "that I've even thought of being a nun. I would if it weren't for papa, and John,--and my hair. (I couldn't bear to have it cut.) And he shows so plainly that he likes her, and then she tells me what he says,--oh, dear!"

"Darn fool!" said Father McGowan. "Is he _crazy_?" He glared at Cecilia with his question, and she laughed unsteadily.

"I'm ashamed to bother you," she said, "but it helps, and I can't tell papa. I think papa'd kill him. He's done nothing wrong, you know. You can't help what your heart does." She avoided the fat priest's eyes and looked down at her ringless left hand. "There have been lots of men," she said, "but none I could even dream of marrying. This is different, and--and I do! His eyes are so dear and so is he, but I would love him anyway. I think he's the rest of me."

"Drat!" said Father McGowan forcibly. "Drat him!"

"I wish I'd been left in the flat. Then I'd have grown up to marry some teamster. It's only when you reach for things too high above you that your arms begin to ache,--then papa and John, all the time misunderstanding each other. Both of them being hurt by this money,--and I--I _love_ him so!"

"Cecilia," said Father McGowan, "this world is full of hurts. You have to take them as you do the weather, without a question. Some one put them here to polish our little souls.... After you are fifty you will accept them with thankfulness and cease questioning. The faith of childhood will return in a bigger way, with a belief in the absolutely unknown. Some one put them here to polish our little souls. They are here, let them polish, not scratch."

"Yes," answered Cecilia meekly.

"Oh, drat!" said Father McGowan with an entire change of tone. "I don't _want_ you polished. _Dear_ child! Drat him, is he _crazy_?"

Jeremiah wandered in. He was sullen. He had been talked to by a fat priest, who told him that he should leave the discipline of a certain doctor to God and the world, explaining that it was rarely necessary for humans to add to any one's unhappiness by a mistaken sense of dealing out justice.

Jeremiah had listened with his eyes on the top shelf of a gilt cabinet which held a brick. After Father McGowan had finished, Jeremiah had spoken of the weather, and Jeremiah was a good Catholic. Father McGowan realised it was a bad case. He had abandoned it for that time.

"And will yuh stay fer dinner?" asked the sullen Jeremiah.

"I _will_," answered the priest decidedly. Cecilia handed him a handkerchief, which he folded carefully and put in his pocket. Then she got up and played "The Shepherd Boy" for the King of Bricks.

Outside in the grey light a sullen-eyed man played tennis with Marjory. He played with much energy and replied with scant courtesy to Marjory's remarks.

"Cecilia said that she was tired of entertaining,--that I'd have to do it for her," sang out the green-eyed. K. Stuyvesant's chin squared.

"In," he called. "I'm a fool to stick around," was his mental comment on himself. He was not surprised by the dead weight his heart felt, although the sensation was new.

They finished their game and went toward the house. "You're doing lots for John," said Marjory. "He adores you! Imitates your every move! You'll try to get him through this smartness?"

In truth she did not consider it smartness, for to her it was the natural attitude of young men. However she was clever enough to see the way this big, silent man felt about it, and to agree outwardly.

"I'd do anything to help one girl," he said loudly. He wanted Marjory to know how he felt about Cecilia. Perhaps she'd help him. They reached the broad steps.

"After dinner I want to see you," whispered Marjory. "In the garden,--alone. Something about Cecilia. By the white wall?"

"Not there," he answered quickly, "but by the Italian dial, if you like."

In the hall he met a fat priest. The man was heartily uncordial, but he didn't much care. After a few words he went up to his room. There he stood by his window and looked on the grey Sound. A fog was creeping over it. Everything was dismal and dull.

"I'm not much good," he muttered, "but no one could love her more. I would be--so good to her. So good. Little Saint--I----" He covered his eyes with his hands. His hands shook.

There was a tap on the door. John came in. "Hello, old chap!" he said energetically, the languid indifference all gone from his tone. "Can I stay and talk?" He settled, while K. Stuyyesant took a grip on himself, and tried to bring himself to an agreeable acceptance of his task.

In another wing of the house Cecilia was dressing. Marjory, gorgeous in a flame-coloured negligee, lounged in a comfortable chair and talked during the operation.

"You may go, Josephine," said Cecilia, "and thank you."

"If I treated my maid as you do yours," said Marjory, "she'd have no respect for me."

"If I weren't decently kind," answered Cecilia, "I'd have no respect for myself, and Josephine likes me."

"Oh, my _dear_," said Marjory, "she _adores_ you." Marjory scrutinised her nails. "I told Stuyvesant to-day," she said, "how much he'd done for John. You don't mind?"

"No," answered Cecilia. "He has. I'm grateful."

"He said he was glad I wanted him to, that he'd do anything for a certain girl. He has the dearest eyes, when he looks at you--oh, you know how----"

"Yes," answered Cecilia, "I know." There was a pause while the only sound heard was the brush on Cecilia's hair--the soft snap and swish.

"Cecilia," said Marjory, "_were_ you engaged to Tommy Dixon?"

"Yes," answered Cecilia, "but, Marjory, I can't bear to remember it. It--it was while I was much younger and hurt because of something Annette Twombly had said. I thought I'd have to marry some one like that to help papa. You know how foolish duty may be at nineteen? He was of a splendid family. I thought papa would like it, when now I know that all he wants is my happiness. After all, decayed flowers from a good plant are not worth anything."

"When did you break it off?" asked Marjory.

"When he kissed me," answered Cecilia. "It taught me how intolerable love is unless it is very true. I will always remember those kisses. I can't forget them. What are you going to wear to-night?" Cecilia changed the subject with suddenness, for it made her sick.

"Black," answered Marjory. Cecilia's heart sank. Marjory was so very pretty in black! Marjory got up. "Bye, childy," she called, "I must go." And she waved her hand airily as she went out.

On the way down the hall she repeated Cecilia's words: "I will always remember those kisses. I can't forget them." That would do very nicely for the little talk by the Italian dial.... She would play sympathy, understanding. She would not lie, but if he cared to misunderstand how could she, Marjory, help that? A sudden spark of her honest father flew across her soul.

"I don't care!" she said in answer to it, "I love him, I really do!" Then the love and trust of the small Cecilia twanged on a heart chord. Marjory shut her eyes. In her mind came those of K. Stuyvesant Twombly, as he looked when he gazed on the daughter of a "Brick King." Marjory hardened. "She doesn't love him as I do," she whispered; "she can't!"

She was only the echo of a single purpose: cruel in its selfishness, animal in its origin, and savage in intensity.

CHAPTER XI

ACCEPTANCE

"Celie, be yuh happy?" asked Jeremiah anxiously.

"Oh, yes!" answered Cecilia. She caught her breath rather spasmodically and went on: "Of course I'm happy! Here I am, all through being improved and ready to stay at home with you and John. Isn't that enough to make any one happy?"

"Don't you want some new frills, or something?" asked Jeremiah wistfully. "You know I can buy yuh anything, and I like to, good."

"I have so much," answered Cecilia. She went over to him and perched on the arm of his chair. "You and John are everything to me," she said. "When I have you I have everything!" She leaned toward him and kissed him. Her arms tightened fiercely about his neck. "You are _everything_!" she repeated loudly. 'Iggins came sliding in with that effect of being on casters, proper to butlers.

"Was yuh lookin' fer me, sir?" asked Jeremiah. Higgins assented and delivered a small box. Then he elevated his head and left. Outside the door he muttered of leaving. He recalled with bitterness his last post, where the man of the house had been a "perfect gentleman" and had thrown boots and curses at him without partiality.

"'Sir!'" he echoed with a fine scorn. "'Ow is a man to keep 'is self-respect?"

Josephine tripped down the hall. She carried Marjory's small dog, who had a scarlet coat buttoned about his small tummy. "Dee-ar Eegeens!" she purred, then fluttered her eyelashes.

"The post 'as its hadvantages," said Dee-ar Eegeens, and followed in Josephine's direction.

Inside the library Cecilia stood by a window with Jeremiah. He was untying the string of a small box and his fingers shook.

"I got it fer you, Celie," he said, "because I thought you was peaked like." He opened the box reverently.

"Oh!" said Cecilia.

"_Twenty_-five thousand," said Jeremiah. "_Look_ at her!" Jeremiah lifted his present from the box. The pendant of his present looked like a lamp shade from Tiffany's.

"_Oh!_" said Cecilia again.

"_Look_ at that there diamond and emerald and ruby all mashed together like!" said Jeremiah proudly. "_Look_ at her! _Don't_ she sparkle?"

"It does," said Cecilia; "it certainly does!"

"I told 'em to take out the pearls and put more sparkly stuff in. I sez, 'Put in all yuh can! Don't spare no expense.' I sez, 'Make her showy. She's fer the best girl on earth.' They done it too."

"Oh, yes!" said Cecilia. Her eyes were a little moist. Tears came easily lately. She put her arms around Jeremiah's neck. "Dear," she said, "I love it. I can't say thank you the way I want to."

Jeremiah didn't answer and she laid her cheek against his shoulder. Together they looked out of the window on the green and then the water's grey.

"Celie," said Jeremiah uncertainly.

"Yes?" answered Cecilia.

"Celie," he said, "you wasn't sweet on that young Twombly? You _wasn't_?" Cecilia shook her head.

"I was afraid you was frettin' over him," said Jeremiah; "you wasn't?" Again he felt her head move against his shoulder. She clung to him for a moment, and then straightened and said, "I must go dress." At the door she paused and turned back. "I love the pendant," she said. "It is beautiful. I _love_ it!"

Jeremiah beamed widely. "I knew yuh would," he said boastfully. "I sez, 'Spare no expense. It's fer my little girl that nursed her maw, cooked her paw's meals, and then learned him to wear a _dress_-suit. None smarter!'"

"It is beautiful, dearest," murmured Cecilia. Then she left the room. Alone, Jeremiah went to stand below a portrait.

"Mary," he whispered, "what makes her look like she wants to cry?"

CHAPTER XII

PAIN

"If it is any satisfaction," said Father McGowan dryly, "I will assure you that he loves you. Anybody could see that. I suppose it is your father, Cecilia."

She nodded. "Marjory----" she started, then stopped.

"Well?" said Father McGowan.

"Marjory told me he said it was--papa," said Cecilia. All the tragedy possible to feel at twenty-one was in her young eyes. "She did it kindly," added Cecilia. Then she went on unsteadily: "I don't know why I am not brave. I am so ashamed. He--he isn't worth it."

"No," answered Father McGowan, "he isn't." Cecilia slipped her hand in his. The warm contact had brought her peace at many times. It did now, in a way. "Cecilia," said Father McGowan, "sometimes love means pain. You know Father Tabb's poem about it?"

"No," said Cecilia.

"Once only did he pass my way 'When wilt Thou come again? All, leave some token of Thy stay!' He wrote (and vanished) 'Pain.'"

Cecilia tightened her fingers about Father McGowan's thumb. "You have always been so good to me," she whispered. "You have always understood and helped me!"

"Well, well!" said Father McGowan. "What else am I here for?"

"Marjory said if I kept papa,--kept papa----" Cecilia stopped.

"Kept him in the backyard or in the cellar, it would be better?" ended Father McGowan.

"Oh, _don't_!" said Cecilia. "Please don't; for two or three times I've felt like John,--I'm _so_ ashamed."

"Dear child!" Father McGowan said. "Dear child!"

"I love papa," said Cecilia. "It's only this new feeling that unsettles me. Sometimes I think I'd pay any price. Sometimes, like John, I'm ashamed, and then how I _hate_ myself!"

A gilded moon had slid from behind a line of poplars. It had shown Father McGowan eyes that reflected an aching soul, tragic young eyes, almost bitter in their hurt.

Suddenly Cecilia held his fat hand against her cheek. Then she smiled at him bravely. "I'm going to be good!" she said with a little catch in her voice. "I'm going to be good!"

"Cecilia Evangeline," said Father McGowan, "dear child!"

Marjory entered the room with a slam and a swish. "I telephoned Stuyvesant and asked him to come out to dinner," she said. "You don't mind?"

"No," answered Cecilia, "certainly not."

"He seemed anxious to come," said Marjory consciously. Cecilia didn't reply.

"What's in that box?" asked Marjory.

"A present," answered Cecilia. She took it from the box and held it up for inspection.

"Oh, Lord!" said Marjory. "Your father?"

Cecilia again did not reply. Her cheeks were pink and her eyes sparkled.

"If I were you," advised Marjory, "I wouldn't wear it to-night. You know how conservative the Twomblys are----"

"What he thinks is not vital to me," said Cecilia. "I shall wear it. I _love_ it. I think it's beautiful!"

"You dear child!" said Marjory. She looked on the small liar with respect. Suddenly she was shocked into speechlessness. The small liar was sobbing wildly.

"Oh, Marjory! Oh, Marjory!" she gasped.

Much later Cecilia stood at the foot of the broad stair.

"Where's your necklace?" asked Jeremiah.

"Oh," said Cecilia, "I forgot it, but I want to wear it. I do! I'm going to get it now." She turned from him and ran up the steps.

"Here he is!" she heard John call from the porch. Then came Marjory's loud laugh. Cecilia's breath came fast, and her fingers trembled as they clasped the new necklace about her throat. She stood before the mirror a minute before she started down. "It _is_ beautiful," she said, "and I am proud to wear it!"

That night Cecilia lay long wakeful. She had not slept much or well lately. She heard the different clocks follow each other with minutes' difference in their chimes. Hour after hour.... Cruel hours.... Control left her and she turned from side to side, restlessly moving into what seemed, each time, a more restless position.

She hoped K. Stuyvesant had believed her when she said she thought her new necklace beautiful. She remembered John's sneer and his question: "Been shopping at the 'Five and Ten'?"

Best, she remembered Jeremiah's proud pleasure in his gift. The remembrance hurt, and made her feel little.

There was a tap on her door which made her strained nerves leap. She sat up in bed and turned on the lights, blinking in their glare.

"What is it?" she called.

"It is I," answered Marjory. "I've been wakeful. I want to talk with you for a moment."

"Come in," said Cecilia. Marjory opened the door and came across the room to sit on the edge of Cecilia's bed.

"I'm sorry you haven't slept," said Cecilia.

"That doesn't matter," answered Marjory. Cecilia saw that she was very tired, so tired that she looked old. She was the Marjory of gay evening, with a grey veil shrouding her.

"I'm going away," said Marjory abruptly. Her fingers played with the coverlet and her eyes avoided Cecilia's. "I'm going back to mamma," she continued. "I think she needs me, and--and I _hate_ the States!"

"Marjory, _dear_!" said Cecilia, "I'm sorry--so sorry."

"No one wants me," said the new Marjory. "I only make trouble wherever I go. No one wants me----"

"I always want you," said Cecilia. "I do, Marjory,--I really do."

"I believe you really mean that," said Marjory slowly. "I'm almost too little to understand you, but I know you never lie."

"I lied about the necklace," said Cecilia; "I don't think it beautiful, except for the love it shows."

"Cecilia," said Marjory, "I can't be truthful. I can't, Cecilia----"

"Don't!" answered Cecilia. "You are! I know you better than any one. You have been my best friend always, and I say you are!"

Marjory's fingers plucked at the coverlet restlessly. She breathed in quick gasps. Cecilia laid her hand on Marjory's. "Perhaps to-morrow you'll feel differently?" she suggested. "You know dark makes things so much darker. I'll do anything to make you happier. I'll ask Mr. Twombly to come out and play with you often, Marjory dear."

"Don't, oh, don't!" whimpered Marjory. Her shoulders shook. Cecilia closed her eyes a moment, and then spoke quite loudly and steadily. "Dear," she said, "I'm sure he loves you. I'm sure he does."

"Don't!" implored Marjory. "Don't!" She threw back her head and spoke in a different tone. "I hate America!" she said viciously. "I hate everything! Life, my place in it. I hate you for being so good! I hate,--oh, God! Oh, God!" Her tirade ended in a paroxysm of dry sobs. Small Cecilia reached out her arms and drew Marjory's head against her soft bosom.

"Oh, dear Marjory!" she whispered, "you have been so good to me! I would do anything to make you happier! _Anything!_ Marjory, dear Marjory!"

Marjory sobbed on.

"I wasn't worthy of my dreams," Cecilia heard her say between gasps. "I--they were too big for me. I knew it, but----" she stopped. Cecilia, all uncomprehending, baffled, said only, "Dear!" and again, "Dear!"

Some strange trouble this was to bring tears to the dry-eyed Marjory, but Marjory needed comfort, not questions. "Dear!" she said once again. Marjory drew away. "Oh, heavens!" she said, laughing, "what an emotional actress I could have been. Forget this and sleep; I shall." She stood up, stretching. Suddenly she was again the new Marjory. She looked on Cecilia. "I _did_ try," she said, "and some people can't be decent even when they try. They can only get halfway."

"What?" began Cecilia.

"Nothing," said Marjory. "Good-night." She started for the door, and then turned back. She leaned above the bed and kissed Cecilia rather fiercely, quite as if she thought of some one else whom she loved in another way while she did it. After she'd gone Cecilia hid her eyes. Without reason the kisses of Tommy Dixon were recalled. Those of the life-half, without a touch of soul. Then Cecilia forgot them in her wonder about Marjory.

"I would do anything for her happiness," thought Cecilia, "even that." And then she closed her eyes and asked to be strong.

When she opened them she saw a golden streak across the floor. The sun was up.

CHAPTER XIII

A REQUEST

"Miss Cecilia----" said Stuyvesant Twombly into the telephone which stood on his desk. His heart hammered so that his ears ached, and the furniture in the room swayed and bent.

"I want to ask you a favour," he heard. "It matters a great deal to me, and, well, to----" she stopped.

"Yes?" he said, aware that his voice was crisp. He had not meant to have it so, but his voice, when Cecilia was near, did as it pleased.

"It's about John," he heard her say very quickly. "He--you know he cares a great deal about you, and that you influence him greatly. You did more than any one else ever has for him."

"I'm sure," interrupted K. Stuyvesant, "I'm glad. I don't mean that," he blurted out; "I mean----"

"I understand," said Cecilia; "I telephoned you to ask you if you wouldn't come to the house sometimes because of him? I--I'm not home very much. The--the little incident of the boat is quite forgotten----"

K. Stuyvesant coughed.

"I understand you," said Cecilia. "I hope you do me?"

"Yes," answered K. Stuyvesant miserably.

"You will help him?" she questioned further.

"I will," he answered. "I told Miss Marjory I'd do----

"Yes," broke in Cecilia, unable to bear more; "she told me what you said. I'll be more grateful than you can ever know, too."

K. Stuyvesant swallowed convulsively.

"Good-bye," she said in a small voice. "Good-bye," he answered gruffly. He hung up the receiver and stared across the room. His teeth were set with cruel tightness on his lower lip.... He remembered how her little hand had crept into his beneath a blue and green checked steamer blanket. He almost wished he could forget it.... And that distance at which she'd kept him had not been

what he'd thought, her proving of his sudden love, but only her inclination. Lord, how he'd dreamed, and still dreamed! ... He'd do what he could for John. He believed much was possible.

And how even the sound of her voice left him! Shaking, and aching with his want. First hot, then cold.... He stared, unseeingly, across his office. He recalled his first evening at the country house when he'd stood by the white wall with a Greek relief, worshipping a little Irish maid.

Then Marjory had come. He wished she hadn't. He almost hated her, and found no reason why he should, except for her telling him something which haunted his long nights.... "Cecilia, Cecilia!" ran through his head,--and heart.... For her, he'd do what he could for John. He reached for the telephone and called a number he knew too well. After an interval, and a request, John answered.

At first his tone was languid, then it leaped into colour from pleasure, and K. Stuyvesant hid his eyes.... John, genuine, echoed the dearest Cecilia. His voice, even in its grating boy-quality, held a hint of hers.

"Then we'll go riding?" K. Stuyvesant asked.

"I'd be jolly glad to!" answered John. "I've wanted to see you, but I thought I'd better not bother you."

"We'll take in the aeroplane show," said K. Stuyvesant, "if you like." John liked very much. He hung up the receiver, looking like a boy. His thickened eyelids were lifted, his eyes wide open.

Looking toward the photograph of Fanchette, he recalled an engagement. "You may go to hell!" he said loudly, not stopping to think that his staying away would not send her there; but that she was more liable to its admittance on earth, if he, and other idle young men of his stamp, were with her.

The aeroplane show! That would be great! Of all the chaps he'd ever known he most admired K. Stuyvesant, and to chum with him! Well, wouldn't the fellows look! Well, rather!

In the hall he passed Jeremiah. "Going out with Stuyvesant," he called pleasantly. Confiding his intentions or aim in direction was unusual. Both he and Jeremiah wondered at it. Jeremiah was so pleased that he was past smiling. A little quirk came in his heart, and he whispered, "Just then he looked like Mary used to when I brung her the wages. He did! I wished she could have saw him!" Then Jeremiah went on down the hall, stooping a little more than usual, as he always did with the thought that made him old.

"A bunnit with pink roses on!" he muttered next. That always came with his memory of Mary, that "bunnit" that she never had.

"Hello, Madden," said K. Stuyvesant. John threw out his chest. K. Stuyvesant had acknowledged him a man. "How're yuh?" he added. John said that he was well. As they spoke they sped away from the stern-faced houses of New York's moneyed folk and into its hum.

"Glad to be in town again," said John; "awful glad to see you too. Got beastly quiet out there after Marjory left. Can't be sleepy while _she's_ around!" K. Stuyvesant assented.

"You mashed on her too?" inquired John. K. Stuyvesant took his eyes, for the faintest second, from the street ahead. Then he looked back. He had answered. John felt limp, and adored with more fervor. "Didn't mean to offend," he muttered.

They had spent a pleasant afternoon. At least John thought so, the pleasantest, he thought, for ages, but just now he was suffering from a profound shock. K. Stuyvesant had said something that had left John mentally holding on to his solar plexus.

"You say it's an evidence of _youth_ to get drunk?" said John.

"Uh huh," answered K. Stuyvesant in an indifferent tone. "Surest sign in the world that a fellow's about nineteen. You know how it is, a chap wants to get old, be thought old, so he imitates what he thinks is manhood. Like a kid, picking out gilt instead of gold, he picks out a drunk, and thinks it's a man. Look at that motor! _Some_ peach!"

"Yes," agreed John absently. However he hadn't seen the motor. He was hoping with violence that K. Stuyvesant had not heard of his lurid past. For the first time he thought of his "past" without pleasure. Heretofore his "past" had been like a treasured museum. Each piece of fresh wickedness added to it with great pleasure, and the knowledge that its value was greater.

"Everybody goes through that stage," said K. Stuyvesant, quite as if he'd read John's mind. "It's the measles of the pin-feather age. Look here, John, whatcha think of that shaft? Looks kinda heavy to me."

"Hollow, aluminum," said John in a little voice. He was suffering from a complete emotional turn over. It was difficult to contemplate shafts. K. Stuyvesant fingered a frame with interest. "Like to own one," he said, "darned if I wouldn't!"

"Keep yer hands off them machines!" said a loud voice, the owner of which glared on K. Stuyvesant. K. Stuyvesant removed his hands. He also smiled. John was nettled. His great dignity was hurt.

"Why didn't you tell him who you were?" he asked of Stuyvesant with heat.

"Oh, Lord!" said Stuyvesant. "Why should I? The fact that I draw a little more on pay day than the next fellow doesn't give me the divine right to paw all over the works." John was silent. He was again mentally steadying his solar plexus. The afternoon had been full of earthquakes to his small ideas, and reconstruction.

"Look here," said John seriously, "did you go through that period?"

K. Stuyvesant looked sheepish, then he laughed. "Sure," he said; "I was a real devil at twenty. I couldn't stand girls because I thought they laughed at me, so I decided to drink myself to death. My proud ideal was to be the heaviest drinker in New York, and to be so pointed out. Sometimes I stayed out as late as two."

John laughed with him, although his inclinations were far from laughter. Coarse hands were despoiling his altar, and, worse, laughing at it, as an echo of childhood.

K. Stuyvesant had seated himself on a folding chair that smelled of a hearse. John settled by him. "These chairs always make me think of Uncle Keefer's funeral," said Stuyvesant. "Mother went, draped in eighteen yards of crape. She mourned him deeply until she heard the will, then she tore off the weeds and had 'em burned."

John was far away, so the subject of Uncle Keefer's funeral was abandoned.

"Did--did you collect girls' photographs?" asked John.

"Girls never liked me," said Stuyvesant, "and guns weren't allowed. I did use to have a gallery of second-rate actresses decorating my boudoir. I bought the pictures at a photographer's. The less they wore the better. Lord, what a calf period! Hiccoughing, little asses! Makes me sick to think of it!" Real disgust was written on K. Stuyvesant's face. John pushed his hair away from his forehead. He felt very hot. If some one else had spoken, he would not have noticed. But K. Stuyvesant--chased by most of New York! Honestly liked by the fellows, as a good sport. Owner of several cups for several achievements. Rated as "damned indifferent, but a bully chap!"

John felt weak and little,--worse,--he felt terribly young. He looked away from K. Stuyvesant. Perhaps K. Stuyvesant sensed something of his misery, for he laid a big hand on John's shoulder. The hand was cheering.

"Where you going to college?" he asked. John explained that he had not thought of going, that he hated work, and that a certain amount of study seemed necessary for school.

K. Stuyvesant talked persuasively. "If you studied this winter you could enter next fall," he said; "you have all of the year to do it in. I'll look up some decent tutors, and help all I can, but I'm darned stupid, myself. Wish I weren't. All I could do would be to root. I'd do that!"

"Would you kind of help me keep interested?" said John, looking at his feet. "I haven't done anything that I haven't wanted to, for so long, that I've lost the knack. If you'd help me keep interested,--will you?"

"You bet I _will_!" answered K. Stuyvesant.

"Thank you," said John quietly. K. Stuyvesant's hand tightened on John's shoulder convulsively. Then he took it away. Cecilia's voice had seemed to say the little "thank you." He was shaken, and vastly relieved when John began to talk of monoplanes. He wondered with dull misery if all his years would be full of this "where is the rest of me?" feel. "Why isn't she here? _How_ can we be apart when I feel like this?"

He looked at John. The monoplane essay had ceased. "How is your sister?" asked K. Stuyvesant gruffly.

"Cecilia," said John, "I wish you'd come in." He was by the door of his bedroom as he spoke. Cecilia answered that she'd be happy to come in, and stepped past him. "I'm going to college," said John dramatically after he'd closed the door. "Stuyvesant wants me to. He thinks he can get me in his Frat. He's going to buy an aeroplane, but he says I can't go up unless you say so. Can I? Are you glad I'm going to college?"

Cecilia was entirely bewildered, but said she was glad he had decided to go to college. She sat in a low chair by a table, and her bewilderment increased when John took several photographs from his bureau and threw them carelessly into the waste basket. Next she saw Fanchette thrown in a table drawer, which was then slammed.

"John dear," said Cecilia, "_are_ you sick?"

"No," answered John, then she saw a twinkle in his eyes, often there in the little boy days. "I'm Irish," he continued, "and I can see a joke, even on myself. I've tried to be very old, Celie."

She put her arms around his neck. He hid his face against her throat, and she felt him shake. The joke was forgotten. "It's so hard," she heard in muffled tones; "I'm ashamed of dad, and then I try to gloss it over, I----"

"If it hadn't been for dad," said Cecilia slowly, "we would have both been getting slabs of peat out of an Irish bog, surely barefooted, probably hungry."

"It would have been better," said John bitterly.

"Perhaps," answered Cecilia, "but that is not the question. We're here."

"Quite so," said John, and laughed a little. He had drawn away, ashamed of his emotion.

"Have I seemed like a kid to you?" he asked.

Cecilia looked at him squarely. "Yes," she answered.

"Why didn't you help me?" he blurted out. "Let me be the laughing stock of every one. The son of a multi-millionaire, the laughing stock of----"

"If you recollect," interrupted Cecilia, "I did try. More than once. You told me I was only a girl, that I didn't understand. You even told me to mind my business on several occasions."

"Oh, Celie!" said John.

"Dear!" answered Cecilia, in another tone. She sat on the arm of the chair in which he'd thrown himself. He put an arm around her.

"Now that you are awake," said Cecilia, "what do you think of those near-men you've been introducing me to all summer?" She was smiling. John's inclination to anger vanished. He smiled foolishly instead.

"The mixture is the trouble," he said, "with no one whom you can respect to guide you,--no power above. I feel better, naturally, than the Gov'ner."

Cecilia let that pass. "Orchids and hollyhocks in one bed," she said, "but in time I believe you'll come to love the homely honesty of hollyhocks,--those that thrive in all weathers. I believe you will, John. I do."

He got up and stretched. The new man had gone. She saw this, and rose with him. "Good-bye, dear," she said in a very everyday tone; "I'm glad you had a good time this afternoon."

In a flash he changed again. His arms closed about her soft body, and he kissed her. "Celie," he said huskily, "you're the _best_ fellow!"

"Johnny," she answered, "you _darling_!" He gave her another squeeze, and released her. Then he was again the conscious boy. "This darn tie," he muttered, looking in a mirror; "it wads up rottenly!"

Cecilia left indifferently, but outside his door she turned and kissed a panel opposite her small head.

She wore the want-to-cry expression which so worried Jeremiah, but her eyes were happy. They looked like those of a little girl who holds the best beloved, just mended, doll, all fixed up, ready to love and spank some more, to scold, forgive, and kiss.

CHAPTER XIV

PINK

"You are an advocate of gum-chewing?" asked Miss Annette Twombly, with a faint, not too pleasant smile.

"No," answered Cecilia, "but I do think we ought to give them a good time, not reform them. Why, they get discipline all day at their work. I wanted to make them forget that, and all their imperfections." She turned with the words to glance about the group of young women who sat in the office of the Girls' Club.

There was a vague murmur. "But--gum--!" Cecilia heard in a voice which held horror.

"My idea," said Annette, in her cool, slow voice, "was to give them higher ideals, and to teach them not to wear those horrid, pink silk blouses, you know. Teach them that it isn't nice to chew gum, and,--ah,--well, give them a _larger_ life."

"How are you going to give it?" asked Cecilia. "I see what you are going to destroy, but what are you going to put in their places? I think a certain amount of pink is necessary. It has to be _very_ bright, for there is so little of it. It has to reach a long way."

Annette didn't think this worth answering. She simply raised her shoulders and eyebrows in a gesture denoting suffering tolerance and pity. Then she turned to a neighbour and spoke in an undertone. They laughed, and Cecilia flushed.

"Are you an upholder of the green velvet 'throw' on the parlour organ, Miss Madden?" asked a young woman, noted for her bizarre dress.

"I am when the green velvet is the only possible beauty for them,--the only reachable one. I think it's so narrow," she went on heatedly, "to make them enjoy themselves just in our way,--to inflict our likes and dislikes because it's possible to do so. I want to give these girls what _they_ consider a good time, and what they want. Patterns for good times differ. I want dances instead of classes in art. They need them."

"But, my dear,--gum, and those fearful frocks! Annette meant to tell them not to wear cheap laces, but to dress plainly, and suitably to their station," explained a drab young lady whose own dress looked as if it had been designed for a futurist ball.

Cecilia sighed. She saw a band of heavy-eyed and tired-out girls denied their little cravings for beauty. She saw them laying aside pink blouses which brought a faint pink into their small, starved souls. She saw them trying to be ladies, and losing the little solace of "spear-mint gum," and roses of cabbage size and architecture on their cheap hats.

"I think they need the pink," said Cecilia. "If their dress is criticised I think the Club is failing in its mission. Every one will criticise them, few will love them. Let's leave their manners and their dresses to their own management. Let us just try to make them forget the factories, and the flat crowded full of children. I wanted to give them a place where they could bring their beaux."

"We agreed about the dances," said Miss Twombly; "I shall _adore_ coming to them! Won't they be _killing_?" A hum of voices followed this, in which was heard: "But their horrible frocks!"--"In the end they would thank us!"--"Give them a vision of a larger, more helpful life!"

"I shall not subscribe to a reformatory," said Cecilia loudly. She hated to say it, but an echo of some one who had wanted a "bunnit with pink roses on" flew before her. She meant to do all she could to help other people get, and keep, their particular brands of pink roses.

Cecilia's contribution for the club's maintenance was large. It was agreed that for the present at least no helpful hints as to the bad taste of its members' clothes should be given. Cecilia looked at a small watch, and got up. She said good-bye pleasantly. When the door closed after her there was a surge of noise.

"Well," said Annette in a carrying tone, "of course she _would_ sympathise. I suppose her own tastes are really theirs. _Have_ you ever seen her father?"

"She plays 'The Shepherd Boy,' and 'The Storm in the Alps' for him every evening," said the bizarre.

"My _dear_," said another, "_have_ you seen the boy? He is _really_ quite possible and they say that the horrible old man is fabulously wealthy too."

"Criminal!" breathed Annette. Her eyes were angry and full of resentment.

"Annette," said a girl from across the room, "how are you getting on? I think it's too original of you!"

"You aren't still doing that?" asked another. Annette nodded.

"What?" asked a bewildered onlooker.

"Working, really work," she was informed.

"My _dear_, how sweet!" said the informed. "Isn't it ennobling, and broadening, and all that kind of thing?"

Annette nodded, and then spoke flippantly of it as a "lark." Her bravado was a bit too thick. Several young people who knew something of Mrs. Twombly's investments looked at each other across Annette's head.

After she left there was another free discussion. "Social secretary," said the drab one, "to a horrid person from Ohio, or the state of Washington, or somewhere terribly west. Trying to break in, lots of money, but oh,--like the Maddens."

"Hasn't Stuyvesant a huge fortune?" asked the bizarre. "Why doesn't he help then? Though his not doing so is quite what I'd expect. I tried to be so pleasant to him on one occasion, and he was absolutely _rude_! Really rude! He said----"

Cecilia had stopped at Mrs. Smithers' on her way home. She sat by the stove holding the latest Smithers on her lap.

"We got it with tradin' stamps," said Mrs. Smithers. She held up a purple vase which had evidently been created by some one suffering with a toothache. Mrs. Smithers was trying not to smile. She felt that she should be easily careless with her new grandeur, but it was hard to be so. "Look at that there seascape," she said, turning the seascape side toward Cecilia, "an' that there sailor with his girl. Ain't she purty? My old man, he sez if he seen one like her, he wouldn't come home no more!" Cecilia joined Mrs. Smithers' loud laughter over the "old man's" subtle humour.

"Two books," Mrs. Smithers explained after the laughter had ceased, "an' next time we're going to get a plush photograph album. It has a mirror-like on top, with daisies and I dunno what all painted around. _Hand_ painted on that there velvet, mind yuh. It's _swell_!"

"I imagine it is," agreed Cecilia. "You like to have pretty things, don't you?" she questioned.

Mrs. Smithers' wide and fat face clouded. "Dearie," she said, "yuh gotta have gilt an' fancy vases to make yuh ferget how homely most life is. I wish you could have saw me yesterday. My Gawd, I get tired a-doin' the wash, an' Jim so tony, him usin' _two_ shirts a week! Well, I didn't mind the sweatin' all day, the way I do over the wash, f er all I seen was that there vase a-settin' there. Now ain't it purty?"

Cecilia agreed that it was. Mrs. Smithers smiled again. "Why," she exclaimed, "I nearly forgot Lena's dress--the one she's going to wear to the club dance. She set up 'til one last night a-fixing it. She was tickled to fits about it. Looka here." Mrs. Smithers reached below the dining table and took out the third box from the bottom. She opened it reverently. It disclosed a dress of cheap and flimsy lawn, made in the most extreme of styles. There was black velvet on it, several bales of lace, and some roses. Its colour was pink.

"How lovely!" said Cecilia, and she meant it; for Cecilia saw what the colour meant,--what it brought,--and the dress to her was truly lovely.

"Yessir," said Mrs. Smithers; "Lena, she sez, 'Maw, I feel like a queen in this here!' (she's partial to pink) an' yuh oughta see her in it. Mebbe she ain't purty. Her gentleman friend, who works at Helfrich's delicatessen store, cold meat counter, yuh know,--he sez, 'My Irish rose,' when he seen it. That's a song, 'My Irish Rose.' The Kellys got it on the graphaphone. It's swell. Ever hear it?"

Cecilia had not.

"I wish she had a pink hat," said Mrs. Smithers, "an' then she could wear this to church. First Luthern, we go to,--that one with the fancy brick, corner of Seventh, and----"

"I have a hat," said Cecilia, "that I'm going to send to Lena. It's pink, and it has lots of roses on it!"

Tears came to the little eyes of Mrs. Smithers. She beamed widely. "I didn't mean fer to hint," she said; "honest to Gawd, I didn't."

"I know," answered Cecilia, "and you know I love to send Lena things. Is she still coughing, and is she drinking the milk I send?"

"Yes," answered Mrs. Smithers, "but she don't just like it. She likes evaporated better, bein' used to it." Mrs. Smithers looked doleful. The mention of Lena's cough always made her so. Her expression was like that of a meditative pig, for her small eyes and fat face together provided everything but the grunt. However, to Cecilia she was beautiful, for Cecilia saw the love in Mrs. Smithers' soul, which she spread around her seven children and the "old man."

"I won't forget the hat," called Cecilia from the doorway, "and it shall be _very_ pink!"

"Miss Madden, meet my gentleman friend." The gentleman friend shuffled his feet and emitted a raucous "Pleased tuh meet yuh."

It was the night of the first dance at the Girls' Club. Little knots of its members stood around the edges of the floor, laughing often, and loudly. The gentlemen friends seemed to spend their time deciding which foot to stand on, and then shifting to the other.

The committee of "uplift workers" rushed around wildly, doing nothing. It was notable that Cecilia was the one to whom the "gentleman friends" were introduced.

Lena Smithers came up to Cecilia. "That hat," she said, "I dunno how to thank yuh! Paw, he's talkin' alla time about them roses. They're grand!"

"I'm glad you liked it, dear," said Cecilia.

"Yes," went on Lena more shyly, "an' my gentleman friend, him who clerks at the delicatessen, he likes it too. Honest, that boy's grand to me! They ain't hardly an evening that he don't bring me a string of sausage or a hunk of ham!" Cecilia looked impressed and murmured, "Really?"

"Um hum! Gawd's truth!" said Lena.

"Mr. Ensminger," said a fat girl, towing a flaxen-haired boy with no chin. "Soda fountain clerk to the Crystal. Better kid him on, Miss Madden, mebbe he'll give yuh a soda!"

There was loud laughter at this persiflage. Suddenly Cecilia forgot it, her surroundings, the gentlemen friends, in fact everything but the cruelly fast pumping of her small heart, for across the room she saw John coming in, and by him Stuyvesant Twombly.

"How did Mr. Twombly happen to come?" Cecilia asked of John much later, when they were dancing.

"Why," answered John, "I told him of it, and he said, 'Let's go down. Would your sister mind?' Of course I said, 'No.'"

"Of course," answered Cecilia.

"Who's the girl who dances like a duck with the rheumatism?" asked John. "She walked halfway up my shins, got discouraged, gave it up, and then later started it all over again."

"Sweet persistency," murmured Cecilia. Her eyes were on the partner of the duck with the rheumatism, K. Stuyvesant. He looked warm.

The music stopped. Cecilia and John found themselves with the duck and her partner. K. Stuyvesant stepped toward Cecilia with determination. "Will you _please_ give me the next?" he said. His request was made in a desperate tone, a tone absolutely unsuitable for the asking of a dance.

"Why," said Cecilia, "there are so many girls here who sit about. I have to see that they have partners, and----"

"Oh, go on!" broke in John. "You dance; I'll do the proper for you." K. Stuyvesant put a hand on John's arm; the touch was full of gratitude. Then the music started in a slow, sentimental, sweet waltz song, popular that season. K. Stuyvesant invented several new steps. It was good that Cecilia was an unusual and adaptable dancer, for his tempo and intentions were mixed. "What is this?" he asked at last.

"A waltz," answered Cecilia, and at that he stopped his mixture of one-step and maxixe. "Excuse me," he said gruffly. Beads of wet stood out on his forehead. He was out of breath.

"Would you like to stop?" asked Cecilia. "It's warm and you seem tired."

"Oh, no!" he said passionately. She looked up at him, and when their eyes met his arm tightened with a spasmodic quickness about her; then he turned a deep mahogany colour and stared unseeingly across her head. He had not meant to do that. He wondered what she'd think of him.

As for Cecilia, she shut her eyes and tried to be indignant. It was an insult, an insult when he felt as Marjory said he did, an insult! But oh, how sweet, how sweet!

The music stopped. "Thank you," said K. Stuyvesant huskily. Then he left Cecilia with many maidens and singled out John. "If you don't mind, I'm going home now," he said. "I'm tired. Thank you for bringing me along."

He looked back toward Cecilia. He saw the top of her golden head, surrounded by others of more elaborate coiffure. They made a worshipping circle around her.

"Gosh!" said K. Stuyvesant. He recalled the little second when he'd drawn her nearer. "I'm not sorry!" he thought, then turned to hurry away from the lights and the music, for he wanted to be alone.

CHAPTER XV

FIRELIGHT

"It's a serious," said a boy with a voice like a nutmeg grater.

"Yuh boob!" exploded his companion. "He means a serial," he explained to Father McGowan.

"And," said Father McGowan, "you have come to me because you are temporarily embarrassed for funds?"

"Yep," said the nutmeg grater. "We're broke."

"An' it's that exciting! Every time they busts up an automobile an' wrecks a train--we'd pay yuh back,--an' him an' her in it, they----" broke in the other.

"You'd like a loan," said Father McGowan. "Well, well, here it is. What's the name of it?"

"'The Iron Claw,'" said the younger impressively. "It's grand. Them there shows learn yuh a lot too." His voice showed his great thirst for knowledge. Father McGowan smiled. He was urged to go along, with the assurance that they would also pay for that in the future, but he refused on the plea of work.

He went to the rectory door with them and let them out into the dismal snowfall, the first of the season. Half-hearted, damp, then he went back to his study, with a tender look in his eyes.

He was thinking of a small boy who had known no such pleasures--a small boy brought up by an always-old aunt, whose heart and soul were cut square, and without any dimples. He had been a very quiet small boy with a great hankering for nails and something to pound with.

He had gone through the pound period without pounding, and when he reached the dream time he knew that dreams to his unyielding old aunt would be as troublesome as nails, so he had kept silent.

Father McGowan's eyes still held the wistful look that had come into them at seventeen. He recalled all his naillessness as he saw two joyful theatregoers start off to see "The Iron Claw," but in thinking of it there was no regret--only a gratitude that from his denials had come a backyard full of junk and a paradise for many little boys who otherwise would have gone without their small-boy heaven.

"She was a good woman!" said Father McGowan; "a good woman!" He was thinking of the still old aunt who'd brought him up.

"Are you well, Father McGowan-dear?" asked Cecilia later in the afternoon when Father McGowan had settled before a fire in the Madden library.

"Oh, yes," answered Father McGowan. "Have a little cold, but I feel splendidly." Cecilia did not look impressed, and certainly Father McGowan's aspect was not convincing. His head was thrown back against the chair, and his breath came raspingly.

"A hot lemonade," said Cecilia rather to herself.

"Never!" said Father McGowan. "Never! Cecilia, you are a dear child. Don't irritate me. I hate lemonades. They make me think of money for the parish house, and they are bad enough cold."

"Hot toddy?" suggested Cecilia; her eyes twinkled.

"Ah--!" replied Father McGowan softly. Cecilia rang, spoke to a haughty person in buttons, and soon Father McGowan was sipping something warm which did not smell of lemons.

"How's the pain?" asked Father McGowan in a commonplace tone; he studied the glass he held.

"Oh," answered Cecilia, "it is the same, but I am braver. I _will_ be good, Father McGowan. I can't help lov--caring for him. I fixed my hair eight times the other day when I knew I'd see him, and used an eyebrow pencil Marjory left, but it wasn't becoming, and I washed it off. I can't help caring for him, although I know he's unworthy. I seem to have lost my handkerchief,--thank you." Father McGowan supplied a large square.

"You didn't use to cry much, did you, dear child?" he asked gently.

"No," answered Cecilia, "and I don't now except with you. You see, when I voice it it becomes so tragically real. It is fixed because I speak it to a human, while when I think of it it seems like a bad dream. It--it doesn't seem possible that I can care so much, while he doesn't."

The fat priest reached for Cecilia's hand. He lifted it and kissed it. Cecilia looked surprised.

"A token of immense respect and humble love, dear child," said Father McGowan. "Kisses," he continued, "Cecilia, tie to the man who humbly kisses your hand. There are two kinds, the kind who wants only your lips and the kind who humbly touches your hand and who longs to be absolved by whimpering out his shames against your throat. Lord, what an old fool I am! _What_ a subject for a priest to lecture on!"

Cecilia was silent, for she was thinking of Stuyvesant's kisses, which still burned her palm. They had held humbleness,--and hunger. She remembered how he had muttered that he "darn well wanted to get down on his knees, gosh! How he _did_ love----" And then Mrs. Higgenmeyer had come along and called loudly of the night: "Purty night, ain't it?" and, worse, the chaperone of Boston had then appeared and said in her crisp, quick-cut way: "'Beautiful night of stars,' as our inimitable Mr. Browning said."

Then the man with the Vandyke beard from Philadelphia had passed. He had crossed forty times, had a valet, and complained of the coffee and service, therefore commanding every one's respect. "Stevenson," he had corrected in passing. "Horrid person!" said Miss Hutchinson, but to Cecilia there were no horrid persons, for the world was full of a tall, gruff man, and her heart was swollen from his hot kisses on her small palm. Her eyes must have told him something of this, for he muttered, "Dear!" with the impetuosity of a loosened champagne cork. "What say?" Miss Hutchinson had asked.

"Father McGowan," said Cecilia, "shall I ever be allowed to forget my inferiority to the most? It is always there, even when they ask me for money for their charities. They say, 'Mrs. Dash has subscribed. _You_ will probably _want_ to.' By right of bricks, I purchase my admission. Shall I always feel this way?"

"Oh, no," answered Father McGowan. "When you get past thirty you forget how you feel--that is, if you're any good. After that you think of others, and the _ego_ is rubbed down by the world into its proper size."

"I _am_ a pig!" said Cecilia.

"You're not!" disagreed Father McGowan. "No one could call you that----" He paused. "For a long time," he went on, "I've wanted to say something to you, because you are too near it to get a perspective. I want you to look around at the snobs who do not mix with those in trade, and then I want you to ask what grandpapa did. Probably he made pretzels or ran a laundry. Do not ask the

immediate members of the family of this, for they may not like it, but ask some _kind_ friend. You and John, you people of stronger, fresher blood, are America. You are what comes in and puts bright eyes into depleted stock and takes out the hiccoughs. Don't apologise for your strength and the fact that papa's reservations for his first trip were made in the steerage."

"I don't," answered Cecilia. "I'm rather blatantly proud of it, although since boarding school I haven't bragged of it."

"In time you may even elevate your lorgnette and ask coldly, 'Who _is_ she?'" suggested Father McGowan.

"Oh, no!" said Cecilia, "I'll _never_ do that!"

"Your children probably will!" said Father McGowan, and then he said "Drat!" to his own stupid self.

"My children," said Cecilia, "are gentle, white ghosts, and they play and do only what I dream. They would never do that, I would send them from my arms first, and I do--love them. My arms would be empty. Am I going to be a sentimental old maid, Father McGowan-dear?"

Father McGowan said he thought not. Then he turned and again quite brazenly kissed Cecilia's small palm.

"Cecilia," he said, "to-day seems like the end of the world to me.... My soul is on wings. Dear child, I wish you could know what you have always been to me. But you do, don't you?"

"Yes, Father McGowan-dear," answered Cecilia. "I have known. I have always brought my worst hurts to you, and one does that only to one who loves."

"Well, well," said Father McGowan, unused to personal sentiment and awkward from it, "now we understand. How's John?"

"Wonderful," answered Cecilia. She smiled mischievously. "Almost a boy again," she added in explanation.

"Twombly responsible?" asked Father McGowan.

"Yes," she answered, "entirely. His ideals when transplanted are unusually good. However, they do not seem to take root in him."

"Well, well," said Father McGowan. He stretched in a tired way and said he must go. No, he couldn't stay for dinner, for he was to take the night turn at nursing a burned iron moulder. "Won't he be thirsty when he sniffs my lemonade?" said Father McGowan.

Cecilia rang; the lofty person appeared. "Just a minute," said Father McGowan. "I want one more word with you." The person faded.

"Cecilia," said Father McGowan, "there's a doctor to whom your father is playing God. I don't want to bother you about it, but to-day, coming here, I somehow felt as if I ought to." Father McGowan settled on the edge of a chair, and he told Cecilia the dry facts of the ruin of Doctor Van Dorn. "Try to make your father see that it's better not to tamper with the works," he ended; "to leave that to whoever or whatever is pushing the old ball around.... Well, good-bye, dear child. Oh, I can get out without the help of his Royal Buttons, thank you."

After he left Cecilia again settled in front of the fire to think of her new problem. Her brain eluded it with a maddening persistency. She thought of a new frock, the Girls' Club, a dance. Then again of the really horrible revelation, and the unexpected obstinacy of her father.

She looked up at a softly coloured painting above the mantel, which she'd had painted in Paris. It had been marvellously done, and especially since the only model had been a small tintype.

"Dearest," said Cecilia, "you would not want him punished, would you? And,--is there any punishment more cruel than life?"

The painting smiled down gently.

"Pink roses," it seemed to say. "There are always pink roses, but youth must hold them to see their beauty.... Seeing no loveliness in dreams denied, no heights in greatest depths...."

"Come in!" said John. "Please!" K. Stuyvesant hesitated. He wanted to, for just a glimpse of Cecilia was everything to him; but, she--she had not wanted to see him. "I am out a great deal," she said in that memorable 'phone message,--also, "I have quite forgotten the little episode of the boat." Those two sentences had made things cruelly plain.

"Come on," begged John, "you must be cold!"

K. Stuyvesant got out of his machine, and went with John into the long-waisted house.

"Fire in the library," said John; "wood, you know. Bully, aren't they?" John, ahead, stopped with his hand on the drapery which softened the broad doorway into the library. He put the other, silencingly, on K. Stuyvesant's arm. Cecilia sat in front of the fire. She held a framed picture in her hands, standing upright on her knees. Looking,--looking,--looking, she was. They stood there for what seemed to Stuyvesant many minutes. He felt himself grow hot, cold, then he longed to shake John,--again, hug him.

"Celie!" called John. With a crash the photograph slipped from her hands to the floor.

"Oh!" she cried breathlessly, "_how_ you frightened me!"

"Come in, Stuyv," said John, loudly. "Look what she's looking at! _Your_ picture!" Stuyvesant didn't answer. He had set his teeth, and his chin was very square.

"How long were you there?" asked Cecilia.

"We just came in," said Stuyvesant, before John could answer.

"I just picked up your picture," said Cecilia. "John hadn't shown it to me. I'm sorry I was stupid and broke the glass."

She moved, and Stuyvesant's eyes followed her, a heartache too large for concealment showing in them.

"Whatcha go for?" asked John. "Stay and talk!"

"I really can't, dear," she answered. "I'm sorry." Then, nodding, she disappeared. In a moment they heard the sound of the piano. Some one who could feel, as well as play, was tinkling out "The Shepherd Boy."

"She does it for dad," said John, "because he likes it, but you ought to hear her play good music. She's a wonder; why, in school----"

John broke off, another thought interrupting: "Why didn't you let me jolly her about your picture?" he asked. "It was a great chance."

"She wouldn't like it," answered K. Stuyvesant miserably. "Please don't tell her we were watching her, will you, John?"

"Aw,--why not!"

"_Please_, John!" Stuyvesant's voice was earnest.

"Well, I won't," agreed John in a disappointed way. "But I do like to tease her! She's awfully cunning when she gets excited, and you can get a rise out of her every time."

After that they settled to play rum for a small stake. Stuyvesant was absent. Time and again John and the cards faded while he saw Cecilia sitting before an open fire,--soft in the firelight, gentle,--almost ready to smile on him. His picture? ... Probably scorning him,--but,--at least she'd thought of him for that little space. He looked toward the chair, and he saw her gently smile in his direction.

"Rum!" yelled John, much delighted. "That puts me out. Gee, you're in the clouds! You owe me forty-nine cents."

CHAPTER XVI

THE MYSTERY

The rectory hall was quiet, although it was well filled with people--shabby, the most of them, and sitting uneasily upright in their chairs. Damp snow clung to the coat of one woman who had just entered, and the smell of dirty and wet clothing was in the air.

Now and again the steam pounded in a low radiator below a window. There was a great deal of sniffing, and a hacking cough from a woman who bragged of a "weak chest." At last an old man who had been fingering the brim of his hat spoke in a hoarse whisper. "How _is_ he?" he croaked. His thumb pointed over his shoulder toward the stairs.

"Ain't no better," responded the woman who coughed. "_She_ come down a half hour ago an' sez 'He's the same.'" The woman coughed again, and afterward wiped her eyes.

"He gimme a pipe," said the old man, turning the hat in his hands. "It hez a real amber mouthpiece on. He sez, 'Here, Jake, you know a good pipe, now I don't. This here was gave to me, I want you should hev it,' he sez,--like that he sez----"

"I bet!" said a frightened looking little man, hitherto silent, "I bet he did! What he done fer me----!" The little man stopped, looked around, and cowered back in is chair, swallowed several times, then spoke in a high voice, evidently unnatural and the fruit of great effort. "I was in the penitentiary," he said, "an' when I come out no one would gimme a job. I was despert. I got my wife, an' her aunt, what's had a stroke, an' can't use her limbs no way. My wife took to coughin' an' couldn't work no more. Gawd, it was fierce! I was despert. I come to him. What he done fer me----! I sez 'What kin I do? I gotta feed them women. Hev I gotta steal again?' He sez no, an' he set me down an' gimme a meal. Talkin' to me while I et ... Gawd, I never kin fergit it.... That there meal was none of them cold potato hand-outs served up with a sneer. Human beings is awful rough with each other sometimes. When I got through I got up. I sez, 'I don't want no more. I guess I kin hunt my own job now, fer you've made me a man agin....' He sez, 'Well, well,' an' then he set me down, an' believe it or not, he gimme a c_ee_gar! A fie' center too! Then he come with me to my old woman, and Aunt Ellen, an' he seen that they was did for, an' the next week he got me a job at the cement plant." After he finished he cowered again. The world had shown him little forgiveness. His world was scorn, or a hidden shame.

The little man had, in telling of Father McGowan's goodness, voiced his crucifixion. The pain of telling it made him feel as if he were at last thanking the big priest adequately.... He blinked, and avoided his companions' eyes now. He knew what to expect.

"I'm glad he helped yuh," said the old man, "but he would. There ain't nothing he wouldn't do fer nobody."

Common sorrow, like common joy, had drawn these people together. The love of the man upstairs had filled their souls, and left no room for littleness. The little man of the penitentiary was one of them, not an outcast.

He sat up straight again, still blinking. "Yer right," he said; "he's helped a lot of us to believe there is a Gawd ... an' something beside hell, livin' or dead."

"Yep," answered the woman with the cough. She drew a shawl close about her and moved near the clanking radiator. "Ain't it cold?" she said. "I'm used to settin' near the stove. I wisht she'd come. That there woman in white, I mean, the one what nurses him."

"I wish too," said a fat soul who surveyed every one with suspicion. "I gotta get home an' pack my man's dinner pail. Night work he does. It ain't so nice. _I_ don't get no company. All day long he snores, an' at night I set home, or go alone. We used to go to pictures every Monday regular as clockwork."

"He helped me buy a parlour organ," said a thin woman a little apart from the group. "I come to him, and I sez, 'I'd go hungry to get a organ, what I could pick out tunes on, an' mebbe learn to play "Home, Sweet Home" on.' He sez, 'Well, well!' (yuh know his way) an' then I told him how I'd wanted one, an' saved up, and then had to use that there money to bury pop (his insurance havin' ran out) an' he helped me. I got it. I kin play three measures a 'Home, Sweet Home,' real good, except fer being slow in the bass.... There ain't nothing like music fer company. I don't get lonely no more of evenings. I use to get that down, an' tired a settin' alone after work, that I'd hate to hear the six a'clock whistles. It ain't no joke, settin' in one room with the wall paper all off. I wonder how he is?" she ended in another voice. No one answered. The woman near the radiator coughed, then wiped her eyes. The old man twirled his hat.

A girl with a sullen look slunk in, and settled near the door. There was quiet. Once in a while a chair was moved, and grated on the floor. The radiator clanked. There was the staccato tap of heels in the upper hall, then on the stairs.

"_You_ ask her," said one woman to another.

The old man spoke. "Mrs.," he said, "how _is_ he?"

"There ain't no change," said Mrs. Fry, "and there ain't no sense to your settin' here."

"We'll be quiet," said the old man wistfully, "and we'd kinda like to. We all love him."

Mrs. Fry covered her face with her handkerchief. "Set if yuh want to," she said in what was, for her, a softened tone, "but there ain't a bit a sense to it." Then she turned and went down the hall, blowing her nose loudly.

"There's three doctors," said a girl just out of childhood, and yet from her place in life old looking.

"I know that," replied the thin woman. "It looks bad fer him, but he _can't_ die! There ain't another!"

"He won't die!" said the old man. "Fer them that knowed him, he'll always live."

In the kitchen Mrs. Fry was sobbing in the roller towel. She heard Father McGowan's voice come, as it had, in gasps. "Now,--now! Mrs. Fry----" echoed in her heart, "don't feel badly--I'm tired,--and--I'm ready to go--to sleep----" And then he had smiled.

"Mrs. Fry," came in a voice from the doorway, "yer wanted!" She looked up to see an old man with the tears running down his face and following the wrinkles in criss-cross paths of salty moisture.

The nurse stood in the hall. She alone was calm. "You'd better go now," she said quietly to the little group. Several of them sobbed loudly. The door opened suddenly. "Where's Father McGowan?" called a little boy. "I got a new kitty what I want to show him. _Ain't_ he in?"

Cecilia was on her knees in the dark, by her bed.

"Father McGowan," she whispered, "oh, Father McGowan-_dear_, where are you?" He had not gone where childhood had had an Irish mother go. Growing had made the mystery--the vast uncertainty--the haunting question of the still, dark hours!

Cecilia lifted her face. Her eyes were dry. "Oh, God," she said aloud, "if you are, give us another life. There is no possible good-bye for little human hearts that love. Oh, God, let me see Father McGowan-dear again. Oh, let me! I will be good all my life, if I may meet him once again----"

She stopped, choked.

The mystery echoed.... "Father McGowan-dear," she whispered, "where _are_ you? Dearest, _where_ have you gone, and why?"

CHAPTER XVII

A RELAPSE

"He died," said Johnny, "of pneumonia. One of those quick cases, you know. Cecilia's frightfully broken up--you can see it--although she doesn't say anything."

"I'm sorry," said Stuyvesant.

"I never saw much in him," said John musingly, "but he had an awful hold on a lot of people."

"Your sister cared for him, didn't she?" asked Stuyvesant, then added bravely, "I think that assures his being unusual."

"Oh, I don't know," said John in a lazy way; "girls are queer,--sometimes sentimental. He was good to her when she was tiny. She always remembers things like that. I think she's kinda sentimental."

Stuyvesant looked peculiar and grunted.

"Saw Tommy Dixon down town to-day," said John. A sudden flush spread across Stuyvesant's face. His eyes were unpleasantly bitter. "Good sport," continued John.

"I disagree," said Stuyvesant loudly. "Don't like him, nor his rotten code." John looked on Stuyvesant speculatively. He reflected that, after all, Stuyv didn't know it all, and that if he wore a cassock he might have been taken for Father McGowan. His ideals were very similar.

"Can't train with a Sunday school class," said John. "Live while you're here, yuh know. Damned if I haven't been good lately!"

Stuyvesant was worried. Thus far his work had been easy, because of John's adoring following. But,--were John to follow Tommy Dixon with the same adoration,--then,--it _would_ be work! He thought, with an inward sneer, of the smallness of the boy's measures for life. He thought of his always following the new, and of his weak swaying, and then he thought of who had asked his help.

"Come to dinner with me, John," he said, while he made mental arrangement for the cancelling of another engagement.

"Don't mind," answered the old John, in his old tired-of-life manner. "Got a date before dinner. Where'll I meet you?" Stuyvesant named a club, and they parted. Stuyvesant went to his office. There were several matters awaiting his attention, but he pushed them aside. Across the room he saw Tommy Dixon's insolent face. On it was the ever-present smile, that which shaded into a leer too easily.... "She says she can't forget his kisses," came with a touch of flame across his tortured brain.

"God!" said K. Stuyvesant. "God!" He hid his eyes with his hands. His breath came fast.

It was half after eight, and John was to have met him at eight. Stuyvesant looked at his watch, and frowned. The day had been hard, and had left small capacity for patience.... The mention of Tommy Dixon had brought back a misery he'd hoped somewhat dulled (one remembered by a stern control of thought, usually not more than once a day).

Now John, after Stuyvesant's breaking an engagement,--was late. His casual acceptance of Stuyvesant's hospitality brought a smile to that gentleman's lips. He wondered if John thought he courted the opportunity of hearing his rather young, and too often callow, opinions stated with absolute assurance as truths?

At nine Stuyvesant shut his watch with a snap, and went out alone to dinner. He was entirely out of humour. He allowed himself to meditate largely on Tommy Dixon. It was torture--exactly fitted his mood, and helped.

"Celie," said Jeremiah.

Celie stopped playing the chimes of a new "piece" of Jeremiah's pattern.

"Celie," he went on, "I done that you asked."

"Doctor Van Dorn?" she asked in a whisper.

"Yes," answered Jeremiah. He blew his nose loudly. "_He_ asked me, an' he asked me," Jeremiah explained, "an' I was that uppish! Jeremiah,' he'd say, 'don't try to cast yourself for God. It won't work,' an' I'd say, 'Is it going to rain, Father McGowan?' Just the last time he come I seen him in the hall, an' he was pleadin' with me; he sez, 'You can control his work. See that he does no harm, but don't do more,' an' I sez, 'It's snowin' now, ain't it?' Oh, dear Lordy! Ain't life one mess of regrets! One after the other, spoilin' your digestion, an' makin' yuh kick around of nights! ... I loved him too."

"Dear," said Cecilia, "he knew that!"

"Yuh think so, Celie?" asked Jeremiah wistfully. "Oh, yes!" she answered. Her answer held an applied genuineness. It convinced Jeremiah.

"I give him back his rotten little factory (I was losin' money on it, anyway), and I wrote him a letter. I sez, 'Dear Sir----' An' I went on telling him Father McGowan an' Gawd done it, not me. I sez I was his well-wisher now, wishin' him all success, an' I sez not to get funny in the hospital business on sick kids no more or I'd have him jailed. The letter was friendly and Christian, all owing to Father McGowan, who doesn't know it--God rest his soul!"

Cecilia was smiling tremulously. "You absolute darling!" she said. She perched on the arm of his chair, and they sat in silence.

"After all," she said, "hurting this little man wouldn't bring mamma her pink roses, would it, dear?"

Jeremiah's eyes snapped. In them was the look that certain competitors, who scorned him socially, dreaded. "It brung me mine," he stated; "it brung me mine!" Cecilia laughed. A sudden lightness of spirit, like the flash of day into dawn, was hers.

"Dear," she said, "I believe Father McGowan knows! I believe he does!" Jeremiah kissed her and smoothed her golden hair with his hand which would never become smooth. "You're like your maw," he said. It was his greatest tribute. Cecilia clung to him with a pathetic hunger.

"Miss Cecilia, the telephone," said the pompous person from the doorway.

"Yes, sir; yes, sir," answered Jeremiah, "she's a-coming." Cecilia went to an adjoining room. After her "yes" things swayed a bit. She did not need his voice, which said, "This is Stuyvesant Twombly." She knew. "Yes," she repeated.

"I _have_ to bother you," he said. "I've just had a message from John. He's been a little hurt--just a little, Miss Cecilia, and he wants you to come with me to where he is. He's a little hurt. You won't worry? I'll stop for you in a moment, that is, if you'll come?"

"Oh, of course!" she answered; "but you're sure he's not really hurt?"

"Yes," he answered. "Do up well. It's cold." She hung up the receiver, and stood a minute, hand over her thudding heart. She was not thinking of John.

As for Stuyvesant, he hung up the receiver and swore loudly. He was thinking of the 'phone message which had come from John, and of John's small sister. "Stuyv," he had heard John say, "I'm up here at the Eagles' View House. I had a bust-up. Get Celie and come. I'm dying----" There had been a lull. "He's fainted," had come across the wires in another tone. Stuyvesant's first amusement over the last 'phone message faded suddenly. Perhaps John had made the supreme effort and had managed to speak those few words? Then he abandoned speculation and telephoned Cecilia. He had assured her that John was not much hurt.... The gentle care of her was instinctive. If John were right the other would come later.

With a doctor in the car they drew up before the Madden House. The chauffeur was not off his seat before Stuyvesant was out and on the steps. "Are you warmly enough dressed?" he asked of her.

"Yes, thank you. John?" she questioned.

"He telephoned me that he had a smash-up and that he wanted you. I have a doctor; he may have some sprains or bruises," said Stuyvesant.

"It's so good of you," she responded. All of Marjory's hints had gone. She felt his hand on her arm and felt from it a sweet sickness.

"Miss Cecilia, may I introduce Doctor Holt? Miss Madden----" After that she settled, and felt rugs being wrapped around her. Stuyvesant's hands lingered. They held a thrilling tenderness. "Are they well around you?" he asked. Cecilia said they were, and Stuyvesant drew a long breath. The doctor looked from one to the other speculatively. He judged them lovers and himself in the way. The girl was certainly entirely lovely--the soft type who asked for gentleness in return for unbounded love. The way she looked at young Twombly as he stared straight ahead was rather beautiful, thought the doctor. She jumped as he spoke. "These gay young men and their speeding," he had said.

"Oh, yes," said Cecilia, "aren't they fearful? I think they should be reared without silly sisters to worry over them!"

The doctor agreed. He imagined young Madden to be a hard-muscled fellow who liked sport. In speaking of speed, his only thought had been mileage.

The car had left the city and was running with difficulty over a road which was bad from a light snow.

"Miss Madden is skidding quite a bit (pardon me, Miss Madden) alone on that back seat. You'd better get back there, Mr. Twombly," said the doctor. He smiled. He thought he had done something very kind, and done it neatly. Mr. Twombly stuttered something that sounded like, "I'm glad; I'd be glad--pleased----" Cecilia stared agonizedly ahead. The car made a turn, and, alone on the broad seat, she swayed, slid half across the seat, bumped.

Stuyvesant turned his chair. "May I, Miss Cecilia, or the doctor? We're going so fast. You'll be so jolted." In answer she turned back the rug, and Stuyvesant settled by her. After that there was quiet. Cecilia looked ahead, through steamed glass, at the ears of Stuyvesant's chauffeur. Stuyvesant sneakingly looked at her.

"Only ten," said the doctor; "we're making good time."

"Pardon?" said Stuyvesant, and at the same time from Cecilia, "Excuse me. I didn't hear." Under cover of the dark the doctor smiled. Cecilia flushed, and Stuyvesant bit his lip. He clasped his hands together very tightly, for he was afraid that if she looked toward him he would put his arms around her and draw her close.

The doctor began to criticise the administration, as people always do when they know little of the facts. Stuyvesant clutched the straw, and argued hotly first on one side, and then the other. The doctor was pleased, for K. Stuyvesant was illustrating a pet theory of his, universal insanity. "Now if Van Dorn could hear this!" he reflected. "Why, the man could be locked up! He's much worse than millions in asylums!"

The car jolted, and turned. Cecilia swayed, and bumped against Stuyvesant's arm. It slipped back of her protectingly, and closed around her. "That was a jolt--" he said shortly, "these roads,--did it jar you?"

"No," answered Cecilia, "thank you." His arm had been pulled away with a jerk. Cecilia stared ahead at the chauffeur's ears. They were large and floppy, and the whole world seemed like them, a misfit. She felt chilled, alone, afraid. She wished the car would jolt again. She wished so brazenly. She didn't care,--she did!

At the Eagles' View Cecilia was ushered up creaking stairs to a cheap, little room. It was shabby, and hung with soiled cretonnes. There were pictures on the walls, entitled "The Bathers,"--"Playful Kittens,"--"A Surprise!" Some more lurid with titles impossible. Stuyvesant had followed Cecilia and from the doorway, over her head, he caught the impression. He had expected it, but it hurt cruelly. His spirit was a mixture of longing to press her face against his shoulder, and a great hankering to kick John.

"I'm dying!" gasped John.

"My dearest!" said Cecilia, and caught her breath sharply, then she slipped to her knees by the bed. She put her arm beneath his head, which was too low, and turned to Stuyvesant. "Where is the doctor?" she asked. At that moment he appeared in the doorway. "Well, young man," he, said, "speeding?"

"I'm going to die," answered John in gasps. Cecilia had grown very white.

"Nonsense!" said the doctor. "Now if you people will just leave us for a few moments----" He began to open his case as he spoke.

"Want me?" asked Stuyvesant.

"No," he was answered; "you take care of Miss Madden." The door opened and a girl appeared. Her hair was streaked from bleach, and dark at the roots; her expression insolently daring.

"How yuh feel, honey boy?" she asked of John. John turned away his face. He looked sicker.

"One of your friends?" questioned Cecilia. John did not answer. "Yes," replied the girl. "I'm Miss LeMain. Me and John have been pals for this long while."

"I'm John's sister," said Cecilia, and held out her hand. Miss LeMain took it with a limp and high gesture cultivated as "elegant." "Pleased to meet yuh," she murmured, and then, "I'm glad you've came. My nerves is that shook up! Mebbe the gent'man would get us something to drink. My nerves is all shook. I feel fierce."

They descended the rickety stairs, the girls followed by Stuyvesant. If John had been well something would have happened to him. As it was Stuyvesant was fiercely protective of the small sister in a curt, silent way. His anger was almost overpowering.... He thought of Cecilia on her knees in that evil room. He thought of her gentle treatment of Miss LeMain.... He was humbled by her sweetness, and furious from its cause.

"Is he your gent'man friend?" asked Miss LeMain while Stuyvesant ordered the drink. Cecilia shook her head.

"Thought he was. Seems like a cute fellah. Gawd, my nerves is shook! Jacky speeds so! I sez, 'Jack, you'll do this trick once too often!' an' he sez, 'I'm running this boat, girlie,' an' I sez some more, an' then he kissed me; yuh know what a kidder he is! An' the car a-running like that! Then the next thing she was over, an' I was in a field. Jack was somewhere in the road. This ain't the _first_ accident I been in. I believe in a short life an' a merry one. All my gent'men friends has cars. No Fords neither. I hope Jacky ain't suffering. He's a sweet boy, an' some sport!" Cecilia's hands were locked tightly together in her lap. Her eyes were tragic. "My nerves is shook up fierce!" echoed Miss LeMain.

"I'm sorry," said Cecilia.

Stuyvesant had appeared in time to hear the last of the recital. "You'd better go lie down," he said decidedly. "It will do you good, and Miss Madden needs quiet."

"An' 'two's company, three's a crowd!' ain't that it?" questioned Miss LeMain with a giggle. Her sally was not greeted with enthusiasm. She left, terming Stuyvesant a grouch, and Cecilia sweet, but lacking pep.

Alone, Stuyvesant stood looking down at Cecilia. His arm was on the mantel. The shadows and lights from an open fireplace played on them. The rest of the room in half dark brought them close. Constraint was impossible because of the situation and Cecilia's dependence on Stuyvesant.

"The money came too quickly," she said meeting his eyes. "John has to spend it in the way that makes the most noise. I--I am so tired of it! So bruised by it! I wish we were back in that little flat, with John laying bricks as my father did. Perhaps then he would be a good man. That is everything to me."

"He is going to be a good man, Cecilia," said Stuyvesant. Neither noticed the use of her first name. "He will be a good man. This is a relapse,--a recurrence of growing pains. There are good things in him. When he's awake he has a sense of humour. That is a darn good thing to have, you know. I think, next to God, it's the best thing a man can own."

Cecilia pressed her handkerchief against her lips. "You will help him again?" she whispered.

"I will," said Stuyvesant. He put out his hand in pledge and hers was swallowed in his huge grasp. At the touch of her hand he gasped, "Cecilia!" but she did not answer, for the doctor's step was heard on the rickety stairs.

"Two broken ribs," he said; "scratch on his arm. Now we'll take him home. He'll probably yell over the bumps, but I judge the yells will do him good. Where's his companion? Send another car for her, or take her along?"

"Send for her," said Stuyvesant.

"No," disagreed Cecilia, "if you don't mind, we'll take her. I think it would be better." Stuyvesant looked annoyed, but sent the oily proprietor to call the lady of the shook-up-nerves. She descended immediately, wrapped in a large fur coat, and with a cerise motor scarf about her head. "I couldn't get no rest," she called; "I'm all fussy. How's Jacky darling?"

"_She_ isn't going with us?" said John at the top of the stairs. He stopped and leaned heavily on Stuyvesant. "My God!" he exploded. "Stuyv, she _can't_! Celie can't meet her! She can't! Tell her we'll send a car. I don't want Celie to see her."

"They've been talking for half an hour," said Stuyvesant. "Your sister insists on taking her in."

"Oh, Lord!" said John. "Oh, Lord!"

"Come along!" said Stuyvesant roughly.

"I really thought I was dying," said John in a shamed way.

"Shut up!" ordered Stuyvesant. "You make me sick!" They went down with no more conversation.

"How are you, dear?" asked Cecilia.

"Oh, Celie!" said John. He reached for her hand and clung to it. "Oh, Celie!" he echoed.

Until dawn Stuyvesant relived the night. The ride home had made the deepest impression. A girl with a painted soul and face had chattered loudly, and with a cheap sentiment reeking in her talk. She had spoken often of "Jacky darling."

While Jacky darling, from shame and pain, had groaned in deep, shaky groans, his head had lain on his sister's shoulder. On the other side Stuyvesant had sat. The doctor had disposed of the case as typical, and was thinking of an article which he'd just read in the _Medical Journal_.

"Dearie," Fanchette LeMain had said, "your fur's open." She had reached toward Cecilia's throat, but Stuyvesant reached first. He fastened the clasp with shaking hands, and the back of one hand touched her chin. Then he had sunk back to dream his impossible dreams, and wonder why she should have cared. He knew he was a duffer! But he was almost sure that she once had cared,--for him.

CHAPTER XVIII

FORGIVENESS

"Celie," said John, "honestly he was devilish to me, and I deserved it!" John was lying on a lounge, covered and looking wan. The library fire burned cheerfully, and the portrait of an Irish mother smiled down on Cecilia and John.

Stuyvesant Twombly had just left. He had uttered some scathing truths.

"He said I was a 'callow pup,'" said John. "He said I shouldn't have called you to that place if I'd been half dead. Cecilia dear, he was right. Celie, forgive me!"

"Dearest!" said Cecilia. She sank to her knees by the lounge, and pressed John's face to hers. He felt her tears.

"I never will again!" he said huskily. "God help me!" She didn't reply. She couldn't, but only pressed him closer.

"I can't bear to see you take the tawdry and cheap," she whispered at length, "for, John dear, it does crowd out the real. I know it does."

He nodded.

"Kiss me," he ordered. She turned her face, and then the door opened.

"I beg pardon," said Stuyvesant uncomfortably, "I thought you were alone." Cecilia had gotten to her feet, and stood, shy and flushing adorably.

"Cecilia's been weeping over the prodigal pup," explained John. "I told her I was sorry. I am. If you and she will give me another chance----" He held out his hand with his words, and Stuyvesant took it.

"I came back to say I was sorry I was so darn brutal," he said, squeezing John's hand, "but I'm afraid I meant it all."

Cecilia left them with a word or two. At the door she turned. Stuyvesant was looking after her, oblivious to John's presence.

"Celie's tears," said John, using a handkerchief on his cheeks. He recalled the new leaf, and added, "Three or four of mine too, I guess." His expression was sheepish, but that vanished, for in Stuyvesant's face was approval. "John," said Stuyvesant, "you're _all_ right!"

John coughed. The genuine gruffness of Stuyvesant unsettled him. "I'm awfully glad you came back," said John. "You'll stay? Let's play rum."

CHAPTER XIX

SPRING

"What are _you_ doing here?" Stuyvesant asked of Annette. Considerable surprise was in his face and voice.

"Oh," answered Annette, "I have been telling Cecilia Madden that I was a pig. I asked her to forgive me. I feel much better!"

They had met on the long drive that ran on the inland side of the Sound house, toward the main road.

"I'm stopping at a house up the road for Sunday," explained Annette. "Cecilia wanted to motor me back, but I needed air. Indigestion and conscience are so much alike. You want to breathe deeply after the easing of both."

"Yes," agreed K. Stuyvesant absently. "How could you ever dislike her, Annette?"

"She came into school," said Annette, "the rawest little person you ever saw. I felt the injustice of her having money, while I, who knew so well how to use it, had to scrimp and save. I saw her with everything in the world that would have put me into heaven and she was miserably unhappy. It was my first taste of injustice. I hated it. I never was a resigned person, you know, Stuyv."

"How did the girls treat her?" asked Stuyvesant. He was becoming gruff.

"We put her through a refined form of hell," answered Annette, "the cruelties of which were only possible for the feminine mind to evolve. Stuyv, _do_ look what you're doing! The gardener will be grateful to you!"

Stuyvesant had been switching a cane viciously. He had taken off many heads of a particularly dressed-up variety of tulip.

"I'll be darned!" he said, looking at them with surprise. "Couldn't you see how dear and all that kind of thing she was?" he queried farther. "I don't see how even a set of simpering, half-witted, idiotic, jealous girls could _help_ seeing----"

"So you're in love with her?" interrupted Annette.

Stuyvesant looked on his cousin with surprise. Then he answered. "Of course," he said, "but how'd you know?"

Annette laughed. After her laughter she slipped a hand through his arm. "Stuyvesant," she said, "your soul and mine are cut from a different pattern. It was always hard for me to understand you, but something has happened lately which has made me larger, much decenter. Stuyvesant, I want a long talk--a heart-to-heart effect. Will you walk back with me?"

"Of course," he answered.

"You'll be glad to know," she went on, "that after Cecilia had pneumonia she was quite the idol of the school. There was one of those complete shifts so characteristic of our American youth, and every one liked her but me. She used to try to make me like her with the most transparent little appeals. Heavens, I was a devil! She sent me violets at one time when I had a cold, and I gave them to the maid, and then spoke loudly before her of unwelcome attentions and social climbers."

Stuyvesant was walking in jerks. His arm beneath Annette's was rigid.

"She's forgiven me," said Annette, smiling.

He relaxed. "I am a darn fool!" he said, "but honestly----!" He stopped and shook his head.

"Doesn't she care for you?" asked Annette; "turned you down?"

"I haven't asked her. She's shown very plainly what she thinks of me."

"Rubbish!" said Annette shortly. "No man in love is a judge of anything! He only knows that she has blue eyes, or he can't just remember, maybe they're brown, but anyway they're beautiful!" Annette's cousin grinned sheepishly.

"What colour are they?" asked Annette.

"I don't know, but I guess they're brown. I know they're unusual, now aren't they, Annette?"

Annette giggled. "Very ordinary," she answered, "and they happen to be blue."

"They're not ordinary. You know they aren't! It doesn't make any difference to me, of course. I'm not in love with her looks, but they're _not_ ordinary!"

"It is not like you," said the girl, "to give up anything you want in that half-hearted way. I don't quite understand, Stuyvesant."

"I----" he began, then stopped.

"Well?" questioned Annette.

"I didn't give it up without being sure. Her friend Marjory, well, she made me see a few things." He was staring moodily ahead. A car whizzed by, leaving a trail of dust. "Damn!" said Stuyvesant. Annette laughed. "You see now if I asked her," he continued, "I'd lose my chance of seeing her. I don't suppose you or any one else could know what that means to me!"

"You might not lose it. I don't trust the green-eyed lady. I never have."

"But she's Cecilia's best friend," objected Stuyvesant, "and why would she do anything to hurt her?"

"I used to think you posed," she answered despairingly. "Now I imagine it is only feeble-mindedness. Take my advice, Stuyvesant: _Ask_ her! The other course is so spineless."

"You don't know what I'd lose!"

"You wouldn't lose it!"

"I wouldn't?" he repeated. "Excuse me, Annette, but really you don't know what you're talking about. I do. I know too well." His voice had become bitter. She looked at him and saw that in the year past he had changed greatly.

"And now about you?" he said in a changed way. "Are you still set on this working business? I hope you aren't. I honestly want to help. It worries me like thunder!"

"You're a dear!" responded Annette, "and that is quite a tale. Can't we sit on this wall? Whose is it? ... The Maddens own all this? Heavens!"

She perched on the wall and he lit a cigarette. "No, not now," she answered as he held out the case. "The small Saint Cecilia doesn't, does she? Well, she couldn't. She might revert to the cob pipe." It was a flash of the old Annette. Stuyvesant looked unpleasant.

"My tale--" said Annette. "You know mamma is a worshipper of the long-haired. Any one who can create _anything_--futurist painters, pianists, the inventor of a new cocktail. You know her, Stuyv."

"Yes," admitted Stuyvesant.

"Well, what with their bleeding and papa's insane investments, he never provided properly for us, Stuyv. Mamma used to go to him and really cry! It was pathetic! And all he would say was that he had no money."

"He hadn't," answered Annette's cousin.

"I'd expect you to sympathise," she said. "You men always do, but that isn't my story. When he died his affairs were in such fearful shape that mamma and I were terribly pinched. She never liked you, Stuyv, or she might have asked your advice. As it was, she invested in lovely nut groves in southern California. The promoters quite misrepresented them; they didn't pay at all or declare dividends or whatever they do. In fact they assessed the owners of the common stock for irrigation or something like that. I don't just understand business. About that time I met Dicky Fanshawe, who doesn't do anything original--only works--fearfully poor. I fell in love with him, but mamma saw me as the mistress of some gilt and pink salon, with a long-haired genius as a husband, and was simply devilish about Dicky. You know her, Stuyv."

"Yes," answered Stuyvesant. "I do."

"Then you know the Altshine failure took us in too."

"Yes," he answered. "I know. Why were you so stiff-necked about my help, Annette? I have enough to help you all you need, and I want to. You know it."

"Mamma has never liked you," said Annette, "but when the crash came, well, she was willing to live on you. For the same reason I was not. I know you disapprove of me. My ideals are not many, but under the circumstances----!"

"You make me feel an awful dub!" said Stuyvesant. "I haven't any right to disapprove of you or be lofty."

"But you do. Well, mamma saw me retrieving the family fortune in some romantic and bohemian manner. I was to create something, a book, or be a decorator for the smart, a reader of East Indian poems. She had splendid ideas, but the fact is, I've found, you have to have a hint of something inside to do anything successfully outside. I hadn't it.

"I descended to a social secretary and chaperoning that horrid woman's nasty little white pups, and from that mamma has consented to my marrying Dicky. He only has ten thousand a year, and I'm going to marry him on that! I love him terribly! Isn't it splendidly romantic?"

"Um," grunted Stuyvesant. "Annette," he said, "I want you to let me provide for your mother. You will? ... No, don't thank me. It irritates me. Oh, please!" After his last plea she stopped her effusive thanks and pressed his arm. Suddenly she laughed.

"What are you laughing at?" asked Stuyvesant.

"Cecilia advocated pink for the poor," Annette explained, "and I never understood how they felt until my terrible employer asked me not to wear frills. She said they weren't suitable for my position! It's all so relative, isn't it? Cecilia saw the panorama. I saw only my corner."

Annette slipped from the wall. "Must go," she said. "Dicky's coming out at eight. You want me to be happy?"

"Of course," said Stuyvesant. Annette's face changed. "Stuyv," she said, "it's everything when you find the one who fits your heart and mind.... _Ask_ her. Please, Stuyv. I can't believe she doesn't care."

"You're awfully good," he answered huskily. "Lord, Annette! If you were right----!"

Annette stepped near him. For the first time since the nursery days she kissed him. "Stay here," she ordered, "and think it out. Bye!" With a wave she left. At the first turn in the road she looked back. Her cousin was still sitting on the wall, and he was staring intently at the cigarette between his fingers. Annette had seen that it had gone out before she started.

"Poor boy!" she said. "Poor boy!" and then she thought of Dicky, who had turned her hard little heart softer to all the world. She forgot the "poor boy" who sat alone on the wall. She forgot money and things, the two which had mattered most to her, and once had been her life. With a new look on her face, she dreamed of a future--a future at which she once would have laughed.

Hers was the spirit that puts glory into the face of the tired mother in the overcrowded flat; beauty into the face of the tawdry little girl who sits on a park bench with her "gentleman friend"; youth into age, waiting for soft and endless night; a little touch of God, a hint of something larger, veiled for eyes too young; the proof intangible, sublime.

CHAPTER XX

PULLING OFF THE THORNS

The heat of June in the city drew forth a hot, damp steam. It made white faces and brought to mind sunstrokes, not June's country thought--roses.

"Gee, it's hot!" said John. He sat opposite Stuyvesant Twombly in a restaurant famed for its coolness. "Come out with me to-night!" he added. "Dad and Celie will be glad to have you, too. Come on! Awful nice and cool out there."

Stuyvesant answered absently, and smiled a little as he did. The idea of "Celie's" being glad to see him amused, even while it hurt, him desperately. He thought with a cankered humour of his trying to find out whether there was a spark of hope for him, after the talk with Annette had made his dreams too daring, and had made him need, all over again, proof of how little he mattered. He had gotten the proof. His first talk had been full of Marjory,--Marjory,--Marjory. He had not wanted to talk of Marjory. Again he had hated her for coming between them.

Cecilia had told of what Marjory's letters had held,--how dear Marjory was (Cecilia had been a bit breathless at this point)--how she, Cecilia, loved her,--where Marjory was,--where she was going. It had been a very surface talk, not once touching anything personal, at least no more than the small Cecilia's great love for her friend. Then John had appeared and Cecilia had excused herself with much relief and gone quickly away.

It was as always, her avoidance, and what in a less sweet nature would have shown as marked distaste. Stuyvesant had understood, and held on to his small privilege doggedly.

"Then I'll leave," Stuyvesant heard John say; he didn't know what had come before, "but I'll get home from school often and see you."

"I'm going away myself for a while," said Stuyvesant,--"I don't know just where. I'm tired of business,--everything. I guess I need a change." He thought miserably of the "change" he needed, and then shut his heart on her sweet image. He made up his mind to stop thinking of "that kind of thing," and his heart laughed at his decision.

[Illustration: CECILIA STOPPED AND GASPED. IT WAS HARDER THAN SHE HAD DREAMED]

"Stuyv!" said John aghast, "what am I going to do without you? Why, Stuyv! You can't go, at least for long. You don't mean a long trip?"

"'Fraid so," he was answered. "I guess I'd better, John. I--the fact is I've wanted something I can't have. I don't want to baby about it, only I'm,--well, I can't forget it here. I'm going to try a change. Damn it! What did I say that for? I hate to whine."

"Stuyv!" said John. He reached across the table, and squeezed the hand that was drawing designs on the tablecloth with a strawberry fork.

Stuyvesant felt the sympathy, and looked up. The boy on the other side of the table gasped.

"Is it as bad as that?" he asked. Stuyvesant shook his head, and then he uttered his own word and convincingly. "Gosh, John," he said, "it's the limit. I'd never have believed it possible."

"Would it help to tell?" asked John. Stuyvesant smiled a little. "Not exactly," he replied. "I did tell one person," he continued after a pause, "and after that it was worse. This person meant well too. Rot it, if I couldn't run a world better than it's run! I'd have people that love each----" he stopped, and looked wildly around. Then he mopped his forehead. "It's awful hot," he finished inanely.

"Yes," agreed John. "Lord, I'll miss you!" John was utterly despondent. "There's no one like you, Stuyv," he said in an embarrassed way. "You know how hard it is to say some things, but you can bet I know what you've done for me! I do--so does Cecilia. I had the wrong idea."

"I've been glad to be your friend," answered Stuyvesant. "You'll write me and tell me how,--how you all are?"

"Certainly," responded John. "Why, of course I will, but I don't know how I can say good-bye! Stuyv, I depend on you awfully. You know,--you know with dad, that is, I can't take his advice because I don't respect him."

"Why not?" broke in John's companion. "I'd like to know why not?"

John's mouth flew open. "His grammar----" he began.

"Trimmings," said K. Stuyvesant.

"Crudeness," said John.

"Companion of strength," said K. Stuyvesant.

"Mentioning money all the time," said John, "how much things cost."

"Better than spending it without mention on dubious objects." John looked away as Stuyvesant replied. "Look here," continued Stuyvesant, "you and I both know the honest goodness in your father--his rugged ideas of a decent life--his respect of them. The other things are tinsel balls on the Christmas tree. Desirable trimmings, but not essential for the tree's strength. A few more years will convince you,--absolutely convince you. Some day you won't even wince when your father forgets and uses his knife to eat from."

"Never," stated John.

"You prefer a man who is slippery both inside and out?" questioned Stuyvesant.

"They get along better with the world," said John.

"Oh, no," said Stuyvesant. "They get along better with the empties. A few people, those that count, look for something on the inside."

John suddenly leaned well across the table. "Look here, Stuyv," he said, "is this a bluff? Damned if I understand you! I was lying in the hammock on the porch last summer when Marjory and Cecilia came from the courts. They didn't see me, and I thought I'd hear about some beau and have a joke. I heard Marjory say that you said the old man should be kept in the garage. Not just those words, but smooth--Marjory's way. I never saw Celie so mad! She turned white as----"

"Did she say that?" shouted Stuyvesant.

"Lord, Stuyv!" said John, "everybody's lookin' at you. Yes, of course she said that. What's the matter with you?"

"What else did she say?" asked Stuyvesant. He was somewhat breathless, but for the sake of John more restrained.

"Well, Marjory told Cecilia what a hell of a case you had on her, talking about her eyes, and all that kind of stuff. Trust girls--they blab everything. Gimme the salt, will you?"

Stuyvesant shoved his glass of water toward John. "The salt, man!" said John, and then as he surveyed Stuyvesant with sad eyes, he added, "I hope it isn't catching."

"You go telephone her that we're coming out," said Stuyvesant.

"Who?"

"Your sister, of course. Tell her not to have any one else there. I've got to see her, John,--got to! Honestly, John, I've _got_ to. I've got to see her a little while alone. I really must."

"I think you've made it plain," replied John. "You say you must see Cecilia. You did mention that, didn't you?"

There was no room for anything but heaven in Stuyvesant. He nodded seriously. "Yes," lie answered, "I must! Really, I've got to, John!"

John howled. "The heat!" he explained, then he sobered.

"Look here, Stuyv," he said, "_did_ you say that?"

"What?" asked Stuyvesant, then he remembered, and for the first and last time made a certain utterance. "She lied," he said quietly, and then, "Oh, my _gosh_, I'm happy! I believe I'm going crazy."

"Oh, no!" replied John, "impossible."

"Yes, John?" said Cecilia.

"Stuyv's coming out with me," she heard him say.

"Yes, dear," she answered.

"Any one coming to dinner?"

"No, dear. Shall I ask one of the Welsh twins? They're always so sweet about coming."

"No," said John; "Stuyv and I were talking about dad, rather Marjory, and he's got a hunch that he's got to see you alone. Got to,--got to,--got to!" Cecilia did not understand, and was rather bewildered at John's laughter.

"Certainly he shall, John," she replied. Her heart beat in her voice. "Good-bye, dear," she ended, and heard the click of his receiver.

"Talking of Marjory" ... Cecilia turned away from the telephone and went to stand by the sea window of her room. She would help them both all she could. All she could.... She closed her eyes, for she felt sick and faint.

"How can I help him?" she questioned, for Marjory's letters had not held a mention of him, although Cecilia's had tactfully recorded his every move. She looked out on the world--it was grey like the frothing Sound.

"I will help them to be happy," she whispered unsteadily. "Father McGowan-dear,--I am learning. Some day I will learn to think of it, and smile----" Then she turned to dress.

Norah came in, and looked on happily. Cecilia was not vain after all. No, she didn't care which frock she put on, and she told Josephine not to fuss so over her hair, that it bored her. "What is the difference?" she had asked a little bitterly, and then to Norah she had said, "I didn't mean that! I didn't! What made me say it? I am not bitter, am I, Norah?"

"And why should you be," Norah had answered, "with everything in the world that money can buy?"

CHAPTER XXI

PINK ROSES

At five K. Stuyvesant and John started for the Sound house. The sun beat down cruelly with the same murky, hot-damp feel. The car wove between the traffic of the crowded streets like a huge shuttle. Both men in it were silent--Stuyvesant breathless and afraid to trust his hope, yet hoping; John despondent over Stuyv's going away. All that that gentleman had done came to John with a new force,--came when the possibility of losing Stuyv even for a few months was thrust before him.

Stuyvesant spoke:

"Takes so long to get out to-day," he said; "we seem to crawl. Look at that fellow ahead. Won't let us get past; have to crawl! Lord! Say, John, let me drive."

"I will not!" replied John with decision. "I have a distinct fondness for life. What's wrong with you?"

"Nothing," answered Stuyvesant loudly, "nothing at all!" Then he began to speak of certain affairs downtown, talking quickly, as if afraid of silence. John looked at him with wonder. It was very unlike Stuyvesant to be hectic. He recalled the mentioned disappointment. That, also, brought wonder. Stuyvesant didn't seem to care for girls. In business he seemed to get what he wanted. What could it be? Suddenly an idea, which seemed to John almost insane, flew across his mind.

He couldn't recognise it in the face of Cecilia's and Stuyvesant's open avoidance of each other, but in spite of that, the idea clung. "Got to see her, got to----" echoed in John's ears. He swallowed convulsively. If it were true! And it was not Marjory after all,--well, wouldn't he be the happiest fellow on earth? Well, rather!

The last months had brought John to a state of adoration of Cecilia and Stuyvesant. More than love it was. To be as sure of Stuyv's always closeness,--to have Cecilia so cared for.... "Can't you let her out a little?" he heard Stuyvesant say impatiently. John answered with a gentleness absolutely new, but it was not noticed. He ran the car faster and well, and his best efforts were greeted with: "This thing seems to crawl to-night. Darned if I don't want to get out and push!"

"You're in a hurry!" said John bravely.

"Oh, no, no!" answered Stuyvesant, looking on John suspiciously. Then he mopped his forehead, leaving it streaked with the dust that came off. "Hot," he said.

They rounded the last hill before the Madden gateway, and through a gap in some stately poplars they caught a glimpse of a white speck on an upper terrace.

"Cecilia!" blurted out Stuyvesant. "Oh, gosh! John, is my tie, that is, do I look----"

"Sure, you do," said John, comfortingly. Stuyvesant mopped some more. His face looked like a futurist painting of "The Dancers" or some one's aunt.

They rounded up the hill slowly. Evangeline bounded from the shrubbery and barked welcome.

"Evangeline," said Stuyvesant, as one in a trance.

"Yes," answered John; "Norah named him for Cecilia. Norah is an old family servant." Had Stuyvesant heard, he might have smiled, but Stuyvesant was past hearing.

"You poor boys!" said Cecilia. "How hot and tired you must be!" Then she looked at Stuyvesant and laughed. "I judge it was dusty?" she said.

"No, that is, I mean quite so," stuttered Stuyvesant. He stood before her silent, openly staring.

When John saw Cecilia flush he put his hand on Stuyvesant's arm. "Come on," he said. "We'll go brush up."

John's manner was as gentle as Cecilia's. Stuyvesant followed him. On the broad porch he paused and looked back.

Evangeline was telling Cecilia that he loved her, in dog fashion--wag code.

Cecilia patted him.

"Gosh!" said Stuyvesant, and then he mopped his forehead, making another picture in the dust.

Dusk came before dinner time. It crept down stealthily, like the thief it is of day. Shadows darkened and lengthened. Greens grew black. Cecilia in the half light on a wide porch watched a certain big and unusually gruff man. Something, she could see, was making him like a wistful boy--a boy so heart-set on his want that he fears the risk of refusal.

Cecilia thought of Marjory across the seas. There was a chance to play traitor--a chance to rekindle the little spark she had once fired in Stuyvesant. The idea danced about her soul and burnt its edges.

"Father McGowan-dear," she appealed inside, "please help me! I am trying, but I _am_ so little!" A breeze from the Sound came with a swish and moaned gently in and out among the loving arms of trees.

The lights in the dining room were soft. They shone gently down on a large bowl of pink roses which were in the centre of the table. Their hearts were a deeper colour and they nodded and seemed to talk when the steps of two pompous persons who passed things shook them.

Stuyvesant looked at Cecilia and then quickly away. He did not know what kind of a frock she wore except that it was white. He knew that she looked good, gentle and pure; that her eyes held the depths that hurts bring and the deep loyalty of love. There was a little droop to her lips that made him ache to see. He wondered at it, dared to hope that it had come because of him, and then he put the thought away. Unbelievably sweet it seemed.

And Cecilia?

"Marjory across the seas," she thought, "to subdue Jeremiah just a little----" She closed her eyes. "Oh dear!" she thought, "what _is_ the matter with me? These awful thoughts!" She opened them again and saw Jeremiah leaning on the table. His fists were closed about his knife and fork, and he held them upright, the handle ends resting on the cloth. John, curiously enough, did not seem bothered by this. He was watching Stuyvesant, who sat opposite.

"After that I started makin' bricks instead of layin' 'em. (Celie, ask that young feller to loan me a piece of bread. I want bread with my supper. I don't care what the style is.) So I begin to make bricks, an' when I look around and think that bricks done it all----" Jeremiah's voice faded. He left the rest to the imaginations of his listeners, while he laid a piece of bread flat on the table, and spread it _en masse_.

"I wisht my wife could have saw it," said Jeremiah as he loosened the piece of bread from the cloth. "She deserved everything. I never gave her nothing."

"You gave her a great deal," disagreed Cecilia. "You know you did! We were happy in that little flat. I remember that. We loved each other and we had enough to eat."

Cecilia was aware of Stuyvesant's eyes. They were so dear! She wondered if it was very wicked to love them, for she knew she always would.... And he had intimated that if Jeremiah were less prominent--Cecilia swallowed hard. The gods are visited with temptations, and too often they come to little humans. Cecilia was meeting hers. For the minute she felt anything possible, justifiable for the end she craved, and in the middle of her minute the white spark in her little heart flared.

"Papa," she said, "please tell Mr. Twombly about the time you hit the boss on the ear with a brick."

The request of that tale was her crucifixion on the cross of loyalty ... her proof beyond all doubt that her heart was in Jeremiah's rough old hands. Jeremiah looked pleased. His face lit rather pathetically. Cecilia answered his happy smile, and then she looked down at her plate. Her throat felt full and stiff. She found it hard to swallow.

Through a numbed consciousness she heard a long and much loved tale.

"I love him, I love him!" she chanted inside. "He and John are _everything_!" She looked up and found Stuyvesant looking at her. The way he looked made her gasp a little, and below the table she closed her small hands so tightly that her nails hurt her palms.

"An' then I sez, 'Yuh can lay yer own bricks,'" came in the voice of Jeremiah. "'An' here's one to begin with.' (It took him on the ear.)" He ended in parenthesis.

"Your stand for liberty--was--well--timed. It was--certainly the best thing you could have done," commented Stuyvesant in jerks. He was trying very hard not to look at Cecilia, and it was work not to.

"Celie," said Jeremiah, "what _has_ this fellow did to the potatoes? He does be-devil 'em so. He puts on so many airs that yuh hardly recognise 'em fer potatoes!"

"I don't know, dear," answered Cecilia, "but I'll see about it to-morrow."

"Mebbe Celie couldn't fry potatoes!" said Jeremiah. He smacked his lips loudly in remembrance. "These here furriners," he went on, "that we hire to cook,--poor things, _they_ don't know no better!" And thus Jeremiah disposed of French chefs. The lips of one of the pompous persons curled a little. The roses nodded and bobbed.

To Stuyvesant, who stared resolutely on them, they all whispered, "Cecilia!"

To Cecilia they shouted "Keefer, the butler."

To John they were lovelier that night from a new hope, and, of his father, a new understanding.

But to Jeremiah Madden they brought back only the heat of an overcrowded flat--the woman who held his heart dying by inches, when money might have made her live.... Money! ... A little tired-eyed girl struggling under a woman's load. A little boy who always cried for things he couldn't have.

"The bunnit with pink roses."

Life's question mark,--Fate's smile,--or God's hand?

Jeremiah looked away from the roses, and absently stuck the corner of his napkin in his collar. Then he looked about to see if any one had noticed, and hastily took it out.

Cecilia saw and her heart leaped with love. It seemed to her that the Saints had made Jeremiah do that then. Do it to show the little earth maiden her work in life. The taking from her father the shame which a son would have him feel, and giving him a substitute for the love that left him too soon,--too hungering.

They got up at last. Cecilia took a bobbing rose from the centrepiece. She began to break the thorns from it, but Stuyvesant's hands took it from her. He removed them methodically, and surely,--as he would. When he gave it back to her, there was nothing left to hurt.

"Thank you," she said.

"I wish I could take them out of the world for you," he answered gruffly. She shook as she crossed the room to where her father and John waited at the door. Her temptation was past. Her heart was strong, but she prayed that he would not say such things so much as if he meant them. It made it too hard.

"I am so weak," she thought, "so weak!"

Stuyvesant walked laggingly across the soft grass. John had said that he would find her by a white wall with a Greek relief, that that was her favourite spot. Stuyvesant knew that he dreamed of that spot because of her, but his connection with it influencing her, he never thought of. His spirit, always humble with her, knelt.

He thought of John's understanding, and whispering, "Good luck, Stuyv, dear!" and of his gasping, "John,--you'd be willing?" John had whacked him on the back and had answered convincingly. Then he'd gone unsteadily down the steps, and had lagged across the close-clipped grass. He wanted as he had never wanted anything to see her, but he was shaken and unsure ... sick from longing and fear.

Ahead of him in the half light he saw the stretch of wall standing out among the shadows.

He stopped, heart pounding, at the corner of the hedge-sheltered path. The little Irish maiden who was his key to heaven sat on the wall. Behind her the Sound was black. The soft stillness enveloped everything. The half night throbbed. Cecilia looked up, and saw the tall shadow in the shadows.

"John, dear?" she queried. Stuyvesant didn't answer for his voice was gone, but he stepped toward her. He put out a hand and laid it on a white wall. The world was reeling for him.

"Oh," she said, "I thought it was John, but--but you wanted to see me?"

He nodded.

"Marjory----" she began, then scolded herself for a too abrupt start. She drew a quick breath, and tried to control reason and tact. "She is so lovely, Mr. Stuyvesant," she went on, "but sometimes she doesn't let people know when she likes them. She's like that."

Cecilia stopped and gasped. It was harder than she had dreamed.

"Has she been a good friend to you?" asked Stuyvesant in a queer, tight voice.

"Oh, yes!" answered Cecilia, "so good! I do love her so much! I would do anything to make her happy!"

"You _darling_!" said K. Stuyvesant. He spoke loudly, but his words shook, for his heart was pounding with a sickening speed. With his words Cecilia caught her breath so deeply that it seemed a sob. Doubts vanished,--seemed incredible,--but she spoke what would always be her truth, though her heart famished from it. She looked Stuyvesant squarely in the eyes: "I love my father," she said, "and I am proud of him. I am proud to be his daughter."

"Of course you are," he answered. "You should be. Cecilia, I am very little, but I am large enough to see what you love in him. Have you misunderstood what I thought?"

She nodded. White, she was, and her eyes were on his face, imploring in their new hope.

"I loved you," said Stuyvesant, "on the boat. I saw how wonderful you were, but, Cecilia,--when I saw you here! When I see you turn and kiss your father when his eyes grow hurt because of John's unkindness.... Oh, my dear! Every instant of this year I've loved you, and more and more. I love you so ... No one could be worthy of you, but, little Saint,--no one could love you more! No one."

He stopped, choked. "I dream on my knees," he went on: "I'll dream of you until I die. But,--what's the use of saying all this? I love you! I love you so! That's everything."

He put a hand out toward her, then drew back. "Cecilia," he whispered, "you are so sweet!"

He looked down and drew his breath sharply. He wondered if she would ever speak.

He heard her slip from the wall.... Perhaps she would leave him without a word. Dully, he wondered how he could go on living if she did that.

And then the world turned over and then it ceased to be, for Cecilia's hands lay on his shoulders. He felt them move and creep up and around his neck. It was true.... He felt a wonderful, shaken strength.

"Cecilia! Cecilia!" she heard him gasp.

After a time she pushed him away and laughed tremulously. "Dearest Keefer Stuyvesant," she whispered shakily, "whose tears are these? Yours or mine?"

There was no room for laughter in Keefer Stuyvesant's soul. He drew her close again and answered gruffly: "There is no yours nor mine any more, little saint. They're ours, dearest,--ours. Oh, Cecilia, _gosh_, how I _love_ you!"

THE END

* * * * * * * *

CHARMING BOOKS FOR GIRLS

May be had wherever books are sold. Ask for Grosset & Dunlap's list

WHEN PATTY WENT TO COLLEGE, By Jean Webster.

Illustrated by C. D. Williams.

One of the best stories of life in a girl's college that has ever been written. It is bright, whimsical and entertaining, lifelike, laughable and thoroughly human.

JUST PATTY, By Jean Webster.

Illustrated by C. M. Relyea.

Patty is full of the joy of living, fun-loving, given to ingenious mischief for its own sake, with a disregard for pretty convention which is an unfailing source of joy to her fellows.

THE POOR LITTLE RICH GIRL, By Eleanor Gates.

With four full page illustrations.

This story relates the experience of one of those unfortunate children whose early days are passed in the companionship of a governess, seldom seeing either parent, and famishing for natural love and tenderness. A charming play as dramatized by the author.

REBECCA OF SUNNYBROOK FARM, By Kate Douglas Wiggin.

One of the most beautiful studies of childhood--Rebecca's artistic, unusual and quaintly charming qualities stand on midst a circle of austere New Englanders. The stage version is making a phenomenal dramatic record.

NEW CHRONICLES OF REBECCA, By Kate Douglas Wiggin.

Illustrated by F. C. Yohn.

Additional episodes in the girlhood of this delightful heroine that carry Rebecca through various stages to her eighteenth birthday.

REBECCA MARY, By Annie Hamilton Donnell.

Illustrated by Elizabeth Shippen Green.

This author possesses the rare gift of portraying all the grotesque little joys and sorrows and scruples of this very small girl with a pathos that is peculiarly genuine and appealing.

Her Book and Heart, By George Madden Martin,

Illustrated by Charles Louis Hinton.

Emmy Lou is irresistibly lovable, because she is so absolutely real. She is just a bewitchingly innocent, hugable little maid. The book is wonderfully human.

STORIES OF RARE CHARM BY GENE STRATTON-PORTER

MICHAEL O'HALLORAN, Illustrated by Frances Rogers.

Michael is a quick-witted little Irish newsboy, living in Northern Indiana. He adopts a deserted little girl, a cripple. He also assumes the responsibility of leading the entire rural community upward and onward.

LADDIE. Illustrated by Herman Pfeifer.

This is a bright, cheery tale with the scenes laid in Indiana. The story is told by Little Sister, the youngest member of a large family, but it is concerned not so much with childish doings as with the love affairs of older members of the family. Chief among them is that of Laddie and the Princess, an English girl who has come to live in the neighborhood and about whose family there hangs a mystery.

THE HARVESTER. Illustrated by W. L. Jacobs.

"The Harvester," is a man of the woods and fields, and if the book had nothing in it but the splendid figure of this man it would be notable. But when the Girl comes to his "Medicine Woods," there begins a romance of the rarest idyllic quality.

FRECKLES. Illustrated.

Freckles is a nameless waif when the tale opens, but the way in which he takes hold of life; the nature friendships he forms in the great Limberlost Swamp; the manner in which everyone who meets him succumbs to the charm of his engaging personality; and his love-story with "The Angel" are full of real sentiment.

A GIRL OF THE LIMBERLOST. Illustrated.

The story of a girl of the Michigan woods; a buoyant, loveable type of the self-reliant American. Her philosophy is one of love and kindness towards all things; her hope is never dimmed. And by the sheer beauty of her soul, and the purity of her vision, she wins from barren and unpromising surroundings those rewards of high courage.

AT THE FOOT OF THE RAINBOW. Illustrations in colors.

The scene of this charming love story is laid in Central Indiana. The story is one of devoted friendship, and tender self-sacrificing love. The novel is brimful of the most beautiful word painting of nature, and its pathos and tender sentiment will endear it to all.

THE SONG OF THE CARDINAL.

Profusely illustrated.

A love ideal of the Cardinal bird and his mate, told with delicacy and humor.

GROSSET & DUNLAP, PUBLISHERS, NEW YORK

==========

Fuente Ovejuna

Lope de Vega

Project Gutenberg Release: August 30, 2019 · eBook #60198

Note: Images of the original pages are available through Internet Archive. See https://archive.org/details/fuenteovejunacom00vega

Nota del Transcriptor:

Las letras itálicas se denotan con el caracter de _subrayado_.

Las versalitas (letras mayúsculas de tamaño igual a las minúsculas) han sido sustituidas por letras mayúsculas de tamaño normal

Coleccion Universal N.os 5 y 6

LOPE DE VEGA

UCOMEDIA

Precio: Una peseta

MADRID, 1919

LOPE DE VEGA

FUENTE OVEJUNA

Comedia

Edición revisada por Américo Castro

[Ilustración]

Madrid, 1919

Talleres "Calpe", Ríos Rosas, 24.--MADRID

Como tantas otras comedias de nuestro teatro, la presente--publicada en 1619--se basa en un hecho histórico: en 1476, los vecinos de Fuente Ovejuna (Córdoba) tomaron venganza, en la persona del comendador de la Orden de Calatrava, de las vejaciones inhumanas que aquél les hacía padecer. La crónica de Rades y Andrada narra prolijamente la justicia hecha por los aldeanos y la pesquisa ordenada por los Reyes Católicos.

Culmina en este drama el espíritu rústico y primitivo, que animó los ternas populares, muy activos dentro del teatro de nuestro siglo XVII, _siglo próximo a la Edad Media tanto por su pensamiento como por la forma de sentir la vida. Otras comedias de Lope poetizan la caballerosidad o la altivez aldeana_ (El alcalde de Zalamea, Peribáñez, El mejor alcalde, el rey, El villano en su rincón, etc.); FUENTE OVEJUNA, _empero, tiene como héroe a toda una villa, cuya fisonomía va concretándose en una firme progresión y acaba por adquirir tremenda e indivisible personalidad_.

Los aldeanos se rebelan contra una autoridad de privilegio y se someten a la monarquía nacional, que a la sazón representaba la uniformidad de la ley, un ideal más amplio, una mayor garantía de justicia para el pueblo. De esta suerte el drama es de una profunda lógica dentro de la historia: los vecinos de Fuente Ovejuna dan a su pleito la única solución jurídica y democrática entonces posible. Si sólo pensáramos que se trata de un cambio de señores y que la villa aclama a la autoridad que, con bárbara tozudez, desgarra las carnes de sus habitantes, entonces nos parecería poco motivada aquélla grandiosa conspiración.

Es curioso observar que FUENTE OVEJUNA _fué traducida al ruso y que sus representaciones provocaron frenético entusiasmo entre las masas oprimidas por el zarismo_.

Literariamente, tenemos aquí una de las más intensas producciones del teatro nacional. Lope supo conducir maravillosamente los hilos sentimentales que le ofrecía el episodio narrado en la crónica. Diversos chispazos heroicos van preparando el momento trágico en que los habitantes de la villa, sin flaquear, gimen bajo las cuerdas de la tortura. Pero esta suprema belleza, las múltiples situaciones de interés y el atractivo de los versos se manifestarán al lector sin necesidad de que el editor lo advierta.

Para imprimir esta comedia se ha tenido en cuenta el texto de la parte XII _de Lope, publicada en 1619. Los paréntesis cuadrados [] indican que se añade algo. No se advierte, sin embargo, la modificación de algunos pequeños errores del texto, de todo punto evidentes._

De esta comedia existe un manuscrito en la biblioteca de Parma, copia del texto de 1619, y otro no autógrafo, en poder de lord Ilchester (Londres), que no hemos podido consultar. Por consiguiente, carecemos de recursos para enmendar ciertos pasajes defectuosos de la obra, que quizá sólo se aclararían si se conservara el autógrafo. Cuando éstos existen se notan siempre grandes diferencias entre el autógrafo y el impreso de la época; FUENTE OVEJUNA, _pues, contiene también yerros, que no siempre podremos enmendar. El lector excusará este pequeño alarde de erudición; pero como las ediciones llamadas monumentales están hechas, en realidad, con una gran negligencia, no hemos podido limitarnos en este caso a reproducir, sin más, una edición anterior._

No hemos puesto más indicaciones escénicas que las que figuran en el original. En el siglo XVII _apenas se usaban las decoraciones, y los cambios y movimientos escénicos se deducían de las palabras de los actores. Ahora el lector tendrá que deducirlos del contexto. Lo creemos preferible a alterar el carácter original de la obra con adiciones personales._

COMEDIA FAMOSA

DE

FUENTE OVEJUNA

Hablan en ella las personas siguientes:

FERNÁN GÓMEZ [_comendador_]. ORTUÑO. FLORES. _El_ MAESTRE DE CALATRAVA. PASCUALA. LAURENCIA. MENGO. BARRILDO. FRONDOSO. JUAN ROJO. ESTEBAN, ALONSO, _alcaldes._ REY DON FERNANDO. REINA DOÑA ISABEL. _Un_ REGIDOR. CIMBRANOS, _soldado._ JACINTA, _labradora._ _Un_ MUCHACHO. _Algunos_ LABRADORES. _Un_ JUEZ. _La_ MÚSICA. [DON MANRIQUE]. [LEONELO].

ACTO PRIMERO

ACTO PRIMERO

(_Salen el_ COMENDADOR, FLORES _y_ ORTUÑO, _criados._)

COMENDADOR

¿Sabe el maestre que estoy en la villa?

FLORES

Ya lo sabe.

ORTUÑO

Está, con la edad, más grave.

COMENDADOR

Y ¿sabe también que soy Fernán Gómez de Guzmán?

FLORES

Es muchacho, no te asombre.

COMENDADOR

Cuando no sepa mi nombre, ¿no le sabrá el que me dan de comendador mayor?

ORTUÑO

No falta quien le aconseje que de ser cortés se aleje.

COMENDADOR

Conquistará poco amor. Es llave la cortesía para abrir la voluntad; y para la enemistad la necia descortesía.

ORTUÑO

Si supiese un descortés cómo lo aborrecen todos --y querrían de mil modos poner la boca a sus pies--, antes que serlo ninguno, se dejaría morir.

FLORES

¡Qué cansado es de sufrir! ¡Qué áspero y qué importuno! Llaman la descortesía necedad en los iguales, porque es entre desiguales linaje de tiranía. Aquí no te toca nada: que un muchacho aun no ha llegado a saber qué es ser amado.

COMENDADOR

La obligación de la espada que se ciñó, el mismo día que la cruz de Calatrava le cubrió el pecho, bastaba para aprender cortesía.

FLORES

Si te han puesto mal con él, presto le conocerás.

ORTUÑO

Vuélvete, si en duda estás.

COMENDADOR

Quiero ver lo que hay en él.

(_Sale el_ MAESTRE DE CALATRAVA _y acompañamiento._)

MAESTRE

Perdonad, por vida mía, Fernán Gómez de Guzmán; que agora nueva me dan que en la villa estáis.

COMENDADOR

Tenía muy justa queja de vos; que el amor y la crianza me daban más confianza, por ser, cual somos los dos, vos maestre en Calatrava, yo vuestro comendador y muy vuestro servidor.

MAESTRE

Seguro[1], Fernando, estaba de vuestra buena venida. Quiero volveros a dar los brazos.

[1] _Seguro_, descuidado, ajeno.

COMENDADOR

Debéisme honrar; que he puesto por vos la vida entre diferencias tantas, hasta suplir vuestra edad el pontífice.

MAESTRE

Es verdad. Y por las señales santas que a los dos cruzan el pecho, que os lo pago en estimaros, y como a mi padre honraros.

COMENDADOR

De vos estoy satisfecho.

MAESTRE

¿Qué hay de guerra por allá?

COMENDADOR

Estad atento, y sabréis, la obligación que tenéis.

MAESTRE

Decid que ya lo estoy, ya.

COMENDADOR

Gran maestre don Rodrigo Téllez Girón, que a tan alto lugar os trajo el valor de aquel vuestro padre claro, que, de ocho años, en vos renunció su maestrazgo, que después por más seguro juraron y confirmaron reyes y comendadores, dando el pontífice santo Pío segundo sus bulas, y después las suyas Paulo para que don Juan Pacheco, gran maestre de Santiago, fuese vuestro coadjutor: ya que es muerto, y que os han dado el gobierno sólo a vos, aunque de tan pocos años, advertid que es honra vuestra seguir en aqueste caso la parte de vuestros deudos; porque muerto Enrique cuarto, quieren que al rey don Alonso de Portugal, que ha heredado, por su mujer, a Castilla, obedezcan sus vasallos; que aunque pretende[2] lo mismo, por Isabel, don Fernando, gran príncipe de Aragón, no con derecho tan claro a vuestros deudos; que, en fin, no presumen que hay engaño en la sucesión de Juana[3], a quien vuestro primo hermano tiene agora en su poder. Y así vengo a aconsejaros que juntéis los caballeros de Calatrava en Almagro, y a Ciudad Real toméis, que divide como paso a Andalucía y Castilla, para mirarlas a entrambas[4]. Poca gente es menester, porque tienen por soldados solamente sus vecinos y algunos pocos hidalgos, que defienden a Isabel y llaman rey a Fernando. Será bien que deis asombro, Rodrigo, aunque niño, a cuantos dicen que es grande esa cruz para vuestros hombros flacos. Mirad los condes de Urueña, de quien venís, que mostrando os están desde la fama los laureles que ganaron; los marqueses de Villena, y otros capitanes, tantos, que las alas de la fama apenas pueden llevarlos. Sacad esa blanca espada, que habéis de hacer, peleando, tan roja como la cruz; porque no podré llamaros maestre de la cruz roja que tenéis al pecho, en tanto que tenéis la blanca espada; que una al pecho y otra al lado, entrambas han de ser rojas; y vos, Girón soberano, capa del templo inmortal de vuestros claros pasados.

[2] _El original_, pretenden.

[3] Juana la Beltraneja, hija, según se supuso, de D. Beltrán de la Cueva, privado del rey Enrique IV y amante de la reina.

[4] _El original_, entrambos.

MAESTRE

Fernán Gómez, estad cierto que en esta parcialidad, porque veo que es verdad, con mis deudos me concierto. Y si importa, como paso, a Ciudad Real mi intento, veréis que como violento rayo sus muros abraso. No porque es muerto mi tío, piensen de mis pocos años los propios y los extraños que murió con él mi brío. Sacaré la blanca espada, para que quede su luz de la color de la cruz, de roja sangre bañada. Vos, ¿adónde residís? ¿Tenéis algunos soldados?

COMENDADOR

Poco, pero mis criados; que si dellos os servís, pelearán como leones. Ya veis que en Fuente Ovejuna hay gente humilde, y alguna no enseñada en escuadrones, sino en campos y labranzas.

MAESTRE

¿Allí residís?

COMENDADOR

Allí de mi encomienda escogí casa entre aquestas mudanzas. Vuestra gente se registre; que no quedará vasallo.

MAESTRE

Hoy me veréis a caballo, poner la lanza en el ristre.

(_Vanse, y salen_ PASCUALA _y_ LAURENCIA.)

LAURENCIA

¡Mas que nunca acá volviera!

PASCUALA

Pues a la he que pensé que cuando te lo conté, más pesadumbre te diera.

LAURENCIA

¡Plega al cielo que jamás le vea en Fuente Ovejuna!

PASCUALA

Yo, Laurencia, he visto alguna tan brava, y pienso que más; y tenía el corazón brando como una manteca.

LAURENCIA

Pues ¿hay encina tan seca como esta mi condición?

PASCUALA

Anda ya; que nadie diga: de esta agua no beberé.

LAURENCIA

¡Voto al sol que lo diré, aunque el mundo me desdiga! ¿A qué efeto fuera bueno querer a Fernando yo? ¿Casarme con él?

PASCUALA

No.

LAURENCIA

Luego la infamia condeno. ¡Cuántas mozas en la villa, del comendador fiadas, andan ya descalabradas!

PASCUALA

Tendré yo por maravilla que te escapes de su mano.

LAURENCIA

Pues en vano es lo que ves, porque ha que me sigue un mes, y todo, Pascuala, en vano. Aquel Flores, su alcahuete, y Ortuño, aquel socarrón, me mostraron un jubón, una sarta y un copete. Dijéronme tantas cosas de Fernando, su señor, que me pusieron temor; mas no serán poderosas para contrastar mi pecho.

PASCUALA

¿Dónde te hablaron?

LAURENCIA

Allá en el arroyo, y habrá seis días.

PASCUALA

Y yo sospecho que te han de engañar, Laurencia.

LAURENCIA

¿A mí?

PASCUALA

Que no, sino al cura.

LAURENCIA

Soy, aunque polla, muy dura yo para su reverencia. Pardiez, más precio poner, Pascuala de madrugada, un pedazo de lunada[5] al huego para comer, con tanto zalacatón[6] de una rosca que yo amaso, y hurtar a mi madre un vaso del pegado canjilón[7]; y más precio al mediodía ver la vaca entre las coles, haciendo mil caracoles con espumosa armonía; y concertar, si el camino me ha llegado a causar pena, casar una berenjena con otro tanto tocino; y después un pasa-tarde, mientras la cena se aliña, de una cuerda de mi viña, que Dios de pedrisco guarde; y cenar un salpicón con su aceite y su pimienta, y irme a la cama contenta, y al «inducas tentación» rezalle mis devociones, que cuantas raposerías, con su amor y sus porfías, tienen estos bellacones; porque todo su cuidado, después de darnos disgusto, es anochecer con gusto y amanecer con enfado.

[5] _Lunada_, pernil.

[6] _Zalacatón_, trozo de pan.

[7] Vasija untada de pez.

PASCUALA

Tienes, Laurencia, razón; que en dejando de querer, más ingratos suelen ser que al villano el gorrión. En el invierno, que el frío tiene los campos helados, decienden de los tejados, diciéndole «tío, tío», hasta llegar a comer las migajas de la mesa; mas luego que el frío cesa, y el campo ven florecer, no bajan diciendo «tío», del beneficio olvidados, mas saltando en los tejados, dicen: «judío, judío». Pues tales los hombres son: cuando nos han menester somos su vida, su ser, su alma, su corazón; pero pasadas las ascuas, las tías somos judías, y en vez de llamarnos tías, anda el nombre de las pascuas[8].

[8] _Nombre de las pascuas_, «putas, bellacas, alcahuetas». (Correas, _Vocabulario._)

LAURENCIA

No fiarse de ninguno.

PASCUALA

Lo mismo digo, Laurencia.

(_Salen_ MENGO _y_ BARRILDO _y_ FRONDOSO.)

FRONDOSO

En aquesta diferencia andas, Barrildo, importuno.

BARRILDO

A lo menos aquí está quien nos dirá lo más cierto.

MENGO

Pues hagamos un concierto antes que lleguéis allá, y es, que si juzgan por mí, me dé cada cual la prenda, precio de aquesta contienda.

BARRILDO

Desde aquí digo que sí. Mas si pierdes, ¿qué darás?

MENGO

Daré mi rabel de boj, que vale más que una troj, porque yo le estimo en más.

BARRILDO

Soy contento.

FRONDOSO

Pues lleguemos. Dios os guarde, hermosas damas.

LAURENCIA

¿Damas, Frondoso, nos llamas?

FRONDOSO

Andar al uso queremos: al bachiller, licenciado; al ciego, tuerto; al bisojo, bizco; resentido, al cojo, y buen hombre al descuidado. Al ignorante, sesudo; al mal galán, soldadesca; a la boca grande, fresca, y al ojo pequeño, agudo. Al pleitista, diligente; gracioso, al entremetido[9]; al hablador, entendido, y al insufrible, valiente. Al cobarde, para poco; al atrevido, bizarro; compañero, al que es un jarro, y desenfadado, al loco. Gravedad, al descontento; a la calva, autoridad; donaire, a la necedad, y al pie grande, buen cimiento. Al buboso, resfriado; comedido, al arrogante; al ingenioso, constante; al corcovado, cargado. Esto [al] llamaros imito, damas, sin pasar de aquí; porque fuera hablar así proceder en infinito.

[9] _El original_, al gracioso, entremetido.

LAURENCIA

Allá en la ciudad, Frondoso, llámase por cortesía de esa suerte; y a fe mía, que hay otro más riguroso y peor vocabulario en las lenguas descorteses.

FRONDOSO

Querría que lo dijeses.

LAURENCIA

Es todo a esotro contrario: al hombre grave, enfadoso; venturoso, al descompuesto[10]; melancólico, al compuesto, y al que reprehende, odioso. Importuno al que aconseja; al liberal, moscatel[11]; al justiciero, cruel, y al que es piadoso, madeja[12]. Al que es constante, villano; al que es cortés, lisonjero; hipócrita, al limosnero, y pretendiente, al cristiano. Al justo mérito, dicha; a la verdad, imprudencia; cobardía, a la paciencia, y culpa, a lo que es desdicha. Necia, a la mujer honesta; mal hecha, a la hermosa y casta, y a la honrada... Pero basta; que esto basta por respuesta.

[10] _Descompuesto_, audaz, atrevido.

[11] _Moscatel_, hombre pesado e importuno. _El original_, liberal, al moscatel.

[12] _Madeja_, hombre flojo y dejado.

MENGO

Digo que eres el dimuño.

BARRILDO

Soncas[13] que lo dice mal.

[13] _Soncas_, a fe, en verdad.

MENGO

Apostaré que la sal la echó el cura con el puño.

LAURENCIA

¿Qué contienda os ha traído si no es que mal lo entendí?

FRONDOSO

Oye, por tu vida.

LAURENCIA

Di.

FRONDOSO

Préstame, Laurencia, oído.

LAURENCIA

Como prestado, y aun dado. Desde agora os doy el mío.

FRONDOSO

En tu discreción confío.

LAURENCIA

¿Qué es lo que habéis apostado?

FRONDOSO

Yo y Barrildo contra Mengo.

LAURENCIA

¿Qué dice Mengo?

BARRILDO

Una cosa que, siendo cierta y forzosa, la niega.

MENGO

A negarla vengo, porque yo sé que es verdad.

LAURENCIA

¿Qué dice?

BARRILDO

Que no hay amor.

LAURENCIA

Generalmente, es rigor.

BARRILDO

Es rigor y es necedad. Sin amor, no se pudiera ni aun el mundo conservar.

MENGO

Yo no sé filosofar; leer, ¡ojalá supiera! Pero si los elementos en discordia eterna viven, y de los mismos reciben nuestros cuerpos alimentos, cólera y melancolía, flema y sangre, claro está.

BARRILDO

El mundo de acá y de allá, Mengo, todo es armonía. Armonía es puro amor, porque el amor es concierto.

MENGO

Del natural, os advierto que yo no niego el valor. Amor hay, y el que entre sí gobierna todas las cosas, correspondencias forzosas de cuanto se mira aquí; y yo jamás he negado que cada cual tiene amor correspondiente a su humor, que le conserva en su estado. Mi mano al golpe que viene mi cara defenderá; mi pie, huyendo, estorbará el daño que el cuerpo tiene. Cerraránse mis pestañas si al ojo le viene mal, porque es amor natural.

PASCUALA

Pues ¿de qué nos desengañas?

MENGO

De que nadie tiene amor mas que a su misma persona.

PASCUALA

Tú mientes, Mengo, y perdona; porque ¿es [mentira][14] el rigor con que un hombre a una mujer, o un animal quiere y ama su semejante?

[14] _El original_, materia.

MENGO

Eso llama amor propio, y no querer. ¿Qué es amor?

LAURENCIA

Es un deseo de hermosura.

MENGO

Esa hermosura ¿por qué el amor la procura?

LAURENCIA

Para gozarla.

MENGO

Eso creo. Pues ese gusto que intenta, ¿no es para él mismo?

LAURENCIA

Es así.

MENGO

Luego, ¿por quererse a sí busca el bien que le contenta?

LAURENCIA

Es verdad.

MENGO

Pues de ese modo no hay amor, sino el que digo, que por mi gusto le sigo, y quiero dármele en todo.

BARRILDO

Dijo el cura del lugar cierto día en el sermón que había cierto Platón que nos enseñaba a amar; que éste amaba el alma sola y la virtud de lo amado.

PASCUALA

En materia habéis entrado que, por ventura, acrisola los caletres de los sabios en sus academias y escuelas.

LAURENCIA

Muy bien dice, y no te muelas, en persuadir sus agravios. Da gracias, Mengo, a los cielos, que te hicieron sin amor.

MENGO

¿Amas tú?

LAURENCIA

Mi propio honor.

FRONDOSO

Dios te castigue con celos.

BARRILDO

¿Quién gana?

PASCUALA

Con la quistión podéis ir al sacristán, porque él o el cura os darán bastante satisfación. Laurencia no quiere bien, yo tengo poca experiencia. ¿Cómo daremos sentencia?

FRONDOSO

¿Qué mayor que ese desdén?

(_Sale_ FLORES.)

FLORES

Dios guarde a la buena gente.

PASCUALA

Este es del comendador criado.

LAURENCIA

¡Gentil azor! ¿De adónde bueno, pariente?

FLORES

¿No me veis a lo soldado?

LAURENCIA

¿Viene don Fernando acá?

FLORES

La guerra se acaba ya, puesto que[15] nos ha costado alguna sangre y amigos.

[15] _Puesto que_, aunque.

FRONDOSO

Contadnos cómo pasó.

FLORES

¿Quién lo dirá como yo, siendo mis ojos testigos? Para emprender la jornada de esta ciudad, que ya tiene nombre de Ciudad-Real, juntó el gallardo maestre dos mil lucidos infantes de sus vasallos valientes y trecientos de a caballo de seglares y de freiles; porque la cruz roja obliga cuantos al pecho la tienen, aunque sean de orden sacro; mas contra moros, se entiende. Salió el muchacho bizarro con una casaca verde, bordada de cifras de oro, que sólo los brazaletes por las mangas descubrían, que seis alamares prenden. Un corpulento bridón, rucio rodado, que al Betis bebió el agua, y en su orilla despuntó la grama fértil; el codón labrado en cintas de ante, y el rizo copete cogido en blancas lazadas, que con las moscas de nieve que bañan la blanca piel iguales labores teje. A su lado Fernán Gómez, vuestro señor, en un fuerte melado, de negros cabos, puesto que con blanco bebe[16]. Sobre turca jacerina, peto y espaldar luciente, con naranjada las saca (?), que de oro y perlas guarnece. El morrión, que coronado con blancas plumas, parece que del color naranjado aquellos azares vierte; ceñida al brazo una liga roja y blanca, con que mueve un fresno entero por lanza, que hasta en Granada le temen. La ciudad se puso en arma; dicen que salir no quieren de la corona real, y el patrimonio defienden. Entróla bien resistida, y el maestre a los rebeldes y a los que entonces trataron su honor injuriosamente mandó cortar las cabezas, y a los de la baja plebe, con mordazas en la boca, azotar públicamente. Queda en ella tan temido y tan amado, que creen que quien en tan pocos años pelea, castiga y vence, ha de ser en otra edad rayo del Africa fértil, que tantas lunas azules a su roja cruz sujete. Al comendador y a todos ha hecho tantas mercedes, que el saco de la ciudad el de su hacienda parece. Mas ya la música suena: recebilde alegremente, que al triunfo, las voluntades son los mejores laureles.

[16] «Frase que se entiende de los caballos, para dar a entender que tienen alguna señal blanca en el hocico, de la cual se infiere que serán buenos y leales.» (_Diccionario de Autoridades_, de 1726.)

(_Salen el_ COMENDADOR _y_ ORTUÑO; MÚSICOS; JUAN ROJO _y_ ESTEBAN, ALONSO, _alcaldes._)

(_Cantan._)

Sea bien venido el comendadore de rendir las tierras y matar los hombres. ¡Vivan los Guzmanes! ¡Vivan los Girones! Si en las paces blando, dulce en las razones. Venciendo moricos, fuertes como un roble, de Ciudad-Reale viene vencedore; que a Fuente Ovejuna trae los sus pendones. ¡Viva muchos años, viva Fernán Gómez!

COMENDADOR

Villa, yo os agradezco justamente el amor que me habéis aquí mostrado.

ALONSO

Aun no muestra una parte del que siente. Pero, ¿qué mucho que seáis amado, mereciéndolo vos?

ESTEBAN

Fuente Ovejuna y el regimiento[17] que hoy habéis honrado, que recibáis os ruega y importuna un pequeño presente, que esos carros traen, señor, no sin vergüenza alguna, de voluntades y árboles bizarros, más que de ricos dones. Lo primero traen dos cestas de polidos barros; de gansos viene un ganadillo entero, que sacan por las redes las cabezas, para cantar vueso valor guerrero. Diez cebones en sal, valientes piezas, sin otras menudencias y cecinas; y más que guantes de ámbar, sus cortezas. Cien pares de capones y gallinas, que han dejado viudos a sus gallos en las aldeas que miráis vecinas. Acá no tienen armas ni caballos, no jaeces bordados de oro puro, si no es oro el amor de los vasallos. Y porque digo puro, os aseguro que vienen doce cueros, que aun en cueros por enero podéis guardar un muro, si de ellos aforráis vuestros guerreros, mejor que de las armas aceradas; que el vino suele dar lindos aceros. De quesos y otras cosas no excusadas no quiero daros cuenta: justo pecho de voluntades que tenéis ganadas; y a vos y a vuestra casa, buen provecho.

[17] _Regimiento_, el concejo municipal.

COMENDADOR

Estoy muy agradecido. Id, regimiento, en buen hora.

ALONSO

Descansad, señor, agora, y seáis muy bien venido; que esta espadaña que veis y juncia a vuestros umbrales, fueran perlas orientales, y mucho más merecéis, a ser posible a la villa.

COMENDADOR

Así lo creo, señores. Id con Dios.

ESTEBAN

Ea, cantores, vaya otra vez la letrilla.

(_Cantan._)

Sea bien venido el comendadore de rendir las tierras y matar los hombres.

(_Vanse._)

COMENDADOR

Esperad vosotras dos.

LAURENCIA

¿Qué manda su señoría?

COMENDADOR

¡Desdenes el otro día, pues, conmigo! ¡Bien por Dios!

LAURENCIA

¿Habla contigo, Pascuala?

PASCUALA

Conmigo no, tirte ahuera[18].

[18] _Tirte ahuera_, ¡anda allá!

COMENDADOR

Con vos hablo, hermosa fiera, y con esotra zagala. ¿Mías no sois?

PASCUALA

Sí, señor; mas no para casos tales.

COMENDADOR

Entrad, pasad los umbrales; hombres hay, no hayáis temor.

LAURENCIA

Si los alcaldes entraran (que de uno soy hija yo), bien huera entrar; mas si no...

COMENDADOR

Flores...

FLORES

Señor...

COMENDADOR

¿Qué reparan en no hacer lo que les digo?

FLORES

Entra, pues.

LAURENCIA

No nos agarre.

FLORES

Entrad; que sois necias.

PASCUALA

Arre; que echaréis luego el postigo.

FLORES

Entrad; que os quiere enseñar lo que trae de la guerra.

COMENDADOR [_Aparte a_ ORTUÑO.]

Si entraron. Ortuño, cierra.

LAURENCIA

Flores, dejadnos pasar.

ORTUÑO

¿También venís presentadas con lo demás?

PASCUALA

¡Bien a fe! Desvíese, no le dé...

FLORES

Basta; que son extremadas.

LAURENCIA

¿No basta a vueso señor tanta carne presentada?

ORTUÑO

La vuestra es la que le agrada.

LAURENCIA

Reviente de mal dolor.

(_Vanse._)

FLORES

¡Muy buen recado llevamos! No se ha de poder sufrir lo que nos ha de decir cuando sin ellas nos vamos.

ORTUÑO

Quien sirve se obliga a esto. Si en algo desea medrar, o con paciencia ha de estar, o ha despedirse de presto.

(_Vanse los dos y salgan el_ REY DON FERNANDO, _la_ REINA DOÑA ISABEL, MANRIQUE _y acompañamiento._)

ISABEL

Digo, señor, que conviene el no haber descuido en esto, por ver a Alfonso en tal puesto, y su ejército previene. Y es bien ganar por la mano antes que el daño veamos; que si no lo remediamos, el ser muy cierto está llano.

REY

De Navarra y de Aragón está el socorro seguro, y de Castilla procuro hacer la reformación de modo, que el buen suceso con la prevención se vea.

ISABEL

Pues vuestra majestad crea que el buen fin consiste en esto.

MANRIQUE

Aguardando tu licencia dos regidores están de Ciudad Real: ¿entrarán?

REY

No les nieguen mi presencia.

(_Salen dos_ REGIDORES _de Ciudad Real._)

REGIDOR 1.º

Católico rey Fernando, a quien ha enviado el cielo, desde Aragón a Castilla, para bien y amparo nuestro: en nombre de Ciudad Real a vuestro valor supremo humildes nos presentamos, el real amparo pidiendo. A mucha dicha tuvimos tener título de vuestros; pero pudo derribarnos deste honor el hado adverso. El famoso don Rodrigo Téllez Girón, cuyo esfuerzo es en valor extremado, aunque es en la edad tan tierno, maestre de Calatrava, él, ensanchar pretendiendo el honor de la encomienda, nos puso apretado cerco. Con valor nos prevenimos, a su fuerza resistiendo, tanto, que arroyos corrían de la sangre de los muertos. Tomó posesión,

en fin; pero no llegara a hacerlo, a no le dar Fernán Gómez orden, ayuda y consejo. El queda en la posesión, y sus vasallos seremos, suyos, a nuestro pesar, a no remediarlo presto.

REY

¿Dónde queda Fernán Gómez?

REGIDOR 1.º

En Fuente Ovejuna creo, por ser su villa, y tener en ella casa y asiento. Allí, con más libertad de la que decir podemos, tiene a los súbditos suyos de todo contento ajenos.

REY

¿Tenéis algún capitán?

REGIDOR 2.°

Señor, el no haberle es cierto, pues no escapó ningún noble de preso, herido o de muerto.

ISABEL

Ese caso no requiere ser despacio remediado; que es dar al contrario osado el mismo valor que adquiere; y puede el de Portugal, hallando puerta segura, entrar por Extremadura y causamos mucho mal.

REY

Don Manrique, partid luego, llevando dos compañías; remediad sus demasías, sin darles ningún sosiego. El conde de Cabra ir puede con vos; que es Córdoba osado, a quien nombre de soldado todo el mundo le concede; que éste es el medio mejor que la ocasión nos ofrece.

MANRIQUE

El acuerdo me parece como de tan gran valor. Pondré límite a su exceso, si el vivir en mí no cesa.

ISABEL

Partiendo vos a la empresa, seguro está el buen suceso.

(_Vanse todos y salen_ LAURENCIA _y_ FRONDOSO.)

LAURENCIA

A medio torcer los paños, quise, atrevido Frondoso, para no dar que decir, desviarme del arroyo; decir a tus demasías que murmura el pueblo todo, que me miras y te miro, y todos nos traen sobre ojo. Y como tú eres zagal, de los que huellan, brioso, y excediendo a los demás, vistes bizarro y costoso, en todo el lugar no hay moza, o mozo en el prado o soto, que no se afirme diciendo que ya para en uno somos; y esperan todos el día que el sacristán Juan Chamorro nos eche de la tribuna, en dejando los piporros[19]. Y mejor sus trojes vean de rubio trigo en agosto atestadas y colmadas, y sus tinajas de mosto, que tal imaginación me ha llegado a dar enojo: ni me desvela ni aflige, ni en ella el cuidado pongo.

[19] Instrumento de música, llamado también _bajón_.

FRONDOSO

Tal me tienen tus desdenes, bella Laurencia, que tomo, en el peligro de verte, la vida, cuando te oigo. Si sabes que es mi intención el desear ser tu esposo, mal premio das a mi fe.

LAURENCIA

Es que yo no sé dar otro.

FRONDOSO

¿Posible es que no te duelas de verme tan cuidadoso, y que imaginando en ti, ni bebo, duermo ni como? ¿Posible es tanto rigor en ese angélico rostro? ¡Viven los cielos que rabio!

LAURENCIA

Pues salúdate[20], Frondoso.

[20] _Saludar_, usar de ciertas fórmulas (hacer cruces con saliva, etcétera), pretendiendo curar la rabia y otros males.

FRONDOSO

Ya te pido yo salud, y que ambos, como palomos, estemos, juntos los picos, con arrullos sonorosos, después de damos la Iglesia...

LAURENCIA

Dilo a mi tío Juan Rojo; que aunque no te quiero bien, ya tengo algunos asomos.

FRONDOSO

¡Ay de mí! El señor es éste.

LAURENCIA

Tirando viene a algún corzo. Escóndete en esas ramas.

FRONDOSO

Y ¡con qué celos me escondo!

(_Sale el_ COMENDADOR.)

COMENDADOR

No es malo venir siguiendo un corcillo temeroso, y topar tan bella gama.

LAURENCIA

Aquí descansaba un poco de haber lavado unos paños; y así, al arroyo me tomo, si manda su señoría.

COMENDADOR

Aquesos desdenes toscos afrentan, bella Laurencia, las gracias que el poderoso cielo te dió, de tal suerte, que vienes a ser un monstruo. Mas si otras veces pudiste huir mi ruego amoroso, agora no quiere el campo, amigo secreto y solo; que tú sola no has de ser tan soberbia, que tu rostro huyas al señor que tienes, teniéndome a mí en tan poco. ¿No se rindió Sebastiana, mujer de Pedro Redondo, con ser casadas entrambas, y la de Martín del Pozo, habiendo apenas pasado dos días del desposorio?

LAURENCIA

Esas, señor, ya tenían, de haber andado con otros, el camino de agradaros; porque también muchos mozos merecieron sus favores. Id con Dios, tras vueso corzo; que a no veros con la cruz, os tuviera por demonio, pues tanto me perseguís.

COMENDADOR

¡Qué estilo tan enfadoso! Pongo la ballesta en tierra, ...[21] y a la práctica de manos reduzgo melindres.

[21] Falta un verso para el romance, pero no para el sentido.

LAURENCIA

¡Cómo! ¿Eso hacéis? ¿Estáis en vos?

(_Sale_ FRONDOSO _y toma la ballesta._)

COMENDADOR

No te defiendas.

FRONDOSO [_Aparte._]

Si tomo la ballesta, ¡vive el cielo que no la ponga en el hombro!

COMENDADOR

Acaba, ríndete.

LAURENCIA

¡Cielos, ayudadme agora!

COMENDADOR

Solos estamos; no tengas miedo.

FRONDOSO

Comendador generoso, dejad la moza, o creed que de mi agravio y enojo será blanco vuestro pecho, aunque la cruz me da asombro.

COMENDADOR

¡Perro, villano!...

FRONDOSO

No hay perro. Huye, Laurencia.

LAURENCIA

Frondoso, mira lo que haces.

FRONDOSO

Vete.

(_Vase._)

COMENDADOR

¡Oh, mal haya el hombre loco, que se desciñe la espada! Que, de no espantar medroso la caza, me la quité.

FRONDOSO

Pues, pardiez, señor, si toco la nuez[22], que os he de apiolar.

[22] Botón con que se disparaba la ballesta.

COMENDADOR

Ya es ida. Infame, alevoso, suelta la ballesta luego. Suéltala, villano.

FRONDOSO

¿Cómo? Que me quitaréis la vida. Y advertid que amor es sordo, y que no escucha palabras el día que está en su trono.

COMENDADOR

Pues ¿la espa[l]da ha de volver un hombre tan valeroso a un villano? Tira, infame, tira, y guárdate; que rompo las leyes de caballero.

FRONDOSO

Eso no. Yo me conformo con mi estado, y pues me es guardar la vida forzoso, con la ballesta me voy.

COMENDADOR

¡Peligro extraño y notorio! Mas yo tomaré venganza del agravio y del estorbo. ¡Que no cerrara con él! ¡Vive el cielo, que me corro!

ACTO SEGUNDO DE FUENTE OVEJUNA

ACTO SEGUNDO DE FUENTE OVEJUNA

(_Salen_ ESTEBAN _y_ REGIDOR 1.°)

ESTEBAN

Así tenga salud, como parece, que no se saque más agora el pósito. El año apunta mal, y el tiempo crece, y es mejor que el sustento esté en depósito, aunque lo contradicen más de trece.

REGIDOR 1.°

Yo siempre he sido, al fin, de este propósito, en gobernar en paz esta república.

ESTEBAN

Hagamos de ello a Fernán Gómez súplica. No se puede sufrir que estos astrólogos, en las cosas futuras ignorantes[23], nos quieran persuadir con largos prólogos los secretos a Dios sólo importantes. ¡Bueno es que, presumiendo de teólogos, hagan un tiempo el que[24] después y antes! Y pidiendo el presente lo importante, al más sabio veréis más ignorante. ¿Tienen ellos las nubes en su casa y el proceder de las celestes lumbres? ¿Por dónde ven lo que en el cielo pasa, para damos con ello pesadumbres? Ellos en [el] sembrar nos ponen tasa: daca el trigo, cebada y las legumbres, calabazas, pepinos y mostazas... Ellos son, a la fe, las calabazas. Luego cuentan que muere una cabeza, y después viene a ser en Transilvania; que el vino será poco, y la cerveza sobrará por las partes de Alemania; que se helará en Gascuña la cereza, y que habrá muchos tigres en Hircania. Y al cabo, al cabo, se siembre o no se siembre, el año se remata por diciembre.

[23] _El original_, y ignorantes.

[24] El que será después y fué antes.

(_Salen el licenciado_ LEONELO _y_ BARRILDO.)

LEONELO

A fe que no ganéis la palmatoria[25], porque ya está ocupado el mentidero.

[25] Al muchacho que llegaba primero a la escuela le daban la palmeta para que aplicase los castigos.

BARRILDO

¿Cómo os fué en Salamanca?

LEONELO

Es larga historia.

BARRILDO

Un Bártulo seréis.

LEONELO

Ni aun un barbero. Es, como digo, cosa muy notoria en esta facultad lo que os refiero.

BARRILDO

Sin duda que venís buen estudiante.

LEONELO

Saber he procurado lo importante.

BARRILDO

Después que vemos tanto libro impreso, no hay nadie que de sabio no presuma.

LEONELO

Antes que ignoran más siento por eso, por no se reducir a breve suma; porque la confusión, con el exceso, los intentos resuelve en vana espuma; y aquel que de leer tiene más uso, de ver letreros sólo está confuso. No niego yo que de[26] imprimir el arte mil ingenios sacó de entre la jerga, y que parece que en sagrada parte sus obras guarda y contra el tiempo alberga; éste las distribuye y las reparte. Débese esta invención a Gutemberga, un famoso tudesco de Maguncia, en quien la fama su valor renuncia. Mas muchos que opinión tuvieron grave, por imprimir sus obras la perdieron; tras esto, con el nombre del que sabe, muchos sus ignorancias imprimieron. Otros, en quien la baja envidia cabe, sus locos desatinos escribieron, y con nombre de aquel que aborrecían, impresos por el mundo los envían.

[26] _El original_, del.

BARRILDO

No soy de esa opinión.

LEONELO

El ignorante es justo que se vengue del letrado.

BARRILDO

Leonelo, la impresión es importante.

LEONELO

Sin ella muchos siglos se han pasado, y no vemos que en éste se levante un Jerónimo santo, un Agustino. ...[27].

[27] Falta un verso para la octava.

BARRILDO

Dejadlo y asentaos, que estáis mohino.

(_Salen_ JUAN ROJO _y otro labrador._)

JUAN ROJO

No hay en cuatro haciendas para un dote, si es que las vistas han de ser al uso; que el hombre que es curioso es bien que note que en esto el barrio y vulgo anda confuso.

LABRADOR

¿Qué hay del comendador? No os alborote.

JUAN ROJO

¡Cuál a Laurencia en ese campo puso!

LABRADOR

¿Quién fué cual él tan bárbaro y lascivo? Colgado le vea yo del aquel olivo.

(_Salen el_ COMENDADOR, ORTUÑO _y_ FLORES.)

COMENDADOR

Dios guarde la buena gente.

REGIDOR

¡Oh, señor!

COMENDADOR

Por vida mía, que se estén.

[ESTEBAN] ALCALDE

Vusiñoría, adonde suele se siente, que en pie estaremos muy bien.

COMENDADOR

Digo que se han de sentar.

ESTEBAN

De los buenos es honrar, que no es posible que den honra los que no la tienen.

COMENDADOR

Siéntense; hablaremos algo.

ESTEBAN

¿Vió vusiñoría el galgo?

COMENDADOR

Alcalde, espantados vienen esos criados de ver tan notable ligereza.

ESTEBAN

Es una extremada pieza. Pardiez, que puede correr [al][28] lado de un delincuente o de un cobarde en quistión[29].

[28] _El original_, a un.

[29] _Quistión_, cuestión, tormento.

COMENDADOR

Quisiera en esta ocasión que le hiciérades pariente[30] a una liebre que por pies por momentos se me va.

[30] _Hacer pariente_, juntar, reunir.

ESTEBAN

Sí haré, par Dios. ¿Dónde está?

COMENDADOR

Allá vuestra hija es.

ESTEBAN

¡Mi hija!

COMENDADOR

Sí.

ESTEBAN

Pues ¿es buena para alcanzada de vos?

COMENDADOR

Reñilda, alcalde, por Dios.

ESTEBAN

¿Cómo?

COMENDADOR

Ha dado en darme pena. Mujer hay, y principal, de alguno que está en la plaza, que dió, a la primera traza, traza de verme.

ESTEBAN

Hizo mal; y vos, señor, no andáis bien en hablar tan libremente.

COMENDADOR

¡Oh, qué villano elocuente! ¡Ah, Flores!, haz que le den la _Política_, en que lea de Aristóteles.

ESTEBAN

Señor, debajo de vuestro honor vivir el pueblo desea. Mirad que en Fuente Ovejuna hay gente muy principal.

LEONELO

¿Vióse desvergüenza igual?

COMENDADOR

Pues ¿he dicho cosa alguna de que os pese, regidor?

REGIDOR

Lo que decís es injusto; no lo digáis, que no es justo que nos quitéis el honor.

COMENDADOR

¿Vosotros honor tenéis? ¡Qué freiles de Calatrava!

REGIDOR

Alguno acaso se alaba de la cruz que le ponéis, que no es de sangre tan limpia.

COMENDADOR

Y ¿ensucióla yo juntando la mía a la vuestra?

REGIDOR

Cuando que el mal más tiñe que alimpia.

COMENDADOR

De cualquier suerte que sea, vuestras mujeres se honran.

ESTEBAN

Esas palabras deshonran[31]; las o[t]ras[32], no hay quien las crea.

[31] _El original_, les honran.

[32] _El original_, obras.

COMENDADOR

¡Qué cansado villanaje! ¡Ah! Bien hayan las ciudades; que a hombres de calidades no hay quien sus gustos ataje; allá se precian casados que visiten sus mujeres.

ESTEBAN

No harán; que con esto quieres que vivamos descuidados. En las ciudades hay Dios, y más presto quien castiga.

COMENDADOR

Levantaos de aquí.

ESTEBAN

¿Que diga lo que escucháis por los dos?

COMENDADOR

Salí de la plaza luego; no quede ninguno aquí.

ESTEBAN

Ya nos vamos.

COMENDADOR

Pues no ansí.

FLORES

Que te reportes te ruego.

COMENDADOR

Querrían hacer corrillo los villanos en mi ausencia.

ORTUÑO

Ten un poco de paciencia.

COMENDADOR

De tanta me maravillo. Cada uno de por sí se vayan hasta sus casas.

LEONELO

¡Cielo! ¿Que por esto pasas?

ESTEBAN

Ya yo me voy por aquí.

(_Vanse._)

COMENDADOR

¿Qué os parece de esta gente?

ORTUÑO

No sabes disimular que no quiere[s][33] escuchar el disgusto que se siente.

[33] _El original_, quieren.

COMENDADOR

Estos ¿se igualan conmigo?

FLORES

Que no es aqueso igualarse.

COMENDADOR

Y el villano ¿ha de quedarse con ballesta y sin castigo?

FLORES

Anoche pensé que estaba a la puerta de Laurencia, y a otro, que su presencia y su capilla imitaba, de oreja a oreja le di un beneficio famoso.

COMENDADOR

¿Dónde estará aquel Frondoso?

FLORES

Dicen que anda por ahí.

COMENDADOR

¡Por ahí se atreve a andar hombre que matarme quiso!

FLORES

Como el ave sin aviso, o como el pez, viene a dar al reclamo o al anzuelo.

COMENDADOR

¡Que a un capitán cuya espada tiemblan Córdoba y Granada, un labrador, un mozuelo ponga una ballesta al pecho! El mundo se acaba, Flores.

FLORES

Como eso pueden amores.

ORTUÑO

Y pues que vive, sospecho que grande amistad le debes.

COMENDADOR

Yo he disimulado, Ortuño; que si no, de punta a puño, antes de dos horas breves, pasara todo el lugar; que hasta que llegue ocasión al freno de la razón hago la venganza estar.-- ¿Qué hay de Pascuala?

FLORES

Responde que anda agora por casarse.

COMENDADOR

¿Hasta allá quiere fiarse?...

FLORES

En fin, te remite donde te pagarán de contado.

COMENDADOR

¿Qué hay de Olalla?

ORTUÑO

Una graciosa respuesta.

COMENDADOR

Es moza briosa. ¿Cómo?

ORTUÑO Que su desposado anda tras ella estos días celoso de mis recados, y de que con tus criados a visitalla venías; pero que si se descuida, entrarás como primero.

COMENDADOR

¡Bueno, a fe de caballero! Pero el villanejo cuida...

ORTUÑO

Cuida, y anda por los aires.

COMENDADOR

¿Qué hay de Inés?

FLORES

¿Cuál?

COMENDADOR

La de Antón.

FLORES

Para cualquier ocasión ya ha ofrecido sus donaires.

Háblela por el corral, por donde has de entrar si quieres.

COMENDADOR

A las fáciles mujeres quiero bien y pago mal. Si éstas supiesen, ¡oh, Flores!, estimarse en lo que valen...

FLORES

No hay disgustos que se igualen a contrastar sus favores. Rendirse presto desdice de la esperanza del bien; mas hay mujeres también, porque el filósofo dice que apetecen a los hombres como la forma desea la materia; y que esto sea así, no hay de que te asombre.

COMENDADOR

Un hombre de amores loco huélgase que a su accidente se le rindan fácilmente, mas después las tiene en poco, y el camino de olvidar al hombre más obligado es haber poco costado lo que pudo desear.

(_Sale_ CIMBRANOS, _soldado._)

[CIMBRANOS], SOLDADO

¿Está aquí el comendador?

ORTUÑO

¿No le ves en tu presencia?

[CIMBRANOS], SOLDADO

¡Oh, gallardo Fernán Gómez! Trueca la verde montera en el blanco morrión y el gabán en armas nuevas, que el maestre de Santiago, y el conde de Cabra cercan a don Rodrigo Girón, por la castellana reina, en Ciudad Real; de suerte que no es mucho que se pierda lo que en Calatrava sabes que tanta sangre le cuesta. Ya divisan con las luces, desde las altas almenas, los castillos y leones y barras aragonesas. Y aunque el rey de Portugal honrar a Girón quisiera, no hará poco en que el maestre a Almagro con vida vuelva. Ponte a caballo, señor; que sólo con que te vean, se volverán a Castilla.

COMENDADOR

No prosigas; tente, espera.-- Haz, Ortuño, que en la plaza toquen luego una trompeta. ¿Qué soldados tengo aquí?

ORTUÑO

Pienso que tienes cincuenta.

COMENDADOR

Pónganse a caballo todos.

[CIMBRANOS], SOLDADO

Si no caminas apriesa, Ciudad Real es del rey.

COMENDADOR

No hayas miedo que lo sea.

[_Vanse._]

(_Salen_ MENGO _y_ LAURENCIA _y_ PASCUALA, _huyendo._)

PASCUALA

No te apartes de nosotras.

MENGO

Pues ¿a qué tenéis temor?

LAURENCIA

Mengo, a la villa es mejor que vamos unas con otras (pues que no hay hombre ninguno), por que no demos con él.

MENGO

¡Que este demonio cruel nos sea tan importuno!

LAURENCIA

No nos deja a sol ni a sombra.

MENGO

¡Oh! Rayo del cielo baje, que sus locuras ataje.

LAURENCIA

Sangrienta fiera le nombra; arsénico y pestilencia del lugar.

MENGO

Hanme contado que Frondoso, aquí en el prado, para librarte, Laurencia, le puso al pecho una jara.

LAURENCIA

Los hombres aborrecía, Mengo; mas desde aquel día los miro con otra cara. ¡Gran valor tuvo Frondoso! Pienso que le ha de costar la vida.

MENGO

Que del lugar se vaya, será forzoso.

LAURENCIA

Aunque ya le quiero bien, eso mismo le aconsejo; mas recibe mi consejo con ira, rabia y desdén; y jura el comendador que le ha de colgar de un pie.

PASCUALA

¡Mal garrotillo le dé!

MENGO

Mala pedrada es mejor. ¡Voto al sol, si le tirara con la que llevo al apero, que al sonar el crujidero, al casco se la encajara! No fué Sábalo, el romano, tan vicioso por jamás.

LAURENCIA

Heliogábalo dirás, más que una fiera inhumano.

MENGO

Pero Galván, o quién fué, que yo no entiendo de historia; mas su cativa memoria vencida de éste se ve. ¿Hay hombre en naturaleza como Fernán Gómez?

PASCUALA

No; que parece que le dió de una tigre la aspereza.

(_Sale_ JACINTA.)

JACINTA

Dadme socorro, por Dios, si la amistad os obliga.

LAURENCIA

¿Qué es esto, Jacinta amiga?

PASCUALA

Tuyas lo somos las dos.

JACINTA

Del comendador criados, que van a Ciudad Real, más de infamia natural que de noble acero armados, me quieren llevar a él.

LAURENCIA

Pues Jacinta, Dios te libre; que cuando contigo es libre, conmigo será cruel. (_Vase._)

PASCUALA

Jacinta, yo no soy hombre que te puedo defender. (_Vase._)

MENGO

Yo sí lo tengo de ser, porque tengo el ser y el nombre. Llégate, Jacinta, a mí.

JACINTA

¿Tienes armas?

MENGO

Las primeras del mundo.

JACINTA

¡Oh, si las tuvieras!

MENGO

Piedras hay, Jacinta, aquí.

(_Salen_ FLORES _y_ ORTUÑO.)

FLORES

¿Por los pies pensabas irte?

JACINTA

Mengo, ¡muerta soy!

MENGO

Señores... ¡A estos pobres labradores!...

ORTUÑO

Pues ¿tú quieres persuadirte a defender la mujer?

MENGO

Con los ruegos la defiendo; que soy su deudo y pretendo guardalla, si puede ser.

FLORES

Quitalde luego la vida.

MENGO

¡Voto al sol, si me emberrincho, y el cáñamo me descincho, que la llevéis bien vendida!

(_Salen el_ COMENDADOR _y_ CIMBRANOS.)

COMENDADOR

¿Qué es eso? ¡A cosas tan viles me habéis de hacer apear!

FLORES

Gente de este vil lugar (que ya es razón que aniquiles, pues en nada te da gusto) a nuestras armas se atreve.

MENGO

Señor, si piedad os mueve de suceso tan injusto, castigad estos soldados, que con vuestro nombre agora roban una labradora [a] esposo y padres honrados; y dadme licencia a mí que se la pueda llevar.

COMENDADOR

Licencia les quiero dar... para vengarse de ti. Suelta la honda.

MENGO

¡Señor!...

COMENDADOR

Flores, Ortuño, Cimbranos, con ella le atad las manos.

MENGO

¿Así volvéis por su honor?

COMENDADOR

¿Qué piensan Fuente Ovejuna y sus villanos de mí?

MENGO

Señor, ¿en qué os ofendí, ni el pueblo en cosa ninguna?

FLORES

¿Ha de morir?

COMENDADOR

No ensuciéis las armas, que habéis de honrar en otro mejor lugar.

ORTUÑO

¿Qué mandas?

COMENDADOR

Que lo azotéis. Llevadle, y en ese roble le atad y le desnudad, y con las riendas...

MENGO

¡Piedad! ¡Piedad, pues sois hombre noble!

COMENDADOR

Azotalde hasta que salten los hierros de las correas.

MENGO

¡Cielos! ¿A hazañas tan feas queréis que castigos falten?

(_Vanse._)

COMENDADOR

Tú, villana, ¿por qué huyes? ¿Es mejor un labrador que un hombre de mi valor?

JACINTA

¡Harto bien me restituyes el honor que me han quitado en llevarme para ti!

COMENDADOR

¿En quererte llevar?

JACINTA

Sí; porque tengo un padre honrado, que si en alto nacimiento no te iguala, en las costumbres te vence.

COMENDADOR

Las pesadumbres y el villano atrevimiento no tiemplan bien un airado. Tira por ahí.

JACINTA

¿Con quién?

COMENDADOR

Conmigo.

JACINTA

Míralo bien.

COMENDADOR

Para tu mal lo he mirado. Ya no mía, del bagaje del ejército has de ser.

JACINTA

No tiene el mundo poder para hacerme, viva, ultraje.

COMENDADOR

Ea, villana, camina.

JACINTA

¡Piedad, señor!

COMENDADOR

No hay piedad.

JACINTA

Apelo de tu crueldad a la justicia divina.

(_Llévanla y vanse, y salen_ LAURENCIA _y_ FRONDOSO.)

LAURENCIA

¿Cómo así a venir te atreves, sin temer tu daño?

FRONDOSO

Ha sido dar testimonio cumplido de la afición que me debes. Desde aquel recuesto vi salir al comendador, y fiado en tu valor, todo mi temor perdí. Vaya donde no le vean volver.

LAURENCIA

Tente en maldecir, porque suele más vivir al que la muerte desean.

FRONDOSO

Si es eso, viva mil años, y así se hará todo bien, pues deseándole bien estarán ciertos sus daños. Laurencia, deseo saber si vive en ti mi cuidado, y si mi lealtad ha hallado el puerto de merecer. Mira que toda la villa ya para en uno nos tiene; y de cómo a ser no viene, la villa se maravilla. Los desdeñosos extremos deja, y responde no o sí.

LAURENCIA

Pues a la villa y a ti respondo que lo seremos.

FRONDOSO

Deja que tus plantas bese por la merced recibida, pues el cobrar nueva vida por ella es bien que confiese.

LAURENCIA

De cumplimientos acorta; y para que mejor cuadre, habla, Frondoso, a mi padre, pues es lo que más importa, que allí viene con mi tío; y fía que ha de tener ser, Frondoso, tu mujer, buen suceso.

FRONDOSO

En Dios confío.

(_Escóndese._)

(_Salen_ ESTEBAN, _alcalde_, _y el_ REGIDOR.)

[ESTEBAN], ALCALDE

Fué su término de modo, que la plaza alborotó: en efeto, procedió muy descomedido en todo. No hay a quien admiración sus demasías no den; la pobre Jacinta es quien pierde por su sinrazón.

REGIDOR

Ya [a] los Católicos Reyes, que este nombre les dan ya, presto España les dará la obediencia de sus leyes. Ya sobre Ciudad Real, contra el Girón que la tiene, Santiago a caballo viene por capitán general. Pésame; que era Jacinta doncella de buena pro.

[ESTEBAN], ALCALDE

Luego a Mengo le azotó.

REGIDOR

No hay negra bayeta o tinta como sus carnes están.

[ESTEBAN], ALCALDE

Callad; que me siento arder, viendo su mal proceder, y el mal nombre que le dan. Yo ¿para qué traigo aquí este palo sin provecho?

REGIDOR

Si sus criados lo han hecho, ¿de qué os afligís ansí?

[ESTEBAN], ALCALDE

¿Queréis más, que me contaron que a la de Pedro Redondo un día, que en lo más hondo de este valle la encontraron, después de sus insolencias, a sus criados la dió?

REGIDOR

Aquí hay gente: ¿quién es?

FRONDOSO

Yo, que espero vuestras licencias.

REGIDOR

Para mi casa, Frondoso, licencia no es menester; debes a tu padre el ser, y a mí otro ser amoroso. Hete criado, y te quiero como a hijo.

FRONDOSO

Pues señor, fiado en aquese amor, de ti una merced espero. Ya sabes de quién soy hijo.

ESTEBAN

¿Hate agraviado ese loco de Fernán Gómez?

FRONDOSO

No poco.

ESTEBAN

El corazón me lo dijo.

FRONDOSO

Pues señor, con el seguro del amor que habéis mostrado, de Laurencia enamorado, el ser su esposo procuro. Perdona si en el pedir mi lengua se ha adelantado; que he sido en decirlo osado, como otro lo ha de decir.

ESTEBAN

Vienes, Frondoso, a ocasión que me alargarás la vida por la cosa más temida que siente mi corazón. Agradezco, hijo, al cielo que así vuelvas por mi honor, y agradézcole a tu amor la limpieza de tu celo. Mas como es justo, es razón dar cuenta a tu padre de esto; sólo digo que estoy presto, en sabiendo su intención; que yo dichoso me hallo en que aqueso llegue a ser.

REGIDOR

De la moza el parecer tomad antes de acetallo.

[ESTEBAN], ALCALDE

No tengáis de eso cuidado, que ya el caso está dispuesto: antes de venir a esto, entre ellos se ha concertado. --En el dote, si advertís, se puede agora tratar; que por bien os pienso dar algunos maravedís.

FRONDOSO

Yo dote no he menester; de eso no hay que entristeceros

REGIDOR

Pues que no la pide en cueros lo podéis agradecer.

ESTEBAN

Tomaré el parecer de ella; si os parece, será bien.

FRONDOSO

Justo es; que no hace bien quien los gustos atropella.

ESTEBAN

¡Hija! ¡Laurencia!...

LAURENCIA

Señor...

ESTEBAN

Mirad si digo bien yo. ¡Ved qué presto respondió!-- Hija Laurencia, mi amor, a preguntarte ha venido (apártate aquí) si es bien que a Gila, tu amiga, den a Frondoso por marido, que es un honrado zagal, si le hay en Fuente Ovejuna...

LAURENCIA

¿Gila se casa?

ESTEBAN

Y si alguna le merece y es su igual.

LAURENCIA

Yo digo, señor, que sí.

ESTEBAN

Sí; mas yo digo que es fea y que harto mejor se emplea Frondoso, Laurencia, en ti.

LAURENCIA

¿Aun no se te han olvidado los donaires con la edad?

ESTEBAN

¿Quiéresle tú?

LAURENCIA

Voluntad le he tenido y le he cobrado, pero por lo que tú sabes...

ESTEBAN

¿Quieres tú que diga sí?

LAURENCIA

Dilo tú, señor, por mí.

ESTEBAN

¿Yo? Pues tengo yo las llaves, hecho está.--Ven, buscaremos a mi compadre en la plaza.

REGIDOR

Vamos.

ESTEBAN

Hijo, y en la traza del dote, ¿qué le diremos? Que yo bien te puedo dar cuatro mil maravedís.

FRONDOSO

Señor, ¿eso me decís? Mi honor queréis agraviar.

ESTEBAN

Anda, hijo; que eso es cosa que pasa en un día: que si no hay dote, a fe mía que se echa menos después.

(_Vanse, y quedan_ FRONDOSO _y_ LAURENCIA.)

LAURENCIA

Di, Frondoso, ¿estás contento?

FRONDOSO

¡Cómo si lo estoy! ¡Es poco, pues que no me vuelvo loco de gozo, del bien que siento! Risa vierte el corazón por los ojos de alegría, viéndote, Laurencia mía, en tal dulce posesión.

[_Vanse._]

(_Salen el_ MAESTRE, _el_ COMENDADOR, FLORES _y_ ORTUÑO.)

COMENDADOR

Huye, señor, que no hay otro remedio.

MAESTRE

La flaqueza del muro lo ha causado, y el poderoso ejército enemigo.

COMENDADOR

Sangre les cuesta y infinitas vidas.

MAESTRE

Y no se alabarán que en sus despojos pondrán nuestro pendón de Calatrava, que a honrar su empresa y los demás bastaba.

COMENDADOR

Tus desinios, Girón, quedan perdidos.

MAESTRE

¿Qué puedo hacer, si la fortuna, ciega, a quien hoy levantó mañana humilla?

(_Dentro._)

¡Vitoria por los reyes de Castilla!

MAESTRE

Ya coronan de luces las almenas, y las ventanas de las torres altas entoldan con pendones vitoriosos.

COMENDADOR

Bien pudieran, de sangre que les cuesta. A fe que es más tragedia que no fiesta.

MAESTRE

Yo vuelvo a Calatrava, Fernán Gómez.

COMENDADOR

Y yo a Fuente Ovejuna, mientras tratas o seguir esta parte de tus deudos, o reducir la tuya al Rey Católico.

MAESTRE

Yo te diré por cartas lo que intento.

COMENDADOR

El tiempo ha de enseñarte.

MAESTRE

¡Ah, pocos años, sujetos al rigor de sus engaños!

(_Sale la boda._ MÚSICOS, MENGO, FRONDOSO, LAURENCIA, PASCUALA, BARRILDO, ESTEBAN _y_ ALCALDE [JUAN ROJO].)

MÚSICOS

¡Vivan muchos años los desposados! ¡Vivan muchos años!

MENGO

A fe, que no os ha costado mucho trabajo el cantar.

BARRILDO

Supiéraslo tú trovar mejor que él está trovado.

FRONDOSO

Mejor entiende de azotes Mengo que de versos ya.

MENGO

Alguno en el valle está, para que no te alborotes, a quien el comendador...

BARRILDO

No lo digas, por tu vida; que este bárbaro homicida a todos quita el honor.

MENGO

Que me azotasen a mí cien soldados aquel día... sola una honda tenía; ...[34] pero que le hayan echado una melecina[35] a un hombre, que, aunque no diré su nombre, todos saben que es honrado, llena de tinta y de chinas, ¿cómo se puede sufrir?

[34] Falta un verso.

[35] _Melecina_, lavativa.

BARRILDO

Haríalo por reír.

MENGO

No hay risa con melecinas; que aunque es cosa saludable... yo me quiero morir luego.

FRONDOSO

Vaya la copla, te ruego, si es la copla razonable.

MENGO

Vivan muchos años juntos los novios, ruego a los cielos, y por envidia ni celos ni riñan ni anden en puntos. Lleven a entrambos difuntos, de puro vivir cansados. ¡Vivan muchos años!

[FRONDOSO][36]

¡Maldiga el cielo el poeta, que tal coplón arrojó!

[36] _El original_, Mengo.

BARRILDO

Fué muy presto...

MENGO

Pienso yo una cosa de esta seta[37]. ¿No habéis visto un buñolero, en el aceite abrasando pedazos de masa echando hasta llenarse el caldero? ¿Que unos le salen hinchados, otros tuertos y mal hechos, ya zurdos y ya derechos, ya fritos y ya quemados? Pues así imagino yo un poeta componiendo, la materia previniendo que es quien la masa le dió. Va arrojando verso aprisa al caldero del papel, confiado en que la miel cubrirá la burla y risa. Mas poniéndolo en el pecho, apenas hay quien los tome; tanto que sólo los come el mismo que los ha hecho.

[37] _Seta_, secta.

BARRILDO

Déjate ya de locuras; deja los novios hablar.

LAURENCIA

Las manos nos da a besar.

JUAN [ROJO]

Hija, ¿mi mano procuras? Pídela a tu padre luego para ti y para Frondoso.

ESTEBAN

Rojo, a ella y a su esposo que se la dé el cielo ruego, con su larga bendición.

FRONDOSO

Los dos a los dos la echad.

JUAN [ROJO]

Ea, tañed y cantad, pues que para en uno son.

MÚSICOS

Al val de Fuente Ovejuna la niña en cabellos baja; el caballero la sigue de la Cruz de Calatrava. Entre las ramas se esconde, de vergonzosa y turbada; fingiendo que no le ha visto, pone delante las ramas. «¿Para qué te ascondes, niña gallarda? Que mis linces deseos paredes pasan.» Acercóse él caballero, y ella, confusa y turbada, hacer quiso celosías de las intrincadas ramas; mas como quien tiene amor los mares y las montañas atraviesa fácilmente, la dice tales palabras: «¿Para qué te ascondes, niña gallarda? Que mis linces deseos paredes pasan.»

(_Salen el_ COMENDADOR, FLORES, ORTUÑO _y_ CIMBRANOS.)

COMENDADOR

Estése la boda queda, y no se alborote nadie.

JUAN [ROJO]

No es juego aqueste, señor, y basta que tú lo mandes. ¿Quieres lugar? ¿Cómo vienes con tu belicoso alarde? ¿Venciste? Mas ¿qué pregunto?

FRONDOSO

¡Muerto soy! ¡Cielos, libradme!

LAURENCIA

Huye por aquí, Frondoso.

COMENDADOR

Eso no; prendelde, atalde.

JUAN [ROJO]

Date, muchacho, a prisión.

FRONDOSO

Pues ¿quieres tú que me maten?

JUAN [ROJO]

¿Por qué?

COMENDADOR

No soy hombre yo que mato sin culpa a nadie; que si lo fuera, le hubieran pasado de parte a parte esos soldados que traigo. Llevarle mando a la cárcel, donde la culpa que tiene sentencie su mismo padre.

PASCUALA

Señor, mirad que se casa.

COMENDADOR

¿Qué me obliga a que se case? ¿No hay otra gente en el pueblo?

PASCUALA

Si os ofendió perdonadle, por ser vos quien sois.

COMENDADOR

No es cosa, Pascuala, en que yo soy parte. Es esto contra el maestre Téllez Girón, que Dios guarde; es contra toda su orden, es su honor, y es importante para el ejemplo, el castigo; que habrá otro día quien trate de alzar pendón contra él, pues ya sabéis que una tarde al comendador mayor (¡qué vasallos tan leales!) puso una ballesta al pecho.

ESTEBAN

Supuesto que el disculparle ya puede tocar a un suegro, no es mucho que en causas tales se descomponga con vos un hombre, en efecto, amante; porque si vos pretendéis su propia mujer quitarle, ¿qué mucho que la defienda?

COMENDADOR

Majadero sois, alcalde.

ESTEBAN

Por vuestra virtud, señor.

COMENDADOR

Nunca yo quise quitarle su mujer, pues no lo era.

ESTEBAN

Si quisistes...--Y esto baste; que reyes hay en Castilla que nuevas órdenes hacen con que desórdenes quitan. Y harán mal cuando descansen de las guerras, en sufrir en sus villas y lugares a hombres tan poderosos por traer cruces tan grandes; póngasela el rey al pecho, que para pechos reales es esa insignia y no más.

COMENDADOR

¡Hola! La vara quitalde.

ESTEBAN

Tomad, señor, norabuena.

COMENDADOR

Pues con ella quiero dalle, como a caballo brioso.

ESTEBAN

Por señor os sufro. Dadme.

PASCUALA

¡A un viejo de palos das!

LAURENCIA

Si le das porque es mi padre, ¿qué vengas en él de mí?

COMENDADOR

Llevalda, y haced que guarden su persona diez soldados.

(_Vase él y los suyos._)

ESTEBAN

Justicia del cielo baje. (_Vase._)

PASCUALA

Volvióse en luto la boda. (_Vase._)

BARRILDO

¿No hay aquí un hombre que hable?

MENGO

Yo tengo ya mis azotes, que aun se ven los cardenales sin que un hombre vaya a Roma. Prueben otros a enojarle.

JUAN [ROJO]

Hablemos todos.

MENGO

Señores, aquí todo el mundo calle. Como ruedas de salmón me puso los atabales.

ACTO TERCERO DE FUENTE OVEJUNA

ACTO TERCERO DE FUENTE OVEJUNA

(_Salen_ ESTEBAN, ALONSO _y_ BARRILDO.)

ESTEBAN

¿No han venido a la junta?

BARRILDO

No han venido.

ESTEBAN

Pues más apriesa nuestro daño corre.

BARRILDO

Ya está lo más del pueblo prevenido.

ESTEBAN

Frondoso con prisiones en la torre, y mi hija Laurencia en tanto aprieto, si la piedad de Dios no los socorre...

(_Salen_ JUAN ROJO _y el_ REGIDOR.)

JUAN

¿De qué dais voces, cuando importa tanto a nuestro bien, Esteban, el secreto?

ESTEBAN

Que doy tan pocas es mayor espanto.

(_Sale_ MENGO.)

MENGO

También vengo yo a hallarme en esta junta.

ESTEBAN

Un hombre cuyas canas baña el llanto, labradores honrados, os pregunta qué obsequias[38] debe hacer toda esa gente a su patria sin honra, ya perdida. Y si se llaman honras justamente, ¿cómo se harán, si no hay entre nosotros hombre a quien este bárbaro no afrente? Respondedme: ¿hay alguno de vosotros que no esté lastimado en honra y vida? ¿No os lamentáis los unos de los otros? Pues si ya la tenéis todos perdida, ¿a qué aguardáis? ¿Qué desventura es ésta?

[38] _Obsequias_, funerales.

JUAN

La mayor que en el mundo fué sufrida. Mas pues ya se publica y manifiesta que en paz tienen los reyes a Castilla y su venida a Córdoba se apresta, vayan dos regidores a la villa, y echándose a sus pies pidan remedio.

BARRILDO

En tanto que Fernando, aquel que humilla a tantos enemigos, otro medio será mejor[39], pues no podrá, ocupado, hacemos bien, con tanta guerra en medio.

[39] La frase está construída como si hubiese escrito el autor: «En tanto que Fernando humilla a tantos enemigos.»

REGIDOR

Si mi voto de vos fuera escuchado, desamparar la villa doy por voto.

JUAN

¿Cómo es posible en tiempo limitado?

MENGO

A la fe, que si entiendo el alboroto, que ha de costar la junta alguna vida.

REGIDOR

Ya, todo el árbol de paciencia roto, corre la nave de temor perdida. La hija quitan con tan gran fiereza a un hombre honrado, de quien es regida la patria en que vivís, y en la cabeza la vara quiebran tan injustamente. ¿Qué esclavo se trató con más bajeza?

JUAN

¿Qué es lo que quieres tú que el pueblo intente?

REGIDOR

Morir, o dar la muerte a los tiranos, pues somos muchos, y ellos poca gente.

BARRILDO

¡Contra el señor las armas en las manos!

ESTEBAN

El rey solo es señor después del cielo, y no bárbaros hombres inhumanos. Si Dios ayuda nuestro justo celo, ¿qué nos ha de costar?

MENGO

Mirad, señores que vais en estas cosas con recelo. Puesto que[40] por los simples labradores estoy aquí, que más injurias pasan, más cuerdo represento sus temores.

[40] Aunque.

JUAN

Si nuestras desventuras se compasan, para perder las vidas, qué aguardamos Las casas y las viñas nos abrasan: tiranos son; a la venganza vamos.

(_Sale_ LAURENCIA, _desmelenada._)

LAURENCIA

Dejadme entrar, que bien puedo en consejo de los hombres; que bien puede una mujer, si no a dar voto a dar voces.
¿Conocéisme?

ESTEBAN

¡Santo cielo! ¿No es mi hija?

JUAN

¿No conoces A Laurencia?

LAURENCIA

Vengo tal, que mi diferencia os pone en contingencia quién soy.

ESTEBAN

¡Hija mía!

LAURENCIA

No me nombres tu hija.

ESTEBAN

¿Por qué, mis ojos? ¿Por qué?

LAURENCIA

Por muchas razones, y sean las principales, porque dejas que me roben tiranos sin que me vengues, traidores sin que me cobres. Aun no era yo de Frondoso, para que digas que tome, como marido, venganza; que aquí por tu cuenta corre; que en tanto que de las bodas no haya llegado la noche, del padre, y no del marido, la obligación presupone; que en tanto que no me entregan una joya, aunque la compren, no ha de correr por mi cuenta las guardas ni los ladrones. Llevóme de vuestros ojos a su casa Fernán Gómez: la oveja al lobo dejáis, como cobardes pastores. ¿Qué dagas no vi en mi pecho? ¡Qué desatinos enormes, qué palabras, qué amenazas, y qué delitos atroces, por rendir mi castidad a sus apetitos torpes! Mis cabellos, ¿no lo dicen? ¿No se ven aquí los golpes, de la sangre y las señales? ¿Vosotros sois hombres nobles? ¿Vosotros padres y deudos? ¿Vosotros, que no se os rompen las entrañas de dolor, de verme en tantos dolores? Ovejas sois, bien lo dice de Fuente Ovejuna el nombre. Dadme unas armas a mí, pues sois piedras, pues sois bronces, pues sois jaspes, pues sois tigres... --Tigres no, porque feroces siguen quien roba sus hijos, matando los cazadores antes que entren por el mar y por sus ondas se arrojen. Liebres cobardes nacistes; bárbaros sois, no españoles. Gallinas, ¡vuestras mujeres sufrís que otros hombres gocen! Poneos ruecas en la cinta. ¿Para qué os ceñís estoques? ¡Vive Dios, que he de trazar que solas mujeres cobren la honra de estos tiranos, la sangre de estos traidores, y que os han de tirar piedras, hilanderas, maricones, amujerados, cobardes, y que mañana os adornen nuestras tocas y basquiñas, solimanes y colores! A Frondoso quiere ya, sin sentencia, sin pregones, colgar el comendador del almena de una torre; de todos hará lo mismo; y yo me huelgo, medio-hombres, por que quede sin mujeres esta villa honrada, y torne aquel siglo de amazonas, eterno espanto del orbe.

ESTEBAN

Yo, hija, no soy de aquellos que permiten que los nombres con esos títulos viles. Iré solo, si se pone todo el mundo contra mí.

JUAN

Y yo, por más que me asombre la grandeza del contrario.

REGIDOR

Muramos todos.

BARRILDO

Descoge un lienzo al viento en un palo, y mueran estos inormes[41].

[41] _Inorme_, forma anticuada de «enorme».

JUAN

¿Qué orden pensáis tener?

MENGO

Ir a matarle sin orden. Juntad el pueblo a una voz; que todos están conformes en que los tiranos mueran.

ESTEBAN

Tomad espadas, lanzones, ballestas, chuzos y palos.

MENGO

¡Los reyes nuestros señores vivan!

TODOS

¡Vivan muchos años!

MENGO

¡Mueran tiranos traidores!

TODOS

¡Traidores tiranos mueran!

(_Vanse todos._)

LAURENCIA

Caminad, que el cielo os oye. --¡Ah mujeres de la villa! ¡Acudid, por que se cobre vuestro honor, acudid todas!

(_Salen_ PASCUALA, JACINTA _y otras mujeres_)

PASCUALA

¿Qué es esto? ¿De qué das voces?

LAURENCIA

¿No veis cómo todos van a matar a Fernán Gómez, y hombres, mozos y muchachos, furiosos, al hecho corren? ¿Será bien que solos ellos de esta hazaña el honor gocen, pues no son de las mujeres sus agravios los menores?

JACINTA

Di, pues, ¿qué es lo que pretendes?

LAURENCIA

Que puestas todas en orden, acometamos a un hecho que dé espanto a todo el orbe. Jacinta, tu grande agravio, que sea cabo[42]; responde de una escuadra de mujeres.

[42] _Cabo_, el jefe.

JACINTA

No son los tuyos menores.

LAURENCIA

Pascuala, alférez serás.

PASCUALA

Pues déjame que enarbole en un asta la bandera: verás si merezco el nombre.

LAURENCIA

No hay espacio para eso, pues la dicha nos socorre: bien nos basta que llevemos nuestras tocas por pendones.

PASCUALA

Nombremos un capitán.

LAURENCIA

Eso no.

PASCUALA

¿Por qué?

LAURENCIA

Que adonde asiste mi gran valor, no hay Cides ni Rodamontes.

(_Vanse._)

(_Sale_ FRONDOSO, _atadas las manos_; FLORES, ORTUÑO, CIMBRANOS _y el_ COMENDADOR.)

COMENDADOR

De ese cordel que de las manos sobra quiero que le colguéis, por mayor pena.

FRONDOSO

¡Qué nombre, gran señor, tu sangre cobra!

COMENDADOR

Colgadle luego en la primera almena.

FRONDOSO

Nunca fué mi intención poner por obra tu muerte entonces.

FLORES

Grande ruido suena.

(_Ruido suene._)

COMENDADOR

¿Ruido?

FLORES

Y de manera que interrumpen tu justicia, señor.

ORTUÑO

Las puertas rompen.

(_Ruido._)

COMENDADOR

¡La puerta de mi casa, y siendo casa de la encomienda!

FLORES

El pueblo junto viene.

JUAN (_Dentro._)

Rompe, derriba, hunde, quema, abrasa.

ORTUÑO

Un popular motín mal se detiene.

COMENDADOR

¡El pueblo contra mí!

FLORES

La furia pasa tan adelante, que las puertas tiene echadas por la tierra.

COMENDADOR

Desatalde. Templa, Frondoso, ese villano alcalde.

FRONDOSO

Yo voy, señor; que amor les ha movido.

(_Vase._)

MENGO (_Dentro._)

¡Vivan Fernando y Isabel, y mueran los traidores!

FLORES

Señor, por Dios te pido que no te hallen aquí.

COMENDADOR

Si perseveran, este aposento es fuerte y defendido. Ellos se volverán.

FLORES

Cuando se alteran los pueblos agraviados, y resuelven, nunca sin sangre o sin venganza vuelven.

COMENDADOR

En esta puerta, así como rastrillo, su furor con las armas defendamos.

FRONDOSO (_Dentro._)

¡Viva Fuente Ovejuna!

COMENDADOR

¡Qué caudillo! Estoy porque a su furia acometamos.

FLORES

De la tuya, señor, me maravillo.

ESTEBAN

Ya el tirano y los cómplices miramos. ¡Fuente Ovejuna, y los tiranos mueran!

(_Salen todos._)

COMENDADOR

Pueblo, esperad.

TODOS

Agravios nunca esperan.

COMENDADOR

Decídmelos a mí, que iré pagando a fe de caballero esos errores.

TODOS

¡Fuente Ovejuna! ¡Viva el rey Fernando! ¡Mueran malos cristianos y traidores!

COMENDADOR

¿No me queréis oír? Yo estoy hablando; yo soy vuestro señor.

TODOS

Nuestros señores son los Reyes Católicos.

COMENDADOR

Espera.

TODOS

¡Fuente Ovejuna, y Fernán Gómez muera!

(_Vanse, y salen las mujeres armadas._)

LAURENCIA

Parad en este puesto de esperanzas soldados atrevidos, no mujeres.

PASCUALA

¿Lo[s] que mujeres son en las venganzas, en él beban su sangre es bien que esperes?

JACINTA

Su cuerpo recojamos en las lanzas.

PASCUALA

Todas son de esos mismos pareceres.

ESTEBAN (_Dentro._)

¡Muere, traidor comendador!

COMENDADOR

Ya muero. ¡Piedad, Señor, que en tu clemencia espero!

BARRILDO (_Dentro._)

Aquí está Flores.

MENGO

Dale a ese bellaco; que ese fué el que me dió dos mil azotes.

FRONDOSO (_Dentro._)

No me vengo si el alma no le saco.

LAURENCIA

No excusamos entrar.

PASCUALA

No te alborotes. Bien es guardar la puerta.

BARRILDO (_Dentro._)

No me aplaco. ¡Con lágrimas agora, marquesotes!

LAURENCIA

Pascuala, yo entro dentro; que la espada no ha de estar tan sujeta ni envainada.

(_Vase._)

BARRILDO [_Dentro._]

Aquí está Ortuño.

FRONDOSO [_Dentro._]

Córtale la cara.

(_Sale_ FLORES _huyendo_, _y_ MENGO _tras él._)

FLORES

¡Mengo, piedad!, que no soy yo el culpado.

MENGO

Cuando ser alcahuete no bastara, bastaba haberme el pícaro azotado.

PASCUALA

Dánoslo a las mujeres, Mengo, para... Acaba por tu vida.

MENGO

Ya está dado; que no le quiero yo mayor castigo.

PASCUALA

Vengaré tus azotes.

MENGO

Eso digo.

JACINTA

¡Ea, muera el traidor!

FLORES

¡Entre mujeres!

JACINTA

¿No le viene muy ancho?

PASCUALA

¿Aqueso lloras?

JACINTA

Muere, concertador de sus placeres.

PASCUALA

¡Ea, muera el traidor!

FLORES

¡Piedad, señoras!

(_Sale_ ORTUÑO _huyendo de_ LAURENCIA.)

ORTUÑO

Mira que no soy yo...

LAURENCIA

Ya sé quién eres.-- Entrad, teñid las armas vencedoras en estos viles.

PASCUALA

Moriré matando.

TODAS

¡Fuente Ovejuna, y viva el rey Fernando!

(_Vanse, y salen el_ REY DON FERNANDO _y la_ REINA DOÑA ISABEL, _y_ DON MANRIQUE, _maestre._)

MANRIQUE

De modo la prevención fué, que el efeto esperado llegamos a ver logrado con poca contradición. Hubo poca resistencia; y supuesto que la hubiera, sin duda ninguna fuera de poca o ninguna esencia. Queda el de Cabra ocupado en conservación del puesto, por si volviere dispuesto a él el contrario osado.

REY

Discreto el acuerdo fué, y que asista es conveniente, y reformando la gente, el paso tomado esté. Que con eso se asegura no podernos hacer mal Alfonso, que en Portugal tomar la fuerza procura. Y el de Cabra es bien que esté en ese sitio asistente, y como tan diligente, muestras de su valor dé; porque con esto asegura el daño que nos recela, y como fiel centinela, el bien del reino procura.

(_Sale_ FLORES, _herido._)

FLORES

Católico rey Fernando, a quien el cielo concede la corona de Castilla, como a varón excelente; oye la mayor crueldad que se ha visto entre las gentes desde donde nace el sol hasta donde se oscurece.

REY

Repórtate.

FLORES

Rey supremo, mis heridas no consienten dilatar el triste caso, por ser mi vida tan breve. De Fuente Ovejuna vengo, donde, con pecho inclemente, los vecinos de la villa a su señor dieron muerte. Muerto Fernán Gómez queda por sus súbditos aleves; que vasallos indignados con leve causa se atreven. El título de tirano le acumula todo el plebe, y a la fuerza de esta voz el hecho fiero acometen; y quebrantando su casa, no atendiendo a que se ofrece por la fe de caballero a que pagará a quien debe, no sólo no le escucharon, pero con furia impaciente rompen el cruzado pecho con mil heridas crueles, y por las altas ventanas le hacen que al suelo vuele, adonde en picas y espadas le recogen las mujeres. Llévanle a una casa muerto, y, a porfía, quien más puede mesa su barba y cabello y apriesa su rostro hieren. En efeto fué la furia tan grande que en ellos crece, que las mayores tajadas las orejas a ser vienen. Sus armas borran con picas y a voces dicen que quieren tus reales armas fijar, porque aquéllas les ofenden. Saqueáronle la casa, cual si de enemigos fuese, y gozosos entre todos han repartido sus bienes. Lo dicho he visto escondido, porque mi infelice suerte en tal trance no permite que mi vida se perdiese; y así estuve todo el día hasta que la noche viene, y salir pude escondido para que cuenta te diese. Haz, señor, pues eres justo, que la justa pena lleven de tan riguroso caso los bárbaros delincuentes: mira que su sangre a voces pide que tu rigor prueben.

REY

Estar puedes confiado que sin castigo no queden. El triste suceso ha sido tal, que admirado me tiene, y que vaya luego un juez que lo averigüe conviene, y castigue a los culpados para ejemplo de las gentes. Vaya un capitán con él, por que seguridad lleve; que tan grande atrevimiento castigo ejemplar requiere; y curad a este soldado de las heridas que tiene.

(_Vanse, y salen los labradores y labradoras, con la cabeza de Fernán Gómez en una lanza._)

MÚSICOS

¡Muchos años vivan Isabel y Fernando, y mueran los tiranos!

BARRILDO

Diga su copla Frondoso.

FRONDOSO

Ya va mi copla a la fe; si le faltare algún pie, enmiéndelo el más curioso. «¡Vivan la bella Isabel, pues que para en uno son, él con ella, ella con él! A los cielos San Miguel lleve a los dos de las manos. ¡Vivan muchos años, y mueran los tiranos!»

LAURENCIA

Diga Barrildo.

BARRILDO

Ya va; que a fe que la he pensado.

PASCUALA

Si la dices con cuidado, buena y rebuena será.

BARRILDO

«¡Vivan los reyes famosos muchos años, pues que tienen la vitoria, y a ser vienen nuestros dueños venturosos! Salgan siempre vitoriosos de gigantes y de enanos, y ¡mueran los tiranos!»

MÚSICOS

¡Muchos años vivan!, etc.

LAURENCIA

Diga Mengo.

FRONDOSO

Mengo diga.

MENGO

Yo soy poeta donado.

PASCUALA

Mejor dirás lastimado el envés de la barriga.

MENGO

«Una mañana en domingo me mandó azotar aquél, de manera que el rabel daba espantoso respingo; pero agora que los pringo, ¡vivan los reyes cristiánigos, y mueran los tiránigos!»

MÚSICA

¡Vivan muchos años!

ESTEBAN

Quita la cabeza allá.

MENGO

Cara tiene de ahorcado.

(_Saca un escudo_ JUAN ROJO _con las armas [reales]_)

REGIDOR

Ya las armas han llegado.

ESTEBAN

Mostrá las armas acá.

JUAN

¿Adónde se han de poner?

REGIDOR

Aquí, en el ayuntamiento.

ESTEBAN

¡Bravo escudo!

BARRILDO

¡Qué contento!

FRONDOSO

Ya comienza a amanecer, con este sol, nuestro día.

ESTEBAN

¡Vivan Castilla y León, y las barras de Aragón, y muera la tiranía! Advertid, Fuente Ovejuna, a las palabras de un viejo; que el admitir su consejo no ha dañado vez ninguna. Los reyes han de querer averiguar este caso, y más tan cerca del paso y jornada que han de hacer. Concertaos todos a una en lo que habéis de decir.

FRONDOSO

¿Qué es tu consejo?

ESTEBAN

Morir diciendo _Fuente Ovejuna_, y a nadie saquen de aquí.

FRONDOSO

Es el camino derecho. Fuente Ovejuna lo ha hecho.

ESTEBAN

¿Queréis responder así?

TODOS

Sí.

ESTEBAN

Ahora[43], pues; yo quiero ser agora el pesquisidor, para ensayarnos mejor en lo que habemos de hacer. Sea Mengo el que esté puesto en el tormento.

[43] _El original_, agora.

MENGO

¿No hallaste otro más flaco?

ESTEBAN

¿Pensaste que era de veras?

MENGO

Di presto.

ESTEBAN

¿Quién mató al comendador?

MENGO

Fuente Ovejuna lo hizo.

ESTEBAN

Perro, ¿si te martirizo?

MENGO

Aunque me matéis, señor.

ESTEBAN

Confiesa, ladrón.

MENGO

Confieso.

ESTEBAN

Pues ¿quién fué?

MENGO

Fuente Ovejuna.

ESTEBAN

Dadle otra vuelta.

MENGO

Es ninguna.

ESTEBAN

Cagajón para el proceso.

(_Sale el_ REGIDOR.)

REGIDOR

¿Qué hacéis de esta suerte aquí?

FRONDOSO

¿Qué ha sucedido, Cuadrado?

REGIDOR

Pesquisidor ha llegado.

ESTEBAN

Echá todos por ahí.

REGIDOR

Con él viene un capitán.

ESTEBAN

Venga el diablo: ya sabéis lo que responder tenéis.

REGIDOR

El pueblo prendiendo van, sin dejar alma ninguna.

ESTEBAN

Que no hay que tener temor. ¿Quién mató al comendador, Mengo?

MENGO

¿Quién? Fuente Ovejuna.

(_Vanse, y salen el_ MAESTRE _y_ UN SOLDADO.)

MAESTRE

¡Que tal caso ha sucedido! Infelice fué su suerte. Estoy por darte la muerte por la nueva que has traído.

SOLDADO

Yo, señor, soy mensajero, y enojarte no es mi intento.

MAESTRE

¡Que a tal tuvo atrevimiento un pueblo enojado y fiero! Iré con quinientos hombres, y la villa he de asolar; en ella no ha de quedar ni aun memoria de los hombres.

SOLDADO

Señor, tu enojo reporta; porque ellos al rey se han dado, y no tener enojado al rey es lo que te importa.

MAESTRE

¿Cómo al rey se pueden dar, si de la encomienda son?

SOLDADO

Con él sobre esa razón podrás luego pleitear.

MAESTRE

Por pleito ¿cuándo salió lo que él[44] le entregó en sus manos? Son señores soberanos, y tal reconozco yo. Por saber que al rey se han dado me reportará mi enojo, y ver su presencia escojo por lo más bien acertado; que puesto que tenga culpa en casos de gravedad, en todo mi poca edad viene a ser quien me disculpa. Con vergüenza voy; mas es honor quien puede obligarme, y importa no descuidarme en tan honrado interés.

[44] El pueblo.

(_Vanse; sale_ LAURENCIA _sola._)

LAURENCIA

Amando, recelar daño en lo amado, nueva pena de amor se considera; que quien en lo que ama daño espera aumenta en el temor nuevo cuidado. El firme pensamiento desvelado, si le aflige el temor, fácil se altera; que no es a firme fe pena ligera ver llevar el temor el bien robado. Mi esposo adoro; la ocasión que veo al temor de su daño me condena, si no le ayuda la felice suerte. Al bien suyo se inclina mi deseo: si está presente, está cierta mi pena; si está en ausencia, está cierta mi muerte.

(_Sale_ FRONDOSO.)

FRONDOSO

¡Mi Laurencia!

LAURENCIA

¡Esposo amado! ¿Cómo a estar aquí te atreves?

FRONDOSO

¿Esas resistencias debes a mi amoroso cuidado?

LAURENCIA

Mi bien, procura guardarte, porque tu daño recelo.

FRONDOSO

No quiera, Laurencia, el cielo que tal llegue a disgustarte.

LAURENCIA

¿No temes ver el rigor que por los demás sucede, y el furor con que procede aqueste pesquisidor? Procura guardar la vida. Huye, tu daño no esperes.

FRONDOSO

¿Cómo que procure quieres cosa tan mal recibida? ¿Es bien que los demás deje en el peligro presente y de tu vista me ausente? No me mandes que me aleje; porque no es puesto en razón que, por evitar mi daño, sea con mi sangre extraño en tan terrible ocasión.

(_Voces dentro._)

Voces parece que he oído, y son, si yo mal no siento, de alguno que dan tormento. Oye con atento oído.

(_Dice dentro el_ JUEZ, _y responden._)

JUEZ

Decid la verdad, buen viejo.

FRONDOSO

Un viejo, Laurencia mía, atormentan.

LAURENCIA

¡Qué porfía!

ESTEBAN

Déjenme un poco.

JUEZ

Ya os dejo. Decid, ¿quién mató a Fernando?

ESTEBAN

Fuente Ovejuna lo hizo.

LAURENCIA

Tu nombre, padre, eternizo[45]. ...

[45] Falta un verso para la redondilla, pero no para el sentido.

FRONDOSO

¡Bravo caso!

JUEZ

Ese muchacho aprieta. Perro, yo sé que lo sabes. Di quién fué. ¿Callas? Aprieta, borracho.

NIÑO

Fuente Ovejuna, señor.

JUEZ

¡Por vida del rey, villanos, que os ahorque con mis manos! ¿Quién mató al comendador?

FRONDOSO

¡Que a un niño le den tormento y niegue de aquesta suerte!

LAURENCIA

¡Bravo pueblo!

FRONDOSO

Bravo y fuerte.

JUEZ

Esa mujer al momento en ese potro tened. Dale esa mancuerda luego.

LAURENCIA

Ya está de cólera ciego.

JUEZ

Que os he de matar, creed, en este potro, villanos. ¿Quién mató al comendador?

PASCUALA

Fuente Ovejuna, señor.

JUEZ

¡Dale!

FRONDOSO

Pensamientos vanos.

LAURENCIA

Pascuala niega, Frondoso.

FRONDOSO

Niegan niños: ¿qué te espantas?

JUEZ

Parece que los encantas. ¡Aprieta!

PASCUALA

¡Ay cielo piadoso!

JUEZ

¡Aprieta, infame! ¿Estás sordo?

PASCUALA

Fuente Ovejuna lo hizo.

JUEZ

Traedme aquél más rollizo; ese desnudo, ese gordo.

LAURENCIA

¡Pobre Mengo! El es sin duda.

FRONDOSO

Temo que ha de confesar.

MENGO

¡Ay, ay!

JUEZ

Comienza a apretar.

MENGO

¡Ay!

JUEZ

¿Es menester ayuda?

MENGO

¡Ay, ay!

JUEZ

¿Quién mató, villano, al señor comendador?

MENGO

¡Ay, yo lo diré, señor!

JUEZ

Afloja un poco la mano.

FRONDOSO

El confiesa.

JUEZ

Al palo aplica la espalda.

MENGO

Quedo; que yo lo diré.

JUEZ

¿Quién lo mató?

MENGO

Señor, Fuente Ovejunica.

JUEZ

¿Hay tan gran bellaquería? Del dolor se están burlando. En quien estaba esperando, niega con mayor porfía. Dejaldos; que estoy cansado.

FRONDOSO

¡Oh, Mengo, bien te haga Dios! Temor que tuve de dos, el tuyo me le ha quitado.

(_Salen con_ MENGO, BARRILDO _y el_ REGIDOR.)

BARRILDO

¡Vítor, Mengo!

REGIDOR

Y con razón.

BARRILDO

¡Mengo, vítor!

FRONDOSO

Eso digo.

MENGO

¡Ay, ay!

BARRILDO

Toma, bebe, amigo. Come.

MENGO

¡Ay, ay! ¿Qué es?

BARRILDO

Diacitrón.

MENGO

¡Ay, ay!

FRONDOSO

Echa de beber.

BARRILDO

...Ya va[46].

[46] Falta el principio del verso.

FRONDOSO

Bien lo cuela. Bueno está.

LAURENCIA

Dale otra vez a comer.

MENGO

¡Ay, ay!

BARRILDO

Esta va por mí.

LAURENCIA

Solemnemente lo embebe.

FRONDOSO

El que bien niega bien bebe.

REGIDOR

¿Quieres otra?

MENGO

¡Ay, ay! Sí, sí.

FRONDOSO

Bebe, que bien lo mereces.

LAURENCIA

A vez por vuelta las cuela.

FRONDOSO

Arrópale, que se hiela.

BARRILDO

¿Quieres más?

MENGO

Sí, otras tres veces. ¡Ay, ay!

FRONDOSO

Si hay vino pregunta.

BARRILDO

Sí hay: bebe a tu placer; que quien niega ha de beber. ¿Qué tiene?

MENGO

Una cierta punta[47]. Vamos; que me arromadizo.

[47] _Punta_, sabor agrio del vino. Mengo ha debido hacer antes un gesto de desagrado.

FRONDOSO

Que [beba][48], que éste es mejor. ¿Quién mató al comendador?

[48] _El original_, lea.

MENGO

Fuente Ovejunica lo hizo.

(_Vanse._)

FRONDOSO

Justo es que honores le den. Pero decidme, mi amor, ¿quién mató al comendador?

LAURENCIA

Fuente Ovejuna, mi bien.

FRONDOSO

¿Quién le mató?

LAURENCIA

Dasme espanto. Pues Fuente Ovejuna fué.

FRONDOSO

Y yo ¿con qué te maté?

LAURENCIA

¿Con qué? Con quererte tanto.

(_Vanse, y salen el_ REY _y la_ REINA _y_ MANRIQUE [_luego_].)

ISABEL

No entendí, señor, hallaros aquí, y es buena mi suerte.

REY

En nueva gloria convierte mi vista el bien de miraros. Iba a Portugal de paso, y llegar aquí fué fuerza.

ISABEL

Vuestra majestad le tuerza, siendo conveniente el caso.

REY

¿Cómo dejáis a Castilla?

ISABEL

En paz queda, quieta y llana.

REY

Siendo vos la que la allana no lo tengo a maravilla.

(_Sale_ DON MANRIQUE.)

MANRIQUE

Para ver vuestra presencia el maestre de Calatrava, que aquí de llegar acaba, pide que le deis licencia.

ISABEL

Verle tenía deseado.

MANRIQUE

Mi fe, señora, os empeño, que, aunque es en edad pequeño, es valeroso soldado.

([_Vase, y_] _sale el_ MAESTRE.)

MAESTRE

Rodrigo Téllez Girón, que de loaros no acaba, maestre de Calatrava, os pide, humilde, perdón. Confieso que fuí engañado, y que excedí de lo justo en cosas de vuestro gusto, como mal aconsejado. El consejo de Fernando y el interés me engañó, injusto fiel; y ansí, yo perdón, humilde, os demando. Y si recebir merezco esta merced que suplico, desde aquí me certifico en que a serviros me ofrezco, y que en aquesta jornada de Granada, adonde vais, os prometo que veáis el valor que hay en mi espada; donde sacándola apenas, dándoles fieras congojas, plantaré mis cruces rojas sobre sus altas almenas; y más quinientos soldados en serviros emplearé, junto con la firma y fe de en mi vida disgustaros.

REY

Alzad, maestre, del suelo; que siempre que hayáis venido seréis muy bien recibido.

MAESTRE

Sois de afligidos consuelo.

ISABEL

Vos, con valor peregrino, sabéis bien decir y hacer.

MAESTRE

Vos sois una bella Ester, y vos un Jerjes divino.

(_Sale_ MANRIQUE.)

MANRIQUE

Señor, el pesquisidor que a Fuente Ovejuna ha ido, con el despacho ha venido a verse ante tu valor.

REY

Sed juez de estos agresores.

MAESTRE

Si a vos, señor, no mirara, sin duda les enseñara a matar comendadores.

REY

Eso ya no os toca a vos.

ISABEL

Yo confieso que he de ver el cargo en vuestro poder, si me lo concede Dios.

(_Sale el_ JUEZ.)

JUEZ

A Fuente Ovejuna fuí de la suerte que has mandado, y con especial cuidado y diligencia asistí. Haciendo averiguación del cometido delito, una hoja no se ha escrito que sea en comprobación; porque conformes a una, con un valeroso pecho, en pidiendo quién lo ha hecho, responden: «Fuente Ovejuna». Trecientos he atormentado con no pequeño rigor, y te prometo, señor, que más que esto no he sacado. Hasta niños de diez años al potro arrimé, y no ha sido posible haberlo inquirido ni por halagos ni engaños. Y pues tan mal se acomoda el poderlo averiguar, o los has de perdonar, o matar la villa toda. Todos vienen ante ti para más certificarte: de ellos podrás informarte.

REY

Que entren, pues vienen, les di.

(_Salen los dos_ ALCALDES, FRONDOSO, _las mujeres y los villanos que quisieren._)

LAURENCIA

¿Aquestos los reyes son?

FRONDOSO

Y en Castilla poderosos.

LAURENCIA

Por mi fe, que son hermosos: ¡bendígalos San Antón!

ISABEL

¿Los agresores son éstos?

ALCALDE ESTEBAN

Fuente Ovejuna, señora, que humildes llegan agora para serviros dispuestos. La sobrada tiranía y el insufrible rigor del muerto comendador, que mil insultos hacía, fué el autor de tanto daño. Las haciendas nos robaba y las doncellas forzaba, siendo de piedad extraño.

FRONDOSO

Tanto, que aquesta zagala, que el cielo me ha concedido, en que tan dichoso he sido que nadie en dicha me iguala, cuando conmigo casó, aquella noche primera, mejor que si suya fuera, a su casa la llevó; y a no saberse guardar ella, que en virtud florece, ya manifiesto parece lo que pudiera pasar.

MENGO

¿No es ya tiempo que hable yo? Si me dais licencia, entiendo que os admiraréis, sabiendo del modo que me trató. Porque quise defender una moza de su gente, que con término insolente fuerza la querían hacer, aquel perverso Nerón, de manera me ha tratado, que el reverso me ha dejado como rueda de salmón. Tocaron mis atabales tres hombres con tal porfía, que aun pienso que todavía me duran los cardenales. Gasté en este mal prolijo, por que el cuero se me curta, polvos de arrayán y murta más que vale mi cortijo.

ALCALDE ESTEBAN

Señor, tuyos ser queremos. Rey nuestro eres natural, y con título de tal ya tus armas puesto habemos. Esperamos tu clemencia, y que veas, esperamos, que en este caso te damos por abono la inocencia.

REY

Pues no puede averiguarse el suceso por escrito, aunque fué grave el delito, por fuerza ha de perdonarse. Y la villa es bien se quede en mí, pues de mí se vale, hasta ver si acaso sale comendador que la herede.

FRONDOSO

Su majestad habla, en fin, como quien tanto ha acertado. Y aquí, discreto senado, FUENTE OVEJUNA da fin.

FIN

INDICE

Páginas.

Acto primero 13

Acto segundo 61

Acto tercero 109

* * * * *

Nota del Transcriptor:

Se ha respetado la ortografía y la acentuación del original.

Se han corregido los errores obvios de imprenta.

Se han eliminado las páginas en blanco.

==========

Untitled

Unknown

Project Gutenberg Release: December 24, 2019 · eBook #61010

Ma

Ein Porträt

Von

Lou Andreas-Salomé

[Illustration]

Stuttgart 1901

J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger

G. m. b. H.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Druck der Union Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft in Stuttgart

=I.=

Die Iberische Mutter Gottes fuhr spazieren.

Aus der Tiefe ihres kerzenerhellten blaugoldschimmernden Tempelchens vor dem Eingang zum Schönen Platz am Kreml war sie von ehrfürchtigen Händen in den Wagen gehoben worden.

Da saß sie nun im prächtigen Vierspänner, ihrer ständigen Equipage, breit auf dem Vordersitz, ihr gegenüber zwei Priester in reichen scharlachroten Gewändern, Kreuz und Weihrauchgefäß vor sich hinhaltend.

Irgend eine der kleinern Glocken im Kreml bimmelte und bimmelte. Hin und wieder nur unterbrach ein vereinzelter tiefer Glockenton, lang nachdröhnend und wie verträumt, dies helle Geläute. Hoch über den verschneiten Straßen klang es unermüdlich, mit dringlicher Monotonie, in den Winterwind hinein.

Die Menge umringte den Wagen so nahe, als sie es vermochte, junge Gesichter und alte, bärtige bückten sich in gleich demutvollem Eifer, um einen Kuß auf das wunderthätige Bild zu erhaschen oder wenigstens auf den Rahmen daneben.

Ein paar elegante Offiziere, die über den Woßkreßenskiplatz herkamen, machten mitten auf dem Fahrdamm Halt, beugten das Knie in den Schnee und bekreuzigten sich feierlich mit bis zur Strenge ernsten Mienen.

Täglich fuhr die Iberische Mutter aus, um allen Besuchsanforderungen zu genügen, dennoch mußte oft ihre Gegenwart in einem Haus wochenlang vorher erfleht werden, damit sie noch Zeit dafür fand.

Langsam lenkte der imposante Kutscher, trotz der empfindlichen Kälte entblößten Hauptes, seine vier Rappen aus dem Menschenhaufen heraus.

Viele blieben noch stehn, um ihm nachzuschauen. Auf den Stufen zum Tempelchen lagerten Pilger, Bastschuhe an den tücherumwickelten Füßen, den Stab in der Hand. Mit ihren Anliegen wandten sie sich jetzt an die Kopie des Bildes, die stellvertretend im Heiligtum hing, und steckten betend brennende Wachskerzen davor auf.

So mehrte sich drinnen immer noch Licht um Licht zu erhöhtem Glanze, -- von außen anzusehen wie eine mächtige gelbflimmernde Sonne, die mitten im nüchternen Alltag des Straßenlebens gleich einem leuchtenden Geheimnis dastand und winkte und winkte --.

Die Mutter Gottes im Vierspänner hatte mit nicht gar vielen Equipagen zu konkurrieren. Wer sie fahren sah, konnte sie gut für die große Dame Moskaus halten und für den Inbegriff des heiligen Mütterchens Moskau selbst.

Was da auf dem hartgefrorenen Schnee an Fuhrwerken vorüberglitt, waren fast nur kleine, niedrige Schlittchen, wie sie für wenige Kopeken sogar dem Volk zugänglich sind. Weiber mit Sack und Pack befanden sich häufig drin, Bauern in hoch um die Ohren geschlagenen Schafpelzen. Seltener schon flog eine Troika des Weges dahin, und, zugleich mit dem lustigen schellenläutenden Dreigespann, vielleicht irgend ein Lied, angestimmt von den Insassen, -- ein Lied, wie es in den Theebuden zur Harfe gesungen wird oder in Sommernächten vor der Thür der Dorfhütten.

Das zitterte dann mit dem nachschwingenden Glockenton wundersam in eins zusammen, -- selbst dann wundersam in eins, wenns zufällig ein Tanzlied war. Auch dann mußte es der Iberischen Mutter heimisch entgegenklingen.

Und auch unter den Fußgängern begegneten ihr vorherrschend ihre ureigensten Kinder, Kinder des Volks. Nicht das Proletariat großer Städte, wie es gern die entlegeneren Gassen füllt, sondern Volk, -- das Volk zu Hause auf seinen breiten Straßen und Plätzen. In der ihm zugehörigen Tracht schritt es einher, nicht in abgelegten Almosenkleidern Reicherer oder deren Nachahmung, und diese Tracht überwog so sehr, daß sich die Andersgekleideten, die Allerweltstypen, fast darunter verloren.

Das alte Moskau, -- zumal in der winterlichen Frühdämmerung einer solchen Nachmittagsstunde, -- nahm sich beinahe aus, als sei es im Grunde seines Herzens ein Riesendorf, zutraulich herumgebaut um die allwaltende Herrlichkeit und Heiligkeit der Kremlhöhe.

Rot und grün und blau an Dächern oder Mauerwerk, in Farben, wie sie Kinder am liebsten auf ihren Bilderbogen anbringen, schauten die Häuser zum großen Kreml empor. Und in Rot und Grün und Blau antwortete er ihnen von der Höhe seiner Kuppeln und Paläste, väterlich ihnen angepaßt, mit ihnen verschmelzend, und malte noch bunte Sternchen oder Streifen mitten hinein in sein Gold.

Mit dem Golde aber übertrumpfte er sie, überstrahlte er sie, mit dem Golde übertönte er alles wie mit einem lauten Lobgesang, sodaß sie gleich darauf doch wieder ganz klein unter ihm dalagen und ganz verstummt trotz ihrer beredten Farben. Und ein andres Gold war es zu jeglicher Stunde, zu jeder jedoch ein königliches, vom ersten Tagesgrauen an, das über Moskau aufging, bis tief in die tiefste Nacht, denn keine gab es, tief genug, um das Gold ganz auszulöschen.

Immer war es da, ob breit entfaltet in seinem selbstverständlichen Glanze oder geheinmisvoll gesammelt wie eine Leuchte von innen her, die sich nur verstohlen verrät. Immer war es da, allen gegenwärtig, von den äußersten Kreuzspitzen der Kathedralen an bis hinein in das verborgenste Dunkel der Kirchenräume und selbst bis hinab in den geschlossnen Wagen, worin die Iberierin durch die Straßen fuhr, feierlich umblitzt von Goldfunken und dem vielfarbigen Schimmer ihres köstlichen Geschmeides. --

Sie machte nur eine kurze Fahrt, schon in einer Seitenstraße der Twerskaja schien ihr Ziel erreicht. Unter einem erneuten Auflauf von Menschen, die leise beteten, sich bekreuzigten und einen Kuß anzubringen suchten, wurde sie hinausgehoben, um den inbrünstig Harrenden entgegengetragen zu werden, denen ihr Besuch galt, und deren Thränen sie trocknen, deren Qual sie bannen, oder deren Jubel über eine Glücksfügung sie Weihe und Segen erteilen sollte.

Am Fenster eines hölzernen Miethauses schräg gegenüber standen zwei junge Mädchen und sahen, aneinander gelehnt, der Scene auf der Straße zu.

»Ach Rußland -- Rußland! Mir ist doch wieder, als ob ich nach Asien zurückgekehrt wäre,« sagte die Aeltere kopfschüttelnd, »traurig ist es! Ich wundre mich, daß du nur dazu lachst, Sophie.«

Sophie kehrte sich vom Fenster ab, weil es nichts mehr zu sehen gab. Sie entgegnete mit einem sanften, begütigenden Stimmchen: »Es ist nicht so schlimm. Vielleicht noch ein bißchen Mittelalter, aber es kann auch etwas ganz Feierliches bekommen, mitunter. Dann lache ich auch nicht. -- Man muß nur nicht grade als Studentin frisch aus dem Auslande angereist sein!«

»Wir haben keinerlei Grund, uns für dies Mittelalter zu begeistern, Sophie. Sind wir etwa Russen? Und selbst wenn wirs wären --«

Sophie war nach dem andern Fenster gegangen, wo neben einer Gruppe wohlgepflegter hoher Blattpflanzen ein Schaukelstuhl stand.

»Sind wir auch nicht gradezu Russen, so sind wir doch hier zu Hause,« meinte sie zögernd. »Und eigentlich möchte ich manchmal, wir wärens noch mehr! Wären zum Beispiel in einem stockrussischen Gymnasium erzogen worden, -- wenigstens ich, Schwesterchen.«

»-- Warum --?!«

Sophie blieb die Antwort auf diese erstaunte Frage schuldig.

Ihre zartgliedrige Gestalt dehnte sich lang aus im Schaukelstuhl, und sie legte den blonden Kopf mit seinen zwei schimmernden Flechten, die ihn kranzförmig umwanden, so weit zurück an die Stuhllehne, daß ihr Blick zur Zimmerdecke emporsah, anstatt auf die Schwester.

Erst nach einer kleinen Pause bemerkte sie ablenkend: »Uebrigens: diese niedrigen Decken abgerechnet, -- findest du nicht auch, Cita, daß unsre jetzige Wohnung ganz ungeheuer behaglich ist? Ich freute mich so, als wir wegen Mas vieler Lehrstunden in dies gute Viertel ziehen mußten.«

Cita hatte sich auf den Fenstersims gehockt und strich sich in einer ihr eigentümlichen hastigen Bewegung mit der Hand durch ihr kurzverschnittenes welliges ganz dunkelblondes Haar.

»Gewiß, -- sehr behaglich habt ihr es,« gab sie zerstreut zu, »aber es sollte wohl selbst der vertracktesten Wohnung schwer fallen, unbehaglich zu wirken, wenn unsre Mama sie bewohnt und einrichtet. -- Aber daß sie dies Viertel gewählt hat, ist auch abgesehen von den Lehrstunden gut. Die meisten ihr bekannten Häuser liegen nicht weit von hier. Ich meine: das ist gut -- besonders für später.«

»Wie denn: für später?«

Cita hob ihren hübschen Bubenkopf und blickte auf die Schwester.

»Verstehst du mich nicht? -- -- Für später, wenn sie hier allein ist, weil auch du irgendwo im Auslande studierst, -- Medizin --«

Sophie lachte hell auf, wie über einen Scherz. »Was dir nicht alles einfällt! Daran denkt doch niemand im Traum!« bemerkte sie und wippte leise mit dem Schaukelstuhle.

Cita zog unwillig die dunkeln feinen Augenbrauen zusammen. »Ach Sophie, laß doch die Flausen, hinter denen du dich versteckst. Gewiß denkt jemand daran, im Traum und im Wachen: nämlich du selbst. Und aus diesem einzigen Grunde bedauertest du offenbar plötzlich, nicht ein stockrussisches Gymnasium hinter dir zu haben. Du erwägst in deiner Ratlosigkeit: könnt ich wenigstens hier --, wenn nicht schon im Auslande --«

»Ja, -- Ma verlassen --: das thu ich eben nicht!« fiel Sophie erregt ein.

Cita entgegnete sehr ruhig: »Zeit wärs, zu wissen, was du selbst willst. Du bist neunzehn, hast seit Ostern dein Diplom. In dem Alter war ich schon fort. Und in anderthalb Jahren werd ich promoviert haben, -- wenn nicht eher.«

»Mein Gott, damit brauchst du nicht zu protzen!« sagte Sophie empfindlich, »-- so, wie Ma dir alle Wege geebnet hat. Sogar noch ehe Vaters Lieblingsschwester starb und jeder von uns das kleine Legat vermachte --«

»Ich protze nicht. Ma war reizend, in jeder Beziehung. Es spornt mich nur an, um so energischer ans Ziel zu gelangen.«

»Nun -- und was weiter? Ich glaube durchaus nicht, daß weibliche Juristen heutzutage die geringsten Aussichten haben,« erklärte Sophie im Ton einer gezwungenen Bewunderungslosigkeit und wippte heftiger.

»Vielleicht heute noch nicht. Aber morgen. Uebermorgen meinetwegen. Wir Frauen arbeiten eben an einem Stück Zukunft. -- -- Und inzwischen, da will ich mir schon durchhelfen. Du mußt nicht glauben, daß ich nicht mehr vermag, als juristisch fachzusimpeln.«

»Ach nein, hoffentlich nicht. Denn _das_ würde unsrer Ma auch ganz schrecklich sein.«

Sie schwiegen beide.

Cita trat vom Fenster fort und fing an, langsam auf und ab zu gehn, wobei sie die Arme auf dem Rücken verschränkte und den Kopf ein wenig gesenkt hielt, wie ein grübelnder Feldherr.

Vor dem Schreibtisch ihrer Mutter, der, quergestellt, ein Drittel des Zimmers durchschnitt, blieb sie einige Augenblicke stehn.

Er war mit Büchern und Schulheften bedeckt; aus der Mitte all dieser Tagesarbeit erhob sich ein italienischer Olivenholzrahmen mit durchbrochen gearbeiteten verschließbaren Thüren. Dahinter verbarg sich des jung verstorbenen Gatten Bild.

An der einen Wand dahinter hingen mehrere Radierungen von seiner Hand, in schlichte dunkle Holzstreifen eingefaßt: sie stammten aus den Jahren seiner kurzen Ehe, aus der Zeit vollen Glückes und voller Künstlerhoffnungen, -- unten in Italien verlebt.

An der andern Wand hinter dem Schreibtisch eine ganze Gruppe Familienporträts, darunter sehr alte, die mit sichtlicher Pietät hier zusammengestellt waren. Zwei davon blasse Pastellbildchen: der Großvater mütterlicherseits, Martin, mit mächtiger schwarzer Halsbinde und nach vorn gebürstetem grauem Haar, ein kluger, fast bedeutender Kopf. Daneben die reizende alte Großmutter, von der Cita und Sophie ein gut Teil Anmut als Erbe erhalten hatten.

»Für Ma wär es auch tausendmal besser gewesen, nicht hier stecken zu bleiben,« entfuhr es Cita.

Sie stand und betrachtete die Bilder. »Mit ihrer Begabung, ihren Talenten hätte sie etwas werden müssen. Aber freilich, hier in Rußland, wo sie einfach den reichen Kaufleuten die Rangen unterrichten muß --«

Sophie hatte die Augen geschlossen.

»Arme liebe Ma!« sagte sie leise, »du lieber Gott, die konnte eben nicht Juristerei studieren. Dabei wären wir zwei armen kleinen Würmer geschwind genug verhungert. -- -- Und hier in Rußland gab es doch wenigstens Lebensmöglichkeiten, und die guten Anknüpfungen von unserm Großvater-Gymnasialdirektor her, und schließlich doch auch Tante Ottilie -- --. Aber schwer und schrecklich muß es gewesen sein --«

Sophie unterbrach sich, dann fügte sie in gequältem Ton hinzu: »Du und ich, wir sind undankbare Scheusale! Wir, mit unserm dummen Ehrgeiz -- --«

Cita ging schon wieder mit verschränkten Armen auf und ab. Es entfuhr ihr ungeduldig: »Deine Logik ist einfach schauderhaft. Grade das Gegenteil muß daraus gefolgert werden: in uns beiden lebt ja doch Ma weiter, in uns muß sie also etwas über sich selbst hinaus erreichen. Das ist doch wahrhaftig die einzige rationelle Art von Kindesliebe.«

»Ach, ich weiß nicht, ob das Kindesliebe ist. -- -- Und ob Kindesliebe rationell zu sein hat,« murmelte Sophie.

Cita bemerkte seufzend: »Du redest wirklich oft wie ein ganz unentwickelter Mensch. Wenn ich nur nicht so gut wüßte, woher das kommt: es ist ganz einfach Bangigkeit, du wehrst dich gegen deine eigne bessere Erkenntnis. Die reinste Feigheit.«

»Das verbitt ich mir denn doch!« rief Sophie aufgebracht.

Der Schaukelstuhl flog. Sie fing an zu husten.

Die Schwester lenkte ein. »Verzeih. Beleidigen wollt ich dich nicht. Du hast recht: das darf man nicht. Fest zusammenstehn müssen wir Frauen vielmehr. Uns gegenseitig unsre besten Freunde sein. Ich schelte dich als dein Freund, Schwesterchen, -- zu deinem Besten. Bin voll Sehnsucht und Ehrgeiz für dich, -- -- möchte dir helfen, -- und nicht nur mit Worten. Nein, nein, bauen sollst du auf mich dürfen von Grund aus.«

Sophie schwieg. Sie hatte die Augen voll Thränen, und aus Furcht, in der Stimme Thränen zu verraten, blieb sie wieder die Antwort schuldig.

Cita drängte auch nicht in sie. Sie trat langsam an das breite Büchergestell aus kunstvoll zurecht getischlertem, braun angestrichenem Birkenholz, das in Mannshöhe die ganze Hinterwand einnahm, und zog irgend ein Buch heraus.

Schon war es längst nicht mehr hell genug im Zimmer, um zu lesen, doch nahm sie Band um Band und blätterte zerstreut darin.

Hier fand sich allerlei noch von Großvaters, des Schulmanns, Zeiten her zusammen. Und manches wohl auch, was der Mutter nur ihr Beruf als Lehrerin praktisch aufgenötigt hatte. Aber der Mehrzahl nach standen die Bücherreihen gedrängt voll von den höchsten Schätzen, die Menschengeist gehoben hatte. Und all das war, Band für Band mühselig angeschafft, -- Band für Band

benutzt, abgegriffen, genossen --.

Das Mädchen kam herein und brachte die Lampe.

Sie war eine noch sehr junge und ein wenig blöd dreinschauende Person, die unschlüssig stehn blieb und Sophie fragend anblickte.

Diese erhob sich schweigend aus ihrem bequemen Stuhl und ging mit ihr hinaus. Das späte Mittagessen konnte man Stanjka nicht allein anrichten lassen. Denn so oft man das, nach allen guten Belehrungen, probeweise gethan hatte, wurde Stanjka düster und fing an zu weinen. Sie setzte sich dann auf die kleine Bank am Herd und klagte und betete unter Thränen zur Mutter Gottes, die sie laut als Zeugin dafür anrief, daß es ihr sicher nicht gegeben sei, ein Mittagessen wohlbekömmlich herzustellen.

Das kleine Heiligenbild, braun und unkenntlich hinter seiner blanken Zinnbekleidung, hing vorschriftsmäßig in der Küchenecke, sah immer zu und mußte es folglich genau wissen.

Daß es zufällig gar keine Muttergottes war, vielmehr ein heiliger Nikolaus, das hatte sich Stanjka nicht klar gemacht, jedenfalls focht es sie nicht weiter an. Wenn sie nicht grade »höhere« Arbeit verrichten sollte, sondern sich im Gröbern tummeln durfte, blieb sie strahlender Laune und bewältigte alles mit Herzenslust.

Während Sophie noch mit ihr in der Küche herumwirtschaftete, schellte es laut und dringlich.

Cita war schon gegangen, um die Wohnungsthür zu öffnen. Ihre Mutter stand davor, noch etwas atemlos vom raschen Gange.

»Da hab ich richtig vergessen meinen Schlüssel mitzunehmen, -- mußte schellen,« sagte sie und trat hastig ein, »-- ein Wind draußen, Kind, -- Sophie ist doch nicht etwa unnütz an die Luft gegangen?«

»Aber nein, Ma. Wie müde mußt du heute sein, du Arme.«

Cita nahm ihr sorglich den leichten Grauwerkpelz ab und küßte sie.

»Ich danke dir, Kind. Gewiß habt ihr schon einen Wolfshunger, was? Ich lief, was ich konnte,« bemerkte die Mutter, indem sie sich die Fellüberschuhe von den Füßen streifte.

»So! Und nun bin ich wieder Mensch! Feierabend läutets, und die Arbeit ist gethan,« sagte sie froh, »-- und für heute ganz gethan: am Abend brauche ich nicht mehr fortzugehn. Wir wollens aber auch herzhaft genießen, ihr Kinder.«

Wer ihre Stimme so aus dem noch unerleuchteten Vorflur vernahm, konnte dahinter leicht ein junges Geschöpf vermuten. Alle Ueberanstrengung, aller Mißbrauch dieser Stimme hatten nicht vermocht, ihr den eigentümlichen Schmelz zu nehmen. Den Gesichtszügen selbst sah man die vierzig Jahre eher an. Sogar schon einzelne graue Haare mischten sich an den Schläfen in das volle weiche Braun, das Cita in lichterer Schattierung besaß, und das sich auch bei der Mutter hier und da übermütig zu locken versuchte, soweit der schlichte Knoten tief im Nacken das zuließ.

Die Mutter erreichte ihre Aelteste nicht ganz an Größe, und ihre geschmeidige Gestalt hatte ehemals entschiedene Neigung zur Fülle gezeigt; jetzt jedoch vereitelte das anstrengende Tagewerk gründlich jeden Ansatz dazu. So blieb sie schlank, nahezu mager, und konnte dadurch auf Augenblicke fast mädchenhaft wirken.

Als die Mutter in ihrem Schlafgemach verschwunden war, um sich ein wenig menschlich herzurichten, wie sie es nannte, machte sich Cita dran, in der kleinen schmalen Eßstube neben dem Wohnzimmer den Tisch zu decken. Doch war sie noch voll Nachdenklichkeit, und es ging ihr langsam von der Hand.

Dies schmale Eßstübchen, nicht ohne Grund »der Spalt« geheißen, war bei der Wohnungseinrichtung an Möbeln zu kurz gekommen. Die Mutter hatte ein paar Bauerntruhen hineingestellt und rund um den Tisch einfache Sitzschemel von gleich ländlicher Abstammung. Dann erhandelte sie jedoch auf dem großen Trödelmarkt, den das Moskauer Volk in der Sonntagsfrühe abhält, noch hier und da ein Stück volkstümlichen Kunstgewerbes, wodurch der arme Spalt einen gewissen Glanz erhielt, -- so durch ein Wandbort aus dunkelm in Spitzenmuster geschnitztem Holz mit grellen Malereien auf Goldgrund, und durch einen originellen Stuhl, dessen ganzes Hintergestell aus einem rotlackierten Krummholz hergestellt war, wie es die Pferde im russischen Gespann tragen.

Am einzigen Fenster, an dem der rote Stuhl stand und repräsentierte, hingen buntbestickte kleinrussische Tücher als Vorhänge nieder, und auch das grobleinene Tischtuch wies eine solche bunte Bauernstickerei an der Kante auf.

Als die Mutter wieder eintrat, trug sie statt des dunkeln knappen Straßenkleides einen bequemen Hausanzug von tiefrotem Flanell. Sie kam an den Tisch zur Tochter, und, ohne daß diese es bemerkte, schob sie jedes Gerät auf dem Tisch ein wenig anders und gefälliger zurecht.

Als sie aber dann einen Teller mit allerlei Obst hernahm, den Cita in die Mitte gestellt hatte, und sorgfältig begann, die Orangen und die blassen, länglichen Krimäpfel von ihren dünnen Papierhülsen zu befreien und sie in einer Krystallschale zu ordnen, da meinte die Tochter mit einem Lächeln: »So viel Mühe um das bißchen Aeußerlichkeit, Ma, müde, wie du doch bist. Schmecken nun etwa die Früchte besser?«

Die Mutter nickte, indem sie das Lächeln erwiderte. Ueber die Schale geneigt, sog sie den kühlen Duft des Obstes in sich ein.

»Auf alle Fälle schmecken sie besser,« sagte sie, »und außerdem machen sie, daß man auf Augenblicke das ganze Leben besser genießt, während man sie verspeist. Man genießt sie ja nicht nur um des lieben Futters willen als bloße Magenfreude, nicht wahr?«

Als Cita nichts antwortete, richtete sie sich auf und faßte ihre Aelteste zärtlich um die Schulter.

»Aber du sollst dich hier keineswegs mit Hausarbeit plagen, mein lieber kleiner Professor du. Hast nun einmal eine Sybaritin zur Mutter. Bist aber rechtschaffen zerarbeitet angekommen und sollst nichts thun, als es dir wohl sein lassen, -- faulenzen. Wenigstens einstweilen, -- bis über Weihnachten hinaus.«

Und mit einem unterdrückten Seufzer fügte sie leiser hinzu: »Schnell genug verlier ich dich ja wieder.«

Sie fuhr sich mit der Hand über die Augen, wie um den störenden Gedanken zu verscheuchen. Als nun Sophie, etwas erhitzt und eilig, von Stanjka gefolgt, hereinkam, nickte sie der jüngern Tochter schon wieder wohlgemut zu.

»Also zu Tisch, Kinder! Wir wollen es uns schmecken lassen,« sagte sie und hob den Deckel von der dampfenden Terrine mit roter Beetensuppe, in der Saucischen und Schinkenschnitten schwammen.

Sophie küßte die Mutter, ehe sie sich ihr gegenüber setzte.

»Ich bin nicht in den Mädchenkursen gewesen, weil du es des Wetters wegen nicht wolltest. Dafür hab ich ziemlich lange Geige geübt, und später habe ich über den Büchern gesessen, die Doktor Tomasow neulich brachte,« berichtete sie über ihren Tag, »er hat gewiß noch herrliche Dinge in seiner Bibliothek, aber er sagt, ich möchte mich erst an diese Werke halten.«

»Thu blind, was er sagt,« bemerkte die Mutter, »aber warum ißt du mir so wenig, Kind? Nimmst du nicht von der sauren Sahne zur Suppe? Ich fürchte, das Herumstehn in der heißen Küche ist nichts für dich; -- es raubt dir den Appetit.«

»O nein! Ich esse schon noch.«

Cita hatte auf den Lippen, zu äußern: »Die berühmte Haushaltungsarbeit ist eben lange nicht so gesund, wie ausposaunt wird.«

Aber sie schwieg noch immer. Es war so entsetzlich schwer, in Mas Gegenwart ein spöttisch gefärbtes Wort mit dem nötigen Selbstbewußtsein herauszubringen.

Wie ein Unrecht wurde es gleich, denn die Mutter hätte den Spott darin nicht bemerkt. Für Spott fehlte ihr das aufnehmende Organ. Sie wäre ihm gleichsam mit offnen Armen entgegen gegangen und hätte erwidert: »Meinst du wirklich, Kind?« und dann hätte sie versucht, mit vereinten Kräften, mit Citas eigner Hilfe, ausfindig zu machen, was zu thun sei, -- -- und ob nicht lieber Ma selber beim Heimkehren von den vielen Stunden jedesmal erst noch kochen solle --.

Die Mutter unterbrach ihren Gedankengang. Als das Fischgericht auf den Tisch kam und sie davon austeilte, sagte sie: »Allernächstens, wenn ich nach Hause komme, sorge ich für einen großen Weihnachtsbaum. Es ist Zeit, sich nach einem umzusehen. In den letzten paar Tagen vor dem Festabend steigen sie im Preise. -- Diesmal müssen wir das Allerschönste haben, was es überhaupt gibt.«

Beide Mädchen sahen einander unwillkürlich, wie auf Verabredung, an.

»Einen Baum --?« fragte Sophie und stocherte im Fisch auf ihrem Teller.

»Ja, sicherlich. Etwa nicht? Warum denn nicht, ihr Kinder?«

»Wir haben doch voriges Jahr auch keinen gehabt.«

»Nein. Das lag jedoch an Zufällen. Wir konnten nicht gut anders, als bei Tante Ottilie sein. Und dann waren wir ja auch so traurig getrennt und verwaist, ohne unsre Cita.«

Cita warf einen dankbaren Blick auf die Mutter.

»Natürlich können wir gern einen Baum haben, -- warum denn nicht, Sophie?« bemerkte sie; »wenn Ma es doch gern sieht, wollen wir jedenfalls einen haben, -- den allerschönsten. -- Aber -- -- was werden wir mit dem Baum nur anfangen, Ma? Eigentlich gehören Kinder mit dazu.«

Die Mutter lächelte fein.

»Laß uns einen Abend lang Kinder sein, Liebste. Da wir zusammen sind, haben wir reichen Grund dazu, -- haben wir reich beschert bekommen.«

Cita schwieg. Sophie sagte für sie: »Ich weiß schon, wie es Cita meint. Alle Welt will ja gern sich wie ein Kind fühlen. So ganz unbefangen fröhlich sein. Aber, wenn man es absichtlich versucht, so gelingt es nie recht. Man _ist_ eben doch kein Kind. Man kann nicht ungezwungen so thun, -- es wird so gezwungen --«

»Das ist auch ganz natürlich,« fiel Cita, mit Fischessen beschäftigt, ein, »denn man kann doch eben nicht ganz den schweren, den wirklichen Ernst des Lebens vergessen. Man drängt ihn nur für einen Abend lang in den Hintergrund. Ja, _das_ kann man, künstlich. Aber dahinter, -- da steht er doch immer da --.« Sie war voll Eifer, mehr darüber zu sagen, indessen eine Gräte kam ihr dazwischen.

Beinah entschlüpfte es der Mutter: »-- Huh --! ihr Kinder! Macht ihr euch denn wirklich schon das Leben zum ›bösen Mann‹ im Hintergrunde von allem? Ist euch denn wirklich stets so schaudererregend ernsthaft zu Mute --?«

Aber sie sprach das nicht aus. Sie fürchtete, die Mädchen könnten argwöhnen, sie habe dabei insgeheim auf dem Grunde der Seele ein Lächeln über sie beide.

Und sie fürchtete auch, die Mädchen könnten sie für entsetzlich oberflächlich halten. Das letztere war sogar das Wahrscheinlichere --.

Sie sah ihre beiden Ernsthaften mit einem tiefen Blick voll Güte an.

»Aber nun wollen wir dennoch, während wir vor unsern Tellern sitzen, uns bemühen, so zu thun, als ob das Leben ganz annehmbar wäre, -- was meint ihr? Aus hygienischen Rücksichten!« schlug sie munter vor, und das Lächeln vom verborgenen Seelengrunde kam ganz leise herauf und spielte verhalten um ihren Mund.

Das Fischgericht war hinausgetragen worden, und sie saßen beim Obst, als ein unerwarteter Besuch hereinkam.

»Ach, Ottilie, du! Wie lieb von dir. Du bekommst auch gleich dein Schälchen Kaffee, -- starken,« sagte die Mutter.

»Nur auf einen Sprung! Ich war grade in eurer Nähe,« entgegnete ihre Schwester und begrüßte sie, »-- weißt du, man trifft dich ja eigentlich nie, sonst käm ich nicht so selten.«

Ein ganzer Strom von Winterluft wehte mit ihr ins Zimmer. Hut und Handschuhe hatte sie garnicht abgelegt.

Sophie schob den Stuhl aus der Fensterecke, der als Lehne das Joch besaß, an den Tisch heran, denn auf den kurzbeinigen Schemeln saß ihre Tante höchst ungern.

»Danke,« bemerkte diese und nickte ihr zu, während sie Platz nahm, »-- es ist wirklich euer einziger Stuhl, -- wenigstens hat er einen Rücken, wenn man sich auch halb wie ein Pferd dabei vorkommt. -- Nun, das macht nichts. Traulich ist es doch bei euch, wie jedesmal.«

Sie sagte es mit einer Art von liebevollem Neid. Traulich war es wirklich, und eine solche heitre Wärme, von irgend woher, über allem --.

Saß doch Marianne, in ihrem tiefroten Hausanzug, der sie nirgends beengte, und doch seltsam schmückte, da wie ein Bild der Ruhe und des Genusses. Die feierte in Wahrheit Feierabend. Sie saß da und atmete mit jedem Atemzuge Ruhe und Genuß aus, wie den Duft unsichtbarer Blumen.

»Gott, ja, du hast es gut! Wenn ich jetzt nach Hause komme, muß ich den Andrjuscha erst noch zu Bett bringen. Wobei er neuerdings schreit.«

»Besorgt denn nicht das alles eure Kindsfrau, Tante Ottilie?« fragte Cita und schälte der Tante eine Orange.

»Ich verlasse mich nicht gern auf sie, -- ich muß immer alles selbst thun. Aber übrigens wär es zu undankbar, wenn ich klagen wollte. Nein, das sind ja so süße Pflichten. Man reibt sich gern für sie auf. Man ist für sie auf der Welt.«

»Du bist auch eine der gewissenhaftesten Mütter, die es gibt,« bestätigte die Mutter. »Und solche haben stets zu thun, selbst bei ausgiebigster Hilfe, -- können eigentlich nie sagen: nun ruh ich mich aus.«

»Ja, siehst du: so, ganz so ist es, das behaupte ich immer!« rief ihre Schwester, ordentlich lebhaft, und lockerte ihre Hutbänder.

Bis unter den Hut lag ihr dunkelblondes Haar glatt von der Stirn zurückgestrichen, volles weiches Haar wie Mariannens, jedoch stärker ergraut als bei dieser, obwohl Ottilie um ein Jahr jünger war.

Marianne löschte zerstreut die kleine Spiritusflamme unter dem Kaffeekocher aus und füllte die flachen Täßchen. Ihre Gedanken schweiften unwillkürlich weit zurück in eine Zeit, wo auch sie noch ihre Kleinen zu Bett zu bringen, zu baden, zu füttern, zu besorgen hatte --.

Solch kleiner Nachwuchs, wie ihn Ottilie zu eigen besaß, das war doch etwas Köstliches. Köstlich das Heranwachsen, aber köstlich auch die Kleinen -- --.

»Mein Mann reist nächstens nach Petersburg,« sagte die Schwester, »-- natürlich kein Gedanke, daß ich ihn begleiten kann. Nun, damit find ich mich schon ab. Bis meine Inotschka ganz erwachsen ist, ist es für mich überhaupt nichts mit geselligen Freuden. Aber ihr wünschte ich wohl, daß sie nicht nur Moskauer Kaufmannskreise kennen lernt.«

Sophie rief: »Ach, inwiefern soll es dort besser sein? Ich habe Moskau gern. In Petersburg ist man weder im Auslande, noch in Rußland. Schrecklich lange Straßen, und was für ein Nebel --!«

»Tante Ottilie hat ganz recht,« bemerkte Cita, »dort ist man wenigstens in Europa! Man weiß wenigstens ungefähr, welches Jahrhundert man eigentlich schreibt, während hier --«

Tante Ottilie nickte.

»Ja, man merkt es an allem: nicht nur, wenn man geistige Bedürfnisse hat, sondern auch wenn man einen modernen Kleiderstoff kauft,« bestätigte sie, »dort ist alles: die Newa, der Hof, alles Offizielle und überhaupt alles, was gilt. Wir sind hier wie zurückgeblieben. Die Russen haben überhaupt was Zurückgebliebenes.«

»Gar nicht alle. Etwa Tomasow?« meinte Sophie.

Cita mußte lachen.

»Nein, der ist aber auch wirklich der einzige!« gab sie zu. »Wirklich der einzige, auf den ich mich freute. Ein Glück, daß der unser liebster, nächster Freund ist.«

»Nun, nun! Von Haus aus doch einfach euer Arzt,« dämpfte die Tante, aber Sophie unterbrach sie lebhaft: »Ach, da bist du aber schief gewickelt! Wenn wir gesund sind, brauchen wir ihn noch viel mehr, nicht wahr, Ma?«

Die Mutter blickte auf.

»Sprecht ihr von Tomasow? Ja, lieber Himmel, was sollten wir ohne ihn wohl anstellen?«

Ihre Schwester warf ihr einen zurückhaltenden Blick zu.

»Aber, liebste Marianne! Das heißt doch wohl ein wenig übertreiben.«

Ma sagte sanft: »Nein, es ist kaum übertrieben. Das kann nur ich allein beurteilen. Es ist ja so alte, uralt gefestete Freundschaft. Sie stammt aus der allerersten Zeit meines Zurückkehrens hierher. Die Kinder waren damals sechs und sieben Jahr alt. Zähl selbst.«

»Ach ja, Marianne, das weiß ich. Aber das Wichtigste ist ja doch gewesen, daß er dir als Arzt aushalf. Daß er dir half, dein Leben genau zu regeln. Damals, als du dich gleich so schrecklich überanstrengtest. Und wenn er dir dann vielleicht auch noch manche gute Beziehungen verschafft hat --«

Ma machte eine leise abwehrende Handbewegung.

»Laß das,« bat sie, »was du da nennst, ist das ganz Aeußerliche. Und über das andre kann ich nicht sprechen. Nicht, ohne es zu profanieren.«

Tante Ottilie hatte ihr allerverschlossenstes Gesicht.

»Wirklich, Marianne, ich begreife manchmal gar nicht, wie du nur sprichst! Du, die so ungeheuer selbständig ihr Leben in die Hand genommen hat, -- die sich mit solcher Energie und aus eigner Kraft behauptet hat, -- wie sprichst du mitunter nur? Ganz wie irgend eine kleine unselbständige Frau, die andern alles verdankt, und der andre zu allem verhalfen. Nun, weißt du, _wenn_ das so ist --«

»-- Es ist so,« sagte Ma lächelnd.

»Ja, dann muß ich dir sagen: dann braucht sich auch unsereins neben dir gar nicht so gering vorzukommen, denn schließlich: unser Stück Arbeit thun wir auch im Leben.«

»Ja gewiß, du Liebe!« meinte Marianne, und sie lachte.

»Aber wir schwärmen nun einmal für Doktor Tomasow,« erklärte Sophie, im Drang, ihre Tante zu bekehren, »er ist ganz außerordentlich gescheit, mußt du wissen.«

»Ja, das ist er,« bestätigte Cita nachdrücklich.

»Das ist noch eine recht zweifelhafte Tugend,« meinte die Tante etwas kühl, »aber für euch Kindsköpfe, die ihr es in dem Punkt noch seid, braucht ja wohl ein Mensch nur gelehrt oder gescheit zu sein, damit ihr ihn in einer Weise anbetet -- --!« Sie hob die Augen ironisch zur Zimmerdecke.

Cita stand brüsk auf.

»Du kannst mir einfach leid thun, Tante Ottilie!« äußerte sie mit einem vielsagenden Achselzucken, das nicht eben artig ausfiel. Und sich demonstrativ abwendend, horchte sie hinaus, wo es grade geschellt hatte.

Ihre Tante war dunkelrot geworden, doch hielt sie an sich, nur ihre Augen zeigten einen erhöhten, stählernen Glanz.

Sie sah über Cita hinweg auffordernd auf deren Mutter.

»-- Ja, -- ich weiß wirklich nicht, Marianne, -- gestatten deine Erziehungsgrundsätze diesen Ton --?« bemerkte sie fragend, und ihre Haltung wurde gemessner.

Aber in diesem Augenblick hatte auch Marianne nach dem Vorflur hingelauscht.

Man hörte, daß die Wohnungsthür wieder geschlossen wurde, eine halblaute Frage, ein Räuspern --

»Das ist Doktor Tomasow!« rief Sophie.

Sie lief hinaus.

Tante Ottilie hatte sich bereits von ihrem Pferdejochstuhl erhoben.

»Aber liebe Ottilie! Du wirst doch nicht deshalb fortgehn --?«

»Gewiß nicht, meine gute Marianne; du vergißt nur, daß ich bloß auf einen Sprung kam und eilig bin, -- auf ein andermal also,« sagte die Schwester etwas gezwungen und verabschiedete sich kaum merklich von Cita.

»Nun, wie du willst. Komm, laß uns durchs Wohnzimmer hinausgehn, -- sieh, da könnten wir so gut plaudern, denn die Kinder, die schleppen jetzt unsern Doktor in den ›Spalt‹ hinein; ich wette, sie gießen ihm noch den kalten Kaffeerest ein.«

Den Arm um Ottiliens Schulter, ging Marianne langsam durch das Wohnzimmer, das nur durch eine Lampe mit dunkelgrüner Glaskuppel vom Schreibtisch her erhellt war. Die Thür zum »Spalt« hatte sie zugedrückt.

»-- Nun --? Stört dich der Doktor hier nicht mehr?«

»Ach, an den dachte ich eben wahrhaftig nicht! Was mich drückt und erstaunt, ist etwas ganz andres --;« Ottilie blieb mitten im Zimmer stehn, und die Schwester groß anblickend, fügte sie mit betonter Langsamkeit hinzu: »Du läßt dir deine Töchter über den Kopf wachsen, meine arme Marianne.«

Marianne lachte leise und schelmisch, sie ergriff die Schwester am Arm und schüttelte sie in heiterm Zorn: »O du Böse, -- du Böse! Kannst du denn nicht dem Mädel ein unachtsames Wort vergessen? Gewiß, sie hätt es nicht so sagen sollen. Aber treffen und verwunden kann unsereinen doch nicht dieser kleine schwache Pfeil --? Ein Pfeil aus solchen jugendlich heftigen, jugendlich übereifrigen Händen?«

»Du hättest es aber rügen müssen. Darum allein handelt es sich nur.«

»Rügen -- sofort? Vor dir? Meine einundzwanzigjährige Tochter um einer Bagatelle willen vor euch demütigen? Nein, wie magst du das nur sagen, Ottilie! Du mußt auch nicht vergessen, daß Cita längst --«

»Längst im Auslande studiert! Ja ja, das weiß ich! Das ist grade das Unglück. Und ist sie erst ›Doktor‹, -- mein Himmel, dann darf sie wohl vollends thun, was ihr beliebt,« fiel ihr Ottilie nervös ins Wort.

Marianne schüttelte verneinend den Kopf.

»Ich meinte jetzt eben nicht grade: weil sie im Auslande studiert. Ich meinte nur: weil sie in so vielen Beziehungen schon fest und tüchtig dasteht und jedes Vertrauens würdig, wie ein reifer Mensch,« sagte sie warm und mit ruhigem Stolz.

Ihre Schwester seufzte. Sie band die Hutbänder zu und wandte sich zum Gehn.

»Fruchtlos, mit dir zu streiten, Marianne. Wir einigen uns doch nicht. Ich sehe den Fehler zu deutlich: du gehst immer zu weit in allem, -- das thatest du immer. Alles packst du mit solch innrer Leidenschaft an, gibst dich so ganz dran! Es war auch mit deiner Ehe nicht anders, glaub ich, --«

»Da glaubst du recht!« antwortete Marianne sehr leise, und in ihre Augen trat ein dunkles Leuchten.

»Und die Folge?! Nun, ich will nicht drüber sprechen. Aber daß du so ganz zerbrochen am Boden lagst, -- diese gräßliche Zeit. Man kann das doch nicht einfach Witwentrauer nennen --. Und jetzt mit deinen Töchtern. Sie gehn dir buchstäblich über alles. Sind dir dein ganzes Mark und Blut.«

»Ja, Ottilie. So ist es. Soll es denn nicht so sein?«

Ottilie hatte schon den Griff der Thür nach dem Vorflur gefaßt. Sie ließ ihn noch einmal los, wandte sich der Schwester voll zu und sagte halblaut: »Nein! Nein, -- siehst du, das ist es eben: es soll nicht so sein. Man muß die Dinge nicht so bis auf den Grund auskosten. Man muß sich zurückhalten, sonst ist man verloren. Sonst verliert man jeden Halt.«

»O du! Das wäre eine traurige Lehre! Man lebt ja nicht, es sei denn, um sich hinzugeben. Man lebt ja nur soviel, als man liebt.«

Marianne sagte es inbrünstig.

Hinter der Thür zum Spalt hörte man Scherzen und Lachen. Ein Durcheinanderreden von Russisch und Deutsch.

Ottilie entgegnete mit gesenkter Stimme und einem Anflug von Bitterkeit: »Das ist kein Ding wert. -- -- Und wer sich dermaßen ausgibt, verflacht mit der Zeit. Was behält er dann noch Unangetastetes, Eignes? -- -- Aber geh jetzt, bitte, zu den andern hinein. Sie warten drinnen auf dich.«

»Sie warten nicht. Ich gebe dir deinen Pelz um,« bemerkte Marianne und geleitete die Schwester hinaus. In ihren Gedanken weilte sie jedoch noch beim Gespräch. Sie hätte rufen mögen: »Ein Ding ists wert: die Kinder! Warum sie nur erziehen? Warum nicht von

Grund aus sich freuen und jubilieren über sie? Frage deine Tochter! -- sie hätt es bei mir seliger als bei dir --.«

»Grüße mir Inotschka!« sagte sie nur.

»Die wird nur rot, wenn ich ihr das bestelle. Ueber alles wird sie rot. Es ist wirklich schon fast ihre einzige Sprache, -- und dabei kann sie drei Sprachen so gut. -- -- Willst du nicht vielleicht morgen abend den Thee bei uns nehmen, wenn du vom Unterricht kommst? Du hast es schon lange nicht gethan. Wir sehen uns wahrhaftig fast nur, weil du Montag Nachmittags mit Nikolai lernst.«

»Ja, ich will kommen,« meinte Marianne. »Am Sonntag kann ich ja ausschlafen.«

Sie küßten sich, und Ottilie ging.

Nachdenklich blieb Marianne im Vorflur stehn. Sie blickte zu Boden, als suche sie etwas. Sie suchte, sich in ihrem Innern auf etwas zu besinnen.

Wie sagte doch Ottilie? »Sonst verflacht man mit der Zeit.« Es gab Leute, die hielten Ottilie für »tief«. Das war es also. Sie gab sich nicht aus, lebte einfach mit Dreivierteln ihrer selbst, -- vielleicht nicht einmal damit --.

Aber war es denn immer so gewesen? Nein, sicher nicht. Einst, als Kinder, hatten sie einander viel stärker geglichen als jetzt, hatten gemeinsam und gleich empfunden. Erst viel später mußte die Schwester ihr Temperament außer Gebrauch gesetzt haben, -- es beiseite gelassen, -- es »reserviert« haben --, wofür? Und wie, in aller Welt, machte man das? -- --

Marianne war ins Wohnzimmer zurückgegangen und setzte sich vor das geöffnete Pianino, worauf Sophiens Geige lag.

Zerstreut, ganz leise schlug sie ein paar Töne an.

Sie dachte an Inotschka. Ach, der würde sie sich auch gern hingegeben haben. Die würde sie gern zu ihren Schülerinnen gezählt haben.

Aber sie fühlte selbst, daß es nicht anging. Auch wider Wissen und Wollen hätte sie jeden Augenblick ihren Einfluß dem der Eltern entgegengerichtet.

Inotschka, halberwachsen, noch mager, mit ihren allzu ernsthaften Augen und einem so weichen Munde, einem so kußbedürftigen weichen Munde, blieb vor ihrer Phantasie stehn, während sie die leisen, dunkeln Töne anschlug -- --.

Darüber merkte sie gar nicht, daß sich die Thür zum Spalt öffnete.

Beide Mädchen und Doktor Tomasow drängten sich geräuschlos in den Rahmen der Thür.

Und da weckte ein fröhliches Gelächter Marianne aus ihrem Sinnen. Sie schaute sich um. Alle drei standen sie da und lachten sie aus.

Sie lachte ohne weiteres mit.

»Kommt nur herein. Tante Ottilie ist fort,« sagte sie.

Vor Tomasow sprach sie stets deutsch, wie mit den Kindern untereinander.

»Ja freilich! Die ist lange fort. Aber was verstecktest du dich denn vor uns, Ma? Dürfen wir deine geheimen Gedanken gar nicht wissen, aus denen wir dich herausgelacht haben?« fragte Sophie neckend.

»Jawohl. Ich dachte darüber nach, warum ich euch gutwillig mir dermaßen über den Kopf wachsen lasse, ihr Kinder,« entgegnete Marianne, und sie reichte dem Freunde die Hand zum Willkommen.

Sophie schlug entrüstet die Hände über dem Kopf zusammen, Cita aber erkundigte sich interessiert: »-- Nun, -- und das Ergebnis war, Ma --?«

»Es war: Wachset nur, -- wachset!« sagte Marianne lachenden Mundes, und ihre Augen strahlten gütig.

Doktor Tomasow blickte unter halb gesenkten Lidern nach ihr hin. Sein bartloses Gesicht, das so offen jede Falte und Furche in den Zügen des hohen Vierzigers zur Schau trug, war in Bezug auf seine stummen Gedanken nicht plauderhaft. Hager, mit slavisch kurzer Nase und energischen Kinnlinien, -- dem Grundriß nach ein russisches Barbarengesicht, war es vom Leben verarbeitet,

vergeistigt, aber im Ausdruck wie verschlossen worden. Kurz, dicht und früh ergraut, wellte sich das Haar über der freien Stirn fast ganz grade empor.

Die beiden jungen Mädchen mußten ihn gut kennen. Als er sich nicht in ihr Scherzgespräch mit der Mutter mischte, blickten sie einander flüchtig an und zogen sich dann einmütig in ihr Zimmer zurück, -- in Sophiens eigenstes Reich, das, über den Gang hinaus, nach dem Hofe zu lag, und wo jetzt Cita wohlgelittener Gast war.

Die Mutter sah ihnen nach, wie sie, nach einigen heiter gewechselten Worten, fortgingen: Cita mit ihrem festen, gleichmäßigen Schritt voran, und hinter ihr Sophie, die sich noch einmal mit einer graziösen Wendung umsah und lächelte.

Als sich die Thür hinter ihnen schloß, hob Marianne ihre Augen zu Doktor Tomasow.

»Nicht wahr, die Sophie ist schmal in den Schultern? Sie hustet.«

Er antwortete ruhig: »Das thun wir hier alle mehr oder minder zu dieser Jahreszeit. Sie sind mit dem Kinde etwas zu ängstlich, Marianne.«

»Ja, sie erinnert mich so an -- --, auch er war zart.«

Und da sie einen zaudernden Ausdruck in Tomasows Gesicht wahrzunehmen wähnte, trat sie ganz dicht auf ihn zu.

»Tomasow! Wenn -- nein, wenn --, Sie dürfen mir nie etwas verschweigen, nie --.«

Und sie erblaßte plötzlich.

»Aber! Aber!« sagte er mit seiner überredenden eindringlichen Stimme und nahm ihre Hände, wie die eines Kindes, in die seinen. »Verbieten Sie ganz harmlosen Dingen, mit Ihnen gleich so durchzugehn, wie wildgewordene Pferde. -- -- Ganz kalte Hände haben Sie auf einmal bekommen. Kälteres Blut wäre besser. -- -- Also: Sophie ist absolut gesund. Ich bürge Ihnen dafür. Die Aehnlichkeit, die Sie da eben andeuteten, beschränkt sich auf die zarte Hautpigmentierung, die mit so blondem Typus zusammengeht, -- sie garantiert Sophie auf lange hinaus einen blendenden Teint, bei etwas Pflege. Nun, hübsch genug ist sie schon jetzt, dächt ich. Ein liebes, gutes, schönes Kind haben Sie an ihr, Marianne.«

Sie hörte ihm aufmerksam zu, unendlichen Glauben in den Augen.

Seine Gestalt, obwohl in den breiten Schultern unmerklich geneigt, überragte sie um ein gutes Stück. Sie erschien nicht mehr mittelgroß, sondern fast klein, und wenn sie beim Sprechen die Augen so zu ihm heben mußte, konnte man den Altersunterschied zwischen ihnen für beträchtlicher nehmen, als er in Wirklichkeit war.

»Aber gut ist es für Sophie, daß sie bei mir ist, und ich für sie sorgen kann, bis in jede Geringfügigkeit, -- das finden Sie auch? Cita ist ja so vortrefflich aufgehoben in der Familie, bei der sie in Berlin wohnt, -- ich korrespondiere ja auch mit den Leuten, -- und doch, -- für Sophie wäre das nichts --.«

Sie sah ihn dabei fragend an.

Tomasow zuckte die Achseln.

»Natürlich würde sie es nirgends in der Welt auch nur annähernd so gut haben, wie bei ihrer Mutter. Indessen, das ist doch selbstverständlich. Warum fragen Sie erst danach?«

»Ich weiß es nicht,« murmelte Marianne; »ich weiß nicht, warum sie mein Angstkind ist. In meiner Liebe zu ihr ist so viel Angst --. Darum muß ich manchmal von Ihnen hören, daß sie Ihnen keine Sorge macht.«

»Nein. Die machen höchstens Sie mir von Zeit zu Zeit, kleine Ma,« sagte er mit leisem, fast nachsichtigem Lächeln und gab ihre Hand frei.

Er nannte sie gar zu gern mit diesem Namensstummel, der daraus entstanden war, daß sich die Kinder in der Kindheit bisweilen herausgenommen hatten, die Mutter wie einen guten Kameraden »Marianne« zu titulieren, was Tomasow schon damals äußerst bezeichnend fand. Hin und wieder ließ jedoch das Erstaunen andrer sie mitten in diesem Unternehmen stecken bleiben. Zuletzt blieb von Mariannens Namen nur das übrig, was ein guter Wille auch als Anlauf zu dem Wort »Mama« nehmen konnte.

»Und die Einzigkeit der Silbe paßt zu ihr,« dachte Tomasow bei sich, »-- dieser einzige Ton als Name, -- es ist, wie wenn man etwas nur eben intonierte, was man nicht ganz nennen will, noch auch äußern kann. Weit, weit hinter dem einzelnen Ton ruht und klingt das Ganze --.«

Marianne war zum Schreibtisch getreten und schraubte die Lampe höher.

»Stehn Sie mir da noch immer im Rücken? Das ist ja unheimlich,« sagte sie, den Kopf nach Tomasow zurückwendend, und dann ließ sie sich müde vor dem Schreibtisch in dem alten Luthersessel nieder, der noch von ihrem Vater, dem Schuldirektor, stammte.

Tomasow zog sich den langen Schaukelstuhl neben der Blattpflanzengruppe ein wenig näher zu ihr heran.

Er nahm von den Zigaretten, die Marianne ihm anbot, und zündete sich schweigend eine an.

»Ich glaube, speziell dafür bin ich am Ende auch das letzte Mal vom Auslande wieder heimgekehrt, ein so schauderhafter Kosmopolit ich auch schon zu werden drohte,« bemerkte er dann.

»Wofür? Für die Plauderecke?«

»Es ist nicht einmal eine Plauderecke, streng genommen, denn wir sind oft ziemlich wenig redselig, besonders wenn Sie abends müde sind oder gar anfangen, Notizen in Ihre schrecklichen blauen Schulhefte zu machen.«

Marianne lehnte sich zurück und kehrte ihm das Gesicht zu. Sie sagte lächelnd: »Nun, dann sitzen Sie eben und freuen sich drüber, wie unendlich brav und artig ich bin. Denn das muß ja doch eine Freude für Sie sein! Wer hat mich denn gelehrt, diese Schulheftexistenz auszuhalten.«

»Ich etwa?!« Tomasow machte eine ungläubige Miene. »Ich habe Ihnen wohl im Gegenteil alle Schwierigkeiten und Schrecknisse einer solchen klarzumachen gesucht, als Sie sich in den greulichen Kampf stürzten.«

»Ja. Und mich dadurch für ihn gewappnet, -- mich dadurch gelehrt, nicht gleich beim ersten Ermatten zu erliegen. Ich wußte so bestimmt: Sie stehn da und helfen mir immer wieder auf, -- ach, das war ein gutes Gefühl, glauben Sie mir.«

Tomasow rauchte schweigend.

Ganz so war es wohl nicht. Er hatte in Wirklichkeit ihren Kräften nicht den Existenzkampf zugetraut, den sie so löwenmutig für sich und ihre Kleinen vollbracht hatte. Nein, ursprünglich hatte er ganz und gar nicht annehmen können, daß sie einem derartigen Leben gewachsen sei.

Er half ihr damals mit seinem Rat und Beistand gleichsam nur so vorläufig. Er half ihr, um ihr nah bleiben zu können.

Jedoch dann -- später -- wenn sie doch am Ende ihrer Kräfte sein würde, die sie bis zum Zersprengtwerden anspannte, -- ja, damals dachte er sich dann ein ganz andres Ende. Ein völlig andres --.

Fast ohne daß er es wußte, fixierte Tomasows Blick bei dieser Erinnerung den geschlossnen Olivenholzrahmen, der in der Mitte des Schreibtisches stand.

Marianne war der Richtung seines Blickes gefolgt.

»Darf ich?« fragte er.

Sie streckte, ohne zu antworten, die Hand aus, nahm den Rahmen vom Tisch und reichte das ihm wohlbekannte Bild herüber.

Er schaute aufmerksam auf das junge beseelte Gesicht im Rahmen, -- ein bartloses Jünglingsgesicht. Eine Aehnlichkeit mit Sophie war in der That unverkennbar, nur nicht in der Kühnheit der Stirn und des Kinnes.

Aber etwas so Zartes lag über dem Ganzen --.

Tomasow bückte sich tiefer über das Bild und bemerkte: »Wenn ich mir vorstelle, wie Sie damals ausgesehen haben müssen, -- und wie dieses hier aussieht, -- so kommt mir leicht das Gefühl: sieh da, zwei Kinder, die man schützen möchte.«

Sie lächelte unmerklich.

»Wir brauchten keinen Schutz. Gegen nichts. Wir hatten ja einander.«

»Zugegeben. Aber wer von Ihnen schützte wen?«

»Jeder den andern. -- Ach, es ist nur eins nicht zu fassen: daß der eine zurückbleibt, wenn der andre geht. Wie mag denn das nur möglich sein? -- -- Arme Menschen, daß es so ist.«

Er erhob sich, um das Bild auf den Schreibtisch zurückzustellen.

»Keine solchen Worte, Marianne! Keine solchen Aufwallungen, auch nicht für Sekunden! Sie haben an sich selbst erfahren, daß das Leben immer wieder neu keimt.«

»Ja, das Leben: das heißt meine Kinder.«

Tomasow nahm wieder Platz im Schaukelstuhl. Nach einer Pause, in der er schweigend vor sich hinrauchte, sagte er langsam: »Mir hat es doch immer scheinen wollen, als ob in Ihnen ein starkes Bedürfnis ist nach einer Ueberlegenheit neben Ihnen, -- nach jemand, zu dem Sie aufblicken. Sie haben so viel vom Kinde irgendwo in sich, Marianne. -- Daher kann ich Sie mir vielleicht so schwer an der Seite -- an ›seiner‹ Seite vorstellen.«

Sie lehnte in ihren Stuhl tief hineingeschmiegt und starrte wie gebannt auf den Rahmen. Auf ihren Wangen lag ein leichtes Rot.

»O über uns beiden war ja so viel -- über uns beiden!« sagte sie mit halber Stimme. »Wozu noch eine andre Ueberlegenheit? Wir wandelten, ineinander geschlungen, gemeinsam unter so hohen Träumen, so hohen Zielen entgegen. Und ich meine immer: was wir da lebten, nur das ist Leben. Von allen Seiten wölbte es sich um uns wie ein Himmel, dem gaben wir uns anheim. Und so war uns jede Krume Erde eine Heimat.«

Tomasow dachte wieder: »Wie zwei Kinder.« Doch erwiderte er nichts.

Aber Marianne wendete ihm den Kopf zu, und plötzlich streckte sie ihm die Hand entgegen: »Sie urteilen nach später,« bemerkte sie, »ja, da brauchte ich allerdings jemand über mir, brauchte Rat und Hilfe und Halt. -- Einen Halt in der vollkommnen Heimatlosigkeit, eine Orientierung in der vollkommnen Fremde. -- -- Da brauchte ich _Sie_. Ich konnte nicht allein sein, so ganz allein im Finstern. -- Und ich denke auch jetzt oft: meinetwegen das Allerbitterste überwinden, wenn nur eine warme menschliche Stimme dazu überredet, es befiehlt, anbefiehlt. -- Ich weiß nicht, ob alle Frauenherzen so schwach sind. Ich bin es.«

Er hatte ihre Hand entgegengenommen und hielt sie, darauf niederblickend, einen Augenblick in der seinen. Ganz leicht strich er mit den Fingern über ihren Handrücken hin, der ein wenig rauh geworden war vom Wind und der Kälte dieser Wochen, die Marianne unausgesetzt auf die Straße trieben.

Er wußte, daß sie einen nervösen Widerwillen gegen rauhe, gerötete Hände oder aufgesprungene Lippen besaß. Als sie jung und glücklich war, da mußte sie sich gewiß, selbst unter schmalen äußern Verhältnissen, mit Entzücken gepflegt haben, wie ein schöner Mensch vor einem Fest.

Tomasow ließ Mariannens Hand sinken und stand auf.

»Was ist Ihnen denn? Sie wollen doch nicht schon gehn? Warten Sie noch ein wenig, und am besten: bleiben Sie zum Thee,« schlug Marianne vor, »Sophie wollte Ihnen so gern ihre Fortschritte im Geigenspiel vorführen, -- mögen Sie? Dann machen Sie ihr die kleine Freude.«

»Ja, warum nicht?«

Tomasow war ans Fenster getreten und schaute vor sich hin.

Marianne öffnete die Thür nach dem Gang, rief dem Mädchen etwas zu und kam dann wieder zu ihm.

»Was schauen Sie denn so unverwandt an?« fragte sie und trat dicht an ihn heran.

Er zuckte die Achseln.

»Ich betrachte mir nur, was da in Reih und Glied zwischen den Doppelscheiben im Fenster aufgestellt ist,« entgegnete er und deutete auf eine Anzahl verdeckter Glasbehälter, »wie Soldaten mit Papierhelmen auf dem Kopf. Finden Sie diese Dinger nicht häßlich?«

»Sie sind nur häßlich, bis sie blühen. Dann kommen sie ins Zimmer, und die Papierkappen kommen fort. Und dann sind es Hyazinthen!« sagte sie tröstend, mit einem Lächeln.

Aber Tomasow war verstimmt.

»Hyazinthen? Wozu denn? Mögen Sie etwa diesen allzusüßen Duft? Es sind doch nicht am Ende gar Ihre Lieblingsblumen, Marianne?«

»Lieblingsblumen? -- Rosen hab ich schon lieber, -- und am liebsten, wissen Sie was? -- am liebsten besäße ich ein ganzes Treibhaus und einen Wintergarten dazu!« meinte sie schelmisch. »Solche Hyazinthe unter ihrer Papierkappe ist nun eben mein Treibhaus. Man muß sie nicht allzudicht unter die Nase halten, sondern die Gläser im Zimmer gut verteilen, dann geht es schon. -- Frühling und Duft ist es ja doch! Und ganz ohne die beiden mag ich so wenig sein, wie ganz ohne Musik.«

»Wegen der Hyazinthen werden ja hier die Doppelscheiben im Winter nicht eingeklebt, wie die übrigen,« bemerkte Sophie, die hereingekommen war und nach ihrer Geige suchte.

Tomasow zündete sich eine frische Zigarette an und setzte sich in der Nähe des Fensters nieder. Er betrachtete Marianne.

»Wie viel Genußfreudigkeit ist doch in ihr. Selbst jetzt noch!« dachte er. »Unausgegeben, aufgestaut! Köstlich müßte es sein, das zu lösen, zu befreien. Selbst jetzt noch.«

Sie saß wieder auf ihrem frühern Platz, den Kopf ein wenig geneigt. Während sie darauf wartete, daß Sophie die Kerzen am Notenpult anzünden und beginnen sollte, schien sie vor sich hinzuträumen, -- vielleicht in Gedanken, die das kurze Gespräch mit Tomasow über ihr Eheglück vorhin in ihr geweckt haben mochte. So kam es ihm vor.

Etwas sehr Sanftes lag über ihren Zügen, ein Abglanz, wie aus der Jugend. Für die Mutter der beiden großen Mädchen hätte man sie in diesem Augenblick kaum gehalten.

Cita war leise eingetreten und stand noch an der Gangthür, um die ersten Geigentöne nicht zu stören. Auch sie schaute zu Marianne hinüber, und dabei kam auch ihr in den Sinn, wie schön ihre Mutter sei, -- wie so sanft und schön sie doch jetzt eben aussehe.

Es berührte sie mit einem warmen kindlichen Stolz. Ihre dunkeln Augen erglänzten vor Freude.

In einer Pause des Spiels trat sie von hinten an Mariannens Stuhl heran. Und mit einer ihrer spontanen, unvermittelten Bewegungen umschlang sie die Mutter und küßte sie in den geneigten Nacken.

Dabei kehrte sich Cita halb gegen Tomasow, dessen Blick unverwandt auf ihrer Mutter ruhte. Cita sah unwillkürlich, mit einem hübschen Ausdruck, zu ihm hinüber, als wollte sie, an Marianne geschmiegt, entzückt sagen: »Wie lieb und schön sie ist, nicht wahr? Möchte man sie nicht auf dem Fleck totküssen?!«

Da verdüsterten sich plötzlich ihre Augen.

Irgend eine unerklärliche Befangenheit überfiel sie. Sie bückte ihren Kopf, wie abwehrend, gegen den Kopf der Mutter, und errötete langsam über das ganze Gesicht.

Tomasow hörte inzwischen zerstreut dem Geigenspiel zu. Er liebte und verstand Musik, musikalisch von Natur, wie fast alle Russen, aber heute war ihm nicht nach Sophiens Musik, die noch Nachsicht verlangte.

Ja ja! Daß die Kinder da waren, das hatte Marianne so unzugänglich erhalten und so vorzeitig ernst gemacht. Es machte sie bisweilen ergreifend schön, dies Ernstsein tief unter aller Heiterkeit, jedoch zu ernst, -- allzu ernst für ihn --.

Tomasow begegnete bei dieser Erwägung Citas Augen, die ihn forschend anzusehen schienen. Sie stand noch an den Stuhl der Mutter gelehnt, als schütze sie ihn.

»Wie ein kleiner Polizist!« dachte Tomasow bei sich.

Aber zugleich gestand er sich, daß diese Kinder es allein gewesen waren, die einst Marianne die Fähigkeit zum Leben wiedergegeben hatten.

Ursprünglich schien der gewaltsame Schmerz um den toten Gatten auch die Mutter in ihr getötet zu haben. Als man sie nach Rußland brachte, -- mit ihren beiden allerliebsten kleinen Dingern, -- da war sie nicht bereitwillig, weiterzuleben. Sie konnte nicht leben. Und in der Verwandtschaft begann man, von Geistesstörung zu sprechen und von Ueberführung in eine Heilanstalt.

Damals, während dieser ersten furchtbaren Verzweiflungszeit ihres Schmerzes, sah Tomasow Marianne zum erstenmal.

Er selbst kam grade verstimmt aus dem Auslande. Nach Jahren anregenden Genusses und interessanter Arbeit in Wien und Paris, erschien ihm zu Hause alles so schal und abgestanden, so gänzlich regungslos. Und am wenigsten spürte er Lust, sich hier wieder dauernd in seine ärztliche Praxis einzugewöhnen.

An einem dieser Tage wurde er zu Marianne hineingeführt.

Auf dem Boden ihres Zimmers kauernd, das braune Haar dicht und wirr um ihr armes Gesicht, -- das Gesicht eines fassungslos leidenden Kindes, -- ganz stumm und sehr abgemagert, denn sie weigerte sich, Nahrung zu sich zu nehmen: so sah er sie zum erstenmal.

Was ihn betroffen machte und fesselte, von allem Anfang an, das war die Stärke dieses Temperaments, das gegen den Tod anstürmte, ihm innerlich fortwährend seine Beute abzujagen schien. Nie, meinte Tomasow, ein Gleiches an Seelenkampf geschaut zu haben, -- an Kampf gegen das Unentrinnbare, -- wie er jetzt Tag um Tag vor sich sah, seitdem er begonnen hatte, Marianne seine ärztliche Pflege zu widmen.

Ihre Verwandten bedauerten sie aufrichtig, aber ihnen war von Beginn an die Ehe verrückt vorgekommen. Beide Gatten so blutjung, beide noch kaum reif für den großen Jubel und den großen Ernst, den sie vom gemeinsamen Leben erwarteten, -- und der junge Künstler noch keineswegs genügend zu Geld oder zu Ruhm gelangt, als er um Marianne warb. Daß er auch dazu, wie zu allem, eben ihrer Nähe bedurfte, verstanden die vernünftigen Leute nicht. Und er durfte sie auch keines Bessern belehren, denn als es ihm eben gelingen wollte, mußte er schon sterben.

Das jedoch war wiederum Marianne unfähig zu verstehn, -- nein, nie und niemals vermochte sie es zu fassen, daß das Leben wider ihren liebsten Menschen sein konnte, daß es ihn sterben lassen, -- ihn im Stich lassen konnte.

Auf Tomasows Rat kam Marianne aufs Land. In einem Dorf bei Moskau bezog eine alte Verwandte mit ihr ein kleines Landhaus, dicht neben einem verwilderten Park gelegen, der zu einer ehemaligen Privatbesitzung gehörte.

Es wurde grade Frühling, -- später nordischer Frühling. Unendliche Ebenen im ersten Ergrünen, weite knospende Birkenwälder, ein stiller baumumstandener See --.

Dort in der Einsamkeit, dort im Frühling, dessen sanfte Schönheit ihr bis zu Tode wehe that, und der ihr mit seinem Zauber die Seele blutig riß, tobte sich für Marianne das Schwerste rückhaltlos aus.

Sie gesundete vielleicht aus der nämlichen Kraft heraus, aus der sie gelitten hatte, -- sie durchkostete ihren Schmerz viel zu stark und inbrünstig, um sich nicht eines Tages auch selbst von ihm zu heilen.

Von der Veranda des Landhauses führte ein primitives Holzbrückchen, über etwas morastiges Wassergerinsel geschlagen, direkt auf die grasbewachsenen Wege des alten Parks. Unzählige Mückenschwärme durchsummten ihn im Sommer und hielten beständig einen feinen dunkeln Ton in der Luft fest; warm und feucht stieg von den schattigen Wiesen der Duft über üppig verwilderten Blumen auf, und hier und da stand eine zusammengebrochene, bemooste Steinbank an lichte Birkenstämme gebaut. Hier hinaus fuhr Tomasow jeden Tag. Wenn er kam, pflegten ihm die beiden kleinen Mädchen schon entgegenzulaufen, Annunciata, die Aeltere, mit muntern großen Sprüngen, und die jüngere, Sophie, die immer zu hastig lief und oft über ihre eignen kleinen Beine stolperte, bis sie endlich der Länge nach und mit bitterm Geschrei bei ihrem Freunde angelangt war.

In der Stadt und in seinen eignen Angelegenheiten beschäftigten Tomasow allerlei komplizierte Sorgen: wie er sich zur Heimat stellen, sich in ihr einleben werde, und warum ihr noch so vieles abgehe, was in den kulturreifern Ländern des Auslandes längst auf der Tagesordnung stand? Aber hier in diesem sommerdunkeln Park, bei Marianne und ihren Kindern, verblaßte ihm regelmäßig die Wichtigkeit aller Kultur- und Geistesfragen. In den Vordergrund trat das Leben in seiner elementarsten, seiner einfachsten Bedeutung, -- das Leben angesichts des Todes und die Frage, ob es zu ertragen sei. Es kam ihm vor, als müsse das Leben etwas Schönes sein, weil er Marianne leise dazu zurückkehren sah, -- ganz leise anfangs, indem sie mit den Kindern zu spielen begann.

Noch ehe sie wieder für sie zu sorgen und zu denken wußte, spielte sie mit ihnen, als sei sie selbst noch nicht viel mehr, als ein schwaches Kind. Und doch hatte sie damit schon die große Frage für sich beantwortet.

Der erste Gedanke, der später ganz von ihr Besitz nahm, war ebenfalls naheliegend und primitiv: der Drang, für das tägliche Brot zu arbeiten. Für den Augenblick war diese Sorge ihr von andern abgenommen worden, -- und im Fall der Not versprach man, ihr auch die Kinder abzunehmen.

Sie wollte mit ihnen zusammenbleiben können, sie selbst ernähren können. Daran erstarkte sie.

Tomasow erinnerte sich gut des entscheidenden Gespräches darüber, an einem unerträglich heißen Sommernachmittag voll Gewitterdrohungen, auf einer Bank im Park. Er ging auf alles ein, was Marianne wünschte, froh, sie überhaupt schon so weit zu haben, daß ihr starke Wünsche und Sorgen kamen. Er erbot sich auch, alle ersten notwendigen Schritte in der Sache zu thun.

Da hob Marianne die kleine Sophie auf ihren Schoß und sich zu Cita niederbeugend, die sich neugierig horchend an ihr Knie drückte, rief sie leise: »Jetzt wird Ma für ihre lieben Kinder schrecklich viel zu thun bekommen! Und je mehr sie thut, desto schöner und größer sollen sie ihr werden, von Tag zu Tage! Ist das nicht herrlich, ihr Kinder?«

Citas kleine Ohren mochten aus den Worten nur den Klang aufgefaßt haben, -- einen so ungewohnt freudigen Klang, daß er an etwas ganz Fernes, Süßes, schon halb Vergessnes mahnen mußte, was einst durch alle Worte der Mutter hindurchgejauchzt hatte, als seien es ebensoviel liebkosende Verheißungen.

So klatschte sie stürmisch in die Hände und sprach der Mutter nach: »Herrlich, ihr Kinder!«

Und in der schwülen Gewitterluft unter den reglosen Bäumen saß Marianne zum erstenmal mit einem Anflug von Lächeln da, wie am Vorabend von bessern, festlichern Tagen.

Tomasow aber dachte fast mit Abscheu an das lähmende, entnervende Arbeitsleben, das nun vor ihr liegen sollte. Und angesichts dieses Lächelns stiegen andre, schönere Möglichkeiten für die Zukunft vor seinen Gedanken auf -- --.

»Unterschätzen Sie nur die Schwierigkeiten der Sache auch nicht allzusehr!« bemerkte er nach einer Pause mit zögerndem Warnen. »Es ist noch nicht sicher, ob Sie so brutalen Anforderungen an Ihre Spannkraft gewachsen sind.«

Marianne hob den Kopf und sah ihm mit zversichtlichem Vertrauen ins Gesicht. Ihre Hand lag auf Citas Haar.

»Daß ich ihnen nicht gewachsen bin, weiß ich wohl!« sagte sie ruhig. »Aber Sie werden mir helfen, über mein bißchen Können hinauszugelangen. -- -- Wollen Sie mir nicht dazu helfen --?«

»Ich will es gewiß, wenn Sie nicht bei näherm Zusehen selbst davor zurückschrecken!«

In Mariannens Augen trat ein Ausdruck wie qualvolle Erinnerung an die überstandenen Seelenkämpfe.

Sie murmelte: »Ich schreckte vor allem zurück, -- vor jeder Minute, weil sie durchlebt sein wollte, -- und war nicht auch das eine brutale Anforderung: -- leben zu sollen --? Ich weiß, daß es mich noch manchmal überkommen wird, -- daß ich dann nicht will, nicht kann, -- ich werde mich gewiß noch oft vor dem Leben fürchten --.« Sie brach ab, ein Schauer ging über sie hin. Dann setzte sie jedoch langsam hinzu: »Deshalb muß jemand mir helfen, der meine Furcht und meinen Widerstand bricht, um der beiden Kleinen willen.«

-- In diesem Augenblick begriff er, wie nah er ihr in der schweren Zeit getreten war als der Unbeteiligte, Unbeeinflußte, der sich ihr ärztlich und menschlich mit strenger Sachlichkeit gewidmet hatte. Er begriff, wie viel sie seiner Hilfe zuschrieb, was zu einem großen Teil die Hilfe ihrer eignen Natur gewesen war.

Ihr sollte er helfen, fortan dem Leben gewachsen zu sein, -- dabei aber lebte er noch sein eignes Leben in unschlüssigem Zwiespalt --.

Und dennoch: er fing an, daran zu glauben, daß es ihm ihr gegenüber gelingen werde. Ein so starker Appell an seine eingreifende, planvolle Kraft ging von diesen ruhig vertrauenden Augen aus, -- eine so starke Freude an der ihm auferlegten Verantwortung weckten sie in ihm, als spannten sich alle Fähigkeiten seiner Seele auf ein Ziel hin.

Und seltsam: gleichzeitig empfand er es noch nie so bitter wie in der Stunde, nicht selber zwiespaltlos und einheitlich, mit voller Thatkraft, im Boden seiner Heimat zu wurzeln. Hätte er nicht schon als Jüngling, -- in jugendlicher Begeisterung zu allem bereit, --

immer nur an die harte, hohe Mauer der bestehenden Zustände stoßen müssen; hätte er nicht erst im Auslande draußen seine volle Entwicklung finden müssen; hätte er, vom Heimweh zurückgezerrt, nicht davon absehen müssen, in seiner Heimat grade diejenigen Einsichten und Fortschritte zur Wirksamkeit zu bringen, deren sie ganz augenscheinlich am dringendsten bedurfte, -- -- wie ganz anders würde sich dann für ihn als Mann, als Mensch, sein Leben zusammengefaßt haben! Wie oft würde es einen ähnlich starken, -- und stärkern Appell an seine Leistungskraft enthalten haben!

Aber davon sprach er nie zu jemand; in der Fremde sprach er von der Heimat nur leise, und dann zärtlich, wie von einem leidenden Kinde, das auch nur anzurühren man Fremden schon verwehrt; und daheim konnte er von seinen Jahren im Auslande nicht mit dem Accent reden, den sie für ihn besaßen, weil hier alle seine Worte unwillkürlich so ausfielen, als sei ihm bloß egoistisches Genußleben gewesen, was ihm dort mindestens ebensosehr als eifriges und ernstliches Arbeitsdasein vorgekommen war.

Er schwieg deshalb, mißtraute den Menschen, und sie vertrauten ihm nicht mehr recht.

-- -- Während er im alten, dichten Park auf der Steinbank unter den Birken saß, schaute er, in solche Gedanken versunken, auf Marianne hin.

Sie blickte gradeaus über die Wiesengründe in die Ferne, den Kopf ein wenig vorgeneigt, die Hände leicht im Schoß gefaltet. Der lose aufgesteckte Haarknoten ließ die sanfte Wölbung der Nackenlinie wundervoll frei.

Kein einziger Zug bewußter Selbständigkeit in der gesammelten Haltung, und doch etwas wie Getrostes --

Es erfüllte ihn mit Erstaunen!

Was ihm auch geschähe: zu allerletzt würde er doch im stande sein, zu einem zweiten Menschen so vertrauensvoll aufzublicken, daß er dessen seelischer Hilfe sich gläubig anheimgab!

Und bei ihr war das im Wiedererwachen zum Leben das erste, -- das Unwillkürliche --.

Das allererste, was sie wiederfand, war eine ruhige, vertrauende Gebärde. -- -- --

[Illustration]

=II.=

Draußen herrschte das lustigste Schneetreiben von der Welt.

Den Kutschern und vielleicht auch ihren Gäulen lachte das Herz im Leibe drüber, wie leicht heute die Schlitten über den weißblendenden Boden dahinflogen, der seit etlichen Tagen einer erneuten Schneelage entbehrt hatte, sodaß hier und da bereits das holperige Steinpflaster der unebenen Moskauer Straßen durch den zerstampften und vergrauten Schnee durchzuscheinen begann.

Auch Marianne freute sich, schnell vom Fleck zu kommen. Seit dem frühen Morgen war sie schon so viel herumgetrieben worden, in verschiedene Privatstunden und eine Schule.

Noch ein paar Tage lang! Dann gab es Ferien. Schlossen auch die Anstalten erst kurz vor Weihnachtsabend, so hörte doch der Unterricht in den Häusern meistens schon früher auf.

Marianne kam von weit außerhalb gefahren, wo sich an den Grenzen der Stadt ein großes Mädchenstift befand, nicht allzufern von dem berühmten Jungfernkloster, dessen phantastische Türme herüberwinkten. Auf dem Rückwege von dort ließ sie ihren Schlitten in einer unbelebten, fast ländlichen Vorstadtgegend vor einem einstöckigen, rot angestrichenen Holzhause halten.

Sie stieg aus, bezahlte und ging über den weiten, hellen Hof, den ein einfacher Lattenzaun umschloß, auf eine Wohnung im Erdgeschoß eines Hauses zu, an der sie mit beinah ungeduldiger Freude läutete.

Dies Erdgeschoß war himbeerfarben. Mit rührendem Vertrauen in die Schönheit des Farbigen überhaupt, war hier ein bunter Ton neben den andern gesetzt. Aber das gedämpfte Winterlicht ward zum Künstler an all dem Grellen: es stufte es wunderseltsam ab, bis es aussah, als stünden die bunten Farben da, wie Blumen in einem Strauß.

Hier pflegte Marianne jeden Sonnabend vorzusprechen, wenn sie der Weg vom Stift vorüberführte, mochte die Zeit auch noch so knapp sein. Denn jedesmal bedeutete das für sie inmitten der Arbeitswoche eine sonntägliche Stunde.

Eine ihrer ehemaligen Lieblingsschülerinnen, seit Jahresfrist verheiratet, wohnte hier; eine, die ihr innig zugethan blieb, auch nachdem sie, längst der Schule entwachsen, mit Energie und verblüffender Leichtigkeit Mathematik studiert und es darin zu etwas gebracht hatte.

Die junge Frau öffnete selbst die Thür und bewillkommnete ihren Besuch mit drei schallenden Küssen, einen auf den Mund und je einen auf Mariannens schneenasse Wangen. Dann nahm sie ihr den weiß überschneiten Pelz von den Schultern und schüttelte ihn aus, wobei sie aber sorglich jedes Geräusch vermied.

»Dadrinnen steckt Taraß tief bis über die Ohren in einer Arbeit über das Vogelgetier,« flüsterte sie in ihrem weichen Russisch, das an sich schon zärtlich klang, und wies auf das Hauptzimmer der kleinen Wohnung.

Erst jetzt bemerkte Marianne die breite buntgestreifte Küchenschürze an ihr, und daß sie die Aermel hochgezogen hatte. Eine Messerbank, nach der sie griff, mußte sie eben erst hastig aus der Hand gestellt haben.

Im Hintergrunde des engen dämmerigen Vorflurs stand die Thür zur Küche noch offen; man sah die Holzscheite im Herdfeuer rot glimmen.

»Ja, unser Mädchen ist nämlich schon wieder krank. Sie ist wirklich ewig krank, diese Aermste,« sagte die junge Frau und zog Marianne in die Wohnstube.

Die Wohnstube war ziemlich groß, niedrig und so dicht über dem Hof, daß der gegenüberliegende Schneehaufen sie schon verfinstern konnte. Auf dem Hof flogen weiße und graue wohlgemästete Tauben umher, flatterten auf den Fenstersims und schlugen mit ihren Flügeln an die Scheiben, an denen drinnen blühende Azaleen standen.

Ein Teil des Zimmers wurde durch zwei mitten hineingebaute mannshohe Scheinwände isoliert, hier befand sich der Schlafraum. Die zurückgeschobene Portière ließ das Ehebett unter einem Baldachin von geblümtem Stoff sehen, sowie die Ecke mit den Heiligenbildern. Ein paar davon besaßen schwere Silberverkleidung; unter ihnen hingen gestickte Handtücher und lagen auf einem Wandbort geweihte Brötchen.

Im Wohnraum am Fenster stand breit und bequem ein Tisch, worauf sich in friedlichem Nebeneinander Schreibereien und Hausarbeiten, nicht grade zierlich geordnet, befanden. Auf einem Seitentisch zeigte der nie fehlende blitzende Samowar, daß hier auch gespeist wurde.

Marianne hatte es sich wunderschön behaglich gemacht in einem Großvaterstuhl, der dicht bei einem wärmeausstrahlenden Kachelofen von anerkennenswerten Dimensionen stand. Neben dem Ofen hing am Bande eine altertümliche kleinrussische Guitarre, eine Gusli. Fröstelnd vergrub Marianne ihre durchkälteten Füße im Bärenfell, das sich vor dem Stuhl ausbreitete.

»Das ist unser Diwan, dort sitzen wir immer beide drin,« sagte die junge Frau.

»Ist es jetzt nicht sehr schlimm für euch mit dem kranken Mädchen, Tamara?« fragte Marianne bedauernd. »Da werdet ihr kündigen müssen. Wie treibt ihr es nur überhaupt --? Du alle Morgen in deinem statistischen Bureau, dein Mann über seiner ornithologischen Gelehrsamkeit? Was fangt ihr denn jetzt an?«

Tamara lachte leise auf, ihr ganzes freundliches Gesicht lachte mit.

»Wir treibens, wie es eben geht; -- es wird ja auch wieder besser. Alles wechselt unter dem Mond. Kündigen wollen wir nicht; darauf vertraut die Arme so fest.«

»Russische Sorglosigkeit!« dachte Marianne bei sich. Aber sie mochte nichts Tadelndes äußern, sie wiegte sich darin wie in etwas Wohlthuendem.

Vielleicht wäre es anderswo tadelnswerter gewesen, doch ihr schien immer: wo man unter russischen Menschen war, wo diese Sprache klang, da wurde das Leben in der That in allen Dingen gleichsam simpler und weiter, -- vertrauender. Obschon sie selber kein russischer Mensch war, so zählte sie doch nicht zufällig unter diesen ihre besten Freunde.

»Aber überanstrengt es dich auch nicht, Tamara?« meinte sie besorgt. »Noch kann es ja eine ganze Weile dauern, ehe dein Mann die verdiente Berufung bekommt, und ehe du also dem statistischen Bureau ein Schnippchen schlagen kannst.«

Tamara schüttelte belustigt den Kopf, von dem zwei starke Zöpfe unaufgesteckt niederhingen.

»Bis dahin hilft mir eben mein Mann. Wenn ich nicht mal _das_ von Ihnen gelernt hätte, Marianne Martinowna: gute Laune am Alltag bewahren, -- die schönste Lektion, die Sie unbewußt allen Ihren Schülern mitgeben, -- gratis neben all dem Schulkram.« Tamara fuhr ungeniert mit dem Messerputzen fort, worin sie der Besuch unterbrochen hatte. »Und im Sommer,« bemerkte sie mit aufleuchtendem Blick, »da erholen wir uns schon! Da schlepp ich den Taraß zu den Eltern aufs Gut, oben hinauf nach Wologda, in meine lieben großen Wälder. Da erholen wir uns schon! Ach, warum sind wir da nicht zwei Einsiedler! Sie können mir glauben: ich bin doch gewiß glücklich, aber Heimweh nach den Wäldern und dem Norden hab ich doch. -- -- Aber nun erzählen Sie doch mal von sich? Also die Cita ist heimgekommen?«

Marianne nickte.

»Mit Beginn der deutschen Weihnachtsferien und bleibt bis über die russischen da. Aber ich habe noch so wenig von ihr, -- es war eine so gehetzte Arbeitszeit. Drum wird Weihnachten diesmal so strahlend schön! Mir kommt vor, als ob ich mich seit meiner Kindheit nicht mehr so darauf gefreut hätte, wie dieses Mal. -- -- Immer möcht ich die Cita jetzt nahe um mich haben, -- so ganz nah bei mir, -- -- sie so recht tief anschauen: »»Bist du noch dieselbe? Ist auch nichts an dir verändert? Hat mir die Trennung nichts gestohlen? Zeig mir all dein Schönes: -- das und das und das, -- weißt du noch?«« Ach, Tamara, du hast noch kein Kind, -- kannst du das wohl begreifen?«

Tamara nickte schweigend.

In der Küche hörte man es bedrohlich brodeln und zischen. Sie setzte die Messerbank nieder, lief hinaus, klapperte ein Weilchen draußen zwischen den Tiegeln und Töpfen und kehrte dann in die Stube zurück.

»Ja,« sagte sie, »nun ist also Cita auf dem Wege, etwas Erkleckliches zu werden. Aber, Hand aufs Herz, liebe Marianne Martinowna: wären Sie nicht doch seelenfroh, wenn -- ja wenn sich die Cita ordentlich verliebte und heiratete?«

Marianne blieb einen Augenblick lang stumm. Dann sagte sie fast andächtig: »Wenn über meine Kinder _mein_ Glück käme, -- ein so unfaßbares Frauenglück, das reicher und weiser macht, als alle Reichtümer und Weisheiten der ganzen Welt zusammengenommen, -- wenn ihnen das geschenkt würde! -- -- Und wären es auch nur acht kurze Jahre, wie bei mir, gleichviel. Und käme auch selbst dahinter -- wie bei mir --«

Sie konnte nicht weitersprechen.

Tamara sammelte schweigend ihre Messer zusammen. Nach einer Pause bemerkte sie dabei: »Kenne ja auch die Freude am Lernen. Aber mein heimlichster Traum war doch immer nur der aus dem Märchen von Puschkin, dem Zar Saltan: möchte Gott mir geben, einen Helden, einen Bogatyr, zu gebären! Ja ja, dafür kann man nichts thun. Sonst wär es ja auch nur wieder armseliges Menschenwerk. So ist es: Studium ist Verdienst, aber Liebe ist Gnade. -- Aber ganz jammerschade scheint es mir, daß Sie nicht mit Ihren beiden Kindern zusammenleben können wegen des Studiums, -- gradezu eine Missethat scheint es mir manchmal.«

Marianne fiel rasch ein: »Darüber muß man nicht nachdenken. Es ist nicht anders. Ich muß Sophie doppelt geben, doppelt --«

»Aber ich hätte Ihnen einen kuriosen Vorschlag zu machen,« meinte Tamara, »wenn nur Cita nicht grade in Berlin studierte.«

»Einen Vorschlag --?«

»Ja, von meiner Tante bin ich dazu autorisiert, -- wissen Sie, von der, die in Bern das Mädchenpensionat leitet und voriges Jahr hier war.«

»Ach, thut sie das noch immer? Sie klagte doch schon so über ihr Alter und ihre Gebrechlichkeit. -- -- Will sie es etwa abtreten?« fragte Marianne mit unverhohlener Spannung.

»Sie möchte gern einer Hilfe die Leitung übergeben. Sie wissen: es sind lauter unerwachsne Mädchen, vielfach Russinnen, die dort den sogenannten letzten Schliff bekommen. -- -- Und auf Sie hält sie so große Stücke, sie wäre entzückt. Aber es wäre doch wohl nichts?«

Marianne schüttelte zögernd den Kopf. Im stillen rechnete sie nach. Es war ihr klar, daß sie hier mehr verdienen konnte. Und schließlich blieb Cita auch dann weit von ihr.

Aber wenn es doch möglich wäre, -- mit Cita? Sie wurde ganz still und hörte nicht auf, zu rechnen.

An der Thür, die das Wohnzimmer mit der größern Hauptstube verband, wurden rasche, ungeregelte Schläge hörbar, wie ein Geprassel von Kleingewehrfeuer.

Tamara sagte mit befriedigtem Lachen: »Das ist Taraß' Triumphgeschrei: er hat für heute glücklich sein Ei gelegt. Es ist auch hohe Zeit, daß er frei wird. Ich muß schnell den Tisch decken.«

»Und ich muß leider weiter wandern,« äußerte Marianne mit einem Seufzer; sie erhob sich ungern aus ihrer weichen, behaglichen Ecke.

Tamara nickte betrübt.

»Wir armen Arbeitsgäule,« meinte sie lächelnd und stieß die Thür nach dem Vorflur auf, laut rufend: »Taraß, bist du da? Komm doch mal her, Marianne Martinowna muß schon fortgehn.«

»Jawohl!« schrie es aus der Küche zurück, »aber dann mußt du herkommen, -- das Zeug brennt an!«

Der Ton der Verzweiflung, worin das verkündet wurde, erheiterte Marianne. Sie trat auf den Vorflur hinaus und schaute nach der Küche. Tamara war, die Hände ringend, schon an ihr vorbei vorausgeschlüpft.

Zwischen seinem Studierzimmer, das weit offen war, und der Küche mitten drin stand auf dem Vorflur Tamaras Mann mit lebhaft vorgerecktem Hals und richtete seine Augen angsterfüllt auf eine Pfanne, die auf dem Herde stand und furchtbar zischte. Die Brille hatte er sich auf die Stirn geschoben.

Seine Frau stürzte zur Pfanne.

»Geh nicht so nah heran, geh ihr nicht nah!« rief er beängstigt, »-- das Zeug spritzt! Man darf sie nur von hier aus ansehen. Es spritzt! Paß auf, es spritzt in die Augen!«

Als das Zischen und Prasseln gelinder wurde, wandte er sich aufatmend der lachenden Marianne zu. Auch er lachte nun. Aus seinem hübschen dunkeln Bart, der tief über das gestickte russische Hemd fiel, das er zu Hause trug, schimmerten die Zähne.

»Ja, ich war nun grade fertig, -- und angerührt hatte sie die Geschichte ja, ich sollte nur Wache halten, -- aber aufregend ist die Sache ungeheuer, -- uff!« und er fuhr sich über die Stirn und die etwas wildgewordenen krausen Haarringel.

Tamara, die am Herde herumwirtschaftete, rief: »Ja, darin ist er gut, wirklich! Sie sollten nur wissen, was wir uns beide alles zusammenkochen. Aber ohne Herzklopfen geht es eigentlich nie ab. -- -- Die reine Nervenkur. -- -- Er thut es auch nur, um wenigstens gelegentlich zu beweisen, daß ich ihm neben seinen Vögeln doch auch was gelte.«

Sie kam aus der Küche, streifte die Aermel herunter und trat zu Marianne, die sich grade an den Vögeln ergötzte, die man im offenstehenden Arbeitszimmer sah. Jeder Platz, den die Bücher übrig gelassen hatten, gehörte den Vögeln, -- toten, ausgestopften Bälgen -- und lebendigen in zwei Riesenkäfigen, aus denen es zwitscherte, piepte und sang.

»Ja, denken Sie nur,« behauptete Tamara, »sein Getier konnte er sogar auf der Hochzeitsreise nicht vergessen. Ich konnte nicht gefühlvoll gegen ihn werden, ohne daß er mir sofort auseinandersetzte, wie es zum Beispiel die Enten und Gänse in ihren Liebesspielen untereinander halten. Damals schrieb er nämlich grade über die. Zuletzt war ich ganz beschämt, keine Gans zu sein.«

Ihr Mann wurde verlegen, aus seinen träumerischen dunkeln Augen sah er Marianne hilflos an.

»So war es gar nicht, -- nein, so war es nicht,« bestritt er lebhaft. »Ich habe nur gesagt: ein Gelehrter zu sein, das ist nichts ohne Liebe. Man muß die Tiere lieben, dann versteht man sie gut. Und dann habe ich ihr erzählt, die Enten wären --«

Aber seine Frau fiel ihm ins Wort. Vom nächststehenden Tisch in seinem Zimmer hatte sie geschwind ein dickes Buch aufgegriffen, ein Werk von ihm, schlug es fachkundig auf und las mit heller Stimme:

»Beispielsweise -- =pagina= 136: ›Alle Männchen ziehen sich nahe zusammen. Dann schwimmt je ein Weibchen zwischen ihren Reihen schnell hindurch. Hierauf schnellen die Männchen im Takt in die Höhe, biegen dann den Schnabel gegen die Bauchmitte und pfeifen =a tempo=. Verpaßt einer der Enteriche dabei den genauen Anschluß, so scheint das etwas Uebles zu sein: er muß alsdann seine Kräuselfedern in die Höhe richten und vernehmlich: ›Räp!‹ rufen --‹«

»Schäme dich! schäme dich!« rief Taraß laut, »ich habe dir nicht so was vorgelesen, -- ich habe dir Lieder zur Gusli gesungen!«

»Ja, wissen Sie warum?« Tamara legte das Buch aus der Hand, »um mir mit kleinrussischen Klängen mein Nordrußland zu verleiden! Ist denn Kleinrußland noch Rußland?! Ach, wir zanken uns darüber noch bis zu Tode!«

»Nicht wahr! nicht wahr!« rief Taraß dazwischen, »die schönsten Lieder und die schönsten Sagen sind im Norden und Süden gleich! Der blinde Sänger unten bei uns singt dir, was bei euch gesungen wird. Aber vom Süden hinauf ist es gekommen!«

»Vom Norden zu Euch ist es gekommen!« ereiferte sich Tamara, »von da oben, wo alles rein russisch blieb. Wo auch später nicht einmal der Tatar hindrang --.«

Marianne verließ sie zwischen Küche und Stubenthür im vollsten Streit. Sie lachte noch, als sie auf den Hof hinaustrat zwischen die gurrenden Tauben. Beschämt sah sie nach ihrer Uhr. Noch konnte sie rechtzeitig zur Unterrichtsstunde kommen, doch mußte sie sich tüchtig beeilen.

Eine Weile später durfte sie endlich für kurze Zeit heimgehn. --

Obgleich Marianne müde war, machte sie den Heimweg zu Fuß. Das Schneetreiben hatte nachgelassen, hier und da schaute schon die Wintersonne freundlich zwischen zerrissnem Gewölk hervor.

Marianne liebte es, durch diese Straßen zu wandern, die ihr bei ihren Gängen tagein, tagaus, jahrein, jahraus vertraut geworden waren wie ein Heimatort. Das Ungeordnete und Halbasiatische auf vielen von ihnen störte sie nicht mehr, -- nicht die Bettler oder Betrunkenen, die ihr begegneten, nicht die grellbemalten Schenkenschilder mitten zwischen dem bizarren Glanz der zahllosen Kirchen und Kapellchen.

Und sie mußte lächeln, wenn sie schmale, hügelige Gassen sich plötzlich auf einen jener Riesenplätze öffnen sah, die wie weite Ebenen sein konnten, und an deren Rande mitunter kleine Häuser kindlich dastanden wie Spielzeug neben den ungeheuren Raumverhältnissen mancher Nachbarbauten.

Denn der Raum hatte hier keine Bedeutung, keinen Hochmut; keine Pracht schien sich ihrer Größe zu rühmen, und keine Bescheidenheit möglichst eng zusammenzukriechen. Größe und Kleinheit warfen friedlich ihren Wert in eins, nachlässig zu einander gesellt, wie Baum und Grashalm in derselben Landschaft.

Sogar der Kreml, der von jedem Punkt Allgegenwärtige, erschien fast nur zufällig groß: als im Grunde wesensgleich irgend einem der kleinen heiligen Altarschreine in Kapellenform, wie sie Fürst und Bauer zu eigen besitzen, -- aber von der Inbrunst einer gewaltigen Andacht irgend wann einmal in solchen Dimensionen geschaut und fixiert, daß er fortan immer allen sichtbar blieb, immer allen gemeinsam gehörte --.

Mitten in der Stadt sah sie, wie dort so oft, ein kleines mageres Füllen neben dem Mutterpferd traben, das einen Lastwagen zog. Das glückliche Pferd! es brauchte nicht von seinem Kinde fort, wenn es auf Arbeit ging.

Marianne fand: alle Arbeit, die Frauen thun, müßte so weise eingerichtet sein.

Sie seufzte und ging rascher.

Beim Ueberschreiten eines Fahrdammes mußte Marianne innehalten, weil zwei Gefährte ineinander geraten waren, was beim wahllosen Durcheinanderjagen leicht genug geschah.

Die Fuhrleute schrieen sich an und fluchten sich gegenseitig in die Hölle; der eine Schlitten wurde frei und flog weiter, am andern war der Gaul ausgeglitten und gestürzt.

Ein Mann, der den Schnee vom Fußsteig schaufelte, trat heran, um zu helfen, doch keine Neugierigen blieben gaffend stehn. Nur ein kleines Mädchen mit rotem Kopftuch schaute auf das daliegende Pferd und kraute es im Vorübergehn mitleidig, mit ganz schüchterner Liebkosung, am Stirnhaar, wie um es zu trösten. Ein Schlitten kam an der Gruppe vorbei und hielt jählings an.

Tomasow saß darin. Er warf dem Kutscher ein Geldstück zu, sprang heraus und ging auf Marianne zu.

»=Quelle chance, madame!=« sagte er lächelnd, und streckte die Hand aus.

»Und nun begleiten Sie mich nach Hause!« meinte sie gleich.

»Aber selbstverständlich.«

»Das heißt, -- falls Sie nicht etwas Wichtigeres vorhaben --?«

Tomasow machte ein etwas spöttisches Gesicht.

»Was sollte ein Tagedieb wie ich besonders Wichtiges vorhaben?«

»Tagedieb! O pfui!« Sie war entrüstet; -- »Sie sind ja doch Arzt!«

»Nicht allzusehr. Mir würde es vielleicht bald genügen, Ihrer Gnaden, Frau Mas, Leibarzt zu sein.«

Aber sie ging auf den scherzenden Ton nicht ein.

»Dafür sind Sie noch zu jung, um sich zurückzuziehen. Das wäre sehr, sehr schade. Für viele!« antwortete sie ernst.

»Aber ganz und gar nicht! Hier gibt es genug Aerzte für Moskau, -- viel zu viele, -- sie treten einander auf die Füße. Es ist gradezu eine gute That, Raum für sie zu schaffen. -- Sie werden sagen: in der Provinz? Ja, das ist schon etwas andres. Aber Sie wissen, dafür bin ich verdorben. Es fehlt mir durchaus an der nötigen Aufopferungslust, um in irgend einem Winkel zu versimpeln, -- als Menschheitsheros oder als stiller Säufer.«

»Sie sind heute entsetzlich garstig!« rief Marianne und hielt ihren Muff ans Ohr. Sie lief förmlich von ihm fort. »Warum machen Sie sich schlecht vor mir? Warum nur? Ich weiß schon selbst, ob Sie was taugen oder nicht.«

Tomasow suchte nach seinem Kneifer, den er selten trug, und setzte ihn auf, was seinen Gesichtsausdruck ganz verwandelte, als setze er eine Maske auf.

»Laufen Sie nicht so schrecklich geschwind,« sagte er; »wollen wir nicht überhaupt fahren?«

Marianne schüttelte abwehrend den Kopf.

»Nein, ich muß ohnehin so viel sitzen. Und die Luft thut jetzt gut. Ich gehe so gern durch all die Buntheit und Herzlichkeit des Straßenlebens hier; wenns die Zeit nur öfter erlaubte! Sie nicht?«

Tomasow zuckte mit einer Gewohnheitsgebärde die Achseln.

»Wie mans nimmt. Meistens ärgere ich mich dabei, weil ich mich frage, warum in aller Welt einen das Heimweh immer wieder auf den alten Fleck zurückzieht? So oft ich versuche, auf längere Zeit fortzugehn, -- ich komme doch wieder. Was soll man aber hier? Ja, wäre man noch ein richtiger dem Grabe entstiegener Altrusse von vor Peters Zeiten, so einer mit langem Bart und langem Kaftan --! Denn sonst würgt man hier ja nur an alledem, wozu man sich eventuell im europäischen Geistestreiben mit entwickelt hat. -- -- Ich will mich nicht entschuldigen, aber das macht so merkwürdig indolent.«

»Sobald Sie Ihre Russen von Herzen lieben, haben Sie auch einen Wirkungskreis unter ihnen,« meinte Marianne.

»O nein! Das ist ein Irrtum. Sehen Sie sich nur einmal das Volk an mit seinem breiten Gleichmut gegen die ganze eigentliche Welt der Kultur, -- wie es alle seine wirklich tiefen Interessen anderswo hat, -- was weiß ich, wo: bei Wind, Wetter, Tod, Musik, Ammenmärchen, Heiligenbildern -- --. Mit seinen Aufklärern war es noch nie eins. Gegen sie lehnt es sich auf. Und dies Naturell, dies seelische Tempo, ist mindestens ebenso oft schuld an seinem Zurückbleiben, wie unsere oft verrufenen Zustände.«

»Ich weiß schon! Fangen Sie nur nicht an zu politisieren!« sagte Marianne. -- »Lieber will ich es sein, die Ihnen von diesem Volk erzählt: zum Beispiel könnte ich Ihnen davon erzählen, warum ich hier, in dieser russischen Stadt, so gern grade an Sonntagen eine Gemäldegalerie besuche, wo auch das Volk vor den Bildern steht --. Es tritt leise auf mit seinen schweren Stiefeln und ist voll von Andacht. Haben Sie eine solche Andacht schon anderswo häufig beobachtet? Man muß nur in des Volkes seelische Art eingehn, um seine Seele zu fassen.«

»Das mag alles sein. Indessen für den einzelnen bleibt das geistige Unbehagen, hier zu leben, weil das Volk in seiner Aufklärung noch nicht weiter ist.«

»-- Oder weil wir nicht tiefer sind, mit all unserm Geist,« meinte Marianne nachdenklich. »Jedes Menschenleben sollte doch von jedem Punkt aus, durch die aufrichtige Macht seines Erlebens, bis in alle Tiefen gelangen können, -- nicht nur da, wo der Verstand es so herrlich weit gebracht hat. Könnten wir uns nicht durch unsre einseitige Geistigkeit um dieses Kostbarste bringen? -- -- Was Ihnen hier auf die Nerven fällt, mein lieber Freund, das thut mir so unendlich wohl bis in alle Nerven. Es ist wie ein Trost, wenigstens für den, der, wie ich, nicht mehr mit kann in der großen Kulturhetze, in den immer rastlosern Fortschritten, in der ganzen nimmersatten Selbstentwicklung --«

Marianne sprach lebhaft, fast übereifrig.

Tomasow warf ihr einen aufmerksamen Blick zu. Es war selten, daß sie etwas äußerte, was wie Resignation über ihren Tagesberuf klang, der sie zu nichts anderm kommen ließ.

»Ein Trost, den Sie aber doch am allerwenigsten brauchen,« bemerkte er, »so frisch und angeregt wie Sie --«

»-- Von Stunde zu Stunde laufen!« ergänzte sie mit gutmütiger Ironie. »Ja, so ist es nun einmal: Zeit und Schwung läßt das nicht übrig. Und ich würde jetzt eine traurige Rolle spielen in euren glänzenden Geisteszirkeln, unter euren entwickelten Menschen, von denen Cita und auch Sie so gern aus eurem ausländischen Leben erzählen --«

»Unsinn, Ma!« fiel er ein. »Niemand in der Welt eignet sich so herrlich dazu, wie Sie, zwischen solchen Menschen zu leben. Sie würden dort strahlen --«

Marianne schüttelte den Kopf.

»Nein, das würd ich wohl nicht, und das will ich ja auch gar nicht. Aber es ist doch gut für mich, daß ich nicht so ganz nah dabei stehn muß --. Ich würde die Liebe zu meinem Alltagsdasein nicht festzuhalten vermögen und fühle doch: sie ist das allein Wichtige, das allein Ausschlaggebende -- --. Hier gibt es ja genug Hochstehende, Schaffende, Menschen über den Alltag hinaus. Aber sie leben einsam, und leben insgeheim doch nur für das Volk. Schon der Lärm der offiziellen Hauptstadt ist ihnen zu viel, deshalb ziehen sie hierher, -- und am liebsten weit hinaus, bis an die Grenzen der Stadt, wo schon die Gärten beginnen.«

Marianne nahm Tomasows Arm und fuhr leiser fort: »Ihnen will ich gestehn, daß ich manchmal, aus tiefer Sehnsucht nach Erquickung heraus, hier und da ein Künstleratelier besucht habe -- --. Aber auch die, zu denen ich nie gekommen bin, meine ich zu kennen, als hätte ich heimliche Zugänge zu ihnen in allen müden Stunden. -- Für mich gibt es noch ein zweites Moskau in Moskau, -- mit stillern Straßen, als die ich Tag für Tag betrete, und mit Häusern, wo große Menschen wohnen, die ich verehre. Und manchmal, wenn ich so von Stunde zu Stunde haste, belebe ich meine eigne Ermüdung damit, daß ich mir einbilde, ich ginge gar nicht zu meiner Lehrstunde, sondern zu einem von ihnen --.«

»Und immer noch wieder leben Sie ein Leben, wovon man nichts weiß!« entfuhr es Tomasow. -- »Wie können Sie nur von Schwunglosigkeit sprechen? Wer so viel Trost wie Sie schöpft aus --«

»Warten Sie einen Augenblick!« unterbrach Marianne ihn unvermittelt und zwang ihn, mitten auf der Straße stillzustehn, während sie sehnsüchtig nach den ausgelegten Waren eines Straßenobsthändlers hinsah.

Der junge Bursche hatte sein Fruchtbrett vom Kopf gehoben und hielt, sich vor Marianne und Tomasow auf ein Knie niederlassend, ihnen erwartungsvoll seine Zitronen, Aepfel und prachtvollen Südtrauben entgegen.

»Ach, wer kann an so etwas vorübergehn!« bemerkte Marianne seufzend und wählte mit entzückten Augen unter den großen tiefblauen Trauben. Tomasow sah zu, wie eifrig sie bei der Sache waren, der junge Händler und sie. Beide lachten vor Vergnügen.

»Eben wollte ich damit anfangen, Sie über allerlei zu trösten; aber ich sehe, es ist gar nicht mehr nötig,« sagte er, als Marianne fertig war; »Sie sehen aus wie ein beschenktes Kind.«

»Diese sind auch extra schön! Ich freu mich auf das Erstaunen der Kinder,« entgegnete sie, schneller ausschreitend, und steckte die Düte hinter ihren Muff; »beide essen sie gern. -- Aber wir sind wirklich gleich zu Hause! Wollen Sie nicht ein wenig mit hinaufkommen? Die Kinder würden so froh sein --«

»O nein, die haben ja schon die Trauben!« sagte er spitz und schüttelte den Kopf. »Aber ich würde für mein Leben gern einmal so ein Obstbrett vor Ihnen ausbreiten, Marianne, -- die schönsten Früchte, -- ganz unwahrscheinlich schöne, -- damit Sie dann so aussehen, wie jetzt eben.«

»Dummes Zeug!« meinte sie ärgerlich, »übrigens habe ich ja fast alles Schöne, was ich besitze, von Ihnen mal geschenkt bekommen. Ist Ihnen das nicht genug?«

»Geschenkt? Von mir? Ich wüßte nicht. Es ist nur Ihre eigenste Spezialität, die Dinge so aufzufassen, als kämen sie Ihnen von andern. Wenn ich Ihnen wirklich schenken wollte, wär es ganz anders --«

Marianne blieb stehn. Sie waren am Hause angelangt.

»Danke für Ihre Begleitung!« sagte sie und gab ihm die Hand. »Sie sind zwar mitunter garstig gewesen, aber im ganzen doch gut, wie immer.«

Er antwortete langsam: »Ein klein wenig garstig waren auch Sie. -- -- Daß Sie mich Ihren Kindern mitbringen wollten, -- gleichsam eine zweite Düte, neben den Trauben. -- -- Nun, irgendwann werden Sie das schon noch einsehen.«

»Auf Wiedersehen!« rief sie heiter und öffnete die Hausthür.

»Auf Wiedersehen, Ma! So bald als möglich auf Wiedersehen!«

Marianne lief rasch wie ein Mädchen die zwei Treppen hinauf, oben mußte sie Atem schöpfen, als sie den Schlüssel in die Thür steckte. Aber alle ihre Ermüdung war verflogen, das Sprechen und Scherzen mit dem Freunde hatten sie von ihr fortgenommen.

Oben schien Besuch zu sein.

Sie trat vom Vorflur in ihr Wohnzimmer. Ja, da saß ein junger, ganz junger blonder Mann mit ihren beiden Töchtern und erhob sich ehrfurchtsvoll, als er ihrer ansichtig wurde.

»Dies ist Herr Hugo Lanz, Ma,« sagte Sophie vorstellend, »-- du weißt, wir trafen uns neulich in der Gesellschaft --«

»Ich komme nur als Abgesandter meiner Verwandten, gnädige Frau,« erklärte Hugo Lanz mit einer weichen sympathischen Stimme, »es handelt sich um eine Schlittenfahrt für heute abend. Vor zehn Uhr sind alle wieder heimgeleitet.«

»Das ist freundlich von Ihnen,« entgegnete Ma und reichte ihm die Hand, »ja, fahrt nur, ihr Kinder.«

»Und du, Ma?« fragte Cita.

»Ich bin ja heute abend zum Thee bei Tante Ottilie und werde euch dort entschuldigen, ihr Nichtsnutze.«

»Aber du wirst heute zu müde sein, Ma,« meinte Sophie bedenklich und küßte die Mutter.

»Nein, Kind, ich bin jetzt so frisch. Und morgen ist Sonntag. -- -- Aber wer fliegt jetzt wie ein Pfeil und zaubert mir geschwind eine heiße, starke Tasse Thee oder Kakao herbei?«

Die Mädchen stürzten zur Thür.

Hugo Lanz sah so heftig diensteifrig aus, als wollte auch er stürzen, aber er besann sich rechtzeitig auf das Zwecklose eines solchen Unternehmens.

»Thee also!« rief Sophie.

»Nein, besser Kakao!« rief Cita.

Sie verschwanden, und Hugo Lanz blickte ihnen ernsthaft nach -- mit einem Gesicht, als hätte eine jede von ihnen etwas Geistreiches ausgesprochen, was lange dunkel in ihm gelegen habe.

Marianne sah den Blick und sah ihn selbst an und war ihm gut. Daß ihm die Gesellschaft dieser jungen, hübschen und geweckten Mädchen ausnehmend gefiel, begriff sie vollkommen und fand es in der Ordnung. Auch fürchtete sie nie, daß ihre Töchter je zu »gelehrt« werden könnten, um zu gefallen. Ihr war zu gut bekannt, wie sehr dabei nicht der Kopf, sondern das Temperament entscheidet.

»Sie sind noch nicht lange hier?« bemerkte sie freundlich, um dem Gast die Zwischenzeit füllen zu helfen.

»Nein. Ueberhaupt nur für einige Monate zu Besuch bei hiesigen Verwandten. Dann soll ich nach Deutschland zurück, um Kaufmann zu werden.«

Er sagte das trübe. Sie fragte nicht, doch traf ihn ihr Blick so warm und mütterlich, daß er spontan fortfuhr: »Mein Traum war, Künstler zu werden.«

Sie fragte auch nicht: in welcher Kunst? Sie sagte nur sehr weich:

»Der höchste Traum. Und die schwerste Erfüllung.«

Er hob die Augen bescheiden zu ihr.

»Aber man soll doch nicht gleich anfangs verzagen, nicht wahr? Ich fühle so bestimmt: ich könnte mich dazu durchringen, wenn man mich nicht so ganz in die Familie einengen wollte. Ein Künstler und jeder, der es werden will, braucht Freiheit.«

Marianne nickte.

»Mehr als Freiheit: Heimat,« sagte sie unwillkürlich.

Hugo Lanz sah sie fragend und wie erwartend an. Ihre Art und Weise nahm ihn leise gefangen.

»Ich meine,« versuchte Marianne zu erklären, »niemand braucht so sehr als er breitesten Spielraum, weil alle seine Bewegungen unberechenbarer, unbezwingbarer sind, als die irgend welcher andern Entwicklung. Aber in seiner angebornen Sensitivität, in seiner fast hilflosen Eindrucksfähigkeit hat er zugleich, wie niemand anders, Furcht vor der Fremde. Seine Freiheit mag sich noch so breit strecken wollen, aber an den äußersten Grenzen seiner Freiheit, da muß er Heimat um sich fühlen, -- eine Welt, der er vertraut.«

Aus dem Klang ihrer Stimme vibrierte etwas, als wenn sie jedes ihrer Worte aus tiefen, warmen Glückserfahrungen hebe. Weniger in den Worten selbst, als in diesem Stimmklang lag etwas Suggestives, was Hugo Lanz ergriff.

»Das ist so nur in einem Paradies!« rief er. -- »In Wirklichkeit gibt es das nicht,« setzte er traurig hinzu.

Marianne widersprach nicht.

Sie schwieg, doch ihre Augen widersprachen. Sie leuchteten in so ruhigem Glanz und wendeten sich unwillkürlich dem verschlossnen Rahmen auf dem Schreibtisch zu.

Da vernahm man von der Thür her Gelächter.

Die Mädchen kehrten zurück, jede mit einer vollgefüllten Tasse in der Hand. Den Blick starr auf ihre Tassen geheftet, deren Inhalt überzuschlagen drohte, näherten sie sich langsam und feierlich dem Schreibtisch, neben dem die Mutter auf ihrem gewohnten Lieblingsstuhle saß.

»Thee schmeckt bei weitem schöner und regt an, hat Ma stets gesagt,« behauptete Sophie.

»Kakao ist ihr bei weitem gesunder, hat Doktor Tomasow stets gesagt,« behauptete Cita, »-- und zwischen dem Schönen und dem Guten, Nützlichen, wirst du doch nicht lange zaudern, Ma! Bedenke auch, welche schlechte Einwirkung ein böses Beispiel auf uns haben, könnte.«

»O du überredest, das ist gegen alle Abmachung!« rief Sophie voll Unwillen.

»Ein Jurist überredet nie genügend, Sophie! -- Also: erst jedenfalls das Schöne, -- und dann auch noch das Gute, Nützliche,« entschied die Mutter sofort und zog lachend alle beiden Tassen zu sich heran.

Cita hockte sich auf die Seitenlehne ihres Lutherstuhles.

»Du unmoralische Mutter!« sagte sie.

Hugo Lanz hatte sich beim Eintritt der Mädchen erhoben. Er sah ganz zerstreut aus. Ihm erschienen mit einemmal alle beide doch noch recht kindisch, ohne daß er ahnte, wie außerordentlich damit sein Urteil in der Richtung fehlging.

Wohl empfand er den heitern Reiz der kleinen harmlosen Familienscene, aber ihm schien, daß alles Intime dieses Reizes doch ganz und gar nur von dieser köstlichen Frau mit der jungen Stimme und den mütterlichen Augen ausginge.

»Wollen Sie wirklich schon gehn?« fragte Marianne freundlich, als er sich jetzt ehrerbietig von ihr verabschiedete. »Nun, ich danke Ihnen noch für die überbrachte Einladung. Und seien Sie uns hier zwanglos willkommen, falls einmal Weg und Stimmung Sie bei uns vorüberführen.«

»-- Ja, gnädige Frau, wenn ich das dürfte, -- dann danke ich Ihnen von ganzem Herzen dafür, aber --« er stockte, »-- dann lassen Sie mich nicht als einen Fremden kommen und gehn, denn das -- das würde ich nach diesem kurzen Gespräch schon nicht mehr ertragen,« fügte er leiser, sehr rasch und, im sichtlichen Kampf gegen seine eigne Schüchternheit, fast heftig hinzu.

Die Bitte, wiederkommen zu dürfen, hatte er vor einer Stunde erst der Töchter wegen an sie richten wollen --.

Marianne gab keinen Bescheid in Worten, aber er empfand ihr ganzes Wesen als eine Antwort. Mit Bestimmtheit fühlte er, daß er von heute an hier nur noch einkehren würde, wie man bei einer Mutter einkehrt, und nur allein ihretwegen.

Als er sich beim Abschied über ihre Hand beugte, gab ihm Marianne unwillkürlich jenen Stirnkuß, auf den nach russischer Haussitte der Gast Anspruch hat. Und als er sein Gesicht erhob, lag eine so dankbare Kindlichkeit auf seinen jungen Zügen, daß sie Marianne rührte.

Sobald sich die Zimmerthür hinter ihm geschlossen hatte, bemerkte Cita mit einem Lächeln: »_Der_ sah dich ja aber mal eben kurios an, Ma. Weißt du, wie? Ungefähr so, wie wenns ihm schlecht ginge, und er dir gleich den Kopf in den Schoß wühlen möchte, um dir zu beichten und von dir getröstet zu werden.«

Sophie mußte lachen.

Cita fuhr, nicht ganz frei von Spott, fort: »Ja, sind Männer nicht eigentlich höchst wunderliche Pflanzen? So etwas Unmännliches sind sie, scheint mir. Es klingt gewiß dumm, aber sag selbst, Ma! Könntest du dir leicht vorstellen, daß ich irgend jemand so -- so hilfsbedürftig ansähe? Nein, im Gegenteil: kerzengrade würd ich mich grade dann recken. -- -- Alles andre ist eben Schwäche.«

Marianne lächelte fein.

»Nicht notwendig Schwäche. -- -- Schwere Aehren stehn auch nicht kerzengrade,« sagte sie.

Aber in ihrem Innern empfand sie bei Citas Worten einen heimlichen Stich. Cita, ihr tüchtiges, kernfestes Mädchen! Sie konnte ihr vertrauen und mit ihr reden über alle Sorgen und Nöte, fast wie mit einem klugen Freunde, ja fast wie mit einem Mann --.

Ja, das alles konnte sie. Aber -- den Kopf noch einmal anschmiegungsbedürftig in Mas Schoß wühlen, das würde Cita doch wohl nie mehr --.

Sophie hatte sich ans Fenster gestellt. Sie sah Hugo Lanz, der aus dem Hause herausgetreten war, unten über den Fahrdamm gehn. Er sah schlank und fein aus in der dunkeln Pelzmütze und trotz des Pelzes, der alle Konturen vermischte. Eigentlich gefiel er ihr doch sehr gut, viel besser, als sie es Citas Spottlust einzugestehn wagte.

Jetzt äußerte sie aber doch:

»Du, -- den mag ich trotzdem gern. Warum soll er auch Ma nicht angucken, wie er will? -- -- Ich habe mich mit ihm schon prachtvoll unterhalten, neulich in der Gesellschaft, ehe du hier warst, Cita. Ich erzählte ihm von den höhern Mädchenkursen, und dann, daß mich die Naturwissenschaften so sehr interessieren, -- daß ich aber noch weit lieber ein Arzt würde, -- grade wie Doktor Tomasow.«

»Aber das alles sind ja dem jungen Dichter völlig gleichgültige Beschäftigungen, Sophie,« meinte Cita und trug die Tassen der Mutter hinaus.

»Die Beschäftigungen an sich: ja!« gab Sophie kleinlaut zu und schaute noch immer angestrengt einem dunkeln Punkt in weiter Entfernung -- einer Pelzmütze -- nach, obschon sie nicht mehr ganz sicher war, ob es nicht längst eine andre Mütze auf dem Kopfe eines andern sei. »Aber,« fuhr sie eifrig fort, »auf die Art der Beschäftigung kommt es auch nicht an, sondern darauf, daß er _auch_ hinausstrebt, -- fort, hinaus! Mit dem einzigen Unterschied, daß er das infolge von Gedichten thut. Das schadet aber doch nichts. Die Hauptsache haben wir doch gemeinsam. Auch ihm ist eng, auch er hat allerlei Träume, die er kaum zu Hause zu

nennen wagt, -- auch seine Pläne lassen sich nun einmal nicht zu Hause verwirklichen. Und seine Familie, -- die hält ihn. Wie sollten wir da nicht sympathisieren?! Wie sehr kann ich ihm doch das alles nachfüh--.«

Sie stockte jäh.

Die Nase an die Scheibe gedrückt, hatte sie ganz vergessen, wo sie sich eigentlich befand. Ihr ward plötzlich erst bewußt, was sie da sagte.

Cita konnte es überhaupt nicht mehr hören, die war ja eben mit den beiden Tassen hinausgegangen.

Aber da, im Luthersessel vor dem Schreibtisch, mit dem Gesicht grade zum Fenster, da saß, Sophie im Rücken, ganz schweigsam -- Ma --

Einen Augenblick lang, einen Augenblick nur, war ihr Ma wirklich ganz und gar aus dem Gedächtnis entschwunden gewesen.

Wohl eine volle Minute stand Sophie wie erstarrt. Sie bekam ein Gefühl, als wär es noch besser, sich mit ihrer kleinen Nase ganz durch das Fensterglas durchzubohren, um nie, nie wieder die Augen zurückwenden zu müssen.

Ihr Herz schlug heftig, sprunghaft, die Lippen wurden ihr trocken. »Arme, süße, liebe Ma!« dachte sie außer sich, voller Wut.

Plötzlich drehte sich Sophie gewaltsam um, zu ihrem eignen Schreck. Sie sah das Zimmer vor sich wie im Nebel. Sie lief auf die Mutter zu, fiel vor ihr auf die Kniee und umhalste sie wortlos, stürmisch.

»Ach Ma, -- dummes Zeug -- solch dummes, -- ich benutzte unwillkürlich seine Worte, -- weißt du: einfach seine Worte -- sie passen ja auch einzig und allein für ihn, alle, alle diese Worte!« stammelte sie endlich, ganz in Thränen, und dann lachte sie fast ein wenig, verlegen und sonderbar.

Marianne herzte sie ganz leise.

»Aber -- du wildes Mädchen, -- wie kann man sich dermaßen erregen! Viel zu leicht erregt bist du, weißt du das? Du mußt dich besser zusammennehmen. -- Komm, sei nun wieder ruhig und mein liebes altes heitres Kind, -- ja?«

Sophie hob den Kopf. Bei diesen sanften Worten verflog langsam ihr Schreck, sänftigte sich auch ihre Reue. -- Vielleicht hatte Ma gar nicht so genau hingehört vorhin -- --.

Marianne strich ihr liebreich über das schimmernde blonde Haar. Ihre Augen aber schauten großgeöffnet über ihr Kind hinweg.

Dann stand sie auf.

»Man braucht nur ein wenig wieder ›daheim‹ zu sein, um gleich wieder zu vergessen, daß es auch noch ein ›Draußen‹ mit allerlei Pflichten gibt, -- ich muß ja fort,« sagte sie zu Cita, die eben eintrat und einen heimlich verwunderten Blick auf das thränenfeuchte, gerötete Gesicht der Schwester warf.

»Ach, mußt du schon gehn, Ma? Ist es nicht zu früh?« Cita holte schnell den Pelz und die Ueberschuhe vom Vorflur herein. »Komm, ich helfe dir! Du wirst wohl von Tante Ottilie später nach Hause kommen, als wir.«

»Wohl nur wenig später,« meinte Marianne, »und ihr wißt: wer zuerst kommt, geht schlafen, ohne zu warten, -- nach unsrer alten Verabredung.«

»Es ist aber wirklich noch viel zu früh, deine Stunde fängt viel später an,« murmelte Sophie, die der Schwester Mas Ueberschuhe hastig aus der Hand gezogen hatte. Sie kniete mit ihnen zu Füßen der Mutter, um sie ihr anzuziehen.

Marianne ließ es schweigend geschehen.

»Lebt wohl, ihr Kinder, und vergnügt euch so gut wie möglich! Der Himmel ist jetzt klar, und ich denke, ihr bekommt herrlichen Sternenschein zu eurer Ausfahrt.«

Sie sagte es einfach und harmlos. Aber die Art, wie sie beide noch einmal küßte, war voll unterdrückter Leidenschaftlichkeit. Rasch ging sie fort.

Die reine kalte Winterluft draußen that ihr wohl. Ihr war das Herz plötzlich so schwer geworden, so bange und schwer.

Einen Augenblick lang, vorhin, fühlte sie deutlich, -- so deutlich wie in einer grellen höhnischen Beleuchtung, die sie blendete und verwirrte, -- ihre beiden Kinder fern von sich: die eine lebenssicher, im Grunde fertig, nur noch ein Gast im Mutterheim, und die andre -- ja, die andre sich sehnend, -- sich von ihr hinwegsehnend.

Es war in der That noch nicht die Zeit für die beiden Privatstunden, die sie, ganz in der Nähe von Ottiliens Wohnung, in einem reichen Kaufmannshause zu geben hatte. Es hatte sie nur nicht länger gelitten, mit ihrer wehen Angst, unter den Augen der Kinder.

Marianne ging einige Straßen weit in der Richtung auf ihr Ziel, dann blieb sie unterwegs vor einem Stift für arme Frauen stehn. Von zwei kleinern Nebenbauten flankiert, lag es lang und flach hinter einem grün angestrichenen hölzernen Zaun.

Noch ehe sie sich überlegt hatte, ob sie eintreten wolle, war sie bereits aus einem Fenster des Erdgeschosses von derjenigen bemerkt worden, der ihr Besuch galt.

Kaum stand sie im steingepflasterten Flur, der die ganze Mitte des Hauses durchschnitt, als sich auch schon eine der vielen Zimmerthüren zu seinen beiden Seiten öffnete, und die ihr wohlbekannte energische Stimme auf russisch erfreut herausrief: »Willkommen! Willkommen! Frau Marinka!«

Aus dem Hintergrunde des Flurs, wo dieser in ziemlich dunkle Küchenräume zu münden schien, quoll starker Dampf und Speisegeruch. Eine dralle Magd, mit aufgekrempelten Aermeln und in Bastschuhen, schlürfte vorüber.

Aber im Zimmer selbst, das Marianne betrat, war es, trotz seiner rohen grellbunten Tapete und den ungestrichenen Dielen, nicht unbehaglich. Wer hier eigne Möbel um sich aufstellen konnte, entbehrte nicht ganz eines gewissen Komforts.

Aus einem Sessel am Fenster hatte sich eine große, starkknochige Sechzigerin erhoben und ging Marianne belebt entgegen, wobei sie sich auf einen Stock stützte.

»Nun, meine Liebe, das ist wirklich aufopfernd von Ihnen, -- ich wäre Ihnen auch längst auf dem zugkalten Flur entgegengelaufen, aber, Sie wissen: die dumme Gicht! Und Doktor Tomasows Verbot! -- Setzen Sie sich, meine Einzige; was kann ich Ihnen anbieten: Thee, Obst, Schokolade, Konfekt oder etwa kaltes Rebhuhn?« -- fragte sie, in rascher, lebhafter Rede, mit der Miene einer Schloßfrau, die bewirtet; zugleich hob sie den Krückstock und deutete damit auf die verschiedenen Stellen im Zimmer, wo die angebotenen Herrlichkeiten ihren Platz gefunden hatten.

Marianne mußte lächeln, sie sah um sich. Ja, da standen in der That allerlei Leckereien, -- die guten Bekannten hatten sie gebracht.

»Ach, Wera Petrowna, das ist ganz gut, aber daß Sie hier wohnen müssen! Sie sollten es jetzt besser haben: hat Tomasow Ihnen von der neuen billigen Pension erzählt?«

Wera Petrowna lachte voll Nichtachtung und zeigte dabei ihre starken, gelblichen, wohlerhaltenen Zähne.

»Thorheit, meine Liebe, Thorheit!« sagte sie und zog Marianne neben sich auf das große, mit verblichener geblümter Wolle überzogene Sofa. »Von meinem winzigen Gelde kann ich auch in der billigsten Pension nicht leben. Armenstift, -- das ist Vorurteil. -- Und Konfekt und Rebhuhn, das ist ja recht schön, aber wenn meine Verwandten glauben, daß sie mich dadurch ködern und willfährig machen können, -- daß ich deshalb bei ihnen irgendwie als gute Tante unterkriechen würde! -- Ich esse einfach die guten Sachen, und komme doch nicht.«

Die Alte wußte ganz gut, welch schmerzlicher Stein des Anstoßes ihren ansehnlichen Verwandten ihr »Schloß« war, wie sie das Armenasyl nannte.

Sie nahm bedächtig eine Prise.

»Kommen Sie nicht vielleicht morgen zu uns zum Frühstück?« fragte Marianne. »Heute habe ich knapp Zeit, aber dann könnten wir von den Weihnachtseinkäufen plaudern. Ich weiß schon, daß Sie so gut sind, mir mancherlei Besorgungen abzunehmen, -- ich komme ja erst dicht vor Thorschluß dazu.«

Wera Petrowna nickte.

»Ja, so gut bin ich, -- sehr gern, thu ich sehr gern. Sie wissen ja, wie für mein Leben gern ich in den schönen Läden herumflankiere. -- Mit einigen blanken Rubeln oder ein paar Papierscheinchen lauter gute Dinge ansehen und bestellen, -- nun,

und die Verkäufer, die haben auch höllischen Respekt vor meinen scharfen Augen und müssen herzeigen, worauf ich mit dem Stock weise, -- und sollten sie sich selbst beim Hinundherklettern den Hals verrenken.«

»Aber reinen Mund vor den Kindern!« warnte Marianne.

»Natürlich. Freue mich recht, morgen die beiden wiederzusehen. Sah die Cita ja lange nicht. Und sie sind beide so recht hübsch zum Ansehen, -- nun, auch zum Sprechen gut, wirklich sehr gut. Schade, zu denken, daß so was bald weggeheiratet wird. Schade, schade.«

»Ganz so pessimistisch urteile ich darüber nicht, ein solches Fortgehn ist nicht das schlimmste Fortgehn,« sagte Marianne leise.

»Nun, ist vielleicht auch wahr. Wenn ich so denke, wie es mir erging. Verschlagen ins ärgste Gutsleben in entlegenster russischer Provinz -- vom ersten Tage der Ehe an. Und hineingekommen mitten aus der feinsten städtischen Erziehung, -- ja, alles, was wahr ist: mitten aus den feinsten Pensionaten und voll von allerlei Bildungsbedürfnissen. Und trotzdem -- was meinen Sie wohl? -- trotzdem hab ich doch diesen Menschen bis an seinen Tod angebetet, diesen prachtvollen Jungen, meinen Mann! Konnte er etwa mehr als Gutsarbeit, Trinken, Spielen --? Nein, keine Spur! Und brutal war er auch, wenn er nicht grade zärtlich war. Was that mir das alles? Tottreten hätt er mich dürfen! -- -- Nun ja, Leidenschaft ist blind und taub, das weiß man ja, -- und mitunter ist sie auch unglaublich dauerhaft dabei, -- das muß wahr sein. -- -- Die längste Zeit des Lebens ist man einfach verrückt.«

Es klang fast cynisch. Marianne kannte diesen Ton. Aber auch das kannte sie: daß Wera Petrowna dasaß und durch ihr lebhaftes Erzählen von irgend etwas Marianne von der Unterhaltung enthob, weil sie merkte, wie wenig Marianne, ihrer lieben »Marinka«, nach Unterhaltung zu Mute sei. Und was merkte sie nicht? Gewiß schon bei den ersten Begrüßungsworten hatten diese hellgrauen fast ironisch blickenden Augen alles, was sie wollten, gesehen.

Wera Petrowna griff nach einem frisch angebrochenen Zigarettenkästchen und machte Feuer.

»Geschenk von meinem Neffen!« bemerkte sie kurz. »Und Sie rauchen noch immer nicht? -- -- Wird auch noch kommen, meine Einzige, wird auch noch kommen. Wissen Sie überhaupt: alle wahren Genüsse kommen im Alter, -- und so weit sind Sie eben noch immer nicht, Sie Aermste. -- Da hat man nämlich erst die Ruhe dazu, -- ich meine: so die inwendige Ruhe. Man hat kälteres Blut. Taxiert die Dinge anders. Nimmt nicht alles so wahnsinnig persönlich, woraus ja doch allein alle schrecklichen Schmerzen kommen. -- Nun, ich will Ihnen übrigens alle diese spannenden Vorteile nicht vorweg erzählen, Sie erleben sie ja auch noch. -- Es ist wirklich zu schön, sagte der Bauer, und da ließ er sich zur Ader, so lange, bis er starb --.«

Sie lachte auf und rauchte wie ein Schornstein.

Marianne sah nach der Uhr.

»Jetzt muß ich zur Stunde,« sagte sie bedauernd, »also auf morgen. Wie gut und ruhig sitzt es sich bei Ihnen, man ruht aus.«

»Ja, mein Täubchen, wollten Sie nur noch bleiben, -- ich würde gern das Maul halten; übrigens, ich begleite Sie, wenn Sie erlauben. Fahre mit der Pferdebahn von der Ecke an in der Richtung der Schmiedebrücke. Ich habe, weiß Gott, hier nichts zu thun. -- Für gestern abend bekam ich richtig noch ein überzähliges Theaterbillett zugesteckt. Ein Lotterleben führt die Alte, was?«

Sie erhob sich schwerfällig und streichelte Marianne liebkosend die Wange.

»Ein Leben, um dessen Frische und Elastizität der Jüngste Sie beneiden muß,« versetzte Marianne, »wer von uns würd es an Ihrer Stelle wohl ohne Trübsal aushalten -- bei diesem Mangel an dem Ihnen gewohnten Behagen und Ueberfluß?«

Wera Petrowna hatte ihre Haube von dem ganz dünnen grauen Haar heruntergenommen und band sich umständlich einen wattierten Kapottehut, mit Ohrenklappen für den Wind, auf dem Kopf fest.

»Behagen? Da hust ich drauf!« antwortete sie derb, und es wetterleuchtete von Spott über ihren scharf geschnittenen Zügen; »was schert mich denn das bißchen Behagen? Eiderdaunen und Tischporzellan, fette Braten und Dienerschaft rechts und links, bis man sich nicht mehr rührt noch regt, sondern irgendwo einschläft. Mit all dem Behagen haben wir uns da hinten auf dem Gut gestopft, wie Mastgänse. Das Behagen quoll uns direkt zum Halse heraus. Aber das Leben stand mir still, -- all mein Leben, bis auf das eine verliebter Leute. Nun bin ich als Mastgans alt geworden, aber vom Leben will ich noch schnell was mitnehmen, soviel eben eine alte Gans noch begreift.«

Sie ließ sich von Marianne in ihren Pelz helfen, versorgte sich reichlich mit Zigaretten und klapperte mit ihrem Stock auf den steinernen Flur hinaus.

Sie gingen nur ein kleines Stück gemeinsam, bis zu der Pferdebahn.

»Sehen Sie, da kommt sie schon!« sagte Wera Petrowna mit innigem Vergnügen und wies mit ihrem Stock auf den herannahenden Straßenbahnwagen: »Und nun geht es für bloße fünf Kopeken mitten hinein in die Wagen und Menschen, Schauläden und Ausstellungen -- und sogar in die Unglücksfälle -- meinetwegen, wenn das Genick doch schon gebrochen sein muß.«

Marianne blieb lächelnd stehn, bis sie die Alte im Inneren des Wagens gut placiert sah, dann schritt sie schneller aus, zu ihrer Privatstunde.

Die Eindrücke des heutigen Nachmittags zu Hause traten dabei langsam in den Hintergrund, und die Notwendigkeit, alles zurückzudrängen, was sie nicht in ihren Beruf mitbringen durfte, erwies sich, wie so oft, heilsam befreiend für ihre Stimmung. Als sie vom Unterricht zu ihrer Schwester ging, hatte ihre Grundnatur, getrost und tapfer, bereits wieder den Sieg über die Traurigkeit gewonnen.

Es war schon halb neun Uhr. Sie kam bei Ottilie grade noch zum Abendthee zurecht. Neben dem Tisch im Eßzimmer dampfte schon der silberne Samowar auf seinem Gestell, die Theegläser standen bereit und dazwischen flache Schüsseln mit eingekochten Früchten und mit winzigen belegten Brotschnittchen, -- jedes grade ein Mundvoll groß, fast so zierlich wie Konfekt hergerichtet.

»Aber seid ihr etwa nicht allein heute?« fragte Marianne beunruhigt, als sie diese kunstvollen Zuthaten zum Abendthee wahrnahm und die hübschen gestickten Tellerservietten, -- Ottiliens eigne mühsame Handarbeit.

»So gut wie allein,« versetzte ihr Schwager, der sie empfangen und hereingeführt hatte, »Ottilie sitzt nur noch drinnen mit einem Fräulein -- eine ausländische Konzertsängerin, glaub ich --. Jedenfalls schwärmt Tilie für das Fräulein Clarissa.«

Er machte bei seinen Worten ein gutmütiges, behagliches Gesicht. Ihm gefiel, wenn schon nicht die Konzertsängerin, so doch der um ihretwillen so schön bestellte Theetisch sehr gut.

Ueber die Schüssel mit den zierlichen Brotscheibchen gebeugt, steckte er eins davon, mit geräuchertem zartrotem Lachs belegt, in den Mund. Grade wollte er Marianne auffordern, sich der gleichen Beschäftigung hinzugeben, als seine Frau mit dem fremden Fräulein bereits eintrat.

Nun wurde nach den Kindern gerufen, man nahm geräuschvoll Platz und tauschte die üblichen Redensarten. Inotschka, die dreizehnjährige Tochter, erschien schüchtern an der Thür, sie machte vor der Fremden ihren eingelernten Knix mit einer Befangenheit, die sie linkisch aussehen ließ und die schlanke Grazie ihrer feinen Bewegungen ganz verwischte.

Rot bis an den lichtbraunen Haarschopf über ihrer Stirn, setzte sie sich in ängstlicher Haltung neben ihre Mutter, deren Stirnrunzeln sie schon bemerkt hatte. Aber dabei flog ihr Blick mit einem Aufleuchten zu Marianne hinüber, die von ihr in all der Verlegenheit nicht einmal begrüßt worden war. Dafür grüßten sie ihre Augen nun fortwährend und brachten dadurch ihr Theeglas in Gefahr, von den unachtsamen schmalen, rötlichen Händen umgestoßen zu werden.

Nikolai, der älteste Sohn, ein großer Junge in der kleidsamen Gymnasiastenuniform, saß neben Marianne, mit der er sich ebenfalls besonders gut stand. An seinen freien Montagnachmittagen war er ihr Schüler, da trieben sie auf Wunsch des Vaters englische und französische Konversationsstudien, und bei diesen Gelegenheiten hatte er mit vielen grammatikalischen Fehlern Marianne mehr von seinen vierzehnjährigen Wünschen und Nöten anvertraut, als je auf gut russisch seinen eignen Eltern. Heute klagte er Marianne heimlich, mit ausdrucksvollen Andeutungen, sein Leid über diesen unerwarteten Damenbesuch; er wollte zu bestimmter Stunde einen Kameraden treffen, und nun konnte »die Geschichte schrecklich lange dauern hier bei Tisch«.

Seine beiden kleinen Brüder schauten hinter ihren breiten Milchtassen nur ganz verstohlen auf den fremden Gast in dem für einen simpeln Familienthee etwas zu prächtig geratenen Gesellschaftsanzug. Sie waren beide beängstigend artig, -- so artig, wie, nach Mariannens in diesem Punkt ziemlich trüben Lebenserfahrungen, lebhafte Kinder nur dann sind, wenn sich bald darauf etwas Fürchterliches ereignet.

Aber diese Kleinen hier regierte auch bei Tisch der wachsame Blick ihrer Mutter mit unmerklicher Strenge. Der Jüngste, Mariannens Liebling, war schon zu Bett.

Ottilie verstand es musterhaft, in sich stets gleichbleibender Liebenswürdigkeit sowohl für die Unterhaltung wie für das Betragen der Kinder zu sorgen. Und während sie emsig ihrem Mann den Thee auf seine ganz spezielle Weise mit Fruchtgelee anrührte, blieb sie doch ganz Ohr und fiel bei jeder heitern Aeußerung ihres Gastes mit einem kleinen hellen, klingenden Lachen ein.

»Sie ist darin einfach bewunderungswürdig!« dachte Marianne aufrichtig, die inzwischen ganz still geworden war. Sie hatte genug damit zu thun, gegen ihre Abspannung anzukämpfen, von der sie an solchen Tagen, beim ersten Nachlassen von Pflicht oder Freude, überfallen werden konnte.

Hin und wieder verschwammen ihr die Worte der andern in einem eintönigen Gesumm. Sie wußte sich sogar ganz gut im stande -- zu ihrer eignen Beschämung --, auf diesem bequemen Stuhl mitten unter ihnen allen recht tief und süß einzunicken, um dann zu einer gegebenen Zeit frisch und heiter zu erwachen, von neuem aller ihrer Kräfte Meister --.

Erschrocken bemühte sie sich, besser zuzuhören. Fräulein Clarissa schwärmte soeben von Oesterreich.

»Das ist ganz Wasser auf die Mühle meiner Frau!« sagte der Schwager. -- »Die ist ganz versessen drauf, und nun gar Wien! -- Hier ist nur das Diesseits, dort das schönere Jenseits: so etwa denkt sie sichs. Und die Praterfahrten, und die feschen Offiziere, -- nicht wahr, Tilie?«

Er sprach mit gutmütigem Spott, Stockrusse, wie er durch und durch war, kaum je über die Landesgrenze gekommen, und vielleicht zu seiner eignen Verwunderung mit einer halben Nichtrussin verheiratet. Sein naiver Chauvinismus kam seiner Karriere als höherer Beamter sehr zu statten, war indessen intensiv ehrlich gemeint.

Ottilie erwiderte gar nichts. Doch hatten sich alle Züge ihres Gesichtes während seiner Worte verändert, strafften sich plötzlich, -- es sah aus, wie wenn sie sich auf Eis legte. Die Theekanne zitterte leicht in ihrer Hand.

Nur Marianne bemerkte es. Ganz erstaunt sah sie die Schwester an. Ach so, -- der fesche Offizier?! -- Nein, das konnt es doch wohl nicht sein? Ein österreichisch-ungarischer schmucker Husar, Leichtfuß und nichtssagend, hatte Ottilie einst einen Heiratsantrag gemacht -- in gänzlicher Verkennung der materiellen Verhältnisse. Eine belanglose Schwärmerei Ottiliens. Wie belanglos, das empfand Marianne damals doppelt deutlich gegenüber ihrem eignen Bündnis, das sie kurz zuvor eingegangen war.

Sie erinnerte sich noch ganz gut, wie heftig der zigeunerische Teint und die Husarentracht die Schwester bestachen. Und um wie viel älter sie sich selbst urplötzlich daneben vorkam. Um so viel älter wie erglühende inbrünstige Jugend neben den Gefühlswallungen der Backfischentwicklung.

Ottiliens Mann hatte die Bedeutung dieses ominösen Husaren offenbar rein vergessen. Ottilie hatte sie jedoch sonderbarerweise hinter ihrer ruhigen, liebenswürdigen Verschlossenheit ganz und gar nicht vergessen. Der Schwager schien nicht allzuviel Ahnung von den geheimen »Tiefen« in seiner Frau zu haben.

Nikolai rückte immer unruhiger auf seinem Stuhl herum und schielte nach der großen Wanduhr gegenüber. Er wagte aber nicht, aufzustehn. Der Blick seiner Mutter, der jetzt um eine Nuance schärfer und gereizter schien als vorher, mahnte ihn wiederholt daran, daß auch er einen, wenn auch nur bescheidenen Beitrag zur Unterhaltung zu liefern habe, weil es sich für seine Jahre schicke, die Umgangsformen zu üben.

Nikolai zermarterte sein Gehirn. Ihm kam eine entsetzliche Menge von Gedanken und Vorstellungen, aber sie waren alle so merkwürdig unpassend.

Schon war er nahe daran, bei Tante Marianne einen kleinen Gedanken zu borgen. Da fiel ihm grade noch etwas ein, und er sagte ganz verzweifelt, -- viel zu laut mitten hinein ins Gespräch der übrigen: »In unsrer Schule ist ein Junge für immer abhanden gekommen.«

»Wie denn abhanden gekommen?« fragte Marianne befremdet.

»Ja so, ganz abhanden. Er war dort Pensionär, lief fort und hinterließ einen Zettel, daß er sich töten wolle. Niemand weiß, wo und was. Seine Eltern leben in Südrußland. Man hat ihn noch nicht aufgefunden.«

Ein kleiner Alarm entstand am Theetisch. Nikolai war ganz stolz. Alle redeten durcheinander.

»Mein Himmel, daß du das auch nicht gleich erzählt hast!« rief sein Vater.

Nikolai nahm sich das heimlich bereits für das nächste Mal vor, wenn wieder ein Junge abhanden kommen sollte. Er hatte gefürchtet, es sei im Hinblick auf einen Gast ein zu bescheidener Beitrag.

Ottilie seufzte. Sie sah streng und bitter aus.

»Das sind Zustände!« bemerkte sie empört. -- »Ja, wenn schon die Kinder so anfangen! Dann ist es freilich nicht zu verwundern, wenn sie sich ohne alle Zucht und Sitte erst recht töten, nachdem man sie glücklich bis zum Erwachsensein durchgebracht hat. Was für ein Kind muß das gewesen sein, das so etwas Schändliches thut.«

»Und welch eine Behandlung, die so etwas ermöglicht!« setzte Marianne im stillen hinzu. Sie erschauerte. Konnte man sich wohl je genügend tief in eine Kinderseele hineindenken, die zu solchen Entschlüssen gelangt war? Vielleicht bezwungen vom Heimweh, -- von irgend einer unverstandenen Angst, -- Angst vor dem ganzen Leben selbst vielleicht, -- wer weiß es denn?

Und ihr wurde das Herz ganz weit und groß, als müßte sichs über eine Welt ausdehnen und alle Kinder darin umfassen, -- mit solcher Wärme und Inbrunst umfassen, daß keins davon ausgeschlossen bliebe.

Ganz verträumt und zerstreut stellte sie sich vor, wie es wäre, wenn sie jetzt hingehn könnte und suchen und finden, und wie das ratlose Kind, anstatt in irgend eine letzte Dunkelheit, sich hinein verfangen würde in helfende, starke, mutterzärtliche Hände --.

Endlich erhob man sich.

Nikolai entfloh. Die kleinen Brüder machten ihre Runde mit einem schläfrigen, etwas schwankenden Kratzfuß und wünschten gute Nacht. Im Nebenzimmer wurde der schöne Flügel geöffnet, und Fräulein Clarissa setzte sich davor, um ein Arie aus Figaros Hochzeit vorzutragen.

Marianne griff der Gesang an. Die Stimme, ein prachtvoller Alt, erwies sich als zu groß für das nicht sehr geräumige Zimmer. Ottilie ließ sich augenscheinlich nicht weiter davon anfechten, übrigens war sie auch nicht sonderlich musikalisch.

Der Schwager setzte sich zu Marianne. Er schob ihr ein bequemes Kissen in das Sofa, dessen Polsterlehne im Rücken unbequem einfiel, und warf seine Zigarette fort. Etwas so Sorgliches besaß er.

»Findest du nicht: Tilie sieht schön und vorteilhaft aus, sogar neben der viel Jüngern, -- ihr seid eine dauerhafte Rasse, ihr beide!« bemerkte er mit einem freudigen Blick auf seine Frau, die am Flügel stand.

»Ja. Ich bewunderte sie heute wiederholt,« gestand Marianne.

Er nickte eifrig.

»Einfach famos!« Und er versank in Gedanken über die Vorzüge seiner Frau, die er aufrichtig liebte.

Inotschka hatte sich hinter das Sofa geschlichen, gegen das sie sich lehnte, indem sie ihre Arme auf seiner Rückseite verschränkte, sodaß sie Mariannes Haar berührten.

Marianne gab leise nach und legte den Kopf zurück an die magern zärtlichen Mädchenarme, von denen sie wußte, wie viel lieber sie sie herzhaft umhalsen würden.

Immer hatte sie an sich gehalten, wenn sie spürte, daß ihr Inotschkas Vertrauen entgegenflog, denn sie durfte sie nicht der Mutter wissentlich entfremden.

Dadurch wurde der Wortaustausch zwischen ihnen wunderlich einsilbig und karg. Doch beredter als Worte schlich sich eine feine leise Zärtlichkeit ergänzend in ihren Verkehr, kaum wahrnehmbar andern, kaum merklich ihnen selbst --.

Marianne dachte: »-- Wenn Inotschka erst älter und reifer ist, dann wird sie mir auch mehr zugehören dürfen. Ueber diese paar Jahre muß sie hinweg, wie so viele --.«

Und sie dachte dankbar daran, daß in diesem Alter nicht viele so ganz eins im Sinn und Sein mit der eignen Mutter sind, wie es Cita und Sophie mit ihr gewesen waren.

Darüber fiel ihr der heutige Nachmittag wieder ein --.

Aber sie wollte nicht wieder zaghaft werden: diese Zeit der innigsten Zueinandergehörigkeit konnte nicht vorbei sein. Wußte doch sie am allerbesten, wie viel, wie unendlich viel sie ihren Kindern noch gar nicht gegeben, noch gar nicht mit ihnen geteilt hatte, weil sie auch jetzt noch zu jung und unerfahren waren, um alles zu empfangen. Voll Freude und Ungeduld ersehnte sie die Zukunft, wo ihnen einmal alles, ihr ganzer tiefster Lebensgewinn, zu eigen werden durfte. Wo sie einander ganz verstanden und durchdrangen, wie drei Freunde, -- um miteinander eine unzertrennliche seelische Einheit zu bilden. Dann erst würden alle ihre Schmerzen und Erfahrungen, alle ihre Kämpfe und Siege kostbare Ernte tragen, -- eine Ernte auf den Feldern ihrer Kinder --.

Marianne bekam Heimweh nach ihren beiden Mädchen, es trieb sie aus dem heißen Zimmer nach Haus.

Als sie endlich mit gutem Anstand fortgehn konnte, war es über dem Singen elf Uhr geworden.

Die Begleitung des Schwagers schlug Marianne aus. Sie schlich sich nur noch für einen Augenblick in die große Schlafstube, um das jüngste Bübchen in seinem Gitterbett schlummern zu sehen, was sie nie zu thun unterließ.

Dann gab ihr Inotschka das Geleit bis auf die Treppe hinaus.

»Wann kommst du denn wieder zu uns, Tante Marianne?« fragte sie ganz zum Schluß und lehnte sich über das Treppengeländer.

»Sehr bald, mein liebes Kind, -- ich komme ja schon übermorgen wieder, zu Nikolais Konversationsstunde,« antwortete Marianne.

Inotschka schwieg eine Weile, aber als Marianne schon hinunterging, bemerkte sie zögernd: »Weißt du, -- ich sticke Pantoffeln für Mama zu Weihnachten.«

»So? Bist du noch nicht mit den Weihnachtsarbeiten fertig?« fragte Marianne.

»Nein, nicht ganz. Da dachte ich, -- mit dem Pantoffel könnte ich mich gut in unsre Lernstube setzen, während du bei Nikolai bist --. Meinst du nicht auch?«

Marianne sah zu ihr hinauf.

»Gewiß, wenn Mama nichts dagegen hat? Aber du mußt sie lieber erst fragen.«

Inotschka nickte schweigend.

»Gute Nacht, meine kleine Ina!« rief Marianne ihr noch zu, während sie schon die letzte Treppe hinabstieg.

Indessen Inotschka antwortete noch nicht gleich, sie bückte sich nur tiefer über die Brüstung, und erst als sie nicht mehr wissen konnte, ob ihre Worte von unten her noch vernehmbar wären, rief sie zaghaft, mit gedämpfter Stimme, und ganz hastig hinunter: »Gute Nacht! Gute Nacht! Ich muß dir doch noch schnell sagen, daß ich dich ganz schrecklich lieb habe, und daß du mich fortnehmen sollst zu dir, und daß ich immer bei dir sein will und nirgends sonst. Und daß du mich nicht so stehn lassen sollst -- nicht so allein --.«

Sie brach ab. Schon während der ersten Worte schloß der Portier unten geräuschvoll die Hausthür auf, die dann mit einem mächtigen Knall zuklappte.

Im Treppenhause wurde es plötzlich so beängstigend still.

»Sie hat nichts gehört, -- gar nichts hat sie gehört. Das ist mal gut. Unsinn, -- wozu auch!« sagte Inotschka wesentlich lauter als vorhin.

Aber obwohl sie es gut fand, daß Marianne nichts mehr vernommen hatte, verfinsterte sich ihr schmales Gesichtchen mit dem weichen Munde. Sie drückte die Zähne auf die Lippen und rieb sich mit blinzelnden Augen, um nicht loszuweinen, am Geländer, bis die Stimme der Mutter von drinnen in erstauntem Ton nach ihr rief.

[Illustration]

=III.=

Seit zehn Uhr waren die jungen Mädchen von ihrer Schlittenfahrt im Sternschein zurück.

Cita saß schon eine Weile auf dem Rande ihres weißlackierten Eisenbettes und zog sich bedächtig die Strümpfe von den hübschen Füßen.

Sophie ging noch unausgekleidet umher, sie machte sich bei ihren Büchern zu schaffen, die sie auf ihrem Tisch am Fenster aufzustapeln pflegte, und etliche von ihnen trug sie ins Wohnzimmer auf den Schreibtisch der Mutter hinüber.

Dabei sprach sie kein Wort. Sie war schon den ganzen Abend gegen ihre Gewohnheit still gewesen und behielt auch jetzt die Miene einer düster Versonnenen.

Cita legte gähnend ihre Strümpfe auf den Stuhl am Bett.

»Schlittenfahren ist ganz schön,« entschied sie, »aber dies gesellige Vergnügtsein von Männlein und Weiblein, die nichts Besseres zu thun wissen, -- wie bin ich froh, daß ich mich davon gründlich entwöhnt habe! Kindisch ist es einfach. Es gibt doch wahrhaftig ernstere Aufgaben in der Welt.«

»Meinetwegen kann es auch aufhören,« versetzte Sophie apathisch, mit einer bekümmerten kleinen Stimme, »und auch das Schlittenfahren, und überhaupt alles.«

Sie kam eben wieder aus dem Wohnzimmer zurück. Cita fragte gar nicht, was sie dort eigentlich treibe, sie wußte gar nicht, daß Sophie soeben ihre Studienbücher und Lieblingswerke auf Mas Schreibtisch aufgeschichtet hatte, wie man sündhafte Kostbarkeiten auf einen Scheiterhaufen trägt.

Sie wollte Ma so gern nach der heutigen Kränkung ihre rückhaltlose Ergebenheit beweisen. So gern ihr zeigen: »Siehst du, ich entsage allem, was mich von hier fort zu locken anfing! Schließe es für immer vor mir zu.«

Aber Cita brauchte das einstweilen noch nicht zu wissen. Denn Sophie fürchtete sich entsetzlich davor, ihr eignes Thun klar und endgültig aussprechen zu hören.

Sonst hätte sie es noch am liebsten heute abend Hugo Lanz anvertraut. Ja, dem am ehesten! Sie meinte: wenn er zum Beispiel, davon erschüttert, nun auch seinerseits alle ehrgeizigen Pläne fahren ließe, dann hätten sie gemeinsam trauern, sich gemeinsam trösten und ermannen können.

Er würde dann kein Dichter werden, sondern ein Kaufmann, und sie kein Arzt, sondern -- sondern vielleicht irgend wann einmal die Frau eines Arztes, Dichters oder Kaufmanns in der Welt.

»Geh doch endlich schlafen!« rief Cita in ihre schwermütigen Betrachtungen hinein. Sie selbst lag bereits im Bett, grade auf dem Rücken ausgestreckt, die Arme über dem Kopf verschränkt.

Sophie setzte sich zu ihr auf die Bettkante.

»Glaubst du, daß es glückliche Ehen gibt?« fragte sie langsam und ernst.

Cita gähnte gleichmütig.

»Ja,« versetzte sie nach kurzer Ueberlegung, »aber entschieden nur unter den Frauen, die sich unsrer Frauenbewegung anschließen. Das ist sonnenklar: denn die setzen sich in den Stand, sich selbst zu versorgen, den Mann nicht zu brauchen. Also kann es die schlimmste Eheschließung überhaupt nicht mehr geben: nämlich die wegen Geld und ohne Liebe. Dafür sind andre, schönere nun erst möglich, --«

»Zum Beispiel sogar ohne Geld und mit Liebe!« fiel Sophie hoffnungsvoll ein. Wie schön war das eigentlich! Aber davon schloß sie sich auch aus, wenn sie nicht Arzt wurde, -- kein selbständiger, erwerbender Berufsmensch.

Cita sagte plötzlich leise: »An die ganze Heiraterei mag ich aber einstweilen weniger als je denken. -- -- Weißt du, es hat etwas so Schreckliches: man ist keines Menschen sicher, -- jedem kann noch einfallen, das Verrückte zu thun und zu heiraten. -- -- Stell dir zum Beispiel vor, daß unsre Ma -- --«

Sophie stellte es sich nicht vor. Sie schüttelte den Kopf und lachte.

»Schäm dich,« sagte sie kurz.

Cita richtete sich im Bett auf. Ihre dunkeln Augen hefteten sich erregt und finster auf die Schwester.

»Nein, nein, glaube mir! Ich behaupte nur, daß so etwas möglich ist, -- nichts weiter. Aber möglich ist es. Es ist möglich, es ist möglich.«

Der Ton, in dem sie es wiederholte, wurde immer härter und kälter. Nach einer Pause fuhr sie fort: »Und wer könnte auch was dagegen thun, dagegen sagen? Schließlich ist es doch das Recht eines jeden Menschen -- --. Auch Mas Recht also, -- -- jawohl, unsrer Ma auch, die bis jetzt so ganz ausschließlich uns gehörte, -- ganz allein _unsre_ Ma war, an die niemand sonst den geringsten Anspruch machen darf. Niemand, niemand --«

»Nein, niemand!« bestätigte Sophie gedehnt. »Niemand außer uns --«

»Es ist aber ihr gutes Recht! Vergiß nicht: ihr gutes Recht!« fiel Cita nachdrücklich ein. »Von uns ist es ganz unberechtigt, so zu sprechen. Ja, vollständig. Mama kann jeden Tag heiraten, wenn sie will, -- und überhaupt thun und lassen, was sie will --«

Sie brach ab. Ihre Stimme vibrierte von verhaltener Erregung.

Sophie stand auf und küßte die Schwester flüchtig auf die Stirn.

»Gute Nacht. Schlaf lieber. Du bist einfach verrückt geworden. Ich glaube, du träumst schon!« erklärte sie. »Ebensogut könnte ich mir vorstellen, daß Ma überhaupt gar kein Mensch, sondern ein Walfisch ist.«

Mit diesem Bescheid kehrte sie ins Wohnzimmer zurück und setzte sich an den Schreibtisch vor die aufgeopferten Bücher. Oben drauf hatte sie das Mikroskop gestellt, das sie erst vorigen Weihnachten zum Geschenk erhalten hatte. Nun war es eine ganze Pyramide von Sachen.

Eigentlich wollte sie Ma hier erwarten. Es sollte keine Nacht drüber hingehn und sie wankend machen und auf andre Gedanken bringen --.

Seltsamerweise fiel ihr wieder Hugo Lanz ein. Ja, wer weiß: indem sie dem erwählten Beruf entsagte, entsagte sie vielleicht sogar einer jener allein glücklichen Eheschließungen, die Cita noch gelten ließ. -- -- Denn Hugo Lanz besaß kein Geld -- --.

Also war es wirklich ein Totalverzicht. Ein Opfer der Kindesliebe, wie es nicht bald ein zweites gab.

Sophie saß beim Schreibtisch mit gefalteten Händen und den gemischten Gefühlen einer über ihre eigne Größe fast bis zur Verlegenheit erstaunten Märtyrerin.

Cita hatte inzwischen ihren Rat befolgt und war in gesunder Müdigkeit nach der langen Fahrt durch die Winterkälte fest eingeschlafen. Aber sie lag da mit finster zusammengerückten Augenbrauen und einem bösen Ausdruck um den Mund.

Die zurückgedrängte Bitterkeit in ihrem Herzen hatte noch ihre Schrift auf ihr Gesicht geschrieben. Ihr letzter klarer Gedanke war das Gelübde gewesen, mehr als je ganz allein auf sich selbst stehn zu wollen.

Doch als sie in das Land der Träume hinüberglitt, senkte sich dichter und dichter eine große Finsternis um sie. Sie schaute vergebens nach den Dingen aus, die ihr vertraut gewesen waren, nach den Stätten, an denen sie sich heimisch fühlte. Eine schwarze Wand wehrte ihr Durchgang und Ausblick.

Und da überfiel sie Angst, wie sie nur als kleines Kind Angst gekannt hatte.

Beide Hände legte sie vor die Augen, um wenigstens das Dunkel nicht zu sehen. Doch was sie nicht sah, das fühlte sie: wie alle Gegenstände und alle Fernen über sie her kamen, wie sie sich zusammenrotteten und ballten, um sie zu ersticken --

Da entrang sich ihr in dumpfem Entsetzen Mas Name. Mit leiser, furchtsamer Stimme rief sie nach Ma. War denn nicht auch Ma irgendwo unter all dem da draußen, was sie umdrohte und gefährdete? Dann würde sie alles entwirren, alles Böse abhalten --.

Aber Ma war nicht da.

Und plötzlich wußte sie, daß Ma nicht mehr da war, -- das allein, nur das war die Finsternis ringsum -- --.

* * * * *

Gegen Mitternacht fuhr ein Schlitten vor.

Marianne stieg die Treppe hinauf und öffnete so geräuschlos wie möglich die Thür zur Wohnung.

Alles blieb still. Also schliefen die Kinder bereits. So ging sie leise hinüber in ihr nach dem Hofe gelegenes Schlafzimmer neben Sophiens und Citas Stübchen.

Hier hatten zärtliche Hände schon für alles gesorgt. Die Lampe angezündet, die warmen Vorhänge vor dem Fenster zugezogen, jedes Ding bequem bereit gestellt, von der Wasserkaraffe auf dem niedrigen Tischchen bis zu den tiefroten, kleinen Tuchpantoffeln vor dem aufgeschlagenen weißen Bett.

Neben der Karaffe stand am Bett ein schmales Kelchglas mit einer Handvoll italienischer Anemonen darin, -- blaßrote, violette, gelbe --, -- ein wenig angewelkt noch von dem Weg hierher.

Die Blumen mußten die Mädchen heute abend bei den Bekannten geschenkt bekommen haben. Und sie wußten, warum die Mutter diese Erinnerungen an Italien und seine Sonne so leidenschaftlich liebte --.

Marianne hob die angewelkten Stengel behutsam einzeln aus dem Wasser und beschnitt sie unten etwas, damit sie besser saugen möchten. Dann ordnete sie sie neu, mit Bewegungen, die sie fast liebkosten.

Die feine kleine Freude machte sie warm und wach. Ach, daß die beiden schon schliefen, die Langschläfer! Jetzt hätte sie sich gern noch auf einen Augenblick an ihre Betten gesetzt und sie geherzt.

Ihr war so kindfroh und bewegt zu Mut.

Als sie das Licht angezündet hatte und die Lampe herausstellen und auslöschen wollte, bemerkte sie einen hellen Schein in der Thürritze des Wohnzimmers.

Hatten sie die grüne Studierlampe brennen lassen? War doch noch eine von ihnen wach?

Sie glitt in die Tuchpantöffelchen und ging leise über den Gang zurück. Die Thür war nur angelehnt, sie stieß sie auf, um einzutreten.

Aber jählings hielt sie inne. Sie sah Sophie am Schreibtisch sitzen, die Arme auf den Büchern verschränkt, den Kopf mit den halb offen niederhängenden Flechten darauf, -- fest schlummernd.

Sie sah die Bücher, das Mikroskop, -- und das Gesicht sah sie, das ihr im Profil zugekehrt lag, hell bestrahlt vom Schein der Lampe.

Es war naß von Thränen. Die Mundwinkel wie im Weinen herabgezogen, die Augenbrauen so rührend im Ausdruck, so hilflos --. Ein so bekümmertes, schmerzliches, -- ein fast gramvolles kleines Gesicht!

Ja, hier mußte Sophie auf die Mutter gewartet haben, aus irgend einem Grunde. Gewartet mitsamt allen ihren Büchern, die sie hier aufeinander getragen hatte. Vielleicht um etwas zu erbitten? Vielleicht um zu sagen: »Sieh doch, wie lieb mir das alles geworden ist, wie gern ich frei sein möchte und mich dem widmen!«

Vielleicht auch, um etwas abzubitten. Um zu sagen: »Nimm es alles fort von mir, ich gebe dirs zurück, denn es weckt in mir die Sehnsucht, von dir hinwegzugehn.«

Und nun war sie unter Thränen hier eingeschlafen, wie ein müdes Kind, und nur dies traurige, kleine Gesicht erzählte der Mutter von ihren Nöten --.

Marianne stand noch in der halboffnen Thür, den Kopf gegen den Thürrahmen zurückgelehnt. Ihre Hände hingen schlaff an ihr herunter.

Was half es, daß sie fortgewesen, daß sie getroster und freudiger heimgekehrt war. Zu Hause trat es ihr wieder entgegen, das Gefürchtete, -- wie ein Gespenst.

Und mit diesem Gespenst trat ihr die liebste Gestalt entgegen, sie, von der sie es nicht ertrug.

Konnte die Mutter denn gewähren, was ihr Liebling von ihr heischte? Konnte sie denn wirklich auch die letzte fortlassen? Ganz, ganz allein nachbleiben? Mußte das sein?

»Nein! Nein!« schrie es in ihr.

Und mit Blitzesklarheit nahm die Erkenntnis ihr Herz ein: »Wenn du jetzt -- jetzt gleich sie wecktest, wenn du vor dein Kind hintreten würdest wie vor eine Ertappte, die du heimlich belauscht, -- wenn du ihre kleine schmiegsame Mädchenseele jetzt in die Hand nehmen und nach deinem stärkeren Willen prägen würdest: ja, dann wäre es vielleicht möglich, deinem Einfluß in ihr Gewalt zu verleihen. Nimm den Augenblick wahr, wo sie, sich selbst verratend, daliegt, als sei sie dir ausgeliefert. Mache sie zu deinesgleichen, hauche ihr dein Wesen und deine Wünsche ein. Sie ist ja dein. Sie vertraut dir grenzenlos, und ihr höchster Maßstab bist du. Nutze deine Macht über dein Kind --.«

Aber noch während Marianne deutlich ein jedes dieser Worte in ihrem Innern vernahm, als raune irgend wer sie unablässig ihr zu, machte sie eine übermenschliche Anstrengung, sich ebenso unbemerkt zu entfernen, wie sie hergekommen war.

Nur jetzt keinen Laut! Nur jetzt leise, leise hinweg, ehe sie erwacht, ehe sie ahnt, wer hier gestanden und mehr, als sie sagen wollte, von ihr erfahren hat --.

Es gelang Marianne, die Thür wieder anzulehnen und geräuschlos ihr Schlafzimmer zu erreichen.

Mechanisch begann sie, sich zu entkleiden.

Da standen noch die Anemonen.

Marianne blickte mit heißen Augen auf sie.

Dann löschte sie die Kerze aus.

Unerwartet, dicht, ohne den kleinsten Lichtfleck von draußen, den die zugezogenen Vorhänge am Fenster aussperrten, umhüllte sie das Dunkel wie eine Gruft.

Sie stürzte vor dem Bett in die Kniee und verbarg ihren Kopf in den Kissen --.

* * * * *

Dieser Sonntag war kein Sonntag zum Ausschlafen gewesen. Sowohl Marianne als die Kinder erschienen am Morgen übernächtig und mit übermüdeten Augen.

Keines von ihnen dreien wußte indessen etwas von dem eigentlichen Grunde der Traurigkeit in der Seele des andern. Cita schwieg, ihr war wunderlich weich, als ob ihr allerlei nächtliche Träume nachgingen, aber auch ihre Befürchtungen waren noch in ihr und stimmten sie reizbar, obgleich sie sichs auszureden suchte.

Marianne bemühte sich, vor den Augen der Kinder wohlgemut zu erscheinen. Als Sophie hereinkam, sagte sie freundlich: »Ich sehe, du hast gestern meinen Schreibtisch für deine Beschäftigungen auserkoren. Das ist recht so, ich gebrauche ihn jetzt in der Weihnachtszeit ja nicht. Und Cita wird vielleicht etwas stark Anspruch an den deinigen machen.«

Sophie errötete lebhaft, ohne zu antworten. Sie wußte nur noch dunkel, auf welche Weise sie gestern schließlich zu Bett gekommen war. Und es kam ihr im nüchternen Morgenlicht unmöglich vor, der Mutter die großen Eröffnungen zu machen. Jedenfalls lag es an der Nacht, daß diese Dinge ihr wesentlich leichter und natürlicher erschienen waren.

Das Dienstmädchen Stanjka, das sich zum Kirchgang rüstete, war die einzige, die sonntäglich und unbeschwert zwischen ihnen herumging. Sie trug ein neues grellrot gemustertes Kattuntuch um den Hals und hatte ihr aschblondes Haar mit Kwas glänzend gemacht; der Sonntag gehörte ihr fast immer, und sie freute sich auf ihn während der ganzen Woche.

Alles Gute war augenscheinlich immer auf einen Sonntag gefallen: in den Kirchen, in den Häusern, in den Vergnügungslokalen und Theebuden feierte man nur ihn! Die Glocken, die mit mächtigen Klängen die Luft erfüllten und in die Stuben hineintönten, redeten Stanjkas frommer Naivetät ganz unterschiedslos von himmlischen wie von irdischen Herrlichkeiten, von Kniebeugungen bei Orgelklang und Kirchengesang, wie vom Tanz zur Balalaika.

Nach dem Gottesdienst brauchte sie nur noch um zwölf Uhr den Frühstückstisch zu richten und den Samowar aufzustellen.

Kurz vorher erschien Wera Petrowna zur festgesetzten Stunde.

Sie hatte ein altmodisches und durch langen Gebrauch reichlich leuchtend gewordenes schwarzes Seidenkleid angezogen und trug auf dem Kopf eine komplizierte Haube mit lila Tolle, die sich im wattierten Kapottehut auf keine Weise unterbringen ließ, und die sie daher stets in einem besondern Beutel mit sich führte.

»Um ein Haar wär ich nicht gekommen, ich sollte nämlich heute vormittag in das Dawydowkonzert,« erklärte sie, als sie sich zu Tisch setzten. »Das Billet war noch nicht da, ich wartete drauf bis halb zwölf, es kam jedoch nicht. Es sollte nämlich nur dann kommen, wenn die Frau meines Neffen, die sich gestern abend schon unwohl fühlte, über Nacht krank würde. Sie ist aber nicht krank geworden.«

Sophie mußte lachen.

»Dafür ist es freilich kein Ersatz, wenn wir Ihnen später etwas vorspielen und vorsingen wollen,« meinte sie und legte Wera Petrowna von den kleinen Pasteten mit gehacktem Fleisch und Kohl vor.

»Nein, meine liebe, schöne, kleine Sophie. Auch muß ich später ohnehin fortgehn, denn ich habe noch andre Billete. Die habe ich mir eben geholt. Später drängen sich die Menschen so an der Kasse. Es ist weit besser, man ist versorgt.«

»Wohin denn?« fragte Cita ohne Neugier. Sie kannte die Ausgehewut und Belustigungssucht der Alten.

»Diesmal nur zur behaarten Riesin und zum zweiköpfigen Kind,« sagte Wera Petrowna gelassen und nahm sich Citrone zum Thee.

»Sie sind doch immer kreuzfidel, -- aber wirklich immer!« bemerkte Cita nachsichtig.

»Kreuzfidel? Nein, ihr junges Volk, das bin ich gar nicht. Ich muß mich nur beeilen, die Augen aufzureißen, ich habe viel nachzuholen. Wie lange dauert es, dann heißt es: Mund zu und Erde auf die Augen. -- -- Nun, hoffentlich dauert es noch ein Weilchen,« ergänzte sie.

»Nachholen? Ja, -- aber -- die behaarte Riesin --?«

»Nun, wenn auch nur eine Riesin. Was meinen Sie denn, ob bei uns dahinten auf dem Gut auch nur so eine gewesen wäre?! Nein, keine Spur! Das wäre ja Sensation genug für lange hinaus gewesen. -- Natürlich gibt es auch noch was Besseres als das. Natürlich. Man muß aber zufrieden sein, wie es sich trifft; die besseren Treffer kommen auch noch.«

Sie konnte es den jungen Mädchen gut anmerken, daß sie nicht mehr recht wußten, ob sie sich selbst ironisiere, oder ob sie von ihr zum Narren gemacht würden. Wera Petrowna gefiel das ausnehmend; sie betrachtete aus ihren klugen Augen die beiden Schwestern mit Wohlgefallen.

»Ja, ja, wenn ich auch noch so jung wäre. Herr du mein Gott!« sagte sie und schob den Teller zurück.

»Dann würden Sie sich ohne Zweifel noch weit besser und viel mehr amüsieren, nicht wahr?« äußerte Cita und zuckte bedauernd die Achseln. »Nun sehen Sie, daran liegt uns trotz aller Jugend gar nichts.«

»Nein, meine lieben dummen Unschuldstäubchen, -- ich würde ins Kloster gehen, ja, das würde ich!« behauptete die Alte, und ihr ganzes Gesicht lächelte fein und spitzbübisch aus allen seinen Fältchen. »Ja, davon habt ihr noch keinen Begriff,« fuhr sie auf der Mädchen erstaunten Blicke fort und nickte ihnen zu, »so eine Jugend, die geht ins Zeug! Nun, wohl bekomm's! Prosit Mahlzeit also!«

Sie stand auf, noch ehe Marianne, die geduldig dasaß und wartete, das Zeichen dazu gegeben hatte.

Marianne wollte ja mit ihr noch allerhand Weihnachtsbesorgungen besprechen. Und so viel sah sie recht wohl mit ihren beiden guten Augen: daß ihre liebe Marinka auch heute ein bedrücktes Herz haben mochte. Aus irgend einem Grunde, gleichviel aus welchem. Jedenfalls schienen heute selbst die Kinder dagegen machtlos zu sein, deren Geplauder die Mutter sonst heiter zu stimmen pflegte.

Ihr schien, daß sich Marianne nach Ruhe sehne, -- vielleicht nach einem Alleinsein, das die jungen Mädchen grade in ihrer zärtlichen Sorge vereitelten.

Als alles erledigt war, was zu besprechen gewesen, zog sie ihre Staatshaube vom Kopf und bestand darauf, fortzugehen. Aber schon im Mantel und Kapottehut mit zugebundenen Ohrenwärmern, klapperte sie noch einmal an ihrem Stock in den »Spalt« hinein, wo die Schwestern soeben an Stanjkas Statt den Tisch abgeräumt hatten.

»Also auf Wiedersehen, meine zwei Täubchen,« sagte sie, -- »wie ist es nun? Ich bin eine alte Frau, die am Stock humpelt -- in meiner Jugend würde man so eine nicht allein ins Menschengedränge haben gehn lassen, -- aber die junge Welt von heute --«

Cita und Sophie sahen sich verdutzt an. Sie blieben vor ihr stehn und machten verlegene Gesichter.

»Ja, warten kann ich nicht!« entschied die Alte und schwenkte aufmunternd ihren Beutel, »-- also, eins, zwei, drei: geht jemand mit mir ins Sonntagsvergnügen bei der behaarten Riesin und dem zweiköpfigen Kinde, -- und wer?«

Im edlen Wetteifer, nicht der andern die lästige Pflicht aufzubürden, riefen sie alle beide kleinlaut: »Ich!«

»Bravo! Bravo! Also alle beide!« lobte Wera Petrowna, und es zuckte dabei ganz wunderlich um ihre Mundwinkel, in Güte und Bosheit zugleich; »-- nun freilich! junges Volk ist eben junges Volk, wie ernsthaft es auch thut, da sieht man wieder: es will sich amüsieren.«

Marianne that es leid, als sie die beiden Mädchen betreten hinter der Alten fortgehn sah, indessen mochte sie ihr die so dringend provozierte Begleitung nicht mißgönnen. Ihr Kopf schmerzte heftig, sie hätte sich am liebsten mutterseelenallein in ein Zimmer mit verhängten Fenstern gelegt.

Aber eine innere Unruhe ließ es nicht zu. Mehr noch als nach Stille und Vergessen sehnte sie sich nach einem Beistand.

Langsam ging sie durch die Wohnstube. Bei den hohen Blattpflanzen, ihren gepflegten und geschonten Lieblingen, blieb sie einen Augenblick stehn. Sie las ein welkes Blatt ab und schaute nach den harten, knollenförmigen Knospen am Gummibaum.

Der Schreibtisch stand schön aufgeräumt. Neben den Schulheften lagen ein paar kleine dünne Bücher, -- Kindergeschichten, mit neuem Buchschmuck herausgegeben. Sie kosteten nur wenige Kopeken, und Marianne hatte sie voll Entzücken gekauft. Fast immer lag hier dergleichen, als warteten immer allerlei Kinderhände auf sie --.

So totenstill war es. Man war wie allein auf der Welt. Nichts von der hastigen Geschäftigkeit der Wochentage in der Wohnung.

Es wollte ihr vorkommen wie ein Atemanhalten um sie her. Alle Dinge wurden darin beredter, belauschbarer --.

Die Stille machte bange, sie war so selten allein.

Alle Dinge in dieser kleinen Wohnung liebte sie, ein jedes Stück darin hatte sie mit zärtlichem Bedacht gewählt, -- nur was sie lieb haben konnte, das hatte sie allmählich zusammengetragen.

Sie hatte gewünscht, diese Räume sollten mehr als wohnlich wirken, -- wie Arme, die sich weit und warm erschließen.

Aber sie wirkten nur so, weil geliebte Menschen sie erwärmten. Weil immer noch Sophie in ihnen ging und stand, lebte und lachte, -- weil Sophie in ihnen die Mutter erwartete, wenn sie abends müde von der Tagespflicht heimkam.

Wenn alle diese Liebesfülle keine Bethätigung mehr fand, dann konnte auch keine Liebe mehr auf die Dinge überströmen. Sie blieben nicht länger beseelt, -- sie entseelten sich, -- -- starben --.

Marianne fröstelte. Und plötzlich richtete sie sich entschlossen auf, schritt in den Vorflur hinaus und nahm ihren Mantel.

Sie wußte wohl, was sie thun mußte. Einen Beistand brauchte sie. Sie mußte, wie mit allem, so auch hiermit zu Tomasow. Mit ihm sich beraten, ihn hören. Daß er da war, das war eine Zuflucht.

Aber in all ihrem Verlangen danach fürchtete sie sich zugleich, und mit schwerer Hand machte sie sich fertig, zu ihm zu gehn. Sie wußte: zu den weichen Tröstern gehörte er nicht. Ihm eingestehn, was sie heute quälte, das hieß sich entscheiden --.

Draußen ruhte frostige Winterdämmerung, obschon es noch früh am Nachmittag war. Der Wind machte es bitterlich kalt. Marianne durchquerte einen Teil des Kreml; in dampfenden Wölkchen stieg ihr Atem und gefror zu Tausenden winziger Eisperlchen an ihrem Pelzkragen fest.

Stumpf und leblos wölbte sich der dicke Schnee um alles ringsum, rundete jeden Umriß, verwischte jede scharfe Linie. Hier und da klang ein Glockenton an, -- wie im Traum, -- leise verhallend. Es war, als raune eine Glocke der andern schlaftrunken etwas zu.

An manchen Kirchenthüren auf dem großen Kremlplatz lagerten Pilger oder lehnten an den Mauern, auf ihren Pilgerstab gestützt. Marianne war nicht in der Stimmung, um irgend etwas von der Außenwelt mit Interesse aufzufassen, aber auf diesem Bilde blieb ihr Blick mit einer dunkeln, unverstandenen Sehnsucht ruhen; über den zerlumpten Pilgern, -- über ihnen, die sich bis an die Thore der Gotteshäuser in vielleicht wochenlanger mühseliger Wanderung durchgefroren und durchgehungert hatten, lag eine solche kindliche Zufriedenheit. Man sah ihnen allen an, -- Greisen, Weibern, jungen Menschen: sie standen am Ziel -- da, wo sich alle Wünsche erfüllen, und man alle Bürden abwirft, -- _zu Hause_ --.

Gern hätte auch sie ihre Füße wund gelaufen, um Frieden zu finden und sich alles Schweren zu entlasten. Würde sie das erreichen, unter Tomasows klugen und guten Worten? würde sie es bei ihm erreichen? In diesem Augenblick glaubte sie es.

Bald war Marianne an seinem Haus angelangt. In einer ruhigen Straße stand es, einstöckig und unscheinbar, hinter einem hofartigen Vorgärtchen.

An den Vorflur stieß ein großes Schrankzimmer, wo der Diener, Andrian, sich aufzuhalten hatte, der, aus Tomasows Heimatsdorf gebürtig, ihm seit vielen Jahren anhing, und auch alle Reisen ins Ausland mitmachte. Dies Schrankzimmer erschien Marianne stets als der weitaus behaglichste Raum zwischen den konventionell eingerichteten Empfangsgemächern im Erdgeschoß. Vielleicht aus reiner Bequemlichkeit mochte Andrian hier alles zusammengehäuft haben, was seiner speziellen Pflege oblag: eine stattliche Reihe hoher Blattpflanzen, besonders mehrere prachtvolle Palmen, an denen er unermüdlich herumspritzte und putzte; daneben hing am Fenster ein Bauer mit einem singfrohen Kanarienvögelchen, Batjuschka »Väterchen« genannt, mit dem Andrian sich den ganzen Tag über alles, was geschah, unterhielt.

Marianne ertappte sich auf dem Gefühl, das manchen von Tomasows Patienten beschleichen mochte: lieber in diesem friedlichen Idyll von Palmenlaub und Vogelgezwitscher verweilen zu wollen, als sich weiter zu wagen in die Zimmer des Arztes.

Indessen noch hatte Andrian ihren Besuch nicht melden können, als bereits Tomasow selbst erschien, sichtlich beunruhigt über ihr unerwartetes Kommen. In Anwesenheit des Dieners that er keine Frage, sondern führte sie gleich durch seine Bibliothek in die Studierstube.

Marianne ließ sich in den ersten besten Sessel sinken, hilflos zu ihm aufschauend.

»-- Sophie will fort!« sagte sie unvermittelt, wie man mit geschlossnen Augen blind losschießt.

»-- Hat sie es Ihnen gestanden?«

Sie schüttelte den Kopf.

»Das nicht -- --. Aber untereinander werden beide gewiß schon davon geredet haben. So direkt sagt sie es nicht. -- -- Aber jetzt weiß ich: erst neulich brachen beide ganz verlegen ein Gespräch ab, weil ich unvermutet eintrat. Und ich -- meinte, es handle sich vielleicht nur um Weihnachten --. -- -- Haben die Mädchen am Ende auch Ihnen -- --?«

»Nein,« entgegnete Tomasow.

Er war vor ihr stehn geblieben, gespannte Aufmerksamkeit im Gesicht, während sie rasch und mit trockenen Lippen sprach.

»Nun, das ist gut,« fügte er jetzt hinzu.

»-- Gut --?!«

»Ja. Es mußte einmal zur Sprache kommen und zum Ausbruch, -- es war hohe Zeit!« sagte er ruhig, »denn vorher ließ sich nichts machen, weil Sie es nicht zuließen, Marianne. Obschon Sie es vor sich selbst verheimlicht haben, nagte die Furcht davor doch schon unablässig leise an Ihren Nerven. Das mißfiel mir längst. Aber nun ist es gut, daß es durchgekämpft wird.«

Marianne hob ihren Blick angstvoll zu ihm auf.

»-- Ich kann aber Sophie nicht hergeben! -- -- Nein, nicht auch Sophie noch -- --. Sie ist ja auch zart, sie bedarf meiner fortwährend -- -- Gott sei Lob und Dank, daß sie meiner noch bedarf!«

Tomasow zog einen Stuhl heran.

»Nun lassen Sie einmal sehen, Marianne! Jetzt bitte ohne alle Hinterhalte. Wie ist es denn mit Sophie? Sie machen doch ihrer Freude am Studium die weitgehendsten Konzessionen. Sie veranlaßten mich noch selbst, ihrem Verlangen nach ganz bestimmten Fachbüchern nachzugeben --«

»Ja,« sagte Marianne hastig, »so ist es ja auch. Weil doch ihr Interesse grade hierfür alle übrigen Interessen so entschieden überwuchs. Und wenn ich nun bedenke, daß Sophie die höhern Kurse besucht, und daß sie Sie zum Berater hat und vorwärts lernt, so viel sie nur will, -- ist es damit nicht genug? Muß sie durchaus auf den praktischen Arzt studieren, -- muß sie von mir fortgehn --?«

Tomasow zuckte scheinbar erstaunt die Achseln.

»Nein, selbstverständlich muß sie das keineswegs. Sie beruft sich dabei einfach auf ihr Reifezeugnis zum Universitätsbesuch und auf ihre Neigung, so zu handeln. Beides braucht ganz und gar nicht den Ausschlag zu geben. -- Indessen: ob ich sie für genügend befähigt dafür halte, ob mir die Sache aussichtsvoll erscheint, -- auch das haben Sie doch schon nebenher von mir zu erfahren gesucht, Ma.«

Marianne entgegnete heiser: »Ja, aber umsonst. -- -- -- Verstehn Sie denn nicht, Tomasow: ich wollte wissen, wie Sie sich selbst insgeheim dazu stellen, -- wie Sie selbst -- eventuell -- in meiner Lage handeln würden. Aber Sie antworteten stets nur auf ganz bestimmte praktische Fragen, eingehend und gewissenhaft. Dabei erfuhr ich das mir Wesentliche nicht.«

Tomasow erhob sich. Er antwortete zurückhaltend: »Nein, natürlich nicht. Denn abgesehen von den möglichen praktischen Ueberlegungen, gibt es da eben keine letzte, objektiv gültige Entscheidung. Was ich thäte, wenn ich Töchter hätte, kann ich nicht so abstrakt von vornherein feststellen, vielleicht -- möglicherweise -- wäre meine Erziehung der Ihrigen sogar entgegengesetzt von allem Anfang an. Vielleicht wäre sie weltlich, oder philiströs, oder gleichviel wie! Ganz genau aber kann ich feststellen, was _Sie_ thun werden, -- Ihrem ganzen Sein und Wesen nach, und das hätt ich Ihnen längst sagen können, wenn Sie es hätten hören wollen. Und offenbar, wenn ich nicht völlig irre, kamen Sie jetzt auch nur dazu hierher: nicht um meine Meinung zu erfahren, sondern um -- nun, um eine letzte kleine Feigheit zu überwinden, die Sie bisher noch hinderte, sich selbst anzuhören.«

Marianne sprang nervös auf.

»Wie reden Sie denn nur! Sie quälen mich!« murmelte sie gereizt, die Stimme voll Thränen.

Seine Augen richteten sich mit einem eindringlich forschenden Blick auf sie.

»Ich weiß, daß ich das thue!« sagte er ernst. »Und ich weiß auch, daß Ihre Nerven grade heute um Schonung schreien. -- Und nun hören Sie mich an, Marianne, und zwar ganz getrost, denn ich kann Ihnen wirklich helfen, wenn Sie nur wollen. Ich schlage vor: überlassen Sie die ganze Sache mir. Ueberlassen Sie es mir, Sophie von ihren hochfliegenden Wünschen zu kurieren. So gänzlich zu kurieren, daß sie nie wieder Lust nach dem ärztlichen Studium und Beruf verspürt. Wollen Sie?«

Marianne sah ihm ungläubig in die Augen.

»Wie sollte das wohl möglich sein? Womit könnten selbst Sie das erreichen?«

»Das ist meine Sache. Für das Gelingen steh ich ein.«

Ein seliger Hoffnungsschimmer überflog ihr Gesicht, aber so zaghaft noch, daß es ihn rührte.

»Aber -- warum hätten Sie das dann nicht längst gethan?!«

»Warum? Nun offenbar darum, weil Sie ja für die Pläne und Interessen Ihrer Kinder nicht nur Nachsicht zeigen, sondern sie gradezu -- in Ihrer unnachahmlichen Art, Ma, -- heilig halten, ängstlich bemüht um die geistige Eigenart jedes einzelnen.«

Marianne sah sehr unruhig aus.

»Ja, das ist doch aber auch das einzig Richtige? -- Sie sprechen ja jetzt doch wohl nur davon, Sophie rechtzeitig in wirklich bestehende und unausweichliche Schattenseiten Ihres Berufes einzuweihen --?«

Tomasow schwieg einen Augenblick.

»Meine liebe Ma!« versetzte er dann. »Die Dinge sind nun einmal, als was sie uns erscheinen. Suggestion ist schließlich alles. Ich halte mich für sehr wohl im stande, stärkern Wesen als ein Mädelchen wie Sophie ihr Studium für alle Ewigkeit hinaus zu verekeln, unerträglich zu machen, -- und ebenso bürge ich dafür, daß ich ein viel zarteres kleines Menschenkind, als sie ist, mit etwas Kraftaufwand durch alle Schwierigkeiten und Fährlichkeiten derselben Sache mit Erfolg hindurchbringen würde.«

Marianne machte eine hilflose Bewegung. Sie suchte nach Worten, -- lehnte sich innerlich auf gegen die Worte, die ihr kamen, -- und endlich entschlüpfte es ihr leidenschaftlich: »-- Nein -- o nicht! Sophie nichts anthun! Nichts Hemmendes, nichts Arges --. Nichts gegen ihr Wachstum, nichts gegen ihre Kraft und Freudigkeit --,« sie unterbrach sich und hielt erschrocken inne.

»... nichts gegen ihren Wunsch, fortzugehn --?« ergänzte Tomasow.

»Also doch!« murmelte er, als sie darauf nichts antwortete.

Er nahm ihre Hand in die seine, küßte sie fast unwillkürlich und hielt sie fest, während er sich dicht über Marianne neigte: »Kind! Jetzt haben Sie sich richtig selbst in die Entscheidung hineingestoßen, -- jetzt besiegen Sie auch die Angst, die Sie haben, weiter zu sprechen. Sehen Sie nun ein, wie wenig es hilft, Ihnen helfen zu wollen? Sie laufen ja doch gradeswegs in das hinein, was Ihnen das Schwerste ist und Sie ängstigt. Und eben deshalb muß es entschieden sein! Dieser hingezogene Kampf ist ein Wahnsinn. Verwerfen Sie meinen Vorschlag von vorhin, so siegt Sophie. Soll sie das --? Soll sie gehn dürfen, oder soll sie bei Ihnen bleiben --?«

»-- Gehn!« sagte sie und brach in ein bitterliches Weinen aus.

Tomasow ließ sie mehrere Minuten gewähren.

Er atmete tief auf und ging einigemal im Zimmer auf und ab. Sein Gesicht behielt dabei den gespannten, aufmerksamen Ausdruck.

Dann kam er wieder zu Marianne. Er zog ihr leise, mit sanftem Zwange die Hand von den Augen, die sie verdeckt hielt.

»Nun ist es aber genug!« äußerte er lächelnd, »zeigen Sie Ihren Nerven den Herrn. -- Wollen Sie nicht eine Tasse Thee nehmen? Sehen Sie, dort steht das ganze Geschirr noch, -- ich war grade dabei, als Sie kamen. Zur Strafe trinken Sie ihn nun kalt, natürlich.«

Sie gehorchte mechanisch und ließ sich ein wenig Thee eingießen, in den Tomasow aus einem Arzneifläschchen ein paar Tropfen mengte.

Dann überließ er sie wieder sich selbst und nahm den Spaziergang im Zimmer von neuem auf.

Aber Marianne erhob sich vom Eisbärfell.

»Es ist spät geworden. Ich will nach Hause gehen,« sagte sie mit einer leisen Stimme, »die Kinder sind gewiß schon zurück und warten erstaunt. Sie waren nur für kurze Zeit mit Wera Petrowna ausgegangen.«

Tomasow blickte auf die Uhr.

»Wie Sie wollen, Ma. Vielleicht ist es so am besten. Indessen -- sind Sie jetzt auch schon dazu im stande? Sind Sie Ihrer selbst ganz sicher? Ich lasse Sie nicht fort, ehe ich das genau weiß.«

Und als Marianne ihn müde fragend ansah, fügte er hinzu: »Ihrer Töchter halber ist es notwendig, daß sie ihre Mutter in dieser Angelegenheit fest und sicher auftreten sehen. Als eine Autorität -- nicht wie ein hingeschlachtetes Opferlamm. -- Darum müssen Sie es sein, Marianne, die entschlossen die Initiative ergreift.«

»-- Ich soll selbst --?« murmelte Marianne.

»Ja. Das ist notwendig, und zwar sofort. Lassen Sie die Ungewißheit keine Stunde länger anstehen. Lassen Sie sich keinen Raum zu Beängstigungen und Traurigkeiten dazwischen. Bringen Sie noch heute -- heute noch! die Sache zur Sprache und Entscheidung.«

»-- Heute?!« wiederholte sie erschreckt.

Sie war tief erblaßt.

Tomasow ergriff ihre Hand und nahm sie in seine beiden Hände. Er sagte ermutigend: »Versuchen Sie es nur! Bleiben Sie nicht mitten im Kampf stecken, der Ihren Nerven stündlich härter zusetzen wird -- überstehen Sie es schnell ganz. Hinterher kommt die allheilende Ruhe. -- Glauben Sie, daß Sie es mir versprechen können?«

»Ja. Ich will es thun,« sagte sie traurig.

»Dann lasse ich Sie ruhigen Herzens fort. -- Wenn Sie erlauben, geleite ich Sie selbst an einen Schlitten,« bemerkte Tomasow und führte Marianne durch die Bibliothek hinaus.

Er schellte nicht dem Diener, sondern gab ihr selbst den Mantel um. Marianne that seine Art so wohl, wie einem leise umsorgten Kinde.

»Ich bin ganz zerschlagen und wund,« meinte sie mit einem mühsamen Lächeln, »aber ich danke Ihnen, Tomasow.«

»Ach, Ma --« er stockte und murmelte: »Wenn Sie nur -- wenn Sie wenigstens ohne Groll herdenken. Es ist eine schändliche Aufgabe, die mir wiederholt zufällt, Ihnen weh thun zu müssen, Sie zu etwas Hartem ermannen zu müssen. -- Die Erleichterung wird auch diesmal nachkommen, ich hoffe es mit Bestimmtheit. Aber die Ueberwindung ist deshalb nicht minder schwer.«

Marianne schwieg. Sie stand, fest an ihn gelehnt und schloß die Augen.

Nein, so feige würde sie doch nie sein, sich nicht immer diesem unbestechlichsten aller Freunde mit ihren Nöten und Schwächen anzuvertrauen, weil er streng gegen sie war! Ein großer Dank gegen ihn stieg in ihr auf. Wenn nur er ihr blieb --!

Tomasow verstand die stumme Antwort vollkommen.

Er öffnete die Thür und rief Andrian zu, einen Schlitten vor das Gitterthor zu winken.

Dann geleitete er Marianne durch den verschneiten Vorgarten, half ihr einsteigen und knüpfte ihr die Felldecke um die Kniee.

»Ich bin heute viel aus,« bemerkte er dabei, -- »darf ich gegen Abend für einen einzigen Augenblick bei Ihnen vorsprechen? Mich überzeugen, wie alles steht --?«

Marianne nickte. Sie wußte, wovon er sich überzeugen wollte --. Dann also mußte es schon geschehen sein --. Ihr schlug das Herz stärker bei dem Gedanken.

Als der Schlitten fortfuhr, ging Tomasow langsam ins Haus zurück.

Andrians Gesicht strahlte, er freute sich immer, wenn er Marianne sah, denn es kam vor, daß sie sich von ihm Geschichten aus dem Dorfleben erzählen ließ, und das war ihm das Höchste. So erfuhr sie manche Einzelheit aus Tomasows Kindheit, der als kleiner Bursche, zu Besuch beim Großvater, -- einem echten alten Bauern, -- mit Andrian noch barfuß umhergelaufen war.

»So ein Mütterchen, -- wirklich, so ein prächtiges!« entschied Andrian, und sah seinen Herrn lächelnd an, während er seine schwachen kurzsichtigen Augen zukniff, die der Schnee blendete. Ganz wie sein Herr trug er einen Kneifer, wenn auch keinen goldnen, und nur einen mit dunkelm Schutzglas. Er fühlte sich sehr stolz auf diesen Kneifer, und kam sich darin ganz wie ein Ausländer vor.

Tomasow würdigte Andrian keiner Antwort. Er ging schweigend in sein Zimmer hinüber und ließ den Thee forträumen.

Nachdenklich schritt er dabei auf und ab.

»So ein Mütterchen!« In seinen eignen Erinnerungen spielte Elterntreue eine große Rolle. Den Vater hatte er wenig gesehen: der hatte sich zum Kaufmann und Reeder heraufgearbeitet, ungeheuer erwerbstüchtig, ungeheuer strebsam, bewußt einseitig, ohne Zeit sich Bildung anzueignen: alles das für die Kinder. Die sollten dann alles haben: Bildung, Macht, Geld, Glück. Zwei Schwestern von Tomasow verheirateten sich früh und ansehnlich. Und er, als Student der Medizin, in jugendlichem Enthusiasmus fast in nihilistische Umtriebe verwickelt, voll drängender, unruhiger Energie, kam immer wieder ins Dorf zurück, zum Großvater. Wenn er den Alten vor sich sah, eisgrau, mit den klugen, beredten Augen unter den buschigen Brauen, dann erschien er ihm in seinem Schafspelz wie ein ganz Großer, wie ein Fürst oder Gewaltherr. Herr in seiner Hütte, auf seinem Felde, Ahnherr eines starken Geschlechts. Dies Dorfbild behielt für Tomasow eine sonderbare Poesie --.

Plötzlich blieb er mitten im Hin- und Herschreiten stehn. Er horchte. Drüben im Dienerzimmer unterhielt sich Andrian mit Batjuschka. Er pfiff ihm russische Weisen vor und erzählte --.

Tomasow beschlich ein leiser Neid. Wenn Andrian seinen Kneifer fallen ließ, so war er wieder der Bauer von einst, aller europäische Firniß fiel einfach von ihm ab. Wer das ebenso machen könnte, oder aber sich eine neue Welt bauen --. Ja, der wäre erst des »Mütterchens« wert --.

Er stand auf und horchte auf das Geplauder und Gezwitscher in der Dienerstube.

* * * * *

Ma erwartete zu Hause eine Ueberraschung.

Ihre beiden Mädchen waren soeben heimgekommen. Noch stand die Wohnungsthür weit offen, und ein Bauersmann mühte sich eben damit ab, einen hohen herrlichen Weihnachtsbaum in der Stube unterzubringen.

Sophie sah die Mutter glückstrahlend an. Es war doch eine gute Idee, das mit dem Baum! Es war _ihre_ Idee. Ma hatte ihn sich doch so sehr gewünscht, und wenn sie ihr auch erst gestern abend etwas weit Großartigeres darbringen wollte, so erleichterte sie dies doch für den Augenblick.

Cita stand noch in Mütze und Pelzjacke und lohnte den Mann ab; mitten im Wohnzimmer erhob sich jetzt die Tanne und duftete wirklich wie ein ganzer Wald. Oben stieß sie sogar ein wenig an die geweißte Decke an, sodaß sie ihre höchste Spitze krümmen mußte, von der Seite jedoch breitete sie ihre Aeste ebenmäßig und tiefgrün, wie ein schirmendes Dach, über Mas Schreibtisch aus.

Sophie hatte sich an das geöffnete Pianino gestellt, das der Baum von der andern Seite überschattete, und unter seine Zweige gebückt, suchte sie ein paar Accorde eines alten Weihnachtsliedes.

Die Mutter äußerte nichts, bis der Mann hinausgegangen war. Sie sah blaß aus, und ihre Augen besaßen etwas so Stilles, so nach innen Gekehrtes im Blick.

Endlich sagte sie mit ihrer warmen Stimme: »Dank euch! Ja, dies Weihnachtsfest soll uns schön werden, wie nie eins gewesen ist! Wir wollen froh sein, wir drei zusammen! Denn es wird hier am Ort unser letztes sein. Uebers Jahr feiert auch Sophie es nicht mehr hier. -- Ich dank euch, ihr Kinder.«

Sophie, die eine leise Melodie angeschlagen hatte, brach mit einem gräßlichen Mißton ab.

Cita, eben im Begriff, ihre Sachen abzulegen, hielt erwartungsvoll inne und blickte die Mutter an.

Da ging Marianne zu ihrer Jüngsten hin und nahm sie in die Arme.

»Aber nicht getrennt!« sagte sie bewegt, »-- ich werde mein Weihnachtsfest da haben, wo du grade studieren wirst.«

»-- Ach -- Ma!« schrie Sophie auf.

Sie glaubte es noch nicht recht. Mit dunkel gerötetem Gesicht schaute sie angstvoll und zugleich strahlend zur Mutter auf und umklammerte ihren Hals.

»-- Ach, Ma --! Ist es denn wirklich wahr --?«

Dieser Augenblick that Marianne doch bitterer weh, als sie jetzt eben beim Heimkehren geglaubt hatte. Sie drückte Sophiens leuchtendes Gesicht an sich, um nicht den Ausdruck der Freude darin zu sehen.

»Ja, es ist wahr, Herzenskind. Alles Nähere besprechen wir noch ein anderes Mal. Auch mit Cita muß ich noch vieles besprechen. So ganz einfach ist es nicht. -- Aber die Sache selbst ist entschieden. Nun sollst also auch du hinaus, -- gebe Gott, einst zu deinem und deiner Mitmenschen Segen.«

Sophie drückte sich fester an sie.

Sie schämte sich schrecklich vor Cita, aber sie weinte dennoch Ströme von Thränen in Mas Hals hinein, als ob sie nichts in der Welt je von da fortreißen sollte --.

Cita stand mit großen ernsten Augen beiseite. Das Wort, das ihr innerlich kam, lautete ganz spontan: »Donnerwetter!« Aber glücklicherweise behielt sie es bei sich.

Ein tiefer Respekt prägte sich auf ihrem jungen Gesicht aus.

Plötzlich kam sie auf die Mutter zu, ergriff deren Hand und küßte sie.

»Du bist wahrhaftig der famoseste Kerl unter der Sonne, du herrliche Ma!« versicherte sie ganz begeistert.

Marianne lächelte nicht über diese Ehrfurchtsbezeugung; sie überlegte auch nicht, ob sie nun nicht gradezu glänzend ihre Autorität behauptet und die Initiative ergriffen habe.

Sie hielt ihr weinendes Kind im Arm und bückte ihr Gesicht tief zu ihm herab, als lausche sie fast gierig diesen Thränen, -- als redeten diese Thränen artikuliert zu ihr -- Süßes, Versöhnendes, Beschwichtigendes --.

Dann trocknete sie Sophie, wie einem kleinen Kinde, das nasse Gesicht mit ihrem eignen Taschentuch ab.

»Komm,« sagte sie sanft, »es ist doch ein großer Entschluß und daher ein großer Tag für dich. Geh hinaus und bring uns eine Flasche Wein. Wir wollen auf dein Wohl anstoßen.«

Sophie ging, der Mutter Taschentuch vor die Augen gepreßt, langsam, als sei dieser Tag mehr ein schwerer als ein großer für sie.

Cita sah ihr unwillig nach.

Sie bemerkte zur Mutter: »Sophie ist doch noch sehr ein Kind. Hiernach muß doch nun ein jeder denken, es ginge zur Schlachtbank. Aber du kannst mir glauben, daß sie darauf brennt, zu studieren. Man muß nur erst in ihr alles das klären und ordnen.«

Marianne schwieg einen Augenblick.

»-- Bist du es, die diesen Entschluß in ihr zu klären versucht hat?« fragte sie dann ruhig.

Cita begegnete ihrem Blick fest und offen.

»Ja, Ma. Sobald mir das selbst klar geworden war. Sie konnte nur nicht den Mut finden, dich zu fragen --. Sieh, ich stehe ja so dazu: es ist etwas, wofür ich jederzeit kämpfe und eintrete, -- wie denn also nicht, wo es die eigne Schwester gilt? Nur mit einem Unterschiede freilich: daß ich in diesem Fall nicht nur für die allgemeine Sache einstehe, sondern auch mit jedem Blutstropfen für Sophie selbst. Daß ich mich ihrem Leben verbinde, ihr helfen, zu ihr halten will jederzeit, -- was auch geschehe.«

Marianne zauderte nur noch einen letzten Augenblick. Dann reichte sie ihrer Aeltesten schweigend die Hand.

Sie schauten einander dabei voll in die Augen, wie zwei Freunde, die, wenn sie auch nicht auf ganz gleichem Boden kämpfen, es doch in gleichem Sinn und für dasselbe höchste Ziel thun.

»Ich stelle Sophie in deine Obhut, -- ich baue auf deine Treue: Höheres hab ich dir nicht anzuvertrauen,« sprach Marianne leise; »-- Sophie war ›sein‹ Liebling -- und ›seinen‹ Blick hat Sophie. Mir ist, als ginge noch einmal ›er‹ von mir hinweg, indem sie geht --.«

Cita war sehr blaß.

Ihre Schwester kam mit Rheinwein und Gläsern zurück, entkorkte die Flasche und goß ein.

Keiner von den dreien sprach ein Wort, als Marianne ihr Glas erhob und mit ihnen anstieß.

Sie küßte ihre blonde Tochter, ihr zarteres Herzenskind, doch that sie es heiter und herzhaft, um keinesfalls mehr Thränen aufkommen zu lassen.

Cita unterstützte sie in dieser Absicht nach Möglichkeit, denn es verletzte sie fast, daß Sophie heute weinen konnte.

»Eigentlich ist das ja ein Weihnachtsgeschenk, das allergrößte, und gleich unter den noch ungeschmückten Baum gelegt!« sagte sie scherzend, »-- wie kann man nur seine Gaben so vorweg verschwenden, Ma! Jetzt sollte ich von Rechts wegen alle übrigen Geschenke bekommen, denn Sophie hat nun an diesem einen vollauf genug.«

»Bis zum Weihnachtsabend hab ich vielleicht noch ein andres Geschenk für euch, -- und dann für euch beide!« erwiderte Marianne mit leisem Lächeln, und man hörte ihr an, daß sie von einer noch zaghaften, aber goldnen Hoffnung sprach.

»Noch ein andres? Noch ein schöneres? Nein, denn das gibt es ja gar nicht mehr auf der Welt. Nicht wahr, Sophie?«

Sophie schüttelte energisch den Kopf, ihre geröteten Augen strahlten jetzt doch.

»Also dies einzig ist das Schönste für sie, Besseres gibt es nicht!« dachte Marianne still, einen Augenblick lang weh berührt, doch an der verschwiegnen Hoffnung, die sie hegte, hob sich ihr Mut wieder. Diese Stunde sollte eine freudige sein, und sie wurde es. So vieles drängte sich zur Aussprache, den beiden Mädchen wurde es in diesen Minuten erst bewußt, daß sie in mancherlei Heimlichkeiten gelebt hätten die Zeit über, -- und daß es köstlich sei und an sich schon ein Fest, keinerlei Heimlichkeiten mehr zu kennen, Mas Blick und Lächeln gegenüber.

Und allgemach lenkte Marianne das Gespräch in immer ruhigere Bahnen. Sie saßen eng zusammengerückt bei der halbgeleerten Flasche, und während sie die praktische Seite der Frage näher erörterten, scherzten sie schon wieder.

Endlich stand Marianne auf. Es war fast halb sechs geworden.

»Jetzt möchte ich hineingehn und ein wenig ruhen, ihr beiden Taugenichtse. Diese Nacht war nicht gut für mich. Und morgen ist kein Sonntag mehr --. Aber von da an nehmen die Stunden endlich reißend ab. -- Bis wir um halb sieben essen, bin ich wieder da. Sollte nun noch inzwischen ein Sonntagsgast kommen, so bestrickt ihn mit so viel Liebenswürdigkeit, als ihr wollt, mich jedoch soll er auf alle Fälle in Frieden lassen.«

An der Thür wendete sie sich noch einmal nach den Mädchen um und nickte ihnen zu. Sie sah ihre leuchtenden zutraulichen Augen, und ein warmes Dankgefühl kam über sie, als fiele langsam von ihren Schultern eine Last, unter der gebückt sie gegangen war: -- wieder lagen jetzt die Herzen ihrer Kinder offen und ihr zu eigen vor ihr da, wie ihre blühenden Gärten. --

Nur ein Sonntagsgast schellte ein wenig später. Es war Tomasow.

Marianne hatte gewußt, daß er noch kurz vorsprechen wollte, indessen hatte sie selbst ihn in diesen Stunden vollständig vergessen.

Die beiden Mädchen erzählten ihm wörtlich den Auftrag der Mutter, falls jemand zu Besuch käme. Er mußte lachen --, nun wußte er genug.

Was etwa noch fehlte, ergänzte ihm ein einziger Blick auf die Schwestern. Sophies Gesicht war noch voll roter Thränenspuren. Cita war blaß und die dunkeln Augen brannten ihr.

»Nun, das hier scheint mir ja schon mehr ein Bacchanal gewesen zu sein!« bemerkte Tomasow, als er ins Wohnzimmer kam, wo noch die leeren Gläser standen.

Sophie fuhr es heraus: »Ja --! Denn ich soll nun Cita ins Ausland folgen und von Ostern ab Medizin studieren!«

Sie kam aus der Küche, die weiße Schürze schief umgebunden; heute konnte man wohl einige Bedenken wegen ihrer Beaufsichtigung des Mittagmahles hegen.

Tomasow sprach das nicht aus; er sagte nur: »-- So, so. -- Nun, und Ma, -- was sagt denn die dazu?«

»Ma ist es ja grade, die es selbst vorgeschlagen hat,« erklärte Cita.

»So. -- Nun, und wo wird denn Sophie diese große That thun?«

Sophie rief: »Aber natürlich in Berlin!«

»Natürlich da, wo ich mit ihr zusammen sein kann,« meinte Cita.

»Nein, Cita, das kannst du so doch nicht sagen. Deshalb allein doch wohl nicht,« verbesserte Sophie einschränkend.

Tomasow hatte sich im Schaukelstuhl niedergelassen.

Er nahm seinen Kneifer aus der Seitentasche, rieb ihn mit einer Ecke des bastseidenen Taschentuches klar und setzte ihn auf seine etwas stumpfe Nase. Dann blickte er den beiden sichtlich noch ganz aufgeregten Mädchen nacheinander prüfend ins Gesicht.

»Eine kleinere Universitätsstadt, -- eine solche natürlich mit gut bestellter medizinischer Fakultät, -- wäre für den Beginn ebenfalls nicht übel!« bemerkte er langsam.

»Ach nein!« rief Sophie unwillig und ergriff ihn am Aermel, »-- daß Sie sich nicht etwa unterstehn, Doktor Tomasow, unsrer Ma dergleichen einzublasen!«

»Aber Sophie, du benimmst dich rein wie ein Kind!« tadelte Cita, von der zwanglosen Intimität dieser Worte unangenehm berührt.

»Mir scheint hiernach aber doch,« nahm Tomasow sehr gelassen das Wort, »daß Sophie nur mit löblicher Offenherzigkeit ihres Herzens Meinung, -- und auch Ihres Herzens Meinung, Cita! -- kundgibt. Mir scheint, daß bei Ihnen die Wahl des Ortes fast eine ebenso wichtige Rolle spielt wie die soeben erst eingeholte Erlaubnis zum Studium selbst, -- hab ich nicht recht?«

Sophie errötete und wollte widersprechen. Aber Cita setzte sich Tomasow gegenüber seitwärts auf einen Stuhl, schlang den Arm um die Lehne und bemerkte eifrig: »So kindisch ist es nicht zu nehmen, wie es bei Sophie leicht aussieht. Allerdings freut sie sich darauf, -- und ich für sie! -- daß sie auch außerhalb des Studiums am Leben teilnehmen wird. Aber selbstverständlich nicht etwa an seichten Vergnügungen! Nicht um irgend welcher Genüsse willen, die eine große Stadt naturgemäß reicher bietet, --.« Citas Lippen kräuselten sich bei dieser Erwähnung fast so verächtlich, wie die einer jungen Nonne, die im Kloster vom Weltverzicht spricht.

Im »Spalt« nebenan, wohin Sophie eben verschwunden war, um einiges Geschirr für die Küche zurechtzustellen, hörte man es beängstigend laut klirren.

»-- Sondern --?« forderte Tomasow Cita zum Weitersprechen auf. Der Kneifer saß ihm noch immer auf der Nase. Eigentlich hatte sie wenig Lust, weiterzusprechen. Sie fand ihn heute ganz merkwürdig arrogant aussehend.

»-- Sondern um teilzunehmen am Leben der heutigen strebenden Frauenwelt, -- an dieser ganzen Bewegung,« sagte sie dennoch. »Sophie wird sich bald, so wie ich es thue, innerlich eins damit fühlen, daran emporwachsen --«

»-- Jedenfalls hat es etwas Begeisterndes!« fiel Sophie ein, die es doch nicht aushielt, im Hintergrunde zu bleiben. Sie hatte das Geschirr niedergesetzt und trat wieder zu ihnen. Sie fand, daß man ganz über sie hinwegspräche, während es sich doch ausschließlich um ihre eigenste Angelegenheit handelte. Auch sie wollte sich Luft machen und mit ihrer Ueberzeugung herausrücken.

So fuhr sie lebhaft fort: »Es ist doch etwas ganz andres, ob man so vor sich hin studiert und nur ganz egoistisch an die eigne Zukunft denkt, -- oder ob man mit allen zusammen diesen neuen großen Zielen entgegengeht. -- -- Es hat etwas Begeisterndes!« wiederholte sie mit einer inbrünstigen Betonung, die darüber hinweghelfen sollte, daß ihr gar nichts weiter einfiel.

Sie stand neben Tomasows Stuhl, sodaß er zu ihr hinaufsehen mußte. Wie sie diese Worte mit so viel Wärme sprach und dabei so zart und lieblich dastand, flog ein Ausdruck durch seine Augen, der Cita frappierte, obwohl sie ihn nicht verstand. Arrogant nahm er sich jedenfalls nicht mehr aus.

Tomasow nickte vor sich hin und bemerkte, indem er den Kneifer fallen ließ: »Ja ja, es ist schon so. Studieren oder nicht, -- das ist gar nicht mehr allein die Frage. Sondern damit bildet sich zugleich ein neuer Typus der Frauen heraus, -- ja, gewissermaßen ein neuer Typus, man muß es wohl so nennen. Damit, daß eine studiert hat, ist es nicht mehr abgethan.«

»Sehr richtig! Man muß das nur erst allerseits einsehen lernen!« bestätigte Cita billigend, während ihre Schwester mit einem unterdrückten Seufzer in die Küche abging, obwohl sie sich weit lieber an dieser interessanten Diskussion beteiligt hätte.

»Sind Sie nun eigentlich für oder gegen den neuen Typus -- so im Grunde Ihrer Seele, Doktor Tomasow? Farbe bekennen!« fügte Cita lächelnd hinzu.

Jetzt waren seine Augen wieder voller Spott.

Er verneigte sich, das Lächeln zurückgebend, ironisch vor dem jungen Mädchen.

»Werde die Ehre haben, mich zu entscheiden, sobald Sie mir das erste vollzählige Regiment neuer Musterexemplare vorführen! -- -- Einstweilen, -- Sie wissen: wer neue Wege sucht, muß sich drauf gefaßt machen, unter Umständen mit zerfetzten Kleidern und einigen dicken Beulen und Schrammen aus dem Dickicht wieder aufzutauchen, -- -- was einem Frauengesicht --«

»-- Davor fürchten wir uns nicht, Doktor Tomasow!« unterbrach ihn Cita etwas scharf, einen feinen Hochmut um die Lippen.

»Nein, -- wie ich sehe!« versetzte er, und wieder glitt der Ausdruck von vorhin durch seine Augen, »-- auch befürchte ich selbst für euch beide jetzt noch kaum sehr viel. Nein, für euch beide minder als für manche andre. Denn möglicherweise seid ihr bis zu gewissem Grade -- gefeit. -- Obschon keinesfalls durch euer eignes Verdienst,« fügte Tomasow hinzu, indem er sich aus dem Schaukelstuhl erhob. »Ich muß nun gehn. Meinen Gruß eurer Mutter und der kleinen zukünftigen Kollegin.«

»Gefeit, und nicht durch eignes Verdienst?!« wiederholte Cita erstaunt und entrüstet. Auch sie stand auf und trat mit ihm hinaus auf den Vorflur; »-- das wäre wirklich das Aeußerste. Wenn wir einmal durch eigne Kraft etwas Tüchtiges geworden sind, werden Sie uns auch noch das Verdienst daran abstreiten --! Ich möchte wissen, wer dies Verdienst -- --«

Sie vollendete nicht, weil sich grade die Thür zu Mariannens Schlafzimmer öffnete, und diese in den Gang hinaustrat, wo ihr Sophie von der Küche her entgegenlief.

»Das Essen ist gleich fertig!« rief Sophie erhitzt.

Marianne kam auf den Gast zu.

Tomasow, der schon im Pelz, zum Fortgehn bereit, dastand, blickte Cita schweigend an.

Und plötzlich verstand sie, was er meinte, -- wen er meinte --. Ihre Entrüstung hielt nicht stand, fast gegen ihren Willen kam Demut in ihre Augen, als sie dem Ehrfurchtheischenden in seinen Augen begegnete. Denn dieser Blick hatte fast etwas Gebieterisches, etwas, was sich ihr eindrücken, einprägen wollte, wie eine Stimme, die deutlich sprach: »Ihr seid die Kleinen, die eine Große großmütig auf ihre Schultern hebt. Eine, die ihre Schultern beugt, damit sie euch tragen kann. Ich weiß das: ich habe geholfen, euch da hinaufzuheben. Nun seht ihr euch die Welt von da oben an!«

»Was, Sie wollen schon gehn?!« fragte Marianne und gab ihm die Hand.

»Ja, ich muß gehn. Und Sie, lassen Sie gefälligst die Suppe auf dem Tisch nicht kalt werden, -- nach meiner Berechnung hat sie heute dem jüngsten Fräulein Tochter arge Mühe gekostet. -- -- Froh bin ich, Sie noch zu sehen. Sie sind aber auch eine entsetzliche Langschläferin, meine Gnädige.«

»Ja, ich habe wirklich geschlafen!« sagte Marianne.

Sie stand lächelnd, mit schlafroten Wangen, wie ein eben aufgewachtes Kind, und mit blinzelnden Augen da, denen das Lampenlicht noch weh that.

An jeder Seite hing ihr jetzt eine Tochter. Sophie hatte ihr einen Arm um die Hüfte geschlungen und sich an sie geschmiegt, sodaß sie nicht vorwärts gehn konnte. Cita schob ihre Hand leise in den Arm der Mutter.

Marianne stand da und strahlte in einer so warmen und innigen Schönheit, daß Tomasow ganz betroffen davon war.

»-- Sie ist ja doch die tausendmal Jüngste von allen dreien, -- die tausendmal Anfänglichere --; sie ist wie das Leben an der Wurzel selbst und am unversieglichen Anfang --!« dachte er wie berauscht, als er die Treppe hinabstieg.

Ganz langsam trat er den Heimweg an.

Ein eigenartiges Triumphgefühl mischte sich in sein Entzücken über Marianne, -- eine feine Sensation, wie sie ihm nur durch ihr Wesen vermittelt wurde. Das kam von dem ausschlaggebenden Anteil, den seine Bestimmungen an allen ihren wichtigen Entschlüssen zu haben pflegten. Was sie so schön und sieghaft aussehen ließ, führte stets irgendwo auf einen Einfluß, ein Zureden, einen Rat von ihm zurück: und bei ihrer ganzen Art, so tief und inbrünstig zu leben, lag in dieser Mitarbeit daran etwas, was seinen Ehrgeiz wunderlich erregte.

Mochte er auch in seinem persönlichen Dasein enttäuscht oder gleichgültig geworden sein in hundert Punkten, -- in diesem einen Punkt fühlte er um viele Jahre jünger, in diesem einen Punkt bekam seine Energie wertvollen Spielraum und großen Stil.

Als sich Tomasow schon seinem Hause näherte, blieb er zögernd stehn. Er bog in eine hügelige Seitenstraße und schritt sie langsam hinauf, bis ihm die kleinen erhellten Fenster des Stifts für unbemittelte Frauen entgegenblinkten.

An den Zaun gelehnt, schaute er nach dem Erdgeschoß hinüber, dann trat er an das Mittelgebäude heran und klopfte mit seinem Stock leicht an das Fenster von Wera Petrownas Stube, wo kein Licht brannte.

Das Klopfen wurde sofort von innen erwidert, und als er dann durch den Hausflur ging, wurde auch schon die Zimmerthür geöffnet.

Wera Petrowna war eifrig damit beschäftigt, die Lampe anzuzünden, sie sagte vor aller Begrüßung, indem sie eilig ein Streichholz anstrich, abwehrend: »-- Ja, ich weiß, -- ich weiß schon: ich soll nicht abends im Dunkeln dasitzen, um den Tropfen Petroleum zu sparen, und vorzeitig einzunicken auf dem alten Sofa, und dann nachts nicht zu schlafen --. -- -- Aber ich bin wirklich eben erst nach Hause gekommen, -- und, der Abwechslung halber, -- -- es denkt sich so gut im Dunkeln.«

Sie setzte die Glaskuppel auf die Lampe, deren schwerer Fuß und vorzügliches Brennwerk aus bessern Zeiten stammten, und schob sie in die Mitte des Tisches vor das geblümte Sofa.

»Unverbesserlich!« bemerkte Tomasow.

»Herrlich, daß Sie mal kommen! Seit einer Woche freu ich mich schon von Tag zu Tag, --« lenkte sie ab und ging geschäftig zu der Kommode, wo das Schachbrett nebst Figurenkasten immer bereit stand.

Sie griff nach dem Brett und schaute Tomasow fragend und bittend an.

»-- Sie mögen doch --?«

Er nahm ihr Brett und Kasten ab, trug beides auf den Tisch und rückte einen Stuhl heran.

Aber anstatt die Figuren aufzustellen, setzte er sich nur hin, stützte den Kopf in die Hand und blickte zerstreut in das geöffnete Kästchen, als müsse er raten, was darin sei.

Wera Petrowna hatte sich ihm gegenüber auf das Sofa niedergelassen und sah erwartungsvoll zu. Als nichts weiter kam, schüttelte sie den Kopf.

»Schlechter Laune!« konstatierte sie erbarmungslos.

Dabei schob sie ihm aufmunternd die Zigarettenschachtel hin. Die Zigaretten ihres Neffen waren gar nicht zu verachten.

»Von wo kommen Sie denn? Hat vielleicht irgend ein Patient Ihnen den Kopf beschwert?«

»Nein. Ich komme jetzt eben von Frau Marianne.«

»Ach so -- --, am Ende -- -- selbst Patient --?«

Tomasow schaute zu ihr hinüber und runzelte merklich die Stirn.

Die Alte setzte ihr allerharmlosestes Gesicht auf.

»Nun, nichts für ungut. Mit bejahrten schwatzhaften Personen muß man Nachsicht üben, lieber Tomasow. -- -- Und wir Frauen sind nun mal so veranlagt, daß es uns immer nur von der Liebe zu singen und zu sagen drängt.«

Er mußte unwillkürlich lächeln, Wera Petrownas Worte und ihr Aeußeres bildeten einen zu heitern Kontrast. Mit ihrem alten energischen Gesicht und im fadenscheinigen weiten schwarzen Gewande, -- dem ziemlich traurigen Produkt eigner Schneiderkunst, -- in dem sie zu Hause umherging wie in einem Talar, sah sie einem herabgekommenen russischen Popen um vieles ähnlicher als einer Frau.

Vorhin, in der Eile, von seinem Besuch überrascht, hatte sie vergessen, ihre Alltagshaube aufzustülpen; der Ofenhitze wegen, die nichts zu wünschen übrig ließ, bedeckte sie ihr dünnes Haar am liebsten gar nicht, das, wie unter einem durchsichtigen Schleier, überall schon die Kopfhaut hell durchscheinen ließ und ihr jetzt hinten in traurigen kleinen Strähnen lose in den starken Nacken hing.

»Warum haben Sie eigentlich nicht geheiratet?« fragte Wera Petrowna plötzlich. Sie war aufgestanden, langte sich mit ausgestrecktem Arm ihre alte Tüllhaube von einem Nebentisch und that sie auf ihren Kopf wie eine Krone; »-- schon längst hätten Sie das vollbringen können, -- selbst im Auslande --«

»Einer Ausländerin würde es hier nicht behagt haben,« bemerkte Tomasow, eine Zigarette anzündend.

»Aha, -- also gegeben hat es dort doch eine!« bemerkte sie mit weiblicher Logik und ließ sich auf ihren vorigen Platz nieder, -- »nun, und hier --? -- Auch hier wüßte ich mehr als ein Genre, das ganz gut für Sie gepaßt hätte.«

Wera Petrowna musterte dabei ihr Gegenüber mit hellen, etwas ironischen Augen sorgfältig prüfend, während sie den Rauch ihrer Zigarette in langen Ringeln von sich stieß. »-- Ein Mann wie Sie --? Was wird denn den am heftigsten angezogen haben --,« sagte sie nachdenklich; »-- nichts Naives natürlich, -- etwas Pikantes. Möglicherweise irgend ein Typus der Frauen mit den Verführungskünsten --, die Frau als die große Verführerin und Lehrmeisterin auf schweres Lehrgeld, -- möglicherweise überhaupt ein Leben, das mehr verführt als befriedigt -- --. Wenn ich Sie mir so anschaue --«

»Ach, lieber Himmel, vor hundert Jahren vielleicht?« unterbrach er sie halb ärgerlich, halb belustigt.

Wera Petrowna griff resolut in das Kästchen und begann an Tomasows Statt, die Figuren auf dem Brett aufzustellen.

»Nun ja, das ist wahr: jetzt sind Sie bequem geworden,« gab sie zu, »-- und ich will auch nichts Indiskretes ausplaudern über das, was mir allerlei kleine Fältchen um Ihren Mund da und um Ihre Augen bereitwillig zu verstehn geben. -- -- Aber: nun zum Beispiel eine Ehe mit einer Mustergattin, -- dafür ist mitunter grade das russische Mädchen ein Prachtexemplar: liebevoll, heiter, nachgiebig, voll Tüchtigkeit und Tapferkeit --«

Tomasow nickte anerkennend.

»Schätze ich auch ungemein,« bestätigte er kurz.

»Und man sollte doch meinen, jemand wie Sie, der ganz gern herrscht, der müßte doch auch gern endlich sein eignes Haus um sich bauen, -- sein Leben breit ausbauen mit so einer russischen Frau -- von jener Sorte, der noch der Mann das Schicksal ist, das sie liebt, und dem sie gehorcht --«

»Ein schönes Glück!« bemerkte Tomasow spöttisch, »sein eignes Leben mit allen Unzulänglichkeiten und Defekten so festgenagelt zu sehen rund um sich, -- ein Wesen darin mit einer Miene umhergehn zu sehen, als sei das nun wirklich das Paradies --. Nein, für den Reiz danke ich. Ich danke für die kleine Art der Männertyrannei. Leicht genug zu herrschen, wo nichts zu beherrschen ist. Wozu?«

»Sieh da! Sie können sich sogar selbst verspotten,« entgegnete die Alte beifällig. »Das wirft mir ein ganz neues Licht auf Sie. Da begreif ich zum Beispiel schon besser, daß Sie mal, in Ihrer Jugend Blüte, für eins von den kleinen heldenmütigen Mädchen geschwärmt haben, die hier und da aus lauter edelm Fanatismus in unsre entlegensten und verarmtesten Provinzen als Lehrerinnen abgehn. Wie sah die aus? Mager, sehr mager, blaß, mit großen enthusiastischen Augen --? -- -- Aber geheiratet haben Sie das kleine Mädchen doch nicht --.«

»Möchten Sie nicht vielleicht Ihre diesbezüglichen Meinungen lieber für sich behalten?« meinte Tomasow grob, aber er lächelte.

»Wenn es Ihnen besser behagt, -- warum denn nicht?« sagte die Alte seelenruhig, »-- ich spiele ja viel lieber Schach. -- -- Aber das reine Wohlwollen treibt mich -- --, -- es ist wirklich merkwürdig, wie reichhaltig Sie sind, ich kann mir so ganz verschiedenartige Frauen recht gut neben Ihnen vorstellen --. Ist das nun Reichtum, oder -- oder ist irgend etwas nicht recht zum einheitlichen Ende gekommen --? -- -- Also spielen wir?«

Sie fingen endlich damit an, wie jedesmal, wenn Tomasow herkam. Erst mußte die Redelust der Alten ein wenig ausschäumen.

Wera Petrowna blieb indessen zerstreut. Sie machte Fehler auf Fehler. Zuletzt lachte sie kurz auf, sodaß sich die Oberlippe von den Vorderzähnen fast höhnisch hob, und äußerte ohne rechten Grund: »Die Zeiten ändern sich. Der Heldenmut auch. Jetzt ziehen es die kleinen Mädchen manchmal vor, ihre Mutter zu verlassen, um irgendwo in allem Behagen und mit viel männlichem Selbstbewußtsein zu studieren. So wie Marianne ihre -- --. Ein Glück noch, daß Sophie --«

»-- Sophie geht ebenfalls. Um Ostern. Heute hat Frau Marianne eingewilligt,« sagte Tomasow.

Wera Petrowna starrte ihn erst ungläubig an. Wie mit einem Schlage verschwand aus ihren Zügen alles Ironische und der spielende Spott und das versteckte Lachen. Schrecken und ein fast ehrfürchtiges Erstaunen stritten in ihrem lebhaften alten Gesicht um die Herrschaft.

Sie schlug laut die Hände ineinander.

»O du grundgütiges Seelentäubchen, meine einzige Marinka --! Was das sie kostet --! Und das sagen Sie mir erst jetzt, Sie Eisbär, Sie Feuerländer, Sie -- Sie -- --. Was das sie kostet --!« Sie hielt inne und starrte ihn wieder an. Man konnte deutlich sehen, wie angestrengt und durchdringend hinter ihrer Stirn und ihrem sich sammelnden Blick hundert Gedanken auftauchten. »Die Kinder fort!« sagte sie langsam, »-- beide Kinder, -- das ist ein ganz neues Leben, ein ganz zerbrochenes Weitervegetieren für sie oder -- --. Es ist eine vollkommne Einsamkeit, Vereinsamung, -- oder -- --? -- Marianne ist noch jung, -- sie ist noch immer jung --«

Tomasow, der unwillkürlich niedergeblickt und mechanisch mit dem Deckel der Zigarettenschachtel gespielt hatte, hob den Blick.

Eine kurze Pause lang schauten sie einander schweigend in die Augen, einer des andern Gedanken enträtselnd --.

Wera Petrowna rief plötzlich in fast klagendem Ton: »-- Ach Tomasow, wer verdient denn das aber, so viel Glück, wie diese Frau noch geben könnte, -- was für ein Mannsbild verdient denn das --?«

Er wollte etwas erwidern, aber sie unterbrach ihn gereizt: »Nein, schweigen Sie nur! Es ist schon so, -- ich weiß, ich weiß!« beharrte sie fast giftig.

Und plötzlich stand sie auf und fuhr mit der Hand durch die Figuren, daß sie alle umfielen.

»Es muß schon so sein! Die Jugend muß wohl immer erst heraus aus einem Menschen, -- da hilft nichts!« murmelte sie ergrimmt, und sie fing an, an ihrem Stock auf und ab zu gehn. Das Sitzen hielt sie nicht mehr aus.

Tomasow schob das Brett zurück und rauchte schweigend. Gegen die Sonderbarkeiten der Alten war er nachsichtig. Und viel lieber, als zu spielen, hing er jetzt seinen Gedanken nach.

Da hörte er sie sagen, ganz in Zorn: »-- Ist es nicht wie eine Löwengrube, -- so ein Menschenleben --? Man muß doch immer wieder hinein, -- immer wieder hinein --. Und was hat diese Frau nicht angesammelt in all den langen Jahren, -- all die unausgegebene Fülle -- --. Es ist sogar einerlei im Grunde: ob sie noch einmal neu anfängt mit dem Leben, oder ob sie einsam bleibt, -- diese ganze Fülle, die ganze Inbrunst reißt sie ja doch notwendig in die tausend Lebenskämpfe, wie unter brüllende Tiere --«

Nach einer Weile fuhr sie grollend fort: -- »Da ist nun Sophie, -- nun viel ist sie noch gar nicht, -- aber was bedeutet so ein Mensch mitunter nicht alles für seinen Mitmenschen! Daß sie bei ihr war, glich für Marianne alles aus, -- sänftigte das ganze Leben --. Manchmal genügt so wenig, -- so ein bißchen Menschennähe, um gar nicht zu merken, wie viel man noch in sich herumträgt, -- wie vieles man noch unter Schmerzen entladen soll. -- Erst wenn diese sänftigende Schutzdecke davon abgerissen wird, -- plötzlich steht man da wieder hart am Rande, -- ganz hart am Absturz -- mitten in alle Untiefen von neuem hinein -- unerbittlich hinein!« Wera Petrowna holte sich in ihrer Erregung die Haube vom Kopf herunter und lief fast auf und ab. »Gott meint es erst gut mit denen, die es hinter sich haben, -- hinter sich. -- -- Arme Marinka!«

Tomasow saß zurückgelehnt, mit dem Rücken nach ihr. Er vernahm wohl ihre Worte, aber gleichzeitig umfingen ihn andre, weit weniger düstere Bilder --. Und auch sie scharten sich um dieselbe Erwägung, wie um ein Leitmotiv dazu: »-- Marianne ist noch immer jung --«

Die Alte hinter ihm im Zimmer war still geworden. Auch ihr Stock berührte nicht mehr, im Takt aufschlagend, den Fußboden.

Tomasow empfand spontan, wie starkes Erleben und Erkennen hinter ihrer gewohnten Alltagsironie stehn, -- wie tief sie selbst in die Löwengrube hinabgestiegen sein mochte, -- und daß sie von dort herausgekommen war mit einem Herzen, das ganz wund war von zartem Mitleid und verstehender Furcht für andre --.

Er wandte sich zu ihr um. Sie saß im Stuhl am Fenster. Die Haube hielt sie noch wie einen wunderlichen dunkeln Knäuel in der Hand.

Und sonderbar hob sich dieser nackte Kopf von der hellen unfeinen Tapete des Zimmers ab, -- wie durchaus nicht hergehörig in diese banale Stube, -- wie nicht einem Mann und nicht einer Frau zugehörig, -- vielmehr einem geheimnisvollen Wesen oder

Unwesen, das nun dasitzt in den Wohnungen der Menschen, um dunkle Dinge zu weissagen --.

Ganz unbeweglich saß sie da. Und ihm wurde es fast unheimlich, so auf sie hinzuschauen. -- -- Als müßte er schnell, jetzt gleich, irgend einen Bannspruch, irgend einen Wahrspruch finden, -- der ihre finstern Gedanken, -- der den Lebensgedanken selbst -- in Freude löste. -- -- Oder als würde sie sich selbst langsam erheben, unmenschlich groß, und etwas Unerhörtes, Unüberwindliches sagen --.

-- In solcher Stimmung hört man als Kind Märchen erzählen -- --.

Tomasow erhob sich und trat zu ihr hin ans Fenster.

Da blickte Wera Petrowna auf. Sie sah auf mit dem welken, freundlichen Antlitz einer alten Frau, die sich Sorgen macht.

»-- Arme Marinka --!« sagte sie nur mit einer schwachen, bekümmerten Stimme.

[Illustration]

=IV.=

»-- Also: Schluß für vierzehn Tage. Junge, klapp die Bücher zu und freu dich!« sagte Marianne zu ihrem Neffen nach Beendigung der französischen Montagskonversation.

Sie saßen schon bei der Lampe im Lernzimmer der ältern Kinder. Nikolai hatte beide Ellbogen aufgestützt und schob trübselig seine etwas breit geratene Unterlippe vor.

»Freu mich gar nicht. Aber auch nicht die Spur!« versicherte er; »worauf denn? Eine Menge Familientage, schrecklich lange Mittagessen, -- und zu Hause sitzen --. Ob man sich schließlich in der Schule ducken muß oder zu Hause -- --. Mußt du denn schon gehn?«

Marianne war heute so besonders angenehm gewesen, fast so lustig wie ein guter Schulkamerad, daher paßte es ihm nicht, daß sie schon ging.

»Du hast doch eine Menge Vergnügen in deinen Ferien! Ein undankbarer Junge, nicht wahr, Inotschka?« meinte Marianne.

Inotschka beugte sich über ihre Weihnachtsstickerei, die ihr heute wirklich Eingang zu der Montagsstunde verschafft hatte. An diesen Tagen heimlicher Arbeit ging vieles ungerügt durch.

»Ach, was weiß denn Ina! Ein Mädchen! Gut ist es doch nicht eher, als bis man groß ist und ein selbständiger Mann,« konstatierte Nikolai, griff verdrießlich nach seinen Büchern und verließ das Zimmer.

Inotschka antwortete ganz still: »Nein, so darf man nicht sprechen. Die Eltern bereiten uns so viel Freude, wie sie nur können. Wir müssen ihnen sehr dankbar sein.«

Dann sah sie jedoch sehnsüchtig zu Marianne hin und fügte in ganz anderm, drängendem Tone hinzu: »Warum ist es nur so, daß ihr diesmal nicht mit uns Weihnachten feiert? Ach, thus doch! Weißt du noch: voriges Jahr -- --!«

Marianne, die schon aufgestanden war, strich mit der Hand Inotschka über das weiche Haar, dessen feinen seidigen Strähnen man die Fülle, die sie enthielten, kaum ansah. Es lockte sie immer heimlich, dies feine Haar zu lösen und ganz anders zu ordnen.

»Das war ja nur ein Zufall voriges Jahr! Du mußt dich nicht so danach sehnen,« sagte sie sanft. »Sieh mal: ist es denn nicht überhaupt ein Zufall, daß ich hier in eurer Nähe lebe? Wie leicht hätte es so kommen können, daß ich im Auslande blieb. -- -- Und vielleicht -- -- vielleicht kommt es noch dazu, Inotschka.«

Die Kleine hatte ihre Stickerei auf den Tisch geworfen. Sie schaute mit erschrockenen Augen empor.

»Das -- das hab ich gefühlt --!« entfuhr es ihr heftig.

»Aber nein! Sei nur ruhig, meine kleine Ina, -- heute und morgen ist noch alles beim alten. -- -- Und übermorgen, im Handumdrehen, -- da ist aus der Ina schon ein großes, vernünftiges Mädchen geworden!« beschwichtigte Marianne sie tröstend.

Aber Ina war aufgesprungen. Sie hing sich Marianne an den Hals und brach hilflos in Thränen aus.

»Ich werde nicht groß! Ich werde nicht vernünftig! Alle Vernünftigen sind so gräßlich. Laß mich doch klein bleiben! Laß mich bei dir bleiben!«

Marianne blieb ganz stumm. Sie schlang nur ihre Arme um sie und küßte sie auf das Haar und auf die weinenden Augen. Dann, nach Minuten schweigender Liebkosung, beugte sie den Kopf tief zu Inotschka nieder und flüsterte ihr ins kleine heiße Ohr: »Sei still, mein Herz, ich komme jetzt oft und oft zu dir, -- so oft du mich nur wirst haben wollen --.«

Ina ließ sie los und blickte ungläubig auf. »Wirklich?! Sagst du es auch nicht nur so?«

»Nein. Ich sage es nicht nur so. Ich werde Mama um die Erlaubnis bitten, recht oft kommen zu dürfen, um mit dir zusammen zu sein.«

»Und glaubst du, daß -- --, meinst du, Mama wird erlauben, daß du so wirklich zu mir kommst -- --? Denn wenn ich mit den Großen dabei zusammensitzen soll -- --«

Marianne setzte sich auf Inas Stuhl und zog sie wie ein kleines Kind zu sich auf die Kniee.

»Mama erlaubt alles, was geeignet ist, dich froh und glücklich zu machen,« entgegnete sie zuversichtlich, und als sie Inas schüchterne Augen voll Zweifel auf sich gerichtet sah, fügte sie ernst hinzu: »Du denkst mit Unrecht, deine Mama enthielte dir dies oder jenes vor, und du wirst scheu, weil du meinst, vor verschlossnen Thüren zu stehn. Aber sie gehn noch alle auf, mein Liebling. -- -- Siehst du, davon und von vielem andern will ich dir erzählen, wenn wir so bei einander sind, wie jetzt.«

»Willst du mir von Mama erzählen, wenn du bei mir bist?« fragte Ina stockend und sah sie unsicher an.

Marianne streichelte sie mit einem feinen Lächeln voll Güte.

»Von uns Mamas überhaupt. Denn, weißt du wohl, wer das ist? Eine Mama, das ist jemand, der gewaltig reich geworden ist durch das Verlangen, recht viel zum Verschenken an seine Kinder zu haben. Aber die Kinder sind erst ganz klein, und dann jedes Jahr nur ein bißchen größer, und es dauert lange, bis sie ganz groß sind, sodaß sie wirklich alle die reichen Geschenke benutzen können. Daher muß Stück für Stück in festen Truhen verwahrt bleiben, und wenn die Mama aufschließt und nachschaut, was sich für ihre Lieblinge wohl schon eignet, dann darf sie sich doch nichts merken lassen von der Bescherung, für die es noch zu früh ist. Und dann sieht es den Kindern fast so aus, als hätte sie nichts übrig für sie. -- -- Aber alle ihre Truhen sind grade dann voll Gold. -- -- Jemand, der ungeduldig und sehnsüchtig zwischen lauter Truhen voll Kostbarkeiten umhergeht: das ist eine Mama. -- -- Weißt du es nun?«

Ina schmiegte sich fester an Marianne an.

»Und du hast auch solche Truhen, die du nicht aufmachst?« fragte sie, »-- du auch?«

»Ja, ich auch. Viele -- viele.«

»Aber einmal -- da springen sie alle auf! Alle?« Ina richtete sich mit verlangenden Augen auf Mariannens Schoß hoch.

»Alle -- alle!« versicherte Marianne mit unterdrücktem Jubel in der Stimme und legte ihre Arme um das kleine Mädchen. Man fühlte, daß irgend eine eigne große Freude oder Erwartung aus allen ihren Worten herausklang wie eine überströmende Wärme.

Inotschka lächelte, sie hatte leicht gerötete Wangen und sah unendlich zufrieden aus. »Was für wunderschöne Geschichten du aber auch weißt, Tante Marianne! Wirst du mir noch viele erzählen?«

»Ich werde dir gewiß noch schönere erzählen. Denn nun mache ich bald die allerschönste Truhe auf --«

»Für mich auch!« rief Ina vergnügt und klatschte in die Hände.

Plötzlich hielt sie jedoch inne. Sie ließ Marianne los und glitt von ihren Knieen hinunter.

»Da kommt Mama!« murmelte sie, »-- vorhin fuhr ein Schlitten vor --. Die Wohlthätigkeitsvorstellung muß jetzt auch schon längst vorüber sein --.«

Man vernahm etwas hastige Schritte und das Rascheln eines seidenen Kleides. Die Thür wurde nur ein ganz klein wenig geöffnet, Ottilie schob den frisierten Kopf an die Spalte.

»Bist du noch da, Marianne? Hast du Zeit --? Nein, Inotschka, mein Kind, laß dich nicht stören, du brauchst nicht zu erschrecken, Mama hat nichts gesehen, -- du sollst sehen, wie überrascht ich sein werde zu Weihnachten --.«

Marianne trat zu ihr heraus, in das Schlafzimmer der Schwester.

»Ich höre, du kommst aus der Oper, Otti?! Du und in die Oper, mitten am Tage? Du wirst ja noch ganz musikalisch auf deine alten Jahre,« bemerkte Marianne erstaunt.

»-- Der ›Troubadour‹ -- zu wohlthätigen Zwecken -- und mit dem durchreisenden Star als Gast. -- -- Fräulein Clarissa überredete mich. Herrgott, es passiert ja auch selten genug!« entgegnete Ottilie, noch in voller Theatererregung, und begann sich in aller Hast umzukleiden.

In einer Ecke am Tisch fütterte die Wärterin den Jüngsten, dem sie in russischem Kinderkauderwelsch zusprach, in der Nebenstube sah man die beiden ältern kleinen Brüder sitzen und artig Flittergold auf Nüsse kleben, als Schmuck für den Weihnachtsbaum.

Ottilie warf ihre geschnürte Seidentaille ab und ergriff Marianne am Arm.

»-- Ich sage dir: schön ist so was! Siehst du: in dem Augenblick, da lebt man! Wenn sie so füreinander sterben -- --« Ottiliens Augen strahlten.

Marianne lachte.

»Aber du, seit wann hast du so romantische Anwandlungen --? Du bist doch sonst die Nüchternheit selbst?«

»-- Sonst --? Ja, du lieber Gott, im wirklichen Leben ist doch kein Raum dafür. Da heißt es seine Pflicht thun, und damit basta. Das muß jeder anständige Mensch. -- -- Aber deshalb bewahrt man sich doch einen Winkel für das Ideale innerlich. Einen Winkel, wo das Leben anders wäre, wenn es nach uns ginge --: edel, höher, -- noch unbefleckt schön, -- kurz --«

»-- Romantisch?« fragte Marianne zweifelnd, mit einem gutmütigen Lächeln. Sie wußte selbst nicht, woher ihr Ottilie plötzlich so viel jünger geworden vorkam, ja fast unerwachsen jung, wie vor langen Jahren.

»-- Romantisch --!« wiederholte die Schwester etwas gereizt, während sie sich von Marianne in ihr Hauskleid hineinhelfen ließ, »-- meinetwegen nenn es so. Name ist bekanntlich Schall und Rauch. Aber du willst wohl andeuten: davon verstünde ich nichts, -- davon verstündest nur du was, -- einfach, weil du zufällig so blitzjung und so kopfüber eine Liebesehe geschlossen hast --. Aber was ist am Ende mit solcher Ehe los --?! Ich kann dir nur sagen, wovon ich nicht oft spreche: mein erstes Liebeserwachen war zwar lauter Verzicht, -- aber was ich hier innen besitze, --«

Sie sagte nicht, was sie innen besaß, sondern ließ ihre Worte unvollendet und knüpfte sich mit aufgeregter Hand das Kleid zu, wobei sie Mühe hatte, die richtigen Knöpfe zu finden.

»-- Du meinst doch nicht etwa den Husaren --?« wollte Marianne schon fragen, unterdrückte es jedoch.

Sie setzte sich neben den Toilettenspiegel, vor dem sich Ottilie ankleidete, und schaute die Schwester mit im Schoß gefalteten Händen gedankenvoll an.

Der harmlose Husar konnte so wenig dafür! Der mußte, wie es schien, nur ritterlich stillhalten bei allem, was ihm Ottilie so allmählich auf sein armes kleines Konto hinzuschrieb --. Vielleicht war es grade das Fehlen jeglichen starken Seelenaufruhrs in Ottiliens geordnetem Leben gewesen, das in ihr so allerlei emotionelle Restbestände aufgestapelt hatte -- --.

Ottilie mißverstand Mariannens Verstummen. Sie nickte ihr zu, wie von einer verborgenen Höhe.

»Ich glaube, du hast auch nur wenig Anlage dazu: du hast dich ja stets so ganz im Thatsächlichen ausgegeben und es überschätzt,« bemerkte sie und steckte sich ihr Häubchen fest. Auf ihren Wangen blühten noch zwei blaßrote Flecke.

Dabei hatte sie irgend eine halbmädchenhafte Kopfhaltung, irgend eine kleine Gebärde, -- fast wie unbewußte Koketterie einer Ungeübten, -- die mit einemmal Marianne wie eine lebendig gewordene Erinnerung aus beider frühester Jugendzeit durchfuhr.

Es paßte gar nicht recht hinein in das Wesen der jetzigen Ottilie, der musterhaft Fertigen, Korrekten! Aber dafür waren es nicht mühsam erworbene, sondern ihre eigensten einstigen kleinen Mienen und Gebärden --.

Sie besaßen etwas wunderlich Halbes, Verlorenes, -- wie wenn künstlich gestutzte Vögelchen zu fliegen unternehmen, -- dachte Marianne bei sich.

Und plötzlich umfaßte sie Ottilie von hinten und stand auf und küßte sie innig mitten ins erstaunte Gesicht. Ja, das war wirklich die Otti von ehemals, mit der sie so vieles geteilt, so kindisch geschwärmt hatte! Dann kam das ganze Leben dazwischen: das war von Marianne mit zitterndem Herzen, selig und schmerzlich, durchlebt worden, -- von Ottilie nicht --.

Und da ging sie nun in irgend eine alte Oper, und mit einemmal kamen allerlei hinuntergedrängte Sensationen herauf, -- unbegründet, etwas hysterisch, alle durcheinander: der Husar und die Ideale, Backfischhaftes und Erhabenes, Pathos und Koketterie --.

»-- Was fällt dir ein? Nein, aber Marianne, was fällt dir denn ein?! Man küßt sich doch nicht derartig mitten am Tage, ich muß jetzt an den Speiseschrank,« sagte Ottilie und wehrte sich.

»Und ich nach Hause. Aber, weißt du, Schwesterlein: ich komme nun oft, viel öfter --. Gib mir recht viel Raum. Laß mich viel mit euch sein, auch mit Inotschka --. Wer weiß, ob ich noch lange hier --« Marianne brach ab und wandte sich dem Kleinsten zu, sie hob ihn von den Knieen der Wärterin auf ihrem Arm hoch und liebkoste ihn, während er sie vergnügt ankrähte.

»Das ist schon recht, falls wir hier wirklich etwas haben, was dich, -- die viel Anspruchsvollere, -- fesseln kann,« erwiderte Ottilie; sie vermochte nicht den Uebergang ins Tagesleben ganz ohne Gereiztheit zurückzufinden.

»O! Ihr habt ja so vieles, was sich noch willig lieben läßt!« meinte Marianne leise und herzte noch immer das Kind.

»Ja, wie du das auch gleich sagst! Ich glaube wahrhaftig, Marianne, trotz deiner vielen Kenntnisse und Fähigkeiten, -- nimm mirs nicht übel: aber es ist im Grunde das einzige, was du zu thun weißt. -- Du sprachst von Inotschka: sag, glaubst du, daß sie den Pantoffel noch fertig stickt?«

»Der ist ja für dich, -- weißt du?« rief Marianne.

»Eben darum, weil er für mich ist, kann ich mich nicht gut drum kümmern. Wenn sie ihn vertrödelt, -- du verstehst, es ist mir nicht um den Pantoffel. Aber es wäre von übler Wirkung auf das Kind. Es gibt einem Kinde Selbstbewußtsein, seinerseits was zum Verschenken bereit zu haben. -- Von solchen Dingen hängt mitunter der moralische Halt im spätern Leben ab.«

Marianne seufzte. Sie setzte den Kleinen auf den Schoß seiner Wärterin nieder und ging mit der Schwester hinaus.

Sollte sie nun Ottilie erzählen: »Sophie geht Ostern auch zum Studium ins Ausland?« -- Würde Ottilie nicht fragen: »Was schenkt sie dir aber dafür wieder?« -- Ja, -- etwas Aehnliches würde sie fragen.

Wie konnte sie ihr das deutlich machen! Dieses Einssein mit den Kindern, dieses Mutterglück und diese drängende Hingebung in allen Fasern. Dieses Auskosten der vollen Liebe bis auf den letzten Tropfen. Denn jetzt waren sie zu Hause alle drei doch nur noch wie ein Mensch, -- nun erst ganz unzertrennlich.

Marianne ging fort, ohne etwas von der großen Neuigkeit mitgeteilt zu haben.

Trotz ihrer Ungeduld, heimzukehren, entschloß sie sich noch zu einem weiten Umweg.

Sie benutzte eine Pferdebahn, die nahe bis zu Tamaras kleiner Wohnung im Vorstadtviertel heranfuhr. Tamaras Mann öffnete ihr, mit einem listigen und erwartungsvollen Gesicht, -- er hatte seine Frau erwartet.

»Was, sie ist aus?« fragte Marianne stark enttäuscht, »ich muß sie so notwendig sprechen, und dachte sie zu dieser Stunde sicher zu treffen.«

»Ja, glücklicherweise ist sie fort, ich kann sie nämlich momentan gar nicht brauchen.«

Marianne bemerkte erst jetzt, wie er aussah. Im dicken Paletot, den Kragen hochgeschlagen, sogar warme Ueberschuhe an den Füßen, stand er da und rieb sich die Hände. In der That schien es kalt da drinnen zu sein.

»Was machen Sie eigentlich?! Frieren Sie vielleicht Ihre Vögel aus?«

»Ach nein, bei mir ist es warm. Wir müssen jetzt dort sitzen, zwischen den Vögeln, leider. Wir schlafen die paar Tage auch drin. Denn im Wohnzimmer, da wird jetzt nicht geheizt. Das ist wegen Weihnachten. Es soll nämlich wie ein Wald werden, -- Tamara stammt doch aus dem Walde. Sie darf jetzt nicht herein.«

Er öffnete die Thür zur Wohnstube, und Marianne erblickte in drei von ihren Ecken je einen großen Tannenbaum. Eine Küchenlampe stand am Boden. In dem ungewissen Schein, den das Lämpchen von unten her verbreitete, nahm sich die Bescherung seltsam genug aus, die zwischen den Tannen im Aufbau begriffen war.

Da näherten sich, fast lebensgroß in bemalter Pappe ausgeführt, die heiligen drei Könige einer kleinen Korbwiege, deren blaue Vorhänge dicht geschlossen waren. Was die Weisen des Morgenlandes darbrachten, bestand aber nicht in Gold oder Juwelen, sondern in den winzigsten Hemdchen, Jäckchen und Strümpfchen, die man sich denken konnte.

Die Bäume waren nicht geschmückt. Nur an dem schönsten, der sich über der Wiege erhob, hing Kinderspielzeug, -- Hampelmänner, Glöckchen an Knochengriffen -- und, wie ein Hinweis auf die Zukunft, schon ein erstes, zartes Paar Schuhe, lächerlich klein, aus rotem weichem Saffian, mit silberner Stickerei bedeckt.

In der Anordnung des Ganzen drückte sich ein unbeholfener jubelnder Ueberschwang aus, der Marianne ergriff.

Sie wandte sich zu Taraß und sagte leise: »Ich wußte gar nicht -- -- Aber es ist noch lange hin --«

Er nickte.

»Lange noch bis dahin,« bestätigte er, »aber, wissen Sie, ich kenne ja Tamara. In diesen Monaten wird sie schon ungeduldig sein: wann sie das alles arbeiten soll, -- ich bitte Sie, eine solche Menge! Und sie hat doch gar keine Zeit! Es mag ja schön sein, selbst daran zu nähen, nun aber, sie soll sehen: es geht auch so. Eine große Näherin ist sie überhaupt gar nicht. Sie sticht sich dreimal nacheinander in jeden Finger. Und allzufest näht sie auch nicht. -- Aber eine Mutter wird das sein! Ja, das ist noch eine Mutter!«

Er sah strahlend aus und trat frierend von einem kalten Fuß auf den andern.

»Darf ich Tamara nichts ausrichten? Soll sie zu Ihnen kommen?«

»Nein nein,« wehrte Marianne hastig ab, »ich komme lieber selbst wieder. Sagen Sie ihr nur: ich sei wegen des Vorschlages gekommen, den sie mir neulich im Auftrag des Berner Mädchenpensionates gemacht habe. Sagen Sie ihr: den wollte ich annehmen. Auf alle Fälle annehmen. Sie möchte mir helfen, die Sache so schnell als möglich ins reine zu bringen.«

Taraß schlürfte in den Ueberschuhen ihr voran zur Hausthür.

»Dann wird Tamara gleich alle Hebel in Bewegung setzen. Ich weiß, sie sprach davon. Und wir sind so froh, wenn wir Ihnen zeigen können, wie lieb wir Sie haben.«

Er küßte Marianne die Hand, und sie beugte sich auf seine Stirn. Ihr kam es vor, als sei alles bereits erledigt. Sie zweifelte nicht am Gelingen. Es mußte gelingen. Und sie war zu jedem Opfer bereit, zu jedem Nebenverdienst durch Stunden --.

Nur mit ihrem Kind zusammenbleiben mußte sie. Dann wollten sie auch schon Cita näher bekommen, -- mindestens näher als jetzt --.

Als sie sich wieder in die Pferdebahn setzte, schien es ihr, als führe sie schon weit, weit fort aus ihrem bisherigen, hiesigen Wirkungskreis.

Fast abschiednehmend spähte ihr Blick nach den einzelnen Häusern, die sie kannte. Da -- und da, -- und dort war sie zum Unterricht hingegangen. Nun aber wollte sie weit, weit fort, so weit wie ihre Kinder wollten.

All dies wurde Vergangenheit. Die Kinder allein, das war ja Heimat.

Kurz ehe sie den Bahnwagen verließ, stieg ein armer Krüppel ein, ein Stelzfuß in zerlumpter Kleidung.

Mit ehrerbietigem Blick bekreuzigte sich der Schaffner vor ihm und nahm kein Geld von ihm an. Diese Handlungsweise war allgemein üblich, solche Unglückliche durften fest darauf rechnen.

Als sich Marianne erhob, um auszusteigen, sah sie, daß jemand dem lahmen Mann ein Kupferstück zusteckte.

Da fuhr sie in die Tasche, faßte nach dem gehäkelten Seidenbeutelchen mit dem Tagesbedarf an Silberlingen, das sie grade frisch gefüllt hatte, und schob es im Vorübergehn dem Krüppel in die Hände.

Das gewährte ihr eine momentane Erleichterung. Sie wäre gern in irgend einer Weise aktiv geworden, aus ihrer weichen, warmen Stimmung heraus, -- wäre gern mütterlich geworden an irgend einem armen Wesen, aus ihrem Ueberfluß heraus --.

Und nun konnte sie nicht einmal für ihre nächsten Pläne etwas thun, weil sie Tamara verfehlt hatte. Aber ihr wollte es scheinen, als schade das alles nichts, wenn man ihr nur ringsum von der warmen Liebeslast abnahm --.

Oben öffnete ihr Stanjka. Doch im Wohnzimmer lief ihr Sophie entgegen.

»Cita ist nur für eine kurze Besorgung fortgegangen, Ma, sie kommt gleich wieder. -- -- Aber du bliebst so lange fort, -- ach, ganz schrecklich lange, wo warst du nur noch?«

Marianne drückte sie an sich.

»War das so schlimm? Du bist wohl ungeduldig geworden?«

»Ja, Ma. Jetzt möchte ich jede Minute bei dir sein. Das ist doch ganz natürlich, -- immer, immer.«

»Und wenn wir uns nun nicht trennten, -- wenn wir beisammen blieben, du mein Herzenskind!« murmelte Marianne.

Es kam ihr fast gegen ihren Willen auf die Lippen. Sollte sich Sophie unnütz quälen, -- und wären es auch nur Tage --, um der Trennung willen, die nach ihrer Ansicht bevorstand?

»Ach ja, Ma!« rief Sophie innig, jedoch gleich darauf schien sie ein plötzlicher Schreck zu durchfahren. »-- -- Du meinst doch nicht, -- ich soll doch nicht --«

Sie war ganz blaß geworden.

»Nein, o nein!« sagte Marianne schnell, »wie kannst du das glauben! Nichts wird rückgängig gemacht. Aber denke dir, mein Liebling, denke dirs nur als eine noch nicht gewisse Möglichkeit: wir blieben trotzdem beisammen, -- in einem kleinen Städtchen zum Beispiel, -- etwa in den Schweizer Bergen --«

Sophie machte sich sichtlich beunruhigt frei.

»-- Warum denn ein so ganz kleines Städtchen, Ma --?«

»Ich meine natürlich ein Universitätsstädtchen.«

»Ja ja, aber wenn auch --. Daß es so gar klein sein soll --? Warum denn eigentlich nur?«

»Stell dir zum Beispiel vor, dort wäre eine Mädchenpension, die ich zu leiten hätte, -- eine solche ist nämlich in Bern, -- lauter halberwachsne Mädchen --«

»-- Aber -- das wäre ja gräßlich, Ma!« fiel ihr Sophie ängstlich ins Wort.

Marianne hielt einen Augenblick inne.

Sie suchte mit plötzlicher Bangigkeit Sophiens Blick.

»-- Wäre das so gräßlich, -- Sophie?«

»Nein, -- das heißt: es wäre ja wunderschön natürlich, -- aber, -- ach nein, Ma! das kann ja doch gar nicht dein Ernst sein?«

Marianne versuchte zu lächeln, aber sie fühlte, daß ihr mitten in diesem schwachen Lächeln die Lippen kalt wurden.

»-- Nur so eine Idee, Kind,« sagte sie mühsam.

»Siehst du, das dachte ich.« Sophie küßte sie heftig und lachte beruhigt: »Das wäre ja auch gar nichts, nicht wahr? Denke nur: so eine Mädchenpension, -- Hammelherde, -- huh! Da müßten wir uns ja immer nach den Zimperliesen richten. Wenn du da Stunden gäbst und von allen möglichen Leuten abhingest, wäre alles gleich so gebunden, -- so wie hier --. -- -- Und übrigens, solches Kleinstädtchen doch auch für dich im Grunde recht öde, -- nicht?«

Marianne nickte, ohne Sophie aus den Augen zu lassen, die ihr unleidlich brannten und stachen von den bemeisterten Thränen.

»Ja ja, Sophie. Daran, ob es öde wäre, hab ich so gar nicht gedacht --. Wenn ich mir das überlege, ist es also wohl nichts damit.«

Sophie wurde wieder ganz heiter.

»Nein, was du aber auch für eine Phantasie hast, Ma?« meinte sie neckend und setzte sich der Mutter auf den Schoß. Sie war voll kleiner Zärtlichkeiten.

Nun wollte sie Ma auch ordentlich erzählen, wie sie sich das Leben dächte, mit Cita zusammen, in Berlin, wo Cita ja so vortrefflich aufgehoben sei und schon Beziehungen habe, und wo sie es nun ebenso gut haben werde. Beziehungen nämlich, das ist wichtig --! -- -- Eine Menge interessanter Einzelheiten plauderte ihr Sophie redselig vor.

Marianne saß müde in ihrem alten Lutherstuhl.

Sie hörte immer mit dem gleichen Anflug von Lächeln zu, es war wie erstarrt auf ihrem Gesicht.

Das also war das weitaus Schönere, wovon Sophie träumte. Und das hatte sie ja nun endgültig den Kindern gegeben, ihnen erlaubt. Mehr zu geben hatte sie nun überhaupt nicht. Nein: nur sich selbst noch hinzugeben hatte sie wollen. Sie selbst jedoch, -- ja sie selbst -- lehnten sie leise ab --.

-- Marianne überfiel plötzlich, mitten in Sophiens Hinplaudern, eine jähe Furcht, sie könnte mit einemmal -- jetzt gleich -- etwas Gräßliches, Grelles thun müssen, entweder laut schreien oder gar lachen --.

Besonders das letztere: jawohl, grell und gell lachen --.

In der Furcht davor brachte sie kein Wort heraus.

Zum Glück kam Cita nach Haus, eh es Sophie auffiel.

Als sie zu ihnen ins Wohnzimmer trat, sprang Sophie vom Schoß der Mutter heiter auf.

»Denke nur!« rief sie der Schwester ganz unbefangen entgegen, »Ma und ich sitzen hier gemütlich und malen es uns eben aus, wie das sein würde, wenn wir in ein ganz kleines Universitätsstädtchen zögen, anstatt nach Berlin. Und wenn Ma dort gar eine Pension leitete, -- und -- und wir Sonntags nachmittags mit im Zuge der Mädchen vor dem Thor spazieren gingen --«

Sie erzählte es ganz wie einen Scherz. Und ganz wie über einen Scherz lachte Cita mit ihr.

»Uff!« sagte diese dann, die Handschuhe abstreifend, und warf sich in den Schaukelstuhl, -- »wie gut ist es hier bei dir, Ma. Ja, das wird Sophie schon noch vermissen! Sie muß sich eben erst gewöhnen, man lernt es aber. Bis jetzt redet sie nur so hin. Wenn sie nur erst ordentlich in ihrem Studium drin ist --«

Marianne richtete ihre Augen müde und groß auf ihre Aelteste.

»Wenn es nur so ist, Cita, daß man dann nichts mehr vermißt,« sagte sie leise, mit matter Stimme, »-- denn das meint ihr doch wohl nicht, -- das kannst du doch selber nicht wollen: so ein Fachstudium, und nichts mehr dahinter und darüber --. Etwas so Spezielles, etwas so Hartes --. Du mußt nicht vergessen, wie sehr Sophie, -- und früher auch du, -- euch in einem allseitigern, harmonischern Ganzen geistig angeregt habt. Es schloß ein Studium nicht aus, aber das beseelte Leben ging doch noch drüber --.«

»Es war einfach dilettantischer,« bemerkte Cita ruhig. Sie hatte ernsthaft zugehört, während sie leise schaukelte und ihre Handschuhe bald zurollte, bald in alle einzelnen Finger auseinanderbreitete.

Marianne lehnte sich erschöpft zurück. Sie hatte sich gewundert, woher ihr nur so viele Worte kamen. Als ob sich ihre Zunge löste und selbständig spräche --. Aber als sie einsah, daß diese Worte ohne Wirkung waren, gab sie es auf, zu widersprechen.

Cita nahm ihr Schweigen wie ein leises Gekränktsein und fuhr rasch fort: »Ja, süße Ma, du hast sicherlich recht. Aber, siehst du, was du so das ›beseelte Leben‹ und ›das Allseitigere‹ in der geistigen Anregung nennst, das werden wir ebenfalls haben. Das Fachstudium wird bei weitem nicht alles sein, sondern der ganze Kreis der Interessen in der Frauenbewegung. Das wird uns frisch und kampflustig erhalten. Sieg der modernen Frau! Das soll die Losung sein. -- -- Hier konnte Sophie diesen belebenden Geist

unmöglich aufnehmen. Uns fehlte hier ja auch der laufende Zusammenhang mit allem Modernen. Wenn man aus dem Auslande kommt, spürt man das arg, du kannst es glauben! Nun, aber es schadet weiter nichts: wir holens schon nach.«

Sie erhob sich aus dem Schaukelstuhl, kam zur Mutter, bückte sich, küßte sie auf den Scheitel und sagte mit fast mütterlicher Zärtlichkeit im Ton: »Du unsre süße Ma! hier ist es einzig und allein schön, weil du hier bist. Vielleicht würdest du dich in einem andern Rahmen nicht mehr wohl fühlen. Und du machst alles schön rings um dich her. Aber wir können jetzt nicht nur auf das Schöne achten.«

Dann richtete sie sich auf, verschränkte die Arme auf dem Rücken und stellte sich nachdenklich musternd vor das Bücherregal.

»Siehst du, Sophie, -- dort hinein schaffen wir dann auch Ma neue Bücher, -- nicht an Stelle der alten, aber mindestens zwischen die alten. -- -- Man kann auch nicht immer nur Dante und Homer und Shakespeare und Goethe und ähnliche Herren lesen. Nicht wahr, Ma?«

Marianne saß ganz still und lauschte. Sie lauschte noch, als gar keine Rede mehr kam, und die Schwestern miteinander in den Büchern zu kramen anfingen, wobei Sophie auf dem Boden saß und Unsinn trieb.

Sie lauschte in alle geredeten Worte tief hinein --. Denn daraus klang ja nicht nur die naive Ablehnung Sophiens, nein, etwas viel Tieferliegendes hörte sie immer deutlicher heraus, -- etwas auf dem verborgenen Grund aller dieser Worte --.

Sophiens Gefühl war so ganz unwillkürlich gewesen. Aber es verriet, daß Mutter und Kinder ganz und gar nicht eins waren, eines Wesens, -- daß das ein bloßes Trugbild war, ein Traum. Die arme Sophie konnte nichts für ihren naiven Egoismus, -- Cita, die sagte es ja: sie waren etwas andres, wollten etwas andres, strebten anderm zu, als die Mutter --.

Der Mutter gehörten sozusagen nur noch Wesensreste aus der Kindheit, -- nicht mehr der entwickelte Mensch. Dem wurde sie leise fremd -- fremd -- fremd. Von dem wurde sie mit dankbarer Nachsicht geliebt. Notwendig blieb sie ihm nicht mehr.

Wahrscheinlich ging das immer so zu. Auch dann, wenn das Muttersein das gesamte Wesen eines Menschen aufgesogen und ausgemacht hatte --? Auch dann, wenn er sich mit seiner ganzen tragenden, nährenden Lebensfülle den Kindern einverleibt hatte --? Ja, auch dann. Auch dann blieb er wie ein blutendes, losgerissnes Stück am Boden liegen, allein liegen, -- ohne es ändern zu können -- --.

Cita hatte ja im Grunde recht: während die Mutter hier umherging und Stunden gab, vermochte sie nicht zugleich die Wege weiterzugehn, die sich nun den beiden öffnen sollten, -- die Wege neuer Zeiten, einer neuen Generation --. Und wohin die führen würden? Ob nicht zum entgegengesetzten Ende dessen, was sie mit heißester Inbrunst für ihre Kinder erfleht und selbst in ihrem ganzen Leben demütig zu verwirklichen gestrebt hatte?

Ja, vielleicht, -- wer konnte es wissen --? Ihr Urteil und das der Kinder würde sich in diesem Punkt wahrscheinlich entgegenstehn. Welche Instanz wollte über sie richten?

Mariannens Gedanken verschwammen, schmerzgefoltert, undeutlich ineinander. Noch hörte sie die beiden plaudern und lachen und sich gegenseitig Stellen aus Büchern vorlesen.

Ihre Arme waren wie gelähmt. Die Stimmen schienen ihr von weit, weit her zu kommen. Konnte sie die Arme nicht mehr ausbreiten, ihre Mädchen darin zu umfangen? Konnte sie ihnen denn nichts, gar nichts zum kostbaren Besitz und zum Leitstern mit auf den Weg geben von alledem, was zu gewinnen ihres Lebens Inhalt gewesen war --?

Weit, weit gingen sie fort --. Und plötzlich kamen Marianne, -- seltsam und leise, wie ein Raunen von Wind zwischen Blättern in der Nacht, -- Klänge aus einem Lied, -- aus einem Wiegenlied, der Dichtung eines Dichters von heute mit dem klaren Erkennen von heute. Es waren nur einzelne abgerissne Klänge, und während sie ihnen lauschte, wußte sie schon nicht mehr, ob sie sie nicht nur weinte --.

* * * * *

»-- Blinde, so gehn wir, und gehen allein, Keiner kann keinem Gefährte hier sein.

Schlaf mein Kind, und horch nicht auf mich! Sinn hats für mich nur, und Schall ists für dich!

Schall nur, wie Windesweh'n, Wassergerinn, Worte -- vielleicht eines Lebens Gewinn. Was ich gewonnen, gräbt mit mir man ein: Keiner kann keinem ein Erbe hier sein --.« *)

*) Aus Richard Beer-Hofmann, Pan 1899.

* * * * *

Die jungen Mädchen bemerkten gar nicht den Augenblick, wo Marianne das Zimmer verließ.

Erst als es hastig im Vorflur schellte, und gleich darauf Stanjka hereinkam und Tamaras Besuch meldete, blickten sie sich erstaunt nach Ma um.

»Eben war sie noch hier,« versicherte Cita, während Sophie den Gast hereinzog und unterhielt; »-- Ma, hör doch! Tamara ist gekommen!«

Marianne öffnete die Thür des Schlafzimmers, wo sie allein gesessen hatte. Sie ließ Tamara dort eintreten.

Diese fiel ihr um den Hals.

»Liebste Marianne Martinowna! Eben komm ich nach Hause, und Taraß erzählt mir --. Mein erster Gedanke: gleich hierher! Ich habe gar nicht erst abgelegt. -- -- Es ist allzu wichtig: natürlich muß die Sache gleich ins reine gebracht werden --.«

»Wie gut bist du!« murmelte Marianne. »-- Du weißt, daß Sophie zu Ostern --«

Tamara nickte.

»Sie sagte es mir soeben. Ja, ich dachte mir, daß so etwas der Grund sein würde. Wie könnten Sie sich von den Mädchen trennen, -- wie können die Mädchen Sie entbehren! -- -- So muß es denn sein, daß wir Sie aus unsrer Mitte verlieren.«

Marianne erwiderte nichts darauf. Sie saß neben einem kleinen Tisch, worauf eine einzelne Kerze brannte, und blickte an Tamara vorüber.

Tamara wurde sich erst jetzt dessen bewußt, daß irgend etwas an Marianne anders sei als sonst. Etwas so wunderlich Eingefrornes, Steifes.

Sie hatte sich nahe zu ihr gesetzt und faßte jetzt unwillkürlich besorgt nach Mariannens Händen, die ruhig im Schoß lagen.

Da sagte Marianne: »Weißt du, -- halte mich nicht für die wetterwendischeste Person, die es gibt. Aber seit meinem Gespräch mit deinem Mann hab ich mirs anders überlegt. Ich halt es für unmöglich, fortzugehn.«

Tamara sah sie erstaunt und ungläubig an.

»Aber warum?!«

»-- Diese ganze ungeheure Veränderung! Das schwierige Einleben dort. Wer weiß, ob wir alle drei es nicht später bereuen würden --. Es war eine erste Aufwallung, weißt du, aber -- -- die ist ganz vorüber.«

Tamara schwieg. Wie sie Marianne so dasitzen sah, bei dieser einzelnen Kerze, auf dem Rohrstuhl, -- da erschien sie ihr plötzlich wie eine Gefangene zwischen den Wänden des eignen Zimmers -- --.

Hinter Ma, über dem Bett, hing die Totenmaske ihres Gatten, daneben, wie ein Schmerzensschrei, Vogelers Radierung: das greise Paar, das in den Frühling hinausblickt.

Tamara sagte halblaut, tief betroffen: »Ach, Liebste, ich kann es nicht glauben. Wie -- ja wie wollen Sie alle drei denn so ohne einander auskommen? Ist das nicht das Wichtigste --?«

Ma lächelte.

»Ich denke, ganz gut. Weißt du, Tamara, eins muß man durchaus lernen, -- merke du dirs auch: die Dinge nicht zu weit zu treiben. Die Gefühle sich nicht über den Kopf wachsen zu lassen. Alles muß schließlich eine Grenze haben. Wenn man das gelernt hat, geht wirklich alles ganz leicht, -- viel leichter.«

Tamara stand auf.

»-- Also ist es wirklich entschieden. Nun, ich weiß nicht, ob ich mich freuen darf. -- -- Ich muß jetzt nach Hause eilen, Taraß wartet auf mich. -- Aber -- sagten _Sie_ diese Worte, Marianne Martinowna? Sie, die doch immer so ganz innig in ihrem Gefühl lebte, wie in einer großen unteilbaren Freude --.«

Marianne entgegnete rasch, mit plötzlicher Bitterkeit: »-- Kein Freudenbecher, der nicht zum Leidenskelch wird, wenn man ihn bis zur Neige leert! Nein nein, kein einziger, -- und vielleicht am wenigsten von allen das vielgepriesene Mutterglück.«

Sie erhob sich, um Tamara hinauszugeleiten. Da begegnete sie deren still und ernst auf sie gerichteten Augen, und sie gedachte mit einemmal dessen, daß diese Augen ja eben jetzt in grenzenloser seliger Erwartung dem zukünftigen Mutterglück entgegenschauten --.

Sie dachte an Taraß und seine strahlende Freude und an das kalte Zimmer mit den Tannen, der Korbwiege und dem Kinderspielzeug --.

Marianne umarmte die junge Frau plötzlich, aber ganz zaghaft, wie eine heimlich Geweihte, sie nahm ihre Hände zwischen die ihren, drückte sie an ihr Gesicht und murmelte hilflos: »-- Verzeih mir, -- ach verzeih! Hör nicht auf mich. -- -- Wie gut bist du doch. Hast da den weiten Weg in der Kälte gemacht --. Deck dich im Schlitten gut zu, hörst du --? -- -- Du mußt jetzt solche Wege vermeiden, -- dich in acht nehmen --.«

Tamara wurde dunkelrot. Sie küßte Marianne herzhaft, mitten auf den Mund.

»Ach,« sagte sie, und ihre Stimme klang ganz hell von viel Glück, »ich weiß es ja, -- ich wußt es ja: Sie sind doch noch ganz dieselbe, -- unverändert dieselbe und werden es immer bleiben. -- -- Es genügte nicht, daß Sie mir Schulunterricht gaben und noch manchen andern, schönern Unterricht: ich hab es ja Ihnen allein abgeguckt, wie man eine gute Mutter wird, -- so eine von Herrgotts Gnaden --. -- -- Und mein kleines Kind, das bring ich zu Ihnen, daß es hier heimisch werde von Anfang an, und es soll Großmutter sagen lernen von Anfang an --.«

Marianne geleitete sie hinaus und ging nicht mehr ins Schlafzimmer zurück. Der Theetisch wurde schon gedeckt; wie immer saß sie beim Abendthee mit ihren beiden Mädchen zusammen und plauderte mit ihnen.

Aber eine undenkliche Mühe kostete sie ein jedes Wort, das harmlos und heiter klingen sollte wie immer --. Und während sie gleichgültige Dinge sprach, dachte sie immer denselben Gedanken: »Ist es im Grunde nicht wahr? Haben sie denn nicht recht? Sie lassen sich erfüllen von allem, was sie vorwärts bringen mag, ich aber, -- habe ich nicht jahraus, jahrein nur ein paar immer gleiche Sorgen mit mir herumgetragen: tägliches Brot beschaffen, -- Lektionen vorbereiten, -- und wieder das tägliche Brot, und wieder die Lektionen --. Ich habe mich bemüht, es so gut zu machen, wie ich nur konnte: und da hat das Wenige genügt, -- da haben diese anderthalb Gedanken schon genügt, -- um alle Kraft aufzuzehren --. Oder hatte ich nicht genug Kraft -- --?«

Und langsam sank die Bitterkeit von ihrer Seele, um nur einer tiefen, demütigenden Entmutigung den Platz zu lassen. Bitterkeit vermochte ihre Seele nicht lange zu ertragen: die Entmutigung nahm sie schweigend auf.

Als die Mädchen sahen, daß die Mutter nicht recht heiter gestimmt war, schoben sie es auf die Ermüdung durch den anstrengenden Tag, und unwillkürlich suchten sie ihre eigne Fröhlichkeit etwas zu dämpfen, die sich mitunter allzuhell Luft machte.

Marianne merkte es, und das Herz zog sich ihr zusammen. »Sie wagen nicht mehr, mir zu zeigen, wie glücklich sie über die Wendung der Dinge sind, -- sie fürchten mich damit zu kränken, -- sie verhalten es lieber vor mir, bis sie unter sich sind,« dachte sie.

Und die kleinen Zärtlichkeiten ihrer Kinder thaten ihr nur weh. Sie fühlte etwas Nachsichtiges aus allem heraus, -- etwas Absichtliches. Nein, lieber noch wollte sie es sein, die sich vor ihnen verstellte, und mit ihnen froh sein.

Aber sie konnte es nicht.

Am nächsten Morgen beim Frühstückstisch wurde Cita doch trotz Mariannens Bemühungen stutzig. Sie meinte so genau zu wissen, daß die Mutter heute fast keine Lehrstunden mehr zu geben habe, und dabei schien sie sich doch so zu beeilen, um nur fortzukommen.

Marianne behauptete sogar, sie könne noch nicht zum zweiten Frühstück zurück sein, sondern erst spät am Nachmittag, sie möchten nicht auf sie warten.

Sophie machte ein pfiffiges Gesicht, offenbar hatte Ma heimliche Weihnachtsbesorgungen vor. Aber Cita blickte stumm und mit einem zweifelnden, besorgten Ausdruck vor sich nieder. Wohin ging die Mutter? Und warum sah sie dabei so gequält und müde aus? Ging sie vielleicht, um wieder mit Tomasow etwas zu besprechen? Und diesmal vielleicht etwas, womit sie ihren Kindern Leid anthat --? Ach, ginge sie doch nicht zu ihm! -- --

Marianne atmete tief auf, als sie endlich auf der Straße stand.

Langsam machte sie einen weiten Gang im klaren Winterwetter, dann raffte sie sich zu einem Besuch bei einer aus dem Schuldienst scheidenden Kollegin auf, von der sie sich erst in den Feiertagen hatte verabschieden wollen. So kam allmählich die Zeit für die einzige Stunde heran, die sie heute geben mußte.

Dabei weilten ihre Gedanken zu Hause. Alle Räume ihrer kleinen Wohnung durchschritt sie, aber, als sei ihr Blick verhext, erschienen sie ihr alle schon öde und leer. Sie erwog schon, wo, -- in welchem Raum, an welchem Platz -- sie wohl sitzen würde, so ganz allein --. Kleinigkeiten erwog sie angestrengt: ob man die hohen Blattpflanzen, ihre Lieblinge, nicht fortgeben sollte, da sie nicht auf ihre Pflege achten konnte, wenn sie so von Stunde zu Stunde lief -- --.

Von ihrer einzigen Unterrichtsstunde wäre Marianne fast aus Zerstreutheit nach Hause gegangen. Plötzlich fiel ihr jedoch der Weihnachtsbaum ein, der sich so groß und anspruchsvoll mitten in ihrem Zimmer erhob, -- als erwarte er sie da förmlich mit herausforderndem Hohn. -- -- Morgen war schon heiliger Abend. Da würde man ihn sogar noch schmücken müssen. Denn das wollten die Mädchen ja ihretwegen gern thun, obschon es ihnen ein bißchen lästig war, -- sie selbst hielten nichts auf solche Kindereien --.

Wie recht sie hatten! Wie froh wäre sie jetzt gewesen über ein sang- und klangloses Weihnachten!

Nein, sie vermochte nicht heimzugehn und sich an den gedeckten Frühstückstisch zwischen ihre beiden Kinder hinzusetzen --.

Frierend und unschlüssig, wie obdachlos, stand Marianne auf der Straße im Winterwinde.

Sie, die sich so auf die Ferien gefreut hatte, sie, die es so haßte, sich Tag für Tag draußen herumtreiben zu müssen, sie stand jetzt da, um den Ihrigen Lehrstunden vorzutäuschen, die sie gar nicht zu geben hatte --.

Einmal fiel sie durch ihr zauderndes Stehnbleiben auf. Irgend ein Straßenflaneur beugte sich vor, um sie deutlicher zu sehen --. Es war mitten im Menschengetriebe unweit der Schmiedebrücke; Marianne durchquerte den Fahrdamm, um in eine der stillern Seitenstraßen einzubiegen, als sie zwischen den dahinhastenden Menschen Tomasows Gestalt erkannte.

Er schritt langsam neben irgend einem Bekannten. Als er Marianne auf sich zukommen sah, verabschiedete er sich jedoch von ihm und ging ihr erfreut entgegen.

Leise schob sie ihren Arm in den seinen.

»Danke!« sagte er lächelnd. »-- Offenbar auf Weihnachtswegen?«

Sie schüttelte den Kopf.

»Nein. Ich bin todmüde. Ich möchte irgendwo eintreten, wo ich etwas essen könnte.«

»Sie wollen nicht erst den langen Weg nach Haus?« Er besann sich. »Gehen wir zu Philippow? Oder ziehen Sie ein Restaurant vor?«

»Keins von beiden. Ueberall könnten Bekannte sein. Ich möchte dort in der Seitenstraße in eine der kleinen billigen Theebuden, wo kein Mensch hinkommt.«

Sie suchte ihn die paar Schritt weit hinzulenken.

»Aber, Ma! Da geht man mit einer Dame nicht hin.«

Marianne ließ geschwind seinen Arm los.

»-- Dann lassen Sie mich allein hingehen -- Ich nahm wirklich zu dem Zweck Ihre Begleitung an,« sagte sie und blickte aus so sonderbar müden Augen auf ihn, daß er sofort nachgab.

Er zuckte die Achseln.

»Nun es sei, also wie Sie wünschen,« meinte er zögernd und führte sie dem kleinen Lokal zu, das mit einem breiten grellblauen Schild zum Eintritt lud. »Schließlich ist es eine warme Ecke, wie eine andre, wenn sie auch ein bißchen tief im Erdgeschoß drin liegt.«

Im Innern der Theestube hingen blendend saubere Leinwandvorhänge an den niedrigen, fast quadratischen Fensterchen, und auch das weiße Holz der simpeln Einrichtung sah so weiß und sauber aus, als müsse es Seifengeruch ausströmen. Im ersten Raum dampften ein paar mächtige blanke Kupfersamoware auf dem Schenktisch, und an den Wänden lagen bis hoch hinauf unendlich viele Schwarzbrote aufgestapelt.

Doch gab es auf Wunsch auch helles Gebäck, sowie die volkstümlichen Pastetchen mit Grützfüllung, und Tomasow bestellte davon, dessen sicher, sie vorzüglich bereitet zu finden. Der bedienende Gehilfe im weißen Leinwandkittel und hohen, dermaßen glänzend gewichsten Kniestiefeln, daß man sich in ihnen beinahe hätte spiegeln können, brachte das Verlangte in den schmalen Nebenraum, wo Marianne schon im Hintergrunde an einem der länglichen ungestrichenen Holztische saß.

Nur zwei Frauen aus dem Kleinbürgerstande, mit bunten Kopftüchern und kurzen Schaffellpelzen, tranken beim Fenster ihren Thee, wobei sie die gefüllte Untertasse auf den gespreizten Fingern der rechten Hand balancierten; schweigend, mit einer gewissen Feierlichkeit und ohne um sich zu sehen, nahmen sie einen heißen Schluck um den andern.

»Hier ist es gut!« sagte Marianne.

Sie sah abgespannt aus, und dabei brannte ihr das Gesicht vom Winde. Die Hitze, die der mächtige Kachelofen im geschlossnen Zimmerchen ausströmte, machte es noch fühlbarer.

Marianne empfand wirklichen Hunger, er war ganz plötzlich und fast mit Gier erwacht, als sie beim Eintreten das viele ringsum an den Wandborten aufgeschichtete Brot sah. Aber wie nun ihr Frühstück vor ihr stand, vermochte sie ebenso plötzlich nichts mehr zu essen.

Sie bückte sich über ihr Theeglas, aus dem dicht vor ihrem Gesicht der Dampf in die Höhe stieg, und folgte mit dem Blick gedankenlos seinen Windungen. Dieses Gefühl von sich nachgebender Schwäche war merkwürdig angenehm.

Tomasow betrachtete sie aufmerksam.

»Sie gefallen mir ganz und gar nicht!« äußerte er; »aber eigentlich hätt ich mir das ja schon vorgestern selbst voraussagen können --«

Marianne hob verwundert den Kopf.

»Was denn --?« fragte sie zerstreut.

»Daß der erste Kraftaufwand nicht vorhalten, -- daß die Stimmung zunächst sinken würde --. Sie haben sich seelisch bis zum äußersten anspannen müssen, und jetzt kommt der Rückschlag.«

Marianne rührte mit ihrem Löffel im Thee herum. Ihr fiel ein, daß Tomasow ja so gar nichts vom gestrigen Tage wußte. Ueberhaupt nichts von der heimlichen Hoffnung, die sie ja allein so tapfer hatte erscheinen lassen, -- noch auch von der großen Bitterkeit hinterher.

Es war etwas ganz Ungewohntes für sie, daß er nicht vollen Bescheid wußte und dementsprechend urteilte. Aber nur nicht davon erzählen! Sogar ihm nichts! Was konnt es denn helfen?

Tomasow stützte einen Arm auf, und sich näher zu Marianne hinwendend, mit dem Rücken gegen das Fenster, bemerkte er halblaut: »Frau Marianne, jetzt ist es an der Zeit, daß Sie mir mehr Machtvollkommenheit geben --. Vollmacht, Sie ganz anders als bisher in Obhut zu nehmen, zu pflegen, abzulenken, zu beaufsichtigen, -- kurz: um Sie zu sein --«

Sie faßte seine Worte nur ungenau auf, in ihre Kümmernisse klangen sie aus solcher Ferne herein, daß sie keinerlei verborgenen Sinn hinter ihnen vermutete.

»Ich weiß, Sie sind immer gut!« sagte sie nur freundlich.

»-- Gut --?! Nein, Marianne, mit meinem Gutsein hört es nun auf. Glauben Sie nur, es ist mir nicht immer leicht gefallen ›gut‹ gegen Sie zu sein, Ihr guter Freund zu sein -- alle die Jahre. Jetzt aber, wo Sie allein bleiben, wo sich Ihre Töchter ihr eignes Leben bauen, da will ich ein andres Recht, als das der Güte: das Recht, auch ein Leben aufzubauen -- Ihnen und mir.«

Er sprach noch immer halblaut, jedoch rasch und bestimmt, und in seiner Stimme vibrierte tief gedämpft ein Ton, den er Marianne gegenüber noch nie angeschlagen hatte.

Sie schrak aus ihrer Müdigkeit auf, ihr Blick streifte Tomasow wie erwachend und noch verständnislos erstaunt; als sie jedoch dabei seinen fest auf sie gerichteten Augen begegnete, geriet sie in Verwirrung.

Tomasow sagte fast gütig: »Es ist schlecht von mir, daß ich Sie so überfalle, Ma --. Aber es hilft nun nichts mehr: bei Ihnen zu Hause bin ich mit Ihnen tausendmal weniger allein als hier, -- und im nächsten Augenblick stehn Sie wieder lächelnd und gewappnet da, -- in jeden Arm hineingeschmiegt eins Ihrer Kinder. -- -- Sie sollen mir auch nicht antworten müssen, Ma. Heute nicht und selbst morgen nicht, wenn Sie wollen. Nur wissen, -- wissen, daß Sie keineswegs so selbstherrlich allein dastehn werden, wie Sie wohl glauben, -- -- weil ich Sie mir nunmehr nehme --«

Marianne sah nicht auf. Die Röte auf ihren Wangen hatte sich vertieft, als ob sie wieder den Wind draußen um sich sausen fühle. Sie sprach sich innerlich die Worte vor, die sie Tomasow jetzt zweifellos sagen mußte, -- sie nahm sich vor, den Kopf zu heben und ihn einfach zu bitten, -- ja, zu bitten, er möchte doch wieder, ganz so wie bisher, gegen sie »gut« sein --.

Aber nach seiner Bemerkung, daß er keine Antwort erwarte, beugte sie den Kopf nur noch tiefer, und mit einem seltsamen Gefühl von Beklemmung erließ sie sich alles, um was sie bitten wollte.

Denn bei dem Ton seiner Stimme, da quoll langsam, unvermutet und betäubend eine wunderseltsame Gemütswallung in ihr auf -- --. Und machte sie zaudern, und ließ sie verwirrt den Blick Tomasows meiden, wie wenn eine geheime Sehnsucht etwas ganz andres ersehnt habe, als alle jemals bewußt gewordenen Gedanken in ihr.

-- -- Es war grade, als risse Tomasow mit ein paar gewaltsamen Griffen den Vorhang von irgend einer fremden Landschaft zurück, sodaß ihr plötzlich bewußt werden sollte: nur ein Vorhang scheide sie davon --.

Sie meinte noch nie durch diese Landschaft gewandelt zu sein und wußte doch auf einmal: nur ganz durchsichtig verhangen war sie ihr gewesen, und immer da war sie gewesen, dicht vor ihr. Und blitzschnell, zu neuem, verwirrendem Wiedererkennen, drängte sich plötzlich vor ihrem Auge Bild auf Bild daraus. Minuten, Momente aus ihrem Verkehr mit Tomasow sah sie vor sich, -- oft unterbrochen durch Monate und weit länger, oft einander rascher folgend in feinen, unmerklichen Sensationen, -- auf die sie mit dem Finger hätte weisen können: da -- und da -- und da, -- ja, war sie da seinen Wünschen nicht, ohne es zu wissen, ganz nah gewesen, -- ganz nah einem weiblichen, eignen Glücksverlangen --?

Marianne saß regungslos und noch immer im Bann der leichten Mattigkeit, die sie heute umfing. Allmählich vermischte sichs ihr ganz, wo und wozu sie sich hier befand, tief benommen von der Gemütsbewegung, die Macht über sie gewann. Sie fühlte sich wie jemand, der ganz unvermutet geweckt wird und in völlig irreführender Gegend zum Erwachen kommt. -- --

Tomasow war ebenfalls verstummt. Nur sein Blick ruhte immer wieder auf Marianne und mochte ihm einiges von dem enträtseln, was in ihr vorging.

Ohne daß sie miteinander sprachen, ohne daß sie einander auch nur anschauten, leitete sich zwischen ihnen eine Verwandlung ihres gegenseitigen Verhältnisses ein: das nahm er mit allen Nerven wahr. Und auch er überließ sich einem Hinträumen, das ihn weit fort entführte -- --.

Das Blut stieg ihm in die Schläfen, und seine Augen bekamen einen eigentümlichen starken Glanz.

Ganz still war es in dem kleinen heißen Zimmer. Ein einziges Mal ging draußen im Vorraum kreischend die Außenthür, ein paar schwere Tritte, kurze Frage und Antwort, Papierknistern, und wieder wurde alles still.

Die beiden Frauen am Fenster hatten sich erhoben, rückten ihre Kopftücher zurecht und gingen auf knarrenden Schuhen mit wortlosem Gruß hinaus.

Da blickte Marianne auf, fast verstört. Unmittelbar darauf erhob sie sich schon. Die dumpfe, schwere Ofenluft benahm ihr den Atem.

»-- Sie wollen gehn?« fragte Tomasow und half ihr in den Pelz. »-- Wollen Sie nichts weiter genießen?«

Marianne schüttelte stumm den Kopf. Sie schien zu meinen: jetzt an die freie Luft draußen gelangen, das hieße zugleich, den ganzen Bann und Druck abschütteln. Diese heiße Stubenschwüle war allein schuld --.

Tomasow zahlte, und sie entfernten sich. Der Ostwind blies ihnen auf der Straße scharf, förmlich wehethuend entgegen, er weckte fast ein Gefühl unwillkürlichen Sichbergenwollens.

»Wohin nun?« fragte Tomasow, »muß es schon heimwärts gehn?«

Marianne nickte zögernd.

»Den Kreml durchqueren,« meinte sie, »das ist wohl der nächste Weg.«

»-- Und wärs auch nicht der nächste! Denn allzu kurz darf er nicht geraten,« bemerkte er lächelnd.

Beim Ueberschreiten des Fahrdamms, zwischen den durcheinander sausenden Schlittengespannen, hatte er Marianne den Arm gegeben und führte sie mit der sichern Haltung dessen, bei dem sie sich von nun an bergen sollte. Oder empfand nur sie es so, als ob alles um eine Nuance verändert sei, als ob in allem schon eine stillschweigend anerkannte Zueinandergehörigkeit betont liege --.

Eben begann Tomasow Marianne von seiner Liebe zu reden, da traten sie schon in das Erlöserthor ein, das in den Kreml hineinführt. Die Fuhrwerke mäßigten den Schritt, die Menschen entblößten ihr Haupt, und Tomasow, der mechanisch seinen Hut abnahm, konnte in der um sie eingetretenen Stille nicht recht weitersprechen.

Dann kamen sie auf den weiten Platz hinaus, vorüber an den Kathedralen und dem alten Facettenpalast. Er schaute hin, und ihm fiel eine kleine Zeichnung von Rjepin zu dessen Gemälde »Die Brautwahl« ein, -- ja, so hätte er um Ma freien mögen: inmitten der Pracht der alten Palasträume, der niedrigen Wölbungen russischer Terems, als der alten Fürsten einer --. Und er dachte zurück: noch sein Großvater hatte sich seine Bäuerin vom Feld in die Hütte geführt, und die geschmückten Dorfmädchen tanzten zur Hochzeit. Ja, Hütte oder Palast, das war fast das gleiche: in beiden Fällen ward der Mann der Fürst, der Herr vor seinem Weibe, das von ihm sein Leben empfing.

Vor Tomasows unruhig umherblickenden Augen erhob sich der Uspenski-Dom in der energischen Schlichtheit seiner männlich gedrungenen Architektur, die grauen Kuppeln gleich Heldenhelmen auf Heldenhäuptern, ohne andern Schmuck, andre Farbe, als die verwitterten Bilder unter dem dunkeln Bleidach über dem Thor. Und davor, wie in sich selbst zusammengeschmiegt, in festlicher Anmut, die reizende Verkündigungskirche, die Vielkuppelige, die aussieht, als bildete die Gliederung ihrer Mauern nur eben soviele Vorwände, um eine stillleuchtende Kuppel nach der andern über sich emporzuhalten. Wie Weib und Mann standen die beiden in Tomasows Phantasie zusammen, die überall Symbole dessen schaute, wovon sie aufgeregt erfüllt war.

Den Kopf gesenkt, ging Marianne neben ihm, ihren Blick immer auf den flimmernden Schnee am Boden gerichtet, wie wenn sie mit geblendeten Augen was ablese von dem weißen Geglitzer mit seinen bläulichen huschenden Schatten und Lichtern.

Ihre Hand ruhte im Arm Tomasows; ein wenig zu ihr vorgebeugt, unterhielt er nun Marianne mit halber Stimme. Unruhevoll schweiften ihre Gedanken um das, was er zu ihr sprach. Kaum vermochte sie es aufzunehmen in den einzelnen Sätzen, in den verhaltenen Worten, so stark wirkte es seiner Grundbedeutung nach auf sie --. Ihr ward beklommen wie in der kleinen dumpfen Gaststube vorhin; die Schwüle blieb -- --.

Führte er sie nicht hinauf auf einen Berg und zeigte ihr der Welt Herrlichkeit, -- jene Herrlichkeit, die man zu eignem Genießen haben kann, in der man sich selbst leben kann, sich sättigen in allem Angenehmen und Erfreulichen des Daseins? Führte er sie nicht hinweg aus der Alltagsniederung mit ihrer einseitigen, bittern Mühsal, mit den armseligen paar Aufgaben, die ihre Kraft aufgesaugt, sie gedemütigt und unfähig gemacht hatten zu eigner, breiterer Entfaltung? -- -- Und wieder schaute sie bei Tomasows Worten wie in lockende Weiten, in eine Landschaft hinein, seltsam fremd, seltsam vertraut, in der sie sollte ausruhen dürfen an labendem Glück, sich gehn lassen in süßer Ermattung, -- und seine Stimme verhieß ihr fort und fort: wolle nur, und all dies ist dein --.

Sie überschritten grade den Platz, als ein erster tiefer Glockenklang mit überwältigender Gewalt die Luft durchhallte. Unmittelbar darauf setzte das Geläute von mehreren großen Glocken ein. Es that den Menschen kund, daß die Feierzeit nahe, daß sie das Werkzeug niederlegen möchten und die Seele öffnen, auf daß auch sie feiere.

Und in Mariannens Seele wiederhallte es in einer lauten Bejahung: sie sehnte sich, zu feiern --.

Aber gleichzeitig klangen mit den Glockenklängen ganz andre Stimmungen als zuvor in ihr an, sie kam heim von ihren ungewiß schweifenden Träumereien, zurück in die Gegenwart ihres wirklichen Lebens, und -- wie zwei, die sie gewaltsam hatte vergessen wollen, -- schauten ihr die Gesichter ihrer beiden Kinder fragend daraus entgegen --.

Fragend, -- so wie heute morgen: Sophiens Gesicht dabei ein wenig verschmitzt, voll pfiffiger Erwartung, beinahe wie sie auch als kleines Kind ausgesehen hatte, wenn die Heimlichkeiten um Weihnachten begannen. Citas Augen fragten nicht mehr kindlich: bringst du mir auch was Schönes mit? Sie hatte sorgenvoll vor sich hingeblickt, -- zweifelnd fast, -- sie war beunruhigt durch das Benehmen der Mutter. Und wenn sie jetzt erfuhr, -- Cita --

Mariannens Herz that plötzlich einen starken, harten Schlag. Sie blieb stehn, wie atemlos: wenn Cita erfuhr -- und auch Sophie -- --, sie sah mit einem Schlage die beiden Gesichter verwandelt, bestürzt, ungläubig --, sie fühlte mit unwiderleglicher Deutlichkeit: dann erst entfremdeten sich ihr die Kinder ganz --.

Alles Entfremden bisher bedeutete, dagegen gehalten, noch wenig, -- wie weh es auch thun mochte, es mußte machtlos bleiben, solange die Mutter selbst nur ihren Mädchen dieselbe blieb. Auch wenn sie Tausende von Meilen weit fort von ihr gingen: sie entfernten sich weniger weit, als durch einen einzigen Schritt, den sie selber fort von ihnen that.

»-- Die Kinder --!« sagte Marianne unwillkürlich, mitten in Tomasows Worte hinein, und sie hob zum erstenmal den Blick zu ihm, -- ratlos, hilfeheischend. War er doch da, ging er doch neben ihr, -- er, der immer alles entschieden, bei allem helfend eingegriffen hatte.

Voll Zuversicht schaute sie zu ihm auf.

»Was ist denn mit den Kindern?« fragte er etwas brüsk, aus der Stimmung gerissen; seine Augen begegneten den ihren mit eigentümlichem, flackerndem Leuchten, »-- es handelt sich jetzt doch gar nicht um die Kinder.«

Mariannens Blick glitt rasch, betroffen von ihm ab. Wer half ihr von nun an in allen Fragen und Kämpfen? Er nicht mehr! Er half ihr nicht mehr gegen ihre eignen Schwächen. Bisher konnte er sich ihr so geben, wie sie ihn brauchte, um sich als Mensch hoch und höher emporzuringen. Jetzt, ohne alle Zurückhaltung, brauchte er sie selbst, brauchte sie ohne die Kinder. Wie weit, -- weit standen ihm da ihre Herzenssorgen --!

Irgend etwas in Marianne, irgend ein eben erst entfachtes, eben erst wiedererwachtes Sehnen des Weibes in ihr verschüttete sich wieder und wollte zagend erlöschen --.

Tomasow fühlte sofort, daß er einen Fehler begangen habe.

»Alles hat seine Zeit!« sagte er schnell und bestimmt. »Auch die Kinder haben ihre Zeit gehabt, wo Sie sich ihnen ausschließlich widmeten. Nun ist es endlich Zeit geworden, in diesem Punkt vernünftig umzulernen. Schließlich muß man eben wählen, ob man einander leben will und dem Glück, oder ob man von ihrem unreifen Willen abhängen will.«

Und mit größerer Dringlichkeit als vorher sprach er auf sie ein, indessen sie weitergingen im hallenden Glockengeläut, vorbei an den weißgoldenen Mauern der zahllosen Kirchen und Kathedralen. Und je länger er redete, desto mehr wurde es eine Apotheose des sorglosen Feierns und Genießens, wozu er sie einlud. Er suchte alles hervor, was er ihr schenken könnte, und alles ward immer wieder Genuß und Fest. Aber Mariannens Hand lag nur ganz leicht in seinem Arm, sie stützte sich nicht mehr auf ihn, sie sah unruhig aus, und aus ihrem Gesicht war die gläubige Zuversicht geschwunden.

Und Tomasow überfiel plötzlich eine zornige, bittere Ungeduld wider alles, was er da selbst zu Marianne sprach. Alle die Worte von Glück und Freude erschienen ihm unwahr und schal. Er begriff plötzlich, daß er, an Mariannens Seite, doch immer nach einem suchen würde, nach eben dieser emporschauenden Zuversicht, nach eben dieser gläubigen Anlehnung an ihn, als an einen Stärkern, Ueberlegenen, -- an den Herrn. Glück mit ihr genießen, das konnte nur heißen: ihr im Leben selber so hoch und stark als Mensch überlegen sein, wie er ihrs in einzelnen Stunden durch Verstand und Rat gewesen war --.

Tomasow verstummte.

Und Marianne merkte es kaum. Wie sie so an seinem Arm hinging, schienen ihr jetzt die Glocken über ihr mit den weithin hallenden Feierklängen nicht mehr dieselbe Sprache zu sprechen, wie die dringliche Stimme dicht an ihrem Ohr, -- aus einer andern Welt schienen sie zu reden, als dies halblaute überredende Raunen von Feiertagsglück und abgeworfenen Sorgen --. Und immer mächtiger wurden die Glockenklänge und immer verhaltener die zuredende Stimme, und endlich vernahm sie nur noch Glocken, -- Glocken allein -- --.

»-- Leben Sie wohl, Ma!« hörte sie unvermittelt Tomasow sagen, der stehn blieb. »Ich habe Ihre Antwort schon, noch ehe Sie eine Antwort in Worten gefunden haben. Und lassen Sie mich bekennen: Sie haben recht --«

»Tomasow,« fiel Marianne tief bewegt ein, »-- warum wollen Sie so -- --! -- Sie sind immer und immer mein bester, einziger, liebster Freund --«

»-- Gewesen!« ergänzte er rasch mit einem unmerklichen Lächeln, und dann, sich umsehend, trat er zur Seite. Es kam jemand von hinten her an ihnen vorbei und zog grüßend den Hut.

Hugo Lanz war es, der desselben Weges ging und Marianne hocherfreut begrüßte. Marianne mußte ihn Tomasow vorstellen.

»Ich eilte grade zu Ihnen, gnädige Frau,« bemerkte Hugo Lanz, »um Ihnen eine für mich freudige Nachricht mitzuteilen --«

»Das trifft sich in der That gut,« meinte Tomasow etwas heiser, »daß ich mithin die gnädige Frau in Ihrer Begleitung lassen kann. Mein Weg führt hier leider nach andrer Richtung.«

Marianne reichte Tomasow die Hand, zögernd, fast zitternd.

»-- Aber doch auf Wiedersehen sehr bald --?« fragte sie mit nicht ganz beherrschter Stimme.

»Gewiß, gnädige Frau: sobald sich einmal gute Bekannte bei Ihnen versammeln, dann gestatten Sie mir vielleicht, auch dabei zu sein,« entgegnete er mit leichter Betonung dieser Antwort, beugte sich über ihre Hand, grüßte Hugo Lanz und entfernte sich, in die nächste Straße einbiegend.

Marianne ging statt vorwärts wieder zurück, ohne recht zu wissen und zu sehen, wo sie ging. Ein Angstgefühl umklammerte sie dumpf: sie konnte nicht fassen, daß das ein Abschied für das Leben gewesen war.

Sie machte eine gewaltsame Anstrengung, um sich Hugo Lanz zuzuwenden, dessen offnes Gesicht von Freude geleuchtet hatte, der aber jetzt ernst und still aussah, weil er sie so seltsam ernst vor sich hin gehn sah.

Er erzählte dennoch froh: »Soeben erst hab ich die Erlaubnis ausgewirkt, den nächsten Winter noch ganz frei zu bleiben, -- und ich werde ihn hier zubringen. Meine Verwandten haben mich aufgefordert, bei ihnen zu wohnen. Und schon die Aussicht, Sie und Ihre Familie besuchen zu dürfen --«

»Das freut mich innig,« bemerkte Marianne leise, »doch werden Sie im nächsten Winter nur noch mich wiederfinden, -- nicht mehr meine Töchter. Auch Sophie geht fort, folgt der Schwester ins Ausland.«

Hugo Lanz blickte Marianne mit aufrichtigem Schreck ins Gesicht. Die kleine Familienscene, der er beigewohnt hatte, stand vor ihm, Mariannens strahlendes Glück zwischen ihren Kindern, -- auch dessen, was ihm Sophie mitgeteilt hatte, entsann er sich.

»-- Ganz allein bleiben Sie --?« entfuhr es ihm voll Mitleid und in unwillkürlichem Unwillen.

Marianne wiederholte mechanisch: »-- Allein --,« und sie nickte bejahend. Aber das dumpfe Angstgefühl in ihr verstärkte sich dabei, als risse es sie mit jedem Schritt gewaltsamer hinein in etwas Endloses, Grenzenloses, -- wie in eine leere, gähnende Unermeßlichkeit, wo ihre Kinder und der Freund und alles, was ihr lieb gewesen war, alles Warme, alles Trostvolle, alles Hilfreiche, weiter und immer weiter zurückwich, -- unerkenntlich geworden schon, -- unaufhaltsam, unerreichbar -- --.

Und mit dunkelm Grauen stieg in ihrer Seele eine Erinnerung auf an abgrundtiefe Einsamkeit, aus der sie doch nur die Hand des Freundes und der Blick ihrer Kinder gerettet hatte, -- und sie fühlte, daß das dunkle Grauen nahe und näher über ihrer Seele zusammenschlug, -- als würde sie unbarmherzig dahinein gestoßen von derselben Hand, von denselben Blicken, die sie einst rettend festhielten, -- und als fände sie diesmal nie mehr, -- nie mehr hinaus --.

Marianne nahm nichts mehr deutlich wahr, die Dinge ringsum schienen ihr langsam zu entschwinden, sich in sich selbst aufzutrinken, unterzugehn in einem chaotischen Nebel. Einförmig nur und erschütternd laut hallten fort und fort die Glocken über ihr, -- hallten um sie, -- hallten in ihr, -- begruben sie wie unter einem Mantel von dröhnenden, besinnungraubenden Tonwellen, -- ließen alles an ihr erbeben unter der Gewalt des einen unerbittlichen Klanges, -- drangen auf ihre zitternde Schwäche ein, wie mit läutenden Unendlichkeiten -- --

Marianne war, einer Ohnmacht nahe, stehn geblieben und rang nach Atem.

Sie standen wieder dicht vor der Verkündigungskirche, an den Stufen, über denen sich die Eingangspforte erhebt. Hugo Lanz hatte einen Arm um Marianne gelegt und führte sie, sie vorsichtig stützend, hinauf bis in den Seitengang, wo längs den Fensterchen von gewelltem Glas eine Bank stand.

Dort ließ er Marianne niedersitzen und neigte sich, neben ihr stehn bleibend, mit besorgter Frage zu ihr.

Aber sie achtete nicht auf das, was er flüsternd fragte. Dicht vor ihr öffnete sich das blausilberne Portal in den innern Kirchenraum, auf der Seite, wo sie eben hereingetreten waren, blickte von der Thür ein großes dunkles Christusbild zu ihr nieder, die Züge kaum kenntlich, ein schwarzer Fleck, umhüllt und umkleidet von unendlichem Goldglanz. Sie starrte darauf hin, bis sie vor Thränen nichts mehr sah. Rätsel hinter Gold --.

Aber leise und wohlthuend legte sich die Dämmerung dieser Kirchenwände wie schützend um sie. Kaum glichen sie Wänden, bedeckt mit alten nachgedunkelten Malereien wie reiche alte Stoffe, sich niedrig wölbend und wellend, wie ein ungeheurer Mantel, der sich in schweren weichen Falten um den Betenden legt, ihn sanft bergend vor der Außenwelt --.

Sie hob beide Hände vor das Gesicht und beugte sich tief vor, ohne ein Wort zu sprechen. Schweigend verharrte sie lange so.

Hier und da kamen von draußen Menschen vorüber, meistens Leute aus dem Volk; leise auftretend mit ihrem groben Schuhwerk, schritten sie tiefer hinein in das Schiff der Kirche, das in feierlicher Dämmerung vor ihnen dalag, nur an wenigen Punkten schwach erhellt von vereinzelten Wachskerzen, die daraus hervorblinkten.

Hugo Lanz stand neben Marianne, an ihre Bank gelehnt, und blickte auf sie nieder. Er wußte nicht, was in ihr vorgehn mochte, aber daß in dieser Stille etwas Erschütterndes in ihrer Seele zum Austrag kam, das mußte er wohl fühlen -- --. Und wenn er einst zu ihr gekommen war im drängenden Verlangen, an ihrer warmen Mütterlichkeit getrost und froh zu werden wie ein Kind, so wuchs jetzt eine Sehnsucht in ihm empor, -- groß, wie er sie nie gekannt hatte, -- stark zu werden und kraftvoll, ein Mann, um beschützen und behüten zu dürfen --.

Er stand da und horchte stumm auf das Geläute der Glocken, -- auf den seltsam packenden Klang dieser russischen Glocken, die sich weigern, sich mit ihren Klängen mitzuwiegen, und ehern feststehn, daß der Klöppel in ihnen anschlägt wie ein weithin tönender Befehl -- --.

Da ließ Marianne die Hände von ihrem Gesicht sinken und erhob sich ganz langsam. Hugo Lanz machte eine Bewegung zu ihr hin, aber die Andacht in ihren Augen und in ihrer ganzen Haltung bannte ihn. Es war wie eine unsichtbare Einsamkeit und Hoheit um sie, die er nicht zu entweihen wagte. Und unwillkürlich trat er zur Seite.

Einen Augenblick lang stand Marianne da, sich besinnend, fast schüchtern, mit einer sanften Neigung des Kopfes, die etwas Rührendes für ihn hatte, etwas von unaussprechlicher Ergebung. Aber auf ihren Zügen lag ein ruhiger Glanz, alle Angst war von ihnen gewichen.

Sie machte eine Wendung, um aus dem Portal hinauszutreten, ohne ihren Begleiter zu bemerken. In diesen Minuten hatte sie auch ihn vergessen. Er schaute ihr nach, und unwiderleglich kam ihm das Gefühl: -- als ginge sie gar nicht allein -- --.

Ein paar Schritte hinter ihr trat er hinaus auf den Platz.

Unten in der Stadt, die dem Kreml zu Füßen lag, blinkten eben die ersten Lichter auf. Schon war es nicht mehr ganz hell. Weißlicher Winternebel zog sich in der Ferne über die Ufer des Flusses. Fest um den Kreml geschmiegt, standen die Häuser da, rot und blau und grün an Dächern oder Mauerwerk, und erwarteten nach des Tages Treiben das Dunkel, durch das das siegende Gold der zahllosen Kuppeln hindurchschien wie eine ewige Leuchte, die nicht mit dem Tage erlischt.

Ein unerhörtes Abendrot stand über Moskau. Und die Buntheit der Farben ringsum nahm auch noch den schwächsten Abglanz davon, nahm auch den leisesten Funken so innig auf, hielt sich ihm an der Oberfläche aller Dinge als ein so williges Gefäß entgegen, daß es fast wirkte wie ein Lobgesang, der emporstieg von der Erde zum erglühenden Himmel. Eine Stimmung wie ein Ausgleich zwischen Freude und Gebet lag über dem Ganzen. Die paar Wolken, die inmitten der Bläue des Himmels zögernd dunkelten, zogen sich, lichtdurchschossen, langsam zu breitschimmernden Goldbändern auseinander -- --.

Da ging ein flüchtiger Regenschauer nieder, warm und ganz kurz, wie ein Thränensturz.

Hugo Lanz blieb stehn und schaute hinab, dorthin wo Mas feine ruhige Gestalt im Abstieg zu den Anlagen sichtbar blieb.

Wie klein und unscheinbar verschwand sie dort zwischen den Bäumen. Und ihm schien doch alles ringsum sie allein zu feiern und zu umstrahlen --.

Denn in ihm arbeitete sich irgend ein Bild mit mächtiger Gewalt zu künstlerischer Klarheit hindurch, -- ein Bild, in dem er Ma vor sich sah, -- ein Bild, in dem ihr Glück lebte und ihr Vereinsamen, und ihr Weh, und ihr Sieg, -- ein Bild, in dem geheimnisvoll lebte, was in diesem Augenblick in ihr selbst wohl nur in dunkeln Ahnungen rang -- --.

Und es kam ihm vor, als stünde er angesichts eines großen Schauspiels, um deswillen man das Leben fürchten und lieben lernen mag. Und das den Schauenden, dem es seine Heimlichkeit enthüllt, zum Kinde werden lassen mag, und zum Manne, -- und zum Dichter.

-- Ganz benommen und wie sich selbst entrückt, blickte er hinab von der Kremlhöhe in die Tiefe der Stadt.

So sah er Ma schweigend, still niedersteigen unter dem verhallenden Geläute der Glocken, -- einen von oben in die Wohnungen der Menschen entsendeten guten Geist.

[Illustration]

J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger G. m. b. H. in Stuttgart.

Die nachstehend verzeichneten Romane und Novellen sind auch elegant in Leinwand gebunden zu beziehen.

Preis für den Einband 1 Mark.

Andreas-Salomé, Lou, Ruth. Erzählung. 3. Auflage. Geheftet M. 3.50.

--"-- Aus fremder Seele. Eine Spätherbstgeschichte. 2. Aufl. " M. 2.--

--"-- Fenitschka. Eine Ausschweifung. Zwei Erzählungen. " M. 2.50.

--"-- Menschenkinder. Novellencyklus. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Ma. Ein Porträt. " M. 2.50.

Anzengruber, Ludw., Wolken und Sunn'schein. 2. Aufl. " M. 3.--

Arminius, Wilhelm, Der Weg zur Erkenntnis. Roman. " M. 3.--

--"-- Yorks Offiziere. Historischer Roman. " M. 3.50.

Bobertag, Bianca, Moderne Jugend. Roman. " M. 4.--

Bourget, Paul, Das gelobte Land. Roman. " M. 3.--

Boy-Ed, Ida, Die Lampe der Psyche. Roman. 2. Aufl. " M. 4.--

--"-- Um Helena. Roman. " M. 3.50.

Bülow, Frieda v., Kara. Roman. " M. 4.--

Burckhard, Max, Simon Thums. 2. Auflage. " M. 3.--

Busse, Carl, Die Schüler von Polajewo. Novellen. " M. 2.50.

Ebner-Eschenbach, Marie v., Erzählungen. 3. Aufl. " M. 3.--

--"-- Božena. Erzählung. 5. Auflage. " M. 3.--

--"-- Margarete. 4. Auflage. " M. 2.--

-- Moriz v., =Hypnosis perennis=. Ein Wunder des heiligen Sebastian. Zwei Wiener Geschichten. " M. 2.--

Eckstein, Ernst, Nero. Roman. 6. Auflage. " M. 5.--

Ertl, Emil, Mistral. Novellen. " M. 3.--

Fulda, L., Lebensfragmente. Zwei Novellen. 7. Auflage. " M. 2.--

Haushofer, Max, Planetenfeuer. Ein Zukunftsroman. " M. 3.50.

Heer, J. C., An heiligen Wassern. Roman. 6. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Der König der Bernina. Roman. 9. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

Heilborn, Ernst, Kleefeld. Roman. " M. 2.--

Heyse, Paul, Neue Novellen. 7. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Marthas Briefe an Maria. 2. Auflage. " M. 1.--

Hillern, Wilhelmine v., 's Reis am Weg. 2. Auflage. " M. 1.50.

--"-- Ein alter Streit. Roman. 3. Auflage. " M. 3.--

Höcker, Paul Oskar, Väterchen. Roman. " M. 3.--

Hopfen, H., Der letzte Hieb. Eine Studentengeschichte. 3. Aufl. " M. 2.50.

Junghans, Sophie, Schwertlilie. Roman. 2. Auflage. " M. 4.--

Kirchbach, Wolfgang, Miniaturen. Fünf Novellen. " M. 4.--

Langmann, Philipp, Verflogene Rufe. Novellen. " M. 2.50.

Lindau, Paul, Der Zug nach d. Westen. Roman. 9. Aufl. " M. 4.--

Loti, Pierre, Japanische Herbsteindrücke. " M. 3.--

Mauthner, Fritz, Hypatia. Roman. 2. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

Meyer-Förster, Wilhelm, Eldena. Roman. 2. Auflage. " M. 3.--

Muellenbach, E. (E. Lenbach), Abseits. Erzählungen. " M. 3.--

--"-- Vom heißen Stein. Roman. " M. 3.--

Petri, Julius, Pater peccavi! Roman. " M. 3.--

Prel, Karl du, Das Kreuz am Ferner. Roman. 2. Aufl. " M. 5.--

Proelß, Johannes, Bilderstürmer! Roman. 2. Auflage. " M. 4.--

Riehl, W. H., Aus der Ecke. Sieben Novellen. 4. Auflage. " M. 4.--

--"-- Neues Novellenbuch. 3. Aufl. (6. Abdruck.) " M. 4.--

Saitschick, Robert, Aus der Tiefe. Ein Lebensbuch. " M. 2.--

Schunsui, Tamenaga, Treu bis in den Tod. Hist. Roman. " M. 3.--

Seidel, Heinrich, Leberecht Hühnchen. Gesamtausgabe. " M. 4.--

Stegemann, Hermann, Stille Wasser. Roman. " M. 3.--

Stratz, Rudolph, Der weiße Tod. Roman. 5. Auflage. " M. 3.--

--"-- Buch der Liebe. Sechs Novellen. 2. Auflage. " M. 2.50.

--"-- Der arme Konrad. Roman. 3. Auflage. " M. 3.--

--"-- Die letzte Wahl. Roman. 3. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Montblanc. Roman. 5. Auflage. " M. 3.--

--"-- Die ewige Burg. Roman. 3. Auflage. " M. 3.--

--"-- Die thörichte Jungfrau. Roman. 5. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

Sudermann, Herm., Frau Sorge. Roman. 57. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Geschwister. Zwei Novellen. 22. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Der Katzensteg. Roman. 44. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Im Zwielicht. Zwanglose Geschichten. 26. Auflage. " M. 2.--

--"-- Jolanthes Hochzeit. Erzählung. 23. Auflage. " M. 2.--

--"-- Es war. Roman. 30. Auflage. " M. 5.--

Telmann, Konrad, Trinacria. Sizilische Geschichten. " M. 4.--

Voß, Richard, Römische Dorfgeschichten. 4. Auflage. " M. 3.--

Wereschagin, W. W., Der Kriegskorrespondent. " M. 2.--

Widmann, J. V., Touristennovellen. " M. 4.--

Wilbrand, Adolf, Fridolins heimliche Ehe. 3. Aufl. " M. 2.50.

--"-- Meister Amor. Roman. 2. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Novellen aus der Heimat. 2. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Hermann Isinger. Roman. 5. Auflage. " M. 4.--

--"-- Der Dornenweg. Roman. 4. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Die Osterinsel. Roman. 3. Auflage. " M. 4.--

--"-- Die Rothenburger. Roman. 5. Auflage. " M. 3.--

--"-- Vater und Sohn und andere Geschichten. 2. Auflage. " M. 3.--

--"-- Hildegard Mahlmann. Roman. 3. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Schleichendes Gift. Roman. 3. Auflage. " M. 3.--

--"-- Die glückliche Frau. Roman. 4. Auflage. " M. 3.--

--"-- Vater Robinson. Roman. 3. Auflage. " M. 3.--

--"-- Der Sänger. Roman. 4. Auflage. " M. 4.--

--"-- Erika. Das Kind. Erzählungen. 3. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Feuerblumen. Roman. 3. Auflage. " M. 3.--

--"-- Franz. Roman. 3. Auflage. " M. 3.50.

--"-- Das lebende Bild und andere Geschichten. 3. Auflage. " M. 3.--

Wildenbruch, E. v., Schwester-Seele. Roman. 11. Aufl. " M. 4.--

Worms, Carl, Du bist mein. Zeitroman. " M. 4.--

--"-- Thoms friert. Roman. " M. 4.--

[Illustration]

[Hinweise zur Transkription

Das Originalbuch ist in Frakturschrift gedruckt.

Darstellung abweichender Schriftarten:

gesperrt : =Antiqua=

Verlagswerbung wurde vom Buchanfang an das Buchende verschoben.

Der Text des Originalbuches wurde grundsätzlich beibehalten, mit folgenden Ausnahmen,

Seite 23: "nichs" geändert in "nichts" (Nun, das macht nichts.)

Seite 49: "leiebkosende" geändert in "liebkosende" (als seien es ebensoviel liebkosende Verheißungen)

Seite 63: "»" eingefügt (»die schönsten Lieder und die schönsten Sagen)

Seite 109: "auch" geändert in "nach" (in die Hand nehmen und nach deinem stärkeren Willen prägen)

Seite 112: "«" eingefügt (Sie ist aber nicht krank geworden.«)

Seite 160: "halbmäd henhafte" geändert in "halbmädchenhafte" (Dabei hatte sie irgend eine halbmädchenhafte Kopfhaltung)

Seite 168: "Das" geändert in "das" (»Nein, -- das heißt: es wäre ja wunderschön)

Seite 179: "." eingefügt (um alle Kraft aufzuzehren --.)

Seite 185: "«" hinter "helfen?" entfernt (Was konnt es denn helfen?)]

==========

Untitled

Unknown

Project Gutenberg Release: January 27, 2020 · eBook #61260

IT’S FUN TO SEW aprons and skirts

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE PHASE 2 OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, CORVALLIS 4-H CLUB SERIES L-86

It’s Fun to Sew—Aprons and Skirts

Prepared by THETA JOHNSON Clothing Specialist, Extension Service Utah State University Logan, Utah

PHASE 2

Where to find page Your guide for the project 1 Plan your project 1 Take care of your clothing 2 Shine your shoes 2 Sew on buttons 2 Assemble your sewing tools 3 Do your shopping 3 Buying cotton fabric 3 Learn to use the sewing machine 4 Learn to press cotton 6 Sew—have fun 7 Make a scarf 7 Make a sewing kit 8 Make TV slippers 8 Make your apron or skirt 9 Peasant apron with band 10 Peasant apron with elastic top 12 Gathered skirt 13 How does your apron or skirt look to you? 16 Complete your record book 17 Show others what you have learned 17 Exhibits 17 Give a demonstration 17 Are you ready for the next project? 17

Read this book from cover to cover before you start your project.

Your guide for the project

Learn to sew—have fun. This book will help you get the right start on your second 4-H clothing project. Read it carefully and study the pictures. Ask your mother to read and study with you. Follow the instructions and you will form good habits. This project is planned for you. Learn to do each part step by step.

Keep this book in your sewing box. Refer to it whenever you need help.

Study these subjects

1. Care of clothing— sew on buttons shine your shoes keep dresses on hangers in closets or placed neatly in drawers 2. Good grooming— keep neat and tidy practice good health habits 3. Cotton fabrics 4. Use of your sewing machine

Articles to make

One of the following first for practice Head scarf—single Head scarf—double Sewing kit TV slippers An apron or skirt as your main project Gathered skirt Peasant apron Elastic top apron Cover-all apron

Add to your record book

Your County extension agent will give you your 4-H record sheets. Keep your clothing record up to date. Write your 4-H story for the year when you complete your project. Be sure to fill in your permanent record, too. There are places on your permanent record to show the activities you have participated in—be sure to keep a record of them. Activities plus project work make a well-rounded 4-H program.

Learn to give a demonstration

Show others what you have learned by giving a demonstration at one of your club meetings. When you show another club member how to tie a knot or sew on a button, you are giving a “demonstration.” Things that are done or seen are remembered longest. Give your demonstration alone or with a partner. You will find demonstrations interesting and helpful. Ask your leader to give you ideas on how to give a demonstration. Choose a topic you have studied in your project.

Plan your project

You will want to talk about your project with your mother and leader. This will help you to understand your project. Study the project outline and your record book. Take your mother with you to your first 4-H club meeting.

You will need your mother's cooperation in selecting equipment and cloth.

Plan to do all your shopping at one time. Buy the cloth for your apron or skirt and slippers or scarf at the time you buy your sewing equipment. This will save you time.

Before you go shopping make a list of all of the things you will need. Think about the blouses or dresses you have when you plan the colors for your skirt or apron. You may want to wear your scarf and skirt together—if you do, plan the colors to go together.

This project is more than just sewing. You will study health and good grooming and how to care for your clothes.

Get off to a good start by learning how to care for your shoes and how to sew on buttons.

Take care of your clothing

Shine your shoes

Daily care will improve the looks of your shoes and will help make them wear longer. Clean and polish your shoes. Wipe them off with a clean (wool) cloth and brush away the loose dirt before you put them away. When they need polishing, use one of the many good polishes that are on the market. Select the kind that is best for the leather in your shoes. Follow the directions given with the polish.

[Illustration: Shoe]

Shoes become damp from perspiration when you wear them. Wearing socks will protect the lining. Allow your shoes to dry thoroughly between wearings. Filling the toes of your shoes with tissue paper will help absorb the moisture.

Examine your shoes for signs of wear. Keep the heels straight and do not wear the sole through before having it repaired. Have all rips mended as soon as they appear.

Do not place wet shoes near heat or in the sun to dry. When they are dry, clean and polish them to make them look like new.

Your dress is only as pretty as the shoes you wear with it. Are you proud of the care you give your shoes? Keep a record of the care you give your shoes in your record book.

Sew on buttons

To help mother care for the family clothing, why don't you take the responsibility of replacing buttons on shirts and blouses for the family. Make a game of it with other members of your club. Have a button contest. Give yourself a point for each button you sew on. The club could plan to give a prize to the girl who sews on the most buttons during the club year.

Keep a record of the buttons you sew on, something like this:

Date	Article of clothing	Points—or number of buttons
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Record the total in your record book.

Use buttons to trim your bedroom slippers. Select one flat, medium-sized one or three small ones. Arrange them on the toes of your slippers to make an attractive trim.

How to sew on a button

1. Make a small knot in double thread (15 inches long). Fasten to article where center of the button is to be placed. Take two or three stitches over the knot.

2. Sew the button in place with one or two stitches. See that the stitches run in the same direction as the buttonhole.

[Illustration: Sewing on a button]

3. Place a pin on top of buttons under the first stitches. This makes a shank. Continue to sew on the button. Take as many stitches as necessary to hold the button securely. When the stitches are in place, remove the pin. Lift the button away from the article. Wind the thread tightly around the stitches, as shown, and fasten the thread on the back by taking three or four stitches, one on top of the other.

Assemble your sewing tools

You will need a sewing box or basket and good sewing tools. Obtain a small box to hold your tools and another one large enough to hold your small box plus your apron or skirt. A small suitcase makes an ideal sewing box.

[Illustration: Sewing tools]

You will need

Thimble—This is for the middle finger. Make sure of a snug fit. A thimble protects your finger.

Needles—A package of needles, assorted sizes of 7 to 9 sharps, will give you the various sizes needed. Use as fine a needle as will carry the thread you are using.

Thread—White mercerized thread No. 50 is used for basting. Match other thread to your fabric.

Pins—Select smooth fine dressmaker pins so they will not leave a dark spot on your cloth. These usually come in a box.

Pin cushion—Plan for a pin cushion that can be worn on the wrist. You may make or buy this.

Scissors and shears—Scissors have short blades and are used for snipping threads and cutting small pieces of material. Seven-inch blades are a good length. Shears have one long handle for the fingers and one short one for the thumb. Scissors with bent handles are handy because the cutting blade rests flat on the table. Use plain scissors to cut out your articles. Do not use pinking shears.

Tape measure—Select a tape measure that will wear well and one that is numbered with “1” on each end on opposite sides.

Measuring gauge—You can cut a gauge from cardboard or buy a 4-inch metal one. From the start, learn to measure accurately. On a tape or measuring gauge, locate the 1-inch, ½-inch, and ¼-inch marks.

Do your shopping

Buying cotton fabric

When you start to sew, it is most important that you have a fine, firm piece of cotton cloth. The best fabric for your scarf, skirt, or apron is percale, either plain or crease resistant. Percale is soft and firm, and comes in figured and plain colors. Select a small all-over pattern in colors that you will enjoy wearing. Avoid plain colors, plaids, or large designs. Also avoid cloth which feels stiff. Crush several pieces of cloth in your hand. You will be able to tell the difference. Select the one that wrinkles the least.

When you buy your fabric, be sure it is preshrunk and colorfast. Also find out if it is crease-resistant and how to wash it. Is it hand washable or machine washable? You will find most of this information on the end of the bolt of fabric or on attached labels. Study these and also ask the clerk to tell you about the fabrics.

[Illustration: Bolt of fabric]

WASH & WEAR LITTLE or NO IRONING MACHINE WASH—DRIP DRY CREASE RESISTANT

Cotton/Arnell coordinates

55% Cotton 45% Arnell Tri-Acetate

WIDTH 44/5″ COLOR_____ YDS._____

Good percale has the same number of threads in the warp as in the filling. The warp threads are those that run the long way of the fabric. The filling threads go back and forth across the warp threads. The filling threads are softer than the warp threads but not as strong. Examine the edge of the fabric. The edge is called selvage. It is stronger than the rest of the cloth because it has more threads in it. This may also cause it to shrink more during washing.

[Illustration: Selvedge]

Percales should be torn, not cut, from the bolt. This leaves a straight line or shows one thread for the entire width of the cloth. Before you buy any fabric, lay the folded cloth on the counter and examine the torn end. Are both sides even or is one side an inch or so shorter than the other? Select a piece which is reasonably even. Do not select fabric if one side is more than ½-inch shorter.

Border prints make interesting skirts. Study the design on the cloth and buy enough cloth so you can match the design on the side seam. Make sure the fabric is straight. Crooked fabric will give you a curved side seam.

[Illustration: I KNOW THESE FABRICS—DO YOU?]

Percale may be used for all the articles you will make in this year's project. Other fabrics that may be used are chambray, broadcloth, poplin, and novelty fabrics.

Plan a shopping tour with your club before buying your fabric. After studying the different cotton fabrics, have your leader and mother help you select the fabric for your scarf, apron, or skirt. If you plan to make a double scarf, buy ½ yard additional fabric like your skirt and the same amount of a contrasting color.

You will need two washcloths if you plan to make the TV slippers. Select medium weight washcloths either with or without border trim.

Learn to use the sewing machine

Many of you learned to use the sewing machine in Phase 1 of _It's Fun to Sew_. You will find this section of your bulletin to be a good review.

For those of you who are starting with this phase, this section will help you become acquainted with the parts of the machine and will tell you how to use it.

The needle—Notice that it has an eye near the point instead of at the top like the one you use for hand sewing.

The presser foot—See the two toes between which the needle passes? This is the presser foot. Find the small metal arm which raises the presser foot up and down. The metal arm is on the back of the machine.

The bobbin—This carries the thread for the underside of the sewing. Bobbins are different shapes and sizes for different machines. Learn to place the bobbin in the machine and to remove it. Learn to wind the bobbin.

The balance wheel—This is the wheel on the right-hand side of the machine.

When you can recognize these parts and know their use, you are ready to learn to run the machine. Check these points before you start to use the machine:

1. Remove the bobbin and top thread.

2. Have the needle up as far as it will go.

3. Raise the presser foot.

How to start the machine

You are now ready to get the "feel" of running the sewing machine. You will first practice starting the machine off slowly and evenly.

If you use an electric machine, you must learn how much pressure to put on the knee or foot control. Remember there is a lot of power in an electric machine.

If you use a treadle machine, put both feet on the treadle, one ahead of the other. With your right hand, move the balance wheel forward or back, whichever is right for your kind of machine. Take your hand off the balance wheel and treadle with your feet, pressing first with your toes and then with your heels. Practice treadling until you can run it smoothly at a moderate speed.

[Illustration: Sewing.]

How to stop the machine

Try stopping the machine by slowing down the treadling or releasing the pressure on the electric control. With your right hand, stop the balance wheel. Turn the wheel slowly until the needle is raised as high as it will go. Always do this when you stop the machine. Practice starting and stopping. You will do this many times while you are sewing. Try stitching both forward and backward if there is a reverse lever on your machine.

Practice sewing on paper

Now that you can run the machine, practice sewing by first stitching on paper. Draw some straight and curved lines on paper as a guide to follow as you stitch. Here is how to do it:

Place the end of a line under the needle.

Lower the presser foot. This holds the paper securely and helps feed it through the machine.

Start the machine by turning the balance wheel. Treadle slowly or press on the foot or knee release of the electric machine.

Guide the paper with both hands. Place the left hand in back of the needle and the right in front of the needle. Keep your hands at a safe distance from the needle when stitching.

When you can stitch straight and control the speed of the machine, you are ready to learn to thread the machine and start sewing an easy-to-make article.

Thread the machine

You can best learn to thread the machine by having your leader show you how to thread it. Then practice while she watches you. Watch closely when she draws the bobbin thread to the top and see how she pulls both threads back of the presser foot. Learn about the tension. The tension determines whether or not you have a good stitch. Until you are older, have your leader or mother adjust the tension for you. Watch her while she does it.

Check the stitch

Pull both top and bobbin threads back of the presser foot. Place a double thickness of cloth under the presser foot and make several inches of stitching. Inspect the stitch. Does it look the same on both sides? If not, have the tension adjusted until it does.

Use 12 stitches to the inch for the type of sewing you will be doing. Have your leader show you how to adjust the length of the stitch.

When you have finished sewing, raise the needle as far as it will go. Raise the presser foot and pull the fabric back about 4 inches from the needle. Cut the thread with your scissors or on the cutting knife on the side of the needle-bar.

[Illustration: Sewing machine needle]

Use a cloth gauge

A cloth gauge placed to the right of the needle will aid you in making straight seams. Place a strip of colored scotch tape, band aid, or adhesive tape to the right of the needle if you do not have a gauge. Watch the edge of your cloth as it follows along the gauge rather than watching the needle when stitching. This will help you make a straighter seam.

Your posture at the machine

Posture is important. If you sit “tall,” you will be less tired and will do better work.

Become a 4-H machinist

There is a special activity planned to help you learn how to use the sewing machine. It is called “Know Your Sewing Machine.” Ask your leader and county home agent about this.

Learning to use the machine is the most important part of this clothing project and it is a lot of fun. Bring your mother to club with you the day you study machines so she can enjoy it with you. When you have learned to use the machine and can pass your test for a 4-H sewing machinist, your leader will sign your certificate. You are now ready to start to sew.

Have you learned to:

[_] Start and stop the machine? [_] Run the machine smoothly? [_] Wind the bobbin and place it in its case or shuttle? [_] Thread the machine, top and bobbin, and pull up the bobbin thread? [_] Adjust the length of stitch? [_] Stitch on straight lines, corners, and curves? [_] Guide, not force, the fabric? [_] Tell a good stitch?

Learn to press cotton

Examine the iron—locate the different parts. Set the heat indicator of your iron for cotton. This will keep the iron at the correct temperature.

Cotton may be ironed on either the right or the wrong side. If your fabric does not iron out smoothly or take a sharp crease, dampen it. Here is how to do it:

Dampen a piece of cheesecloth and squeeze it tight. Do not make it wet. Place it over the cloth you want to press and set iron on it. Steam will form and dampen the cloth.

Always iron or press with the grain of the cloth. Follow the warp or the filling threads. Do not iron on the bias.

[Illustration: STRAIGHT and BIAS]

Sew—have fun

Now that you have practiced using the sewing machine, you are ready to make a scarf, slippers, or sewing kit.

Make a scarf

[Illustration: Wearing a scarf]

This scarf may be made larger than the measurements suggested but it will require more fabric. Using these measurements, a square of cloth can be cut into four scarves. It will be more economical to cut a scarf this way if four in your club use the same colored fabric.

Plan to have your scarf match or look nice with your skirt. For a double scarf, have one side the same as your skirt fabric and one a plain or contrasting color. A single scarf may either match your skirt or be a contrasting color.

Double scarf

[Illustration: Scarf Pattern]

Cut two triangles of fabric—

1—plain 1—contrast

Pin right sides together and sew a ½-inch seam around edge.

Start sewing 6 inches from center of scarf. Stitch around scarf and stop 3 inches before reaching starting point (see diagram). The opening is for turning your scarf.

[Illustration: Scarf seam]

Press the seams open. Then trim the seams until they are ¼-inch wide. Trim off corners. Turn your scarf and press.

[Illustration: Hemmed scarf]

Baste a slot for headband, 14 inches long and ¾ inch wide. Sew across one end. Turn and stitch along basting threads. Turn and stitch across other end. See diagram.

[Illustration: Scarf and headband]

Sew (by hand) 2 inches of opening, leaving 1 inch open to insert head band.

Insert head band and your scarf is finished.

Single scarf

Cut one triangle of fabric.

[Illustration: Scarf pattern]

Press ¼-inch hem on both 25-inch sides of scarf. Press ¾-inch hem on long edge of scarf.

[Illustration: Hemmed scarf]

Trim off end of hem on dotted lines. Turn ends under even with side hems. Press.

[Illustration: Folds in cloth]

Miter corner on point of scarf according to directions under sewing kit.

[Illustration: Mitered corners]

Refold the scarf on folds for hem. You now have a mitered corner.

[Illustration: Stitched scarf]

Stitch around your scarf. Start stitching 6 inches from center on 35-inch side. Stitch all around scarf.

Stop 1 inch from where you started to stitch. Turn and stitch to folded edge of hem. Stitch across hem 7 inches from center of scarf to make other end of slot to hold head band. Finish two top corners by hand. Trim off peak (x) to edge of hem. Insert head band and your scarf is finished.

Make a sewing kit

[Illustration: Sewing kit pattern]

This kit can be used to roll your sewing in and to cover your work table to protect your fabric while you are sewing.

[Illustration: Hems]

Use a 36-inch square of muslin. Make a ¼-inch hem on all sides.

To make the hem, turn the edge of the fabric over ¼ inch and press. Turn this over once again and press. Pin or baste around the hem. Pressing eliminates many hours of basting.

Miter the corners. Open the corners and fold along diagonal dotted line as shown in the diagram. Refold the hem and press.

Start to stitch in the center of one side and continue to stitch all around the square. Stitch as near the edge of the hem as possible. Remove your sewing kit from the machine when you finish stitching and tie ends of the threads. Pull out the basting and press your sewing kit. Trim off the extra fabric in each corner.

Place an 8 x 12-inch pocket in the center of this square to hold your pattern and sewing equipment. See “Pockets,” page 12.

Make TV or lounging slippers

[Illustration: Slippers]

Materials needed:

2 washcloths thread to match 2 10-inch pieces of ¼-inch elastic wool yarn for pompons or flat buttons

1. Fold each cloth in half. If there is a design on two sides, fold the cloth so the design is at the top. Stitch 4 inches from folded edge for top. Make a ¼-inch seam.

[Illustration: Folded sewing kit]

Stitch from fold to edge of cloth for heel on other end of washcloth. Stand on a ruler and measure length of your foot. Add 1½ inches to this length to get the size needed for your slipper. Example: foot—9 inches, plus 1½ inches equal 10½ inches. Your seam will be at this point. Most washcloths are 12 inches square. You would have a heel seam 1½ inches wide.

2. Turn seams to inside. Open the heel seam.

3. Fold the edges over 2 inches to the outside of the slipper. Pin or paste in place. Stitch ½ inch from folded edge to make a casing for the elastic. Tie or back tack ends of thread.

[Illustration: Casing for elastic]

4. Thread elastic through casing. Use medium-size safety pin. Pin to one end of elastic and thread elastic through casing. Start at opening of front toe. Pull both ends so they extend out from slipper. Overlap ends ½ inch and sew them together.

[Illustration: Threading elastic]

Pull on heel and toe seam and the slippers will cover the elastic. Trim your slippers with pompons or buttons.

[Illustration: Making pompons]

5. To make the pompons, use a four-tined table fork. Cut a piece of yarn about 6 inches long and place through the center tine of the fork. Bring both ends down and hold next to the handle. Now wrap the yarn around the tines, either weave it in and out of the tines or wrap smoothly around. When the tines are completely covered, bring the two ends which you are holding with the handle up around the other yarn and tie a knot, at the same time slipping the yarn from the fork. Tie securely. Clip through looped ends and fluff into a ball.

Sew pompons to center front of slipper to cover opening for elastic.

You may use buttons to trim your slippers instead of the pompons. Select flat buttons that can be washed. Use one average or large button or three small ones on each toe. (See “How to sew on a button,” page 2.)

Select yarn or buttons that will look nice on your slippers. They may be the same color as the slippers or another color that will look good on them. Try several colors. Medium colored buttons rather than black or other dark colors look best on pale colored slippers.

Make your apron or skirt

[Illustration: Aprons and skirt]

Aprons and skirts are fun and easy to make. This will probably be the first apron or skirt you have ever made all by yourself. Your leader will show you how to make it, step by step. Follow her instructions and you will learn to sew in no time at all. Learn to do each step right the first time.

Choose one that you would like to make

1. Peasant-type skirt

2. Peasant apron with straight band

3. Peasant apron with elastic top

Plan to have one or two pockets on your apron or skirt.

Peasant apron with band

You will need to buy:

30 inches of 39-inch percale or other firm cotton fabric—if you are taller you will need more material to make your apron longer. 1 spool of matching thread

[Illustration: Apron pattern]

SELVAGE APRON 20 × 32½ 5 × 32½ SASHES 5 × 32½ SELVAGE 6½ × 18 BAND POCKETS 5 × 6½ 5 × 6½

Measure and cut your apron

Mark the apron according to the diagram.

Band 6½ x 18 inches Apron skirt 20 x 32½ inches Two sashes 32½ x 5 inches One or two pockets 6½ x 5 inches

Measure and mark off these pieces with chalk or pins before cutting. Cut with long, even strokes.

Make your sashes

Fold the right sides of each sash together. Place pins across the stitching lines as shown in the diagram. Make a ¼-inch seam along the side and end of the sash. Backstitch for two or three stitches to make the end of your thread secure. Trim off the corner.

Check the stitch on your machine. Be sure it looks the same on both sides of the fabric.

[Illustration: Stitched sash]

Press the seam open and turn the sash. Use the end of a table knife or ruler for turning. Press the sash flat, keeping the seam at the edge. Make the corners square.

If you prefer to hem the sash, make a ¼-inch hem, miter the corners. See instructions on scarf, pages 7 and 8.

Press and stitch hems

Side hems

1. Make a ¼-inch hem on each side of the apron. To make a hem, press a ¼-inch fold on the side edges of your apron (20-inch sides). Press with your fingers, then with the iron.

[Illustration: First turn]

2. Fold edge over again ¼ inch and press. Stitch along edge of hem. This completes the hem.

Selvage edge—If the selvage is used, clip only the very edge of it every 2 or 3 inches. This prevents puckering when it is laundered. Fold the edge over ¼ inch, press and stitch. A double hem is not needed.

Bottom hem

Make a 3-inch hem on the bottom of your apron. Measure and turn ¼-inch fold at bottom of apron. Press. From this edge measure 3 inches, fold, and press. Pin and stitch the hems. Use matching thread. Stitch as near as you can to the edge of the hem. Backstitch on both ends of hem.

Gather the top edge

Divide the top edge of your skirt into four equal parts.

Set your cloth guide for a ¼-inch seam. Lengthen your stitch to make the largest stitch possible.

Make three rows of stitching along the top of the apron, placing rows ¼ inch apart. Place the first row ¼ inch from the edge. Be sure to follow the guide.

[Illustration: Gathered top edge]

Make your apron band

Your apron band is made the same way as a skirt band, only the proportions are different. Turn to page 14 for illustrations.

1. Press a ½-inch fold along one side of your 18-inch band. Divide the band, lengthwise into three equal parts. This gives three 2-inch sections. Make the section with the ½-inch fold slightly shorter than the other two sections. Place a damp press cloth over the folded band and press sharp creases along the folds.

2. The section with the ½-inch fold is the front of your band. The double part is the back. Stitch criss-cross through the back part of the band. You can stitch straighter if you make a guide or pattern. Cut a strip of waxed paper the length and width of your band, 18 x 2 inches.

Fold in four equal sections.

Then fold it diagonally. Then diagonally again. Open the paper and pin it to the band and follow the creases in the paper. This will give practice on starting and stopping the machine and on turning corners. Tear the paper away after the stitching is completed.

[Illustration: Apron band]

3. Pin and sew the end of the sashes to the end of the band. Fold the band right sides together, and stitch across ends. Do not sew the ½-inch fold at bottom of band into the seam.

[Illustration: Apron band]

Stitch both sides. Turn and press along the original crease.

[Illustration: Band on apron]

Sew apron to band

Be sure the edges of the band and apron are marked in four equal parts. Place the right side of the apron to the right side of the band. Match the quarter marks and pin. Place the hemmed ends of the apron at the seam ends of the band. Ease in the fullness in the apron until it fits the band. Pull all bobbin threads from each end at the same time. Pull gently so you do not break the threads. Spread the gathers so they are even and pin. Baste along the second row of gathering and the crease in the band. Machine stitch along the bastings. Press.

Pin so back edge of band is ■ inch longer than edge of front of band. Top stitch along front edge of band. This finishes your band. Be sure to press the band before you stitch. It will make stitching easier.

Add your pockets

Pockets are for both use and decoration. Make patch pockets that are securely stitched and have no raw edges at the top.

Press the side and bottom hems of the pocket first. Then fold the top hem over and stitch in place. Study the most convenient location for your pocket. Baste it in place. Check to see that it is even. Reinforce the top of the pocket with double stitching, as shown in the drawing. Stitching is ¼ inch apart.

[Illustration: Pockets]

Remove gathering stitches and press your apron.

[Illustration: Finished apron]

Peasant apron with elastic top

You will need to buy

30 inches of cotton fabric 1 spool of matching thread 14 inches of ½-inch elastic

Measure and cut your apron

Cut your apron 20 x 31 inches. This will fit a girl of size 10 to 12. Make this longer than 20 inches if you are tall.

Cut two sashes 26 x 5 inches.

Cut two pockets 5 x 5 inches.

Make sashes and hems the same as for peasant apron with band, page 10.

[Illustration: Apron pattern]

31 in. 20in. APRON 5in. 26 in. Pocket 5in. 5in. SASHES Pocket 5in.

Make the side hems ¼ inch wide and the top and bottom hems 2 inches wide.

Gather the top

1. Make a heading or hem at the top of your apron. From the top edge of the apron, measure down ¾ inch and mark with pins or chalk. Start stitching at upper corner and slope to ¾-inch line. Stitch across the apron and slope up to the corner.

[Illustration: Hemmed apron]

2. Stitch one sash to end of ½-inch elastic. Thread elastic through heading. Then stitch other sash to end of elastic. Pull ends of sashes into heading of apron.

[Illustration: Elastic hem]

3. Finish ends of bottom hem with a slip or blind stitch.

The slip stitch is used on a hem with a folded edge.

Fasten the knotted thread in the fold of the hem. Slip the needle through the fold for about ½ inch. Pick up one thread in the skirt or, if the fabric permits, split a thread with the needle. This thread should lie at right angles to the hem edge. Slip the needle back into the fold of the fabric, and continue hemming. Stitches are almost as invisible on the wrong side as the right side of the skirt.

[Illustration: SLIP STITCH]

Gathered skirt

Select fabric that is colorful and gay for your skirt. Closely woven cloth will be easy to sew and will hold a sharp crease.

You will need from 3 to 3½ yards of fabric for your skirt. The more fabric you try to gather in your skirt the harder it will be to make. For the girl of average height cut your skirt as follows:

How to cut your skirt

Cut or tear a 6½-inch strip from one side of your skirt fabric. Measure in from the selvage edge. Use this for the skirt band and pockets. There will be some left over.

Tear off the selvage edge from the large piece.

[Illustration: Skirt pattern]

6½″ SELVAGE BAND POCKET POCKET CUT OR TEAR SELVAGE

You may have to cut the band from the end of your fabric instead of the side if you are tall and need the extra length.

The above method of cutting gives you one seam on the placket side.

Sometimes the design in the fabric will be more attractive if the skirt is cut in several lengths. When this is necessary, you will have three or four seams in your skirt. This may make a difference in the amount of fabric you will need, so decide how you will cut your skirt before buying your fabric.

Make your skirt

Pin the short edges together to make the side seam. Make the seam 1¼ inches wide. It is to be used for the placket. When finished, the placket will be on the left side.

Stitch the side seam. Stitch the seam from the bottom up. At a point 5 inches from the top, turn and stitch half way across the seam. Turn both edges of the seam toward the front section and press.

[Illustration: Stitched seam]

Trim the seams. Start at the bottom of the wide seam and trim it to ■ inch wide up to the placket. Do not trim above this point.

[Illustration: Trimmed seam]

Finish the placket

1. Baste and stitch a ½-inch hem on the back edge of the placket.

[Illustration: Hem on placket]

2. Fold the front edge of the placket even with seam line. Press. Now fold again to make a complete hem. Baste.

[Illustration: Pinned placket]

Pin placket together. Stitch from the top to the bottom of the placket, turn and stitch across the end of first stitching. Pull threads through and tie ends. This is a strong, easy-to-make placket.

[Illustration: Stitched placket]

Hem the skirt

Skirts look best with hand-stitched hems. Make the hem before placing the band on the skirt. Unless you have poor posture, it will hang even. Decide how long you would like your finished skirt to be. Be careful not to make it too short. Measure from the top edge to the length you would like the skirt to be and press in the hem. Turn the top edge of the hem under ½ inch. Your skirt will be prettier if you make a wide hem—3 inches or wider.

When the hem has been carefully pressed, stitch ■ inch from the fold of the top edge of the hem, to keep the fold in place. Pin hem in place. Ask your leader to show you a hand hemming stitch.

Place gathering threads at top of skirt

Make a long stitch on your machine. Use size 50 top thread and heavy duty for bobbin thread.

Using the guide on your machine, stitch around the top of your skirt ¼ inch from the edge. Make two more rows ¼ inch apart. You are now ready to make your skirt band.

[Illustration: Gathering treads]

Make the skirt band

1. Measure your waist. Add 2½ inches. This will give you the length needed for your skirt band. Cut your band 6½ inches wide.

2. Press a ½-inch fold along one side of your band. From the folded edge divide the rest into three sections. This gives three 2-inch sections. Make the section with the ½-inch fold slightly shorter than the other two sections. Press.

3. The section with the ½-inch fold is the front of your band. Stitch criss-cross through the back part of the band. You can stitch straighter if you make a guide or pattern. Cut a strip of waxed paper the length and width of your band, 24 x 2 inches.

[Illustration: Cross-stitched band]

Fold it in six equal sections. Then fold it diagonally. Then diagonally again. Open the paper and pin it to the band and follow the creases in the paper. This will give practice on starting and stopping the machine and on turning corners. Tear the paper away after the stitching is completed.

[Illustration: Folded paper for band]

4. Stitch a ½-inch seam at the ends of the band. Turn and press. Do not sew the ½-inch fold at the bottom of band into the seam.

Gather in fullness

Divide both your skirt and the skirt band into eight equal parts to help you make the gathers even in your skirt. Do not include the placket or 1-inch overlap at the end of the band. Mark with colored threads. Mark the skirt band so the extension or extra length will be on the back of the placket. The front of band will be even with the front edge of the placket.

Pin and stitch band to skirt.

Pin the pieces together, right side of skirt to right side of band. Match dividing marks that you have made. Gently pull on the gathering threads at the side seams, the center front, and the center back. Pull the threads until they are the same length as the band. Work with the gathers until they are even. Baste and stitch along ½-inch fold on the skirt band.

Top stitch the band

Fold the double section of your band toward the back and baste the edge of the band to the skirt. Baste it so the folded edge hangs just below the stitching you just made on the front side of the band. Machine stitch from the front side of the band. Place the stitching as near the edge of the band as you can. Press before you stitch. It will flatten the seam and make stitching easier.

Press your skirt

Press your skirt. Use a dampened cheese-cloth and an iron set for ironing cotton, or use a steam iron. A skirt must be well pressed and fresh looking to be pretty.

[Illustration: Pressed skirt]

Fastenings for the skirt

[Illustration: Fastenings]

Study the drawing above. It shows the placing for fasteners on your skirt. Sewing them in this position will keep the placket from gaping. Sew a snap fastener in the center of the placket if it is needed to keep it closed. Do not try to set in a zipper. Use hooks and eyes or buttons for fastening this band.

Buttons and buttonholes—When buttons and buttonholes are used, make the buttonhole lengthwise of the band. Place it far enough from the end of the band so there will be at least ¼ inch beyond the button when it is sewed in place. Measure half the distance across your button and add ¼ inch for this measurement.

Learn to use the machine attachment for making buttonholes. They are stronger and easier for you to make than hand-made buttonholes. Have your leader, mother, or a neighbor set it up for you and show you how to use it. After you have made a few sample buttonholes, make some in your apron or on your skirt. If you have a machine with a zig-zag stitch, learn to make buttonholes on it.

Pin the band together and mark place for buttons. See page 2 for instructions for sewing on buttons.

Sew fasteners to skirt band

Snaps—Examine the snap fasteners. One part has a ball on top. This is placed on the front part or top of your placket. The other part has a hole or socket and is placed on the back or under part of the placket. Place them exactly opposite each other on your placket.

Sew the top snap on first. Mark the placing of the bottom part of the snaps by rubbing chalk on the ball and then pinning placket together. Press ball against fabric. The chalk will rub off and mark the exact spot to sew the under part of the snap.

[Illustration: Snap fasteners]

Sew snap fasteners on with several over-and-over stitches. Be sure to hide your knot under the snap. Sew securely through all four holes. When you cross from one hole to the other, take a stitch in the cloth and bring your needle up from the under side to the next hole.

Hooks and eyes—Each package of hooks and eyes, has two types of eyes, a round and a straight. Use the round eye for your skirt. Sew the hook on the inside edge of the top part of your band. (You will need two.) Sew these with several over-and-over stitches.

[Illustration: Hooks and eyes]

Sew several stitches through the hook end. Pin the placket in place and place the round eye directly under the hook. Sew with several over-and-over stitches.

Press all the things you have made. Pressing will improve their appearance. Make sure they are clean.

Have each member of your club judge what you have made and then make the corrections they suggest.

How does your apron or skirt look to you?

Once again, score your own and other club members' work. These are the points to use in judging:

Your score

1. Fabric or trimming used 25 _____ Is it suitable for aprons and skirts? Will it launder? Will it wear well? 2. Workmanship 35 _____ Are seams, hems, finish good choices? Are they well made? 3. Design and color 20 _____ Are design and color attractive? Are they right for you? 4. Condition of article 10 _____ Is it clean? Is it well-pressed? 5. Value of garment 10 _____ Is there good value for the time and money spent? Total 100 _____

Complete your record book

Your record book is important. Examine it carefully. Have you completed your clothing record? Have you recorded your activities as well as your project summary on your permanent record? Have you written your 4-H story for the year? In your story tell how you feel about the things you have made and the experiences you have had.

Each year your record book will add another chapter to your 4-H Club story. You will have fun looking back at each chapter as the years go by. Is this chapter as complete as you would like it to be?

You may want to keep a scrapbook of pictures and newspaper stories to go along with your record book.

Show others what you have learned

Exhibits

It is fun to let others see what you have done. Your club may want to plan a display for your families. You may want to exhibit your work at a fair. If you do, your exhibit will be the main article you made. Be sure your article is clean and pressed and clearly labeled so it can be returned to you.

Give a demonstration

A demonstration means "to show someone else how to do something." Select one small subject for your demonstration. Avoid one that has too many parts or details. Here are some suggestions:

How to sew on a button How to make a pocket How to shine your shoes How to thread a needle How to thread a sewing machine How to make a scarf How to make washcloth slippers How to make a mitered corner How to make a hem How to make gathers

How to make a sash for an apron How to make a skirt band How to make a hemmed placket

Because everything you use for sewing is small, you will need to make your samples large. Use contrasting thread, large stitches, and make large buttons so the audience can see what you are doing.

Are you ready for the next project?

1. Have you kept your shoes clean and shining? 2. Have you studied and improved your health habits? 3. Have you sewed buttons on family clothing? 4. Have you kept your record book up to date? 5. Have you made two or more articles?

Keep this bulletin. You will need it for your next project. When you have completed all the 4-H clothing projects, you will have a complete sewing book.

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

[Illustration: OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE]

SERVES EVERY FAMILY

County, State, and Federal governments cooperate with Oregon State University to make the latest information available to everyone.

—Homemaking and Consumer Information

—4-H Club and Other Youth Education

—Community Development

—Agricultural Production and Marketing

—Development, Use, and Conservation of Natural Resources

—Marketing and Use of Agricultural and Forest Products

4-H Club Work is the Youth Education Program of the Cooperative Extension Service; 5,500 Volunteer Adult Leaders and 1,500 Junior Leaders guide 35,000 4-H members in 4,200 clubs in every county and city in Oregon.

Cooperative Extension work in Agriculture and Home Economics, F. E. Price, director. Oregon State University and the United States Department of Agriculture cooperating. Printed and distributed in furtherance of Acts of Congress of May 8 and June 30, 1914.

6M—Reprinted May 1964.

Transcriber’s Notes

—Silently corrected a few typos.

—Retained publication information from the printed edition: this eBook is public-domain in the country of publication.

—In the text versions only, text in italics is delimited by _underscores_.

End of Project Gutenberg's It's Fun to Sew Aprons and Skirts, by Anonymous

==========

Untitled

Unknown

Project Gutenberg Release: February 07, 2021 · eBook #64484

Zur Männerfrage!

Von

Clara Schott.

Leipzig, A. Bleier Verlag Nachf. Joh. Eckell 1898.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Einleitung.

Um den Verdacht, ich sei eine Männerfeindin, nicht aufkommen zu lassen, halte ich es für geboten, gleich von vornherein zu bekennen, daß ich nichts weniger als das bin, daß ich mich im Gegentheil stets behaglich in Männergesellschaft befinde und freudig mit der Eleonore im Tasso sage:

»ich schweige gern, wenn klügere Männer reden.«

Und da ich das Glück hatte, vielen vorzüglichen Männern mit klarem Verstande und offnem Herzen zu begegnen, so hörte ich schweigend zu. Wenn sie mich nun reden hören, so werden auch sie, wie ich hoffe,

»verstehen wie ichs meine,«

so wie ich sie verstanden habe.

Ihr, meine Freunde, wißt, daß ich nicht ungerecht, noch weniger gehässig bin, und Ihr werdet mir beistimmen, daß die guten Männer nur Ausnahmen sind, denn Ihr kennt die Welt so gut wie ich. Ihr werdet mich auch nicht für den Fuchs halten, dem die Trauben sauer sind -- Ihr wißt ja, daß es nicht so ist.

Zu den Fremden, die meine Schrift lesen, sage ich: Wenn Ihr brav seid, braucht Euch dieselbe nicht zu alteriren, denn Euch klagt sie nicht an. Könnt Ihr Euch aber getroffen fühlen -- so schießt nur los, Eure Pfeile werden mich nicht verwunden.

Leipzig, im November 1897.

Clara Schott.

Männlich-sittlich.

Männlich-sittlich heißt mit Würde Tragen seiner Fehler Bürde: Bummeln, rauchen, Unfug treiben, Renommiren, schuldig bleiben.

Trinken, bis nicht Kopf, noch Magen Können länger es vertragen, Was nicht immer appetitlich, Das ist alles männlich-sittlich.

Heimlich zu der Liebsten gehen, Doch auf Zucht bei Andern sehen Und im Hause unerbittlich -- Das ist alles männlich-sittlich.

Ferner noch gehört das Spielen Zu den männlich-ernsten Zielen, -- Ei, was kann es Schön'res geben, Als so männlich-sittlich leben!

#Thusnelda Vortmann.#

Es ist wirklich sehr freundlich, das Publikum von heute. Wie viel Jahre läßt es sich nicht schon in allen Schreibarten, in Zeitungen, Zeitschriften, Büchern, Broschüren u. s. w. die Frauenfrage gefallen?

Immer und immer, von vorn und rückwärts gelesen, das Gleiche: Studentin -- Arbeiterin -- Dienerin -- lauter unverheirathete Frauen.

Und doch ist es nur _eine_ Frage, an der das Weib hauptsächlich krankt: es ist nicht die Brotfrage, sondern die -- Männerfrage!

Wie kommt es, daß sie bisher unaufgeworfen geblieben? Aus Respect? -- Aus allgemeiner Zufriedenheit mit dem Ewig-Männlichen?

Oder -- »und begehre nimmer und nimmer zu schauen, ... u. s. w.«? -- -- -- Ich glaube, der letztere Umstand hat viel dazu beigetragen.

#Der Schriftsteller# »studirt« das Weib, das er als ewiges Räthsel hinstellt. Er giebt vor, ihre Psyche zu belauschen, und was dabei heraus kommt, erzählen die vielen Cocotten-Romane, die in den letzten Jahren durch die Jungdeutschen in die Mode gekommen sind.

#Die Schriftstellerin# kann nicht belauschen, nicht »studiren«, aber sie vermag scharf zu beobachten und Erfahrungen zu sammeln. Und diese, gewissenhaft von Vorurtheilen getrennt, wiedergegeben, sind werth als Spiegelbild unserer heutigen »Ritter von der traurigen Gestalt« zu gelten. Sie sieht den Mann nicht als Räthsel an, sondern als das brutale Product seiner Erziehung, und als ein Wesen, das sich mit eingebildeter Uebermacht hochstellt und alle Rechte für sich beansprucht. Mit welchem gedankenlosen Selbstbewußtsein beansprucht, das wollen wir nachstehend illustriren. Wir geben reine Thatsachen, lassen alles Dichterische bei Seite und versuchen nicht mal zu retouchiren. -- -- --

Unsere Frauenrechtlerinnen sagen: wir sind im Nachtheil gegen die Männer, und bringen das Arbeitsgebiet -- auf das hier Hauptgewicht gelegt wird -- in den Vordergrund. Das »Ich bin« und »Ich werde sein« -- gewiß, es ist ein Feld, das sich als breites Terrain abgaloppiren läßt. #Allein, wer schützt das verheirathete Weib vor ihrem natürlichen Beschützer?#

»Oft sind ja die Männer Charmant und galant Und reichen uns Frauen Den Arm und die Hand.

Sie sagen, wir sollen Uns stützen auf sie, Das sei dann die richt'ge Weltharmonie.

Doch wenn wir sie rufen Uns Stützen zu sein, Sie lassen uns frierend Und hungernd allein.

Selbst brauchen die _Retter_ Ihr Geld, ihre Ruh, Die süßesten Freuden Des Lebens dazu.

Verlaß dich auf Keinen, Nur schau, nimmer trau, Und brauch' keinen Schützer, Denn selbst ist die Frau!« --

Des Weibes Vortheil liegt nicht im Wettkampf mit dem Manne, noch weniger liegt darin ihre Glückseligkeit. -- Diese kann nur gewonnen werden, durch die _Selbständigkeit des Characters_.

Die Frau soll dem Manne nicht die Peitsche aus der Hand nehmen, aber sie lasse ihn die Sporen fühlen. Ich meine nicht das Pantoffelheldenthum, das den Mann zur Memme herabwürdigt; aber was den Frauen fehlt, -- das ist das _würdevolle Selbstbewußtsein_ des Menschen.

Nur zu oft geht im Weibe der Mensch unter. Unsere Bräute, unsere Frauen -- was beanspruchen sie? Das ekelhafte »Beglücktsein«, dem Erwählten des Herzens »dienen« zu können -- es breitet einen blumenhaften Teppich vor dem »Herrlichen« aus, und vor ihm kniet das Weib mit erhobenen Händen: »Herr, was befiehlst du?«

Was? -- o, schrecklich viel!

Die Naivetät -- wir wollen keinen härteren Ausdruck wählen -- der Männer im Fordern und Herrschen ist von fabelhafter Keckheit. Der kleine Bruder »befiehlt« der kleinen Schwester, ihm mal die Puppe zu geben, die er ihr zerbricht. Weint sie, schlägt er einfach auf sie los, denn sie ist ja »nur« ein Mädel. Die größte Beleidigung für den kleinen Knirps ist, wenn er gelegentlich mal für ein Mädel gehalten wird. Wird er größer, so äußert sich sein Ritterthum darin, daß er nun »schon« Schulmädels »abdrischt«. Dann kommen die Flegeljahre, in die die meisten Männer wieder zurückkommen, wenn sie verheirathet sind.

Jetzt haben wir die Studien- und Lehrjahre. Vor allem ist das Studentenleben der Beleuchtung werth.

»Was studieren Sie denn?« fragte ich einmal einen jungen Herrn.

»Die Lumperei!« war die ehrliche Antwort.

Die Lumperei! Je toller sie es dabei treiben, je »fescher« werden sie bezeichnet. Gradezu ekelhaft ist es, daß unsere Witzblätter mit Studentenstreichen angefüllt sind und solche bei den jungen Leuten fast provoziren. Was für Witz liegt denn darin, Schulden zu machen, übermäßig zu trinken und Mädchen zu verführen? -- Ich setze den Fall, ein junger Kaufmann, oder Handwerker, mache fortwährend Schulden, kneipe, arbeite nicht und treibe allerlei Schabernack. Dann heißt es: »ein Taugenichts«, ein »verbummelter Mensch«, »arbeitsscheu«, »betrügerisch« u. s. w. Hier aber ist es -- weil es »sich ziemt«, auch »erlaubt«. Man hängt dem »Burschenschafter« ein buntes Bändchen um und läßt ihn laufen.

Bei Aufzügen und Commersen sehe man sich die »alten Herren« in Cerevis und diversen Abzeichen an. Was würde man wohl sagen, wenn »alte Damen« also markiert und frankiert herum laufen würden? -- --

Daneben gehen das schneidige Offizierchen, die Einjährigen, die Kaufleute, Beamte aller Arten, die alle um das »ewige Räthsel« herumflattern, es zu »erlösen« meinen, und so sich selber zu Liebe das Weib anbeten.

Und das Weib? -- Es sollte sich doch mal klar werden, was so die landläufige »Liebe« bedeutet, was so ihre »Ideale« eigentlich sind, an die sie ihre Gefühle und ihr junges Leben verschwenden! Wie viele blühende Gestalten sind nicht schon am »Amüsement« des Mannes zu grunde gegangen?! --

Haben sie dann genug hofiert, geschwärmt, Herzen gebrochen u. s. w., dann gelangen sie in das Stadium der Heirathskandidatur.

Hier giebt es eine Unmasse von Kategorien.

Es heirathen Gott Lob noch eine stattliche Reihe von Männern aus wahrer Liebe und gehen mit ehrlichem Pflichtgefühl in die Ehe. Dann kommt die Mehrzahl, die besteht aus:

Müden Seelen, die ein Ausruhebedürfnis haben,

Weltschmerzlern, die ihre Melancholie auf das Weib zu wälzen beabsichtigen,

Verschuldeten,

Solchen, die weder Geschick, noch den Muth haben, den Kampf mit dem Leben allein aufzunehmen, endlich

»Gemüthsmenschen«, die mit liebevollen Worten nach _außen_ verstohlen das Weib zur Dienerin ihres lieben Ichs herabzwingen und so nach und nach zwei bis drei Frauen florumwunden zu Grabe tragen.

Auch giebt es Männer, die sich Frauen für den »Hausbedarf« wählen und diese als Gegenstand betrachten.

Und die Weiber? -- wie schnell sie sich nur ergeben! als Braut hat auch jede den »herrlichsten von allen« für sich.

Thatsächlich leisten aber auch die Männer an Verstellungskunst so absolut das allerhöchste, daß sich die meisten während des Brautstandes mit Glanz behaupten.

Bevor ich nun daran gehe, einige Illustrationen zu geben, d. h. aus dem Leben gegriffene Spiegelbilder männlicher Tugenden zu zeigen, darf ich in meiner aufgezählten Kategorie der Heirathskandidaten eine Hauptserie nicht vergessen, die in allen Gesellschaftskreisen zu finden ist: nämlich die -- Heirathsschwindler.

Bei den Ehegesetzen, wobei die Männer alle, die Weiber fast gar keine Rechte haben, ja wo die Frau gewissermaßen als Leibeigene des Mannes betrachtet werden könnte, -- hat der Heirathsschwindler die weitestgehenden Chancen. Zunächst läßt er sich Haus und Hof einrichten. Damit ist er schon »Herr« im Hause, denn selbst in Ehen, wo die Gütergemeinschaft ausgeschlossen ist, hat der Mann -- was auch geschehe -- den Nutzen von allem, was da ist.

Und nun wollen wir einige Typen aus dem Leben herausnehmen. Es sind nicht nur wahre Gestalten, es sind Thatsachen, die ungeschminkt zeigen, daß die »#Männerfrage#« mehr der Beleuchtung bedarf, als die »#Frauenfrage#« an sich. --

Es ist noch gar nicht so lange her, daß ein »Aristokrat« eine Million geheirathet und mit sauersüßer Miene ein zartes Fräulein, das daran hing, in den Kauf nahm.

Rund 6 Wochen dauerte die »Ehe«, dann erklärte »er« dem nichtssagenden Puttchen, das sich so wohl als Frau Gräfin fühlen wollte: es könne nun gehen, ihr Geld sei in den besten Händen.

Es bedurfte allerdings erst der Reitpeitsche, bevor sie »ging«. Von ihrem Gelde erhielt sie natürlich keinen Pfennig heraus, denn die noblen Passionen des Mannes verschlangen eben alles was da war -- er hat ja von Rechtswegen den Nießbrauch und »brauchte« daraufhin so viel, daß am Ende des Prozesses nichts mehr vorhanden war.

Ein anderer »Herr« in angesehener Stellung ließ seine junge sehr verliebte Frau vor seiner Trauung selbst die Handschuhe für seine »Freundin« bezahlen u. s. w. u. s. w. Und nach der Hochzeit fiel es ihm gar nicht ein, seine Lebensweise zu ändern, obgleich er das beschworen, ebenso wenig in seinen Liebeshändeln irgend welche Rücksicht auf seine Gattin walten zu lassen. An einem Theaterabend, als die Gattin gerade ihren Fuß auf das Trittbrett ihres Wagens setzte, der sie nach Hause bringen sollte, erkühnte sich der Herr Gemahl sie zurückzuhalten.

»Den Wagen habe ich soeben Fräulein so und so (Name einer Schauspielerin) versprochen, Du kannst laufen!«

Nun war sie -- was leider ja vereinzelt dasteht -- keine nach Lyrikern gebildete Frau, sie zog nach Nietzsche ihre Hand zurück und zeigte »die Tatze« die »böse Krallen hat«. So kam es, daß sie ihn »laufen« ließ. Freilich, all die schweren Seelenkämpfe wurden ihr nicht erspart, aber sie ist noch Herrin auf ihrem Grund und Boden, und er bettelt sich irgendwo durch.

Nach den mehr gewaltthätigen Heirathsschwindlern, kommen die verkniffenen, die treten sanfter auf und wenden andere Mittel an.

Wir illustrieren sie mit nachstehendem:

Herr R. ist Gutsbesitzer in Polen. Seine Frau, die viel vornehmer als er, aus guter Familie, mit vorzüglichen Charaktereigenschaften, hat ihm das Vermögen zugeführt. Dafür muß sie, um Geld zu sparen, die Stelle der Mamsell vertreten. Da sie ihn lieb hat, ihr Interesse im Haushalt auch gern wahrnimmt, steht sie um 3 Uhr Nachts auf, überwacht rechtzeitig das Melken und bleibt auf, bis die Milchwagen in die Stadt gefahren sind. Tags über geht es Trepp auf, Trepp ab, die Landwirthschaft will besorgt sein.

Der »Herr« fährt recht oft zu einem Spielchen in die nahe Garnisonstadt. Die Frau kennt kein anderes Vergnügen, als alljährlich ein neues Sprößlein zu wiegen. »Er« murrt schon: »alle Jahre ein Kind, was das kostet!« An Geld, meint er. Die Lebenskraft der Frau -- daran denkt doch ein Mann nicht! Er hat auch schon vergessen, wer das Baby beim Storch bestellt!

Jetzt sind acht Jahre herum, die Frau ist acht Jahre im Dienste bei ihrem »Herrn«. Hier ist es aber so, daß sie den -- Lohn gezahlt, nicht er!

Es ist ja selbstredend, daß ein Weib arbeitet, wozu heirathet man es?! -- Das Geld ist alle. Wieso? -- Das weiß der Mann, und das genügt!

Der »Herr« wird nervös, alles reizt ihn, am meisten die Frau, die nichts mehr recht machen kann. Er will hier fort und zieht mit Frau und fünf Kindern in die Stadt -- in ein Haus, wo seit Jahren seine Maitresse wohnt, die er die Frechheit hat, seiner Frau als »Nachbarin« vorzustellen.

Und nun bekommt die »Nachbarin« das Regiment, und es geht mit dem letzten Heller des Vermögens bergab, der Mann ohne Thätigkeit, die Frau vor Leid krank. Schlußpointe, des Mannes Frage, die alles besagt:

»Weshalb hab' ich Dich eigentlich geheirathet, da Du doch nichts verdienen kannst?«

No. 4 hat eine Schriftstellerin geheirathet, weil ihn ihr edler Beruf, ihr Geist und schließlich ihre liebliche Gestalt »anzog«.

Wie bald merkte das arme Wesen, daß sie ihn thatsächlich »angezogen!« Vom Kopf bis Fuß sogar. Von den Stiefeln bis zum Hut hat sie indirekt alles bezahlt.

»Mein Lieb, jetzt soll die Feder ruhen,« hatte er ihr am Verlobungstage gesagt. Der Gute, Zarte, wie wollte er alle Lasten von ihr nehmen! --

Vier Wochen nach der Hochzeit:

»Möchtest Du nicht wieder etwas schreiben, Herzchen? -- Es ist nämlich, Du weißt, wenn eine Künstlerin vergessen wird, das thut nicht gut.«

Das sieht sie ein. Und noch mehr sieht sie ein! Der Schuft hat sie gefangen, und nun heißt es arbeiten, um all die Schulden, die das Hauswesen hervorgerufen, zu bezahlen.

Sie gleicht sich nicht mehr, sie ist blos noch eine Schreibmaschine im Hause.

Es kommt ein Quartal, wo die Miethe nicht bezahlt werden kann. Die Verleger sind nicht pünktlich, sie schreibt und schreibt um Geld -- keine Antwort. Da erbietet sich der Edle, ihr Mann, die »natürliche Stütze«, für sie einzutreten. Wie gut, wenn man verheirathet ist!! Vor einem Mann hat man doch ganz anderen Respekt. -- Schon darauf bauend, reist er nach S. und erhält sogleich 500 Mark ausgezahlt.

Natürlich sendet er ihr ein Telegramm, damit sie daheim von der Sorge befreit ist, setzt sich auf die Bahn und fährt über Leipzig nach Hause. In rosiger Stimmung natürlich, er hat ja Geld!

Hier trifft man ein paar Freunde, mit denen man ausgeht, und auch ein paar hübsche Pflänzchen. Die eine ist reizend und findet so viel Gefallen an dem auf Reisen geschickten Ehemann, daß sie es unverhohlen zeigt. Und wenn ein Mann gefällt, bei der angeborenen Eitelkeit, dann kommt sehr schnell die angeborene Untreue hinzu.

Der Edle vergißt seine Frau und kauft für deren sauer verdientes Geld einen Schmuck für die Dirne. Allerdings amüsiert er sich dafür prächtig, und das ist doch auch etwas werth! -- Soll ich noch aus höheren Kreisen Copien bringen, oder soll ich herabsteigen in die einfachste Klasse, wo die Sparkassenbücher eine rührselige Rolle spielen -- -- -- »und begehre nimmer und nimmer zu schauen« ....

Nun giebt es noch eine liebliche Sorte -- Verlobungsschwindler, die gegen freie Kost und Logis frisch drauf loslieben. Und zwar so lange, als es ihnen dienlich erscheint. Dann untergraben sie in irgend welcher Weise den guten Ruf der Braut, damit die »Welt« ihren Rücktritt nicht etwa verdamme -- so etwas könnte bei der nächsten Parthie schaden --, und verschwinden.

In einer Berliner Zeitung hieß es einmal: ein hoffnungsvoller Jüngling sei auf drei Stellen zu gleicher Zeit »verlobt« gewesen. Bei den »Schwiegereltern« der ersten Braut wohnte er, bei der zweiten Braut, einer Schneiderin, aß er, und der dritten, einer Putzmacherin, nahm er ihr Geld ab, mit der Weisung, dafür wolle er ein Geschäft kaufen.

Von London aus, wohin sich auf Kosten der Putzmacherin der Verlobungsschwindler gewandt, erhielten alle drei »Bräute« gleichlautende Zettel:

Für die Zeit, wo Du mich geliebt hast, Bedank i mich schön, Und i wünsch, daß Dir's Jetzt nun besser mag geh'n!

Wir sehen davon ab, aus der besseren Gesellschaftsklasse noch »Illustrationen« zu bringen, es dürfte den Leser ermüden. Jedoch einen Brief hier abzudrucken, den mir eine Dame zur Verfügung gestellt, möchte ich nicht unterlassen. Es spricht so viel zarter Dank für genossene Liebe daraus und er birgt so viel echtmännliche Gewissenhaftigkeit, daß er mein Spiegelbildchen vervollständigen hilft.

»Lieber Gustav!

Das war eine rechte Freude, das ist ja famos, da habe ich auch wieder mal kolossales Schwein! Du sollst nämlich mein Retter in der Not sein. Diesmal nicht in Geldangelegenheit -- ich habe meine hiesigen Gläubiger sehr gut erzogen --, sondern Du sollst mir helfen -- nicht wie damals _eine_ zu bekommen, sondern _eine_ los zu werden. Es müßte mit dem Teufel zugehen, wenn solch patenter Kerl, wie Du bist, das nicht leicht zu Wege brächte!

Die Martel wird mir unbequem, das Verhältniß war der dümmste Streich meines Lebens, die nimmt die Sache ernst und ich sage Dir -- ich wäre lieber wo der Pfeffer wächst, als hier. Die taxiert sich hoch und sagt sehr freimüthig »mit jedem Jahre lerne ich mich mehr lieben und mehr schätzen, weil ich mich besser kennen lerne.« Thatsächlich wird sie mit jedem Jahre üppiger. Aber Bester, ich habe grade genug und will überhaupt fort, es ist hier öde und aufregend zugleich.

Da Du doch, wie Du schreibst, nach H. gehst, kannst Du mir zu Liebe schon den kleinen Abstecher machen. Ich stelle Dich ihr vor, und hübsch, wie Du bist, und wie ich ihren Geschmack kenne, machst Du ohne Zweifel kolossalen Eindruck. Das übrige überlasse ich Dir ... Ich spiele dann den Eifersüchtigen und sichere mir damit einen respectablen Abgang.

Also ich rechne bestimmt auf Dich, so wie Du stets auf meine Dankbarkeit rechnen kannst. Telegraphiere wann ich Dich erwarten kann.

Dein K.

Dir gebe ich den guten Rat, Dich nie an brünette Weiber heranzumachen, die sind von einer verfluchten Anhänglichkeit.«

Man sieht, sie arbeiten mit allen Mitteln, die Herren Männer, und sie sind ja so schlau, so schlau, daß man gar nicht begreift, wie man einstens die Weiber mit der Annahme beehren konnte, sie seien »schlau wie die Schlangen!« -- --

So lange der Mann keine Verpflichtung hat, sieht er im Weibe das anbetungswürdige Geschöpf; gesellt sich zu seiner Anbetung und Liebe aber die Pflicht, so ist es aus. Er ist immer berechnend, und wo die Rechnung quittirt ist, wo nichts zu holen, so oder so, da hört nach und nach jeder Reiz auf.

Und nun kommen wir zu dem Punkt der Treue, und das ist ein sehr wunder Punkt!!

Der Mann kann sich selber, dem Freunde, im Handel und Wandel treu sein -- dem Weibe ist er es höchst selten. Fast immer wird es von ihm hintergangen. Ist es nicht mit einer Freundin, ist es mit einer Unbekannten. Für sie ist wenig vorhanden, für die Geliebte immer Ueberfluß. Bei der Frau knausert man, der Geliebten will man imponieren, nichts ist zu theuer für sie. Natürlich gilt dies bei Männern besser begüterter Stände, die überhaupt etwas zu geben haben. Die Mittelklasse steigt tiefer. Vielen Hausherren haftet leider auch die Dienstmädel-Manie an, und nicht vielen Frauen wird die tiefe Scham erspart, von den Mädchen selbst zu vernehmen, der »Herr stelle ihnen nach«!

Bei den besser gearteten Männern regt sich dann das Gewissen und ihre Zärtlichkeit für die Gattin verdoppelt sich nach einer solchen Missethat. »Mein Mann muß mich wieder hübsch hintergangen haben,« sagte einmal eine Dame, »er hat mir aus eigenem Antriebe einen Pelzmantel gekauft.«

Würde dieses »Hintergehen« nur allein das Gefühl der Frau verletzen, so wäre es noch nicht gar so schlimm und zu überwinden, aber es sind ganz andere Gefahren dabei! -- Der Mann zeigt selten die volle Theilnahme an einem Erkranken der Frau, als es oft umgekehrt der Fall ist. Er klagt, so bald sie leidend, zunächst, daß das Hauswesen ins Wanken kommt, nebenbei erst thut es ihm gelegentlich leid, daß sie nicht gesund ist. Darüber läßt er sich dann gern bemitleiden -- auch eine typische Eigenschaft des Mannes --, denn am Ende -- es ist doch höchst lästig eine kranke Frau zu haben!

Als einmal ein Freund dem anderen klagte, daß seine Frau ewig leidend und schon in drei Bädern gewesen, was das koste! schrieb dieser zurück: »Für die Reparaturkosten hättest du schon eine neue gehabt.«

Woher aber die vielen Frauenkrankheiten kommen, davon wissen Aerzte und Aerztinnen zu erzählen! Eine derselben, die seit 12 Jahren in Deutschland eine blühende Praxis ausübt, kann nachweisen, daß von 100 Patienten, 70 ihren Männern die Krankheit verdanken.

Und diese haben dann natürlich »ein Kreuz« mit den »Weibern«, die ewig klagen und so viel kosten!

Und während ich die »Männerfrage« beleuchte, tönt eine andere an mein Ohr: »Giebt es denn gar keine guten Männer??« -- O ja, viele, viele prächtige Männer, ganze »Kerle« mit Herz und Verstand, mit Seele und Gewissen, aber mit ihnen geht es wie mit den Weibern:

#Von den besten spricht man nicht!#

Von dem Gros aber, das sich mit seinen vielen Arroganzen so hoch über das Weib stellt, muß gesprochen werden. Die Fehler der Frau kennt jeder, sie sind in allen Formen bloß gelegt worden; vom minderwerthigen Gehirn, bis zum eitlen Tand, mit dem sie sich umgiebt, hat der Mann gesprochen, es gehört ja alles zur #Frauenfrage#.

Nun aber werfen wir die #Männerfrage# auf, und wir werden ja sehen, wie weit sie führen wird, sehen, ob die »Herrlichen« -- weß Standes sie seien -- ewig nehmend, ewig fordernd, sich behaupten werden. Und wie naiv die Herren der Schöpfung im Fordern sind -- das ist einfach fabelhaft.

Wenn man sie reden hört von ihrem Standpunkt aus -- ich weiß nicht, ob man darüber lachen oder weinen soll.

Fahre da einmal von Frankfurt a. M. nach Leipzig. In Eisenach steigt ein Herr ein, der sich veranlaßt fühlt, eine Unterhaltung anzuknüpfen.

»Nein, ich heirathe nie!« erzählt er mir im Laufe einer zweistündigen Fahrt. »Nie, denn die Weiber von heute! -- Ich verlange von einer Frau 1. natürlich Vermögen, 2. Schönheit, 3. Bildung, 4. gute Familie.

Sie muß wirthschaftlich sein, darf keine theure Roben tragen, muß selbst kochen und mir in meinem Beruf behülflich sein.«

»Hm,« machte ich, »wie ist denn die Gegenleistung?«

Er sah mich verständnislos an.

»Na wie denn, die Gegenleistung? -- Sie scherzen wohl?«

»Durchaus nicht, Sie müssen doch, wenn Sie so vieles verlangen, etwas bieten können.«

»Ich? -- na, ich heirathe sie doch! Sie ist doch ihr lebtag versorgt.«

»Wenn die Dame Vermögen bringen und arbeiten soll u. s. w., so könnte sie sich doch mit diesen hübschen Eigenschaften recht fidel selbst »versorgen«.« (»Versorgen« im Sinne der heutigen Männer heißt gewöhnlich mit Sorgen überschütten.)

»Na, wissen Sie, Gnädigste, bei solchen Auffassungen würden die meisten Mädchen alte Jungf...« er sah ängstlich nach meiner Hand.

»Früher, mein Herr, hat man »alte Jungfer« im verächtlichen Sinne gesagt. Heute -- nun erst beginnt man das Symbol des Eheringes zu verstehen!

Die Hand ohne Ring ist das Freizeichen. Die »alte Jungfer« lebt nicht mehr. Heut ist die #Unverheirathete# die #Freifrau#, die unabhängig von einem Haustyrannen ihren Weg macht. -- Die Hand #mit dem Ringe# aber sagt: Ergeben auf Gnade und Ungnade. Bitte, mein Herr, sagen Sie mir, wessen Loos ist besser, das der »Freien« oder der »Gebundenen«?«

Der Mann verlangt von der Frau alles. Sie soll ihm Kinder geben, ihm dienen, kochen, sparen, helfen, wo immer sein, im Geschäft, Bureau, Werkstätte u. s. w. Er selbst aber ist eben entweder nur Fachmann, oder mit einem Worte Verdiener. Sie aber soll universell sein. -- -- --

Von der großen Masse Ausnahme-Männer, die Würde genug besitzen, sich ihr Haus selbst zu gründen und es pflichtgemäß auch selbst zu erhalten, hört man oft bewunderungsvoll sagen: »er hat sich ein armes Mädchen geheirathet!«

Erstens: Ist denn eine Menschenseele absolut nichts werth? Und besitzt die Frau an sich nicht schon all die Eigenschaften, die der Mann absolut gebraucht? Sie bezahlt mit ihrem #ganzen Sein# schon genug Entrée für den Eintritt in das zweifelhafte Glücksinstitut der Ehe. Der Mann sollte mal nachrechnen, was er zu bezahlen hätte, wenn er nicht verheirathet wäre! Da kommt erst: Ein sogenanntes Verhältnis, das Geld kostet. Eine Wirthschafterin, die hoch bezahlt wird, und die lange nicht so rechnet, als eine Frau, die ihre eigenen Interessen vertritt. Eine Ausbesserin der Wäsche und Garderobe und diverse Vereine, in denen er seine freie Zeit verbringt, weil er kein eigenes Haus besitzt. Kurz -- man sieht, der Mann ist #viel besser# in der Ehe »versorgt«, als die Frau, die die größeren Lasten übernommen! --

Zu den weiteren naiven Eigenschaften der Herrn Männer gehört auch die, ihre Untugenden auf Rechnung der Weiber zu setzen.

»Sie« hat ihn betrogen -- #deshalb# hat er sich dem Trunk ergeben, #deshalb# hat er sich in den Strudel des Lebens gestürzt.

Weil #die Frau# die Wirthschaft vernachlässigt -- geht er in die Kneipe. Weil #die Frau# nicht geschäftstüchtig ist, verdient er nichts u. s. w. Ergo: gäbe es keine Weiber, es liefen lauter männliche Engel herum.

In Ausreden sind die Männer überhaupt fabelhaft gewandt und im Abwälzen ihrer Fehler auf andere virtuosenhaft.

Die ekelhaftesten aller männlichen Specien aber sind diejenigen, die ewig heulen.

Unter Thränen schwören sie Treue. Unter Thränen brechen sie dieselbe und versprechen Besserung bis zum nächsten Mal.

Unter Thränen geben sie der Frau einen Versöhnungskuß und küssen unter Thränen lächelnd das holde Lieb zweiter Garnitur. Und dann die freimüthigen Geständnisse, die sich mit ahnungsloser Unverschämtheit zusammen finden!

Man höre:

»Ich bin sehr jähzornig -- #deshalb# muß ich eine sanftmüthige Frau bekommen.«

Nein, Herr der Schöpfung, #deshalb# mußt du hübsch Selbsterziehung üben und Dir hübsch manierlich diese heillose Untugend abgewöhnen, nicht aber über das Haupt einer Sanftmüthigen ergehen lassen. Oder: »Ich bin ewig mürrisch und verdrießlich, #deshalb# muß ich eine heitere Frau bekommen.«

Ich möchte sehen, wessen Heiterkeit ein ewiger Griesgram nicht verscheucht! --

Nun geben sich eine ganze Masse kreuzbraver Männer, die ihr Lebtag nichts Böses thun könnten, für Herzensbrecher u. s. w. aus und renommieren mit Unthaten, die ihr ästhetisches Gefühl schon nicht zuließe, um »männlich« zu erscheinen. Was für Lob für die Allgemeinheit hierin liegt, kann sich ein Jeder wohl ausmalen! --

Die Neuzeit hat noch eine Art Männer herangebildet: Rhetoriker.

Am allerschlimmsten ergeht es denjenigen Frauen, die jene Sorte von Maulhelden geheirathet haben. Ganz besonders wenn sie in politischen Versammlungen von gleichen Rechten faseln, um sich dort Weihrauch zu streuen. Sie haben erwiesener Maßen weder Herz für ihre Familie noch Verstand genug, irgend Jemanden zu beglücken. Ihre erheuchelte allgemeine Menschenliebe ist nichts weiter als die Sucht, sich bewundern zu lassen, als die geistige Koketterie, sich reden zu hören, denn in Wirklichkeit lieben die »Volksbeglücker« einzig und allein nur sich selbst und sind im eigenen Hause der rasende Roland. Von dem Elend der Ehefrauen, die sich durch die Zungen-Gymnastik der »Beglücker«, der »Kämpfer für Freiheit und Recht«, haben bethören lassen, ist nicht zu erzählen.

Man versetze sich in die Lage einer Frau, die ihren Gatten salbungsvoll der »Menge« predigen hört, wobei er in Ethik überfließt und in Achtsamkeit und Ehrlichkeit einzig dasteht, und die genau weiß, daß seine Handlungsweisen dem entgegen laufen, und daß er alle die Laster und Untugenden, die er öffentlich beklagt und verwirft, im hohen Maße selbst besitzt! Im Hause »rettet, rennet, flüchtet« alles, wenn er sich zeigt, weil man ihn fürchtet, »draußen« ist er ein Mann der Humanität, ein Engel ohne Flügel, der herabgekommen, um dem Unterdrückten zu seinem Rechte zu verhelfen.

Ist das alles nicht werth, aufgezeichnet zu werden? Vielleicht halten unsere Herren einmal Selbsteinkehr und sie werden nicht zu kurz dabei kommen.

Eine Ungerechtigkeit, an der allerdings der Mann nicht schuld ist -- die sich aus unserer gesellschaftlichen Lage ergiebt -- ist es auch, daß des Weibes Stellung vom Manne bedingt wird.

So kommt es, daß eine zur Gräfin erhobene Magd mehr gilt, als eine vollendete Dame, die einen in bescheidenen Verhältnissen lebenden Mann geheirathet hat.

Die Frau fällt oder steigt durch die Heirath, dem Manne läßt man Rang und Würde, er mag wählen, wie es auch sei.

Warum kann sich das Weib ihre Stellung nicht selbst bestimmen, wenn sie die Fähigkeit dazu besitzt? -- Unsere Frauen aber sind -- besonders in kleinbürgerlichen Kreisen -- sehr gern geneigt, in dem Manne »aufzugehen«.

Es ist fast lächerlich, wie viel manche Damen auf Titulatur geben. Der ärgste Schuft, der neben der Schufterei noch etwas gelernt hat (Schufte sind fast immer intelligent zum Nachtheil ihrer Mitmenschen), hat, sobald er einen »Rang« bekleidet, Chancen, denn Fräulein Soundso drückt gelegentlich mal ein Auge zu, bei der fraglichen Moralität ihres Zukünftigen, wenn sie von da ab Frau Ober-Soundso sich nennen kann.

Man beobachte mal die Kaffee- und sonstigen Gesellschaften, in denen die Vorstellungen ja eine so wichtige Rolle spielen! Vor allem liebt es die Wirthin, mit ihren Eingeladenen zu glänzen. Oftmals mit der größten Nichtachtung vor der Person, die sich zufällig emporgeheirathet hat, im Herzen, ruft sie -- wenn volltönend -- mit gehobener Stimme deren Aushängeschild aus.

Putzig war es, als eine Dame ein Fräulein =Dr. ph.= einer Appellationsgerichtsräthin vorstellte. Der Tonfall besorgte alles! »Frau Ober--appellations--gerichts--räthin ....« Einige Töne tiefer: »Fräulein =Dr.= S.«

Die hübschen Augen der Philosophin lachten mich an.

»Ja, was wollen Sie,« tröstete ich, »Sie haben nur sechs Buchstaben vor Ihrem Namen, die Sie sich noch dazu mühselig erarbeiten mußten, und diese Dame stolzirt mit 26 solcher herum, die ein anderer auf ihr vergoldetes Schild getragen!« -- Und die Titelsucht ist nicht nur in den Kreisen des Scheins, sie reicht bis zur Frau Ober-Straßenfegerin hinab.

So kommt es also, daß die socialen Verhältnisse die Frauen dahin bringen, daß sie mit ihren Männern prahlen, obwohl sie vielfach wissen, daß sie dem Charakter nach mehr sind, als diese.

Gradezu »gefährlich« -- im komischen Sinne, sind auch diejenigen Männer, die von ihren Frauen »nicht verstanden« werden.

Ich kannte ein Ehepaar, wo der Mann freilich diverse Vocabeln mehr wußte, als die Frau, der auch dickbändige wissenschaftliche Werke geschrieben und Forschungsreisen gemacht hatte. Aber seiner Frau gesunder Menschenverstand und ihr köstlicher Humor standen doch turmhoch über seiner griesgrämigen Gelehrsamkeit, und doch war sein ewiges Seufzen: »Dieses Weib ist nicht bedeutend genug, meine Bedeutung zu verstehen!« Als er sich aber einmal in die Tinte hineingeritten hatte, war »dieses Weib« bedeutend genug, der Geschichte eine andere Wendung zu geben, und in den Tagen der Noth war sie »das treue Weib«, seine »Stütze«, sein »Halt«. Die ganze verkrochene Feigheit des »bedeutenden Mannes« trat hier grell zu Tage.

Das sind so komische Figuren, Kleinigkeiten, die charakterisiren helfen, etwa wie die Momentaufnahmen auf den Straßen, wo wir jetzt auch Gigerl, als Zärtlichkeits-Aeußerungen, auf den Arm junger Mädchen gestützt, sehen. Früher führte sehr galant der Ritter seine Dame, #die Frau stützte sich auf den Mann#. Heute lassen sich die Männer von jungen Mädchen führen. Symbolisch gar nicht übel! --

Und nun -- das ist ein Punkt, der mir auf der Seele brennt! Ist es wirklich ein Fortschritt der Cultur, daß das Vaterrecht herrscht? -- Ich glaube der Irokese, der im Urzustande nach seinem Herzen das Mutterrecht gelten ließ, war weiter wie wir; dem Weibe gehörte das Kind, das sie trägt, gebärt. Es ist ihr Fleisch, ihr Blut und ihr Geist. Am besten kann man diese Wahrheit bei denjenigen beobachten, die außerehelich geboren haben.

Beim schlechtesten Weibe dringt selbst in der verzweifeltsten Situation das Muttergefühl durch. Sie bringt ein Kind zur Welt in Schimpf und Schande, in Noth und Elend. Und doch, in Lumpen gehüllt, trägt sie es am Herzen mit sich herum. Der Vater? -- oft weiß er überhaupt nicht, daß er ein solcher ist!!

#Und dies allein spricht von Natur aus der Mutter das Kind zu!#

Weiß er es aber, freut er sich darüber?? --

Das kraftloseste, verlassene Weib arbeitet bis zum letzten Athemzuge für ihr Kind, oder erbettelt sich die Nahrung für dieses. Der Vater will oftmals nichts von seinem Ueberfluß für dasselbe geben. Er ist ganz Genuß, die Mutter ganz Entsagung.

Trotzdem hat der roheste Patron, der zufällig Vater ist, das alleinige Recht über das Kind der Mutter. Wie viel Trunkenbolde und Spieler giebt es nicht, denen das gesetzliche Recht zusteht über die Zukunft des Kindes zu bestimmen! --

Kommen wir nun wieder auf unser eigentliches Thema zurück!

Für die Frauenfrage interessirte sich der Mann bisher:

1) wenn er heirathen will aus beliebigen Motiven;

2) wenn er sich am Weibe »zu berauschen« beabsichtigt;

3) wenn er es loswerden will.

Bei den Frauen aber gab es nur eine Männerfrage, die da lautet: »wo bekomme ich einen?«

Diejenigen Frauen, die durch Schiller und Goethe die männlichen Helden kennen gelernt haben, wissen, daß sie #nur# durch »Dienen« zur #Herrschaft# gelangen (ja freilich!) und geben sich daraufhin zu allem her.

Die Backfische, die Chamisso's Syrup

»Seit ich ihn gesehen, Glaub' ich blind zu sein« u. s. w.

hinhimmeln, die gehen mit einem suggerierten Idealismus in das Eheglück hinein. Freilich, klug ist es nicht, daß unsere Mütter ihren Töchtern all die veralteten Melodien in die Hand geben. Unsere Zeit ist eine andere. Es leben andere Menschen, es sind andere Verhältnisse. Die Töchter dürfen nicht mehr »blind sein«, seit sie ihn gesehen.

Nein, #weil# sie ihn gesehen, muß man ihnen die Augen öffnen!

Nach Chamisso ist ein anderer hehrer Geist herabgestiegen. Und seine gewaltige Stimme sprach:

»Manchen Menschen darfst Du nicht die Hand geben, sondern die Tatze, und ich will, daß Deine Tatze auch Krallen habe.«

Wäre dem so, der Mann und die Frau, beide wären sie glücklicher. Aber es giebt so verschiedene Arten von Weibern, die, obzwar sie in der Welt Bescheid wissen, doch singen:

»Eines Mannes schönste Tugend Ist nicht Keuschheit, noch ists Jugend, Ist nicht Schönheit und Verstand, Ueberfluß an Geld und Land.

Auch nicht Stellung ists, noch Titel, Nicht der Rock, noch bunter Kittel, Dann erst lob' ich mir den Mann, Wenn ich ihn noch kriegen kann.«

Aber die edle Frau, die aus kühler Ferne beobachtet, ohne Herz und ohne Galle sprechen zu lassen, die gleichgültig lächelnd vom hohen Balcon herabschaut auf das Treiben der Männlein und Weiblein, die singt ein anderes Lied, das da lautet:

»Seit Amor sich hat verwundet Mit seinem eigenen Pfeil, Reist er in olympische Bäder Zu suchen dort sein Heil.

Er hat ein krankes Herze, Seit Psyche ihm entfloh, Nicht mag er mehr regieren, Wird nicht des Lebens froh.

Nun aber treibt auf Erden Viel wüsten Spuk und Graus Ein täppischer Geselle, Giebt sich als Amor aus.

Er ist gemeiner Herkunft Und widrig von Gestalt, Verliebt und ganz vertrunken, Mit kahlem Haupt und alt.

Und fahl sind seine Wangen, Und frech der blöde Blick. Betäubend ist sein Treiben, Doch bringt er Keinem Glück.

Die Väter täuscht er Alle, Sie freut der glatte Wicht, Die Mütter aber seufzen: »Das ist der Amor nicht!«

Sie knieen nieder und beten: »O Göttin im Himmelsrund, Gieb Deinen Sohn uns wieder Und mach' ihn wieder gesund.«

Ja, das wäre was, wenn nochmals das alte Reckengeschlecht aufstände, mit ehrlicher Liebe, mit ehrlicher Leidenschaft, mit der Würde, die Ehrlichkeit im Handel und Wandel verleiht, durch die allein das Weib #vor# dem Manne beschützt werden kann. #Von# dem Manne beschützt zu werden, hat sie längst aufgegeben und auch nicht mehr nöthig: unser Jahrhundert ist anders geworden, der schlafende Riese hat sich geregt. Aber -- wenn sie nochmals käme, die goldene Zeit, die Männer erstehen ließe -- so wäre gelöst, #die Frauenfrage#, in der

#Männerfrage#.

Druck von G. Reusche, Leipzig.

[Hinweise zur Transkription

Das Originalbuch ist in Fraktur gesetzt. Darstellung abweichender Schriftarten: _gesperrt_, =Antiqua=, #fett#.

Der Text des Originalbuches wurde grundsätzlich beibehalten, mit folgenden Ausnahmen,

Seite 5: "ihr" geändert in "ihre" (Er giebt vor, ihre Psyche zu belauschen)

Seite 7: "erhobenenen" geändert in "erhobenen" (vor ihm kniet das Weib mit erhobenen Händen)

Seite 7: "Witzlätter" geändert in "Witzblätter" (unsere Witzblätter mit Studentenstreichen angefüllt)

Seite 10: "in in" geändert in "in" (die Milchwagen in die Stadt gefahren)

Seite 15: "," entfernt hinter "vielen" (mit seinen vielen Arroganzen so hoch über das Weib)

Seite 21: "Überfluß" geändert in "Ueberfluß" (von seinem Ueberfluß für dasselbe geben)]

==========

A Short Treatise on Boots and Shoes, Ancient and Modern

Walter H. Goater

Project Gutenberg Release: June 16, 2021 · eBook #65623

TRANSCRIBER'S NOTES

Punctuation has been made consistent.

The positioning of the 11 illustrations has been changed slightly to accommodate each one between paragraphs, on every second page.

A SHORT TREATISE

ON

BOOTS AND SHOES

ANCIENT AND MODERN,

BY

Walter H. Goater.

Presented by

J. & J. Slater,

1185 Broadway,

N. W. COR. OF 28TH STREET. New York.

Boots and Shoes, Ancient and Modern.

As far back as we can trace the early history of man, under civilized conditions of life, we find that shoes of some kind have been worn.

At first they were very crude and simple, being nothing more than soles fastened to the foot by means of thongs or straps, which passed between the toes and around the ankle, like Figs. 1, 2, 3. Shoes of this description were called sandals, and were worn by the ancient Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans.

It has been discovered, by means of paintings on the walls of Thebes, that shoemaking formed a distinct and quite lucrative trade away back in the reign of Thothmes III., some fifteen hundred years before Christ, so that followers of the awl and last can truthfully boast of the great antiquity of their profession.

The material chiefly employed in the manufacture of shoes, from the earliest times to the present, has been leather, though stuffs of various kinds and colors have entered into their composition at different periods.

The sandals worn by the priests of ancient Egypt were generally made of palm and papyrus leaves fastened together. Some well-preserved specimens of these sandals, obtained from tombs, can now be seen at the British Museum, in London.

[Illustration:

Fig. 1.

Fig. 2.

Fig. 3.]

Such were the shoes probably worn by Rhodope, the Cinderella of the Nile. Rhodope was said to have the loveliest foot in all Egypt. One day, as she was taking her bath, an eagle stooped from Heaven and carried off her sandal. She watched him as he soared on high, until he finally disappeared in the distance.

When, after a time, he let the sandal drop, it fell at the feet of the King, who was so charmed with its beauty that he commanded that a search be made immediately for its owner. Rhodope was soon discovered, and shortly afterwards became the Queen of Egypt.

* * * * *

In both ancient Greece and Rome we find that, while it was common for the women to wear some kind of a foot covering, shoes were not generally worn by the men or youth, the latter always being taught to go barefooted. But later on, on ceremonial occasions, the magistrates began to wear a red shoe, while the soldiers took to a boot reaching almost to the knee, very elaborate in design, and in a short time the custom of wearing a covering for the feet was adopted by all classes. The shoes of the women were always white in color, the senators black, while the magistrates kept to themselves red.

* * * * *

[Illustration:

Fig. 4.

Fig. 5. _Fig. 6._ _Fig. 7._

Fig. 8.]

In eastern countries we find the Japanese wearing a shoe of rice and straw woven together (Fig. 5). This material is very light and soon wears out; so, when starting on a journey of any length, it is customary to take a number of pairs of shoes with one, leaving the old ones along the roadside as they become unfit for use.

The Japanese, on entering a house, observe the same rule as the Turk on going into his mosque, always taking off their shoes and leaving them at the threshold, lest they might soil the door-mats, for which they have a peculiar and marked respect. The military in Japan wear a kind of clog, covered with movable metallic plaques (Fig. 4). To this is attached a sole of wood or plaited straw, which is held on the foot by means of a roll passing between the toes.

The Chinese, we all know, have, for ages past, religiously devoted themselves to dwarfing the feet of their women of the higher classes, so that it is not at all uncommon to find a full-grown woman with a foot as small as a child’s of four or five with us.

Of late years this barbarous custom has been gradually dying out, and now one can occasionally come across a woman whose feet have not been distorted; still, when they are allowed to wear shoes of natural size and form, they are usually fixed on high, conical soles, like Figure 8, which renders walking very difficult. But the Chinese women are not expected to walk much, as their lives are passed in seclusion and retirement.

[Illustration:

Fig. 9.

Fig. 10.

Fig. 11.]

Some of the shoes worn by the ladies are very beautiful, indeed (Figs. 6 & 7), being made of delicate pink and blue satin embroidered with birds and flowers.

The men generally wear black satin boots with white soles, which they lay off in summer for shoes made of plaited bamboo, with cork soles.

In India, shoes are worn only by the higher classes, and a few of the lower castes. This habit of going shoeless seems to render the toes of the Hindoo almost as lissom as fingers. Sitting at his work, if his hands are employed he can use his feet to pick up any article he may require, as the big toe becomes quite prehensile.

Among the Persians we find that in ancient times one of low stature was generally looked upon with dishonor; hence arose high heels to repair the deficiency of nature. At first they were worn only by actors and actresses on the stage, but were afterwards adopted by all classes, even those whose stature required no additional height blindly conforming to the prevailing fashion, as many people do at the present day.

Some of the shoes worn in Eastern countries, at different times, have been very interesting (Figs. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14).

[Illustration:

Fig. 12.

Fig. 13.

Fig. 14.]

Figure 11 shows a lady's shoe richly painted with small flowers. In front is a knob of brilliant color, divided into segments to imitate the petals of a flower, and at every step the wearer takes she presses a spring concealed under the sole, which causes the petals to alternately open and close. One can easily imagine the sensation such a shoe would cause, seen promenading along any of our prominent thoroughfares for the first time.

The shoes worn by the wealthy are of the richest description, being overlaid with gold and silver, and embroidered with precious stones. Others, like Figure 14, are adorned with inlaid work of pearls or delicate shells set in gold, closely resembling _cloissonne_ enamel, while many employ the wings of gorgeous insects in their decoration.

The color of shoes in the East seems to be a matter of importance, indicating the rank or caste of the wearer, red and yellow being the favorite shades.

In olden times the Mohammedans were very jealous that none should wear yellow but themselves, wishing it to be preserved as their distinctive mark; and there is an old story which tells how some charitable person gave a Christian beggar an old pair of yellow slippers, and the Sultan happening to see them had the old man thrown into prison, and despite his explanations and protestations of innocence would not spare his life.

* * * * *

[Illustration:

Fig. 15.

Fig. 16. _Fig. 17._ _Fig. 18._

Fig. 19.]

Leaving the East, and coming back to Europe, we find that in the early days of the Church at Rome there lived a pious man named Crispin, and his brother, who became converted to Christianity, and leaving their native village traveled into France and Britain.

While on their travels they supported themselves by making shoes, which they sold to the poor at very low prices.

(There is a legend which says that an angel supplied them with all the leather, which probably accounts for their moderate charges.) At any rate, they are said to have done a great deal of good among the poor, but were finally martyred for their faith, in the third century. Ever since their memory has been celebrated by the faithful of their craft with great rejoicing and merriment on the 25th of October, which is known as St. Crispin's Day, while he is considered the patron saint of all shoemakers.

* * * * *

In the ninth and tenth centuries, we find the use of wooden shoes, or _sabots_, very general throughout Europe, princes of all degrees wearing them. Their reign was of short duration, however, as they were soon relegated to the poorer classes, by whom they have been worn ever since.

[Illustration:

Fig. 20.

Fig. 21.

Fig. 22. _Fig. 23._

Fig. 24.]

One would think, from their clumsy appearance (Fig. 16), that it must be rather awkward work to walk in them, but the peasants do not seem to find it so, and even indulge in the “light fantastic” with considerable grace and freedom of motion.

Their chief objection, however, is the noise they make. Having lived for some time in the close vicinity of a public school in Brittany, where some one or two hundred children were in daily attendance, wearing these wooden sabots, I have a very distinct recollection of the din and clatter these little ones would make, as they raced each other down the hill on their release from school. Not many years ago an attempt was made to introduce wooden shoes into the United States, but it met with so little success that its projectors were forced to abandon the scheme.

* * * * *

In Venice we find that the custom in olden times was to have the shoes of the women mounted very high, so as to make walking as difficult as possible. By this means jealous husbands thought they would be able to keep their wives at home; but the plan did not succeed very well, I believe.

Figs. 17 and 18 show the Venetian shoes of this period, the sixteenth century. The first one, of white leather, is cut out in a delicate lace-work pattern, furnished with a broad sole, and would have been comfortable enough, were it not for its high support.

[Illustration:

Fig. 25.

Fig. 26.

Fig. 27.]

These supports, or _chapineys_, as they were called by the Venetians, were made of wood and covered with leather of different colors. Many were curiously painted, while the richest were of gilt. The height of these _chapineys_ was determined by the rank of the wearer, the noblest ladies often having them one-half yard or more high. Of course no woman could walk easily, hampered with such appendages, so all that could at all afford it would have one or two attendants to support them on either side when they walked abroad; and even thus supported, walking was extremely difficult.

Finally, the daughters of one of the Doges came to the conclusion that the fashion was abominable, and they would stand it no longer. It was not long before their suffering sisters became of the same mind, and the fashion gradually died out.

When Charles I. first met his future wife at Dover, he seemed surprised to find her so tall, and, having made some remark to that effect, she answered him as follows: “Sire, I stand upon my own feet. I have no help of art. Thus high I am; I am neither higher or lower,” wishing him to understand, it seems, that her fine stature was not due to artificial means.

Fig. 15 represents a highly ornamented clog of this period, while Figure 19 shows another style of Venetian pattern.

[Illustration:

Fig. 28.

Fig. 29.

Fig. 30.]

On page 13 we have two shoes from Africa, Figs. 21 and 22. The first, of yellow leather, is quite simple in design, but the latter is more elaborate in decoration. Fig. 24 shows an Indian shoe, while Fig. 23 is a Persian boot, whose pointed front is supposed to have been designed for the purpose of preventing the wearer from kicking up the dust, so unpleasant in hot countries.

* * * * *

In France the clothing of the foot has always been a subject of special consideration, and many have been the styles that have emanated from there. Among the first was the long pointed shoe, called the _poulaine_ (Fig. 25), in England named _crakowes_. (This name, _poulaine_, seems to indicate that the fashion came from Poland, though the pointed shoe is supposed to be of Eastern origin.) These shoes grew both in favor and length, for a number of years, until the _poulaine_ had reached such proportions that it was necessary to fasten it to the knee by means of a chain of gold or silver, while in order to keep it in shape it had to be stuffed with hay, straw, or fine moss. The length of the _poulaine_ was determined in the same manner as the height of the _chapineys_, by the rank of the wearer, and it was no uncommon sight to find a nobleman with his _poulaine_ some twelve inches or more in extent, while the upper part of his shoes would be cut out to imitate the windows of a church.

[Illustration:

Fig. 31.

Fig. 32.

Fig. 33.]

When the crusading army was before Nicopolis, these _poulaines_ astonished the Turks very much, who probably wondered how fighting was to be done in them. When it came to decisive action, however, it was found that the _poulaines_ impeded the movements of the knights so much that an order was given to cut them off.

There was also made, at this time, in order to avoid trailing the _poulaines_ in the mud of the narrow streets, a kind of wooden clog (Fig. 27), with cross-bars edged with iron; this was fastened to the foot by an embroidered leather strap. By means of this contrivance the _poulaines_ were kept from contact with the ground.

This fashion flourished for a long time despite the anathemas of the bishops, who stigmatized them as immoral, and the denunciations of officials.

By an act of Parliament, in 1463 shoemakers were prohibited from making, for the lower classes, shoes with points more than two inches long; and afterwards excommunication was pronounced on any person found wearing them; so they were forced to retire, after a vigorous reign of almost three centuries.

From the _poulaine_, fashion ran into the opposite extreme, and in the sixteenth century people wore shoes with square toes as broad, and sometimes broader, than they were long (Fig. 26). They had no straps, and were only held on the foot by the narrow piece rising above the heel. It was shoes of this kind that were worn by Francis I. of France, and Henry VIII. of England.

[Illustration:

Fig. 34.

Fig. 35.

Fig. 36.]

In the latter country they were abolished during the reign of Mary Tudor. The examples given are believed to be German, and must have belonged to a person of high rank, from their decoration.

Another early example of a French shoe is Fig. 29. It is of white stuff ornamented on the instep with a large rosette of silver lace and a long metal point. The heel is so high that the wearer must have literally walked on her toes. Another female shoe of interest is from the wardrobe of Catherine de Medicis, Fig. 28. The shoe, of white leather, no longer has the toe pointed but is square in shape, covered to the instep with silk, on which are worked figures in silver lace, giving to it the appearance of a metal surface. This shoe is peculiar, in having a sole which connects the toe and heel together in the form of a pattern.

Fig. 30 shows a shoe of this period, of delicate workmanship. The toe has now become quite round, while the leather is slashed to show the stocking underneath.

Fig. 31 represents an Italian shoe of the seventeenth century; Fig. 33 is another style of the peaked shoe, of the same date. Fig. 32 is thought to be Flemish in origin, and of the eighteenth century. The heel and back are not unlike in shape the shoe worn during the Regency in France, but the peculiar front-piece makes us think that this shoe could never have been very popular for every-day

wear.

[Illustration:

Fig. 37.

Fig. 38.

Fig. 39.]

During the Revolution in France, there was quite a mania for classic styles in shoes, and many ladies in high society adopted the Greek and Roman sandals, which were fastened on the foot by gay-colored ribbons. Mme. Tallien once appeared at a ball in such sandals, with her toes decorated with diamond rings.

Fig. 34 shows the shoe of the unfortunate Duke de Montmorency, a victim of the relentless animosity of Richelieu. It is of black leather, with a large red heel, and entirely covered with ornaments; tradition says it was gathered on the scaffold. Fig. 35 represents a highly ornamented lady's shoe of this period, while Fig. 36 is a shoe worn during the Regency. The heel is very high and not unlike a barber's wig-stand; the front, however, is rather graceful in shape.

Figs. 37 and 38 are samples of the curiously carved wooden shoes which were worn by ladies at the end of the sixteenth century. Fig. 39 represents a black leather shoe of Louis XIV., with red heel; these were in high favor at court at this time.

* * * * *

[Illustration:

Fig. 40.

Fig. 41.

Fig. 42.]

The use of boots marks a conquering race. In Germany, during the Middle Ages, serfs were forbidden to wear them; and this probably explains why, when they rose for justice, after ages of oppression, they chose for their standard a great peasant's shoe. The samples of boots given are from the time of Louis XIV. and XV. Fig. 40 was called the cauldron boot; this had a peculiar appendage around the ankle. Fig. 41, the bellows boot, has an enormous top, so that a man could hardly wear a pair without straddling. Fig. 42, the postillion's boot; these were generally made of very heavy material, so if the postillion, by chance, should fall from his horse, the wheels of the carriage might pass over his legs without doing him any injury.

* * * * *

We have now followed the various changes that shoes have undergone from the earliest times to the present, and would bring our remarks to a close with a notice of some of the shoes of to-day furnished by J. & J. Slater, which, if not as fantastic in shape as some that we have treated, cannot be excelled for grace or durability.

Fig. 43 is a Ladies' Riding Boot, made of morocco and patent-leather. This style is the only correct one at present, and no riding costume is complete without them.

Fig. 44 represents Ladies' Button Boot. The material employed is kid top, with patent-leather foxing. This makes not only a very stylish but comfortable walking boot.

Fig. 45 shows Ladies' Toilet Slipper. It is made of Suéde kid lined with silk. This material is now the latest style for dress or toilet slippers.

[Illustration:

Fig. 43.

Fig. 44.]

Fig. 46 shows Ladies' Oxfords, made of French kid, with patent-leather tips. This is a delightful summer walking shoe, either for city or country wear.

Fig. 47 is a Gentleman's Riding Boot, the only proper boot for park riding.

Fig. 48, Gentleman's Button Boot, made with kid top, calf foxing, with tips, for walking, or cloth tops and patent-leather foxing, for dress wear.

Fig. 49, Gentleman's Oxfords, or summer walking shoe; very easy and comfortable for every-day wear.

The above are but a few of the various styles introduced by them, and a visit to their establishment will convince all of the high reputation their goods have achieved in the last twenty-five years.

* * * * *

Shoes have not only been used for their natural purpose of covering the feet, but from remote time have played a part in many of the important actions of life. Years ago it was the custom in Ireland to elect a person to a certain office by throwing an old shoe over his head. But on one occasion an excited elector, whose place it was to throw the shoe, aimed too low, so that the shoe hit the candidate on the head, instantly killing him. After this occurrence the practice fell into disrepute.

[Illustration:

Fig. 45.

Fig. 46.]

In England it was once customary to bind contracts by the exchange of old shoes, while we are all familiar with the practice of throwing an old shoe after a bride for good luck; but I wonder how many know what it originally signified. It is a custom that has come to us from the Saxons, and with them denoted that the authority under which the bride lived while in her father's home was now delivered over to the husband, who was privileged to exact implicit obedience from his wife.

* * * * *

Shoes have also had their share of superstition attached to them, it being considered to portend great evil, if by chance one should put the right shoe on the left foot, or _vice versa_. Even one of the Roman Emperors is said to have run the greatest risk from just this cause alone.

"Augustus having by o'ersight, Put on his left shoe for his right, Had like to have been slain that day, By soldiers mutinying for their pay."

But in this day of button shoes the dangers to be incurred from this cause are very slight.

[Illustration:

Fig. 47.

Fig. 48.

Fig. 49.]

J. & J. SLATER,

1185 Broadway.

==========

A Short Treatise on Head Wear, Ancient and Modern

Anne C. Goater

Project Gutenberg Release: June 16, 2021 · eBook #65624

Transcriber's Notes.

Page 10 — changed Shirrifs to Sharifs. Page 17 — The word Tiara added to Pope's Ti (Pope's Tiara). The positioning of the 17 illustrations has been changed slightly to accommodate each one between paragraphs, on every second page.

[Illustration]

Copyrighted, 1885, By R. DUNLAP & CO.

LOCKWOOD PRESS, 126 & 128 Duane St., New York.

[Illustration]

A SHORT TREATISE

ON

* HEAD * WEAR *

ANCIENT AND MODERN,

ILLUSTRATED BY

Walter H. Goater.

Head Wear, Ancient and Modern.

Tracing the history of man as far back as we can under civilized conditions of life, we find that in one form or another he has made use of some artificial contrivance to protect his head.

Nature, in her bounty, seems to have provided in part against the necessity of the hat, by giving to the head a thick and abundant covering of hair, but, instead of considering this as an indication that the head required no other protection, mankind seems rather to have regarded it as a hint to keep this most important part of the body well covered.

The hat being the most conspicuous article of dress, and surmounting all the rest, it is only natural to find that from the earliest times special care and attention has been given to its adornment—showy plumes, rare jewels and rich bands of gold and silver being used at different periods to decorate it.

Its form and frequently its color have also been made to designate the rank and character of the wearer: As the Monarch by his crown, the Cardinal by his red hat, which betokens his readiness to spill his blood at any time for the sake of Christ, and the court fool by his cap with bells. In one form it serves to designate the military officer, in another the peaceful Quaker or the quiet man of letters.

[Illustration:

Fig 1. _Fig 2._ _Fig 3._ _Fig 4._ _Fig 5._ _Fig 6._ _Fig 7._]

The materials employed in the manufacture of hats have been various, stuffs of every kind and color having entered into their composition. The birds have been robbed of their brilliant plumage, the beasts of the field of their wool and hair. Amphibious creatures have yielded their fur, while the mines of the earth have given up precious metals and stones. All these have been used by man to make a suitable covering for his august head. Felt hats are by far the most ancient, silk hats being of quite recent introduction. They were known in Florence about a century ago, but were not introduced into France until 1825.

Tradition ascribes the discovery of felting to St. Clement. It occurred in this manner: While on one of his charity missions, becoming weary and foot-sore, he took off his sandals to ease his feet, which were all bruised from long walking over rough roads. While resting by the wayside an opportunity was afforded him of rescuing a little lamb from the cruel clutches of a wily fox that was pursuing it. The grateful little creature jumped round him and licked his hand for joy, and it was in fondling it that St. Clement observed some loose wool, which he gathered.

While carelessly handling it the thought suddenly struck him that it would be good to bind up the wounds on his feet with. No sooner was it thought than done, and he found it so soothing that he immediately resumed his journey.

[Illustration:

Fig 8. _Fig 9._ _Fig 10._ _Fig 11._ _Fig 12._ _Fig 13._ _Fig 14._ _Fig 15._]

At night when he came to remove his sandals he was surprised to find, instead of fine, soft wool, a piece of cloth, so firm and thick that he could not pull it apart. This was called felt, and St. Clement was made the patron saint of the craft. (However, it is only fair to state that, according to some authorities, there is abundant evidence to show that felting was known to the ancients long before the time of St. Clement or the Christian era.)

* * * * *

The most ancient form of head wear we find to be the cap such as is seen on figures representing the goddess of liberty. Hoods, also, of various shapes, date back long before hats appeared, the latter for a long time only being employed as an article of extra clothing in winter, worn over the hood or when going on a journey.

* * * * *

Among the ancient Egyptians very peculiar shaped caps were worn, like from Figures 1 to 7. Some of them would rise to a great height above the head, and then descend very low upon the chest in the shape of lappets. Those of the priests and of their attendants were often loaded with a profusion of symbolical decorations, composed of feathers, lotus leaves and other natural products.

In religious processions it was common to wear masks that covered the whole head and neck down to the shoulders. These represented the heads and busts of various sacred animals, such as the ibis, hawk, bull, dog and ram.

* * * * *

[Illustration:

Fig 16. _Fig 17._ _Fig 18._ _Figs 19 & 20._ _Fig 21._ _Fig 22._ _Fig 23._]

Our modern hat can be traced back to the _pileus_ worn by the ancient Greeks when on a journey. Hats with brims were also worn by them, though some authorities claim that the Greek citizen of mature years never wore a head-covering, it being confined to youths, workmen and slaves. The _pileus_ was a closely-fitting woolen skull-cap, which was sometimes worn as a lining to the helmet. It was adopted by the Romans at their public games and festivals by those who had once been slaves, and by the aged and infirm for sake of warmth.

From ancient coins and medals we find that the Romans went bareheaded, except at sacred rites, games, festivals, and when at war.

Baldness was looked upon by them as a great deformity, and Cæsar, mighty conqueror though he was, yet could not make nature add one single hair to his very scanty supply, is said to have prized the honor of wearing a laurel crown above all the other dignities conferred upon him by the senate, as it served to conceal his weakness.

In the city, to screen themselves from the heat, rain or wind, the Romans frequently threw the folds of their robe over their heads, but if they met any one to whom they owed respect, they immediately let the folds drop and remained bareheaded.

Figs. 10 and 12 are specimens of ancient Greek helmets, while Fig. 11 represents a young warrior equipped for battle. Fig. 8 shows the _petasus_, not greatly unlike our tennis hat of to-day. Fig. 14 is the Phrygian bonnet, which held its own for so many centuries.

* * * * *

[Illustration:

Fig 24. _Fig 25._ _Fig 26._ _Fig 27._ _Fig 28._ _Fig 29._ _Fig 30._]

The inhabitants of Eastern nations always have their heads covered. In China the men wear hats in shape and size resembling large umbrellas, like Figs. 18 and 23, or else small conical caps similar to Fig. 17. These are made of beautifully wrought cane-work and often have pictures of birds and flowers painted upon them. They also have another cap, which though richer in material is not so graceful. It is similar in shape to Fig. 22, made of black velvet with a blue silk centre and a red tassel surmounting the top. The distinctive mark of different ranks among the mandarins consists in the color and value of the button worn on the cap. Figs. 19 and 20 show the peculiar head-dress worn by the Japanese when going forth to battle. In Arabia, notwithstanding the heat of the climate, the men wear a most preposterous head-dress. Frequently fifteen cloth or linen caps are worn one over the other, the upper one being gorgeously embroidered in gold with a sentence from the Koran worked upon it. Not satisfied with this curious coiffure they add to it by wrapping around the outer cap a large piece of muslin ornamented at the ends with silk or golden fringe, which stream loosely on the shoulders.

A plume of white heron’s feathers is the distinctive badge of a chief among the Uzbek Tartars.

Throughout the East the turban is generally worn, its height being a mark to denote the rank of the wearer. In color it is generally of the most brilliant hue, and of richly embroidered materials. Great taste and ingenuity are exercised in the manner of twisting it around the head so as to make the folds appear as graceful as possible. The different turbans on page 9 give some idea of the various shapes they can be made to assume.

Emirs or Sharifs, descendants of Mohammed’s daughter, are alone allowed the high honor of adorning their heads with green turbans.

[Illustration:

Fig 31. _Fig 32._ _Fig 33._ _Fig 34._ _Fig 35._ _Fig 36._]

On page 11 we have some types of African head-dress, Figs. 31, 32 and 34 showing what the natives of that dark continent have done for themselves in the way of head adornment, entirely unaided by fashion or the knowledge of what their brothers in other parts of the world were wearing. Fig. 33, though of Asiatic origin and finer workmanship, is quite as grotesque in design as anything the wild tribes of Africa could devise.

At one time the Turks had a law by which none but themselves could wear turbans of rich texture. Their Greek subjects were condemned to wear dark cotton caps as a mark of their servitude. Armenians were compelled to appear in ridiculous-looking balloon-shaped caps, while the Jews were only permitted to wear brimless caps resembling inverted flower-pots. Later on, the Sultan issued a decree that all of his subjects should wear a red fez instead of their turbans. This law was received with the most determined and indignant opposition. So obnoxious to their feelings was this change, that the discontented party set fire to the houses of all those who favored it, and though finally the Sultan’s wishes passed into a law, it was years before many of his subjects became reconciled to it. Fig. 40 shows a turban worn by one of the Sultans; Fig. 41, the fez of the people. Figs. 37, 38, 42 and 43 on the same page are samples of Russian hats. In some parts of that country the head-covering of the people is made of birch bark and plaited grasses; but fur is the material most commonly used. The prevailing male head-dress of the inhabitants of Asia Minor appears to be the Phrygian bonnet, of which the characteristic features with them are its point on top, bent forward, and its long flaps descending on the shoulders. This style of hat was worn for many centuries, and traveled as far west as Venice, where the Doge always wore one.

* * * * *

[Illustration:

Fig 37. _Fig 38._ _Fig 39._ _Fig 40._ _Fig 41._ _Fig 42._ _Fig 43._]

As a part of defensive armor the hat became the helmet, which has changed but little in shape from the earliest times. Very elaborate and fantastic were some of the early forms, with their double or two-story heads, Figs. 46 and 47, to give the impression of increased height. The workmanship, also, was very beautiful, some of the ancient helmets being entirely covered with chasing

and designs of the most intricate character. With the Greeks and Romans the subject of armor was one of importance, and from their ancient monuments we can learn much of their form and beauty. Page 15 shows several kinds of helmets worn during the middle ages.

* * * * *

In Spain serious disturbances took place in Madrid in the eighteenth century over an attempt being made to banish the _sombrero_. While in other countries the fashion of hats has been undergoing changes, in Spain the same shapes are worn year after year, with but little modification. Page 19, with the exception of Figs. 52 and 53, which are Mexican, show several forms of Spanish hats. Fig. 51 is the style commonly worn by the priests when traveling about.

Page 21 gives some German types; Fig. 61 is the hat of a judge; Figs. 58, 60 and 62 are military hats, while Fig. 63 shows a Teutonic fool's cap decorated with bells.

* * * * *

[Illustration:

Fig 44. _Fig 45._ _Fig 46._ _Fig 47._ _Fig 48._ _Fig 49._]

In France the clothing of the head has long been a subject of special consideration, and many have been the styles that have emanated from there. At first, as in most of the other countries mentioned, hoods were worn, but when Charles VII. made his triumphal entry into Rouen, in 1449, he wore a hat lined with red velvet and surmounted with a rich plume of feathers. From this date hats and caps became general throughout France.

A curious appendage that was worn with the hat for many years was like Fig. 66, consisting of a piece of black stuff which was fastened to one side of the hat, the other end being thrown over the left shoulder. This band was often held in the hand and the hat allowed to fall off from the head and rest on the back.

Another peculiar head-dress was the Capuchin hood, Fig. 68. This had a long pointed tail that hung down the back, and in front was buttoned close up to the chin. Some gallants twisted the tails into all sorts of fantastic forms and carelessly poised them on the top of the head. With the shaven faces that were always worn with this hood, the men all looked very much like monks. It was fear of this appearance that induced Francis I. to set the fashion of velvet caps in his kingdom. Fig. 67 represents a French military hat. For the past fifty years the high silk hat has been the most popular style in France.

At one time there was a law in France which compelled all bankrupt Jews to wear a green hat, so that people might avoid losses by trading with them. The slang expression "Do you see anything green about me," is said to have derived its origin from this circumstance.

* * * * *

[Illustration:

RUSSIAN. PRINCE OF WALES. ** FRENCH. POPE'S TIARA. ** ENGLISH. ** SULTAN'S TIARA. DUKE'S. ** AUSTRIA. GERMAN.]

The early Anglo-Saxons for years wore no other covering for their heads than their long flowing hair, which they sedulously cultivated. When they did take to a covering, about the eighth century, it was in the form of a cap made most likely from the undressed skin of animals. The Britons, at the time of the invasion of Cæsar, wore on their heads a conical hat, which derived its name from the cabin or hut in which they lived, it strongly resembling it in shape. Helmets, with a projecting piece in front called a nasal, were worn by the early Briton warriors. The nasal was afterward discarded, as it was found to afford too convenient a hold to the enemy of the wearer, Stephen, at the siege of Lincoln, having been seized by the nasal of his helmet and held a prisoner.

It was not until after the Norman conquest that the use of hats became general in England. "A hatte of bever" was worn by some one of the nobles met at Clarendon about the middle of the twelfth century, and in the "Canterbury Tales" we hear mention of the merchant wearing on his head a "Flaunderish bever hat."

In the fourteenth century we find a very peculiar kind of head-gear popular in England, Figs. 70 and 72. First, on the head is a close-fitting skull-cap, which is encircled by a roll of cloth, flat like a band, or twisted turban-wise. Above is another piece of cloth,

cut and clipped around the edges in all manner of queer shapes, the whole falling around the head in a confused manner. Such hoods were worn by the ancient Knights of the Garter, and are said to have been borrowed from Italy.

It is in this same century that for the first time in England we find a feather in the hat, Fig. 75. It was stuck in perfectly straight in front, as they had not as yet acquired any grace in its adjustment.

[Illustration:

Fig 50. _Fig 51._ _Fig 52._ _Fig 53._ _Fig 54._ _Fig 55._ _Fig 56._]

During the reign of Queen Elizabeth a great variety of hats and caps were worn. They were mostly made of velvet and richly decorated with jewels, bands of gold or silver lace and feathers. A writer of that time describes them thus: “They wear them sharpe on the crowne, peaking up like the speare or shaft of a steeple, standing a quarter of a yard above the crowne of the head. Some others are flatte and broade on the crowne like the battlements of a house. Another sort have round corners, sometimes with one sort of band, sometimes another; now black, now white, now russet, now red, now green, now yellow, now this, now that—never content with one color or fashion two days to an end; and thus they spend the Lord’s treasure consuming their golden years and silver days in wickedness and sin.” Those must have been glorious days for the hatter when the fashions changed so rapidly that men were obliged to buy a new hat every two or three days.

During this same reign laws were made compelling the lower classes to wear on the Sabbath a cap of peculiar shape and make.

The escape of Lord Nithsdale from the Tower, in the early part of the eighteenth century, was principally effected by the large riding-hoods worn at that time, which he put on, along with his wife’s dress and cloak. Such hoods were ever after called Nithsdales.

On page 25 are pictures of some of the early forms of English hats. Figs. 76 and 78 belonged to the clergy. Fig. 77 is a Scottish bonnet.

* * * * *

[Illustration:

Fig 57. _Fig 58._ _Fig 59._ _Fig 60._ _Fig 61._ _Fig 62._ _Fig 63._]

The Puritans discarded all ornament of any kind from their dress and wore the steeple hat, high and narrow in the crown, with a broad brim (Fig. 83). The Cavalier of the same era wore a low, broad-crowned hat with a feather stuck on one side. The principal changes that have taken place in hats from time to time have been in the height of the crown and in the width of the brim. As this latter became wider it led to the device of looping it up, and thus originated the cocked hat that was worn during the eighteenth century.

To all Americans this hat brings patriotic recollections of revolutionary days—for Washington and his generals all wore cocked hats. On page 27, Fig. 85, we have the hat of the “Minute Man.” Also one worn, Fig. 79, during the good old Knickerbocker days. Fig. 84 shows the style of hat worn by Kossuth when on a visit to this country in 1851. Previous to this time the only hat made for gentlemen was the high silk hat and cloth caps for boys, but a few weeks after Kossuth’s appearance in the country thousands of hats similar to his were sold, the demand for them being universal. Since then soft and stiff felt hats have been brought to perfection in quality and style in this country far superior to any made abroad. This was shown in our Centennial Exhibition, in 1876, by Dunlap & Co. receiving the first prize for their productions over all competition of foreign and domestic manufactures. Figs. 86, 87, 88 are three different styles of high hats worn about fifty years ago. In the latter part of the eighteenth century the gaudy ornaments of lace, jewels, feathers, &c., gradually began to disappear from hats, giving place to the sober black band and simple buckle, and when that, too, had its day and passed away, the hats of men were left without any ornament, but in much better taste and more in keeping with their use than were those of old.

[Illustration:

Fig 64. _Fig 65._ _Fig 66._ _Fig 67._ _Fig 68._ _Fig 69._]

Hats have not only been used for the practical purpose of covering the head, but from remote time have played their part in many important actions in life. Among the Romans the hat was the symbol of liberty, and slaves were presented with one on receiving

their freedom. The Quaker hat dates from the origin of the sect in the middle of the seventeenth century, Fig. 80. After the assassination of Cæsar coins were issued by Brutus and Cassius, on which was represented a cap between two daggers. Even at a later period the hat or cap was identified with liberty as in the republic of the Netherlands. After the emancipation from Spain a hat became their national emblem, while we all know the part Gessler's hat played in gaining for the Swiss their freedom. The common practice of doffing the hat when meeting a friend is thought to be a modification of the ancient custom of unclothing some part of the body when in the presence of one to whom respect was due.

Many persons profess that from the dress alone they can give you a true estimate of the character of the man.

While this is, perhaps, expressing it rather strongly, it is certainly true that the material and style of one's dress does, to a large degree, denote the wearer's character; and especially is this so of hats and the manner in which they are worn.

[Illustration:

Fig 70. _Fig 71._ _Fig 72._ _Fig 73._ _Fig 74._ _Fig 75._ _Fig 76._ _Fig 77._ _Fig 78._]

The man of refined tastes will always be found to be very fastidious in regard to his head wear, buying only the finest quality of hat, while a coarse nature will be satisfied with a cheap slouch hat. The prosperous business man also can generally be picked out by his hat, it being something substantial and good of its kind, while the man of mean and parsimonious habits will usually have a hat to correspond with his dwarfed nature.

"Have a good hat; the secret of your looks Lives with the beaver in Canadian brooks; Virtue may flourish in an old cravat, But man and nature scorn the shocking hat."

[Illustration:

Fig 79. _Fig 80._ _Fig 81._ _Fig 82._ _Fig 83._ _Fig 84._ _Fig 85._ _Fig 86._ _Fig 87._ _Fig 88._]

We have now followed a few of the changes that hats have undergone from the earliest times to the present, and would bring our remarks to a close with a notice of the house of R. Dunlap & Co., which was founded by Mr. Robert Dunlap in 1857, who opened a small store November 14, at 557 Broadway, between Spring and Prince streets, and by originality of designs and selling the finest class of hats, he soon became the popular hatter of the city. Two years later, in 1859, Mr. Paran Stevens, the Napoleon of hotel-keepers, induced Mr. Dunlap to occupy a store under the Fifth Avenue Hotel, which was just then completed, and who desired only those as tenants who sold the best goods in their line. At this time the hotel, situated at the corner of Twenty-third street and Fifth avenue, was considered very far up town, and it was predicted that Dunlap's venture would be a failure; but the young and enterprising hatter soon became the leading hatter of the country. The firm remained there for twelve years, and then removed to their present location, at 178 and 180 Fifth avenue. Finding the demand for their hats increasing from the residents of Brooklyn, Jersey City and surrounding suburbs, in 1876 they moved their store from 557 to 179 Broadway, near Cortlandt street, as their down-town store.

[Illustration: FALL STYLES, 1885.

N^o 52. N^o 52. N^o 53. N^o 53.

PRICE OF SILK HATS, $8.00. In Ordering give Number.]

[Illustration: FALL STYLES, 1885.

N^o 56. N^o 54. N^o 55. N^o 55.

STIFF HATS, IN BLACK AND BROWN, $5.00. In Ordering give Number.]

[Illustration: FALL STYLES, 1885.

N^o 57 STIFF. N^o 58 SOFT. N^o 59 SOFT. N^o 58 SOFT. SOFT HATS, IN BLACK AND BROWN.

In Ordering give Number and state price of Hat desired.]

[Illustration: FALL STYLES, 1885.

N^o 63. N^o 60. N^o 61. N^o 62.

SOFT POCKET-HATS, IN BLACK, BROWN AND BLUE. In Ordering give Number.]

The popularity of the Dunlap hat induced the firm to increase their manufacturing facilities by the erection of a large factory on Seventh avenue, New York, where all the silk and opera hats are made, and a straw-hat factory at 132 and 134 South Fifth avenue, New York, and also the erection of one of the largest and most complete felt hat factories in this country at the corner of Park and Nostrand avenues, Brooklyn.

The growing demand for these hats in the West induced the firm to open a branch store under the Palmer House, Chicago, about three years ago, which has proved a grand success; also, quite recently, they have opened an elegant store on Chestnut street, Philadelphia. Besides their own stores in New York, Chicago and Philadelphia, their celebrated hats are sold by authorized agents in all the principal cities of the United States, where the patrons of the Dunlap hat can purchase their hats of the same style, quality and price as sold by them in their own stores.

[Illustration]

[Illustration]

==========

The Story of Milk

Johan Ditlev Frederiksen

Project Gutenberg Release: August 14, 2021 · eBook #66061

THE STORY OF MILK

[Illustration:

Well kept creamery with attractive surroundings]

THE STORY OF MILK

[Illustration]

BY

JOHAN D. FREDERIKSEN

GRADUATE OF THE ROYAL DANISH AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, AUTHOR OF “CHEESE MAKING IN AMERICA” (IN DANISH), “CREAMING MILK BY CENTRIFUGAL FORCE,” ETC., GENERAL MANAGER OF CHR. HANSEN’S LABORATORY, MANUFACTURERS OF DAIRY AND MILK-FOOD PREPARATIONS, LITTLE FALLS, N.Y.

New York THE MACMILLAN COMPANY 1919

All rights reserved

COPYRIGHT, 1919

BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and electrotyped. Published September, 1919

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HISTORICAL

CHAPTER I

PAGE

PRODUCTION, COMPOSITION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF 1 MILK

Milk Ferments 1

—Pasteurization 1

Dairy Cattle 1

—Milk-Breeds 1

—Beef-Cattle 4

—Food and Water 5

—The Barn 9

—Milking 10

—Test the Cows 11

—Healthy Cows 12

Composition of Milk 13

—Butter-fat 13

—Casein and Albumen 14

—Milk-Sugar 14

—Mineral Matters 15

How to Test Milk 15

—The Babcock Test 16

—Sampling 17

—The Lactometer 18

—Acidity Test 19

Ferments 20

Enzymes 21

—Rennet 20

—Pepsin 21

Bacteria 21

—Lactic Acid Bacilli 21

The Control of Bacteria 22

—Cleanliness 22

—Heat 22

—Cooling 22

—Disinfectants 25

Pasteurization 25

Pure Cultures 30

—Starters 32

CHAPTER II

MILK SUPPLY AND CREAMERY PRODUCTS 35 Milk Supply 35 —Bovine Tuberculosis 35 —Milk as a Disease Carrier 36 —Bacteria Count 36 —Certified Milk 36 —The Sanitary Code 38 —New York State Milk Grading 38 —City Delivery 39 —Milk Stations 41 —Skim Milk 44 Cream 44 —The Separator 46 —Percentage of Butter-fat 48 —Standardizing Cream 48 —Pasteurized

Cream 49 —Whipped Cream 49 —Emulsified Cream 50 Ice Cream 52 —Freezers 52 —Classification of Ice Cream 56 —Ice Cream Recipes 56 Butter 69 —Dairy Butter 70 —Centrifugal Creaming 70 —Co-operative Creameries 70 —Ripening the Cream 71 —Coloring 74 —Churning 75 —Working 78 —Salting 79 —Composition 79 —Overrun 79 —Packing 79 —Sweet Butter 79 —Renovated Butter 80 —Oleomargarine 80 —Coco-Butter 80 Buttermilk 80 —Cooling Essential 81 —Commercial Buttermilk 81 —Ripening 82 —Breaking up the Curd 82 —Thick Milk 82 —Yoghourt 83 Fermented Milk 83 —Koumis 83 —Kefir 85

CHAPTER III

CHEESE 86 Cheddar Cheese 89 The Factory System 99 —Ripening the Milk 90 —Coloring and Setting with Rennet 92 —Cutting the Curd 94 —“Cooking” 94 —Matting 95 —Salting 97 —Pressing 97 —Curing 97 —Form, size and packing 98 —Cleaning the vats 101 —Yield 102 —Composition 102 —Qualities 103 Cheese Made from Pasteurized Milk 103 Making Cheddar Cheese on the Farm 104 Other Types of Hard Cheese 111 —Gouda 112 —Edam 112 —Swiss 115 —Roquefort 120 —Parmesan 123 —Caccio Cavallo 124 —Limburger 125 —Brick 125 —Munster 126 Soft Rennet Cheese 126 —Neufchatel 126 —Cream Cheese 127 —Cured Soft Cheese 128 —French Soft Cheese 128 Cottage Cheese 129 —Making Cottage Cheese with Rennet 132 Snappy Cheese 134 Club Cheese 134 Whey Cheese 134 Milk-Sugar 135 Casein 135 Milk Powder 136 —Just-Hatmaker Process 136 —Eckenberg Process 136 —Merrell-Soule Process 136 —Economic Process 136 —Skim-Milk Powder 136 —Whole-Milk Powder 136 Condensed and Evaporated Milk 137 Whey 138

CHAPTER IV

MILK AS A FOOD 139 Nutrients 139 —Protein 139 —Fats and Carbohydrates 139 —Mineral Matters 140 —Relation 140 —Nutritive Ratio 140 —Calories 141 —Fallacy of Theoretical Valuation 143 —“Something Unknown” 143 Care of Milk in the House 145 —Keep the Milk Cool 145 —Top-Milk 146 Milk for Infants 148 —Modifying Milk 148 —Recipes for Infant Food 149 Milk for Growing Children 152

CHAPTER V

MILK COOKERY 154 Soups 155 —Cream Soups 155 —Cereal Cream Soups 157 —Milk Chowders 158 —Milk Stews 158 Milk Cereals 159 Luncheon and Supper Dishes 159 —Creamed Dishes 160 —Souffles 161 —Cheese Fondu 161 —Milk Toast 162 Cheese Dishes as Meat Substitutes 162 Cheese Salads 166 Cottage Cheese 167 Milk Breads and Biscuits 170 Desserts 172 Junkets 179 Milk Beverages 181 Miscellaneous Suggestions 184 The Thermometer 184 Weights and Measures 185

End Notes 187

Bibliography 188

INTRODUCTION

The conception of this “Story of Milk” dates many years back. In his life-long study of problems connected with dairy farming and milk industries in two of the world’s greatest dairy countries, Denmark and the United States, the author has felt the need of a concise handbook covering this interesting subject. In his forty years of work in the manufacture and distribution of dairy and milk-food preparations he has been brought constantly into contact with men and women interested in the production of milk and has found a persistent demand for a book that might be consulted by anybody in regard to questions related to these greatest of all foods, which are, or ought to be, a most important part of the daily diet of children and adults alike, at all times, everywhere.

There was a time during the war when, frightened by the soaring of the price which had remained remarkably low for many years, much too low in fact compared with the cost of other food, people began to cut down the consumption of milk to an alarming extent. Even the National Food Administration for a short time recommended saving in the wrong place, forgetting that, at the highest figures reached during the temporary shortage, milk was still one of the cheapest of foods and that it was absolutely indispensable for growing children and exceedingly beneficial for men and women who were called upon to exercise their physical and mental powers as never before. But with men like Dean Russell of the Wisconsin Agricultural College in the Department and Dr. Graham Lusk of Cornell University representing the United States on the Inter-Allied Council of Alimentation, the Food Administration could not long maintain this mistaken attitude but quickly joined the College authorities and the representatives of the dairy industry in

advocating a liberal use of milk. And the Department of Agriculture sent out over the country a large force of demonstrators to show the people how to use milk in making cottage cheese and many other ways, and Agricultural Colleges, Farm Bureaus and Home Economics Agents worked hand in hand with Washington in disseminating the knowledge of handling and utilizing milk.

A genuine interest has been aroused in our country in the economy and conservation of food, and in “The Story of Milk” the author hopes to place at the disposal of the student of Domestic Science a comprehensive book of reference which may open the eyes of many to the fact that there is no more interesting subject than “Milk” in connection with the study of the welfare and physical improvement of humanity, and that milk and its products should be used to a much greater extent than heretofore.

It would make a long list of references if the author should mention the sources on which he has drawn for information beyond his own life-long experience in the dairy and related industries. He desires to express his sincere appreciation of the kindness and ready response of institutions and friends to whom he has appealed for photographs and cuts which have enabled him to illustrate the text so liberally. In the back of the book will be found a brief bibliography of standard dairy literature in which students may find material for further information.

Many interesting data and several excellent illustrations have been obtained from the bulletins and collections of the Department of Agriculture in Washington and the Dairy Schools at Ithaca, N.Y., Madison, Wis., and Ames, Ia.

The Chapter on Milk Cookery was written and classified by the author’s wife, whose practical experience will make it useful alike to housekeepers and students of Domestic Science.

J. D. FREDERIKSEN.

Little Falls, N.Y.,

April, 1919.

HISTORICAL

Milk and its products have been known and used from time immemorial. In the Bible milk and milk foods are mentioned in some thirty places. In Gen. 18:8 we read: “... and he (Abraham’s servant) took butter and milk and set it before them ...”; 1 Sam. 17:28: “And Jesse said unto David, his son: ... bring these ten cheeses unto the captain of their thousand and look how thy brethren fare....”; Prov. 30:33: “For the churning of milk bringeth forth butter,” etc.

Though in some of these passages butter is mentioned it is hardly probably that this product was really made or used at the time under the climatic conditions in Palestine. More likely it was various kinds of curd and cheese which the translator called butter. At any rate, the Hebrews of that far-off day coveted milk and its products among their most valued foods. From Egyptian, Greek and Roman history it appears that knowledge of cheese goes back to the most ancient times and that it was made from the milk of sheep, goats, cows, asses, mares, in fact from all domestic animals; in the far North, Lapps and Eskimos still make it from the milk of the reindeer, the Arabs use camel’s milk, Llama cheese is famous in the Cordilleras and Zebu cheese in Ceylon and India.

Even in ancient times the great food value of dairy products was recognized. Plinius tells of Zoroaster that for twenty years he lived exclusively on cheese, and Plutarch calls cheese one of the most nourishing of foods.

As time went by, the cow excelled all other domestic animals in capacity for the production of milk and by constant use through centuries for the one special purpose,—by care in feeding, breeding and selection,—special breeds of cattle were developed which gave milk in extraordinarily large quantities.

[Illustration:

From Maelkeritidende, Copenhagen]

[Illustration:

Thomas R. Segelcke, father of scientific dairying in Denmark]

[Illustration:

L. B. Arnold, noted dairy expert and writer, of Herkimer County, N.Y.]

In the cold climate of the northern countries where butter will keep for a long time it has been made for centuries. The illustration above is from a mural painting in an old church in Finland. Evidently at the time when that was built the devil already played havoc with the churn and even up to the days of our grand-fathers his Satanic Majesty was often accused of preventing the butter from "coming."

Not until the middle of the nineteenth century did dairying take its place among the important industries of the world and science begin to be applied in its development. Between 1860 and 1870 Thomas R. Segelcke, the "Father of Scientific Dairying" in Denmark, introduced the thermometer in churning instead of the rule of thumb and started the keeping of records in the manufacture of butter. N. J. Fjord started a series of experiments in the creameries, continued through the next decades, and which became models for similar work throughout the world, covering pasteurization, ice houses and cold storage, comparison between various systems for raising the cream, separators, feeding rations, etc., and Denmark developed its agriculture and dairy industry to an enviable position. About the same time Dr. Schatzman applied scientific methods in cheese making in Switzerland and Jesse Williams started the first American cheese factory near Rome, N.Y., while L. B. Arnold, X. A. Willard, Harris Lewis, Harry Burrell and many other progressive dairymen made Herkimer County cheese famous.

From New York, dairy farming spread rapidly westward through Ohio to Michigan and Northern Illinois, where butter making was developed around Elgin, and to Wisconsin, where Governor Hoard preached the gospel of progress, Babcock invented and gave to the world the famous test that bears his name and Russell made a specialty of dairy bacteriology.

[Illustration:

J. H. Monrad, the "Pen and Ink" buttermaker of New York Produce Review]

[Illustration:

Governor W. D. Hoard, of Wisconsin, promotor of progressive methods of dairying]

[Illustration:

J. A. Ruddick, Dairy Commissioner of Canada]

J. H. Monrad, Assistant Dairy Commissioner of Illinois, student, writer and lecturer on dairy subjects, collected and indexed one of the most complete and valuable libraries of dairy literature found anywhere, which after his death in 1915 was taken over and installed in special rooms by Chr. Hansen's Laboratorium in Copenhagen, where a librarian is keeping it up to date and it is open to the public.

In Canada, Dairy Commissioners Jas. W. Robertson and J. A. Ruddick, D. M. McPherson, the "Cheese King," and others contributed to an enormous development of the manufacture of high-class cheese, and in New Zealand and Australia similar progress was made.

Business and science have vied with each other in increasing the output of dairy products and improving their quality. In the table below, showing estimates for 1917, some interesting figures are given of the amount of milk produced in the United States and the uses to which it is applied.[1]

Uses to which milk is put (calculations based on estimates)

■■■

Although the table accounts for all the milk produced, it does not tell the whole story, since the preparation of a number of products results in the formation of vast quantities of by-products that are not used to the fullest advantage for human food.

New York City alone consumes 1,600,000 quarts of milk a day, but even this enormous quantity means only 0.6 pint per capita. The consuming public has been slow to realize the value of milk and its products, and too much emphasis cannot be laid upon the fact that even at the largely increased cost of all dairy products they are still some of the cheapest and the most healthful of foods, especially for growing children, and should be used in much larger quantities.

THE STORY OF MILK

THE STORY OF MILK

CHAPTER I

PRODUCTION, COMPOSITION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF MILK, MILK FERMENTS, PASTEURIZATION

DAIRY CATTLE

[Illustration:

Holstein]

A number of typical but widely different breeds of dairy cows have been developed in various dairy countries, each owing to the soil and the climatic conditions of its home, as well as to the skill and fancy of the breeders, its characteristic features, form, color, etc.

[Illustration:

Herd of pure-bred Holstein cows on a farm in central New York]

=Milk-Breeds.=—The black and white _Holstein-Friesians_ (which, by the way, had their home in Holland and not in Holstein) are known for their large production of not very rich milk, while the _Guernseys_ and _Jerseys_ give milk exceedingly rich in butter-fat. A good Holstein cow will give from 7,000 to 10,000 lbs. of milk in a year, containing from 3¼% to 4% butter-fat. Some of them produce as much as 20,000 to 30,000 lbs. in a year—nearly 4,000 gallons—just think of it! Jersey cows will usually not produce as much in quantity as the Holsteins but Jersey milk often contains 5% or 6% or more butter-fat, and a few of the best have been known to produce 800 to 900 lbs. of butter in one year, an amount equal to the cow's own weight. The red _Danish_ cow is an exceedingly good and highly bred milk producer which, however, has not been introduced in the United States, but the Scotch _Ayrshires_ and the _Brown Swiss_ are other well-known dairy breeds which are in favor with many American farmers.

[Illustration:

Guernsey]

But, alas! too many herds of dairy cattle average less than 5,000 lbs. of milk per cow per year and do not pay for their feed.

[Illustration:

Jersey cows]

[Illustration:

Red Danish]

[Illustration:

Ayrshire]

[Illustration:

Shorthorn, beef-strain]

Many native cows respond, however, to good care and feed and with a thoroughbred bull a satisfactory herd can readily be built up from carefully selected native stock. Such continued cross-breeding is more apt to succeed than attempts to cross two thoroughbred breeds because the characteristic features in full-blooded animals are so strong as to invariably predominate in the progeny over the less pronounced forms and tendencies inherent in native cows. But where two full-blooded animals are mated and the strong characteristics in each are fighting for predominance the result is apt to be a poor, ill-proportioned offspring as the result of atavism.

[Illustration:

Shorthorn, milk-strain]

=Beef-Cattle.=—Cattle bred and developed for the purpose of producing beef rather than milk are called by contrast beef-cattle. As examples of beef-cows look at the _Shorthorns_ or the _Herefords_ or the _Polled Angus_ at the next State Fair you visit and notice the square, deep, smooth body with muscles and fat strongly developed in contrast to the loosely built, bony milk-cow with its tendency to turn all its food into milk at the expense of the body. There are, however, also among the Shorthorns, strains of good milkers, but as a rule these beef-breeds are not selected for the dairy farm, and "dual purpose" cows are not usually profitable.

=Food and Water.=—The natural food for the dairy cow in summer is grass, and where rich, succulent grass and clover grow in abundance, as on the fertile meadows of Holland and the Channel Islands, or the Swiss Alps, the highly cultivated Danish farms, the eastern and middle-western states of America, etc., dairying early reached its highest development. As the value of milk and its products for human food became more generally recognized and all-the-year-round production was forced, it was found necessary to feed the cows heavily in winter too, not only hay, but also grain and succulent food such as beets and corn-ensilage (green corn cut, stalks, cobs and all, and packed in a silo), and science was taken into play to formulate _Balanced Rations_ containing the proper amounts and proportions of the various nutrients—Protein, Fat and Carbohydrates. It is not the place here to go deeper into this problem which has long been a subject for thorough research and experiments. In fact, more attention has been paid to the feeding of cattle than to the proper nourishment of human beings, and much of what we know about the latter has been deducted from experience and study on the dairy farm, and from laboratory work along that line. In the chapter on "Milk as a Food" we are taking up food values, etc., in relation to the feeding of children and men. Suffice it here to say that the same fundamental principles apply to the feeding of calves and cattle for the production of milk and beef. And we wish to emphasize the fact that, with due consideration to the proper proportion between the various groups of nutrients, it is much more important that the food is succulent, appetizing and easily digestible than that the ration shall be accurately balanced.

[Illustration:

Cutting ensilage and filling the silo]

This fact, long well known to practical breeders and dairymen, has recently been confirmed by Dr. E. V. McCullom to whose experiments further reference is made in the chapter on milk as a food for children. He shows that there is a very great difference in the quality of Protein and Fat from various sources and that there is "Something Unknown" in butter-fat, for instance, which is absent in most other fats and which is vital for the growth of the child as well as for the proper nourishment of man. This unknown but essential substance is also found, in small quantities, in the leaves of certain plants, as in alfalfa, while it is absent in the grain of the cereals.

[Illustration:

An abundant crop of alfalfa hay; cut three times during the summer. Supplies protein in the ration]

In modern dairy farming _alfalfa_ is considered an indispensable source for protein, and corn-ensilage or beets for carbohydrates, while bran, cottonseed meal or oil cake, malt-sprouts, gluten, distillers' grain, etc., may be used to advantage in various combinations.

[Illustration:

Cows milked with machine]

Contrary to a general impression one cannot feed fat into the milk. A large amount of oil cake or other food rich in fat in the daily ration does not increase the percentage of butter-fat in the milk. Rather, it depends largely upon the breed and to some extent upon the period of lactation. Provided the food agrees with her digestion and keeps the cow in a good, healthy condition, the composition of the milk is not changed to any appreciable extent by a change in make-up of the food.

It goes without saying that to produce from 20 to 50 lbs. of milk a day the cow must have an abundance of _fresh, pure water_ to drink and she should not have access to stagnant water.

=The Barn= must be clean, light and well ventilated and the cows should be milked with clean hands into a clean pail which is covered as far as possible so as to prevent dust from falling into the milk, or with one of the excellent milking machines which are now frequently used in large dairies. The milk is strained and cooled immediately after milking.

[Illustration:

Milking machine]

[Illustration:

In the partly covered milk-pail dust does not fall as readily as in the one entirely open]

=Milking.=—The cows are usually milked twice a day; occasionally, when the highest possible yield is desired, as in important tests, three or four times. The first five days after the birth of the calf the milk,—the Colostrum so called,—is not normal and should not be used for human consumption. It may be fed to the calf. The first three to four months the yield of milk generally is higher than later, when it gradually drops until after about ten months it stops altogether and the cow goes “dry” at least for some six weeks before dropping the next calf. The highest annual yield may be obtained by having the cows “come in” in the Fall or early Winter and feeding them well all Winter to keep up an abundant flow of milk. Then, when they come out on pasture in the Spring,—in the latitude of the Great Lakes about May 15th,—the fresh, rich feed will stimulate production and give it a fresh start so that the milk-pail may continue to be filled during the next few months and the shrinkage of the yield will not occur until the time when the pastures dry up. The cow will then go dry in the early Fall, when feed is scarce. Usually, however, the cows are allowed to “come in” in the Spring and the yield of milk begins to shrink in the late Summer with little or nothing in the Winter.

[Illustration:

Milking on a Danish farm]

=Test the Cows.=—To ascertain if a cow pays for her feed the amount and the quality of the milk should be tested and computed for the year. If the milk from each cow cannot be weighed every day it may be done regularly once a month or preferably oftener. If it is weighed morning and evening once every ten days it is easy to keep the account by multiplying the number of pounds by ten and adding the totals for the year. Occasionally the milk may be subjected to the Babcock Test to ascertain its richness; three or four times during the period of lactation is sufficient.

Where farmers do not have time to do the testing themselves they often combine and hire a young man or woman, trained in an agricultural college, to go around from farm to farm and do the work. These experts not only test the yield and the percentage of fat but also weigh and compute the feed so as to help the farmer make up his rations and calculate whether each cow pays for her feed or not. The members of these associations meet and compare notes and a friendly rivalry is stimulated which may do much toward increasing production. As a matter of fact, where Cow Test Associations have been introduced, both yield and quality of the milk have been largely increased.

[Illustration:

Dr. Bernhard Bang of Copenhagen, Denmark]

=Healthy Cows= alone can be depended upon to produce sanitary milk. In many herds of milk-cows tuberculosis is prevalent, and constant vigilance is necessary to prevent its spread. The _Tuberculin Test_ discovered by Koch is invaluable for the purpose of ascertaining the presence of tuberculosis. It is not necessary, however, to kill every infected animal. Only where the lungs or the udder is affected and a physical examination shows an advanced stage of the disease such radical means are advisable. When the tuberculin test was first introduced many valuable herds were wantonly and foolishly killed off because some of the highly

developed dairy cows showed reaction to the test while worthless scrubs were allowed to live and spread the disease. For only the intelligent and public-spirited owners of fine herds submitted their cows to the test, a reaction to which, under ill-advised regulations, permitted state officials to condemn the infected herds. In Denmark Dr. Bernhard Bang introduced a system of isolation of the infected animals which together with _Compulsory Pasteurization_ of the milk from such cows has proved efficient for the eradication of tuberculosis, and the _Bang Method_ is now generally recognized as the proper way of handling the matter.

COMPOSITION OF COW'S MILK

Cow's milk contains on an average in 100 lbs.:

87 lbs. of water 4 lbs. of butter-fat 3¼ lbs. of casein and albumin (protein) 5 lbs. of milk sugar ¾ lbs. of ash (mineral matter) 100 lbs. total.

It consists therefore of 87% water and 13% "solids," 4 of which are fat and 9, "solids—not fat." =Butter-Fat= is found in milk in the form of minute globules suspended in the liquid. As fat or oil is lighter than water (has less specific gravity) it naturally floats and the fat globules therefore soon rise to the top when milk stands at rest, forming a layer of _cream_ which may be skimmed off from the _milk_. In chemical composition butter-fat is very nearly the same as other animal and vegetable fats, but the slight variation may make a lot of difference in digestibility and palatability as well as in nutritive value, and it is a mistake to consider Oleomargarine, Butterine, Nut-Butter and other substitutes for butter "just as good" because a chemical analysis shows them to contain "almost" the same elements or compounds. These products may be good and legitimate if sold for what they are, but should never be allowed to be sold or served for what they are not, genuine butter.

[Illustration:

Composition of cow's milk]

=Casein and Albumin= are the proteids or nitrogenous matters of the milk, in chemical composition and in food value much the same as the protein in beans and peas or in meat, or the white of eggs. Casein is present in much larger quantity than albumin and is distinguished from the latter by being precipitated by rennet, which has no effect on albumin. Casein may also be precipitated by acids, while it required boiling as well as acidity to throw the albumin out of solution.

=Milk-Sugar= is related to the vegetable sugars, glucose, cane sugar, etc., and remains in solution in the whey which separates out from the cheese-curd when milk is curdled with rennet or acids. The whey also contains the mineral matters or _ash_, which consists largely of phosphate of lime, of use to the young in building up bones. When whey is boiled down to a thick syrup and left to stand, the sugar will crystallize out and may be separated from the liquid, still holding in solution the mineral matters.

[Illustration:

Fat globules as they appear under the microscope]

=Mineral Matters.=—These may be gathered as _ash_ by boiling off the water from this liquid or from the whole milk and burning the rest, as all the constituents except the ash belong to what in chemistry is called organic matter, which disappears in the air by burning.

[Illustration:

Dr. S. M. Babcock of Madison, Wis.]

HOW TO TEST MILK

Milk may be adulterated or decreased in value either by skimming or by watering. In either case the percentage of the most valuable constituent, the butter-fat, is diminished. It is upon this fact that the most practical test, the Babcock, is based.

[Illustration:

Babcock test outfit]

=The Babcock Test.=[2]—By treating a sample of milk with strong sulphuric acid the butter-fat is liberated as an oil. By subjecting the mixture to centrifugal force the light butter oil is separated from the rest of the milk and the percentage can be easily

determined. Centrifugal force had already been used in the Fjord Cream Test, but it remained for Dr. Babcock to work out the splendid practical and reliable test which bears his name and in which he has given to the world an invention of incalculable value.

[Illustration:

A two-bottle machine]

=Sampling.=—Whether it is new milk or skim milk or buttermilk or cream that is to be tested the first thing to observe is to take a _truly representative sample_. The liquid must be thoroughly mixed by pouring it several times from one vessel to another, or stirring vigorously.

It may not always be convenient to make a test immediately when the sample is taken. In the creamery where the milk is paid for according to its fat contents, samples are taken every day from every patron's milk and it would take too much time for the butter maker to test all of these samples before they would spoil. A preservative, corrosive sublimate,—poisonous but all right for the purpose,—is therefore added and all the samples of one farmer's milk for several days or a whole week are put together in one glass to be kept and tested at one time. This is called a composite test and has proven entirely satisfactory.

=The Lactometer= has been used to discover adulterations, depending upon the difference in specific gravity of the various constituents. The specific gravity of whole milk is about 1.032 which means that, if a certain volume of water weighs 1.000 weight units, the same volume of whole milk weighs 1.032, the same volume of butter-fat weighs, say, .900, or of cream about 1.000, and of skim milk 1.036 units. If the Lactometer shows a sample of milk to have a higher specific gravity than 1.032 it may therefore be suspected of having been skimmed. But it will readily be seen that by removing from whole milk some of the cream and adding water, the specific gravity can easily be brought back to normal for whole milk. This test is therefore unreliable and has been discarded with the advent of the Babcock.

[Illustration:

The acidemeter]

=Acidity Test.=[3]—The acidity, or sourness, of milk or cream, which depends upon the amount of lactic acid developed in it, may be tested by a liquid normal alkali or by the Farrington Alkaline Tablets, a solution of which added to sour milk neutralizes the acid. A few drops of an indicator, Phenolpthalein, added to the milk, turns it pink when all the acid has been neutralized, and the amount of alkali solution used shows the percentage of acid in the milk. This is quite important in preparing "starters" for ripening the cream in butter making or milk in cheese making, and in the manufacture of "Commercial Buttermilk," etc.

There are other tests used in scientific dairying as the _Fermentation Test_ to ascertain the relative purity of milk, the _Casein Test_, etc., but the above are those mostly used besides the _Bacterial Count_ which is mentioned under the chapter on "Milk Supply," and the _Rennet Test_ described under "Cheese Making."

FERMENTS

Two classes of ferments are of importance in connection with milk: (1) "unorganized" or chemical ferments, the "enzymes," and (2) "organized" ferments such as bacteria and yeast.

Enzymes

=Rennet.=—Among the unorganized ferments, _Rennet_ or _Rennin_ is highly important on account of its power of coagulating or curdling milk by precipitation of the casein. Rennet is extracted from the stomach of the suckling or milk-fed calf, where it serves in digesting the calf's food. It is in the market in the form of a liquid extract as well as a dry powder compressed into tablets (Rennet Tablets and Junket Tablets). The characteristics and use of rennet are described under "Cheese Making" in Chapter III.

=Pepsin= is another enzyme the office of which in the process of digestion is to dissolve albuminoids. It is not considered identical with rennet though in an acid solution it will curdle milk. It occurs in the stomachs of grown animals fed on solid food and is usually produced from hogs' stomachs.

Bacteria

Everywhere, in the air, in water, in the soil, and clinging to every object in the world, are minute organisms known under the common names of _bacteria_ or _microbes_. In contrast to rennet and the other “unorganized” ferments, bacteria belong to the “organized” class. Some are harmful, producing putrefaction, dissolution, poisons or disease; others are beneficial, leading to desirable fermentations and changes; others again are indifferent, neither good nor bad, but harmless.

As the milk comes from the cow it is almost free from bacteria, but milk makes an excellent soil for many of these organisms to grow in, and they soon get in, to multiply with enormous rapidity at any temperature from 60° to 100° F.

=Lactic Acid Bacilli= are bacteria of special importance to the dairyman, for they convert sugar of milk into lactic acid and produce various more or less agreeable flavors. They are also powerful germicides and scavengers, destroying or neutralizing the products of other bacteria which in the absence of these bacteria and the lactic acid produced by them would play havoc with the food and produce putrefaction or disease. Everybody who handles milk knows that pure sour milk or buttermilk in which lactic acid bacteria abound keeps well for a long time, free from other fermentations which have no chance to develop in their presence. It is due to this purifying property that Metchnikoff recommended Bulgarian sour milk as a health food, asserting that it prevents harmful fermentations in the digestive channel.

The Control of Bacteria

The principal means at our disposal to prevent or control and regulate bacterial growth are:

Cleanliness, _Heat_, _Cold_ and _Disinfectants_.

=Cleanliness.=—Only the most scrupulous cleanliness will prevent contamination. Hence the necessity of thorough scouring and sterilizing of all utensils, and the need for fresh air and pure water.

=Heat.=—The prevention of fermentation in milk by heating is called “sterilization” or “pasteurization” according to the intensity of the heat and the length of time the milk is subjected to it. Boiling destroys almost all bacterial life. Some germs require, however, exposure to a much higher temperature, up to 250° F. (boiling under pressure), to be entirely eradicated, but for all practical purposes a thorough boiling is considered sufficient to eliminate all danger of contamination. Such boiling is usually termed _Sterilization_.

[Illustration:

Effect of heating milk to various temperatures. Published by the Toronto Board of Health]

=Cooling= checks bacterial growth and but few germs thrive at a temperature below 50° F. The following table and diagram[4] show how quickly bacteria multiply in milk at ordinary room temperature, 68° to 70°, which emphasizes the importance of keeping milk cool.

Relative growth of bacteria when held at different temperatures

■■■

supply should not only be cooled strongly, but must be kept thoroughly chilled up to the time they are used, which means that they should be delivered cool to the consumer, and kept on ice in the house, never being allowed to warm up until used.

[Illustration:

The diagram (after Conn) shows the rapidity with which bacteria multiply in milk not properly cooled. A single bacterium (a) in 24 hours multiplied to 5 (b) in milk kept at 50° F.; (c) represents the number that develop from a single bacterium in milk kept 24 hours at 70° F.]

=Disinfectants.=—Antiseptics, such as benzoate of soda, formalin, boracic acid, etc., are not permissible _in_ milk, but _disinfectants_ such as soda, lime, washing powders, etc., should be freely used in cleaning utensils, bottles, floors and walls where milk is handled, so as to prevent as far as possible any infection.

PASTEURIZATION

[Illustration:

Louis Pasteur, French scientist and originator of the process of pasteurization.]

Pasteurization depends upon the fact that almost all bacteria, and especially the disease-producing species, are checked in their growth and made harmless, if not totally destroyed, by instantaneous exposure to a temperature of 175° F., or a more or less prolonged exposure to lower temperature, for instance for 20 minutes to 157° or 30 minutes to 145°. These lower temperatures are recommended in the case of new milk to be consumed as such, in order not to change its digestibility. Pasteurizers with “holding devices” are therefore largely taking the place of the “continuous” sterilizing machines, which allow only momentary exposure to the highest temperature.

Whatever method is used it is essential that after the heating is finished the milk should be cooled as quickly as possible to a temperature sufficiently low to prevent development of the germs that have not been entirely destroyed by the heat and which, if the milk is left for any length of time at a temperature favorable for bacterial life—anywhere between 65° and 110°,—will begin to grow again. Cool the milk to below 60° and if possible to 50° or 40°.

Sometimes a second pasteurization is practiced, the milk being purposely allowed to stand at 70° to 80° for 12 to 24 hours after the first pasteurization for the germs which escaped destruction to develop into full-grown bacteria. They are then killed by the second heating before the milk is finally chilled to stop any further growth.

Pasteurization can be done by placing the milk in any tin or enamelled or glass vessel, set in another vessel containing water (a double boiler). Heat until the milk has reached the desired temperature, hold it at that temperature the necessary time, and then place the vessel in cold running water or in ice water until the milk is thoroughly chilled. It is not advisable to place the hot milk in the ice box as cooling in air is too slow. Not until it is thoroughly cooled in water is it safe to put it in the ice box to _keep_ it cool.

[Illustration:

N. J. Fjord, Danish investigator]

In the seventies Prof. N. J. Fjord, in Denmark, applied to milk the process which had been developed by Louis Pasteur in France to give keeping quality to wine and beer. A Danish dairy expert, J. Moldenhauer, now connected with the New York State Department of Agriculture, first brought the process to this country and used pasteurization in a city creamery in Kentucky. American experiment stations established the temperatures and the time of exposure necessary for best results, and no one has done more for the introduction of pasteurization than the New York philanthropist, Nathan Straus, who has established pasteurizing plants and milk distributing stations in many localities, thereby contributing so largely to the lowering of the death rate among the children of the poor.

[Illustration:

The Straus Pasteurizer]

[Illustration:

A continuous pasteurizer]

The following directions are given by the Straus Pasteurized Milk Laboratories of New York for the pasteurization of milk for babies:

1. Only use fresh, filtered milk, which has been kept cold, and proceed as follows:

2. Set the bottles, after they have been thoroughly cleaned, into the tray (a), fill them to the neck, and put on the corks or patent stoppers.

3. The pot (b) is then placed on a wooden surface (table or floor) and filled to the three supports (in the pot) with boiling water.

4. Place tray (a), with the filled bottles, into the pot (b), so that the bottom of the tray rests on the three supports, and put cover (c) on quickly.

[Illustration:

Milk cooler]

5. After the bottles have been warmed up by the steam for five minutes, remove the cover quickly, turn the tray so that it drops into the water. The cover is to be put on again immediately. This manipulation is to be made very quickly, so that as little steam as possible can escape. Thus it remains for twenty-five minutes.

6. Now take the tray out of the water and cool the bottles with cold water and ice as quickly as possible, and keep them at this low temperature till used.

7. Before use, warm the milk—in the bottles—to blood heat. Never pour it into another vessel.

8. The milk must not be used for children later than twenty-four hours after pasteurization. Never use remnants.

In a _Continuous Pasteurizer_ a constant stream of milk is fed into the machine, heated by flowing over a metal surface with steam or hot water on the opposite side, and cooled by running over a cooler furnished with a stream of cold water or ice water.

PURE CULTURES

[Illustration:

Professor V. Storch, originator of pure cultures for ripening cream and milk]

Before 1890 it was supposed that the flavor of fine butter depended upon certain volatile oils and acids peculiar to butter-fat. In the early nineties Professor V. Storch of the Danish Experiment Station showed, however, that it was due rather to the products of bacteria and he isolated the lactic acid bacilli which would produce such exquisite flavor even when perfectly neutral and tasteless butter-fat was churned with milk acidified or ripened with a pure culture of these bacilli. In this country Dr. H. W. Conn of Wesleyan University, Storrs, Conn., did much to advance the theory and practice of ripening cream with a pure culture starter.

“Pure cultures” are produced in the bacteriological laboratory by picking out under the microscope colonies of the desired species of bacteria, planting them in a sterilized medium and allowing them to grow under the most favorable conditions and with the exclusion of all other germs.

[Illustration:

Streptococcus lacticus (Storch, No. 18)]

[Illustration:

Bacterium lactis acidi (from Storch)]

When such a culture has reached its maximum growth it is transplanted into a larger quantity of a sterilized medium containing proper nourishment for the particular organism. In the bacteriological laboratory, where alone absolute sterility of utensils and medium, and entire exclusion of foreign infection are possible, the culture may remain pure while this inoculation and propagation are repeated over and over again. But when the propagation is carried on in the house or the dairy, for instance in preparing starters or buttermilk, such absolute cleanliness is impossible and in the long run infections will creep in from the air or from the utensils and after a while it becomes necessary to start with a new “pure culture.” How often such renewal must be resorted to

depends largely upon the surroundings and the care of the operator. Usually it must be done after a week's time, although it is surprising to find milk preparations made by the simplest processes equal in purity to those prepared with the assistance of bacteriological science and technique. This is, for instance, the case in Bulgaria, where the famous Yoghourt sour milk is prepared pure without special care and in Denmark where the country is fairly permeated with the lactic acid bacilli used in ripening the cream for the celebrated Danish butter and where careful buttermakers often maintain their starters for months or even for years without "renewal."

[Illustration:

Typical lactic acid bacteria (L. A. Rogers)]

There are many different varieties of bacteria which convert sugar of milk into lactic acid, at the same time developing flavors more or less agreeable and characteristic for the various products. In the bacteriological laboratory certain species are selected which will produce the results desired for the particular purpose in view.

=Starters.=—Beginning with a commercial dry culture in the form of a powder as generally used in the creamery or the cheese factory as well as for the preparation of commercial buttermilk, or with buttermilk tablets as used in the ordinary household or the hospital, such culture is added to a small quantity of thoroughly pasteurized milk. If fresh, sweet skim milk is available it is preferable to whole milk as the butter-fat in the latter only interferes with the process; but either can be used.

Milk for starters should be strongly pasteurized by being kept at a temperature near the boiling point—at least 180°—for 40 to 60 minutes, then cooled to the degree at which it is to be set, usually between 65° and 75°, somewhat higher for the first propagation with the pure culture than for the subsequent transplantings when the bacteria, more or less dormant in the dry powder or tablets, have attained full vitality. Some species of bacteria, as the Bacillus Bulgaricus, require higher temperatures—90° to 100° or even 110°—than others. The culture having been thoroughly incorporated in the milk by vigorous and repeated stirring or shaking, the milk is left at rest in an incubator or a waterbath or wrapped in paper or cloth in a warm room where an even temperature can be maintained, until it is curdled, which may take 18 to 24 hours or even longer for the first propagation.

One part of this curdled milk is now added to 5 or 10 parts of fresh pasteurized milk and set to ripen in the same way as described above, possibly at a little lower temperature, and this is repeated every day, thus maintaining the "Mother Starter." After the second or third propagation the bulk of each batch is used as a starter in the larger lot of material to be ripened, be it cream for butter or milk for cheese or for commercial buttermilk, while a little is taken for maintenance of the mother starter as described above.

The _amount of starter_ to prepare every day depends upon the amount of milk or cream to be ripened and the per cent of starter used in same. For instance, if you have ten gallons of cream to ripen every day in which you wish to use about 10% or 12% starter, or one gallon, take a little less than one pint of the first or second propagation for one gallon of milk; the next day use one pint of this to add to a gallon of fresh starter milk, and the remaining gallon to add to the ten gallons of cream, and so on every day.

If you have 4,000 lbs. of milk in the cheese vat to ripen with 2% or 80 lbs. starter, prepare 88 lbs. of mother starter. If, on the other hand, you wish to make only a quart of buttermilk every day, take, say, two buttermilk tablets, crush them thoroughly in a spoonful of pasteurized milk and stir this into a tumblerful of the same milk; let stand till it is thickened the next day and use a tablespoonful of this thickened milk in a quart of fresh pasteurized milk which when ripened is your buttermilk, from which you take out a tablespoonful for starter in the next batch, and so on. In this case there is no "mother starter" except that perhaps the first tumblerful prepared with the tablets may be called so, but afterwards the starter is taken right out of the finished product every day.

The process may be modified to suit special purposes and local conditions, but the following precautions should be strictly observed: (1) to interrupt the ripening immediately by quick and intense cooling as soon as it has reached the proper point in case the ripened product is not used at once, and (2) to _keep_ it ice-cold until it is used. If this is done, it may be kept for two or three days without deterioration if it is not convenient to make it fresh every day which, however, should be the rule.

CHAPTER II

MILK SUPPLY AND CREAMERY PRODUCTS

In the first chapter the composition of cow's milk and the nature of its constituents have been considered, the most important tests for its richness and purity have been described, and the ferments have been mentioned which instigate changes for good or for bad, together with the means at disposal for regulating their activity. To use these means intelligently in handling milk and its products is the key to the dairyman's success.

We shall now briefly consider the various steps that are of importance in modern dairy industry.

MILK SUPPLY

In the first place, the farmer must furnish pure, clean, unadulterated milk, fresh from the cow and cooled immediately after milking. His cows must be healthy.

=Bovine Tuberculosis.=—Many milk-cows, for the very reason that they have been bred with the one purpose in view of turning all their food into milk and wasting as little as possible in building up the body, are more or less weak-chested and apt to suffer from tuberculosis. Unless this disease is so far advanced as to affect the general health of the cow, or it has spread to the milk organs, the udder and the teats, it is not so dangerous as has heretofore been supposed. It is now held by the great majority of physicians that bovine tuberculosis is hardly ever transmitted to grown persons and seldom to children. Neither is it hereditary. Nevertheless, wherever it is possible to have the herd tested with tuberculin, segregating, if not killing, the animals which show by reaction that they are somewhat tuberculous, it should be done. Milk from such cows should always be pasteurized.

=Milk as a Disease Carrier.=—A greater danger lies in the fact that, warm as it comes from the cow, milk is an ideal medium for human disease germs to grow in, and may thus become a great conveyor of such germs. For this reason it is of the greatest importance that the milkers are healthy and clean, that the udders and teats be free from dirt, and the milk pail covered as far as possible; the barn must be clean, and every source of infection excluded. This fact also points to the advisability of pasteurization. On page 23 a chart is shown, published by the Toronto Board of Health and indicating the temperatures at which various germs of disease are made harmless.

=Bacterial Count.=—The test for clean milk now mostly used is the "Bacterial Count," the number of bacteria—or rather colonies of bacteria—found in a cubic centimeter of the milk. It would be better if the nature or quality of the bacteria could be taken into consideration as well as the quantity, but that being as yet impracticable, the next best thing is to depend upon the number. Ordinary good milk often contains hundreds of thousands of bacteria in a cubic centimeter, but where the greatest cleanliness is observed the number may be less than 1,000.

=Certified Milk= is now sold in many cities which, according to varying city ordinances, is guaranteed to have less than 10,000 or 20,000 or 30,000 bacteria, as the case may be.

[Illustration:

Counting the bacteria in a cubic centimeter of milk]

The cost of producing certified milk places it beyond the reach of the great majority of consumers. But such care and cleanliness as can be observed by the farmer and the milkman without extra expense should be insisted upon, and milk which nevertheless contains a large number of bacteria can be made safe by pasteurization.

=The Sanitary Code.=—The regulation of the production and delivery of milk in cities and towns as well as at creameries and cheese factories, the "Sanitary Code" established by state and municipal health authorities, has been very effective in improving the quality of the supply. So enormous have been the improvements in caring for and handling the products by the large establishments engaged in the delivery of milk as to make the increase in cost seem trifling compared with the great benefit to the public health secured by these agencies.

=New York State Milk Grading.=—The New York State Board of Health prescribes a grading for milk offered for sale, the most important features of which are as follows:

Certified.—Must be produced under specially sanitary conditions approved by a county medical commission.

Grade A Raw.—Cows must be tuberculin tested and milk must not contain over 60,000 bacteria per cubic centimeter.

Grade A Pasteurized.—Cows must be subjected to physical examination and milk must not contain more than 200,000 bacteria before, nor more than 30,000 after pasteurization.

Other grades permitted under the rules, all subject to inspection and approval of the authorities, are:

Grade B Raw. _Grade B Pasteurized._ _Grade C Raw._ _Grade C Pasteurized._

Deliveries must be made within a certain time after production or pasteurization, barns and milk stations are inspected, and altogether such safeguards are employed as to make the supply exceedingly safe and reliable.

=City Delivery.=—In villages and small cities the milk supply is still to a large extent in the hands of farmers who come to town early in the morning peddling their milk, often at considerable waste of time for horse and man. Or a number of peddlers go over the same route so that it takes a dozen wagons to cover a town where three or four could do it.

As long as there was no efficient regulation as to price and quality such waste was perhaps unavoidable, as competition on the part of the producers and distributors was the only means of protection for the consumers. But lately state and municipal control is being exercised to such an extent as to largely eliminate the danger of poor milk and exorbitant prices. Further development of organized delivery systems so much to be desired for sanitary as well as for economical reasons, may be looked for as soon as normal conditions return after the close of the war. The delivery of milk is one of the things that in the interest of public health must be under the strictest official control, and _co-operation_ between farmers and consumers is the logical system for elimination of unnecessary expenses of distribution and for prompt and satisfactory service. Their interests are or should be identical and both classes are hurt by inefficient and wasteful delivery.

In the large cities there has grown up an industry which largely monopolizes the milk supply and which until lately was powerful enough to dictate prices and conditions both for producers and consumers. Several attempts have been made from time to time by farmers to combine to regulate prices and dictate the terms to the middlemen. Such attempts have, however, invariably failed as long as they were built on false economic principles and prompted by selfish interests only. No farmers' association can be strong enough to ignore the law of supply and demand, and it is only quite recently that the _Dairymen's League_ has succeeded in influencing the market by taking into consideration the actual cost of production of milk as worked out by the agricultural colleges, and fixing the price on a scientific basis. There is one other element entering into the causes on which the price to the consumers depends, namely, _Transportation_, and while municipal boards of health are looking after the sanitary conditions and prevention of adulteration, State and Federal authorities are stepping in as moderators or arbitrators to reconcile the interests of the _Producers_, the _Railroad Companies_, the _Distributors_ and the _Consumers_. The next step in the development will no doubt be towards full co-operation between producers and consumers and, to a large extent, elimination of the "middlemen."

It should not be forgotten, however, that while the much abused middlemen in time past have been able to dictate terms and prices and have often abused the privilege; they have at the same time used their influence and power to improve the milk supply. As the supply of oil and gasoline has been perfected and cheapened by the all-powerful Standard Oil Co. as a monopoly crushing all competition, so the "Milk Trust" has improved the distribution of milk and has built up the magnificent sanitary plants in which milk is handled, pasteurized, bottled and distributed in a way that might not have been possible without the monopoly. It has served a good purpose, but has at the same time acquired such power that official control has become necessary for the protection of producers and consumers alike, and the time may be near when these two classes will combine and take the matter into their own hands so that the distribution may be done at actual cost.

[Illustration:

Milk station in the country where milk is received from the farmers to be shipped to the city]

=Milk Stations= are plants erected in dairy sections in the country either by the city milk supply houses or by co-operating farmers, where the milk is delivered and handled so as to make it ready for shipment to the city. As in the creamery and the cheese factory, the milk is carefully examined and, if it is not sweet and pure, it is rejected and sent back to the farm. Any impure flavor remains in the cover for some time and is easily detected by smelling of the cover as soon as it is removed from the can.

A sample is taken and put aside for the Babcock test and perhaps another for the Fermentation test. Each farmer's milk is weighed in the _Weigh Can_ and run through a cheese-cloth strainer. The further treatment varies in different plants. The milk may simply be cooled by running it over a cold water or brine cooler and placing it in shipping cans in the refrigerator or in ice water until the

milk-train comes along to pick up the cans. Or it may be clarified by running it through a centrifugal machine, the same as a separator, in which, however, cream and milk are not separated, but impurities are thrown out by the centrifugal force and deposited on the wall of the bowl, and the purified milk may then be pasteurized and bottled before being shipped to the city.

[Illustration:

Receiving milk at the milk station]

Arriving in the city in iced cars the milk is taken to one of the elaborate plants in which it is pasteurized and bottled, if that has not been done at the country station. The machinery used in these plants is getting more and more perfect and expensive and leaves little to be desired as to sanitary requirements and economy in handling. Pasteurizers, bottling machines, bottle-washing machines, conveyors, etc., are wonders of ingenuity, and one needs only to see one of these modern plants to understand that in a large city milk can only be handled to advantage in expensive establishments.

=Skim Milk= is one of the cheapest of foods and under proper regulations its sale should not be prohibited. The reason why in times past skim milk has been discredited and excluded from sale was that, as produced by the old methods of raising the cream, before the advent of the separator, it was always more or less old and sour before it was available and certainly before it could be distributed to consumers. Under such conditions it was hardly ever fit for human food. But when produced by the separator and pasteurized and cooled immediately after—within a few hours after milking, which is entirely feasible—it is an excellent and nutritious food for adults and even for children over two years of age. Ripened with a pure culture of lactic acid bacteria, it makes a healthful, refreshing drink, like buttermilk. Only when it is allowed to sour without proper care or control does skim milk, as whole milk does, become unfit for food or drink. On a cold winter morning when men are going to work (or perhaps are looking for work which they cannot find), and children are on their way to school, often underfed, a street-corner wagon or stand where boiling hot, fresh, sweet skim milk might be distributed at a cent or two a glass would be a blessing in any city.

[Illustration:

Pasteurizing and bottling milk in a Borden plant]

CREAM

When new milk is left at rest the cream will rise to the top and after 12 to 24 hours a cream-line can be seen in the bottle. This cream-line is sharper and more easily seen in raw milk than in pasteurized milk and its absence is not always a sure sign of lack of richness or purity of the milk. By cooling the milk thoroughly so that it will keep, almost all the cream will be at the top in forty-eight hours and can be skimmed off. The cream can be used for coffee or on cereals or fruits or puddings; the skim milk left will still hold ½% or more of butter-fat and can be used to drink or for cooking.

=The Separator.=—On the farm or in the creamery the cream is no longer raised by gravity, that is, by letting the milk “set” either in shallow pans on the kitchen shelf or in deep cans in ice water, but the fresh, warm milk is run through the separator in a continuous stream.

[Illustration:

Early conception of the separator]

It was noticed that the rising of the cream due to the difference in specific gravity between the butter-fat and the milk-“serum” (the watery solution of the other constituents) might be greatly hastened by subjecting the milk to centrifugal force. This physical phenomenon was taken advantage of in the first conception of the separator where it was shown that if a pail of milk was whirled around like a stone in a sling the heavier milk-serum would be thrown towards the bottom of the separator pail with so much greater force than the lighter cream (butter-fat mixed with a small part of the serum) that the separation which would take 48 hours in the milk at rest, could be accomplished in a few minutes when exposed to centrifugal force. From this early crude attempt the continuous _bowl-separator_ was developed and still later a number of divisions in the bowl were designed which increased the capacity and efficiency of the machine wonderfully. The most successful separator was designed by Dr. Gustaf De Laval of Sweden and the machines bearing his name are used all over the world where butter is made. But there are many other excellent separators on the market.

[Illustration:

Dr. Gustaf De Laval of Sweden, inventor of the separator bearing his name]

In the machine the milk is separated instantaneously by centrifugal force and runs out through two tubes, one for cream and the other for skim milk. A small modern hand machine will take care of from 200 to 1,000 lbs. of milk an hour, and power machines are built to separate 6,000 lbs. or more. By regulating the cream-outlet a heavier or lighter cream can be produced.

[Illustration:

Hand separator]

Suppose we are separating some milk containing 4% butter-fat. If ■ of this milk is separated out as cream and contains all the butter-fat, the cream will be eight times as rich in butter-fat as the original milk; 32% of the cream will be butter-fat. Such cream is called “32% cream.” If we take ¼ as cream, we get a cream four times as rich as the milk, a “16% cream.” So out of 100 lbs. of milk we can take 12½ lbs. (■) of 32% cream, 25 lbs. (¼) of 16% cream, etc.

Although the skim milk is really valuable as a food, it is worth but little commercially; the cream containing the butter-fat is the expensive part of the milk, and we must be prepared to pay for the cream all that the milk would have cost.

=Percentage of Butter-Fat.=—The “richness” of cream or milk and their value depend upon the amount of butter-fat in them. So cream or milk is often called “30% cream” or “20% cream” or “4% milk” according as 30% or 20% or 4% of the fluid is butter-fat; 30% cream is quite rich; ordinary market cream varies between 18% and 40%, though it may fall below 18%, or it may be sold as a very expensive article as high as 60%. Rich milk may contain more than 6% of butter-fat and skim milk less than 0.1 of one per cent. The average for good whole milk is between 3% and 4½%.

For a long time scientists and scientific dairymen were the only ones to speak of milk and cream in terms of percentage of butter-fat. Now, however, people are beginning to realize how valuable a part of the milk the butter-fat is and are paying more attention to the actual percentage of butter-fat in the cream or milk they use. So it is no longer unusual to see a dairyman advertise cream of a certain percentage or to hear a housewife ask for it specifically.

=Standardizing Cream.=—For ice cream or for preparing modified milk for babies, it is often desirable to dilute rich cream to a certain lower standard. The following simple steps can be taken to find out how much milk to add for diluting:

1. From the test—fat-percentage—of the rich cream subtract the test desired.

2. From the test desired subtract the test of the milk used for diluting.

3. Divide the first difference by the second, and the result will be the number of pints (or pounds) of milk to be added for each pint (or pound) of the rich cream.

For instance, you may want to thin some 30% cream to 10% for making ice cream. The milk to be added is skim milk. Then:

1. 30 - 10 = 20.

2. 10 - 0 = 10.

3. 20 divided by 10 = 2. So for each pint of rich cream you may add 2 pints of skim milk.

Or you may wish to thin the 30% cream with whole milk, which has 4% butter-fat. Again:

1. 30 - 10 = 20.

2. 10 - 4 = 6.

3. 20 divided by 6 = 3■. So you may add 3■ pints of the whole milk to each pint of the 30% cream and still have a 10% cream.

=Pasteurized Cream= does not look as rich as raw cream, and fresh, sweet cream appears to be thinner than when it is 24 hours old and slightly ripened. So it is well, when buying cream, not to judge by appearances. Demand of the milkman that he furnish you cream of a certain percentage of butter-fat and see to it that you get what you pay for. If you have no Babcock tester the milk inspector will test the cream for you.

=Whipped Cream.=—For whipping, cream must be fairly rich, from 24% to 32%, and it must be cold. Fresh, sweet cream does not whip as readily as that which has been kept for 12 or 24 hours in ice water. There is no other secret connected with the process. Use a rich cream, suitably cooled and aged, and with a good beater there can be no trouble in getting a fine, stiff whipped cream. If the cream is too thin or too warm it may not become stiff. Sometimes, when it is beaten too long, it turns into butter and buttermilk.

[Illustration:

Installation in a Danish creamery. From the separator at the right the cream runs through the continuous pasteurizer which forces it up over the cooler whence it runs into the cream-vat at the left. (From Boggild—Maelkeribruget i Danmark)]

=Emulsified Cream.=—One of the recent additions to the already elaborate machinery used in the creamery, the milk supply or the ice cream business, is the _Emulsifier._ To be sure, emulsifiers were used thirty to forty years ago to mix animal and vegetable fats—oleomargarine oil, lard and cottonseed oil—into skim milk for “Filled Cheese” or for Butterine, but lately they are serving new purposes in the milk industry. By forcing melted butter-fat or oil mixed with water or skim milk through exceedingly small apertures under high pressure, or otherwise breaking up the mixture, an emulsion can be formed in which the fat globules are much finer even than those in natural milk or cream, and separation can be prevented. The force used in these emulsifiers may be produced by powerful pumps, or a steam jet, or centrifugal force under high speed; whichever system is used the machines answer the same purpose, to produce a permanent emulsion in which the oil or fat will stay in suspension even after cooling. In some milk supply plants and ice cream factories all the cream is emulsified and the system has especially been applied since the advent of the milk powder. It is now a not infrequent practice to run the new milk through the separator, make sweet, unsalted butter from the cream, and milk powder from the skim milk, and to ship or store these products separately where or until cream is wanted and then bring them together again by running them through the emulsifier with a suitable amount of water. At first thought this process would seem impractical and uneconomical. But it has proven good business because in many cases and places skim milk powder and butter keep better separately or can be shipped at long distance to better advantage than new milk or cream or condensed milk. In ice cream factories business may be dull in cold weather and cream is perhaps not provided and not available, when suddenly a hot spell brings orders for large quantities. With a stock of skim milk powder and butter on hand in the refrigerator, and an emulsifier to mix these products, cream can be produced on short notice and there will be no danger of shortage.

ICE CREAM

Ice cream has fast become the national dessert served on all festive occasions, winter and summer. Originally it meant a frozen mixture of sweetened and flavored milk and cream, but the name has long been applied to all kinds of frozen delicacies in which cream enters as a constituent. Not even there has the line been drawn, but gums, gelatine, cornstarch, eggs and other “fillers” have been substituted or added to thicken the mixtures and give “body” to “creams,” which have but little relation to the genuine emulsion of butter-fat from cow’s milk. Standardization has been attempted by National and State food authorities with varying success of enforcement. While the application of the name to a great variety of frozen desserts has no doubt become legitimate by long usage it may properly be demanded that as an article of merchandise “ice cream” shall contain at least 8% to 12% butter-fat and that no ingredients dangerous to health enter into its manufacture.

[Illustration:

Hand freezer]

=Freezers.=—The freezing is usually done by contact of the material with metal cooled on the other side by a “freezing mixture” of salt and ice which produces temperatures far below the freezing point of water while air is whipped into the cream by the rapid motion of the beater. A great variety of excellent freezers of this kind for hand or for power are on the market which answer the purpose for making ice cream at home or at the ice cream parlor.

Coarse-grained salt and crushed ice, mixed in the proportion of 1 part salt to 4 parts of ice, are constantly filled into the space surrounding the ice cream can, and the brine produced by the melting of the mixture is gradually drawn off from the tub. In a good freezer the operation should not take over fifteen minutes. When the cream is frozen to a soft mush, stop the beater and scrape down the hard particles which may have accumulated on the sides of the can, add any ingredients which may be better incorporated at this stage than mixed into the original material, such as crushed fruit or preserves, and finish the freezing without carrying it too far.

Remove the beater, stir the cream which should still be soft enough to handle, and pack in ice with only a little salt. Or the cream may be transferred from the freezer can to the shipping can and packed in it. If bricks are wanted the soft cream is packed in molds of the desired shape and size and buried in the freezing mixture to harden.

In modern ice cream factories _Brine Freezers_ are generally used. In a _Refrigerator Plant_ intensely low temperatures are produced by the vaporizing of compressed ammonia or carbonic acid in an ice machine, and brine circulating in iron pipes is cooled by such medium and may, in turn, cool the air in the _Cold Storage_ room, or the cream in the freezer, or pure water in metal boxes for the manufacture of _Artificial Ice._ It has been attempted to make the brine freezers _continuous_, the cream mixture being fed into the machine at one end and discharged frozen at the other. But this system has not so far been successful, and intermittent or batch freezers are most practical yet both for hand and for power.

[Illustration:

Power brine freezer]

Rich material, frozen in a good machine, whether intermittent or continuous, will expand from 50% to 100%, and the original material should not fill the freezer can more than half full.

The manufacture of ice cream has been the subject of study and experiments for years in the Dairy Department of the Agricultural College at Ames, Iowa, where Professor M. Mortensen has worked out a comprehensive classification from which any manufacturer may readily choose his formulas, modifying them to suit his local conditions and special problems. The outline kindly furnished the author by Professor Mortensen is so interesting and instructive as to be well worth copying substantially in full, leaving out the “Ices” in which no milk or cream is used and which are therefore not of special interest in connection with the purpose of this book—the use of more and better milk.

[Illustration:

Ice cream factory]

CLASSIFICATION ADOPTED AT IOWA EXPERIMENT STATION

Considering the work of former writers as well as names used by business men, the following classification was worked out by the station:

I. Plain Ice Creams. II. Nut Ice Creams. III. Fruit Ice Creams. IV. Bisque Ice Creams. V. Parfaits. VI. Mousses. VII. Puddings. VIII. Aufaits. IX. Lactos.

Explanation and Formulas

I. _Plain Ice Cream_ is a frozen product made from cream and sugar with or without a natural flavoring.

Formulas are given for making ten gallons of finished ice cream.

Vanilla Ice Cream:

5 gallons 25% cream 8 lbs. sugar 4 oz. vanilla extract

Chocolate Ice Cream:

5 gallons cream 10 lbs. sugar 1½ lbs. bitter chocolate 4 oz. vanilla extract

Maple Ice Cream:

5 gallons 25% cream 6 lbs. cane sugar 2 lbs. maple sugar 2 oz. caramel 4 oz. vanilla extract

Caramel Ice Cream:

5 gallons 25% cream 8 lbs. sugar 12 oz. caramel 4 oz. vanilla extract

Coffee Ice Cream:

5 gallons 25% cream 8 lbs. cane sugar Extract from 1 lb. coffee

Mint Ice Cream:

5 gallons 25% cream 8 lbs. cane sugar 1 pt. concentrated Creme de Menthe syrup Few drops green coloring.

II. _Nut Ice Cream_ is a frozen product made from cream and sugar and sound non-rancid nuts.

Walnut Ice Cream:

5 gallons 25% cream 8 lbs. cane sugar 4 oz. vanilla extract 4 lbs. of walnut meats.

According to this general formula the following nut ice creams may be prepared by substituting different kinds of nut meats:

Chestnut Ice Cream _Filbert Ice Cream_ _Hazelnut Ice Cream_ _Pecan Ice Cream_ _Peanut Ice Cream_ _Almond Ice Cream_ _Pistachio Ice Cream_.

At times pistachio ice cream is made from oil of pistachio instead of from the nuts. If thus prepared, it will come under the head of plain ice cream.

III. _Fruit Ice Cream_ is a frozen product made from cream, sugar and sound, clean, mature fruits.

Strawberry Ice Cream:

5 gallons 25% cream 8 lbs. sugar ½ gallon crushed strawberries.

Employing the same formula the following creams may be made by merely substituting other fruits and berries for the strawberries. The amount of sugar may be varied according to the acidity of the fruit.

Pineapple Ice Cream _Raspberry Ice Cream_ _Cherry Ice Cream_ _Peach Ice Cream_ _Apricot Ice Cream_ _Currant Ice Cream_ _Grape Ice Cream_ _Cranberry Ice Cream_.

Preparation of _lemon_ and _orange_ ice creams cannot be included under this general rule. These creams may be prepared as follows:

Lemon Ice Cream:

5 gallons 25% cream 10 lbs. sugar 2 pts. lemon juice 1 pt. orange juice

Orange Ice Cream:

5 gallons 25% cream 10 lbs. sugar 2 qts. orange juice ½ pt. lemon juice.

IV. _Bisque Ice Cream_ is a frozen product made from cream, sugar and bread products, marshmallows or other confections, with or without other natural flavoring.

Macaroon Ice Cream:

5 gallons 25% cream 8 lbs. sugar 4 oz. vanilla extract 5 lbs. ground macaroons.

From this formula we can make:

Grape Nut Ice Cream Nabisco Ice Cream Sponge Cake Ice Cream Marshmallow Ice Cream.

V. _Parfait_ is a frozen product made from cream, sugar and egg yolks with or without nuts or fruits and other natural flavoring.

Walnut Parfait:

4 gallons 30% cream Yolks of 10 dozen eggs 14 lbs. sugar 4 oz. vanilla extract 4 lbs. walnut meats.

From this formula by substituting the nut meats we can make:

Filbert Parfait _Almond Parfait_ _Peanut Parfait_ _Hazelnut Parfait_, etc.

By substituting the same proportion of fruits as are used for fruit ice cream, for the vanilla extract and nut meats, fruit parfaits such as strawberry, raspberry and cherry parfaits and others may be prepared.

Coffee Parfait:

4 gallons 30% cream Yolks of 10 dozen eggs 14 lbs. sugar Extract from 1 lb. coffee

Maple Parfait:

4 gallons 30% cream Yolks of 10 dozen eggs 4 lbs. maple sugar 10 lbs. cane sugar 2 oz. caramel paste

Tutti-Frutti:

4 gallons 30% cream Yolks of 10 dozen eggs 14 lbs. cane sugar 4 oz. vanilla extract 3 lbs. candied cherries 3 lbs. candied assorted fruit 3 lbs. pineapple.

VI. _Mousse_ is a frozen whipped cream to which sugar and natural flavoring have been added.

Cranberry Mousse:

2 gallons 30% cream 4 lbs. cane sugar 1 qt. cranberry juice ¼ pt. lemon juice.

From the same formula combinations may be made with various other fruit juices and natural flavors, such as coffee, vanilla, maple, caramel, pistachio, etc.

Sultana roll, as indicated by the name, is made in a round mold. The center of the mold is filled with tutti-frutti, and the outside with pistachio mousse.

VII. _Pudding_ is a product made from cream or milk, with sugar, eggs, nuts and fruits, highly flavored.

Nesselrode Pudding:

3 gallons 30% cream 10 dozen eggs 10 lbs. cane sugar 4 oz. vanilla extract 6 lbs. candied cherries and assorted fruits 4 lbs. raisins 4 lbs. macaroons

Manhattan Pudding:

3 gallons 30% cream 10 dozen eggs 12 lbs. sugar 2 qts. orange juice 1 pt. lemon juice 4 lbs. walnut meats 4 lbs. pecan meats 4 lbs. cherries and assorted fruits

Plum Pudding:

3 gallons 30% cream 10 dozen eggs 10 lbs. sugar 2½ lbs. chocolate 4 lbs. cherries and assorted fruits 2 lbs. raisins 2 lbs. figs 1 lb. walnut meats 3 teaspoonfuls ground cinnamon ½ teaspoonful ground cloves.

VIII. _Aufait_ is a brick cream consisting of layers of one or more kinds of cream with solid layers of frozen fruits.

Fig aufait may be made from three layers of cream of various flavors with two layers of whole or sliced figs. It is most satisfactory to slice the figs lengthwise in halves.

Other aufaits may be made from a variety of preserved fruits and berries and combined with different creams.

IX. _Lacto_ is a product manufactured from skimmed or whole sour milk, eggs and sugar, with or without natural flavoring.

Formulas for lactos may be found in Bulletin No. 140 published by the Ames Station.

As an example, the following mixture will make 5 gallons of

Cherry Lacto:

3 gallons lacto milk 9 pounds sugar 12 eggs 1 quart of cherry juice or concentrated cherry syrup 1½ pints lemon juice

“Lacto Milk” is the same as described under “Commercial Buttermilk” and “Thick Milk,” pages 81 and 82.

The sugar is first dissolved in the lacto milk. The eggs are then prepared. The whites and yolks are kept in separate containers and each lot is beaten with an egg beater. Both the yolks and whites are then added to the milk. The mixture is thoroughly stirred and strained through a fine wire gauze. The fruit juices are added last. The freezer is now run until it turns with difficulty when the paddle is removed. The brine is removed and the freezer repacked with ice and salt and left for an hour before the contents are served.

Orange, Mint, Pineapple, Maraschino, Raspberry or Grape Lacto may be prepared by substituting any of these flavors for the Cherry.

X. _Ices_ are frozen products made from water or sweet skimmed or whole milk, and sugar, with or without eggs, fruit juices or other natural flavoring.

Ices may be for convenience divided into _sherbets_, _milk sherbets_, _frappes_, _punches_ and _souffles_.

Milk Sherbet is an ice made from sweet skimmed or whole milk with egg albumen, sugar and natural flavoring, frozen to the consistency of ice cream.

Pineapple Milk Sherbet:

6 gallons milk 20 lbs. sugar Whites of 2 dozen eggs 1 gallon pineapple pulp 1 qt. lemon juice.

Milk sherbets of various flavors may be prepared according to above formula by substituting other flavorings.

The formulas presented above have been given mainly for the purpose of making clear the difference between the various groups. Numerous other formulas may be prepared on the same general outline.

* * * * *

Prof. Mortensen's formulas are mostly made out for ten gallons of ice cream. It is hardly necessary to call attention to the fact that they can easily be adapted to any smaller quantities by reducing each of the ingredients alike. For instance, to make:

1 gallon of Plain Vanilla Ice Cream, divide the figures given above by 10 and use:

2 quarts 25% cream ¾ lbs. sugar ½ oz. vanilla extract.

To make:

1 quart of Strawberry Ice Cream, divide by 40 and use:

1 pint 25% cream 3 oz. sugar Crushed strawberries to taste.

[Illustration:

Professor Mortensen, behind the vat at the left, giving a lesson in the making of ice cream at Ames]

It will be noticed that in the formulas worked out at Ames as above, very rich cream is used,—with a fat contents of 25% or 30%,—which makes exceedingly rich ice creams and great expansion in freezing. The ordinary ice cream maker will usually employ cheaper material, mixing some milk in the cream and standardizing the material to suit his local trade. Also most housekeepers making ice cream at home will find it convenient and economical to use a mixture of milk and cream and in doing so one must not expect so much expansion.

In many places outside of dairy sections cream is scarce and _condensed milk_ is substituted to a large extent. Lately milk powder has come into use and _Emulsified Cream_ has become popular. Skim-milk powder and unsalted butter may be kept in stock and be available at any time, and by means of an _Emulsifier_ they are united again into a product identical with the milk or cream from which they were originally separated.

=Junket Ice Cream.=—By setting a mixture of milk and cream with a solution of Junket Tablets and allowing it to jelly before freezing, the body of the cream may be improved so that a material of comparatively low fat-percentage will make a very good ice cream, rich enough for most people and especially well suited for invalids and children. Ice-cold milk or cream is rather hard to digest for a weak or delicate stomach because the action of the rennet in the digestive juice is imperfect and slow except at blood-temperature. In Junket Ice Cream, however, such action takes place before it is eaten and the digestive ferment of the

stomach is relieved of that function. For that reason Junket Ice Cream is considered healthier than the ordinary frozen products and may be indulged in freely by children and invalids.

The following are examples of tested Junket Ice Creams:

Vanilla Ice Cream

Dissolve two Junket Tablets in a tablespoonful of cold water, heat two quarts of milk and one pint of cream lukewarm in which has been dissolved one cup of sugar and two teaspoonfuls of vanilla flavor, then add the dissolved Junket Tablet, stir quickly for one-half minute and pour into ice cream can, let stand undisturbed ten or fifteen minutes or until set. Pack with ice and salt and freeze.

Pistachio Ice Cream

Excerpt from an article by Alice Bradley in “Woman’s Home Companion”

This is the best ice cream for the money that we know. It may be made ready for the freezer early in the morning, and kept in the ice box until it is convenient to freeze it. It is quite possible to utilize cream that is not perfectly fresh.

Put in the can of the freezer one pint of milk, one-half cup of heavy cream, one-third cup sugar, one teaspoonful vanilla, one-half teaspoon of almond extract, a few grains of salt, and vegetable color paste to make a delicate green color. Set the freezer in a pan of hot water. As soon as the mixture is lukewarm, add one Junket Tablet dissolved in one tablespoon cold water. Mix thoroughly and let stand until firm. Put in the ice box until ready to freeze, then put can in the freezer tub, adjust the crank, put in three small measures of ice that has been crushed in a heavy bag or shaved fine with an ice shaver, cover this evenly with one measure of rock salt, add three measures more of ice and one of salt, let stand five minutes and then turn the crank of the freezer for about ten minutes, when it may be turned a little more rapidly. Continue the turning until the mixture is firm.

Remove the dasher, pack ice cream solidly into the can, surround with four measures of ice to one of salt, cover with heavy burlap bag or newspaper and keep in a cold place until needed. Be sure the opening in the side of the freezer tub is not plugged up, so that any surplus of salt water will drain off instead of getting into the freezer. It may be necessary to repack the freezer if the cream is frozen very long in advance of the meal. The cream may be put into a mold, set in the fireless cooker kettle, surrounded with ice and salt and left in the fireless cooker all day. Peel peaches, cut in thin slices, sprinkle with sugar and set in the ice box to chill. To serve, place peaches in chilled dessert glasses, cover with ice cream and garnish each with a candied cherry.

In the following recipes the cream is added after the junket prepared from mixtures of milk, sugar and flavors has been partly frozen, a method which is preferred by many.

Coffee Ice Cream

Make a cup of very strong coffee, add it to two quarts of warm milk in which one cup of sugar has been dissolved, taste in order to see if the flavor is strong enough, add three dissolved Junket Tablets, stir quickly for one-half minute, pour into ice cream can and let stand undisturbed ten or fifteen minutes or until set. Pack with ice and salt; freeze to a thick mush before adding one pint of cream, then continue freezing.

Simmons College Peach Ice Cream

Heat two quarts of milk lukewarm in which has been dissolved one cup of sugar and two teaspoonfuls of vanilla flavor, add two dissolved Junket Tablets, stir quickly for one-half minute and pour into ice cream can, let stand undisturbed ten or fifteen minutes or until set. Pack with ice and salt; freeze to a thick mush before adding one pint of cream and crushed and sweetened peaches, then continue freezing. Save the needed amount of peaches to serve on top of ice cream.

Frozen pudding, strawberries, bananas, or pineapple, may be added in this way when making any Junket Ice Cream.

Orange Sherbet

Heat two quarts of milk lukewarm in which has been dissolved two cups of sugar, then add two dissolved Junket Tablets, stir quickly for a minute and pour into freezer can, let it stand ten or fifteen minutes before packing with ice and salt; freeze to a thick mush, then add juice and grated rind of six oranges and continue to freeze.

=Raspberry Sherbet= may be made in the same way by substituting for the juice and rind of oranges one quart of crushed and sweetened raspberries, and

=Pineapple Sherbet= by substituting two cups of grated and sweetened pineapple.

Custard Ice Cream

When cream is scarce many housekeepers substitute a mixture of eggs and milk. The following is a good standard recipe which can be varied by using different fruits and flavors the same as in any of the above combinations.

1 quart milk 4 eggs 2 teaspoons vanilla (more if desired) 2½ cups sugar 1 quart cream (or rich milk)

Scald milk, add sugar, then add the well-beaten eggs. Cook until thick, remove from fire and cool. Be careful not to cook too long or it will curdle. Then add the cream and vanilla and freeze.

BUTTER

As everybody knows, butter is one of the oldest and most important products of the dairy industry and since the middle of the nineteenth century, when science was first applied to it, the art of buttermaking has gradually been developed to a high degree of perfection, while the taste for fine butter has grown apace with its manufacture.

Between 1840 and 1850 the large estates in Holstein, then connected with Denmark, were known for their fine dairies and excellent butter, made in a practical way without much attention to the reason for the rules that were gradually worked out.

A class of superior dairymaids was educated on these large farms, many of whom were hired by progressive farmers on the Danish islands where an effort was made at that time to introduce better methods of dairying.

The practical handicraft of these imported expert dairymaids was supplemented and regulated by the scientific work of Professor Segelcke and his pupils and from the Sixties buttermaking became an art in Denmark which was subjected to the most searching study and improvements. Danish butter soon captured the English market where previously Isigny (from Northern France) and Dutch butter had commanded the highest prices, and Danish sweet butter put up in sealed tin cans also became known all over the world as the only butter that would stand export to the Tropics.

In this country Orange County, N.Y., first produced a high-class article and, later, Elgin, Ill., became the center that stood for the top of perfection. Thence the industry soon spread over the middle western states, largely populated by Scandinavian immigrants many of whom were skilled buttermakers, educated in the old countries. Even up to this day it is noticeable that the list of prize winning buttermakers at the National Dairy Shows and other exhibitions is largely made up of Scandinavian names. In Minnesota, for instance, as fine butter is now made as anywhere in the world.

Dairy Butter.—In the early days of the industry butter was made at home on the farm. The milk was set in shallow vessels,—in the Holstein and Danish dairies in wooden tubs 24 inches in diameter placed on the stone or concrete floor in the milk-vault, a cool cellar partly underground,—or in tin pans on the pantry shelf. After 36 to 48 hours the cream was skimmed off with a flat scoop, often both cream and skim milk being sour.

About 1860 the deep tin can was introduced, set in cold running water or, where ice was available, in ice water. This was a great improvement over the shallow setting system. It was now possible to raise most of the cream in 24 hours leaving not to exceed ½% butter-fat in the skim milk, and to have both cream and skim milk sweet.

Centrifugal Creaming.—But the climax of perfection was not reached until the separator (see under Cream) was invented about 1879 and cream was raised instantaneously. For a long time it was the object of the manufacturers to produce _power separators_ of larger and larger capacity, handling from 6,000 to 10,000 lbs. of milk an hour.

=Co-operative Creameries= were established, taking in 20,000 lbs. of milk and more a day. But in thinly settled sections where the roads were poor it was expensive to haul the milk a long distance to the creamery and _hand separators_ were introduced, each farmer skimming his own milk fresh from the cows and delivering the cream, only, to the creamery. This system has the advantage of leaving the skim milk on the farm in the very best condition for the calves and hogs and of saving time and expenses in transportation. It has the disadvantage that many farmers can hardly be expected to handle all of these separators as skilfully and cleanly as the creamery expert can run his one or few machines, and consequently that the skimming is more or less

imperfect—more butter-fat being left in the skim milk and more impurities in the cream than in the whole-milk creamery. But in practice the advantages of the hand separator and cream-gathering system seem to be greater than the disadvantages and it is rapidly taking the place of the whole-milk creameries.

Ripening the Cream.—Butter may be made by churning whole milk, but usually it is made from cream that has been “ripened” or soured by standing for about 10 hours at a temperature of from 65° to 75° F. Modern buttermakers often pasteurize the cream and then add a “starter” to sour it. By preparing the starter with a pure culture of lactic acid bacteria one can get the desired acidity and aroma, and exclude undesirable flavors (as to Pure Cultures and Starters, see under “Bacteria” and “Commercial Buttermilk”).

[Illustration:

Sanitary Cream Ripener showing coil swung up into cleaning position]

The process of ripening requires considerable skill and attention and is one of the most delicate functions the buttermaker is called upon to perform. In the first place the cream must be faultless, sweet and pure before it is set to ripen, so the buttermaker will have full control of the fermentation. For, if it is already turned or partly fermented, no skill will avail to bring it back to perfection. But with a first class, pure cream the operator has it in his power to turn out perfect butter. In the big western creameries cream is often collected from farms at a distance of a hundred miles or more and in warm weather such cream is likely to arrive at the central plant in more or less advanced condition. It is therefore difficult for the _centralizers_ to make really first-class butter while the “whole-milk creamery” as well as the farmer handling his own milk are in position to control the ripening from the beginning,—starting with pure material and being able to develop the desired flavor and acidity in the cream.

After adding the starter to the cream it must be kept at a uniform temperature of 65 to 75° during the ripening process and it must be watched carefully and occasionally stirred gently until the consistency, aroma and acidity are as desired. Then it should be cooled quickly to stop further fermentation and if it is not to be churned at once it should be kept cold until churning time. Usually it is safer to set the cream in the morning and hasten the ripening so it will be completed in the evening rather than to leave it overnight warm. For, if it is finished in the evening, the cream may be cooled and placed in ice water overnight and one is sure to have it in good condition for churning in the morning. But it is quite feasible for the experienced operator to regulate the process so the cream will not be fully ripened in the morning until he is on hand to watch it and see that the process does not go too far. Taste and smell will tell when it is just right, and the _acid test_ may also be applied to determine when to stop the fermentation. An acidity of .5% is usually desired. When the condition is right, chill the cream, cooling it to below 50°—preferably down towards 40°—and leave it in ice water or in the refrigerator until churning time; then temper it to the proper temperature for churning.

Even if it is to be churned soon after the ripening is completed it is best to chill it and then raise the temperature to the point wanted for churning. This gives a better “grain” and “body” to the butter than if the ripened cream is just cooled to the churning temperature, and is especially desirable when the cream has been pasteurized.

[Illustration:

Branch of the Annatto tree]

=Coloring.=—When the cream is ready it is poured into the churn and a little butter color is added. Some people prefer butter very light or even uncolored, but usually 1 to 2 teaspoonfuls of a standard butter color[5] to 10 gallons of cream will be found right, varying according to the season and the breed of cows furnishing the milk. The butter-fat in Guernsey and Jersey milk is naturally highly colored, while that in Holstein milk is comparatively white. When the cows are on fresh pasture in the early summer the butter-fat is more highly colored than when they are on dry food. The amount of coloring to be added to the cream is regulated to overcome such variations and make the butter of uniform color all the year round.

[Illustration:

Adding the butter color]

=Churning.=—Hundreds of varieties of churns have been constructed from time to time; 2,000 years ago Pliny described the old dash churn much the same as still occasionally used on the farm, and the principle involved in the process has not been changed. The object is to make the fat globules conglomerate into grains that can be collected and leave as little butter-fat as possible in the buttermilk.

[Illustration:

Old Arabian churn made out of the skin of a goat]

[Illustration:

Ancient churn]

[Illustration:

Danish churn]

The best temperature for churning varies from 48° to 56° and must be determined by local conditions and experience. To allow plenty of room for the cream to shake about, the churn should not be much more than half full. When the globules of fat suspended in the milk stick together and form granules as large as good sized pin-heads it is time to stop the churn and drain off the buttermilk. If the butter fails to “come” in half an hour or forty minutes it may be because the cream in the churn is too warm or too cold. A little cold or warm water, as the case may be, can be added as a simple remedy.

[Illustration:

Churning room in a large modern creamery]

Toward the end of the process care must be taken that the churn is stopped at the right moment, when the butter will separate clear from the buttermilk. After the buttermilk is drawn off pure cold water is poured into the churn and the butter granules are rinsed in it. This water again is drawn off and fresh cold water put in.

[Illustration:

Butter worker]

=Working the Butter.=—The butter can now be taken out with a sieve and worked on the butter-worker, or it may be worked in the churn. “Working” the butter consists in squeezing out the buttermilk and kneading the butter into a smooth but not “greasy” mass. If it is too warm and if it is worked too much, with a sliding motion instead of just pressing, the butter is apt to become greasy. If there seems to be any danger of greasiness, it is better to stop and put the butter in a cool place for a few hours to recover its elasticity. The working can then be finished safely.

=Salting.=—During this working process salt is added and thoroughly distributed and worked in. About half an ounce of salt is used for a pound of butter.

=Composition of Butter.=—When finished, the butter ought not to contain more than 12% to 15% of water, and there should be at least 80% of butter-fat. If all the butter-fat originally in the milk could be taken out in the butter, 100 lbs. of 4% milk should yield 4.88% (4.88 lbs.) of butter with 82% butter-fat. But a little is lost in the skim milk and more in the buttermilk, which usually contains ½% fat, so that about 4½ lbs. is all the butter that can be expected from 100 lbs. of milk.

=Overrun.=—Creamery men are much interested in the “Overrun” which means the increase from the churn over the amount of fat in the milk. For instance, if a quantity of milk containing 100 lbs. butter-fat as shown by the Babcock Test produces 114 lbs. of finished butter, the overrun is 14%. The buttermaker who gets the largest overrun by reducing the loss of butter-fat in the skim milk and the buttermilk to a minimum, keeping the percentage of water in the butter just below 16%, and yet producing high scoring butter, is considered most efficient.

=Packing.=—For the market, butter is packed in tubs or stone jars. Or it is molded in neat one-pound bricks and wrapped in parchment paper.

=Sweet Butter.=—Real “sweet” butter is churned from fresh, sweet, unsoured cream. But usually the name is given to the _unsalted_ and _uncolored_ butter that many people relish. Without the salt it does not keep as well as ordinary butter, and must be eaten quite fresh. Well-made salted butter will keep for months with ordinary care, and in cold storage it may be kept a year. But when it comes out of cold storage it must be used within a few weeks, for butter, like other cold storage foods, will soon spoil and become rancid when it is exposed to a higher temperature for any length of time.

=Renovated Butter.=—Butter that has become old and rancid can be “renovated.” The butter is melted and the butter-oil washed,—aërated in the renovating plants,—and then churned with fine-flavored sour skim milk. From the sour skim milk it gets back its old butter flavor. The granular physical consistency of fresh butter is gained by pouring the emulsified mixture over cracked ice or into ice water. By the time the excess of “buttermilk” has been removed by working, and salt has been mixed in, the renovated butter may be almost as good as fresh creamery butter.

=Oleomargarine= or =Butterine= is made in much the same way. A mixture of beef-fat (the soft part of beef-tallow) and lard and cottonseed oil is churned with sour milk and worked and granulated like renovated butter. For the better grades, some of the finest creamery butter is mixed with it, so that the mixture can hardly be distinguished from real butter.

=Coco-butter=, =Nut-butter=, etc., in great variety, are now also on the market as substitutes for butter, all prepared in a similar way, but lacking the vital unknown element that makes genuine butter so superior to substitutes.

BUTTERMILK

If the cream has been carefully ripened, with or without a pure culture starter, and it has shown the proper sourness when churned, the buttermilk will be of a pleasing taste and flavor. Its thickness will of course depend upon the amount of water, if any, added to the cream in the churn during the buttermaking. If the buttermilk is to be used for human food care must be taken not to dilute it too much.

=Cooling Essential.=—If buttermilk is left to stand for hours in a warm room, fermentation goes on and may soon spoil the buttermilk by making it sloppy or bitter. It should therefore be cooled at once when drawn from the churn; if kept in ice water it may remain in fine flavor for several days. Well taken care of it is not only a pleasing and refreshing drink but eminently healthful. In cooking, too, it can be used to advantage.

=Commercial Buttermilk= or =Cultured Milk= is simply carefully soured milk. It can be made at home from fresh milk either whole or skimmed or partly skimmed. Partially skimmed milk containing from 1% to 2% butter-fat is plenty rich enough and even better for most purposes than whole milk. The essential qualities of good buttermilk depend upon the proper ripening of the cream or milk, the development of a pure “breed” of healthful bacteria in a clean field free from weeds. Such a plantation or “culture” may be grown in milk as well as in cream. Its function is to turn the sugar of milk into lactic acid under the development of pleasing flavors and whether the butter-fat is removed by the separator or by churning makes little difference. In natural buttermilk there is always a little butter-fat—at least ½%—left, mostly in the form of fine granules, too small to be retained in the butter. If the same amount of butter-fat is left in skim milk and that is ripened and churned, the product will be identically the same as natural buttermilk from ripened cream.

=Ripening.=—For best result the milk should be pasteurized, not necessarily as thoroughly as for starters, but sufficiently so as to destroy all obnoxious bacteria and give those introduced through a pure culture starter a chance to grow. Buttermilk may, however, also be made from good, clean, unpasteurized milk of good flavor. Whether pasteurized or not the milk is set to ripen with from 5 to 10% starter at a temperature of from 65 to 75°. The preparation of starters is described under “Bacteria” and the ripening of the milk for “buttermilk” is essentially the same process (see also under _Ripening_ of cream for butter). When ripened to the desired acidity,—say .5% to .6% by the acid test,—stop further fermentation by thorough cooling.

=Breaking up the Curd.=—After cooling, the ripened milk may be broken up fine and if vigorously shaken or “churned” it will remain smooth and creamy. Otherwise it may separate into curd and whey. If churned long enough for the butter to form, it becomes absolutely identical with real buttermilk. But, for all practical purposes, a vigorous shaking for a few minutes is enough.

=Thick Milk.=—“Thick Milk” as eaten in Scandinavia is made in the same way as commercial buttermilk, except that the milk—rich whole milk—is set to ripen in the bowl in which it is to be served. Instead of being churned or stirred, it is left thick, to be served as a pudding, like Junket made from sweet milk. The rich layer of cream that forms on top is excellent. “Thick Milk” is eaten plain with the oatmeal for breakfast, or as a dessert with grated stale bread and sugar spread over it.

The uses of buttermilk in making pancakes and for many other culinary purposes are mentioned in the chapter on “Milk Cookery.”

[Illustration:

Dr. Elie Metchnikoff, author of “The Prolongation of Life”]

=Yoghourt= or =Bulgarian Sour Milk= is prepared with a culture of bacteria originally found in Bulgaria where Metchnikoff, the late director of the Pasteur Institute of Paris, found people living to exceptional old age which he ascribed to the fact that their principal diet is sour milk of very high acidity.

The theory is that a luxurious growth of lactic acid bacilli, acting as a germicide, destroys other fermentations in the lower intestines. The bacilli active in Yoghourt require a somewhat higher temperature for their best growth than the lactic acid bacilli predominant in sour cream for the finest butter, a fact which must be taken into consideration in preparing the various products.

FERMENTED MILK

In the preparation of Koumis, Kefir and other fermented milks of the same class, Yeast plays an important part, changing some of the milk-sugar into the alcohol which is found in these preparations in quantities up to 2%.

[Illustration:

Baba Vasilka, 126 years old and her son, Tudor, 101; Bulgarian peasants whose principal food has been sour milk all their lives]

=Koumis= was first made from mare's milk by the Tartars, but is now prepared in this country from cow's milk by the addition of sugar and yeast. As carbonic acid is developed in the process it is quite effervescent and may be regarded both as a food and a stimulant. It is sometimes prescribed by physicians in cases when the patient cannot retain other food.

=Kefir= is a similar preparation originally made in the Caucasus by a fermentation started by Kefir grains which contain both yeast and various bacteria. The dry Kefir grains are soaked, first in lukewarm water, later in lukewarm milk, for several days, until they develop so much gas as to float on the top. A couple of tablespoonfuls of the grains are then added to a quart of milk which is left to ferment at 70° F. under frequent stirring or shaking. When the fermentation is fully developed the grains are strained off and the milk is bottled and kept for 1 to 2 days at 60°. The grains may be used at once again in fresh milk, and when the manufacture is finished they may be dried and kept, to be used again another time.

[Illustration:

Kefir grains of natural size; a, b and c dried; d, e and f soaked (Orla Jensen, Milk Bacteriology)]

CHAPTER III

CHEESE

[Illustration:

Students making cheese in the University cheese factory, Madison, Wis.]

Most of the following pages on _Cheese_ were published in 1918 as a separate pamphlet to meet an urgent demand for brief directions along this line during the Food Conservation campaign. The copy has, however, been revised and new material has been added with the view of making this chapter more useful to those who desire to study in detail the manufacture of various fancy foreign types of cheese such as Edam, Swiss, Brick, Roquefort, etc., which are now made in this country in constantly increasing quantities.

For more complete directions in cheese making students are referred to "A B C in Cheese Making" by J. H. Monrad, and other technical works.

Cheese of a thousand different kinds is made, varying in properties and appearance from the solid, yet mellow and agreeable Cheddar cheese to the semi-soft, malodorous Limburger, the delicious, soft Neufchatel and Cream cheese, or the sweet Myseost of Norway. In India cheese was made centuries ago; to-day it is produced the world over, in the caves of the Swiss Alps and in the most modern and scientific American cheese factories and laboratories. Of these myriad types we can here describe only a few.

Cheese may be classified into that made with rennet and that made without. Of cheese made with rennet some is what is called hard, some soft.

The English and American _Cheddar_—the common _American cheese_—the _Dutch Gouda_ and _Edam_, the Swiss _Gruyere_, and the Italian _Parmesan_ are all hard cheese made with rennet. As examples of the soft varieties may be mentioned the French _Camembert_ and _Brie_, _Cream_ and _Neufchatel_ cheese. In a class by themselves are such cheeses as the French _Roquefort_, the English _Stilton_, and the Italian _Gorgonzola_, their peculiar flavors being derived from molds implanted in the curd.

[Illustration]

When cheese is made without rennet, the milk is allowed to curdle by natural acidity or it is in some other way made acid. Among the varieties made by this method the common _Cottage_ cheese is the best known.

For many years imitations of foreign varieties such as Swiss and Limburger have been made in Northern New York and Wisconsin. As a result of the war and the cutting off of foreign cheese imports, the State of Wisconsin has built up a large business in these fancy varieties. New types have lately been added, as the _Romano_, _Riggiano_, and _Myzethra_, which are of Italian and Greek origin. Some of these are made of whole milk, some of partly-skimmed milk, and others of the albumin of the whey.

Let us briefly review the characteristic features in the making of the older types.

CHEDDAR CHEESE

For a hundred years or more this famous cheese has been made and marketed at the village of Cheddar near Bristol, England.

In the middle of the nineteenth century a farmer in that neighborhood, Joseph Harding of Marksbury Vale, systematized the manufacture and it was his method that became the model for cheesemaking in America. In this country it was first made in Herkimer County, N.Y., where Harry Burrell not only made cheese for the home market, but also exported to England, and his son, David H. Burrell, at Little Falls later developed the machinery which became the standard for the American and Canadian cheese factories.

The factory system by which cheese was made from milk brought together from several farms, originated near Rome, N.Y., and soon cheesemaking became an important industry throughout Central and Northern New York whence it spread into Pennsylvania, Ohio and the West, as well as to Canada. To-day Wisconsin makes more cheese than all the other states together and Canada largely supplies England with Cheddar cheese of excellent quality.

[Illustration:

Joseph Harding, who systematized the making of Cheddar cheese in England]

[Illustration:

David H. Burrell, who introduced laborsaving machinery and supplies in the cheese factories]

[Illustration:

Jesse Williams, father of the American factory system]

The Factory System

The milk is delivered in the morning by the farmers at the factory and is weighed and strained through cheese-cloth into the cheese vat. When it is all in the vat it is warmed to a temperature of 86° F. by letting steam into the water surrounding the bottom and sides of the jacketed vat.

[Illustration:

A measuring glass and an accurate thermometer are indispensable]

[Illustration:

The Marschall rennet test]

=Ripening.=—The milk should be slightly acid, not noticeably sour, yet sufficiently ripened for the proper fermentation to take place in the process that follows. The best cheesemakers regulate the ripening by adding a starter to the sweet milk and allowing the

lactic acid bacteria to multiply in the milk until a _Rennet Test_[6] or _Acid Test_[7] shows that the desired degree of acidity has been reached. The starter may be sour whey or preferably prepared from sweet skim milk or whole milk with a commercial lactic acid culture as described in Chapter I under _Ferments_ and _Buttermilk_. From 1% to 2% starter is usually sufficient. An acidity of .18% to .20% or 2½ degrees on the Rennet Test is usually desired before the rennet is added.

[Illustration:

Christian D. A. Hansen, inventor of commercial rennet extract]

[Illustration:

Blowing up the rennets to dry them]

=Adding Color and Rennet.=[8]—If the cheese is to be colored, from 1 to 2 ounces of liquid cheese color (Annatto dissolved in an alkali) per 1,000 lbs. of milk is now added and thoroughly mixed into the milk which is then set with rennet. Three ounces of a standard rennet extract to 1,000 lbs. of milk is usually sufficient. Enough should be used so that the milk will show beginning coagulation in 10 to 15 minutes and be ready to cut in 30 to 40 minutes.

The extract should be diluted with ten times as much water and is then poured into the milk under vigorous stirring so as to be thoroughly distributed and incorporated in the whole mass.

Owing to the scarcity of the raw material for rennet extract during the war, pepsin extracted from hogs' stomachs has been substituted in many factories and is used either in dry form or as a liquid extract instead of rennet extract.

With pepsin as the coagulant it is necessary to ripen the milk somewhat further than if rennet is used, in fact to the danger-point where a little more acidity is apt to do harm and produce a dry and crumbly cheese and loss of butter-fat in the whey. Most cheesemakers therefore prefer rennet when they can get it.

The rennet having been added, the milk is left undisturbed until a firm curd has been formed. When the curd breaks or splits sharply before the finger pushed slowly through it, it is ready to be "cut."

[Illustration:

Curd knives]

=Cutting.=—Two sets of curd knives are used, each consisting of a metal frame in which tinned steel blades are hung, in one vertically and in the other horizontally. The vertical knife is first carried slowly through the curd lengthwise and crosswise; the horizontal set of blades is then moved carefully through the length of the vat. When the cutting is over, the entire mass should be in cubes about half an inch square.

The whey that begins to separate out should be clear and yellow. Milky whey is a sign that the butter-fat is escaping in it; the curd has been broken up too violently. In curdling, the casein encases the butter-fat and the object of the breaking up of the curd in the vat is to expel the whey but retain the fat in the cheese.

="Cooking" the Curd.=—Gentle heat is now applied to raise the temperature gradually to 98° or 100° in the course of about 30 minutes. Meanwhile the small pieces of curd are kept floating in the whey by gentle stirring with a rake and the hands, and are not allowed to pack at the bottom of the vat. The heating is easily regulated by opening the steam valve little by little. Through the "cooking" the pieces of curd shrink to some extent and are hardened so that they will gradually stand livelier stirring without losing butter-fat. After the cooking the curd is left for an hour or so in the whey for a slight acidity to develop and it is then shoved toward the sides of the vat and the whey is drained off. Here again the "Acid Test" may assist in determining when the whey should be drawn.

[Illustration:

Cutting the curd]

=Cheddaring or Matting.=—After thorough draining, the curd is packed together in the bottom of the vat or on a "sink" provided with a false bottom covered with cheese-cloth. After fermenting for 10 or 15 minutes it is cut into large pieces which are again packed together for further matting. The exact condition to be attained can be determined only by experience.

[Illustration:

“Cheddaring” or “Matting” the curd]

A simple test, the “Hot Iron Test,” may, however, help the cheesemaker to judge of this point. A handful of curd squeezed together and touched to a hot steam pipe or an iron rod heated almost red-hot in the fire under the boiler, and slowly withdrawn, will leave threads sticking to the iron. Depending upon the maturity of the curd, the threads will break at a length of from ½ to 2 inches. Usually fermentation is considered sufficient when threads 1½ inches long are formed by this test.

[Illustration:

Curd mill]

=Salting.=—The matting is then interrupted by breaking up and salting the curd. This can be done by hand or by a curd-mill which cuts or breaks up the curd and permits a thorough mixing in of the salt. Two or three pounds of salt to one hundred pounds of curd, or the curd from 1,000 lbs. of milk, is the usual ratio.

=Pressing.=—Stirring and cooling the salted curd to about 80° F. makes it ready for packing into the hoops in which it is to be pressed. The hoop is usually a cylinder of heavy tin with a “follower” of wood on which the pressure is applied. Before the curd is put in, the hoop is lined with cheese-cloth which remains on the cheese, when it is taken out. The press mostly used in the factory is the continuous pressure “gang-press” in which a number of cheeses can be pressed at the same time.

=Curing.=—After 18 hours’ pressure the cheese is taken out of the press and out of the hoop, weighed and placed on a shelf or table in the curing room. For the first week or ten days it is kept at a temperature of about 70°, later the cheese is removed to a cooler room and possibly placed in cold storage. Usually it is paraffined to prevent too much drying and cracking of the rind.

[Illustration:

Filling the curd into the hoops]

To cure a first-class Cheddar cheese takes from three to six months, but most of the American cheese is made to cure much more quickly and is eaten two to four months old. Indeed, it is generally shipped from the factory eight to ten days old and whatever further curing it gets is in the warehouse of the commissionman or in the grocery store.

[Illustration:

The Gang press]

=Form, Size and Packing.=—The old style American cheese is cylindrical, about 14 inches in diameter, and varying in depth to weigh between 60 and 80 pounds. Various other forms are now often made, square and long or in fancy shapes, such as a ball or a pineapple. Aside from such freaks, which have never become very popular, other deviations from the large, standard, American Cheddar, are also made to a considerable extent. People who have visited the beautiful National Dairy Shows held in turn in Chicago, Springfield, Mass., and Columbus, O., the National Milk and Dairy Farm Expositions of New York City, the Ontario Provincial Fair held each year at Toronto, or the annual State Fairs in New York, Wisconsin, Michigan and other cheesemaking sections will have in mind first the prominent exhibits of the regular Cheddar, showing a uniformity in texture, form and taste that is really remarkable. But one will also admire the variety of other forms. There are the _Flats_ or _Twins_, packed two in a box and weighing together the same as one _American_; the _Young Americas_ packed four in a box; the _Longhorns_ of six to eight inches in diameter; others made like a loaf of bread and creased so that a pound or two may be cut off fairly accurately, etc.

[Illustration:

Taking the cheese out of the press]

The _Giant Cheeses_, weighing five to six tons, occasionally exhibited and cut up at World Fairs and on similar occasions are, like the pineapple cheese, a curiosity rather than an industrial product.

One of the best forms, in the writer’s opinion, is the small 5-lb. cheese, proportioned exactly like the large American. This makes a suitable size for an average family, the members of which have learned to appreciate a good cheese. If it is made smaller, too much is lost in the rind; if larger it gets too old before it can be consumed by one family.

[Illustration:

Curing room]

The larger cheeses are usually packed in neat, snug-fitting elm-wood boxes, with thin “Scale Boards” on the top and bottom of the cheese, the smaller ones in paraffined pressed pulp or pasteboard boxes.

=Cleaning the Vats and Utensils.=—Like every other place where milk and its products are handled, the cheese factory must be kept scrupulously clean. Vats and utensils should be rinsed first with cold or lukewarm water or whey, then scrubbed with boiling hot water and if necessary with soda, soap, or washing powder. The surroundings should be kept neat and attractive, and the cheesemaker must see that the transportation cans are kept clean by the farmers and the milk delivered in good condition.

[Illustration:

Cheese box]

=Yield.=—The yield is around 10% of the milk. To make a pound of fresh cheese takes from nine to eleven pounds of milk. In curing, a part of the weight is lost by evaporation, but this loss is reduced to a minimum by paraffining.

In some localities an increased yield is obtained by washing the curd and making it absorb all the water it can hold. The process is not commendable and while it may sell to some extent, in certain markets where a soft, fresh cheese is liked, “washed” or “soaked” curd cheese can never compare favorably in quality with a well-made, firm Cheddar cheese that is mellowed down by long-time curing to a consistency so it will fairly melt in your mouth.

=Composition.=—The American cheese contains almost all the casein and the butter-fat of the milk, besides such portions of the milk-albumin, milk-sugar, and mineral matter as are held in the water or whey which is retained in the cheese. In round figures average American cheese contains equal parts of casein, butter-fat and water, 30 to 35% of each. In order to protect the honest maker and the consumer and prevent “soaking” of the curd to an extent that may be considered fraudulent, the dairy laws of the State of New York limit the contents of water permissible to 40% and 42% respectively for certain classes of cheese.

=Qualities.=—A good Cheddar cheese should be mellow, yet solid, without holes, and of an agreeable taste, neither sharp nor bitter. Cheese can be made of skim milk, but it is hardly palatable. In the fall of the year, when the average milk is rich in butter-fat, 1% or 2% butter-fat may be taken from the milk and the resulting partly-skimmed milk will still make a fairly good cheese, hardly distinguishable from full cream cheese. Under the laws of the State of New York it must, however, be marked “Skim Milk Cheese.”

Cheese Made from Pasteurized Milk

From time to time attempts have been made to make Cheddar cheese from pasteurized milk. If the milk is heated to 145° only, and held for 30 minutes at such temperature, its property to form a firm curd with rennet is not destroyed and it will make a fine cheese, but if it is pasteurized at a higher temperature it will not curdle firmly until it is ripened or otherwise brought back to the condition required for satisfactory action of the rennet ferment. Thorough ripening with a pure culture starter will do it, or an addition of muriatic acid will accomplish the same in a shorter time, but care must be taken not to use too much, which would make the cheese dry and crumbly. Dr. J. L. Sammis and A. T. Bruhn of the Wisconsin Dairy School worked out the problem and systematized a process which is described in Bulletin 165 of the U. S. Department of Agriculture and by which it is claimed a first-class cheese can be made regularly from thoroughly pasteurized milk.

Making Cheddar Cheese on the Farm

[Illustration:

American outfit for farm cheese making]

[Illustration:

Plain wooden vat and curd mill]

It takes quite a little experience to make a good Cheddar cheese and, unless one has the time and opportunity to study it and make it an every-day practice, it is not as a rule advisable to attempt making Cheddar cheese in the home from the milk of one or a few cows.

The amateur will usually find it easier to make Neufchatel or Cream or Cottage cheese for home use or for the home market.

[Illustration:

Danish kettle and cheese vat]

If Cheddar cheese is to be made regularly it is best to get an outfit consisting of a small boiler and a jacketed vat, although cheese may be made in a plain wooden tub or any other convenient vessel. The double bottomed vat generally used in American as well as in Danish dairies facilitates both the heating of the milk before setting and the “cooking” of the curd in the whey after cutting. Either low pressure steam, or—better—water heated by steam, is introduced in the space between the outer, wooden bottom and the inner, tinned steel or copper bottom. If it is cool the milk should be warmed to 86° F. In the summer it may be warm enough as it comes in, fresh from the cow. If not, heat it by steam or by setting it in a “shot-gun” can in another vessel of hot water, stirring frequently, until the thermometer shows 86°. It may be well to add a little buttermilk or sour whey from the preceding day, or a pure culture starter made with Buttermilk Tablets, not to exceed 1% or 2%.

[Illustration:

Cutting the curd]

If it is desired to make colored cheese add a teaspoonful of liquid cheese color, or ½ cheese color tablet dissolved in warm water, to 100 pounds of milk, more or less according to season and the shade of color desired in the cheese.

Next add the rennet. Where cheese is made from less than 500 lbs. of milk Rennet Tablets are handy, one tablet to 80 or 100 lbs. For less than 50 lbs. of milk, Junket Tablets may be used, one to a gallon. Dissolve the tablet, or tablets, or fraction of a tablet, as the case may be, in _cold_ water and stir the solution well into the milk, making sure of thorough mixing. Let stand covered for half an hour until a firm curd is formed. Cut or break the curd very carefully with a big knife or spoon or home-made fork with wires across the prongs, imitating as far as possible the operation with curd knives in the factory.

[Illustration:

Taking the temperature of the milk in a shot-gun can]

[Illustration:

Curd fork]

[Illustration:

Mold or “Hoop”]

“Cook” the curd as in factory cheesemaking. If steam is not available, allow the curd to settle and dip off some of the whey which is then heated and poured back on the curd so as to raise the temperature of the whole mass about 2 degrees. Repeat this several times, gradually raising the temperature to 100°, a few degrees at a time.

Keep the curd gently stirred up and floating in the whey and do not allow it to lie on the bottom of the vat long enough to pack firmly together, stirring once in a while until by smell and taste (if not also by acid or hot iron tests) it appears to be sufficiently fermented for the whey to be drawn, a condition that can only be learned by experience. This will be about two or three hours from the time the rennet is added.

[Illustration:

Diagram of lever press]

[Illustration:

Combined screw and lever press]

Draw the whey and press more out of the curd with the hands. Let the curd mat and break it up alternately several times; finally crumble and pulverize it and keep it stirred with the hands, adding salt at the rate of three to four ounces to the curd from 100 lbs. of milk and continuing the stirring until the curd is cooled down to below 80°, when it should be packed into the hoop and put to press.

This salting and cooling may take another hour. The hoop may be made of wood or heavy tin of any size desired, with a loose follower of wood. The sides and bottom should be perforated to allow the whey to escape. Or it may be a cylinder without top or bottom, placed on a corrugated piece of board. Line the hoop with cheese-cloth before putting in the curd.

[Illustration:

Upright factory and dairy cheese press]

For pressing, a home-made lever-press, as outlined in the diagram, may be made of a plank or bar, one end of which (_C_), is stuck under a piece of a board nailed on the wall while at the other end a weight (_K_) is applied which may be moved in and out to regulate the pressure. The hoop is placed under the plank at the fulcrum (_K__{1}) near the wall. If a compound lever-press or a screw-press is available it is better. It is important that the pressure is applied straight so as to make the cheese even and not one side lower than the other. Begin with light pressure and increase it gradually every hour until at night the full pressure is applied. After an hour take the cheese out and turn it in the hoop, then return it to the press and at night apply full pressure. The next morning take it out and weigh it and place it on the shelf to cure in a room of moderate temperature, turning it every day. After a couple of weeks it may be removed to a cool cellar and rubbed with grease. In two to three months it should be sufficiently matured for consumption.

OTHER TYPES OF HARD CHEESE MADE WITH RENNET

[Illustration:

A variety of domestic and foreign cheese made at the dairy school of the University of Wisconsin]

In the manufacture of the Dutch Gouda, the Danish Export, and other similar types, the “cooking” and matting of the curd, characteristic of the English and American Cheddar, are more or less omitted. Otherwise the process and the result are not greatly different. They are all “hard” or solid cheese of the same class, though there are hundreds of varieties in different localities, each with some peculiarity of its own.

[Illustration:

Gouda cheese]

=Gouda Cheese.=—The _Gouda_, like the _Danish Export_ cheese, is made from whole or partly-skimmed milk which is set with rennet at 90° F. and is coagulated, ready for cutting, in fifteen to twenty minutes. The curd is broken with the “lyre,” so called, a frame on which piano wires are suspended. The curd is but slightly “cooked” and the whey is drawn while still sweet. After being pressed with the hands in the vat to squeeze out the whey the curd, still quite warm, is put into wooden molds and worked and squeezed in them with the hands for half an hour to eliminate more whey, when the mold is placed in a regular press for 12 to 18 hours. To salt it the cheese is placed in a strong brine where it remains for several days. It is then put on the shelf in the curing room where it is turned and rubbed daily and in four to six weeks it is marketed. The cheese is about 10 inches in diameter by 4 to 5 inches high.

[Illustration:

The Lyre]

=Edam Cheese.=—The ball-shaped red _Edam_ is also made in Holland by a similar method to that of the Gouda.

Fresh milk is set at from 90° to 93° F. in summer and up to 97° in winter,—colored to a rather high yellow with Annatto. Add sufficient rennet to coagulate the milk in 8 to 15 minutes. Cut curd carefully with the “lyre” and break with fork into very fine pieces, as small peas. Leave to settle for 3 to 4 minutes, putting cover on the vat if the temperature in the room is below 60°. When settled, the curd is gently pushed into a heap which takes 5 to 6 minutes and the whey is removed with a dipper. Weight is applied for 5 minutes and the tub or vat is tipped so the whey will drain off while the curd is held back with the dipper. This pressing is repeated twice more for 4 and 3 minutes respectively.

[Illustration:

Curing room in a Gouda cheese factory]

The curd should now be elastic and firm and show a temperature, in winter of at least 83°, in summer at most 90°. If necessary the temperature is regulated by pouring hot whey (not exceeding 104°) or cold water over the curd.

The mold is then placed in the vat and two handfuls of curd put in which is squeezed and worked thoroughly with the hands. More curd is added and worked in the same way and this is repeated until the mold is full with a large top on, which is pressed with the hands for 4 or 5 minutes, turning the cheese 3 or 4 times and opening the drain holes if plugged up. Some makers sprinkle a teaspoonful of fine salt in the bottom of the mold, but in warm weather it is better to work in a quarter of an ounce of salt. This work must be done quickly so the curd will not cool.

[Illustration:

Mold for Edam cheese]

When thus formed the cheese is dipped for 1 or 2 minutes in fresh whey heated to 126° (in winter 131°) and pressed with the hands in the mold for another 2 minutes when it is carefully wiped off by rolling on a fine cloth to remove the last drop of whey. The cheese is then wrapped in a fine cloth, placed in the mold and put to press, in the Spring for 5 to 7 hours, later in the year for 12 hours. The cloth is now removed and the cheese is put in a larger mold which is placed in a water-tight salting box provided with a cover and a drain-hole in one end. The first day a pinch of salt is put on the top of the cheese and the next the whole cheese is rolled in damp salt, turned and put back in the mold, a liberal quantity of salt being placed on the top. This is repeated every day until the cheese from being soft and elastic becomes hard which as a rule takes 8 to 10 days for a 4 lb. and 12 days for a 10-12 lb. cheese. Finally the cheese is left a few hours in the brine collected in the box, washed, wiped and placed on the shelf in the curing room.

The curing room should be light and well ventilated, never above 72° nor below 45°. Windows must not be opened to admit dry wind or moist air. If too dry the cheese will crack and if too moist it will be covered with deleterious yellowish red fungi. The cheese is turned daily the first month, later every other day or twice a week. When 24 to 30 days old the cheese is soaked for one hour in water of 68 to 77°, washed with a brush, dried for 20 to 40 minutes in the sun and returned to the shelf. This is repeated two weeks later and then the cheese is painted with linseed oil and left on the shelf until shortly before shipping when it is scraped with a sharp knife and painted according to the demand of the particular market for which it is prepared; yellowish with Annatto for England and Spain, red with Turnsole for other countries. When dry it is rubbed with a little butter and red color.

=Swiss Cheese.=—The Swiss Gruyere or Emmenthal also belongs to this class. It is characterized by its form and size, being large, round and flat, weighing 100 to 140 lbs. or more, and by the large holes which are wanted in Swiss, but not tolerated in American or Dutch cheese. It was formerly supposed that first-class Swiss cheese could only be made in the Alps, but very good imitations have long been made in Northern New York and in Wisconsin. Besides in the usual large round form, the same as the genuine imported Emmenthaler, American Swiss or “Switzer” is also made in _blocks_, six inches square and twenty inches long, weighing 25 to 30 lbs.

Until lately Swiss cheese has been made in the old-fashioned way, the factory and tools being of the simplest description. The milk was heated in a copper cauldron hanging on a crane, enabling the cheesemaker to swing it on or off the fireplace. Nowadays the kettle is usually jacketed and heated with steam. The round form is still preferred to the American cheese vat, however, as it adapts itself better to the peculiar method of handling the curd.

[Illustration:

Swiss cheese]

The milk is set with rennet at a temperature of 90° F. in summer and 95° in winter, sufficient rennet being used to make a firm curd in thirty to forty minutes. But very little color is added. The curd is cut with a long, sharp wooden knife, the “cheese sword,” first one way into sheets, then, as soon as the cuts stand clear, beginning to expel the whey, crossways, into vertical sticks, two inches square.

[Illustration:

Scoop]

[Illustration:

Cheese sword]

[Illustration:

Cutting the curd with the scoop]

[Illustration:

Tools for stirring the curd]

No horizontal knife is used, but a few minutes after the last vertical cutting the curd is further broken by the “scoop,” a wooden spoon or ladle about eight inches long, thirteen inches wide, one and one-half inches deep, and provided with a short handle. Standing at one side of the kettle, the cheesemaker scoops off a layer from the top and, drawing the scoop towards himself, drops the pieces of curd close to the side of the kettle. This movement is repeated, at first slowly, then faster, and soon the whole mass of curd is moving, the pieces cut off going down along the side of the kettle and the rest of the sticks sliding upward along the other side, to be attacked by the scoop as soon as they come to the top. All the curd having been cut into square pieces, it is further broken by the stirrer, a stick at the lower end of which a few cross sticks or wings of brass wire are fixed, the whole mass being kept in constant motion.

=Cooking the Curd.=—After breaking up the curd to the size of peas or beans, the stirring is discontinued for about ten minutes, when it is begun again and the kettle is turned over the fire, or steam is applied, to heat the curd to 140° under constant stirring which is continued for 45 to 60 minutes after this temperature has been reached. The condition of the curd is judged by squeezing a handful and noticing its elasticity and consistency. It is important to stop stirring at the right moment. More whey is expelled in making Swiss cheese than for Cheddar cheese.

The cooking and agitating having been finished, the mass, which now consists of grains the size of wheat, is once more stirred up with such force as to make it form a funnel at the center and it is then left at rest for five to ten minutes.

The curd, forming a rather solid cake at the bottom of the kettle, is now lifted out without being broken. One end of a large piece of cloth is folded around a flexible rod. Bending over the kettle the maker takes hold of both ends of the rod and gathering the other end of the cloth between his teeth, pushes the rod down along the farther side of the kettle, letting it follow the bottom towards himself until the whole mass of curd is gathered in the cloth, when it is lifted out of the kettle and placed in the hoop on the press table. The hoop can be enlarged or diminished to take care of a varying amount of curd which is put into it in the same solid cake as formed in the kettle without being broken. Pressure is applied, at first, gently, later heavier and after half an hour the cheese is taken out, turned and provided with fresh bandage, put back into press and left till the next day.

[Illustration:

In Swiss cheese making the curd is lifted out of the vat with a strong cloth]

Curing and Salting.—The cheese is first placed in a curing room above ground and heated in winter. After a few weeks it is removed to the cellar. Sometimes three to five cheese are piled one on the top of the other for a few days with a few handfuls of salt between them. The salting proper is done by rubbing and brushing dry salt and the brine formed from same into the cheese,—altogether 4 to 5 lbs. of salt to 100 lbs. of cheese. Every day it is rubbed with a dry rag and the cheese is turned and salted on the other side until the salt is thoroughly incorporated.

[Illustration:

Swiss cheese press]

The cheese is cured for at least 100 days in the factory and is usually stored for another three to six months by the dealer before it is ready for the consumer.

=Roquefort.=—The French _Roquefort_ is inoculated with a mold from stale bread which spreads through the cheese and produces the peculiar flavor of this type. It is made from sheep’s milk and was formerly cured in cool subterranean caverns, but now in elaborate curing houses. In this country imitation Roquefort is made of cow’s milk and cured in cold storage.

It should be remembered, however, that sheep’s milk is very rich in fat and that a rich Roquefort that will compare favorably with the genuine cannot be made from cow’s milk without an addition of cream if sheep’s or goat’s milk is not available. In France a small addition of cow’s milk to the sheep’s milk—not to exceed 10%—is often used.

Around Roquefort a milk ewe produces on an average 135 lbs. of milk a year, which makes up to 35 lbs. of cheese.

[Illustration:

Milking the ewes at Roquefort, France (G. Ellbrecht)]

The milk is set at about 80° with rennet sufficient to coagulate it in 1½ to 2 hours. To cut or break and stir the curd, tools similar to those used in the manufacture of Dutch cheese are employed and stirring is continued until the pieces of curd are about the size of peas when the whey is dipped off and the curd is further broken with the hand and placed on a cloth to drain. In fifteen minutes it is ready to be put into the hoops which are either of glazed stoneware or perforated tin, 8 inches in diameter by 4 in. high.

Ground stale, moldy bread is sprinkled in the curd as it is put into the hoop, at the rate of 1 part of bread to 10,000 parts of curd. This moldy bread is prepared from 2 parts of wheat flour and 1 part of rye flour leavened with sour yeast and vinegar and baked hard. The loaf is placed in a dark, moist cellar to mold. In six weeks it is penetrated with mold when it is dried at 86° and pulverized, forming the powder used for inoculation into the cheese-curd.

When the hoops are filled they are placed in large wooden boxes at a temperature of 65° to 70° for the whey to drain off. The first few days the cheese is turned three times a day, later once a day, and when five days old it is brought into the curing room where it remains until it is firm enough to be shipped to the large cold storage establishments, where it is taken care of until ready for the general market.

In the “caves” a high degree of moisture, a low temperature—40° to 50°—and pure air are essential conditions.

The cheese is first _salted_ by being rubbed repeatedly with salt on all sides. The slime forming on the surface is brushed or scraped off so as not to prevent the admission of air, which is essential to the curing. In order to further facilitate the penetration with air the cheese is now _pricked_ with numerous needles by means of a machine and placed on the shelf in the cave where the proper moisture and temperature are maintained.

Various fermentations are now developing, one after another, regulated by scraping, ventilation, etc., until in six to twelve weeks the cheese is ready for the market and is packed for shipment in paper or in tinfoil and in wicker baskets or airtight boxes, according to destination,—for home consumption or for export.

[Illustration:

Curing room in a Roquefort cheese factory (G. Ellbrecht)]

=Parmesan Cheese= is an Italian cheese made mostly in the Valley of the River Po and named from the City of Parma. It is produced from partly-skimmed milk and is allowed to become hard and dry, being used grated with macaroni.

The milk is set with rennet at a comparatively high temperature, about 95° F., and when it is firmly curdled it is broken up and stirred rather vigorously, which makes the curd fine and dry. Color is now added—powdered _Saffron_—at the rate of 0.5 gram to 100 kg. milk. The curd is cooked slowly under constant stirring to a temperature up towards 100° when the whey should be perceptibly acid.

The curd is then allowed to settle in the round kettle and when fairly firm it is lifted up in a cloth, the same as in Swiss cheesemaking. The mold is also much the same as the Swiss and the curd is but slightly pressed. In the course of the day the cheese is turned once or twice and put into fresh cloth. The next day it is put into the curing room when it is rubbed with salt. In a few months the cheese is cured and is then scraped and polished with linseed oil. Sometimes it is kept in storage two or three years in a dark room at a temperature of 63° F. The composition averages: 32% water, 21% fat, 41% nitrogenous matters and 6% ash.

[Illustration:

Caccio Cavallo]

=Caccio Cavallo= is made in Southern Italy of a form almost like a beetroot. The milk is set with rennet at about 95° F. and after the curd has been broken up the whey is dipped off and heated to boiling when it is poured back on the curd. The mass is then allowed to ferment eight to fourteen hours according to the temperature of the air. The quality of the cheese depends largely on this fermentation. The fermented curd is cut into pieces and submerged in boiling water and is then kneaded and formed into the

desired shape.

After lying in cold water for two hours and in brine for thirty hours it is dried and smoked until it attains a fine golden color. It is made in various sizes, from 5 to 20 pounds, and the yield is said to vary from 10% to 16% of the milk. Caccio Cavallo is eaten on bread as well as with macaroni and is much relished by the Italians.

=Limburger=, =Brick=, =Munster= and other similar semi-soft cheese of the proverbial strong flavor, originated in Belgium and Bavaria, but are now largely made in Northern New York and Wisconsin as well.

For Limburger the milk is not ripened as for Cheddar but is set with rennet quite sweet at a temperature of about 90°; the curd is cut rather soft, care being taken, however, not to lose butter-fat. The curd is but slightly “cooked,” to a temperature not to exceed 96°, and is not salted in the vat but is dipped out into perforated wooden boxes or molds about 5 inches square and left to drain without pressure. The cheese are placed edgeways like bricks on shelves and are rubbed with salt and turned every day until cured. During the curing process moisture exudes and a fermentation takes place which develops the well-known “Limburger” flavor. After eight or ten weeks the cheese is packed in paper and tinfoil and is ready for the market.

=Brick= cheese is something between a Cheddar and a Limburger, of a milder flavor than either, not as hard as the former but firmer than the latter.

The milk is slightly ripened and is set with rennet at 86° so as to coagulate in 20 minutes. The curd is “cooked” to 110° or more and is not allowed to “mat” as for Cheddar cheese, but is dipped out of the vat before much acidity has developed, into the molds, which are rectangular boxes without top or bottom placed on a draining table where the whey runs off.

The mold is usually 5 inches wide, 8 inches deep and 10 inches long. When it is filled with curd a follower is put on the top and a slight weight, a couple of bricks, on the follower. The cheese is turned a few times and the next day it is taken out of the mold and placed on the salting table. The salting is done by rubbing the cheese on all sides with salt which penetrates the curd and draws out moisture. This is repeated for 3 days and the cheese is then left to cure, being washed and wiped off every week to prevent molding.

Brick cheese is shipped one or two months old. It is wrapped in paper and packed twenty in a box.

=Munster Cheese= is very much the same as Brick except for the form, it being round, molded in a perforated tin hoop instead of the box used for Limburger and Brick.

SOFT RENNET CHEESE

The soft cheese made with rennet may be classified as _fresh_ and _cured_.

=Neufchatel.=—The fresh soft cheese of the _Neufchatel_ or _Cream Cheese_ type is easily made and may be produced in any house from a small quantity of milk. The milk is set at a comparatively low temperature, usually 72° F., with very little rennet, just enough to coagulate the milk in about eighteen hours. During that time a slight acidity develops in the milk. When it is firmly curdled it is carefully dipped on to cheese-cloth suspended on a frame, or into cotton bags where it drains overnight.

To make the cheese quickly a starter is sometimes used and more rennet employed. The milk is heated to 80° F., 25% starter and 7½ c.c. of rennet extract, or one rennet tablet per hundred pounds of milk, are added and the milk curdles in about 30 minutes.

After draining for a few hours the curd is gently pressed for a similar time. When the whey is fairly well expelled, the curd is kneaded or run through a meat cutter with a little salt, not more than 2½ oz. to 10 lbs. of curd. The outfit and the manipulation is essentially the same as described under Cottage cheese.

A superior quality is obtained by pasteurizing the milk and if that is done a pure culture starter should always be used. If the slow setting method is used a very small amount of starter, say ½%, is sufficient, but when the quick process is employed 10% to 25% may be added.

[Illustration:

Molding Neufchatel cheese]

To give it a good appearance for market, the cheese is molded in little tin molds very much like a quarter-pound baking powder can with open ends. The cylindrical roll of cheese is wrapped in parchment paper and tinfoil and is immediately ready for consumption. In an ice box it will keep for a week or so. Neufchatel cheese may be made from whole milk or partly-skimmed milk. The yield is from 10 to 20 lbs. out of 100 lbs. of milk.

=Cream Cheese= is usually made in the same way. A mixture of cream and milk containing about 10% butter-fat is used, though sometimes the cream is not added until the time of salting. The mold is square, 2½" × 1½" × 2" deep. These soft kinds of cheese are often mixed with chopped peppers, olives or nuts and make excellent sandwiches.

=Cured Soft Cheese.=—For _Cream_ or _Neufchatel_ cheese, made for curing, the curd is salted more than for fresh cheese, or the molded cheese is rolled in salt. For a week or two it is placed in a curing room on straw mats or the like where it ferments slightly before being wrapped and packed for shipment.

=French Soft Cheese.=—The many forms of French soft cheese as represented by the _Brie_, the _Camembert_, etc., are subjected to special fermentations which give to each its peculiar flavor. Attempts have been made to use pure cultures of the bacteria active in such fermentations and so reduce the art of cheesemaking to a more scientific process. But it has been found that any desired kind of cheese cannot be made simply by adding a culture of this or that bacterium to pasteurized milk. Of vastly greater importance for the development of the proper bacteria and flavor is the handling of the milk and the curd by the experienced cheesemaker. Inoculation with a pure culture alone does not make the special cheese wanted.

CHEESE MADE WITHOUT RENNET

[Illustration:

Mono-service jar]

=Cottage Cheese.=—Of the sour milk types the common _Cottage Cheese_ is the best known. It is made from skim milk which in a warm room will curdle when sour, whether rennet and a starter are used or not. The thick sour milk is heated to anywhere between 100° and 120° and dipped into bags of cheese-cloth hung up for draining. The next day light pressure is applied for 12 to 24 hours, when the curd is kneaded, slightly salted, formed into balls and wrapped in parchment paper or packed into jars. For this purpose paraffined paper jars are very practical.

The more the curd is heated in the whey the drier will be the cheese. Often it is improved by allowing the curd to become rather dry and then working new milk or a little cream into it, according to the use to which it is to be put—whether it is for bakers' stock or for the table.

Simple directions for making Cottage cheese are given in Farmers' Bulletin 850 and A. I. 17, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture from which we reprint the following and copy the accompanying illustrations:

[Illustration:

Pouring the curdled milk on cloth to drain]

"One gallon of skim milk will make about 1½ pounds of cheese. If the milk is sweet it should be placed in a pan and allowed to remain in a clean warm place at a temperature of about 75° F., until it clabbers. The clabbered milk should have a clean, sour flavor. Ordinarily this will take about 30 hours, but when it is desirable to hasten the process a small quantity of clean-flavored sour milk may be mixed with the sweet milk.

"As soon as the milk has thickened or firmly clabbered it should be cut into pieces 2 inches square, after which the curd should be stirred thoroughly with a spoon. Place the pan of broken curd in a vessel of hot water so as to raise the temperature to 100° F. Cook at that temperature for about 30 minutes, during which time stir gently with a spoon for 1 minute at 5-minute intervals.

[Illustration:

Lifting the cloth back and forth to facilitate draining]

"At the conclusion of the heating, pour the curd and whey into a small cheese-cloth bag (a clean salt bag will do nicely) and hang the bag in a fruit-strainer rack to drain, or the curd may be poured into a colander or a strainer over which a piece of cheese-cloth

has been laid. After 5 or 10 minutes work the curd toward the center with a spoon. Raising and lowering the ends of the cloth helps to make the whey drain faster. To complete the draining tie the end of the bag together and hang it up. Since there is some danger that the curd will become too dry, draining should stop when the whey ceases to flow in a steady stream.

[Illustration:

Pressing the curd]

“The curd is then emptied from the bag and worked with a spoon or a butter paddle until it becomes fine in grain, smooth, and of the consistency of mashed potatoes. Sour or sweet cream may be added to increase the smoothness and palatability and improve the flavor. Then the cheese is salted according to taste, about one teaspoonful to a pound of curd.

“Because of the ease with which the cheese can be made it is desirable to make it often so that it may be eaten fresh, although if it is kept cold it will not spoil for several days. If the cheese is not to be eaten promptly it should be stored in an earthenware or glass vessel rather than in one of tin or wood, and kept in a cold place.”

[Illustration:

Apparatus needed in making cottage cheese]

=Making Cottage Cheese with Rennet.=—In the bulletin mentioned a method is also given for making the cheese with rennet or pepsin. Junket Tablets make a convenient form of rennet to be used for this purpose.

The advantages claimed for this method are:

1. A finer textured and more uniform cheese.

2. The making requires less time and attention.

3. Losses of fat in the whey are reduced.

The process is the same as described above except that a solution of _Junket Tablets_ is added to the milk at the rate of one tablet to 100 lbs. of milk. For less milk use a fraction of a tablet, or dissolve one tablet in ten tablespoonfuls of water and use one spoonful of the solution for each 10 lbs. of milk.

If a starter is used the rennet solution is added immediately after the starter is put in; if no starter is used the milk is left for five or six hours at 80° F. to ripen before adding the rennet. The milk will curdle overnight.

After draining for thirty minutes on cotton sheeting the ends of the cloth are tied together and a weight is placed on top to press the curd gently until the desired consistency is attained.

Salt may be worked in at the rate of 2½ ounces to 10 lbs. of curd. If desired, add sweet or sour cream at the rate of ½ pint to 10 lbs. of curd or ¼ pint of cream to the product from 30 lbs. of milk.

It will be seen that Cottage cheese made with rennet is really the same as Neufchatel cheese, the only difference being in the form and packing or wrapping of the finished cheese.

=Snappy Cheese.=—By allowing the sour skim milk curd to ferment under careful regulation, a variety of sharp, snappy, more or less hard cheese can be made. Though there is no general demand for them, some kinds are quite popular in their own restricted localities. The Danish _Appetite cheese_ is only one of the many varieties which have as many names.

=Club Cheese= and similar varieties are made by grinding up old dry cheese with a little butter and packing the product in jars or other attractive packages. American, Roquefort, or any other well-known type may be used as the stock for these cheeses. Everywhere they are favorites in dining cars and lunch rooms.

[Illustration:

Milking the goat in Norway]

=Whey Cheese.=—In Switzerland the so-called _Zieger cheese_ is made from sour whey, the albumin being coagulated by heat and, with whatever butter-fat there may be left in the whey, skimmed off the top. In Norway _Myseost_ (“Ost” is Norwegian for

cheese) is made by boiling down whey almost to dryness. If goat milk is available to mix in, it improves the cheese. The main substance is sugar of milk and the cheese has a sweet, syrupy flavor.

MILK SUGAR

The by-product, sugar of milk, is produced by acidifying the whey, heating to boiling and neutralizing with lime until the albumin is coagulated. It is then filtered out and the clarified liquid is concentrated in vacuum. From the thick syrup the sugar is allowed to crystallize out, leaving the salts or mineral matters (milk-ash) in the remaining liquid. The use of milk-sugar is limited to medicinal purposes and for modifying milk for infants. The production is therefore not very extensive.

CASEIN

In a number of creameries casein is produced from skim milk by precipitating it with an acid and drying and pulverizing the precipitate. Casein is widely used as a substitute for ivory, in billiard balls, buttons, etc. It is also used as glue, and as a binder in paints.

MILK POWDER

The production and use of dry milk has increased enormously during the last few years and the processes of manufacture have been improved well-nigh to perfection. There are several methods practiced, the most important being the following:

The _Just-Hatmaker_, in which a large metal drum or cylinder revolves slowly in a tank of milk. The drum is heated by steam inside and, as it rolls out of the milk, the metal surface picks up a thin film of milk which quickly dries and is removed by a scraper.

The _Eckenberg_ process employs vacuum evaporating pans, like those used for making condensed milk and maple syrup.

The _Merrell-Soule_ Company's method consists in driving a blast of hot air into a fine spray of milk, which at once reduces the milk to a fine powder.

In the "_Economic_" process the milk is dried by hot air the same as in the Merrell-Soule method, but in dropping through a tower from a height of some 30 feet the milk meets several blasts of air of different temperatures. It is claimed that in this way alone rich milk and cream may be reduced to a powder without injury to, or change of, the original fat globules.

=Skim Milk Powder.=—Beautiful skim milk powders are now made which dissolve perfectly in water. Containing, as they do, the extremely nourishing constituents of the fatless milk in a most palatable form, they can be used in baking and in many food products to great advantage.

=Whole Milk Powder.=—Until recently dried whole milk was not produced of good keeping quality as the butter-fat had a tendency to become rancid before many months. But improvements are constantly being made and milk powders of every degree of richness bid fair to take the place of fresh milk on board ships and in other places where milk must be kept a long time before being used.

In many new food preparations of value, milk powder is filling a long-felt want. Dissolved in 8 or 9 times as much water, milk powder makes a liquid almost identical with pasteurized fresh milk.

It has already been mentioned under the chapter on "Cream" and under "Ice Cream" how skim milk powder and unsalted butter, _emulsified_ in a suitable amount of water or milk, make an excellent material for ice cream.

CONDENSED AND EVAPORATED MILK

Milk cannot be boiled down in a common open kettle or steam boiler without being scorched. Evaporating or condensing is therefore usually done in a vacuum pan at a low temperature. Condensed to one-third of its volume and excluded from the air by canning, milk will keep well for months, and has many uses as a substitute for fresh milk. Often sugar is added as a preservative, and where sugar would be added anyway, as in coffee, ice cream, etc., this is unobjectionable.

For purposes where sugar is not wanted, unsweetened condensed or evaporated milk is on the market, so carefully made that the taste of the original milk is hardly changed at all by the process. When water is added in the proportion of two parts of water to one of the evaporated milk, the fluid obtained excels even that from milk powder in its resemblance to fresh milk.

WHEY

Whey is a by-product in cheesemaking. Usually it is fed to hogs and especially together with grain or bran it makes an excellent food for them. But whey is also prepared for human food. In the hospital or in the home it serves as a substitute for milk when a mild diet of easily digested food is temporarily required for a weak stomach. For such purposes it must not be allowed to become acid as in cheesemaking, but should be prepared as the chief product from sweet new milk or freshly separated skim milk. The sweet milk is set with rennet—one Junket Tablet, dissolved in cold water, to a quart of milk—at a temperature of 90° to 100° F. As soon as a firm curd is formed it is carefully broken up and transferred to a strainer of cheese-cloth. Unless it is to be used at once, the whey strained off should be immediately cooled to 50° or lower. If left at a higher temperature it will soon become sour. A teaspoonful of limewater to a quart, or a pinch of soda, will help to keep it sweet. Still, in any event, it should not be kept long, but prepared fresh when required.

CHAPTER IV

MILK AS A FOOD

Milk is first of all the food for the young,—until a certain age the only food, and a perfect food. It contains but little refuse or waste and is under favorable conditions almost wholly digestible.

NUTRIENTS

All foods contain certain groups of nutrients which may be classified according to various functions in nutrition and their chemical composition.

=Protein.=—The protein group of nutrients contains nitrogen and is necessary for building up the tissues of the body, the muscles and the tendons which also contain nitrogen. Only by this group can tissues wasted by constant wear and tear be rebuilt. Proteins are the flesh-forming group. To some degree the proteins or albuminoids are also active in producing fat in the body, but the other groups of nutrients, especially the fats, also contribute.

=Fats and Carbohydrates.=—Another important function of food is to produce and maintain the animal heat. The main sources of this necessity are the fats and the carbohydrates, so called because they consist of the element carbon combined with oxygen and hydrogen, the last two in the exact proportion in which they are combined in water. All of these three groups furnish the fuel, so to speak, for the body, but they are not equal in this respect. Pound for pound, when burned in the body, the fats yield 2¼ times as much heat as protein or the carbohydrates.

=Mineral Matters.=—Finally there are in all foods the mineral matters, a group containing a number of salts which are indispensable because they are constituents of every part of the body. Phosphate of lime, for instance, makes up one-half of the substance of the bones, and the sulphates and chlorides of potash and soda, iron, etc., are everywhere present in smaller quantities. No food in which any of them is lacking is complete.

=Relation.=—The value of a food depends largely upon the relation of one group of nutrients to another. Proper nutrition can only be obtained when a sufficient amount of flesh-forming as well as of heat-producing nutrients are present, when the “nutritive ratio” is properly balanced for the particular purpose in view, be it the growth of the child, the maintenance of the body, the restoration of matter consumed by labor of body or brain, or the supply of heat to make up for cold surroundings.

=Milk contains all= of these groups of nutrients. The protein is represented in milk by the casein and albumin, the fats by the butter-fat, the carbohydrates by milk-sugar, and the mineral matters by the milk-ash. Human milk contains them in a perfect proportion for infants, and for all purposes of nutrition cow’s milk may be used to make up a “balanced ration,” if not alone, then in connection with other food.

=Nutritive Ratio.=—As we said before, the “nutritive ratio” of a food means the ratio of its flesh-forming constituents—proteins—to its heat-producing nutrients—carbohydrates and fats. Cow’s milk, containing 3.25% protein, 4% fat and 5% milk-sugar, has a nutritive ratio of 1 : 4.3, i. e., 1 part of protein to 4.3 parts of heat-giving nutrients, counting the fat equal to 2¼ of carbohydrates (multiplying the 4% fat by 2¼ makes 9, added to the 5% of sugar, makes 14; 3.25 to 14 equals 1 to 4.3). Skim milk, containing 3.4%

protein, 0.2% fat, and 5.1% sugar, has a ratio of 1 : 1.6 (3.4 : 5.45). Mother's milk, containing 2% protein, 4% fat, and 6.5% carbohydrates, has a ratio of 1 : 7.75. To substitute cow's milk for mother's, it must therefore be "modified."

=Calories.=—Another way of comparing various foods than by the nutritive ratio is by measuring their "fuel value" or energy-producing capacity. The amount of heat required to raise the temperature of one kilogram of water 1° C., or one pound 4° F., is called a calorie. By extensive feeding experiments the caloric value of the various nutrient groups has been estimated as follows:

Protein at 1820 calories per pound[9] Fats at 4040 calories per pound Carbohydrates at 1820 calories per pound

Measured by this rule the fuel value of:

Whole milk is 310 calories per pound

Skim milk is 160 calories per pound

Full cream 1885 calories per cheese is pound

Butter is 3410 calories per pound

Compared with other food, milk, although not suited to act as the sole food of adults, is one of the best and cheapest articles of diet, and should be much more extensively used.

The following table, compiled by specialists of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, shows the quantities of various foods needed to supply as much protein or energy as 1 quart of milk:

■■■

=Fallacy of Theoretical Valuation.=—While the contents of protein and the ratio between digestible protein and fats and carbohydrates on one hand, and the fuel or energy value on the other, have long been the only recognized measures for food values, they are admittedly quite inadequate and insufficient and although they are a great help when used with discrimination in making up food rations, they are often abused by persons who do not take their fallacies into consideration.

[Illustration:

Dr. E. V. McCollum]

"=Something Unknown.="—Recent investigations by Dr. F. G. Hopkins, of Cambridge, England, and Dr. E. V. McCollum, formerly of Wisconsin, now of the Johns Hopkins University, have proven conclusively that one food ingredient cannot always be substituted for another with impunity even though the most searching chemical analysis shows them both alike in contents and digestibility. There is "Something Unknown" in certain foods—"Vitamines" some call it—essential especially in promoting the growth of the young, which our present knowledge of chemistry cannot explain. In Bulletin No. 17 of the Wisconsin Experiment Station experiments with the feeding of rats are described which show how butter-fat could not be replaced in the ration by vegetable fats of apparently the same composition and digestibility without disastrous results, and similar conditions have been found in regard to other foodstuffs, proteins as well as fats. The yolk of eggs and butter-fat contain this unknown something which is absolutely essential for the growth of the child and which is missing in most substitutes, especially in lard and vegetable fats.

[Illustration:

The rat on the left got five per cent of cottonseed oil and the one on the right got instead one and a half per cent of butter-fat, otherwise their rations were alike. These results are typical for any ration made up of purified foodstuffs with butter-fat in them as compared with any fat of plant origin. The plant fats lack an unknown something without which growth cannot proceed.]

The above illustration is from the work of McCollum and Davis at the Wisconsin Experiment Station.

Realizing the fallacy of the old rules for making up rations for the feeding of farm animals, Professor Evvard of Iowa is trying the _reliability_ of the _instincts_ of animals as a guide to the proper selection of the most favorable combinations and proportions of food ingredients.[10]

We mention these experiments as a warning against placing too great reliance on the caloric theory or the relation of nutrients in making up food rations. We have yet much to learn and the good housewife trying to cook according to scientific rules will do well not to neglect the palatability of the food, but to watch the "instinct" which causes the child or the adult to reject or approve of, and enjoy, the food, which in most cases is a better guide than calories or protein contents, or the ration between the various groups of nutrients.

CARE OF MILK IN THE HOME

If received fresh and warm from the cow, milk should at once be strained through absorbent cotton or several thicknesses of cheese-cloth into wide-mouthed bottles or glass jars and placed in running water or ice water to cool as quickly as possible. If obtained from the milkman it may be left in the bottle in which it is received. The practice of delivering milk "loose," dipping it from the wagon, should not be permitted, and is fast being abolished. Public safety demands that it should be bottled on the farm or in the creamery or milk station under sanitary conditions.

=Keep the Milk Cool.=—If the milk when delivered at the house is not cold enough to keep sweet as long as desired, it should, we repeat, be placed in ice water or cold running water until thoroughly cooled. Even if the air is cold, in the ice box, for instance, the milk cannot be cooled quickly enough without water. After it has been cooled in water it may be put in the ice box. In most ice boxes the temperature is allowed to rise higher than is generally supposed, and it is better to keep the milk bottle next to the ice than in the food compartments.

[Illustration:

A clean ice box]

Milk and cream easily absorb flavors from the air and should not be kept in open vessels next to other food. Any housekeeper knows how quickly milk or cream will be tainted by standing in the same compartment with onions or muskmelons; if the bottle is

not covered, milk may also be contaminated by other less noticeable but more harmful vapors from nearby products. Let the milkman furnish you with some extra milk bottle caps, or cover your milk bottle with an inverted tumbler.

As has been shown in previous chapters, milk is a favorable soil for all sorts of germs and bacteria to grow in. It must therefore be kept from contamination with the utmost care, and everything that comes in contact with it must be scrupulously clean.

=Top-Milk.=—When the milk has been standing at rest three or four hours, the top-milk will be considerably richer than the rest. If such rich milk is wanted for any particular purpose it may be poured off, to be eaten with cereals, berries, etc. In twelve hours most of the cream will rise and may be skimmed off, although thirty-six or even forty-eight hours may be required to get all that can be obtained by setting. The half-skimmed milk left when the top-milk has been removed after 3 to 6 hours' setting will still contain 2% or more of butter-fat and is very good for drinking; even the skim milk from which the cream has been taken after 12 hours' setting is still an excellent beverage, provided it is sweet. Perfectly skimmed, almost entirely fatless, milk may be used in various ways in cooking, to make up for lack of protein in many other food products. But care must be taken that it is pure and sweet, or rather, its condition, sweet or sour, must be under the perfect control of the housekeeper. If a sample of milk will stand scalding or even boiling without curdling, it is usually fresh and in good condition for any use. On the other hand, if it curdles by scalding, it is beyond control and it may or may not make good sour milk, depending on the bacteria working in it.

MILK FOR INFANTS

[Illustration]

Comparing cow's milk with mother's milk, it will be seen that the latter contains less protein, about the same percentage of fat and more carbohydrates than the former. A comparison may be made from the following table of average composition in round figures:

■■■

as fresh milk. Every time the baby is fed the milk must be warmed by placing the bottle in a pan of water and heating to the right temperature.

Mrs. Rorer's Recipe

Where cow's milk, even when diluted, or partly modified as in the home fashion, disagrees with the infant, this mixture may be used with good results: heat two quarts of milk to 100° F. Add two Junket Tablets dissolved in a tablespoonful of cold water. When the milk is congealed and perfectly solid draw through it backward and forward an ordinary four-tined silver fork; this will separate the curd. Strain through two thicknesses of cheese-cloth, saving the whey as this is the part you are to use; add a pint of water, a half ounce of sugar of milk, three ounces of cream and four ounces of the white of egg. The whites may be dropped into a quart fruit jar, a pint of the whey added, the top screwed on and the jar thoroughly shaken until the whites are well mixed with the whey; then add them to the remaining quantity and stand at once in a very cold place. This will be given in quantities from two to three ounces in an ordinary nursing bottle.

RECIPES _of the Nathan Straus Laboratories_

Formula by Dr. A. R. Green for 1st to 4th week:—

¾ ounces of 16% Cream 3 ounces of Full Milk 19 ounces of Water 1½ ounces Milk Sugar

This mixture fills 8 bottles—each to contain 3 ounces. Feed 2½ hours apart.

Formula by Prof. A. Jacobi for 3d to 7th month:—

18 ounces of Full Milk 18 ounces of Barley Water 1 ounces of Cane Sugar 20 grains of Table Salt (less than ¼ teaspoonful)

This mixture fills 6 bottles—each to contain 6 ounces. Feed 3 hours apart.

Formula by Prof. R. G. Freeman for 1st to 3d month:—

1½ ounces of 16% Cream 3 ounces of Full Milk 13 ounces of Water ½ ounce Lime Water 1 ounce Milk-Sugar

This mixture fills 6 bottles—each to contain 3 ounces. Feed 3 hours apart.

Formula by Dr. A. F. Hess for 7th to 9th month:—

22½ ounces of Full Milk 7½ ounces of Oat or Barley Water 1½ ounces of Cane Sugar 30 grains of Table Salt (about ¼ teaspoonful)

This mixture fills 5 bottles—each to contain 6 ounces. Feed 3½ hours apart.

Formula by Prof. R. G. Freeman for 2d to 6th month:—

18 ounces of Full Milk 16½ ounces of Water 1½ ounces of Limewater 1½ ounces of Milk Sugar

This mixture fills 6 bottles—each to contain 6 ounces. Feed 3 hours apart.

After 9th month:—

Full pasteurized milk, 8 ounces every 4 hours.

When the modified milk can be obtained from a dairy laboratory where it is prepared with scientific care and accuracy, it is better to use it than to depend on home-made preparations, and in many cases a doctor's prescription may be necessary. Even if the modified cow's milk is prepared so as to contain apparently the same proportion of the various groups of nutrients as mother's milk, there may still be some essential difference. For instance, the protein in human milk consists mainly of albumin, while that of cow's milk is mostly casein. It is often a question whether the individual baby can digest the casein without trouble. A trifle of rennet ferment,—a fraction of a Junket Tablet,—added to the modified cow's milk just before feeding may be beneficial to overcome that defect. A little limewater also is healthful as it neutralizes any acid that may develop in the mixture. For the particular needs of the individual baby, a competent doctor should be asked to prescribe.

MILK FOR GROWING CHILDREN

[Illustration]

When the child is big enough to thrive on undiluted, unmodified cow's milk, it should not only be allowed, but urged, to continue on a diet in which this, the best of all foods, is the most essential part. An excellent form in which to feed milk to the growing child is junket. Eaten slowly with a spoon as a pudding, it is exposed to the action of digestion much better than milk swallowed by the glassful in a hurry and even if it is cold there is no danger of defective rennet action in the stomach because such action has already taken place.

Doctors still disagree as to the desirability of pasteurizing milk for young children (see "Pasteurization," Chapter I), some holding that the digestibility is affected by the process. The truth is probably that strong pasteurization at a temperature above 157° and holding the heated milk unnecessarily long at such high temperature do change the properties of the milk so as to make it harder to digest, but that the main difficulty is in the change of diet from raw to pasteurized milk or vice versa. Let the child get used to the change by making it gradual, diminishing the amount of one and increasing the amount of the other from day to day in a week, until the change is completed, and there will usually be little if any trouble. The secretions of digestive ferments in the stomach soon adapt themselves to the change in the food. The same holds good in case of other changes, as, for instance, from whole milk to more or less fatless milk, with additions of cereals or other partial substitutes;—it is always advisable to make any change in the child's diet gradual.

CHAPTER V

MILK COOKERY

Milk should also be used a great deal more than it is by grown persons, not only as a drink but in the daily cookery. In some homes milk in some form is a part of every menu and the meals are more delicious, attractive and nourishing than the ordinary milkless diet, and are also less expensive, as the milk takes the place of part of the meat. Dr. Graham Tusk of Cornell University, who represented the United States on the Interallied Council of Alimentation, says:

"No family of five should spend any money for meat until three quarts of milk have been purchased, and this should be done even though the price of milk should go to twenty cents a quart. Absolutely nothing in the food line will keep children so healthy as their daily supply of milk."

In cooking with milk it is well to remember:

1. That, although milk is a liquid, it contains a large amount of solid food and of exceedingly nourishing, palatable and easily digestible food, much more than many vegetables or fruits. While milk has 13% of solid matter, water-melon has only 2%, turnips 4%, beets 12%, etc. When substituting milk for water, you add _nourishment_ to the food and it is well to keep in mind the ingredients,—the amount of protein, fat, etc., added in the form of milk, which may take the place of other similar ingredients in the combination.

2. That if milk is even but slightly sour, or if some other acid is added to it,—in the form of fruit, for instance,—it is apt to curdle by scalding or boiling.

The limits of a single chapter do not allow many recipes to be given, but a few are furnished under each of the several kinds of milk dishes, and a clever domestic science pupil or the ordinary good housekeeper and cook can easily add to these recipes indefinitely, by following out the simple suggestions offered.

All measurements are level.

SOUPS

=Cream Soups.=—So-called cream soups may be made with or without the addition of meat stock. For example:

=Asparagus Soup=

3 cups veal or chicken broth 1 can asparagus ¼ cup butter ¼ cup flour 1 qt. scalded milk Salt and pepper

Reserve tips of asparagus. Add stalks to cold stock, boil fifteen minutes, rub through sieve, thicken with butter and flour cooked together, add milk, tips, salt and pepper. If fresh asparagus is used, cut one bunch in small pieces, boil in as little water as will cover, remove tough bits of stalk, add two cups stock and proceed as above.

=Cream of Celery Soup=

3 cups veal or chicken broth 3 cups celery cut in inch pieces 4 cups milk Yolks 2 eggs ½ cup cream Salt and pepper

Boil celery in broth till tender. Rub through sieve, add milk, bring to the boiling point and add egg yolks beaten and diluted with cream.

=Spinach Soup=

4 cups broth 2 qts. spinach 3 cups boiling water 2 cups milk ¼ cup butter ½ cup flour Salt and pepper

Wash the spinach and cook thirty minutes in boiling water to which ■ teaspoon soda has been added. Drain and chop fine. Add stock and butter and flour cooked together, milk and seasoning.

Cauliflower, mushrooms, lettuce, string beans, onions and other vegetables may be used for soups in the same way. _In all of these recipes milk may be substituted for the stock._ The soups will be more nourishing, many like them better, and they are more easily prepared.

If canned vegetables are used they may be added to the thickened milk, which should be made in the proportions of one quart of milk to two tablespoons butter or substitute and two tablespoons flour. One can of beans, peas, asparagus, or corn, may be added to three pints of thickened milk.

If fresh vegetables are used, they should be boiled in as little water as possible and this water added with the vegetables to the hot, thickened milk. The addition of one-half to one cup of cream to these soups improves their taste but is not necessary. If the cream is whipped and added just before serving, the appearance is also much improved. The vegetables may be pressed through a sieve or not, as preferred. If the soup is to be served in cups it is better to do this or chop the vegetables very fine, but if the soup is to be served in soup plates it looks attractive and is more substantial if the vegetables are cut in inch pieces and left in the soup.

All cooks are familiar with _cornlet soup_, _tomato_ _bisque_, and _oyster_ and _clam stews_, the foundation of which is also milk. Plenty of good recipes for them can be found in any standard cook book.

=Cereal Cream Soups.=—There is another class of soups used much in Europe but, unfortunately, little known here. They are very nourishing, easy of preparation, and delicious.

A few recipes will suffice to introduce the housewife to this class of soups and she can then easily add to the varieties herself. Her family will enjoy the new dishes for their good taste and their novelty. Croutons, crackers, zwieback, or toast may be served with any of them. They should always be prepared in a double boiler.

=Rice Soup=

1 qt. milk ■ cup rice 1 tablespoon butter 1 tablespoon sugar

Heat the milk in a double boiler, add the rice and cook two hours. Add sugar and butter. Sprinkle cinnamon on each plate of soup when serving.

=Sago Soup=

1 qt. milk 4 tablespoons sago 1 tablespoon butter 1 egg yolk 2 tablespoons sugar

Heat the milk in a double boiler, add sago and cook one-half hour. Care must be taken to stir the mixture often when the sago is first added or it will lump. Add butter and egg yolk beaten with sugar.

=Oatmeal Soup=

1 cup oat flakes 1 pint boiling water 2 tablespoons sugar 1 pint milk 1 tablespoon butter

Add oat flakes to water and boil one-half hour. Add milk and boil one-half hour, add sugar and butter.

=Farina or Cream of Wheat Soup=

3 pints milk ½ cup farina or cream of wheat 1 tablespoon butter 1 tablespoon sugar

Scald milk and add cereal slowly. Cook one hour and add butter and sugar and a sprinkling of nutmeg.

=Milk Chowders=

Chowders are also a very acceptable way of serving milk. For rich chowders the proportions used are: Two cups of milk or of milk and water, 1 cup of potatoes cut into small pieces and 1 pound of fish. For flavoring add an onion fried in two tablespoons of fat tried out from salt pork. While these proportions make a rich dish, it is possible to reduce the amount of fish greatly, to leave it out entirely, to use small portions of left-over fish or some salt codfish which has been freshened, or to substitute corn for it. Such dishes are palatable and of reasonably high nutritive value, providing the greater part of the liquid used is milk.

Similar, but less rich and thick, is:

=Milk Stew=

1 qt. of milk 1 cupful raw potatoes cut into small pieces 2 tablespoonfuls of butter or bacon fat 1 cupful of codfish cut into small pieces or just enough to flavor the stew

Soak the fish in lukewarm water until it is soft and the salt removed. Cook the potatoes in water until tender, drain them, add the milk and codfish, and bring to the boiling point; add the butter and salt to taste.

In place of the codfish, fresh fish, clams, oysters, or a little chipped beef may be used. Or the fish may be omitted and the soup made savory and palatable by adding a few drops of onion juice, or cheese or a vegetable cut into small pieces and cooked thoroughly.

MILK CEREALS

Most cereals are better cooked in milk than in water and those not familiar with this method have no idea of the many good dishes which they can thus easily provide for their families. Cereals so prepared make an especially good wholesome breakfast or supper for school children and the writer has never seen an adult, who, on a cold night, did not enjoy a dish of rice, or corn meal, boiled in milk and served with cream and sugar for supper. Milk cereals must always be cooked in a double boiler and the milk must be hot when the cereal is added.

Rice 1 cup to 3 cups milk, boil 2 hours Cornmeal 1 cup to 4 cups milk, boil 1 to 2 hours Fine Hominy 1 cup to 4 cups milk, boil 1 hour Cream of Wheat 1 cup to 4 cups milk, boil 1 hour Farina 1 cup to 4 cups milk, boil 1 hour

=Cream of Wheat or Farina Pudding= is also delicious. It is prepared in the same way, but ¾ cup of cereal only is added to 1 quart hot milk. Just before serving, a teaspoonful of vanilla is added, and two beaten eggs are folded in. It is eaten with cream, or milk, and sugar, or with maple syrup.

LUNCHEON AND SUPPER DISHES

Dishes prepared principally of milk, with the addition of either eggs, cheese, meat, or vegetables are particularly adapted for luncheon or supper use. Here again a few standard recipes are given which can be varied to make any desired number of good, wholesome and delicious dishes.

=Creamed Dishes.=—The same sauce may be used to cream _cold chicken_, _lamb_, _veal_, _chipped beef_, and cold boiled or baked _fish_, canned _salmon_, _lobster_ or _shrimps_, according to the following recipe:

=Creamed Chicken=

2 cups cold cooked chicken cut into dice 3 tablespoons butter 3 tablespoons flour 1½ cups milk Salt and pepper

Melt butter and add the flour and milk. Bring to the boiling point and add diced chicken. Season with salt and pepper.

Many grate a small onion into the sauce before adding the chicken. The writer does not favor indiscriminate use of onion as it tends to make all dishes taste alike. It seems better to use sometimes a little celery or celery salt, sometimes an onion, and again frequently no flavor but the chicken or meat or fish. One's cooking is thus more distinctive and varied.

If the creamed mixture is turned into a baking dish, covered with buttered bread or cracker crumbs and browned in the oven, the result is even more pleasing.

Such a sauce flavored with cheese makes a good and very nutritious gravy to pour over cauliflower and cabbage or to serve with boiled rice or hominy or poured over toast.

CREAMED VEGETABLES

In creaming vegetables the proportion is usually 1 cup of sauce to 2 cups of vegetables. _Potatoes_, _asparagus_, _cauliflower_, _boiled onions_, _beans_, and _carrots_, _beets_ or _peas_ are all delicious served in this way.

=Eggs and Asparagus=

Cream asparagus. Arrange in a baking dish, alternate layers of the asparagus and slices of hard boiled eggs. Cover with buttered crumbs and bake till crumbs are a delicate brown.

=Souffles.=—Souffles are always delightful, and while many consider them difficult to make they are really very simple and if made correctly are always to be depended upon. They should, however, be eaten at once when baked.

Salmon, _chicken_, _lamb_, _veal_, _ham_ and _cheese_, and also many vegetables such as _asparagus_, _cauliflower_ and _peas_ may be prepared in this way. Elaborate recipes are often given, but the following is entirely sufficient and always satisfactory:

2 cups chopped meat or vegetables cut fine 2 cups thick white sauce Yolks of 2 eggs Whites of 2 eggs

To the meat or vegetables add white sauce (2 tablespoons butter and 3 tablespoons flour to 1 cup milk) and beaten yolks. Cool and add whites beaten stiff. Bake 30 minutes in moderate oven. This makes a dish large enough to serve four or five persons.

A similar dish, Cheese Fondu, is also good, and can stand longer than a souffle before serving.

=Cheese Fondu=

2 cups milk 2 cups minced cheese 1 cup bread crumbs 2 eggs beaten

Bake in a hot oven for twenty minutes.

Variations of this dish are made by substituting one cup minced ham for one cup of the cheese, or by using two cups of ham and omitting the cheese altogether.

MILK TOAST

A very good way to serve milk toast is to toast bread thoroughly and to pour hot milk over it at the time of serving. In serving milk toast in this way all the dishes should be kept very hot. A heavy earthenware pitcher may be used for serving the hot milk, as it retains heat for a long time.

EGGS POACHED IN MILK

Eggs are much better poached in milk than in water. If served on toast the hot milk may be poured on the egg if a soft toast is desired. If not, dip the eggs out of the milk with a perforated spoon and lay on the toast in the usual way, adding salt and butter.

CHEESE DISHES AS MEAT SUBSTITUTES

Meat is wholesome and relished by most persons, yet it is not essential to a well-balanced meal, and there are many housekeepers who, for one reason or another, are interested in lessening the amount of meat which they provide or to substitute some other

foods for it.

Cheese naturally suggests itself as a substitute for meat, since it is rich in the same kinds of nutrients which meat supplies, is a staple food with which everyone is familiar, and is one which can be used in a great variety of ways. In substituting cheese for meat, pains should be taken to serve dishes which are relished by members of the family. A number of recipes for dishes which are made with cheese follow:

=Cheese Soup=

1 qt. milk 1 onion grated 1 blade mace 2 tablespoons butter 2 tablespoons flour ½ c. grated cheese 2 egg yolks 1 teaspoon salt ¼ teaspoon white pepper

Scald milk, onion, mace and pepper pod. Melt butter in saucepan, blend flour with melted butter. Strain milk and seasonings and add gradually to flour mixture, stirring all the time. Return to double boiler to cook. When creamy, add the cheese, salt and pepper, stirring until cheese is melted. Then pour over well-beaten egg yolks, stirring all the time. Whip until frothing and serve.

=Delmonico Potatoes=

Arrange creamed potatoes and grated cheese in alternate layers. Cover with buttered crumbs and bake till crumbs are brown.

=Stuffed Potatoes with Cheese=

Split hot baked potatoes lengthwise and remove contents without injuring skin of potato. Put potato through ricer or mash, add salt and pepper to taste and enough hot milk to make of proper consistency. Beat until light, refill the skin, piling up lightly. Sprinkle thickly with grated cheese and reheat in oven until cheese is melted and a delicate brown.

=Macaroni with Cheese=

1 cup macaroni 2 qts. boiling salted water 2 cups white sauce 1 cup grated cheese 1 cup buttered bread or cracker crumbs

Break macaroni into one-inch pieces. Cook in boiling water until tender. (If macaroni is put in a wire basket in kettle, it will not stick to the kettle.) Drain and run cold water through it.

Make sauce:

2 tablespoons butter 2 tablespoons flour 1 teaspoon salt 2 cups milk

Add cheese and macaroni. Cover with crumbs and bake until crumbs are brown.

=Rice Baked with Cheese=

1 cup rice 2 qts. boiling salted water ½ lb. grated cheese Milk Buttered crumbs (bread or cracker)

Add rice to boiling water. When tender drain, cover bottom of buttered baking dish, sprinkle with grated cheese and a little paprika. Add alternate layers of rice and cheese until dish is full. Add milk nearly to fill dish. Cover with crumbs and bake until milk is absorbed and crumbs are brown.

=Cheese Souffle with Bread Crumbs=

1 cup scalded milk 1 cup soft, stale bread crumbs ¼ lb. mild cheese, cut in small pieces 1 tablespoon butter ¼ teaspoon salt 2 egg yolks 2 egg whites

Mix milk, bread crumbs, cheese, melted butter and salt. Add yolks of eggs beaten until lemon colored. Cut and fold in whites of eggs beaten until stiff. Pour into a buttered baking dish and bake twenty minutes in a moderate oven.

=Cheese Souffle=

2 tablespoons butter 3 tablespoons flour ½ cup scalded milk ½ teaspoon salt Few grains cayenne ¼ cup grated cheese Yolks of 3 eggs Whites of 3 eggs

Melt the butter in a saucepan, add the flour and mix well; add scalded milk gradually and seasonings; cook two minutes. Remove pan to back of stove and add cheese and well-beaten yolks of eggs. Set pan where mixture will cool. When cold, add the whites of eggs beaten until stiff and dry. Turn into a buttered baking dish and bake twenty minutes in a slow oven. Serve the moment it comes from the oven.

=English Monkey=

1 cup bread crumbs 2 cups milk 1 cup grated cheese ½ teaspoon salt ¼ teaspoon white pepper or paprika 1 egg 1 tablespoon melted butter

Scald milk in double boiler and add bread crumbs to it. Then add grated cheese, melted butter and seasonings. Cook in double boiler until cheese is melted; add the slightly-beaten egg gradually. Cook five minutes and serve on dry toast.

=Cheese Omelette No. 1=

4 eggs ½ teaspoon salt Few grains pepper 4 tablespoons hot water 1 tablespoons butter 1 cup grated cheese

Beat yolks of eggs thoroughly; add salt, pepper and hot water. Beat whites till stiff and dry; add cheese and fold into first mixture. Melt butter in pan, turn in mixture and cook slowly. When well raised and a delicate brown underneath, place pan in hot oven to cook top. Fold and turn on hot platter.

=Cheese Omelette No. 2=

Make as above, omitting cheese. Make two cups of hot, white sauce; add 1 cup grated cheese, melt and pour around the omelette.

=Baked Eggs with Cheese=

4 eggs 1 cup grated cheese 1 cup soft bread crumbs ¼ teaspoon salt Few grains cayenne 2 cups white sauce

Break the eggs into a buttered baking dish and cook in hot oven until they begin to turn white around the edges. Then cover eggs with the white sauce and over this put the mixture of crumbs, cheese and seasonings. Brown in very hot oven, so eggs will not be overcooked by time cheese is brown. If preferred, or for variety, the cheese may be added to the white sauce and only the seasoned crumbs put on the top.

=Boston Roast=

1 can kidney beans or same amount of cooked beans Salt ½ lb. grated cheese Bread crumbs

Mash beans or put them through a meat grinder. Add the cheese and sufficient bread crumbs to make the mixture stiff enough to be formed into a roll. Place in buttered baking pan and bake in moderate oven. Baste frequently with one-half cup hot water, in which one tablespoon butter is melted. Serve the roast with tomato sauce. If desired, a few drops of onion juice or a little finely chopped onion may be added to flavor this dish.

=Camouflaged Cabbage=

Remove the heart from a small cabbage, cut or chop the remainder into half inch pieces, boil in salted water exactly twenty minutes and drain. For one pint of this cooked cabbage make a sauce of:

2 tablespoons butter 2 tablespoons flour ½ cup milk ½ cup cheese

When thoroughly blended add the cabbage; cover with buttered crumbs and bake twenty minutes. The result is a good dish for supper or luncheon and it is well named.

CHEESE SALADS

=Cheese and Pimento Salad=

Stuff canned pimentos with cream cheese, cut into slices, place on lettuce leaves and serve with mayonnaise dressing.

=Cheese and Celery Salad=

Select celery stalks with deep grooves in them; wash and dry on clean towel. Mix a small cream cheese with a bit of salt, and ¼ cup finely chopped nuts (pecans are best). Fill grooves in celery stalk with the cheese mixture and chill. When ready to serve cut stalks into small pieces with sharp knife. Serve on lettuce leaves with French dressing.

For a pleasant addition to fruit salad, fill tender celery stalks with roquefort cheese, and lay one or two on each plate of salad.

=Pepper and Cheese Salad=

Remove top and seeds from a sweet green pepper. Scald it with boiling water, letting it stand in water about ten minutes. Mix soft cream cheese with chopped nuts, or with tiny cubes of cooked beets and fill pepper with this mixture; chill well, cut in thin slices with sharp knife and serve on bed of head lettuce with French dressing.

Apples can also be used (with cheese and nuts) by removing core without breaking the apple.

COTTAGE CHEESE (See also under the chapter on Cheese)

All that has been said of cheese as a valuable food and as a substitute for meat, applies equally to cottage cheese and it is so easily prepared, inexpensive and generally relished that it should be used much more freely than it is.

The following recipes are only a few of the many that might be given, but the careful cook should evolve other combinations equally attractive.

=Cottage Cheese by Government Method=

(From Food Administration Bulletin)

Unit, 1 gallon. For lesser amounts, measurements to be divided accordingly.

Take 1 gallon of sweet skim milk; add ¾ cup of clean, sour milk and stir as it is put in. Raise the temperature in hot water to 75 degrees Fahrenheit, using a dairy thermometer. Remove from heat and place where it is to remain until set. Add ■ of a junket tablet thoroughly dissolved in a tablespoon of cold water; stir while adding. Cover with cloth and leave for 12 to 16 hours in even temperature, about 75 degrees Fahrenheit. At end of this period there should be a slight whey on the top and when poured out the curd should cleave sharply. Drain through cotton cloth, not cheese-cloth. When whey has been drained out, work in 1 or 2 teaspoons of salt to the cheese, according to taste; 1½ to 2 pounds of cheese should be obtained from a gallon of milk.

For table use it is advisable to work in 1 or 2 tablespoons of cream to the pound. For use in cooking, this is not necessary.

One may also make cottage cheese of freshly soured milk by simply heating it in a double boiler till whey forms, letting it stand an hour and then turning it into a cheese-cloth bag to drain. To the dry curd formed add sweet or sour cream and salt to taste. When made in this way care must be taken that the milk is freshly soured—if it is old it will have a bitter taste and the cheese will not be good.

=Cottage Cheese Sandwiches=

Thin slices of rye, brown or white bread, buttered, with fillings of cottage cheese in combination with jelly, marmalade, pimentoes, lettuce or mayonnaise are all good.

=Cottage Cheese Club Sandwiches=

Toast slices of bread, cut diamond shape and spread with butter and cottage cheese or cottage cheese alone and put together with any one of the following combinations:

Tomato, lettuce and mayonnaise dressing.

Thin slices of ham spread with mustard and lettuce.

Sliced, tart apple, chopped nuts and drops of French dressing.

Sliced orange and mayonnaise.

Sliced Spanish onion, a hot fried egg sprinkled with Worcestershire sauce.

Thin slices of tomato, bacon, chicken, lettuce and mayonnaise dressing.

=Cottage Cheese Salad Dressing=

½ cup cottage cheese 1 tablespoon vinegar ½ teaspoon sugar ¼ teaspoon salt 1 cup heavy cream (either sweet or sour) whipped stiff.

Mix in order given. A chopped hard boiled egg improves it.

A similar salad dressing, although containing no cottage cheese, may be given here also.

=Sour Cream Salad Dressing=

1 cup sour cream—whipped 1 tablespoon vinegar 1 tablespoon olive oil ¼ teaspoon salt (1 teaspoon sugar, if desired) 2 hard boiled egg yolks finely chopped

Mix in order given.

Either of these is particularly good with green vegetables.

For a fruit salad the eggs should be omitted and double the amount of sugar used.

=Cottage Cheese Salad=

Lettuce, sliced cucumber or green, sweet peppers, cottage cheese formed in small balls or slices, mayonnaise or French dressing.

=Cottage Cheese Pie=

1 cup cottage cheese ■ cup sugar ■ cup milk 2 egg yolks, beaten 1 tablespoon melted butter Salt ¼ teaspoon vanilla

Mix the ingredients in the order given. Bake the pie in one crust. Cool it slightly and cover it with meringue made by adding 2 tablespoons of sugar and ½ teaspoon of vanilla to the beaten white of 2 eggs and brown it in a slow oven.

=Devonshire Dainty=

Serve on individual plates ½ cup cottage cheese to which has been added 2 tablespoonfuls whipped cream (sweet or sour). Over this pour ½ cup currant jam.

Pass saltines or other dry, unsweetened crackers.

MILK BREADS AND BISCUITS

=Parker House Rolls=

2 cups scalded milk (skim) 3 tablespoons butter 1 teaspoon salt 1 yeast cake dissolved in ¼ cup lukewarm water

Dissolve yeast in water, melt butter, combine all ingredients except flour. Add 3 cups flour gradually, beating vigorously. Let rise till light; cut down and knead in 2½ cups flour. Cover and allow to rise until three times original bulk. Roll ½ inch thick. Cut, spread half with butter and fold over. Put in buttered tins to rise, placing 1 inch apart. Bake when light in a hot oven 15 to 20 minutes.

=Popovers=

1 cup flour ¼ teaspoon salt 2 eggs ½ teaspoon melted butter 1 cup milk

Beat eggs thoroughly. Add gradually, while beating, the milk and flour, to which salt has been added. Add butter and beat two minutes with Dover egg beater. Put a half teaspoon of butter in hissing hot iron gem pans. Fill half with batter and bake thirty minutes in a hot oven. Serve immediately.

=Boston Nut Bread=

½ cup molasses 1 teaspoon soda 2 cups sour milk 2 cups graham flour 1 teaspoon salt ½ cup sugar 1 cup chopped nuts 1½ cups white flour

Mix and sift all the dry ingredients. Add molasses to the milk and combine this gradually with the dry materials. Add the nuts. Half fill baking powder cans, with oiled cover, and let stand one-half hour. Bake three-quarters of an hour in moderate oven.

=Sour Milk Biscuit=

1 qt. flour 1 teaspoon soda 1 teaspoon salt 1 teaspoon sugar 2 tablespoons butter Sour milk to moisten (about 1½ cups)

Sift dry ingredients together, cut in butter with knife, add milk to make a stiff dough. Roll out thin and bake in hot oven. Serve with honey or maple syrup.

=Gingerbread=

4 tablespoons butter ½ cup sugar 1 egg ½ cup molasses 2 teaspoons cocoa ½ cup sour milk 1¾ cups flour ¾ teaspoon soda 1 teaspoon ginger 1 teaspoon cinnamon ¼ teaspoon salt 1 teaspoon allspice

Sift flour and spices, salt and soda together. Mix other ingredients in the order given and combine mixtures. Bake in moderate oven 30 minutes.

=Sour Milk Waffles=

1 egg 1 cup sour milk 1 cup flour 1 tablespoon butter 1 teaspoon soda ½ teaspoon salt

Beat egg thoroughly, add sour milk, flour and salt. Dissolve soda in ½ tablespoon cold water. Add to mixture. Beat thoroughly. Cook on oiled, hot waffle iron and serve hot with maple syrup.

=Sweet Milk Waffles=

2 cups flour 3 teaspoons baking powder ½ teaspoon salt 1¼ cups milk Yolks 2 eggs Whites 2 eggs 2 tablespoons butter

Mix and sift dry ingredients, add milk, beaten yolks, butter and egg whites beaten stiff.

=Buttermilk Griddle Cakes=

2 cups buttermilk 2 cups flour 1 teaspoon soda 1 egg beaten

Mix in order given.

=Sweet Milk Griddle Cakes=

1 egg beaten 2 cups milk 3 cups flour sifted with 3 teaspoons baking powder and ½ teaspoon salt 2 tablespoons melted butter

Mix in order given.

=Boston Brown Bread=

1 cup whole wheat flour 2 cups graham flour 1 teaspoon soda 1 teaspoon salt 2 cups sour milk ½ cup molasses

Mix dry ingredients thoroughly. Mix the sour milk and molasses. Stir in dry ingredients, beating thoroughly. Turn into well buttered pound baking powder cans. Cover tightly and steam three hours. Take from can and slice, ½ cup raisins or nuts can be added to the dough mixture, if desired.

DESSERTS

For desserts the number of custards, creams and puddings made with milk is legion, and they are so well known and can be so easily varied that only a few stock recipes need be given.

=Boiled Custard=

2 cups scalded milk Yolks 2 eggs ¼ cup sugar ■ teaspoon salt ½ teaspoon vanilla

Beat eggs slightly, add sugar and salt; stir constantly while adding gradually hot milk. Cook in double boiler, continue stirring until mixture thickens and a coating is formed on the spoon; strain immediately, chill and flavor. If cooked too long the custard will curdle. Should this happen, by using a Dover egg beater it may be restored to a smooth consistency, but custard will not be as thick. Eggs should be beaten slightly for custard that it may be of smooth, thick consistency. To prevent scum from forming, cover with a perforated tin or sprinkle with granulated sugar when cooling.

=Blanc Mange or Cornstarch Pudding=

1 qt. milk ½ cup cornstarch Pinch of salt 3 eggs ½ cup sugar

Heat milk to boiling, add cornstarch dissolved in a little cold milk and a pinch of salt. Boil five minutes, add yolks of eggs beaten with sugar. Boil 2 minutes longer, remove from fire and beat in the whipped whites of eggs. Flavor with vanilla or lemon. Serve cold with cream and sugar or canned peaches or pears.

This is used also as a filling for cream pie, using the beaten whites of eggs, sweetened for a meringue and browning slightly in oven. Bake the crust before filling with the cream.

=Baked Custard=

4 cups scalded milk 4 eggs ½ cup sugar ¼ teaspoon salt Few gratings nutmeg

Beat eggs slightly, add sugar and salt, pour on slowly scalded milk, strain in buttered mold, set in pan of hot water. Sprinkle with nutmeg and bake in slow oven until firm, which may be readily determined by running a silver knife through custard. If knife comes out clean, custard is done. During baking care must be taken that water surrounding mold does not reach boiling point or custard will whey. Always bear in mind that eggs and milk combination must be cooked at a low temperature. For cup custards allow three eggs to four cups milk; for large molded custard four or five eggs; if fewer eggs are used, custard is liable to crack when turned on a serving dish.

=Baked Apple, Southern Style=

[Illustration]

6 choice apples ½ cup sugar 1 qt. milk Salt 4 eggs ■ cup sugar 1 teaspoon vanilla

Pare and core apples that are not too sour to hold their shape when baked. Put in a pudding dish, sprinkle the half cupful of sugar over and around them, also filling place where the core was taken out. Put in oven and bake. Remove from oven and pour around them the milk mixture made thus: Beat the eggs well, add sugar and beat again, add milk, salt and vanilla. Bake slowly until a knife-blade will come out clean after insertion in the custard. Serve hot or cold, with or without whipped cream. This is an especially good dessert for children.

=Coffee Custard=

2 cups milk 1 cup strong coffee 3 eggs ¼ cup sugar ■ teaspoon salt ¼ teaspoon vanilla

Beat eggs slightly; add sugar, salt, vanilla, milk and coffee. Strain into buttered individual molds, set in pan of hot water and bake until firm.

=Caramel Custard=

4 cups scalded milk 5 eggs ½ teaspoon salt 1 teaspoon vanilla ½ cup sugar

Put sugar in omelette pan, stirring constantly over hot part of range until melted to a syrup of light brown color. Add gradually to milk, being careful that milk does not bubble up and go over, as is liable on account of high temperature of sugar. As soon as sugar is melted in milk, add mixture gradually to eggs slightly beaten, add salt and flavoring, then strain in buttered mold. Bake as custard. Chill and serve with caramel sauce.

=Rice Pudding=

1 qt. milk ■ cup rice ½ teaspoon salt ■ teaspoon ground nutmeg, or cinnamon, or grated rind of ¼ of a lemon

Wash the rice thoroughly, mix the ingredients and bake three hours or more in a very slow oven, stirring occasionally at first.

=Tapioca Custard=

Add to the list of ingredients for boiled custard ¼ cup of pearl tapioca. Soak the tapioca in water for an hour or two, drain it, and cook in the milk until it is transparent. Proceed as for boiled custard.

GENERAL RECIPE FOR CEREAL-MILK PUDDINGS

Bread and rice puddings, made with milk and eggs, are familiar to all cooks. Made without eggs, the following will be found suggestive:

For a quart of milk allow ■ of a cup of any coarse cereal (rice, cornmeal, cracked wheat, oatmeal or barley); add ■ of a cup of brown, white or maple sugar, syrup, honey or molasses; ½ teaspoon salt; ■ teaspoon spice. The flavoring may be omitted when honey or molasses is used.

The above recipe makes quite a large pudding. It is often convenient to make a smaller one, and enough for a child's dinner can be made in the double boiler, allowing two level or one rounding tablespoon of cereal to a cup of salted and flavored milk. Cook an hour and sweeten slightly.

These puddings, if made thin, may be poured over stewed prunes or other cooked fruits, and are a good and economical substitute for the cream or soft custard usually used for that purpose.

A very old recipe for a baked corn pudding has recently been given to the author.

=Indian Meal Custard=

1 pt. sweet milk, when hot add slowly ½ cup cornmeal Pinch salt ½ teaspoon each cinnamon and ginger Sugar to taste 1 tablespoon molasses Boil 5 minutes, and add 2 beaten eggs 1 pt. milk Bake about one-half hour or till set.

=Milk and Fruit Mold[11]=

[Illustration:

Milk and fruit mold]

3½ cups hot milk, ½ cup cold milk, 5 tablespoons granulated sugar 10 tablespoons cornstarch 2 beaten egg whites 1 teaspoon almond extract, ½ teaspoon salt Candied cherries, cut into small pieces

Heat milk in double boiler. Mix cornstarch with cold milk, stir it into the hot milk, add salt and sugar and cook, stirring occasionally, for 10 minutes. Remove from fire, fold in the beaten whites and add the flavoring. Rinse mold in cold water, drain, pour in part of the cooked mixture, add a layer of cherries and continue until mold is filled. Set on ice to chill. May be served in tall glasses, as illustrated, or unmolded on a flat serving platter.

=Caramel Rice[11]=

6 cups milk 1 cup rice 1¼ cups granulated sugar 1 teaspoon salt 2 slightly beaten eggs Grated rind of half an orange

Cook rice, salt, the quarter cup of sugar and milk together in a double boiler until rice is tender. Remove from fire, add grated rind and beaten eggs and mix well.

Put the cup of sugar in a small saucepan over the fire and stir constantly until it is a golden brown liquid. Have a mold heating, and when very hot pour the liquid in it, turning the mold so that all parts are coated. Turn the rice into the mold and set it in a pan of water in a hot oven for 20 minutes, having the mold covered the entire time.

Remove from oven, let stand until cold, unmold and serve with the caramel sauce that is in the mold.

=Milk Cream=[11]

1½ cups hot milk ½ cup cold milk ■ cup granulated sugar 3 eggs ½ ounce granulated gelatine 1 teaspoon vanilla Pinch of salt

Soak gelatine in the cold milk for 10 minutes. Heat balance of milk in a double boiler, add salt, sugar and beaten yolks, stirring constantly. Cook until mixture coats the spoon, remove from fire, add soaked gelatine and stir until dissolved. Then set aside to cool and when beginning to thicken add flavoring and mix in lightly the stiffly beaten whites.

Rinse a mold in cold water, drain, pour in mixture and set in a cold place until firm. Unmold and serve plain or with thin cream.

[Illustration:

Milk cream]

=Plain Junket=

Heat a quart of milk until lukewarm, not to exceed 100° F. Remove from fire; sweeten and flavor to taste, using vanilla or any other desired flavor. Dissolve one Junket Tablet in cold water and stir the solution quickly into the lukewarm milk. Pour immediately into individual serving dishes, sherbet glasses, bowls or the like, and let stand warm until thickened. When “set” remove to ice box or other cool place without stirring and let stand until serving time. Serve with or without whipped cream, a sprinkle of nutmeg, or a few strawberries on the top, etc.

[Illustration:

Plain junket]

=Chocolate Junket=

Sweeten a quart of milk with half a cup of sugar. Melt one square of chocolate or two tablespoonfuls of cocoa, add half a cup of the milk and boil one minute. Remove from fire and add the remainder of the milk, which must not be boiled, and a teaspoonful of vanilla. Probably the mixture will be lukewarm, if not, warm until it is. Stir in dissolved Junket Tablet, pour at once into serving dishes and leave undisturbed until set. Chill and serve. If whipped cream sweetened and flavored with vanilla is heaped upon the Chocolate Junket when serving, a most attractive dessert is obtained, and Chocolate Junket frozen makes a delicious ice cream.

=Coffee Junket=

One-half cup very strong coffee, ½ cup sugar, added to 1¾ pints of heated milk. Dissolve. Add your Junket Tablet and finish as ordinary Junket. Serve with cream.

An endless variety of Junkets can be made by varying flavor and color, by adding fruit or preserves, etc., and in the sick room various medicines or stimulants, peptone, wine, etc., may conveniently be administered as an ingredient in the pudding.

=“Prepared Junket”=

Prepared Junket in which all the ingredients are found except the milk is on the market in the form of a powder called “Nesnah.” It is put up in various flavors and is easily and quickly made when milk is at disposal.

Heat 1 qt. milk lukewarm, remove from fire, add one package of the prepared Junket and dissolve quickly and thoroughly by vigorous stirring for ½ minute only. Pour immediately into individual serving dishes and let stand in warm room until thoroughly set. Place in ice box until serving time. Serve with or without plain or whipped cream.

MILK BEVERAGES

=Whey=

1 qt. fresh milk 1 Junket Tablet 1 tablespoon cold water

Heat the milk until lukewarm and add the tablet dissolved in the cold water. Allow it to set in a warm room. Then break up the curd gently and strain it through two thicknesses of cheese-cloth, being careful to remove all the casein. Cool at once and serve cold,

without or with sweetening, and flavor as desired.

=Lemon Whey=

1 qt. hot milk 3 tablespoons sugar ½ cup lemon juice

Heat the milk in a double boiler and add the lemon juice. Cook without stirring until the whey separates. Strain through cheese-cloth and add the sugar. Serve hot or cold, garnished with small slices of lemon.

=Cinnamon and Milk=

1 qt. new milk Stick cinnamon Sugar

Boil milk with sufficient cinnamon to flavor as desired. Sweeten and serve warm or cold.

=Rice Milk=

1 ounce rice 1 pint milk 1 saltspoon salt 1 teaspoon sugar

Soak the rice twelve hours. Add the scalded milk, salt and sugar. Stir well and cook one hour; then rub through a fine sieve. Thin with more hot milk and serve.

=Kumyss= (see also Chapter II)

■ cake Fleischmann's yeast 1¼ tablespoons sugar 1 tablespoon water 1 quart milk

Make a thin syrup of the sugar and water and cook one minute. Soften the yeast in two tablespoons of lukewarm milk. Heat the milk until lukewarm, add other ingredients and shake. Put in stone, sterile bottles, place in an upright position for twelve hours, at 70° (kitchen heat); then turn on side and leave at a temperature of 50° (lower part of ice box). Ready for use after the first twenty-four hours; often kept several days, but the longer it is kept the less palatable it is. It should look like thick, foamy cream.

=Egg Milk Shake=

1 egg 1 cup milk Sugar Vanilla

Break the egg into a large glass and beat well. Add sugar and a couple of drops of vanilla or a dust of nutmeg and beat again. Fill up glass with rich milk. This makes a very nourishing drink.

=Buttermilk Shake=

1 cup buttermilk 1 egg Sugar Few drops lemon extract Salt

Break egg into bowl, beat thoroughly with egg beater, add sugar, flavoring, a tiny pinch of salt and buttermilk. Beat again till light and foamy. Turn into glass.

=Buttermilk Lemonade=

A variation may be made from ordinary buttermilk by the addition of lemon juice and sugar. "Buttermilk lemonade" usually requires the juice of three lemons to one quart of buttermilk. The quantity of lemon and sugar, however, should be varied to suit the taste of the individual. The beverage is delightful and is especially refreshing on a hot summer day.

One may also use the juice of two oranges and one lemon to one quart of buttermilk, instead of the lemons alone.

Many people like the clear buttermilk slightly sweetened with a few grains of salt added.

=Chocolate=

1½ squares chocolate 4 tablespoons sugar Few grains salt 1 cup boiling water 3 cups milk ½ teaspoon vanilla

Scald milk. Melt chocolate in small saucepan and gradually add boiling water. When smooth add to scalded milk, sweeten and add salt and vanilla. Mill with Dover egg beater, and serve, putting a large teaspoon of whipped cream on each cup.

=Cocoa=

¼ cup cocoa ¼ cup sugar Few grains salt 1 cup water 3 cups milk ½ teaspoon vanilla

Mix cocoa and sugar, add water and stir into milk already heated in double boiler. Cook 15 minutes, add vanilla and salt. Serve with whipped cream. A famous cook known to the writer adds 1 teaspoon cornstarch dissolved in 1 tablespoon cold water to the cocoa when nearly ready for the table. It adds to the apparent richness of the beverage.

MISCELLANEOUS SUGGESTIONS

1. A tablespoonful of milk put in the pan before frying eggs will keep them tender.

2. Covering cold chicken or other meat with buttermilk will keep it for twenty-four hours or more, without affecting the meat except to make it more tender.

3. Custards and ice cream kept too long in warm weather may cause ptomaine poisoning.

4. Keep milk covered to shut out flavors from other food.

5. Milk warm from the cow should not be kept in a closed receptacle.

6. Danish cooks soak a piece of veal in skim milk overnight before roasting it, to improve the flavor.

7. Sliced ham covered with milk and baked in a moderate oven for an hour has delicate flavor and is always tender.

THE THERMOMETER

[Illustration:

Dairy and household thermometers]

In the United States and Canada as well as in England _Fahrenheit's_ thermometer is generally used according to which water freezes at 32° and boils at 212° at ordinary air pressure, leaving 180 degrees between the freezing and the boiling point. In some countries in Europe Réaumur's thermometer is used with 0° for the freezing point and 80° for boiling. In France and for scientific work in all countries, however, the Celsius or Centigrade system is employed for measuring heat and cold, having 0° for freezing and 100° for boiling. As there are 180° Fahrenheit, 80° Réaumur and 100° Centigrade between freezing and boiling, the divisions are therefore as 9° F. to 4° R. and 5° C.

To change from degrees of F. above the freezing point to the other systems deduct 32, divide the remainder by 9 and multiply by 4 or by 5 respectively. To change from C. to F. divide by 5, multiply by 9 and add 32, etc. As the metric system is gradually being introduced everywhere instead of the old systems for weights and measures, so also is the Centigrade thermometer being substituted for the others and in cookery it may soon be used exclusively.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

1 pound = 16 ounces = 453.6 grams 1 ounce = 16 drams = 28.35 grams 1 kilogram = 1000 grams = 2.2 pounds 1 gram = 15.43 grains = .035 ounces

1 gallon = 4 quarts = 3.785 liters 1 quart = 2 pints =.9464 liters 1 pint = 16 fluid ounces = .4731 liters 1 fluid ounce = 8 drams = 29.57 c.c. 1 liter = 1000 cubic centimeters = 1.0567 quarts

1 mile = 5280 feet = 1.6 kilometer 1 foot = 12 inches = .3048 meter 1 kilometer = 1000 meters = .6214 mile 1 meter = 100 centimeters = 39.37 inches

1 acre = 43,560 sq. ft. = .4047 hectare 1 sq. ft. = 144 sq. inches = 9.29 sq. decimeters 1 hectare = 10,000 sq. meters = 2.471 acres 1 square meter = 100 sq. decimeters = 10.764 sq. ft. 1 bushel = 4 pecks = .3552 hectoliter 1 hectoliter = 2.8377 bushels

1 U. S. gallon = 128 ounces = 231 cb. inches 1 Imperial gallon (English and Canadian) = 160 ounces = 277 cb. in. 6 U. S. gallons = 5 Imperial gallons

1 gallon of water weighs 8.34 pounds 1 gallon of milk weighs 8.6 pounds A 40 quart can of milk = 86 pounds

Approximate Household Weights and Measures

4 saltspoonfuls = 1 teaspoonful 3 flat teaspoonfuls = 1 heaping teaspoonful 1 heaping tablespoonful of granulated sugar = nearly 1 ounce 1 rounded tablespoonful of butter = 1 ounce 2 ordinary cups of granulated sugar = 1 pound 3 ordinary cups of wheat flour = 1 pound 1 pound of granulated sugar = 1 pint

4 flat teaspoonfuls of liquid = 1 flat tablespoonful = ½ fluid ounce 4 large tablespoonfuls = 1 ordinary wine glass = 2 fluid ounces 1 pint = 2 cups or glasses 1 cup or glass = 8 fluid ounces.

END NOTES

Footnote 1:

From circular No. 85 of a series of statements prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, covering the agricultural situation for 1918.

Footnote 2:

The Babcock Test is operated as follows: When the milk has been thoroughly mixed and a true sample has been taken the _pipette_ is filled to the mark by sucking the milk into it until it stands a little above the mark on the stem, then quickly placing a dry finger over the end of the pipette and allowing the milk to escape until it just reaches the mark. The quantity thus measured off is 17.6 c.c. The pipette is then emptied into the _test bottle_ by placing the point in the neck and allowing the milk to flow slowly down the inside of the neck, taking care not to lose any of the milk. Blow the last drops out of the pipette into the bottle.

The _measuring glass_, holding 17.5 c.c., is filled to the mark with _sulphuric acid_ of a specific gravity of 1.82 to 1.83 and this is poured into the milk in the test bottle. The acid is a strong poison and must be handled with care. Pour it slowly down along the wall of the bottle which is held at an angle and turned slowly during the operation.

Now give the bottle a rotary motion to thoroughly mix the milk and the acid, shaking vigorously towards the end of the operation so as to be sure not to leave any of the acid which is heavier than the milk at the bottom of the bottle.

Whirling.—The bottles are then placed in the centrifugal machine and whirled for five minutes at the proper speed—from 600 to 1200 revolutions per minute—according to the diameter of the machine and as stated in the directions which come with the tester. The mixture of milk and acid is hot enough if the whirling is done at once, but if it is allowed to cool the bottles should be placed in hot water of 150 to 170° for about 15 minutes; whirling at full speed for 4 minutes brings all the fat to the top.

Hot water is now added until the bottle is filled almost to the scale on the neck and the bottles are again placed in the machine and whirled at full speed for one minute. Hot water is then again added until the lower end of the fat column is within the scale, preferably at the 1% or 2% mark on the neck of the bottle. Whirl once more for one or two minutes and then read off the percentage of fat on the scale. Each division represents 0.2% fat. The fat column is measured from the lower line between the fat and the water to the point where the top of the fat column touches the wall of the neck. A pair of dividers are handy for measuring the fat column and reading off the percentage of fat in the milk. The bottle with contents should be warm—about 140°—when the measure is taken.

For testing skim milk and cream special forms of test bottles are used—which are described in the circulars coming with the testers and students who desire fuller information are referred to Farrington and Woll's "Testing Milk and its Products," published by the Mendota Book Co., Madison, Wis.

Footnote 3:

The _Acid Test_ depends upon what in the laboratory is called "titration" and makes use of a "burette," a long, graduated measuring tube provided with a pinch-cock. This burette is filled with an alkali solution of known strength, usually a "tenth normal"

solution of caustic soda. A certain amount of the milk to be tested is measured off into a glass or a white porcelain cup. As a 17.6 c.c. pipette belonging to the Babcock test usually is at hand, that may be used for this purpose. A few drops of an _Indicator_ is added to the milk and under constant stirring the soda solution is allowed to drip into it until suddenly it turns pink. The color will quickly disappear, however, and a few more drops of the alkali are added and stirred in several times until a faint but distinct pink color remains for some time. That indicates that the acid in the milk has been neutralized and the amount of the soda solution consumed is then read off on the scale on the burette. By dividing the number of c.c. of the soda solution used by two, the tenths per cent of lactic acid in the milk is found. For example, if it takes 4 c.c. of the soda solution to neutralize 17.6 c.c. milk, the acidity is .2%. This depends upon the fact that 1 c.c. of a tenth normal soda neutralizes .009 gram of lactic acid and that therefore the per cent of acid in the milk is equal to .009 multiplied by the number of c.c. of soda solution used, divided by the number of c.c. of milk and multiplied by 100.

If 50 c.c. of milk is taken instead of 17.6 the calculation is changed accordingly.

Footnote 4:

Farmers' Bulletin No. 602, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture.

Footnote 5:

Butter Color is made of the coloring matter of "Annatto" dissolved in a refined vegetable (salad) oil. The Annatto tree (Bixa Orelana) grows in the tropics and the seed which has a thin coating of this beautiful coloring matter comes mostly from the West Indian Islands, Jamaica, Porto Rico and Guadeloupe. It is perfectly harmless and is used by the natives to flavor and color soup and other foods much as we use tomatoes.

Footnote 6:

The Marschall Rennet Test consists of a graduated cup (a) with a fine hole for an outlet in the bottom. One cubic centimeter of a standard rennet extract is diluted with water in the glass bottle (c). The cup is filled with milk and placed on the corner of the cheese vat, the milk being allowed to run through the fine hole in the bottom of the cup. The moment the surface of the milk reaches the upper mark of the graduation in the cup the diluted rennet extract is added and quickly stirred into the milk with the spattle (d).

When the milk begins to curdle it stops running out. The sweeter the milk is the more will run out before coagulation stops it and the mark on the scale at which it stops indicates the degree of acidity or ripening. The point is to have the milk alike every day and if, for instance, the cheesemaker has found that his cheese is best if he adds the rennet to the milk in the vat when the test shows 2½, he wants to ripen the milk to that degree every day. So, if the test shows 3 or 4, it indicates that the milk is not sufficiently ripened and it should be allowed to stand warm for a longer time before it is set with rennet.

Footnote 7:

The Acidemeter for making an Acid Test is described in Chapter I.

Footnote 8:

Rennet (see under "Ferments" in Chapter I) is prepared from the third division of the stomach of the suckling or milk-fed calf. Fifty years ago cheesemakers used to make their own rennet by soaking salted calves' stomachs in sour whey, and our grandmothers used a piece of a dry, salted stomach to make Junket or "Curds and Whey." About 1868, Christian Hansen, of Copenhagen, Denmark, began the preparation of Commercial Rennet Extract which soon supplanted the home-made rennet in all countries wherever cheese was made. Nowadays rennet in liquid or powder or tablet form for cheesemaking, and Junket Tablets for milk puddings, are prepared pure and of known strength in laboratories and handled by druggists and dealers in dairy supplies.

The fresh stomachs are saved by the farmers or butchers and are either blown up and dried in the air protected from sunlight and rain, or split lengthwise and spread out flat and salted on both sides.

In the laboratory the ferment is extracted by chemicals and a pure, clear liquid extract is prepared, of uniform strength and good keeping quality. Or the extract is condensed into a powder which again is compressed into tablets of great strength.

The ferment acts best when the milk is lukewarm, but it will do the work at temperatures ranging from 50°, or even lower, to 120° F. Strongly pasteurized or sterilized milk will not curdle with rennet, but milk pasteurized at a low temperature is not changed enough

to prevent it from making a firm curd. More rennet does not make a firmer curd but causes the milk to curdle quicker; less rennet makes the process slower. Diluted milk will not curdle firmly, and the failure of milk to make a smooth coagulum of the usual consistency and in the usual time, the temperature being right and the regular amount of a standard rennet being used, is a never-failing proof that something is the matter with the milk. It has been changed from its natural condition by over-heating in pasteurization or by watering or doctoring, or it has not been properly ripened.

Footnote 9:

W. O. Atwater, Farmers' Bulletin No. 142.

Footnote 10:

Dr. E. V. McCollum in "Hoard's Dairyman."

Footnote 11:

Prepared for "The Story of Milk" by A. Louise Andrea.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cheese Making; John W. Decker, Columbus, O.

The Milk Question; M. J. Rosenau, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston.

The Manufacture of Cheese of the Cheddar Type from Pasteurized Milk; J. L. Sammis and A. T. Bruhn, Bulletin 165, Bureau of Animal Industry, Washington, D. C.

Dairy Laboratory Guide; Charles W. Melick, D. Van Nostrand Company, New York City.

Handbook for Farmers and Dairymen; F. W. Woll, John Wiley & Sons, New York City.

Testing Milk and Its Products; E. H. Farrington and F. W. Woll, Mendota Book Company, Madison, Wis.

Farmers' Clean Milk Book; Dr. Charles E. North, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Ost og Osteproduktion; G. Ellbrecht, Nordisk Forlag, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Outlines of Dairy Bacteriology; N. L. Russell, Madison, Wis.

A B C in Butter Making; J. H. Monrad, Urner-Barry Co., New York.

A B C in Cheese Making; J. H. Monrad, Urner-Barry Co., New York.

Dairy Chemistry; Henry Droop Richmond, Charles Griffin and Company, Ltd., London.

Milk, its Nature and Composition; C. M. Aikman, Adams and Charles Black, London.

Milk and Its Products; H. H. Wing, The Macmillan Co., New York.

Principles and Practice of Buttermaking; G. L. McKay and C. Larsen, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Science and Practice of Cheese Making; L. L. Van Slyke and Chas. A. Publow, Orange Judd Company, New York.

Agricultural Bacteriology; H. W. Conn, P. Blakiston's Son & Co., Philadelphia.

Creaming Milk by Centrifugal Force; J. D. Frederiksen, Little Falls, N.Y.

The Common Sense of the Milk Question; John Spargo, The Macmillan Company, New York.

Practical Dairy Husbandry; X. A. Willard, Excelsior Publishing House, New York.

Maelkeri Bakteriologi; Orla Jensen, Copenhagen.

Maelkeribruget i Danmark, Bernhard Boggild, Copenhagen.

Mejerivaesenet i Nord-Amerika; J. D. Frederiksen, Copenhagen.

Modern Dairy Guide; Martin H. Meyer, Madison, Wis.

La Laiterie; A. F. Pouriau, Librairie Audot, Lebroc & Cie, Paris.

The Dairying Industry in Canada; J. A. Ruddick, Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa, Canada.

Canadian Dairying; Henry H. Dean, William Briggs, Toronto.

The Business of Dairying; Clarence B. Lane, Orange Judd Co., New York.

Questions and Answers on Buttermaking; Chas. A. Publow, Orange Judd Company, New York.

The Prolongation of Life; Elie Metchnikoff, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

The Bacillus of Long Life; Loudon M. Douglas, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

The Book of Butter; Edward Sewall Guthrie, The Macmillan Co., New York.

The Care and Feeding of Children; L. Emmett Holt, M. D., D. Appleton & Co.

Printed in the United States of America

The following pages contain advertisements of a few of the Macmillan books on kindred subjects.

The Book of Ice Cream

BY WALTER N. FISK

Cloth, 12 mo

This book is intended to aid the student and the commercial manufacturer in better understanding the principles of making and handling ice cream. It is not primarily intended as a recipe-book, although many recipes are included in the text.

The first five chapters consist in a general discussion of the materials used in the manufacture of ice cream as well as the stabilizers and fillers and flavoring materials. The next chapter deals with the classification of ice creams, and here the recipes are given. The equipment and refrigeration are then explained in a separate chapter, followed by three chapters devoted to the actual making of ice cream.

The concluding pages are taken up with an analysis of the qualities of ice cream and of the bacteriology of its manufacture. Such a discussion should be useful both to the student in the class-room and the progressive manufacturer.

* * * * *

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

THE RURAL TEXT-BOOK SERIES

EDITED BY L. H. BAILEY

Butter

BY E. S. GUTHRIE

Professor in the Dairy Department, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University

* * * * *

Cloth, 12mo, $1.75.

A practical discussion of the general characteristics of butter, and of all of the problems connected with its manufacture and marketing, together with a brief history of the product. Among the topics considered are the history of butter; composition and food value of butter; cleansing and care of dairy utensils; care of milk and cream; cream separation; grading milk and cream and neutralizing acidity; pasteurization; cream ripening; churning, washing, salting and packing butter; flavors of butter; storage of butter; marketing; whey butter, renovated and ladled butter; margarine, and testing.

The Book of Cheese

BY CHARLES THOM

Mycologist in charge of Microbiological Laboratory, Bureau of Chemistry, United States Department of Agriculture; formerly Investigator in Cheese at Connecticut Agricultural College

AND

WALTER W. FISK

Assistant Professor of Dairy Industry, New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University

Cloth, 12mo, $1.90.

An exposition of the processes of making and handling a series of important varieties of cheese. The kinds considered are those made commercially in America or widely met in the trade here. The relation of cheese to milk and to its production and composition has been presented in so far as required for this purpose.

After a general statement on cheese, the authors consider the following subjects: The milk in its relation to cheese; Coagulating materials; Lactic starters; Curd making; Classification of cheese; Cheese with sour milk flavor; Soft cheeses ripened by mold; Soft cheeses ripened by bacteria; Semi-hard cheeses; The hard cheeses; Cheddar cheese making; Composition and yield of cheddar cheese; Cheddar cheese ripening; The Swiss and Italian groups; Miscellaneous varieties and by-products; Cheese factory construction, equipment, organization; History and development of the cheese industry in America; Testing; Marketing; Cheese in the household.

A Manual of Milk Products

BY W. A. STOCKING, JR.

Professor of Dairy Bacteriology in the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University

Cloth, 12mo, $2.50

This is a very recent addition to the Rural Manual Series under the editorship of L. H. Bailey. The work is intended to serve as a reference book covering the entire subject of milk and its products. There are chapters on The Chemical Composition of Milk, The Factors Which Influence Its Composition, Physical Properties, The Various Tests Used in the Study of Milk, The Production and Handling of Milk, Butter Making, The Cream Supply, Butter Making on the Farm, Cheese Making, and the Bacteriology of Dairy Products.

Milk and Its Products

BY HENRY H. WING Professor of Dairy Husbandry in Cornell University

New Revised Edition, with new illustrations, cloth, 12mo, $1.60

The revolution in dairy practice, brought about by the introduction of the centrifugal cream separator and the Babcock test for fat, by a more definite knowledge regarding the various fermentations that so greatly influence milk, and the manufacture of its products, have demanded the publication of a book that shall give to the dairyman, and particularly to the dairy student, in simple, concise form, the principles underlying modern dairy practice. Such has been Professor Wing's purpose in this work. This is not a new edition of the author's very successful volume published under the same title many years ago; it is, in reality, an entirely new book, having been wholly reset and enlarged by the addition of new matter, both text and illustrations. The author's aim has been at all times to give the present state of knowledge as supported by the weight of evidence and the opinions of those whose authority is highest.

● Transcriber's Notes: ■ Footnotes have been gathered and moved to their own section. ■ Missing or obscured punctuation was silently corrected. ■ Typographical errors were silently corrected. ■ Inconsistent spelling and hyphenation were made consistent only when a predominant form was found in this book. ■ Text that was in: italics is enclosed by underscores (_italics_); bold by is enclosed by "equal" signs (=bold=).

==========

Good Health and How We Won It, With an Account of the New Hygiene

Upton Sinclair

Project Gutenberg Release: August 17, 2021 · eBook #66077

GOOD HEALTH AND HOW WE WON IT

[Illustration: Fig. A. Fig. B.

“THE BATTLE OF THE BLOOD”

Micro-photograph of leucocytes (white and grayish bodies) in conflict with Germs (black dots and bodies). In Fig. A the germ is that of influenza, in Fig. B that of plague.]

GOOD HEALTH AND HOW WE WON IT

WITH AN ACCOUNT OF THE NEW HYGIENE

BY UPTON SINCLAIR AND MICHAEL WILLIAMS

WITH SIXTEEN FULL-PAGE ILLUSTRATIONS FROM PHOTOGRAPHS

NEW YORK FREDERICK A. STOKES COMPANY PUBLISHERS

COPYRIGHT, 1909, BY FREDERICK A. STOKES COMPANY

All rights reserved

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

I. THE BATTLE OF THE BLOOD 21

II. HOW TO EAT: THE GOSPEL OF DIETETICS ACCORDING TO HORACE FLETCHER 41

III. THE YALE EXPERIMENTS 69

IV. HOW DIGESTION IS ACCOMPLISHED 95

V. HOW FOODS POISON THE BODY 113

VI. SOME IMPORTANT FOOD FACTS 127

VII. HOW OFTEN SHOULD WE EAT 145

VIII. HEALTH AND THE MIND 159

IX. THE CASE AS TO MEAT 173

X. THE CASE AGAINST STIMULANTS 193

XI. DIET REFORM IN THE FAMILY 203

XII. BREATHING AND EXERCISE 219

XIII. BATHING AND CLEANLINESS 239

XIV. A UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH 258

XV. HEALTH REFORM AND THE COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED 274

APPENDIX 287

ILLUSTRATIONS

“THE BATTLE OF THE BLOOD” FRONTISPIECE

FACING PAGE MR. UPTON SINCLAIR AND MR. MICHAEL WILLIAMS 16

MR. HORACE FLETCHER 42

MR. HORACE FLETCHER MAKING A WORLD’S RECORD 52

PROFESSOR RUSSELL H. CHITTENDEN, PH. D., LL.D., SC. D. 70

PROFESSOR IRVING FISHER, PH. D. 82

MR. JOHN E. GRANGER BREAKING THE WORLD’S RECORD FOR DEEP-KNEE BENDING 88

M. ELIE METCHNIKOFF 114

PROFESSOR LAFAYETTE B. MENDEL, PH. D. 138

MR. UPTON SINCLAIR’S CHILDREN 146

MR. SINCLAIR’S CHILDREN 176

THE DAILY SWIM 206

FRESH AIR IN BERMUDA 220

OUTDOOR EXERCISE 236

DR. J. H. KELLOGG 258

A GROUP AT THE BATTLE CREEK SANITARIUM 270

INTRODUCTION

BY UPTON SINCLAIR

Ten years ago, when I was a student at college, I fell a victim to a new and fashionable ailment called “la grippe.” I recollect the date very well, because it was the first time I had been sick in fourteen years—the last difficulty having been the whooping-cough.

I have many times had occasion to recall the interview with the last physician I went to see. I made a proposition, which might have changed the whole course of my future life, had he only been capable of understanding it. I said: “Doctor, it has occurred to me that I would like to have someone who knows about the body examine me thoroughly and tell me how to live.”

I can recollect his look of perplexity. “Was there anything the matter with you before this attack?” he asked.

“Nothing that I know of,” I answered; “but I have often reflected that the way I am living cannot be perfect; and I want to get as much out of my body and mind as I can. I should like to know, for instance, just what are proper things for me to eat——”

“Nonsense,” he interrupted. “You go right on and live as you have been living, and don’t get to thinking about your health.”

And so I went away and dismissed the idea. It was one that I had broached with a great deal of diffidence; so far as I knew, it was entirely original, and I was not sure how a doctor would receive it. All doctors that I had ever heard of were people who cured you when you were sick; to ask one to take you when you were well and help you to stay well, was to take an unfair advantage of the

profession.

So I went on to “live as I had been living.” I ate my food in cheap restaurants and boarding-houses, or in hall bedrooms, as students will. I invariably took a book to the table, and ate very rapidly, even then; frequently I forgot to eat at all in the ardor of my work. I was a worshiper of the ideal of health, and never used any sort of stimulant; but I made it a practice to work sixteen hours a day, and quite often I worked for long periods under very great nervous strain. And four years later I went back to my friend the physician.

“You have indigestion,” he said, when I had told him my troubles. “I will give you some medicine.”

So every day after meals I took a teaspoonful of some red liquor which magically relieved the distressing symptoms incidental to doing hard brain-work after eating. But only for a year or two more, for then I found that the artificially digested food was not being eliminated from my system as regularly as necessary, and I had to visit the doctor again. He gave my ailment another name, and gave me another kind of medicine; and I went on, working harder than ever—being just then at an important crisis in my life.

Gradually, however, to my great annoyance, I was forced to realize that I was losing that fine robustness which enabled me to say that I had not had a day’s sickness in fourteen years. I found that I caught cold very easily—though I always attributed it to some unwonted draught or exposure. I found that I was in for tonsilitis once or twice every winter. And now and then, after some particularly exhausting labor, I would find it hard to get to sleep. Also I had to visit the dentist more frequently, and I noticed, to my great perplexity, that my hair was falling out. So I went on, until at last I was on the verge of a nervous breakdown, and had to drop everything and go away and try to rest.

That was my situation when I stumbled upon an article in the _Contemporary Review_, telling about the experiments of a gentleman named Horace Fletcher. Mr. Fletcher’s idea was, in brief, that by thorough and careful chewing of the food, one extracted from it the maximum of nutriment, and could get along upon a much smaller quantity, thus saving a great strain upon the bodily processes.

This article came to me as one of the great discoveries of my life. Here was a man who was doing for himself exactly what I had asked my physician to do for me so many years previously; who was working, not to cure disease, but to live so that disease would be powerless to attack him.

I went at the new problem in a fine glow of enthusiasm, but blindly, and without guidance. I lived upon a few handfuls of rice and fruit—with the result that I lost fourteen pounds in as many days. At the same time I met a young writer, Michael Williams, and passed the Fletcher books on to him—and with precisely the same results. He, like myself, came near killing himself with the new weapon of health.

But in spite of discouragements and failures, we went on with our experiments. We met Mr. Fletcher himself, and talked over our problems with him. We followed the course of the experiments at Yale, in which the soundness of his thorough mastication and “low proteid” arguments were definitely proven. We read the books of Metchnikoff, Chittenden, Haig and Kellogg, and followed the work of Pawlow of St. Petersburg, Masson of Geneva, Fisher of Yale, and others of the pioneers of the new hygiene. We went to Battle Creek, Michigan, where we found a million-dollar institution, equipped with every resource of modern science, and with more than a thousand nurses, physicians and helpers, all devoting their time to the teaching of the new art of keeping well. And thus, little by little, with backslidings, mistakes, and many disappointments, we worked out our problems, and found the road to permanent health. We do not say that we have entirely got over the ill effects of a lifetime of bad living; but we do say that we are getting rid of them very rapidly; we say that we have positive knowledge of the principles of right living, and of the causes of our former ailments, where before we had only ignorance.

In the beginning, all this was simply a matter of our own digestions, and of the weal and woe of our immediate families. But as time went on we began to realize the meaning of this new knowledge to all mankind. We had found in our own persons freedom from pain and worry; we had noticeably increased our powers of working, and our mastery over all the circumstances of our lives. It seemed to us that we had come upon the discovery of a new virtue—the virtue of good eating—fully as important as any which moralists and prophets have ever preached. And so our interest in these reforms became part of our dream of the new humanity. It was not enough for us to have found the way to health for ourselves and our families; it seemed to us that we ought not to drop the subject until we had put into print the results of our experiments, so that others might avoid our mistakes and profit by our successes.

Historians agree that all known civilizations, empire after empire, republic after republic, from the dawn of recorded time down to the present age, have decayed and died, through causes generated by civilization itself. In each such case the current of human progress has been restored by a fresh influx of savage peoples from beyond the frontiers of civilization. So it was with Assyria, Egypt and Persia; so Greece became the wellspring of art and the graces of life, and then died out; so Rome conquered the world, built up a marvellous structure of law, and then died out. As Edward Carpenter and others have shown us, history can paint pictures of many races that have attained the luxuries and seeming securities of civilization, but history has yet to record for us the tale of a nation passing safely through civilization, of a nation which has not been eventually destroyed by the civilization it so arduously won.

And why? Because when ancient races emerged out of barbarism into civilization, they changed all the habits of living of the human race. They adopted new customs of eating; they clothed themselves; they lived under roofs; they came together in towns; they devised ways of avoiding exposure to the sun and wind and rain—but they never succeeded in devising ways of living that would keep them in health in their new environment.

The old struggle against the forces of nature once relaxed, men grew effeminate and women weak; diseases increased; physical fibre softened and atrophied and withered away; moral fibre went the same path to destruction; dry rot attacked the foundations of society, and eventually the whole fabric toppled over, or was swept aside, to be built up again by some conquering horde of barbarians, which in its turn grew civilized, and in its turn succumbed to the virulent poison that seemed inherent in the very nature of civilization, and for which there seemed to be no antidote.

So much for the past. As to the present, there do not lack learned and authoritative observers and thinkers who declare that our own civilization is also dying out. They point out that while in many directions we have bettered our physical condition, improved our surroundings, and stamped out many virulent diseases (smallpox, the plague and yellow fever, for instance), and have reduced average mortality, nevertheless we have but exchanged one set of evils for another and perhaps more serious, because more debilitating and degenerating set: namely, those manifold and race-destroying evils known as nervous troubles, and those other evils resulting from malnutrition, which are lumped together vaguely under the name of dyspepsia, or indigestion—the peculiar curse of America, the land of the frying-pan.

It is also plain, say the critics of our civilization, that society to-day cannot be regenerated by barbarians. To-day the whole world is practically one great civilization, with a scattering of degraded and dying little tribes here and there. Modern civilization seems to have foreseen the danger of being overrun some day as the ancient civilizations were, and to have forestalled the danger by the inventions of gunpowder and rum, syphilis and tuberculosis.

Are these critics right? I believe that they are, as far as they go; I believe that to-day our civilization is rapidly degenerating; but also I believe that it contains within itself two forces of regeneration which were lacking in old societies, and which are destined ultimately to prevail in our own. The first of these forces is democracy, and the second is science.

To whatever department of human activity one turns at the present day, he finds men engaged in combating the age-long evils of human life with the new weapon of exact knowledge; and their discoveries no longer remain the secrets of a few—by the agencies of the public school and the press they are spreading throughout the whole world. Thus, a new science of economics having been worked out, and the causes of poverty and exploitation set forth, we see a world-wide and universal movement for the abolition of these evils. And hand in hand with this goes a movement of moral regeneration, manifesting itself in a thousand different forms, but all having for their aim the teaching of self-mastery—the replacing of the old natural process of the elimination of the unfit by a conscious effort on the part of each individual to eliminate his own unfitness. We see this movement in literature and art; we see it in the new religions which are springing up—in Christian Science, and the so-called “New Thought” movements; we see it in the great health movement which is the theme of this book, and which claims for its leaders some of the finest spirits of our times.

In the state of nature man had to hunt his own food, so he was hungry when he sat down to eat. But having conquered nature, and accumulated goods, he is able to think of enjoyments, and invents cooks and the art of cookery—which is simply the tickling of his palate with all kinds of stomach-destroying concoctions. And now the time has come when he wishes to escape from the miseries thus brought upon him; and, as before, the weapon is that of exact science. He must ascertain what food elements his body needs, and in what form he may best take them; and in accordance with this new knowledge he must shape his habits of life. In the same way he has to examine and correct his habits of sleeping and dressing and bathing and exercising, in accordance with the real necessities of his body.

This is the work which the leaders of the new movement are engaged upon. To quote a single instance: while I was “living as I had been living” and eating the preparations of ignorant cooks in boarding-houses and restaurants, Dr. Kellogg of Battle Creek was bringing all the resources of modern chemistry and bacteriology to bear upon the problem of the nutrition of man; taking all the foods used by human beings, and analyzing them and testing them in elaborate experiments; determining the amount of their available nutriment and their actual effect upon the system in all stages of sickness and health; the various ways of preparing them and combining them, and the effect of these processes upon their palatability and ease of digestion. Every day for nine years, so Kellogg told me, he sat down to an experimental meal designed by himself and prepared by his wife; and the result is a new dietary—that in use at the Battle Creek Sanitarium—which awaits only the spread of knowledge to change the ways of eating of civilized man.

This new health knowledge has been amassed by many workers and, as in all cases of new knowledge, there is much chaff with the grain. There are faddists as well as scientists; there are traders as well as humanitarians. It seemed to us that there was urgently needed a book which should gather this new knowledge, and present it in a form in which it could be used by the average man. There have been many books written upon this; but they are either the work of propagandists with one idea—containing, as we have proved to our cost, much dangerous error; or else the work of physicians and specialists, whose vocabulary is not easily to be comprehended by the average man or woman. What we have tried to write is a book which sets forth what has been proved by investigators in many and widely-scattered fields; which is simple, so that a person of ordinary intelligence can comprehend it; which is brief, so that a busy person may quickly get the gist of it; and which is practical, giving its information from the point of view of the man who wishes to apply these new ideas to his own case.

Michael Williams was recently persuaded to give a semi-public talk on the subject before an audience of several hundred professional and business people. He was compelled to spend the rest of the evening in answering the questions of his audience; and listening to these questions, I was made to realize the tremendous interest of the public in the practical demonstration which Mr. Horace Fletcher has given of the idea of Metchnikoff, that men and women to-day grow old before they ought to do so, and that the prime of life should be from the age of fifty to eighty. A broken-down invalid at forty-five, Mr. Fletcher was at fifty-four a marvel of strength—and at fifty-eight he showed an improvement of one hundred per cent. over his tests at the age of fifty-four; thus proving that progressive recuperation in the so-called “decline of life” might be effected by followers of the new art of health.

As a result of this address, Williams was invited by the president of one of the largest industrial concerns in the country to lecture to his many thousands of employees on the new hygiene; his idea being to place at their disposal the knowledge of this new method of increasing their physical and mental efficiency.

For business men and women, indeed, for workers of all kinds, good health is capital; and the story of the new hygiene is the story of the throwing open of hitherto unsuspected reserve-stores of energy and endurance for the use of all.

In writing upon this subject, the experiences most prominent in our minds have naturally been those of ourselves, of our wives and children, and of friends who have followed in our path. As the setting forth of an actual case is always more convincing than a general statement, we have frequently referred to these experiences, and what they have taught us. We have done this frankly and simply, and we trust that the reader will not misinterpret the spirit in which we have done it. Mr. Horace Fletcher has set the noble example in this matter, and has been the means of helping tens of thousands of his fellow men and women.

[Illustration: MR. UPTON SINCLAIR AND MR. MICHAEL WILLIAMS Resting from their favorite exercise.]

I have sketched the path by which I was led into these studies; there remains to outline the story of my collaborator. Williams is the son of a line of sailors, and inherited a robust constitution; but as a boy and youth he was employed in warehouses and department stores, and when he was twenty he went to North Carolina as a tuberculosis patient. Returning after two years, much benefited by outdoor life, he entered newspaper work in Boston, New York, and elsewhere, and kept at it until four years ago, when again he fled South to do battle with tuberculosis, which had attacked a new place in his lungs. After a second partial recuperation, he went to San Francisco. At the time of the earthquake he held a responsible executive position, and his health suffered from the worry and the labors of that period. A year later there came the shock and exposure consequent upon the burning of Helicon Hall. Williams found himself hovering upon the brink of another breakdown, this time in nervous energy as well as in lung power. A trip to sea failed to bring much benefit; and matters were seeming pretty black to him, when it chanced that a leading magazine sent him to New Haven to study the diet experiments being conducted at Yale University by Professors Chittenden, Mendel and Fisher. He found that these experiments were based upon the case of Horace Fletcher, and had resulted in supporting his claims. This

circumstance interested him, suggesting as it did that he himself might have been to blame for his failure with Mr. Fletcher's system. So he renewed the study of Fletcherism, and later on the same magazine sent him to Dr. Kellogg's institution at Battle Creek, with the result that he became a complete convert to the new ideas. Like a great many newspaper men, he had been a free user of coffee, and also of alcohol. As one of the results of his adoption of the "low proteid" diet, and of the open-air life, he was able to break off the use of all these things without grave difficulty. A bacteriological examination recently disclosed the fact that his lungs had entirely healed; while tests on the spirometer showed that his breathing capacity was far beyond that of the average man of his weight and size. In less than three months, while at the Battle Creek Sanitarium, tests showed a great gain in the cell count of his blood, and in its general quality. Also, his general physical strength was increased from 4635 units to 5025, which latter figure is well above the average for his height, 68.2 inches.

In conclusion, we wish jointly to express our obligation to Mr. Horace Fletcher, to Dr. J. H. Kellogg, to Professor Russell H. Chittenden, to Professor Lafayette B. Mendel, and to Professor Irving Fisher for advice, criticism and generous help afforded in the preparation of some of the chapters of this book. The authority of these scientists, physicians and investigators, and of others like Metchnikoff, Pawlow, Cannon, Curtis, Sager, Higgins and Gulick, whose works we have studied, is the foundation upon which we rest on all questions of fact or scientific statement. They are the pathbreakers and the roadbuilders,—we claim to be simply guides and companions along the journey to the fair land of health. The journey is not long, and the road is a highway open to all.

I

THE BATTLE OF THE BLOOD

The new ideas of living which are the subject of this book have proceeded from investigation of the human body with the high-power microscope. The discoveries made, which have to do, not so much with the body itself as with the countless billions of minute organisms which inhabit the body, may be best set forth by a description of the blood. "The blood is the life," says Exodus, and modern science has confirmed this statement. From the blood proceeds the life of all the body, and in its health is the body's health.

If you should prick your finger and extract a drop of your own blood, and examine it under a microscope, you would make the fascinating discovery that it is the home of living creatures, each having a separate and independent existence of its own. In a single ounce of blood there are more of these organisms than there are human beings upon the face of the globe. These organisms are of many kinds, but they divide themselves into two main groups, known as the red corpuscles and the white.

The red corpuscles are the smaller of the two. The body of an average man contains something like thirty million of millions of these corpuscles; a number exceeding the population of New York and London are born in the body every second. They are the oxygen conveyers of the body; the process of life is one of chemical combustion, and these corpuscles feed the fire. No remotest portion of the body escapes their visitation. They carry oxygen from the lungs and they bring back the carbon dioxide and other waste products of the body's activities. They have been compared to men who carry into a laundry buckets of pure water, and carry out the dirty water resulting from the washing process.

The other variety of organisms are the white cells or leucocytes, and it is concerning them that the most important discoveries of modern investigators have been made. The leucocytes vary in number according to the physical condition of the individual, and according to their locality in the body. Their function is to defend the body against the encroachments of hostile organisms.

We shall take it for granted that the reader does not require to have proven to him the so-called "germ theory" of disease. The phrase, which was once accurate, is now misleading, for the germ "theory" is part of the definite achievement of science. Not only have we succeeded in isolating the specific germ whose introduction into the body is responsible for different diseases, but in many cases, by studying the history and behavior of the germ, we have been able to find methods of checking its inroads, and so have delivered men from scourges like yellow fever and the bubonic plague.

THE DEFENSES OF THE BODY

An experiment that is often tried in operating rooms furnishes a vivid illustration of the omnipresence of these invisible, yet potent, foes of life. In order to impress upon young surgeons the importance of maintaining antiseptic conditions, they are instructed to thoroughly wash their hands and arms in antiseptic soap and water; then they are told to leave their arms exposed for a few minutes, after which a microscopic examination of the bared skin will result in exposing the presence of myriads of germs. Many of

these are, of course, harmless; some are even “friendly”—since they make war upon the dangerous kinds. But others are the deadly organisms which find lodgment in the lungs and cause pneumonia and tuberculosis; or the thirty odd varieties of bacilli which cause the various kinds of grippe and influenza and “colds,” which plague the civilized man; or others which, finding entrance into the digestive tract, are the cause of typhoid and other deadly fevers.

So it appears that we live within our bodies somewhat in the same fashion as isolated barons lived in their castles in the Dark Ages, beleaguered constantly by hordes of enemies that are bent upon our destruction—these being billions upon billions of disease germs. Every portion of the body has its defenses to protect it against these swarms. The skin is germ-tight in health; and each of the gateways to the interior of the body has its own peculiar guard—tears, wax, mucous membrane, etc. As Dr. Edward A. Ayers points out,—“Many of these entrances are lined with out-sweeping brooms—fine hairs similar to the ‘nap’ or ‘pile’ of carpet or plush—which constantly sweep back and forth like wheat stalks waving in the breeze. You cannot see them with the low-powered eye, but neither can you see the germs. They sweep the mucous from lungs and throat, and try to keep the ventilators free from dust and germs. Behind the scurf wall and the broom brigade of the mucous membranes, the soldier corpuscles of the blood march around the entire fortress every twenty-eight seconds” (the time occupied by the blood in its circulation through the body).

HEALTHY BODIES ARE GERM-PROOF

And again (to quote another authority, Dr. Sadler), “All the fluids and secretions of the body are more or less germicidal. The saliva, being alkaline, discourages the growth of germs requiring an acid medium. The normal gastric juice of a healthy stomach is a sure germ-killer. In the early part of digestion, lactic acid is present, and there soon appears the powerful hydrochloric acid, which is a most efficient germicide....

“The living, healthy tissues of the body are all more or less germicidal; that is, they are endowed with certain protective properties against germs and disease. This is true of many of the other special secretions, like those found in the eye and elsewhere in the body, when they are normal. The blood and lymph, the two great circulating fluids of the body, are likewise germicidal. In some conditions of disease, there may be found various substances in the blood which can destroy germs.”

THE WHITE CELLS ON GUARD

And this definitely brings us to the other kind of inhabitants of the human blood, the leucocytes, or white blood corpuscles,—and so to the germ theory of health, which science is showing to be no less true than the germ theory of disease. In their natural state these cells are transparent, spherical forms of the consistency of jelly drops, which float in the bloodstreams or creep along the inner surface of the vessel. Their function was for a long time not understood; the discovery of the real facts, perhaps the most epoch-making discovery ever made concerning the human body, the world owes to the genius of Metchnikoff, the head of the Pasteur Institute of Paris. These cells are the last reserves of the body in its defense against the assault of disease. Whenever, in spite of all opposition, the hostile germs find access either to the blood or to the tissue, the white cells rush to the spot, and fall upon them and devour them.

In their fight against the hordes of evil bacteria that invade the blood, where the battles are waged, the body’s defenders have four main ways of battling. Again we quote from Dr. Ayers: “The blood covers some germs with a sticky paste, and makes them adhere to one another, thereby anchoring them so that they become as helpless as flies on fly paper. The paste comes from the liquid of the blood, the plasma. Another blood-weapon (the ‘lysins’) dissolves the germs as lye does. A third means of defense is the ability of the white blood corpuscles to envelop and digest the living germs. One white cell can digest dozens of germs, but it may mean death to the devouring cells.

The fourth and recently discovered weapon, or ammunition, of the blood is the opsonins. Wright and Douglas in London in 1903 coined the word, which comes from the Latin _opsono_: “I cook for the table,” “I prepare pabulum for.” This is precisely what the opsonins do in the blood. They manifest this beneficial activity when invading disease germs appear. They attract white blood cells to the germs and make the bacteria more eatable for the cells. They are appetizers for the white blood cells; or sauces, which help the white blood cells to eat more of the bacteria than they could do without this spur to their hunger. Wright and Douglas demonstrated beyond peradventure the ability of the white blood cells to eat a larger number of bacteria when the latter are soaked in opsonins. They also showed that this opsonic sauce, or appetizer, which stimulates the blessed hunger of the white blood cells for disease bacteria, could be artificially produced, and hypodermically introduced into a patient’s blood, thus increasing that blood’s power of defense by raising the quantity of opsonins. They also worked out a practical laboratory technique by means of

which the opsonins can be measured, or counted, with a considerable degree of exactitude, thereby making it possible to estimate within limits of accuracy any one's ability to resist bacterial invasions. If the blood is rich in opsonins, its power to fight disease is strong. Opsonins are now inoculated into the blood at several institutions, notably McGill University in Montreal, and at the Battle Creek Sanitarium.

HOW THE WHITE CELLS DO THEIR WORK

The process by which the white cells fight for us may be watched in the transparent tissue of a frog's foot or the wing of a bat. If a few disease germs are introduced into this tissue, the white cells may be seen to accumulate on the wall of the blood vessel just opposite where the germs have entered. "Each cell begins to push out a minute thread of its tissue," writes Dr. Kellogg, in describing the process, "thrusting it through the wall of its own blood vessel. Little by little the farther end of this delicate filament which has been pushed through the wall grows larger and larger, while the portion of the cell within the vessel lessens, and after a little time each cell is found outside the vessel, and yet no openings are left behind. Just how they accomplish this without leaving a gap behind them is one of the mysteries for which Science has for many years in vain sought a solution. The vessel wall remains as perfect as it was before. Apparently, each cell has made a minute opening and has then tucked itself through, as one might tuck a pocket handkerchief through a ring, invisibly closing up behind itself the opening made. Once outside the vessel, these wonderful body-defenders, moving here and there, quickly discover the germs and proceed at once to swallow them. If the germs are few in number, they may be in this way destroyed, for the white cells not only swallow germs, but digest them. If the number is very great, however, the cells sacrifice themselves in the effort to destroy the germs, taking in a larger number than they are able to digest and destroy. When this occurs, the germs continue to grow; more white cells make their way out of the blood vessels, and a fierce and often long-continued battle is waged between the living blood cells and the invading germs."

Now, it must be understood that this description is not the product of any one's imagination, but is a definitely established fact which has been studied by scientists all over the world. Because of the importance of the discovery, and of the new views of health to which it leads, we have placed a picture of this "battle of the blood" at the front of this book. It shows the leucocytes of the human body in conflict with the germs of influenza: the black dots being the germs, and the larger grayish bodies the leucocytes. We have chosen a photograph rather than a drawing, so that the reader may realize that he is seeing something which actually has existence. We request him to study the picture and fix it upon his mind, for it is not too much to say that from it is derived every principle of health which is set forth in the course of this book.

THE PROBLEM OF HEALTH

The human body is a complex and intricate organism, in some wonderful and entirely incomprehensible way integrating the activities of all these billions of other living organisms. Each and every one of these latter has its function to fulfill, and the life of the individual body is a life of health so long as the unity of all its organisms is maintained. Outside of the body are millions of hostile organisms assaulting it continuously; and the problem of health is the problem of enabling it to make headway against its enemies for as long a period as possible. Every act of a human being has its effect upon this battle; at every moment of your life you are either strengthening the power of your own organism or strengthening your enemies. Once the organism is unable to beat back its enemies, health begins to fail and death and complete disintegration is the ultimate result.

It must be understood that the peril of these hostile germs is not merely that they devour the substance upon which the body's own organisms have to be nourished. If that were all, they might remain in the body as parasites, and by taking additional nourishment a man might sustain life in spite of them. Nor is it even that they multiply with such enormous rapidity; the peril is that they throw off as the products of their own activity a number of poisons, which are as deadly to the human body as any known. These poisons are produced much more rapidly than they can be eliminated from the system, and so they fill the blood, and death ensues.

Thus the problem becomes clear. In the first place, what can we do to keep disease germs from securing entrance to the body; and second, what can we do to strengthen the body's army of defense so that the fate of any which do find entrance may be immediate destruction?

HEALTH, LIKE DISEASE, IS CATCHING

In actual practice it is found that the second problem is by far the more important one. Some germs we can avoid. If we boil all the water that we drink we will not be very apt to have typhoid. If we exterminate rats and mosquitoes and flies and fleas, we will not have yellow fever, or malaria, or plague. But we cannot hope to do this at present in the case of such diseases as, for instance,

consumption, grippe, and influenza. If we live in a city, we take into our lungs and throat millions of the germs of these diseases every day. Therefore the one hope that is left is to keep ourselves in such a condition of health that the army of our bodies shall be able to destroy these germs. When the blood is in a healthy condition, the white cells are numerous, powerful, and active, but when the blood flows stagnantly, or when it is impoverished, then the white cells are few and the forces of disease obtain a foothold.

Healthy men can go through many epidemics with impunity. Because the Japanese army was an army of healthy men, its death rate from those diseases which usually follow in the wake of all armies was lower than the world had ever known before. Robert Ingersoll once said that if he had been God and had made the world, he would have made health “catching,” and not disease. As a matter of fact, health is catching. It abounds in the very air we breathe, in the water we drink, in the movements of every muscle and the play of every fibre and nerve of the body; it comes from and is nourished by each and every one of the bodily actions and functions; while disease is only secured by persistent transgressions of the proper way of living, and by injurious habits and customs that result in lowering the “vital resistance.”

This vital resistance is the innate power of the body to keep itself strong; its very lifeforce. This is what we mean when we say that this or that person has “a good constitution,” or has “a weak constitution.” This is the capital in the bank of each individual life, placed there by Nature at the birth of that life, and increased or diminished by each and every action of our bodies, and also of our minds. As Rokitansky, the eminent German scientist, said, “Nature heals. This is the first and greatest law of therapeutics—one which we must never forget. Nature creates and maintains, therefore she must be able to heal.”

Many of the most notable discoveries and experiments of modern science concur in demonstrating that the natural and innate healing power of the body is man’s greatest resource in combating disease and maintaining health. It is the body itself which cures the sick man; his own vitality, and not the drug or medicants which he may take. These may assist the healing process, but they do not set going the healing processes themselves. More often, indeed, they are distinct detriments. They stamp out or banish the distressing symptoms of ailments, and thus in effect they silence the signal bells of danger which the body rings at the approach of disease.

Modern science has turned its forces upon this question of maintaining at its highest potentiality the ability of the body to resist disease. All the habits of the human race have been investigated in the light of this idea, and some have been found to be wise and others to be unwise. These conclusions, with the evidence therefor, are the subjects of our book.

OUR FOOD IS THE CHIEF FACTOR

It has been found that the most important problems connected with health are those of nutrition—the questions of what and when and how and how much food we ought to eat.

Every language under the sun contains a prayer somewhat similar to that which we have in the Anglo-Saxon tongue, “Give us this day our daily bread.” If we stop to think for a moment, we realize that next to the air we breathe, and the water we drink, our food is the most important consideration in the maintenance of life. All this is the veriest commonplace; yet the fact remains that it is very rarely indeed that we do stop to think upon the subject of our food. It is something that we take for granted, like life itself. In the regular routine of our days our meals become fixed habits, and the taking of food an almost involuntary custom. It requires some extraordinary event to arouse us to a just appreciation of the importance of knowledge on this subject. Or else the coming of one of the myriad forms of digestive diseases will serve the purpose of introducing the subject to our notice.

Our blood is made directly from what we eat, and that old Saxon proverb is true which says that every man has lain in his own trencher. Man is his food. Each human body is made by chemical action from its food. All our actions and all our thoughts come from what we eat, even as the movements of machinery proceed from the coal fed into the boilers of the engine which operate the machine. If we eat the right food, namely, the food which contains the elements our bodies require in the proper proportions, we repair all waste, replace broken down tissue and supply ourselves with physical and mental energy for our toils and joys in life; while if we eat the wrong foods we quickly injure our delicate though powerful physical and mental machinery.

All this would seem to be obvious; yet most people would grant that they have still much to learn concerning what really constitutes the best foods, and about the best ways of preparing, or making, or using those foods. Few of us possess anything more definite to guide us in our eating than the habits we acquired as children, or habits picked up in later life from following the example of our friends, or the food fashions of the day—for there are such things as fashions in foods and in the eating of foods, even as there are fashions in clothes and the making and wearing thereof. In this place it is proposed to study the subject of food from one standpoint,

namely, its effect upon the Battle of the Blood; its relation to the vital resistance of the body whereby health is maintained.

II

HOW TO EAT: THE GOSPEL OF DIETETICS ACCORDING TO HORACE FLETCHER

We shall first of all see what modern science has to tell us concerning the question of _how_ we ought to eat.

It may not seem possible that anything essential remains to be said at this late day on the subject of one of the commonest and decidedly most necessary of all human acts. That there should be knowledge of the utmost importance to learn regarding the actions and movements of the tongue, the teeth, and the jaws, may come with as much surprise to the majority of our readers as it did to us when we first hit upon this disturbing, but illuminating, fact.

The act of eating is the starting point of the long series of processes whereby our bodies are nourished. It is the only act of them all which lies within our control. We can directly supervise the work of our mouths; we can watch over the action of the teeth, and tongue, and palate; but we can not supervise the work of the stomach, or of the intestinal tube. Once we have swallowed our food, our mastery over it has ceased—except for some hit-or-miss participation in the further processes of its digestion by means of pills or potions. Realizing this, we come to recognize the basic importance of knowing the right way of eating.

THE STORY OF HORACE FLETCHER

This knowledge the world owes to Horace Fletcher, the American business man who has made many of the greatest physiologists of our times embark upon years-long series of experiments and inquiries into the problems of man’s nutrition. As a result, the text-books of physiology are now being rewritten; and as a further result, tens of thousands of men and women, among them some of the best known authors, physicians, clergymen, military men, and business men of both Europe and America, have been restored to health by the knowledge of how to eat their food.

[Illustration: MR. HORACE FLETCHER, Whose books on dietetics and good health were the forerunners of the present movement.]

This knowledge Mr. Fletcher gained at the very door of death, and in no more interesting and striking fashion could the importance of it be shown than by the relation of his remarkable case.

At the age of forty-five, after a varied and adventurous career, as miner, and explorer, and sailor, and hunter, Mr. Fletcher had won wealth, and retired from his business in order to devote himself to long-cherished interests in art and philosophy. He was still comparatively young, he was a member of many clubs, he had warm friends in all the capitals and countrysides of the world (Mr. Fletcher being one of the most untiring of globe-trotters), and in all ways except one he was equipped and ready for a long life of ease and enjoyment.

The one way in which he was not equipped was—in health.

HOW A STRONG MAN BROKE DOWN

Once he had been a man of robust physique, a champion gymnast and athlete; he had been president of the far-famed Olympic Club in San Francisco (which he founded, and where the pugilist Corbett was discovered), and had won plaudits even from famous professionals for his prowess with the gloves.

But he had overdrawn his account at the bank of life. He had expended more vital resistance than he had stored up; to such an extent, indeed, that when Mr. Fletcher went to the insurance companies at the time he retired from business he was rejected by them all; he was obese; he was suffering from three chronic diseases, and he was dying fast. Such was the verdict given by the skilled and experienced medical examiners of the life insurance companies. And instead of entering upon a long life of ease and enjoyment, he was thus condemned, seemingly, to a short life of invalidism and suffering.

FIGHTING FOR LIFE

But Mr. Fletcher declined to accept any such decision as that. He decided that he would regain his health—not that he would _try_ to regain his health, but that he _would_ regain his health.

He first turned to the physicians. Possessed of wealth, he was able to secure the services of many of the most able specialists of the world. He visited the most celebrated “cures” and “springs” and sanitariums of Europe and America. Nothing availed. He found passing relief now and then, but no permanent good. He gained no health, in other words, but obtained merely temporary abatement of this or of that disease.

Then he turned to himself. He began the study of his own case. As he attributed most of his bodily woes to faulty habits of eating, the subject of nutrition became uppermost in his studies. He was, coincidentally, deeply immersed and interested in the study of practical philosophy; and in a very remarkable fashion these two subjects, these two interests, nutrition and practical philosophy, became fused into one subject, supplementing and completing each other and jointly forming the burden of the message of Hope, of the tidings of great joy, which it became the mission of Horace Fletcher to deliver to mankind.

MR. FLETCHER’S DISCOVERY

He discovered, or rather rediscovered, and applied, two great and simple truths:

First, that the complete chewing of all food, both liquid and solid, whereby a process of involuntary swallowing is established, foods being selected in accordance with individual tastes, is by far the most important and most necessary part of human nutrition. It is the key that unlocks the door of health, and opens the way to the real hygienic life.

Second, that nothing poisons the body, and aids the forces of disease, more than worry—which Mr. Fletcher has named Fearthought. It is our nature to look forward, to anticipate. We can anticipate in two ways—anticipate evil, or anticipate good. The first way is to use fearthought; the second way is to use forethought. Forethought will produce cheerfulness and health, even as unspoiled rose seeds will produce roses. Fearthought will produce disease and trouble, even as the germs of putrefaction will produce sickness and death.

So great an authority in philosophy and psychology as William James has given the sanction of his use to Mr. Fletcher’s phrases; and has also named him as a shining example of those exceptional men who find in some mental idea a key to unlock reservoirs of hidden and unsuspected energy. While there is no doubting the fact that Horace Fletcher is decidedly an exceptional man, yet the records prove that his key is not merely for the use of exceptional people, but that it is one susceptible of being used by everybody possessing willpower enough to enable them to say “yes” when offered something good.

Like other great discoveries, Mr. Fletcher’s discovery of the right way to eat came partly as an accident. Happening to be in Chicago at a time when his friends were all away, and being forced to stay in the city, he took to lingering over his meals in order to pass away the time. He began to taste every spoonful of soup, to sip every mouthful of anything liquid, with great deliberation, noting the different tastes and searching out new flavors.

He chewed each morsel of meat or bread or fruit or vegetable until, instead of being gulped down, it was drawn in easily by the throat. And in this manner did he stumble upon his pathway to deliverance. He had not been “toying” with his food—as he then considered he was doing—for more than a few weeks before he noticed that he was losing a great deal of superfluous fat, that he was eating less, but with far greater enjoyment, than ever before in his life, that his taste for simpler foods increased as his taste for highly seasoned and complex dishes decreased, and that he was feeling better both physically and mentally than he had felt in many years.

THE MAGIC OF MASTICATION

What did these things mean? Some hidden virtue in the food he was eating? Some hitherto quite unsuspected tonic in the smoke of Chicago? Or a lesson in health furnished by the “how” of his eating? At this point there flashed through Mr. Fletcher’s memory the story of Gladstone’s advice to his children to chew each morsel of food thirty-two times (once for each tooth in their heads) if they would preserve their health. In that moment, Mr. Fletcher began his investigation of the many processes that go to make up the simple act of mastication, an investigation which has now been going on for more than ten years, and which has resulted in directing public attention to the supremely important subject of nutrition with more emphasis, and in the arousing of more general interest and the production of more telling effect than any other circumstance or event has done in the history of physiologic science. The word “Fletcherizing” was first applied by Dr. J. H. Kellogg, of Battle Creek, after the analogy of “pasteurizing,” in describing the act of mastication as recommended by Mr. Fletcher. “Fletcherism,” as Mr. Fletcher’s system of mental science and of physical culture through mastication has come to be known, after first being for years a stock jest of the newspaper funnyman, has

now been recognized, even by those scientists who detest all “isms,” as a most valuable bridge from the land of bad food habits and disease to the land of good food habits and health.

The bridge certainly afforded its builder a passage from one region to the other. Following a constant improvement in his general condition, beginning almost simultaneously with the adoption of his new way of life, Mr. Fletcher is to-day one of the strongest and most enduring men alive. Tests of his strength and endurance made at the Yale gymnasium at different times prove beyond a doubt that this is so. The following is a quotation from the report of Dr. William G. Anderson, director of the Yale Gymnasium:

DR. ANDERSON’S REPORT

“In February, 1903, I gave to Mr. Horace Fletcher the exercises used by the ‘Varsity’ crew. He went through these movements with ease and showed no ill effects afterwards. At that time Mr. Fletcher weighed 157½ pounds, and was in his fifty-fifth year. On June 11, 1907, Mr. Fletcher again visited the Yale Gymnasium and underwent a test on Professor Fisher’s dynamometer. This device is made to test the endurance of the calf muscles.

“The subject makes a dead lift of a prescribed weight as many times as possible. In order to select a definite weight, the subject first ascertains his strength on the Kellogg mercurial dynamometer by one strong, steady contraction of the muscles named—and then he finds his endurance by lifting three-fourths of this weight on the Fisher dynamometer as many times as possible at two or three second intervals. One leg only is used in the lift, and as indicated, the right is usually chosen.

“Mr. Fletcher’s actual strength as indicated on the Kellogg machine was not quite four hundred pounds, ascertained by three trials. In his endurance test on the Fisher machine he raised three hundred pounds three hundred and fifty times and then did not reach the limit of his power.

“Previous to this time, Dr. Frank Born, the medical assistant at the Gymnasium, had collected data from eighteen Yale students, most of whom were trained athletes or gymnasts. The average record of these men was 87.4 lifts, the extremes being 33 and 175 lifts.

[Illustration: MR. HORACE FLETCHER Making a World’s Record on the Dynamometer without previous training. Dr. William G. Anderson, Director of the Yale Gymnasium, in the Background.]

“You will notice that Mr. Fletcher _doubled_ the best record made previous to his feat, and numerous subsequent tests failed to increase the average of Mr. Fletcher’s competitors. Mr. Fletcher informs me that he had done no training nor had he taken any strenuous exercise since February, 1907. On two occasions only during the past year he reports having done hard work in emergencies; once while following Major-General Wood in the Philippines in climbing a volcanic mountain through a tropical jungle on an island near Mindanao for nine hours; and once wading through deep snow in the Himalayan Mountains, some three miles one day and seven miles the next day, in about as many hours. This last emergency experience came through being caught in a blizzard near Murree, in Northern India, at 8500 feet elevation, on the way to the vale of Kashmir. These two trials represented climatic extremes, and Mr. Fletcher states that neither the heat nor the cold gave him discomfort, a significant fact in estimating physical condition.

“Before the trial on the Fisher machine, the subject’s pulse was normal (about 72); afterwards it ran 120 beats to the minute. Five minutes later it had fallen to 112. No later reading was taken that day.

“The hands did not tremble more than usual under resting conditions, as Mr. Fletcher was able to hold in either hand immediately after the test a glass brimming with water without spilling a drop. The face was flushed, perspiration moderate, heart action regular and control of the right foot and leg used in the test normal immediately following the feat. I consider this a remarkable showing for a man in his fifty-ninth year; 5 feet, 6½ inches in height, weighing 177½ pounds and not in training.”

In order to make a more thorough test of Mr. Fletcher’s power of endurance under varying degrees of physical strain, he underwent on the 17th, 18th, 19th, 21st and 22nd of June, 1907, a number of other exceedingly severe tests, of which Dr. Anderson says: “After each test the respiration and heart action, while active, were healthy, and, under such conditions, normal.

“There was not the slightest evidence of soreness, stiffness or muscular fatigue either during or after the six days of the trials. Mr. Fletcher made no apparent effort to conceal any evidence of strain or overwork and did not show any. He informs me that he felt no distress whatever at any time. Should any one wish to become more familiar with the strenuousness of the movements selected, let him try them. The effort will be more convincing than any report.

“During the thirty-five years of my own experience in physical training and teaching, I have never tested a man who equalled Mr. Fletcher’s record.

“The later tests, given in June, 1907, were more taxing than those given in 1903, but Mr. Fletcher underwent the trials with more apparent ease than he did four years ago.

“What seems to me to be the most remarkable feature of Mr. Fletcher’s test is that a man nearing sixty years of age should show progressive improvement of muscular quality merely as the result of dietetic care and with no systematic physical training. The method of dietetic care, too, as given by Mr. Fletcher, is so unusual that the results seem all the more extraordinary. He tells me that during the four and a half years intervening between the first and the recent examinations he has been guided in his choice of foods and in the quality also, entirely by his appetite, avoiding as much as possible any preconceived ideas as to the values of different foods or the proportions of the chemical constituents of the nourishment taken.

“During this four year period he has more than ever catered to his body nourishment in subservience to instinctive demand. He has especially avoided eating until appetite has strongly demanded food, and has abstained from eating whenever he could not do so in comfort and enjoyment. Mastication of solid food and sipping of liquids having taste to the point of involuntary swallowing, according to his well-known theory of thoroughness in this regard, has also been faithfully followed.

“There is a pretty good evidence that taking food as Mr. Fletcher practices and recommends limits the amount ingested to the bodily need of the moment and of the day, leaving little or no excess material to be disposed of by bacterial agency. This might account for the absence of toxic products in the circulation to depress the tissue.

“The possible immunity from lasting fatigue and from any muscular soreness, resulting from the unaccustomed use, and even the severe use, of untrained muscles is of utmost importance to physical efficiency.

“My own personal observance and trial of Mr. Fletcher’s method of attaining his surprising efficiency, strengthened by my observation of the test-subjects of Professors Chittenden and Fisher who have come under my care meantime, lead me to endorse the method as not only practical but agreeable. As Mr. Fletcher states, both the mental and mechanical factors in selecting and ingesting food are important, the natural result of the care being a wealth of energy for expression in physical exercise.”

FLETCHERISM

So much for Horace Fletcher’s own case.

Yet when he first announced his discovery, his own family laughed at him, and the medical world called him crank. But by quiet, sane, persistent work—by applying to the propaganda of his idea the same methods that had brought him success in business, he succeeded in impressing the scientific world with the value of his method.

An extensive literature has grown up around Mr. Fletcher’s own books. The most important medical bodies in Europe and America have invited him to lecture before them. Hospitals in larger cities have printed his own code of the rules of mastication for distribution. And no large sheet of paper was required, for the whole system could be printed on a postal card, and room would be left for a picture of its author.

Why is complete mastication the best way of eating? Why does its practice lead to recovery of lost health, or increase of health; to increase of strength, to increase of endurance. Is it not a very tedious method, and thus of more trouble than its promised benefits are worth? Does it not waste time? Does it not lead to loss of enjoyment of food?

These are a few of the questions which a discussion of Fletcherism invariably arouses. We speak with a deep conviction of truth when we say that Fletcherism leads to saving of time, instead of loss of time; that it brings increase of sensuous enjoyment of food instead of decrease of it; and that if it is tedious or a bore, then it is not Fletcherizing. The very essence of Fletcherism is the dropping of worry, the elimination of stress and strain. If you do as Fletcher says, instead of doing as somebody says that Fletcher says, you will chew for taste, and not for time; you will take a crust of bread, or a morsel of potato, for instance, into your mouth and roll it with your tongue, and press it against the roof of your mouth, and pass it to and fro, and crunch it, and crush it; and all the while you will not be counting the chews, nor even thinking about chewing, but on the contrary you will be thinking of the taste of the morsel, and seeking that taste—and finding it.

Yes, finding it, even in a crust of bread or in a morsel of potato, in those humble foods which the most of us seem to take more as matters of habit; for by giving the saliva in the mouth a chance to fulfill the work for which it is put in our mouths by nature, we find that the starch in the bread and in the potato is turned into a sweet, toothsome and partly digested morsel of sugar.

Here is a point that answers another of the questions which arose a paragraph or so back. This turning of the starch in bread into sugar by the action of saliva is only one of the numerous acts of digestion which is accomplished in the mouth by the teeth, the tongue, the palate, and the various kinds of juices, or saliva, which are in the mouth. Horace Fletcher pointed out, and medical science now confirms his assertions, that many of the most important parts of the digestive process are meant by nature to be carried out in the first three inches of the alimentary canal. And this is the only place in all the thirty feet or so of the alimentary canal where digestion is in our own control. If we bolt or insufficiently masticate our food, these mouth processes of digestion are simply not accomplished; and for this the whole system suffers sooner or later. The stomach and the intestines are called on to do a great deal of extra work, and much of this extra work is of a kind which they are unable to do. Consequently, what food can not be digested must decompose in the intestines, with the consequent production of poisonous fluids and gases which permeate the body. The whole machinery of digestion is thrown out of gear. All the various germs of disease race to be first to enter the disarranged mechanism, as criminals rush to a city that is in disorder. The blood not being as well nourished as it should be, the white army of the soldiers of the body begin to weaken and to die, and the forces of disease penetrate through their warding lines and attack the fort of life from many sides, or else concentrate their strength in the form of some virulent sickness.

Thorough mastication, on the other hand, means the reverse of these conditions. Almost incredible seem the hundreds of stories which we personally know to be true of men and women who have used Mr. Fletcher's method as a means to enter the land of good health. In the opinion of Dr. Kellogg of Battle Creek, "There is no doubt that thorough mastication of food solves more therapeutic problems than any other thing that can be mentioned. It solves the whole question of the right combination of foods; solves the question of the quantity of foods, and the quality of foods, after one has got his appetite trained, his natural instinct trained; and when it comes to certain diseases like acidity of the stomach, hyper-acidity or hypo-acidity, dilation of the stomach or cirrhosis of the liver, or any other trouble with the digestive organs, if it does not effect a radical cure it makes it possible to tolerate a condition which otherwise would be deadly in a short time. It makes it possible for a patient to live a long time, enjoying comfortable health, where otherwise he would be crippled so that he could not live long at all."

Although we insist upon the fact that Fletcherism is simple, and easy, too, once you have really begun its proper use, yet we also know that there are many difficulties which the average man or woman has to face at the outset. Professor Fisher encountered these difficulties when experimenting with his students at Yale, and we are indebted to him for enumerating some of them. And these difficulties, like the habit of hasty eating itself, are products of our civilization.

We mean such difficulties as, first, _conventionality_, or the desire to eat what others eat, and the unwillingness to appear different; _politeness_, the desire to please one's host, or hostess, and eat "what's set before you," or to eat something which you know you don't want or which you know is bad for you, because you fear to offend somebody or other who has cooked it, or bought it for you; _food notions_, or the opinion that certain foods are "wholesome," and that certain foods should be avoided as injurious even if delicious to the taste; _narrowness of choice_, as at a boarding house table (and a great number of home tables!) which often supplies what is not wanted and withholds what is; and, lastly, habit, by which the particular kinds and amounts of food which have become customary through the action and interaction of the causes previously named, are repeated day after day, without thought.

"Habit hunger" is another of our handicaps. Habit hunger is said by Mr. Fletcher to be responsible for a vast deal of overeating. He refers to the fact that when we are children we eat at least one-third more proteid or tissue-building foods, in proportion to our size, than we require as adults, for the reason that our growing frames must then be nourished and upbuilt; but when we reach the adult stage we are apt to maintain this excessive consumption of proteid food—and proteid, as we shall see later on, is the chief source of dietary ills.

These are some of the difficulties to be encountered by the person who sets out upon the road to health. But they are very slight barriers, indeed, to the person possessed of willpower, and when the benefits and pleasures to be gained are so enormously in excess of the few initiatory troubles, it is not to be wondered at that more than a million persons in England and America are already following Horace Fletcher's system in whole or in part.

HOW CHEWING STIMULATES DIGESTION

Certain remarkable experiments conducted by Rogers, Metchnikoff, and Pawlow in Europe, and by Cannon and Kellogg in America, have thrown a new and interesting light upon the ideas of Fletcher; proving that the act of chewing the food gives to the nerves that control the digestive fluids an opportunity to assay the food, to test it and select for it the particular kind of digestive fluid which that particular kind of food requires. It appears that there are many different kinds of saliva, and each one of these kinds has a particular kind of work to do, which no other kind is able to do. Metchnikoff has shown that if one takes cane sugar into the mouth with or without other food, there is manufactured by the salivary glands a certain peculiar fluid which digests cane sugar. If the cane sugar is not taken into the mouth, then that substance is not made. The saliva that flows into the mouth when there is food there but no cane sugar with the food, will not digest cane sugar. So it readily can be seen that if cane sugar should be hastily swallowed, it is much less likely to be properly digested. And this holds good with nearly all other kinds of food.

THE “FOOD FILTER”

“But how is a person to know when he has chewed a mouthful long enough?” the reader asks. Mr. Fletcher answers that nature has provided us with a food filter—an automatic safety device. Professor Hubert Higgins, formerly demonstrator of anatomy at Cambridge University in England, and Professor Hasheby of Brussels, Belgium, have lately conducted a series of experiments which throw light on this question on its scientific side. At the back of the tongue there are a number of little knobs, which are really taste buds, or apparatus for the tasting of food. During the time that mastication is going on, the mouth is closed and is completely air tight, and germproof. This fact one can readily demonstrate by filling out the lips with air. The mouth is full of air, yet one can breathe behind this curtain of air, showing that the mouth is thoroughly cut off. This is what happens during mastication, for of course one should masticate with the lips closed. Now, when the food has become sufficiently ensalivated, or mixed up, the circumvallate papillæ at the back of the throat, where the taste buds are, relax, and behind that the soft palate forms a negative pressure. This soft palate is muscled just as it is in the horse—which is an animal that masticates, but is not found in the dog, which is an animal that bolts its food. Whenever the food is ready for the body, the soft palate relaxes, and is sucked back, and the swallowing of a mouthful of the prepared food takes place involuntarily.

The body is thus supplied with as perfect a protection as could be devised, and perfectly automatic; all that is necessary being that one should masticate the food until it naturally disappears. One must not attempt to keep the food too long in the mouth, but let it have its own course. There are some sorts of food which, when one has chewed them three or four times, are sucked up, showing that they have received all the mouth treatment that nature requires they should. With other foods one can masticate up to one hundred and fifty times, and still they are not sucked up.

This food filter is a perfectly instinctive apparatus; but as people have acquired the habit of flavoring foods with artificial sauces and relishes, most of them have spoiled this protective device. In the words of Mr. Fletcher himself: “This is a gift of Nature to man which we have been neglecting. It is not a gift which has been given to me and a few others alone. I think everybody could acquire the use of it if they would give Nature a chance by eating slowly, by eating with a sense of enjoyment, and by never eating save when they are really hungry and in a mood to enjoy the food.”

III

THE YALE EXPERIMENTS

At Yale University, Professor Russell H. Chittenden, Director of the Sheffield Scientific School, Lafayette B. Mendel, Professor of Physiological Chemistry, and Irving Fisher, Professor of Political Economy, have carried on a long series of experiments, begun six years ago as a test of the claims made by Fletcher. The net results of these experiments up to date (for they are still in progress) may be put into a nutshell. The following statement was drawn up by one of the writers of this book and submitted to Professors Chittenden and Fisher, who have accepted it as a summary of their present views:

“The commonly accepted standards which claim to tell the quantity of food needed each day by the average man are based upon many careful observations of what men actually do eat.

“We challenge these standards, however, as the exact science of to-day cannot accept as authority common customs and habits in any attempt to ascertain the right principles of man’s nutrition, since experiments have demonstrated how readily one set of habits may be substituted for another and how easily wrong habits become hardened into laws. The evidence presented by observers of common customs, while they must be duly considered, cannot, therefore, be taken as proof that these habits and customs are in

accord with the true physiological needs of the body.

“We believe that the following propositions have been demonstrated as truths by the experiments we have made at Yale.

“People in general eat and drink too much.

“Especially do they eat too much meat, fish and eggs.

“This is so because meat, fish and eggs are the principal proteid-containing foodstuffs.

[Illustration: PROF. RUSSELL H. CHITTENDEN, PH.D., LL.D., SC.D., Director Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University. He has conducted many dietary experiments from the physiologist’s point of view.]

“Proteid is an essential food element, absolutely necessary for the upbuilding of tissue, for the maintenance of life. It is one of three main elements into which all foodstuffs may be divided—the others being Carbohydrates (the sugars and starches) and Fat. While it is indispensable, it is also the element which the body machinery finds most difficult to dispose of. Proteid is ‘nitrogenous.’ Nitrogen is never wholly consumed in the body furnace as fats, sugars and starches are. There is always solid matter left unconsumed, like clinkers in a furnace; which clinkers the kidneys and liver have to labor to dispose of. If the clinkers are produced in excess of the ability of these organs to handle them without undue wear and tear, damage of a serious, and sometimes permanent, nature follows. The ideal amount of proteid is the amount which will give the body all of that substance which it needs without entailing excessive work upon the body machinery.

“Excessive consumption of proteid foodstuffs—like meat, fish and eggs—is the greatest evil affecting man’s nutrition. The excess of proteid not only remains unburned in the bodily furnace, but this waste matter very often decays in the body, forming a culture bed for germs which effect the whole system, a condition scientifically known as autointoxication, or self-poisoning of the body through the action of the germs of putrefaction, and of other germs, which are bred in the colon, or large intestine. The researches of Metchnikoff, Bouchard, Tissier, Combe, and other eminent scientists, have shown that autointoxication is the source of a great number of the most serious chronic diseases which afflict mankind.

“We say, then, that the existing dietary standards place in all cases the minimum of proteid necessary for the average man’s daily consumption at far too high a figure. It may be safely said that it is placed twice as high as careful and repeated experiments show to be really necessary.

“There can be little doubt that the habit of excessive eating and drinking, combined with the habit of too hasty eating and drinking, especially of meat, fish and eggs, are probably the most prolific sources of many bodily disabilities affecting men and women, and are consequently the greatest deterrents to the attaining by men and women of a high grade of efficiency in work, of better health, of greater happiness, and of longer life.

“We believe that it has been demonstrated as a fact that health can be bettered, endurance increased, and life lengthened, by cutting down the commonly accepted standards of how much meat, eggs, fish and other proteid food we should eat and drink by about one-half.”

* * * * *

After Horace Fletcher had attracted the notice of the scientific world in 1902, Professor Chittenden invited him to become the subject of a series of experiments at Yale, where the Sheffield Scientific School possessed an equipment suitable for an elaborate inquiry of this kind much superior to any to be found in Europe.

FLETCHER’S CLAIMS SUPPORTED

Professor Chittenden first made certain, by experiments which precluded any chance of error, that Horace Fletcher’s claims were justified so far as Horace Fletcher himself was concerned. But this, of course, by no means solved the problem. Mr. Fletcher might simply be a physiological curiosity—a digestive freak—of whom there are many known cases. He lived and thrived on an amount of proteid food startlingly less than was deemed necessary by all existing standards, but this could not be taken as proof that people in general could do likewise. Only an exhaustive series of tests on a large number of people of varying ages and conditions of life could prove this. Professor Chittenden resolved to make these tests.

At the very outset, however, he faced this difficulty. If Mr. Fletcher's was merely a freak case, there would be a grave danger in putting other men upon his dietary. Mr. Fletcher was flourishing on a daily consumption of proteid foodstuffs amounting to an average of only 45 grams, and the fat, sugar and starch consumed by him were in quantities only sufficient to bring the total food value of the daily food up to a little more than 1600 "calories," or units of fuel energy. The Voit standard—which is the typical one, the one most commonly accepted, and which is based upon thousands of studies of what men and women actually eat—demands that the average man shall eat at least 118 grams of proteid, with a total fuel value of 3000 large "calories" for the daily ration.

To make clear to the non-scientific reader just what quantity of foodstuffs is represented by 50 grams of proteid, which is 5 grams more than that consumed daily by Mr. Fletcher in his tests, and is approximately the amount consumed daily by other men in the Yale experiments, it may be said that 50 grams is about equal to 772 grains, which are equal to about 1¾ ounces. This quantity would be represented by the proteid contents of 9½ ounces of lean meat, or 7 eggs, or 27 ounces of white bread. Nine and one-half ounces of meat (using comparisons furnished by Dr. Edward Curtis) is about the weight of a slice measuring 7 by 3 inches and cut ¼ of an inch thick. Twenty-seven ounces of bread represent somewhat less than two loaves, the standard loaf weighing one pound (16 ounces). Of course, few people ever eat 7 eggs, or 2 loaves of bread in a day; but the vast majority of people in America do eat a great deal more proteid than would be represented by 7 eggs, or 2 loaves of bread or a slice of meat of the size named, since proteid is found in a great number of other foodstuffs besides those mentioned.

CHITTENDEN'S EXPERIMENTS ON HIMSELF

Professor Chittenden realized that to ask a number of men to subsist on a ration similar to that which nourished Mr. Fletcher might possibly result in seriously weakening their constitutions. This is the problem which has often confronted other scientists, and Professor Chittenden solved it in a way characteristic of the true scientist—the devoted warrior in humanity's cause who wages warfare against the forces of evil. He began his experiments upon himself.

The result rewarded his self-sacrificing spirit; for within a few months a severe case of muscular rheumatism (which had plagued him for years, refusing to yield to treatment) disappeared; and with it went a recurrent bilious headache. And it may be stated that these have never returned. Professor Chittenden has adopted as a habit of life the dietary which he began as an experiment five years ago. At that time he was a hearty eater of three meals a day, meals rich in meat and other proteid foodstuffs.

THE OTHER CHITTENDEN TESTS

Professor Chittenden then began experiments with a group of university professors and instructors, with a group of thirteen enlisted men of the army, and a group of eight college athletes in training. All three of these groups of men were subjected to careful laboratory observations for continuous periods of many months, during which the proteid ration was reduced from one-half to one-third what had been customary. The professors and athletes followed their customary vocations during the period of observations, while to the ordinary drills of the soldiers were added severe gymnasium work under the supervision of Dr. Anderson.

Results were as follows: The subjects usually lost some weight, especially such as were fat. But it was found that having got down to a new standard, they held this steadily. They all maintained muscular and nervous vigor. Careful tests determined that the soldiers and athletes positively gained in muscular strength. All kept in good health; and many got rid of illnesses with which they had been suffering in the beginning. Appetite was thoroughly satisfied; and quite a number of the subjects permanently adopted the new method of living. Nine of the soldiers went in a body to a new station, and from thence they afterwards wrote, through one of their number, to Professor Chittenden, saying: "The men are in first-class condition as regards their physical condition, and all of them feeling well. We eat little meat now as a rule and would willingly go on another test."

At the beginning of the experiments these soldiers were subsisting on a daily ration which allows one and one-quarter pounds of meat per day apiece; and toward the end of the experiments they were subsisting and increasing their strength on a daily ration of meat equivalent to about one small chop or less!

These experiments constituted the first series made by Professor Chittenden. He later carried through a series with dogs: prior experiments having supported the view that the dog, a typical high proteid-consuming animal, declined or died when forced to subsist on quantities of proteid less than the amount ordinarily consumed. Professor Chittenden, however, challenged here the methods, as well as the results, of previous investigators. In previous experiments with dogs the animals had been invariably handicapped by being confined in dark and dismal quarters, too cramped to permit of exercise, and at times unsanitary in condition. He reversed these conditions—and reversed the results. His dogs lived and thrived on a diet far less rich in proteid than former

investigators deemed necessary.

PROFESSOR CHITTENDEN'S CONCLUSIONS

Summing up the conclusions reached by him after arduous years of experiment and study, Professor Chittenden declares that 60 grams of proteid (about the quantity which a single small chop would supply) are all that are required by the average man of 150 pounds body weight. This is one-half the Voit standard, and far below the common practices of the majority of mankind in Europe and America.

"But there should be no practical use of the terms 'standard diets' and 'normal diets' by people in general," says Professor Chittenden. "What is needed to-day is not so much an acceptance of the view that man needs so many grams of proteid per kilogram of body weight, as a full appreciation of the general principle that the requirements of the body for proteid food are far less than the common customs of mankind, and that there are both economy and gain in following this principle in practice."

HOW TO INCREASE ENDURANCE

The most broadly interesting of these Yale food experiments are those having to do with the question of endurance. The vast majority of people are not ambitious to excel as athletes; they find better and more enjoyable forms of work in life than putting up big dumb-bells, or breaking records on the athletic field. Of course, everybody wants to be strong, and to have well-trained and active muscles; but on the whole, what the majority of people need is physical and mental stick-to-itiveness—the ability to work without deterioration, without running down like worn-out machinery. Professional men, day laborers, students and athletes, all need this invaluable quality of endurance—this quality that is the true capital in the bank of life to be at their command day in and day out, with a reserve ready to be drawn upon whenever an emergency arises. And it is precisely here that the new art of health bestows its benefits upon those who follow it.

It was to ascertain the relation between diet and endurance in the light of the new knowledge shed upon the subject by Professor Chittenden's experiments, that Professor Irving Fisher inaugurated his own experiments at Yale University. He conducted two series of tests, as follows:

First, to ascertain the effect of thorough mastication on endurance, following the rules laid down by Horace Fletcher, with the help of nine healthy students.

Second, to ascertain the influence of flesh eating on endurance as compared with the effect of abstinence from flesh, with a group of forty-nine persons, splitting the group as follows,—first, athletes accustomed to a flesh, or high proteid dietary; second, athletes accustomed to a low proteid, or non-flesh dietary; third, sedentary persons accustomed to a low proteid, or non-flesh dietary.

[Illustration: PROF. IRVING FISHER, PH.D., Professor of Economics at Yale University. His investigations have had to do largely with the cost of necessary food.]

The flesh-eaters were Yale men, including some of the best known athletes of the university. The abstainers were nurses and physicians attached to the Battle Creek Sanitarium.

Professor Fisher's interest in the subject was that of a political economist. Meats, as a general rule, are the most expensive part of the national diet, and it is apparent that if a fleshless, or low proteid, diet will increase endurance, it will also increase the national earning capacity, and thus add to the national wealth. When Professor Fisher began his experiments he encountered a singular fact, which was that the science of physiology had given very little attention to the study of endurance. "That strength and endurance are not identical, is only partly recognized," he writes. "The strength of the muscle is measured by the utmost force that it can exert once; its endurance, by the number of times it can repeat any exertion within its strength. The repetition of such exertion, if not stopped by the refusal of the will, is finally stopped by the reduction of the strength of the muscle till it is unable to perform further. Thus endurance may be expressed in terms of loss of strength. It is related to fatigue, and it is only through the study of fatigue and fatigue poisons, made by Mosso and others, that light has been thrown on the nature of endurance."

When these tests were held Professor Fisher had not then invented the machine for registering endurance which is now in use in the Yale gymnasium; therefore, three simple tests were employed: first, holding the arms horizontal as long as possible; second, deep knee bending; third, leg raising with the subject lying on his back.

VICTORY FOR THE LOW PROTEID DIET

The results of the competitive tests were all in favor of the flesh-abstaining athletes. In the first test, which was holding the arms horizontal, only two of the fifteen flesh-eaters succeeded in holding their arms out over a quarter of an hour; whereas twenty-two of the thirty-two abstainers surpassed that limit. None of the flesh-eaters reached half an hour, but fifteen of the thirty-two abstainers exceeded that limit. Of these, nine exceeded one hour, four exceeded two hours, and one exceeded three hours, the last going exactly two hundred minutes, or three hours and twenty minutes.

In the leg raising test the record showed little difference. None of the abstainers reached their absolute limits. The highest record for the abstainers was one thousand times. A flesh-eater reached one thousand, three hundred and two, but did so after the one-thousand mark had already been set for him by an abstainer, and he went into the test with the expressed intention of defeating his rival. Professor Fisher states that it was evident from his fatigue at the end of the test that he could not have repeated the performance on the next day, as did his flesh-abstaining rival.

In respect to deep-knee bending, Professor Fisher pointed out that of the nine flesh-eaters who went into this contest, only three went above three hundred and twenty-five times, while of the abstainers, seventeen surpassed this figure. Only nine of the flesh-eaters reached one thousand, as against six of the twenty-two abstainers. None of the flesh-eaters surpassed two thousand, while two of the abstainers did. One abstainer, an athlete, S. A. Oberg, did two thousand and four hundred dips or deep knee bends, almost doubling the highest figure set by the flesh-eating athlete, which was one thousand, two hundred and ninety-two. Most of the Yale flesh-eating athletes were so severely crippled by their efforts in this particular set of movements that Professor Fisher resolved not to employ them again, and went to work on his device for mechanically registering endurance. One of the Yale athletes, who in the deep-knee bending test had reached five hundred times, fainted. Several had to be carried down the gymnasium stairs, and others were made so stiff and sore that for days they could not walk up and down stairs with comfort, while in the case of the abstainers from flesh foods there were comparatively little painful after-effects. Two of the abstainers, one a Yale athlete, were almost free from physical after-effects. The Yale man ran on the track of the gymnasium after his performance, and took a long walk afterward; while the other athlete, Oberg, a Sanitarium nurse, who made the highest record of all, two thousand four hundred times, continued his duties and found little annoyance from stiffness or soreness. (Another flesh-abstaining athlete, John E. Granger, of Battle Creek Sanitarium, has since made a new record of five thousand and two dips in two hours and nineteen minutes.)

Professor Fisher tried many means to stimulate the flesh-eating athletes to do their very best. He called upon their “Yale spirit” to rally to their aid, and he states that the advantage of rivalry as between the flesh-eaters and the abstainers was decidedly upon the side of the flesh-eaters, for their tests, with two exceptions, came after all the records of the abstainers had been completed. The Yale men felt that their tests would go on record as tests of Yale athletes, and Professor Fisher states that the “Yale spirit” which aided them appeared to be as great a stimulus as any “vegetarian” spirit could possibly be.

THE RESULT OF THE MASTICATION TEST

As to the experiment with the nine healthy students, Professor Fisher says:

“The results of the experiment demonstrated so great an increase of endurance as to seem at first incredible. It certainly was a surprise, both to the men and to me. But statistics which I have been collecting during the last two years have prepared me to find great differences and changes in endurance. The special result of the present experiment is to show that diet is an important factor in producing such alterations. The fact that endurance, even among persons free from disease, is one of the most variable of human faculties—far more variable than strength, for instance—is evident to any one who has made even a superficial examination. Some persons are tired by climbing a flight of stairs, whereas the Swiss guides, throughout the summer season, day after day spend their entire time in climbing the Matterhorn and other peaks; some persons are “winded” by running a block for a street car, whereas a Chinese coolie will run for hours on end; in mental work, some persons are unable to apply themselves more than an hour at a time, whereas others, like Humboldt, can work almost continuously through eighteen hours of the day.

[Illustration: MR. JOHN E. GRANGER BREAKING THE WORLD’S RECORD FOR DEEP KNEE BENDING. The spectator at the extreme right is Mr. Alonzo A. Stagg, coach of the Chicago University football team. Mr. Michael Williams is between the two.]

“It is, to say the least, remarkable that hitherto so little effort has been directed toward discovering the factors which explain such differences in endurance. That exercise is one of the most and perhaps the most important factor has long been recognized. A correspondent assures me that by means of moderate _regular_ exercise he succeeded in increasing his endurance between 100

and 200% in three weeks as measured by leg-raising and “dipping.” The influence of diet has always been regarded as small or negligible, and the opinion has almost been universal, until recently, that a diet rich in proteid promotes endurance. Even among those whose researches have led them to the opposite conclusion, there is very little conception of the extent to which diet is correlated with endurance. Such a person, a medical friend of the writer, stated, when the present experiment was planned, that he did not think the dietetic factor strong enough compared with others to produce any marked effect. We have all heard, of course, of the enthusiastic reports of vegetarians as to their increased endurance, but these we have discounted as exaggerations. The result of the present experiment, however, would seem to indicate that one’s improvement in endurance is usually not less, but greater, than he himself is aware of. Probably it is also true that we may lose a large fraction of our working power before we are distinctly conscious of the fact.

“While the results of the present experiment lean toward ‘vegetarianism,’ they are only incidentally related to that propaganda. Meat was by no means excluded; on the contrary, the subjects were urged to eat it if their appetite distinctly preferred it to other foods.

“The sudden and complete exclusion of meat is not always desirable, unless more skill and knowledge in food matters are employed than most persons possess. On the contrary, disaster has repeatedly overtaken many who have made this attempt. Pawlow has shown that meat is one of the most, and perhaps the most, ‘peptogenic’ of foods. Whether the stimulus it gives to the stomach is natural, or in the nature of an improper goad or whip, certain it is that stomachs which are accustomed to this daily whip have failed, for a time at least, to act when it was withdrawn.

“Nor is it necessary that meat should be permanently abjured, even when it ceases to become a daily necessity. The safer course, at least, is to indulge the craving whenever one is ‘meat hungry,’ even if, as in many cases, this be not oftener than once in several months. The rule of selection employed in the experiment was merely to _give the benefit of the doubt_ to the non-flesh food; but even a _slight_ preference for flesh foods was to be followed.

“Under flesh foods are included all meat and ‘stock’ soups. It has been shown that although these extracts of meat contain a large amount of nitrogen, it is not in the form of proteid which can be utilized, but only of waste nitrogen which must be excreted. Apparently the sole virtue of such soups is that they supply the ‘peptogenic’ stimulus above referred to.

ANYBODY CAN APPLY THE NEW KNOWLEDGE

“The practical value of the experiment consists in the fact that any layman can apply it, with or without a knowledge of food values, though with more advantage if he possess than if he lack such knowledge. If the dietetic rules of the present experiment are followed, no self-denial as to foods is required. It is, however, absolutely necessary that there should be _self-control_ enough to break up the habit of hurried eating to which modern civilization has brought us—habituating us, as it were, to eat against time.

“Experience indicates that appetite does not lead to a diet fixed in amount or constituents, but moves in undulating waves or cycles. The men who took part in the experiment were encouraged, after any of the symptoms which seemed to be associated with high proteid (such as heaviness, sleepiness, stiffness, or soreness after exercise, or catching cold), to cut down on their proteid and substitute fat to restrain the gastric juice. This advice was intended to make application of the theories of Folin that we usually carry a reservoir of proteid, enough to supply our needs for body-building for a fortnight. If this reservoir is exhausted, proteid starvation occurs and the body feeds on itself; if it is filled too far it overflows and causes the evils of excessive proteid. If this theory is correct, the art of eating may consist largely in maintaining a golden mean, such that the proteid reservoir is neither empty nor overflowing much. Many persons fear to reduce their proteid to the Chittenden minimum for fear of proteid starvation; but the experience of those who have tried it would seem to show that this fear is groundless, _provided_ no violence is done to natural appetite. This may be trusted, so it would appear, to raise a warning in the form of ‘nitrogen hunger,’ before the danger point is reached.” In other words, the body will ask in the language of hunger for proteid food, if you are not eating as much as you should. Professor Fisher considers that an amount of meat equivalent to about one small chop will supply all the proteid necessary in the daily ration, since proteid is also consumed in bread, potatoes and nearly all other foods.

It might be added that one of the writers has found the remedy for continual bilious headaches in the rigid exclusion from his diet of all foods that are rich in proteids, including meat, fish, eggs, milk, cheese, peas and beans; and maintains weight and working efficiency upon such amount of proteid as he derives from ordinary breadstuffs. He has found that the craving for high proteid foods soon disappears if it is not gratified; and that the quantity of bread, potatoes, etc., which the average person would eat at dinner and supper supplies all the nitrogen which his system needs, without leaving any to cause autointoxication.

IV

HOW DIGESTION IS ACCOMPLISHED

In order not to interrupt the narrative of the Yale experiments, we have foregone defining certain of the technical terms which it was necessary to use. It will be well, before going further, to give a simple description of the manner in which the food we eat is transformed in the body into tissue building material and energy: a process the many parts of which are grouped by physiologists under the name of Metabolism.

When you take a mouthful of food it enters on a journey through the body in which it traverses more than thirty feet of the intestinal tube before that part of it which the body cannot use is ejected; the process of metabolism begins the moment the lips touch it. The six salivary glands which are located in the mouth manufacture saliva, which flows out through numerous openings, and mixes with food as it is chewed. The saliva not only moistens the food, thus allowing it to be more easily swallowed, but it also has a most important chemical office, converting all starchy food matter into sugar, and thus performing the first and one of the most essential steps in the process of digestion.

After the food has been masticated and saturated with saliva, it passes down the throat through the gullet, which performs a peculiar muscular contraction, thrusting downward the particles of food. The conversion of the starch in food into sugar, or glucose, which is begun by the saliva in the mouth, is continued as the food passes into and down the gullet, but stops almost completely when the food once reaches the stomach.

THE WORK OF THE STOMACH

It is in the stomach, on the other hand, that most of the work of digesting the albuminoids, or proteids, of food is performed by the gastric juice. The stomach is a pear-shaped bag, that holds about three pints of material, or three-quarters of an ounce for every inch of the individual's height. Food enters it through the gullet on the upper left hand side, just below the heart. Myriads of glands in the walls of the stomach are active in the formation of either pepsin, or an acid fluid which, when combined with pepsin, forms the gastric juice.

At the back of the stomach, partly overlapping it, lies the liver, which discharges a liquid called the bile into the alimentary canal just below the stomach. Behind the stomach, lies a large gland called the pancreas, which discharges a remarkable fluid, named pancreatic juice, into the intestine through the same opening which the liver uses for its bile. Connected with the stomach is the small intestine, which is the narrow portion of the alimentary canal, and the largest and most important of all the digestive organs. It is some twenty-five feet in length, and its walls are everywhere covered with glands which secrete and exude mucous and other fluids.

At the lower end of the intestine is the colon or large intestine which is not a digestive organ in itself, but is a reservoir in which the food is stored up for a short time, to allow opportunity for complete absorption of the digested portions.

THE ELEMENTS OF FOOD

Although there may be thousands of different dishes, and combinations of foodstuffs, fundamentally they are all closely akin, and can be all resolved into a few quite simple elements: Proteid, Carbohydrate, Fat or Mineral Salts, or combinations of these; the Proteid class having many subdivisions, and the Carbohydrates being made up of the various sugars and starches.

We also know definitely just what use the body makes of these various substances. The Proteid is the up-builder of tissue, the essential foodstuff without which life cannot exist. If we compare the human body to an engine, as nearly all physiologists seem bound to do, we may say that Proteid is like the brass, or other metal, of which the structure is composed. The various Carbohydrates and the Fats are the fuels from which are derived the energy which animates and operates the mechanism. The Mineral Salts are used to supply various important bodily needs, such as elements required by the bones, or the delicate tissue in the eyes, the enamel for the teeth, and so forth.

THE WORK OF THE DIGESTIVE JUICES

As there are five main food elements, namely, proteid, starch, sugars, fats, and salts, so also there are five main digestive fluids, the saliva, the gastric juice, the bile, the pancreatic juice, and the intestinal juice.

The saliva is an alkaline fluid that digests starch. Its work is checked by the presence of acid substances; which explains why the digestive action of saliva ceases soon after it enters the stomach. Hence the importance of giving the saliva ample opportunity to perform its function, by complete mastication, is obvious.

The gastric juice, of which about seventy ounces is formed by the stomach daily, contains in addition to hydrochloric acid, a quantity of pepsin, which with the acid dissolves all sorts of proteids or albuminous substances, like meat and eggs; and it also contains rennet, which coagulates milk. The gastric juice digests proteids by converting them into pepsin, an exceedingly soluble substance which passes readily into the blood.

The bile manufactured by the liver has the function of digesting fats. Fats are not changed chemically, as are starches and proteids. They are only broken up into particles so small that the cells of the mucous membrane can take them up and effect their removal into the blood stream.

The pancreatic juice is able to perform the work of all the three digestive fluids which we have already named. In fact, it is even more powerful than saliva in the digestion of starch, since it is able to digest raw as well as cooked starch, which the saliva cannot do. It is also able to convert proteid into peptone, as does the gastric juice; and it emulsifies fats, as does the bile.

The intestinal juice digests cane sugar, and is supposed to have a digestive influence upon all the other food elements.

The mineral salts which are taken into the body are dissolved by all the digestive fluids which we have named, some by the saliva and the juices of the intestinal tube, and others, which require acids for their solution, by the gastric juice.

Nearly all these digestive fluids are also powerful antiseptics and are able to destroy germs when the health of the body as a whole is good. The gastric juice, for instance, acts as an antiseptic, preserving the stomach contents from putrefaction during the digestive process. It is a remarkable fact that the gastric juice, although it is so essential to life, is a deadly poison, which, when introduced into the blood produces insensibility and death.

These digestive juices and organs are able completely to dispose of all the food elements which are introduced into the body, save proteid alone. The sugars and starches are either completely absorbed and oxidized, or stored up in the form of surplus fat. The oxidation or burning up of proteid, however, is never complete. There is always a certain amount of unburnable substance left behind from the processes of metabolism, which the liver and kidneys of the body have to dispose of. If only as much proteid as is needed by the body for the upbuilding of its tissue, and the repair of waste, is taken, the body can very readily handle it; but an excess of proteid is highly disadvantageous. Professor Chittenden, in his great work, “The Nutrition of Man,” has set forth in elaborate detail the process of the assimilation of proteid. It appears that there are many kinds of proteid; the proteid of eggs is different from that of meat, and that again from the proteid of beans, and so on; and human proteid is different from all. Consequently, the body is obliged to transform every kind of proteid which is brought to it. This proteid is then absorbed by the blood, and carried to the tissues, which are kept perpetually bathed in a supply of nutritive material. The taking of more proteid than is needed would not be so dangerous if it were simply passed on without being digested; nor even if it were digested and transformed, and then promptly eliminated. But what actually happens is that the new proteid taken in is passed through all the stages of assimilation, and drives out in front of it, so to speak, the proteid which has already been prepared, but has not yet been used. And the result is, of course, to throw a double strain upon the liver and the kidneys, the organs of elimination.

Professor Chittenden also points out the common blunder which is made in assuming that persons who are doing hard work need an additional amount of proteid substance. One commonly hears the phrase that laborers and athletes can eat meat in large quantities, and “work it off.” As we have seen, one can “work off” sugars and starches and fats completely; but one cannot “work off” proteid completely. Professor Chittenden is now recognized as the leading authority of the world upon this particular question; and he sets forth clearly in his book the fact that the quantity of proteid needed is not increased by muscular activity. One may work as hard as he pleases, but his body will use no more nitrogen, save only in the case where a sufficiency of other food elements is not supplied. Only as a last resort will the system undertake the labor of burning up proteid to make energy.

HOW MUCH SHOULD WE EAT

When foodstuffs are taken into the body, digested, assimilated, and used up, they produce the same amount of heat and other forms of energy as if burned outside of the body; and hence it follows that the number of calories, or units of heat, represented in a given foodstuff, is taken by scientists as a common measure of its food value.

A calory is a heat unit, which has been adopted as a means of estimating the nutritive value of foodstuffs. It represents the amount of energy required to raise the temperature of four pounds of water one degree Fahrenheit. The number of calories contained in food is obtained by burning the food and measuring the heat produced by means of a calorimeter.

It has been calculated that the normal, average person needs from one hundred and sixty to two hundred and forty calories of proteids every day, in order to build blood and tissues. He needs daily from five hundred to nine hundred calories of fats, which supply heat.

He needs of carbohydrates, which are the starches and sugars, and which the body uses to produce energy for work and heat, from one thousand to one thousand four hundred calories daily. It is declared by Chittenden and Kellogg, whose work has overset the old notions, that the total number of calories, or food units, should rarely exceed two thousand.

Two thousand calories are furnished respectively by twenty-eight ounces of bread, or ninety-six ounces of milk, or sixty-two ounces of potatoes, or nine ounces of butter. One quarter of each of these, or any other fractions which together equal unity, will make up a ration containing two thousand calories.

It is quite impossible, however, to make a hard and fast rule in this matter. Every individual differs from others in his requirements. Moreover, the weather, the season of the year, the amount and kind of work done, are all factors in the situation. Hard physical work and exposure to cold demands the largest food supply. A person who naturally perspires freely needs more food than a person who does not, because of the large amount of heat carried off from his body by the evaporation of sweat from the skin. Adults require food chiefly to repair waste and losses. Growing children require in addition to food to repair waste and losses, material for tissue building. According to the best authorities upon the diet of children, a growing infant utilizes fully one-third of its total intake of food in tissue building. When an adult becomes emaciated he requires more tissue building material than the normal adult, his need for it being practically the same as that of a growing child.

We give below a table showing the average number of food units or calories required daily by people of various heights and weights. This table is one drawn up by Dr. J. H. Kellogg, Superintendent of the Battle Creek Sanitarium. In calculating the number of calories required in a given case, the estimate should be based not upon the actual weight of the individual, but upon the weight of the average person of his height.

“Persons who are in good health,” says Dr. Kellogg, “and find their weight somewhat greater than the figures given in the table, should not necessarily consider themselves obese. While above the average in weight, their condition is probably natural, and no attempt should be made to reduce the weight to any considerable amount, as injury may result. The average for adults applies especially to healthy adults between twenty and thirty years of age. Most people who are above forty years of age have a natural tendency to increase of flesh, which requires no attention unless it becomes excessive. Any reduction in foods made by an obese person should be in carbohydrates rather than in proteids or fats, unless these latter have been taken in excess.”

TABLE NO. 1

Showing for different ages the average height, weight, and the number of food units or calories required daily.

Boys

Height in Weight in Calories or Age Inches Pounds Food Units 5 41.57 41.09 816.2 7 45.74 49.07 912.4 9 49.69 59.23 1,043.7 11 53.33 70.18 1,178.2 13 57.21 84.85 1,352.6

Girls

Height in Weight in Calories or Age Inches Pounds Food Units 5 41.29 39.66 784.5 7 45.52 47.46 881.7 9 49.37 57.07 1,018.5 11 53.42 68.84 1,148.5

Men

Calories or Food Units Height in Weight in Inches Pounds Proteids Fats Carbohydrates Total 62 110.0 165 495 890 1650 64 121.0 181 543 1086 1810 66 132.0 198 594 1188 1980 68 143.0 215 645 1290 2150 70 154.0 231 693 1386 2310 72 165.0 247 741 1482 2470 74 176.0 264 792 1584 2640

Women

Calories or Food Units Height in Weight in Inches Pounds Proteids Fats Carbohydrates Total 57 78.4 118 344 688 1180 59 88.8 132 396 792 1320 61 99.2 149 447 894 1490 63 109.3 163 489 978 1630 65 120.2 180 540 1080 1800 67 130.7 195 585 1170 1950 69 143.0 215 645 1290 2150 71 155.0 232 696 1392 2320

PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF DIETARY RULES

While dieticians have ascertained the number of food units daily required by the average person, yet on no point do they reach more thorough agreement than in saying that the average person should not establish any hard and fast rules as to the quantity and kinds of food he consumes. It is really only an invalid, one who is in a physician's care, who needs to have his food regulated in this precise fashion. The average person should be careful to practice thorough mastication, and should see to it that the proteid part of his meals is not excessive, but he should avoid worrying about his food habits. Any person who fusses and fumes about the kind of foodstuffs and the number of calories they contain, will be apt to cause himself harm; for science has proved by laboratory experiments, which we shall describe later on, that worry, in fact any of the unpleasant emotions, exercises a prohibitive effect upon the flow of digestive juices.

The really important thing to do is to follow a simple dietary, which at the same time is well balanced in its food elements, well cooked, and tastefully served. The housewife will see to it that the foodstuffs she chooses represent more of carbohydrates and fats than of proteids; her guiding rule in this matter being that _the proportion of proteids to the other food elements be ten per cent._ The United States Department of Agriculture has prepared a list of foodstuffs, comprising all those in common use, which shows the proportion of their constituents, and their total energy value, in calories, per pound of material.

This is "Bulletin No. 28, Revised Edition," the work of two of the leading physiological chemists of America, W. O. Atwater and A. P. Bryant; and may be had on sending five cents to the Department. We have inserted in the Appendix a selected list of foodstuffs taken from this publication; and we give here a rough classification of foods, from which one can see at a glance their leading elements:

FOODSTUFFS WHICH ARE RICH IN PROTEIDS

Eggs White of Egg Skimmed Milk Buttermilk Yogurt Cottage Cheese Nut Products

FOODSTUFFS WHICH ARE RICH IN FATS

Butter Nut Oils Olive Oil Cream Olives Nuts (except chestnuts) Egg Yolks

FOODSTUFFS WHICH ARE RICH IN CARBOHYDRATES

Potato Rice Breads Cereal Preparations

PURE CARBOHYDRATES

Fruits (raw and cooked) Fruit Juices Fruit Jellies Honey Malt Honey Marmalades

FOODSTUFFS WHICH ARE RICH IN PROTEIDS AND FATS

Nuts Nut Butters Eggs Cheese Nut Products

FOODSTUFFS WHICH ARE RICH IN PROTEIDS AND CARBOHYDRATES

Peas Beans Lentils Chestnuts Skimmed Milk Gluten Preparations.

FOODSTUFFS WHICH CONTAIN ALL THE FOOD ELEMENTS IN FAIRLY GOOD PROPORTION

Crackers Batter Breads Pastry Malted Nuts Custards Puddings Salads Sandwiches Soups (other than meat or fish soups).

V

HOW FOODS POISON THE BODY

In our survey of the processes and organs of digestion, we saw that after food has traversed the stomach and small intestine it passes into the colon, where it must remain for some considerable time, while the absorption of its digested elements is completed. And this brings us to the most important of the discoveries of the new hygiene. It has been found that some of the foods which human beings eat are loaded with injurious bacteria, and with the poisons which these bacteria produce. And others of them are indigestible, and when they reach the colon, become a source of incubation for countless billions of other bacteria. It was demonstrated by Metchnikoff that these poisons are absorbed into the system, and are the cause of manifold evils. This is the process which is called “autointoxication.”

It would not be regarded as an exaggeration by the leading physiologists of the world to-day to speak of autointoxication as the primary source of nine-tenths of the afflictions from which humanity suffers. Any one would be prepared to admit that the banquet he had attended on the previous night was responsible for the headache which he has on the present morning; but the investigations of bacteriologists have revealed that the food habits of which banquets are typical are responsible for a chronic ailment, of which such diseases as gout, rheumatism, Bright’s disease, consumption, and pneumonia are merely symptoms.

THE INVESTIGATIONS OF METCHNIKOFF

Elie Metchnikoff, sub-director of the Pasteur Institute of Paris, is a philosopher, as well as a physiologist; a philosopher who brings to the support of his speculations the exact methods of the laboratory. He, with the other great leaders of the new art of health, is at last removing from science the reproach leveled at it by Metchnikoff’s great fellow-country-man and friend, Tolstoi, who said that science was useless to man, since it did not direct its attention to the problems which mean most to humanity, such as the great questions of life and death, but confined its efforts to investigating useless birds and butterflies.

[Illustration: M. ELIE METCHNIKOFF, OF THE PASTEUR INSTITUTE OF PARIS. His researches have thrown great light on autointoxication. He believes that the normal life should be over 125 years long.]

The books in which Metchnikoff has recorded the results of the investigations which for many years he has been making into the problems of old age and death, have caused a profound sensation in the scientific world. In these books, the great Russian emphatically and definitely ranks himself with the optimists. He states that scientific study of the constitution of man, and of the workings of man’s nature, and of his environment in the world, do not support the view that man is born unto sorrow as the sparks fly upward—to quote the words of the Psalmist—but can really be fitted to live a useful and happy life, ending in a calm and peaceful old age—if man will but turn his attention to the knowledge by which he can really live in harmony with his environment. Metchnikoff has arrived at the conclusions that man and woman would live to be at least one hundred years old, if they could enable their bodies to eliminate those deadly toxins which are the product of the activities of the bacteria which inhabit the human body, as well as of the body’s own organic processes.

Age is not always to be computed in years. As a common saying puts the case, “A man is as old as he feels, a woman as old as she looks.” A famous French physiologist has altered this to read, “A man is as old as his arteries.” The primary change produced by the coming of old age is the hardening and withering of the arteries. As the result of this withering process, a large number of the smaller arteries disappear, so that the blood supply of the muscles, brain, heart, and other important organs, is cut off. This is the change that is technically known as “arterio-sclerosis.” It is quite often found in persons of less than fifty years of age. On the other hand, Harvey, the famous discoverer of the circulation of the blood, declared that in the post-mortem examination made of Old Parr, the celebrated Englishman who died at the age of one hundred and fifty-two years and nine months, he found not a trace of this degenerative change.

In the United States the average length of life is about forty-two years; but a large and growing school of modern scientists (comparative anatomists) declare that the natural age of the human family cannot be much less than from one hundred, to one hundred and twenty-five years. Any death that comes at least before one hundred years, is not a natural death but accidental or violent. From the point of view of science, death through disease is just as accidental and violent as the extinguishment of life in a railway wreck or by drowning in the sea; and the fact that the average life of man is to-day only about one-third of that which nature designed for him is due to the operation of autointoxication more than to any other cause.

Natural death in man is therefore more a possibility than an actual occurrence. Nevertheless, instances have been recorded of the actual appearance of the instinct in aged people, where the wished-for death came not because life was burdensome, not because of poverty, disease, or loneliness, but seemed to arrive as naturally as sleep to a younger person, or the wish for more extended life which all of us possess. Metchnikoff states that instances of veritable cases showing an instinct of death are extremely rare, yet this

instinct really does seem to lie deep in the constitution of man. And if the cycle of human life followed an ideal course, he concluded men and women after living a healthy and useful life extending over at least a century, with their usefulness and satisfaction in life at maximum during the latter portion of that period, would then give themselves up calmly and gracefully to the arms of death, as to the arms of a friend laying them down to earned and wished-for rest. Old age would have no terrors, and death no victory.

It has been, perhaps, Metchnikoff's crowning discovery, that the immediate cause of old age is not merely the accumulation of poisonous wastes, but is due to a destruction of the tiny cells which make up the tissues by certain cells of the body, which he describes as macrophages. These are of an especial kind, which wander through the body and devote their energies to the destruction of waste particles and organic débris—particles of material which are not used in the building up of tissue, just as particles of brick and wood might be left on the ground after the erection of a house. These macrophages enact the part of scavengers, very much like the turkey buzzards, which in southern cities eat up the refuse from the back alleys. Just so long as these wandering cells confine themselves to this useful and necessary work, all goes well; but when the vigor of the body cells has been lowered by the accumulation of tissue poisons, these scavenger cells turn traitor to the cause of the body and attack the very cells which they formerly guarded. They have been photographed in the very act of devouring nerve cells in the brains of old people.

HOW TO PREVENT DEGENERATION OF TISSUE

It can readily be seen that if the pernicious activity of these macrophages can be prevented, the coming on of degenerative changes in the body tissue will be much delayed. The practical question, which Metchnikoff therefore asked himself was, How may this revolt of the macrophages, this rebellion of the body's army, be prevented?

It is not possible to attack the macrophages themselves without at the same time doing damage to the body. For these wandering cells are more hardy and vigorous than the higher cells by which the bodily functions are performed, and which they attack, so whatever might be done to weaken the attack of the wandering cells would to a greater degree damage the higher cells of the body. The conclusion that Metchnikoff reached was that the only direction in which we can hope for success in the attempt to prolong human life, lies in giving attention to the predisposing causes which weaken the vitality of the higher body cells and thus expose them to the successful attacks of the scavenger cells. In other words, if we are to prolong human life, we must make the conditions of life such that the premature accumulation of body wastes or poisons shall be prevented.

One of the first steps to take to affect that end is, obviously, the avoidance of the introduction of poisons, and poison-forming foods, into the body. Out of all proportion to all other causes which lead to the formation of body poisons, is the production of toxins in the colon or large intestine. Metchnikoff's studies show beyond a doubt that there is a close connection between the size of the colon and the duration of life in various birds and animals. Where the colon is used, and has attained large proportions, as in man, in the horse, and many other animals, life is comparatively short, and death is premature. Where the colon is rudimentary, or where only such foods are eaten as do not decay or ferment in the colon, then life is long.

Thus the most important problem, according to Metchnikoff, is how to prevent the development of poisons in the colon. He believes that the colon, indeed, is quite superfluous, and that man would be better off without it. He quotes several curious cases in which the colon has been removed from the body, and the subjects of the operations have recovered impaired health and lived for long periods afterwards. Since the colon cannot be generally removed from the body, however, the practical problem comes down to this: How may we avoid the evils which result from the fermentative and putrefactive processes which go on in this organ?

If the large intestine is kept clean, if only those foods which are antitoxic are eaten, then there will be very few poisons generated in the colon, and the health of the body will be maintained in a higher degree and for a much longer period than can be possible when toxic foods are freely partaken of. It is here that the great argument for vegetarianism on its scientific side arises. All meats and fish are not only "toxic" foods in themselves, but they are quite likely to contain parasites of various kinds.

Ordinary bread has been shown to contain a sufficient amount of proteid to supply all the body needs, as do also rice and other cereals and potatoes. Nuts and dried peas and beans are exceedingly rich in proteid, like meat, and therefore should be eaten sparingly. The best foods in the order of excellence are given by Dr. Kellogg, as follows—the antitoxic foods being in italics: _fresh ripe fruits_, _cooked fresh fruits_, _cooked dried fruits_, nuts, cooked cereals, _rice_, _zweibach_, _toasted corn flakes_, _potato_, _cauliflower_, _and other fresh vegetables_, _honey_, _malted nuts_, _yogurt_, _or buttermilk_, sterilized _milk_, and cream, peas, beans, lentils, _raised bread_, and sterilized butter.

HOW TO ENLIST THE SERVICES OF FRIENDLY GERMS

Since the poisons which are produced in the colon are due to the growth and cultivation of germs, the remedy which naturally suggested itself to a bacteriological specialist like Metchnikoff was to find some harmless or comparatively harmless germ with which the poison-forming germs might be fought—or, in other words, to introduce into the body an extra battalion of soldiers to assist the warrior cells in the battle of the blood.

After years of study and research, Metchnikoff found this beneficient germ in various lactic acid forming microbes, particularly an especial microbe known by the name of Bulgarian bacillus, or Yogurt. This bacillus grows in milk, and in growing it produces large quantities of pure lactic acid. It does not decompose fats, nor does it produce alcohol, as do other lactic forming germs, such as those found in kumyss, matzoon, and kephir.

Milk is first sterilized by boiling for a few minutes, then allowed to cool and a quantity of the ferment is added. In a few hours a sour taste which is pleasant to all whose palates relish mild buttermilk, is developed. Metchnikoff advises that a pint or a pint and a half of this sour milk be taken daily. By this means large quantities of the acid forming and beneficient germs are taken into the intestine, and by degrees the poison producing germs are killed or driven out. Thus the work required of the kidneys, the liver, the skin, and other excretory organs is lessened, and the vigor of the living cells is maintained so that the macrophages do not attack and destroy them.

In Bulgaria where Yogurt is a staple article of food, there are more centenarians, and more vigorous old people to be found than anywhere else on earth. Not only are the Bulgarians and the Hungarians the longest lived races in Europe, but they show a remarkable freedom from appendicitis, colitis, and other diseases due to intestinal infections, circumstances which called the attention of European physicians to a study of the milk ferment which produced Yogurt, and led to the scientific investigations, first by Masson of Geneva and later and more completely by Metchnikoff and Kellogg, which have placed its use both as a curative and a preventive agent upon a thoroughly scientific basis.

Its use is bound to supersede that of kumyss, kephir, matzoon, and other lactic acid ferments on account of the fact that these ferments are able to live only in the small intestine, while Yogurt bacillus thrives in the colon, where it may be found weeks after the administration of Yogurt has ceased. The importance of this fact will be seen at once when it is recalled that the colon is the chief seat of the anaerobic infection and poison production which are the causes of intestinal autointoxication. Thus the last word of modern science on this subject would seem after all to be but the confirmation of a means for reaching natural old age which has been known for hundreds of years. But to-day we are learning to use means for the prolongation of life by the light of knowledge; no longer blunderingly, handicapped by evil habits which nullify the value of the small fraction of hygienic truth which we possess. To-day, Hygeia, while it holds out to our lips an elixir of life, insists that if it is to have its maximum power, we must also breathe rightly, sleep rightly, and eat and drink rightly.

VI

SOME IMPORTANT FOOD FACTS

The importance of avoiding constipation will be obvious to those who have followed this account of the process of autointoxication; one should see that his daily bill of fare contains a generous supply of laxative foodstuffs, such as sweet fruits, ripe figs and prunes, acid fruits and fruits juices, fresh vegetables, fats and all grain preparations. It is of the utmost importance that the bowels should move regularly once a day. There is another reason for eating food in the shape of fruits or salads, which is that the body may have a sufficient supply of mineral salts.

Nuts and fruits are a splendid combination, since the fat of the nuts and the sugar of the fruits supply the energy and heat producing substances. Fruit sugar indeed is merely a digested form of starch—the digestive process having been accomplished by the heat of the sun in the ripening of the fruit. Fruits contain no fat and practically no starch, and with the exception of the fig, the banana, and a few others, they contain so small an amount of proteid that that element may be considered practically missing. Fruits are used for the sugar, the acids, and the water they contain. Nuts and fruits may be eaten and digested raw by persons who have sound teeth, and who will thoroughly masticate these foods.

Bananas should never be eaten until they are completely ripe, this condition being shown by the appearance of black or dark brown spots on the skin. When in this condition they are usually thrown into the garbage can by the fruit dealer.

Before eating them, one should scrape off the outside fluff, which is next to the skin, as experiments have shown this to be highly indigestible. Eaten when ripe no fruit is more nutritious or delightful than the banana. The only way in which unripe bananas should be used is baked, the same as apples, when they make a succulent and nutritious dish.

Sweet apples will digest more quickly than any other raw fruit substance; but if eaten raw, apples should be thoroughly ripened, and most thoroughly masticated, else hard pieces of apple will enter the stomach and give rise to fermentation. A mealy apple is considered by physiologists as a food substance almost completely predigested, and ready for absorption. If such an apple is reduced to a smooth pulp by chewing, it will pass out of the stomach within an hour. Baked, sweet apples are digested by persons whose stomachs will not tolerate any other fruit.

The acid of sour apples is an excellent corrective for foul conditions of the stomach, such as exist in biliousness. The germs of typhoid, of cholera, and others likely to produce acute disease, are quickly killed by solutions of citric and malic acids, the acids of the lemon or the apple. The juice of a lemon added to an ounce of water will render that water sterile within half an hour, even though it may contain the germs of typhoid fever and cholera. The antiseptic properties of fruit juice render it exceedingly valuable as a means of killing the germs in the stomach and the alimentary canal; a fact which explains the benefits derived from various “fruit cures,” which have been for many years practiced in Europe, and more recently have been employed in various parts of the United States.

The indigestion which many people complain of as arising from the use of fruit comes not from fruit in itself, but from its improper use in combination with other foods with which it does not agree. It is sometimes supposed, for instance, that fruits conduce to bowel disorders; but the truth is that an exclusive diet of fruit is one of the best known remedies for chronic bowel disorders. Care should be taken, however, to avoid fruit juices which contain a large amount of cane sugar; only the juices of sweet fruits should be employed, or else a mixture of sour and sweet fruit juices without sugar. Raisins, figs, prunes, sweet apples and sweet pears may be mixed with sour fruits. Fruit that is sweetened with sugar to a large extent is indigestible, since cane sugar often proves an irritant: while the combination of cream and sugar which is so often used with many fruits is a very bad one. Fruits should be eaten with vegetables only if both are thoroughly masticated, for the reason that the cellulose in vegetables takes a long time to digest, while fruit takes a very short time, and is held in the stomach and ferments. Fruit combines well with cereal foods, breads, and the like, and with nuts.

WHAT COOKING DOES FOR GRAINS

Cooking does for grains what the sun does for fruit; it performs a preliminary digestion. In undergoing digestion the starch in food passes through five stages: first, it is converted into amylodextrin, or soluble starch; second, erythrod extrin; third, achroödextrin; fourth, maltose; and fifth, levulose, or fruit sugar. Cooking can carry the starch through the first three of these processes, rendering it ready for almost instant conversion into maltose, on coming into contact with the saliva in mouth and stomach. In the intestine maltose is converted into levulose or fruit sugar and the process of digestion is completed. Modern science has shown by experiments that the preliminary digestive work done by cooking varies greatly with the method of cooking adopted. There are practically three methods used in the cooking of cereals, kettle cooking (that is, boiling and steaming), over cooking, or roasting, and toasting, or dry cooking. Kettle cooking changes the raw starch into soluble starch; in other words, it carries the starch through the first step of the digestive process. Baking, or very prolonged kettle cooking, will convert the starch into erythrodextrin, the second stage of starch digestion. Toasting, or dry cooking, in which the starch is exposed to a temperature of about 300 Fahrenheit, advances the starch one step farther, yet.

ABOLISH THE FRYING PAN!

One important thing to remember in connection with cooking is that fried foods, the use of which is so prevalent in America is an unmitigated evil. “Of all dietic abominations for which bad cooking is responsible, fried dishes are the most pernicious,” says Dr. Kellogg. “Meat fried, fricasseed, or otherwise cooked in fat, fried bread, fried vegetables, doughnuts, griddle cakes, and all similar combinations of melted fat or other elements of food are most difficult articles of digestion. None but the most stalwart stomach can master such indigestibles. The gastric juice has little more action upon fats than water. Hence a portion of meat or other food saturated with fat is as completely protected from the action of gastric juice as is a foot within a well-oiled boot from the snow and water outside.”

This same reason explains why rich cake, shortened pie crust and pastry generally, as well as warm bread and butter disagree with sick stomachs and are the cause of many diseases. Not only does the interfering with the digestion of the food by its covering of fat set up fermentation, but the chemical changes occasioned in the fat itself develop exceedingly injurious acids which irritate the mucous membrane of the stomach, causing congestion and sometimes even inflammation. The frying-pan is an implement that should be banished from every kitchen in the land.

For many years past America has been deluged with various breakfast foods, the virtues of which have been loudly trumpeted. Yet in the ordinary process of cooking these breakfast foods, oatmeal, cracked wheat, etc., it is seldom that more than half the starch completes even the first stage of conversion. Hence it cannot be acted upon at all by the saliva, which does not begin the process of digestion with raw starch. The use of imperfectly cooked cereals is without doubt responsible for a great share of the dyspepsia prevailing among Americans. Oatmeal porridge, and similar preparations, unless most thoroughly cooked, are not wholesome foods, and when cream and sugar are added, there is a combination calculated to create a marked form of dyspepsia. Cereals must be cooked dry in order to be thoroughly cooked, and when prepared by dry cooking or toasting, they are well adapted to the human stomach, are easily digested and in combination with fruits and nuts, constitute a good dietary. Cereals must not only be cooked dry in order to be promptly digested, but they should also be eaten dry. Experiments show that an ounce of dry, well cooked cereal food when well masticated will produce two ounces of saliva; whereas mush, gruel, and other moist cereal foods cause the secretion of only a very small quantity of saliva, less than one quarter of the amount produced by the same food in a dry state.

In connection with the cooking of cereals, it is well to remember that the chief vegetable proteid, gluten, is also rendered very much more easily digested by thorough cooking. On the other hand, the digestibility of animal proteids, in the form of both meat and eggs, is greatly diminished by cooking.

The potato is another important foodstuff; when it is well cooked it is one of the most nutritious and wholesome of all foods. The starch of the potato is more easily digested than that of cereals, as has been shown by numerous experiments conducted of late in Germany and in America. A good way of preparing potatoes so as to increase their digestibility is to cut them into slices after cooking and then place in an oven until slightly browned; but the admixture of fat of any sort should be avoided.

On the other hand, cabbage is one of those vegetables which is less likely to create stomach trouble when eaten raw than if cooked. The food value of cabbage, however, is so small that it is hardly worth eating, save as a relish. The same remark may be made as to such other foods as celery, spinach, and greens of all sorts. They are only valuable for the sake of the small quantity of mineral salts they contain, and for the sake of adding another taste to the bill of fare. Onions have a higher nutritive value, but this is offset by their containing an irritating volatile oil, which when onions are used too freely may harm the mucous membrane. The onion plays its best part in cookery when used as a flavoring substance.

The mushroom is another article of food, popular among those who can afford it, which modern science shows to be practically unfit for human use. Paradoxically enough, although chemical analysis of mushrooms show them to be so rich in proteids as to earn for them the name of vegetable beefsteak, yet researches have shown that these proteids are not available by the body, and hence that mushrooms have no nutritive value whatsoever.

DAIRY PRODUCTS NEED ATTENTION

Milk is commonly considered a wholesome and easily digested food, but this is true only in a modified sense. Thousands of infants die annually because of indigestion set up by the use of cows' milk, and hundreds of adults are more or less injured by the too free use of unsterilized cows' milk, which produces biliousness, sick headache, inactive bowels and a variety of other disturbances. These are not alone due to the toughness of the curds which are formed by milk, and which set up fermentative and putrefactive processes in the stomach unless the milk is thoroughly cooked beforehand.

Federal departments at Washington were, not long ago, almost crippled by the prevalence of typhoid fever among the employees; and the public health service under Surgeon-General Walter Wyman traced more than ten per cent. of the cases to the milk supply. Professor Lafayette B. Mendel of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University, told one of the writers of this book that he went to a certain city that had suffered an epidemic of typhoid, and made a map showing each house that had contained a case of typhoid fever. He made a similar map showing the houses where certain milkmen stopped—and the two maps were almost completely identical. It has also been established beyond a doubt that tuberculosis is communicated from the cow to the human being, and in certain sections of the world it is believed that milk from tubercular cows is the chief channel of infection. It has been shown that even if the udder of a cow be healthy, a tubercular cow may give infected milk, and that the presence of a single

tubercular cow in a herd may be responsible for the infection of the milk of healthy animals. Several international medical congresses have lately declared that all milk should be boiled in order to kill the germs.

[Illustration: PROF. LAFAYETTE B. MENDEL, PH.D., YALE UNIVERSITY, Who has carried on researches in conjunction with Prof. Chittenden.]

The United States Department of Agriculture issued in Circular No. 111 of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and in Circular No. 114, the recommendations made by a conference of some twenty of the foremost scientists of the United States, and few more important documents concerning the public health have ever been issued by a government. In brief, these recommendations may be thus stated: Raw milk is highly dangerous. Boiling or pasteurizing kills the disease germs and makes the milk safe without seriously impairing the taste or digestibility. Milk produced under the most ideal conditions, such as “certified” milk, is only relatively safe. Pasteurization, when properly done, makes the milk absolutely safe.

Butter, of course, is subject to all the arguments that can be advanced against milk, with the additional one that it is even more subject to infection with germs than milk itself, since the time that elapses between its manufacture and its consumption is usually far longer than the time that elapses between the drawing of milk from the cow and its use. Only butter that is made from sterilized cream should be used.

Cheese, of course, is open to all the objections urged against unsterilized milk and butter, and in addition has a disagreeable quality all its own. The cheese eater may at any time swallow a serious or even a fatal dose of “cheese poisons,” which are substances produced in cheese by the action of germs. These are not ordinarily present in sufficient quantity to render their presence apparent; nevertheless, a great number of cases of cheese poisoning are annually reported by various boards of health all over the country. Cheese made from sterilized milk is less open to these objections. A delicious cottage cheese may be made from Yogurt milk.

The too free use of sugar at the table and in cooking, not only in its pure form, but in the shape of preserves, syrups and sweet beverages, has been shown to be a most prolific source of injury to the stomach. Sorghum, maple sugar, and maple syrup are essentially the same as cane sugar and molasses. It has been shown that if we eat freely of fruits we will obtain all the sugar our system requires in a form that is easily digestible.

The constitution needs quite a good deal of fat; wholesome fats are contained in nuts, and in cereals, and are also provided liberally by ripe olives and olive oil. Emulsified fats are those in which the minute particles are broken up; and these are far more readily absorbed by the tissues of the body. The fat in ripe olives is emulsified fat—as likewise is olive oil when used in mayonnaise dressing. It should not be mixed with vinegar, however, as vinegar is an irritating substance that works harm, when used freely, to the mucous membrane of the stomach. Lemon juice is not only much safer, but makes a much more delicious dressing.

The objection which applies to vinegar, applies also to pepper, mustard, and other condiments and spices.

The too free use of salt, of which nearly everyone is guilty, is another habit upon which modern physiologists frown. While salt is essential, it is contained as an element in many foods, and there is no more reason why it should be sprinkled upon each and every article of food that is taken than we should have castors containing all the other kinds of inorganic salts, that the system needs, and which are supplied to it in fresh foods. Salt using is merely a habit, and a disastrous one, since it has been shown to be one of the factors in the causation of kidney troubles, such as Bright’s disease.

The large use of glucose in the form of candy, syrups, adulterated honey, and various sweets which are in common use, is said by physiologists to be responsible for a large number of cases of diabetes, a disease which is rapidly increasing in America. There is now produced a malt sugar, called malt honey or “meltose,” which can be used freely for all the purposes that cane sugar is used.

The case of food reform against fish would merely lead to the relating of the arguments against meat. Fish contains nearly seven per cent. of uric acid. It is exposed like meat to the presence of tape worms and other parasites. Even when fresh out of the water its flesh is filled with fatigue poisons, the result of its struggles to escape from the net or the hook; and Mosso of Turin and other authorities have shown that these fatigue toxins have a bad effect upon the body. No food will so quickly decompose and putrefy as fish, and unless perfectly fresh it will always be found full of the putrefactive bacteria which are the active agents in causing autointoxication.

It may be stated, however, that the person who follows that careful and helpful mode of eating recommended and practiced with such marked benefits by Horace Fletcher and his converts, will assuredly minimize the dangers that lurk unsuspected by the uninformed in many of our commonly used foods, and will derive a greater benefit from all food than it is possible for those to gain who eat in the hasty and careless fashion characteristic of most Americans.

VII

HOW OFTEN SHOULD WE EAT?

WE have discussed the question how to eat and what to eat; there remains the question of when to eat. English people, as a rule, eat four meals a day. The French are practically a two meal a day nation, eating a very light breakfast.

Of late years there has been a strong tendency on the part of American dieticians to advocate a reduction in the number of daily meals, the ideal aimed at being the establishing of the custom of two meals a day, with at least six hours intervening between them.

It may be asked whether appetite is not a safe guide to follow, and whether it is not the part of wisdom to follow personal inclination in the choice and quantity and number of meals. Does not a study of dietetic customs and habits definitely decide the essential rules of dietetics? While it is true that habits and customs are very strong factors in everybody's life, yet it is also true that they are very unreliable guides. We are constantly acquiring new habits, and sloughing off old ones; and even the most deeply impressed of habits may be changed for others. And while the common customs of mankind would seem to indicate that three or four meals a day is the rule, at least among civilized nations, yet the facts are that the most primitive people take one meal a day, and the great majority of people in the world, as a rule, eat certainly less than three.

TWO MEALS A DAY THE BEST

Physiological facts argue for the two meal plan, or else for very light and easily digested food, if an extra meal be taken.

Healthy digestion requires at least five hours for its completion, and one hour for rest before another meal is taken. This makes six hours necessary for the disposal of each meal. If food is taken at shorter intervals than this, when ordinary food is eaten, the stomach will be allowed no time for rest. Again, if a meal is taken before the preceding meal has been digested and has left the stomach, a portion remaining, one is likely to undergo fermentation, in spite of the preserving influence of the gastric juice; thus the whole mass of food will be rendered less fit for the nutrition of the body, and the stomach itself will be likely to suffer injury from the acids developed.

[Illustration: MR. UPTON SINCLAIR'S CHILDREN, Well nourished on two meals a day.]

These facts make it plain why eating between meals is a gross breach of the requirements of good digestion. The habit of nibbling at confectionery, fruit, nuts, and other things between meals, is a positive cause of dyspepsia. No stomach can long endure such usage. There is a continual irritation of the mucous membrane of the stomach, and a continual excitation of the glands, which, in the long run, work great harm.

The same reasons which are advanced against the habit of eating between meals fit the case of irregularity of meals. Those who have regular duties, regular hours of work, should have regular meal hours. The human system is continually forming habits, and seems in a great degree dependent upon the performance of its functions in accordance with the habits that are formed. This fact is especially observed in respect to digestion. When meals are taken at regular times the stomach becomes accustomed to receiving food at those times, and is prepared for it. If meals are taken irregularly, the stomach is taken by surprise, so to speak, and is never in that state of rest in which it should be for the prompt and perfect performance of its functions. The habit which many business and professional men form, in the stress of their occupations, of allowing their meal hours to be intruded upon, at times depriving themselves of a meal, will undermine the best digestion in the long run. There is no physiologist who would not endorse the following words of Kellogg: "Every individual ought to consider the hour for meals a sacred one, not to be intruded upon under any ordinary circumstances. Eating is a matter of too momentous importance to be interrupted or delayed by ordinary matters of business or convenience. The habit of regularity in eating should be cultivated."

DON'T EAT BEFORE SLEEPING

The meal which most people would find it advantageous either to drop altogether, or to reduce in quantity, is supper. The physiological law which is now come to be recognized is, that the brain must be active to insure good digestion; and that the stomach must be empty to insure good sleep. That sense of drowsiness which so often follows a hearty meal is not a physiological condition; it is not evidence of a naturally sedative effect in eating; but is really an evidence of indigestion. Those who practice eating before retiring often sleep soundly until an hour or two after midnight, then awake, and find difficulty in getting to sleep again. This is due to irritation of the solar plexus set up by the labor of digesting under unfavorable conditions. The lack of appetite for breakfast after a late supper is evidence of the exhausted state of the stomach. Fruits and cereals are the ideal supper rather than the ideal breakfast—though good at any time!

DRINKING AT MEALS

It is nearly always the case that a hasty or over-hearty eater is also in the habit of drinking copiously of water or other fluids at his meals. He “washes his food down” instead of legitimately drinking. The body, of course, needs liquid, but, as a rule, meal times are not the times for the taking of this liquid supply; except for what is contained in the food itself. The hasty eater thus associates two great evils.

Liquid of any kind in large quantity is inimical to digestion, because it delays the action of the gastric juice, and weakens its digestive qualities, and also checks the secretion of saliva. In case the fluid taken is very hot, as tea, coffee, cocoa, or a considerable quantity of soup—it relaxes and weakens the stomach. On the other hand if it is very cold, it checks digestion by cooling the contents of the stomach, and reducing its temperature to a degree at which digestion cannot proceed. Even a small quantity of cold water, ice cream, or other very cold substance will create a serious disturbance if taken into a stomach where food is undergoing digestion. The process of digestion cannot be carried on at a temperature that is less than the body, which is about one hundred.

The old notions about the processes of digestion were chiefly drawn from the experiments of Dr. Beaumont made nearly a hundred years ago up in Northern Michigan, around Mackinac; with a Canadian hunter, Alexis St. Martin, as the subject. Most people have probably read of St. Martin and Beaumont in the physiologies they studied in their school days. Beaumont was a very capable physician, and a man of the truest scientific spirit. It happened that through an accident he was given an opportunity to make the most valuable contribution to the study of the stomach of man that so far had been furnished by any investigator. The hunter, St. Martin, had suffered a gunshot wound in his stomach, and Beaumont kept him alive for years with the wound open so that he might study the movements of the man’s interior organs. For the first time, here was a human body with a window in it, so to speak, and through this window the scientist patiently watched and studied for years. Of course, however, the window gave only a limited view of what was going on inside this particular house of life, and a great number of Beaumont’s ideas and theories have been proven erroneous; nevertheless, he obtained much important knowledge. When Dr. Beaumont peered through that curious window which he made in the stomach of Alexis St. Martin, he noticed that when the latter drank a glassful of water at the usual temperature of freshly drawn well water, the temperature of the food undergoing digestion fell immediately to 70. The process of digestion was checked absolutely and did not resume until the body had regained its proper temperature, which it did not do for more than half an hour.

Another way in which drinking at meals proves harmful is because of the fact that particles of food not thoroughly masticated are washed from the mouth into the stomach. If any drink at meals is taken at all, it should be a few minutes before eating. Of course, sipping of a little water will not be harmful, if care is taken not to sip at the time when food is in the mouth. It will be found, however, that unless the meal is composed of very dry foods, there will be little inclination to drink at meals. When, however, the food is rendered either fiery or irritating with spices, and other stimulating condiments, it is small wonder that there is an imperious demand for water or liquid of any kind to allay the irritation.

HOW THE BODY PRODUCES “APPETITE JUICE”

He who is really hungry, however, has no need of condiments, and usually small relish for them.

The old saying that hunger is the best sauce is one of those proverbs of the people which modern science is proving to be firmly established on truth. No sauce can equal appetite. Experiments by Professor Pawlow of St. Petersburg, Director of Department of Experimental Physiology in the Imperial Literary School of Medicine, have shown that there is a real “appetite juice” formed by the body when it is hungry.

Appetite, and hunger, are not synonymous terms with the mere habit-craving for food which most people consider to be either appetite or hunger. Real hunger, or appetite, only comes to the body when the body has earned it. There must be an expenditure of tissue, which the body requires to be repaired; or there must be a real need for energy to carry on work before the body will manifest its need for energy-supplying material. In other words, the body cares nothing about our likes or dislikes, our whims or our fancies, in the nature of food, save when it has a real need for food. Professor Chittenden demonstrated that most people simply eat the entire round of meals from mere habit. The disturbance when for any reason they miss one or two meals from the accustomed routine is simply the outcry of a habit and not the outcry of a real need. While Dr. Kellogg advises that no meal be missed, yet he also strongly advises us not to eat unless really hungry, merely drinking a little fruit juice or something of the kind at the meal hour in order to keep up the normal action of the digestive organs.

The digestive juice which is manufactured by the body when it is really hungry and food has been given to it has been shown by Pawlow and Hanecke to be the most important element in digestion. The chemical juices produced in the stomach and intestines while food is in them is of small importance and value compared with the juices that are formed while food is being chewed when the body has a good appetite or is really hungry.

This juice begins to flow at the very sight of food, and continues to from three to five minutes after beginning mastication. The production of juice in the stomach is stimulated by the contact of food with the mouth, and only during that contact; so it is obvious that the longer the food is held in the mouth, if it is held there in enjoyment, and the more completely it is chewed, so long as chewing is accompanied by taste, the more thoroughly are the flavors set free by the act of chewing, and the higher becomes the stimulating effect of these flavors upon the psychic centers which cause the appetite juice to flow into the stomach.

These facts prove the dependence of gastric digestion, or stomach digestion, upon mastication. Pawlow was experimenting with gastric juice when he hit upon this demonstration; and he has concluded that we cannot have gastric digestion at all well without thorough mouth digestion; that the complete mastication of food, in other words, is the thing necessary to prepare the stomach to receive the food. Thus, if you chew your food well, the food will be predigested in the mouth, and when it enters the stomach it will find already there waiting for it not only enough gastric juice to digest it, but just the particular kind of gastric juice that is needed.

Pawlow turned this discovery of his to a very practical use. He has a dozen or more healthy dogs which he calls his Dog Dairy. From these dogs he collects daily a quart or more of gastric juice, or appetite juice; and the dogs produce this large quantity without taking a particle of food into their stomachs. The juice is carefully filtered, and bottled and shipped all over the world to those physicians who are in touch with Pawlow and his work, and by them are administered to human patients. It is given to those patients who are deficient in gastric juice, and is used in very obstinate cases of indigestion.

Pawlow collects his juice by having openings made in the throat and in the stomachs of the dogs. When the dogs are hungry they are given food of kinds which they particularly like, and they are allowed to smell the odor and to become excited over the prospect of eating it before they are actually allowed to have it. With the first sight and odor of this food, the dogs begin to secrete the appetite juice, which flows from the opening made in their stomachs through tubes into receptacles. Then when they begin to eat their food, the food does not reach the stomach at all, but simply passes through the openings in the throat into a receptacle before the dog, and the dog can go on eating the same meal over and over again. They thus enjoy themselves thoroughly for a long time. When the appetite juice ceases to flow, the process of feeding them in this manner stops, and they are given a real meal.

VIII

HEALTH AND THE MIND

This account of Professor Pawlow's experiment leads directly to the all important subject of the influence of mental states upon digestion and assimilation. Dr. Saleeby has published a book called "Worry, the Disease of the Age"—the very title of which shows the attitude of physicians upon this question; and the bad opinion which mankind has always entertained of such states of mind as "the blues" has now been scientifically justified. The effects of pain and pleasure upon digestion have been demonstrated by actual experiments in the laboratory of the St. Petersburg professor.

A vivid account of these experiments has been given to the writers by Dr. J. H. Kellogg, who witnessed them about a year ago. Dr. Kellogg writes:

“Professor Pawlow took Professor Benedict and myself into a quiet corner of his laboratory, and there we found a dog that had his salivary glands or ducts arranged so that by means of little tubes passing through the skin all the saliva, instead of passing down his throat, passed out through the tubes and could be collected in small glass bottles suspended beside his neck.

“The dog had been prepared beforehand by the attendant. Little empty bottles were attached to the collecting tubes, and as soon as the dog saw Pawlow, he seemed to be very happy, and wagged his tail, and his eyes gave evidence of satisfaction; but there was no flow of saliva until Professor Pawlow brought near to his nose a bottle containing some powdered meat. He took out the cork in the presence of the dog, turned out a little of it in his hand, shook it in the bottle and brought it near to the dog’s nose. The dog began to sniff it, licked his chops, snapped his jaws, reached out after it, and in less than two minutes the saliva began to flow very profusely, and it was not more than fifteen or twenty seconds before the saliva was pouring down into the bottles.

“Professor Pawlow, then, after holding the bottle out before the dog for about thirty seconds, put the stopper into it, and put it behind him out of sight, and in a very few seconds the saliva ceased to flow. Then he brought it back again, showed it to the dog, brought it near his nose, allowed him to smell it but kept it just out of his reach all the time, and the saliva poured out again freely. He continued this until the dog finally made up his mind he was not going to get any meat, and when the powder was brought near to him he paid no attention to it, but turned his head around and looked very disappointed and very ugly, and at that point, the saliva ceased to flow.

“That was a very remarkable thing to me. The meat was right there, he could smell it, but he knew he was not going to get it, so he was angry, and as his state of mind changed, the secretion of saliva was wholly arrested. I was very much surprised. Of course, I believe thoroughly in the importance of being in a happy state of mind when eating, but I really did not appreciate thoroughly the importance of those things; I did not fully appreciate how positive an inhibitor of the activity of the salivary glands an unhappy state might be.

“But a common experiment made in India shows the same idea. When an Anglo-Indian has lost anything of value, he has his whole family of servants brought to him to find out which one has stolen it. A common test is to stand them all up in a row, and then to give each one a morsel of dry rice to chew. They must chew this rice for five minutes, and then the master goes around and examines each man’s mouth. The mouth which is dry is the mouth of the culprit, and the state of that man’s mind has the effect of arresting the flow of saliva. Pawlow has shown that this is a positive physiologic law and operates upon the dogs as well as upon human beings.

“Another experiment astonished me even more than this. We followed Pawlow down through a long narrow hall and upstairs into a room which was small and secluded, in a very quiet part of the laboratory, remote from any noisy occupation, and there we found a brown dog standing on a high table. It was a delicate and very intelligent looking animal. The attendant sat near by, and the dog was prepared as the other had been. As we came in, the Professor beckoned to us to sit down on a little bench beside the wall and indicated that we should be quiet. He stepped up to the dog, looked at him, and the dog recognized him with a smile in the dog’s way of smiling!—and presently the saliva began to flow.

“Professor Pawlow was very much surprised. We had come into the room and he had offered the dog nothing, but the saliva was flowing. That was contrary to his expectation. He looked with considerable astonishment at the attendant. The attendant quietly said, ‘You have been feeding meat to the other dog, and he smells the meat on your hands.’

“The dog had such a keen sense of smell that the odor of meat on Pawlow’s hands even at a distance of several feet was sufficient to cause the saliva to flow. So he went out, washed his hands and came back. At this time, not a drop of saliva was flowing. The arrangement was such that every particle secreted must come outside of the mouth into these bottles. While we were waiting in silence, watching the dog quietly, suddenly the attendant pressed his foot without making any motion of the body at all, upon a little lever beneath his toe and the result was the causing of a high musical note to be sounded, a very high pitched tone.

“Instantly, in less than three seconds, the saliva was flowing into the tube. We waited a little while until the saliva ceased to flow, then the note was sounded again. Instantly the saliva began to flow.

“Professor Pawlow has been experimenting upon this line for a long time. Other experiments were made. One interesting experiment was with a large number of dogs. He had upon one counter a long row of dogs, about a dozen, which had their stomachs fixed in such a way, and their throats fixed also in such a way, that upon the secretion of the gastric juice in the stomach the juice would flow out into a flask.

“The dogs were suspended in a sort of harness. They had had their throats fixed so that food instead of going into the stomach came out at the throat. So as the dog ate the food, the food fell back into the plate and the dog continued eating the same breakfast over and over. These dogs had been eating the same breakfast for four hours, from six to ten o’clock in the morning, and they were still eating, and just as hungry as ever because there was no food entering their stomachs at all and their appetites were growing keener every moment, and they were having a wonderfully good time. I thought that some people I have met might enjoy such an arrangement. This really has the same effect without having your throat cut.

“I noticed that if these dogs got disgruntled, or tired, or dissatisfied, then the gastric juice would cease to flow. Sometimes the food, having been chewed a very long time, lost its flavor, and the dogs secreted no more juice; then the attendant would come along and put a little fresh food into the plate and the dogs would seize this with great avidity, and the gastric juice would begin to flow again in a perfect stream.

“These experiments have demonstrated in the most positive manner the definite connection there is between psychic conditions and the process of digestion, and have shown us that the food must be palatable, that it must address the olfactory sense agreeably, and that the mind must be in a happy state in order that the digestive process may proceed.”

And then Dr. Kellogg goes on to tell of the work of Professor Cannon, of Harvard University, who actually has made visible the digestive processes in the stomach by means of the X-ray. By feeding cats food colored with certain substances which are impervious to the X-rays, he was enabled to photograph all the actual movements of the organs concerned in the acts of digestion. It was demonstrated that certain emotions, such as anger and fear, positively stopped the whole process of digestion.

Depressing thought will affect injuriously the circulation of the blood; it will also affect the breathing. The mere attitude of the body assumed by the despondent person has its bad influence. The head droops in a melancholy fashion—and this very attitude prevents normal action of the lungs and the blood veins. Depressing thoughts destroy the appetite; and when the body does not receive its proper nourishment, the blood becomes impoverished.

“Any severe anger or grief is almost certain to be succeeded by fever in certain parts of Africa,” says Sir Samuel Baker, in the British and Foreign Medico Chirurgical Review. “In many cases, I have seen reasons for believing that cancer had its origin in prolonged anxiety,” says Sir George Paget, in his “Lectures.” “The vast majority of the cases of cancer, especially of breast or uterine cancer, are probably due to mental anxiety,” says Dr. Snow, in the London _Lancet_. “Diabetes from a sudden mental shock is a true, pure type of physical malady of mental origin,” says Sir B. W. Richardson in “Discourses.” “I have been surprised how often patients with primary cancer of the liver lay the cause of this ill health to protracted grief or anxiety. The cases have been far too numerous to be accounted for as mere coincidences,” says Murchison.

“Eruptions on the skin will follow excessive mental strain. In all these and in cancer, epilepsy and mania from mental causes there is a predisposition. It is remarkable how little the question of physical disease from mental influence has been studied,” says Sir B. W. Richardson.

“My experiments show that irascible, malevolent and depressing emotions generate in the system injurious compounds, some of which are extremely poisonous; also that agreeable, happy emotions generate chemical compounds of nutritious value, which stimulate the cells to manufacture energy,” says Elmer Gates, the celebrated American scientist. Gates’ experiments show with minute exactitude just how it is that one’s impalpable thoughts and emotions affect the battle of the blood, and his work makes it easier for one to understand and appreciate the portion of truth underlying such manifestations as the New Thought and Christian Science movement. There can be no doubt that men and women have practically remolded their bodies and changed the whole course of their lives by using the impalpable yet potent force of their wills. Sometimes these have been men and women seemingly without a vestige of will; and yet, by comprehending the necessity for will, they took the first steps towards attaining possession of it. Many very remarkable stories could be told illustrating this point. Professor William James, of Harvard, introduced one of the writers to a man who had been afflicted with what had seemed a helpless case of mental trouble, accompanied by physical ailments which were rapidly breaking him down; and this man had affected a complete cure through his own unaided efforts. He resolved that he could be cured, and cured he was.

We remember another instance; this time of a consumptive; a man who was so far gone that all the physicians gave up his case as hopeless. To all intents and purposes he was already a dead man, when there came to him the light of a new hope. He had spent a great deal of money in taking various “treatments” for tuberculosis, without deriving permanent benefit, and then had come to believe utterly that in only one way was there hope for the consumptive, namely, by living entirely in the open air. When seemingly

at his last gasp he arrived at a branch of the Battle Creek Sanitarium at Boulder Creek, Colorado. In certain photographs of this establishment you may see on a bare hillside that stands back of the building, a narrow foot-path. This path has many turnings and windings in its lower course, but towards the top of the hill it aspires upward in a straight line. That trail was made by the consumptive who had determined that he would live, crawling on his hands and knees up the side of the hill. He positively refused to go under a roof for any consideration whatsoever. His meals were brought to him where he lay on the road side. At first he was so weak that he could only go a few feet in the course of a day, and had to drag himself along in a wavering line. But he began to improve—he went on improving—until, finally, along the track on which he had crawled he was running at top speed.

And a little while ago this man was one of the athletes who took part in Professor Irving Fisher's endurance competition between flesh-eating athletes and vegetarians; and he proved to be best of them all! He doubled the best record made by any Yale man in the deep-knee bending contest. The most enduring Yale man was able to make the deep-knee bend—which is a very severe test of physical endurance—twelve hundred times. The consumptive who had cured himself went twenty-four hundred times. He thinks nothing of a ten or fifteen mile ran before breakfast in the morning.

It is important to apply these truths to the question of nutrition. It is positively harmful to eat food when one is gloomy or low spirited or worried or angry.

You may object to this that you cannot at will make an optimist of yourself at meal times, and turn on a flow of good humor as you draw water from a tap. But you can at least refrain from eating, and if you do you will discover that the real hunger which is bound to develop is a very strong emotion. It will drive away any ordinary attack of the blues very quickly; and will call up pleasant anticipations of the joy of food to assist the digestive processes.

IX

THE CASE AS TO MEAT

"I wish there was a science of nutrition worthy of the name," writes Bernard Shaw in a private letter. "The mass of special pleading on behalf of meat eating on the one side and vegetarianism on the other, which calls itself the science of metabolism to-day, seems to me to be so corrupt as to be worthless." The fact that Shaw himself is a perfervid vegetarian lends additional significance to this statement. Until quite recently the advocacy of either dietary has been based upon considerations the opposite of physiologic. It has been the sentimental aspects of the controversy—vegetable versus animal foods—which have received most emphasis. The vegetarian supported his position on the ethical ground that the eating of animal food, involving as it does the taking of life, is wrong. On the other hand, the advocate of meat eating based his arguments on the support given to it by common custom, and a belief that a meat diet is that which supplies vigor and manly force. As Dr. Woods Hutchinson, the most prominent of the champions of meat eating, puts the case: "Vegetarianism is the diet of the enslaved, stagnant, and conquered races, and a diet rich in meat is that of the progressing, the dominant and the conquering strains. The rise of any nation in civilization is invariably accompanied by an increasing abundance in food supplies from all possible sources, both vegetable and animal."

At the same time, even Dr. Hutchinson admits that human life can be maintained upon a vegetarian diet. "Nearly one-half of the human race," he writes, "has been compelled from sheer necessity to prove that thesis in its actual experience; but we find absolutely no jot of evidence in support of the contention that there is any advantage or superiority in the vegetable diet as such—no more than that there is any inherent superiority in a pure animal diet as such.... There is no valid or necessary ground, so far as we have been able to discover, for the exclusion of any known article of food, whether vegetable or animal, from our diet list in health."

Dr. Hutchinson's views were printed in a popular magazine, and have been very widely quoted, but he seems to have written without paying attention to a number of scientific investigations which suggest ample grounds for the radical reduction of the meat portion of the ordinary diet. Among these are the experiments of Dr. Horter of New York, Professors Mendel, Chittenden and Fisher of Yale, Dr. Fenton B. Turck, and such world-known physiologists as Combe of Lausanne, and Metchnikoff, Gautier, and Tissier of Paris. The elaborate researches of Dr. Kellogg of Battle Creek are dismissed by Woods Hutchinson, because of the fact that Dr. Kellogg not only upholds the exclusion of meat from the diet for purely scientific reasons, but also on ethical grounds. The writers of this book, however, have discarded meat from their dietary for scientific reasons, paying as little attention to the ethical side of the question as Dr. Hutchinson could desire. They will give in this place a brief summary of these scientific reasons.

THE BELGIAN EXPERIMENTS

We have already told of the experiments whereby Professor Fisher of Yale proved the superior endurance of vegetarians over meat-eaters. It happens that experiments of the same nature were carried on at about the same time by two women scientists in Belgium, Dr. J. Ioteyko, head of the laboratory at the University of Brussels, and Mlle. Varia Kipiani. They studied the question of vegetarianism by several methods, and became convinced that the vegetarian régime is a more rational one.

Their experiments were for the most part comparisons of strength and endurance between men and women subsisting on the usual high proteid, or flesh diet, and men and women who for longer or shorter periods had abstained entirely from meat. The results tally remarkably with those obtained by Professor Fisher. So far as strength was concerned, very little difference was discovered between vegetarians and "carnivores." In endurance, on the other hand (and it is endurance that most people need) a very remarkable difference was found, the vegetarians surpassing the carnivores from 50 to 200%. The Brussels investigators found also that the vegetarians recuperated from fatigue far more quickly than the meat eaters, a discovery which was one of the most remarkable features of the Yale experiments.

[Illustration: MR. SINCLAIR'S CHILDREN, Brought up according to good health principles.]

In commenting upon the Belgian experiments, Professor Fisher writes:

DR. TURCK'S INVESTIGATIONS

It is possible that flesh-eating, as ordinarily practiced, is injurious both because of excessive proteid and because meat, as such, contains poisonous elements. It is well known that Liebig came to repudiate the idea that the extractives of meat were nutritious, and that investigation has shown them to be poisonous. Professor Fisher also points out that Dr. F. B. Turck has found that dogs, mice, and rats fed on meat extractives exhibit symptoms of poisoning and often die. The poisonous effect is aggravated by intestinal bacteria, which find in these extractives an excellent culture medium. Dr. Turck concludes:

"(1) It is clearly evident from these experiments, which correspond to the investigations of others, that the injurious effects of meat are due not so much to the muscle proteid, myosin, as to the extractives.

"(2) That the injurious effects of the extractives are increased through the action of intestinal bacteria."

Dr. Turck does not find any evidence that the extractives in small quantities are injurious.

Dr. Turck therefore concludes that the "high liver" who uses much flesh and also an excess of starch and sugar is a "bad risk" for life insurance companies. He recommends, if meat is to be used, that the extractives first be removed by special processes, which he explains.

These investigations, with those of Combe of Lausanne, Metchnikoff and Tissier, of Paris, as well as Herter and others in the United States, seem gradually to be demonstrating that the fancied strength from meat is, like the fancied strength from alcohol, an illusion. The "beef and ale of England" are largely sources of weakness, not strength.

THE DANGER OF INFECTION FROM MEAT

It has always been conceded that by eating raw or underdone beef or pork one may acquire tape worms; and that in eating raw or underdone pork one runs the same risk of contracting that uncurable malady, trichinosis. The danger from these sources, however, is comparatively slight, since most people eat their meat well cooked; but in the view of many modern scientists all meat eaters are open to a particular form of germ infection which involves all kinds of meat, fish, flesh and fowl, cooked as well as uncooked.

Everybody knows how readily meats of all kinds, and particularly seafood, such as fish, oysters and clams, undergo putrefaction. The processes of decay in fish and animals begin within an hour or two after death, under the influence of putrefactive bacteria, which are always present in the colon, or large intestine of animals, upon the skin and in the atmosphere about them. Ordinary cooking does not destroy them, for they are able to stand the ordinary cooking temperature. Salt and smoked fish, and other meats have these germs present in vast multitudes; and beef and game that is "hung" for a long time in order to become "tender," are so far advanced in decay before they are brought to the table that every minute particle of them is alive with these germs.

These facts are granted by all; but the physiologist who favors the use of meat, says that unless excessive quantities are consumed, the healthy person undergoes little risk. The argument is, that when the germs are swallowed into the stomach they are

there destroyed by the action of the gastric juice, which is germicidal; but experiments have lately proved that some of these germs escape destruction by the gastric juice, and find their way to the colon, where they continue to multiply in the mucous which covers the intestinal wall, and thus maintain constant and active putrefactive processes in that part of the body.

THE NUMBER OF GERMS WE EAT

Dr. Kellogg of Battle Creek has lately made public the results of a carefully conducted series of observations made by Dr. A. W. Nelson, bacteriologist of the clinical laboratory of the Battle Creek Sanitarium. Various specimens of meat were purchased in the ordinary way in the market, wrapped in clean paper, and immediately taken to the laboratory, where samples were removed for observation under the microscope. The meat was then taken to the diet kitchen and well cooked, after which cultures were again made.

The germs found in meat are classed as aerobes and anaerobes. The aerobes are for the most part acid-forming germs, and comparatively harmless. But the anaerobes are poison-forming germs, and are the agents of putrefaction and of various diseases. They are to-day considered as the most potent causes of many chronic maladies, and especially of that most common of diseases, intestinal autointoxication.

Dr. Nelson found that in one specimen of raw beef, there were present per moist gram of material 105,000 aerobes and 90,000 anaerobes. On the outside of the beef after it had been fried, there were no germs present, but on the inside of the fried beef, he found 3000 aerobes and 2000 anaerobes per gram. With three other specimens of beef, that were broiled, and boiled, and roasted, respectively, the results were generally similar. Of all modes of cooking, roasting seems to have least effect upon the bacteria, for in specimen No. 3, while there were fewer bacteria than in specimen No. 1 before cooking, there were found after it had been well roasted 150,000 aerobes and 160,000 anaerobes.

In fresh fish raw there were found 870,000 anaerobes per gram; in sardines in oil, 14,000,000; while in codfish that had been soaked to remove the salt, there were found 47,600,000. In another experiment specimens of meat were secured such as were served on the dining tables of one of the prominent city hotels, and taken at once to the laboratory, where without delay bacterial cultures were made. A specimen of sirloin steak was found to contain 378,000,000 anaerobes per gram of moist material.

An interesting experiment which showed the increase of anaerobes or poison-forming germs in dead flesh, was that made with two chickens of equal size, one of which was drawn, and the other undrawn. Both were placed under the same conditions in a room the temperature of which was maintained at 70° Fahrenheit. Bacterial cultures were made at frequent intervals, with results as given in the following table, the figures showing the number of bacteria per gram of moist material.

No. 11 Drawn No. 12 Not Drawn Aerobes Anaerobes Aerobes Anaerobes

3 hrs after death 4,500 5,650 5,000 6,500 2d day 8,500 9,000 10,000 12,000 3d day 17,000 16,000 60,000 20,000

It must be remembered that these chickens were freshly killed, and that the anaerobes had no such opportunity to increase as in ordinary market beefs.

Specimens of several other kinds of meat were purchased in the market, and at once taken to the laboratory for study. Cultures were made immediately on reaching the laboratory, and again after the meat had been allowed to stand (covered) at room temperature for twenty hours. The following table shows the results of the bacterial counts:

BACTERIA PER GRAM (MOIST)

Immediately after purchase

Specimen Aerobes Anaerobes No. 13 Large sausage 560,000,000 420,000,000 No. 14 Small sausage 834,400,000 663,000,000 No. 15 Round steak 420,000,000 560,000,000 No. 16 Roast beef 252,000,000 560,000,000 No. 17 Smoked ham 47,320,000 43,120,000 No. 18 Hamburger steak 138,000,000 129,000,000 No. 19 Pork 635,600,000 126,040,000 No. 20 Porterhouse steak 31,920,000 30,800,000

After being kept at room temperature for twenty hours.

Specimen Aerobes Anaerobes

No. 13 Large sausage 770,000,000 490,000,000 No. 14 Small sausage 770,000,000 640,400,000 No. 15 Round steak 750,000,000 840,000,000 No. 16 Roast beef 728,000,000 750,000,000 No. 17 Smoked ham 616,000,000 750,000,000 No. 18 Hamburger steak 784,000,000 700,000,000 No. 19 Pork 952,000,000 1,036,000,000 No. 20 Porterhouse steak 336,000,000 700,000,000

These experiments were made in the winter time, when, because of the diminished amount of dust in the air, germs are less abundant. Even in the winter time, however, certain meat products simply swarm with germs. A specimen of raw liver examined in January was found to contain 269,800,000 bacteria per ounce or gram. Raw sausage contained 48,280,000 bacteria per ounce or gram.

“A food which introduces these deadly organisms, the anaerobes, at the rate of ten to twenty-five billions to the ounce, as do pork, beef and sausage, must certainly be classed as unclean,” said Dr. Kellogg, in summing up the report on his experiments. “When thousands are daily indulging themselves in this dietary, what wonder that Bright’s disease, enteritis, and other maladies due to germs and germ poisons are so rife and so rapidly increasing? It is quite as important to keep the inside of the body in a sweet, clean and wholesome condition as to maintain a wholesome state of the external portion of the body.”

CANCER AND MEAT EATING

That nothing could seem more definite than the connection between cancer and the practice of eating inferior meat, is the conclusion reached by Dr. G. Cook Adams, who made a series of statistical studies under the direction of the Chicago Board of Health. “There cannot be the slightest doubt,” says this expert, “that the great increase in cancer among the foreign born of Chicago over the prevalence of that disease in their native countries, is due to the increased consumption of animal foods, particularly those derived from diseased animals.” This conclusion substantiates the original deductions made by Dr. Adams from investigations carried on over a number of years in Australia and London.

Dr. Woods Hutchinson stated that the rise of any nation in civilization is invariably accompanied by an increased abundance in food supply; and the rise of these foreign born in Chicago in civilization substantiates Dr. Woods Hutchinson’s views. Receiving more wages than in their native homes, where their diet was simple, they are enabled to indulge in a meat diet denied them in Europe. The result is an increase in the death rate from cancer between the years 1856 and 1866 of 680%, while from 1866 to 1905 the increase was 232%.

In 1905 cancer was responsible for one in every twenty-three deaths, while in 1906 one death in every 21.8 was due to this horrible disease. The Italians and the Chinese were the only two of all the races represented in Chicago that do not show a far greater death rate from cancer than in their own homes. The Italians keep up the use of macaroni and spaghetti, while the Chinese adhere to their native diet of rice. The nations showing the higher mortality consume large quantities of canned, preserved, dried and pickled meats, sausages, etc. It was also shown that the bulk of the fresh meat prepared at the plant of a slaughtering company was stock condemned by official inspectors, and this was the meat eaten by the poor.

INVESTIGATIONS IN NEW YORK

Dr. W. H. Guilfoy, of the New York Health Department, recently published the results of investigations of the death rate among foreigners in New York, and showed that cancer, heart disease and chronic Bright’s disease have increased alarmingly in recent years, and his statistics show that foreigners of flesh eating nations reveal the highest rates for the three diseases mentioned, in marked contrast with nations that consume from 50 to 400% less meat per capita. The following list shows the exact comparison:

DEATHS PER 100,000 AMONG FLESH-EATING FOREIGNERS

Chronic Heart Bright’s Cancer. Disease. Disease.

Irish 166.6 381.2 410 German 151.9 231.5 212 English 140 207 209 Bohemian 246 237.4 255.7

DEATHS PER 100,000 AMONG NATIONALITIES NOTED FOR SMALL CONSUMPTION OF MEAT

Chronic Heart Bright’s Cancer. Disease. Disease.

Austro-Hungarian 151.5 190.7 131.2 Swedish 84.7 69.7 99.6 Polish 130 170 121 Italian 63.7 161 107.7

Another argument which the opponents of meat-eating bring forward, is based upon the fact that in eating flesh which contains blood, we consume a great deal of waste material and poisons from the body of the animal. When the blood flows from the heart outward to each organ of the body it is a life-stream containing life-giving oxygen and particles of fresh food material for the use of the tissues, but when it flows back it is freighted with the elements of disease and death, with poisonous substances which are the bi-products of organic activity, and which, if retained in the body for any length of time invariably cause disease. The rapidity with which the blood becomes impure and poisonous may be easily noted by winding a string about the finger, when the flesh will quickly turn a blue color. Animals die as men and women die, with their ailments within them, and if you eat of them you eat the products of their disease process. Tuberculosis is known to be one of the maladies sometimes transmitted by the use of flesh. Numerous epidemics of typhoid fever have been traced to the use of oysters.

THE PROTEID ARGUMENT

It had generally been assumed by physiologists that the great virtue of meat lay in the greater digestibility of its proteid matter. Recent experiment investigations, however, have shown that the vegetable proteids are as a rule not less digestible than those from animal sources. The vegetable proteids are often packed away and enveloped in cellulose or other material difficult of digestion, or are permeated with fats, as in some of the nuts; but modern methods of preparing grains for the market, and also the thorough cooking of them, remove this difficulty.

The deficiency of ordinary vegetable dietaries in proteids has been a ground for criticism by the opponents of this regimen. Since, however, the researches of Chittenden, Mendel, Metchnikoff, Dr. Folin, and others have shown us that we need much less proteid than the elder school of physiologists so long supposed, this objection loses its weight. And, furthermore, there are many nut foods which are even richer in proteids than cooked meats. Cooked meat contains 25% of proteids, while peanut butter contains 29%. The edible portion of walnuts contains 27%, and the edible portion of pine nuts 35%.

To sum up the argument in this matter it is our belief that modern science has demonstrated that excessive meat eating is dangerous, because of its high proteid content and its liability to germ infection; and, also, that we can obtain all the elements which meat contains from other kinds of food which are not open to the objections fairly to be made against the use of meat. Nevertheless, here, as elsewhere, it may be said that “Fletcherism,”—complete mastication—is again the key that unlocks the solution of this problem for many. Thorough mastication leads to the use of less meat; it also gives the germicidal saliva a chance to kill harmful germs; and it aids the digestive organs very materially. Eat meat—says the rational physiologist—if you feel you must, or if it is difficult to abandon its use, but be careful to chew it well.

It is true, to be sure, that the digestion of proteid is accomplished not by saliva, but by stomach juices, which would seem to be an argument in favor of bolting meat (as the dog does), but the mere maceration of the meat by the teeth, if nothing more, is a help to the stomach in its work of digestion.

X

THE CASE AGAINST STIMULANTS

The dominant note of the discussion that for years has been waged in scientific and medical circles as to the effect of alcohol on the human constitution has been, to the puzzled layman at any rate, the insistent, reiterated cry of the fundamental “mystery” of alcohol. Alcohol is poison! cries one school. It is not anything of the sort, being, as a matter of fact, a food! retorts the opposing school. Its use in health or its administration to patients sick of any ailment is hardly short of a crime, declares one leading physician. Tut! tut! alcohol in moderation does no harm, and it is invaluable in the treatment of many diseases! replies another. And so the arguments proceeded.

Summing up his views of the deliberations of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, recently held at Leicester, England, and which formed a storm center for the great alcohol debate, a noted chemist in London “Science,” said that we know how far the sun is, and can tell the weight of the earth, predict when the next comet may be expected, and give true answers to many other important questions, but we do not know “anything to speak of” on the subject of alcohol. As to the discussions that have waged at Leicester and elsewhere on the question of the medical use of alcohol, the general impression left on the world of laymen is that they all (the noted authorities) disagreed with one another more or less, and that nobody can declare with any scientific authority whether alcoholic liquor is good for us or bad for us.

We propose here to describe the work of one scientist who has made experiments which enable him to declare with authority that alcohol is injurious. This investigator is Charles E. Stewart, M. D., of the Battle Creek Sanitarium. He has closely studied the work of Sir Edward Wright, London, the discoverer of “Opsonins”; and his experiments were suggested by those of Wright. They led him to the discovery that alcohol has a harmful effect on the blood by lowering its supply of opsonins.

It has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of most students of Wright and Metchnikoff, and their allies, that the opsonins form one of the most valuable of the body’s defences against disease. And if Dr. Stewart has demonstrated that alcohol poisons the opsonins, it must be admitted that at last a positive and tangible proof has been brought forward of alcohol’s harmful qualities. What nourishes and strengthens the blood, helps the lifeforce within us; what weakens or poisons the blood, is an attack upon the very citadel of vitality. Alcohol, says Dr. Stewart, is such an enemy.

In such diseases as pneumonia and tuberculosis, the white cells, according to Wright, cannot effectually combat the germs unless there are plenty of opsonins present to aid them. Now, in treating pneumonia and tuberculosis, many practitioners encourage the use of alcohol. Dr. Stewart believed that alcohol was injurious. Having heard Sir W. Edward Wright’s lectures, he asked himself the question:

“Can the evil effects of alcohol be due to its lowering of the opsonic power of the blood?”

He instituted a series of experiments to determine, if possible, the facts in the case. He first of all administered to four persons who all their lives had been total abstainers, two ounces each of port wine. The normal opsonic power of each of these individuals had been determined as being 75 or above—that is to say, it was well above the point at which the opsonic power must be maintained in order that the white cell may do effective fighting. At the time when the subjects took the port wine, the first subject had a normal amount of opsonic power to resist the germ of tuberculosis which may be expressed by the term 1.13., and a normal power of resistance to the pus germ, which infects wounds, of 1.06. After drinking the wine, both those powers of resistance were lowered most perceptibly; the first to .85, and the second to .67. Similar results, in greater or less degree, followed in all other cases. The port wine decreased the power of the blood to make opsonic sauce for the white cells.

In a second series of experiments, two ounces of Scotch whisky were taken an hour apart; that is, the normal index was taken, and immediately afterwards an ounce of the Scotch whisky was taken, an hour later another ounce, and an hour after this the index was taken again. The results here were similar. For the germs of tuberculosis it was discovered that the opsonic power had dropped 10% and for the streptococci (or pus-forming) germs about 8%.

In another experiment where two ounces of sherry wine were used, the opsonic power for the germs of tuberculosis dropped 11% and for the streptococci 5%.

In another experiment where four ounces of champagne were taken, the opsonic power dropped 9% for the germs of tuberculosis and 19% for the streptococci germ. Many other experiments were performed, but they gave practically the same results. The opsonic power decreased in proportion to the amount of alcohol contained in the liquor.

Dr. Stewart carried on his experiments in the laboratory of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, with the assistance of Dr. A. W. Nelson. He reported his results to the American Society for the Study of Alcohol and Drug Neuroses:

“I realize that there are a great number of factors which influence the opsonic power of the blood, and that there is considerable variation in even what may be considered normal cases, but, notwithstanding these variations, there is a sufficient uniformity to enable us to make some very valuable deductions. I feel justified in concluding that alcohol has a marked influence in reducing the vital forces of the body, thereby greatly interfering with the natural power of the body to remedy ailments. Since Wright has shown that out of all comparison the most valuable asset in medicine lies in raising the anti-bacterial power of the blood, the adminstration of alcohol, which according to these experiments, is pro-bacterial, and as such a strong liability instead of an asset, should be eliminated from our therapeutics, at least so far as internal administration in infectious diseases is concerned.

“While only a comparatively few experiments have been made, the results obtained have been uniform, and justify, I believe, the preliminary report of it given to the medical profession and the public with the hope that it may encourage others to pursue the work further in this direction.

“Heretofore, when any statement was made to the effect that alcohol caused this or the other disease, or ailment, or harmful effect of any sort on the human constitution, the reply could be and was made that the case could not be proven; that there were always

circumstances which might be construed as showing that other factors besides alcohol influenced the situation. Now, however, I believe that we have opened up a line of investigation which will place the proofs against alcohol on a solid scientific basis by demonstrating its injurious effect on the blood, which is the life."

TEA AND COFFEE

In the same laboratory where Dr. Stewart placed his case against alcohol, experiments are being made which show in the same direct way that such drinks as tea and coffee also lower the opsonic power of the blood. Into the United States alone are imported more than one billion pounds, or five hundred thousand tons of tea and coffee each year. It is estimated that tea and coffee contain from three to six per cent. of poison. Therefore, more than fifteen thousand tons of poison, "so deadly that twenty grains might produce fatal results if administered to a full-grown man in a single dose"—in all more than ten billion deadly doses of poison, or, "fully six times as much as would be required to kill every man, woman and child on the face of the earth," are brought into this country every year, as component parts of substances which are commonly regarded as pleasant foodstuffs.

This is the case stated against coffee and tea in its broadest and most emphatic form. The opponents of the use of tea drinking term both tea and coffee "drugs." What is commonly thought to be the pleasantest property of both tea and coffee, namely, their ability to banish one's sense of fatigue, is regarded by the critics of the tea and coffee drinking habits as perhaps the most sufficient evidence of their poisonous character.

"No one would doubt for a moment," says one such critic, "the poisonous nature of a drug capable of producing irresistible drowsiness in a person who is not weary, as morphine would, for instance. Vice versa, the power of a drug to produce wakefulness in a person strongly inclined to sleep as the result of fatigue is equal evidence of its poisonous character. The sallow complexion common among women of the higher classes who have reached middle life, the almost universal nervousness among American women, and many common digestive disorders, and the increasing prevalence of nervous or sick headaches, afford to the experienced physician ample evidence of the toxic or poisonous character of tea and coffee."

Tea and coffee contain (in addition to caffeine) tannic acid, and various other volatile poisons, each of which produces characteristic harmful effects. The volatile oils give rise to nervous excitability, and after a time provoke serious nervous disorders. Caffeine is a narcotic, which has been shown to diminish the activity of the peptic glands—and thus seriously to interfere with the normal operation of the organs of digestion. The eminent physiologist, Wolfe, showed by experiments that three grains of caffeine—an amount that might easily be imbibed in an ordinary cup of tea or coffee—very substantially impairs the quality of the gastric juices, lessening their total acidity. Roberts' experiments showed that tea and coffee interfere with the action of the saliva upon the starch of the food, and at times may even wholly destroy its effect.

XI

DIET REFORM IN THE FAMILY

The reader is now familiar with the new ideas upon the subject of human nutrition. It is obvious, of course, that if these ideas should ever come into general acceptance, there would be enormous changes in the every-day habits of human beings. And we can well imagine that a person might be fully convinced of the soundness of all the arguments which have been advanced in this book, and yet shrink in dismay from the complications incidental to applying them.

We ourselves have faced these difficulties in many forms. We have wished to have two meals, and yet felt obliged to have three, because all our friends had them, and we did not wish to be hermits. We have wished to avoid meat, and yet have eaten it, because it was on the table, and we did not like to startle our hostess—and perhaps find ourselves involved in an argument about vegetarianism, in the course of which we had either to permit a good cause to go down into defeat, or else to tell facts about meat which would take away every one's appetite for meat, and for vegetables as well. But in the end, the desire for health has conquered all other motives with us, and we have broken with every trace of the old ways. It seemed to us that we would help and interest others if we gave some account of how the new ideas have worked out in practice, and the daily regimen of a family which adopts them.

This book is written in Bermuda, where the writers have been living in co-operation, along the lines worked out at Helicon Hall, only upon a much smaller scale. Their party consists of eight adults and three children—this including two governesses, a secretary, and a servant. They live in an isolated neighborhood, upon the waterfront. Most of the party sleep out of doors on the broad

verandas of the house, while the wide doors and windows of the other rooms afford ample ventilation. Daily sea-bathing is the habit of all of the group.

The married women of the party assume in turn the direction of our dietaries; that is to say, they choose the menus, and attend to the ordering of the food supplies. We eat but twice a day, and the menus are made up entirely of fruits, grains, nuts and vegetables, with the occasional use of eggs. We obtain from the Battle Creek Sanitarium a great number of the foods we use, availing ourselves of its splendidly managed food-department. The children eat three times a day, but their breakfasts are very light, consisting of orange juice and a fig or two, or perhaps a banana. The children have this light breakfast immediately after arising. At ten o'clock comes the principal meal of the day for the whole household. An effort is made to make this meal "well balanced"; that is to say, to have the proportion of proteids, carbohydrates and fats. There are usually not more than two, or at the most, three cooked dishes. Sometimes the main dish is a soup; sometimes it is baked or boiled macaroni with tomato dressing; sometimes it is bean or pea croquettes; sometimes it is scrambled eggs, or the yolks of hard boiled eggs.

We have a constant supply of fresh vegetables, the justly celebrated Bermuda onion; beets, turnips, egg plant, raw cabbage, potatoes, white and sweet, rice, hominy, green peas, tomatoes, and lettuce.

We have corn pones, corn bread, brown bread containing oatmeal, ordinary white bread, and oven toast—that is to say, slices of bread baked in the oven until it is brown all the way through. From Battle Creek we have malt honey, malted nuts, ripe olives, olive oil, fig and prune marmalades made without cane sugar, various crackers and grain preparations, and several other nut products. The Sanitarium health-chocolate, a sweet made without the use of cane sugar, and with chocolate divested of its caffeine, also appears on our table. We have eliminated dessert at dinner, having learned not only at Battle Creek, but in the sore school of experience, that the heterogeneous mixtures of cream or milk and cane sugar and various mushy stuffs, along with butter or lard, in the shape of pies and puddings and cakes, are extremely undesirable foods. We find the sweet, pure taste of malt honey an adequate and highly satisfactory substitute.

[Illustration: The Daily Swim]

Fruits rarely appear on the table at dinner, since we do not wish to mix them with vegetables. They make their appearance in great abundance at supper, which we have at five o'clock. At this meal we have various cooked fruits, such as prunes or apricots or baked or stewed apples; and of uncooked fruits, oranges, apples, figs, bananas, grapes, and whatever else the market affords. With these we have zweibach and common bread or crackers. At both meals appears Yogurt, an acidulous and agreeable beverage which gratefully checks thirst and in itself nourishes, and is also the vehicle whereby millions of beneficial germs are introduced into the body.

The work of preparing and serving these two meals is done by one person—and that person has time left to play tennis and go in swimming with the rest of us. The total cost of the food is less than thirty dollars a week; cooked and served, its cost is about three dollars and a quarter a week per person. In this connection it should be explained that Bermuda prices, for even the commonest things, are in excess of prices in New York. We pay five cents each for eggs and twelve cents a quart for milk. We have oranges by the barrel, but they come from California, or from Jamaica by way of New York. We have olive oil at four dollars a gallon, and sterilized butter at fifty cents a pound. And in addition the figures quoted include expressage and steamer charges, and ten per cent. duty as well. We mention these things for the light they throw upon the relative costs of the vegetarian and carnivorous life.

The reader will also wish to know about the health of a family living in this manner. When we came here all our children were half-sick from too long contact with cities, and we were not used to the climate, and so one of them caught a severe cold. With this exception there has not been a day's sickness among them, nor the remotest trace of an ailment. If we were to describe their looks the reader might attribute it to parental blindness, and so the proper plan seems to us to insert a picture of them, and let the reader come to his own conclusions.

For the guidance of any housewife who may wish to try our regimen, we give a few typical menus, and also recipes for some of the favorite dishes of our family. We are all hungry when mealtime comes in our household, and we enjoy the surprises of the menu with all the zest that we ever welcomed roast turkey and pumpkin pies in the old days. And this seems in some magical way to be true, not only of ourselves, but also of such guests as happen along. It is worth noting that three different persons, who have never before known or thought anything about vegetarianism, have stayed with us for periods of several months; and all of them have fallen into the ways of our household, have been well and strong, and untroubled by craving for meat—and in two cases have found, to their great dismay, that they were gaining in weight upon two "low proteid" meals a day!

The first of the tables which follow contains a typical menu for a week; and the second gives an extra list of dinners. The third shows what we do upon some special occasion; it was the banquet which we prepared for Mark Twain—only, alas, his physician had ordered him to be home by sundown, and he couldn't stay to partake of it.

Inasmuch as all people cannot change their meal hours in accordance with those we have suggested, we give these menus upon the basis of three meals a day, with the various food elements properly balanced. We have also included simple desserts, for the benefit of those who do not care to dispense with this feature. The menus in our own home are similar to these, with the exclusion of the breakfasts and the dessert.[1]

[1] Very good vegetarian cook books are those entitled "Science in the Kitchen," and "Healthful Cookery," both of them by Mrs. E. E. Kellogg, the wife of the superintendent of the Battle Creek Sanitarium. Some of the books which are listed in another place as being those which a student of the new art of health may read will also furnish many good recipes. The "Art of Living in Good Health," by Dr. Daniel S. Sager, will be found especially helpful in this regard. We give in the Appendix three simple menus of the Battle Creek Sanitarium. These menus have the food values indicated, and will be found very useful in giving a rough idea of the number of calories contained in ordinary foods.

MONDAY

Breakfast

Oranges Poached eggs Graham gems

Dinner

Lima beans, dried or fresh Baked potatoes Mixed nuts Whole wheat bread Lettuce salad Tapioca pudding

Supper

Oven toast brown bread Cottage cheese Apple sauce Almond cream Figs Bananas

TUESDAY

Breakfast

Grape fruit Corn meal mush with cream Buttered toast

Dinner

Baked macaroni Mixed nuts Brown bread Tomato salad with mayonnaise dressing Indian meal pudding

Supper

Zweibach Brown bread Ripe olives Stewed prunes Dates Bananas Hot malted nuts

WEDNESDAY

Breakfast

Baked apples and cream Omelet Pop overs

Dinner

Peas patties with tomato sauce Baked sweet potatoes White bread Boiled onions Baked custard

Supper

Oven toast Whole wheat bread Nut butter Stewed fruit Cottage cheese Apples Bananas

THURSDAY

Breakfast

Oranges Hominy with cream Currant puffs

Dinner

Bean and nut croquettes with cream sauce Baked egg plant Graham bread Boiled rice Dates with whipped cream

Supper

Oven toast Graham bread Honey Ripe olives Apple sauce Grapes Bananas

FRIDAY

Breakfast

Grapes Scrambled eggs Whole wheat gems

Dinner

Vegetable soup Assorted nuts Beet and lettuce salad with mayonnaise dressing Corn pones Cottage pudding

Supper

Golden maize crackers Graham bread Nut butter Canned fruit Bananas and apples

SATURDAY

Breakfast

Grape fruit Toasted corn flakes with cream Buttered toast Marmalade

Dinner

Baked beans Cabbage slaw Baked potatoes Mashed turnips Brown bread Baked apples with cream

Supper

Oven toast Brown bread Cottage cheese Sliced pineapple Bananas Figs

SUNDAY

Breakfast

Grapes Soft boiled eggs Corn meal gems Orange marmalade

Dinner

Pea and tomato soup Succotash Corn bread Potato salad Baked bananas Mixed nuts and raisins

Supper

Zweibach Oatmeal bread Malted nuts Ripe olives Canned fruits Bananas Dates

EXTRA DINNERS

Yolks hard boiled eggs Baked potatoes Beets Prune pudding Vegetable soup Cabbage salad Corn bread Baked custard

Scrambled eggs Baked lyonnaise potatoes Beet and lettuce salad Dates with whipped cream

Macaroni with tomato sauce Whole wheat gems Egg salad Apple tapioca pudding

Baked beans Tomato, chili sauce Mashed turnips Lettuce with French dressing Lemon jelly

Pea soup Corn pones Potato and onion salad Cabinet pudding

Peas patties with tomato sauce Mashed potatoes Carrots with butter sauce

Baked nuttolene with cream sauce Baked sweet potatoes Stewed tomatoes Baked apples and cream Lima beans (fresh or dried) Baked sweet potatoes Lettuce Corn pones Stuffed dates

Baked beans Lettuce Corn (canned or sweet) Nuts and raisins

RECIPES

Vegetable soup: Cut in dice three turnips, three carrots, three onions, three potatoes. Cover with water and simmer for thirty minutes. Cook one can of tomatoes, or one quart of fresh tomatoes, strain and thicken a little with flour. Add to vegetables and cook thirty minutes. Add butter and sprinkle with parsley.

Corn pones: Three cups corn meal, 1 heaping teaspoon salt, 1 tablespoon sugar, 1 heaping tablespoon butter. Add boiling water until meal is scalded, pat it into flat, thin cakes and bake three-quarters of an hour.

Mayonnaise dressing: Yolk of egg; add 1½ cups olive oil, drop by drop, stirring in one direction. Juice of two small lemons, 1 teaspoon salt.

Macaroni with tomatoes: Half package macaroni; drop into a kettle of boiling water. Boil vigorously for thirty minutes. To one can tomatoes add two onions chopped fine. Simmer until onions are done, then strain and thicken with flour. Put macaroni into colander and rinse with cold water. Add the tomato sauce and simmer gently for fifteen minutes. It is well to do this in double boiler to prevent burning.

Bean or pea soup without meat or pork: Soak two cups of split peas over night. In the morning slice and add two large onions and simmer for several hours. Strain.

Beans baked without pork: Use butter or nut butter instead.

Bean and nut croquettes: Cook dried beans until soft. Strain through colander to remove all skins. Add equal parts of walnut meat ground in chopper; season with salt and a little sage. Mix with beaten egg. Form into croquettes and bake until dry and nicely browned. Serve with tomato or cream sauce.

Baked egg plant: Boil egg plant until tender; pare and mash; mix with bread crumbs and eggs, and bake until nicely browned. A little finely chopped onions may be added if desired.

Peas cutlets: One cup pea pulp, one cup steamed rice, one grated onion, one-half teaspoon sage, one-half cup tomato juice, one-third cup browned flour. Mix together and mold in cakes two-thirds of an inch thick. Bake half an hour. Serve with tomato or cream sauce.

XII

BREATHING AND EXERCISE

We have devoted most of our space to the problems of nutrition, since nutrition is the most important factor in the question of how to keep in health. We wish now to speak of other matters, of great importance in the art of keeping well; these are breathing, bathing, and exercise.

Many people have lived for more than a month without food. You can go for days without water. But if you are deprived of air for but a few minutes, your death is certain. Sixteen to eighteen times a minute the normal person respires, one breath being taken for every four beats of the heart, the central engine of life. Each time you breathe, the amount of air which passes into the lungs is about twenty-five cubic inches; which represent, however, but a small part of the actual capacity of the lungs. The average man can take into the lungs with an ordinary inspiration one hundred or more cubic inches, and is able to force out an equal amount with an ordinary expiration. If you have striven your utmost to expel all the air possible from your lungs, there will still remain about one hundred cubic inches of air within them. The total lung capacity of the average man is about three hundred and twenty-five cubic inches, or nearly one and a half gallons of air.

THE INDISPENSABILITY OF OXYGEN

Sunlight is the basis of all life. It is sunlight which plants absorb, and which they transform into materials which go to make up the living tissues of all things. The place of breathing in the process of life is manifold. But its primary function is to make available for the body’s uses the sunlight, or energy, which is stored up in the food we eat. It does this by means of the oxygen which it contains,

and the purpose of breathing is to obtain from the air an adequate supply of oxygen. Oxygen is one of the essential materials required for the support of life. Without oxygen the whole life process would come to an end. From every breath that is taken into the body, about one and a quarter cubic inches of oxygen must be obtained by the body, to keep up the fire of life within us. You cannot burn a match, or your reading lamp in the evening, unless there is an adequate supply of oxygen; and even so does the body require this indispensable and all powerful element in order to maintain itself.

[Illustration: FRESH AIR IN BERMUDA]

We have noted the fact that of the myriads upon myriads of swarming cells which the blood contains, a large proportion are the oxygen-conveyers. When you take air into your lungs, these cells absorb the precious element, and rush with it to all parts of the body. After distributing the oxygen wherever it is needed, they pick up for the return journey to the lungs all manner of débris and gases—the poisons which are produced by the organs of the body as they carry on their work. As Metchnikoff has shown us, it is the accumulation of poisons produced by the activity of our various organs which, unless properly disposed of, or kept below excessive quantities, bring about premature old age, the majority of all diseases, and early death. The amount of poisons which the average person throws off from the body with a single breath, as has been shown by delicate laboratory experiments, is enough to contaminate and render unfit for breathing three cubic feet or three-quarters of a barrel of air. Assuming an average of twenty breaths per minute, which is the normal rate for breathing for adults, the amount of air each person contaminates per minute will be sixty cubic feet, or one cubic foot a second.

If you hold your breath for a minute, you will be conscious of an extremely unpleasant feeling, which is the way in which the body manifests its urgent need for oxygen. The need of ventilation is not merely the need of oxygen, however. There may be plenty of oxygen in the air of a room which has been closed for some time, and which has been breathed in and out of the lungs of the people in the room; the trouble is that this oxygen is unfit for breathing, being full of impurities thrown off by the bodies of these people.

HOW TO CALCULATE ROOM VENTILATION

Dr. Kellogg has supplied some exceedingly useful calculations of the degree of ventilation needed in rooms of various sizes. “Every one,” he says, “should become intelligent in relation to the matter of ventilation, and should appreciate its importance. Vast and sometimes irreparable injury frequently results from the confinement of several scores or hundreds of people in a school room, church or lecture room, without adequate means of removing the impurities thrown off from their lungs and bodies. The same air being breathed over and over becomes intensely charged with poisons which render the blood impure, lessen resistance and induce susceptibility to taking cold and to infection with germs of pneumonia, consumption and other infectious diseases which are always present in a very crowded audience room.

“Suppose, for example, a thousand persons are seated in a room forty feet in width, sixty in length, and fifteen in height; how long a time would elapse before the air of such a room would become unfit for further respiration? Remembering that each person spoils one foot of air every second, it is clear that one thousand cubic feet of air will be contaminated for every second that the room is occupied. To ascertain the number of seconds which would elapse before the entire air contained in the room will be contaminated, so that it is unfit for further breathing, we have only to divide the cubic contents of the room by one thousand. Multiplying, we have 60 × 40 × 15 equals 36,000, the number of cubic feet. This, divided by one thousand, gives thirty-six as the number of seconds. Thus it appears that with closed doors and windows breath poisoning of the audience would begin at the end of thirty-six seconds, or less than one minute. The condition of the air in such a room at the end of an hour cannot be adequately pictured in words, and yet hundreds of audiences are daily subjected to just such inhumane treatment through the ignorance or stupidity of architects, or the carelessness of janitors, or the criminal negligence of both.”

TUBERCULOSIS POINTS THE MORAL

No circumstance has been more successful in impressing the great importance of fresh air and adequate ventilation upon the public mind than the success which has attended the open air cure for consumption. This is a mode of treatment of comparatively recent adoption in America, but it is by this time generally recognized as really the only possible cure for tuberculosis. The mortality from this disease is greater than any except pneumonia; another disease that proper breathing habits will do much to avert. In America one person in every nine dies of tuberculosis; and of the deaths which occur between the ages of fifteen and thirty-five, one-third are due to the great white plague. We give these figures on the authority of Professor Irving Fisher of Yale, who is

Secretary of the New Haven AntiTuberculosis Association. His interest in this disease is that of one who has had it, and who has cured it by the open air treatment. Of the authors of this book, one has had an experience similar to Professor Fisher. There is nothing academic about this insistence on the need of fresh air and proper breathing habits; literally, and in the fullest degree, it is a question of life and death whether you shall breathe properly, and have good air to breathe, or whether you shall not.

HOW BREATHING AIDS THE BATTLE OF THE BLOOD

To return for a moment to the processes of breathing, we find that the act of inflating the lungs is a blood-pumping process as well. This blood-pumping process has a great effect upon the struggle of the white soldiers of the blood to maintain the body against the inroads of disease. Each time that the wall of the chest is elevated after the lungs have been emptied, a suction force is exerted upon the large veins which enter the chest, especially those which come in through the abdominal cavity. “At the same moment,” to quote Dr. Kellogg again, “the downward pressure of the diaphragm by which the liver, stomach, and other abdominal organs are compressed against the muscular walls of the abdomen, serves to force the blood from below upward, emptying the venous blood of the abdominal cavity into the chest, thus helping it toward the heart. The more tense and well developed the muscles of the abdominal wall and the stronger the muscles of respiration, the stronger will be this upward movement of the blood. When the abdominal muscles are weakened by improper dress, by corsets, tight lacing, or by wearing of belts or bands or by sedentary habits, especially sitting in a stooped position, the weakened muscles yield to the downward pressure of the diaphragm, thus neutralizing to a large degree the beneficial influence of this action. This condition is unquestionably a cause of chronic disease of the liver and stomach, inactive bowels, and possibly lays the foundation of cirrhosis of the liver, spleen, and other grave disorders of the abdominal region.”

It is very obvious how deep breathing will thus influence the vigor of the blood’s army of cells. Deep breathing forces the blood to rush into the lungs, there to be charged with oxygen. Without this oxygen the white cells die. Vigorous breathing also directly aids digestion, and promotes the absorption of food materials. Those who have slow digestion will find that breathing exercises will be of especial benefit. In ordinary breathing of a quiet person, the movements of the chest are so slight as to be scarcely noticeable, but when vigorous breathing is indulged in, the diaphragm as it moves up and down kneads the stomach and its contents and, very materially, assists the digestive organs.

HAVE FRESH AIR AT NIGHT

During sleeping hours the breathing movements are slighter and slower than when one is awake and active. It is necessary that the activity of the body should be lessened in order that rest may be secured; and yet the work of the liver, kidneys, and other organs which are engaged in throwing off poisons goes on continually; as does also the repairing work of the living cells, which are forever building up the parts of the body broken down by work or sickness. For some six to nine hours the body is thus occupied in resting and repairing itself, in order that on the next day it may respond like a living machine to the demand of the conscious mind. We should do all in our power to help on this recuperative process; and no way will be more effective than to sleep, out of doors, or with the head at a window, or at least in a well-ventilated room.

There are a great number of breathing exercises described in various books on the subject, but the best breathing exercise is natural breathing. If the head is kept erect, and the shoulders low so that the chest is upright; if breathing is carried on through the nostrils, and the habit of deep breathing carefully cultivated—there will be no need for special exercises, save in the case of invalids. The most effective of all breathing exercises is to run or walk rapidly, or walk up a hill, or up stairs, if these be in the open air, with the head well back. This exercise heightens the action of the lungs, and all parts of the body are flooded with fresh air.

HOW EXERCISE AIDS THE BATTLE OF THE BLOOD

The question of breathing properly is intimately bound up with the question of exercise. The best of all exercise is play. All games in the open air which a person takes part in for the love of them far surpass the cleverest and most scientific sets of rules which physiologists have ever evolved. Unconscious performance of all the functions of the body is the ideal of hygiene. Exercise aids the battle of life within us in a direct manner. Exercise breaks down worn out tissue, making room for new and healthy tissue. It increases the rate of oxidation or burning up of fuel within us, and this in its turn enables the body to get rid of waste of material. Exercise also increases the strength and endurance of the muscles and fibres.

When muscles become weak, they relax and allow various portions of the body to drop into positions which are not only ungraceful, but are decidedly injurious. When the muscles are not used and become flabby, the shoulders get rounded and drop forward

through the weakness of the muscles which are intended to hold them back in position. The ribs which form the framework of the chest not being properly sustained by the muscles attached to them, gradually fall inward, thus flattening the chest, and compressing the lungs. There is a very close connection between gracefulness of carriage and sound bodily health.

The person who lounges, or slouches, be it ever so picturesquely, does so at the expense of the body. Proper exercise will prevent these physical defects, and will remedy them in most persons who have not yet attained middle age. Even in advanced years, say the physiologists, much may be done to correct these physical deformities by properly directed and systematic exercises.

EXERCISES MAKE NEW BLOOD

Exercise has another most important task in supplying an adequate amount of blood to the bones of the body, in order that these bones may carry on their work of manufacturing fresh blood for the use of the body. Unless these bones are bathed with the already existing blood of the body, which carries to them oxygen and nourishment, the process of manufacturing new blood, which goes on within the marrow of the bones, would quickly cease. It has been demonstrated by science that muscular activity increases the blood flow through the muscles as many as six times.

Here, then, lies perhaps the first hope for supplying new blood to any body which has begun to deteriorate through the accumulation of poisons emanating from the large intestine, or from the other organs. Exercise will supply the blood-producing bone marrow with six times as much raw material to make new blood as a sedentary mode of life would produce, and at the same time this six-times-strengthened flood will wash out of the crevices of the bones and muscles and fibres the stored up poisons. For these purposes, the exercises which move the large muscle masses are the most helpful. Dr. Benton A. Colver, of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, to whom we are indebted for assistance in preparing this chapter, names the following exercises as being beneficial for this purpose:

Low knee bending, stretching and heel sinking, and heel raising; lying on the floor with the weight supported by toes and hands, and lowering and raising the body; raising the body by the arms, holding to a bar above the head; walking with a vigorous stride, and running and swimming.

Of all these exercises, swimming is theoretically the best, for the reason that it exercises equally all the muscle masses in the body, and requires the best balanced of all movements. Walking and running come next in the order of excellence, simply for the reason that they can be carried on best in the open air and without the bother that may accompany the performance of more formal exercises.

EXERCISES WHICH RETARD AUTO-INTOXICATION

Another way in which exercise directly helps the battle of the blood within us, is by assisting such organs of body-poison elimination as the spleen, the liver, and the portal system of veins. It is in these organs that the exhausted blood is broken up and cast off. The blood in these organs is loaded with broken down tissue and other waste material from the body, and is contaminated with gases and poisons. In the body of the person who leads a sedentary life a great volume of blood settles in these organs and is prematurely put out of use.

Proper exercises will empty this great tank of stagnant blood as easily as a sponge is emptied by the pressure of the hand. This passive blood, having access to all the organs of digestion, is largely responsible for the supply of inferior digestive juices, and thus is a leading factor in indigestion, loss of appetite, and such diseases as catarrh of the stomach and bowels. If, however, this blood is pumped on as it should be to the heart and lungs, there to be cleansed, the fresh blood rushes in to fill its place, armed by the activity of the lungs with its life-giving ammunition of oxygen.

By persistently keeping up this emptying and filling of the portal veins, and of the spleen and liver, the old cinders left from the oxidation of food are washed away, new digestive juices are formed, and the whole tone of the body is improved. For such purposes such exercises as the following are extremely valuable:

Stand erect and, with the hands on hips, bend the trunk forward, backward, and sideward, keeping the legs stiff. Trunk rotation, performed by bending forward and then describing as large a circle as possible with the head thrown first to the right and then to the left, and bending the trunk backward as far as possible when that segment of the arc is reached; lying on the back and raising first the head, second the feet, with bent knees, and third, the feet with straight legs. These exercises stretch the diaphragm against the liver and portal vein, and thus squeeze out the blood from these organs and send it back to the heart and lungs.

EXERCISES WHICH PROMOTE DEEP BREATHING

A third manner in which exercise directly assists the battle of the blood is by increasing heart action and deep breathing. Exercises which accomplish these functions insure an abundant supply of oxygen to the blood and the tissues. In this manner, more heat will be produced in the active tissues, and the blood current will carry this beneficial glow of heat to the most distant parts. This toning up of the “heating system” will be evidenced by the appearance of perspiration. When skin and lung activity are thus increased, the accumulated wastes of the body are quickly eliminated.

[Illustration: OUTDOOR EXERCISE.]

The person who takes vigorous exercise in the open air such as playing games like tennis or golf, or who walks vigorously, will have no need for formal breathing exercises. For those, however, who cannot readily obtain outdoor exercises the natural way, the following chest movements and breathing exercises are recommended. They should be taken with the body free from tight clothing, and either in the open air or a well-ventilated room. First, raise the hands above the head as far as they can reach, and then bring them forward and upward several times, and then upward and downward on the side of the head, inhaling on the uplifting of the arms, exhaling on the sinking of the arms. When the arms are lifted above the head, opportunity is given for the air inhaled to reach the upper part of the lungs, parts which in the sedentary person are very rarely used, and where usually the germs of tuberculosis begin their evil work. Arm extension forward, breathing deeply with arms carried sideward and backward, at shoulder height. If those who exercise in their rooms will be careful to breathe only through the nose and will keep the head erect, they will find that the performance of almost any set of exercises will serve also as breathing exercises, since they will increase lung activity.

XIII

BATHING AND CLEANLINESS

The soldiers of the body which carry on for us the battle against disease, old age, and death, have as great and as constant a need of water as do the human soldiers, part of whose equipment is always the indispensable canteen. Water is needed by the body in many ways, but it is especially required by the blood. Water is the solvent in which float the white and red corpuscles of the blood, and the many nutritive elements which the blood carries through the body, and the particles of waste material which it bears to the lungs to be burnt up, or to the other excretory organs to be ejected. By the aid of water, the minute particles of food which are broken up and transformed by the chemical processes of the body are conveyed to the most distant fibre of the intricate human mechanism, wherever repair or new growth is required. No other element of nature could so well carry on this function as water. It is so limpid and mobile that it can move through the most delicate and intricate network of veins, and can find its way by osmosis or percolation into such parts as are inaccessible by openings.

The human body is constantly throwing off water. A large portion is lost by evaporation from the skin, upon which it is poured out by millions of what might be termed little sewer pipes or sweat ducts, for the purpose of washing away impurities from the system. The kidneys remove a considerable quantity, bearing with it poisonous elements in solution, the product of various vital activities. In other ways water is removed from the body, to the amount of about five pints in twenty-four hours. This loss must be made good in order that the requisite fluidity of the blood shall be maintained; and the need of the body is expressed by thirst. Beverages which contain other substances, as flavor, or as part of some mixed drink, are useful as thirst quenchers just in proportion to the amount of water which they contain.

Physiologists point to the evaporation of water from the surface of the human body as being one of the most perfect adaptations of means to ends exhibited in the whole circle of life. The vital activities of the body occasion the constant production of heat. At times the heat is greater than is needed, and would destroy the vitality of certain tissues if it were not speedily conducted away, just as too much heat in a stove would melt the iron of the stove. The evaporation of water from the skin accomplishes this heat dispersal. When external heat is great, perspiration in the normal, healthy person is more active than when external heat is less than that in the body, and, by this provision of Nature, the temperature of the body is maintained at about 100° Fahrenheit under all circumstances, and thus man is enabled to exist under such great extremes of heat and cold as are found in nature.

There are numerous other ways in which water is essential to the process of life within us. The free drinking of water greatly favors the elimination from the system of the products of waste. It hastens tissue change, and encourages the assimilation of food. And apart from its use internally, it has also a very great value as a means of applying heat to or abstracting it from the body for

remedial purposes, to say nothing of the functions it performs as a cleansing agent. Of late years the value of water in therapeutics has become generally recognized by the medical profession, and all over the world its use as an active agent has increased. Indeed, in the view of some physiologists, ordinary pure cold water is by far the most powerful and useful of all known healing agencies. It heals not by any strange or occult power, but by co-operating with the natural forces of the body, by aiding to the utmost those physiological processes by means of which the body sustains itself in health, and resists the encroachments of disease by the means of its bodyguard of blood cells, and by maintaining at its high pitch its innate vital resistance. When the Austrian Priessnitz first began the use of water in his mountain village a century ago, the world believed that the wonderful cures he wrought were accomplished by mystical charms or incantations by which he was supposed to communicate to the water its healing power. Modern science, however, has revealed the secret of water's potency as a curative agent, and hydrotherapy, or curing by water, is now as well recognized as almost any other branch of medical science.

THE VALUE OF BATHING

The daily cold bath is one of the best ways of keeping the doctor at a distance. Cold water has the property of increasing vital work of all kinds. When it is applied to the skin "impulses are sent inward that awaken every organ of the body," says Kellogg. Let us see what takes place: when a person dips his body into cold water, as in sea bathing, or when he steps into the bath at home, the first thing he does, which in fact he finds himself doing involuntarily, is to draw in a deep breath.

"Oooh-h-h!" he says, but he says it with an indrawing breath. The lungs swell out, the heart begins to pound away with unusually increased vigor and strength, and every part of the system is stimulated. Cold bathing and deep breathing are two valuable things which go inseparably together. The deep breathing increases lung activity, and the lungs bring in more oxygen; the heart circulates the blood with greater force, and hence more and better blood is carried to every tissue of the body. The result is a stirring up of the bodily forces, and a distribution throughout the system of a larger amount of highly vitalized and oxygenated blood.

It has been shown definitely that cold bathing increases enormously the number of white blood corpuscles in the blood. Whether this result is accomplished by the birth of new cells, or by the calling forward of cells from remote parts of the body into the general stream of the blood, is not generally known; but the fact remains that counts of the blood cells taken just before and just after the body has been stimulated by cold water show a decided increase in the army of the warrior cells.

The benefit of sea bathing comes not from the salt in the air or in the water, as some people suppose, but simply from the cold water. The reaction from the dip into the cold water, which is brought about by the blood rushing to the surface to supply the heat which has been taken from it by the application of the water, is one of the most valuable of all curative processes. It is this reaction that sends the blood cells scurrying actively throughout the whole fortress of the body.

HOW COLD BATHING AIDS NUTRITION

Another way in which the application of cold water promotes the functions of life is by the stimulation of the secretion of gastric juice which it accomplishes. It thus helps on actively the digestive processes by which food is absorbed and taken into the blood. The liver and the salivary glands are stimulated in the same way.

When applied to the face, cold water stirs up the flagging energies of the brain, by invigorating the blood. A dash of cold water upon the chest produces a stimulation of all the bodily forces, which a tired person will find more valuable than any pick-me-up or tonic or cup of tea, or nip of whisky or other alleged stimulant could possibly be. Applied over the heart, this organ is made to beat with greater steadiness and vigor. Application to the stomach causes increased production of pepsin and acid or gastric juices. Over the bowels it stimulates intestinal activity; over the loins it increases the action of the kidneys. A cold compress, or a douch over the liver will cause increased liver activity. Every organ in the interior of the body may be thus aroused to increased activity by a simple application of cold water upon the skin overlying the organ, for thus a rush of blood will be caused to that particular portion. It is necessary that the application should be brief, three or four seconds to as many minutes. These short cold applications of water to the skin will increase immediately the activity of any sluggish part, or of any organ whose function we wish to increase as a means of aiding the body in its battle against the causes of disease.

The whole nervous system derives benefit from the stimulation of brief cold baths. This is one of the most valuable functions of water. Hydrotherapy has come to be a most valuable adjunct to the treatment of all nervous diseases. A slow stomach may be wakened up and set to doing effective work by a general cold bath taken daily, or by a local application of cold water. A cold water bag over the stomach for half an hour just before meal time is a wonderful appetite awakener, which may be used by persons

whose circumstances preclude them from the general cold bath and the exercises which cause a natural desire for food.

The best of all prescriptions for cold feet is to stand in very cold water a half inch deep and rub one foot with the other in alternation for five minutes. Hydrotherapy is the principal curative agent employed in the great Battle Creek Sanitarium, and its branches throughout the world, and in his book “Rational Hydrotherapy,” Dr. Kellogg has presented in a shape that makes the knowledge available to everybody the modes of treatment which may be employed at home. “A good way,” says Dr. Kellogg, upon whom we draw for information in the preparation of this chapter, “is to stand in the bath tub with the cold water faucet open and the plug out.” It will not be long before the feet will be red and will fairly burn with the afflux of fresh, warm blood which will rush to the feet.

Hot water can be used in conjunction with cold water, since heat tends to lessen vital work, and so heat may be employed when it is desired to diminish organic activity. Pain is one direct evidence of excessive activity. Heat is nature’s great remedy for internal pain. Heat cuts off the influence of cold and at the same time diverts the blood to the surface of the body. Cold, on the contrary, usually increases pain when the seat of it is some internal organ. Sometimes heat and cold are applied at the same time, as for a toothache, for instance, when a hot fomentation is applied to the cheek and an ice bag to the neck under the jaw. Pain in the pelvis is almost always relieved by a very hot foot bath or leg bath, which relieves the congestion by diverting the blood into the legs, and thus removes the condition which was responsible for the pain.

THE CARE OF THE TEETH

It appears to be a fact that in the United States the profession of dentistry, both mechanical and medical, has been carried to its highest point. No doubt Americans will cheerfully assure themselves that American brains and “bustle” are responsible for this condition. But the truth can not be quite so comforting; the great development of dentistry in this country must be due to the demand for it; and the demand for it evidences a state of affairs that is far from reassuring.

So rapid has been the increase of degeneration of the teeth in modern times, that many physiologists have seriously asked the question, “Will the American race become toothless?” To-day, while artificial teeth are manufactured from such a variety of substances and sold at such a variety of prices, it would seem that Americans are becoming a race of “store teeth” men and women.

As with all other branches of hygiene, dentistry is now beginning to discover the ideal of _prevention_; recognizing that the sanitary care of the mouth is a more important object that the most cunning imitation of teeth, or the most ingenious masterpieces in bridge and crown work. Under the leadership of a man who will be recognized in the future as a pioneer in the cause of health, Dr. D. D. Smith, of Philadelphia, a large and rapidly growing body of dentists have formed what is termed the Prophylactic School, the development of which will result not merely in the prevention of a great deal of disease of the teeth and mouth, but of all the body. Physicians in general, and even most dentists, have only begun to recognize the part which the mouth plays in the causation of diseases.

At the present time, there are, roughly speaking, about 14,000 dentists in the United States, who annually extract twenty million teeth, manufacture and insert three million artificial teeth, and hammer into the cavities of diseased teeth at least three tons of pure gold, to say nothing about the many tons of mercury, tin, and other metals employed in fillings. When the principles of the Prophylactic School spread, it is safe to say that while the importance of the dentist will become even more generally recognized than it is to-day, nevertheless he will pull fewer teeth, and use less gold and other metals. The principle upon which Dr. Smith, and his rapidly growing band of followers, build their work, is an intelligent recognition of the fact that there are in the human mouth to-day, as has been the condition through all the centuries, highly malignant features of general infection and causes of numerous diseases which until now have been wholly unperceived and neglected. The ordinary physician tells his patient to poke out his tongue, when he looks for an index to that patient’s general condition of health, but he does not look above or below or around or about the tongue, where, in a great number of cases he might find not merely the symptoms but the cause of his patient’s ailment.

“THE VESTIBULE OF LIFE”

To show some of the common mouth conditions that make it almost an ideal medium for bacterial culture, we quote the following paragraph from Dr. Smith, adding the fact that his statement is one with which all up-to-date physicians concur:

“The mouth, with its large extent of dentate surface, becomes quickly infested and infected with all manner of bacterial formations, decomposing particles of food, stagnant, septic matter from saliva, mucous and sputum, not infrequently with pus exudations from

irritated and inflamed gum margins, gaseous emanations from decaying teeth and putrescent pulp tissue, salivary calculus (tartar), nicotine, and the chemical toxins, or poisons, of decomposition which result from a mixing of mouth secretions, excretions and food remains in a temperature constantly maintained at the high normal of ninety-eight degrees Fahrenheit. While this may seem a formidable array, it fails to prevent any of the sources of infection connected with untreated teeth; and incredible as it may appear, these conditions are found not in the lower classes alone, but in general mouth conditions in high and low born, fastidious and boor, king and peasant."

"Try to estimate the amount of poisonous products that would be generated if such a surface were smeared over with the various foods from the dining table, and these allowed to decompose," says Dr. Alfred C. Fones,[2] "and a fair idea may be obtained of the amount of decomposition that is taking place in unsanitary mouths. Nor is this simile forceful enough, for the food in the mouth is in one of the most favorable environments known for the activity and virulency of germ life, so that the products generated would be far more numerous, more poisonous and irritating in every action, than such products from food decomposing in the open air."

[2] In his essay "Clean Methods, The First Law of Hygiene."

HOW MOUTH INFECTION SPREADS

Mouth infection, due to the teeth, sees its most critical period during that of childhood and early youth, a period in which the mouth under present conditions is almost entirely without intelligent care. Children's mouths, says Dr. Smith, are frequently veritable crucibles in which are generated chemical agents and compounds highly detrimental to the teeth themselves, and not less to the general health of the child. The poisons arising from decaying food particles and decaying teeth themselves, vitiated salivary and mucous secretions, germ life upon the teeth and gums, and breaths loaded with emanations from stagnant septic material, all with the high temperature of ninety-eight degrees, insinuate into the general circulation of the blood a constantly increasing infection, which will later on find expression in many diseased conditions, and often in chronic and fatal disorders. It may appear, as it commonly does, in stomach or kidneys, in lungs or nervous system, in heart, brain, or skin, in any organ or tissue, indeed, to which mouth toxins are directly or indirectly conveyed. Experience has shown that it is not only possible, but entirely practicable to arrest and prevent teeth diseases in the mouths of children, and at the same time to keep the mouth aseptic or free from germ life.

Not only does an infected mouth work havoc to the body of which it is the vestibule, but it spreads disease about it. The original experiments of Koninger have shown that in a room where there is no current of air perceptible, a person coughing or sneezing can scatter germs to a distance of more than twenty-two feet. They are conveyed through the air by means of little droplets of saliva. These globules are microscopic balloons, having a bubble of air in the center, and remain in suspension but a short time. Ordinary breathing will scatter these droplets to a considerable distance, but, of course, their germ-carrying capabilities are most marked during coughing and sneezing. The more microbes the mouth contains the greater the danger of infection. Washing the mouth has the effect of decreasing the microbes of such diseases as diphtheria and consumption, and other bacilli susceptible of being scattered abroad in these salivary droplets. Placing the hand or a handkerchief over the mouth prevents the emanation of droplets charged with bacilli. So well is this fact of droplet germ infection recognized, that in many operating rooms no one present is allowed to speak during operations. Chronic headaches, neurasthenia, constipation, coughs and colds, and many other grave troubles, have all been helped and many times cured by "oral prophylaxsis" or proper mouth treatment.

The practical application of the discoveries and recommendations of the new school of dentists can be expressed very simply and briefly, and if followed out, will undoubtedly prove of tremendous service to the white cells in the battle of the blood. It must be remembered that proper mastication of food, which we have seen to be a leading principle of the new hygiene, cannot be carried out unless you have a good and healthy mouth. Five brushings a day at home is the ideal and proper care for every mouth, for those who eat through the ordinary routine of three meals a day. The first thing in the morning the teeth should be thoroughly brushed with tepid water to remove the decomposed mucous and saliva produced in the mouth during sleep. After eating the teeth should be cleansed with the help of a dentifrice. The thorough removal of grease is a chemical process, not to be accomplished by mere brushing, and therefore requires a solvent such as is contained in a good dentifrice. Such duties soon become habits; and if they are based upon common-sense, the health which they will bring will more than compensate for the trouble involved.

XIV

A UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH

There have been frequent references in this book to the Battle Creek Sanitarium, and to Dr. J. H. Kellogg, its superintendent. We have written here of the art of staying well, but many people are sick, and are in need of special advice and assistance; to such we believe that we can do no greater service than to tell them of this Sanitarium and its work.

The institution is not a commercial one; its founder is one of the great humanitarians of the time, as well as one of the great scientists. None of its thousand odd men and women workers receive more than a bare living for their services, and the institution is legally so constituted that all its profits must be turned into the work. Therefore, we hold it to be a public duty to spread as widely as possible the facts relating to it. Mr. Horace Fletcher has called Battle Creek the “Mecca of Health.” More aptly still, the Sanitarium has been named a “University of Health”; and no image could be more essentially true.

[Illustration: DR. J. H. KELLOGG, Of the Battle Creek Sanitarium.]

For, while the people at Battle Creek realize that the record of the institution for more than forty years in curing sick people is one to which they may point with pride, yet in their view this good work is but a trivial thing in comparison with their principal object, which is the conversion of those who come to them to be cured, into home teachers and missionaries of the truths of right living. It is wonderful to observe to what a great extent success has already rewarded their efforts, to see the signs which indicate the growth of public interest in their work.

Dr. Kellogg took charge of the institution which is now known as The Battle Creek Sanitarium thirty-two years ago. The institution at that time was a small two-story building, known as a water-cure or health institute, with three or four cottages and twelve patients. With the changing of the name and management, and the application of scientific methods, a new era of prosperity began, and the work has steadily progressed ever since.

The Battle Creek Sanitarium was the first attempt to assemble in one place all rational means of treating disease in combination with the regulation of diet and habits of life, and giving special emphasis to physiologic or natural methods of cure. The institution has for many years been recognized as the leading establishment of the sort in the world.

From the beginning, the Sanitarium has been non-sectarian in character. Although a deeply religious spirit pervades the place, the institution is not and never has been under the control of any denomination. For many years it was closely affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, because of the preponderance of persons belonging to this denomination among its managers and employees. For years, however, this affiliation has ceased to exist.

The institution is non-dividend paying. That is, it is a strictly altruistic or philanthropic enterprise. The charter which it received from the State requires that its earnings shall be devoted to the development of the enterprise and the maintenance of its charities. Dr. Kellogg receives no compensation for his labors in connection with the institution, and the thirty or forty physicians and business managers who are associated with him in his work likewise accept very meager compensation for their labors. Dr. Kellogg has for many years received a liberal income from the sale of his books, foods, and from his various inventions, but the income from these sources, as well as from the institution itself, has been devoted to the carrying forward of the humanitarian work to which he has devoted his life. The Haskell Home for Orphans, The Bethesda Rescue Home, the Life Boat Mission in Chicago, The American Medical Missionary College, and other charitable and philanthropic enterprises are allied enterprises which have grown out of the work which began at the Battle Creek Sanitarium.

The institution has never been endowed, and therefore, if the work was to grow, it was necessary to make money. The authors of this book have seen and read the legal documents by which Dr. Kellogg turned over to the American Missionary Association nearly everything of which he was possessed. The value of his work as a surgeon, estimated at prevailing rates for such work, would be at least fifty to sixty thousand dollars yearly. He touches not a cent of this money, nor does he touch his salary as superintendent—which he himself placed at the figure of twelve hundred dollars. There are many other physicians connected with the institution who, as specialists in New York or Chicago, would be in receipt of large incomes, but they are as content as is Dr. Kellogg to accept a bare pittance, finding their joy in the work they are doing.[3]

[3] The reader must be warned that there are many charlatans and shrewd business men who have taken advantage of the work of Dr. Kellogg and of the prestige of the name “Battle Creek.”

The energy displayed by the faculty and staff of the University of Health in carrying on their work is nothing less than astonishing. During one week when the writers were at the Sanitarium, there were more than a thousand patients all told, including the non-paying ones. There are many days when Dr. Kellogg operates from early in the morning until late at night, having very many

highly difficult and dangerous operations to perform, for he is well known as a surgeon. After such a long day in the operating room, without a break for food or rest, he will give one of his lectures to the patients, or go the rounds of the wards, winding up the day by attending to a mass of business or writing or studying in his laboratories. He works continually, day in and day out, for eighteen hours a day; and this he has done for the past thirty-five years or so. He wrote one bulky book containing much technical and scientific matter in ten days, using three or four stenographers, and working in stretches of twenty hours at a time. He has never taken a holiday. All of his many journeys abroad or in this country are on matters connected with his mission in life; and while on his journeys he is continually writing or studying, and carrying on the direction of his multitudinous affairs by letter or telegraph. Yet to-day, at the age of fifty-five, he shows no signs of diminution of energy; no signs of nervous breakdown, or of the ailments which bring thousands of business men and women to him for treatment.

He himself thinks that there is nothing very remarkable in all this. He attributes it to his abstention from meat, from tea and coffee, alcohol and tobacco. He never eats more than one “hearty” meal a day; his second meal, when he takes one, consisting of a little fruit. His sole regret is that during the first fourteen or fifteen years of his life he ate meat. He believes that any child, if it begin right, can, when it grows up, do all that he is doing.

“I was,” he said to a friend, “a puny, undersized, ailing child; born when my father was more than fifty. It was the accepted opinion that I would not live to be a man which I fully believed. I had an appetite for knowledge and resolved that since I was to die early I must study and work very hard in order to accomplish a little something before I died. So I would study until one to three o’clock in the morning; then rise at six. From the age of ten I have fully supported myself. All this deliberate stealing of time from sleep resulted in a permanent stunting of my growth. And as I went on in life, I kept up the same habits of night work. And yet, I have only once been troubled by an illness; which came upon me a few years ago as a result of overwork. But which I got rid of; and now I am in better bodily condition than I was twenty-five years ago. But I was not handicapped by a great number of things that are bars to other workers, over which they stumble. I have slept when I could in the open air; I have drawn from air, water, light, heat, and proper exercise, the benefits that inhere in them; and I have nourished my body on wholesome foods. I mention these points with insistence—these points that seem so freakish to many people—simply because to me they are fundamental points in the physiologic, or natural, way of healing and of living.”

Dr. Kellogg publishes a big magazine of large circulation named _Good Health_; and in this he teaches that health is not a mere negation of ailments—a state of being free from rheumatism, or consumption, or biliousness, or any other of the “thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to”—but that it is being wholesome, happy, sane, complete, a unit—a man or woman eating, drinking, sleeping, working, playing, functioning in all parts as naturally, as inevitably, as easily and as unconsciously, as a flower grows.

One of the writers has told of his experience many years ago, when he went to a physician and requested to be helped in keeping well. He went to Battle Creek Sanitarium on account of the illness of his wife, and when one of the physicians proposed to him that he himself undergo the treatments, he answered (having in mind this earlier experience, and of the doubts it had bred in him), “There is nothing the matter with me at present that I know of.” The answer of the Sanitarium physician was, “The less there is the matter with you the better, from our point of view.” And so he realized that at last he had found a place where his own idea of health-preservation was understood.

He accepted joyfully the offer to assist him in getting a scientific understanding of his own bodily condition. A drop of his blood was taken and analyzed, microscopically and chemically. He went to the diet table, and for three days ate precisely measured quantities of specified foods; during the period all his excretions were weighed and analyzed and examined under the microscope. A thorough physical examination was made, and also a series of tests, upon a machine invented by Dr. Kellogg, to register the strength of each group of muscles of the body. The results of all these examinations were presented to him in an elaborate set of reports and charts, together with a prescription for treatments, diet and exercise. He had stated that there was nothing the matter with him, so far as he knew. He found that anaerobes—the dangerous bacterial inhabitants of the intestinal tract—numbered something over four billion to the gram of intestinal contents—a gram being about a thirtieth part of an ounce. During the six weeks of his stay at the Sanitarium the more important of these tests were repeated weekly; and when he left, the number of anaerobes had been reduced nearly ninety per cent.

Dr. Kellogg terms the system of treatment employed by the Sanitarium the Physiologic Method, and he writes of it as follows:

“The Physiologic Method consists in the treatment of the sick by natural, physical, or physiologic means scientifically applied.

“The haphazard or empirical use of water, electricity, Swedish movements, and allied measures is not the Physiologic Method. It is no method at all. It is empiricism, at best; at its worst, it is quackery. The application of the Physiologic Method requires much more than simply a knowledge of the technique of baths, electricity, movements, etc. It requires a thorough knowledge of physiology, and an intelligent grasp of all the resources of modern medical science. For, while the Physiologic Method depends for its curative effects upon those natural agencies which are the means of preserving health, and which may be relied upon to prevent disease as well as to cure, it recognizes and employs as supplementary remedies, all rational means which have by experience been proved to be effective.

“The Physiologic Method concerns itself first of all with causes. In the case of chronic maladies, these will generally be found in erroneous habits of life, which, through long operation, have resulted in depreciating the vital forces of the body and so deranging the bodily functions that the natural defenses have been finally broken down and morbid conditions have been established.

“Chronic disease is like a fire in the walls of a house which has slowly worked its way from the foundation upward, until the flames have burst out through the roof. The appearance of the flame is the first outward indication of the mischief which has been going on; but it is not the beginning. It is rather the end of the destructive process.

“The Physiologic Method does not undertake to cure disease, but people who are diseased. It recognizes the disease process as an effort on the part of the body to recover normal conditions,—a struggle on the part of the vital forces to maintain life under abnormal conditions and to restore vital equilibrium.

“At the outset of his course of treatment, the patient is instructed that his recovery will depend very largely upon himself; that the curative power does not reside in the doctor or in the treatment, but is a vital force operating within the patient himself. The Physiologic Method is based upon this fact. [Illustration: A GROUP AT THE BATTLE CREEK SANITARIUM (DR. KELLOGG ON THE RIGHT).]

“So the treatment of a patient consists, first of all, in the exact regulation of all his habits of life, and the establishment of wholesome conditions. The simple life and return to Nature are the ideals constantly held up before him. He must work out his own salvation; he must ‘cease to do evil and learn to do well’; he must cease to sow seeds of disease, and by every means in his power cultivate health.”

XV

HEALTH REFORM AND THE COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED

We have set forth the underlying principles of the new art of health; and we have shown how these principles may be applied by individuals, and how they have been formulated and taught at the great University of Health at Battle Creek. It remains to give an account of a great national movement which has for its aim the spreading of a knowledge of the new hygiene in a semi-political way, a circumstance which to our minds proves that not only this nation but the whole of modern civilization is on the eve of a great revolution in its habits of living, and that this revolution will have for its rallying cry the word “Knowledge.” And more especially, “Knowledge of Our Bodies, and of How to Care for Them.”

The state of ignorance of the majority of people concerning the workings of their own bodies and the way to take care of them is to-day one of the greatest barriers to human progress. Few people realize that they ought to care for their bodies; or that they ought to know about their bodies until they are actually broken down. Men use their intelligence more aptly elsewhere; but all progress in other directions, in the arts and crafts and the labors of modern industry, will go for nothing if we do not learn to apply our intelligence to the matter of health.

More and more does the need for knowledge press home upon us. It is impossible for the race to survive unless that knowledge is spread. Our ancestors, it is true, knew less of their bodily make-up and bodily care than we do, but our ancestors did not need it so much. They were country dwellers, and people of the open air; they were not slaves of machinery and of office routine.

Dr. J. Pease Norton, Assistant Professor of Political Economy at Yale University, recently read before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a paper which vividly summed up the situation which confronts us. He said:

“There are four great wastes to-day, the more lamentable because they are unnecessary. They are preventable death, preventable sickness, preventable conditions of low physical and mental efficiency, and preventable ignorance. The magnitude of these wastes

is testified to by experts competent to judge. They fall like the shades of night over the whole human race, blotting out its fairest years of happiness.

“The facts are cold and bare—one million, five hundred thousand persons must die in the United States during the next twelve months; equivalent to four million, two hundred thousand persons will be constantly sick; over five million homes, consisting of twenty-five million persons, will be made more or less wretched by mortality and morbidity.

“We look with horror on the black pages of the Middle Ages. The black waste was but a passing cloud compared with the white waste visitation. Of people living to-day, over eight million will die of tuberculosis, and the federal government does not raise a hand to help them.

“THE NEGLECT OF HEALTH A NATIONAL EVIL”

“The Department of Agriculture spends seven million dollars on plant health and animal health every year, but, with the exception of the splendid work done by Doctors Wiley, Atwater, and Benedict, Congress does not directly appropriate one cent for promoting the physical well-being of babies. Thousands have been expended in stamping out cholera among swine, but not one dollar was ever voted for eradicating pneumonia among human beings. Hundreds of thousands are consumed in saving the lives of elm trees from the attacks of beetles; in warning farmers against blights affecting potato plants; the importing Sicilian bugs to fertilize fig blossoms in California; in ostracizing various species of weeds from the ranks of the useful plants, and in exterminating parasitic growths that prey on fruit trees. In fact, the Department of Agriculture has expended during the last ten years over forty-sixmillions of dollars. But not a wheel of the official machinery at Washington was ever set in motion for the alleviation or cure of diseases of the heart or kidneys, which will carry off over six millions of our entire population. Eight millions will perish of pneumonia, and the entire event is accepted by the American people with a resignation equal to that of the Hindoo, who, in the midst of indescribable filth, calmly awaits the day of cholera.

“During the next census period more than six million infants under two years of age will end their little spans of life while mothers sit by and watch in utter helplessness. And yet this number could probably be decreased by as much as half. But nothing is done.

“In the United States alone, of the eighty millions living to-day, all must die, after having lived, say a little more than three billion, two hundred million years of life, on the average slightly more than twoscore years. Of these years, one billion, six hundred million, represent the unproductive years of childhood and training.

“Consider that the burden of the unproductive years on the productive years is 20-20, or say 100 per cent. Could the average length of life be increased to sixty years, say to forty-eight billion years lived by eighty millions of people, the burden of the unproductive years would fall to 50 per cent. In the judgment of men competent to hold opinions, this is not impossible.”

It was the reading of this paper, which led to the formation of the Committee of One Hundred on National Health, of which Professor Irving Fisher of Yale is president, and which includes among its members such men and women as Ex-President Eliot of Harvard, Dr. Lyman Abbott, Miss Jane Addams, Luther Burbank, Horace Fletcher, Professor Chittenden, Dr. Kellogg, and Dr. Trudeau.

The primary and immediate purpose of the Committee’s work is to promote the idea of a national Bureau of Health; but the field open to the committee includes the whole subject of public sanitation and hygiene. President Roosevelt has formally endorsed the work, in a letter from which the following is an extract: “Our national health is physically our greatest national asset. To prevent any possible deterioration of the American stock should be a national ambition. We cannot too strongly insist on the necessity of proper ideals for the family, for simple life and for those habits and tastes which produce vigor and make more capable of strenuous service to our country. The preservation of national vigor should be a matter of patriotism.... Federal activity in these matters has already developed greatly, until it now includes quarantine, meat inspection, pure food administration, and federal investigation of the conditions of child labor. It is my hope that these important activities may be still further developed.”

And in his notable message to the country, rather than to Congress, which he issued in December, 1907, President Roosevelt wrote: “There is a constantly growing interest in this country in the question of public health. At least, the public mind is awake to the fact that many diseases, notably tuberculosis, are national scourges. The work of the State and City Boards of Health should be supplemented by the constantly increasing interest on the part of the national government. The Congress has already provided a Bureau of Public Health, and has provided for an hygienic report. There are other valuable laws relating to the public health connected with the various departments. This whole branch of the government should be strengthened and aided in every way.”

As somebody said before, these things are no more true because a President has said them; but the fact that President Roosevelt has said them, has given wide publicity to them, and impressed them upon the public consciousness.

The knowledge that economic conditions;—the way in which men and women live because they have to so live in order to earn a living, is the fundamental factor in the case of public health, is something that is bound to become recognized as the growth of knowledge goes on. It will only be a question of time before men and women will see that in order to have health, it will be necessary to organize all the affairs of life with a view to the well-being of humanity as a whole.

In order to make effective the work of the Committee of One Hundred, its President, Irving Fisher, assisted by Professor Norton, organized the American Health League, which has absorbed the Public Health Defense League, an organization formed for the purpose of fighting the patent medicine evil, and awakening public interest in matters of hygiene. The Health League already numbers nine or ten thousand citizens, who are pledged to give financial and moral support to the work of the Committee of One Hundred in its efforts to establish a national Bureau of Health. The League is rapidly increasing in membership, for a spirit of interest in hygiene is abroad in the land. Local advisory committees have already been formed in more than two hundred cities and towns, and it is planned to prosecute the work of multiplying these branch committees until every town in the United States shall be represented in the membership. The Committee of One Hundred publishes the magazine _American Health_ as its official organ, and all American men and women who are interested in the spread of the new hygiene are invited by the Committee to correspond with its Executive Secretary, Drawer 30, New Haven, Conn.

Connected with the advisory and other subcommittees, are committees of writers, editors, and newspaper men, numbering many of our most prominent penmen and pressmen, and the power of molding public opinion through this channel alone is very great. There is now being organized a Council on Co-operation, to consist of the leading officers of American religions, fraternal, learned, secret, and educational organizations; and also a Council of Research, to consist of leading investigators interested in original research along public health lines.

In other words, the Committee of One Hundred has grown to a compact, well-organized, rapidly-spreading, national Army of Health. It has grown within a wonderfully short period, simply because there was a great and pressing _need_ for it.

Professor William H. Welch, a member of the Committee of One Hundred, and Professor of Pathology at Johns Hopkins University, has put himself on record as saying that if the nation were to apply in practice the existing knowledge of hygiene, the nation’s death rate would be cut in two. In commenting on this statement, Irving Fisher said:

“The greatest asset of all, the physical health of our citizens, is still neglected. Professor Nicholson, an economist of Scotland, has estimated that the living capital of Great Britain is worth five times the physical capital. That is, if we capitalize each man’s working capacity and add together this capitalization throughout the whole realm of Great Britain, the value of the population so obtained is five times the value of all the land and all the railroads and all the buildings, and all the iron mines and all the other capital which is ordinarily called wealth. If we could make this human capital within the United States double its present worth (it is already five times that of the inanimate capital), it is evident what an enormous improvement would ensue as compared with the possible improvements in saving arid lands, and other physical resources. Our health has much more than a money value. But these calculations show that even on the most materialistic method of reckoning, there is truth in Emerson’s statement, “the first wealth is health.”

APPENDIX

DIET LIST

Proteid Carbo Fat % Water % Mineral Food Value % hydrate Matter per pound % % calories

Broiled tenderloin steak 23.5 0 20.4 54.8 1.2 1300 Lamb chops, broiled 21.7 0 29.9 47.6 1.3 1665 Smoked ham, fat, edible portion 14.3 0 52.3 27.9 3.7 2485 Roast turkey, edible portion 27.3 0 18.4 52.0 1.2 1295 Fricasseed chicken, edible portion 17.6 2.4 11.5 67.5 1.0 855 Cooked bluefish, edible portion 26.1 0 4.5 68.2 1.2 670 Canned salmon, edible portion 21.8 0 12.1 63.5 2.6 915 Fresh oysters, solid 6.0 3.3 1.3 88.3 1.1 230 Boiled hen’s eggs 13.2 0 12.0 73.2 0.8 765 Butter 1.0 0 85.0 11.0 3.0 3605 Full cream cheese 25.9 2.4 33.7 34.2 3.8 1950 Whole cow’s milk 3.3 5.0 4.0 87.0 0.7 325 Wheat flour, entire wheat 13.8 71.9 1.9 11.4 1.0 1675 Boiled rice 2.8 24.4 0.1 72.5 0.2 525 Shredded wheat 10.5 77.9 1.4 8.1 2.1 1700 Macaroni 13.4 74.1 0.9 10.3 1.3 1665 Brown bread 5.4 47.1 1.8 43.6 2.1 1050 Wheat bread or rolls 8.9 56.7 4.1 29.2 1.1 1395 Whole wheat bread 9.4 49.7 0.9 38.4 1.3 1140

Soda crackers 9.8 73.1 9.1 5.9 2.1 1925 Ginger bread 5.8 63.5 9.0 18.8 2.9 1670 Sponge cake 6.3 65.9 10.7 15.3 1.8 1795 Apple pie 3.1 42.8 9.8 42.5 1.8 1270 Custard pie 4.2 26.1 6.3 62.4 1.0 830 Indian Meal pudding 5.5 27.5 4.8 60.7 1.5 815 Fresh asparagus 1.8 3.3 0.2 94.0 0.7 105 Fresh lima beans 7.1 22.0 0.7 68.5 1.7 570 Dried lima beans 18.1 65.9 1.5 10.4 4.1 1625 Cooked beets 2.3 7.4 0.1 88.6 1.6 185 Fresh cabbage, edible portion 1.6 5.6 0.3 91.5 1.0 145 Dried peas 24.6 62.0 1.0 9.5 2.9 1655 Green peas 7.7 16.9 O.5 74.6 1.0 465 Boiled potatoes 2.5 20.9 0.1 75.5 1.0 440 Fresh tomatoes 0.9 3.9 0.4 94.3 0.5 105 Baked beans, canned 6.9 19.6 2.5 68.9 2.1 600 Apples, edible portion 0.4 14.2 0.5 84.6 3.0 290 Bananas, yellow, edible portion 1.3 22.0 0.6 75.3 0.8 460 Oranges, edible portion 0.8 11.6 0.2 86.9 0.5 240 Peaches, edible portion 0.7 9.4 0.1 89.4 0.4 190 Fresh strawberries 1.0 7.4 0.6 90.4 0.6 180 Dried prunes, edible portion 2.1 73.3 0.0 22.3 2.3 1400 Almonds, edible portion 21.0 13.3 54.9 4.8 2.0 3030 Peanuts, edible portion 25.8 24.4 38.6 9.2 2.0 2560 Pine nuts, edible portion 33.9 6.9 49.4 6.4 3.4 2845 Brazil nuts, edible portion 17.0 7.0 66.8 5.3 3.9 3265 Soft-shell walnuts, edible portion 16.6 16.1 63.4 2.5 1.4 3285

INDEX

A

Abbott, Dr. Lyman, 277

Achroödextrin, 131

Adams, Dr. G. Cook, 186

Addams, Miss Jane, 277

Aerobes, 181

Albumenoids, 96

Alcohol, 193-199

Ali—mentary canal, 97

American Health, 281

American Medical Missionary College, 261

Amylodextrin, 131

Anderson, Dr. William G., 50

Anaerobic infection, 126

Antiseptics, 101

Antitoxic foods, 123

Appendicitis, 125

Appetite, 153

Apples, 129 sweet, 130

Arms, holding horizontal, 84

Arterio-sclerosis, 116

Atwater, Dr., 275

Autointoxication, 72, 113, 117, 126

Ayers, Dr. Edward A., 25

B

Bacillus, Bulgarian, 124

Bacteria, putrefactive, 180

Baker, Sir Samuel, 167

Bananas, 128

Bath, daily cold, 243

Bathing, sea, 245

Battle Creek Sanitarium, 6, 30, 170, 205, 247, 258-266

Beans, 123

Beaumont, Dr., 151

Beef, 182 roast, 184

Benedict, Prof., 159, 275

Bethesda Rescue Home, 261

Bile, 97, 99, 100

Blood, 26 battle of, 21 -pumping process, 226

Boiling, 132, 139

Bones, 99

Born, Dr. Frank, 52

Bouchard, 72

Bowels, catarrh of, 235 inactive, 227

Bread, raised, 123 warm, 133

Breathing, 219

Bright’s disease, 114, 142, 185, 188

Bubonic plague, 24

Buds, taste, 66

Bulgarians, 125

Burbank, Luther, 277

Butter, 139 sterilized, 123

Buttermilk, 123

C

Cabbage, 136

Caffeine, 202

Cake, 133

Calories, 75 in food, 105

Calory, 104

Canal, alimentary, 97

Cancer, 167-168, 186, 188

Candy, 142

Cannon, Prof., 19, 65, 166

Carbohydrate, 98, 105

Carbohydrates, 71 foodstuffs rich in, 111

Carbon dioxide, 22

Carnivores, 177

Cauliflower, 123

Cells, white, 22 (see leucocytes)

Cellulose, 190

Cereals, 141 cooked, 123 cooking of, 132 eating of, 135 prepared, 263

Cheese, 140 poisons, 140

Chewing, complete, 46

Chickens, 183

Chittenden, Prof. Russell H., 5, 18, 19, 57, 69, 73, 80, 102, 154, 175, 191, 277

Christian Science, 11, 169

Coffee, 200

Cold, taking, 223

Colds, 24

Colon, 97, 113, 121

Colver, Dr. Benton A., 233

Combe, 72, 175

Compress, cold, 246

Complete chewing, 46

Constipation, 127

Consumption, 114, 223, 256 air cure for, 225

Cooking, dry, 132 kettle, 132 over, 132

Corn flakes, toasted, 123

Corpuscles, 25 red, 22 white, 22, 27

Coughing, 255

Council on Co-operation, 281 of Research, 281

Cow, tubercular, 138

Cream, 123

Curtis, 19

D

Deaths, ratio of among flesh-eaters, 188 ratio of among those eating little meat, 189

Deep-knee bending, 85

Degeneration of tissue, 120

Dentistry, 249

Diabetes, 142, 167

Diet and endurance, relation between, 82 list, 287 reform, 203

Disease, Bright’s, 114, 142, 185, 188 germ theory of, 23 heart, 188

Diphtheria, 256

Dog-dairy, 154

Douglas, 28

Dynamometer (Prof. Fisher’s), 51 (Kellogg mercurial), 51

E

Eating between meals, 147

Eliot, President, 277

Enamel, 99

Endurance, 81

Enteritis, 185

Epilepsy, 168

Erythrodextrin, 131

Exercise, 230 regular, 89, 219

Exercises, 233 retarding autointoxication, 24

Eye, 26, 99

F

Fat, 71, 98, 105 emulsified, 141 foodstuffs rich in, 111, 127

Fatigue poisons, 34, 143

Fearthought, 46

Feet, cold, 247

Fever, yellow, 23

Figs, 127, 130

Fish, 143, 182

Fisher, Prof. Irving, 6, 18, 19, 57, 62, 69, 85-94, 175, 225, 277

Fletcher, Horace, 4, 15, 18, 19, 42-64, 73, 74, 143, 277

Fletcherism, 50, 57, 191

Fletcherizing, 49

Folin, Dr., 93, 191

Food-filter, 66 -units required daily, 108

Foods, antitoxic, 123 breakfast, 134 fried, 132 toxic, 122

Foodstuffs, laxative, 127 rich in various elements, 112

Fruit juices, 130

Fruits, 123, 127

G

Gastric juice, 97, 99, 165

Gates, Elmer, 168

Gautier, 175

Germ theory of disease, 23

Gladstone’s advice as to chewing, 49

Glucose, 96

Gluten, 135

Gout, 114

Grain preparations, 127

Grains, cooking of, 131

Granger, J. E., 87

Grippe, 24

Guilfoy, Dr. W. H., 188

Gulick, 19

Gullet, 96

H

Habit hunger, 64

Haig, 5

Ham, smoked, 184

Hanecke, 155

Haskell Home for Orphans, 261

Health, Defense League, Public, 280 League, American, 280 National Bureau of, 277 National Committee of One Hundred on, 277

Health-chocolate, 206

“Healthful Cookery,” 210

Heart disease, 188

Heat, 248

Helicon Hall, 204

Higgins, Prof. Hubert, 19, 66

Holding the arms horizontal, 84

Honey, 123 adulterated, 142 malt, 142

Horter, Dr., 175

Hunger, habit, 64

Hutchinson, Dr. Woods, 174, 186

Hydrochloric acid, 100

Hydrotherapy, 243, 247

Hyperacidity, 62

Hypoacidity, 62

I

Infection, anaerobic, 126

Influenza, 24, 32

Ingersoll, Robert, 35

Intestinal juice, 99, 101

Intestine, large, see colon small, 97

Intestines, 60

Ioteyko, Dr. J., 176

J

James, William, 7, 169

Juice, gastric, 97, 99, 165 intestinal, 99, 101 lemon, 141 pancreating, 97, 99, 100

Juices, fruit, 130

K

Kellogg, Dr. J. H., 5, 13, 18, 19, 30, 61, 65, 107, 123, 125, 133, 148, 155, 159, 175, 181, 243, 258, 277

Kephyr, 124

Kidney troubles, 142

Kidneys, 102

Kipiani, Mlle. Varia, 176

Knee bending, deep, 85

Koninger, 255

Kumyss, 124

L

Leg-raising, 85

Lemon juice, 141

Lentils, 123

Leucocytes, 22, 27, 32

Levulose, 131

Liebig, 177

Life Boat Mission, 261

Liver, 102 chronic disease of, 227 cirrhosis of, 62, 227

Lung capacity, 220

Lymph, 26

Lysins, 28

M

Macaroni, 187

Macrophages, 120

Maltose, 131

Mania, 168

Maple sugar, 141 syrup, 141

Mason, 6

Masson, 125

Mastication, 49, 58, 61

Matzoon, 124

McGill University, 29

Meals, drinking at, 150 eating between, 147 irregularity of, 147

Meat, case as to, 173 cooked, 191 digestibility of proteid in, 190 extracts of, 177

Meltose, 143

Mendel, Prof. Lafayette B., 19, 69, 138, 191

Menus, 211-217

Metabolism, 95, 101, 173

Metchnikoff, Elie, 5, 15, 19, 27, 65, 72, 113-126, 175, 191, 195, 221

Milk, 137

Mineral salts, 98, 101, 127

Morphine, 201

Mosso, 84, 143

Mouth, infection of, 254

Mucous, 25, 97 membrane, 25

Murchison, 168

Mushroom, 137

Mustard, 142

Myosin, 178

N

Nelson, Dr. A. W., 181, 198

“New Thought,” 11, 169

Nicholson, Prof., 282

Nitrogen, 71

Norton, Dr. J. Pease, 273

Nuts, 123, 141 malted, 123

O

Oatmeal, 134

Oberg, S. A., 86, 87

Olive oil, 141

Olives, 141

Olympic Club, 44

Onions, 136

Opsonins, 28

Osmosis, 240

Oxygen, 22, 220

Oysters, 190

P

Paget, Sir George, 167

Pain, 248

Palate, soft, 67

Pancreas, 97

Pancreatic juice, 97, 99, 100

Papillae, circumvallate, 67

Pasteur Institute of Paris, 27

Pasteurization, 139

Pastry, 133

Pawlow, 6, 19, 65, 91, 153, 155-166

Pears, sweet, 130

Pelvis, pain in the, 249

Pepper, 142

Pepsin, 97, 100

Peptic glands, 202

Peptogenic food, 91

Perspiration, 241

Physiologic method, 270

Pie-crust, 133

Plague, bubonic, 24

Plasma, 28

Play, 230

Pneumonia, 24, 114, 195, 223, 225

Poisons, cheese, 140 fatigue, 34, 143 volatile, 202

Pork, 184

Potato, 123, 135

Priessintz, 242

Prophylactic School (of dentistry), 250

Prophylaxsis, oral, 256

Proteid, 70-73, 98, 103, 123 animal, 135 equivalents, 75 food, 64, 105 muscle, 178 vegetable, 135, 190

Proteids, foodstuffs rich in, 111 in cooked meat, 191 in peanut butter, 191 in pine nuts, 191 in walnuts, 191 proportion of to other food elements, 109

Prunes, 127, 130

Pus germ, 196

Putrefactive bacteria, 180

R

Recipes, 217

Rennet, 100

Resistance, vital, 36

Rheumatism, 114

Rice, 123

Richardson, Sir B. W., 5

Roasting, 132

Robert, 202

Rogers, 65

Roosevelt, President, 277

Rositansky, 36

S

Sadler, Dr., 26

Sager, 19

St. Martin, Alexis, 151

Salads, 127

Saleeby, Dr., 19, 159

Saliva, 26, 59, 65, 95, 99, 160

Salivary glands, 95

Salts, mineral, 98, 101, 127

Sardines, 182

Sausage, large, 184 raw, 185 small, 184

Science, Christian, 11, 169

“Science in the Kitchen,” 210

Self-poisoning, 72 (see autointoxication)

Shaw, Bernard, 173

Skin (germ tight), 25

Smith, Dr. D. D., 250-254

Sneezing, 255

Snow, Dr., 167

Solar plexus, 149

Spaghetti, 187

Spleen, 227

Standard, voit, 75

Starch, 60

Steak, hamburger, 184 porterhouse, 184 round, 184

Steaming, 132

Stewart, Dr. Charles E., 194

Stimulants, 193

Stomach, acidity of, 62 catarrh of, 235 chronic disease of, 227 dilation of, 62

Streptococci, 197

Sugar, 60, 96 cane, 65, 130 malt, 142 maple, 141

Supper, 149

Syrup, maple, 141

Syrups, 142

T

Table, showing for different ages the average height, weight, and No. of food units required daily, 108

Tape worms, 143, 179

Taste, 59

Taste buds, 66

Tea, 200

Tears, 25

Teeth, care of the, 249

Therapeutics, physiological, 268

Therapy, physical, 266

Tissier, 72, 175

Tissue, degeneration of, 120

Toasting, 132

Tolstoi, 115

Tongue, 66

Toxic foods, 122

Trichinosis, 179

Trudeau, Dr., 277

Tuberculosis, 24, 170, 190, 195 deaths from, 225

Turck, Dr. F. B., 175, 177

Twain, Mark, 210

Typhoid, 24, 138

U

Uric acid, 143

V

Vegetables, 123, 127

Vegetarianism, 122, 174, 176

Ventilation, 223

Vinegar, 141

Vital resistance, 36

Voit standard, 75

W

Water, cold, 248 hot, 248

Water bag, cold, 247

Wax, 25

Welch, Prof. William H., 282

When to eat, 145

Whisky, Scotch, 197

White cells, 22 (see leucocytes)

Wiley, Dr., 275

Williams, Michael, 15, 16

Wine, port, 196

Wolfe, 202

Wood, Maj. Gen., 52

Wright, Sir Edward, 28, 198

Wyman, Gen. Walter, 138

X

X-ray, 166

Y

Yale University, experiments at, 69

Yellow fever, 23

Yogurt, 124-126, 207

Z

Zweibach, 123

==========

Foods and Their Adulteration

Harvey Washington Wiley

Project Gutenberg Release: August 29, 2021 · eBook #66164

Transcriber's Notes

Text printed in italics has been transcribed between _underscores_, bold faced text between =equal signs=. Small capitals have been replaced with ALL CAPITALS.

More Transcriber's Notes may be found at the end of this text.

FOODS AND THEIR ADULTERATION

WILEY

=BY THE SAME AUTHOR.=

=BEVERAGES AND THEIR ADULTERATION.=

OUTLINE OF CONTENTS.

I. Spring, well, and other potable waters.

II. Potable mineral waters.

III. Contamination of waters and how to avoid them.

IV. Coffee, Tea, Cocoa, Chocolate, etc.

V. Soda Waters, Pops, Seltzers, etc.

VI. Fermented Beverages--Growth of Raw Materials, Manufacture, and Storage: (_a_) Beers. (_b_) Wines. (_c_) Ciders, Perrys, Meads, etc.

VII. Distilled Liquors: (_a_) Whiskey. (_b_) Brandy. (_c_) Rum. (_d_) Gin and other flavored compounds. (_e_) Imitation and compound liquors. (_f_) Blends. (_g_) Cordials, denatured alcohol, etc.

VIII. So-called temperance drinks.

IX. Beverages of a miscellaneous character.

=Octavo. Illustrated. In Preparation.=

=P. BLAKISTON'S SON & CO., Publishers, Philadelphia.=

FOODS AND THEIR ADULTERATION

ORIGIN, MANUFACTURE, AND COMPOSITION OF FOOD PRODUCTS; DESCRIPTION OF COMMON ADULTERATIONS, FOOD STANDARDS, AND NATIONAL FOOD LAWS AND REGULATIONS

BY HARVEY W. WILEY, M.D., PH.D.

WITH ELEVEN COLORED PLATES AND EIGHTY-SIX OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS

PHILADELPHIA P. BLAKISTON'S SON & CO. 1012 WALNUT STREET 1907

COPYRIGHT, 1907, BY P. BLAKISTON'S SON & CO.

WM. F. FELL COMPANY ELECTROTYPERS AND PRINTERS 1220-24 SANSOM STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA.

PREFACE.

This manual is descriptive in character and aims to give, within its scope, as thoroughly and intelligibly as possible, an account of the various food-products in common use in their natural and manufactured conditions, with the usual adulterations which have been found therein.

It includes information regarding Methods of Preparation and Manufacture, Food Values, Standards of Purity, Regulations for Inspection, Simple Tests for Adulterations, Effects of Storage, and similar matters pertaining to the subject.

It has been designed to interest the consumer, as well as the manufacturer, the scientific, as well as the general reader, all of whom it is hoped will find in it something useful. The consumer is entitled to know the nature of the product offered, the manufacturer and dealer the best methods of preparation. It will give the physician and sanitarian knowledge of the value of foods, their proper use and inspection, and, while not analytical in purpose, will provide the chemist with information which will guide him in his work of detecting impurities.

It has been thought advisable to give in the appendices extracts from the national laws relating to the subject, as well as the rules and regulations for their enforcement and official standards of purity, as these are now of general interest to all classes. In revising the manuscript and in reading the proofs, especial recognition is made of the valuable aid of Dr. W. D. Bigelow, Chief of the Division of Foods of the Department of Agriculture; Dr. F. V. Coville, Botanist of the Department of Agriculture, and Dr. B. W. Evermann, of the Bureau of Fisheries. Acknowledgement is also made of the favors of the Bureaus of Plant Industry, Animal Industry, and Forestry. Many helpful suggestions from other sources can only be acknowledged in this general way. All opinions respecting adulterations, misbranding, nutritive value, and wholesomeness are the individual expressions of the author and are not to be considered in any other manner. Honest and truthful practices of manufacture and labeling are to be promoted in every possible manner. In the end the true, the ethical, and the just in these practices will prevail.

HARVEY W. WILEY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., _May 1, 1907_.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1-10

Proper Ration, 3; Social Function of Food, 5; Definition and Composition of Foods, 6; Classification of Foods, 7; Explanation of Chemical Terms, 8.

PART I.--MEATS AND MEAT PRODUCTS 11-94

Definition, 11; Edible Animals, 11; Classification of Meat Foods, 12; Preparation of Animals, 12; Inspection, 13; Tuberculosis, 13; Consumers' Rights, 14; Slaughter and Preparation of Carcasses, 14; Names of Parts, 15-20; Delivery of Fresh Meat, 21; Storage, 23; Disposition of Fragments, 23; Detection of Different Kinds of Meat, 24; Dried and Pickled Meat, 25; Composition of Pig's Flesh, 26-33; Preserved Meats, 34-38; Argument of Small Quantities, 38-40; Preparation for Canning, 41; Parboiling, 41; Sterilization, 42; Special Studies of Canning, 43-48; Relation of Canned to Fresh Beef, 48; Canned Ham and Bacon, 48-50; Canned Tongue, 50; Fat as a Test for Adulteration, 51; Potted Meats, 51-56; Canned Poultry, 56; Canned Horse-meat, 57; Canned Cured Meats, 59-60; Magnitude of Industry, 61; General Observations, 62; Lard, 63-77; Soups, 77-78; Beef Extract, 79-80; Beef Juice, 82; Soluble Meats, 83; Preparations of Blood, 83; Beef-tea, 84; Dried and Powdered Meats, 85; Active Principles in Meat Extracts, 86; Relation between Juice and Nutritive Value, 87; Nitrogenous Bases, 88-90; Gelatine, 90-92; Terrestrial Animal Oils, 93.

PART II.--POULTRY AND EGGS AND GAME BIRDS 95-116

Application of Name, 94; Domesticated Fowls, 95-116; Chicken, 95-104; Duck, 104; Goose, 105; Pigeon, 107; Turkey, 107; Forced Fattening, 109; Slaughtering and Preparing for Market, 111; Poisonous Principles in Eggs, 116; Parasites in Eggs, 116.

PART III.--FISH FOODS 117-166

Classification, 117; Edible Portion, 119; Principal Constituents, 119; Alewives, 121; Anchovy, 122; Black Bass, 122; Bluefish, 122; Carp, 123; Catfish, 123; Codfish, 124; Eels, 126; Flounder, 127; Graylings, 128; Haddock, 128; Hake, 128; Halibut, 128; Herring, 129; Horse Mackerel, 130; Hog-fish, 130; Mackerel, 131; Menhaden, 132; Mullet, 132; Muskallunge, 133; Pickerel or Pike, 133; Pompano, 134; Red Snapper, 134; Rock Bass, 135; Salmon, 135-138; Sardines, 139-140; Scup, 141; Shad, 141-142; Sheepshead, 143; Smelt, 144; Spanish Mackerel, 144; Sturgeon, 144; Caviar, 145; Striped Bass, 146; Sole, 146; Tautog, 147; Tilefish, 147; Trout, 147-148; Turbot, 149; Weakfish, 149; Whitefish, 150; Fluorids in Fish, 151; Marketing, 151; Cold Storage, 151; Canning, Drying, and Adulteration, 152; Value as Food, 153; Shellfish, 153; Clams, 153; Lobster, 155; Crabs, 155; Crawfish, 156; Shrimp, 157; Aquatic Reptiles, 157; Turtle, 157; Terrapin, 158; Mussel, 158; Oysters, 158-164; Animal Oils, 165; Marine Animal Oils, 165-166.

PART IV.--MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS AND OLEOMARGARINE 169-216

Milk, Limitation of Name, 169; Composition, 169; Method of Production, 169-174; Cream, 175; Curd Test for Purity, 176-178; Whey and Koumiss, 179; Buttermilk and Bonnyclabber, 181; Butter, 182-187; Oleomargarine, 187-189; Cheese, 190; Kinds, 191; Adulteration and Misbranding, 192; Coloring, 193; Cottage Cheese, 195; American Cheese Manufacture, 196-200; Grading Cheese, 200; Cream Cheese, 201; Foreign Types, 201-202; Sage Cheese, 203; English Cheese, 203-205; French Cheese, 206-208; Limburger, 208; Edam, 210; Bacterial Activity, 211; Chemical Changes in Ripening, 212-214; Digestibility, 214; Effect of Cold Storage, 215; Preparations of Casein, 215.

PART V.--CEREAL FOODS 217-273

Barley, 217-218; Buckwheat, 219-221; Indian Corn (Maize), 222-232; Oats, 232-236; Rice, 236; Rye, 237-239; Wheat, 239-242; Wheat Flour, 243-245; Gluten, 245-247; Bleaching, 247; Adulterations, 248; Standard Age and Substitutes, 248; Bread, 249; Yeast, 250; Ferments, 250; Chemical Aerating Agents, 251; Baking Powders, 251-254; Composition of Bread, 254-255; Comparative Nutritive Properties, 256-257; Biscuit, 258; Sugar Lost in Fermentation, 259; Texture of Loaves, 259; Macaroni, 260-264; Cakes, 265-267; Breakfast Foods, 267-271.

PART VI.--VEGETABLES, CONDIMENTS, FRUITS 273-388

Succulent Vegetables, 273; Artichoke, 274; Asparagus, 275; Bean, 275-276; Beets, 277; Brussels Sprouts, 278; Cabbage, 278; Carrot, 279; Cauliflower, 279; Celery, 280; Chicory, 280; Cranberry, 281; Cress, 281; Cucumbers, 281; Egg-plant, Garlic, and Gourds, 282; Horseradish, Jerusalem Artichoke, and Kale, 282; Leek, Lettuce, Melons, and Cantaloupe, 284-286; Okra and Onion, 286; Parsnip, 287; Peas, 287; Potatoes, 288-298; Potato Starch, 296-299; Rhubarb, 299; Squash, 299; Sweet Potato, 299-304; Turnip, 304; Yam, 304; Canned Vegetables, 305-315; Ketchup, 316; Use of Refuse in Ketchup, 317; Starches as Foods, 317-321; Condiments, 321-326; Fruits, 326-329; Apples, 330-335; Cherries, 336; Grapes, 337-338; Peaches, 339-341; Plums, 341; Quince, 342; Small Fruits, 342-343; Tropical and Subtropical Fruits, 343-348; Citrus Fruits, 348-369; Composition of Pineapple, 363-364; Ash of Tropical Fruits, 367; Sugar and Acid in Fruit, 369; Canned Fruits, 370-372; Fruit Sirups, 373-374; Jams, Jellies, and Preserves, 375-381; Manufacture of Jellies, 381-382; Compound Jams and Jellies, 383; Preserves, 384; Fruit Butter, 385; Brandied Fruit, 386; Importance of Preserving Industry, 386-388.

PART VII.--VEGETABLE OILS AND FATS, AND NUTS 389-428

Definition, 389; Chemical Characteristics, 390; Drying and Non-drying Oils, 391; Physical Characters, 392-393; Edible Vegetable Oils, 394-413; Cottonseed Oil, 397-401; Olive Oil, 402-405; Peanut Oil, 406; Rape Oil, 407; Sesame Oil, 408; Sunflower Oil, 409; Cacao-butter, 410; Coconut Oil, 411; Palm Oil, 412; Nuts, 413-428; Acorn, 414; Beechnuts, Brazil-nut, 415; Butternut, Chestnut, 416; Chinese Nut, 417; Coconut, Filbert, 418; Hazelnut, Hickory-nut, 419; Peanuts, 420-424; Pecan, 424-425; Pistachio, 426; Walnut, 426-428.

PART VIII.--FUNGI AS FOODS 429-454

Mushrooms, Production, 429-430; Varieties, 430; Food Value, 430; Distinction between Edible and Poisonous, 433-439; Types of Edible Mushrooms, 440; Horse Mushroom, 441; Shaggy Mushroom, 443; Fairy Ring Mushroom, 443; Puff-ball, 444; Cepe, 445; Fly Amanita, 446; Poisoning by Mushrooms, 448; Canned Mushrooms, 449; Truffles, 450-453; Food Value of Fungi, 454.

PART IX.--SUGAR, SIRUP, CONFECTIONERY, AND HONEY 455-494

Sugar, Origin of Sugar, 455; Beet Sugar, 456-465; Cane Sugar, 466; Maple Sugar, 467-468; Sugar Refining, 468-470; Sugar Production, 471; Adulteration of Sugar, 471; Sugar as Food, 472; Sirup, Maple, 472-473; Cane, 475; Sorghum, 476; Molasses, 477-478; Mixed Sirups, 479; Adulteration of Sirups, 480; Confectionery, 482; Materials, 482; Manufacture, 483; Crystallized Fruits and Flowers, 483; Food Value of Candy, 483; Adulteration of Confections, 483-486; Honey, Definition, Historical, 486; Preparation of Honey, 487; Beehives, 488; Distribution of Honey Industry, 489; Comb Honey, 489; Extracted Honey, 490; Properties of Honey, 491-492; Adulteration of Honey, 493-494.

MISCELLANEOUS 494-496

Mince Meat, 494; Pie Fillers, 496.

PART X.--INFANTS' AND INVALIDS' FOODS 497-500

Modified Milk, 497; Solid Infants' Food, 498; Invalids' Food, 498-499; Composition Infants' and Invalids' Foods, 500.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A 501-521

Food Standards, 501-517; Law Relating to Filled Cheese, 517-521.

APPENDIX B 522-537

Rules and Regulations for the Enforcement of the Food and Drugs Act, 522-533. The Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, 533-537.

APPENDIX C 538-561

Regulations Governing the Meat Inspection of the United States Department of Agriculture, 538-556; Meat Inspection Law, 556-561.

APPENDIX D 562-615

Food Inspection Decisions under the Food and Drugs Act, 562-615. Food Inspections Decisions under the Imported Foods Act F. I. D.'s 1-39, 562-584. Food and Drugs Inspections and Decisions under the Food and Drugs Act F. I. D.'s 40-64, 584-615.

INDEX, 616-625

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

COLORED PLATES. PAGE. 1. Beef Tenderloin, _Facing_ 15 2. Beef Sirloin, „ 15 3. Beef Ribs--Regular Cut, „ 15 4. Beef Ribs--Spencer Cut, „ 15 5. Sirloin Butts, „ 15 6. Beef Rib, „ 15 7. Beef Loin, „ 15 8. Drying Figs: Smyrna, Smyrna Section, Adriatic, Adriatic Section, „ 349 9. Olives: Mission, Sevillano, „ 402 10. Jordan Almond, „ 414 11. Peanut (Arachide), „ 420

FIG. 1. Cuts of Beef, 16 2. Commercial Cuts of Beef, 17 3. Diagram of Cuts of Veal, 18 4. Diagram of Cuts of Lamb and Mutton, 19 5. Diagram of Cuts of Pork, 19 6. Commercial Cuts of Pork, 20 7. Graphic Chart Representing the Comparative Influences of Foods and Preservatives, 39 8. Lard Crystals, 67 9. Beef Fat Crystals, 67 10. Kettle for Rendering Lard, 72 11. Apparatus for Test of Adulteration of Lard, 74 12. Chicken House, Rhode Island Experiment Station, 96 13. Cow Stables, Mapletown Farm, Sumner, Washington, 170 14. Apparatus for Cooling Milk, 172 15. Improvised Wisconsin Curd Test, 177 16. Milk; Broken Curd in Whey; Matted Curd, 177 17. Curd from a Good Milk, 178 18. Curd from a Tainted Milk, 178 19. Curd from Foul Milk, 178 20. Power Churn, Ready for Use, 183 21. Power Churn, Open, 184 22. Barley Starch, 218 23. Buckwheat Starch, 222 24. Section of Raw Popcorn, 224 25. Section of Popcorn in First Stage of Popping, Showing Partially Expanded Starch Grains and Ruptured Cell Walls, 225 26. Section of Fully Popped Popcorn, 226 27. Indian Corn Starch, 229 28. Starch Grains of Indian Corn, under Polarized Light, 230 29. Oat Starch, 235 30. Rice Starch, 237 31. Rye Starch, 238 32. Wheat Starch, 242 33. Wheat Starch under Polarized Light, 243 34. Kedzie's Farinometer Showing the Parts, 246 35. Kedzie's Farinometer in Use, 247 36. Comparative Appearance of Breads of

Different Kinds, 259 37. A Field of Durum Wheat, 261 38. Drought-resistant Macaroni Wheats (Heads and Grains), 262 39. Potato Starch, 291 40. Potato Starch under Polarized Light, 291 41. Rasping Cylinder for Making Starch, 297 42. Shaking Table for Separating the Starch from the Pulped Potato, 297 43. The Potato Rasping Cylinder Arranged for Work, 298 44. View of Indian Corn Canning Factory, Showing Accumulation of Husks and Cobs, 308 45. Maranta (Arrowroot) Starch, 318 46. A Cassava Field in Georgia, 319 47. Cassava Starch, 321 48. Scuppernong Grape Vine, Roanoke Island, 338 49. Vineyard Near Fresno, California, 339 50. Avocado Tree, 346 51. Fig Tree Thirty Feet High Near Yuba, California, 350 52. Jamaica Mango Tree, 356 53. An Edge of a California Orange Grove, 358 54. The Original Seedless Orange Tree, 359 55. A Group of the Washington Navel Orange on the Tree, 360 56. Covered Pineapple, 361 57. Removing the Oil Cakes from a Cottonseed Press, 400 58. Pecan Tree, 30 Years Old, Morgan City, La., 422 59. Five Forms of Choice, Thin-shelled Pecans. Also Wild Nut Showing Difference in Size, 423 60. Full Grown Pecan Tree, 425 61. Common Mushroom, _Agaricus campestris_, 440 62. Edible Mushrooms (_Agaricus arvensis_ Schaeff.), 441 63. Shaggy Mushroom, _Coprinus comatus_, 442 64. Fairy Ring Formed by _Marasmius oreades_, an Edible Mushroom, 444 65. Puff-ball, _Lycoperdon cyathiforme_, Top View, 445 66. Amanita (Full Grown), 446 67. Fly Amanita Buttons (_Amanita muscaria_), 447 68. Correct Position of a Mature Beet in the Soil, 458 69. Map Showing Temperature Zone in Which the Sugar Beet Attains Its Greatest Perfection, 459 70. A Field of Beets Ready for Harvesting, 460 71. Beets Ready for Transportation to Factory, 461 72. Diffusion Battery, 462 73. Multiple-effect Evaporating Apparatus, 463 74. Vacuum Strike Pan, 464 75. Sugar Cane Field Ready for Harvest, 465 76. Cane Field Partly Harvested, 466 77. Tapping the Maple Trees, 468 78. Transporting the Sap to the Sugar House, 468 70. Boiling the Maple Sap, 469 80. Small Primitive Mill for Extracting Juice from Sugar Cane for Sirup Making, 473 81. Mill and Evaporating Apparatus for Sirup Making in Georgia, 474 82. Relative Length of Canes Used for Sirup Making, 475 83. Swarm of Bees on Bough of Tree, 487 84. Artificial Bee Hives under Shade of Grape Vine, 488 85. A Frame Containing 24 Boxes of Honey, 489 86. Showing Box of Honey Partially Capped, 490

INTRODUCTION.

The growing importance to manufacturers, dealers, and consumers of a knowledge of food products has led to the preparation of the following manual.

Unfortunately, many misleading statements respecting the composition of foods, their nutritive value, and their relation to health and digestion have been published and received with more or less credence by the public. Claims of superior excellence, which are entirely baseless, are constantly made for certain food products in order to call the attention of the public more directly to their value and, unfortunately, at times to mislead the public with respect to their true worth.

It is not uncommon to see foods advertised as of exceptional quality, either as a whole or for certain purposes. Many of the preparations of this kind are of undoubted excellence, but fail to reach the superior standard or perform the particular function which is attributed to them. Particularly has it been noticed that foods are offered for specific purposes or the nourishment of certain parts of the body, especially of the brain and nerves. We are all familiar with the advertisements of foods to feed the brain, or feed the nerves, or feed the skin. It is hardly necessary to call attention to the absurdity of claims of this kind. One part of the body cannot be nourished if the other parts are neglected, and the true principle of nutrition requires a uniform and equal development and nourishment of all the tissues. It is true that many of the tissues have predominant constituents. For instance in the bones are found large quantities of phosphate of calcium and in the muscles nitrogenous tissues dominate. In the brain and nerves there are considerable quantities of organic phosphorus. All of these bodies, however, are contained in normal food properly balanced.

It would be contrary to the principles of physiology to attempt to feed the bones by consuming a large excess of phosphorus in the food or the muscles by confining the food to a purely nitrogenous component. Such attempts, instead of nourishing the tissues indicated, will so unbalance the rations as to disarrange the whole metabolic process, and thus injure and weaken the very tissues they are designed to support.

It seems, therefore, advisable to prepare a manual which may be used in conjunction with works on dietetics and on physiology and hygiene and yet of a character not especially designed for the expert.

The American public is now so well educated that any average citizen is fully capable of understanding scientific problems if presented to him in a non-technical garb.

It is, therefore, not difficult to see that the great army of manufacturers and dealers in food products, as well as the still greater army of consumers, are able to receive and to utilize information concerning food products which is of common interest to all. A

dissemination of knowledge of this kind will guide the manufacturer in his legitimate business and protect the public against deceptions such as those mentioned above.

In the evolution of society, economy and efficiency indicate that specializations should be made as completely as possible. For this reason it is advisable that foods of a certain character be manufactured and prepared for consumption on a large scale, so that due economy and purity may be secured. On the other hand there are many other kinds of foods which, by reason of their properties, cannot be prepared on a large scale but must be produced near or at the place of consumption. Milk is a type of this class of foods. It is altogether probable, therefore, that the consumption of manufactured foods will not decrease but increase even more rapidly than the number of our population.

In order that the people may be able to judge of the quality and character of products of this kind, information readily available appears to be highly desirable.

In the other case of the utilization of raw materials, it is equally important that the people of this country understand their nature and their functions in the digestive process. The great nutritive value of our food is found in the cereals, the meats, the fruits, and vegetables which we consume. A description of foods of this class, the places of their growth, the conditions under which they are matured and marketed, the problems which relate to their storage and transportation, their composition in respect of nutrition and digestibility, the dangers which may accrue from their decay, and the adulterations or sophistications to which they may be subjected are matters of the greatest public importance.

A treatise of this kind in order to be of its full value for which it is intended must be concise, expressed in simple language, in a form easily consulted, and yet be of a character which will be reliable and which will give full information on the subject.

It is a common habit of speech to divide foods into two great classes, namely, foods and beverages. This is not a scientific division, but is one which has been so well established by custom as to render it advisable to divide this work into two portions, one devoted to food in the sense just used and the other to beverages. The first volume of this work devoted to foods will treat of those bodies commonly known under the term “foods,”--namely, cereals, meats of all kinds, milk, vegetables, nuts, and fruits. The second volume will embrace the study of beverages, namely, natural and artificial mineral waters, soda waters, soft drinks, coffee, tea, cocoa, wines, cider, beer and other fermented beverages, distilled beverages of all kinds, and mixtures or compounds thereof.

In connection with the description of the origin of foods and their general characteristics will be given a statement of their chemical composition, especially in relation to nutritive properties. The principal adulterations or sophistications to which the food products are obnoxious will be briefly described, and where simple methods of detecting adulterations are known, of a character to be applied without special chemical knowledge or skill, they will be given.

An attempt is thus made to lay before those interested, in as compact a form as possible, the chief points connected with the production of food, its manipulation, and its use for the nourishment of the body.

It is not the intention of this manual to enter at all into the subject of cooking or the physiology of foods and nutrition. That is a distinct and separate part of this problem and has already been treated in many manuals. In this connection, however, attention may be called to the great importance of proper cooking in the use of food. Raw materials of the best character, prepared and transported in the most approved manner, may be so injured in the kitchen in the process of cooking as to be rendered both unpalatable and difficult of digestion. On the contrary, food materials of an inferior quality, provided they contain no injurious substances, may be so treated by the skilled cook as to be both palatable and nutritious. The desirability of the dissemination of correct principles of cooking is no less than that of giving information respecting the materials on which the art of cookery is exercised. It may be added that the art of cookery at the present time should not be confined to the mere technical manipulation, the application of heat and of condimental substances, but should also have some reference to the actual process of nutrition.

Foods should be prepared in the kitchen, not only of a palatable character and properly spiced but also selected in such a manner as to safeguard one of the chief purposes of food, namely, the proper nutrition of the body and the avoidance of any injury to digestion.

It is commonly admitted that many, perhaps most, of the diseases of the digestive tract to which the American people are so subject arise from the consumption of rations improperly balanced, poorly prepared, or used in great excess. To the intelligent and scientific cook the information contained in this manual will especially appeal.

A PROPER RATION.

The study of the science of nutrition has revealed the character of nourishment necessary to build the tissues and restore their waste. The term “food” in its broadest signification includes all those substances which when taken into the body build tissues, restore waste, furnish heat and energy, and provide appropriate condiments. The building of tissues is especially an important function during the early life of animals as it is through this building of tissues that growth takes place. The restoration of waste of tissues assumes special importance during that period of life when the weight of the body is supposed to be reasonably constant. At this time the waste of tissue in the natural processes is restored by the assimilation of new material in the same proportion.

If the assimilation of new material goes on at a greater rate than the waste of old material it manifests itself during the period of expected equilibrium in the deposition of adipose tissue and a consequent abnormal increase in weight.

In the after period of life the process of waste is naturally more vigorous than that of assimilation, and the tendency is manifested, which is wholly in harmony with the laws of Nature, to gradually diminish the weight of the body, and this continues to the extreme emaciation of old age.

It is evident, therefore, that the food consumed should be adapted to these changing periods. The growing animal needs a larger quantity of food in proportion to its actual weight than the animal which is in a state of equilibrium, that is, of mature age, and the animal which is entering upon the period of old age needs a less quantity of food in proportion to its weight than in either of the other periods of life. Thus, the rations of infants and children should be generous, the rations of mature man sufficient, and the rations of old age limited.

The food should also contain the various elements which enter into nutrition in the proper quantity. The nitrogenous constituents in food, when subjected to the ordinary process of digestion, yield a certain quantity of heat and energy but their more important function is to nourish the nitrogenous elements of the body, of which the muscles, hair, skin, and finger-nails are types. The mineral constituents of food, especially phosphorus and lime, have a general utility in promoting the metabolic functions, especially in the movement of the fluids of the body through the cell walls, and at the same time are actual nourishing materials, entering particularly into the composition of the bones and teeth.

The fats and oils which are present in the foods have the capacity of producing large quantities of heat and energy during their combustion in the body, and thus serve as a source of animal heat and muscular activity.

The starches and sugars which are the most abundant elements of our food, although they have a heat-forming power of less than one-half that of fats, are largely utilized in the production of heat and energy and in the formation of animal fat.

To secure a proper and complete nutrition of the body it is desirable that all these elements should be so adjusted as to provide for complete nourishment without having any one of them in great excess. It is evident that an excess of any one or more of these nutrient materials must necessarily impose on the organs of the body an additional work in securing their proper elimination. This tends to overburden the excretory organs and to cause a premature breakdown thereof. This giving away of the organs may not come for many years, not, perhaps, until advanced life, but when it comes it necessarily shortens the period of human existence.

The term =“balanced ration”= means the adjustment of nutrients in the food in such a way as to secure complete and perfect nutrition without loading the body with an excess of any one element. This is also an important point on the score of economy. A large percentage of all the earnings of man is expended for food products, and hence these products should be used in a manner to secure the best results possible. If, by a practice of scientific nutrition, 10 percent of the value of foods could be saved it would create a fund which, could it be utilized, would minister in the highest degree to the comfort and welfare of the human family and form an abundant pension for old age.

SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OF FOOD.

In the above paragraphs attention has been directed particularly to the nutritive and economic properties of food. It must not be considered that mere nutrition is the sole object of foods, especially for man. It is the first object to be conserved in the feeding of domesticated animals, but is only one of the objects to be kept in view in the feeding of man. Man is a social animal and, from the earliest period of his history, food has exercised a most important function in his social life. Hence in the study of food and of its uses a failure to consider this factor would be regrettable. For this reason it is justifiable in the feeding of man to expend upon the mere social features of the meal a sum which often is equal to or greater than that expended for the mere purpose of nutrition. This

part of the subject, however, belongs especially to the kitchen and dining room, and, therefore, will not be discussed at greater length at the present time.

It is believed that a more careful study of the food he consumes will benefit man in many ways. It will lead to a wider public interest in the problem of the purity of food and the magnitude of the crime committed against mankind in the debasement, adulteration, and sophistication of food articles.

This study will impart to the social function of food an additional charm, in that the origin and character of the material consumed will be known and the properties which they possess for nourishing the body understood. This will enable man, as a social animal, to so conduct himself at table as to secure the greatest possible pleasure and social benefit therefrom and at the same time avoid any injury which ignorance might permit and invite.

It may appear that the inartistic treatment of a subject of this kind, as indicated in the following pages, is not one which is calculated to excite any sympathetic interest or appeal to the natural desire for literary and artistic expression. Yet the importance of the subject is so great as to warrant the experiment of presenting the matter in this form rather than in any more elaborate and connected way.

DEFINITION AND COMPOSITION OF FOODS.

=Food=, in its general sense, is that which nourishes the body without regard to its physical state, that is, it may be solid, liquid, or gaseous. More particularly defined, food is that material taken into the body in the ordinary process of eating which contains the elements necessary for the growth of tissues, for the repair of the destruction to which the tissues are subjected during the ordinary vital processes and for furnishing heat and energy necessary to life. Incident to the utilization of these elements there is consumed, also, a considerable quantity of matter inextricably mingled with food in a natural way, which takes no direct part in nutrition and yet which is useful, as a mass, in promoting the digestive processes. These bodies are certain indigestible cellular tissues which are present in foods, mineral matter, and other materials which are naturally found in food products. Included in this broad definition, therefore, are many substances which are usually not thought of in the sense of food; among these are water and air. Air, however, would probably be excluded because it is not introduced into the stomach, that is, not in quantities which have any significance in the vital processes. Water, on the contrary, is one of the most indispensable constituents of food and is also used in considerable quantities as a beverage. The water, itself, is indispensable to nutrition and is also one of those bodies mentioned above which are necessary to secure the proper conduct of the digestive processes.

By means of the oxygen in the air the combustion of food in the various parts of the body is secured, and thus animal heat and energy developed. In this respect the combustion of a food product is similar in every way to the burning of coal in the production of heat and motion. The same calorific laws which govern the steam-engine are applicable, in all their rigidity, to the animal engine. The quantity of heat produced by the combustion of a certain amount of fat or sugar is definitely measured in a calorimeter and is found to correspond exactly to the quantity of heat produced by the ordinary combustion of such bodies. The term “food,” therefore, in this respect, would include the oxygen of the air without which the development of animal heat and energy would be impossible. It also includes those bodies of a liquid character which are classed as beverages rather than as foods. All of these bodies have nutritive properties, although their chief value is condimental and social.

That large class of food products, also, which is known as condiments is properly termed food, since they not only possess nutritive properties but through their condimental character promote digestion and by making the food more palatable secure to a higher degree the excellence of its social function.

It is now possible to condense into a distinct expression the definition of food in the following language: Food in a general sense embraces those substances taken into the body which build tissues, restore waste, and furnish heat and energy.

CLASSIFICATION OF FOODS.

Foods may be considered under different classifications. First, as to general appearance and use three classes may be made,--foods, beverages and condiments. As types of the first division of these foods may be mentioned cereals and their preparations, meat and its preparations (except meat extracts), fish, fowl, and game. Beverages are those liquid food products which are more valued for their taste and flavor than actual nutritive value. As types of beverages may be mentioned wines, beers, distilled spirits and liquors of all characters, tea, coffee, cocoa, chocolate, etc. Under wines, in this sense, may be included the

fermented beverages made of fruit juices, such as cider, perry, etc. Types of condiments are salt, pepper, spices, vinegar, etc. Milk, although a liquid substance, is hardly to be considered a beverage, and on account of its high nutritive properties may be classed, together with its preparations, under the first head.

Foods may also be classified as nitrogenous, starchy, oily, and condimental. Nitrogenous foods are those in which the proportion of their material containing nitrogen is large. Lean meat may be regarded as a type of nitrogenous food, since it consists almost exclusively of tissues known as protein and contains nitrogen and sulfur as essential ingredients. The white of an egg is also a typical nitrogenous food and, to a less extent, the yolk. Among vegetables, peas and beans are typical foods containing large percentages of nitrogenous matter. The gluten of wheat is also a typical nitrogenous food and the zein of Indian corn, corresponding to gluten, is a nitrogenous material.

Practically all the vegetables used as foods contain more or less protein in their constituents. Among the cereals oats has the largest quantity and rice the smallest of this valuable food material. Of oily foods the fat of animals, including butter, is a typical representative. All meats, fish, fowl, and game contain more or less fat. Of vegetables and fruits there are many which contain large quantities of fat, such as nuts, oily seeds, etc. All vegetables contain more or less fat, although the succulent vegetables usually contain but little thereof. Of starchy foods there are no types in animal food, the quantity of carbohydrate material therein being extremely limited. The lobster and horse-flesh contain perhaps a little more than 1 percent of carbohydrate food, but most meats contain much less than that. Sugar and starch are typical carbohydrate foods.

The cereal grains are composed largely of starchy foods, and so are certain tubers, such as the potato, cassava, etc. Of the common cereals rice contains more starch than any other and oats the least. Sugars are intimately related to starch and are included under the term starchy food or carbohydrate food. The carbohydrate matter in the flesh mentioned above, namely glycogen, is of the nature of a sugar. Among the typical sugar foods are beets, melons, and fruits, some of which contain large percentages of sugar. All fruits contain greater or less quantities of sugar, and that is true, also, of all vegetables.

Of the plants which produce the sugar of commerce there may be mentioned the sugar-cane, the sugar-beet, the maple, and palm trees. The principal sources of the sugar of commerce are the sugar-cane and the sugar-beet.

Of the condimental foods may be mentioned spices, including pepper, mustard, cinnamon, allspice, and other foods of this class. Common salt occupies a unique position in food products. It is the only mineral substance which has any value as a condiment in human food. But it also has a more important function than its condimental character, namely, it furnishes the supply of hydrochloric acid without which digestion in the stomach could not take place. For this reason common salt must be regarded as an essential food product as well as a condiment.

EXPLANATION OF CHEMICAL TERMS.

Inasmuch as this manual is not solely intended for expert chemists and physiologists but also for the general public, a simple explanation of the use of the terms used in analytical data and tables is advisable.

Under the term =moisture= is included all the water which is present in a free state, that is, not combined in any way with the ingredients of the material, and other substances volatile at the temperature of drying. The water is determined by drying to a constant weight at the temperature of boiling water or slightly above. In bodies which are easily oxidized this drying takes place in a vacuum or in an inert gas like hydrogen or carbon dioxid.

=Protein.=--Under this term is included all the nitrogenous compounds in a food product which contain in their composition sulfur, nitrogen, carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen, forming that class of tissues represented by the gluten in wheat, the white of an egg, muscular and tendinous fibers, etc.

=Ether Extract.=--Under this term is included the fats and oils, the term fat being applied to animal fat and the term oil to vegetable products. These bodies are all soluble in ether and therefore are grouped together under the term “ether extract.” There are some fats both in animal and vegetable substances insoluble in ether, but they exist in minute quantities and therefore are not separated from the extracts, but the whole matter is given together and represents practically the fats and oils in food.

There are also minute quantities of bodies not fats in foods soluble in ether, and these are included in the ether extract.

=Ash.=--The term ash is applied to the residue left after the burning of food products in the air at a low temperature until the carbon has disappeared. Ash is rather an indefinite term and is applied to that residual material of a mineral nature composed of sand or silica and the carbonates or oxids of alkaline earth or alkalies. The ash also contains the principal part of phosphorus present in food products and usually a small proportion of sulfur. These bodies in the ash exist as phosphoric and sulfuric acids or their salts.

=Fiber.=--The term fiber is applied to those carbohydrate products in food which are insoluble in solutions of dilute acid and dilute alkalies at the boiling temperature. Inasmuch as these separated bodies are not wholly pure cellulose they are often designated as crude fiber.

=Starch and Sugar.=--The terms starch and sugar are applied to the carbohydrates in a food product of a starchy or saccharine nature, together with the other carbohydrates present which are soluble in dilute acids and alkalies.

=Calories.=--The term calorie is used to denote the amount of heat-forming material contained in one unit weight of a food product. The number given represents the number of degrees of temperature produced in a unit mass of water by the heat formed in burning the unit weight of food. The unit weights employed are usually as follows: Of the food product, one gram (15 grains); unit weight of water to be heated, one kilogram (2.2 pounds); unit increment of temperature, 1°C. (1.8°F.). The expression 4000 calories therefore means that if one gram of food substance in a dry state be burned the heat produced will raise one gram of water through a temperature of 4000°C., or the unit of water (one kilogram) through a temperature of 4°C. For convenience the calories are usually expressed as small calories, namely 4000, instead of large calories, namely 4. In this manual the expression in terms of small calories, that is, the temperature increase of one kilogram of water produced by burning one gram of substance, multiplied by 1000, will be uniformly employed.

FOODS AND THEIR ADULTERATION.

PART I.

MEATS.

One great division of human food is meat. Technically, perhaps, the edible flesh of every animal used for human food might be described as meat. In this manual, however, preference is given to the common meaning of the term.

The flesh of animals is by common consent divided into three principal classes, namely, the flesh of terrestrial mammals, or animals not provided with wings; second, aerial animals, or animals provided with wings, and, third, aquatic animals. A very common classification of these three kinds of food is flesh, fowl, and fish. There are animals, the flesh of which is eaten by many, which are not exactly included in this classification; for instance, animals of an amphibious nature, living partly on land and partly on sea. Also many of the animals classed as aerial live chiefly upon the earth; although having wings they do not use them, such as domesticated fowls. This classification, however, is sufficiently exact for the practical purposes of a food manual and, therefore, under the head of meat is included the edible flesh of mammals living on the land.

=Animals Whose Flesh is Edible.=--Probably the only complete classification of this kind would be to include every animal living on the face of the earth since, perhaps, the flesh of every animal living has been more or less eaten by man. In a civilized community, however, except in times of disaster and dire necessity, certain classes of animals only furnish the principal meat food. Nearly all the meat food consumed in the United States is derived from cattle, sheep, and swine. Goat flesh is eaten only to a limited extent and horse meat scarcely at all, and the only other meats of importance are those of wild animals. The principal wild animals used for food are the deer, bear, rabbit, and squirrel. Many other wild animals, however, are eaten and in some cases highly prized. In this manual only the principal meat foods both of domesticated and wild animals will be mentioned.

=Classification of Meat Food as Respects Age.=--The edible flesh of domesticated animals as well as of wild animals is eaten both in the young and full-grown state. Common names, however, designate these different classes. For instance, veal in the growing and beef for the full-grown animal, lamb for the young and mutton for the full-grown sheep, pig in the younger and pork in the full-grown swine, etc. There is no legal limit of age for such a distinction, but as long as the animal is not fully grown it may be classified under the name representing the young animal. There is a common understanding, however, that in the case of veal and lamb the animal must be under one year of age and usually not under two nor more than eight months of age. A classification of this kind is so indefinite, however, that no strict definition can be given other than that founded on the general principles above

outlined.

=Preparation of Animals.=--The proper sanitary conditions attending the fattening of animals intended for slaughter are of great importance to the consumer. It is a common understanding that animals intended for slaughter should be plump and healthy. Poor animals, either those which are meager from lack of food or from disease, are to be rigidly excluded from the slaughter pen. Animals intended for slaughter should be fattened under sanitary conditions with plenty of fresh water and fresh air as well as good food. The stalls in which they are fattened should be clean and well ventilated, and the sanitary conditions surrounding them should be such as to exclude contagious and epidemic diseases and provide the most favorable environment for growth and preparation for the market.

It is evident that all these conditions are to be secured by proper inspection of the animals while preparing for the market. The time will, doubtless, soon arrive in this country when the supervision of the preparation of animals for the market, the sanitary conditions under which they live, and the general environment which surrounds them shall be subjects of local, municipal, and state inspection. Since the power of the general government cannot extend to states and municipalities, these corporate bodies should take uniform and scientific action concerning all these matters. National and state conventions of municipal and state sanitary authorities should decide upon uniform systems of inspection and sanitation to which all state and municipal authorities must agree, so that a uniform and effective method of inspection and sanitation will be secured throughout the country.

When animals are transported before slaughter from one state to another the national government is then entitled to inspect and certify respecting the condition of the animal thus to be transported from state to state. By thus combining municipal, state, and national inspection the rights of the consumer may be conserved, and this is the only means by which they can be kept inviolate.

It is assumed, therefore, that the animal which has been brought for slaughter has been fattened under proper sanitary conditions, has not been exposed to epidemic or contagious diseases, and outwardly is not afflicted with any disease of its own. Such a healthy animal may then be certified as fattened for slaughter.

=Inspection after Slaughter.=--The inspection after slaughter is of the utmost importance, not even second to that of the proper inspection during fattening and before slaughter. The veterinarian, skilled in his science, can tell by the inspection of the vital organs of the slaughtered animal whether it is affected with any organic disease. Among cattle the most frequent organic diseases are lumpy jaw and tuberculosis. In the case of swine one of the most common of diseases is trichinosis. In the latter case an inspection of the vital organs of the animal is not sufficient. The muscles of the swine, first and most commonly affected by trichinosis, must be examined microscopically in order to eliminate the possibility of the flesh of such animals going into commerce untagged or unnoticed.

If the flesh of the swine impregnated with trichinosis be thoroughly cooked practically all of the danger to man is eliminated. The consumer, however, should not be subjected to the chance of imperfect cooking. A swine affected with trichinosis should either be refused admission into consumption or should be so tagged that the consumer should know the danger to which he is exposed in order to take the necessary precaution to safeguard his health.

=Tuberculosis.=--There is a difference of opinion among veterinary and hygienic experts respecting the disposition which is to be made of carcasses affected with tuberculosis. It is claimed by some that if the tuberculosis is local, that is, does not extend beyond the lungs, there is no reason why the flesh of the animal should be refused to the consumer. The basis of this contention is founded upon the opinion of some of the most eminent veterinarians that bovine tuberculosis and human tuberculosis are entirely distinct diseases and cannot be transmitted either from the cow to man or vice versâ. It is not the province of this manual to decide this controversy, although it is only right that the consumer should be given the benefit of the doubt. Therefore, if the carcass of an animal affected with local tuberculosis is to be passed into consumption it should be plainly marked as the flesh of a tuberculosed animal,--not only the carcass as a whole, but every piece thereof that is introduced into consumption directly or after canning or mincing. The consumer is thus left free to choose for himself whether to eat such meat or not. There is a universal agreement among hygienists and veterinarians that where tuberculosis is generalized, that is, has affected practically all the organs of the body, the carcasses should be condemned. No one will take exceptions to this ruling, though it does not appear very plain to the ordinary consumer why a little tuberculosis is not a bad thing if a great deal of it is a very bad thing. There is an unfortunate tendency in many quarters to neglect minute effects and only pay attention to mass action. This does not seem to be a reasonable or desirable method of procedure.

=The Right of the Consumer.=--In all these cases of post mortem inspection it is the right of the consumer to be informed respecting the condition of the animal admitted to slaughter. Only the undoubtedly sound and healthy carcass should be given a free certificate. The badly diseased carcass should be condemned and refused admission to consumption. If the partially diseased carcass is to be consumed, it should be done under such a system of tagging as will absolutely protect any consumer against the use of the partially diseased carcass without his knowledge.

Summary.--The general conclusion reached is that the consumer has the right to protection in the character of food which comes upon his table. This protection begins at the time the animals are being fed for slaughter. It continues during the time the animals are slaughtered and afterwards in the preparation of their carcasses for consumption. It does not end until the meat is delivered to the consumer properly certified as being sound and wholesome and warranted to be free from deleterious coloring matter and preservatives. The consumers of this country can have this protection if they demand it. They outnumber the makers of meat products to such an overwhelming extent as to be able to secure proper legislation, because the manufacturers themselves, as consumers, are equally interested with others in this most important point, and should themselves receive for their families the same protection that the consumer who has nothing to do with the preparation of meat products is entitled to.

Since the above paragraph was written the Congress has provided for a complete inspection of meats as outlined therein.

=Slaughter and Preparation of Carcasses.=--It is not the purpose of this manual to enter into any discussion of the technique of slaughter and preparation of animals whose meat is intended to be eaten. It is believed that in this country the mechanism of this process is very near perfection, and especially so in the larger establishments where the highest skill is employed. In small slaughtering establishments and in farm slaughter there are found many points of technique which should be greatly improved. The principal thing to be considered is, first, a sudden and in so far as possible a painless death of the animal; second, the immediate withdrawal of the blood of the slaughtered animal if slaughtered otherwise than by opening the principal artery; third, the removal of the intestines and hair or hide of the animal; fourth, immediate cooling at a moderately low temperature until the animal heat is entirely radiated; fifth, the cutting of the carcass into the usual form for consumption and the removal and utilization of the débris for food or other purposes; sixth, the delivery of the meat, if to be eaten in a fresh state, in a condition secured from contamination and decay until it is in the hands of the consumer; seventh, the curing of the meat in a proper manner by salt, sugar, vinegar, and wood smoke, and the delivery thereof in an uncontaminated form to the consumer.

Natural Appearance of Cuts of Healthy Beef

Beef is the most important of any of the meat or flesh foods. To be able to judge of its freshness and freedom from disease is of great practical value. The following colored plates show the appearance of some of the principal cuts of beef in the proper condition for cooking. By comparing the appearance of the beef bought in all markets with these plates it is possible to form a sound judgment of their suitability for consumption.

These seven Plates are reproduced by courtesy of Armour & Co., Chicago

[Illustration: BEEF TENDERLOIN]

[Illustration: BEEF SIRLOIN]

[Illustration: BEEF RIBS--REGULAR CUT]

[Illustration: BEEF RIBS--SPENCER CUT]

[Illustration: SIRLOIN BUTTS]

[Illustration: BEEF RIB]

[Illustration: BEEF LOIN]

It is not established that any further manipulation than that above outlined is desirable or necessary. The use of any kind of dye or coloring matter directly or indirectly, of any so-called preservative substance other than those of a condimental nature already mentioned, or any further manipulation save that to secure low temperature and freedom from infection is not useful, necessary, nor desirable. The sooner the manufacturer of these products understands the rights of the consumer in this respect and recognizes the fundamental verity of the above postulates the better it will be for all parties. When these conditions are met all of

the many and just objections which have been made to the meats of this country will pass away and they will assume in the markets of the world that position to which their natural merits, when not interfered with by maltreating during curing, entitle them.

=Names Applied to the Different Pieces of Edible Animals.=--In the preparation of animals for the market experience has shown that they are best cut in certain pieces of a shape determined by the race of the animal itself and to these pieces or cuts certain definite names have been applied. The method of making these cuts is not the same in all parts of this country and various parts of different countries. In the United States the most common cuts are illustrated in the accompanying figures, with the names which are attached thereto.

The analyses here reported apply to cuts as indicated by the following diagrams. These show the positions of the different cuts, both in the live animal and in the dressed carcass as found in the markets. The lines of division between the different cuts will vary slightly, according to the usage of the local market, even where the general method of cutting is as here indicated. The names of the same cuts likewise vary in different parts of the country.

[Illustration: FIG. 1.--CUTS OF BEEF.--(_Nutrition Bulletins, Office of Experiment Stations._)]

The Cuts of Beef.--The general method of cutting up a side of beef is illustrated in Fig. 1, which shows the relative position of the cuts in the animal and in a dressed side. The neck piece is frequently cut so as to include more of the chuck than is represented by the diagram. The shoulder clod is usually cut without bone, while the shoulder (not indicated in diagram) would include more or less of the shoulder blade and of the upper end of the fore shank. Shoulder steak is cut from the chuck. In many localities the plate is made to include all the parts of the fore quarter designated on the diagrams as brisket, cross ribs, plate, and navel, and different portions of the plate, as thus cut, are spoken of as the “brisket end of plate” and “navel end of plate.” This part of the animal is largely used for corning. The ribs are frequently divided into first, second, and third cuts, the latter lying nearest the chuck and being slightly less desirable than the former. The chuck is sometimes subdivided in a similar manner, the third cut of the chuck being nearest the neck. The names applied to different portions of the loin vary considerably in different localities. The part nearest the ribs is frequently called “small end of loin” or “short steak.” The other end of the loin is called “hip sirloin” or “sirloin.” Between the short and the sirloin is a portion quite generally called the “tenderloin,” for the reason that the real tenderloin, the very tender strip of meat lying inside the loin, is found most fully developed in this cut. Porterhouse steak is a term most frequently applied to either the short steak or the tenderloin. It is not uncommon to find the flank cut so as to include more of the loin than is indicated in the figures, in which case the upper portion is called “flank steak.” The larger part of the flank is, however, very frequently corned, as is also the case with the rump. In some markets the rump is cut so as to include a portion of the loin, which is then sold as “rump steak.” The portion of the round on the outside of the leg is regarded as more tender than that on the inside, and is frequently preferred to the latter. As the leg lies upon the butcher’s table this outside of the round is usually on the upper, or top, side, and is therefore called “top round.” Occasionally the plate is called the “rattle.”

In Fig. 2 is shown a side of beef with the various cuts indicated as used for commercial designation.

[Illustration:

1. Shank 5. Rib 9. Clod 2. Round 6. Flank 10. Neck 3. Rump 7. Plate 4. Loin 8. Chuck

Tenderloins, Sirloin Butts and Strips cut from No. 4.

Rib Rolls cut from No. 5.

FIG. 2.--COMMERCIAL CUTS OF BEEF.--(_Courtesy of Armour & Co._)]

In Fig. 6 (page 20) is shown the interior view of a hog carcass with the cuts indicated as known to the trade.

[Illustration: FIG. 3.--DIAGRAM OF CUTS OF VEAL.--(_Nutrition Bulletins, Office of Experiment Stations._)]

The Cuts of Veal.--The method of cutting up a side of veal differs considerably from that employed with beef. This is illustrated by Fig. 3, which shows the relative position of the cuts in the animal and in a dressed side. The chuck is much smaller in proportion, and frequently no distinction is made between the chuck and the neck. The chuck is often cut so as to include a considerable of the portion here designated as shoulder, following more nearly the method adopted for subdividing beef. The shoulder of veal as here indicated includes, besides the portion corresponding to the shoulder in beef, the larger part of what is here classed as chuck in the adult animal. The under part of the fore quarter, corresponding to the plate in the beef, is often designated as breast in the veal.

The part of the veal corresponding to the rump of beef is here included with the loin, but is often cut to form part of the leg. In many localities the fore and hind shanks of veal are called the “knuckles.”

[Illustration: FIG. 4.--DIAGRAM OF CUTS OF LAMB AND MUTTON.--(_Nutrition Bulletins, Office of Experiment Stations._)]

The Cuts of Lamb and Mutton.--Fig. 4 shows the relative position of the cuts in a dressed side of mutton or lamb and in a live animal. The cuts in a side of lamb and mutton number but six, three in each quarter. The chuck includes the ribs as far as the end of the shoulder blades, beyond which comes the loin. The flank is made to include all the under side of the animal. Some butchers, however, make a larger number of cuts in the fore quarter, including a portion of the cuts marked “loin” and “chuck” in Fig. 4, to make a cut designated as “rib,” and a portion of the “flank” and “shoulder” to make a cut designated as “brisket.” The term “chops” is ordinarily used to designate portions of either the loin, ribs, chuck, or shoulder, which are either cut or “chopped” by the butcher into pieces suitable for frying or broiling. The chuck and ribs are sometimes called the “rack.”

[Illustration: FIG. 5.--DIAGRAM OF CUTS OF PORK.--(_Nutrition Bulletins, Office of Experiment Stations._)]

The Cuts of Pork.--The method of cutting up a side of pork differs considerably from that employed with other meats. A large portion of the carcass of a dressed pig consists of almost clear fat. This furnishes the cuts which are used for “salt pork” and bacon. Fig. 5 illustrates a common method of cutting up pork, showing the relative position of the cuts in the animal and in the dressed side. The cut designated as “back cut” is almost clear fat and is used for salting and pickling. The “middle cut” is the portion quite generally used for bacon and for “lean ends” salt pork. The belly is salted or pickled, or may be made into sausages.

[Illustration: FIG. 6.--COMMERCIAL CUTS OF PORK.--(_Courtesy of Armour & Co._)

1--Hind Foot 2--Ham 3--Rib Belly 4--Fat Back 5--Pork Loin 6--Cala Ham Butt 7--California Ham 8--Fore Foot 9--Neck]

Beneath the “back cut” are the ribs and loin, from which are obtained “spareribs,” “chops,” and roasting pieces, not designated in the figure. The hams and shoulders are more frequently cured, but are also sold fresh as pork “steak.” The tenderloin proper is a comparatively lean and very small strip of meat lying under the bones of the loin and usually weighing a fraction of a pound. Some fat is usually trimmed off from the hams and shoulders which is called “ham and shoulder fat” and is often used for sausages, etc. What is called “leaf lard,” at least in some localities, comes from the inside of the back. It is the kidney fat.

As stated above, cuts as shown in the diagrams herewith correspond to those of which analyses are reported in the table beyond, but do not attempt to show the different methods of cutting followed in markets in different parts of the United States.

=Delivery of Fresh Meat to Consumers.=--Perhaps the most important aid to the manufacturer, as well as a protection to the consumer, which modern science has offered to the public is the possibility of delivering fresh meats to consumers at a low temperature. A well equipped abattoir is provided with apparatus by means of which a constantly low temperature may be maintained in the room where the fresh meat is kept after the preparation described above. When the meats are to be distributed over long distances refrigerator cars or boats are provided where low temperature may be maintained.

=Roast Beef.=--The parts of the beef which are used for roasting are shown in the diagram, comprising a considerable portion of the hind quarter of the beef and part of the ribs. The roast is perhaps the most important of the parts of the beef for edible purposes. The average composition of the edible part of roast beef (before cooking) is given below:

Water, 60.14 percent Solids, 39.86 „ Nitrogen, 4.47 „ Phosphoric acid, .54 „ Sulfur, .26 „ Fat, 10.48 „ Ash, 1.30 „ Protein, 27.95 „

=Beefsteak.=--The most important parts of the beef next to the roast are the parts used for steak. Beefsteaks have different names, such as tenderloin and sirloin, and when the latter two are joined together by the bone the whole is called porterhouse. There are also round steaks and rump steaks which are less highly prized portions of the meat, but in nutritive value are probably quite as valuable as the others mentioned. The average composition of the edible part of a large number of samples of beefsteak is given in the following table:[1]

Water, 63.95 percent Solids, 36.05 „ Nitrogen, 4.54 „ Phosphoric acid, .59 „ Sulfur, .27 „ Fat, 5.93 „ Ash, 1.48 „ Protein, 28.37 „

[1] Means of numerous analyses in Bureau of Chemistry.

It is seen that the roast beef contains less water, less protein, and decidedly more fat than the steak.

=Roast Lamb.=--The parts of the lamb which are used for roasting are usually the hind quarters, although all of the parts are roasted at times. The average composition of a number of samples of lamb roast is given in the following table:[2]

Water, 58.56 percent Solids, 41.44 „ Nitrogen, 4.91 „ Phosphoric acid, .61 „ Sulfur, .28 „ Fat, 9.12 „ Ash, 1.30 „ Protein, 30.71 „

[2] From numerous analyses made in the Bureau of Chemistry.

=Lamb chops= or mutton chops are the short ribs with attached flesh of lamb or young sheep. They are considered to be the most desirable part of the young sheep or lamb for edible purposes. The average composition of the edible portion of a number of samples of lamb chops is given in the following table:

Water, 63.98 percent Solids, 36.02 „ Nitrogen, 4.35 „ Phosphoric acid, .61 „ Sulfur, .24 „ Fat, 7.09 „ Ash, 1.49 „ Protein, 27.18 „

Roast lamb, as shown by the above data, has less water, more fat, and more protein than lamb chops.

=Preservation of Fresh Meats.=--After delivery the meats are at once consigned to refrigerator departments in the markets, where they are preserved until they pass into the consumer’s hands. Thus, a properly fattened, properly slaughtered, and properly dressed piece of fresh meat may be brought into the consumer’s hands in a manner at once unobjectionable and at the same time one which secures it admirably from contamination of any kind. So perfect are these means of transportation that fresh meat may be sent not only from city to city but across the sea, and reach the consumer as near perfection as human ingenuity can devise.

=Length of Storage.=--The question of how long meat can be safely kept in cold storage of this kind is one which has not been decided. It may be said, however, that the period should not be extended any longer than is necessary and that the consumers of meat should be provided in ordinary times, if transportation is undisturbed, with practically fresh meat. It is evident that if the principal meat-packing centers are Chicago, Omaha, and Kansas City the cities and parts of the country remote from these localities must have meat somewhat older than those which are near by. If we pass to distant countries, as for instance, Europe, where fresh meats are received from the United States or even from Australia, the time elapsing between slaughter and consumption must necessarily be long. Thus the length of time in which meat should be left in cold storage after it is properly matured depends upon its geographic distribution and is not a matter to be decided arbitrarily.

When meats are not only kept in cold storage for transportation but are actually frozen, as is often the case, they can, of course, be kept for a much longer time than when subjected merely to a low temperature at or slightly above the freezing point. For this reason meats that are to be carried to a long distance and not to be consumed for a long time after preparation are usually frozen and kept so during transport.

=Effect of Low Temperature on Enzymic Action.=--Attention has been called to the fact that low temperature does not inhibit enzymic action, and, therefore, it must be admitted that this continued activity must gradually deteriorate the quality of the product. The question, therefore, which is the most important is not how long can meat be kept in a frozen condition but how short a time must it be kept. In all cases, therefore, of this kind the consumer is entitled to know the length of time during which his meat has been kept frozen, and this desirable condition of affairs is easily secured by the necessary local, state, and national inspection already mentioned.

=Disposition of Fragments Arising From the Dressing of Beef.=--It is evident that the fragments of sound, wholesome meat which is dressed for delivery to commerce are themselves edible and hence there can be no hygienic or other objection to preparations made from these fragments, such as sausage and other minced and comminuted meats which appear upon the market. In other words, the consumer is entitled to know that because a piece of meat is comminuted is no reason for supposing that it is not edible.

Sausage, mince meat, comminuted meat, potted, canned, and other meats or preparations from these sound, clean, edible fragments, necessarily rejected in the process of preparing fresh meats for curing and for consumption, are entitled to the same consideration and may be looked upon with the same certainty of purity by the consumer when properly inspected and prepared as the larger pieces.

The possibility of detecting any effects of disease in meats by inspection at the time of or after delivery is very remote and therefore the inspection before killing and during the process of manufacture should be a most rigid one in the case of these fragments. Such inspection and certification would restore public confidence in the purity and hygienic properties of these meats which not only are

nutritious but by the spicing and condimental treatment which they receive are rendered highly palatable and desirable.

DETECTION OF DIFFERENT KINDS OF MEAT.

When meats are in large pieces they may be recognized by their anatomical characteristics. In order that this may be done, however, the piece of meat must either be of a sufficient size to be recognized by its shape and general appearance or must have a bone of sufficient size to indicate its anatomical character.

According to the German law pieces of meat of less than eight pounds in weight are not supposed to be large enough to be recognized anatomically or otherwise with certainty. This, however, is a matter which pertains more to the meat of animals from which the bone is taken rather than to its actual size. It requires some little expert knowledge of the anatomy of animals in order to distinguish these pieces, but one who is in the habit of purchasing or cutting meats acquires this knowledge without any special study.

=Odor and Taste.=--Each kind of meat may also be detected both by its odor and taste, as well as by its physical appearance and shape. Beef, mutton, pork, and other meats in a proper state of preparation and preservation have characteristic odors and flavors by which they are easily detected. One of the common faults of cooking is the putting together of meats of various kinds in the same oven, by means of which the odors become so intermingled that in small pieces even the experienced taster may not always be able to discriminate between them.

=Detection of Meat by Microscopic Appearance.=--Meats are so nearly related histologically that the microscope is not a certain means of detecting the different varieties. Were this the case it would be easy to identify the different kinds of meat which may be found in a finely comminuted mixture. The expert microscopist may have difficulty in discriminating between different microscopic portions of meat, but the microscope is of practically no advantage to any but an expert and not a very great advantage to him. The fibers of some animals vary in size, coarseness or fineness of texture, and other characteristics as much as fibers do from different animals.

=Detection by Chemical Examination.=--The most satisfactory method of detecting meats is by means of their chemical examination. There are two distinct points which are kept in view in a chemical examination. One is the presence of glycogen, which in quantities of more than one percent is characteristic of horse meat. Unfortunately, this test can only be applied to a meat in practically a fresh state, as the glycogen is rapidly changed into other forms of carbohydrate substances which make it difficult to identify. The chemical examination, therefore, which is of the most value is that which is performed upon the fat. The fat of different animals has different physical and chemical characteristics. The fats crystallize in different forms and have different melting points,--also the fatty acids derived therefrom. They absorb different quantities of iodin and bromin, and have other physical and chemical properties which are peculiar to each variety.

A careful examination of the fat, therefore, will lead to an approximate degree of knowledge concerning the character of the flesh from which it has been derived. For instance, lard and beef fat are easily distinguished from each other. In case a minced meat is made wholly of one kind of flesh or of one kind of animal the chemical examination of the fat will, with a considerable degree of certainty, lead to its identification. In the same manner, if a minced meat be made up of equal parts of two different kinds of animals the characteristics of the fats will lead to the identification of the two sources of meat. If, however, one kind of meat be mixed in only a small proportion, say 10 or 15 percent, of another, the chemical methods of separation are not to be relied upon. None of these chemical or physical methods, unfortunately, is of value in the hands of any but an expert, and, therefore, cannot be regarded as a common means of identification. For this reason the only common manner of identification of the kinds of meats which are sent out to the consumer at large must consist in the general knowledge of their anatomical, physical, palatable, and gustatory properties outlined above.

In all cases the consumer must eventually rely upon the official inspection and the label which accompanies the meat or which should accompany it.

=Dried Meat.=--A very effective method of preserving meat is practiced in certain of the arid regions of the country by exposing it to the dry air and sunlight. Meats prepared in this way are often called “jerked” meats. The small amount of aqueous vapor in the air is not sufficient to maintain the life of the ordinary fermentative germs, and they are, therefore, destroyed by desiccation. Meat which is exposed under such circumstances does not become infected with any fermentative germ, and the moisture which it contains is

rapidly given off in the dry air surrounding it. For this purpose the meat is cut into thin strips and suspended by appropriate means in the air and exposed to the direct sunlight. In a short time the moisture disappears, and the hard dry pieces keep indefinitely in certain arid regions of this country. The meat also maintains a fair degree of palatability and practically all of its nutrient properties, so that when properly cooked it is a palatable and nutritious dish. Probably of all the methods of preserving meat this one is the least open to objection, since not even spices or condimental substances are necessary in order to preserve the meat from decay. By reason of the change in its physical appearance, however, which makes it less attractive, this method is not likely to come into general use in the ordinary preservation of meat.

Dried beef is also prepared by preserving the meat by condimental substances and, instead of placing it in brine, drying it artificially. Chipped or dried beef is a common article of commerce and is prepared in the manner described above. This meat, however, has already been treated with condimental substances, and hence the drying is only one of the means of preservation. Dried or chipped meats are often smoked also as well as desiccated, so that in their preparation more than one method of preservation is employed.

=Pickled Meats.=--The method of preserving meats in a liquid environment is sometimes called pickling. All kinds of meat are pickled in this way, but pork especially. The pickling brine may be simply made of common salt, though other substances, such as sugar, vinegar, and spices, are used. The brine also sometimes contains a chemical preservative which is highly objectionable on the general ground of the harmfulness of these substances. The preservative commonly used is either sulfite of soda or boric acid. The making of a pickled meat of this kind should be discouraged. The vinegar which is employed or acetic acid may be injected into the carcass before it is cut up. When the arteries or veins are filled with vinegar in this way it rapidly permeates to all parts of the meat and acts as an excellent and unobjectionable preservative in all cases where an acid taste is desired. It is claimed that carcasses which have been injected with vinegar in this way are easily preserved, and require far less salt and other condimental substances than when not so treated. As vinegar is a condimental substance used everywhere, and one which promotes digestion when used in proper quantities, the preservation of meats or the pickling of meats by a previous injection of vinegar is not objectionable.

COMPOSITION OF THE FLESH OF PIGS.

Extensive investigation of the composition of the flesh of pigs has been made in the Bureau of Chemistry (Bulletin 53). The pigs upon which these examinations were made were specially bred and fattened at the Agricultural Experiment Station of Iowa, and were prepared for the market by the most approved modern style of feeding. They were slaughtered according to the approved method and immediately, after proper preparation, the carcasses were placed in cold storage, where they were kept until removal for the purpose of dissection and preparation of the samples for analyses. Expert butchers from Washington were secured for the dissecting and dressing of the pigs in the manner in which it would be done for the best market. The pigs were of different varieties, namely, Berkshire, No. 1; Tamworth, No. 2; Chester White, No. 3; Poland China, No. 4; Duroc Jersey, No. 5, No. 6, No. 7; Yorkshire, No. 8.

TABLE A.--WEIGHTS OF WHOLE CUTS AND DATA RELATING TO THE PREPARATION OF AIR-DRY SAMPLES.

PIG NO. 1.--BERKSHIRE.

----------+----------+ | WEIGHTS OF WHOLE CUTS. | +----------+----------+ | | | | | | | | | + NAMES OF CUTS. | Chicago. | Washington. | ----------+------------+-----------+----------+ |_Lbs._ _Oz._| _Grams._ |_Lbs._ _Oz._|_Grams._| Two American clear| | | | backs, | 35½■ 0 |16,102.8 | 34 6 |15,592.5| Meat, | .. | .. | .. | .. | Two clear bellies,| 19½■ 0 | 8,845.2 | 19 4 | 8,731.8| Meat, | .. | .. | .. | .. | Two short-cut | | | | hams, | 23½■ 0 |10,659.6 | 23 5 |10,574.6| Meat, | .. | .. | .. | .. | Two New York | | | | shoulders, | 20½■ 0 | 9,298.8 | 20 10 | 9,395.5| Meat, | .. | .. | .. | .. | Four feet (seven | | | | hoofs), | 3½■ 0[3]| 1,594.2[4]| | 1,514.1| Meat, | .. | .. | .. | .. | Spareribs, | 5 0 | 2,268.0 | | 2,212.0| Meat, | .. | .. | .. | .. | Tenderloins, | 1 0 | 453.6 | | 470.8| Neck bones, | 2 0 | 907.2 | | 842.5| Meat, | .. | .. | .. | .. | Backbones, | 3½■ 0 | 1,587.6 | | 1,580.0| Meat, | .. | .. | .. | .. | Trimmings, | 18 0 | 8,164.8 | 16 9 | 7,512.8| Meat, | .. | .. | .. | .. | Tail, | ½■ 0 | 113.4 | | 363.0| Meat, | .. | .. | .. | .. | +----------+----------+----------+--------+ Total, |132½■ 0 |59,995.2 | |58,789.6| ----------+----------+----------+----------+

----------+----------+---------- | |PREPARATION OF AIR-DRY SAMPLES. | +--------+---------+---------+ | DIRECT | | |Weight of| | DETERMINATIONS ON | | Air-dry | air-dry | | ORIGINAL MATERIAL.| Weight |sample of| sample | +---------+---------+of fresh| original|after ex-| NAMES OF CUTS. | Water. | Fat. | sample.|material.|traction.| ----------+---------+---------+--------+---------+---------+ |_Per ct._|_Per ct._|_Grams._|_Per ct._| _Grams._| Two American clear| | |

| | | backs, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | Meat, | 31.33 | 58.21 | 833.0 | 13.16 | 109.6 | Two clear bellies,| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | Meat, | 36.09 | 52.69 | 741.2 | 14.33 | 106.2 | Two short-cut | | | | | hams, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | Meat, | 60.29 | 22.19 | 532.5 | 22.95 | 122.2 | Two New York | | | | | shoulders, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | Meat, | 54.97 | 29.01 | 532.5 | 17.65 | 94.0 | Four feet (seven | | | | | hoofs), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | Meat, | 59.78 | 17.04 | 221.1 | 25.10 | 55.5 | Spareribs, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | Meat, | 50.33 | 30.05 | 359.9 | 20.81 | 74.9 | Tenderloins, | 67.14 | 9.14 | 427.9 | 27.11 | 116.0 | Neck bones, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | Meat, | 53.82 | 28.72 | 390.6 | 20.02 | 78.2 | Backbones, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | Meat, | 51.89 | 27.16 | 397.5 | 22.24 | 88.4 | Trimmings, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | Meat, | 29.68 | 62.00 | 783.7 | 9.72 | 76.3 | Tail, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | Meat, | 23.99 | 69.25 | 199.2 | 8.73 | 17.4 | +---------+---------+--------+---------+---------+ Total, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | ----------+---------+---------+--------+---------+---------+

---------- | PREPARATION OF AIR-DRY SAMPLES. +--------+--------+--------+---------- | | | Removed in | | Air-dry| | preparation | | sample | Weight | of sample. | Weight | plus |of water+---------+--------- NAMES OF CUTS. | of fat.| fat. |removed.| Water. | Fat. ----------+--------+--------+--------+---------+--------- |_Grams._|_Grams._|_Grams._|_Per ct._|_Per ct._ Two American clear| | | | backs, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. Meat, | 458.0 | 567.6 | 265.4 | 31.86 | 54.98 Two clear bellies,| .. | .. | .. | .. | .. Meat, | 362.1 | 468.3 | 272.9 | 36.82 | 48.84 Two short-cut | | | | | hams, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. Meat, | 88.3 | 210.5 | 322.0 | 60.47 | 16.58 Two New York | | | | | shoulders, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. Meat, | 152.9 | 246.9 | 285.6 | 53.64 | 28.71 Four feet (seven | | | | | hoofs), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. Meat, | 33.7 | 89.2 | 131.9 | 59.66 | 15.24 Spareribs, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. Meat, | 98.6 | 173.5 | 186.4 | 51.78 | 27.39 Tenderloins, | 26.6 | 142.6 | 285.3 | 66.67 | 6.21 Neck bones, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. Meat, | 100.5 | 178.7 | 211.9 | 54.25 | 25.73 Backbones, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. Meat, | 102.1 | 190.5 | 207.0 | 52.08 | 25.69 Trimmings, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. Meat, | 479.2 | 555.5 | 228.2 | 29.11 | 61.17 Tail, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. Meat, | 134.7 | 152.1 | 47.1 | 23.64 | 67.62 +--------+--------+--------+---------+--------- Total, | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. ----------+--------+--------+--------+---------+---------

[3] Missing hoof, 6.6 grams.

[4] Corrected for missing hoof.

=Preparation of Samples for Analyses.=--The meat obtained from all of the cuts of the same kind in each sample was passed through a meat chopper two or three times in order to get an even, finely divided condition. A portion of known weight was then placed in a dish and dried in a steam oven at a temperature of boiling water or slightly above and heated until the fat had well separated so that it could be poured off into a flask, with care not to remove any of the water which may have separated with it. Small samples were removed before drying for the determination of the exact quantity of fat and water therein, and the results of these analyses were used for calculating the relative portion of the large samples. Samples of skin, bones, marrow, spinal cord, tendons, hoofs, and other parts of the animal were also carefully secured and subjected to analyses. In this way the whole animal was subjected to examination for analytical data, and at the same time each particular part of it, in so far as its relation to the market is concerned, was kept separated. In Table A are found the weight of the whole cut and the data relative to the preparation of the air-dried sample.

The data show that there was a slight loss of water during the transit from Chicago to Washington. The part of the pig which has the largest percentage of fat is the meat of the tail, while the smallest percentage is found in the tenderloins. The largest percentage of water in any part of the meat is in the tenderloins and the smallest in the meat of the tail.

TABLE B.--WEIGHTS OF PARTS FROM EACH CUT AND DATA RELATING TO THE PREPARATION OF AIR-DRY SAMPLES.

PIG NO. 1.--BERKSHIRE.

NAMES OF PARTS AND CUTS. WEIGHTS OF PARTS. From Total. Of entire each cut. pig. Meat (fat and lean): _Grams._ _Grams._ _Percent._ Backs, 14,767.9 .. .. Bellies, 8,230.6 .. .. Hams, 9,407.9 .. .. Shoulders, 8,448.2 .. .. Feet, 325.3 .. .. Spareribs, 1,683.8 .. .. Tenderloins, 470.8 .. .. Neck bones, 493.2 .. .. Backbones, 704.0 .. .. Trimmings, 7,021.5 .. .. Tail, 291.7 .. .. -------- 51,844.9 88.19 Bones: Backs, 191.1 .. .. Bellies, 81.4 .. .. Hams, 879.6 .. .. Shoulders, 693.8 .. .. Feet, 802.6 .. .. Spareribs, 528.2 .. .. Neck bones, 336.1 .. .. Backbones, 833.5 .. .. Trimmings, 71.0 .. .. Tail, 27.1 .. .. -------- --------- ----- Total, .. 4,444.4 .. Marrow, 69.7 69.7 0.12 Total bones less marrow, .. 4,374.7 7.44

TABLE C.--ANALYTICAL DATA FOR MEATS.

PIG NO. 1.--BERKSHIRE.

--------------+---------+ | | | + | | | | | Air-dry | | sample: | | Percent | | of | | original| NAMES OF CUTS.|material.| --------------+---------+ Two American | | backs, | 13.16 | Two clear | | bellies, | 14.33 | Two short-cut | | hams, | 22.95 | (Fat extracted| | with ether), | 16.58 | | | | | Two New York | | shoulders, | 17.65 | | | Four feet, | 25.10 | (Fat extracted| | with ether), | 15.20 | | | | | Spareribs, | 20.81 | | | Tenderloins, | 27.11 | | | Neck bones, | 20.02 | (Fat extracted| | with ether), | 18.69 | | | | | Backbones, | 22.24 | | | Trimmings, | 9.72 | | | Tail, | 8.73 | | | --------------+---------+

--------------+---+ | PERCENT AIR-DRY MATERIAL. | +------+-----+---------------------------+-----+----+ | | | Nitrogen. | | | | | +------+-------+-------+------+ | + | | | |Of pro-| | | | | | | | | teids | | | | | | | | | in- |Precip-| | | | | | |soluble| itated| Of | | | | | | | in hot| by | flesh|Leci-| | NAMES OF CUTS.|Water.| Fat.|Total.| water.|bromin.|bases.|thin.|Ash.| --------------+------+-----+------+-------+-------+------+-----+----+ Two American | | | | | | | | | backs, | 3.14 |20.55| 11.32| 8.51 | 0.62 | 2.19 | 1.16|3.89| Two clear | | | | | | | | | bellies, | 3.14 |21.59| 11.15| 7.78 | 0.65 | 2.72 | 0.99|3.85| Two short-cut | | | | | | | | | hams, | 4.14 |15.43| 11.85| 9.77 | 0.48 | 1.60 | 1.10|4.18| (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | 0.22| .. | .. | .. | 2.43| .. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Two New York | | | | | | | | shoulders, | 2.31 | 2.10| 13.76| 10.22 | 0.73 | 2.81 | 0.85|5.03| | | | | | | | | | Four feet, | 6.46 | 6.32| 13.73| 7.75 | 3.00 | 2.98 | 0.75|3.28| (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | 0.13| .. | .. | .. | 2.68| .. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Spareribs, | 3.66 | 8.23| 13.03| 10.31 | 0.89 | 1.83 | 1.68|4.80| | | | | | | | | | Tenderloins, | 5.14 | 9.47| 12.50| 10.95 | 0.28 | 1.27 | 1.82|4.30| | | | | | | | | | Neck bones, | 7.23 |10.93| 12.25| 9.97 | 0.59 | 1.69 | 1.33|4.02| (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | 0.21| .. | .. | .. | 2.17| .. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Backbones, | 3.36 | 6.88| 13.03| 10.36 | 0.62 | 2.05 | 1.20|5.59| | | | | | | | | | Trimmings, | 3.69 | 8.34| 13.09| 8.54 | 1.11 | 3.44 | 1.16|4.23| | | | | | | | | | Tail, | 4.30 | 6.97| 13.45| 10.56 | 0.98 | 1.91 | 1.98|4.41| | | | | | | | | | --------------+------+-----+------+-------+-------+------+-----+----+

--------------+-- | PERCENT ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +--------------------+--------------------+-----+ | Water. | Fat. | | +-------+------+------+-------+------+------+ + | | | | | | | | | | In | | | In | | | | |steam-| | |steam-| | | |In pre-| dry | |In pre-| dry | | | |paring | mate-| |paring | mate-| |Leci-| NAMES OF CUTS.|sample.| rial.|Total.|sample.| rial.|Total.|thin.| --------------+-------+------+------+-------+------+------+-----+ Two American | | | | | | | | backs, | 31.86 | 0.41 | 32.27| 54.98 | 2.71 | 57.69| 0.15| Two clear | | | | | | | | bellies, | 36.82 | 0.45 | 37.27| 48.84 | 3.09 | 51.93| 0.14| Two short-cut | | | | | | | | hams, | 60.47 | 0.95 | 61.42| 16.58 | 3.54 | 20.12| 0.25| (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 0.40| | | | | | | | ----| | | | | | | | 0.65| Two New York | | | | | | | | shoulders, | 53.64 | 0.41 | 54.04| 28.71 | 0.37 | 29.08| 0.15| | | | | | | | Four feet, | 59.66 | 1.62 | 61.28| 15.24 | 1.59 | 16.83| 0.20| (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 0.41| | | | | | | | ----| | | | | | | | 0.61| Spareribs, | 51.78 | 0.76 | 52.54| 27.39 | 1.71 | 29.10| 0.35| | | | | | | | Tenderloins, | 66.67 | 1.39 | 68.06| 6.21 | 2.57 | 8.78| 0.49| | | | | | | | Neck bones, | 54.25 | 1.45 | 55.70| 25.73 | 2.19 | 27.92| 0.27| (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 0.41| | | | | | | | ----| | | | | | | | 0.68| Backbones, | 52.08 | 0.75 | 52.83| 25.69 | 1.53 | 27.22| 0.26| | | | | | | | Trimmings, | 29.11 | 0.36 | 29.47| 61.17 | 0.81 | 61.98| 0.11| | | | | | | | Tail, | 23.64 | 0.38 | 24.02| 67.62 | 0.61 | 68.23| 0.17| | | | | | | | --------------+-------+------+------+-------+------+------+-----+

-- PERCENT ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +----------------------------+ | Nitrogen. | +------+-------+-------+------+ | |Of pro-| | | | teids | | | | in- |Precip-| | | |soluble| itated| Of | | | in hot| by |flesh | NAMES OF CUTS.|Total.| water.|bromin.|bases.| --------------+------+-------+-------+-------+------+ Two American | | | | | backs, | 1.49 | 1.12 | 0.08 | 0.29 | Two clear | | | | | bellies, | 1.60 | 1.12 | 0.09 | 0.39 | Two short-cut | | | | | hams, | 2.72 | 2.24 | 0.11 | 0.37 | (Fat extracted| | | | | with ether), | 0.04 | .. | .. | .. | | | | | | | | | | Two New York | | | | | shoulders, | 2.43 | 1.80 | 0.13 | 0.50 | | | | | | Four feet, | 3.45 | 1.95 | 0.75 | 0.75 | (Fat extracted| | | | | with ether), | 0.02 | .. | .. | .. | | | | | | | | | | Spareribs, | 2.71 | 2.15 | 0.18 | 0.38 | | | | | | Tenderloins, | 3.39 | 2.97 | 0.08 | 0.34 | | | | | | Neck bones, | 2.45 | 1.99 | 0.12 | 0.34 | (Fat extracted| | | | | with ether), | 0.04 | .. | .. | .. | | | | | | | | | | | | Backbones, | 2.90 | 2.30 | 0.14 | 0.46 | | | | | | Trimmings, | 1.27 | 0.83 | 0.11 | 0.33 | | | | | | Tail, | 1.17 | 0.92 | 0.09 | 0.16 | | | | | | --------------+------+-------+-------+-------+------+

-- PERCENT ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +-----------------------------+----+------- | Nitrogenous substances. | | +-------+-------+------+------+ | | Pro- | | | | | teids | | | | | in- | | | | |soluble| | | | | in hot|Gelati-| Flesh| | |Total. NAMES OF CUTS.| water.| noids.|bases.|Total.|Ash.| [5] --------------+-------+-------+------+------+----+------- Two American | | | | |{ 98.46 backs, | 7.00 | 0.50 | 0.91 | 8.41|0.51|{ 98.88 Two clear | | | | | {98.11 bellies, | 7.00 | 0.56 | 1.22 | 8.78|0.55| {98.53 Two short-cut | | | | | hams, | 14.00 | 0.69 | 1.15 | 15.84|0.96|{ 99.28 (Fat extracted| | | | |{ 98.34 with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Two New York | | | | | shoulders, | 11.25 | 0.81 | 1.56 | 13.62|0.89| {98.49 | | | | | {97.63 Four feet, | 12.19 | 4.69 | 2.34 | 19.22|0.82|{ 96.86 (Fat extracted| | | | |{ 98.15 with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Spareribs, | 13.44 | 1.13 | 1.19 | 15.76|1.00| {97.14 | | | | | {98.40 Tenderloins, | 18.56 | 0.50 | 1.06 | 20.12|1.17|{ 97.57 | | | | |{ 98.13 Neck bones, | 12.44 | 0.75 | 1.06 | 14.25|0.81| {97.60 (Fat extracted| | | | | {98.68 with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Backbones, | 14.38 | 0.87 | 1.44 | 16.69|1.24|{ 96.98 | | | | |{ 97.98 Trimmings, | 5.19 | 0.69 | 1.03 | 6.91|0.41| {99.00 | | | | | {98.77 Tail, | 5.75 | 0.56 | 0.50 | 6.81|0.39|{100.44 | | | | |{ 99.45

--------------+-------+-------+------+------+----+-------

[5] In this column the totals obtained by both the direct and the indirect determination of water and fat are given. The upper number in each case was obtained by use of the results of direct determinations of these constituents; for the lower number in each case the results obtained during the preparation of the sample, and in the analysis of the dry-air sample, were used. Lecithin is not included in the totals given in this table.

TABLE D.--ANALYTICAL DATA FOR BONES, MARROW, SKIN, SPINAL CORD, TENDONS, AND HOOFS.

PIG NO. 1.--BERKSHIRE.

--------------+---------+ | | | + | | | | | Air-dry | | sample, | | percent | | of | NAMES OF | original| PARTS. |material.| --------------+---------+ Bones, | 52.67 | (Fat extracted| | with ether), | 11.40 | Marrow, | 4.44 | (Fat extracted| | with ether), | 17.36 | Skin, | 36.93 | | | (Fat extracted| | with ether), | 15.90 | | | | | Spinal cord, | 8.80 | Tendons, | 31.93 | (Fat extracted| | with ether), | 4.81 | | | | | Hoofs, | 63.44 | --------------+---------+

--------------+---+ | PERCENT AIR-DRY MATERIAL. |
|------+----+---------------------------+-----+-----+ | | | Nitrogen. | | | | | +------+-------+-------+------+ | + | | | |Of pro-| | | | | | | | | teids | | | | | | | | | in- |Precip-| | | | | | |soluble| itated| Of | | | NAMES OF | | | | in hot| by | flesh|Leci-| | PARTS. |Water.|Fat.|Total.| water.|bromin.|bases.|thin.| Ash.| --------------+------+----+------+-------+-------+-------+------+-----+-----+ Bones, | 5.72|0.52| 6.18| 5.32 | 0.11 | 0.75 | 0.84|49.59| (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | | with ether), | (.61)| .. | 0.29| .. | .. | .. | .. |(.28)| Marrow, | 6.68|0.19| 8.31| 7.08 | 0.65 | 0.48 | .. | .. | (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | 0.07| .. | .. | .. | 2.64| .. | Skin, | 8.31|3.28| 15.02| 10.95 | 2.89 | 1.18 | 0.33| 1.70| | | | | | | | | (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | 0.15| .. | .. | .. | 1.85| .. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Spinal cord, | 6.01|8.28| 8.85| 7.02 | 1.26 | 0.57 | .. | .. | Tendons, | 10.23|1.53| 14.10| 11.26 | 2.22 | 0.62 | 0.39| 3.71| (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | 0.23| .. | .. | .. | 6.65| .. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Hoofs, | 7.14|1.35| 14.63| .. | .. | .. | .. | 1.46|
--------------+------+----+------+-------+-------+------+-----+-----+

--------------+-- | PERCENT ORIGINAL MATERIAL.
+-----------------------+-----------------------+-----+ | Water. | Fat. | | +-------+---------+------+-------+---------+------+ + | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |In pre-| In | |In pre-| In | | | NAMES OF | paring|residual | |paring | residual| |Leci-| PARTS. |sample.|material.|Total.|sample.|material.|Total.|thin.| --------------+-------+---------+------+-------+---------+------+-----+ Bones, | 35.93 | 3.01 | 38.94| 11.40 | 0.27 | 11.67| 0.44| (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | (.07) | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | Marrow, | 14.06 | 0.30 | 14.36| 81.50 | 0.01 | 81.51| .. | (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 0.46| Skin, | 47.17 | 3.07 | 50.24| 15.90 | 1.21 | 17.11| 0.12| | | | | | | | | (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 0.29| | | | | | | ----| | | | | | | 0.41| Spinal cord, | 65.17 | 0.53 | 65.70| 26.03 | 0.73 | 26.76| .. | Tendons, | 55.16 | 3.27 | 58.43| 12.91 | 0.49 | 13.40| 0.13| (Fat extracted| | | | | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 0.32| | | | | | | | ----| | | | | | | 0.45| Hoofs, | 36.56 | 4.53 | 41.09| .. | .. | 0.86| .. |
--------------+-------+---------+------+-------+---------+------+-----+

-- PERCENT ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +-----------------------------+ | Nitrogen. |
+------+-------+-------+------+ | |Of pro-| | | | | teids | | | | | in- |Precip-| | | |soluble| itated| Of | NAMES OF | | in hot| by | flesh| PARTS. |Total.| water.|bromin.|bases.| --------------+------+-------+-------+-------+------+ Bones, | 3.26 | 2.80 | 0.06 | 0.40 | (Fat extracted| | | | | with ether), | 0.03 | .. | .. | .. | Marrow, | 0.37 | 0.32 | 0.03 | 0.02 | (Fat extracted| | | | | with ether), | 0.01 | .. | .. | .. | Skin, | 5.55 | 4.04 | 1.07 | 0.44 | | | | | | (Fat extracted| | | | with ether), | 0.024| .. | .. | .. | | | | | | | | | | Spinal cord, | 0.78 | 0.62 | 0.11 | 0.05 | Tendons, | 4.50 | 3.59 | 0.71 | 0.20 | (Fat extracted| | | | with ether), | 0.01 | .. | .. | .. | | | | | | | | | | Hoofs, | 9.28 | .. | .. | .. |
--------------+------+-------+-------+------+

-- PERCENT ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +-----------------------------+-----+------- | Nitrogenous substances. | | +-------+-------+------+------+ | | Pro- | | | | | | teids | | | | | | in | | | | |soluble| | | | | NAMES OF | in hot|Gelati-| Flesh| | | PARTS. | water.| noids.|bases.|Total.| Ash.| Total. --------------+-------+-------+------+------+-----+------- Bones, | 17.50 | 0.38 | 1.25 |19.13 |26.12| 95.86 (Fat extracted| | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. |(.03)| .. Marrow, | 2.00 | 0.19 | 0.06 | 2.25 | .. | 98.12 (Fat extracted| | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. Skin, | 25.25 | 6.69 | 1.37 |33.31 | 0.63|{108.44 | | | | |{101.89 (Fat extracted| | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Spinal cord, | 3.88 | 0.69 | 0.16 | 4.73 | .. | 97.19 Tendons, | 22.44 | 4.44 | 0.62 |27.50 | 1.18| 100.51 (Fat extracted| | | | | with ether), | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Hoofs, | .. | .. | .. |58.00 | 0.93| 100.88
--------------+-------+-------+------+------+-----+-------

Similar data were obtained for all of the other samples used, but the chemical composition is so nearly the same that it is not advisable to repeat the data for the other varieties. The Berkshire for which the data are given may be taken as a fair representative of the composition of the varied parts of the meat of pigs. The comparative weights of various parts of the Berkshire pig are given in Table B.

The data show that 88.19 percent of the weight of the carcass, after dressing, is composed of meat, fat, and lean, and 7.56 percent of bone. The complete data for the variety of Berkshire pig may be taken as a type for the other varieties and is given in Table C.

The composition of the bone, marrow, skin, spinal cord, tendons, and hoofs of the Berkshire pig is shown in Table D.

The percentages of the various parts of the original material of the Berkshire pig are found in Table E.

TABLE E.--REVISED ANALYTICAL DATA.

PIG NO. 1.--BERKSHIRE.

[Percents original material.]

	NITROGENOUS SUBSTANCES.								
	Pro-				teids,				in-				sol-				NAMES			uble				LECI-		OF CUTS			in hot	Gelati-	Flesh		THIN.		AND PARTS.	WATER.	FAT.	water.	noids.	bases.	Total.	[6]	ASH.	TOTAL.
Meat:								American								backs,	32.27|57.69| 7.00| 0.50	0.91	8.41| 0.15| 0.51| 99.03 American								bellies,	37.27|51.93| 7.00| 0.56	1.22	8.78| 0.14| 0.55| 98.67 Short-cut								hams,	60.29|22.19| 14.00| 0.69	1.15	15.84| 0.65| 0.96| 99.93 New York	[7]							shoulders,| 54.97|29.01| 11.25| 0.81	1.56	13.62| 0.15| 0.89| 98.64	[7]							Four feet,| 61.28|16.83| 12.19| 4.69	2.34	19.22| 0.61| 0.82| 98.76 Spareribs,| 52.54|29.10| 13.44| 1.13	1.19	15.76| 0.35| 1.00| 98.75 Tender-								loins,	68.06| 8.78| 18.56| 0.50	1.06	20.12| 0.49| 1.17| 98.62 Neck								bones,	55.70|27.92| 12.44| 0.75	1.06	14.25| 0.68| 0.81| 99.36 Back-								bones,	52.83|27.22| 14.38| 0.87	1.44	16.69| 0.26| 1.24| 98.24 Trimmings,| 29.68|62.00| 5.19| 0.69	1.03	6.91| 0.11| 0.41| 99.11	[7]						Tail,	24.02|68.23| 5.75| 0.56	0.50	6.81| 0.17| 0.39| 99.62 Bones,	38.94|11.67| 17.50| 0.38	1.25	19.13| 0.44|26.12| 96.30 Marrow,	14.36|81.51| 2.00| 0.19	0.06	2.25| 0.46| ..	98.58						[8]|	Skin,	50.24|17.11| 25.25| 6.69	1.37	33.31| 0.41| 0.63|101.70 Spinal cord,| 65.70|26.76| 3.88| 0.69	0.16	4.73| 1.47| 0.40| 97.19						[9]| [10]| Tendons,	58.43|13.40| 22.44| 4.44	0.62	27.50| 0.45| 1.18|100.96 Hoofs,	41.09| 0.86| ..	..	..	58.00| ..	0.93|100.88

[6] Lecithin in extracted sample only, unless otherwise noted.

[7] Result of direct determination on original material. Other numbers in this column represent the sum of the percent of water removed in the preparation of sample and the percent of water remaining in the air-dry sample.

[8] In fat extract.

[9] In fat extract, calculated from averages for like cuts.

[10] Calculated from averages of like cuts.

TABLE F.--DATA FOR THE ENTIRE DRESSED ANIMAL; THE HEAD, LEAF LARD, AND KIDNEYS HAVING BEEN REMOVED.

PIG NO. 1.--BERKSHIRE.

| | | | | | | | | |

.. | 159.5| 0.27| 93.2 | 21.4 | Hoofs, | .. | 52.6| 0.09| 21.6 | 0.4 | +--------+--------+------+---------+---------+ Total | | | | | | weights, | .. |58,789.6| .. |25,341.0 |23,785.6 | Total per-| | | | | | cents of | | | | | | original | | | | | | material, | .. | .. | .. | 43.10| 40.46| ----------+--------+--------+------+---------+---------+

---------- WEIGHT OF EACH CONSTITUENT. +-----------------------------------+---------+--------- | Nitrogenous substances. | | +---------+---------+--------+--------+ | |Proteids,| | | | | |insoluble| | | | | NAMES OF | in hot | Gelati- | Flesh | | | PARTS. | water. | noids. | bases. | Total. |Lecithin.| Ash. ----------+---------+---------+--------+--------+---------+-------- Meat (fat and |_Grams._ | _Grams._|_Grams._|_Grams._| _Grams._| _Grams._ lean): | | | | | | Backs, | 1,033.8 | 73.8 | 134.4 |1,242.0 | 22.15 | 75.3 Bellies, | 576.1 | 46.1 | 100.4 | 722.6 | 11.52 | 45.3 Hams, | 1,317.2 | 64.9 | 108.2 |1,490.3 | 61.15 | 90.3 Shoulders, | 950.4 | 68.4 | 131.8 |1,150.6 | 12.67 | 75.2 Feet, | 39.6 | 15.3 | 7.6 | 62.5 | 1.98 | 2.7 Spareribs, | 226.4 | 19.0 | 20.0 | 265.4 | 5.89 | 16.8 Tenderloins,| 87.4 | 2.3 | 5.0 | 94.7 | 2.31 | 5.5 Neck bones, | 61.4 | 3.7 | 5.2 | 70.3 | 3.35 | 4.0 Backbones, | 101.3 | 6.1 | 10.1 | 117.5 | 1.83 | 8.7 Trimmings, | 364.4 | 48.4 | 72.3 | 485.1 | 7.72 | 28.8 Tail, | 16.8 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 19.9 | 0.50 | 1.1 +---------+---------+--------+--------+---------+--------- Total for | | | | | meats, | 4,774.8 | 349.6 | 596.5 |5,720.9 |131.07 | 353.7 Bones (less | | | | | | marrow), | 765.6 | 16.6 | 54.7 | 836.9 | 19.25 |1,142.6 Marrow, | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 0.32 | .. | | | | | [11] Skin, | 563.7 | 149.4 | 30.6 | 743.7 | 9.15 | 14.1 Spinal cord, | 2.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 0.82 | 0.2 | | | | | [12] | [13] Tendons, | 35.8 | 7.1 | 1.0 | 43.9 | 0.72 | 1.9 Hoofs, | .. | .. | .. | 30.5 | .. | 0.5 +---------+---------+--------+--------+---------+--------- Total | | | | | | weights, | 6,143.5 | 523.3 | 683.0 |7,654.9 |161.33 | 151.3 Total per-| | | | | | cents of | | | | | | original | | | | | | material, | 10.45| 0.89| 1.16| 13.02| 0.27 | 2.57 ----------+---------+---------+--------+--------+---------+---------

[11] In fat extract.

[12] In residue and fat extract, calculated from averages of like cuts.

[13] Calculated from average of like cuts.

The data for the entire dressed animal after the removal of the head, hoofs, lard, and kidneys are shown in Table F.

=General Conclusions.=--The composition of the flesh of pigs has been given in detail for two reasons. First, because the data relative to this point are much more complete than those of any other flesh product and were obtained in a more systematic way. In the second place, pork is one of the chief meat products of the United States,--the industry being one of great magnitude, and pork being a common article of diet among all classes of people. Further than this, the data indicate the general character of fresh meat, and illustrate as well as that of any of the typical animals the nutritive value and properties of flesh. The study of pork, therefore, may be regarded as a typical study of meat products. It is quite as important that all people should be informed respecting the nature of the wholesome meat which they consume and its value as a diet as it is that they should be certain these meats be procured from healthy animals and in a sanitary way. These two classes of knowledge together give a complete scheme of information which the consumers in this and other countries are entitled to have.

Pork, by many hygienists, is regarded as the least desirable of meat products, and it is not the purpose here to combat that idea. Granting, however, for the sake of argument, that pork is a less desirable meat food than those derived from cattle or sheep, that is all the more reason for knowing particularly everything connected with it. Modern investigations have appeared to establish the fact that swine are less subject to those forms of disease, with the exception of trichinosis, which tend to infect the meat and make it unfit for consumption than cattle or sheep. The diseases to which swine are usually subject act quickly, as a rule, and are speedily fatal, as in the case of hog cholera, whereas the diseases most to be feared in cattle and sheep are those of slow activity and those of a nature which is often not revealed until slaughter, namely, tubercular diseases. In so far, therefore, as infection from disease is concerned, previous to slaughter, it appears that the flesh of swine is less objectionable and less open to suspicion than that of cattle or sheep. One of the chief objections to the use of pork in any form, whether fresh or cured, has been based upon the unsanitary habits of the animals themselves. With the modern methods of cleanliness and care, however, the conditions under which the pigs grow and fatten are, or should be, quite as sanitary as those surrounding cattle and sheep. The consumer, of course, has the right to insist upon such sanitary conditions and these, under present laws or those which are to be enacted, will doubtless be supplied. It is believed that in this country sanitary environments and a sanitary method of feeding will develop types of animals superior to those grown in other countries, where the population is denser and where the facilities for the proper growth and fattening of the animal are less abundant. It is hoped that the general diffusion of knowledge respecting all food products among our people will aid greatly in securing these very desirable results.

PRESERVED MEATS.

Meats which cannot be eaten at the time of or soon after slaughter are necessarily preserved until the time of consumption. It is difficult to draw a definite line between a preserved and a fresh meat. A general distinction is the following: Fresh meat is meat which is prepared for consumption without the use of any condiment or preservative, without sterilization, and with none of the artificial methods of keeping, except cleanliness and a low temperature.

The above definition, as will be seen, covers meat placed in cold storage. A special distinction, however, must be made in this case between meat placed in cold storage for the purpose of transportation only and meat placed in cold storage to be kept for an indefinite time. Where meats are prepared for consumption by slaughter and appropriate dressing and shipped long distances to the consumer the cold storage car, ship, and warehouse become a necessity. There is some reasonable limit for keeping such products, beyond which they should be differentiated from fresh meats. Whenever meats are kept in cold storage so long as to afford the opportunity for the growth of a mould, or undergo other changes of a chemical or physical character which distinguish them from the fresh products, they should be placed in a different class. Fresh meats may, therefore, be divided as follows:

Class I. Meats intended for immediate consumption and passed to the consumer within, at the most, one week after slaughter. Class II. Cold storage meats, which are placed in refrigerators, frozen, and kept for a longer period than one week. There is evidently also a limit to the length of time which meat should remain in cold storage, no matter how low the temperature may be, since the action of organisms which produce decay cannot be entirely overcome. The exact limit at which frozen meats can be kept without becoming inedible has not been determined. Without this determination, however, it is advisable that such limit should not be approached. Inasmuch as the supply of fresh meat is practically uniform, or can be made so by the dealer therein, there seems no good reason for the storage of meat in refrigerator compartments for a longer time than is necessary for transportation and a reasonable time thereafter for passing into consumption, except in cases of emergency. It might be safe to say that no meat should be kept in a cold storage warehouse longer than a month after its reception. Numerous instances might be cited in which meat may be kept for a much longer time, but the question for the consumer is not how long a while meats can be kept but how soon they can be placed in his hands. In this connection it should not be forgotten that it is the opinion of perhaps the majority of hygienists and connoisseurs that fresh meat, especially beef, improves for a certain length of time in cold storage. It is probable that the fresh beef which is served to the people of the United States is on an average a month old, and is said to be improved by keeping this length of time. This is a question, however, which is still undetermined, and it deserves a further investigation. Under present conditions it is well to know the truth respecting these matters and to realize that the fresh meat we get, such as beef and mutton, is not direct from the shambles but has been kept for at least four weeks in cold storage.

=Effect of Long Cold Storage.=--It has been stated in semi-scientific publications that the flesh of a mammoth incrusted in polar ice and presumably thousands of years old has been found to be intact and edible. This story, lacking corroboration, is hardly in harmony with known facts. The author had the opportunity of examining a quarter of beef which had been kept frozen in a warehouse for more than eleven years. This meat was found to be wholly inedible. It had an unpleasant and mummy-like odor, was light in fiber and color, having evidently lost a large part of its weight, and was of a character wholly unsuitable for consumption. This fact appears to show that eleven years is too long a time in which to keep meat frozen. In fact, it is scarcely worth while, from a practical point of view, to discuss so long a limit. Only the necessary time for the preparation and transportation of the meat is to be considered, and the sanitary laws of the nation, states, and municipalities should undoubtedly regulate the time of cold storage and see that all packages of meat exposed for sale are plainly tagged as to the date of slaughter, in order that the consumer may know.

In the consideration of the subject of preserved meats there are excluded all meats delivered in the fresh state for consumption and meats kept in cold storage in a fresh state during the necessary time of preparation and transportation say, on the whole, from four to eight weeks. Meats kept longer than this may generally be considered as preserved meats, even when cold is the only factor active in their preservation.

=Method of Preserving Meats.=--Aside from cold storage there are four methods in vogue for preserving meats. These may be classified as follows: (1) Curing with the aid of condimental substances; (2) treatment with chemical and non-condimental preservatives; (3) sterilization with heat; (4) drying. These all except the second may be regarded as legitimate means of preserving meats.

=Curing with Condimental Substances.=--This method of preserving meat has been practiced from the remotest antiquity. The chief condimental substances employed are salt, sugar, vinegar, and wood smoke. With the proper technical skill and knowledge of the

process, meats can be preserved in this way, and at the same time aromas and flavors developed which are considered most agreeable by the consumer and which give an additional value to the product. It is not to be claimed in any case that condimental preservatives add anything to the nutritive value of the product, except in so far as condiments themselves aid the digestion by exciting in a perfectly proper way the activity of the glands which secrete the digestive ferments.

It is not the purpose here to describe the technical processes used. In general it may be said that the application of salt is the first process, and this is done as soon after the slaughter as possible to secure the proper cooling of the carcass, usually from twenty-four to forty-eight hours. The meat, properly cut into the forms known to commerce, is carefully packed and heavily salted, and allowed to remain for some time in contact with the salt or with the brine which is produced therefrom. The salt penetrates to the interior of the flesh and hardens, to some extent, the tissues, abstracting water therefrom, and, without being wholly germicidal in character, prevents the introduction of eggs of insects and the development of ordinary germ life. The salt, however, does not entirely inhibit the enzymic action which tends to ripen the meat and make it more palatable. It naturally gives to the meat the salty flavor which is demanded by the taste in a preparation of this kind.

Sugar is used, if at all, always in connection with salt as a preservative for meats. It may be employed in the pure state, but is usually the yellow or low-grade sugar or molasses. It gives to the preserved meat, especially ham, a flavor and quality much appreciated by the consumer.

The application of wood smoke is usually the last process after the meats are properly cured in salt and sugar. The pieces are suspended in a convenient room and underneath is built a fire of hard wood, which is kept smouldering as much as possible in order to produce the maximum of smoke and minimum of heat. Oak, maple, and hickory woods are most highly prized for this purpose, since they develop on burning a rich aroma which imparts to the flesh a delicate flavor.

The object of curing the meat is, first, to prevent decay; second, to impart the flavor of the well known condiments mentioned above, and third, to favor the development of the enzymic action which has the property not only to make the meat more aromatic than it otherwise would be, but also more pleasant to the taste.

The curing of meat in this respect may be compared to the development of a cheese, except that the enzymic action in the case of meat is one of minimum extent, while in the case of cheese it is one of maximum intensity. In addition to the condimental substances above mentioned spices of different kinds are sometimes added. Vinegar is also used at times as a condimental substance and is, to a certain extent, also a preservative substance, but vinegar is chiefly used in the preservation of vegetable substances rather than meats in bulk. For meats which are spiced as well as preserved as above, vinegar is often used as one of the ingredients, intended as a condimental substance. No other substances than those mentioned above are necessary to the proper curing of meat, but convenience of application and certain other considerations have led packers of meats, when not prevented by law, to abandon the old methods to a certain extent and substitute what is known as the quick-aging process described below.

=Preservation by Means of Non-condimental Chemical Preservatives.=--The use of non-condimental chemicals in the preservation of meat is practically an industry of the last quarter of a century. Up to that time the use of non-condimental chemicals was practically unknown in the meat industry. The chemicals employed are those known as germicides. In the quantities used they neither impart a taste nor odor to a preserved meat, but by their germicidal properties prevent the development of organic ferments and thus make the preservation of meat far more certain and very much less expensive. By the use of some chemicals the salting, sugaring, and smoking of preserved meats may be done with very much less care, in a very much shorter time, and at a very greatly reduced expense. For this reason the practice has gained a great vogue, not as a means of benefiting the consumers, but rather as a means of enriching the packer and dealer. Chemical preservatives are also highly objectionable because they keep meats apparently fresh, while in reality changes of the most dangerous character may be going on. They thus prevent the display of the red light danger signal.

=Preservatives Used.=--The principal chemical preservatives used in the curing of meats are borax and boric acid and sulfite of soda. There are many other chemical preservatives which have been employed, but these are by far the most useful, the most certain, and the most widely employed. Borax and boric acid, of the two classes, are by far the more common. Sulfite of soda is used more as a preservative of color, and is probably found more frequently on fresh than on preserved meats. Borax has the property of paralyzing fermentative action and thus securing immunity from decay. Its use, however, tends to diminish the palatability of the meat because of its restraining influence upon the condimental method of preservation described above. The

meats are more quickly preserved, require less condimental substances, and the borax probably inhibits, to a certain degree, the enzymic action of a favorable kind, described above.

The use of any kind of a chemical preserving agent on meat is most reprehensible, no matter what they may be. Unfortunately, experts differ respecting the influence of these chemical preservatives upon health. The users of chemical preservatives have employed experts of known fame and distinction to testify in favor of these products, while the consumer, perhaps, is not able to go to the expense of securing expert testimony, and, therefore, as respects numbers of witnesses, at least, chemical preservatives have an advantage. In a case of this kind the accused must be considered guilty until proven innocent. It is not sufficient to prove in a given case that borax is not injurious. If it be proven that it is injurious in a single case conviction must ensue. There is no doubt of the fact that the injurious character of borax, even in small quantities, has been fully established, and therefore any amount of testimony to the effect that in individual cases it has not produced injurious results is of no value whatever. If a citizen be robbed and in the course of the prosecution it be shown that there are a million citizens who have not been robbed by this criminal the evidence would be of no value. If it has been shown that the individual citizen has been robbed the prisoner is convicted. No expert would testify that borax has never been injurious,--even those who appear in its favor admit that, but plead that it is generally used in small quantities, and, therefore, cannot be harmful.

=The Argument of Small Quantities.=--The fallacy of the argument for small quantities is so evident that it needs only to be presented in brief form to show the intelligent and thinking people of this country the fallacy of the claims of experts in favor of chemical preservatives.

The arguments which have been advanced in excuse of the use of preservatives when used in minute quantities have, perhaps, been more vigorously urged for salicylic acid than for almost any other substance. This argument has been urged with such vigor and such ingenuity that a further reference may not be out of place here. The principle which is laid down is that a substance which is injurious to health when added to foods, if not a natural constituent thereof, or if not added for condimental purposes, does not lose its power of injury to health because it is diluted or given in small quantities. The only change which is made is to mask the injurious effects produced--to make them more difficult of ascertainment and impossible of measurement. The fallacy of the argument that small quantities of an injurious substance are not injurious may, perhaps, be best represented graphically. The accompanying chart (Fig. 7) shows theoretically the normal and lethal dose of a food and a drug or, as in this case, a chemical preservative. The chart shows two curves, one representing a chemical preservative and one representing a food. The normal dose of a food is that quantity of food which maintains a healthy adult body in equilibrium. It is represented in the chart on the right by the number 100. If the quantity of food necessary to maintain the equilibrium in a healthy adult body is slightly diminished, no apparent change is at first experienced and possibly even no discomfort. If, however, the quantity of food be still further diminished progressively, as indicated by following the curve down to the left, the point is finally reached when no food is given at all and death ensues, represented by 0 on the left hand of the diagram designated “Lethal dose.” As the curve begins to deviate from the perpendicular on the right the degree of injury is very readily noticed and starvation or symptoms of starvation are set up. Thus if you follow the perpendicular on the right downward to the point 80 the divergence of the corresponding point of the curve is already measurable. As you descend to 0 the magnitude of the measurement increases. It requires but very little further illustration to show how easily the effect of diminishing the normal dose of a food can be measured immediately after the curve begins to vary appreciably from the perpendicular on the right.

[Illustration: FIG. 7.--GRAPHIC CHART REPRESENTING THE COMPARATIVE INFLUENCES OF FOODS AND PRESERVATIVES.]

Let us now consider the perpendicular on the left, which is marked at the top under the term “Lethal dose,” namely, a quantity of the added preservative sufficient to destroy life. The normal dose of such an added chemical preservative is 0 and is shown at the base line to the right, marked “Normal dose.” If you add a very minute quantity of a chemical preservative, the curve representing it varies so slightly from the horizontal base as to be impossible of measurement by ordinary means. If we follow along to the number 75 on the horizontal base we see the deviation of the curve is sufficiently great to measure. At 50 it is still greater, at 25 still greater, while at the left of the basic line it is a maximum extending from 0 to 100, or the lethal dose. It is easy to show by mathematical data that no matter how small the quantity of an injurious substance or preservative it will still produce an injurious effect which may be infinitely small if the dose be infinitely small. It follows, then, as a mathematical demonstration that any quantity of an injurious substance added to a food product must of necessity be injurious, provided it is in the nature of a drug and the body is in a perfectly healthy, normal condition.

Hence the argument which has been so persistently urged in favor of a chemical preservative, that if in small quantities it is harmless, is shown to be wholly untenable. While there is no necessity for the addition of a harmful substance, where no particular benefit is secured thereby, and where there is no disturbance of the normal state of health, there can be no possible excuse of a valid nature to offer for the exhibition of even minute quantities. That these minute quantities would not be dangerous in so far as producing any fatal effect is concerned is conceded, but that in the end they do not produce an injury even in these small quantities is certainly to be denied. The course of safety, therefore, in all these cases is to guard the opening of the door. If the admission of small quantities is permitted, then there can never be any agreement among experts or others respecting the magnitude of the small quantity, and continued litigation and disagreement must follow. On the other hand, when the harmfulness of any substance which it is proposed to add to food is established and no reason for its use can be given other than the convenience, carelessness, or indifference of the manufacturer, the exclusion of such bodies entirely from food products follows as a logical sequence and a hygienic necessity.

The third method of preparing or preserving meat is by sterilization. Of all the various methods which have been proposed there is probably none which is, theoretically, so free of objections as the preservation of meat by sterilization, in other words, as canned meats. The only important thing is that the raw material used in canning must itself be meat free of disease, obtained under sanitary conditions, and subjected to sterilization before any fermentation or decay takes place. Pure, wholesome meat thus prepared and thoroughly sterilized will remain in an edible condition for a reasonable length of time. Unfortunately, as has been shown in the testimony respecting the packing industry of the country, canned meats have not always been selected solely for freedom from disease and for palatability. The question of diseased meat is discussed in another part of this book and, therefore, may not be taken up here. There have been used for canning purposes the fragments and, perhaps, inedible portions of carcasses, and this practice cannot be too severely condemned. This does not mean that these fragments and portions of carcasses are not fit for food, but they should be collected, prepared, and sold as such with plain notices to the consumers of their origin. A cheaper supply of beef would thus be furnished for those in humbler circumstances, and no imposition of any kind would be practiced because the nature of the meat would be fully understood.

=Preparation of Meat for Canning.=--In the following description it is understood that the ordinary processes of canning sound, properly prepared beef are described. The question of the canning of improper samples is reserved for the remarks on adulterations.

There is no uniform practice followed, as has been carefully ascertained by a study of the different packing houses and processes for selecting and preparing meats for canning. The exigencies of trade determine this to a greater or less extent. When there is a demand in the fresh state for all the beef which can be supplied the canning industry will necessarily suffer. When there is a surplus of beef offered for sale or in case of war, where the army contracts for large quantities of canned meat, the opposite conditions probably prevail, and the best meats are used for canning purposes and those of a less desirable quality offered for sale in the fresh state. The portions of the carcass used, as described in Bulletin 13, Part 10, Bureau of Chemistry, depend, to some extent, upon the market of fresh beef. All of the meat on the fore quarter, except the shank and the “third rib,” is usually canned, and in some cases those portions are not reserved. The cheaper cuts from the hind quarter are also used for preserving purposes. Very fat, and therefore easily marketed, carcasses are not used for canning purposes except in case of unusual demand as above stated. There are two reasons for this, one of which has already been outlined, namely, that such meat brings a better price in the fresh state, and, in the second place, lean meat has a better appearance in the canned state than the fat meat. For these reasons, in the proper preparation of the meat for canning, the more fatty portions, together with the gristle, are removed and sent to other parts of the factory for making up into other kinds of food.

The meat having been selected, it is cut into pieces of approximately from one to four pounds in weight, according to the size of the tins in which it is to be placed. It is important, for the purpose of appearances, that the size of the pieces of meat in each tin be approximately the same. Also for the process of sterilization the pieces of meat should be practically the same size, so that they can all be thoroughly sterilized at the same time. If the pieces be of different sizes the small ones would become thoroughly cooked and disintegrated before the large ones became thoroughly sterilized, and thus the mass which would be presented to the view on opening the can would be unpleasant to the sight.

=Parboiling.=--After the pieces have been selected and dressed they are parboiled before being sterilized. The time of parboiling varies in different packing establishments from eight to twenty minutes, according to the size of the pieces of meat. In some cases a uniform time for parboiling is prescribed, irrespective of the size of the pieces. One of the principal reasons for parboiling the meat

is to secure the shrinkage, which always takes place on heating, before the meat is placed in the tins.

The experiments have shown that meats when put in tins in a fresh state and sterilized shrink to about two-thirds of their original volume. Parboiling is, in the essence, a process of shrinking. When the meat is put at once into boiling water there is less loss of protein matter than when the meat is placed in cold water and heated gradually. The substances removed in parboiling are water, fat, soluble mineral matter, and the meat bases. The fat is removed by becoming rendered, and rises to the surface where it can be skimmed off. A little over one percent of the protein content of meat is lost by parboiling while the total meat bases lost amount to almost one-third of the total quantity contained in the meat. Of mineral matter in the meat as high as 50 percent is lost in parboiling.

By shrinking, parboiling tends to make a more concentrated article and thus favors transportation. Practically the nutritive value of a pound of properly canned beef is about one-third greater than that of one pound of the fresh beef of the same kind. Hence parboiling may be regarded as a perfectly legitimate and desirable process without which the beef could not be properly prepared for canning.

=Tinning.=--After the meat is properly parboiled it is placed in the tins either by machinery or by hand. To each tin is added a small quantity of a liquid preparation made by the canners and known as soup liquor. This liquor generally contains salt, and sometimes a little sugar or molasses. The composition of soup liquor is as follows:

Solids, .92 percent Protein, .09 „ Meat bases, .23 „ Ash, .28 „ Salt, .11 „ Water, 98.37 „

This soup liquor may be regarded as a thin soup. The origin of the liquid analyzed above was not disclosed, and, therefore, no expression can be made of the way in which it was formed. It was probably made from soup stock, namely, the waste meat and bones of the factory. There is no objection to a soup liquor of this kind provided it is made from sound, clean, and wholesome material. There are two reasons for adding this liquid, namely, to fill up the space which would otherwise exist between the pieces of meat and thus aid in the preservation of the material, and, second, to add a condimental substance which makes the contents of the tin more palatable.

=Sterilization.=--After the cans are filled in this way and closed by soldering or otherwise they are placed in retorts which are composed of strong iron or steel boilers, properly covered and secured, and when these boilers are full they are subjected to the action of steam heat under pressure. Usually a small hole is left in the can through which any gas, air or other kind, is expelled from the can. As soon as everything is complete the retorts are opened and the cans are sealed.

In all cases, however, after sealing the cans they are subjected to a second heating at a temperature of from 225 to 250 degrees F. The time of heating varies from one to two hours. After removal from the retorts the cans are washed with a spray of cold water for several hours, and they are then dried, painted, and labeled.

The above is a general description of the process employed which, however, is varied to some extent in different packing houses.

A modification of the above method consists in exhausting the cans in vacuo and automatically sealing them in the exhausted state, thus removing all air and other gases therefrom. The cans are then placed upon an endless conveyor and dipped into an oil bath at a temperature of 240 degrees, the speed of the conveyer being so regulated that the cans remain in the bath a sufficient length of time to complete sterilization before being carried out at the opposite end. After passing through this bath they are carried automatically into another bath consisting of a solution of carbonate of soda and, finally, into a bath of pure water. The cans are then painted and labeled as originally described.

SPECIAL STUDIES OF METHODS OF CANNING BEEF MADE IN BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY.

=Composition of Beef Used for Canning.=--Samples of fresh beef intended for canning purposes, and examined in the Bureau of Chemistry, have the following composition:

Water, 71.17 percent Insoluble protein, 13.87 „ Globulins, 1.38 „ Proteoses, peptones, and gelatin, 1.31 „ Meat bases, 1.09 „ Fat, 9.89 „ Ash, .96 „ Salt, .04 „ Undetermined, .33 „

The sample, of which the above data are representative, was secured from a mass of meat weighing 356 pounds, after passing through a sausage grinder and being thoroughly mixed. The above data may therefore be regarded as the representative constituents of the usual grade, most carefully selected canning beef.

=Effect of Parboiling.=--A similar lot of meat secured in the same way and from the same carcass weighed 358 pounds and was parboiled as follows: The meat was placed in water in a steam-jacketed tank, the temperature of which stood at 196 degrees F. The reduction in the temperature caused by the meat was restored by heating the contents of the retort, and it was kept at 196 degrees F. for 15 minutes. It is thus seen that this parboiling was accomplished at a temperature below the boiling point of water. After the parboiling was completed it was found that the meat weighed 235 pounds, showing a net shrinkage in weight of 123 pounds. This sample of meat was then tinned in two-pound cans with the addition to each can of two ounces of canning jelly of the following composition:

Water, 95.18 percent Protein, 1.75 „ Common salt, 2.85 „ Ash, .22 „

After sterilizing, the cans were opened and the contents subjected to analysis. The data obtained are as follows:

Water, 62.47 percent Total protein, 24.88 „ Insoluble protein, 22.25 „ Proteoses, peptones, and gelatin, 2.63 „ Meat bases, 1.15 „ Fat, 9.87 „ Ash, .91 „ Salt, .19 „

Composition of Parboiling Water.--The liquor, after parboiling the above sample, weighed 280 pounds and had the following composition:

Water, 99.12 percent Protein, .06 „ Meat bases, .25 „ Ash, .25 „ Salt, .05 „

The above data show that the general effect of parboiling upon the canned meat is to diminish its content of water. Only a small quantity of the soluble proteids is found in the liquor, and the other principal constituents removed, aside from water, are the meat bases and mineral content or ash. The fat in the soup liquor was not determined because it rises to the surface and is not in any sense a constituent of the liquor itself. Considerable quantities of fat were removed in parboiling, the amount depending largely upon the temperature. At a low temperature of parboiling, such as described, the amount of fat secured is far less than when the temperature of parboiling is higher.

TABLE SHOWING THE COMPARATIVE EFFECT OF PARBOILING AND STERILIZING UPON THE FRESH BEEF.

----------+-----+---------+--------+----------- | | |COMPOSITION | | | | OF CANNED | | | | BEEF AS | |EXTRACTED| |DETERMINED |FRESH| BY |ADDED IN| BY CONSTITUENTS.|BEEF.| BOILING.|CANNING.| ANALYSIS. ----------+-----+---------+--------+----------- | Lbs.| Lbs. | Lbs. | Lbs. Water, |254.8| 122.1 | 14.1 | 146.8 Protein, | 59.3| .1 | .1 | 58.5 Meat bases, | 3.9| .7 | .0 | 2.7 Fat, | 35.4| 12.2 | .... | 23.2 Ash, | 3.4| .7 | .2 | 2.1 Salt, | .1| .1 | .2 | .4 Undetermined,| 1.2| .... | .... | 1.7 |-----| ----- | ----- | ----- Total, |358.1| .... | .... | 235.4 ----------+-----+---------+--------+-----------

Preparation of Canned Beef with More Intensive Parboiling.--In another experiment, determining the effect of the changes produced upon the fresh meat, more vigorous preparatory operations were performed. Samples were secured from eight healthy carcasses for use in this determination. Half of the sample was reduced to sausage and secured for analysis as described, and the other submitted to parboiling, sterilizing, and analysis.

COMPOSITION OF THE SAMPLE OF FRESH MEAT.

Water, 69.33 percent Total protein, 16.81 „ Insoluble protein, 12.69 „ Globulins, 3.06 „ Proteoses, peptones, and gelatin, 1.06 „ Meat bases, 1.12 „ Fat, 10.68 „ Ash, 1.13 „ Salt, .24 „

The original sample represented over a thousand pounds. The opposite sides of the carcasses were prepared for canning and produced the following amount of articles as sold on the market:

Total weight of half carcasses, 1,761 pounds 3 ribs, 53 „ 5 rolls, 43 „ 5 loins, 166 „ 3 tenderloins, 13 „ 3 sirloin butts, 28 „ 3 boneless strips, 24 „ 8 rump butts, 36 „ 8 flank steaks, 8 „ 8 kidneys, 9 „ 24 beef hams, 261 „ Shank meat, 85 „ Soft bones, 198 „ Shank bones, 107 „ Tank tallow, 132 „ Canning meat, 598 „

The above data show that only about one-third of the whole carcass is suitable for canning purposes. The best and juiciest pieces, it is noticed, are cut away and sold for other purposes. In explanation of the above data it should be stated that only the fore-quarters of the carcass were used and not the whole carcass.

In the preparation of the sample for analysis, the same selection was made as for canning, and only the canning meat was used in the preparation of the sample.

Parboiling.--The parboiling of this sample was accomplished in the following manner: The meat was first placed in cold water, 50 degrees F., and heated by means of injected steam. In five minutes the temperature had reached 122 degrees F., and at the end of eleven minutes the boiling temperature was reached and continued for one hour. The soup liquor resulting from the parboiling weighed 1,500 pounds and had the following composition:

Water, 99.08 percent Protein, .09 „ Meat bases, .23 „ Ash, .28 „ Salt, .11 „

These data show that, as in the other cases, the chief extraction from the meat during parboiling is water and the next most important removal is of meat bases and mineral matter or ash. After sterilization in the usual way the cans were opened and the canned beef subjected to analysis. The composition of the canned beef was as follows:

Water, 56.18 percent Total protein, 31.57 „ Insoluble protein, 27.94 „ Proteoses, peptones, and gelatin, 3.63 „ Meat bases, 1.44 „ Fat, 7.72 „ Ash, .82 „ Common salt, .04 „

Composition of the Fresh and Canned Meat.--Below is found a table similar to that already given for the other sample, showing the composition of fresh beef and the resulting canned beef.

----------+-----+---------+--------+----------- | | |COMPOSITION | | | | OF CANNED | | | | BEEF AS | |EXTRACTED| |DETERMINED |FRESH| BY |ADDED IN| BY CONSTITUENTS.|BEEF.| BOILING.|CANNING.| ANALYSIS. ----------+-----+---------+--------+----------- | Lbs.| Lbs. | Lbs. | Lbs. Water, |414.6| 243.2 | 12.9 | 184.3 Proteins, |100.5| 1.3 | .... | 101 Meat bases, | 6.7| 3.4 | .... | 4.6 Fat, | 63.9| 39.2 | .... | 24.7 Ash, | 6.8| 4.2 | .... | 2.6 Undetermined,| 5.5| .... | .... | 2.8 |-----| ----- | ----- | ----- Total, |598 | .... | .... | 320

From the above table it is seen that the shrinkage during parboiling amounts to 46.49 percent of the weight of the fresh meat. Of this shrinkage 82.85 percent is water, 14.11 percent is fat, 1.51 percent ash, and 0.82 percent meat bases. It is noticed that more than half of the water originally found in the meat is extracted by parboiling.

It seems rather anomalous that boiling a substance with water would extract water from it, but in the case of meats it is seen that half the water, or even more, which a meat contains is extracted from it by boiling in water.

The two samples given are extreme cases in the method of preparing meats for canning. In the first instance the meat is placed at once into hot water just below the boiling point and kept there for only a short time. In the second case the meat is placed in cold water and is brought to the boiling point and maintained there for one hour. In the last case the low temperature of the water in which the meat was originally placed favors the extraction of a portion of the soluble protein matter, namely, albumins, globulins, etc., while, on the other hand, the long-continued boiling to which it was subjected tends to decompose the connective tissues of the meat and causes the loss of small particles of the insoluble protein thus separated by disintegration. Although in the last case the shrinkage was much greater than in the preceding experiment, practically no insoluble protein matter was extracted, mechanically or otherwise.

Canning of Beef without Parboiling.--To determine the amount of shrinkage which takes place and the general effect which is produced by canning meats without parboiling, samples were prepared, sterilized, and canned in the usual way, with the exception of the omission of parboiling. On opening the cans it was found in each case that the meat had shrunk to about two-thirds of its former volume and that the place was occupied by a liquid containing a number of particles of solid matter. The appearance of the sample was much less inviting than that of meat canned after parboiling.

An analysis of the sample was made, with the following results: Total weight of sample, 31 ounces; weight of canned meat, 21 ounces.

Water, 63.83 percent Protein, 27.25 „ Meat bases, 1.09 „ Fat, 4.62 „ Ash, 1.01 „ Salt, .04 „ Undetermined, 1.20 „

Composition of Liquid.--The liquid in the can was examined with the following result: Weight of liquor, 10 ounces.

Solids, 6.93 percent Protein and gelatin, 1.94 „ Meat bases, 1.84 „ Ash, 1.22 „ Salt, 1.15 „

The above data show that the beef lost 32.06 percent of its weight in the canning, a little over half of which is water.

It appears that less protein matter is extracted when the meat is parboiled by being plunged into boiling water than when it is packed in a can without parboiling and subsequently subjected to the temperature of sterilization. In the former case the soluble

proteins in meat near the surface are coagulated before they can diffuse into the surrounding water. In the other case, owing to the low conductivity of meat, the temperature at the surface of the can penetrates slowly to the interior and the juices which are extracted from the meat carry with them protein matter in solution which is afterwards precipitated by heat and remains in the liquid as matter coagulated at the temperature of sterilization.

It is seen that parboiling has many advantages. It extracts less of the valuable matter from the meat, it shrinks the meat before packing so that the tins contain more nutrient matter, and it improves the appearance of the meat to the consumer when opened.

=Relation of Canned to Fresh Meat.=--In the following table is given the number of ounces of canned meat in a number of cans compared with the equivalent amount of fresh beef used in filling them:

NO. OF CAN. CANNED BEEF, EQUIVALENT TO FRESH BEEF. Ounces. Ounces. 1, 29 44.2 2, 29.9 42.6 3, 28.5 38.7 4, 12.6 19 5, 30.5 57 6, 30.6 50.9 ---- ---- Means, 26.9 42.1

It thus appears that a can of 26.9 ounces of beef contains, as an average content, an amount of meat equivalent to 42.1 ounces of fresh beef, and retains practically all of the nutrient value of the larger quantity of fresh beef.

=Canned Ham and Bacon.=--It seems unnecessary, as a rule, to can ham and bacon properly cured and transported in a suitable manner. There are occasions justifying the use of these products in tropical countries and in other places far remote from the sources of manufacture, and where the preservation of them, by reason of the character of the climate, is difficult.

The proper preparation of these articles, packing in tins and sterilizing, makes it possible to send them to the most distant points and to have them consumed in the most unfavorable climatic conditions. Canned ham, as it is found upon the market, has a higher percentage of fat and a consequently lower percentage of protein than canned beef. The ham is packed closely and the smaller pieces added for the purpose of filling up interstices between the larger pieces of meat and keeping the can full. It is reasonable to infer that the added meat is pork, although very probably it may not always be so.

=Composition of Canned Ham and Bacon.=--The character of the canned ham and bacon upon the market may be illustrated by the composition of the following samples (these samples were purchased in the open market and are presumably representative of the products as commonly sold in the shops):

COMPOSITION OF CANNED HAM AND BACON.

---------- |COMPOSITION OF ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +--------+--------+--------+ | | | | | | + | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |Water in| | | |fat-free| | | sub- | | DESCRIPTION. | Water. | stance.| Fat. | ----------+--------+--------+--------+ |_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._| Sliced Star ham, | 43.80 | 71.84 | 38.22 | Boneless ham, | 53.30 | 64.09 | 16.84 | Gold Band sliced ham, | 48.37 | 68.72 | 29.78 | Boneless cooked ham, | 41.53 | 63.50 | 34.60 | Prosciutto Scelto in Fette,| 36.77 | 57.27 | 35.79 | Lunch ham, | 40.74 | 59.53 | 31.56 | Huckins sandwich ham, | 36.56 | 72.17 | 49.34 | Ham, “Coin Special,” | 50.87 | 69.12 | 26.42 | Sliced Star bacon, | 15.34 | 21.24 | 27.79 | Beechnut bacon, | 18.59 | 26.42 | 29.59 | Sliced breakfast bacon, | 20.73 | 67.06 | 69.07 | Gold Band sliced bacon, | 19.69 | 62.99 | 68.74 | Fresh pork, rib and loin, | 51.80 | 78.32 | 33.86 | ----------+--------+--------+--------+

---------- COMPOSITION OF ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +----------+ | Nitrogen. | +--------+--------+--------+--------+ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Coagu- | Preci- | | | | lated | pitated| | | | pro- | by | Meat | DESCRIPTION. | Total. | teids. | bromin.| bases. | ----------+--------+--------+--------+--------+ |_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._| Sliced Star ham, | 2.07 | 1.62 | 0.06 | 0.39 | Boneless ham, | 3.75 | 3.15 | .10 | .50 | Gold Band sliced ham, | 2.82 | 1.89 | .09 | .84 | Boneless cooked ham, | 3.03 | 2.50 | .12 | .41 | Prosciutto Scelto in Fette,| 3.05 | 1.96 | .19 | .90 | Lunch ham, | 3.68 | 3.21 | .16 | .31 | Huckins sandwich ham, | 2.04 | 1.77 | .07 | .20 | Ham, “Coin Special,” | 2.94 | 2.55 | .34 | .05 | Sliced Star bacon, | 6.68 | 4.75 | .74 | 1.19 | Beechnut bacon, | 5.74 | 4.10 | .26 | 1.38 | Sliced breakfast bacon, | 1.07 | .92 | .07 | .08 | Gold Band sliced bacon, | 1.40 | .91 | .10 | .39 | Fresh pork, rib and loin, | 2.15 | 1.57 | .25 | .33 | ----------+--------+--------+--------+--------+

---------- COMPOSITION OF ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +----------+ | Nitrogenous substances. | +--------+--------+--------+--------+ | | | Gelati-| | | | noids | | | | and pro-| | | | teids | | | | Coagu- | preci- | | | Protein| lated | pitated| | | (N × | pro- | by | Meat | DESCRIPTION. | 6.25). | teids. | bromin.| bases. | ----------+--------+--------+--------+--------+ |_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._| Sliced Star ham, | 12.94 | 10.12 | 0.38 | 1.22 | Boneless ham, | 23.44 | 19.69 | .62 | 1.56 | Gold Band sliced ham, | 17.62 | 11.81 | .56 | 2.62 | Boneless cooked ham, | 18.94 | 15.62 | .75 | 1.28 | Prosciutto Scelto in Fette,| 19.06 | 12.25 | 1.19 | 2.81 | Lunch ham, | 23.00 | 20.06 | 1.00 | .97 | Huckins sandwich ham, |

12.75 | 11.06 | .44 | .62 | Ham, “Coin Special,” | 18.38 | 15.94 | 2.12 | .16 | Sliced Star bacon, | 41.75 | 29.69 | 4.62 | 3.72 | Beechnut bacon, | 35.88 | 25.62 | 1.62 | 4.31 | Sliced breakfast bacon, | 6.69 | 5.80 | .44 | .25 | Gold Band sliced bacon, | 8.75 | 5.69 | .62 | 1.22 | Fresh pork, rib and loin, | 13.44 | 9.81 | 1.56 | 1.03 | ----------+--------+--------+--------+--------+

---------- COMPOSITION OF ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +--------+--------+--------+ | | | | + | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Sodium | | DESCRIPTION. | Ash. |chlorid.| Total. | ----------+--------+--------+--------+ |_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._| Sliced Star ham, | 3.86 | 3.29 | 97.60 | Boneless ham, | 5.43 | 4.34 | 97.54 | Gold Band sliced ham, | 5.03 | 4.10 | 98.07 | Boneless cooked ham, | 4.33 | 3.66 | 98.25 | Prosciutto Scelto in Fette,| 8.37 | 7.51 | 97.38 | Lunch ham, | 3.84 | 3.08 | 98.26 | Huckins sandwich ham, | 1.75 | .. | 99.79 | Ham, “Coin Special,” | 3.55 | 2.39 | 99.09 | Sliced Star bacon, | 15.02 | 13.28 | 96.28 | Beechnut bacon, | 19.90 | 17.84 | 99.63 | Sliced breakfast bacon, | 3.06 | 2.37 | 99.41 | Gold Band sliced bacon, | 2.57 | 2.27 | 98.55 | Fresh pork, rib and loin, | .78 | Tr. | 98.88 | ----------+--------+--------+--------+

----------+---------- | COMPOSITION OF DRY MATERIAL. +--------+--------+--------+-------- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

=Examination of Fat as a Test for Adulterations.=--It is evident, from what has already been said, that the character of the fats which are used in the canning of preserved meats is not always the same as that of the meat to which they are added. A careful study has been made in the Bureau of Chemistry of the fats extracted from different canned meats. The chemical and physical characteristics of these fats are given in the following table:

---------+---------+---------+---------+---------+--------- SOURCE | MELTING | CHILLING| IODIN |MAUMENÉ |DEGREES BUTYRO- OF FAT. | POINT. | POINT. | NUMBER. |NUMBER. | REFRACTOMETER. ---------+---------+---------+---------+---------+--------- | C.° | C.° | | C.° | Canned roast | | | | | beef, |36.5-43.9|27.8-37.0|36.1-50.6|35.6-36.0| 47.0-55.5 Canned smoked| | | | beef, |37.7-41.8|22.0-29.0|50.9-57.5| .. | 51.0-58.5 Canned ham | | | | | and bacon, |23.6-30.5|17.5-24.0|48.5-68.2|39.8-43.5| 49.0-58.2 Fowl, |28.0-34.0|12.0-36.5|67.0-86.4|38.9-52.0| 49.0-62.5 ---------+---------+---------+---------+---------+---------

It has been noticed that the crystals deposited by the evaporation of the ether solution of chicken fat resemble beef stearin in shape, but are much smaller and more delicate. It is seen that the melting point of fat in ham and bacon is rather lower than in leaf lard. It is evident, therefore, that this fat is not lard or, at least, not wholly composed of the best lard, but probably consists of the fat not usually employed for lard making.

=Potted Meats.=--There is found on the market a large number of varieties of potted meat. It is difficult to describe in any scientific way these potted meats because the term “potted” is employed by all manufacturers to describe a mixture of a great many different articles, the exact composition of which is usually a trade secret. There is, apparently, an understanding among manufacturers that the labels of potted goods are not intended in any way to indicate the variety of meat or principal meats contained in the package. In the absence of any trade, sanitary, or chemical standard it is difficult to make any just criticism of the character of the potted goods upon the market.

The principal object of mentioning them here is to inform the consumer of the probable character of the potted goods which he may consume, and to let him understand that it is by no means certain that the name of the meat upon the label describes the character of the meat which he is actually eating. The chief object in the manufacture of potted meat is to make a supply of uniform character and consistency, and properly spiced and flavored to attract and hold the patronage of the consumer.

A certain degree of consistency is established by each manufacturer for each variety of potted goods made, and to obtain this consistence more or less fat meat of some kind is added. It may thus be of some advantage to add the fat of pork rather than the fat of beef or mixtures of the two. It is claimed by many manufacturers that a single kind of meat does not give the desired flavor in potted and deviled goods. Therefore, meats of different origin are finely ground and mixed together, and a sufficient quantity of oil or fat added to secure the required physical consistence. For this reason cured meats, such as beef and pork, are often preferred for making potted and deviled meats because of the agreeable flavor and aroma which they impart thereto. These meats are therefore used in potting, although they cost more than corresponding quantities of fresh meat. In a character of goods so variegated as these it is impossible to lay down any rule which may guide the consumer in his choice. The widest latitude is left to the manufacturer, and the only real protection is in a strict inspection of the factory or factories where such goods are made. It is there only that the character of the materials employed and the quality of the condiments or other substances added can be determined. The day is doubtless rapidly approaching when consumers will be perfectly protected in this matter, and when no canned, potted, or deviled meats of any description will be allowed to enter into commerce without bearing the certificate of competent inspection officers as to the kind of meats used, their sanitary character, etc.

Potted meats should always be carefully sterilized and the contents of the tins should be consumed as soon as possible after they are opened.

=Potted Beef.=--Potted beef, more than any other product bearing the label of potted, corresponds more closely to the character of the meat named on its label. Of four samples of commercially potted beef examined in the Bureau of Chemistry only one appeared to contain any other meat than beef. The composition of the potted beef is shown in the table on page 53.

=Adulteration of Potted Beef.=--From the average data given above it is seen that the principal adulteration in potted beef, assuming that the meat is beef, is starch. Two of the four samples contained starch, one more than 14 percent and one more than 11 percent. The admixture of starch is evidently solely for fraudulent purposes, to increase the weight and bulk with a very much cheaper substance and one for which no necessity for the addition can be claimed. It also increases the quantity of water which the

product will carry. Saltpeter was found in one of the four samples and boric acid in two. One of the samples contained a large quantity of tin, due probably to the action of the potted meat upon the tin lining of the can.

=Potted Deviled Meats.=--The term “deviled meat” is applied to a mixture of finely ground meat with spices, condiments, and other substances, and, like the term “potted,” is used rather to indicate a miscellaneous mixture than any single compound.

All that has been said respecting the composition of potted meat applies with equal force to deviled meat. If there be any difference at all it is understood by the term deviled that the spices and condiments are more pronounced in character and greater in quantity and the miscellaneous character of the goods more pronounced. Under the terms of “deviled” and “potted” may be found every kind of mixed and miscellaneous finely comminuted meat, flavored with all kinds of condimental substances and prepared so as to appeal as strongly as possible to the taste and desire of the consumer.

COMPOSITION OF POTTED BEEF.

-----+---------- | COMPOSITION OF ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +--------+--------+--------+----------+ | | | | Nitrogen. | | | | +--------+--------+ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Water | | | | | | in fat-| | | | | free | | | | SAM- | | sub- | | | Meat | PLES.| Water. | stance.| Fat. | Total. | bases. | -----+--------+--------+--------+--------+--------+ |_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._| | | | | | | 1, | 28.24 | 50.33 | 43.89 | 3.76 | 0.56 | 2, | 51.80 | 64.40 | 19.58 | ... | ... | 3, | 54.92 | 62.20 | 12.70 | 2.87 | .64 | 4, | 65.51 | 72.92 | 10.26 | 3.14 | .42 | -----+--------+--------+--------+--------+--------+

---------- COMPOSITION OF ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +----------+--------+--------+--------+ | Nitrogenous substances. | | | | +--------+--------+--------+--------+ | | | | | | Gelati-| | | Glyco- | | | | | noids | | | gen, | | | | Pro- |and pro-| | | calcu- | | | | teids | teids | | | lated | | | | in- | preci-| | | to dry | | | Protein| soluble| pitated| | |fat-free| | SAM- | (N × | in hot | by | Meat | | mate- | Salt- | PLES.| 6.25). | water. | bromin.| bases. | Starch.| rial. | peter. | -----+--------+--------+--------+--------+--------+--------+--------+--------+ |_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._|_P. ct._| | | | | | | | | 1, | 23.50 | 19.50 | 0.50 | 1.75 | ... | 0.32 | 0.05 | 2, | ... | ... | ... | ... | 14.26 | ... | ... | 3, | 17.94 | 12.88 | 1.06 | 2.00 | 11.56 | .22 | ... | 4, | 19.62 | 15.06 | 1.94 | 1.31 | ... | .25 | ... | -----+--------+--------+--------+--------+--------+--------+--------+

----------+ COMPOSITION OF ORIGINAL MATERIAL. +--------+--------+---------+----------+--------+ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

accompanied by an official certification that it has been inspected and found to be up to the standard. It is only in this way that the public can be protected against fraud and imposition. Where no descriptive word at all is used with the word pâté there is no reasonable limit to be placed upon the kind of meat used, provided it is of a sound and sanitary character. The term pâté itself means a mixture and, therefore, it is no deception and imposition upon the public to sell a pâté of a miscellaneous character, provided it does not bear any false statement regarding origin or character.

The mean composition of forty-three samples of pâtés and purées is found in the following data:

Water, 45.87 percent Water in fat-free substance, 71.18 „ Fat, 35.41 „ Protein, 11.92 „ Meat bases, .82 „ Starch, 7.44 „ Total ash, 2.88 „ Of which sodium chlorid, .97 „

From the above data it is seen that the pâtés are characterized by a very high percentage of fat and a correspondingly low percentage of protein. A very large majority of the samples examined contained starch, the highest quantity found being 15.80 percent. Only two of the samples were found to contain saltpeter; six contained boric acid and three benzoic acid. Tin and zinc were found in a few cases.

=Principal Adulterations of Mixed, Miscellaneous, Potted, Deviled, and Comminuted Meats.=--As has been observed in the analyses of the commercial articles which have been submitted it is evident that no detection of the adulteration of these minced meats with impure fragmentary, diseased, or unwholesome articles is possible in so far as chemical analysis is concerned. A microscopic analysis also often fails to reveal the true character of the meats which have been used in the preparation of these bodies. Hence the adulteration of these bodies with diseased, unwholesome, unfit, and unsanitary meats cannot be controlled nor even positively affirmed after the meats are prepared and canned. Such adulterations are doubtless frequent and are the most objectionable. The only protection to the consumer is in a certificate of inspection before preparation and packing. The consumer, by refusing to purchase such comminuted meats in the absence of such a certificate, would soon compel the manufacturer to secure official inspection and certification of his products.

=Adulteration with Starch.=--One of the chief adulterants in sausages and prepared meats is starch. It has been said by some hygienists that starch is not an objectionable adulterant on hygienic grounds. This, however, is not strictly true. The injection of large quantities of starch into meat tends to unbalance a ration which is fixed with certain quantities of other food and tends to increase the proportion of starchy matter therein. There are many conditions of disordered digestion in which such increases of starch, unknown to the physician or patient or even known, are highly objectionable. Hence the use of starch as an adulterant in meat of this kind is reprehensible on hygienic grounds. The principal purpose for using starch is deception. Starch increases the bulk and weight of goods, and, in the process of cooking, prevents undue shrinkage. The consumer, therefore, thinks that he has secured a larger quantity and better quality of meat than he really has, and is, to this extent, defrauded and deceived.

=Preservatives.=--The preservatives which are principally used in meat are borax, boric acid, sulfite of soda, and benzoic acid. All of these preservatives have been shown, by researches in the Bureau of Chemistry, to be deleterious to health. They should be rigidly excluded from all meat as well as other food products.

=Coloring Matter.=--Dyes are frequently used for coloring sausage and other minced meats. All such dyeing materials are reprehensible, both on account of the danger to health and deception. Preserved meats gradually lose the natural red tint of the fresh meat, and to that extent the color is an index of the time during which they have been preserved. Inasmuch as consumers prefer fresh meats preserved as short a time as possible, they are deceived and to that extent injured by the use of dyestuffs which impart to preserved meats a fresh appearance.

=Indirect Coloring Matter.=--Certain chemicals, which of themselves have no color, serve to fix and hold, or even accentuate, the natural color of meat. The two principal chemicals used for this purpose are saltpeter and sulfite of soda. Saltpeter is used generally in preserved meats to retain and accentuate the red color thereof. Sulfite of soda is used principally on fresh meats, where it acts both as a preservative and as a retainer of color. Sprinkled over the freshly cut surface of fresh meat, sulfite of soda preserves the red tint, and the customer thinks it has just been cut. In this way he is deceived. Both of these substances are highly objectionable not only on account of deception but on account of being injurious to health. In the case of saltpeter, the general opinion concerning its therapeutic action is that it is not a proper substance to mix with foods. It would be highly desirable on the part of the packer, if he deemed it necessary to use bodies of this kind, to plainly state upon each package the character and quantity of preservatives and coloring matter employed. The consumer is then left to judge for himself whether or not he desires to eat these bodies.

The principal objection to notifications of this kind is that the consumer, not being an expert as a rule, cannot form any intelligent opinion respecting the desirability of these substances in food. He is more apt to be guided by common practice in this matter and by his own opinion than by any general principles of chemistry and hygiene.

=Potted Tongue.=--The term “potted tongue” may apply equally to tongue of a single character, such as beef, lamb, pork, or swine, or the mixture thereof. The examinations which have been made of the potted tongues of commerce do not indicate whether they are of a single character or whether the tongues are derived from a variety of sources. The mean composition of twenty-one samples bought in the open market, as found in the Bureau of Chemistry, is given in the following table:

Water, 52.50 percent Water in the fat-free substance, 67.67 „ Fat, 22.99 „ Protein, 17.80 „ Meat bases, .75 „ Total ash, 5.46 „

Adulteration of Potted Tongue.--In the samples examined above starch was found in four cases, the largest amount being 11.6 percent. Saltpeter was found in eighteen cases, the largest amount being .06 percent. Tin was present in thirteen cases and zinc in eight cases. Boric acid was found in fourteen cases.

From the above it is evident that the principal adulterations in potted tongue, aside from the use of meats which are not tongue, and which chemical analysis cannot disclose, are the addition of starch, saltpeter, tin, and zinc, the two latter derived either from the solder or from the can in which the goods are placed.

=Canned Poultry.=--Other fresh meats, in addition to beef and pork, are canned in a fresh state. In the case of poultry the fowls are dressed and drawn and the whole carcass boiled until the meat is sufficiently cooked to facilitate the separation from the bones. The bones are then removed and the meat is canned and sterilized by practically the same method as practiced with canned beef. Game and wild fowl meats are also subjected to the same process of canning as the domesticated chickens, geese, ducks, turkeys, etc. In general it may be said that there are no differences in the processes employed, but the important question to the consumer is the character of the raw materials used, the sanitary conditions which attended their preparation, and their freedom from admixtures of other meats cheaper in price and of different dietetic values.

=Adulteration of Canned Fresh Meat.=--Fortunately the process of sterilization is of such a character, when properly carried out, as to exclude all necessity for the addition of any preservative substances to canned fresh meat. The use of ordinary condimental substances in moderate quantities cannot be regarded as an adulteration. Hence, the addition of small quantities of salt, sugar, vinegar, and the ordinary spices, when used solely for the improvement of the taste and flavor and not for preservative purposes, is regarded as unobjectionable.

The common preservatives used in canned meat are, first, those which give color to the meat and preserve its natural red tint. For this purpose saltpeter and sulfite of soda are most commonly employed. Red dyes of any description are rarely, if ever, found. The preservative which is used most frequently in canned meat is borax or boric acid. That this use is not necessary is evident from the investigations which have been made in the Bureau of Chemistry which show that in most cases no preservatives at all are used. The addition of any chemical preservative is, therefore, to be regarded as unnecessary and as an adulteration.

The use of any diseased, tainted, decomposed, or filthy meat, even if it is of the same origin as that in the can, is an adulteration of the most serious character and which can only be effectually controlled by the inspection mentioned above. The adulteration of the meat of fowls of all descriptions by cheaper meats, such as pork or veal, even if they be of wholesome and sound character, is an adulteration said to be often practiced and one which it is difficult to detect if the particles of meat are finely comminuted.

=Standard for Preserved Meats.=--The standard for preserved meat is the same as that for fresh meat which is given in the Appendix (Circular 19, Office of Secretary, Department of Agriculture). The meat must be sound, wholesome, clean, freshly taken from the slaughtered animal, and not one that has died from disease, suffocation, or otherwise, and must conform in name and character to the meat of the animal.

=Frequency of Adulteration.=--The examination made of numerous samples of canned meat in the Bureau of Chemistry shows that the adulteration of these foods is rather common but by no means general.

=Canned Horse Meat.=--Horse meat is commonly used for human food in many European countries, although it is believed that it is not used to any extent in the United States. When procured from healthy animals in a proper way there is no hygienic objection to

its use, though it is considered to be somewhat tougher than the flesh of other animals more commonly employed as food, but that is probably due to the fact that horses are not raised for food purposes and are usually not used for such until they are worn out in domestic service. There are many sentimental and often religious objections to the use of horse meat, but experience has shown that it is wholesome and nutritious. Horse meat is characteristic in containing more natural sugar, commonly known as glycogen, than any of the other ordinary meats used for human consumption. It approaches in its content of sugar some of the shell-fish flesh, such as that of the lobster. Practically all of the horse meat which is prepared in this country is exported to Europe. There are cases, however, on record of the sale of horse flesh to domestic consumers. Especially could it be used in this way in the form of sausage or other finely comminuted products without much danger of detection.

=Composition of Horse Meat.=--A number of samples of horse meat of undoubted origin and wholesomeness have been examined in the Bureau of Chemistry and the data tabulated. The average composition of sixteen samples of horse meat, representing different parts of the carcass, is shown in the following table:

Water, 69.81 percent Water in fat-free substance, 76.91 „ Fat, 9.61 „ Protein, 19.47 „ Protein insoluble in water, 14.83 „ Gelatinous protein, 1.23 „ Meat bases, 1.70 „ Glycogen, 1.82 „ Ash, 1.01 „

Composition of Dry Material.--

Protein, 67.98 percent Fat, 27.71 „ Ash, 3.18 „ Undetermined, 1.13 „

The high percentage of glycogen in horse meat is one of the safest methods of determining its character when comminuted or cut up into pieces so small as not to be identified by the usual anatomical characteristics. Very few other kinds of edible flesh contain as much as one percent of glycogen. Glycogen is a transitory product which tends naturally to be broken up into other substances, and, hence, even in horse meat after slaughter, it may rapidly disappear and thus, unless the meat is examined at once, very little glycogen may be found in it. A safer test for horse meat is in the nature of the fat therein. This fat does not tend to change as the glycogen does, and, therefore, in a pure preparation of horse meat even in a finely comminuted state the separation and examination of the fat will lead to a determination of the character of meat employed. The fats of horse meat have a lower melting point, a higher iodin number, and a higher heat value when mixed with sulfuric acid than those of beef.

Indeed, these differences are so marked as to afford a ready means of detection to the practical chemist. Even in the mixture of horse meat with other meat the variation in the character of the fats will be such as to lead to a correct judgment respecting the approximate amount of horse meat which has been used, provided it forms any notable amount of the mixture.

=Canned Cured Meats.=--Sterilization is such a certain method of preventing the decay of meats that it has now come into use to a large extent in the final preservation of shipments of cured meats. The object of curing, as has already been stated, is not merely to prevent the meat from decaying, nor is it intended to inhibit entirely enzymic action. On the contrary, if the method of curing were such as to entirely stop fermentative action, the flavors and aromas of preserved meats, upon which their value so much depends, would be eliminated, and we would simply have a mass of tasteless meat, preserved from decay by the application of chemical preservatives of a character to impart neither flavor nor aroma to the meat and at the same time prevent the activity of the various ferments above described. Such methods of preparation, naturally, should never be of general use, because in cured meats the consumer demands the flavor which naturally proceeds from the ordinary method of curing. After curing and when subjected to transportation the meats may undergo decomposition and reach their destination in a spoiled state. To avoid this it has been a customary practice to pack the meat in a chemical preservative, such as borax. This is, however, a very objectionable practice because even in the cured state the meat is still absorptive, and the borax, which is packed externally upon it, as a precaution during transit, must necessarily penetrate to a certain extent to the interior of the meat. By packing cured meat in tins and subjecting these tins to sterilization complete immunity from decay may be secured and there is no damage done to the aroma or flavor. We, therefore, find upon the market at the present time in tinned, canned, or potted form almost every variety of meat that is used either in a fresh state or after the usual method of curing.

=Canned Sausage.=--One of the most important of cured meats which is offered for sale is sausage. Sausage may be canned either in the fresh or cured state and, of course, may be adulterated in both conditions. Canned sausage should have a clean bill of health from the local inspector the same as any other meat food.

There is, perhaps, more room for deception in the manufacture of sausage than in almost any other form of comminuted meat. When properly treated with condimental substances, such as salt, spices, vinegar, etc., sausages are highly prized as a food product, and justly so. In the canned state sausage should undergo no other manipulation than spicing and sterilization at a temperature necessary to kill all fermentative germs and prevent decay.

Composition of Canned Sausage.--Twenty-five samples of canned sausage examined in the Bureau of Chemistry had the following average composition:

Water, 58.51 percent Water in fat-free substance, 75.59 „ Fat, 21.82 „ Protein, 13.92 „ Protein insoluble in water, 11.37 „ Gelatinous protein, 1.21 „ Meat bases, .67 „ Ash, 2.86 „ Sodium chlorid, 1.02 „

The above data show that canned sausage differs from fresh meat largely in its composition, especially in the much higher content of fat and lower content of water which is found therein.

Adulteration of Canned Sausage.--The principal adulteration, as has already been stated, is in the admixture of meats of unknown and miscellaneous origin and possibly inedible in character. The degree of comminution to which sausage is subjected renders it difficult in the inspection of sausage itself to determine the character of the animal from which it is made. The study of the fat is the most useful guide in such cases. Presumably sausage is made almost exclusively of beef and pork, but, as a matter of fact, much which is not eaten under its own name may be found in sausage.

Next to the introduction of meat of an improper character the most important adulteration is the common use of starch. Starch is very much cheaper than meat, and its abundant use enables a greater profit to be made. It is highly esteemed, also, as a “filler,” on the ground that it prevents the shrinkage of sausage when fried. Starch granules under the influence of heat are gelatinous, holding moisture with tenacity and preventing shrinkage in bulk.

The presence of starch in sausage must be regarded as an unjustifiable adulteration unless the amount therein is plainly marked on the label of the package.

The use of preservatives in the curing of sausage is a very common practice and, hence, canned sausages are found to often contain boric acid or borax and sulfite of soda especially. Dyes of various kinds are also used in coloring sausage or its covering, largely of a coal tar origin.

The proper safeguard for the consumer in regard to the character of sausage is in the inspection of the factory. It is highly important that each municipality and state should have a rigid system for the inspection of sausage, and the sausage thus inspected should bear the certification of the kind of meat used and its general character. The presence of inspectors in factories would prevent the use of preservatives which, it has been shown by the researches of the Bureau of Chemistry, are prejudicial to health.

=Magnitude of the Meat Industry.=--According to the census of 1905, showing the results of the tabulation of the statistics of slaughtering and meat packing and slaughtering, wholesale, for the calendar year 1904, forming a part of the census of manufactures of 1905, which was taken in conformity with the act of Congress of March 6, 1902, the figures indicate that there has been a normal increase in the slaughtering and meat packing industry in the United States, as compared with the statistics of 1900, which covered the fiscal year ending May 31st.

Comparative figures for 1905 and 1900 are shown in the following summary:

PERCENT OF 1905. 1900. INCREASE.

Number of establishments, 929 921 .8 Capital, $237,699,440 $189,198,264 25.6 Salaried officials, clerks, etc.: Number, 12,075 10,227 18.0 Salaries, $13,377,908 $10,123,247 32.1 Wage-earners: Average number, 74,132 68,534 8.2 Wages, $40,447,574 $33,457,013 20.9 Miscellaneous expenses, 30,623,108 24,060,412 27.3 Materials used: Total cost, $805,856,969 $683,583,577 17.9 Animals slaughtered: Beeves, $289,040,930 $247,365,812 16.8 Sheep, 44,359,804 37,137,542 19.4 Hogs, 329,763,430 278,736,961 18.3 Calves, 12,666,942 7,356,560 72.2 All other, 61,905 559,839 All other materials, 129,963,958 112,426,863 15.4 Products: Total value, $913,914,624 $785,562,433 16.3 Beef-- Sold fresh, $247,135,029 $211,068,934 17.1 Canned, 7,697,815 9,167,531 17.1[14] Salted or cured, 8,107,952 9,661,834 16.1[14] Mutton-- Sold fresh, $36,880,455 $32,963,219 11.9 Veal-- Sold fresh, $12,856,369 $7,812,714 64.6 Pork-- Sold fresh, $91,779,323 $84,019,387 9.2 Salted, 116,626,710 88,674,016 31.5 Hams, smoked bacon, etc., 132,210,611 148,666,859 11.1[14] Sausage, fresh or cured, 25,056,331 21,472,413 16.7 All other meat sold

fresh, 9,579,718 7,813,078 22.6 Refined lard, 74,116,991 52,620,348 40.8 Neutral lard, 8,423,973 8,588,350 1.1[14] Oleomargarine oil, 10,201,911 11,482,542 11.2[14] Other oils, 2,595,951 3,440,358 24.5[14] Fertilizers, 4,397,626 3,300,132 33.3 Hides, 44,137,802 33,925,911 30.1 Wool, 5,229,521 3,335,824 56.8 All other products, 76,880,536 47,548,983 61.7

[14] Decrease.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

It is evident, from the foregoing description of the methods of preparing and sterilizing meat, that it is a process which commends itself both on account of the economy in the use of meat which it secures and because of the nutritive value of the products obtained.

The real value of the products must necessarily depend upon the selection of the raw materials and the sanitary conditions which attend their manipulation. Experience has shown that it is not safe to leave these matters to the packers themselves. While, doubtless, the greater number of packers will exercise all possible care in the selection of the materials and in their preparation, human nature is of such a character that when opportunity for deception, fraud, and illegitimate gains are presented there are always some who take advantage of them. Hence, it may be safely said that no tinned or canned or sterilized meat of any description should be allowed to enter into consumption except when prepared under the inspection of qualified municipal, state, or national officers. The health of the animal furnishing the meat should be ascertained by inspection both before and after slaughter. This inspection should be of the most rigid kind, and all diseased animals should be excluded from entering into standard products. If it be claimed that there are certain diseases which are local only in character and which do not affect the wholesomeness of the whole carcass, special provisions can be made for this kind of meat. If admitted into consumption at all, it should be under a permanent label or tag by which the intended consumer would be informed of the character of the contents of the package.

There is a reasonable doubt respecting the suitability for human food of carcasses of animals afflicted in a moderate degree with tuberculosis, pleuro-pneumonia, lumpy jaw, or other contagious or epidemic diseases. In all such cases the rights of the consumers demand that the benefit of the doubt should be given to them and not to the owner, manufacturer, and dealer in any of the products they consume. Such meat would then enter the market under a separate grade and command a lower price, and when consumed no one would be deceived respecting its character.

It must be admitted, even if such meat be regarded as wholesome, that it is of inferior character, and cannot in any justice demand the right to pass under the name of higher grades of the article. The sanitary conditions under which such meats are prepared are of the highest importance. The slaughter house should be clean, and provided with good ventilation and natural light. The workmen should be free of disease, neatly dressed, and required to observe all necessary sanitary precautions. The débris and fragments of the packing house should be carefully removed and so disposed of as to prevent any suspicion that any part of them enters any of the products of the factory. Municipal, state, or national inspection should be frequent, thorough, and entirely removed from any possible influence of the packing business itself. Competent veterinary experts should pass upon the state of health of each carcass, and any one found diseased in any way should be subjected to a further careful inspection to see whether it should be admitted, under proper label and notification, as human food or consigned to the fertilizer heap. It is only by such inspection as this that the consumer can secure adequate protection. After the meat is once in the can inspection will only reveal whether or not preservatives and coloring matter have been used, or whether the contents of the can are spoiled or in a state unfit for consumption. No examination of the contents of the can will reveal in a satisfactory manner the state of health of the carcass from which the meat has been secured or the sanitary conditions under which it has been prepared. It is hoped the new methods of inspection established by the Secretary of Agriculture will secure the desired purity of meat products.

LARD.

The fat of swine, properly separated from the other tissues, is known as lard. The process of separation is termed “rendering.” Various methods of rendering are practiced, all depending, however, upon the use of heat, which liquefies the fat and gradually frees it from its connective tissues.

=Parts of Fat Used for Lard Making.=--In the making of lard the highest grades are produced from the fat lining the back of the animal and that connected with the intestines. The sheets of fat which are found lining the back of the animal furnishes a variety known as leaf lard. All parts of the fat of the animal not used in the meats themselves may be used in the manufacture of lard. In the preparation of the carcass, the parts cut off in trimming the pieces and containing fat are sent to the rendering tank. The leaf lard is

also removed by tearing it off from the back of the animal, and the intestinal fat is separated from the viscera in like manner. There is probably no question of wholesomeness between the lards made from different parts of the carcass. The lard differs in its chemical composition and its physical consistence as determined by its location in the body. Inasmuch as it is important that lard should have a certain degree of consistence even in summer time and not become too soft or liquid in character, the lard which has a high melting point is preferred, especially during the summer. The lards made from the feet and some other parts of the hog have lower melting points. The different kinds of fat from all parts of the animal might be mixed together and a lard made therefrom representing the average consistence of the fat of the whole body. A small quantity of stearin is often added to raise the melting point, but the addition of this substance without notice must be regarded as an adulteration.

=Names of Different Kinds of Lard.=--The names applied to the different kinds of lard may be referred principally to the parts of fat used, such as leaf lard, intestinal lard, etc., or to the method of preparing it. The old-fashioned method of preparing lard for family use consisted in placing the fat in an open kettle and heating usually over the open fire. The rendering takes place as the mass increases in temperature, so that the residual tissues become browned by the high temperature reached. Lard made in this way is of most excellent quality and, of course, being made under family supervision, its character is well understood and the parts of the body used are well known. In the large packing establishments the lard is usually rendered by the application of heat in the form of steam under pressure, of a suitable temperature to make the character of lard uniform. Large yields can be secured in this way with less charring of the residual tissues, and consequently a finer and whiter color in the lard itself. Lard of this kind is sometimes known as steam rendered lard.

=Uses of Lard.=--The fat of swine prepared as above mentioned, and known as lard, finds a very extended use in every kitchen. It is mixed with various forms of bread making materials, cake, etc., and is often known in this sense as “shortening.” It is also employed for lubricating the pans and other culinary utensils used for baking purposes. It is sometimes employed for the purpose of cooking by the process of frying or of introducing the substance to be cooked directly into the hot lard, as in the frying of oysters, the making of doughnuts, and similar operations. Lard has come to be looked upon as a necessity in every kitchen, even of the humblest citizen.

Many objections are made to the use of lard on hygienic grounds, and probably on account of its cheapness and general utility it is more freely used in American cooking than it should be. In other words, American cooking is under the reproach of being too greasy. There is no reason to question the digestive and nutritive value of lard when used in proper quantities and in proper conditions. It is a typical fat food composed of materials which are almost wholly oxidized in the body and which upon combustion produce a higher number of units of heat than that of any other class of food substances.

COMPOSITION OF DIFFERENT VARIETIES OF AMERICAN LARD.

----------+-----+-------+------+-----+-------+--------+-------+------ | | | | CRYS- | | | | | | |MELT-| TAL- | RISE OF| | | |SAPONI-| | ING |LIZING | TEMPER-| | | SPE-| FICA- | |POINT| POINT | ATURE | | |CIFIC| TION | MELT-| OF | OF | WITH | IODIN | |GRAV-| EQUIV-| ING |FATTY| FATTY |SULFURIC| AB- | | ITY.| ALENT.|POINT.|ACID.| ACID. | ACID. |SORBED.|WATER.
----------+-----+-------+------+-----+-------+--------+-------+------ | | | | | | | Per- | Per- | | | C. ° | C. °| C. ° | C. ° | cent | cent Leaf lard, |.9057| 272.64| 41.6 | 43.0| 40.40 | 39.7 | 59.60 | .165 Pure leaf | | | | | | | | lard, |.9028| 281.01| 44.9 | 42.8| 40.40 | 37.1 | 53.04 | .025 Prime steam| | | | | | | | lard, |.9052| 279.06| 38.4 | 41.8| 39.53 | 33.7 | 63.84 | .040
----------+-----+-------+------+-----+-------+--------+-------+------

=Adulteration of Lard.=--The principal adulteration to which lard is subjected is admixture with other and cheaper fats. Among the fats which are used for this purpose may be mentioned beef fat and cottonseed oil. Beef fat has a higher melting point than lard and cottonseed oil a much lower melting point, being liquid at ordinary temperatures. A mixture of beef fat and cottonseed oil may, therefore, be made, having approximately the same melting point as lard itself. The addition of this mixture to lard would not alter its melting point to any sensible extent. Instead of using the whole cottonseed oil for the purpose mentioned it may be previously chilled and its product of a higher melting point, or as it is sometimes called, the stearin of cottonseed oil, may be used for admixture with lard. Large quantities of these mixed fats were formerly made in this country under the name of “compound lard” in which the above adulterants were the chief constituents. The laws of the various states are happily of a character which forbids the sale of a mixture of a compound of lard and other fats under the name of lard, although there is no objection to such admixture from a hygienic and dietetic point of view. There are many hygienists who are of the opinion that the more extended use of vegetable oils instead of lard would be of value to the health of the public. If this be true, the admixture of a vegetable oil with lard would improve it

from a hygienic standpoint. The principal, perhaps the sole, objection to such admixtures is their fraudulent character. Vegetable oils, especially cottonseed oil, being very much cheaper than lard, their use in lard without notification cheapens the product and defrauds the customer. Lard may also be adulterated with its own stearin. In the manufacture of lard oil a residue is left of a much higher melting point and this residue may be mixed with a vegetable oil, such as cottonseed, in the production of a compound of approximately the same melting point as lard itself. In a case of this kind both constituents are fraudulent, in as much as neither the cottonseed oil nor the lard stearin may be regarded in any sense as lard.

=Detection of Adulterations.=--The presence of cottonseed oil in any form in lard is at once determined by the application of a simple color test known as the Halphen test. This is not a reliable test in those cases where the animal has been fed cottonseed.

Halphen Reaction for Cottonseed Oil.--Carbon disulfid, containing about one percent of sulfur in solution, is mixed with an equal volume of amyl alcohol. Mix equal volumes of this reagent and the oil under examination and heat in a bath of boiling brine for fifteen minutes. In the presence of as little as one percent of cottonseed oil an orange or red color is produced, which is characteristic.

Lard and lard oil from animals fed on cottonseed meal will give a faint reaction; also the fatty acids thereof.

This test is more sensitive than the Bechi test (nitrate of silver) and less liable to give unsatisfactory results in the hands of an inexperienced person. It is not affected by rancidity. The depth of color is proportional, to a certain extent, to the amount of oil present, and by making comparative tests with cottonseed oil some idea as to the amount present can be obtained, but it must be remembered that different oils react with different intensities, and oils which have been heated from 200° to 210° C. react with greatly diminished intensity. Heating ten minutes at 250° renders cottonseed oil incapable of giving the reaction.

Cottonseed oil also has the property of reducing silver in silver nitrate to a metallic state. When mixed with a solution of silver nitrate under proper conditions a blackening or precipitation of black metallic silver is observed. This is known as the Bechi test which is conducted as follows:

Bechi or Silver Nitrate Test for Cottonseed Oil.--_Reagent_: Dissolve 2 grams of silver nitrate in 200 cubic centimeters of 95 percent alcohol and 40 cubic centimeters of ether, adding one drop of nitric acid.

Mix 10 c.c. of oil or melted fat, 5 c.c. of reagent, and 10 c.c. of amyl alcohol in a test tube. Divide, heat one-half in a boiling water bath for ten minutes, and then compare with portion not heated. Any blackening due to reduced silver shows presence of cottonseed oil.

Other oils which have become rancid, and lards which have been steamed or heated at high temperature, contain decomposition products which have a reducing action on silver nitrate. There were found in testing a large number of salad oils some which contained no cottonseed oil, according to the Halphen test, but gave a brown coloration with Bechi reagent, and in some cases reduced silver. These same oils on being purified gave no reaction. Hence the oils or fats should be purified before testing.

To purify the oils and fats, heat from 20 to 30 grams on water bath for a few minutes with the addition of 25 c.c. of 95 percent alcohol, shake thoroughly, decant as much of the alcohol as possible, and wash with two percent nitric acid, and finally with water. The oil or lard thus purified will give no reduction at all if it contains no cottonseed oil. Heating the oils or fats to 100° C. or simple washing with two percent nitric acid is not sufficient, except in a few cases.

With oils the use of the Halphen and Bechi tests will be found to be useful as a means of approximately determining the amounts of adulteration present. If Halphen gives a reaction and Bechi does not, the adulteration with cottonseed oil is probably less than 10 percent.

The admixture of beef fat with lard is best detected by means of the microscope. The fat is dissolved in ether and allowed to slowly crystallize. If it is composed of pure lard the crystal assumes a form which is represented in Fig. 8.

If, on the other hand, beef fat be mixed with lard, the crystals will assume a radiated fan-shaped appearance shown in Fig. 9. Even one who is an expert with the microscope may not be able without some difficulty to detect these adulterations by the simple tests above mentioned.

[Illustration: FIG. 8.--LARD CRYSTALS. × 140.--(_Bureau of Chemistry._)]

[Illustration: FIG. 9.--BEEF FAT CRYSTALS. × 140.--(_Bureau of Chemistry._)]

=Commercial Classification of Lards.=--In addition to the kinds of lard mentioned above other varieties are known in commerce.

=Neutral Lard.=--This, which is one of the best varieties of lard, is made from the fat derived from the leaf lard of the slaughtered animal in a perfectly fresh state, that is, taken immediately after slaughter and before the carcass is cold. The leaf lard, when it is removed from the animal, is at once placed in cold storage or put into cold water, in order to rapidly remove the animal heat. As soon as it is thoroughly chilled it is reduced to a pulp in a grinder and sent at once to the rendering kettle. The fat is rendered at a very low temperature, from 105 to 120 degrees F. (40-50 degrees C). It is evident that only a part of the lard is separated at this temperature, and this part is regarded as being of the best quality, almost tasteless, free of acids and other impurities. The residue from the making of neutral lard is sent to other kettles, where it is subjected to a higher temperature and the remainder of the lard extracted, which is sold under the name of another grade. Neutral lard, obtained as above, while still liquid, is washed with water containing a trace of sodium carbonate, common salt, or a dilute acid. The product thus formed is almost neutral in its reaction to litmus paper containing not to exceed .25 percent of free acid, but it has more water and mineral matter than is found in the pure rendered untreated lard. The neutral lard made in this way is not used so commonly for culinary purposes but chiefly in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

=Leaf Lard.=--The residue of lard obtained by rendering the unseparated part of lard from the above process at a higher temperature is also of a high quality and is sometimes improperly designated leaf lard, a term which should be reserved for the whole product instead of a part obtained by rendering the residual leaf fat.

=Choice Kettle-rendered Lard.=--The amount of neutral lard which is demanded in the manufacture of oleomargarine does not by any means exhaust the supply of leaf lard. For making choice kettle-rendered lard the leaf lard together with the fat cut from the back of the animal is rendered in steam-jacketed open kettles and produces a lard of a high quality known as kettle-rendered or choice kettle-rendered lard. The hide is removed from the fat portion of the back used for this purpose before the rendering. Both the leaf and pieces of the back are passed through a fine sausage grinder before they enter the rendering kettle. According to the requirements of the Chicago Board of Trade, choice lard, which is another term for the above variety, is to be made from leaf and trimmings only, either steam-rendered or kettle-rendered, and the manner of rendering to be branded on each package.

=Prime Steam Lard.=--The prime steam lard of commerce is made as follows: The whole head of the hog, after the removal of the jowl, is used for rendering. The heads are placed in the bottom of the rendering tank. The mesenteric fat adhering to the small intestines is also used in the tank. Any fat that may be attached to the heart or other organs of the animal may also be used. In those factories where kettle-rendered lard is not made the scrap fat from the back of the animals and trimmings are also used. When there is an excess of leaf it is also put in the rendering tank and, in general, all the fat portions of the body which are removed in the trimming process. It is thus seen that prime steam lard is a term which may practically represent the average fat of the whole animal.

Prime steam lard is thus defined by the Chicago Board of Trade: “Standard prime steam lard shall be solely the product of the trimmings and other fat parts of hogs, rendered in tanks by the direct application of steam, and without subsequent change in grain or character by the use of agitators or other machinery except as such change may unavoidably come from transportation. It shall have proper color, flavor, and soundness for keeping, and no material which has been salted shall be included. The name and location of the renderer and the grade of the lard shall be plainly branded on each package at the time of packing.” All the lard which is made is subjected to the approval of inspectors both as to the material employed and the method of procedure, together with the character of the final product.

=Disposition of the Intestines of the Hog.=--In the term intestines is included all of the abdominal viscera of the animal but not the thoracic viscera, namely, the heart and lungs. The material is handled in the following way: When the animal is opened the viscera are separated, including the flesh surrounding the anus and a strip containing the external genito-urinary organs. The heart is thrown to one side and the fatty portions trimmed off for lard. The rest of the heart is used for sausage or for fertilizer. The lungs and liver are either used in the manufacture of sausage or for fertilizer. The rectum and large intestines are separated from the intestinal fat and peritoneum and, along with the adhering flesh and genito-urinary organs, sent to the trimmer. All flesh from the above-mentioned organs is cut away and the intestine proper is used for sausage casings. The trimmings, including the genito-urinary organs, are washed and placed in the rendering tank where lard is made. The small intestine is also separated from

the fatty membrane surrounding it and prepared for sausage casings. The remaining material, consisting of the peritoneum, diaphragm, stomach, and adhering membranes, together with the intestinal fat, constitutes the “guts” which are subjected to washing in three or four different tanks. In the first tank the stomach and peritoneum are split open, and also any portion of the intestines which still adhere to the peritoneum. The portions then go from tank to tank, usually four in number, and are then ready for the rendering tank. The omentum fat is cut from the kidneys, and the kidneys with any adhering fat go into the rendering vat. The spleen, pancreas, vocal cords, trachea, and œsophagus also go into the tank.

In general it may be said that everything connected with the viscera go into the rendering tank with the following exceptions: First, that portion of the intestines which is saved for sausage casings; second, the liver and lungs; third, that part of the heart free from fat.

In the killing of small hogs, where the intestines are not of sufficient size to be suitable for sausage casings, they also go into the rendering tank. It should be stated here that the grease or lard obtained by the rendering of the above described viscera, according to the statements of the manufacturers, is used solely in the manufacture of lard oil and soap, and does not enter into the lard of commerce.

When the processes of manufacture are properly controlled by official inspection the public may be assured that this disposition of the fat obtained by the rendering of the intestinal viscera is secured.

=Butchers’ Lard.=--A considerable quantity of lard is made for commercial purposes by the small butcher for family use, etc. This lard is made almost exclusively by rendering in the open kettle. In the country where butchering is conducted for family use the ordinary open kettle is placed over an open fire. All parts of the fat of the animal which can be easily separated and the scraps derived from trimming the animal are used for rendering. The offal and refuse of the animal are also rendered separately and the product used for soap grease. The lard made in this way is regarded as perfectly wholesome, but it is frequently dark-colored from the charring due to rendering over the open fire and by reason of using some portions of the animal, such as tendons, from which glue is made. Such lard may contain traces or even considerable quantities of glue which, however, cannot be regarded as an unwholesome product. The partially browned residues in the kettle in the country are known as “cracklings” and are used for soap grease.

=Inedible Hog Fat Products.=--In the shipping of hogs a great many are smothered and others die of disease or are in a condition, at the time of slaughter, which renders them unfit for human food, either by the presence of disease or otherwise. The fats are separated from dead animals of this class and are used for technical purposes such as burning oils, soap grease, etc. There are several varieties of these inedible fats of which the following are the principal:

White Grease.--This grease is made chiefly from hogs which die in transit by being smothered or from freezing. Formerly it was the custom to make white grease also from the animals which died of disease, but the manufacture of this product has been restricted by certain state laws which forbid the use of animals which die of particular diseases, such as hog cholera, from being used for any purpose whatever and their carcasses are to be buried so as to remove all danger of infection.

Brown Grease.--Brown grease is a product of a lower grade than white grease and is made usually by rendering the whole animal. It is one of the by-products in the manufacture of tankage from condemned animal carcasses, the tankage being used as fertilizer. Both white and brown grease are used chiefly in the manufacture of low grade lard oil and in the making of soap.

Yellow Grease.--Yellow grease is a product intermediate in value between white and brown grease. It is made chiefly from the carcasses of animals that die while on the packers’ hands. It is used for the same purpose as white and brown grease.

Pig’s-foot Grease.--A special variety of grease is made from pigs’ feet as a by-product in the glue factory. This grease is used also in making lard oil and soap. It is evident that these varieties of grease are only inedible varieties of lard, and through proper inspection the public is protected against the use of these varieties of grease in the edible product.

=Lard Stearin.=--Mention has already been made of the fact that by melting a fat and cooling it slowly towards its solidifying point, certain constituents of the fat which have a higher melting point separate first, leaving those constituents with a lower melting point still in a liquid condition. Those portions of an oil or fat which separate first under such conditions, are the constituents of the product which is known as stearin, while the part that remains liquid is the constituent known as olein. Lard stearin is made

principally for the manufacture of mixtures and is a by-product of the highest grade of lard oil. Lard stearin is made as follows: The lard is melted and kept in a crystallizing room at from 50 to 60 degrees F., until it is filled with the crystals of the separated stearin. The product is then wrapped in the form of cakes with cloth. Each package contains from 10 to 20 pounds. The cakes are then placed in a large press with suitable arrangements to facilitate the escape of the oil and maintain the low temperature. The pressure is applied very gradually at first, and as the process advances, with increasing power. The high grade oil obtained in this way is known as prime or extra lard oil and is used for illuminating and lubricating purposes. The resulting solid product, which is principally stearin, is used as one of the adulterants of lard, that is, in making a mixture which is sometimes called lard, composed of lard stearin and cottonseed oil.

[Illustration: FIG. 10.]

=Tanks Used for Producing Lard Under Pressure.=--There are various forms of tanks used for producing steam rendered lard. In the open kettle there is a jacketed arrangement by means of which steam, at the proper temperature, is made to act upon the contents of the inner kettle. In the closed kettle the steam may be applied in the form of a jacketed arrangement or introduced directly into the kettle. The residues which remain after the steaming is completed and after the lard has been drawn off are withdrawn from the conical lower portion of the kettle which can be opened for the removal of these residues. A typical kettle for rendering lard is shown in Fig. 10. The fragments of meat to be received are placed in the opening M which is then properly closed when the tank is full. Steam is admitted and the condensation which is produced at first by the cold contents of the tank is drawn off through a water pipe. After the tank is thoroughly heated and the fat begins to separate the lard will rise above the water and the solid fragments and at the end of the process will fill the upper part of the tank. By means of the cocks at D it can be determined to what depth the tank is filled with lard and the lard can be drawn off through these cocks until water begins to flow. The bottom of the tank at G is then opened and the residues withdrawn, dried and ground for tankage.

=Physical Properties of Lard.=--_Specific Gravity._--The specific gravity of pure lard is to be determined at some definite temperature, inasmuch as a statement of its specific gravity without some reference to the temperature at which it is determined is likely to be misleading. It is not convenient to ascertain the specific gravity of a lard at a temperature below its melting point. It is customary, therefore, either to take the specific gravity at about 40 degrees C., or at a temperature of boiling water.

The average specific gravity of pure lard at 40 degrees C. (104 degrees F.), regarding water as 100, is 89, and at 100 degrees C. it is 86, the weight of water being determined at the point of greatest density, namely, 4 degrees C. (39 degrees F.). Unfortunately the specific gravity of pure lard is not very greatly different from that of other oils or other fats used in its adulteration. For this reason it is not of the highest value for determining whether or not the pure article has been subjected to adulteration.

Melting Point.--The melting point of a pure lard is a physical characteristic of great value, since it is chiefly influenced by the part of the body of the animal from which it is made. The fat which is rendered from the foot of the hog has the lowest melting point, namely, about 35 degrees C. (95° F.). The fat adhering to the intestines has the highest melting point, namely, 44 degrees C. (111 degrees F.). The fat derived from the head of the hog has a slightly higher melting point than that from the feet. The kidney fat has a melting point of 42.5 degrees C. (108.2 degrees F.). In the steam rendered lards, representing the average of lards passed upon by the Chicago Board of Trade, the average melting point is found to be about 37 degrees C. (98.7 degrees F.). The melting point of superior or leaf lard has an average value of about 40 degrees C. (104 degrees F.).

Color Reaction.--A pure high grade lard when mixed on a white porcelain plate with the proper amount of sulfuric or nitric acid should give only a very slight coloration. The production of any considerable quantity of color, either brown or black, indicates the presence of organic impurities in the lard.

Rise of Temperature with Sulfuric Acid.--The various fats give different degrees of heat when mixed, under certain conditions, with strong sulfuric acid. It is possible to determine the approximate degree of the adulteration of lard by applying this test. The operation is a simple one and is conducted in the apparatus shown in Fig. 11. A common test tube about 24 cubic centimeters in length and 5 cubic centimeters in diameter is hung as indicated in the figure, provided with a stopper carrying a thermometer in the center with a bent glass rod stirrer passed loosely through the stopper on the side and a funnel for the introduction of the acid on another side of the thermometer. A coil which is on the stirring rod is so arranged as to permit the bulb of the thermometer to pass through its center.

[Illustration: FIG. 11.]

Manipulation.--Fifty cubic centimeters of the fat or oil to be examined are placed in the test tube and warmed or cooled, as the case may be, until the temperature is the one required for the beginning of the experiment, say 35 degrees C.; 10 cubic centimeters of the strongest sulfuric acid at the same temperature are placed in the funnel, the stopper being firmly fixed in its place; the test tube containing the oil is placed in a non-conducting receptacle; the wooden cylinder lined with cork, used in sending glass bottles by mail, is found to be convenient for this purpose. The glass rod or stirrer which fits loosely in the stopper, so as to be moved rapidly up and down, is held by the right hand of the operator; with his left hand he opens the glass stop-cock of the funnel and allows the sulfuric acid to flow in upon the oil. The glass stirring rod is now moved rapidly up and down, for about 20 seconds, thus securing a thorough mixture of the oil and acid. The mercury rises rapidly in the thermometer and after two or three minutes reaches a maximum, and then, after two or three minutes more, begins to descend. The reading is made at the maximum point reached by the mercury. With pure cottonseed oil, linseed oil and some other substances the rise of temperature is so great as to produce ebullition in the mass, causing it to foam up and fill the tube. To avoid this, smaller quantities of acid should be used or the oil in question be diluted with a less thermogenic one, so that the maximum temperature may not be high enough to produce the effect cited.

=Chemical Properties.=--_Volatile Acids._--The quantity of volatile acid arising on the decomposition of a soap made by the saponification of lard is very minute in lard of high quality. The total amount of volatile acid should not be in excess of that necessary to saturate .2 cubic centimeter of deci-normal alkali solution.

Fixed Acid.--The quantity of fixed acid, consisting principally of oleic and stearic, in pure lard should not be less than 93 percent. The total quantity of free acid in lard, that is, acid uncombined with the glycerine, should not exceed one-half of one percent, and in neutral lard should be much less than this.

Quantity of Iodin Absorbed.--All common fats and oils have the property of absorbing, under given conditions, certain quantities of iodin. Lard of the highest quality should not absorb more than 60 percent of its weight of iodin. The lard made from the feet and certain other parts of the animal, however, may have a larger iodin number, rising as high as 75 or even 80.

=Properties of Lard.=--The average properties of different classes of lard in relation to physical and optical conditions are shown in the following table:

RE- RISE OF TEMPER- SPECIFIC MELTING FRACTIVE ATURE WITH IODIN GRAVITY. POINT. INDEX. SULFURIC ACID. WATER. ABSORBED. 35° C. ° C. 25° C. ° C. PERCENT. PERCENT. .9053 40.7 1.4620 41.5 .077 62.48

The above table is the average composition of nineteen samples of lard furnished under affidavits of purity and which appear from their chemical and physical properties to be composed purely of the fat of swine taken from those parts of the animal usually devoted to lard making. The average data may be regarded as representing the properties of the ordinary pure commercial lard on the market.

=Average Properties of Steam Lard.=--Below is given the average composition of eleven samples of steam lard furnished under affidavit and, apparently, as judged by their chemical and physical properties, composed solely of the fat of swine. Steam lards are not of as high a quality as the lards contained in the preceding table. They have usually a distinctively strong odor, quite different from that of lards which are rendered in open kettles at low temperature and from selected portions of fat.

RE- RISE OF TEMPER- SPECIFIC MELTING FRACTIVE ATURE WITH IODIN GRAVITY. POINT. INDEX. SULFURIC ACID. WATER. ABSORBED. 35° C. ° C. 25° C. ° C. PERCENT. PERCENT. .9055 37.0 1.4623 39.9 .109 62.86

=Properties of Adulterated Lards.=--It is possible to mix together the different materials used in making adulterated lard in such a manner as to produce a compound which in some respects resembles the natural product. This compound, however, necessarily differs from the natural product in its physical and microscopic properties and in its reaction with various chemicals which give distinct color with the different fats and oils used as adulterants. The mean properties of thirteen samples of mixed or compound lards are shown in the following table:

RE- RISE OF TEMPER- SPECIFIC MELTING FRACTIVE ATURE WITH IODIN GRAVITY. POINT. INDEX. SULFURIC ACID. WATER. ABSORBED. 35° C. ° C. 25° C. ° C. PERCENT. PERCENT. .9060 40.6 1.4634 46.5 .098 63.58

These lards, in addition to the above properties, show distinct color reaction with sulfuric and nitric acid and with the reagents which are distinctive of cottonseed oil. They are mostly mixtures of lard and tallow stearin with cotton oil or cotton oil stearin.

In addition to the adulterations already mentioned as mixing with cottonseed oil may be added the use of coconut oil. It is not probable that in the United States any adulteration of lard with coconut oil has been made for commercial purposes. Such an adulteration, however, is practiced in some foreign countries. Coconut oil contains considerable quantities of volatile acid, and, therefore, when used as an adulterant of lard, would increase the normal quantity of volatile acid materially. One sample examined by Allen, of England, was found to contain a quantity of coconut oil, amounting to 33 percent.

=Summary.=--In the preceding pages has been given a description of the character of lard, the sources from which it is made, the method of its preparation, its chemical and physical properties and the common adulterations to which it is subjected. There is no question of the wholesomeness of the usual fats and oils, or parts thereof, which are used in the sophistication of lards. The adulteration is intended solely for fraudulent purposes, that is, to sell under the name of a higher priced article one of a lower price.

There are many persons who prefer to use vegetable oils and fats as substitutes for lard in all cases. It is only fair to the consumer that the character of a fat and oil, however, for edible purposes be plainly made known to the purchaser. He is then to judge of the propriety or impropriety of using the articles in question. It seems quite certain that the use of vegetable oils and fats will be greatly increased in this country. All hygienists grant that they are at least equally as wholesome as the animal fat and oil. They are certainly less open to suspicion as having been derived from diseased sources. As a rule, they are carefully expressed and properly refined, free from rancidity and from any mechanical or chemical constituents which render them unpalatable or unwholesome. They are generally much cheaper, perhaps the only exception being that of olive oil. These vegetable oils, as a rule, are excellent for salad dressing, for frying and general cooking purposes and for the ordinary uses to which lard and other animal fats are devoted. A proper labeling of all such packages would increase the quantity consumed, restoring confidence to the public in the character of the goods purchased, and prove of mutual benefit to the grower, the manufacturer and the consumer. It must be remembered, however, that there are many people who prefer the animal fats, and so there will probably always be a large field for their use. Such consumers are entitled to secure the pure article, properly prepared from healthy animals and free from rancidity and organic impurities. Lard and other animal fats offered in this way will have a greater vogue, command a greater degree of confidence and secure a larger trade than if sold under conditions engendering suspicion and distrust.

SOUPS.

=Classification of Soups.=--The soups which are commonly consumed are divided into two great classes--those of animal and those of vegetable origin. Any liquid or semi-liquid preparation of a meat or vegetable or the two combined which may or may not carry particles of solid substances is classed with these preparations. Soups are generally used at the beginning of a meal, usually at dinner-time, and, as a rule, do not have any very high nutritive value. That they have a useful function cannot be denied, since the introduction of a small quantity of a condimental and slightly nutritive warm liquid into the stomach at the beginning of dinner tends to stimulate the secretive glands of the stomach walls to greater activity and thus to promote digestion. Soup should be regarded pre-eminently as a condimental and not as a nutritive substance.

=Preparation of Stock.=--In the making of stock the base of the material, as a rule, is that part of the meat and bone soluble in hot water. The best way of preparing this stock is as follows:

The meat and bones selected should be fresh, free from all impurities and be derived solely from healthy animals as soon as they have been slaughtered. Inasmuch as the shape of the material used is of little consequence the parts of the carcass that are cut away in the preparation of the usual cuts of the marketable meats are utilized for stock making. The flesh should be cut into fragments of proper size and the bones broken up into small pieces. This material with the appropriate amount of water and salt is placed in a vessel capable of being closed in such a way that no aqueous vapor will escape, and a slight degree of pressure, equal to the half of an atmosphere, can be sustained. Simple forms of digesters are made for this purpose which are perfectly safe at low pressure and supplied with a safety valve so as to allow steam to escape if the pressure runs too high. Several hours of digestion are necessary for the preparation of stock, and if an ordinary vessel is used care must be exercised that the liquid does not evaporate so as to make the mass dry. Stirring from time to time assists the solution of the soluble substances. After the extraction is complete the liquid contents are poured off and the solid material pressed gently to separate the liquid held in solution. The mass is then put in a cool place and allowed to stand until thoroughly cooled and all the fat particles are collected at the top. The fat is then removed and the resulting liquid strained to remove any solid particles. The clear solution thus obtained is set aside and used

as stock in the preparation of the various forms of soups. When properly flavored and used by itself it produces the soup known as consommé.

The soup stock made in this way usually contains not less than 95 percent of water and not more than 5 percent of nutritive matter. Many of the clear soups prepared in this way contain very much less nutritive matter, sometimes as low as one percent. It is evident, therefore, that the soup stock is valuable as a condiment and flavoring and not as a food.

The number of soups which can be made from soup stock is practically unlimited. They are formed by the admixture, chiefly of vegetables cut into small pieces, of starchy materials, mashed peas or beans, particles of potato, fragments of parched bread, and in fact almost any nutritive and palatable substance which the cook may wish to employ.

A soup made from a stock of the above description with pea flour was found to have the following composition:

Water, 88.26 percent Protein, 3.38 „ Fat, .93 „ Ash, 1.13 „ Starch and other carbohydrates, 6.30 „

A soup made with potatoes from stock of the above description was found to have the following composition:

Water, 90.96 percent Protein, 1.37 „ Fat, 1.53 „ Ash, .99 „ Starch and other carbohydrates, 5.13 „

The French make soups which are very well known and highly valued by cutting vegetables, such as carrots, beets, radishes and other vegetable substances, into small pieces and adding them to the soup stock.

=Oyster Soup.=--A soup made of milk, cream, flour, condiments, oysters and the liquid of oysters is very largely eaten in the United States. The difference between oyster soup and oyster stew is chiefly in the amount of oysters employed.

=Green Turtle Soup.=--A soup stock prepared as above described and flavored with pieces of green turtle is a very common dish.

=Mock Turtle Soup.=--A soup made in imitation of a turtle soup in which veal takes the place of turtle for flavoring is known as mock turtle soup.

=Clam Soup or Clam Chowder.=--This is a soup made of clams in the same way that oyster soup is made. When the clams are cut into small pieces and are in great abundance and when potatoes are used in large quantities in the mixture it is known as clam chowder.

=Beef Extract.=--It is evident that a beef extract is only a soup or a soup stock specially prepared from beef. Beef extract first became known by the researches of the celebrated chemist Liebig, and has passed from a mere local preparation to an article which is important in commerce. Factories have been established in localities far removed from the principal markets of the world, but where cattle are extremely plentiful, as in South America, and the preparation of beef extract is carried on on a large scale, the meat of the animal being thrown away after the preparation of the extract. The method of preparing beef extract is practically that described for making a soup stock under pressure. Instead of using only the trimmings and refuse of the animal, however, usually the whole of the flesh is employed. The bones are sometimes used in the making of a beef extract. The sound, fresh meat is cut into small pieces and extracted under pressure as already described. After cooking and filtering the product it is brought, in vacuo, to a proper consistence. Meat extract is, therefore, simply a concentrated soup stock. It requires about thirty-four pounds of meat to yield one pound of concentrated extract, and this extract may be diluted for consumption so as to make from six to seven gallons of beef tea. The composition of the ordinary beef extract of commerce shows that it contains from 15 to 20 percent of moisture, from 17 to 23 percent of ash and from 50 to 60 percent of meat bases, that is, the soluble nitrogenous contents of meat. The bones and tendons are not used in making beef extract on account of the introduction of considerable quantities of gelatine into the material. Liebig does not recommend the presence of gelatine in beef extract because, being cheaper in quality, it is an adulteration of the genuine article, which should contain only the pure bases and not the gelatinous principle of the meat in the tendons and bones.

Character of Nitrogenous Bodies in Beef Extract.--When beef extract is prepared according to the Liebig method those nitrogenous bodies commonly known as meat bases are found in the concentrated extract. In a beef extract which contains a total of 9.28 percent of nitrogen the quantity of nitrogen in the form of nitrogenous compounds which were found therein is as follows: Nitrogen in the form of soluble albumin,--trace; in the form of albumoses,--1.17; in the form of peptone,--trace; in the form of meat bases,--6.81; in the form of ammonia compounds,--.47; in the form of unenumerated compounds,--.83. The chief meat bases which form the principal part of the substance are creatin, creatinin, xanthin, carnin and carnic acid.

There are many different forms of beef extract upon the market, sometimes called by fanciful names and sometimes by the name of the manufacturer. Among the fanciful names are some which indicate origin or kind. The extracts which bear the names of the manufacturers are very numerous, but all of these extracts are essentially of the same character. One of these is a meat extract in which some of the meat fiber is contained. The quantity of meat fiber which is used varies, but is not very great. A comparison of the dry substance in a preparation of the class mentioned above with the dry substance in meat shows the following relation:

ASH AND PROTEIN. MEAT BASES. MINERAL MATTER. Percent. Percent. Percent. Extract, 49.7 25.6 24.7 Meat, 86.7 7.8 5.3

The above data show that the extract is essentially different in its composition from dried meat and has added to it a large quantity of meat fiber or the meat rendered soluble by some kind of treatment.

Nutritive Properties.--It cannot be denied that meat extract, as has been said in the case of soup stock, contains only a small part of nutritive matter. This nutritive substance is in a state of solution and probably is more readily absorbed than a similar amount of other nutritives in the form of ordinary meat. Its chief value as a nutrient, therefore, is not in the amount of nutrient material which it contains, but in the ease and speed with which it may become absorbed into the circulation. In case of illness this is often a very important point. It is not a question so much of the utilization of a large amount of nutrients as the absorption and assimilation in small quantities which will sustain life until the disordered conditions disappear. For these reasons the meat extracts have a value. There is, however, little doubt of the fact that in the popular mind a great deal more credit is given to meat extracts than should properly belong to them. They must be regarded principally as condimental and incident to nutrition rather than as nutritive substances. The claims which are made by the manufacturers are sometimes misleading, as, for instance, that one pound of extract contains the nutritive properties of many pounds of meat. Such a statement, of course, is absurd upon its face and should not be allowed to go unchallenged. Even when meat extracts are reinforced by the addition of soluble or comminuted fiber, as is often the case, the quantity of nourishment is very small as compared with a similar weight of meat itself.

It is not intended by the above remarks to cast any discredit upon the value of beef extract, as its value has been attested in numerous cases. It is only designed to call attention to the fact that as food these extracts have comparatively little value. They may be useful as stimulants or as condimental substances or as a means of speedily introducing a soluble nutrient in the case of disease where it is extremely important that even small amounts of nutritious material should enter the body.

=Beef Juice.=--A distinction is made between a beef extract and a beef juice. The latter term applies solely to the liquid naturally remaining in the fresh meat after its proper preparation for consumption, that is, after the withdrawal of the blood and the proper cooling and storing of the flesh. The fresh meat is then subjected to strong pressure and the juices which are extracted are concentrated in vacuo to the proper consistence. The meat of old bulls is often used. A true beef juice must be extracted from the cold meat and not with the aid of heat, hot water or other solvents. It is difficult to preserve an extract of this kind without sterilization, and the heat required for sterilization is likely to coagulate some of the albuminous material which is expressed. It is a great temptation, therefore, in some cases to preserve the beef juice by a chemical preservative other than common salt. Boric acid and sulfite of soda may be used for this purpose, but these substances are objectionable on the score of possible injury to health. Glycerine is also used. Inasmuch as these juices are usually given to invalids or those whose digestive functions are impaired it is most important that injurious substances should be omitted. In case of pressure it is advisable, in some cases, to chop the meat very fine, and in this comminuted condition extract the juice with cold water. This does not produce any change in the character of the juice and the water is subsequently removed by evaporation at a low temperature in vacuo. Beef juices are usually prepared from heated meats.

Composition of Beef Juice.--The composition of beef juice from different parts of meat which was previously heated externally is shown in the following table.

COMPOSITION OF BEEF JUICE AND MEAT EXTRACT.

BEEF MEAT JUICE. EXTRACT. Water, 90.65 21.66 Ash, 1.36 20.46 NaCl (salt), .15 5.47 P■O■ (phosphoric acid), .36 4.55 Fat, .19 .50 Acid (as lactic), .15 8.42 Nitrogen (total), 1.15 7.66 „ insoluble and coagulable, .68 .48 „ as proteoses, .04 2.02 „ as peptones, .14 1.90 „ meat bases, .30 3.05 „ creatin, .75 „ xanthin bases, .04 „ ammonia, .21

The above analyses show the general character of meat juice extracted first by externally heating the meat and then pressing. They show that there is less nitrogenous bodies present in meat juice than there is in meat extracts. It is evident that meat extracts

cannot be heated for sterilization without coagulation of the globulins. When it is advisable to use a beef juice in a case of illness it is far better to prepare it at the time when it is used than to prepare it on a commercial scale and preserve it by any of the chemical means in vogue. Meat juice can be very well prepared for domestic use by chopping the meat very fine, placing it in a vessel, heating to 140° F., and pressing it by any simple means, as, for instance, with the hand or by using an ordinary lemon squeezer. The juice obtained in this way can be flavored with salt and spices to suit the taste of the patient, and used immediately. In some cases, in order to get a greater yield, pure cold water may be mixed with the chopped meat and a somewhat dilute juice obtained but giving a greater yield of nutritive material for the same weight of meat.

Various names, fanciful and otherwise, are given to the so-called beef juices. These names are either fanciful or, as in the case of beef extracts, that of the manufacturer. Some of the fanciful names are, like those already mentioned, suggestive of origin. Some of these have large quantities of coagulable protein, like albumin, while others have such small quantities as to indicate that they are not wholly beef juice. In the case of some of these preparations there is some indication that they are prepared chiefly from blood and thus are not true meat juices. Naturally there must be particles of blood in a meat juice and the mere occurrence of blood cells would not be an indication that blood itself had been used in its preparation. By reason of these facts the use of so-called meat juices is restricted. They contain relatively very little nutritive material, they are sometimes preserved with harmful chemicals and they may be made from blood, and in general there is such a degree of secrecy attending their preparation as to warrant the physician and patient to confine themselves to the domestic article prepared at the time of using. Another objection which is not of a hygienic character is found in the great expense of securing a very little nourishment by this means. The quantity of juice which meat will yield is very small and, therefore, the relative expense for any given quantity of nourishment is far greater than it is even in the case of beef extract. While in the case of rich patients an objection like this is of little value, in the great majority of cases it should be given due consideration.

=Soluble Meats.=--Various attempts have been made to put soluble meats upon the market for use, especially for invalids and in cases of disordered digestion. The principle which underlies the preparation of these meats is to subject them to a certain degree of artificial digestion, by means of which the protein matter becomes converted into soluble forms, either albumose, proteose or peptone. The process which is employed is a simple one, namely, the comminution of the meat into as fine particles as possible and its admixture with hydrochloric acid and pepsin. It is then subjected to artificial digestion until a considerable portion of the meat is soluble. Another method of preparation is to omit the pepsin and after the addition of hydrochloric acid to place the meat in a digestor where it is subjected to a temperature of steam under pressure for a considerable length of time. A goodly proportion of the meat becomes soluble under this process. After the preparation is completed the residual hydrochloric acid is neutralized by carbonate of soda, forming common salt, which gives the proper flavor to the compound.

The composition of soluble meat prepared in this way is given in the following table (Foods and Principles of Dietetics, by Robert Hutchinson):

Water, 67.21 percent Fat, 5.93 „ Albumin, 11.00 „ Peptone, 6.51 „ Meat extract, 7.55 „ Ash and salt, 1.74 „

A meat solution of this kind is not really a solution, since not only is that part which passes into solution contained in it, but also the residual meat fibers which are not dissolved but so softened by the process that they lose their distinct form and can be rubbed up to a thick pasty mass. The product, therefore, consists not only of the part of the meat rendered thoroughly soluble in water by the process, but also of a residual part, softened and reduced to a paste. The mass has practically the same nutritive value as an equivalent amount of meat with the claimed advantage that a large portion of it is already soluble. This partial predigestion may be of value in cases of disease or disordered digestion of any kind, but there is no reason for believing that the healthy stomach requires any sort of artificial predigestion for the proper conduct of its functions. On the other hand, there is every reason for supposing that any kind of predigestion which is at all effective will in the end prove injurious to healthy digestive organs by depriving them of a part of their normal functions and thus tending to bring them to a condition of feebleness which may result in the omission, in part, of the normal functions of the vital organs.

=Preparations of Blood.=--There is no doubt of the valuable nutritive properties of blood and its preparations are sometimes used as foods. There is a deep-seated prejudice against the use of blood as human food, doubtless based on older and more effective grounds than even the laws of health promulgated by Moses. Man is an animal of some refinement of character and the sight or use of blood is repugnant to his finer instincts. Sometimes blood is dried and powdered and the blood powder mixed with other food. Another method is to coagulate the blood, then remove the coagulated portion and use the residue for food purposes. This preparation, of course, contains no coagulable portions of blood, that is, the protein thereof known as fibrin. There is no reason for

believing that preparations of blood will ever occupy any prominent position in the food supply, either of persons in health or of invalids.

=Beef Tea.=--A very common food preparation from beef is that known as beef tea. In all essential particulars beef tea is nothing more than a rich unfiltered soup stock. Inasmuch, however, as it is constantly prescribed in many kinds of illness and is prepared under certain conditions it should be mentioned specially here in addition to the preparations already described. As in the case of meat juice, beef tea should always be prepared in the home, and immediately before using. It is a preparation which can not be properly made and kept without the addition of some preservative which renders it totally unfit for human consumption. The very choicest portion of the beef should be selected in the preparation of beef tea and it should be reduced to a fine state of comminution. The removal of the fat and tendons should be as complete as possible, as particularly the latter tend to add to the extract more of the gelatine-like principles than is desirable. The fragments should be mixed with a sufficient quantity of cold water to make the desired amount of beef tea, usually one pound of water to a pound of comminuted beef is a good proportion. The mixture should be kept cold for a considerable length of time with frequent stirrings in order to extract as much as possible of the nitrogenous matter which becomes coagulated by heating. Salt may be used not only to promote the solubility but also to give the proper taste. After the lapse of an hour or more the vessel may be covered and gradually warmed. During this warming the mass should be frequently stirred so to as promote the solution. When finally the extraction is complete, before the tea is administered it should be cooked, that is, heated to the boiling-point, by which process the soluble protein is coagulated but not hardened, and the material is rendered more palatable. The beef tea should be administered without separating the coagulated fragments of albuminous material, which is in a state easily digestible, and adds much to the nutritive value of the mixture. Finally the residue of beef may be put into a bag and subjected to pressure to remove as much of the juice contained therein as possible. The difference between beef tea and soup stock, as will be seen, is largely in the filtering. The beef tea should retain the coagulated flocks, while in the soup stock they are removed. One pound of good lean beef and one pint of water yield about one-half pound of good beef tea. As in the case of soup stock, beef tea is not a very nutritive substance. It is, however, stimulating, and the nourishment which it contains is quickly absorbed. The soft, coagulated flocks of albumin are readily digested, and often a patient may be nourished for days on a preparation of this kind when he is in a condition which renders it impracticable to use either solid or other liquid foods.

Beef tea is also made on a large commercial scale and with some degree of approximation to the home prepared article. For various reasons, however, which have already been advanced, a well made domestic beef tea which can be used as soon as prepared is to be preferred in all cases to the manufactured article. A beef tea properly made contains approximately the following composition:

Water, 88.00 percent Meat bases, 3.50 „ Protein--soluble and flocculated, 8.00 „ Ash and salt, 1.50 „

=Dried and Powdered Meats.=--The preparation of dried meat has already been described. There has lately been placed upon the market a number of preparations dried and finely ground, under various names, fanciful and those of the manufacturer. Inasmuch as ordinary meats are largely composed of water, it is evident that if the water can be removed without impairing the quality of the meat, great expense in transportation would be saved and the use of preservatives would be unnecessary. Various attempts, therefore, have been made to place dried meats upon the market. The meat powders are not only offered in their natural state of desiccation but also are prepared with a more or less previous digestion. One of the most common of these meat powders is known as somatose, which has been made in large quantities, and sold throughout all parts of the world. It consists largely of albumoses rather than of peptones, but this is true of a great many of the so-called peptone preparations. The composition of somatose is represented in the following table (Allen’s Commercial Organic Analyses, Vol. IV, page 384):

Water, 14.25 percent Albumin rendered soluble by alkali, 21.83 „ Albumin, 3.40 „ Albumoses, 33.96 „ Peptone, 3.06 „ Meat bases, 2.62 „ Ash and salt, 5.30 „

The above data show that the meat still contains nearly 15 percent of moisture and that an alkali has been used to render the protein more soluble. This alkali has increased the quantity of mineral matter over that which would naturally be present. Whatever may be the relative value of the prepared protein matter as compared with that in the original meat, it is seen that a large quantity of it, practically as much as was in the original meat, has been preserved in the finished product. Whether or not it is advisable to use a preparation of this kind is a question to be left with the physician. It may be said unhesitatingly that in all cases of health somatose could not possibly present any advantage over fresh meat. On the contrary, for theoretical and practical reasons, it is certain that it is less valuable.

=Composition of the Ash of Meat Juice and Meat Broth.=--The principal mineral component of the natural juice of meat broth or meat extract is phosphate of potassium, though there are also small quantities of magnesium and smaller quantities of calcium present. In addition to this there is a certain quantity of common salt present, which is determined, however, largely by the method of preparation. The following analysis shows the composition of the ash of a meat juice to which little or no common salt has been added:

Potassium (K), 34.40 percent Sodium (Na), 9.70 „ Calcium (Ca), .36 „ Magnesium (Mg), 2.55 „ Phosphoric acid (P■O■), 27.00 „

Other constituents are not determined in this analysis. The phosphate of potassium may therefore be regarded as the principal natural ash constituent of meat extract and meat juice. (Zeitschrift für Biologie, Vol. XII, 1876.)

=Adulteration of Meat Extract.=--The principal adulterations of meat extract have already been mentioned. The substances used in preserving it are of the greatest hygienic consequence. These are chiefly salt and glycerol or alcohol. The use of all of these substances is reprehensible. Fortunately they are seldom used. Another adulteration which has been practiced is mixing the meat extract with extracts of yeast. The extract of yeast has valuable dietetic properties and contains the active principles of fermentation. It also resembles, in many respects, physically and chemically, the extract of meat, and can, therefore, be mixed with meat extract, and, being a cheaper article, forms a mixture which can be sold at a greater profit. The presence of yeast extract in meat extract can easily be determined by treating the mixture with a strong solution of sulfate of zinc and filtering. In meat extract the filtrate obtained is always quite clear, but when a yeast extract is present the filtrate is turbid.

=Active Principles Contained in Meat Extract.=--Attention has already been called to some of the more important active principles, namely, meat bases which form a valuable portion of meat extract. There are various forms of nitrogenous bodies, however, besides meat bases, which become soluble naturally in meat or by the treatment of meat with digestive ferments. Lean meat, as is well known, consists almost exclusively of protein matter and water. This protein matter is principally insoluble. Under the action of digestive ferments the protein of meat becomes broken up into more soluble bodies, known as albumoses, proteoses and peptones,--the latter being the final product of solution. These bodies are still true protein bodies containing the elements of sulfur as one of their essential constituents. The meat bases, on the contrary, contain the other elements that are in protein but do not have the sulfur element. They belong to that class of bodies which is known as simple amido compounds. All of these bodies are mixed together in meat juice or beef extract, and it is an important task of the chemist to separate them, both from an analytical point of view and the determination of their relative abundance. There is also another soluble or semisoluble protein substance in these extracts derived from the tendinous tissues and bones, namely, the gelatine or glue. This is quite a common product, being the soluble protein procured by the digestion of the tendons and bones. It is important, therefore, that the chemist should distinguish between the gelatine and the amido bodies. There is also a true and a false protein form of these soluble bodies, the true one being formed by natural proteolytic ferments and the false one being formed by heat or digestion under pressure of steam. The chemist should also be able to distinguish between the true extract formed directly from the meat and the yeast extract used as an adulteration.

It is not the purpose of this manual to enter into the details of how these different bodies may be distinguished from one another, as that is purely a chemical study. It is due, however, to the general reader that some explanation be given of the different classes of bodies which are contained in these extracts.

=Relation between the Price of an Extract and its Nutritive Value.=--The studies made in the Bureau of Chemistry show that there is little relation between the price of a beef extract and its real nutritive value. In three cases of extract which are all well known brands and are of the thick or pasty variety, showing that a dissolved meat had been added to them, the average weight of a package costing 45 cents was only 55 grams, or nearly a cent a gram. In another three samples of extract, also well known brands, of the same pasty variety and costing little more per package, it was found that the weight of the more expensive variety was double that of the first, costing only one-half cent per gram. In the case of the liquid extracts where no pasty material is incorporated there is still greater variation in the relation of the price to the nutritive constituents. An extract which retails for one dollar per bottle contains 91.69 percent of water and only .42 percent of nitrogen. Another so-called meat extract which retails at 60 cents per bottle must have been wholly an artificial product, since it contained no creatin or creatinin at all. It was also preserved by the addition of alcohol and contained an artificial coloring matter.

The ash existing in these extracts is, of course, usually due to the presence of large quantities of common salt. Sodium chlorid is added to this extract without any definite rule at all and sometimes in very excessive quantities. In some cases thirty percent of the

total extract is composed of common salt. In other words, a person taking a solution of this kind would be injecting into his stomach a very concentrated brine. When common salt may be sold at the rate of one dollar per pound, the profit on the transaction is one which ought to make the business exceedingly attractive.

The total phosphoric acid in the ash also shows variations, and if it were not so easy to add artificial phosphoric acid the actual amount present might be taken as a base by which quality could be judged. In the natural extract the total phosphoric acid should be in the proportion to organic phosphoric acid as 10 to 1, which is the natural condition in which it is found in meat extract. In many cases the amount of inorganic phosphorus is so great as to render it certain that a phosphate, probably the phosphate of soda, has been added. In another case the quantity of organic phosphoric acid was very much greater than could have possibly been the case in a natural product, indicating the addition of lecithin or glycerophosphoric acid. The amount of fat in beef extract, when properly prepared, should be very small and should certainly not exceed one percent, since by the proper method of preparation the fat is largely separated. In the pasty material, however, where the meat is reduced to a pulp and retained in the package the amount of fat will be very much greater.

=The Nitrogenous Bases.=--The average nitrogen content of the pasty or solid extracts varies from 6 to 9 percent. The nitrogen in the meat juice is subject to much greater fluctuation, depending largely on the content of solids. Although a high nitrogen content is not a guarantee of the character or mode of manufacture of an extract, it is naturally expected and is desirable.

The addition of gelatine to extracts is now largely practiced and has been for some years. By adding gelatine the manufacturer raises or maintains a certain nitrogen content, but supplies the nitrogen in a form lacking in all quickly stimulating qualities, and the natural flavor of the meat extract nitrogen is lowered. The buyer is consequently deprived of the characteristic essentials of a beef extract although the nitrogen content is relatively high. In many cases only a small proportion of the original gelatine exists in the extract as such. The gelatine is converted by a gradual process of hydration into gelatoses and gelatine peptones. While the separation of gelatine from protein matter is a process in anything but a satisfactory condition, it is a far simpler process than the detection and separation of gelatoses and gelatine peptones from albuminoses and peptones. The question has not been thoroughly studied up to date.

The question of adulteration of meat extracts with gelatine is not the only form of adulteration we have to face. The mixing of varying amounts of yeast extract with meat extracts is being practiced at the present time in some countries. As we have not investigated this question, we cannot state whether it is practiced in this country at the present time or not.

=Kinds of Preparations.=--Meat preparations of the above types in general may be divided into three classes, liquid extracts, pasty extracts and powdered extracts. In addition to the above, within the last few years beef extract pellets, some of them being enclosed in gelatine capsules, have appeared upon the market. The old-time product of Liebig’s extract belongs to the second class, in which we also find many of our best known brands. The liquid extracts are varied and numerous and their number is rapidly increasing. The amount of meat extractives in some of these liquid products is remarkably small, the quantity of solids in two or three cases being under 10 percent. Alcohol is sometimes met with in these liquid preparations. The meat powders are far less numerous than the extracts of the first two classes. They consist largely, if not entirely, of albuminoses and peptones in addition to some insoluble proteid matter.

Moreover, it is necessary to distinguish between a meat extract containing large amounts of stimulating amido-acids and relatively small percentages of albuminoses, peptones and insoluble proteid matter on the one hand, and, on the other hand, an extract, or, more properly, a meat product, which consists largely of albuminoses, peptones and insoluble matter and relatively small amounts of amido-acids. The food value of this last group of products is undoubtedly greater than that of the former group, but being sold as meat extracts, their value should be based on the amount of extractives they contain and not on their food value.

The value of the amido-bodies, such as the meat bases, as food, is of uncertain character, but we must admit, as in the case of alcohol, they can at least be burned and furnish energy to the body. Like alcohol, the value of meat extractives lies principally in their stimulating qualities. The active principles of tea and coffee are on a similar basis. As these simpler amido-bodies are the final links in the long chain of hydrolytic products of the proteid molecule prior to the complete resolution of that molecule into carbon dioxid, water, etc., it is readily seen that an ounce of meat extractives (the various amido-bodies) represents a far larger amount of beef than an ounce of albuminoses does. The various protein bodies and amido-acids are closely interwoven and it is impossible to produce amido-acids without producing albuminoses and peptones. Consequently, every commercial meat extract must consist partly of albuminoses, peptones, etc. The best of our extracts on the market to-day contain about 50 percent of their total nitrogen

in the form of meat base nitrogen. When an extract contains less than 5 percent of its nitrogen in the form of meat base nitrogen the term “extract” seems to be no longer applicable. It is evident that the product represents much less meat than an extract with 50 percent of its nitrogen in the form of meat base nitrogen, provided the total nitrogen in both cases is approximately equal.

The proteid matter coagulated by heating to boiling, as well as the proteid matter insoluble in cold water, are both undesirable factors in an extract of meat. As a rule, the lower the proportion of these constituents, the higher the character of the meat extract. The same thing holds true in regard to the presence of albuminoses and peptones.

The quantity of total nitrogen in the form of meat base nitrogen in the best extracts reaches 50 percent. In one of the poorest it is 3.82 percent. The food value of the latter product might be greater than that of the former, but its cost of manufacture and its stimulating value are much less.

Creatin figures are very interesting and of much value in determining the source and value of an extract. Creatin is the principal amido-body found in meat, consequently we expect to find it or creatinin, its hydrated form, in still larger quantities in meat extracts. In several cases which came under our notice where the extract acted suspiciously, the creatin values were nil, and in such cases grave doubts exist as to the source of the extract. Our best extracts give high creatin as well as high meat base figures.

The xanthin bases and ammonia nitrogen figures present a variety of problems. While the xanthin bases are desirable constituents, ammonia in any amount is not. It is questionable whether the ammonia figures obtained by the magnesium oxid method do not give too high results (W. D. Bigelow).

=Gelatine.=--Gelatine is a substance obtained from the nitrogenous portions of bones, hide, horns, hoofs, connective tissue, tendons and other nitrogenous matter of the animal. One of the principal constituents of these bodies is a substance known as collagen. When this is heated either under pressure or without pressure it is changed to gelatine. Glue is unrefined gelatine or impure gelatine to which usually some substance has been added to increase its holding power. A type of gelatine known as isinglass is made from the bladders of sturgeons.

The general process of manufacturing gelatine is as follows (Whipple, Technology Quarterly, Vol. XV, No. 2, June, 1902):

“The hide scraps are first macerated and subjected to the action of a solution of lime or caustic soda in pits for two or three weeks. This dissolves most of the blood and saponifies the fats. The excess of lime or soda is then largely removed by washing and the solution steamed to dissolve the gelatine, but an excess of heat is avoided. Sulfurous acid is used to bleach the gelatine. When of sufficient strength, the gelatine is allowed to harden in molds or on slabs, and is ultimately dried in sheets on wire nets. Bone gelatine is made in a somewhat similar manner. The bones are crushed, boiled, treated with hydrochloric acid, and the gelatine is dissolved as before, washed, bleached and dried in sheets. The process requires a number of weeks.”

Gelatine is also made from bones, fresh as well as old, and from the residues of bones used in the manufacture of buttons. The thin slices of the bones are treated with acid until all the phosphate of lime is extracted. They are then treated with lime and the gelatinous residue is then dissolved in warm water and purified for use.

The use of gelatine as a food has of late years become very common. The ease with which it can be made into jellies, the consistence which it gives to ice-cream and its general utility in the cuisine have made it deservedly popular. Gelatine is the product of some of the nitrogenous parts of the animal and should be made only from the edible parts thereof. It is particularly abundant in the tendinous portions of the animal and in the tissues about the head, from which a large part of edible gelatine is made. No portion of the animal which is filthy or unfit for food should ever enter into the composition of the gelatine. If the parts from which the gelatine are made are cured previous to manufacture they should be cured in a perfectly sanitary way, as carefully as any other part of the meat. There can be no objection to the use of gelatine made from these sanitary materials in foods of all kinds.

There is, however, a possibility that some of the gelatines on the market may be made from materials wholly unfit for food. The food law forbids the use of animal substances unfit for food either directly or indirectly. As an illustration of this condition of affairs I may call attention to the fact that a part of the gelatines sold in the United States are made from parts of animals slaughtered in South America. It is not known to the consumer in what conditions these parts are preserved and transported. They may be possibly packed with the hide and sent to Belgium or other countries in a filthy, putrid and abhorrent state and these parts be cut from the hides before they are sent to the tanneries and converted into gelatine and sold as edible gelatine. Such a possibility should not exist, and there is no danger of its existence with high class manufacturers. A part of the horns is also used for such purposes, which being of an inedible portion and unfit for food is not admissible, under the law, as a constituent of edible gelatine. All such

materials should be excluded in the manufacture of such an important product. Further than this, it may be stated that the line of demarcation between gelatine and glue is not always as well drawn as it should be, and this is illustrated in the report that the gelatine and glue are manufactured in the same factory, and the same conditions of odor and insanitation which adhere to glue may attach themselves to the gelatine. Such a condition, of course, would be an exceptional case, but its possibility should be excluded. Under the food law only those forms of gelatine first described above can be legally made and sold for use in food.

Adulteration of Gelatine.--The adulterations of gelatine are such as those referred to above in the form of raw materials employed which are insanitary and unfit for food. In addition to this, bleaching agents, namely, sulfurous acid or sulfites and mineral acids, are often employed in the manufacture, portions of which may remain in the finished article. All of these substances must be regarded as adulterants and as insanitary and unsuitable to gelatine, and to that extent unfit for human consumption.

Presence of Tetanus in Commercial Gelatine.--The Public Health and Marine Hospital Service has investigated gelatine to determine whether or not it may be infected with pathogenic germs. The conclusions of the investigation are as follows (Bulletin No. 9, Hygienic Laboratory):

“Seven samples of gelatine examined; one showed tetanus spores.

“Two samples showed an oval end-spore rod, whose identity was not proved, but, in stained specimens, it would be hard to distinguish from tetanus, if indeed not tetanus with diminished virulence.

“In tetanus investigations it is important to use _freshly_ made bouillon, as the organism is apt not to germinate in bouillon over ten days old. The thermal death point of the organism isolated was found to be between twenty and thirty seconds at 100 degrees C.

“It is important, therefore, that gelatine to be used for injections should be boiled at least ten minutes on account of the variability of the thermal death point in different species of tetanus. Whether this amount of heating impairs in any way the hemostatic power of gelatine has not been settled, but in case it does it is believed that the danger from tetanus more than overbalances its therapeutic value.

“It is suggested that when, as in hospitals, there is likelihood of gelatine injections being used for hemostatic purposes the gelatine solution be sterilized by the fractional method on three successive days and kept ready for use in sterile containers.”

From the data given above it is seen that gelatine may become infected and the material from which it is made for edible purposes should be healthful, sanitary and fit for food. It is not likely that tetanus germs would prove dangerous when taken into the stomach, but freedom from infection should be secured if possible. These investigations show the wisdom of the pure food law in forbidding the use of parts of animals unfit for food, whether manufactured or not, in the production of food products. It is evident that a sufficient quantity of fresh, sanitary material or material properly preserved can be obtained in this country or in other countries to supply the needs for edible gelatine without resorting to the use of inedible parts of hides, horns, hoofs and other waste and unfit portions of the animal.

=Summary.=--Above have been presented some of the principal meat foods, the analytical data which show their composition, the processes by means of which they are prepared and the principal methods, objectionable and otherwise, by which they are preserved.

Meat is a staple article of diet among almost all nations of men. The anatomical structure of the human animal indicates that his environment has adapted him to eating meats of all kinds. In other words, man is an omnivorous animal. He has been developed in an environment in which all kinds of meats and vegetables have ministered to his sustenance, and thus he is an omnivorous animal both by evolution and necessarily by heredity. That man can live and flourish without meat has been fully established by experiments, but that man cannot be nourished by meat alone has likewise been fully established, so that if the human race were necessarily to be deprived either of animal or vegetable foods, it would be the animal food which must be sacrificed.

It is not the purpose of this manual to discuss the relative merits of vegetarianism as compared with the common diet of the human race. It may not be amiss, however, to say that probably in the United States especially, a larger quantity of meat is eaten than is either necessary or wholesome. The people of our country are better able to supply themselves with expensive foods than those of other countries, and of the common foods meats are far more expensive than cereals. The eating of larger quantities of cereals and smaller quantities of meat would probably be conducive both to economy and health. It appears to be certain that the meat eating of the future may not be regarded so much as a necessity as it has in the past, but that meats will be used more as condimental

substances than as staple foods. In all meat, for instance, that costs 25 cents a pound, such as steaks, there is over one-third or a half of it which is inedible, so that the edible portion really costs double that amount. On the contrary, when a pound of flour or maize is purchased, the price of which is perhaps only one-eighth that of meat, the whole of it is edible. Thus, from the mere point of economy as well as of nutrition the superiority of cereals and other vegetable products is at once evident. On the one hand, a cereal is almost a complete food containing all the elements necessary to nutrition, and it costs only a few cents a pound. On the other hand, a steak or roast is only a partial food and it costs much more than cereals.

It is hoped that one purpose of this manual may be secured, namely, by showing the consumer the actual composition of the different kinds of food and their method of preparation he may be led in the selection of his food to follow the dictates of science and economy to a certain extent rather than merely the impulse of taste. The eating of such large quantities of meat is merely a habit which often is developed in children through the carelessness and ignorance of parents, much to the detriment of the child as well as to his future health and activity. It is believed that if the true principles of the use of meat were properly inculcated a large saving in the energy of the wage earner as well as those in more affluent circumstances would be secured.

Sound principles of economy establish a better condition of health and lead to greater activity and fruitful labor.

TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL OILS.

Terrestrial animal oils are obtained directly from parts of the animals which yield, at ordinary temperature, a substance which remains liquid. The fats which are in the feet of the animals are usually more liquid than in any other part of the body, and hence the natural animal oils are derived largely from the feet. Among the most important are sheep’s foot oil, horse foot oil, and neat’s foot oil, which is obtained from the feet of cattle. These oils are all highly valued for technical purposes, especially for lubricating, and for this purpose bring a very high price. They are not used or should not be used for edible purposes, though they perhaps may sometimes be used in cooking. Neat’s foot oil, especially, on account of its high price, is often subjected to adulteration, and is mixed for this purpose with cheap vegetable oils, such as cottonseed. Fish oil is also often used in the adulteration of neat’s foot oil, though the addition of any of these oils to neat’s foot oil raises the iodin number to a very high degree, and hence this addition is easily detected by the chemist.

=Lard Oil.=--Lard oil is one of the most important of terrestrial animal oils. It is made from lard by melting it and allowing it to slowly cool. The stearin in the product crystallizes first, and when it reaches a condition favoring the separation of the stearin the mass is subjected to straining or pressure, whereby the olein or liquid portion of the oil is separated, and thus, having been freed from the most of its stearin, remains liquid at ordinary temperature. The residue is known as lard stearin and is largely employed in the preparation of lard to give it a higher melting point and in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

Lard oil is used to some extent for edible purposes and is itself sometimes employed in the manufacture of oleomargarine when mixed with tallow or tallow stearin.

Properties of Lard Oil.--It is evident that the chemical and physical properties of lard oil are determined by the completeness with which the stearin is separated. Inasmuch, however, as the conditions of manufacture are nearly constant, lard oil has characteristics of a physical and chemical nature which do not vary greatly. The specific gravity of lard oil at 15 degrees is about .916, and its iodin number varies from 68 to 75. When made of the best material it has a neutral taste, not an unpleasant odor, and, therefore, can be used for edible purposes without introducing any characteristic odor or flavor into the prepared food. In point of fact, however, it is not used to any extent for edible purposes except in the manufactured articles above mentioned. When carefully made and of the proper quality pure lard oil should be practically free from free acid.

Adulterations.--On account of the high value of lard oil for lubricating and other purposes it has been subjected to extensive adulterations. The addition of cheaper animal oils or vegetable oils has been largely practiced. Fish oil, blubber oil, and other marine animal oils have also been freely used in the adulteration of lard oil whenever the difference in price has rendered it advisable. These adulterations are of such a character that they can be detected only by the skilled microscopist and chemist. The other animal oils, both of marine and terrestrial origin, while important from a technical point of view, are of no significance in respect of edible qualities.

PART II.

POULTRY AND GAME BIRDS.

=Application of Name.=--The term poultry for descriptive purposes may be applied to those classes of feathered domesticated birds used for human food. It, therefore, includes practically all of the domesticated fowls. The term game bird, for the purpose of this manual, is applied to feathered animals which are wild and which are used for human food. This also may apply to almost all wild birds, since at times they practically all have been used for food purposes. Here only those in common use, both domesticated and wild, will be referred to. In connection with poultry the eggs of the birds will be considered.

DOMESTICATED FOWLS.

The principal domesticated fowls which are used for human food are chickens, turkeys, geese, ducks, and guinea hens. The most common of all is the chicken,--the next perhaps are turkeys in this country and the goose in Europe. The others are more infrequently used but are highly prized.

=Chicken.=--The chicken scientifically is known as _Gallus domesticus_. For food purposes the chicken is eaten at various ages. The very young chicken is commonly called a broiler and is prepared for the table at varying ages from six to twelve weeks. Young chickens are also very commonly called spring chickens, since they occur in greater abundance in the spring than at any other time. Since the introduction of the modern method of incubation, however, the spring chicken may be had at all seasons of the year. The “broiler” and “spring chicken” may be regarded as synonymous terms, though the larger chicks are usually called spring chickens instead of broilers.

Full Grown Chickens.--The full grown chicken is better suited for food when still young. The flesh loses flavor and gains in toughness as the chicken grows older. There is no legal limit fixing the division of chickens into different classes with respect to age and the only criterion is the price and taste of the consumer. There is, perhaps, no objection to the use of old chickens for food purposes, provided they are not sold fraudulently as young chicks. The size and toughness of the pieces one often secures when ordering spring chicken is an indication that the age limit is not very definitely established. Both hens and roosters are used for food purposes, but especially the young roosters are devoted to food purposes while the young hens are often kept for the production of eggs.

Preparation of Chickens for Food Purposes.--In former times, when the chickens of commerce were derived chiefly from the farm, no special preparation was made before the chicken was marketed. The eggs were hatched in the old-fashioned way by the hens and the chicks sold to hucksters or in market, at various ages and without any special preparation or control. All this has been changed in later times by the introduction of scientific methods of breeding poultry. It has been demonstrated that the breeding and care of poultry require as much scientific and economic attention as is devoted to any other successful business.

[Illustration: FIG. 12.--CHICKEN HOUSE, RHODE ISLAND EXPERIMENT STATION.]

The Incubator.--The introduction of the incubator for the hatching of eggs with the other necessary arrangements for the caring for young chicks has perhaps done more than any other one thing to revolutionize the method of preparing poultry for the market. By the use of the incubator the hatching of chicks is regulated with the utmost degree of nicety. A larger percentage of eggs produce chicks and the expense of the incubating process is greatly diminished. The incubator is in its widest significance a thermostat in which the eggs may be placed and maintained constantly at the temperature of the hen’s body, namely, about 102 degrees F. The arrangement of the chicken house and the other environments of the young chick are shown in Fig. 12.

Care of Young Chicks.--The principal points in the care of young chicks are fresh air, freedom from infection by epidemic or contagious diseases, exclusion of insect pests, even high temperature, and abundance of food. The young chick is especially sensitive to low temperatures and must be protected from cold, especially from cold rains. For this reason the chicks, after hatching, must be kept, if it is not summer time, in a room where the temperature can be regulated until they have acquired some degree of strength and vitality. The temperature of the chicken house for the young birds should not be lower than 85 or 90 degrees F.

A temperature of about 102 degrees F. is found very favorable to the development of the chicks in the eggs, although the temperature may sometimes fall to 101 or rise to 103 degrees F. without materially affecting the results. Experiments show that too low a temperature arrests the development of the chick. On the contrary there seems to be no indication that an increase of heat,

up to 103 degrees F., has any tendency to kill the chick in the last stages of development. It is found best in all cases to set the eggs in the incubator as soon after they are laid as possible. Where the age of the egg is not known it should be carefully candled, that is, held up between the eye and a light in order to determine its condition. In old eggs, the yolk, on candling, becomes more or less diffused with the white and such eggs are to be rejected for incubator purposes as they are not likely to produce chickens. The fertility of the egg must also be assured before placing in the incubator. An unfertilized egg is so much loss in the incubator since it might have been used for food purposes, since the egg, for marketable purposes, when fresh is just as good as a fertilized egg. It is an observed fact that the complete fertilization of the egg, that is, the proper union of the male and female germ cells, is not always complete at the time the egg is laid, but the mingling of the two elements takes place under proper conditions afterwards. The development will also depend upon the vitality of the germ and its component parts. Just, for instance, as the color of the feathers, the size of the body and the general character of the chick may be inherited from either parent, so the vital qualities are much more strongly shown in some eggs than in others. The proper germination of the egg may also be improved by many of the conditions of environment. In the case of eggs, any slight change which would interfere with the functions of the yolk or albumin, both of which are extremely sensitive to change, would interfere with the growth of the embryo either by depriving it of food or subjecting it to other conditions in which its vitality would be diminished or destroyed. The fertilized egg may be separated from the non-fertilized also by candling. At the Rhode Island station it is found that a very good light for candling is the ordinary calcium carbide bicycle lamp, placed in a proper candling box. This is a strong white light quite equal in power to the electric incandescent light and is not so trying to the eyes.

When eggs which have been submitted to incubation permit light to shine through and show the yolk suspended in the upper half of the center as a clearly defined mass, which quickly reassumes its position in turning the egg with its long axis nearly horizontal, they are probably infertile or sterile. When, on the contrary, the yolk assumes indefinite outlines, approaching near the upper portion of the shell at the large end or appears with a thick spur upon its upper side, it may be regarded as having started to incubate. In the later stages the embryo can be plainly seen, because it becomes opaque and cuts off more of the light. In the incubation of eggs the candling is resorted to during the first few days of the experiment in order that the unfertilized eggs may be separated. The best time for the candling, if it is practiced only once, is on the sixth or seventh day of incubation. By that time all the eggs which are fertilized will be so changed as to be easily recognized by the candling process. Experience has shown that eggs which are more than two weeks old are not profitable for use in incubators since the percentage that does not hatch is so large. The incubating part of the plant is sometimes placed in the cellar over which the brooding house is built.

The brooding of young chicks is of the utmost significance. In Europe the changes in temperature are much less violent than in this country. The principal brooding houses in the United States are in the North where the temperature often falls in winter to below zero while in the summer it may rise to blood heat, a difference of over 100 degrees F. For this reason the incubating houses in the United States are often placed in cellars where the uniform conditions of temperature are more easily secured. There is no objection to this location provided proper care be taken to secure ventilation and the proper content of moisture in the atmosphere. In Great Britain the incubating houses are usually placed above ground instead of in cellars. The mean range of temperature in an incubating room in Great Britain, from March 12, 1903, to March 30, 1904, was 10 degrees. The highest temperature registered was 70 degrees on the 24th of June and the lowest 42 degrees in January. The humidity of the air was also quite constant, the lowest degree of humidity being 59 and the highest 94. These data show a very even temperature in the room itself. Of course the temperature in the incubator is necessarily greater, being that already referred to, namely 102 degrees.

Early Market.--One principal object in the raising of chicks is to force them to an early maturity in so far as size and palatability are concerned. The sooner the young broilers can be made ready for the market the more economy there is in their production. To this end they ought to receive a more abundant and specially prepared kind of food than if they were intended for ordinary farm purposes. In other words, the forcing process should be pushed as far as possible without interfering with the health and normal functions of the bird. Foods which are nutritious and stimulating and promote vigorous growth should be employed. Birds prepared in this way for the market are extremely tender and palatable and bring the highest prices where their merits are recognized.

Artificial Feeding.--Where chickens of greater age are prepared for the market they are subjected, during the last two or three weeks previous to sale, to a forcing process in order to produce more fat and make their flesh more palatable. To this end the chickens are fed from time to time mechanically by passing a tube into the craw and forcing the food therein. Fowls prepared in this way bring high prices in the market and the largest profits to the growers. It is a method, however, which is not used in the raising of the ordinary poultry found on the market.

Preparing Chickens for the Market.--Chickens are sold in four different conditions in the markets of this country. First, they are offered alive. A great many purchasers prefer to get their poultry in this way because they can then be certain that it has not been long killed and kept in cold storage or preserved by means of chemicals. It is a very common custom for consumers to have their own chicken coups and buy a number of birds at a time and fatten them particularly for their own use. Under the present system of law this method is highly to be commended as a certain way of knowing the age of the poultry consumed. With proper municipal and state regulations of the markets it would not be necessary for the consumer to go to this trouble since when rigid inspection and certification are established, the age of the chicken offered on the market can be easily ascertained. Until such time comes, however, on the part of the consumer, the desirability of securing chickens alive cannot be denied.

Freshly Killed Chickens.--Chickens which have been killed within twenty-four or forty-eight hours and properly kept may be regarded as freshly killed. There is a very wide-spread opinion, and probably founded on reliable experiments, that fowls are better if they are kept some time after slaughter, provided they are kept in a proper way. In the winter time it is customary, especially in Europe, to hang the fowl for a week or ten days exposed to the ordinary temperature, before consumption. This, of course, is a practice which could not be indulged in in warm weather. Fowls, however, can be hung in cold storage even in the summer time and with the same advantage which accrues by hanging them in ordinary temperature in the winter time. Just how long fowls should be kept after slaughter in this way in order to secure a maximum degree of palatability has not been scientifically determined. There is evidently a limit beyond which the keeping of slaughtered fowls should not be indulged in. If a low and even temperature could be secured it may be certain that the hanging of the fowl for a week or ten days is not too long. The temperature, however, should not be much above the freezing point.

Freshly killed chickens are offered in two forms, namely, drawn and undrawn. The proper method of keeping a slaughtered chicken has been the subject of very lively discussions. There are many who are advocates of the exposure of the chicken in the undrawn state asserting that in this condition it is less exposed to infection and keeps better during the necessary time elapsing between slaughter and consumption. This argument is advanced chiefly by dealers. On the other hand the consumer, as a rule, is in favor of having the chicken drawn before it is exposed for sale, that is, as soon as it is slaughtered. There is perhaps much to be said on both sides of this question. If, however, chickens are to be secured by the consumer within forty-eight hours after slaughter there can be no very great danger of infection by having them undrawn. The subject is one of sufficient importance to warrant an extended scientific investigation and upon this investigation the municipal and state regulations for the sale of poultry can be based. It is not wise in such cases to be swayed solely by prejudice or sentiment but rather by the facts which can be ascertained by unbiased scientific investigation. Because a chicken weighs more undrawn is probably one of the reasons why dealers prefer them in this state. It may be said, too, that the intestinal organs are so impenetrable to the diffusion of their contents as not to create any danger of contamination by remaining in the undrawn state. On the contrary, the keeping of chickens with the intestinal contents undisturbed does not appeal to the imagination of the consumer any more than the freezing of the carcass of a beef or hog with the viscera remaining would appeal to the consumer. If the carcass of a chicken can be better kept undrawn it is evident that the carcass of a steer or hog can also be better kept if subjected to the proper temperature. Upon the whole it appears that the safer way would be to have the poultry drawn at the time of slaughter and delivered to the consumer at an early date thereafter. In this way all danger of infection on the cut surfaces becomes avoided. At any rate the consumer should be allowed the choice in the matter which, at the present time, is not the case in many parts of this country where only undrawn poultry is exposed for sale.

Poultry in Cold Storage.--Whenever a fowl is kept for a longer period than the week or ten days above referred to for the purpose of improving its flavor and palatability it is necessary that it be placed in cold storage. This method of keeping poultry or other foods is wholly unobjectionable unless carried to excess. Poultry is a food product which under the present scientific methods of production can be furnished in a fresh state all the year. The necessity for cold storage, therefore, is not so apparent in this case as in that of fruit and other perishable foods. It appears then that cold storage only should be extended to that limit necessary to secure its delivery to the consumer. There can scarcely be any excuse for the placing of poultry in cold storage at certain seasons of the year when they are slightly less in price by reason of the abundant production than at other seasons. The methods of producing poultry are such at the present time that this excess in supply can easily be avoided on the part of the producer and thus maintain an even price and an even supply the year round. The producer as well as the consumer is benefited by such a condition. The necessity, often, for cold storage in the limited sense above referred to is acknowledged by all and a reasonable degree of time in cold storage cannot be regarded as in any way measurably harmful with reference to the character of the product. It is probable that as long as four or six months may be regarded as a justifiable limit for securing a proper market for poultry in cold storage though the exact length of time in which it may be left in cold storage will be determined only by careful scientific investigation.

There seems to be no necessity whatever for carrying fowls for a longer period and especially, as has been known, for a year or even two years. The deterioration, even if the temperature is far below the freezing point, is very marked during these long periods of time and actual danger may accrue to the consumer in the possible development of poisonous degradation products in the flesh. Municipal, state, and national regulations should be of a character to inform the consumer of the exact length of time which the poultry he proposes to purchase has been in cold storage. This is the least which the consumer has the right to know and is a right which the producer and packer should concede without discussion. The unwillingness which has been manifested on the part of dealers in poultry to make public the length of time which it has been in cold storage is of itself a suspicious condition. The argument is constantly heard that the length of time poultry has been in cold storage does not impair its palatability or wholesomeness. If this be true then a statement of the length of time cannot in any way injure the market. But to this reply is made to the effect that if the consumer is told the fowl has been in cold storage a certain length of time he will not purchase it. To this the evident answer is,--why should you deceive the consumer by selling him an article which if he knew its character he would not buy? It is evident that such deception is nothing more nor less than obtaining money under false pretenses. The remedy for the evil of cold storage is the label which will indicate the length of time which has elapsed since the slaughter of the fowl.

There is, perhaps, no greater blessing which has been conferred upon mankind during the last quarter of a century than the development of cold storage methods of preserving food. The continued prosperity and benefits of this business depend upon a thorough study of the conditions attendant thereon and the elimination of any evil which may be incident thereto. When this is accomplished the absolute confidence which the consumer will have in cold storage will be such that the magnitude of the business will be immensely increased. Thus the interests of the consumer and the dealer are one and they should work together to promote their common good.

Composition of the White Meat of a Chicken.--The meat of a chicken, carefully prepared in the laboratory of the Bureau of Chemistry, was analyzed by separation into the white and dark portions. The composition of the two meats is as follows:

WATER IN FAT-FREE MEAT WATER. SUBSTANCE. FAT. PROTEIN. BASES. Percent. Percent. Percent. Percent. Percent. White meat, 61.38 75.08 18.25 17.06 .37 Dark meat, 59.48 78.44 24.16 15.94 1.03

The above data show that there is a notable difference in the composition of the white and the dark meat. The white meat has much less fat and a correspondingly larger quantity of protein. The quantity of water in the two classes of meat is not very different although there is a slightly less quantity in the dark meat. The dark meat has a much larger proportion of meat bases but as these bases are often considered of little value and sometimes degenerate into poisonous constituents it is seen from this point of view that the white meat is to be preferred to the dark meat.

Preserved Chicken.--Practically the only methods of preserving chickens are the canning processes which have already been described and cold storage. Chickens may be canned in the same way as has been described for beef and in that way may be kept for a certain length of time without notable deterioration. The pickling of chicken is not very extensively practiced nor is it cured in the ordinary sense of the word, that is, by the addition of salt, sugar, vinegar, spices, and wood smoke. Chicken may also be put up in the form of potted chicken, which has already been described. Practically the only methods which are in vogue and which can be commended for preserving chicken are sterilizing or canning and cold storage. These methods, when not unduly prolonged, are open to no reasonable objection. The preserving of chickens with spices and condiments may also, perhaps, be considered as desirable provided no harmful chemical preservatives are employed. The temptation, however, to employ such preservatives is so great as not to be always resisted.

Adulteration of Potted Chicken and Turkey.--Perhaps there is no other form of potted meat, with the possible exception of pâté de foie gras, where such an opulent field for sophistication is found as in the case of potted chicken and turkey. The average composition of ten samples of alleged potted chicken and turkey, found upon the market, is shown in the following table:

Water, 58.52 percent Water in fat-free substance, 71.24 „ Fat, 17.98 „ Protein, 19.12 „ Meat bases, .96 „ Glycogen, .26 „ Total ash, 2.67 „ Of which sodium chlorid, 1.05 „

All but one of the ten samples contained starch but not in very considerable quantities, the largest amount being 4.13 percent.

None of the samples contained saltpeter. This is an interesting point because of the claim of the packers that saltpeter is used solely for preservation purposes. When a meat is expected to be of a white color no saltpeter is found while, on the contrary, where the meat is of a red character it is frequently found. Tin was present in four samples, doubtless due to some contamination with the

solder or by corrosion of the tin can itself. Where tin is present due to the corrosion of the can itself it is always in greater abundance in the old than in the newly canned sample. It is quite certain that the contents of these packages were not made up of chicken and turkey exclusively. The characteristic odor and taste of smoked meats which are found in these packages would indicate that they are used to give flavor and aroma to the mixture. The addition of flavoring materials of this kind, or “force” meats as they are sometimes called, is not objectionable from any sanitary or dietetic point of view. It is, however, an offense against an ethical principle which must be closely followed in a case of this kind if the doors of fraud and adulteration are not to be left wide open. This principle is that no false idea by inference, omission or otherwise, should be conveyed to the consumer by the label. Some form of expression for potted meat should be used in which the label gives the principal or dominant meat in the mixture, accompanied by the statement that it is a mixture with other meats also named, spiced and flavored. Under the present condition of affairs a manufacturer who really wishes to put into potted form chicken and turkey with only spices and condiments has to undergo an unfair competition with another manufacturer who uses the same label and reduces the quantity of expensive meat to a minimum or may possibly leave it out altogether. Under the new food law this unfair competition will be prevented.

Adulteration of Chicken.--The flesh of chicken is not subjected to any very extensive adulterations. It has been claimed that preservatives are applied externally to fresh fowls but the evidence on this point is not very conclusive. There is, perhaps, little doubt that other methods have been practiced but probably without any very great vogue. The use of chemical preservatives in potted chicken is also reprehensible. In general it may be said that there is no very extensive adulteration of chicken meat. The principal objection to the commerce in preserved chicken meat is the use of old chickens, the unlimited cold storage, the failure to draw at time of slaughter, and exposure in the market in an unsanitary condition and for an indefinite time. Cheaper meats are sometimes substituted for the genuine article in potted chicken. Turkey and pork are said to be used in chicken salad.

Capons.--The castration of the male bird produces the capon, the flesh of which is very highly valued as being superior to that of the male or female chicken. Capons are much more extensively used in Europe than in the United States but are gradually coming into favor in this country. It is difficult to describe the difference between the taste of the flesh of the capon and the rooster and hen. A greater degree of tenderness and a more delicate taste characterize the flesh of the capon. In France, especially, the production of capons has been carried to its highest perfection. Caponizing should be practiced at an early date in the life of the young bird. In fact, as soon as the distinction in sex is well marked in the young chicken the removal of the testes should take place. The young fowl is laid upon its left side and the skin is exposed by pulling back the feathers and trimming them off at the proper place until the space between the first and second ribs of the right side is laid bare. An incision is then carefully made and the testes removed by instruments particularly adapted for that purpose. The operation should be done by an expert although theoretically it appears easy of accomplishment. In practice, however, it requires an expert to avoid any injury to the bird and to insure a speedy recovery. When done in the proper way, apparently no great inconvenience attends the operation. There is little blood shed and usually no inflammation when the proper antiseptic measures are provided.

The capon develops a bird that apparently has little to do except grow fat and prepare itself for the market. The caponized bird often develops brooding instincts and when eggs are hatched by the heat of the bird the capon makes a better brooder than the hen because of the greater spread of the wings and the larger number of eggs that can be covered in the operation. The larger breeds of birds make the best capons such as the brahmas and plymouth rocks. The capons are fattened and prepared for the market as in the case of other birds. When skimmed milk is made a large portion of the diet the flesh is considered to be of greater value. The best age for marketing a capon is at about twelve months. At that time they have attained their full size and their maximum degree of excellence as a food bird. The feeding should be done upon the principles already described, namely, to keep the birds growing in the usual way until about three or four weeks before the market when the extra food is given in as large quantities as possible for quick fattening. In Europe this extra food is usually given mechanically under the forced system though in this country the mechanical method of feeding capons has not generally been introduced.

Capons bring a higher price upon the market than the other varieties of chicken, sometimes the difference being as much as four or five cents a pound. For this reason the growth of capons becomes more profitable to the farmer than that of the ordinary chicken.

=Duck= (_Anas boschas_).--The domesticated duck is used very largely for food in all parts of the world. Its flavor is not so highly prized as that of the wild duck but it is an excellent article of diet. The production of ducks is conducted in the same manner as the production of poultry in general. They are still chiefly grown upon the farm without any special care but the best results are obtained by the systematic growth of ducks under scientific conditions in poultry houses. The duck is not so extensively used for food as the turkey and chicken but perhaps in this country much more extensively than the goose. The price of the wild duck, however, is still

sufficiently low to limit to a certain extent the production of the domesticated article.

Varieties of Ducks.--There are many varieties of ducks cultivated for the market. The Pekin is perhaps the most abundant of all. It is creamy white in color, has a long and graceful body and has been particularly bred for the market. When ready for the market the average weight of the drake is about eight pounds and the duck seven. The Aylesbury is also a favorite variety. It is said to be somewhat whiter than the Pekin in color. It is specially valued in England as a market duck. It is somewhat larger than the Pekin. Other varieties of ducks are the Rover, the Cayuga, the Gray and White Call, the East Indian, the Crested White, the colored and white Muscovy, and the Indian runner. The latter is a very small duck, being only about one-half the size of the Pekin. Usually the ducks on the market are not designated by any particular variety and, in fact, most consumers are not sufficiently acquainted with the different varieties of duck to be able to ask for any particular one. The mallard, canvas-back, and teal are common varieties of the wild duck.

Composition of the Flesh of Ducks.--The flesh of two varieties of ducks, namely the Pekin duck and the Mallard duck, was carefully separated in the Bureau of Chemistry and subjected to analysis. The composition of the meat of these two ducks is shown in the following table:

WATER IN FAT-FREE MEAT WATER. SUBSTANCE. FAT. PROTEIN. BASES. Percent. Percent. Percent. Percent. Percent. Pekin duck, 47.46 78.20 39.31 13.37 .43 Mallard duck, 69.06 75.98 7.11 19.25 .65

The above data show a striking difference between these two varieties of ducks. The Pekin duck has a large excess of fat while the Mallard duck, which is a wild duck and evidently not very fat, has a small percentage of fat and a large percentage of protein. It is evident that the flesh of wild fowl would not, except at a certain season of the year, approach that of domesticated fowls in the percentage of fat which it contains.

=Goose= (_Anser anser_).--The goose is not so commonly used as a food product in this country as in Europe,--the turkey to some extent has taken its place. The remarks which are applicable to the production of chickens are also applicable to the production of geese. They, perhaps, are grown more extensively in the old-fashioned way in this country than chickens or turkeys at the present time since they are used chiefly for the feathers which they produce and not for food. Goose is also considered a winter dish both in this country and in Europe. It is customary in Europe that the goose be hung even for a longer period before consumption than the chicken. Its flesh is made more tender and more palatable by this preliminary exposure. From one to two weeks is not considered too long a time in the winter for hanging in the old country. The remarks relative to cold storage of turkey and chicken apply also to the goose. The goose is, perhaps, the most easily artificially fattened of any other poultry birds. This is especially true in those regions where fatty goose livers are so highly prized in the manufacture of _pâté de foie gras_. By long-continued artificial feeding the goose is made excessively fat and the liver especially is changed in its composition by this treatment so as to make it peculiarly suitable for the production of this delicacy.

Varieties of Geese.--The varieties of geese upon the market comprise the following leading breeds. The Toulouse is perhaps the most extensively raised. It is highly prized on account of its hardihood, its size and the general appearance of its body. It is of a gray to white color and the wings are a deeper gray or brown. The legs are usually of a deep orange. When ready for the market the average weight of the gander is 20 pounds and the goose 18. Of the other common varieties there are the Embden, the African, the brown and white Chinese, the white or Canada, and the Egyptian. The latter is a small goose only weighing about half as much as the Toulouse when ready for the market. The wild goose is highly esteemed as a game bird.

Feeding of Young Geese for the Market.--The feeding of geese for the market begins as soon as the hatching is complete. The first meal of the young chicks consists of oat meal, middlings, finely chopped dandelions, lettuce or some similar green stuff, and milk. The goslings during the first week are kept indoors and should be fed four or five times a day on the mixture above named. After this they may go into a yard where there is plenty of grass, not overgrown, and they will thrive on this very well for a time without hand feeding. Not more than two feedings a day are necessary between the ages of one and six weeks where plenty of grass is at hand. During this time no better food than ground oats and skimmed milk can be used. During all this period great care is taken that the goslings are not subjected to any disease or to cold. They should be carefully housed in sanitary coups where the temperature does not sink too low and where they are protected from cold rains. After the goslings are eight weeks old they are usually able to take care of themselves in respect of food and need, perhaps only one feeding a day. If these goslings are hatched in the early spring they may be ready for fattening for the Christmas market. The geese until shortly before the time for market are

allowed to run free in a field, not too large, where there are ponds or troughs of water in abundance. In this way the frame of the goose will be sufficiently developed by the time the fattening period comes but there will have been no unusual expense in the production of the fowl until it is prepared for the market. The large frame is necessary in order that the goose may properly fatten. It usually requires about three weeks of artificial feeding to bring a goose into proper condition for the market. If the geese are for the Christmas market about the 25th of November they are put up in sheds for fattening for though they have been well fed during the summer and autumn they cannot be called fat geese until they have gone through a special course of nutrition. While they are confined for fattening, geese require plenty of fresh air but very little light and these conditions are procured by housing them in large airy sheds without windows. Before the fattening season these sheds are thoroughly cleaned and whitewashed and the floor covered with cinders, ashes, and charcoal. This mixture is not only a good bedding but is also a good deodorizer, which is quite important. Food troughs are arranged along the walls inside the shed and troughs for water outside in such a way that the birds can reach the water but cannot get into it. Clean charcoal is to be put into the shed every day as it is constantly eaten by the geese and is valuable. The foods used are oat meal, boiled potatoes, linseed meal or other oil cakes, and plenty of milk, usually skimmed. The birds should have all of this that they can eat, for in the process we are now describing the artificial forcing of food into the craw is not practiced. In three weeks a good goose will increase four or five pounds in weight and this increase brings the goose up from an ordinary bird in good condition to one which is properly fed for the market.

The killing of geese is practiced in practically the same manner as that which is described for slaughtering fowls. A goose is a bird of large vitality and dies hard as is the case with most fowls. The feathers should be taken off the body clean, as they are valuable for commercial purposes. Any pin feathers should be cut with a sharp knife so as to make the bird look as clean as possible when brought to the market. The carcass of the goose should not be packed to send to market until it is entirely cold and in this country, especially, where the distances are great, it is advisable to send it packed in ice or in a cold storage car. The average weight of a goose about nine months old thus prepared for the market is about fourteen pounds and the flesh is certain to be more palatable at this age when fattened in the manner above described.

=Domesticated Pigeon= (_Columba livia_).--In the last few years the production of domesticated pigeons has been extensively practiced in this country, and especially the production of young pigeons which are known as squabs. They are rapidly taking the place of game birds at the hotels and restaurants of the country. The conditions of production, preparation, etc., are the same as those for the ordinary domesticated fowl. There are many varieties of the bird grown; some, as the carrier, for special purposes. The other principal varieties are barbs, fantails, jacobins, runts, trumpeters, tumblers, and turbits.

=Turkey= (_Meleagris americana_).--In general the statement which has been made regarding the production of fowls or chickens may be applied also to the production of turkeys. No further comment, therefore, is to be made under that head. The old-fashioned method of securing turkeys grown under natural conditions has, to a great extent, given way to the production of turkeys on a large scale and under scientific conditions. Turkeys, as a rule, are not eaten young, but practically full-grown. In this country the turkey is a dish which is particularly affected for festive occasions such as Thanksgiving and Christmas, though they are eaten largely throughout the whole year. The market, however, for turkeys is particularly a November and December market and the large introduction of turkeys in the market is so timed as to furnish them in proper condition for consumption during those two months.

The methods of preparing turkeys for the market, keeping them in cold storage, of hanging them previous to consumption and exposing them drawn or undrawn for sale, are subject to the same remarks as has been made in the case of chickens. Turkeys are said to be more difficult to care for, both on the farm and in the professional poultry factory, than chickens. They are more subject to disease and more difficult to bring to maturity than chickens.

Composition of Meat of Turkey.--The flesh of the turkey was separated into two portions, the white and dark meats, and these were found to have the following composition:

WATER IN FAT-FREE MEAT WATER. SUBSTANCE. FAT. PROTEIN. BASES. White meat, 55.50 74.70 25.71 18.31 1.31 Dark meat, 54.13 75.76 27.76 16.75 1.15

A comparison of these two analyses show that there is little difference in the content of water in the white and dark meat. The dark meat, as in the case of chicken, has more fat and a correspondingly less amount of protein. The quantity of protein in the meat of turkey is about the same as that of chicken. The white meat of turkey differs from the white meat of chicken more in its content of meat bases than in any other way, except that the meat of turkey contains more fat, especially the white meat, than that of chicken.

=Composition of the Meat of Chicken, Turkey, Duck, and Goose.=--The composition of the chicken, turkey, duck, goose, and pigeon as given by König is found in the following table:

WATER. PROTEIN. FAT. ASH. Chicken (lean), 76.22 19.72 1.42 1.37 Chicken (fat), 70.06 18.49 9.34 .91 Young cock (fat), 70.03 23.32 3.15 1.01 Turkey, 65.60 24.70 8.50 1.20 Duck (wild), 70.80 22.65 3.11 1.09 Goose (fat), 38.02 15.91 49.59 .48

The above data show that with the exception of the goose the percentage of fat given in the flesh of the animals is very much less than that found in our own work. Even in the fat chicken only a little over 9 percent of fat was found. It is believed that the composition of these fowls as given by the work of the Bureau of Chemistry more nearly represents the average composition in this country than the data taken from König.

=Importance of Animal Food in the Growth of Poultry.=--Many people suppose that poultry can live upon vegetables alone and this is probably true. Experience, however, shows that poultry does not thrive and fatten well on purely vegetable food. This fact was brought out very prominently in the experiments at the Cornell station where poultry of the same origin and character was fed two kinds of diet, one being partly of animal food and the other purely vegetable foods. The ration of the animal food consisted of Indian corn meal, wheat flour, ground oats, wheat bran, wheat middlings, pea meal, linseed meal, meat, and fresh bone. The vegetable ration consisted of pea meal, linseed meal, wheat bran, ground oats, Indian corn meal, wheat middlings, gluten meal, and skimmed milk. Before the experiment had been long under way it was noticed that the birds receiving the meat food were developing rapidly and evenly while those that received the purely vegetable diet were becoming thin and uneven in size. The authors of the bulletin say that it was sometimes almost pitiful to see the long-necked, scrawny, vegetable-fed birds, with troughs full of abundant good, wholesome food before them, stand on the alert and scamper in hot haste after the unlucky grasshopper or fly which ventured into their pen, while the contented looking meat-fed ducks lay lazily in the sun and paid no attention to the buzzing bee or crawling beetle. The vegetable-fed birds literally starved to death, at least many of them, so that only twenty of the thirty-three with which the experiment was commenced were alive at the close of the fifteen weeks of feeding.

=The Forced Fattening of Poultry.=--Allusion has already been made to the forced fattening of poultry secured by injecting food into the craw in larger quantities than would naturally be taken by the fowl if left to itself. There is much to be said both for and against this method of fattening. In favor of this method it may be stated that the birds fattened in this way are more highly prized by the connoisseur, are naturally fatter by reason of the enforced idleness of the birds during the fattening process, thus diminishing muscular activity, and more tender than the birds left at freedom and forced to secure their own food. From the point of view of the seller, also, the birds are heavier and the artificially fattened fowl usually brings a higher price, pound for pound, on the market. Against the method it is urged that it is barbarous, imposing upon the birds a diet far beyond normal capacity and thus tending to damage and injure the organs of the body charged with the assimilation of food and the secretion of the waste products.

The above indictment is doubtless true is almost every respect. In explanation it may be said that the period of forcing food is always a short one, rarely extending beyond three weeks, and, therefore, any injury to the organs which might be induced is not of sufficient duration to establish any real form of disease. In other words, the birds are slaughtered before any lesions of the organs are produced. The livers of the animals, especially geese, thus artificially fattened, take on an extra quantity of fat during this period but it cannot be said that they become really diseased. The fatty livers, as is well known, are used particularly in the manufacture of a mixed spiced meat known as _pâté de foie gras_.

Upon the whole it is believed that no injury is done the bird by this process of feeding which could in any way be regarded as detrimental to the flesh as a food product. In regard to the apparent barbarity of the process little need be said. The slaughter of animals for human food in itself is a barbarous practice from one point of view but if this practice is justified, as it doubtless is, by the exigencies of human nutrition, the slight degree of force which is employed in artificial fattening cannot be condemned. Moreover the artificial fattening of the fowl is of necessity a somewhat limited operation and confined to those establishments that are devoted exclusively to the production of high-grade and high-priced poultry for the market. The fattening is done by experts and, in so far as the experience of feeding men in the same way is concerned, is not attended with any pain or discomfort other than that incident to a chronically full craw.

Increase in Weight.--There is a larger increase in the weight of artificially fattened poultry over those fed in the ordinary way and allowed to run free than is usually supposed. It is stated by some authors that the average increase in weight of artificially fattened birds is as much as 35 percent. There is no secret connected with the method of artificial fattening as is sometimes supposed. There are perhaps proprietary methods for preparing foods for fattening purposes but there is no secret in the mechanism of the

process. In fact the process is so simple that it might be easily taught in a general way so that the farm hand would become an expert in its use and the farmer's poultry instead of being sent to market in a half-emaciated condition might be offered to the public in the best possible shape. Poultry running at large use up a large part of the value of their food in the heat and energy developed in the ordinary search for food. When confined and fed artificially this excess of heat and energy is naturally stored as fat.

Experience has shown that the artificial feeding must be a limited one and the bird must be sent to market as soon as it has reached its maximum of perfection under the process. Experience has also shown that in the artificial feeding it is best to have each bird in a small compartment to itself with the cage so arranged that the bird can put its head through a slat in front and thus receive the food from the machine without disturbing any of its neighbors. That the birds are perfectly willing to take the food in this way is evidenced by the fact that they voluntarily put their heads through the apertures to receive their food. Each individual coup must be kept scrupulously clean and disinfected and the air in the room kept perfectly fresh and sweet. Lime should be used freely in all parts of the coup house in the form of whitewash or sprinkled about the floor or upon the floors of the coups. Gypsum or ordinary land plaster is also highly prized as another form of lime which is found to be very valuable. The whitewash must be freely indulged in and at frequent intervals.

There are various forms of fattening food used in this country. Indian corn meal forms an important part. The presence of certain animal products must not be neglected in the food as it has been shown that fowls thrive better when given, in their food, a certain amount of animal matter, both of flesh and finely ground bone. The fattening food must be in the form of a finely ground paste of the proper consistency to be handled well in the machine. It is a universal practice which custom has shown to be necessary to mix with the food a certain quantity of finely pulverized charcoal, usually about three pounds of the charcoal to 97 pounds of food. Some feeders prefer to mix the paste about twenty-four hours before it is administered, believing that the slight fermentation thus produced is beneficial.

The Cramming Machine.--Various forms of machines are employed for introducing the food into the craw. The tube carrying the food is introduced into the esophagus of the bird in a manner to avoid any pain and the apparatus is so adjusted that with a single movement of the machine, usually operated by the foot, the proper amount of food is injected. The birds should be arranged according to size so that all of a certain size may have exactly the same quantity of food administered. The operator would thus be saved the difficulty of guessing the different sizes. The arrangement of the coups and the kind of the cramming machine vary greatly. In the beginning of artificial feeding the birds should not be pushed to their full capacity. An increasing quantity of food should be given up to the end of the first week or ten days before the full maximum dose is administered. In general it is found best to take the bird out of the coup for feeding, holding it under the arm so that the neck can be made perfectly straight and gently inserting the flexible tube which carries the food and thus with the single movement of a lever, filling the craw. The use of the machine, however, is found to be advantageous from a point of economy although it is claimed that the cramming of birds by means of a funnel has been found very efficacious. With a good machine an expert operator can feed about 250 birds in an hour. An important point in the fattening is that the food should be given regularly.

=Slaughtering Fowls for the Market.=--It is important that a uniform and proper method be used for killing fowls intended for the market. There are two methods in common vogue, namely, by bleeding and by dislocation of the neck. The method of killing is important in order that the proper method of dressing for the market may be secured. A fowl which is offered for sale ought to be attractively dressed and any brutal or defacing method of slaughter makes it impossible afterwards to render the fowl attractive to the customer.

In killing by the dislocation of the neck the operator takes the bird by the thigh and top of the wing in the left hand and the head in the right and then draws it steadily until dislocation takes place. The skin remains unbroken and no bruised effect is produced but all the blood in the body drains into the neck and remains there. This method is one especially practiced in England (Journal, Board of Agriculture, 1904-5, page 306). Where the bird is very large, as is the case with turkeys, it may require the full strength of a man in order to produce the dislocation in the manner mentioned. In this case it is often necessary to first hang the bird up by the leg to secure the best results.

In killing a fowl by bleeding it is strung up by the legs with its head hanging downward. The operator then gives it a sharp blow with a stick on the back of the head and when he has stunned it by this means he inserts a sharp knife into the roof of the mouth, penetrating the brain. He also severs the large artery of the throat by rotating the knife and the bird rapidly bleeds to death. This method of killing, it is seen, is not a very humane one. If, for instance, the sensation of the bird is not destroyed by the first blow the other process must be needlessly painful. This process, simplified somewhat by omitting the hanging, is the one commonly

followed by professionals in this country. In England turkeys which are prepared for the market are plucked but not drawn. One of the newest methods of plucking is known as the Devonshire style and consists in stripping the feathers clean off the breast and thighs but leaving the neck, back and wings covered. The fowls are then tied around the legs with a strong cord in such a manner as to show the plumpness of the breast prominently.

The methods of preparation of the fowls depend largely on the demands of the market to which they are going. Some require the fowls to be clean plucked and others prefer some of the feathers left on.

=Eggs.=--Eggs are a common article of diet throughout the world. The eggs of domesticated fowls are those which are principally used for food, though the eggs of wild fowls, and birds and reptiles are also edible but on account of the difficulty of getting them and their rarity are not to be considered as a commercial article. The chief sources of supply are the eggs of chickens, ducks, and geese. Chicken eggs are by far the most important, duck eggs the next important, and goose eggs the least important. The eggs of fish also constitute an article of food of considerable value and are extensively used. For instance the fresh eggs of shad are used in large quantities during the whole of the shad season and are often kept in cold storage for use at other times. The eggs of sturgeon are used extensively in the fresh state and when pickled as caviar are highly esteemed throughout the world. These two kinds of eggs are probably the most important of fish eggs used for food purposes. Chicken eggs vary greatly in size according to the age and variety of the fowl. The average weight of chicken eggs is 680 grams per dozen. They vary also in color from pure white to a brownish yellow. Duck eggs are larger and also variegated in color. The average weight of duck eggs is 847.2 grams per dozen. Goose eggs are the largest of the three varieties, varying also in color. They weigh on an average 2284.8 grams per dozen. Eggs also vary greatly in shape, being generally ovoid but some being much more spherical than others according to the species of the fowl and variety. The number of eggs which a chicken will lay varies greatly. Attempts have been made, with great success, at experiment stations, to develop chickens with high laying powers. A hen which will produce over 200 eggs a year is regarded as a high-grade fowl for egg-producing purposes. Eggs are produced more abundantly during the early spring and summer than during the winter months. One of the purposes of scientific egg producing is the development of fowls that will produce eggs more evenly throughout the whole year, thus avoiding the very great depression in the price of eggs in the spring and the excessively high price of eggs in the winter.

Composition of Eggs.--A large number of eggs have been analyzed in all quarters of the world and found to vary but little in composition in different localities, and very little also in regard to the variety of the fowl. The egg consists essentially of two portions,--an external highly albuminous portion known as the white and an internal colored portion, yellow or reddish in tint, known as the yolk. The white of an egg is composed almost entirely of albumin partially dissolved in water. The yolk of the egg is composed of albumin, fat, and a phosphorus-bearing material of high nutritive value known as lecithin. The yolk of an egg is a much richer food product than the white, containing in addition to the nitrogenous element the fat and mineral bodies necessary to nutrition. Both the white and yolk of an egg are composed principally of water as will be seen by the following analytical data:

COMPOSITION OF EDIBLE PART OF EGGS.

WATER. PROTEIN. FAT. ASH. CALORIES. Percent. Percent. Percent. Percent. Per pound. Hen, 73.7 13.4 10.5 1.0 .... Duck, 70.5 13.3 14.5 1.0 985 Goose, 69.5 13.8 14.4 1.0 985 Turkey, 73.3 13.4 11.2 0.9 850

Preservation of Eggs.--Freshly laid eggs may be preserved for several days without any notable deterioration by keeping in a cool place. The temperature of preservation should be as nearly the freezing point as can be secured. The vital processes are continually going on in a fresh egg and hence there is a development of a certain degree of heat due to these activities. For this reason eggs can be placed in an atmosphere below the freezing point of water without being frozen. An additional reason for this is found in the fact that the water which is present in eggs holds the albumin and other bodies in solution and the freezing point of a solution is always lower than that of the solvent alone. For domestic purposes where refrigerating establishments are not available the fresh eggs should be kept in a cool dark place where the temperature is not allowed to go above 50 or 60 degrees. At a higher temperature than this fresh eggs lose their freshness in a remarkably short time. The porous nature of the shell is a condition which favors the deterioration of the egg by the admission of air and microbes into the substance of the egg itself.

The preservation of eggs is, therefore, materially assisted by coating the egg artificially with a varnish or film of some kind which renders the egg impervious to air and water. One of the cheapest, simplest, and best of these coatings, as has already been noted, is soluble glass. This is produced by dissolving the chemical substance known as silicate of soda in water, and dipping the egg into the solution, removing and allowing to dry. The silicate of soda which is thus left in a thin film over the surface of the egg penetrates

and stops the pores and renders the egg shell practically impervious both to air and water. This material has the property of becoming totally insoluble in water when it has once been dried so that even if the egg is afterwards subjected to rain or water in any form the film is not removed. Many other methods of coating eggs have been employed and are dependent upon the same principle but are perhaps not so effectual and simple as the inexpensive method above described.

Cold Storage.--Eggs either with or without the coating of the surface, usually without, may be kept for a considerable length of time without deterioration in cold storage. In this case it is advisable to reduce the temperature to the lowest possible point to retain the semi-fresh condition of the contents. Water freezes at 32 degrees, but for the reasons above mentioned the temperature at which the egg is stored may be reduced notably below 32 degrees without danger of solidifying. The eggs kept in cold storage gradually acquire a taste and aroma which are quite different from the fresh article and the period of preservation should never be prolonged, probably a month or six weeks is the extreme limit for keeping eggs which can still be regarded as having the qualities of the fresh article. In practice, eggs are kept often a very much longer time since the principal object of cold storage is to lay in a supply in the spring and summer when they are abundant and keep them over until the next winter. The average age of cold storage eggs is probably more than six months. At this time the eggs have acquired a distinctly unpleasant odor and flavor which enables even one who is not an expert to distinguish between them and the fresh article. Such eggs should not be allowed on the market except under their proper designation so that the purchaser may know the character of the product he is getting. There is a determined opposition on the part of those dealing in cold storage eggs against such marking, an opposition which can only be explained by the fact that the amount of deterioration is fully as great as specified. If cold storage eggs have not been kept long enough to develop any of the objectionable conditions mentioned above and are inferior only in respect of taste and aroma there seems to be no just reason why they should be forbidden sale. They usually bring a lower price than fresh eggs produced at the time of sale and thus are brought more readily within the means of those who are less able to pay the higher prices. Cold storage eggs are extensively used for baking purposes and in this condition escape the detection of the consumer. This appears, however, to be no just reason for their use without notice.

Broken Eggs.--An extensive industry has been practiced for many years in the product known as broken eggs. In the preparation of broken eggs at times of great abundance, the eggs are collected and broken and then mixed together in containers of various sizes, often as large as barrels, and preserved by the admixture of borax. From two to four pounds of borax are usually employed per 100 pounds of broken eggs. In this condition the eggs are kept from the time of great abundance until the time of higher prices, namely, from six to eight months, and then sent into commerce. The use of broken eggs of this kind for edible purposes is totally indefensible. While borax prevents the development of bacteria it does not entirely inhibit enzymic action and hence that subtle change of nitrogenous matter which produces poisonous bodies may go on in the presence of borax while apparently the egg itself remains undecomposed. Broken eggs were formerly sent to this country in large quantities from China and other Asiatic countries but since the passage of food inspection laws as applied to foreign commerce the importation of this class of food products has been prohibited, on the ground that they are unfit for human consumption. Other preserving agents have been used in place of borax for these products, but all are open to similar objections. Broken eggs are used chiefly by bakers in large cities.

Dried Eggs.--The rapid drying of fresh eggs is perhaps an unobjectionable method of preservation. The drying may take place by spreading the eggs in a thin film on a dry surface, which is the usual method, or by forcing the egg product through small orifices under a high pressure into a drying chamber so adjusted as to temperature and size as to secure the desiccation of the minute particles of egg spray before they fall to the bottom. This method is perhaps the best which has yet been developed in the desiccation of such products. The egg powder thus formed is almost devoid of moisture and when properly collected and stored out of contact with the air, may be kept for a time without deterioration. Dry egg products such as have been described made from fresh eggs, may be considered unobjectionable for a reasonable length of time. Unfortunately dried products are sometimes made from decayed eggs. During the past year a factory making a product of this kind was discovered by the food inspector of one of our large cities.

Egg Substitutes.--Many products have been put upon the market of a yellow color and containing protein under the guise of eggs. There is a number of so-called egg powders offered for making cakes, etc., which contain no egg at all. They are composed of other forms of protein matter, generally casein from milk, and colored to resemble the egg in tint. Starchy substances are also colored and sold as egg powder. These substances may be regarded as adulterations when sold under the name or in the guise of an egg product. There are no other adulterations of eggs of any consequence practiced except the simulation of egg material by such products as those just mentioned.

Poisonous Principles in Eggs.--While fresh eggs for most people form a food product entirely devoid of danger, nutritious and easily digestible, eggs may easily become injurious and even poisonous. According to experiments made by Bouchard (Scientific American, August 11, 1896, page 95), even fresh eggs, unless the sanitary conditions in which the fowls live are well cared for, may become very poisonous. The fowl producing eggs, as a rule, is not a cleanly animal, and this is especially true of the duck. Thus injurious organic material rich in microbes may contaminate the egg and the microbes may penetrate the shell thus rendering the egg unsuitable for consumption. Eggs contaminated in this way have given evidence of toxic phenomena even in a fresh state. Experiments have shown too that the food material of eggs if directly injected into the blood of an animal produces toxic effects whereas if injected into the stomach no unfavorable effects are produced. Egg albumin, that is, the albumin of the white of the egg, when fed in considerable quantities to animals partially escapes digestion and thus becomes a source of irritation and even of poisoning. There are many people who are remarkably sensitive to the influence of eggs and those who possess this idiosyncrasy are injured even by eggs which are perfectly harmless to other people. A large number of species of injurious microbes which infect eggs have been identified. These even are found in fresh eggs in the unsanitary conditions above mentioned. Eggs kept for a long while in cold storage or decayed in any way are extremely injurious. Fortunately decayed eggs are self protecting since they can only be eaten by accident. If, however, decayed eggs be eaten in diluted form by mixing with other foods they may be eaten without their characteristic odor or taste being known and thus great injury arises. It is advised in all cases where eggs are to be kept for some time even in cold storage to varnish them with some substance impenetrable to air. For this purpose, as has already been mentioned, soluble glass, which is chemically a silicate of soda, has been found extremely effective. Any of the varnishes which make the shell of an egg air tight tends to restrain the activities of bacterial life since the bacteria cannot live without air. The officials who inspect food should direct special care to the storing of eggs in order that no damage may result from keeping them too long in cold storage or otherwise. It must not be understood that poisoning by eggs is of common occurrence. In fact it is very rare. The fact that the egg itself, which is such a common article of diet, may be unsanitary and improperly kept is a matter of great concern to the consumer.

Parasites in Eggs.--The egg also when produced in unsanitary conditions may become infected with parasites. Many of these are apparently harmless, but some are injurious and even dangerous. The mere fact that parasites may exist in eggs is of itself a sufficient reason for the consumer to insist that the eggs he eats, like the milk he drinks, shall be free from all infections due solely to carelessness in production.

PART III.

FISH FOODS.

FISH.

Fish furnish a very important and useful part of the animal food of man. Both the fish growing in fresh water and in salt water are generally edible. Usually the smaller-sized fish are considered more palatable, but this is not universally the case. The large-sized fish are apt to be coarse, and have a less desirable flavor than those of smaller size. The size of the fish usually depends upon the magnitude of the body of water in which the species grow, the largest being in the lakes and oceans, the medium-size in rivers, and the smallest in brooks. Fish are known chiefly by their common names, and these names are different for the same species of fish in different parts of the country. For instance, the term trout covers a multitude of species, and, likewise, under the term sardine a large number of different species or varieties of fish are considered. There is also a large number of varieties known as salmon, perch, bass, etc.

In the following table are given the common and the scientific names of the principal food fishes used in the United States (see Report of U. S. Commission of Fish and Fisheries, 1888, pages 679-868):

Acipenseridæ: _Acipenser sturio oxyrhynchus_, Sturgeon. _Catostomidæ_: _Moxostoma velatum_, Small-mouthed red-horse. _Clupeidæ_: _Clupea harengus_, Herring. _pilchardus_, Sardine. _vernalis_, Alewife. _sapidissima_, Shad. _Salmonidæ_: _Osmerus mordax_, Smelt. _Coregonus clupeiformis_, Whitefish. sp., _tullibee_ or _artedi_, Ciscoe. _Oncorhynchus chouicha_, California salmon. _Salmo salar_, Salmon. subsp. _sebago_, Land-locked salmon. _Salvelinus namaycush_, Lake trout. _fontinalis_, Brook trout. _Esocidæ_: _Esox lucius_, Pike. _reticulatus_, Pickerel. _nobilior_, Muskellunge. _Anguillidæ_: _Anguilla rostrata_, Eel. _Mugilidæ_: _Mugil albula_, Mullet. _Scombridæ_: _Scomber scombrus_, Mackerel. _Scomberomorus maculatus_, Spanish mackerel. _Orcynus thynnus_, Tunny. _Carangidæ_: _Trachynotus carolinus_, Pompano. _Pomatomidæ_: _Pomatomus

saltatrix_, Bluefish. _Stromateidæ_: _Stromateus triacanthus_, Butter-fish. _Centrarchidæ_: _Micropterus salmoides_, Large-mouthed black bass. _dolomieu_, Small-mouthed black bass. _Percidæ_: _Perca fluviatilis_, Yellow perch. _Stizostedion vitreum_, Wall-eyed pike. _canadense_, Gray pike. _Serranidæ_: _Roccus lineatus_, Striped bass. _americanus_, White perch. _Centropristis atrarius_, Sea bass. _Epinephelus morio_, Red grouper. _Sparidæ_: _Lutjanus blackfordi_, Red snapper. _Stenotomus chrysops_, Porgy. _Diplodus probatocephalus_, Sheepshead. _Sciænidæ_: _Sciæna ocellata_, Red bass. _Menticirrus saxatilis_, Kingfish. _Cynoscion regale_, Weakfish. _Labridæ_: _Hiatula onitis_, Blackfish. _Gadidæ_: _Phycis chuss_, Hake. _Brosmius brosme_, Cusk. _Melanogrammus æglefinus_, Haddock. _Gadus morrhua_, Cod. _Microgadus tomcod_, Tomcod. _Pollachius virens_, Pollock. _Pleuronectidæ_: _Hippoglossus hippoglossus_, Halibut. _Platysomatichthys hippoglossoides_, Turbot. _Paralichthys dentatus_, Flounder. _Pseudopleuronectes americanus_, Flounder. _Petromyzontidæ_: _Petromyzon marinus_, Lamprey eel. _Raiidæ_: _Raia_ sp., Skate.

Some of the scientific names in the above list have been modified by recent research, but it is advisable to present the above classification for purpose of reference. The variations from these names will be given in the part of the discussion relating to the food value of fish, in which the classification of Jordan and Evermann is followed.

=Edible Portion of Fish.=--As in the case of other animals large parts of fish as taken from the water are inedible. In the preparation of fish the head is usually removed, especially if the fish be of any size, and the entrails rejected. If the fish be scaly, the scales are also removed. The latter vary very greatly in different specimens according to species, size, etc. Usually the edible portion of the fish is larger in quantity than the inedible, though this is not by any means universally the case. Taking fish of all kinds together it may be said that from 55 to 60 percent of the total weight is edible. This, of course, excludes the bones as well as the other portions already referred to.

=Principal Constituents of the Flesh of Fish.=--In the flesh of cattle, swine, and other edible animals already mentioned it is seen that the protein is the principal part of the edible portion. In many kinds of meat, however, the fat is the principal portion, as in bacon. In the flesh of fish the albuminoids occupy a more prominent part than in the flesh of domesticated animals or game. In other words the proportion of fat, which is one of the principal ingredients of the flesh of other animals, is less than in the other kinds of flesh. The protein in the water-free substance often constitutes over 90 percent of the total matter, and rarely falls below 80 percent. The next most important constituent of the dry flesh of fish naturally is the fat. The average content of fat in the dry flesh of fish is under 10,--it rarely goes above 20 and sometimes falls as low as 2 or 3 percent. The mineral content of the dry flesh of fish is quite constant. It rarely falls below 4 or goes above 8 percent; 5 percent may be regarded as a fair average content of mineral matter. The mineral matter consists chiefly of phosphate of potash and lime, together with some common salt. In the analyses made by Atwater, adopted in the following pages, he grouped together the fish analyzed in proportion to the quantity of the edible portion or flesh which they contained. Groupings were also made on account of the dry substance in the flesh and in proportion to the water and fat which they contained. These tables are of value showing in a general way the relative food importance of the different specimens of fish. This classification is given in the following table:

CLASSIFICATION OF FISHES BY PERCENTAGES OF FLESH, CHIEFLY MUSCULAR TISSUE IN ENTIRE BODY.

------------------------------+---------+---------- | NO. OF | |SPECIMENS| KINDS OF FISH. |ANALYZED.| FLESH. ------------------------------+---------+---------- _Containing 60 percent or over| |_Percent._ of flesh._ | | Spanish mackerel | 1 | 65.4 Salmon | 4 | 64.7 Red snapper | 1 | 60.0 | | _Containing between 60 and 70 | | percent of flesh._ | | Smelt | 2 | 58.1 Pike (pickerel) | 1 | 57.3 Cisco | 1 | 57.3 Butter-fish | 1 | 57.2 Spent salmon | 2 | 56.4 Mackerel | 5 | 55.4 Pompano | 2 | 54.5 Lamprey eel | 1 | 54.2 Herring | 1 | 54.0 Pickerel | 2 | 52.9 Spent land-locked salmon | 2 | 52.7 Turbot | 1 | 52.3 Brook trout | 3 | 51.9 Muskellunge | 1 | 50.8 Alewife | 2 | 50.5 | | _Containing between 50 and 40 | | percent of flesh._ | | Shad | 7 | 49.9 Weakfish | 1 | 48.1 Cod | 2 | 47.5 Whitefish | 1 | 46.5 Small-mouthed black bass | 1 | 46.4 Striped bass | 5 | 45.1 Large-mouthed black bass | 1 | 44.0 Sea bass | 1 | 43.9 Winter flounder | 1 | 43.8 Lake trout, “Mackinaw trout” | 1 | 43.7 Kingfish | 1 | 43.4 Pike perch, “Wall-eyed pike” | 1 | 42.8 Mullet | 1 | 42.1 Tomcod | 1 | 40.1 Porgy | 3 | 40.0 | | _Containing between 40 and 30 | | percent of flesh._ | | Blackfish | 2 | 39.9 White perch | 2 | 37.5 Yellow perch | 1 | 37.3 Pike perch | 1 | 36.8 Red bass | 1 | 36.5 Sheepshead | 1 | 34.0 Common flounder | 1 | 33.2 ------------------------------+---------+----------

CLASSIFICATION OF FISHES BY PROPORTIONS OF FAT IN THE FLESH OF SPECIMENS ANALYZED.

----------------------------+---------+----------+---------- | NO. OF | | |SPECIMENS| | KINDS OF FISH. |ANALYZED.| WATER. | FATS. ----------------------------+---------+----------+---------- _Containing over 5 percent | |_Percent._|_Percent._ of fats._ | | | California salmon

| 2 | 63.6 | 17.9 Turbot | 1 | 71.4 | 14.4 Salmon | 5 | 63.6 | 13.4 Lamprey eel | 1 | 71.1 | 13.3 Lake trout | 2 | 69.1 | 11.4 Butter-fish | 1 | 70.0 | 11.0 Herring | 1 | 69.0 | 11.0 Shad | 7 | 70.6 | 9.5 Spanish mackerel | 1 | 68.1 | 9.4 Salt-water eel | 2 | 71.6 | 9.1 Pompano | 2 | 72.8 | 7.6 Mackerel | 6 | 73.4 | 7.1 Whitefish | 1 | 69.8 | 6.5 Halibut | 3 | 75.4 | 5.2 Porgy | 3 | 75.0 | 5.1 | | | _Containing between 5 and | | | 2 percent of fats._ | | | Alewife | 2 | 74.4 | 4.9 Mullet | 1 | 74.9 | 4.6 White perch | 2 | 75.7 | 4.1 Sheepshead | 2 | 75.6 | 3.7 Spent salmon | 2 | 76.7 | 3.6 Cisco | 1 | 76.2 | 3.5 Spent land-locked salmon | 2 | 78.5 | 3.0 Striped bass | 6 | 77.7 | 2.8 Muskellunge | 1 | 76.3 | 2.5 Small-mouthed black bass | 1 | 74.8 | 2.4 Weakfish | 1 | 79.0 | 2.4 Small-mouthed red-horse | 1 | 78.6 | 2.4 Brook trout | 3 | 77.7 | 2.1 | | | _Containing less than 2, the | | | _majority less than 1 percent| | | of fats._ | | | Sturgeon | 1 | 78.7 | 1.9 Smelt | 2 | 79.2 | 1.8 Skate | 1 | 82.2 | 1.4 Blackfish | 4 | 79.1 | 1.4 Bluefish | 1 | 78.5 | 1.3 Red snapper | 3 | 78.5 | 1.0 Large-mouthed black bass | 1 | 78.6 | 1.0 Kingfish | 1 | 79.2 | 1.0 Pollock | 1 | 76.0 | 0.8 Yellow perch | 2 | 79.3 | 0.8 Pike perch, gray pike | 1 | 80.9 | 0.8 Hake | 1 | 83.1 | 0.7 Common flounder | 2 | 84.2 | 0.7 Grouper | 2 | 79.4 | 0.6 Pike (pickerel?) | 1 | 79.8 | 0.6 Sea bass | 1 | 79.3 | 0.5 Pike perch, wall-eyed pike | 1 | 79.7 | 0.5 Pickerel | 2 | 79.7 | 0.5 Red bass | 1 | 81.6 | 0.5 Tomcod | 1 | 81.6 | 0.4 Cod | 5 | 82.6 | 0.4 Winter flounder | 1 | 84.4 | 0.4 Haddock | 4 | 81.7 | 0.3 Cusk | 1 | 82.0 | 0.2 ----------+---------+----------+----------

CLASSIFICATION OF FISHES BY PROPORTIONS OF WATER-FREE SUBSTANCE IN THE FLESH OF SPECIMENS ANALYZED.

----------+---------+---------- | NO. OF | |SPECIMENS|WATER-FREE KINDS OF FISH. |ANALYZED.|SUBSTANCE. ----------+---------+---------- _Containing over 30 percent of | |_Percent._ water-free substance._ | | California salmon | 2 | 36.4 Salmon | 5 | 36.4 Spanish mackerel | 1 | 31.9 Herring | 1 | 31.0 Lake trout | 2 | 30.9 Whitefish | 1 | 30.2 | | _Containing from 30 to 25 percent| | of water-free substance._ | | Butter-fish | 1 | 30.0 Shad | 7 | 29.4 Lamprey eel | 1 | 28.9 Turbot | 1 | 28.6 Salt-water eel | 2 | 28.4 Pompano | 2 | 27.2 Mackerel | 6 | 26.6 Alewife | 2 | 25.6 Small-mouthed black bass | 1 | 25.2 Mullet | 1 | 25.1 Porgy | 3 | 25.0 | | _Containing between 25 and 20_ | | percent of water-free substance._| | Halibut | 3 | 24.6 Sheepshead | 2 | 24.5 White perch | 2 | 24.3 Pollock | 1 | 24.0 Cisco | 1 | 23.9 Muskellunge | 1 | 23.7 Spent salmon | 2 | 23.3 Striped bass | 6 | 22.3 Brook trout | 3 | 22.3 Bluefish | 1 | 21.5 Red snapper | 3 | 21.5 Spent land-locked salmon | 2 | 21.5 Small-mouthed red-horse | 1 | 21.4 Large-mouthed black bass | 1 | 21.4 Sturgeon | 1 | 21.3 Weakfish | 1 | 21.0 Blackfish | 4 | 20.9 Smelt | 2 | 20.8 Kingfish | 1 | 20.8 Yellow perch | 2 | 20.8 Sea bass | 1 | 20.7 Grouper | 2 | 20.6 Pickerel | 2 | 20.3 Pike perch, “wall-eyed pike” | 1 | 20.3 Pike (pickerel?) | 1 | 20.2 | | _Containing between 20 and 15 | | percent of water-free substance._| | Pike perch, gray pike | 1 | 19.2 Tomcod | 1 | 18.5 Red bass | 1 | 18.4 Haddock | 4 | 18.3 Cusk | 1 | 18.0 Skate | 1 | 17.9 Cod | 5 | 17.4 Hake | 1 | 16.9 Common flounder | 2 | 15.8 Winter flounder | 1 | 15.7 ----------+---------+----------

In the scientific names of the food fishes described in the following pages and in the description of their habits, methods of spawning, geographic distribution, etc., the classification of Jordan and Evermann[15] has been followed.

[15] “American Food and Game Fishes,” by Jordan and Evermann, 1 vol., large 8vo, pp. i to l + 1 to 572. Twelve colored plates and several hundred full-page plates from photographs from life and text-figures. Doubleday, Page & Co., New York.

=Alewives.=--A fish belonging to a genus very close to that to which the herring belongs is known as alewife. The name of the genus is _Pomolobus_. It is commonly known as a herring. For instance, the fresh-water skipjack or blue herring,--the tailor herring or hickory shad,--and the real alewife or branch herring are all common species of this genus. One specimen of this genus is the fresh-water skipjack or blue herring (_Pomolobus chrysochloris_) found in the larger streams in the Mississippi valley and also in Lake Erie and Lake Michigan. It is strictly a fresh-water fish, but has also been found in salt water on the Gulf coast. The tailor herring is found along the Atlantic coast from Cape Cod to Florida. In the Potomac river it is known as tailor shad or “fresh-water tailor,” and is highly esteemed as a food fish in Washington and vicinity. Their value is found rather in their coming earlier than the shad than in their true value, for as soon as the shad come in great abundance there is no longer any market for the alewife.

Composition of Alewife.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 74.41 percent Protein, 19.17 „ 75.87 percent Fat, 4.92 „ 19.08 „ Ash, 1.47 „ 5.78 „

This fish, it is seen, has very much less oil in it than the true herring,--in fact, only a little more than one-half as much. It, however, has a correspondingly larger percentage of protein.

The tailor herring and hickory shad are distributed along the coast from Cape Cod to Florida. The branch herring (_Pomolobus pseudoharengus_) is found along the Atlantic coast as far south as Charleston, entering fresh-water streams to spawn, usually two or three weeks ahead of the shad. It occurs also in Lake Ontario and in several of the small lakes in northern New York in which it is

land-locked. The summer herring (_Pomolobus æstivalis_) also occurs along the Atlantic coast.

=Anchovy.=--The anchovy is a small fish which is eaten more as a relish in the pickled state than in the fresh state, and is highly prized by many connoisseurs. Anchovies of various species are found on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts,--on the Atlantic coast from Cape Cod to Brazil and on the western coast from southern California southward. These fish reach a length of from 2 to 7 inches. The very small ones are sometimes known as “whitebait.” Those that are pickled and used for food are usually from 3 to 6 inches in length.

Composition of Preserved Anchovies.--

Water, 57.8 percent Protein, 22.3 „ Fat, 2.2 „ Ash (principally salt), 23.7 „

=Black Bass.=--Two species of black bass are well known to the American fisherman and to the American cuisine. The one is called the small-mouth black bass (_Micropterus dolomieu_) and the other the large-mouth black bass (_Micropterus salmoides_). These fishes are found in the fresh waters of the United States, especially in the northern portion, almost everywhere. Both species have been propagated both by the National and State Fish Commissions. Especially have they been introduced into the northeastern waters where they originally did not occur, or only in small numbers.

=Bluefish.=--The bluefish (family Pomatomidæ) is one of the valuable food fishes of our Atlantic coast. It is a voracious, carnivorous fish, and apparently loves to destroy as well as to eat. It is stated that the bluefish copies after the style which was once said to be in vogue in Rome, viz., when its stomach is filled it disgorges it for the purpose of eating a new ration. The size of the bluefish runs from 3 to 5 pounds, though occasionally very much larger examples are taken. As a food fish it is said to rank in the estimation of the connoisseur with pompano and Spanish mackerel. The bluefish is one of the popular fishes in all the large markets of the Atlantic coast. The flesh has a fine flavor, but, like the pompano, it does not keep well.

Composition.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 78.46 percent Protein, 19.02 „ 90.13 percent Fat, 1.25 „ 5.79 „ Ash, 1.27 „ 5.91 „

A comparison of the flesh of this fish with the pompano shows that it is particularly a protein food, the fat being even less abundant than the mineral matter. It, therefore, is not so well balanced a ration as the flesh of the pompano and other fish in which the fat forms a considerable portion of the edible matter.

=Carp.=--The carp is a fish used very largely for food purposes, but it has not the fine flavor and character of most fishes. The carp cultivated in America is known as the German carp (_Cyprinus carpio_).

The carp belongs to the large family of fishes known as the minnows or Cyprinidæ. This family is a large one, having about 200 genera and more than 1000 species, all of which are inhabitants of fresh water in North America and Eurasia. None of this family is highly regarded as food in the sense of flavor and aroma, except, perhaps, some of the smaller species. The nutritive value of the carp, however, is probably as great as that of any, but it is coarser and less attractive to the taste. Some of the most common species of this family are the dace, fallfish, river chub, creek chub, squaw-fish, and roach.

=Catfish.=--Catfish, of which there are many species, belong to the family of Siluridæ, and are among the most common fresh-water fishes found in the United States. They occur in small as well as large fresh-water streams and lakes, and it is one of the species which the American boy most delights in catching with hook and line. The catfish is most conveniently taken after night, and the smouldering fire and small boy on the bank of a stream is a frequent picture of American country life. There are more than 100 genera of the catfish family and about 1000 species. Only about one-third of the species inhabit salt water. The North American fresh-water species are confined particularly to the Atlantic coast, the Mississippi valley, and the Gulf states. There are no native species of the catfish in the fresh waters of the Pacific coast. The blue catfish, known as the Mississippi catfish, is the most prominent species (_Ictalurus furcatus_). It is found particularly in the Mississippi river and its large tributaries. Sometimes it grows to an immense size, individuals having been found reaching 150 pounds in weight. If the stream in which the catfish lives runs north and south it will be found in the southern part of the stream in the winter and in the northern part in summer. This fish is highly prized for edible purposes. In the small streams the catfish is correspondingly small and weighs from less than one pound to two or three pounds only. The small catfish, especially in the small streams tributary to the Ohio and Mississippi, has edible properties which are far superior to the large catfish growing in the rivers themselves.

The catfish of the small streams and lakes are commonly known as bullheads, since the head is large and wide. The name of the most common or best known species is _Ameirus nebulosus_. This species is found from Maine westward and southward. In Pennsylvania it is known as the Schuylkill cat, and everywhere generally throughout the country as a small catfish.

=Codfish.=--One of the most famous food fish of the American waters is the codfish. It is a widely distributed fish. There are said to be about 25 genera and 140 species. The codfish is particularly a fish of the northern waters. Only one genus is found in fresh-water lakes and streams.

=The Common Cod.=--The common codfish (family Gadidæ) is the species _Gadus callarias_. It is rarely found south of the Virginia coast, but is especially abundant off the New England and Newfoundland coast. The great center of the codfish industry is in the vicinity of Newfoundland. Gloucester, Massachusetts, is the principal town devoted to the codfish industry in the United States. The cod is an omnivorous fish and especially fond of crustaceans, mollusks, and small fish. It also eats vegetation, and it is stated by Jordan and Evermann that all sorts of things have been found in cod stomachs, such as oil cans, finger rings, rubber dolls, rocks, pieces of clothing, etc. The livers of the cod, especially those of Norwegian origin, are extremely valuable, being the source of cod liver oil, which is considered by many to be the most valuable medicinal food known. Cod liver oil, while not palatable, is highly nutritious. The cod livers contain, according to some authorities, over 60 distinct chemical substances, many of which are highly important for their medicinal qualities. The cod move in schools, but not in such dense bodies as the mackerel, herring, and menhaden. Their movements are largely controlled by the temperature of the water and their desire for food. This species probably does not reach a greater length than 3 feet and a weight of more than 25 pounds. The average weight of the large-size cod in New England waters is about 15 pounds and on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland 20 pounds. The average weight of the small-size cod in these waters is about 12 pounds. It is one of the most prolific of fishes. The ovaries of a 21-pound cod were found to contain 2,700,000 eggs and of a 75-pound cod 9,100,000 eggs. The eggs are very small and require about 337,000 to make a quart. The cod is one of the most valuable of all fishes from a commercial point of view and also on account of international relations. On some occasions this country has apparently been on the verge of war with Great Britain respecting questions relating to the fisheries on the banks of Newfoundland. The U. S. Bureau of Fisheries has probably done more to propagate the cod than any other variety of fish. More than five hundred million cod fry have been liberated at different times by the Bureau and the number in one year has approximated 100,000,000. The color of the common cod is green or brown, but is subject to very great variations,--sometimes it is yellow or red and a variety of tints are assumed.

Composition.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 82.64 percent Protein, 15.77 „ 95.13 percent Fat, .36 „ 2.07 „ Ash, 1.23 „ 7.08 „

These data show that the flesh of cod fish is perhaps the most exclusively nitrogenous of any of the more abundant food fish. The quantity of fat contained therein is less than ½■■ of the total weight. The flesh of the fresh cod is more largely composed of water than that of the ordinary fish, containing approximately 83 percent of that substance. The flesh of the cod itself is an unbalanced ration, and needs to be eaten with butter and potatoes in order to make a complete ration. The hake, which is sometimes substituted for the cod without the knowledge of the purchaser, has very much the same chemical constituents, containing--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 83.11 percent Protein, 15.24 „ 91.00 percent Fat, .67 „ 3.97 „ Ash, .96 „ 5.77 „

It is seen that there is very little difference in the chemical composition of these two fishes. This, however, does not justify the substitution of the hake for the cod, inasmuch as the hake is inferior in palatability to the cod.

=Salted and Dried Cod.=--In the United States the cod is particularly devoted to the use of curing and salting, and in this cured state is even more highly valued, especially for the making of codfish balls, than it is in its fresh state. The old-fashioned method of salting and smoking produced a flesh of very high flavor, yielding under proper treatment in the kitchen a most delicious base for the fish ball. Under the modern system of quick curing, the salting and smoking have largely disappeared and the fish are cured in brine, and with the help of borax a product is produced which is less palatable than the old-fashioned cured fish.

Composition of dry Salted and Dried Cod.--

Protein, 45.65 percent Fat, .53 „ Salt, 53.82 „

These data show that more than half of the weight in the water-free state is composed of salt. The codfish is also put up as boned fish in which nothing but the flesh is found, as desiccated cod, as shredded codfish and in various other forms.

Average Composition of Codfish Balls.--

Water, 65.43 percent Solids, 34.57 „ Nitrogen, 1.05 „ Phosphoric acid, .25 „ Sulfur, .10 „ Fat, 7.84 „ Ash, 4.05 „ Protein, 6.58 „

The difference between the composition of the fish balls and the average composition of fish is clearly brought out by the data recorded. In the average composition of fish the sum of the fat, ash, and protein is greater than the solids obtained by difference by 0.36 percent. In the codfish balls the sum of the ingredients mentioned is less than the solids by difference by 16.10 per cent. This is due to the added potato, salt, etc.

Average Composition of Shredded Codfish.--

Water, 46.52 percent Ash (chiefly salt), 22.81 „ Fat, .33 „ Protein, 30.85 „

=Eels.=--The common eel is a fish which is extremely long in proportion to its size and gives the general appearance, to the uninitiated, of a snake. The resemblance of the eel to a snake in shape is probably one of the reasons why it is not more highly valued as a food. The eels, perhaps, are not to be considered as true fish. The common eel (_Anguilla chrysypa_) is widely distributed throughout most parts of the United States, especially the eastern part. It extends southward as far as the West Indies, and is found in more or less abundance on the Gulf coast. Although a salt-water fish, it differs from most other eels in its penchant for ascending fresh-water streams. It often goes to the very headwaters, especially in the rivers of the Atlantic coast and Mississippi valley. Eels are often found in lakes which seem to have had no communication with the sea, which shows that they are able to surmount barriers which seem impossible to cross. Jordan and Evermann claim that the eel is really a fresh-water fish and that its real home is in the fresh-water rivers and lakes, and that it runs down to salt water only at spawning time, thus showing a quality or characteristic exactly opposite to that of the salmon and shad, which are true salt-water fish and come into fresh waters for spawning. Eels, like the carp, are more or less scavengers, feeding upon all manner of refuse, especially dead fish. They are very destructive of other fish, especially of young shad and herring. When nets are placed for shad and herring and the fish are caught therein the eels often invade the net, and when it is drawn it is filled largely with the skeletons of the fish, the flesh of which has been removed by the eels. Eels have a high value as food fish, both on account of their nutritive value and their flavor. The average length of the eel is from 2 to 3 feet, though much larger examples are sometimes found.

Composition of the Eel.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 71.60 percent Protein, 18.28 „ 65.25 percent Fat, 9.11 „ 31.92 „ Ash, 1.01 „ 3.60 „

These data show that the eel is rather richer in fat than the majority of fish, although there are some that exceed it in this constituent.

=Conger Eel.=--The conger eel belongs to the family Leptocephalidæ. It inhabits salt water only, is scaleless, and grows to much larger sizes than the common eel, sometimes as long as 7 or 8 feet. It is not used for food in the United States, but is to some extent in Europe and the West Indies. On the east coast of the United States they do not occur very frequently. Only a few species are known, and these are of small extent and have little food value.

=Summer Flounder.=--This fish (_Paralichthys dentatus_) is quite abundant on the Atlantic coast, frequenting the coast from Cape Cod to the Carolinas. It reaches a length of from 2 to 3 feet and has a weight of about 15 pounds. It is caught very extensively off the New England coast. The principal fishing grounds are in the region of Block Island, Marthas Vineyard, and the eastern end of Long Island. There is another species known as the southern flounder (_Paralichthys lethostigmus_), which flourishes from Charleston southward, and is found along the entire Gulf coast. There is also another species on the Gulf coast called the Gulf flounder (_Paralichthys albiguttus_). There is also a wide flounder or common flatfish (_Paralichthys americanus_). It is found on the coast of Labrador and extends down to the Carolinas. It is especially abundant along the coast of southern New England. It is a small species, rarely being over 20 inches in length, the average length being from 12 to 15 inches, and weighs from 2 to 3 pounds. This species of flounder has been extensively propagated by the U. S. Bureau of Fisheries, as many as 100,000,000 fry having been planted in one season.

Composition of Summer Flounder.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 84.21 percent Protein, 13.82 „ 89.03 percent Fat, .69 „ 4.46 „ Ash, 1.28 „ 8.15 „

The flesh of this fish is particularly rich in water and poor in fat.

=Graylings.=--The graylings belong to a family very closely resembling the Salmonidæ. They occur chiefly in northern or Arctic waters. One species found in Michigan is known as the Michigan grayling. It is a fish that is not only distinguished on account of its food value but also on account of its graceful shape and pleasing appearance. Another species occurs in Montana, and has been distributed very largely by the Bureau of Fisheries. It is not a fish which is of any great economic importance.

=The Haddock.=--This is a fish very nearly related to the cod, but it has a smaller mouth and differs in other essentials, particularly in its chemical constituents, from the cod. The haddock has a food value which is probably not inferior to that of the cod. It is one of our most abundant fishes, and by some consumers the flesh is preferred to that of the cod. The usual weight of the haddock is about 3 or 4 pounds. It is, therefore, a much smaller fish than the cod. The species is _Melanogrammus æglefinus_. On the Atlantic coast it does not occur north of the Straits of Belle Isle. The haddock is particularly abundant on the Massachusetts coast in summer. Like the cod, the haddock is well suited for salting, smoking, and curing in various ways. It, however, has not been used to such an extent as the cod for those purposes, finding a more ready market in the fresh state.

Composition.--

Water, 81.69 percent Protein, 16.83 „ Fat, .25 „ Ash, 1.23 „

In the dry substance.

Protein, 93.89 percent Fat, 1.34 „ Ash, 6.76 „

The flesh of the haddock, it is seen, is even more exclusively nitrogenous than that of the cod. The two species resemble each other very closely in composition.

=The Hake.=--There are several species of hakes, family Merluccidæ. The common European hake is the species _Merluccius merluccius_. The hake which is found mostly in American waters is _Merluccius productus_, and occurs very abundantly on the Pacific coast and is largely eaten as food. The flesh, however, is rather coarse and not very palatable. Another species which is found on our Atlantic coast from New England northward is _Merluccius bilinearis_.

=Halibut.=--The halibut (_Hippoglossus hippoglossus_) is a fish which is highly esteemed and occurs in great quantities. It is a fish which frequents northern waters, and especially the North Atlantic on the American coast. It has not been taken south of Montauk Point, but extends as far north as the coast of Greenland, and is also found about Iceland and Spitzbergen in a latitude of 80 degrees. It does not like water above 45 degrees F., and is often found in water at the freezing point, namely, 32 degrees. The halibut is also found on the Pacific coast, especially off Oregon and Washington and in British Columbia and Alaska. It is one of the largest of food fish. The fish weighing about 80 pounds are considered the best for food, although the halibut sometimes reaches a weight of over 500 pounds. The male is always smaller than the female and less palatable. The annual value of the halibut fisheries on the North Atlantic coast is probably ¾■ million dollars. It is probably slightly more than this on the Pacific coast,--in fact the Pacific coast fisheries have grown so extensively that halibut is shipped eastward across the continent. Vast freight trains known as the “Halibut Express” have been sent across the continent from Vancouver to Boston, making the trip in six or seven days.

Composition.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 75.42 percent Protein, 18.35 „ 77.18 percent Fat, 5.17 „ 19.32 „ Ash, 1.06 „ 4.39 „

The halibut is a fish containing considerable quantities of fat, and is not so peculiarly nitrogenous in its character as the cod or the haddock. It, therefore, makes a better balanced ration than either of the other fish. The halibut in the fresh state is esteemed fully as highly as the cod, and the halibut steak is a very common part of the fish sold upon the market.

=Herring.=--The herrings form a very important group of fishes belonging to the family Clupeidæ. There are about 30 genera in the family and 150 species. The herrings are essentially salt-water fishes and are usually found in large schools. Many species, and some of these the most valuable for food, ascend fresh-water streams for spawning. Certain species, for instance, are caught at the same season as the shad in the Chesapeake and Susquehanna. There are a few species which remain permanently in fresh water.

The common herring (_Clupea harengus_) is one of the most important of the food fishes of the whole Atlantic coast, and really over almost all the north Atlantic, throughout which it is generally distributed. The principal herring fisheries are in the North Sea, in Denmark and Norway. Important fisheries are also found off the coast of Great Britain, Belgium, France, and the United States. It is estimated that as many as three billion herring may be found in a shoal covering a dozen square miles. Herring shoals of much larger extent are on record. The herring do not frequent southern waters, but are found in the cool and more northern waters of the Atlantic. On the coast of the United States it has been found as far south as Cape Hatteras, though it does not occur very abundantly further south than New England. The fish at the period of spawning are considered the most valuable for food purposes.

The herring is either sold in a fresh state or it may be smoked, salted, or pickled, and in this condition is very extensively used as food. A species of herring is found on the Pacific coast known as California herring (_Clupea pallasii_). It does not differ very greatly in its general aspect from its relation on the Atlantic coast. This species occurs very abundantly in the region of Puget Sound, especially in summer time, and in southeast Alaska. They are extremely abundant in San Francisco markets in the spring time, so much so that it is difficult to find a sale for them.

The California herring are more highly valued and bring the highest price in the early winter, when they are the fattest.

Composition of Herring.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 69.03 percent Protein, 18.46 „ 61.69 percent Fat, 11.01 „ 35.55 „ Ash, 1.50 „ 4.83 „

The above data show that the flesh of herring is particularly rich in fat. In fact the herring is sometimes used as a source of oil. In southeast Alaska are extensive oil and guano works which utilize the herring for these purposes.

=Horse Mackerel.=--Another species belonging to the mackerel family is the horse mackerel or tuna (_Thunnus thynnus_), which is found in considerable abundance on our North Atlantic coast and on the coast of southern California. Its common name is “tuna,” “tunny,” “horse mackerel,” or “great albacore.” The horse mackerel is a fish of very great size and is the very largest of the whole mackerel family. They occasionally attain a length of 10 feet or more and a weight of 1500 pounds. The average dimensions, of course, are very much less than this. The horse mackerel does not grow so large in Europe or upon the Pacific coast. In these regions a horse mackerel weighing 500 pounds is considered of an extraordinary size. The very large ones are never taken with hook and line, but there are records of fish of over 200 pounds that have been captured in this way.

=The Hogfish.=--The hogfish of the West Indies and our southern coasts is another of the wrasse-fishes whose scientific name is _Lachnolaimus maximus_. It is called in Porto Rico “el capitan.” It often reaches a weight of 20 pounds and a length of from 2 to 3 feet. The name “hogfish” doubtless is derived from the shape of the head, which resembles somewhat that of the hog. It is valued as a food fish throughout the West Indies.

=Lake Herring.=--The so-called lake herring is very closely related to the whitefish. The name of the species is _Argyrosomus artedi_. The lake herring has a large number of common names, of which the most widely applied is the term “Cisco.” The terms blueback, greenback, and grayback are also applied to these herring. The habitat of this fish is that of the whole region of the Great Lakes and north to Hudson Bay. It has much the same habitat as the whitefish. The average weight of the lake herring is about one pound. The subspecies (_Argyrosomus artedi sisco_) is found in Lake Tippecanoe and other small lakes in Wisconsin and northern Indiana.

Composition of Cisco.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 76.15 percent Protein, 19.12 „ 80.75 percent Fat, 3.48 „ 14.59 „ Ash, 1.25 „ 5.25 „

=Mackerel.=--The mackerel is a food fish which is very commonly used in a cured state in the interior of the country and is eaten fresh on the sea coast. Its habitat is principally the North Atlantic ocean. On the coast of the United States it is found from Cape Hatteras north to the Strait of Belle Isle. In Europe it is found from Norway southward to the Mediterranean and Adriatic. The mackerel on the Atlantic coast usually appear first in the spring near Cape Hatteras and following the custom of the shad are found later farther north in the New England states and also in the British possessions. They leave the coast in the inverse order in the autumn, disappearing first in the northern regions and later in the southern portion.

The mackerel is one of the most abundant of fishes in the Atlantic Ocean, traveling in immense schools. There is record of a school which was seen in 1848 which was at least half a mile wide and 20 miles long. In some seasons the mackerel is extremely abundant and in others very scarce. The average catch is probably about 300,000 barrels. Boston and Gloucester are centers of the mackerel fishing industry. It is estimated that from 150 to 300 vessels of American bottoms are engaged in the mackerel industry. The U. S. Bureau of Fisheries has been particularly interested in the propagation of mackerel, but the result has not been as satisfactory as in the case of many other fishes. The young mackerel or small fishes are known as “spikes,” “blinkers,” and “tinkers.” When they are about two years old they measure from 5 to 9 inches in length. The mackerel attains its full size at about the fourth year. The scientific name of the common mackerel is _Scomber scombrus_ Linnæus.

Composition of Mackerel.--Edible portion:

FRESH. DRY. Water, 73.37 percent Protein, 18.26 „ 71.71 percent Fat, 7.09 „ 24.88 „ Ash, 1.28 „ 4.78 „

The above data show that the flesh of the mackerel is composed of about two-thirds protein and one-third fat and ash.

Pickled mackerel, salted mackerel, and smoked mackerel are perhaps as highly valued for food purposes as the fresh fish itself.

=Menhaden.=--The menhaden is not used chiefly as a food fish but to some extent therefor. It is one of the most abundant fishes taken upon our Atlantic coast and is used almost exclusively as a source of oil, the residue being dried and ground for fertilizing purposes. In this sense it has great value because of the high nitrogen content of the residue and also of the considerable quantity of phosphoric acid which is contained therein.

The menhaden is known scientifically as _Brevoortia tyrannus_. Up to 1880 immense quantities of menhaden were taken off the Atlantic coast. Since that time the supply has not been considered so great. In the year 1877 it is stated by Jordan and Evermann that one oil company took 20 million fish and in one town alone, namely Booth Bay, 50 million fish were caught.

The fecundity of the menhaden is very great, exceeding that of the shad. More than 140,000 eggs have been taken from a single fish. The menhaden are not eaten very extensively in a fresh state as food but preserved in salt they have a considerable value for that purpose. An extract has also been made from the flesh of the menhaden on the same principle of manufacture as is utilized in preparation of meat extracts. The menhaden is known under a great number of common names, some thirty of which have been enumerated by Dr. Goode.

Composition of Menhaden.--

Water, 77.15 percent Fat, 3.91 „ Protein by difference, 18.94 „

The water-free flesh contains (including bones) 21.7 percent of mineral matter.

Composition of the Mineral Matter.--

Lime, 8.67 percent Phosphoric acid, 7.78 „ Silicic acid, 1.33 „ Potash, 1.54 „ Soda, 1.02 „ Magnesia, 0.67 „ Chlorin, 0.69 „ ----- Total, 21.70 „

=Mullet.=--The mullet belongs to the Mugilidæ, an important family of fishes in which there are several genera and species. The mullet is not particular about its food but is in the habit of swallowing large quantities of mud, or rather partially swallowing it and separating the refuse and most obnoxious particles by means of the gills. The common mullet or striped mullet (_Mugil cephalus_) is a widely distributed species. This fish is common along the Atlantic coast and in Hawaii, usually traveling in large schools, and is most abundant in the shallow waters of the coast. It sometimes reaches a length of two feet and is an important food fish. The mullet is very abundant on the Florida coasts. While the mullet may be regarded as a scavenger, living principally on mud, it does not eat any other species of fish, but is itself eaten by nearly all fishes that can gain access to it.

Composition of the Mullet.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 74.87 percent Protein, 19.32 „ 77.50 percent Fat, 4.64 „ 18.45 „ Ash, 1.17 „ 4.66 „

=Muskallunge.=--A very noted member of this family is the muskallunge (_Esox masquinongy_). It is a native of the Great Lakes and is especially found in the upper St. Lawrence. It is not a very abundant fish, but is highly prized from the angler’s point of view.

It is of very great size, having been found as long as 8 feet and weighing over 100 pounds. Two other species of muskallunge are known, one (_Esox ohiensis_ or the Chautauqua muskallunge) in the Ohio river basin, particularly in Lake Chautauqua, where it has been artificially propagated with great success, and the unspotted muskallunge (_Esox immaculatus_), which occurs sparingly in certain small lakes of northern Wisconsin and Minnesota.

Composition of the Muskallunge.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 76.26 percent Protein, 19.63 „ 84.87 percent Fat, 2.54 „ 10.70 „ Ash, 1.57 „ 6.63 „

The flesh of the muskallunge, as is seen, contains about four times as much fat as that of the pickerel, and forms a ration which is not so unbalanced as that of the pickerel itself.

=Pickerel or Pike.=--One species (_Esox reticulatus_) is of common occurrence along the Atlantic coast and also in the fresh-water streams of the southern interior portions of the country. The pike of the Great Lakes belongs to the species _Esox lucius_ Linnæus. It is found in the fresh waters of North America, Europe, and Asia, but is not found on the Pacific coast except in Alaska. It reaches in some cases a large size, having been found as much as 4 feet in length and weighing 40 to 50 pounds. The Kankakee in northern Indiana is a well-known fishing ground for this species of pike.

Composition of Pickerel.--Edible portion:

FRESH. DRY. Water, 79.68 percent Protein, 18.64 „ 92.15 percent Fat, .50 „ 2.48 „ Ash, 1.18 „ 5.80 „

The flesh of the pickerel, as is seen, is almost a pure type of protein. The fat falls to an insignificant quantity, being only about half as much as the ash.

=Wall-eyed Pike.=--The wall-eyed pike or pike perch (_Stizostedion vitreum_) is a fish most abundant in Lake Champlain, the Great Lakes, and in eastern Canadian lakes; it occurs also in certain small lakes and streams in the upper Mississippi valley. In some localities it is known as the salmon or jack salmon, but of course these are misnomers.

Composition.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 75.71 percent Protein, 19.03 „ 79.31 percent Fat, 4.07 „ 16.74 „ Ash, 1.19 „ 4.92 „

=Common Pompano.=--The pompano (family Carangidæ) is one of the food fishes which is most highly esteemed along the Gulf coast. It has been found as far north as Cape Cod on the Atlantic coast, but does not occur in sufficient numbers to make it of any economic value as a food fish north of Florida. It is taken chiefly in the Gulf waters. The average weight of the pompano is from 2 to 3 pounds, though very much larger examples are sometimes found. As a food fish there is none that is regarded more highly than the pompano, especially when it is eaten fresh from the water and prepared in the manner of the creole cooks of New Orleans.

Composition.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 72.78 percent Protein, 18.65 „ 72.37 percent Fat, 7.57 „ 24.46 „ Ash, 1.00 „ 3.82 „

These data show that the edible portion of the pompano is valued both for its protein and its fat. The latter exists in quantities of approximately one-third of the former. It is not so much its nutritive value which makes the pompano desirable as a food fish but the extreme delicacy of flavor and the richness of its taste. It does not bear shipping well, and therefore is found in its greatest perfection only near the place where it is taken.

In New Orleans and in Florida the pompano is one of the principal food fishes furnished by the high-class hotels and restaurants to their guests.

=Red Snapper.=--The red snapper (_Lutianus aya_) is the most noted fish of all the snapper family (Lutianidæ), although there are others which are highly prized, such as the gray snapper. It sometimes reaches a length of two or three feet and a weight of from 10 to 35 pounds. It is particularly abundant in the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico and off the west coast of Florida. The red snapper bears shipping better than most of the Gulf fish, and Pensacola is one of the principal points where the fish are packed in ice as soon as possible after capture and dispatched to northern markets.

Composition.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 78.46 percent Protein, 19.20 „ 91.75 percent Fat, 1.03 „ 4.70 „ Ash, 1.31 „ 6.05 „

This is another one of the fishes in which the edible portion is almost exclusively protein, the fat appearing only in small quantities.

=Rock Bass=; =Redeye=; =Goggle-eye= (_Ambloplites rupestris_).--The rock bass is a very common fish particularly abundant in the fresh waters of the northern central portions of the United States. It is the fish which the American boy, living near small streams, most delights to catch. The size of the rock bass varies largely according to the magnitude of the body of water in which it lives. The average weight of the fish in streams of ordinary size is probably about a pound, though often it is considerably more. The rock bass has been propagated to some extent by the Bureau of Fisheries and has been introduced into waters where it formerly did not occur.

=Salmon.=--The salmon is one of the most important food fishes of the United States. It belongs to the genus _Oncorhynchus_. The five species of this genus are, in America, confined to our Pacific coast. Of these species the one known as blueback or sockeye is found most abundantly in the Fraser and Columbia rivers and in Alaska, the silver salmon in Puget Sound, the chinook salmon in the Columbia, and the dog salmon along the coast from California to Bering Sea. The salmon begin running early in the spring and the early run is considered of greater value than the later. The habits of the salmon in the deep waters of the ocean are not very well known. It is only when they come into fresh water for spawning purposes that their life history can be well studied. It is believed, however, that they do not go very far from the shore. The run of salmon on the Pacific coast usually begins about the latter part of March and lasts through the spring and greater part of the summer. On account of the great abundance of these fish on the Pacific coast and the distance from large markets the canning industry has developed with great rapidity. In fact on the Pacific coast the product of salmon fishing is devoted almost exclusively to canning purposes. In the canning of salmon no particular care is taken, and perhaps none at all to designate upon the can whether its contents are of the early salmon or the later, less valuable run. It is claimed by many authorities that the salmon of the Pacific coast of America, taken all together in their relation to the economic problem of fish food, are the most important and valuable fish in the world.

Composition of a Pacific Coast Species.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 63.61 percent Protein, 17.46 „ 52.31 percent Fat, 17.87 „ 49.05 „ Ash, 1.06 „ 2.92 „

Composition of Atlantic Salmon.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 63.61 percent Protein, 21.60 „ 61.45 percent Fat, 13.38 „ 36.88 „ Ash, 1.41 „ 3.81 „

The above data show that the Pacific salmon are richer in fat than the Atlantic salmon. In fact in the edible portion of the fish the fat is almost as great as the protein.

Another species of Pacific salmon is the humpback salmon (_Oncorhynchus gorbuscha_), which appears in great abundance in the rivers of Alaska, but not every year,--usually coming in larger quantities in alternating years. As a fish to be eaten fresh, this is one of the very best of the salmons. Owing to the pale color of the flesh, this species does not hold as high a rank for canning purposes. It cans well, however, and the product is very palatable and doubtless very nutritious. The trade-name of the canned product is “pink salmon,” as its flesh is of a paler color than that of the chinook salmon or red salmon. Another species is known as dog salmon. It is found in considerable abundance from California northward to Bering Strait, spawning usually late in the fall. It is considered as the least valuable for food purposes, although it is now coming to be used very extensively by freezing, in which form it finds a ready market both in this country and abroad. When canned it is put on the market as “chum.” Its chief interest at the present time is on account of the fact that it is sometimes sold under the names of better species.

=Chinook Salmon= (_Oncorhynchus tschawytscha_).--This species is also known as quinnat, king, Columbia river, and Sacramento river salmon. It is, next to the sockeye, the most important of all salmon in commercial value. The individuals of this species reach a larger size than those of any other. They have been known to weigh 90 pounds, and fish of from 40 to 60 pounds in weight are not infrequently taken. The average weight of the king salmon which are captured in the Columbia river is probably not far from 22 pounds, while those that run further south, for instance in the Sacramento river, average 16 pounds.

Another species, known as silver salmon (_Oncorhynchus kisutch_), also has a number of other names, mostly of Eastern or Russian origin. It is quite an important member of the genus and its average weight is about 5 pounds. It is very valuable as a food

fish, only the Chinook and blueback salmon going ahead of it. It is also a species which bears shipment in a fresh state very well. The silver salmon resembles very closely the Chinook, but is easily distinguished therefrom by experienced fishermen. The canned product of this species is usually put on the market as “medium red” or “coho” salmon, names which have now come to have a definite meaning and are perfectly understood by the trade.

=The Sockeye or Blueback Salmon= (_Oncorhynchus nerka_).--This is the species which has the greatest commercial value and forms a large part of the catch of the Pacific coast. It is the most abundant of all the species of salmon in Alaska. Its flesh has a rich red or “salmon” color, and lends itself admirably to canning processes. In palatability and attractiveness as a canned product it is not inferior to any, unless, possibly, the Columbia river chinook.

Canning of Salmon.--The canning of salmon is one of the most important of the fish industries of the United States. The immense coast line possessed by the United States on the west, which is so vastly extended by the Alaskan coast and Aleutian Islands, affords the most extensive fisheries of salmon in the world. As has already been stated, there are no large markets in that region in which the fresh salmon can find a purchaser. The fish, therefore, must be neglected as a food product or else prepared in some way to enable them to be shipped to great distances. Probably the most unobjectionable way is by canning. The principles of the canning of salmon are not different at all from those which underlie the sterilization of any kind of food. The establishments in which the canning takes place are perhaps the most extensive in the world. The prime necessity in these cases is to secure complete sterilization. In the case of fish any failure to secure the proper sterilization is the more reprehensible, because fish decompose so readily, forming fermentative products which are extremely poisonous. Cases of poisoning from eating canned salmon have been reported, and in some cases they may prove fatal. Every can of salmon which is to be eaten ought to be examined carefully in order to see if there are any incipient signs of decomposition. A bad smelling or otherwise imperfect can should be rejected without question. Only the fish which is perfectly fresh to the taste and odor and which gives no signs of any kind of deterioration should be eaten. When properly prepared, canned salmon affords a delicacy as well as a food product which can hardly be too highly prized.

Composition of Canned Salmon.--Mean of three samples. Water-free substance:

Protein, 53.52 percent Fat, 40.52 „ Ash, 6.24 „

=The Salmon of the Atlantic Coast.=--As has already been noted, the Pacific salmon belong to a different genus from the common Atlantic salmon,--_Salmo salar_. There is a very close resemblance between the two genera, and the common name “salmon” is applied to the individuals of each. The Atlantic salmon is a fish which has been known from the earliest time. The Roman people became acquainted with it in the early history of the Republic, and especially when they conquered Gaul and Britain. It is found distributed over the whole North Atlantic coast, but especially the northern portion from Massachusetts northward. The salmon extends, as far as observations have been made, beyond even the Arctic circle, and the same species is found upon the western and northern shores of Europe. The salmon enters the St. Lawrence and has been found as far up as Niagara Falls. Our principal fisheries for this species are in Maine and in Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. They do not extend southward beyond the Delaware and have rarely been found in that river. The shad and salmon were particularly abundant in early colonial days. The shad were so abundant that they were not regarded as useful for food purposes, but their value as a fertilizer was taught to the whites by the Indians. Salmon, apparently, were equally abundant, and it was considered an affront to offer salmon more than twice a week even to servants. In this respect they were on the same plane as the diamond back terrapin and canvas back duck, which were so abundant, in those days, that they were a drug on the market. The salmon enters the fresh-water streams for the purpose of spawning. The eggs are largely laid late in the fall, and in that case do not hatch until the next spring. The Atlantic salmon often reach a very large size. Individuals have been known to weigh from 40 to even 80 pounds. The average weight of the salmon taken in Maine waters is about 10 pounds each. Another valued specimen of salmon is known as the Sebago salmon (_Salmo sebago_), from the lake in which it occurs. It is a fresh-water fish, having been doubtless landlocked in some way after originally entering from the sea. Still a third species is the famous ouananiche (_Salmo ouananiche_), inhabiting the waters of the Lake St. John region north of Quebec.

Composition of Atlantic Salmon.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 76.74 percent Protein, 18.52 „ 79.13 percent Fat, 3.60 „ 15.32 „ Ash, 1.14 „ 4.93 „

Composition of Sebago Salmon.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 78.54 percent Protein, 17.24 „ 78.00 percent Fat, 2.98 „ 13.74 „ Ash, 1.24 „ 5.76 „

The above data show a striking difference in the composition of the edible portions of Pacific and Atlantic salmon. This difference is shown chiefly in the relative proportion of fat. In the Pacific salmon the fat approaches in quantity the protein, while in the Atlantic salmon the protein is much greater than the fat. The Atlantic salmon is used chiefly in the fresh state for two reasons, first, because the catch is very much smaller than that of the Pacific species while the markets are very much more numerous and very much larger; second, because it is commercially more profitable to dealers in the fresh state. In Europe and Scotland the salmon is constantly used in a fresh state during the whole of the summer and a dinner is scarcely considered complete without it. It is also very commonly used at luncheon. It is generally eaten cold and offers a food product of high palatability and great nutritive value in so far as the protein is concerned. Eaten with plenty of potato, as it usually is, it forms a reasonably well-balanced ration. The American visitor who is not used to eating salmon every day is likely to find its constant occurrence upon the English table in the summer to be a bit trying to his taste.

=Sardines.=--The sardine belongs to the herring family--in fact small herring along the coast of Maine are put up as sardines. The sardines are very closely related to the herrings, but there are rather important differences. The European sardine, which is known as the sardine, is the _Sardinia pilcharda_, and does not occur on the coast of the United States. The species existing on the Pacific coast is known as the California sardine (_Sardinia cærulea_). It is quite abundant on the California coast and spawns in the open sea. It resembles very strongly the European sardine, but has no teeth. The Spanish sardine (_Sardinia pseudohispanica_) is found rather abundantly in Cuba and is often carried northward in the Gulf Stream as far as Woods Hole or Cape Cod. It is about 8 inches in length and of high food value, resembling very closely the European sardine. There has been a good deal of discussion as to whether or not small herring which are packed as sardines in the United States should be allowed, under the food laws of the various states and of the United States, to be sold by that name. The answer to this is that any deception in the label should be avoided. The herring, however, belongs to the same genus as the true sardine, and, differing from it only in the variation of species, may have some right to the name. The true ethical principles of trade, however, would require that they should be named Maine sardines or herring sardines and not bear the name simply sardines, which is reserved exclusively for the species _Sardinia pilcharda_.

Composition of Canned Sardines.--

Water, 56.37 percent Water-free substance, 43.63 „ Protein, 24.87 „ Fats, 12.71 „ Ash, 5.00 „ Sodium chlorid, 0.61 „

The above data are based upon the analysis of the sample after the oil has been separated by drainage.

=European Sardines.=--The sardine is eaten fresh along the Spanish and French coast, where they are taken in great abundance and form a delicious food in this condition. The number which is given to a single individual is quite generous, as the writer has had served him on the Mediterranean coast in Spain as many as twenty fresh sardines at one order. The number, however, was not found any too large when the palatability of the product is taken into consideration. Sardines are preserved by salt and smoke and particularly by packing in oil.

Method of Packing in Oil.--The sardines after proper cleaning are heated in oil for the purpose of sterilizing them. Olive oil is usually employed for this purpose, though some packers prefer to heat the fish in peanut oil, claiming that it gives them a better color. There seems to be, however, no sufficient ground for this claim. The peanut oil is probably used simply because it is cheaper. When the fish are thus sterilized and thoroughly cooked they are placed in boxes in the well known manner in which they are found and covered with oil, sealed, and, if necessary, again sterilized in order to prevent decomposition. Olive oil is the oil usually employed for packing purposes, though cheaper grades of edible oil are very commonly found in sardines. The substitutes for olive oils which are usually employed are peanut oil, cottonseed oil, and sesame oil, either single or mixed. When the sardines have been previously boiled in a cheaper oil and then packed with olive oil the olive oil will be contaminated with the cheaper oil used in the boiling.

Adulteration of Sardines.--As indicated above, the chief adulteration of sardines is in the misbranding respecting the nature of the fish and the oil used in packing. A young herring packed in the manner of a sardine properly demands a special label instead of the word “sardine” alone. A difference respecting the misbranding in regard to the oil employed is avoided by the statement on the package of the character of the oil used. The phrase “Sardines packed in oil” should be construed always to mean in the highest grade oil, that is, olive oil. This phrase, however, is usually employed when inferior oils are used. Inasmuch as oil is not the name of

any individual product but of a large class of products, including that of both animal and vegetable origin, it is generally held that the term “oil” is not a sufficient indication of the character of the oil used. In all cases the packages should designate the special kind of oil used in the preparation. The addition of chemical preservatives to sardines in so far as the author knows, is not practiced, at least not to any appreciable extent.

The French Fisheries.--The sardine fisheries in France are mostly off the coast of Brittany, and are subject to many very serious fluctuations. For instance, the present year, 1906, has been one of disaster to the French fisheries. What is the cause of the disappearance of the pilchard (the true sardine) is not known. The fishermen think that large fish have driven the small ones either into the Bay of Biscay or the Mediterranean, or even to the west shores of Africa. The fish are thought to originate in the Mediterranean, and their name is derived from the fact that they were originally found in great quantities off the coast of Sardinia. When the spring comes and the fine weather is established they migrate first along the coast of Spain, finally reaching the French coast some time during the month of May. By this time the young fish are nearly grown to a proper size for catching. The fishing, however, does not really begin until July and is usually finished by November. The little town of Concarneau is the seat of these fisheries. About two thousand small boats go out from this town and at or near this place are also the large canneries and packing establishments. The fishing grounds are about five miles from the coast and the small boats sail out from two to four o’clock in the morning. The fishing is by means of nets and a very important part of the work is the spreading of the bait upon the surface of the water to attract the fish. The principal bait or _roque_ is the roe of the cod, which sometimes reaches a price of $60 per barrel. Sometimes a single boat will use from 30 to 40 barrels of bait. Only the most skilled fisherman, usually the master himself, is allowed to distribute this precious material. As many as one hundred thousand fish have been caught in the net, though this magnitude of catch is, of course, exceptional. When the fish are brought ashore they are counted into baskets, about 200 to a basket, and those unfit for use are thrown out. They are taken to the canneries as quickly as possible to be cleaned, boiled, dipped in oil, and then hermetically sealed into a tin in which they are sent into commerce.

Adulteration.--The chief adulteration of sardines is found in misbranding as to country of origin. The French catch has the highest reputation of any in the world and for this reason the label is often made to represent the fish as of French origin when in reality they are caught on the shores of Spain or of other countries. Formerly the fish were brought in great numbers from the Spanish coast into France. They were naturally much deteriorated in transit. Nevertheless they were tinned and marked as of pure French origin. This practice has now been forbidden by law in France. The Norwegian fish known as Sprötten (sprats) on the German and Holland coasts are packed as sardines and sent into this country as sardines.

=Scup.=--The scup is a fish (family Sparidæ) which is taken in great abundance on our Atlantic coast in the summer and autumn and is brought in immense quantities to the market. The proper name of the fish is _Stenotomus chrysops_.

Composition.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 74.99 percent Protein, 18.52 „ 75.33 percent Fat, 5.11 „ 19.25 „ Ash, 1.38 „ 5.64 „

The flesh of this fish is a better balanced ration than that of the red snapper, the proportion of fat being much larger.

=Shad.=--One of the most important food fishes on the Atlantic coast is the shad. It is found along the whole Atlantic coast, coming into fresh water for spawning, where it is caught for food purposes. The shad begin to appear in the streams of the south Atlantic coast early in the winter and as the spring advances they go northward. They appear in the Potomac in April and May, and later in the Delaware and Connecticut rivers and other fresh-water streams further north. The fish is, therefore, to be had fresh upon the market over a long period of time. The common shad is known scientifically as _Alosa sapidissima_ (Wilson). As a result of the work of the U. S. Bureau of Fisheries the shad has been introduced into the waters of the Pacific coast where none was found originally. The shad fry were first introduced into the Sacramento river and afterward into the Columbia river. The environments on the Pacific coast were found congenial. The fish soon found grounds on which they could spawn, and they have spread over almost the entire length of the Pacific coast. It has, of late, become a very common and abundant food fish on the Pacific coast and has lost none of its palatability by transplanting. Science has not been able to ascertain anything of very great interest respecting the life of the shad in the sea. When they leave the rivers they practically disappear, and are not known again until the next spawning season returns. For spawning purposes the shad prefer a water temperature of from 55 to 65 degrees. Whenever the temperature goes above the latter figure they begin to disappear. The males and females go in separate schools. The males usually precede the females. It is stated by Jordan and Evermann that of 61,000 shad received at the Washington market from March 19 to 24, 99

percent were male. As the season advanced the males became very much less frequent and at the end extremely scarce. The U. S. Bureau of Fisheries has taken especial pains to increase the number of shad in all waters. During the spring of 1900 there were artificially planted in the Atlantic coast streams over 240,000,000 young shad. One fish often contains as many as 150,000 eggs. The average number, however, is about 30,000. Shad roe is the most valuable part of the fish and brings a much higher price in the market than an equal weight of fish itself. Planked shad is one of the greatest delicacies of the Washington markets. At Marshall Hall, opposite Mount Vernon, there are given a great many shad bakes during the season. Oak wood is placed in long lines and burned,--oak planks are set up on each side of the line of burning wood, inclined at an angle of about 60 or 70 degrees. On these oak planks the shad are cooked, held usually by driving a nail through the head,--the cut surface being exposed to the heat of the burning fire. In addition to being cooked in this way the fish absorbs a small amount of the empyreumatic odors of the burning wood. During the baking the shad are treated from time to time with melted butter. There is no other way which a shad can be cooked which renders it so delicious as by this primitive method. The shad, from an economic point of view, is third in importance in the United States, only the salmon and the cod exceeding it in value. The annual catch of shad on the Atlantic sea coast numbers from 10 to 20 million, weighing from 40 to 60 million pounds and worth from one and one-half to two million dollars.

Composition of Shad.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 70.62 percent Protein, 18.56 „ 64.36 percent Fat, 9.47 „ 31.93 „ Ash, 1.35 „ 4.62 „

Of the whole weight of shad the average edible portion amounts to 52.35 percent, and the refuse, counting the bones, skin, and entrails is 47.65 percent.

Shad Roe.--The eggs of shad, as has already been mentioned, are regarded as the most valuable portion of the fish. Roe shad also are more highly prized as a food fish than the male shad. As a result, roe shad sell for a much higher price on the market than the male shad. The eggs are quite small, and as has already been said, occur in immense numbers, the average number to a fish being about 30,000.

Composition of Shad Roe.--

Water, 71.2 percent Protein, 23.4 „ Fat, 3.8 „ Ash, 1.6 „

Aside from the water of the roe, it is noticed that by far the most abundant component is the protein. This, of course, is what would be expected of an egg product. The protein is a little more than six times as great as the fat. The ash contains large quantities of phosphorus, which exists in the original egg, largely in the form of lecithin, in which state it is regarded as most valuable for nourishing the phosphatic tissues of the body. Shad roe is eaten almost entirely in the fresh state. It does not produce a pickled or cooked product of anything like the value of the sturgeon eggs. So far as the author knows no form of shad egg preparation similar to caviar is on the market.

There are three species of shad in America, but the only one of great importance is the common Atlantic shad which has been described.

=The Sheepshead.=--This abundant and important food fish exists in large numbers along the Atlantic coast. It also belongs to the Sparidæ and its scientific name is _Archosargus probatocephalus_. This species is found from Cape Cod to Texas. It is especially found in the vicinity of oyster beds, where it is destructive to the oysters. It is quite abundant in the Indian river, being, next to the mullet, the most frequently found fish in those waters. Though strictly a salt-water fish, it often runs up into fresh waters. The fish is distinguished by the number of broad silvery colored bands extending around its entire body. The average weight of the sheepshead is three or four pounds, though occasionally a fish three or four times that size is captured.

Composition of Sheepshead.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 75.55 percent Protein, 19.54 „ 83.47 percent Fat, 3.69 „ 13.59 „ Ash, 1.22 „ 5.14 „

=The Smelt.=--The smelt belongs to a family which has a number of species, some of which are very abundant in Europe, where they are highly prized even to a greater extent than in this country for food. The smelt is a small fish, very long in proportion to its breadth. The American smelt (_Osmerus mordax_) is found very abundantly on the Atlantic coast north of New York. Although a sea fish, it often enters rivers and becomes landlocked in lakes. It is found abundantly in Lakes Champlain and Memphremagog

and many of the New England and Nova Scotian lakes. The smelt in early times was a very abundant fish.

Composition of the Smelt.--Edible portion:

FRESH. DRY. Water, 79.16 percent Protein, 17.37 „ 84.31 percent Fat, 1.79 „ 8.65 „ Ash, 1.68 „ 8.16 „

These data show that the flesh of the smelt is very rich in protein, the fat falling to a very small proportion of the total edible substance.

=Spanish Mackerel.=--This is a very highly prized fish and is eaten largely in the fresh state along the Atlantic coast. Its scientific name is _Scomberomorus maculatus_. The catch is subject to great variations. In early years the Spanish mackerel was scarcely known on our coast, but in the last forty years it has assumed considerable importance. Although more abundant than formerly it still commands a very high price. The weight of the full-grown mackerel is usually from five to eight pounds, though occasionally very large individuals are taken. Jordan and Evermann speak of one which was 41 inches long and weighed 25 pounds.

Composition.--Edible portion:

FRESH. DRY. Water, 68.10 percent Protein, 20.97 „ 67.25 percent Fat, 9.43 „ 29.56 „ Ash, 1.50 „ 4.71 „

In this fish it is seen that the fat is a little less than one-third the quantity of the protein.

=Sturgeon.=--The sturgeon belongs to the family of Acipenseridæ. They are large fishes frequenting the sea and also the fresh waters of northern regions. Most of the species are anadromous, entering fresh water and ascending the streams in spring. There are two genera belonging to this family and 20 species that are well defined, although about 100 nominal species have been described. The white sturgeon or Oregon sturgeon is found on the Pacific coast from Monterey north to Alaska. It ascends the large rivers during the spring, notably the Sacramento, Columbia, and Fraser rivers. Some of them are very large and their value for food and commercial purposes has only been lately recognized. They are principally valuable, however, for their eggs or roe, since it is from the eggs of sturgeon that caviar is made. The roe in the fresh state is worth from 25 to 30 cents a pound. The fresh fish are frozen and shipped to Eastern markets.

The common sturgeon (_Acipenser sturio_) frequents the east and north Atlantic coast and ascends the rivers in the spring, especially the Delaware. The quantity of sturgeon taken, however, has constantly decreased for several years. The principal part of the caviar made in the United States is procured from the common sturgeon and the Lake sturgeon, which is found in the Great Lakes, the upper Mississippi Valley, and the Lake of the Woods.

Preparation of Caviar.--After the eggs have been removed from the fish, they are placed in large masses upon a stand, the top of which is formed of a small-meshed screen. On the under side is placed a zinc-lined trough, about 18 inches deep, 2 feet wide and 4 feet long. The operator gently rubs the mass of eggs back and forth over the screen, whose mesh is just large enough to let the eggs drop through as they are separated from the enveloping membrane. They thus fall into the trough from which they are drawn off into tubs through a sliding door in one end of the trough. After all the roe has been separated, the tub is removed and a certain proportion of the best Luneberg salt is added and mixed with the eggs by careful stirring with the hands. This is the most delicate part of the whole process, and the best results can be obtained by that proficiency which comes from long experience. After adding the salt, the eggs at first become dry, but in 10 or 15 minutes the salt has drawn from the eggs their watery constituents and a copious brine is formed, which is poured off when the tub becomes too full. The salted eggs are then poured into fine-meshed sieves which hold about 10 pounds each, where they are allowed to drain for 8 to 20 hours. The eggs have now become the caviar of commerce, which is put in casks or cans of various sizes.

Composition of the Flesh of Sturgeon.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 78.71 percent Protein, 17.96 „ 85.19 percent Fat, 1.90 „ 8.90 „ Ash, 1.43 „ 6.72 „

Composition of Caviar.--

Water, 66.05 percent Protein, 14.37 „ Fat, 8.97 „ Ash, 7.26 „ Undetermined, 3.35 „

Of the ash, 6.16 parts of the 7.26 present are common salt.

=Composition of the Eggs of Fish.=--Attention has been called to the valuable food properties of the eggs of fishes. The roe of a number of fishes is celebrated both for flavor and food value. The two most important roes are those of the sturgeon, used in the manufacture of caviar, and the roe of shad, used principally in the fresh state.

=Composition of Roe.=--The composition of shad roe, fresh sturgeon caviar, and pickled caviar is given in the following table:

---------+---------+---------+---------+--------- | WATER. | PROTEIN.| FAT. | ASH. ---------+---------+---------+---------+--------- |_Percent_|_Percent_|_Percent_|_Percent_ Shad roe, | 71.25 | 23.44 | 3.78 | 1.53 Fresh caviar, | 56.97 | 27.87 | 2.85 | 2.31 Pickled caviar,| 50.92 | 27.92 | 13.59 | 7.57 ---------+---------+---------+---------+---------

The above data show a marked difference between the composition of shad roe and sturgeon roe, the latter being very much richer in fat and also containing a greater quantity of ash. The large quantity of ash in the pickled caviar is doubtless due to the common salt used in the curing. There is not a very great difference between the composition of the roe and that of the flesh of fish. The roe is essentially a nitrogenous food, also with a considerable quantity of fat and with a certain amount of mineral matter. It contains less water than the flesh of fish, and, therefore, pound for pound in the fresh state has a larger quantity of nutrients. Otherwise, for food purposes, there is but little difference. It is doubtless true, however, that the mineral matters of the roe are somewhat different from those of the flesh of fish in containing a larger quantity of organic phosphorus in the form of lecithin.

=Striped Bass.=--The striped bass or rock (_Roccus lineatus_) is a fish of the family Serranidæ and quite common in the Potomac. It occurs commonly around the Atlantic coast. Its scientific name is _Roccus lineatus_. It is taken in all waters along the coast from the Carolinas to New England, and especially near the mouth of the Potomac and in Chesapeake Bay. It is a fairly common as well as one of the best food fishes at Washington and in many of the fish markets on the Atlantic coast.

FRESH. DRY. Water, 77.70 percent Protein, 18.31 „ 83.28 percent Fat, 2.83 „ 12.50 „ Ash, 1.16 „ 5.22 „

=Sole.=--The term “sole” is applied here to certain species of flounders and the two terms are sometimes used synonymously. The true soles, however, of which there are several species, belong to a distinct though closely related family. The species of flounder to which the term “sole” is generally given is _Eopsetta jordani_. It occurs along the Pacific coast from Monterey to Puget Sound. Large numbers are taken in Monterey Bay. The average weight of this “sole” is about three pounds. It is highly esteemed as a food fish. They are dried in great numbers by the Chinese, who suspend them by strings on a frame placed on the roofs of the houses, where, after they become dry, they strike against each other when moved by the wind, producing a sound which is something like that emanating from the leaves of a forest.

=Tautog.=--The _Tautoga onitis_ is one of the wrasse-fishes (family Labridæ) and is abundant along the Atlantic coast from New Brunswick to the Carolinas. East of New York it is commonly called the “tautog.” On the New York coast it is known as “blackfish,” and further south as the “oyster fish.”

=Tilefish.=--The tilefish is interesting not because of its high food value but because of the fact that it was discovered by accident in 1879 when a fisherman off the coast of Nantucket captured 5000 pounds of a fish which was new to him. The species was also new to science. This fish disappeared as suddenly as it came and no more were caught until 1892. Since then they have been taken rather frequently. The tilefish reaches a length sometimes of three feet and a weight of 30 pounds. It is pronounced by experts to be the equal of the pompano.

=Trout.=--Trout, of which there are many species, are greatly prized both on account of their value as game fishes, affording sport for anglers, and because of their high palatable qualities. They belong to the same family as the Atlantic salmon and often it is difficult to distinguish by any of its common characteristics a trout from a salmon. This is especially true of trout of western America. The species of trout which are most highly prized on the Pacific coast are the cut-throat trout (_Salmo clarkii_), the rainbow trout (_Salmo iridens_), and the steel-head (_Salmo gairdneri_). The familiar silver trout of Lake Tahoe is another closely related species. They are distinguished by a remarkable system of spots of a circular form, black in color, and of varying size. The Lake Tahoe trout which is commonly secured is not the same as the silver trout of Lake Tahoe but is of a little different character, and is also known as the Truckee Trout, “Pogy,” and “Snipe.” It reaches a weight of from three to six pounds and is sometimes served on the dining cars of the Central Pacific Railway, in running through Idaho and into California. Various other species of the trout are found in Utah, in the Rio Grande and the Colorado, and in the lakes of Colorado. Perhaps the most important of these is the steel-head trout occurring along the Pacific coast. The rainbow trout is also a fish that is highly prized along the Pacific coast. The

brook trout of western Oregon is also an important fish.

The Trout of the Great Lakes.--The fish known as trout in the Great Lakes belong to a different genus from those already mentioned, namely, genus _Cristivomer_. It has, however, the typical spots, which are of a grayish color instead of red or black like those of the other trout which have been mentioned.

The principal species which abounds in the Great Lakes is the Mackinaw trout (_Cristivomer namaycush_). It is also found in the large lakes from Maine westward to the Pacific ocean and even to northern Alaska. This is the largest species of trout. The average weight of the fish probably does not exceed 15 or 20 pounds. Individual examples have been found weighing over 100 pounds. There is only one common fish which exceeds it in weight, namely, the sturgeon. Next to the white fish it is the most important commercial fish of the Great Lakes. The supply of lake trout has been diminishing and the price increasing for several years. The spawning season of lake trout begins in September and continues until December.

Composition of Lake Trout.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 69.14 percent Protein, 18.22 „ 60.10 percent Fat, 11.38 „ 36.80 „ Ash, 1.26 „ 4.90 „

Composition of Brook Trout.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 77.72 percent Protein, 18.97 „ 86.62 percent Fat, 2.10 „ 9.16 „ Ash, 1.21 „ 5.39 „

The above data show that lake trout has a flesh which approximates in composition that of Pacific salmon, being quite rich in fat, while the brook trout has a composition more like the Atlantic salmon, being very rich in protein and poor in fat. Trout of all kinds are used practically in only a fresh state. The catch is not large enough to warrant the establishment of canning factories and all that are caught in the northern and central northern lakes and streams find a ready market in a fresh state at much more remunerative prices than could be obtained by canning. It is always a fortunate circumstance when the condition of the catch and of the market are such as to enable the fish to be eaten as fresh as possible from the water. Fish is a kind of food which is never improved by keeping in any way and is at its best the minute the fish is taken from the stream. The brook trout do not belong to the same genus as the lake trout but to the genus _Salvelinus_. They have a general resemblance, however, to that genus. As a fish to be caught by the hook and as a victim of sport the brook trout perhaps occupies the highest place among the fish of the country; especially is it sought for in the mountain streams, and it occurs in most parts of the northeastern United States. It extends from Maine to northern Georgia and Alabama, especially in the Appalachian Mountains and west through the Great Lakes to the Mississippi, while in Canada it is found from Labrador to the Saskatchewan.

The brook trout has been especially cultivated by the U. S. Bureau of Fisheries and introduced into waters in the United States where it is not found naturally. The season for spawning for the brook trout is in the autumn, when the water is growing colder, and continues from August to December, according to the latitude. In spawning time the fish come up into the smallest parts of the stream where shallow water can be found. The eggs remain until the next spring, when they are hatched. The brook trout varies greatly in size, according to the magnitude of the stream. In the small streams it weighs often less than ½■ pound, while in large streams it weighs 2 or 3 pounds. The large trout has almost disappeared from the small streams as a result of the activity of fishermen.

There are many other species of trout which are known in different parts of the country. For instance, the Dublin Pond trout of Dublin Pond, N. H., the Dolly Varden trout in the northern Pacific states and Alaska, the Sunapee trout in the northeastern states, and the Blueback trout in Maine. These fishes all have practically the same quality, varying only in minute details, and have the same value as a food.

=Turbot.=--A species of halibut known as Greenland halibut (_Reinhardtius hippoglossoides_) is also known as turbot in this country. It occurs chiefly off the coast of Greenland, and is taken in the very coldest part of the year. The European turbot is _Psetta maxima_.

=Weakfish.=--The weakfish belongs to the croaker family (Sciænidæ) and has a high value as a food fish, the flesh being rich in flavor and very tender and easily disintegrated, from which quality it is believed the name “weakfish” is derived. The common weakfish is the species _Cynoscion regalis_. It is also known in some localities as the squeteague. The fish is rather long in proportion to its breadth and sometimes grows to a large size. Examples weighing over 25 pounds have been captured. Very

rarely, however, does a weakfish weigh more than 10 pounds, and the average is perhaps not more than one-half that. The weakfish is, particularly when young, a victim of the bluefish, and great numbers succumb to the ravages of its more powerful enemy. The weakfish is found over the entire length of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts as far north as the Bay of Fundy. The weakfish sometimes ascends the tidal waters and congregates around the river mouths, where the food is more abundant. While found on the markets in the North, it is more highly prized in the southern markets.

Composition.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 78.97 percent Protein, 17.45 „ 84.63 percent Fat, 2.39 „ 11.37 „ Ash, 1.19 „ 5.64 „

The flesh of the weakfish, as shown by the above data, is one in which the protein exists in very much greater proportion than the fat. It is not so rich in protein, however, as some of the other species which have been mentioned.

=Whitefish.=--This fish occurs in large numbers in all our Great Lakes, and is an abundant article of food. Its scientific name is _Coregonus clupeiformis_. It inhabits the whole of the Great Lakes regions from Lake Champlain to Lake Superior. It does not occur in very great abundance, if at all, west of Lake Superior, although it has been reported to have been found in the fresh water lakes both to the north and west of that region.

The common whitefish prefers the deep water of the lakes, coming only into shallow water near the shore at spawning time, which, in the Great Lakes, is from October to December. During the months of January, February, and March the fishing for whitefish is practically discontinued, since the fish at that time have returned to deep water and are not accessible.

The size of the whitefish in the Great Lakes is not so great as the extent of water would indicate. Probably three pounds would be an average size, although the individual fish range from 1½■ to 6 pounds. The weight rarely, however, exceeds 4 or 5 pounds. Occasionally whitefish have been found weighing as high as 20 pounds, but this is very rare. The whitefish reaches its full average size about the end of the fourth year. The number of eggs which are found in the female fish is not so large as in the shad, but usually the number does not fall below 10,000 and sometimes reaches as high as 75,000. The eggs are very small comparatively, and about 36,000 of them make a quart. The U. S. Bureau of Fisheries has done a great deal to increase the supply of whitefish by planting millions of whitefish fry in suitable water.

Different Species of Whitefish.--There are many species of whitefish besides the common whitefish which appear in the Great Lakes. Coulter's whitefish is found in the waters of British Columbia, but it is not distributed very widely throughout the country. The Rocky Mountain whitefish is very widely distributed, occurring in all suitable waters from the west slope of the Rockies to the Pacific. There is also a subspecies of this fish occurring in the headwaters of the Missouri river. Menominee whitefish occur in the lakes of New England, New York, and the Great Lakes,--it is also known as round whitefish, frostfish, shadwaiter, pilotfish, chivey, and blackback.

Composition of Whitefish.--

FRESH. DRY. Water, 69.83 percent Protein, 22.06 „ 76.00 percent Fat, 6.49 „ 21.51 „ Ash, 1.62 „ 5.36 „

Average Composition of Fish.[16]--

Water, 76.06 percent Solids, 23.94 „ Nitrogen, 3.51 „ Phosphoric acid, .52 „ Sulfur, .24 „ Fat, 1.45 „ Ash, 1.21 „ Protein, 21.92 „

[16] Average analysis of cod, halibut, bass, etc., used at the hygienic table of the Bureau of Chemistry.

=Fluorids in Fish.=--Nearly all kinds of fish yield a distinct test for fluorin which is not to be mistaken for an adulteration. The fluorin is found normally in the bones of the fish and sometimes in traces in the flesh. The addition of fluorid as a preservative is highly reprehensible, and its presence is indicated by the increase in quantity.

=Marketing of Fish.=--In the food act it is provided that no animals shall be used for food which have died otherwise than by slaughter. Whether or not this would apply to fish is a matter of some doubt. Unfortunately fish, as a rule, are allowed to die by being deprived of oxygen, which they get from the water as it passes over their gills. The common practice is to take the fish for commercial purposes in seines or other gear and allow them to die, as it were, by suffocation. The greater number of fish exposed upon our markets have died in this way and are then packed in ice and kept until sold. The ideal way to treat fish would be to

transfer them from the seine to a pool of water, fresh or salt, in which they are kept alive until they are wanted for cooking. This method is practiced in some very high-grade restaurants and hotels where the diner may pick for himself from the pool the fish he desires to eat. It is evident that for commercial purposes where a cheap food is desirable a method of this kind could not be practiced. It is a question which the hygienist as well as the practical man should consider, that is, whether or not it is possible to slaughter the fish and, as soon as they are taken, dress them, pack their carcasses in ice, and in this way deliver them to the markets. Where fish are used for canning or salting purposes they are often slaughtered as soon as caught. This is particularly true of herring captured in the Potomac and Susquehanna rivers. It is an interesting problem to study whether or not the flavor and character of the flesh are impaired by the suffocation process subsequent to their capture. In all cases except in cold weather, the fish after capture, no matter whether they are allowed to die by suffocation or slaughtered, should be packed in ice and kept until the market is reached, which should be at as early a date as possible. Fish are never so good as when fresh and the fresher the better.

=Cold Storage.=--Fish is a product which is often found in cold storage in large numbers and kept there for a long time. The usual problem attending the cold storage of food is even more important when applied to fish. In cold storage fish are frozen solid and kept in this state until ready for consumption. Just how long the palatability and wholesomeness of fish can be preserved when frozen solid has not been determined. It follows logically that the colder the temperature the less the degree of deterioration, but it does not follow logically that this temperature can be maintained indefinitely without injuring the character of the product. One thing appears to be certain, namely, that the consumer is entitled to know whether in any given case the fish he purchases is a fresh or a cold storage article. At the present time, in so far as I know, there are no national, state, or municipal laws whereby this fact can be ascertained. Without raising the question of comparative value or palatability there is no doubt but what the consumer is entitled to know the character of the fish he purchases.

=Canning Fish.=--Allusion has already been made to the practice of canning fish, especially salmon. Great precautions must be used in cases of this kind, since fish is a food which tends to develop poisonous principles incident to decomposition. Canned fish, therefore, must be thoroughly sterilized so that no fermentative action tending to produce ptomain poison can possibly take place. It should be the duty of inspectors of food to frequently examine packages of canned fish to determine, first, by the external appearance of the can, and, second, by opening a certain number of them, whether any decomposition has taken place. Too great care cannot be exercised in this matter, since dangerous and often fatal results follow the consumption of spoiled fish.

=Drying and Salting Fish.=--The preservation of fish by pickling, salting, drying, and smoking is a great industry and produces some of the most palatable products. Mackerel, herring, and cod are types of fish which upon proper curing make a most delectable dish. Nothing but encouragement should be given to industries of this kind, but in order that they be of their true value they should be conducted properly with due regard to hygienic principles and for the sole purpose of making a wholesome and palatable product.

=Adulteration of Fish Products.=--Attention has already been called to the adulteration of salmon by canning an inferior grade or even a different kind of fish under the name of a better species. The same remark may be made respecting all fish, hake, haddock, and cusk being often offered as cod. In the case of sardines a similar practice is in vogue, and the small herring which are captured off the coast of Maine are often sold under the name of sardines. The substitution of one variety of fish for another, however, is injurious only in the way of fraud, the substitute fish presumably being of equal wholesomeness to the other under whose name it is sold. On the contrary, the form of sophistication which permits the introduction of deleterious substances into fish food is highly objectionable from the dietetic point of view. Following the general principles of nutrition, all chemical, non-condimental preservatives are to be rigidly excluded from fish products. This rule excludes boric acid, borax, benzoic acid and benzoates, sulfites, formaldehyde, and all other forms of chemical preservatives.

When fish are packed in oil the character of the oil used should be made known to the consumer. Especially is this true if from the locality where the fish is preserved and the general method of packing the consumer is led to believe that a high-grade oil such as olive oil has been used.

=Value of Fish as Food.=--From the statements which have been made in connection with fish in particular and the analyses which have been given it is seen that fish is a food of a peculiarly nitrogenous character. The edible portions, exclusive of water, are at least three-fourths, and probably more composed of protein. The other edible nutritive product is fat or fish oil. The mineral nutrients compose the remaining edible portion of fish after the protein and fat are considered. The mineral portions of fish cannot be regarded as not nutritious since they contain phosphoric acid and lime, which are essential ingredients of food. The flesh of fish,

however, as it has been seen, is not a complete ration, but is lacking in carbohydrates, and for this reason fish should be eaten with potatoes, rice, or other highly starchy foods. The value of fish as a food is unquestionable and its more general consumption would doubtless prove beneficial.

Those who live in the interior of large and extensive regions where fresh water fish are not very abundant do not appreciate the value of fish as food as do those who live upon the coasts washed by salt water and near the interior fresh waters where an abundant supply of fish is secured.

SHELLFISH.

=Clams.=--Clams are shellfish which, though not so extensively used as the oyster, are valued food products. The clams of commerce are of two kinds. The species known as long or soft clam is abundant on the New England coast, and is of considerable commercial importance both fresh and as a canned product. This is the clam used at clam bakes, for which the New England coast is famous. Its technical name is _Mya arenaria_.

The other species, the round or hard clam, northward known as quahog, is the most common clam of the markets south of New York. Its scientific name is _Venus mercenaria_.

A very small round clam is known as the little neck. This has a flavor which is extremely delicate and it takes the place, in the warm months, of the blue point oyster on the menus of the hotels and restaurants. The clam may be considered as a supplemental shellfish to the oyster, being most delicious and most abundant during the closed oyster season. The average weight of the round clam is about 60 grams, of which about one-fourth is flesh, one-fourth liquid, and one-half shell and refuse. There are many specimens very much larger than this but the weight is given for those usually eaten.

Composition of Clams.--Edible portion:

Water, 78.57 percent Protein, 14.86 „ Fat, 1.78 „ Ash, 2.49 „ Undetermined, 2.30 „

The liquid which escapes upon the opening of the shell is composed chiefly of water and salt and its composition is as follows:

Water, 96.02 percent Protein, .65 „ Fat, None Common salt, 2.81 „ Undetermined, .52 „

The flesh of clams, it is seen, is not very different from that of fish in general. It is composed chiefly of water and of the nutrients the protein is the predominating constituent. The ash content is somewhat higher than is the case with fish.

If the flesh and fluid substance of the clam be considered together the composition of the whole mass is represented by the following data:

Water, 86.11 percent Protein, 8.71 „ Fat, 1.01 „ Ash, 2.63 „ Undetermined, 1.54 „

Composition of Water-free Substance of the Flesh.--

Protein, 69.37 percent Fat, 8.32 „ Ash, 11.64 „ Undetermined, 10.67 „

Composition of the Dry Substance of the Liquid Portion.--

Protein, 16.37 percent Fat, .10 „ Ash, 70.41 „ Undetermined, 13.12 „

Composition of the Dry Substance of the Flesh and Liquid Together.--

Protein, 62.81 percent Fat, 7.30 „ Ash, 18.92 „ Undetermined, 10.97 „

=The Lobster= (_Homarus americanus_).--The lobster is a crustacean which occurs along the northern Atlantic coast. Formerly it was so very abundant that it was almost a drug on the market. In the last quarter of a century the increase in the consumption of the lobster has been more rapid than the increased growth, so that the price has become higher and higher; and this, to a certain extent, is limiting the consumption. The coast of Maine is especially the fishing grounds for the American lobster, though it is found much further south and also in great abundance further north. The lobster varies greatly in size. The law, at the present time, prevents very young lobsters from being sent into commerce. They are usually from 10.5 to 15 inches in length, though

occasionally examples of enormous size are taken. The edible portion of the lobster is the liquid and the flesh of the body, claws, and tail. Only about one-half the weight of the lobster, including the liquid, therefore, is edible. The rest is refuse. In a lobster weighing a thousand grams (2.2 pounds), five hundred grams (1.1 pound) will be the average edible portion, and the other half the refuse and loss. The average lobster of the present day, perhaps, weighs scarcely two pounds, though in former times the weight was very much greater because the younger and smaller lobsters were not sent to the market. The color of the lobster as it comes from the water is dark green, almost black at times. Heat changes the color of the shell, so that after boiling or baking the lobster becomes red. The flesh of the lobster is decidedly sweet, owing to the large quantity of glycogen which it contains. There is only one kind of meat that is eaten which approaches the lobster in its content of glycogen, and that is horse meat.

Composition of the Lobster.--Edible portion:

FRESH. DRY. Water, 84.30 percent Protein, 11.63 „ 74.06 percent Fat, 1.82 „ 11.62 „ Ash, 1.63 „ 10.38 „ Glycogen, .62 „ 3.94 „

=Crabs.=--The crab is a shellfish very highly prized along the whole of the Atlantic coast. Numerous species of crabs are used for food. These are used in two forms--as hard-shelled or soft-shelled crabs. The species most valued is _Callinectes hastatus_. It is very abundant on the middle and south Atlantic coast. Crabs are quite abundant on the Pacific coast also. About 44 percent of the total weight of the crab is edible and 56 percent shell and refuse. In the edible portion about 77 percent is water and 23 percent solid matter.

Composition of the Water-free Substance of the Crab.--

Protein, 72.56 percent Fat, 8.55 „ Ash, 13.64 „

The flesh of the crab is, therefore, essentially a nitrogenous food, containing only a small quantity of fat. A considerable portion of the ash is common salt.

=Crawfish.=--The crawfish may be regarded as a fresh-water lobster. It is found practically over the whole of the United States in the fresh waters but is not used to any extent for food purposes, except on the Pacific coast. It contains even a less proportion of edible matter than the lobster. The refuse, shell, etc., form about five-sixths of its weight. In the edible portion the water constitutes 81.22 percent, while the solid matters are only 18.78 percent.

Composition of the Water-free Substance of the Crayfish.--

Protein, 85.19 percent Fat, 2.45 „ Ash, 6.98 „

=Canned Lobster, Clams, and Crabs.=--As in the case of oysters, there is a large industry in the United States engaged in the canning of the flesh of lobsters, clams, and crabs. The same precautions should be observed in the eating of these canned products as those mentioned in the case of salmon. Numerous instances of illness and sometimes of death have been recorded as the result of eating these canned products which have been imperfectly sterilized. When the flesh is canned immediately after the capture of the animal, before any incipient decomposition has taken place and when the sterilization is perfect, the canned product can be eaten without fear. Where the health of the people is so seriously involved, the factories where these products are prepared should be carefully inspected either by the municipal, state, or federal authorities. All material used in canning which is not perfectly fresh from the water is to be rejected and the processes employed in the preparation and sterilization must be those which will effectively secure a complete immunity from subsequent fermentation and the development of ptomain products.

Composition of Canned Lobster (Dry Substance).--

Protein, 81.46 percent Fat, 4.64 „ Ash, 11.23 „

As seen from the above the composition of the dry substance in canned lobster, except content of water, is not perceptibly different from that of the fresh sample.

Composition of the Dry Substance of Canned Crabs.--

Protein, 79.10 percent Fat, 7.55 „ Ash, 9.68 „

=Shrimp= (_Crangon vulgaris_).--The shrimp is a highly valued article of food, especially when it can be had fresh or properly canned. It has been a practice to ship shrimps in bulk preserved with sulfites or boric acid. This is a most reprehensible form of adulteration.

=Canned Shrimps.=--In the total dry edible portion, including solids in the liquid contents of the can, are found:

Protein, 86.89 percent Fat, 3.44 „ Crude ash, 8.84 „

In edible portion (flesh plus liquids):

Water, 70.80 percent Water-free substance, 29.20 „ Protein, 25.38 „ Fat, 1.00 „ Crude ash, 2.58 „ Extractives, 0.24 „ Nitrogen, 4.06 „ Total edible portion, 100.00 „

The above data show that the shrimp in the canned state has less water in it than in the fresh state, and contains one-fourth of its weight of protein.

=Aquatic Reptiles.=--All forms of turtle may be used for edible purposes, both of the fresh-water and salt-water species. Both the turtle and terrapin are amphibious animals; that is, they can live either in the water or on the land. Among the turtles the marine variety known as the green turtle is most highly prized for food purposes. Its Latin name is _Chelonia mydas_. It grows sometimes to an enormous size, weighing several hundred pounds, and specimens weighing 50 and 100 pounds are not unusual. It is utilized chiefly for making soup, and green turtle soup is considered of high quality by experts. The flesh is also edible, and in the making of some varieties of green turtlesoup pieces of the flesh are included.

Composition of the Green Turtle.--The edible portion of the green turtle has the following composition:

Water, 79.78 percent Protein, 19.83 „ Fat, .53 „ Ash, 1.20 „

The edible portion of the green turtle is not very large in proportion to its weight, as it forms only from 20 to 24 percent of the whole weight of the turtle.

Among the reptiles there are several aquatic species which are used as food. The most noted of these is the diamond-back terrapin, which is found in the salt-water bays, lagoons, and marshes of our Atlantic coast from New Jersey to Texas. Its center of greatest abundance is in Chesapeake Bay. There is no fish or other water animal that has a higher value for edible purposes than the terrapin. The extreme delicacy of its flavor, the richness of its aroma, and its easy digestibility give to it a rank which perhaps no other usual food product possesses. In addition to this the increased scarcity of the terrapin, especially the more famous variety of it, namely, the diamond-back, has gradually increased the cost until at the present time the terrapin is eaten only by the rich. In the United States it exists along the whole Atlantic coast from New York southward and also along the Gulf coast. Formerly it was most abundant on the Maryland coast, but the nearness of this field to the great markets of the country has resulted in such a depletion of the stock as to make the terrapin very scarce. Many attempts have been made at artificial growing of terrapin and these have been more or less successful, but have not met with pronounced success which has been expected. The enclosure in which the terrapin are kept, viz., the “crawl,” is a feature in the artificial cultivation or breeding of these marine vertebrates. It is to be hoped that greater success in the future will attend the artificial breeding of terrapin, since the natural stock seems well on the way to extinction.

Composition of the Terrapin.--Edible portion:

FRESH. DRY. Water, 74.47 percent Protein, 21.23 „ 83.13 percent Fat, 3.47 „ 13.59 „ Ash, 1.02 „ 3.99 „

=The Mussel.=--The mussel may be described as a fresh-water oyster. It occurs in almost all parts of the United States in the fresh waters and in external appearance resembles to some extent the oyster, but the shell is usually smoother. In the mussel is often developed concretions of the carbonate of lime in a particular form known as pearls. In fact the chief value of the mussel is in the supply of pearls which they furnish, since their flesh, although often eaten, is not considered very palatable nor desirable. Pearls may be found in mussels in every locality, but in some regions they are more abundant than in others,--for instance, the mussels of Wisconsin are especially noted for the occurrence of the pearls. Pearls are also frequently found in oysters, but by no means so frequently as in the mussel.

Composition of the Mussel.--The edible portion of the mussel forms about one-half its weight.

Water, 78.64 percent Protein, 12.51 „ Fat, 1.67 „ Ash, 1.73 „ Undetermined, 5.45 „

=Oysters.=--Oysters belong to a class of animals known as mollusks. They grow in salt or brackish water and are found along almost the whole of the coast of the United States. They exist in the greatest abundance along the coast in the vicinity of Long Island Sound, Norfolk, Virginia, along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, off the coast of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, and along the Pacific coast from San Francisco to the northern limits of Washington.

Size.--The size of an oyster depends greatly upon its food and also upon its species. There are some varieties which at a given period of growth are naturally very much larger than others. The larger variety grows near Norfolk and along the Gulf coast. A smaller species is especially abundant on the Pacific coast, though a number of very large specimens of oysters have been found on that coast.

Age.--An oyster is eaten at any time after two years. Oysters, however, three or four years old are, perhaps, in all respects the best. The age is determined largely by the appearance of the shell, experts being able to practically determine the age of an oyster by an examination of the shell.

The oyster grows within a shell which is composed almost exclusively of carbonate of lime. The periphery of the shell is ovoid in shape, irregular, and the surface, especially of old oysters, is corrugated, rough, and unattractive. The interior of the shell is smooth and generally white, but sometimes has a blue or reddish tinge. The shells of edible oysters vary in size from 2 to 6 inches in length and from 2 to 4 inches in width. The oysters sold in the market are known by various names, usually derived from the location from which they come. A small variety distinguished by a blue color on the inside of the shell is known as blue points. The real blue points come only from Long Island. Another variety named Rockaway is also a Long Island variety, and should come exclusively from Rockaway or vicinity. Shrewsbury is another highly prized variety from the neighborhood of Shrewsbury, New Jersey. Buzzards Bay, James River, Norfolk, Lynnhaven, Rappahannock, Stony Creek, Saddle Rock, etc., are names commonly found in the trade. Unfortunately, the name of the location is not always an indication of the actual source from which the oysters may have come. For instance the term “blue point” is now very commonly given to small oysters not exceeding 2 or 2½■ inches in length with a correspondingly diminished breadth. On the contrary “saddle rock” is a name given to very large oysters no matter from what region they may come. It is a common practice to separate the oysters taken from one location into groups of similar size and attach to each group a special name which may or may not be indicative of location.

Cultivation of Oysters.--The natural beds of oysters are rapidly exhausted by the free fishing which is in some cases allowed, and the supply must be kept up by proper cultivation. Oyster farming has become a great industry along all parts of the coasts where the conditions are well suited to culture. The ideal conditions are inlets where the oysters are protected from the action of ocean waves and where abundant food can be derived from the low marshy grounds in the vicinity. The laws in force in the states protect the oyster farms from poachers and deeds are given for oyster beds which are beyond the low water line. The conditions of culture vary in various states. The public beds are also protected by law in many states and incipient war is sometimes carried on between the authorities of one state and the poachers from other states. Maryland, especially, has laws of a very strict character respecting the taking of oysters, and the state furnishes armed forces for the protection of public beds.

Season for Oysters.--The best season for oysters on the Atlantic coast of the United States extends from September first to May. These dates may also be applied to oysters of the Gulf and Pacific coasts. It is commonly said that all months which have an “R” in them are suitable for eating oysters. In point of fact oysters are eaten the year round, especially on the Atlantic coast, though to a very limited extent during the spring and summer months. Those who own their own oyster beds are privileged to take oysters at all seasons, and it is not unusual that a restaurant furnishes oysters during the whole year, those in the closed season being derived from private beds.

Life of an Oyster.--After an oyster is taken from its bed it may be kept alive for a long time at a temperature which does not rise too high nor sink too low. The best temperature for keeping oysters alive is about 40 to 50 degrees Fahrenheit. The oysters should be protected from the sunlight by a proper covering in a cool place and kept moist with sea water or brine which is sprinkled over them in such a way as to come in contact with each oyster in the heap. Oysters kept under these conditions often remain in an excellent state for consumption for a week or ten days or even longer. If such conditions are maintained oysters may be shipped in bulk to all parts of the country in cars kept cool, and this is the best way in which oysters should be distributed for consumption in a

fresh state.

The treating of oysters with fresh water in order to swell them and thus make them appear larger and plumper than they really are is a treatment which is reprehensible in every respect. Not only does it deceive the customer in regard to the size of the oyster but it deprives the oyster of its proper taste and flavor. “Soaked” oysters quickly lose their flavor, whereas the oysters kept as above described and sprinkled with brine retain their natural flavor and odor. The objection to the transportation of oysters in this way is that the shell usually weighs many times more than the oyster and the same rate of freight must be paid upon it as upon the oyster itself. Nevertheless, the fact remains that fresh oysters should be eaten directly after removal from the shells. As soon as the shell is removed and the oyster killed by this removal it begins to deteriorate and in a short time its flavor and aroma are impaired. It is a common practice in many cities, even where oysters are delivered fresh daily from their beds, to open large quantities of them and put them in tubs and sell them from these tubs to customers. It thus happens that customers often buy oysters that have been opened 24 hours or more and which are naturally of a very changed flavor. Strict regulations in regard to the use of fresh oysters, favoring their being opened when they are ready for consumption or requiring that they should be kept in the condition of palatability and properly kept cool until ready for consumption, should be observed.

Shipment of Opened Oysters.--Opened oysters are shipped extensively to all parts of the country. After removal from the shell the oysters are washed to remove the natural water, since this becomes ropy during shipment. They are then packed in wooden tubs of various sizes, a piece of ice added, covered, and delivered to the fast express or freight service. In this way the oysters may be kept free of dangerous deterioration for several days. In such cases care must be exercised to keep the temperature low and to secure a sanitary environment. Thus protected the oysters should arrive at their destination without any further change than the necessary loss of flavor caused by the conditions of preparation and transportation.

Proportion of Shell and Oysters.--The following illustration (Report of the U. S. Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries for 1888, page 784) shows the relative proportion of the flesh, liquid, and refuse for two or three varieties of oysters:

Name: Oysters (“East Rivers”).

Locality: Cow Bay, Long Island Sound, New York.

Received: April 8, 1881, from E. G. Blackford.

Description: Length, 2½■ to 5½■ inches; breadth, 1⅜■ to 3½■ inches.

WEIGHINGS IN PREPARATION FOR ANALYSIS.

GRMS. LBS. OZ. PERCENT. Flesh, 558.0 1 3.6 10.27 Liquid, 543.7 1 3.1 10.01 Refuse (shells, etc.), 4,284.7 9 7.2 78.86 Loss, 47.3 .. 1.7 .86 ------- -- ---- ------ Total, 51 oysters, 5,433.7 11 15.6 100.00

Name: Oysters (“Sounds”).

Locality: Princess Bay, Staten Island, New York.

Received: November 30, 1881, from Dorlon & Shaffer, New York City.

Description: Thirty oysters in shell.

WEIGHINGS IN PREPARATION FOR ANALYSIS.

GRMS. LBS. OZ. PERCENT. Flesh, 384.0 .. 13.5 8.24 Liquid, 436.0 .. 15.4 9.35 Refuse, 3,816.0 8 6.6 81.87 Loss, 25.0 .. 0.9 0.54 ------- -- ---- ------ Total, 30 oysters, 4,661.0 10 4.4 100.00

The above data show that for 100 pounds of shelled oysters only about 10 pounds of meat are found. There is also about 10 pounds of liquid or juice that escapes when the oyster is opened. There is an average of 80 pounds of shell and other refuse. When it is remembered that, as will be shown in the table given below, in 10 pounds of the meat there is over 80 percent of water it is seen that the actual nourishment contained in 100 pounds of oysters is reduced to a little over 1 pound. There is a general opinion that oysters are a very nutritious food and this is true in so far as the nitrogenous element of food, that is, the protein, is concerned, and in proportion to the quantity present. As a nourishing food the oyster cannot be considered as worthy of any very great esteem. It must be confessed that it will continue to be used as it has been in the past, that is, practically, as a condimental food substance

and not to satisfy hunger nor provide the heat and energy of the human activities.

Process of Floating.--Reference has already been made to the practice of soaking oysters in fresh water for the purpose of making them more plump and increasing their weight. This, in the language of the fisherman, is called “floating,” “drinking,” or “laying out.” By this process the body of the oyster affects a plumpness and largeness which materially increases its selling qualities, as it increases its weight and size and, therefore, the profits of the dealer. The principle of this process depends upon the fact that when a soft substance like an oyster, containing a mineral salt in its composition, is brought in contact with water, a process of diffusion takes place which is known, in chemical physics, as osmosis, whereby water passes through the cell walls and enters the cells of the oyster and the mineral substance thereof is forced out into the external water. Larger volumes of water pass into the cells than accompany the particles of mineral matter to the outside of the cells and the result is a swelling of the oysters and consequent increase in the size and weight by the addition of pure water, but at the expense of the natural salt, mostly chlorid of sodium or common salt, which the oyster contains.

The U. S. Bureau of Fisheries has been experimenting to show the change which takes place with the following results:--

STATISTICS OF WEIGHTS, ETC., OF SPECIMENS OF OYSTERS.

----------+----------+ | JAMES RIVER.[17] | ----------+----------+----------+ | | | CONSTITUENTS. | From beds. | From floats. | +----------+----------+ | Lab. No. 82; 31 | Lab. No. 83; 34 | | oysters. | oysters. | ----------+-------+----------+-------+----------+ Shell contents: |_Grms._|_Lbs. Oz._|_Grms._|_Lbs. Oz._| Flesh (body) | 312.5| 11.0| 412.5| 14.5| Liquids (liquor)| 181.5| 6.4| 208.0| 7.3| +-------+----------+-------+----------+ Total | 494.0| 1 1.4| 620.5| 1 5.8| +=======+==========+=======+==========+ Refuse: | | | | | Shells | 2778.0| 6 2.0| 2976.0| 6 9.1| Loss[18] | 21.0| 0.8| 17.5| 0.6| +-------+----------+-------+----------+ Total | 2799.0| 6 2.8| 2993.5| 6 9.7| +=======+==========+=======+==========+ Total weight of | | | | | specimen | 3293.0| 7 4.2| 3614.0| 7 15.5| ----------+-------+----------+-------+----------+

----------+---------- | POTOMAC RIVER.[17] ----------+----------+---------- | | CONSTITUENTS. | From beds. | From floats. +----------+---------- | Lab. No. 85; 35 | Lab. No. 84; 41 | oysters. | oysters. ----------+-------+----------+--------+--------- Shell contents: |_Grms._|_Lbs. Oz._|_Grms._|_Lbs. Oz._ Flesh (body) | 302.5| 10.7| 415.5| 14.7 Liquids (liquor)| 282.0| 10.0| 264.3| 9.3 +-------+----------+-------+---------- Total | 584.5| 1 4.7| 679.8| 1 8.0 +=======+==========+=======+========== Refuse: | | | | Shells | 3017.0| 6 10.4| 3386.0| 7 7.4 Loss[18] | 22.5| 0.8| 15.2| 0.5 +-------+----------+-------+---------- Total | 3039.5| 6 11.2| 3401.2| 7 7.9 +=======+==========+=======+========== Total weight of | | | | specimen | 3624.0| 7 15.9| 4081.0| 8 15.9 ----------+-------+----------+-------+----------

[17] Transplanted to beds in New Haven harbor, Connecticut, in April, and taken for analysis the following November.

[18] Loss in opening and weighing, chiefly water.

COMPARATIVE PERCENTAGE COMPOSITION OF OYSTERS BEFORE AND AFTER “FLOATING.”

----------+----------+---------- |JAMES RIVER OYSTERS |POTOMAC RIVER OYSTERS | TRANSPLANTED TO | TRANSPLANTED TO | NEW HAVEN. | NEW HAVEN. ----------+----------+----------+----------+---------- CONSTITUENTS OF OYSTERS. | As taken | As taken | As taken | As taken | from | from | from | from | beds. | floats. | beds. | floats. +----------+----------+----------+---------- | No. 82. | No. 83. | No. 85. | No. 84. ----------+----------+----------+----------+---------- _In whole specimen:_ |_Percent._|_Percent._|_Percent._|_Percent._ Shell contents: | | | | Flesh | 9.49 | 11.41 | 8.35 | 10.18 Liquids | 5.51 | 5.76 | 7.78 | 6.48 +----------+----------+----------+---------- Total shell | | | | contents | 15.00 | 17.17 | 16.13 | 16.66 +==========+==========+==========+========== Refuse: | | | | Shells | 84.36 | 82.35 | 83.25 | 82.97 Loss in preparation | | | | for analysis | 0.64 | 0.48 | 0.62 | 0.37 +----------+----------+----------+---------- Total refuse | 85.00 | 82.83 | 83.87 | 83.34 +==========+==========+==========+========== Total constituents,| | | | shell contents, and| | | | refuse | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 +==========+==========+==========+========== _In flesh (body):_ | | | | Water | 77.99 | 82.77 | 77.90 | 82.06 Water-free substance | 22.01 | 17.23 | 22.10 | 17.94 +----------+----------+----------+---------- Total flesh | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 +==========+==========+==========+========== In water-free | | | | substance: | | | | Nitrogen | 1.70 | 1.40 | 1.65 | 1.45 Protein (nitrogen × | | | | 6.25) | 10.63 | 8.79 | 10.31 | 9.09 Fat (ether extract) | 2.61 | 1.91 | 2.33 | 1.93 Ash | 2.21 | 1.55 | 2.17 | 1.58 Carbohydrates, etc. | | | | (by difference) | 6.56 | 4.98 | 7.29 | 5.34 +----------+----------+----------+---------- Total water-free | | | | substance | 22.01 | 17.23 | 22.10 | 17.94 +==========+==========+==========+========== _In liquids:_ | | | | Water | 94.74 | 95.22 | 94.99 | 95.69 Water-free

substance | 5.26 | 4.78 | 5.01 | 4.31 +----------+----------+----------+---------- Total liquids | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 +==========+==========+==========+========== In water-free | | | | substance: | | | | Nitrogen | 0.31 | 0.34 | 0.29 | 0.33 Protein (nitrogen × | | | | 6.25) | 1.95 | 2.09 | 1.81 | 2.05 Fat (ether extract) | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.02 | 0.01 Ash | 2.54 | 1.42 | 2.47 | 1.19 Carbohydrates, etc. | | | | (by difference) | 0.73 | 1.14 | 0.71 | 1.06 +----------+----------+----------+---------- Total water-free | | | | substance | 5.26 | 4.78 | 5.01 | 4.31 +==========+==========+==========+========== _In total shell contents,| | | | flesh, and liquids:_ | | | | Water | 84.15 | 86.95 | 86.14 | 87.36 Water-free substance | 15.85 | 13.05 | 13.86 | 12.64 +----------+----------+----------+---------- Total shell | | | | contents | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 +==========+==========+==========+========== In water-free | | | | substance: | | | | Nitrogen | 1.19 | 1.05 | 0.99 | 1.02 Protein (nitrogen × | | | | 6.25) | 7.44 | 6.54 | 6.20 | 6.37 Fat (ether extract) | 1.66 | 1.31 | 1.21 | 1.18 Ash | 2.32 | 1.50 | 2.32 | 1.43 Carbohydrates, etc. | | | | (by difference) | 4.43 | 3.70 | 4.13 | 3.66 +----------+----------+----------+---------- Total water-free | | | | substance | 15.85 | 13.05 | 13.86 | 12.64 +==========+==========+==========+========== _In whole specimen:_ | | | | Shell contents: | | | | Water | 12.62 | 14.93 | 13.89 | 14.55 Water-free substance | 2.38 | 2.24 | 2.24 | 2.11 +----------+----------+----------+---------- Total shell | | | | contents | 15.00 | 17.17 | 16.13 | 16.66 Refuse | 85.00 | 82.83 | 83.87 | 83.34 +----------+----------+----------+---------- Total shell | | | | contents and refuse| 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 +==========+==========+==========+========== _In whole specimen:_ | | | | Shell contents: | | | | Nitrogen | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.17 Protein (nitrogen × | | | | 6.25) | 1.12 | 1.12 | 1.00 | 1.06 Fat (ether extract) | 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.20 | 0.20 Ash | 0.35 | 0.26 | 0.37 | 0.24 Carbohydrates, etc. | | | | (by difference) | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.67 | 0.61 +==========+==========+==========+========== Total water-free | | | | substance | 2.38 | 2.24 | 2.24 | 2.11 Water | 12.62 | 14.93 | 13.89 | 14.55 +----------+----------+----------+---------- Total shell-contents | 15.00 | 17.17 | 16.13 | 16.66 +==========+==========+==========+========== ----------

Result of Treatment.--As shown by the data the first result is one which would naturally be expected, namely, that the total weight of the oyster thus inflated with water is increased relatively to the total weight of the shell since no change takes place in the weight of the shell during floating. The gain of weight in the oyster is due to the absorption of the water, although there is a loss of mineral salt. The average gain of the oyster was, in round numbers, 10 percent. The danger of infecting oysters thus treated with any germs, which may be present in the water or ice used, should also be taken into consideration.

In respect of the composition of the oyster itself when subjected to floating the chief change is in the increase of the water content. As has already been said the process of floating is fatal to the flavor and palatability of the product.

Adulteration.--The chief adulterations of oysters are the “floating” above described and the treatment of the “shucked” oysters with formaldehyde, boron compounds, and other preservatives to keep them from spoiling. These processes are thoroughly reprehensible and are rapidly disappearing. The consumer who lives near the source of supply should never eat any but freshly shelled oysters and those at a distance confine themselves to the properly prepared and shipped article. The chief delight of the epicure is the freshness, and not the quantity of nourishment of this justly prized bivalve.

Average Composition of Oysters:[19]--

Water, 60.08 percent Solids, 39.92 „ Nitrogen, 1.56 „ Phosphoric acid, .42 „ Sulfur, .19 „ Fat, 9.48 „ Ash, 1.77 „ Protein, 9.73 „

[19] Average of samples used at Hygienic Table, Bureau of Chemistry.

ANIMAL OILS.

The same distinction is made between oils and fats for animal products as has been made for the vegetable preparations further on. An animal fat remains solid or semisolid at the ordinary temperature of the living room. An animal oil, on the other hand, is one which at ordinary temperature is a liquid. Animal oils, as a rule, are not used for edible purposes directly, but are used to some extent in cooking, and to a large extent as medicinal food. Inasmuch as these oils are used for medicinal food purposes, those which are most important in this use may be very properly described in this manual. As these oils are derived both from sea and land animals they are often conveniently divided into marine animal oils and terrestrial animal oils. There is also a marked difference as a rule between the oils of marine origin and those of terrestrial origin. The oils of marine origin, as a rule, have a very high iodin number while the animal oils of terrestrial origin have an iodin number not much greater than the fats from which they are derived. This distinction corresponds somewhat closely to those vegetable oils which belong to the drying and non-drying variety. The iodin number represents the percentage of iodin absorbed by a unit weight of substance. If one gram of an oil absorb 0.67

gram of iodin, the iodin number is 67. The marine oils correspond to the dry vegetable oils and the terrestrial oils to the non-drying vegetable oils. While this difference is one which is marked, it does not always exist in each individual case.

MARINE ANIMAL OILS.

The marine animal oils may be conveniently divided into fish oils, liver oils, and blubber oils. Of these the liver oils are the most important from an edible point of view or a medicinal edible point of view. The fish oil and blubber oil are used chiefly for illuminating and other technical purposes.

=Fish Oils.=--These are obtained by rendering from all parts of a fish where fat exists. The herring, sardine, salmon, and the menhaden are the fish which are chiefly used for getting oil of this kind. The fish oils have very much improved in quality since the steamer has taken the place of the sail boat for gathering the fish. During the days of the sail boat the fish were often kept for ten days after seining before they were brought ashore. The decomposition which took place would naturally affect the oil. At the present day the steamers fishing close to the shores deliver their products much more frequently, often the same day they are caught, and thus a better quality of oil is produced. In this country menhaden is the chief fish used for obtaining oil. The scientific name of menhaden is _Brevoortia tyrannus_. These fish appear in enormous quantities around the Atlantic coast from May until November. It is estimated that nearly one-half million tons have been taken of these fish during a season. Menhaden oil is rarely if ever used for edible purposes. It is used principally in the leather trade and sometimes in the adulteration of cod liver oil made in Newfoundland.

Sardine Oil.--Sardine oil is principally prepared in Japan from the Japan sardine (_Clupea sardinus_). It is not used to any extent for edible purposes. It is also prepared to some extent in the boiling of sardines in France preparatory to packing in oil.

Salmon Oil.--This oil is obtained in large quantities on the Pacific coast. It is one of the fish oils which has an agreeable odor and taste and, therefore, can be used for edible purposes. It has a specific gravity at 15 degrees of about .926 and its iodin number is about 160.

Cod Liver Oil.--The most important of all the animal oils for food purposes is the oil which is obtained from the liver of the cod (_Gadus callarias_). Cod liver oil is valuable for food purposes not on account of its odor and taste, which are usually quite disagreeable, but by reason of the specific effect which it is often said to exercise in cases of emaciation and general disorder of the functional activities of the body. It is a food or medicine, whichever it may be best called, which is highly prized in tuberculosis and similar diseases. The oil is chiefly prepared in the Loffoden Islands. Different classes of oil are prepared which are differentiated chiefly by their color, the lighter the color the higher the quality of the oil. The chemical composition of cod liver oil is extremely complex, many different kinds of substances having been found in it by various authorities. The probability is that many of these supposed substances are only mixtures of others. Yet it cannot be denied that the number of chemical compounds occurring in cod liver oil is very much greater than that which occurs in ordinary oils. Both the medicinal and food values of the oil are often attributed to these bodies which occur in minute quantities.

Properties.--Cod liver oil at 15 degrees has a specific gravity of .922. Its iodin number varies very greatly but is always high, ranging from 150 to 180. Its refractive index is also very high, namely 1.47.

An important constituent of cod liver oil is cholesterol. Cod liver oil contains naturally a small quantity of iodin and this natural compound of iodin is one of the properties to which much of its medicinal virtue has been attributed. The quantity present is extremely minute, and probably never exceeds .002 of one percent.

Adulteration of Cod Liver Oil.--Owing to its increasing price cod liver oil has been subjected to many forms of adulteration. The chief adulteration consists in the admixture of fish liver oil of lower quality or the use of blubber oil. Seal and whale oils have been used very extensively in the adulteration of cod liver oil. Japan fish oil and, in fact, all other fish oils which are of a character not to disguise the properties of cod liver oil have been used. It is evident that it is with extreme difficulty that the presence of these adulterants can be detected, especially if they are used in small quantities. The only certain method of guarantee of the purity of a cod liver oil is in the proper inspection and control of the manufacturing works. The livers of many other kinds of fish are employed in the manufacture of cod liver oil, but the other varieties have little value as compared with the cod liver oil itself and they are probably used almost exclusively in the adulteration of the genuine article. The Norwegian cod fish gives a much better character of oil than those coming from the Atlantic coast of America. In fact the latter product is of little medicinal food value and is used chiefly

in the leather trade.

=Blubber Oil.=--Blubber oil includes the oils made from seals, whales, turtles, etc., and is used exclusively for technical purposes, unless surreptitiously placed in cod liver oil as an adulterant.

PART IV.

MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS AND OLEOMARGARINE.

MILK.

=Limitation of Name.=--By the term “milk,” unless qualified in some way, is meant a lacteal secretion of the healthy cow, free of colostrum and of standard quality. If the milk of other mammals is meant the name of the class of animal is used in connection with the term, such as ewe’s milk, goat’s milk, etc. Milk is one of the most important articles of commerce and, by reason of its composition, high nutritive character, and easy digestibility, it is not only the natural food of infants but a most important food for children and adults. It is also an indispensable food in many, if not most, cases of disease where nutrition is impaired. In some cases life may often be sustained over a critical period by the use of milk as a food where other forms of food would fail of digestion and prove injurious instead of beneficial.

The United States standard for milk is found in Appendix A.

=Average Composition of Milk.=--Perhaps there is no food substance which has been subjected to so many and such severe analytical tests as milk. Hundreds of thousands of analyses have been made in all civilized countries, not only of the milk of the individual cow but of herds of greater or less size.

There is a great variation in the composition of milk in different breeds of cattle and also in different individuals of the same breed. For instance, the Holstein breed of cattle affords a milk with a very low content of fat, sometimes as low as 3.25 percent, and in individual cases lower. On the other hand the Jersey breed of cattle affords a milk of a very high content of fat, sometimes reaching as high as 6 percent, and in individual cases very much higher. The content of the nitrogenous element in milk is more stable than that of fat and the common content of casein in milk ranges from 2½■ to 3½■ percent. The sugar in the milk is usually the complementary substance with the fat, diminishing in relative proportions as the fat increases and vice versa. The average content of sugar in cow’s milk is approximately 4 percent. The content of mineral substances in milk is also quite constant, being about 0.70. The ash contains the phosphoric acid which is one of the essential food components of milk. A milk of fair average quality contains 12 percent of solids and 88 percent of water. This is an expression for milk during the various seasons of the year and from all breeds and kinds of cows. The influence of season has much to do with the quantity of milk produced. It is always greater in the spring and summer months, when the cows are turned out to pasture and the growth on which they feed is unusually succulent. The increase in volume is not attended with a proportionate increase of solids, and thus the percentage of solids in spring and summer milk is less than that in the winter milk unless the cows are particularly well fed during the winter on a generous diet, including large quantities of roots.

[Illustration: FIG. 13.--COW STABLES, MAPLETOWN FARM, SUMNER, WASHINGTON.]

The character of the milk is greatly influenced by the environment in which the cow lives. The stable in which the cow is kept should be clean, well ventilated, and protected against extreme changes in temperature, thus being cooler in the summer than the hot air on the outside and much warmer in the winter. An excellent arrangement of the stables to secure cleanliness and good ventilation is shown in Fig. 13. Cows should be supplied with an abundant quantity of pure water and should not be allowed access to stagnant pools when pasturing in the summer. Every animal giving milk should be examined from time to time by a competent veterinarian to determine, by the injection of serum or otherwise, whether or not the animal is afflicted with tuberculosis. Every animal infected with tuberculosis should be separated from the herd and destroyed. Tuberculosis is an infectious disease and may spread from a single cow to every one in the herd. It is still by some authorities claimed that there is no authentic case of transmission of bovine tuberculosis to the human system. Other authorities hold that such transmission is possible, even if it has not been proven in a particular case. Since experts disagree on this point the same rule is applicable here as in other cases of the same kind, namely, where experts disagree on a point relating to the public health the benefit of the doubt, if any, should be given to the public, and the advice of those experts followed which is the most radical respecting the protection of health from infection of

any kind. It would be difficult to prove, for example, in any case of tuberculosis in man that it had been contracted from the sputa of tuberculosed patients, yet because it is possible, in the opinion of many experts, that such infection and transmission of disease can take place, it is the part of wisdom to guard against it.

It is, I think, a statement which will be accepted by all that it is possible in this country to secure and keep a sufficient number of healthy cows to give the milk supply of the nation. Therefore, it is the duty of the state, either by municipal, state, or federal inspection, to eliminate, as far as possible, and, if necessary, at the expense of the state, every diseased animal from the dairy herd. The farmer whose herd becomes infected through no fault of his can justly claim a compensation for the destruction of his animals for the common good. There is, perhaps, no more important point connected with the keeping of sanitary conditions than the proper inspection of the dairy, not only furnishing milk for family use, but especially for sale. It is the plain duty of every municipality and state to prohibit the sale of milk to its citizens from dairies which are not periodically and frequently subjected to the most rigid expert inspection. Such inspection would not only secure the health of the animals but tend directly toward the cleanliness of the dairy. Only by the exercise of unusual care is it possible to keep milk from becoming contaminated.

=Preparation of Milk.=--Every part of the animal, especially the udders, should be kept scrupulously clean by proper currying and washing. The milk should be collected in vessels with as small an orifice as possible. As soon as drawn the milk should be strained and artificially cooled to a temperature of at least 50 degrees F., if not lower. A convenient apparatus for cooling the milk is shown in Fig. 14. In this condition, without being exposed to infection and being protected from every point by closed vessels, stoppered when necessary by sterilized cotton, the milk is conducted into sterilized bottles and again stoppered with a sterilized cork of some description. The milk is kept cold until delivered to the consumer and by the consumer should be kept cold until used. By following these precautions it is possible to deliver a pure, wholesome, unpasteurized milk in a condition which keeps practically unchanged for even a longer period than twenty-four hours.

[Illustration: FIG. 14.--APPARATUS FOR COOLING MILK.]

=Certified Milk.=--Dairies which are inspected either by operation of the law or, voluntarily, by a competent body of medical and scientific experts duly authorized to make such inspection furnish to the market what is known as certified milk. Each bottle of this milk bears the stamp of certification and this stamp may be used from the time of one inspection until a certain date specified on the stamp when the next inspection takes place. The duty of the inspectors is to see that diseased animals are at once removed from the dairy, that the sanitary conditions of the stable are perfect, that the food is abundant and wholesome, that the milking process is conducted according to the principles above outlined, and that the proper precautions are taken to prevent infection during the preparation of the milk for the market. The milk should be examined chemically and bacteriologically at each inspection, or oftener, to see that it is of a standard quality, both in respect of the number and character of the organisms which it contains and of its chemical constituents. Certified milk is, of course, more expensive than non-certified, inasmuch as the dairy is necessarily called upon to bear the expense of inspection. However, the superior quality of such milk and its certain freedom from infection more than offsets the increased price, and makes certified milk the ideal food of a milk character, not only in the family, but especially in the hospitals, orphan asylums and other public institutions. It seems quite certain that in the near future practically all the milk that is sold upon the market of the country will be of a certified quality.

=Pasteurized Milk.=--When milk is heated to a temperature of about 140 to 160 degrees the greater part of the living organisms contained therein are destroyed. At the same time the temperature is not high enough to give to the milk that peculiar taste which it acquires when boiled. Such pasteurized milk, placed in sterilized bottles, stoppered with sterilized stoppers and kept in a cool place, will keep many days and even weeks without apparent deterioration. Physicians and hygienists are quite agreed that pasteurized milk is not so wholesome, especially for children, as certified milk which has not been subjected to a heat sufficiently high to kill the organisms contained therein. The natural ferments of the milk, namely, the enzymes which produce the lactic fermentations, promote rather than interfere with the digestion of the product. The killing of the beneficial organisms of the milk is only justified when there is danger of pathological germs being present. Hence the pasteurization of milk must in this sense be regarded as a substitute for inspection and certification.

There may arise cases where pasteurizing even of certified milk may be desirable, namely, when from necessity it must be kept for a considerable period before use, as on shipboard, and other places inaccessible to a daily supply of fresh milk. Pasteurizing is also justifiable in miscellaneous milk supplies, the origin of which is unknown. It is safer, by far in this case, to pasteurize than take the chance of consuming pathological germs.

=Pasteurizing of Milk.=--A convenient method of pasteurizing milk is recommended by the Dairy Division of the Department of Agriculture, which is as follows:

=Directions for the Pasteurization of Milk=.[20]--The pasteurization of milk for children, now quite extensively practiced in order to destroy the injurious germs which it may contain, can be satisfactorily accomplished with very simple apparatus. The vessel containing the milk, which may be the bottle from which it is to be used or any other suitable vessel, is placed inside of a larger vessel of metal, which contains water. If a bottle, it is plugged with absorbent cotton, if this is at hand, or in its absence other clean cotton will answer. A small fruit jar loosely covered may be used instead of a bottle. The requirements are simply that the interior vessel shall be raised about half an inch above the bottom of the other, and that the water shall reach nearly or quite as high as the milk. The apparatus is then heated on a range or stove until the water reaches a temperature of 155 degrees Fahrenheit, when it is removed from the heat and kept tightly covered for half an hour. The milk is rapidly cooled without removing it from its containers and kept in a cool place. It may be used any time within twenty-four hours. A temperature of 150 degrees maintained for half an hour is sufficient to destroy any germs likely to be present in the milk, in cold weather, or when it is known that the milk reaches the consumer soon after milking, and it is generally safe to adopt this limit. It is found in practice that raising the temperature to 155 degrees and then allowing the milk to stand in the heated water for half an hour insures the proper temperature for the required time. If the temperature is raised above 155 degrees the taste and quality of the milk will be affected.

[20] By Dr. De Schweinitz.

Inasmuch as the milk furnished to consumers in large cities in summer contains at the time of delivery an immense number of miscellaneous bacteria, this procedure may not fully meet the requirements during hot weather, not only because such milk will not remain sweet for twenty-four hours unless kept in a good refrigerator, but also because the bacteria not destroyed by the heating may at times produce digestive disturbances in the very young. Under such circumstances it is best to keep the bottles in the water until it boils or to use one of the many steamers now on the market. After the bottles have been kept at the boiling point for three to five minutes (or longer if they are large) they should be cooled as promptly as possible and kept in a refrigerator until used.

The simplest plan is to take a tin pail and invert a perforated tin pie-plate in the bottom, or have made for it a removable false bottom perforated with holes and having legs half an inch high to allow circulation of the water. The milk-bottle is set on this false bottom, and sufficient water is put into the pail to reach the level of the surface of the milk in the bottle. A hole may be punched in the cover of the pail, a cork inserted, and a chemical thermometer put through the cork, so that the bulb dips into the water. The temperature can thus be watched without removing the cover. If preferred, an ordinary dairy thermometer[21] may be used and the temperature read from time to time by removing the lid. This is very easily arranged, and is just as satisfactory as the patented apparatus sold for the same purpose. Any other simple method of procedure will give the same result.

[21] Before using the dairy thermometer it is best to have it tested, as it may be unreliable in the upper parts of the scale.

Average Content of Fat in American Milk.--From the thousands of analyses of American milks that have been made it appears that the average content of fat therein is about 3.90 percent. Of the different breeds of cows the Holsteins produce milk with the least content of fat and the Jerseys with the greatest. It is not unusual to find in the milk of a Jersey cow a content of 6 or 7 percent of fat.

=Comparison of Cow's Milk with Other Varieties.=--Human milk differs from milk chiefly in having a much lower content of casein and a higher content of milk sugar. Goat's milk has a higher content of casein than milk, somewhat higher content of fat, and slightly less sugar. Ewe's milk is very rich both in protein and fat. Mare's has a low casein and fat content and is exceptionally rich in sugar. Ass's milk has less casein and protein than milk but more sugar.

=Cream.=--When milk is allowed to stand for some hours in a cool place or when it is mechanically treated in a separator the fat particles, being of a less specific gravity, are separated, and when they reach a certain degree of consistence they form a product known as cream. The quantity of fat in cream varies according to the method of separation. On standing for a period of about twelve hours in a cool place the separated cream may be removed by skimming and should contain at least 18 percent of milk fat. Under the action of the separator, cream of a much greater content of fat is usually produced, often reaching as much as 30 percent or more. The separation of cream mechanically in a separator is preferable to the method of time separation by gravity alone. The cream secured by the separator is very much fresher, as it can be removed as soon as the milk is drawn and cooled. Its content of butter fat can also be regulated to the desired amount and, in the third place, a more complete separation is secured

than by gravity. By the proper manipulation of the separator almost all of the fat in milk is readily removed. Cream should be kept under the same conditions as has been described for sanitary milk. When placed in sterilized containers, properly stoppered and kept cool, fresh cream will keep sweet as long as milk under similar circumstances.

In large dairy industries the separator is practically the only method now employed for securing cream while for farm use the gravity method of standing in a cool place for twelve or twenty-four hours is the commonly practiced method.

Cream is used on the table with fruit and cereal foods and especially in beverages such as tea and coffee. It is also prescribed by physicians for certain diseases and derangement of the digestive organs where the nitrogen content of milk produces irritation and fails of digestion. Cream is not a complete food in the sense that milk is inasmuch as the other constituents of milk are less in proportion as the percentage of fat is increased, yet cream contains at least a part of all the food elements in milk, as, for example, nitrogenous constituent, principally, casein, milk, sugar, and mineral matters.

It must be remembered in this case that the fat is the variable element and as that is increased the proportion of other ingredients, necessarily, is diminished.

The most important use of cream is in the manufacture of butter.

=Standards of Cream.=--The composition of cream varies with almost every sample. The standards for cream vary in different states and cities. The national standard requires 18 percent of fat.

=Skimmed Milk.=--The residue which is left from the removal of cream is known as skimmed milk. Skimmed milk contains the principle part of the nitrogenous constituents of milk, the greater quantity of its sugar and a very large quantity of its mineral matter. It is still a very valuable food product, lacking only the element of fat. When eaten with nuts or other oily food skimmed milk would complete the ration and make a well balanced food. The chief prejudice against skimmed milk is that it has been so often sold for whole milk. When sold and consumed under its own name it is not a fraudulent body and is deserving of a higher place in the dietary than has been ascribed to it. In the large creameries of the country the skimmed milk is usually fed to animals. It is one of the most highly esteemed foods for pigs and poultry, and is largely used for those purposes.

Composition of Skimmed Milk.--Naturally the composition of skimmed milk would be that of milk corrected for the abstraction of fat. It contains some little fat when prepared by the gravity method and only a very small portion when separated mechanically. The abstraction of the fat increases the relative proportions of sugar and casein.

=Curd Test for Purity of Milk.=--The Wisconsin curd test is conducted as follows: 1. Sterilize milk containers so as to destroy all bacteria in vessels. This step is very important, and can be done by heating cans in boiling water or steam for not less than one-half hour.

2. Place about one pint of milk in covered jar and heat to about 98 degrees F. (Figs. 15 and 16).

3. Add ten drops of standard rennet extract and mix thoroughly with the milk to quickly coagulate.

4. After coagulation, cut curd fine with case knife to facilitate separation of whey; leave curd in whey one-half hour to an hour; then drain off whey at frequent intervals until curd is well matted.

5. Incubate curd mass at 98 to 102 degrees F. by immersing jar in warm water. Keep jars covered to retain odors.

6. After 6 to 9 hours incubation, open jar and observe odor; examine curds by cutting the same with sharp knife and observe texture as to presence of pin holes or gas holes. Observe odor.

7. Very bad milks will betray presence of gas-producing bacteria by the spongy texture of the curd and will have an off flavor.

8. If more than one sample is tested at the same time, dip knife and thermometer in hot water before each time used.

“Normal milk contains practically no organisms but the straight lactic acid bacteria. These germs produce no gas and no bad odors, but purely lactic acid and the curd formed therefrom is such as is represented in Fig. 17.

[Illustration: FIG. 15.--IMPROVISED WISCONSIN CURD TEST.

C, Can used to hold sample; P, pipette for measuring rennet; K, knife for breaking curd.]

[Illustration: FIG. 16.--A, MILK; B, BROKEN CURD IN WHEY; C, MATTED CURD.]

[Illustration: FIG. 17.--CURD FROM A GOOD MILK. LARGE, IRREGULAR HOLES MECHANICAL.]

[Illustration: FIG. 18.--CURD FROM A TAINTED MILK. LARGE, IRREGULAR HOLES MECHANICAL; SMALL PINHOLES DUE TO GAS.]

[Illustration: FIG. 19.--CURD FROM FOUL MILK.]

“Milk contaminated by the introduction of dust, dirt, fecal matter, or kept in imperfectly cleaned cans becomes fouled with gas-producing bacteria that break down the milk sugar and so produce gases and usually undesirable odors.... Therefore milks showing the presence of gas or bad odors in any considerable degree are milks that have been more or less polluted with extraneous organisms or carelessly handled, and as a consequence such milks show a type of curd revealed in Figs. 17, 18, and 19.

=Whey.=--The residue left from milk in the process of the making of cheese is known as whey. Whey consists of that portion of milk which is not precipitated by the rennet and which separates when the casein of milk is coagulated and sets in the process of cheese making. The whey contains the principal portion of the water in milk, the most of the milk sugar therein, and small quantities of butter and soluble nitrogenous portions (albumin) and solid particles which remain suspended in the solution. It may, therefore, be properly considered as milk from which the greater part of the nitrogenous portions and fat particles has been separated. The value of whey as a food product consists chiefly in the milk sugar which it contains. It is not very largely used for human food but is valued as a food for young domesticated animals, especially pigs and poultry.

=Composition of Whey.=--The whey resulting from the manufacture of cheese contains nearly all the foods of the whole milk with the exception of the casein and fat. It is composed of from 6 to 8 percent of solids consisting chiefly of milk sugar, some albumin, a little fat, and about 0.6 percent of mineral matter.

=Koumiss.=--Koumiss originated in Asia Minor in the production of a fermented drink from mare’s milk, which is richer in milk sugar than the lactic secretions of most other mammals. By the fermentation of the milk sugar mare’s milk is converted into a fermented beverage containing a small percentage of alcohol. In this country koumiss is made almost exclusively from cow’s milk and by special fermentation at a low temperature. It is a beverage valued especially by convalescents and invalids and frequently is capable of nourishing the body in diseases which affect the digestive organs when other foods fail of assimilation. It is also a cooling and delicious beverage for those in health when properly prepared and stored.

Modified Koumiss or Kephir.--Koumiss made from cow’s milk with the previous addition of milk or cane sugar to increase the alcoholic content cannot be regarded as a natural product but rather one to which the term “modified” may be applied. The greater part of koumiss made in the United States from cow’s milk is of this modified variety. Cow’s milk contains on an average about 4 or 5 percent of sugar and does not yield a fermented beverage of a sufficient alcoholic content without reducing the actual sugar content of the beverage below the point of palatability. Cane sugar is usually employed as the modifying agent. While modified koumiss cannot be regarded as of equal value with the natural article made from mare’s milk it is a palatable and wholesome beverage when produced and stored under proper conditions. The quantity of alcohol produced in any case is not very great and the change in composition which renders koumiss so easily assimilable in many cases cannot be due alone to the alcohol formed but to the fermentative changes produced by enzymic action which takes place in the other constituents of koumiss, especially casein during the process of fermentation.

Koumiss or kephir, which is the name applied to koumiss made from cow’s milk, is also prepared with the addition of honey, in the place of sugar, and small quantities of wheat flour, not exceeding 20 parts to 1500 parts of other constituents. Koumiss is sometimes artificially fortified by the addition of small quantities of alcohol, but this practice must be regarded as extremely reprehensible. The alcohol of koumiss is incident to its fermentation and should not be increased beyond the normal amount. One of the important points in the making of koumiss is the control of the temperature which, during fermentation, ought not to rise above 50 degrees in order to get the best results. Koumiss may be made in the bottle in which it is kept, in fact, it is best made so, and its fermentation then resembles that of champagne. During the process of fermentation the bottle should be shaken at least once a day in order that the part which coagulates cannot be unevenly distributed throughout the mass. The bottle should be strong enough to resist the pressure produced by the carbon dioxid which is formed and the cork should be securely tied in. As in the case

of champagne it is best to place the bottle with the cork down. Before using, the bottle containing the koumiss should be well shaken in order to thoroughly mix the contents which form a creamy, foamy mass extremely palatable, highly nutritious, and valuable not only as a beverage but in many cases of disease and disordered digestion as a food. In fact the value of koumiss for medicinal purposes, that is for medicinal food, is not thoroughly appreciated by the medical profession. This may be due to the fact that the art of making koumiss is not generally known, and while the general principles upon which its manufacture is based have been set forth it requires an expert to make a palatable and useful article ("British Dairy Farming" by Jas. Long). It is worthy of suggestion now that the use of horses for draft purposes has practically been superseded by the automobile and the trolley that the production of real koumiss from mare's milk might become a very useful field of industry in the United States. It is perfectly certain that the genuine article must possess properties which are not wholly found in the imitations of koumiss which are so common in this country. It is well understood by physicians that a natural product produced from natural material is always superior in character both as a food and medicine to the synthetic or artificial product. Whenever, therefore, a fermented beverage produced from natural sources is contaminated by artificial products the resulting compound is not so useful nor digestible. For instance, wine which is made partially from sugar and beer made partially from dextrose, although they may be healthful and wholesome beverages, are inferior in quality and character to the real product made from grape juice or barley malt.

=Buttermilk.=--The residue left in the churn in the manufacture of butter is termed buttermilk. There are two distinct varieties of buttermilk, namely, that resulting from the churning of unsoured cream and that remaining from the churning of soured and ripened cream. The first kind of buttermilk does not differ in its characteristic essentials from skimmed milk and therefore is not considered here. The second class of buttermilk is far more common and is a beverage of pleasing acid taste. When made from properly ripened cream it is wholesome and delicious, especially in summer time. Its composition is that of cream subjected to enzymic action during the ripening process by which an agreeable degree of acidity is produced due to lactic acid, together with the incidental changes which take place in the composition of other parts of the liquid due to enzymic action. Buttermilk also usually contains small particles of butter itself which escape aggregation during the final process of churning. In well prepared buttermilk, however, these particles of butter are not very numerous and they add nothing to the palatability, although they do add something to the nutritive properties of the beverage. The buttermilk represents that portion of milk which is one of the chief constituents of cream as far as bulk is concerned, freed practically from its butter fat. It does not differ greatly, therefore, in its chemical properties from skimmed milk, although there is a slight difference in the relative percentages of the milk solids in cream as compared with the same constituents in whole milk. The composition of buttermilk is shown in the following table:

COMPOSITION OF BUTTERMILK.

FROM SWEET FROM SOUR CREAM. CREAM. _Percent._ _Percent._ Water, 89.74 90.93 Fat, 1.21 0.31 Milk sugar, 4.98 4.58 Protein, 3.28 3.37 Ash, 0.79 0.81 Acidity, ... 0.80

=Bonnyclabber.=--Bonnyclabber is a term applied to milk which has become soured by lactic fermentation, producing a gelatinous coagulation of casein which is sufficiently firm at times to prevent the liquid from being poured. Clabber may be regarded as a natural cheese curd except that the fat is chiefly on top. It is a beverage or food of a very agreeable taste to most persons and is often eaten with sugar. In the summer it is often formed during hot murky weather, especially of that character which produces thunder storms. For this reason it is a common supposition that thunder or lightning sours milk. The thunder and lightning, however, have nothing to do with this process. The condition of the atmosphere which produces an environment favorable to electrical disturbances of this kind also favors in the highest degree the growth of the organisms which produce the lactic ferments. Hence thunder storms and the rapid souring of milk are frequently coincident leading to the popular impression as above mentioned. Inasmuch as the souring of milk usually takes place after the cream has risen the composition of clabber is practically that of skimmed milk modified by the lactic fermentation which has taken place.

BUTTER.

When cream, especially cream in which incipient lactic fermentation has been set up, is subjected to agitation in a churn under proper conditions of temperature the particles of butter therein contained are collected into masses so that the butter can be separated from the residual liquid. This process is technically called churning. The domestic churn in its simplest form is perhaps well known to almost everyone, especially those who have lived in the country. In the domestic manufacture of butter the cream is collected and set aside until sour, that is, until lactic fermentation has set up. When this is sufficiently advanced the cream is placed in a churn, the simplest form of which is a wooden, cylindrical vessel of appropriate size, being much longer than its horizontal

diameter. The churn is provided with a dasher, namely a perforated wooden disk with a handle which passes through a hole in the cover. When the churn is charged the butter is produced by agitation with the dasher. In winter time warm water is added to the mixture in order to raise the temperature to the proper gathering point of butter, namely 65 to 70 degrees F. For the same reason cold water is added in the summer time. The art of the dairy maid is shown in the proper regulation of the temperature to secure the best results. When the cream is properly ripened and the temperature is suitable the gathering of butter will be accomplished in from twelve to thirty minutes. In unfavorable conditions the duration of churning may be for a much longer period.

[Illustration: FIG. 20.--POWER CHURN READY FOR USE.--(_Courtesy of the Bureau of Animal Industry._)]

In dairies and large establishments churning is accomplished by machinery with very different mechanical appliances, but the principle which underlies the process is the same as those outlined above. The accompanying figures illustrate the process of churning by mechanical means in a modern dairy (Figs. 20 and 21).

[Illustration: FIG. 21.--POWER CHURN, OPEN.--(_Courtesy of the Bureau of Animal Industry._)]

=Treatment of Butter.=--The crude butter secured by churning is subjected to washing and seasoning processes in order to prepare it for the market. The washing or working of butter is accomplished by means of water. The object of this “working” is to separate from the crude butter as much of the curd and other non-fatty constituents of the cream as can be conveniently accomplished. The removal of these mechanical particles not only makes a butter of a higher grade but also one of better keeping qualities. The working of butter also has much to do with its grain or texture, which is one of the characters of butter to which great attention must be paid. The best grade of butter and that which brings the highest price in the market is that which receives no treatment other than that of the washing and working process to which attention has been called. This kind of butter is known as natural or unsalted or uncolored butter, that is, a fresh, sweet product of an agreeable aroma, palatable, of fine texture and grain, and is the best product of its kind for human consumption. It also brings the highest price on the market and, by reason of its method of preparation, the consumer can usually be assured that it is fresh in character.

=Salting Butter.=--In the United States, especially, consumers of butter generally require that it shall be salted. For this purpose fine grades of dairy salt are used as free as possible from impurities and consisting of fine particles or crystals which rapidly dissolve in the residual moisture of butter. This promotes a uniform distribution of the salt in the form of brine throughout the mass of butter. The existence in butter of undissolved particles of salt is highly prejudicial to its taste and character. The quantity of salt used in butter is determined by the taste of the consumer. The more salt the butter contains the less value it is as butter and hence the quantity should be limited to the smallest possible amount demanded by the consumer’s taste. Often butters are found in commerce which are so full of salt as to be wholly unpalatable and there is a tendency on the part of the greedy manufacturer to add excessive quantities of salt because it is very much cheaper than the butter itself and thus he hopes to add to the profit of the industry. On the contrary this practice usually results in loss, since such highly salted butter naturally brings the lowest price. The amount of salt which is used in butter should not exceed two percent.

It is a common supposition that salt in butter is a preservative. This is true when used in large quantities, that is, in quantities which render the butter somewhat unpalatable. The very small quantity of salt used purely for condimental purposes cannot be regarded as aiding in any material way the preservation of the product.

=Coloring Butter.=--Unfortunately the practice of artificially coloring butter is very prevalent in the United States. Practically all the butter found upon the market, even in the spring and summer, is more or less artificially colored, often with coal tar (anilin) dyes which, to say the least harm of them possible, are open to suspicion in respect of wholesomeness. The practice of coloring butter produced in winter may be regarded as universal, though none the less reprehensible on that account. The object of coloring butter is, undoubtedly, to make it appear in the eyes of the consumer better than it really is, and to this extent can only be regarded as an attempt to deceive. If cows are properly fed during the winter months with wholesome, nutritious food to which a small proportion of roots such as carrots or ruta bagas are added or with yellow maize and clover hay, even in winter time the butter produced will have an attractive light amber tint which appeals strongly to the æsthetic sense of the consumer. The natural tint of butter is as much more attractive than the artificial as any natural color is superior to the artificial. There is the same difference between the natural tint of butter and the artificial as there is between the natural rose of the cheek and its painted substitute. It is claimed, and perhaps justly, that the use of certain vegetable colors, such as annotto, does not introduce any unwholesome substance into the product. Admitting this, we must next ask whether it deceives the consumer. If so, it is difficult to understand upon what ethical principal any plea for the artificial coloring of butter can rest. If it is admitted that there is no valid reason why butter should be colored other than

the artificial coloring of foods in general, which is a practice so reprehensible that it is almost universally denounced, its practice cannot be easily defended. The dairymen of our country are honest and honorable and evidently do not clearly see the false position in which the practice of coloring butter puts them. When the dairymen of our country understand that the naturally colored products will bring the highest price on the market and appeal more strongly to the confidence of the consumer it is believed the artificial coloring in butter will be relegated to the scrap pile of useless processes. It cannot be claimed in any sense that coloring of butter artificially ever adds anything to its value as a nutritive substance.

One of the claims for justifying the coloring of butter is that it distinguishes it from oleomargarine. This, however, is not the case since, under the law, oleomargarine may be colored upon the payment of a tax of ten cents per pound. The consumer has at his disposition a complete protection against fraud in the use of oleomargarine by the operation of state and federal laws, irrespective of the tint of the product. Oleomargarine and butter are distinguished from each other by their natural colors and also by their chemical and physical properties and, therefore, there can be no justification for the coloring of butter on the plea that it distinguishes it from oleomargarine. Thus, from every point of view it is evident that the artificial coloring of butter is undesirable. It interferes with the right of the consumer, who should know the exact character of the product he buys, and it stands in the way of the prosperity of the manufacturer by keeping upon the market a cheaper product which tends to decrease the price even of that of better quality.

=Standard Butter.=--According to the standard established by Congress butter must contain more than 16 percent water and not less than 82.5 butter fat.

=Renovated Butter.=--The law of Congress which controls the manufacture of renovated butter is executed jointly by the Treasury and Agricultural Departments. The quantity of renovated butter produced during the year ending June 30, 1905, was 60,290,421 pounds.

=Adulterated Butter.=--The quantity of adulterated butter which was produced under the authority of the Act regulating the manufacture of oleomargarine and butter and on which is laid a tax of 10 cents per pound during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, was 3,671 pounds. These data show that the tax of 10 cents per pound laid upon adulterated butter has practically destroyed the manufacture of that article. Normal butter has from 12 to 14 percent of water. It is sometimes rechurned with water to raise the water content to 16 percent. Such a practice results in adulteration whether the content of water exceeds 16 percent or not.

=Influence of Food upon Butter.=--The character of butter is very easily affected by the nature of the food consumed by the cow. Butter has the faculty of absorbing very readily odors of all kinds. Foods, therefore, which have characteristic odors impart them to the butter. A most striking instance of this is in the eating of wild garlic. In this case both the milk and the butter are affected to such a degree as to be in many cases unpalatable. Hence foods or substances in foods which are aromatic or odoriferous are likely to impart their peculiar odor to the milk, cream, and butter. Of all the constituents of milk the fat appears to have the highest faculty of absorbing these objectionable odors. Therefore, the feeding of distillery slops is also apt to impart an unpleasant odor to milk and butter, whereas if these slops be dried and their volatile aromatic principle expelled little discomfort is experienced in their use. The physical characteristics of butter are also changed in a marked degree by the character of the food. Butter fat, as has already been indicated, is distinguished from other animal fats by its content of soluble and volatile acids of which butyric is the chief. There are certain kinds of foods which decrease or tend to decrease the content of butyric acid in butter.

=Influence on Melting Point.=--The character of the food also has a marked influence upon the melting point of butter. The author showed many years ago that the use of cottonseed meal as food for cows tends to raise the melting point of butter. This was regarded as an index of some value for the southern portion of the country, where a high temperature obtains over a period of six or seven months of the year. If the melting point of butter, which when normal is about 33 degrees C. (91° F.), could be increased to 35 or 36 degrees C. (95° F.), it would be of immense advantage in these warm climates and, in fact, in all parts of the country during the months of July, August, and September. There is no apparent tendency to increase the melting point of butter by feeding other oil cakes.

=Transmission of Other Principles in the Food to the Butter.=--Experience has shown that when cows are fed cottonseed meal or its products the quality of cottonseed oil which responds to the color test known as the Halphen test, namely, the production of a red color with carbon disulfid and amyl alcohol, is transmitted also to the butter. In some cases this reaction is extremely faint while in others it is displayed with an intensity which is claimed by some to be equal to that of the admixture of 5 percent of cottonseed oil

with the butter. The use of cottonseed meal, on the contrary, does not seem to notably affect either the content of volatile acid in the butter nor its refractometer reading. (Experimental Station Record, Volume 25, Page 716.)

OLEOMARGARINE.

Oleomargarine is the name applied to any fatty substance which is prepared to be used in the same manner as butter. Oleomargarine is defined by Act of Congress as follows:

An Act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine. (Approved August 2, 1886.)

“That for the purposes of this act certain manufactured substances, certain extracts, and certain mixtures and compounds, including such mixtures and compounds with butter, shall be known and designated as “oleomargarine,” namely: All substances heretofore known as oleomargarine, oleo, oleomargarine oil, butterine, lardine, suine, and neutral; all mixtures and compounds of oleomargarine, oleo, oleomargarine oil, butterine, lardine, suine, and neutral; all lard extracts and tallow extracts; and all mixtures and compounds of tallow, beef fat, suet, lard, lard oil, vegetable oil, annotto, and other coloring matter, intestinal fat, and offal fat made in imitation or semblance of butter, or, when so made, calculated or intended to be sold as butter or for butter.”

The manufacture of oleomargarine can only take place in the United States under the supervision of officials of the Internal Revenue. All oleomargarine which is artificially colored a yellow or yellowish tint in semblance of natural butter pays an internal revenue tax of 10 cents per pound. Oleomargarine uncolored pays a revenue tax of one-fourth cent per pound. Oleomargarine when made under proper sanitary conditions from sanitary raw materials is a wholesome and nutritious article of diet and usually can be sold at a smaller price than butter. It is especially a food product which commends itself to those who are under the necessity of practising strict economy in the cost of food in the family. The principal objection, and in fact the only valid objection, to its use is found in the frauds which have been committed in its manufacture and sale. There has been a constant disposition on the part of dishonest manufacturers and dealers, since the time when oleomargarine became a commercial commodity, to sell it as butter. Although the penalties of national and state laws are very severe in this respect the practice is continued. The opportunity for gain is so great that the cupidity of the manufacturer overcomes his fear of punishment and disgrace. With a more rigid national and state inspection, it is reasonable to hope that this fraudulent use of oleomargarine can be avoided and the pure, unadulterated article under its own name be supplied to those who prefer it either on account of its properties or its price.

=Materials Used in the Manufacture of Oleomargarine.=--_Neutral Lard._--One of the principal basic components of oleomargarine is neutral lard or lard stearin, the properties of which have already been described. Beef fat stearin is another basic ingredient of oleomargarine and is the stearin derived from tallow or tallow itself. Beef fat has a higher melting point than lard and beef fat stearin a still higher melting point than the tallow. Hence it forms an ideal ingredient with which to mix the oily components which enter so largely into the manufacture of oleomargarine. The beef fat or beef fat stearin is easily distinguished by means of the microscope. It forms beautiful radiated fan-like crystals, the characteristic appearance of which is shown in Fig. 9, page 67.

Cottonseed Oil and Cottonseed Oil Stearin.--These are also important ingredients of oleomargarine affording the oily or more liquid constituents which, when mixed with the lard and stearin above mentioned, form a compound the melting point of which is slightly above that of butter and sufficient to maintain it in an unmelted state even in warm weather. The quantities in which these different ingredients are used vary greatly in different manufacturing establishments and depend largely upon the location where the oleomargarine is to be used. When manufactured for tropical or subtropical regions larger quantities of stearin are employed than when used in temperate zones or for winter consumption, in which case larger quantities of cottonseed oil and cottonseed oil stearin are employed with the mixture. After the fats are mixed it is usually the practice to churn them with milk in order to give a flavor of butter to the product. In some cases the yolk of eggs is mixed with oleomargarine, as it is claimed that they impart thereto a firmer and more homogeneous structure which renders the mass better, especially for cooking purposes. All the ingredients which are used in the manufacture of oleomargarine are made known and recorded in the books of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and thus it is a product which it may be said is strictly under government supervision.

=Description of Process of Manufacture.=--The fat is taken from the cattle in the process of slaughtering, and after thorough washing is placed in a bath of clean, cold water, and surrounded with ice, where it is allowed to remain until all animal heat has been removed. It is then cut into small pieces by machinery and cooked at a temperature of about 150 degrees until the fat, in liquid form, has separated from the fibrine or tissue, then settled until it is perfectly clear. Then it is drawn into graining vats and allowed to

stand a day, when it is ready for the presses. The pressing extracts the stearin, leaving the remaining product, which is commercially known as oleo oil, which, when churned with cream or milk or both and with or without a proportion of creamery butter, the whole being properly salted, gives the well-known food-product, oleomargarine.

=Adulteration of Oleomargarine.=--Since the coloring of oleomargarine is permitted upon the payment of a tax, oleomargarine which is colored cannot be said to be adulterated when the tax has been paid, although if coloring were not a legalized operation it would be an adulteration. Yellow oleomargarine is an imitation of natural butter and its manufacture should be prohibited unless the product is marked “imitation.” The character of the coloring materials used is not prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue but as a rule the coal tar dyes are preferred in the coloring of oleomargarine to the vegetable coloring matter such as annotto and saffron. The remarks which have been made in connection with the use of poisonous materials in other products apply to oleomargarine.

Adulteration with Egg Yolks.--An adulteration which has been practiced in this country is the admixture of preserved egg yolks. Usually these yolks are secured in China, broken, and placed in vessels and preserved with borax or boric acid or salt. These eggs are generally collected during the early spring and summer months and are not sent to the United States until the fall or winter. The importation of such articles is now prohibited under the food laws of the country so that the adulterations with the imported article is no longer to be feared. It is possible to preserve domestic eggs in the same way, and the use of them in this manner is regarded as an adulteration, since such preserved egg products cannot be regarded as suitable for human food.

Adulteration with Preservatives.--Fortunately preservatives are not used to any extent in the manufacture of oleomargarine when intended for domestic use. The most suitable preservative in such a case as this would be borax or boric acid. It is not believed that these preservatives are used to any extent when the product is intended for domestic consumption. Whether or not preservatives are used in the product sent abroad I am unable to say.

=Production of Oleomargarine.=--According to the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the quantity of oleomargarine taxed at 10 cents a pound produced in the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, was 5,584,684 pounds, and for 1906, 4,888,968 pounds. The quantity produced in 1906 taxed at one-fourth cent a pound was 50,545,914 pounds.

COMPOSITION OF OLEOMARGARINE.

SOL. SOL. SPECIFIC IN- ACID BY ACID BY GRAVITY SOLUBLE WASHING DISTIL- ALBU- AT 40°C. WATER. ACID. OUT. LATION. SALT. MINOIDS. .90490 9.34 93.59 0.12 0.25 3.64 0.35

From the above data it is seen that the objections to the use of oleomargarine are more on the grounds of fraud and deception than in regard to nutritive and dietetic value. The components used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, when properly made, are all wholesome and digestible materials such as are consumed in eating various food products. It does not appear, therefore, that any valid objection can be made against the use of oleomargarine from a physiological or hygienic standpoint.

CHEESE.

=Historical.=--The preparation of cheese is one of the oldest of the technical processes. It appears that it was known during the time of King David, at least a thousand years before Christ, and the Greeks were acquainted with it before the writings of Homer. Aristotoles and Hypocrates describe the curdling of milk which at that time appears to have been accomplished by the use of the juice of the fig. The use of cheese was very common in Rome in the earlier historical days but the most of it was imported from the North. Cæsar speaks of the preparation of cheese among the German tribes. Cheese must, therefore, be regarded as one of the very oldest forms of prepared food used by man. It probably is almost, if not quite, as old as wine. These historical facts are interesting in showing how from the earliest times man has made use of the natural ferments to prepare food from the raw material. Attention must be called in this connection to the fact that many people claim that such foods as these are not natural foods but wholly artificial. The fallacy of such a claim is not difficult to show. An artificial food is one which is prepared out of materials which, themselves, are not edible food products or, at least, are not digestible or of a character which does not naturally occur by ordinary processes. Artificial foods, therefore, are purely synthetic, that is, made up from the elemental substances, or they are mixtures or compounds. On the contrary a food like cheese or wine is not a mixture or compound but a natural product from materials which themselves are food products. Milk is the raw material of cheese as the must of the grape is of wine. Both milk and must are rich and nutritious foods. The changes which each undergoes are in many respects the same. The must of wine undergoes an alcoholic

fermentation and the milk sugar of cheese is subjected to a lactic fermentation and its casein to a proteolytic change which materially alters its character.

Cheese products are a very important part of food materials of the dairy. The term cheese is applied to the solid product produced from milk by coagulation of the casein with rennet or lactic acid and subjecting the solid product thus produced to a process of fermentation and ripening by the addition of appropriate seed material, seasoning, and storage at convenient temperature for varying periods of time. In the precipitation of the casein of milk the fat particles become mechanically entangled and form a part of the precipitate. There is a certain quantity of other milk constituents incorporated in the form of water, milk sugar, and mineral matter in the precipitated mass. The greater part of the other bodies which the milk contains, consisting of the milk sugar and a considerable portion of the soluble mineral matter, are separated in the form of whey. The composition of fresh cheese is that of that part of the milk which is precipitated and which is entangled mechanically in the precipitated matter. The ripened cheese is changed in its chemical constituents mostly as the result of fermentative action upon its nitrogenous constituents, that is, the casein, albumin, etc., contained therein. The ferments tend to change the casein into a more soluble form of protein, while at the same time they develop a flavor and aroma in a way agreeable to the nostril and palate. Various forms of moulds and other organisms grow on and in cheeses which influence their palatability and character. The final product of the ripened cheese varies not only with the nature of the original material as determined by the milk itself but with the character of the preparation and the nature of the organisms and ferments which are active during the ripening period, and also with the time and temperature of storage.

=Kinds of Cheese.=--It is not necessary and perhaps it would be impossible to attempt an enumeration of all the various kinds of cheese which are offered on the market. The first classification of cheese depends upon the character of the milk used. The term “cheese” in this country naturally refers to a product made from cow’s milk since that is the principal milk used in the United States for cheese making. The term is used in this manual in that sense and when there is no qualifying word employed it is always understood that the product in question is made from the cow’s milk. This implies that the milk is at least a standard milk, that is, a whole milk, unskimmed and containing not less than 3.25 percent of butter fat. According to the definition fixed by the Congress of the United States the term cheese is applied not only to this product but also to one containing a larger percentage of fat than this. The term cheese applies both to cheese made from milk and cheese made partially from milk and partially from cream. The term “full cream cheese” is also often used in the trade but is likely to be misleading and deceptive. The real significance of the term full cream cheese is that it is made of whole milk or milk unskimmed which contains its full complement of cream. The term “cream cheese” is also often used to indicate a cheese made partially of milk and cream. It is evident that the term cream cheese in this sense is misleading, since it can be properly applied only to a cheese made from cream alone. Such cheeses are made but, inasmuch as cream must have not less than 18 percent of fat in order to be called cream according to the United States standard, the cheeses made from such a source are too oily and fatty for ordinary consumption.

=Cheese Made from Goat’s Milk.=--Goat’s milk is also frequently used in making cheese. It is extensively employed in France and Switzerland for cheese making and also in other parts of Europe, and to a limited extent in this country. Some of the varieties of cheese which are most highly prized are made from goat’s milk, such as Roquefort.

=Adulteration and Misbranding of Cheese.=--The most common form of adulteration or sophistication of cheese is the misbranding thereof in respect of the country where made or in respect of character. This is a form of deception which has long been established in the trade and one which cannot be condoned or excused. There are certain varieties of cheese whose names should be respected and in fact, in the case of all varieties that have an established character and reputation, their name should not be applied to other articles made in imitation thereof. In this country there is a national law which prohibits the marking of a food or dairy product falsely as to the state or territory where made. For instance, a cheese made in Ohio cannot be marked New York cheese and peaches grown in Delaware cannot be marked California peaches, maple sirup made in Indiana cannot be labeled Vermont maple sirup, etc. The ethical principle underlying this law is one which will meet the approbation of every well meaning man and therefore the extending of this principle to other forms of misbranding is an easy step. If it is a violation of the law to mark a cheese made in Ohio as made in New York it is certainly a violation of the ethical principle underlying that law to name a cheese made in Connecticut Cammerbert. Unhappily, however, there are cheeses made in the United States to which foreign names are given, the universal excuse being that they are cheeses of the same type. In many cases this excuse is not a valid one and in no case is it an accepted one. To name a cheese made from cow’s milk the same as that made from ewe’s milk is a distinct misbranding in every sense of the term. There should be no difficulty in established varieties of cheese made in this country having

names which are not deceptive and not intended to mislead the consumer as to the state, territory, or country where made. In one sense all cheese may be said to be of the same type, but because the taste and odor of a cheese made in the United States imitates to some extent that of a cheese made in France is no excuse for giving the French name to the American product. A further illustration of this principle is found in the following: The term Roquefort, for instance, is not properly applied to any cheese product except that which is made at or in the vicinity of Roquefort. In no other part of France can cheese be made bearing the name of Roquefort. The use of the term Roquefort, therefore, in any way upon American cheese is a misbranding and an attempt to deceive which usually is successful. There is not so great an objection to the term Swiss cheese as to Roquefort, but there is the same kind of an objection. The cheese which bears the name of Schweitzer-Käse is very extensively manufactured in Germany and sold under that name. A similar cheese is also extensively made in this country and sold under the name of Schweitzer-Käse. In this case there is no particular location or place which originated the name and has the sole right to use the name Swiss cheese. It is the name of a whole country and not of a location, and yet it is evident that Swiss cheese properly can only be made in Switzerland and not in Germany or in the United States. Any hard, tough cheese in which a large number of holes is found and which on cutting makes a flexible, semi-leathery slice has to a certain extent the appearance and perhaps the taste and flavor of genuine Swiss cheese.

It should not be difficult to find a market for all good cheese made in this country, under appropriate American names indicating their origin. If the term Swiss cheese is at all allowable on a package it should be placed as a minor part of the label and with the statement that it is of that type. Even this transgression is perhaps difficult of excuse.

=Artificial Coloring.=--Next to misbranding and misnaming of cheeses, perhaps the most common adulteration is that of artificial coloring. The public taste has been led in the matter of cheeses, especially of American origin, to look for a deep yellow color. This is also associated with the idea of the use of a large quantity of rich, naturally yellow-colored cream. The addition of an artificial color to a cheese never adds anything to its value, and to the really æsthetic eye detracts much from its appearance. The presence of this rich artificial tint is calculated in many instances to excite a suspicion in regard to the character of the cheese and thus interferes with its proper gustation. There is another more serious objection than the one just mentioned, namely, that it is possible from skimmed milk to make a highly colored cheese which would appear to the consumer to be made of whole milk or of milk and cream, and thus a deliberate deception is perpetrated. The consumer of cheese should demand that artificial coloring of all kinds be omitted from cheese products.

Moreover, these colors may of themselves be deleterious in character and there is no restriction, so far as I know, at this time in the United States to prevent a manufacturer, if he so desires or through his ignorance of the use of coloring materials of a poisonous character, from using any amount.[22] The coal tar dyes are cheaper and produce faster and more natural looking tints than the vegetable colors such as annotto and saffron, and hence, unless they are prohibited by law, they are almost universally employed. All of these dyes in a concentrated form are highly poisonous and injurious and several instances are on record of death, especially in the case of young children, from eating concentrated colors. The fact that a poison of this kind is diluted by the cheese is no excuse for its use. The only protection which the consumer has, which is reliable in all cases, is the prohibition of coloring matter in cheese.

[22] Written before the passage of the food-bill.

By Act of Congress of June 6, 1896, coloring matter is permitted to be used in cheese in the United States and doubtless it will continue to be used under this authority until that portion of the Act is repealed or until the consumer demands an uncolored article. The pure, natural color of the cheese is universally acknowledged to be best, most palatable, and most desirable.

=Preservatives.=--Fortunately there is little to be said in regard to preservatives in cheese because they are almost unknown. The addition of a preservative to a cheese at the time of its production would so seriously interfere with the ripening process as to defeat the purpose of storage altogether. Hence in so far as preservatives are concerned there is little danger of adulteration.

=Impure Raw Materials.=--If cheese be made of standard milk as provided for by the commissioners it must be made of pure, wholesome material. On the contrary, inasmuch as there is no official inspection of cheese factories, it is entirely possible through carelessness, ignorance, or design to use in the making of cheese milk which may itself be infected. Cheese made from such milk of course would carry the infection of the milk. This is a sort of adulteration which can only be excluded by careful sanitary inspection of cheese factories.

=Filled Cheese.=--Formerly there was a very considerable adulteration of cheese by manufacturing it from skimmed milk and supplying from an artificial source the necessary fat. Cottonseed oil, lard, and other edible oils are used for this purpose.

Composition of Filled Cheese (Circular No. 11, Bureau of Animal Industry).--Neutral lard is the principal fat which is substituted for milk fat in filled cheese. It is used to the extent of two or three pounds for every 100 pounds of skimmed milk. The principal objection to a filled cheese is not on account of its containing lard, which in itself is not unwholesome. But lard is an entirely different fat from milk fat, and differs in the character of the fermentation which takes place. The characteristic flavors and odors which are contributed by the milk fat in the cheese are entirely wanting, and the cheese is devoid of aroma and flavor and is nothing more than a mixture of casein with lard. Filled cheese is such a poor imitation of the genuine article that it can never have any very great vogue, and especially under the present law which requires it to be labeled and the payment of a tax. The law relating to filled cheese is found in the appendix.

A filled cheese which is on the market not properly stamped and duty paid in harmony with this Act of Congress is adulterated, and they who make and sell it are amenable to the law. The annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the year ending June 30, 1905, shows that no receipts were obtained by the tax on filled cheese during that year. If any was made it was made surreptitiously and in defiance of the law.

From the above data it is seen that the manufacture and sale of filled cheese in the United States is almost a thing of the past and this form of adulteration, assuming that the law is thoroughly executed, is not now likely to be often met with.

=Cottage Cheese.=--Cottage cheese is a term applied to a product which is usually only a raw material of cheese. It is the fresh, precipitated, and unripe milk product, above described as used in cheese making. It is a highly nutritious and very palatable product, usually prepared at home and not suitable for keeping or transportation. It is often made from sour milk in which the casein is coagulated by the natural development of lactic acid. The sour milk is placed in a cloth bag and the whey allowed to escape by gravitation. The final portion of the whey may be forced out by pressure. The residue, when properly seasoned with salt or in any way to suit the taste of the consumer, is very palatable. Cream is often added to this residue which increases the normal amount of fat which it contains.

COMPARATIVE COMPOSITION OF AMERICAN AND EDAM CHEESE.

The chemical composition of some of the principal varieties of cheese are shown in the following table:

WATER. ASH. FAT. PROTEIN. Percent. Percent. Percent. Percent.

American cheese, 27.5 4.1 32.5 28.38 Edam cheese, 36.34 4.24 31.17 22.28

The data show that cheese is essentially a nitrogenous and fat food, containing only small quantities of carbohydrates, and therefore it is not a complete ration. It is a ration, however, which is complementary to a highly starchy diet such as rice or maize bread or potatoes. Bread and cheese or potatoes and cheese or rice and cheese, therefore, make a well balanced diet, highly nutritious, easily digestible, and quite palatable.

=Manufacture of American Cheeses.=--The large cheeses which are principally found upon the American market may be said, in general, to resemble the Cheddar type, although the calling of these cheeses by the name “Cheddar” is misleading, and to that extent a misbranding of the product.

There are two common methods of making these cheeses which are in vogue in the United States, namely, the “stirred curd” or “granular” method and, second, the Cheddar method. (Bulletin 104, Department of Agriculture of Pennsylvania, 1902.) The latter one is the more extensively used. The second product does not differ essentially in character from the first, though the latter method, it is claimed, gives a more solid cheese and one of more uniform character and with a slightly less content of moisture. Since the Cheddar method has practically come into sole use, displacing the first method, a description of the Cheddar method alone will be sufficient to illustrate the method of making large cheeses which are now so common on the American market and which have such a well merited reputation. The process is divided into eight parts: First, coagulating the milk; second, cutting the curd; third, heating the curd; fourth, removing the whey; fifth, cheddaring the curd; sixth, milling the curd; seventh, salting and pressing the curd; eighth, curing the cheese.

Rennet.--As has been said in the description of cheese making, the material which is most useful in the precipitation of the curd is rennet. The rennet is the secretion of the stomach of various animals, that of the calf being most highly priced for cheese making. The fourth stomach of the animal is the one which is used in the manufacture of rennet. The aqueous extract made from these stomachs contains a ferment which has the property of coagulating casein in a very high degree. One part of good rennet preparation from healthy stomachs of calves will coagulate 1000 parts of milk. In former days rennet was freshly made and used at the factories. At the present time it is largely prepared on a commercial scale and sold to the cheese maker. It is highly important that the rennet used in cheese making should be of the best quality, as an inferior grade gives a bad taste and color to the cheese. Just as in the manufacture of fermented beverages and making of bread the character of the yeast is a dominant factor in the nature of the finished product, so it is even to a greater degree in the case of rennet. Those who purchase the rennet already made should therefore be certain it is of a quality to give the desired character to the cheese. The greater the amount of milk fat in milk the larger the proportion of rennet, since the milk fat protects to some extent the casein from the action of the ferment. Experience has shown also that during the summer the rennet acts more readily upon the milk, probably due to the higher temperature. Care should be taken to avoid the use of any excess of rennet, since anything more than the amount necessary to conduct the coagulation is apt to add an unpleasant flavor to the cheese. The curd also in such cases is less cohesive and makes a tougher and drier product which does not lend itself so readily to the ripening process. For this reason the rennet which is to be used should always be tested in small quantities of milk beforehand in order that the proper proportion to be used may be known so that the process in a large way may be conducted with certainty and not by guess. (“British Dairy Farming,” by Jas. Long.)

Rennet is sometimes treated with borax to preserve it during transit. In such cases the borax may not all be removed by the whey and is consequently found in ripened cheese. Its introduction in this way should be avoided.

Coagulating the Milk by Rennet Extract.--This process is often termed by the cheese makers “setting the milk with rennet.” The milk which is used for the purpose of cheese making should be, in the technical language of the cheese maker, “ripe,” that is, containing a sufficient quantity of lactic acid. The principal method of producing the proper amount of lactic acid in milk is by keeping it warm, namely, at a temperature of about 84 degrees. At this temperature the most favorable conditions exist in milk for the rapid growth of the lactic acid ferments. If the natural ferments which produce lactic acid are not in sufficient quantity in the original milk it is better, rather than to wait too long a time, to start the development of the lactic acid by adding an artificial ferment. Lactic ferments are specially prepared for this purpose, or some previously ripened milk may be added to the mass. This is called a “starter.” From two to five pounds of “starter” are usually required for each one hundred pounds of milk. The degree of ripening is ascertained by measuring the quantity of lactic acid present. The proper condition of the milk is tested by means of a rennet preparation and if the milk will coagulate, when thus tested, in about one minute or a little more it is an indication that a sufficient amount of acid has been developed to add the rennet for the proper coagulation of the milk. It is important to have the milk in just the right condition in order that the proper operations in cheese making may go on uniformly. Care must be taken, however, not to have too much lactic acid in the milk. For instance, 0.2 of one percent is too great, and such a milk is very liable to give trouble in subsequent operations. In the curding of milk by rennet the temperature should be kept between 82 and 86 degrees. The amount of rennet extract, of course, varies with its character and strength, and this is best determined by the cheese maker’s experimenting in order that the proper quantity to be added to the great mass of milk may be known beforehand. A sufficient quantity of rennet extract should be used to curdle the milk in fifteen or twenty minutes for a quick-curing cheese, and in thirty to forty minutes for a slow-curing cheese. The rennet extracts in common use are added at the rate of from one-half to five ounces for 1000 pounds of milk. Before adding, the extract should be diluted with from 20 to 40 times its volume of water at a temperature of from 85 to 90 degrees. The rennet thus diluted acts with uniformity on the milk, preventing the production of curd of a lumpy character. Previous to adding the rennet extract the mass of milk is thoroughly stirred in order to mix the fat therewith and the dilute rennet added evenly and slowly with constant stirring which is continued for several minutes. A gentle stirring of the surface of the milk should be continued until the curd is at least half formed, in order that the fat may not separate. After the stirring is finished, a cloth is placed over the top of the vat to keep the surface of the milk from cooling, and the milk is then left undisturbed until the coagulation is complete. The coagulation goes on gradually until the whole mass of milk is one solid coagulum produced by the changing of casein into paracasein.

Cutting the Curd.--In order that the whey may be separated it is necessary that the curd be cut into pieces. The smaller the pieces of curd, the more rapidly will the whey escape. As soon as the curd is formed it shows a tendency to contract and this tends to force out the whey. By cutting the extent of the surface from which the whey can exude is amplified and the rapidity of the process is enormously increased. The time at which the curd is to be cut is one of great importance and is determined by the skill

and experience of the cheese maker. If the curd is cut when it is too soft there may be large loss of fat and a decreased yield of cheese. If the curd is too hard the whey is more difficultly removed and the quality of the cheeses is not so fine. The following test is used to determine when the curd is in the right condition to cut. The end of the index finger is inserted obliquely into the curd half an inch or more and then slowly raised toward the surface. If the curd breaks apart with a clean fracture without leaving any particles on the finger and the whey which exudes from the broken surface is clear and not milky it shows the proper time has come for cutting. Specially devised knives are used for cutting the curd, which leave it in small cubes of about one-half inch surface. Skill in the use of the cutting knife is important and can only be acquired by proper experience.

Heating the Curd.--As soon as the curd is cut the whey begins to go out of it and the curd settles to the bottom of the vat, the whey being of a higher specific gravity than the curd. After the pieces of curd sink to the bottom the surface easily reunites and, when broken apart, additional fat is lost. As soon, therefore, as the curd is cut the whole mass is kept in gentle motion by hand stirring or with a wire basket designed for the purpose, care being taken to avoid breaking or comminuting the cubes. When properly stirred the whey appears clear and is free of small particles of curd.

The curd contracts and hardens during this process, and soon reaches a condition when the surface does not adhere so readily. The vat should be kept warm during the process of separation of the whey, the temperature being raised to about 90 degrees and finally, toward the last, to 98 degrees, about blood heat.

Separating the Curd.--The precipitated curd is left in contact with the whey for some time, and during this period some of the lactic acid in the whey unites with the paracasein. The setting of the curd is finished when a small mass which has been squeezed in the hand to remove the whey is pressed against a bar of iron heated to little short of redness, and it is found that there is left, adhering to the iron, fine silky threads. These threads are formed by the compound of lactic acid and paracasein, and the more of this compound there is the longer will the strings be. When the curd shows by the hot iron test strings one-eighth inch long it is an index that the time has arrived for the separation of the curd from the whey.

Gathering the Curd.--After the whey is removed the cubes of curd are left in the bottom of the vat until they mat or pack together, a process which is technically known as cheddaring. The curd is sometimes removed from the vat and placed on a special apparatus for this purpose called a curd-sink. When the curd has matted together, forming a solid mass, it is cut into blocks 8 × 8 × 12 inches. These blocks are turned in the vat in order to facilitate the removal of more whey. The blocks of curd are carefully placed, one over the other until they form a large mass.

The process of solidifying or cheddaring accomplishes two purposes:

First, the whey is expelled to a considerable extent and, second, the lactic acid unites with more of the curd, changing not only its chemical composition but also its physical state from a spongy, tough, rubber-like consistence, with a high water content, to a mass having a smooth, velvety appearance and feeling, and a soft, somewhat plastic consistency.

Milling the Curd.--This process consists in cutting the lumps of curd into small pieces in order to introduce the salt and to handle it more readily when it is to be placed into hoops for pressing. This process is done by special mills which avoid, in so far as possible, the loss of fat.

Salting and Pressing.--Salt is added for several purposes, chiefly for flavoring, but it also has other uses. It aids in removing the whey,--it hardens the curd and it checks or retards the formation of lactic acid. Excessive salting, however, is injurious. From 2½■ to 3 pounds of salt should be added to the curd made from 1000 pounds of milk. Before putting in the press the curd is cooled to a temperature of about 80 degrees, and after putting into the mold it is subjected to pressure to give it a proper form, rather than to remove the whey which is practically all gone by this time. If the whey has not been properly removed before the cheese goes into the press it is almost impossible to get it out then. The pressure should be uniform and continued for at least twenty-four hours. If a screw is used the pressure should be light at first and gradually increased. After the cheese has been in the press about an hour it is removed, turned, a cloth adjusted about it, and the entire surface wiped carefully with a cloth wrung out of hot water.

The sizes in which American cheeses are made depends largely upon the market, the more common size being 15 inches in diameter, and the cheese weighs from 60 to 65 pounds. There is also a very large manufacture of cheese seven inches in diameter, known as “Young Americas” and weighing only from 8 to 10 pounds.

Curing.--The higher the temperature to which cheese is exposed in curing the more rapid the curing process will take place, but the poorer the quality of the cheese. Experience has shown that a low temperature, 55 degrees F. or even less, gives much better results, although it requires a greater length of time. If cured at a higher temperature the fat is apt to exude, and will not be evenly distributed in the cheese. It is, therefore, more profitable, as well as better for the consumer, to cure at low temperatures, producing a superior quality with less loss of moisture and a cheese which sells for a better price.

Moisture in the Curing Cellar.--The cellar in which the curing takes place should contain air with a proper degree of moisture. The relative percentage of moisture in the air as compared with the total amount which it can hold should be from 65 to 75. This is determined by placing in the curing room a hygrometer which registers the degree of saturation.

=Qualities of American Cheese.=--The quality of cheeses is judged by (1) flavor, (2) body, (3) texture, (4) color, and (5) general appearance. In regard to flavor it is impossible to describe what is meant. Only the connoisseur can determine properly whether a cheese has a flavor which is sound, healthy, and indicative of the highest quality. The cheese flavor should be free from any admixture of other flavors. Cheese resembles butter in this respect, that it absorbs and then gives off foreign flavors with great facility. Therefore in the whole process of cheese making care must be exercised to exclude every odor or flavor of an undesirable character from the cheese house.

Flavor.--Under flavor also may be described taste, which should be of that biting, incisive character due to proper development of ripening and its attendant bacterial and enzymic products. The various foreign flavors in cheese may be due to the odor of cows or the stable or may suggest “rotten eggs,” or it may be the flavor of rancid butter due to the decomposition of butter fat in the cheese.

Body.--This is also a term which it is difficult to define. An American cheese is said to have a perfect body when it is solid, firm, and smooth in substance. This quality is ascertained by pressing the cheese between the fingers. When it does not press down evenly between the finger and thumb it is said technically to be “corky.” It is smooth when it feels velvety-like and is not harsh or gritty.

Texture.--The term texture applied to American cheese refers mainly to its compactness. It is nearly related to body. The texture may be fine and close or porous. The texture is perfect when a cut surface of the inside of the cheese presents to the eye a solid, compact, continuous appearance, free from breaks, holes, or lumps. Cheese should not show any visible or separated moisture or fat. The texture of American cheese should be smooth, free from breaks, and fairly hard. The bandage should be smooth and neat, extending over the edge on each end of the cheese about two inches.

Color.--A true and unadulterated cheese should have only the color of the milk from which it is made, and any other color incident to ripening which is usually green. Unfortunately cheeses of American origin are often artificially colored. An over-deep yellowish or reddish tint, therefore, should be regarded as a mark of inferiority. Artificially colored cheese should not rank as high on the market as that of a natural tint, which is much more pleasing to the eye and much less objectionable to the æsthetic taste. Color is often added to conceal inferiority in the milk used.

The sides of the cheese should be straight and of uniform height all around.

The following scale of points is used in judging cheese, according to the above qualities: Flavor, 45 to 50; texture, 30 to 35; color, 10 to 15; general appearance, 5 to 15.

=Cream Cheese.=--This is a soft cheese which is rapidly growing in popularity. It is made from rich milk or milk and cream mixed together. It resembles in general Neufchatel, but it is richer in butter fat and is put up in a different form. The temperature of the room in which the cheese is made is quite important. It should be kept as nearly as possible at 75 degrees. The milk is first warmed to 70 degrees and run through a separator by means of which the cream is taken out, together with one-half the volume of milk. This makes either dilute cream or very rich milk, as you may choose to call it. The cream is heated to 84 degrees and about four or five ounces of rennet extract added per thousand pounds. The rennet is carefully and gradually stirred into the mixture, using about fifteen minutes for the addition. The mass is then allowed to remain at rest until whey is seen around the sides. The whey is then removed by draining, the resulting curd pressed and mixed with about 3 percent of salt. The cheese is not subjected to a curing process. It is molded into flat, thin cakes about 3 by 4 inches, wrapped in parchment paper, and in this condition packed for shipment.

=Manufacture of Foreign Types of Cheese in the United States.=--The improvement of cheeses made in the United States by securing different forms of ferments and utilizing the best method of setting, pressing the curd, and ripening used in other countries is worthy of all encouragement. Unfortunately a disposition has arisen in our country of giving the names of foreign varieties to the domestic articles. Many fancy domestic cheeses are sold under strictly foreign names such as Cheddar, Stilton, Cheshire, Schweitzer, Limburger, Camembert, Brie, Roquefort, etc. In fact there seems to be no limitation upon the adoption of a name already identified with a distinct type and locality. Such a tendency is greatly to be regretted and perhaps it is only necessary to point out to our people the ethical offense which they are committing by such practices to secure their discontinuance. It is, however, a perfectly legitimate undertaking to import the ferments which produce the famous cheeses of the world and utilize them to the fullest extent in cheeses of American origin. This, however, should be done in such a way as to carefully avoid applying the name of the original article to the domestic product. Perhaps it would be no ethical offense or no very great offense to place upon the labels of the cheese products a statement that they are of the same type as the foreign product they imitate. This, however, should be an explanatory phrase and not a part of the label which attracts principal attention. It is far better that a manufacturer should adopt some local name which would become identified with his product, and thus become a valuable trade-mark. The attempt to pass domestic cheese under foreign names is an offense against good ethics and also against the law. It is nothing more nor less than misbranding, and cannot be justified even in the absence of a law forbidding it.

Success with Foreign Ferments.--Considerable success has attended the introduction of the foreign processes into the United States, together with the ferments which produce the cheeses abroad. The environment, however, cannot be imported and therefore the ferments may rapidly assimilate different properties under changed conditions, and the continued importation of fresh ferments may be necessary to preserve the type of cheese. Some of the principal types of foreign cheeses made in the United States are those which are mentioned above. A particularly excellent study has been made of the process of making a Camembert type of cheese in this country. (Bureau of Animal Industry, Bulletin 71, 1905.) This particular cheese is a type of Camembert which is made at the Storrs Agricultural Experiment Station of Connecticut. For these experiments a cheese maker familiar with the Camembert manufacture in France was secured. The method of making the cheese and also of separating the curd and ripening was as nearly as possible like that used in France. The style of the packages was the same, so that from external appearances it would be quite difficult to distinguish them from the genuine Camembert cheese of France. The success attending these experiments shows that it is possible to improve domestic cheeses by scientific effort in the direction of using the proper ferments. These soft cheeses made in Connecticut were of good quality and had something of the flavor and type of the Camembert itself, though it was not difficult for even a novice to distinguish the two varieties from one another.

These studies above referred to have resulted in a marked degree of progress in the knowledge of the real changes which take place in the ripening of cheeses. The officials in charge of the work differ somewhat with the author in respect to the character of the product, claiming that the making of Camembert cheese is not dependent upon uniform conditions obtained only in certain localities but rather on securing the proper cultures and conditions which are possible almost anywhere. The fact of the case is that the cheeses made at the Connecticut station are probably made under much more scientific conditions and much more rigid control than the real Camembert cheese made in France. The success which attended these efforts is only a proof of the statement made above that the introduction of these processes for making fancy cheeses in this country will doubtless result in the development of types of American origin of peculiar flavor and quality. Such cheeses when properly named and not confused with those of foreign origin will become quite as familiar and well known, both at home and abroad. (Bureau of Animal Industry, Bulletin 82, 1906.)

=Sage Cheese.=--The consumption of the variety of cheese known as sage cheese is not very large at the present time in the United States and is restricted to certain localities, yet it is rapidly growing in favor. Consumers who are accustomed to it are willing to pay a larger price for it than for ordinary cheese. Sage cheese is made exactly in the same manner as that described for the manufacture of Cheddar. The flavor of sage is imparted in three different ways, first, by adding the sage extract or tea to the milk; second, by adding the extract to the curd before salting; third, by adding the sage leaves to the curd before salting. The latter method is found to be the most satisfactory requiring the least amount of sage to give any definite flavor. Three ounces of sage leaves are found to be sufficient to flavor the curd from 1000 pounds of milk. The stems and impurities of the sage leaves are carefully removed and the leaves ground to a fine powder before mixing with the curd (Michigan Board of Agriculture, 1904).

=Principal Cheeses of England.=--The principal English cheeses are Stilton, Cheshire, Cheddar, double and single, Gloucester, Derby, and Leicester. According to Dr. Voelcker, the finest flavored cheese is Cheshire, which differs from any other in being made from milk which is perfectly sweet, and some authors think its peculiar aroma is due to this fact. On the contrary, the more general

opinion is that the best cheeses are made from milk slightly sour rather than that which is perfectly sweet.

Cheshire cheese is manufactured by mixing the evening milk, which is kept cool over night, with the morning milk, and then warming the mixture until the temperature is about 90 degrees. The proper quantity of rennet is added and when the cheese is to be extremely yellow also some annotto. After thoroughly mixing, the mass is left for nearly an hour, by which time the coagulation is completed. The next operation is the breaking down or cutting up of the fresh curd, and this is an important process. Upon the care which is exercised in doing this depends in a large measure the richness and quality of the finished product. When properly manipulated the whey which is separated will be of a greenish color and clear, while the proper combination of milk fat and casein which is secured in separating the whey will make a cheese of first class quality. The curd is so dense as to naturally separate from the whey by deposition, and the latter is thus drawn off by a stopcock properly placed in the vat. The curd is then placed upon a cloth stretched over lattice work in order that the separation of the whey may be complete. Finally before passing to the cheese house the curd is treated with eight ounces of salt to twenty pounds of curd. After the cheese is molded it is placed in a warm room for one or two days, and then taken to the press house where it is subjected to the usual pressure. The pressing process is continued by wrapping the cheese in dry cloths and subjecting to new pressure every day for five or six days. The cheese is then removed to the ripening cellar where it is turned two or three times a week. It is ripe and ready for consumption in less than one year. There are a great many variations from this method of making Cheshire cheese, but they all follow the same general plan.

Manufacture of Cheddar Cheese.--The cheese is made in various parts of England though chiefly in Somerset, the period of manufacture extending from April to November. Cheddar cheeses are made in large sizes varying from 60 to 100 pounds each. The temperature of precipitation for Cheddar cheese is somewhat less than for the Cheshire cheese, being about 80 degrees. Rennet is used solely in the coagulation, lactic acid not being liked for that purpose. In the making of Cheddar often some of the fat escapes in the whey and this is afterwards collected and made into butter. Two pounds of salt to 100 pounds of curd are used.

Derby cheese is a name applied to cheese made in Derby. The Cheddar system of making it is usually employed.

Gloster cheeses are made on the same plan as that of the Derby and do not need any further description.

Leicester cheese is a variety of cheese which is very popular and made chiefly in the county of Leicester. The coagulation of Leicester cheese is made at a little lower temperature than that previously described, varying from 76 to 84 degrees. The curd is allowed to stand for about one-half hour before it is broken up and the whey separated. The best manufacturers of cheese disapprove of the use of artificial coloring and it may be said that eventually it is pretty certain that all cheese makers will come to the same conclusion. The use of coloring matter in cheese, even of annotto, adds nothing to its richness, and tends to deceive the customer into thinking that the milk employed was richer in cream than it really was. The Leicester cheeses are small in size compared with Cheddar. About eleven pounds of milk are used to make an ordinary cheese.

Stilton cheese is probably the most familiar and highly prized of all English varieties. It is not always to be obtained, and many imitations of Stilton are made and bear its name. The name it bears is from the name of the town where it was first, and is now, made. It is a cheese which has been known for about a century and a quarter. It is principally made between March and September and solely from the milk of cows fed on natural pasture, that is, for the finest variety. The use of artificial food for the cows is at once detected in a change for the worse in the character of the cheese. At first the rennet employed was made from the stomachs of lambs instead of cows and in the olden times the cheeses were not considered to be sufficiently mellow and ripe until they were two years old and exhibited spots of green in the interior.

The most approved modern process of manufacture is mixing the morning and evening milk and bringing it to a temperature of 79 degrees. Rennet is then added and the mass allowed to stand for about an hour and a half. The curd is removed into cloths set in frames for the purpose of allowing the whey to separate. Usually about an hour is allowed for the natural separation. The cloths are then tightened and brought closer together to produce slight pressure and placed in a cheese tub, several of them together, where they are allowed to remain for twelve hours. Usually a longer time is allowed before the curd is cut up. The salt is added in proportion of one pound to 60 pounds of fresh curd. The curd is then placed in tin cylinders with perforated sides, the cylinder being 12 inches deep and 12 inches in diameter, and put in a room at about 65 degrees to favor the separation of the whey which requires from six to seven days. The cheeses are then removed from the cylinders, brought into proper shape by a knife and wrapped with strong cotton cloth and allowed to remain for twelve days longer when they are removed to the drying room and kept at 65 degrees. During this process the original curd placed in the cell loses about one-half its weight so that ten pounds of curd in

the end make five pounds of cheese. A very common method also is to make cheese twice a day from morning milk and evening milk separately. Extra cream is often added in making Stilton cheese, only whole milk or milk and added cream being used. The principal point to be considered with curing is the regulation of the temperature.

Other varieties of cheese which are known in England are mostly named from the localities where they are produced and partake in general of the character of cheeses already described. These are Lancastershire, Wensleydale, skimmed milk cheese, butter milk cheese, potato cheese, and various forms of soft cheese or those used without being allowed to ripen for any length of time.

=Varieties of Cheese Made in France.=--There is a general idea that France is pre-eminently a cheese making country and this is true in so far as the making of certain brands of cheese which have international reputations is concerned. France, however, according to statistics, imports a larger quantity of cheese than she exports though probably the value of her exports is greater than the imports because of the high character and price of the exported articles.

Manufacture of Camembert.--The first cheese of this variety was made in 1791 by Marie Fontaine on a farm in the community of Camembert, near Vimontiers. The period of manufacture of Camembert cheese extends from March to September. It is made from whole cow's milk from which none of the cream has been extracted. The rennet is added at the temperature at which the milk comes from the cow as nearly as possible and the milk is artificially heated, the morning and evening milk being mixed, to this temperature. After the addition of rennet the milk is gently stirred for two or three minutes, a wooden cover placed over the pan, and left for five or six hours. The curd is sufficiently set when touched with the finger it does not adhere thereto. The curd is removed from the pan by a spoon and put into cylindrical metal molds open at the end and from these molds the whey is allowed to escape. It requires about two liters of milk to make one cheese. The whey is allowed to drain for about two days. After that time the mold is turned, a little fine white salt placed upon the top and allowed to drain for another day. After about 48 hours the cheeses are taken from the molds and salted. They are then placed in the drying room upon racks covered with straw. The drying room must be well ventilated and the air which is blown in for ventilation must be strained to be free of dust and insects. Care is taken also to exclude the sunlight, as this is very injurious to the proper development and ripening of cheese. The cheese remains in the dryer from 20 to 25 days. The ripening cellar is the next point to which the cheese is removed, and this cellar is kept as nearly as possible at 50 degrees F. The cheeses remain in the ripening cellar about 30 days, during which time they are frequently turned and carefully watched. The progress of the fermentation which takes place in the cheese is indicated by its appearance. In modern times the manufacture of Camembert cheese is continued practically throughout the whole year, but the artificially ripened cheese, that is, made during the winter by the aid of artificial heat, does not compare in quality with the product which is naturally ripened during the summer months. The manufacture of Camembert cheese has extended to a considerable distance from the original village, but it is all made in that part of France.

Emmenthaler Cheese.--Emmenthaler cheese is a variety of Swiss cheese of the same type as Gruyère. It is sometimes called the "cart-wheel" cheese on account of its immense size. These cheeses are sometimes three or four feet in diameter and of a disk-like shape, something like a wooden wheel sawed out of a round tree. It is a cheese which was originally made in Switzerland, although the manufacture of it has spread over into that part of France bordering Switzerland. It has the general character of Swiss cheese in texture, also in composition and nutritive value.

Brie Cheese.--This is one of the most famous of French cheeses. It is made in the form of a round flat mass about 16 inches in diameter for the grande Brie and 12 inches in diameter for the petite Brie. The thickness of the cheese is about one inch. The method of preparation is not very greatly different from that of cheeses in general. During the curing process, as in the case of Camembert, mould develops, especially on the outside of the cheese, and the change which goes on in the interior breaks down the casein, forming a creamy mass of a strong, piquant flavor. The mould which grows upon the outside of Brie cheese gives it a strong odor which reminds one of decomposition. Brie cheese might be said to resemble in general properties the Camembert variety of cheese.

Roquefort cheese is a very popular cheese made in France from sheep's milk. When properly ripened it shows a green mould. It is made in a particular way at Roquefort, and according to König has the following composition:

Water, 36.85 percent Fat, 30.61 „ Proteids, 25.25 „ Lactic acid, 1.90 „ Ash, 5.39 „

Port Du Salut.--This variety of cheese has a most deserving popularity, not only upon the Continent but in the United States. It is, however, not so generally known in this country as the Roquefort and Camembert varieties. It was long manufactured by a secret

process by the Trappist monks of Bricquebec in the Department of Manche.

The secret of the manufacture of this variety of cheese is guarded with the same jealousy by the monks as is the secret of making the chartreuse liqueur. Port Du Salut is always put up in very small packages of cylindrical form, flat, and about one inch in thickness. The cheese has a number of holes, in which it resembles the Swiss cheese. Its flesh, however, is mellow, and does not have the toughness nor solidity which characterizes the flesh of Swiss cheese. Although the monks' secret has been well guarded the general method of its manufacture has been described ("Cheese and Cheese Making," by Jas. Long and John Benson). The milk is brought to a temperature of 86 degrees F., and is treated with rennet in such a way as to separate the curd in about one-half hour. The separation of whey is secured in the usual manner, first, by allowing broken curd to stand, and afterwards by pressure. A peculiar form of pressure is said to be used by the monks,--a number of screws are placed side by side on a beam and a number of cheeses may be pressed at the same time. The pressure is applied solely by the hands and so is not very severe. After pressure the cheeses are placed in a ripening cellar, which is kept at about 54 degrees F. Care is taken in the ripening that the cheese does not become too dry.

Pont L'Evêque cheese is well known upon the Continent, especially in France where it is made. It takes its name from the village where the manufacture is carried on, which is not very far from Havre. The cheese is usually put up in a square or oblong package about one inch in thickness and of a size weighing about one pound. It has a tough crust and may be kept for some time after it is ripe with safety. The milk is set at a temperature of 88 degrees and a sufficient amount of rennet added to produce precipitation of the curd in about fifteen minutes.

When the curd is stiff enough to be cut and removed it is placed upon a mat made of rye straw through which the whey is allowed to filter. As the whey runs off the curd becomes tougher and the mat is brought together in such a way as to exert gentle pressure. This separation of the whey is continued until the curd can be placed in metal molds which vary in size according to the size of the intended cheeses. The cheese is ripened at a temperature of about 58 degrees in a humid cellar so as not to lose too much water.

Gervais cheese belongs strictly to the family of fancy cheese, being made of a mixture of milk and cream. It is produced in large quantities in France and finds almost an exclusive domestic market. It is named for its manufacturer, M. Gervais. The mixture is set at a very low temperature, about 65 degrees. The rennet which is used is diluted with water and added in small quantities so that the curd does not separate for eight or ten hours. The whey is separated in a cloth bag and under very gentle pressure. The cheeses are usually sold in only a partially ripe state and the cheese combines the flavor of both cheese and cream.

Bondon cheese is another cheese which is made largely in the region of Rouen. The size of the cheese is usually very small, from seven to nine being made from a gallon of milk. The method of manufacture is more like that of Gervais and differs from it chiefly in being made solely from milk instead of a mixture of milk and cream.

Limburger Cheese.--Limburger cheese is one of the most famous of the different varieties of foreign cheese, chiefly because of its bad odor. This odor is due to specific forms of ferments introduced during the ripening process. Generally Limburger cheese is made from pure milk, but occasionally skimmed or partially skimmed milk is used. The milk is set at rather a high temperature, from 92 to 100 degrees. After the coagulation has taken place the curd is broken into pieces the size of a hen's egg and allowed to settle to the bottom of the kettle as the whey separates. In England a copper kettle is usually employed for the testing vessel. After the whey has separated the curd is taken out and placed in rectangular molds with perforated bottoms, then laid on tables so that the remaining portion of the whey may drain off. The molds are turned from time to time to promote the separation of the whey and to make the cheeses keep their form. The cheeses are next placed in rows on a flat table with thin pieces of boards between them and subjected to light pressure. During this time they are salted by applying salt externally and rubbing the surface at frequent intervals for three or four days. The salt dissolves and permeates the mass. During the salting and pressing the cheeses are kept at a uniform temperature of about 60 degrees. The curing takes place in cellars, well ventilated but very moist, at a temperature of about 60 degrees. As the cheeses ripen they grow soft. The curd takes on its characteristic greasy appearance at the time of the ripening, becoming, at first, a yellow and then a reddish yellow. The softening begins on the outside and proceeds toward the center and the cheese is considered to be marketable when one-fourth of it has taken on its characteristic texture. The softening of Limburger cheese is due to a ferment which breaks down into a soft mass the casein or paracasein of which the cheese is largely composed. By using the same kind of ferments and by following the same process, imitations of Limburger cheese are made in the United States and other countries. These imitations, however, never equal the original in the character of the product nor in flavor or taste, and should not bear the name of the real article.

COMPOSITION OF LIMBURGER CHEESE.

Water, 35.7 percent Fat, 34.2 „ Casein products, 24.2 „ Milk sugar and undetermined, 3.0 „ Ash, 2.9 „

Limburger cheese was first made in the Province of Lüttick in Belgium. It has, however, come to be considered chiefly as of German production. The chief cause of the putrefactive fermentation which takes place in Limburger cheese is the extremely moist condition in which it is kept. For this purpose the atmosphere of the ripening cellar should be almost saturated with aqueous vapor, containing at least 95 percent of its maximum degree of saturation. This moist atmosphere, together with the low temperature at which the curing takes place, keeps the cheese soft and promotes the putrifactive ferments. Under these conditions the surface soon begins to get shiny and soft and changes from white to a reddish yellow. This change makes its way to the center, converting the harsh curd to a soft condition. The time required for this softening of the cheese is from four to six weeks. (“Cheese Making,” by John W. Decker.)

Edam Cheese.--Edam cheese is one of the most famous of the cheeses of Holland. It is made at the town of Edam, situated on the Zuyder Zee, about twelve miles northeast of Amsterdam. The milk from which Edam cheese is made should be properly acidified as has already been described. The coagulation takes place and the curd is separated much in the same manner as is used in the manufacture of Cheddar cheese. The curd is held for a time in the vat in a granular condition in order to develop greater acidity and until it will string one-half inch or one inch on the hot iron already described. It is then ready for the mold. The molds are of such a character as to give the cheese a spherical shape about six inches in diameter. Each cheese weighs about four pounds. It has a perfectly solid texture and its flavor is something like that of old Cheddar, except that it is a little more salty and somewhat harder. It is cured at a temperature of about 60 degrees and at a humidity of about 80 degrees. The curing period is somewhat longer than for most cheeses, lasting about eight or ten months and even a year. A slow curing is particularly necessary in the production of Edam cheese.

Coating with Paraffine.--In the curing of cheese sometimes it is coated with paraffine to avoid loss of weight. Coating with paraffine does not necessarily interfere with the character of the cheese, though it is probable that it must interfere in some way with the normal ferments. Paraffine is wholly indigestible and may produce injurious effects if swallowed with the cheese. (“Farmers’ Bulletins,” Nos. 186-190.)

=Fancy Cheeses.=--There is a large number of cheeses made in which cream enters as a prominent part. It is difficult to give these any particular name and the term “fancy cheese” has been applied to this form of cheese as a whole. They are usually put up in small packages or little pots and thus form an article of diet quite distinct from the large press cheese of commerce. In fact they are intended more for condimental purposes and to be eaten in something of the same manner as butter rather than cheese. These cheeses usually are sold for a much higher price and, therefore, can be regarded more as a luxury than as a regular article of diet.

It might be well to mention some of the more particular varieties of these fancy cheeses.

Gruyère.--Gruyère is a cheese made in Switzerland, where it is much prized and from where it is sent to the various parts of the world. It is a pressed cheese and is rather of a larger size than the fancy cheeses already described, and it is difficult to say whether or not it should find a place among them.

Parmesan.--Parmesan is a variety of cheese made in Italy. It is about the same size as Gruyère and thus has an intermediate place between the large pressed cheeses of commerce and the fancy cheeses above mentioned.

Gorgonzola cheese is a very familiar cheese made in Italy and belongs to the same class as the two preceding ones. It is in one sense a fancy cheese and yet is made in such quantities as to belong rather to the commercial variety.

=Bacterial Activity in Cheese.=--Modern science has led to the conclusion that the ripening of cheese is due principally to bacterial activity. The changes which take place in the chemical and physical properties of cheese materials, the flavor and aroma which are developed, the production of mould and other growths are marks of the activity of organisms of different character, living and unorganized. Due credit must be given to the enzymic (unorganized) action in these processes and the enzymes are not regarded as living organisms but, on the other hand, as catalytic agents inducing chemical changes similar to those produced in starch by the action of diastase. The peculiar flavors of cheeses which are found in different kinds have been ascribed in late years almost exclusively to the character of bacterial activity. This assumption is perhaps correct, but it must not be forgotten in this connection

that the same species of bacteria, in changed environments, does not always produce the same results. The activities of bacteria are peculiarly sensitive to the environment, such as change of temperature, physical conditions of different kinds, locality, and other factors of a complex nature, making up the total conditions in which the organisms live. For this reason the attempts to produce peculiar cheeses which belong in particular localities in other localities have not been gustatorily even if technically successful. It is true that cheeses may be made of the types mentioned, having some of the general characteristics but lacking that indescribable something which after all gives true character. Just as it is impossible to make a Rhine wine in California or a Bordeaux wine in New York so is it impossible to make a Cheddar cheese in Ohio or a Camembert cheese in Connecticut.

=Number of Bacteria.=--The number of bacteria, per gram, which appear in cheese varies according to the age of the cheese, conditions under which it is made, temperature, etc. The usual number of bacteria in one gram of cheese varies from five hundred thousand to nearly one hundred million (21st Annual Report of the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station).

Ageing does not seem to increase the number of organisms, since it has been found by some observers that the maximum number present in cheese is found at the time it is taken from the press. It is difficult also to properly sample a cheese for the number of bacteria, since they are unequally distributed in different parts thereof, and the trier, by means of which the sample is secured, may show largely differing numbers in different parts of the same cheese. During the process of curing, especially if the curing be at a high temperature, the number of organisms decreases. At first the decrease is very rapid and then becomes slower as the cheese becomes riper. The decrease in the number of bacteria when the temperature of curing is raised is somewhat contrary to expectations. It has been found that when a cheese is taken from cold storage, say at 24 degrees F., and placed in a temperature of 60 degrees F., the decline in the number of bacteria is always greater than when the cheese is retained at the lower temperature. This may be due to the fact that bacteria which have been developed at a low may lose their vitality at a higher temperature. On the contrary, the development of flavor does not seem to depend upon the number of organisms since the peculiar flavor of cheese is more rapidly developed at the higher temperature, provided it be not too high, although this be attended with a diminution in the number of organisms. Evidently the conditions which favor the metabolic activities of organisms also favor their destruction, since when they have performed their functions they undergo natural disintegration. The character of cheese is such that when it is once formed there is no more opportunity given for a rapid proliferation of the organisms.

It may be found, however, that the development of bacterial life is not the sole or perhaps not the dominant factor in the development of flavors and aromas in cheeses but that this process is due very largely to the enzymic activities obtained from the rennet and which pre-exist in the milk.

=Chemical Changes Which Take Place During the Ripening of the Cheese.=--_Loss of Weight._--During the process of ripening of cheese there is considerable loss of weight, amounting to from 15 to 20 percent of the total weight of the fresh product. This loss is due chiefly to the evaporation of water, while in the fermentation which takes place volatile bodies are formed which also escape with the water. For instance, any free gas, either carbon dioxid, hydrogen, or nitrogen, which is produced will escape, likewise any alcohol which is formed will at least partially volatilize. There may be also a slight loss due to mechanical attrition, but that is not of any consequence. Owing to the loss of water some of the constituents which may diminish in actual quantity have their percentages proportionately increased. These changes are illustrated by the following analytical data:

MILK WATER. PROTEIN. FAT. SUGAR. ASH. Fresh cheese, 40.42 24.80 28 1.65 5.43 In the dry substance, ... 41.62 46.99 .... Same cheese one year old, 33.12 27.35 31.70 2.96 4.87 In the dry substance, ... 40.89 47.40 ....

The quantity of water which is lost in part depends upon the temperature of the store house and the dryness of the air. The loss of water should not be too great, otherwise the cheese would be dry and the ripening process would not go on in a proper manner. In some of the processes which take place during the ripening of cheese water is formed. If, therefore, there is no loss of weight during the process of ripening, the ripened cheese would have more water than the fresh cheese and this would impair the quality of the product. The loss of a certain part of water, namely, from 15 to 20 percent must be regarded as an advantage in the production of cheese.

Changes in the Protein.--The most important chemical changes, from a digestive point of view, which take place in the cheese are those which the protein undergoes. This protein substance consists chiefly of casein and undergoes profound alteration due to enzymic action during the process of ripening. The casein which when dry naturally forms a leathery, tough material changes into a more soluble and softer product, and during this change there are produced aromas and flavors which add much to the value of the cheese for edible purposes.

The character of the coagulation of the cheese originally has much to do with the general changes which the product undergoes during fermentation. The cheese makers for this reason must pay special attention to the rennet which they employ in the production of the precipitate. One of the most important of the changes which the casein undergoes is that which results in the production of ammonia. This indicates a complete decomposition of the protein substance, at least in part, so that the total amount of protein which is lost as such may reach as high as 25 or 30 percent of that present in the original cheese. There are also produced notable quantities of lucin and other nitrogenous compounds soluble in alcohol. In general it may be said that the changes in the nitrogen constituents of cheese are extremely helpful to digestion. Not only is the protein of ripened cheese more soluble but even the parts which remain unchanged as far as the protein constituent is concerned are so affected by the action of fermentation as to render them more readily subject to the action of the digestive ferments in the alimentary canal. There is a popular superstition that the use of cheese at the end of a meal helps to digest the other food which has given rise to the adage "Cheese, thou mighty elf, digesting all things but thyself." There is a base of scientific truth in this expression since in ripe cheese the enzymes remain still in an active form and when taken into the stomach must necessarily exercise an influence of considerable magnitude upon the process of digestion. The custom, therefore, which is so universal, of finishing a dinner with a bit of cheese is evidently based upon sound physiological as well as gastronomical principles.

Changes in the Fat.--The chemical changes which the fat undergoes in the process of ripening the cheese are also of considerable importance. It is claimed by some authors that additional fat is produced from the casein during the process of ripening, which is the cause of the lardy appearance of some cheeses. Many observers have found in ripened cheese a larger percentage of fat than that which was noticed in the fresh cheese. This apparent increase, however, may be due to analytical error, since in the fresh cheese the fat becomes entangled with highly insoluble caseous matter and is difficult of extraction, whereas after the ripening of the cheese and degradation and breaking up of the caseous tissues the fat is much more readily extracted. While it is not impossible that fat should be formed by the fermentation of the casein it does not seem that it is probable.

In examinations which were made of fresh and ripened cheese of the variety known as Roquefort there was found in the dry substance of the fresh cheese 40.80 percent of protein and 53.91 percent of fat. In the same cheese after it was quite old there was found in the dry substance 37.78 percent of protein and 56.14 percent of fat. These data serve to bear out the theory that fat is formed from the protein. On the contrary, it must be remembered that in the fermentation of the protein a number of volatile bodies are formed, especially ammonia, and thus the diminution in the percentage of protein is probably due to the loss of volatile bodies, and the increase in the quantity of fat is therefore a relative one, probably, and not absolute. There is no doubt, however, of the fact that the quantity or character of the fat does change considerably during the process of ripening. There is no reason for supposing that the fat alone of all the contents of cheese escapes enzymic action. It is profoundly changed in its character by the fermentations to which it is subjected, and this change, while it unsuits the fat for butter, may probably make it more palatable and desirable in cheese.

=Digestibility of Cheese.=--Reference has already been made to the fact that in the ripening of cheese the protein of the milk, consisting principally of casein, undergoes certain changes which apparently, at least, increase its digestibility. I use the word "apparent" because the flavor and aromas which are produced in the ripening of a cheese act as condimental substances and thus naturally excite the glands which secrete the digestive enzymes to greater activity. Therefore the increased digestibility may be due in part to the increased activity of the digestive ferments as above described rather than to the changes in the casein itself. It must be admitted, however, that these changes during ripening tend to make the casein more granular, softer, and to convert it into compounds more easily acted upon, and are thus favorable to increased digestibility. Experimental studies have shown that in a well ripened American cheese of the Cheddar type 93 percent of the protein present in the cheese and 95 percent of the fat are digested. Artificial digestion experiments have also shown that the pancreas ferments have much more effect upon cheese digestion than the peptic, showing that the cheese is more acted upon in the small intestines, perhaps, than in the stomach. Attention must also be paid to idiosyncrasies in these cases, as there are many people who find it impossible to digest cheese in any form. The eating of larger quantities than are necessary also tends to derange the digestive organs. A well ripened cheese, therefore, should be eaten rather as a condimental substance than as an actual food product, though its value as a food is fully attested. ("Farmers' Bulletin," No. 162.)

=Effect of Cold Storage on the Curing of Cheese.=--Attention has been called, in the description of different methods of making varieties of cheeses, to the ordinary temperature at which cheeses are cured. In European countries these temperatures are maintained without the use of artificial means. In the United States it is difficult to maintain a very low temperature in summer time

without the use of artificial refrigerators. Experimental studies have determined that when the temperature of ripening or storage is reduced to a considerable extent below that usually specified for the standard varieties of cheese the quality of the cheese is superior although the time for storage or ripening is very much prolonged. The artificial curing of cheese has been secured at as low a temperature as 40 degrees. There is also a less loss of weight in cheese cured at this low temperature. A cheese which was cured at 40 degrees when examined by experts scored a mark of 92.4 while the same cheese ripened at 60 degrees scored 95. Another test of a cheese cured at 40 degrees scored 95.7 while the same cheese cured at 50 degrees was marked 94.2 and the cheese cured at 60 degrees 91.7.

=Preparations of Casein.=--Properly in connection with cheese preparations may be mentioned those products which are of a food value, procured from casein itself. The precipitated casein is prepared for the market by washing, drying, and grinding to a fine powder, and is then sometimes called protein flour. Sanose is a mixture consisting of about 80 percent of casein and 20 percent of the protein derived from the white of egg. The addition of the white of egg enables the casein to remain in suspension when mixed with water and thus causes the preparation to resemble milk. Casein preparations of this form are practically insoluble in water and, therefore, are not perhaps of the best forms of nitrogenous food for invalids. To avoid this insolubility the casein has been combined with alkalies and the preparations are known as _nutrose_ and _eucasein_. Plasma is also a preparation of casein with alkalies which are added in sufficient quantities to give 7 percent of ash. These caseinates, as they are sometimes called, that is, combinations of casein with alkalies, are soluble in water and are found to be to a certain extent digestible and nutritive preparations. Casumen and sanatogen are other preparations of casein with alkalies or glycero-phosphate. Wonderful claims are made by manufacturers concerning the digestibility and nutritive properties of these preparations. It is doubtful, however, if they have much greater value, if any, than natural casein in the form of milk or as ripened in cheese. Preparations of this kind usually appeal strongly to those who suffer from digestive disorders and therefore high-sounding names, which are given to practically the same preparations, lead the seeker after health often to try the same substance under a dozen different appellations. These remarks are not made for the purpose of decrying in any way the merits which these preparations may have but only to illustrate a very marked tendency on the part of many people to attribute extreme virtues to ordinary food substances which are sold under attractive and sometimes deceptive names and whose properties and virtues are advertised in an expert manner. Because a food substance consists almost wholly of pure protein is no indication whatever of its exceptionally high food value. Protein is only one form of food and a concentrated ration of protein in any of these forms is just as likely to do harm as good. For emergency rations, for economy in transportation, and for certain diseased conditions of the digestive organs these preparations are undoubtedly valuable, but they have little claim upon the general public in a state of health as staple articles of diet. They are much more nutritive than the extracts of beef and other meats which have obtained a vogue wholly out of proportion to their dietetic or medicinal value. (“Foods and Principles of Dietetics,” by Robert Hutchinson.)

PART V.

CEREAL FOODS.

BARLEY (GENUS _Hordeum_).

In the United States barley is not used to any extent as human food. It has all the nutritive properties of the common cereals and may be considered as a food product, although its chief use is in the making of fermented beverages which will be described in full in the second volume.

Barley is cultivated chiefly in the northern and western portions of the United States and is similar to the oat in this respect, that when the grain is threshed by the ordinary process the first layer of chaff is not separated, and, therefore, it goes into the market unhulled. There are varieties of naked barley which are not much cultivated. The cultivated varieties (_Hordeum sativum_ Pers.) belong practically to one species, although there are very many different varieties grown.

The character of barley best suited to malting will be discussed in the second volume.

Acreage and Yield of Barley.--The area planted to barley in the United States and other statistical data relating thereto for the year 1906 are as follows:

Acreage, 6,323,757 Yield per acre, 28.3 bushels Total production, 178,916,484 „ Price per bushel, 41.5 cents Value of crop, 74,235,997 dollars

=Composition of a Typical Unhulled Barley.=--From a comparative study of a number of samples of American barley the following numbers are regarded as typical of the composition of the unhulled barley grown in the United States:

Weight of 100 kernels, 4.53 grams Moisture, 10.85 percent Protein, 11.00 „ Ether extract, 2.25 „ Crude fiber, 3.85 „ Ash, 2.50 „ Starch and sugar, etc., 69.55 „

The important points brought out in the above data are that the percentage of fiber in the unhulled barley is less than one-half that of the unhulled oat, as stated further on, while the percentage of ether extract is only about one-half that of the unhulled oat, and the protein is also decidedly less than in the whole oat.

As has been stated, barley is not very generally used in this country for human food, but is used in this and other countries as an ingredient of soup.

[Illustration: FIG. 22.--BARLEY STARCH. × 200.--(_Bureau of Chemistry._)]

=Protein of Barley.=--The following protein compounds are found in barley in proportionate weight to the total weight of the seed:

Leucosin, 0.30 percent Hordein, 4.00 „ Edestin, 1.95 „ Proteose, 1.95 „ Insoluble protein, 4.50 „

As seen from the above table the most important of the soluble proteins is hordein, which in quantity is almost equal to the insoluble protein of the barley grain. The starch granules of barley are recognized by their distinctive shape and size, as revealed by the microscope. A typical microphotographic view of barley starch is shown in Fig. 22.

BUCKWHEAT (_Polygonum fagopyrum_ L.).

=Buckwheat= is usually classed with the cereals, but botanically it does not belong to the order of true grasses to which the cereals belong.

Buckwheat is commonly grown in many parts of the United States, and its seed is highly prized for bread and cake making purposes. The buckwheat is ground and the outer black tough hull separated, and the flour is used chiefly for making hot breakfast cakes which are much prized throughout the country. Properly ground buckwheat flour has a more or less dark tint, due to fine particles of the outer envelope which escape the bolting process.

Acreage and Yield of Buckwheat.--This crop is not grown in many states. New York, Pennsylvania, and Michigan produce the largest quantities. The statistical data for buckwheat grown in the United States in 1906 are as follows:

Acreage, 789,208 Yield per acre, 18.6 bushels Production, 14,641,937 „ Price per bushel, 59.6 cents Total value, 8,727,443 dollars

=Composition of Buckwheat Flour.=--The composition of finely bolted buckwheat flour is as follows:

Moisture, 11.89 percent Protein, 8.75 „ Ether extract, 1.58 „ Ash, 1.85 „ Fiber, .52 „ Starch and sugar, 75.41 „ Calories per gram, 3,854

The above is the composition of a white flour more finely ground and bolted than is advisable for palatable purposes. In the grinding of the above flour the germ which contains a greater part of ether extract is eliminated and also a large quantity of the bodies rich in protein. The composition of a less highly refined flour and one which is more palatable and more nutritious is given in the following data:

Moisture, 11.19 percent Protein, 9.81 „ Ether extract, 2.33 „ Ash, 1.53 „ Fiber, .73 „ Starch and sugar, 74.41 „ Calories per gram, 3,954

=Milling Process.=--In the preparation of the so-called highest grade of buckwheat flour, that is, that which is most carefully ground and thoroughly bolted, the process employed is as follows: During the process of milling the buckwheat grains pass to a receiving separator which removes all the coarse particles, stones, straws, etc., by means of a series of sieves. At the same time any dust which they contain is blown out by a current of air. The sifted grains pass next to the scouring machines, in which they are thoroughly scoured, cleaned, and polished. From these machines the grains pass to a separator containing magnets, by means of which any pieces of metal, in the form of nails, screws, pieces of wire, etc., are removed.

The grains next pass through a steam dryer for removing the greater portion of the water employed for the scouring. As soon as they are dry they are again treated to a blast of air, which removes any dirt, dust, or light particles which may have been detached during the process of drying. The grains next pass to the shelling rolls, where the greater part of the outer hulls is removed. This process is accomplished by means of an apparatus which is called a sieve scalper. After the separation of the outer hulls the residue of the material passes to a drying chamber, where the moisture is reduced to about 10 percent, thus insuring the keeping qualities of the flour. After drying the grains are ready for the rolls. After entering the rolls the process is practically the same as that which is employed in milling wheat, consisting of a series of breaks and reductions, with the attendant bolting and grading, and this process is prolonged until the flour is practically removed from the feed or middlings. The sifting cloths used in the bolting of buckwheat flour are somewhat coarser than those for wheat, and this allows some of the dark particles of the inner hulls to pass into the flour, which gives it a dark color on baking. It is quite possible to make a buckwheat flour as white as that from wheat, but in this country the public taste requires a darker product, so that the white flour does not readily sell. The requisite degree of darkness is secured by using bolting cloths which will allow a part of the inner hulls (middlings) to pass into the flour. Two grades of flour are generally produced--a whiter one in which finer cloths are used, and a darker flour made by using coarser bolting cloths, allowing larger quantities of middlings to pass through. The outer hulls which are first removed are used for fuel, although from their composition it is seen that they contain a large quantity of carbohydrates and might be very profitably used in connection with some highly nitrogenous food, such as cottonseed meal or flaxseed meal for feeding cattle. The middlings are used principally as cattle food, and especially by dairymen.

The above process, while it makes a white and fine-looking flour, is not to be compared with the meal made in the old-fashioned way of grinding between stones and separating the principal part of the outer hull by bolting. This old-fashioned flour is more nutritious, that is, it contains more fat and protein, has a greater fuel value, or in other words has a greater number of calories and makes a much more palatable cake than the fine modern flour.

=Buckwheat Cakes.=--Buckwheat cakes are prepared from batter made by mixing buckwheat flour into a paste of the proper consistency, seeding it with yeast, and allowing it to remain in a moderately warm place until fermentation takes place. The proteins of buckwheat have some agglutinating power, and thus, when treated as above, make a cake capable of a considerable degree of aeration. Baking powders are often used as a substitute for yeast and permit of preparation in a few minutes instead of waiting for the fermentation above mentioned. The product made in this way cannot be considered so palatable or nutritious as the old-fashioned product. The batter is baked on a smooth hot iron or soapstone, polished and kept bright in order to prevent the sticking of the cake. The proper polishing of the iron is a better means of preventing sticking than greasing. The batter is poured over the smooth iron and is of a consistency to flatten out without help and to form a film over the baking iron, which produces a cake about one-fourth of an inch in thickness. The cake is to be turned as soon as the side in contact with the iron is brown. It is evident that in this baking process there can be no very profound change in the starch granules, but this does not appear to materially interfere with the digestibility of the product. Buckwheat cakes are eaten hot, usually with butter and sirup. Maple sirup, sorghum sirup, or cane sirup in a pure state are highly prized for use with buckwheat cakes. These sirups are both condimental and nutritious. Mixed sirups made of glucose, melted brown sugar, or molasses, or mixtures of all these bodies are more commonly furnished to the consumer than the pure sirup mentioned above. Honey is also used very extensively as a condimental flavor for cakes of this kind.

=Adulterations.=--There is probably no bread or cake making material which is subjected to more extensive adulteration than buckwheat flour. Much of what is sold as buckwheat flour may be regarded as imitations of that substance. Mixtures of rye flour, Indian corn flour, wheat flour, and other ground cereals are used as a substitute for buckwheat. There can be no objection from the hygienic point of view to such substitutes but the use of these mixtures under the name of buckwheat can be regarded in no other light than as an unpardonable fraud.

=Detection of Adulterations.=--There is rarely any mineral adulteration practiced with buckwheat flour and if so it is easily detected by incineration. Any content of ash, unless baking powder has been used, above 2 percent may be regarded with suspicion as indicating an admixture of some mineral substance. The cereal flours used for adulteration are readily detected by the microscope in the hands of an experienced observer. The field of the microscope has only to be compared with the microscopic appearance of genuine buckwheat starch in order to detect the added substance.

=Buckwheat Starch.=--The microscopic appearance of buckwheat starch is shown in the accompanying figure. The granules of buckwheat starch are very characteristic. They consist of chains or groups of more or less angular granules with a well defined

nucleus, and without rings or with very faint rings. The contour of buckwheat starch is more angular than that of any other common cereal with exception of maize and rice, and it is this and the relative size which enable the observer to distinguish it from other starches. The size of the granules is quite uniform, varying usually only from 10 to 15 microns[23] in diameter. In so far as the angular appearance is concerned the granules of buckwheat starch have a general resemblance to that of maize and rice and oats, but a comparison under the microscope of the three starches reveals lines of distinction which with a little practice would prevent the observer from drawing a false conclusion.

[23] A micron is one thousandth of a millimeter.

[Illustration: FIG. 23.--BUCKWHEAT STARCH. × 200.--(_Courtesy of Bureau of Chemistry._)]

INDIAN CORN (_Zea mays_).

Next to wheat the most important cereal used as a human food in the United States is Indian corn. According to the magnitude of the crop, Indian corn is the leading cereal of the country. Statistical data on the production of Indian corn in the United States during 1906 are given in the following table:

Acreage, 96,737,581 Yield per acre, 30.3 bushels Production, 2,927,416,091 „ Value per bushel, 39.9 cents Total value, 1,166,626,479 dollars

=Indian corn= is universally employed as food throughout all parts of the country, but more especially in the South, where the daily dietary is rarely complete without one or more meals in which Indian corn is served in some form or other. Although it is grown much more extensively in the North than in the South, it is not so generally used as human food. Indian corn grows in all kinds of soil and produces, under favorable conditions, large yields in all parts of the country. It is the most important agricultural crop of many states, namely, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and Kansas. It is planted in the late winter and spring in different parts of the country. The planting season varies from January in Florida to June in Maine and Minnesota and the earlier varieties will mature in 120 days.

=Maize= is a crop which requires an abundance of rainfall and a high temperature during the growing season. Maize is planted in rows about three and one-half feet apart and in hills of about the same distance apart, or it may be drilled between the rows so that one stalk grows a distance of about from nine inches to a foot from its fellows. It requires constant cultivation during the early period of its growth and a careful preparation of the seed bed. Good farmers give from four to seven cultivations to the growing crop. The field must be kept free of weeds and in good tilth to secure the best results.

Many hundreds of analyses of the maize kernel have been made, but a combination of them all in the following data may be regarded as typical of the Indian corn grown in this country.

Weight of 100 kernels, 38 grams Moisture, 10.75 percent Ether extract, 4.25 „ Protein, 10.00 „ Fiber, 1.75 „ Ash, 1.50 „ Starch and sugar, etc., 71.75 „

The consideration of the above data shows that Indian corn is a ration in which the protein is rather low. In other words, the ratio of protein to the carbohydrates and fat is rather large. It is a food product which is particularly well suited to furnish heat and energy and support a high degree of muscular exertion. For this reason it is a food product which is particularly well adapted to men engaged in hard manual labor.

=Varieties.=--There are many distinct varieties of Indian corn. Sturtevant has published a description of several hundred. These varieties are classified under various subspecies. The polymorphic species, _Zea mays_, according to Sturtevant, can be divided into a number of groups which, on account of their well defined and persistent characters, may be considered as presenting specific claims and may properly receive specific nomenclature. The grouping adopted is founded upon the internal structure of the kernel for cultivated varieties, and the presence of a husk to the kernel in the assumed aboriginal form. Hence Sturtevant offers the names _Zea tunicata_ for the husk-kernel forms, _Zea everta_ for the popcorn, _Zea indurata_ for the flint corns, _Zea indentata_ for the dent corns, _Zea amylacea_ for the soft corns, and _Zea saccharata_ for the sweet corns.

[Illustration: FIG. 24.--SECTION OF RAW POPCORN. × 150.--(_Courtesy of Bureau of Chemistry._) Shows cells with the small angular starch grains closely packed together within them.]

Argument in favor of the specific claims for these groups is based primarily on the convenience thus attained; secondarily, on the absence or rarity of intermediate or connecting forms, so far as present data extend, and also on the antiquity of the separation. It seems almost certain that in the order of evolution (excluding from consideration the puzzling sweet corn group) progress has been from the pops, through the flints and the dents, to the softs. Certainly the soft corns in some of their varieties present a kernel that is larger, softer, and less fitted to the struggle with natural conditions than is the kernel from any of the other groups. Yet soft corns are the prevailing form in the mummy burials of Peru and of our Southwestern states. The popcorn, on the contrary, has stronger regerminative powers than have the other groups, is better fitted to contend against natural vicissitudes, and is the kind that has been reported as found growing wild in Mexico under the name of Coyote corn, _Zea canina_ Watts.

Some of these subdivisions may not be accepted by botanists, but they are convenient for purposes of description. The principal field varieties which are grown are the flint corn, _Zea indurata_, and the dent corn, _Zea indentata_.

POPCORN.

This variety of maize is used very largely in the United States as a delicacy, and with sugar and cream as a dessert. It is a hard, small-grained variety which has the property, when heated, of exploding with a very great enlargement of the starch grain, producing a soft and very delicate edible material which is highly prized.

[Illustration: FIG. 25.--SECTION OF POPCORN IN FIRST STAGE OF POPPING, SHOWING PARTIALLY EXPANDED STARCH GRAINS AND RUPTURED CELL WALLS. × 150.--(_Courtesy of Bureau of Chemistry._)]

In the raw popcorn the starch grains are packed together very closely within the cells. When popping begins there is an expanding of the starch grains, producing a cavity nearly circular in form in each grain. This causes a rupturing of the cell walls, though fragments are plainly visible in the early stages. In the fully expanded or popped kernel the starch grains have expanded until each is about half or two-thirds as large as the original cells of the endosperm. The cell walls in this stage are practically obliterated as far as detecting in a section is concerned. The exploding of the starch grains is influenced by the water content of the kernel. It must not be too wet nor too dry; about 10 or 12 percent is the proper content of moisture. These changes are beautifully shown in the accompanying microphotographs, Figs. 24, 25, and 26, by Mr. Howard, of the Bureau of Chemistry.

[Illustration: FIG. 26.--SECTION OF FULLY POPPED POPCORN. × 150.--(_Courtesy of Bureau of Chemistry._) The fully expanded starch grains are nearly half as large as the original cells in which they were contained.]

SWEET CORN.

This is a variety of maize which develops a high sugar content and is eaten while the starch is yet soft, in other words, in an unripe state. It is a food product of immense importance in the United States, although almost unknown in Europe. The content of sugar varies from 5 to 8 percent in the fresh, soft kernel. The sugar which is present in the kernel rapidly disappears after the husking or removal from the stalk. In order to secure the maximum sweetness the corn should be cooked and eaten as soon as possible after removal from the stalk. Where it is not possible to do this it should be placed in cold storage after removal from the stalk and remain unhusked until it is ready for cooking. Green corn is universally eaten hot. It is usually cooked by boiling in water, although it may also be roasted before the fire. It has a high food value, and the composition of the grains of fresh, soft, green corn is shown in the following table:

Composition of Fresh Green Indian Corn:

Moisture, 73.00 percent Starch, 13.50 „ Sugars, 6.00 „ Protein, 5.00 „ Crude fiber, 1.20 „ Ash, .70 „ Fat, .60 „

=Maize Proteins.=--The proteins of maize are composed principally of two zeins. The two forms are differentiated by their behavior toward alcohol. The first form constitutes the zein soluble in alcohol and the second the zein insoluble in alcohol. There are two other proteins in maize existing in small quantities which have been named myosin and vitellin, respectively. There is also a third unnamed variety and small quantities of albumin.

=Variation in Maize, under Different Climatic Conditions.=--It is possible that most of the varieties and subvarieties of maize are simply the existing standard varieties modified by changing environments. There are certain conditions of climate, soil, and distribution of rainfall which tend to produce a large, starchy, soft grain, while other conditions tend to produce a small, hard grain richer in protein. The variations of importance are those of the carbohydrates and the protein, which are complementary, since as

the protein rises the carbohydrates fall in relative proportion. There is also a marked variation in the carbohydrates, due to variety and climatic conditions combined. It is, for instance, the increase of the sugar at the expense of the starch that produces the body known as sweet maize eaten in the green state, as already described. Even in the sweet variety the relative proportion of sugar varies in different localities and under different conditions of growth.

=Early Varieties.=--There are certain varieties of maize which are of especial value on account of their early maturation. This is a property extremely valuable in the sweet variety of maize or that eaten in the green state, since it is important to get these varieties into the market as early as possible and to continue them as long as possible. This is secured by planting the early variety at as early date as possible and planting later maturing varieties at intervals thereafter. By the selection of varieties of different periods of maturing it is possible in the climate of Washington to offer green corn from neighboring fields on the market from July until the advent of a killing frost which is usually the last of October or first of November. This gives a period of nearly four months during which the green corn may be delivered to the local market. Further south the period of supply is longer.

=Canned Corn.=--Immense quantities of green corn are grown for the purpose of canning in order to supply the market during the closed season. The canning industry for green corn is located chiefly in the north. In the eastern states the industry is of great importance, from Maryland to Maine. The northern-grown corns are often preferred as they are supposed to be sweeter and more palatable. In the central western states, northern Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, northern Illinois, and Iowa are the principal centers of the canning industry, although it is practised to a greater or less extent in almost all parts of the country.

=Adulterations of Canned Corn.=--Unfortunately in the canning process of corn additions have been made to the product which are of an objectionable nature. Chief among these is the use of bleaching agents such as sulfur in the form of burnt sulfur or of sulfite or bisulfite of soda or potash. These bleaching agents impart to the corn a white color which some consumers prefer, but at the expense of introducing a substance which must be regarded as deleterious to health. Still more objectionable is the practice of using saccharin instead of sugar as a sweetening agent. Saccharin is a coal tar product which has an intense, sweet taste, very persistent, and when used alone becomes disagreeable. A very small quantity of it is sufficient to impart a very sweet taste to the canned corn at a much less expense than could be secured by using the pure sugar. This form of adulteration is extremely reprehensible both because it deceives the consumer and adds a substance which by most hygienists is regarded as prejudicial to health. The bleaching agent and the artificial sweetener are wholly unnecessary. The manufacturers of sweet corn are expected to use the best and freshest and sweetest materials and cannot be excused for tampering with them in any way which either produces deception or injury to health.

Sugar added to make an ordinary corn taste like sweet corn is to be regarded as an adulteration unless its use is noted on the label.

Maize starch is also often added to sweet corn at the time of canning and this practice can only be regarded as an adulteration.

=Detection of Adulterations in Sweet Corn.=--_Test for Sulfurous Acid._--To about 25 grams of the sample (with the addition of water, if necessary) placed in a 200-c.c. Erlenmeyer flask, add some pure zinc and several cubic centimeters of hydrochloric acid. In the presence of sulfites, hydrogen sulfid will be generated and may be tested for with lead paper. Traces of metallic sulfids are occasionally present in vegetables, and by the above test will indicate sulfites. Hence positive results obtained by this method should be verified by the distillation method.[24] It is always advisable to make the quantitative determination of sulfites, owing to the danger that the test may be due to traces of sulfids. A trace is not to be considered sufficient as indicating either a bleaching agent or a preservative.

[24] U. S. Dept. Agr. Bureau of Chemistry, Circular No. 28, pp. 11-12.

Detection of Saccharin.[25]--Add from 25 to 40 c.c. of water to about 20 grams of the sample; macerate and strain through muslin; acidify with 2 c.c. of sulfuric acid (1 to 3) and extract with ether. Separate the ether layer, allow the ether to evaporate spontaneously, and take up the residue with water. If saccharin be present its presence will be indicated by the sweet taste imparted to the water. To confirm this test add from one to two grams of sodium hydroxid, and place the dish in an oil bath. Maintain the temperature of the oil at 250° C. for 20 minutes, when the saccharin will be converted into salicylic acid. After cooling and acidifying with sulfuric acid, extract in the usual way and test for salicylic acid. This test, of course, presupposes the absence of salicylic acid in the original sample. If salicylic acid is present in the original sample it must be removed before making the test for saccharin.

[25] _Ibid._, Bul. 65, p. 51.

[Illustration: FIG. 27.--INDIAN CORN STARCH. × 200.--(_Bureau of Chemistry._)]

=Starch of Indian Corn.=--Maize starch has characteristics which enable it to be easily detected by the microscope. The granules of this starch are of a more uniform size than those of wheat and vary from 20 to 30 microns in diameter. Occasionally very much smaller granules occur which probably are more of the original size and which have been arrested in growth by the ripening of the grain. The granules of maize starch are more or less polyhedral in form with round angles. The only common cereal starch which they can be mistaken for is rice, but they are generally larger than the granules of rice. Under the microscope with ordinary light they give only the faintest sign of rings but show in most cases a well developed hilum, which is at times star-shaped or like an irregular cross, while at other times it has the appearance of a circular depression. The maize starch granular is a type of the angular, as the wheat is of the sphere or spheroid form. The characteristic appearance of maize starch kernels is shown in the accompanying Fig. 27. Viewed with polarized light the starch grains of Indian corn present deep, well marked crosses, which divide each grain into four distinct parts as shown in Fig. 28. It is interesting to note that the angularity of maize starch is greatly influenced by the hardness of the kernels from which the grains are taken. The hard varieties, such as popcorn, have very angular grains while those from soft varieties have a great many almost spherical forms.

[Illustration: FIG. 28.--STARCH GRAINS OF INDIAN CORN, UNDER POLARIZED LIGHT. × 200.--(_Courtesy of Bureau of Chemistry._)]

=Maize Flour= (_Corn Meal_).--Formerly the maize kernel was ground between stones, bolted to remove the bran, and the maize flour or corn meal thus produced used directly as a human food. Modern milling operations have changed the method of producing maize flour so that not only is the outer bran removed but also, to a large extent, the germ itself, thus diminishing the quantity of fat in the prepared meal. This is notably true of the maize flour which is prepared for exportation. Leaving in the flour such a large quantity of fat tends to produce rancidity during shipment. To avoid any change of a deleterious nature which the flour may undergo during shipment, it is also frequently kiln-dried before being sent to foreign shores and even when intended for domestic consumption at points remote from the mill.

While this preparation of maize flour is doubtless important for transportation purposes, it impairs the palatability and nutritive value of the product. It is advisable to continue to have the maize flour prepared in the old-fashioned way and sent directly into consumption.

=Method of Preparation.=--One method of preparing the maize flour is as follows: The grains are broken into large pieces and dried with steam heat at a temperature of from 105° to 110° C. (221°-239° F.). The mass while still hot passes into a mill composed of two stones which revolve rapidly in opposite directions. The smaller portions of the meal, which have been reduced to a kind of gum by the high temperature, are separated by this process from the covering or the bran of the kernel. A small mass of the starchy matter leaves the mill in the form of small noodles, which are freed from any particles of bran by sifting. In this manner a mass is obtained which is quite free from fiber and fat.

The composition of maize meal prepared by the above process is as follows:

Moisture, 9.70 percent Protein, 12.68 „ Ether extract, 1.19 „ Ash, .60 „ Fiber, .35 „ Starch, sugar, and dextrin, 71.48 „

This method of preparing maize meal is not used to any extent in this country, but is said to be commonly employed in Germany.

=Composition of Maize Flour.=--The color of maize flour depends upon the color of the corn from which it is produced,--it may be white or yellow. The starch granules when heated in water to 62.5° C. swell up and become deformed, except a few, usually the small ones, which resist the action of water at that temperature. The starch granules of maize flour under polarized light present a black cross, very marked and very distinct when the field is obscured. When viewed under polarized light with a selenite plate the starch grains of maize are colored red with a green cross or reciprocally, and this coloration is very brilliant.

As has already been said, the composition of Indian corn meal made by the old-fashioned method of grinding and removing only the bran is practically that of the whole grain itself.

The composition of degerminated maize meal (Indian corn flour) is shown by the following average data:

Moisture, 12.57 percent Protein, 7.13 „ Ether extract, 1.33 „ Ash, .61 „ Fiber, .87 „ Starch and sugar, 78.36 „ Calories calculated on the moist meal, 3,837

The above data show that the refined Indian corn meal has lost more than three-fourths of its fat, a large portion of its mineral matter, and also a very considerable proportion of its protein, due to the separation of the bran which is extremely rich in protein and the germ which is rich both in oil and protein. A mere glance at the data shows that this refined Indian corn meal is much less nutritious than the natural meal in so far as its content of tissue-forming bodies and its faculty to furnish heat and energy are concerned. In other words, the calories are very much lower than in the natural corn meal. This is another reason for urging our people to return to the consumption of the old-fashioned material.

=The Adulteration of Indian Corn Meal.=--Owing to the cheapness of Indian corn in so far as is known there is no adulteration practiced. The refined Indian corn flour itself is sometimes used as an adulteration for buckwheat flour, wheat flour, and other cereal flours, but has not itself been subjected to adulteration.

=Corn Bread= (_Indian Corn Bread_).--Corn bread is a very common diet among all classes of people in the southern states and also to a considerable extent in the north.

Owing to the lack of agglutinating powers of the nitrogenous constituents of Indian corn flour, corn bread cannot be aerated or raised, as is the case with wheat bread. It is often eaten in an unleavened state. It may be partially leavened by the usual agent, namely, yeast or a chemical baking powder. Two varieties of bread are very commonly used, namely, that made of white flour or meal and that made of yellow. There is apparently no difference in the nutritive values of these two kinds. Some consumers prefer the white loaf and some the yellow.

=Composition of Indian Corn Bread.=--The composition of bread depends upon whether the whole grain flour is used from which only the coarse bran has been removed by bolting or whether the decorticated and degerminated meal is used. In the first case bread is made richer in fat and protein and in the second case richer in starch. In the bread will also be found the materials used in its preparation, namely, salt, lard or other fats, milk, yeast, or baking powder residues. The best bread is made from the freshly ground flour of the whole grain from which only the outer covering, namely, the coarse bran has been removed. As offered at many of our hotels and some private houses, corn bread has been so manipulated as to lose a large part of its palatability, without any compensating improvement of its nutritive properties.

OATS (GENUS _Avena_).

This cereal is an important food product, being used very largely in Europe, especially in Scotland, and also very extensively in this country as human food. The chief use of oats is for cattle food, especially for horses. It is extraordinarily rich in its nutritive constituents and, therefore, is prized highly as a food in the building and restoration of nitrogen tissues, such as the muscles. The variety in common cultivation is _Avena sativa_ L.

Oats are grown in almost every part of the United States, but chiefly in the northern and western portions. In the southern states the crop is planted in the late autumn or early winter. In the northern states it is chiefly a spring crop, being sown early in the spring as soon as the ground is in fair condition. The oat crop is one which requires a rather abundant and well-distributed rainfall. A spring drought is very detrimental to the growth of oats, much more so than wheat or rye. It is a crop which is well suited to be grown under irrigation.

There are many varieties of oats in cultivation, but in general characteristics they all correspond to one description. The husk adheres firmly to the grain, and when threshed the grain of a common variety of oat carries the first layer of husk or chaff with it. Oats, as bought in the market, therefore, consist not only of the kernel or grain but also of this outer, chaffy envelope. The magnitude of the crop in the United States is very great, but only an inconsiderable proportion of the whole is used for human food, and this chiefly in some form of oatmeal. The statistics of the crop grown in the United States during 1906 are given in the following table:

Acreage, 30,958,768 Yield per acre, bushels, 31.2 Total yield, bushels, 964,904,522 Price per bushel, cents, 31.7 Total value at farm, $306,292,978

=Ratio of Kernel to Hull.=--Numerous examinations of unhulled oats show that the average percentage of kernel to hull for 100 parts is as 73 to 27. In the oats grown in the western states the proportion of kernel is relatively higher and in the southern states lower.

In the analytical process if the hull or chaff is ground with the grain the proportion of fiber or crude cellulose is very considerably higher than in the class of cereals ground without the chaff. The mean composition of unhulled kernels of oats of American growth is represented by the following table:

Weight of 100 unhulled grains, 2.92 grams Moisture, 10.06 percent Protein, 12.15 „ Ether extract, 4.33 „ Crude fiber, 12.07 „ Ash, 3.46 „ Starch and sugar, 57.93 „

A study of the above data shows that the flour of unhulled oats is rich in fat, fiber, and ash. The large percentage of fiber and ash is due to a great degree to the composition of the hulls or chaff. The fat or oil comes chiefly from the germ.

=Composition of Hulled Oats.=--Inasmuch as the chaff is always separated from the oat flour when the latter is to be used for human food, the composition of the oat in the hulled state is of greater importance to the present purpose than in the unhulled condition. The means of 179 analyses show the hulled oats to have the following compositions:

Moisture, 6.93 percent Protein, 14.31 „ Ether extract, 8.14 „ Crude fiber, 1.38 „ Ash, 2.15 „ Starch and sugar, 67.09 „

The removal of the hulls, as is seen, and the partially dried condition of the grain in the above analysis increases the percentage of other ingredients. The protein and fat are especially large in quantity. Oatmeals may be regarded as the richest of the cereal flours, both in protein and in oil.

=The Protein of Oat Kernels.=--There are three principal products in the oat kernels characterized by their different degrees of solubility, namely, protein soluble in alcohol, protein soluble in dilute salt solution, and protein soluble in alkali. The protein soluble in alcohol constitutes about 1.25 percent of the whole grain, the protein soluble in dilute salt solution about 1.5 percent, and the protein soluble in alkali the remainder, viz., 11.25 percent. The protein of oats has very little agglutinating power and, therefore, oat flour is not suitable for making bread, or rather it is very little used for that purpose.

=Oat Products.=--As has been intimated before, the principal oat products, as far as food is concerned, are the various forms of oatmeal commonly classed as breakfast foods. These products are prepared in various forms of agglutination and physical texture but if made from genuine oats, as there is little cause for doubt, they have essentially the same composition and nutritive power. It is doubtful if there is any preparation of oatmeal any more nutritious or palatable than the plain oat grain properly cooked. The forms in which the oat products are offered to the public are perhaps more convenient for use and in some cases by reason of heating and preparation require less trouble, but otherwise they apparently have no advantage over the simple product.

The mean composition of a number of oat flour products is shown in the following table:

Moisture, 7.66 percent Protein, 15.48 „ Ether extract, 7.46 „ Crude fiber, 1.20 „ Ash, 1.29 „ Starch and sugar, 67.61 „

In the dry substance:

Protein, 16.77 percent Ether extract, 8.08 „ Crude fiber, 1.38 „ Ash, 1.94 „ Starch and sugar, 73.20 „ Calories, 4,875

It is evident from the above average analysis that the products examined are made from the whole kernel without the removal of the germ but with a very careful removal of the hull and bran. The composition of these products compares very favorably with the typical composition of the kernel itself. These data show the high nutritive value of these oat products, both in respect of fat and protein.

[Illustration: FIG. 29.--OAT STARCH. × 200.--(_Courtesy of Bureau of Chemistry._)]

=Adulterations.=--There are very few adulterations of oatmeal. Fortunately the price of this cereal is such that the admixture of other cereals would not be profitable. Doubtless such admixtures have often been made but evidently, from the examination of the products upon the open market, they are not very frequent. The characteristic appearance of oat starch is shown in Fig. 29.

Oat starch grains average about 10 microns in diameter. There are usually present some grains of somewhat oval shape, which assist in identifying oat products when present. The starch granules also have a tendency to agglutinate into masses of varying

size, as shown in the photograph.

=Detection of Adulterations.=--The adulteration of oatmeal with the flour of other cereals can easily be detected by the use of the microscope. Oat starch when highly magnified presents a peculiar cellular structure of pentagonal character which might be compared to the effect produced by grinding a large number of faces upon a precious stone. This peculiar appearance is caused by the tendency of the starch granules in oats to become compacted in large masses. The appearance of the separate granules and also the compact aggregate are shown in the figure on the preceding page. The large aggregated masses are of different sizes, ranging from .02 to 1.2 millimeters in length. These masses are usually broken up by grinding or pressure and, therefore, are not found in very great abundance in the commercial oatmeal. When separated into single granules these are found to be irregular in outline, due to the compression to which they have been subjected, more or less pentagonal in structure, and from .015 to .02 millimeter in diameter. The starch granules do not show any very marked characteristics under polarized light and have neither lines nor hilum. The above statements can easily be verified by any one who can operate an ordinary microscope, but before attempting to detect adulteration a careful examination of starch granules, prepared by the investigator himself, should be made.

RICE (_Oryza sativa_).

Rice is one of the most important food cereals. It furnishes a large part of the food of the inhabitants of China and Japan. It is a food rich in starch and poor in protein, and furnishes, therefore, heat and energy, and is well adapted for the nourishment of those engaged in hard labor or who undergo extreme physical exertion. The cultivation of rice is rapidly extending in the United States, especially in Louisiana and Texas. The statistical data relating to the rice crop for 1906 are as follows:

Acreage, 575,014 acres Production, 17,854,768 bushels Yield per acre, 31.1 „ Price per bushel, 90.3 cents Total value, 16,121,298 dollars

The adulteration of rice is confined to coating it with talc, paraffin, and glucose. The object of this treatment is to give a better appearance to the grain and to protect it from the ravages of insects. The use of indigestible substances such as talc and paraffin is scarcely justifiable. The starch granules of rice have distinctive properties which enable them to be readily recognized under the microscope, as shown in Fig. 30.

The rice starch grains are polygonal in form and have sharp angles. The grains vary in size from 2 to 10 microns, though the latter size is seldom reached, the most of the grains being about 6 microns. The hilum is seldom visible. The grains occur in the rice kernels mostly in groups of a considerable number of the individual grains forming starch masses of ovoid or angular form.

[Illustration: FIG. 30.--RICE STARCH. × 200.--(_Courtesy of Bureau of Chemistry._)]

RYE.

This is the source of the principal supply of bread in many European countries, but is not extensively used in the United States except among our citizens of foreign birth. It is also extensively used for making whisky. Rye belongs to the genus _Secale_. Only one species (_Secale cereale_ L.) is commonly cultivated, but this species has a great many different varieties or races. According to the time of sowing there are two great classes of rye, namely, that planted in the autumn or early winter and that planted in the early spring, generally known respectively as winter and spring rye. This is one of the hardiest of cereals, and grows well in all locations where wheat and other common cereals flourish. The area planted in rye in the United States in 1906 and the quantity harvested are given in the following table:

Acreage, 2,001,904 Yield per acre, 16.7 bushels Production, 33,374,833 „ Price per bushel, 58.9 cents Total value, 19,671,243 dollars

=Composition of Rye.=--From a study of many hundreds of analyses of rye of American origin the following table may be given as approximating the composition of a typical American rye:

Weight of 100 kernels, 2.50 grams Moisture, 10.50 percent Ether extract, 1.50 „ Protein, 12.25 „ Fiber, 2.10 „ Starch and sugar, 71.75 „ Ash, 1.90 „

[Illustration: FIG. 31.--RYE STARCH. × 200.--(_Courtesy of Bureau of Chemistry._)]

The percentage of moisture in American grown rye is usually less than that of European origin. The American rye, also, has smaller kernels as a rule than that of foreign growth. In the content of protein the American samples of rye are fully equivalent to those of foreign origin, and in their mean composition, except as noted above, do not differ greatly from that of standard varieties collected abroad.

=Protein of Rye.=--As is the case with other cereals more than one nitrogenous constituent exists in the rye. Three of the principal ones have been separated and named as follows: leucosin, gliadin, and edestin. Other proteins belonging to the globulin, albumin, and proteose family are also found in small proportions. The gliadin of rye resembles in its chemical and physical properties the gliadin of wheat. There is, however, in the rye no protein compound corresponding to the glutenin of wheat, and, therefore, rye flour does not form a gluten similar in quality to that of wheat, although it comes more nearly doing so than any other cereal. The gliadin of rye is soluble in alcohol, the leucosin of rye is soluble in water, and the edestin is soluble in a salt solution.

In a typical sample of American rye there will be found about 5.16 percent of gliadin, 2.27 percent of edestin and proteose, 0.55 percent of leucosin, and 3.14 percent of protein soluble in salt solution.

=Adulteration of Rye Flour.=--Rye flour is frequently adulterated by the admixture of flours of other cereals. Real rye flour is distinguished by the character of the starch granules, as shown in Fig. 31.

Rye starch grains are lenticular in form, and the largest grains are of about 50 microns diameter. They average somewhat larger than wheat starch grains and are characterized by many of the large grains having a fissure in the form of a slit, cross, or star, which is rare in wheat and barley. The rings and hilum are indistinctly seen in some of the grains.

=Rye Bread.=--This bread may be made leavened or unleavened, since the analogy in the property of its protein to that of wheat renders the leavening of rye bread somewhat more easy of accomplishment than that of the other cereals, with the exception of wheat.

Rye bread made of pure rye flour has a dark color, sometimes almost black. It is often baked long in advance of the time of eating and keeps well, is highly nutritious, and is the staple bread of many European countries.

A partial rye flour bread is made by mixing rye flour with other flours, such as wheat, barley, Indian corn, etc., and this is the kind which is commonly used in this country and in many portions of Europe where the light-colored breads are preferred to the dark.

The large consumption of bread made from rye and Indian corn indicates that even if the supply of wheat should become limited there is no reason to fear a famine of bread. It would be easy to substitute bread made wholly or in part of Indian corn and rye for that made wholly of wheat and thus to supply practically any demand for bread which the increasing population of the earth may make.

WHEAT (GENUS _Triticum_).

In respect of human nutrition wheat is the most important of the cereals. It is grown in the temperate regions of almost every country, but does not flourish in tropical or subtropical countries.

In the United States the wheat is divided in respect of the period of its growth into two great classes, namely, winter or fall planted wheat and spring or spring planted wheat. Winter wheat is usually planted from September to November and spring wheat from the last of March to the last of April.

In this country wheat is not cultivated, that is, there is no cultivation of the soil after seeding. The soil is, however, plowed and harrowed before planting. In the winter wheat regions the harvesting is in the month of June, though in the southern localities it comes somewhat earlier and in the more northern localities may extend into July. In the spring wheat regions the harvesting is from the last of July to the middle or end of August. The statistics of wheat grown in the United States during 1906 are as follows:

WINTER. SPRING. Acreage, 29,599,961 17,705,868 Yield per acre (bushels), 16.7 13.7 Total yield (bushels), 492,888,004 242,372,966 Total value at farm, $336,435,081 $153,897,679 Price per bushel (cents), 68.3 63.5

All the different varieties of wheat which are now known are cultivated. The simplest form, namely, the one grain wheat is the only one which grows wild, and the origin of the other varieties of wheat is unknown.

Botanists recognize three species, namely--Species 1, one grain wheat (_Triticum monococcum_ Lam.); species 2, Polish wheat (_Triticum polonicum_ L.); species 3, common wheat (_Triticum sativum_ Lam.). All of these species are distinct, especially the third one, of which the most valuable variety is the common wheat, _Triticum vulgare_ Vill.

The quality and properties of wheat depend more upon the environment in which it is grown than upon the species to which it belongs. There is perhaps no other field crop in which the environment, namely, condition of the soil, temperature, precipitation, etc., makes a greater difference than in wheat. In general, the environment and the species together produce two kinds of wheat as far as milling and bread making are concerned, namely, the soft or starchy wheat and the hard or glutinous wheat. In the first variety there is a larger percentage of starch in relation to the content or protein matter than in the second. Taking the wheat as a whole its average composition is shown in the following table:

Weight of 100 kernels, 3.85 grams Moisture, 10.60 percent Protein, 12.25 „ Ether extract, 1.75 „ Crude fiber, 2.40 „ Ash, 1.75 „ Carbohydrates other than crude fiber, 71.25 „ Dry gluten, 10.25 „ Moist gluten, 26.50 „

In regard to protein American wheat, as a rule, is quite equal to that of foreign origin. This is an important characteristic when it is remembered that both the milling and food value of a wheat depend largely upon the nitrogenous matter which is present. It must not be forgotten, however, that merely a good percentage of protein is not of itself a sure indication of the milling value of a wheat. The ratio of gluten to the other protein constituents in a wheat is not always constant, but it is the gluten content of a flour on which the bread making qualities chiefly depend.

=Gluten.=--The principal part of the protein in wheat is known as gluten. Gluten as such does not exist in the wheat but is formed when the pulverized wheat, that is, the wheat flour, is mixed with water by the union of two elements in the wheat, namely, gliadin, which is soluble in dilute alcohol and forms nearly half of the whole protein matter of the wheat kernel, and glutenin, a compound insoluble in water, dilute salt solutions, and dilute alcohol and which is quite as abundant as gliadin in the wheat kernel. In fact, the gliadin and the glutenin together make the whole of the protein, except a little over one per cent.

There are three other forms of protein, as pointed out by Osborne, in the wheat kernel, making altogether nearly 1½■ percent of total protein content. The average quantity of these compounds in the protein of wheat is as follows.

Constituents:

Globulin, 0.70 percent Albumin, 0.40 „ Proteose, 0.30 „ Gliadin, 4.25 „ Glutenin, 4.35 „ ----- 10.00

=Starch in the Wheat Kernel.=--The most abundant constituent of the wheat kernel is the starch. The appearance of wheat starch is shown in the figure. Wheat starch grains ordinarily show the rings and hilum in a few cases only under the most favorable conditions, though there are sometimes cases where the striations are quite distinct. The granules of starch vary greatly in size, being from 5 to 10 microns in diameter. There are, in fact, two kinds of granules in wheat starch, one having the appearance under the microscope of irregularly rounded particles in sections like a circular disk, and the other of elongated particles with a distinct hilum, as shown in Fig. 32. The appearance of the granules under polarized light is shown in Fig. 33.

Wheat starch is not very commonly used for commercial purposes but is highly prized for some things, especially in the sizing of textile fabrics. The germ in wheat is particularly rich in oil and the bran or outside covering in protein. The common idea that the bran is composed mostly of silicious matter is wholly erroneous. On the contrary the bran is a highly nutritious food, and the objection to it for human food is mostly of a mechanical nature.

=Adulterations.=--Wheat grains are never adulterated but they may sometimes contain dirt and foreign seeds, due to the growth of some body in connection with the wheat itself.

=Standards.=--Wheat, commercially, is sold under three standards, namely, one, two, three. The difference is an arbitrary one and not founded upon any chemical data but wholly upon the physical appearance, degree of moisture, and freedom from extraneous admixtures.

=Wheat Products.=--The principal product of wheat is flour. The milling process for wheat is highly interesting both from a chemical and technical point of view, but cannot be described in full in this manual. The old-fashioned milling of wheat, namely, pressing between stones and separation of the flour by bolting has been almost entirely superseded by the modern milling with metal rollers.

[Illustration: FIG. 32.--WHEAT STARCH. × 200.--(_Courtesy of Bureau of Chemistry._)]

Altogether nearly a hundred different products are made incident or final to the milling of wheat. Only those products, however, which are used for human food interest us at the present time.

=Chief Varieties of Flour.=--The highest grade of wheat flour is known usually by the term “patent”; a lower grade is known as “bakers’ flour” and a third as low grade flour. A barrel of flour weighs 196 pounds and requires about 258 pounds of wheat for its manufacture. The whole product from the 258.35 pounds of wheat is shown in the appended table.

In general it may be said that about 75 percent of the weight of the wheat is obtained as merchantable flour of some kind, about 60 to 70 percent being good grade or straight flour. About 24 percent of the weight of the wheat is obtained as cattle food and about 1 percent is lost during the process of manufacture.

PRODUCT. POUNDS. PERCENTAGE. Patent flour, 149.37 57.82 Bakers’ flour, 29.13 11.28 Low grade flour, 17.50 6.77 ------ ------ Total flour, 196.00 75.87 Bran, 45.56 17.64 Shorts, 9.80 3.79 Screenings, 4.99 1.93 Waste, 2.00 0.77 ------ ------ Total weight, 258.35 100.00

[Illustration: FIG. 33.--WHEAT STARCH UNDER POLARIZED LIGHT. × 200.--(_Courtesy of Bureau of Chemistry_).]

=Special Names of Flour.=--In addition to the classification above mentioned other names are used in many commercial senses for flour. These additional names are “family,” “red dog,” “blended,” gluten, etc. Many flours are also named after the name of the mill or locality or bear simply fanciful names.

Graham Flour.--This term was originally applied to the coarse, unbolted flour which was made by grinding the whole wheat. The name, therefore, should be applied to all flour made from well grained wheat, ground, and unbolted. Most of the flours however, which are sold nowadays as graham flours are produced by a more or less perfect bolting process. From the above it is seen that true graham flour will contain practically the same constituents as the wheat kernel itself and in the same proportion and have the same composition as wheat.

Entire Wheat Flour.--This name would naturally carry the idea of a flour corresponding to the graham flour above mentioned. It is, however, a misnamed trade-mark for a flour produced in a special manner which consists in the removal of the outer or purely branny covering of the grain. “Entire wheat” flour, therefore, contains all the ingredients of wheat grains, save those which are found in the outer branny covering.

Gluten Flour.--This is a name applied to a flour which is produced by removing the greater part of the starch from ordinary flour. It is especially recommended for the use of diabetic patients. Unfortunately, the name is very commonly applied to flours made from wheat containing a little higher percentage of protein than the ordinary and sometimes even to an ordinary wheat flour. Its use with such a product is purely fraudulent.

Mixed Flour.--The act of Congress of June 13, 1898, defines mixed flour and imposes a tax upon the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of that article. The maximum tax laid upon mixed flour is 4 cents on a barrel of 196 pounds. The total number of barrels of mixed flour returned for taxation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, was 362; half barrels, 59,443; quarter barrels, 6,265; eighth barrels, 24,974. The total quantity of mixed flour returned for taxation during the year is 5,495,937 pounds. The above data show that the amount of mixed flour offered for sale is a very small part of the total flour manufactured in the United States. It may be that there is a great deal of flour mixed and sold in violation of the law since it is quite impossible in the inspection of the stores to supervise all the transactions of business deals in flour; especially is it believed that rye flour and buckwheat flour are often adulterated by mixing with them the flour of other cereals. This adulteration is not one which is at all injurious to health but is simply practiced for the purpose of making a rye or buckwheat flour look whiter or because the added flours are cheaper than the real rye or buckwheat.

=Properties Affecting the Commercial Value of Flour.=--Aside from its nutritive properties wheat flour has a commercial value depending upon its color and texture and upon the gluten which it contains. The character of gluten also varies largely in different varieties of wheat and in wheat grown in different localities. A chemical examination will not always tell the bread making properties of a flour, and the character of the bread itself depends often quite as much upon the skill of the baker as upon the flour which is used.

In cases where loaves are sold by weight, a flour with a high percentage of tenacious gluten is often preferred, since it permits of the forming of loaves containing a maximum percentage of water. With a flour rich in gluten it is not difficult to make a palatable loaf which does not bear any evidence of an excess of water, containing as much as 40 percent of moisture. The baking of bread is an art which is most successfully practiced by professionals, and the American method of home bread making does not always lead to the happiest results.

The ideal flour for bread making is one which contains a sufficient quantity of gluten to make a porous and spongy loaf, but not one which permits an excessive quantity of moisture to be incorporated in the loaf itself.

=Average Composition of Different Varieties of Flour.=--Analyses of a great number of samples of different varieties of flours lead to the following data, which may be accepted as a very close approximation of the average variety of different grades of flour offered upon the American market:

----------+--------+--------+--------+--------+ | | PRO- | PRO- | | | | TEIDS | TEIDS | | | MOIS- | N × | N × | MOIST | NAME OF FLOUR. | TURE. | 6.25. | 5.70. | GLUTEN.| ----------+--------+--------+--------+--------+ |_Perct._|_Perct._|_Perct._|_Perct._| Patent flour, | 12.77 | 10.55 | 9.62 | 25.97 | Bakers' and family flour,| 11.69 | 12.28 | 11.20 | 34.70 | Common market flour, | 12.28 | 10.18 | 9.28 | 24.55 | Miscellaneous flour, | 12.73 | 10.45 | 9.52 | 26.80 | Self-raising flour, | 11.45 | 9.75 | 8.89 | 26.97 | Gluten flour, | 12.99 | 13.30 | 12.13 | 39.68 | ----------+--------+--------+--------+--------+

----------+--------+--------+--------+--------+ | | | STARCH | | | | | N × | | DRY | | | 6.25. | NAME OF FLOUR. | GLUTEN.| OIL. | ASH. | [26] | ----------+--------+--------+--------+--------+ |_Perct._|_Perct._|_Perct._|_Perct._| Patent flour, | 9.99 | 1.02 | 0.44 | 74.76 | Bakers' and family flour,| 13.07 | 1.30 | 0.57 | 73.87 | Common market flour, | 9.21 | 1.30 | 0.61 | 75.63 | Miscellaneous flour, | 10.22 | 1.08 | 0.49 | 75.23 | Self-raising flour, | 9.65 | 0.70 | 4.45 | 73.66 | Gluten flour, | 14.84 | 1.05 | 0.55 | 72.11 | ----------+--------+--------+--------+--------+

----------+--------+--------+------- | STARCH | | | N × | | | 5.70. | CRUDE | CALO- NAME OF FLOUR. | [26] | FIBER. | RIES. ----------+--------+--------+------- |_Perct._|_Perct._| Patent flour, | 76.14 | 0.21 |3,858.0 Bakers' and family flour,| 74.98 | 0.22 |3,929.6 Common market flour, | 76.53 | 0.28 |3,882.5 Miscellaneous flour, | 76.15 | 0.25 |3,846.3 Self-raising flour, | 74.51 | 0.21 |3,719.3 Gluten flour, | 73.28 | 0.32 |3,891.1 ----------+--------+--------+-------

[26] In the first of these columns the starch is calculated by difference, assuming the protein to be the quantity of nitrogen present multiplied by 6.25, and in the second column the figure is obtained in the same way, using 5.70 as the protein factor.

=Separation of Gluten.=--The character of a wheat flour, as has already been intimated, is measured largely by the quantity of gluten which it may contain. The separation of gluten may be accomplished by any one, even without a chemical training, by a little practice. It is, therefore, one of the tests for the value of a wheat flour which can be easily and generally applied. The principle of separation of the gluten rests upon the fact that when wheat flour is moistened and kneaded into a sticky mass it may be washed with pure water with constant kneading until nearly all the starch has been removed from the mass. Meanwhile only that portion of the protein is removed which is soluble in the water and the gluten which is formed by the process of kneading remains as a sticky mass. When this moist mass is kneaded and rolled until all the moisture is taken out of it that can be removed in this way, it may be weighed and the proportion of moist gluten in the sample determined. It may then be placed in an oven and dried, and then the proportion of dry gluten secured. The following method is one which is easily applied. Place 10 grams of the sample in a porcelain dish and moisten with from 6 to 7 cubic centimeters of water, knead, and allow to stand for an hour. Work into a ball, being careful that none of the material adheres to the dish. Holding the mass in the hand knead it in a slow stream of cold water until the starch and all soluble matter are washed out. Place the ball of gluten thus formed in cold water and allow to stand for one hour; remove from water, press as dry as possible between the hands, roll into a ball, and weigh in a flat-bottomed dish. After weighing, place the ball of moist gluten in the drying oven for twenty hours; cool and weigh.

[Illustration: FIG. 34.--KEDZIE'S FARINOMETER SHOWING THE PARTS.--(_Bulletin 13, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture._)]

=Gluten Tester.=--A simple test for determining the approximate percentage of gluten in flour may be used, based upon the principle that the viscosity of dough is a measure of its practical gluten content. The name applied to a gluten tester is farinometer.

A convenient form of farinometer devised by Kedzie is shown in the accompanying figure. It is patterned somewhat upon the plan of Jago's viscometer. The instrument is shown in parts in Fig. 34. The instrument as in use is exhibited in Fig. 35. Parts shown in

Fig. 34 are as follows: No. 1 is the stand or support of the parts. No. 2 is the cap of No. 1, and discloses the half-inch opening (half closed by the slide) through which the dough is forced by the pressure of the rod No. 4. The slide by which this opening is closed is plainly shown; also the socket for holding No. 3. No. 3 is a brass tube 3 inches high and 1 inch internal diameter, with a small knob to fit into the notched opening in the side of the socket seen in No. 2, to hold No. 3 firmly in place. No. 4 is a steel rod ¹■/■■ inch in diameter and 12 inches long, with a thin brass cap 1 inch in diameter, beveled slightly so that the front edge fills the barrel of No. 3 without friction, and is yet dough-tight. Near the top the rod is marked into inch spaces.

In using the farinometer two points are considered:

1. The water-absorbing power of a flour, or the percentage of water it will take up to form a dough of a certain consistency.

2. The viscosity of such dough, or its resistance to change of form under a uniform force; _e. g._, the length of time in seconds required to force a cylinder of dough 1 inch high through a hole one-half inch in diameter under the pressure of a vertical steel rod 13 inches long and weighing 2½■ pounds avoirdupois.

[Illustration: FIG. 35.--KEDZIE'S FARINOMETER IN USE.--(_Bulletin 13, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture._)]

=Bleaching of Flour.=--At the present time flour is extensively bleached for the purpose of making an inferior article resemble a superior one. By this means a greater percentage of the flour produced can be rated as of first quality. Ozone and oxids of nitrogen developed by electrical discharges are the principal bleaching agents employed. Bleached flour should bear a label indicating to the purchaser the character of the manipulation to which it has been subjected.

=Adulterations of Flour.=--The adulteration of wheat flour is not practiced to any extent in this country. The most common adulteration arises from grinding with wheat foreign seeds and other foreign matter, rust, smut, etc., which may be present in the grain. Other adulterations are the mixture with wheat flour of the starch or flour of maize and other cereals. The adulteration with any form of terra alba or white powdered earthy substance is exceedingly rare. Although some attempts have been made to introduce such adulterations in this country they have not reached any commercial success. The adulterations, with the exception of those with white earthy powders, are most readily ascertained by microscopic examination for foreign matters and other varieties of starch than grow naturally in the wheat.

=Standard.=--The United States standard for flour is as follows:

=Flour= is the fine, sound product made by bolting wheat meal and contains not more than thirteen and one-half (13.5) percent of moisture, not less than one and twenty-five hundredths (1.25) percent of nitrogen, not more than one (1.0) percent of ash, and not more than fifty hundredths (0.50) percent of fiber.

=Graham flour= is unbolted wheat meal.

=Whole wheat flour=, entire =wheat= flour, improperly so called, is fine wheat meal from which a part of the bran has been removed.

=Gluten flour= is the product made from flour by the removal of starch, and contains not less than five and six-tenths (5.6) percent of nitrogen and not more than ten (10) percent of moisture.

=Age of Flour.=--The freshly ground flour is most highly esteemed by many consumers on account of palatability and freedom from all danger of mold and ferments. Older flours are likely to lose flavor, become moldy and infested with weavil and other insect pests. The last-named evils are avoided by the use of wheat containing no fungus, none of the eggs of the weavil, nor of other insects, and enclosing the freshly ground flour in packages not accessible to infection. Even then it is advisable to consume the flour as soon as convenient after the milling process. Many manufacturers and experts contend that flour is improved by keeping for a certain length of time, and this contention is based on the assumption that the flour assumes a lighter color and improves in flavor on keeping. There is of course a certain limit to improvements of this kind.

=Substitutes for Flour.=--Wholesome ingredients are used in part instead of flour in bread making, and when that fact is clearly made known the admixture of these substances with flour is not considered an adulteration. Bread which is made of an admixture of Indian corn meal with flour or rye flour with flour or other cereal products is well liked by many people. Potatoes are also used

very often in bread making. Acorns, buckwheat, and other farinacious and oily substances are also employed. The admixture of inert substances with flour merely to increase the bulk and weight of the loaf, even if notified, cannot be regarded as other than an adulteration.

In times of famine such admixtures are sometimes made in order to increase the size and weight of the loaf. Such substances are known in times of famine as “hunger bread.” Finely ground straw, bark, the hulls of nuts, etc., are often used for this purpose. These bodies practically have no nutritive value and serve no useful purpose except to deceive the eater respecting the quantity of bread he consumes.

BREAD.

The term “Bread” when used alone is understood in this country to apply to bread made from wheat flour or some form of wheat. If made from other cereals a prefix is used to distinguish this fact, as Indian corn bread, rye bread, etc. The term bread includes also the materials which are used necessarily therewith in the ordinary process of baking. Thus, the term bread would apply to a loaf which contains not only the wheat flour as the base and chief part of its mass but also the yeast or other leavening agent employed, together with salt, lard, or butter used in its preparation. The presence of these bodies, used in the sense above described, is not regarded as an adulteration. The term “bread,” however, is not to be used to include those other forms of nutriment made from wheat flour in which condimental substances, especially sugar, are used to such an extent as to give the dominant taste of the condiment or condiments employed. Thus, the ordinary cake of all descriptions, tarts, puddings, and other edible substances made largely from wheat flour, but to which the condiment or condiments impart a distinct taste, are not included under the term bread.

In the generic sense the term bread may be used in the largest signification to signify food in general.

=Varieties of Bread.=--In general all forms of bread may be divided into two great classes, leavened and unleavened. By far, the greater quantity of bread consumed belongs to the former class. Unleavened bread is used chiefly for certain religious festivals, in the form of biscuits or in certain varieties of Indian corn bread such as hoe cake, johnnie cake, etc. Of the leavened bread there are two distinct classes, namely, bread which is baked and eaten cold and bread which is consumed hot from the oven. Bread intended to be consumed cold is generally eaten within twenty-four or forty-eight hours from the time of making though some varieties may be kept for an indefinite period. The use of hot bread is not commended by hygienists though it is difficult to see why, when properly made, the consumption of a good hot roll can be regarded as injurious. The apparent injury which may result therefrom is probably due to the larger quantity eaten on account of greater palatability than is the case with cold bread. That variety of bread which is baked so as to present a maximum of crust and made of flour which gives a tough consistency to the loaf is most highly regarded both for palatability and nutritive purposes. This form of bread is improperly called French or Vienna rolls in this country.

Unleavened bread is particularly advisable for use in emergency rations for marching soldiers, in logging camps, etc. This bread is compact, comparatively free of moisture and has a high nutritive value. The leavened bread may be divided into distinct classes in respect of the leavening agent employed.

Class 1 is bread in which the leavening agent is yeast. Class 2 is bread in which the natural ferments residing in the flour or wheat are utilized for the leavening agent as in the making of that variety known as salt rising bread. Class 3 includes that form of bread in which the leavening is secured by chemical reagents mixed with the dough. Class 4 includes that variety in which a leavening reagent such as carbon dioxid or air is mechanically incorporated with the dough during the kneading process.

Unleavened bread is also divided into several technical forms. The first class includes the biscuit of commerce, sometimes incorrectly called crackers, and intended to be used soon after preparation. The second class includes biscuits which are intended for long storage and transportation. The third class includes wafers and other delicate forms of unleavened bread for special use. Class 4 is the unleavened loaves which are made most frequently from Indian corn meal and intended to be eaten while still hot. Class 5 includes any miscellaneous unleavened loaves or cakes made in various ways and for different purposes.

In nearly all forms of unleavened bread made from wheat flour the dough is thoroughly beaten, and mechanically mixed or kneaded, in order to make it lighter in color and more crisp and hard after baking.

=Yeast.=--Bakers’ yeast is one form of the ordinary yeast ferments or a mixture thereof producing alcoholic fermentation under proper conditions. All flour contains a certain quantity of sugar which is easily fermented. By the action of the yeast upon this sugar carbon dioxid and alcohol are formed. The particles of carbon dioxid become entangled in the gluten of the wheat flour when it is

mixed into a dough and thus make the mass spongy and light. When placed in the oven to be baked these minute particles of carbon dioxid expand still more and produce additional lightness and sponginess of the loaf. The yeast may be propagated from one mass of dough to another, may be used in a moist state or, as is very commonly the case, manufactured in large quantities, and sold either moist or more commonly in a partially dried and pressed cake.

=Spontaneous Ferments.=--All cereals contain ferments of a character to produce alcoholic fermentation spontaneously under proper conditions. It is possible even to ferment dough by seed from one loaf to another or by developing a spontaneous fermentation. This method is quite a common one in the rural districts, and all bread made in this way is known as salt rising bread. It may be made according to the following receipt:

A quarter of a pint of fresh whole milk is slowly heated to near the boiling point, but not allowed to boil. This process will sterilize the milk and prevent the development of a too rapid lactic fermentation in the subsequent processes. The heated milk is added to a quantity of maize meal sufficient to make with the milk a stiff batter, and the whole is thoroughly mixed. The vessel containing the batter is wrapped with paper and then with a heavy flannel cloth, and kept in a warm place at a uniform temperature of about blood heat for several hours, until fermentation is fully established and the batter assumes a definite sour odor. At this point a teaspoonful of salt is stirred into a pint of blood-warm water and into this a sufficient quantity of high-grade wheat flour is stirred to make a moderately stiff batter. This is thoroughly mixed with the sour mass obtained by the previous fermentation and the mixture exposed for from three-fourths to one hour to a blood heat as before. If the fermentation has been well conducted the mass will now be in a sufficiently active state to secure a proper porosity of the loaf. The salt rising thus prepared is mixed with a wheat flour dough made with warm water in sufficient quantities to make from four to six loaves, the whole mass well kneaded, molded into loaves and put aside at a temperature of blood heat until the fermentation has proceeded far enough to make the loaf light and spongy. The loaf is then baked in the ordinary way.

=Chemical Aerating Agents.=--In this country a very common method of aerating bread is practiced, based upon the use of certain chemical reagents which when mixed in the dough set free carbon dioxid. These reagents are known as baking or yeast powders and are especially prized by reason of the fact that it is possible with their aid to prepare in a few moments a light spongy loaf or roll which would require from 10 to 24 hours to make by the ordinary fermenting with yeast. The principal objection to the use of baking powder lies in the fact that the residues arising from the chemical reaction are necessarily left in the loaf. While these residues may not have any specific or poisonous properties they increase the quantity of mineral matter in the bread, and this mineral matter is in the inorganic state and as such does not take any part in the process of nutrition. It can only be regarded as a waste product, burdening, to that extent, the excretory organs of the body.

=Constituents of Baking Powder.=--The essential constituents of baking powder are a carbonate of some kind and an acid reagent capable of decomposing this carbonate and setting the carbon dioxid free. The common carbonate of a baking powder is bicarbonate of soda. The classification of baking powders rests upon the acid elements which they contain. They may be classified as follows: (1) Cream of tartar baking powder, in which the acid constituent is cream of tartar which is known chemically as acid potassium tartrate. Other forms of tartaric acid may be used in baking powders of this class but they are not common. (2) Phosphate powders, in which the acid constituent is phosphoric acid usually in the form of the acid phosphate of lime. (3) Alum powders in which the acid constituent is alum or some form of aluminium sulfate, usually the basic sulfate of alumina.

The acid and basic constituents of these powders may be kept in separate containers and mixed together at the time of making the dough. A more common form is to use them in such a way that until they mix with the dough they do not exert any notable effect upon each other. For instance, perfectly dry bicarbonate of soda and perfectly dry acid potassium tartrate may be mixed together and kept for quite a while without any notable decomposition of the bicarbonate taking place.

In order to render any such possible action minimum in its effect it is customary to add to the mixture a small quantity of starch, milk sugar, or some other diluent. These materials tend to keep apart the particles of acid and base and render it possible to make a mixture of them which may be kept for a long while without any notable loss of leavening power. When a cream of tartar baking powder is mixed with dough the moisture of the dough gradually dissolves the two ingredients and in this state a chemical reaction occurs between them. The carbon dioxid is set free as a gas, commonly known as carbonic acid. The mineral substance which results is a tartrate of sodium and potassium that is a union of tartaric acid with potash and soda. This compound is commonly known under the term of Rochelle salts. If there be a sufficient quantity of water in the bread to allow the Rochelle salts to crystallize in the usual way a portion of the water becomes incorporated with the salt. Two teaspoonsful of a tartrate baking powder leave a

residue of about 11 grams (165 grains) of crystallized Rochelle salts in the loaf.

=Phosphate Powders.=--As has already been said, the acid constituent of phosphate powder is chiefly acid phosphate of lime. In this case the acid phosphate of lime decomposes the bicarbonate of soda with the production of carbon dioxid and leaves a residue consisting of a mixture of sodium and lime phosphate. If in two teaspoonsful of phosphate powder there are approximately 16 grams (250 grains) there is formed a crystallized residue, about an equal weight of phosphate of soda and lime, which is left in the loaf.

=Alum Powders.=--Perhaps by far the largest part of baking powders used contain alum in some form as the acid constituent. Formerly the common substance known as alum or burnt alum was employed but in late years an aluminium basic salt known as basic sulfate of aluminium has largely succeeded the old form of alum. When the reaction takes place in the dough between these two constituents of alum baking powder there is formed an equivalent quantity of sulfate of soda and hydroxid of alumina if the acid constituent be basic aluminium sulfate.

The quantity of residue left in the loaf if two teaspoonsful of baking powder be used is about 11 grams (165 grains).

=Harmfulness of Baking Powder Residues.=--The question of the harmfulness of the residues left by the various forms of baking powder is one which has been of much interest to the hygienist and physician. It is not claimed in any case that these residues are beneficial. The principal question which has been discussed is which of them is the least harmful. This is a question which it is not proper to enter into in this manual. It might, however, not be out of place to say that the use of chemical reagents for leavening bread is not as advisable as the use of the ordinary fermentation. It would be better, evidently, if all people used more yeast bread and less baking powder rolls. At the same time the utility and convenience of baking powder cannot be denied, and this is a factor which must be taken into consideration in the general discussion and final resolution of the question.

=Character of Alum Residues.=--Every one is agreed that the substance known as alum, namely, the sulfate of alumina in conjunction with another mineral or base, such as soda, potash, or ammonia, is not a desirable constituent of food products. In the manufacture of baking powders containing alum an effort is made to so balance the constituents that when the reaction is completed no undecomposed alum remains. If this condition is secured in every instance the materials which remain in the bread are not alum but the residues above mentioned, consisting of aluminium hydrate, and sulfates of soda, potash, or ammonia.

The residue of chief importance is the hydroxid or hydrate of alumina, which is the form in which the alumina itself should appear when a complete reaction like that defined above takes place. When the hydroxid of alumina is dried and especially when ignited it is converted into an oxid of alumina which is highly insoluble in water and only slightly soluble in a very dilute acid solution. The claim is made by the manufacturer of alum powders that the aluminium residue which is formed is insoluble in the digestive juices and therefore cannot produce any effect usually ascribed to the soluble salts of aluminium. It is important that the conditions which are found in the baking of a loaf are such as to produce this highly desirable result. The temperature of the interior of the loaf during baking does not rise much above that of boiling water, although the exterior temperature, which is sufficient to produce the browning of the crust, is very much above that temperature. It is evident that as long as any considerable proportion of water remains in the loaf it will be difficult to raise the interior of the loaf to the temperature just mentioned, and if this were done the caramelization would take place throughout the whole loaf. Unfortunately, from a scientific point of view the investigation of this subject has not been always undertaken under conditions which are wholly beyond criticism. Many of the investigations have been in the interest of rival baking powder companies, and it is very desirable that this matter should be undertaken in a wholly unbiased way and conducted in such a manner as to lead to results which all will accept. Chemical and physiological investigations, which have even as a remote object the promotion of the sale of one compound and the repression of the sale of another, lose at the outset much of that claim upon the public confidence which such investigations made from a purely scientific point of view should have.

General Statement.--In respect of the use of chemical leavening agents in general it may be said that they introduce an extraneous product into the bread which is not likely to promote the health and which, therefore, on general principles should be excluded. On the other hand, large experience has shown that the consumption of bread made by these leavening agents does not produce any general effect upon the public health which is noticeable. This, it is understood, is not any valid argument in favor of the process. It must also be acknowledged that a fermentation of a bread with yeast also introduces extraneous matter into the food, viz., alcohol and congeneric products of fermentation, and hence this process may be open to a certain extent to the same

objection as the one above. It is too early yet to formulate definite principles either of inclusion or exclusion of these products, and the purpose of this manual is secured when the general character and effects thereof are briefly outlined.

=Composition of Bread.=--Because of the many different methods of bread making which are practised it is not possible to give in a chemical form an analysis which would do more than represent in general the character of the bread in common use. For instance, the quantity of water which is found in bread varies greatly and the nature of bread itself must be influenced by the character of the flour from which it is made. The flour depends upon the quality of the wheat used in its manufacture. Hence the same brand of bread prepared in the same way and baked in the same manner must necessarily vary in composition from season to season and even from day to day. It must be understood also that it is a very common custom in the United States to use milk in the mixing of dough, and thus a food product is introduced which of itself is not of constant character. Some bakers use whole milk, others skimmed, and others sour milk.

A very good formula for mixing dough for bread making consists in using the following proportions of ingredients mentioned:

Flour, 2,000 grams Whole milk, 500 „ Water, 650 „ Salt, 25 „ Yeast cake, 10 „

When properly leavened and kneaded and baked these quantities of materials will make a loaf of bread weighing 2750 grams.

Average Composition of Bread.--In the following tables are given the average composition of bread of different classes. Class 1 is composed of loaves of the so-called Vienna or French type; Class 2 consists of what is known as home made bread or bread baked at the home and not in the bakery; Class 3 consists of bread made from graham flour; Class 4 consists of bread made largely of rye flour; Class 5 is a second collection of home made bread which may be very properly compared with Class 2; Class 6 consists of bread of miscellaneous origin bought on the open market. The data given represent the mean composition of numbers of samples (Bull. 13, Bureau of Chemistry):

MOIS- ETHER TURE. PROTEIN. EXTRACT. FIBER. _Perct._ _Perct._ _Perct._ _Perct._ CLASS 1. 38.71 8.09 1.06 .62 In the dry substance, .. 13.23 1.73 .97

CLASS 2. 33.02 7.24 1.95 .24 In the dry substance, .. 10.80 2.91 .36

CLASS 3. 34.80 8.15 2.03 1.13 In the dry substance, .. 12.51 3.13 1.74

CLASS 4. 33.42 7.88 .66 .62 In the dry substance, .. 11.86 1.02 .95

CLASS 5. 36.16 7.10 1.14 .26 In the dry substance, .. 11.17 1.75 .41

CLASS 6. 34.41 6.93 1.48 .30 In the dry substance, .. 10.59 2.21 .46

STARCH AND CALO- ASH. SUGAR. SALT. RIES. _Perct._ _Perct._ _Perct._ CLASS 1. 1.19 53.72 .57 .. In the dry substance, 1.95 83.10 .93 4458

CLASS 2. 1.05 56.75 .56 .. In the dry substance, 1.55 84.75 .84 4497

CLASS 3. 1.59 53.40 .69 .. In the dry substance, 2.29 82.06 1.07 4434

CLASS 4. 1.84 56.21 1.00 .. In the dry substance, 2.79 84.36 1.50 4395

CLASS 5. 1.06 54.53 .58 .. In the dry substance, 1.68 85.41 .92 4395

CLASS 6. 1.00 56.18 .49 .. In the dry substance, 1.53 85.66 .76 4401

A Typical American High-grade Yeast Bread.--In conjunction with the actual analyses given above it is of interest to combine as many analytical data as can be conveniently secured for the purpose of determining what the average composition of a high-grade typical yeast bread is. This comparison leads to the following composition:

Moisture, 35.00 percent Protein, 8.00 „ Ether extract, .75 „ Starch and sugar, 54.45 „ Fiber, .30 „ Ash, 1.50 „

Of the ash mentioned in the above analysis .50 percent may be ascribed to the natural mineral ingredient of flour and 1 percent to added salt.

The chief variations from the typical composition of bread made from high-grade flour are found in the moisture and ether extract. The moisture may rise above 40 percent in breads made of flour rich in gluten or sink to 30 percent or under when flour of an inferior gluten content is employed. The quantity of ether extract depends chiefly upon the amount of milk which is used in the making of bread and the amount of fat employed either in the bread itself or in greasing the pan in which it is baked. There is great difficulty in extracting a fatty body which has been mixed with a glutinous material like flour. The analytical data, therefore, do not represent in the ether extract all the fat naturally present in the flour plus that added in the making of dough or in baking.

The quantity of moisture in bread may also be determined largely by the time of baking and the temperature of the oven. A bread baked for a long while at a low temperature will be much drier than a bread baked quickly at a high temperature. The high temperature solidifies the exterior of the loaf so as to make it difficult for the interior moisture to escape. By quickly baking the bread the temperature of the interior does not reach so high a temperature as in an oven with a low temperature and a long-continued heat.

Standard for Moisture.--The quantity of moisture in bread of standard quality in the District of Columbia may not exceed 31 percent.

The average temperature of the baking oven is about 240° C. (464° F.).

=Quantity of Sugar in Bread.=--The quantity of sugar found in fermented bread is always less than that present in the flour, added in milk, or otherwise introduced in the preparation of the dough. The sugar disappears largely under the influence of the fermentation due to the yeast.

=Quantity of Ash.=--The quantity of ash in bread is uniformly higher than the content of mineral matter in the flour. This is due to the addition of common salt which is uniformly employed in all bread, and in the case of bread made from baking powder the retention of the mineral residues in the loaf increases to that extent the content of ash. With the exception of the ash, the ether extract or fat, the sugar, and the dry material of bread correspond in quantity to the same materials in the flour from which it is made, except the loss due to the caramelization of the crust.

Acidity of Bread.--The development of the lactic acid ferments is important in regard to hygienic conditions and to palatability. Flour contains practically no acid in a free state, and the acidity of bread is itself due to the changes which take place in its preparation under the influence of the ferments therein. Bread baked in the usual manner after the yeast ferments have exerted their activity shows the presence of acetic acid, lactic acid, and other acids and salts. The acidity of bread adds to its palatability and also, doubtless, to its digestibility. Bread, containing, as it does, a large percentage of protein, is digested in an acid medium. The natural acidity of bread, therefore, must be regarded as beneficial.

=Comparative Nutritive Properties of Indian Corn Bread and Wheat Bread.=--There is a widespread opinion that the products of Indian corn are less digestible and less nutritious than those of wheat. This opinion amounts to a conviction in most European countries, where the products obtained by the milling of Indian corn are not regarded as fit for human food in an unmixed state. The above opinion, it appears, has no justification either from the chemical composition of the two bodies or from recorded digestive and nutritive experiments.

A study of the analytical data of the whole grain shows that in so far as actual nutrition is concerned the maize is fully as nutritious as wheat. In respect of its content of fat Indian corn and its direct products easily take precedence of all the other cereals, with the exception of hulled oats. In round numbers Indian corn flour or bread made therefrom contains twice as much fat or oil as wheat, three times as much as rye, twice as much as barley, and nearly as much as hulled oats. In regard to digestible carbohydrates, that is digestible starch, sugar, dextrin, and fiber, Indian corn flour possesses a higher content than hulled oats and almost the same content as wheat. In regard to digestible protein Indian corn has nearly the same quantity as the other leading cereals, except oats. What it lacks, however, in its quantity of protein in so far as nutrition is concerned is more than made up in its excess of fat.

=Comparative Digestibility and Nutrition of Wheat and Indian Corn from Experiments Made in South Dakota Station, Bulletin 38.=--Pigs were fed with Indian corn and wheat, or rather the ground Indian corn and ground wheat, and it was found that pound for pound there was a greater gain in the case of Indian corn flour than wheat. For 100 pounds of flour fed the average gain with Indian corn was 21.83 pounds and where wheat flour was used 20.79 pounds. These experimental data show that in regard to nutritive properties Indian corn flour cannot be considered inferior to wheat flour. Indian corn bread is particularly well suited for persons

engaged in hard manual labor. A ration which is composed largely of Indian corn products and oatmeal is found to be particularly valuable for those engaged in lumbering, harvesting sugar-cane, etc.

Indian Corn Flour Pudding.--Various forms of pudding are prepared from Indian corn flour. Among the most important is that known in the New England States as hasty pudding and in the west and south as mush. A simple method of preparing Indian corn pudding, hasty pudding, or mush is to stir into water, very slowly, the Indian corn flour in such a way as to avoid the formation of lumps. The flour should be sifted into the water either cold or at boiling temperature and the mixture vigorously stirred meanwhile. By this means a thin, uniform paste is secured which is allowed to cook slowly until quite thick in consistence and until all the starch granules are thoroughly disintegrated. The product is improved by allowing to stand for several hours at near the boiling point after the cooking is finished, provided precautions are taken not to allow the mass to become too solid. This product is eaten hot with butter, milk, or cream, or is much prized when allowed to cool, cut into thin slices and fried. A very important dish for the children of working people and farmers of the south and west is mush and milk, namely the product above mentioned eaten with skim milk. This mixture forms a palatable and wholesome diet. Various other forms of pudding are made into which Indian corn enters to a greater or less degree.

=Composition of Biscuits.=--The composition of a biscuit or dry unleavened bread does not differ essentially from that of the ordinary bread except in the content of moisture. The biscuits are usually baked in thin cakes or loaves which become heated throughout and sometimes caramelize throughout a large part of their substance. This favors the expulsion of the greater part of the moisture which the dough originally contained. The average composition of biscuits is shown in the following data:

Moisture, 7.13 percent Protein, 9.43 „ Ether extract, 8.67 „ Fiber, .47 „ Ash, 1.57 „ Salt, .99 „ Starch and sugar, 73.77 „

In the dry substance:

Protein, 10.18 percent Ether extract, 9.33 „ Fiber, .53 „ Ash, 1.70 „ Salt, 1.08 „ Starch and sugar, 78.79 „ Calories, 4,755

The above data show that biscuits vary in composition from bread chiefly in their content of moisture and fat or oil. The moisture, as is noted, is very low, while the quantity of fat which the biscuit contains is from 8 to 10 times as great as that contained in flour from which they are made. The salt content and the mineral ingredients of the biscuit are often higher than in bread or flour. Inasmuch as a large quantity of fat and salt are used commonly in the manufacture of biscuits the presence of these bodies cannot in any sense be regarded as an adulteration. In forty-eight samples examined only four were free of notable quantities of added fat. In one case over 16 percent of fat was found, and as it has been shown that all the fat which is added is not extracted by ether it is evident that in this case an amount of fat equal to 20 percent of the weight of the flour may have been used.

It appears, from a study of the composition of biscuits, that it is advisable to use them as a relish or delicacy for eating with cheese, etc., in ordinary daily life, while they become almost a necessity in some form or other in the preparation of emergency rations for marching armies, on shipboard, in logging camps, etc. It is not advisable to employ them in the daily diet to the exclusion of bread. Their nutrient contents have, in comparison with bread, a lower coefficient of digestibility, due largely to the added fat.

=Amount of Sugar Lost in Fermentation.=--The total quantity of sugar and other carbohydrates lost in fermentation amounts to about 2 percent of the weight of flour used. Sometimes it is much greater and sometimes less than this. The nutritive value of the product is diminished in proportion to the extent of the loss of sugar. The carbon dioxid produced during fermentation has no food value, and the alcohol is largely lost in the form of vapor during the process of baking. About half the loss is due to carbon dioxid and half to alcohol. The alcohol, although lost mostly during the baking, serves a useful purpose,--in the expansion of the vapor it aids the carbon dioxid in making the bread more porous. The hydrolysis which takes place in baking converts some of the starch to dextrinoid or saccharoid conditions. It is evident that from 6 to 8 percent of total starch present in the flour is changed during the fermentation and baking into more or less soluble forms.

[Illustration: FIG. 36.--COMPARATIVE APPEARANCE OF BREADS OF DIFFERENT KINDS.]

=Texture and Size of Loaves Made from Different Kinds Of Flour.=--The variations in bread and size of loaves made from different kinds of flour when the conditions of fermentation and baking are the same depends upon the texture and quantity of the gluten material in the flour. The difference in the appearance and size of loaves is shown by a photograph of the cross-sections of three loaves of bread in Fig. 36.

It is seen that the loaves made from graham flour and entire wheat flour are somewhat coarser in structure and are less in size than those made from the same quantity of standard patent flour.

MACARONI.

The preparation of wheat flour of a high glutenous character and molded into various forms, usually tubes, cylindroids, or fine shreds, is known in the trade under various names such as noodles, spaghetti, and macaroni. An examination of a number of these bodies shows them to have the following average composition:

Moisture, 9.66 percent Protein, 12.02 „ Ether extract, .42 „ Crude fiber, .56 „ Ash, .78 „ Starch and sugar, 77.12 „

In the dry substance:

Protein, 13.33 percent Ether extract, .47 „ Crude fiber, .62 „ Ash, .86 „ Starch and sugar, 85.34 „ Calories, 4,428

These bodies, it is seen, do not have a composition very different from that of a first-class bread except in their content of moisture and protein. They are made from various kinds of wheat, especially hard wheat which forms a tenacious gluten product well suited to molding into the different forms which these bodies have. Their nutritive value is practically the same as that of good wheat bread of the same moisture content.

=Domestic Macaroni.=--The introduction of varieties of wheat with the properties suitable for making macaroni has been thoroughly exploited by the Department of Agriculture. The macaroni wheat grown as a subvariety is known botanically as _Triticum durum_. The durum wheats are not regarded as of equal value to the ordinary wheats for general milling purposes and command a lower price. The French name is Blé dur and the German name is Hartweizen. The wheat of this subspecies grows rather tall, having broad, smooth leaves of a whitish green color and a very hard cuticle. The heads are comparatively slight in most varieties, compactly formed, and occasionally very short. All the durum wheat is bearded and the beards are exceptionally long. The kernels are hard and glassy, often partly translucent. They are generally yellowish white in color, occasionally inclined to red, and the grains are generally rather large. In other aspects this wheat resembles barley and for this reason in Germany it is often called Gerstenweizen. The general appearance of these wheats both in the field and in the individual heads is shown in the accompanying figures.

[Illustration: FIG. 37.--A FIELD OF DURUM WHEAT.--(_Courtesy of Bureau of Plant Industry._)]

[Illustration: FIG. 38.--DROUGHT-RESISTANT MACARONI WHEATS (HEADS AND GRAINS).

1, Kubanka; 2, Nicaragua; 3, Velvet Don; 4, Black Don; 5, Wild Goose.--(_Bulletin No. 3, Bureau of Plant Industry, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture._)]

Macaroni wheats are well adapted to semi-arid regions; in fact it may be said that they are the product of such an environment rather than adapted to it. For this reason they are wheats which are able to resist continued dry weather and high temperature. These wheats do not grow well in acid soils but flourish best in an alkaline soil of fine texture and well supplied with humus and the necessary plant foods. The largest quantity of macaroni wheat is grown in east and south Russia. These wheats have given very good results in the semi-arid regions of the United States. The appearance of the wheat as it grows in the field is shown in the accompanying plate.

The domestic macaroni is now made in many factories in the United States and there is a continually increasing demand for the domestic article. The hardiest varieties of wheat are used in the manufacture of this article in the United States, especially the hard Kansas winter wheat.

Composition of Domestic Macaroni.--In the table below is given the mean composition of twenty samples of macaroni of domestic origin, made from domestic wheat. In the second column is given the mean composition of five samples of imported macaroni.

DOMESTIC FOREIGN PRODUCT. PRODUCT. Moisture, 10.27 10.32 Fat or ether extract, .40 .35 Crude fiber, .49 .53 Protein, 11.61 12.27 Starch and sugar, 76.52 76.10

Preparation of Flour for Macaroni.--The term Semolina or Semola (Italian) or Semoule (French) is usually applied to the flour used in the manufacture of macaroni. In the United States the flour which is used is obtained by selecting the hardest wheat and preparing the flour in the usual manner. In France and Italy the preparation of semolina is accomplished in separate mills. The devices for grinding are essentially the same as those for producing the best grade flour, the main difference being that the wheat is moistened slightly before grinding and the flour is less fine than ordinary baking flour.

Evidently very slight changes in the method of milling would enable the ordinary mill to produce a fine grade of macaroni flour either from the macaroni wheat or from any very hard glutinous wheat grown in the United States.

=Manufacture of Macaroni.=--As practiced in the best districts of Italy, macaroni is manufactured according to the following method:[27]

[27] Fairchild, U. S. Dept. Agr., Bureau of Plant Industry, Bulletin 25.

The durum wheat is ground into semola and sieved to remove the starchy part of the grains and leave the clear, light amber, or glutinous part. Three or four grades of quality are made, and these depend on the size of the sieve meshes.

The semola is put into a special iron mixer, shaped like an old-fashioned artillery mortar, except that it is square instead of cylindrical, and furnished in the bottom with special screw-shaped fans with which to stir the paste or dough. Boiling water is added to the semola and the dough is mixed for about seven minutes. The mass is then put on a flat, circular kneading board and kneaded by two sharp-edged parallel beams which rise and fall as the table turns and press into the dough as they descend. A few minutes of kneading are sufficient and the homogeneous dough is then put into the cylinder and the piston descends upon the mass, forcing it in strings slowly through the perforated plate at the bottom. Fifteen minutes are required to convert the gallons of dough into thousands of feet of yellow macaroni. The yellow color is produced by the use of saffron or of a coal tar dye of which a very small quantity is put into each batch of dough. This is a reprehensible practice.

As soon as the strings of fresh paste which issue continually from the die are of the proper length they are cut and thrown over a reed pole and carried into the sunlight, if the weather is fair, or into sheltered terraces, protected by curtains from the rain, if the weather is unfavorable. On bright days the strings of macaroni are exposed to the sunlight only two hours. They must be dried out only slightly before being cellared for the night in dungeon-like underground vaults similar to the Bavarian beer cellars.

For twelve hours or more the poles of macaroni are kept in these damp places, until the dough has become moist and pliable again and the strings have lost the brittleness that the exposure to the sunlight has given them. From the cellars the poles are carried to shaded storehouses open on all sides to the air but not lighted from above. Here, in great masses of millions of strings, they hang for several days, from eight to twenty being required, depending upon the dryness of the atmosphere. According to the statements of a manager of a factory this process of drying is necessary to give to the brittle paste a horn-like toughness and fit it to withstand the rough handling to which it will be subjected without breaking into small pieces.

In all this simple process the one point at which bacteria might have a chance to play a rôle is in the first drying, cellaring, and subsequent slow drying in the shade. The theory that the water is responsible for the flavor must rest, it seems to the writer, on other than bacterial grounds, for from the appearance of the tank which supplied the hot water the inference is easy that the water is chalybeate, for the tank was incrusted with iron.

ROLLS.

The term rolls is given to bread usually leavened with yeast or baking powder, and usually eaten warm, or hot. The term biscuit is generally but improperly used in this country for hot bread made with baking powder. The composition of rolls varies greatly with their method of preparation. Those made with yeast have practically the same composition as ordinary fermented bread, while those made with a baking powder or with exceptionally large additions of milk, butter, or lard vary in composition accordingly. In the making of hot rolls with baking powder, lard or butter is commonly used to a very large extent as “shortening.” These fatty bodies render the gluten less tenacious, and the roll is thus easily broken and is without toughness or elasticity. Owing to this irregular use of shortening and of mineral matter, including salt, the composition of rolls of commerce is extremely variable. In eleven samples of rolls analyzed, for instance, the content of moisture varied from 7 to 34. Evidently the sample sold as a roll which contained only 7 percent of moisture was in point of fact a biscuit and not a roll. The percentage of ether extract in these samples varied from .43 to 7.55. The average composition of the eleven samples is as follows:

Moisture, 27.98 percent Protein, 7.48 „ Ether extract, 3.41 „ Crude fiber, .60 „ Ash, 1.31 „ Salt, .69 „ Starch and sugar, 59.82 „

In the dry substance:

Protein, 10.46 percent Ether extract, 4.74 „ Crude fiber, .77 „ Ash, 1.81 „ Salt, .81 „ Starch and sugar, 82.99 „ Calories, 4,538

CAKES.

Wheat flour is one of the principal constituents of that class of sweetened bread known generally as cake. The kind and character of cake vary so greatly that no general statement of any very great value can be made respecting the average composition. In addition to the sugar and flour which are used in the manufacture of cake various flavoring ingredients or essences are employed, and usually excessive quantities of butter or lard for shortening purposes. In addition to this, other forms of cake are cooked in oil after the dough is made, thus adding an additional quantity of fatty matter to the material. Eggs are also a common constituent of cakes and these introduce into their composition additional quantities of protein and fat. Baking powder is very generally used in this country instead of yeast for the leavening of the cake and thus an additional quantity of mineral matter is introduced into their composition.

In the manufacture of sweetened cakes the flour is mixed with eggs and sugar and butter or lard to the proper consistency with or without the use of milk or cream. The cakes are baked in all kinds of sizes and shapes and may be eaten plain or in layers separated by a jelly, marmalade, or some other preserve. The exterior of the cake is often frosted with a mixture consisting of the white of egg beaten up with white sugar. The methods of mixing the ingredients of these cakes as well as the method of frosting are so various that it would not be possible to undertake any minute description of them.

For flavoring various materials are employed, either the real article or the imitation thereof, such as artificial strawberry, vanilla, etc. The cake or sweet cake is a very common dainty which is served at dessert. The ordinary cane sugar of commerce is the common sweetening matter usually employed in the refined state although sometimes yellow sugar is used. Honey is not so commonly used as a sweetening agent in this country as it is in European countries.

In the manufacture of one of the common varieties known as ginger cake sugar-cane sirup or molasses is a common ingredient.

An examination of a large number of samples of cake shows the following average composition:

Moisture, 11.65 percent Protein, 6.29 „ Ether extract, 9.81 „ Crude fiber, 0.50 „ Ash, 1.17 „ Salt, 0.39 „ Sugar, 24.57 „ Starch, 46.01 „

In the dry substance:

Protein, 7.29 percent Ether extract, 11.41 „ Crude fiber, 0.57 „ Ash, 1.30 „ Salt, 0.44 „ Sugar, 27.84 „ Starch, 51.59 „ Calories, 4,805

A study of the individual data shows extremely wide variations from the mean. The ether extract in the moisture samples in some cases amounted to over 19 percent and in the dry substance to over 24 percent. The moisture in one case was over 64 percent while in the dry cake of biscuit character it sinks below 5 percent and in one case below 4 percent. The average data, therefore, are to be considered only as a representative of this class of bodies and not as a type of any particular variety.

=Adulterations.=--It is difficult to speak of adulterations of a substance of the composition of cake. Any wholesome flavoring or sweetening ingredient or other wholesome ingredient may be used in the manufacture of a cake of this kind without being an adulterant. From this class of bodies, however, there is excluded artificial colors and artificial flavoring essences bearing the name of genuine. A yellow cake which does not owe its color to the eggs or other normal ingredients employed must be regarded as an adulterated article, especially if the dye used in producing the yellow is one of the coal dyes or coal tar derivatives such as naphthol yellow. The use of imitation fruit flavors such as the so-called strawberry, blackberry, raspberry, vanilla, etc., is also to be regarded as an adulteration. The adulteration of cakes may be regarded as confined particularly to these two classes of article assuming that all the other ingredients are wholesome and without injurious effects upon the digestion. The eggs used in cake making should be fresh and palatable. Too often passé storage eggs and eggs broken and preserved with borax or formaldehyde and unfit for consumption have been used by the bakers of cakes.

Mineral coloring matters have sometimes been found in cakes and these are more objectionable by far than the artificial colors above mentioned. Where molasses from sugar-cane factories is used in the manufacture of cake a considerable trace of chlorid of tin or of zinc salts may be found therein, derived from the wash used in the centrifugal when drying sugar crystals or from the

process of bleaching the molasses. This must be regarded as a very serious adulteration and molasses of this kind should never be used in the manufacture of cake nor for edible purposes upon the table. Sulfurous acid may also be absorbed during the process of bleaching the sugar-cane juices.

It is needless to add that cake with its complex character should be eaten as a relish rather than a diet. There is no hygienic or dietetic objection to the mixture of sugar with the flour in the making of ordinary sweetened bread. Such bread must be regarded as highly nutritious and as differing from ordinary bread only in a disturbance of the natural food content of the loaf caused by the addition of a carbohydrate to the bread. Many of the cakes which are sold contain so small a quantity of sugar that they ought not to be classed with the sweet cake. Out of the whole number of samples used in the making up of the above average only four contained so little sugar as to be ineligible to bear the name of sweet cake or sweetened bread.

=Breakfast Foods.=--A very large variety of cereal preparations are on the market under the general name of breakfast foods. These preparations are made directly from the cereals more or less completely ground by subjecting them to certain manipulations of a fermentative or culinary character by means of which the preparations are made ready for immediate consumption or at least with only a moderate degree of additional cooking. The changes which take place in the preparation of cereals for breakfast foods are of two general characters, namely, those produced by fermentative action with malt, yeast, or other ferments, and, second, changes produced by heating, either in the moist or dry state. Often both sets of changes are produced in the same product. The general difference, therefore, between a so-called breakfast food and the raw material from which it is made is found in the conversion of more or less starch into sugar and the change in the composition of the material produced by moist heat or dry heat. In the latter case the temperature may be raised to the state of considerable caramelization.

Breakfast foods may also contain added condimental substances, such as salt, sugar, etc., sometimes used in their preparation. Nearly all the cereals or mixtures of cereals are represented in these prepared foods. Oats probably occupy the first rank and the preparations of oatmeal have to a large extent in the United States taken the place of home-prepared oatmeal for the breakfast table. Wheat, barley, and Indian corn are not far behind oats in their contributions to the numerous varieties of breakfast foods.

The particular methods of preparation are usually trade secrets and at any rate the description of the extensive technical processes would be improper in this manual. The secrets, however, are merely methods of manipulation, since it is certain that the changes of a chemical nature which take place are of the general character or class described above.

Breakfast foods are usually sold under trade-mark names which may or may not give an indication of their origin or character. Sometimes, in fact, the trade name gives a false indication and the use of such trade names must be considered as entirely reprehensible. Whenever a name used is descriptive it should be used in a practical sense and not for the purpose of misleading or deceiving. Breakfast foods may represent practically the whole grain or the grain with a removal of a proportion of the outer covering or they may represent the refined flour from which all or a considerable proportion of the germ and some of the rich nitrogenous ingredients have been removed.

The attempt to give a list of the names which have been applied to breakfast foods would consume many pages and be of little value.

=Composition of Breakfast Foods.=--In so far as possible the breakfast foods noted in the following tables have been arranged in accordance with the raw material from which they have been produced and the data given represent the average composition of breakfast foods of the classes mentioned. Individual variations from the average are often very great.

Class I.--Breakfast foods made from Indian corn products. Class II.--Breakfast foods made from wheat products. Class III.--Breakfast foods made from oat products. Class IV.--Breakfast foods made from starch and tapioca. Class V.--Breakfast foods made from noodles, spaghetti, and macaroni. Class VI.--Breakfast foods made from barley. Class VII.--Breakfast foods of miscellaneous origin, that is consisting of those compounds of raw material not specified.

COMPOSITION OF BREAKFAST FOODS.[28]

ETHER MOIS- PRO- EX- TURE. TEIDS. TRACT. FIBER. CLASS I, _Indian Corn Products:_ _Perct._ _Perct._ _Perct._ _Perct._ In the original substance, 12.33 7.92 0.58 0.67 In the dry substance, .. 9.02 0.66 0.76

CLASS II, _Wheat Products:_ In the original substance, 10.08 12.01 1.80 1.48 In the dry substance, .. 13.36 2.01 1.65

CLASS III, _Oat Products:_ In the original substance, 7.66 15.32 7.46 1.20 In the dry substance, .. 16.60 8.08 1.38

CLASS IV, _Starch and Tapioca Products:_ In the original substance, 11.29 .39 .03 .13 In the dry substance, .. .43 .04 .15

CLASS V, _Noodles, Spaghetti and Macaroni:_ In the original substance, 9.66 12.02 .42 .56 In the dry substance, .. 13.33 .47 .62

CLASS VI, _Barley Products:_ In the original substance, 10.92 7.50 .89 .67 In the dry substance, .. 8.42 1.00 .75

CLASS VII, _Miscellaneous Products:_ In the original substance, 6.41 12.81 1.05 .99 In the dry substance, .. 13.68 1.12 1.04

STARCH AND CALORIES. ASH. SUGAR. Per Gram. CLASS I, _Indian Corn Products:_ _Perct._ _Perct._ In the original substance, 0.66 78.51 .. In the dry substance, 0.75 98.57 4385

CLASS II, _Wheat Products:_ In the original substance, 1.55 75.62 .. In the dry substance, 16.73 84.08 4462

CLASS III, _Oat Products:_ In the original substance, 1.79 67.61 .. In the dry substance, 1.94 73.20 4875

CLASS IV, _Starch and Tapioca Products:_ In the original substance, .14 88.15 .. In the dry substance, .16 99.37 4193

CLASS V, _Noodles, Spaghetti and Macaroni:_ In the original substance, .78 77.12 .. In the dry substance, .86 85.34 4428

CLASS VI, _Barley Products:_ In the original substance, .86 80.35 .. In the dry substance, .97 90.19 4344

CLASS VII, _Miscellaneous Products:_ In the original substance, 1.06 78.68 .. In the dry substance, 1.13 84.07 4449

[28] U. S. Dept. Agr., Bureau of Chemistry, Bull. 13, Part IX, p. 1345.

=Remarks on Table of Analyses.=--

Class I, Indian Corn Products.--The analytical data show that in the breakfast foods made from Indian corn products the germ has been quite uniformly removed. The quantity of fiber also shows that the maize flour produced has been very carefully bolted. The ash is almost normal, showing only a small addition, probably of salt. The mean quantity of protein is that which would be predicted of an Indian corn product ground by the most approved milling process in order to make as white a flour as possible. These methods of preparing the flour, although so common, are not to be preferred either by reason of palatability or nutritive properties of the products. The old-fashioned milling process makes a more palatable and more nutritious diet and affords a higher degree of heat and energy.

The analysis of the Indian corn products show that they are very much lower in protein than would be expected from an analysis of the whole kernels. The low content of fat in the products is doubtless due to the complete degermination of the grain during the milling and to the further fact that the baking and other preparation of the material tend to occlude the fat particles, making their extraction quite difficult.

Class II, Wheat Products.--The study of wheat products used as breakfast foods shows that the wheat germ is not removed to any very great extent during the preparation of the raw material. In fact the quantity of ether extract appears somewhat greater than would be expected in pure wheat products, and this leads to the supposition that oatmeal or Indian corn must be mixed with the food product in small quantities, since the ether extract in the case of wheat products is more than three times as great as in the case of Indian corn products of a similar character. This is an indication either of the use of mechanical methods as stated above or else to the admixture of other bodies without mention. There does not appear to have been any notable quantity of mineral substance, common salt or otherwise, added during the process of preparation. The quantity of protein in the product is that which would be predicted from the composition of wheat flour from which the samples are supposed to be made.

Class III, Oat Products.--The oat products have evidently been made without any extensive degermination, as is shown by the high content of fat or oil. The average composition of oat products shows that genuine oatmeal is used in their preparation and the probability is that little adulteration is practiced. The high content of oil and protein produces a corresponding depression in the quantity of carbohydrates. The high nutritive value of the product, both in respect of fat and of proteins, is fully illustrated by the analytical data obtained. The calories, as will be noticed, are very much higher than in the corresponding product from Indian corn, wheat, or in fact of any other of the breakfast foods.

Class IV, Products made of starch and tapioca show, in the analytical data, that very high-grade starch materials are employed in the preparation of these bodies. The protein, ether extract, fiber, and ash almost disappear. As shown in the data for the dry substance, more than 99 percent of the whole material consists of carbohydrates, chiefly starch. The calories are correspondingly diminished since starch and sugar have the least heat value of any class of food products, except those of a mineral character. Foods of this kind are highly unbalanced, that is, contain a large excess of starch and sugar, and are often very prejudicial to the health of persons whose ability to digest starch and sugar has been lessened by disease.

Class V, Noodles, spaghetti, and macaroni are often used as breakfast foods, though not by any means so universally as many others in this category. The analytical data show that these bodies correspond very well to the material, that is to the flour, rich in gluten, from which they are supposed to be made. The protein content is high,--the ether extract, fiber, and ash low, and the calories correspond to the chemical composition of the material.

Class VI, Barley Products.--Barley products are not very commonly used as breakfast foods, but the malt used in the preparation of other breakfast foods is usually made of barley, since the barley malt has the highest diastatic value of any of the cereals.

Class VII, Miscellaneous breakfast foods are so called because the character of the materials of which they are made is not known or no statement is made by the manufacturer or dealer concerning them. The analytical data, of course, do not lead to any decision regarding the nature of the raw material employed. The percentage of protein, however, taken in conjunction with the rather low ether extract, indicates that they are probably made chiefly from wheat products.

Much may be said in favor of the use of prepared breakfast foods, for, in so far as I know, they are usually palatable, wholesome, and nutritious. There are many points which may be urged against their general use, chief of which is in regard to their cost. There is no cereal now in general use for edible purposes which is worth as much as two cents per pound in the markets of this country, yet breakfast foods, which are only prepared cereals, are often sold for 10 or 15 cents per pound. This is a high price in comparison with the cost of the raw material, but it must not be forgotten that the cost of manufacture is to be considered. In the second place the cereal foods are undoubtedly best at the moment they are prepared. Unless carefully packed, they may become infected with insects of various kinds, which certainly add nothing to their value and detract very much from their desirability. In moist climates they become infested with mould and even with bacterial growths. Inasmuch as necessarily a large proportion of the prepared cereals remain for an indefinite time unsold, the consumer is liable at any time to come into possession of one of these deteriorated packages. In the third place there is no reason to believe that a prepared breakfast food is any more digestible, nutritious, or favorable to the health of the healthy individual than the broken cereal itself properly cooked. Further than this it may be stated that there is no preparation of cereals better than those which are freshly made from the freshly broken or ground grain. If, therefore, one has the time to properly prepare the fresh grains of the cereals they will be more palatable and more nutritious and equally as digestible as any of the prepared articles. On the other hand, there are cases of diseased or disordered digestion in which the prepared cereals will be more digestible, but this is certainly not the case in a state of health. There is reason to believe, therefore, that the demand for prepared cereals will continue, but the old-fashioned method of preparation of the cereal from the grain will still have its advocates.

I think it may be said with certainty that the proper home preparation of a cereal as a breakfast food will not cost any more than the original cereal itself, and hence the price of this food ought not to be much more than 4 cents per pound without counting the added water in its preparation.

I believe, therefore, that our people of limited means can be safely advised on the score of economy, palatability, and nutrition to prepare their own cereals for ordinary breakfast purposes.

PART VI.

VEGETABLES, CONDIMENTS, FRUITS.

SUCCULENT VEGETABLES.

The term vegetable as applied to food in the broadest sense of the word means that class which distinguishes it from animal food. In a narrower sense, however, the term vegetable is used to denote a certain class of food which is of a succulent or juicy nature. While cereals and fruits are vegetables in the broadest sense of the word they are not in the narrow and common meaning. The

term “vegetable” in this section therefore refers to those substances commonly known as vegetables upon the market and which are characterized by their high water content. On account of this abundance of liquid or juice the term succulent is applied to them. The common vegetables which are included in this class consist of lettuce, spinach, potatoes, cauliflower, beets, radishes, turnips, cabbage, green Indian corn, peas, beans, tomatoes, yams, etc. These vegetables contain in a fresh state from 70 to 95 percent of water. Many of them can be kept for a length of time without deterioration, especially the potato and beet, and for a short time cabbage, radishes, etc., if kept cool and moist. Other kinds of vegetables are not easily preserved for any length of lime except in cold storage, such as lettuce, peas, beans, tomatoes, etc. If the potato and other starchy tubers are kept out of account these vegetables do not have a very high nutritive value, as will be seen by the analysis which follows. They have, however, an important part in the ration because of their palatability and the effect which they have upon the general activity of the alimentary canal. For instance, there is very little nourishment obtained in eating a turnip which perhaps is 95 percent water,--yet its palatability, its condimental character, and its general salutary effect upon digestion is such as to make it worth while to pay even a high price in proportion to its nutriment. For this reason, as well as for their nutritive value, the use of succulent vegetables is to be very highly commended.

In general, as has been said, these vegetables are eaten in a fresh state or after being kept for a considerable time in cold storage or otherwise. The potato, for instance, can be kept by properly covering it in the earth or in bins through the winter. Cabbages are also kept in the same way and many other vegetables without apparent deterioration. These vegetables are often desiccated, and in this way can be kept for a much longer period. Unfortunately no method of desiccation has been developed which preserves entirely the palatability of the vegetable, although its nutrient properties, which are perhaps the least important of its properties in many respects, are preserved to a certain extent by desiccation.

We may, however, leave out of consideration the desiccation of fresh vegetables. Certain of the vegetables above mentioned naturally become desiccated on maturity as in the case of peas and beans, but then they are removed from the category of succulent vegetables. Green Indian corn is also often dried, but in this process its palatability is to a certain extent impaired even when it is prepared for cooking in such a way as to restore practically all of the water whi

[... TRUNCATED at 800,000 chars for file-size management — full text in original source ...]

==========

The Abergeldie Winter Book

Eléonore Riego de la Branchardière

Project Gutenberg Release: September 07, 2021 · eBook #66234

[Illustration:

THE ABERGELDIE WINTER BOOK

BY M^{LLE} RIEGO.]

THE

ABERGELDIE WINTER BOOK.

BY

MLLE. RIEGO DE LA BRANCHARDIERE.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT ARTISTE IN NEEDLEWORK TO H. R. H. THE PRINCESS OF WALES.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.; AND ALL THE BERLIN WAREHOUSES.

1867.

Price One Shilling.

* * * * *

[Illustration:

Prize Medal, 1851.

Prize Medal, 1862.

Prize Medal, 1862.

Prize Medal, 1855.

AWARDED

“FOR THE SKILL DISPLAYED IN THE IMITATION OF OLD SPANISH AND OTHER COSTLY LACES.”

SEE JURORS’ REPORT, INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION.]

* * * * *

[Illustration:

CAPE MUFF CROSS-OVER

VESTE PETTICOAT HOOD]

* * * * *

THE ABERGELDIE WINTER BOOK.

OPERA HOOD.

IN CROCHET, ORNAMENTED WITH TATTING.

See the Frontispiece.

Materials—16 skeins of Pink and the same of White single Berlin Wool; 3 skeins of White Floss Silk. Walker's Tricot Needle No. 5 Bell gauge.

The Tatting—A large Shuttle, and for the pearl loops a short mesh, which measures 1¾ inches in circumference, and another 1¼ round, are required.

THE CROWN.

Commence with the White wool and the Tricot needle; make a chain of 15 stitches. The whole of the stitches should be worked very loosely.

1st row—Miss the last 4 chain stitches, and work a plain crochet stitch into the next stitch of the foundation chain; then (make 2 chain, miss a stitch of the foundation and work 1 plain crochet stitch, 5 times); turn back.

2nd row—Make 2 chain, miss 2, and work 1 plain stitch in the 2 chain of the last row; repeat to the end, then to Increase work 2 chain and 1 plain again in the last loop; turn back.

Work 7 rows more, the same as the last, when it will be increased to 14 loops. It should measure seven inches across without stretching.

Work 9 rows of the same stitch, but omitting the increased loops at the end of the rows.

19th row—To decrease, miss the last stitch and work 1 plain in the last loop of chain; then 2 chain and 1 plain as before, to the end.

Work 8 rows more as the last. Then work a row of 1 chain and 1 plain in each loop.

Join on the Colored wool, and work a row of plain crochet all round, working two stitches to the side of each of the white rows.

For the second round—Work 4 chain, miss 1 and 1 plain. Repeat and fasten off.

Use the Floss Silk and an Embroidery Needle. Work an ordinary Cross stitch over each of the plain stitches of the Crown, putting the needle into the open spaces.

THE TATTING FLOWERS.

1st CIRCLE—Wind the colored and White Wool together, and fill the Shuttle with it, using the doubled wool as one thread.

Commence a loop, work a double stitch; then using the largest mesh for the pearl loops, work (1 pearl and 1 double alternately 16 times); draw close; leaving a small circle in the centre about the size of the 2nd mesh, and knotting the ends firmly together, cut them off.

2nd CIRCLE—Use the colored wool doubled, and the second sized mesh. Commence a loop, work 1 double, then (1 pearl and 1 double 12 times); draw close and fasten off.

3rd CIRCLE—Use the White Floss, and for the pearl loops the Tricot needle can be used. Commence a loop; work 1 double, (1 pearl and 2 double 8 times); draw close. Fasten off.

Place the second circle over the first, and the silk one in the centre, sewing them together with the silk, then attach them to the crown about an inch from the edge of it.

Make nine Flowers for the Crown and four for the Lappets.

THE LAPPETS.

Work with the White wool and Tricot needle. Make a chain of 11 stitches.

1st row—Raise 11 loops in the ordinary Tricot stitch, and work back, see page 28.

2nd row—Raise a loop, Increase a loop, raise 2 loops; then to _decrease_, put the needle into the three next stitches, and bring the wool through them all. Raise the 2 next loops as before. Increase again, and raise the 2 last loops. There will be 11 loops on the needle. Work back as before. Work 8 rows more as the last.

11th row—Raise the 1st stitch and increase a loop as before; then decrease the two next stitches, taking them together as one stitch; take the next three loops together; then take the two next loops together as one stitch, then Increase a loop as before, and raise the two last loops. There will now be 9 loops. Work back.

12th row—Raise a loop and increase as before; raise the next loop, then take 3 together, raise a loop, increase, raise 2 loops. Work back. Work 8 rows more as the last.

21st row—Raise a loop and increase as before; then put the needle into the next 5 loops, and bring the wool through them all as one stitch; increase again and raise 2 loops: there will now be 7 loops. Work back.

22nd row—Raise a loop and increase; then take the next 3 loops together; increase and raise 2 loops. Work back. Work 20 rows more as the last, or any length preferred.

THE EDGE—With the colored wool, work loosely a row of plain crochet all round the lappet, putting the needle into the spaces formed by the increased stitches. 2 chain and an extra plain stitch should be made at the two ends and centre of the first white row.

Make sufficient of the Scallop Trimming, page 11, to go round the Lappet, using the colored wool doubled, and the smaller mesh for the pearl loops. For the crochet row the wool is to be single.

THE JOINING—work with the Floss Silk, which had better be used double. Commence at the colored row, round the Lappet, and work a plain crochet stitch; then take out the needle and put it into the last stitch of the Scallop Trimming, taking both edges of the plain row, bring the Floss through; then work another plain stitch on the lappet, taking both edges, continue joining and working a plain stitch alternately.

Work a row of Cross stitches with the Floss silk up the centre.

Make the other Lappet the same, sew them to the crown and attach two flowers at each side.

MAZARIN CAPE.

Materials—For the Cape, 4 ounces of single or double Wool, and for the Trimmings 3 skeins of double Berlin Wool of a color which contrasts; Walker’s Tricot Needle No. 7 Bell gauge, a large Tatting Shuttle, and a round Mesh No. 1 Bell gauge.

This Cape is worked in open Crochet ornamented with Tatting, see the Frontispiece.

It will be greatly improved if Floss Silk is introduced as described in the Opera Hood. The centre should then be white with colored Trimming, but any two colors that contrast will look well, as Pearl Grey with Crimson, Mauve with Amber, or Violet with Grey.

THE DIVISIONS.

Commence with the Wool for the centre, and make 15 chain stitches.

1st row—Miss the last 4 chain and work a plain crochet stitch in the next stitch; (then 2 chain, miss 1 and 1 plain, 5 times); turn back. It should measure 3 inches in length without stretching. If single Wool is used it should be worked loosely.

2nd row—Work 3 chain, miss 1 and 1 treble in the last 2 chain; then 2 chain, miss 2 and 1 plain in each loop of 2 chain to the end; turn back.

3rd row—Work the same as the 2nd row.

4th row—3 chain, miss 1, 1 treble in the last loop of chain; then 2 chain, miss 2, and 1 plain as before to the end; and to Increase a loop work 3 chain and 1 plain in the same loop as the last plain stitch; turn back.

5th row—Work the same as the 4th row.

Repeat the last 4 rows 6 times more. As the work will increase two loops every four rows there will now be 20 loops. It is intended that the work should be longer at the sides than in the centre of the division.

30th row—3 chain, miss 1 and 1 treble; then 2 chain, miss 2 and 1 plain as before, for 7 loops, then work 5 loops, making only 1 chain instead of 2 chain; then work 7 loops with 2 chain, and increase in the last loop.

31st row—3 chain, miss 1, 1 treble, then work 7 loops with 2 chain; 6 loops with 1 chain, and 7 loops of 2 chain; then increase at the end.

32nd row—Work 1 chain, miss 1 and 1 plain in each loop of chain to the end; then 1 chain and 1 plain in the last loop. Work 2 rows more as the last, and fasten off.

Work five Divisions more the same, and sew the slanting sides of them together. Three rounds of 1 chain, miss 1 and 1 plain, should be worked along the neck, then commencing at the right point work a plain row up the front, across the neck, and down the other side.

THE TRIMMING IN TATTING.

THE ROSETTE—Fill the Shuttle with the Wool and using the mesh for the pearl loops, commence a loop, work 1 double, (then make a pearl and work a double stitch alternately for 7 loops); draw close. Keep the Wool at the back and join it to the centre pearl.

Work another Rosette the same, and join it to the same pearl of the previous Rosette as before; then keep the Wool as the back and join to the centre pearl of the last Rosette. Repeat the last Rosette until sufficient is made for the sides and border, to which it is to be attached by sewing it with the same colored Wool.

The Rosettes down the Divisions are made in the same manner, but as they are to be smaller, only 5 pearls instead of 7 pearls are to be made for each Rosette.

THE BALLS—Take a yard of the Wool the same color as the Tatting, split it three times, and wind it round the tops of the first and second fingers, take it off the fingers and wind a piece of fine thread about three times very tightly round the middle of the wool, knotting the ends together, also tie in a piece of the wool not split, to form the thread to attach the Balls to the work; cut the wool at each end, rounding it into the shape.

Make sufficient of these Balls to go all round the Edge, placing them about two inches apart.

RETICULE MUFF.

IN TRICOT ECOSSAIS.—SEE FRONTISPIECE.

Materials—4 skeins of Scarlet and 2 of Black double Berlin Wool, or 4-ply Fleecy, Walker’s Tricot Needle No. 6 Bell gauge.

Commence the Outside with the Black wool, and make a chain of 34 stitches. See Instructions for this stitch page 28.

1st row—Miss the last chain stitch. * Put the needle into the next chain stitch, and bring the wool through it in a loop. Repeat from * until there are 34 loops on the needle. Then join on the scarlet wool, and “Work Back.” Join on the black wool.

2nd row—Work with the Black wool, and raise all the loops of the last row; then join on the scarlet wool and Work back.

Repeat as the last row until 16 inches are worked; then, to shape the Flap or part which falls over the pocket, work the same stitch, but decreasing at the beginning and end of every row by taking two stitches together until it is reduced to a point.

THE LINING.

Work with the Scarlet wool and make a piece the same as the outside; when finished it is to be made round by joining the foundation row to the one before the flap is begun, so as to leave it on the outside.

For the Pocket take a piece of merino or silk the length of the muff, and about 8 inches deep double it, and sew the double part to the Lining 4 inches below the joining; then sew one edge of the silk to the joining. Wadding is to be placed between the lining and the outside, which is now to be sewn at the sides and round the flap, but the foundation row is to be joined to the other edge of the

pocket. Finish with a Fur Trimming or Border, as given in the Winter Book, 1862, round the end and flap, which must be secured with a loop and button.

CROSSOVER SHAWL.

IN TRICOT ECOSSAIS, WITH TATTING BORDER.

See the Frontispiece.

Materials—For the Tricot, 6 ounces of Mauve, Blue, or Magenta 4-ply Fleecy, Walker's Tricot Needle No. 3 Bell gauge. Berlin Wool 8-ply can be used, or 3-ply Fleecy.

For the Border, a skein of Black and two of White double Berlin Wool, a large Shuttle, and a Mesh No. 1 Bell gauge.

THE BACK.

Commence with the Colored Fleecy, and the Tricot Needle. Make a chain of 7 stitches.

1st row—Miss the last chain stitch. * Put the needle into the next stitch, and bring the wool through in a loop. Repeat from * until there are 7 loops on the needle. Work back. See Instructions, page 28, at the end of the book.

2nd row—Raise the 7 loops of the 1st row, and work back.

3rd row—Raise a loop, then Increase a loop by putting the needle between the upright stitches; Raise 3 loops as usual; then Increase another loop; raise the 2 last loops. Work back.

4th row—Raise a loop, Increase, raise 5 loops, increase again, raise 2 loops. Work back.

5th Row—Raise a loop, increase, raise 7 loops, increase again, raise 2 loops. Work back.

6th row—Raise a loop, increase, then raise all the loops to within two of the end; increase again, and raise the two last loops. Work back. The work should be loose. As a guide for the size of the stitch, the last row should measure 4 inches across, and these 6 rows 2½ inches in depth.

Work 5 rows more the same as the 6th row.

12th row—Raise all the loops without increasing, and work back.

Work 4 rows as the 6th row, that is increasing 2 stitches each row, and then work every 5th row without increasing until 37 rows in all are worked, when there will be 65 stitches.

Work 4 rows without shaping. If for an extra size a few more rows may be added here, and also at the plain rows on each shoulder. This finishes the back.

TO SHAPE THE RIGHT FRONT—1st row—Raise all the loops of the last row until there are 28 on the needle. Work back.

2nd and 3rd rows—Raise all the loops to the two last, then decrease by taking these loops together as one stitch. Work back.

4th row—Raise a loop, then decrease as before, raise the rest to the end. Work back.

Then work 4 rows plain without shaping.

Repeat as the 4th row, and the 4 rows plain after it, 5 times more; that is decreasing a stitch at the beginning of every 5th row; the left selvedge should be quite straight.

Then to shape the end, decrease a stitch at the beginning and end of every 3rd row, until it is reduced to a point.

TO SHAPE THE LEFT FRONT—1st row—Commence at the stitches left at the back, and leaving 9 for the neck, raise the remaining 28 loops as usual. Work back.

2nd and 3rd rows—Work 2 rows, decreasing a loop at the beginning of each row. All the rows must now be kept straight at the beginning.

Work 4 rows plain, and at the end of every 5th row decrease a stitch, in all 6 times. Then decrease a stitch at the beginning and end of every 3rd row until it is reduced to a point.

THE TATTING BORDER.

THE DOT—Fill the Shuttle with the White Wool, and use the Tricot Needle for the pearl loops. Commence a loop, work 3 double stitches, then (1 pearl loop and 3 double stitches twice); draw quite close and reverse the work.

Commence the next Dot close to the last and repeat the dot, reversing them after each is made. Work sufficient to go all round the Tricot.

THE EDGE—Work with the Black Wool, and commencing at the last pearl of the Dots, crochet a plain stitch in it; then work another plain stitch in the next pearl of the same Dot, and missing the Dot which turns down, work a plain stitch in the 1st pearl of the next dot but one. Repeat working a plain stitch in the two pearls of every other dot.

THE JOINING—Work with the Black wool, and commencing at the left corner of the Tricot, work a plain crochet stitch between the rows of it; then, to join the Tatting, take out the needle, put it into a pearl of a Dot, and bringing the loop through work a plain stitch on the Tricot, and continue the same until the Tatting is joined. To round the corners so that the Border may lie flat, the needle should be put into the last pearl of one dot and the 1st pearl of the next, and worked as one stitch. This should be done five or six times. With the same colored wool as the Tricot, make sufficient of the Scalloped Trimming to go all round, and join it to the black row of the Border with the black wool, always putting the needle into both edges of the plain rows.

TATTING SCALLOP TRIMMING.

Materials—The edging being used to ornament more than one of the patterns in this book, the materials are given with each article.

THE SCALLOPS—Fill the Shuttle with the Wool, and commencing a loop work 2 double stitches, then with the Mesh or pin (make a pearl loop and work a double stitch alternately, until 6 loops are made); then work another double stitch and draw the loop nearly close, leaving a space in the centre the size of the Mesh.

Leave three-quarters of an inch of Wool before commencing the next Scallop. Continue them until the length is made.

Work with the Tricot Needle; take the Tatting and, keeping the straight edge at the top, work a plain Crochet stitch in the last pearl of the Scallop; then work 2 plain in the space in the centre of the Scallop and 1 plain in the last pearl. The thread which connects the Scallops is to be worked under these stitches. Continue working 4 plain stitches to each Scallop.

GENTLEMAN'S SOCK OR HALF-HOSE.

RIBBED KNITTING.

Materials—4 ounces of plain or speckled Fingering Yarn, and 1 ounce of a contrasting color for the top and toe. 5 Knitting Needles No. 17 Bell gauge.

The following directions will make a full-sized Stocking, viz—12 inches round the top of the leg, 12 inches in length from the top to the heel, and 11 inches long in the foot. By using Needles Nos. 16 or 18 it will make a size larger or smaller.

THE LEG—Use the color for the top—Cast on 24 stitches on each of four needles, keeping the fifth to make it round.

1st round—Pearl 3 stitches and knit 3 stitches alternately all round; in all 96 stitches.

Work 30 rounds or two inches more the same, always knitting or pearling the same stitches throughout the leg.—With the other color, knit 8 inches more the same.

TO SHAPE THE HEEL—Knit 23 stitches plain off the 1st needle which leaves a stitch, and putting it on the 2nd needle turn back, so as to work on the 23 stitches. Slip the 1st stitch and pearl the 22 stitches, then, using the same needle, pearl 20 stitches off the next needle, which leaves 4 stitches; put them on the next needle and turn back. The 53 stitches on the other needles are left for

the Instep.

1st row—Slip the 1st stitch, knit 20, pearl 1, knit 21; turn back.

2nd row—Slip 1, pearl 42 stitches; turn back.

Repeat the 2 last rows 22 times more.

TO ROUND THE HEEL. 47th row—Slip 1, knit 15, knit 2 together, knit 6, knit 2 together, knit 1, turn back, leaving 16 stitches on the other needle.

* * * * *

[Illustration:

MUFFATEE. GENTLEMAN'S SOCK. BABY'S BOOT.

LADY'S STOCKING. SLEEPING SOCK.]

* * * * *

48th row—Slip 1, pearl 10, turn back, leaving 14 stitches—slip 1, knit 2 together, knit 7, knit 2 together, knit 1, turn back; † slip 1, pearl 12, that is, 2 stitches on those left unworked, turn back—slip 1, knit 2 together, knit 9, knit 2 together, knit 1, turn back. Repeat from † 6 times more, always knitting or pearling 2 stitches more each time, so as every row to use two of the stitches left unworked; when finished, there will be 25 stitches on the needle.

THE INSTEP—Commence at the end of the 53 stitches left unworked, and with another needle raise 23 stitches from the selvedge formed by the rows at the right side of the heel.

Take another needle, and knit the 25 stitches left from the heel.

Then with the 5th needle, raise 23 stitches down the selvedge of the left side of the heel, and with the same needle knit off the first plain stitch of the 53. Put 51 of these instep stitches on one needle, and place the remaining stitch on the next needle to the left. It will now be 124 stitches round.

1st round—Work across the instep. (Pearl 3 and knit 3, alternately as before, 8 times) then pearl 3; knit 1, knit 2 together, knit 67 _plain_; then knit 2 together, knit 1 plain.

2nd round—(Pearl 3 and knit 3, 8 times), pearl 3, knit the rest of the round all plain.

Repeat these two rounds 16 times more, knitting 2 stitches less at the stitches marked in italics each time.

Then knit 50 rounds the same as the 2nd round; when finished knit 20 rounds all plain.

THE TOE—Join on the other color and decrease thus—

1st round—Knit 2 together, knit 37 plain, knit 2 together, knit 4 plain. Repeat once more to finish the round.

2nd round—All plain.

Repeat the 2 last rounds 16 times more, knitting 2 plain less each time instead of 37.

Place the remaining stitches together so as to double the work, and knitting a stitch off each needle together, cast off the remaining stitches.

A SLEEPING SOCK.

KNITTING.—SEE PAGE 13.

Materials—For a Lady, 2 skeins of white 3-ply Fleecy, and a pair of knitting pins, No. 12 Bell gauge; for a Gentleman the pins must be No. 10.

Commence at the sole. Cast on 28 stitches.

1st row—Slip 1, then increase a stitch by knitting the next stitch, but before taking it off the left pin, put the needle into the back of the same stitch and knit it off the pin; knit the rest of the row plain. Work 9 rows more the same.

Then work 18 rows, increasing in the same way at the beginning of every alternate row only, which will make one side slant more than the other; there will now be 47 stitches.

Knit 6 rows plain, always slipping the 1st stitch.

TO FORM THE INSTEP—Slip 1, knit 29, turn back, leaving 17 stitches on the pin: and on the 30 stitches knit 26 rows plain. The wool will be at the side nearest the stitches left, and with it cast 17 stitches on the pin with the 30 stitches, in all 47 stitches; and for the other side of the sole, knit 6 rows plain.

Next row—Slip 1, knit 2 together, knit the rest plain. Then knit a row plain. Work the last two rows 8 times more. Then 10 rows, decreasing every row, and cast off.

THE LEG—Return to the stitches left, and with the same pin raise 14 stitches from the selvedge formed by the rows across the instep, thus: put the pin into the nearest stitch at the edge, and bring the wool through in a loop on it; then in the same manner raise 17 stitches from the stitches cast on; there will now be 48 stitches.

1st row—Slip 1, knit 1, then (pearl 2 and knit 2 alternately to the end).

Knit 29 rows more the same, then 6 rows plain, and cast off.

Sew the sides together, then the 1st and last rows of the sole, and the slanting sides, drawing the straight rows at the toe together.

BABY'S CROCHET BOOT.

Materials—8 skeins of white and 16 of colored Single Berlin Wool; Walker's Penelope Crochet Needle, No. 1. See page 13.

Commence at the Toe, and with the colored wool make 16 chain. The work should be tight.

1st row—Miss 1, 7 plain, 3 plain in one stitch, 7 plain, then 1 chain to form the selvedge, turn back. Now work in raised crochet, that is, putting the needle into the lower edge of the stitch of the previous row, and working a plain stitch, which will leave the upper edge in the front.

2nd row—Miss the 1 chain, work 8 plain always raised, then 3 stitches in one, 8 plain as before, 1 chain, turn back.

3rd row—Miss the 1 chain, then the rest plain; 1 chain at the end.

Repeat the last 2 rows, 9 times more, working a stitch more before and after the centre stitches each repeat. Then, to form the side of the boot,

22nd row—Miss the 1 chain, then 18 plain, still raised, 1 chain, turn back.

Work 37 rows more as the last, and when finished, crochet the last row to the other half of the front.

THE LEG—With the Colored wool commence at the centre stitch of the front of the boot, and round the ribs formed by the side, worked thus—

1st round—4 chain, miss a rib, 1 plain in the side of the next rib. Repeat all round.

2nd round—Work in the 4 chain, (1 plain, then 3 chain, 1 treble, 3 chain, 1 plain, all in the same 4 chain). Repeat all round, and fasten off.

3rd round—With white wool commence at the top of the 10th rib of the 38 rows, and keeping the little Scallops formed by the last 2 rounds down in the front, work 1 chain, miss a rib, 1 treble in the top of the rib not used in the 1st round. Repeat all round.

4th round—All plain crochet.

5th round—Work in double crochet, that is, putting the needle into both edges of the previous round, and working a plain stitch.

Work 14 rounds more as the last.

20th round—4 chain, miss 1 and 1 plain. Repeat.

21st round—5 chain, miss 4, 1 plain in the 4 chain. Repeat. Join on the colored wool.

22nd and 23rd rounds—Work as the 21st round. Join on the white wool.

24th and 25th rounds—Work as the 21st round.

26th round—1 chain, miss 4, 1 plain in the 5 chain. Repeat, and fasten off.

THE SOLE.

With the Colored wool make a chain of 9 stitches.

1st row—Miss 1, 2 plain in one stitch, 7 plain, turn back.

Now work the rest of the sole in double crochet, which being worked backwards and forwards, will have a different effect from the leg.

2nd row—2 plain in the first stitch, the rest plain. Work 8 rows more the same as the last. There will now be 18 stitches.

11th and 12th rows—Plain.

13th row—Miss 1, the rest plain. Work 5 rows more as the last. Then 4 rows plain.

23rd row—2 plain in one, the rest plain. Work 7 rows more as the last.

31st and 32nd rows—Plain.

33rd row—Miss 1, the rest plain. Work 5 rows more the same.

39th row—Miss 1, the rest plain to the last 2 stitches, then miss 1, 1 plain.

Work 3 rows more the same, and fasten off. Sew the sole to the front, and finish with a bow and ribbon run into the open row at the leg.

LADY'S STOCKING.

IN RIBBED KNITTING.

Materials—5 ounces of Andalusian, Eider, or Welsh Yarn, 5 Knitting Needles No. 18 Bell gauge. The following directions will make a full size stocking, viz., 15 inches round the top of the leg, 26 inches from the top to the heel, and 10½ inches long in the foot. By using Nos. 19 or 17 Needles a size smaller or larger can be made. See Page 13.

Commence at the top of the leg, and to make the foundation strong, the wool should be used double in casting on the stitches. Cast on 42 stitches on each of two needles, and 36 on the other two; keeping the fifth for making it round.

1st round—Pearl 3 stitches and knit 3 stitches plain alternately all round, in all 156 stitches. Continue the same until it is 13 inches in length.

Always pearl or knit the same stitches throughout the leg.

TO SHAPE THE LEG—1st round—Pearl the 3 first stitches; then to decrease, slip 1, knit 1, and turn the slipped stitch over; knit 1 plain; pearl 3 and knit 3, to within 2 stitches of the end, and decrease again by knitting them together.

Knit 8 rounds without decreasing.

Repeat the same, decreasing 2 stitches every 9th round, until it is reduced to 120 stitches.

In these rounds the 3 first stitches are always to be pearled; but the few stitches immediately following will vary, on account of the decreased stitches altering the number to be knitted or pearled. After the decreasing is worked three times, the stitches will require

to be pearled together until the rib is decreased.

When the work is reduced to 120 stitches, sufficient rounds are to be worked without shaping to make it 23 inches in length from the top.

TO FORM THE HEEL—1st row—Knit 1, pearl 1, knit 28; turn back, so as to work on the 30 stitches, leaving the rest of the stitches unworked.

2nd row—Slip 1, pearl 29; then pearl 27 off the next needle; in all 57 stitches; turn back, leaving 63 stitches on the other needles for the Instep.

3rd row—Slip the 1st stitch, knit, 27, pearl 1, knit 28; turn back.

4th row—Slip 1, pearl 56 stitches; turn back. Repeat the 2 last rows 25 times more.

TO ROUND THE HEEL—47th row—Slip 1, knit 21, knit 2 together, knit 8, knit 2 together, knit 1, turn back, leaving 22 stitches on the other needle.

48th row—Slip 1, pearl 12, turn back, leaving 20 stitches—slip 1, knit 2 together, knit 9, knit 2 together, knit 1, turn back; † slip 1, pearl 14—that is, 2 stitches on those left unworked, turn back—slip 1, knit 2 together, knit 11, knit 2 together, knit 1, turn back. Repeat from † 9 times more, always knitting or pearling 2 stitches more each time, so as every row to use two of the stitches left; when finished, there will be 33 stitches.

THE INSTEP—Take another needle and raise 26 stitches from the selvedge formed by the rows of the left side of the Heel; then with a second needle work across the Instep (pearling 3 and knitting 3 as before, 10 times); then pearl 3; and with a third needle raise 26 stitches from the right selvedge of the Heel; and with a fourth needle knit the 33 stitches of the Heel. It will now be 148 stitches round.

1st round—Work across the instep. (Pearl 3 and knit 3, alternately as before, 10 times) then pearl 3; knit 1, knit 2 together, knit 79 plain; then knit 2 together, knit 1 plain.

2nd round—(Pearl 3 and knit 3, 10 times), pearl 3, knit the rest of the round all plain.

Repeat these two rounds 16 times more, knitting two stitches less at the stitches marked in italics each time. Then knit four inches the same as the 2nd round.

THE TOE—1st round—Knit 2 together, knit 49 plain, knit 2 together, knit 4 plain. Repeat once more to finish the round. 2nd round—All plain.

Repeat the last 2 rounds, knitting 2 plain less each time instead of 49, until it is reduced to a few stitches. Then double the work, and knitting a stitch off each needle together, cast them off.

ZOUAVE VESTE.

IN TRICOT ECOSSAIS, WITH TATTING EDGE.—SEE FRONTISPIECE.

Materials—6 ounces of Crimson, Mauve, Grey, or Violet 4-ply fleecy, and Walker’s Tricot Needle No. 4 Bell gauge. For the Border 2 skeins of White Berlin Wool, a large Shuttle, and round mesh No. 1 Bell gauge.

THE BACK.

Commence with 7 chain and work as directed for the Back of the Crossover, page 9, ending with the 4 plain rows.

TO SHAPE THE RIGHT SIDE.

1st row—Continue working from the last row of the back. Raise 28 loops, leaving the rest unworked for the other side. Work Back on these 28 loops.

2nd row—Raise all the loops of the last row to within 3 loops of the end, then to decrease take 2 loops together as one stitch, raise the last loop. Work back.

3rd row—Same as 2nd row.

4th row—Raise all the loops of the last row. Work back to within 4 loops, of the end, keep the 5th loop on the needle, and instead of finishing the row, put the needle into the next stitch to the _left_, and raise a loop so as to commence the next row.

5th row—Continue raising all the stitches of the last row. Work back all the loops on the needle.

6th row—Raise 4 loops, but in raising the 5th loop, put the needle into the next stitch of the lower row, which is under the one ordinarily used. This will prevent any space showing where the last row was turned. Raise the rest of the row as usual. Work back.

7th row—Raise all the loops without shaping. Work back.

Repeat the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th rows, 5 times more.

28th row—Raise a loop, increase a loop, then raise all the loops to within 4 loops of the end, decrease by taking 2 loops together, and raise the last two loops. Work back.

29th row—Raise all the loops to within 4 of the end, then decrease, and raise the last two loops. Work back.

Repeat the last two rows 10 times more. Then work 5 rows, leaving 2 loops unworked at the right end of the needle each time; which finishes the right side. The last row is to be attached to the right side of the first 10 rows of the back after the Border is worked.

THE LEFT SIDE.

1st row—Commence at the stitches of the Back, and, leaving 9 stitches for the neck, raise the rest of the row—in all 28 loops. Work back.

2nd and 3rd rows—Work as usual, decreasing at the beginning of each row.

4th row—Raise all the loops to within 4 stitches of the end of the last row, and, leaving them unfinished. Work back.

5th row—Raise all the loops of the last row, then raise the 4 loops of the lower row. Work back.

6th and 7th rows—Work the rows without shaping.

Repeat as the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th rows, 5 times more.

28th row—Raise a loop, then decrease. Raise all the loops to within 2 of the end. Increase a loop, and raise the 2 loops. Work back.

29th row—Raise a loop, decrease, then raise all the loops to the end.

Repeat the last two rows 10 times more; then work 5 rows, leaving 2 stitches at the left side of each row, and fasten off. After the Border is worked, sew it to the left side of the back.

THE SASH.

Work as the Lappets of the Hood, page 4, commencing with the same color as the Veste, and using the white wool for the Edge.

Make the Scallop Trimming with the white wool, and for the Joining use the same color as the Veste.

THE BORDER.

For the Outside, commence with the white wool at the last stitch of the left side of the Veste, so as to work on the selvedge formed by the end of the rows, putting the needle sufficiently deep in the work to correspond with the edge row of the Sash: work 3 plain crochet stitches; * then 1 treble in the next stitch, 1 chain, 1 treble, 1 chain, and 1 treble again; these 3 treble stitches are all to be worked in the same stitch of the Veste, then work 7 plain; and repeat again from *, continuing the same all round to the opposite end at the right side of the Veste. As the 3 treble stitches should come at the centre of the back, it will be necessary to increase in rounding the point.

Make sufficient of the Scallop Trimming to go along this row, and join it the same as the Sash. For the inner Border, commence at the last stitch of the right side of the Veste, and work as the outer border. The last row of each of the sides is then to be sewn to the back under the Border, and the Sash ends attached on the wrong side. The Veste should be fastened with buttons down the front.

KNITTED MUFFATEE.

FOR A GENTLEMAN.

Materials—1 ounce of White and 6 skeins of colored Single Berlin Wool; pair of Walker's knitting pins No. 12 Bell gauge. See page 13.

Commence with the Colored wool, and cast on 48 stitches.

1st row—Slip 1, knit 1, then (pearl 2 stitches and knit 2 alternately to the end).

Knit 5 rows more the same.

Join on the white, and knit 6 rows. Then 3 rows of the colored.

For the Centre, knit 36 rows of white—then 3 rows of coloured—6 rows of white, and 6 rows of coloured.

For the Lining, knit 60 rows of white. Cast off. Sew the sides together, then double the cuff and sew the first and last rows together.

ROUND SHETLAND VEIL.

KNITTING.

Materials—One ounce of Shetland Wool and a pair of Knitting Pins No. 14 Bell gauge.

THE CENTRE.—Cast on 49 stitches loosely with two pins.

1st row—Make 1, knit 2 together, * make 1, knit 3 plain, make 1, knit 3 all together. Repeat from * to the last 5 stitches, then make 1, knit 3, make 1, knit 2 plain.

2nd row—Make 1, knit 2 together, * make 1, 2 together, knit 1, 2 together, make 1, knit 1; repeat from *, and at the end knit 2 plain instead of 1.

3rd row—Make 1, knit 2 plain; * make 1, 2 together, make 1, 3 together, make 1, knit 1. Repeat from * to within 5 stitches of the end, then make 1, knit only 2 together, make 1 and knit 3 plain.

4th row—Make 1, 2 together; * make 1, knit 1, make 1, 2 together, knit 1, 2 together. Repeat from * to the last 3 stitches, then make 1, knit 1, make 1, knit 2 plain.

The work will now be increased 6 stitches. Commence again at the 1st row and repeat these four rows until it is the required size; then knit three rows plain and cast off.

Make sufficient of the Diamond Border to edge it.

DIAMOND EDGING.

Commence by casting on 12 stitches.

1st row—Make 1, knit 2 together, knit 1, make 1, knit 2 together, knit the rest plain. The 3rd, 5th, 7th, 9th, 11th, 13th, and 15th rows are all worked as the 1st row, and are therefore not given.

2nd row—Make 1, knit 3, make 1, 2 together, knit 4, make 1, 2 together, knit 1.

4th row—Make 1, knit 5, make 1, 2 together, knit 3, make 1, 2 together, knit 1.

6th row—Make 1, knit 1, 2 together, make 1, knit 1, make 1, knit 1, 2 together, make 1, 2 together, knit 2, make 1, 2 together, knit 1.

8th row—Make 1, knit 1, 2 together, make 1, knit 3 (make 1, 2 together and knit 1, three times).

10th row—Make 1, knit 3 together, knit 1, make 1, 3 together, make 1 knit 1, 2 together, make 1, knit 3, make 1, 2 together, knit 1.

12th row—Make 1, knit 3 together, knit 1, (2 together twice), make 1, knit 4, make 1, 2 together, knit 1.

[Illustration]

14th row—Make 1, knit 3 together, then 2 together, make 1, knit 5, make 1, 2 together, knit 1.

16th row—Make 1, 3 together, make 1, knit 6, make 1, 2 together, knit 1. Commence again at the 1st row. When sufficient is made it is to be sewn to the Veil.

THE “EMPIRE” PETTICOAT.

TRICOT ECOSSAIS.—SEE FRONTISPIECE.

Materials—1lb. of Scarlet or Mauve 4-ply Fleecy; also 2 ounces of Black and 1 ounce of White Wool. Walker’s Tricot Needle No. 5 Bell gauge.

FIRST STRIPE.

Commence with the Scarlet Wool, and make a chain of 33 stitches.

Work 2 rows of Tricot Ecossais as described at page 28, then join on the Black Wool to finish the last stitch.

3rd row—Black—Raise the 1st loop, then increase a loop, raise 13 loops; then decrease by taking 3 loops on the needle and working as one stitch. Raise 13 loops, increase again, and raise the two last loops. Work back. All the rows are worked in this manner, that is, increasing at the beginning and end, and decreasing in the centre.

4th row—Work as the last row.

Then with the White Wool work a row as the last.

Black 2 rows.

Scarlet 10 rows.

18th row—Raise the 1st loop and increase as before. Raise 11 loops, then decrease by taking 2 loops together; decrease again, taking 3 loops together as usual; then decrease a third time, taking 2 together. Raise 11 loops. Increase and raise 2 loops. There will now be only 31 loops. Work back.

Work 10 rows more as the 3rd row, but raising 12 loops instead of 13 on each side of the centre decreased stitches.

29th row—Work as the 18th row, but raising 10 loops instead of 11 loops on each side the decreased stitches.

Continue working 10 rows as the 3rd row, and then a row decreasing 3 times in the same manner as the 18th row, until the work is reduced to 23 stitches, when it will be about 30 inches in length.

As the number of stitches decreases each time the 18th row is worked, a less number of stitches must be raised on each side of the centre.

To finish the Stripe work 3 rows, decreasing in the centre and leaving 2 stitches unworked at each side; then work back to the right side, and end with a row of single crochet.

For an ordinary sized Petticoat 10 stripes will be required. The last stripes should not be joined to the top.

THE EDGE—With the Black Wool commence at the top of the left side of a Stripe, and work down the selvedge a row of plain Crochet, putting the needle into the open spaces formed by the increased stitches. This row should be worked loosely. Continue this row across the foundation, and up the right side of the Stripe. Work the other Stripes the same.

THE JOINING ROW—With the White Wool commence at the black stitch even with the white row of the stripe; work a single stitch on the stripe. Take a second stripe, put the needle into the corresponding stitch of it, work another single stitch. Continue working a

single stitch alternately on each stripe, until they are joined; the needle should be put in both edges of the black row. The first four rows of the stripes are to be sewn together with Scarlet and Black Wool.

THE BORDER—With the White Wool commence at the black row of the foundation, and work a row of 1 chain, miss 1 and 1 plain; putting the needle in the same scarlet stitches as the black row, so as to cover the alternate stitches of it. Repeat all round.

With the Scarlet Wool work 3 chain, miss 1 and 1 plain in each chain stitch of the white row.

TRICOT ECOSSAIS.

A CHAIN ROW is always made for the foundation of the work, the same as in Crochet, and after the number of chain stitches are made, as given in each direction, the last loop is to be kept on the needle.

[Illustration: SECTION.]

1st row—still keeping the loop on the needle—miss the 1st chain stitch, put the needle into the next chain stitch, take up the wool on the needle and draw it through in a loop; * keep the two loops on the needle, put the needle into the next chain stitch and repeat from * to the end of the chain. This is termed “raising” loops or stitches, and there should be as many loops on the needle as the foundation chain.

To “Work back”—Take up the wool on the needle and bring it through the last loop on it, * then take up the wool again and bring it through the two next loops, as shown at the left side of the Section. Repeat from * to the end.

In raising the loops for the 2nd row the needle is to be put into the upright loops of the previous row, as shown in the two first loops at the right side of the section.

To “Increase”—The third loop on the needle is an increased stitch, which is made by putting the needle between two upright loops and bringing the wool through as usual.

In counting the loops always reckon the number on the needle, including the one at the edge.

* * * * *

To insure correctness in the size of the Needles used in Mdlle. Riego’s publications, a drawing of the Gauge by which they are numbered, is now given. All Knitting Needles are measured in the circle close to the numbers. Tricot Needles the same, gauging by the stem.

[Illustration: UNCOTOPIC H. WALKER’S PATENT.]

H. WALKER,

Manufacturer to the Queen of Pins, Fish Hooks, Hooks & Eyes, Hair Pins, Thimbles, &c.

WAREHOUSE—GRESHAM STREET, LONDON, E.C. MANUFACTORY—ALCESTER.

[Illustration: BELL GAUGE]

H. WALKER’S NEEDLES have long enjoyed great popularity with those who value really good Needles. They have been greatly altered by Patented Improvements of a most important character.

H. WALKER’S PATENT PENELOPE CROCHETS have had so many imitations, it is necessary to repeat the request that all who wish for the true Needle will see that the word “Penelope” is on the handle.

The new Patent Uncotopic Handles to the Penelope Needles have the word “Uncotopic” on each, and persons who would avoid disappointment will please to observe these trade marks. The Uncotopic Handle keeps the Needle at all times in the true position for work, and is invaluable alike to a beginner, or to an accomplished worker.

[Illustration: H. Walker Needles

Fig. 1.

Fig. 2.]

The following is from "_The Engineer_," of May 4, 1859:—"Difficult as it may appear to entirely change the structure of so small an article, the figures above show what may be done even with the eye of a Needle.

"Fig. 1. A, is a ridge or slightly raised part before the eye; B, the eye; C, a groove beyond the eye into which the thread falls.

"Fig. 2 is a side view of the part A, B, C, showing the thread recessed as in sewing, when the usual pressure of the thimble drives the Needle with its thread at once through the cloth, affording relief of no ordinary character to the tailor or seampstress, and saving much of their time. We have submitted these Needles to a good judge of such articles, who has declared them superior to all others, not only as above stated, but particularly also with relation to facility of threading."

[Illustration:

CHRISTMAS PRESENTS AND NEW YEAR'S GIFTS FOR ALL WHO COURT THE GAY AND FESTIVE SCENES.]

ROWLANDS' MACASSAR OIL,

IS A DELIGHTFULLY FRAGRANT AND TRANSPARENT PREPARATION FOR THE HAIR.

And, as an invigorator and beautifier, beyond all precedent. It bestows a permanent gloss, with a silky softness, and a strong tendency to curl, and is the only known specific capable of effectually sustaining the Hair in decorative charm during the exercise of dancing, or the relaxing effects of crowded rooms. Prices 3s. 6d.; 7s. 10s. 6d.; equal to four small, and double that size, 21s. per bottle.

ROWLANDS' KALYDOR,

FOR THE SKIN AND COMPLEXION.

A balmy, odoriferous, creamy Liquid, as equally celebrated for safety in application as

UNEQUALLED FOR ITS RARE AND INESTIMABLE QUALITIES.

The radiant bloom it imparts to the cheek, the softness and delicacy which it induces of the hands and arms, its capability of soothing irritation, and removing cutaneous defects, discolourations, and all unsightly appearances render it

INDISPENSABLE TO EVERY TOILET.

Price 4s. 6d. and 8s. 8d. per bottle.

ROWLANDS' ODONTO,

OR PEARL DENTIFRICE.

A White Powder, compounded of the choicest and most _recherché_ ingredients of the Oriental Herbal, and of inestimable value in

PRESERVING AND IMPARTING

A PEARL-LIKE WHITENESS TO THE TEETH;

STRENGTHENING THE GUMS; AND IN GIVING A PLEASING FRAGRANCE TO THE BREATH.

Price 2s. 9d. per box.

Sold at 20, Hatton Garden, London, and by Chemists and Perfumers.

☞ _Ask for_ "ROWLANDS'" _articles_.

WALTER EVANS & CO.,

BOAR'S-HEAD COTTON MANUFACTORY,

DERBY,

MANUFACTURE THE FOLLOWING:—

SUPERIOR SIX CORD CROCHET COTTON, on Spools and in Skeins, for Sewing, Knitting, and Crochet Work. SUPERIOR SIX CORD SEWINGS, on Spools, soft finish, for Sewing Machines, &c. TATTING COTTON, on Spools. PATENT GLACE THREAD, in White, Black, and Colors, on Spools and Cards. TWO AND THREE CORD SEWINGS, on Spools, soft finish. SEWINGS in Balls. EMBROIDERING, KNITTING, MENDING, COTTON CORDS, AND SMALL CORDS.

[Illustration: 1862.

London Exhibition Prize Medal, Awarded “for very Strong & most superior Thread.”]

[Illustration: 1867.

Paris Universal Exhibition Gold Medal.]

NOTICE.

Mlle. Riego de la Branchardiere begs most gratefully to thank her correspondents for the kind letters she has received during sorrow and illness, and trusts that any omissions on her part will be excused now the cause is known.

She has also to inform them that for the future all her registered and copyright designs will be signed with her surname in full, she having hitherto used only the first as more convenient for business; but as she has reason to believe that there has been a recent infringement and use of her name, it has become advisable for her to vary her signature, otherwise she cannot so readily detect fraud.

Mlle. Riego de la Branchardiere must caution ladies against purchasing any of her designs without the whole signature, as she is informed by law it is against the purchaser only she must proceed in case it should be necessary to assert her rights.

Mlle. Riego’s ONLY Establishment is at 2, Old Quebec Street, London.

s. d.

The Complete Tatting Book 1 0 The Instruction Tatting Book 1 0 The Exhibition Tatting Book 1 0 The Royal Tatting Book 1 0 The Lace Tatting Book 1 0 The Etoile Tatting Book 1 0 The Pearl Tatting Book 1 0 The 6th Series Crochet Book 1 0 The Simple Tatting Book 0 6 The 18th Series Crochet Book 1 0 The 10th and 17th Series 1 6 The Useful Knitting Book 1 0 Winter Book for 1862 1 0 “Melange de Laine” 1 0 “Tricot Ecossais” 1 0 The Andalusian Knitting and Netting 1 0 Coloured Antimacassars 1 0 Tatting Edgings 0 6 La Mode Winter 0 6 The Book of Siberian Wool 0 6 The Child’s Winter Knitting 0 6

Entered at Stationers’ Hall.]

[The Author reserves the right of Translation.

==========

The Origin, Tendencies and Principles of Government

Victoria C. Woodhull

Project Gutenberg Release: January 08, 2022 · eBook #67127

[Illustration: _Victoria C Woodhull_]

THE ORIGIN, TENDENCIES AND PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT: OR, A REVIEW OF THE RISE AND FALL OF NATIONS FROM EARLY HISTORIC TIME TO THE PRESENT; WITH SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES AS THE REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD AND THE FORM OF ADMINISTRATION WHICH WILL SECURE THIS CONSUMMATION. ALSO, PAPERS ON HUMAN EQUALITY, AS REPRESENTED BY LABOR AND ITS REPRESENTATIVE, MONEY; AND THE MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE OF LIFE FROM A SCIENTIFIC STANDPOINT, WITH ITS PROPHECIES FOR THE GREAT FUTURE.

BY VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

NEW YORK: WOODHULL, CLAFLIN & CO., 44 BROAD STREET. 1871.

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1871, by VICTORIA C. WOODHULL, in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

FROM THE CO-OPERATIVE PRESS, 30 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

CONTENTS.

PAGE God in Creation, History and Government, 1

Constitution of the United States, 3

First Pronunciamento, 19

A Review of the General Situation, 23

Second Pronunciamento, 36

The Tendencies of Government, 41

Woman’s Idea of Government, 86

The Limits and Sphere of Government, 88

The Principles of Government, 109

Papers on Labor and Capital, 128

Paper on Finance and Commerce, 174

The Basis of Physical Life, 205

The Tendencies and Prophecies of the Present Age, 223

INTRODUCTORY.

Specializations have been characteristic of the present generation. Branches of science, philosophy or art have been selected and treated as though possessed of great and independent importance. The process of individuality has been the cause; but true evolution, whether in man or matter, consists in viewing whatever is presented for consideration as being related to all the rest, and as a part of the whole.

It will be evident to the careful reader that the various subjects contained in this volume were not originally prepared for this purpose. In several instances the same points receive consideration, which, while they perhaps interfere with the general consecutiveness of the entire work, would interfere still more with the construction of its parts, were they omitted. For this we have no other apology to offer.

Perhaps, however, an explanation is due for errors which have undoubtedly been passed unnoticed. During the publication we have been variously engaged and not able to devote the time actually requisite to reviewing a work of this character. Very much of the proof-reading has necessarily been intrusted to others, and we regret that some typographical errors have crept in. Those we have noticed are so evident they scarcely need be mentioned. In one case evolution has been rendered revolution; in another, evolve, revolve; in another, farce, force, etc. All who might desire to read part of this book may not care for other parts. Those who would find food for thought in “The Basis of Physical Life” might not care to inquire whether the governmental evolution of the world has been consistent and persistent; but we trust that everybody who takes up this book will carefully read “The Limits and Sphere and the Principles of Government,” and “Papers on Labor and Capital and Commerce,” for these immediately concern us all.

In introducing the Constitution of the United States and the late action in reference to human rights, it is hoped to meet in a manner the rapidly-growing demand for information upon the Woman Question, and in giving it the prominence of introducing the book to our readers, we trust to cause further inquiry into the subject of the equality of human rights. Asking the indulgence of an ever generous public we commit our effort to its care, with the hope that the Providence of God may approve it, and that it may benefit that humanity in whose cause I profess to labor.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL

NEW YORK, February 1, 1871.

GOD IN CREATION, IN HISTORY AND IN GOVERNMENT.

Almighty God! Who art alone first cause, Of all that Nature works through changeless laws, Maker and author of whate’er we see That lives Thy life amid eternity.

Look back ere time was, and the face of earth, Lifeless and still, was solitude and dearth; No lovely valleys and no hills sublime; No rocks or waters marked the hours of time.

Yet look again; behold the grass-clad hills, Dew-spangled, multitudinous with rills, Yet lifeless still: no reason and no sight, That in these many glories know delight.

Yet look again; field-beasts and birds of sky Range woods and glades mere hunger to supply; And time rolls onward, rocks grow old and gray, And Nature’s face is wrinkled with decay.

Yet look again; Creation’s fullness past, And one supreme is born. Man comes at last; Man, who to man is what God is to earth; God’s image in the soul; in form her birth.

Yet look again; Man reaches to his prime, Like God, creating through fixed laws and time, Must he not, too, through each gradation go, Reaching to higher passes from the low?

Is not our life breathed forth from God’s own breath? Once having lived, can we in truth know death? Each soul from birth until the final sleep, Must on God’s own fixed lines its travel keep.

Then, wherefore, with loud prayer and unctuous face, To brother say: “Ye run a foolish race To the abyss.” For how shall any know Whither God’s ministry shall make us go?

Doubt ye the power that governs everything That lovely earth from chaos forth did bring? Canst mark the line where ceases God’s command From work that’s done by man’s own shaping hand?

Forever, no! For man is but effect Of causes which the Father doth direct; Each act and thought and movement of his soul Hath source in God, the Infinite and Whole.

From earthly things man must his body feed; But doth not soul from Heaven its nurture need? His earthly frame bound earthward by fixed laws, Doth not the soul yearn for a heavenly cause?

Brothers to brothers linked, and each to all, Live we one life on this terrestrial ball; One life of those who live and those who die, Of those whom sight knows and whom memory.

Those elder brothers on that farther shore, Risen higher than we in wisdom and in lore, Send messages of knowledge and of love; But know we well that these come from above!

For angels' wisdom to the earth descends, And each fresh hour some bright, fresh wisdom sends; Each day some wonder of new lore displayed, Each year man's mind with triumph new arrayed.

Can mouldering relics, or can fossiled creeds, Provide the quickening age her mighty needs? Can codes, half dead, framed in days long gone by, The soul's new wants, so manifold, supply?

New palaces of Science, Faith and Truth, Tower o'er the humble dwellings of our youth. Shall rule and State, then, in their old ways stand, Denying Progress her supreme demand?

Yet stand they do, and with contemptuous pride, Fling Reason, Progress, Hope and Faith aside. Shall the soul's mighty yearnings thus have end? As well with words think God's own plans to bend.

Decrees are sealed in Heaven's own chancery, Proclaiming universal liberty. Rulers and Kings who will not hear the call, In one dread hour shall thunder-stricken fall.

So moves the growing world with march sublime, Setting new music to the beats of Time; Old things decay, and new things ceaseless spring, And God's own face is seen in everything.

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

ARTICLE I.

SEC. I.—All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. II.—1. The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year, by the people of the several States; and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature.

2. No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained the age of twenty-five years and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of the State in which he shall be chosen.

3. Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians, not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons. The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years in such manner as they shall by law direct. The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty thousand, but each State shall have at least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three; Massachusetts, eight; Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, one; Connecticut, five; New York, six; New Jersey, four; Pennsylvania, eight; Delaware, one; Maryland, six; Virginia, ten; North Carolina, five; South Carolina five, and Georgia, three.

4. When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

5. The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers, and shall have the sole power of impeachment.

SEC. III.—1. The Senate of the United States shall be composed two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

2. Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided, as equally as may be, into three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class

at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, that one-third maybe chosen every second year; and, if vacancies occur by resignation or otherwise, during the recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such vacancies.

3. No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he is chosen.

4. The Vice-President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote unless they be equally divided.

5. The Senate shall choose their other officers and also a President _pro tempore_, in the absence of the Vice-President or when he shall exercise the office of the President of the United States.

6. The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside; and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present.

7. Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend farther than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment according to law.

SEC. IV.—1. The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State, by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may, at any time, by law, make or alter such regulation, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year; and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

SEC. V.—1. Each House shall be judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members; and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business, but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent members, in such manner and under such penalties as each House may provide.

2. Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member.

3. Each House shall keep a journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may, in their judgment, require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the members of either House on any question, shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the journal.

4. Neither House, during the session of Congress, shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

SEC. VI.—1. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the treasury of the United States. They shall, in all cases, except for treason, felony and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to or returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House they shall not be questioned in any other place.

2. No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a member of either House, during his continuance in office.

SEC. VII.—1. All bills for raising revenues shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments, as on other bills.

2. Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves, he shall sign it; but if not, he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it must be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law. But in all such

cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays; and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill, shall be entered on the journal of each House respectively. If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress, by their adjournment, prevent its return; in which case it shall not be a law.

3. Every order, resolution, or vote, to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the face of a bill.

SEC. VIII.—The Congress shall have power—

1. To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; to pay the debts, and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States:

2. To borrow money on the credit of the United States:

3. To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes:

4. To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States:

5. To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures:

6. To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States:

7. To establish post-offices and post-roads:

8. To promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing, for limited times, to authors and inventors, the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries:

9. To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court; to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offences against the law of nations:

10. To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning capture on land and water:

11. To raise and support armies; but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years:

12. To provide and maintain a navy:

13. To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces:

14. To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection and repel invasions:

15. To provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia, according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

16. To exercise exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings:—And

17. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

SEC. IX.—1. The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight; but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation not exceeding ten dollars for each person.

2. The privilege of the writ of _habeas corpus_ shall not be suspended unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it.

3. No bill of attainder, or _ex-post facto_ law, shall be passed.

4. No capitation, or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

5. No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State. No preference shall be given, by any regulation of commerce or revenue, to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to or from one State, be obliged to enter, clear or pay duties in another.

6. No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement or account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money, shall be published from time to time.

7. No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States; and no persons holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.

SEC. X.—1. No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, _ex-post facto_ law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts; or grant any title of nobility.

2. No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws; and the net produce of all duties and imposts laid by any State on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress. No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

ARTICLE II.

SEC. I.—1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and together with the Vice-President, chosen for the same term, be elected as follows:

2. Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in Congress; but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

3. [Annulled. See Amendments, Art. XII.]

4. The Congress may determine the time of choosing the elector, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.

5. No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office, who shall not have attained to the age of thirty-five years, and been fourteen years a resident within the United States.

6. In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice-President; and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice-President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

7. The President shall at stated times receive, for his services, a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected; and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States or any of them.

8. Before he enter on the execution of his office he shall take the following oath or affirmation:

“I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.”

SEC. II.—1. The President shall be Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into actual service of the United States; he may require the opinion in writing of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices; and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardon for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

2. He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the consent and advice of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law. But the Congress may, by law, vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

3. The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

SEC. III.—He shall, from time to time, give to the Congress information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States.

SEC. IV.—1. The President, Vice-President and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

ARTICLE III.

SEC. I.—1. The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may, from time to time, ordain and establish. The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

SEC. II.—1. The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the United States shall be a party; to controversies between two or more States, between a State and citizens of another State, between citizens of different States, between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States, and between a State or the citizens thereof, and foreign States, citizens or subjects.

2. In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress may make.

3. The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.

SEC. II.—1. Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.

2. The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason; but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attainted.

ARTICLE IV.

SEC. I.—1. Full faith and credit shall be given, in each State, to the public acts, records and judicial proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may, by general laws, prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceeding, shall be proved, and the effect thereof.

SEC. II.—1. THE CITIZENS OF EACH STATE SHALL BE ENTITLED TO ALL PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS IN THE SEVERAL STATES.

2. A person charged in any State with treason, felony or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime.

3. No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.

SEC. III.—1. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State, nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislature of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress.

2. The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States or of any particular State.

SEC. IV.—THE UNITED STATES SHALL GUARANTEE TO EVERY STATE IN THIS UNION A REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT, AND SHALL PROTECT EACH OF THEM AGAINST INVASION; AND, ON APPLICATION OF THE LEGISLATURE, OR OF THE EXECUTIVE (WHEN THE LEGISLATURE CANNOT BE CONVENED), AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

ARTICLE V.

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution; or, on the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, shall, in any manner, affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; AND THAT NO STATE, WITHOUT ITS CONSENT, SHALL BE DEPRIVED OF ITS EQUAL SUFFRAGE IN THE SENATE.

ARTICLE VI.

1. All debts contracted, and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

2. This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby; anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

3. The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and executive and judicial officers both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office, or public trust, under the United States.

ARTICLE VII.

The ratification of the convention of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same.

GEORGE WASHINGTON, President.

WILLIAM JACKSON, Secretary.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

ARTICLE II.

A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

ARTICLE III.

No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner; nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

ARTICLE IV.

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated; and no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

ARTICLE V.

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service, in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject, for the same offence, to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall he be compelled, in any criminal case, to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

ARTICLE VI.

In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for the defence.

ARTICLE VII.

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved; and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of the common law.

ARTICLE VIII.

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

ARTICLE IX.

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

ARTICLE X.

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

ARTICLE XI.

The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign State.

ARTICLE XII.

1. The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President; and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which list they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted; the person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no one has such majority, then, from the persons having the highest numbers, not exceeding three, on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President, whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.

2. The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have a majority, then, from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice.

3. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

ARTICLE XIII.

If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive or retain any title of nobility or honor, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office or emolument, of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them or either of them.

ARTICLE XIV.

1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

2. Representatives shall be appointed among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed; but whenever the right to vote at any election for electors of President and Vice-President, or for United States Representatives in Congress, executive and judicial officers, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in that State.

3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, elector of President or Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath as member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State Legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof; but Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for the payment of pensions and bounties for service in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned, but neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave, but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

ARTICLE XV.

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color or previous conditions of servitude.

[Revised from the New York Herald of April 2, 1870.]

FIRST PRONUNCIAMENTO.

The disorganized condition of parties in the United States at the present time affords a favorable opportunity for a review of the political situation and for comment on the issues which are likely to come up for settlement in the Presidential election in 1872. As I happen to be the most prominent representative of the only unrepresented class in the republic, and perhaps the most practical exponent of the principles of equality, I request the favor of being permitted to address the public through the medium of the _Herald_. While others of my sex devoted themselves to a crusade against the laws that shackle the women of the country, I asserted my individual independence; while others prayed for the good time coming, I worked for it; while others argued the equality of woman with man, I proved it by successfully engaging in business; while others sought to show that there was no valid reason why women should be treated, socially and politically, as being inferior to man, I boldly entered the arena of politics and business and exercised the rights I already possessed. I therefore claim the right to speak for the unenfranchised women of the country, and believing as I do that the prejudices which still exist in the popular mind against women in public life will soon disappear, I now announce myself as candidate for the Presidency.

I am quite well aware that in assuming this position I shall evoke more ridicule than enthusiasm at the outset But this is an epoch of sudden changes and startling surprises. What may appear absurd to-day will assume a serious aspect to-morrow. I am content to wait until my claim for recognition as a candidate shall receive the calm consideration of the press and the public. The blacks were cattle in 1860; a negro now sits in Jeff Davis' seat in the United States Senate. The sentiment of the country was, even in 1863, against negro suffrage; now the negro's right to vote is acknowledged by the constitution of the United States. Let those, therefore, who ridiculed the negro's claim to exercise the right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and who lived to see him vote and hold high public office, ridicule the aspirations of the women of the country for complete political equality as much as they please. They cannot roll back the rising tide of reform. The world moves.

That great Governmental changes were to follow the enfranchisement of the negro I have long foreseen. While the curse of slavery covered the land progress was enchained, but when it was swept away in the torrent of war, the voice of justice was heard, and it became evident that the last weak barrier against complete political and social equality must soon give way. All that has been said and written hitherto, in support of equality for women has had its proper effect on the public mind, just as the anti-slavery speeches before secession were effective; but a candidate and a policy are required to prove it. Lincoln's election showed the strength of the feeling against the peculiar institution; my candidacy for the Presidency will, I confidently expect, develop the fact that the principles of equal rights for all have taken deep root. The advocates of political equality for women have, besides a respectable known strength, a great undercurrent of unexpressed power, which is only awaiting a fit opportunity to show itself. By the general and decided test I propose, we shall be able to understand the woman question aright, or at least have done much toward presenting the issue involved in proper shape. I claim to possess the strength and courage to be the subject of that test, and look forward confidently, to a triumphant issue of the canvass.

The present position of political parties is anomalous. They are not inspired by any great principles of policy or economy. Political preachers paw the air; there is no live issue up for discussion. The only seemingly distinctive feature upon which a complete and well-defined diversion exists, is on the dead issue of negro equality, and this is to the political leaders a harp of a thousand strings.

The minor questions of the hour do not affect parties as such, and no well-defined division of sentiment exists. A great national question is wanted, to prevent a descent into pure sectionalism. That question exists in the issue, whether woman shall remain sunk below the right granted to the negro, or be elevated to all the political rights enjoyed by man. The simple issue whether woman

should not have this complete political equality with the negro is the only one to be tried, and none more important is likely to arise before the Presidential election. But besides the question of equality others of great magnitude are necessarily included. The platform that is to succeed in the coming election must enunciate the _general_ principles of enlightened justice and economy.

A complete reform in our system of prison discipline, having specially in view the welfare of the families of criminals, whose labor should not be lost to them; the rearrangement of the system and control of internal improvements; the adoption of some better means for caring for the helpless and indigent; the establishment of strictly mutual and reciprocal relations with all foreign Powers who will unite to better the condition of the productive class, and the adoption of such principles as shall recognize this class as the true wealth of the country, and give it a just position beside capital, thus introducing a practical plan for universal government upon the most enlightened basis, for the actual, not the imaginary benefit of mankind.

These important changes can only be expected to follow a complete departure from the beaten tracks of political parties and their machinery; and this, I believe my canvass of 1872 will effect.

That the people are sick of the present administration and the principles it professes to sustain, is a proposition, I think, that does not require to be argued; but as I have now taken a decided stand against its continuance for another term of four years, and offered myself as a candidate for the Presidential succession, a few preliminary observations on the general management of our home and foreign policy will not be out of place. The present administration has been a failure from the beginning; weak, vacillating and deficient in moral courage, it commands neither the respect nor admiration of foreign Powers nor receives the active support of its party. The general management of our foreign and domestic affairs does not seem to have risen to the dignity of a policy; though it be allowed to have been consistent in its various parts, it has been destitute of that decision and firmness which characterized the victorious soldier who is now President.

A decided Cuban policy would not only have settled at once the inevitable destiny of that island, but would also have given republican sentiment in Spain an impetus, strengthened the South American republics and exercised a healthy influence in Mexico and Canada. But instead of this we have to submit to the consequences of a policy of cowardice. American citizens abroad are murdered by Spanish cut-throats, our consuls are insulted, and our flag is disgraced. This is unworthy of the American nation, and the people will hold Grant accountable. A giant who never shows his strength is neither feared nor respected. On the important questions of taxation, the tariff and the public debt, the administration seems to have no settled policy. Taxation, whether for the support of the Government or the payment of the debt, should in all cases be general and never special. No special interest, nor several special interests, should be singled out to sustain an extra proportion of taxation. And in regard to the tariff the same principle should be enforced. Whether the public debt be a blessing or a curse, it exists. Created to save the republic, it must be paid strictly according to both the spirit and the letter of the law. But there is no immediate necessity for paying it off. By a proper policy its payment might be made to extend through a hundred years, for even beyond that time will the benefits its creation produced be felt and appreciated. In older countries the pressure of national debt becomes a heavier charge and a mightier burden every succeeding year, but with us this is reversed. The development of our magnificent resources will render the gradual payment of our indebtedness easier of accomplishment with each decade of time.

All other questions, whether of a foreign or domestic nature, stand illustrated by the Cuban policy of the administration. A bold, firm and, withal, consistent national policy, if not at all times strictly within the conservative limits of international law, will always command the respect and support of the people.

With the view of spreading to the people ideas which hitherto have not been placed before them, and which they may, by reflection, carefully amplify for their own benefit, I have written several papers on Governmental questions of importance and will submit them in due order. For the present the foregoing must suffice. I anticipate criticism; but however unfavorable the comment this letter may evoke I trust that my sincerity will not be called in question. I have deliberately and of my own accord placed myself before the people as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, and having the means, courage, energy and strength necessary for the race, intend to contest it to the close.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

A VIEW OF THE GENERAL SITUATION.

NEW YORK, November 10, 1870.

In national as well as in individual affairs, it is well to occasionally take an exact account of the situation in which we are; to balance “our general books,” to see whether the balance is to the “debit or credit” or “profit and loss,” and to decide from the results obtained whether satisfactory progress has been made. As nothing more than “a journal” of such affairs as we shall take into the account has been kept, it will be our duty to “post” these affairs into a new “ledger” from existing “journals,” and also to enter up the new balances which we may find standing to the several accounts.

At no time since the close of the Revolutionary War has there been a time more fitting and inviting for such a work. The whole world is in a ferment, which was begun by the terrific strife into which the course of events forced us, and from which we have just emerged through the reconstruction of an almost demolished Governmental structure. Not all of the legitimate results of that strife are even yet externally apparent, either in our own country or in the world at large. There are various undercurrents, eddies and outcroppings which have never been taken into any consideration; but when considered, the destiny of this country, so long foreshadowed, but which was pretty nearly eclipsed, shines forth more clearly brilliant than ever before.

Whatever may have been the arguments favorable for the continuance of the institution of slavery, the destruction of it has rendered them nugatory, and but few of those who once used them could now be found to favor its resurrection. The atmosphere is cleared of the cloud it was draped with, under its influence, and the radiant sun of freedom now shines for all, and the star of hope our night was illumined by shall now no more be dimmed by the dense fogs that were wont to arise from its then already decaying carcass. With its destruction the lives of two great political parties passed away, and left the people with no distinct lines of demarkation. It is true that there bodies still exist, but the process of disintegration is rapidly going on, and the stench of their decay fills the nostrils of all whose senses are rendered acute by the intensifying power of intuitive perception.

Creation is from one point toward one purpose, the extremes of which course, are beyond the comprehension of human ken. Any fact in the line of its progress may be considered, and the relations it bears to contemporaneous facts determined. A fact isolated from all connections loses its significance. The comparison of a fact with other facts forms the basis of all relative knowledge, and the further this comparison is extended, the wider the range of this knowledge becomes: while an infinite series of facts constitutes the sum total of creation.

Hence, to obtain a substantially correct knowledge of the present, the facts of it must not only be considered as facts of the present, but their relations to, and dependencies upon prior facts, out of which they arose, must be traced, so that it may be determined why they exist. It is not sufficient to simply assert that this or that is thus or so. To do so carries no conviction nor prophetic knowledge of what must be next, as a necessary sequence. But if a retrospective glance be taken of the causes that produced it, it is thus demonstrated why it is thus. If the demonstration is placed with the fact, and their tendencies are examined, it may be fair to conclude that what they may next lead to, may be in a measure predicated. The chief value, then, of an intimate knowledge of the past is, that from it the future may be foreseen, and that the lesson it teaches may assist in the formation of aids to the natural order of things.

If a tree or plant is desired in a certain place, for a certain purpose, its growth is promoted by all the means which experience has demonstrated will assist. All other growths that draw from the same source for supplies, and thereby diminish its fountain of supplies, are destroyed; the weeds are uprooted, and if the natural supplies which the earth and air furnish are not sufficient for its demands, that which is lacking is supplied. The same line of action should govern in the various departments of nature, and especially in the higher departments of mind.

There is another consideration that should never be lost sight of when a survey of the situation is to be attempted; and this is, that while the facts which are to be passed upon bear special relations to their immediate predecessors and surroundings, that these with them bear certain definite, general relations to the facts of all past time, and to those that will be in all future time. The present is a part of the common order of the universe, extending infinitely backward and forward—a part of the line of evolvement, neither end of which can be compassed by human mind; and if we would learn well, we must learn all there is to learn regarding what we learn.

It is a definite and unanswerable proposition, then, that every nation of which we have historic record, was a result of pre-existing causes, and led to further effects, and that each filled and performed a part, especially its own, which was a natural and necessary result of the time and place it existed in. By a careful study of the rise and fall of each of the great nations that have existed and an analytic comparison of the elements of strength and decay that were prominent therein, and of their relations to each other, just deductions as to what the present will lead to, may be arrived at. If the present is the result of the past, the future must be the result

of the present, and like it be the experiences of creation in the process of evolution from the infinite to the infinite.

Government, standing forth prominently as the grandest of all human conceptions and realizations, has in all times been the representative of civilization, and the principal means of its diffusion. Bearing this impress of importance, it may be well to examine the real significance of the term, or to find the relations it sustains to society. One fact meets us wherever we may search in the past—the fact of government Though it is one of the universal necessities and accompaniments of existence, it is extremely doubtful if its composition is realized to any considerable extent. Government means control—implies power. No people can create government because they cannot create power. An existing power may be organized into form by a people, and this becomes their government. This power is not in the individuals who exercise it, they are simply its servants. It is not the people who organize or consent to it; they are simply represented by it. It is above individuals, and is independent of peoples, though its channels of operation may be modified by individuals and peoples. Thus come all governments, while revolutions are the results of the outworking of principles, through peoples, who are their representatives. When analyzed, it thus appears that governments are independent of peoples, and always exist in some form while peoples come and pass away.

It is problematically true, that China was the first nation that arrived at a system of government at all removed from brute, individual force, and historically so, that there always was a westward tendency to empire. After China, India; then Assyria, Egypt, Persia, Greece, Rome, general Europe and America. Each one of these nations, to Rome, was the result of the course of events, begun in China, to the course of which each succeeding one added its experiences. The progress of this course of events has encircled the world. It can go no further westward without crossing the Pacific and beginning again in China. What is the significance of this fact, or has it no special indications? It is evident that the old order of nature has completed a cycle, and that a new order will be commenced, and that, the new order is to spring from this country, and consequently, that we are its representatives. This is made doubly plain, when we refer to the fact that Asiatic tendencies are now eastward, and that John Chinaman is the new competition our laboring classes have to encounter.

It cannot be expected that the new order of events, we, as a country are inaugurating, will be characterized by the element of the old, just completed. It had its mission to perform. It accomplished it, and has passed away. Its fruit is our Government and the civilization of the present. A new mission begins. Are there any sources from which its character may be predicated? Though the creation has completed another cycle of progressive development, the common course of nature never stops. Therefore the same common order prevails now, that did when the planes of Iran poured forth its people westward.

One of the principal features of natural events has been a tendency on the part of all great nations to acquire universal dominion. Each in turn attempted it and failed, because of the imperfectly developed form of the government they sought to control by. What are the evidences that all future forms may not fail from similar causes, or specially, that the form we represent will not fail?

The first and most important evidence is, that in its organic principles the Brotherhood of the Human Race is recognized. All men are born free and equal, does not mean that all men born in the United States are free and equal, but that all men everywhere are. This, then, is the basis idea upon which our Government is built; whether the structure is yet perfect or not the foundation is, and can never be overturned. There can be no higher proposition upon which to build; therefore additions, tending to perfectability, must be made upon this foundation.

Another evidence is, that the world is becoming Americanized: that is, the world is assimilating to the American idea of freedom and equality. How and why? The vast populations other countries have transplanted to our soil are in constant communication with friends they left behind, who thus catch the spirit of equality and freedom, and become imbued with the spirit of our institutions, and thus involuntarily become like us, while still subjects of other powers.

All nations contribute to our strength, and by so doing render us not only peculiarly American in character, but cosmopolitan to the world. We are not only American, but European, Asiatic and African; while each of these are becoming American. We are, therefore, the centre of attraction for the world, and the world involuntarily recognizes our superior strength by giving up its population to increase it; while we repay it, not in physical strength, but with progressive and comprehensive ideas. In accordance with these facts, patent to every one, it is asserted, that The World is becoming Americanized, and that this is an evidence that the form of government by which we tend to universal control is founded on those general principles which give it that permanency, which insures its continuance until it shall become universal.

If the order of civilization is observed the same deduction will be arrived at The material universe has had its geologic periods The social has had and will have its periods to correspond. Nature maintains a regular and consistent order everywhere. It is the degree

that this order is understood, by the general mind, that constitutes the sociologic periods of the world. The first era of civilization was inaugurated by the Assyrian and Egyptian empires, more especially the latter, more than 2000 years B. C.

This civilization began to spread in the barbaric world immediately after the famous conquests of Sesostris, and continued during the time of the Persian, Grecian and Roman empires, culminating with the downfall of the latter, and thus completing the order of civilization made possible by Egypt. Egypt conquered and levied tribute upon the barbarian. Rome conquered, and the barbarian became the Roman citizen. The present configuration of Europe rose from the ruins of Rome, and assumed the form through which a greater variety of power could operate than in the previous era.

No part of the world but has felt the mighty modifying influence of the civilizing power of modern Europe. It has permeated the entire temperate zone, penetrated the frozen latitudes north and south, and attacked the Hottentot of Central Africa and the Bushman of Australia. It organized legislation, perfected and maintained administration and made it possible for all minds to attain individuality, and for individuals, as such, to rise by personal merit, even from the lowest strata of society. By its procreative power a new continent, full of native purity and vitality, conceived, and a higher degree of life than it represented burst upon the startled world.

In the first era, it was one controlling mind operating for personal ends and aggrandizement; in the second, it was several, operating for the same end; in the third, it will be all minds merged in one channel, to operate for the good of the whole. The first was personal civilization thrust upon the barbarism of the world compelling it into servility; the second was sectional civilization exerting its influence, first upon its immediate subjects, and through them upon others less advanced; the third shall be general civilization, in which the utmost parts of the earth can join in one grand and common effort for mutual advancement, its peoples having risen to the recognition of the greatest of all human facts—the common brotherhood of mankind.

From these general observations the tendencies in the order of the universe must be inferred, and if there is any inference possible to be drawn, which will coincide with the present aspect of affairs, it is, that upon this country devolves the duty, no less than the privilege, of presenting the world with a form of administrative government that shall be possessed of the elements of perfection and duration; and this brings us down to the consideration, whether this general indication of the centuries does coincide with the condition in which the world is to-day.

Europe contains but four positive determining powers: Russia, Prussia, France and England, while the remainder of the Eastern Continent is unrepresented. The Western Continent contains the United States. France and Prussia have been the contending parties for simple European supremacy: the former probably also entertaining an ulterior design upon Africa. The policy of England and Russia is more comprehensive, and undoubtedly includes the possibility of a consolidated Continent. Consistent with this view, England is performing in India what Cæsar did in Gaul; and Russia, in Western Asia, what Rome did in “The East.” They comprehend that every nation is an object upon which change is indelibly stamped, and that it will remain so until some one of them shall arrive at a perfect system of government, which shall be the pattern for all government, or which shall absorb all government. These countries labor under one insurmountable difficulty. All the effort they expend to carry their policies abroad detracts just so much from their actual home strength, and they have no fountain, furnishing supplies to make good their expenditure, and they thus expand at the expense of vitality.

Notwithstanding this great difficulty, Russian supremacy might be a consistent conclusion, could the fact of the rapid diffusion of principles antagonistic to monarchy be left out of the consideration; but considered, as it necessarily must be, the legitimate conclusion is entirely different. It is too well known what sentiments lie suppressed in various parts of continental Europe—in Poland, Hungary, Italy, France, Germany, Spain and England—to ever make it possible that the common order of advancement should so change as to compel the general mind from general freedom toward absolute monarchy, as represented by Russia, or to any monarchy represented by any of the nations of Europe. The common course of events will not so change, but it will continue in the direction of general freedom, not only in Europe but over the entire continent. Considering the progress this sentiment has already made in connection with events which are transpiring in Europe, it is not presuming very much to say that it will ultimately convert Western and Central Europe into great republics, represented by the Latin and the Teuton.

So much for the special situation of Europe proper, as connected with its local policies. England and Russia have further reaching pretensions, and, by so having, their policies become intermingled with American policies.

The processes of civilization are soon to receive accelerating powers in Asia. England, by virtue of her great commercial influence, has already exerted very considerable modifying effect upon the vast population of India. China, by its fickle action regarding foreigners resident there, is claiming the attention of all interested countries, in such manner as will undoubtedly force these

countries to use some other than moral suasion to compel its people to the common usages of the civilized world. Thus barbarism invites the elements which ultimately transform it into general worldly utility.

With China, the United States has more intimate connection, by reason of recent scientific progress, and, with England, will divide the honor of civilizing Eastern Asia. American influence, however, will be the preponderant influence, for the Chinese are attracted to this country, and the genius of our institutions cannot fail to react through such as come here upon China itself. While this process of evolution is going on in Eastern Asia, Russia will be effecting the same purposes in Western Asia, and thus these three nations will in due course of time reclaim the most densely populated part of the world and add it to the sum total of civilization.

There is a very important and highly suggestive inference to be drawn from the tendency the peoples of Europe have been exhibiting during the past few years. Italian unity has been accomplished, and German unity is about to be accomplished. It is not to be supposed that this process will stop short of further consolidations. Continental Europe is Latin and Teuton, and Slav, and this process cannot well cease until these are united under their respective governments. When this shall have been accomplished, thrones and crowns will have done their work, and the peoples will be ready to erect the Latinic, the Teutonic, and the Slavonic Republics, three mighty nations which could in peace and quiet pursue their respective appointments in the path of progress, until a necessity should arise for a still wider and more comprehensive unity, in which, under one head, the three should be united. They who have studied the general tendencies of governmental evolution cannot doubt but such a consummation awaits Continental Europe, nor that Asia is destined to be regenerated as above shadowed forth.

If such be the course events must take, what is the lesson to be gathered by that part of the world's people who speak the English language? The location of the countries they inhabit does not so readily point to unity, but all their interests will compel it. The nations of the world instinctively seek equality of power, or rather, they seek to keep pace with each other in acquiring power. In view of the prospective union of the three dominant races in Continental Europe, where shall England look for her compensating power, except it be in a unity of all peoples speaking the English Language?

It is true that in this Western Continent there is a new race being built up, in whose composition all other races are destined to become blended, and which will inevitably be the dominant and the absorbing future race of the world. However, in the mean time, England's only hope for the retention of an existence, or at least of any general power, will be to unite its peculiar national characteristics to the younger and more rapidly changing peoples of America. There might be reasons without number adduced in support of the suggested course, while valid ones against it cannot be found. The power such a nation would represent would be one that neither nor all of the prospective Continental European countries could hinder from pursuing its predestined work in Asia and Africa, to which latter division enterprise is just being attracted by the discovery of immense diamond countries, which are first offered as the necessary temptation to draw people to it, who shall afterward find other riches than precious stones within its virgin soil, as other than golden wealth has been found in California.

Thus, in as comprehensive a manner as possible, is presented the present general situation and its evident tendencies, which bring us to the special consideration of the present condition of the country, which, of all countries, is destined to play the most prominent part in the third order of civilization—the United States of America.

We have just arisen mightier than ever from a civil war which was intended by the world's conservatism to destroy us, and with a population of forty millions we step at once into the front ranks of, and into the lead in, the grand march of progress. Our Government is a nearer approach to a popular form, and more nearly allied to true freedom and justice than any other in existence. We have, however, only to review the causes which led to the civil war to see how far we still are from a perfect form.

This war was either a necessary result of existing causes or else it was a great national blunder. Many who recognize no order or law in the progress of civilization, deny both these propositions, and affirm that the war was produced solely by the personal ambition of party leaders, representing the _pro_ and _con._ of the institution of slavery. If the matter is viewed from the standpoint of the science of society, each one of these propositions is relatively true, but neither is absolutely so. The war was the necessary result of the growth of the principles of freedom within the general mind, in antagonism to special, local interests, which evidences that it did arise naturally, out of the existing conditions, while the individuals who were prominent upon either side may be considered as responsible for precipitating it. Those who stood by, constituting much the larger proportion of the representative men of the nation, and observed the growth of the conflict between the two extremes, without stepping in to control the situation, place it altogether in the light of a great national blunder or crime. Had the circumstances been controlled by this large third party, the first proposition would have been true, and yet the war have been prevented.

We are obliged to speak relatively of relative things, and to consider facts, isolated from the general sum of all facts, and in a special sense, and in this sense the war was an enormous national blunder, and should have been averted by a bold grasping and control of the circumstances on the part of the Government and those whose _duty_ it was to have known what the result would be. These servants of the people, to whom was intrusted the welfare of the country, were utterly false and faithless, and allowed us to be precipitated, entirely unprepared, into a fratricidal war which cost the common country millions of lives and billions of treasure.

How much better would it have been had the situation been understood and controlled; had the Government shown itself competent to meet it; had it raised armies and occupied the disaffected country and then abolished slavery, which it was finally obliged to do, but which could have been done previously without the sacrifice of life and wealth. Such action would have exhibited the highest order of statesmanship and would have been the admiration of ages.

This examination of the causes which led to the war is made to show, that in our system of government as now administered, there is no responsibility anywhere, and if we drift into danger and destruction no one is accountable; and also, that it is the habitual practice, to evade issues which press for solution, by dodging along with small expedients, hoping the issues themselves will die out or pass away. This has been true of us as a government since corruption first began to find its emissaries among our legislators, and since, it has continually grown more and more decidedly a feature of its administration, until to-day we stand a gigantic nation without giving any indication that we realize our power or that we have any national policy other than to be quite certain that we do not interfere with any of the nice arrangements of other nations, or that we do not lend struggling freedom a sympathetic helping hand, such as we first acquired life by.

By whom are our legislative halls filled? Do we find any Jeffersons, Jacksons, Hamiltons, Bentons, Websters or Clays among them? No! As a rule, to which, however, there a few most honorable exceptions, there are all small men with ideas no more comprehensive than the districts or States they represent, and who make the purposes of personal gain the mainspring of all their actions. What can such men thus employed, know of a great nation’s power; or what her policy should be?

There have been two great political divisions of the people called Republican and Democratic, the issue between which, grew entirely out of the slavery question and its sequel, War and Reconstruction. These issues are all settled. Slavery can never more be made a party issue. All efforts that have been made to galvanize it into life have proved futile. The Democratic party leaders have pretty nearly given up the issue as utterly dead, though many of the rank and file still mouth “the nigger.” The Republican party has absolutely nothing to make it hold together except possession of place and power, which in these times of levying official taxation is no inconsiderable advantage. As for issues and policies, both parties absolutely lack them. The Democratic and Republican parties exist to-day in opposition to each other, simply and solely because they were opposed to each other upon the issues now dead. No live issues divide them. All of these which are before the people find advocates and opposers in both ranks, so that in reality there are no political parties in existence which represent any question to be solved or settled. Nothing could be more appropriate in the political musterings and parades of either party than that upon their banners should be inscribed—

WANTED, A POLICY.

It is evident, if another Presidential canvass passes over, that some grand issue must come up to give the people inspiration, and which will be of such character as to _divide_ them, not such as would _unite_ them unanimously; for to this last condition, it is to be feared, we have not yet arrived _though there may be such things arise as will command as much unanimity_ as Washington commanded; but this could not be, _except revolution_ occurs and it becomes the result of it.

With a young intelligence such as we represent, no old issues can be made to divide parties. Upon such questions as have heretofore been made the distinguishing features of political parties, there should be no misunderstanding. That there is, demonstrates that the principles of government have not been taught to the people. It teaches that party leaders have built up theories which lack the support of science and principle; and in this way all those issues upon which the permanent vitality of the country depends have been put before the people, colored and trimmed to suit their prejudices and to shape parties into opposition. Were all of these issues taught to the people as the legitimate deduction of the science of government, and entirely bereft of partisanship, they would all work together for the obtaining of more, greater and better conditions and privileges. To bring about this course for the people is the object of the science of society which is just beginning to be recognized.

There are but three principles by which all questions should be tested: Freedom, Equality and Justice; and when legislation shall be brought to the test of these, and entirely abstracted from partisanship, there will not be very much further legislation to be performed. All questions now undecided, which still remain before the people, such as those of finance, commerce, revenue,

internal improvements, and international policy, should have the touchstone of these principles applied, and they should be decided thereby. It should be asked of them, What course do you point out which will be consistent with freedom, which shall not interfere with equality, and which shall be just to everybody? We venture to assert that, tried by these tests, not a single line of policy which is now being pursued by the Government will stand. Surely its financial policy cannot; for what is there in it which is consistent with the constitutional question of freedom? Surely its revenue, its tariff system, cannot, for what is there in either which is not in direct antagonism with equality?—while we may look in vain for even the skeleton of justice wherever money can find its way.

All this is true, and very much more, and it comes of the departure of legislation and administration from the fundamental propositions of the Constitution. It is also true that such conditions cannot last. The people, as a whole, are not entirely unregenerate, though so many of their self-appointed leaders are. It only remains for the people to become fully aroused to the depths of corruption to which legislation and administration have been carried to demand and obtain the needed redress. This corruption is not confined to Government, but it has permeated nearly all corporate organizations, many of which are organized specially to defraud the productive classes of their hard-earned wealth. The possibility of this being done is because our system of finance is entirely wrong, and nothing will save the country from general financial and commercial ruin except complete revolution in this system. If the ruin comes it will ultimately fall upon the producing classes. In other words, the producing interests of the country cannot sustain the inflation of prices which has been brought about by speculation, in alliance with fraud, which are the ruling spirits of the day.

It may be said that such radical changes as will depose the powers which rule us, and inaugurate the reign of principles, which will secure freedom, equality and justice to every power, cannot yet be introduced. We aver that they can; and further, we aver that unless it is done, revolution such as has never yet been known will inaugurate them for us. The whole substrata of society is seething and foaming with pent-up endurance of injustice and wrong, and unless those abuses which have produced this condition are remedied at once, the existence of the Government cannot be counted upon. And it is criminal to seek to ignore this fact. We must not “lie supinely upon our backs while the enemy binds us hand and foot,” and delivers us to destruction.

In view, then, of our destiny as a nation, and in view of the position which the order of events seems to have assigned us, we are called upon to put our Government in perfect order before the constructive part of the work of the third part of the order of civilization is to be begun. We must be perfect within ourselves before we can expect to become the pattern for others, or expect that others will gravitate to us. THE REVIEW OF THE GENERAL SITUATION, then, results in the finding that the process of diffusive government has culminated, and that the process of a continuously constructive and concentrating government has already been begun, in which our Government, as the most progressive representative of the principles upon which a perfect government can alone exist, is assigned the leading position, and that we, recognizing this assignment, should proceed to assume the responsibilities and the duties which legitimately flow from it; and they are great in the same degree that our destiny is great.

It was under the realization of what our destiny should be that the Pronunciamento of April 2, 1870, in the New York _Herald_, was made; and now, having offered this general review, my Second Pronunciamento, which is supplementary to and the completing of the first, is laid before the people. It is believed that the policy and principles underlying it, proclaimed therein, will be the final departure necessary to be made, as the point from which progress will be continued, until the grand realization of the prophecies of all ages is fulfilled, when all nations, kindred and tongues shall be united in one harmonious family, they having risen into the full knowledge of the truth, that whether we be Christian or Pagan, Greek or Roman, Atheist or Spiritualist, we are all the children of one common Father, God, whom we shall ever worship as the Creator, Ruler and Final Destiny of the Universe.

SECOND PRONUNCIAMENTO.

CONSTITUTIONAL EQUALITY THE LOGICAL RESULT OF THE XIV. AND XV. AMENDMENTS, WHICH NOT ONLY DECLARE WHO ARE CITIZENS, BUT ALSO DEFINE THEIR RIGHTS, ONE OF WHICH IS THE RIGHT TO VOTE, WITHOUT REGARD TO SEX, BOTH SEXES BEING INCLUDED IN THE MORE COMPREHENSIVE PROHIBITORY TERMS OF RACE AND COLOR.

THE STATE LAWS WHICH PROSCRIBED WOMEN AS VOTERS WERE REPEALED BY THE STATES WHEN THEY RATIFIED SAID AMENDMENTS—THERE ARE NO EXISTING OPERATIVE LAWS WHICH PROSCRIBE THE RIGHT OF ANY CITIZEN TO VOTE—THE PERFECTED FRUITS OF THE LATE WAR—THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES IS BOUND TO PROTECT ITS CITIZENS, MALE AND FEMALE, IN THE EXERCISE OF THEIR RIGHT TO VOTE—THE DUTY OF CONGRESS IN THE PREMISES.

The time has now arrived when it becomes proper to present the final and unanswerable proposition, which cannot by any possibility be controverted, that the several States which, until recently, assumed and exercised the right of defining which of its citizens should exercise the right to vote, have by their own voluntary act not only forever repealed all such prohibitory laws, but also have forever barred their re-enactment.

Of this I have been fully aware since the proclamation by the President that the XV. Amendment had become a part of the Organic Law of the country.

To bring the whole matter properly before the public I published an address on the 2d of April last, in which I announced myself a candidate for the Presidency in 1872, and thus asserted the right of woman to occupy the highest office in the gift of the people.

After that address had had its legitimate effect in arousing the press of the country to the realization that women are a constituent part of the body politic, and to a discussion in a much more general way than had ever been before, I published my second address to the people, announcing that the XVI. Amendment was a dead letter, and that the Constitution fully recognized the equality of all citizens.

In this address the general bearings of the Constitution were examined, and from the blending of its various parts the conclusion was arrived at that no State should deny the right to vote to any citizen.

I now take the final step, and show that the States themselves, by their legislative enactments, have removed the only obstacle which until then had prevented women from voting, and have forever debarred themselves from receding to their former position. It is as follows:

SUFFRAGE, or the right to vote, is declared by the XV. Article of Amendments to the Constitution to be a RIGHT, not a privilege, of citizens of the United States.

A right of a citizen is inherent in the individual, of which he cannot be deprived by any law of any State.

A privilege may be conferred upon the citizen of the State, and by it may be taken away. This distinction is made to show that _to vote is not a privilege_ conferred by a State upon its citizens, but a CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT of every citizen of the United States, of which they cannot be deprived. The language of the Constitution is most singularly emphatic upon this point. It is as follows:

ARTICLE XV.

1. _The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude._

It is thus forever proclaimed, in unmistakable terms, that _to vote is a right_ of citizens of the United States.

Were it an immunity, or even were it a privilege, to vote, those who possess it could not be deprived of it by any State, for the State is bound to protect every citizen within its jurisdiction in the exercise thereof. It being declared by the XV. Amendment that citizens of the United States have the right to vote, the next step to determine is, Who are citizens? This is also definitely, though for the first time, determined by Article XIV. of Amendments to the Constitution as follows:

ARTICLE XIV.

1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. _No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States._ Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, _nor deny to any person_ within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The next point of inquiry is, How is it that the State laws which formerly did proscribe women and exclude them from the exercise of suffrage, no longer _do_ so? Simply and effectively by this fact, that, by the adoption of the XV. Article of Amendments to the Constitution, the States established, as the “SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND,” the fact that no person born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof shall be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, of the RIGHT TO VOTE.

Women are citizens of the United States; and the States themselves, by their own voluntary act, have established the fact of their citizenship, and confirmed their right to vote, which, by such action, has become the supreme law of the land, which supersedes, annuls and abrogates all previous State laws inconsistent therewith or contravening the same. The XV. Article of Amendments to the Constitution is as much a part of it as any originally adopted; for Art VI., ¶ 2, says:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, _shall be_ THE SUPREME _law of_ THE LAND; and the _judges in_ EVERY _State shall_ BE BOUND THEREBY; anything in _the Constitution or laws_ OF ANY _State_ TO THE CONTRARY NOTWITHSTANDING.

The XV. Amendment was adopted by the several States as a legislative enactment by their Legislatures, under Art V., which provides:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, _shall propose amendments to this Constitution_; or, on the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, _which_, in either case, _shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution_, when _ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths thereof_ as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress, provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, shall, in any manner, affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; AND THAT NO STATE, WITHOUT ITS CONSENT, SHALL BE DEPRIVED OF ITS EQUAL SUFFRAGE IN THE SENATE.

Since, therefore, all citizens have the RIGHT TO VOTE under this act or participation by the Legislatures of the several States, all State Laws which abridge the right are inoperative, null and void, and the exclusion of women who are citizens from the right to vote, was repealed and must stand repealed until the Legislatures of the several States shall again pass an act positively excluding her. If we again examine Art XV. we shall see that this right shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of RACE, COLOR, or PREVIOUS CONDITION OF SERVITUDE; it is left to be inferred that it might be on account of SEX, but this denial has not yet been attempted, nor could it be accomplished if it were, for here the XIV. Amendment again comes to our relief saying, “That no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.”

Again, the Constitution is assuredly a contract between States and citizens, and Sec. 10, Art I., provides that no State shall pass any law impairing contracts.

Art I., Sec. 4,¶ I, provides that:

“The times, places and _manner of holding elections_ for senators and representatives shall be prescribed in each State, by the Legislature thereof; but the _Congress may, at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations_, except as to the places of choosing senators,” while the judiciary of the United States has acquired complete jurisdiction over this matter by the authority of Art III., Sec. 2,¶ 1, which provides that: “_The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority_.”

And for all these reasons, the State Legislatures having, by the adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment, abrogated all previously existing, conflicting laws on the subject of suffrage, are now forever precluded by the Fourteenth Amendment from re-establishing any restriction to apply to women, whom the authorities of the United States, in their support of the Constitution, are in duty bound to protect in their right to vote.

Now what was the fruit of the late war, which threw the entire nation into such convulsive throes, unless it is found in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, namely: that grand change in the fundamental laws which declares _who_ are citizens and what are their _rights_, _privileges_ and immunities, which cannot be abridged? Will any one pretend that these great enactments can be understood to mean less than the language thereof plainly conveys? Or will any one claim that the old, absurd State laws, which were sunk in oblivion by the adoption of these amendments to the Constitution, are still in force? Who will _dare_ to say, in the face of these plainly worded amendments, which have such an unmistakable meaning, that the women of America shall not enjoy their emancipation as well as the black slave?

WOMEN HAVE THE RIGHT TO VOTE! It is the duty of the Government to see that they are not denied the right to exercise it, and, to secure the necessary action of Congress in the premises, I did, on the 21st day of December, 1870, memorialize Congress as

recorded in the Congressional _Globe_, December 22, 1870.

In the Senate:

Mr. Harris presented the memorial of Victoria C. Woodhull, praying for the passage of such laws as may be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the right vested by the Constitution in the citizens of the United States to vote without regard to sex; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

In the House:

Mr. Julian—I ask unanimous consent to present at this time and have printed in the _Globe_ the memorial of Victoria C. Woodhull, claiming the right of suffrage under the XIV. and XV. Articles of Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and asking for the enactment of the necessary and appropriate legislation to guarantee the exercise of that right to the women of the United States. I also ask that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

No objection was made, and it was ordered accordingly.

The petition is as follows:

THE MEMORIAL OF VICTORIA C. WOODHULL,

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, respectfully showeth:

That she was born in the State of Ohio, and is above the age of twenty-one years; that she has resided in the State of New York during the past three years; that she is still a resident thereof, and that she is a citizen of the United States, as declared by the XIV. Article of Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

That since the adoption of the XV. Article of Amendments to the Constitution, neither the State of New York nor any other State, nor any Territory, has passed any law to abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote, as established by said article, neither on account of sex or otherwise:

That, nevertheless, the right to vote is denied to women citizens of the United States by the operation of Election Laws in the several States and Territories, which laws were enacted prior to the adoption of the said XV. Article, and which are inconsistent with the Constitution as amended, and, therefore, are void and of no effect; but which, being still enforced by the said States and Territories, render the Constitution inoperative as regards the right of women citizens to vote:

And whereas, Article VI., Section 2, declares “That this Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and all judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution and laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding:” And whereas, no distinction between citizens is made in the Constitution of the United States on account of sex; but the XV. Article of Amendments to it provides that “No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws:”

And whereas, Congress has power to make laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution all powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States; and to make or alter all regulations in relation to holding elections for senators or representatives, and especially to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of the said XIV. Article:

And whereas, the continuance of the enforcement of said local election laws, denying and abridging the Right of Citizens to Vote on account of sex, is a grievance to your memorialist and to various other persons, citizens of the United States, being women,—

Therefore, your memorialist would most respectfully petition your Honorable Bodies to make such laws as in the wisdom of Congress shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the right vested by the Constitution in the citizens of the United States to vote, without regard to sex.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

Dated NEW YORK CITY, _December 19, 1870_.

This memorial having been referred to the Judiciary Committee, I then prepared and submitted the following legal deductions in support thereof:

CONSTITUTIONAL EQUALITY.

TO THE HON. THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

The undersigned, VICTORIA C. WOODHULL, having most respectfully memorialized Congress for the passage of such laws as in its wisdom shall seem necessary and proper to carry into effect the rights vested by the Constitution of the United States in the citizens to vote, without regard to sex, begs leave to submit to your honorable body the following in favor of her prayer in said Memorial which has been referred to your Committee:

The public law of the world is founded upon the conceded fact that sovereignty cannot be forfeited or renounced. The sovereign power of this country is perpetual in the politically-organized people of the United States, and can neither be relinquished nor abandoned by any portion of them. The people in this Republic who confer sovereignty are its citizens: in a monarchy the people are the subjects of sovereignty. All citizens of a republic by rightful act or implication confer sovereign power. All people of a monarchy are subjects who exist under its supreme shield and enjoy its immunities.

The subject of a monarch takes municipal immunities from the sovereign as a gracious favor; but the woman citizen of this country has the inalienable “sovereign” right of self-government in _her own proper person_. Those who look upon woman’s status by the dim light of the common law, which unfolded itself under the feudal and military institutions that establish right upon physical power, cannot find any analogy in the status of the woman citizen of this country, _where the broad sunshine of our Constitution has enfranchised all_.

As sovereignty cannot be forfeited, relinquished or abandoned, those from whom it flows—the citizens—are equal in conferring the power, and should be equal in the enjoyment of its benefits and in the exercise of its rights and privileges.

One portion of citizens have no power to deprive another portion of rights and privileges such as are possessed and exercised by themselves. The male citizen has no more right to deprive the female citizen of the free, public, political expression of opinion than the female citizen has to deprive the male citizen thereof.

The sovereign will of the people is expressed in our written Constitution, which is the supreme law of the land. The Constitution makes no distinction of sex. The Constitution defines a woman born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, to be a citizen. It recognizes the right of citizens to vote. It declares that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of “race, color or previous condition of servitude.”

Women, white and black, belong to races; although to different races. A race of people comprises all the people, male and female. The right to vote cannot be denied on account of race. All people included in the term race have the right to vote, unless otherwise prohibited.

Women of all races are white, black or some intermediate color. Color comprises all people, of all races and both sexes. The right to vote cannot be denied on account of color. All people included in the term color have the right to vote unless otherwise prohibited.

With the right to vote sex has nothing to do. Race and color include all people of both sexes. All people of both sexes have the right to vote, unless prohibited by special limiting terms less comprehensive than race or color. No such limiting terms exist in the Constitution.

Women, white and black, have from time immemorial groaned under what is properly termed in the Constitution “previous condition of servitude.”

Women are the equals of men before the law, and are equal in all their rights as citizens.

Women are debarred from voting in some parts of the United States, although they are allowed to exercise that right elsewhere.

Women were formerly permitted to vote in places where they are now debarred therefrom.

The Naturalization Laws of the United States expressly provide for the naturalization of women.

But the right to vote has only lately been distinctly declared by the Constitution to be inalienable, under three distinct conditions—in all of which woman is distinctly embraced.

The citizen who is taxed should also have a voice in the subject matter of taxation. “No taxation without representation” is a right which was fundamentally established at the very birth of our country’s independence; and by what ethics does any free government impose taxes on women without giving them a voice upon the subject or a participation in the public declaration as to how and by whom these taxes shall be applied for common public use?

Women are free to own and to control property, separate and apart from males, and they are held responsible in their own proper persons, in every particular, as well as men, in and out of court.

Women have the same inalienable right to life, liberty and the _pursuit of_ happiness that men have. Why have they not this right politically, as well as men?

Women constitute a majority of the people of this country—they hold vast portions of the nation’s wealth and pay a proportionate share of the taxes. They are intrusted with the most holy duties and the most vital responsibilities of society; they bear, rear and educate men; they train and mould their characters; they inspire the noblest impulses in men; they often hold the accumulated fortunes of a man’s life for the safety of the family and as guardians of the infants, and yet they are debarred from uttering any opinion, by public vote, as to the management by public servants of these interests; they are the secret counsellors, the best advisers, the most devoted aids in the most trying periods of men’s lives, and yet men shrink from trusting them in the common questions of ordinary politics. Men trust women in the market, in the shop, on the highway and the railroad, and in all other public places and assemblies, but when they propose to carry a slip of paper with a name upon it to the polls, they fear them. Nevertheless, as citizens women have the right to vote; they are part and parcel of that great element in which the sovereign power of the land had birth: and it is by usurpation only that men debar them from their right to vote. The American nation, in its march onward and upward, cannot publicly choke the intellectual and political activity of half its citizens by narrow statutes. The will of the entire people is the true basis of republican government, and a free expression of that will by the public vote of all citizens, without distinctions of race, color, occupation or sex, is the only means by which that will can be ascertained. As the world has advanced in civilization and culture; as mind has risen in its dominion over matter; as the principle of justice and moral right has gained sway, and merely physically organized power has yielded thereto; as the might of right has supplanted the right of might, so have the rights of women become more fully recognized, and that recognition is the result of the development of the minds of men, which through the ages she has polished, and thereby heightened the lustre of civilization.

It was reserved for our great country to recognize by constitutional enactment that political equality of all citizens which religion, affection, and common sense should have long since accorded; it was reserved for America to sweep away the mist of prejudice and ignorance, and that chivalric condescension of a darker age, for in the language of Holy Writ, “The night is far spent, the day is at hand, let us therefore cast off the work of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light. Let us walk honestly as in the day.”

It may be argued against the proposition that there still remains upon the statute books of some States the word “male” to an exclusion, but as the Constitution in its paramount character can only be read by the light of the established principle, _ita lex Scripta est_; and as the subject of sex is not mentioned and the Constitution is not limited either in terms or by necessary implication in the general rights of citizens to vote, this right cannot be limited on account of anything in the spirit of inferior or previous enactments upon a subject which is not mentioned in the supreme law. A different construction would destroy a vested right in a portion of the citizens, and this no legislature has a right to do without compensation, and nothing can compensate a citizen for the loss of his or her suffrage—its value is equal to the value of life. Neither can it be presumed that women are to be kept from the polls as a mere police regulation: it is to be hoped, at least, that police regulations in their case need not be very active. The effect of the amendments to the Constitution must be to annul the power over this subject in the States whether past, present or future, which is contrary to the amendments. The amendments would even arrest the action of the Supreme Court in cases pending before it prior to their adoption, and operate as an absolute prohibition to the exercise of any other jurisdiction than merely to dismiss the suit.

3 Dall., 382; 6 Wheaton, 405; 9 Id., 868; 3d Circ., Pa., 1832.

And if the restrictions contained in the Constitution as to color, race or servitude, were designed to limit the State governments in reference to their own citizens, and were intended to operate also as restrictions on the Federal power, and to prevent interference with the rights of the State and its citizens, how then can the State restrict citizens of the United States in the exercise of rights not mentioned in any restrictive clause in reference to actions on the part of those citizens having reference solely to the necessary functions of the General Government, such as the election of representatives and senators to Congress, whose election the Constitution expressly gives Congress the power to regulate?

S. C., 1847: Fox vs. Ohio, 5 Howard, 410.

Your memorialist complains of the existence of State Laws, and prays Congress, by appropriate legislation, to declare them, as they are, annulled, and to give vitality to the Constitution under its power to make and alter the regulations of the States contravening the same.

It may be urged in opposition that the Courts have power, and should declare upon this subject.

The Supreme Court has the power, and it would be its duty so to declare the law; but the Court will not do so unless a determination of such point as shall arise make it necessary to the determination of a controversy, and hence a case must be presented in which there can be no rational doubt. All this would subject the aggrieved parties to much dilatory, expensive and needless litigation, which your memorialist prays your Honorable Body to dispense with by appropriate legislation, as there can be no purpose in special arguments “ad inconvenienti,” enlarging or contracting the import of the language of the Constitution.

Therefore, Believing firmly in the right of citizens to freely approach those in whose hands their destiny is placed, under the Providence of God, your memorialist has frankly, but humbly, appealed to you, and prays that the wisdom of Congress may be moved to action in this matter for the benefit and the increased happiness of our beloved country.

Most respectfully submitted, VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

Dated NEW YORK, January 2, 1871.

The issue upon the question of female suffrage being thus definitely and clearly set forth, and its rights inalienably vested in woman, a brighter future dawns upon the country. When Congress shall have moved in the matter, and thus secured to woman the free exercise of these newly-defined rights, she can unite in purifying the elements of political strife—in restoring the Government to pristine integrity, strength and vigor. To do this, many reforms become of absolute necessity. Prominent among these are—

A reform in representation by which all Legislative Bodies and the Presidential Electoral College shall be so elected that minorities as well as majorities shall have direct representation.

A complete reform in Executive and Departmental conduct, by which the President and the Secretaries of the United States, and the Governors and State Officers shall be forced to recognize that they are the servants of the people, appointed to attend to the business of the people, and not for the purpose of perpetuating their official positions, or of securing the plunder of public trusts for the enrichment of their political adherents and supporters.

A reform in the tenure of office, by which the Presidency shall be limited to one term, with a retiring life pension, and a permanent seat in the Federal Senate, where his Presidential experience may become serviceable to the nation, and on the dignity and life emolument of Presidential Senator he shall be placed above all other political position, and be excluded from all professional pursuits.

A radical reform in our Civil Service, by which the Government, in its executive capacity, shall at all times secure faithful and efficient officers, and the people trustworthy servants, whose appointment shall be entirely removed from, and be made independent of, the influence and control of the legislative branch of the Government, and who shall be removed for “cause” only, and who shall be held strictly to frequent public accounting to superiors for all their official transactions, which shall forever dispose of the corrupt practices induced by the allurements of the motto of present political parties, that “to the victor belong the spoils,” which is a remnant of arbitrarily assumed authority, unworthy of a government emanating from the whole people.

A reform in our systems of finance, by which the arbitrary standard of ancient and feudal despotisms shall be removed; by which the true source of wealth shall become the basis and the security of a national currency, which shall be made convertible into a National Bond bearing such an interest, while in the hands of the people, as shall secure an equilibrium between the demands of all

the varieties of exchanges and the supply of money to effect them with, the Bond being also convertible at pleasure into money again, by which system of adjustment, “plethora” equally with “tightness” shall be banished from the financial centres of our country; and which, in its practical workings, shall secure such pecuniary equality between the employing and the laboring classes as will forever make poverty and its long list of consequent ills impossible in our country; and which shall suggest the solution of those schemes which are being discussed for “funding the public debt” at a lower rate of interest.

A complete reform in our system of Internal improvements, which connect and bind together the several States in commercial unity, to the end that they shall be conducted so as to administer to the best interests of the whole people, for whose benefit they were first permitted, and are now protected; by which the General Government, in the use of its postal powers, and in the exercise of its duties in regulating commerce between the States, shall secure the transportation of passengers, merchandise and the mails, from one extremity of the country to the opposite, and throughout its whole area, at the actual cost of maintaining such improvements, plus legitimate interest upon their original cost of construction, thus converting them into public benefits, instead of their remaining, as now, hereditary taxes upon the industries of the country, by which, if continued, a few favored individuals are likely to become the actual rulers of the country.

A complete reform in commercial and navigation laws, by which American built or purchased ships and American seamen shall be practically protected by the admission of all that is required for construction of the first, or the use and maintenance of either, free in bond or on board.

A reform in the relations of the employer and employed, by which shall be secured the practice of the great natural law, of one-third of time to labor, one-third to recreation and one-third to rest, that by this, intellectual improvement and physical development may go on to that perfection which the Almighty Creator designed.

A reform in the principles of protection and revenue, by which the largest home and foreign demand shall be created and sustained for products of American industry of every kind; by which this industry shall be freed from the ruinous effects consequent upon frequent changes in these systems; by which shall be secured that constant employment to workingmen and workingwomen throughout the country which will maintain them upon an equality in all kinds and classes of industry; by which a continuous prosperity—which, if not so marked by rapid accumulation, shall possess the merit of permanency—will be secured to all, which in due time will reduce the cost of all products to a minimum value; by which the laboring poor shall be relieved of the onerous tax, now indirectly imposed upon them by government; by which the burden of governmental support shall be placed where it properly belongs, and by which an unlimited national wealth will gradually accumulate, the ratio of taxation upon which will become so insignificant in amount as to be no burden to the people.

A reform by which the power of legislative bodies to levy taxes shall be limited to the actual necessities of the legitimate functions of government in its protection of the rights of persons, property and nationality; and by which they shall be deprived of the power to exempt any property from taxation; or to make any distinctions directly or indirectly among citizens in taxation for the support of government; or to give or loan the public property or credit to individuals or corporations to promote any enterprise whatever.

A reform in the system of criminal jurisprudence, by which the death penalty shall no longer be inflicted—by which the hardened criminal shall have no human chance of being let loose to harass society until the term of the sentence, whatever that may be, shall have expired, and by which, during that term, the entire prison employment shall be for—and the product thereof be faithfully paid over to—the support of the criminal’s family; and by which our so-called prisons shall be virtually transformed into vast reformatory workshops, from which the unfortunate may emerge to be useful members of society, instead of the alienated citizens they now are.

The institution of such supervisory control and surveillance over the now low orders of society as shall compel them to industry, and provide for the helpless, and thus banish those institutions of pauperism and beggary which are fastening upon the vitals of society, and are so prolific of crime and suffering in certain communities.

The organization of a general system of national education, which shall positively secure to every child of the country such an education in the arts, sciences and general knowledge as will render them profitable and useful members of society, and the entire proceeds of the public domain should be religiously devoted to this end.

Such change in our general foreign policy as shall plainly indicate that we realize and appreciate the important position which has been assigned us as a nation by the common order of civilization; which shall indicate our supreme faith in that form of government

which emanates from, and is supported by, the whole people, and that such government must eventually be uniform throughout the world; which shall also have in view the establishment of a Grand International Tribunal, to which all disputes of peoples and nations shall be referred for final arbitration and settlement, without appeal to arms; said Tribunal maintaining only such an International army and navy as would be necessary to enforce its decrees, and thus secure the return of the 15,000,000 of men who now compose the standing armies of the world, to industrial and productive pursuits.

Thus in the best sense do I claim to be the friend and exponent of the most complete equality to which humanity can attain; of the broadest individual freedom compatible with the public good, and that supreme justice which shall know no distinction among citizens upon any ground whatever, in the administration and the execution of the laws; and also, to be a faithful worker in the cause of human advancement; and especially to be the co-laborer with those who strive to better the condition of the poor and friendless; to secure to the great mass of working people the just reward of their toil,—I claim from these, and from all others in the social scale, that support in the bold political course I have taken, which shall give me the strength and the position to carry out these needed reforms, which shall secure to them, in return, the blessings which the Creator designed the human race should enjoy.

If I obtain this support, woman's strength and woman's will, with God's support, if He vouchsafe it, shall open to them, and to this country, a new career of greatness in the race of nations, which can only be secured by that fearless course of truth from which the nations of the earth, under despotic male governments, have so far departed.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 10, 1871.

TENDENCIES OF GOVERNMENT.

[Revised from the New York Herald of April 16, 1870.]

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL ON THE "TENDENCIES OF GOVERNMENT."

GOD IN CREATION, IN HISTORY, AND IN GOVERNMENT—A PHILOSOPHICAL PREFACE TO A PHILOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE.

[The head of the firm of Woodhull, Claflin & Co., Commodore Vanderbilt's financial _proteges_—the famous brokers of Broad street—has undertaken the difficult task of correcting popular errors in the science of government, and has prepared a paper on the subject, which, as the lady expects to be too busy to deliver for some time to come, we publish it _in extenso_. Whether her conclusions will agree with her premises or not, the document will be found exceedingly interesting, as showing the quality of the female mind against which the money changers of Wall street will have to contend in business:]

As far back into the past as dim historic lights enable us to see, and still much farther, even behind the appearance of man upon the face of this planet, the existence of government can be plainly traced. Wherever two or more of any species of animals—not to descend lower and including man—are or have been, something simulating to what is in our day denominated government exists or existed; and, whether it is or was over a greater or less community, it is or was possessed of certain characterizing elements, from and by which a clear insight into the composition of the community can be obtained by those who will analyze the elements somewhat philosophically; that is to say governments are truthful reflections of the governed when considered as a whole, and all changes or modifications that occur therein, result from growth of the governed.

No just nor advantageous deductions from any subject or fact which is worthy of a position in the world's history, and which is capable of permanently maintaining such a position, can be arrived at, except through a complete philosophical analysis of all the elements entering into its composition. All facts as well as all chemical compounds are made up of elementary principles brought into intimate productive relations by some general power, operating by some general law of combination. By such an analysis the composition of such subjects and facts as are analyzed are not only determined, but the relations which they sustain to all other subjects and facts are also demonstrated, and thus a general law of relativity is found which makes the whole round of creation one in purpose and effect.

It is not proposed in the present article to prosecute an exhaustive analysis of government as it is or as it has been, but rather to observe the chain of progression which has been evolved, and to endeavor to determine whether, link by link, it does not form one

harmonious whole, from the present aspect of which its culmination may be caught sight of; and whether that culmination will not be found a complete circle, containing within its immense area all that has conspired and assisted in its completion, and which will be entitled to positions in such a community of interests by virtue of having thus conspired and assisted in its formation.

Neither is it proposed to extend the limits of this inquiry beyond the consideration of human government, except in so far as analogies may be sought to enforce the application of general laws and to assist by such application in the solution of such questions as may not be entirely apparent from the evidences contained specifically within the said limits. Philosophically considered, however, the objects sought could as well be obtained from any other department of government; for, while a general law underlies all forms and systems of human government and controls all its modifications, the self-same law underlies and controls all other forms and systems of government, from which human government sprung and upon which it rests as a primary basis.

It is believed that there is sufficient mental development and comprehension contained in the philosophic minds of this latter part of the nineteenth century to gather into form the evidence that has been and is being presented, in the evolution and dissolution of government, and grasp its signification, so that in its application to existing things, permanent instead of politic modifications in governmental affairs may be inaugurated. Governed by any other than such a broad standard, changes and modifications in present systems and forms are made simply to meet the exigencies of the times, and with no view to place government upon a basis which should never need modification, and which should meet all exigencies of all times. The reasons why such government has not hitherto been inaugurated or attempted, are, because in no country has the general mind as yet become sufficiently broad and comprehensive to discover that great general laws underlie the universe and govern all its manifestations, applying to each and every department thereof with perfect uniformity. It is not my province to discuss what these great general laws and principles are. I assume that they do exist, and it is my office to predicate what the future of government must be when it shall have its basis in such laws and principles, and to judge whether what has been, and what is, may be considered as gradual approaches from the most simple and homogeneous forms in which the interest of all were very indefinite, either individually or collectively, toward that wherein the interests of all, while becoming more distinct individually, shall be merged in the general interests of the whole and become identical therewith.

Mr. Maine says, in his “Ancient Law,” that “society in ancient times was not what it is assumed to be at present—a collection of individuals. In fact, and in view of the men that composed it, it was an aggregation of families. The contrast may be best and most forcibly expressed by saying that the unit of an ancient society was the family; of a modern society, the individual.”

In speaking of ancient society, Mr. Fiske says: “Family government excluded not only individual independence but also State supremacy; and that vestiges of a time when there were no aggregates of men more extensive than the family may be found in every part of the world, when social organization was but one step removed from absolute and ferocious anarchy;” and this he defines as a social aggregate of the first order; the coalescence of families into civic communities an aggregate of the second order; the coalescence of civic and tribual communities into the nation an aggregate of the third order. The coalescence of nations would then describe an aggregate of the fourth order. Under these four orders all the forms of government which can ever exist in the world must be classified.

As low a form of government as can be conceived as existing next above that of the family, worthy to be called human government, still exists among the barbarians inhabiting some portions of Central Africa, some of the East India Islands, and perhaps some of the South Sea Islands. These people unite in bands or tribes, and rove about seeking the means of subsistence and endeavoring to conquer other tribes. Some have central points of rendezvous, where the rudest habitations are constructed, in which the women and children remain during the absence of the men. The women almost universally are considered very much in the light of slaves by all these nomadic tribes, and as only fit to minister to their passions and to perform their drudgery. Their language is as rude as their habits, consisting of little more than a comparatively few spasmodically uttered harsh sounds. Written language they have none, excepting perhaps some images or rude figures symbolizing some special event they in this way attempt to commemorate, and which may be considered as the foundation of it for the tribes using them as they were the primary foundation of all written language.

One notable feature is universally observable among all these representatives of primitive government—they all recognize the necessity of a leader under some of the many forms of control exercised by the one over the many, and he is generally one who has exhibited some particular prowess in battle, the capacity to perform which he is supposed to be endowed with by some unknown power, and which renders him superior to all others, and best capable of ruling and protecting those who thus recognize

him, and who obey him in every particular, even to sacrificing their lives. Such may be considered an outline of our conceptions of the most primitive form of government of the present day; and the fact that such still exists has a marked bearing upon the subject of general government, when it is remembered that the time was when no higher form existed on the face of the earth.

The law of evolution and that of dissolution being a universal deduction from the philosophic ultimatum _that force persists_, they apply to all things wherein force is exhibited; consequently human government must be the objective result of the persistence of force exhibited among the people of the earth, and at the same time the subject of all modifications that grow out of its transformations and equivalent relations. In whatever light, then, human government is viewed, these philosophic laws should never be lost sight of nor disregarded; but the causes of all the rises and falls, transformations, modifications and amalgamations, should be sought by the application of those laws to the objective points under consideration.

The question now naturally arises, Can human government, then be analyzed, and the facts it presents be found to correspond to the deductions of philosophic law?

It has been remarked that the simplest combinations of force among human beings, representing government which existed when none higher had been attained, was still represented on the earth by certain of its inhabitants. Beginning with this as the basis of the superstructure of human government, can there be traced a gradual scale of progress from it to the government of this country, in which scale each nation, tribe and tongue will find its appropriate place, which, unoccupied, would render the scale imperfect, as a chain would be imperfect were one of its central links missing? and would an analysis of each of these governments develop the fact that each successive one in the progressive scale would represent some new application of the principle of liberty, some more extended idea of equality, or some better formula of justice than the preceding had, which application, idea or formula entitles it to rank superior thereto, and also determines its position in the scale?

Of all systems and forms of government that came and passed away during the long lapse of ages, from the time the most primitive alone existed on the earth to the time wherein those flourished that have left records of their existence, we can know nothing except what may be gathered from philosophic deduction unsupported by any actual record of facts concerning them. It is, however, philosophically certain that very many such intermediate governments did exist, variously modified and advancing from the primitive forms. Possessing, as we may justly infer, but little capability for duration, their integration was rapidly succeeded by disintegration; being exposed to numerous and different external influences, rapid and successive changes were inevitable, because they were possessed of but little individuality and consequently but little capacity for resisting external influences. They were bound together by none of the higher laws of association, but were led by transient ephemeral contingencies, combining at times together, to soon divide and subdivide only to again form new and equally temporary amalgamations. Thus constantly organizing and dissolving, the long interval alluded to was occupied by primitive inhabitants in their march from the purely homogeneous toward the individualized times wherein civilization left records of itself.

While no special inquiries into the correctness of the formulas laid down at various times by various philosophers, which seek to include and cover all the phenomena of the universe, will be made, those of the most eminent may with propriety be stated; indeed, if it be attempted to show that history obeys a fixed law of evolution, the law that it is presumed to obey must be given, that it may be seen whether the deductions arrived at are included within the limits of the formula. If it should not so turn out, then either the deduction must be illegitimate, the formula imperfect or impossible, or the fact made apparent, that, while all the other sciences, as biology, psychology and their various divisions, are known to conform to certain well determined laws of causation, sociology, in which all history and government find their basis, conforms to no law, but is the product of the merest chance.

Until within the present century it was not claimed by any of the various philosophers who had flourished that there was such a science as sociology; or, if so claimed by any far-seeing mind, the attempt to demonstrate or formulate it was not made until the time of Comte, who, about the year 1830, did attempt it, and he may be justly styled the father of the present system of formulated science. Though his system is now shown to contain many imperfections and omissions, it is nevertheless certain, that but for it, the improvements since made would not have been possible to the present degree attained, though those who have made them may repudiate the idea, and scorn to acknowledge that they have built upon Comte.

Gathering from his profuse writings upon this point his earlier and most continuous opinions, the following are the terms in which they can be the most simply expressed: Social progression is a gradual change from rudimentary, homogeneous and anthropomorphic conditions to civilization, heterogeneity and to definite conceptions of the external world; and at the same time from nomadic characteristics, with aggressive purposes, to inhabitative propensities and individual industrial pursuits.

A number of philosophers, who have written since the days of Comte, have from time to time presented formulas which at best can only be considered as modifications of his, and it may confidently be asserted that no real addition was acquired until the Spencerian was made, which, while it included Comte's, was more general and comprehensive, and at the same time more definite and special. This seeming anomaly was made possible by his having discovered the law of evolution, and by having exhaustively demonstrated that all mental action—emotional as well as intellectual—was included in it. It is as follows: Evolution is an integration of matter and a concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a partial transformation. This general formula includes all evolution, organic and inorganic, and interprets not only the genesis of the sidereal and solar systems and of the earth, but also of life upon the earth, and has become the law of all social, moral and intellectual change. He afterward found it necessary to make a supplement especially applicable to organic life, in such terms as should not include the inorganic. It was as follows: "Life—and intelligence being the highest manifestations of life—consists in the continuous establishment of relations within the organism, in correspondence with relations existing within the environment or the surroundings."

To this exhaustive statement a late generalization and specialization has been made by Mr. Fiske, especially applicable to social evolution, as follows: The progress of society is a continuous establishment of psychical relations within the community, in conformity to physical and psychical relations arising within the environment, during which, both the community and the environment pass from a state of incoherent homogeneity to a state of coherent heterogeneity, and during which the constitutional units of the community become ever more distinctly individuated.

Having now arrived at that point where history must furnish the facts upon which the subject rests, it may be well to comprehensively recapitulate a perhaps somewhat too long introduction. It was seen that all over the face of the earth where human life was represented, government exists, and that this government was representative of one or another of the three orders of aggregates of individuals—the family, the tribal, or the nations, and that an aggregate of nations would add the fourth order. It was also seen that the evolution of government was the objective result of the persistence of force among its component parts. Fixing the basis of government in this philosophic fact, it was necessary to examine the history of government to see if in its evolution it had conformed to this law, according to present accepted formulas; and if so found to have done, to extend the same into the future, to ascertain if possible what the future would be. Thus by a present understanding of the law and its tendencies, all modifications and changes made in present systems and forms might be so made in harmony therewith, and not with a simple view to meet the present exigencies, but with an understanding that would meet all exigencies of all time, which alone is perfect legislation.

THE TENDENCIES OF GOVERNMENT.

[Revised from the New York Herald of April 25, 1870.]

SECOND PART OF MRS. VICTORIA C. WOODHULL'S PHILIPPIC—LAWS, PEOPLES AND COMMUNITIES FROM A FEMALE POINT OF VIEW—LESSONS IN HISTORY, POLITICS AND WAR.

[Mrs. Victoria C. Woodhull, head of the firm of female brokers in Broad street, presents to the readers of the _Herald_ the following communication, the second part of her paper on "The Tendencies of Government," the preface to which has already appeared. Mrs. Woodhull has undertaken the difficult task of enlightening the public mind on the best means of running the Government machine of America. Though her views, expressed in this paper, have a wide range, it must be said that she is but putting herself in wind for a tremendous attack on "the best Government the world ever saw." Being already in the race for the Presidency (not of the Sorosis, but of the United States), her pronunciamentos are of course very important:]

It must begin to be apparent that the proposition is, that the evolution of government does not differ from that of simplest organic forms either in principle or in mode of operation. The same laws that govern the growth and multiply the plant also govern society and multiply it. The same laws that bring fruit to perfection and dissolution perfect and dissolve societies. The same laws that produce and control the units of the animal kingdom produce and control the units of society. The same law that governs the ebbing and flowing of the tides, that determines whether the component parts of water shall exist as water or vapor, determines the movements of society and the conditions of its existence; and the same law that produces an earthquake here, a volcanic eruption there or a terrific hurricane elsewhere, produces the earthquakes, volcanic eruptions and the hurricanes that are ever modifying and changing society. Symbols of all the various processes society passes through in its growth and extension can be found in

every other department of the universe; or, to assert the same fact differently, everywhere in the universe there is a constant effort to attain an equilibrium—a continuous working to supply wants, an unceasing process of demand and supply, which are universal exemplifications of the law that motion is always in the direction of the least resistance or the greatest traction, or the resultant of the two operating conjointly.

But what does history tell of the foundation and dissolution of governments, and what illustrations of the law of progress does it afford? As before stated, those who have most earnestly studied pre-historic time have found ample evidence that the time was when the head of the family was the highest sovereign power, and so absolute in its character that the individual was entirely submerged in it, and State supremacy was an impossibility. Nothing but anarchy and confusion could have attended such rule; constant rivalry, jealousy and contention must have kept up a continual strife between adjacent families, which could know no settlement except through the subjugation or destruction of the weaker of the contending parties. Of this order of governmental aggregations, it is questionable if the earth at present furnishes any illustrations, unless it be in some part thereof to which the discoverer has not yet penetrated. Of the next, or tribal, order of aggregates, it does, however; and with this second order the real analysis and comparison must begin, though we have no objective means of demonstrating the conditions stated as existing. When family sovereignty was universal it can readily be seen that the continued existence of such conditions would be impossible, for the continuous subjugations and amalgamations of families would lead directly to tribal communities, at first in absolute subjection to one tribe, which would grow into some power, distributed among the several tribes. So also would the joining together of several weak families to resist a more powerful neighbor lead directly to confederation.

The subjugation and reduction of families to bondage and slavery was the beginning of that system of interdependence now so broadly extended into commerce, exchange and mutual dependence for almost the necessities of life. In the times referred to every man was his own farmer, tailor, carpenter and cook, and this condition was only modified when the individuals of conquering families began to rely upon the conquered for certain services they otherwise would have been obliged to render themselves. All of these facts exemplify another philosophic proposition—that for anything in the universe to remain in its homogeneous condition is impossible, which impossibility is the result of the fact that motion must produce change, while constant motion is inevitable so long as force persists and matter resists.

That eminent historian of the third decade of the eighteenth century, Rollin, thus remarks of the earliest monuments which are preserved, treating of the progress from simple to complex forms of government:—“To know in what manner the states and kingdoms were founded that have divided the universe, the steps whereby they rose to that pitch of grandeur related in history, by what ties families and cities united in order to constitute one body of society, and to live together under the same laws and common authority, it will be necessary to trace things back in a manner to the infancy of the world and to those ages in which mankind, being dispersed into different regions, began to people the earth.” In these early ages every father was the supreme head of his family; the arbiter and judge of whatever contests and divisions might arise within it; the natural legislator over his little society, the defender and protector of those who, by their birth, education and weakness, were under his protection and safeguard. The laws which the paternal vigilance established in this domestic senate being dictated with no other view than to promote the general welfare, were concerted with such children as were come to years of maturity and accepted by the inferiors with a full and free consent, were religiously kept and preserved in families as an hereditary polity, to which they owed their peace and security.

But different motives gave rise to different laws. One man, overjoyed at the birth of a first born son, resolved to distinguish him from future children by bestowing on him a more considerable share of his possessions, and giving him greater authority in his family. Another, more attentive to the interests of a beloved wife or darling daughter, whom he wanted to settle in the world, thought it incumbent on him to secure her rights and increase her advantages. The solitary and cheerless state a wife might be reduced to in case she should become a widow affected more intimately another man, and made him provide beforehand for the subsistence and comfort of a woman who formed his felicity. In proportion as every family increased by the birth of children and their marrying into other families, they extended their domain, and by insensible degrees formed towns and cities. From these different views and others of a like nature arose the different customs and rights of nations.

These societies growing in time very numerous, and the families, dividing into different branches, each having its head, it was necessary to intrust one person with the whole in order to unite all these heads under one authority and to maintain the public good by a uniform administration. To heighten the lustre of this newly acquired dignity and to cause them to devote themselves entirely to the public good, the title of king was bestowed upon them and they were invested with full power to administer justice and to punish crime.

At first every city had its particular king, who, being more solicitous of preserving his dominion than of enlarging it, confined his ambition within its limits But the unavoidable feuds that break out between neighbors, the jealousy against a more powerful rival, the turbulent spirit of a prince, his martial disposition or thirst for aggrandizing himself and displaying his ability, gave rise to wars which frequently ended in the entire subjugation of the vanquished and the addition of their cities to the victors. Thus a first victory led the way to a second, which, making a prince more powerful and enterprising, several cities and provinces became united under one monarch, forming kingdoms of greater or less extent, according to the degree the victor pushed his conquests. Such was the origin of the famous empires that at times included the greater part of the known world.

From various historical authorities the following summaries of history are obtained, and are presented as containing some of the principal points by which the general progress of the world should be judged. The principal empires of ancient time will be observed separately; those of modern time under one head, because of the more connected character of their histories, and because of the more general knowledge that is possessed of them. Then the general course events took will be noticed, the deductions that legitimately flow from them introduced, and the bearing they have upon present affairs of the world in reference to its future condition of government considered.

There are several nations that have, at various times, and that still do claim, the greatest antiquity. The Chinese, the Indians, the Syrians and Egyptians appear to have the most evidence to support their claim. The Egyptians once accorded it to the Phrygians, through the result of the somewhat singular experiment of confining two children away from all intercourse with the world until they began to cry, "_Beecos_," which was found to be the Phrygian word for bread. This word, Psammetichus, the King decided must be of the original language, and consequently that the Phrygians were the original people.

Manetho, a high priest in Egypt, who had charge of the sacred archives, pretends to have extracted from the writings of Mercurius and to have proved thereby that up to the time of Alexander the Great, whose reign began 356 years B. C., there had been thirty dynasties in Egypt, which together covered a space of more than 5,300 years. If this claim be allowed, Egypt has existed 7,500 years. Herodotus says "that the Egyptian priests computed 341 generations until the reign of Sethon," which began 719 years B. C. "These generations," he adds, "make 11,341 years." They also counted a like number of priests and kings, who had succeeded one another without interruption, under the name of "Pyromas," signifying good and virtuous. These priests hewed 341 colossal statues in wood of these Pyromas, all arranged in a large hall in the order of their succession.

Let these claims be false or true, historians unanimously agree that Menes was the first King of Egypt, and that his reign began 2,188 years B. C., which would make its historic age about 5,000 years; undoubtedly its fabulous age would cover a sufficient period to make what is claimed, at least by Menetho, if not by the priests Herodotus mentions. These claims will seem the more probable when we are informed that a few ages only after Menes, the first King, one Busiris, built the famous city of Thebes, and made it the seat of his empire, which would seem to indicate that the arts and sciences had at that time been carried to a considerable degree of perfection, not only in the building of cities, but also in their adornment; for we are told that the public buildings were decorated with sculptures and paintings of the most exquisite beauty.

Additional force is also given these claims by the fact that Osymandyas, the successor of this Busiris, collected a magnificent library at Thebes, called "The Treasury of Remedies for Diseases of the Soul," which would indicate that polite learning had made considerable advancement as well in philosophy as in religion. Historians also inform us that Cham, the father of Misriam—the same with Menes—was the second son of Noah, and it is supposed that he retired into Africa after the "confusion of tongues." He was doubtless the Jupiter Ammont so long worshiped as a god by the Egyptians. We are also informed that this Cham, or Ham, had three other sons—Chus, who settled Ethiopia; Phut, who settled Africa westward from Egypt, and Canaan in the country that afterward was called after him, and whose descendants were called Phœnicians.

When we remember the so-called flood; that Cham was the second son of Noah and the father of Menes, the first king, 2,189 years B. C., and that 200 years later Osymandyas, one of his successors, was able to fit out an expedition against the Bactrians of Asia, consisting of 400,000 foot and 20,000 horse, it must be conceded that if the "flood" destroyed all the people existing on the face of the earth, except those saved in the ark, the descendants of Cham must have multiplied with inconceivable rapidity to have made the collecting of such an army possible. But this is not more astonishing than the supposition would be that there could be contained in the atmosphere surrounding the earth sufficient moisture to form the amount of water, which, falling through a space of forty days and nights, should cover the whole earth to the depth narrated of Noah's flood; nor more so than that the temperature of the whole earth at that time should have been so uniform as to have permitted rain throughout, instead of hail or snow, in frigid portions thereof. And if we were to inquire where such a quantity of water was borrowed from and returned, a consistent reply

would be equally surprising; for it is now known that there is just as large a quantity of the elements that compose water at present as there was then.

Considerable latitude can be allowed the statements regarding the flood, when it is remembered that the knowledge of geography, astronomy and meteorology must have been exceedingly limited at that time. But if credence is given to it as having occurred—and it is conceded that all the people Noah knew were destroyed by it—and a solution is sought, it can be imagined that a tremendous upheaval of mountains in Northern Asia might have thrown the waters of the Arctic Ocean southward over the country Noah dwelt in; but this could not have been the result of forty days and forty nights rain, though it may have rained continuously during that period, and may have been considered such by Noah.

This digression was not made so much to consider the probabilities of a flood having occurred as to give additional force to the historic fact that but a few generations after it is said to have occurred, immense tribes of people did exist in that portion of the world bordering on the eastern Mediterranean Sea, who were possessed of considerable general knowledge, immense wealth, and, for that age, good ideas of governmental justice; besides these people, it must also be remembered vast hosts of barbarians existed in the more remote parts of Europe, Asia and Africa, of whose origin and condition nothing can be positively known, either of which bodies of people could not have descended from Noah's family through the common course of reproduction.

What concerns this inquiry most, is not whether all or any of the narratives of ancient writers are entitled to credence, but how and in what directions the ancient tribal nations extended themselves and became merged one with another. Following the history of Egypt from the time of Menes through the reigns of his successors—Busiris, Osymandyas (whose mausoleum displayed such extravagant magnificence), and Euchoreus, who built the famous Memphis and made it the key to the Nile—on through the space of two hundred and sixty years of the Shepherd Kings, from Phœnicia to Amosis, who expelled them, and reunited the country, and to Sesostris, the most powerful king and the greatest conqueror the world had then known, but little evidence of increasing proficiency in science and art is found, but much that the acquired standard was continually being extended among the people and among surrounding nations.

With the reign of Sesostris a new era was inaugurated, and a mighty impetus to general civilization, as well as to special advancement, was given by his wisdom and foresight. Amenophis, the father of Sesostris, no doubt feeling the weight of impending events, foresaw the necessity of preparing him to meet them. He not only took great care that his education in the arts and sciences, the principles of government, philosophy and the art of war, should be complete, but also caused all male children of Egypt born the same day he was, to be educated with him, with the distinct understanding that they were to be his future comrades, his officers, ministers and friends in the aggressive wars he intended he should engage in when he should ascend the throne. It is said that the celebrated Mercurius had charge over them all, especially in politics, war and government.

The first war Sesostris engaged in was against the Arabs, which his father sent him upon while yet quite young, that he might acquire practical knowledge in conducting military campaigns. This people, who had never before been subdued, he conquered, and added their country to Egypt The next year he invaded Lybia, a country to the southwest of Egypt. During this expedition his father died, leaving the throne to him. He immediately formed a no less design than of conquering the whole world. This was in 1491 B. C., and he was probably the first of the great conquerors of ancient times who conceived the idea of reducing the world to a single form of government, and most assuredly the first possessed of sufficient wisdom to carry out so gigantic an undertaking. The manner he set about to do this, and the capacity he evinced in all the preparations, we shall have occasion to compare hereafter with that pursued and shown by others in after time, simply remarking here that it is safe to conclude that Sesostris was great among the greatest; for, to boundless ambition—possessed by many—he united the capacity to sustain it, which few can boast. While making the most extensive preparations for raising and disciplining armies for foreign operations, he was not less active in providing for sustaining the dignity and power of his Government during his absence, which he foresaw would give opportunity for rivals to attempt to overthrow for their own benefit. His first army consisted of 600,000 foot, 24,000 horse, and 27,000 armed chariots, and its principal officers were the 1,700 youths who had been educated with him, and who now made it possible for him to secure perfect discipline and the greatest efficiency.

With this army he first invaded and conquered Ethiopia, and made it tributary to Egypt. He next fitted out an expedition of 400 sail, and made himself master of all the islands and coasts of the Red Sea, as a preparatory step to the conquest of Asia, then advanced into Asia, subduing all the countries, even "beyond the Ganges." Returning westward, he conquered Scythia, Armenia, Cappadocia, Colchis, and all Asia Minor: then crossed into Europe, and would probably have subdued all its nations had he not encountered a great scarcity of provisions in Thrace, which caused him to return. Herodotus says that the Egyptian Empire

extended from the Danube even beyond the Ganges, and included all of Africa, and that all over this vast territory there were erected pillars, on which was inscribed “Sesostris, king of kings and lord of lords, subdued this country by the power of his arms;” which, while it displayed a commendable spirit in marking the limits of his conquest, it at the same time evinces a growing personal vanity that afterward seriously tarnished his early fame.

After having thus conquered the then entire known world, Sesostris returned to Egypt with innumerable captives and laden with spoils, and, by devoting himself to enriching and benefiting Egypt, rather than to extending his dominions, fame and grandeur, showed that his ambition had expended itself in his first great campaign. From all that can be gathered of his reign over Egypt, it must be inferred that no country before, if since, was ever more happily disposed toward its sovereign. The many monuments of his greatness, throughout his dominions, were covered with inscriptions, asserting that all Sesostris’ mighty deeds were accomplished without burdening his subjects; but, on the contrary, they all had become able, through them, to pass the remainder of their days in “calm and repose.”

Having subdued so much of the world, had he been equally ambitious to extend over it the same beneficent Government that he held over Egypt—which he could easily have done through the numerous competent persons the foresight of Amenophis had provided him with, who were well versed in his policy and administration of affairs—Sesostris would undoubtedly have earned and been entitled to the appellation of the world’s benefactor. It appears, however, that he did not exert himself at all in this direction, but was content to receive the annual tributes he levied to enrich Egypt proper. His reasons for pursuing this course, rather than of endeavoring to reward his most worthy adherents by making them rulers of the countries they had assisted him to conquer, are incomprehensible, and that they should not have urged him to it equally so. When it is considered how wisely and happily he governed Egypt, it can be imagined how vastly he might have benefited the conquered people by diffusing correct knowledge of the art of government among them through extending his rule over them.

As it was, it came about, that various Egyptian colonies scattered here and there over the conquered country, and in this way were instrumental in spreading the wisdom of their nation. It was one of these colonies that afterward became the famous Athens—the seat of learning, literature and philosophy. It was about this time also that the use of letters was introduced by one Cadmus, whom the Egyptians claimed to be of their country; but the majority of writers agree that they originated in Syria, and that they were identical with the Hebraic. Of these, however, there were but sixteen, four others being added some two hundred and fifty years later, and the remaining four a long time afterward.

The reign of Sesostris may justly be considered as having produced more general and extended influence upon the world than that of any of his ancestors of any country, and that nothing occurred that can hold any degree of comparison to it until the time of Alexander, more than a thousand years afterward. Sesostris was succeeded by Pheron, and he by Proteus, who dedicated the beautiful temple to “Venus the Stranger,” supposed to be “Helen of Troy,” famous for her beauty, and who was stolen by Paris, from whom she was taken by Proteus and returned to the Greeks.

Under succeeding reigns, the glory of Egypt began to decline, violence and cruelty to usurp the places where justice and moderation had so long prevailed, and jealousies, petty malice and personal aggrandizement to take the place of that love of country which is superior to self; nor could aught else have been expected from the ill-advised luxury and ease the country obtained under Sesostris, which should have been converted into action and expended upon tributary nations. The downward tendency, or the disintegrating process, having begun, demonstrated that the principle upon which Egypt rose and flourished had culminated, and was now to be disseminated among other nations and tribes. Nor could any effort of succeeding rulers, who saw the process at work and understood the causes thereof, stop the downward tendency, which continued with but temporary interruptions until the death of Tharaca, 687 years B. C., when the kingdom remained in a state of anarchy, until twelve noblemen conspired to divide it among themselves. For some superstitious reasons Psammetichus, one of the twelve, was banished; but he, entering into a league with some Greeks, made war upon the eleven, defeated them, and again united the kingdom under one rule, and remained sole possessor of it until his death.

Six hundred and sixteen years B. C. one Nechos arose, who attempted the cutting of a canal from the Nile to the Red Sea, but was unsuccessful. This, however, was partly atoned for by the accomplishment of a voyage entirely around the coast of Africa by some skilful Phœnician sailors he employed, they leaving Egypt by the Red Sea and returning by the way of the Mediterranean after an absence of three years. This passage was made some 2,000 years before the Portuguese discovered this way to the Indies, by which these Phœnicians were able to enter the Mediterranean through the Straits of Gibraltar.

Trouble after trouble now distracted the kingdom, and its power and influence declined with every reign, until the Persians, under Cambyses, 525 years B. C., subdued it. Since the downfall of the Persian Empire, Egypt has successively been subject to the Macedonians, Romans, Saracens, Mamelukes, and lastly the Turks, by whom it is now nominally possessed. The late accomplishment of the project Nechos failed in may be prophetic of radical changes in the condition Egypt has so long been submerged in—the indications being favorable for a return to considerable importance among the nations of the earth.

THE TENDENCIES OF GOVERNMENT.

[Revised from the New York Herald of May 2d, 1870.]

MRS. WOODHULL'S THIRD LETTER.

Nearly all historians who have written since Josephus have endeavored to reconcile sacred and profane history. This task Rollin attempts regarding the origin of the Assyrian empire. Diodorus says that "Ninus, the most ancient Assyrian king, performed great actions. Being naturally of a warlike disposition, and ambitious of glory which results from valor, he armed a considerable number of young men that were brave and vigorous, like himself, and trained them to all manner of hardships." This Ninus, Rollin endeavors to make it appear, was the Nimrod of the Scriptures, and the Belus who was afterward worshiped as a god. Calisthenes, a philosopher, who was one of the retinue of Alexander the Great, says the Babylonians reckoned their origin back some 115 years after the Deluge, which would be about 2,250 years B. C. The conflict of authority upon the origin of this empire, renders it competent for our purpose to assume this date, and that Nimrod was the first historic king of Assyria.

* * * * *

Assyria is supposed to have derived its name from Asshur, the son of Shem, who, the Scripture says, settled this country. Nimrod possessed himself of the province, introduced his own subjects into it, built cities and made himself generally beloved. It is said he built Nineveh, more grand and magnificent than all the rest, and named it after his son Ninus, who, on his accession to the throne, conceived the design of extending his conquests, and began to prepare troops and officers capable of carrying it out. In seventeen years he conquered all the country between Egypt, India and Bactriana, which last country he did not think himself strong enough to attack with success.

While preparing for further and greater conquests he also determined to immortalize his name by making of Nineveh a city at once commensurate with his power and wealth. His design, says Diodorus, was "to make it the largest and noblest city in the world, and to put it beyond the power of others who might come after him to ever build another such. Nor," as Rollin adds, "was he deceived in this; for never did any city come up to the greatness and magnificence of this." It was eighteen miles and three-quarters long and eleven miles and one-quarter broad, and was surrounded by a wall one hundred feet high.

Having completed Nineveh he pursued his intended campaign against the Bactrians, into whose country he marched an army of 1,700,000 foot, 200,000 horse and 20,000 chariots, armed with scythes. With this vast array he quickly overran the whole country and finally laid siege to its capital. This city was strongly fortified and stoutly defended, so much so that Ninus began to despair of reducing it, when the wife of one of his officers advised him how to attack its citadels so as to capture them, and by them the city. This woman was the afterward celebrated Semiramis. Ninus made use of her advice, and the city fell into his hands with but little loss to him.

Ninus, finding a woman possessed of such remarkable capacity to aid him in his ambitious designs, at once conceived for Semiramis the most violent passion. Her husband, upon hearing this, killed himself to escape the fury of Ninus. Having married her, he not long after died—some assert by her connivance—and left the kingdom to her.

It was Semiramis who undertook the building of the mighty Babylon, in which work she employed two million men. Dr. Prideaux tells us the walls around Babylon were three hundred and fifty feet high and eighty feet thick, and that it contained six hundred and seventy-six squares two miles and a quarter in circumference. His description of the walls, the quays and bridges, lakes, ditches, canals, palaces, hanging-gardens and temple of Belus presents a picture of grandeur and magnificence unknown in this age. Diodorus also says even in his time there were many monuments of grandeur still standing bearing the name of Semiramis.

This beautiful and extraordinary woman possessed the most marvelous control over all she came in contact with. Her simple presence was sufficient to quell any tumult or mutinous proceeding. Not satisfied with the immense possessions left her by Ninus, she conquered Ethiopia and the larger part of Africa. Not yet content, she determined upon the subjugation of India, against which

she set out with 3,000,000 foot, 500,000 horse and a multitude of camels, with which she thought to make head against the Indian elephants. After she had successfully crossed the river Indus the Indian King fell upon her army, with his elephants, with such fury that it was utterly routed. Semiramis was by this defeat compelled to give over the conquest of India. Having reigned forty-two years she resigned the throne to Ninyas, her son, whom she discovered was plotting against her life, as the Jupiter Ammon of Egypt had told her years before he would. She retired from the sight of men, hoping speedily to have divine honors granted her name, which was also prophesied for her by the Egyptian god.

Of these vast armies, which predicate still more vast population, Rollin remarks: “I must own I am somewhat puzzled with a difficulty which may be raised against the extraordinary things related of Ninus and Semiramis, as they do not seem to agree with the times so near the deluge; I mean such vast armies; such a numerous cavalry; so many chariots armed with scythes; such immense treasures of silver and gold, and the magnificence of the buildings. The temple of Belus alone contained more than twenty millions pounds sterling hoarded treasure.” Rollin argues that the Greek historians, from whom he compiled, must have fallen into some grave errors, since, that such things should have occurred so soon after the deluge, presupposes what must have been beyond the range of possibility.

The Assyrian empire, having attained the zenith of power and magnificence under Semiramis, began to sink into a gradual decay, the kings themselves setting the example of indolence and dissipation. This process of decay continued until the time of Sardanapalus, about 700 years B. C. He surpassed all his predecessors in effeminacy, cowardice and licentious luxury, and abandoned himself completely to pleasure, wine and women; even dressing and painting his cheeks as the women did. It seems strange that a people so used to glory and conquest should not have sooner revolted against such debauchery and dissoluteness. This was left for one Arbaces to do; he obtained entrance to the King’s palace, and with his own eyes witnessed the truth of the reports about the King. Arbaces at once began to incite rebellion; by his reports he gained over the governors of several provinces, who raised an army and marched against the King, whom they succeeded in shutting up in the city of Nineveh. The King considered Nineveh impregnable, but the river Tigris suddenly rose to a great height and broke down some portions of the walls of the city, which admitted the troops of the rebellious governors. Sardanapalus then proceeded to burn himself, his women and treasure, which latter, according to Atheneus, amounted to “a thousand myriads of talents of gold and ten times as much silver, each myriad of which was of the value of $7,000,000.” Such treasure we in this age know nothing of. After the death of Sardanapalus the empire was dismembered, and the kingdoms of Babylon, Nineveh and Medea formed from its ruins. Between these there was constant warfare waged. During the time of Cyazares a horde of Scythian barbarians devastated the three kingdoms, remaining their masters until the people disposed of them by a general stratagem—slaughtering them while drunk with wine, at feasts to which, by concert, each family of Assyrians had invited them upon an agreed day. Such as escaped this, fled the country. Cyazares, after repeated efforts, succeeded in utterly destroying Nineveh, the last city that held out against him, and with the aid of his nephew, Cyrus, united the three kingdoms again under one government, which was the beginning of the famous empire of the Medes and Persians.

Crœsus, King of Lydia, is here entitled to a slight digressive reference on account of the influence he at this time exercised. Vast riches in most kingdoms had led to indolence, effeminacy and licentiousness; but Crœsus thought it unworthy for any person, much less a king, to surrender himself to these. Not only was he vastly rich, and an extraordinary conqueror, but his chief delight consisted in literature and science; he patronized the learned and wise of all nations; so much so that they all made particular effort to visit his dominions to receive his assistance. His court was the ordinary residence of the seven wise men of Greece. It was with him that Æsop, the author of the Fables, flourished. The possession of these characteristics entitle Crœsus to most honorable mention and memory, and he should be regarded as a representative king.

It will be remembered that Cyrus was the first king of Persia, which by conquest he enlarged until it comprised all the territory between the Tigris and Indus, the Caspian Sea and Indian Ocean. His uncle, Cyazares, retained Medea. He, finding himself involved in a terrible war with the kings of several provinces—among whom was Crœsus of Lidya—sent to Cyrus for aid, who set out at once with an army. The vast preparations made on both sides culminated in the battle of Thimbra—one of the most remarkable events of ancient times—which decided the empire of Asia against the Assyrians and in favor of the Persians. This battle has always been the study of great commanders, because the military genius there displayed by Cyrus makes him rank as one of the greatest of generals. After reducing all the smaller nations of Asia Minor, Cyrus turned his whole power against Babylon, which he determined upon destroying. He accomplished its capture by emptying the river Euphrates into the vast ditches prepared by Semiramis, and marching his army over its dry bed into the city at night, while its inhabitants were engaged in some general entertainment. Thus the mighty city built by Semiramis fell, and the destruction ceased not, until not even its walls remained to tell

the story of its grandeur.

With the reunion of what constituted the first Assyrian empire, the conquests of Cyrus seem to have ceased. He turned his whole attention to perfecting a system of government for the vast country he had acquired. This he accomplished most wisely. All historians agree that in this task he was greatly aided by the wisdom and counsel of Daniel the Prophet, who obtained a position of great power and influence. It was no doubt he who obtained from Cyrus the famous decree regarding the Babylonish captivity of the Jews. So prosperous and happy did the empire become under the reign of Cyrus, that historians affirm “that after his death he was universally regarded as the common father of the people.” Having reigned seventy years he died 529 years B. C., leaving the empire to Cambyses, his son, who was as great in crime as his father had been in virtue. He caused the death of his only brother, Smerdis, married his youngest sister (who was very beautiful), and afterward killed her because she lamented the death of Smerdis. Happily his reign was cut short by death, having lasted less than eight years.

It was not generally known that Cambyses had caused the death of his brother Smerdis, which made it possible for Smerdis the magician to usurp the throne, giving out that he was the true Smerdis. He was exposed by one of his wives, at the instance of a nobleman named Darius, who managed to slay him, and was then unanimously named king, by his brother noblemen, for having done so. Soon after becoming king, Darius, with an army of 1,000,000 men, marched into Europe to chastise the Scythians for having overrun Assyria in the time of Cyazares. The expedition resulted disastrously to Darius, who could not even bring the Scythians to battle. They continually retired before him, and left him to be defeated by the scarcity of provisions, from which cause Darius came near losing his whole army, and was obliged to beat a hasty retreat to his own country. Darius then determined upon the conquest of India, which he accomplished. Of the particulars of this campaign no records are left, though it is known that India remained a Persian province many years, and paid annual tributes of £50,0000 sterling. Darius was the only conqueror who ever subjugated India sufficiently to reduce it to a tributary province; it made the twentieth that had been added to Persia.

During the reign of Darius, the Ionians revolted against Persian control, and succeeded in involving the Athenians with them; they furnished the Ionians twenty ships, by the aid of which Sardis was captured and burned. This so enraged Darius that he formed a solemn resolve to destroy Greece. Thus began that implacable strife of the Persians against the Grecians, by which Persian power was almost destroyed, and in which the Greeks performed the most remarkable exploits known in military history. These, coming more properly under Grecian summary, it will only be remarked here that Miltiades on the plains of Marathon, Leonidas at Thermopylæ, Themistocles at Salamis, Aristides at Plateæ, Leotychides at Mycale, and Simon at Eurymedon, taught the Persian monarchs that they were not to be subdued by them, though they should expend their mightiest power in their attempts.

So exhausted was the empire from the Grecian wars, that when the Egyptians revolted during the reign of Darius II. he found himself unable to subdue them. The superb empire made and left by Cyrus the Great under such admirable government was now becoming thoroughly corrupted and debauched, and was given to all species of licentiousness. Its former glory rapidly departed, and the elements of destruction were actively at work preparing it for the blow Alexander of Macedon was soon to deal it, from which it was destined never to recover.

After the dismemberment of the Macedonian Empire, Persia in part recovered, but became the field for constant barbarian inroads, which kept the kingdom in poverty and misery. Under Chosron, about the year 600, the empire again extended from the Indus to the Mediterranean. Justinian I. waged a successful war against Chosron, and compelled a disadvantageous peace. This was annulled by Chosron II., who again raised Persia to her former greatness by conquering Egypt, Ethiopia, Lydia and Yemen. These sudden conquests were soon lost, and the partially resuscitated empire passed into a rapid decline. At no time since has Persia exerted any considerable influence upon surrounding nations. Under Timour, in the fourteenth century, and the Turks in the fifteenth, it decayed rapidly; in the sixteenth century it became nearly extinct, and, as a nation, it remains virtually so to this day.

THE TENDENCIES OF GOVERNMENT.

[Revised from the New York Herald of May 9, 1870.]

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL’S FOURTH PAPER—A RETROSPECT OF ANCIENT GRECIAN AND ROMAN HISTORY.

[Below we present the fourth subdivision of Mrs. Woodhull’s treatise on “The Tendencies of Government,” from which it will be perceived that the lady has delved deep into the mines of governmental lore, and is vigorously training for the Presidential sweepstakes of 1872:]

Regarding the earliest traditions of Greece, it can be said they are less indefinite than those of Egypt or Assyria. No country of antiquity can be reverted to with more admiration and respect than this. In whatever light her history is considered, illustrious examples of true greatness abound. If her military career be reviewed, where can more glory be found to have been achieved? If her government be examined, where has greater wisdom and moderation ever been exercised? If the comparative advancement of science, literature, art and philosophy made within her domain be appealed to, where has greater proficiency ever been attained? If the personal characteristics of her great men be analyzed, where has patriotism ever risen to so sublime a degree? In many respects Greece may be considered the school-house of the world, wherein it has been taught the rudimentary principles of knowledge, especially that species of knowledge that conduces to the development of wisdom.

The territory of ancient Greece was by no means the Greece of to-day, but embraced all that country lying southward from Illyria and Thrace, now forming a part of Turkey in Europe. It then consisted of the provinces of Epirus, Peloponnesus, Greece proper, Thessaly and Macedonia, besides many islands in the Ægean Sea. The earliest inhabitants of Greece of whom anything is known were the Pelasgi, who "knew no other law than force, were ignorant even of agriculture, and fed on roots and herbs." A people called the Hellenes, from Asia, mingled with them, and their common name became Greeks, from Græcus, the son of Pelasgus. Although Greece was afterward the seat of so much knowledge and wisdom, it does not appear that these originated among the descendants of its original inhabitants, but that they sprung from the Phœnecian and Egyptian colonies that from various causes found their way into Greece.

Of the constant internal strife carried on between the several Grecian provinces no mention will be made. The first of these to arise was Sicyon, followed by Argos, Mycenæ, Athens, Sparta, Corinth and Macedon. When the population of any of these became large, it was the custom to send out colonies, thus distributing Grecian influence, instead of by war. The powerful cities of Rhegium, Syracuse, Sybaris, Crotona, Tarentum, Gela, Locris, Messina, Marseilles and Agrigentum, were formed from such colonies. For the space of a thousand years, or until 520 years B. C., the Grecians appear to have confined their operations within their own dominions. Being continually engaged in war with each other, they had no opportunity of carrying on aggressive warfare—this was never a Grecian characteristic, though so forcibly illustrated by Alexander of Macedon, and by Cimon and Agesilaus, for retaliation rather than aggression.

It is to be specially observed as illustrating the part Greece performed in the general advancement and diffusion of civilization that while all other great nations were made so by aggressive conquests, Greece rarely ever made war except in self-defence. The influence other nations had upon the world was gained by conquering contiguous countries. The influence Greece exercised was by diffusing among other nations the principles of science, philosophy and government and by commercial intercourse. Thus it is found that up to the time of the first Persian invasion there had been no concentration of the military forces of the several provinces, except as they had taken sides against each other in their feudal wars.

The Persian attempt to subjugate Greece was most unpropitious from the very onset. Mardonius marched a large army into the very heart of Greece, with scarcely any opposition; but his fleet, in approaching the coast of Macedon, encountered a storm, and was destroyed. Meanwhile, Mardonius took no pains to encamp his vast army in a place or form of security. A mere band of Thracians, taking advantage of this, fell upon the Persians in the night, and completely routed the whole army. This double defeat, by such unexpected means, caused Mardonius to return quickly into Asia.

Nothing daunted by this defeat, which he attributed to the inexperience of Mardonius, Darius dispatched another army, consisting of 500,000 men and 600 ships. The fleet first captured Eretrea, while the army caused such consternation in Greece that only Sparta, of all the provinces, responded to the Athenian call for succor. The Spartan troops, even, did not arrive in time to participate in the battle of Marathon, where Miltiades, with 10,000 Athenians, completely routed the whole Persian army. This victory gained by the Greeks over an army outnumbering theirs nearly twenty times, was, no doubt, the inspiring cause by which all succeeding victories over the Persians were gained. It taught the Greeks that a few determined men, fighting in defence of their country, were mightier than a multitude with no such incentive. Through the course of succeeding ages the Grecians exhibited a noble emulation of, and desire to imitate, if not excel, their ancestors, who fought and conquered at Marathon.

Xerxes, the successor of Darius, persisting in his determination to destroy Greece, crossed the Hellespont on a "bridge of boats," with an army of 1,700,000 and 80,000 horse, to which submitting countries added 300,000, so that he appeared before the pass of Thermopylæ with 2,000,000 men. Against this force Leonidas opposed 12,000 Spartans and allies. The whole power of the Athenians had been turned into preparations for naval warfare, which, as the sequel showed, was the salvation of Greece. The manner in which Leonidas and his 300 Spartans defended Thermopylæ, still further raised the determination of the Greeks to resist

after the same fashion all movements of the invaders. On the same day as the battle of Thermopylæ a great, though indecisive, naval battle was fought at Artemesium. Xerxes advanced upon, captured and burned Athens. The fate of Greece seemed decided; but the great naval battle of Salamis entirely changed the face of affairs. Xerxes being secretly informed that it was the intention of Themistocles to proceed with the Athenian fleet and destroy his “bridge” across the Hellespont, precipitately abandoned Greece, leaving Mardonius with 300,000 men and instructions to subdue Greece “if he was able.” At the battle of Platæa, which soon followed, Mardonius was completely defeated, and the same day the remainder of the Persian fleet was destroyed at Mycale.

Having thus rid themselves of the Persians the Athenians set about to rebuild their city. The Spartans, fearing Athens would gain great naval superiority over them, opposed it; thus the Grecians were no sooner rid of a common foe than strife broke out among themselves. This tendency arose from the process of individualization and is specially illustrative of the progress of evolution. Athens was rebuilt, and, as the Spartans feared, soon exceeded all other States in power and splendor. Athens also became the centre of the arts and sciences, knowledge of which was at this time rapidly developed. Sparta, no longer able to endure the overbearing pride of Athens, brought on the Peloponnesian war. This war devastated Greece and enslaved Athens. Sparta in turn was compelled to yield to Epaminondas, the Theban. In spite of this terrible war, poets, philosophers, artists and statesmen continued to arise, commerce flourished and the customs of the people were raised to the highest degree of perfection.

But a time of unhappiness soon came upon this too prosperous condition. Philip of Macedon, bold and cunning, took advantage of the dissensions that at all times prevailed, and by a sudden _coup de main_ thought to make himself master of all Greece. It can be asserted that not Greece, but one man, for forty-eight years continually frustrated the designs of Philip, who himself said, “The eloquence of Demosthenes did me more harm than all the armies and fleets of the Athenians. His harangues are like machines of war and batteries raised at a distance, by which all my projects and enterprises are ruined. Had I been present and heard that vehement orator declaim I should have been the first to conclude that it was necessary to declare war against me. Nor can I reach him with gold, for in this respect, by which I have gained so many cities, I find him invincible.” Antipater also says of him, “I value not the galleys nor armies of the Athenians. Demosthenes alone I fear. Without him the Athenians are no better than the meanest Greeks. It is he that arouses them from their lethargy and puts arms into their hands almost against their will. Incessantly representing the battle of Marathon and Salamis, he transforms them into new men. Nothing escapes his penetrating eye, nor his consummate prudence. He foresees all our designs; he countermines all our projects and disconcerts us in everything. Did the Athenians confide in him and follow his advice we should be irremediably undone.”

From all that can be gathered about this remarkable man it may seriously be considered whether, had he had the power of a Sesostris, a Cyrus or an Alexander, he would not have conquered and ruled the world. But the Athenians failed to follow his advice, and were reduced to submission to Macedon by the youthful Alexander, who said of him, when he passed Thermopylæ, “Demosthenes called me a child when I was in Illyria; he called me a young man when I was in Thessaly: I must now show him before Athens that I am a man grown.”

After the conquest was complete Alexander summoned at Corinth representatives from the several Grecian States, and requested from them the supreme command of all their armies against the Persians. No assembly ever held was embryotic of more momentous events. It was the Western World taking counsel and resolving upon the destruction of the Eastern, and was the initiatory step to almost incredible events, and to the revolutions that were to change the condition of the whole world, through the unexampled career of him who caused its assembling.

After the death of Alexander, the several Grecian States renewed the struggle for freedom. The Romans, who had risen in the West, becoming involved in the strife, proved fatal to Greece; for in the year 146 B. C. the capture of Corinth reduced Greece to a Roman province.

During the whole period of strife from the battle of Platæa, the arts and sciences flourished in a most extraordinary manner. Indeed, it was the golden age of art. The Grecian colonies were still more prosperous than their mother country. Alexandria, in Egypt, especially, became famous as the seat of learning. In the time of Augustus, the Greeks lost even the shadow of their former freedom and ceased to be an independent people; but they became the instructors of their conquerors; for their language, manners, customs, learning, arts and tastes spread over the whole Roman empire. After a time the Romans came to esteem the Greeks as the most worthless of creatures.

Asiatic luxury, acquired from the Persians, had wholly corrupted the Greek’s ancient love of freedom, and a mean servility became substituted therefor. At the beginning of the fourth century the people scarcely showed a single trace of their former noble

characteristics of simplicity and grandeur; and thus Greece passed into her condition of unimportance.

ROME.

Rome originally was but an insignificant city, founded on the banks of the Tiber by some herdsmen, whose small numbers were swelled somewhat “by strangers and outcasts from all the country about.” The herdsmen were without doubt Pelesgians, who had previously occupied the more easterly portions of Europe. The language they introduced bears unmistakable evidence of similarity to the Greek. That a people so humble as the original Romans were, who labored principally upon an unproductive soil for sustenance, should have increased in numbers, power and influence, so as to rule the world, seems almost incredible; but so it was.

A three-fold division of the people was early spoken of, probably representing as many different tribes. Each of these tribes was divided into ten smaller bodies called “Curial;” in war these divisions were represented by thirty centuries that made up the “legion.”

There were very few women among the early Romans. They seized on some Sabine women who came among them to witness their games, which seizure caused a war with the Sabines; the result of the war was the union of the Sabines with the Romans, and the extension among them of the same rules and divisions that existed among the Romans. This first conquest was prophetic of all future conquests, terminating as it did by the conquered country being added to Rome to increase its territory and power. The system of conquest thus begun continued with more or less activity during four centuries, when Rome had acquired nearly all the country as far east as the Euphrates. 500 years B. C. Tarquin, the last king, was expelled by the Senate, and the Roman republic began. During its first century, contentions among themselves prevented the Romans from materially extending their conquests. About the eightieth year of the republic the Gauls first attacked, captured and plundered Rome; nor could the Romans expel them until the banished Consul Camillus was recalled to command the armies. Soon after this, rapid strides to greatness were made, and Rome became the centre of attraction for the world. All countries, not already Roman, sought alliance, thereby hoping to escape conquest.

It was during this time of glory that luxury was first admitted and practised by Romans; and, as in all other countries, it laid the foundation for future ruin, by introducing into use licentious, vicious, and effeminate practices, where simplicity, purity and honor had previously held full sway.

Two hundred and eighty years B. C. the Carthagenians forming an alliance with the King of Syracuse brought on the first Punic war. The Syracusans soon deserted to the Romans and ever remained constant to them. The Romans had now acquired such love of, and thirst for, glory that they were considered unconquerable. In Sicily they gained great naval victories, and Africa trembled when her fleets neared its shores. The Carthagenians, through the advice of the Lacedemonian, Xantippus, defeated the army commanded by Regulus and captured him; he subsequently lost his life at the hands of the Carthagenians for opposing at Rome the conclusion of peace. The war continued by the advice of Regulus, turned in favor of the Romans, and the Carthagenians were compelled to accept the terms of peace offered by the Romans, thus ending the first Punic war.

The conquest of Seguntum by the Carthagenians, contrary to the terms of peace, led to the second Punic war, in which the celebrated Hannibal figured so conspicuously, and for a time made Rome tremble. From this temporary fear the Romans emerged more terrible than ever. They not only put a stop to the victorious career of Hannibal, but conquered Spain, and, crossing into Africa, compelled the recalling of Hannibal to defend Carthage. The famous battle of Zama ensued, in which both Hannibal and Scipio displayed the greatest military talent. The study of this battle has since been the admiration of all great military captains. The victorious Romans dictated again the terms of peace, which Carthage was obliged to accept. Thus ended the second Punic war.

The ambition of Rome now increased to such an immoderate extent as to threaten the reduction of the whole world to submission. Macedon and Syria endeavored to make head against them, but nothing could withstand the irresistible power of the perfectly disciplined Roman legions. Macedon was glad to end the war by becoming a Roman province, and Syria, to escape total destruction, by ceding to Rome the larger portion of her territory.

Carthage, the former powerful rival of Rome, still existed, which so annoyed the Romans that its destruction was determined upon and accomplished by the third Punic war, which ended 145 years B. C. The complete subjugation of all the Greek and Spanish provinces immediately followed, and Roman power was unparalleled. This begat a spirit of intolerance which goaded many of her conquered provinces into revolt. Combining their armies, they for a time successfully resisted the Romans. Pompey, coming into command, rapidly crushed out all resistance. Internal contentions between the several factions at Rome quickly followed the

reduction of the formidable revolt. Cæsar, Pompey and Crassus, more active than the rest, divided the government between themselves. This was the first triumvirate. Cæsar would have no equal, and Pompey could endure no superior. The rivalry between these two powerful men was the initiatory step to the conditions that ruined the republic. Cæsar obtained the consulate and government of Gaul, and began to lay the foundation for his future greatness by extending his military enterprises in all directions. He defeated the Swiss, conquered the Germans, subdued the Belgians, reduced the whole of Gaul, invaded Britain, imposed tributes upon the people everywhere, and became the master spirit of the time.

When Cæsar returned to Rome Pompey fled. Cæsar then became perpetual dictator. This was about 50 years B. C. Pursuing Pompey into Greece, Cæsar defeated him at the great battle of Pharsalia, and thus overcame all opposition to unlimited power. In this possession Cæsar became so intolerably overbearing that a conspiracy was formed against him, which resulted in his death at the hands of Brutus. The love of the people, especially the women, remained Cæsar's, so the new ruler found no peace. The strife between Brutus, Antony, and Octavius waxed warm, and Rome, as in the days of Marius and Scylla, became the scene of infamy and horror. Octavius and Antony, overcoming all opposition, divided the empire between them. Octavius remained in the west, Antony went to the east, and there became enamored of Cleopatra, the Egyptian Queen, for whom he abandoned Octavio, the sister of Octavius. This brought about a conflict, and Octavius proceeded to the east with a great army to chastise Antony. By the treachery of Cleopatra, whose army and navy deserted to Octavius, Antony was totally defeated. The treachery of Cleopatra determined him to take his life, which in turn caused her such grief that she sought and found relief through the aspen's bite.

Octavius thus became sole master of the mightiest empire the world had ever beheld. It comprised nearly every country then known under a universal monarchy. Octavius assumed the title of Augustus Cæsar, and reigned over this mighty empire forty-five years with the most consummate skill and prudence, and with a profound appreciation of the position he occupied. It was during his reign that literature flourished so extensively. The best literary age of all countries has since been called its Augustan age, as likened to that of Rome under him. In the thirtieth year of his reign Jesus Christ was born. The Roman Empire at this time assumed its proudest and grandest pitch of power and glory, which will ever be the wonder and admiration of coming ages, until another nation shall arise to a greater and still more glorious condition, of which Rome will forever remain prophetic until fulfilled.

From the reign of Augustus to Constantine the Great, who transferred the capital to Byzantium, the empire sustained a series of good and bad rule, and declined somewhat from its previous proud position. On the death of Constantine the Great, Constantine II., Constantius and Constance divided the empire. Constantine II. had all Europe west of the Alps; Constantius Italy, Sicily and Africa; and Constance Asia, Egypt and the whole East. This division was the beginning of the great disasters that came fast upon Rome. Constantine and Constantius being disposed of by treason, Constance usurped the whole power; being destitute not only of all capacity for so extended rule, but also of all honor, the empire began to disorganize. During his reign and that of his successor, until Theodosius, about the year 400, country after country successfully revolted against the power of Rome. Everything in which her former renown and glory consisted degenerated, until Rome was precipitated into that condition which ultimated in her entire destruction, so that she who so lately was the proud mistress of the world, was unable to resist the barbarians of Northern Europe, who extinguished her light, thereby leaving the world in the midnight and anarchy of the "Dark Ages."

MODERN EUROPE.

With the downfall of Rome that portion of history called ancient ceases. The numerous provinces of Europe that had been under the Roman power were completely under the control of the various barbarians who had destroyed that power. Out of this condition of anarchy modern Europe rose. As it consists of a number of countries their separate histories will not be considered; only such prominent facts regarding the whole will be observed as seem to indicate and mark its general progressive steps.

From the fall of Rome in 476 to the time of Charlemagne in 800, Western Europe was the scene of those operations that determined its present divisions. The barbaric tribes that occupied it were the Vandals, Suevi, Alans, Visigoths, Burgundians, Germans, Franks, Lombards, Angles, Saxons and Huns. The Visigoths founded Spain; the Angles and Saxons formed the seven kingdoms of Britain; the Germans fixed themselves on the Danube, and from these grew all the German States; the Lombards had Italy, and the Franks France. During this period Mohammed founded an empire in Asia, out of the ruins of which most of the monarchies of Western Asia arose.

Charlemagne was the ruling spirit of what may be termed the second period of modern European history, from 800 to 1074. Under him France took form and rank as one of the first powers of the world, and has never since been entirely divested of it. He temporarily re-established the Western Empire, but with his death it went to pieces. Spain was the theatre of the terrible wars

between the Moors and Christians. The seven Saxon kingdoms were united by Egbert, who became the first King of England. The whole north of Europe was still barbarous, and frequently poured its hordes over the civilization in the south that was struggling for existence. The Danes ravaged England, and became masters of it; while Germany, under Otho the Great, rose to great power. The other present European States were still in obscurity.

The third period of modern European history extended from 1074 to 1453. During this period the German Empire was the scene of constant quarrels between the Emperors and the Popes, under the factions called Guelphs and Ghibelines, which dimmed the lustre Otho had conferred on it; Naples and Sicily were erected into kingdoms by the Normans; Denmark arose to some importance under Wildemar II.; in France, legislation and police restraints were introduced, but her power was nearly crushed by Edward III. of England, which country was in turn deluged in blood by the “Wars of the Roses;” Genoa and Venice increased in rank and importance; Spain still suffered from the Moors; Portugal became a distinct kingdom; Sweden and Norway came into existence; Russia emerged from the barbaric rule of the Tartars; Poland put on the royal dignity; Hungary and Bohemia were added to Austria, and the Turkish Empire rose to great power, putting an end to the Eastern Empire. The arts and sciences began to be cultivated again in the West, and literature and learning to flourish. Many inventions were produced, such as paper making, printing, engraving, painting in oil, gunpowder, and the mariner’s compass, and this brings us to the fourth period of history, which was pregnant with events that were to modify and change the general conditions of the world.

The fourth period extended two hundred years to 1650. In it America and the West Indies were discovered. The Reformation brought about great changes in very many respects in nearly every European country, many of which underwent important revolutions. Germany made important legislative improvements; feudal government was destroyed in France; Spain became a Christian kingdom; England rose to great power, especially under Elizabeth; Italy divided herself into numerous small States; Switzerland became a republic; the provinces of Holland declared their independence of Spain; Poland flourished; Denmark became of importance; affairs in Russia assumed a new appearance, the power of the Tartars being destroyed, and the Ottoman Empire became grand under Solyman II.

About 1650, the beginning of the fifth historic period, the political systems of Europe began to undergo considerable change, which, from various causes, continued until the time of Bonaparte. Revolutions in England, France, Germany and Russia caused various modifications, not only in the limits of the various countries, but also in their governments. England and France seemed to divide the other Powers about equally in the support and continuance of their wars; the general configuration of Europe, however, did not sustain any radical changes. This period is important in another and new aspect. Colonies from all the western kingdoms were continually going to the new America—that country which should in future exercise such control over the destinies of the world.

From time to time in the history of the world there have arisen single great men who by the grandeur of their enterprises and the power of their intellect and ambition, have left indelible impressions of themselves upon its history and condition. Such were Sesostris, Cyrus, Alexander, Cæsar and Charlemagne. Though they all possessed many traits of character which the present age cannot admire, they must ever be regarded as having given general civilization those great impulses that have so rapidly evolved the world from barbarism.

At the beginning of the next period another great man appeared, the waves of whose power were felt over the whole world, and who, by the grandeur of his conceptions, power and executive will, rose from obscurity to dictate to Europe, which was at that time the world. From 1789 to 1815 may justly be styled the Bonapartean period. It would be superfluous to recapitulate his career; nor would it be less so to trace the rescuing of America from the savages by the resistless advance of civilization, which, since the settlement of Jamestown, in 1607, has made such unexampled progress in all things that pertain to greatness, grandeur and glory—in literature, science, art and government.

Before closing the _resume_ of general history it should be observed that many great events have been passed unnoticed, the principal aim having been to follow the western tendency of empire, and to present only such facts as were prominent in forming standards of progress, perpetual landmarks and historic eras. In Asia particularly, great events occurred, such as the career of Ghengis Khan and Tamerlane. The former, it is computed, slaughtered fifteen millions of human beings during his reign. The efforts of such as he were the last struggles of barbarians to arrest the onward course of general progress. Though for a time triumphant in their course the genius of progress could never be entirely eradicated where once it had found root and growth. China and India have been passed because, for the most part, they have been confined within themselves; the reason whereof will be discussed hereafter.

THE TENDENCIES OF GOVERNMENT.

[Revised from the New York Herald of May 16, 1870.]

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL'S LAST LESSON IN POLITICAL HISTORY.

[The following communication from Mrs. Woodhull, who, as the public is already informed, has devoted herself to enlightenment on the question of government, will be found as interesting as any of her previous letters on the same subject This is Mrs. Woodhull's concluding letter on the Tendencies of Government:]

In entering upon the next and third part of the subject, we are conscious of the imperfect construction of the second. It must be remembered that the purpose of the _resume_ was not to give consecutive historic detail, but to mark such special facts as evidently show there was a progressive and consecutive rise and fall of nations. Without apology for omissions and minor errors, we proceed to the consideration whether the facts elicited from history form a consecutive chain of progress, by which the world has been evolved from barbarism, and whether this evolution has been according to present philosophic formulas. The first and most prominent fact that becomes obvious to the observer of general history is that the progress of empire has always been from the east, westward. The progress of the earth in its daily rotation upon its own axis and also in its orbital movement around the sun is toward the east. This is believed to explain the order maintained by the course of empire. Motion being in the direction of the least resistance, the general tendency of the surface influence of the earth must be west. Counter side influences have at times caused deviations from straight lines, but this only makes the general proposition still more forcible. Therefore, as a general proposition, the course of empire and of civilization and population has always been westward.

If this proposition is applied to pre-historic times, to govern deductions regarding it, neither Assyria nor Egypt can be considered as having been the first powerful empire of the world. It is known that in them there existed a numerous and powerful people of whom history fails to give the exact or even supposed origin; the same is true of all the surrounding countries, in Europe, Asia and Africa. If it is allowed that population has resulted from the same general law that civilization has, it must be admitted that China and India were the predecessors of Assyria and Egypt.

Allowing that China and India existed as vast tribal communities previous to the historic age of Assyria and Egypt, it will be seen that population, general civilization and improving government crossed Asia westward and developed the Assyrian Empire, which, for the same general reasons must be held the predecessor of Egypt.

The Assyrian Empire attained its greatest power under Semiramis, 2,150 years B. C., which was about the beginning of the historic age of Egypt, and 700 years before Sesostris conquered the greater part of the known world. In whatever comparative light the histories of these two countries are viewed, Assyria must be deemed the more ancient empire. It may be further observed, if Nimrod was the first King of Assyria, and the father of Ninus, who was the husband of Semiramis, the empire came to its greatest glory in an exceedingly short time. Very many reasons can be assigned why Assyria must have been an empire of centuries when Semiramis reigned.

The Assyrian Empire, in the year 2,150 B. C., was the great power of the world, having sway over the greater part of Asia and Africa. Seven hundred years afterward, or 1,499 years B. C., Egypt had risen to its greatest glory, and under Sesostris acquired the Assyrian Empire, besides a vast country in Europe and Africa which Semiramis had never subdued.

Out of the ruins of Assyria, Babylon, Nineveh and Medea were formed, and, after being consolidated, were merged into the famous Persian Empire by Cyrus, 536 years B. C., or 950 years after the proudest Egyptian period. The Persian Empire absorbed the Indian and Egyptian, and became the most splendid power that had existed, and with rising Greece divided the world.

Grecian power being concentrated by Alexander of Macedon, he acquired the ascendancy over the Persians, and became the world's conqueror. Numerous Grecian colonies, following the general tide of influence westward, formed powerful kingdoms in various parts of the Mediterranean coasts and islands.

Rome, rising to power, contended with Carthage for supremacy in the west. Carthage being destroyed by the three Punic wars, the attention of Roman armies was turned eastward, to gather in the elder empires that were verging on decay. Greece, 146 years B. C., became the Roman province of Achaia. Continuing its conquests further, fifty years B. C., Rome became ruler of a greater part of the inhabited world than any of the previous empires, and existed in the utmost pomp and glory several centuries, until the northern barbarians swept over and extinguished it.

No considerable Power existed after 476, until Charlemagne's, though some influence attached to several Asiatic countries. Civilized nations were extinct in Europe. From Charlemagne, in 800, to 1500, civilization continued to rear its blighted head in various parts of Europe, and to mark the countries that should play the next last act in the drama of unceasing general progress.

The historic age of the world, then, has been occupied thus: The Assyrian Empire existed and was subdued by the Egyptian, which was conquered by the Persian, which was destroyed by the Grecian, which was compelled to yield to the Roman, which was destroyed by the barbarians, that from its ashes numerous kingdoms and empires should arise, to exist together, and to spread over and occupy the outside world Rome had never known.

From this succession of empire many deductions might be drawn which would assist in forming a well-defined line of progress. Many are so obvious that it would be superfluous to name them; therefore we leave them, with the general observation, that in each succeeding empire the condition of the people was more directly and distinctly recognized, while each, in grasping for universal sway, and not possessing the principles upon which universal government was possible, exceeded the limits of its central strength, and thereby fell. India and China alone, of all ancient nations, survive, because they have never sought to extend their limits, but have expended their strength within their own, though it often was in war.

The commercial greatness of England, more than any other present externally apparent power, is promoting the general assimilation of the world. This influence is producing very great and diffusive results in Asia, Africa and South America, and the way is being opened and cleared for more radical and general control. It is impossible that the increasing power of civilized and enlightened ideas and customs in India, China and Asia generally, should not revolutionize those countries. Many Chinese will return from this country, carrying with them the solvent power of the genius of our institutions, which, combining with all similar powers, will ere long kindle the flame of popular individual freedom. This flame will cause republics to spring into existence where one form of government has existed through historic time over the same defined limits of kingdom. Another great and powerful influence is being evolved that cannot fail to exercise a tremendous modifying power over Asia. Russia, the European giant, is slowly but surely pushing into Asia from the west. If it continue its present well-consolidated home strength, it will absorb Asia until it meet the same absorbing process proceeding westward, when Asia will be prepared for a still grander consummation.

In Europe, Russian influence is also gaining the ascendancy. Though one of the youngest of European kingdoms, it seems possessed of an inherent strength superior to them all, which Bonaparte, with all his terrible power and ambition, could not scatter nor weaken, and which stands ever ready to gather under its protecting wings the sickening adjacent kingdoms. At present Russia is biding her time and strengthening her arms, which she is conscious shall soon reach out and grasp all they can compass.

Prussia, meantime, is spending its strength in the vain, though apparently successful, endeavor to consolidate a country under absolute control, that is impossible of a people so numerously and diffusively represented, in a country where freedom is the rule. Throughout Southern, Central and Southwestern Europe, republicanism impatiently awaits the time to burst forth, and sweep among the debris of the past all traces of monarchy. The country over which the Roman eagles triumphed will again be under a republican form of government, improved upon that of Rome by 2,000 years of successful experiment. Russia will then occupy a central position between the republics of Europe and Asia, and its emperors be the last to yield their crowns. Like no other country, Russia has vast possessions in the unyielding frigid zone, which gives way but slowly before the gradually equalizing temperature of the globe, and of the character of which Russian Government naturally partakes.

Though revolutionized, Southeastern Asia will remain China and India, the ancient Assyrian, Persian and Grecian Empires will be resurrected under the consolidated Russian, while Africa will be left for Egyptian control, the promise of which begins to be visible in the direction given to civilization and commerce by the successful accomplishment of Nechos' defeated project, and, Egypt returned to be a nation of importance. Africa will naturally gravitate to Egypt, as it is possessed of no other salient point from which dominion and power can spring. In this regard Africa differs from all the other grand divisions of the globe. The character of its inherent wealth is also different. Other countries have their frozen regions, inland seas and marshes, stupendous mountains and deep jungles, but Africa alone has its Sahara. Commerce has scattered the germs of civilization here and there upon the coasts of Africa, but its central portions are to all intents as undeveloped as when Semiramis went into Ethiopia, and Sesostris levied his tributes of gold, silver, precious stones and woods. What Africa is held in reserve for by the general economy of the universe it is impossible to determine; but that a time will come when her resources will be required and obtained, is philosophically certain.

In Europe, where the more prominent scenes of modern history have been enacted, a modified method of conquest was begun by its countries, resembling that which was pursued by ancient Greece. This was not so much a subdual of foreign countries to actual

control as it was the general diffusion among them of civilization upon a more extended scale, made possible by improvements in the art of navigation. The assimilation of the world was thus begun upon a more perfect basis than by force of arms, and which differed widely from it in this fact: that while arbitrary control was at all times open to overthrow, the process of becoming alike, could never be interrupted except by the suspension of intercourse. Under the former, no two empires could exist side by side for any length of time without one being subjugated by the other; under the latter a number of kingdoms have existed for centuries, and though frequently engaged in conflict to settle some dispute of boundary or policy, it has seldom been pursued to utter destruction. The same end grasped for by Semiramis first and by Bonaparte last is being reached by the much more certain though gradual process of assimilation.

Thus far America has been untouched, but its consideration now becomes necessary. The Old World, as has been found, must continue its evolution, until like conditions shall exist everywhere. Similar interests beget union. When the general people shall begin to realize that their common interests depend upon the interests of each individual, one system of government must follow, whether it proceed from one common centre or from several centres.

What is America? Americus Vespucius and Christopher Columbus, acting upon sound scientific principles, discovered to the inhabitants of the Old World a new country, that was to be a haven of retreat for such of them as sought greater freedom and better equality, in which individuality could expand without coming in contact and being dwarfed by personal government. In continuing to be this haven of retreat it has become the representative country of the world. To its hospitable and ever-inviting shores people of all nations and climes have come, so that in two centuries the principal country of it has grown to be a Nation of more inherent strength than any country of the Old World, and to rank among its nations as a first class Power, both feared and respected.

The United States of America, all genuine Americans believe, will become the United American States. The very name is prophetic of what shall be, while the progress made in that direction begins to give well-defined outlines of it. Beginning on the Atlantic coast an infant republic, the United States has stretched its arms westward across the Continent. The same oceans that bound the east and west of the Old World wash its eastern and western shores. Having gained ocean-bound limits latitudinally, which form a central basis of strength, it will expand longitudinally until it shall become an ocean-bound republic—a grand confederation of States and interests, which, while being peculiarly American, will be so far cosmopolitan as to represent the descendants of every nation of the world—we no longer say of the known world. Europe has its well-defined limits of kingdoms and states, the people of which seldom pass from one to the other to become citizens; so also has Asia, while Africa is more nearly homogeneous; but they all give up their people to America. America, besides being American, is European, Asiatic and African, while each of these is becoming American. No well-informed person doubts that the progressive greatness, of republican forms of government, is rapidly dissolving the strength and solidity of all the monarchies of the Old World; though they may affect to despise republics, and to call ours a failure, their subjects are anxiously asking, When can we successfully revolutionize? Though such a step may not be openly advocated by any, it is, nevertheless, secretly discussed, and preparatory means are being devised, in every country.

And for these reasons the United American States will be the representative country of the world. Some may argue, because the commercial power of England is so superior; because she has such numerous general possessions, the English language being the one that must become universally used, that, by virtue of these, that dignity belongs to England. The fact cited above, showing that the general disintegrating influence of the world centres and is integrated in the United States, is a sufficient answer to such an illegitimate argument—illegitimate, because it is evident to all, that the process of the diffusion of English influence throughout the world is, so far as England is concerned, one of disintegration; while that going on upon American soil is diametrically opposite, being most decidedly one of integration. If the process of integration is pursued until it culminates, and the argument is educed that disintegration must follow in America as it has in England, it may be answered that the English influence that is being diffused world-wide is peculiarly English; while, when that process shall have commenced in America, it will proceed from a centre formed by previous influx from all countries in the world, and in this sense is not a process of disintegration, but simply of reaction.

The general law of direction for population and civilization was westward until it had encircled the globe, and in their last conquest found a country of sufficient inherent vitality to attract all other countries toward it. Not only does the tide of influence continue to flow to America from the east, but since her power has made itself felt upon the Pacific coast, the same tide has set in from the west, and Asia pours her surplus population upon our western coast, which exemplifies one of the modifying portions of the rule of motion. For the time, therefore, though preponderant commercial importance must be accorded England, the United States thereby loses none of its general prestige as the representative country of the world.

From whatever point consideration begins, the conclusion that is inevitably reached is, that the world must, in due time, become subject to one system of government. Whether that system shall at first proceed from one common centre or from several centres, is not so presently apparent, though that such a consolidation will be ultimately reached no one can doubt, who gives proper weight to the established fact that all perfect things become universal. So it is with everything of vital interest to the general people; rapid and sufficient communication is the only limiting power that controls their diffusion. In proportion as the diffusive means increase, in number and extent, so do the interests of the people become proportionately assimilated and best systems prevail.

A striking exemplification of the benefit that would flow from the adoption of general systems in all things may be drawn from the system of international telegraphing. A universal language in this becomes of the first importance. How much more important when the general uses and benefits are considered. The adoption of a universal language would remove the greatest obstacle from the path of the general diffusion of knowledge and innumerable difficulties from methods of communication.

It should be further observed, that the same law governs in all communications between the different countries. This is a necessity, in order that the intercourse may be preserved and be at all times safe. Should it be inquired, how much of the common law of the world is similar, the answer returned would astonish all who had not given it consideration, by being so considerable a portion of the whole. Were the inquiry pressed further, to find how great modifications of common law would be required in the various nations to make a common administration possible to all, a still greater astonishment would be developed by the slight disparities that would be shown to exist.

It has been remarked that England has possessions in very many latitudes and longitudes of the world. Over these possessions a governing control is exercised, which control foreshadows the possibility of a government that shall control every country in all latitudes and longitudes. When it is remembered that the countries of Asia are practically as near Washington as California, there can be no argument deduced from distance against a common and world-wide administration of government. The broad assertion is made, that there is no argument against universal governmental administration, but that every possible argument urges all people to prepare for it as the thing of all things to be desired by them.

It only remains for some one of the great countries of the world to arrive at, or to approximate to, a perfect system of government that shall contain the elements and principles of sufficient inherent strength, to insure to that country the power which shall control the destinies of the world. From what has been said regarding the position of the United States, it must be admitted, that nearly all the natural advantages, as well as the general order of things, are on this side of the globe. If any conclusions naturally flow from the observation of the past tendencies in the order of nature, they are that the United States is destined to be the centre of a universal government.

The tendencies of government from earliest historic time have persistently been to universal sway. The systems and forms through which this tendency has been manifested have changed from time to time, as the circumstances that created them—the environment—the sum total of the governed—have changed. These systems will continue to be modified, until this tendency shall have opened such channels for itself, as will permit free and untrammeled action; until these channels shall have encircled the world, and its utmost limits shall have been attracted within the realm of its positive flow and negative reaction, and until the commanding magnetic influence that shall proceed from its central seat of power shall reach all subjects and find in their general heart an answering response of fidelity and confidence.

In such fidelity and confidence each and all can safely and earnestly devote themselves to the best aims and wisest purposes of life—to intellectual, moral and spiritual growth. In this general and universal pursuit the millennium, so long prophesied and prayed for, can alone be gained, through which reaching, the government of heaven can alone be administered on earth.

Government, then, will be no longer one of physical force, but of the more powerful control of wisdom, including, perhaps, modified forms of force. Caste will no longer be distinction regarding material position or possession, but in moral and spiritual position and intellectual possession. In such government and caste a true aristocracy can exist in the midst of a true democracy. All will be born free and entitled to the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in self-chosen paths, which alone is perfect equality. Perfect equality in the order of nature does not presuppose that all shall be alike, but it does presuppose that all shall be equal in the right to apply their natural or acquired talent according to the dictates of the power that governs them—the same as the flower and the tree follow their natural courses, and are equal, but not alike. As the lightning and the sunshine, the mountain and the river, the bird and the bee, the earthquake and the storm, follow their natural courses and tendencies under the government of the universal God, so shall the people follow theirs under a universal social government, when fashioned after the same general

principles that obtain in the domain of nature. For

Honest nature's voice shall give The laws to man by which he'll live.

It will be seen, then, that the philosophic formulæ that it has been demonstrated the evolution of matter conforms to, apply with equal force, effect and directness to the evolution of society, which is the fruit, so to speak, of the evolution of matter. The evolution of society, then, is "a continuous establishment of psychical relations within the community, in conformity to physical and psychical relations arising within the environment, during which both the community and the environment pass from a state of incoherent homogeneity to a state of coherent heterogeneity, and during which the constitutional units of the community become ever more distinctly individualized." Thus it has been from the earliest existence of communities, and this formulæ applies to all communities, whether Assyrian or American.

The process of revolution in its ultimate effects brings about a perfect state of action and reaction in all the various productions of nature, by which they are first perfected and then destroyed. The process in society must also continue until an equilibrium shall have been attained between the governing power and the power governed. When this is reached its perpetual continuance will depend solely upon the perpetuity of that over which it acts, or upon continuous individual existence. Continuous existence does not belong to the kingdoms below man, but does to man, from the fact that inherent within his consciousness there is a persistent though utterly unexplainable and undefinable knowledge of continuous existence, which is forever independent of all the changeable circumstances of the purely material, and which represents in him that characteristic of Divine power exhibited everywhere in the universe which is forever beyond scrutiny and limitation.

This evidence of Divine power within the individual, then, is the distinction between man as the product of nature and all other products of nature; while the consciousness of its existence is the direct evidence to the understanding that as the Divine power is eternal, so must that within be, which partakes of it, or is made up of its essential attributes.

It becomes the duty, then, of each individual who can catch but faint glimpses of such a consummation as universal government, to point it out and to assist by all legitimate means in the dissemination of light upon it and all relevant subjects. It becomes the duty of each nation to see that its people are educated to the same ultimate perception; and specially does it become the duty of that nation which seems appointed by the Divine order of things to become the central power of all the rest to push its influence and the genius of its institutions abroad and into every nation. A mere passive acquiescence in this Divine appointment will not suffice; an active and positive acceptance of the mission, and the faithful and persistent performance of the great trust, is required.

When the people of this country shall rise to a true and competent conception of the responsibilities of the position assigned it in the order of the universe, the present system of things will undergo such rapid transformations as no revolution ever yet accomplished, and to which the destruction of the Roman empire by the barbarians can alone compare in magnitude. By that the dominion of the world was wrested from Rome; by this that shall come, it shall be restored to that country of which Rome was the Divine prophecy. Personal, sectional and national motives will be sunk in oblivion, and such governing rules of action will obtain as shall bring the world into intimate, harmonious and Divine relations, such as will know no Jew nor Christian, Mohammedan nor Pagan, but one general and acknowledged brotherhood of man, flowing from the common fatherhood of God.

[Editorial from the New York Herald of May 27, 1870.]

WOMAN'S IDEA OF GOVERNMENT.

The public have, during the past few months, been interested and perhaps edified by the ideas and impressions put forth by Mrs. Victoria C. Woodhull upon the broad, general subject of human government, as well as by her subsequent nomination of herself as a candidate for the Presidency in the election of 1872. The articles in which she has announced these views and purposes have from time to time appeared in the _Herald_, and to-day we present a further communication on the question of the "Limits and Sphere of Government." It is evident Mrs. Woodhull is imbued with at least one very sensible idea, and that idea is one which it would be well for large numbers of aspirants for public positions to emulate—viz., that fitness is the first prerequisite of qualifications entitling the seeker to enjoy the position sought for. This it is, doubtless, which has led her not only to study and perfect herself in the nature of the functions she seeks to exercise, and their effect, but, in the honest belief that she does understand the question, to give her opinions to the people, that they may judge of her ability and the correctness of her views.

At the same time it is somewhat difficult to see what good will come out of this particular Nazareth. Mrs. Woodhull offers herself in apparent good faith as a candidate, and perhaps has a remote impression, or rather hope, that she may be elected, but it seems that she is rather in advance of her time. The public mind is not yet educated to the pitch of universal woman's rights. At present man, in his affection for and kindness toward the weaker sex, is disposed to accord her any reasonable number of privileges. Beyond that stage he pauses, because there seems to him to be a something which is unnatural in permitting her to share the turmoil, the excitement, the risks of competition for the glory of governing. There is therefore but one position that may be taken in considering the aim of this ambitious lady, and that is that, perceiving and fully appreciating the natural obtuseness of man, she has boldly put herself forward with a view to wearing down these scrupulous angles in his sympathetic character and nature, and that she will, after all, be content with the knowledge that she has done her full share in educating him for the new order of things which shall supervene when woman, in all matters, has equal rights and duties with him.

LIMITS AND SPHERE OF GOVERNMENT.

[Revised from the New York Herald of May 27, 1870.]

MRS. WOODHULL'S LATEST EPISTLE TO THE AMERICANS—"THE LIMITS AND SPHERE OF GOVERNMENT" CONSIDERED FROM A FEMALE POINT OF VIEW.

[In the following communication Mrs. Woodhull, whose former essays on political matters have been published in the HERALD, considers the question of government with special reference to the system under which we live in the United States:]

Having in "The Tendencies of Government" traced the rise and fall of nations, and found that from earliest historic time to the present, there has been a continual grasping for universal power, and a constant failure to maintain the extent of control actually reached; that the systems through which universal control was sought were too imperfect to admit of support for any great length of time over an extended area of country; that the general order of the world seems to indicate that universal government will become a fact, and that the United States shall be the seat of such governmental power, we may now come to consider what control a government must be invested with in order that it shall at all times meet the demands of the people and the times, and therefore be continuous while becoming universal.

It is predicated that government exists by the consent of the governed. While this is nominally true, it virtually contains but an undeveloped germ of truth. In no country as yet does the government exist by the consent of the governed. In this country least of all does it apply, though superficially it may not so appear.

Government is universal. All things in all the various kingdoms of nature are the objects of governing laws which form the subjective order of the universe. In all natural government the relations between the governing power and the powers governed are always well defined, while the requirements of the governed are always met by requisite modes of administration. Each coming demand falls into some common method of being answered. Thus, in the greatest conceivable diversity of conditions, are found the fewest and simplest laws of control. Rising from purely material to the more refined powers of mind, represented only in the human, a new phase of development springs up. Being an individualized power within itself, the human family represents the divine power that controls the whole, and in this relation fashions its governments according to the limitations of its acquired standard of wisdom, which must always necessarily be imperfect in comparison with the common laws of the universe, in the same proportion as human wisdom is imperfect when compared with divine wisdom.

The world of mind has now arrived at an age and corresponding development, which begins to comprehend the general laws of the universe, and to understand their great simplicity and perfect adaptation to all things under them. Seeing that such a perfect system of government exists throughout the universe of matter, the inquiry is beginning to be earnestly made, why the universe of mind cannot be controlled by equally simple and general laws and systems of administration. Seeing that changes are never necessary in the common universal laws, the inquiry is also beginning to be made, why the laws that govern society cannot be so fashioned after the laws of nature as not to require the constant remodelling now necessary when changes come, in the circumstances required to be met.

The solution of the difficulty in which the mind becomes involved when considering these most serious questions, seems reduced to a single proposition—that all strifes, difficulties and controversies regarding government and its administration, arise from the fact, that the governing power is not general but specific in its operations, or that the powers governed are not subservient to a

common law of control. This is still more clearly perceptible if the question of “reserved rights” on the part of any of the governed is considered. No individual can have a reservation that militates against the general welfare of others, or the whole, without specific laws to sustain him in it. If no individual can have such special reservation, no number of individuals less than than the whole, can have reservations without specific protection. Therefore no city, county, State, or number of them, less than all cities, counties and States forming a consolidated union, can hold in reserve any rights or privileges that do not contribute to the general welfare of the whole, without sooner or later coming into conflict regarding them. This theory of reserved rights was pretty forcibly, logically and effectually refuted by the late war; so must all such reservations be equally well refuted before permanent peace, harmony and prosperity can be expected to flow from government and it remain permanent.

Analytically and philosophically considered, government exists for the general good of all the governed, in which individual rights and privileges can find freedom and justice without conflict. All systems that exist upon a less comprehensive basis than this must eventually be swept away. All parts of systems that conflict with the general fundamental propositions in which they were based and reared must be expunged, so that administration can be in perfect harmony with profession, before it will be possible for general good to flow from administration. The fundamental propositions upon which this government professes to rest—that all men and women are born free and equal and entitled to the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—are in accordance with the general order of the universe below man, and are therefore of the highest possible authority.

That all are born free is a proposition that no one can question; but this freedom is general to all, and does not refer to the individual, nor entitle him or her to push his freedom so as to encroach upon the same freedom guaranteed to every other individual. Therefore, individual freedom is merged in, and is a part of, general freedom.

That all men and women are born equal is another strictly philosophic proposition that can never be refuted by the concurrent scientific truth that no two of the whole are born alike in every particular. Equality, in a philosophic sense, does not imply similarity or even likeness; one thing may be equal to another, or a number of others, and still be unlike them all. A pound of feathers is equal to a pound of lead in gravitating power, but the lead does not resemble the feathers in any respect; hence, equality does not presuppose likeness.

The pursuit of happiness is an additional common right, naturally resulting from freedom and equality, and which can be prosecuted in any direction that does not interfere with the general pursuit of it on the part of the whole. From this analysis of inherent rights it would seem that it should be the sphere of government to maintain such freedom and equality, and thus guarantee to all and every the pursuit of happiness, and to protect them therein; and, co-relatively, that the limits of government should be nothing less than the circle that will permit such fatherly—such motherly—control.

It will scarcely be questioned by those who accept the evolution of government as a common law, that the government of this country, as a system, comes nearer being an exponent of the philosophic limit and sphere than that of any other country, though it must be confessed that the practices under it belie its fundamental principles. So much is this true, that, while it is safe to assert of the system that it is the best of all, scarcely one can be named wherein so great distinctions obtain between the intentions of the system and the effects obtained by its administration. This follows because, having asserted fundamental principles of freedom and justice, the lines of policy pursued have not been shaped by them. The principles have been lost sight of in the pursuit of party and personal or sectional policies, so that the government is no longer an exponent of principles, but rather of the persons, parties or sections which have raised themselves above principles as authorities: hence the government has limitations put upon the operations of its principles, and becomes thereby inconsistent within itself.

All the corrupt practices that are prevalent in the various parts of the governing process are possible only because the professions and practices of government are not in harmony. The professions of government relate to principles; the practices to its limits and sphere. Therefore, in the present article, the practices will be dealt with. In dealing with them it will come within the intended limits to examine the machinery by which government is administered, and to determine what movements within the body of society should be under its general control, so that all its movements may be made in harmony. Were any other branch of government than that relating to society being examined, its limits and sphere would be found so plainly determined there would be no possibility of even apparent departure by the governing control from them; for in all these the divine power is that control, and consequently is perfect. In society, the divine power, though the controlling element, is maintained over human minds, which are finite and imperfect representatives of the divine power, and are thereby incompetent to so arrange and order subservient circumstances, that harmony shall be the only result of the combinations formed to secure consecutive order.

The government of this country is selected for analysis because, as a system, it is the latest production of the social order of things, and, consequently, the highest in the scale of evolution. It represents a greater “coherent heterogeneity” in its construction than any other, and its “constituent units” are more “distinctly individuated,” which demonstrates that it is the highest order of government yet attained on the globe. The fault in its construction is, that the powers of the constituent units are not harmoniously related to the central power, nor to each other, discord being the natural consequence of such inequality. Though the constituent parts of society are in themselves imperfect, their relations to each other and to the governing power may be so well defined and regulated that their imperfections shall not have power to mar the harmony of action proceeding from the central power. And this is the point which is sought.

LIMITS AND SPHERE OF GOVERNMENT.

[Revised from the New York Herald of June 4, 1870.]

GRAVELY IMPORTANT QUESTIONS CONNECTED WITH GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION AND ITS ADMINISTRATIVE DEVELOPMENT, AS VIEWED AND REVIEWED BY ONE OF THE FIRM OF FEMALE BROKERS OF WALL STREET.

There are a variety of operations, natural and artificial, by which the proper limits and sphere of government may be illustrated. It is desirable that some of them be presented, so as to convey a correct idea of a perfect controlling power, which bears the same relations to the parts controlled as government should to the people under it.

The cotton mills of New England are good artificial representatives of government. In them all the various parts are compelled into unity of action by the controlling power evolved from coal or transformed from water. The crude cotton is first taken and freed from all foreign substances by “the picker;” the pure remainder is then formed into a homogeneous mass by “the cards;” this mass is then divided and subdivided into the different degrees of heterogeneity required, and these are more distinctly individuated into “the webbing and filling” by “the jacks and mules,” and are then reunited by “the webber and loom” into cotton cloth, the ultimate result. Every part of this process forms points of resistance more or less easily compelled into unity of purpose. Every bobbin, spindle, shuttle and card are so many different experiences which are required to be gone through with before the result can be reached, while all parts of the process are going on at the same time. The power is the government; the operatives its administrators; the various pieces and parts of the machinery are the people working in the several parts of the process; the cloth is the attained civilization, while the different degrees of fineness are its progressive steps.

Thus it should be with human government. It is the power resident in the central part which should control all the processes by which the people are guided to produce the ultimate result. It should be of such character as to take the people in the homogeneous mass, and, by picking, carding, spinning and weaving, compel them into a unit of action for divine use. Every operation in nature, if analyzed, presents the same process and similar results. A central power competent for its purposes, through various means and avenues, controls the materials into perfected productions, each one of which is perfect of its kind. The sphere of this government is to produce the legitimate result; and its limits are only bounded by the necessities of the power that the result shall flow; but flow it must and does always.

It is then predicated, that a power, competent to produce harmony in that over which it reigns, must be sufficient to control all the different parts to one end; whatever individual or combined points of resistance may be raised to its edicts must yield to the general purpose, even to the extinction of their resistance. It is necessary, therefore, that the governing power must be invested by the governed with the necessary control, to compel them into harmonious action, so that no antagonism may arise, to divert the tendency to unity of purpose. It must not be supposed that a self-constituted, absolute power is argued for; but this power should be one fashioned and organized by and with the consent of the people, who, knowing their weakness and acknowledging it in their sober and wiser moments, shall recognize the necessity of it, to compel them, if need be, to act with the general whole for the general good, even if it seemingly militate against their individual good, and which shall be of sufficient strength and diffusiveness to regulate all the movements within the body of society.

We will now proceed to the analysis of the various operations of government, to find to what the inharmonious relations between the governing power and the resistance are attributable, and thereby be able to determine the required remedy. Wherever this may lead, whatever “infallible” political dogmas it may destroy, or cherished forms and privileges disprove, it will be pursued as relentlessly—unmercifully if you will—as the crucible and the flame proceed to disorganize material compounds and separate their constituent elements into the poisonous, the nutritious and the useful, that the former may be put away and the remainder

appropriated to promote the general good.

Government has its centre and its circumference. From its centre its power is distributed to its entire circumference, measuring and shaping the various channels through which it flows, into such form as permits harmony in all its parts, and, having spent its positive force, is then returned to its centre. This centre and circumference must be the perfect body, every member of which must not only bear its proper relations to all the other members, but must be in such accord with them, as to permit the uninterrupted flow and action of the power by which the whole is bound together. No individual member of it can say to the body itself, “I have functions and rights peculiarly my own, which, if they are not such as your general power can recognize as contributing to the general good, you cannot interfere with.” The member, in becoming such, merges its function and power with the general functions and powers of the body. By consenting to become a part of the body it gives up special sovereignty over itself and becomes a part of the general sovereignty. By adding its life and power to the body, it increases the sum total of its life and power and receives its portion of the aggregated and assimilated mass. Its parts and functions must change—if change is required—so that the power distributed to it by the general power can perform its mission in harmony with all its other parts. Like the body human, the body corporate must be under one governing power, while each part is different in form from all other parts, and performs separate—perhaps distinct—functions. The eye may not say to the ear, nor the hand to the foot, “I have no need of you,” for each and all, are alike dependent upon a central part for existence, while the central part could not itself exist without the surrounding and distant parts. The very nature of the compact is, that each and every part is joined in a system of mutual and reciprocal interdependence, to which general system no member can set up for itself any system peculiarly its own, in contradistinction or opposition to, or to interfere with, the general system.

The government of any country, originally, is a compact among a certain number of previously separate or unorganized powers, by which they merge and consolidate into one power, or are compelled so to do. This power, so formed, is the governing power, which, while all parts have contributed to its formation, is in itself superior to any power that can be organized within its limits by any part of the originally consolidating powers. If at any time an opposition is organized to it, the result must either be, the reduction of the opposition or the destruction of the confederation. For a natural illustration the human body is again referred to.

If from any cause an opposition to the harmonious action of the general powers of the body be raised, a contest for supremacy is inevitable. If the bowels refuse to perform their allotted part in the general economy of the whole, a conflict ensues, and never ends until they are returned to duty or until they demonstrate that their opposition to the general administration is more powerful than its general power, and that the organization must be dissolved in conformity to this power. On the other hand, the general power cannot compel any of the constituent parts to conform to rules and forms not operative in the whole, nor to bear any inequality of any kind, nor to perform duty outside its special sphere. The governing power, though superior to all, must itself be subject to the common law of justice. Specialties of conferment or requirement are utterly inconsistent with a perfect form of government. The same rule of contributing to the general support, and in turn receiving appropriate sustaining power, must be uniform throughout the whole. Such a body, thus acting, be it human or corporate, is alone a healthy and harmoniously constituted power. All governments, to be able to contribute to the public welfare, must exist upon general similar principles and act by similar means.

It must again be observed that when several parts or powers are organized into one, no power less than the whole has authority therein; for, in consenting to the union at first, all absolute individuality is forever waived; the individual is no longer simply an individual power, but forms a part of the common power. Nor can absolute individuality ever again be maintained, except a superior antagonistic strength is developed, which demonstrates that the powers originally attempted to be consolidated were impossible of harmonious action—a natural and sufficient reason for dissolution. Tested by these propositions, what conditions and relations does the government of the United States, as a whole composed of parts, present? Does it form one homogeneous whole, the paramount interests of the parts of which is the best welfare of the whole? Does each and every part act in unity and harmony with every other part, and in turn yield to the preponderant authority of the whole, with that grace and dignity which bespeak unison of purpose and interest? If not, where does the difficulty find its starting point? Is it in the system by which the power was organized—in the interpretation of it, or in its administration? For this the Constitution must be referred to to find wherein, if at all, its organization is defective. If the conferment of power by the organization is complete, then it must be concluded that those who administer its organic force either fail to comprehend the extent of its application or to perform their duty in applying it.

LIMITS AND SPHERE OF GOVERNMENT.

[Revised from the New York Herald of June 19, 1870.]

ANOTHER LETTER FROM VICTORIA C. WOODHULL ON POLITICAL HISTORY.

ARTICLE IX. of Amendments to the Constitution declares that “The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

ART. X.—“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it, to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

SECTION 1 of Article IV. of the Constitution says, “Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records and judicial proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, &c., shall be proved, and the effect thereof.”

SEC. 2.—“The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States.”

SEC. 8.—“That Congress shall have power to provide for the general welfare of the United States,” which last is tantamount to saying, the general welfare of the people as a whole.

It seems from these quotations, made in inverse order, that it was the intention of the framers of the Constitution, to make such provisions as would permit and compel harmonious action throughout the States, but that subsequently it became a part of party policy to maintain that the States had rights reserved, and while not defining what these rights were, to declare that such as were not distinctly and positively delegated constituted this reservation.

Under this interpretation it is possible for serious difficulties to arise between the general government and the States, as they have. It seems from the general tenor of the original Constitution that these amendments are nugatory, because the inference to be drawn from them is inconsistent therewith. One of the most prominent, as well as the first declaration, is to the effect that nothing shall exist in any State injurious to the general welfare of the whole. While it is within the scope of Congress to determine what is for or against the general welfare of the whole, no State can set up its rights against such judgment. When it is further made the duty of the United States to guarantee a republican form of government to every State, and to protect each State in such against all others, there can be no limit set upon the general powers of Congress.

The only fault, if fault it may be called, in the original Constitution, lies in this—that while the power to do is vested in the United States, it is not made an imperative duty to perform, though the duty is to be inferred by the vesture of the power. In failing to exercise this power in its fullest sense and to perform this inferred duty, lies the cause of all the disturbances within the limits of the country.

We can now proceed to the consideration of what duties Congress is invested with the power to perform, which have not been exercised, and which, being exercised, would contribute to the general welfare of the people, and thereby promote the public good. It will also be considered whether there are any additional powers Congress should possess which can be conferred, and which the Constitution neither directly nor inferentially vests. This consideration will proceed without regard being given to separating what comes within the limits already possessed from that which should be conferred.

First in importance, because of general application, stand the common laws of the country. Of these it is asserted, with the utmost directness and force, that when a general condition is to be provided for in the country, it should be the sphere of the government to make the same law applicable everywhere, so that the citizens of the United States shall, at all times and places within its limits, be subject to the same controlling and guiding rule. There should be no such possibility as an Indiana divorce under Indiana law, differing so much from those of other States as not to be recognizable by them. There should be only United States divorces, under a general law that could not be questioned anywhere, and by which the parties to it, should stand in the same relations to each other, in whatever part of it they might chance to be, also in such relations to every one, that they may remarry without becoming liable to the charge of bigamy.

Within the last few years, many States have found it necessary to so reconstruct their general systems of law as to cut off all special legislation. This course is eminently judicious in every respect it can be viewed, and has proved excellent in practice, by relieving legislation and procuring uniformity. If this is a desirable result, so far as a State is concerned, why should not the application be made general for the United States, with prospect of proportional benefit? All people would then be subject to the same rule of action and responsibility. To illustrate: A State has a general law under which joint stock and other companies can become incorporate. Before this, each proposed company was obliged to make direct application to the State government for an

act of incorporation. After it, any proposed organization could become incorporated by conforming to the regulations prescribed, and thereby obtain all the power that could be conferred by the Legislature direct.

No one having knowledge of the tedious processes of legislation will question the advantage of this general law, both as regards legislation and the people. This admitted, it must be further admitted, that the advantage would be still greater, were this a general law of the United States, applying in every State, instead of a mere State law, with the probabilities that each State having it would provide different steps and regulations, so that a person familiar with that of one State, finds he knows nothing of it in the State he removes to.

The same line of reasoning applies with more or less force to every branch of legislation. Especially is it pointed regarding the Criminal Code, for here very great distinction exists in the several States. The penalty for a specified crime is scarcely the same in any two States; while some have abolished the taking of life for life, others still imprison for debt, which shows a degree of divergence entirely incompatible in a country that professes unity of purpose and practice. In civil practice it is utterly impossible for the most studious and profound jurist to acquire and retain accurate knowledge of it, in even a small proportion of the States. Every lawyer can testify to the difficulties he encounters at every turn when the laws of another State have any bearing in the case he is engaged upon.

Some States require that deeds executed in another State for property within itself, shall be acknowledged before a notary, while another requires a commissioner of deeds; and still another the certificate of some Court of Record that the notary is duly appointed, &c. The difficulties that arise from this condition of things are of such magnitude as scarcely to be conceived of by those who have never experienced them; nor can they be adequately presented in the limited space of this article. It is, however, held to be apparent, that if a general bankrupt and election law is to be preferred to thirty-seven different ones, general laws upon all other subjects are also preferable. It is a logical conclusion that the “public welfare” would be promoted if Congress should pass general laws for the whole country, to cover all cases and causes that are general to the whole country, leaving for the States such legislation only as can have no application outside of their individual limits.

It is not surprising that well instructed jurists of foreign countries have no faith in our existence as a consolidated nation. They argue, that it is impossible of a country containing so many internal sources of discord and differences. “A house divided against itself cannot stand” they hold to equally apply to nations. If this has stood thus long and prospered, it by no means follows that it will always stand and prosper; but the inference is, that sectional interests will be the source of continual disturbances and revolutions, until some great sectional interest shall become powerful enough to separate itself from the rest of the country and to defy its power successfully. In view of that consideration, should not the attention of Congress be called to the fact that it is its inferred duty, at least, to enact all laws that will promote the public welfare? And to this end it should inquire how the public welfare is suffering from the neglect thus far practised, that the remedy may be applied.

If it is found that its power under the Constitution to remedy such evils is doubtful, amendments granting it should be at once proposed and submitted. Whatever opposition there might be on the part of present State Legislatures and officials the people will welcome any measure looking to the eradication of the cause of internal agitation. It cannot be that patriotism is to pass away entirely, though it appears to be nearly submerged by the rising tide of individual selfishness. Let it arouse itself and consider whether there be not room for exercise in the direction indicated, and whether it is not better to prevent disaster than to repair damages. The example of Louis Napoleon is an excellent one to follow. Nor should patriotism be blinded by the mere name of freedom and justice, sounded so loudly to cover the deformities practised under their shelter.

In many directions, this is eminently an analytic age. Let the fruits of government be submitted to the crucible. Many of them would be found not only hollow, but basely deceptive. It is well enough to cry peace when war rages, but the crying will not bring it. It is well enough to laud the freedom of the land, but why not make the direct inquiry to find how much of it is real, and how much is fancied freedom, not to say genuine slavery? It is well to assert that justice holds sway everywhere, but those who have had most occasion to find it, must hold their peace lest the fair delusion be dispelled. Let the peace that is cried, the freedom that is lauded and the justice that is asserted, be subjected to the test of analysis, that it may be really known what principles enter into their composition. It is much to be feared that when all the dross and foreign substances are separated, and the pure residuum only left, its proportion to the mass submitted would be lamentably small. Still let us have the analysis.

LIMITS AND SPHERE OF GOVERNMENT.

[Revised from the New York Herald of July 4, 1870.]

THE FIFTH PART OF MRS. WOODHULL'S DISQUISITION ON GOVERNMENT—INDIVIDUAL ENTERPRISE AND ITS DEVELOPMENT AS AFFECTED BY GOVERNMENT.

Individual enterprise, especially among Americans, has produced the most wonderful results. Very much of the advancement of the country is directly attributable to it. Great minds have been obliged to operate singly and alone to develop their inspirations, ideas and conclusions. Thousands possessed of comprehensive principles in a semi state of application have sunk with them into obscurity for lack of appreciation and support. In the infancy of the republic, before it was possible for any to catch the idea of its grand destiny, it was not to be expected that any great or general system of interdependence between the government and the people should be adopted. There was a general fear of everything that did not seem to promote that individual freedom which seeks no harmony with the greatest freedom of the whole, while no regard was paid to any philosophic relations of the individual to the whole number of individuals represented by the government. This was intellectual individuality, lacking the harmony of wisdom.

It came after a while that the great enterprises demanded by the rapidly increasing growth of the country could not be conducted by single individuals, and numbers of them combined to carry them out. Rapid means of transit began to be developed, which in many instances redounded to the pecuniary benefit of the company prosecuting them, but always to the general interest of the whole, both as a people and as a government. On the contrary, many enterprises which have proved equally beneficial to the country have ruined those who projected them. Thus the general welfare has been promoted by the sacrifice of individual interests. Especially has this been true of the great system of railroads that binds the nation together with bonds of iron, too powerful, it seems, for any sectional interest ever to sever.

Internal improvements are eminently a legitimate branch of the general government. They are not for the benefit of individuals or sections, but for the benefit of the whole. So true is this that a seemingly purely local government cannot confine its benefits and uses to the section it is located in. Its influence permeates the very extremes of the country. A railroad connecting two cities in the same State may be built. At first glance this would be declared simply and only of benefit to the localities it passes through. But upon close scrutiny a variety of ways develop themselves that must be advantageous to thousands, residing in all parts of the country, and to the government itself. It therefore conduces to the public welfare and convenience in a much more general sense than to sectional or local good. It is therefore entitled to the protection of the government, whose duty it is to look after and promote the interests of the public. Is it entitled to anything more, or does the full duty of the government begin and cease with simple protection?

Continuous railroad connections exist between Maine and California, between Minnesota and Louisiana, which have been built by private enterprise, and are still maintained and conducted by combinations of private enterprise. These, with their connections, form a net work that penetrates every section of the whole country, all parts of which system are conducted as nearly as possible, considering the variety of management, with regard to the harmonious working of the whole as a general railroad system of the country. The representatives of the several roads meet and arrange terms of transfer and connection, first, to accommodate themselves; second, the public which patronizes them (be it especially remembered that the public welfare is always secondary); and thus it comes that that which is made the duty of the government to guard with jealous care is subserved to the interests of a company of incorporated individuals, whose profits, drained from the productive interests of the country, amount in many instances to an enormous per cent per annum upon the original costs of the enterprises This is not the greatest good to the greatest number. It is the greatest good to the smallest number at the expense of the greater number. The public is hoodwinked into the toleration of their extortions by fictitious arrays of figures, and by the increase of the "watering" of their capital stock whenever an eight per cent. dividend will not consume their unexpended balances.

Again, there are railroads of great importance to the general public whose earnings are not sufficient to make any returns to stockholders, scarcely sufficient to meet current expenses, and yet the public welfare would not permit of their discontinuance.

The same line of policy that controls the postal service should be pursued by government in regard to railroads. None now think of intrusting that very important department of the government to private enterprise. Is the transportation of the public itself of less vital and general importance than its thoughts and wishes are, that it should be obliged to rely upon private enterprise to accomplish its welfare, and to obtain it be subject to its extortions? The custody of transportation of all kinds by government would insure regularity, harmonious operation, safety and dispatch, at minimum cost, to all whose pursuits, interests or comfort, incline or compel them to its use. If the sphere of government is to be determined upon principle, and it is the true principle for the

government to conduct the postal service, to the end that the public welfare be subserved, then the same principle determines that railroads and telegraphs should also be conducted by government to the same end.

The time was, when it was necessary to the general good for the government to guarantee protection and even assistance to enterprises that should introduce these improvements into the country. The country needed them. Government, not understanding its true relations to the people, failed to provide them. Private enterprise, more sagacious and more perceptive of the actual demands of the age, stepped forward, and, taking advantage of governmental supineness, developed the true greatness of the country. The time has now come, and the government is in position and understanding, to not only guarantee all needed internal improvements to the public, but also to take charge of those already existing, and to conduct them in the interests of the people.

These improvements are not patents that should forever remain hereditary charges upon the industry of the country. They are granted privileges, made by the government to promote the public welfare, and not for the continuous private gain of wealth and power. Let a limitation be put upon these patented privileges, so that the public good may be still further promoted. Let government purchase what are already in operation and construct others, as demanded, and conduct them all under one grand system, to subserve the interests, necessities and comforts of the people, which it is its duty to provide for, even if in exceptional instances it be at the expense of the public, as in some instances it is in sparsely populated districts regarding the postal service. Let the same rule of action that governs this service be applied to telegraphs, railroads and all improvements that are public in their character. Let the present owners and conductors of them become the servants of the government and the people, instead of remaining, as now, their masters, thus forcing them, by the only possible way, to comply with the interests and demands of the general welfare.

Besides, these gradually consolidating interests are becoming too powerful and selfish to longer allow of the government or the people regarding them with indifference. Even now they control a deal of legislation by the power they possess. Unless soon dispossessed of the means of increasing their power and influence, they will become greater than the government, and even dangerous to liberty. The national banks are powerful enough to feel they can dictate to Congress. What might not a grand consolidation of railroads, representing thousands of millions of dollars, be able to do, if left to present tendencies? This is a matter of most serious import, which is tending to a despotism more intolerable than that exercised by any of the monarchies of the Old World—the despotism of capital over labor.

This despotism is making the productive interests of the country utterly subservient to the power they have created, fostered and protected, which should forever remain their servant instead. These improvements are demanded by all the growing interests of the country that express themselves through commerce between the several States, and it is the duty of Congress to “regulate” them. It has the power. The remedy is required. Let it be applied, and at once, so that the greatest and most beneficial of all the many systems of internal improvements any country possesses, both for the country as a whole, and to the comforts of the people as individuals, may be conducted and extended in accordance with the interests and demands of the public welfare. Nor should there be any outcry raised against the purchase and control of railroads by government, as an unwarrantable interference with private rights. There are no such things as private rights when the public good stands in question. If the public good demands a new street through the most densely populated part of the city, the property of private citizens is condemned to its use, and damages assessed, from which the individual has no appeal. The same rule must apply to all property that the public demands for the promotion of its interests, telegraphs and railroads not excepted.

LIMITS AND SPHERE OF GOVERNMENT.

[Revised from the New York Herald of July 11, 1870.]

MRS. VICTORIA C. WOODHULL’S CONCLUDING CHAPTER ON THE SCIENCE OF GOVERNMENT

[The following is the concluding chapter of the essay on government, its aims, sphere and tendencies, by Mrs. Woodhull, the female candidate for the Presidency:]

There are no circumstances existing within the range of government which are deleterious to the conditions among which they are found that do not come within the sphere of its control. If it were attempted to enumerate all such conditions, a very large proportion existing would come in for mention. Special reference will be made to such only as are represented by crime, indigence, helplessness and perverseness. While government has its duty to perform regarding all these, in their relations to society in general and the public welfare, it must not be lost sight of that they form a part of the general public, and, as such part, it has a duty to render even to them and to the relations they sustain as individuals to other individuals.

The criminal is not only the son and brother, but often the husband and father. Though he may have, by some act, forfeited the guarantee of liberty government extends to the people, he has not thereby sundered family relations, responsibilities and duties. It is the duty of government to foster these, while protecting public welfare by preventing the criminal from pursuing his course of individual freedom at the expense of the freedom or happiness of other individuals or the public. In this view penitentiaries should not be what they are, but should be changed into vast workshops, where the convicted may labor at some not altogether distasteful employment, to the same end that he should labor when free. The theory of punishing crime is not all that should be taken into consideration regarding the criminal. As now practiced it is exceedingly doubtful whether the State does not do the individual greater injustice than he has done the public. The State should pursue such a course as is perfectly clear from injustice, such as can conscientiously be held as committing no crime against the criminal. To render to him what and only what he has rendered another is maintaining the old Mosaic rule of “an eye for an eye,” which in these latter times should be obsolete. The world has risen from the condition of Mosaic times by the experience of thousands of years. Fear was the only controlling power then. Should it be so now? Prevention is better than remedy; besides, there is no such thing as remedy for crime already committed. The criminal can by no possible means—nor can the State—undo the wrong. Reparation in most cases is impossible, but should be rendered, wherever possible. It becomes, then, the chief duty of the State to prevent the recurrence of wrong by putting such restraint upon those who are inclined to it as will effectually prevent their inclinations finding expression.

Supposing that all living persons who have ever committed any infringement upon the rights, liberties or privileges of others of sufficient moment to warrant preventative means being applied were restrained from mingling with the public, what would be the ratio of decrease in crime? These persons have trespassed upon the public welfare and it must be protected from further trespass. It is the duty of the State to see this done. At the same time the means of prevention must be such as shall not encroach upon the culpable one’s rights further than such prevention actually requires. As a member of society he has forfeited to society, to a certain extent, the freedom of expressing his privileges and rights as an individual, by the infringement upon the privileges and rights of another individual, also a member of the same society; and for this, society is in duty bound to restrain him. It only requires that the present universally adopted theory, that crime is against the people and not the individual suffering, be carried to its legitimate sequences to teach the proper limitation to this restraint. Having arrived at that, it remains for the State to concede every other individual privilege to him.

It should be his right and privilege to labor and receive its full recompense, to which the State should have no right, further than the cost of his maintenance. The profits should be given those dependent upon him, or should go toward reparation for the damages done by him. He should have the privilege of amusement, should have access to a public library and the daily news. His whole restraint should be made as nearly as possible analagous to the every-day life of a useful citizen. He should no longer be the condemned criminal, but the member of society whom the public welfare requires shall be restrained from following the freedom his proclivities indicate.

There is another class of individuals who, either from circumstances beyond their control, from indolence, from incapacity, from settled habits or from perverseness, do not perform sufficient labor to maintain themselves and families in a condition that renders them useful members of society. Society suffers more or less from all the different representatives of this class. They must live, and society must, in some manner, furnish the means to them of living. If it is not earned, it is begged or stolen. There are those also who, being too honest to steal and too proud to beg, suffer untold privations. All who would cannot obtain remunerative occupation, or that which they are suited to perform. To all of these as members of society, as a part of the people, government owes a duty. Society, of which they are a part, owes them the necessities of life, even if it be compelled to force them to earn them. It cannot be made the duty of individual members of society to look after the amelioration of these conditions. It is a general condition growing out of the relations of all its members, and hence becomes a governmental function, not only so far as they, as a class, are concerned, but also to protect individuals of other classes from being made to bear the burdens of them, either by voluntary contributions or from the impositions of beggary and theft. Every one who has attained proper age, and is possessed of moderate health, is capable of performing sufficient service to support him or herself, and by so doing is a useful member of society, because contributing to the sum total of its productions. If he cannot obtain employment, society should supply it to him. If he will not labor, society should compel him. If he cannot labor, society should maintain him. Were this practice once instituted, the dens of infamy and vice, the sink-holes of crime and disgrace, the pest-houses of disease, and the crammed-to-suffocation attics and cellars of our large cities, would be emptied of their occupants, and they be made useful, instead of, as now, iniquitous members of society. They are a dead weight society has to carry. It is a duty society owes them and itself to compel them to assist in maintaining its general progress. The same principle that applies to the criminal should also include them. The general influence they exert upon society is

even worse than that of the downright criminal—for where the criminal is one they number thousands. If it is necessary for the interests of the people that he who steals a hundred dollars should be restrained of his liberty—and it is the sphere of government to do it—how much more would it be for its interests to transpose these leeches upon the vitality of society into producing members of it? As a subject wherein the public welfare suffers, it is strictly within the sphere of government. Other citations of unprofitable members of society could be made, but sufficient has been alluded to to indicate the general limits and sphere of government when considered philosophically. The evidences of a perfect government must not be sought among the most powerful and useful members of society, but among the very lowest classes. A good government can have no classes so low in the scale of development or use as to be detrimental to its interests. And here is the test of governmental perfectability. If the United States, as a nation, occupies any superior or conspicuous position in prophecy which is to make it representative—if it is the point around which consolidation into universal government is to begin, and from which control shall revolve until the world is its object—it becomes the imperative duty of our statesmen and legislators to extend the sphere of government until its limits are bounded by nothing that is detrimental to the general welfare of the people. Such government, and such only, can be enduring while becoming universal.

VICTORIA C. WOODHULL, 44 Broad Street.

THE PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT.

NO. I.

Government being an organization of power, and power always presupposing action, motion, it becomes a matter of the gravest importance to a people who are formulating a government that they should lay hold of the highest sources from which action can spring—that is to say, as all action is the result of some prime motor power, to have action which will proceed in perfect channels, producing harmonious motion, it is primarily essential that the motor, or moving or controlling force, shall be of that character which in expression will move majestically yet sympathetically against all opposition, always having in view the fact that the presence of low forms of any development is detrimental to all higher forms with which they come in contact, either directly or through exerted influence.

It has previously been found that the deductions which are to be drawn from a complete analysis of all the tendencies which governments have exhibited during the historic age of the world, conform to the propositions of the highest form of religious conviction, which is, that God being the common Father of humanity, that humanity must be a common brotherhood. Consistent with this the tendencies of government are found to have ever been to one common form. If these propositions grow out of the fact that the principle of unity is at all times operating to bring about a perfect expression of itself, through humanity, the legitimate deduction is, that the time will come when its ends will be accomplished, and that that time will be when humanity has risen into a complete recognition and acceptance of the fact that they are all children of one common parent.

Principles never change. They constitute the basis of creation, the forms of which are constantly changing under the influence of the application of the same power. The same force which caused the matter of which this planet is composed to first assume its orbital position and motion, now causes the various parts of it to exhibit the almost infinite variety of manifestation which is now presented. The same power that was exhibited in the construction of the original rocks, is also exhibited in the construction of the sweetest, most fragile flower. The evidence of evolution—progress—being, that from the rocks the flower has been produced. Ascending to the animal kingdom, motion, the result of power applied to matter, was found manifesting itself in the simplest of organic forms. There, as in the previous periods, it continued its constructive workings, until the perfect animal form, man, was evolved.

In the strictest examination which can be made into the power which controls, there can be nothing detected which would seem to, even indicate that there is anything outside of, and superior to the contained life, to which to attribute the direction the form takes through which life is manifested. If this be so, the principles which underlie the physical universe are but names for this inherent power, which cannot be attributed to any power less than the Source of all power. Manifested principles of action, then, which relate to matter, may justly be considered as the perfect operation of divine law through the physical universe.

It becomes resolved to this: that the power which is the compelling principle of all action is at all times the same, but that it manifests different results, as the channels through which it operates are different Thus, the motion of the atmosphere over the surface of the ocean exhibits power by the waves it produces; while the same power proceeding to land bends the forests and the

fields, verdure before it. The tiller of the soil involuntarily recognizes this fact, when he destroys all growths which exhaust the constructive power of the air and soil except the particular one he desires to further or perfect. He knows that to concentrate all the power upon this one, he must concentrate its expression in the form he wishes developed. If this process could be understood, it should be the ordinary rule in every department of the universe. All the power there is, should be concentrated into action through the most advanced, and consequently the most perfect forms—perfect forms always being those which are adapted to the highest uses.

Wherever this rule is generally applied by nature or man, the lower existing forms disappear, and in due time the higher fill the places they occupied. Thus, species of plants and animals are constantly disappearing from the economy of the universe, while new and higher are as constantly appearing. And it is to be specially observed, that where the new exists the old dies out. This law is also distinctly visible in the development of the different races and types of the human, all of which a universal tendency prophesies will ultimately be merged into one grand, all-comprehending race. The tendency to this condition was distinctly traced in the Tendencies of Government, and was held to be the basis for the conclusion, that, in its continuance, the condition named would be naturally and inevitably reached. It may be stated then, as a general rule, that the most certain method there can be to destroy the bad—the old—and to inaugurate the reign of the good—the new—is to attend to introducing the good in the most rapid and best manner, which will naturally live upon and sap the life from the old, which must necessarily pass away.

If a new race of humans is introduced among a race which is not possessed of that capacity which makes it possible for it to develop or assimilate to the new, it will most certainly die out. Such races are fixed types of the human, and their characteristics can never be merged among the general characteristics of the future common race of humanity. The North American Indians are good examples of this fixedness, and they will soon cease to exist upon the face of the earth; while the Negro is an excellent representative of the capacity of evolution and also of amalgamation. It is not to be lost sight of, that when the Anglo-Saxon and the Negro amalgamate, the direction the amalgamation takes is always from the black to the white, and never from the white to the black, which is positive evidence that the Negro will ultimately be entirely lost in the white races.

A mighty lesson is also to be gathered from observing the constructive process of the several kingdoms of the earth, each one of which is built upon the preceding and leads to the succeeding. The vegetable kingdom could not exist until the elements comprising the mineral had gone through their various processes of integration and destruction, by which vegetable life was made possible. The vegetable, taking up the process inherited from the mineral, began moving through the same cycle of advancement by which the mineral had made it possible, and it gradually merged into the animal; and so gradually that it can scarcely be decided whether some forms of life belong to the latter or to the former. The evolution of the animal, having ultimated in the production of the human, it is not to be inferred that there is nothing beyond the animal kingdom which is the fruit thereof, as the vegetable was of the mineral and the animal was of the vegetable.

Again, the vegetable world feeds from the animal—the animal feeds from the vegetable, which is the only source which furnishes living protoplasmic food, upon which the animal can alone exist. Humanity takes this protoplasmic dish either fresh from the vegetable or second-hand from the animal. It will thus be seen that everything which nature accomplishes serves specific purposes, and that when the supply is exhausted the demand ceases. If this principle is followed to its legitimate end, it will close in the life of the whole animal kingdom being merged into humanity, which will then feed entirely from the fresh protoplasmic dishes of the highly developed fruit of the vegetable kingdom.

These arguments are not pursued as a necessary part of the Principles of Government, but that the working of universal principles may be caught sight of and made use of in the endeavor which will be made to decide how humanity can best assist the operations of these principles as applied in its own government. Nature being ever consistent in all her movements in the several kingdoms, how shall “Mind” assist her in accordance with her own principles of operation, in establishing perfect channels for her powers to produce the perfect fruit of the animal kingdom?

In the Tendencies of Government it was found that all movements in government which have been made during the historic age of the world have been in the direction of universal control, the persistence of which course leads to the conclusion that it will be attained when government shall be based in those principles which, proceeding from a common centre, shall be sufficiently potent to control the entire circumference of humanity. The limits and sphere for such a government to exercise its power in, was found to properly extend to all matters in which the common interests of the public are concerned as against assumed individual interests, which would in reality be to the “greatest good of the greatest number.”

An exemplification of the natural working of a government founded and administered according to strictest governmental justice may be seen in the growth and in the maintenance of the life of the tree, which may be made to represent the tree of humanity. The tree is a complete community within itself; all its branches and twigs, even to the extremest distance, are dependent upon the same fountain for its controlling life currents that the parts nearer the base are. No single branch can maintain its life independent of the rest. Each separate one must draw its proportion of supplies from the same source and return the stream to its fountain when its demands upon it are completed. This power, starting from a common fountain, is delegated to the various branches for still further and more general distribution; but no branch can set up a distributing process for itself in opposition to the general process. If the branches had the power to set up processes of their own, the inevitable result would be inharmonies in the common order, which would work ultimate injury to all parts connected with the main body. Thus it is with a country. It must possess a common governmental fountain, and all divisions of it must be directly dependent upon the common fountain. No division can be permitted to set up special channels of administration for itself. Each must work in harmony with all others, and all be equally dependent and dutiful to the common head. In such and in only such can harmony prevail and life be continuous.

Having found, then, what the destiny of government must be, and having determined its proper limits and sphere for operation, it becomes still more essential and necessary that the true mainsprings of governmental power shall be recognized, for without this, government would still linger in its age of temporary resorts to get over the constantly arising contingencies of the times. When this recognition takes place, legislation will have accomplished its work, and the vast talent therein expended can be turned into the channels of governmental art. It is to attract the mind to the operation of general principles in nature that we have thus far dealt with the material universe. In advancing into the subtler department of mind, it cannot be for a moment supposed that an entirely new arrangement of principles lies at its base, any more so than that there should have been new rules of nature to introduce the animal or the vegetable. Instead of this having been, it is perfectly demonstrated that the same laws govern in each and all; that is to say, that the same principles of government control them all. Bearing this in mind, we now proceed to the consideration of the operation of principles wherein the human mind comes to assist nature in its strife for perfection, itself joining in the race.

THE PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT.

NO. II.

It was remarked previously that Nature is consistent in all her operations throughout her entire domain; to which may now be added that the nearer the human approximates his rules and methods to those exhibited in the departments of Nature below him, the nearer will he approach to true rules and methods. Arbitrary and dogmatic formulas do not belong to Nature in her free manifestations, nor can they be administered in any of her combinations. In all the uses men may make of the elements of matter, he must comply with the laws of their existence: he cannot frame a law, and then command that Nature shall obey it.

Certain quantities of certain elements will combine and form a compound; but no other proportions of the same elements will combine to form the same compound, and in many cases they will not combine at all, unless certain fixed quantities are adhered to. Again, an effort may be made to unite two or more bodies, and they will be found to be incompatibles; that is, incapable of being united, because each has a stronger self-affinity than for any property existing in either of the other bodies with which they are brought in contact; but to these two or more bodies another principle may be added, which will produce the effect of uniting the whole. It is this principle in nature by which its elements combine and form all the various and diversified manifestations that are visible everywhere. These forms are none of them absolutely independent: they may, by their inherent power, attract other forms to themselves, or be by others attracted; the more complex and distinctly individuated ones being dependent upon those from which they spring for their existence; thus, as was before stated, the animal world is absolutely dependent upon the vegetable world for the protoplasm it must make use of to replace that expended by the animal economy. No animal can take the elements protoplasm is composed of and manufacture it; that process is alone the office of the vegetable world. And thus it is that a complete and infinite system of dependence exists from the lowest form of organic life to the highest; each is necessary to every other, while every one fills a special individual position of its own, and this is because they are all bound together by the same controlling powers or principles of action.

It is readily seen that the principles referred to are the same that are expressed by a common humanity, a universal brotherhood: one is a brotherhood of the elements; the other is a brotherhood of the ultimates of elements, of which mind is a product. Each kingdom has its beginning and culmination, and by the observation of their evolution we must draw the deductions as to what really governs that age of the world, and the special kingdom we find ourselves living in. The beginning of the mineral kingdom was when

simple elements began to unite to form compounds; which was when the cooling process had so far progressed as to allow of combination; this process of the uniting and dispersing of elements culminated in the production of the simplest vegetable life, and thus ushered in the vegetable kingdom. In this, again the same process of uniting and dispersing was gone through with that had characterized the mineral. It began as it did, and culminated as it did by producing the next higher, or the animal kingdom, the simplest form of which is a single unit of nucleated protoplasm. Upon this single unit the animal kingdom began to be built. The same process of integration and disintegration continued through countless ages and until a form was produced, which is the ultimate of form in the animal kingdom. This ultimate, man, is the perfection of form that protoplasm can produce, and hence is the grand ultimate of the process of elemental combination first referred to. No other or higher form is possible to be arranged from the elements that the earth is composed of. Therefore, all future advancement to perfection must be in the perfecting process in man, and therefore it is logical to conclude that the same law that governed the beginning, the evolution and the ultimation of each of the kingdoms that produced man, will also govern the beginning, the evolution and the ultimation of the different stages in the perfecting process in him; and not only in the perfecting process as a whole, but in each division of the perfecting process; and this brings us to that part of the process illustrated by government, and to the principles of government which are under consideration.

It will be observed that there is a perfect analogy in the process of evolution that is observed below man, and in that which comes of man. First, there was the elementary unit, which corresponds to what was the governmental unit—the family government. Next, and second, there was the vegetable division, which corresponds to the second order of government—the consolidation of families into tribes. Third, there was the animal division of the process, which corresponds to the amalgamation of tribes into nations. Fourth, there was man, the ultimate of the whole process, containing in him the elementary principles represented by all the preceding forms—in none of which were they all represented as they are represented in him—and he corresponds to the ultimate of the process of governmental evolution, the complete consolidation of nations into one grand nation, as man is the complete consolidation of all animal forms in one grand animal form. His form is the animal form, containing all animal forms. A universal government would be a national form, containing the form of all nations gathered into one grand form. Here it is that the analogy is complete, and Nature is consistent in all her parts and processes, at all times and in all forms observing the simple general principles which so unerringly lead her.

There is, however, one important addition to the processes in which man takes part, over those where principles apply only in the so-called material control. Below man there is nature only. After man there is art added to nature; and it is this power to administer to Nature’s processes, to assist in them, and to remove and replace obstacles to activity in higher channels, that distinguishes man from all previous formations, and which virtually makes him an assistant in the after and higher evolutions of mind, which have, until very recently, been generally considered not of material origin, but which science now demonstrates are purely physical results—are combinations in consciousness of consecutive manifestations of matter. Here we have the ultimate production of the ultimate of the animal kingdom, the mental kingdom, or the kingdom of ideas.

Science also demonstrates that ideas evolve after the same formula which all preceding processes observed, and that all new discoveries of ideas are not discoveries of existing facts, but that they are new truths evolved from preceding forms of truth; or, in other words, that they are higher forms of truth.

These relations are thus specifically stated, because in them is found the authority for man to make use of all things which exist, that by such use, higher purposes may be subserved and better general conditions obtained. As the gardener destroys all weeds and foreign growths about the vegetables he would produce, so must the gardener in ideas pull up, eradicate or destroy, all false or decaying ideas which sap the vitality from those he would have flourish; and this authority is the same—the authority of the higher over the lower, to the extent of individual freedom and within the limits of the general good.

Such is the province of art, and man, in whatever department of nature he operates, is the artist, adding to her beauties, which she can produce by her laws, those which the evolution of higher ideas proposes. Thus art utilizes and beautifies all that nature produces. Nature alone could never produce a Central Park, nor the perfection in fruits and flowers that is now presented to please the taste and gladden the eye. No one will question the right of man to make from nature the most of beauty it is capable of, nor to make it most conducive to all his natural desires. And here is found the basis for the authority from which it is analogically argued, that man has the right to practice as an artist in ideas. The position this artist in ideas should be assigned should be as much higher in the scale of importance as ideas are higher than crude matter.

Government being the most formidable director of ideas and the most powerful opponent of their diffusion, if they are not in channels it can operate through, its perfectability according to the highest existing ideas is a matter of the most fearful importance.

It is for this reason that so great importance attaches to the diffusion among the people of knowledge of the principles government should be constructed upon that its administration may be productive of the greatest individual, and the greatest public good, which it is possible to obtain from the application of the highest evolved ideas.

THE PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT.

NO. III

It has been the intention to show the importance of unity of purpose in government, and that such unity of purpose can only be obtained by the application to administration of those principles which in operation produce unity in the kingdoms below the kingdom of ideas. Human government differs from all other kinds of government in this, that it is for the control of Mind instead of Matter. The natural direction the individual would pursue results not only from causes which arise in his material nature, but to these are superadded those which pertain to the Mental in contradistinction to Matter. Each individual is not only an epitome of all previous material forms which have been evolved, but he is also the finite representative of the Infinite Power which caused all those evolutions, and therefore has an individualized, determining power of his own to the extent that he represents the Infinite; and as this extent differs in degree so extensively among the total of individuals over whom government presides, it is the most difficult of all tasks to prescribe forms for it to operate through, by which it can reach and control this diversity.

This most serious difficulty which arises at every step in the search for the true source of government, comes from the innate sentiment of freedom in man, which is the truthful expression of the characteristics of the Infinite, which are indigenous, so to speak, to his nature. He involuntarily resists all attempts to exercise authority over him because of these sentiments. He feels, he realizes, that no individual, nor any number of individuals, has any authority from any competent authority to exercise supreme control over him; and thus it is that all individuals resist control.

Just at the point arrived at comes in the other part of the fact, which being considered, modifies the absoluteness of individuality. Every individual must either ever remember, or be compelled to remember, that he is but one of millions of individuals who live upon the face of the earth, each one of whom feels the same innate sentiment of self-right; and thus it comes that there should be no restraint at all over each individual exercising all his selfish ideas of rights strictly within his individual sphere; and that all these should be compelled to harmonize so that none may interfere with others. Even to this last proposition there are natural modifications to be inferred from everything below man. The higher order has the authority of its position in the natural scale of evolution, over all that precedes it; and this authority is of that absolute character which receives the sanction of nature in all the kingdoms which man can view.

The higher orders of ideas and thoughts should thus be the controlling power among men. They should assume the business of the artist in ideas, and prune, dig and destroy, if possible, all lower ideas which, live but to sap the vitality from the more advanced. The best expression, then, which it is possible for principles to find in the individualized productions of the highest animal form, must be sought in the most highly developed mentality; or in that mentality which expresses the most of the Infinite, and which is consequently the highest authority represented through humanity.

Mentality represents the most important department of the duality which constitutes the source of governmental power; but this, acting alone, would not prove the perfect principle. It would pursue its aims with no regard to sentiment or feeling. It would ruthlessly destroy all imperfections which debarred it from having absolute control, instead of endeavoring to consolidate their life with the higher and the better because it is the higher. To this active, sternly analytic principle, must be added the principle of unity or the affectional, which seeks to combine all mentality in one harmony. The head and the heart should act in concert; the head perceiving that the same general principles should be used to direct the forms of every department of life, and endeavoring to apply them to control humanity, should head the appeals of the heart, which, from its mainsprings of love and tenderness, feels, that the whole universe is bound together by the indissoluble ties of fraternity, and, therefore, should realize that as a father and mother, they should govern their children. Of these principles, government should be the true exponent, representative and administrator.

But here the question arises: How shall such government be inaugurated? How shall those who are the best representatives of advanced ideas and the broadest fraternal feeling become installed as the administrators of government? Every thinking person knows that no such persons or principles are in authority now, and that they have not been these many years. In the early days of the republic, which was constructed by men whose souls were imbued with these principles—or at least the fraternal principle—it may be fair to admit that something nearly assimilating to the true kind of government did exist. A government founded in the

principles ours was could not have been organized except by men of the very highest order of development in the true principles of government. They were hundreds of years in advance of the general people, for whom they wrought, and it may be seriously questioned whether they have had any representatives since, and whether they have any at present, who are actuated by any such lofty patriotism as they were. So long as they lived it was but natural that the people should have continued them at the head of what they had constructed, by the means they prepared for the expression of their right of self-government. It is well demonstrated that these men fully realized the principles of freedom, equality and justice, which realization comes from the conspicuous development of the paternal and affectional elements. Mentality, it is plain, was not so conspicuously developed, for they did not comprehend that the time would come in which those who should fill their places should be almost infinitely lower in the scale of true governmental principles than they were, or that the controlling motives of such could ever descend from their lofty stand to grovel in the purely selfish. But the time has come and now is, in the which the present places the fathers of the republic occupied are filled by those who are not in any sense the representatives of the true principles of government. It is quite true that the people are responsible for the men they select to represent them, but that does not better the very bad fact that the people are not represented, any more than that the true principles of government are. When this fact is seriously considered, it becomes apparent that there is a difficulty somewhere in the processes of government which has such imperfections that the ends of government as understood by its founders are utterly defeated. The result of this imperfection is, that instead of the true and best representative men of the country—those whom the previous analysis points out as possessed of the qualities demanded in government—being chosen to perform the function for which they are adapted, they are left one side, while others without ideas are sent where they should go. In short, the whole governmental operations have been and are being prostituted to the selfish ambitions of party leaders, who do not care a whit what means are used so that they win thereby. This shows not only that there are imperfections in the organization, but that there is much which is radically wrong. It is even now being more than whispered around that there is a plot being matured by which some of those who are now in power intend to continue themselves in power, even if they are obliged to seize upon the government in spite of the people. Such a plot could only bring destruction upon the actors; but that such a disgraceful thing could occur, or even be conceived, proves that a remedy is needed somewhere, which shall prevent such persons acquiring the power they would thus prostitute to their own purposes, at the expense of the sacrifice of the rights of the people.

This government is either a government for the people or for the office holders; latter practices incline outside observers to the opinion that it is the people's only in theory. If we examine the theory, it looks finely enough; but when the manner it is outwrought comes under observance, nothing can be found which entitles it to the name of the people's government. It is not the people's government by a very great deal; nor is it a government for one-half the people even; neither is it a government which guarantees equality to its citizens; every count which can be made is against it, as the exponent of principles upon which it professes to stand.

In the first instance, one-half of the people are debarred from all political rights whatever, and they are those who form the producing part of humanity, and whose interests in government are in every way equal to that of those who exercise all the political power. Thus at the very outset we find a professed equal government proscribing one-half the people over whom its authority is exercised; and, be it ever remembered, is fully maintained. While they are made responsible for all infringement of law, they have no voice in determining what that law shall be. While they are compelled to assist equally with the preferred class to maintain and support government by the payment of taxes, revenues, &c., they have no power to control the use that shall be made of them. This proscribed class, though living in the United States of America, a so-called Republic, are in no better condition and stand in no superior relation to the government they are compelled to give adhesion, respect and support to, than are those of the most absolute monarchy upon the face of the earth. What think you, enslaved people, of the great, the free, the exalted government of a country which professes so much and grants you nothing?

In the next instance, it is not the government of the one-half of the people it has really the semblance of being, and which many think it is. To completely establish this significant fact, the attention of the people is called to the immense minorities in the several States, and the relations which they sustain to a Presidential election, wherein the sum total of all the citizens of all the States who are permitted to cast their ballots, and who do so cast their ballots, for the electors who vote for the defeated candidate, exceed the sum total of all the citizens of all the States who are permitted to cast their ballots and who do so cast their ballots for the electors who vote for and elect their candidate. Such results have obtained; but a President thus elected is elected by the votes of the minority of the citizens of the United States who are permitted to vote, and consequently, within the Union as a whole, a person may occupy the Presidential chair against the will of the majority of the voting citizens of all the States. Such is the perfection of the forms which have been framed and used through which to obtain popular self-government; and such the results obtained.

The same line of argument applies with equal directness and force to the citizens of each State in relation to their entire State government, with the exception of such officers as are elected upon the ticket with the Governor; their representation in the lower House of Congress, and in their Legislatures and through their Legislators and their representation in the Senate of the United States may be, and often is, that of the minority of the voting citizens of the State. The same is also true of all incorporated cities outside of their general officers.

This condition of affairs shows that there are two conflicting principles ever operating against each other, and that their very worst features appear when their object is the “first office in the gift of the people,” which, above all others, should be filled by the choice of the majority of all the citizens of all the States.

Scarcely less in importance, as compared with the Chief Magistracy of the Union, is the importance of Congressional legislation, which should be determined by Representatives and Senators who should represent the majority of all the voting citizens of all the States. This government will always stand in danger of being overthrown by the unrepresented majority, so long as such forms of arriving at representation are allowed to determine these questions, which lie at the very basis of a republican form of government.

The whole difficulty which this question presents arises from the seeming stubbornness with which the people refuse to understand that the interests of the people as a whole can only be promoted by promoting the interests of each individual composing the whole. In this consideration the Democratic doctrine of States rights, to which the Democrats adhere even yet with so much apparent stubbornness, is utterly subversive of the first principles of unity and it may be emphatically stated that until enlightenment is obtained upon this point by the common ignorance of the country, there is no security from wars such as that from the effects of which we have not yet fully recovered. The same principle of States rights, as compared with those of all the States, if a correct principle of self-government, should also be recognized as the proper one to be acted upon in counties as against the State, and in cities as against counties and States, and in wards as against cities, and by citizens as against the wards in which they reside, and by the several partners of firms as against the authority of the firm as a whole. It is the only mischievous principle which is operating to destroy the Republic which is prophetic of so much civilization and advancement to the whole world.

Under the application of such principle a single government for all the “nations, kindred and tongues” of the earth would be utterly impossible and impracticable. Nothing but strife, contention and wars would follow a government founded on such principles of individuality as do not and will not recognize the superiority of the community as compared to the individual members of it. Upon this principle brought down to individuals, every individual would have the absolute right to act upon his own self-interests, no matter how seriously such action might interfere with others possessing the same right. The community would have no right to compel any restraints upon the individual under this principle of rule. This principle applied everywhere would carry us back to pre-historic times, when every individual was his own supreme authority, and maintained it at the risk of his life. This is the purest form of anarchy, and as such is laid down by all writers upon pre-historic times.

Why do not the advocates of States rights contend for the application of the same principle to its fullest extent, and thereby become consistent? Why do they advocate any general government at all? The truth and the facts of the case are, that such doctrines as recognize the rights of the individual as superior to the rights of the community in which he resides, are subversive of the first principles of order. Suppose such principles governed the entire sidereal and solar systems, what chance among so many vast planets would our little earth have? _It is saved from destruction because there is a Prime Power which compels them all into harmony of action and movement, whatever courses their individual proclivities would lead them to._ The application of this general superior controlling power in governmental affairs is the only method which can secure—because it will compel—harmony.

THE PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT.

NO. IV.

Notwithstanding all this, which has been said in opposition to the doctrine of individual sovereignty as the true principle of government, it contains the germ of an ultimate truth, which will be realized when the total of individuals forming the world’s community shall have become so advanced from the present low conditions to those of wisdom and love, as to make every individual involuntarily recognize the rights of every other individual. In other words, individual sovereignty will be the principle of government when that time shall come wherein there will be no necessity for government, because the people shall have grown into the condition of a universal brotherhood. It is this innate sense of individual right which is present in the consciousness of every individual who has grown to know he is an individual, which makes this constant conflict between ultimation and approximation. It is

the expression, politically, of the same principle which, religiously expressed, makes it possible for the consciousness of the individual to contain an undefinable knowledge of a Great First Cause, and at the same time to feel that he is an individual agent. In other words, it is the old doctrine of free agency reproduced in the political world, which, if it is but considered a single moment with an unprejudiced mind, it must be seen that there is no such thing as free agency; for every individual is dependent upon something, over which he has no control, every instant of his whole life, which something even produces the capacity which gives him the power to think he is free.

It will be seen, then, that the great general principles which govern the entire universe, are recognized in the proposition that all people are born free and equal, and entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, which are inalienable rights; but it fails to be comprehended that the inalienable rights of freedom are limited by the other condition of equality, which makes every individual free within the distinct sphere of his individuality, but not free within the sphere of other individuals. He has the inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, when it is not exercised at the expense of the inalienable rights of others in the same direction. These are the governing laws which the worlds obey, and which control the minutest particles of matter. And these are the true “Principles of Government.”

It will be also seen that the forms by which the principles of our government are administered are imperfect, and consequently that, however much we may reverence the Constitution of the United States, it requires remodeling to enable the true principles of government to find expression through it. The inconsistencies, also, of the rights of States, as represented by the common government, must also be removed. The State is either the source of governmental power or it must proceed from all the States, as combined in government. If the former, we are no more to be respected as a Union than the numerous Italian and German States were before the consolidation. The republic, under such construction, amounts to nothing more or less than a union for offensive and defensive purposes, _at the option_ of the several States, which is as purely a governmental force as could well be imagined. The inconsistency of this construction of the Constitution was fully shown in No. III. of the “Limits and Sphere of Government,” and need not be repeated here; the subject has been pursued here, that the utter folly, inconsistency and impossibility of the recognition of individual rights, where such rights conflict with the community as a whole, might be the more palpably apparent. Having considered the source of the imperfections which exist in the form of our government, what should legitimately follow for consideration is, the remedy. In the first place, the theory of States rights must be abandoned, and each State must become a member of the Union by organizing under a common form, to be prescribed by them all, or by the present required constitutional majority of them all, to make an amendment to the Constitution valid. The same rule should be applied as that which has come to be a recognized necessity in States regarding incorporating companies. All the States should be required to organize under a general State law, which should be clearly and concisely set forth in the Constitution, which should recognize the general government as the determining power, and not that it exists by the sufferance of the States, but that the States exist as organic bodies, because they have complied with the requirements of the Constitution, which was necessary to constitute them States. In conformity with such acquired power, States should prescribe the means by which cities can become incorporated. In this way, unity of purpose and harmony of interest can be secured from the individual up to the total of individuals forming the nation.

Such a government would be a strong government indeed, but one in which its composing members of States and the composing members of individuals would have the utmost extent of freedom that the interests of the whole would admit. If this is not the end to be gained by government, then government is a simple farce, and unworthy of being allowed to exist anywhere. From the earliest historic ages the world has constantly been extending to individuals through its forms of government, more and wider freedom and greater privileges and immunities. This process will continue to spread, as the general people become more and better fitted to be the recipients and the appreciators of such extensions to them.

The individual has more rights and privileges to-day in the world than at any other previous time, but all individuals have not yet become such perfect laws to themselves that no formulated law is required to restrain them from the infraction of others’ present rights, privileges and immunities. Until such time come, a strong central government is required.

A strong central government does not necessarily mean anything approaching a monarchy. But it does mean a republic which will have the support of all its citizens as a central support, instead of each State comprising the Union reserving to itself the right to differ from the central power. In such a government, the majority of the people would, at any time, have the right to elect new officers, as provided for, so that the strong central power would not be in the individuals administering the government, but in the organic law which constitutes the several parts of the country a common government, which, while being the strongest possible governmental form, it would, at the same time guarantee the greatest possible freedom, equality and justice to its people which would be compatible with the common interests and the common good.

Lastly, such a central power of government is the only one to which peoples not already within the government could be admitted without endangering its existence. A new State desires to become associated with the several States forming the present Union. Immediately she is admitted, she has, under the present doctrine and practice, the right to withdraw. She has been admitted by and with the consent of the required majority of the States previously constituting the Union; therefore, logically, she has not the right to withdraw without the same consent It required this consent added to her free and self-expressed desire to become a State; it should also require the same consent before she should be allowed to withdraw from the Union.

Under a general rule for the admission of new States, and of allowing addition to the present limits of the Union, all that would be required would be for the people of a certain limit to adopt the requirements of the Constitution, and present themselves to Congress for admission. Aggregation, according to this rule, could always proceed without ever endangering the safety of the general government, because a country once having become a part of the Union would be under the mighty constraint of the whole Union to properly and peacefully perform the functions of a State in the Union. This condition can be well illustrated, by supposing that there was a confederation of all the European powers to preserve peace among themselves under certain defined agreements. If a single power violated any of those agreements, or attempted to make war upon its own account against another nation, a party to the agreement, all the other contracting powers would be in honor bound to make the interest of the nation against which proceedings were being had contrary to the common agreement their own. War, under such conditions, would be practically impossible. So would disunion, under the proposed system of confederation.

The country which shall first adopt such a system will be the centre of the future Universal Government of the world; and it is with this view in mind that these suggestions are offered to the people of the United States of America, which country is, by the common order of the universe, appointed to be that centre, to the end that they shall see the necessity of immediate action to perfect the organic laws of the country.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL

NO. I.

It is a mistaken notion that the interests of labor and capital are in any way antagonistic to each other. This fallacy has, however, taken such hold of the minds of the representatives of both these interests, that it is engendering a spirit of bitterness which, it is to be feared, will grow into as fierce a character as that against slavery did. It is always hard to produce any argument that will convince this spirit If convinced, the spirit of opposition will not be calmed, and obstinacy, assuming the place of all sentiment, compels the individual to remain rebellious.

It is most true that there could be no capital unless labor first existed. This stamps labor as of the greater importance. Let a person be cast upon a fertile island, without pecuniary means, and he will live by labor from its fertility; but let him fall upon an utterly barren and sterile land, and all the millions of a Rothschild would not insure his existence. So it is everywhere, and under all circumstances, to a greater or less extent. Labor can exist—though not flourish—without capital; but capital cannot exist entirely divorced from labor. Being dependent upon it for primary existence, it must ever remain under a direct analysis in the state of semi-importance.

The capitalist is the more unreasonable of the two in the position he assumes. He continues to apply all his energies to the acquisition of wealth, utterly regardless, in most cases, of any idea of justice to what has given it to him. The general practice is—and this is the true test, for whatever is of general application must be governed by some underlying principle of right—when capital requires any given thing done which it is obliged to apply to labor to accomplish, it must give one-half interest in the venture to enlist its co-operation. This is true regarding nearly all speculative pursuits, and when there is an actual necessity for either to apply to the other for aid to carry out its desires, this rule of agreement always obtains. This forms one of the most conclusive arguments by which to demonstrate the true relations of labor and capital, and should be made the basis of all co-operation.

It is not for the best interests of the wealthy to become still more so at the expense of poverty to those under them. On the contrary, it is their true interest to render fullest justice and strictest equality to the demands of labor, to be determined by the principles that shall promote the most general good. It is the greatest mistake of the age—it has been the greatest mistake of all ages—to suppose that individual benefit must accrue from the acquisition of wealth at the expense or sacrifice of any general principle of justice. It is also a great mistake for labor to array itself in opposition to wealth, and to form combinations to control it. It is too late in the ages for these kinds of arguments to convince. They can only end in producing still more injustice and distance between the

two interests, which distance will be filled by rankling bitterness and contemptuous insinuation. An approach of the two interests is what is desired—an assimilation of them, so that the same end shall be best for each.

It may be laid down as an unanswerable proposition that there can be no general happiness, peace or comfort among a people so long as the principles society is built upon tend to promote unequal distributions of the products of labor; and this brings us to the consideration of the remedy. It is to reconstruct society upon such principles as shall tend to promote complete unity, harmony and equality among its various classes. To accomplish this it should be the special aim of every one possessed of wisdom enough to comprehend a common logical proposition to endeavor to bring about this equality by diffusing the deductions of it, in all possible ways, among both classes. Let the various producing and exchanging classes exist as they do, but let their relations be governed by such rule of law as shall render them equal, both as to caste and to the benefits to be derived from an equal interest in the common cause of the brotherhood of mankind.

NEW YORK. July 10, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. II.

The strife that is being urged to create divergence between the interests of these bases of society is purely the result of ignorance of the first principles of constructive use on the part of their representatives. Instead of an endeavor to demonstrate to the understanding of all, the true principles which underlie these interests, which would effectually unite them, those who have selfish personal ends in view seek to further them, by engendering a spirit of bitterness and a desire for strife. There are those who cherish the ideas of aristocracy who have no wealth, on the one hand, and are too indolent to endeavor to attain their desires by active labor, on the other, who think to create some serious diversion, and upon it to ride into place and power. This class of individuals are ever busy stirring the coals of dissatisfaction into flames of rebellion, thinking thereby to become the acknowledged representatives of the labor interest. It is generally true that a cause supported by such means has no principles upon which to base its claims; but in this instance the most absolute and just principles are ignored, while cant and bombast usurp their proper sphere.

It is quite true that there is a growing tendency to centralize capital, and that consolidation of monetary interests is the rule; but the fault of this does not lie in capital or capitalists—it is farther back than it or they. It is in the people themselves, and in the fundamental principles upon which society is built, and those which the people allow government to be administered upon. If the laws of a country permit the doing of a certain thing, which it is for the interests of a certain few to do, and they chose to avail themselves of it, there are many to be found in these times so much governed by the desire for the public welfare as to take the advantage offered them by the people, for it comes down to that at last. The labor class have it in their power to send to Congress just those who shall fully represent their interests; but they do not do this; most of them are found actively supporting those whom Capital selects and holds up for their suffrages. The remedy lies with the people, and they must make use of it before they can ever expect to see their rights adjusted.

There is, as was said above, no conflict between Capital and Labor. The conflict is among their representatives. On the contrary, there is an entire harmony of interests between them. The true interests of each are best promoted by rendering justice, full and complete, to the other, and in the understanding of this lies the _only_ solution of the Labor Question. Strife may continue, war, even, may come of the strife, but finally the settlement must be made upon the principles of justice, which underlie their relations. One comes from the existence of the other; this, when created, should ever acknowledge its paternity, and never assert supremacy, nor be allowed to do so; to be so allowed shows that defects exist in the fundamental principles of government, or in its application to existing things. These defects it should be the duty of those who prate with so much volubility to discover and proclaim, to the end that they may be understood by the people. The people in turn should send as their representatives to frame laws, such persons as shall make it their business to attend to their duties rather than those who allow themselves to become immersed in the schemes of plotting politicians who seek eternally to continue themselves in place and power, and who lose all sight of, or care for, their constituency, in their necessarily continuous efforts to secure that end. Such representatives should be religiously ostracized by the common people, and none tolerated but such as understand the relations which the interests they wish fostered bear to those they feel they are becoming subjected to, and who will unflinchingly advocate them at all proper times and in all proper places. The durability of government rests upon the entire harmony of all the interests it is framed to protect, and no country can ever become continuously prosperous that has within it the elements of discord; no country can endure for any length

of time that does not seek to eradicate all causes of dissatisfaction, and to so adjust its interdependencies that they shall be mutual and just to each as individuals, and to all as the public.

NEW YORK, July 20, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. III.

The duty of the philanthropist is to point out the harmony of interests that exists between the extremes of the different grades that society consists of. There are a certain class of would-be reformers, who make it their business to stir up strife and contention between these grades, and thus to separate their interests, and to make it appear that they are antagonistic. The number of the latter class as compared with the former, gives them a preponderant influence, which, added to the real grievances existing, enables them to create considerable excitement and much imagined wrong, which has no foundation in fact.

The laboring classes, being occupied by their labor, do not devote much time to the study of the circumstances that control their condition. They see that other classes fatten from their productions, and without stopping to inquire why it is so, straightway conclude that they are the subjects of an oppressive power which desires to completely wrest the results of their labor from them, and to always keep them in the condition of virtual vassalage. This conclusion rouses the spirit of independence in the laborer, and he determines to redress his wrongs. He sets about forming combinations, having in view the control of wages and hours, not comprehending that the remedy lies deeper than these, or that these would regulate themselves, could the true cause of the condition they rebel against be reached and generally understood. While it is true that capital can never enslave labor to a degree that can be considered compulsory on the part of capital, and unnecessary on the part of labor, it is equally true that labor cannot compel capital to its commands. Therefore both these methods of cure should be abandoned, and preventive means be resorted to instead. And these it is our duty to point out.

The judicious architect, before pulling down the old structure, provides the material to replace it; in other words, he substitutes the new for the old, and in the process leaves no unnecessary interval in which the fostered interests shall be left to the vicissitudes of anarchy. It is evident from the rapidly spreading knowledge among the laboring classes, that they will soon demand some modifications in the forms, and in the relations they sustain through them to society. Before breaking down the present organizations society exists in, by revolution, which would end in a period of anarchy, out of which better conditions _might_ grow, the better conditions should be first considered, prepared and determined upon, and, by being thoroughly understood, should be substituted for the present by general consent, without society being compelled to pass through the anarchical period that succeeds all violent disruptions of present forms, whether in government, religion or society.

As society is constructed at present, it must look to legislation to produce forms and to enforce order through them, that society may observe in their operations the better results to them. Society expresses itself most powerfully through legislation. Public opinion is a force capable of many things, but is powerless to redress grievances or to institute the new and better for the old and decayed, unless it is directed by the formula of law. All the energies of labor reform, then, should be directed to the main point, from which benefit to itself must spring. It should waste no time nor strength upon the minor issues, but concentrate all upon the one strategic point. And when this concentration is effected, it should not fritter away its strength by dealing with the contingencies of the present, or in small expedients, to enable us to dodge along, simply escaping shipwreck, to be again forced the next day, week or year, to the same expedients to escape similar shoals. Instead, it should direct all its capacities to substitute a new and better foundation, upon which a new and better superstructure of society can be reared. How shall such a work be begun?

Legislation is the primary constructive point from which better conditions must emanate. The laboring classes, then, must see to it that they are properly represented in legislation. Nor should they be deceived into the support of any who, by bluster and tongue, loudly proclaim themselves the champions of labor, without the understanding of the first principles that control the relations of labor to capital. Let it be set down, once for all time, that he who denounces capital as the oppressor is not the representative labor should choose to right its wrongs. In every community there are some who think a great deal and say little; these, as a general thing, are the antipodes of those who say a great deal and think little. Though the last are usually found floating about the surface of society, it is to the first, society must look for that wisdom, judgment and executive ability that shall guide it to the desired harbor.

It should be the first duty of the labor interest, in each State or national district, to select and elect one from that class that has calmly observed the workings of present systems, and who can show where the cause of existing ills lies. It is to the philosopher,

and not to the politician, that the labor interest must turn its eyes, and though he be not smooth of tongue and glib of speech, he will lay such a foundation in law as will produce the conditions desired. Your present representatives, State and national, have shown themselves incompetent to the task you demand of them. Leave them to seek their level, and turn you to others, who will not lose sight of your interests in the allurements which place and power present. You cannot expect that those who are not of you can appreciate your wants or understand your conditions. Choose from among yourselves and you will not go far astray. There are, however, noble exceptions to this rule of decision. There are those who were reared in wealth whose hearts sympathize with you, and who feel quite as keenly as you do the injustice you suffer. In these you will find your best advocates, but see to it that your suffrages are never, once again, worse than withheld.

You are in the majority, and the fault is your own if you do not make use of the power you possess. Nominate and elect your own men; if your first choice fails you, try again, and continue trying, until the right man for the position is found; and when found, while holding him strictly accountable, give him your cordial support while he is true to your interests. Most persons who occupy position now, feel compelled to yield principle to the demands of policy, in order to retain it. This must be remedied. None are fit to hold position who will sacrifice one iota of their conviction in order to retain it. Self-interest must be surrendered to those whose power fills the place, and for the time being it must act as the representative of them and not as its own. It cannot be too strongly insisted upon, nor too often repeated, that it is the first duty of the labor interest to look to it that our halls of legislation are filled by those who understand the true and the harmonious relations of labor and capital.

NEW YORK, July 27, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. IV.

In our last the attempt was made to show how important the laborer should consider the choice of representatives to be, and also what class of persons should be chosen. The task of making these selections cannot be begun too soon. In every district in the Union the laborers should be made alive to this question. Some who fully appreciate its importance should take it upon themselves to begin the work; they should converse with the few they come in contact with, and these, becoming interested, should be induced to extend the agitation; and finally, all over the country, primary labor meetings would come to be held for the full and complete discussion of the whole subject.

It is the most complete evidence of supineness on the part of the laboring classes that they are not now represented as they should be. Being so vastly in the majority, every office should be filled by them. The difficulty has been—and we fear will be—that while the laborer has been busy at his regular task, others have managed the incipient stages that produce the candidates, in such a manner that the interests of the majority have been entirely ignored. Finally, when the regular party ticket is presented, the least objectionable one receives the support; and thus it comes that the real interests and wishes of the people are seldom represented, and as seldom is the elected candidate the real choice of the people.

Unless our laboring classes arouse themselves to the real importance of this matter, and become willing to devote sufficient time to preparing their candidates, they should cease blaming others for results; for they now complain of things they have it in their power to remedy, but which they cannot expect others, whose interests seem to be at variance with theirs, to correct for them. Those who declaim so loudly and profusely about the wrongs labor suffers at the instance of capital, should be strictly guarded against, lest they, unwittingly, become your leaders and advisers.

There are at all times numbers of persons standing waiting and ready to step forward to take advantage of any favorable movement among the people which seems to offer inducements. It matters not to them in what, or where the movement may originate; they have no principles to crush out or control in order that they may fall into the current. It is almost impossible to escape the curse of these ever-ready tools. The safest and surest remedy against them is to select those who have never mingled in politics, and who will come direct from the shop or the field. It does not matter so much if they are not able advocates, if they only understand the work to be done and are devoted and true. Let this course be pursued a few years, and the enormous proportion of lawyer-legislators would be diminished by one-half. Many of these have no sympathies in common with you, most of them are, by all their controlling influences, drawn from the consideration even of your condition. What does it matter to them if the few articles you must purchase to render yourselves and families comfortable, cost you ten, twenty or fifty per cent. more than the actual cost of their production, if corporations for which they are attorneys become still more corpulent upon this that is indirectly filched from you!

For, do you not know that capital under such rule does not pay the taxes of the country, but that your labor does? In this way, the common laborer, who should not be compelled to pay any levy at all, is taxed on almost everything he eats, drinks and wears, and thus labor is compelled not only to produce what makes wealth possible, but also to sustain it after having produced it. This is a vast inequality in favor of capital and against labor, and still it is the laborer's fault; and it lies just where we pointed, in the selection of proper candidates as representatives, State and national.

There are but a very few newspapers that do not _profess_ to be the advocates of the rights of labor. Let them be called upon to take hold of this matter, and take hold of it at just that point where the remedy must be applied. Let them lay before the people a plain exposition of the matter, and certainly aim to make the people understand it. Let them urge the people to assemble and concert plans and devise means to carry them out, and to warn them to no longer intrust the most vital parts of the "necessary course" to the care of hereditary members of the caucus, whom money buys or whisky controls. It has become proverbial that he who would be elected to any important position must dispense both these "powers" with a lavish hand; and he who can do this the most profusely is pretty sure to "be elected." You may rest perfectly assured that if he spend ten thousand dollars to secure his election by your votes, he intends at least to double his venture during his official term. You should know by this time that "the purity of the ballot box" is simply a "play upon words," and that elections are but farces to approve what is previously determined.

The people, then, must look on every side for treachery to their interests and dishonesty of purpose, not forgetting that a large portion of the press that profess your interests so warmly, that you almost know their truth, are open to the influence of at least one of the abovementioned powers, and that to go counter to the _commands_ of those who "back them" is to go to certain destruction. Nevertheless, demand of the press a course that cannot be denominated hypocritical, and if it does not respond, withdraw your patronage, and give it where it will contribute to your interests.

These introductory details cannot be dwelt upon too long nor insisted upon too earnestly. To begin a work right, is to have it half accomplished; and most powerfully does this apply in the matter of determining who shall be your representatives.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. V.

One of the great questions of the day, if not the greatest, is the true relations that should exist between labor and capital. It is one fraught with more direct benefit to a greater number of people than any other question has even the external appearance of being. The real merits of the question are of much greater significance than is generally supposed, even by those who raise it. The welfare and the individual rights of three-fourths of the people are at stake. The question assumes this shape: Labor has, by its continuous efforts, produced a certain amount of wealth, from the use of the materials nature presents, that has not been required to support and sustain the general life of man. By certain advantages, either of general policy or of individual acuteness, certain individuals have accumulated more than their necessities demanded they should expend, and this accumulation has become an added power to that possessed by the individual previously, which power endeavors to maintain itself partly at the expense of that which first produced it, and to transfer just so much of the cost of its production from itself.

That such conditions can exist and really increase in power and importance, so that they can virtually control legislation, gives evidence that principles are operative that do not promote the interests of the entire people. There must be a fault somewhere, which fault it is necessary to discover and expose, and then remedy. Now, where does this fault really have beginning? It is in certain protections and guarantees that law extends to individuals, which permit them to have an advantage over those with whom they sustain the relations of society. These laws arise out of false conceptions of the principles of common equality and economy, which pertain to man as a common fraternity. In legislation, which first allows and then fosters such departures, then, must the point at which reform should begin be sought. Any attempt to teach the general mind can have no practical effect, unless, finally, the result of the teachings express themselves through legislation. Legislation presupposes legislators, and to have the right kind of legislators involves the necessity of the laboring classes giving sufficient time and attention to the matter of nominations and elections to insure that those who will represent their true interests shall be returned.

Although the remedy for all the laborer's ills must be sought through legislation, there are, nevertheless, many fallacies still received, even by the laborer, that have the direct tendency to degrade labor and to elevate the position of capital. One of the principal of these is a false monetary basis, a false representative standard of values, which is arbitrarily imposed upon the people, with no positive and absolute value within itself, except that which such arbitrary law gives it. Gold, as a standard of values, has

been set up and worshiped so long, that people submit to its decrees with about the same appreciation of its real merits that they have of the mysteries of religion, as expounded by their paid oracles, who have constituted themselves into authorities to declare, “Thus saith the Lord.” The people have surrendered their reason in these matters to these self-constituted authorities, and so have they surrendered common sense to the god of value.

Another, and almost as important fallacy, is that of interfering with the natural ebb and flow of the products of the world by imposing upon certain of them such tribute as makes it pretty nearly impracticable for them to find their way to the locality of natural demand, in order that a special few who inhabit that locality may produce the same at a greatly increased cost, which the consumer must pay in order to obtain. It does not matter how this plain statement may be twisted and bent by the alluring sophistries and glittering generalities of the protectionist; a plain statement, viewed with clear light, needs no authoritative sanction to determine its truth. If it be any benefit for a thousand men to pay one man ten per cent more for a desired article, because it is of home production, than it could be purchased for from a foreign producer, we should be most happy to have it demonstrated. The argument used is, that by that one man being protected in its production he is thereby enabled to give employment to a certain number of laborers. But to make even this tenable upon their own statement, they must at the same time prove that those laborers would not have been able to apply themselves to any other labor during the time required to produce the article in question. This at once leads to such an intricacy of cause and effect that those who attempt to solve the mysticism prefer to accept the declaration that protection is a good thing rather than acknowledge that they are lost in the fog and obscurity they have been sent to explore to find the required evidence.

Another extensive popular fallacy is that of the continuation of special protection to monopolies after their existence as monopolies is assured, which renders them perpetual taxes upon the labor that must make use of them, and perpetual patents upon the industry of the country, by which a few already plethoric capitalists become still more obese. The great systems of internal improvements of the country belong to the country, and the country should so arrange their conduct that the people could make use of them at the least possible expense of support.

It is these and sundry like matters that the laborers of the country should require their representatives to understand and act upon, and they should cast their vote for no one that will not, at all times and under all circumstances, advocate and vote for the greatest good of the greatest number. In this way, labor may hope to arise from its present position of degradation to sit side by side with capital in all public and profitable positions and those of honor and trust.

NEW YORK, August 10, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. VI.

From various sources we learn that there is beginning to be a manifest interest in all the different States and Congressional districts regarding the next elections. The representatives of labor seem to begin to realize the great importance of special attention to all that belongs to primary organization, and to perceive that heretofore they have been obliged to throw their strength away or waste it in unprofitable directions, from the very fact that they did not give the necessary attention to the first steps in the process of determining who should be set up for them to choose between. It does not seem possible that any should be returned to office who entertain opinions antagonistic to the general interests of labor. Three-fourths of the entire population of the country are in this interest, and whether they be artisans in mechanics or nature—whether they be by the anvil or the plow—whether they be printers or writers—their interests are all the same; it only requires that they should all understand this to consolidate them into a power that would control every movement of government. Should this unity once be found practical, and should it be recognized by capital as consummated, its representatives would be compelled to come to those, who now look to them, for the granting of ameliorating conditions. It is most probable that when such a unity shall be attained both the capitalist and the laborer will, for the first time, discover that whatever really militates against the true interests of one, is equally antagonistic to the best interests of the other.

Some who have thought this might be so, have endeavored to devise methods by which harmonious action could be secured. Various schemes of co-operation have been suggested, many of them tried and found faulty and then discarded, until it has come to be pretty thoroughly understood that there is no level upon which they can meet and part in mutuality of interest. It is true that no perfect method can be suggested or instituted that will from the first give complete results; but the principle must be sought that governs the relations between the separate interests and applied, at first, with imperfect results, which must afterward be improved

as the interests grow into a true comprehension of each other's character.

The principle is this, that labor and capital are equally interested in the productions that flow from their joint operations; that is, the capital that gives employment to one hundred laborers is entitled to an equal interest with the laborers in what is produced. But here is an inequality to begin with. The capital may only represent one individual, while the laborers are one hundred; still, this is the relation, and the final result of its operation will be a complete equality in this wise: The one hundred laborers perform their regular duties, receiving therefor such regular wages as are proper; and also their respective proportions of the profits of their productions. In, say, five years, these one hundred laborers will have accumulated a sufficient capital with which to transact the business on their own account; and here is where a system of equality is reached, which again would be followed by another degree of progress for the laborer. The capitalist, finding himself left out of the count by the operation of this method, would come forward and offer his capital to labor organizations at a reasonable rate of interest, and in this way a common interest would be the only possible result. The entire profits of the labor would then be divided among the producers, while the capitalist would have to be satisfied with the moderate interest he would realize, in place of the extraordinary sums now sometimes acquired from the sweat and muscle of the laborer. There is one point, however, in the first instance, that modifies the inequality mentioned in a very material degree. The capitalist, while enjoying as much profit as all the laborers, is also liable for all losses, in which the laborer has no interest.

Following the results of the co-operation above mentioned would be various modifications in society and in the locality of populations. People engaged in the same pursuits would naturally gravitate to each other and into distinct localities, while the various interests they represented would gravitate to those localities that should offer the most inducement to their respective trades. One of the results of this would be that all raw material would, in all cases—where all the requirements were present—be manufactured in the locality of its production, thereby saving vast amounts of transportation; and this again would be illustrative of another department of general economy, in the light of which protection to special manufacturing interests would be seen in its true colors.

We have thus briefly endeavored to point out the practical results that would flow from the adoption, generally, of the true principle of co-operation for the specific purpose of assisting the labor interest in selecting candidates for their representatives, both State and national. They should be those who understand these relations, and what would naturally follow them, and who would at all times, and under all circumstances, advocate their adoption, and, in the first instance, such policies as would most materially assist in their development, and lead to their introduction and practice on the part of all who compose both interests. Labor is the basis upon which all society rests, and nothing is entitled to so much consideration at the hands of legislation. Nothing heretofore has been so grossly neglected, insulted and imposed upon.

NEW YORK, August 20, 1870

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. VII. PRIORITY OF RIGHT—THEIR POSITION IN THE PROCESSES OF SOCIETY—THE EARTH BELONGS TO MAN AT LARGE—INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS, PURE ASSUMPTION—PRINCIPLES, PRACTICE, REMEDIES AND CURE.

Capital, primarily, is the product of labor, but labor, in the abstract, could produce nothing of itself. It must have something upon which to apply itself. It cannot create anything; it can only alter, readjust or rearrange the materials which nature offers, and by bringing them into new relations with each other make it possible for them to subserve other and better purposes than when, in the constitution assigned them by the operation of natural laws, they are unmodified by the touch of mind. Therefore, while capital is the direct result of labor, labor would not be possible without the free gifts of nature. Absolute originality, then, or absolute priority of right, as between labor and capital, cannot be claimed by or for either.

The formula of the operation, beginning with nature and ending in the ultimate use of its productions, in contributing to the happiness of the race, is this: Nature is made up of the elements of the universe, which, compounded into forms, are offered to man to be modified into other forms and to combine in new relations which may best contribute to the needs of the human family. In this view, and in view of the inharmonious relations that exist between capital and its co-equal labor, it becomes necessary to give the whole matter a complete analysis, in order to discover, if possible, where the primary fault lies, and to find the proper solution of all differences.

The human race exists upon the earth. At a past period no human being existed upon it. At a later day the human race arose. Before man, nothing claimed the ownership of any part of the earth's surface. When man presented himself he began to make use

of various parts of it for his own ends, but to the land thus appropriated he acquired no permanent title or right of ownership. It was his to obtain from it all that his genius and strength made possible. So much as he could thus extract he could possess, but further than this his title was valueless.

The races of men that now inhabit the earth are scattered over the greater part of its surface, drawing what it spontaneously yields and what they can force it to yield. From these premises it would seem unquestionable that each individual of the human family had an equal right to its benefits. The only difference that ought to exist should be that limited and bounded by the capacity of each to produce. No person could therefore ever acquire, under the rule of universal justice, an absolute ownership to any part or portion of the earth's surface. If the chain of title to any claimed ownership is followed backward sufficiently, it will be found to have originated in an assumption in the first instance of ownership to something that belonged to men in common.

We can now acquire landed property from the government, and this creates the most absolute ownership that can exist; but here again comes the question whether governments can do what is impossible to individuals? Can a system organized by a people perform acts not in the power of the people themselves to perform? Can a government by the mere fact of having been organized to preserve harmony among a people acquire an absolute title to the earth that is contained within its jurisdiction? If an individual cannot go into an unclaimed territory and take absolute possession of a certain portion of it, then no number of persons, nor can any government they may establish, do so. And here exists one cause of discord between labor which produces and capital which monopolizes.

All monopolies arise from landed monopolies. Were there no inequalities between men in claims to certain areas of the earth's surface, no other monopolies would find a basis for existence. Every individual should have a right to the use of a certain quantity of the real estate of the country, and the right to all improvements he might make upon it. Here would be a basis of equity which would forever prevent the accumulation in the hands of any few persons, of vast quantities of real estate, which is the real basis of all securities. It is such a basis because everything is produced from it. All manufacturers must rely upon it for their raw material, and, therefore, a practical equality in the occupation and use of the public domain would insure a certain degree of equality in all things that might spring from it. It was the perception of this principle that caused Lycurgus to divide the lands of Lacedemon equally among all the people; and a general recognition of it should now take place.

While these are the principles that underlie the workings of society, and which must be practiced before a general equality can exist, it is not to be expected that they can be immediately introduced. There are too few who understand the real rights of man, and too many who do not wish to understand them. While this condition of ignorance and perverseness keeps the world inharmonious and subjected to suffering, we should avail ourselves of all the alleviatory methods that can be suggested in our present system. Between two evils choose the least; but in the pursuit of remedies, the root of the disease should never be lost sight of. Nor should the spirit that is exhibited in many so-called Labor and Workingmen's Journals be encouraged. Strife and animosity will never accomplish half so much as calmness, reason and persuasion. "Come, let us reason together," was never more judiciously proposed than it could now be by capitalists and workingmen. The latter must remember that they cannot compel capitalists to their terms, and capitalists must not forget that if there are real causes of dissatisfaction growing out of injustice, the sooner justice is done the less serious will be the reckoning with the laborer. Instead of strife let us have co-operation; instead of war let us have peace; instead of the process of fermentation let us have that of mutual understanding.

NEW YORK, August 27, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. VIII. THE CINCINNATI CONVENTION—NEW PARTIES AND NEW ISSUES—PEOPLE'S EYES OPEN—DETERMINATION TO TAKE MATTERS INTO THEIR OWN HANDS—WILL THEY MAKE JUDICIOUS MOVEMENTS?—THE RIGHTS OF LABOR—SHALL THEY BE IGNORED?—OUR POSITION REGARDING THE LABOR MOVEMENT.

The National Labor Convention lately held in Cincinnati was called for the special purpose of beginning an organization having in view the next Presidential canvass. It had taken the means of obtaining the views of a number of the most prominent public men, letters enunciating which views were duly presented before the convention. That of Governor Geary, of Pennsylvania, appears to have occupied the position of most prominency, and to have been regarded with peculiar and unanimous favor. The views presented by him are such as were sure to find favor with the representatives of labor, and so far he stands A No. 1 as the prospective candidate for the Presidency of the National Labor party.

It has been very evident for the last year that the old parties had lost their power of inspiration over the people. The Democratic party sold itself out to slavery and virtually died when slavery died. A party may exist called Democratic, but it will be upon new issues and must take new departures. The hard conservatism that attaches to it from its former practices does not suit the spirit of the eighth decade of the nineteenth century. The rank and file that have so long blindly followed wherever their leaders commanded are becoming imbued with this spirit, and they begin to realize that they have been mere automatons that have been moved with no acquiescent will of their own. Newspapers have become too commonly read. That the blind should be led necessitates the continuous condition of blindness. So, too, with, the understanding. What have the masses known of the essence of the issues that have formed the platform of the political parties for the last fifty years? When war came, as the result of a blind course on the part of politicians, the masses began to open their eyes to the fact that they had been unwittingly betrayed into a most dangerous and fearful condition, wherein it became necessary to cut each other's throats. Since the close of the war they have not only kept their eyes open to the full extent the war opened them, but they have also opened their understanding and for the first time fully realize that they are indeed freemen; and to become conscious that heretofore they have been so only in name. Awaking as they have from the delusion so long hugged to their hearts, it will not be strange if they do some inconsiderate and short-sighted things.

It is the duty of all who have the true interest of the whole people at heart to warn them of all the extremes they are likely to contend for, and to suggest permanent practical methods, which shall spring from principles that will apply at all times to all men—and women. The Republican party being composed of somewhat different elements is disintegrated from different action of the same causes; with the destruction of slavery and the reconstruction of the country its strength was expended. All people who were opposed to slavery had concentrated in the Republican party, because of the similarity of sentiment upon this single question; this settled, they find themselves without a common rallying idea; they differ as widely upon the old and common topics among themselves as they differ from those who do not belong to the party and never did. Place and power are the sole things that hold the Republican party together at all; these gone it will be gone.

It is just at this time that new parties are demanded, and they are sure to arise. The conditions are all favorable. It remains for wise counsels to prevail in the formation and departure of these, to insure them something more than death with the accomplishment of one of their central ideas, which destiny fell to the lot of the Republican party. Unquestionably there will be a Labor party in the next canvass. We are sorry it is denominated the Labor party, because it should be something more than a Labor party, and because this is a direct challenge to capital, and it will very probably result in arraying these two interests in an antagonism which will be but a repetition of the slavery antagonism. No party built upon a specific idea, looking in a single direction, can ever attain to even the promise of permanency; and it is for this reason we say we are sorry to see a party sectionalizing itself at the very outset of its attempting a general movement toward organization.

It seems, also, a little premature that an organization calling itself a Labor organization, should at the outset put itself upon the record against the freedom of labor, let it come from whence it may, and be of whatever nature it may. This policy is short-sighted, and will prove a stumbling-block to the party, though for the time Chinese emigration may serve for a rallying-cry. All assertions that the Chinese emigrants can be reduced to a system of slavery among us are humbuggery of the first water. There is no law to prevent a person contracting with a hundred American workmen at the best terms he can. It is quite certain there is no law to prevent him from employing Irishmen, Germans or even Chinese upon the same terms. And if it is done, and labor is thereby obtained cheaper than the citizens of this country desire to furnish it, the laboring class must not lay the charge to the capitalist who accomplishes it, but to the imperfections of our social and financial systems which make such resorts possible. Then, instead of committing this new national organization against any form of legal labor, its managers should have proposed remedies for the existing imperfections in our systems.

We are no special advocate of the introduction of Chinese or any other labor into this country; neither are we desirous of advocating any policy that will conflict with the interests of any laborer, but we are advocates, and always expect to be, of justice and equity to all people everywhere, because the time has come in the ages when we must begin to remember that we are all brothers under the sun, and that he or she who does not recognize and act upon this universal truth will, sooner or later, be obliged to learn it at the cost of dear experience. We expect to be found advocating very many of the principles laid down in the platform of the Labor party, and could wish that we may find nothing there adverse to the principles which are of general application. We desire to see the Labor interest advanced to the right and position of equality with capital, and we shall put forth our best endeavors to assist in this most just movement. At the same time we shall not commit ourselves to sustain or advocate anything that we conceive will be ultimately injurious to the true interests of humanity, or any part of it, therefore we shall at all times point out what we regard as errors in whatsoever this new party may endeavor to carry out. At the same time we shall, perhaps, be among its

firmest and truest advocates. The best friends are those who show us our faults and sustain us in the right.

NEW YORK, September 3, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. IX.

This question forms one of the corner-stones of future society, but of all the questions in which society seems interested it is the worst understood. Four-fifths of the people of the world toil on, year after year, and all the time see the other fifth revelling in the luxuries the sweat of their brows has produced. While the one-fifth enjoy the luxuries thus produced, as though they had acquired them by divine right, which none may call in question nor dispute, the great power of the laboring many has never been felt. It has never been concentrated or organized into concert of action. Even now this immense force is still dispersed. It seems to have no centre around which it can gather. It has no organization, and herein lies its weakness.

Organization should be effected for two principal ends: First, for construction; second, for destruction. The old systems cumber the ground whereon the new must be reared, and they must be pulled down to give it room; nevertheless, the constructive part of the operation must first begin; before the old will yield, the new must at least be formulated. This is not impossible in the department of principles. This new rests upon foundations deeper down than existing things, and these can, therefore, be used previously to the destruction of the foundations of the old. The new also reaches higher than the old; hence its frame-work may be reared, while yet the old stand comparatively intact. The work of construction once begun, that of destruction must necessarily immediately follow, and when the former shall have been completed the latter will have been but finished. This is the philosophy of Integration and of Disintegration in all departments of the universe.

Labor and Capital is a question relating in the first instance to the material prosperity of a people; but secondarily it reacts upon all other interests—intellectual, moral, physical and religious. None of these interests can flourish among a people who are burdened by material wants; neither are they usually unitedly prosperous among that part of a people who are greatly advanced in material possessions. Either extreme in material interests appears to be deleterious to the best and most harmonious general advancement of all the other interests. It is the mean between the extremes—the calling up from those below, and the leveling down of those above the mean—in which the harmony of all is found.

Harmony of all the interests of humanity can alone be attained through organization. A permanent basis of organization can only be discovered by scientific investigation. The organization of society must be realized through the science of sociology, which, of all sciences is the least understood by the general mind. Yet there are among the great minds of the planet a large number of those who thoroughly comprehend this science, and it is to these that the world must look for a reconstruction of its society upon such principles as shall render it permanent; upon such, as it can constantly be improved upon, without changing its methods of operation.

Into such a reconstruction the branch of sociology that relates to production and use, or labor and capital, will enter largely, and must be the portion of it to be first entered upon, because all things which are built upon earth must have a material foundation until there shall be such a harmony and unity of interests, and such co-operation among mankind as would proceed from a universal brotherhood, in which each would have his special part to perform to contribute to the common result.

The agitation that is beginning to be felt all over the world where intelligent labor exists, indicates that the time is at hand wherein the first steps toward a constructive organization of society, upon scientific principles, is to be begun. Not only is this agitation shown to exist in this country, but it has lately been developed that labor societies exist throughout Europe, having a common head and centre, and that they deem themselves strong enough to express wishes entirely antagonistic to the ruling powers.

Now what these organizations require to become—something more than mere instruments for agitation, mere means by which the injustice between labor and capital is exposed—is to become constructive in their action; instead of expending all their means and strength in the work of pulling down the old systems of things, they should begin the actual construction of a new system. For this end they must bring science—the science of sociology—to their aid, and make its professors active leaders and trusted assistants in the grand work. Capital is putting forth some strong efforts to confine science in its interests, but the teachings of science are of too general and cosmopolitan a character to permit its professors to ally themselves with a pseudo aristocracy—the aristocracy of wealth.

Well may the political parties view with alarm the beginning of organization among the classes they have until now relied upon to carry themselves into power. If bereft of the capacity to influence the masses who heretofore have not thought for themselves, they know their power will depart. How has it been possible thus long for leaders to control the masses, except that the masses have permitted others to act for them, and that without rendering any account for such action? The time for such representation has passed. The people have arrived at that degree of understanding of their actual interests, that will not admit of a blind acquiescence in all that even a “People’s Congress” may do. They will begin to instruct their representatives instead of being led by them.

’Tis true that by capital coming to the rescue of the country it is intact to-day; but it asked its price and has been paid. So far the obligation is removed, and justice to all is demanded. Legislation entirely in the interests of capital will not be any longer tacitly acknowledged as binding those whose interests are sacrificed. Whatever obligations the country may be under to those who hold its securities, it is under still greater to the producing interest, to which it must look for the ability to retire them when called upon so to do by the tenor of the contract they contain. It thus appears that all the interests and all the prosperity of the country are dependent upon the producing classes, and therefore to them government must listen, for they will not be ignored much longer.

NEW YORK, Oct. 10, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. X.

Production lies at the basis of all progress. Material production precedes all other kinds of acquirement. In the first degrees of social evolution, labor was merely to obtain the means of bodily sustenance and comfort; from this the present has widely departed; while the future must still further widen the distance between production as an end and production as the means to some end beyond. Production in early times meant simple muscular toil; it still means this, but also a great deal more; the proper direction of power makes it possible for a given amount of force to accomplish a greatly increased result. In the next century make proportionate rapid advancement in the better adaptation of means to ends than last made over the preceding, the direct application of muscular exertion to accomplish a material purpose will be almost unknown. Steam and water have relieved muscle of nearly all its most laborious occupations and increased the capacity of production a thousand fold.

The reduction of these powers to the uses of man will be supplemented by that of still more subtle and powerful agents to the same end, and this reduction will be followed by a proportionate relief to manual labor. The results of this advancement in the discovery of the means of reducing the elements of nature to the service of man, is to be revolutionary to the present grades and distinctions between the laborer and the capitalist—unless a proper understanding and application of the science of society first perform that inevitable result—which will guarantee to all individuals the possibility of like attainment in all things.

Science equalizes everything that comes within its sphere. Let the great scientist be never so destitute of material wealth, he is still the great man sought for and honored by those who have nothing but material wealth to recommend them. Any person may incidentally become wealthy in material possessions, but none but the devoted student of nature can become rich in mind; and, none but the devoted philanthropist can become rich in heart and soul. Even those who have immense earthly possessions, show their consciousness of inferiority by courting the great in other fields of acquirement. This alone should teach all people that true greatness is not to be gained through riches, and that these should only be considered advantageous as the means by which to acquire other greater riches and blessings.

The true uses of wealth are to advance the peoples of earth from the conditions in which they are to higher and better conditions, to those where caste and distinctions shall not be measured by it, but by the good that is accomplished by its use, in which he will be considered the greatest man and the most honored, who shall make the best uses of material wealth in benefiting humanity as a common brotherhood.

It has become too late in the ages for individuals to think of living for themselves, or even for those immediately connected with them. Mutuality of interest is spreading from family interests to world-wide interests, and the greatest minds of the present are those which perceive and act upon this fact. The leavening power of assimilation is rapidly at work among the nations, races and peoples of the earth. The electric telegraph makes it possible for all the different nations of the earth to be possessed of the same thought at the same time. For the last two months the minds of the whole world have been turned toward France, where the real contest of the future has but just begun. It is impossible for this concentration of mind upon one centre to be productive of anything but a growing likeness among those who are the subjects of it. All the discoveries in all departments of life tend to the same unification of thought

and interest. In this unification is contained the prophecy of what the future shall be when no individual, family, nation or race, shall feel that they can live entirely for themselves.

The lesson the present movers in labor reforms have to learn is that of harmonizing the interests of labor and capital by the demonstrations of science. Springing from a common source and tending toward a common end, humanity must learn to progress on its course according to rule, to law and the requirements of order. These sustain the harmonies of the universe, and should be never-failing authorities for humanity to pattern after. Those who achieve the greatest conquests are they who can bring themselves into harmony with the principles that govern the movements of the innumerable worlds, no two of which are ever known to disastrously cross each other's path.

The world is capable of producing luxuriousness for all its children. It is their fault that all do not have it. A very large proportion of the capacity of humanity for production is diverted from natural occupations by the illegitimate relations existing in society. A part live off of the vitality of the rest; the principal object of the part being to see how much of the fruits of the rest they can aggregate, either by personal capacity, trickery or cunning, or by ingenious devices of law formed and administered in their interests. A perfect equality and an equal justice condemns all such distributions of the fruits of the earth. If capacity for acquisition exist among a part of the people, government should interfere to stop its being practiced at the expense of others.

We are aware that this kind of social rule will be repudiated as an infringement upon individual freedom of action. In this connection, however, it must ever be remembered that the individual can never be greater than the community of which he forms a part; in other words, the interests of the community must always be superior to those of the individual, and when individual interests conflict with the interest of the community they must yield to the community. This principle is recognized in very many things in government; for instance, the public demands a common highway which must interfere with the rights and interests of individuals; the individuals are compelled to give way for the public, from whose adjudgment there is no appeal. To this rule of action all the relations of society must sooner or later become subject, and the sooner it is reduced to this scientific determining power, the quicker society will have begun a progress whose course need never be deviated from.

NEW YORK, October 17, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. XI.

One of "our Fundamental Propositions" is the ultimate analysis of the perfected results of harmonious relations between labor and its reward. It is not laid down in any spirit of mere speculation, but as a mark which the human family is capable of attaining, and one to which it should aspire. Neither is it at all impossible with some of the present representatives of the race; but it is a natural and legitimate condition for society when it shall have become sufficiently "grown" to be possible of organization.

Organization is the first step to be made toward reaching such conditions as the proposition indicate. Simple individual exertion can never be constructive of society. Neither can the exertions of a great number of individuals become constructive unless their action is combined or organized in one direction and for the same purpose. Agitation must always precede organization, and hence it is that nearly all primary movements are simply destructive or disintegrating to existing conditions. A perfect system of society cannot be organized to conta in those who are under any condition of servitude other than is rendered by the collective number to the law or rule they shall formulate, to control these relations. A perfect system of freedom is one of the first essentials, and this must be regulated by an exact justice, as between a community of brothers and sisters. No ignoring of any part of the community, whether male or female, can exist The organization must recognize each and every member of the community, and they in turn must also recognize the organization which becomes the rule of government.

No one will attempt to deny but that there is sufficient capital or wealth in the world to enable every one to live in a palace; neither would any deny that the conditions of humanity would be very much improved could such a leveling down and such a leveling up, as this equalization would require, be attained. This cannot result from any arbitrary rule of force, but must be the result of the operation of the proper principles of law in the relations of society. It must emanate from a consciousness within society itself of the justice of such principles therefore the mind of society must be imbued with these principles; and to do this is the business of those who understand the science of society. It has been denied that there is a science of society. The recognition now that there is such a science, and the fact that the evolution of society thus far has been formulated under it, is a vast step toward a general recognition of it. When once it is generally received as one of the demonstrated sciences, there will be various attempts in all

directions to organize upon its not yet demonstrated principles.

Those who have followed these articles will begin to see that the attainment of great wealth will not constitute one of the principal aims of the society of the future. It will only be considered as a means to other and higher ends. It has not been until quite recently that the fact of continuous life has been any more than _theoretically_ received. The practices of mankind have been just such, and only such, as would obtain, were there no life after physical death, and they have lived as though the whole of this life should be devoted to purely material ends, to the gratification of physical desires, and to comforts and pleasures arising from material possessions. Since the conviction has been stealing into the minds of humanity that life is continuous, that death is simply a change of the conditions of life, and that the best wealth that can be accumulated in the material life is that kind that will make the best capital to begin the next with, there is a marked change in the community at large.

It is beginning to be realized that there is a great deal more to live for in this life than mere bodily satisfaction and accumulation of wealth—of money. Nor is complete luxury one of the most preferable of circumstances. It is not conducive, under present conditions, to the best and most rapid development of the true wealth of the soul, nor can it ever be until correct views of the uses of wealth more generally obtain than they do at present.

In a true condition of society there would be no such thing as wealth, in its present signification. It would be reduced to the requirements of men in obtaining better wealth for themselves, and for the diffusion of it among their kind. In this consideration of the uses of life, there is no more important feature of it than that of organization in all departments. Such organization as will dispose of misery, poverty, ignorance and crime. All these can be cast out of society; and it is to be sincerely hoped for, that there will be formed a political party having its basis in the necessity and the possibility of such a disposal. Such conditions cannot exist in the midst of a community without exerting their deleterious influences over the higher and better conditions. People lose sight of this fact, and in all legislation it is ignored. Government now has the power to take these conditions in hand, and none are more interested in having it do so than the so-called labor party. Why should not this party organize upon some such radical principles of reform that will reach the roots of the ills they feel society labors under?

The policy of a party that would be permanently successful must be one that will include all of the great principles of reform. If such a party is not shortly organized, there will be conditions developed which will make such a party a necessity, even without organization. It would arise as if by magic out of the conditions of the times, and leaders will rise and come to the front as though Heaven-directed, and they will be received by the people by acclamation. The force of elections will be dispensed with, and party trickery forever killed.

The whole substrata of society is in foment. The terrific strifes that have been waged, and are being waged, lift the weight from the strata, and it begins to rise into demanding such recognition as has not been accorded it. The “Moses” who shall divide the “waters of the Red Sea,” that separates them from their “Canaan,” will be their God-appointed leader, whom to oppose would be futile. Political parties have been in the hands of such leaders, and have been used for such corrupt purposes, that the people have lost all confidence in them, and they demand A NEW ORDER OF THINGS, in which common honesty may properly find a place.

Labor and capital, lying, as they do, at the foundation of present society, and as they will enter largely into all societies of the future, so long as material wants are conducive to the true interests of humanity, should receive such consideration at the hands of the present as will so arrange their interests that there may be no violent disruption between them, when present governmental forms shall change. The sphere of government must be enlarged and made to include very many questions which are now utterly ignored, before society can ever be considered as resting upon a surely permanent foundation. To arrive at this foundation is the first and most important step for humanity to take. All minor ones are insignificant beside it, because the corner stones of this foundation must consist of a perfect individual justice, which will not be inconsistent nor at war with perfect collective justice. This condition the present inequalities between labor and capital forbid, and hence the importance of their harmonization.

NEW YORK, October 25, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. XII.

Perhaps there is a no more suggestive or instructive fact in all the realm of society than that the laboring classes are the liberal classes. It is among them that nearly all social reforms begin, and among them that all governmental reforms first find moving

power. The wealthy classes are systematically conservative; and by instinct they are opposed to all movements which tend to equalization. They are to social reform just what bigots are to religious liberalization. They adopt a creed which their practice is never to depart from, and it is only by the force of the large majority of the people combined against them that they ever do depart from them. The time was when it was the grossest infidelity to question any of the extravagant assertions contained in the Bible; but nearly all Christian sects now assume the right to place their own construction upon what is found therein. This construction is found to grow more human and liberal every year. Twenty years ago, the more “hell-fire and brimstone” a minister gave forth, the more Gospel it was considered that he taught. The same rule obtains in regard to all social questions, and the same rule of extending liberalization will continue, until the balancing point of equalization is reached, in which there shall be no power to determine for the individual, except himself or herself, what is for his or her individual good, or what to him or her is right.

Wealth, in its present position, is aristocratic; and Labor, in its present position, is democratic. Aristocracy always assumes to control that which is under it, in a material sense. It has always assumed this control, and whenever possible has exercised it. This assumption has been exercised so long that those over whom it has been swayed have come to regard it as something approaching a “divine right.” This condition of servitude was possible so long as ignorance possessed the masses over whom it sought control. When education began its silent yet potent work, the power of assumed “divine right” began to weaken. General education is all that the world requires to emancipate it from the rule of all kinds of aristocracy. Common schools for children, and the public press for adults, have done and are doing the work of emancipation.

It was not until quite recently that the representatives of labor began to know the benefits to be derived from organization. They do not yet know the full benefits which it is possible for them to obtain from it; much that they do obtain from it is, on the whole, deleterious rather than beneficial. They require more general knowledge. They need the aid of science to point out the paths in which they should seek to walk. Science, to the organizations of labor, is what discipline is to the army. Without it, the first is powerless, and the last dangerous to those who command and support it.

It is very much to be regretted that so much of bitter denunciation of the wealthy is heard among laborers. It shows that they, if possessed of the power, would wield it more despotically than it is now wielded by those possessing it. Force, as a regulator, can at best be but a mere temporary makeshift, which, unless quickly followed by justice in organization, degenerates into absolutism. This is the danger which it is to be feared would follow the elevation of labor into the position now occupied by wealth. Hence it is that it takes long years of disappointment to chasten the hearts of those who seek change, before the order of civilization will allow it to come in its fullest extent.

Could changes in society be arranged and managed as changes in other departments are, no danger would ever supervene. New railroad bridges are constructed before the old ones are removed, and throughout the process of change the trains continue their regular movements. So it will be with society, when science shall have so enlightened the people that they shall know just what they are preparing to pass to.

The Labor Party now desires to be elevated into political place and power; but have its advocates any well-defined ideas regarding the results which are to follow such a change in the administration of government? It is much to be feared that the same old story of “Make hay while the sun shines,” would be the ruling element. We would not have it understood from these suggestions that we are opposed to such a change as the success of the Labor Party would imply. Any change cannot be for the worse. Principle could not, in any event, be less the ruling power than now; nor could money buy more politicians than it does now. One has to spend but a “season” in Washington to convince himself that there is a deal more truth than there is vulgarity in the saying, that “money makes the mare go.” Representatives and Senators who prate with loudest mouths of patriotism and devotion, spend all their own money and all they can borrow to get to Congress, and retire to private life, having made a fortune upon “five thousand a year.” The inference is too palpably plain. It is not necessary for us to say that all such fortunes are the results of bribery and corruption, and their possessors public thieves, and utterly unworthy of the confidence of honest devotees to a popular form of government.

It is this species of corruption that is becoming a stench in the nostrils of all those whose patriotism is more than pocket deep. In its growth they see the process of national disintegration begun, which they well know cannot continue indefinitely without bringing destruction to our country. The almost criminal indifference with which the masses of the people regard these examples of the power of money over the consciences of those to whom they have intrusted their most sacred political rights, speaks badly for the safety of republican institutions, as now operated. A saving power is needed. Where shall it be sought? All true reformers are looking to the Labor party for it. Let it unite to itself the principle of equal rights, regardless of sex, and it will succeed. Then, if it fill its mission well, it will prove itself to be what the present demands, to crush corruption which is so rapidly permeating our whole

body politic.

NEW YORK, November 1, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. XIII.

The principles which should regulate these two great interests are, even in this age of scientific attainment and philosophic speculation, very imperfectly considered and still more imperfectly understood. There can be no perfect practice of the true principles which should govern their relations until the practices of the peoples are based on the recognition of the fact of the common brotherhood of humanity. There are a few people now living who fully appreciate the relationship which exists between the peoples of the world, and who would regulate their conduct toward their brothers by the “Golden Rule.” All the governments of the world are in direct opposition to this rule; hence it becomes an utter impossibility for isolated individuals to practice upon it to any great extent.

It is an acknowledged fact that the world is gradually being evolved by the means of government; and that government was at first organized to control individuals who would otherwise have operated from their own standpoint for selfish purposes. This kind of control will continue to be exercised until government will be able to control all individuals to act for the general public good, and this again will eventuate in all people acting for the public good of their own accord, when government in its present sense and for its present purposes will be done away with.

The relations of labor and capital are most intimately connected with the frame-work of all governments, because they could not exist without their active support. The difficulty with all present systems of government is that they are built upon the supposition that capital is the primarily controlling power; while the fact is that behind capital labor stands first and strongest. As intelligence becomes more and more generally diffused the domination of capital over labor becomes weaker and weaker, and the dignity of labor more and more apparent, and, as a necessary result of the growth of this sentiment, labor is accorded more and wider privileges.

It is a singular fact, and one to be regarded with a feeling bordering on astonishment, that it is possible for all legislation to be either conducted in the interests of capital or controlled by it, when the capitalists of the country are to the laborers as one is to ten. The same principle makes it possible for one man to control a dozen horses possessed of a hundred times his own strength. It is the power of knowledge over ignorance. The horses on the one hand are ignorant of their real power and yield it obediently to the command of assumed authority. So, too, is it with the mass of laborers; they do not know their real power and they yield obedience to the power of assumption aided by a superior intellect.

It is for this reason that the general diffusion of knowledge among the common people should receive so much more attention than it has or does. Every child, whether born of wealth or poverty, should inherit the right from government of a complete education in all the important branches of education. Not only should they inherit this right but the government should see to it that the right is obtained, compulsorily if need be. The acquisition of knowledge has ever tended to the liberalization of existing orders of things, and it was not until something akin to its general diffusion was obtained that any adequate ideas of the advantages of freedom became fixed in the minds of the people. It was a grand—almost a fatally grand—mistake which the people made when they considered that they had obtained complete freedom when they emancipated themselves from the so-called “tyranny” of England.

First, then, and that which is the basis of all other tyranny, is the fact that man, individually considered, is, in the strictest sense of the term, a slave to the conditions of his existence. Whatever else he may be free to perform he can never be emancipated from the necessity of yielding obedience to the demands of this existence. In his ignorant, undeveloped condition, intellectually, he has been led to yield himself in obedience to others whom it seemed to him were able by their superiority, mentally, to better administer to these prime necessities than he could do it for himself. This was the argument for the continuation of slavery in the South. They said the negroes were better off than they would be if cast upon their own resources for the supply of the necessities of life. Many persons felt the strength of this argument and yielded to its pleading. It is the same principle—that of inferior intelligence yielding to superior intelligence—which makes the possibility of all forms of slavery. It is this principle which has made it thus long possible for government to be conducted entirely in the interests of capital.

But it is just at this point, where the beginning of comprehension on the part of the representatives of labor is, that the fallaciousness of this arbitrary form of control begins to be felt by the masses who have hitherto yielded to it. They begin to see that they obtained freedom from one “tyranny” only to yield themselves to another, less odious than it was from the fact that one was represented by one person, while the other is represented by numerous persons. In some regards the last condition is worse than the first; for in it there is nothing to guard the constant encroachments of the tyrant upon their “reserved” rights. They are constantly subjected to legislation which filches from them the last possible farthing, that it may go to swell the coffers of some wealthy individual or some obese corporation.

At present the indications are anything but favorable for the interests of the producing classes. It seems as though the representatives of corporate interests, in which large amounts of money are invested, are organizing to make a crusade against the present possessed rights of the producing classes, to the end that, by all corporate organizations combining and making their interests mutual, they may come into the position that shall give them supreme and lasting control over the destinies of the country. They behold with jealousy the attempts at organization among laborers, knowing that, if it is carried to its full results, it will compel equality of interest and obtain the means necessary to enforce it.

It is the age of rapid change. What it would once have required an age to accomplish, is now performed in a single night. It would not _be very strange_ should the interests of labor control the next Presidential election. One thing is patent to all, some great issue must come up which will be of sufficient magnitude and general importance to arouse the people from the slough of indifference into which they have fallen since the settlement of the slavery issue. It is also equally patent that this issue must be some new combat between some form of slavery and a growing freedom; perhaps a consolidation of the several questions of progress into one interest to crush out, at once and forever, the reign of conservatism of all kinds, and the substitution therefor of an enlightened freedom, to be governed, guided and supported by the lights of science which shall point the way to all things which ought to be obtained.

What the world needs to-day is, that science, supported by wealth, shall come into power. Could this be arrived at, the dangers and difficulties now hovering around the issues between the still captive and the interests of enslaved labor, would be dispelled, and society, without further convulsive efforts, could assume its uninterrupted march toward perfect conditions of existence. It is to be feared that wealth will not yield to science, and that it will endeavor to bring it under its sway to further enslave the “toiling millions” and make them minister longer to its despotism. Let this be as it may, the existence of government upon its present basis of liberty and equality depends upon its checking a power that is being organized to control it. The New York _Herald_, not many days ago, pointed out this danger, but did not warn the people that it was a danger, leaving each to gather his or her own deduction from the mere presentation of the facts. Subsequently, however, it said, editorially, as follows:

“Now it is possible the American people may not be alarmed at the probable effects a combination of the capital and influence of these vast railroad corporations may have upon the future of the country—upon the permanency of its institutions and the perpetuity of its political liberties; but, in view of possible contingencies, we think we are justified in cautioning the people against the possible creation of a railroad oligarchy here that may prove as dangerous to the nation in times to come as was the Southern cotton oligarchy in times past.

“This subject is one of considerable interest to the American people, and the elections of members to the next Congress should be graduated accordingly.”

It is the duty, then, of the New Labor Party to become the best representative of general reform and a wider freedom for all individuals, male and female, which freedom should have no limit except that which borders upon interference with the freedom and rights of others, or that would be detrimental to the common interests of the public if practiced. In the widest freedom there is the most virtue, because, under restraint, compulsion often passes for virtue, while its semblance only is there. Freedom stamps all that is genuine, and exposes and denounces all that is counterfeit and affected. Enforced virtue in any direction, except for the protection of the community, is not one of the principles of a free government; but everything that the government can do that will further the interests of the community, come legitimately within its sphere. And it is to this end and purpose that the Labor party should press its claims to recognition upon the representatives of labor.

The workingman makes the government, and therefore has it in his hands to unmake it. If the government is not what it should be, it is because the workingmen have permitted it to exist and not perform its duty. It seems, then, that the _main point at issue_ is, to acquaint the representatives of labor everywhere with their power; to make them recognize the fact that they, being the majority,

have it in their power to elect the men who will legislate in their interests, and, by so doing, do away with this insane denunciation of wealth by the mouths of those would-be leaders, who, to become leaders, would stir up any kind of strife, required to gain their wishes. Of all such, the Labor Party should beware.

NEW YORK, Nov. 10, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. XIV

We have repeatedly appealed to the productive classes to arouse from the slough of trustfulness and indifference in which they have remained so long, and to bestir themselves about their business of governing themselves. Thus far they have utterly failed in all duties of self-government. They have nominally lived in a country which proffers equality to all, but under which proffering they have virtually surrendered themselves to be governed by the considered mighty few, who, for their own purposes, exalt themselves into the position of The People's candidates until office is obtained, when they begin at once to invent schemes for continuing themselves in power; or, if they know it is impossible to be again returned, they devote themselves to making the most of what time they have.

The present doings of the people's representatives, both State and national, are practically limited to getting the most they can for themselves and their friends, while the study of the interests of their constituents and the country is either entirely ignored or shirked to the greatest possible extent. Each year this condition becomes more and more the controlling element of Congress and Legislature, and unless soon remedied, it will lead the country on blindly to its destruction. This course being directly in the interest of special and favored interests, has the favor and support of capital, while labor looks on with the utmost indifference, and sees its productions filched year after year.

Capital, of the two, is the more foolishly blind to its future; for it does not seem to comprehend that with the continuation of this course must come the day of reckoning, in which the debit side of all accounts will be heavily against it—so heavily that it will never be able to satisfy the demand which humanity will have for it to settle.

This consummation may be averted, but only in one way. The laboring classes must exercise their right of self-government themselves, after the dictates of reason and common sense, and no longer blindly intrust their interests and the common interests of the country to the self-selected few who prate with so much volubility, and who mouth the "King's English" so furiously about their undying patriotism and self-denying devotion. It may be set down at once and for all time that the patriotism and devotion professed by this class of orators and statesmen will be certain to continue until after their election is sure, after which it will do to watch them carefully lest they may have entirely expended it in their efforts for election.

While we have urged the laboring classes to arouse, we have at the same time shown the necessity of complete and thorough organization, and we now further urge the absolute withdrawal of affiliation with any party, and the devotion of their entire strength to the construction of their own party, upon the principles of freedom, equality and justice for all, let them lead where they may. All that is required by them is granted in the present Constitution, though, perhaps, in some points, were so, blindly, for the time, but which are now made plain and clear by late events in some of our States.

It is time that active movements should begin to be made toward organization for the next Presidential election. Both political parties are manœuvring in every possible direction to gain advantages. If the Labor Party will act wisely it can take up one of these parties and incorporate its remnants before the election comes off. But if the class who should form this party will remain stupidly blind, and continue to maintain these virtually defunct parties by their strength, instead of constructing a new party of their own, nothing which will positively shape the future course of events can be accomplished. The old will simply be bolstered up for another term, and four years more of submission to the behests and dictates of capital must be endured.

There will be a desperate attempt made during the coming session of Congress by capital to obtain further, and greater and stronger hold upon the vitals of the country. Efforts to effect the perpetuation of the franchises it already has, it counts upon making, with certainty of success; but the very extent of its efforts which it will make under the knowledge that what is to be obtained must be so at once, will press it to such extremes that it will most probably defeat its own purpose. This event will be rendered certain if the Labor Party will take a positive stand upon its own ground, which will make effective the springing of some "mines" that are prepared, which will put their representatives in such a light before the country as will most effectually dispose of all selfish

schemes which are now afloat. Let it be seen that no shirking of duty is permitted on the part of pretended labor representatives, and also let it be seen that all who lend themselves to the schemes of capital are properly shown up to the country.

Our interests are great and our country is dear to us, for it has cost us immense treasure and blood. Is it not worthy of being defended from all schemes, when so much has been required to construct and preserve it? To the care of laboring classes its preservation is now committed. Will they prove themselves worthy of the high trust? Or will they sell their birthright for less than a "mess of pottage?" Is it necessary that some great calamity come before an awakening to the reality of the condition will occur? Let it rather be, that wisdom be gleaned from the sore trials and the desperate situation of our brethren in France, which shall teach the use to be made of possessed rights and privileges.

NEW YORK, November 18, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. XV.

The New York _Sunday Despatch_, of the 20th inst., contains a lengthy, interesting and highly instructive article, based upon recent interviews with Thomas Hughes and J. P. Mundella, members of the British House of Commons, who are also workingmen and employers. They are strongly of the opinion that "strikes" were never productive of anything but damage to both parties, and that arbitration is the only reasonable resort for the settlement of all mooted questions between laborers and their employers.

As examples of the misery engendered by "strikes," several instances are quoted, among which is found that of the potters and moulders in the vicinity of London, which proceeded to the very last extremity on the part of the strikers. Arbitration at last was resorted to, and resulted in no gain of conditions to the strikers.

These facts go to show that the immediate purposes of labor organizations are detrimental to their true interests. They must acknowledge that they cannot compel capital to their terms, and that in moderate counsels and wise action they will be much more likely to find their interests advancing.

The ultimate purposes of the Labor party which are to obtain control of legislation, may be productive of much good, or may be made the most fruitful cause of national disaster. We have all the time endeavored to show that the real interests of both capital and labor lie in the direction of complete unity; and that although labor is now suffering at the instance of capital, that it should not be laid to the charge of capital that it is in position to thus infringe upon the rights of labor, but to the charge, secondarily, of legislation, which is performed by the very men whom the laboring classes do their utmost to elect to office: and, primarily, to the imperfections in our present financial and social systems, which must be remedied before any very great benefit can accrue to the oppressed conditions of society.

To accomplish what is required in order that labor may rise to an equality with capital, the laboring classes must become enlightened upon the principles of political and social economy. Revolution, which is threatened from some quarters, would only lead away from justice and in the direction of anarchy. We are sorry to be obliged to say that we can find but little in the present propositions of the Labor Party which promises very much of good. For the most part, its leaders are bigoted and cliquish to the extreme, possessing but little of the philosophic comprehension of the conditions through which labor must be elevated. Declaration of principles in series of resolutions which form a necessary part of all political gatherings amounts to nothing unless the party presenting them "squares" itself by them. This is the fatal error of all parties and all governments. They set out by making certain fundamental declarations, which they afterward endeavor to compel into meeting the exigencies of the times.

There is a great work the Labor Party can do. There are imperfections in our government, and these it should take up and remedy. It is a well-established fact, as every one knows, that a government that is not a representative of the minorities as well as of the majorities is not a government of freedom, equality and justice. If imperfections exist even in the much revered Constitution, it should not be held so sacred that none of its faults can be remedied. If there are inconsistencies in it, or if it contain provisions which the present has outgrown, let it be thoroughly amended, and as often as it can be, and made better. We do not believe in anything being held so sacred as not to be submitted to a complete analysis, so that it may be determined just what there is good, and what there is which can be bettered. We are inclined to the opinion that the whole Constitution should be revised, clarified and simplified, and made so plain that there would be no possibility of different constructions being put upon any part of it.

Our government should soon be so formulated, and the people so well informed upon the true principles of government, that all existing administrations should exist by the unanimous consent of all the people. The strife should not be for party, representing different principles, but for the best representative men to administer the Constitutional principles which all would be agreed upon.

There will a party arise having these objects in view, and it need not be predicted that such a party, once organized, will begin a new era in the history of governments, for sufficient comprehension of what the future will be exists to make this a foregone conclusion. The Labor Party should make itself that party. Has it the requisites?

NEW YORK, November 25, 1870.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. XVI.

In the full and legitimate consideration of this subject the range should extend beyond the things immediately attaching to the capitalist and the laborer as persons, and merge into the question of Philosophic Equality, out of which consideration arises the true relations of the extremes of it represented by these two classes. Under a true republican form of government the inherent right to equality on the part of all its citizens should not only be recognized but guaranteed. Equality, except as a mythical name, does not exist in practice in this country; nor for that matter in any country, except where each individual is his own governor, to the extent of his power to maintain such authority; and each individual being possessed of this right to maintain it, comprises that equality. Philosophic Equality presupposes the right of each individual to exercise all the powers possessed by him, in which exercise the rights of no other individual would be interfered with, but which exercise should not be aided or protected by any device of law. The moment a law is made to assist an individual, or any number of individuals, in the performance of his or their undertaking, that moment equality on the part of all other citizens ceases. Not only is this true specifically, but it is a great deal more; it is true generally that if an individual or a class of individuals receive aid, comfort and protection from the law, in their pursuits, all other individuals of all pursuits are rendered unequal in their competition with them in all of their respective pursuits.

That is to say, if a person is protected in the manufacture of salt by the law, which imposes a heavy tax on all foreign salt imported into the country, the manufacturer or producer of grain is at once placed by the law in a condition of inequality with him, and in a double sense if he be a consumer of salt; for not only is the price of the home manufactured salt increased by the imposition of the tax, while the price of the home grown grain is not proportionately increased, but the producer of the grain is obliged to pay the increased price for the salt which he consumes. The same rule is applicable to all things wherein individuals are obliged to seek protection from foreign importations, to be able to produce the same at home.

The argument in favor of this course is, that while protection, extended to certain interests, increases the prices of their productions to the consumers of them, the consumers by it are also enabled to obtain higher prices for what they have to place upon the market. This is all very well so far as it has any application, but what is the effect upon the very large proportion of the working people of the country who are not producers of anything in their own right, but are simply laborers for such producers? If there is only an equality maintained to the employers of such labor, how can the benefit extend to the employed?

In making this complex argument, it is forgotten that real wealth and real prosperity do not consist in high prices for everything, but in the quantity which is actually possessed. Prices under protection must ever fluctuate, and a person rich this year may be rendered poor next year, by the depreciation of his property. Witness the fall of real estate in this city for an exemplification of what we mean. High prices are not the ultimatum to be gained by any people of any country; but, on the contrary, the true point to attain is the employment of the industry of a country in those directions, wherein _the most can be produced at the least cost_, in the accumulation of the proceeds of which the country, as a whole, must become wealthy more rapidly than in the pursuit of the other extreme, which is the production of the least at the greatest cost; or in any modification of this proposition.

The result of continuous protection to any interest of the country may be exemplified by the application of it to something which comes directly home to us. Suppose that there are some gardeners on the upper part of Manhattan Island who appeal to the city authorities for protection against the gardeners of Long Island, New Jersey, &c., because their soil being not so fruitful as that of Long Island and New Jersey, they cannot afford to sell their vegetables as low as those can be sold which are produced outside. Thereupon a tax of twenty-five per cent. is levied by the city upon all foreign vegetables sold in the market. The result is, that all purchasers of vegetables in the city are forced to pay the additional cost merely to enable a few insignificant persons to pursue a calling which they would otherwise abandon for some other which they could pursue without protection. This, though a common

illustration, exemplifies the operation of special protection in all its phases. It enables the few to pursue callings at the expense of the many without returning to that many any adequate benefit.

The trouble with our manufacturers is, that they want to get rich too fast. They are not willing to begin a new business in a way proportionate to their small means, and from this grow gradually into large producers as the manufacturers of other countries have done. They want to be able to employ labor and pay much larger prices than are paid to those laborers who toil in unprotected industries. Nor is the laborer any better off in the general result. The laboring classes of the country are not so well off under the present system of high prices as they were before the war, which indicates that the advance in wages has been more than counterbalanced by the increase in the prices of the laborers' necessities. As a general proposition, it is true that low prices are more favorable to the laborer than high prices; and that, under a system of protection to special favored interests, those interests become rich at the expense of the laborer; or, in more general terms, the rich become richer and the poor poorer with each succeeding year.

Such is the general argument against protective duties; but it does not by any means follow that all protection should be immediately abandoned and Free Trade become at once and fully inaugurated. This would be as grossly unjust to all these interests which have been encouraged into existence by the present system, as that of protection was to the common industries. What should be done is this: Unrestricted commerce, which would allow of the natural demands of a country being supplied, without restrictions of any kind, should be laid down as the true principle, and a gradual approach from present protective measures to freedom be inaugurated. No immediate jump—nor even rapid advance that would produce misfortune to any branch of industry, should it be attempted—but an approach, running through a sufficient number of years to allow of the adjustment of industries, should be the course. Under such a system all the various industries of the country would gradually equalize, and the laborers and employers in each would approach an equal footing. The farmers of the rich Western prairies would no longer be able to complain of the discrimination of government in favor of the cotton, woolen and iron manufacturers of the sterile East. Whether this policy is immediately adopted by government or not, it certainly will be, when the rapidly increasing West shall become the dominant power in it. Better that steps looking to it should be at once adopted than that it come after awhile upon an unprepared country, which course has been so often erroneously pursued to the destruction, demoralization and discouragement of those classes of industries which require consideration in their youth from the strong arm of the government; to accord which is not only for the interests of the country, but which is also its duty to its acknowledged citizens; the error heretofore having been that the consideration thus extended has been at the expense of a _part of the citizens_ of the country and not at the expense of the country as a whole.

Equality to all the citizens of the country can only be possible where there is no special discrimination on the part of government toward any, whether that discrimination is in the form of specific protective duties, unequal levies of taxes, or through devices of law; or, in other words, equality is an impossibility so long as special legislation is allowed either in our State or National councils.

PAPERS ON LABOR AND CAPITAL.

NO. XVII.

The great object of a republican form of government is to arrive at that condition wherein all the people constituting its citizens will stand upon a perfect equality in all things, which can be effected by government. A government cannot determine that each citizen shall have equal capacity to apply and make use of the rights, privileges and immunities which it guarantees to its people, but it can determine that each citizen shall have an equality of right to these benefits, the perfect attainment of which must rest with the citizen.

The question of Labor and Capital, as was said before, is included in the greater and more important question of a Common Equality, or an equality which is predicated upon the fact that all mankind are brethren. A republican form of government should find its fountain in this fact, and all its causes should be governed by its deductions. All the means of providing for the administration of the government, for its maintenance and for the correction of any existing abuses, should be formulated with this one greatest of all human possibilities ever in view. Thus formulated, its practices would ever tend to bring all the people into a comprehension of it, which comprehension is now scarcely existent except in meaningless words, which are dealt from pharisaical pulpits. In our last number the practice of protection to favored interests was considered, with reference to its general effect upon other unfavored industries; the unequal working of the system of levying duties does not stop with generalities; it extends and touches a still more vital point, and one which the people are more sensitive upon than almost any other. The laying of specific duties upon imported goods and wares is an indirect way of _taxing_ that portion of the people who consume such imported goods and wares. It not only

makes it possible for the protected interest to exist at the expense of other interests which consume, but by this operation the government obtains revenue which is an indirect tax gathered from those who are compelled to pay the advanced prices which the levying of duties implies. The amount obtained by such unequal and indirect methods of revenue for the last fiscal year was the enormous sum of $194,448,427, every dollar of which was in reality but an additional tax drawn from the individuals who purchased such imported merchandise. This manner of levying taxes would not matter so much as a system of taxation did it fall equally upon the taxable property of the country, upon which general taxes are levied, but nearly $100,000,000 of the above sum was collected upon woolens, cottons, sugar, molasses, coffee and tea, of all of which the poorest in common with the richest are almost equal consumers.

Laborers of the United States! How like you this manner of filching your hard-earned dollars, under the specious, fraudulent name of “protection to home industries.” It is no wonder that your hard-earned wages will scarcely supply your families’ necessities, when you are compelled to pay such a sum upon the most common staple articles of general consumption. It is no wonder you are continuously laborers, never being able to become producers upon your own account, when you, who should not, and, under general principles of taxation would not be called upon to pay a single dollar as a direct tax, are thus burdened.

Thus it will be seen that the levying of specific duties on imported goods is a most unequal and iniquitous manner of taxing the poor laboring classes of the country to support the government, which is administered to all intents and purposes in the interests of the rich, and under which the really poor become poorer every year.

Nor are the other means to which the government resorts to support itself entitled to very much more consideration than that of the indirect one just mentioned. There is no equality to the general people in any of them; and it is quite evident that the whole system of revenue for the support of the government should be remodeled, so as to fall where it should, in justice, upon the taxable property of the whole Union. This done, and a sound financial system also inaugurated, the lower classes of society would begin to be leveled up to the medium, and the upper classes to be leveled down to the same basis of material prosperity.

A system of taxation for the support of all government—town, city, county, state and national—should be formulated and inaugurated, based upon the proposition that all taxes should be general and none special. All of these taxes, for the several purposes, should be assessed, levied and collected by one set of revenue officers, and thereby an immense system of economy introduced, whereby the collection of the revenues of the country should not consume, by one-twentieth part, what is now consumed in the almost innumerable methods which are adopted to obtain the people’s money by indirect means. All of these subjects are for the laboring classes to take up, examine, decide upon and rectify, and never will they obtain the possibility of an equality until this is done. Never can equality be possible under the forms through which government is now administered and supported, and never will the laboring classes become independent of the wealthy classes until the freedom, equality and justice, which are the birthright of every citizen of the United States, become possible of attainment under its government.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. I.

In the following papers it will be our design to treat the questions of Finance and Commerce in a somewhat different manner from the ordinary and current way. The mere records of the transactions had in the world of money and of merchandise belong to the ordinary method of dealing with all matters that interest the people. The facts—the results—only enter into the consideration, and if serious conflict or serious faults are recorded, no attention is paid to the sources from which they spring, and from which they will continue to spring so long as the sources furnish the causes. All subjects, and all parts of the common interests of humanity, will receive from us not only the attention which the present demands, but if the present brings unhappiness to humanity, or does not bring happiness, the fountains will be examined to discover where the stream takes on its bitterness and its sediment—and, for instance, produces financial disease—with the view of exposing to the people what causes their unhappiness or lack of happiness.

As society is constituted at present, nothing within its interests has so much power for good or ill as money. He that has it is independent—is a free man; while he that has it not is dependent—a slave in some one or other of the forms of slavery. Men recognize that this is an imperfect condition of society, made up, as it is of people born free and equal in the eyes of the law, and by it entitled to their chosen path of happiness. These being the birthright of every one, the construction of society should be such as to guarantee it to every one. As society improves its condition, the advance made will be ever toward practical equality in all temporal things. It is the duty of those who labor in the interests of society to lay hold of the future, and bring its conditions into the

broadest present application.

Money being the corner-stone upon which society is now built, is thereby that stone of all others which should be perfect, not only in form, but perfect in duration: that is, it should be of such composite elements that time nor change should be able to produce any effect, either upon its external appearance or upon the arrangement of its parts. It becomes apparent, then, at first observation from this standpoint, that our present corner-stone is not one that can endure; it becomes plain that it not only will change, but that it should change, because of its capability to meet the requirement of a perfect corner-stone, upon which society can rest with perfect and continuous security.

Gold has long been the accepted money standard of value. Intrinsically, it has no value other than for the other uses to which it is adapted, but custom and long usage have raised it into the position of a god, before whom the world falls down and worships with as much devotion as Pagans do before their various gods. And, considered as a god, none other has in this day and age one-half the power, nor is any other worshiped with one-half the devotion it is. This may be considered an unjust reflection upon the so-called Christians; but let them, as a class, examine themselves individually, and if the analysis does not sustain the proposition, we shall be very willing to confess our error, and appeal for forgiveness. Gold _has_ been the accepted money standard, but the practice, since the depreciation of our country's credit, has, to all intents and purposes, reduced it to a mere commodity. Our money is not measured by Gold—Gold is measured by it. It may be said that this is merely for temporary convenience, but nevertheless it is so measured, and the practice has demonstrated that so far as facilitating exchange of products in our own country is concerned, its use might be dispensed with. If it can be dispensed with and trade continue, its importance as money entirely disappears. Would dispensing with its use offer any impediments to commerce with other countries? But this article is simply introductory, intended rather to indicate what our treatment of finance will be, than for the discussion of any of the questions that arise under it. These will remain for future consideration; here we will simply state that we do not believe gold to be a true standard of value; that we do not believe its use as money is at all necessary; that we do not believe that its use as money contributes to general prosperity; and that we do believe that its use will be supplanted by a new medium—the true representative of that portion of the real wealth of the country which is at the given time in the process of exchange.

NEW YORK, August 25, 1870.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. II.

Finance and commerce are so intimately connected that one cannot be treated without the other being, at least, indirectly alluded to. If these terms are analyzed, their relations will be perfectly understood. Commerce is the simple exchange of something one individual possesses for something another individual is possessed of. This exchange may be between neighbors, or between nations; it is all commerce. In ancient times, articles of merchandise were exchanged for articles of merchandise, but as commerce increased in amount, and its limits became extended, it became necessary to make use of something that should represent value, so that there need not, in all cases, be an actual transfer of property for property. The medium used to facilitate these exchanges was money in its first phases, and out of this necessity have grown all the different monetary devices made use of, at various times, in the history of civilization.

To demonstrate that money is only a convenience and not an absolute necessity, any one has only to observe that frequent purchases, sales and payments are made without the use of money or any other representative of value, but by the direct transfer of value for value. It is plain, then, that money, be it gold, silver or what else it may, if not intrinsically of the value set upon it, but that it represents something that has intrinsic value. If this is questioned, let any one who doubts it procure some gold in its original state and endeavor to make exchanges with it. He will find that no one will receive it, even at its value by weight. Were he to apply to a dozen places where gold, in mass, is dealt in, he would be offered a dozen different prices for his article. It is only after gold has passed through the hands of the government, and has received its impress as an indorsement, that it becomes current as money.

It is further to be observed that the time came when even coin became too burdensome to be directly transferred in making exchanges, and something representing it was brought into use. This consisted of bits of paper, containing upon them promises to pay so much in coin, &c., &c.; and under this practice banks of issue sprung into existence, their issues being supposed to represent a gold or coin basis of value. But a full representation alone of coin deposited was found not to supply a sufficient

circulating medium to accommodate the movement of produce, and for other uses, and it became customary for the banks to expand their issues beyond the amount of coin on hand, upon the supposition that these promises to pay would never be presented in sufficient quantities to consume their actual specie. But suppositions are only true _generally_, and hence it came that promises to pay often exhausted the ability to pay, and here began the ills that must necessarily attend a false standard of values.

In all seasons of financial distress, gold, as a standard, has failed. The necessities of our late war demonstrated and represented the fallacy of an absolute standard in gold, and happily suggested a better standard. No sooner did the supply of gold at the command of the government fail, than the latter was compelled to resort to its credit, or to a direct representation of the true value and wealth of the country. The credit of the government was the ability and intention of the country to meet the promises of its government, and this ability determined its currency. It was not the amount of gold, absolutely, that the country was supposed capable of acquiring that thus entered into consideration, but the ability of the country to produce certain quantities of merchandise, which should, in time, be sufficient, above consumption, to balance these promises to pay. It was the productive capacity of this country that gave value to its currency and bonds irrespective of gold. The productive capacity of a country is then the virtual standard of the value of its currency, and as gold can only be obtained by the products of the country, its necessity as a medium may be dispensed with. It is now predicted that the sooner gold, as the money god, is dethroned in the hearts and customs of the people, the sooner a sound and perfect system of finance will be inaugurated.

That there is a true standard of value, and one that can never fail in time of need, nor be made use of for speculative purposes as gold is, must be apparent to every thinking mind. How many of the people of this country, during the last eight years, have received gold or silver for what they have disposed of, or have used it to purchase their necessities? And yet the talk of a return to specie payment is everywhere heard. When will the idol worship of the god of gold be completely abolished?

NEW YORK, August 31, 1870.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. III.

We have said that there is a true standard of value, and that this is based in the capacity of a country to pay without infringing upon the country itself; that is, without resorting to an actual transfer of supposed title to any part of its domain for something the domain itself produced. Actual ownership in the soil of a country is an assumption, as has been stated in the “Papers on Labor and Capital.” If the title to any real estate is traced back far enough, it would be found to have originated in the practice of “Squatter Sovereignty.” The inhabitants of a country having the right to make use of the land they occupy, render it more or less valuable, according to the amount they can make it produce, whether it be in the shape of its natural products or those of artificial assistance, or whether it is simply occupied for purposes other than production.

The basis, however, of the value is in the productions of the soil of a country; it matters not how much value may be added by the art of man to what nature furnishes. This would find no scope for action did the earth not first yield the fruits of her bosom to the hand of the artist. The finest cloth, the most delicate silks and laces, the most costly jewels, even the light that robs night of its darkness, are all primarily the products of the earth. Without this yielding of the earth there would be nothing. This giving up of the earth to the demands, efforts and desires of man, is the process by which he acquires all his wealth. Even the gold that has so long been called money the earth has yielded, and still yields. When this is considered in its true light, we come to a realization that gold is no more money, absolutely, than any other of the different products of the earth, but with them all it forms the real value standard. Gold is relatively valuable for the general uses it can be made to subserve; so, too, and only so, are all other products. Any other metal might just as well have been selected out of which to coin money as gold. It no longer answers the purpose it has been used for so long. It is not “radical” enough to suit “the times.” It is one of the landmarks of conservatism, reminding us that once it required at least six months to communicate with, and receive an answer from, London, whereas we now know the 5 o’clock P. M. closing prices of stocks in London at 1 o’clock of the same day.

Such annihilation of time and space is entirely ahead of, and above, the era of gold, which must yield its sway to something more elastic, and consequently possible of better adaptation to the constantly varying requirements of the peoples. The world having been so long held in financial bondage to gold, is now approaching a period wherein it will rid itself of the yoke. A very few people in the world rule it. What of the thrones of Europe without the Rothschilds? and what of them if not for gold? The vast debts of those countries alone render crowns longer endurable. Just a little more intelligence among the common people—just a few more

newspapers and readers, and the work is done; those who play king, and they who are the real kings, will fall together. Kings rule the people, but money rules kings. This is beginning to be realized, and the realization is not satisfactory to those who produce wealth; they do not care to live under the tyranny of a god they themselves have fashioned. But after gold, what?

NEW YORK, Sept 7, 1870.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. IV.

If gold, as a medium of exchange, is behind the requirements of the times—and that it is has been pretty fully demonstrated—some reform should be instituted to supply the failure; some reform—not merely to meet the exigencies of present time and circumstances—which should be inaugurated as a permanent change.

Our government, during the last war, was obliged to resort to what was considered then by nearly all people, and is still considered by many people, as very extreme measures, in order to furnish the material by which the war might be carried on. Without the greenbacks we never could have succeeded as we did. To the person who conceived this project we are as greatly indebted as to our generals, who successfully prosecuted the war upon the means furnished through his financial foresight. This was one means of resorting to the credit of the country. If the credit of the country was sufficiently good to furnish it with the means to carry on such an exhaustive war as ours was, it surely should be good for any peaceful time.

For our part, we cannot see the propriety of returning to specie payment; and there is one insuperable objection to it. Gold cannot furnish the circulating medium for the world, and credit must be resorted to; and the necessity of having two kinds of circulation involves difficulties which the mercantile world would be glad to have forever done with.

Why should people be obliged to use one kind of circulating medium to purchase another kind with, and then use this second kind to pay his debts to another party, who will sell it again to obtain what the first person used to purchase it? This is the logic of specie payments. If it is argued that the actual transfer of the gold is not necessary, we would then ask why is specie payment desirable at all? The facts regarding this question are that people have become wedded to the idea that gold is the only possible thing that can be made money, while all their practice has been that it is the least entitled to the name of money of anything they have ever used as such.

As has been said, the real standard value of a country is its capacity to produce, and it is this production that requires to be moved, exchanged, bartered or sold. The use of something to represent this, for which it can stand responsible in general terms, is what is required of money. That kind of money which will best meet all these requirements is the best money. That kind of money which has elasticity, that will be plenty when business is active, and that can be readily put to other use for profit when business is less demanding, is the kind the prosperity of a country demands. With a money of this kind, all financial crises would be impossible. It is the possibility of making a stringent market that unsettles financial matters and causes financial destruction. And it is because we have not a financial system of our own that it is possible for exigencies in other countries to unsettle values here. To-day, the price of our securities in London determines the price of gold here. In view of the possible complications in which Europe is liable to be involved any time, and which she must within a very few years be involved in, it becomes a matter of considerable moment, whether our finances are to be governed and guided by the condition of things there, when these things shall come.

As a nation we are or can be, were it necessary, independent of the world, and are the first and best representative of a republican form of government. Why should we not be the nation to give to the world a reformed currency? The world—or that part of it which has grown to appreciate our kind of freedom—involuntarily turns its eyes to us for patterns of all things that a people during a change of government require. One of the first things a government requires is money. Why shall we not show the nations how to make the best use of their means, and give them a system that will do more for them than any system that has yet been tried, and by so doing also meet our own needs?

The capability to do this would instantly place us at the head of nations, and financially to stand thus, is to complete the measure of our greatness. Politically, we can never be subdued. During our late war there were two millions of men under arms. Just in this proportion, also, should we be powerful financially, and to become so would be to be allotted by the world the lead of it and all its nations.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. V.

The gravest of all questions of political economy is that of a country's money. A very great deal more of the people's common happiness depends upon money than even political economists generally suppose. Happiness is very closely allied to prosperity, and general prosperity in a country can never obtain unless it is under a sound financial system. Very few people understand what general prosperity means. It does not mean vast sums of gold in the hands of a few of the inhabitants of the country, while the great majority struggle month after month for the absolute necessities of life. There may be a great deal of money in a country and still be very little general prosperity with the common people. The question of money has never been considered philosophically, nor with due regard to the common interests of humanity. It is always viewed from the standpoint of the wealthy, and usually by the wealthy or by those in their direct interests.

The producing classes, however, are beginning to awake to the fact that they have never been represented in any of the legislation that has been had regarding finance and the currency they have been forced to use. On the contrary, they perceive that all legislation has been in the interests of capital, and this perception is what is arraying these supposed two interests against each other. The facts existing have only to be considered to prove that our financial system is unsound, and this should be sufficient to force our legislation to take up the question, and to handle it in the light of the demands of the present, utterly regardless of the superstition that has so long existed about the gold idol.

The objectors to any thing as money but gold, make much of the need of it to make good the balances of trade between different countries. But these forget that gold is nothing but merchandise until the country has placed its indorsement upon it, and that it is this which gives it the character of money, and that it does not derive this character from the fact that it is gold. The indorsement of a country upon gold coin is a simple guarantee that it is of a specific purity, after this, its value is determined by its weight. Thus gold sent to other countries to pay balances against us, is sent and received, as so much by weight of a specific quality of gold, and not as so much of our national money. The force of this objection, then, is utterly destroyed by these considerations; and especially so, when this same gold, coined by our government, is recoined by the country we send it to. Here it is distinctly proved that gold is not money, and that it is only a commodity which we produce and part with in exchange for other commodities, and that it is just as valuable for this purpose if it goes direct from the mines where we produce it, to other countries, as it is if it goes by the way of a United States Mint, where it receives the indorsement of the government.

To go still deeper, there is a no more mischievous idea than that all paper money should be redeemable in gold which should alone be legal-tender, because everybody knows that the amount of currency this country demands cannot by any possibility ever be redeemed by gold. It may be redeemed by using the same gold coin over and over again, as it is again and again received and paid; but just here is the difficulty; for ten dollars of currency in reality have to be redeemed by the one gold dollar. This is the _practice_ of specie payments, and a most mischievous one it is, too; it is the sole idea that leads to great inflations, and consequently to great collapses in finances and values. Under this system there never was nor never can be a reliable mercantile value to anything. Fluctuation is its direct result, while speculation, without this, would cease, and the vast horde of mere speculators who spend their whole time in it, would of necessity be compelled to become producers of some kind. It will thus be seen that the first principles of economy are in direct opposition to the results coming from the use of gold as money; and that these declare that something should supersede its use as such that it would be impossible to speculate upon; something that would have such absolute and never varying value as could be positively counted upon to endure a month, a year, a century or a thousand years, as the cases in question should respectively involve. Such a substantial thing might with propriety be called money, and in comparison to it gold would sink into utter insignificance and be forgotten.

NEW YORK, September 14, 1870.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. VI.

A very fallacious argument has been the rule, because gold has been considered "money," that all currency is "credit;" this at first blush would seem to be still further strengthened by the proposition that gold is only merchandise. By no means, however, is all currency credit. All bank currency is credit. All currency that is not legal-tender for contracts and debts is credit; but a currency

which is of itself legal-tender is money, because it is itself intrinsically valuable. All the uses one has for money it fills; it not only meets all demands that “credit currency” can meet, but it fills other and specific demands that bank currency cannot. It is receivable for nearly all governmental demands upon the people; it pays taxes, and cannot be refused by any one in payment of contracts and obligations. Such a currency has all the features and characteristics of money, except that in our practice it has not been receivable for duties upon imports. Had greenbacks been made legal-tender for all governmental purposes, they would have been “real money,” having intrinsic value, of which nothing short of the absolute destruction of the country and death of its inhabitants could have robbed them. The gold fallacy, however, prevented Congress from seeing the real drift of what they did, and the country, therefore, must yet a little longer be blinded by the thought that gold is the only money.

The only argument which is at all tenable, that converts anything that has all the qualities of merchandise into a measure of value is, that the article thus rendered costs at all times, and in all countries, the same labor to produce it. This test, every one knows, is not applicable to any single thing the earth yields; and as little as to any other does it attach to gold, and, therefore, gold in itself is subject to fluctuation, and can in no sense be considered an absolute measure of anything. This country, since California began to yield her gold, has been a great producer of the precious metal; that is, a certain amount of labor has produced a larger proportionate quantity of it than has generally been produced in this or in other countries; consequently we have been large exporters, not of money, but of gold, in its character as merchandise: very much of this has been exported in mass, uncoined, in which condition not even the most rigid gold stickler will pretend it is money.

Hence it follows that we do not need “money” to balance our accounts with other countries; we need particular kinds of merchandise which we have in larger quantities than we have use for, or which other countries need more than they do some merchandise they have which we require more than they do; which system brings about exchange, the sum total of which is commerce. If commerce were left to regulate itself without any interference to prevent the natural flow and reflux of the products of the earth, as stated above, there would soon become established permanent courses for certain products, to take which would still further localize all kinds of labor, and render each of nearly unvarying profit. It is this interference with the natural demand and supply of the various parts and peoples of the earth that breaks down the equilibrium of labor, and makes possible the extreme unequal distribution of wealth.

It will be seen that all questions of finance and commerce are intimately connected, while those of labor and capital grow out of the conditions they make possible and inevitable. To properly understand the relations of capital and labor, and to harmonize them, demands a correct comprehension of the basic principles of economy which relate to finance and commerce. If these were based in correct universal principles, there could be no questions to settle between labor and capital. Hence it is that it becomes specially requisite at this time, when labor is rising to a sense of the unjust position it is confined to, that these questions of finance should be agitated as the most important ones for adjustment. To begin at the root of the evil is the philosophic way to deal with all the ills of society as it is with all ills which result in the gradual evolution of all departments of the universe.

For a measure of value and to aid exchanges, then, there is required a currency, or medium, that does not possess any of the characteristics of merchandise, that is not a commodity nor a product in any sense of those terms, but something that has intrinsic value of itself, being a true representative of value, and of equal and absolute value at all times and under all circumstances and changes. Such a thing would be money, and anything not possessing these requirements is not worthy the name of money.

The question arises, then, Can there be anything formulated or brought into use that would possess all these requirements under all circumstances? It is quite certain that there never has been, as yet, anything used as money that was as absolute as a dollar, as a pound is as a pound, or as a foot is as a foot. A pound is just a pound under any and all circumstances; so, too, is a foot under the same; and so is a gallon, and so is a cord of wood; whether a greater or less number of any of them are required at one time or another for use, they are always a pound, a foot, a gallon, or a cord, and no more nor no less. Now, what we require is a measure of values of just as fixed and absolute a character as any of these. When this is acquired, then just as unvarying value will attach to the measure of values as there does to those measures. Money is but another name for values, and the dollar is one of the divisions of its measures. There is no more reason why money should fluctuate in its capacity of measuring or of being measured than there is that the foot should grow longer or shorter, or the pound greater or less, and there is just the same reason why it should not.

Then, the products of the earth once placed upon this unvarying standard, the cost of producing each different product would determine its exact value, and in time the producers of each kind would be upon an exact equality in regard to the value of their products. It is the attaching, in practice, of absolute value to something that can have no absolute value which makes possible all

the various degrees of poverty that belong to the laboring or producing classes. If these inequalities are to be remedied, there is but one method by which it can be done—that is, to reduce our money systems to the same fixedness that we have reduced all our other systems to. This once done, all labor will gravitate to an equality, and capital will become its best ally instead of, as now, its apparent enemy, while each of these interests, and all divisions of each of them, everywhere in the world, would become mutual, and by so being would prepare the way and lay the foundation for that grand harmonization of society which must precede the practical co-operation of mankind, as brethren, under a universal unitary government of the United States of the World.

NEW YORK, Sept. 20, 1870.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. VII.

The point has now been arrived at where it is to be considered as decided that gold is not, cannot, be money; that it is a valuable article of merchandise. Its utility beyond this character has not only departed as a principle, but in practice a very considerable portion of the most enlightened people in the world consider it the source of great mischief, and the more the causes of the financial ills we are subjected to are analyzed, the more they will be found to be dependent upon the attaching of a specific value to something that is as changeable in cost of production as it is possible for anything to be.

The philosopher and the best reformer would here step in and say that it is their province not so much to tear down the old as it is to prepare the new that shall take the place of the old. This is the science of all reform. However, before there can be a field prepared in which the new can be used, the defunct condition of the old must be pointed out, and its _debris_ cleared away, so that the new may find space for operation.

This preparation has in reality been already made. The necessities of the Government in the late war broke the first ground for the consideration of this very important question, and prepared the minds of the mass of the people, though, perhaps, unconsciously, for the reception of the idea that it is possible to do without gold; that specie payment is by no means a necessary accompaniment of a sound financial condition, and that a money system which is made dependent upon a redemption by something else, is not only not to be desired, but that it is the real foundation for all financial disasters, because it makes an undue expansion possible. The people who would once have considered a proposition for an irredeemable currency with the utmost alarm now discuss it as one of the things that is sure to be. It is believed by those who have studied this subject deepest that the time has arrived when this government must enter upon the consideration of a permanent change in our financial system, and that a return to the gold standard would be a disaster.

But, says the objector, how can an irredeemable currency ever be made to adapt itself to the varied demands of the country? How can anything so unsubstantial as a paper currency, without gold support, be made as absolute a measure of values as the yard-stick is of distance? and, if this can be accomplished, where will the elasticity of the currency be found? In general terms it is assumed that, unless the proposed financial system will answer all these conditions—that unless it will be elastic, adapting itself to all the demands that can be made, be they great or small, and at the same time remain absolute in its value, it is not even fit to be thought of, much less to be seriously considered as a substitute for what has been.

And this brings us back to the beginning of the argument—to the point from which the first departure was made. The course that will be pursued, however, after leaving this point this time will not be that of reconnoitring—looking over—the ground to be covered, but a steady, firm and final advance directly toward the objective result desired, which, if a failure is made in reaching, the campaign against gold may be considered a failure. Under the system of currency being good only when it can be redeemed by gold, there is required, to make the currency actually in circulation good, just as many gold dollars as there are currency dollars—that is, if there is at any time in circulation any more currency than there is gold to redeem it, then there is an expansion, which any sudden change in any of the circumstances by which nations are surrounded is liable to convert into a collapse. So long as everything is prosperous, so long as nothing arises to shake the confidence of the people, or to call the attention of any considerable number to the possibility that there is not gold enough to redeem all the currency that is in circulation, so long everything goes well; but so soon as any one of said conditions occur or change, then there is a rush to see who shall get what gold there is; the supply exhausted, the unredeemed currency is valueless. This is the practice and the result of a redeemable currency; the same results will also follow so long as such a system is tolerated.

Everybody knows that there never has been a currency in circulation sufficient in quantity to meet all the requirements of commerce that had a complete basis in gold, and everybody also knows that there is not gold enough in the world to meet this specific requirement. Hence it is that institutions possessing, say $100,000 in gold, put forth and obtain interest upon $500,000 in currency—that is to say, with a real capital of $100,000, which is worth six per cent. interest, they really obtain thirty per cent. interest, thus making it possible for them to double their original capital every three or four years. Did those who now so loudly complain of the National Banks receiving interest from the government upon their bonds deposited, and from the people upon their circulation, ever object to the greater enormities of the specie-paying banks?

The only use of money is to facilitate exchanges of what the earth produces, voluntarily or under compulsion. Money, then, has its direct relation to these products as a whole, and can have no special relation to any part of them; if made to enter upon and sustain any such special relation, it is a purely arbitrary law, without foundation in principle, that compels it, and all arbitrary laws belong to the ages past, when brute force was required to guide ignorance; they cannot be long in this age without generating irritation, and such irritation is now being rapidly developed all over the world, wherever the laboring classes have become at all advanced in knowledge. The few can no longer control the many; the many are to control the few. Capital, through false systems of values, has been able to control labor; but the time has nearly come when the producing many will control the accumulated wealth of the world for the benefit of the whole world—not simply and only because they are the many, but because they are to be reinforced by the invincible powers of demonstrated science, which are always to be found operating for the “greatest good for the greatest number.”

NEW YORK, Sept. 27, 1870.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. VIII.

Money was invented as a method to facilitate the exchanges of the products of the industry of the world. If this is a true definition of money, the only legitimate money it is possible to have is something that naturally grows out of the uses it is required for. A national currency, then, should be a representative of that which it is its sphere to exchange; that is to say: a currency dollar should stand for a certain amount of the different products, which have been produced at the expense of a certain amount of labor. It will be perceived that this representation is upon an entirely different hypothesis from that of a currency which is supposed to represent gold.

To begin with something which everybody can understand: It may be supposed that a farmer, occupying a given quantity of land, can, in a series of ten years, produce an average amount of ten thousand dollars per year to dispose of commercially. During the process of production he is obliged to have, say, eight thousand dollars’ worth of means to enable him to continue the process. Now, instead of his being obliged to obtain credit based upon his prospective crop, he is supplied with a representative currency based upon it; this enables him to purchase from time to time that which he requires. When his crop is harvested, it is disposed of, and his currency is _redeemed_ by it.

Now, make this application general to all kinds of production in the country—which is the only basis of value a country can have—and make the government the appraiser of the value thereof, and the maker and utterer of its representative, and a currency will be obtained that will possess all the requirements and characteristics of money; because it will be used to exchange that upon which it is based and of which it is representative, and which is substantially redeemed every time it exchanges any products of the country.

Now, how shall this system be instituted? In the census now being taken, the value of the total products of the country can be arrived at, which sum total should be used as the basis of issue, and continue as such during the next _ten years_, at the end of which time the increased products would require another valuation to amend the bases for an increased issue for the next ten years.

A currency thus obtained would possess all the substantial value that could be required of money. It is really the basis of value when gold is used; for how are a people to obtain gold unless they have produce to exchange for it?—which operation is, in reality, nothing more than the exchange of one commodity for another, of which it is not and cannot be representative, while in the case of the proposed currency an exchange is effected for that of which it is representative.

In this view of currency for a country, our system of greenbacks come nearer being money than anything that has ever been in use in this or in any other country. They were based upon the capacity of the country to produce, and had the government confined itself to their use, and had not been obliged to invent some further means to predicate securities, we should now have had a real money currency. Who is there to find fault with “greenbacks” as a national currency, provided there are enough of them to transact the business of the country with, _and no more than just enough_? But they lack one essential quality of real money—they are not receivable for all things that people need money for, and which the government demands of the people. They should have been made receivable for all government demands, _even for duties on imports_. But the necessities of the government, which was then struggling with all its might for existence, made it a “military necessity” to exact gold for duties on imports, as an indirect way of taxing the people who could afford to indulge in the luxuries of foreign products.

Though not available for duties there never has been in the history of the world so stable and invariable a measure of value as the greenbacks, since government ceased issuing any more than the amount already out. There has been no great financial panic and no considerable unsettling of commercial values. They require that one thing more should be done—they should be given a _fixed measure of value_. Then nothing more could be required of a currency than would be found in the greenbacks.

The reason, and the only reason, why the people can feel that such a currency may be unstable is the fear that the government may be induced to issue it in greater amount than primarily authorized, and consequently that it would depreciate; but this could not be until the nation should issue more than the value of its property. But for this deficiency there is a good and sufficient remedy, which can be provided and used in connection with the proposed new currency, which is to be based upon the capacity of the country for production, and which will also provide for different seasons or parts of seasons when more or less circulating medium is demanded to fulfill the business indications of the country; and with this it is believed all the objections are covered that can possibly be raised by the most strenuous stickler for a currency with a gold basis, though the government may issue never so great a volume of the currency proposed.

NEW YORK, Oct. 3, 1870.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. IX.

There are several propositions which should always remain in all considerations about money, so that the mind may not be led from its true sphere, and so that it may not be invested with peculiarities and characteristics that never did nor never can belong to money:

First and most important—most important because it is the determining point which gives all that follows tangibility—is, that _money, in its primary uses, is a means and not an end_. It is a means, because it was invented to assist the people in performing something that could be performed without, but not so well without it. And this is the _sole use_ of money. Because this has been lost sight of and it has been invested with other functions, it has been possible for it to be converted to uses which at times, in culminating, have almost turned the world topsy-turvy.

Second. Money is the medium of exchanging commodities, and when diverted from its legitimate use and is made an end, results will ever follow which _must_ be detrimental to the general interests involved.

Third. All the material value money possesses is so possessed because of the relation it bears to commodities, that relation being representative of or standing for.

Fourth. While money is the medium of exchanges, and while it is in use representative of valuable materials, it is in its _last_ analysis the _objective_ of that department of life of which labor is the _subjective_, and, therefore, when scientifically viewed, it resolves itself into a principal which is one of those upon which society must be built when a perfect foundation is formulated.

In providing a currency, therefore, to meet the uses which are demanded of it, its _scientific_ feature, as a principle, should be the point of departure, and should be the only guide until it is attained. Labor being the basis of production, is the positive power which reaches forth and expends itself, where money, the other pole of the social battery, is reached; this reaction upon labor completes the circuit, and here is the process which is continually going on: A certain amount of labor—a positive power—produces a certain amount of money or negative result The interference with this natural process by extraneous means, through which undue quantities of negative forces are accumulated, is that process which robs labor of its natural and, therefore, just results.

The labor which the people of this country are capable of performing, then, is the real basis upon which money should be formulated, and, as in practice, the results generally are annual in their return, this basis should be measured by all they can produce annually. It follows that the basis upon which money should be uttered is this annual capacity of labor, and there should be sufficient uttered to completely measure this capacity, between which two, when once established, there would be an equilibrium produced, which would only require to be permanently regulated and maintained to insure a perfect harmony in the material interests of society.

For example, let it be supposed that the extremest legitimate amount of currency that would be warranted under the previous rule is one billion of dollars; and that this amount is all that the uses of money require when there is the largest amount of business being transacted. It must be remembered that this is not a redeemable currency, but that it is money; that it is the representative of the wealth of the nation, and that the government, as the head of the nation, has uttered it, upon the soundest and best basis of value any money could possibly have—the productive capacity of the country. In this money system there could be no such thing as the failure of banks to redeem their issues; nor of any loss to be sustained by the individual because of the mismanagement of any board of directors; and what is more than all the rest, in the present systems of society, its value would be sustained by the collective accumulated wealth of the whole country, and it could by no possibility depreciate in value so long as the value of the country was not exceeded by the amount of the issue.

To guard the people against all apprehension of such a result ever being possible, there should be a measure placed upon this currency that will at all times make it just as absolute in its measure of value as the pound is in its measure of weight, or as inches are in their measure of distances. Though this is comparatively a new proposition, and one that but very few minds think a possibility, it nevertheless is just as possible and just as essential—and more so—as all other absolute and arbitrary standards are, that have been invented to give regularity and stability in their respective spheres of use.

This currency—this money—should be made convertible into a United States Bond, which should bear such a rate of interest—say four per cent.—as experience has or should demonstrate to be the true point of balance; and the bond should also be convertible into the currency at the option of the holder. The rate of interest should be open to readjustment every ten years, when the estimates for the currency are made. Thus it would come that whenever there should be so much currency in circulation that it would be worth less than four per cent. for business uses, the surplus would immediately be converted into four per cent. bonds; and whenever money for business should be worth more than four per cent., the bonds would be converted into the currency in just sufficient quantities to meet the demand and to restore the equilibrium.

It will be readily seen how perfectly this meets all the requirements of money, and how perfectly all the irregularities of demand and supply are met by it. Thus, when business is dull, and but little money is required, it (the surplus) will be in bonds drawing four per cent. interest; the moment business revives, the bonds will be at once converted, and the currency will meet the demand, and thus the constant conversion of the one into the other will regulate and maintain the equilibrium that all previous systems of money have so signally failed to do.

In our next the advantages of such a system will be still further considered and expounded, so that every one may be able to comprehend that a money system is possible of invention, upon which foreign bankers can not play their long-practiced games to any further one-sided advantage.

NEW YORK, Oct. 11, 1870.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. X.

The advantages of a currency which, instead of possessing the capacity of redeemability, is at all times convertible into something that is itself productive, cannot fail to be appreciated by all who have given any attention to the science of money. Theories regarding this branch of social science have been about as destructive to the proper development and understanding of the science as religious theories have been to that of a proper appreciation of the functions and the benefits of religion. The last have at all times stood in the path of progress. So, too, have the first. And for this reason are we to-day almost at the mercy of those who are possessed of the accumulated wealth of the world, which in combination would be a power sufficient to control all government in its interests, and thus it would be enabled to bring the world again under a despotism to which that of past despotism would hold no

comparison.

In such a money system too much circulating medium could never be uttered, for the moment a surplus quantity over the demands of legitimate business was in circulation, that moment it would begin to be converted into the four per cent. bonds; so that if there were two thousand millions uttered, it would always be worth just four per cent.; and if there were but five hundred millions uttered, it would never be worth any more than four per cent. Thus it is plainly to be seen that the government would always be necessitated to provide just as near the amount of circulating medium demanded as it would be possible to arrive at, _and no more_; for on any such surplus it would, as a matter of course, be obliged to pay the interest provided, which thus becomes the absolute measure of value that money requires to make it substantial, and which is required to deprive it of that capacity for producing great commercial inflations, which, in the financial history of this country, develop and burst about every second decade, and which produce not only the complete destruction of all purely speculative enterprises, but also the most wide-spread and fearful demoralization in all legitimate business.

Under such a money system, speculation, with all its accompanying demoralization, would rapidly depart from all classes of society. It is a notorious, yet unappreciated fact, that speculative enterprises lie at the foundation of all financial disorder, for which, if a remedy can be provided, the very considerable talent and time which is now devoted to it would be turned into channels of general usefulness and productiveness. Production is the foundation of all wealth, and, consequently, to increase wealth, production must be increased. Speculation is that spirit which constantly saps the vitality of wealth, and, therefore, society has no greater nor more debasing enemy than speculation.

It may be objected to by some that speculation leads to national development; that in many of the wild railroad, emigration, city and other schemes, that have been projected and carried through under its stimulus, the welfare of the country has been subserved. To this ingenious objection it may be answered that, under a sound financial system, these enterprises would have been undertaken everywhere when the demands of the country warranted them, and because there was a demand for them, instead of for the pure purposes of individual or corporate speculation. One of the best results that would flow from this change of incentive would be, that no “Bubbles” could be palmed off on the unwary by “flash” advertising, which would burst at some future time, to the destruction of some deluded victims of unscrupulous financiers.

It is one of the most fatal of commercial errors to suppose that large general prices are an evidence of prosperity. On the contrary, it is true that when the prices affixed to any kind of property are larger than its real capacity for production, it is an expansion which must at some time collapse, to the detriment of the holder. Thus, whenever property is valued at such a price that it cannot be used to pay a certain per cent. income, its value is expanded, and though this expansion may continue under the pressure of a so-called prosperity, and become general, even country-wide, if the general productive capacity of the country cannot sustain this increased value, collapse must as surely come as results follow causes. Even in this demonstration it is conclusively shown that the productive capacity of the country is the _real_ measure of value, and that, _finally_, no matter how irrelevant the process of wealth and prices may have been to it, _it is the power which ultimately measures all values_.

This appears to us such a plain proposition that it seems almost superfluous to present further arguments to prove the desirability of at once proceeding to make the productive capacity of the country the basis of value upon which to issue a currency to meet the legitimate demands of the people for the purposes of exchange. The attention of all who realize the unstableness of our present system, and the desirableness of providing against the tremendous fluctuations it is capable of, is called to the necessity of uniting to bring this matter prominently before the NEXT CONGRESS, with the view of having it thus brought prominently before the _country_, and of having it thoroughly analyzed and understood. When analyzed and comprehended, the idea of a _gold basis_ will forever depart from all progressive minds, and the impetus the new money system will thereby receive will never be checked until its science is developed into general national practice.

NEW YORK, Oct. 27, 1870.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. XI.

In our last, the necessity of urging the consideration of the finance question upon Congress, with the view of having the whole range of the matter brought prominently before the country, was proposed. Of all practical questions that require immediate solution, none is of so much importance to man as this; and none more so to woman unless that of equality for herself is. No

country can enjoy a series of years of uninterrupted commercial prosperity when that country has a circulating medium which can be affected by the manipulations of shrewd financiers for their own ends. And no financial policy is more ruinous to the true interests of a whole country than that of a constantly changing commercial valuation upon either personal or real estate, excepting alone in the latter, when it becomes the location of more capacity for actual production.

Real estate, abstractly considered, has no appreciable value. It only becomes relatively valuable when labor can make use of it to produce something valuable from it or by it. Absolutely there can be no individual title to any part of the soil of any country. Taken as a whole, the land comprised within the limits of the authority of any government can be made such use of as such government may determine, but as to actual conveyance of absolute individual ownership, that is impossible, because none of the powers involved in the attempt at conveyance could have had any part in the production of said land, and, therefore, could have no right or authority to transfer it, from the fact of an entire lack of title to transfer.

It may be objected that these are merely technical assumptions which the customs of society have never admitted. So, too, may it be objected to all encroachments of scientific principles upon old forms and customs. Nevertheless, science continues to analyze and demonstrate, and the world continues to come more and more under its guidance every year. In the principles of government science has not, until very recently, found grounds of attack. Since it has come to be recognized that there really is a science of society, and consequently that all its structure can be analyzed, understood and guided by its deductions many of the customs and practices that have so long controlled the people are found to be entirely without the support of principles fundamentally necessary to assure a permanently constructive form of society.

Wherever maxims of temporary policy are the guiding rules, there will ever be alternate construction and destruction; but wherever scientific, demonstrable principles are the governing power, there will be found permanency. That “money” is susceptible of analysis, and of being predicated upon a scientific basis is no longer to be questioned. It is a branch of the science of society, and as such must receive consideration as the science itself becomes disseminated among the peoples. It was not many years ago that “the sciences” were unknown in our common schools. It will not be many years hence until the science of society will be a recognized branch of every child’s education in the most enlightened portions of the world. Political economy, which is a branch of social science, is regarded with favor by many now, and, comprehensively speaking, all these questions which have been looked upon as “too abstract” for common comprehension, are found to be the real principles which underlie all social strictures.

First in importance, because it leads to the recognition of the “ultimate condition,” is the question of intercourse between the peoples of the earth. Money, as the means of bringing about this intercourse, should receive primary consideration. Let the fact once be generally recognized that the world is at last tending to “a unity of the peoples,” and financial and commercial unity are the introductory unities upon which to hasten governmental unity. Were these fully established upon a basis of mutual interest instead of upon the policy of each obtaining all the personal and selfish advantages possible, there could no such strifes as the one convulsing Europe to-day ever occur. Thus it appears that the assimilation of the world under one common interest is in the first instance a question of a unity of material interests which must serve as the foundation for all others to build upon.

Finance and commerce, then, lie at the very threshold of all the progress that is to be made in the direction of governmental consolidation, and when so recognized they will be rescued from the position that they now occupy as the means only of pursuing selfish interests, and be raised into that of principles and rules of action by which all intercourse must be regulated. Commerce, in its most comprehensive sense, does not apply merely to the exchange of the material products of the world, but to the exchange of intellectual, moral, social and religious products also, and its application thereby becomes common to all the interests of humanity. And as finance grows out of the necessities of commerce, it also becomes equally with commerce a humanitarian question. It is in this broad and general sense that all questions regarding it should hereafter be considered and not upon the basis of how much advantage such a measure will give an individual or a nation over another individual or nation.

Like all other questions that are now coming prominently before the world for solution, this one of finance and commerce rises to the dignity of a question of humanity. They are all to be considered in regard to their application, not merely to nations, but to all nations—all peoples—as forming the basis of the future confederation of the world under one government to be known as the United States of the World, when all the people will be inspired with a common Religious sentiment in regard to their primary origin and their ultimate destiny; when all the peoples will be governed in their relation to each other by the common social sentiment arising from the recognition of the fact that they are necessarily a community of brothers from having a common origin and destiny; when all the peoples will give a common adhesion to and support the deductions of a Universal Science, let those deductions militate as they will and must against whatever of speculation and theory there may still hang like a pall of night over the intellect of

man. To all of these ultimate conditions of mankind, finance and commerce must furnish the means of attainment; and being thus the first essentials to the beginning of the actual constructive process which, when completed, will be this grand consummation, they should be treated with that gravity and consideration which is due to so grand a position as they are assigned in the third order of general civilization. Policy should be entirely discarded from all place in the argument, and principles should alone be discussed. When the consideration is fairly begun upon this basis, scientific ideas regarding money will be rapidly diffused among the people, who now do not even dream that money can be reduced to the rules of scientific demonstration.

We urge again that this question should receive its proper share of attention at the hands of our next Congress as being the questions upon which the future good of mankind depends more immediately than any other that will be likely to command the undivided attention of it. This once settled upon the true principles, all other questions which all future Congresses will have to consider will be virtually determined by it.

NEW YORK, Nov. 4, 1870.

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. XII.

In the treatment of these subjects in the general sense in which they become important to all the people the range is very much extended beyond that commonly compassed by those whose interest compels them to temporary considerations for the promoting of immediate interests under the systems in vogue. All such kind of treatment deals with effects, and would never remedy an existing want, nor correct illegitimate practices. If there are wants in existing systems, and if there are illegitimate practices which are possible under them, there is but one way to supply the one or to correct the other, and that is to go to the root of the matter where the causes exist which make these possible.

In this series of articles it has been the endeavor to point out some of the most prominent evidences that our financial system was unsound, and also to show, by as strict an analysis as was possible in the space allotted, what the true basis for a sound financial system was, and where it was to be found, and, having done this, such methods of administration were hinted at as would reduce the system, when put into operation, to a permanent and fixed measure of all values, which it was argued was equally as necessary when value is to be measured as the same fixedness is when any other quantity is to be measured.

It has been suggested by some that, in presenting our statements in the terse, undiluted manner we have, that those who have not been habitual thinkers upon this subject might fail to catch the full application of the propositions, and by so failing consider the system impracticable. To obviate such objections we shall, by further treatment of obscure points, attempt to make them plain to all who can understand the English language.

First, a brief re-statement and condensation of the entire outline: Money, being an invention to facilitate the exchanges of the products of labor, it should be formulated with direct reference to the conditions which made the invention necessary, out of which it should naturally grow; and also with direct regard as to how the invention should best meet the required case—that is, the invention should be adapted to the conditions, instead of making an invention without regard to the conditions, and then attempting to force the conditions to comply with the capacity of the invention.

This is a point which should be thoroughly comprehended, for in it lies the whole fault of making gold a measure of value, and we therefore shall attempt to offer a common illustration directly in point.

Let it be supposed that there is a stream which, to accommodate travel, requires to be bridged, and that the bridge has to be constructed and moved to the stream. The first procedure would be to determine just how long the bridge must be to span the stream. It would then be constructed and moved to the stream, which it of course would span. But suppose persons knowing there was a stream to be crossed, but not knowing its breadth, had gone to work and constructed the bridge and then had attempted to compel it, when too short, to extend across the stream. This would have been a case of attempting to compel the conditions for which the invention was made to accommodate themselves to the invention. And this has been just what the world has been all this time doing in attempting to compel the conditions for which money was invented to accommodate themselves to the possibilities of gold, which was invented as money without any reference being had to the functions it was to perform, or to the conditions it was required to meet.

It would be just as reasonable and just as sensible to attempt to compel a house to perform the functions of a bridge as it is to attempt to compel gold to perform the functions of money, for gold is not nor cannot ever be made to meet the requirements for which money is demanded; whereas, money should be of such character as to fully meet the requirements for which it is used, but should not be possessed of _any qualities that would render it useful for any other purpose whatever_, so that there could be no possibility of its ever being used for any other purposes, which impossibility would forever make speculation impossible.

It is believed that we have made clear the purposes for which money is required and also clear that it is utterly futile to attempt to compel any invention to meet those requirements where it is not formulated for the express purpose. We have heretofore shown that gold is a purely arbitrary standard which has no scientific relations whatever to the product of labor which it is required to measure, but that it is itself a product, and as such requires to be measured. A gallon of molasses would never be thought of as a measure of distance, but it would be just as reasonable to expect it to measure it as it is to expect a certain quantity of gold to measure the value of a horse. A horse may be exchanged for a certain amount of gold. So, too, may a horse be exchanged for a certain amount of wheat, but that process does not make either the horse or the wheat money. Money is that which can equally represent the wheat, the horse and the gold; and anything that cannot do this is not money.

Hence it is seen that every step we take in examining the true bearings of the money question brings us nearer and clearer to the proposition already made—that the capacity for production is the true basis of value.

NEW YORK, Nov. 11, 1870

PAPERS ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE.

NO. XIII.

We are perfectly aware of the very many objections which arise in the minds of the people to such a currency as has been proposed, but the thoughtless one of “What! an irredeemable paper money! Oh, no! that will never do; that means utter repudiation,” which is the most commonly made, scarcely merits attention. Will those, who so earnestly place themselves in opposition to a convertible currency, stop and consider for just one moment. What is the ten-dollar gold piece you have just received for a ten-dollar note good for? Will it feed or clothe you? or will it _directly_ minister to any of your needs or to those of any of your family? Directly, it will do none of these things for you; _but you can have it really redeemed by something that will_ feed, clothe and minister to all your requirements. You will thus perceive that you have been and still are laboring under a foolish delusion regarding this precious metal, for you have all the time been getting your paper money redeemed by your gold money, which you finally are obliged to redeem by that which is really valuable—that which it takes to maintain life and make it desirable.

Now, you know very well that the gold there is in the world cannot redeem or represent the values of the world. Were it a thousand times as valuable as it really is—that is to say, could the consent of the world be obtained to making the amount of gold which now represents one dollar to represent a thousand dollars—there would be a possibility of the gold in existence representing the value of the world; but as no such result as this is anticipated, it is in vain for you to cling to any such mythological and speculative theory.

Again: What terrible outrage would your conscience sustain if you would give a little calmer consideration to a proposition which you have always heretofore rejected without thought. With your gold you have been able to obtain that which you required to sustain and make life agreeable. These necessities, then, are the really valuable things of the world. What objection, then, can you make that can have the sanction, even of your own reason, to at once admitting that these are the only real values the world contains, and consequently—because legitimately—that whatever is money must be a representative of these valuables: and also and further, that anything bearing the name of money, which does not justly and fully represent the sum total of these, is not money in the true sense of that term.

Again: Money may be considered the negative pole of the battery of value. To all things there are two extremes and a mean, the evidence of perfection being that there is always an equilibrium sustained between the extremes through the medium of the mean. Products are positive existences which go forth to administer to the demands of human nature, and expend themselves in the negative returning force, money; which, in being brought back to the point which it represents, becomes a positive power itself, having the capacity to obtain labor which restores what has been expended, and thus the circuit is complete and nothing is lost; the same products exist and the same representation of them also exists. If, perchance the return of the products is not always immediately made, the power to return them is never lost, though that may be in a thousand years.

Thus it will be seen by all, if they will but give the necessary attention, that the proposed currency which shall be representative of the products of labor is not only the only natural money there can be, but that it can never appreciate nor depreciate, because every twelve months it is worth just one twenty-fifth part of itself—for it is believed that this per cent. of increase is the true balance between accumulation and production; if, on trial, this balance should be found too small, or too much in favor of production, it would be increased; and if found too large, or too much in favor of accumulation it could be reduced. This must be a subject of test, and when tested, legislation can increase or decrease the standard of value by making the “measure” larger or smaller, just the same as it does other “measures.”

We believe that the inauguration of such a money system would be the beginning of the “leveling down and the leveling up” of the capitalist and the laborer, and that such a thing as practical equality will be impossible under any less radical and comprehensive change from present systems. It is to be hoped that that large proportion of the whole people which is represented by the classes that desire to be “levelled up,” will give this most serious matter their most serious attention. We are aware that it is a subject but little understood, and that the prejudice of the people is in favor of the money god, gold. But, as in religion, so will it be in money; when reason and common sense are admitted to the debate, mythologic spectres and theoretic fancies will begin to assume their true shapes, and the realities to arise from the depths in which they have been confined.

NEW YORK, Nov. 25, 1870.

BASIS OF PHYSICAL LIFE.

THE UNITY OF LIFE, POWER AND MOTION.

I beg to present the following as the foundation for a series of articles which it is proposed to present in due time. At first glance it may be deemed too abstract for the purpose in view, but it must be remembered that all action is primarily derived from a common basis of life, and that it is from this basis all action _must_ spring, because general principles only are deducible from it:

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” Although human conception cannot trace existence back to the time when “the Word was God,” the proposition is one which consciousness can accept without analysis, and define and understand as the Absolute in its broadest sense; but, when invested with the infinitude of phenomena and facts, the mind loses itself and gives way beneath the universal evidence that life, power and motion form a unit. Accepting, then, this proposition, without attempting to solve it, a basis is found from which to reason, and which we could not have discovered by reasoning backward from effects. God was in the beginning: the beginning was God. Acknowledging this, the mind cannot conceive of aught else existing in the beginning. He was the Supreme Whole, the great Central Heart, from and by which all things were to come. This truth should be fully accepted, for from it can be shown that the facts of the present are the legitimate outgrowth of this complete Oneness.

All nations have had a god or gods, though no two of them have been identical. Nor has the conception of a god remained unchanged with any people for any great length of time. Were each person to define his idea of a god, there would be nearly as many different ideals as there are individuals in the nation, thus showing that all knowledge is relative or symbolic. As there can be but one god conceived of under our proposition, the question arises how so many can be held up before the Christian world, and each claimed to be “the only true god.” In the solution of this will be found the chief burden which ignorance and superstition use to load the mind with their absurdities. Freed from this burden, the mind would form a true conception of the unity in diversity of nature, and recognize God as infinite and eternal. It will be readily admitted that God is indestructible. So, too, is matter. Then we have from the beginning two indestructibles—or, at least, for the present, it must be assumed they are two—God and Nature, Spirit and Matter, or Power and Resistance. These embrace “the Whole,” from which nothing could have been taken away or added thereto. As God, therefore, was All in All at the beginning, so he must ever remain the same; and this is true also of Nature.

Reasoning thus from this basis it must be found that every power has its origin in the first power—God, the mainspring of all action. Life, then, may be said to be motion making itself manifest under the influence of power—to what? It may be difficult for the mind to accept so broad an application of this all-pervading power, but it confesses it without comprehending it whenever it declares that God is omnipotent and omnipresent. The world little thinks of the extent of such an assertion, for it breaks down all the Christian ideas of that antagonism known as the Powers of the Devil; it banishes the possibility of creation proving a partial failure and enables the soul to recognize an ever-present, all-pervading, though inscrutable God.

It may then be asked, Is God omnipotent? If believers in an incarnation of Evil answer yes, what becomes of the foundation for such a belief? If no, what becomes of their God? If He be omnipotent, He must be not only the source of all power, but All Power. To assert otherwise is to declare that there are two infinites—an assertion which contains its own refutation. While the mind can conceive that God is All in All, it cannot at the same time conceive that He is not All in All, or that the Devil is a part of the All in All, in opposition and contradistinction to God. Those, therefore, who believe that God is All in All, and also believe in a Devil, believe an impossibility, for two persons or things cannot be the same, or occupy the same place at the same time. The absurdity, then, of the divisibility of the Supreme Power becomes at once apparent. The argument is of importance as it furnishes a well-defined basis, which meets every difficulty and arrays it in support of the unity of all things and the supremacy of God.

The question, what and where is God? has been often asked; but the various attempts to answer the unanswerable, have only given the unreflecting mind another's idea instead of a just and comprehensive conception of God's complete existence. In reasoning on so important an inquiry, the mind should soar above principles and ideas, and in one vast grasp say that God is the whole. Where is God? He is everywhere. In this answer we have no clearer solution of the query than we have when we say God is incomprehensible to the human mind; still the form is such as the mind can use in measuring its relative parts.

From the Great First Cause, and from it alone, has come the present in all its beauty and variety, material and spiritual. Though the effects may continue to increase in number throughout an infinite future, the sum of them can never amount to the First Cause. God must and will forever remain superior to all the effects of the workings of this power.

The material universe, science tells us, is composed of some sixty-four or more elementary parts. An element cannot be resolved into two or more different substances. These elements combine under certain conditions and in certain proportions with each other to form compounds differing materially from their component parts. Everything we see in nature is formed of these elementary materials; yet, extensive as these compounds are, they are fashioned according to universal and unchangeable laws. While the existence of any of the elements uncombined is rare, their combinations fill all space, and are co-extensive with the Divine Spirit. Spirit and Matter—God and Nature, seem, therefore, to be forever united.

But how have all these things come? What is this inexhaustible power everywhere manifested, and what the laws governing its application? Go back to the time when no compound bodies existed on this planet, and what was there? God was there in all his absoluteness, all his infinity. All the elements of matter were there in the same proportions and quantities as now exist, but uncombined. In an abstract sense, an element is a unit mass, without life, power or motion. What constitutes it an existence, gives it life, power and motion, and the capacity of combining with other diverse existences? We cannot conceive of matter, even in its simplest form, as devoid of all active life principles, for that would be to conceive a place, occupied by matter, where God is not. Each element, therefore, contains its portion of the Eternal Spirit, without which it would not even be a substance, but with which it can unite with other similarly endowed simples. It seems impossible not to conclude, then, that the life, power and motion found in all material substances, is that life and power we call Infinite.

To further illustrate this indwelling life principle, we quote from a celebrated author, who, speaking of the "winds and currents of the sea," says: "Men try to explain everything by the wind and the current. Now there is in the air a force which is not wind, and in the water a force that is not current. This force, the same in the air as in the water, is effluvium. The air and the water are two masses of liquid nearly identical and changing mutually into each other. * * * The effluvium is alone fluid; the wind and the current are only impulses. The effluvium is a steady stream * * * and is invisible. Yet from time to time it says, 'There I am;' and its way of saying so is a thunder clap. The sea is as much magnetic as watery. An ocean of forces floats unknown in the ocean of currents. To see in the ocean only a mass of water is not to see it at all." To which we would add, that to see in the manifestations of nature, nature only, is not to see it at all, for the power producing it is not recognized. What is seen is not the reality, but that through which the reality makes itself known.

What has thus far been considered may be consolidated into this comprehensive proposition: That there is a power existing everywhere, of which we can know nothing absolutely except that consciousness tells us it is. At the same time we are conscious of our incapability to define or comprehend it, and that all we can ever know of this power is its physical manifestations. Hence the knowledge of what we see, hear, feel, taste and smell is abstractly symbolic and relative, the only absolute knowledge we can possibly have—if knowledge it be—is a consciousness of our infinite existence. In this view of the existence of God, which is the basis of all religious ideas, religion may be said to be superior to science, because it remains immovable in consciousness. Religion belongs to the unknowable; science deals with the knowable, which is the manifestation of the unknowable. Therefore, viewed philosophically, religion and science stand for the subjective and objective whose relations comprise the whole. The presence,

then, in consciousness, of what we can by no means account for, must be the actual presence of that of which consciousness is made up—the elementary spiritual principles representative in us as individual existences of the great Infinite existence.

Ambiguity in the use of terms leads to confusion of ideas and thought, and is one great general cause of the ignorance and superstition still existing among apparently enlightened nations. Many terms, supposed to convey certain well-defined ideas, are found to be deficient when analyzed, and others stand for nothing in substance. Many are in common use whose meaning the man of religion, science or philosophy would be embarrassed to explain. Chief among these are: The Infinite, The Absolute, Causation and Effect, Power, Motion, Matter, Space, Time, Resistance, Eternity, Immortality, Good, Evil, Heat, Light, Rewards, Punishment, Justice, Law, Order. As the argument proceeds it will be seen how nearly the whole of these and many similar terms are resolvable into the few which convey realities.

All things that can be resolved into parts cannot be said to be existences. Existence carries with it the idea of permanent continuity, something self-dependent, superior to everything else as an entity. What one term will express absolute superiority? The universe of space is occupied by matter which, acted upon by an incomprehensible Power, produces manifestations or motions. These being successive, time becomes a necessary constituent. Do we need any other term to cover all the manifestations? Is there any part of the universe left untouched by the few terms? But allowing that they include the Whole, some one must be of primary consequence, while the others are auxiliary thereto.

The term Motion will be found, on analysis, to be the result of Power acting upon Matter, and the proposition is comprehensive enough to include every known movement. Hence every manifestation in the material world can readily be accounted for by the combination of these two terms. Though not so immediately apparent, it will be shown that mental manifestations are also included in this. If all manifestations are then explainable by these two terms, all minor terms must be but names for the different forms under which these two manifest themselves, and into which they must ultimately be resolved. Motion, it was found, was resolvable into Power and Matter. Can these be resolved into anything more general than themselves?

The universe is composed objectively of matter. Is it made up of anything else? An absolute vacuum is an impossibility in thought. Then what we term space is filled with something, and only matter is comprehensive enough to include all. But matter alone would convey the idea of space filled with something at perfect rest. The term motion then becomes necessary. This involves a subject, the cause of the motion; and an object, the thing moved—power the cause, motion the object. Can these be resolved into anything more general? As stated, the universe is composed of matter, manifesting itself by and through motion; and motion, as was seen, can be caused only by the application of power to matter, and no other term is sufficiently general to comprehend the causes of motion. By the union or duality of power and matter everything is brought within the sphere of consciousness, if not of comprehension. But which of all the manifestations of power acting upon matter is of primary importance? Of which does consciousness earliest take cognizance?

The universe of matter is boundless. Space conveys the idea of something beyond which there is nothing. Else it would be limited by that which is beyond, and we can conceive of nothing as existing without extension, and extension implies the occupancy of a certain defined limit, which limit must be within space. Space being undefinable, that which occupies it must partake of the same characteristic when considered as a whole. The same line of reasoning applies to power and time. Succession of events compels an occupation of a part of infinite duration as matter, relatively considered, occupies space; that is, between two or more separate facts there must be a lapse of time before consciousness can arrange them so as as to take cognizance thereof. Whether this is of itself an actual existence, or some method of an actual existence, it is a necessity to consciousness. Hence, time is related to power as space is to matter. Power and matter being the subjective realities, while space and time are their objective results, or the necessary effects of the experience in consciousness of their united result, which is motion. Our ideas of space and time are derived from experiences of power acting upon matter, while motion, the effect thereof, unites the two in consciousness as relative realities which must be a part of absolute realities.

It is clear, then, that all we can know of the unknowable arises from our experience of power and matter, and that within the sphere of their manifestations all effects are included. But while each is necessary to produce effect, we must not forget that we would have no consciousness of the existence of matter were it not the object of the application of power; hence we must conclude that power is of primordial importance, and, as such, the most general and comprehensive of scientific terms. All knowledge and consciousness grow out of experiences of power, which must be considered the general ultimate. All theories regarding it are but theories. Power is untouched by them, while matter, space, time and motion may be considered either as its constituents or as modes of its manifestations.

To make the argument more complete to those unaccustomed to resolve phenomenon into its ultimate cause, some illustrations of such resolutions will prepare the mind to accept the conclusions arrived at: Let it be supposed that some circumstance calls for the manufacture of cotton cloth unlike, in some respect, any ever manufactured—say in width—how must it be produced? Reasoning inductively and given the raw material, the last necessity apparently is a loom that will admit of the width required and the prepared webbing and filling. Still, the cloth cannot be produced without the further aid of motion in the loom, which motion must be generated by power through certain machinery, obtained from setting free such portion of power as had been concentrated in coal. This expands water into steam; steam in escaping compels the piston of the engine to move, and this motion is communicated to the loom, the required cloth being the effect. It will be seen that whatever intermediate processes were necessary they were all resolvable into the power concentrated in the coal. What was then of first importance in the production of cloth? It was neither the loom nor the cotton nor the machinery, but the power giving motion to all. This illustration may be used symbolically to explain everything incomprehensible in the universe, that is, all manifestations of power working in and through matter, producing motion and its effects.

All material effects being explained by power acting on matter, may not this simple formula equally symbolize all mental operations the product of which is thought? The question primarily arising would be, what is thought and how is it produced? Let us analyze it. Something cannot be produced from nothing. Thought is something. Thought is then the product of something previously existing. Immateriality cannot be conceived of. Therefore thought is not only material in itself, but the product of matter in motion; and as motion is only possible through power applied to matter, thought must be a result of such an operation. Can it be explained and comprehended upon this theory? Let it be supposed that some great noise should suddenly occur just outside a house in which were 5,000 people. Each one would ask the mental question, or “think,” What was that caused by? Now, that thought would be the product of the sound heard. But how heard? Simply thus: Rapid vibrations of the air, caused by some unknown matter in motion, came in contact with the organs of hearing, were transmitted to the nerves, and finally taken up into consciousness. The whole operation is a purely physical one, and there is a perfect equivalent between the amount of vibration and the resulting sensation; in other words, the effect corresponds to the cause. It may also be remarked that a hundred physical bodies of different weights produce as many different sensations; the difference being always in exact proportion to the difference in their respective weights. Similar differences follow when matter at various degrees of temperature comes in contact with the body. The same is true regarding light upon the optic nerve.

Let us next see if that variety of thought or sensation which arises spontaneously within the individual is due to any different agency. Perhaps the most comprehensive and conclusive evidence of the material origin of thought is, that a child born under even favorable circumstances, but kept from all external, material and mental manifestations, grows up a simple idiot. Without, then, the manifestation of power acting upon matter, no original individual thought or conception is possible with the supposed exception of spontaneous thought hereafter to be treated. Further evidence of this is seen when an adult is kept in solitary confinement, or cast away upon an uninhabited island; memory fails, language is lost, and the person becomes a semi-idiot. The following extract, from an address by Dr. J. W. Draper, is made to show that scientific men are admitting the fact that the mind is the result of the processes here indicated—a collection of facts gained by impressions constantly repeated. He says: “There are successive phases * * * in the early action of the mind. As soon as the senses are in working order * * * a process of collecting facts is commenced. These are at first of the most homely kind, but the sphere from which they are gathered is extended by degrees. We may, therefore, consider that this collecting of facts is the earliest indication of the action of the brain, and it is an operation which, with more or less activity, continues through life. * * * Soon a second characteristic appears. The learning of the relationship of the facts thus acquired to one another. * * * This stage has been sometimes spoken of as the dawn of the reasoning faculty. A third characteristic of almost contemporaneous appearance may be remarked—it is the putting to use facts that have been acquired and the relationships that have been determined. * * * Now this triple natural process * * * must be the basis of any right system of instruction. It appears, then, that contact and constant intercourse with external manifestations is not only necessary for the production of thought and its collaterals, but that to retain the consciousness which makes thought possible such manifestations must be continuously impressed upon the individual. This seems to be conclusive that mind is the result of the experiences of the manifestations of power.”

There is still more subtle evidence that thought, which is only the memory of past manifestations of power, or deduction of reason upon them, is the product of material action. All mental action depends upon the nervous apparatus, and is limited by its capacity. The activity and power of this apparatus is in a great measure dependent upon the quantity of phosphorus supplied to it, and this varies at different periods of life.

The point in question is further sustained by the fact that the rapidity of thought varies with the supply of blood to the brain. Reduce the action of the heart to forty beats per minute, and a feeling of languor permeates the whole system. On the other hand, excess of cerebral circulation results in excitement amounting sometimes to actual delirium. We must, then, either admit that mental action is a product of material power, and consequently itself material, or else conclude that, while it is the result of the expenditure of power, it is in its character immaterial, which would be absurd, because it is impossible to represent immateriality in thought, as consciousness requires a subjective action and objective reception of it to complete a thought, while immateriality is neither.

Not only is mental action affected by the quantity of blood supplied to the brain, but also by its quality. This is fully shown in the progress of certain diseases that prevent its being properly oxygenized, and even more conspicuously in the administration of anæsthetics. A similar effect can be produced upon the brain by deep, full and continuously rapid breathing, by which an undue amount of oxygen is introduced into the circulation.

It appears, then, that having a perfect nervous apparatus, certain special materials must be supplied to it from or by which to manufacture mental and nervous action. Excessive mental action and powerful and continuous emotions produce, as everybody knows, physical prostration. From whatever position, then, we may view any action the physical, mental or nervous system is capable of producing, we come finally to the conclusion that they are possible only as the result of the expenditure of some physical power, and every mind that will justly consider the evidence must give its adhesion to what science is rapidly making plain.

Before closing the consideration of thought another phase of its manifestations demands attention. Who has not observed the effect of one or two minds concentrated upon another person unconscious of the intention? The object of such concentration becomes conscious of the fact, and invariably, though involuntarily, looks in the direction whence the influence proceeds. Before following this to its legitimate deductions it must be taken for granted that there is an individual existence after the dissolution of the physical body. Nearly all people accept this as a part of consciousness. From two propositions already received and well understood, a third may be deduced, and along with it will follow such legitimate additional thoughts, ideas, impressions, and modifications of former ones, as such deductions necessarily imply. But how shall those thoughts not derived from anything already in consciousness, be accounted for? And are not all conscious of receiving many such thoughts in passive conditions and during sleep? Following up the truth that something cannot be produced from nothing, the source of these must be found, else our premises are false or incomplete.

Every variety of mental action can be communicated. Given a mind possessed of a new truth and one that has not yet perceived it, the former can communicate it to the latter. This communication and reception have been effected through the medium of speech. Another method is through written or printed language. All this is simply symbolic. Sounds and written or printed forms are in themselves nothing but motion in the atmosphere and material formations by common consent accepted to represent other and previous material formations. The one thing of primary importance is, that the symbols used must be previously understood by both parties to represent identical things at all times. Thought, expressed in an unknown language, is not comprehended; this indicates that thought abstracted from form is never communicated. It cannot rise into consciousness even, except through an established form. Capability of thought is only possible as the result of constant contact with external manifestations, systematized under certain regular and received forms which always remain purely symbolic.

It remains to be considered how mind affects mind, through the concentration of the will, without the apparent use of the above methods of communication. We have seen that sounds produce an effect upon the object through the sense of hearing. But can you analyze hearing, and show how the sounds rise into consciousness? When forms are used an effect is produced through vision. But how does vision rise into consciousness? We have seen that an effect is produced by a concentration of the mind upon an object, but how this effect rises into consciousness is beyond our comprehension.

We can now proceed to the application of what has been offered, to the communication between minds by other methods than sound and form. Whence all these thoughts and impressions that steal into consciousness through no apparent form? The conclusion seems inevitable that mind can influence mind, whether it be within a physical organization or out of it. We predicate, therefore, that all thoughts, ideas, impressions, and sensations not coming from present external manifestations nor from previously acquired facts, nor yet from direct communications through recognized symbols, are emanations received from some unknown mind either in or out of the physical form. Nor can we escape from this conclusion, unless we concede that this case forms an exception to the general law. All forms, then, of thought, emotion and sensation are the legitimate result of the expenditure of power, and may be arrayed in support of the premises that Life, Power, and Motion, wherever found, are Unitary.

Let us consider in continuation, what application this unity has as the basis of physical life. What constitutes this basis? Is physical life the direct effect of the edict of a God reigning over the whole universe from some unknown point within it? No, the theory of a special Providence is fast giving place to new and better things—to law and order. It is beginning to dawn upon mankind that “the only true God” must be beyond our comprehension as the universe is, and that it is folly or presumptive egotism to assert that God is this or that. A God possessing such inconsistent infinite powers as are usually ascribed to him, is fast being discarded by all thinkers. Therefore the basis must be sought elsewhere.

The universe is ruled in uniform ways. Special enactments for special contingencies are inconsistent with our conception of the nature of that general law by which all is governed. This alone is inferable, when viewed with the conclusions previously arrived at, that things of which we can be conscious are unitary in origin and in ultimate effect. Supreme rule is removed beyond the pale of vicissitudes of time and circumstance. The deduction, then, is that the cause of physical life is universally the same, the manifestations being varied according to the properties involved in them. Does life then consist of anything more than this uniform Basis Power?

The world of mind demands facts, not theories. Truth is no longer feared, no matter how terribly it may shock the sensibilities of the religiously-educated and philosophically-dwarfed intellect. Let us have truth, then, even if it strips away the last of our preconceived opinions. The cry for more light continues to extend. You who cannot yet endure its brightness hide yourselves behind clouded dogmas, creeds and theories. We know no creed but that which declares that an infinite, inscrutable Power is the life of all things, material and spiritual; we know no dogma save that life is the operation of this Power; we know no theory but that which makes clear the laws and modes by which these operations are governed.

Discarding, then, all dogmas, the growing minds strikes boldly out for truth, and he who catches but faint glimpses of it badly performs his duty if he attempts to hide it from his brothers. If in its attainment the Church crumbles, why falter? If governments totter, why falter? Whatever will be crushed out by new discoveries and publication of truth has already performed its mission. Suppose, for example, that the grossest materialism ever conceived of was absolutely true, would it not be best that the world should be convinced of its truth? It speaks little for any system of religion or philosophy that it cannot bear the light of facts, but evades, shuts out, or hurls anathemas at that which it cannot refute. Such a course stands condemned before the tribunal of a progressive philosophy. The very effort of a late institution in opposition to physical freedom precipitated upon it its own destruction; such will doubtless be the result of an attempt now being made by a powerful institution to rivet religious bondage upon its subjects.

In continuing this subject, extracts will be made from Prof. Huxley’s lecture, “The New Theory of Life, or Matter the Basis of Vitality,” to show that science has demonstrated that “life” is the same everywhere; and though he disclaims materialistic philosophy, the tendency of these extracts is in that direction. While matter must be looked to for all expression of facts, it must not be overlooked that the realm of power or spirituality is the producing cause; consequently, while allowing science full scope in analyzing, demonstrating and systematizing facts, religion must not be despoiled of its basis idea which remains immovably fixed in consciousness. The Professor says: “I have translated the term _Protoplasm_, which is the scientific name of the substance I am about to speak of by the words ‘The Physical Basis of Life.’ * * * * To many, the idea that there is such a thing as a physical basis or matter of life may be novel. * * * Even those who are aware that matter and life are inseparably connected may not be prepared for the conclusion plainly suggested by the phrase ‘The Physical Basis of Life.’” After giving various illustrations, drawn from nearly every department of nature, grasping contrasts and dissimilarities, he adds: “I propose to demonstrate that, notwithstanding these apparent difficulties, a three-fold unity—a unity of power or faculty, a unity of form and a unity of substantial composition, does pervade the whole living world; * * that the complicated and multifarious activities of man are comprehensible under three categories—either they are immediately directed toward the maintenance and development of the body, or they are to effect transitory changes in the relative positions of parts of the body; or they tend toward the continuance of the species. Even the manifestation of intellect, of feeling and of will, are not excluded from the classification.”

Prof. Huxley then illustrates the action of the _protoplasm_ in the common nettle and in the drop of blood, showing that both plants and animals have their origin in a particle of nucleated _protoplasm_, and that this _protoplasm_ “not only dies and is resolved into its mineral and lifeless constituents, but is always dying, and strange as the paradox may seem, could not live unless it died.” Thus we are led to the conclusion that all matter has a common basic principle by which we obtain our evidences of it. It is equally clear that analysis fails to grapple this principle, for the process dissipates the power that compelled the combination. Dead _protoplasm_ differs from living in that something has departed from it, and though we cannot catch this to decide upon its nature, can we with consistency say it is a property of matter? If it is, what has become of it that it does not manifest itself again upon the recombination of the matter it once made use of? One fact is evident, and seems to be conclusive. This life principle never

manifests itself through artificial combinations of matter. Again, is there no difference between ordinary matter and “matter of life?” What changes the former into the latter, and _vice versa_? If chemical analysis can tell us nothing about the composition of living matter, what can it tell us of life itself? If nucleated _protoplasm_ is the basis of all life, and yet nothing but matter, why does one “structural unit” of it produce a plant, another an animal? While it is evident that the material composition of these units is uniform, it seems to be quite absurd to say that chemical analysis teaches everything that they comprehend.

If the manifestations of matter are the result of its properties, the law must be of general application. Water always seeks its level: is that a property of water or the result of gravitation? Water can be expanded into vapor: is this a property of water or the result of the introduction of heat? Is it a property of matter that transfers the digestible and animal food we eat into man? Does man exhibit nothing but the properties of matter? It is evident that after the strictest chemical analysis the vital life principle common to all matter remains unreached—thus indicating its great ultimate character, which is beyond the reach of both chemical and mental analysis.

What is this power by which the nucleated _protoplasm_ of the various species always produces representatives of the one which furnished the germ? If it were simply a property of nucleated _protoplasm_, considered as matter, why should not a germ from the lion just as readily produce a lamb? In the various crosses between animals, the aggregated masses of _protoplasm_ partaking of both, the inference plainly is that in each of the particles of _protoplasm_ was contained a power which controlled their successive aggregations and modifications. Other evidence that the determining power is something more than a mere property of matter is found in the fact that if the young of several different species of animals be reared in company and fed with the same material, they will each retain the peculiarities of the species they represent, modified somewhat by the community of influence exerted on them. The same is true of the offspring of different races and nations.

The law indicated is still more generally applicable, descending as it does from the wide range of species and nations to each individual member thereof. Upon different individuals the same cause, acting under like circumstances, produces different effects, and this difference is dependent upon something more persistent than matter which is constantly changing. Is this persistent individuality a property of the matter we possess now, or of that which we shall be made up of some years hence? The consciousness of each one answers that this individuality is superior to the vicissitudes of matter—this consciousness having this peculiarity over its consciousness of the manifestations of matter, that while it constantly acquires new experiences it loses none of those previously acquired.

We know nothing of this power, except that it is a name for an unknown cause: and so far as practical utility is concerned, the distinction between power and matter might be discarded, the danger of falling thereby into the slough of materialistic philosophy being avoided, if we remember that all the knowledge we can acquire is simply relative and symbolic.

Returning for a moment to the fact of reproduction, to ascertain if possible the determining power by which one “structural unit” of nucleated protoplasm develops into a beast, and another chemically identical into a man, and realizing fully that this power is beyond common modes of proof we infer that a reasonable conclusion can only be deduced from observing the general unchanging law of the constant recurrence of similar results under similar circumstances. The first step in the inquiry is to ask what “protoplasm” is, and how and where it is obtained.

Prof. Huxley informs us that its chemical constituents are carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen and oxygen, which form carbonic acid, water and ammonia; and that these are compounded by plants into the “matter of life” or protoplasm, which is the first compound of elements possessing inherent organic motion. This being the only way protoplasm can be produced, we must always look to the vegetable world for continuous supplies of it; and though we obtain it in large quantities from the animal world, it is only at second-hand. In the vegetable world, then, must we find the first traces of organic life. But though plants thus manufacture protoplasm, they are not wholly protoplasm, but consist of various other elements necessary in an organized form. The manufacture of protoplasm may be considered the end of the vegetable world. This substance builds up the animal world, and forms a connecting link between the kingdoms.

How long it took protoplasm to produce its ultimate animal man we cannot ascertain, but the numerous species and varieties thereof between the simplest and most complete compounds signify a labor of which we can scarcely conceive, and yet science has traced and classified it all, each succeeding link in the chain being a little more complex, until man appears. As no higher types have been produced it is fair to presume that none can be. The formula, then, that will present man will include everything below him in the order of creation, not only in the animal and vegetable kingdoms, but in the inorganic world upon which the vegetable is founded.

It remains to be observed that in the order of nature each of the various species of animals reproduces its kind, and gradually merges into the next higher, but never recedes. Each species represents in different proportions and numbers the “structural units,” from which, reproduction follows, each unit containing the life principle representative of the general life principle of the animal from which it comes. Now, it is predicated as a result of the study of nature that this life principle is the determining power that controls the process whereby protoplasm builds up such various and dissimilar material reforms. Dead protoplasm consists of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen; living protoplasm, of these permeated and held together by this life principle, and this differs in its controlling power according to the formations it has gone through. Thus the “structural unit” of the lion or of the horse, containing the life principle peculiar to each, develops into a lion or a horse, as the case may be, unless in this process it is furnished with living protoplasm containing a life principle of different determining powers, when the aggregate result is a modification of the two powers.

Again, if the phenomena presented by matter are its absolute properties, the same elements and combinations should always produce identical results when taken into the human system. Do facts coincide with this? This “matter of life” should, if it is simply matter, always produce similar effects from whatever source it is derived. It is a physiological fact, however, that habitual living upon certain kinds of food—all containing this identical “matter of life”—does produce heterogeneous effects, mental and physical, upon the system. Thus, if a person who has constantly lived upon animal food changes his diet entirely to fruit and vegetables, a corresponding change will take place in his individual capacities.

The same point is well illustrated by a case which occurred in England, where saltpetre, obtained direct from the soil, was quite inert compared with that obtained from animal substances, the cause of the difference being due to the tact that the latter, in passing through the animal kingdom, had acquired a power which it did not previously possess. This illustration is of general application. It is evident that matter, in passing through each successive and higher organic form, becomes impregnated with the life principle which determines such form, and which manifests itself in all future combinations into which such matter enters.

The question now naturally arises, Is there a life principle common to all matter, which has become variously modified as the elements of matter have become modified by having given rise to or passed through the different changes and steps between its original homogeneous state and its present heterogeneous condition? Or are we to conclude that all matter is dead, except that termed “matter of life?” That there is, consequently, no life except organic life, and that this organic life is a special creation entering into a single compound, which thereby raised to the dignity of “matter of life,” makes use of other elements as auxiliaries to its supreme rule? With all proper deference to “matter of life,” we would ask, what do we know of life except as a result of motion? and where can matter be found that does not manifest motion? and how could the compound in which the “matter of life” is first found, have been compounded without motion? If the life principle, manifested by protoplasm, is simply a property of matter, I see no logical reason why the motion existing in matter should not with equal propriety be called its property. This brings us to first principles, to the threshold of elemental combination, for if this power determines the forms compounds shall assume, why should it not determine simple elemental form also?

Protoplasm is the foundation of all organic life; and if we add to this that this substance is itself the ultimate of a previous system of formation, the formula will express the whole. Yet it must not be forgotten that the building up of organic life is the result of a constructive power common to the universe, and not indigenous to protoplasm alone. It must then be apparent that there is a power common to all matter, of which the motion or life inherent in living protoplasm is but a modification; also, that the capacity of this common power for modification is only limited by the necessary forms to represent it, and the time required to develop them.

If this view of the power that pervades the universe is correct, the real basis of life lies retrospectively far behind the motion contained in or manifested by the matter of life, and this motion, instead of being life of matter in its absolute sense, is but one of its modes of expression. This homogeneous power common to matter still exists, undisturbed in extent, though most heterogeneously distributed in the formations which make up the present external universe.

The basis of physical life, then, is this power, and this power is the same that was found to be unitary, though incomprehensible in its extent, while its manifestations are simply symbolic of that unlimited power which is alone attributable to the Unknowable, commonly designated God. If this conclusion is not in accordance with the modes of manifestation, there is no halting-place between it and the opposite extreme of the materialist that “there is no God”—that matter is all there is in the universe. If materialistic philosophy involve “grave error,” it becomes the duty of all who detect this tendency to preserve and point out the distinctions between the “matter of life” and the life of matter.

If the true province of philosophy is to discern the “soul of truth,” said to exist “in all erroneous things,” it ill becomes the ultra Spiritualist with a “soul of truth,” contained within his vast body of errors, to denounce the ultra Materialist, who, if he has not the “soul of truth,” has a vast body of it. To the superficial thinker, the Materialist may seem to be the more consistent of the two, as he can in part comprehend his truth, while the Spiritualist cannot. Whether one is more or less consistent than the other matters not, so far as their predications are concerned.

But the ultra Spiritualist would show his consistency by descending to the plane of the Materialist to find in his “body of truths” evidences of the handiwork of his God, which his ultra religious ideas fail to furnish; and the ultra Materialist would show his by ascending to the plane of the Spiritualist to find in his “soul of truth” the key that shall transform his “body of truth” into living evidence of an unlimited Power entirely beyond the pale of matter or the keenest scientific analysis.

TENDENCIES AND PROPHECIES OF THE PRESENT AGE.

[Revised from the American Workman of October 9, 1869.]

NO. I.

It is eminently proper, before approaching the future of any subject, to make strictest inquiry and most diligent search in and around its present—to look with retrospective glance upon the convergent paths of the past that have led to its present, and to catch the indices pointing onward; and, having found them, to judge whether such as Time’s unfolding calendar has left here and there along the pathway of passing events were reliable prophecies of what was to come—were truthful indications of what was to follow. In the judgment determined and warranted by the evidences obtained, a certain basis may be found upon which to predicate the prophecies of the living present.

The existing present is the absolute result of the eternal past; the sum total of all that has gone before; the product of God’s everlasting workings, by and through unchangeable law upon the elemental material universe; nor can there be extracted from this result, this sum total, this product, one simple separate effect which is not the legitimate offspring of the operation of immutable law, co-extensive with the universe, and co-existent with God.

A proposition that there are powers within God’s realm which did not spring from Him, or that the Original Cause has, in the economy of Nature, found it necessary to amend and change the original law, in order to accomplish His original purpose, or that contingencies have arisen which have demanded special enactments on the part of the Divine Ruler, presupposes that God did not know the end from the beginning, or, knowing it, was incompetent to provide therefor. Such a proposition, entertained by the human mind, destroys within it the God of the universe, and leaves the world, to it, a mere toy in the hands of its master, subject, at all times, to the caprices of his infinite rule, to be led here and there by circumstances he knew not of previous to their external development.

It may be said, that reasoning upon the character of God’s government, or the mode through which he manifests himself to the world, is not pertinent to the subject in view; to those who think thus the query should be propounded—What of the _future_ without a reliable present? and what of the effects that must follow, if the operating, existing general laws of the universe be not the same in a thousand years as now? It becomes, then, extremely important that some permanent, unchangeable basis be found before proceeding to predicate the future; and unless God is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, we can find no certain basis upon which to stand and from which we can start.

We have but to question the earth whether or not, from its incipiency onward through countless ages, it has obeyed the one great command, Progress? and in answer received, determine if, in the past, God has found it necessary to change the great fundamental laws of the universe. Geology tells in unmistakable writings what the earth was; we have but to look about us to see what it is. At no time since _it was_ can we learn that the law of progressive unfoldment has been inverted, and the world turned backward toward its commencing point. Since this has not occurred in the past, we may safely assume that it will not occur in the future; the law of progress may be accepted as one of God’s immutable decrees. The universe to-day, in all its variety and beauty, is no more in essence than it was millions of years ago, when it first assumed its orbital movements; the same elements exist in the exact quantity—nothing added—nothing taken away. Progress is simply a new arrangement of elementary principles.

Simple elements are indestructible; when two or more are combined, and produce an effect, the combination may be destroyed, and the elements separated and returned to their natural condition. This process is not one of destruction, but simply of change of

the relations of the elements that formed the combination. An acorn deposited in the earth attracts to itself such elements as produce growth; after years of labor, the mighty oak is the result. Although in its formation it has taken from the earth and air certain properties, the same quantity of such proportions still exists—nothing new has been created, a new form only has been produced by Nature, testifying that she never rests. Now, suppose a power were applied to the oak to dissolve it, the oak only would be destroyed, not the properties that entered into its composition.

It is supposed there are a certain number of elementary principles contained in and that make up the material universe; were these principles simple units, incapable of divisibility, we could, by applying the rule of geometrical progression, soon arrive at the exact number of different combinations, and consequently the exact number of different forms they are capable of producing; but, being infinite in quantity and divisibility, infinitude of form and effect is possible. The power of arrangement being infinite, infinitude of association and combination is the legitimate result.

Combination and association began in the simplest forms! When God, by his omnipotent voice, spoke the earth into existence, as an individual planet, it contained exactly the same elements of which it is now composed; but they were simply in elemental form, without organization, and, consequently, without variety of manifestation in form; motion being an inherent quality, constant agitation brought the elements into relations and combinations, simple at first; but by constant change they arose from the simple to the complex, and from the complex toward the infinite, and in the sum total of them we have the living present.

The argument does not require that minute examination of geological science be made, following, one by one, the rise and fall, the organization and destruction of each of its classified periods, nor of the specific results by and through each; but only to recognize _the law_ by which these results are arrived at. It is possible to so trace and classify these results as to show a continuous chain of progression, link by link, from the simplest form of combination, to the most complex and perfect, wherein all the original elements were first represented—man! Having arrived at perfection of form, wherein all the properties of the material world find themselves forming a part, it might reasonably be accepted that progression in formation would cease; while it has ceased so far as producing higher types is concerned, it has not in the quality of the types already produced; and in this proposition lies the greatest problem of life; the one most difficult for the human mind to grasp. Man, representing in form all that has gone before, is the result of the grand chain of progressive material formations; and, having combined within his physical form a portion of every element contained in the world, he may be likened in his infancy to the infancy of the earth. God, in spirit, pervades all material nature, and the union—if union it may be called—forms a perfect whole, and man being an epitome of all things contained in the material world, receives into his organization the spirit of each of its representative constituent parts, and consequently is endowed with all the spiritual attributes of the universe, the attributes of God! and, as God is eternal, man, created in His image, must likewise be eternal.

As the earth, in its first efforts at organization, combined but few of its principles, and presented the crudest form, and as time rolled on and its combinations continued to include more and more of the several principles, so with man; in his infancy his spiritual manifestations were crude in the extreme, but there has constantly been brought into co-operative combination, more and more of the spiritual principles, and higher and higher types of spiritual manifestations have been the result.

If man, as a unit, were analyzed to-day, he would be found to be made up spiritually of the elements corresponding to that age of the development of the physical world of which he is now the representative; that is to say, in his manifestations spiritually, he exhibits the same ratio of spiritual elements that the earth did in her manifestations in material elements at the time in her growth corresponding with the present condition and growth of man.

If cool and deliberate reason, unbiased by mythological and theoretical dogmas, be applied to the correspondence between the material and spiritual elements, the conclusion can scarcely fail to be arrived at, that each primary element of the material universe is the external expression and representative of a spiritual attribute of God; and as there are a definite number of elements in nature, forming the perfect _material whole_, so there are an equal number of analagous spiritual elements that constitute the _spiritual whole_.

As the elements and their corresponding interior principles are susceptible of infinite combinations and associations, the varied manifestations of nature and man are readily accounted for. Nor should it be forgotten that each of the manifestations is the legitimate and inevitable result of the combination out of which it springs; and, as the combination is not self-creative, but the result of the action of progressive law, so the effect of the combination is but the outward expression of the purposes contained within the law, behind the formation of the combination, and is thus the result of God’s operative law of progress.

Having argued thus far to show that the _present age_, material, mental and spiritual, is the legitimate result of the law of progressive development, the following propositions are deduced therefrom, forming a basis or platform from which to ask of the present—What of the future? Whither doth it lead?

First—All power, wherever manifested, is a unit.

Second—God is the source of all power, and the elements the subject of its application.

Third—Each attribute of God has its corresponding material element.

Fourth—All the material elements constitute the material world; all the spiritual elements, God.

Fifth—There is nothing contained in creation outside of the power of God, on the one hand, and the elementary principles on the other—the first positive, the last negative.

Sixth—Nothing can be added to what was; nothing taken away from what is.

Seventh—All the diversities in nature are the legitimate effect of the power of God, operating through and upon different elements, and different proportions of different elements, contained in nature, the diversity being infinite, because the material and producing power are infinite.

Eighth—Man, collectively, being the representative of all the material and spiritual elements, the individual diversities observed in him are the legitimate result of the different relative proportions of these elements contained in his organization.

Ninth—The present is the result of spiritual principles acting upon and through the material elements during the eternal past.

Giving a comprehensive glance at the world it will be seen that _government_ of some kind is everywhere established, which purports to rule the people embraced within certain geographical boundaries. An analysis of each form, from the crudest and most barbarous up through all the modifications of civilized government, will discover that each government was a true exponent of the character of the people by or over whom it was established. Every country, as it advances in intellectual and moral development, demands modifications in its government adapted to the improved capacity of the people. Hence, as the character of the governed progresses, so must that of the government keep pace with that of the governed, else the power behind it will rise to its _might_, and _sweep it away_.

There is but little doubt that the government of this country is the highest form now in existence on the earth; but to show how crude and even barbarous it is, reference only has to be made to the terrible conflict it has just survived, which became inevitable and necessary as the only practical demonstration of the power of the principles upon which it purports to have been founded—that all men are born free and equal, and entitled to certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This proposition was made fundamental by great and good men, the representative lights of the country at that time, standing far in advance of the general mind. Liberty and equity had burst upon their souls under the sway of tyranny and oppression, which became so odious that anything was preferable to them, to longer enduring its injustice. In this land, far removed from that where freedom could not lift its head—with a mighty ocean rolling between, they felt they had found a secure asylum from further oppression, and a land where their new-born hopes could be realized. But, unfortunately, all who came to the _New World_ had not these hopes and anticipations; some there were who still desired the strong hand of the tyrant to sway; and, thus invoked, it reached even across the mighty deep, and sought anew to enslave these new-born sons of freedom. Submission they never thought of—resistance was their only theme; and most thoroughly did they resist; through the long conflict that ensued, carried on by them under every conceivable disadvantage, their hopes never completely died out; and at last—triumphant over the crown—freedom reigned!

It cannot be wondered at that souls rising from such a conflict as the Revolution, triumphant, should assert so broad a proposition in behalf of equality as they did at the commencement of the struggle; nor is it wonderful that the great majority of the people did not understand, or did not have a full perception of the principle for which their representatives periled their lives and fortunes and pledged their sacred honor; but principles which were but partially discerned by the Fathers of the Republic have now grown into rules of action enforced by the sanctions of fundamental law; slavery of the body is no longer possible; the verdict of the majority of the people proclaimed it “behind the age.”

The South, recognizing this fact, knew that separation from the progressive mind of the North was the only chance for the continuance of a system which furnished so many excuses for physical, mental and moral lethargy; and in their attempt to separate, they precipitated a conflict in which history repeated itself, and freedom came out triumphant; thus what sprung from the seeds of tyranny and oppression, left scattered here and there by those who made that broad declaration, have been finally uprooted, and never more can take root and flourish under the scorching blaze of freedom's noontide sun.

That physical, mental and spiritual lethargy was the condition of the South under the system of slavery all statistics touching this point indisputably attest; and the verdict of fifty years will pronounce the abolition of their system the greatest blessing God has yet vouchsafed them; it has opened the door of progress for all things, material and spiritual, and has rescued from the barbaric chains of the past a country more favored by God, in the bestowal of natural advantages, than any other on the face of the globe.

The general love of freedom, because it is an inherent right, is one of the first evidences the soul presents that it is growing from the boundaries and control of the material, from which it sprang, into those of the spiritual toward which it tends. When this love first takes root the soul has attained that degree of development wherein the spiritual has the superior control of the individual, resulting from the predominance of the spiritual over the material.

The fact that the general sentiment of the country demanded that slavery should no longer exist within its boundaries, is a very significant one, when considered in connection with the tendencies and prophecies of the present; it shows that the capacity and desire for freedom is being rapidly developed in the human soul; it indicates that the mind begins to appreciate what freedom really guarantees to its votaries in its broadest signification; it begins to recognize the glorious truth that every soul will, sooner or later, demand and receive all its rights.

The demands of public sentiment, which have already resulted in modifications of the constitution of the country, will not stop at the door of African slavery, which it has thrown wide open; there are many other systems of slavery still left to be abolished; while they do not all enslave the body, they so fetter the soul and the mind, that their influence is even more pernicious and galling than the enslavement of the body.

The African slave, toiling under the burning sun in the cotton, rice and sugar plantations of the South, was virtually in possession of more freedom of soul than are many of the white race, even in our own midst. Look into these things, and see if, while you have "cast the mote out of your brother's eye," you have not a "_beam_" in your own; these, however numerous, will in turn and time demand of the people and of the government, when in its province, such attention as may be required to extend freedom in all directions where "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" legitimately lead.

The history of the past as well as the tendencies of the present prophecy with distinctness and positiveness that the demand will soon go out, not only for a government founded on equal rights to all, but whose laws shall be administered with justice and equity, guaranteeing freedom of body, mind and soul to every living intelligence.

From evidences rapidly accumulating, it is believed that this country is ripening for such a form and administration of government; but in the present condition of society and of servitude to its customs, the imperfect and partial manner of arriving at representation, and of making and administering law, such a reform cannot be inaugurated; that is to say, although such a reform would be acceptable to and welcomed by the country, and will soon be demanded by it, as yet it is impossible to organize an effort, strictly within itself, that could effect it, because there is not a sufficient concentration of understanding upon the requirements to be met, nor of wisdom enough to draft for these requirements adequate laws and forms of administration. Were such a code prepared and submitted to the people, do you think it would be rejected?

In the earlier days of the republic legislation seems to have been conducted upon constitutional principles; but in these latter days it has so far departed from its seeming mainsprings of action that it is safe to assert that legislation, founded strictly upon considerations of principles of justice and right, is unknown in the land. If sometimes a great principle is demonstrated through legislation, it will invariably be found upon strict investigation, that the legislation was not predicated upon the principle, but upon some personal or party benefit expected to flow therefrom; the _principle_, therefore, stands under obligation to the expected benefit, and to the party _needing_ it, and will doubtless, in its impartial operations, _remember_ them. While this condition is a perfectly legitimate one, flowing from adequate producing causes, there are individual minds and souls, by thousands, who rise in their capacities for government out of it, and demand reform and the essential truth of Principle.

Government may be compared to an individual who, having committed some infringement upon the law of justice, is impelled, by the position it forces him into, to continue the practice to sustain himself from falling; but as a system of injustice cannot be perpetual, fail he must, sooner or later; and the longer it is delayed, the more complete will be the wreck and ruin when it comes;—as with the individual, so it must be with the State. Once started upon a system of law-making and executing not founded upon principles of justice and right, the course must be pursued and sustained by further enactments, either to _cover_ the deformities of the previous proceeding or _hide_ its purposes, and unless righteous judgment come to the rescue before the course has led to wide-spread and apparent corruption throughout all its channels of administration, it must eventually culminate in the downfall of the government, if not in the destruction of the nation.

Policy, not principle, is the ruling power behind all present legislation. Policy, inevitably and indiscriminately, leads to corruption. Corruption, obeying the inherent laws of its own nature, untouched by and beyond the control of the enactments that first gave it life and afterward fostered its growth, must culminate in certain destruction to all parts involved, whether it be within the body human, the body corporate or the body politic.

Did the Republican party, as a party, desire the freedom of the negro simply and solely because it was one of his natural rights? Would freedom have been extended to him by that party had it been positively known that all his influence would be used against it? Or would the Democratic party, as a party, have opposed the enfranchisement of the negro had it been known that he would become its political ally?

Judging from the indices of the past, it is fair to suspect, at least, if not to conclude, that the Republican party is expecting another such exigency as existed when it was found politic to extend freedom and suffrage to the negro; and in the question of female suffrage, for which the demand is now being earnestly made, there is but little doubt that it sees another means of salvation in the future, and seeks to postpone the question until the exigency shall become more imminent and dangerous. It may be argued that the Republican party was organized upon the principles of freedom. If this were wholly true, it would be also true that it had no sooner become a party in power than it resolved itself into a tribunal to define the limits for the application of the very principles that had placed it in power; thereby endeavoring to prostitute the principle to subserviency to the policy of its leaders, instead of calmly and firmly following where it would legitimately lead; like all parties and sects, of previous origin, it built upon a principle, and then, instead of wisely following, recklessly attempted to guide it.

With all the prestige of possession, and of being the acknowledged representative of the principle which had carried it into power, the result of the late elections began to be feared by the party, because its leaders knew they had driven it from its birthright, and led it after strange gods; and, had the opposing party been actuated by true progressive principles of justice, no man, however popular in himself, could have saved it from destruction.

Conscious of having departed from the principles that gave it power, the Republican party is even now seeking every means within its grasp to fortify itself behind measures looking solely to success in ’72; but it is prophesied that ere that time there will have sprung into existence another party that will not be the mere professed representative of freedom and equal rights to all, but the actual, living, moving, irresistible incarnation of those principles.

The lines of policy pursued by party leaders, and the channels of corruption opened by the executive officers of the government, have produced a result so wide-spread in its influence and ramifications that, instead of their being under the control of the government, they exert a vast if not controlling power over all its actions; it is not necessary to go beyond its own records to establish this fact; every newspaper in the country teems with evidence in point; the clergy have deemed the situation dangerous enough to hurl the anathemas of the Church against it; the dramatist and the artist, the poet and the philosopher, have each dealt his blow, while the “toiling millions” everywhere cry for reform.

So general and earnest has the demand for reform become that something must be done; the gathering masses of corruption all over the body will soon have ripened to bursting; and who can tell how much the body itself has become involved. May it not be feared that it does not possess sufficient recuperative purity and strength to stand the shock? Could the enlightened mental, moral and spiritual elements of the country which are possessed by those who stand in the front ranks of the advancing column of progress be combined into organized action, they might be able to arrest the abnormal growth of corruption, and, by strengthening and stimulating the sound members of the body to co-operative action, restore the whole system to its normal condition.

The machinery of the government has become so complex and unwieldy—so full of departmental and petty offices—that it is utterly beyond the power of one man, though he be “_a great and mighty_ President,” to understand and control it.

The tendencies of the government being dangerous to the liberties of the people, their demand for reform is earnest, and must be heeded. But where will reformation begin? To whom must we look for relief? If we go to Congress with the Constitution in our hands, and demand such legislation as would give practical efficiency to the preamble and charter of freedom, they may possibly pay sufficient attention to the subject to pass a joint resolution setting forth that, while certain inalienable rights seem to be guaranteed to all, still Congress must be the dispensing power and judge of its application; and that it has decided that the negro shall be the first on the list—next, perhaps, the Indian may come in—next the Chinaman, and all the ends of the earth—except woman. Yes, go to Congress for relief from onerous taxes, wrung from the blood and bones of the laboring poor to fill the coffers of government vampires, and they will answer you by passing some new _Revenue Act_, in whose cunningly prepared articles will be found traps set for the people's money, which the trained bands of political party secretly manage on joint account for themselves and their party leaders; it will answer you by granting new subsidies to corporations already grown rich from the fruits of the labor of the people; by granting to powerful monopolies still further privileges increasing their power through bribery and corruption to make subordinate the welfare of the country to their own selfish purposes, and by favoring all schemes for the _centralization of power_. Such being the answers to your demands, there is still a tribunal to which you can appeal, which in all time past has heard and answered the _demands of the age_.

In the system of _special_ and _class_ legislation causes of corruption and the downfall of governments may always be found; it is the bane of the nations, whence flows that subtle, entrancing poison that permeates all the arteries and veins of a country—so quietly and alluringly to the people, that, before its effects are suspected, the vital principle of the government is destroyed, and the lifeless form finally falls to rise no more forever; or, if the spiritless form be still upheld by the usurper, it is only retained as "a cheat and a delusion" to shield the person of the tyrant who has enslaved his victims in the name and under the guise of liberty.

TENDENCIES AND PROPHECIES OF THE PRESENT AGE.

[Revised from the American Workman of Oct. 16, 1870.]

NO. II.

The subject of government and the solution of all its difficulties seem to hinge upon the question, Where does God's government drop its sway (if it does so at all), and where does man take it up, on his own account, by inherent natural right, guaranteed to him by the law that gave him being? The only modification of this question required to be considered is, How far man is or can be the authorized, competent agent of the Almighty in working out His purposes? To solve all these questions it becomes necessary to determine what the fundamental principles of government must be, to be in harmony with the laws of God, and to adopt them and to follow them out to all their legitimate conclusions and results, discarding everything else. In such government and legislation the eternal principles of right, which are God's laws, are in full force and effect, and _man_, thus far, an authorized competent agent in the administration of His decrees in the material world.

Whether a government founded or administered upon any other basis than the eternal principles of right and justice can or cannot be enduring, is a proposition the simplest mind may solve. Progress is from the lower to the higher; in its certain and irresistible march all systems and things that have risen out of the circumstances of the times to which they belong will be swept away to make room for the new and the better; but principles and self-evident truths that were contained in such systems will endure to be incorporated into all future systems.

There can be no higher form of expression than that life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are "_inalienable_" rights to _all_; and, being such, it is safe to assume that it will always remain as a fundamental proposition in the organic law of this country; and legislation will be required to guide itself by it, instead of being its exponent.

Change upon change will come in the future, as it has in the past, until government will become so simplified as to have for its foundation nothing but an annunciation of general principles of justice and equity, as self-evident truths upon which all legislation must be based.

Passing, for a time, the consideration of the principles of government, it may be well to inquire into the injustice of some of its present details. All men, and women, too, are _born_ free and equal, entitled to certain natural rights, which no government has the right to take from them. While every man and woman is a result of the general law of procreation, there are distinguishing points peculiar to each, which renders every _one_ different from every _other_; thus no two persons can be so precisely alike as to make

their individuality the same; consequently no two persons are governed by the same internal and external mainsprings of action and influence. Let the same power and influence be exerted upon different individuals, no matter how nearly they may _resemble_ each other, different results will flow from each, the character of which will be absolutely determined by the status of the development of, and the relations between the material, and spiritual elements represented in the individuals acted upon. No argument is needed to prove this proposition; and the legitimate deduction to be drawn from it is, that no judgment of the action of the individual, by others, is just that does not take into consideration all the various points in character and influence under which action is produced.

It must not be forgotten that all thought and action on the part of an individual is the legitimate result of some competent producing cause, operating by natural law. The cause being competent, the law of operation natural, and the result consequently legitimate, can another's idea of right step in to sit in judgment over the action, and render a verdict of justice to the actor? Or, can any number of individuals determine what the demands of justice are which God himself has declared by the mouth of all His holy prophets, material and spiritual. "Judgment is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."

No one can hope to escape the judgments of the eternal law, or to hide himself from God's officers of justice; but must by them be brought before its stern, undeviating bar, to receive its unpardonable sentence. But, says the objector, this does not satisfy me, who have suffered from the offence. What if it does not satisfy you? God is satisfied; and are you greater than He, that you may question His justice? If you are not yet satisfied, God will most surely satisfy you in His own good time.

Look into your statutes, and within them, find their own stultification. They assert that no criminal shall be subjected to two trials and penalties for the same offence; but, in the face of this righteous rule, and with the positive knowledge that God has already tried, convicted and sentenced the murderer, the courts of the country take possession and control of the criminal, proceed to try, convict, condemn and hang him by the neck until he is dead. Rest assured God will not overlook this attempt of yours to forestall his judgments.

We stop here to make a broad assertion: For man to affix certain definite penalties as punishment for so-called crime is to arrogate to himself what alone belongs to God!

Stumbling-blocks are constantly found in the path of progress, against which the earnest traveler finds himself precipitated; these consist of the ideas of the past, clothed with form and expression, and which were set up by their conceivers as "guides and lights" of their times, for those who groped their way by such assistance. The earnest seeker after light finds these set up all along his path, declaring "thus far shalt thou go, and no farther;" but he, catching a glimpse of the light so bright beyond, clears the obstruction by a single bound, and goes on his way rejoicing, seldom deeming it his duty to turn upon and cast what to him was but a hindrance from the path of progress, so that others coming that way should not encounter it, who perhaps might lack the power to surmount it. "Let your light shine" so that those who come after you may be aided thereby.

A single argument upon the question of the relations between debtor and creditor, which is maintained by the present laws, will be sufficient to illustrate the whole subject of customs, authorities and laws, which are obstructions in the path of progress. The time was when imprisonment for debt was authorized by law in all the States of this land of freedom (?); but the spirit of progressive justice has been at work until but few of the States now retain this libel upon Christian civilization to disgrace their statutes. Imprisonment for debt! What good ever resulted from it? The malignity of the creditor may have satisfied itself by still further humiliating the broken spirits of the debtor; but the creditor, by such action, places it still further beyond the power of the unfortunate debtor to satisfy the demand. It is asserted, without fear of successful contradiction, that the same deleterious effects generally flow from all similar laws. All kinds of crime are but species of debt, and the same rule applies with about the same force to its laws and penalties. Imprisonment for debt has been pretty generally abolished, but still our statute books are laden with laws to enforce collection.

A philosopher and economist, not long ago, fully investigated the relations between debtor and creditor, and the practical results of the laws now in force, and arrived at the "deliberate conclusion" that the costs attending the attempts to collect debts by legal process were three times the amount collected; not a very flattering commentary upon the policy of the law, and certainly not a paying investment to the crediting part of our community. This conclusion may at first thought appear fallacious; but when the expensiveness of courts, and the immense incomes of lawyers who practice at their bars, are considered, the afterthought will fully sustain the conclusion. It is believed by many that if there were no laws at all to enforce collection, there would be many less _bad debts_; even now a debt of honor is held by public opinion to have precedence of those which the _law_ claims the right to enforce.

The thinker of ordinary capacity will see at a glance that an immense amount of labor would be withdrawn from the courts, which now bears heavily upon the people, not only in the form of taxes to pay for court-houses, jury-rooms and judges' salaries, but in the waste of time employed in jury-boxes by men dragged from their inevitable toil, and held as prisoners, while their wives and children are often suffering, and even dying, from the want of their care and attention at home. Contracts should be so well defined as to admit of no misunderstanding; and if there was no method of collection and enforcement, there would be very many less disagreements; hence, in no light in which it can be viewed, does our present system commend itself to the wisdom and justice of the reflecting; on the contrary, it throws open the door for cunning and knavery to enter to test their strength through technical evasions and blind inferences, practiced, on the unwary and ignorant by the "_Quirks_, the _Gammons_ and the _Snaps_," who, as _vampires_ of the time-honored profession they disgrace, feed and fatten upon the misfortunes of the deluded, long-forbearing, long-suffering _children of toil_.

It may be safely asserted that a very large part of _all law_ contained within the statutes of the world, when analyzed, will present about the same deleterious results in practice and in the opportunities presented for infringement and subsequent evasion of their penalties that inevitably flow from all laws for the collection of debts.

The time has probably not yet come for the abolishment of all such laws, but the time has come when the relations of individual debtors and creditors should be left to the control of general principles of justice, which declare that a contract once fairly made, an obligation once fairly incurred, can never be discharged until satisfaction shall have been entered upon the record by divine justice.

TENDENCIES AND PROPHECIES OF THE PRESENT AGE.

[Revised from the American Workman of Oct. 30, 1870.]

NO. III.

When it is considered, how much the useful portion of life is dependent upon the preparatory part, the character of the influences brought to bear during that part, and the manner of their application, become a subject of deep importance. Education has received the most special attention from scholars, savants and professors; but they seem to have forgotten or to have ignored the fact that within the mind is contained the germ of all acquirements, and that teaching by rule merely what others have said or written, cramps and dwarfs the mind which, under a more natural system, would more rapidly and more healthfully develop its latent powers, through its stimulated efforts to evolve ideas connected with such facts and phenomena as may be exhibited to it, and thus become a part of the mind itself.

Instead of training the mind to rely upon method, books and authorities as rules, it should be encouraged to form methods of its own. The mind should be questioned, and its answers listened to, instead of being furnished by the teacher.

The mode proposed has many decided advantages. It inspires self-reliance, disciplines the mind to think for itself, accustoms it to express its own conclusions in its own chosen language, leads to clear and comprehensive forms of expression, gives decision and confidence, and tends to produce individuality of thought and character.

The Children's Progressive Lyceum, instituted upon this idea, has already been inaugurated, and should receive the careful and unprejudiced attention of all interested in educational reform. Children who have been under this system but a few months are able to stand before an audience, and, in a clear and comprehensive manner, speak without embarrassment upon any subject comprehended by their minds. The coming generations will acknowledge a debt of gratitude to the founder of this system which no depth of respect or reverence could fully express.

No proposition can be made which will be more readily accepted by the general progressive mind than that, as the world advances in knowledge and wisdom, its general welfare becomes more and more dependent upon reciprocal interests; that is to say, as _persons_ and _nations_ become more and better individualized, their reliance upon interests outside of themselves becomes more positively and distinctly defined; thus a system of mutual dependence and reciprocal interests is every day being more widely inaugurated, which will continue to spread until the whole world will be brought into harmonious co-operation. This is _commerce_! Commerce, to the material world, is what thought is to the spiritual—interchange and exchange of material product in the one and of spiritual in the other—hence no restrictions or embargoes should be placed on the one which would not be legitimate if placed upon the other. The dependence and independence of each is mutual and general.

Restrictions upon commerce is a system of commercial slavery, flowing from _politic_ and _special_ legislation, and is in violation of the eternal principles of right, because it renders equality in interchange impossible. If it is the right principle to restrict commerce between nations, it extends to States, to cities and to individuals as well.

Under the rule of an unrestricted commercial intercourse throughout the world, the principle of supply and demand would control the movements of commerce without the aid of legislation; and, when once fully established, it would give stability and security to production everywhere. The products of the world entering into commerce would localize themselves where they naturally belong—where most could be produced with the least labor; and, population obeying the laws of equalization, would adjust itself to the demands of the respective interests of productive labor. This is a vast problem, in the solution of which the whole world is vitally interested, and one which, sooner or later, must be solved. If its solution were possible _now_, coming generations would look back and bless us for the solving. An international congress should be called to consider the subject, and to take proper measures for the inauguration of a system of general economy in production and consumption. The prophecies of the age point to this as a reform of sufficient magnitude to demand the immediate attention of the nations, and to call for a _Christ_ to rise up for their salvation more powerful than the Democratic Party.

The political, national or personal advantages which are supposed to flow from restraints upon commerce, have nothing to do with the question of general reform. While it is the duty of every nation and every individual person to press forward the work of reform upon general principles, each nation and person must always keep in view the law of _self-preservation_, otherwise individuality will be lost in the struggle for supremacy, which has hitherto characterized the legislation of nations and the conduct of individual persons. The great principle of unrestricted universal commerce can only be practically established by universal acquiescence in its wisdom and justice. When legislation shall conform itself to general principles, instead of sectional, local or personal policy, and when its course shall be shaped by such broad action, it may be safely prophesied that the government it represents will be perfect and perpetual. Commerce will then obey the law of progress, and rise from the petty policies of nations, which strangle its development and limit its benefits: it will rise to be conducted upon the dignity of principle, untrammeled by policy; and on this platform the world will unite in harmonious prosperity under a universal government, not limited even by the boundaries between the material and the spiritual world.

Underlying all advancement and prosperity, material and spiritual, is action—motion—which, guided by intellect, results in _labor_, without which the world would be as though man had never been; for no form of creature below him has ever left permanent artificial beauty, systems of economy or usefulness as the result of its workings, except in so far as the form itself may be accounted such.

What, in two hundred years, has so changed the face of this country from the wilderness it was to the teeming garden it is, dotted all over with the habitations of men? What has produced the floating palaces that everywhere walk its deep waters “like a thing of life?” What has united all its distant parts by iron bands, along whose guiding lines those other representatives of _art_ and _motion_ speed, almost outstripping the wind? What has overcome time and space, and is now extending its arms to embrace the globe, that we may speak, and that the ends of the earth answer our call? Marvelous demonstration of the rapidly growing mutual and reciprocal dependence of the children of men! What has made the wilderness to blossom as the rose? What has achieved all these glorious, god-like results? Labor! labor! labor! physical, mental and spiritual labor!

Labor, therefore, is the fulcrum of the great lever of progress, lifting humanity from the material up to the spiritual realm. One short century ago nearly all physical labor was performed by the hands of man. Since then the mind has come up to the work, and rescued the body from the laborious servitude of former times; and now a single mind, directing a single machine, produces an hundred-fold more than it could when acting through its own personal machine. The inventive powers of the mind will continue to produce more labor-saving machines until labor directly with the hand will be almost, perhaps entirely, superseded.

The products of the mind, when compared with purely physical labor, are of inestimable value, and the great distinction everywhere recognized in their relative compensations is still too limited. No argument is needed to establish the dignity of labor; it has established itself in becoming the architect of the great future, by building the past and the present.

Out of the multiform phases of labor, questions will arise which will require for their adjustment equitable rules of compensation; the best talent in the world can find ample scope for useful employment in the solution of the numerous problems growing out of this vast subject. _Labor_—physical, mental and spiritual—finding itself in a position of injustice, is in a state of constant irritation and discontent, and legitimately seeks redress through the organization of associations to control its price; but it is at least questionable

whether such combinations have been productive of any permanently beneficial results. If it could be perceived and comprehended, there must be, in the nature of things, perfect and complete harmony in the practical operation of all the working elements or agencies, not only in this world, but in the boundless universe.

This problem may find a practical solution in co-operative labor associations, in which the members share equally the profits upon what they produce.

Suppose the entire labor of the country were conducted upon this just principle, what would be the result? The rapidly accumulating wealth of the country is the result of labor; if the united labor of the country, producing this increase, should henceforward share it equally, the result, in time, would be the _equalization_ of the wealth of the country, which is now rapidly growing into a necessity, to modify the luxurious habits of the rich on the one hand, and the crying evils of poverty on the other, which are rapidly engendering an antagonism, which will continue to increase in volume and intensity until it will culminate in a storm that will consume the elements of discord in the same manner (and upon the same immutable principles) by which African slavery was abolished in the Southern States of this Union.

A careful investigation of the co-operative principle will show that it is not only possible, but perfectly simple and practicable, and that it is full of glorious prophecy to the vast numbers who are now “ground to the earth” by the condition of actual slavery to the ordinary demands of nature which is entailed upon them from generation to generation, through the operations of false systems, which were founded upon and which are sustained by injustice and usurpation.

While viewing this subject in its practical aspects, it must not be forgotten that _it_, too, is intimately connected with progress, and subject to its decrees.

It is a well-established fact that the powers of endurance of the physical system are growing less, generation after generation, while the mental power is increasing in about the same ratio; the legitimate deduction from this fact is in perfect harmony with the general progressive tendency of all things leading from the purely physical to the spiritual, from which we may safely prophecy that the time will come when all labor will be performed by the mind, and when it shall have acquired perfect dominion over the material. The necessity for physical endurance will then have ended. The tendency to such a condition, though it has been, is, and may continue to be gradual, is nevertheless positive and well-defined.

Intimately connected with the subject of labor, and the tendency to perform by the agency of inventions what still devolves upon the direct application of physical strength, is that of supplying the demands of the body. The food used now is very different from that of a hundred years ago. Some who recognize this fact argue that the change of diet has produced the change in the physical condition; but reasoning from analogy, and applying the general rules of progress, leads to the conclusion that the changes in the relative conditions of the physical and mental, by which the latter asserts superior control, have rendered a corresponding change of diet necessary; hence it is fair to conclude that the change grows out of the necessities of the consumer, and is not the producing cause in the premises; in other and general terms, the physical system demands and should receive appropriate supplies.

Hundreds of people who once made use of the flesh of swine have entirely discarded it from their boards, instinctively feeling that it does not meet their present demands, and there is a growing distaste for it. Common observation shows that all kinds of flesh are gradually falling into disfavor, especially among those who labor mentally or are devoted to spiritual things.

As the physical system is gradually being relieved of labor and the consequent waste of its energies, the character of food it requires necessarily changes, and in the place of physical strength to be supplied is that upon which the brain can draw to replenish its wasting stock; the failure to recognize these demands causes very much of the dyspepsia from which those who lead sedentary lives suffer so generally; these should discard those articles of diet that principally contribute to build up the material, and use such as will impart strength to the mind.

There are quite a number of well-authenticated cases of the actual subsistence of the body upon the elements contained in the atmosphere a sufficient length of time to show that it could be continued indefinitely if the proper conditions were preserved. One of these cases in the State of Kentucky has remained seventeen years in this condition; one in Chicago nearly four years; there is one in Brooklyn of three years’ duration; and a number of others from ten to sixty days. In this condition the physical system becomes entirely renovated, purified, and almost transparent, and the spiritual faculties intensified many fold.

TENDENCIES AND PROPHECIES OF THE PRESENT AGE.

[Revised from the American Workman of Nov. 20, 1870.]

NO. IV.

Arguing from the fact that the character of food subsisted upon is gradually changed from the purely physical to the more refined and rare, in connection with that of exceptional cases having existed, in which supplies were drawn from entirely different sources than digested food, leads toward the conclusion, at least, that the time will come when men will have grown out of the necessity of supplying the wasting energies of the body and mind by the use of food, and into that refined spiritual condition in which he can draw directly upon the elements which the atmosphere does or will furnish to supply all his demands. All the arguments nature furnishes point to this condition. All know how very important it is to have a plentiful supply of pure air; but how far this goes toward furnishing the elements of supply demanded by the body, the deepest inquiries have not decided.

In a given case, the actual amount in weight that is furnished the body can be determined; deducting the weight of the excretions and palpable secretions, it is supposed the difference is consumed by some undefined process within the body; but who can tell how much and what the system takes directly from the atmosphere, or how much it gives up to it, that we have no means of defining by weight or otherwise? We also know that the atmosphere maintains an immense pressure upon the body, and that it involuntarily resists this pressure; this could not happen were there not some well defined and intimate relations between the two upon which man, as the object, must be greatly dependent.

Another strong and pointed argument is to be found in the process sometimes resorted to to sustain life: in cases of great prostration of the physical system, under exhaustive disease, when the means cannot be supplied through the medium of the stomach and digestion, they are furnished by being absorbed into the system through the pores of the skin.

The constant death and decay of all the materials upon which we feed, besides all that vast amount not drawn upon directly, is continually giving off to the atmosphere the same kind of elements which the body retains and uses from supplies of food; as they exist in the atmosphere in the form of elements, and there is a demand within the body for them, it is only necessary to create and maintain the means of supply to solve the problem. A glorious prophecy comes forth from the tendencies of labor toward the mental, and the accompanying necessity for modifications of diet, adapted to the many gradations man must pass through to reach a purely spiritual condition.

The physical system has been the accredited medium through which the spirit within it—the real man—has wrought, and still is, in all individuals who are not beyond the point where _spirit_ becomes the predominant and governing characteristic. In the present, however, there are scattered here and there among the masses individuals who have passed—are passing—or are approaching that point in which the spirit, at times, acts independently of its material machine in which it has been fostered and cultured, and gives positive proofs of an existence within the body of an individualized life, which can and does act without the agency of the body, and performs functions before impossible. There are a thousand persons, at least, in this country who have a sight entirely independent of the physical eye, which overleaps the boundaries of physical vision; penetrates the barriers of external sense, tears off the mask of hypocrisy and deceit, detects the motives and mainsprings of action, and lays bare the heart of man. While comparatively but few have attained this, all are approaching it. What does Paul mean but this when he says, “Now we see, as through a glass, darkly; but then face to face”? When the spirit-eye shall have fully pierced its barriers of flesh, when the body shall have become subservient to the spirit, instead of the spirit being dependent upon the body, when we “shall see as we are seen, and know as we are known,” how radical the changes, and how rapid the strides of advancement will then be!

Reason for a moment upon the effect that would be produced were every tenth person suddenly endowed with spirit-sight, and compelled to demonstrate it by exposing the hearts and the lives of all the rest. Where could oppression hide itself? Where could the lusts of the flesh plot their treason against the sovereignty of the spirit, beyond the range of _spirit vigilance_—this new safeguard of human society, the eternal law of progress, which is now unfolding? In such a condition of things, courts of justice, with all their attendant judges, bailiffs and attorneys-at-law, would find their occupation gone. Prisons would be converted into asylums and workshops for the weak and unfortunate, and their keepers into superintendents and teachers. Churches would be converted into lecture-rooms; and preachers, now hurling their anathemas against unrepentant sinners, would become professors of the great principles through and by which the world, and all things, have been brought from the primary condition thus far on their march toward the _perfect_.

Many individuals know that they are under the surveillance of this spirit-sight, and demonstrate in conduct its beneficent influence; but the capacity has not yet become sufficiently general to compel the recognition of its efficacy by the public mind. As the rising

sun first gilds the mountain's loftiest peak, next the hill-top, then glides along the inviting slope to the universal plain, where all creation rejoices under the refulgence of its noonday glories—so comes this _rising light_, to illumine the hearts and souls of all when it shall have reached the zenith of its mid-day glory. As the beams reflected from the mountain top are of the sun, and not the mountains, so are these spiritual rays of the spiritual sun, and not of the individual reflecting them, or through whom they may chance to shine. Verily, verily, I say unto you, this people vaunteth and puffeth itself with knowledge, but wisdom hath surely departed to the lowly ones of earth! Religion, clad in its robes "of purple and fine linen," faring "sumptuously every day," forgetting that Christ was cradled in a manger, and that His disciples were fishermen, continually cries, as did the "Pharisees and hypocrites" of old: "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"

The time is not far distant when the possession of spirit-sight will be accounted of the first importance, not to those only who possess it, but to the public generally, and will be sought for and made practical to the honor of its possessors and to the inestimable benefit of all. The time will come in the not far distant future when those who now cry out, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" will bow, with becoming humility, before the later-day _fishermen_; for these will then occupy the places of public trust, and spirit-telegraphy, having superseded material wires, will convey the commands of God's accredited ministers from the central seat of Power throughout the world.

Where are all the great of the _past_; its orators, philosophers and statesmen; Confucius, Zoroaster, Moses, David, Solomon, Lycurgus, Demosthenes, Cicero, Bonaparte, Washington, and many others, of all nations and climes, to whom history points as having stood hundreds of years in advance of their times? Do they still live? and, living, are they idle? Are their minds withdrawn from subjects to which they were devoted in this primary school-house of the children of God? Are not their minds expanded to the comprehension of the great principles of governmental justice? Are they not better qualified to direct legislation _now_ than the wisest among us? If they still live as spirits, if they have had better opportunities of obtaining wisdom and knowledge pertaining to earth-life than we—can this world avail itself of their assistance to establish on earth the government of heaven? If the angel in the bush were possible, why may not angels manifest the wisdom, power, and justice of God in our legislative halls? Who will dare to assert that they are not even now seeking another Moses to lead "His people" up out of Egypt? Then will the prophecies of the present have reached consummation; then will commence the earthly reign of the King of kings and Lord of lords, as prophesied by all the holy prophets of the world; then old things shall pass away and all things become new; then _the Christ_ shall sit upon the throne, and from his inexhausted fountain of love, justice shall continually flow over all the earth, "as the waters cover the sea."

As vanish the heavy mists of the morning before the radiance of the rising sun, so will vanish the clouds that hang around the minds of man, and shut out the rising spiritual sun, for whose "star in the East" _wise men_ are continually watching; the sun that will rise higher and higher, and extend its rays wider and wider, until it shall enlighten the minds of all mankind, until the icebergs of ignorance, tradition and superstition are dissolved which now float in the ocean of progress—society, with its cankered, festering heart; commerce robbed of its legitimate function; labor of its recompense, and religion of its spirituality; education lacking wisdom, marriages forming "disunions," and women without rights.

All the false forms of the present must yield their sway to God's command—"Let there be light." The laws of God are never changed—though old as creation—they are ever new, ever sufficient for all the vicissitudes of life; they are ever full of wisdom, justice and love; they are written all over the face of creation, in the bosom of the earth and in the heart of man; they are uttered by the raging tempest that rocks the mighty ocean; in the terrible mutterings of the earthquake; in the fury of destructive battle, when hosts are hurled on hosts in fraternal strife; through all these the voice of God proclaims—"Let there be light," and there is light.

We also hear its whispers in the gentle zephyrs that stir the bursting buds and in the blooming flowers that lift their heads to drink the falling dew; in the hum of busy nature; in the gushing fountain; we see it in the gambols of the bubbling brook; in the mother's love for the new-born life; in the father's pride; in the unspoken joy of the maiden's soul, listening to the first sweet tones of love; in the magnetic ties of human sympathy which bind all mankind in a common brotherhood, and in the dawning light of heaven brought to earth by the angelic hosts to usher in the reign of universal justice, peace and love.

TRANSCRIBER'S NOTES

1. Silently corrected obvious typographical errors and variations in spelling. 2. Retained archaic, non-standard, and uncertain spellings as printed. 3. Enclosed italics font in _underscores_.

==========

Untitled

Unknown

Project Gutenberg Release: February 05, 2022 · eBook #67326

Transcriber’s Notes

Obvious typographical errors have been silently corrected. Variations in hyphenation and accents have been standardised but all other spelling and punctuation remains unchanged.

Italics are represented thus _italic_ and bold thus =bold=.

THE A. B.-Z.

OF

OUR OWN NUTRITION

HORACE FLETCHER’S WORKS

THE A. B.-Z. OF OUR OWN NUTRITION. 462 pp. Just issued.

THE NEW MENTICULTURE; OR, THE A-B-C OF TRUE LIVING. Fortieth thousand. 310 pp.

THE NEW GLUTTON OR EPICURE; OR, ECONOMIC NUTRITION. 324 pp. Just issued.

HAPPINESS AS FOUND IN FORETHOUGHT MINUS FEARTHOUGHT. Tenth thousand. 251 pp.

THAT LAST WAIF; OR, SOCIAL QUARANTINE. 270 pp.

The A. B.-Z. _of_ OUR OWN NUTRITION

_By_ HORACE FLETCHER _Author of “Menticulture,” “Happiness,” “That Last Waif,” “Glutton or Epicure,” Etc., Etc._

EXPERIMENTALLY ASSISTED BY DR. ERNEST VAN SOMEREN, M. R. C. S., L. R. C. P., _of Venice, Italy_ & DR. HUBERT HIGGINS, M.A., M. R. C. S., L. R. C. P., _of Cambridge, England_

NEW YORK ■ FREDERICK A. STOKES COMPANY ■ _PUBLISHERS_

COPYRIGHT, 1903 BY HORACE FLETCHER

Published November, 1903 Reprinted February, 1904, August, 1904 February, 1905, August, 1905

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS CAMBRIDGE U. S. A.

CONTENTS

Page INTRODUCTION ix

POSTINTRODUCTORY xxvii

THE A.B.-Z. PRIMER

Explanation 3

Some Pertinent Questions 4

A.—The Psychology of Nutrition 6

B.—The Mechanical and Chemical Physiology of Nutrition 8

Method 9

Z.— The True Chemical End-Point of Digestion 10

A.B.-Z. Figure 12

Preface to 1906 Edition 13

HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

Summary of the Foregoing Pages by an Experimenter of One Month’s Experience 19

First Scientific Recognition of the Principles of Economic Nutrition Outlined in “Glutton or Epicure.” H.F. 26

Was Luigi Cornaro Right? by Ernest Van Someren 27

The Cambridge Tests.H.F. 47

Experiments upon Human Nutrition, by Sir Michael Foster, K.C.B., M.P., F.R.S. 48

Report of a Plan for the Institution of an International Inquiry into the Subject of Human Nutrition.H.F. 53

Proposal to Found an International Laboratory of Research for the Study of Nutrition in all Its Aspects. Recommended by the following 55 Professors of Physiology, etc.:

Sir Michael Foster, Cambridge, England. Angelo Mosso, Turin, Italy. Hugo Kronecker, Bern, Switzerland. N. Zuntz, Berlin, Germany. Paul Heger, Brussels, Belgium. A. Dastre, Paris, France. Henry P. Bowditch, Harvard Medical School. Russell H. Chittenden, Yale University. William H. Welch, Johns Hopkins University. J.P. Pawlow, Saint Petersburg, Russia.

Nationality and Scientific Titles of the above Board of Scientific Assessors 68

Persistent Scientific Doubts.H.F. 69

Physiological Economy in Nutrition, by Professor Russell H. Chittenden 72

Introduction to Dr. Harry Campbell’s Contribution on the Importance of Mastication.H.F. 92

Observations on Mastication, by Harry Campbell, M.D., F.R.C.P. 96

Introduction to Professor Pawlow’s Demonstrations of Psychic Influence in Digestion.H.F. 180

Selected Lectures by Professor J.P. Pawlow (Dr. W.H. Thompson’s translation) 182

Lecture IV.: General Scheme of an Innervation Mechanism--The Work of the Nervous Apparatus of the Salivary Glands--Appetite, the First and Most Potent Exciter of the Gastric Secretion 182

Lecture V.: Period of Occurrence and Importance of the Psychic or Appetite Juice in the Secretory Work of the Stomach--The Inefficiency of Mechanical Stimulation of the Nervous Apparatus of the Gastric Glands 212

Lecture VIII.: Physiological Action and the Teaching of Instinct: Experiences of the Physician 247

Introduction to Dr. Cannon’s Papers on Movements in the Alimentary Canal studied by Means of the Röntgen Rays.H.F. 284

Swallowing and Movements of the Stomach and Intestines, by W.B. Cannon, M.D. 285

The Movements of the Food in the Œsophagus, by W.B. Cannon and A. Moser 285

The Movements of the Stomach, by W.B. Cannon 301

The Movements of the Intestines, by W.B. Cannon 342

The Battle Creek Laboratories.H.F. 389

Experimental Investigation of the Influence of Mastication and Cooking of Food, etc., in the Laboratories of the Battle Creek, Michigan, Sanitarium, under the direction of Dr.J.H. Kellogg 391

Dr. Edward Hooker Dewey and the “No Breakfast Plan.” H.F. 396

Professor Jaffa and the Fruitarians.H.F. 397

Dr.H.P. Armsby.H.F. 397

Explanation of the A.B.C. Series.H.F. 399

INDEX 409

INTRODUCTION

DO WE EAT TOO MUCH? CAN WE LEARN TO EAT RIGHT? WITHOUT LOSS OF ENJOYMENT? WITHOUT CARE BEING A NUISANCE? WITHOUT SOCIAL INTERFERENCE? WITH ASSURANCE OF HEALTH? WITH INCREASE OF ENERGY? WITH INCREASE OF ENDURANCE?

* * * * *

TO ALL THESE VITAL QUESTIONS, THIS BOOK ANSWERS ONLY “YES.”

* * * * *

VERIFY THIS BY PERSONAL EXPERIMENT. IRRESISTIBLE DESIRE FOR PHYSICAL EXERCISE WILL FOLLOW, AS A MATTER OF COURSE, PROBABLY FRUITING IN USEFUL ACCOMPLISHMENT BY THE SAME INVITATION OF HEALTHY IMPULSE WHICH CAUSES CHILDREN TO PLAY TIRELESSLY. DO RIGHT YOUR FEEDING OF THE BODY. NATURE WILL DO ALL THE REST FOR YOU ARIGHT.

Introduction

DO WE EAT TOO MUCH?

(_A propos of the Scientific-Military Experiments at Yale University_)

Do we eat too much?

Nine out of every ten physicians tell us “Yes,” and tell us true!

How much too much?

* * * * *

Luigi Cornaro suggested that all persons in his time ate more than was necessary; most persons ate twice as much as was good for them; and some, who were extravagantly gluttonous, ate ten times as much as was their most economic need; and Cornaro, who was a dissipated wreck at forty, reformed his manner of eating and lived to be a hundred to prove his declaration.

Experiments carried on in this country and in Europe during the past five years confirm this estimate of habitual excess; but fortunately they have also revealed a natural protection, heretofore unappreciated, available to all, which can regulate the appetite to suit the real needs of nutrition and thus avoid the dangerous excess which predisposes to discomfort and disease.

* * * * *

Luigi Cornaro lived more than three hundred years ago. His charmingly frank and interesting autobiography has been published in English upwards of forty times in different new editions, and no one has disproved the possibility or probability of his claim. We all know that Cornaro was right. We know, in a general way, that the great Italian dietitian and philosopher was wise and uttered wisdom, and we are told that most, if not all, of the diseases which pain, worry, and afflict us are caused by indigestion or mal-assimilation of food, the result of some indiscretions of eating. The questions then are “What are our indiscretions?” “How can we avoid them?” and “What is the new discovery that will protect us and, at the same time, add to the pleasures of the palate and of

living?”

The answers to all these queries will be found herein, as will also an explanation of the very active interest which is being taken just now in the problem of human nutrition by scientific and military authorities, as evidenced by the Yale investigation.

The author has, in collaboration with several others, found a way how _not to eat too much_ while eating _all that the appetite desires_, and in a way that leads to a _maximum of good taste_ and at a _minimum of cost and waste_, but it is necessary to test many persons of different physiques and varying temperaments, and also to test other methods of attainment of economy, to learn what is best for general application, and that is what is being done at Yale.

* * * * *

The cost to the pocket that is saved by economic nutrition is of little matter as compared with the saving of the waste of energy and the menace of disease.

* * * * *

Nature certainly never intended that we should weaken, depress, and distress ourselves in the way that is common to present-day living, as is made evident by the prevalence of discomfort and disease relative to our daily food. Nature’s plan of evolution does not work that way in general, does not retrograde in the progress of the improvement of plants and dumb animals, and certainly does not intend that Man, the First Assistant of Nature in the cultivation of things and in the domestication of the powerful natural forces, should suffer and become degenerate contrary to her general law.

If we are agreed upon the foregoing, let us ask ourselves a few questions.

Without any undue egotism, may it not be possible for a generation of human beings, who have progressed so far in intelligence as to be able to move things by steam, to communicate across the ocean even without wires to guide our messages, and to see clearly through objects that are as dark as night to the unassisted human eye with the aid of an artificial light, to learn the secret of right self-nutrition and practise it in a manner that will not deprive us of the maximum of pleasure which Nature invariably gives as a reward for conformity with her beneficent requirements? May we not assume that beings who have learned to breed and train horses to race with human intelligence, and to run, trot, or pace a mile in less than two minutes, may also train themselves to have the proportional relative speed, endurance, and longevity that has been attained by race horses through man’s care, and to enjoy the pleasure of living that is evident in these favoured animals, mere servitors of man though they be?

If this disparity of man is due to ignorance arising in self-neglect, which is the usual accompaniment of genius, may we not now, at the beginning of the pregnant twentieth century, rest for a moment from discovering, developing, and improving the world outside our personal selves and concentrate our attention for a while on learning to know and care for ourselves? May we not, at least, give “horse sense” attention to such a vital interest?

* * * * *

In the midst of the present confusion which exists among opinions as to the right conduct of life and activity, and the best manner and system of diet to be used to secure health and efficiency, it seems almost a vain appeal to call for concert of action in a matter of common and persistent neglect. Each person, as his own keeper, is careless, and in matters of bodily management no one feels called upon to be his brother’s keeper; but this is merely the lethargy of oversight and consequent ignorance, and this book is published to call attention to the oversight and to attempt to dispel the ignorance.

* * * * *

At the present moment of writing (October, 1903) there are quartered at New Haven, Connecticut, twenty privates of the Hospital Corps of the United States Army and three non-commissioned officers, under the command of Assistant Surgeon, Lieutenant Wallace DeWitt. These men and officers, while they are under regular army discipline and are performing duty in conformity with their oath of enlistment, are yet volunteers. They are from the same corps, if they are not the same men, which furnished volunteers to investigate the causes of yellow fever in Cuba, whose heroism resulted in stamping the fever out of the islands and in that more effectually protecting our coast states from its yearly incursions. These are the same men who generously refused to accept the offered bounty. This latter expression of exalted manhood is evidence of what humanity is whenever there is real need for heroes to serve the general good. They refused to _sell_ themselves as risks for money, but they freely _offered_ themselves as subjects of

scientific investigation for the benefit of their fellows and of mankind at large.

* * * * *

The duty that the soldiers are engaged in at Yale has no element of risk, and need not have any feature of monotony or tediousness in it, much less has it the romance of sacrifice, for it deals with an attempt to restore normality and does not consort with disease. But the service being rendered by these guardians of our health, these soldiers of hygiene, is even more important than was the service rendered in stamping out yellow fever, for it deals with an enemy much more subtle, treacherous, common, and deadly than Yellow Jack. Yellow fever calls for a halt and an immediate attempt at cure, and further, for stringent defence to extermination; but indigestion and the American plague, _dyspepsia_, work their evils slowly but surely to cut off our best men and loveliest women in their prime and to rob us of their richest product and of their maturest wisdom.

* * * * *

The investigation at Yale is a link in a chain of effort that has developed in logical sequence and has been planned to effect a cure of the common ignorance and practice relative to right human nutrition in its relation to profitable thinking and doing; and to discourage the personal neglect which has been responsible for the existing ignorance, this book is issued to show what may easily be done and what has been done, so far, in this direction. It is a compilation of important knowledge which has been born of recent scientific research but which is hidden away from common comprehension in scientific publications; and it relates the story of the development of which this book is an exponent. Herein are given the reasons why the government and the most eminent scientists in the line of researches in nutrition are coöperating so earnestly and so unusually in a commonweal inquiry.

* * * * *

About ten years ago, at the critical age of forty-four, the author was fast becoming a physical wreck in the midst of a business, club, and social tempest. Although he was trained as an athlete in his youth and had lived an active and most agreeable life, he had contracted a degree of physical disorder that made him ineligible as an insurance risk. This unexpected disability, with such unmistakable warning, was so much a shock to his hopes of a long life that it led to his making a strong personal effort to save himself. The study was taken up in systematic manner, account of which is too long to relate here; but the eager auto-reformer soon learned that his troubles came from _too much_ of many things, among them too much food and too much needless worry; and realising the danger ahead, he sought a way to cure himself of his disabilities by the help of an economic food supply, as did Luigi Cornaro; but what is even more important, he found a way to enjoy the smaller quantity of food much more than any plethoric luxury can give, and arrived at the method by a route that showed a means of conserving a healthy economy and an increased pleasure of eating, at the same time, in quite a simple and scientific manner, that any one may learn and practise without any ascetic deprivation whatever. Cornaro buried the real clew to his economic and pleasurable success with his body, owing to his vague generality of description of his method. The author is determined not to make the same mistake, and thereby bury _his_ key to a happy and easy life.

* * * * *

The secret of the method is all told in this book and is confirmed herein by both theoretically scientific and scientifically practical authority; but the experiments which are being conducted at Yale by Professor Chittenden, in coöperation with Surgeon-General O'Reilly of the army, of which the _Daily Press_ has given notice, together with experiments which are in progress in many university laboratories in this country and in Europe, are for the purpose of explaining the "reasons for things" by complete scientific reasoning, so that none may doubt the disadvantage and sin of dietic ignorance and carelessness.

The acceptance of the theory and method of the author at the great Battle Creek Sanitarium, after more than a year's trial, and elsewhere among curative agencies, and their adoption and use as the first requisite of treatment, of which the public have not so generally heard, are indorsements coming from practical, intelligent, and expert sources of experience and judgment, and hence they are of the utmost value and significance.

* * * * *

This introductory chapter is being written after the "clippings" of newspaper comment relative to the presence of the soldiers at Yale have begun to come in. The majority of comments are generous in spirit, but indicate a lack of complete understanding which this "Introduction" is intended to correct.

* * * * *

Some of the comments are couched in ridicule, and express pity for the poor soldiers who are being “misused” as subjects of starvation in an investigation which promises to make starvation a rule in the army. To the writers of such trifling and unfair paragraphs let me, one of the fraternity in an amateurish way, beg consideration of the following.

The campaign that has been started is against a common enemy of mankind, and of the American and English nations in particular. In our successes in agriculture, manufacture, and commerce we have cultivated insidious, luxurious temptations which bring all of us some ill and many of us, or our loved ones, fatal disease and premature death. The advance agent of these enemies of ours is Eating-and-drinking-too-much.

* * * * *

The officers and men of the army and the eminent scientists of our country and those of all nationalities who have entered into the campaign with us, and the great power of the sanitaria joining as practical nurses, demonstrators, and exponents of the reform, are all working for you and for everybody. It is voluntary service and has already cost some of the volunteers much time and patience and also a considerable sum in money.

* * * * *

You, gentlemen of the Press, wielders of the helpful or careless pen, have a conspicuous pulpit and a far-reaching influence. No one can escape you. In the search for the news of the day you are encountered at every turn in your editorials or your paragraphs. In this campaign we need your assistance to make the coöperation between the army and science easy and effective. They are too busy working for you and your best interest to stop to argue to correct your misunderstanding, but the cause will feel the benefit of your assistance.

Encouragement has powerful influence in stimulating effort and also in creating and conserving conditions in which men may “do their best.” What we are trying to learn is, what man _may_ do, under favourable conditions of knowledge and confidence, to relieve his body of the _strain of energy-taxing labour_ in disposing of the waste _which any excess of food imposes_. It is a constructive experiment and not a mere statistical measurement. Appreciation and applause assist; doubt and ridicule obstruct.

The soldiers and physiologists are too busy studying indigestion and possible proteid poisoning and what-not-other causes of intemperance, disease, and suffering to ask you to assist in spreading only serious report and right suggestion relative to the importance and purport of the investigation, but it is my privilege to ask it for the general good.

* * * * *

Just another word of introduction and then will follow some _postintroductory_ coincidences relative to the work in hand, and then an attempt to lay out a ten-page chart of the personal responsibility in the care of the body and the nourishment of the mind by aid of an economic and most satisfactory nutrition, so as to make conservation of energy as easy as possible and life well worth the living. The scientific support from the pens of professional observers is, however, the real meat of the book, for which compiler and reader alike are and should be grateful.

* * * * *

In serving in the humanitarian ranks in a commonweal campaign one should not need to use the concealment of modesty, nor should he fail to speak with all frankness. What are the motives behind all this energy to reform the eating habits of the people? The question has been so often asked that it is better thus publicly answered.

No one concerned in the campaign has any personal monetary interest in any kind of food, prepared or otherwise. The movement began in a suggestion carried by an accidental word given to the author by a friend, an old-time friend in Japan, and a friendship never to be forgotten, as related in the author’s book “Menticulture.” Pursuit of menticulture led further to the discovery that the best mental results could not be accomplished in a body weakened by any indigestion, any mal-assimilation of nutriment, any excess of the waste of indigestion. Then came the quest for the causes of mal-nutrition, which were soon found, by study of the natural sequences and by going behind the hypotheses of text-book authority, to arise in the careless ingestion of food, its neglect in the mouth, and the consequent glut of unassimilable excess within the body, necessitating enormous expense of brain and body energy to get rid of the excess.

When the secret of the potency for good of a rationally economic alimentation was revealed to the author, was confirmed by several colleagues of different ages and both sexes, and was tested by work and endurance measurement, and also by the test time, it became necessary to have given to it the indorsement of highest authority in order to have the information credited. The new rediscovery was a simple matter, something everybody thought they knew all about because it had been under their nose all their life and was one of the commonplaces of every-day living, but for that very reason it failed to receive credence, and the backbone of the doubt was habit--lifelong habit--and this was hard to break even in those who accepted the theory of economic nutrition as a logical conviction. It was also necessary to prove that it was not personal idiosyncrasy that favoured us, its advocates.

It is in pursuit of the latter desideratum that the officers of the army, the scientists, and the great humanitarian health-restoring institutions have entered upon conclusive investigations, each in their own way, to chart out a law of economy that will be generally applicable and which, it is hoped, can be understood by kindergartners and mothers for the benefit of the present and of coming generations.

* * * * *

It was just stated that no one concerned in the inquiry was interested in any food product or in any personally profitable business concern, and mention of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, so widely known as the pioneer in fostering the pure food and prepared-cereal manufacture, may cast a doubt upon the matter in the minds of those who do not know that the Sanitarium organisation, in its every department, is a philanthropic, humanitarian institution. It is the parent and feeder of the American Medical Missionary Cause, which already has established branches in something over sixty localities situated in or near large cities in different parts of the world, chiefly America. By perpetual charter all the profits revert to the spread of the work and the employees serve for a mere pittance, deriving their major compensation from enjoyment of the altruistic work.

* * * * *

The old prejudice against the human race which declared that “everybody had an axe to grind,” that there was “a nigger in every woodpile,” and such like slanders, must be modified in the light of recent altruistic development. Altruism has always been existent and had a great new birth with the beginning of our era, but it was never before so frankly put upon a business basis as it is now, and this is fast being applied to every department of business activity. It is now done, not in the name of any particular creed or cult, or for future reward, but because _it pays_--first, last, and all the time.

* * * * *

In the study and pursuit of menticulture the author has found that working for the common good is as necessary to happiness as working for self, and that the retroactivity and reciprocity of the idea multiplies the profits indefinitely.

The sequence of profitable, altruistic interrelation is stated in the “Explanation” of the chain of the A. B. C. Life Series, of which this book is one of the links.

* * * * *

Aside from those actively engaged in the several investigations to whom reference is often made, the author wishes to express special gratitude to Sir Michael Foster and to Professor Henry Pickering Bowditch of the Board of Scientific Assessors. Unselfish and unremitting in their assistance and encouragement, the author’s work has been made easy since their interest was enlisted.

Sir Michael, as Member of Parliament in England, and as a physiological savant, knows that economic nutrition is the key to England’s welfare, as well as the basic necessity of temperance, morality, health, and efficiency, as is expressed in the two documents from him reproduced in the “Report of a Plan for an International Investigation into the Subject of Human Nutrition” and in his “Note” on the Cambridge examination of the author and Dr. Van Someren at Cambridge University laboratories, given herein.

Professor Bowditch, as a distinguished physiologist, publicist, and especially as the President of the Children’s Aid Society, of Boston, Massachusetts, often mentioned as the model institution of its kind in the world, realises that the effort of the author to secure basic knowledge relative to right nutrition, adaptable to kindergarten teaching and home training during the impressionable period of youth, is of the greatest importance in social reform.

A trial suggestion relative to ways and means of _beginning right_ with _all the children_ and thus insuring a regeneration of the classes most in need of reform, in not longer than two decades, is outlined in the author’s appeal for the waifs of society, entitled

“That Last Waif; or Social Quarantine.”

Whenever there is any disposition to slack up in patience or enthusiasm to accomplish the ultimate end aimed at, the picture of the waif in that story is flashed back by memory, and there can be neither forgetfulness, indifference, nor repose until “that last waif” has been given _at least a chance of choosing_ between the right and the wrong, the good and the bad.

POSTINTRODUCTORY

[Just before “going to press” the author has received a letter from his esteemed colleague, Dr. Hubert Higgins, giving the gist of interviews with an eminent European physiologist and with a famous American chemist and dietitian, which so well describes the attitude of the scientific mind towards the problem of human nutrition that the scientific mentor of the writer advises its addition to the book.

By the same post there arrived a letter from Dr. J. H. Kellogg, the life and director of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, expressing practical appreciation, the result of demonstration, of what is being done to solve the problem.

Eliminating the personal element and keeping the ultimate object in view, these communications are coincidentally _a propos_ and intimate to our “Introduction”; hence their reproduction here.

Numerous other letters and extracts from communications received by the writer, bearing upon this subject, from the above and other sympathetic friends are reproduced in “The New Glutton or Epicure,” a free and easy companion of this book, intended to appeal to a variety of readers.

When it is known that the proceeds of all the publications of the author are dedicated to the promotion of the objects they advocate, reference to them or advertisement of them cannot be considered inappropriate.—HORACE FLETCHER.]

EXTRACTS FROM DR. HIGGINS' LETTER

PALAZZINA TASSO, CAMPO S. POLO, VENEZIA.

October 3, 1903.

DEAR MR. FLETCHER,--A. appears to me to have an exceedingly broad and philosophic grasp of the problem of nutrition.

He recognises that all present data are subject to criticism, and that there are no scientifically accurate data available because

(_a_) Observations are taken over too short a period.

(_b_) They have mainly dealt with one side of the problem,--the output of muscular work.

(_c_) The observations are not sufficiently complete.

He acknowledges that cleavage products from food broken down in the intestines by bacteria are the cause of

(_a_) Inefficiency (_b_) Diseases (_c_) Mental derangements. (See Mott’s work.)

He recognises that the majority of people eat far too much. He puts this in the following way. If a “mediæval devil” had wished to discover the most subtle and most effective way to destroy mankind mentally, morally, and physically, he would have arranged for them to be supplied with tasty, well-cooked foods, wines, etc.; in short, he would have used every means to tempt, confuse, and pervert their appetite. He would also have arranged every possible means to prevent their being in the fresh air and taking exercise. He thinks one has here the picture of modern civilisation.

He talked in a very interesting and instructive manner about the necessity and value of exercise and a muscular body for the maintenance of good health. He has evidently worked at and thought a good deal about this side of the subject.

He regrets that there are not more people who realise the huge importance of understanding the nutrition problem for the sake of the progress of humanity. He would like to join all those who are interested in forming an international society, as far as I understood him.

He is most keen on getting subjects, such as myself, for study over a very long period of time,--two to three years,--as he very justly observed “Muscular output is a very small part of the measure of a man’s efficiency. Mental efficiency, manual dexterity, and other psychological tests are necessary.” He seemed very much interested in my idea of making a large number of curves of daily observations. He said that it appeared to him to offer the best means of ultimately measuring the degree of deviation from the subject’s optimum state of health.

He argues the necessity of getting some scientific definition of health.

* * * * *

The phrase that reduces all these people to contemplative silence is this.

“You acknowledge that the state of knowledge is insufficient to prescribe a diet for any individual that he should take daily; or in other words, that there is very little accurate knowledge of the nutrition problem.”

Reply. “Yes. I do not feel I could prescribe a diet for any one with any degree of confidence.”

“Very well, then. Why should not the body have or acquire the quality that all animals have, in a free, natural state, of knowing what their body wants by appetite and taste?”

This is more or less how you put it to me when I first met you at Cambridge. Its full significance did not dawn on me till much later; till, in short, I commenced the study of my desires at Cambridge.

Now this point of view is the rock on which we stand, and is the cause of H.'s and A.'s interest, and as H. said, is the “most fascinating idea” he ever heard.

It had very much the same effect on A. He was reduced to silence. The more you think of it the more you see there is no answer that could contradict it.

He then admits that

(_a_) The food should be finely divided.

(_b_) That it should be thoroughly insalivated.

(_c_) That in all probability most diseases are caused by dietetic error.

(_d_) That we have still to find the optimum health and the optimum diet.

He only kicks at the low proteid. Now I don’t care a “kuss” for the low proteid, as such, or high proteid. Proteid like everything else will be demanded by the appetite when it is wanted.

Our great danger, to my mind, is the tendency so strongly exemplified by some of prescribing diets and quantities and the length of time food should be chewed.[1] Now the very errors we are fighting against are the prescription of methods on insufficient information or knowledge. _You have gone straight back to Nature._ _There is your strength_ in convincing the scientific world, and we must study the problem from that point of view if we are to get any great degree of success.

A. had nothing to say when I told him that I did not hold by either high or low proteid but only by my appetite and taste, developed by ample mouth opportunity to discriminate, which I hoped, in time, to understand more thoroughly than I do now. He told me that he feared that there would be great physical deterioration after a long period of low proteid. I said that I did not believe it would be the case by your method. For instance, right in the midst of a long period of most satisfactory low-proteid supply, I once ate nearly a whole chicken with some ham at Penegal. I could not get saliva for anything else.[2] In short, then, I insisted only on thorough mastication to protect taste and appetite, and had no other theories. I was only concerned in observing the factors determining my taste and appetite. I would be more than contented to leave the question of minimum and maximum quantity of proteid to be settled in the future after normality had been established by practical demonstration.

Yours faithfully, HUBERT HIGGINS.

EXTRACTS FROM DR. KELLOGG’S LETTER

BATTLE CREEK, MICH. October 7, 1903. MR. HORACE FLETCHER.

DEAR FRIEND,--Yours of September 30th just reached my hands and I hasten to reply.

I saw a newspaper note in reference to the soldiers which the government has selected for the dietetic experiments, and also read an interesting article in the _Popular Science Monthly_. You have accomplished a great good thing in enlisting these scientific and military men and interesting them in the investigation of this wonderful reform. The marvellous thing about it is that these busy men of science should have so readily undertaken an investigation which involves so much surrender and self-denial, at least, at the start. I know you are absolutely right. My personal experiences and observations confirm me. In the experiments you mention, which I made in reference to the daily ration for ordinary persons, I simply sought to ascertain, as have others, how much and what kinds of food people are in the habit of using, taking no account of the possible excess or the careless manner in which they eat. The figures I got were sixteen ounces of starch; 1.2 ounces fat, and three ounces proteids,--approximately 2,500 calories. In observation of patients I have seldom found one able to eat this amount. Personally, I habitually eat scarcely half as much. My breakfast to-day was the yolks of two eggs, two or three tablespoonfuls of corn flakes, a moderate-sized potato, and a couple of peaches. At dinner I shall take a little more.

I have been so busy with my patients and the new building, getting things organised, that I have not done as much as I ought to in the way of promoting your splendid reform; but I am going at it now in good earnest. I feel it is one of the greatest things in sight, and it fits right in to all the other things I am trying to do. I feel that I owe you continually a great debt for the efforts you have made and the splendid work you are doing, which will accomplish more for the uplifting of humanity than all that Carnegie and Rockefeller are doing with their millions. What they are doing is mainly to perpetuate old errors, while you are bringing out new truth of basic importance, and a kind Providence has certainly inspired you to do this grand work.

I thank you for all your good thoughts towards us, and assure you the loving encouragement your letters always contain is very much appreciated, and sometimes it gives us a mental uplift just when we need it. The road we are travelling over is not altogether free from thorns. All your suggestions are gratefully received. I remain,

Faithfully yours,

J. H. KELLOGG.

A. B.-Z. PRIMER

EXPLANATION

This is a condensed presentment of a subject of basic importance to everyone, supported by numerous appendices of great scientific weight.

The special object of such brevity and elementary treatment of the subject is:

=1.= To accentuate the facts showing how little we really have to know and do in connection with our sustenance in order to have the NATURAL AUTOMATIC PROCESSES done rightly and healthfully.

=2.= To permit busy persons who will take our dictum as gospel and our advice as sound to learn their necessary share in their own nutrition in the least possible time, leaving the less credulous and more curious to study the appendices at leisure and at will.

=3.= For some ten years it has been the ambition and the aim of the older and non-professional author to embody the fundamental essentials of human responsibility in self-understanding and self-management in not more than ten pages of coarse print that a child could understand and that mothers and teachers might commit to memory and never forget.

This is only a first trial-attempt to fulfil the ambition and the aim; but the appendices show the assembling and concentration of scientific and militant forces which will not allow this subject of primal human interest to remain longer the most neglected of educational departments.

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS

Will the reader not ask himself the following questions?

=1.= How much do I know about my own nutrition?

=2.= Do I know the particular need and purpose of my last meal and what it is likely to accomplish?

=3.= Considering my body as an engine, would I accept myself as a competent engineer on my own examination and confession?

=4.= Were I an iron and steel automobile, instead of a flesh and blood automobile, which I really am, could I get a license for myself, as a _chauffeur_, to run myself with safety, based upon my knowledge of my own mechanism and the theory and development of my power?

=5.= Were I an owner of valuable live-stock, would I employ a farm-hand or a stable man, even at so low a wage as fifteen dollars a month, who knew as little about the proper feeding of my animals as I know about the proper feeding of myself and my children?

=6.= Should I employ such an ignorant attendant for my live-stock, and catch him worrying them during their feeding, and hurrying them away from their fodder to hitch them up for work, would I not have the man arrested for cruelty to animals? And yet this is what is habitually done to children!

=7.= Do I appreciate how important it is to learn sufficient of the requirements of economic and healthy nutrition to enable me to escape the depressing and debilitating effects of a faulty nutrition.

=8.= How can I religiously “ask a blessing” upon food and then immediately sin by treating it in a manner abhorrent to the natural requirements?

=9.= If “cleanliness is next to godliness” is it respectable for me to slight my proper feeding in a manner that I know may induce putridity of excreta through indigestion and that _may_ produce fatal disease?

=10.= With All Eternity ahead of me, cannot I afford at least 1■48[3] of my time for careful feeding of my body in a manner known to favour physical health; mental keenness; firmness of character; enjoyable temperance; sexual vigour without morbidity. In fact, general respectability and efficiency?

Having duly reasoned out logical answers to the questions, may they not seem sufficiently important to be remembered and respected as a DIETARY TEN COMMANDMENTS?

A

The Psychology of Nutrition

APPETITE ATTENTION APPRECIATION

APPETITE is the most important factor in digestion (vide Pawlow).

NORMAL APPETITE is indicated by a desire for _some particular_ simple food accompanied by a “watering of the mouth.”

FALSE APPETITE is a general discontent of the body, indefinite of description. It is often expressed by “all gone-ness,” or stomach craving, and calls for _something_, ANYTHING! to smother the discomfort of present or recent indigestion. It is like the thirst which follows a debauch.

IGNORE FALSE APPETITE, and WAIT for a RETURN of NORMAL APPETITE. It will come as soon as body repairs have been effected by natural agencies and more material is required. No one was ever injured by intelligently and calmly waiting for an appetite. No one ever starved to death for lack of appetite. Most human ills come from forcing appetite, anticipating appetite, abuse of appetite in some form.

APPETITE is the most important factor in nutrition. This estimation is based upon evidence given more fully in the various appendices, but the measure of its importance may be briefly stated, as follows:—

First

In its normal state, Appetite is a perfect indicator of the bodily need of nutriment and moisture, both as to quantity and as to the chemical elements required at the moment.

Second

APPETITE is a creature of the mind and does not attach to a tissue. It can be as easily changed, from abnormal to normal, by suggestion, as can the mind itself, and is not like a solid, the form or habit of which has been set in a mould. Whoever has once experienced a bad oyster and has abhorred oysters ever after will substantiate this claim regarding the caprices of appetite.

Third

APPETITE can be easily comprehended and read and the degrees of its satisfaction understood by simple attention and study for a brief period (vide Van Someren).

Fourth

ATTENTION is necessary to create APPRECIATION, and appreciation is absolutely necessary to stimulate the secretion and flow of gastric and other digestive juices (vide Pawlow).

Fifth

ANGER, or shock of any kind, and WORRY, or any of the pessimistic depressants, stop digestive activity and cause indigestion (vide Cannon).

Sixth

MENTICULTURE should begin with its application to selection (through a normalised appetite) of nutriment for the body, and continue to aid digestion by right thinking.

It is very easy to cultivate calm and fortify against surprise, shock, and anger if the nutrition of the body is carefully attended to. The physical and the mental equipments are beautifully reciprocal and necessary to each other in promoting MENTICULTURE.

B

The Mechanical and Chemical Physiology of Nutrition

BUCCAL DIGESTION

THROUGH

MOUTH THOROUGHNESS

Mouth treatment of food, which permits, aids, and includes insalivation (mixing with saliva), and which is both actively digestive in its functions and preparatory to final digestion, is the only _actual mechanical responsibility_ we have in our nutrition; and, in connection with favourable A conditions, insures perfect digestion. It has been so fully and clearly explained in some recent articles, “Observations on Mastication,” by Dr. Harry Campbell, F.R.C.P., physician to the Northwest London Hospital, printed in the “Lancet” of July 11th, 18th, 25th, and August 8th, 1903, that reference to the articles, reprinted herewith, is all that is necessary here.

In giving attention to careful mouth-treatment of soft or liquid foods until they are absorbed by the Swallowing Impulse the best health and economic results are obtained. It should, at least, be tried.

This will not be found to be a tedious operation after a little practice, when the habit of attention and care has been formed. On the contrary, a new appreciation and enjoyment of taste will be acquired, the delight of which has to be experienced to be understood.

Some hints on learning how to _read_ the appetite, _command_ the attention, and _masticate_ and _swallow_ food material _properly_ follow.

METHOD

First; Last; and All the Time

Be sure that you are really hungry and are not pampering False Appetite. If true appetite that will relish plain bread alone is not present, wait for it. Especially beware of the early-morning habit-craving. Wait for an _earned_ appetite, if you have to wait till noon. Then: “Chew,” “Masticate,” “Munch,” “Bite,” “Taste” everything you take in your mouth (except water, _which has no taste_), until it is not only thoroughly liquefied and made neutral or alkaline by saliva, but until the reduced substance all settles back in the (glosso-epiglottidean) folds at the back of the mouth and excites the Swallowing Impulse into a strong inclination to swallow. Then swallow what has collected and has excited the impulse, and continue to chew _at_ the remainder, liquid though it be, until the last morsel disappears in response to the Swallowing Impulse. Never forcibly swallow anything that the instincts connected with the mouth show any disposition to reject. It is safer to get rid of it beforehand than to risk putting it into the stomach.

Sip and taste milk and all liquids that have taste as the wine-tasters do. They never drink wine and yet they get all the enjoyment there is in it and waste none. In a very short time sipping and tasting liquids and masticating and tasting solid food for “all they are worth” will become an agreeable and profitable fixed habit.

WHETHER WE “EAT TO LIVE OR LIVE TO EAT,” WHY NOT DO AS ABOVE?

Z

The True Chemical End-Point of Digestion

THE DIGESTION-ASH WHAT IT SHOULD BE LIKE WHEN IT IS NORMAL

First

In adults; or, in children after the eruption of teeth and the ingestion of solid food: The non-liquid and non-gaseous waste of the human body, which, in its normal state, is not offensive, should be very small, in quantity, should be pillular in form, either separate or massed together; should have no odour when released, should take on no odour on standing, should be entirely aseptic (non-poisonous); should drop freely from the exit, leaving nothing behind to wash or wipe away. It _may_ not be collected in the intestines of full-grown and elderly persons, when normal, as above, in sufficient quantity to require or necessitate emptying oftener than from twice a week to once in two weeks; according to age, activity, etc.; and should neither invite nor justify the description “it is not that which goeth into a man that defileth him but that which cometh out.”

Second

Economic Digestion-Ash (solid _excreta_), as a daily average for an adult of 140 lbs. (10 stone; 63.5 kilos), including moisture, when released, should not weigh more than two ounces (56.70 grams). An average of less than one half this amount of waste has been secured in test experiments.

Third

The true test of healthy Z is absence of odour and completeness, ease and cleanliness of delivery. Frequency or otherwise, does not so much matter. Quantity too, is not so important; but with foul odour there is disturbance, strain and danger.

The normal man is a cleanly being with all excreta inoffensive; and by these tokens he may be his own private judge.

Why is it that barn-yards are tolerable to the human senses while open _dépôts_ of human excreta are fever-breeding nuisances and intolerable to beasts and humans alike?

This curse of putrid excreta caused more deaths from enteric fever during the Boer War in South Africa than all other causes. It is equally a menace to health and even to life while being formed and carried in the body.

Fourth

Offensive excreta are quite certain evidence of neglect of the self-controllable parts of our own nutrition. They are the tell-tale condemnation of ignorance or carelessness. Each person should learn to read the true bulletins of his health conditions in his waste-products of digestion.

Z

is the form the body _must_ assume to render emptying of the digestion-ash natural and easy. Man was built to squat on his heels in defecating, and sitting erect on a modern seat is like trying to force a semi-solid through a kinked hose. HEALTHY HUMAN EXCRETA ARE NO MORE OFFENSIVE THAN MOIST CLAY AND HAVE NO MORE ODOUR THAN A HOT BISCUIT.

A. B.-Z. FIGURE

TO ILLUSTRATE THE “DIVISION OF LABOUR”

First. A

Psychic Environment } This Mental State } involves:

APPETITE (to select for) } ATTENTION (to prepare for) } DIGESTION APPRECIATION (to assist in) }

(Absolutely necessary to secure secretion and flow of the digestive juices: Vide Pawlow and Cannon.)

Second. B

BUCCAL-DIGESTION } This MOUTH-TREATMENT } involves:

MECHANICAL (teeth) } THOROUGHNESS CHEMICAL (salival) }

(Absolutely necessary to secure complete digestion and avoid the putridity incident to bacterial decomposition: Vide Campbell and Van Someren.)

INTERMEDIATE

The twenty-three letters between “=B=” and “=Z=” represent but an inadequate proportion for the spelling of the enormous share Nature assumes in our welfare, marvellously performing her forty-seven forty-eighths share in the secret laboratory of the alimentary canal.

Third. Z

The true chemical end-point of digestion, by which each self-respecter may know how well he has respected his “A” and his “B,” and how faithfully he has performed his one forty-eighth share in the promotion of his own most fundamental interest.

PREFACE TO 1906 EDITIONS

Since the former introductions were written much success has been attained in further advancing the reforms advocated in the _A. B. C. Life Series_. Professor Chittenden has published his report on the Yale experiments in book form in both America[4] and England,[5] and his results have been accepted in scientific circles the world over as authoritatively conclusive.

At the present writing the most important Health Boards of Europe[6] are planning to put the new standards of dietary economy into practical use among public charges in a manner that can only result in benefit to the wards of the nations as well as make an important saving to the tax-payers. In the most important of these foreign public health departments the Health Officer of the Board has himself practised the newly established economy for two years, and his plans are formulated on personal experience which fully confirms Professor Chittenden’s report and that of the author as herein related.

At a missionary agricultural college, situated near Nashville, Tenn., where the students earn their tuition and their board while pursuing their studies, a six months' test of what is termed “Fletcherism” resulted in a saving of about one half of the drafts on the commissary, immunity from illness, increased energy, strength and endurance, and general adoption of the suggestions published in the several books of the author included in the _A. B. C. Life Series_.

In the various departments and branches of the Battle Creek Sanitarium in America, and widely scattered over the world, some eight hundred employees and thousands of patients have been accumulating evidence of the efficacy of “Fletcherism” for more than three years, and scarce a month passes without a letter from Dr. Kellogg to the author containing new testimony confirming the _A. B. C._ selections and suggestions.

The author has received within the past two years more than a thousand letters bearing the approval of the writers with report of benefits received which seem almost miraculous, and these include the leaders in many branches of human occupation--physiologists, surgeons, medical practitioners, artists, business men, literary workers, athletes, working men and women, and almost every degree of mental and physical activity.

One of the medical advisers of King Edward, of whom the King once said: “He is a splendid doctor but a poor courtier,” follows the suggestions of these books in prescribing to his sumptuous clients.

HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT

AND

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

SUMMARY OF THE FOREGOING PAGES BY AN EXPERIMENTER OF ONE MONTH’S EXPERIENCE

(_Requested and given as a test of effectiveness_)

The entire principle of economic nutrition is simple and practical. It does not prescribe that we shall follow any special diet nor do away with any of our meals. It simply requires you to throw present habits and conventions to the winds, and for a little time try the experiment of giving the matter of your every-day living honest, intelligent thought.

Eat all you crave, but do not eat more than this simply because you have been in the habit of doing so. See to it that each morsel put into your mouth is thoroughly masticated and mixed with the saliva before going down into the stomach, which is not equipped to perform the work which the teeth and salivary glands were given you for. The stomach will struggle bravely to overcome the abuse which you heap upon it, but in spite of all it can do to manage hastily chewed food, undigested portions remain which clog the intestines and interfere with the healthy conditions which Nature intended.

The appetite is given as an indicator of what the body requires. If you crave potato, the system needs starch, which the saliva makes digestible, but which the acids of the stomach cannot dissolve. Other needs of the system are similarly indicated. Take the trouble of asking your appetite the question, instead of accepting the conventional number of courses simply because they are set before you. The appetite will close the valve when you have eaten enough, if you will give it a chance.

Suppose your time for eating is limited; in twenty minutes you could not eat slowly the luncheon which you usually select. Then eat that much less. The amount of food which you can eat and thoroughly masticate in twenty minutes will give you more nourishment and will sustain you better than twice the amount thrown into the stomach in the same manner in which a man usually packs a trunk.

Why is it that so many men require a “bracer” at eleven o’clock? Because they have loaded their stomachs with a heavy breakfast, and instead of gaining nourishment from it, the smothered organ is doing its best to tear the undigested morsels to pieces, that they may pass into the intestines and prevent sickness, or even death. The time finally arrives when it finds itself unable to do this, and then comes acute indigestion, or something worse, and the system becomes run down, ready to receive typhoid, or any other germs which happen to come along.

Do you know why griddle-cakes hurt you? Because the syrup, which is cane-sugar,--and as such is indigestible,--is allowed to pass through the mouth and down into the stomach, without being properly mixed with the saliva, which makes it digestible. As soon as it enters the stomach it becomes acid and interferes with everything it meets. Had the cakes been properly masticated and mixed with the saliva, the cane-sugar would have become grape-sugar, and in this form it is easily digested.

Why is it that stout people are advised to avoid starchy foods? Economic nutrition does not advise this. Potatoes, eaten too hastily, when not craved by the appetite, supply the system with a superabundance of starch, and this is fat-inducing. Potatoes are supposed to produce fat; but if your appetite craves potato, and you properly masticate it, eating only as much of it as satisfies your appetite, the system absorbs it all, leaving nothing to produce fat. On this same principle economic nutrition assures that the same food, taken in accordance with its requirements, will add to one man’s weight and decrease another’s, simply because proper care of the stomach supplies the vital organs with the necessary materials to form each individual person after the model which Nature intended for him. If Nature intended him to be slight, economic nutrition will not make him heavy; if Nature intended him to be

muscularly strong and heavy, economic nutrition will not reduce his weight. In each case he will enjoy that perfect condition which Nature intended him to possess without fat encumbrance.

Did you ever try to reason out why it is necessary for athletes to go into training? Simply because, in order to get the best use of their strength, they are obliged to spend some number of weeks or months in overcoming false conditions which they have brought upon themselves. Any person who lives in accordance with the simple requirements of economic nutrition has nothing of this kind to overcome, but is in perfect condition all the time.

The requirements of economic nutrition are not hardships but pleasures. Proper mastication and insalivation (mixing with saliva), give your sense of taste far greater gastronomic enjoyment than you have ever before had. If you are a wine drinker, try insalivating a little port wine; but it must be good wine, for this is a severe test. A sip will quench your immediate desire and give you more pleasure than a whole glass gulped down. The professional tea-taster does this in tasting tea; he never allows himself to drink any tea at all, for drinking anything that has taste destroys the delicacy of the sense of taste. But he will tell you that he gets more real enjoyment out of the little he takes than he previously gained from drinking a larger amount. The same thing applies to the professional wine-tasters; they never drink any wine, and yet they enjoy the taste of wine as drinkers never can do. These men adopt this method as a business; is their commercial advantage of greater importance than your health and happiness, and even life itself?

Is it not ridiculous that the average man is so ignorant of the engine which supplies him with all his activity and upon which depends every action of his life? Could you tell, were you asked, the particular need and purpose of your last meal and what it is likely to accomplish? Consider your body as an engine: would you accept yourself as a competent engineer on your own examination and confession? Would you employ a chauffeur to run your automobile who knew as little about its mechanism and requirements as you do about your own stomach? Yet which is of greater importance? Were you the owner of valuable live-stock, would you dare entrust their care to a farm-hand or stableman who knew as little about their proper feeding as you know about your own proper feeding or that of your children?

Have you ever stopped to think why the excrements are foul and odorous? Simply because undigested food, which should have been so masticated as to give the body nourishment, is thrown off by the stomach into the intestines, there to decay and produce this unclean condition. If the dead carcass of a cow is lying in the road, it is removed before it has an opportunity to decay and thus become filthy and dangerous. Yet how much more safe it would be for the carcass to lie where it was than for you to take portions of it into your intestines and allow it to decay there instead of in the road? In other words, food is intended to be eaten that nourishment may be gained from it, and when you only gain a part of the nourishment, you prostitute your stomach and take tremendous risks of germ diseases in your body.

These facts are set forward thus simply in the hope that they may impress the reader as they have impressed the writer. Economic nutrition is not a joke, is not a fad; it is solely an appeal to self-examination and self-instruction in the most vital question of all the world, since upon perfect nutrition depends not only health, but strength, mental acuteness, moral tendencies, attractability to others, happiness, and, in fact, life itself.

FIRST SCIENTIFIC RECOGNITION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMIC NUTRITION OUTLINED IN “GLUTTON OR EPICURE”

[With the exception of a brief review of _Glutton or Epicure_, by Dr. Joseph Blumfield, of London, published in _The Lancet_, no scientific or professional recognition of the principles of an economic nutrition attained by means of thorough buccal digestion was gained until issue of the following paper by Dr. Ernest Van Someren, of Venice, Italy.

The previous autumn and winter had been devoted to experiments by Dr. Van Someren and the writer, in co-operation with Dr. Professor Leonardi, for twelve years Professor of Chemistry in the University of Pavia, Italy. In the spring and summer of 1901 the field of experiments was changed to Mendel Pass, _bei_ Bozen, Süd Tirol, Austria, and related to endurance work in climbing mountains and bicycle runs among the Dolomites.

Dr. Van Someren’s paper attracted the attention of Sir Michael Foster, Professor of Physiology at the University of Cambridge, England, and Permanent Honorary President of the International Congress of Physiologists.

Professor Foster entered into correspondence with Dr. Van Someren, and this was followed by an invitation to Dr. Van Someren and the writer to attend the Congress which was to convene in Turin, Italy, during the month of September following. At the Congress Dr. Van Someren presented a technical thesis on the probable causes of the economy attained, and gave a demonstration of the movement of his Swallowing Reflex in relation to food in the process of liquefaction and preliminary digestion in the mouth.

Following the Congress we received an invitation to visit Cambridge, England, and submit to tests of nitrogenous measurements in the Physiological Laboratory of the University, under the direction of Dr. F. Gowland Hopkins; and also to an examination of the bacterial flora incident to the nitrogenous estimations, under the direction of Dr. George H. F. Nuttall.

The report of the experiments in the Chemical-Physiological Department is given in the “NOTE” of Sir Michael Foster, which follows Dr. Van Someren’s paper, but the bacterial examination was not carried far enough to warrant a scientific report, owing to difficulty of obtaining, at the time, sufficient data.—HORACE FLETCHER.]

WAS LUIGI CORNARO RIGHT?

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE PHYSIOLOGICAL SECTION OF THE BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, AUGUST, 1901, BY ERNEST VAN SOMEREN

Mr. President and Gentlemen:

Being a general practitioner, it is with some trepidation and an apology that I present myself before this section. The reasons for my doing so are: First, that I believe that a hitherto unsuspected reflex in deglutition has come to light which has an important bearing on health, the prevention of disease and on metabolism. Second, that any theory whatever, based on a possible physiological function, claiming to diminish, as this does, the amount of sickness and suffering now existent, should have serious investigation. Third, that I desire to enlist your skilled help in the consideration of the theories I have doubtless crudely erected on my premise.

According to the “Encyclopædia Britannica,” “Luigi Cornaro (1467-1566) was a Venetian nobleman, famous for his treatises on a temperate life. From some dishonesty on the part of his relatives, he was deprived of his rank and induced to retire to Padua, where he acquired the experience in regard to food and regimen which he has detailed in his work. In his youth he lived freely, but after a severe illness at the age of forty, he began under medical advice gradually to reduce his diet. For some time he restricted himself to a daily allowance of 12 ozs. of solid food and 14 ozs. of wine. Later in life he still farther reduced his bill of fare, and he found that he could support his life and strength with no more solid meat than an egg a day. So much habituated did he become to this simple diet that when he was about seventy years of age the addition, by way of experiment, of 2 ozs. a day had nearly proved fatal. At the age of eighty-three he wrote his treatise on the ‘Sure and Certain Method of Attaining a Long and Healthful Life.’ And this work was followed by three others on the same subject, composed at the ages of eighty-six, ninety-one, and ninety-five, respectively. ‘They are written,’ says Addison (‘Spectator,’ No. 195), ‘with such a spirit of cheerfulness, religion, and good sense, as are the natural concomitants of temperance and sobriety.’ He died at the age of ninety-eight. Some say of 103!

Now, was Luigi Cornaro right? Did he make use of a physiological process unknown to us of the value of which he was not cognisant? To live to an advanced age, must we be as temperate as he, reducing the quantity of our food to a minimum required by Nature?

That we all eat more than we can assimilate is unquestionable. How can we determine the right quantity? Instinct _should_ guide us, but an abnormal appetite often leads us astray. Nature’s plans are perfect if her laws are obeyed. Disease follows disobedience. Wherein do we disobey?

We live _not_ upon what we eat, but upon what we digest; then why should undigested food, recognisable as such, be deemed a normal constituent of our solid egesta?

Something like the following must be a common experience to general practitioners, especially to those practising on the Continent. The patient comes to see us and volunteers the information that he or she has the “gout,” “rheumatic gout,” or “dyspepsia.” Symptoms are asked for. The case is gone into carefully for causation. An appropriate diet and an appropriate bottle of medicine prescribed. As the patient leaves the room, we may, or may not, call attention to the fact that both teeth and saliva are meant to be used. The patient returns, better, _in statu quo_, or worse. If better, he remains so while under treatment, and relapses when he returns to ordinary habits. If unaffected, or worse, we try again and again, until we despair, then take or send him to a consultant.

Temporary benefit, possibly owing to renewed hope, results; but finally the unfortunate gets used to his sufferings and, if he can afford it, is sent to join the innumerable hosts that wander from one _Bad_ to another, all Europe over, trying, praising, and damning each in turn. Their manner of living is, of course, at fault. Nature never intended that man should be perpetually on a special diet and hugging a bottle of medicine, nor did she ordain that he should go wandering over the map of Europe drinking purgative and other waters.

Though early yet to speak with certain voice, it would seem that we are provided with a Guard, reliance on which protects us from the results of mal-nutrition. There seems to be placed in the fauces and the back of the mouth a Monitor to warn us what we ought to swallow and when we ought to swallow it. The good offices of this Monitor we have suppressed by habits of too rapid eating, acquired in infancy or youth.

Last November my attention was called by Mr. Horace Fletcher, an American author living in Venice, to the discovery in himself of a curious inability to swallow, and a closing of the throat against food, unless it had been completely masticated. My informant stated that he noticed this peculiarity after he had begun to excessively insalivate his food, both liquid and solid, until all its original taste had been removed from it. Any tasteless residue in the mouth, being refused by the fauces, required a _forced_ muscular effort to swallow. He further told me that since adopting this method of eating he had been cured of two maladies, adjudged chronic, the suffering from which rendered him ineligible for Life Insurance. His weight now became reduced from 205 lbs. to 165 lbs. He had practised no abstemiousness, had indulged his appetite, both as to selection and to quantity, without restraint, and for the last three years had enjoyed perfect health.

After his cure, he was accepted without difficulty for insurance, the last examination finding him an unusually healthy subject for his age. Having leisure, he had spent three years in investigating the cause of his cure, had pursued experiments upon others, and had extended his inquiries, both in America and Europe, until our meeting in Venice. He had also published a statement and inquiry in book form, entitled “Glutton or Epicure,” which had been reviewed by the “Lancet.”

For nearly a year I also had been experimenting on myself and others with various diets, and was ready to believe that in the _manner_ of taking food and not altogether in its varying _matter_ lay perhaps its protean effects on our system. I at once adopted the same method of eating. At the end of six weeks, I noticed that not only did the fauces refuse to allow of the passage of imperfectly prepared food, but that such food was returned from the back to the front of the mouth by an involuntary, though eventually controllable, muscular effort taking place in the reverse direction to that occurring at the inception of deglutition.

What actually happens is this: Food, as it is masticated, slowly passes to the back of the mouth, and collects in the glosso-epiglottidean folds, where it remains in contact with the mucous membrane containing the sensory end-organs of taste. If it be properly reduced by the saliva it is allowed to pass the fauces,--a truly involuntary act of deglutition occurring. Let the food, however, be too rapidly passed back to these folds, _i.e._, before complete reduction takes place, and the reflex muscular movement above referred to occurs. The process of this reflex is as follows: The tip of the tongue is involuntarily fixed at the backs and bases of the lower central incisor teeth by the anterior fibres of the geniohyoglossi muscles. With this fixed point as fulcrum, the lower and middle fibres of these muscles, aided by those of the stylohyoid and styloglossi muscles raise the hyoid bone, straighten out the glosso-epiglottidean folds, passing their contents forward, by the fauces, the opening of which is closed by approximation of its pillars and contraction of the superior constrictor. The tongue, arched postero-anteriorly by the geniohyoglossi, palato, and styloglossi muscles, laterally, by its own intrinsic muscles, is approximated to the fauces, soft and hard palates in turn, and thus, the late contents of the glosso-epiglottidean folds are returned to the front of the mouth for further reduction by the saliva preparatory to deglutition.

The word reduction is used for the reason that all foods tested, without exception, give an acid reaction to litmus, when served at table. The reflex muscular movement occurs in the writer’s case from five to ten times during the mastication of each mouthful of food, according to its quantity and its degree of sapidity. As often as it recurs, the returned food continues to give an acid reaction, while food allowed to pass the fauces is alkaline.

Saliva, flowing in response to the stimulation of taste, seems more alkaline than that secreted in answer to mechanical tasteless stimulation. It is found that the removal of original taste from any given bolus of food coincides with cessation of salivary flow and complete alkaline reduction. The fibre of meat, gristle, connective tissue, the husk of coarse bread and cellulose of vegetables are carefully separated by the tongue and buccal muscles and rejected by the fauces. To swallow any of these necessitates a _forced_ muscular effort, which is abnormal.

Adult man was not originally intended to take his nourishment in a liquid form, consequently all liquids having taste, such as soup, milk, tea, coffee, cocoa, and the various forms of alcohol, must be treated as sapid solids and insalivated by holding them in the mouth, moving the tongue gently, with straight up and down masticatory movements, until their taste be removed. Water, not having taste, needs no insalivation and is readily accepted by the fauces.

In explanation of the phenomenon described, the following theory is advanced: The fauces, back of the tongue, epiglottis, in short, those mucous surfaces in which are placed the sensory end-organs of taste and “taste-buds” (the distribution of which, by the way, has yet to be explained), that these surfaces, readily becoming accustomed to an alkaline contact by excessive insalivation and consequent complete alkaline reduction of the food, afterwards resent an acid contact and express their resentment by throwing off the cause of offence by the muscles underlying them.

This phenomenon must not be confused with the cases of rumination and regurgitation, which from time to time are recorded. The food in this case is not swallowed, nor does it pass any point from which it can be regurgitated. Eighty-one individuals of different nationalities and from several classes of society whom we have studied are now in conscious possession of their reflexes. These seem readily educated back to normal functions by all who seriously and patiently adopt the habit of what seems only at first to be excessive insalivation.

The dictum “bite your food well” that we so often use, has no meaning to those suffering from the results of mal-assimilation and mal-nutrition, especially should they have few or no teeth of their own. I make so bold as to state that dyspepsia _et morbi hujus generis omnis_ will cease to exist if patients be persuaded to bite their food until its original taste disappears, and it is carried away by involuntary deglutition.

The important point of the whole question seems to be this alkaline reduction of acid food before it passes on to meet subsequent digestive processes elsewhere, which then become alternately acid and alkaline.

In the first few months of infant life, when saliva is not secreted, Nature ordains that mammary secretion be alkaline. With the eruption of teeth come an abundant flow of saliva and a synchronous infantile capacity for managing other foods. This flow of saliva depends on a thorough demand and use to maintain its generous supply. It is just at this time that children learn to bolt their food,--the demand fails, with a consequent detriment to the salivary glands, digestive processes, and the system generally.

A, B, C, and D were placed on an absolute milk diet. A drank his milk in the ordinary way, and at the end of three days begged to discontinue the experiment owing to disgust at the monotony of the diet. B, C, and D continued the experiment for seventeen days, insalivating the milk, but to a varying extent, B the least and D the most. Though D took most milk, he excreted least solid egesta, C excreting less than B. Can one infer that increased insalivation of a non-starchy food insured its better digestion and assimilation? Each subject took as much milk only as his appetite demanded, D taking the most, which never exceeded two litres daily. The weights of the subjects after the usual sudden drop of the first three days remained remarkably even until the end of the experiment. B, C, and D all relished the diet, and it satisfied the requirements of their appetites, but they experienced an increasing monotony.

As long ago as the seventeenth century, before the transformation of matter into energy by the animal organism, known as Metabolism, was understood, the fact was recognised that by the lungs, kidneys, skin, and intestines, substances no longer useful to the organism were eliminated, the retention of which proved harmful. The nature of these substances was unknown, but it was noted that however much the food was increased the weight of the body remained the same. In other words, a state of complete nutritive equilibrium was maintained.

The following table contains the _résumé_ of two experiments in which a state of complete nutritive equilibrium was maintained by individuals of about the same weight, on widely different quantities of food similar in quality. The subjects of the experiments were a laboratory assistant of Dr. Snyder, of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, and the writer. The experiment of the former was made primarily to show the relative digestibility of the several articles of diet, potatoes, eggs, milk, and cream:

■■■

411.08 grammes ■ 124.7 grammes Milk (daily average) ■ 710 c.c. ■ 710 c.c. Cream (daily average) ■ 237 c.c. ■ 237 c.c. Daily urine ■ 1108 grammes ■ 1098 grammes Daily fæces ■ 204 grammes ■ 18.9 grammes ——————————————

What has just been stated is based not entirely on experimental evidence but somewhat upon inference. The inference seems justified because the excreta, more especially of the intestines, but also of the kidneys and skin, become almost odourless and entirely inoffensive. The solid egesta are voided thickly covered with mucus, leaving the end of the bowel dry and clean. The sense of cleanliness can only then be appreciated to the full, for it is internal as well external. _Flatus_ is no longer produced. The urine is inoffensive and seems to be materially changed in quality, as shown by chemical analysis. Uric acid, the chlorides, and, more markedly, aromatic sulphates are reduced in quantity.

Owing to deliberation in eating, necessitated by this new habit, satiety occurs on the ingestion of considerably less food. By carefully studying one's self I believe it possible to cultivate an instinct which will regulate not only the quantity but the quality of food that the body may need, and that in the _normal health_ of a full-grown body, no more food either in quantity or quality should be supplied than suffices to supply diurnal waste. Any excess must result in pathological processes.

Although there results enhanced pleasure in the taking of all foods, rich and simple, and especially in the appreciation of good wines, the quantities of these foods and beverages that suffice to fully satisfy the appetite are much smaller than before, while there is a marked preference for the simpler kinds of food. The writer now can imagine no more pleasurable meal than one consisting of good brown bread, eggs, butter, cheese, and cream. These, with fresh vegetables and a very little fruit, form his staple diet. This tendency and preference for simple foods is the general experience among those who have recovered their reflexes of deglutition.

Following on the ingestion of a lessened quantity of food and on its better assimilation, there is less waste, the egesta are voided less frequently, sometimes only once in five to eight days.

The lower bowel is not the reservoir it formerly was. So hæmorrhoids cease from troubling and constipation cannot exist. For this same reason the body, at the beginning of the practice, commences to approximate to its normal weight, increasing or decreasing as the individual's environment demands.

A few more words only need be said. It has been easy to state the results of experiments and observations: but the acquiring of this new reflex, while pursuing daily occupations, is not easy, and needs more than a little patience and much serious thought. The habits of a lifetime cannot be changed in a few days or weeks. The shortest time in which the reflex has been re-established is four weeks, and this only by avoiding conversation at meal-time and concentrating the attention on keeping the food in the mouth until complete alkaline reduction has taken place and sapidity has disappeared.

In closing I wish to maintain as a fact, gentlemen, of the truth of which you will only be convinced by actual experience, that by the restoration of this reflex and in complete dependence on its use, there lies true health, the establishment of a condition of stable nutrition and the possible abrogation of two great predisposing factors of disease, mal-assimilation and mal-nutrition. Unless there be among you, as in the "Cities of the Plain," a parlous minority who possess this reflex and take your food as you ought, none of you are in the enjoyment of such health as you might have. A like punishment will be meted out to you as was visited on those cities, for you will all be consumed long before your day by the unnecessary combustion in your bodies caused by the circulation in them of toxins, the product of undigested and decomposing food.

The writer, bearing in mind the warning suggested by the Frenchman whose donkey died as soon as he had reduced his food to a single wisp of straw, finds that he is taking less and less food. While his mind is open as to his arriving at the final diet of Luigi Cornaro, yet it is easily conceivable that living a similar life of retirement in a placid environment, it would be quite possible to do as he did. Hence the title of this paper and the queries at the commencement.

The objects in publishing and distributing this paper are twofold: to make the subject as widely known as possible, and to solicit the aid of colleagues in investigating it more fully.

There is ready at the service of the general practitioner an important and potential therapeutic agent in the saliva of his patients and in the use _ad finem_ of their salivary digestions.

By any chance should readers of this paper wish to ask any questions, the writer will be happy to communicate with them.

183, CALLE DEL CAPELLO NERO, Piazza San Marco, Venice, Italy.

Editor's notes. (1) Confirmatory evidence of the correctness of the deductions made in this paper has begun to come in from many professional sources and notably from a famous child specialist who avers that children would follow the natural requirements in eating were it not for artificial food, bad example, and bad teaching.

(2) In a report of a paper read before the _Société de Biologie_, Paris, France, March 15th, 1902, by M. Max Marckwald, of Kreuznach, “ON DIGESTION OF MILK IN THE STOMACH OF FULL-GROWN DOGS,” the following appears: “Hence these experiments confirm those of Horace Fletcher and Ernest H. Van Someren on the importance of prolonged mastication” (_translation_). Referring, as the latter statement does, to mastication (insalivation) of liquid, it gives an important suggestion relative to some probable causes of uncertain or defective digestion in human nutrition.

THE CAMBRIDGE TESTS

[In connection with a report of the Cambridge Examination the writer wishes to acknowledge the interest and assistance of Dr. Francis Gowland Hopkins, head of the Physiological-Chemical Department of the Physiological Laboratory of the University; Dr. George H. F. Nuttall, in charge of the Bacteriological Section of the Pathological Laboratory; Mr. Sidney W. Cole, Mr. Robert Barrett, and Dr. Hubert Higgins, both for practical work in the laboratory and in serving as test-subjects. To Dr. Higgins so much is due that it is difficult to measure. Since our first meeting in Cambridge, Dr. Higgins has been unremitting in his study of the subject and in consideration of its application to human betterment. Having the altruistic temperament inborn and not yet smothered by disappointment, the good doctor has consecrated himself to the service of poorer humanity, and his inspiration in so good a cause is wonderful motive power behind the native desire to do good. The statement of Dr. Higgins' experiences in pursuit of an Economic Nutrition is given in his own manner in the new edition of _Glutton or Epicure_, which is being published coincidently with this volume in the A. B. C. Life Series.

At the time we were in Cambridge, Dr. Hopkins and Mr. Cole had just published their paper in the _Journal of Physiology_ (English), describing their isolation of the tryptophane element of the proteid molecule which had eluded chemists from the beginning. In tryptophane they found embodied the odourous indol and skatol which appear so offensively in the putrid decomposition of proteid. In the excreta of the test-subjects in our Economic-Nutrition-Inquiry these malodorous substances did not appear, and hence another question is opened up to investigation relative to the putridity of human excrement under ordinary conditions of carelessness, and the absence of putridity in the case of nutrition accomplished by aid of thorough buccal treatment of food preparatory to digestion.

It is a matter of interest, relative to the patience required in science, to state that Dr. Hopkins and Mr. Cole were fourteen months searching for the fugitive tryptophane element after they received their first clew to its whereabouts. When isolated, tryptophane masses in a substance having the appearance of silver, but not the solidity of that metal.—HORACE FLETCHER.]

EXPERIMENTS UPON HUMAN NUTRITION

NOTE BY SIR MICHAEL FOSTER, K.C.B., M.P., F.R.S.

In 1901 Dr. Ernest Van Someren submitted to the British Medical Association, and afterwards to the Congress of Physiologists at Turin, an account of some experiments initiated by Mr. Horace Fletcher. These experiments went to show that the processes of bodily nutrition are very profoundly affected by the preliminary treatment of the food-stuffs in the mouth, and indicated that great advantages follow from the adoption of certain methods in eating. The essentials of these special methods, stated briefly and without regard to certain important theoretical considerations discussed by Dr. Van Someren, consist of a specially prolonged mastication which is necessarily associated with an insalivation of the food-stuffs much more thorough than is obtained with ordinary habits.

The results brought to light by the preliminary experimental trials went to show that such treatment of the food has a most important effect upon the economy of the body, involving, in the first place, a very notable reduction in the amount of food--and especially of proteid food--necessary to maintain complete efficiency.

In the second place this treatment produced, in the experience of its originators, an increase in the subjective and objective well-being of those who practise it, and, as they believe, in their power of resistance to the inroads of disease. These secondary effects may indeed be almost assumed as a corollary of the first mentioned; because there can be little doubt that the ingestion of food--and perhaps especially of proteid food--in excess of what is, under the best conditions, sufficient for maintenance and activity, can only be deleterious to the organism, clogging it with waste products which may at times be of a directly toxic nature.

In the autumn of 1901 Mr. Fletcher and Dr. Van Someren came to Cambridge with the intention of having the matter more closely inquired into, with the assistance of physiological experts. The matter evoked considerable interest in Cambridge, and observations were made not only upon those more immediately interested, but upon other individuals, some of whom were themselves medical men and trained observers.

Certain facts were established by these observations, which, however, are to be looked upon as still of a preliminary nature. The adoption of the habit of thorough insalivation of the food was found in a consensus of opinion to have an immediate and very striking effect upon appetite, making this more discriminating, and leading to the choice of a simple dietary, and in particular reducing the craving for flesh food. The appetite, too, is beyond all question fully satisfied with a dietary considerably less in amount than with ordinary habits is demanded.

Numerical data were obtained in several cases, but it is not proposed to deal with these in detail here, as they need the supplementary study which will be shortly referred to.

In two individuals who pushed the method to its limits it was found that complete bodily efficiency was maintained for some weeks upon a dietary which had a total energy value of less than one-half of that usually taken, and comprised little more than one-third of the proteid consumed by the average man.

It may be doubted if continued efficiency could be maintained with such low values as these, and very prolonged observations would be necessary to establish the facts. But all subjects of the experiments who applied the principles intelligently agreed in finding a very marked reduction in their needs, and experienced an increase in their sense of well-being and an increase in their working powers.

One fact, fully confirmed by the Cambridge observations, consists in the effect of the special habits described upon the waste products of the bowel. These are greatly reduced in amount, as might be expected; but they are also markedly changed in character, becoming odourless and inoffensive, and assuming a condition which suggests that the intestine is in a healthier and more aseptic condition than is the case under ordinary circumstances.

Although the experiments hitherto made are, as already stated, only preliminary in nature and limited in scope, they establish beyond all question that a full and careful study of the matter is urgently called for.

For this fuller study the Cambridge laboratories do not possess at present either the necessary equipment or the funds to provide it. For the detailed study of the physical efficiency of a man under varying conditions, elaborate and expensive apparatus is required; and the advantages claimed for the special treatment of the food just discussed can only be fully tested by prolonged and laborious experiments calling for a considerable staff of workers.

It is of great importance that the mind of the lay public should be disabused of the idea that medical science is possessed of final information concerning questions of nutrition. This is very far indeed from being the case. Human nutrition involves highly complex factors, and the scientific basis for our knowledge of the subject is but small; where questions of diet are concerned, medical teaching, no less than popular practice, is to a great extent based upon empiricism.

But the scientific and social importance of the question is clearly immense, and it is greatly to be desired that its study should be encouraged.

M. FOSTER.

April 26th, 1902.

REPORT OF A PLAN FOR THE INSTITUTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL INQUIRY INTO THE SUBJECT OF HUMAN NUTRITION

[Sir Michael Foster's "Note" (preceding) and Professor Chittenden's article in the _Popular Science Monthly_ (following), which form a part of this book, show a common want of exact knowledge relative to human nutrition not at all creditable to human intelligence at the beginning of the twentieth century; but they both offer hope of relief from this discreditable stigma in systematic study of the question. For this purpose an international inquiry was proposed, a plan was drawn up under advice of Sir Michael Foster, and the matter was given to the writer to promote by the best means available.

The Carnegie Institution seemed, at the time, the most likely supporter of such a scheme; but owing to an embarrassment of applications for support of American science needs, it was considered best not to attempt any foreign or even international benefaction, for the present at least, and hence other means of furthering the inquiry were sought.

The invitation of Professor Chittenden to repeat the demonstration of food-economy made by the author and Dr. Van Someren at Cambridge, England, of which Sir Michael Foster's "Note" treats, at the laboratories of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University, led to the discovery that New Haven already possessed an equipment suitable for the inquiry much more complete than the plan Professor Foster had outlined as being desirable.

At Yale were found not only a very well-adapted chemico-physiological laboratory with some of the most active and scientifically respected research talent of the world in charge, but the laboratory stood only three minutes away from one of the best furnished gymnasiums in the world, under a director who is an M. D. of twenty years' experience, as well as a famous athlete and author of an athletic manual. It so happened that this gymnasium was especially suited for assisting in a research into the very causes of human efficiency, or lack of it, which nutrition is supposed to affect.

Only forty minutes from New Haven by rail,--a distance not greater, as measured by time separation, than from one side of London to the other,--at Middletown, Conn., stood also the recently completed calorimeter of Professors Atwater and Benedict ready for making a calorimetric trial-balance measurement of metabolism attained and chemically estimated in the tests at New Haven.

After the Yale demonstration, of which Professor Chittenden's article, previously mentioned, treats, the author responded to an invitation from Professor Atwater and submitted himself to a 32-hour confinement in the calorimeter for confirmation of the results obtained at New Haven.

This experience in the calorimeter at Middletown was very significant and instructive. The author was the first test-subject used in the newly completed calorimeter. The oxygen-measuring attachment of Dr. Benedict that completed the apparatus and gave a complete trial balance of the metabolism of the subject under examination was as yet untried, but it proved its integrity within the fraction of one per cent and registered as accurately as necessary for all practical purposes. So much for the machine; but it measured a result which is of the greatest importance to the human race. The author had just demonstrated the possibility of running the human machine on half the heat, on one-third of the fuel, and with only one-tenth of the waste, as represented by the waste, or ashes of digestion. Not only was this done while in pursuit of the ordinary activity of present-day life, but under stress of 'Varsity-Crew exercise, as reported by Professor Chittenden and Dr. Anderson. Had this demonstration been made relative to steam engines or electrical motors, the information would have been revolutionary in establishing new values for things industrial and commercial.

Its significance relative to human profitable possibilities is even more important than if related to steam or electrical power. The possibility of economy in the human machine gives also a hope of immunity from the common diseases which now afflict mankind.

The trial of the calorimeter as a measuring machine and the trial balance of the economic metabolism which the author had attained by five years of careful attention to the natural requirements of nutrition were epoch-making events coincidently related, and for them the author here makes this distinguished claim--not on account of any accomplishment of himself, but as a promise of great possibilities for human betterment.

Here follows a reproduction of the plan just referred to, with _fac-simile_ of the signatures of the distinguished physiologists who approved the plan and consented to serve as "Assessors." To this list should have been added the name of Professor Ozawa, professor of physiology at the University of Tokio, Japan; but time and distance did not permit gaining the required understanding and assent. Professor Ozawa's connection with the inquiry would make it not only international but interhemispherical and interracial as well, and this possibility of scientific coördination and coöperation is typical of the harmonising wave that is fast enveloping the earth for the benefit of mankind.

I give a copy of the document entire, with estimates of cost, etc., just as it was originally drawn and intended only as a trial suggestion, to be modified by circumstances.—HORACE FLETCHER.]

PROPOSAL TO FOUND AN INTERNATIONAL LABORATORY OF RESEARCH FOR THE STUDY OF NUTRITION IN ALL ITS ASPECTS

Notwithstanding the enormous development which the study of Experimental Physiology has undergone during the last half-century, and the constant multiplication of physiological laboratories fitted in a manner which enables them to be used as places of research as well as of instruction in the methods of physiological inquiry, it has appeared to many physiologists that a great need remains to be supplied by the establishment of an International Laboratory of Research, devoted primarily, if not exclusively, to the investigation of problems connected with the Nutrition of the Animal, and particularly of Human Organisms,--studies particularly, and in the first instance, from the point of view of the relation of the food consumed by the animal body to its output of energy, either in the form of heat or mechanical work.

The reason for establishing such a laboratory, available for the use of investigations of all nations, is to be found in the fact that the researches which are now called for, in order to place upon a firm foundation our knowledge of food and its relations to the activity of the organism, necessitates an assemblage of apparatus and machinery so specialised and so costly that they are not to be found collected together even in the best equipped of the physiological laboratories of Europe or America, which all subserve in the first instance the purposes of systematic instruction. Undoubtedly, unquestionably, certain of the great and costly appliances of research are to be found in particular laboratories, as, for instance, in those of Berlin, Munich, Paris, and Turin, but there certainly exists no laboratory in which the investigator can find assembled under one roof all the specially fitted chemical, physical, and even bacteriological appliances which he may need to employ in the investigation of the Phenomena of Nutrition.

A more precise conception of the nature of the proposed laboratory may be formed if reference is made to certain groups of appliances which such a laboratory should possess and be able to place at the disposal of the scientific men coming to it for facilities which may be denied them at home. It should possess a complete set of respiration chambers of various types, and especially should be provided with the “Atwater Respiration Apparatus;” the most perfect appliances for the analyses of gases should be available; it should be provided with the most perfect calorimeters of various types, both for the investigation of the calorimetric value of the foods experimented on, and for the determination of the heat produced by man or by the lower animals,--the subjects of observation. The laboratory should possess, besides, the most perfect appliances for the measurement of work done by man and by animals (“ergostat,” “ergograph”), and a set of balances of the highest perfection capable of weighing with accuracy very heavy loads. These characteristic appliances of a laboratory specially designed for placing our knowledge of Animal Nutrition on a thoroughly sound basis must be superadded to the ordinary means for pursuing with success researches in Pure Organic, Physiological, and Physical Chemistry, as well as in Bacteriology.

OUTLINE OF THE PROPOSED SUBJECTS OF RESEARCH TO BE UNDERTAKEN IN THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL LABORATORY

1. To determine with greater precision than has yet been possible the efficiency of the animal organism considered as a machine in which potential energy of the organic constituents of food is converted into mechanical work. The knowledge that we already possess has shown that in the animal we have an engine infinitely more efficient as a utiliser of the potential energy supplied to it than any appliance yet constructed, or which we can, in the present state of physical science, construct. A still more precise study of the actual efficiency of the animal as a whole, as well as of certain of the vital organs which are mainly concerned in mechanical work, and a more thorough investigation of the processes whereby--for instance, in the muscles--the potential energy of stored-up chemical compounds is, as appears certain, directly converted into mechanical work, is not only desirable in the interest of the ultimate object of the work of the Laboratory, but possesses a high degree of theoretical interest, even from the point of view of Pure Physics. To sum up: One of the first objects of the investigations to be carried out in the projected Laboratory should be “the more precise determination of the minimum transformation of energy which corresponds to mean and accurately determined conditions of the animal body, and of that of man in particular.”

2. We are acquainted with the fact that the potential energy which is utilised by the animal is supplied to it with the least wear and tear to, or strain upon, its mechanism by non-nitrogenous organic constituents of food which must belong to the groups of starches and sugars or fats, but that the continued existence of the organism demands, as an essential condition, the introduction of a certain proportion of albuminous matter. In spite of numerous very fine investigations on this subject, the yet more precise determination of the minimum quantity of the albuminous constituents which are absolutely necessary or desirable, under the most varying conditions, is eminently desirable, especially in the light of recently recorded facts, amongst which are those to be referred to under 3 (following):—

3. Certain very noteworthy observations made by Messrs. Horace Fletcher and Ernest H. Van Someren have shown that an excessively prolonged mastication and insalivation of food leads to remarkable results in respect to the diminution of the total

quantity of food necessary to keep the body in a state of health, and to, as is alleged, a remarkable improvement in the digestive functions as well as of the general health of the individual. It appears highly important thoroughly to investigate the remarkable phenomena discovered by Messrs. Fletcher and Van Someren, and to determine how far they may lead to a modification of or improvement in the dietary of healthy individuals and of persons in a state of disease.

4. Indeed, it may truly be said that the average diet of man, that is to say, the absolute and relative amount of certain food-stuffs on which an average man should live, is at present, to a large extent, determined in an empirical manner. It is most necessary that this should be determined in an exact manner, since it is at least possible that a more complete knowledge may reveal that the good results thus obtained empirically are only reached by means of an excess of one element being counterbalanced by excess of another element, and thus open up a way to considerable economy. The changes needed for variations from the average, to meet certain conditions, are also at present, to a very large extent, determined empirically, and these also most certainly ought to be determined in an absolutely exact manner.

5. The researches of Pawlow on the conditions which influence the activity of the secreting glands of the organs of digestion, upon the relation of their activity to the nature of the food ingested, upon the influence exerted by the secretion of the glands situated in one part of the alimentary canal, upon the activity of glands situated lower down, indicate lines of research only recently opened out, but the importance of which in reference to the problems of nutrition is probably great.

6. Similarly, the facts which have in recent times been ascertained in reference to the remarkable influence exerted by the so-called “internal secretion” of certain ductless glands on the general metabolism, the part played by the pancreas in reference to the transformations of sugar in the body indicate yet other lines of research to be carried out in connection with the main inquiry.

In conclusion: The final problem of the work of the proposed Laboratory will be to ascertain the conditions which will “render it possible to obtain from the human machine, under varying conditions, the highest efficiency at the least cost.”

The value of results which may be thus obtained, considered from the point of view of social, political, and administrative economy, is hardly to be exaggerated.

SUGGESTIONS AS TO STAFF AND PERSONNEL OF THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL LABORATORY

For the coördination and general direction of the several investigations, the services of an eminent physiological chemist (preferably one having the principal European languages at his command) is essential.

Such a director would need at least two efficient permanent technical assistants, as for instance, one to deal with the problems of Organic Chemistry, and another competent to deal with the problems of Physical Chemistry. Other assistants might be necessary, but it would probably be desirable that the Institute should have the power of subsidising, for a longer or shorter period, men who would undertake special investigations in coördination with the general work, and who would thus be, as it were, temporary assistants. This would be quite apart from the general hospitality of the Laboratory offered by the Institute to other investigators.

ESTIMATES FOR THE PROPOSED LABORATORY

INITIAL OUTLAY

Director $5,000 $5,000 Permanent and Temporary Assistants 7,500 to 10,000 Other General Maintenance 5,000 to 7,500 ——————— ——————— — $17,500 $22,500

With regard to the second item, the permanent assistants would be required at the outset, but the temporary assistants would be taken on as opportunity offered. Less than even the lower estimate might suffice at first.

Regarding the third item, also, the maximum might not be required in the beginning.

SUGGESTIONS AS TO DESIRABILITY OF LOCATION

The place fitted for the establishment of an International Institute should be one which can be reached with comparative facility by investigators of the different nationalities. It must be one free from the objections due to national susceptibilities. It should also be, if possible, a place agreeable to live in; a place where work can be carried on through the year; and a place where expenses, both the personal expenses of the investigators, and the general expenses of the Institute, are not excessive. Venice has been

suggested as a place fulfilling the above requirements. It can be reached readily from all parts of Europe, and is as accessible to Americans as any other European city. Living is very cheap, and, indeed, all expenses are very moderate.

On sea level itself, Venice is within near distance of very high altitude, and hence offers facilities for the study of the effects of climatic influence on nutrition. It is also sufficiently near the Regina Margherita Laboratory, on Monte Rosa, to enable the observations made at the two places to be coördinated. Venice is, moreover, a cosmopolitan centre; and persons of many different nations and races might readily be obtained as subjects for observation and experiment.

On the other hand, it may be regarded as essential to the complete success of the proposed Institute that both the director and those engaged in investigation should have ample opportunities of ready and frequent intercourse with eminent men engaged in investigation in Physics, Chemistry, and the allied sciences. The help which is thus gained by intercourse with men at the very head of various scientific inquiry cannot be supplied in any other way. There is also an urgent reason for ready access to a most thoroughly equipped scientific library. It is also essential that the Institute should have facility of obtaining, or of getting constructed, with the least possible delay such apparatus as it might need. These essentials cannot be supplied otherwhere than in great centres of scientific activity. A small university cannot supply them. If they are insisted on, the Institute must be located in a place which has metropolitan distinction and holds not only a large but an active university. The choice of a situation, from this point of view, in Europe, is thus almost limited to such places as Paris, Berlin, Vienna, or London. Of these London probably best recommends itself for international purposes.

But, on the other hand, London is distinctly an expensive place to live in. Indeed, all expenses there are great, and the same may be said of any great metropolitan centre. Moreover, London cannot be reached from the countries of Europe without sea transit.

The choice between such a place as London and such a place as Venice must depend upon the relative weight attached, on the one hand, to the scientific advantages dwelt on above, and, on the other hand, to the advantages other than scientific.

SUGGESTIONS AS TO MANAGEMENT OF THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE

It is proposed that: First, there should be a small body of trustees who should undertake the financial responsibility; and, Second, a board of scientific assessors, representing several nations, who, in conjunction with the director, should exercise general supervision of the work of the Institute. Such a board need meet only at rare intervals, much being done by way of correspondence. The expenses which the members incur in the exercise of their functions ought to be met out of the funds of the Institute.

The following have expressed willingness to act as scientific assessors:—

[Illustration: Signatures]

NATIONALITY AND SCIENTIFIC TITLES OF OUR BOARD OF SCIENTIFIC ASSESSORS

SIR MICHAEL FOSTER, M.D., K.C.B., F.R.S., M.P., etc. Late Professor of Physiology, University of Cambridge, England; Secretary of the Royal Society; Permanent Honorary President of the International Congress of Physiologists, etc.

DR. PROFESSOR ANGELO MOSSO. Professor of Physiology, University of Turin, Italy; Director of the Regina Margherita Biological Station on the summit of Monte Rosa, etc.

DR. PROFESSOR HUGO KRONECKER. Professor of Physiology, University of Berne, Berne, Switzerland, etc.

DR. PROFESSOR N. ZUNTZ. Professor of Physiology, Berlin, Germany, etc.

DR. PROFESSOR PAUL HEGER. Professor of Physiology, Brussels, Belgium; Director of the Solvay Sociological Institute, Brussels.

DR. PROFESSOR A. DASTRE. Professor of Physiology, Universitie de la Sorbonne, Paris, France, etc.

DR. PROFESSOR HENRY PICKERING BOWDITCH, Professor of Physiology, Harvard Medical School; Second President American Physiological Society; President of the Children’s Aid Society, Boston, Mass., etc.

PROFESSOR RUSSELL H. CHITTENDEN. Director Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University; Professor of Physiological Chemistry in Yale; Present President of the American Physiological Society, etc.

DR. PROFESSOR WILLIAM H. WELCH. Professor of Pathology in Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland; President of the Rockefeller Institute of Preventive Medicine, etc.

DR. PROFESSOR J. P. PAWLOW. Director of the Department of Experimental Physiology in the Russian Imperial Military School of Medicine, etc.

PERSISTENT SCIENTIFIC DOUBTS

[Notwithstanding the report of the Cambridge examination of the claims for an economic nutrition advanced by the authors, American physiologists were still doubtful if a nitrogenous economy like that reported could be maintained, and the writer was invited to submit to further tests at the Physiological Laboratory of Yale University, under direction of Professor Russell H. Chittenden, Director of the Sheffield Scientific School, and President of the American Physiological Society, and Dr. Lafayette B. Mendel.

The following article, first published in the _Popular Science Monthly_, June, 1903, is a report of that test, and indicates a desire to carry the investigation further to include a variety of test-subjects.

In response to Professor Chittenden's request, the Trustees of the Bache Fund of the National Academy of Sciences appropriated $1000 towards a more extended inquiry; and other means having been assured, a project of experiments was taken under consideration.

One of the difficulties encountered was the control of test-subjects for a sufficiently long time to make conclusive estimates relative to the minimum needs of nitrogenous food in relation to the common occupations of life. Few if any volunteers, with the leisure and interest fortunately possessed by the writer, were available outside the laboratory force itself, and there were serious objections to using for test-subjects the same persons who did the chemical analyses and estimated the results.

In this dilemma the good fortune of a meeting with Surgeon-General O'Reilly of the United States Army and with General Leonard Wood--the former on his way to Madrid to attend a medical congress, and the latter _en route_ to the Philippines to take command there--happened to the writer on the S. S. _Commonwealth_, on a voyage to Italy in April, 1903.

Both these officers are medical men and research enthusiasts. They had fought yellow fever together, in coöperation with martyr Dr. Major Walter Reed, in Cuba, and the fame of their success was being talked of as one of the great triumphs of pathologic, or hygienic, science at the time of the meeting.

There was ample time on the steamer to discuss a subject of such mutual and general interest, and both officers had had, in service, experiences that led them to believe that the results obtained by the writer and his colleagues were the common possibilities of all persons under right conditions of alimentation.

General O'Reilly was of the opinion that the corps he commanded could furnish intelligent and earnest test-subjects for nutrition investigation, as it did in the yellow fever case. In the yellow fever investigation privates and officers alike had volunteered to act as test-subjects, even though their lives were at stake and many had already been sacrificed. It is to their great honour, also, that they refused to receive the bounty that was offered for test-subjects, preferring to serve science and humanity freely as volunteers rather than sell themselves as experimental risks. From such material General O'Reilly was sure that capable assistants could be secured to test the not at all dangerous or disagreeable economies of nutrition that the projected inquiry wished to solve.

Armed with letters of recommendation to the President and to the Secretary of War from General Wood, and an invitation from Surgeon-General O'Reilly to call on him if coöperation on his part were desired, the writer returned to the United States and consulted with Professors Chittenden and Bowditch relative to the desirability of army coöperation. It was believed to be just the thing wanted to facilitate the inquiry, and the writer proceeded to Washington to effect the combination.

General O'Reilly had already had the matter under consideration and was quite ready to draw up a project for presentation to the Secretary of War when Mr. Root should return to Washington from his summer vacation.

Twenty privates and three non-commissioned officers of the Hospital Corps of the United States Army under command of Dr. Lieutenant Wallace DeWitt are now quartered at New Haven in coöperation with the staff of the Sheffield Scientific School. It is the intention to learn, if possible, how little nitrogen is necessary to secure the best human efficiency; and also, if possible, to ascertain

some measure of the evil effects of an excess of nitrogenous food as well as excess of food in general upon human efficiency.

The writer is grateful for the good fortune of being able to be of service in a development of interest in a subject which is of vital importance to the human race. He has enjoyed the benefits of an economic nutrition and knows its value.

The practical proof of a subject of personal application must come from such personal application. Each person must be his own doctor and his own scientist in the matter of his alimentation or he runs the risk of running amuck in his health economy. There is not so much to learn, neither is there very much to do to insure right alimentation, perfect digestion, and continuous good health; but the little required of us must be attended to with no lapses of attention.—HORACE FLETCHER.]

PHYSIOLOGICAL ECONOMY IN NUTRITION

BY RUSSELL H. CHITTENDEN

Director of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University

Among the many problems awaiting solution, none is of greater importance for the welfare of the individual and of the race than that which relates to the proper nutrition of the body. Man eats to live and to gain strength for his daily work, and without sufficient nutriment the machinery of the body cannot be run smoothly or with proper efficiency. The taking of an excess of food, on the other hand, is just as harmful as insufficient nourishment, involving, as it does, not only wasteful expenditure but, what is even of greater moment, an expenditure of energy on the part of the body, which may in the long run prove disastrous. While it is the function of food to supply the material from which the body can derive the necessary energy for its varied activities, any excess of food over and above what is needed to make good the loss incidental to life and daily activity is just so much of an incubus, which is bound to detract from the smooth running of the machinery and to diminish the fitness of the body for performing its normal functions.

A proper physiological condition begets a moral, mental, and physical fitness which cannot be attained in any other way. Further, it must be remembered that lack of a proper physiological condition of the body is more broadly responsible for moral, social, mental, and physical ills than any other factor that can be named. Poverty and vice on ultimate analysis may often be traced to a perversion of nutrition. A healthy state of the body is a necessary concomitant of mental and moral vigour, as well as of physical strength. Abnormal methods of living are often the accompaniment or forerunner of vicious tastes that might never have been developed under more strictly physiological conditions. Health, strength (mental and physical), and moral tone alike depend upon the proper fulfilment of the laws of nature, and it is the manifest duty of a people hoping for the fullest development of physical, mental, and moral strength to ascertain the character of these laws with a view to their proper observance. Poverty, crime, physical ills, and a blunted or perverted moral sense are the penalties we may be called upon to pay for the disobedience to Nature’s laws; penalties which not only _we_ may have to pay, but which may be passed down to succeeding generations, thereby influencing the lives of those yet unborn.

There is to-day great need for a thorough physiological study of those laws of nutrition which constitute the foundation of good living. It is a subject full of interest and promise for the sociologist and economist, as well as for the physiologist. We need a far more complete knowledge than we possess at present of the laws governing nutrition; we need fuller knowledge of the methods by which the most complete, satisfactory, and economical utilisation of the diet can be obtained; we need to know more concerning the minimum diet and the minimum amount of proteid or albuminous foods on which health, mental and physical vigour can be permanently maintained; we need to know more fully concerning the influence of various forms of food on growth and recuperative power; we need more complete knowledge regarding the rôle of various dietetic and digestive habits, fixed or acquired; the effects of thorough mastication, insalivation, and the influence of two versus three meals a day upon the utilisation of food and hence upon the bodily health. Further, we need more concise information as to the effect of the mental state upon digestion and nutrition. These and many other problems of a like nature confront us when we attempt to trace the influence of a proper nutrition upon the condition of the body. These problems, however, all admit of solution, and in their solution undoubtedly lies the remedy for many of the personal ills of mankind.

The foregoing thoughts have been suggested by observations recently made in the writer’s laboratory on the amount and character of the food actually required by a healthy man in the maintenance of bodily equilibrium in periods of rest and physical work. Our ideas at present are based primarily upon observations as to what civilised peoples are accustomed to do, and not upon what they need to do in order to meet the demands made upon the body. Sir William Roberts has well said that the palate is the dietetic conscience, but he adds that there are many misfit palates, and we may well query whether our dietetic consciences have not

become generally perverted through a false mode of living. The well-nigh universal habit of catering to our appetite on all occasions, of bowing to the fancied dictates of our palates even to the extent of satiety, and without regard to the physiological needs of the body, may quite naturally have resulted in a false standard of living, in which we have departed widely from the proper laws of nutrition. Statistical studies carried out on large groups of individuals by various physiologists have led to the general acceptance of dietary standards, such as those proposed by Voit, of Munich, and Atwater in this country. Thus the Voit diet for a man doing moderate work is 118 grams of proteid or albuminous food, 56 grams of fat, and 500 grams of carbohydrates, such as sugar and starch, with a total fuel value of 3,055 large calories or heat units per day. With hard work, Voit increases the daily requirement to 145 grams of proteid, 160 grams of fat, and 450 grams of carbohydrates, with a total fuel value of 3,370 large calories. Atwater, on the other hand, from his large number of observations, is inclined to place the daily proteid requirement at 125 grams, with sufficient fat and carbohydrate to equal a total fuel value of 3,500 large calories for a man doing a moderate amount of work; while for a man at hard work the daily diet is increased to 150 grams of proteid, and with fats and carbohydrates to yield a total fuel value of 4,500 large calories. These standards are very generally accepted as being the requirement for the average individual under the given conditions of work, and it may be that these figures actually represent the daily needs of the body. Suppose, on the other hand, that we have in these figures false standards, or, in other words, that the quantities of food-stuffs called for are altogether larger than the actual demands of the body require. In this case there is a positive waste of valuable food material which we may calculate in dollars and cents; a loss of income incurred daily which might be expended more profitably in other directions. To the wage-earner with a large family, who must of necessity husband his resources, there is in our hypothesis a suggestion of material gain not to be disregarded. The money thus saved might be expended for the education of the children, for the purchase of household treasures tending to elevate the moral and mental state of the occupants, or in many other ways that the imagination can easily supply. This kind of saving, however, is purely a question of economy, and in some strata of society would be objected to as indicative of a condition of sordidness. It has come to be a part of our personal pride to have a well-supplied table, and to eat largely and freely of the good things provided. The poorer man takes pride in furnishing his family with a diet rich in expensive articles of food, and imagines that by so doing he is inciting them to heartier consumption and to increased health and strength. He would be ashamed to save in this way, under the honest belief that by so doing he might endanger the health of his dear ones. But let us suppose that this hypothetical waste of food is not merely uneconomical, that it is undesirable for other and weightier reasons. Indeed, let us suppose that this unnecessary consumption of food is distinctly harmful to the body, that it is physiologically uneconomical, and that in our efforts to maintain a high degree of efficiency we are in reality putting upon the machinery of the body a heavy and entirely uncalled-for strain, which is bound to prove more or less detrimental. If there is truth in this assumption, our hypothesis takes on a deeper significance, and we may well inquire whether there are any reasonable grounds for doubting the accuracy of our present dietary standards.

In this connection it is to be remembered that the food of mankind may be classified under three heads, viz., _proteid or albuminous_, such as meat, eggs, casein of milk, gluten of bread, and various vegetable proteids; _carbohydrates_, as sugar and the starches of our cereals, and _fats_, including those of both animal and vegetable origin. The proteids are characterised by containing nitrogen (about 16 per cent), while the fats and carbohydrates contain only carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen. The two latter classes of food-stuffs are burned up in the body, when completely utilised, to carbonic acid (a gas) and water, while the proteid foods, beside yielding carbonic acid and water, give off practically all of their nitrogen in the form of crystalline nitrogenous products in the excreta of the body. Proteid foods have a particular function to perform, viz., to supply the waste of proteid matter from the active tissues of the body, and this function can be performed only by the proteid foods; hence the latter are essential food-stuffs without which the body cannot long survive. Fats and carbohydrates, on the other hand, are mainly of value for the energy they yield on oxidation, and in this connection it is to be remembered that the fuel value of fats per gram is much larger than that of carbohydrates, viz., 9.3: 4.1, or more than twice as great. Further, it is to be noted that the various food-stuffs cannot be utilised directly by the body, but they must first be digested, then absorbed and assimilated, after which they gradually, in their changed form, undergo decomposition with liberation of their contained energy, which may manifest itself in the form of heat or of mechanical work. The thoroughness with which foods are digested and utilised in the body must therefore count for a great deal in determining their dietetic or nutritive value. Moreover, it is easy to see how an excess of proteid food will give rise to a large proportion of nitrogenous waste matter, which, floating through the system prior to excretion, may, by acting on the nervous system and other parts of the body, produce disagreeable results. A mere excess of food, even of the non-nitrogenous variety, must entail a large amount of unnecessary work, thereby using up a proportional amount of energy for its own disposal, since once introduced into the body it must be digested and absorbed, otherwise it undergoes fermentation and putrefaction in the stomach and intestines, causing countless troubles. When absorbed in quantities beyond the real needs of the body, it may be temporarily deposited as fat; but why load up the system with unnecessary material, thereby interfering with the free running of the machinery?

In other words, it is very evident that the taking in of food in quantities beyond the physiological requirements is undesirable, and may prove exceedingly injurious. It is truly uneconomical, and defeats the very ends we aim to attain. Instead of adding to the bodily vigour and increasing the fitness of the organism to do its daily work, we are really hampering the delicate mechanism, upon the smooth running of which so much depends.

Why, now, should we assume that a daily diet of over 100 grams of proteid, with fats and carbohydrates sufficient to make up a fuel value of over 3,000 large calories, is a necessary requisite for bodily vigour and physical and mental fitness? Mainly because of the supposition that true dietary standards may be learned by observing the relative amounts of nutrients actually consumed by a large number of individuals so situated that the choice of food is unrestricted. But this does not constitute very sound evidence. It certainly is not above criticism. We may well ask ourselves whether man has yet learned wisdom with regard to himself, and whether his instincts or appetites are to be entirely trusted as safe guides to follow in the matter of his own nutrition. The experiments of Kumagawa, Sivén, and other physiologists, have certainly shown that men may live and thrive, for a time at least, on amounts of proteid per day equal to only one-half and one-quarter the amount called for in the Voit standard. Sivén's experiments, in particular, certainly indicate that the human organism can maintain itself in nitrogenous equilibrium with far smaller amounts of proteid in the diet than is ordinarily taught, and, further, that this condition can be attained without unduly increasing the total calories of the food intake. Such investigations, however, have always called forth critical comment from writers on nutrition, indicating a reluctance to depart from the current doctrines of the Voit or Munich school; and, indeed, it may justly be claimed that the ordinary nutrition experiments, extending over short periods of time, are not entirely adequate to prove the effect of a given set of conditions when the latter are continued for months or years. Thus, Schäfer writes: "It may be doubted whether a diet which includes considerably less proteid than 100 grams for the twenty-four hours could maintain a man of average size and weight for an indefinite time. It has frequently been asserted that many Asiatics consume a very much smaller proportion of proteid than is the case with Europeans. The inhabitants of India, Japan, and China chiefly consume rice as the normal constituent of their diet, which contains relatively little proteid; and this has been advanced as an argument in favour of the view that the minimal amount of proteid is much less than that ordinarily given as essential to the maintenance of nutritive equilibrium. It must, however, be stated that we have no definite statistics to show that, in proportion to their body-weight, Asiatics doing the same amount of work as Europeans require a less amount of proteids; indeed such evidence as is forthcoming is rather in favor of the opposite view." This statement is typical of the attitude of physiologists in general on this important subject. Why not candidly admit that the matter is in doubt, and, with a due recognition of the importance of the subject, attempt to ascertain the real truth of the matter?

The writer has had in his laboratory for several months past a gentleman (H. F.) who has for some five years, in pursuit of a study of the subject of human nutrition, practised a certain degree of abstinence in the taking of food and attained important economy with, as he believes, great gain in bodily and mental vigour, and with marked improvement in his general health. Under his new method of living he finds himself possessed of a peculiar fitness for work of all kinds, and with freedom from the ordinary fatigue incidental to extra physical exertion. In using the word abstinence possibly a wrong impression is given, for the habits of life now followed have resulted in the disappearance of the ordinary craving for food. In other words, the gentleman in question fully satisfies his appetite, but no longer desires the amount of food consumed by most individuals.

For a period of thirteen days, in January, he was under observation in the writer's laboratory, his excretions being analysed daily with a view to ascertaining the exact amount of proteid consumed. The results showed that the average daily amount of proteid metabolised was 41.25 grams, the body-weight (165 pounds) remaining practically constant. Especially noteworthy, also, was the very complete utilisation of the proteid food during this period of observation. It will be observed here that the daily amount of proteid food taken was less than one half that of the minimum Voit standard, and it should also be mentioned that this apparent deficiency in proteid food was not made good by any large consumption of fats or carbohydrates. Further, there was no restriction in diet. On the contrary, there was perfect freedom of choice, and the instructions given were to follow his usual dietetic habits. Analysis of the excretions showed an output of nitrogen equal to the breaking down of 41.25 grams of proteid per day as an average, the extremes being 33.06 grams and 47.05 grams of proteid.

In February a more thorough series of observations was made, involving a careful analysis of the daily diet, together with analysis of the excreta, so that not alone the proteid consumption might be ascertained, but likewise the total intake of fats and carbohydrates. The diet consumed was quite simple, and consisted merely of a prepared cereal food, milk, and maple sugar. This diet was taken twice a day for seven days, and was selected by the subject as giving sufficient variety for his needs and quite in accord with his taste. No attempt was made to conform to any given standard of quantity, but the subject took each day such amounts of the above foods as his appetite craved. Each portion taken, however, was carefully weighed in the laboratory, the

chemical composition of the food determined, and the fuel value calculated by the usual methods.

The following table gives the daily intake of proteids, fats, and carbohydrates for six days, together with the calculated fuel value, and also the nitrogen intake, together with the nitrogen output through the excreta. Many other data were obtained showing diminished excretion of uric acid, ethereal sulphates, phosphoric acid, etc., but they need not be discussed here.

■■■

My conclusion, given in condensed form, is this: Mr. Fletcher performs this work with greater ease and with fewer noticeable bad results than any man of his age and condition I have ever worked with.

To appreciate the full significance of this report, it must be remembered that Mr. Fletcher had for several months past taken practically no exercise other than that involved in daily walks about town.

In view of the strenuous work imposed during the above four days, it is quite evident that the body had need of a certain amount of nutritive material. Yet the work was done without apparently drawing upon any reserve the body may have possessed. The diet, small though it was, and with only half the accepted requirement in fuel value, still sufficed to furnish the requisite energy. The work was accomplished with perfect ease, without strain, without the usual resultant lameness, without taxing the heart or lungs, and without loss of body-weight. In other words, in Mr. Fletcher's case at least, the body machinery was kept in perfect fitness without the consumption of any such quantities of fuel as has generally been considered necessary.

Just here it may be instructive to observe that the food consumed by Mr. Fletcher during this seven days' period--and which has been shown to be entirely adequate for his bodily needs during strenuous activity--cost eleven cents daily, thus making the total cost for the seven days seventy-seven cents! If we contrast this figure with the amounts generally paid for average nourishment for a like period of time, there is certainly food for serious thought. Mr. Fletcher avers that he has followed his present plan of living for nearly five years; he usually takes two meals a day; has been led to a strong liking for sugar and carbohydrates in general and away from a meat diet; is always in perfect health, and is constantly in a condition of fitness for work. He practises thorough mastication, with more complete insalivation of the food (liquid as well as solid) than is usual, thereby insuring more complete and ready digestion and a more thorough utilisation of the nutritive portions of the food.

In view of these results, are we not justified in asking ourselves whether we have yet attained a clear comprehension of the real requirements of the body in the matter of daily nutriment? Whether we fully comprehend the best and most economical method of maintaining the body in a state of physiological fitness? The case of Mr. Fletcher, just described; the results noted in connection with certain Asiatic peoples; the fruitarians and _nut_arians in our own country recently studied by Professor Jaffa, of the University of California; all suggest the possibility of much greater physiological economy than we as a race are wont to practise. If these are merely exceptional cases, we need to know it; but if, on the other hand, it is possible for mankind in general to maintain proper nutritive conditions on dietary standards far below those now accepted as necessary, it is time for us to ascertain that fact. For, if our standards are now unnecessarily high, then surely we are not only practising an uneconomical method of sustaining life, but we are subjecting ourselves to conditions the reverse of physiological, and which must of necessity be inimical to our well-being. The possibility of more scientific knowledge of the natural requirements of a healthy nutrition is made brighter by the fact that the economic results noted in connection with our metabolism examination of Mr. Fletcher is confirmatory of similar results obtained under the direction and scrutiny of Sir Michael Foster at the University of Cambridge, England, during the autumn and winter of last year; and by Dr. Ernest Van Someren, Mr. Fletcher's _collaborateur_, in Venice, on subjects of various ages and of both sexes, some account of which has already been presented to the British Medical Association and to the International Congress of Physiologists at its last meeting at Turin, Italy. At the same time emphasis must be laid upon the fact that no definite and positive conclusions can be arrived at, except as the result of careful experiments and observations on many individuals covering long periods of time. This, however, the writer hopes to do in the very near future, with the coöperation of a corps of interested observers.

The problem is far-reaching. It involves not alone the individual, but society as a whole, for beyond the individual lies the broader field of the community, and what proves helpful for the one will eventually react for the betterment of society, and for the improvement of mankind in general.

INTRODUCTION TO DR. HARRY CAMPBELL'S CONTRIBUTION ON THE IMPORTANCE OF MASTICATION

[Since the publication of Van Someren's paper, "Was Luigi Cornaro Right?", read before the British Medical Association, and reprinted elsewhere in this volume, much more attention has been given to the study of mastication than had been previously reported. Mr. Gladstone's advice to his children, which was commonly current and was repeated whenever mastication was mentioned, was usually accompanied and met by an amused smile that showed that the full importance of better mouth-treatment of food was not appreciated. _Glutton or Epicure_, a little book by the present writer, published in 1898, insisted on thorough use of

the functions of the mouth in alimentation but did not go into the anatomical, physiological and dental details.

Dr. Harry Campbell of Northwest London Hospital has performed this latter service to science and humanity, with splendid carefulness, and must have devoted much time and study to the collection of evidence and suggestion which is given here following in full, reprinted from the _London Lancet_.

The authors acknowledge with much gratitude, the courteous permission of both Dr. Campbell and of the editor of the _Lancet_, to reprint all four articles which composed the series.

In our own study of the subject of mouth-treatment of food we have been led to give more credit to the chemical feature of preparation than Dr. Campbell yet attributes to the chemical side of the problem. Comminution of hard food is of first importance, undoubtedly, but insalivation and neutralisation or alkalinisation are, seemingly, much more easily and quickly accomplished in the mouth than farther on in the alimentary canal. The intestines _can_ do all in the way of digestion, even if the mouth and stomach are passed and their assistance in the digestive process is entirely neglected, but it is done at tremendous disadvantage in the supplementary digestive tract of the intestines. We have proven the economy of letting the mouth do _all it can_, by the insalivation (sipping and tasting) of liquids that have taste up to the point of compulsory swallowing (a sucking-up by the Swallowing Impulse which naturally occurs in the course of treatment in the mouth if not fought against too strongly). If Dr. Campbell will extend his observations to liquids, say milk, and for a sufficiently long time to measure results by continued economy of assimilation and saving of solid excreta, he will find that it pays to let the mouth do all it can do, and that while it _cannot do too much_ it _may do too little_. The natural instincts of the mouth, or those that attach to the mouth, become much more discriminating also if exercised on liquids as well as on solids. This they do not learn to do so well if sapid liquids are habitually rushed past their field of discrimination.

Taste enjoyed in the mouth is good, and a good part of the pleasure of living comes from taste gratification, but taste that returns from the stomach and is belched by eructation or is lingeringly reminiscent in the mouth or nose is indicative of indigestion.

Hence it is better to dissipate taste in the mouth, which is the sole region of taste. Spirits tasted into absorption in this way leave no odour upon the breath, and asparagus munched and tasted to the limit in the mouth, carries no odour to the urine. Even the stale and disagreeable odour of onion or garlic can be neutralised by saliva and killed in the mouth.

It is extremely difficult to get observers to practise tasting taste out of liquids as the wine tasters do, and as the tea tasters _have to do or die_; or, at least, become useless in their profession. Once the efficacy of the liquid-tasting precaution in digestion is understood, however, to swallow anything but pure water without tasting it into absorption produces a shock. This care becomes instinctive quite easily and regulates itself automatically. It is also a distinct gain to the gustatory possibilities, which are very limited at best.

When the body will tolerate spirits tasted into it--not poured into it--at all, which is not often when the nutrition is normal (only in damp or cold weather, as a general thing, and then in the case of the writer only at rare intervals, say two or three times a year), the spirit will mix quickly with the saliva and become neutralised sufficiently to excite the Swallowing Impulse. Continue sipping the spirit for a time and you will note that there comes a point where the saliva and the spirit do not mix, do not neutralise; the mouth becomes unduly full of liquid without any relaxation or invitation of the Swallowing Impulse; and the really instinctive inclination will be to _spit it out_. It is a clear indication that the body-_toleration_ has been fully taxed; there is no longer any bodily need for alcohol--in fact, there is no longer natural toleration--and the secretion sent down into the mouth is evidently mucous for a washing-out process, and is not alkaline saliva for assisting in a utilisation function.

It is quite uncanny to observe the nicety of mouth-discrimination and the consistency of it as related to similar substances under similar conditions, if one learn to read it with precision and intelligence.

With increased ease of digestion, which comes with more thorough attention to solid foods alone, the ordinary observer will think that he has accomplished the whole of the possible benefit. It is only when he gives sufficient time to liquids also, to get the added delight and relief that salivary respect of them brings, that the whole of the beneficence of mouth-service is realised. Follow this discrimination and care to a comparative measurement of the waste of digestion, the solid excreta, and note the increased proportionate gain in assimilation and the value of the economy will be appreciated. Try the different treatments on milk for a month; fifteen days with drinking and fifteen days insalivating (sipping and tasting) the milk to the limit, and keep account of quantity of intake required to satisfy appetite and maintain body-weight; and also note carefully the condition and quantity of the fæces. In

the one case you will find the waste to be _fæces_ indeed, and unmistakably worthy of the name; but in the case of sipping, tasting and insalivating the milk to the full satisfaction of the appetite, the _digestion-ash_ will assume quite a different amount and character and deserve a change of name. The proportions of the saving in our own experiments have approximated the difference between three and ten; that is, on a reduction of only one-third the quantity of food commonly ingested, but fully satisfying the sipping and tasting appetite, the quantity of solid excreta was only one-tenth of the other and of quite a different character, æsthetically considered.

While these suggestions do not discredit or affect the value of the purely mechanical side of the treatment as given by Dr. Campbell, and are not intended to be controversial, they are ventured as an amendment to be worked out in regard to liquids, which are, in fact, only an extreme of the pultaceous foods against which Dr. Campbell warns us as being subtly dangerous.

There is another point in our experiences and observations of the largest importance that may appropriately be introduced here: The treatment of all liquids in the manner suggested prevents intemperance of drinking as effectively as it does intemperance of eating.

When food is filtered into the body after having become liquified and made alkaline, or, at least neutral, by saliva, the appetite is given a chance to measure the needs of the body and to discriminate against excess. As soon as the point of complete saturation of any one deficiency is reached, the appetite is cut off, as short as possible to imagine, with no indication of stomach fullness. It will welcome a little of proteid in beans, cheese, eggs, or in some other of its richer forms, and then turn to sugar or fat in some of their numerous forms. Thirst for water will assert itself for a moment, sometimes asking but for a drop and again for a full glass, and afterwards, when near the point of complete saturation, appetite will hesitate for a moment, as if searching around for some rare substance, and may find its final satisfaction in a single spoonful of a sweet or a sip of something in sight.

The appetite satisfied by the infiltering process is a sweetly appeased appetite, calm, rested, contented, normal. There is no danger from the flooding of intemperance, for there is not even toleration of excess either of more food or of more drink, and this contented appetite will remain in the condition of contentment until another need has really been earned by evaporation or destructive katabolism.

In the teaching of this physiology and psychology of alimentation to the children of England, lies the only true solution of the drink question, which is now the curse of the nation.

Dr. Campbell has made such a splendid case for the mechanical side of mouth work, that it is the hope of the writer that he will give equally careful consideration to the chemical and psychological sides, and in a completeness of observation render inestimable service to his country, to science, and humanity. A decade of trial on the inmates of an infant orphan asylum will show the possibilities for the nation in a single generation, if broadly applied. It might lead to an effective intemperance, inhibition, or quarantine, and that is all any nation needs of advantage to make it independent of the world and truly great.—HORACE FLETCHER.]

OBSERVATIONS ON MASTICATION

BY HARRY CAMPBELL, M.D., F.R.C.P. (Lond.)

Physician to the Northwest London Hospital

[London _Lancet_, July 11, 18, 25, and August 8, 1903]

SECTION I. From _London Lancet_, July 11, 1903

THE EFFECTS OF MASTICATION

The primary object of mastication is to break up the food so as (1) to facilitate the swallowing of it, and (2), still more important, to insure its intimate admixture with the digestive juices, not only within the mouth, but throughout the entire digestive tract. Mastication has, however, other important and far-reaching effects. Thus it promotes the flow of saliva and, when properly performed, secures a due insalivation of the food; it increases the quantity of alkaline saliva passing into the stomach; it stimulates the heart and circulation; and it finally influences the nutrition of the jaws and their appendages by stimulating the local blood and lymph circulation. Now to consider these various objects and effects of mastication.

Mastication facilitates swallowing.--Many foods cannot be swallowed without first going through some preparation in the mouth. Soft, moist, pultaceous foods, such as milk pudding and porridge, can be and often, indeed, are swallowed with little or no preliminary chewing. On the other hand, it is a mechanical impossibility to swallow large lumps of tough food, or very dry food, even though, like flour, it be in a finely divided state. Dry food needs first to be well moistened; and it is not surprising that it promotes a more abundant flow of saliva than moist food, though the secretion thus excited may be poor in ferment. Hence it follows that if we desire to give foods which compel mastication, they should be tough or dry. On the whole, vegetable foods necessitate more thorough mastication than animal. The carnivora can scarcely be said to masticate at all the flesh which they consume; they simply tear off portions, and forthwith swallow them whole. Cooked flesh, however, does require mastication, owing to the coagulation of its proteids. The herbivora, on the other hand, unlike the carnivora, have to subject their food to considerable mastication before it can be swallowed; but they generally masticate it far more than is needful to render swallowing mechanically possible, as is exemplified in the act of rumination, the object here being to facilitate the admixture of the digestive juices with the food.

According to Van Someren, if the habit of masticating efficiently is once acquired, the food is not swallowed before it is converted into the liquid state, the swallowing of unmasticated lumps being effectually prevented by a pharyngeal reflex.

Mastication, by breaking the food up into small particles, enables it to be brought into intimate contact with the digestive juices.--Such comminution is especially needful in the case of raw vegetable foods of the tougher kind, in order to break up their cellulose framework, and to set free the contained starch, proteids, and fats. Foods of this kind, unless masticated, yield practically no nutriment to the organism. I cannot too strongly emphasise the fact that before man learned to break up the cellulose framework of his vegetable food by cooking he was compelled to subject it to laborious mastication. But, while thorough comminution is especially needed for vegetable food when raw, it is also needed for many cooked forms of it also,--as, for example, solid batter pudding and new underbaked bread, heavy lumps of which, passing into the stomach, may seriously hamper the work of that organ. Such substances are indigestible essentially by virtue of their impermeability to the digestive juices, and they gain in digestibility in proportion as they are comminuted. The indigestibility of new bread would appear to be wholly due, not to any peculiarity of chemical composition, but to its tendency to elude the teeth and form a sodden mass impermeable to the digestive juices, while the more powdery stale bread is more easily broken up both in the mouth and within the stomach. Cabbage, again, owes its indigestibility to the fact that it is allowed to pass into the stomach in large masses, while the well-known digestibility of cauliflower and minced spinach is due to the fineness of their division; were cabbage as finely minced as spinach usually is it would be equally digestible.

Turning now to animal food it has to be remarked that while in the raw state it may be readily digestible with little or no previous mastication, since massive pieces of it are readily attacked by the digestive juices, the like is much less true of animal food the proteids of which have been coagulated and rendered less permeable by cooking. Large lumps of hard-boiled egg or overdone meat, for instance, may obstinately resist gastric digestion; indeed, as with vegetable so with animal foods, their relative digestibility depends more upon physical consistence than chemical composition; beef is generally more indigestible than mutton and pork or veal than either, not so much by virtue of chemical composition as of physical consistence; the indigestibility of cheese illustrates the same truth; the individual nutritive ingredients of this substance--the proteids and fats--are not in themselves indigestible; casein in the form of protein or plasmon is known to be easy of digestion, and butter is one of the most digestible of fats; but in cheese the two are welded together into a comparatively impermeable mass, which is apt to escape comminution by the teeth and to pass down into the stomach in the form of solid lumps. A plain, wholesome cheese well masticated or intimately mixed with other foods, as in macaroni cheese, is quite easily digested by the majority.

I do not, of course, deny the influence of the chemical factor. Undoubtedly food may disturb digestion by virtue of its chemical composition, apart altogether from its physical characters; thus, while cooked goose-fat sets up violent irritation in some, others cannot tolerate eggs in any shape or form, and innumerable idiosyncrasies in respect of special articles of diet are met with which are essentially referable to chemical composition; but making due allowance for this chemical influence there can, I think, be little doubt that the digestibility of the more common articles of diet, both animal and vegetable, depends in the main upon their physical constitution, _all of them tending to be equally digestible when reduced to the same degree of comminution_. This, if true, is, I need scarcely say, a fact of the greatest practical importance, for it amounts to this: that we may often allow to those with very weak digestions foods which are generally considered indigestible, provided that they be thoroughly comminuted, whether by mastication or artificial means.

Mastication promotes the flow of saliva and the insalivation of the food.--The more efficiently food is masticated the greater is the salivary flow, and the more intimately is it mixed with the saliva, or, as we say, insalivated. The saliva has apparently no effect on

fats; whether it acts on proteids seems more doubtful, though by some authorities the penetration of these by the alkali of this fluid is said to aid in their subsequent digestion; on starch, however, the saliva acts very potently, and hence mastication plays a special part in promoting the digestion of starchy foods. Indeed, if only mastication be persisted in long enough, starch may be wholly converted into maltose within the mouth, and it need scarcely be said that it is better for the individual himself to manufacture his maltose in this way than that he should take it ready made for him in the form of one of the many “malt extracts” on the market. Patients are often forbidden starchy food, while they are allowed the maltose which they can quite well manufacture in their own mouths. Provided they be sufficiently insalivated, there are few starchy foods which are indigestible, not even excepting the proverbially indigestible new potato. These remarks are especially applicable to children, as will be more particularly insisted on later.

Mastication increases the amount of alkaline saliva passing into the stomach, and this not only prolongs the period of starch digestion within this organ but, by its influence upon the reaction of the gastric contents, influences all the digestive processes taking place there. I shall have occasion to point out later that a deficient supply of alkaline saliva in the stomach predisposes to certain forms of indigestion.

Mastication acts reflexly upon the stomach.--It is now known that the act of mastication influences the stomach reflexly, promoting the flow of gastric juice and thus preparing the stomach for the entrance of food into it. If the œsophagus of a dog is cut so as to allow the swallowed food to escape instead of passing into the stomach, it is found that the mastication of food causes a considerable flow of gastric juice. Food introduced into the stomach unaccompanied by mastication is less effective in promoting the gastric flow. It is probable that the influence of mastication on the flow of gastric juice is largely produced through the medium of psychic influences, for the more efficient the mastication the more is the sense of taste affected.

Mastication stimulates the heart and so promotes the general circulation.--This stimulating action may be partly due to its local action on the flow of blood and lymph in the jaws and accessory parts, and partly to a reflex influence, but whatever the explanation there can be no doubt of the fact. Hence the mere chewing of a non-nutritive substance, such as gum arabic, is stimulating, and, doubtless, the stimulating effects induced by the chewing of such articles as tobacco and betel are largely to be explained in this way.

THE INFLUENCE OF MASTICATION ON THE JAWS AND ADJACENT STRUCTURES

This subject is of such importance that it needs to be dealt with in some detail. By “adjacent structures” I mean the masticatory muscles, tongue, teeth, salivary glands, the nasal passages and sinuses pertaining thereto, the naso-pharynx, soft palate, and tonsils.

The muscles of mastication.--Let me at the outset draw attention to certain anatomical points, in connection with the muscles of mastication. These are (_a_) their massiveness; (_b_) the very close relation of the pterygoids to the naso-pharynx; and (_c_) the outward direction of the pterygoids.

(_a_) It is not until one studies the muscles of mastication closely that one comes to realise their massiveness. Their large size, in relation to the bony structures in connection with them, is well shown in a vertical transverse section of the head carried through the ascending ramus of the mandible[7] (see Fig. 1). It is evident that the functional activity of so large a mass of muscle tissue cannot but exercise considerable influence on the nutrition of the neighbouring parts.

[Illustration:

FIGURE 1.--Vertical transverse (slightly oblique) section through the head on a level with the epiglottis. The massiveness of the system of masticatory muscles is apparent.]

(_b_) The pterygoid muscles, springing as they do from the internal pterygoid plates, must necessarily be in close relation with the naso-pharynx, especially the internal pair, which take their origin from the internal aspect of the internal plates. I would further point out that the external pair, although they diverge from the naso-pharynx on their way to the mandibular condyles, yet remain on a level with that cavity. This close relation of the pterygoids to the naso-pharynx is, if I mistake not, of great importance in relation to the etiology of “adenoids.”

(_c_) Of the two pairs of pterygoids the external pair pass in the more outward direction, forming with the sagittal plane of the head an angle of 45° (see Figs. 1 and 2). In consequence of this direction they tend by their contraction to pull the pterygoid plates and

posterior parts of the maxilla away from the sagittal plane of the head, and thus to secure the normal width of the posterior nares. It is these muscles which bring about the lateral movements of the mandible, causing the lower teeth to move laterally and sagittally across the upper, the food being in this way far more effectually ground than by a mere vertical pressure of the teeth against one another. These lateral movements are, as we shall see, less pronounced among the moderns than among primitive peoples.

[Illustration: FIGURE 2.--Portion of horizontal section of head about an inch below the condyles of the lower jaw. The outward direction of the external pterygoids is well shown; also the close relation of the levatores and tensores palati with the internal pterygoids.]

The influence of the contraction of the masticatory muscles on the local circulation of blood and lymph.--When a muscle is at rest the blood flows sluggishly through it, while there is a complete, or all but complete, stagnation of the lymph current; if a lymphatic trunk of a limb at rest be cut no lymph escapes from it. Rhythmic muscle contractions, however, stimulate the flow both of blood and lymph (_a_), in the contracting muscles themselves and (_b_) in the neighbouring parts. (_a_) Not only are the muscle arteries dilated during rhythmic contractions, but the blood is vigorously squirted out of the muscle veins, so that much more blood flows through a muscle during its rhythmic contraction than during rest. The flow of lymph is even more markedly stimulated,--this fluid, which, while the muscle is at rest, is stagnant or all but so, being during contraction driven actively along the lymphatic trunks. (_b_) How greatly rhythmic muscle contractions influence the circulation of fluids in the neighbouring parts is shown by the flushing of the skin and the swelling of the soft parts generally of a limb which is being exercised. We thus see how profoundly the exercise of the masticatory muscles--and among these we must not forget to include the tongue--influences not only their own nutrition but that of the important structures adjacent to them--that is to say, of the jaw-bones, salivary glands, buccal mucous membrane, soft palate, faucial tonsils, pharynx, and naso-pharynx, as well as of the nasal cavities and their accessory sinuses. All these parts are during mastication copiously flushed with blood and lymph, from which it is evident that efficient mastication must stimulate their nutrition and favour their proper development. Hence, in one who has from childhood upwards been accustomed to masticate efficiently, we generally find these parts well developed, the jaws large and shapely, the teeth regular and straight, the tongue and salivary glands large, the nasal and naso-pharyngeal passages spacious, and the mucous membrane of the buccal and adjoining cavities healthy.

Influence of mastication on the jaw-bones.--It is well known that the size of a bone is largely determined by the degree to which the muscles attached to it are exercised. That the jaws do not grow to their normal size, if not adequately exercised during their period of growth, is strikingly shown by the overcrowding of the teeth, which takes place in those brought up on soft foods, and this even though there be no contraction of the jaws resulting from mouth-breathing. The dependence of the size of the jaws upon the degree to which they are exercised is also shown by the smallness of the modern jaw, as compared with that of primitive peoples, a difference which, as we shall see, is in part congenital and in part due to the comparative disuse of the former. Mastication influences not only the size but also the shape of the jaws (_a_), through its influence on the size of the tongue, which by pressing against the teeth tends, as Sim Wallace has shown, to expand the jaws; (_b_) by the pressure of opposing teeth against one another, which has a similar effect; and (_c_) by the outward pull of the pterygoids, which tends to widen the maxilla posteriorly and to broaden the posterior nares.

Influence of mastication on the teeth.--The teeth being developed within the jaw-bones and remaining, even after eruption, in close anatomical and physiological association with them, must necessarily share in their nutritive tendencies. If these bones are efficiently exercised during the formation of the teeth--and my remarks apply especially to the permanent set--the tooth-germs will be abundantly flushed with blood, while the ample growth of the jaws themselves will provide the germs with plenty of room in which to grow and to develop, and the more perfect their growth and development the more resistant should we expect them to be to the ravages of caries. Who can contemplate the jaw-bones of a six-years-old child, dissected so as to display all the imbedded teeth, without being assured of the effect of mastication upon dental development? Fifty-two teeth meet the view: the whole region from the orbital rims to the inferior border of the mandible is literally paved with them, and I can hardly doubt that they collectively weigh more than the bone in which they are imbedded. Surely no one can examine such a dissection without being convinced of the urgent necessity, if the teeth are to grow and to develop normally, of giving the child’s jaws from infancy onwards plenty of work to do.

The ample development of the jaws, which efficient mastication brings about, has a further beneficial effect as regards the teeth, in that it enables them to take up their proper places in the alveolar ridges, thus securing all the advantages of a good “bite.” These I now proceed to consider. The teeth during mastication, and especially when the bite is good and the food of a kind necessitating vigorous and sustained mastication, are made to move in their sockets both vertically and horizontally; the effect of this is to stimulate the circulation in the tooth-pulp, the alveolar periosteum (and hence also in the cementum and alveolar walls which are

supplied by it), and the circumjacent mucous membrane of the gum. All this makes for the health of the teeth; not only does it promote the nutrition of the tooth itself and of its bony socket, thus maintaining a firm dental setting, but it also tends to secure a healthy environment for the exposed part of the tooth--that part, namely, wherein caries begins--by maintaining a healthy state of the surrounding and, indeed, of the entire buccal mucous membrane, as well as of the various secretions which bathe the mouth. Wherefore it is not surprising to find that those who masticate efficiently suffer much less from dental caries and its complications (such as abscess at the root) and disease of the periodontal membrane (_e.g._, pyorrhœa alveolaris and loosening of the teeth) than those who are accustomed to bolt their food.

A few words as to the influence of mastication in wearing down the teeth. In those races which masticate vigorously the teeth in quite early adult life show signs of wearing away, while in later life it is quite common for the biting surfaces to be worn flat; sometimes the crown of the molars is worn away so that its surface shelves downwards and inwards and not infrequently it is concave, having a scooped-out appearance; often the dentine is exposed in this way; and yet among many hundreds of skulls examined I do not remember to have seen one single case where caries has started on the biting surface thus worn down.

I had always attributed this wearing down of the teeth to the friction of coarse food against them. Primitive races eat coarse vegetable food, which frequently contains grit, and this doubtless helps to grind the teeth down, but they may be markedly ground down even in those living on soft food, and in such cases the grinding away can obviously only be due to the friction of opposing teeth against one another. I, indeed, believe this to be the essential cause of the phenomenon, both in civilised races living on soft food and in primitive races whose coarse food necessitates prolonged and vigorous mastication and a corresponding amount of attrition between the biting surfaces of opposing teeth. In order that this attrition may occur two things are requisite: the upper and lower teeth must be well opposed--there must be a good bite--and mastication must be vigorous and of the right kind. Mere vertical pressure of the teeth against one another will not wear away the opposing surfaces; there must be friction of these surfaces against one another--a transverse and sagittal movement of the lower teeth against the upper by means of the pterygoids. Mainly to this do I attribute the marked wearing down of the teeth observed in primitive peoples, and I am gratified to know that so competent an authority on dental pathology as Sim Wallace is a convert to this view.

That all the teeth may be worn down just as we observe in primitive people, even in those who have lived all their lives on the ordinary fare of the moderns, is proved by a case I have under observation. It is that of a man in his fiftieth year, who was brought up in Belgium but who has resided in London for the last thirty years. When he came to my out-patient room I was not a little surprised to find that all his teeth were sound--a very unusual occurrence, I need hardly say, among the London poor at his age. In seeking for an explanation I elicited the fact that he was unable to swallow his food without chewing it very thoroughly, and on giving him a moderate-sized piece of bread, with the request that he should chew it in the ordinary way, I found that he subjected it to one hundred and twenty separate bites before swallowing it, and in the steady, deliberate way he went to work and in his extensive lateral movements of the mandible he reminded one for all the world of a cow chewing its cud. The temporals and masseters of this man are enormous, and the like is no doubt true of the pterygoids; he has well-developed nasal passages, has never suffered from nasal obstruction, while his buccal mucous membrane is unusually healthy for one of his years and circumstances. May we not attribute this healthy state of the mouth, teeth, and nose to the good effects upon them of efficient chewing? Here is a man who has lived for thirty years in London on the same kind of food as the average poor Londoner, but instead of finding his mouth full of carious, tartar-coated teeth, and spongy, receding, pus-exuding gums, we find thirty-two sound teeth firmly set in healthy gums and all but devoid of tartar.

A word as to the wearing down of the teeth in the anthropoid apes. In this respect the gorilla differs markedly from the orang and the chimpanzee. In all the skulls of these latter which I have examined the teeth show signs of wearing away, while I have found the teeth of the gorilla, with the exception of the tusk-like canines, but little worn. From this we should expect the latter animal to be mainly carnivorous, and the orang and chimpanzee to be largely herbivorous.

SECTION II. From _London Lancet_, July 18, 1903

CHANGES WHICH THE JAWS AND TEETH OF MAN HAVE UNDERGONE DURING MAN’S EVOLUTION FROM HIS ANTHROPOID ANCESTORS

During man’s progress upwards from the anthropoid his diet has undergone a progressive change, and a parallel adaptation has taken place in his jaws and teeth. Dietetically considered, we may divide his evolutionary career into the following epochs[8]: (1) the anthropoid stage; (2) the pre-cooking human stage; (3) the cooking pre-agricultural stage; (4) the early agricultural stage; and (5)

the late agricultural stage.

1. _The anthropoid stage._--The diet of man's anthropoid ancestors was probably much the same as is that of existing anthropoid apes; it consisted, namely, of raw vegetable and animal food, necessitating a vigorous use of the maxillary apparatus. This latter, we may assume, was of the type belonging to the anthropoids--_i. e._, the jaws were massive and markedly prognathic; the denture was the same as it is in existing man, but the teeth were larger, especially the upper canines, which served as weapons of offence and defence; the third molars (the wisdom teeth) were as large as the other molars and were provided with three fangs, and there was an ample portion of alveolar ridge behind them; there was no chin. No doubt the massiveness and the marked prognathism, which characterised the jaws at this stage, served other ends than that of mastication; it is obvious that projecting jaws and teeth are much more effectual for seizing and lacerating prey than are the orthognathic jaws of modern man.

2. _The pre-cooking human stage_ extends from the time man's ancestors first assumed the human form till they learned to apply fire in the preparation of their food. During all this period the jaws and teeth were probably used as much, or almost as much, for mastication as during the anthropoid stage; raw animal food had to be torn from the bones, the latter had to be crunched, while the bulk of the raw vegetable food needed then no less than it needs now prolonged and vigorous mastication in order to liberate the starch and other nutritive ingredients from their undigestible cellulose envelopes.[9] Nevertheless, the jaws and teeth underwent considerable change during this period, for not only were they with every advance in intelligence called less and less into requisition for purposes of offence and defence, but the jaws, at least, became materially modified in correlation with the expanding cranial cavity and in connection with the assumption of the erect posture. It is, I think, rather for these reasons than in consequence of alterations in the nature of the food that the masticatory apparatus now gradually lost its more bestial aspect and assumed an essentially human type, becoming towards the close of the period much the same as may be observed among the most primitive peoples now living.

3. _The pre-agricultural cooking period._--The characters of the maxillary apparatus belonging to this period are still available for study, the aboriginal Australians, the Bushmen, Negritos, and many Esquimaux not having yet emerged from it. So far as mastication is concerned, cooking influences vegetable far more than animal food, for it not only softens it but by rupturing the undigestible cellulose chambers and liberating their contents relieves mastication of one of its essential functions. Wherefore, with the advent of cooking, man's jaws and teeth began to get smaller, and they have continued to diminish in size up to the present time. No great diminution, however, took place at first, inasmuch as the diet still continued to be largely animal (and prior to the use of knives and forks such food had to be torn by the teeth), while the coarse vegetable food of this date, even when cooked, still needed laborious mastication. The chief differences between the maxillary apparatus of this early cooking age as compared with that of the present day are as follows: the jaws of the earlier period--_e. g._, in the aboriginal Australian--are more massive, and their sagittal diameter is greater, giving rise to decided prognathism, the teeth for the most part are larger and stronger, the third molars being nearly, if not quite, as big as the other molars, and provided with three fangs, while there is a considerable portion of alveolar ridge behind them. The third molars, however, show a decided tendency to be smaller than the rest, and the alveolar ridge behind them is less marked than in the previous period, features, I doubt not, attributable to the influence of cooking in diminishing mastication. Dental caries is rare and is chiefly met with in the third molars.

4. _The early agricultural age._--All the existing primitive races which have attained to the cultivation of the soil may be regarded as belonging to this period. Previously to it man was mainly carnivorous, owing to the comparatively limited quantity of vegetable food available, so long as the supply was left to nature alone; but when by cultivation this supply was increased and, at the same time, rendered more constant and certain, he gradually became less carnivorous and more vegetarian in his diet. The result of agriculture, however, is not only to increase the supply of vegetable food, but to diminish its fibrous, cellulosic ingredients, and thus to render it more easily masticated. Hence at this stage we find the maxillary apparatus becoming smaller than in the previous period, although the difference as shown--_e. g._, by the examinations of the skulls of the African negroes and the Melanesians--is less pronounced than we might perhaps have anticipated; prognathism is not so decided, the jaws are smaller, also the teeth, especially the third molars, which now for the first time show a tendency to be furnished with two instead of three fangs, while the alveolar ridge behind them is distinctly shorter than in the preceding period. Dental caries, hitherto rare, now becomes more frequent.

5. _The late agricultural period._--A mid-agricultural period might be described, but I shall take no account of it here, but pass on to a consideration of the late agricultural period--that, namely, in which we ourselves live. The chief characteristic of the food of this period is its softness. Cooked animal food requires, indeed, more mastication than raw, but the vegetable food of to-day, owing to the combined effects of improved agriculture, and skilful milling and cooking, is so soft as to excite comparatively little mastication.

The present may, in fact, be described as the _age of pap_. Hence the jaws and teeth are now called upon to perform far less work than in any earlier stage of our evolution, and there has taken place in consequence a great diminution in their size, more especially in the size of the jaws, so that there is now often no room for the teeth to take up their normal positions, and there is generally a complete absence of alveolar ridge behind the last molars. The latter are, moreover, apt to be very small or even absent, while dental caries is alarmingly frequent.

It will thus be seen that from the period of the anthropoids to the present time, a progressive change in the size and shape of the jaws and teeth has been taking place, a change which is to be explained by (1) the cessation of the need for using them for offensive and defensive purposes; (2) the growing capacity of the cranium and the assumption of the erect position; (3) the progressive alteration in man's diet; and probably also (4) considerations of beauty. The first three factors have operated through natural selection, the last through sexual selection, which has come into play, I would suggest, chiefly within recent times. Probably the most pronounced change which has taken place in the jaws during the agricultural periods has been the suppression of prognathism which, in the woman especially, is very unsightly, and tends to diminish the likelihood of marriage.

INSTANCES OF THE VIGOROUS USE TO WHICH THE JAWS AND TEETH ARE PUT AMONG EXISTING PRIMITIVE PEOPLES

A study of existing primitive peoples brings forcibly home to the mind how laboriously the jaws and teeth of our primitive ancestors were used. I have already shown how in pre-agricultural and early agricultural times the nature of the food compelled a sustained and vigorous exercise of these structures, and I wish here only to refer to a few specific and peculiar instances of laborious mastication exercised by primitive races now or recently living.[10] Among some of these mastication has been promoted almost to the position of an industrial art.

The chewing of very tough substances in order to extract therefrom liquid or nourishment.--The recently extinct Tasmanians included among their articles of diet a species of sea-weed which, even when cooked, was so tough as to require long-sustained mastication in order to extract its nutrient elements. The Indians of North California chew kelp, which is "as tough as white leather" (_i. e._, leather dressed with alum). "A young fellow with good teeth will masticate a piece of it a whole day." Again Featherman[11] tells how when the Bushmen are short of food in the winter they steep an old dried gnu-skin in water and, having rubbed off the hair, boil it, and proceed to gnaw the tough morsel until their very jaws ache. The Modoc Indians are said to munch the raw kais root all day long.[12] Among the Esquimaux it is a universal custom to chew the raw skin of the whale, the porpoise, and the seal for the blubber it contains, and the skin being as tough as india-rubber, it requires, as may be imagined, a good deal of chewing. The Lower Californians also chew deer-skin and ox-skin (Bayert). The more southern Esquimaux, according to Nansen, preserve the stalks of _angelica_ by steeping them in a mixture of chewed blubber and saliva. Finally, I may refer to the habit of chewing the sugar-cane, a practice which is prevalent among the natives in all countries where the cane grows, and affords, it need scarcely be said, abundant exercise for the jaws and teeth.

Mastication in the preparation of beverages.--I find that among widely separated aboriginal peoples chewing is resorted to in the preparation of beverages, both intoxicating and non-intoxicating. The Gran Chaco Indians make an intoxicating drink by chewing the algarroba bean and then spitting into a receptacle. In other parts of South America berries are chewed with the same object. In some of the Pacific Islands boys and girls with good teeth are selected to chew a root (kava), from which they then prepare a drink. In New Guinea drinks are similarly prepared from roots. Boiled cassava root is chewed by the Indians of Nicaragua for the same purpose. In British Guiana the natives make a drink by adding chewed maize and saliva to sweet potato, maize, and sugar-cane. The Indians in Honduras, after steeping cassava cake or carbonised bread in hot water, chew a portion and mix it with the rest.

Mastication in the industries.--Even among moderns teeth are used for many purposes other than mastication--_e. g._, for holding pins and needles and for severing cotton; also in some industries--_e. g._, among diamond workers--where it is the custom for girls to hold the diamond between their front teeth, which in consequence get much worn away, as I have myself seen. It is only among primitive peoples, however, that the jaws and teeth actually play the part of implements for use in the arts. The Australian women make lines, nets, and bags by chewing various kinds of fibre, a process which wears down their teeth considerably and may cause them to be tender.[13] The Esquimaux are still more dependent upon the use of their teeth as implements, especially in the preparation of skins for their clothing, boats, and lines. The teeth are used to hold the skins, while the latter are being scraped, the mouth constituting, in fact, "a third hand;" and the front teeth of Esquimaux women are often by this means worn away to the merest stumps.[14] The garments of the Esquimaux, even to the boots, are made up of skins which have been laboriously chewed for this purpose by the women "inch by inch," till they acquire a beautiful softness and flexibility, and are often, indeed, chewed

again after having been dried. And we are told that the women have no objection to the task, while the children are eager to help in it on account of the blubber the skin contains; also, that in bad times the men do not object to join in the work. The lines for harpooning are prepared in a similar way from the skin of the bearded seal, and in very large quantities.[15] When we think of the quantity of skins needed for these lines, for their dress, including boots and gloves, and for their boats (although for the latter some skins are used without having first undergone chewing), it is clear that enormous quantities must be chewed. The Esquimaux men also use their teeth considerably in other work--_e. g._, in lashing the sledges together.[16] The Indians of North California use their teeth for stripping the bark from the fresh shoots employed in making their wickerwork utensils, and they also employ their teeth in making strings, cords, and nets.

THE INSTINCT TO MASTICATE

Seeing that the maxillary apparatus of man has for long ages past been put to vigorous use, it is not surprising that the need to exercise it should express itself as a powerful instinct. This instinct manifests itself in many and curious ways, some of which I will now consider. During the early months of life the natural function of feeding at the breast provides the infant's jaws, tongue, and lips with all the needful exercise. This bottle-feeding fails to do, and we frequently find bottle-fed children seeking to satisfy the natural instinct by sucking their thumb, fingers, or any convenient object to hand. The teeth are a provision for biting hard foods, but even before they actually appear we find the child seeking to exercise his toothless gums on any hard substance he can lay hold of, and there can be no doubt that exercise of this kind tends to facilitate the eruption of the teeth, a truth, indeed, recognised universally, whether by the primitive mother who strings the tooth of some wild animal round the neck of her infant, or the up-to-date parent who provides her child with a bejewelled ivory or coral bauble. When the teeth have erupted, the masticatory instinct finds among primitive peoples abundant satisfaction in the chewing of the coarse, hard foods which constitute their dietary; but among us moderns, subsisting as we do mainly on soft foods, affording but little exercise for the masticatory apparatus, it does not find its proper expression, and thus tends to die out. Nevertheless, it dies a hard death, and long continues to assert itself; witness the tendency of children to bite their pencils and pen-holders; I have known a child to gnaw through a bone pen-holder, much in the same way as a carnivorous animal gnaws at a bone.

This instinct to chew for chewing's sake manifests itself all over the world. In our own country not only do children bite pencils and pen-holders, but they will chew small pieces of india-rubber for hours together. The practice of gum-chewing, so common among our American cousins, evidently comes down from far-off times, for the primitive Australians chew several kinds of gum, attributing to them nutrient qualities,[17] and the Patagonians are said to keep their teeth white and clean by chewing _matri_, a gum which exudes from the incense bush, and is carefully collected by the women and children.[18]

A widespread custom in the East is betel-chewing, which is met with in India, Malay, Melanesia, and Polynesia, and even among the primitive Veddahs of Ceylon. This article is composed of the pungent leaf of the betel plant, the areca nut and lime rolled together, and when chewed yields a reddish juice which stains the mouth and teeth. The Veddahs, failing to get the genuine article, manufacture a quid from the leaves of an aromatic plant, the barks of one or two kinds of tree, and calcined small shells.[19] The compound must possess some strange attraction, for otherwise such pains would not be taken to secure it. What is the attraction? Doubtless betel has stimulating properties, and it must, moreover, be remembered that the mere mechanical act of mastication stimulates the circulation, a fact which helps to explain the tendency for man, all the world over, to chew non-nutrient substances. Tobacco-chewing is common in many parts of the world, and here, again, the effect for the time is stimulating. Pitcherie is extensively chewed among the aboriginal Australians; it consists of twigs of about the thickness of rye-grass stems, which are first chewed into a mass, then mixed with the ash of gum trees, and made into a paste, which is chewed for its stimulating and narcotic effects.[20]

I may allude in passing to the grinding of the teeth, which takes place during sleep in disturbed states of the nervous system. It is a true masticatory act, in which the normal lateral movement of the mandible is well marked, and it may thus be regarded as a perverted manifestation of the masticatory instinct.

THE CAUSATION OF INEFFICIENT MASTICATION

The effects for good upon the organism of efficient mastication being profound and far-reaching, it follows that inefficient mastication must lead to many evils. What these are we have now to consider; but first it will be well to inquire into the causes of the defective mastication which prevails among moderns.

1. _Softness of food._--By far the most important of these lies in the nature of the food taken. The food of to-day--of the late agricultural age period, as I have termed it--is for the most part soft and pappy, of a kind which does not compel thorough mastication; so much so, indeed, that, as I have already said, we may speak of this as the age of pap. This feature is especially noticeable in the case of children's diet: under the modern system children are kept on a liquid, or semi-liquid, diet, not merely during the first months, but during the first years of life, and at the seventh or eighth month all kinds of artificial saccharide foods in liquid or semi-liquid form are poured into the child's stomach; thereafter he is fed on such viands as mashed potatoes and gravy, rusks soaked in milk, milk puddings, bread dipped in bacon fat, pounded mutton, thin bread-and-butter, and the like; and we are told that this is the kind of diet best suited to the young human, from the time of weaning to the end of the second year! The same pernicious methods are adopted subsequently. "Perhaps the great majority of children after they have got their complete set of temporary teeth have," writes Dr. Sim Wallace,[21] "a dietary such as the following. Breakfast: bread-and-milk or porridge, milk, tea, coffee, or cocoa, bread-and-butter, perhaps an egg. Dinner: potatoes and gravy, or meat, milk pudding. Tea: milk or tea with bread-and-butter, jam, cakes. Supper: bread or biscuit and milk." Now food of this kind does not invite mastication, and it finds its way into the stomach all too readily. Hence the instinct to masticate has little opportunity of exercise and, not being properly exercised, tends, as I have said, to die out. Small wonder that the child nourished on such pappy food acquires the habit of bolting it, and learns to reject hard, coarse foods in favour of the softer kinds; everything nowadays must be tender, pultaceous, or "short." Given a choice between a food compelling little or no mastication and one necessitating prolonged mastication--as between, say, fresh Vienna bread and an Abernethy biscuit--and in nineteen cases out of twenty the one which gives the least trouble in eating will be chosen. To such absurd lengths has this harmful custom been pushed that even bread crust is avoided by many. Witness the fashion of eating bread-and-butter with a minimum of crust; order bread-and-butter at any place of refreshment, and the last thing you will be served with is a plateful of crusts of bread. Many establishments, indeed, make a regular practice of giving away their crusts as unsaleable. Thus, the rectangular loaves used for bread-and-butter in the "Aërated bread-shops" are cut transversely into slices, each loaf thus yielding two end crusts which are put into baskets for the poor, only the soft crumby pieces being reserved for the customers, to be, in due course, no doubt washed down by copious libations of tea and coffee.

When we trace the diet of the modern from childhood upwards we find the same story: it tends to remain soft and pappy to the end. Animal food, especially as it comes to the tables of the well-to-do, necessitates very little mastication. It is the coarser varieties of vegetable food alone which call out the full functional activity of the masticatory apparatus, but the vegetable food of to-day is rarely of a kind to do this; cooked vegetables, such as potatoes, greens, peas, and beans, can be, and generally are, swallowed after little or no preliminary mastication, and our flour is so carefully deprived of its fibrous portions and so cunningly dealt with in the bakehouse and kitchen in the making of bread, cakes, and pastry which shall eat light and short that these articles get very little chewing; while such vegetable products as rice, vermicelli, tapioca, and macaroni are, as served at table, so soft that they slip down into the stomach almost as readily as simple milk. Let any one run through his dietary of any one day, and he will realise how very little work his masticatory apparatus is called upon to perform. It will read something like the following. Breakfast: porridge and milk, eggs, bacon, bread, and marmalade. Lunch: fish, tender meat, boiled vegetables, bread, some "sweet," and cheese. Tea: bread, butter, and cake. Dinner: much the same as lunch. What opportunity, I ask, does such a bill-of-fare afford for the development of teeth and jaws, and for the proper functional activity of the salivary glands?

2. _Defective masticatory apparatus._--Another potent cause of inefficient mastication is some defect in the masticatory apparatus, and defects of this kind are very common in those who have not been accustomed to masticate thoroughly in early life. Foremost among these are irregularities of the teeth leading to faulty "bite" and caries of the teeth which causes them to be tender or to break away, if it does not lead to their actual extraction. Mastication cannot be thorough where the bite is defective, for this not only leads to imperfect opposition of the upper and lower teeth, but renders the lower ones incapable of that ample lateral movement, against the upper which is needful to normal mastication.

3. _Idiosyncrasy._--Some are temperamentally more disposed to hurry over their meals than others. The katabolic, restless, nervous individual is more apt to swallow his food hastily than is his more deliberate and phlegmatic brother. Individual differences in this respect are even observed among the lower animals. Thus, one of a pair of horses of about the same age and build is nervous and excitable and inclined to bolt its food, while its companion of more stolid temperament is a thorough and efficient masticator. The former shows comparatively little wearing down of the teeth, and often suffers from indigestion, a large portion of corn grains passing through his digestive canal intact; in the latter the teeth are well worn, indigestion never occurs, and but very few grains pass through the digestive tract unchanged. It may be objected here that we cannot help temperament, and to a large extent this is true; but much can be done towards modifying it, and it is something to know where dangers, temperamental dangers, among others, lie.

4. _Circumstances of life._--Again, in this hurrying, strenuous age people are much less deliberate than in the easy, slow-going days of long ago. A meal is too often regarded as something to be got through quickly, as taking up time which might be devoted to something more profitable. Especially is this true of breakfast and lunch; it is no uncommon thing for a business man to hurry through his breakfast in a few minutes, preparatory to rushing off to his train, and his lunch as likely as not is as hastily swallowed in his office or at a bar. Tradesmen are apt to take their meals in mere snatches; apprentices, shop girls, and other “hands” are often not allowed sufficient time for their meals; while, to come to the professions, we all know how the busy medical man, for instance, is often obliged to take a hurried snack in the short intervals between seeing his patients. No wonder that thus circumstanced people acquire the habit of bolting their food. A meal should be regarded as an end, and an important end, in itself. It should be taken at leisure, body and mind being, for the time being, given up to it, and to agreeable social intercourse. If this rule were always observed a most important source of inefficient mastication would be removed.

SECTION III. From _London Lancet_, July 25, 1903

EVILS RESULTING FROM INEFFICIENT MASTICATION

Too much food is eaten.--Inefficient mastication conduces to excessive eating. Now it is obvious that soft foods, and these constitute the bulk of our modern dietary, pass much more readily into the stomach than coarse, hard foods which compel a certain amount of preliminary mastication, and for this reason the former predispose to excessive eating: hence a danger at all periods of life, not only in grown-ups but in children, even infants; brought up as the latter are, mainly on liquid and pappy foods, many of them consume not only far more than is needful, but far more than is healthful, their stomachs being literally deluged with nutriment.

When the food is of a kind necessitating abundant mastication it is much less likely to be taken in excess, for the longer the time spent in mastication the less will the individual be tempted to consume; even in the case of soft food, less will probably be eaten if it be thoroughly masticated and insalivated than if it be bolted. Thorough mastication, however, not only tends to diminish the amount of food consumed on account of the time and labour which it entails; it actually reduces the amount needful to constitute a sufficiency, for the more perfectly the food is chewed the more perfectly is it digested and the more economically is it disposed of in the system; the less, moreover, is the tendency to that morbid craving for food which is so frequent an accompaniment of defective digestion. It is certain that appetite and the needs of the system are sooner satisfied when food is well masticated and digested than when it is swallowed whole.

A mass of unmasticated food may lodge in the throat and cause fatal suffocation.--This may seem to be a very exceptional kind of evil, but I am informed by one whose experience makes him an authority on the ways of the British soldier that it is by no means uncommon for soldiers in barracks to die from this cause. Usually it is when they are under the influence of alcohol that fatal results occur, post-mortem examination disclosing large undigested masses of food in the stomach. A like experience is also frequently met with in the case of men killed by accident.

The presence of masses of imperfectly masticated food in the stomach may cause disturbance either mechanically or by reason of their imperviousness to the gastric juices.--We have already seen that the digestibility of a food is largely determined by its consistence, and that many articles of diet, such as cheese, hard-boiled egg, cocoa-nut, lobster, and new bread, which have the reputation of being very indigestible, can, if finely comminuted by chewing or otherwise, be rendered quite digestible. Such articles are indigestible essentially by reason of their compactness; the compact lumps, but little pervious to the gastric juice, tend to undergo abnormal chemical change in the stomach, and may in this way cause violent local irritation, even to the extent of setting up acute gastritis; or they may paralyse the nerves of the stomach and check gastric secretion and movement, and thus remain _in loco_ wholly undigested for hours or even days; or, again, more distant nervous effects may be produced, such as frontal headache, which may be felt almost immediately after ingestion of the peccant substance, being of reflex rather than toxic origin, and presumably in some cases, at least, due to the mere mechanical irritation of the stomach. The passage of imperfectly digested food into the bowel may still further aggravate matters. It does not seem improbable that the habitual bolting of food, by the prolonged local irritation to which it gives rise, may predispose to cancer of the stomach: Napoleon was a notorious fast eater and it is well known that he died from this disease.

While, however, the bolting of food readily sets up disturbance in some, it must be conceded that in many it seems to cause little or no inconvenience; especially is this the case in the young with vigorous muscular stomachs capable of triturating the food, and thus doing duty for the teeth. The human stomach is, indeed, a long-suffering organ, and wonderfully tolerant of ill-treatment, sometimes almost rivalling in its hardiness the gizzard of the bird. Nor is this surprising when we reflect that it is, in the ordinary course of

nature, constantly exposed to the entrance of noxious substances. In this respect it stands in marked contrast to the intestines, for not only are highly irritant substances often vomited rather than passed onwards, but in ordinary circumstances the gastric contents are not allowed to pass the pylorus, until they have been duly prepared by the stomach; the pylorus, in fact, stands guard over the entrance to the bowel and is jealous of anything passing it which is likely to injure that canal.

And just as the pylorus protects the bowel so, in exceptional cases, may the œsophagus protect the stomach, regurgitating, after the fashion of the ruminants, insufficiently masticated bits of food, in order that they may be re-masticated. I have myself met with cases in point. Sometimes, in cases of this kind, the œsophagus may be dilated into a sort of proventriculus, which is capable of temporarily lodging a large quantity of food. Such a proventriculus is said to have developed in an apprentice who, not being allowed sufficient time for his dinner, rapidly bolted it, to regurgitate it after working hours and to chew the cud at leisure. Whether in these cases the food is ever returned from the stomach itself I am unable to say.

While the stomach is the organ especially liable to be injured by the swallowing of lumps of unmasticated food, the bowel may also suffer, especially the cæcum and vermiform appendix. And here we come to one of the most serious indictments against the bolting of food; though man has doubtless always suffered from appendicitis, there can be little doubt that this malady is more common now than it used to be; and there is equally little doubt, in my own mind at least, that the cause of its greater frequency is related to his food. I do not propose to discuss here in detail how food is capable of causing appendicitis, but will merely refer to one of the ways in which it may do so. I had already come to the conclusion that the habit of bolting food is a potent cause, when I read Sir Frederick Treves's Cavendish Lecture in which he makes that contention. Sir Frederick Treves points out that in this rushing age people, especially business men, are apt to hurry over their meals and to take them at irregular times and often while standing at a bar; even when there is more leisure, food is rarely masticated nowadays in the same thorough way that it was in the old time, when it was of a coarser nature: hence solid lumps, especially in the case of such articles as pine-apple, preserved ginger, nuts, tough meat, and lobster, are apt to pass beyond the pylorus and, escaping intestinal digestion, to lodge in the cæcum and precipitate an attack of appendicitis, the most common predisposing cause of which is a loaded cæcum, often preceded by constipation. Sir Frederick Treves contends that this distended state of the cæcum encourages catarrh of the appendix by dragging upon it and blocking its orifice, as well as by twisting it and thus interfering with its blood-supply.[22]

An excess of starch is apt to pass into the stomach.--We have just seen that inefficient mastication tends to promote over-eating, and what has been said on this head applies to all kinds of food, starchy foods among others. It leads, however, to a further evil as regards these latter; not only does it tend unduly to increase the quantity of them consumed, but it too often causes the stomach and intestines to become flooded with starch in a wholly undigested form. I cannot too frequently repeat that in ancient times, especially in the pre-cooking age, laborious mastication was needed in the case of all starchy foods, partly because they were coarse and fibrous, but chiefly because the starch and other nutritive ingredients had, in order to become available for nutrition, to be liberated from their undigestible cellulose envelopes. In these days of prepared, soft, starchy foods, however, mastication is very little required for these purposes, but in other respects it is as needful as ever, indeed more needful, if the large quantities of starch which are now consumed are to be insalivated effectually. The laborious and sustained mastication to which primitive man was compelled to subject _his limited supplies of uncooked starchy food, went far to effect complete digestion of the starch within the mouth_, for raw starch is freely digested by the saliva,[23] and hence in his case _very little passed into the stomach in a wholly undigested form_. How different is the case with us moderns. Since the opening of the era of agriculture and cooking, man has enormously multiplied his supplies of saccharide, and he now consumes large quantities of starch which has been freed from its cellulose framework by cooking, milling, grinding, and the like, and reduced to a soft or pappy form, such as milk puddings, porridge, boiled potatoes, and new bread, all of which can be swallowed with little or no preliminary chewing; and when food can be swallowed easily, without mastication, few will take the trouble to masticate it. In these circumstances the starch does not undergo adequate salivary digestion, and a large quantity passes wholly undigested into, and out of, the stomach, not beginning to be digested until it reaches the bowel. Small wonder that the latter should rebel again this invasion and that flatulence, pain, and other dyspeptic evils should result.

It is especially in young children that these evils are observed. Too often the stomach of the child, semi-carnivorous, remember, by its ancestry, is literally deluged with pure starch. At the seventh or eighth month, or even earlier, for many of the patent infant foods contain it, this substance is poured into the stomach without being afforded any opportunity of undergoing salivary digestion; and for a long time after infancy large quantities are given in the liquid or pultaceous form, such as rusks soaked in milk, puddings, and mashed potatoes. This practice of deluging the digestive organs with starch, besides leading to the more immediate troubles connected with flatulent dyspepsia, gives rise to abundant formation of toxins which, by irritating the alimentary mucous membrane,

set up gastro-intestinal catarrh; this, again, intensifies the dyspepsia already existing and causes a still further production of toxins, so that the motions become intensely fœtid. These poisons being absorbed into the blood the tissues become saturated with them and the nutrition of the entire organism is disturbed, the faulty metabolism manifesting itself by a diminished resistance to pathogenic agencies, by a tendency on the part of the tissues to inflame (as shown by a liability in children thus fed to bronchitis, rhinitis, naso-pharyngitis, and tonsillitis), by their proneness to tuberculosis, and finally by a disposition to rickets, which I little doubt is essentially of toxæmic origin.

Besides the above-mentioned troubles an excess of starch in the stomach may set up hyperchlorhydria--_i. e._, that form of dyspepsia in which there is excessive secretion of hydrochloric acid. This affection occurs during the most vigorous years of life and is apparently due to excessive activity on the part of the gastric glands. The excess of acid does not give rise to any symptoms so long as there is any unsatisfied proteid in the stomach to unite with it, but directly all the proteid is satisfied and free acid is present in the stomach, pain, heartburn, and distention are apt to be felt; hence these symptoms are generally removed temporarily by a meal, the food ingested seizing upon the free acid, and tend to recur in the course of an hour or two. Other symptoms are mental and bodily lassitude and great mental depression, while, if the condition is long-continued, gastric catarrh and dilatation ensue. Eructation of the acrid mass, its removal with a tube, or its dilution or neutralisation by an alkali, causes relief of the symptoms. Now Dr. William Russell, who has recently studied this form of dyspepsia, has shown, and the fact is most significant from our present point of view, that in it starch is the last constituent to leave the stomach; that when this organ has so far emptied itself as to contain but one or two ounces of very acrid material the residue consists chiefly of finely divided undigested starch, which continues to stimulate the gastric secretion; “and, there being no more proteid with which to combine, the secretion accumulates and leads to hyperacidity.”[24] Inasmuch, then, as inefficient mastication leads to an excess of starch in the stomach, we see how it may predispose to hyperchlorhydria and we shall presently see that there is yet another reason why it should do so.

It will be gathered from the foregoing that thorough mastication is the most effective way of securing efficient starch digestion. This simple fact has been most strangely overlooked. Thus “van Valzah considers that not a little of the difficulty of the digestion of starches and cereals can be overcome by more thorough cooking. Patients who cannot eat potatoes after ordinary cooking are [he urges] often able to digest them very readily if they are doubly cooked before being served. Cereals, as a rule, should [he contends] be allowed to simmer all night and then be thoroughly cooked for a half hour in the morning before being eaten.”[25] This is an admirable illustration of the modern tendency to cheat the mouth of its proper work. A much more rational way of facilitating starch digestion in those who experience a difficulty in this respect is by efficient mastication.

Evils resulting from an insufficient quantity of alkali in the stomach.--I doubt if it is adequately realised what a large amount of alkaline saliva passes into the stomach as the result of prolonged mastication. Its presence there serves the useful purpose of prolonging the period of starch digestion within the stomach, while it further aids gastric digestion not only by exciting the secretion of gastric juice, but also by its influence on the reaction of the gastric contents; it can scarcely be doubted that the effect is on the whole one favourable to digestion in general. We have just seen that defective mastication may predispose to hyperchlorhydria by allowing an excess of pure starch to pass into the stomach, and I suggest that it may further operate in the same direction by cheating the stomach of its due supply of alkaline saliva. Now the saliva in this affection is apt, as was pointed out by Sir William Roberts, to be superalkaline, and for this reason he recommended his acid-dyspeptics to excite the flow of it by chewing gum-mastic with the object of neutralising the gastric hyperacidity. That relief can thus be obtained there can be no doubt; but it is surely more rational to get the patient to stimulate his salivary glands by masticating actual food, by which we secure the additional advantages accruing from its complete insalivation and comminution as well as from the reflex gastric effects. Actuated by these considerations, I have long been in the habit of recommending hyperchlorhydriacs to subject their food to prolonged mastication, this being, in my belief, the most rational and effective way of breaking the stomach of its vicious habit. In extreme cases we must insist that each morsel of food should be chewed at least one hundred times and not permit any relaxation of this severe discipline, until the stomach has been schooled into healthier ways. _Evils in connection with the jaws and their appendages and the adjacent structures: the nasal passages, naso-pharynx, and faucial tonsils._--In those who do not masticate properly in early life these parts fail to develop as they should, and they are on this account alone predisposed to disease; their resistance to disease is still further lowered by the fact of their blood and lymph flow not being adequately stimulated by the vigorous exercise of the masticatory muscles. Now we have seen that the great cause of defective mastication in children is the softness of the food given them and that the feeding of them upon an excess of soft food, especially the starchy kind, disturbs digestion, induces toxæmia, and in this way evokes a catarrhal tendency. In children thus fed we have therefore several conditions which make for disease in the parts under consideration--defective development, sluggish circulation, and toxic saturation. Is it any wonder that the modern child should be liable to disease in these regions, that he should so frequently suffer from rhinitis, naso-pharyngitis, tonsillitis, and from hypertrophy

of the pharyngeal tonsil (“adenoids”) and of the faucial tonsils?

It is in this way that I would explain the frequency of adenoids among the children of civilised communities. I claim, in fact, that this disease is largely dietetic in origin. I submit that a child whose nasal apparatus and naso-pharynx are well-grown and habitually bathed by a stream of pure blood and lymph, periodically accelerated by an ample and vigorous use of the masticatory muscles, is unlikely to contract adenoids. On the other hand, I contend that a child in whom these parts are ill-developed and bathed by an habitually sluggish stream of tainted blood and lymph--one, _i. e._, that is not only poisoned, but rarely, if ever, hurried along its lazy course by due exercise of the muscles of mastication--I submit that such a child runs great risk of contracting the disease. The influence in setting up adenoids of toxic saturation with its resulting catarrhal tendency is shown by the frequency with which this affection follows upon the rhinitis and naso-pharyngitis of measles and diphtheria, and in order to realise how greatly the circulation of blood and lymph in the walls of the naso-pharynx must be influenced by mastication, one has but to remember how very closely the pterygoids are related to this region; in exploring it for adenoids they can, indeed, often be felt to stand out prominently.[26]

This, then, is my explanation of the truly fearful prevalence of adenoids among the moderns. It is essentially a disease of pap-fed peoples. A child may, with the one exception that he is fed on a pappy, super-saccharide diet, be brought up under ideal health conditions. He may live in the heart of a dry, open country, far from the darkness, dust, and tainted atmosphere of the town, sleep with the windows open all night, live out of doors all day, be fed on the most nourishing (too nourishing, it may be) food, be clothed after the most approved methods, and yet, in spite of all this, we may find his naso-pharynx packed with adenoids. This disease is, in fact, scarcely less prevalent in the country than in the towns, scarcely less common among the rich than among the poor. Yet in primitive communities it is practically unknown. And what, I would ask, is the one condition in the material environment of my supposititious child differing from that of the primitive child? What but the factor of diet? Therefore, I say, the prevalence of adenoids among moderns must be the result of the modern system of feeding children, and the defective mastication which goes along with it.

That the foregoing is a grave indictment against that system, it need scarcely be said. For adenoid disease is fraught with many evils, among them mental hebetude, blocking of the Eustachian tubes, and manifold other auditory troubles, gastro-intestinal disturbances from the passage into the stomach of unhealthy discharges, and, most serious of all, nasal obstruction and consequent mouth-breathing. So serious are the evils connected with this latter habit that they demand more than a passing reference. Pronounced adenoid disease is always associated with mouth-breathing, and there can be no doubt that in the majority of these cases, the nasal obstruction is not in the nasal passages primarily, but is due to a blockage of the posterior nares by the adenoid growths, for it generally happens that nasal breathing is rapidly re-established after their removal, though in a certain proportion of cases the obstruction still persists, and has to be dealt with by treatment directed to the nasal passages themselves. Some have, indeed, contended that a primary nasal obstruction is one important factor in the induction of adenoids, leading as it does to a dry-cupping of the naso-pharynx during inspiration and to a consequent congestion of its lining membrane. I am quite ready to allow that this mechanism may play some part in causation, and such an assumption is in entire harmony with my main contention that adenoid disease is of dietetic origin, for nasal obstruction in children, other than that caused by adenoids, is mainly due to defective development of the nasal passages coupled with inflammation of their lining membrane, both of which conditions may, as we have seen, be essentially the outcome of defective diet.

Coming now to the evils resulting from mouth-breathing, we have first to remember that normally the air is inhaled through the nose, and is thus warmed, moistened, and filtered before being allowed to pass into the lungs; but in the mouth-breather the air, which may be dry, cold, and dust-laden, passes at once unprepared through the mouth into the lungs, impinging in its passage against the pharynx, thus drying and mechanically irritating the mouth, pharynx, larynx, and bronchial tubes, all of which are thereby predisposed to disease. In this way laryngitis and bronchitis, nay, even phthisis, may be induced. Dental caries is also predisposed to by the habit of breathing through the mouth. Mouth-breathing further interferes with the proper development of the cranial bones, but especially of the maxilla, giving rise to what may be termed the “mouth-breather’s jaw,” so characteristic is it I do not propose to discuss here the mechanism by which this deformity is produced, interesting though the question is; suffice it to say that nasal breathing is essential to the normal development of the jaws. The deformity in question, though it involves the maxilla chiefly, affects also the mandible from the fact of its being, to a large extent, moulded on the maxilla; in typical cases the maxilla is small and its alveolar ridge does not attain its normal length, but is compressed laterally towards the sagittal plane, giving rise to the false appearance of a “high arch” and often thrusting the anterior portion of the ridge forwards; the teeth, the growth of which is not so much interfered with as that of the imbedding bone, are thus prevented from taking up their proper positions and show irregularity, sometimes extreme. Dental irregularity may also, as we shall see, result from inadequate use of the jaws in mastication,

but not to the extent which is frequently observed in the mouth-breather's jaws, and therefore pronounced dental irregularity always shows that there has been protracted nasal obstruction, and this in the vast majority of cases implies the existence of adenoids, past or present; I say in the "vast majority," for in a few rare cases long-continued nasal obstruction in children originates primarily in the nose and may lead to the typical mouth-breather's jaw, with the resulting dental irregularity.

The tongue.--If the tongue is not properly exercised in childhood and youth, we find it imperfectly developed; hence in inefficient masticators it is generally small. It must not be forgotten in this connection that this organ is considerably exercised when the infant is at the breast, from which the milk is obtained, not by suction, but by a vigorous tugging and squeezing of the nipple (in which the tongue takes considerable part), whereby the gland is reflexly excited to secrete. When, on the other hand, the child feeds at the bottle he obtains his milk by actual suction, and generally through an orifice of such ample dimensions as to allow the bottle to be rapidly emptied with comparatively little exercise of the lips and tongue. In short, the breast-fed infant has to do some work for his living, and that of a sort calculated to promote the health of the jaws and their appendages, while the bottle-fed child can glut himself by doing very little more than opening his mouth; wherefore we find the tongue and adjacent parts less developed in the latter than in the former. It may be thought to be a matter of indifference whether the tongue develops to its normal proportions or remains small, but such is by no means the case, for, as Dr. J. Sim Wallace has shown, the pressure of this structure against the teeth promotes the normal development of the jaws, especially of the mandible, and when it is small they are apt to be so too.

The salivary glands.--Just as mastication increases the functional activity of the salivary glands and buccal glands and favours their normal development, so, contrariwise, inefficient mastication during early life fails to call forth their normal functional activity and to secure their adequate development. Thus we find that a child who has been brought up on hard, starchy foods, necessitating abundant mastication has much larger and more active salivary glands than one who has been fed on soft foods which slip down into the stomach before they have had the chance of being properly masticated, and it is needless to say that the more efficient these glands are the more likely is digestion to be carried out satisfactorily.

The jaw-bones.--If the jaws are not adequately exercised in youth by mastication they fail to grow to their normal size and shape, and there is apt in consequence to be overcrowding of the teeth. The main defect of the jaws in such cases is their smallness; they do not present that pronounced lateral compression and anterior protrusion which characterise the mouth-breather's jaw, nor such extreme dental irregularity, the most common being overlapping of the incisors, displacement of the canines, and difficulties in regard to the eruption of the wisdom teeth from shortness of the alveolar ridge. I have already referred to the progressive shortening in the post-molar ridge, which has been taking place during man's evolution from the anthropoid in correspondence with the alteration in his diet.

We thus see that defective use of the jaws leads to irregularity of the teeth (1) directly and (2) indirectly through the induction of adenoids. This irregularity is not only unsightly but leads to certain evils which thus primarily owe their origin, in large measure at least, to defective mastication. What, then, are these evils? In the first place, dental irregularity predisposes to dental caries by favouring the lodgement of food between the teeth; in the next place, it leads to defective "bite." Now when the bite is defective adequate mastication is impossible, for not only is it impossible in these circumstances to oppose the teeth properly, but also, owing to their interlocking, to accomplish that free lateral movement of the lower teeth against the upper, which belongs to normal mastication. I do not say that defective bite is the sole cause of this imperfect lateral movement; it may, indeed, be observed in most moderns brought up on soft pappy food, whether the bite be good or not. Normal mastication is, in fact, becoming a lost art; the average modern masticates mainly by a vertical compression of the lower teeth against the upper, and in only a small degree by a lateral frictional movement which, it is needless to say, is the more effective method for grinding purposes; and it is, I doubt not, chiefly for this reason that the teeth of modern man are so much less worn down than those of primitive peoples.

The teeth.--Imperfect use of the teeth leads to many ills. When adequately exercised and made to execute for one or two hours every day a lively dance in their sockets, during which the circulation of blood and lymph in the tooth-pulp, periodontal membrane, and surrounding tissue of the gum is vigorously stimulated, and the cavity of the mouth is bathed in a copious flow of salivary and other buccal secretions, we have conditions which make alike for the health of the buccal mucous membrane, of the teeth, and of the periodontal membrane and alveoli; but when the circulation is not duly stimulated in this way the teeth do not develop properly, while the secretions of the mouth are apt to be scanty and unhealthy, both of which conditions predispose to caries. How far dental caries is due to inherent dental weakness and how far to faulty conditions outside the teeth we need not stop to inquire; Dr. Wallace attributes little influence to the former factor, contending that caries depends essentially upon faulty dental environment; and one can scarcely doubt that the state of the gums and of the oral secretions profoundly influences the growth of bacteria in the mouth, upon the acid yielded by which organisms the corrosion of the dental enamel essentially depends. Faulty conditions of the oral

secretions likewise favour the deposit of tartar.

Another result of imperfect use of the teeth is undue thinness of the alveolar walls and periodontal membrane, in consequence of which the teeth are not so firmly held in their sockets as they should be. This is, I believe, one of the reasons why they are prone to fall out prematurely among the moderns: we know that the teeth tend to drop out in old people owing to a senile atrophy of the alveolar walls; the Haversian canals get smaller and may, indeed, disappear entirely, and it stands to reason that this atrophy must be hastened by inefficient exercise of the teeth. So far as I am able to gather from an examination of skulls in museums, the teeth are rarely shed among primitive peoples before extreme old age, while among moderns they frequently fall out long ere this is attained.

A still worse evil attaching to insufficient use of the teeth is pyorrhœa alveolaris or Riggs's disease, which, in conjunction with the deposit of tartar, is the great cause of the premature loosening and shedding of the teeth observed among latter-day civilised peoples. This affection consists of a purulent inflammation of the periodontal membrane, owing to the invasion of it by pyogenic cocci, so that pus wells up on pressing the gum against the teeth. Now, when by a vigorous use of the teeth the buccal cavity is kept well flushed with healthy secretions, the growth of micro-organisms within this chamber is kept down, and when, by the same means, the vitality of the periodontal membrane and adjacent tissues of the gum is periodically stimulated, these tissues offer stout resistance to the invasion of pathogenic organisms; but when, contrariwise, the teeth are little used, the secretions of the mouth are in consequence defective both as to quality and quantity, and the growth of organisms in the buccal cavity is promoted; and when, further, the circulation in the periodontal membrane and adjacent soft tissues is not adequately stimulated by vigorous mastication, their vitality is poor and they offer but a feeble resistance to parasitic invasion. We can thus, I think, safely infer that inefficient mastication is a potent cause of pyorrhœa alveolaris; and the chief cause of inefficient mastication being the eating of soft foods, we must also conclude that the latter practice is chiefly responsible for the disease in question; such foods further predispose to this affection in that they are apt to lodge between the teeth and by undergoing decomposition there to favour the growth of micro-organisms within the mouth. The condition of the teeth and gums among the civilised poor is, alas, little calculated to make us proud of our boasted civilisation--the spongy pus-exuding gums, the lengthening, loose, tartar-covered, carious teeth, and the putrescent breath constitute a damning indictment against our modern system of living on a soft, pappy diet, and not giving the teeth the work for which they are designed. I never examine such a mouth without being impressed with, and I may add oppressed by, this fact.

I am not, of course, contending that pyorrhœa alveolaris only occurs in those who masticate inefficiently; whatever causes an unhealthy condition of the gums and saliva predisposes to it, but it is surely much less common in those who masticate well than in those who masticate ill. Confirmatory of this statement is the fact that it is more frequent in those with irregular teeth than in those with a good bite, who are thus able to put their teeth to more effective use. This affection is very common among the carnivora of menageries as well as among dogs and cats; indeed, one seldom fails to find it in dogs over four years of age, and in old dogs it is generally rampant. Doubtless in all these cases the general conditions of life play some part in the causation of the disease, but I do not think that we can eliminate from it the factor of defective use of the jaws and teeth, for it is certain that dogs and cats are fed largely on pappy foods and are often insufficiently supplied with bones.

The causation of dental caries.--Dr. Wallace, in his philosophical work on "The Cause and Prevention of Decay in Teeth," contends that the cause of the prevalence of dental caries is that the natural food-stuffs are, to a large extent, ridded of their accompanying fibrous parts and consumed in a form which renders them liable to lodge and to undergo acid fermentation in the mouth; while from the same cause and the induced conditions the micro-organisms of the mouth lodge and multiply and augment the rapidity and intensity of the acid fermentation. I am perfectly at one with Dr. Wallace in believing that the removal of the fibrous portions of food is the main cause of the prevalence of caries among moderns, and I can hardly doubt that foods so prepared tend to promote caries in the way indicated, but I venture to think that they do this even more by failing to call forth the normal degree of mastication. I cannot but think that if these same soft foods were as laboriously masticated as they would need to be if they retained their fibrous ingredients, dental caries would be much less common than it actually is. I have endeavoured to show how very different the local conditions are in the efficient from what they are in the inefficient masticator--how in the former the jaws and teeth are wont to be well developed, the bite to be good, and the secretions which bathe the teeth to be of a kind calculated to promote their health; and how in the latter an entirely opposite set of conditions is wont to prevail. That it is possible to maintain a fine set of healthy teeth till past middle life on ordinary civilised diet, provided the food be habitually subjected to efficient mastication, is shown in the case of the man already referred to, and by numerous other cases which I have observed.

Since the application of cooking to food there has been a progressive lessening in the work of the jaws and teeth and, parallel with this, a diminution in their size and an incursion of dental caries. Among the anthropoids in their natural state caries is practically unknown, and I think we may conclude that the same was true of man before he learnt to cook. In the pre-agricultural races, such as the aboriginal Australians, the effect of cooking the food is shown in the lessening in the size of the wisdom teeth and of the post-wisdom alveolar ridge; dental caries, though rare among these people, does occur, and especially in the wisdom teeth.[27] In the early agricultural period, owing to the increasing softness of the vegetable food, the jaws and teeth show a tendency to be smaller than in the previous periods; the wisdom teeth are decidedly smaller and more prone to caries, while caries of the other teeth is by no means rare. In the late agricultural period the jaws and teeth often show very decided defects of development, while dental caries is, as we know but too well, rampant.

What has been said concerning the relative prevalence of caries in different diet epochs applies to many other diseases of the teeth; thus, along with the increase of caries, there has been a parallel increase in the prevalence of pyorrhœa alveolaris.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

I have now set forth some of the evils resulting from inefficient mastication. They are many and serious. The immediate evils, such as over-eating, indigestion, adenoids, dental caries, and pyorrhœa alveolaris, are bad enough, but when we consider the secondary evils to which these primary ones give rise,--and I have only mentioned a few of them,--we must come to the conclusion that an appalling amount of misery and suffering may be saved by the simple expedient of inculcating the habit of efficient mastication. How this end can best be accomplished will be considered in the next section.

SECTION IV. From _London Lancet_, August 8, 1903

MEANS OF INSURING ADEQUATE MASTICATION

In order to secure the full advantages accruing from the use of the jaws and their appendages, it is, above all, necessary for them to be adequately exercised during the period of development. If this is done, not only will the tendency to dental caries, adenoids, indigestion, and other evils be greatly diminished, but the masticatory instinct will establish itself as a permanent force, so that the individual will tend for the rest of his life to subject even soft foods to thorough mastication. The tongue, the lips, and the jaws of the newly born child find their natural exercise at the mother’s breast, and we should, therefore, do our utmost to get the mother to suckle her child, the bottle affording neither the same kind nor the same amount of exercise. If, unhappily, we fail in this, we must see that the teat of the feeding-bottle is so constructed as to compel the child to earn his meal by, at any rate, some exercise. This kind of exercise promotes the growth of the tongue and thus of the jaws, especially of the mandible. Directly the infant shows a disposition to bite hard things the instinct should be gratified. We may observe a tendency in this direction as early as the third or fourth month, and it becomes more and more pronounced when, the time for the eruption of the teeth approaching, the gums begin to swell up and to get tender, and saliva begins to flow from the mouth; it is now, more than ever, necessary to provide the child with hard substances on which to exercise the jaws and the gums, and a great deal of the trouble of teething is due to the failure to recognise this fact. What, then, are we to employ for this purpose? I am convinced that it is a mistake to rely solely, or even mainly, upon baubles of ivory, coral, and the like useful though these may be in their way; it is far better to give the child something which is not only hard but nutrient and pleasant to the taste, something which will at one and the same time exercise the maxillary apparatus, excite the gustatory organs, and provide a certain amount of nutriment. To this end we may, as the teething time approaches, give a chop or chicken bone, from which most of the meat has been removed; by powdering the bone with white sugar or salt we may increase its attractiveness. From such bones a good deal of nutriment can be extracted, and this of a kind which is most acceptable to the infant stomach, for it must be remembered that the young human is in the main carnivorous. Indeed, since milk is a purely animal diet, all the mammals must be regarded as essentially carnivorous during the period of suckling, while man, as already observed, from the time he emerged from the anthropoid until he learned to cook his food, was throughout life mainly an animal feeder. Therefore we should not hesitate to allow the teething infant animal food in the form suggested. Chicken and chop bones, yielding as they do before the pressure on the gums, are, moreover, just of the right degree of consistence for the purpose in view, while they afford abundant exercise for the tongue; ivory, coral, and the like are, on the other hand, too hard and unyielding, and lack, moreover, the attractiveness belonging to sapidity.

By thus providing the maxillary apparatus with suitable exercise we shall do much to facilitate the eruption of the teeth and to favour the growth of the jaws and their appendages, including the salivary glands, and so to prepare the mouth for the reception of

vegetable food. This should, of course, not be given till the teeth appear. The order in which these make their appearance gives some indication as to the order in which vegetable food should be administered to the child. The first teeth to penetrate the gums are the lower incisors which appear from the seventh to the eighth month; then follow the upper incisors from the seventh to the tenth month. These teeth enable the child to _bite_, but not, be it observed, to _masticate_, for which function the molars are necessary. Now the first molars do not appear till the twelfth or fourteenth month; the second molars not till between the fourteenth and the twentieth month; and it seems to me certain that our primitive ancestors could not have obtained starch in any quantity until they reached this age; at the best, pre-cooking man was but scantily supplied with starch, and such slender supply as he had could only be rendered accessible to the digestive juices by vigorous mastication, which broke up the indigestible cellulose framework in which all vegetable starch is contained; hence, until the young human cut his molars, he had little opportunity of securing any starch. These considerations strongly suggest the desirability of giving but small quantities of starch before the twelfth month, and though the facts, that ptyaline appears in the saliva about the time the first incisors are cut, and that pancreatic juice develops its amylolytic ferment at the same time, show that the digestive organs are ready for the reception of some starch at the seventh or eighth month, yet I believe the quantity should be strictly limited. I am ready to admit that the modern child may have, indeed probably has, a greater power of digesting starch than his remote pre-agricultural ancestor; but even so, I am convinced that we should be on our guard not to over-gorge infants with this substance. Only a small quantity should be given before the twelfth month, and it should be gradually increased up to the twentieth month.

I have said that the pre-agricultural infant was unable to secure starch in any quantity by means of his incisors. These teeth enabled him, however, to obtain some soluble nutriment from fruits, and Dr. Sim Wallace has suggested that the early eruption of the lower incisors is for the purpose of enabling the infant to pierce the outer covering of fruits so as to permit him to extract the soluble contents by suction; and, accordingly, when these teeth are cut we may allow the child to bite at such vegetable substances as apples, oranges, and sugar-cane. The latter is a useful article of diet for children, for it provides soluble saccharide in a diluted form, and it is advisable that the child should receive his cane sugar well diluted, for it must be remembered that before the agricultural period man's supply of pure sugar was limited to wild honey which, consisting as it does almost entirely of mono-saccharide (grape sugar and fruit sugar), is very easily disposed of by the digestive organs. Nowadays, the less digestible cane sugar (which is a di-saccharide) is very largely consumed in the undiluted state, in which it is apt to set up disturbance. When, however, it is obtained by chewing the sugar-cane, it is diluted both by the water in the cane and by the saliva, and I should like to see children obtain most of their cane sugar in this way.

The consideration of the conditions obtaining for pre-agricultural man not only strongly suggests that the young human of to-day should be given starch in very moderate quantities up to the twelfth month, but it points an even more important lesson--viz., that this substance should be given not, as is the custom, as liquid or pap, but in a form compelling vigorous mastication, for it is certain that early man, from the time he emerged from the ape till he discovered how to cook his vegetable food, obtained practically all his starch in such a form; it cannot too often be repeated that uncooked starch in the natural state, locked up as it is in chambers of indigestible cellulose, has no nutritive value; these chambers need first to be broken up by prolonged and energetic chewing, and in this way much or most of the starch is converted in the mouth into dextrines and maltose, very little passing into the stomach in the crude state to set up disturbance in that organ and later in the bowel. If it is given as liquid or pap it will pass down as starch into the stomach, while if it is administered in a form which obliges the child to chew it properly, not only will the jaws, the teeth, and the gums obtain the exercise which they crave, and without which they cannot develop normally, but the starch will be so thoroughly insalivated that much of it will be converted within the mouth into maltose. How foolish to upset the child's digestive system by deluging it with liquid starch, and then to endeavour to correct matters by giving the malt extract which the child can and should himself manufacture within the laboratory of his buccal cavity.

Clearly, then, the child should make his first acquaintance with starch, not in the form of a liquid or pappy patent food, but in a solid and somewhat tough form. The best means of achieving this end is occupying my attention, and I hope soon to publish the results of my investigation. Meanwhile, I would point out that hard, well-baked crusts constitute a convenient form in which to administer starch to children. A piece of crust may be put in the oven and re-baked; this not only hardens it but helps to convert the starch into dextrine, which is a stage on the road to maltose. If the crust be then cut into a suitable shape and spread with bacon fat or fresh butter, it constitutes a most agreeable morsel. Later, we may give hard plain biscuits. The same principle should be acted upon during later childhood and youth: we should always give, as far as possible, the starch in a form compelling abundant mastication. Loaves should be shaped so as to give a maximum of crust and a minimum of crumb, and should be baked hard. Such loaves are quite as nutritious as the ordinary ones, and much more digestible, containing as they do an abundance of dextrine and not a little maltose, and compelling efficient mastication, especially if eaten, as they should be, without any fluid. A lady who has the catering

for a large number of girls gives the bread in this way, and she tells me that there is keen competition for the most crusty portions.

I do not say that starch in the liquid and pappy form should find no place whatever in man's dietary at the present day, for this would imply the prohibition of porridge, boiled potatoes, milk puddings, and the like. We cannot put back the hand of time and return to the food of our primitive ancestors, nor is it desirable that we should; but we can, at least, arrange matters so that a large proportion of the starch we consume shall be in a form inviting mastication, such as crusts, stale bread, stale cake, biscuits, and so forth. The less children eat of pastry, or, indeed, of any luxurious foods, the better; if brought up on a healthy dietary and under healthy conditions generally, they will relish their simple fare more than the choicest dishes of the epicure. I do not, I say, object to the child consuming a certain proportion of starch in the liquid or pultaceous form, for if, by bringing him up on a rational dietary, his instinct to masticate be afforded due opportunity to develop he will be likely to subject even soft vegetable food to something like adequate mastication; this will tend to mitigate the evils associated with such food, not only by facilitating the digestion of starch, but by flushing the mouth and promoting the health of the teeth and buccal mucous membrane.

The question how far children should be allowed to crack nuts may here be considered. If the child has been brought up on pappy food, and has in consequence brittle and ill-developed teeth, the cracking of hard nuts will be likely to injure them, and this is _a fortiori_ true if any of the teeth are carious or "filled." And not only nuts but hard food of any kind, such as ship's biscuits, may in these circumstances injure the teeth, as many of those who went through the recent South African campaign can testify. But if, on the other hand, the child has from the beginning been fed on coarse, hard foods, so that the teeth have been allowed to grow dense and strong, no harm is likely to ensue from cracking such nuts as filberts and Spanish nuts. If a squirrel or a monkey weighing a few pounds can do so with impunity, surely the young human should be able to also. The cracking should, however, be done by the molars, while such hard nuts as Brazils had best not be tackled at all.

Animal food does not need the same amount of mastication as vegetable food, since it is not digested in the mouth, though some contend that the mixture of proteid with alkaline saliva facilitates its subsequent peptonisation. Cooked animal food is, however, all the better for some mastication, owing to the coagulation of the proteids, and, in order to insure the efficient mastication of meat, fish, and poultry, Dr. Sim Wallace recommends that they should be given in large pieces cut thin. "Flat pieces about one inch square generally _necessitate_ a certain amount of mastication. It is difficult to swallow large flat pieces of meat without mastication, but when finely minced little or no mastication is called forth." The younger the child the more underdone should the meat be.

EXAMINATION OF THE MOUTH AND ADJACENT PARTS

If a child be brought up on the lines indicated and under healthy conditions generally, it is tolerably certain that the maxillary apparatus will develop normally, that the teeth will be strong and well opposed, and show little tendency to disease; but, inasmuch as the methods advocated are but seldom put into practice, disorders of the teeth, more especially caries and irregularities, are common, and hence with a view to promote more efficient mastication it is always advisable to examine our patient's teeth.

Each individual tooth should be inspected in a good light for the presence of caries, and careful note should be taken of the "bite," a normal bite implying not only a proper opposition of the two rows of teeth but the capacity of the lower ones to move freely across the upper; mere vertical movement of the mandible does not constitute efficient mastication. In this connection it must not be forgotten that an unopposed molar is useless for purposes of mastication, and it is by no means rare to find in a mouth several sound unopposed molars which are for this reason absolutely functionless. Nay, more than this, it may happen that teeth, perfectly sound ones, too, far from helping, may actually interfere with mastication; thus, among the poor, we sometimes find all the teeth gone save the upper canines and the lower incisors, and the teeth and gums being alike unable to come into contact, nothing worthy of the name of mastication is possible; it would be far better to be without any teeth whatever, for the toothless gums would then be permitted to come into contact along their entire extent, under which condition they gradually harden and come to be quite efficient grinding agents.

Next the gums, the alveoli, and the roots of the teeth must be examined, especially for the presence of erosion, tartar, and pyorrhœa alveolaris, this latter condition being evidenced by the welling-up of pus upon pressing the gums against the sides of the teeth.

If our examination of the mouth discloses anything likely to interfere with mastication the aid of the dentist should at once be sought, but every physician should be so far acquainted with disorders of the teeth as to be able to say, in the majority of cases, at all events, when this is necessary. I am convinced that far more illness than is generally supposed is attributable to dental defects,

and this even among the more leisured classes. With regard to pyorrhœa alveolaris, it has to be remembered that it not only does harm by causing loosening, lengthening, and shedding of the teeth, and thus interfering with mastication, but also by contaminating the stomach and the blood and thus upsetting the digestion and causing constitutional diseases, such as anæmia and arthritis; and inasmuch as poisonous discharges from the nose, the naso-pharynx, the pharynx, and the tonsils may act in a similar way, these parts also should be inspected in connection with the examination of the teeth. In the dust-laden atmosphere of towns they are very liable to disease, and even when healthy are necessarily dirtied; some go so far as to advise all town dwellers daily to wash out the nasal passages and to gargle the throat; but, whatever may be thought of this, it is certain that under existing dietetic conditions special means are needed in order to keep the mouth and teeth clean. When man fed on raw food this was not necessary, the food itself and the copious flow of saliva, induced by prolonged mastication, effectually cleansing these parts; but, under present conditions, food tends to remain within the mouth, especially between the teeth and in their crevices, and therefore special means are needed to remove it. This is done by “cleaning the teeth” and by rinsing the mouth.

The tooth-brush.--Probably the ideal method of cleaning the teeth is that adopted by many primitive and not a few semi-civilised peoples--viz., rubbing them with a twig of wood which has been teased out at one end so as to form a sort of brush by means of which the teeth can be burnished and food dislodged from them. The modern tooth-brush requires to be used with great caution, as it is capable of doing much harm, not only by removing the mucoid film, which, according to Dr. Wallace, protects the teeth from corroding agencies,[28] but probably also by injuring the edge of the gum and the neck of the teeth, and thus setting up the condition known as “erosion.” Certain it is that some of the best sets of teeth I have encountered have been wholly unacquainted with the tooth-brush. In any case the brush should be employed with great care; it should be soft, and should always be drawn away from the gums both on the inner and outer aspect of the teeth towards the biting surface, as well as across the latter, never transversely across the outer surfaces, as so frequently is done. The object of these procedures is to dislodge any particles of food that may have collected between the teeth or in their crevices. For this purpose the toothpick may also be employed judiciously. In order to render the enamel of the teeth white it is better to rub each tooth carefully with some soft material, such as chamois leather, rather than to scrub them with a brush. Tooth-powders should not be used as a matter of routine, but only occasionally and for appearance rather than for cleanliness, and should consist of some simple non-irritant material. Antiseptic powders and washes are to be scrupulously avoided, for it is neither desirable nor possible to render the buccal cavity aseptic; myriads of bacteria flourish within it, many of which play a useful part as scavengers. The time of all others for cleaning the teeth is just before going to bed, so that the food shall not be allowed to decompose in the mouth during the night. There will then be no need to use the tooth-brush in the morning.

Rinsing the mouth.--The mouth should be rinsed out as a matter of routine after each meal and on rising, and care should be taken to do this before the early cup of tea, so as not to contaminate the stomach with the buccal secretions which have accumulated during the night. Inasmuch as raw vegetable food has a cleansing effect on the teeth, it is often a wise plan, especially in the case of children, to finish a meal with some kind of fruit, such as an apple or an orange. It hardly seems necessary to insist upon the necessity for keeping all artificial dentures thoroughly clean.

PROFESSOR PAWLOW’S DEMONSTRATIONS OF PSYCHIC INFLUENCE IN DIGESTION

[In presenting a theory of human alimentation involving mental or nervous as well as mechanical and chemical factors which influence it for good, it is not often that an author is able to enlist the assistance of a complete battery of scientific confirmation to fortify his own crude observations taken direct from personal experience in the study of natural requirements.

Professor Pawlow, with his marvellously skilful investigation of the workings of the digestive secretions, and Dr. Cannon of the Harvard Medical School, by aid of persistent and patient X-ray studies, explain how it is that earned appetite and thorough mouth-treatment of food are preliminary necessities of easy digestion, and that disturbance or shock of any sort during the process stop digestive proceedings and endanger health. They show also that when the mouth is used to do _all that it can do_ in the work of digestion all the rest is easily accomplished by the NATURAL AUTOMATIC PROCESSES within the body.

They both show that we have, each of us, a certain responsibility in the matter of right digestion and healthy nutrition, and that all this personal responsibility is located in the head, in the mind, and in the mouth, and that while the alimentation is proceeding it is a sacred duty to do our part _right_, according to the intelligence that these most valuable demonstrations teach.

Professor Pawlow has allowed publication of his lectures in Russian and German, and recently Professor W. H. Thompson of the Physiological Department of Trinity College, Dublin, has made an English translation which is issued by Charles Griffin & Company

of London and J. B. Lippincott of Philadelphia.

The author has to express special gratitude to Professor Pawlow, Professor Thompson, Messrs Griffin and Lippincott for permission to reprint herein some entire lectures and extracts that bear especially on the practical understanding of our subject.

Professor Pawlow is one of the Board of Scientific Assessors mentioned in the REPORT of a PLAN for an INTERNATIONAL INQUIRY into the subject of HUMAN NUTRITION.

In one of the lectures, not here reprinted, Professor Pawlow gives merited recognition of the early statements of the French physiologist Blondlot relative to psychic influence on the digestive secretions made some half century ago, but discredited by physiologists since that time, owing to insufficiency of evidence brought forward in support of the statements.

Professor Pawlow's acknowledgment is so gracefully rendered that it is here given as a model of scientific courtesy.

"I have depicted the work of the gastric glands as we have seen it in our experiments, and as it has developed under our hands. Is the picture a new one? In its details, yes; but not in its fundamental features. However singular it may appear, the sketch of this picture was more than fifty years ago outlined by physiology. May this constitute another reason for our science relinquishing its characteristic shyness of new things and for its conversion to our interpretation of the phenomena under consideration!

"The talented author of the _Traité Analytique de la Digestion_--Blondlot--spoke in plain words of the importance of taking food, and of the specific excitability of the gastric mucous membrane. The facts adduced in the working up of his theory were naturally insufficient, but we must not forget that the first experiments on dogs with artificial gastric fistulæ had only just been performed. It is truly incomprehensible that the researches of Blondlot and his views upon the secretion of gastric juice have experienced during the past fifty years no completion, no additions, but, on the contrary, have passed out of sight, thanks to the faulty experiments and erroneous representations of later authors. Only in the works of a few writers--and those mostly French--has Blondlot's theory survived. Of other investigators we must give mention to Heidenhain, who has enriched the physiology of absorption in general, but more especially, in connection with the secretory work of the stomach, has discovered many important facts and has given birth to many fruitful ideas. From him proceed the subdivision of the secretory process according to periods and exciting agencies, as well as the suggestion that it would be important to investigate the individual food-stuffs in relation to the work of the stomach. Heidenhain's results are contained in his well-known article on the secretion of the cardiac glands of the stomach, published in the year 1879 in PFLÜGER'S ARCHIVES. The work of Blondlot and the additions of Heidenhain comprise almost everything of importance which was accomplished by physiology in fifty years concerning the conditions and mechanism of the secretory work of the stomach during digestion. Full of moment, however, for our subject was the obvious error that mechanical stimulation constituted an effective excitant of the gastric glands, and this error was in its turn a result of faulty methods."—HORACE FLETCHER.]

LECTURE IV

GENERAL SCHEME OF AN INNERVATION MECHANISM--THE WORK OF THE NERVOUS APPARATUS OF THE SALIVARY GLANDS--APPETITE, THE FIRST AND MOST POTENT EXCITER OF THE GASTRIC SECRETION

Constituent parts of a complete innervation mechanism--The special duty of the peripheral terminations of afferent nerves--The specific qualities of nerve cells--Analogy between the innervation mechanism of the salivary glands and that of the deeper-lying glands of digestion--The exciting agencies of the nervous mechanism of the salivary glands; their particular properties--Differences between the exciting agencies of the different salivary glands--Discussion of the sham feeding experiment--Mechanical and chemical stimulation of the cavity of the mouth has no effect on the gastric glands--The experiment of Bidder and Schmidt relative to psychic excitation of the gastric secretion--Conditions for success in this experiment--The passionate longing for food--the appetite--alone brings on the secretory effect in the sham feeding experiment.

GENTLEMEN,--As you have learned in the last lecture, and also in part have seen by direct experiment, the nervous system can influence the work of our glands in the most diverse ways. The vagus nerve, already burdened with many duties, has, in addition, proved itself to be an undoubted exciter of the gastric glands and of the pancreas. But we must also assign to the sympathetic nerve a similar _rôle_. This is a matter which cannot be doubted, so far as the pancreas is concerned, and is highly probable as regards the stomach. We also saw good reason for believing that these two nerves contained two different classes of fibres, secretory and trophic, a condition which had already been proved to exist by Heidenhain for the nerves of the salivary glands. As a

hypothesis we might even have proceeded a step farther and have divided Heidenhain's trophic nerves into separate classes of secretory fibres. Lastly, we advanced important experimental evidence to show the existence of special inhibitory fibres to the glands, and these fibres also run in the vagus, the list of whose functions seems almost interminable.

We obtained these results by division and artificial excitation of the nerves which run to the glands. But when, how, and by what means these nerves are thrown into activity during the normal course of physiological events remains a question.

In order to avoid repetition, and at the same time impart the utmost clearness to our representation, it may be useful to bring before your minds at once the plan of innervation of a given organ, all the more since this scheme is seldom completely followed out or adequately described in physiological text-books. Consequently, it is not borne in mind with sufficient precision by the majority of medical men.

A complete innervation mechanism consists of the peripheral endings of the centripetal (afferent) nerves, the centripetal nerves themselves, the nerve cells (a group of nerve cells connected with each other is termed a "nerve centre"), the centrifugal (efferent) nerves, and, lastly, their peripheral terminations. Physiology now accepts it as a settled fact, that nerve fibres serve only as _conductors_ of nervous impulses, which come in from contiguous links of the nervous chain. Only the peripheral endings of nerves and the nerve cells themselves have the power of transforming the external stimulus[29] into a nervous impulse. In other words, in the intact organism these alone constitute the normal receiving apparatus of the nervous system. Whether the peripheral ends of centrifugal (efferent) nerves are likewise able to function as normal sites for the application of external stimuli has still to be answered. Consequently, when any external agency excites the peripheral terminations--the receiving stations--of centripetal nerves in this or that organ, the effect of the stimulus will be conveyed through the centripetal nerves, as through a receiving wire, to the central station--the nerve cells. Here it becomes changed into a definite impulse and now comes back along the centrifugal nerves--the outgoing wires.

The utmost importance is to be attached to the fact that only the peripheral endings of centripetal (afferent) nerves, in contrast to nerve fibres themselves, respond to _specific_ stimuli; that is to say, are able to transform definite kinds of external stimuli into nervous impulses. The function of the end organs with which they are connected is therefore of a purposive nature; in other words, these organs are only called into play by certain definite conditions, and impart the idea of being aware of their purpose, of being conscious of their duty. We have long known that the peripheral endings of sensory nerves are possessed of a high degree of speciality, and cannot therefore have any doubt regarding the specific nature of the end organs of other centripetal nerves. This is a sore point in present-day physiology. But, notwithstanding our knowledge of the separate parts of the animal body, we shall only be able to form a true conception of the motive agencies of the whole complicated machine, when we have established the specific excitability of the end apparatus of every centripetal nerve, and have discovered all the mechanical, chemical, and other factors which throw this or that end apparatus into an active condition. I always look upon it as a period of scientific inadequacy so long as the effects of the most diverse external agencies upon any normal physiological process are admitted to be indistinguishable. As the work of the digestive canal is now represented in the majority of text-books, and consequently presented to the mind of the physician, it bears the impress of this period. To impart to the physician a more correct conception of this matter was my chief object in giving these lectures. I hope, indeed, to furnish you with evidence sufficiently convincing, that the alimentary canal is endowed not with mere general excitability; that is to say, does not respond to every conceivable form of agency, but only to special conditions which are different for the different portions of its length. Just as men and animals in the world are only able to maintain their existence and constantly adapt themselves to changing circumstances by aid of the peripheral endings of their sensory nerves, so every organ, indeed every cell of every organ, can only maintain its place in the animal microcosm, and adapt itself to the activity of innumerable associates, as well as to the general life of the whole, by virtue of the fact that the peripheral end apparatus of its centripetal nerves possesses a specific excitability.

The same applies to the nerve cells: obviously they are endowed with specific sensibility. Irrespective of the excitations which are communicated to them from centripetal nerves, they respond, as originators of nervous impulses, only or at least mainly to definite forms of mechanical, chemical, or other stimuli arising in the organism. This follows not alone from a number of physiological facts but also from various pharmacological data. Thus we learn that various drugs excite or annul the activity of definite portions of the nervous system, at least in the earlier phases of their effects. This specific excitability of nerve cells, just as much as the same property of peripheral end organs, lies at the bottom of the purposive action of these organs.

Hence, our next duty is to endeavour to discover the normal exciting conditions of the centripetal nerves belonging to the glands which we had under consideration in our last lecture, or, more correctly, to find out the conditions which excite the centres, as well

as the peripheral endings of the different nerves, which form parts of the nervous apparatus of these glands. We have, therefore, for each phase of the work of secretion, to find out that portion of the nervous mechanism which is for the time being under excitation, and to discover the primary agency by which this condition is elicited. This would include an exact analysis of the stimulating influence which mastication and food exert upon the nervous mechanism of these glands. We shall also be able more fully to comprehend the inner mechanism underlying the facts which formed the subject of the second lecture. This, of course, is an ideal programme which we can only follow out as far as the present state of physiology permits. It may now be instructive, and, for our further conclusions, advantageous, to glance shortly at the nervous control of the salivary glands.

The salivary glands, whose innervation has long ago been investigated, have generally been accepted as types of the deeper-lying digestive glands, and when it became necessary to form a conception of the mode of activity of the latter, medical science resorted to a bold analogy and thought of the nervous apparatus of the salivary glands. But the attempts of investigators to apply rigidly to others the scheme of innervation which holds good for the salivary glands, have done considerable harm to the usefulness of the analogy and have prevented our arriving at a correct idea of the plan of innervation of the abdominal glands. We have already had an example of this nature before us. In the salivary glands we have no clearly marked indications of nervous inhibition, and this circumstance has decidedly retarded the due development of our knowledge of the nervous control of the abdominal glands. Authors naturally expected to see a simple and prompt stimulation-effect from the same conditions of experiment which sufficed for the salivary glands, and the failure of this gave them, as they thought, the right to deny the existence of any extrinsic nervous influence upon the abdominal glands. The error is now obvious; the abdominal glands behave in some ways different from the salivary glands, and for their successful investigation, other conditions of experiment are necessary than those which held good for the former. In the working of the abdominal glands nervous inhibitory processes play a large part, but they are almost wholly absent in the case of the salivary glands. This is an additional warning that one must never push the conclusions drawn from analogy too far, but must constantly bear in mind that the life-functions of all organs are extremely complicated, and that the work of even the most apparently similar organs should be submitted to separate and careful observation. To me it appears that the unjustified analogy drawn between the abdominal and salivary glands has to be credited with another important misapprehension. And precisely for this reason I think it desirable to bring under consideration, if only in brief fashion, the conditions of work of the salivary glands, especially since Dr. Glinski has instituted in the laboratory some easily performed experiments which bear upon the matter.

The experiences of daily life teach us from the outset, that the activity of the salivary glands begins even before the introduction of food into the mouth. With an empty stomach, the sight of food or even the thought of it is sufficient to set the salivary glands at once into activity; indeed, the well-known expression, “to make one’s mouth water,” is based upon this fact. Hence a psychic event, the eager longing for food, must be accepted as an undoubted excitant of the nervous centre for the salivary glands. On the other hand, the same every-day experience, as well as numerous experiments upon animals, teach us that a number of substances, when brought into contact with the mucous membrane of the mouth, are likewise able to call forth a secretion of saliva. One even acquires the impression that everything brought into the mouth may reflexly influence these glands, the only difference being a gradual shading off in the effect, dependent upon the strength of the stimulation which the substance introduced is able to exert, and it appears to me that it is precisely this impression which has driven the idea into the background, that the peripheral end apparatus of the centripetal nerves of the digestive canal are specifically excitable. The facts were here correctly observed, but their indications erroneously interpreted.

The great multiplicity of excitants of salivary secretion, has without doubt, some connection with the complicated physiological functions of the saliva. This is the first fluid encountered by everything which enters the alimentary canal. It must, therefore, in a sense play the part of host to every substance taken in--moisten the dry, dissolve the soluble, envelop the hard and bulky with mucus in order to facilitate its passage down the narrow œsophagus; and submit certain forms of food material, such as starch, to a process of chemical elaboration. Nor is its duty by any means ended here. The saliva is secreted in the first compartment of the alimentary canal, which is at the same time the sorting-room of the organism. Much of what enters the mouth may prove in the testing process to be useless, or even noxious, and must either have its deleterious properties neutralised or be completely rejected. The saliva is secreted in the first instance to obviate injurious effects in some way; thus, for example, a strong acid is to a certain degree neutralised, while other corroding substances may be simply diluted, and by mere reduction of concentration have their harmfulness diminished.

In the second place, when the injurious substances have to be wholly removed, the saliva plays the _rôle_ of a washing-out fluid; otherwise the material, by clinging to the mucous membrane of the mouth, might in longer or shorter time gain entry into the blood and there develop its noxious influence. This last function of the fluid is hardly taken into account at all in physiology, and yet it is

evident that the saliva, as a cleansing fluid, must have a wide importance. If you only think of how often we are impelled to expectorate, that is, to wash out the mouth with saliva after something unpleasant, this will be clear. Such a view finds additional support when we reflect that a feeling of disgust produces almost as strong a flow of saliva as the sight of a tasty meal. In both cases the secretion performs the office of forerunner: in the first it prepares for the washing out of the mouth, in the second for the requisite elaboration of the food. Think how often, when something disagreeable enters the mouth, with what rapidity the saliva is poured out, even after the unpleasant substance has been for a considerable time removed, and not a trace more is apparent to the sense of taste. Indeed, long afterwards one has only to recall the circumstances to mind in order to bring on anew the secretion of saliva. Apparently the psychic excitation of the nerves of salivary secretion also ushers in the act of vomiting, which, as is well known, can be called forth by mental influence. Further, the function of the saliva just mentioned is probably the true physiological explanation of the feeling of disgust which many persons experience at the sight of the secretion itself.

Hence I hold that substances which obtain entry to the mouth set up a secretion of saliva only because we have here the seat of a definite physiological sense, and not because the peripheral terminations of the buccal nerves are devoid of specific excitability, and capable of being thrown into action by every desired form of stimulus. In other words, the specific excitability of the peripheral endings of the salivary nerves is very comprehensive and widely extended. This is no picture of the imagination, for it can be supported by facts. To say nothing of the testimony of earlier authors, that the salivary glands have each particular exciting agencies to which they specially respond, we can demonstrate the following facts from the material collected in our laboratory.

Dr. Glinski isolated the orifices of the salivary glands in dogs with portions of the adjoining mucous membrane, brought them out of the oral cavity, and caused them to heal into the edges of the skin wounds. In his first animal the ducts of the submaxillary gland were thus led outwards. By means of a Mendeljeff's clip, the wide end of a conical funnel of waterproof material was attached to the skin surrounding the orifice. To the narrow end a small test-tube, which served to collect the saliva, was attached by a wire. I now offer such an animal a piece of flesh, and, as you see, the tube fills up at once with saliva. I stop tempting the dog, hang on a new test-tube, and give it a few pieces of flesh to eat; once more a strong secretion of saliva results. A new tube is now attached to the funnel, the dog's mouth is opened, and a pinch of fine sand thrown in; again there is a flow of saliva. Once more a new test-tube; and now I apply to the buccal mucous membrane, the plume of a feather dipped in acid solution, with the result that I obtain a strong flow of saliva. One may employ a number of substances in this way, when a similar effect is always produced. You see, in this, such a comprehensive excitability of the innervation apparatus of the salivary glands that you might readily interpret it as meaning the power of response to all and sundry forms of stimulation. We now proceed, however, to another dog, whose parotid duct has in a similar manner been diverted outwards. The saliva is collected in the same way. We tempt the dog with a piece of flesh, but to our astonishment no saliva flows, and yet the animal is most eager for the savoury meal offered. Now we give it some raw flesh to eat; again the secretion of saliva is as good as absent; only when I come near can I detect one or two drops of saliva running down the sides of the tube. Probably you will say there is something wrong, either with the method or with the glands of the animal. But wait a little. I now give the dog finely powdered dry flesh, and obtain at once an abundant secretion. Should any one happen to think that the variation in the result is dependent, not on a different specific activity of the glands, but on individual differences in the dogs, I respond that Dr. Glinski has had an animal with double parotid and submaxillary fistulæ, and was able to observe on one and the same dog, a like behaviour on the part of the glands to that which we have just seen in two different individuals. An analogous experiment with bread was also carried out by Dr. Glinski. The eating of fresh moist bread produced no secretion worth mentioning, while dry bread, on the other hand, caused the saliva to flow in large quantities. The results of this experiment permit us to draw extremely instructive conclusions. In the first place, the several salivary glands are, as a matter of fact, very sharply differentiated in the conditions necessary for their activity--that is to say, in respect to the agencies which excite their nervous mechanisms. Secondly, the innervation apparatus of the parotid manifests a very sharp selective power in the choice, so to speak, of an adequate stimulus. The mechanical effect of large pieces of flesh is naturally much greater than that of the finely powdered material, and yet it was precisely to the latter that the glands responded. The stimulus is, therefore, not due to the mechanical, but to some other property of the food. This other property is obviously the dryness of the material. Our example illustrates how that which we may term "purposiveness" comes into play in the working of our glands and also how erroneous is the opinion that the mechanical stimulus is all potent. Indeed, previous authors have already pointed out that dry substances cause a specially free secretion of saliva, and yet physiological opinion throughout the length and breadth of the land, as expressed in text-books, has chosen to recognise a _universal_ instead of a _specific_ excitability. Dr. Wulfson, who is at present carrying on the investigation of salivary secretion in our laboratory, has added a very interesting observation to the results of Dr. Glinski already related. The parotid gland, which is hardly, if at all, excited when one offers fresh meat to the animal, responds with a very active secretion, when dry food (bread or powdered meat) is offered. This phenomenon is all the more surprising since the desire of the

animal for eating is much more strongly excited by flesh than by dry bread. I am quite convinced that an exact study of the exciting agencies of the three salivary glands will furnish a number of new data bearing upon the question in hand.

The second reagent which is poured out on the raw material in the digestive canal is the gastric juice. How, in the normal course of events, is the work of the gastric glands, which prepare this juice, called into play? With the first, and manifestly important factor, which has a relation thereto, you are already acquainted, and, indeed, have already seen. I refer to the production of gastric juice in the empty stomach, as a result merely of the swallowing of food in the so-called sham feeding of an œsophagotomised dog. When one takes into consideration the absolute independence of this factor, and the intensity of the effect, which makes itself evident in the secretion of a large quantity of juice of high digestive power, the exciting agency which brings about such secretion must be recognised as one of the most important and effective processes in gastric digestion. But in what does it consist? At first sight it appears--and when I previously drew your attention to the fact I expressed the opinion--that there is here a simple reflex effect from the cavity of the mouth upon the secretory nerves of the stomach, similar to the reflex excitation, _e.g._, of the parotid gland, by finely powdered flesh thrown into the mouth. Now, however, I assert quite emphatically that this is not the case. We have, it is true, in the activity of the salivary glands an analogous phenomenon to indicate--not, however, that of which we have just spoken. We might apply every conceivable form of stimulus which could possibly come into play in the act of eating, and yet would not obtain the slightest indication of secretory activity in the stomach. In this dog with a gastric fistula, and with also a divided œsophagus, I will try such an experiment, using the most effective chemical stimulus to the buccal mucous membrane, viz., acid solution.

The secretion of saliva begins at once, as you see; the acid is, therefore, effective. From the stomach, however, in spite of continued excitation, no secretion results, although the acid, mixed with the saliva, is swallowed and flows out again from the upper segment of the œsophagus--that is to say, passes along precisely the same path that the food takes in sham feeding.

We could experiment in the same way with a number of other substances: saline, bitters, pepper (strong local excitation), mustard, and so on, and always with the same results; a free secretion of saliva, but perfect quiescence of the gastric glands. We may even, with the same object, employ the soluble constituents of flesh in the form of a decoction, and likewise observe, in most cases at least, no sign of activity on the part of the gastric glands.

With the chemical we may also combine a mechanical stimulus. We can, for example, wipe out the mouth with a sponge soaked in the solution to be experimented with, but always with the same negative result. We may finally give such pieces of sponge, or even smooth stones of considerable size, to the dog to swallow, passing them back behind the anterior pillars of the fauces and allowing them to fall out again, from the upper portion of œsophagus. It may be added that a well-taught dog puts up with all these procedures without the slightest protest. You see that all the manipulations in this case are carried out with bare hands and without instrumental aid. One can easily train a dog to swallow stones which are placed in the anterior part of the buccal cavity. It simply makes a few chewing movements and swallows them down. The dog on which the acid experiment has just been made serves also for the swallowing of the stones. The attendant now places some pebbles in the front part of the mouth, when the animal rolls them round, as if chewing and gnawing them, and then swallows them. The stones fall out, as you see, from the œsophagus, and drop with an audible sound upon the table. This play with the stones has now lasted fifteen or twenty minutes (in the laboratory we have often kept it up for hours), and yet not a drop of gastric juice is to be seen.

In order to prove that the dog is perfectly healthy and normal, we lay aside the stones and proceed to our old experiment of sham feeding. As you see, the first drop of gastric juice makes its appearance precisely at the end of five minutes, and after a further five minutes we have collected more than 15 c.c. of the fluid; consequently there can be no doubt that in this dog both gastric glands and nerves are uninjured and function in normal manner. At one time we even had a dog which voluntarily took the stones out of one’s hand and swallowed them; the sagacious creature had seen our object in previous experiments and learned to perform it of its own accord! But in this case also the result was negative.

Clearly, therefore, neither chemical nor mechanical stimulation of the buccal mucous membrane is capable of reflexly exciting the nerves of the stomach. Further, it is obvious that the excitation of these nerves in sham feeding is not the result of a stimulation coincidently produced; that is to say, the excitement of the chewing and swallowing centres does not imply simultaneous action of the secretory centre of the gastric glands. In what, then, does this influence consist which is intrinsic to the sham feeding, but which we have not been able to reproduce in our analytical investigation? There is only one thing to think of, namely, the eager desire for food, and the feeling of satisfaction and contentment derived from its enjoyment.

It has, indeed, been known for forty years, thanks to the experiments of Bidder and Schmidt, that at times, the offering of food to a hungry dog, in other words, the excitement of a keen desire for it, is sufficient to cause a flow of gastric juice from the empty stomach. We shall presently have occasion to observe the force of this physiological factor. Here I bring before you another dog, likewise having a gastric fistula with divided œsophagus. The stomach has been washed out half an hour ago, and since then not a drop of gastric juice has escaped. We begin to get ready a meal of flesh and sausage before the animal as if we meant to feed it. We take the pieces of flesh from one place, chop them up, and lay them in another, passing them in front of the dog's nose, and so on. The animal, as you see, manifests the liveliest interest in our proceedings, stretches and distends itself, endeavours to get out of its cage and come to the food, chatters its teeth together, swallows saliva, and so on. Precisely five minutes after we began to tease the animal in this way the first drops of gastric juice appear in the fistula The secretion grows ever stronger and stronger, till it flows in a considerable stream. After the lapse of a few minutes we can count the number of cubic centimetres by tens. The meaning of this experiment is so clear as to require no explanation; the passionate longing for food, and this alone, has called forth under our eyes a most intense activity of the gastric glands. If the experiment be frequently repeated, one can easily observe that the keener and more eager the desire on the part of the dog for the food, the more certain and intense is the secretory effect. In extreme cases there is even a quantitative relationship between this effect and that of the sham feeding.

Here is an experiment of Professor Ssanozki, in which the secretory effect of the mere tempting of the animal with the sight of food is compared with that of sham feeding. A few threads of alkaline mucus had just escaped from the stomach, and then the excitation of the dog with flesh was begun. After six minutes the secretion commenced and continued as follows:

Duration of the flow. Quantity of the juice. 8 minutes 10 c.c. 4 ” 10 ” 4 ” 10 ” 10 ” 10 ” 10 ” 8 ” 10 ” 8 ” 10 ” 19 ” 10 ” 19 ” 3 ”

Then followed a sham feeding for six minutes.

Duration of the flow. Quantity of the juice. 17 minutes 10 c.c. 9 ” 10 ” 8 ” 10 ”

It is clear that in this case the tempting, instead of being less effective than the sham feeding, on the contrary excelled it.

Consequently, the observation of Bidder and Schmidt was perfectly correct. It cannot, however, be said that it received general recognition in physiology, or that it was sufficiently appreciated. There are authors who could never convince themselves of its reality, and in many physiological text-books it is not once mentioned. By way of explanation, we shall now consider how this matter must be dealt with by those who wish to observe the effect. It is only under certain conditions that it can be seen. Firstly, the animal must be healthy and vigorous; it must have a perfectly uninjured gastric mucous membrane; and this, from the description in the case of many authors who obtained a negative result, was not the case. Secondly, the success of the experiment, as stated above, is dependent upon the intensity of the desire for eating, and this, again, is dependent upon how freely and how long beforehand the dog had eaten, and also upon what it is tempted with, whether with a dish that excites its desire or leaves its interest unawakened. It is known that dogs have very different tastes, just as men have. Thirdly, one may find among the dogs positively careless, indifferent creatures, incapable of being perturbed in this way by anything which has not actually reached their mouths, and patiently waiting till the food is given them. Hence for success in the experiment, eager, impressionable, and excitable animals are necessary. Fourthly, one has to reckon with the sense and cunning of the dog, a factor which is not lightly to be disregarded. Often the animals perceive at once that they are only being teased with the food, become annoyed thereat, and turn away offended at what is being done before them. We must, therefore, so arrange matters as if the animals were not going to be disappointed but fed in reality. If attention be paid to these conditions the experiment of “psychic excitation of the gastric secretion,” as we usually term it, will be found to be as reliable as the experiment of sham feeding. When one is occupied for a length of time with the study of the gastric secretion under different conditions, one becomes convinced of what a dangerous source of error this psychic excitability may become in the different experiments. We must constantly fight, so to speak, against this factor, keep it ever in view, and guard against it. If the dog has not eaten for a long time, every movement,--the going out of the room, the appearance of the attendant who ordinarily feeds the animal--in word, every little triviality may give rise to excitation of the gastric glands. The minutest attention is necessary in order to avoid such sources of error, and we should not be far wrong if we said that much which has been ascribed in former investigations to the effect of this or that agency was in reality a result of unobserved psychic influence. Consequently, in order to verify our own conclusions concerning the effects of this or that condition, we have performed many of our experiments on sleeping animals, having beforehand convinced ourselves by frequent repetition that sleep exercises no restraining influence on the working of the gastric glands.

When we recall to mind the failure of our attempts to obtain a secretion of gastric juice by any stimulation whatever of the buccal mucous membrane, and at the same time see how constant and intense the action of this psychic impression is, we are forced to the inevitable conclusion that in our sham feeding experiment the whole secretory effect is due to the psychic stimulus, that is to say, to the keen desire on the part of the animal for food and the satisfaction of enjoying it.

In view of the importance of the act of eating, which even now is apparent, but which will become still more obvious when the succeeding periods of secretion are investigated, we have spared neither time nor trouble to arrive at a correct explanation of the mechanism of this factor. We have, therefore, taken in hand a number of modifications of the sham feeding experiment, and these investigations have confirmed the opinion at which we had arrived. If, for instance, the dog has been prepared by a long fast of two to three days, a very intense secretion of gastric juice will always be obtained by the sham feeding experiment, no matter what may be given it to eat, whether boiled or raw flesh, bread or coagulated egg-white, etc. The dog, however, which has not fasted, that is to say has been fed fifteen to twenty hours before, will pick and choose amongst the different foods, eating one with great greed, tolerating another, and refusing altogether a third, and, corresponding therewith, the amount and quality of the gastric juice will manifest wide variations. The more eagerly the dog eats the more juice will be secreted and the greater the digestive power which it possesses. The majority of dogs prefer flesh to bread, and correspondingly less juice will be produced by sham feeding with bread than with flesh. Sometimes, however, we find dogs which will devour bread with greater appetite than flesh. In these cases one obtains more and stronger juice in sham feeding with bread than with flesh. Here is a case in point: a dog is given boiled meat which has been cut into pieces of definite size, and the pieces follow each other at regular intervals of time. The animal eats, but soon, from its behaviour, you see that it develops no particular greed for the meal, and this observation is confirmed by the fact that after fifteen to twenty minutes it ceases taking the flesh. The secretion of juice has meanwhile either not begun at all, or only after a longer interval than five minutes, and remains scanty to the end. Now wait till the secretion has stopped and give the same dog raw flesh, either forthwith or next day, in pieces of the same size and at the same rate as before. The raw meat tastes excellently to the dog; it eats for hours at a time; the secretion of gastric juice begins precisely after five minutes and is very active. With another dog which prefers boiled to raw meat exactly the reverse occurs. Broth, soup, milk--towards which dogs are usually more indifferent than towards solid food--often produce in sham feeding either no secretion at all or only very little, although broth, for instance has essentially the same taste as flesh.

It is therefore clear that in sham feeding the psychic effect may readily become an absolute and independent factor. All the conditions which we enumerated above, and which are necessary for the successful production of the psychic effect, hold good in combined form for the sham feeding experiment. The dog eats with greed before one’s eyes; the food which it receives is pleasant; it not only imagines food but actually eats it, and has therefore no reason to feel offended, for naturally the idea does not occur to any of the dogs that all their trouble is in vain.

Consequently, in the sham feeding experiment, by the act of eating, the excitation of the nerves of the gastric glands depends upon a psychical factor which has here grown into a physiological one, that is to say, is just as much a matter of course, and appears quite as regularly under given conditions as any other physiological result. Regarded from the purely physiological side, the process may be said to be a complicated reflex act. Its complexity arises from this, that the ultimate object is attained by the joint working of many separate organic functions. The material to be digested--the food--is only found outside the organism in the surrounding world. It is acquired not alone by the exercise of muscular force, but also by the intervention of higher functions, such as judgment, will, desire. Hence the simultaneous excitation of the different sense organs, of sight, of hearing, of smell and taste, is the first and strongest impulse towards the activity of the gastric glands. This especially applies to the two latter senses, since they are only excited when the food has already entered the organism, or at least has arrived very near it. It is by the establishment of this passionate desire for eating that unerring and untiring nature has linked the seeking and finding of food with the commencement of the work of digestion. That this factor, which we have now carefully analysed, stands in closest connection with an every-day phenomenon of human life, namely, appetite, may easily be predicated. This agency, which is so important to life and so full of mystery to science, becomes here at length incorporated into flesh and blood, transformed from a subjective sensation into a concrete factor of the physiological laboratory.

We are therefore justified in saying that the appetite is the first and mightiest exciter of the secretory nerves of the stomach, a factor which embodies in itself a something capable of impelling the empty stomach of the dog in the sham feeding experiment to secrete large quantities of the strongest juice. A good appetite in eating is equivalent from the outset to a vigorous secretion of the strongest juice; where there is no appetite this juice is also absent. To restore appetite to a man means to secure him a large stock of gastric juice wherewith to begin the digestion of the meal.

LECTURE V

PERIOD OF OCCURRENCE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE PSYCHIC OR APPETITE JUICE IN THE SECRETORY WORK OF THE STOMACH--THE INEFFICIENCY OF MECHANICAL STIMULATION OF THE NERVOUS APPARATUS OF THE GASTRIC GLANDS

The psychic secretion is the normal commencement, in the majority of cases, of secretory activity on the part of the gastric glands. If the meal be subdivided and administered at intervals, the psychic juice appears each time--Demonstration of “appetite juice” in a dog with an isolated gastric _cul-de-sac_. The work of the gastric glands if appetite juice be avoided by introducing food through a gastric fistula unperceived by the animal--Digestion of flesh by the stomach with and without sham feeding--Duration of the secretory influence of sham feeding--After the cessation of the psychic effect, how is the secretory work of the stomach maintained?--Experiments to prove the ineffectiveness of mechanical stimulation: excitation of the mucous membrane by means of a glass rod, a feather, a puff of sand, and by rhythmic dilatation of an india-rubber ball--Contact between the food and the stomach-wall may indirectly call the activity of the glands into play by awakening or increasing the desire for food.

GENTLEMEN,--On the last occasion we made ourselves acquainted with the first normal impulse which, in the natural course of events, calls into activity the innervation apparatus of the gastric glands. This impulse is a mental one, and consists in a passionate longing for food, that which in every-day life, and in the practice of the physician, is called “appetite,” and which everybody, both medical and lay, endeavours carefully to promote. We may now venture to say explicitly, APPETITE IS JUICE, a fact which at once displays the pre-eminent importance of the sensation. Medical science endeavours to assist the debilitated stomach by introducing the active constituent of gastric juice--pepsin--from without, or by prescribing other remedies believed to promote its secretion. It is, however, of interest to follow our experimental investigation still farther. What position is to be assigned to the “psychic” or “appetite-juice”[30] in the course of normal gastric digestion? Is any definite _rôle_ to be attributed to it? What course does gastric digestion take when it is absent? Fortunately to all these important questions satisfactory answers are forthcoming by experiment. We have only to regret that these answers come so late.

Let us recall to memory how the secretion of gastric juice proceeded after feeding with flesh or bread in the case of our dog with the isolated miniature stomach. The following are the quantities and digestive capabilities of the first two hourly portions of juice after the administration of 200 grams of flesh or bread (experiments by Dr. Chigin):

■■■

interest it to the same degree as flesh or bread, you will find the initial increase in quantity and strength of juice does not appear. Offer the animal milk, for example, which in sham feeding, especially if it does not last long, calls forth, as a rule, no secretion, or at all events only very little, and the rapid flow of the commencement--the already-mentioned initial rise--absolutely fails to appear. You have already seen the figures which deal with this matter; I think it necessary, however, to bring them forward again in order that you may be better able to compare them with the secretion after flesh and bread.

The dog was given 600 c.c. of milk (experiment by Dr. Chigin).

Hour. Quantity of juice. Digestive power. 1st 4.2 c.c. 3.57 mm. 2nd 12.4 ” 2.63 ”

We have now begun the analytical examination of the variations of our secretory curve. But owing to the importance of the matter we did not confine ourselves to conclusions which might be drawn from earlier investigations. We turned to new forms of experiment for further proof.

Thus we divided the ordinary ration of flesh given to our dogs--400 grams--into four equal parts, which were administered at intervals of an hour and a half. (Experiments by Privat docent Kotljar and Dr. Lobassoff.) Each time after the dog received its 100 grams of flesh we were able to detect a rise both in the quantity and in the digestive power of the juice. The following table shows the figures in question:

■■■

This experiment proves to us, first, that the main and miniature stomachs work in perfectly parallel manner with each other. The beginning, the end, and the intermediate variations of the secretion correspond in both cases. Secondly, the digestive power of the secretion coincides in both, and is the same which was observed in the so-called sham feeding. It has here remained at the same height till the cessation of the secretion, without falling to the lower value which we observed from the beginning of the second hour onwards, after normal flesh feeding.

This was also confirmed later, when we performed an œsophagotomy on the dog, and carried out sham feeding in typical form. Here follows one of these experiments taken from Dr. Lobassoff's article.

The first drop of juice appeared from both cavities during the sixth minute after commencing the feeding, which was kept up for half an hour. The further course of the secretion was as follows:

■■■

into ■ (Lobassoff). ■ quan- ■ ■ ■ ■stomach(Lobassoff)■ ■ tity ■ ■Hour.■——————————■——————————■——————————■——————————■——————————■——————————-■ in two■ ■
■Quantity■Digestive■Quantity■Digestive■Quantity■Digestive■experi-■ ■ ■of juice■ power. ■of juice■ power. ■of juice■ power. ■ ments.■ ■ ■ c.c. ■ mm. ■ c.c. ■ mm. ■ c.c. ■ mm. ■ ■ ■——————■——————■——————-■——————■——————■——————■——————-■——————■——————■——————■——————-■——————■ ■ 1st ■ 12.4 ■ 5.43 ■ 5.0 ■ 2.5 ■ 7.7 ■ 6.4 ■ 12.7 ■ ■ 2nd ■ 13.5 ■ 3.63 ■ 7.8 ■ 2.75 ■ 4.5 ■ 5.3 ■ 12.3 ■ ■ 3rd ■ 7.5 ■ 3.5 ■ 6.4 ■ 3.75 ■ 0.6 ■ 5.75 ■ 7.0 ■ ■ 4th ■ 4.2 ■ 3.12 ■ 5.0 ■ 3.75 ■ — ■ — ■ 5.0 ■ ■——————■——————■——————■——————■——————■——————■——————-■——————■——————■

The progress of juice secretion in the above is also represented in the following curves:

[Illustration: FIGURES 4-7.—A. Ordinary curve of gastric secretion (200 grms. flesh). B. Curve from direct introduction of food (150 grms. flesh). C. Sham feeding with same. D. Summation of B and C.]

As you see, the curve which represents the results of the direct introduction of flesh ascends much more slowly and does not attain anything like the height of that caused by normal feeding with the same food. But if the quantities obtained by direct introduction of the flesh be added to those of sham feeding, the resulting curve is almost identical with the normal.

In like manner the digestive power of the secretion in the foregoing experiments can be dealt with, and with the same result. It is a good instance of how a secretion curve can be synthetically constructed from its constituent factors.

Finally, I am able to demonstrate to you the following instructive experiment. In the presence of some of my listeners, whom I had invited to attend an hour before the lecture, I carried out the following procedures on two dogs, both of which had ordinary gastric fistulæ and were, besides, œsophagotomised. Into the stomach of one, while its attention was distracted by patting and speaking kindly to it in order to avoid arousing any thoughts of feeding, a definite number of pieces of flesh were introduced through the fistula. The morsels were threaded on a string, the free end of which was fastened to the fistular cannula by inserting a cork. The dog was then brought into a separate room and left to itself. A like number of pieces was introduced into the stomach of the other dog in the same way, but during the process a vigorous sham feeding was kept up, the animal being afterwards left alone. Each dog received 100 grams of flesh. Since then an hour and a half have elapsed, and now we may draw the pieces of flesh out by means of the thread and weigh them. The loss of weight, and consequently the amount of flesh digested, is very different in the two cases. In that of the dog without sham feeding the loss of weight amounts to merely 6 grams, while the flesh withdrawn from the stomach of the other dog weighs only 70 grams, that is to say, was reduced by 30 grams. This, therefore, represents the digestive value of the passage of food through the mouth, the value of an eager desire for food, the value of an appetite.

I give also a series of figures obtained by Dr. Lobassoff in analogous experiments. Into the dog’s stomach 25 pieces of flesh (100 grams) were brought. The flesh remained two hours in the cavity. Without sham feeding 6.5 per cent, with eight minutes' sham feeding 31.6 per cent, of the quantity was digested.

Again: the flesh remained an hour and a half in the stomach; without sham feeding 5.6 per cent, with five minutes' sham feeding 15 per cent, was digested.

Once more: the flesh remained five hours in the stomach; without sham feeding 58 per cent, with sham feeding 85 per cent, was digested, the balance of undigested food being 42 per cent in the one case and 15 per cent in the other.

I must, however, add that from the nature of this experiment it is not well adapted for class demonstration, and may often fail. On the one hand, it is not at all easy to conceal the introduction of the flesh from the dog; on the other, the unusual and distracting surroundings of the animal often causes a short period of sham feeding to have less effect than would otherwise pertain. In order to avoid such failures it is better before an audience to carry out this experiment only on dogs accustomed to appear in the lecture theatre, and of whose temperament the experimenter is well assured.

I hope you have now been convinced of the great importance which is to be attached to the passage of food through the mouth and œsophagus, or, in other words--and this, according to our former experiences, means the same thing--to the eager desire for food. Without this longing, without the assistance of appetite, many forms of food-stuffs which gain entry to the stomach remain wholly devoid of gastric juice. Others, it is true, excite a secretion, but the juice poured out is scanty and weak.

It is only later, when we have still more fully recognised the conditions upon which the secretory work of the gastric glands depends, that we shall be able to grasp the meaning of these facts in a more comprehensive manner. For instance, why does bread brought unnoticed into the stomach of the dog cause no secretion for hours, while flesh tolerably soon (after twenty to forty minutes) provokes this act? This will be explained in the next lecture; now, however, we must consider other questions.

How long does the after-effect, the echo of the first impulse to the secretory nerves of the stomach, continue to last? How long does appetite juice continue to flow after the normal act of eating, which, especially in the case of animals, is not of long duration? We have already determined many times, not only on our dog with the isolated stomach, but also on other animals, how long the after-effect of sham feeding is continued.

Here, for example, is an experiment from the article of Professor Ssanozki which deals with the point. The dog had a gastric fistula and also an opening leading into the œsophagus. After a sham feeding of five minutes the secretion began, and was continued as follows:

Time in minutes. Quantity. Digestive power. 10 25.5 c.c. 8.1 mm. 10 20.0 ” 8.0 ” 10 13.5 ” 6.8 ” 10 11.0 ” 7.5 ” 10 8.5 ” 8.1 ” 10 6.5 ” 9.0 ” 20 13.5 ” 7.4 ” 20 11.0 ” 7.2 ” 20 7.0 ” 7.2 ” 20 11.5 ” 6.8 ” 20 11.0 ” 6.5 ” 30 6.5 ” 7.6 ” 20 5.5 ” 7.2 ”

The effect, therefore, even after a short period of sham feeding, stretches over a length of time. Naturally the same holds good for the taking of food in the normal way. One must, however, bear in mind that in sham feeding, with all the force and reality of a hunger sensation not satisfied, the eager desire for food, the effective agency, becomes more and more accentuated, and therefore the secretory influence is prolonged and more powerful. In normal feeding, however, the quelling of the longing, the feeling of satisfaction which, as is well known, sets in long before the termination of the digestive period from the mere filling and distension of the stomach, must diminish the desire for food, and, consequently, bring the secretory effect to an end.

It is, therefore, improbable that the whole secretory process in the stomach, which, in the case of certain kinds and quantities of food, lasts from ten to twelve hours, is dependent on the factors which we have up to the present investigated. This is all the more obvious since a sham feeding of five minutes, even under the most favourable circumstances, does not call forth a secretion for longer than three to four hours. We must, therefore, seek for other exciting agencies of the innervation apparatus of the gastric glands.

Why and wherefore is the secretion instituted by psychic influence maintained? What would first occur to all your minds is naturally the immediate influence which the food exerts upon the walls of the stomach. And this is true, but it does not happen in the simple, direct fashion current in the minds of many physiologists and physicians. When I said that bread or boiled white of egg, introduced directly into the stomach, may not for hours produce a trace of secretion, probably many of my hearers may have asked themselves with natural astonishment, “How, then, is the effect of the forced feeding of phthisical and insane patients, and the artificial feeding of those with gastric fistulæ (performed on account of stricture of the œsophagus) to be explained?” I will introduce my answer by a very unexpected pronouncement relative to the assertion that mechanical stimulation of the stomach wall by food constitutes a reliable and effective means of calling forth the secretory work of the glands. This assertion, which is so categorically set forth in many text-books of physiology, and which consequently has gained hold of the mind of the physician, is nothing else than a sad misconception degenerated into a stubborn prejudice. My own statement, repeated in many published articles, and at the meetings of various medical societies, that this dictum is only a picture of the imagination, has met, for the most part, either with an unbelieving shake of the head or else with a direct avowal that “it cannot be so.” I regret exceedingly that these steadfast unbelievers are not here, so that we might together bring the matter before the tribunal of fact, to the demonstration of which we will now proceed. To this matter I attribute very great importance. It is on this ground, according to my opinion, that the whole battle must be fought out between the generally accepted view that every agency is capable of exciting the gastric mucous membrane and the theory that it is only excitable by specific and selected stimuli. If once the defenders of the old opinion are driven from their position and obliged to admit the inefficiency of mechanical stimulation, there would be nothing further left for them than to build up new theories and search out old facts concerning gland work which have hitherto been rigidly kept in the shade. We may take it that it is mainly because people were so seized with the belief in the direct and simple mechanical explanation that Bidder and Schmidt’s experiment of the excitation of gastric secretion by mental effect has been so little taken into consideration, notwithstanding that it appeared so thoroughly reliable and convincing.

I will now repeat the experiment of mechanical stimulation of the gastric mucous membrane before you in the well-known, traditional, and classic manner. Here is a dog with a gastric fistula on which a cervical œsophagotomy has in addition been

performed. I open the fistula; as you see, nothing flows out of the stomach; it was washed out clean with water an hour ago. We take the celebrated feather and also a tolerably strong glass rod. Folds of blotting-paper saturated with red and blue tincture of litmus are placed at hand. I now ask my assistant to continuously move the feather and glass rod, alternately, in all possible directions in the stomach, changing from one to the other every five minutes. On removal from the stomach each is carefully dried with red and blue blotting-paper. You have all seen, gentlemen, that this procedure has now been kept up for half an hour. From the fistular orifice not even a single drop has escaped, and, moreover, the drops of moisture on all the pieces of red blotting-paper I have been able to hand to you have assumed a distinct blue tinge, caused by the moisture of the alkaline mucous membrane. The blue pieces, however, have merely been made wet without altering their colour. Consequently, with the most thorough mechanical stimulation of the whole cavity of the stomach, we have not been able to find a single spot possessing a noticeable acid reaction. Where, then, are the streams of pure gastric juice of which we read in text-books! What objection can be raised against the conclusiveness of this experiment? In my opinion only one: that we are dealing with a dog out of health, whose gastric glands from some possible cause are unable to react normally. This single objection can be set aside before your eyes. After failing with the mechanical stimulation, we proceed forthwith to the sham feeding of the same animal. The dog takes the food offered it with keen appetite, and you see that, exactly five minutes after beginning the feeding, the first drops of juice appear from the stomach, followed by others faster and faster. I catch a couple of drops on the blue litmus paper, and you see that they produce bright red specks on the blue sheet. After thirty minutes' sham feeding we have collected 150 c.c. of juice, which, without filtering, looks as clear and transparent as water.

We cannot, therefore, possibly doubt that, when the proper stimulus is used, the gastric glands react to it in a perfectly normal fashion, furnishing a healthy gastric juice. From this it irrefutably follows that only one explanation is to be found for the negative result in the first half of our experiment, viz., that the mucous membrane of the stomach, so far as secretory activity goes, is perfectly indifferent to mechanical excitation. And yet this mechanical stimulus is demonstrated as an exciting agency in the physiological lecture theatre. I venture to think that this lecture experiment from now onwards will quit the field, and give place to the one I have just shown you. This apparently simple experiment of mechanical stimulation can, however, only be successfully performed when certain very obvious rules are followed. These, however, physiologists have not observed, probably on account of a preconceived belief in the effectiveness of the mechanical stimulus. These rules are two. First, it is necessary that the stomach should be clean, and that nothing shall gain entry to it from without. Such conditions were not formerly fulfilled. It is true the stomach was emptied by removing the stopper from the fistular cannula, but it was not washed out till an acid reaction was no longer given, and consequently preformed gastric juice was left behind between the folds of the mucous membrane. At the same time saliva from the cavity of the mouth could gain entry, which quickly became acidified in the incompletely emptied and imperfectly washed-out organ. It is, therefore, not surprising that the glass tube, by setting up contractions of the stomach, was the means of expressing small quantities of acid fluid from the fistula-tube. (The relationship between mechanical stimulation and the motor functions of the stomach is not to be confounded with what we are here speaking of.) That matters are as I state, and that the facts correspond to the explanation is proved by this; namely, that nobody till now has obtained genuinely pure gastric juice of an acidity amounting to 0.5 or 0.6 per cent. It is only necessary to call to mind that Heidenhain, when determining the acidity of the juice first obtained from the resected stomach, was placed in no little doubt as to whether his results (0.5 to 0.6) were correct, and his assistant at the time (Gscheidlen) was set to verify the correctness of his standard solutions. The acidity of the “purest” juice known at that time was scarcely 0.3 per cent. As a further proof that none of the older observers ever really obtained a secretion from mechanical stimulation pure and simple, we may adduce the fact that none of them made mention of the constant and precise period of five minutes' latency. To overlook this was not possible if a genuine excitation of the glands had been obtained.

Of no less importance is the second condition when we wish to perform the experiment of mechanical stimulation in the correct way. It is very necessary that the gastric glands be not already in activity at the beginning of the experiment, and also that during the experiment no impulse comes into play, which of itself, apart from mechanical excitation, could excite the glands to secretion. Nor have we any proof that observers formerly waited for hours before commencing the experiment and convinced themselves that the gastric glands had ceased working. On the contrary, we have not the slightest evidence to indicate that the authors had attempted to guard against accidental psychical stimulation of the glands--a matter which we have seen is of considerable difficulty. And some dogs are so easily excited in this way that it is almost impossible to bring their glands to rest, or at least it is necessary to wait for hours. The experimenter must strain his whole attention to preserve such an experiment free from objection. It is only necessary that some food be near the dog, or that the hands of the attendant who has prepared the food should smell of it, or that some other similar circumstance should come into play, and the glass tube, quite undeservedly, will be made answerable for the excitation of the gastric glands. As you have just seen, both of our conditions have been fulfilled on the dog before you, and the

result of the experiment stands in irreconcilable contradiction to those of the laboratory and lecture experiment of former times.

The importance of the experiment, which I have already dwelt upon, justifies me in making still further demands upon your attention in order to show you two modifications of it. Nobody has as yet said, with regard to mechanical stimulation, that in order to obtain results the mechanical agency must simultaneously come into contact with numerous points of the inner surface of the stomach. But in order to meet this possible objection I will now show you two new modifications. Again a similar dog is used, that is to say, one on which both gastrotomy and œsophagotomy have been performed. The stomach has been washed out clean and is at present in a state of complete rest. Into the fistula I bring a thick glass tube containing a number of small openings (2 to 3 mm. diameter) at its rounded end. The other end of the tube is connected with a glass ball containing tolerably coarse sand. Leading into the ball is a second tube, with which an india-rubber pump can be connected and a blast of sand blown through. By rhythmic compression of the india-rubber ball I inject sand with considerable force into the stomach, and this play is kept up for ten to fifteen minutes; nevertheless, we see no trace of gastric juice. The sand falls out again between the side of the cannula and the glass tube, and it is either dry or scarcely moistened, but in no case is it able to turn blue litmus red. And yet we are here dealing with a strong and widely diffused stimulus. Look for a moment at the performance of the bellows outside the stomach. From every opening of the tube--numbering considerably more than ten--a strong stream of sand is ejected. If you hold your hand against it, you feel quite distinctly that the grains of sand strike with considerable force. And now, when our experiment is ended, we may convince ourselves by sham feeding, in easy and unquestionable fashion, that the innervation of the dog's stomach is perfectly normal.

Yet another experiment on a similar dog. Into its empty and resting stomach an india-rubber ball is introduced. This is distended with air by means of a syringe till it is as large as a child's head and maintained in this condition for a time, afterwards being allowed to collapse. The procedure is kept up for ten to fifteen minutes. During this time not a single drop of juice has appeared from the stomach. The surface of the ball taken out of the organ is everywhere alkaline. And here also subsequent sham feeding shows that the dog is in a suitable condition for the experiment. I must add that in making this observation the dog must not be too hungry, that is to say, must have been fed within ten to twelve hours before, otherwise a psychic excitation of the secretion can readily be induced.

If one dispassionately regards this question, and if any of our methods for the study of gastric secretion are reliable, one must be convinced step by step in the laboratory of the uselessness of mechanical stimulation. In the case of dogs with an ordinary gastric fistula, and failing some special reason, not a drop of gastric juice ever escapes from the stomach other than during the digestive period. How could this be the case if the mechanical stimulus were effective, since the inner rim of the fistula-tube is continuously in contact with the gastric mucous membrane? The same holds good for the dog with resected stomach. During the experiment a glass or india-rubber tube is brought sufficiently far into the _cul-de-sac_ to catch the juice, and yet not a drop flows through the tube, nor does its inner surface ever become acid, so long as true secretory conditions are absent. Moreover, the tube has tolerably often to be taken out and set right.

In the ordinary gastric fistula in dogs, when the operation has lasted a long time--over a year--folds of mucous membrane are often formed in the neighbourhood of its inner orifice which completely close the tube. In these cases a long, thick, perforated metal tube has to be passed in deeply, and yet the manipulation of itself never calls forth a secretion. Further, it is a daily occurrence to find in the stomach of the dog thick rolls of hair, and yet their presence in no way hinders the arrest of the secretion, which occurs when digestion has ceased. Such an occurrence would have been specially obvious in our dog with the isolated stomach, since it was bedded with sawdust in order to guard against maceration of the wound by juice trickling out. Very often we found enormous quantities of sawdust in the stomach, as much as half a pound weight; obviously the dog had licked the wound from adherent sawdust, which it then swallowed, together with that sticking to its nose. And yet these particles of sawdust of themselves, which certainly acted as mechanical stimuli, never caused a secretion. It appears to me that this long series of facts ought to suffice to carry the supposition to its grave that by direct mechanical stimulation one is able to set the neuro-secretory apparatus of the stomach into activity.

And yet the feather and the glass tube continue the even tenor of their ways to this moment and function in some text-books, yea, even in articles which specially treat of gastric secretion as exciters of the gastric glands. There are, it is true, a few physiologists who hold mechanical stimulation, in relation to gastric secretion, not to be very effective, and give it a subordinate position in the series of exciting agencies, but as yet I know of no other physiologist who has wholly denied its influence, and who has not held it possible to obtain at least some juice by it.

To conclude this lecture, we will take into consideration a question connected with the matter we have just discussed. Since the contact of food with the gastric mucous membrane has no direct influence on the secretion, is its entry into the stomach devoid of all connection with the secretory process?

It can hardly be doubted that, under normal conditions, the stomach is the seat of certain definite sensations, that is to say, its surface has a certain degree of tactile sensibility. This sensation is, as a rule, very weak, and the majority of people become accustomed to pay no heed to it in the normal course of digestion. They obtain their sensations of general well-being, and especially of satisfaction from the enjoyment of food, without taking cognisance of the factors contributing to them. The feeling of general hunger, however, is referred solely to the stomach.

On the other hand, all of us have met with men who could describe exactly, and with gusto, how they were able to follow a special tit-bit, or a mouthful of a favourite wine, the whole way through the œsophagus down to the stomach, especially when the latter happened to be empty. Naturally the gourmand, who directs his attention continuously to the act of eating, can in the end distinctly perceive sensations, and even call them up to the consciousness, which in other people are normally masked by other sensations and impressions. We may therefore take it that the satisfaction derived from eating is caused not only by stimulation of the mouth and throat, but also by impulses awakened by the passage of the food along the deeper portions of the œsophagus and by its entry into the stomach. In other words, food which merely passes through the mouth and throat produces less enjoyment and excites, therefore, a less feeling of appetite than the food which passes the whole way into the stomach. The appetite, the eager craving after food, is, indeed, a very complex sensation, and often not merely the need of the organism for food material is necessary for its excitement, but also a condition of thorough well-being, together with a normal healthy feeling in all parts of the digestive tract. For this reason it is easy to understand how patients who have diseased sensations in these organs, and who have no feeling of appetite, no desire for food, remember the sensations, whether consciously or unconsciously, even when they are no longer present. Cases are known to neuro-pathologists where people with gastric anæsthesia suffered from this loss of appetite. Such patients are no longer conscious of having stomachs, and dislike the idea of eating because the food, as they express it, appears to fall into a strange empty sack. In this way one can also conceive how the appetite becomes lost in cases of long-continued obstruction of the alimentary tube. The patients forget their stomachs, and in such instances direct introduction of food into the organ, after an operation, may suddenly bring back the appetite.

As a further illustration, I may be permitted to give an instance from my own personal experience. After an illness with which a transient but high fever was associated, although otherwise fully recovered, I had lost all desire for food. There was something curious in this complete indifference towards eating. Perfectly well, I only differed from others in that I could with ease abstain from all food. Fearing that I should collapse, I resolved on the second or third day to endeavour to create an appetite by swallowing a mouthful of wine. I felt it quite distinctly pass along the œsophagus into the stomach, and literally at that moment perceived the onset of a strong appetite. This observation teaches that the tactile sensation of the stomach at the moment of entry of food is capable of awakening or increasing the appetite. It is known that withholding food from the organism, or in other words the creation of a necessity for food, does not lead immediately, nor in all cases, to the production of an appetite, to a passionate craving for food. How often does it happen that the ordinary hour for a meal has struck, and yet, owing to some keenly interesting occupation, not the least desire for food is felt? It is known to everybody, indeed it has become a proverb, that real appetite first sets in with eating. If this be true, the initial impulse towards awakening an appetite may originate in the stomach and not in the buccal cavity. When we spoke above of the desire for food being the excitant of the secretory nerves of the stomach, we naturally meant the passionate and conscious longing for food, that which is called “appetite,” and not the latent need of the organism for nourishment, the lack of nutrition, which has not yet been transformed into a concrete passionate desire. A good example which enables us to differentiate between these two factors is furnished by our dogs with sham feeding. The necessity for food exists in such cases even before the experiment; the juice, however, only begins to flow as soon as this need has taken the form of a passionate longing. It is therefore quite possible that in the case of some dogs, and at a certain stage of hunger, the touching of the gastric mucous membrane with any object at hand, its mechanical excitation, its distension by the food mass, may give the impulse which excites the appetite, and when the appetite is awakened the juice flows. This is possibly a third reason why, in the old experiment, the mechanical stimulus came to be considered effective. Viewed from this point it may, to a certain degree, lead to a reconciliation between my assertion concerning the inefficiency of the mechanical stimulus and the generally prevailing belief. I further also admit that mechanical excitation will at times call into play the work of the gastric glands, not however directly by means of a simple physiological reflex, but indirectly, after it has first awakened and enlivened the idea of food in the dog’s consciousness, and thereby called forth the passionate desire. I hope that the foregoing will in no way lead to a confusion of ideas in your minds, but will assist you to an exact and concrete analysis of the previous simple explanation of the facts. This representation, which bears more

or less of a hypothetical character, could, of course, be submitted to experimental proof. For such it is only necessary to compare the influence which sham feeding exercises in an œsophagotomised dog with that in one having a simple gastric fistula.

LECTURE VIII

PHYSIOLOGICAL ACTION AND THE TEACHING OF INSTINCT: EXPERIENCES OF THE PHYSICIAN

It would be desirable, in the interests of medicine, that the methods described in these lectures should be employed in experimental investigations into the pathology and therapeutics of the digestive canal on the lines laid down--The fact that the beginning of the secretory work in the stomach depends upon a psychic effect harmonises with the experiences of every-day life, namely, that food should be eaten with attention and relish--To restore the appetite has from all ages been the endeavour of the physician--The indifference of the present-day physician towards appetite--Probable causes of this--Curative remedies based upon a restoration of appetite--The therapeutic effects of bitters depend upon the excitation of appetite--The usages of the mid-day meal are in agreement with physiological requirements--Physiological reasons for certain instinctive customs and empirical regulations--Importance of an acid reaction of the food--Dietetics of fat and its therapeutic application--The peculiar position of milk among food-stuffs is based on physiological reasons--Explanation of the curative effects of sodium bicarbonate and sodium chloride--The causes of individual differences in the work of the digestive glands--Participation of the inhibitory nerves of secretion in the production of pathological effects.

GENTLEMEN,--To-day we shall endeavour to bring the previously communicated results of our laboratory investigations into reconciliation with the customs observed in the ingestion of food, and with the regulations prescribed by the physician in disorders of the digestive apparatus. To bring our knowledge to full fruition, and so secure for it the most useful application, the same methods should be applied from the same standpoint to the experimental investigation of the pathology and therapeutics of the alimentary canal. Nor should we be likely to encounter insuperable difficulties. Thanks to the advances of bacteriology, many of the pathological processes can now be experimentally produced in the laboratory. Moreover, we would, in a sense, have to deal with external ailments, since our present methods enable us to obtain access to any desired part of the inner surface of the digestive canal. In such pathological animals the functional diseases of the apparatus could be studied in a precise and detailed manner; that is to say, the alterations of secretory activity, the properties of the fluids, and the conditions under which they appear could be examined. On such animals therapeutic remedies could also be tested, the whole process of healing and the final result experimentally observed, while the conditions of secretory activity during every phase of the healing process could be investigated. It can hardly be doubted that scientific, that is to say ideal, medicine, can only take its proper position as a science when, in addition to an Experimental Physiology and Pathology, there has also been built up an Experimental Therapeutics. A proof that this is possible is furnished by the recent vigorous strides made by the science of bacteriology.

I have already described one of such pathological therapeutic experiments; namely, on the dog whose vagi nerves were divided in the neck. Other similar cases I can also call to mind. Our dog with the two stomachs suffered at one time from a slight and transitory gastric catarrh. It was then very interesting to observe that the pathological process (which we were usually able to wholly guard against) spread from the large to the small stomach. It manifested itself here in an almost continuous slimy secretion of very slight acidity, but of strong digestive power. At the beginning of the ailment, indeed before it became fully established, the psychic stimulation was remarkably effective (that is to say, still furnished juice in appropriate quantity), while local excitants almost completely failed. One may conceive that the deeper layers of the mucous membrane with the gastric glands were still healthy, and thus easily thrown into activity by central impulses, whilst the surface of the membrane with the end apparatus of the centripetal nerves was already distinctly damaged. I mention these, which I may call impressions rather than precise observations, because I wish to point out what a fruitful field awaits the investigator who wishes to study, with the aid of our present methods, the pathological conditions of the digestive organs and their treatment. Such an investigation is all the more desirable because clinical study of the same subject (notwithstanding the zeal devoted to it during the last ten years and the results derived therefrom) has to contend with serious difficulties. We must not forget that the sound or stomach-tube, the chief clinical instrument, is more uncomfortable than the ordinary form of gastric fistula which was previously practised on animals, and yet the physiology of the stomach, even with the aid of the latter, made no material progress for many long years. Nor is this difficult to understand. The investigator obtained through the fistula a mixture of substances from which it was difficult, or even at times impossible, to decide anything.

Hence the exact scientific study of therapeutic questions in this region still belongs to the future. But this does not exclude the probability that the newer acquirements of physiology may fruitfully influence the work of the physician. But physiology naturally can make no pretence to guide the field of medicine, since the knowledge at its disposal is incomplete and is much more restricted than that of the broad world of clinical reality. As a recompense for this, however, physiological knowledge is often able to explain the causation of an illness and the meaning of empirical curative methods. To employ a remedy the mode of action of which is not clear is quite a different thing from knowing precisely what we are doing. In the latter case the treatment of the diseased organ will be more effective because it will be better adapted to the special needs of the case. It is thus that medicine, being daily enriched by new physiological facts, will at length grow into what it ideally must become; namely, the art of repairing the damaged machinery of the human body, based upon _exact_ knowledge, or, in other words, applied physiology.

We may now return to our subject. If it be at all admitted that human instinct is the outcome of an every-day experience, which has led to the unconscious adoption of the most favourable conditions for life, it is particularly so with regard to the phenomena of digestion. The expression that physiology merely confirms the precepts of instinct is justified here more than anywhere else. It appears to me also that, in relation to the foregoing facts, instinct has often made out a brilliant case when brought before the tribunal of physiology. Perhaps the old and empirical requirement, that food should be eaten with interest and enjoyment, is the most imperatively emphasised and strengthened of all. In every land the act of eating is connected with certain customs designed to distract from the business of daily life. A suitable time of day is chosen, a company of relatives, acquaintances, or comrades assemble. Certain preparations are carried out (in England a change of raiment is usually effected, and often a blessing is asked upon the meal by the oldest of the family). In the case of the well-to-do a special room for meals is set apart, musical and other guests are invited to while away the time at meals--in a word, everything is directed to take away the thoughts from the cares of daily life, and to concentrate them on the repast. From this point of view it is also plain why heated discussions and serious readings are held to be unsuitable during meal-times. Probably this also explains the use of alcoholic beverages at meals, for alcohol, even in the lighter phases of its action, induces a mild narcosis, which contributes towards distraction from the pressing burden of the daily work. Naturally this highly developed hygiene of eating is only found in the intelligent and well-to-do classes, first, because here the mental activity is more strained and the various questions of life more burning; and secondly, because here also the food is served in greater quantity than is required for the wants of the organism. In the case of the poorer classes, where mental activity is less highly developed, the greater amount of muscular activity and the constant lack of more than sufficient nourishment insure a strong and lively desire for food in a normal manner, without recourse to any special regulations or customs. The same conditions explain why the preparation of food is so choice in the case of the upper classes and so simple in that of the lower. Further, all the accessories of the meal, which are foretastes of the actual repast, are obviously designed to awaken the curiosity and interest, and to augment the desire for food. How often do we see that a person who begins his customary meal with indifference afterwards enjoys it with obvious pleasure when his taste has been awakened by something piquant or, as we say, appetising. It was here only necessary to give an impulse to the organs of taste, that is, to excite them, in order that their activity might be later maintained by less powerful excitants, for a person who feels hungry such extra inducements are, of course, not necessary. The quelling of hunger in his case affords of itself sufficient enjoyment. It is not, therefore, without reason that it is often said that “Hunger is the best sauce.” This dictum, however, is only right up to a certain point, for some degree of appetising taste is desired by everybody, even by animals. Thus, a dog which has not fasted for more than some hours will not eat everything with equal pleasure which dogs usually eat, but will seek out the food which it relishes best. Hence the presence of a certain kind of spice is a general requirement, although naturally individual tastes differ.

This short discussion as to how different people behave with regard to the act of eating is of itself testimony that care should ever be taken to keep alive the attention and interest for food and to promote enjoyment of the repast--that is to say, that care should be taken of the appetite. Every one knows that a normal, useful food is a food eaten with appetite, with perceptible enjoyment. Every other form of eating, eating to order or from conviction, soon becomes worse than useless, and the instinct strives against it. One of the most frequent requests addressed to the physician is to restore the appetite. Medical men of all times and of every land have held it to be a pressing duty, after overcoming the fundamental illnesses of their patients, to pay special attention to the restoration of the appetite. I believe that in this they are not only animated by an endeavour to free their patients from troublesome symptoms, but also by the conviction that the return of appetite of itself will favour the restitution of normal digestive conditions. It may be said that to the same extent to which the patient wishes back his appetite the physician has effectively employed measures to restore it. Hence we have not a few remedies which are specially named “gastric tonics,” and whose action is to promote appetite. Unfortunately medical science has latterly deviated from this, the correct treatment of the appetite, and that which corresponds to the real conditions. If one reads current text-books on disorders of digestion, it is remarkable how little attention is paid to appetite

as a symptom or to its special therapy. Only in a few of them is its importance indicated, and then merely in short, parenthetic phrases. On the other hand, one may meet statements in which the physician is recommended to adopt no special means for counteracting so unimportant a subjective symptom as a bad appetite! After what I have said and demonstrated to you in these lectures, one can only designate such views as gross misconceptions. If anywhere, it is precisely here that symptomatic treatment is essential. When the physician finds it necessary, in disorders of digestion, to promote secretory activity by different remedies, this object can most certainly and completely be achieved by endeavouring to restore the appetite. We have already seen that no other excitant of gastric secretion, so far as quantity and quality of the juice are concerned, can compare with the passionate craving for food.

To a certain degree we can understand--and this contributes to an explanation of matters--how medical science of our time has come to regard so lightly the loss of appetite as a special object for treatment. Now, however, the experimental method has penetrated more and more into medical science, with the result that many pathological factors and therapeutic agents are judged of according to whether they hold good in the laboratory or not--that is to say, they are valued only in so far as they can be verified by laboratory experiments. Naturally we do not doubt that a movement in this direction indicates a great advance, but even here, as with every undertaking of mankind, things do not proceed without mistakes and exaggerations. We must not consider an event to be a mere picture of the imagination because it is not realisable under given experimental conditions. We often do not know all the essential conditions for the production of the phenomenon in question, nor are we yet able to grasp the connection between all the separate functions of life as fully as may be desired. Thus in the clinical treatment and pathology of digestion assistance was sought for in the laboratory, but nothing was there met with which had a relation to appetite, and consequently this factor was overlooked in medical practice. As stated above, the psychic gastric juice obtained only cursory mention in physiology, and this not even by all authors; and when it was noticed it was related more as a curiosity. Great importance was, on the other hand, assigned to the mechanical stimulus, the efficiency of which, now that our knowledge is more complete, has been shown to be purely imaginary. Each of the contending factors has at length been assigned its proper place, and if clinical medicine maintains her worthy desire of following out the experimental investigation of her problems, she must in actual practice accord to appetite its old claim for consideration and treatment.

But notwithstanding the indifference of physicians to appetite in itself, many therapeutic measures are based on the promotion of it. And in this the truth of empiricism makes itself irresistibly felt. When the patient is enjoined to eat sparingly, or when he is restrained from eating at all till the physician expressly permits, or again, when he is (for instance, during convalescence) removed from his ordinary surroundings and sent to an establishment where the whole life, and particularly the eating, is regulated according to physiological needs--in all these cases the physician seeks to awaken appetite, and relies upon it as a factor in the cure. In the first case, where the food is prescribed in small portions, in addition to preventing the overfilling of a weak stomach, the oft-recurrence of appetite juice, which is so rich in quantity and so strong in digestive power, is of great importance. I ask you here to call to mind one of our experiments in which food was given in small portions to a dog, and thus led to a secretion of much stronger juice than if the whole ration had been eaten at once. This was an exact experimental reproduction of the customary treatment of a weak stomach. And such a regulation of diet is all the more necessary, since, in the commonest disorders of the stomach, only the surface layers of the mucous membrane are affected. It may, consequently, happen that the sensory surface of the stomach, which should take up the stimulus of the chemical excitant, is not able to fulfil its duty, and the period of chemical secretion, which ordinarily lasts for a long time, is for the most part disturbed, or even wholly absent. A strong psychic excitation, a keen feeling of appetite, may evoke the secretory impulse in the central nervous system and send it unhindered to the glands which lie in the deeper as yet unaffected layers of the mucous membrane.

An instance of this, taken from the pathological material of the laboratory, I have already related at the beginning of this lecture. It is obvious in these cases that the indication is to promote digestion by exciting a flow of appetite juice, and not to rely upon that excited by chemical stimuli. From this point of view the meaning of removing a patient, the subject of chronic weakness of the stomach, from his customary surroundings is also plain. Take, for instance, a mentally overstrained individual, or a responsible official; how often does it happen that he cannot for a moment distract his thoughts from his daily work. He eats without noticing it, or eats and carries on his work at the same time. This often happens, particularly in the case of people who live in the midst of the incessant turmoil of great cities. The systematic inattention to the act of eating prepares the way for digestive disturbances in the near future, with all their consequences. There is no appetite juice, no “igniting juice,” or, at most, very little. The secretory activity comes slowly into play; the food remains much longer in the digestive canal than is necessary, or passes, for want of sufficient digestive juices, into a state of decomposition which irritates the mucous membrane of the alimentary canal and brings it into a condition of disease. No medicinal treatment can help such a patient while he remains surrounded by his old conditions. The

fundamental cause of his illness still continues in progress. There is only one course to pursue; namely, to take him completely away, to free him from his occupation, to interrupt the interminable train of thought, and to substitute for a time, as his only object in life, the care of his health, and a regard for what he eats. This is attained by sending the patient to travel, or by placing him in a hydropathic establishment. It is the duty of the physician to regulate not only the life of individual patients according to such rules, but also to have a care that in wider circles of the community a due conception of the importance of eating should be disseminated. This is particularly so with the Russian physician. It is precisely in the so-called intelligent classes of Russians that a proper conception of life generally is often found wanting, and where an absolutely unphysiological indifference towards eating often exists. More methodical nations, like the English, have made a species of cult of the art of eating. It is, of course, degrading to indulge excessively and exclusively in culinary enjoyments, but, on the other hand, a lofty contempt for eating is also reprehensible. As so often is the case, the best course here also lies between the two extremes.

With the establishment of mental effect upon the secretion of juice the influence of condiments enters upon a new phase. The conclusion had already been empirically arrived at that it was not alone sufficient for the food to be composed exclusively of nutrient substances, but that it should also be tasty. Now, however, we know why this is so. For this reason the physician, who has often to express an opinion upon the suitability of the dietaries of different persons, or even of whole communities, should constantly bear in mind the question of psychic secretion; that is to say, he should inquire after and learn how the food has been eaten, whether with or without enjoyment. But how often do the people who have charge of the commissariat pay attention solely to the nutritive value of the food, or place a higher value on everything else than taste? We must, further, in the interest of the public weal, direct attention especially to the feeding of children. If this or that inclination of the taste ultimately determines the relation of grown-up individuals towards food, a matter with which the commencing phase of digestion is closely linked, it would seem undesirable to habituate children solely to a nicety and uniformity of gustatory sensations. Such might effect their capabilities of adapting themselves to other conditions in after life.

The question of the therapeutic influence of the so-called bitters, it appears to me, bears the closest connection with that of appetite. After a long period of high repute these substances have been almost expelled from the list of pharmaceutic remedies. When tested in the laboratory, they were unable to justify their old and valued reputation; when directly introduced into the stomach, many of them were unable to produce a flow of gastric juice. Consequently, in the eyes of the clinician, they became greatly discredited, so that many were quite ready to discard their use altogether. Obviously, the simple conclusion was drawn that a weak digestion could only be assisted by a remedy which directly excites secretory activity. In this, however, it was forgotten that the conditions of the experiment possibly had not corresponded with the actual state of affairs. The whole question of the therapeutic importance of the bitters, however, acquires a different significance when we link it with another question, such, for instance, as how do bitters affect the appetite? It is the universal opinion of the earlier and later physicians that bitters increase the appetite, and if this be so everything is said. They are, in consequence, real secretory stimulants, since the appetite, as has many times been repeated in these lectures, is the strongest of all stimuli to the digestive glands. It is, however, not by any means strange that this had not previously been observed in the laboratory. The substances were either introduced directly into the stomachs of normal dogs or else injected into the circulation. But their action is chiefly bound up with their effect upon the gustatory nerves, and it was not, therefore, without some reason that this large group of remedies, consisting of substances of the most varied chemical composition, were grouped together mainly on account of a certain bitter taste common to them all. A person who suffers from digestive disturbance has, moreover, a blunted taste, a certain degree of gustatory indifference. The ordinary foods, which are agreeable to other people, and also to himself when in health, now appear tasteless. They not only arouse no desire for eating, but may even cause a feeling of dislike; there is no sense of taste, or at best a perverse one. It is necessary, therefore, that the gustatory apparatus should receive a strong stimulus in order to restore a normal sensation. As experience teaches, this object is most quickly attained by exciting sharp, unpleasant, gustatory impressions, which by contrast awaken the idea of pleasant ones. In either case there is no longer indifference, and this is the foundation upon which an appetite for this or that kind of food may be awakened, and here a general physiological law is illustrated. The light appears brighter after darkness, a sound louder after silence, the enjoyment of blithesome health more intense after illness, and so on. This explanation of the appetising effects of bitters proceeding from the mouth does not exclude the possibility of some such similar influence coming also from the stomach. As has been already stated in the fifth lecture, there is some reason for believing that certain impulses from the cavity of the stomach are likewise necessary for the excitation of appetite. It is possible that bitters not only act directly on the gustatory nerves in the mouth, but that they also act on the mucous membrane of the stomach in such a way that sensations are generated which contribute to the passionate craving for food. As a matter of fact, it has been confirmed by many clinicians that after the administration of bitters some such special sensations do arise in the stomach. The effect of these remedies consists, therefore, not

merely in the generation of a simple reflex, but in the production of a certain psychic effect, which indirectly excites a physiological secretory activity. The same probably applies to other substances, such as condiments. In any case, whether our explanation corresponds to the actuality or not, the question of the therapeutic effect of bitters is settled in the affirmative the moment we acknowledge that these substances awaken appetite. The problem, therefore, of an experimental investigation of bitters consists in establishing the fact that they have an effect upon the appetite. The question is a difficult one, and has not hitherto been attempted in the laboratory. It is not sufficient to hand over clinical observations to the laboratory as experimental proofs. One must have, in addition, the assurance that the investigation has been correctly carried out; that is to say, that it dealt exactly with the point under consideration. It is interesting to observe that the connection between appetite and gastric juice is by many physicians, and in many text-books of medicine, exactly reversed. Thus it is represented that some medicinal remedy calls forth a secretion of gastric juice, and this, by its presence in the stomach, awakens an appetite. Here we have to deal with a false explanation of a true fact, and that because it was not recognised that a psychic effect could by any possibility be a powerful excitant of secretory nerves. The customs of the chief meal of the day also correspond with our physiological results. After this or that _hors d'œuvre_, perhaps also with a liqueur of brandy (especially customary in Russia), both of which are designed to awaken the appetite, the repast proper begins, and, in the majority of cases, with something hot, consisting mostly of meat broth (_bouillon_, different soups, and so on). After this comes the really nourishing food--meat of different kinds served in various ways, or, in the case of poorer people, stews made with vegetables, and therefore rich in carbohydrate material. This sequence of foods, from the standpoint of physiology, is quite rational. Meat broth, as we have already seen, is an important chemical excitant of gastric secretion. An attempt is therefore made in two ways to secure a free secretion of gastric juice to act on the chief food; first, in the excitement of the appetite juice by the _hors d'œuvre_, and secondly, in the promotion of the flow by the action of the meat broth. It is in this way that human instinct has made provisions for the digestion of the chief meal. A good meat broth can only be afforded by well-to-do people, and consequently with the poorer classes a less expensive, and, indeed, also a less effective, chemical excitant is used for awakening the early secretion. For example, _kwas_[31] serves in this way with the Russian population, while in Germany, where the price of meat is high, different kinds of soups are used, consisting of water mixed with flour, bread, etc. It is further to be borne in mind that the quantity of the digestive juices in general stands in close connection with the content of water in the organism. This has been shown by the experiments of Dr. Walther for the pancreatic juice, and by my own for the gastric juice. If this sequence of foods, therefore, holds good for healthy people, it must be even more strictly adhered to in pathological conditions. Thus, when a person has no appetite, or only a weak one, he has no psychic juice or only very little; consequently, the meal must in every case be begun with a strong chemical excitant--for example, with a solution of the extractives of flesh. Otherwise solid foods, particularly if they do not consist of meat, would remain long in the stomach without any digestion whatever. It is, therefore, in every way desirable to prescribe meat juice, strong broth, or meat extract to people who have no appetite. The same applies also to forced feeding, for instance, of the insane. It is true that the method of introduction in this case necessarily secures the presence of a chemical excitant, since the food can only be introduced in a fluid form. In any case the addition of meat extract would be very useful. If one arranged the ordinary fluid foods in descending order, according to the influence of the chemical excitants, the following would be the series: first, the preparations of the flesh, such as meat juice and the like; secondly, milk; thirdly, water.

The usual termination of the repast is also, from the physiological standpoint, easy to be understood. The chief meal is generally ended with something sweet, and everybody knows that sweets are pleasant. The meaning of this is easy to guess. The repast, begun with pleasure, consequent on the pressing need for food, must also, notwithstanding the stilling of hunger, be terminated with an agreeable sensation. At the same time the digestive canal must not be burdened with work at this stage; it is only the gustatory nerves which should be agreeably excited. After thus dealing in general with the usual arrangement of our meals, we may now speak of some special points.

Above all comes the acid reaction of the food. It is apparent that acidity enjoys a special preference in the human taste. We use quite a number of acid substances. Thus, for example, one of the commonest seasoning substances is vinegar, which figures in a number of sauces and such like. Further, many kinds of wine have a somewhat acid taste. In Russia, _kwas_, especially in the acid form, is consumed in great quantities. Moreover, acid fruits and green vegetables are used as food, and they are either of themselves acid, or made so in the preparation. In medicine this instinct is likewise often made use of, and acid solutions, especially of hydrochloric and phosphoric acids, are prescribed in digestive disturbances. Finally, Nature itself constantly endeavours to prepare lactic acid in the stomach in addition to the hydrochloric acid. The former arises from the food introduced, and is consequently always present. These facts are all physiologically comprehensible when we know that an acid reaction is not only necessary for an efficient action of the peptic ferment, but is at the same time the strongest excitant of the pancreatic gland. It is even conceivable that in certain cases the whole digestion may depend upon the stimulating properties of acids, since the

pancreatic juice exerts a ferment action upon all the constituents of the food. In this way acids may either assist digestion in the stomach where too little gastric juice is present, or bring about vicarious digestion by the pancreas where it is wholly absent. It is easy, therefore, to understand why the Russian peasant enjoys his _kwas_ with bread. The enormous quantity of starch which he consumes, either as bread or porridge, demands a greater activity upon the part of the pancreatic gland, and this is directly brought about by the acid. Further, in certain affections of the stomach, associated with loss of appetite, we make use of acids, both from instinct as well as medical direction, the explanation being that they excite an increased activity of the pancreatic gland, and thus supplement the weak action of the stomach. It appears to me that a knowledge of the special relations of acids to the pancreas ought to be very useful in medicine, since it brings the gland--a digestive organ at once so powerful and so difficult of access--under the control of the physician. We could, for instance, intentionally discard digestion in the stomach, and thus transfer it to the bowel, by prescribing substances which do not excite the gastric glands. On the other hand, by lessening the acidity of the gastric juice we could reduce the activity of the pancreas, and these are matters which might be made use of in various special diseases, or even in some general disturbances of the digestive apparatus.

No less instructive is a comparison of the results of our experiments upon fat, with the demands of instinct and also with the precepts of dietetics and therapeutics. Everybody knows that fatty foods are heavy, that is, difficult of digestion, and in the case of weak stomachs they are usually avoided. We are now in a position to understand this physiologically. The existence of fat in large quantities in the chyme restrains in its own interest the further secretion of gastric juice, and thus impedes the digestion of proteid substances; consequently, a combination of fat and proteid-holding foods is particularly difficult to digest, and can only be borne by those who have good stomachs and keen appetites. The combination of bread and butter is less difficult, as might _a priori_ be inferred from its wide employment. Bread requires for itself, especially when calculated per unit, but little gastric juice and but little acid, while the fat which excites the pancreatic gland insures a rich production of ferment both for itself and also for the starch and proteid of bread. Fat alone does not count by any means as a heavy food, as may be seen from the fact that large quantities of lard are consumed in certain districts of Russia with impunity. This also is comprehensible, since the inhibitory influence of the fat in this case does not prevent the digestion of any other food-stuff, and is conducive to the assimilation of the fat itself. There is no struggle in this case between the several food constituents, and therefore no one of them suffers. In harmony also with daily experience the physician, in cases of weakness of the stomach, totally excludes fatty food and recommends meat of a fat-free kind; for example, game, etc. In pathological cases, however, where an excessive activity of the gastric glands is manifested, fatty food, or fat as emulsion, is prescribed. And here medicine has empirically brought to its aid the restraining action of fat, which we have so strikingly seen in our experiments.

Amongst all the articles of human food, milk takes a special position, and this is unanimously recognised, both in daily experience and in the practice of medicine. By everybody milk is considered a light food, and is given in cases of weak digestion as well as in a whole series of severe illnesses; for example, in heart and kidney affections. The extreme importance of this substance, a food prepared by Nature itself, we can now well understand. There are three properties of milk which secure it an exceptional position. As we already know, in comparison with nitrogenous equivalents of other foods, the weakest gastric juice and the smallest quantity of pancreatic fluid are poured out on milk; consequently, the secretory activity requisite for its assimilation is much less than with any other food-stuff. In addition, milk possesses a further important property. Thus, when it is introduced unobserved into the stomach of an animal it causes a secretion both in the stomach and also one from the pancreas; consequently, it appears to be an independent chemical excitant of the digestive canal; and in this action it is remarkable that we perceive no essential difference in the effect when the milk is brought unnoticed into the stomach from that which occurs when it is given to the animal to lap. Although flesh is a better chemical excitant, it is by no means a matter of indifference how it gets into the stomach. It must, therefore, be accepted that milk excites not only a really effective, but at the same time a very economic, secretion, and also that the appetite is unable to stimulate this secretion into a more active or abundant flow. The secret of the relation of milk to the secretion of the digestive juices can, unfortunately, at present be submitted to no further analysis or investigation. We are at liberty, however, to suppose that the fat on the one hand is of importance for the inhibition of the gastric glands, and the alkalinity on the other for the restraint of the pancreas. Thus the gastric glands and the pancreas, notwithstanding the presence of excitants, are maintained by milk at a certain but not too high degree of activity, a matter which is in every way desirable in consideration of the easy digestibility of its constituents. Finally, the third characteristic which is observed to belong to milk, and which is probably only an expression of the first, consists in the following. When one administers to an animal equivalent quantities of nitrogen, in the one case as milk, in the other as bread, and afterwards estimates the hourly output of nitrogen in the urine, it results that the increase during the first seven to ten hours after the milk (compared with the excretion beforehand) amounts only to from 12 per cent to 15 per cent of the nitrogen taken in, while after bread it amounts to 50 per cent. If the hourly rate of absorption and the extent to which milk and bread

are respectively used up be taken into consideration, it has to be admitted that these augmentations of urinary nitrogen which appear soon after feeding must be expressions of the functional activity of the digestive canal itself, and that this activity in the case of bread is three or four times greater than in the case of milk (_Experiments of Prof. Rjasanzew_); consequently, in the case of milk a much larger fraction of its nitrogen is free to be used up by the organism at large (irrespective of the organs of digestion) than in that of any other kind of food. In other words, the price which the organism pays for the nitrogen of milk, in the form of work on the part of its digestive apparatus, is much less than that for other foods. How admirably, therefore, the food prepared by Nature distinguishes itself when compared with all others!

The facts just related bring forward a new aspect from which the relative nutritive values of different foods may be judged. The older criteria must frankly make room for the new or else be displaced by them. Experiments upon the utilisation of food-stuffs, in which what remains undigested is determined as well as what is absorbed into the body fluids, cannot alone be trusted to solve the question in a satisfactory manner. Suppose, for instance, that in the digestion of a given food the alimentary canal has been given a certain work to perform; if it be in health the work will be accomplished in the best possible manner--that is to say, with complete abstraction of everything nutrient. You will thus learn how much nutrient material was contained in the food, but the question of its digestibility remains as obscure as before. In your experiment you do not know how great an effort it has cost the alimentary canal to extract all the nourishment from the food. Nor can artificial digestion experiments settle the question of digestibility, for experiments in which food is normally partaken of are quite different from those in the test-tube, where we have to deal with only one juice, and not with the interaction of different juices and different food constituents. That one must here, as a matter of fact, make a distinction is clear from the observation of Dr. Walther in our laboratory. Fibrin, which is regarded by all as the most easily digested proteid, proved, when compared with a nitrogen equivalent of milk, to be a much stronger excitant of the pancreas, although milk contains, in addition to nitrogenous substances, a good deal of other non-nitrogenous material. The digestibility and nutritive value of foods must obviously be decided by an estimation of the real work which they entail upon the digestive apparatus, both in regard to the quantity and quality of the juices poured out on a given amount of nutrient material. The energy used up in gland metabolism must be deducted from that of food taken in. The remainder will then indicate the value of the food to the organism; that is to say, will give the amount available for use by all the other organs exclusive of the digestive apparatus. From this point of view those materials must be taken as less nourishing and less digestible which are in large part used up to make good the expenditure entailed by their digestion on the part of the alimentary canal; that is to say, those food-stuffs are less useful whose nutritive value little more than covers the cost of their digestion; consequently, it is of great practical importance to compare from this aspect the same foods differently prepared--for example, boiled and roast meat, hard and soft boiled eggs, boiled and unboiled milk, etc.

A discussion of some further medical questions may here be taken up. The first concerns the therapeutic use of the neutral and alkaline salts of sodium. In clinical, pharmacological, and physiological text-books it is stated now, as ever, that these salts promote a flow of gastric juice. We may look in vain, however, for any experimental foundation to support this doctrine. The experiments brought forward cannot be regarded as conclusive. When Blondlot sprinkled sodium bicarbonate upon flesh, or Braun and Grützner introduced sodium chloride solutions directly into the blood, they began with methods either false in themselves or far removed from normal conditions. In this case, however, the gaps in the experiment were happily made good by the clinician, for the experiment appeared to be confirmatory of clinical experience. That sodium salts (the chloride and bicarbonate) are useful in disorders of the digestive apparatus there can be no doubt. How do they act, however? It appears to me that here, as in some other cases, medical science has fallen into error. When we know that an effect takes place it does not by any means imply that we know the mechanism by which it occurs; and although medicine is broad enough and comprehensive enough to make free use of empiricism in practice, yet it often thinks in narrow grooves when it turns to the explanation of facts. It frequently tries to explain complicated healing processes in the simplest way, on supposed physiological data. And this is true in the present case, which affords an example of prevalent medical reasoning; the alkalies work favourably in digestive disturbances--therefore they are succagogues. Naturally the stomach, under the influence of alkalies, sometimes begins to secrete a greater quantity of juice. This means, however, that it has recovered from a disordered state and has returned to normal conditions. Consequently, the effect is due to the fact of recovery, and not to a direct influence of the alkalies. This latter, however, must be specially proved. The assistance afforded by the alkalies to the organism might be capable of another explanation; for example, that which is ordinarily given. In this case, however, I venture to offer a reason for the effects of sodium chloride, and of the alkaline salts of sodium, which is exactly the opposite of that generally accepted. We were unable to convince ourselves of any succagogue influence on the part of these salts. Indeed, both on the stomach and pancreas they proved in our hands to have an inhibitory effect. In addition to the experiments which I previously brought forward concerning the relation of alkalies to gastric and pancreatic juice, I may relate the

following observation. A dog which fortunately had survived the performance, one after the other, of a gastric fistula, a pancreatic fistula, and an œsophagotomy, received daily during the course of several weeks an addition of soda to its food. The animal enjoyed good health and had an excellent appetite. When the first sham feeding experiment was carried out, the relatively small effect of this otherwise very active juice-exciting procedure at once struck us. At the same time we observed that the pieces of flesh which fell from the upper end of the œsophagus, contrary to the ordinary rule, were hardly at all insalivated. In this dog, therefore, a greatly lowered activity of several digestive glands--viz., of the gastric, pancreatic, and salivary glands--simultaneously existed. With regard to the salivary glands the circumstance was naturally submitted to closer investigation. I believe that the inhibitory influence of the alkalies on the digestive glands, which was here proved experimentally, may furnish a basis for the following representation of their mode of action in producing healing effects. Catarrhal affections of the stomach are characterised by an incessant or very protracted secretion of slimy, weakly acid gastric juice. Further, in many cases the affection begins with a hypersecretion, that is an abnormal excitability, of the secretory apparatus which makes itself evident in a superfluous and useless flow. The same must be conceived to happen in disorders of the pancreatic gland; at least such a condition sets in after operations performed for physiological purposes. It is, further, justifiable to suppose that, when an affection is once set up by this or that cause, it may later maintain itself independently; for continuous activity has undoubtedly a harmful influence on the glands. The due nourishment, and the restoration of organs after activity, proceeds best during rest. In the normal course of events, after a period of active work follows a pause, during which the latent work of restoration is accomplished. When, therefore, a remedy effectively restrains the excessive work of a diseased organ, it may in this way contribute to the removal of the pathological condition, and thus to a restoration of the normal state. In this consists, in my opinion, the healing effects of the alkalies. One might draw a parallel between the action of these substances in digestive disturbances and that of digitalis in compensatory disturbances of the heart. An uncompensated heart beats rapidly, and thereby only aggravates its condition. Its time of rest, that is of recovery, of restitution of the organ, is shortened. A vicious cycle is set up. The weak action of the heart lowers blood pressure; the lowering of this leads (from known physiological causes) to an increase in the number of beats; the quickening leads to weakening of the organ. Without doubt the digitalis aids by breaking through this vicious cycle, in that it greatly slows the pulse, and thereby gives new power to the heart. With our explanation of the action of the alkalies harmonises the further circumstance that, with the use of the salts in question, a strict diet is generally prescribed, which means that a certain amount of rest is secured for the digestive glands. It is interesting that in clinical investigations with the stomach-tube, after a period when the alkalies were looked upon as succagogues, a new phase has also set in, mention being now more frequently made of a restraining effect.

The cause of the erroneous belief that alkalies promote a flow of juice obviously lies in this, that people omitted to compare the effects of the saline solutions with those of like quantities of water (_Dr. Chigin_).

The second point which we may consider is the following. The chief difficulty of the physician who wishes to regulate the diet of patients when they suffer from digestive disturbances consists in the fact that idiosyncrasy plays a very important _rôle_. In one and the same illness, different patients react to the same diet in wholly different ways. That which is agreeable to one, and is well borne and useful, may be rank poison to another. Consequently, the golden rule in dietetics is to give no directions with regard to food till one has made inquiries concerning the inclinations and habits of the patient. What does all this indicate? Till now physiology had no experimental answer to the question. But our facts, it appears to me, contribute to a clearing up of the situation. Every food determines a certain amount of digestive work, and when a given dietary is long continued, definite and fixed types of glands are set up which can only slowly and with difficulty be altered. In consequence, digestive disturbances are often instituted if a change be suddenly made from one dietetic _régime_ to another, especially from a sparse to a rich diet; such, for instance, as happens after the long Russian fasts. These disturbances are expressions of the temporary insufficiency of the digestive glands to meet the new demands made upon them.

Finally, it may be of some use to relate the following here. There are often cases of sudden and unaccountable digestive disturbances. From the standpoint of modern physiology they might be explained by an activity of the secreto-inhibitory nervous system, which from some cause or other has been excessively and abnormally stimulated. In any case this system is now a factor of which the physician has to take due account.

SWALLOWING AND MOVEMENTS OF THE STOMACH AND INTESTINES

BY W. B. CANNON, M.D.

Of the Physiological Laboratory of the Harvard Medical School Boston, Mass., U. S. A.

[NOTE.--In the beginning of 1896 Dr. Professor Henry Pickering Bowditch, one of our Board of Scientific Assessors in the Nutrition Case suggested the use of the Röntgen ray as a means of learning more than was then known about the mechanism of swallowing. There was much difference of opinion among research physiologists about this important function, and the question was far from settled. Magendie published a theory of deglutition, in Paris, in 1836, which was practically accepted until 1876, when Dr. Professor Angelo Mosso, of the University of Turin, Turin, Italy, established the theory of sole peristaltic assistance in swallowing. Again in 1880 Dr. Professor Kronecker, of Berne, Switzerland, in connection with Dr. Falk, and later in connection with Dr. Meltzer, of New York, produced evidence to prove a more complicated process in deglutition than that of peristalsis alone. But even Kronecker and Meltzer found, as they went on, evidence to modify their earlier beliefs, and hence the subject was not cleared up to a point of general agreement.

The suggestion made by Dr. Bowditch was taken up in the Harvard Physiological Laboratory and formed the beginning of a series of studies of the mechanical factors in digestion. The reports of these studies, presented by Dr. W. B. Cannon and collaborators, in the _American Journal of Physiology_, in the volumes of 1898 and 1903, are so understandable, even to the layman ignorant of physiological nomenclature, that we are prompted to give them, almost entire, leaving out only the technical description of the methods employed, which are only interesting to research students who have access to the _Journal_.

It will be noted that three of the professors of physiology mentioned in connection with this preliminary study of the nutrition problem--Bowditch, Mosso, and Kronecker--are members of our presently organised Board.—HORACE FLETCHER.]

THE MOVEMENTS OF THE FOOD IN THE ŒSOPHAGUS

BY W. B. CANNON AND A. MOSER

From the Laboratory of Physiology in the Harvard Medical School

Extracts from _American Journal of Physiology_, 1898

The movements of deglutition, in common with many other physiological processes, were explained by the older physiologists on anatomical grounds. Thus, Magendie divided the act into three parts, corresponding to the anatomical regions of the mouth, pharynx, and œsophagus. The muscles of each of these divisions were considered the active agents in propelling the food onward. The function of moving the mass to the pharynx was variously ascribed to the tongue itself, to the mylohyoid muscles, and to gravity. For the second part, the movement through the pharynx, there was more unanimity of opinion, since the constrictors, especially the middle and lower, were evidently concerned.

Direct observations on the movement of swallowed masses in the œsophagus were first made by Mosso. The œsophagus of a dog was laid bare, and a transverse incision made through it, or a piece of it excised. A small wooden ball was placed in the canal below the excised part, and the animal was then stimulated to swallow. One or two seconds after the contraction of the pharyngeal muscles a peristaltic wave began to traverse the œsophagus. This wave did not stop at the point of excision, but in due time reappeared below, and carried the ball to the stomach. Thus the act was shown to be controlled by the central nervous system. Peristalsis was so plainly the motive power that the action was never doubted. Yet this belief was soon to be questioned.

In 1880 Falk and Kronecker studied the movements in the mouth and pharynx, and advanced the theory that deglutition was accomplished by the rapid contraction of the muscles of the mouth. During the act of swallowing the air-tight buccal cavity shows a manometric pressure of twenty centimetres of water. The same pressure was demonstrated to be present also in the œsophagus, but not in the stomach. This pressure was considered sufficient to force food through the œsophagus before the peristaltic wave traversed it. Another argument for rapid descent was found in the fact that cold water can be felt in the epigastric region almost immediately after being swallowed. Further, when strong acids pass through the gullet, they corrode but small parts of it, and not the entire mucous membrane, as would be the case were the acid carried to the stomach by peristalsis.

Over a year and a half ago it was suggested by Prof. H. P. Bowditch that if some substance opaque to the Röntgen rays were swallowed, it could be seen in its passage to the stomach, and the nature of its movement thus determined. Anæsthesia could be dispensed with,--a desirable condition, since observers had found that it interfered greatly with the deglutition reflex. It would be unnecessary to open either the abdominal or the pleural cavity. The reflex stimulus of food, moreover, would be better than electrical stimulation of the superior laryngeal nerve. In short, the animal would swallow normal food under practically normal conditions. At Dr. Bowditch's suggestion and with his valuable assistance--which we gratefully acknowledge--we made the

following series of experiments.

To render the swallowed mass opaque, subnitrate of bismuth was used. The salt is tasteless, practically inert, and can be fed in large quantities without harm. In order that observations could be made by more than one person, all experiments were conducted in a dark room. On the side of the animal opposite the Crookes tube was placed an open fluorescent screen, on which the different tissues of the animal were outlined with varying degrees of light and shade. Among these shadows the swallowed mass appeared as a darker object, and thus its motion could be studied.

For the first experiments the goose was selected. The head and neck were held stationary by a tall pasteboard collar, which allowed free movement of the head without constriction of the neck. The fluorescent screen was placed against this collar at a uniform distance of thirty centimetres from the tube. When a bolus of corn-meal mush mixed with bismuth was placed in the pharynx, it descended slowly and regularly, and occupied about twelve seconds in passing over a distance of fifteen centimetres. The screen was marked at intervals of two centimetres with cross lines, by means of which the relative rate in different parts of the œsophagus could be studied. A vibrator marking tenths of a second was interrupted whenever the bolus crossed a line. An average of over one hundred such observations showed that the rate became slightly slower as the bolus proceeded.

In order to test liquids, molasses was mixed with bismuth to such a consistency as to drop easily from a glass rod. When this was fed with a pipette, it passed slowly and regularly down the œsophagus, clearly by peristalsis. The rate was about the same as for solid food. In both these experiments the addition of water would sometimes cause irregularities in the descent. Microscopic sections from four different parts of the œsophagus of the goose showed no histological difference.

In the experiments on the cat, the animal was placed on its back and left side on a holder. The extremities were secured by straps. The head was held between two upright rods, connected above by a thong; this allowed free movement of the head, without resistance to the passage of food. Shreds of meat dipped in bismuth were ordinarily masticated and swallowed without difficulty. For soft solids, bread and milk were used, so fluid as to be easily drawn up into a pipette. The insolubility of the bismuth salt rendered the study of liquids more difficult. Strong solutions of potassic iodide and other salts, and suspension of bismuth, in acacia and molasses were tried; but a simple mixture of milk and bismuth, shaken in a test tube and immediately drawn up into a pipette, was found most practicable.

Inasmuch as the movement of these different foods varied in different parts of the œsophagus, it will be convenient to divide the latter into three sections. The first or cervical portion extends from the pharynx to the thorax; the second or thoracic, from here to the lower half of the heart; and the third comprises the rest of the canal. The relative length of these three parts is about in the ratio of 9:8:6.

The beginning of deglutition was noted by one observer by a finger on the larynx; the same observer called out when the bolus arrived at the thorax, heart, and stomach respectively, while the other observer noted the time. The movement of solids will first be considered. The descent the entire way was by peristalsis, but the rapidity varied. The duration of the movement in the cervical portion was two and a half seconds, and in the thoracic region a little less than two seconds. At the lower end of the heart there was sometimes a slight pause. In the lower section, from the heart to the stomach, the movement was decidedly different; the rate was always very slow. The distance was less than one-third of the entire canal, yet the time consumed in this part ranged from six to seven seconds, or three-fifths of the entire time of descent. The character of the movement here was also peculiar. Whereas in the upper sections the passage was uniform and regular, with a slight acceleration in the thoracic region, here it was apparently irregular, for the bolus descended about one centimetre with each inspiratory movement of the diaphragm, and remained stationary or descended very slightly during expiration. Thus a series of hitches seemed to carry the bolus to the cardia. A probable explanation of this peculiar movement is that the stomach and lower œsophagus were pulled down with each descent of the diaphragm. This would make the movement appear irregular, although it was really a slow peristalsis. It may be well to remark here that this movement was invariably observed in the cat with every kind of food.

Semi-solids, namely, a mush of bread and milk, descended in the same way as solids; but the rate was slightly faster in the upper œsophagus, for the bolus took about a second less to reach the cardiac level. From here the rate was the same as with solids.

For liquids, one and a half to two seconds sufficed for the descent to the midheart region. Here there often occurred a long pause, from a few seconds to a minute or more. Then the œsophagus apparently contracted above the liquid, which slowly passed on to the stomach, as already described. Sometimes it seemed as if a swallowing movement, evidenced by a rise of the larynx, started the peristaltic wave. Again, several swallows would succeed one another before the liquid passed on. A few times the bismuth and

milk seemed strung out along the œsophagus; some more liquid descending would gather this up, and the whole mass, assuming an ovoid form, would move into the stomach.

Thus in the cat the total time for deglutition varies from nine to twelve seconds. The lowest section presents no change ascribable to a difference in consistency, while in the upper sections the rate does slightly increase with the more liquid character of the food.

In experiments on the dog, bismuth enclosed in capsules or wrapped in shreds of meat was fed as the solid. The general phenomena were as follows: With the rise of the larynx there was a quick, propulsive movement of the bolus, which descended rapidly for a few centimetres, sometimes as far as the clavicle. From this point the rapidity was diminished, yet no pause was observed; the bolus simply moved more slowly. This rate was then continued to the stomach without a slackening of speed in the diaphragmatic region, as was observed in the cat. Semi-solids moved in the same way as solids. The total time of descent from larynx to stomach was from four to five seconds.

Liquids gave even a more decided squirt in the beginning of the movement. To render the œsophagus as lax and free as possible, the head of the dog was released from the upright rods and held by the hands after the food was placed in the mouth. Sometimes the liquid descended rather rapidly as far as the heart, at other times no further than the clavicle; then without a pause it passed on slowly and regularly, reaching the stomach in about the same time as solids and semi-solids.

Thus in the dog and cat but little variation was seen in the swallowing of liquids and solids. The liquids pass somewhat faster in the upper œsophagus. But in some animals the difference of rate with foods of varying consistency is much more marked. In the horse, for instance, mere observation shows a decided variation in the rate of movement in the œsophagus. Liquids shoot along the gullet, while solids move clearly by peristalsis. To determine the rate of solids, one hand was placed on the larynx of a horse to note the beginning of swallowing, and the other hand near the shoulders, where the bolus could be easily felt in its passage. The time consumed by the bolus in passing over a certain distance was measured by a stop watch. The rate obtained for solids, such as hay or grain, was from thirty-five to forty centimetres a second.

For semi-solids, a mixture of bran and water was made, thin enough to run easily between the fingers. Each bolus was watched by a separate observer with a separate watch. The average rate obtained was the same as for solids.

Liquids in the horse pass with a rapidity too great to be affected by peristalsis. Another force must be sought. Among the various muscles supposed to be effectual in moving food into the pharynx, the mylohyoids were shown by Meltzer to be essential. The styloglossi were cut by him without much interference with deglutition, but section of the mylohyoid nerves rendered the act impossible. The activity of these muscles in the horse during swallowing is easily perceived by the hand. Their energetic contraction is a sufficient explanation of the rapid passage of water through the œsophagus. The motion here is more than five times as rapid as that of solids and semi-solids.

Meltzer’s experiment to measure the rate of liquids in man by passing a stomach tube containing litmus paper was repeated by us with some modifications. Congo red paper was used, since it is more sensitive than litmus; it also furnishes a means of differentiating between mineral and organic acids, as the discolouration produced on Congo red by mineral acids is removed by ether. It was thus possible to distinguish between the discolouration produced by gastric regurgitation and that produced by the swallowed liquid. For the swallowed liquid, one-half per cent lactic acid was found most satisfactory, as the colour produced by it on Congo red test paper is almost instantly discharged in ether. By this method the paper was found discoloured within half a second after the rise of the larynx, certainly too short a period for a peristaltic wave to carry the liquid to the neighbourhood of the cardia.

The X-ray method lends itself less successfully to the study of deglutition in man than in the other animals we have studied. The thickness of the thorax, the distance of the œsophagus from the surface, and the relation to dense tissues render the observation of a swallowed mass difficult, especially when the mass is in rather rapid motion. The few observations which we have to report were made on a seven-year-old girl, placed in the sitting posture. Gelatine capsules containing bismuth were used for solids, and were traced to a point below the heart. The motion was very regular, and apparently due to peristalsis, for the bolus descended without a hitch or irregularity of any kind. Sometimes the capsule became fixed in the upper œsophagus, at about the level of the second rib. Repeated swallows of water would fail to dislodge it. An interesting point was noted here. With each attempt at swallowing, the capsule would rise slightly, as if the œsophagus was pulled up with the rise of the larynx; then the capsule would descend to its former position.

Semi-solids--a mush of bread and milk--could be seen about as far as solids; that is, to just below the heart. The motion of the mushy bolus was the same as with solids, except that the rapidity was perhaps slightly greater.

It should be noted here that with the human subject, as well as with the horse, our results for semi-solids differ from those derived by Meltzer's method; for according to his statements semi-solids, like liquids, are squirted down the œsophagus, and are not propelled by peristalsis, as has been the case in our observations.

Liquids--bismuth and water--were seen only in the neck and upper thorax. Here there was a decided squirt. With the rise of the larynx the liquid was seen to pass rapidly through the pharynx and well down into the thoracic œsophagus before it was lost to observation. The rate, however, by estimation was less than that of liquids in the horse.

There remains to be considered Meltzer's latest investigation, in which he endeavoured to ascertain whether liquids remain above the cardia till the arrival of the peristalsis, or ooze down before. An experimental answer was secured by Meltzer by the following method. The abdominal and gastric walls of an anæsthetised dog were incised, and a tube (vaginal speculum) introduced. Through this the entrance of food into the stomach could be observed directly. In repeated experiments no liquid was seen to pass through the cardia before the arrival of the peristaltic wave. An incision through the diaphragm near its anterior origin showed that the swallowed liquid was not squirted as far as a point an inch above the diaphragm. To observe the œsophagus nearer its beginning, the upper three ribs were resected on the left side. Thus the swallowed liquid was seen to shoot along the œsophagus before any peristalsis reached this point. The resection of the fifth rib exposed the œsophagus half-way between the bifurcation of the trachea and the diaphragm. Here a bulging was sometimes observed immediately after the beginning of the act, and the swallowed mass remained there until a peristaltic wave carried it down. If the mass swallowed was small, or was projected with moderate force, it might not even reach as far as the bifurcation. From these experiments Meltzer concluded that in animals, as in man, liquid food is not carried down the œsophagus by peristalsis, but is thrown rapidly into a deep part of the canal. The depth reached depends on the quantity swallowed, the force used, and the tonicity of the lower part of the œsophagus.

The difference between these methods of Meltzer and those employed in our experiments has already been mentioned; and merely his results, which were obtained with liquids alone, need be considered here. According to our observations on the dog, there was no distinct pause at any part of the canal. The movement simply became slower, and continued at this rate until the stomach was reached. Neither was the rate through the diaphragmatic part of the œsophagus slower than through the thoracic. The quick propulsive movement noticed in the dog was observed with solids and semi-solids as well as with liquids, but the liquids descended further down the canal before the movement changed to the slower peristalsis. While this difference was evident to the eye, the total time consumed by liquids in passing from pharynx to stomach was not enough shorter than the time for solids and semi-solids to be determined by our measurements.

SUMMARY.

The phenomena of œsophageal deglutition as determined by our experiments may then be described as follows:—

There is a difference in swallowing according to the animal and the food which is used.

In fowls the rate is slow and the movement always peristaltic, without regard to consistency. A squirt-movement with liquids is manifestly impossible, as the parts forming the mouth are too hard and rigid. With this diminution of propulsive power in the mouth there is observed a greater reliance on the force of gravity. The head is raised each time after the mouth is filled, and the fluid by its own weight trickles into the œsophagus, through which it is carried by peristalsis.

In the cat the movement is always peristaltic, and slightly faster than in fowls. A bolus takes from nine to twelve seconds in reaching the stomach. Liquids move somewhat more rapidly than semi-solids in the upper œsophagus. In the lower or diaphragmatic part the rate is very much slower than above, and is the same for liquids as for solids.

In the dog the total time for the descent of a bolus is from four to five seconds. The food is always propelled rapidly in the upper œsophagus, and moves more slowly below. This rapid movement is frequently continued further with liquid food. No distinct pause was observed when the movement of the bolus changed from the rapid to the slower rate.

In man and the horse liquids are propelled deep into the œsophagus at a rate of several feet a second by the rapid contraction of the mylohyoid muscles. Solids and semi-solids are slowly carried through the entire œsophagus by peristalsis alone.

THE MOVEMENTS OF THE STOMACH STUDIED BY MEANS OF THE RÖNTGEN RAYS

BY W. B. CANNON, M.D.

From the Laboratory of Physiology in the Harvard Medical School

Extracts from _American Journal of Physiology_, 1898

Since the stomach gives no obvious external sign of its workings, investigators of gastric movements have hitherto been obliged to confine their studies to pathological subjects or to animals subjected to serious operative interference. Observations made under these necessarily abnormal conditions have yielded a literature which is full of conflicting statements and uncertain results. The only sure conclusion to be drawn from this material is that when the stomach receives food obscure peristaltic contractions are set going, which in some way churn the food to a liquid chyme and force it into the intestines. How imperfectly this describes the real workings of the stomach will appear from the following account of the actions of the organ studied by a new method. The mixing of a small quantity of subnitrate of bismuth with the food allows not only the contractions of the gastric wall, but also the movements of the gastric contents to be seen with the Röntgen rays in the uninjured animal during normal digestion. An unsuspected nicety of mechanical action and a surprising sensitiveness to nervous conditions have thereby been disclosed.

INTRODUCTORY LITERATURE

The early writings on the subject of gastric movements are characterised by general inferences from physical laws and from the anatomical structure of the stomach. According to Galen the stomach had four functions: to draw the food from the mouth (_facultas attractrix_), to retain the food (_facultas retentrix_) during the process of chemical digestion (_facultas alteratrix_), and, finally, to pass the changed material onward (_facultas expultrix_). In later writings the _facultas attractrix_ failed to appear as one of the functions of the stomach. Fallopius, in the sixteenth century, changed the notion of the _facultas retentrix_ by suggesting that the pylorus alone performed this office, and that the muscles of the gastric wall could help only by remaining quiet. Thus the _facultas alteratrix_ and the _facultas expultrix_ are left as true gastric functions. It is with the latter activity and its effects that this paper is concerned.

The ideas of the early writers concerning the pylorus and cardia are of interest. The cardia, they were agreed, is closed during normal digestion in order to keep the food from re-entering the œsophagus. The pylorus they looked upon as the ruler of the actions of the stomach. Such names as pylorus (keeper of the gate), janitor justus, and rector, which the first investigators gave to the sphincter, indicate their theories of its functions. The passage of chyme into the duodenum, the keeping of undigested food in the stomach, the act of vomiting, were all dependent, they believed, on the “will” of the pylorus.

No substantial advance was made beyond these hypotheses until the beginning of the eighteenth century, when Wepfer and Schwartz applied the experimental method to the study of the gastric movements and laid the foundation of a more accurate knowledge. Wepfer vivisected wolves, dogs, and cats, and observed constrictions following stimulation of the stomach. He remarked a general contraction of the pyloric part in vomiting and noted peristaltic and antiperistaltic movements passing over the organ. About the middle of the stomach he frequently saw a deep constriction. The investigations of Schwartz are more valuable in that his search was for the normal action of the muscular coats. The movements, as he observed them, were generally only slight. They began either at the pylorus and passed to the left, half-way to the cardia, or started at the fundus and went to the pylorus. The contractions and relaxations, following one another, formed larger or smaller depressions and elevations, _i. e._, more or less definite waves.

Near the middle of the last century Haller, after confirming the results obtained by Schwartz and Wepfer, summarised his knowledge of the motor functions of the stomach as follows. In general, contraction alternates with relaxation, so that the stomach is, now here, now there, made narrower by longitudinal or transverse depressions; then in these same places relaxation and bulging occur. So long as both apertures are closed the food is driven hither and thither by the shifting movements. It first takes a definite direction when the cardia or the pylorus opens. If the cardia opens, there is an antiperistalsis followed by regurgitation and vomiting. If, on the contrary, the pylorus relaxes, a contraction, starting at the œsophagus, pushes the contents of the stomach into the duodenum. The pylorus allows the passage of fluids, but if it be stimulated by over distention or by hard pieces of food, it closes tightly.

Such was the knowledge of gastric movements in Haller's time. A comparison of his descriptions with those in any standard work on physiology published ten or fifteen years ago will show that, despite very many researches, little advance had been made. Examinations of animals and men with gastric fistulas, studies of the stomach through the atrophied abdominal wall, and vivisection have yielded numerous results; but these have not been harmonious, and have led to much controversy. Prominent in this mass of material as a valuable contribution are Beaumont's careful observations through the gastric fistula of Alexis St. Martin. Beaumont's work has recently been confirmed by Hofmeister and Schütz, who, with Rossbach, Hirsch, Openchowski, and others, have presented during the last twelve years much new and interesting information. Since, however, it will conduce to clearness to set forth the results of these investigations in connection with my own work, their consideration will be deferred until later.

It will then appear that these later investigations, like the earlier researches, disagree as to the details of the stomach movements. Such differences in results are the proper outcome of the abnormal conditions under which the studies have been conducted. Obviously, in order to see the natural movements of the stomach, the organ should be observed in its natural state, and not after it has been disturbed by removal from the abdomen, or by the adhesions and losses of substance incident to gastric fistulas.

As a means of watching the gastric motor activities under normal circumstances, Dr. H. P. Bowditch, in the autumn of 1896, suggested the use of the Röntgen rays. The present paper is the result of the work thus far completed. The kind assistance and stimulating counsel of Dr. Bowditch throughout the investigation are gratefully acknowledged.

THE ANATOMY OF THE STOMACH AND ITS RELATIONS TO THE SHADOW

It must be constantly borne in mind that the shadows described in this research are cast by the gastric contents, not by the stomach itself. Therefore the movements of the organ are not seen directly, but are indicated by their effect on the contained food. Variations in the length and breadth of the stomach can be inferred from changes in the outline of the shadow, but variations in the front-to-back diameter of the organ must be judged from changes in the intensity of the shadow.

The form of the active stomach soon after food has been taken is shown in outline in Figure 1. Since the several parts of the stomach are to be mentioned frequently, it will be well to recall them here in their relations to the outline. The larger, cardiac part of the organ lies to the left of a line through _w x_. Into it the œsophagus opens through the cardiac sphincter, or cardia, at _c_. The pyloric part, which includes all of the stomach situated at the right of a line _w x_, is closed by the pylorus at _p_. This part has two divisions: the antrum at the right of the line _y z_, and the preantral part of the pyloric portion, or middle region of the stomach, between the lines _w x_ and _y z_. The lesser curvature corresponds approximately to the anterior border of the shadow _c w p_; the greater curvature to the more extensive sweep, _c p_, along the posterior border.

[Illustration: FIGURE 1.]

The wall of the cat's stomach consists of three coats, but as this paper deals only with the functions of the muscular coat, that alone will be described. The gastric muscular fibres are disposed in three sets: an outer longitudinal layer, a middle circular layer, and a set of inner oblique fibres. The longitudinal fibres continue those of the œsophagus, and, radiating over the cardiac end, become more marked along the curvatures than on the front and back surfaces. Over the antrum they lie in a thick, uniform layer. The circular fibres form a complete investment, and are arranged in rings at right angles to the curved axis of the stomach. Towards the pyloric end they become denser and stronger, and at the pylorus form a thick bundle, the pyloric sphincter. Separating the antrum from the rest of the stomach, at _y z_, is a special thickening of the circular fibres, called by the early writers the "transverse band," and described by Hofmeister and Schütz as the "sphincter antri pylorici." The oblique fibres start from the left of the cardiac orifice and pass as two strong bands along the anterior part of the dorsal and ventral surfaces, giving off fine fasciculi to the circular musculature; towards the antrum they gradually disappear.

The musculature of the stomach consists of smooth muscle fibres, the chief physiological characteristics of which are slowness of contraction, rhythmic alternation of contraction and relaxation, and a very great tonicity, or power of prolonged contraction. The action of these muscles in the process of gastric digestion is now to be considered.

THE NORMAL MOVEMENTS OF THE STOMACH

Since the time of Haller the chief contributors to the knowledge of the mechanics of the stomach have been Beaumont, Hofmeister and Schütz, and Rossbach.

Beaumont's famous investigations on Alexis St. Martin are recorded in almost all general works on physiology. Through a gastric fistula he introduced a thermometer-tube and observed how it was affected by the motions of the stomach. His conclusions are as follows: "The circular or transverse muscles contract progressively from left to right. When the impulse arrives at the _transverse band_, this is excited to a more forcible contraction, and closing upon the alimentary matter and fluids contained in the pyloric end, prevents their regurgitation. The muscles of the pyloric end, now contracting upon the contents detained there, separate and expel some portion of the chyme.... After the contractile impulse is carried to the pyloric extremity, the circular band and all the transverse muscles become relaxed, and a contraction commences in a reversed direction, from right to left, and carries the contents again to the splenic extremity to undergo similar revolutions."

In close accord with Beaumont's description of the activities of the human stomach are the records of the investigations on the stomach of dogs by Hofmeister and Schütz. They removed the stomach from the body and placed it in a moist chamber, kept at body-heat and covered with glass. Under such conditions the organ remained active for from sixty to ninety minutes. A typical movement is described by these observers as composed of two phases. In the first phase a constriction of the circular fibres, deeper on the greater curvature, starts a few centimetres from the cardia and passes towards the pylorus. As the constriction proceeds it increases in strength until a maximum is reached about two centimetres in front of the antrum. This annular contraction, called by Hofmeister and Schütz the "preantral constriction," closes the first phase. Immediately thereafter the strong sphincter antri pylorici, or transverse band, contracts. Now, while the preantral constriction is relaxing, the sphincter antri pylorici tightens still more, and the antrum is shut off from the rest of the stomach. As soon as this has occurred a general contraction of the muscles of the antrum follows. Relaxation begins at the sphincter antri pylorici and progresses slowly towards the pylorus; it is sometimes accompanied by an antiperistaltic movement.

Although Rossbach also used dogs, his results vary considerably from those of Hofmeister and Schütz. This discrepancy is possibly accounted for by a difference in method, for Rossbach left the stomach in the body. The dogs were treated with morphia and curare, and the abdomen was then widely opened, so that the movements could be clearly seen. When the stomach was full Rossbach saw deep constrictions begin near the middle and pass in waves to the pylorus. At first these movements were weak; later, however, they became more vigorous. The fundus remained in tonic contraction about its contents and took no part in the peristalsis.

Before attempting to explain the difference in the records of these observers I shall give an account of what may be seen in a cat by use of bismuth subnitrate and the Röntgen rays.

1. _Movements of the pyloric part._--Within five minutes after a cat has finished a meal of bread, there is visible near the duodenal end of the antrum a slight annular contraction which moves peristaltically to the pylorus; this is followed by several waves recurring at regular intervals. Two or three minutes after the first movement is seen very slight constrictions appear near the middle of the stomach, and pressing deeper into the greater curvature, course slowly towards the pyloric end. As new regions enter into constriction, the fibres just previously contracted become relaxed, so that there is a true moving wave, with a trough between two crests. When a wave swings round the bend in the pyloric part the indentation made by it deepens; and as digestion goes on the antrum elongates and the constrictions running over it grow stronger, but until the stomach is nearly empty they do not entirely divide the cavity. After the antrum has lengthened, a wave takes about thirty-six seconds to move from the middle of the stomach to the pylorus. At all periods of digestion the waves recur at intervals of almost exactly ten seconds. So regular is this rhythm that many times I have been able to determine within two or three seconds when a minute had elapsed simply by counting six similar phases of the undulations as they passed a given point. It results from this rhythm that when one wave is just beginning several others are already running in order before it. Between the rings of constriction the stomach is bulged out, as shown in the various outlines in Figures 2, 3, 4, and 5. The number of waves during a single period of digestion is larger than might possibly at first be supposed. In a cat that finished eating fifteen grams of bread at 10.52 A.M., the waves were running regularly at 11.00 o'clock. The stomach was not free from food until 6.12 P.M. During that time the cat was fastened to the holder at intervals of half an hour, and the waves were always observed following one another in slow and monotonous succession. At the rate of three hundred and sixty an hour, approximately two thousand six hundred waves passed over the antrum during that single digestive period.

From the above review it will be manifest that my observations of the movements of the pyloric part agree closely with those of Rossbach, but differ considerably from the harmonious results of the work of Beaumont, and Hofmeister and Schütz. Beaumont's methods, however, may be justly criticised on the ground that the thermometer-tube which he held in the stomach was wholly unlike food and very liable to bring about unwonted contractions in so sensitive an organ as the stomach. Further, the movements observed by Hofmeister and Schütz, as Ewald has pointed out, may easily have resulted from the abnormal stimulus due to lack of

blood--a potent cause of peristalsis. And it will be shown later that the accounts given by these investigators describe very well the actions of the stomach when stimulated by an unusual irritant. In this connection it may be added that since the publication of the preliminary notice of my work, Roux and Balthazard, using the Röntgen rays, have published the results of observations on the stomachs of the dog and man similar to those thus far described in this paper.

The fact that my observations and those of Roux and Balthazard were conducted under normal conditions, and that the conditions of Rossbach's experiments were more nearly normal than those of the other observers mentioned, warrants the conclusion that the pyloric part has a more important function than that of merely expelling the contents of the stomach into the intestines. After summarising the description given by Hofmeister and Schütz, Ewald, for _a priori_ reasons, declares: "I cannot accept this view. The plain fact that the pyloric portion secretes a strongly digesting fluid containing pepsin and hydrochloric acid proves it to be an important part for the peptonising function of the stomach." The account of the remarkable manner in which the pyloric portion performs this function must be deferred until the movements of other parts of the stomach have been considered.

2. _Movements of the pyloric sphincter._--Rossbach mars his otherwise careful work by declaring that the pylorus is tightly closed during the whole digestive period of from four to eight hours, and that then the sphincter relaxes and the peristaltic waves empty the stomach. That this is not the normal action of the sphincter has been shown by several observers. Hirsch watched dogs with duodenal fistulas and saw food come from the stomach at intervals of one-fourth of a minute to several minutes. Roux and Balthazard maintain that in dogs food enters the duodenum at the completion of each wave of constriction. Observations on the cat, however, do not support their view, but agree rather with the statement of Hirsch.

In cats fed with bread mixed with subnitrate of bismuth, ten or fifteen minutes elapse after the first constriction in the antrum before any food can be seen in the duodenum. When food does appear it is spurted through the pylorus and shoots along the intestine for two or three centimetres. Not every constriction-wave forces food from the antrum. On one occasion, about an hour after the movements began, three consecutive waves were seen, each of which squirted food into the duodenum. The pylorus remained closed against the next eight waves, opened for the ninth, but closed once more against the tenth and eleventh. For each of the four succeeding waves the sphincter relaxed, but blocked the food brought by three constrictions that followed; and in this irregular way the food continued passing from the stomach. Near the end of gastric digestion, when the constrictions are very deep, it may be that the pylorus opens for every wave.

When a hard bit of food reaches the pylorus, the sphincter closes tightly and remains closed longer than when the food is soft. This action of the sphincter was shown by giving with the regular food of the cat a dry, hard pellet of equal parts of starch paste and bismuth subnitrate about the size of a pea. The food itself contained merely enough bismuth to throw a dim shadow, near the centre of which the pellet could be clearly seen as a dark object. The continual passing of the contraction-waves finally brought the little ball to the pylorus. When it arrived there, five grams of bismuth subnitrate were introduced into the stomach through a tube in the œsophagus. This was done in order that the food passing into the intestines after the ball came to the pylorus might be distinguished from that which had gone on before. By kneading the stomach the bismuth was distributed, as shown by the uniformly black shadow. The pellet could still be seen near the end of the antrum when the constrictions passed over it. Now, although the waves continued to run regularly, the very black food did not gather in the intestines in sufficient amount to be recognised until forty-two minutes after it had been introduced. And when, finally, the food did show itself in the intestines, its shadow contrasted strongly with that of the food which had already passed on. The slowness of the expulsion is not to be regarded as wholly due to the hard mass. No doubt the kneading of the stomach mixed the contents of different parts of the organ and brought to the pylorus food not yet sufficiently digested to be passed by that selective sphincter. But this does not explain the whole delay. Food similar to that given here, except that it contained no hard particles, has usually been seen as small masses in the intestines within fifteen minutes after being swallowed. A part of the delay was evidently, therefore, caused by the hard pellet. Further evidence on this point was secured when, on one occasion, the sphincter was seen to open only seven times in twenty minutes following the arrival of a hard particle of food at the pylorus. The conclusion may therefore be drawn that hard morsels keep the pylorus closed and hinder the passage of the food into the duodenum.

3. _Activity of the cardiac portion._--The part played by the fundus apparently has not hitherto been properly appreciated. It has been regarded as the place for peptic digestion, or as a passive reservoir for food; but it is in fact a most interestingly active reservoir.

[Illustration: FIGURE 2.]

[Illustration: FIGURE 3.]

[Illustration: FIGURE 4.]

[Illustration: FIGURE 5.--Figures 2, 3, 4, and 5 present outlines of the shadow of the contents of the stomach cast on a fluorescent screen by the Röntgen rays. The drawings were made by tracing the outline of the shadow on tissue paper laid upon the fluorescent surface, and are about one-half the actual size. They show the change in the appearance of the stomach at intervals for half an hour, from the time of eating until the stomach is nearly empty.]

The action of the cardiac portion will be best understood by comparing the appearances the stomach presents at various stages in a digestive period. In order to show these stages I carefully made a set of three tracings of the outlines of the stomach as soon as possible after a cat had finished eating, and another set of three every half hour thereafter, until the contents had disappeared (Figs. 2, 3, 4, and 5). These tracings were made by placing white tissue paper over the fluorescent screen, and drawing with a thick lead pencil, easily seen, as much of the boundary of the stomach as I could at the end of each expiration. Between the times for making the drawings the cat was allowed to rest quietly on a mat, but care was taken to lay her in the same position on the holder for every drawing. The drawings of each set were afterwards fastened over one another, so that the lines coincided as closely as possible. Another piece of tissue paper was then put over these, and all four sheets were laid on an illuminated pane of glass. It was thus easy to get a composite tracing which, considering the movement imparted to the stomach by respiration, and the dimness of the shadows in the later stages of digestion, probably represents more exactly than any single drawing the outline of the stomach for each successive period.

A comparison of these drawings shows that as digestion proceeds the antrum appears gradually to elongate and acquire a greater capacity, and that the constrictions make deeper indentations in it. But when the fundus has lost most of its contents, the longitudinal and circular fibres of the antrum contract to make it again shorter and smaller. Its change of form, however, compared with the rest of the stomach, is slight.

The first region to decrease markedly in size is the preantral part of the pyloric portion. The peristaltic undulations, caused by the circular fibres, start at the beginning of this portion, and gradually, by their rhythmic recurrence, press some of the contents into the antrum. As the process continues, the smooth muscle fibres with their remarkable tonicity contract closely about the food that remains, so that the middle region comes to have the shape of a tube (Figs. 3 and 4--1.30 P.M. to 2.30 P.M.), with the rounded fundus at one end and the active antrum at the other. Along the tube very shallow constrictions may be seen following one another to the pylorus.

At this juncture the longitudinal fibres which cover the fundus like radiating fingers, and the circular and oblique fibres reaching in all directions about this spherical region, begin to contract. Thus the contents of the fundus are squeezed into the tubular portion. This process, accompanied by a slight shortening of the tube, goes on until the shadow cast by the fundus is almost wholly obliterated (Fig. 5--5.30 P.M.).

The waves of constriction moving along the tubular portion press the food onward as fast as they receive it from the contracting fundus, and when the fundus is at last emptied they sweep the contents of the tube into the antrum (Fig. 5--5.00 P.M. to 6.00 P.M.). Here the operation is continued by the deeper constrictions till, finally (in this instance at 6.12 P.M.), with the exception of a slight trace of food in the fundus, nothing is to be seen in the stomach at all.

The food in the fundus may possibly be slightly affected by the to-and-fro movements of the diaphragm in respiration. With normal breathing the upper border of the cardiac portion swings through about one centimetre; with dyspnœa, or deep breathing, through one and a half or two centimetres. Since the lower border does not move so much, the contents are gently pressed, and then released from pressure, at each respiration. The pyloric portion is moved very little by the diaphragm, the oscillation being less than a half centimetre.

Moritz has pointed out the value of an organ like the stomach for holding the bulk of the food and serving it out a little at a time, so that the intestines may not become congested during their digestive and absorptive processes. All of the advantages supposed to be thus secured to the intestines may be claimed also for the stomach itself. For the preceding description indicates, and experiments to be described later prove, that the stomach is composed of two physiologically distinct portions: the busy antrum, over which during digestion constriction-waves are running in continuous rhythm; and the cardiac part, which is an active reservoir, pressing out its contents a little at a time as the antral mechanism is ready to receive them.

THE MOVEMENTS OF THE STOMACH IN VOMITING

The appearance of the stomach during vomiting has been studied particularly by Openchowski. He says that when an emetic is given there follows a quivering of the stomach-wall, which, beginning near the pylorus, shows itself later in the antral and middle regions of the stomach. The quivering afterwards passes into a contraction, most strongly marked in the antral part, since the peristaltic waves running down to the antrum from above are continually growing deeper. At the same time the fundus expands spherically. The increased contraction in the pyloric part drives the contents towards the more dilated portion, and thence they are forced into the œsophagus by abdominal pressure.

The same phenomena occur when a cat is given apomorphine hypodermatically. First the upper circular muscles relax and become so flaccid that the slightest movement of the abdomen changes the form of the fundus. Then there are apparently irregular twitchings of the fundus wall. Soon a deep constriction starts about three centimetres below the cardia and, growing in strength, moves towards the pylorus. When it reaches the transverse band the constriction tightens and holds fast, while a wave of contraction sweeps over the antrum. Another similar constriction follows. In the interval the transverse band relaxes slightly, but tightens again when the second wave reaches it. Perhaps a dozen such waves pass; then a firm contraction at the beginning of the antrum completely divides the gastric cavity into two parts. This same division of the stomach into two parts at the transverse band is to be seen when mustard is given. Now, although the waves are still running over the antrum, the whole preantral part of the stomach is fully relaxed. A flattening of the diaphragm and a quick jerk of the abdominal muscles, accompanied by the opening of the cardia, now force the contents of the fundus into the œsophagus. As the spasmodic contractions of the abdominal muscles are repeated, the gastric wall again tightens around the contained food. Antiperistalsis I have seen only once; then, while the cat was retching, a constriction started at the pylorus and ran back, over the antrum, completely obliterating the antral cavity.

It will be recalled that the principal difference between the movements of the stomach and their effects as described by Beaumont, and Hofmeister and Schütz on the one hand, and Rossbach, Roux and Balthazard, and myself on the other hand, is that the former observed constrictions completely dividing the stomach at the transverse band, and the antrum then squeezing its contents into the intestines; whereas the latter have seen the constrictions moving forward as narrowing rings, but not separating the gastric cavity into two parts.

With the exception of peristalsis in the antrum, the gastric movements at the beginning of emesis are almost exactly the same as those Beaumont, and Hofmeister and Schütz, declare to be the normal contractions of the stomach. Their observations were made, however, when the organ was subjected to unnatural stimulation. In the excised stomach, observed by Hofmeister and Schütz, not only were all nervous connections severed, but likewise all flow of blood to the organ was entirely stopped, and the cutting off of the blood supply is regarded as one of the most powerful predisposing causes of peristaltic action. The thermometer-tube used by Beaumont was an irritant to the stomach, as he himself admits. “If the bulb of the thermometer,” he writes, “be suffered to be drawn down to the pyloric extremity, and retained there for a short time, or if the experiments be repeated too frequently, it causes severe distress and a sensation like cramp, or spasm, which ceases on withdrawing the tube, but leaves a sense of soreness and tenderness at the pit of the stomach.” Moritz also noticed that a rubber sound introduced into the human stomach proved to be a source of irritation. It seems reasonable to suppose, therefore, that these observers did not see the normal movements, but the actions resulting from abnormal irritation.

THE EFFECT OF THE MOVEMENTS OF THE STOMACH ON THE FOOD

In my first observations on the active stomach a bulging of the stomach-wall was to be seen in front of the passing waves. But as food did not immediately appear in the intestine, and as, after the pylorus relaxed, the gastric contents did not diminish rapidly enough to allow the supposition that all of the food squeezed forward by the waves was immediately forced through the pylorus, it was assumed that a part, at least, of the food under pressure was forced back towards the cardia through the constriction-ring. This inference was stated in the preliminary notice of my work. Roux and Balthazard also observed the passage of the undulations over the pyloric part, but state merely that the function of the constrictions is the propulsion of food into the intestine, without mentioning what must be regarded as a very important function; namely, the mixing effect of the waves.

Most writers have agreed that the result of the active and passive movements of the stomach is to force the contents hither and thither, thus mixing them and the gastric juice together. Two observers, Beaumont and Brinton, have attempted to explain the manner of the mixing. Beaumont, after noting how the thermometer-tube, used by him to indicate the gastric motions, was affected, describes the circulation of the food as follows: “The bolus as it enters the cardia turns to the left, passes the aperture, descends

into the splenic extremity, and follows the great curvature towards the pyloric end. It then returns, in the course of the small curvature, makes its appearance again at the aperture, in its descent into the great curvature, to perform similar revolutions." Brinton bases his theory of the circulation of the food on an analogy between the movement of a constriction over the stomach and the passage of a septum with a central perforation along the interior of a cylinder full of liquid. The result in both cases, he declares, must be a peripheral current of advance, and a central current of return. Thus in the stomach there would be peripheral currents from the cardia along the walls of the stomach to the pylorus, where they would unite and run as an axial current back to the cardia.

Certain _a priori_ objections may be urged against each of these conclusions. In the first place Beaumont's observations were made on a subject having a gastric fistula, and the adhesions between the stomach and the abdominal wall would prevent the fundus from acting quite normally in relation to its contents. Beaumont's conclusions, furthermore, are based on the movements of a thermometer-tube introduced through the fistula, and on the recognition of particles of food which he had seen before as they passed the fistulous opening: the first method, as has been shown, made the conditions in the stomach more abnormal than they were previously; the second gave uncertain knowledge of the course of the food when out of the observer's sight. Brinton's hypothesis states the probable movements of fluid contents acted on by a passing constriction. But it may be objected that the conditions assumed by him do not exist in all parts of the stomach. For not only is there no peristalsis visible in the fundus, but with the usual food the fundus contents are not liquid. Moreover, the constrictions at the beginning of the pyloric portion are very slight and move slowly. The food in front of them is, accordingly, not under much greater pressure than the food behind them. The axial current which might result, therefore, could not be strong enough to go far into the cardiac portion.

It is easily possible to test experimentally the validity of these two theories by watching the action of pieces of food which throw a black shadow in a dimly outlined stomach. For this purpose little paste pellets of bismuth subnitrate, with starch enough to keep the form, were given with the customary meal. These pellets, it was found, did not break up in the stomach during the gastric digestion of soft bread. Several times I have been fortunate in getting two of the little balls in the axis of the stomach and about a centimetre apart. As the constriction-wave approached them, both moved forward, but not so rapidly as the wave. Now when the constriction overtook the first ball, the ball moved backward through the constricted ring, in the direction of least resistance. The wave then overtook the second ball, and it also passed backward to join its fellow. At the approach of the next wave they were both pushed forward once more, only to be again forced backward, one at a time, through the narrow orifice. As the waves recurred in their persistent rhythm, the balls were seen to be making progress--an oscillating progress--towards the pylorus; for they went forward each time a little farther than they retreated. This to-and-fro movement of the pellets was much more marked in the antrum, where the waves were deep, than in the middle region. On different occasions from nine to twelve minutes have elapsed while the balls were passing from where the waves first affected them to the pylorus; which means that on the way they were moved back and forth by more than a half hundred constrictions.

If the pylorus does not relax, it is evident that a wave approaching it pushes the food into a blind, elastic pouch, the only exit from which is through the advancing constricted ring. The constrictions are deeper near the end of the antrum, and the rings are small; consequently, the food is squirted back through them with considerable violence. As has been noted, the pylorus opens less frequently for a while after a solid piece of food comes to it. In such a case the slow driving waves squeeze the hard morsel and the soft food about it up to the sphincter, only to have the whole mass shoot back, sometimes half-way along the antrum. Over and over again the process is repeated till the sphincter at last opens and allows the more fluid parts to pass. Hofmeister and Schütz, and Moritz have disclaimed any selective action of the pylorus, and declare that solids are driven from the pylorus to the fundus by antiperistalsis. The action of the pylorus which I have seen, however, is more like that described by the earlier investigators; for during digestion there was no antiperistalsis, and the sphincter, separating the fluids from the solids, caused the solids to remain and undergo a tireless rubbing. Frequently, when several of these balls have been given at the same time, they have all been seen in the antrum after the stomach was otherwise empty. Here they remain to be softened in time by the juices, or to be forced through the pylorus later, for solids do pass into the intestine. Thus when the teeth neglect their work the stomach attempts to perform their function; the relative inefficiency of the gastric method of grinding and its interference with the normal gastric activities point an obvious hygienic moral.

During the process of digestion the food in the cardiac portion gives no sign of currents. Balls which lie in the fundus immediately after the food is ingested keep their relative positions until the cardiac portion begins to contract, and then move very slowly towards the antrum. Moreover, the food in the fundus of a cat has the same mushy appearance when examined after gastric peristalsis had been active for an hour and a half that it had when ingested. The contents of the antrum, on the other hand, look quite different and have the consistency of thick soup. The inactivity of the food in the fundus can also be proved by feeding first

five grams of bread and bismuth, then five grams without bismuth, and finally five grams again with bismuth in it. The stomach contents are thus arranged in two dark layers along the curvatures, with a light layer between. Tracings made on tissue paper show that ten minutes after peristalsis commenced the stratification had entirely disappeared in the pyloric part, but that an hour and twenty minutes thereafter the layers were still clearly visible in the cardiac region.

The value of the circulation of the food, as described by Beaumont and Brinton, lay in the supposition that the contents of the stomach were thus brought near to the secreting gastric wall, and that the gastric juice could thus more readily exert its action. Although my observations do not support their theories of mixing currents running throughout the stomach, they still show that the pyloric portion is an admirable device for bringing all of the food under the influence of the glandular secretions of that region. For, when a constriction occurs, the secreting surface enclosed by the ring is brought close around the food lying within the ring in the axis of the stomach. As this constriction passes on, fresh areas of glandular tissue are continuously pressed in around the narrow orifice. And also, as the constriction passes on, a thin stream of gastric contents is continuously forced back through the orifice, and thus past the mouths of the glands. The result of this ingenious mechanism is that every part of the secreting surface of the pyloric portion is brought near to every bit of food, before the latter leaves the stomach, a half hundred times or more, as evidence by the moving ball.

SALIVARY DIGESTION IN THE STOMACH

The absence of movement in the fundus would seem to give the food during its stay there little opportunity to become mixed with the gastric juices, and thus to undergo peptic digestion. The truth of this supposition can easily be proved experimentally by feeding a slightly alkaline meal, and later testing the chemical reaction of the contents of various parts of the stomach. A cat which had been without food for fifteen hours was given eighteen grams of mushy bread made slightly alkaline with sodium carbonate. One hour and a half after the cat had finished eating she was killed, and the stomach laid bare by opening the abdomen. A very small hole was then made through the wall in the fundus region, and another similar hole was made into the antrum. By means of a glass pipette food was extracted first from the periphery of the fundus; this food was slightly acid. The cleaned pipette was then introduced two and a half centimetres into the fundus contents, and the food thus extracted gave the original alkaline reaction. Specimens of the liquid contents of the antral and middle regions, taken from various depths, were all strongly acid. A dog killed an hour and three-quarters after eating showed similar differences between the reactions of the food in the fundus and the food in the pyloric portion. So, as a matter of fact, the food does not become acid at a uniform rate in all parts of the stomach, as would be the case if Beaumont's and Brinton's theories of mixing currents were true. Moreover, if the facts accorded with their notions, the saliva, which ceases to act in the presence of more than 0.003 per cent free hydrochloric acid, and is destroyed when the percentage of acid proteids is large, would manifestly have its service as a ferment limited to the relatively short time during which the stomach contents, in the process of thorough mixing, were reaching that degree of acidity. There is, however, no movement of food in the fundus, and the alkaline food received from the œsophagus remains alkaline in this region for a considerable period. The nutriment, therefore, if well chewed and thus mixed with saliva, can undergo salivary digestion in the fundus for a considerable period without interference by the acid gastric juice.[32]

From all these observations the conclusion must be that the fundus acts as a reservoir for the food, in which the digestion of sugars and starches may take place; and that the pyloric portion with its simple but marvellous peristaltic mechanism, by a single process, triturates the food, brings it near to the active glands, stirs it thoroughly with their secretions, and expels the products into the intestines.

THE INHIBITION OF STOMACH MOVEMENTS DURING EMOTION

Early in the research a marked unlikeness was noticed in the action of the stomachs of male and female cats. The peristalsis seen with only a few exceptions in female cats failed to appear in most of the males, although both had received exactly the same treatment. Along with this difference was a very striking difference in behaviour when bound to the holder; the females would lie quiet, mewing occasionally, but purring as soon as they were gently stroked. The males, on the contrary, would fly into a violent rage, struggle to be loose from their fastenings, bite at everything near their heads, cry loudly, and resist all attempts to quiet them. On account of this difference only female cats were used for some time, and the significance at first attributed to the action of the males was almost forgotten when the following incident recalled it and suggested that the excitement caused the suspension of the stomach movements. On October 23, 1897, a male cat was fed at 12.00, but was not placed on the holder till ninety minutes later. The waves were passing at the rate of six a minute. The cat fell into a rage and the waves suddenly stopped.

A few days later an observation on a female with kittens explained the absence of gastric movements in the males. While the peristaltic undulations were coursing regularly over the cat's stomach, she suddenly changed from her peaceful sleepiness, began to breathe quickly, and struggled to get loose. As soon as the change took place, the movements in the stomach entirely disappeared; the pyloric portion relaxed and presented a smooth, rounded outline. I continued observing, and stroked the cat reassuringly. In a moment she became quiet and began to purr. As soon as this happened the movements commenced again in the stomach; first a few constrictions were visible near the end of the antrum, then a few near the sharp bend in the lesser curvature, and finally the waves were running normally from their habitual starting-place. By holding the cat's mouth closed between the thumb and last three fingers, and covering her nostrils with the index finger, she could be kept from breathing. At the first sign of discomfort the fingers were removed. This experiment was repeated a great many times on different cats, and invariably the evidence of distress was accompanied by a total suspension of the motor activities of the stomach and a relaxation of the antral fibres.

No amount of kneading or compression of the abdomen with the fingers, short of making the cat angry, would cause the waves to stop; so that the cat's movements, in themselves, were not the source of the inhibition. And since expressions of strong feeling on the part of the animal always accompanied cessation of the constriction-waves, the inhibition was probably due to nervous influence. It has long been common knowledge that violent emotions interfere with the digestive process, but that the gastric motor activities should manifest such extreme sensitiveness to nervous conditions is surprising.

SUMMARY

1. By mixing a harmless powder, subnitrate of bismuth, with the food, the movements of the stomach can be seen by means of the Röntgen rays.

2. The stomach consists of two physiologically distinct parts: the pyloric part and the fundus. Over the pyloric part, while food is present, constriction-waves are seen continually coursing towards the pylorus; the fundus is an active reservoir for the food and squeezes out its contents gradually into the pyloric part.

3. The stomach is emptied by the formation, between the fundus and the antrum, of a tube along which constrictions pass. The contents of the fundus are pressed into the tube and the tube and antrum slowly cleared of food by the waves of constriction.

4. The food in the pyloric portion is first pushed forward by the running wave, and then by pressure of the stomach-wall is returned through the ring of constriction; thus the food is thoroughly mixed with gastric juice, and is forced by an oscillating progress to the pylorus.

5. The food in the fundus is not moved by peristalsis, and consequently it is not mixed with the gastric juice; salivary digestion can therefore be carried on in this region for a considerable period without being stopped by the acid gastric juice.

6. The pylorus does not open at the approach of every wave, but only at irregular intervals. The arrival of a hard morsel causes the sphincter to open less frequently than normally, thus materially interfering with the passage of the already liquefied food.

7. Solid food remains in the antrum to be rubbed by the constrictions until triturated, or to be softened by the gastric juice, or later it may be forced into the intestine in the solid state.

8. The constriction-waves have, therefore, three functions: the mixing, trituration, and expulsion of the food.

9. At the beginning of vomiting, the gastric cavity is separated into two parts by a constriction at the entrance to the antrum; the cardiac portion is relaxed, and the spasmodic contractions of the abdominal muscles force the food through the opened cardia into the œsophagus.

10. The stomach movements are inhibited whenever the cat shows signs of anxiety, rage, or distress.

THE MOVEMENTS OF THE INTESTINES STUDIED BY MEANS OF THE RÖNTGEN RAYS[33]

BY W. B. CANNON

From the Laboratory of Physiology in the Harvard Medical School

Extracts from _American Journal of Physiology_, 1902

INTRODUCTION

The investigation of intestinal movements has been beset by the same difficulties that characterised the investigation of the gastric mechanism. Pathological subjects or animals subjected to the disturbing action of drugs and anæsthetics and of serious operations have been the only sources of our knowledge. A considerable difference of opinion as to the nature of the normal movements in the intestines has resulted from observations made under these necessary abnormal conditions. The slowly advancing peristaltic wave and the _Pendelbewegung_, or swaying movement, described by Ludwig, have been regarded as true physiological processes. Concerning antiperistalsis and the swiftly running vermicular contraction, observers are not so nearly in agreement. The activity of the large intestine has been described as simply peristalsis of a slower rate than that seen in the small intestine.

The best known of the intestinal movements is the normal peristaltic wave. This wave is slow, having a rate of about two centimetres per minute, is regular, and by most observers is said to move always in one direction. The progress of the contraction, as suggested by Nothnagel's experiments, and as clearly stated by Mall and by Bayliss and Starling, is dependent upon a local reflex. According to Mall, when an object stimulates the mucosa there occurs above the point of stimulation a constriction which forces the object downward; and as it moves downward new regions immediately above the mass are by this reflex brought into constriction, and thus the wave and its stimulus advance together. "At the same time," Mall states, "a sucking force, due to active dilatation below the body, may have a tendency to drag it down." In what manner an active dilatation of the intestinal wall may occur so as to produce a "sucking force" he does not make wholly clear. Bayliss and Starling, in describing normal peristalsis in the intestine, state that the contractions above the bolus increase until there is a strong tonic constriction. This passes the bolus onward, and as it advances the ring of constriction follows it. While the bolus is passing down, the gut above it is traversed by waves running as far as the constricted ring. These observers state the law of intestinal peristalsis thus: "Local stimulation of the gut produces excitation above and inhibition below the excited spot."

The pendulum movements are characterised by a gentle swaying motion of the coils, and are accompanied by rhythmical contractions of the intestinal wall. They continue with undiminished force after paralysis of the local nervous mechanism by nicotine or cocaine; they have been called, therefore, myogenic or myodromic contractions. Observers have described them variously as shortenings and narrowings of the gut, rhythmically repeated at nearly the same intestinal circumference; as alternating to-and-fro movements of the long axis without changes in the lumen; as local or extensive periodic contractions and relaxations mainly of the circular musculature; and as waves involving both muscular coats of the intestine, and travelling normally from above downward at a rapid rate (2 to 5 cm. per second). They have been seen in the dog, and in the rabbit and cat. In the cat Bayliss and Starling noticed that when the lumen of the gut was distended by a rubber balloon, there appeared rhythmical contractions, which nearly always were most marked at about the middle of the balloon; _i. e._, the region of greatest tension. This form of constriction, which, as my observation shows, is an indication of the manner in which the rhythmical contraction acts in the cat's intestine, Bayliss and Starling seem to have regarded with slight attention, since it did not accord with the law of peristalsis.

The swift vermicular wave may pass the whole length of the intestine in about a minute. It is often seen just after death, as well as in pathological states such as intestinal anæmia or hyperæmia, and when the bowel contains gases and organic acids from decomposing food. Starling is inclined to regard this type of intestinal activity as an exaggeration of the rhythmic type; Mall, on the other hand, places it in a class by itself, and declares that its service is to rid the intestine rapidly of irritating substances. Nothnagel, who designates this form of movement with the term _Rollbewegung_, thinks it is transitional between a physiological and a pathological activity.

The existence of antiperistalsis has been so much questioned that it will be considered in a special section of this paper, where my observations may be conveniently introduced.

The common understanding of the manner in which food passes through the intestinal canal is that the chyme ejected from the stomach is pressed downward by a peristalsis, which passes slowly over a part or all of the small intestine. The peristaltic waves of the colon are supposed to constitute an independent group, similar to those of the small intestine, but weaker and slower. Movements of the food other than the uninterrupted advance have been mentioned by some observers. Starling states that the effect of the pendulum movement is to mix the contents of the intestine and bring them into intimate contact with the mucous membrane. Grützner writes that he has been brought "by strange and peculiar observations" to believe that the fluid contents of the small intestine move irregularly forward, then forward and back, then perhaps remain quiet for some time, only to pass backward for a long distance, and finally to move forward steadily to the end. In this manner the food is mixed and brought into contact with the absorbing walls. The to-and-fro shiftings of the food Grützner ascribed to advancing and retrograde contractions of the intestinal

musculature, and he argued that even circular constrictions must force the liquid contents away in both directions. To support his contention, Grützner introduced mercury into the intestine and observed it with the Röntgen rays. After noting a backward and forward movement of the mercury he dismissed the method, saying, “Many a flash must come from the Röntgen tube before the _normal_ movement of the intestinal contents is made entirely clear by this method.”

The following account is a summary of many repeated observations on different animals, and is a contribution to a clear understanding of the normal movements of the intestines and their contents.

THE MOVEMENTS OF THE SMALL INTESTINE

When the food has been distributed through the intestine so as to present the appearance shown in Figure 1, a noticeable feature in most or all of the loops is the total absence of movement. If the animal remains quiet, however, only a few moments elapse before peculiar motions appear in one or another of the loops, or perhaps in several, and last for some time. These motions consist in a sudden division of one of the long, narrow masses of food into many little segments of nearly equal size; then these segments are again suddenly divided and the neighbouring halves unite to make new segments, and so on, in a manner to be more fully described. I have called this process the rhythmic segmentation of the intestinal contents. Further observation reveals peristalsis here and there, and under certain circumstances the typical swaying movements may be seen. All these phenomena are now to be considered in detail.

[Illustration: FIGURE 1.--Appearance of food in the intestines 5¾ hours after eating. This and other radiographs reduced two-thirds.]

[Illustration: FIGURE 2.--Diagram representing the process of rhythmic segmentation. Lines 1, 2, 3, 4 indicate the sequence of appearances in the loop. The dotted lines mark the regions of division. The arrows show the relation of the particles to the segments they subsequently form.]

Rhythmic segmentation of the intestinal contents.--This is by far the most common and the most interesting mechanical process to be seen in the small intestine. The nature of the process may best be understood by referring to the diagram in Figure 2. A string-like mass of food is seen lying quietly in one of the intestinal loops (line 1, Fig. 2). Suddenly an undefined activity appears in the mass, and a moment later constrictions at regular intervals along its length cut it into little ovoid pieces. The solid string is thus quickly transformed, by a simultaneous sectioning, into a series of uniform segments. A moment later each of these segments is divided into two particles, and immediately after the division neighbouring particles (as _a_ and _b_, line 2, Fig. 2) rush together, often with the rapidity of flying shuttles, and merge to form new segments (as _c_, line 3, Fig. 2). The next moment these new segments are divided, and neighbouring particles unite to make a third series, and so on. At the time of the second segmentation (line 3, Fig. 2) the end particles are left small. Observation shows that these small pieces are not redivided. The end piece at A simply varies in size with each division; at one moment it is left small, at the next moment it is full size from the addition of a part of the nearest segment, and a moment later is the small bit left after another division. The end piece at B (probably the rear of the mass) shoots away when the end mass is divided, and is swept back at each reunion to make the large end mass again, only to be shot away and swept onward with each recurrence of the constrictions. Thus the process of repeated segmentation continues, with the little particles flitting towards each other and the larger segments shifting to and fro, commonly for more than half an hour without cessation. From the beginning to the end of a period of segmentation the food is seen to have changed its position in the abdomen to only a slight extent; whether this change is a passing of the food along the loop, or a movement of the loop itself, it is impossible to tell from the shadows on the screen. The change of position, however, is much less conspicuous than the lively division and redivision which the mass suffers so many times from the busy, shifting constrictions.

From this typical form of rhythmic segmentation there are several variations. Sometimes, and especially when the mass of food is thick, the constrictions do not make complete divisions and are so far apart that the intermediate portions are relatively large. Moreover, the constrictions do not take place in the middle of each portion, but near one end; thus each portion is constricted, not into halves, but into thirds. If a little pointer is placed at the middle of a segment, when the segments are completely divided into halves, in a few seconds the pointer will be in the middle of the clear space between two segments; but in a few seconds more the first phase will return and the pointer will again be indicating a segment,--two operations intervene between similar phases. When, however, the portions are constricted into thirds, the indicator shows it, since three operations intervene between similar phases. The manner of these changes is made clearer by reference to the diagram in Figure 3. That each portion is constricted into three pieces is proved also by watching the gradual reduction of the portion at the left end of line 1 through lines 2 and 3, and also in the

gradual formation of a full-sized portion at the right end of lines 2, 3, and 4. When food undergoing this process is watched, it appears to be affected by a series of constrictions, each of which starts at one end of the mass and marches through to the other end, leaving its impress at short intervals along the length. The progression of the dotted lines from right to left in _a_, _b_, _c_, and _d_, etc., Fig. 3, gives a notion of these advancing constrictions.

Another variation of the segmentation is shown in Figure 4. In this type there are evidently divisions and subdivisions, _i.e._, one more operation between the appearance and the reappearance of the same phase than is present in the simple division of the small segments in a long string of food (Fig. 2). This form of segmentation is fairly typical for the constrictions seen in food advancing through the intestine. Sometimes the divisions occur in the middle of a long string of food and leave the ends wholly unaffected.

[Illustration: FIGURE 3.--Diagram showing the relations of the portions when they are constricted into three pieces. The dotted lines indicate regions of constriction; the arrows indicate the relationship of the pieces to the portions they subsequently form.]

A remarkable feature in the segmentation of the food is the rapidity with which the changes take place. The simplest way of estimating the rate of division is to count, not the number of times the partition of the food recurs in the same place, but the number of different sets of segments observed in a given period. Thus in Figure 4 the appearances of lines 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., would be counted, and not merely lines 1, 4, etc. Repeated observations on different animals have shown that the most common rate of division in long, thin chains of food varies between twenty-eight and thirty times in a minute; _i. e._, there is a change from one set of segments to another set every two seconds, and a return of the same phase every four seconds. In some cases the rate is as low as twenty-three times per minute. The larger masses seem to be associated with a slower segmentation; the operations indicated in Figure 3, for example, occurred from eighteen to twenty-one times in a minute, so that the same phase reappeared only once in eight or nine seconds. The segmentation frequently continues for more than half an hour; in one instance it was seen to persist with only three short periods of inactivity for two hours and twenty-two minutes. At the rate of thirty segmentations per minute it is clear that a slender string of food may commonly undergo division into small particles more than a thousand times while scarcely changing its position in the intestine.

I have seen once, in a cat only lightly etherised, the exterior of an intestine which was dividing the food as above described. An hour and a half after a meal of salmon the anæsthetic was given, the abdomen opened, and the flaps raised so as to form walls. Warm salt solution was then poured into the abdominal cavity, and the floating coils left covered with the transparent omentum. The gastric peristaltic waves were running regularly; on the intestine there were visible at various places during the period of observation regions of constriction which had the appearance shown in Figure 3, except that the rings were relatively nearer together. New rings of constriction took place on the same side of all the bulging parts at the margin of the constricted portion (_cf._ dotted lines, Fig. 3). As new rings occurred the old relaxed, but apparently with tardiness, for the contents gurgled as if forced through the narrowed lumen. The constrictions recurred irregularly and at much longer intervals than in the normal animal. The contracted rings were pale and bloodless.

The effect of the process of rhythmic segmentation proves it an admirable mechanism. The food over and over again is brought into closest contact with the intestinal walls by the swift kneading movement of the muscles. Thereby not only is the undigested food intimately mixed with the digestive juices, but the digested food is thoroughly exposed to the organs of absorption. Mall has shown that contraction of the intestinal wall has the effect of pumping the blood from the submucous venous plexus into the radicles of the superior mesenteric vein, and thus materially aids the intestinal circulation. Moreover, lacteals loaded with fat will in a few moments become empty unless the intestine is slit lengthwise, so that the muscles cannot exert compression. The rhythmic constrictions, therefore, both propel the blood in the portal circulation and act like a heart in promoting the flow of lymph in the lacteals. This single movement with its several results is an excellent example of bodily economy; the repeated constrictions, as already shown, thoroughly churn the food and digestive fluids together, and also plunge the absorbing mucosa into the very midst of the food masses: but not only are the processes of digestion and absorption favoured by these movements; they also, by compression of the veins and lacteals of the intestinal wall, serve to deport through blood and lymph channels the digested and absorbed material.

Peristalsis.[34]--The phenomena of peristalsis and segmentation are usually combined in some manner while the food passes through the small intestine. Peristalsis is observed normally in two forms: as a slow advancing of the food for a short distance in a coil, and as a rapid movement sweeping the food without pause through several turns of the gut. The latter form is frequently seen when the food is carried on from the duodenum; and it may readily be produced in other parts of the small intestine by giving an enema of soapsuds.

When a mass of food has been subjected for some time to the segmenting activity of the intestine, the separate segments, instead of being again divided, may suddenly begin to move slowly along the loop in which they lie. That this movement is not a swinging of the coil as a whole, but a peristaltic advance of separate rings of its circular musculature, is made probable by the fact that the succeeding segments follow along the same path their predecessors have taken. The advance of the little pieces may continue for seven or eight centimetres, when finally the front piece stops or meets other food. Then all the succeeding pieces are swept one by one into the accumulating mass, which at last lies stretched along the intestine, a solid string manifesting no sign of commotion.

[Illustration: FIGURE 4.--Diagram showing combined peristalsis and segmentation.]

Another form of slow peristalsis is frequently observed when the food is pushed forward, not in small divisions, but as a large lump. The relatively long string of food is first crowded into an ovoid form as the forward movement begins, and as it is collecting thus, it seems at the last to be suddenly formed into a more rounded ball, as if the mass were pulled or pushed together at the two ends. The next moment it is indented in the middle by a circular constriction (as shown in Fig. 4, line 2), which spreads it in both directions along the loop. The trailing portion (_a_) is next cut in two, and the severed part sometimes flies back over its course about a centimetre. Now the whole mass is swept together again and slightly forward as shown in line 4, Fig. 4, and the segmenting process is repeated. At stage 3, Fig. 4, a constriction sometimes appears around the middle of the advanced portion (_b_). Thus, with many halts and interruptions, the food slowly advances.

A slight variation of the movement just described is observed when the amount of food is greater and extends farther along the intestine. Under such circumstances, as the mass moves forward, constrictions appear just in front of the rear end, which separate it from the main body, and cause it to shoot backward sometimes through the distance of a centimetre. The main body meanwhile is not disturbed. No sooner has the rear section been shot away than it is swept forward again into union with the rest of the food, and the whole mass then advances until another interfering constriction repeats the process.

Rhythmic segmentation and the pendulum movement.--There is little doubt that the segmentation of the food which I have seen is due to an activity of the intestinal musculature similar to that which causes the so-called pendulum movement. This activity, as already noted, is rhythmic, and, although accounts differ, analytical methods prove that it involves both the longitudinal and the circular layers of muscle. Observations of the effect of the rhythmic contractions upon the food show that the action of the circular fibres is most prominent. It is probable, however, that the longitudinal fibres also play an important part in the process of segmentation. Examination of Figure 2 makes clear that in line 2 the regions of constriction appear between the regions of constriction in line 3; before _c_ can be formed, therefore, the constriction between _a_ and _b_ must relax. Contraction of the longitudinal fibres between two segments would help to enlarge the constricted lumen of the gut. It seems probable that, as the constrictions on either side of _c_ occur, the longitudinal fibres between them contract; almost simultaneously the constriction between _a_ and _b_ relaxes, and the two particles are thus brought swiftly together. A similar process naturally would take place for each of the shifting segments. Thus the function of the longitudinal muscles would be to contract between new rings of constriction and thereby aid in relaxing the former ring between them. During my one observation of the segmenting process, as seen on the surface of the intestine, I could not be sure that the distance between neighbouring segments was shortened as the constriction relaxed; that activity of the longitudinal fibres is present, however, is indicated by observations of Raiser on the intestines of the rabbit and the cat. Raiser observed the outer surface of the coils, and describes the normal movement as an alternate contraction and relaxation of single divisions of the longitudinal fibres; he notes that these short divisions shift. But whether they shift in alternation with the shifting circular constrictions, as seems probable, is an interesting point not yet determined.

[Illustration: FIGURE 5.--Tracing showing segmentation of chyme in the duodenum. This and other tracings reduced two-thirds.]

Bayliss and Starling state that the swaying pendulum movements are essentially due to peristaltic waves recurring in the same place and running rapidly downward. This form of the movements I have seen only once. At this time about 90 c.c. of soapy water had been injected. This procedure has the effect of exaggerating in every particular the movements of the small intestine. In this instance a broad constriction appeared about the middle of a long string of food and persisted there while it spread down the gut. As the contraction spread, the gut swayed slowly to and fro before it. Then there was a relaxation, followed by a recurrence of the constriction in the same place, a spreading of the contraction, and a swinging of the loop just as before. This phenomenon was repeated again and again, till finally the string was divided and the forward piece pushed through a tortuous course to the colon.

The course of the food in the small intestine.--Chyme is not forced from the stomach by every wave that passes over the antrum, but only at intervals. When the pylorus relaxes, the food, moved towards the pylorus under considerable pressure, is squirted along the duodenum for two centimetres or more. Careful watching of this food shows that usually it lies for some time in the curve of the duodenum until additions have been made to it from the stomach, and a long, thin string of food is formed. While it is resting in this place it is exposed to the outpouring of the bile and pancreatic juices. All at once the string becomes segmented (see Fig. 5) and the process of rhythmic segmentation continues several minutes, thoroughly mixing the intestinal digestive juices with the chyme. In this region the alternate positions of the segments are sometimes far apart, and the to-and-fro movements of the particles may be a relatively extensive and very energetic swinging. Finally the little segments unite into a single mass, or form in groups, and begin to move forward. The peristalsis here, as already mentioned, is much more rapid than the normal peristalsis elsewhere in the small intestine. The masses, once started, go flying along, turning curves, whisking hither and thither in the loops, moving swiftly and continuously forward. After passing on in this rapid manner for some distance the food is collected in thicker and longer strings, resembling the strings seen characteristically in the other loops. Towards the end of digestion the small masses shot out from the stomach, after a few segmentations, may move on in the rapid course without being accumulated in a larger mass until the swift movement ceases.

During the first stages of digestion in the cat's small intestine the food usually lies chiefly on the right side of the abdomen; during the last stages the loops on the left side contain the greater amount of food. In these loops the food remains sometimes for an hour or more with no sign of movement. All at once a mass begins to show irregular depressions and elevations along its length, and then suddenly it is divided, at first partially, later completely, into many little equal parts, and these repeatedly undergo division and reunion, division and reunion, over and over again, in the manner described above as rhythmic segmentation. After a varying length of time the activity wanes and the little segments are carried forward individually and later brought together, or join and move on as a single body, or they may reunite and lie quietly for some time without further change. Thus by a combined process of kneading and peristaltic advance the food is brought to the ileocæcal valve to enter the large intestine. Records from ten different animals show that salmon does not appear in the small intestine until an hour or an hour and a half after the food is eaten. Inasmuch as five or six hours elapse after eating before this food begins to be seen in the colon, it is evident that the chyme takes four to five hours to pass the length of the small intestine. It is interesting to note that the operations are considerably shortened if the meal has consisted of bread and milk.

THE COMPETENCE OF THE ILEOCÆCAL VALVE

The ileocæcal valve in the cat is situated three or four centimetres from the blind end of the cæcum. Its position is usually marked in shadows of the food in the colon by a slight indentation, towards which masses about to enter the colon are ordinarily directed from a point somewhat distant in the small intestine (see Fig. 6).

Regarding the competence of the ileocæcal valve many observations have been made. Grützner has reviewed the evidence bearing on the question and concludes that the valve is not competent, least of all for liquids. He declares that as soon as liquids or thin fluid masses appear in the upper part of the colon they pass in many instances into the small intestine the moment that the pressure on the colon side rises slightly. If the colon contains a solid or a thick, mushy mass, the passage towards the small intestine is scarcely possible, because every increase of pressure in the large intestine must force the two lips of the valve together and close it.

The importance of the competence of the ileocæcal valve under normal conditions cannot be appreciated until the function of the first part of the colon is considered. In order that this part of the intestinal mechanism may perform its service, the competence of the valve for the food which enters the colon from the ileum should be perfect. As a matter of fact, such is the case. Not only does the activity of the colon prove this statement, but the failure of every attempt to drive the food in the colon back through the valve into the ileum confirms the proof. Again and again I have tried, by manipulation through the abdominal wall, to press the normal contents of the colon downward with sufficient force to cause them to return to the small intestine, but without success. The valve held perfectly.

THE MOVEMENTS OF THE LARGE INTESTINE

When the large intestine is full, palpation through the abdominal wall demonstrates that the material in the lower descending colon and in the sigmoid flexure is usually composed of hard, incompressible lumps, while that in the ascending and transverse colon and the cæcum is soft, permitting the walls of the gut to be easily pushed together. The condition of the contents in these two regions

seems to indicate a rough division of the large intestine into two parts, and the mechanical activities of these two parts verify the differentiation. In the descending colon the material is very slowly advanced by rings of tonic constrictions (see Fig. 7); in the ascending and transverse colon and in the cæcum by far the most common movement is an antiperistalsis.

Antiperistalsis in the colon.--The colon of cats which have been without food for a day usually contains enough gas to make the position of the gut distinguishable with the fluorescent screen (see Fig. 1). The first food to enter the colon from the small intestine is carried by antiperistaltic waves into the cæcum (Fig. 1), and all new food as it enters is also affected by these waves. Thus the contents of the colon, instead of being driven immediately toward the rectum by slow peristalsis, as is the general opinion, are first repeatedly pushed toward the cæcum by an antiperistaltic action.

These antiperistaltic waves follow one after another like the peristaltic waves of the stomach (see Figs. 5, 6, and 10). They begin either on the more advanced portion of the food in the colon (when only a small amount is present), or at the nearest tonic constriction, which is usually at the turn between the transverse and descending colon (Figs. 7 and 8.) The waves rarely run continuously for a long time. When the colon is full, it is usually quiet. The first sign of activity is an irregular undulation of the walls, then very faint constrictions passing along the gut towards the cæcum. These constrictions may first appear only on the ascending colon. As they continue coursing over the intestine they become deeper and deeper, until there is a marked bulging between successive constrictions. When the waves have thus become more prominent, they are seen to start near the end of the transverse colon and pass without interruption to the end of the cæcum. After these deepest waves have been running for a few minutes the indentations grow gradually less marked, until at last they are so faint as to be hardly discernible. The final waves are sometimes to be observed only at the end of the transverse colon.

Such a period of antiperistalsis lasts from two to eight minutes, with an average duration of four or five minutes. The periods recur at varying lengths of time; in one instance a period began at 1.38 P.M. and was repeated at 2.06, 2.34, 2.55, 3.15, and at 3.36, when the observation ceased; in another instance a period began at 2.43 P.M., and was repeated at 2.57 and at intervals of from ten to fifteen minutes thereafter while the animal was being watched. The waves have nearly the same rate of recurrence as those in the stomach; about five and a half waves pass a given point in a minute, _i. e._, eleven waves in two minutes. This rate has proved fairly constant in different cats and at different stages in the process of digestion; in one case, however, the waves passed at the rate of nine in two minutes.

The stimulating effect of rectal injections on the movements of the small intestine has already been noted. Enemata have also pronounced stimulating action on the antiperistalsis of the colon. Usually the almost immediate result of a rectal injection of warm water is the appearance of deep antiperistaltic waves, which often continue running for a long period. In one case, after an injection of 50 c.c. of warm water, the waves followed one another with monotonous regularity during an observation lasting an hour and twenty minutes. The manner in which this antiperistaltic mechanism affects nutrient enemata introduced into the bowel will be discussed in the section devoted to the question of antiperistalsis.

These constrictions passing backward over the colon do not force the normal contents back through the valve into the small intestine again. I have seen hundreds of such constrictions, and only twice have there been exceptions to this rule,--once under normal conditions, when a small mass slipped back into the ileum, and at another time when a large amount of water had been introduced into the colon. The importance of the competence of the ileocæcal valve is now apparent; indeed, antiperistalsis in the colon gives new meaning and value to the location of a valve at the opening of the ileum. For, inasmuch as the valve is normally competent, the constrictions repeatedly coursing towards it force the food before them into a blind sac. The effect on the food must be the same as the effect seen in the stomach when the pylorus remains closed before the advancing waves. The food is pressed forward by the approach of each constriction; but since it cannot go onward in the blind sac, and is, moreover, subjected to increasing pressure as the constriction comes nearer, it is forced into the only way of escape, _i. e._, away from the cæcum through the advancing constricted ring. About twenty-five waves affect every particle of food in the colon in this manner during each normal period of antiperistalsis. The result must be again a thorough mixing of the contents and a bringing of these contents into close contact with the absorbing wall--a process which has already been variously repeated many times in the stomach and in the small intestine.

Two other movements have been observed in the ascending colon, but they are rare appearances. The first of these was a serial sectioning of the contents noticed in an animal given castor oil with the food. A constriction separated a small segment in the cæcum; another constriction then cut off a segment just above the first, and with the disappearance of the first constriction the two separated segments united. A third segmentation took place above the second, and the changes occurred again. Thus the whole

mass was sectioned from one end to the other; and no sooner was that finished than the process began again and was repeated several times. A slight modification of this movement was observed in a colon containing very little food. The mass was pressed and partially segmented in the manner characteristic of the small intestine, and was thus again and again spread along the ascending colon, and each time swept back into a rounded form by antiperistalsis. The second of the two movements mentioned above consisted in a gentle kneading of the contents. This was caused by broad constrictions appearing, relaxing, appearing, relaxing, over and over again, in the same place. When several of these regions were active at the same time, they gave the food in the colon the appearance of a restless undulatory mass. Once a constriction occurred and remained permanently in one place, while the bulging parts on either side of it pulsated alternately, at the rate of about eighteen times in a minute, with the regularity of the heart-beat. Although these phenomena are somewhat striking, they are not usual, and are in no way so important as the antiperistalsis.

The changes when food enters the colon.--The passage of food through the ileocæcal valve seems to stimulate the colon to activity. As food is nearing the ileocæcal valve the large intestine is usually quiet and relaxed (Fig. 6, 4.00), though occasionally indefinite movements are to be observed; and sometimes just before the food reaches the end of the ileum the circular fibres of the colon in the region of the valve contract strongly, so that a deep indentation is present there. The indentation may persist several minutes; it disappears as the muscles relax just previous to the entrance of the food. The food is moved slowly along the ileum and is pushed through the valve into the colon. The moment it has entered a strong contraction takes place all along the cæcum and the beginning of the ascending colon, pressing some of the food onward, and a moment later deep antiperistaltic waves (Fig. 6, 4.03) sweep down from the transverse colon and continue running until the cæcum is again normally full, _i. e._, for two or three minutes.

[Illustration: FIGURE 6.--Tracings showing changes when food enters the colon and also the first tonic constriction. 4.00, the colon relaxed as food approaches in the ileum. 4.03, the colon contracted and traversed by antiperistaltic waves after the food has entered.]

The appearance of tonic constrictions.--It has already been noted that as the food accumulates in the ascending colon it is at first confined to this region by antiperistaltic waves. With further accessions, however, the contents naturally must be pressed more and more into the transverse and descending colon. In the early stages of this accumulation, while the food lies chiefly in the ascending colon,

Author: Sylvester Graham

Release date: September 17, 2021 [eBook #66331] Most recently updated: October 18, 2024

Language: English

Original publication: United States: Light & Stearns, 1837

Other information and formats: www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/66331

Credits: Charlene Taylor, Benjamin Fluehr and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team at https://www.pgdp.net (This file was produced from images generously made available by The Internet Archive/American Libraries.)

*** START OF THE PROJECT GUTENBERG EBOOK A TREATISE ON BREAD, AND BREAD-MAKING ***

A

TREATISE ON BREAD,

AND

BREAD-MAKING.

BY SYLVESTER GRAHAM.

“Bread strengtheneth man’s heart.”—HOLY WRIT.

BOSTON: LIGHT & STEARNS, 1 CORNHILL. 1837.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1837, by LIGHT & STEARNS, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

CONTENTS.

HISTORY OF BREAD.

Primitive food of man. Bruising and grinding grain. Baking. Invention of leavened bread. Bread among the Greeks and Romans—among the Hebrews. Simplicity of the bread now used in many countries.

9–16

LAWS OF DIET.

Reasons why food in its natural state would be the best. Concentrated nutriment. Interesting experiments on animals. Mixtures of food. Leavened and unleavened bread. Qualifications of the best bread.

17–30

MATERIAL OF BREAD.

Wheat. Extent of climate favorable to it. Injured by improper tillage. Removal of impurities. Washing of grain. Separation of the bran from the nutrient particles improper. Ancient Roman bread. Public bakers. Use of bad flour. Adulterations. Poisonous agents used to disguise them.

31–50

PROPERTIES OF BREAD.

Superfine flour injurious—a probable cause of some common disorders. Objections to coarse bread. Its medical properties. Extensive experiments of its use, by soldiers and others. Use among European peasantry. Selection, preservation and grinding of wheat.

51–72

FERMENTATION.

Chemical composition of flour. Yeast—modes of preparing it. Substitutes for it. Fermentation, and its products. Vinous, acetous and putrefactive fermentation.

73–86

PREPARATION OF BREAD.

Mixing. Much kneading necessary. Rising, or fermentation. Use of alkalies—saleratus and soda. Baking. Ovens. Alcohol in bread. Preservation of bread.

87–102

WHO SHOULD MAKE BREAD.

Making bread by rule. Bakers. Domestics. Sour bread. An anecdote. Mrs. Van Winkle. Bad bread need not be made. How cake is made. Bread-making a drudgery. Excellent example of a mother. Eating bad bread. Importance of having good bread.

103–126

VARIETIES OF BREAD.

Rye bread. Indian meal bread. Use of sour milk or butter-milk. Acids. Family grinding.

127–131

PREFACE.

There are probably few people in civilized life, who—were the question put to them directly—would not say, that they consider bread _one_ of the most, if not the most important article of diet which enters into the food of man. And yet there is, in reality, almost a total and universal carelessness about the character of bread. Thousands in civic life will, for years, and perhaps as long as they live, eat the most miserable trash that can be imagined, in the form of bread, and never seem to think that they can possibly have anything better, nor even that it is an evil to eat such vile stuff as they do. And if there is occasionally an individual who is troubled with some convictions that his bread is not quite what it should be, he knows not how to remedy the difficulty; for it is a serious truth, that, although nearly every human being in civilized life eats bread of some kind or other, yet scarcely any one has sufficient knowledge of the true principles and processes concerned in bread-making, and of the actual causes of the bad qualities of bread, to know how, with any degree of certainty, to avoid bad and secure good bread.

I have thought, therefore, that I could hardly do society a better service, than to publish the following treatise on a subject which, whether people are aware of it or not, is, in reality, of very great importance to the health and comfort of every one.

It has been prepared for the press with more haste, under more embarrassments from other engagements, and with less severity of revision, than I could wish. Yet, whatever may be its defects of arrangement, method or style, I have taken care to have the principles correct, and the instructions such as, if attended to, will enable every one who is heartily devoted to the object, to make good bread.

I must, however, acknowledge, that I have very little expectation that proper attention will be paid to this subject, so long as the dietetic habits of society continue to be what they are. While the various preparations of animal food constitute so important a portion of human aliment, the quality of bread will be greatly disregarded and neglected, and people will continue almost universally to be cursed with poor bread.

Nevertheless, I trust some good will be done by the little work I now send out; and I am not without hope, that it will be the means of a considerable improvement in the quality of bread, and, as a natural and necessary consequence, an improvement in the health and happiness of those who consume it.

That it may prove thus beneficial to my fellow creatures in a high degree, is my hearty and fervent desire.

S. GRAHAM.

NORTHAMPTON, APRIL 12, 1837.

TREATISE ON BREAD.

HISTORY OF BREAD.

Primitive food of man. Bruising and grinding grain. Baking. Invention of leavened bread. Bread among the Greeks and Romans—among the Hebrews. Simplicity of the bread now used in many countries.

In the English version of the sacred scriptures, the term Bread is frequently used to signify vegetable food in general. Thus in Gen. iii, 19, the Lord says to Adam—“In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread (or food) till thou return to the ground.” See also Gen. xviii, 5, and xxviii, 20, and Ex. ii, 20.

The most extended sense of the word, however, according to general usage, comprehends all farinaceous vegetable substances which enter into the diet of man; such as the farinaceous seeds or grain, nuts, fruit, roots, &c. And in this extended sense, Bread, in some form or other, has been the principal article in the diet of mankind, from the earliest generations of the human race, to the present time; except among the few, small and scattered tribes, which have, perhaps, ever since the days of Noah, in different parts of the earth, subsisted mainly on animal food.

It is nearly certain that the primitive inhabitants of the earth, ate their food with very little, if any artificial preparation.

The various fruits, nuts, seeds, roots, and other vegetable substances on which they fed, were eaten by them in their natural state, with no other grinding than that which was done by the teeth.

As the human family increased, and population became more dense and extended, and providential measures more necessary, the condition and circumstances of society gradually led to the invention and adoption of the simple, and, at first, rude arts of domestic life. Among these, was that of bruising the harder articles of their food, such as nuts and seeds, or grain, on flat stones, selected and kept for the purpose. By constant use, these stones in time became hollowed out; and being thereby rendered more convenient, men at length began to form mortars and pestles from stones; and probably the next step was the construction of the rude kind of hand-mills, which continued in use for many centuries; and indeed, which, with the stone mortars, have, throughout all ages and in almost every portion of the earth, been used in the ruder states of society.

When men became acquainted with the use of fire, they probably often parched their corn or grain before they pounded it; and afterwards, they learned to mix it with water into the consistency of dough, and to bake this, in an unleavened or unfermented state, on flat stones before the fire, or in the hot ashes or hot earth, or in the rude ovens which they formed, by digging holes in the earth, into which they put heated stones, and slightly covered them with leaves or grass, and then laid in the article they wished to bake, and over this strewed some leaves, and then covered the whole with earth.[A]

This kind of unleavened bread, undoubtedly constituted a very important, if not the principal article of artificially prepared food in the diet of the primitive inhabitants of the earth, for many centuries; and the same, or very nearly the same kind of bread continued in general use down to the days of Abraham; and it is probable that the unleavened bread used by his descendants at the feast of the Passover, before and after they left Egypt, was of the same kind.

It is hardly possible, however, that it could have been otherwise, than that, at a much earlier period, larger quantities of this dough were occasionally made, than were immediately baked, and consequently portions of it were suffered to stand and ferment; and by this means, men were in process of time learned to make leavened, or raised bread.

At how early a date, loaf or raised bread came into common use, it is impossible now to ascertain with any considerable degree of precision. The scriptures do not afford us any evidence that Abraham was accustomed to such bread; but the fact that Moses, at the institution of the supper of the Passover, the night before the Jews left Egypt, commanded them strictly to abstain from leavened bread, and to eat only the unleavened, proves conclusively, that the Israelites at least, were then accustomed to fermented, or raised bread.

Neither history nor tradition enables us to speak with any degree of confidence in regard to the period at which other nations became acquainted with the art of bread-making; but from all that has come down to us from ancient times, we learn that the primitive generations of every nation, subsisted on fruits and other products of the vegetable kingdom, in their uncooked or natural state.

“The Greeks assert that they were taught the art of making bread by their god, Pan; and Pliny informs us that this art was not known at Rome till near six hundred years after the foundation of that city. The Roman armies, he says, on their return from Macedonia, brought Grecian bakers into Italy. Before this time, the Romans prepared their meal in a kind of pap or soft pudding; and on this account Pliny calls them pap eaters.”

But though the Egyptians and Israelites were probably among the earliest portions of the human family, who became acquainted with the art of making loaf or raised bread, the quality of their bread continued to be exceedingly simple and coarse for many generations.

Even after the establishment of the Hebrew nation in Palestine—in the most splendid days of Jerusalem—at the period of the highest refinement of the Jews, in the arts of civil and domestic life, their fine flour, from which their choicest bread and cakes were made, was, in comparison with modern superfine flour, extremely coarse,—ground mostly by females, in hand-mills constructed and kept for that purpose.

From Rome the art of bread-making very slowly found its way over considerable portions of Europe. A thousand years after Julius Cæsar first entered Britain, the rude people of that country were little acquainted with raised bread. “Even at present,” says Prof. Thomson, “loaf bread is seldom used except by the higher classes of inhabitants, in the northern countries of Europe and Asia.”

In Eastern and Southern Asia, rice constitutes the principal bread-stuff; and this is generally prepared with great simplicity. In Middle and Western Asia, and in Africa, bread, though made of different kinds of grain, is prepared with almost equal simplicity. In Scotland, Ireland, and indeed throughout Europe generally, barley, oats, rye, potatoes, peas, beans, chesnuts, and other farinaceous vegetables, constitute the bread-stuff of most of the laboring people, or peasantry. In the islands of the Pacific and Southern oceans, the bread of the inhabitants consists of the plantain, bananas, yams, bread-fruit, and other like vegetables, simply roasted, baked, or boiled.

Bread, therefore, of some kind or other, made of some of the farinaceous products of the vegetable kingdom, has probably, in almost every portion of the world, and every period of time, been one of the first, and most important, and universal articles of food, artificially prepared by cooking, which has entered into the diet of mankind; and hence it has with great propriety been called “the staff of life.”

LAWS OF DIET.

Reasons why food in its natural state would be the best. Concentrated nutriment. Interesting experiments on animals. Mixtures of food. Leavened and unleavened bread. Qualifications of the best bread.

If man were to subsist wholly on alimentary substances in their natural state, or without any artificial preparation by cooking, then he would be obliged to use his teeth freely in masticating his food; and by so doing, not only preserve his teeth from decay, and keep them in sound health, but at the same time, and by the same means, would he thoroughly mix his food with the fluid of his mouth, and thus prepare it both for swallowing and for the action of the stomach, and by the same means also, he would be made to swallow his food slowly, as the welfare of the stomach and of the whole system requires he should.

Again, if man were to subsist wholly on uncooked food, he would never suffer from the improper temperature of his aliment. Hot substances taken into the mouth, serve more directly and powerfully to destroy the teeth, than any other cause which acts immediately upon them; and hot food and drink received into the stomach, always in some degree debilitate that organ, and through it, every other organ and portion of the whole system; diminishing, as an ultimate result, the vital power of every part—impairing every function, and increasing the susceptibility of the whole body to the action of disturbing causes, and predisposing it to disease. Again, if man were to subsist entirely on food in a natural state, he would never suffer from concentrated aliment. Every substance in nature which God has prepared for the food of man, consists of both nutritious and innutritious matter. The proportions vary in different kinds of food. Thus in a hundred pounds of potatoes, there are about twenty-five pounds of nourishing matter; while in a hundred pounds of good wheat there are about eighty pounds of nourishing matter. There are a few products of the vegetable kingdom which are still higher in the scale of nutriment, than wheat; and on the other hand there is a boundless variety ranging below wheat, extending down to three or four per cent. of nourishment. But nature, without the aid of human art, produces nothing for the alimentary use of man which is purely a concentrated nutrient substance. And God has constructed man in strict accordance with this general economy of nature. He has organized and endowed the human body with reference to the condition and qualities of those substances in nature, which He designed for the food of man. And consequently, while man obeys the laws of constitution and relation which should govern him in regard to his food, he preserves the health and integrity of his alimentary organs, and through them of his whole nature; and so far as his dietetic habits are concerned, secures the highest and best condition of his nature. But, if he disregards these laws, and by artificial means greatly departs from the natural adaptation of things, he inevitably brings evil on himself and on his posterity.

It has been fully proved that “bulk, or a due proportion of innutritious matter in our food, is quite as important to health as nourishment.” Human beings may subsist from childhood to extreme old age on good potatoes and pure water alone, and enjoy the best and most uninterrupted health, and possess the greatest muscular power and ability to endure protracted fatigue and exposure. But if the purely nutrient matter of the potato be separated out by artificial means, and human beings, fed exclusively on this concentrated form of aliment and pure water, they will soon perish, because the alimentary organs of man are not constituted and endowed for such kinds of food. And this is true of all animals, in the higher orders, at least.

We know that dogs fed on sugar and water, gum and water, fine flour bread and water, or any other kind of concentrated aliment, will soon languish, and droop, and emaciate, and die; but if a due proportion of proper innutritious substance be mixed with these concentrated forms of aliment, the dogs will subsist on them and remain healthy. So if horses, cows, deer, sheep, and other grass-eating animals be fed on grain alone, they will soon lose their appetite and begin to droop, and will shortly perish; but if a due proportion of straw or shavings of wood be given them with their grain, they will continue to do well. Man is affected in the same

manner. He cannot long subsist on purely nutritious substances. And the reason is not because these substances have no azote or nitrogen in them; nor is it because man _necessarily_ requires a variety of alimentary substances, but simply and exclusively because the anatomical construction and vital powers of the alimentary organs, are constitutionally adapted to alimentary substances which consist of both nutritious and innutritious matter; and therefore a due proportion of innutritious matter in the food of man is as essential to the welfare of his alimentary organs, as a due proportion of nourishment is to the support of his body.

Again, if man subsisted wholly on uncooked food, he would not only be preserved from improper concentrations, but also from pernicious combinations of alimentary substances. The alimentary organs of man, like those of the horse, ox, sheep, dog, cat, and most or all other animals of the higher orders, if not in fact, of all other animals without limitation, possess the vital capability of so accommodating themselves to emergencies, that they can be made to digest almost every vegetable and animal substance in nature; and they can, by long training, be educated to digest a mixture of these substances at the same time. Nevertheless it is incontestibly true, that the alimentary organs of man and of all other animals, can manage one kind of food at a time better than a mixed ingestion; for it is impossible that the solvent fluids secreted by the stomach and other organs belonging to the alimentary apparatus, should be at the same time equally well adapted to entirely different kinds of food.

I do not say that the alimentary organs of man cannot, by long habit, be brought into such a condition as that, while that condition remains, they will not manage a mixed ingestion of animal and vegetable food, with more immediate comfort and satisfaction to themselves and the individual, than they will an ingestion of pure vegetable food. But this does not militate against the general principle in the least; for it is nevertheless true, that the same organs are capable of being brought into a condition in which they will manage an ingestion of unmixed food of either kind, with less embarrassment and injury to themselves and the whole system, than they can the mixed food in any condition. Hence it is a general law of nature, concerning the dietetic habits of man, that simplicity of food at each meal is essential to the highest well-being of the individual and of the race.

God has unquestionably provided a great and rich variety of substances for man's nourishment and enjoyment; but it is equally certain that he did not design that man should partake of all this variety at a single meal, nor in a single day, nor season—but from meal to meal, from day to day, and from season to season, varying his enjoyment in strictest consistency with the great laws of his nature. And hence all artificial combinations of alimentary substances, and particularly those of a heterogeneous kind, and yet more especially the concentrated forms, must be more or less pernicious to the alimentary organs, and through them to the whole system.

Finally, if man subsisted wholly on uncooked food, the undepraved integrity of his appetite, his thorough mastication and slow swallowing, and his simple meal, would greatly serve to prevent his overeating, and thus save him from the ruinous effects of one of the most destructive causes operating in civic life.

Whatever may be the material, therefore, from which bread is made, when the artificial preparation is of that simple character which leaves the proportions of nutritious and innutritious properties, as nature combined them, and effects little change in the nutritious principles, and retains the natural requisition for the function of the teeth, and thus secures the proper chewing of the food and the mixing of it with the fluids of the mouth, and swallowing of it slowly, the artificial process militates very little, if at all, against any of the physiological or vital interests of the body. But if our artificial process of bread-making, concentrates the nutrient properties, and destroys the due proportion between the bulk and nourishment, and forms improper changes and combinations in the nutrient elements, and does away the necessity for mastication or chewing, and presents the food in too elevated a temperature, or too hot, and enables us to swallow it too rapidly, with little or no exercise of the teeth, and without properly mixing it with the fluids of the mouth, the artificial process or cooking is decidedly and often exceedingly inimical, not only to the vital interests of the alimentary organs, but of the whole human system.

In all civilized nations, and particularly in civic life, bread, as I have already stated, is far the most important article of food which is artificially prepared; and in our country and climate, it is the most important article that enters into the diet of man; and therefore it is of the first consideration, that its character should, in every respect, be as nearly as possible, consistent with the laws of constitution and relation established in our nature; or with the anatomical construction and vital properties and powers and interest of our systems.

If we contemplate the human constitution in its highest and best condition,—in the possession of its most vigorous and unimpaired powers—and ask, what must be the character of our bread in order to preserve that constitution in that condition? the answer most indubitably is, that the coarse unleavened bread of early times, when of proper age, was one of the least removes from the natural

state of food,—one of the simplest and most wholesome forms of artificial preparations, and best adapted to fulfil the laws of constitution and relation; and therefore best adapted to sustain the most vigorous and healthy state of the alimentary organs, and the highest and best condition of the whole nature of man, as a general and permanent fact; and hence it is very questionable whether loaf or raised bread can be made equally conducive to all the interests of our nature, with the simple unleavened bread.

I am aware that many professional men entertain a very different opinion on this subject, and speak of unleavened bread as being less nourishing and less easily digested. This may be true to a limited extent, in special cases of impaired and debilitated alimentary organs; but I am confident that as a general fact the notion is entirely erroneous.

“The whole people of Asia,” says Dr. Cullen, “live upon unfermented rice. The Americans, before they became acquainted with the Europeans, employed, and for the most part, still employ their maize in the same condition. Even in Europe, the employment of unfermented bread, and unfermented farinaceæ in other forms, is still very considerable, and we are ready to maintain that the morbid consequences of such a diet are very seldom to be observed. In Scotland, nine tenths of the lower classes of people—and that is the greater part of the whole—live upon unfermented bread and unfermented farinaceæ in other forms, and at the same time, I am of opinion that there are not a more healthy people anywhere to be found. We give it to all classes and both sexes with advantage.”

It is incontestibly true, that if two portions of the same kind of wheat meal be taken and made, the one into unleavened and the other into leavened bread, and both be eaten warm from the oven, the leavened bread will prove much more oppressive and difficult to manage in the stomach than the unleavened. But aside from the changes that are produced by the process of fermentation, there are many other considerations why unleavened bread of a proper quality and age, is better adapted to sustain the alimentary organs and general constitution of man, in their highest and best condition.

Nevertheless, it is very certain, that loaf or raised bread can be made so nearly in accordance with the vital laws and interests of our bodies, as scarcely to militate against them in any perceptible or appreciable degree. And when I say this, I mean not merely its effects on the health and longevity of a single individual, but its effects upon the human constitution, through successive generations, for a thousand years or more.

As a general criterion or rule, then, in regard to the character of bread, we perceive that the most perfect loaf or raised bread, is that which, being made of the best material, is light, and sweet, and well baked, and still most nearly retains all the natural proportions and properties of the original material.

MATERIAL OF BREAD.

Wheat. Extent of climate favorable to it. Injured by improper tillage. Removal of impurities. Washing of grain. Separation of the bran from the nutrient particles improper. Ancient Roman bread. Public bakers. Use of bad flour. Adulterations. Poisonous agents used to disguise them.

Among the materials used for making bread in our country—and, in fact, of all the known productions of the vegetable kingdom in any country, wheat is decidedly the best; and it is a remarkable fact, that wheat comes nearer to man than perhaps any other plant, in its power of becoming adapted to different climates, over a wide extent of the earth’s surface, so that it may almost be said that wherever the human species can flourish, there wheat can be cultivated.

“It is not certainly known,” says Prof. Thomson, “in what country wheat was first produced. Mr. Bruce informs us that he found it growing wild in Abyssinia; and in his opinion, that kingdom is the native country of the plant. It would seem,” continues the Professor, “to be originally an African plant, since it thrives best in Barbary and Egypt; and perhaps the mountains of Abyssinia, though within the torrid zone, may not differ much in point of climate, from the more northern plains of Egypt. Wheat is perhaps cultivated over a greater extent of the globe than any other plant. Excellent crops are raised as far north as Sweden, in latitude 60°; it is cultivated in the East Indies, considerably within the limits of the torrid zone; and in the North of Hindostan, it constitutes a chief article in the food of the inhabitants. In India, however, the plant seems to have deteriorated. It is always dwarfish, and the crop is said to be less abundant than in more northern climates.” Yet a cold climate is not most genial to the nature of this plant. “The wheat of France is superior to that of England; the wheat of Italy is still better than that of France; and perhaps the best of all is raised in Barbary and Egypt.”

Excellent wheat is raised in the southern, and western, and middle portions of the United States; and even in the northern and eastern parts of New England, very fine crops have been produced.

But the wheat and other cultivated products of the vegetable kingdom appropriated to the nourishment of man, like those on which our domestic animals subsist, are too generally, in civilized life, very considerably deteriorated, as to their wholesomeness, by the improper tillage of the soil. I have no doubt that it is true, as stated by those who have made the experiment, that the flour of wheat, raised on a cultivated soil recently dressed with crude, stable manure, may readily be distinguished by its odor, from the flour of wheat raised on a new and undepraved soil, or from that raised on a cultivated soil which has been dressed with properly digested manure. And if such and similar results of improper tillage can become the sources of serious evil to the human family, through their effects on the flesh of animals which man devours, and on the milk and butter which he consumes, surely the immediate effects of such a deteriorated vegetable aliment on the human system, must be very considerable.

They who have never eaten bread made of wheat, recently produced by a pure virgin soil, have but a very imperfect notion of the deliciousness of good bread; such as is often to be met with in the comfortable log houses in our western country. It is probably true that the new soil, in its virgin purity, before it becomes exhausted by tillage, and debauched by the means which man uses to enrich and stimulate it, produces most, if not all kinds of vegetables appropriate for human aliment, in a more perfect and healthy state, than any soil which has been long under cultivation, can be made to do. Nevertheless, by a proper application of physiological principles to agriculture, many of the evils which now result from improper tillage may easily be avoided, and the quality of all those vegetable substances which enter into the diet of man may be very greatly improved, both in regard to wholesomeness and deliciousness.

But while the people of our country are so entirely given up as they are at present, to gross and promiscuous feeding on the dead carcasses of animals, and to the untiring pursuits of wealth, it is perhaps wholly in vain for a single individual to raise his voice on a subject of this kind. The farmer will continue to be most eager to increase the number of his acres, and to extort from those acres the greatest amount of produce, with the least expense of tillage, and with little or no regard to the quality of that produce in relation to the physiological interests of man; while the people generally, are contented to gratify their depraved appetites on whatever comes before them, without pausing to inquire whether their indulgences are adapted to preserve or to destroy their health and life. Yet if some one does not raise a voice upon this subject which shall be heard and heeded, there will soon reach us, as a nation, a voice of calamity which we shall not be able to shut our ears against, albeit we may in the perverseness of our sensualism, incorrigibly persist in disregarding its admonitions, till the deep chastisements of outraged nature shall reach the very “bone and marrow” of the human constitution, and fill our land with such a living rottenness, as now in some other portions of the earth, renders human society odious and abominable.

Whether, therefore, my voice shall be heard and heeded or not, I will obey the dictates of my sense of duty, and solemnly declare that this subject demands the prompt and earnest attention of every agriculturist and of every friend to the common cause of humanity; for it is most certain, that until the agriculture of our country is conducted in strict accordance with physiological truth, it is not possible for us to realize those physical, and intellectual, and moral, and social, and civil blessings for which the human constitution and our soil and climate are naturally capacitated.

When proper attention has been paid to the character of the wheat itself, the next thing is to see that it is thoroughly cleansed.

Sometimes, in consequence of the peculiarities of the season, or climate, or soil, or some other cause, there will be a species of disease affecting the wheat and other grains; and this may be of such a character as not easily to be removed nor counteracted by any means; but more generally the rust, and smut, and dust, which attach themselves to the skin of the grain, may, by proper care, be so far removed, as at least to render the meal or flour far more pure and wholesome than it otherwise would be. And here let me remark, that they are greatly deceived, who suppose that the bolting cloth which separates the fine flour from the outer skin or bran, also separates the impurities attached to the outer skin from the flour. By the process of grinding, these impurities are rubbed from the outer skin, and made quite as fine as any portion of the flour, and for the most part pass with the fine flour through the bolting cloth.

To remedy this, it is perhaps generally true, that in large flouring establishments, a kind of smut or scouring mill is in operation, through which the wheat passes, and is pretty thoroughly rubbed or scoured without being broken; and after this, it passes through a screen or winnowing mill, and thus is tolerably well cleansed and prepared for grinding. Yet this process by no means renders the wheat so perfectly clean and wholesome as washing.

Those who have given little attention to this subject, will probably think that the trouble of washing all their bread-stuff before it is ground, would be much greater than any benefit which would result from it. But a short experience in the matter, would convince every one who has a proper regard for the character of his bread, that the trouble of washing his grain bears no comparison to the improvement effected by it. Indeed, they who become accustomed to washing their grain, will soon cease to regard it as a trouble; and the improvement in the whiteness and sweetness of their bread will be so great, that they would be extremely unwilling to relinquish the practice.

When people are so situated that they can have things as they wish, they will also find that their bread is much richer, if the grain is ground but a short time before it is cooked.

The best way, therefore, is, for every family to raise or purchase a sufficient quantity of the best new wheat that can be produced by proper tillage in a good soil, and put that away in clean casks or bins, where it will be kept perfectly dry and sweet; and, according to the size of the family, take, from time to time, as they need it, one or two bushels, and wash it thoroughly but briskly in two or three waters, and then spread it out on a drying sheet or table, made for the purpose, and which is considerably inclined, so that the water remaining with the wheat will easily run off.

The skin or bran of the wheat is so well protected by its own oily property, that little or no water will penetrate it, unless it be suffered to remain in the water much longer than is necessary. Being thinly spread out upon the sheet or table in a good drying day, it will be sufficiently dry in a few hours for grinding. And I say again, let any one who loves good bread, wash his grain a few times in this manner, and he will be very reluctant to return to the use of bread made of unwashed grain.

It would be difficult to ascertain at how early a period in the progress of society, mankind, in the preparation of wheat for bread-making, began to put asunder what God has joined together, and to concentrate the more purely nutrient properties, by separating the flour from the part commonly called the bran. The Bible speaks of fine flour or meal, as a portion of the meat offerings of the temple, but it is not probable this approached very near to the superfine flour of the present time.

We are informed also that the Romans, more than two thousand years ago, had four or five different kinds of bread—one of which was made of the purest flour, from which all the bran was separated. This was eaten only by the rich and luxurious. A second kind, in more common use, was that from which a portion of the bran was taken; and a third kind, which was more generally used than any other, was that which was made of the whole substance of the wheat. A fourth kind was made mostly of the bran, for dogs.

But at whatever period in the history of the race, this artificial process was commenced, certain it is that in direct violation of the laws of constitution and relation which the Creator has established in the nature of man, this process of mechanical analysis is, at the present day, carried to the full extent of possibility; and the farina, and gluten, and saccharine matter of the wheat, are almost perfectly concentrated in the form of superfine flour. Nor is this all—these concentrated nutrient properties of the wheat are mixed and complicated in ways innumerable, with other concentrated substances, to pamper the depraved appetites of man, with kinds of food which always and inevitably tend to impair his health and to abbreviate his life.

Even the bread, which is the simplest form into which human ingenuity tortures the flour of wheat, is, by other causes besides the concentration I have named, too frequently rendered the instrument of disease and death, rather than the means of life and health, to those that eat it.

In cities and large towns, most people depend on public bakers for their bread. And I have no doubt that public bakers, as a body, are as honest and worthy a class of men as any in society. I have no wish to speak evil of any one; and it is always painful to me to find myself compelled, in fidelity to the common cause of humanity, to expose the faults of any particular class of men, when probably every other class in society is as deeply involved in errors which, in the sight of God, evince, at least, an equal degree of moral turpitude.

But public bakers, like other men, who serve the public more for the sake of securing their own emolument than for the public good, have always had recourse to various expedients in order to increase the lucrativeness of their business.

To secure custom and profit at the same time, they have considered it necessary, that a given quantity of flour should be made into a loaf as large and as white as possible, and free from any disagreeable taste, while at the same time it retains the greatest possible weight.

From a variety of causes, the quality and price of flour have always been very unstable. Sometimes the crops are small, or the foreign demand for flour or the home consumption is unusually great, or the season is unfavorable to the health of grain, and the wheat becomes diseased, or the harvest time is unfavorable, and the wheat sprouts before it is secured, or large quantities of flour become soured or musty, or in some other manner damaged.

To counteract these things, and to make the most profitable use of such flour as the market affords them, the public bakers have been led to try various experiments with chemical agents, and there is reason to believe that in numerous instances, they have been too successful in their practices, for the well-being of those who have been the consumers of their bread.

According to treatises on bread-making, which have within a few years past appeared in European scientific journals, “alum, sulphate of zinc, sub-carbonate of magnesia, sub-carbonate of ammonia, sulphate of copper, and several other substances, have been used by public bakers in making bread; and some of these substances have been employed by them to a very great extent, and with very great success in the cause of their cupidity. They have not only succeeded by such means, in making light and white bread out of extremely poor flour, but they have also been able so to disguise their adulterations, as to work in with their flour, without being detected by the consumers, a portion of the flour of beans, peas and potatoes—and even chalk, pipe clay and plaster of Paris, have been employed to increase the weight and whiteness of their bread.”

“The use of alum in bread-making,” says a distinguished chemist, “appears to be very ancient. It is one of those articles which have been the most extensively and successfully used in disguising bad flour, and the various adulterations of bread. Its injurious action upon the health is not to be compared with that of sulphate of copper, and yet, daily taken into the stomach, it may seriously affect the system.”

“Thirteen bakers were condemned on the 27th of January, 1829, by the correctional tribunal of Brussels, for mixing sulphate of copper or blue vitriol with their bread. It makes the bread very white, light, large and porous, but rather tasteless; and it also enables the bread to retain a greater quantity of water, and thereby very considerably increases its weight. A much larger quantity of alum is necessary to produce these effects; but when of sufficient quantity, it strengthens the paste, and, as the bakers say, ‘makes the bread swell large.’”

If the statements of our large druggists can be relied on, the public bakers of our own country probably employ ammonia more freely, at present, than any other substance I have named. Pearlash or saleratus is also used by them in considerable quantities.

But even where these adulterations are not practised, the bakers’ bread is very rarely a wholesome article of diet.

If any dependence is to be placed on the testimony of several of the principal bakers and flour merchants in New York, Boston and other cities, the flour which most of our public bakers work into bread, is of a very inferior quality to what is called good “family flour,” and for which they pay from one to three dollars less per barrel; and they sometimes purchase large quantities of old spoiled flour from New Orleans and elsewhere, which has heated and soured in the barrel, and perhaps become almost as solid as a mass of chalk; so that they are obliged to break it up, and grind it over, and spread it out, and expose it to the air, in order to purify it in a measure from its acid and other bad properties; and then they mix it with a portion of much better flour; and from this mixture they can make, as they say, the very largest and finest looking loaf.[B]

But should the public bakers always use the best of flour, their bread, as a general statement, would still be very inferior to well made domestic bread, in point of sweetness and wholesomeness. Their mode of manufacturing bread—to say the least of it—destroys much of the virtue of the flour or meal; and hence their bread is only palatable—even to those who are accustomed to it—within twelve, or at the longest, twenty-four hours after it is baked.

But I must repeat, that in making these statements, I am not prompted by any unkind feelings towards public bakers; I have no doubt that they are as honest in their calling as any other class of men; but perhaps there is no other class pursuing an interest founded on the necessities of their fellow creatures, whose expedients to increase the lucrativeness of their business, are so immediately and universally injurious to the health of those on whom they depend for support.

If any of my statements are thought to be exaggerated or incorrect, I can only say, that with honest and benevolent intentions, I have diligently sought for the truth; and if I have been in any respect betrayed into error, I have been misinformed by public bakers themselves, who certainly ought to know the truth in this matter; and who could have no conceivable reason for making the general character of their calling appear worse than it really is. Nevertheless, I have no question that there are individuals in every city employed as public bakers, who are too honest—too conscientious—too upright in heart, to be guilty of any practice which they

consider fraudulent or improper.

Still, truth compels me to declare, that if we would have good and wholesome bread, it must be made within the precincts of our own domestic threshold; and by those whose skill and care are exercised more with a view to secure our health and happiness, than their own pecuniary interest.

PROPERTIES OF BREAD.

Superfine flour injurious—a probable cause of some common disorders. Objections to coarse bread. Its medical properties. Extensive experiments of its use, by soldiers and others. Use among European peasantry. Selection, preservation and grinding of wheat.

Whether our bread is of domestic manufacture or made by the public baker, that which is made of superfine flour is always far less wholesome, in any and every situation of life, than that which is made of wheaten meal which contains all the natural properties of the grain.

It is true, that when much flesh is eaten with our bread, or when bread constitutes but a very small and unimportant portion of our food, the injurious effects of superfine flour bread are not always so immediately and distinctly perceived as in other cases. Nevertheless, it is a general and invariable law of our nature, that all concentrated forms of food are unfriendly to the physiological or vital interests of our bodies.

A very large proportion of all the diseases and ailments in civic life, are originated by causes which are introduced into the alimentary canal as articles of diet; and disturbance and derangement of function—obstructions, debility and irritations, are among the most important elements of those diseases.

It is, probably, speaking within bounds, to say that nine tenths of the adults, and nearly as large a proportion of youth in civic life, are more or less afflicted with obstructions and disturbances in the stomach and bowels, and other organs of the abdomen, the symptoms of which are either habitual costiveness or diarrhœa, or an alternation of both; or frequent and severe attacks of what are called bilious colics, &c., &c.; and in children and youth, worms, fits, convulsions, &c. And I cannot but feel confident, that the use of superfine flour bread is among the important causes of these and numerous other difficulties.

I have indeed been surprised to observe, that in the hundreds of cases of chronic diseases of every form and name, which have come to my knowledge within the last five or six years, costiveness of the bowels has in almost every instance been among the first and most important symptoms. And I have never known this difficulty, even after an obstinate continuance of five, ten, twenty or thirty years, fail to disappear in a short time, after the coarse wheaten bread of a proper character has been substituted for that made of superfine flour.

Some physicians and other individuals, without properly examining the subject, have raised several objections against the coarse wheaten bread.

It is said, in the first place, that bran is wholly indigestible, and therefore should never be taken into the human stomach.

This objection betrays so much ignorance of the final causes and constitutional laws, clearly indicated by the anatomical structure and physiological economy of the alimentary organs, that it scarcely deserves the slightest notice. If the digestive organs of man were designed to receive nothing but digestible and nutrient substances, they would have been constructed and arranged very differently from what they are. As we have already seen, everything which nature provides for our sustenance, consists of certain proportions of nutritious and innutritious matter; and a due proportion of innutritious matter in our food is as essential to the health and functional integrity of our alimentary organs, as a due proportion of nutritious matter is to the sustenance of the body.

Another objection is, that although bran may serve, like other mechanical irritants and excitants, for a while, to relieve constipation, yet it soon wears out the excitability of the organs, and leaves them more inactive than before.

Here again, a false statement is urged by inexcusable ignorance; for it is not true that the bran acts in the manner supposed in this objection; nor are the effects here asserted ever produced by it.

It is true, however, that the very pernicious habits of some people, who use the coarse wheaten bread, entirely counteract the aperient effects of the bread; and it is true that others, depending wholly on the virtues of this bread for peristaltic action, and

neglecting all exercise, by their extreme inertness, and indolence, and overeating, bring on a sluggishness, and debility, and constipation of the bowels, and perhaps become severely afflicted with piles, in spite of the natural fitness of the bread to promote regular peristaltic action, and to prevent all these results.

A third objection is, that though the coarse wheaten bread may do very well for those who are troubled with constipation, by mechanically irritating and exciting the stomach and bowels, yet for that very reason it is wholly unfit and improper for those who are afflicted with chronic diarrhœa.

Here is still another objection founded in ignorance of the true physiological and pathological principles which it involves. The truth is, that the coarse wheaten bread, under a proper general regimen, is as excellent and sure a remedy for chronic diarrhœa as for chronic constipation.

I have seen cases of chronic diarrhœa of the most obstinate character, and which had baffled the highest medical skill and every mode of treatment for more than twenty years, yielding entirely under a proper general regimen, in which this bread was the almost exclusive article of food, and not a particle of medicine was used. And I have never known such a mode of treatment to fail of wholly relieving diarrhœa, whether recent or chronic; although a very great number of cases have come under my notice.

It is fully evident, therefore, that the bran does not act on the digestive organs as a mere mechanical irritant; for if it did, it would always necessarily aggravate, rather than alleviate diarrhœa. Nor does it relieve diarrhœa on the principle of a narcotic nor of a stimulant; for the effect of these is always to give an immediate check to that complaint; and in such a manner as to expose the system to a return of it. But the coarse wheaten bread _seems_ to increase the disease for a short time, at first, and then gradually restores the healthy condition and action of the bowels.

The mucilage of wheat bran is probably one of the most soothing substances in the vegetable kingdom, that can be applied to the mucous membrane of the stomach and bowels.

Chronic constipation and chronic diarrhœa, both spring from the same root. Where the constitutional vigor of the alimentary canal is very considerable, continued irritations, resulting in debility, will produce constipation; and these continued causes operating for some time, will often induce such a state of debility and irritability as is attended with diarrhœa:—and in other cases, when this constitutional vigor of the alimentary canal is much less, diarrhœa is far more readily induced, and rendered chronic.

Coarse wheaten bread, then, by its adaptation to the anatomical structure and to the physiological properties and functional powers of our organs, serves to prevent and to remove the disorders and diseases of our bodies, only by preventing and removing irritation and morbid action and condition, and thereby affording the system an opportunity of recovering its healthy and vigorous action and condition. And the thousands of individuals in our own country of every age—of both sexes—of all situations, conditions and circumstances, who within the last six years have been benefited by using the coarse wheaten bread, instead of that made of superfine flour, are living witnesses of the virtues of that bread.

But the testimony in favor of coarse wheaten bread as an important article in the food of man, is by no means limited to our own country nor to modern times.

In all probability, as we have already seen, the first generations of our species, who became acquainted with the art of making bread, continued for many centuries to employ all the substance of the grain, which they coarsely mashed in their rude mortars or mills. And even since mankind began, by artificial means, to separate the bran from the flour, and to make bread from the latter, the more close and discerning observers among physicians and philanthropists, have perceived and asserted, that bread made of fine flour is decidedly less wholesome than that made of the unbolted wheat meal.

Hippocrates, styled the father of medicine, who flourished more than two thousand years ago, and who depended far more on a correct diet and general regimen, both for the prevention and removal of disease, than he did on medicine, particularly commended the unbolted wheat meal bread, “for its salutary effects upon the bowels.” It was a fact well understood by the ancients, that this bread was much more conducive to the general health and vigor of their bodies, and every way better adapted to nourish and sustain them than that made of the fine flour. And accordingly, their wrestlers and others who were trained for great bodily power, “ate only the coarse wheaten bread, to preserve them in their strength of limbs.” The Spartans were famous for this kind of bread; and we learn from Pliny that the Romans, as a nation, at that period of their history when they were the most remarkable for bodily vigor and personal prowess and achievement, knew no other bread for three hundred years. The warlike and powerful nations which overran the Roman Empire, and finally spread over the greater part of Europe, used no other kind of bread than that which

was made of the whole substance of the grain; and from the fall of the Roman Empire to the present day, a large proportion of the inhabitants of all Europe and the greater part of Asia, have rarely used any other kind of bread.

“If you set any value on health, and have a mind to preserve nature,”—said Thomas Tryon, student in physic, in his “Way to Health, Long Life and Happiness,” published in London, in the latter part of the fifteenth century,—“you must not separate the finest from the coarsest flour; because that which is fine is naturally of an obstructive and stopping quality; but, on the contrary, the other, which is coarse, is of a cleansing and opening nature, therefore the bread is best which is made of both together. It is more wholesome, easier of digestion, and more strengthening than bread made of the finest flour. It must be confessed, that the nutrimentive quality is contained in the fine flour; yet, in the branny part is contained the opening and digestive quality; and there is as great a necessity for the one as the other, for the support of health: that which is accounted the worst is as good and beneficial to nature as the best; for when the finest flour is separated from the coarsest and branny parts, neither the one nor the other has the true operations of the wheat meal. The eating of fine bread, therefore, is inimical to health, and contrary both to nature and reason; and was at first invented to gratify _wanton_ and _luxurious_ persons, who are ignorant both of themselves, and the true virtue and efficacy of natural things.”

“Baron Steuben has often told me,” says Judge Peters, “that the peculiar healthfulness of the Prussian soldiers, was in a great measure to be attributed to their ammunition bread, made of grain, triturated or ground, but not bolted; which was accounted the most wholesome and nutritious part of their rations.”[C]

“The Dutch sailors, in the days of their naval glory, were supplied with the same kind of bread.”

“During the war between England and France, near the close of the last century,” says Mr. Samuel Prior, a respectable merchant of Salem, New Jersey—“the crops of grain, and particularly wheat, were very small in England, and the supplies from Dantzic, the Netherlands and Sweden being cut off by the French army, and also the usual supplies from America failing, there was a very great scarcity of wheat in England. The British army was then very extensive, and it was exceedingly difficult to procure provisions for it, both at home and abroad—on land and sea. Such was the demand for the foreign army, and such the deficiency of crops at home and supplies from abroad, that serious fears were entertained that the army would suffer, and that the continental enterprise of the British government would be defeated in consequence of the scarcity of provisions; and every prudential measure by which such a disastrous event could be prevented, was carefully considered and proposed. William Pitt was then prime minister of state, and at his instance, government recommended to the people generally throughout Great Britain, to substitute potatoes and rice as far as possible, for bread, in order to save the wheat for the foreign army. This recommendation was promptly complied with by many of the people. But still the scarcity was alarmingly great. In this emergency, parliament passed a law (to take effect for two years) that the army at home should be supplied with bread made of unbolted wheat meal, solely for the purpose of making the wheat go as far as possible, and thus saving as much as they could from the home consumption, for the better supply of the army on the continent.

“Eighty thousand men were quartered in barracks in the counties of Essex and Suffolk. A great many were also quartered throughout the towns, at taverns, in squads of thirty or forty in a place. Throughout the whole of Great Britain, the soldiers were supplied with this coarse bread. It was deposited in the store-rooms with the other provisions of the army; and on the day that it was baked, and at nine o’clock the next morning, was distributed to the soldiers—who were at first exceedingly displeased with the bread, and refused to eat it, often casting it from them with great rage, and violent execrations. But after two or three weeks they began to be much pleased with it, and preferred it to the fine flour bread.

“My father,” continues Mr. P., “whom I have often heard talk these things over, was a miller and a baker, and resided in the county of Essex, on the border joining Suffolk, and near the barracks containing the eighty thousand soldiers. He contracted with government, to supply the eastern district of the county of Essex, with the kind of bread I have mentioned: and he used always to send me with it to the depositories on the day it was baked: and though I was then a youth, I can still very distinctly remember the angry looks and remarks of the soldiers, when they were first supplied with it. Indeed they often threw their loaves at me as I passed along, and accompanied them with a volley of curses. The result of this experiment was, that not only the wheat was made to go much farther, but the health of the soldiers improved so much and so manifestly, in the course of a few months, that it became a matter of common remark among themselves, and of observation and surprise among the officers and physicians of the army. These gentlemen at length came out with confidence and zeal on the subject, and publicly declared that the soldiers were never before so healthy and robust; and that disease of every kind had almost entirely disappeared from the army. The public papers, were for months filled with recommendations of this bread, and the civic physicians almost universally throughout Great Britain, pronounced it far the most healthy bread that could be eaten, and as such, recommended it to all the people, who very extensively

followed the advice:—and the coarse wheaten bread was very generally introduced into families—female boarding schools, and indeed all public institutions. The nobility also generally used it; and in fact, in many towns, it was a rare thing to meet with a piece of fine flour bread. The physicians generally asserted that this wheaten bread was the very best thing that could be taken into the human stomach, to promote digestion and peristaltic action; and that it, more than anything else, would assist the stomach in digesting other things which were less easily digested, and therefore they recommend that a portion of it should be eaten at every meal with other food.

“Still, after this extensive experiment had been made with such happy results, and after so general and full a testimony had been given in favor of the coarse wheaten bread, when large supplies of superfine flour came in from America, and the crops at home were abundant, and the act of parliament in relation to the army became extinct, most of the people who had before been accustomed to the use of fine flour bread, now by degrees returned again to their old habits of eating fine bread. Many of the nobility, however, continued to use the coarse bread for a number of years afterwards. General Hanoward, Squire Western, Squire Hanbury and others living near my father’s, continued to use the bread for a long time, and some of them still used it when I left home and came to America, in 1816.”

The testimony of sea captains and old whalemen is equally in favor of wheaten bread. “I have always found,” said a very intelligent sea captain of more than thirty years’ experience, “that the coarser my ship bread, the healthier my crew is.”

A writer in Rees’ Cyclopædia, (article Bread) says—“The inhabitants of Westphalia, who are a hardy and robust people, and capable of enduring the greatest fatigues, are a living testimony to the salutary effects of this sort of bread; and it is remarkable that they are very seldom attacked by acute fevers, and those other diseases which are from bad humors.”

In short, as I have already stated, the bread of a large portion of the laboring class, or peasantry, throughout Europe, Asia and Africa, and the islands of the ocean, whether leavened or unleavened—whether more or less artificially prepared, is made of the whole substance of the grain from which it is manufactured: and no one who is sufficiently enlightened in physiological science to qualify him to judge correctly in this matter, can doubt that bread made in the best manner from unbolted wheat meal, is far better adapted to the anatomical structure and physiological powers of the alimentary organs of man, than bread made of superfine wheat flour; and consequently, the former is far more conducive to the health and vigor and general well-being of man than the latter.

If, therefore, mankind will have raised bread which in every respect most perfectly conforms to the laws of constitution and relation established in their nature, and is most highly conducive to the welfare of their bodies and souls, then must it be well made, well baked, light and sweet bread, which contains all the natural properties of the wheat. And if they will have this bread of the very best, and most wholesome kind, they must, as I have already stated, see that the soil from which their wheat is raised, is of a proper character, and is properly tilled,—that the wheat is plump—full-grown—ripe, and free from rust and other diseases; and then, before it is ground, they must see that it is thoroughly cleansed, not only from chaff, cockles, tares, and such like substances, but also from all smut, and every kind of impurity that may be attached to the skin of the kernel. And let every one be assured that this is a matter which really deserves all the attention and care that I suggest.

If human existence is worth possessing, it is worth preserving; and they who have enjoyed it as some have done, and as all the human family are naturally endowed with the capabilities to enjoy it, certainly will not doubt whether it is worth possessing; nor, if they will properly consider the matter, can they doubt that its preservation is worthy of their most serious and diligent care.

And when they perceive how intimately and closely the character of their bread is connected with the dearest interests of man, they will not be inclined to feel that any reasonable amount of care and labor is too much to be given to secure precisely the right kind of bread.

I repeat, then, that they who would have the very best bread should certainly wash their wheat, and cleanse it thoroughly from all impurities, before they take it to the mill; and when it is properly dried, it should be ground by sharp stones which will cut rather than mash it: and particular care should be taken that it is not ground too fine. Coarsely ground wheat meal, even when the bran is retained, makes decidedly sweeter and more wholesome bread than very finely ground meal. When the meal is ground, it should immediately be spread out to cool before it is put into sacks or casks:—for if it is packed or enclosed in a heated state, it will be far more likely to become sour and musty. And I say again, where families are in circumstances to do wholly as they choose in the matter, it is best to have but little ground at a time; as the freshly ground meal is always the liveliest and sweetest, and makes the most delicious bread.

When the meal is thus prepared and brought home, whether in a barrel or sack, the next thing to be attended to, is, that it be placed and kept in a perfectly clean, and sweet, and well ventilated meal room. It should on no consideration be put into a closet, or pantry, or store-room, which is seldom aired, and more rarely cleansed; and into which all manner of rubbish is thrown; or even where other kinds of provisions are kept. If the meal be put into a pantry or store-room which is confined and dirty, and into which old boots and shoes, and old clothes and pieces of carpet, and other things of this kind, are thrown—or where portions of vegetable or animal substance, whether cooked or uncooked, are habitually or even occasionally put and permitted to remain, it must be expected, as a matter of course, of necessity, that the quality of the meal will be considerably deteriorated by the impurities with which the air of the place will be loaded, and which will be continually generated there.

People generally have but a sorry idea of what constitutes true cleanliness; but they may be assured that they cannot be too deeply impressed with the importance of keeping their meal room as clean and sweet and well aired as possible.

FERMENTATION.

Chemical composition of flour. Yeast—modes of preparing it. Substitutes for it. Fermentation, and its products. Vinous, acetous and putrefactive fermentation.

Having procured good wheat, cleansed it thoroughly, and got it properly ground, and placed in the meal room, the next step is to take a portion of the meal and manufacture it into good bread. But in order that this may be done in the most certain and perfect manner, it is important that the properties of the meal and the principles concerned in bread-making should be well understood.

According to the statement of Prof. Thomson, of Edinburgh, one pound of good wheat meal contains ten ounces of farina or starch, three ounces of bran, six drams of gluten and two drams of sugar;—and it is because wheat contains such proportions of these substances that it makes the very best loaf bread. The farina or starch is the principal nourishing property;—the saccharine matter or sugar is also highly nutrient; but in the process of making loaf bread, it serves mainly, by its vinous fermentation, to produce the gas or air by which the dough is raised and the bread made light. The gluten is likewise a very nutrient property, but in loaf bread, it principally serves, by its cohesiveness, like gum elastic, or India rubber, to prevent the gas or air formed by the fermentation of the sugar, from escaping or passing off;—and the gas being thus retained, inflates or puffs up the dough, and makes it porous and light. The bran, with its mucilaginous and other properties, not only adds to the nutritiousness of the bread, but eminently serves to increase its digestibility, and to invigorate the digestive organs, and preserve the general integrity of their functions.

The wheat which is raised in Virginia and the southern states generally, contains a larger proportion of gluten than that which is raised in the western part of the state of New York. Hence bakers are able to make a larger loaf of bread out of a pound of southern flour than they can out of a pound of western flour; and consequently some of them have endeavored to make their customers believe that the southern flour is the most profitable. It certainly _is_ the most profitable for the baker; but it is not the most profitable for the consumer.

The next thing indispensably necessary to the making of good bread, is good lively sweet yeast, or leaven, to produce what is called the panary, or more properly, the vinous fermentation of the saccharine matter, or sugar.

Some bread-makers will do best with one kind of yeast or leaven, and some with another. I have generally found that people do best with those materials to which they have been most accustomed; but I am sorry to find so general a dependence on breweries for yeast. To say nothing of the impure and poisonous substances which brewers employ in the manufacture of beer, and which always affect the quality of their yeast, I am confident that domestic yeast can be made of a far superior quality. However light and good in other respects that bread may be which is made with brewers yeast, I have rarely if ever seen any in which I could not at once detect the disagreeable properties of the yeast.

There are various ways of making domestic yeast. One of the simplest, and perhaps the best, is the following, which was communicated to me by one of the best bread-makers I ever saw:

“Put into one gallon of water a double handful of hops;—boil them fifteen or twenty minutes, then strain off the water while it is scalding hot;—stir in wheat flour or meal till it becomes a thick batter, so that it will hardly pour;—let it stand till it becomes about blood warm, then add a pint of good lively yeast, and stir it well; and then let it stand in a place where it will be kept at a temperature of about 70° F. till it becomes perfectly light, whether more or less time is required; and then it is fit for use;—or if it is desired to keep a portion of it, let it stand several hours and become cool; and then put it into a clean jug and cork it tight, and place it in the

cellar where it will keep cool; and it may be preserved good, ten or twelve days, and even longer."

Another way by which yeast when thus made may be preserved much longer, and perhaps more conveniently, is, to take it when it has become perfectly light, and stir in good Indian meal until it becomes a hard dough: then take this dough and make it into small thin cakes, and dry them perfectly, without baking or cooking them at all. These cakes, if kept perfectly dry, will be good for several weeks and even months.

When yeast is needed, take some of these cakes (more or less according to the quantity of bread desired) and break them fine and dissolve them in warm water, and then stir in some wheat flour till a batter is formed, which should be kept at a temperature of about 60° F. till the yeast becomes light and lively, and fitted for making bread.

Others, in making this yeast, originally put into the water with the hops, a double handful of good clean wheat bran, and boil them up together and strain off the water as above described: others again, boil up a quantity of wheat bran without the hops, and make their yeast in all other respects as above described.

The milk yeast is greatly preferred by many; and when it is well managed, it certainly makes very handsome bread. The way of making it is simple. Take a quart of milk fresh from the cow, (more or less according to the quantity of bread desired,)—a little salt is generally added, and some add about half a pint of water blood warm, but this is not essential;—then stir wheat flour or meal into the milk till it forms a moderately thick batter; and then cover it over, and place it where it will remain at a temperature of from 60° to 70° F. till it becomes perfectly light. It should then be used immediately: and let it be remembered that dough made with this yeast will sour sooner than that made with other yeast; and also that the bread after it is baked will become extremely dry and _crumbly_ much sooner than bread made with other yeast. Yet this bread, when a day old, is exceedingly light and beautiful: albeit some dislike the animal smell and taste which it derives from the milk.

In all these preparations of yeast and dough, it should ever be recollected that "the process of fermentation cannot go on when the temperature is below 30° F., that it proceeds quite slowly at 50°, moderately at 60°, rapidly at 70°, and very rapidly at 80°."

If, therefore, it is desired to have the yeast or dough stand several hours before it is used or baked, it should be kept at a temperature of about 50°. But in the ordinary way of making bread, a temperature varying from 60° to 70°, or about summer heat, is perhaps as near right as it can well be made.

Prof. Thomson gives the following directions for making yeast in large quantities:—"Add ten pounds of flour to two gallons of boiling water;—stir it well into a paste, let this mixture stand for seven hours, and then add about a quart of good yeast. In about six or eight hours, this mixture, if kept in a warm place, will have fermented and produced as much yeast as will make 120 quartern loaves" (of 4 lbs. each.)

A much smaller quantity can be made by observing due proportions of the ingredients.

To raise bread in a very short time without yeast, Prof. Thomson gives the following recipe:

"Dissolve in water 2 ounces, 5 drams and 45 grains of common crystallized carbonate of soda, and mix the solution well with your dough, and then add 7 ounces, 2 drams and 22 grains of muriatic acid of the specific gravity of 1,121, and knead it as rapidly as possible with your dough;—it will rise immediately—fully as much, if not more than dough mixed with yeast—and when baked, will be a very light and excellent bread." Smaller quantities would be required for small batches of bread.

A tea-spoonful or more (according to the quantity of dough or batter) of super-carbonate of soda dissolved in water, and flour stirred in till it becomes a batter, and then an equal quantity of tartaric acid dissolved and stirred in thoroughly, will in a few minutes make very light batter for griddle or pancakes; or if it be mixed into a thick dough, it will make light bread.

Good lively yeast, however, makes better bread than these alkalies and acids: howbeit these are very convenient in emergencies, when bread or cakes must be prepared in a very short time; or when the yeast has proved inefficient.

We see then that wheat meal consists of certain proportions of starch, gluten, sugar, bran, &c.; and that in making loaf bread, we add yeast or leaven, in order to produce that kind of fermentation peculiar to saccharine matter or sugar, which is called vinous, and by which the gas or air is formed that raises the dough. But the sugar is an incorporate part of every particle of the meal, and is therefore equally diffused throughout the whole mass; and hence if we would make the very best loaf bread, the fermentive principle or yeast must also be equally diffused throughout the whole mass, so that a suitable portion of yeast will be brought to act

at the same time on every particle of saccharine matter in the mass.

But let us endeavor to understand this process of fermentation. To speak in the language of chemistry, sugar is composed of certain proportions of carbon, oxygen and hydrogen. The yeast, acting on the sugar, overcomes those affinities by which these substances are held in the constitutional arrangement of sugar, and the process of decay or decomposition of the sugar takes place, which is called vinous fermentation. By this process of decay, two other forms of matter are produced, of an essentially different nature from each other and from the sugar. One of them is called carbonic acid gas or air, being formed by a chemical combination of certain proportions of carbon and oxygen. The other is known by the name of alcohol, and consists of a chemical combination of certain proportions of carbon, oxygen, and hydrogen. Carbonic acid gas is also produced by animal respiration or breathing, by the combustion of wood, coal, &c. &c. and in other ways of nature and of art: but neither in nature nor in art is there any known way by which alcohol can be produced, except by that process of the decay or destruction of sugar called vinous fermentation.

The carbonic acid gas, produced in the manner I have stated, is the air which inflates or puffs up and swells out the bread, when there is sufficient gluten or other cohesive matter in the dough to prevent its escape.

If the dough be permitted to stand too long in a warm place, the fermentation, having destroyed most or all of the sugar, will begin to act on the starch and mucilage, and destroy their nature, and produce vinegar; and therefore this stage of it is called the acetous fermentation: and if it still be permitted to go on, it will next commence its work of destruction on the gluten; and this is called the putrefactive fermentation, because it in many respects resembles the putrefaction of animal matter.

The vinous fermentation, therefore, by which the dough is raised and made light, may be carried to all necessary extent, and still be limited in its action to the saccharine matter or sugar—leaving the starch and gluten, and other properties of the meal, uninjured; and this is the point at which the fermentation should be arrested by the heat that bakes the dough. If it be permitted to go beyond the sugar, and act on the mucilage and starch, and produce acidity, the excellence of the bread is in some degree irreparably destroyed. The acid may be neutralized by pearlash or soda, so that the bread shall not be sour; but still, something of the natural flavor of the bread is gone, and it is not possible by any earthly means to restore it; and this injury will always be in proportion to the extent to which the process of the acetous fermentation is permitted to go in destroying the nature of the starch, and the bread will be proportionably destitute of that natural sweetness and delicious richness essential to good bread. Yet it is almost universally true, both in public and domestic bread-making, that the acetous fermentation is allowed to take place; and saleratus, or soda, or some other chemical agent is employed to neutralize the acid. By this means we may have bread free from acidity, it is true, but it is also destitute of the best and most delicious properties of good bread; and generally, by the time it is twenty-four hours old—and this is particularly true of bakers' bread—it is as dry and tasteless and unsavory as if it were made of plaster of Paris.

Many bread-makers mix their saleratus or soda with their yeast, or introduce it when they mix their dough, so that if the acetous fermentation does take place, the acid is neutralized by the alkali, and therefore, not being perceived, it is supposed never to have existed, and the bread is called sweet and good; especially if a small quantity of molasses be employed in making the dough. Others far more wisely withhold their alkali till the dough is raised enough to mould into the loaf, and then if it is found to be in any degree acid, a solution of saleratus or soda is worked into it, so as just to neutralize the acid, and no more. This is infinitely better that no have sour bread, which, after all, is almost everywhere met with; yet the very best bread that can be made in this way is only second best. Happy are they who can make good light and sweet bread, without the use of molasses—without suffering the least degree of acetous fermentation to take place, and without employing saleratus, soda, or any other kind of alkali.

The third or putrefactive stage of fermentation rarely takes place in domestic bread-making; but it is by no means uncommon in public bakeries. Indeed it is thought necessary in the manufacture of certain kinds of crackers, in order to make them split open, and render them brittle, and cause them readily to become soft when dipped into water. But dyspepsia crackers, and all other kinds of bread made in this way are, to say the least of them, miserable stuff. For besides the fact that all the best qualities of the flour or meal have been destroyed by fermentation, the great quantity of alkali employed in neutralizing the acid, is necessarily injurious to the digestive organs.

PREPARATION OF BREAD.

Mixing. Much kneading necessary. Rising, or fermentation. Use of alkalies, saleratus and soda. Baking. Ovens. Alcohol in bread. Preservation of bread.

Now, then, the business of the bread-maker is, to take the wheat meal, prepared in the manner I have stated, and with all the properties I have described, and convert it into good, light, sweet, well-baked bread, with the least possible change in those properties; so that the bread, when done, will present to the senses of smell and taste, all the delicious flavor and delicate sweetness which pure organs perceive in the meal of good new wheat, just taken from the ear and ground, or chewed without grinding; and it should be so baked that it will, as a general statement, require and secure a full exercise of the teeth in mastication.

In order to do this, as we have seen, it is necessary, in the first place, that the wheat should be of the best kind, and well cleansed, and the meal properly prepared. In the next place, it is necessary that the yeast should be fresh, lively and sweet; and in the third place, it is necessary that the dough should be properly mixed, raised and baked.

Take then such a quantity of meal, in a perfectly clean and sweet bread trough, as is necessary for the quantity of bread desired, and having made a hollow in the centre, turn in as much yeast as a judgment matured by sound experience shall deem requisite; then add such a quantity of water, milk and water, or clear milk, as is necessary to form the meal into a dough of proper consistency. Some prefer bread mixed with water alone; others prefer that which is mixed with milk and water; and others think that bread mixed with good milk is much richer and better; while others dislike the animal odor and taste of bread mixed with milk. Perhaps the very best and most wholesome bread is that which is mixed with pure soft water, when such bread is made perfect. But whether water, milk and water, or milk alone is employed, it should be used at a temperature of about blood heat.

Here let it be understood, that the starch of the meal is of such a nature that, by a delicate process peculiar to itself, it becomes changed into sugar or saccharine matter; and when the fluid used in mixing the dough is of a proper temperature, and the dough is properly mixed and kneaded, this process, to some small extent, takes place, and a small portion of the starch is actually converted into sugar, and thereby increases the sweetness of the bread. Let it also be recollected here, that the saccharine matter on which the yeast is to act, is equally diffused throughout the whole mass of the meal; and therefore if the yeast be not properly diffused throughout the whole mass, but is unequally distributed, so that an undue quantity of it remains in one part, while other parts receive little or none, then the fermentation will go on very rapidly in some parts of the mass, and soon run into the acetous state, while in other parts it will proceed very slowly or not at all; and consequently large cavities will be formed in some parts of the dough, while other parts of it will remain as compact and heavy as when first mixed, and sometimes even more so. I need not say that such dough cannot be made into good bread; yet it is probably true, that more than nine tenths of the bread consumed in this country is more or less of this character. Nor, after what I have said, should it seem necessary for me to remark, that good bread cannot be made by merely stirring the meal, and yeast, and water or milk together into a thin dough or sponge, and suffering it to ferment with little or no working or kneading. Bread made in this manner, if it is not full of cavities large enough for a mouse to burrow in, surrounded by parts as solid as lead, is almost invariably full of cells of the size of large peas and grapes; and the substance of the bread has a shining, glutinous appearance; and if the bread is not sour, it is because pearlash or some other kind of alkali has been used to destroy the acid.

The very appearance of such bread is forbidding, and shows, at a glance, that it has not been properly mixed—that the yeast has acted unequally on different portions of the meal, and that the fermentation has not been of the right kind.

But if the yeast be so diffused throughout the whole mass, as that a suitable portion of it will act on each and every particle of the saccharine matter at the same time, and if the dough be of such a consistency and temperature as not to admit of too rapid a fermentation, then each minute portion of saccharine matter throughout the whole mass will, in the process of fermentation, produce its little volume of air, which will form its little cell, about the size of a pin’s head, and smaller; and this will take place so nearly at the same time, in every part of the dough, that the whole will be raised and made as light as a sponge, before the acetous fermentation takes place in any part. And then if it be properly moulded and baked, it will make the most beautiful and delicious bread—perfectly light and sweet, without the use of any alkali, and with all the gluten and nearly all the starch of the meal remaining unchanged by fermentation.

Proper materials, proper care, a due amount of labor, a suitable length of time, and proper temperature, are all, therefore, necessary to the making of good bread.

With your meal, and yeast, and water or milk brought together before you, then, proceed in the light of the instruction you have now received, to mix your dough; and remember that the more thoroughly you knead it, the more equally you diffuse the yeast throughout the whole mass, and bring it to act on every particle of the saccharine matter at the same time, and the whiter, lighter, and more delicious you make your bread.

Who that can look back thirty or forty years to those blessed days of New England's prosperity and happiness, when our good mothers used to make the family bread, but can well remember how long and how patiently those excellent matrons stood over their bread troughs, kneading and moulding their dough? and who with such recollections cannot also well remember the delicious bread that these mothers used invariably to set before them? There was a natural sweetness and richness in it which made it always desirable; and which we cannot now vividly recollect, without feeling a strong desire to partake again of such bread as our mothers made for us in the days of our childhood.

Let it be borne in mind, then, that without a very thorough kneading of the dough, there can be no just ground of confidence that the bread will be good. "It should be kneaded," says one of much experience in this matter, "till it becomes flaky." Indeed I am confident that our loaf bread would be greatly improved in all its qualities, if the dough were for a considerable time subjected to the operations of the machine which the bakers call the break, used in making crackers and sea-bread.

The wheat meal, and especially if it is ground coarsely, swells considerably in the dough, and therefore the dough should not, at first, be made quite so stiff, as that made of superfine flour; and when it is raised, if it is found too soft to mould well, let a little more meal be added.

When the dough has been properly mixed and thoroughly kneaded, cover it over with a clean napkin or towel, and a light woollen blanket kept for the purpose, and place the bread trough where the temperature will be kept at about 60° F., or about summer heat, and there let it remain till the dough becomes light. But as it is impossible to regulate the quantity and quality of your yeast, the moisture and temperature of your dough, and several other conditions and circumstances, so as to secure at all times precisely the same results in the same time, it is therefore necessary that careful attention should be given that the proper moment should be seized to work over and mould the dough into the loaf, and get it into the oven, just at the time when it is as light as it can be made by the vinous fermentation, and before the acetous fermentation commences.

If, however, by any means there should unfortunately be a little acidity in the dough, take a small quantity of saleratus, or, what is better, carbonate of soda, and dissolve it in some warm water, and carefully work in just enough to neutralize the acid. The best bread-makers are so exceedingly careful on this point, that they dip their fingers into the solution of saleratus or soda, and thrust them into the dough in every part, as they work it over, so as to be sure that they get in just enough to neutralize the acid, and not a particle more.

I must here repeat, that they who would have the very best of bread, must always consider it a cause of regret, that there should be any necessity to use alkali; because the acetous fermentation cannot in any degree take place, without commensurately and irremediably impairing the quality of the bread. And here it should be remarked, that dough made of wheat meal will take on the acetous fermentation, or become sour, sooner than that made of fine flour. This is probably owing principally to the mucilage contained in the bran, which runs into the acetous fermentation sooner than starch.

While the dough is rising, preparations should be made for baking it. Some bake their bread in a brick oven, some in a stove, some in a reflector, and some in a baking kettle. In all these ways very good bread may be baked; but the baking kettle is decidedly the most objectionable. Probably there is no better and more certain way of baking bread well than in the use of the brick oven. Good bread-makers, accustomed to brick ovens, can always manage them with a very great degree of certainty; and as a general fact, bread is sweeter, baked in this way, than in any other. Yet, when it is well baked in tin reflectors, it is certainly very fine; and so it is also when well baked in iron stoves. But the baking of bread requires almost as much care and judgment as any part of the process of bread-making. If the oven is too hot, the bread will burn on the outside before it is done in the centre; if it is too cold, the bread will be heavy, raw and sour. If the heat is much greater from below than from above, the bottom of the loaf will burn before the top is done: or if the heat is much greater from above than from below, the top of the loaf will burn before the bottom is done.

All these points therefore must be carefully attended to; and no small excuse ought to be considered a satisfactory apology for sour, heavy, raw or burnt bread; for it is hardly possible to conceive of an absolute necessity for such results; and the cases are extremely rare in which they are not the offspring of downright and culpable carelessness.

The best bread-makers I have ever known, watch over their bread troughs while their dough is rising, and over their ovens while it is baking, with about as much care and attention as a mother watches over the cradle of her sick child.

Dough made of wheat meal requires a hotter oven than that made of fine flour; and it needs to remain in the oven longer. Indeed, it is a general fault of bread of every description, made in this country, that it is not sufficiently baked. Multitudes eat their bread hot

and smoking from the oven in a half-cooked state; and very few seem to think there is any impropriety in doing so. But they who would have their bread good, not only a few hours after it comes from the oven, but as long as it can be kept, must see that it is thoroughly baked.

I have said that the process of vinous fermentation converts a portion of the saccharine matter of the meal into carbonic acid gas or air, by which means the dough is raised and made light; and that the same process converts a portion of the saccharine matter into alcohol. The alcohol thus generated is mostly if not entirely driven off by the heat of the oven when the dough is baking;—and in modern times, ovens have been so constructed in England, as to serve the double purpose of ovens and stills; so that while the bread is baking, the alcohol is distilled off and condensed, and saved for the various uses of arts and manufacture.

The question has, however, been frequently started, whether a portion of the alcohol thus generated, is not contained in the bread when it comes from the oven.

This question cannot be answered with entire certainty; but there are some facts in relation to it of considerable importance.

It is perfectly certain that if two portions of wheat meal or flour be taken from the same barrel or sack, and one portion be made into unleavened bread, and the other portion be made into the very best fermented or raised bread, and both be eaten as soon as they are baked, the fermented bread will digest with more difficulty, and oppress and disturb the stomach more than the unleavened bread will. Indeed it is well known and very generally understood, that few of the articles which compose the food of man in civic life, are so trying to the human stomach, and so powerful causes of dyspepsia, as fresh-baked raised bread.

It is now well known also that alcohol wholly resists the action of the solvent fluid of the stomach, and is entirely indigestible; and always retards the digestion of those substances which contain it. How far all this may be true of carbonic acid gas, is not yet ascertained; but it is difficult to account for the difference between leavened and unleavened bread, as above stated, without supposing that the alcohol or carbonic acid gas, or both of them, are in some degree concerned in rendering the leavened bread, when newly baked, peculiarly oppressive and injurious to the stomach.

This, be it remembered, is purely a conjecture of my own; and I am not entirely certain that it is correct; but I see no other way of meeting the difficulty.

Be it as it may, however, it is very certain that when the bread has been drawn from the oven, and permitted to stand in a proper place twenty-four hours, either by evaporation or some other means, it becomes perfectly matured, and so changed in character, that it is, if properly made, one of the most wholesome articles entering into the diet of man; and at that age, there is not the slightest reason to believe that a particle of alcohol remains in the bread.

When therefore the bread is thoroughly baked, let it be taken from the oven and placed on a perfectly clean and sweet shelf, in a perfectly clean and well ventilated pantry. Do not, as you value the character of your bread, put it into a pantry where you set away dishes of cold meat, cold potatoes, and other vegetables, and keep your butter, cheese and various other table provisions—in a pantry which perhaps is seldom thoroughly cleansed with hot water and soap, and where the pure air of heaven seldom if ever has a free circulation. The quality of your bread should be of too much importance to allow of such reprehensible carelessness, not to say sluttishness. And if you will have your bread such as every one ought to desire to have it, you must pay the strictest attention to the cleanliness and sweetness of the place where you keep it.

If in baking, the outer crust should become a little too dry and crispy, you can easily remedy this by throwing a clean bread or table cloth over it for a short time when it first comes from the oven; but if this is not necessary, let the bread stand on an airy shelf, till it becomes perfectly cool, and when it is twenty-four hours old, it is fit for use; and if it is in all respects properly made, and properly kept, it will continue to be sweet and delicious bread for two or even three weeks, except perhaps in very hot and sultry weather.

When we have acquired the art of making such bread as I have described, in the very best manner, then have we carried the art of cooking to the very height of perfection; for it is not only true, that there is no other artificially prepared article in human diet of so much importance as bread, but it is also true that there is no other preparation in the whole round of cooking, which requires so much care, and attention, and experience, and skill, and wisdom.

WHO SHOULD MAKE BREAD.

Making bread by rule. Bakers. Domestics. Sour bread. An anecdote. Mrs. Van Winkle. Bad bread need not be made. How cake is made. Bread-making a drudgery. Excellent example of a mother. Eating bad bread. Importance of having good bread.

Who then shall make our bread? For after all that science in its utmost accuracy can do, in ascertaining principles and in laying down rules, there is little certainty that any one, who undertakes to make bread merely by rule, will be anything like uniformly successful. We may make a batch of bread according to certain rules, and it may prove excellent; and then we may make another batch according to the same rules, which may be very poor. For if we follow our rules ever so closely, there may be some slight differences in the quality or condition of the meal or the yeast, or something else, which will materially alter the character of the bread, if we do not exercise a proper care and judgment, and vary our operations according as the particular circumstances of the case may require.

Correct rules are certainly very valuable; but they can only serve as general way-marks, in the art of bread-making. Uniform success can only be secured by the exercise of that mature judgment which is always able to dictate those extemporaneous measures which every exigency and circumstance may require; and such a judgment can only result from a care and attention and experience which are the offspring of that moral sensibility which duly appreciates the importance of the quality of bread, in relation to the happiness and welfare of those that consume it.

But are we to look for such a sensibility in public bakers? Can we expect that they will feel so lively and so strong an interest for our enjoyment and for our physical and intellectual and moral well-being, that they will exercise all that care and attention and patience, and watch with that untiring vigilance and solicitude in all the progress of their operations, which are indispensably necessary in order to secure us the best of bread?

Or can we reasonably expect to find these qualifications in domestics—in those who serve us for hire? Many a female domestic, it is true, can make much better bread than her mistress can. Many a female domestic has an honest and sincere desire to do her duty faithfully; but can she be actuated by those sensibilities and affections which alone can secure that careful attention, that soundness of judgment, that accuracy of operation, without which the best of bread cannot uniformly, if ever, be produced?

No;—it is the wife, the mother only—she who loves her husband and her children as woman ought to love, and who rightly perceives the relations between the dietetic habits and physical and moral condition of her loved ones, and justly appreciates the importance of good bread to their physical and moral welfare—she alone it is, who will be ever inspired by that cordial and unremitting affection and solicitude which will excite the vigilance, secure the attention, and prompt the action requisite to success, and essential to the attainment of that maturity of judgment and skilfulness of operation, which are the indispensable attributes of a perfect bread-maker. And could wives and mothers fully comprehend the importance of good bread in relation to all the bodily and intellectual and moral interests of their husbands and children, and in relation to the domestic and social and civil welfare of mankind, and to their religious prosperity, both for time and eternity, they would estimate the art and duty of bread-making far, very far more highly than they now do. They would then realize that, as no one can feel so deep and delicate an interest for their husbands' and children's happiness as they do, so no one can be so proper a person to prepare for them that portion of their aliment, which requires a degree of care and attention that can only spring from the lively affections and solicitude of a wife and mother.

But it is a common thing to hear women say—"We cannot always have good bread, if we take ever so much pains;—it will sometimes be heavy, and sometimes be sour, and sometimes badly baked, in spite of all our care."

It may be true that such things will sometimes happen, even with the best of care;—but I believe that there is almost infinitely more poor bread than there is any good excuse for. The truth is, the quality of bread is a matter of too little consideration; and therefore too little care is given to the making of it. Moreover, the sense of taste is so easily vitiated, that we can very easily become reconciled to the most offensive gustatory qualities, and even learn to love them; and it is a very common thing to find families so accustomed to sour bread, that they have no perception of its acid quality.

"It is very strange," said a lady to me one day at her dinner table, "that some folks always have sour bread, and never know it." She then went on to name a number of families in the circle of her acquaintance, who, she said, invariably had sour bread upon their tables when she visited them—"and they never," continued she, "seem to have the least consciousness that their bread is not perfectly sweet and good."

Yet this very lady, at the very moment she was thus addressing me, had sour bread upon her own table; and although I had for many months been very frequently at her table, I had never found any but sour bread upon it. Still she was wholly unconscious of the fact.

Difficult however as most women think it is, to have good bread always, yet there are some women who invariably have excellent bread. I have known such women. The wife of Thomans Van Winkle, Esq. of the beautiful valley of Booneton, New Jersey—peace to her ashes!—was deservedly celebrated throughout the whole circle of her acquaintance for her excellent bread. Few ever ate at her hospitable board once that did not desire to enjoy the privilege again. I know not how often it has been my good fortune to sit at her table; but the times have not been few; and though long past, and she who presided there has slept for years in her grave, yet the remembrance of those times and of those hospitalities, awakens in my bosom a deep and fervent sentiment of gratitude while I write.

Never at the table of Mrs. Van Winkle did I eat poor bread;—and of my numerous acquaintances who had sat at her table, I never heard one say he had eaten poor bread there. Her bread was invariably good. Nay, it was of such a quality that it was impossible for any one to eat of it, and not be conscious that he was partaking of bread of extraordinary excellence.

Mrs. Van Winkle, said I to her one day, while I was feasting on her delicious bread, tell me truly, is there either a miracle or mystery in this matter of bread-making, by which you are enabled to have such excellent bread upon your table at all times, while I rarely ever find bread equally good at any other table, and at ninety-nine tables in a hundred, I almost invariably find poor bread? Is it necessarily so? Is it not possible for people by any means to have good bread uniformly?

“There is no necessity for having poor bread at any time, if those who make it will give proper care and attention to their business,” replied Mrs. Van Winkle, confidently. “The truth is,” continued she, “most people attach very little importance to the quality of their bread; and therefore they give little care to the preparation of it. If every woman would see that her flour is sweet and good, that her yeast is fresh and lively, that her bread trough is kept perfectly clean and sweet, that her dough is properly mixed and thoroughly kneaded, and kept at a proper temperature, and at the proper time moulded into the loaf, and put into the oven, which has been properly heated, and there properly baked, then good bread would be as common as poor bread now is. But while there is such perfect carelessness and negligence about the matter, it is not surprising that bread should be generally poor.”

Mrs. Van Winkle was undoubtedly correct. If anything like the care were given to bread-making that its real importance demands, a loaf of poor bread would rarely be met with. Indeed, if the same degree of care were given to bread-making, that is devoted to the making of cakes and pastry, we should far more generally be blessed with good bread.

Who does not know, that as soon as girls are old enough to go into company and to give parties, they begin to notice with great interest the qualities of the different kinds of cake and pastry which they meet with; and whenever they find anything very nice, they are exceedingly curious to learn precisely how it was made. And lest memory should be treacherous, they will carefully write down the exact rules for mixing and cooking it;—“so many pounds of flour, so many pounds of butter, so many pounds of sugar, so many eggs, and spice to your taste—the eggs to be beaten so and so, the whole mixed so and so, and baked so many minutes,” &c. &c. And thus with great care and industry they collect and write down, in a book which they keep for the purpose, all the recipes they can get hold of, for making every kind of cake and pastry used in society. And when they are preparing for company, they rarely if ever order Dinah or any other domestic to make their nice cake. They do not regard it as a menial office, but as a highly genteel employment; and their great desire to have their cake and pastry as good as it can be made, prompts them to undertake the manufacture of it themselves. And during this operation, the scales, the measures, the clock or watch, all are brought into requisition; the Recipe Book is placed upon the table before them, and carefully consulted; and everything is done with the utmost precision, and exactitude, and vigilance. And if the young lady feels any misgiving as to her own judgment, or taste, or experience, she earnestly inquires of Ma, or some one else who she thinks is capable of giving her advice in so important a matter.

If in the midst of this employment some one knocks or rings at the door, and a young gentleman is announced, she is not at all embarrassed, but perhaps hastens to the parlor with her delicate hands covered with dough, and with an air of complacency and self-satisfaction, says—“Good morning, Frank—how do you do? I am just engaged in making some cake—I hope you will excuse me for a few moments.”

All this shows that she regards the quality of her cake as of very great importance, and considers it not only perfectly respectable but highly _genteel_, for a young lady to be employed in making cake. But in regard to bread and bread-making, everything is very different; there is none of this early curiosity to learn how to make good bread. Young ladies do not on every occasion when they

find excellent bread, carefully and minutely inquire how it was made, baked, &c., and write down the recipe;—but when a batch of bread is to be made for the family, they either leave it for Mother or some domestic to make, or go about it themselves as some irksome and disreputable piece of drudgery; and consequently they turn the task off their hands with as much despatch and as little trouble as possible. If all things happen to be as they should be, it is well; if not, they must answer for the present. If the yeast happens to be lively and sweet, very lucky. If otherwise, still it must be used. If the dough rises well and is got into the oven before it becomes sour, very fortunate; if not, why, "nobody can avoid mistakes—and bread will sometimes be poor in spite of the greatest care;"—and if a batch of miserable bread is the result of such an operation, then all that remains to be done is to eat it up as soon as possible, and hope for better the next time.

If Frank or Charles or Edward should call while the young lady is engaged in making bread, she is perhaps quite disconcerted, and would not for the world have him know what she is doing;—she sends word to him, either that she is out, or that she is particularly engaged, and begs he will excuse her;—or if by any means she happens unexpectedly to be caught at her employment, she is greatly embarrassed, and makes the best apology she can for being engaged in such menial services.

As a matter of course, while such are the views and feelings entertained on this subject, and while such is the manner in which this duty is performed, it will ever be a mere accident if good bread is made; and a mere accident if such girls ever become good bread-makers when they are wives and mothers.

But if parents, and especially mothers, could view this matter in its true light, how differently would they educate their children. They would then feel that, grateful as it is to a mother's heart to see her daughters highly refined and elegantly accomplished, and able to "make the instrument discourse most eloquent music," and to transfer living nature, with all its truth and beauty and sublimity, to the canvass, still the art of bread-making, when considered in all its relations and intimate connections with human health, and prosperity, and virtue, and happiness, and with reference to the natural responsibilities and duties of woman, is actually one of the highest and noblest accomplishments that can adorn the female character. And then, too, would they consider it of exceedingly great importance, that their daughters should possess this accomplishment, even though they may never be in circumstances which will require the exercise of it.

Some eight or nine years since, I spent several months in the delightful village of Belvidere, on the banks of the Delaware, in Pennsylvania. While there, I enjoyed for a number of weeks the kind hospitality of S■ S■, Esq., a lawyer, and a gentleman of great moral excellence. Mrs. S. was born and brought up, I believe, in Philadelphia. Her father was a man of wealth, and she was the only daughter, and—almost as a matter of course—was indulged in all that she desired. But there were so many of the elements of a good wife and mother in her natural composition, that as soon as she entered into those interesting and important relations, she began to devote herself to the duties of them with a sincerity and conscientiousness which could not fail of success. Surrounded as she was, with wealth, and every comfort and convenience of life, and all of its luxuries that she desired, still she was industrious in her habits, and vigilantly attentive to all the concerns of her household. She usually kept three female domestics, who, by her kind maternal deportment towards them, were warmly attached to her. She had no difficulty in procuring nor in keeping help, because she always treated them in such a manner that they loved to stay with her; and she took much pains to qualify them for the proper discharge of their duties. They evidently loved her, and were sincerely desirous of performing all their services in such a manner as would be pleasing to her. Yet with all these advantages to justify her leaving such a duty to her domestics, Mrs. S. invariably made the family bread with her own hands. Regularly as the baking day came, she went into her kitchen and took her stand beside the bread trough, and mixed and kneaded the dough, and put it in its proper place for rising, and, in due time, moulded it into the loaf and baked it.

Do you always make your bread, madam? I inquired one day, as she returned from the performance of that task. "Invariably," she replied: "that is a duty I trust no other person to do for me."

But cannot your domestics make good bread? I asked. "I have excellent domestics," answered Mrs. S., "and they can, perhaps, make as good bread as I can; for they have been with me several years, and I have taken pains to learn them how to do my work; and they are exceedingly faithful and affectionate, and are always willing to do all they can to please me; but they cannot feel for my husband and my children as I do, and therefore they cannot feel that interest which I do, in always having such bread as my husband and my children will love and enjoy. Besides, if it were certain their care and vigilance and success in bread-making would be always equal to mine, yet it is wholly uncertain how long they will remain with me. Various circumstances may take place, which may cause them to leave me, and bring me into dependence upon those who know not how to make good bread; and therefore I choose to keep my own hand in. But, apart from all other considerations, there is a pleasure resulting from the performance of this

duty, which richly rewards me for all the labor of it. When my bread is made and brought upon the table, and I see my husband and children eat it and enjoy it, and hear them speak of its excellence, it affords me much satisfaction, and I am glad to know that I have contributed so much to their health and happiness; for, while my bread is so good that they prefer it to anything else upon the table, there is little danger of their indulging, to any injurious extent, in those articles of food which are less favorable to their health."

I need not say that this lady invariably had excellent bread upon her table. But instances of this kind are, I regret to say, extremely rare, even in christian communities; and therefore when such cases are known, they ought to be held up as most noble examples of female virtue, and receive such high commendations as their intrinsic merit deserves, and such as will be calculated to beget in the minds of others an exalted sense of the dignity and importance of such duties, and prompt every wife and mother to the intelligent and affectionate performance of them.

For it should ever be remembered that, though our children, while they depend on us for protection, are also properly the subjects of our government, yet as soon as they are capable of appreciating our authority and our influence, they are, like ourselves, moral agents, and ought, in all respects, to be governed and nurtured as such; and therefore it is not enough that we can give them such bread as we think best for them, and _compel_ them to eat it; but the grand point at which the mother should always aim, in this matter, is, to place before her children such bread as is the very best for them, and at the same time, to make it the most agreeable to them, and thereby make their duty and their enjoyment perfectly coincide.

Let no one therefore say she cannot always have good bread, until she can truly affirm that she has fairly made the experiment; that she has, in view of all its relations and bearings, accurately estimated the importance of the quality of her bread in regard to the welfare of her household, and, with a proper sense of her responsibilities as a wife and mother, has _at all times_ felt that interest and exercised that care and attention which so important a duty demands, and without which it must ever be a mere accident whether her bread is good or bad.

They that will have good bread, not only for a single time, but uniformly, must make the quality of their bread of sufficient importance, in their estimation and feelings, to secure the requisite attention to the means by which alone such an end can be made certain. They must not suffer themselves, through carelessness, to get entirely out of bread unexpectedly, and thus be obliged, without due preparation, to make up a batch of such materials as they may happen to have at hand, and bake it in haste, and hurry it to the table. But they must exercise providence and foresight: they must know, beforehand, when their supply of bread will probably be out, and when they will need to make another batch; and they must see beforehand that measures are taken to secure a proper supply of all the requisite materials—see that they are furnished with good meal or flour; and they must be sure to have the best of yeast or leaven, when they need it—and when the time comes for them to make their bread, if by any means the yeast should not be good, let them throw it away and make good, before they proceed to make their bread; for it is infinitely better that the family should even do without bread one day, and eat roasted potatoes, than that they should eat poor bread three or four days; and if, from any cause, the bread should be poor, it is incomparably better to throw it away, than to set it upon the table, to disgust the whole family with bread, and drive them to make most of their meal on something else.

If a lady can ever find a good excuse for having poor bread, she certainly can find none, except perhaps extreme poverty, for setting her poor bread on the table the second time. Yet, too generally, women seem to think that, as a matter of course, if they, by carelessness or any other means, have been so unlucky as to make a batch of poor bread, their family and friends must share their misfortune, and help them eat it up; and, by this means, many a child has had its health seriously impaired, and its constitution injured, and perhaps its moral character ruined—by being driven, in early life, into pernicious dietetic habits.

It was observed many years ago, by one of the most eminent and extensive practitioners in New England, that, during a practice of medicine for thirty years, he had always remarked that, in those families where the children were most afflicted with worms, he invariably found poor bread; and that, as a general fact, the converse of this was true; that is, in those families where they uniformly had heavy, sour, ill-baked bread, he generally found that the children were afflicted with worms.

A careful and extensive observation for a few years, would convince every intelligent mind that there is a far more intimate relation between the quality of the bread and the moral character of a family, than is generally supposed.

"Keep that man at least ten paces from you, who eats no bread with his dinner," said Lavater, in his "Aphorisms on Man." This notion appears to be purely whimsical at first glance; but Lavater was a shrewd observer, and seldom erred in the moral inferences which he drew from the voluntary habits of mankind; and depend upon it, a serious contemplation of this apparent whim, discloses a deeper philosophy than is at first perceived upon the surface.

Whatever may be the cause which turns our children and ourselves away from the dish of bread, and establishes an habitual disregard for it, the effect, though not perhaps in every individual instance, yet, as a general fact, is certainly, in some degree, unfavorable to the physical, and intellectual, and moral, and religious, and social, and civil and political interests of man.

Of all the artificially prepared articles of food which come upon our table, therefore, bread should be that one which, as a general fact, is uniformly preferred by our children and our household,—that one, the absence of which they would notice soonest, and feel the most,—that one which—however they may enjoy for a time the little varieties set before them—they would be most unwilling to dispense with—and which, if they were driven to the necessity, they would prefer to any other dish, as a single article of subsistence.

To effect this state of things, it is obvious that the quality of the bread must be uniformly excellent; and to secure this, I say again, there must be a judgment, an experience, a skill, a care, a vigilance, which can only spring from the sincere affections of a devoted wife and mother, who accurately perceives and duly appreciates the importance of these things, and, in the lively exercise of a pure and delicate moral sense, feels deeply her responsibilities, and is prompted to the performance of her duties.

Would to God that this were all true of every wife and mother in our country—in the world!—that the true relations, and interests, and responsibilities of life were understood and felt by every human being, and all the duties of life properly and faithfully performed!

VARIETIES OF BREAD.

Rye bread. Indian meal bread. Use of sour milk, or butter-milk. Acids. Family grinding.

I have thus far spoken almost entirely of wheaten bread, because I consider that the most wholesome kind of bread for ordinary use—for “daily bread.” When bread is made of superfine flour, the same general rules should be observed.

Rice, barley, oats, rye, Indian corn, and many other farinaceous products of the vegetable kingdom, may also be manufactured into bread, but none of them will make so good bread as wheat. Good rye, raised on a sandy soil, when cleansed and ground in the manner I have already described, and prepared in all respects according to the rules I have laid down, will make very excellent bread. Rye, coarsely ground, without bolting, and mixed with Indian meal, makes very wholesome bread, when it is well made. Good rye and Indian bread is far more wholesome for common or every-day use, than that made of superfine flour.

There are various ways of preparing Indian meal bread; and when such bread is well made, it is very wholesome—much more so, for every-day use, than superfine flour bread. “In a memoir lately read before the French Academy,” says the Journal of Health, “the author undertook to show that maize (Indian corn) is more conducive to health than any other grain; and, as a proof of this, the fact was adduced that, in one of the departments in which this grain was most abundantly and universally used, the inhabitants were remarkable for their health and vigor.”

One great drawback to the wholesomeness of Indian meal bread, however, is, that it is almost universally eaten hot, and too generally, pretty well oiled with butter, or some other kind of animal fat or oil. But Indian meal bread can be prepared in such a manner as to obviate these difficulties, and render it very wholesome.

Barley and oats may be manufactured into very wholesome bread; but they are little used for such purposes in this country.

Rice, peas, beans, potatoes, &c., may also, by mixing them with a portion of wheat or rye flour, be manufactured into bread; but, as I have already stated, there is no other kind of grain or farinaceous vegetable substance from which so good loaf bread can be made, as good wheat.

In making bread from Indian meal, and other kinds of farinaceous substances containing little or no gluten, yeast or leaven is rarely if ever used to make it light. More generally sour milk or butter-milk and saleratus or soda are used for this purpose; and they who do not well understand the principle upon which these substances make their bread light, often greatly impair their own success by their mismanagement.

It is, perhaps, most common for them to mix their sour milk or butter-milk and saleratus together, and wait till the effervescence is over, before they stir in their meal. But by this means they lose the greater part of the gas or air by which their dough should be made light.

The true way is, to take their sour milk or butter-milk, and stir meal into it till a thin batter is formed, and then dissolve their saleratus or soda, and stir that quickly and thoroughly into the batter, and then hastily add meal till the batter or dough is brought into the consistency desired.

If, instead of sour milk or butter-milk, a solution of muriatic or tartaric acid is used, the bread will be equally light. In this case, the batter should be first made with a solution of saleratus or soda, and then the solution of acid should be stirred in as above described. Batter cakes are made in this manner very light and very promptly. When from any cause batter or dough mixed with yeast fails to rise according to expectations, the thorough mixing in, first the solution of muriatic or tartaric acid, and then the solution of saleratus or soda, will, in a few minutes, make the whole mass very light; but such cakes and bread are not so sweet and savory as those raised with good sweet yeast.

I have said that recently ground meal makes far sweeter and richer bread, than that which has been ground a considerable time; but as it is not convenient for many families to send to a mill as often as they would like to have fresh meal, they are obliged generally to use staler meal or flour than they would choose. Yet every family might easily be furnished with a modern patent hand-mill, constructed after the plan of a coffee mill, with which they could at all times, with great ease, grind their wheat, and rice, and corn, as they want it, for bread and other purposes. With these mills they can grind their stuff as finely or coarsely as they wish, for bread or hominy, and always have it very fresh and sweet.

LIGHT & STEARNS,

PUBLISHERS AND BOOKSELLERS,

1 Cornhill, Facing Washington Street,

BOSTON,

Keep constantly on hand a general assortment of SCHOOL, THEOLOGICAL and MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS, for sale on the most reasonable terms, at wholesale and retail—together with a good assortment of STATIONARY. Among the works published by them, they would ask particular attention to the following:

DR. ALCOTT'S WORKS.

We have made arrangements to publish a regular series of works by DR. ALCOTT, of which these are a part:

THE YOUNG MOTHER,

OR

THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION OF CHILDREN.

Second Edition—Embellished by a Vignette.

BY DR. WM. A. ALCOTT.

The "Young Mother" is designed as an every-day manual for those who are desirous of conducting the physical education of the young—from the very first—on such principles as Physiology and Chemistry indicate. It inculcates the great importance of preventing evil—especially physical evil—by implanting good habits. We believe it to be the only work of a popular character, written by a medical man, on this subject, and that it is, on this account, doubly valuable. It is recommended by the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, and by the Press generally, as a work which should be possessed by every family. The following remarks by the editor of the Portland Christian Mirror, will give some idea of the manner in which it has been noticed in various parts of the country, though many of the best periodicals have spoken of it in still stronger terms of approbation:

"The subject of this book is of vital interest to the whole human family, and is treated by Dr. Alcott with the most intelligible simplicity. We hope it will find its way into the hands of all who are entrusted with the training and rearing of children; and that its sound views will supplant many of those hurtful maxims and practices which are lamentably prevalent, and that the existing

generation of mankind will be succeeded by a more healthy and a more moral race."

Price 75 cts.—By the dozen, 62 1-2 cts.

THE HOUSE I LIVE IN,

OR

THE HUMAN BODY.

Second Edition—entirely re-written, enlarged and improved.

FOR THE USE OF FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS.

BY DR. ALCOTT.

The great difficulty of making a subject which has hitherto been deemed dry and unintelligible, at once agreeable and interesting to the young mind, has led the author of this volume to describe the human body as a HOUSE.

The work treats, first, on the FRAME—consisting of the bones, muscles, tendons, &c.; secondly, of the COVERING—consisting of the skin, hair, nails, eyes, ears, &c.; and thirdly, of the APARTMENTS and FURNITURE—by which are meant the interior cavities and organs. Nearly every anatomical and physiological term which appears in the work is so used or so explained, as to be at once clearly understood and apprehended. The subject is illustrated by numerous engravings.

The best recommendation of this work is, that it has been universally approved of by the families and schools where it has been introduced, and by all medical men who have examined it. It has also received the entire approbation of the Press, and is selling rapidly.

Prices:—50 cts. single—$5.40 a dozen.

WAYS

OF

LIVING ON SMALL MEANS.

A CHEAP MANUAL ON HEALTH AND ECONOMY.

Fifth Edition—Enlarged and Improved.

BY DR. ALCOTT.

This work was prepared to meet the demand of the present exigency. Thousands of families, in the poorer and middling classes of society, are suffering from their unwise attempts to live in the style of those persons whose means are far greater than their own. The author has endeavored to convince them—in a brief manner—that a very few things only, are really indispensable to physical and even intellectual comfort and happiness—and that both these are within the reach of all, even in times like the present, would they be content to live in a manner at once rational, simple and healthful. It discusses the following subjects:

Estates and Business; Houses and Furniture; Equipage and Servants; Dress; Food and Drink; Medicine and Physicians; Books and Schools; Customs and Habits; Society; and gives several interesting Examples of living on small means.

With the emendations and improvements made in this edition, it is believed the work cannot fail to be regarded by every unprejudiced mind, as one of the most useful manuals of the day. Four editions, of 1000 copies each, were sold in a few weeks.

Prices:—25 cts. single—$2.50 a dozen—$20 a hundred.

Will soon be ready,

THE YOUNG WIFE.

Stereotyped—and Embellished by a beautiful Plate and Vignette.

BY DR. ALCOTT.

This work is based on the principle, that the great business of the wife is Education—the education of herself and her family. It therefore exhibits the duties of a wife, especially to her husband, in a manner at once original and striking. The author presupposes her to have set out in matrimony with christian principles and purposes; and hence proceeds to inculcate what he deems the best methods of applying them in the routine of daily life and conversation. We believe that no one can rise from the perusal of this volume without a higher respect for female character, as well as a higher confidence in the divine wisdom of matrimony.

The price will probably be the same as that of the Young Mother.

LIBRARY OF HEALTH,

AND

TEACHER ON THE HUMAN CONSTITUTION.

Monthly—Price $1 a Year, in advance.

DR. ALCOTT, EDITOR.

This is a Periodical work, originally called the “Moral Reformer and Teacher on the Human Constitution.” It is published in numbers of 32 pages each, in neat book style for binding into a volume, illustrated by engravings, and is now on the third year of its publication. The numbers of the two past years are for sale, bound in two neat volumes.

This work discusses, in a familiar manner, all subjects connected with physical education and self-management. It treats on the connection of LIGHT, AIR, TEMPERATURE, CLEANLINESS, EXERCISE, SLEEP, FOOD, DRINK, CLIMATE, the PASSIONS, AFFECTIONS, &c., with HEALTH, HAPPINESS and LONGEVITY. The editor takes the ground that a proper understanding of the constitutional laws of the human body, and of all its organs and functions, and a strict obedience thereto, are indispensable to the highest perfection and happiness—present and future—of every living human being. He deems this knowledge more and more indispensable in proportion to the progress of civilization and refinement. The work is pledged to support no system nor set of principles, any farther than that system and those principles can be proved to be based on the laws of Physiology, and revealed truth, and on human experience; and consequently its pages are always open to fair and temperate discussion.

The work has recently been warmly approved of by GEORGE COMBE, (author of the “Constitution of Man,”) as well as a large number of distinguished men of this country, among whom are the following:

Dr. John C. Warren, Dr. S. B. Woodward, Rev. Dr. Humphrey, Rev. S. R. Hall, Rev. Hubbard Winslow, Rev. R. Anderson, Rev. Baron Stow, Rev. B. B. Wisner, R. H. Gillet, Esq., Rev. Wm. Hague, Roberts Vaux, Esq., Dr. John M. Keagy, Dr. R. D. Mussey, Prof. E. A. Andrews, Rev. L. F. Clark, Rev. M. M. Carll, Rev. Dr. Fay, Dr. Sylvester Graham.

These recommendations are similar to the following, received from Dr. WARREN:

“The Library of Health, is, in my opinion, an excellent publication. It seems to be well adapted to aid in the great reform in habits and customs which is now going on in this country and Great Britain; and which, it may be hoped, will extend to other parts of the world. I beg leave to recommend this little work to all who are desirous of promoting their health of body and tranquillity of mind.”

Many of the most respectable Journals in the country, have also given their testimony in its favor. The following are a very few of them:

Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, Annals of Education, Abbott’s Religious Magazine, Boston Recorder, Christian Register, Christian Watchman, Zion’s Herald, New York Farmer.

We feel entire confidence in offering this publication to all who are interested in the improvement which Dr. Alcott is endeavoring to promote.

THE YOUNG MAN'S GUIDE.

BY DR. ALCOTT.

We keep a good supply of this work on hand at all times, for sale at wholesale and retail, at the publishers' lowest prices. It is too extensively known to need comment.

DR. GRAHAM'S WORKS.

A LECTURE TO YOUNG MEN,

ON

CHASTITY.

INTENDED ALSO FOR THE SERIOUS CONSIDERATION OF

PARENTS AND GUARDIANS.

Second Edition—Enlarged and Improved, with Notes.

BY DR. SYLVESTER GRAHAM.

The second edition of this important work is nearly double the size of the first, although the price is increased but a trifle. It is selling rapidly. Notwithstanding its value is extensively known, we cannot forbear to insert two or three

TESTIMONIALS.

The following remarks, from the Annals of Education for 1834, are from the pen of WILLIAM C. WOODBRIDGE; whose long and zealous devotion to the cause of education, and whose extensive travels and researches both in Europe and America, and special attention to the subject of which he here speaks, pre-eminently qualify him to judge accurately in the matter:

"We are rejoiced to see a work published in our country, on a topic in physiology which the 'artificial modesty' to which we have formerly alluded, has covered up, until a solitary, but fatal vice is spreading desolation through our _schools_ and _families_, unnoticed or unknown. The experience of teachers, the case-books of physicians, and the painful exposures which accident, or the dreadful diseases which follow in its train, have occasionally produced, have at length forced it upon public attention; and we hope it will not again be forgotten. The work before us is the result of extensive observation and study; its usefulness has been tested by its influence as a lecture; and its views of this evil are in accordance with the experience of the few teachers whom we have known possessed of the moral courage to encounter it. We would offer it to those who have earnestly desired a work on this subject, as one adapted to their purposes. We would recommend its perusal to every _parent_ and _teacher_. We would warn them that those who have been most confident of the safety of their charge, have often been most deceived; and that the youthful bashfulness which seems to shrink from the bare mention of the subject, is _sometimes_ the blush of shame for concealed crime. We feel bound to add, what abundant and decisive evidence has shown, that ignorance on this subject is no protection from the vice—nay, that it is often the original cause or encouragement of it; that it gives tenfold power to the evil example and influence which are so rarely escaped; and that a cure can be effected only by the most careful instruction and long continued discipline, both physical and moral, directed by sad experience, as is presented in this work."

The following brief but highly valuable testimony is from the distinguished superintendent of the Massachusetts Lunatic Hospital at Worcester:

"DEAR SIR:—The subject of your Lecture to Young Men, has been much neglected, although of great importance.

This lecture, while it sounds the alarm to the young, will not fail to awaken the attention of parents, if once perused. It is couched in language as delicate as the nature of the subject will admit, and may be read with propriety and benefit by all.

The evil of which it treats, if I mistake not, is more extensively sapping the foundation of _physical vigor_ and _moral purity_, in the rising generation, than is generally apprehended, even by those who are awake to the danger, and who have witnessed the deplorable influence of it upon its victims.

Yours, with respect,

S. B. WOODWARD."

The following is from Dr. ALCOTT; author of the works advertised on the preceding pages—addressed to Dr. GRAHAM.

"DEAR SIR:—The subject of your Lecture to Young Men is one of immense importance, and demands the profound attention of every friend of man. It is vain longer to shuffle it off, when those whose opportunities best qualify them to give an opinion, do not hesitate to say that solitary vice is rapidly gaining ground among us. It is a subject which must be met.

In this view, I rejoice to find that an increasing demand for your little work has justified the publication of a second edition. I rejoice, especially, to see such sound principles in physiology inculcated and warmly enforced. I have no hesitation in saying that it ought to be circulated throughout our country. It would thus not only save many a young person from the murderous fangs of quackery, but—what is much better—it would prevent the necessity of his applying either to quacks or physicians for relief from a situation in which he ought never to be placed."

The following is an extract from a letter written by the chaplain of one of our New England State Prisons to a brother clergyman in a neighboring state:

"I have read the book _three_ times, and derived more benefit from the last, than from either of the other readings. I like this book. Why is it not in the hands of every young man, especially in cities, to counteract the influence of indecent pictures and corrupting books?

One excellence in Graham's Lecture, as it strikes me, is, that it is so purely philosophical. Even an atheist might see force in his statements. A man must deny many of the best established principles of science, before he can deny most of the conclusions to which the lecturer comes."

The Boston Recorder, and several other valuable periodicals, coincide with these testimonials.

Prices:—62 1-2 cts. single—$6 a dozen—$45 a hundred.

A TREATISE

ON

BREAD AND BREAD-MAKING.

BY DR. GRAHAM.

There has been for some time a considerable demand for this work, and it will doubtless have a wide circulation among all classes of society.

Prices:—37 1-2 cts. single—$4 a dozen—$30 a hundred.

MISCELLANEOUS WORKS.

We would call attention to the following valuable and interesting works, by popular writers:

THE BOSTON BOOK, for 1836 and 1837, being Specimens of Metropolitan Literature. Edited by H. T. TUCKERMAN, and B. B. THATCHER. Elegantly executed, and embellished by Vignettes of the Great Tree and Tri-Mountain.

THE ITALIAN SKETCH BOOK. By H. T. TUCKERMAN. Second edition—revised and enlarged, with a plate.

THE PARENT'S PRESENT. Edited by the author of Peter Parley's Tales. A handsome present for youth; with cuts.

MOGG MEGONE—a Poem, descriptive of New England and its early inhabitants. By JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER. Pocket Edition.

BOSTON MECHANIC, and Journal of the Useful Arts and Sciences. The matter furnished by Practical Men. Valuable for mechanics and manufacturers; numerous Cuts.

SCIENTIFIC TRACTS, for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Complete in one volume. By B. B. Thatcher, Dr. Alcott, Dr. C. T. Jackson, Dr. Sylvester Graham, William Ladd, Lieut. R. Park, and others.

THE MORAL REFORMER, and Teacher on the Human Constitution. Edited by Dr. ALCOTT. This work contains a large quantity of matter on Health and Morals, as connected with the education of the Body. With cuts.

REMAINS OF MELVILLE B. COX, (Missionary to Africa,) with a MEMOIR. Published under the superintendence of his brother, GERSHOM F. COX. With a Portrait, and death-bed autograph.

SLAVERY AND THE DOMESTIC SLAVE-TRADE IN THE UNITED STATES. Letters addressed to the American Union for the Relief and Improvement of the Colored Race. By Prof. E. A. ANDREWS.

THE CARPENTER AND HIS FAMILY: ALSO, PRIDE SUBDUED. By the author of the “Black Velvet Bracelet,” &c. An excellent book for youth.

SKETCHES FROM SACRED HISTORY; containing the Story of the Moabitess—the Story of the Queen—and the Story of the Priest. A good book for youth.

MEMOIR OF WILLIAM WILBERFORCE. By THOMAS PRICE. Second American, from the London Edition. With an elegant Portrait, and an Appendix (not in the first edition.)

MEMOIR OF REV. S. OSGOOD WRIGHT, late Missionary to Liberia. By B. B. THATCHER. With a Portrait.

MEMOIR AND POEMS OF PHILLIS WHEATLEY. The Memoir written by a Relative of the Mistress of Phillis. The Poems from the best English Edition. With a Portrait.

SCIENTIFIC & LITERARY JOURNAL

FOR THE

DIFFUSION OF USEFUL KNOWLEDGE.

Semi-Monthly—$2 a Year, in advance.

This work is so well known (it being a continuation of the SCIENTIFIC TRACTS,) that recommendation is unnecessary. The first volume commenced January 1, this year. We believe all who want a scientific work which can be depended upon for its accuracy as well as general value, would be highly gratified with this periodical.

N. B.—The most favorable terms will be offered to those who may wish to purchase any of the preceding works by the quantity, for gratuitous circulation or for any other purpose—and a liberal discount will be made for cash.

FOOTNOTES.

Footnote A:

In this same manner the Sandwich Islanders cooked all their food, when they were first discovered.

Footnote B:

An aged and very respectable member of the Society of Friends, in New York, who had long been extensively engaged in the flour business in that city, and who had always had his family bread made in his own house, was one day asked by his daughter, why he never used the baker's bread:—"Because, my child," replied he, "I know what it is made of."

Footnote C:

See Memoirs of Philadelphia Agricultural Society. Vol. I. p. 226.

TRANSCRIBER'S NOTE.

This eBook makes the following corrections to the printed text:

● Pg iv ■ sour milk or buttermilk ■ sour milk or butter-milk

● Pg 38 ■ their bread stuff before it is ground ■ their bread-stuff before it is ground

● Pg 44 ■ the well being of those who have been the consumers ■ the well-being of those who have been the consumers

● Pg 49 ■ there are indviduals in every city ■ there are individuals in every city

● Pg 77 ■ stir in good indian meal ■ stir in good Indian meal

● Pg 88 ■ In order to this ■ In order to do this

● Pg 124 ■ "Keep ... no bread with his dinner, ■ "Keep ... no bread with his dinner,"

● Pg 130 ■ first the solution of muriatic or tartartic acid ■ first the solution of muriatic or tartaric acid

● Advertisements ■ MANUAL ON HEALTH AND ECOMOMY ■ MANUAL ON HEALTH AND ECONOMY

● Advertisements ■ SCIENFITIC TRACTS ■ SCIENTIFIC TRACTS

==========